Appendix so that it may be brought before this great forum of the American people through the RECORD of this Congress:

OUR PROGRESS IN PUERTO RICO

(By Luis Muñoz-Marín, Governor of Puerto Rico)

Just 3 years ago Puerto Rico celebrated a momentous occasion. For the first time in its history, industrial production surpassed agricultural production and we had arrived at a most important milestone on our long road to a better life for our people.

We have been passing other progress markers steadily in the past 3 years, and if the modest prosperity we are seeking is not exactly just around the corner, it is at least on the horizon. We hope and expect that by 1975 the standard of living will be as high in Puerto Rico as it was in the United States in 1950.

Puerto Rico today is vastly different from the Puerto Rico of 1940 because the people of Puerto Rico realized that they had to solve their own problems and because they had those qualities necessary to solve them.

To be able to appreciate the changes today, it is necessary to know something of conditions as recently as 1940. Puerto Rico was then a stricken land or, as a U.S. Senate commission concluded after a factfinding visit, "a hopeless case."

Beset with overpopulation, bereft of natural resources, besieged by hunger, illnesses of the body and a grave malady of the spirit, we seemed destined to a poverty-stricken existence derived out of one important crop—sugar. The cane season supplied 6 months of employment a year for the bulk of our workers but left them and their families idle and hungry the other 6 months. The annual per capita income was only $121, among the lowest in the world.

In the next few years, using the one natural resource we had plenty of—the hope and resourcefulness of our people—we began to climb out of that mire of hopelessness and poverty. Operation Bootstrap was born, a product of the mating of imagination with will.

Bootstrap had, and still has, one basic doctrine. That is, to be nondoctrinaire, to be hospitable to all ideas and to have a heart. We are not capitalistic nor are we socialistic—we are merely realistic, willing to try anything so long as it does not compromise our freedom and dignity.

One of our most important decisions, arrived at through trial and error, was to use Government funds as a catalyst to stimulate private investment in Puerto Rico.

We built factories to prove that they could be run at a profit and then sold them to private enterprise. We erected plants and invited companies to lease, rent or buy them. We put up hotels and engaged private operators to run them.

And, finally, we developed a tax program which exempts qualifying companies from commonwealth taxes for a period of 10 years.

Incidentally, qualifying for our tax program is not an easy matter. We have set up stringent requirements, prime among them being that we shall never accept a "runaway" plant.

We grant no inducement to any firm that is to close a factory anywhere in the States in order to open it in Puerto Rico. We are not luring runaway capital. We only want, and need, our proportionate share—and it is relatively infinitesimal—of the new capital that is generated each year in the United States so that we can provide the jobs, the decently paid jobs, our people need.

We contribute appreciably for our size to the economy of the United States. Our purchases from the United States have increased over fourfold in the past 15 years. We are now buying more the $600 million worth of U.S. goods every year.

Today we have 565 Operation Bootstrap plants in operation. Our per capita income has risen to $470, less than one-half that of Mississippi, the lowest of the States, but a great improvement nevertheless. Perhaps the greatest single proof of Puerto Rico's progress is that the average span of life has increased from 46 years in 1940 to 68 years today. We also have one of the highest literacy rates in the world.

Politically, Puerto Rico is a commonwealth, freely associated with the United States. This is a result of a compact between the people of Puerto Rico and the Congress of the United States approved in 1952.

Under this compact the people of Puerto Rico wrote their own constitution. It contains a bill of rights which not only incorporates the traditional American guarantees to the individual but also reflects recent advances with respect to social and economic matters, carefully adapted to the social and economic realities of Puerto Rico.

Prominent in our constitution are the rights of workers "to organize and to bargain collectively with their employers through representatives of their own free choosing" and "to strike, to picket, and to engage in other legal concerted activities."

The constitution of Puerto Rico also guarantees the right to choose one's occupation freely, to receive equal pay for equal work, to reasonable minimum wages, to protection against industrial risks to health and safety, and to an 8-hour workday with at least time and a half compensation for overtime.

Beyond these basic guarantees, we have developed a program of labor legislation that contributes more expansively to the climate of healthy labor union practices.

These constitutional provisions are supported by legislation on minimum wages, employment security, workmen's compensation with full coverage including agricultural workers, industrial safety, group insurance for small farmers and vocational rehabilitation of injured workers.

In January, after 2 years of collection to build the fund, we began our first unemployment insurance payments. We now also have a bureau of unemployment insurance for sugar workers, which provides compensation during the offseason.

Workers' education in Puerto Rico is provided freely through seminars and conferences organized by the department of labor and the Labor Relations Institute of the University of Puerto Rico. We teach the principles of democratic unionism, labor-management relations and every phase of labor legislation.

Our department of labor is giving full and honest accounting service and advice to any union that requests such service by a majority vote. Most of the unions affiliated with the AFL–CIO are requesting such services.

Our labor legislation, to a great extent, parallels our legislation granting 10-year tax exemption to new industries. To understand this parallel, it must be realized that the company with an operating loss is exempt from income taxes anyway. Therefore tax exemption does not mean anything if there are no profits. By the same token, our labor legislation will be meaningless if there are no jobs to protect, improve, and multiply.

With its right to strike fully protected, labor has the power to nullify the meaning of tax exemption for any employer. Similarly, with the freedom to cease operations and leave, management can drain good labor laws of all significance to the workers.

During our arduous struggle to lift our people out of poverty, both of these self-defeating extremes have, save for a few exceptions, been avoided.

We have continued to create jobs. Our economic development program has changed Puerto Rico from a one-crop economy to a predominantly industrial economy. Industrialization has brought 41,000 new jobs, and real wages in manufacturing rose by 57 percent between 1953 and 1958. About the same number of jobs has been created indirectly through the operation of the economic development program.

Average hourly wages in Puerto Rico are not only higher than in other countries in Latin America and all of the Near and Far East, but they are also higher than in most of Europe. In the 30 months following January 1956, hourly earnings in manufacturing rose over 40 percent in Puerto Rico while in the United States they rose only 7 percent.

With these gratifying accomplishments under our belts, we realize that we have made a good beginning. But that is all we have made. There is yet very much to be done.

Many of our people still live in substandard housing. There is still much unemployment. We still have an average of 80,000 totally unemployed people—13 percent of our entire work force.

Despite our progress we have only started to make inroads against unemployment. In the transitional period industrialization makes better jobs, better income, and a better standard of living before it provides full employment.

By 1975 we expect there will be enough jobs and sufficient pay to keep our people at home. Until that time, as U.S. citizens and with traditional American get-up-and-go, some of them will continue to move to places that offer a better chance of making a living for their families.

Some of them, I am afraid, will suffer from the prejudices, rackets, and exploitations that have afflicted every wave of migration to the United States. Because of their democratic background and inherent sense of liberalism, they will look to unions to safeguard their rights, and as long as unions do not let them down, they will make loyal and dependable members and, eventually, valuable leaders of the labor movement.

Puerto Rican workers today depend too much on the Commonwealth and Federal minimum wage laws. The ideal minimum for employees and management alike, to my way of thinking, is a minimum of government participation in the fixing of wages; but this is possible only where the workers are properly represented and able to negotiate for themselves.

That is the potential for unionism in Puerto Rico, and our laws and our disposition leave the door open for it to pursue its opportunity.

As I told the recent meeting of the AFL–CIO executive council in San Juan, there is a kind of union, undeserving of the name, that the people of Puerto Rico will not welcome. For the dealer in fraudulent contracts, the gangster, and the racketeer growing rich on labor's funds, there is no room in this Commonwealth. Our people do not tolerate dishonesty in government and they will not tolerate crooks in the guise of labor leaders.

The proud record of the AFL–CIO proves without doubt that the true spokesmen of American labor equally abominate these people and their practices and are willing to fight and sacrifice to wipe them out, as they must. Our government stands ready to give honest unionism our full support in that struggle.

Steel Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, for many years it has been fashionable to label

those who attack the Federal Government's tariff giveaway policies as spokesmen for marginal, inefficient industries or for selfish industries whose workers were poorly paid or for stagnant industries which resisted the trend to diversification.

Recent developments, however, have proven beyond question that those who fought against free-trade philosophy were far closer to the facts of economic life than their opponents. For in spite of systematic tariff whittling, in spite of our dogged devotion to multilateral trade councils, this Nation's trade posture has slumped to a point where the current outlook is for a $5 billion balance-of-payments deficit in 1959.

Equally significant is the fact that injury traced to abnormal foreign competition is no longer confined to our smaller industries. Would anyone call our automobile industry small? Is the steel industry small? Or the lumber and wood products industry? Is the textile industry small?

The steel industry provides one of the most dramatic instance of market penetration by imports. The United States, world's greatest steel producer, now buys more steel abroad than it sells, although the industry's capacity would have far exceeded production even without a strike this year.

These and other aspects of the steel import problem were explored by the magazine Business Week in its edition of August 1, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this timely article as recommended reading for my colleagues:

STRIKE GIVES FOREIGN STEELMAKERS A WEDGE TO WIDEN U.S. MARKETS—STEEL IMPORTS HAVE BEEN SEARCHING, ESPECIALLY INTO HOUSTON, BUT SELLERS MAY NOT BE ABLE TO HOLD ALL GAINS

While the steel industry sweats out its nationwide strike, both the companies and the steelworkers are casting many an anxious glance over their shoulders. They are watching to see if foreign steel suppliers will seize the opportunity to nail down a piece of the huge U.S. market for themselves. In the past couple of years, the industry has learned that oversea competition is not given to missing any bets.

SPARE CAPACITY

The U.S. steel mills—all but a handful of them now shut down—have plant capable of turning out 147.6-million ingot tons of steel a year. Even if the United Steelworkers had not gone on strike, no one in the steel industry expected all that capacity would be used this year; they figured there would be 30 million tons to spare.

Yet, in the first 5 months of this year, steel from foreign mills came into the United States at an average rate of 300,000 tons a month—or 3.6 million tons a year. (You can figure that 300,000 tons of steel products equal 400,000 ingot tons of mill production.) The imports themselves are only a small percentage of the steel used in the United States. But, say men in the industry, what justifies their worrying about steel imports is that foreign steel is coming into the country at all—despite the substantial gap between U.S. production and capacity.

RECENT SURGE

Imports have leapt lately: from 118,000 tons in May last year to 384,700 tons in May this year. Meantime, the United States has lost its longheld position as a net exporter of steel: in May it imported twice as much as it shipped abroad. This, the steelmen say, makes apprehension even more justified.

There's no disputing the fact that steel imports are up sharply; their rise came right along with U.S. industry's scramble to build up steel inventories as a hedge against the strike. But outsiders who know the steel industry say it's still too early to tell the true impact of foreign steel on the U.S. market. The spring of 1960, when industry should be well along on rebuilding depleted steel inventories, will be the earliest time for a clear reading on how much of their inroads foreign steelmakers will be able to retain. It will have to sell then in a well-supplied market.

BUSIER PORTS

Steel imports have been climbing fast. It's not possible to tell how much more is entering the country now than in May (the last month for which there are official figures). But it's plain from a survey made this week by Business Week reporters in the Nation's ports and industrial centers that imports in June and July surpassed those in May.

On the west coast, the amount of foreign steel unloaded at the ports of Los Angeles, Long Beach, and San Diego doubled in the 6 weeks from June 1 to the start of the steel strike; the week before last the three ports combined were handling foreign steel at a monthly rate of 35,000 tons. West German producers shipped most of the west coast's foreign steel until a few months ago. Now more and more is coming from Japanese mills. In Boston it's estimated steel imports so far this year are double those of last year. Toledo, which handled virtually no foreign steel until the Seaway opened, has unloaded 7,000 tons so far this year. Traffic up the Mississippi is growing heavier: In the first half of 1958, some 4,000 tons left New Orleans for upriver cities, so far this year 15,000 tons of foreign steel have been shipped upriver.

BEST CUSTOMERS

Probably the hottest place in the country for foreign steel sales is Houston. There, at least four agents of foreign steel companies have set up offices, and at least another dozen brokers are handling sales of other foreign mills. In the first 5 months of this year 300,000 tons of foreign steel (mostly reinforcement bars and oil country goods) came into the port of Houston compared with U.S. produced tonnage of 461,000 tons. In the same time last year, foreign steel ran to 83,800 tons and domestic to 359,000 tons. It's estimated that steel users in the Houston area buy 20 percent of all steel imported into the U.S.

The biggest man in this business in Houston is Andre Crispin, a 35-year-old Belgian, who holds the post of Belgian consul in Houston as well as running his import business. Some Southwest steel producers say that no matter what prices they charged, Crispin and the mills he represents would undercut them. Crispin, though, insists he's not trying to run anybody out of business. "There's simply not enough European steel available for export for it to become a primary source of supply in this or any other area of the country," he says. Nevertheless, he estimates that even after paying duties he is undercutting domestic prices by 2 percent to 5 percent.

WHO SELLS WHAT?

The American Iron & Steel Institute's import records show that the bulk of steel imports (79 percent in May) comes from Europe and that more than a third of European steel shipped to the United States comes from the mills of Belgium and Luxembourg. Steel producers in those two countries live almost wholly from exports. Their U.S. salesmen and agents are probably the most aggressive in the business. But in the competition to get a share in the U.S. market for imported steel, the West Germans and the French are selling harder; from April to May this year the West Germans boosted their steel exports to the United States from 57,800 to 84,000 tons, and the French from 59,000 to 74,500 tons.

Until this year, the bulk of the business done by foreign steel producers in the United States was in concrete reinforcement bars, pipe and tubing, rods, and wire nails. Some 52 percent of the barbed wire used in the United States last year came from foreign mills. The foreign mills' business in the United States is still heavily in those lines. But in the last few months they've boosted sharply their business in the generally more lucrative lines of plates, sheets, and strip steel.

UPWARD PRICES

Despite the hard selling that's going on, prices quoted for foreign steel have been bounding upward since the strike began. In almost every industrial center, Business Week's reporters found that foreign steel brokers and agents are offering prices now that are little different from those normally charged by domestic producers. Before the strike, the difference between U.S. and foreign mill products was, on the average, $40 to $50 a ton. Now it seems to be $10 a ton at best.

While prices have climbed, orders have gone down. There may be no firm connection between the two, though. It's much more likely that orders have slipped from their peaks in May and June because of the time lag between order and delivery of a shipment of foreign steel. This lag is rarely less than 6 to 8 weeks and for some products runs 3 months.

This dip in orders—several steel import agents say their bookings are 20 percent less this month than last—might give heart to some of the domestic producers who are apprehensive about foreign steel's inroads. But the domestic producers point out that in the last 6 months foreign steel mills have learned a lot about doing business in the United States and that their next step probably will be to set up stocks in warehouses here. (Apart from foreign specialty steelmakers, few do this at present.) So far, there's little indication from Business Week's survey that this is happening.

It's a Great Day for P. J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have been so busy here in Congress, pondering the great problems which confront our own Nation and the world in general, that too often we overlook some of the truly great events which occur in our own backyard.

I should like to take the opportunity today to call my colleagues' attention to an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on August 14. It is significant to me that this great Chicago newspaper would also pause in its reflections on world events to pay tribute to one of the most beloved citizens of Chicago, P. J. Cullerton.

Mr. Cullerton has just been honored by the Irish Fellowship Club, of Chicago when he was elected this organization's president last Wednesday. I wish to

commend the Irish Fellowship Club for its excellent selection. This honor bestowed upon Mr. Cullerton is particularly significant to those of us in public service because it proves that the citizens of this country know how to reward dedicated service to a community.

Mr. Cullerton indeed exemplifies the very essence of public service. Through all the years that he has held public office, he has served as a shining example of all that reflects the highest of standards in serving the people.

Since we Irish of all nationalities must stick together, I am indeed proud to be able to include the Chicago Sun-Times' editorial in today's RECORD.

The editorial follows:

IT'S A GREAT DAY FOR P. J.

Breathes there a Chicago Irishman with soul so dead, who never to himself has said, in this, my own, my native land I want to be No. 1 Irishman in the No. 1 Irish city in all the world—the city that put St. Patrick's Day on the calendar—Chicago?

And so Parky Cullerton has made it. Glory be, the Cullertons and the O'Donnells of Tipperary can now be singing that it's not a long way to Chicago when Bridget O'Donnell's grandson is the king of the Irish in that wonderful place where a Daley is mayor and a Ryan runs the county.

A county assessor is important, but anyone who knows anything about Chicago knows Assessor P. J. Cullerton didn't "arrive" as a VIP until Wednesday when he was elected president of the Irish Fellowship Club of Chicago.

The club has summoned many important men to bang its March 17 gavel and to introduce important men as speakers—and not all of the chairmen and not all of the speakers have been Democrats, as Parky is.

Parky has two important tasks to tackle. First, he should get the club listed in the phone book. Next he must get agreement on a speaker for next St. Patrick's Day. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts, and Vice President NIXON have spoken in the past and the Chicago Norske Club should have first call on Governor Rockefeller.

The problems of the leader of Chicago's Irish are not trivial, believe us, and Parky has our sympathy as well as best wishes.

Panamanian Politicians Exploit Anti-U.S Surge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for some months there have been almost daily news dispatches of ominous character from Panama or other parts of the Caribbean littoral and islands.

The latest news story from Panama by Mr. Ralph K. Skinner, well-informed special correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, in the July 30, 1959, issue of that paper, describes the current status in the deteriorating situation on the Isthmus.

As such, it merits reading by every Member of the Congress, especially those on committees dealing with Panama Canal questions.

The indicated new story follows:

PANAMA POLITICOS EXPLOIT ANTI-U.S. SURGE

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA, PANAMA.—Anti-Americanism is burgeoning here. It comes out in such indirect, as well as direct ways.

In a recent broadcast, former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd called on the Panamanian public to "invade" the Canal Zone on November 3, Panama's Independence Day.

His colleague, former Deputy Foreign Minister Ernesto Castillero furnished newsmen with more details of the plan. It was that Panamanians should "enter the Panamanian territory known as the Canal Zone" and occupy it symbolically and effectively. While Dr. Castillero said this should be done without violence, he offered no guarantees.

With such proposals coming from educated men, recently associated as top officials with the Panama Government, it is not difficult to understand the growing anti-America nattitude of the underprivileged, unemployed, badly oriented masses of Panama's people.

Feeling keenly their economic inferiority, the people of Panama see the Canal Zone as an island of prosperity in an ocean of distress. Under such circumstances, envy is not remarkable. The economic tragedy of Panama is attributed to the United States.

INCIDENT HINTED

Their emotions aroused, and feeling sorry for themselves, the people of Panama are ready to believe virtually anything their press and radio tell them. Almost without exception, they are fed a diet of anti-American propaganda.

There is strong evidence here that ultranationalist forces in Panama believe the next move is to provoke an international incident with the United States in the Canal Zone. It is their stated intent to bring Panama's case before an international group, even as the Suez Canal crisis eventually was brought before the United Nations. Such an incident may come even sooner than the threatened November 3 invasion of the Canal Zone.

President de la Guardia, Jr., says Panama-U.S. relations are deteriorating and that he regrets it sincerely. But he attributes the deterioration solely to the United States.

The President says the two principal causes of friction are inequality of wages in the Canal Zone and failure of the United States to purchase more in Panama.

Panama alleges that Panamanian citizens employed in the Canal Zone by the U.S. Government do not receive the same wages as U.S. citizens. This is termed discrimination and violation of the 1955 Treaty.

EXPLOITATION CHARGED

Washington replies that the treaty is being complied with to the letter. It is stated that negotiators of the treaty, both Panamanian and American, knew that wages for employees in categories plentifully available locally would be based on prevailing wages in Panama. Actually Canal Zone wages for such jobs average from 30 percent to 200 percent higher than in Panama. Panama asserts that its citizens should receive wages based on U.S. scales.

A leading Panama capitalist said the United States is taking advantage of the low wages in this capital city caused by 30,000 unemployed adults out of a total city population of 200,000. Traditionally wages are low in Panama because the family political oligarchy has refused to pass minimum-wage legislation, thus protection vested interests here.

The U.S. Government-owned stores in the Canal Zone usually purchase supplies from Panama and the United States. Purchases of some items are made from other countries. Panama says this violates the treaty, that everything humanly possible of being obtained in Panama should be purchased here, regardless of price.

As an example, the best rice grown in Panama does not meet minimum U.S. standards in the Canal Zone. Therefore rice is purchased elsewhere. This has been going on for several years, but Panamanian producers have not improved the quality of their rice.

The situation in beef is similar; choice quality is not available at any price in Panama. Rather than meet competition, Panamanian monopolists clamor for the Canal Zone to be made a captive market for inferior products, informed sources say.

When Panama's demands were not met by local U.S. officials, President de la Guardia wrote a personal letter on this matter to President Eisenhower and had it delivered to him in Washington.

It was several weeks before Mr. Eisenhower answered. This disturbed Panamanians who expected an immediate reply. The reply stated that the matter would be investigated and a report furnished.

Later, the acting American chargé d'affaires delivered to the Foreign Minister of Panama an aide memoire (an unsigned statement used in diplomatic circles) on the matter.

After deliberation, the Foreign Minister refused to accept the aide memoire, alleging that another personal letter from President Eisenhower should be forthcoming as this was on a President-to-President basis.

The Panama press was encouraged to consider the delivery of the aide memorie as a slap at Panama's dignity. One of the most influential men in this capital, who controls many avenues of propaganda, said the slight to the President was an insult to every citizen of Panama.

Newspapers blazed with the alleged affront, which offended the dignidad of Panama. Wire services reported the Panamanian reaction widely.

Washington reconsidered and, belatedly, there came a personal note from Mr. Eisenhower to President de la Guardia. Panama claimed a moral victory; Washington had been shown it could not trifle with Panama, the newspapers crowed.

If the United States erred in not understanding Latin-American dignidad, Panama may have erred in overplaying the incident, raising anti-American sentiment to a new high pitch.

Bernard Abrams, Elected National Commander, Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Bernard Abrams, of 60 Glenwood Avenue, Jersey City, N.J., has just been elected national commander of the Jewish War Veterans. I would like to call this fact to the attention of my colleagues and to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about him which appeared in the Jersey Journal, of Jersey City, N.J. The article follows:

NEW JEWISH WAR VETERANS COMMANDER MADE DECISION AT SEA

(By John Hoffman)

Bernard Abrams, of Jersey City, whose vigorous campaign led to his election as national commander of the Jewish War Vet-

erans is a man who doesn't believe in half measures.

Though a lawyer he was assigned as a medic in the Army in World War II and served 14 months in the European theater.

On the *Queen Elizabeth* returning from Europe in September 1945, he remembers then that he decided to join the Jewish War Veterans.

"I thought I'd give it a try and if it turned out to be everything I hoped, I'll stay with it and give it my best," Abrams remembers himself thinking.

Abrams joined the newly formed Lieutenant Grover Post in Jersey City and found that the JWV was all that he expected it to be.

He rose from post, to county, State, and finally the national levels in the organization, giving his best all the while.

His associates describe him as a fighter. The symbol with which he carried the JWV convention was a tiger which Abrams says describes the ways he goes after things.

Though not bombastic, Abrams doesn't think too much modesty about oneself is the greatest of virtues, especially about what one thinks.

There's no doubt about what he believes in as the delegates to the JWV convention learned.

Abrams platformed a strong and unrelenting civil rights program, and a dissent to the policy of Saudi Arabia which keeps American Jewish servicemen from being stationed in that country.

In the coming visit of the top Soviet, Nikita Khrushchev, Abrams is characteristically adamant.

"We cannot trust them, we must never let our guard down."

Abrams, who has been a resident of Jersey City since he was 2, graduated from Lincoln High School and was one of the top men in his class at John Marshall Law School. His law office is on Jackson Avenue.

Abrams, 45, is married to the former Clara Wolfson, of Bayonne. They have a 15-month-old son, Alan.

Letter: Educational Program of National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting letter from Mr. Richard B. Knott, superintendent of Consolidated School District No. 30 at Warrenton, Oreg., in which he expresses his reaction to an educational program of the National Science Foundation. I hope that all Members will take the time to read the letter as it is an excellent grassroots report on the work of the Foundation:

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 30, CONSOLIDATED,
Warrenton, Oreg., July 30, 1959.

Hon. WALTER NORBLAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WALT: It has been my privilege this summer to attend Brigham Young University on a National Science Foundation stipend. The physics institute that I attended was well conceived and well executed. It is the first time I have been able to return to a college campus since 1940. It has been a rewarding experience.

I have been interested in talking to nearly all National Science Foundation participants on the B.Y.U. campus this summer. Besides the physics institute previously mentioned, the college is also carrying on institutes in general science and radiation-biology.

All told, on this campus alone, there are in excess of 100 teachers in attendance. Over 90 percent of these teachers have indicated that they would not have been able to attend on their own. If the same situation holds true at the other 299 colleges holding institutes, you can imagine the ultimate effect of the program on science and mathematics teaching.

I also examined to some extent the manner in which these NSF institutes are being administered. I find conditions very healthy.

The National Science Foundation is presently assigning institutional responsibility to the Dean or head of the appropriate science or mathematics department, and the schools of education are used in a consultant basis only. This is most wise, as it insures teachers of true content courses. Comments would indicate that this feeling in our ranks is practically universal.

We received approval this spring of our application under Public Law 864 for $4,400 of science equipment, and we are thankful for the opportunity to attend institutes such as the ones observed here at Brigham Young University, that we may be of more service.

We heartily approve of the educational program presently being carried on under the direction of the National Science Foundation.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. KNOTTS,
Superintendent.

Red China and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks, I enclose my newsletter of May 27, 1959, which discusses the admission of Red China into the United Nations, as follows:

Should the United States recognize Red China and support her admission to the United Nations? Certainly not for the present, in my opinion. The question was discussed in a recent speech by Hon. Walter S. Robertson, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. He described the situations as follows:

The Chinese Communists conquered the mainland of China in 1949, and the Government of the Republic of China withdrew to Taiwan (Formosa). The Chinese Communists were at first mistakenly thought by some to be merely agrarian reformers, but proved to be ardent Communists. "The Peiping (Communist) regime was imposed by force with the volition of only an infinitesimal fraction of the Chinese people. * * * It has kept itself in power by blood purges and the liquidation of some 18 million mainland Chinese in 9 years."

The Far East is a critical area in the global struggle between East and West. American policy there is to encourage the newly independent, lesser developed countries to make progress in the ways of freedom, without falling within the orbit of the Communist bloc, and to build up our Far Eastern allies and friends. It opposes the further spread of Chinese Communist influence, and supports the non-Communist Government of Nationalist China.

Our recognition of Red China would on the contrary strengthen Red China by greatly enhancing her international prestige, and would weaken Nationalist China. "It would, as a practical matter, mean the liquidation of the Republic of China." From this would flow the following results:

(1) The strategic position of the free world would be weakened by the loss of Nationalist China's 600,000 troops in Taiwan, with resultant Communist military threat to Japan, the Philippines, and southeast Asia.

(2) Other Asian nations would feel that they could no longer rely on the protection of the United States against the Communist threat, and would have no alternative but to come to terms with the Red Chinese colossus. There would be a rapid expansion of communism throughout Asia, and America's moral position would suffer irreparable damage.

(3) It would blot out any rallying point in the world for non-Communist Chinese, and deliver Taiwan's 10 million people to the slavery of the mainland.

Of the 13 countries of the Far East, only 3 have recognized Red China. It has long been our policy in granting recognition to consider whether such action would be in the best interests of the United States, and whether the country seeking recognition had shown a willingness to live up to her international obligations.

Recognition of Red China would not be in the best interests of the United States for reasons given above, and Red China has not shown a willingness to live up to her international obligations.

When the Red Chinese gained control of the mainland of China in December 1949, they repudiated the international obligations of China, and confiscated, without compensation, properties of other nationals valued in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Communist China has flagrantly violated her armistice agreements both in Korea and Indochina, and her agreements for the release of American prisoners.

The admission of Red China to the United Nations is governed by the terms of its Charter. After due consideration, those terms were framed to provide not for universal membership, but for membership of "peace-loving nations willing to assume and live up to the obligations of the Charter."

The record shows that Communist China is not a peace-loving nation, but is an outlaw regime. It invaded Tibet. It took part in the aggression against South Korea. It is still threatening war in the Taiwan Strait.

Space Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] addressed this House on the subject of executive branch secrecy in the field of space research and space programing. It was his conclusion that if this House cut the appropriations of the National Aeronautics

and Space Administration, the responsibility should lie with the executive branch because the House could not be expected to grant automatically requests for funds for agencies which were not keeping the appropriate committees of the Congress fully infomed of their activities and plans. He used as proof of this hampering secrecy the recent report of the Senate Subcommittee on Government Organization for Space Activities, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Let me say that the continuing battle which Congress fights to keep itself fully informed of what the executive branch is doing is an important one, and that the gentleman from California has made a great contribution by his efforts in this field. But at the same time, I wish to make clear that the House Committee on Science and Astronautics has insisted on being kept fully informed of the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and that agency has been fully and frankly cooperative in its efforts to comply with the wishes of this committee.

The extensive records and material presented to this committee in the authorization hearings before this committee, and all other contacts we have had on virtually a daily basis with the NASA reflect credit on Dr. Glennan, the Administrator, Dr. Dryden, the Deputy Administrator, and Mr. Gleason, the Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, together with their staff. I am safe in stating that when the Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended to the House the authorization program it did, that these recommendations were on the basis of complete and thorough study. The action taken by the House on the appropriations whatever the reasons, represented the judgment of the Members by majority vote, but were not a reflection of any lack of study or gaps in information on the part of the committee of which I am chairman.

Now I also want to say that the report of the Senate subcommittee to which I have referred is an important study which deserves close attention for the thoughtful conclusions which it presents. It would be my view that the Senate report is correct in directing attention to the needs for Congress to have greater knowledge of how the detailed programs of the NASA and the Department of Defense relating to space are coordinated in the President's National Aeronautics and Space Council. Despite the similarity of name, the Space Council is separate and distinct from the Space Administration. This committee has not received a clear report of what the Council has been doing.

Because I have been well satisfied with the cooperation received from NASA, I would be greatly surprised to discover that there has been any serious gap in information supplied to this committee. If there are any such gaps known to the Members of this House. I should appreciate having them called to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and we shall move swiftly to fill them.

Report From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the following will be of interest to my colleagues. It appeared in the most recent issue of the weekly News Focus, volume II–32, edited and published by Charles L. Bartlett, who is also the Washington reporter of the Chattanooga Times:

REPORT FROM MOSCOW

(The following is excerpted from a report by a U.S. labor economist, Vladimir D. Chavrid, on his observations at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow. Mr. Chavrid, who was born in Russia, was assigned to the exhibition by the Labor Department to answer questions about the worker's life in America.)

I wish there were 20 American labor economists here familiar with American economic life. All of them could be busy answering thousands of questions of how the American people, and especially the average American worker, live. For the average Russian the hunger for knowledge, for facts about Americans, must be far greater than his hunger for food.

The questions most frequently asked deal with unemployment, wages, hours of work, living conditions, social security, unemployment insurance, and many others in this general area.

The attacks on the American way of life have been quite frequent and severe since the beginning of the exhibition. For the last few days, however, these have ceased for some reason or other. (The report was written just prior to the announcement of Khrushchev's visit to the United States.) To all of us, however, these attacks are one of the real indications of the success of our exhibition.

Do the Russian people believe what we tell them about America? After being here for several weeks and discussing with them our way of life, both at the exhibition and at other places, I am sure that the overwhelming majority believe what we tell them and what the exhibits show them.

At the Labor Department exhibit in the dome when some controversial matter develops between myself and some Russian professional propagandist, the crowd invariably will side with me rather than with him. These professional agitators invariably show up as soon as a sizable group of people begin to listen to my presentation.

For example the other day at the Labor exhibit I was explaining to a group of some 50 Russians the American social security programs. The group was vitally interested. Immediately a professional agitator broke in and told the crowd that this social security program did not apply to Negroes or foreign-born persons, that opportunities for these people in America were very poor.

This was an excellent opportunity for me to tell the crowd about myself—how I came from Russian some 30 years ago and how I was able to obtain an education in the United States and also a responsible job in the Labor Department. The agitator kept breaking in that I had already answered his question, but the crowd kept saying I should tell about myself and other groups like myself in the United States.

Frequently the agitator becomes embarrassed and disappears. It may be of interest to know that as soon as the Russian visitors learn that I was born in Russia of modest parentage they are extremely sympathetic and I could stay and talk there, as I often do, for as long as 4 hours at a stretch. It is often physically impossible to break away from the crowd.

When I leave the stand, many continue to follow me asking questions that they might have been uneasy to ask in the presence of the professional agitators. Many thank me most profusely for answering their questions while others apologize for their professional agitators. It is literally impossible to stop and answer a single question of 1 Russian without attracting a crowd of 50 or more Russians within a few seconds. Such is the hunger for knowledge about the United States.

Conservation Reserve Program Booms Production of Game Birds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that at least one of the agricultural programs of relatively recent establishment is gaining support and producing good results. I refer to the soil bank conservation reserve program. While there is room for more progress, the following article from the Milwaukee Journal of Sunday, August 9, 1959, by conservation writer Russ Lynch, shows the beneficial results of the conservation reserve program in Wisconsin:

SOIL BANK'S RESERVE LAND PROGRAM BOOMS PRODUCTION OF GAME BIRDS

(By R. G. Lynch)

Pheasant populations are up in almost every State. And it is no coincidence that cropland has been going wild on farms in the soil bank's conservation reserve at the same time that the birds have been increasing in the last 2 or 3 years.

Wisconsin this year has a sizable conservation reserve acreage for the first time (the 1959 signup tripled the total for preceding years). So Wisconsin game managers and sportsmen have reason to wonder what effect nearly 500,000 acres of "wild" grass, scattered over 9,000 farms, will have on upland game in the next 5 or 6 years.

The answer depends in part on the extent to which they can induce the landowners to delay weed control until after nesting time, to plant food patches and shrub cover, and in ruffed grouse country, to seed clover along with grass.

HELPS PHEASANTS

J. R. Smith, State superintendent of game, said last week that the most important impact of CR land would be to help restore the pheasant population in the southeastern counties, where last winter's heavy snow killed off perhaps a quarter of the breeding population. He also expects the rabbit population to benefit.

Pheasants are down in the area southeast of a line roughly drawn from Manitowoc to Dodgeville. This includes intensively farmed country where more grass cover could be important, particularly if it was undisturbed during nesting.

Rock County, a top agricultural area, will have more than 12,500 acres of grass, distributed over 203 farms, that cannot be grazed or harvested for 5 years. In this

county, 158 whole farms have been retired from production.

Jefferson County will have some 10,600 acres in CR grass on 231 farms; Walworth County, 5,100 acres on 94 farms. Other pheasant producing counties have comparable CR signups.

QUAIL COUNTRY, TOO

Some sample counties in the quail country include Grant, 13,800 acres on 284 farms; Crawford, 9,100 acres on 127 farms; Richland, 3,200 acres on 73 farms.

So far efforts to enlist CR farmers in a wildlife program have been spotty and not very successful. When county meetings were held last fall to discuss CR regulations, the conservation department and local clubs were invited to participate. Despite bad weather, 3,211 persons attended the 71 meetings. Some game managers proved to be salesman but more were not. A few clubs offered help for farmers who would apply wildlife practices.

But all the signups game managers and sportsmen's clubs obtained in the 71 counties totaled only 907 acres, including 200 or 300 food patches, mostly of one-half to 5 acres. Half as many more were carried over from preceding years.

Nick Calabresa, who is program specialist in charge of the soil bank, said, "I'm sure the local clubs can get a lot more cooperation from the farmers if they make a real effort, particularly if they offer some help."

UP TO SPORTSMEN

Smith, the State game chief, intimated that it would be chiefly up to the clubs, saying that conservation department personnel already had more programs than they could handle effectively. "But we have put in some time on the soil bank," he said, "and will find men to work on it."

A landowner who did not want to be named told the writer that he had put in a food patch and wildlife shrubs and from his experience judged that not much would be done by farmers without some help.

"It's a lot of bother and work," he said. "I think it will take something like the tree planting program. That didn't make much headway with farmers until it was organized and planting machines were available locally. If the Department or the clubs would set up a definite program, and help, for food patch and shrub planting, they'd maybe get some results."

MANY HELP SHARPTAILS

Smith said that CR land was not so important for quail or ruffed grouse, although clover seeding along with grass could benefit the grouse.

"There'll be a gain in nesting areas and edge," he said, "but the loss of grazed woodland will more than offset it. Woodland grazing increases ruffed grouse habitat as much as 10 to 1.

"But the CR may help sharptails, particularly along the Lake Superior shore in the clay country. Acre for acre that land is more productive of sharptails than the sand country, but the increase of farming has driven the birds out. Now they may come back."

A Matter of Dollars and Cents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CARLTON LOSER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article from the Nashville Tennessean, written by an excellent reporter and editorial writer, Mr. Gene Graham, who is beginning a series of interpretative articles designed to explain subject of local and national interest.

This article deals with a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for Middle Tennessee, at Nashville. Three Federal judges, all Tennesseans, will conduct the trial and rule upon the matter of reappointment in Tennessee which was not decided by the State general assembly.

The article follows:

A MATTER OF DOLLARS AND CENTS—TEN AND ONE-HALF MILLION DOLLARS IS SIPHONED FROM DAVIDSON TAXPAYERS EVERY YEAR—THREE JUDGES MAY HOLD THE ANSWER

(By Gene Graham)

A lawsuit of historic and national significance will begin in Nashville shortly.

It is one which is destined to keep the eyes of a nation riveted firmly upon a solemn, mahogany-paneled courtroom on the eighth floor of the Federal building here.

For at issue in this milestone American legal clash are problems complex and common among all the Nation's States—even the two new ones which moved from territorial to statehood status this year.

Basically, the issue is one of equity. It is commonly known by the somewhat cumbersome name of legislative reapportionment.

Vast population upheavals growing out of the postwar years in America are behind it, although the trend really began to a less noticeable degree before World War II.

EXPLODING URBAN CENTERS

That population has expanded—and it has shifted as the desert sands, forming huge human drifts upon the archaic governmental structure of America's exploding urban centers.

With the mechanization of farms and the rapid industrial expansion of two and a half decades now, humans in massive numbers have left a rural society to become dwellers of large metropolitan centers, once-small cities which now move toward the metropolitan status, and once-rural towns which can no longer be so classified.

But they have left their State governments behind.

All over America—not just in Tennessee—they have left the same number of legislators representing the same territorial limits, limits within which, unfortunately, the people no longer live in such proportions as they did when States were being hewn of a wilderness.

OLD SAM CRIED "TYRANNY"

By the same token, the same number of legislators represent the narrow territorial confines of modern metropolises which once were not. In truth, it is a condition similar, if not identical, to the one which caused old Sam Adams to cry out "Taxation without representation is tyranny" upon colonial streets, sparking the tinder of revolution.

The world is calmer today. This issue is thus joined in the hushed forum of American juriprudence. The trial, as announced Thursday, will be conducted by three distinguished Federal judges, all Tennesseans.

They are Federal Sixth Circuit Judge John D. Martin, Sr., Memphis, who only last week stepped down as presiding judge of, though remaining upon, the Cincinnati-based appellate court; District Judge Marion S. Boyd, Memphis; District Judge William E. Miller, Nashville, whose rejection of a State motion to dismiss the lawsuit earlier in the week set the stage for the legal test.

"We look forward to this lawsuit with the notion that Tennessee is upon the threshold of a great and long-overdue governmental reform of pioneering proportions and national implications," said Z. T. Osborn Jr., Nashville attorney and one of three who will represent the parties suing the State for fair play.

NO COMMENT

George McCanless, State attorney general, declined comment yesterday. McCanless, in his official capacity, will defend the State, which has insisted reapportionment is a matter for the legislature alone to decide, just as the Tennessee Supreme Court previously held.

The suit will be adjudicated, of course, on the grounds of equity and that alone. But behind the issue of equitable representation is one of tax dollars and cents, just as it was taxes which prompted Adams' outburst against Great Britain two centuries ago.

Using Davidson County as an example, here is that story:

Perhaps few people realize today the degree to which the State has become a tax-collecting agency for local governments. Not counting its receipts last year from Federal sources, the State collected—in State taxes—$270,914,354. It redistributed to counties, cities and local school districts more than half of that amount, $140,442,548.

Part of this was what is called local-share taxes, e.g., gasoline, income, alcohol, beer, etc. A much larger portion, not strictly State-share in nature, is doled out for education in the form of State grants-in-aid.

And due to the balance of legislative power being firmly entrenched with rural counties, those shares—the plaintiffs complain—are grossly out of kilter.

In Davidson's case, just how much is this true—or is it?

Davidson County, according to the studies of the nonpolitical and statewide Tennessee Taxpayers Association, paid $38,178,924 in taxes last year. That represented 14.1 percent of the total—or 14.1 cents of every State tax dollar collected.

Of this, the State returned to Davidson (including the cities of Nashville, Belle Meade, Berryhill, and Oak Hill) $9,882,834—or 2.6 of those 14.1 cents. Retained by the State was 11.5 cents.

Since 48 percent of the State income was not redistributed, this means 5.5 of Davidson's 14.1 cents was used by the State as Davidson's strictly percentagewise share of financing such statewide functions as welfare, roads, etc. That leaves 6 of Davidson's pennies to be accounted for.

WHO TRADES WHERE?

The TTA also estimates, based upon its studies, that 15 percent of Davidson's 14.1 cents was paid by outlying counties, by trade area shoppers who converge upon their natural trading center, which obviously desires that trade. This accounts for 2.1 cents, leaving 3.9 cents as the nearest figurable amount which Davidson County invests in State government without direct return.

Reduced to pennies, this sounds small. But when considered in the light of total State collections—$270.9 millions—it amounts to $10,565,100 a year.

Davidson's local governments, forced this year to make vast increases in its tax rates, look upon that money with a view to what just a portion of it could do in meeting the community's great problems—sewers, expanding schools, parks, slum eradication.

Some argue the TTA's estimate that outlying counties pay 15 percent of Davidson's contribution to State taxes is too low. No exact figures can be given, but the TTA counters with the argument that the biggest chunk of the sales tax, for example, comes from the sale of food, which almost invariably is purchased at home. And it can be shown, too, that the 1-cent share rebated to cities from the 7-cent gasoline tax does not approach the amount actually collected in Tennessee's cities and growing towns.

The most pertinent question, then, would seem to be whether Davidson and the metropolitan centers should, in keeping with the so-called equalization theory, subsidize the admittedly poor counties of the State to the extent of $10 million a year.

"We recognize this obligation," urban leaders say, "but $10 million a year is too much to ask when our own tax burdens, our own community needs are so great."

Whether such arguments can be sustained is a moot matter before a legislature which has resisted all efforts, since 1901, to give the city folks a louder voice in State affairs, tax distribution being but one of them.

So the issue was removed from the legislative branch and dropped before the Federal judiciary to resolve. And that's where the matter lies—while a nation watches—today.

HOW THEY STACK UP

Here is how the four largest Tennessee metropolitan counties fare in sharing State taxes collected within their boundaries. Roughly half of the taxes collected from them are redistributed by the State in either grants-in-aid or local-share taxes.

Hamilton County pays $22,540,074; gets back $7,220,792; or 32 percent.

Knox County pays $22,594,257; gets back $7,053,052; or 31.2 percent.

Shelby County pays $57,569,304; gets back $16,823,099; or 29.2 percent.

Davidson County pays $38,178,924; gets back $9,882,834; or 25.9 percent.

The four counties pay approximately $140.8 million—or roughly 50 percent—of the State's $270.9 million in taxes.

The Labor Bill Battle in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, now that the House debate is over and the Landrum-Griffin substitute bill overwhelmingly approved, on reflection I feel sure that all the problems have not been solved. Somehow I feel we are only treating the outward evidences of trouble and not the inner or basic difficulty that will continue to plague the labor movement, the consumer and free enterprise. This basic problem is the fact that labor organizations are still above and beyond the law because they are not subject to the same ground rules as are business enterprises; namely, antitrust law.

So I was quite interested to read the article by Mr. Arthur Krock in the New York Times of August 14, 1959 on the final day of debate on labor reform legislation. I believe his conclusion supports the views I expressed during debate on pages 14196–14198 of the RECORD of August 11 in presenting my bill, H.R. 8003, as a possible amendment to the labor reform bill.

Surely other Members of Congress share this concern over the need for antitrust legislation.

The article is as follows:

THE LABOR BILL BATTLE IN CONGRESS
(By Arthur Krock)

A balanced analysis of the truth and consequences of the struggle over labor union reform legislation, now coming to a climax in Congress, may have to await the competence in research and the perspective of some future Edward Gibbon. But the stakes of the battle are plain in contemporary view. The most powerful, and in some respects the only, monopoly in the United States is fighting to preserve its control of the national industrial machine.

The monopoly was founded in the first years of President F. D. Roosevelt's New Deal by prolabor laws of Congress and by even more prolabor interpretations of these laws by administrators and judges appointed with that expectation. The results included a political alliance between union labor leaders and the candidates of the Democratic Party in which one interest promoted the interest of the other—an alliance to which liberal Republicans on the northeastern seaboard sought and were granted a sort of second-class membership.

The moral and spiritual animations of this prolabor movement were generated by a prior monopoly which the Republican Party had fostered and protected. This was a combination of financial and industrial management power which operated politically through campaign contributions to submissive political candidates and through influence over the President's choice of administrators and judges. But the subsequent transfer to organized labor of power over the economy and industrial liberty of the United States, which was initiated by President Roosevelt and nailed home by President Truman, has been followed by the usual abuses of monopoly. These have included corruption and some excesses the robber barons of American industry never ventured.

Now for the first time since the pendulum of monopoly hit the reverse top of its arc a President of the United States is trying to unstick it for a moderate downswing. The legislation President Eisenhower favors represents a very moderate backswing because it does nothing to cover labor unions under the antitrust laws that effectively restrain a management monopoly. And this legal immunity is the principal of several which are basic sources of the power of union leaders, both corrupt and otherwise. Yet the bill the President is supporting—proposed by a Democrat and a Republican in the House of Representatives—is the pending legislative draft that would provide effective restraints on the legalized social coercions of the economy by labor unions that also are important sources of their monopoly. These coercive activities are the secondary boycott and picketing, often deserving the administration's tag of "blackmail," which the labor chiefs prefer to call organizational.

The House committee bill, a milder corrective measure of union corruption and union coercive practices than the easy-going Senate measure, was officially opposed by the mergey AFL–CIO, which endorsed a third draft with even less corrective effects. Though a large number of the Members of Congress have publicly quailed under union threats of reprisal at the polls, this third measure had no chance of approval, and that was as well known at Meany-Reuther headquarters as it was in the private rooms of the Democratic and Republican leaders of Congress. But whether or not designed as strategy to make support of the House committee bill appear as bold independence of the AFL–CIO, its draft was so employed by legislators who knew that the union leaders would have been glad to settle for the House committee bill and would have regarded as another political triumph the rejection of the measure endorsed by the President.

One of the possibilities attributed to this latter bill is that its restraints on the secondary boycott and organizational picketing will hamper honest unions in their legitimate concerns.

But it could readily be safeguarded against by conference change in which the fundamental restraint of secondary boycotting could still be preserved. In all likelihood this safeguard would appear in the event of the final passage of a bill which will correct the basic abuses of the labor monopoly.

But, undisturbed by this administration, this Congress and the next one, will be union power to dominate collective bargaining, paralyze nationwide industries if this domination is resisted, elude the laws and ordinances against violence and coercion and suspend vital public services, including the sources of public information.

A Tribute to Mr. Herbert C. Hoover on His 85th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an open letter to former President Herbert C. Hoover which appeared in the St. Joseph, Mo., News-Press extending congratulations, and was written by the editor, Arthur V. Burrowes:

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

Mr. HERBERT C. HOOVER,
Waldorf-Astoria Towers,
New York City.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: The News-Press congratulates you on this, your 85th birthday. The News-Press feels it has a right to send you these congratulations as an open letter, not alone because of the personal esteem in which you are held by the editor of this newspaper, but because of the proud record this newspaper holds as regards your personal self.

The News-Press was keenly alert to the world tension in that fateful summer 45 years ago. It was June 28, 1914, a Bosnian Serb, Gabriel Princep, assassinated Archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne. You, Mr. Hoover, were in England when that tragedy occurred in Sarajevo, Bosnia. Sarajevo caused World War I.

It was the News-Press privilege to commend editorially the generosity of you, Mr. Hoover, nearing 40 years of age, who so gladly financed stranded Americans in London. You made it possible for them to get home, starting in late July, when chancelleries feared the negotiations to prevent a world war would be futile. They were futile, Mr. Hoover, as you so well remember. Germany declared war against Russia August 1 and against France August 3.

You read your London Times and saw, Mr. Hoover, as did we in our paper, that Britain asked Germany to guarantee the neutrality of Belgium by midnight of August 4. Germany refused and Britain declared war on Germany August 4. You were still in London when German troops entered Leige. Our News-Press called that the rape of Belgium. We were probably the first newspaper of the whole Middle West to so severely castigate the German Emperor, the mad Kaiser. For that and following editorial conduct of our newspaper, Albert, King of the Belgians, conferred the Medaille du Roi Albert on Louis T. Golding, our editor and publisher.

Mr. Hoover, that editor and publisher still lives. He was 94 on May 9 last, so he is your own contemporary and no two men ever saw more eye to eye in those far away years

when it seemed God let the very light of the heavens go out one by one.

This newspaper time and again commended you for your great work in feeding Belgium. No man in all world history, singlehanded, had ever to that time, or has since, so endeared himself by a single act to so many millions of people. It was inevitable, Mr. Hoover, that you were Chairman of the American Commission for the Relief of Belgium from 1914 to 1919. It was inevitable your friend, Mr. Woodrow Wilson, name you his U.S. Food Administrator, where you served so well from June 1917 to July 1919.

Your course as Secretary of Commerce under two Republican Presidents was hailed by the St. Joseph News-Press, not once but many times. It was the privilege of the News-Press to support you for President in victory in 1928 and in defeat in 1932. It was our joy to commend Mr. Harry S. Truman when he recalled you to public service after the cruel, willful conduct of Mr. Truman's predecessor.

The News-Press and sister paper, the St. Joseph Gazette, acclaimed you to the world for both the first Hoover Commission and the second Hoover Commission. The good of the Hoover Commissions will live long after you are gone to God.

Your step is slower, your face is more lined, your head more bowed, sir, but you bear that same mark of individual initiative, proud Americanism you had when you were in two Presidents' Cabinets, when you yourself were President. Or when you broke bread in St. Joseph, Mo., in that home of Mr. and Mrs. John Wyeth at 2916 Frederick early in 1933. Yes, even to just this summer when you so hospitably received our friends, Mr. and Mrs. James E. Josendale, of this city, in your home in Waldorf Towers.

The tangible proof of your goodness, your accomplishments, Mr. Hoover, sir, are for all to see: The honorary degrees from 81 institutions here and abroad, the 296 medals and other awards from here and abroad, the honorary citizenship of 24 European cities, 56 honorary memberships in scientific and technical societies. Mr. Hoover, you are the living exemplar of individualist America at her best, from that humble home in Iowa where you were orphaned to the plaudits of the world. It is a rare privilege to know you, sir. God bless you. God keep you for His very own.

Economic Advantages Motivate Support for Labor Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations and for other purposes.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, the labor bills before the House have disturbed many legislators and voters and the speeches in favor of and against the bills have created a great confusion in the minds of a great majority. I believe that we must have labor legislation. Last year I supported and voted for the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill which passed the Senate and was defeated in the House by eight votes. The Kennedy-Ives bill regulated the internal union affairs without undue meddling in the administration of unions and without weakening the collective bargaining powers. The Kennedy-Ives bill was defeated by a combination of Republican Members and southern Representatives.

This year there are three bills before the House. The combination which defeated the Kennedy-Ives bill last year has once again combined and supports the Landrum-Griffin bill. I oppose the Landrum bill, which, in my opinion, is "buckshot" legislation, injuring the guilty and innocent alike. I favor the Shelley bill and shall support this bill.

The labor situation as we all know it is not all black nor all white. There is a great need for reform and for improvement, but no necessity to destroy labor. The support for the blunderbuss Landrum-Griffin bill comes mainly from Republicans and southern Democrats. Why? Why do these bills go beyond the reform of unions and seek to adopt methods which punish labor? It appears to me that selfish economic and political reasons motivate the support for this bill more than a desire to chase out the crooks from the House of Labor.

The Elliott bill, H.R. 8342, known as the committee bill, and the Shelley bill, H.R. 8490, introduced by Representative JACK SHELLEY, of California, and 14 other Members, have provisions to get rid of the crooks in labor, but the Shelley bill contains no provisions which bust unions or destroy their legitimate gains obtained through sacrifice. What does the Shelley bill do and is it effective? The Shelley bill requires financial reports by unions covering 90 percent of the labor force in unions and gives the Secretary of Labor discretion to compel the remaining small unions to file reports if the Secretary thinks it is necessary or that there is a violation of law or any corruption within the union. False filing under the Shelley bill carries severe criminal penalties. Embezzlers of union funds are subject to Federal prosecution and embezzlers, Communists, and convicts are denied the right to hold union office for a period of 5 years. Employees whose rights are denied can sue in Federal courts after they exhaust their remedies within the union. Employees' rights to vote and participate in union activities are protected. The subversive, the neurotic, and the troublemaker are subject to union discipline by reasonable regulations. The Shelley bill provides further that union financial officers must be bonded and they are required to account for their stewardship. No conflict of interest must appear in their conduct and officers are required to report any conflict of interest. No loans in excess of $2,500 can be made and loans above $250 must be reported. The crooks are controlled, the employees are protected, and the ban on secondary boycotting, as provided for in the Taft-Hartley law, is continued. The Shelley bill is not an antilabor bill. It is a fair and effective bill, and under its provisions crooks are controlled, employees are given a bill of rights, and dishonesty is punished. Why not the opposition to the Shelley bill, and why then the support for the Landrum-Griffin bill?

During the amendment stage of the bill, the combination of Republicans and southern Democrats ganged up together to deny the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General to bring an action to restrain any union officer who was about to violate the provisions of title I of the bill and left the remedy to the union member without the support of the Secretary or the Attorney General. This amendment was overwhelmingly supported by the combination and became part of the Landrum bill.

Let us analyze the motives for the Landrum-Griffin bill. This measure was sponsored by Congressman LANDRUM, a Representative from Georgia, and Congressman GRIFFIN, a Republican Representative from Michigan. The Republicans who helped defeat the Kennedy-Ives bill last year are not seeking a solution, but want a political issue. Their votes in my opinion are politically inspired without regard for the economic effect on the industrial East, North, and West. Congressman LANDRUM, the Representative from Georgia, comes from a State which is antiunion. Georgia is 1 of the 19 States in the Union which has adopted "right-to-work" laws, recognized by many as "right-to-wreck unions" laws. Organizational or recognition picking is one of labor's traditional practices to unionize a plant and to raise workers' wages. Bar all organizational picketing and recognition picketing by statute and you authorize and empower employers to exploit and to pay indecent wages and require longer hours. Where picketing is for the purpose of blackmail, then such picketing should be made a crime and prohibited. The Landrum bill, however, outlaws all types of picketing except where a plant is on strike.

The Shelley bill outlaws blackmail picketing, but provides that where picketing is carried out for the purpose of unionizing and obtaining decent wages and decent working conditions, such activities should not be condemned or curtailed. When picketing is carried on by a rival union when a legitimate union represents a plant or a business, an employer should have the right to go before a labor board for relief. Many workers throughout the United States are still not covered by a Federal minimum wage law, and these groups who are not permitted to organize by picketing will be compelled to work at slave wages. Inasmuch as Georgia has no minimum wage law, these unprotected workers are at the mercy of predatory employers. The advantages of cheap labor are recognized by industry and it flees locations where there are strong unions so they can pay cheap wages and make exorbitant profits at the expense of labor. It is a well-known fact that industry has fled from the industrial East and North to find haven in States like Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and other localities, which provide right-to-work laws and do not provide any minimum wage protection and labor legislation.

The following are some of the Southern States which have right-to-work laws: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Their Representatives supported almost unanimously the Landrum-Griffin bill.

What is the situation in Georgia with respect to its labor conditions? Georgia, in my opinion, is an antiunion State. While it has compensation laws on its books, it pays a miserable maximum of $30 per week to an injured worker as compared to $45 per week in other States. Georgia provides no minimum wage law for employees not covered by the Federal minimum wage law and the amount an employer pays may be insufficient to provide the bare necessities of life. In Georgia, where unions seek to help themselves by picketing, statutes prohibit mass picketing. Georgia and other Southern States have a competitive edge against northern industrial States. Their edge lies in the unfair advantage these States enjoy in the form of nonunion shops, lack of compulsory insurance, and lack of minimum wages.

For example, the States of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas do not have any compulsory law for workmen's compensation. An injured worker is left to the whim and bounty of his employer and is not protected by statute when he is injured. When it comes to the question of wages, many of the Southern States who by their support of the Landrum bill are seeking to steal away and lure Northern industry into their area have no minimum wage laws. The Southern States which have no minimum wage law are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Arkansas has a minimum wage law, but the minimum is pathetically low and amounts to a minimum of 16 cents per hour; hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together. These States do not have minimum wages in the retail trades, the hotels and restaurants, and in the laundry and drycleaning establishments. They afford no protection to the workers, and if the workers are denied the right to organization which the Landrum bill takes away from them, then certainly they are at the mercy of the ruthless employers and they are permitted to starve with the sanction of the State.

This is the story behind the support of the Landrum bill. It is an economic drive by a section of our country to continue their practices of indecent wages and to attract business from fleeing industry. The Republicans for political gains have betrayed the industrial sections of our country and have joined with the southern Representatives to pass the Landrum bill over prostrate labor. The philosophy of the Landrum bill is found in the attitudes of Georgia statutes and the statutes in the Southern States. Thus, the Landrum bill is motivated incidentally by a desire to eliminate the crooks, and in my opinion, primarily for selfish economic reasons, to continue nonunion shops, and thereby to maintain for Georgia and other Southern States their competitive edge of cheap labor, thus being able to steal industry from those industrial States which have high standards of working conditions for the working man and high wages.

The Landrum bill bans the "hot cargo" provisions while the Shelley bill does not. The ban on hot cargo is another device to maintain nonunion conditions in Southern States. A hot cargo provision in a contract means that an employer and a union agree that an employee or a truckdriver shall not be compelled to handle his employer's goods which come from or go to a struck plant. It guarantees an employee the right not to be a strikebreaker or cross a picket line. A ban on hot cargo provisions means that nonunion shops which endanger a union worker's standard of living may continue on its merry way and union employees are compelled not only to handle their goods, but cross their picket lines if necessary. Why should a truckdriver be required to handle goods for a nonunion company or a struck company which pays slave wages and compels workers to work under onerous conditions? The Landrum bill with its ban on hot cargo and its provisions make the hot-cargo stipulation an unfair labor practice, forces truckers to cross picket lines of secondary employers who pay indecent wages and provide substandard conditions to the workingman. Must this truckdriver cross a picket line with goods when he knows and recognizes that crossing a picket line will help an employer whose plant is struck and who seeks to undermine his own standard of living and lure away business from industrial States? The Landrum bill requires that action on his part and this is the vice and meanness of the Landrum bill. It is in substance a fight by antiworker States to maintain their competitive advantage by destroying the effective tools which labor has to maintain its gains in this jungle of business rivalry. The Landrum bill alines Government on the side of employers and denies labor unions the right and the opportunity to protect themselves against predatory practices by ruthless employers.

I support the sentiments of knowledgable and responsible leaders who are not antilabor or anti-industry, but are anti-crooks, and who seek a true labor reform bill. What we seek is to guarantee the worker his right to vote, choose and participate in union affairs, to guard union funds from dissipation through loans or larceny, to punish unioneers who steal or who default in their position of trust, to disqualify Communists and convicts from holding office for a stated period of time, to protect employees in their right to refuse to cross picket lines while prohibiting concerted activities by employees to force any person to cease doing business with another person, to prohibit blackmail picketing while preserving the right to picket for legitimate union aims. What we seek in substance is support of a bill which will accomplish these objectives. I believe that the bill which best accomplishes these objectives is the Shelley bill which I support. I favor the defeat of the Landrum-Griffin bill which would press down upon the back of labor a yoke of tyranny.

A Salute to Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 15, 1959

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, no man in American public life has served so unselfishly and has earned and deserves the respect and high regard of the people of the United States and in fact the people of the free world for the great services he has rendered to suffering human being whenever he has been called upon to help.

Herbert Hoover has lived to see the day when those that scorned and ridiculed him have had to eat their words. He stands today as one of the great humanitarians and great statesmen of the generation.

I submit herewith the following article by George Sokolsky which is a tribute to Herbert Hoover:

HOOVER AT 85

(By George E. Sokolsky)

There have been plenty of changes in this world since 1874 when on August 10 Herbert Hoover was born in an Iowa village called West Branch. His parents were Quakers; his father a blacksmith, his mother a seamstress. The parents died young and Herbert was sent to live with relatives, finally settling down in Oregon. This, then, is a proletarian beginning for a man who has been described during most of his career as the stereotype of American capitalism.

AT STANFORD

No State aided him. No government supported him. He was what we today like to call underprivileged, but he was a strong farm boy, sturdy, and willing to work, with a sharp mind and a capacity to make his way.

He managed to get enough education to go to what was then called Leland Stanford University, and he worked on all sorts of projects, many of his own devising, so that he could pay for his needs.

Typically, he ran a newspaper route and a laundry route, and he worked summers for the Geological Survey of the United States.

Thus, Herbert Hoover became a mining engineer. He married a geologist, Lou Henry, and together they set off to work in all parts of the world. His success in his own field and in business was immediate and continuous.

Herbert Hoover got into politics by accident rather than by design.

He was the leading American permanently domiciled in London at the outbreak of World War I and was, therefore, invited by Ambassador Walter Hines Page to assist the large number of American refugees who were stuck in England because of the beginning of the war and who had no means to take care of themselves.

BELGIAN RELIEF

He handled this job so ably that he was invited to undertake Belgian relief. He, who had been a mining engineer, found himself a social worker all of a sudden.

And here the simplicities of Quaker upbringing intervened.

Herbert Hoover could tolerate no conflict to interest.

When he was working for himself and his family, he did well and amassed a fortune. Now that he faced public service, he felt it essential to divest himself of conflicting assets.

From that day in 1914 when he undertook to serve the people and governments, he avoided private involvements of any kind. Fortunately, he could afford to work without compensation and that he has done ever since.

Hoover was an unpopular President, although he received an enormous vote.

The times required him to compromise his judgments and when once or twice he did compromise, particularly with the late Senator Borah, it turned out that he erred.

DEFEATED MAN

A man who has a philosophy of life, must guide himself according to those principles.

I can recall the days in 1933–34 when Herbert Hoover was sittig often alone in his rooms in the Waldorf-Astoria, avoided by those whom he helped on the road of life.

He was a defeated man and the smart boys run from a defeated man.

In contrast today, a quarter of a century later, Herbert Hoover is one of the most beloved men in the Nation, above partisanship, above rancor. He continues to work steadily, writing a series of books which will clarify the record of many otherwise uncovered situations.

Herbert Hoover stays young by working and by his constant interest in affairs. At 85, he refuses to give up to doctors, nurses and the impedimenta of age.

He can still argue a point refreshingly, his head full of details and his philosophic viewpoint clear and always guiding constructively.

SENSE OF HUMOR

His sense of humor never fails him.

Never one to be vengeful, in his old age he knows no rancor.

How he manages to clear the slate of all the little incidents which hurt a man's feelings, I do not understand.

There must be something in early Quaker teaching that does that or perhaps he has grown so big in spirit that the pin-pricks of politics become like the sting of a gnat.

One of the developments of his years is his friendship with Harry Truman: The two ex-Presidents really like each other.

It will be interesting to see Herbert Hoover at the Republican convention in Chicago in 1960, standing before his party, delivering his address. His truth goes marching on.

An Idea for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, when I was at the World Affairs Institute in North Carolina recently I met Mr. and Mrs. Dabney White of Greensboro, N.C. They, like so many people, are much concerned about preserving peace in the world. They, unlike many people, have worked out an idea which they think would help lead to peace. They want the East and West to compete in the area of research.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I am including hereafter their plan for peace. It is entitled "A 10-Year Plan for Preventing World War III":

A 10-YEAR PLAN FOR PREVENTING WORLD WAR III

(By Charlotte and Dabney White)

If the Russian and American people permit themselves to be caught in the death-trap of world war III because of the bait fate has placed in Berlin, then they have no more right to claim intelligence than a doomed rat caught in a cheese-baited rat-trap.

Taking a firm stand in Berlin is not enough. We once took a firm stand with Japan and got Pearl Harbor. Nor is it enough merely to take satisfaction in our own achievements and virtues and to condemn the evils and shortcomings of others. Events demand we propose some way out of today's dilemma that can bring benefit not only to ourselves but to all the world.

Russia and China, today, proud of their great strides in catching up with the West, compete with us for allies, raw materials, and markets. In so doing they force us all to play a dangerous cold war game. It is a very old game, a game that in the past brought on nearly all the wars that have been fought. If continued this cold war game can quite easily explode into world war III. The starting incident may occur in Berlin. It may occur almost anywhere. The world today is a tinderbox and war is very near.

But war will not solve today's basic problem. World Wars I and II and the Korean war did not solve it, nor will another bloodletting. To solve that basic problem we need to find some new game that can be substituted for the present cold war game * * * some new game that can be played with more profit and less danger.

Before the dawn of history, man discovered a new idea of world-changing importance; the very simple idea that we can plant seeds and grow crops. Because of that discovery great civilizations became possible, other invention-discoveries became practical and world population increased from less than 10 million to more than 2,500 million. If that great idea were to be forgotten and remain unknown for just 3 years nearly all of those 2,500 million would be dead at the end of that time. The idea is that important.

However, in recent times, man has discovered an even greater idea, the idea that "by planting enough money and manpower in research we can find the answer to almost any problem." This is an idea that can do for man today even more than the first idea did for man in the past. It is an idea whose importance is fully realized by no one, and of such vastness as to stagger the imagination.

This mighty, godlike force of research, which can so easily be used to create a paradise on earth, it today being employed chiefly to discover deadlier and deadlier weapons for the Russians to use against us and for us to use against them. This is a sinful, shameful thing. Too long have we used research chiefly to discover new ways of killing. It is a force, far too wondrous to be used chiefly for such purpose.

It is man's chief key, given him by God, for unlocking all the shining wonders of the world and universe that man is heir to. As such it should be made into a great and ever expanding international enterprise devoted to bringing new knowledge to benefit all men everywhere.

International research on a grand scale, each year discovering vast stores of new knowledge and new ways to increase wealth; organized upon a highly competitive basis to keep all research workers doing their best, yet with the competition wholly within the organization and entirely divorced from national ambitions * * * can give us a new game to substitute for the dangerous cold war game now being played between East and West.

It can give us a new game played by competing research teams, a game highly publicized, strenuous and dramatic, turning world interest more and more toward man's ever enlarging conquest of the unknown and diminishing interest in profiting at a neighbor's expense.

Properly organized and adequately financed, research into all the fields of human thought and action and including not only research proper, but also invention and development, should grow and grow and grow until one day it becomes the greatest industry in the world, greater than farming or manufacturing, greater even than all other industries put together, providing a new field where men compete under just laws and without fear of war or enslavement. Such work under law can pioneer a pattern for control by law of all world affairs.

The plan is a profitable plan. It will bring us material wealth, a vast new wealth of knowledge and new understanding, dynamic peace and soaring progress.

It is suggested herewith that we wrest the initiative in the present cold war from the Soviets, by proposing that we at once set up an International Agency for Research into all fields, and that we finance that Agency by levying on each nation 10 percent of the amount that nation is now spending on its military, and that this percentage be doubled each year until the whole world is spending on cooperative research at least 10 times what it is spending on war preparations.

It is suggested that we propose that a world truce be declared for the next 10 years to give a decade of peace for getting the research program underway and that any nation using armed force as an instrument of national policy be declared an outlaw and an enemy of the rest of the world and dealt with appropriately.

The above are bold proposals. Perhaps in their very boldness they offer more real chance of averting war and achieving dynamic peace than can be offered by any more traditional and less bold proposal.

If our Nation makes these proposals to the Soviets, and the Soviets turn them down, we will still have won a great ideological victory.

However, the Soviets may not turn them down. They may find in them a meeting ground for East and West and for the devising of a saner, freer, and wiser world order.

If so, we may in a few short years create more real progress for the good of all men and all the future, than will otherwise be created in the next 10,000 centuries.

The Fabulous Fiscal Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Democratic Digest, August 1959 issue:

THE FABULOUS FISCAL FIASCO

The Republican Party, loudly trumpeting farewell to the second Eisenhower recession, is trying to brush under the rug the consequences, past, present, and threatened, of its own fiscal irresponsibility. The Democratic Party, thunders the GOP, is the party of budget busters, of inflationists, of financial hooligans. The din created by the Elephant has reached such a pitch and volume as to persuade the unwary that the fellow might have something there. The Digest therefore desires to submit some sobering truths about the Eisenhower administration and its banker-minded fiscal policies.

(The last five paragraphs of this article list certain indisputable facts which the Elephant is having great difficulty hiding under that rug.)

President Eisenhower, a fiscal innocent who was putty in the hands of his first Secretary of the Treasury, Industrial Titan George M. Humphrey, and who is equally malleable for the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Humphrey, namely, Robert B. Anderson, appears to be as trustful today as ever.

If he found it galling that the results of the Humphrey-Anderson advice forced him to ask Congress in June to raise the ceiling on the public debt, and ask it also to abolish the historic 4½ percent limit on Government bond interest, he took solace in the cry of "Inflation, inflation"—a magic word used by all Republican fiscal wizards to explain why they have got the Government's financial affairs into such a stew.

The Cabinet of millionaries, inheriting from the Democrats a high prosperity without inflation, had scarcely taken the oath before Secretary Humphrey, with a let-George-do-it nod from Ike, started raising interest rates. The Treasury upped the rate on Government bonds far above the requirements of the market—from the previous Democratic rate rate of 3½ percent to a charitable 3¼. (Charitable to the banks and corporations, that is.) The effect on interest rates in general was electric—and a vicious circle began to rotate, generating inflation as it turned. "Why I can remember," Humphrey mused fondly, "when 7 percent interest was normal. We thought nothing of it." (Today the banks' "prime rate," the interest charged gilt-edge commercial borrowers, has climbed to 4½ percent—and the price of money is scaled up rapidly for the less favored.)

Humphrey also sponsored a $7 billion tax cut, of which three-quarters was given unfairly and foolishly to corporations and higher income individuals. Foolishly, because this policy caused investment in productive capacity to outrun consumption, with unhappy results. Columnist Joseph Alsop wrote last month: "There would be no budget-balancing problem today, as there would be much less inflationary pressure too," if Humphrey had not put over this "profligate" tax cut.

Humphrey presided over the first Eisenhower recession (1953–54), and converted the recovery of 1955 into the stagnation of 1956–57. The second recession was leering around the corner as he bowed out and returned to his countinghouses in the summer of 1957.

The Republicans choose to blot the recessions from memory, and to assure us that all is now rosy. They blithely advise Congress that the fiscal policies under which the recessions occurred should be not only ratified but intensified. To be sure, the vast Eisenhower deficits have cooled off the GOP's infatuation with tax cutting, but the ardor for tight money is unabated. The balanced budget is given precedence by a veto-brandishing President over (1) adequate defenses against an opponent of unexampled might; over (2) the encouragement of a swifter growth by the economy, and over (3) the urgent needs of a multiplying population in such fields as education, housing, urban blight, and conservation of natural resources. (Creeping socialism.) Fiscal management under Eisenhower continues to follow classic Republican theory—as imaginative as Calvin Coolidge, as dynamic as Herbert Hoover, as progressive as the trickle-down philosophy of McKinley's day.

The Democratic Party is just as devoted to a balanced budget as the Republicans profess to be—despite their mammoth deficit of fiscal 1959. Speaker SAM RAYBURN pointed out July 2, in a sharp rebuke to GOP propagandists, that the Democratic Congress had already cut $353 million off the Eisenhower budget requests, and he predicted the cuts would reach $500 million to $1 billion. But those savings, basically, are no more than a prudent overseeing of the routine housekeeping of the Government. Let us look beyond such details to the big picture.

In the House of Representatives a few weeks ago Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat of Connecticut, noted that "our annual output of goods and services remains more than twice that of the Soviet Union." But he quoted Allen W. Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, as warning that a much greater rate of growth is enabling the U.S.S.R. to close the gap rapidly. He cited this somber statement by Dulles:

"If it is true that our industrial growth (between now and the end of the new Soviet 7-year plan) will be only 2 percent a year, the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The truth is, the average growth rate of our economy in the first 6 Eisenhower years was only 1.3 percent annually.

TIGHT MONEY STOPS GROWTH

Growth is faster this year, but already the administration (abetted by the Federal Reserve Board) is applying the brakes of tight money. Economists of the top rank[1] reported in July that the "repressive policies now in effect might well lead to an average annual growth rate" for 1958–64—the approximate term of the Soviet 7-year plan—of less than half of the 5 percent annual rate which "we need an can readily achieve."

In 1953–58, these economists said, "we fell more than $150 billion short of full production, and suffered about 10 million man-years of unnecessary unemployment. In addition, Federal, State, and local governments collected about $30 to $35 billion less in revenues than a full rate of economic growth would have generated at existing tax rates."

The economists commented: "The erroneous methods used to fight inflation have contributed greatly to this poor economic performance. Especially, the tight money policy and successive retrenchments in the Federal Budget have been powerful factors in the deficient rate of economic growth."

They continued: "Now in 1959, we are moving upward again as we did in 1955. And once again, we are misreading the signs and applying the wrong policies. The Federal Reserve Board is not reactivating with a vengeance the tight money policy, which has proved to be economically repressive and socally regressive, and a very frail weapon against inflation. In accord with the misguided FRB policies, the administration is asking for the removal of ceilings on interest rates. Budgetary retrenchment is again being given precedence over the neglected priorities of our national and international needs.

"Few, if any, of the fundamental maladjustments which contributed to the erratic and low growth rates of recent years have been corrected. Some of them are now being further aggravated—for example, the further forced decline of farm income, and the immense drive against wage adjustments."

But the President seems content. The oracles of the White House stoop, Messrs. HALLECK and DIRKSEN, are radiant. The Republican National Committee's mimeographs brim with happy tributes to prosperity. The money lenders are happy, too—

The Federal Reserve Board reports that profits (after taxes) of its member banks rose 25 percent in 1958. Since the last Truman year, bank profits (again, after taxes) have increased by 75 percent.

George Champion, president of New York's biggest bank, the Chase Manhattan, says a "prime rate" of interest even higher than the 4½ percent established last May is possible. (He awaits it with open arms.) Henry Clay Alexander, chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Trust, "looks for a continuing rise in the cost of money." (His welcome mat is out.)

Government programs to help home building have felt the hot breath of tight money. Congress a few weeks ago had to raise from 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent the interest allowable on housing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Similarly, the Federal Housing Administration is said to be pondering a raise to 5½ percent in the interest permitted on FHA-guaranteed loans. (Even at the existing rate, a typical FHA mortgage negotiated today would cost $5,700 in interest, against $4,500 in 1952.)

But the GOP, although it has given us more inflation than we ever had before except as a result of war, still insists that high-priced money is the best weapon against inflation. Is it working that way? Perhaps it has deterred some people from buying homes. But look at this—

In May alone, consumers increased their outstanding installment debt by $443 million (seasonally adjusted), the Federal Reserve Board reported in July. That was the biggest jump since September 1955. We may be sure that there was a hidden tax on much of that buying—for higher interest is in effect a tax, imposed by the Government's tight money policies, and payable to lenders rather than to the Government. But the point is, tight money did not dampen the buying urge—hence did not work against inflation.

Actually, higher interest rates are of themselves inflationary, since they increase costs without increasing production. "Few things have contributed as much to inflation as rising interest rates," Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, said recently.

A budget deficit is supposed to be inflationary. Yet Mr. Eisenhower, who loves to denounce inflation, told Congress in June, as casually as if he were asking it to pass the butter, that higher rates necessitated his requesting $500 million more to pay the interest on the public debt than he had asked in his budget message only 5 months earlier.

One penny and part of a second penny out of every tax dime now go to the unproductive cost of carrying the Federal debt. The effect of tight money and inflation are reflected also in the debt burdens of the States and cities, of school districts and of public utilities, of home and automobile buyers—indeed, in one way or another, of every American.

And the Republican Party, failure going to its head, is proud of it!

On June 30 last, the fiscal year ended with the biggest peacetime Federal deficit in history—around $12.5 billion.

Total 6-year Eisenhower deficit—$19.4 billion versus record of first 6 Truman years—$3.7 billion surplus.

Public debt: When Truman departed, $267 billion. On June 30 last, $284 billion.

Cost of interest on public debt: In Truman's last full fiscal year, $5.8 billion. Requested by Eisenhower for fiscal 1960, $8.6 billion (up half a billion from his January estimate). The total Federal budget in 1939 for all purposes was $7.9 billion.

---

[1] "Inflation, Cause and Cure," a study directed by Leon H. Keyserling for the Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D.C.

Public Opinion Has Shaped the Record of Accomplishments of This Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, we are close enough to adjournment to be able to evaluate the record of this 1st session of the 86th Congress.

In this connection, recently the question was directed to me in a press interview as to whether the record of accomplishment was good or bad.

My reply was, "Not bad."

Then I was asked whether the credit for this record should be given to the Democrats or the Republicans.

"The credit should go to the public" was my answer, because, as I said, it was public opinion, most of all, that wrote the record of this Congress and kept it from being bad. I also attributed great credit to President Eisenhower for his leadership and the fact that by his press conferences and otherwise he stimulated discussions in the press and the expression of public opinion.

The question was raised following this remark as to whether the 86th has been a budget-busting Congress, and with proper and due recognition of the efforts of the House Appropriations Committee, I said we could have a balanced budget in fiscal 1960, especially if the present high rate of prosperity continues so that the Federal revenue from taxes will exceed $80 billion.

Also, I expressed the belief that, thanks to public opinion favoring the President's "hold the line" on Federal spending programs, the threat of inflation has diminished. I responded also by stating my opinion that the best bulwark against inflation is public ownership of U.S. Savings Bonds.

Mr. Speaker, recently on the NBC radio and television program "Meet the Press" the distinguished former President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, expressed the opinion that our country is in more imminent danger from internal causes than from the cold war.

He cited inflation, unbalanced budgets, and overspending by Congress as being some of the domestic dangers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Hoover that those are dangers, and that is why I have constantly resisted pressures to increase Federal spending. Moreover, as I have just inferred, I believe the net result of the efforts of those of us in Congress who have opposed new programs calling for excessive expenditures have been successful overall in this Congress.

Herbert Hoover was on the eve of his 85th birthday at the time of that TV interview. His appraisal of the domestic situation is worth noting. He mentioned the dangers from within, but he was not pessimistic; and we can all take a lesson of courage and faith out of his experience and words of wisdom

He was asked:

Have these things weakened us so much that we can't stand out strong against Russia?

To which he replied:

No, I wouldn't want anybody to think for a moment that the American people are not capable of solving any crisis. As a matter of fact, this Nation is now in its 183d year, and it has lasted longer than any representative Government. It has gone through seven wars, has gone through three great depressions.

Mr. Hoover mentioned that we have had some bad administrations in Washington, and we have had evil days on account of wars which produced a series of crises. But he concluded as follows:

And yet, after all that, we still have of the original heritage of the American people a very large part of what the forefathers established. We still have a freedom of religion, freedom of press, freedom of assembly, freedom of enterprise within the limits of some socialistic tack; freedom of speech within the limits of very mild laws on the subject. Generally we possess today the same vitality that gave us the initiative and the ability to solve these crises that we have had in the past.

Mr. Speaker, like Mr. Hoover I have faith in the American people. Perhaps sometimes I feel Congress is not acting wisely. However, as this session of Congress indicates, generally the thinking of the public prevails and I believe the judgment of the people, where they are given the facts, is sound. Yes, I give credit for the accomplishments and record of this Congress and this session to the force of public opinion. As to partisan credit or criticism, I think Republican and Democratic Members of Congress alike can be counted on to debate that issue after adjournment. Instead, I conclude these remarks with the personal comment that service in this House this session, as it always is, has been a privilege and challenge. Individually and collectively we are honored beyond measure to be Members of the greatest legislative body in the world. For that honor I am grateful and only hope my service has merited and justified the judgment of the fine friends and people who sent me here.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, to eliminate any misunderstanding of my position, which may have resulted from my votes on the labor reform legislation passed by the House of Representatives, I think an explanation is in order.

I would like to begin by saying that I am well aware that labor reform legislation is necessary to prevent the continuation of the racketeering and corruption brought to light by the McClellan committee hearings. However, it must be borne in mind that this condition exists in only a minority of the unions; the vast majority of unions, their leaders and members are, like most people, fine, upstanding, law-abiding citizens.

The House Committee on Education and Labor held extensive hearings on all pending labor reform bills and considered them for approximately 4 months. The bill finally reported by the committee, H.R. 8342, was the result of comprehensive consideration and was designed to do away with the evil practices of corruption, boycotting, hot-cargo handling, and blackmail picketing. It was also designed to protect the union members from being victimized by unscrupulous leaders and the general public from unscrupulous racketeers.

The Landrum-Griffin bills were introduced after the committee reported its bill and did not have the benefit of committee hearings and consideration. Although these bills were widely discussed and debated, I sincerely doubt that they were given sufficient consideration to secure a comprehensive understanding of their impact. Personally, I believe this is a punitive measure.

Passage of the Landrum bill was, I believe, a result of appeal to emotions, rather than logic and commonsense. These were my reasons for voting against this measure when it was offered as a substitute for the committee bill.

When the Landrum bill came up for final passage, I voted in favor of it, knowing that some labor reform legislation was needed and should be enacted. This bill will now go to conference to iron out the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions. I hope a reasonable and sensible solution to the problem will be achieved which will result in a bill that is fair and just to the unions, union members, and the welfare of the Nation. Such a bill should not penalize the vast majority of unions and union members who are not guilty of illegal and reprehensible practices and, at the same time, should curb the evils pointed out by the Senate Rackets Committee.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Greenville: Industry and Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a willingness to tackle and solve local problems at the local level is always commendable.

Citizens of Greenville, Tex., with courage and foresight, faced the problem of assuring an adequate supply of water for domestic and industrial use.

Through their elected city officials, citizens of Greenville successfully attacked the problem.

The story of this achievement is related in an editorial entitled "Greenville: Industry and Water," that appeared August 9, 1959, in the Greenville Herald-Banner. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREENVILLE: INDUSTRY AND WATER

Economic and marketing experts have joined the industrial forecasters in proclaiming that water supply and availability are great factors and will become even greater factors in industrial development during the next few years.

In the race for industry, Greenville need not take a back seat to any community when water flows into the picture.

Thanks to the foresight of Greenville city councils who have served in the past and the men now serving, this community will be able to boast of a supply of upward of 30 million gallons daily and can point now to storage of almost 2 billion gallons in reservoirs today. That's beacoup water.

Greenville is to build soon an intake structure at Lake Tawakoni (formerly known as Iron Bridge Reservoir). It has an agreement whereby we have first call on up to 21 millions of gallons daily once the gaping hole that will be the reservoir takes on water. While the cost to build a line from the reservoir site to Greenville will run between $1½ and $2 million, the future industrial development it promises makes the amount somewhat significant.

Industry is already looking at Greenville and the eye they turn toward this community becomes increasingly favorable. Some will be users of tremendous amounts of water. Others are looking for water, location, highway and rail facilities. Greenville has all of these and additional assets not on the list of many communities.

But competition for major industries and industry of any substantial size and payroll is intense. That means that community attitude and desire again rears two heads and Greenville has the right attitude and an intense desire to grow.

While the city administration is currently engaged in a money saving and an efficiency program at some levels, only an idiot would begin to harbor the illusion that Greenville can meet the needs of expansion demanded by the future with a pinchpenny budget and a pennywise, pound-foolish attitude. Progress does cost money, and we can only say it is to the credit of Greenville to save money being spent foolishly or without return and direct it into channels that will return dividends. Growth dividends to include new industry, more families and payrolls. More good, solid citizens and improved facilities and services.

The United Nations and a Bold Suggestion for the Use of Surplus Food Commodities for Economic and Social Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written of late concerning an international food for peace plan and I would like to call the attention of Congress to a bold yet practical suggestion advanced on this subject by Mr. Glen Leet, program director for the Save the Children Federation, with offices in Norwalk, Conn., and New York City.

Recently, Mr. Leet testified in behalf of a suggestion that the United Nations should assume a role of great importance with respect to the use of commodities in ways which will hold many millions of people at a minimum standard of living and some marginal level of productivity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I woud like to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following excerpts from Mr. Leet's testimony in support of his suggestion:

Through the U.N. there can be accomplished the international discussion of the problems, principles, and methods which are involved. There can be multilateral discussions and hearings in which all nations will have an opportunity to study and discuss the plans brought forward by individual countries. The outcome to a contributing country is that they would have assurance that the plans to which they contributed were those based on a thoroughgoing study, that there would be plans that have survived in an international discussion and plans in which any objections from other countries could have already been taken into consideration. The U.N. is in a unique position to exercise a role of value both to the surplus-producing countries and to those which can utilize such surpluses in their development programs. It can—

(a) Provide a forum for the formulation of internationally accepted and generally applicable policies;

(b) Provide a center for receiving applications;

(c) Refer applications to appropriate U.N. agencies for technical appraisal;

(d) Hold hearings enabling interested governments to express themselves on specific proposals;

(e) Transmit to the executing governments internationally approved courses of action, with respect both to commodities and to the use of local currencies derived therefrom, and with indications of available relevant U.N. technical services for economic and social development.

The provision of such international facilities is a very great service to any nation concerned with the constructive use of surplus commodities. Actions taken by such a process, by either donor or recipient countries, will be much less subject to suspicion and distrust. They would remove much of the criticism directed against the contributing country when such arrangements are made on a bilateral basis.

The U.N. should not become involved in the complexities of receiving, storing, and transporting, or in any way physically handling or paying for the handling of such surpluses. Surplus-producing countries already have facilities for this which should not be duplicated.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES

The creation of any new agencies is undesirable. The existing facilities should be used. Within the U.N. framework the major responsibilities should be with those instrumentalities of the U.N. which are primarily concerned with economic and social development. The major concerns are hunger and the need of the underdeveloped areas to eliminate the causes of underprivilege through development.

The major responsibility should not be delegated to FAO because its chief concern is not with economic and social development. The problem will not be solved if the central focus is on agricultural commodities. It can be effectively solved only if surpluses are considered as but one of the resources to be utilized in a comprehensive approach to development.

The use of commodities for development is sound only as a supplement to general development programs reinforced with adequate technical services. Therefore, surpluses cannot be considered as a substitute for member country contributions to the U.N. Special Fund, the expanded program of technical assistance or to the specialized agencies.

It is desirable that local currencies resulting from the sale of such commodities should be made available for economic and social development purposes and for technical assistance services provided by the U.N., the U.N. Special Fund, or the U.N. specialized agencies. Such local currencies should be available to the U.N. in addition to and not as a substitute for normal commitments.

An unprecedented opportunity presents itself at this time for utilization of U.N. facilities in a way which can greatly magnify the effectiveness of the U.N. and the U.N. Special Fund.

Parallel Between Highway Bridges at Mackinac Strait and Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a great discussion prevails in the Pacific Northwest over whether or not to construct a $27 million bridge across the mouth of the mighty Columbia River between Astoria, Oreg., and Megler, Wash.

My own State of Oregon has taken the lead in authorizing bonds to help finance this huge structure on U.S. 101, the Pacific coast highway, but thus far our sister State of Washington has been reluctant to do likewise.

As a member of the Roads and Highways Subcommittee of the U.S. Senate, I have tried to do my best to encourage construction of the great structure because I believe it would do wonders for our seacoast economy in the region. Proof now is demonstrated of this belief, in the economic gains brought to Michigan's Upper Peninsula by the $99,800,000 bridge recently opened across Mackinac Strait.

An illuminating article in the New York Times for August 16, 1959, has described how the Mackinac Bridge attracted 1,390,390 automobiles during its first partial year of operation as contrasted with only 938,282 cars in the last year that ferry boats served the area. Furthermore, the Mackinac Bridge Authority is encountering no difficulty in meeting interest charges and all the necessary operating costs.

Because of the parallel with the proposed Astoria bridge across the mouth of the great Columbia River, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the New York Times article entitled "Mackinac Bridge Spurs Economy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACKINAC BRIDGE SPURS ECONOMY—TRAFFIC RUNNING 11 PERCENT BEHIND 1958, BUT BUSINESS ON PENINSULA IS BOOMING

ST. IGNACE, MICH., August 15.—In its first 25 months Michigan's Mackinac Bridge has operated in the black, pumped new life into the economy of the upper peninsula and established itself as the State's No. 1 tourist attraction.

Despite an almost universal feeling in Michigan's northland that the 5-mile-long steel span over the Mackinac Strait has brought a new era of tourism, it must be noted that bridge traffic this summer is running about 11 percent behind that of a year ago.

But the traffic is about 50 percent greater than that carried by State ferries that formerly provided the only access to the upper peninsula from lower Michigan.

This means that several hundred thousands more tourists are pouring into the small upper peninsula communities amid the green forests, hundreds of lakes and trout streams and areas connected by generally good highways.

ROOMS HARD TO GET

Responding to this relatively sudden influx, businessmen have built numerous new motels, restaurants, gift shops, and tourist attractions. But in this northern terminus of the bridge, motel rooms are still hard to get and visitors often have to stand in line while waiting for a table in restaurants.

"I can fill my 40 units by 11 a.m. every day," said one St. Ignace motel operator, who refuses to hold reservations for late afternoon arrivals.

At Ste. Paul Marie, a chamber of commerce official commented, "Oh, brother, if you wait until 6 p.m. to get a motel room, you're in trouble."

W. Stewart Woodfill, chairman of the Mackinac Island State Park Commission and owner of the Grand Hotel, a showplace on the island, estimates that the number of persons visiting the island has increased about 35 percent since the bridge was opened.

MANY TOURISTS DRIVE

Steamboats for that scenic spot leave from Mackinaw City, at the southern terminus of the bridge, or from this city at the northern terminus. But many tourists drive northward across the bridge—with an auto toll of $3.25—and take a trip to the island from St. Ignace before going elsewhere on the upper peninsula. A ferry line is operating this year also, providing a tremendously increased capacity for island travelers.

In July the Mackinac Bridge Authority grossed nearly a million dollars in tolls and showed signs of catching up with last year's traffic, according to Prentiss M. Brown, chairman of the authority.

The traffic total in July was 273,558 vehicles and revenues were $987,336. By comparison, traffic in July, 1958, the first month after the bridge's dedication, was 307,838 vehicles and revenues were $1,082,885. The bridge was opened in November 1957, but was not dedicated formally until the following June.

In 1958, the first full calendar year of the bridge's operation, traffic totaled 1,390,390 cars and brought in revenue of $5,132,958. This compared with traffic of 938,283 and revenues of $3,664,047 for 1957, including 10 months of ferry operation and 2 months of bridge traffic and revenue.

Engineering studies prior to the bridge's construction estimated that traffic during the first year would reach about 1,850,000. Although this forecast proved too optimistic, the authority is having no trouble meeting its interest charges and operating costs.

Interest on the bonds for the $99,800,000 bridge amounts to $4,242,000 annually. This includes $79,800,000 in 4 percent bonds and $20 million in 5¼ percent bonds. Operational costs are budgeted at $600,000 but $417,000 of this total is paid by the Michigan State Highway Department.

OUTLOOK IS GOOD

Last year the authority spent $588,000 in operating the bridge and thus had to pay $171,000 above what the highway department provided.

Interest charges and operating expenses of the authority totaled $4,413,000, nearly $720,000 less than incoming revenue.

Lawrence A. Rubin, executive secretary of the bridge authority, is optimistic about the future. He thinks the original traffic bulge resulting from curiosity is decreasing and normal tourist traffic is increasing.

"I can't see anything ahead that would jeopardize our financial position," he said. "Our traffic should grow as new recreational facilities and tourist attractions are developed."

Lyndon Johnson Reviews Sound Spending Policies of Democratic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the face of unwarranted charges of wasteful spending by the Democratic Congresses which have served during the present administration, the Senate majority leader has helped give the American people the true facts about fiscal responsibility.

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON has forcefully outlined that during the last 5 fiscal years Congress has reduced the President's budget requests by more than $10 billion. It is estimated that the House and Senate will add substantial savings to that figure for fiscal year 1960.

Senator JOHNSON has also reminded the American people that the Democratic Congress has not approved one single dollar's spending by any backdoor procedure that the President himself did not request or approve.

Commending the Senate majority leader for setting the record straight, the Beaumont (Tex.) Enterprise has reviewed Senator JOHNSON's statements for the past few years regarding the national budget. Under leave to extend my remarks, I submit this editorial of August 11, 1959, in today's RECORD so that every Member of the House and Senate may have an opportunity to review this constructive record compiled by our Democratic leadership:

CONGRESS AND THE SPENDING RECORD

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON is increasingly resentful of having the Democrats labeled the party of spending, a common practice of the Republicans these days.

It must also make him unhappy to have the same accusing finger pointed at him as an individual. He is convinced that, in both instances, some of the GOP backers of President Eisenhower's budget-balancing campaign are engaging in talk that cannot be justified at all.

Furthermore, the Texan is jealous of the good name of Congress, a commendable attitude, and it irks him no end to have the executive branch laying so much blame for the country's financial difficulties at the door of the National Legislature.

Senator JOHNSON said months ago that more than $10 billion were whittled by Congress from budget recommendations in the last 5 fiscal years. And he has cited both figures and personal remarks that give convincing support.

Here are some CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports of budget statements made by the Texas lawmaker back in 1957:

March 8: After indicating that a survey made in Texas favored a reduction in the budget, Senator JOHNSON said his efforts would be directed toward that end.

May 1: Senator JOHNSON pointed out the inconsistency in statements made by members of the executive branch; some responsible Cabinet officers recommending that the budget be cut, but when cuts were made in the House, asking the Senate to restore them. He further said he was going to vote his convictions and not vote for any grant that could not be fully justified.

May 8: In commenting on the budget Senator JOHNSON said, "We cannot cut the budget without cutting spending, and we cannot adopt one course in January and another course in May."

July 11: Senator JOHNSON, in discussing the battle of the budget, provided figures which indicate reductions approaching $4 billion—or 6.4 percent—from the President's budget that was submitted to us in January.

Following are some CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reports of budget statements by the Senate majority leader in 1959:

January 20: Senator JOHNSON, in referring to the President's budget message, stated: "This is not a balanced budget. It is a propaganda budget. * * * This budget would spend substantially more than current income. * * * Both prudence and candor require that this budget be given a most searching study by the Congress."

February 5: Senator JOHNSON said: "I am going to work as diligently as I can, as leader of the majority, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to get the budget in balance."

February 9: Senator JOHNSON stated: "I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a summary of the President's budget estimates and the appropriations of the Congress * * * showing that the Congress has reduced the budget estimate in each one of the last 6 years. The total appropriation was $22.6 billion less than the Congress was asked to appropriate."

February 9: Senator JOHNSON said: "I do not think that either party should be labeled as the party of the savers or the party of the spenders, but the record does show that the Congress as an institution has been much more saving in its appropriations than the Executive has been in its requests for appropriations."

February 16: Senator JOHNSON stated he felt that a distorted picture was being presented of one branch wanting to hold the line on spending—and the other branch wanting to spend. He pointed out the President has asked for increases in budget estimates—such as 26 percent for foreign aid, 80 percent for OCDM, and many others.

May 26: Senator JOHNSON, following final action on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1960, stated: "The Committee on Appropriations has made many reductions, in fact the committee has taken such action each year since the President assumed office. The President of the United States, good, kindly, economical man that he is, has never submitted to Congress a budget which Congress has not reduced."

June 9: Senator JOHNSON assured Senator BUSH that, "It is not a new-found desire of the majority leader to stay within the budget. The majority leader stated last fall that he hoped we could stay within the budget. * * * I have stated on the floor of the Senate and in public meetings all over the country that I hoped this Congress would appropriate less money than the President asked the Congress to appropriate."

June 16: Senator JOHNSON inserted in the RECORD his newsletter, dated February 10, 1959, in which he had recounted over a $10 billion budget cut by Congress during the last 5 fiscal years. The newsletter promised that: "The Senate this year will take the same hard look at the budget recommendations."

July 9: Senator JOHNSON, during a discussion of the housing veto, stated: "Let me say a word about the appropriations bills. * * * In some cases, as I stated last fall when I met with the President, I believe the Congress will actually vote appropriations less than those the President recommended. That prediction has been borne out by the appropriation bills passed thus far."

The majority leader is still convinced that this session of Congress will appropriate less money than requested by the President, since it has been done in the past without jeopardizing national security and without illogical spite work.

Domestic Surplus Property Donations for Education, Health, and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent press release of Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicates that personal property in the amount of $126,822,683. Acquisition cost, was made available to the States for purposes of education, health, and civil defense during the period April 1 through June 30, 1959. During the same period real property in the amount of $3,211,895 was donated for these purposes.

This is the largest quarterly program we have had and indicates better organization at all levels and the continued declaration of surplus property by the military agencies. It is to be noted that the State of New York had the highest total of $16,065,988 for the quarter and this, with the overall increase in volume, bespeaks the added impetus given to the program by my colleagues on the Special Subcommittee on Donable Property, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. Speaker, though the domestic donable surplus property program is large, with allocations of $361 million for the entire fiscal year 1959, it should be larger. Our eligible institutions need much more property which is being sold at small return to the taxpayer.

Unfortunately, we have not yet developed a program to utilize excess overseas property for purposes of education and health. It is expected that the volume of this excess property will amount to $1.4 billion acquisition cost in the current fiscal year.

The release of Secretary Flemming follows:

Surplus property for which the Federal Government paid $130,034,578 was made available to the States for educational, public health, and civil defense purposes during April, May, and June 1959, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Real property accounted for $3,211,895 and personal property for $126,822,683.

Secretary Arthur S. Flemming announced the totals in making his quarterly report to Congress on the Department's surplus property program.

Property no longer needed by the Federal Government is distributed, under the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, to educational and public health agencies and civil defense organizations of State and local governments, and to eligible nonprofit health and educational institutions exempt from Federal taxes. Regional offices of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and various State agencies channel the surplus property to the institutions.

Property transferred to the States includes such items as school and hospital building sites; buildings suitable for college dormitory or faculty housing; motor vehicles; hospital, school, and office furniture; hand and machine tools; motion picture projectors; laboratory equipment; and school and office supplies.

The following is a State-by-State list of real and personal property distributed, April–June 1959. State surplus property agencies can furnish details on the operation of the program within their States.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1959 (acquisition cost)

[In accordance with sec. 203(o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., as amended]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Total	$126,822,683	$3,211,895	$130,034,578
Alabama	4,617,794	30,565	4,648,359
Alaska	564,070	69,300	633,370
Arizona	687,302	18,904	706,206
Arkansas	884,359	11,825	896,184
California	9,779,736	225,351	10,005,087
Colorado	583,729	71,894	655,623
Connecticut	1,305,847	24,777	1,330,624
Delaware	724,427		724,427
Florida	6,765,814	24,090	6,789,904
Georgia	2,492,642		2,492,642
Idaho	684,112		684,112
Illinois	5,842,006	35,700	5,877,706
Indiana	2,835,189	1,625	2,836,814
Iowa	2,137,380	3,310	2,140,690
Kansas	1,431,046	97,625	1,528,671
Kentucky	1,725,509		1,725,509
Louisiana	1,391,063	27,000	1,418,063
Maine	803,949		803,949
Maryland	2,469,444	89,564	2,559,008
Massachusetts	5,164,538		5,164,538
Michigan	3,436,632		3,436,632
Minnesota	2,870,641		2,870,641
Mississippi	2,382,011	116,090	2,498,101
Missouri	1,908,116	89,238	1,997,354
Montana	316,027	4,557	320,584
Nebraska	706,137	29,660	735,797
Nevada	268,118		268,118
New Hampshire	544,318		544,318
New Jersey	2,398,317	3,000	2,401,317
New Mexico	1,096,801	237,155	1,333,956
New York	16,023,454	42,534	16,065,988
North Carolina	3,524,609	5,967	3,530,576
North Dakota	150,527		150,527
Ohio	4,450,696	6,600	4,457,296
Oklahoma	2,874,953	516,143	3,091,096
Oregon	1,128,987	10,000	1,138,987
Pennsylvania	7,507,606		7,507,606
Rhode Island	603,897		603,897
South Carolina	1,919,650		1,919,650
South Dakota	264,779	3,600	268,379
Tennessee	3,116,843	36,157	3,153,000
Texas	4,227,562	884,503	5,112,065

Personal property made available for distribution to public health and educational institutions and civil defense organizations and real property disposed of to public health and educational institutions, Apr. 1 through June 30, 1959 (acquisition cost)—Continued

[In accordance with sec. 203(o), Public Law 152, 81st Cong., as amended]

States	Personal property	Real property	Total
Utah	$1,427,488		$1,427,488
Vermont	299,587	$33,756	333,343
Virginia	3,041,476	96,349	3,137,825
Washington	2,212,494	19,086	2,231,580
West Virginia	1,344,802		1,344,802
Wisconsin	2,415,031		2,415,031
Wyoming	294,642		294,642
District of Columbia	510,858		510,858
Hawaii	300,276	345,970	646,246
Puerto Rico	665,393		665,393

Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, traffic safety is a matter of national interest and national concern.

With increased interest in this problem has come growing recognition of a new facet of highway travel. This is called turnpike driving.

The Abilene Reporter-News, in an editorial carried August 10, 1959, discussed this matter. I ask unanimous consent, in the interest of promoting safer driving, that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURNPIKE DRIVING

As the new network of superhighways spreads (despite temporary slowdowns such as now threatens) all of us motorists around the country will need to change some driving habits, the safety experts tell us. We'll need to learn how to be turnpike drivers.

Here in the Abilene area we have more than the average number of miles of new roads already in use. As soon as the redtape is untangled, Highway Engineer Jake Roberts and his fellow workers will have our town astradle big Interstate 20.

Enough of Interstate 20 has been in use long enough for us to realize that you can't build a highway which will be accident-proof. Not as long as you let automobiles driven by human beings use it. You can divide the traffic lanes, control the access, make it wide and straight as you please, and still you'll have wrecks.

There's more to being a good turnpike driver than just fighting off monotony. For one thing, the superroad automatically steps up the average speed of the cars on it—legally, as in some cases; illegally in many others.

The students of safety point out that one of the commonest mistakes in driving on the turnpikes is in the technique of passing another car. In city traffic or in traffic on an old-style highway a driver usually has little choice but to pass from close behind another vehicle. You dart around when you can.

That tactic can be dangerous, even fatal, on a turnpike. At high speed, a motorist has no business being close on another's heels. Turnpikes are designed for lane traffic. If you swing out sharply from behind a car to pass it from a close position, you run the risk of suddenly blocking the path of a fast car coming up in the left-hand lane.

The main thing to remember in driving on a turnpike is that the average speed is faster and the smallest error can, therefore, be magnified almost instantly into a tremendous crash.

Alabama Department, American Legion, Supports Roberts Bill, H.R. 6671

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 I introduced H.R. 6671, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 22 if he is a student attending school.

This to me is sensible legislation which would greatly aid a number of young people and their families all over the country, and which would contribute to educational achievement.

I was delighted to learn that the Department of Alabama of the American Legion has adopted at its annual convention a resolution strongly approving this bill, and urging congressional approval.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this resolution:

RESOLUTION 5

Whereas there is pending before Congress a measure, H.R. 6671, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining the age of 18, may receive a child's insurance benefits until they attain the age of 22 if he is a student attending full-time school and making satisfactory grades; and

Whereas the youth of this Nation are the very backbone and most precious resource that God has given our country; and

Whereas the Legislature and Alabama Senate has passed a similar resolution: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Alabama Department of the American Legion in its annual convention in Birmingham, Ala., meeting July 19 through 21, 1959, send letters over the signature of the department commander to our Congressmen and Senators in Washington, D.C., to endeavor to their fullest extent that H.R. 6671 be passed and that a copy of this resolution be mailed to each of of the Congressmen and Senators and the Honorable Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON.

This resolution was presented by Post No. 105, Goodwater, Ala., and adopted by the resolutions committee.

Statement by U.S. National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, during the debate upon the bill introduced by Senator CLARK and myself, to repeal section 1001(f) of the National Defense Education Act, the question was asked whether the students themselves objected to the oath and affidavit requirements of this act. Since that debate, the U.S. National Student Association, which represents over 1,300,000 students, has adopted a resolution opposing the oath and affidavit requirements. The resolution expresses the hope that the Senate will see fit to reconsider the action by which it referred the bill to committee.

In order that the attitude of the representatives of American students should be called to the attention of this body, I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by the association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION STATEMENT CONCERNING SECTION 1001(f), NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

The U.S. National Student Association, a confederation of over 390 student bodies and representing over 1,300,000 students, continually has supported efforts to strike from the National Defense Education Act section 1001(f) which requires students entering into the terms of the act to pledge an oath of allegiance and to file an affidavit disclaiming any membership in an allegedly subversive group or belief in allegedly subversive principles. The Senate's recent action in referring consideration of the desirability or necessity of section 1001(f) back to committee, rendering further Senate consideration of the section highly unlikely during the present session of Congress, is considered by USNSA as irresponsible and lacking in the fortitude expected of the U.S. Senate.

By its action, the Senate effectively rejected three viable, realistic alternatives to section 1001(f)—the proposals of Senators KENNEDY, MUNDT, and JAVITS; in doing so, it clearly dictated against the desires of students, student groups, educators, and educational groups, who have for months clearly indicated their distaste for and opposition to the section in question. The referral back to committee clearly ignores the fact that complete committee hearings have already been held and that these hearings indicated strong public support for the amendment of section 1001(f). The committee itself, in fact, voted 12 to 3 to recommend passage of Senator KENNEDY's proposal which would have stricken the section from the act. The Senate's decision, at best, indicates only the unwillingness of the Senate to face a fundamental question directly related to the freedom of the individual.

Because section 1001(f) apparently is meant to remain in the National Defense Education Act, it is safe to assume that a significant number of students, otherwise eligible under the terms of the act, will be dis-

criminated against, not because they are subversive, but because they are opposed in principle to the Federal Government requiring or restricting certain actions or beliefs vis-a-vis a disclaimer affidavit. Such a measure enacted on the part of the Government seems to the USNSA to be an example of employing totalitarian methods to oppose totalitarianism. Democracy, thus weakened, is a poor opponent of totalitarianism itself or of the processes of subversion.

USNSA's 12th National Student Congress, which meets at the University of Illinois during the last 2 weeks of August, will be asked to consider and bring its full weight against the Senate's action. USNSA hopes that the Senate will see fit to reconsider its action, to face the controversial section 1001(f) directly, and to revise it in the light of the fundamental principles of freedom and democracy.

Religious Education and Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following outstanding address by the Reverend John L. Murphy:

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

(Address delivered on the program "This Nation Under God," over WMAL radio station, Washington, D.C., Sunday, July 19, 1959, by Rev. John L. Murphy, S.T.D., department of religious education, associate editor, the American Ecclesiastical Review, the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.)

A number of years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court issued a judgment concerning the released time program. This proposal would permit children in public schools to take religious instruction elsewhere during school hours. Among other things, the decree contained this thought-provoking statement:

"We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being. * * * When the state encourages religious instruction or cooperates with religious authorities by adjusting the schedule of public events to sectarian needs, it follows the best of our traditions. For it then respects the religious nature of our people and accommodates the public service to their spiritual needs.

"To hold that it may not, would be to find in the Constitution a requirement that the Government show a callous indifference to religious groups. That would be preferring those who believe in no religion over those who do believe. * * * We cannot read into the Bill of Rights such a philosophy of hostility to religion." (*Zorach* v. *Clauson*, Apr. 28, 1952.)

This statement of the Court was greeted as a welcome relief by those who have been terrified by the inroads of Godlessness into our national way of life. For many years, those who have been openly opposed to God and religion have been waging a battle against the foundations of faith, and they have, to a large extent, won the day.

America still faces the unsolved problem of the moral training of its young. On all sides we hear complaints that the younger generation is an unmanageable generation—it wallows in crime and delinquency, it has no ideals, no moral code, no standards. There is, granted, a good amount of exaggeration in these complaints, but they are not entirely untrue. Quite the contrary, they ought to be expected. As people become less and less interested in religious and moral standards, it only stands to reason that they will eventually give up that more acceptable manner of living that is supported by those standards. When the religious creed is cast aside, the moral code soon follows; when a man no longer believes in God, he eventually begins to act as if there were no God. And no other force has ever been able to replace the rejected Deity: not fear of punishment, dread of public opinion, nor even love of country. When the true God has been cast aside, no faint image can take His place.

There have been some solutions proposed toward alleviating these problems. Released time instruction has been one; the denominational school is another. It is interesting to consider the purpose of the religious school in American democracy. The question, we must note, is not, as some would phrase it, a question of "Catholic schools" and "public schools." While Catholic education looms larger than others in this regard, it does not stand alone. Other religious groups foster their own denominational schools, and—what is most important in the democratic way of life—they do so because of the same basic principles as the Catholic populace. They do so because they have within them, the deep, personal conviction that education and religion cannot be treated in separate spheres.

The problem is a far deeper one than many people might suspect. It is not simply a matter of "doing things in a certain way." Quite the contrary, we are faced here with a question concerning the basic interpretation of our American way of life. Beneath the outer layer of legal disputes or emotional disagreements, or even at times, of bigotry, we can put our finger on a gigantic struggle that is going on between two completely different ways of thinking.

Fundamentally, as far as the basic principles are concerned, the struggle is between religion and irreligion; a way of faith versus secularism; God versus no-god. It is an attack upon the beliefs of all those who believe in God, and see Him as an important element in the democratic way of life.

Traditionally, America has been a religious-minded people. This belief is something which pertains to the law of the land, reaching back to those scripture-like phrases of the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Creation and Creator are words of deep implication. They give evidence of a grasp of reality among our forefathers that penetrated to the very depths of their being, and became so much a part of them, that it overflowed into their labor of organizing a new nation upon this earth.

The denominational school, actually, exists as a living request that these religious ideals may not be cast aside. It is an alarming thing for the believer to realize that there are men and women in highly influential positions who believe that religion is not important, and that democracy can do very nicely without God.

He realizes, of course, that there are many people who chose to place God and religion in the same class with old wives' tales and savage superstitions. According to our democratic principles, they are entitled to such opinions. But the believer asks only that such an unwanted conclusion be not forced upon others who happen to disagree with it. The man of faith is thoroughly convinced that to separate religious tenets and American democracy is to be guilty of an error in fact. The American way of life took root in the heart of a Christian people; it was formulated in terms that reflect those Christian principles. It was not a case of a Christian people who just happened, as it were, to fashion the American form of democracy. The connection between their faith and their form of life is far more intimate; the two are intertwined.

This is why the believer fears this denial of religion, not only for the sake of religion, but for the sake of democracy as well. Can we hope that our democratic way of life will continue unhampered, if we throw aside this element of religious belief that was originally so basic a part of its groundwork? That is the precise question.

Those American Christians who support a denominational school do not do so because they feel that the public school system is bad. It is not, by any means. But what they do fear, is the conspiracy of silence that has been built up around the public school system—a conspiracy of silence concerning God. Some will speak of it as a religious neutrality, but it is far more. As some would interpret our laws, the public school system would not only be indifferent to the differences between various religious groups; it would be indifferent to God Himself.

In many respects, this can be seen in the pattern of many a modern university as it exists in some circles. The sacred name of God has almost become a dirty word. He must not be mentioned. There is really a double standard involved in this procedure. A teacher in a modern State-run university (or even high-school) may include anything whatsoever in his view of life; and under the shield of "academic freedom" he may teach it—provided, however, that what he sees does not include God. He may, it is true, teach the true worth of man and the democratic way of life, as far as he is able to without mentioning God. But he must work within this limitation.

On the other hand, he may also teach atheism, communism and free love, and find defenders for his stand. Should anyone object, he will cry out "academic freedom," and claim that he is being persecuted and unjustly deprived of his rights. But should the professor in the adjoining classroom see as an essential part of reality, the existence of God and the need of religion, he is forbidden to say so. The banner of academic freedom is run down, and that of separation of church and state unfurls in its place—spelling out, in reality, separation of state from God.

There are those, therefore, who would not ask that our schools be turned into pulpits; but they do ask if God might not be given an equal chance on the campus and in the classroom, if God might not have the right to be mentioned and defended along with free love and communism.

As it can happen in practice, an agnostic may complain if a teacher in a public school mentions God; he has embarrassed his child. But is there not an equal right for the believer? If a teacher ridicules God and religion (either in an open manner or indirectly), can the devout Christian or Jewish parent not complain? Indeed. American education will be in a sad state if one teacher may proclaim in the classroom that God is a myth and religion a fraud, and do so under the banner of "academic freedom," while if a teacher openly indicates that God does exist and is important, he will be stopped by these defenders of freedom, who will cry out that he has broken the law of separation of church and state.

These are the problems of the present age, the concerns of mothers and fathers, of teachers and ministers of religion, of all those who must look to the coming generation and its needs. As Dr. Edward McCrady, then president of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tenn.—an Episcopalian institu-

tion—remarked in 1955: "I ask no more for religion than I do for geography in the educational process; but I also ask for no less." This is the mind of many another in this field. In these days when such matters as personal hygiene and table manners are taught in schools, without the children ever hearing religion seriously considered there, they almost invariablye will get the impression that religion, as Dr. McCrady expressed it, "isn't important enough for the Government to bother to pay anyone to discuss it."

In such a situation, there is at least a tacit assumption that religion and God are unimportant or unreal. It is this that disturbs the man of faith. For him, religion is not simply a part of life, a hobby, as it were. It is an all-consuming truth. It is his answer to the problems of the age, to the question of low moral standards, of delinquency, of failure to respect authority. Religion is important to man, and it is important to American democracy. It was so from the beginning and has continued to be important for many centuries.

Precisely because his faith is this all-consuming truth, the believer realizes that it must come to influence the whole man and pervade his entire view of human life. And as such, it has an essential role to play in the educational system of a God-given democracy.

Milwaukee Mayor Zeidler Answers Chicago Pollution Charge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the reply of the mayor of Milwaukee, Frank Zeidler, to Chicago's pollution charges.

Their being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In response to charges by Chicago officials that Chicago should have the right to divert water from Lake Michigan because Milwaukee has a beach pollution problem—a nonsequitur argument, I have the following observations to make:

Milwaukee is not alone with a lake pollution problem. Chicago probably has its own lake pollution problem. I have seen a very dirty flotsam and jetsam off Navy pier after a heavy rain and had no difficulty in identifying materials in the grayish, cloudy water. The Chicago River pollutes the lake also at times.

As for the suggestion by the sanitary district officials that the sanitary district engineers visit the Milwaukee area, as far as I am concerned, they are welcome any time to come to the city hall to discuss with me their and our problems. I feel sure sewerage comission officials would welcome them also.

However, I would expect, in return, an opportunity to visit their plants and to have our experts tell them how to treat their sludge, how to meter their water, and how to stop much of their industrial pollution so that at least they reach our level of purification, which they do not now do. Perhaps the exchange of visits might be mutually helpful. In the interim Chicago officials should agree with us that they will not seek additional water diversion.

The Sanitary District of Chicago persists in its efforts to divert more water from Lake Michigan, thus aggravating the pollution problem of every other Great Lakes city which must return its effluent to the Lakes after purification.

It should be pointed out that the sanitary district (by its demand for diversion, is proposing to flush still greater quantities of untreated or partially treated sewerage down the Illinois River, thus avoiding a nuisance for itself by creating one for the helpless neighbors down the river. They are making the downstream situation continually worse.

Milwaukee, it must be emphasized, has achieved the highest degree of purification possible under existing technology, and we recognize a water pollution problem exists; however, this is no justification for any community on the lakes demanding that it can therefore lower lake levels. Milwaukee will solve its problem without lowering lake levels and it is reasonable to expect Chicago to try to do the same.

Alabama Legislature Commends Congress on Farm Acreage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of Alabama has gone on record as wholeheartedly endorsing the action of this House in passing H.R. 7740, the cotton acreage allotment bill.

Having strongly supported this legislation, I am pleased to call to the attention of the Members this resolution:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 29

By Messrs. Gilchrist, Solomon, Branyon, Harvey, Johnson (J. T. Tom), Oakley, Adams (Tallapoosa), Gilmer, Lee and Nichols.

Whereas House Resolution 7740, a Federal measure of vital concern to southern cotton farmers, has now been passed by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the provisions of House Resolution 7740 were recommended and endorsed by the Alabama Legislative Cotton Study Committee and many farmers, ginners, processors, and others, and is considered by them the most important piece of legislation introduced to remedy the grossly inequitable system of transferring cotton allotment acreage away from the South, the traditional cotton-growing area, to the new cotton-growing areas of the far war; and

Whereas the Members of Alabama's congressional delegation have worked diligently, unceasingly, and tirelessly to secure the passage of this measure by the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama, the Senate and House of Representatives jointly concurring, That we hereby express our grateful appreciation to the individuals composing Alabama's congressional delegation for their herculean and tenacious efforts, and congratulate them heartily on their momentous contribution to the welfare of the cotton farmers of the South.

Resolved further, That we extend special thanks to the press of Alabama, to the publishers of the Progressive Farmer, and to the many farmers, ginners, processors, and others who promoted and supported this important Federal legislation.

Resolved also, That duly attested copies of this resolution be sent to the Members of Alabama's congressional delegation, and that copies be released forthwith to the press.

Adopted by the house of representatives August 7, 1959.

Concurred in and adopted by the senate August 11, 1959.

Approved by the Governor August 12, 1959.

Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the importance of soil conservation is widely recognized.

The Gilmer (Tex.) Mirror on August 6, 1959, carried a story relating the work of a soil conservationist, John Tolbert, who is now engaged with other scientists in a statewide project mapping the soils of Texas.

Because of the significance of this work in conserving our natural resources, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HE'S MAPPING WIDE AREA—SCIENTIST STATIONED HERE SAMPLES SOIL

A soil scientist is now stationed in Gilmer and is serving Upshur County and six surrounding counties.

The soil scientist, John Tolbert, 23, came here from the Northeast Texas area headquarters office in Mount Pleasant. He is currently working on a statewide project to block-mapped Texas soils and to convert the process of survey to the standard soil survey map.

A more detailed survey than the soil conservation method, the standard soil survey gives each type soil a name and detailed description, Tolbert explained. It's a soil inventory.

Of some 14 counties in the northeast Texas area. Gregg and Upshur's are the only counties that have not been converted to the standard soil survey, Tolbert said. However, he added, these two counties are expected to be converted sometime during the fall. Only six counties in the State have been completely converted.

A soil scientist's study of soil begins with the use of aerial photographs.

Then with samples of earth from selected spots he then determines the type of soil by measuring the texture and permeability, slope of the ground, and the amount of erosion, Tolbert explained.

A soil scientist works in cooperation with the work unit in each district, which in Upshur County is the Sabine River-Cypress Creek Soil Conservation District personnel. With information provided by soil scientists, the work units make recommendations to landowners for the best type of grass or legume for a particular type soil. Or if the land would grow trees better, that is suggested, Tolbert added.

This service, he said, is available for any farmer who is interested in and seeks help in improving his farm either by building ponds, sowing cover crops, or planting trees.

Of further aid to the farmer and rancher will be published reports containing detailed descriptions and characteristics of each type soil in the area with a complete coverage of the area in block maps.

Also containing lists of adaptable crops, recommended fertilizers, and expected yields, these reports will be available at the same time that the area adopts the standard soil survey. Tolbert commented.

There are two other soil scientists in the northeast Texas area—one at Clarksville serving the northern section, and another at Mount Pleasant serving the central counties. Besides Upshur, Tolbert's southern area includes Marion, Gregg, Smith, Wood, Rains, and part of Van Zandt Counties.

Prior to Tolbert's coming here, Upshur County was always served by soil scientists stationed in neighboring towns. Bill Walters, who is now area soil scientist in Gainsville, served this area from Tyler until January of this year.

Tolbert began work with the Mount Pleasant office in 1957 immediately after graduation from Texas Tech with a major in agronomy, a study of crops and soils and their relationship one to another. He is orginally from Sherman and attended Tarleton State College in Stephenville for 2 years.

Tolbert assumed duties in the Gilmer office in early May. He and his wife moved here July 25 and are living in the Ira Gunn garage apartment on the Pritchett Highway.

Another Tirade Against TVA Answered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the strong feeling of our colleague from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] on the TVA. I am sure we all respect his right to hold and express his opinions on this and any other subject. But, Mr. Speaker, in his most recent expression under the heading "Khrushchev Would Feel at Home at TVA" appearing in the Appendix of the RECORD August 10 last, the gentleman from Iowa makes certain implications which as a Representative of the people of Tennessee, I cannot overlook and leave unanswered.

The people of Tennessee yield to no one in their devotion to the fundamental principles of our country and in their abhorrence of communism.

The people of Tennessee are patriots to the core. In fact, Tennessee has won the nickname of the "Volunteer State" because her sons have volunteered in such great numbers in all our wars to preserve our Nation and the principles for which it stands. Mr. Speaker, the people of Tennessee are notable for their rugged individualism and their devotion to liberty, freedom, democracy, and our great American way of life.

Tennessee is the Nation's most enchanting State. With TVA and our industries and agriculture we are building a sound economy and a high standard of living.

We are proud of our history, our traditions of the past—and we are proud of our present-day progress and our contributions to the future.

The implication in Mr. JENSEN's statement that the people of the TVA area are accepting and living with a Communist institution in our midst impugns both the patriotism and the intelligence of our people, not only of Tennessee, but also of the other States served by the TVA and even their Representatives in the Congress. Therefore, in answer I denounce the implications of the statement placed in the RECORD by the gentleman from Iowa on August 10, last.

The people of our country, through their Congress, established the TVA some 25 years ago. Recently the Congress has voted by decisive majorities to continue this great institution in the service of our Nation.

Two years ago the Senate voted 61 to 20 to continue the TVA by providing a means for self-financing its power operations.

This year the Senate voted again in favor of TVA by a vote of 73 to 17. During this session the House voted for the TVA on two occasions by margins of 245 to 170 and 242 to 167.

A few days ago the President signed into law the new self-financing bill approved by the Congress. Thus, the people of this Nation have repeatedly endorsed the TVA over the years and, on recent occasions, in spite of Mr. JENSEN's opposition.

This victory was won in spite of the opposition of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]—and in fact his prediction that the bill would never become law. It is the law of the land today.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every one of those who voted in favor of the TVA bill and the President as well, in approving the measure, will resent strongly the implication that his vote and participation indicates any acceptance of any Communist ideas, as Mr. JENSEN would imply.

Mr. Speaker, I have my own reservations about Mr. Khrushchev's visit to our country. Personally, I do not think Mr. Khruschev should have been invited to the United States. I see no reason why we should roll out the red carpet to those who have denounced our way of life and have dedicated themselves to the overthrow of democracy and our way of life. However, Mr. Khrushchev has been invited to become a guest of our country and should the President and the State Department include a visit to Tennessee in his itinerary, I will say to my colleague from Iowa that our people will proudly show the TVA to him—the world's greatest example of water resource development—where floods have been harnessed, navigation and commerce promoted and where great hydroelectric power dams produce low cost electricity for sale to the people and for the defense of our country. The TVA is one of the greatest showcases in America of democracy in action. Thousands of interested visitors annually come to visit and see this great system of rivers harnessed for the benefit of all the people of our Nation.

The TVA is not all that the people of Tennessee can show Mr. Khrushchev. We could proudly show him the great atomic energy plant where the atom was harnessed and where atomic energy was developed and the atomic bomb produced—the bomb that ended the war and saved the lives of millions of our own soldiers and those of our allies.

We could show him our great industries, farms and factories.

We could proudly show him our great educational institutions—the University of Tennessee, Vanderbilt University and a score of other great public and private colleges.

We could show him our great religious institutions—for ours is a State where religious freedom abounds to the fullest.

In Tennessee we could show him the homes and shrines of three great Presidents of the United States—Andrew Jackson, Andrew Johnson, and James K. Polk.

We could show him the mountains and hills and valleys from which the Volunteers marched forth to King's Mountain with Sevier to New Orleans with the immortal Andrew Jackson, and from which the sons of Tennessee have marched to every war for which our country has fought for freedom—freedom for ourselves and others.

In short, if Mr. Khrushchev comes to Tennessee we could show him at every turn a State where freedom is as natural and necessary to the lives of our people as the very air they breathe. We could show him a land of God fearing people, and churches and homes where Christianity abounds and communism is abhorred.

Thus, the implication in Mr. JENSEN's statement that if he visited the TVA area Mr. Khrushchev would find a little communistic island in our country is one which I highly resent, not only as an individual, but as the representative of the people of Tennessee.

I should point out that a few years ago a group of Soviet Russian agricultural experts, headed by the Soviet Minister of Agriculture, Vladimar Matskevich, visited the State of Iowa to inspect the great farms of that State—Mr. JENSEN's State. I recall that these officials, guests of our Nation, were accorded every proper courtesy while visiting in Iowa; and knowing the natural courtesy and hospitality of the fine people of Iowa, I am sure that these Soviet visitors were made to feel at home as much as possible under the circumstances.

Reports in the press at the time stated how much the visitors from Soviet Russia were impressed with the farms of Iowa. It would be ridiculous for anyone to imply that this common interest in farming evidenced any common interest on the part of the people from Iowa for collectivized farming or any other communistic ideas; but no more ridiculous than the aspersion about TVA which Mr. JENSEN makes in his statement.

The controversy about the TVA is old and has been bitter at times. I would be the first to defend any member's right to express himself fully and completely

on this subject—whether he is for the TVA or against the TVA. Mr. JENSEN is a known extremist on this subject and we have respected his right to be extreme. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that there are limits to intemperance on this or any other matter; and in this instance, the gentleman from Iowa, in my opinion, is exceeding those limits. In so doing he has not only impugned the good people of my State and the South, and the Members of this body, but has also done a disservice to the people of his own great State of Iowa—whose Governor recently publicly stated that the views of Mr. JENSEN did not represent the views of the people and citizens of Iowa. Tirades and extremism and attacks on our American institutions must be answered and stopped in the interest of preserving America.

Increasing Our Cultural Relations With Eastern Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the visit of Vice President NIXON to the Soviet Union and Poland and the announcement of the exchange of visits between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower have created a new international climate in which anxiety and expectation are mingled. On balance I am convinced that the exchange of visits between the heads of state of the two chief adversaries in the world struggle will be a good thing. I believe Mr. NIXON'S visit to Poland has strengthened the ties between that country and our own. Recently I have proposed as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act the building of a children's hospital in Kraków with counterpart funds credited to Poland.

In our preoccupation with the increased tempo of interchange with Poland and the U.S.S.R., we may be in danger of overlooking the other countries of Eastern Europe such as Czechoslovakia and Hungary. On August 5, an editor in the Washington Post and Times Herald said that "this newspaper hopes that the [Nixon] visit to Warsaw will be the beginning of an American policy of paying more attention to the countries of Eastern Europe."

Mr. President, I think the time has come for use to explore the possibility of increased cultural and intellectual contacts with all eastern European countries. The opportunities for this are not, of course, so great as those in Poland, but I believe that an approach can and should be made.

A few days ago a proposal for strengthening American-Hungarian cultural relations came to my attention. It was written by Dr. Bernadotte E. Schmitt, professor emeritus of modern history of the University of Chicago. I think this modest proposal, which recommends donations of books from the United States to Hungarian libraries, the exchange of publications and eventually the exchange of scholarships between the two countries, is worthy of most serious consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Schmitt's proposal and the editorial from the August 5 Washington Post and Times Herald printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proposal and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSAL FOR STRENGTHENING AMERICAN-HUNGARIAN CULTURAL RELATIONS

(By Bernadotte E. Schmitt)

In the last several years it became apparent that there is a deep feeling of need for a development of organized cultural relations on broader scale between the United States and Hungary. The encouraging success of the present American program in Poland suggests a similar approach in Hungary. Although the present Hungarian Government follows a different course from that of the Polish Government in relation to official contacts between the two countries, this does not preclude the possibility of a cultural approach with official Hungarian cooperation.

I submit the following proposal for the serious consideration of the U.S. Government.

I. BOOK DONATIONS

I propose that a selected group of Hungarian libraries should receive, as a gift of the United States, a well-balanced selection of American books and serial publications ranging in number from 500 to 2,000.

I would suggest that the Library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and the National Széchényi Library, both in Budapest, receive the largest contingent, perhaps 2,000 books each. The 14 university libraries should be given 1,200 to 1,500 titles and some 40 other important libraries, including the National Medical Library, the National Technical Library, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Pedagogical Library (established in 1958) should receive 500 selected titles.

The selection of these materials could be done by a small committee of scholars who know both American resources and Hungarian needs.

The following scholars have expressed their willingness to serve on such a committee if they are requested to do so:

Dr. Elemer Bako, Hungarian reference librarian, Library of Congress.

Prof. William Columbus Davis, department of history, George Washington University.

Dr. William Harlen Gilbert, Jr., anthropologist, legislative reference service, Library of Congress.

Prof. Wood Gray, department of history, George Washington University.

Mr. Edmund C. Rowan, director, Hungarian refugee scientist project, National Academy of Science.

This book donation proposal was prompted by increasing evidence of interest in American culture, literature, history, and the American way of life in general, on the part of Hungarian scholars, librarians, etc. The Hungarian events in 1956 produced considerable educational reform in the country. English language and literature are being taught again in Hungarian universities which unfortunately do not have the necessary books for teaching and research purposes, much less the financial means to purchase valuable and well-balanced collections.

II. EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS

Exchange of current publications and retrospective materials between American and Hungarian institutions (academies, universities, research institutions, funds, societies, etc.) should be encouraged and channeled along the lines indicated in the book donation program.

The library of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences and several other libraries have already expressed their eagerness to develop such contacts, especially with American university libraries.

This type of voluntary and institutional contacts would be extremely fruitful in further strengthening of cultural ties, common research interests, personal and other bonds as envisioned by the "People to People" program. There is a general trend in Hungary to evaluate traditional historical ties between the United States and that country, and in a growing number of cases in an appreciative form. Cultural exchange contacts as described above would encourage and broaden this sort of trend in publishing and research activities in Hungary.

III. EXCHANGE SCHOLARSHIPS

Exchange scholarships of the same character and volume as provided under the foreign leadership program between this country and Finland could be extended for Hungarian scholars, and if possible, for graduate students and young researchers. (If we can accept Russian scholars and representatives of different fields of knowledge, art and interests in this country without endangering our internal and international security, we should express at least the same degree of recognition to representatives of the cultural life of a country which just recently proved how far its intellectual circles are from being taken in by Communist ideas.)

This part of the program could be developed through the National Academy of Science and other proper channels in this country which have a staff for administrating such programs.

IV. WELFARE AND CULTURAL ACTIVITIES

The possibility of a more comprehensive program of cultural exchange should be considered. In this area opportunities may soon present themselves for welfare programs and exchanges in the performing arts.

Perhaps American agricultural products could be sold to the Hungarian Government for local currency. This would provide at least a considerable part of the budget for financing modest programs of exchange and may open the door to further cultural and welfare activities.

MR. NIXON IN POLAND

In many ways it is too bad that Vice President NIXON'S visit to Warsaw has been overshadowed by the news of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings. The tumultuous welcome Mr. NIXON received in Poland could not have been staged; it demonstrated the great reservoir of genuine good will for Americans among the Polish people. Mr. NIXON'S task has been an extremely delicate one: to replenish this reservoir without complicating the problems of Poland's precarious independence. In essence his job has been to convey American support but to avoid ostentation that could provoke a new Soviet squeeze on the limited freedoms under Polish communism.

That Mr. NIXON was the first high Western official to talk with Communist Party Leader Gomulka is in itself something of a feat. The Vice President did well to show special concern for Polish fears of a new war. Perhaps in private conversation he was able further to allay any apprehensions that the United States is promoting German

expansionism, and to encourage some sort of Polish understanding with West Germany. A quiet agreement between Warsaw and Bonn could do a great deal to relieve fears and help the solution of other problems.

This newspaper hopes that the visit to Warsaw will be the beginning to an American policy of paying more attention to the countries of Eastern Europe. Of all the Soviet-bloc countries Poland is by all odds the freest—Yugoslavia is no longer part of the Soviet bloc—and there are some extraordinary reasons for the position of the Warsaw regime. But the cause of more independence and freedom elsewhere would best be served in present circumstances, not by urging an overthrow of communism and return to the old social system, but by indicating that the United States thinks these countries important and does not believe that Moscow invariably speaks for them. To ignore them is merely to strengthen Mr. Khrushchev's hold.

Public Works Appropriations Bill of 1960 Rejects "No New Starts" Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, we have passed and sent to the President the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960. In view of the continuing interest of Members of the House and others in the results of our action, I believe it is appropriate to point out further that in enacting this bill the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, and the Congress itself, did not accept the "no new starts" policy which was expressed in the budget presented by the Budget Bureau and the President. The action of the Congress in approving this bill evidences a rejection of the "no new starts" policy and a firm approval of a reasonable program of continuing construction of worthwhile and needed projects and studies of other future projects by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of Interior.

It will be recalled that in submitting the public works budget the President and the Budget Bureau favored a policy of continuing the construction of projects already begun but of not undertaking any new starts or even the planning of new projects. The Appropriations Committee of this body disagreed with this policy and expressed itself in favor of carrying on the program of water resource development in an orderly and uninterrupted manner. The Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations approved and recommended funds for 37 new construction starts and for the planning of 11 other projects. The House approved this recommendation in passing the bill.

The Senate added 30 additional starts and 33 new planning studies of other projects. The conferees compromised on 52 new starts and 30 planning studies. This decision by the conferees was accepted by both bodies in the passage of the public works appropriation bill for 1960.

It should be noted that the additional new starts and studies involve an added cost of less than $25 million over the budget as submitted to the Congress. So that, although the funds appropriated are close to the recommendation of the President, the policy underlying the use of the funds is quite different.

Apparently it is the philosophy of the Budget Bureau and the administration that the principal function of the public works program is to provide employment in poor times and that in good times we should stop or delay the development of the Nation's water resources.

In passing this appropriation bill, the Congress has refused to take such a narrow and limited view, and has, instead, looked upon our water resource development program as a positive program to develop the capabilities of our Nation for the continued growth and prosperity of the entire country. These programs are more than expenditures—they are investments in America. Our Nation must have a well-planned and continuing program of both construction and planning; in the long run this is more economical, practical, and represents sound policy.

Granting that in times of economic stress we can also use this program as an economic stimulant, it would nevertheless be foolish to restrict the surveying and planning of any new projects. Only with intelligent and deliberate planning can we make sure that we have on the shelf, as it were, well-thought-out projects that the Nation will need if an economice emergency should develop.

Therefore, in repudiating the no-new-starts policy, the Congress in my view acted wisely and with a forward-looking perspective, to provide for an orderly development of our resources at this time in step with the growth of our Nation.

Campaign of Postmaster General To Eliminate Obscene Material From the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Postmaster General, the Honorable Arthur Summerfield, is conducting an intensive campaign for the elimination of smutty material from the mails. This campaign is of interest to every citizen concerned about the distribution of this material as it affects our youth.

Those of us who are familiar with the type of pornographic material that is sent through the mail share the views of the Postmaster General and urge him to intensify his campaign against this type of material. Our decent citizens are requesting it.

The Postmaster General has authority to open and inspect second-class, third-class, and fourth-class mail, but is prevented from opening and inspecting first-class mail.

There are indications that much of this material is being distributed through first-class mail.

I am hopeful that the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Congress will take another look at the handling of this type of mail; and I also hope that we may be able to write additional legislation, if necessary, to eliminate it.

In a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared an excellent article entitled "The 'Smut Campaign' Via the Mails," written by Josephine Ripley. I ask unanimous consent that the article be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE "SMUT CAMPAIGN" VIA THE MAILS
(By Josephine Rip'ey)

There has been public debate in recent weeks over whether Postmaster General Summerfield is riding a broomstick, or whether he is merely wielding it in the manner for which it was designed.

As the Postmaster General sees it, nothing but a "clean sweep" will rid the mails of an unprecedented flood of "obscene and pornographic materials."

The distribution of this material is a $500 million racket, he has warned. He is particularly alarmed because the racket is directed primarily at young people. From what the Post Office Department already knows of the operation, and from material confiscated, there is reason to believe some 1 million young people will be approached in this way during the coming year.

While the Postmaster General has been provided with a broom for keeping the mails clean, in the form of laws which make him responsible for preventing their misuse, he may use that broom only under certain conditions.

Some feel that the Post Office Department does not have sufficient authority to deal with the problem; others feel that the jurisdiction should rest wholly with the courts.

For while the Post Office Department is charged with keeping the mails free of obscene and indecent material, there is no clear-cut definition of these terms. The determination must lie with the individual responsible for making the ruling.

This first determination is made within the Department, by its lawyers, then by the examiners, and finally, after it has passed through various processes and hearings, by the "judicial officer."

At this point, if the publisher is still on the negative end of the decision, he may appeal to the courts. Congress passed its first antiobscenity law in 1873. Since then there have been various changes and amendments. Today it is a Federal crime to use the mails in interstate commerce to sell or distribute anything that is obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, or indecent.

This material, in general, takes the form of pictures, films, cartoons, or questionable magazines. It is generally transmitted by second-, third-, or fourth-class mail.

The Post Office Department has authority to inspect such classes of mail if there is reason to suspect it contains matter of this kind. It may also check mail of this type if

it suspects the content ineligible for the class in which it is dispatched.

But the Department has no authority, without obtaining a search warrant, to open first-class mail, even though it knows that letter-class mail is being used for transmitting obscene material.

In fact, the Department has evidence that the peddlers of indecent material to teenagers are actually distributing their wares by letter mail. The Postmaster General does not ask for censorship authority, but he is appealing to parents and teenagers themselves to report the receipt of such material to the postal authorities.

Although the Post Office Department has been much in the news in recent weeks over its ban on the D. H. Lawrence book (later reversed by a Federal court judge), it is rarely that the Department takes action on a novel.

In the first place, the Post Office Department does not have the personnel to review books. Moreover, books are not, generally speaking, transported by mail, at least in bulk. There are other and cheaper modes of transportation.

The Department had plenty of warning, however, in the case of the Lawrence novel. In fact, it was the publisher who sounded the warning—in loud tones.

Thus the Postmaster General was forced to either ban the book or, in effect, approve it. In any case, the publisher could hardly fail to gain from the publicity. And obviously did.

But what the Postmaster General would prefer to publicize is what he calls the "smut campaign" being conducted by means of the mails on a wholesale scale, and in a far more sinister way.

He is deeply disturbed about this, particularly since it is being aimed "more and more at the Nation's children—teenage boys and girls."

This Is What the People Want

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 16, 1959. It is the best analysis of the vote on the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives that I have seen, to date.

The House of Representatives is nearest to the people and more likely to reflect their true thinking. The people are not often roused, having many worries and responsibilities of their own that have nothing to do with government and politics. But, when they are truly aroused they speak with a mighty voice and this voice the House of Representatives heard and responded to.

Let us not forget that there are still 144 million of our population who do not belong to any labor union and their rights must be considered and protected.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 16, 1959]

THIS IS WHAT THE PEOPLE WANT

The wave of public opinion which carried the Landrum-Griffin labor bill high and wide through the House last week is still at full crest. This is the central fact confronting a House-Senate conference which will shortly determine whether the country is to be granted genuine labor reform in 1959.

The victory won in the House on Thursday, and repeated overwhelmingly on Friday, means that the Nation as a whole will no longer tolerate the claims of certain shabby labor leaders and their unscrupulous cohorts to be above morality and the law. It was an extraordinary display of the popular will, led by the President and reflected by the Representatives. There is now no longer any doubt about the issues or the means of resolving them.

But the bill is not yet law. In April, the Senate passed a reform measure of its own under the sponsorship of Senator KENNEDY, and the two must be reconciled by conferees of both Houses. The Kennedy bill is much the weaker piece of legislation, compromised from the start by an attempt to avoid the disapproval of the unions. Although it took color at the last moment from the impaisoned efforts of Senator MCCLELLAN, it is a poor substitute for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

So there is still one more battle to fight. It has been suggested that the conference accept the House bill without further ado, but we dare not hope it will be as easy as that. The chief points of debate are likely to be the curbs the House has imposed on secondary boycotting and blackmail picketing, curbs which are anathema to Jimmy Hoffa but which would put a stop to some of the most blatant Teamster brigandage. The Kennedy bill is largely innocent of such restrictions. Where the bills do agree is the necessity for unions to disclose their financial affairs and the protection of union democracy.

These curbs on practice are the controversial provisions. The House conferees will support them in the spirit of their victory there. The Senators are expected to balk, but just how strongly and for how long? Senator KENNEDY, who will set the keynote for his colleagues, says that compromise will be difficult, but that it must be achieved. Otherwise, as he knows, there will be no labor legislation whatever this session. Is there a hint here that the Senator's antenme are also registering the shockwaves of public opinion?

Let us hope so. For this is Congress' great opportunity to set in order the house that labor cannot set in order for itself. And this reform is what the country demands.

Unemployment in State of West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on several previous occasions this year, I have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information to the effect that, while the national employment picture is brightening, the picture in my own State of West Virginia is not wholly one of rosy improvement.

As a further illustration of this unpleasant reality, there appeared on the front page of last Wednesday's Charleston Gazette two adjoining stories—one of them proclaiming that American employment in July was the highest in history, and the other pointing out that unemployment claims in West Virginia are rising.

In order that the Members of Congress may be reminded that our country still has depressed areas, and that the need for an area redevelopment program to deal with technological unemployment is still with us, I ask unanimous consent that the two items from the newspaper be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston Gazette, Aug. 12, 1959]

U.S. JOB TOTAL HITS PEAK IN JULY

WASHINGTON.—More Americans had jobs in July than in any previous month. There were 67,594,000 employed.

The Government's monthly job survey showed 252,000 more employed than in June, which also was a record. There are 2,415,000 more jobs than a year ago.

Unemployment declined by 238,000 from June to 3,744,000 in July. This is a decline of 1,550,000 from July 1958.

Seymour Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, said in releasing the new data Tuesday that they showed a further and continuing improvement in the overall employment picture.

The seasonally adjusted ratio of workers idle, but seeking jobs, to the rest of the work force rose in July to 5.1 percent from 4.9 in June. The long-term unemployed—those idle 15 weeks or longer—dropped by 110,000 in July to 820,000. This is less than half the figure a year ago.

One sidelight to the new report is that unemployment among Negro workers is 11 percent, or more than double the 4.5 idle rate among white workers.

The July employment increase came despite a more than seasonal decline in farm employment attributed to bad crop weather in many areas—primarily in the South.

Farm employment declined by 406,000 to 6,825,000. But nonfarm employment reached a record 60,769,000, up 658,000 from June.

Many of the youngsters who flooded the labor market in June seeking temporary jobs during their summer vacation, found work in July. Unemployment in the 14-to-24-year age category dropped 364,000 over the month.

The factory workweek declined slightly to an average 40.4 hours. This is still more than an hour longer than a year ago and represents the longest July workweek since 1955.

UNEMPLOYMENT RISES IN STATE BY 5,006 CLAIMS

Unemployment in West Virginia is on the upswing with a total of 21,662 claims being filed under the State's unemployment compensation program, the Employment Security Department reported Tuesday.

The figure compares with 19,311 claims filed last week, compared with 3,431 for the report shows that 5,006 initial claims were filed last week, compared with 3,431 for the previous week. Continued claims equaled 16,656 for the week ended last Saturday, against 15,880 the week before.

A total of $538,095 was paid in unemployment compensation last week, leaving the cash balance at $37,756,997.

James L. E. Jappe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Sunday, August 16, Mr. James L. E. Jappe of Cleveland, Ohio, died at

his summer home on Sheep Island in Rideau Lake, Ontario. He was 68 years old and one of the best known personalities in the State, as well as one of its most influential. Jimmy was an attorney, publicist, politician, and lobbyist extraordinaire. Among the many posts he filled in his lifetime were secretary to the Republican National Convention committees in Cleveland in 1924 and 1936, assistant secretary of the Republican National Committee, legislative representative in Columbus for the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, the Cleveland and Ohio State Bar Associations, and many other State and local organizations. He was the friend and confidante of many Members of this Congress, and I cannot put into words the tremendous help and inspiration he has been to me. It is impossible to estimate the great personal loss his passing means to literally hundreds of people, and I know that every Member of this body who knew him will agree with the sentiments expressed in an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer which follows:

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Aug. 17, 1959]

JAMES L. E. JAPPE

Jimmy Jappe probably had more friends than any other man in our town. The first tenet of the creed he lived by was to help other people; he enjoyed doing it, and the people he did favors for became his lasting friends.

Jappe was also a natural born promoter, and whether he was promoting a Russian ballet at the old Euclid Avenue Opera House or a project to fill the Cleveland Stadium with the biggest baseball crowd ever assembled up to that time, he devoted his full energies to the task.

As a politician, Jappe operated behind the scenes. He helped manage national conventions of the Republican Party in Cleveland, Chicago, and Philadelphia. He was a friend of Presidents, Cabinet members, Senators, Congressmen, Governors, State legislators, councilmen and precinct committeemen, the latter category being the only political office which he ever held or to which he ever aspired.

Jappe had an intimate knowledge of Ohio politics and Ohio politicians, both Republican and Democratic. He was an effective and highly ethical lobbyist in Columbus and he was a close adviser of many a neophyte legislator who went on to achieve higher office and honors.

As a lobbyist, however, Jappe did not confine his efforts to matters in which his clients were interested. He helped to secure the enactment of many measures which he believed to be in the public interest. One of these was a project to recodify the Ohio laws. He originated it, secured legislative approval of it and became one of the members of the commission which carried it out.

His death is a loss to the city, the State, and the Nation.

Amendment of Transportation Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter, in the nature of a resolution, addressed to Mr. W. P. Kennedy, president, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio, from the North Dakota legislative board, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen relating to their support of the so-called Case amendment to the Transportation Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATIVE BOARD,
BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
Fargo, N. Dak., July 22, 1959.

Mr. W. P. KENNEDY,
President, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Cleveland, Ohio.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Whereas the 1958 Transportation Act has resulted in the practical removal from the jurisdiction of the North Dakota State Public Service Commission of the authority to determine the need for railroad transportation within the State of North Dakota; and

Whereas it is the opinion of this committee that the application of said act has deprived the citizens of this State of much-needed transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee go on record as being in support of the Case amendment to said Transportation Act as one means of alleviating the impact of said act on the citizens and their requirements for railroad transportation of this State, and that this committee urge upon the two U.S. Senators and two U.S. Congressmen of the State of North Dakota that they support the Case amendment to said act.

Fraternally yours,
S. F. KALUZA, *Secretary.*
B. J. DELMORE, *Chairman.*
A. F. FORD,
State Legislative Representative.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to included the 22d article of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 10 issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

FINDS BAKU HAS ORIENTAL FLAVOR

(By Charles L. Dancey)

BAKU.—Only 3 hours in the Big Russian jet from Stalingrad to Baku, following the Caspitan seacoast much of the way. Baku sticks out into the sea on a peninsula, and is cool and comfortable. No screens and no flies.

(Stalingrad was hot. About like Peoria this time of year. The only screens I've seen in the Soviet Union—and some flies.)

The camera is nix in Baku between the oilfields and the great harbor that backgrounds the whole city. Also, here were the most police I have seen anywhere, and they have always been plentiful. There is an average of three uniformed cops in every downtown city block.

There were approximately 50 MIG fighter planes on the big paved airstrip where we landed, besides commercial aircraft.

We drove to town through a fores of oil derricks and past miles of low homes built of soft limestone blocks. It looks like a Mexican countryside both in these dwellings and the parched ground.

The people are dark, with aquiline features—Arabic in appearance. The buildings of prominence, the furniture, the dress, everything seems to have an oriental flavor.

Here again, as on the boat, (indeed wherever I get away from a strictly tourist eating isolation) the Soviet "boilermaker" seems to be the most popular appetized at all meals. That is, everyone seems to launch his meal with 150 or 200 grams of vodka and a bottle or two of beer. This includes breakfast. I would guess that 150 grams would make about four shots. The book says 150 grams is 5 ounces and not infrequently they reorder when the food comes.

I also buzzed through the old city here—a veritable Casbah, with streets narrower than our snuggest downtown alleys winding every which way.

Here I managed to meet only two local citizens unofficially, both Azerbaijanese. They repeated over and over to be sure I understood that while they spoke Russian to me that they were not "Rooskee" but Azerbaijan.

I wished I could take one of these young men home, I would get rich. He is strikingly handsome, and also rugged and virile. A Gilbert Roland type only better looking, and a very mobile and expressive face with startling light green eyes flashing out of his dark face and very dark brows.

Here I attended the ballet—best entertainment I have seen. The setting was fabulous, the costuming splendid, and the dancing, of course, superb. The ballet was one enacting an old legend of Azerbaijan concerning a king who fell in love with a maiden who turned out to be the daughter of one of his many wives.

I was told that I would back-track here, flying to Tbilisi in the heart of the Caucasus Mountains, the capital city of Georgia, and the home city of Josef Djugashivili (alias Stalin). Also, that I would fly in a special plane carrying only me and a West German jazz band.

So, on to Tbilisi.

Rev. Ford Lewis, of First Unitarian Church, Portland, Oreg., Supports Mercy Fleet Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the proposal for a Great White Fleet of hospital ships, which would take the wonders of modern healing to the backward nations of the world, where there prevails a shockingly high infant mortality rate and where millions are afflicted with congenital blindness and other tragic diseases.

Life magazine has advanced the suggestion that we take some of our hospital ships out of mothballs and send them across the seven seas with guardian angels of mercy aboard—namely, doctors and nurses and various medical technicians.

A most eloquent sermon in behalf of this proposal was preached at the First Unitarian Church of Portland, Oreg., in my home community, on August 2, 1959, by Dr. Ford Lewis, associate pastor of the First Unitarian Church. Dr. Lewis has emphasized in his message that few

legislative proposals would so circulate and translate into action the noble message of the New Testament.

I ask unanimous consent that the address in support of the Great White Fleet proposal by Dr. Ford Lewis, entitled "From Mothballs to Mercy Missions," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of those of my colleagues who likewise are supporting this humanitarian idea.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM MOTHBALLS TO MERCY MISSIONS

(By Dr. Ford Lewis)

I

Perhaps no dream of the human race has been more persistent and widely cherished than the dream of universal peace. In spite of the fact that no generation since human history began has been without its quota of war, men continue to hope and believe that peace is possible. In spite of the fact that the nations of the world are now in a position to destroy more lives, more homes, more cities, and more civilization in one day than have been destroyed in the entire span of recorded history, we are bold enough to believe in peace as a practical ideal, and to work for it.

Only today our Vice President, who has been on an extended visit to Russia in the interests of peace, has left that land and started home. Representatives of the four most powerful nations in the world have been for several months engaged in discussions in Geneva, attempting to resolve the critical issues of the occupation of Berlin and German unification as well as pave the way for a summit conference to deal with all questions of war and peace.

The dream simply will not die—that the time will come when nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nations shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Not all the Bible, of course, points to peace. The early and more primitive parts of the Old Testament begin with a tribal war god leading his chosen people to bloody triumphs over their enemies. Over the centuries during which the Scriptures were compiled, the social vision broadened. The community of man was widened and made more inclusive. The idea of the brotherhood of man reached a high eminence in the writings of the Old Testament prophets and was recapitulated in the thought of Jesus and the New Testament apostles. Beginning with a god whose highest social vision was a tribal victory, the Bible ends with a God whose worshipers pray for a worldwide kingdom of righteousness and peace.

It was the persistent quest for peaceful coexistence that led during the medieval period in Europe to an arrangement called peace of God. Fighting was prohibited in churches and around all shrines and holy places. Noncombatant populations were protected. Persons who violated these prohibitions were anathematized. They were placed under an ecclesiastical curse involving excommunication from the church and damnation.

The truce of God was similarly enforced to assure peaceful weekends. It prohibited all fighting between Thursday evening and Monday morning. We may think this quaint and naive. Furthermore, when we reflect that one of the objectives of the church in enforcing these rules was to achieve a peaceful Europe in order to organize the Crusades, we may be inclined to discount the whole thing. Nevertheless, the search for peace will go on in our time with or without our cooperation, just as it has in the past.

II

In the 14th century, Dante proposed a world empire for the purpose of ending war. During the same century, Pierre Dubois put forth the idea of a permanent arbitration tribunal. History has vindicated the wisdom of this suggestion, but he was 500 years ahead of his time. In the early 17th century, Henry IV of France proposed a world confederation in the interests of peace. Toward the end of the 17th century, William Penn detailed a plan to establish an international federation between independent nations for the prevention of war. Meanwhile, Hugo Grotious laid the foundation for international law in his book, "The Law of War and Peace," written during the 30-Year War, one of the most destructive holocausts man has ever inflicted upon himself.

All the countries of the world have made their contribution to the effort for peace. Utilitarians and rationalists in England, encyclopediasts and physiocrats in France, and idealists in Germany have all worked toward this end. A half-dozen or so international peace congresses were organized in Europe during the 19th century. The history of the League of Nations, the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921, the London Conference of 1930, the various peace pacts and pledges are well known. Altogether too well known, also, is the fact that in spite of these conscientious efforts to maintain peace, we are still trying to recover from our most recent and worst world war.

We should not be surprised, I suppose, that many persons are disillusioned. They think that a peaceful world society is a false and impossible goal. I have heard some religious fundamentalists quote the Bible to prove that wars will never cease. These people lack faith. They lack faith in themselves and the ideal of a peaceful world. There is no better evidence than this that they lack faith in God, the very God whom they purport to quote literally in support of the inevitability of war. If a man denies the possibility of achieving the highest human dream, he denies either the power or the love of God, or both. His thinking has not evolved with the Bible. He is left in the neolithic backwash of primitive tribalism in which God chooses among the nations and takes sides and supervises the slaughter of one nation by another. But the god they worship was outmoded 2,500 years ago when the Hebrew prophets elevated Yahweh above the nationalistic policies of the tribe and revealed God as a moral judge, a god of peace and justice and of all mankind.

Our question is not the academic one of whether peace is theoretically possible, but what can we do to make it probable? What can we do to advance the cause of peace? Can we do anything as "people to people"—to use the words of President Eisenhower? One specific proposal has been made which I think has great merit. Parenthetically, let it be said that specific proposals are the only kind that can be effective. Everyone is for peace in general. Everyone is against sin, but this is not enough. It was not enough when the "rich young ruler," as he is referred to compositely in the Gospels, came to Jesus to get an opinion on what he must do to share the good life to come. When Jesus proposed a specific course of action, "his countenance fell, and he went away sorrowful."

Again, when the inquiring lawyer asked "Who is my neighbor?" he was given a direct answer which involved certain concrete, if to him unpleasant, realities. He was told that his neighbor was a Samaritan, a good Samaritan, a member of a community with which the Jews had no dealings. We are left with the question of whether the lawyer's good will, which up to this point had been generalized, went to pieces on this particular ethic, or whether it survived the test of a concrete expression of neighborliness.

In any case, the lesson for us is that we must find real ways of putting our ideals into action. William Blake says: "He who would do good to another, must do it in minute particulars. General good is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite, and flatterer."

III

The proposal which seems to me to have such merit was discussed in the July 27, 1959, issue of Life. Here, Commander Manson of the U.S. Navy suggests that this country reactivate part of its mothball fleet for the purpose of waging an aggressive peace program. In 1907 President Theodore Roosevent sent 16 battleships fully armed and freshly painted white, around the world to impress the nations with U.S. naval power. This Great White Fleet was gone 2 years. It succeeded in its mission, but it did not succeed in preventing the next war.

The new Great White Fleet suggested by Commander Manson, consisting of fully equipped hospital ships, cargo vessels loaded with food and clothing, transport vessels converted into floating technical schools, and other auxiliary vessels, would be completely unarmed. Its function would be to bring relief to disaster victims, to carry emergency supplies and medical facilities into famine-stricken areas, and in general to bring the arts of healing into underdeveloped regions wherever emergency needs exist.

Resolutions have been introduced, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, asking the President to take the necessary steps to put the new White Fleet into operation.

There can be no question of our ability to do this. We have the ships, we have the doctors, the money, and the commodities. The cost of putting the first six-unit fleet into operation and maintaining it for 18 months has been estimated at $30 million This is but a small fraction of the amount we now spend for any one of a dozen luxuries. Certainly it represents only an infinitesimal amount when compared with the annual expenditure for the Nation's military armaments.

We now have over $6 billion worth of dairy products, cotton, and various staples and items of food piled up in our surplus commodity warehouses. The President already has the authority under existing law to divert shiploads of these commodities to areas where emergency relief is needed regardless of the friendliness of the governments involved. Here, in the idea of the new White Fleet, is a magnificent opportunity to implement the American dream which was also the dream of the ancient prophets—of turning our swords into plowshares. What an immense appeal this program would have in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples around the world.

I discussed this proposal with the consul of one of the four great powers stationed in Portland. He commented that from an educational standpoint nothing could be better. He was most enthusiastic, describing the proposal as "a sound thing" and "a good plan." Other consuls with whom I discussed this matter were similarly enthusiastic. No one thought that the plan offered any hope of alleviating the age-old problems of poverty and disease. The hope was expressed that such a program could arouse people in the underdeveloped areas of the world from their apathy and hopelessness and encourage them to take steps to do something about their own condition.

As Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has pointed out in his newsletter, Washington Calling, healing can be a more effective form of foreign aid than guns or dams or bulldozers. He cited a story told by Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, a former medical missionary in China, of the Chinese mother who came to him with a child who had tetanus, as a result of using an unsanitary poultice on the unbilical cord. Dr. JUDD saw that he could do nothing for the child and told the mother so. She collapsed into tears. "But you are young," said Dr.

JUDD, "you can have other children." Thereupon the Chinese mother told him this was the seventh child she had lost from the same cause. A few cents' worth of clean gauze and antiseptic salve might have saved each of these children.

What is involved here is a modern application of the truth Jesus had in mind when he said, "I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me to drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me."

Certainly the world needs our help. Just as certainly, we need to give that help. Selfishness impoverishes those who practice it. Undisciplined self-indulgence degrades us as individuals and as a people. Even if there were an impenetrable curtain drawn around us so that the rest of the world could not witness our prosperity, we would be poorer in not sharing. In holding on to our valuable commodities, we are not just guarding these commodities from being used by other people. We are at the same time excluding ourselves from the valuable and necessary fellowship of the rest of the world. The world cannot indefinitely survive with the preponderant majority in poverty and the fortunate few enjoying prosperity. I am not suggesting that we divide all our goods among the rest of the world, but I am suggesting that in sharing our knowledge and techniques in the spirit of brotherly concern, our own real resources, which are spiritual resources, will not only be undiminished but will in fact be increased in that sharing. The lesson of the widow's mite points to the truth that he who gives sacrifically benefits in proportion to the sacrifice. What we have to give is certainly more than a widow's mite. Our obligation to share in proportion as God has blessed us is correspondingly great.

IV

There is a puzzling passage in the New Testament in which Jesus is admonishing his disciples to be perfect even as God is perfect. This has always been a mysterious admonition to me because perfection is an impossible goal. A recent translation by Dr. Torrey renders this, "Be ye therefore all-including even as your Heavenly Father includes all." This is more intelligible than the traditional translation when we apply it to the area of international good will.

One final observation remains to be made. If such a project as this is undertaken, it matters a great deal how it is done. Personnel must be chosen with a view toward obtaining people with the greatest intelligence, sensitivity, and tact. People who come bearing gifts are often looked upon with suspicion. It is imperative in the administration of any such program as this that our assistance will have no strings attached and that our motives shall be the purest.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who organized the first Great White Fleet, was fond of quoting a west African proverb, "Speak softly, and carry a big stick, you will go far." The idea behind the new White Fleet is to speak softly and carry no stick at all. It is to be devoutly hoped and expected that we will go even further.

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years have passed since President Abraham Lincoln signed the great Emancipation Proclamation into law. In commemoration of this "century of freedom," the National Council of Negro Women has voted unanimously to undertake in 1963 the project of memorializing their founder, the late Mary McLeod Bethune.

I have today introduced a House joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant authority to the National Council of Negro Women to erect in the District of Columbia a memorial honoring Mary McLeod Bethune, the design and location of the memorial to be approved by the Secretary, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

Among the Negro people who have truly shared the American dream of freedom none stands higher than the late Mary McLeod Bethune. Rightly called the "first woman of her race," her life work stands as a testimonial to selfless dedication in behalf of her people.

Born of slave parents in South Caroline on July 10, 1875, Mary McLeod Bethune was educated in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Illinois. Consumed with a desire to help others, she set about finding a place to teach with only $1.50 in her pocket. Through prayer, determination and unbounded faith, she was enabled to open a small school with only five girls as students. Today this little school has grown into the thriving institution of Bethune-Cookman College, in Daytona Beach, Fla.

During her 38 years as a college president, Mary McLeod Bethune participated in numerous constructive efforts of her time. Among the governmental positions she occupied were as a member of the National Commission for Child Welfare, Director of the Office of Negro Affairs, and the National Youth Administration under Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, special advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt on minority affairs, and special assistant to the Secretary of War for selecting candidates to the first WAC Officers Candidate School. During her useful and active life she was the recipient of eight honorary degrees from leading American colleges and universities.

Mary McLeod Bethune was affiliated with numerous literary and religious societies and served as an active officer for dozens of professional and civic associations. Next to building Bethune-Cookman College into a million-dollar coeducational institution, her greatest interest was founding the National Council of Negro Women. She considered the vast potential of organizing into one unit the woman power of 800,000 Negro women, already organized into more than 20 national groups. Her dream was accomplished in 1935 and she became the council's first president, a position she held for 14 years, at which time she became president emeritus. Untimely though her passing on May 18, 1955, her memory is enriched by her works and her rare spirit.

It is the hope of the council that the statue of Mrs. Bethune can be erected in Lincoln Park on East Capitol Street where the dramatic figure of President Lincoln and the Negro slave, known as the emancipation group, was erected by the Western Sanitary Commission of St. Louis. Dedicated on April 14, 1876, the 11th anniversary of the assassination of President Lincoln, this memorial was built with funds contributed solely by emancipated citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moment of great significance in the history of mankind's progress toward social justice. Adoption of this resolution will demonstrate that America is keeping faith with its destiny, and will provide renewed inspiration to free peoples throughout the world.

Should National Education Defense Grants Be Made Available to Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the U.S. Senate devoted 2 full days of its crowded and delayed calendar to discussing the general proposition, "Should national education defense grants be available to subversives? And, if not, what legislative language should Congress employ to prevent such a perversion of public funds?"

This issue was precipitated by a bill proposed by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, which would have deleted from the National Defense Education Act the public-protecting language on this issue which the Senate committee recommended and which the Congress adopted at the time of the passage of the act. That protective language required the taking of a loyalty and non-Communist oath before applicants for grants were accepted. Some question had arisen among certain groups in the country about the advisability and the efficacy of such oaths and whether the laws of perjury would operate against offenders. I shared some of these misgivings and as a consequence, Senators will recall I sought to substitute for the Kennedy repealer, language which was admittedly effective—it would have substituted on the oath mechanism a severe fine and a penitentiary penalty against any subversive who sought and secured grants from the National Education Defense Fund by concealing his relationships with Communists or any other totalitarian agents. Ultimately the Senate decided by a narrow margin of one in a rollcall vote to adopt a watered-down substitute for my proposal. Rather than accept the weakened substitute, however, the Senate then voted to return the entire issue to the committee and thus rejected the Kennedy resolution. That is where the controversy rests today.

In that connection the following column from the August 3 issue of the Dallas Morning News, a great constructive Texas newspaper, makes both interesting and informative reading. For that reason, I am asking that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together

legislative proposals would so circulate and translate into action the noble message of the New Testament.

I ask unanimous consent that the address in support of the Great White Fleet proposal by Dr. Ford Lewis, entitled "From Mothballs to Mercy Missions," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of those of my colleagues who likewise are supporting this humanitarian idea.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM MOTHBALLS TO MERCY MISSIONS

(By Dr. Ford Lewis)

I

Perhaps no dream of the human race has been more persistent and widely cherished than the dream of universal peace. In spite of the fact that no generation since human history began has been without its quota of war, men continue to hope and believe that peace is possible. In spite of the fact that the nations of the world are now in a position to destroy more lives, more homes, more cities, and more civilization in one day than have been destroyed in the entire span of recorded history, we are bold enough to believe in peace as a practical ideal, and to work for it.

Only today our Vice President, who has been on an extended visit to Russia in the interests of peace, has left that land and started home. Representatives of the four most powerful nations in the world have been for several months engaged in discussions in Geneva, attempting to resolve the critical issues of the occupation of Berlin and German unification as well as pave the way for a summit conference to deal with all questions of war and peace.

The dream simply will not die—that the time will come when nations "shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nations shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Not all the Bible, of course, points to peace. The early and more primitive parts of the Old Testament begin with a tribal war god leading his chosen people to bloody triumphs over their enemies. Over the centuries during which the Scriptures were compiled, the social vision broadened. The community of man was widened and made more inclusive. The idea of the brotherhood of man reached a high eminence in the writings of the Old Testament prophets and was recapitulated in the thought of Jesus and the New Testament apostles. Beginning with a god whose highest social vision was a tribal victory, the Bible ends with a God whose worshipers pray for a worldwide kingdom of righteousness and peace.

It was the persistent quest for peaceful coexistence that led during the medieval period in Europe to an arrangement called peace of God. Fighting was prohibited in churches and around all shrines and holy places. Noncombatant populations were protected. Persons who violated these prohibitions were anathematized. They were placed under an ecclesiastical curse involving excommunication from the church and damnation.

The truce of God was similarly enforced to assure peaceful weekends. It prohibited all fighting between Thursday evening and Monday morning. We may think this quaint and naive. Furthermore, when we reflect that one of the objectives of the church in enforcing these rules was to achieve a peaceful Europe in order to organize the Crusades, we may be inclined to discount the whole thing. Nevertheless, the search for peace will go on in our time with or without our cooperation, just as it has in the past.

II

In the 14th century, Dante proposed a world empire for the purpose of ending war. During the same century, Pierre Dubois put forth the idea of a permanent arbitration tribunal. History has vindicated the wisdom of this suggestion, but he was 500 years ahead of his time. In the early 17th century, Henry IV of France proposed a world confederation in the interests of peace. Toward the end of the 17th century, William Penn detailed a plan to establish an international federation between independent nations for the prevention of war. Meanwhile, Hugo Grotious laid the foundation for international law in his book, "The Law of War and Peace," written during the 30-Year War, one of the most destructive holocausts man has ever inflicted upon himself.

All the countries of the world have made their contribution to the effort for peace. Utilitarians and rationalists in England, encyclopediasts and physiocrats in France, and idealists in Germany have all worked toward this end. A half-dozen or so international peace congresses were organized in Europe during the 19th century. The history of the League of Nations, the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921, the London Conference of 1930, the various peace pacts and pledges are well known. Altogether too well known, also, is the fact that in spite of these conscientious efforts to maintain peace, we are still trying to recover from our most recent and worst world war.

We should not be surprised, I suppose, that many persons are disillusioned. They think that a peaceful world society is a false and impossible goal. I have heard some religious fundamentalists quote the Bible to prove that wars will never cease. These people lack faith. They lack faith in themselves and the ideal of a peaceful world. There is no better evidence than this that they lack faith in God, the very God whom they purport to quote literally in support of the inevitability of war. If a man denies the possibility of achieving the highest human dream, he denies either the power or the love of God, or both. His thinking has not evolved with the Bible. He is left in the neolithic backwash of primitive tribalism in which God chooses among the nations and takes sides and supervises the slaughter of one nation by another. But the god they worship was outmoded 2,500 years ago when the Hebrew prophets elevated Yahweh above the nationalistic policies of the tribe and revealed God as a moral judge, a god of peace and justice and of all mankind.

Our question is not the academic one of whether peace is theoretically possible, but what can we do to make it probable? What can we do to advance the cause of peace? Can we do anything as "people to people"—to use the words of President Eisenhower? One specific proposal has been made which I think has great merit. Parenthetically, let it be said that specific proposals are the only kind that can be effective. Everyone is for peace in general. Everyone is against sin, but this is not enough. It was not enough when the "rich young ruler," as he is referred to compositely in the Gospels, came to Jesus to get an opinion on what he must do to share the good life to come. When Jesus proposed a specific course of action, "his countenance fell, and he went away sorrowful."

Again, when the inquiring lawyer asked "Who is my neighbor?" he was given a direct answer which involved certain concrete, if to him unpleasant, realities. He was told that his neighbor was a Samaritan, a good Samaritan, a member of a community with which the Jews had no dealings. We are left with the question of whether the lawyer's good will, which up to this point had been generalized, went to pieces on this particular ethic, or whether it survived the test of a concrete expression of neighborliness.

In any case, the lesson for us is that we must find real ways of putting our ideals into action. William Blake says: "He who would do good to another, must do it in minute particulars. General good is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite, and flatterer."

III

The proposal which seems to me to have such merit was discussed in the July 27, 1959, issue of Life. Here, Commander Manson of the U.S. Navy suggests that this country reactivate part of its mothball fleet for the purpose of waging an aggressive peace program. In 1907 President Theodore Roosevent sent 16 battleships fully armed and freshly painted white, around the world to impress the nations with U.S. naval power. This Great White Fleet was gone 2 years. It succeeded in its mission, but it did not succeed in preventing the next war.

The new Great White Fleet suggested by Commander Manson, consisting of fully equipped hospital ships, cargo vessels loaded with food and clothing, transport vessels converted into floating technical schools, and other auxiliary vessels, would be completely unarmed. Its function would be to bring relief to disaster victims, to carry emergency supplies and medical facilities into famine-stricken areas, and in general to bring the arts of healing into underdeveloped regions wherever emergency needs exist.

Resolutions have been introduced, both in the Senate and the House of Representatives, asking the President to take the necessary steps to put the new White Fleet into operation.

There can be no question of our ability to do this. We have the ships, we have the doctors, the money, and the commodities. The cost of putting the first six-unit fleet into operation and maintaining it for 18 months has been estimated at $30 million This is but a small fraction of the amount we now spend for any one of a dozen luxuries. Certainly it represents only an infinitesimal amount when compared with the annual expenditure for the Nation's military armaments.

We now have over $6 billion worth of dairy products, cotton, and various staples and items of food piled up in our surplus commodity warehouses. The President already has the authority under existing law to divert shiploads of these commodities to areas where emergency relief is needed regardless of the friendliness of the governments involved. Here, in the idea of the new White Fleet, is a magnificent opportunity to implement the American dream which was also the dream of the ancient prophets—of turning our swords into plowshares. What an immense appeal this program would have in the eyes of the uncommitted peoples around the world.

I discussed this proposal with the consul of one of the four great powers stationed in Portland. He commented that from an educational standpoint nothing could be better. He was most enthusiastic, describing the proposal as "a sound thing" and "a good plan." Other consuls with whom I discussed this matter were similarly enthusiastic. No one thought that the plan offered any hope of alleviating the age-old problems of poverty and disease. The hope was expressed that such a program could arouse people in the underdeveloped areas of the world from their apathy and hopelessness and encourage them to take steps to do something about their own condition.

As Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER has pointed out in his newsletter, Washington Calling, healing can be a more effective form of foreign aid than guns or dams or bulldozers. He cited a story told by Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, a former medical missionary in China, of the Chinese mother who came to him with a child who had tetanus, as a result of using an unsanitary poultice on the unbilical cord. Dr. JUDD saw that he could do nothing for the child and told the mother so. She collapsed into tears. "But you are young," said Dr.

Jung, "you can have other children." Thereupon the Chinese mother told him this was the seventh child she had lost from the same cause. A few cents' worth of clean gauze and antiseptic salve might have saved each of these children.

What is involved here is a modern application of the truth Jesus had in mind when he said, "I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me to drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me."

Certainly the world needs our help. Just as certainly, we need to give that help. Selfishness impoverishes those who practice it. Undisciplined self-indulgence degrades us as individuals and as a people. Even if there were an impenetrable curtain drawn around us so that the rest of the world could not witness our prosperity, we would be poorer in not sharing. In holding on to our valuable commodities, we are not just guarding these commodities from being used by other people. We are at the same time excluding ourselves from the valuable and necessary fellowship of the rest of the world. The world cannot indefinitely survive with the preponderant majority in poverty and the fortunate few enjoying prosperity. I am not suggesting that we divide all our goods among the rest of the world, but I am suggesting that in sharing our knowledge and techniques in the spirit of brotherly concern, our own real resources, which are spiritual resources, will not only be undiminished but will in fact be increased in that sharing. The lesson of the widow's mite points to the truth that he who gives sacrifically benefits in proportion to the sacrifice. What we have to give is certainly more than a widow's mite. Our obligation to share in proportion as God has blessed us is correspondingly great.

IV

There is a puzzling passage in the New Testament in which Jesus is admonishing his disciples to be perfect even as God is perfect. This has always been a mysterious admonition to me because perfection is an impossible goal. A recent translation by Dr. Torrey renders this, "Be ye therefore all-including even as your Heavenly Father includes all." This is more intelligible than the traditional translation when we apply it to the area of international good will.

One final observation remains to be made. If such a project as this is undertaken, it matters a great deal how it is done. Personnel must be chosen with a view toward obtaining people with the greatest intelligence, sensitivity, and tact. People who come bearing gifts are often looked upon with suspicion. It is imperative in the administration of any such program as this that our assistance will have no strings attached and that our motives shall be the purest.

President Theodore Roosevelt, who organized the first Great White Fleet, was fond of quoting a west African proverb, "Speak softly, and carry a big stick, you will go far." The idea behind the new White Fleet is to speak softly and carry no stick at all. It is to be devoutly hoped and expected that we will go even further.

Mary McLeod Bethune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, nearly 100 years have passed since President Abraham Lincoln signed the great Emancipation Proclamation into law. In commemoration of this "century of freedom," the National Council of Negro Women has voted unanimously to undertake in 1963 the project of memorializing their founder, the late Mary McLeod Bethune.

I have today introduced a House joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant authority to the National Council of Negro Women to erect in the District of Columbia a memorial honoring Mary McLeod Bethune, the design and location of the memorial to be approved by the Secretary, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Planning Commission.

Among the Negro people who have truly shared the American dream of freedom none stands higher than the late Mary McLeod Bethune. Rightly called the "first woman of her race," her life work stands as a testimonial to selfless dedication in behalf of her people.

Born of slave parents in South Caroline on July 10, 1875, Mary McLeod Bethune was educated in South Carolina, North Carolina, and Illinois. Consumed with a desire to help others, she set about finding a place to teach with only $1.50 in her pocket. Through prayer, determination and unbounded faith, she was enabled to open a small school with only five girls as students. Today this little school has grown into the thriving institution of Bethune-Cookman College, in Daytona Beach, Fla.

During her 38 years as a college president, Mary McLeod Bethune participated in numerous constructive efforts of her time. Among the governmental positions she occupied were as a member of the National Commission for Child Welfare, Director of the Office of Negro Affairs, and the National Youth Administration under Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, special advisor to President Franklin D. Roosevelt on minority affairs, and special assistant to the Secretary of War for selecting candidates to the first WAC Officers Candidate School. During her useful and active life she was the recipient of eight honorary degrees from leading American colleges and universities.

Mary McLeod Bethune was affiliated with numerous literary and religious societies and served as an active officer for dozens of professional and civic associations. Next to building Bethune-Cookman College into a million-dollar coeducational institution, her greatest interest was founding the National Council of Negro Women. She considered the vast potential of organizing into one unit the woman power of 800,000 Negro women, already organized into more than 20 national groups. Her dream was accomplished in 1935 and she became the council's first president, a position she held for 14 years, at which time she became president emeritus. Untimely though her passing on May 18, 1955, her memory is enriched by her works and her rare spirit.

It is the hope of the council that the statue of Mrs. Bethune can be erected in Lincoln Park on East Capitol Street where the dramatic figure of President Lincoln and the Negro slave, known as the emancipation group, was erected by the Western Sanitary Commission of St. Louis. Dedicated on April 14, 1876, the 11th anniversary of the assassination of President Lincoln, this memorial was built with funds contributed solely by emancipated citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this is a moment of great significance in the history of mankind's progress toward social justice. Adoption of this resolution will demonstrate that America is keeping faith with its destiny, and will provide renewed inspiration to free peoples throughout the world.

Should National Education Defense Grants Be Made Available to Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the U.S. Senate devoted 2 full days of its crowded and delayed calendar to discussing the general proposition, "Should national education defense grants be available to subversives? And, if not, what legislative language should Congress employ to prevent such a perversion of public funds?"

This issue was precipitated by a bill proposed by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, which would have deleted from the National Defense Education Act the public-protecting language on this issue which the Senate committee recommended and which the Congress adopted at the time of the passage of the act. That protective language required the taking of a loyalty and non-Communist oath before applicants for grants were accepted. Some question had arisen among certain groups in the country about the advisability and the efficacy of such oaths and whether the laws of perjury would operate against offenders. I shared some of these misgivings and as a consequence, Senators will recall I sought to substitute for the Kennedy repealer, language which was admittedly effective—it would have substituted on the oath mechanism a severe fine and a penitentiary penalty against any subversive who sought and secured grants from the National Education Defense Fund by concealing his relationships with Communists or any other totalitarian agents. Ultimately the Senate decided by a narrow margin of one in a rollcall vote to adopt a watered-down substitute for my proposal. Rather than accept the weakened substitute, however, the Senate then voted to return the entire issue to the committee and thus rejected the Kennedy resolution. That is where the controversy rests today.

In that connection the following column from the August 3 issue of the Dallas Morning News, a great constructive Texas newspaper, makes both interesting and informative reading. For that reason, I am asking that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together

with the statement which I have just made.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DO WE ENDOW TREASON?

(By Lynn Landrum)

Egghead opposition to loyalty oaths to be required of applicants for money offered under the National Defense Education Act does not appear to be reasonable, but it is all the more stubborn for its unreasonableness. When a foreign-born person applies for citizenship, he is required to take the oath of allegiance. When the citizen takes an office, he is required to take an oath of loyalty and fidelity. When a citizen becomes a soldier, he is required to take an oath of loyalty and obedience. When a man in the ranks is promoted to the status of an officer, he again faces the requirement that he take an oath. In what way, then, is it degrading, unjust or uncalled for to require an oath of a lad who asks defense money to help him get an education?

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, has brought the issue to sharp focus in an amendment to the National Defense Education Act. Senator MUNDT says, in effect, if it is objected that the student is singled out from all other students with a demand for an oath, then let us skip the oath and provide as follows: Any individual who applies for cash or loan under the terms of the act—and who has within 5 years of his application been a member of a subversive organization—is subject to fine or imprisonment or both. That gets it down to brass tacks.

Subversion is conspiracy to commit sedition—treason, so to speak, in time of peace—or actual treason in time of war. Membership in the seditious or treasonable organization becomes the overt act and the Mundt amendment would impose the penalty for application for defense money by one so guilty of membership within the 5-year period concerned.

Do the eggheads demand that traitors shall be educated with defense money? Do they demand that colleges and universities shall take defense money in this way at the very time when they are harboring the active enemies of the United States of America?

Academic freedom, as advanced by these extremist eggheads, becomes more and more a demand for exemption from all the burdens and all the obligations of citizenship Freedom to plot for the end of freedom is nonsense of the most dangerous sort. And the professed disciples of a freedom so divested of all loyalty and of all love of country are sometimes more dangerous than the actual plotters of treason who meet in dark rooms and mouth moth-eaten dialectical excerpts from Lenin, Marx, and the current Soviet line.

The notion that academicians are somehow or other exempt from the responsibilities of citizenship ignores the line of difference between freedom and anarchy. Science is thinking in search of law. Without law there is no beauty, no wisdom, no justice, no freedom after all.

A Boost for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call attention to the third annual National Conservation Sports Tournament to be held near Davenport, Iowa, August 21, 22, and 23.

This event is sponsored each year by the Davenport Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America in conjunction with the Buffalo Bill Council of the Boy Scouts of America.

Over 500 Explorer Scouts from all over the United States will participate in the 3-day event again this year. The purpose of the tournament is to promote among the Nation's youth the need for the wise use of our soil, woods, water, and wildlife. The sponsor's hope to influence the minds of the participants so that they will realize that only through the wise use of our natural resources can we continue to prosper.

The events of the tournament help develop physical fitness, keen competitive ability, character, sportsmanship, and a basic understanding of the constant need for conservation of resources.

A winner and runner-up will be selected in each of seven competitive vents including marksmanship, archery, mo-skeet, bait casting, fly casting, swimming, and nature trail.

Although my duties here will not permit me to attend this event this year, I have had the pleasure in the past of seeing these young Americans take part in this program which is wholesome and beneficial to all. I trust that other communities will see fit to pattern similar events after this one so that this experience can be made available to more young people all across the Nation.

Architecture of New Buildings on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Douglas Haskell, entitled "Saying Nothing, Going Nowhere," relating to the New Senate Office Building, which appeared in the Architectural Forum for August 1959. The article expresses some of the feelings which many of us have about the New Senate Office Building. We regard it as excessively expensive and as lacking in good taste and in architectural proportions.

I think that as plans are being drawn for the third House Office Building, under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, this article by Mr. Haskell should receive very careful attention.

Mr. Haskell has been associated with the Architectural Record and the Architectural Forum for many years, and has been editor of the latter publication since 1955. He has lectured at various universities and schools throughout the country. He was referred to by the late Frank Lloyd Wright as "The critic with a conscience." This article indicates he not only has a conscience, but a very caustic pen as well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Architectural Forum, August 1959]

SAYING NOTHING, GOING NOWHERE

(By Douglas Haskell)

The controversial New Senate Office Building has faults worse than high cost and low drinking fountains: it fails to dramatize to the people how their Government works.

Understandably the angry going-over that the New Senate Office Building in Washington received from the Senators was related to practical shortcomings. It is far easier to work up a sense of frustrated outrage in the face of scandalous high cost coupled with discomfort, unperformance, and inconvenience, than it is to deal with that queazy feeling in the pit of the stomach when a building as a whole vaguely fails to come across, despite high pretensions, and gives no clear account of itself to either the mind or the emotions. The kind of thing the Senators felt they could cope with, or at least denounce, was a $2 million subway not yet leading anywhere and requiring $4 million more to finish, squawk boxes that really squawked, unworking mail chutes, air conditioning that leaked privileged conversations out of Senate offices, cafeteria equipment that challenged the user not to break his head, and things like that. The equipped building, without subways, cost $22 million, meaning that for the second time in its career the Senate had created one of the world's most expensive office buildings. (The older, 1906, Senate Office Building was labeled the most expensive in its day.) The consequence of such a building economy is that Washington is forever spending loads of money but is forever short of space.

It would be unfair to ask the Senate to deal with architectural issues, for, unlike their forefathers, Senators today only rarely come prepared with any architectural education whatsoever. Yet the problem that this building gives architecturally to Senators and to every educated American is a serious one, for what it pictures is a state of architectural illness attended by extreme mental confusion, threatening to become chronic in Washington. Everyone who sees it must be aware of a certain tired, meager, rundown impression that the building gives compared to its predecessor, the first Senate Office Building. The new one is vaguely a classical building and vaguely a modern one, but really neither: whether it was built primarily for functional purposes or for monumental ones is left amiably uncertain. The rich appearance of the older Senate Office Building across the street is missing, and the rather joyful variety of forms over there has yielded to monotonous repetition of a vertical ribbon window treatment—much like any modern jail—with here and there a classical feature tacked on. There is one consoling feature: some crisp carving. This is quite obviously an architecture on the way down. Like the costly subway, it has no terminal, but unlike the subway it is not even pointed in a hopeful direction.

Paradoxically, a still greater monotony could have been a help, if the desire was to produce a clearly market and understandable "office building." Thus, in a purely business-like modern structure, such as the projected Federal Office Building to be erected west of the Interior Building, the drawings show that large office blocks are to be given indentical windows, and the monotony of these will be so complete as to transfer all attention from the individual unit to the pattern as a whole—a clear one. The office blocks are to be lifted above a clearly marked base where the lobbies are to be found, and the larger, higher ceilinged ground-floor rooms will no

doubt be available for ceremonial or large-group purposes.

In the new Senate Office Building, on the other hand, where the classical "treatment" has been pasted on—presumably as a formality and to "match" adjacent buildings—nothing "reads." So far as official designations are concerned, the floors on which senatorial offices are found are no doubt named as a ground floor, a first floor, and so on, up to a sixth. As to exterior architectural treatment, however, the first two floors are a "basement" with basement windows and the top two floors are an "attic" with attic windows, and Senators with offices on any of these four floors are living either in the basement or in the attic.

Upon entering, the visitor does find that in fact offices and hearing rooms are intermingled at just about every level. If then he discovers his particular State represented in the architectural "basement," he is left guessing whether that was a slur on the honor of the State, or punishment for a Senator, or a sign that the Senate in its housekeeping just did not care what it did, or whether anyone ever told the Senators that classical architecture, like any other serious architecture, is an art that calls signals. In a modern building wth neither "basement" nor "attic" such questions could not arise.

Quite obviously the mixing of two completely incongruous systems, classical and modern, resulted in a building that does not give its signals clearly and that amounts to a picture building. The most thunderous architectural miscue relates to the building's one outstanding feature and ample architectural gesture: that special "portico" at the middle of the block on First Street, which by all the rules, customs, and reasoning of classical architecture ought to be the main entrance to the building. It is not. Ever since Rome the main entrance of any proper governmental or monumental building has been treated as a chief and central celebration. The reason is simple. The first thing anybody has to know after locating a building is where to go in, and the first duty of a Government building is to see that entrants are ceremoniously received. In this instance, having spotted that one big projecting "portico," central to the main facade, capped with a pediment, supported on great box piers, and facing on a ceremonial terrace, the visitor heads straight over there—and finds himself shunted away by a blank marble panel. There is neither a stair from the sidewalk to the terrace nor a door into the building, and apparently the whole costly business has been erected for the sole joy of the bird watchers and the window washers. The real entrance is found around the corner, barely marked at all, and there the visitor heads in, foregoing any remarks about "empty Senate gestures" and "the real business being done through the side door," because manifestly the Senators were innocent and counted on competent architects to guide them.

What difference does it make whether an architecture calls its signals straight or not? Simply this: that when stones are eloquent they proclaim the glory of a government forever. But before eloquence can attend either a work of architecture or a speech, the ideas within must be first coherent and then imaginative.

To begin with, there is here no imaginative realization, inside or out, of what kind of a building, and how very important a building, the architects were dealing with. This was no mere "office building"—that is sure. Now, interestingly enough, the building plan which virtually imposed itself on the architects had implicit within itself a wonderful expression of the drama of government-at-work. All but one of the 15 hearing rooms for the Senate's committees are two stories high and are flanked on either side by a Senator's suite and by a staff suite, and these have a height of only a single story. Since the two-story hearing rooms, scattered through the building, occur on six of the floors, and each of these hearing rooms pushes up through the floor above, the result is a quite wonderful interlock of one- and two-story elements, almost a Chinese puzzle. Such a plan was an opportunity virtually handmade for the devices of a dramatic contemporary architecture. There is an alternation of rooms large and small, rooms extending upward or downward in relation to any particular corridor, rows of smaller workrooms flanking the larger, more elaborate hearing rooms. All this apparatus of a mighty Senate at work had in it potentially a visual drama (both in the interior of the building and reflected on the exterior) more exciting than any scientific laboratory or industrial plant.

Even traditional architecture in its lustier days found excitment in such dramas of space interplay, for example in churches. But such an art of architectural communication seems to be lost today to all architects who have not gone through the modern revolution. The art of space in a space age belongs, like leadership in rockets, only to those who have followed their imaginations and allowed their art to develop.

This technical opportunity to give Washington a fascinating building of interpenetrating shapes and spaces was only the beginning of what was missed. With it was also missed a symbolizing opportunity. Think what the very prescence of such an array of rooms large and small would tell an archaeologist a thousand years hence about the nature and meaning of the U.S. Senate. As students of government well know, the very heart of the American legislative process lies in the committee system. These committees are where the Senators meet constituents face to face in the heat of action. Here is the arena where advocates and opponents of bills fight out their sanguinary battles. Here is the laboratory where the legislators aided by hardworking staff prepare and pursue their relentless fact-finding investigations. If the throngs of Americans visiting the Capitol find the House and Senate Chambers often virtually empty, that is because the real work is being done elsewhere in committee rooms. Yet the building where these arenas are concentrated, this veritable center of the government's performing arts, was treated by Architects Eggers and Higgins as a mere office building in an illiterate classical shell.

In a democracy, government must interpret itself to the people over and over again, and differently as times change. American government has done so. In Jefferson's day the classicism which he imported into a young New World was a romantic interpretation: ancient Greece and Rome were supposed to have been ever so much purer and nobler than the baroque monarchies of Europe as an example to follow.

There were several other very different kinds of classicism in American government building after that, among them imperialist classic, as in the Supreme Court, and penitentiary classic in the new wing of the State Department—but independently of all of them came the second revolution which turned America into an industrial society. It lived by doing exacting work. The egalitarianism of American democracy is less of a marvel now than the capacity of free people in voluntary association to carry through complicated jobs. This triumph is just what a government building such as the new Senate Office Building was fitted to celebrate.

The chance is gone now. But what of the future? The reason why government architecture is going to pieces faster, the closer it lies to the Hill, is that the buildings there are in the hands of a tight little club of architects who all wear the old classical school tie and are epigoni. They operate under a fast-talking little Architect of the Capitol who knows how to pack expensive things into buildings, but is not a registered architect at all. As long as architecture on the Hill continues to be handled without the competition of new men and ideas it will continue to deteriorate, saying nothing, going nowhere.

Birth of a Great City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today is Chicago's 156th birthday. On behalf of the entire Illinois delegation, as the dean of that delegation, I take great pleasure in inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today an article which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times, briefly describing the humble beginnings of Chicago, which today, 156 years later, stands as a symbol of almost indescribable progress in America.

The story of Chicago's growth is indeed a tribute to what people can do if they are free to carry out their wishes. I can only assure you that under the dedicated leadership of our present mayor, Richard J. Daley, and the bold planning which he has drawn up for my native city, we are firm and resolute in our conviction that the next 156 years will bring even greater glory to Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times article follows:

HUMBLE START IN 1803—BIRTH OF A GREAT CITY

On the sun-drenched afternoon of August 17, 1803, a weary company of the 1st Regular Infantry pitched camp at the mouth of the Chicago River. The commander, Capt. John Whistler, had orders to build and occupy a stockade, and it was to be named Fort Dearborn.

Thus, 156 years ago this Monday the bustling city of Chicago had its humble beginning.

It was a bleak scene that greeted Captain Whistler and his men.

Close by the terrain consisted of low, sandy hills dotted with scrub pine and pools of stagnant water. Westward lay windswept prairie; north could be seen thick woods. Land to the south gave way to seemingly endless swamps.

The only signs of life were four crude log cabins, occupied by French-Canadian traders—the forerunners of Chicago's merchant princes.

LOGS DRAGGED BY HAND

Lacking oxen or horses at first, the soldiers had to drag by hand, heavy logs to build the fort. Construction was slow, but by December Fort Dearborn began to function as a link in the chain of garrisons protecting settlers in the Lake Michigan region.

How was it possible that a small fort and a cluster of traders' huts could grow into the Nation's second largest metropolis?

A word provides the answer—location.

Fort Dearborn lay on 6 square miles of land that Gen. Anthony Wayne persuaded the Indians to give to the U.S. Government in 1795.

The general's choice of property was shrewd. The site lay at the intersection of important Indian trails long used by French and British traders. Later these trails became hard roads and eventually U.S. Highways 30, 12, 41, and 66.

PORTAGE EVEN MORE VITAL

Of greater importance than the trails was the Chicago Portage. This was a strip of land 1¼ miles wide connecting the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers, and thus linking the Great Lakes region with the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. Control of the portage meant control of the government, travel and trade of the vast untapped inland empire that stretched to the Rockies.

Despite its favored position, the settlement around Fort Dearborn did not immediately flourish. Savage Indian tribes still roamed the plains, making overland travel difficult.

In 1812 Indians attacked 97 settlers and soldiers 2 miles south of Fort Dearborn and killed or captured the entire party. They burned the fort to the ground. Later it was rebuilt and occupied until its final abandonment in 1837.

With the opening of the Erie Canal in 1825, Chicago's fortunes finally began to improve. The canal, connecting the Hudson River with Lake Erie, provided a direct, easy and inexpensive all-water route from New York to the Fort Dearborn region.

In 1832 the Blackhawk war ended, driving the tribes west of the Mississippi and opening up the way for easier settlement.

INCORPORATED WITH 350

By 1833 Chicago's population increased from 50 to 350, and it was formally incorporated as a town. Four years later, with 4,170 permanent residents, it became a city.

Continued extension of the waterways around Chicago helped its growth.

The opening in 1848 of the Illinois-Michigan Canal, which connected the Chicago and Des Plaines Rivers, eliminated the old portage route.

Real estate prices soared. By 1860 land near State and Madison sold for $300 a front foot; by 1865 the price was $500. A year later the cost had jumped to $2,000.

But in 1871 Chicago suffered a frightful disaster. Fire broke out on the West Side. Fanned by high winds, the flames swept across the dry wooden buildings, traveling 2 miles in little more than 6 hours. Before it was brought under control 27 hours later, the fire had destroyed 17,450 buildings and property worth $197 million, made almost 100,000 persons homeless and taken 250 lives.

Millions of dollars in aid poured in from all over the world. Chicago began to rebuild—this time in stone and steel. Within a year the business district was erected, and the rest of the city took shape shortly afterward.

Public confidence in Chicago's business stability was not set back by the fire. Just 2 years later in the financial panic of 1873, Chicago banks alone among financial institutions in the Nation's large cities continued to pay out current funds.

In 1890 Chicago's population topped the million mark. From this point on, the city has grown steadily until it now contains within its boundaries more than 4 million inhabitants.

The original 6 square miles obtained by General Wayne has mushroomed to 211.

Chicago's Loop is a scant 6 blocks from where Fort Dearborn once stood. This area alone now does an average retail business of $1.5 billion each year.

With the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Chicago stands on the verge of another great expansion, much more than fulfilling the dreams of those who sent Captain Whistler and his men to build a fort at the portage 156 years ago.

Resignation of Dr. John Tyler Caldwell as President of University of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, it was with deep regret that I learned last week of the resignation of Dr. John Tyler Caldwell as president of the University of Arkansas to become chancellor of North Carolina State University at Raleigh. I congratulate the State of North Carolina for its good judgment and discrimination in selecting Dr. Caldwell for this important position.

Dr. Caldwell became president of the University of Arkansas in 1952, and has been an outstanding success as the chief administrator of that great institution. He is a man of boundless energy and enthusiasm, and has devoted all his great talent to the cause of higher education during these hectic years. He and his fine family will be a great addition to the State of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the Northwest Arkansas Times and the Arkansas Gazette concerning Dr. Caldwell's resignation. Also a statement by Mr. L. C. Carter, the chairman of board of trustees of the University of Arkansas.

There being no objection, the articles and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northeast Arkansas Times]

NO EASY JOB

The announcement yesterday that Dr. John Tyler Caldwell is leaving the university presidency to become chancellor of North Carolina State comes as no great surprise. Stories recently have indicated that Dr. Caldwell was being considered as the favorite for the eastern school post, and he made no effort to deny he was interested.

But even with some indication that such a change was probable, the word that he has accepted the offer and asked the board of trustees of the university to release him in Arkansas comes as something of a shock. Dr. Caldwell has made a record of which he, the university, and the State can be proud.

As L. C. Carter, president of the board of trustees, pointed out in a statement, "The people of Arkansas owe much to Dr. Caldwell for his vision and courageous leadership during an important period in the development of higher education in Arkansas. He has directed the university's successful transition from the emergency GI bill days to the present high level of operation. During his presidency the regular enrollment on the Fayetteville campus has increased from fewer than 4,000 to nearly 6,000 students."

During the years he has served as president there has been much building on the campus, and also in Little Rock. The John Barnhill Field House, the Brough Commons, the Roberta Fulbright Hall (to house 400 women students this coming school term), the Carlson Terrace apartments (which are being doubled in size) have gone up during his tenure in office. The great Medical Center in Little Rock has become a reality along with the Medical Center residence hall.

"He has imparted a spirit of enthusiasm, warmth, and high moral principle to the entire institution," correctly reminded Mr. Carter.

Now it will be the job of the university trustees to seek out a worthy successor. The task comes at a difficult time, with classes due to begin next month. There must be much searching, intensive screening of candidates, and a most careful selection of a new president. It is a job that calls for diligence and patience, and the public will do well to consider this is not something which can be accomplished within a period of a few days, maybe not in a few weeks.

To Dr. Caldwell will go good wishes in his new undertaking, which he says he looks forward to "with keen anticipation." And to the members of the board to whose lot it falls to name the next president, our fullest expectation that they will choose most wisely a person who will head the thriving and fast-growing school that means so very much to the State of Arkansas.

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS PRESIDENT CALDWELL GETS NORTH CAROLINA POST

University of Arkansas President John Tyler Caldwell has been named chancellor of North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, it was announced yesterday.

Dr. Caldwell was elected by trustees of the Consolidated University of North Carolina with only one dissenting vote—that from Trustee Edwin S. Pou of Raleigh, who had said he would like a 30-day delay in the selection so more time could be given to finding a qualified North Carolinian for the office. Pou later withdrew his vote to make the action unanimous.

At North Carolina State, Dr. Caldwell will receive $17,000 a year—$2,000 less than his salary at the University of Arkansas.

The post of chancellor is the highest at each of the colleges of the Consolidated University.

President William C. Friday of the Consolidated University, who recommended Dr. Caldwell's appointment, described him as a man of "proven ability as an educator and an administrator. He has great courage and is a strong and vigorous person who is committed to the standards of quality and excellence in higher education."

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS TO BEGIN SEARCH

The University of Arkansas Board will meet at 2 p.m. today at the Medical Center at Little Rock to start the search for a successor to Dr. Caldwell, who will leave Fayetteville August 31.

Dr. Caldwell, 47, has been president of the University of Arkansas since July 1, 1952. Before moving to Fayetteville, he spent 5 years as president of Alabama College for Women at Montevallo.

"The North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering is an important institution," Dr. Caldwell said yesterday, "and I look forward to the chancellorship of it with keen anticipation. On the other hand, I have invested a great deal of labor and love in the University of Arkansas and leave it and the State with regret and with memories I shall cherish.

"It has been a great honor indeed to serve the people of Arkansas as president of their university."

DEEP REGRET

L. C. Carter of Stuttgart, chairman of the University of Arkansas board said, "The board of trustees has not met since learning the news, but I know I speak for each member when I express deep regret that President John Tyler Caldwell has resigned. The people of Arkansas owe much to Dr. Caldwell for his vision and courageous leadership during an important period in the development of higher education in Arkansas. He has directed the university's successful tran-

sition from the emergency GI bill days to the present record high level of operation. During his presidency, the regular enrollment on the Fayetteville campus has increased from less than 4,000 to nearly 6,000. Physically, the university has grown at a spectacular rate.

"During President Caldwell's administration, we have seen the completion of the medical center, John Barnhill Fieldhouse, Brough Commons, Roberta Fulbright Hall, the Carlson Terrace Apartments, the Jeff Banks Student Union, and the medical center residence hall. During this time, the Animal Science Building has been partially completed and numerous other projects advanced. Important new structures are well into the planning stage. Since 1952, the annual budget of the university has been increased substantially.

"SPIRIT OF ENTHUSIASM

"President Caldwell's greatest contribution to the University of Arkansas and thus to the State isn't measurable. He has imparted a spirit of enthusiasm, warmth and high moral principle to the entire institution.

"We wish for Dr. Caldwell and his family happiness and success in North Carolina."

There was no indication yesterday of a possible successor for Dr. Caldwell.

At its meeting today the Board is expected to name a selection committee to consider possible successors.

ACTING PRESIDENT NEEDED

Also expected to be considered at today's meeting is the naming of an acting president. Normally, this job would go to the provost of the University, but Dr. Lewis H. Rohrbaugh, vice president and provost, resigned recently, and no successor has been named.

In the absence of a provost, the Board will likely appoint one of the deans on the Fayetteville campus to be acting president. These include Deans G. D. Nichols of the College of Arts and Sciences, Henry H. Kronenberg of the College of Education, George F. Brannigan of the College of Engineering, Paul W. Milam of the College of Business Administration, Ralph Barnhart of the College of Law, and V. W. Adkisson of the Graduate School.

North Carolina State College has about 6,000 students. As chancellor, Dr. Caldwell will succeed Dr. Carey H. Bostian, who resigned to return to teaching.

Dr. Caldwell, the 15th man to be president or acting president of the University of Arkansas, was born at Yazoo City, Miss.

In 1954, the Arkansas Junior Chamber of Commerce honored Dr. Caldwell as the man who had done most for the State during the year.

STATEMENT BY L. C. CARTER, CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF TRUSTEES, UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

The board of trustees has not met since learning the news, but I know I speak for each member when I express deep regret that President John Tyler Caldwell has resigned. The people of Arkansas owe much to Dr. Caldwell for his vision and courageous leadership during an important period in the development of higher education in Arkansas. He has directed the university's successful transition from the emergency GI bill days to the present record high level of operation. During his presidency, the regular enrollment on the Fayetteville campus has been increased from less than 4,000 to nearly 6,000. Physically, the university has grown at a spectacular rate.

During President Caldwell's administration, we have seen the completion of the Medical Center, John Barnhill Fieldhouse, Brough Commons, Roberta Fulbright Hall, the Carlson Terrace Apartments, the Jeff Banks Student Union and the Medical Center residence hall. During this time, the Animal Science Building has been partially completed and numerous other projects advanced. Important new structures are well into the planning stage. Since 1952, the annual budget of the university has been increased substantially.

President Caldwell's greatest contribution to the University of Arkansas and thus to the State isn't measurable. He has imparted a spirit of enthusiasm, warmth and high moral principle to the entire institution.

We wish for Dr. Caldwell and his family happiness and success in North Carolina.

Labor-Managment Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is only natural that in discussing this legislation, we are primarily discussing the shortcomings of the labor movement. We all know those shortcomings exist, and we are trying to enact a bill that will correct them.

But in the course of this effort, I am afraid that some of my distinguished colleagues are brushing aside too quickly the evidence placed before us by the leaders of the labor movement—not those who have been exposed as crooked, unethical or dictatorial, but those whose conduct has been above reproach.

Ordinarily, I agree, it is wise to discount the arguments of special pleaders, or special interests, in writing legislation that affects them. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is no ordinary case.

Older Members of this House will remember the history of previous regulatory bills. They will remember how, when we established the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate the stock market, we did so over the bitter opposition of the rulers of Wall Street. They will remember how the public utility moguls fought against any interference with their monopolistic practices. In an earlier day, it was the railroads who resisted. And so it has been over the years.

It was the same story, for that matter, when we were in the course of amending the Wagner Act. The labor leaders of that time, the heads of the then rival AFL and CIO—though they were men of integrity—had few proposals to offer that would be regulatory as to labor. We had to proceed almost completely without their advice.

Today we have a different picture. From the very beginning, the leaders of organized labor have cooperated in the field of reform. They have made constructive suggestions. Indeed, they have insisted, time after time, that legislation was essential.

This is the first time, to my knowledge, that any group, any interest, in our society has voluntarily cooperated in a movement for the supervision and regulation of its internal affairs by government.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, when these men of labor come to us and say, "This clause would hurt a legitimate union activity," or, "That clause would impose an insupportable burden on us," I think we should take them seriously. They are experts; and they have proved their good faith.

I do not think this is an issue that can be justly solved by legislation which pleases nobody. I admit it is tempting to say, in effect, H.R. 8400 is damned by labor as too tough, and H.R. 8490 is damned by management as too weak; neither side likes H.R. 8342, so that must be the answer.

I hope we resist the temptation. I say that to take this course would be a shabby reward for the honest union leaders who have given us their help.

We would not expect an innocent man to welcome conviction for manslaughter because his disowned brother has been charged with murder. And in this case, Mr. Speaker, the innocent man actually helped to build the case against the guilty one.

Compromise is essential in the art of government; but let us not compromise with justice.

I support the Shelly bill, and would support the committee bill properly amended if we get a chance to vote on that. As one who voted for the Kennedy-Ives bill in the 85th Congress I favor legislation that will help get the crooks, without harassing and impeding the forward progress of legitimate and decent labor unions.

The action we take here should be aimed at the crooks, not at the decent, law-abiding unions and their decent, honest, and law-abiding members.

There are unwarranted restraints on legitimate union activity in the Landrum-Griffin bill that prevent me from accepting it. The Shelly and the committee bills amended are the more fair and effective ways to meet this problem.

Let Us Pray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column written by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "Let Us Pray," published in the Washington, D.C., Sunday Star, on Sunday, August 16, 1959.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US PRAY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

"There are more things wrought by prayer than this world knows of," declares Tennyson. It is an ominous symptom of the free world's creeping moral numbness that when the Congress of the United States says to all the American people "Let us pray," so many raise the question, "Is this an appropriate time to pray?" But are times for prayer to be determined by political calendars or thermometers? Yes, some reply, "but this particular prayer at this time might upset the international applecart." It is poor timing, say timid souls who themselves are quite free and comfortable—thank you!—to let the jittery world know that prayers are being offered in the United States of America for the victims of the most colossal crime of the 20th century.

There are those who declare that perhaps it is not quite polite to call attention to nauseating things in welcoming malefactors who would like to be regarded by a forgetful world as hail-fellows-well-met.

The Soviet juggernaut has invaded and seized the sovereignty of untold millions who are being denied the right of self-determination for which a host of American boys died in the Europe now enslaved. The Soviet hammer has smashed the national life of independent nations and its sickle has cut down the most cherished blooms in their garden of living.

What a sickening roll it is. Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, when solemn promises were broken as the cruel grip of aliens strangled their freedom. Hungary, with its brave attempt to break the hateful fetters, is kept in the police state prison, as is Rumania, only by Soviet tanks and bayonets. From captured East Germany and North Korea thousands flee constantly to the freedom of West Germany and of South Korea.

The crude and rude boss of the Kremlin recently went like a conqueror to Poland, where the one uniting emotion is hatred of the Russians. The foreign tyrant twitted that deeply religious people about their naive faith. He ridiculed their church leaders as he gloried in his gospel of dirt-without-destiny.

Of course, by putting on civilized shows in Moscow it is ardently hoped that the free world will accept the status quo as its attention is diverted from the terrible things that are being perpetrated in the captive countries—things which if not stopped will soon make it impossible ever to retrieve the national existence, as the very roots are being destroyed.

The free world needs to be told in season and out of season, of the crimes of genocide, of deportation, of torture and liquidation of those who refuse to conform. The smiles being broadcast these days are on the deceitful faces of those who even now are carrying out these almost unbelievably sadistic policies. Could Shakespeare have characterized the Soviet perfidy more accurately than is suggested by his line—"Like the smiling flower, and like the serpent under it"?

Mangled Tibet is the latest addition to the roll of captive nations caught in the tentacles of the Red octopus. Are the sounds of the ballet in Moscow to drown out the piteous pleas for liberation from ancient peoples whose very national life is being stamped into the bloody ground?

No wonder the American proposition for a Week of Prayer has evidently struck the Soviet anatomy in a very sensitive spot.

Of course the repetition in the congressional resolution of what has been said by America again and again brings protests from sycophant Quislings. But the bowed people, behind the curtain, under the taskmaster's whip stir with new hope. Through the resolution a voice which perhaps had seemed to be stifled resounds loud and strong—"Let my people go." The patriotic exiles from all these shackled nations now on our free soil are making the welkin ring with their grateful cheers. They know it is never the wrong time to pray for the right things.

And so we thank the God who hath made and preserved us a nation, that from the halls of our Congress there comes to the enslaved the assurance: "We shall continue to think in terms of your freedom, and not your thraldom. We are looking for your day of liberation, and not for any acceptance of legitimacy to be stamped on your bondage. And so, not only this year—but every year, and every day of every year—we call upon our free Nation to remember you in your captivity, with the poignant resolution of a Hebrew exile of old who, with his people under the rod of the oppressor, swore 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth.'"

And so when Congress says "Let us remember—lest we forget" it is but reechoing the stirring words of Woodrow Wilson: "The right is more precious than peace. We shall fight for the rights of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government, for the rights and liberties of small nations, until at last the world is free."

When Congress says, Let us pray for the captive people, it is but broadcasting the call of James Russell Lowell:

"Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathered hearts, forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No. True freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And, with heart and hand, to be
Earnest to make others free."

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 23d and 24th articles of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 11 and 12 issues of the Peoria Journal Star, respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 11, 1959]

WEST GERMAN JAZZMEN NOT HIP TO RED TOUR

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TBILISI.—When I reached the airport at Baku, a big West German (who turned out to be the jazz singer with the band) spotted me at once and asked me if I were an American.

When I said I was, he grinned and said, "One look and I knew it had to be."

I said that was particularly funny to me, because the Russians had repeatedly mistaken me for a German.

He said that "to a Russian" there probably was a similarity between an American and a West German. On the plane, the jazz band and I were the sum total of passengers, and almost all of them spoke English in varying degrees.

All said their tour in Russia was interesting, but all were eager to get home.

They smiled "you-know-what-I-mean" smiles and said: "It's a different world." They weren't impressed. They had been touring 6 weeks.

In Tbilisi I was met by a charming guide, a college student in English, a native Georgian, whose name is Loli (Persian for "Ruby").

We skipped lightly over the two stadiums, usual big housing projects, and huge new parks building, and dropped the car on a mountaintop overlooking the whole city. Then we rode a cable car down in 3 minutes—swoosh.

We walked most of the afternoon, visiting an ancient castle where Stalin was once a prisoner in the dungeon, saw the crumbling fortress on the mountain built by Persian invaders 1,000 years or more in the past, and walked through the "old city," which dates back to 300 B.C.

Here again were the cramped, stacked Arabic or Mexican-type houses, in narrow, dark winding streets, with a good many crummy looking characters.

Loli would say, "Those people are not Georgian, they are Kurds." Or something else.

She is very proud, very intelligent, very well educated in Georgian history, and speaks English excellently and without Gregory Ratoff accent. Her Georgian accent is very soft.

At the end of one of the winding streets stood a building with blue tile front, and later I returned alone through the old city to this place and had a sulfur water bath in a huge square sunken marble pool fed by an artesian well in a great vaulted marble room with Oriental designs in tile on the floor and two great marble "couches." The water comes from the ground already hot from natural hot springs.

This is the ancient bathhouse of the ancient kings of Georgia.

The Georgians are the proudest and most likable people I have met in the Soviet Union. They are the "Iberians" of ancient Greek writings. Colchis, where the Golden Fleece was found, was a Georgian land. They created their own strange phonetic alphabet at least 500 B.C., a close rival of the budding Roman civilization.

Caesar's rival, Pompey, once marched into their mountain homeland near Tbilisi, but they withstood the Romans and often became their allies later. They are also one of the earliest Christian nations, having converted in A.D. 300.

Their whole history is one of constant war with the non-Christian hordes around them—the Moorish conquest failed to subdue them, and their nation and religion survived Ghenghis Khan, Tameriane, and the constant attacks of Turks and Persians.

Their religious art, dating to A.D. 800, is hundreds of years before that of Rennaissance Italy, and especially in the craftsmanship of their goldsmiths and silversmiths was farther advanced than Italian work of the 13th century.

It is hard to believe that from such a place and such a people came a Josef Stalin.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 12, 1959]

TALK WITH NUN RATTLES GUIDE

(By Charles L. Dancy)

TBILISI.—Today we traveled to a little city that is the old capital of Georgia, and when they say "old" they mean old.

The capital was moved from this place to Tbilisi in A.D. 500.

Here is a tremendous cathedral with services underway. We stopped. The singing was very beautiful, and it seemed amazing to

hear such lovely singing from a handful of nondescript worshipers.

When the priest stepped out in his resplendent robes through two little swinging doors to the altar, he was a very young and handsome man with a full beard and long, flowing, curly, black hair—looking like a figure right out of the Bible.

Loli, my guide, was amazed.

"He is so young," she exclaimed. "How is it possible? Only the old people believe. And he can never marry. He is buried."

A nun came to me and asked if I were a believer but I did not understand her Georgian and Loli translated. I said "Yes," and she asked, "Why don't you kiss the cross, then?"

I said that I was a Christian but my church did not happen to include this same ceremony.

The woman replied in English, "Protestant." I nodded. "It does not matter," she said. "It is all one Christ and one God." (This in Georgian translated by Loli.) The nun spoke more.

Again, Loli was visibly shaken.

"This woman is very well educated," she said. "She knows all about Martin Luther."

A rapid-fire exchange between the two of them, and Loli turned again: "She is an engineer—with two degrees. How can it be—so educated and a believer?"

Loli could not get over these two experiences for some time. They did not fit the flat, absolute preachments of her propaganda-flavored education.

Like everyone else in Russia, she also told me that pipes are not smoked. "They are very bad for health," she said. "I know of no man that smokes them any more, except of course my grandfather."

"And how old is your grandfather?" I asked.

Loli looked at me for a moment, and then she began to laugh and laugh. With tears in her eyes she finally replied: "He is now a full century."

Inside this great cathedral are the burial crypts of old Georgian kings, some of the marble slabs shattered by the hooves of Turkish cavalry horses. In the massive walls are 200 hidden secret rooms entered through a tiny door 80 feet up over a gaint arch—where the women, children, and treasures were hidden during raids. Around the church is a battlement wall.

En route back we stopped at another state farm—100 salaried full-time workers living in 16 small apartment buildings plus a big administration building with offices and such to take care of the farm of 800 hectares—2,000 acres.

This whole area is somewhere in the borderland of what is believed to be the ancient homeland of the entire Aryan race that spread over Northern Europe, and although they are an island among darker-skinned Arabic-type Caucasians, many of the Georgians are like Loli—very fair skinned and light haired.

Two side incidences took place here of special interest that I will tell about separately instead of in chronology.

Remarkable Tree Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has been only in recent years that the "Tree Farm" has become a well-known part of the American lexicon. Up in the beautiful Idaho Panhandle, near the blue waters of Hayden Lake, O. K. Smith started farming his trees back in 1925, pioneering a tree conservation program. Today, experts from across the Nation visit Hayden Lake to see his remarkable accomplishments.

The August 1959 issue of the Northwest Ruralite published an interesting article on Mr. Smith. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKABLE TREE FARMER

Little by little over the past 40 years, O. K. Smith, a craggy, youthful man in spite of his "retirement age," has acquired more than a section of woodland and brushy pasture in a picturesque vale near Hayden Lake, Idaho, and has turned it into one of the continent's most productive tree farms.

"Trees are our principal business," he says, "but we like critters, too."

Foresters come from all parts of the country to see how Mr. Smith has done it. Here's what a group of them found out about his place not so long ago: 560 acres of woodland and pasture; 50 acres of cropland.

Tree thinning operations were started in 1925 (this makes him one of the earliest tree farmers in the Northwest).

Products for home use: house, shed lumber, 15 cords of fuel per year, corral posts and poles (don't be fooled by that cordwood, Mrs. Smith has both a wood and electric range).

Grazing: Six to eighty head of cattle. (Mr. Smith says the number depends on how much time he and his sons can find free from their tree operations).

Products sold: Eight truckloads of poles; 130 thousand feet of saw logs at landing; 400 sawed ties; 1,600 cords of fuel wood; 15 cars of pulpwood.

And, as one nationally known forester has said, "All this was produced by foresight and hard work."

The secret of the tree conservation program appears to be in consistent thinning and pruning. Government agencies pay small conservation bounties to tree farmers now for pruning, but when Mr. Smith started his program, it was done not for the bounty but because it produced more salable wood.

There's a fine pine tree in the Smith front yard which Mr. Smith measures every June. It has grown 17 inches in circumference during the past 8 years. "There's about 1,000 usable board feet in that tree right now," he says. A visitor gets the feeling he can give you the same information about every tree on the place.

He took 130,000 feet of lumber off a 10-acre tract 1 year. Most of his merchantable timber is fir, tamarack, and pine.

"I came west in 1898, and I started this kind of farming because I'd seen wheat selling for 38 cents a bushel," is his comment. "We've acquired our acreage, piece by piece, and we now sell some timber every year. Currently, we've been taking it easy. We move maybe 12,000 feet per year, but we could take 40,000 to 50,000 feet without hurting anything."

Mr. Smith leaves the logging to his sons now and spends a lot of time on planning and on handicraft hobbies. He handcarves fans out of white pine in minute delicate filigree patterns. Has a showcase full of his carvings at home. He has a fine brown bearskin robe, tanned and draped over his sofa in the parlor. "Caught the bear a couple of miles from here," he says, "don't see many like it."

The Smith home is all-electric and, of course, its power supply comes from a co-op: the Kootenai Rural Electric Association at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Presidential Inability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 871 to provide a method for determining Presidential inability.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report on Senate Joint Resolution 40, by the Association of the Bar of the City of New York:

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40, A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION RELATING TO CASES WHERE THE PRESIDENT IS UNABLE TO DISCHARGE THE POWERS AND DUTIES OF HIS OFFICE

INTRODUCTION

There presently exists a defect in the Constitution of the United States relating to the situation where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. This inability may come about because of serious illness, as it has in the past, or some other emergency. In the present day and age, the serious consequences of such an occurrence cannot be stressed too stongly. In the opinion of the committee, action should be taken to clarify the Constitution and to enact legislation dealing with the problem, prior to the advent of some future presidential inability. This report discusses the problem and recommends certain constitutional and legislative action relating thereto.

BACKGROUND

Clause 5 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution reads as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Several times in U.S. history, when the President has been seriously incapacitated, the question of whether the "office" of President, or the "powers and duties of the said office" "devolve on the Vice President" has been forcibly raised. Does a determination of inability affect the Office, or the powers and duties of the office, and does the Vice President, if he assumes the powers and duties of the office, do so on a temporary basis, or on a permanent basis thus displacing or ousting the President?

The problem arises because of the precedent which has been established by seven Vice Presidents upon the death of the President then in office. The Vice President assumed not only the powers and duties of the Office of President but also the Office itself.

In view of the language of the clause, the question has been raised whether the same result will not occur upon the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the Office, namely, that the Vice President will then assume the Office of the President, and the President will be ousted.

Although the records of the debates of the Founding Fathers demonstrate that this was not the intention of the Founding Fathers, nevertheless the precedents established by the seven Vice Presidents upon the death of the President then in office, the language of the clause, and the reluctance of Vice Presidents Arthur and Marshall to act when Presidents Garfield and Wilson were incapacitated because of the fear that by such assumption of the powers and duties of the Presidency, they would be ousting the President, has led to a constitutional ambiguity which should be clarified.

Historians believe that our Government has suffered in the past as a result of this ambiguity and that the matter should be clarified for the future. Certainly the original understanding of the framers of the Constitution that only the powers and duties of the President passed to the Vice President upon the inability of the President, could be set forth in the Constitution, and it would seem that the present congressional session affords an excellent opportunity to clarify this constitutional defect.

This committee has studied the question and concluded that a constitutional amendment should be enacted by the Congress and submitted to the States amending clause 5 of section 1 of article II. Such constitutional amendment should eliminate the ambiguity and provide, in general terms, for the establishment of a system of determining inability by the Congress. The committee further believes that upon the adoption of such amendment Congress should enact legislation (i) providing a method to determine inability; and (ii) establishing a procedure whereby the President, if and when he recovers from his inability, may resume the powers and duties of the Office of President. Throughout the period of inability, however, the President should retain the Office of President, and the Vice President should serve only as Acting President.

The committee believes that the solution to the problem may be found in Senate Joint Resolution 40, and a proposal of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association.

THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE PRESENT PRESIDENT AND THE PRESENT VICE PRESIDENT

President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON on March 3, 1958, published the following memorandum of their understanding of the constitutional role of the Vice President as Acting President during the inability of the President:

"The President and the Vice President have agreed that the following procedures are in accord with the purposes and provisions of article 2, section 1, of the Constitution, dealing with Presidential inability. They believe that these procedures, which are intended to apply to themselves only, are in no sense outside or contrary to the Constitution but are consistent with its present provisions and implement its clear intent.

"1. In the event of inability the President would—if possible—so inform the Vice President, and the Vice President would serve as Acting President, exercising the powers and duties of the Office until the inability had ended.

"2. In the event of an inability which would prevent the President from communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President, after such consultation as seems to him appropriate under the circumstances, would decide upon the devolution of the powers and duties of the Office and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended.

"3. The President, in either event, would determine when the inability had ended and at that time would resume the full exercise of the powers and duties of the Office."

Presumably in the event of inability of the present President this memorandum would be construed as establishing a procedure by which the powers and duties of the Office of President would be assumed by the Vice President until the inability had ended. The determination as to the ending of the inability would be at the sole discretion of the President. The memorandum notes that the procedures "are intended to apply to themselves only" and thus would not appear to be binding upon future incumbents of the Office of President and Vice President.

Accordingly, in the opinion of the committee, a constitutional amendment and implementing legislation to govern cases for the future are necessary.

Senate Joint Resolution 40

Annexed hereto as appendix 1 is Senate Joint Resolution 40, as reported this spring to the Senate Judiciary Committee by its Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, a proposed amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which is the same resolution introduced in Congress as Senate Joint Resolution 161 in 1958.

The essentials of the proposed amendment are that it:

1. Clarifies the established view that upon the removal of the President from office, death, or resignation, the Vice President actually becomes President; and

2. Provides for the case where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President, but makes clear that the Vice President assumes only the powers and duties of the Office, and not the Office itself.

This committee favors enactment of an amendment to accomplish these two purposes.

In the case of inability, Senate Joint Resolution 40 provides that the President may make a written declaration to that effect; provides a method by which the Vice President, subject to the majority approval of the Cabinet, may make such a declaration; and then provides a system for restoring the powers and duties of the Office of the President to the President upon the termination of his inability. This restoration would occur under a procedure providing the maximum safeguards to insure that the President can resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his Office upon the termination of his inability.

This committee believes that the establishment of the procedure for determining inability and the system of restoration would be best left to enactment by Congress, subject to the veto power of the President contained in clause 2 of section 7 of article I of the Constitution. This committee believes that constitutional amendments should not be overly detailed, and future contingencies in the operation of the implementation of the constitutional mandate, not presently foreseeable, left to the good judgment of Congress and the President, i.e., a majority of both Houses and Presidential approval, or a two-thirds vote of both Houses overriding a Presidential veto.

A detailed analysis of the six sections of Senate Joint Resolution 40 follows:

Section 1 deals with the case of the removal of the President from office, death, or resignation. It provides that the Vice President shall become President for the expiration of the then current term. This confirms the practice which has, in fact, been the situation since Vice President Tyler in 1841 eliminated the word "Acting" from the first paper submitted to him for signature after the death of William Henry Harrison from the words "Acting President" below his signature. Since then, six other men elected as Vice Presidents of the United States: Messrs. Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman, likewise assumed, upon the death of the President in office, the actual Office of the Presidency and not just the powers and duties of the Office. The committee favors enactment of section 1 as part of a constitutional amendment.

Section 2 provides that the Vice President shall discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President as Acting President, if the President himself declares in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, but makes it clear that only the powers and duties of the Office shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President. Insofar as this provision makes clear that only the powers and duties of the Office shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President, this committee believes it should be included as part of a constitutional amendment, and this committee's proposal does so. Insofar as it deals with a determination of inability by the President, a matter of procedure, this committee believes it should be included in the implementing legislation of the Congress, and not frozen into the Constitution.

Section 3 provides for the situation where the President does not declare his inability. The Vice President, if satisfied that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his Office, shall, upon the written approval of the majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President as Acting President. Once again, it makes certain that the Office of the Presidency does not devolve upon the Vice President, but only the powers and duties of the Office. Furthermore, it vests in the executive branch of the Government, in the Vice President and the members of the Cabinet, presumably the men closest to the President and upon whom he would rely to the greatest degree, the power to determine and to confirm the President's inability to discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President. Upon such determination and approval, the Vice President assumes the discharge of the powers and duties of the Office of President as Acting President. This committee believes that this section, which deals with procedure, should also be included in implementing legislation of the Congress, and not frozen into the Constitution.

Section 4 provides for the resumption of the powers and duties of the Office of the Presidency by the President, when the President's inability is terminated. This the President may do by a simple public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, and 7 days thereafter, "or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine," he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his Office. If there should be a dispute as to the termination of the President's inability, the Vice President, again with the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office at the time of the President's announcement, may transmit to the Congress the Vice President's written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated. If this should occur, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue and, if it is not in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. Upon a concurrent resolution, adopted by the Congress with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, to the effect that the inability of the President has not terminated, the Vice President shall assume the discharge of the powers

and duties of the Office of the President as Acting President until:

1. He proclaims the President's inability has ended;

2. The Congress itself by concurrent resolution adopted by a majority of the Members present in each House determines that the President's inability has ended; or

3. The President's term ends.

In other words, a two-thirds vote of the Members of each House present is necessary to confirm the Vice President's declaration, with the majority approval of the Cabinet, that the President's inability has not terminated. A simple majority of the vote of the Members present in each House to the effect that the President's inability has ended, would thereafter restore the powers and duties of the Office of President to the President. Again, the President would retain the office of President and only the powers and duties of the Office would devolve upon the Vice President as Acting President.

It should be noted that clause 3 of section 7 of article I of the Constitution reads as follows:

"Every order, resolution, or vote to which the concurrence of the Senate and House of Representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment) shall be presented to the President of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the Senate and House of Representatives, according to the rules and limitations prescribed in the case of a bill."

However, the view of the Senate Parliamentarian seems to be that concurrent resolutions, at least insofar as the Senate is concerned, are not used for legislative purposes, and accordingly are not required to be presented to the President. In "Senate Procedure: Precedents and Practices," by Charles L. Watkins and Floyd M. Riddick, Government Printing Office, 1958, at pages 167–168, there appears the following:

"Concurrent resolutions are not required to be presented to the President of the United States unless they contain matter which is properly to be regarded as legislative in character and effect (footnote, Feb. 20, 1896, 54th Cong., 1st sess., Journal, p. 145; Jan. 26, 1897, 54th Cong., 1st sess., Journal, p. 76; see Nov. 24, 1903, 58th Cong., 1st sess., RECORD, p. 438) and under the practice of the Senate, they are not used for legislative purposes, and are not sent to the President for approval (footnote, Nov. 7, 1919, 66th Cong., 1st sess., RECORD, pp. 8074–8075)."

This committee assumes that under the procedure to be followed, the concurrent resolutions provided for in Senate Joint Resolution 40 would not require the approval or disapproval of the President, Vice President, or Acting President since the congressional action contemplated would seem to be more in the nature of fact determination than legislative in character and effect. If this were not so, confusion could arise as to whether the Vice President as Acting President could disapprove the necessary concurrent resolutions adopted by the Congress, in his capacity as Acting President. This could result in a situation where a two-thirds vote of the Senate and House of Representatives would be necessary under all circumstances to restore the powers and duties of the Office of President to the President from the Vice President serving as Acting President—a result that is certainly not contemplated and directly contrary to the intent of Senate Joint Resolution 40. The committee takes no position, however, on the general view of the Senate Parliamentarian that, under the practice of the Senate, concurrent resolutions are not used for legislative purposes, and accordingly are not required to be presented to the President.

As with respect to section 3, this committee believes this section, which deals with procedure, should be included in implementing legislation of the Congress, and not frozen into the Constitution.

The first sentence of section 5 provides, in the language of the present clause of the Constitution, that the Congress may provide for the case of the removal by death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President. This language should be retained in the constitutional amendment. The Presidential Succession Act [1] provides for the situation, and spells out who shall exercise the powers and duties of the Office of President and that such person shall act as President. The Presidential Succession Act throughout makes it clear that such person as as President, using the words "act as President" and "acting as President."

The second sentence of section 5 provides for the situation where there is no Vice President. Under such circumstances, the powers and duties conferred by the amendment on the Vice President "shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law." Under this committee's recommendation, the amendment will not confer any powers and duties upon the Vice President, and this sentence should accordingly appear in the implementing legislation and not the amendment.

Section 6 provides that the proposed amendment shall be inoperative unless ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of its submission. Section 6 should obviously be a part of the constitutional amendment.

The committee notes that Senate Joint Resolution 40 is silent as to present clause 5 of article II of the Constitution, but assumes that the present clause 5 would be repealed.

PROPOSAL OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE NEW YORK BAR ASSOCIATION, DATED DECEMBER 13, 1958

The committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association, in its report of December 31, 1958, recommended an amendment to read as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the said office shall devolve on the Vice President. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then be President, or in case of inability, act as President, and such officer shall be or act as President accordingly, until a President shall be elected or, in case of inability, until the inability shall be earlier removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide."

The committee on Federal Constitution stated:

"It is felt by this committee that a constitutional amendment is necessary, and that the amendment should provide in substance:

"(a) That the commencement and termination of any inability should be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide; and

"(b) In case of the inability of the President, that the Vice President should succeed only to the powers and duties of the Office and not to the Office itself."

It endorsed as second best to its proposed constitutional amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 161 (1958) (introduced in 1959 as S.J. Res. 40). The reason Senate Joint Resolution 161 was second best is stated by that committee as follows:

"Senate Joint Resolution 161 specifies the method and machinery for determining the commencement and termination of disability. This precludes leaving to Congress the details which might have to be changed in the future because the method selected proved to be unsatisfactory. Senate Joint Resolution 161 appears to us to be preferable, however, to other methods that have been suggested."

The executive committee of the New York State Bar Association on January 29, 1959, adopted the following resolutions:

"Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the executive committee of the New York State Bar Association hereby recommends that the present provisions of the Constitution of the United States dealing with the death, resignation, removal or inability of the President (art. II, sec. 1, clause 5 [sic]) be amended so that (1) the commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide; and (2) the Vice President, in case of the inability of the President, shall succeed only to the powers and duties of the office and not to the office itself;

"*Further resolved*, That said report of this association's committee on Federal Constitution is hereby approved and adopted, including the text of the proposed constitutional amendment therein set forth, and including the determination of said committee that Senate Joint Resolution 161 introduced in the Senate March 4, 1958, by Senator KEFAUVER and bipartisan sponsors (proposing a constitutional amendment which lays down a detailed method and machinery for determining the commencement and termination of disability) is favored as second best to said committee's proposal and as preferable to other methods that have been suggested."

In both the proposed constitutional amendment of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association and Senate Joint Resolution 40, it is made clear that the powers and duties of the Office of President devolve upon the Vice President in the event of the inability of the President, and not the Office itself, i.e., the Vice President does not assume the Office of President but solely the powers and duties thereof. This committee endorses a constitutional amendment making this clear.

The proposal of the committee on Federal Constitution thereafter delegates to the Congress the responsibility for enacting legislation dealing with the determination of the commencement and termination of inability. In this respect:

(1) This committee concurs with this recommendation allowing Congress to deal by law with the determination of the commencement and termination of inability. Such initial legislation would have to have the approval of the President, or be enacted by a two-thirds vote of each House. Repeal or modification would also be subject to the same safeguards. Thus, the possibility of considerations other than the President's "inability" entering into the determinations would be greatly reduced, if not entirely eliminated.

(2) This committee believes that such implementing legislation should be as set forth in sections 2, 3, 4, and the second sentence of 5, of Senate Joint Resolution 40.

As noted above, this committee is of the view that, in the case of the removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, the official designated by legislation should succeed only to the powers and duties of the President, acting as President, and not become President. This is the situation under the language of the present clause 5 of section 1, of article II of the Constitution, and is retained in Senate Joint Resolution 40. The proposal of the Com-

[1] 3 United States Code Annotated, sec. 19 (June 25, 1956, ch. 644, sec. 1,625, Stat. 672).

mittee on Federal Constitution would change this to make such official the President in the case of removal, death, or resignation, but in the case of inability make such official only "act as President."

It does not seem to this committee that the precedent which has been established by the Vice Presidents on the death of the President alone, should be extended over to the cases of the removal, death, or resignation of both the President and Vice President. The President is elected as such; the Vice President is elected as such, one of his duties being to act as President, and indeed succeed to the office upon the death of the President. No other officials are elected, as the President and Vice President are, with these purposes in mind.

THE NEED FOR ACTION IN THIS FIELD

In the assembling of a bibliography of the literature concerning the question of Presidential inability, the committee was impressed by the fact that the literature ebbs and flows with the status of the health of the incumbent in the White House. Thus in 1881, at the time when President Garfield lay critically stricken, a number of articles dealing with the presidential inability question and prospective solutions appeared. In 1919 and 1920, during the illness of President Wilson, once again the question came to the forefront of the minds of the American people. Most recently, during the illnesses of President Eisenhower, the subject was revived and numerous proposals advanced, extensive hearings conducted by both Houses of Congress, and articles written.

The Republic cannot afford, in the present age of global and national problems of great complexity and vital importance, to allow the constitutional problem of possible Presidential inability to remain in its present unsatisfactory state. It would seem that the present is the time for objective analysis and appraisal of the situation, and for setting in motion the necessary machinery for the enactment of a constitutional amendment and implementing legislation resolving the question in the best manner possible.

CONCLUSION

The committee is of the opinion that a constitutional amendment embodying section 1 of Senate Joint Resolution 40, and providing for the determination of the commencement and termination of any inability as the Congress shall by law provide, affords the best means for dealing with this vital question, to the extent that a constitutional amendment is necessary. The committee believes that sections 2, 3, and 4, and the second sentence of section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 40 should be included in implementing legislation by the Congress, after the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment.

The committee has set out as appendix 2, the proposed constitutional amendment of the Committee on Federal Constitution of the New York State Bar Association; as appendix 3, the results of this committee's recommendations insofar as a constitutional amendment is concerned; and as appendix 4, the results of this committee's recommendations insofar as implementing legislation is concerned.

Respectfully submitted.

Richard W. Hogue, Jr., Chairman; M. Bernard Aidinoff; Newell G. Alford, Jr.; Alan J. B. Aronsohn; Stuart K. Barnes; Alfred Berman; Richard E. Erway; Alan R. Finberg; Marvin E. Frankel; Edwin L. Gasperini; Cecelia H. Goetz; Claude E. Hamilton, Jr.; Mark F. Hughes; Joseph S. Iseman; Peter L. Keane; David M. Levitan; Herbert Prashker; William J. Rennert; William I. Riegelman; Hayden N. Smith; L. Harrison Theyer II; Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.

APPENDIX 1

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term.

"SEC. 2. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"SEC. 3. If the President does not so declare, the Vice President, if satisfied that such inability exists, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"SEC. 4. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office on the seventh day after making such announcement, or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon, notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall discharge such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) The Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended, (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended, or (3) the President's term ends.

"SEC. 5. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. If at any time there is no Vice President, the powers and duties conferred by this article upon the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law.

"SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

APPENDIX 2

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL CONSTITUTION OF THE NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION

In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the said office shall devolve on the Vice President. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then be President, or in case of inability, act as President, and such officer shall be or act as President accordingly, until a President shall be elected or, in case of inability, until the inability shall be earlier removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide.

APPENDIX 3

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO CARRY OUT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"Article —

"SECTION 1. Clause 6 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President for the unexpired portion of the then current term.

"SEC. 3. In case of the inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his said office, the said powers and duties shall devolve on the Vice President, until the inability be removed. The commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as the Congress shall by law provide.

"SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

"SEC. 5. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission."

APPENDIX 4

IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION TO CARRY OUT RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LEGISLATION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

A bill to provide a method for determining the commencement and termination of Presidential inability, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the

determination of the commencement and termination of inability of the President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President shall be made as provided in this Act:

SECTION 1. If the President shall declare in writing that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

SEC. 2. The Vice President, if satisfied that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, shall, upon the written approval of a majority of the heads of the executive departments in office, assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

SEC. 3. Whenever the President makes public announcement in writing that his inability has terminated, he shall resume the discharge of the powers and duties of his office on the seventh day after making such announcement, or at such earlier time after such announcement as he and the Vice President may determine. But if the Vice President, with the written approval of a majority of the heads of executive departments in office at the time of such announcement, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that in his opinion the President's inability has not terminated, the Congress shall thereupon consider the issue. If the Congress is not then in session, it shall assemble in special session on the call of the Vice President. If the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of two-thirds of the Members present in each House, that the inability of the President has not terminated, thereupon notwithstanding any further announcement by the President, the Vice President shall discharge such powers and duties as Acting President until the occurrence of the earliest of the following events: (1) the Acting President proclaims that the President's inability has ended; (2) the Congress determines by concurrent resolution, adopted with the approval of a majority of the Members present in each House, that the President's inability has ended; or (3) the President's term ends.

SEC. 4. If at any time there is no Vice President, the powers and duties conferred by this Act upon the Vice President shall devolve upon the officer eligible to act as President next in line of succession to the office of President, as provided by law.

Magazine Publisher Who Toured Russia With Vice President Nixon Says Communism Not Answer to Race Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, any Negro who feels that communism is the solution to the race problem in the United States will be sadly disappointed if he takes a trip to Soviet Russia.

This is the opinion of John H. Johnson, publisher of Jet and Ebony magazines, who, with his wife Eunice, was a member of the press group which accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to Russia and Poland. There are relatively few Negroes in the Soviet Union, and Mr. Johnson agrees with the Russian claim that it does not have a race problem. However, he is quick to point out that most of the privileges which we take for granted, such as freedom of speech and the press, and the right to own property, are not enjoyed by the Russian people.

The American Negro who wants better housing, more productive employment, and more individual opportunities will find that they are not available to him in Russia because they are not available to the majority of the Russian people.

Says Mr. Johnson. He does feel, however, that even though the Communist philosophy is not a good one for Negro, or white Americans, there is no reason why the United States and Russia should not be friendly and peaceful.

Mr. Johnson believes that the Nixon trip contributed much to the development of friendly relations between the two countries and that further cultural and educational exchanges should be continued.

Need To Safeguard Our Hawk Population From Extinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many Americans mistakenly favor or encourage the slaughter of all hawks, without realizing that these majestic birds often help to control the rodent population which could be a peril and threat to the Nation's food supply.

In the June 1958 issue of the Reader's Digest appeared a most illuminating article by Peter Farb about protecting our hawks from decimation and extinction. The article was published originally in Audubon magazine, official organ of the National Audubon Society, for May–June of 1958.

Because we of the U.S. Senate adopt appropriations for the Fish and Wildlife Service, and thus pass on policy in this area of ornithology, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Farb's article from the Reader's Digest, entitled "The Truth About Hawks," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUTH ABOUT HAWKS
(By Peter Farb)

Of all the creatures with whom we share the globe, none is more maligned or senselessly slaughtered than the hawk. There are 32 species of American hawks, but most people simply classify all of them as "big" chicken hawks and "little" chicken hawks, and are quite willing to believe that they are bloodthirsty creatures that kill for sport.

The truth is that hawks kill only when hungry, never for sport. They can be trained to the affectionate obedience of a dog, and are as mischievous in the air as otters are around a pond. "It is hawks' near-human qualities of love, anger and playfulness that have made them the favorite birds of most ornithologists," says Dr. Frederick C. Lincoln, famous birdman of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

An exhaustive study by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, based on analysis of the stomach content of 2,690 hawks and owls, revealed that few hawks preyed on chickens or speedy game birds. Most hawks, it has been found, wage a ceaseless war on rodents and destructive birds, and on insects whose fertility, if unchecked, could overwhelm our production of foodstuffs. Recently Prof. Harrison B. Tordoff, of the University of Michigan, estimated that a single hawk saves farmers $110 a year in rodent damage.

Ranging in size from miniatures no bigger than robins to majestic giants that will attack a gazelle, hawks have been endowed with skills and adaptations that make them undisputed lords of the ether. To search out their quarry, for example, they are equipped with eyes that have been called "perhaps the most highly developed organs of vision in the world." A naturalist once reported having seen a falcon, flying high over a mountain ridge, suddenly close its wings and make a long, unwavering dive for a small bird, which it snatched in its knuckled talons. When the falcon first spotted its prey the two birds were at least 1½ miles apart. If we human beings had comparable visual acuity, we could read newspaper headlines a quarter of a mile away.

Much of the hawk's amazing sight comes from the size of the eyeballs, which are often as large as ours and extend far into the skull. In addition, the retina (the tissues in the back of the eye on which the picture image is thrown) is nearly twice as thick as a human's, and is packed with millions of minute visual cells. To shut out the glare of the sky, the eyes are coated with droplets of yellow oil that act much like a camera filter.

Last summer I saw a little sparrow hawk hurtle down from a height of 100 feet and neatly pluck a grasshopper off a leaf. Astounding as the feat was, more extraordinary still was the physical transformation that had taken place inside the bird's eye during the dive. While the hawk was circling for prey, its eye lens was working like a telescope; by the time it had plummeted to the grasshopper, the lens shape had altered to that of a microscope.

Sandwiched between the two giant eyeballs, the hawk's brain is necessarily small. Regardless, hawks perform prodigious feats. It is almost unbelievable, for example, that a bird could recall the ravages caused by storms from 1 year to the next. Yet the osprey, when about to migrate south, often buttresses its nest with fresh stocks to withstand the winter blizzards. Furthermore, when these fish hawks rise above the water with a catch, they always turn the fish so that its head is pointing forward, to lessen air resistance.

And consider this example of avian generalship. A Cooper's hawk was seen on the edge of a woodlot, peering hungrily at a flock of starlings sunning themselves on a barn roof. To fly directly at the starlings would have sent them scurrying for cover. Instead the Cooper's hawk circled back through the woodlot so it could approach from the rear. Then it flew inches above the ground, using every available tree trunk and dip in the terrain to mask its flight. When it reached the barn it rose vertically up the shadowed side and took its prey by complete surprise.

Hawks exhibit just about every technique to be seen in the world of flight. Watch the master flier of them all, the peregrine falcon, also called the duck hawk. Many times I have seen one, high above me, turn its nose downward, give a mighty flap for thrust, then close its wings and plummet toward the earth like a hurled stone—sometimes attaining the incredible speed of 250 miles an hour. Suddenly there is an exploding puff of feathers as the falcon strikes a bird with its large clawed fist. The prey is usually killed out-

right. But then comes the most amazing maneuver of all: The falcon darts under the falling bird, flips over on its back and catches the prey neatly in its talons. Here is one of the great displays of controlled power in nature.

A completely different method of flight is found in the big soaring hawks we often see wheeling in lazy circles. These birds are living gliders, among the most buoyant aloft. Nearly every one of their skeletal bones is hollow and filled with air sacs that supplement the lungs and decrease weight. Too, the wings and tail are extremely broad, providing a large lifting area in relation to weight. And at the wing tips the feathers have evolved into what are really many separate little wings, resembling a hand with the fingers spread out. These "slots," as they're called, give the hawk instant control over changes in air currents. As the soarers slowly patrol their territories, they coast on deflected air currents and on columns of rising warm air known as thermals, gliding from one to the next. That a hawk can pick up tremendous momentum riding the thermals was shown when an osprey was once clocked at 80 miles an hour in a mere 4-mile-an-hour wind—and not a wing-tip was twitching.

The ability to hover sometimes results in unique methods of hunting. The little sparrow hawk, for example, coaxes mice out of their burrows by hovering a few inches above the ground and squealing loudly. When the rodent pops its head out to see what the commotion is about, exit one mouse.

When not hunting, hawks often tease other birds. Dr. Alexander Wetmore of the Smithsonian Institution has seen them driving blackbirds, herons, and avocets before them, herding them like sheep, yet never attacking. A favorite game is to force a heron, no mean flier itself, lower, and lower until the heron has no choice but to plop down in the middle of a lake and, defeated, swim to the shelter of shore.

But it is in their mating flights that some hawks put on their greatest exhibitions of aerial acrobatics. One spring in South Carolina I saw an ecstatic male marsh hawk plunge wildly downward from a height of 100 feet, flip a somersault at the bottom, bound up again like a ball, and top his rise with another somersault. Then, his mate shrieking approval, he started all over again, tossing in a few barrel rolls for good measure.

Hawks are notable for being among the most devoted of feathered parents, and are believed to mate for life. Many return to the same nests year after year. (One osprey nest was in continual use by successive generations for 125 years, and one of Britain's falcon eyries is known to go back to Elizabethan times.) Although, unlike most other birds, the female is larger than the male, the male does most of the hunting. Occasionally, however, the female joins him, and one naturalist reports having seen a pair of peregrines team up against a nighthawk and fly off with the victim, tossing him back and forth like a football.

Many thousands of hawks have been senselessly shot every year—even near Hawk Mountain Sanctuary in Pennsylvania, which some 20 years ago was set up as the first sanctuary to protect migrating hawks during their autumn passages. Here is the major eastern flyaway for hawks, a narrow 60-mile-long funnel in the mountains where the birds bunch together and boil over the peaks by the thousands. But within a 30-mile radius of the sanctuary, and despite nearly a quarter-century in education as to the practical value of hawks, there are estimated to be more than 100 shooting stands. With Maurice Broun, curator of the sanctuary, I have hiked these "bloody ridges" and seen the woods littered with dead and maimed birds. Broun estimates that upward of 1,500 hawks a day have been shot here during migration.

But hawk protection is gaining. Eight States (California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Rhode Island) and Ontario, Canada, have model protective legislation. Pennsylvania recently strengthened its hunting laws, and 24 State conservation departments are distributing National Audubon Society leaflets which identify the various types of hawks and describe their food habits.

But laws alone cannot save the hawks. First, an alerted citizenry must be ready to plead the facts. In Lambertville, N.J., some facts were dramatically demonstrated by Paul Fluck, a physician and nature enthusiast. In a pen harboring chickens he placed a wounded red-tailed hawk. Farmers, who had frequently shot at this species of hawk, wagged their heads knowingly. But for 3 months, while the hawk's wing was healing, it lived almost affectionately with the chickens, and not a chick was lost. Gone, however, were the rats and mice which formerly fattened on the chickens' feed.

Interest Rates on Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Marriner Eccles, for many years Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, recently made a statement on the problem of interest rates on Government securities. Mr. Eccles is one of the most experienced and, I believe, wisest men in this field, and I think his statement is well worth the attention of the Senate and the country.

I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks to have his statement printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There seems to be a general lack of understanding of the economic factors which determine the interest rate. It is thought by many, including some influential congressional leaders, that the Federal Reserve can control interest rates while at the same time maintaining stable money, which is its primary objective.

The Federal Reserve can influence the growth in the supply of money as well as restrict it. To permit an expansion greater than the growth in the national product, under present conditions, would have the effect of diminishing the purchasing power of the dollar. This is inflation, and if allowed to continue will lead to ever-increasing interest rates.

Under boom conditions—when the supply of money is held in check to prevent inflation—the demand for credit exceeds the supply, and interest rates are bid up. Such is the present situation. You cannot have low interest rates in a booming economy without bringing about a dangerous inflationary situation. Only an economy in a state of declining activity produces an excess in the supply of money and credit and, hence, lower interest rates.

Of course, the Government can control interest rates temporarily, as during the war when it controlled everything else—wages, prices, etc.—but when such controls are taken off, and the excess supply of money released, inflation is inevitable.

A large part of the postwar price inflation was a result of the Federal Reserve purchasing billions of dollars of Government securities at fixed prices in order to prevent an increase in interest rates. This was during the period when the Government had a balanced cash budget.

The Treasury and White House, over the strong protest of the Federal Reserve, required this action be taken. In doing this, an excess amount of bank reserves was created which brought about an inflationary expansion of commercial bank credit and of the money supply.

The present administration and the Federal Reserve are trying to avoid making this mistake by curbing the growth of bank credit and allowing the interest rate to rise.

Under present conditions the aggregate savings by individuals and business are inadequate to meet private investment demands and at the same time finance the large public deficit of the States and Federal Government. Hence we find interest rates going up—even though there is a growth in the money supply equal to the growth in the national product, at stable prices.

There is no effective substitute for larger savings combined with curbs in public spending as a means of preventing inflation and increasing interest rates.

It is a fallacious idea to think that the bankers control this situation and are greatly benefited by high interest rates. On the contrary, this condition causes the banks to pay increasing interest rater for savings deposits and time funds—and depreciates the value of mortgages and bonds held in large amounts by the banking system. At present, this offsets any benefits arising from increased interest rates.

The real beneficiaries of the higher interest rates will be the millions of people who put their money in savings accounts in banks and building and loan companies, or those who purchase bonds and mortgages at the present high interest rates. In short—the savers.

The need is for the Congress to deal with the causes of the higher interest rate, rather than to oppose an increase. The Government cannot expect to keep interest rates from rising as long as it has to finance a large budgetary deficit in times of prosperity. The effect of this deficit under present conditions is inflationary and tends to discourage savings on the part of the public and to increase the need for credit.

A statement I made last March before the joint congressional Committee on the Economic Report bears repeating. It is this:

"I want to say again, that to achieve our objectives will always be a source of great political and economical controversy because everyone wants a greater share of the economic pie than it contains. Government and other public bodies want more money to spend—the leaders of organized labor want more pay and fringe benefits for less hours of work—business presses for further profits, and increasing ranks of oldsters call for higher pensions. However, everyone expects these benefits in dollars of stable purchasing power. Unfortunately, all the economy has to divide are the goods and services it is able to produce, and not the amount of money it could create, which is, of course, limitless.

"In our society, this situation is creating a dilemma for the Members of Congress whose constituents want easy money, lower prices, higher wages, greater profits and fewer taxes. Only a combination of the Government, Congress, and the Federal Reserve can successfully deal with these diverse forces. To do this adequately it would be necessary for them to agree on the problems and have the courage to act, regardless of political conditions."

Indian Vocational Training Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, almost exactly 3 years ago, on August 3, 1956, legislation passed by the Congress to provide a vocational training program for adult Indians was signed by the President and became Public Law 959 of the 84th Congress. Although this law needs to be liberalized and although substantial additional funds need to be appropriated, the program of vocational training for adult Indians is now a reality and already is proving its tremendous worth not only to our Indian people but also to the Nation as a whole.

Money spent on vocational training to qualify people to hold jobs is just about the best investment the Government can make, and this is what is being done under this program.

I am very proud of the fact that the real pioneer among educational institutions participating in training Indians in job skills under this program is located in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma and is the Okmulgee School of Technical Training of Oklahoma State University. Mr. L. K. Covelle, director of this fine school at Okmulgee, Okla., not only followed closely the legislation authorizing the establishment of this program, but also was in close and constant contact with the Bureau of Indian Affairs relative to participating in this program long before funds to actually implement the program had been appropriated.

The Tulsa Daily World of Friday January 3, 1958, carried a picture with the following cutlines:

Another first. Being first in the Nation is becoming routine to Oklahoma State Tech, Okmulgee, with the school enrolling the first Indian to be accepted under the new adult Indian education bill recently passed by Congress. Congressman ED EDMONDSON, center, one of the bill's consistent boosters, and Jack P. Jayne, right, area relocation specialist of the Department of Interior, Muskogee, look over the application of Perry McCombs, Eufaula, the first Indian to pass examinations. Director L. K. Covelle (left) registers his approval of the school being selected and one of four throughout the United States for the training program.

It is my understanding that at present more than 400 courses at more than 160 institutions have been approved by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under this program, but Okmulgee Tech is continuing its outstanding and pioneering leadership in this field .

Mr. Speaker, Okmulgee Tech is now nearing the end of its summer semester, and among its 130 graduates will be five students who will complete their training under the provisions of the program which was established as a result of the law we passed 3 years ago this month.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to salute Okmulgee Tech, its director, Mr. L. K. Covelle, and every member of Okmulgee Tech's staff, for their fine leadership in this program which has such great worth to our Indian people and to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a news story which appeared on page 1 of Okmulgee Daily Times of August 13, 1959:

TECH'S FIRST TO STUDY UNDER INDIAN BILL

Among the 130 graduates at Oklahoma State Tech at the end of the summer semester are five students studying under the adult Indian education bill, Public Law 959.

These are the first students to complete training programs under the law which was established late in 1957, with the first funds allocated early in 1958.

Oklahoma Tech is one of the four schools throughout the United States which was approved for training the Indian youths who were to be educated under the law.

Screening by the Indian Bureau takes place before the student is allowed to enter school, and at Oklahoma Tech only about eight students of the total enrolled under the bill have dropped out of school for any reason.

About 8.5 percent of the total Tech enrollment is students under the Indian bill. However, the largest percentage of enrollment is made up of nonveteran students who enter Tech as soon as they graduate from high school.

The first student accepted at Oklahoma Tech enrolled in January of 1958.

Graduates include Wade Bucktrot, Bristow, completing a 24-month course in auto body metal and painting; Arney Foster, Cromwell and Alice Bear, Okmulgee, completing 16-month courses in secretarial training and Alexandria Cobb, Cushing, and Monica Shoptese, Fairfax, completing 12-month courses in stenography.

Bucktrot, rated as an above average student by his instructors, has had job offers from several different companies, but is still trying to decide which job he wants. Although graduates are allowed to leave Tech 30 days early if they have a job and have completed all their required work, Indian students remain until the last official day of classes.

Each of the four girl graduates have been taking a series of tests prior to accepting employment. Job offers have been made to each of the graduates and they are waiting only for the end of the classes to make a final selection.

Bring World's Fair in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently there has been a substantial interest in progress toward the development of plans for the observance of the world's fair in Washington, D.C., during the period of 1964, or shortly thereafter.

A world's fair in the Nation's Capital—the hub of the free world—I believe would, in itself, be a tremendouly significant event. In addition, it would focus the world spotlight on the advantages of our system—not only to friendly nations, but also to uncommitted countries and to the Communist bloc.

All in all, the fair would provide a unique opportunity to present our way of life to millions of people.

The Washington Board of Trade, local civic officials, and an outstanding committee of industrial leaders from all parts of the Nation, are moving forward in a carefull, constructive and realistic manner, toward development of plans for such a project.

Coordinated with the world's fair, I believe, a Hall of States—such as has long been discussed—to display an all-American panorama—would serve as a show place to display contributions of individual States to our national progress.

The hall would provide our 50 States with an opportunity to display individual, unique exhibits, patterned upon resources and human ingenuity which have marked their own progress.

I am aware, of course, that there are competing proposals from other places in the country. Based on available facts, however, it appears that no city has gone so far in the development of careful plans as has Washington, D.C.; the Capital offers a unique climate in which visitors could observe not only the fair itself, but also our Nation's Capital—a living example of free government, together with the shrines, museums, art galleries, and other edifices illustrating political, educational, religious, cultural, and other developments which have contributed to the creation of the great Nation.

Over the weekend, the Washington Star and the Washington Post and Times Herald carried articles commenting on the significance of Washington, D.C., as a site for the world's fair.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]
HOLD THE FAIR HERE

If a world's fair is to be held in the United States in 1964, it ought to be held in Washington—for more reasons than one. The most persuasive point in favor of our city, of course, is that it is the Nation's Capital, and one of the world's most beautiful capitals, at that. But consideration also should be given to the fact that sponsors of the proposed local exposition have done a vast amount of preliminary planning and negotiating and there have been given the impression that their bid for the fair has an excellent chance of being approved.

It is a distinct jolt, therefore, to learn that Senator JAVITS and Representative KELLY, both of New York, have just introduced resolutions to designate New York City as the site of the 1964 fair. Under the identical measures, President Eisenhower would be authorized to invite foreign nations to participate in the New York show, which would commemorate the 300th anniversary of the city's founding. As District Commissioner McLaughlin has pointed out, a group of civic leaders here and a firm of consultants in New York have been working quietly for more than a year on plans for bringing the fair to Washington. These men have been encouraged by the reception their proposal has met in high quarters, including the State Department and the International Bureau of Expositions in Paris.

Mr. McLaughlin stated the case for Washington effectively, we think, when he declared that this city is generally recognized as the capital of the free world as well as of America and that the 1964 fair should be a truly national exposition, representing the country as a whole, and not a local or regional affairs, primarily promoting the interests of any given community.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

UNITED STATES TO START TALKS AIMED AT SECURING 1964 WORLD'S FAIR—MEMBERSHIP IN PARIS BUREAU NEEDED; OFFICIALS FAVOR WASHINGTON'S OFFER

(By Phil Casey)

The United States soon will begin negotiations that could clear the way for a world's fair in Washington in 1964. Though the Government would not attempt to dictate what city is awarded the exposition, State Department officials are known to look favorably on Washington's bid as the most businesslike and promising.

Discussions are under way on the executive side. Next steps will be State Department discussions with congressional leaders and negotiations with the International Exposition Bureau to provide for U.S. membership under regulations that the Government can accept.

The bureau, a 23-nation body with headquarters in Paris, was set up in 1928 to determine when and where world's fairs are held. Its aim is to prevent ruinous competition among international expositions, and promote international cooperation in them by the member nations.

BUREAU APPROVAL NEEDED

Washington interests seeking the fair for this area want bureau approval in order to insure international participation and offer better prospects of success, financial, and otherwise.

But the bureau's present regulations make it impossible for the United States to join a State Department spokesman said. The bureau dictates the length and number of international expositions a country may hold in a given period, as well as the places the fairs shall be held.

This may work well enough among nations whose governments sponsor the fairs, but it isn't applicable to the United States, the spokesman said where the Government keeps hands off and leaves the fairs to private interests, the States, and municipalities.

Washington would seem to have the inside track among several other cities, including New York and Los Angeles because of the State Department's favorable view and the report by District Commissioner Robert E. McLaughlin that there is encouraging response from very high levels in the Commerce Department and in Congress.

Yesterday, Senators THEODORE F. GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island and ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, came out in support of the Washington bid.

GREEN said, "Washington, as Capital of the strongest nation in the free world, is a logical and ideal location for an international exposition which can truly represent the entire country. Such an exposition in Washington would help to symbolize the tremendously important role which this country is playing in world affairs."

WILEY, saying that Washington officials and private interests are proceeding in a "careful, constructive, and sound fashion," added:

"I feel that the site of Washington, D.C., offers unique advantages for such a fair. * * * My deep interest in the foreign policy of our country convinces me that the exposition could make an important contribution to international understanding, as well as to international trade."

CAPITAL FEATURES CITED

Noting competing proposals from other cities, he said, "It would appear to me * * * that no city has gone as far nor as carefully in the development of its concepts as has Washington. And I believe that no other city is in a better position to offer the inspirational feature which the Capital offers with its great shrines of freedom, as a location for such an international assembly."

Blood on the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very enlightening and truthful editorial written by Mr. Willima Loeb, publisher of the Haverhill Journal, Haverhill, Mass., appearing in the issue for August 11, 1959:

BLOOD ON THE WHITE HOUSE

(By William Loeb)

Nikita Khrushchev and his associates in the Kremlin have been responsible for the murder, death and torture of more human beings than any other group of tyrants in the history of the world. Well-intentioned citizens who think that a visit by this monster to the United States will improve international relations do not understand either Khrushchev or the situation.

Khrushchev doesn't need to come to the United States to understand us. Khrushchev knows all about our material success and how much greater it is than that of Russia.

But Khrushchev, like all barbarian killers from the beginning of history, knows that what is important is not the material wealth of a nation. It is what is the state of its armed forces.

Since the dawn of man's existence on this earth, cruel barbarians, with nothing on their backs but with strong swords in their hands, have conquered the well-developed nations and then plundered them at their leisure.

What Khrushchev knows better than the citizens of this country is the strong thrust of Soviet rockets, versus the weak performance of our missile armament.

Khrushchev wants to come to the United States for two reasons, both of them to his advantage.

Pictures of Khrushchev being wined and dined by Eisenhower and other U.S. leaders will be shown all over the world to indicate to the captive nations that there is no hope for them because we have made friends with their slave masters.

The second purpose of Khrushchev's visit is to sell the people of this Nation on the fake idea that, after all, he is only a fat, humorous, easygoing old gentleman and that he and his gangster cronies actually are all very nice and very friendly people who have just been misunderstood and want to be our friends.

This is all done for the purpose of having the United States cut back on its missile and defense program.

Then, little by little, after the United States has been weakened, while Russia grows stronger, will come the final Russian spring at our throats.

It will be too late to do anything then.

This newspaper believes in friendship with all nations. It believes the Russian people would like to be friends with the people of the United States. We certainly know that people in this country want to be friends with the Russian people.

But we are not dealing with the Russian people. We are dealing with the most ruthless collection of power-mad dictators the world has ever seen. They are now slave masters of a third of the world. They will never feel safe as long as the rest of the world remains free.

Cardinal Cushing, Governor Powell, Senator Bridges, and former Secretary of War Hurley and others have come out against Khrushchev's visit. We hope they will be joined by many, many more Americans before Khrushchev's arrival.

Of course, nations always have to deal with the heads of other governments at arm's length across conference tables, but you do not have to invite killers to the White House.

The spectacle of an American President crawling before Khrushchev is certainly one that must make George Washington, John Adams, and Patrick Henry roll in their graves.

President Eisenhower apparently cannot even obtain an answer from Khrushchev as to what happened to the American airmen shot down by the Russians earlier this year.

The stench of the tyrants in our land is not a smell to which most Americans will take easily. Perhaps, if enough still dare to speak out, the Khrushchev visit will be canceled.

Meteorological Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of this House to a resolution passed at the Governors' conference recently commending this body for its action in approving an appropriation to study the feasibility of a National Institute for Atmospheric Research.

This appropriation is contained in the funds authorized the National Science Foundation for the coming year. While the Independent Offices Appropriations bill remains a source of dispute between this and the other body, the conference committee has agreed, and this House has agreed to the necessary item.

I am convinced, as I have said before, that this is an important accomplishment for science in this session and I am pleased to note that the Governors' conference has expressed itself in this way.

METEOROLOGICAL RESEARCH

Whereas the Congress of the United States has approved the proposals of the National Science Foundation to augment and exploit the national capability for research in meteorology, including the establishment of a National Institute for Atmospheric Research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 51st annual meeting of the Governors' conference commend the action of the Congress of the United States in supporting the National Science Foundation program to accelerate meteorological research to meet national scientific, economic, and military needs for knowledge of the atmosphere and weather phenomena.

Patent Office Pushes Grassroots Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me an article entitled "Patent Office Pushes Grassroots Plan" published in the Sunday issue, August 16, 1959, of the Star by William A. Millen, Star staff writer.

What particularly interested me in this article is that fact that the writer makes special reference to North Dakota and Minnesota as having organized inventors congresses and other States are interested in stimulating inventions, officials said.

Mr. President, this is another indication where the great State of North Dakota shows the way to the rest of the Nation. I know well of the activities of the North Dakota Inventors Congress and the work that they have been doing on a national level by attending conferences and conventions and explaining their program. Hon. Harold Kelly of Devils Lake, N. Dak., is president of North Dakota Inventors Congress and he and his group are doing an outstanding job.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATENT OFFICE PUSHES GRASSROOTS PLAN

(By William A. Millen)

A triple program, to keep the United States ahead in new inventions and scientific knowledge is being pushed by Commissioner of Patents Robert C. Watson.

This comprises:

1. Encouraging the grassroots movement that has recently started to stimulate inventions. Inventors' organizations have been set up in some of the States and these are interested not only in new inventions, but in aiding the inventor to find a practical market for his product.

2. The production of a new informative pamphlet to aid and guide those seeking patent protection. This publication, which can be secured from the Government Printing Office and is titled "Patents and Inventions—An Information Aid for Inventors," gives the A B C's of applying for a patent, preparing an application and prosecuting patent claims.

3. Periodic displays in the Commerce Department lobby of the practical results of the work of inventors and of the patent office. Business cooperates in this and shows its handiwork in the form of machines, devices and other products, results of inventive genius.

IMPORTANCE STRESSED

Commissioner Watson said yesterday:

"In the light of world conditions, it is extremely important to convey the story of the American patent system and the functions and operations of the Patent Office to every person in the United States who has the capacity to invent."

Mr. Watson, a native Washingtonian, became Commissioner of Patents in 1953. He is the son of a patent lawyer, the late James A. Watson.

Are the American people as inventive as ever? The answer is "yes," Patent Office officials say.

The Patent Office is now issuing an average of 1,000 patents weekly. Every Tuesday at noon the inventors get the news. More than 350 new applications for patents are received every workday.

Recently, there has been increased activity in the chemical and electrical fields, in which inventors seek new patents. Synthetics and electronics, since World War II, have become increasingly popular. The mechanical field is holding its own.

Isaac Fleischmann is Director of the Office of Information Services of the Patent Office, which is in the Department of Commerce. He aids in arranging the business displays in the lobby of that building. These present a case history of the patent system by the inventor and by the business firms.

The Patent Office's Official Gazette contains brief descriptions and drawings of patents granted. This goes to the patent profession, directors of research in corporations, private business and libraries.

INTEREST IS PRESSED

North Dakota and Minnesota have organized inventors' congresses and other States are interested in stimulating inventions, officials said. Seattle, Wash., is organizing an effort by business, the chamber of commerce and others to assist inventors in evaluating their inventions and providing contacts. This shows a healthy grassroots movement, officials said.

About 1,000 patent examiners, who are electrical, chemical, or mechanical engineers, make the Patent Office system run.

A Patent Office spokesman said anybody is a potential inventor. "Everyone has a dream of making something new. Everyone has a bit of innate inventiveness in him—a desire to improve," he said.

The Late Mike Benedum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, one of the grandest men it has ever been my pleasure to know was a distinguished West Virginian, the late Michael L. Benedum, who died on July 30 in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Benedum was a world famous oil wildcatter. He extracted fabulous wealth from the ground. But, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Benedum devoted a large part of his great wealth to helping others.

Mr. Benedum was born in the little West Virginia town of Bridgeport. There his heart remained throughout a busy and successful life. Close associates estimate that he spent between $3 and $4 million on his hometown. Among his many gifts were a civic center and recreational area with swimming pool, roller and ice skating rinks, badminton and volleyball courts, and a children's playground.

He did not confine his philanthropy to his hometown. On the contrary, he has given generously to churches, schools and hospitals throughout West Virginia and in other States. Close associates estimate he helped 42 colleges through scholarship funds or direct grants. He has helped financially over 600 students.

One of Mr. Benedum's last acts was to offer $62,500 for an addition to the Webster County, W. Va., hospital, providing county residents raise a like amount.

On the occasion of Mr. Benedum's 90th birthday on July 16, I wrote to him congratulating him on his long and useful life. In answer, Mr. Benedum sent to me a portion of his last will which eloquently outlines his philosophy of life. This impressive will expresses so beautifully the motives which prompted the many generous and unselfish acts of this grand old man that I insert the copy Mr. Benedum sent me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FROM THE LAST WILL AND TESTIMONY OF LATE MICHAEL BENEDUM

The disposition of a not inconsiderable estate is never an easy assignment. It has been a thorny and laborious problem for me because, recognizing my frailty and inadequacy, I have not been able to lose sight of the awesome responsibility involved.

If I could have looked upon my material goods as personal property, belonging to me alone, my task would have been immeasurably lighter. But I have never regarded my possessions in that light. Providence gives no fee simple title to such possessions. As I have seen it, all of the elements of the earth belong to the Creator of all things, and He has, as a part of the divine purpose, distributed them unevenly among His children, holding each relatively accountable for their wise use and disposition.

I have always felt that I have been only a trustee for such material wealth as Providence has placed in my hands. This trusteeship has weighed heavily upon me. In carrying out this final responsibility of my stewardship, I have sought to utilize such wisdom and understanding of equity as the Creator has given me. No one with any regard for his responsibility to his God and his fellow man should do less. No one can do more.

I will not attempt to deny that in certain provisions of this last will and testament, I have been swayed to some extent by the tender sentiment that I have for the land of my birth and by my affection for those who are nearer and dearer to me than life itself. While I may seem to have been generous to these loved ones who are the blood of my blood, I know from experience that I am in reality merely passing a responsibility to them.

The book is not closed. The responsibility is merely lessened and divided. It is none the less fearful. I hope that these loved ones of mine will bear with me in this last word of counsel, as I again remind them of the obligation that goes with their material heritage. I have unlimited confidence that they will be faithful to this trust.

As I have seen it, life is but a proving ground where Providence tests the character and mettle of those He places upon the earth. The whole course of mortal existence is a series of problems, sorrows, and difficulties. If that existence be rightly conducted, it becomes a progress toward the fulfillment of human destiny. We must pass through the darkness to reach the light.

Throughout my adult life, day by day and year by year, I have been instilled with the conviction that wealth cannot be measured in terms of money, stocks, bonds, broad acres, or by ownership of mine and mill. These cannot bear testimony to the staple of real excellence of man or woman. Those who use a material yardstick to appraise their wealth and foolishly imagine themselves to be rich are objects of pity. In their

ignorance and misanthropic isolation, they suffer from shrinkage of the soul.

All of us aspire to a higher and better life beyond this, but I feel that the individual who seeks to climb the ladder alone will never find the way to paradise. Only those who sustain the faltering ones on the rungs above and extend a helping hand to the less fortunate on the rungs below, can approach the end with the strength of sublime faith and confidence.

At the end of life each of us must face the great teacher that we call death. Stern, cold, and irresistible, it walks the earth in dread mystery and lays its hands upon all. The wealth of empires cannot stay its approach. As I near my rendezvous with this common leveler of mankind, which takes prince and pauper alike to the democracy of the grave, I do so with resignation to the will of God and with faith in His eternal justice.

Life has been sweet to me—sweet in the loved ones that have been mine, sweet in the friends who have surrounded me, and rewarding in the opportunities that have come my way. I could not leave this earth with any degree of happiness or satisfaction if I felt that I had not tried to bring some of these joys to those less fortunate than I have been.

We know not where seed my sprout. In the poorest and most unregarded child who seems to be abandoned to igorance and evil, there may slumber virtue, intellect and genius. It is our duty to sow and to nurture, leaving it to others to harvest the fruits of our efforts.

While I am conscious that my love for the land that gave me birth has been an influence in guiding the disposition of my estate, there are other practical reasons why I have favored my native State of West Virginia. It is not that I am unmindful or unappreciative of my adopted home of Pennsylvania, but rather that I have sought to appraise and balance the needs of each and the available potential for supplying those needs.

I cannot close my eyes to the realistic consideration that Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania abound in riches, having a citizenship in which men of great wealth are more common than rare. West Virginia is in a less fortunate position. There can be no question but that its needs are much greater than those of my adopted home. Consequently, in making specific provisions for West Virginia institutions, I have done so in good conscience, with a sense of equity and with recognition of a responsibility to distribute my estate in a way that will bring the greatest good to the greatest number. This decision was not made lightly or impetuously.

Conscious that in this codicil to my last will and testament, I am figuratively speaking from the grave, and that the great book of my account with the Creator has been closed beyond change or amendment, I submit my soul to His tender mercy, and my memory to the generosity and compassion of my fellow man.

Edward W. Hatchett: Canal Zone Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for many months the people of the United States have been reading frequent accounts in the press about deterioration in the relations between the United States and the Republic of Panama. Thus, it was with singular interest that I read in the August 5, 1959, issue of the Panama Star & Herald, the well known isthmian newspaper, an account of recent high honor extended by the Republic of Panama to Edward W. Hatchett, a prominent Canal Zone teacher and civil leader.

Former residents of the isthmus who have watched the influence of Mr. Hatchett grow over the years in both the Canal Zone and the Republic through loyal former students recognize in him an effective ambassador of good will.

Because of the value of such sustained efforts on both sides of the Canal Zone-Panama boundary for the betterment of both areas, I quote the indicated news story as part of these remarks:

ZONE TEACHER IS AWARDED REPUBLIC OF PANAMA DECORATION—FORMER PUPIL, NOW CABINET MINISTER, WILL PRESENT AWARD TO E. W. HATCHETT

Edward W. Hatchett, well-known Canal Zone teacher, has been awarded the Order of Vasco Nuñez de Balboa by the Panama Government, it was announced yesterday.

The presentation of the decoration will take place Thursday at noon in the Panama Foreign Office. It will be made by Roberto Lopez Fabrega, Minister of Public Works of Panama, who is one of scores of Panamanians who were taught by Hatchett at Balboa High School.

Hatchett's citation sets forth his long years of teaching on the isthmus and his close association with many Panamanians whom he taught.

A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis. Hatchett took his master's degreat Duke University. He taught for several years in a high school at Durham, N.C., and came to the Canal Zone in 1931 as a teacher of mathematics at Balboa High School. In 1957, he was made an instructor in the Canal Zone Junior College.

Hatchett is also well known in labor circles. He was secretary of the Canal Zone Central Labor Union for many years and has been president of that organization since December 1955. He was appointed a member of the Canal Zone Board of Appeals in June 1959.

Character

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, every year, at the Military Academy at West Point, in my congressional district, the Association of Graduates gives three prizes to cadets for the best character sketches of graduates.

This year the first prize was awarded to Cadet G. S. Livingston, 1960, for his essay on the character and heroic achievements of Gen. Jonathan M. Wainwright.

This essay is of great interest to all and is one more testimonial to the high ideals, patriotism and achievements of the graduates and undergraduates of the Military Academy:

CHARACTER

(By Cadet Gordon Livingston, second class, Company K–2)

In the annals of professional soldiery there has traditionally existed a single characteristic desire or goal which represents the ultimate aim of each of the members of that profession and the basic reason for their existence. This is victory in battle. Success on the field of combat has, throughout history, remained the criterion which has established the stature of military leaders and the standard by which they are judged. To this general rule there are few notable exceptions. One of these is Gen. Jonathan Mayhew Wainwright—a victor in defeat.

A soldier of the old Army, Wainwright, after his graduation from West Point in 1906, began his career as a cavalry officer in the West of his boyhood. In the trials of his later years he often thought back to his days as a troop commander chasing bandits on border patrol—considering this the greatest freedom he had ever enjoyed. In a day when the Army sought versatility from its officers—men who could act as businessmen, diplomats or showmen, "Skinny" Wainwright was simply a soldier. His claim to distinction was a competence in his chosen profession with an ability to inspire men to the limit of human endurance and beyond.

After a succession of combat staff jobs in World War I, he went through a series of peacetime assignments and schools until September 1940, when he was promoted to major general and sent to Manila to take command of the Philippine Division and keep his rendezvous with the "defeat" which would immortalize his name. On December 7, 1941, he was the senior field commander in the Pacific under Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Together they prepared to face the overwhelming advance of about 250,000 Japanese troops with a meager force of 19,000 U.S. Regulars and about 70,000 assorted Filipino personnel. On MacArthur's removal to Australia, Wainwright assumed command of all forces in the Philippines and continued the fight that comprises one of the great pages in American military history. Paying the price of his country's unpreparedness, he was faced with the prospect of fighting a slow, retrograde action along the Bataan peninsula to buy the necessary time for MacArthur to get help from the United States and start the counteroffensive which would relieve Wainwright's beleaguered troops. This relief was not to come. One of the officers in his command spoke of the general's conduct in this extremity: "Near the end Wainwright was suffering from beriberi. Undernourishment had affected him so badly that he could barely use his right leg. Despite this, dragging himself along and leaning on a cane, he walked along the roads all the time, inspecting the final defenses. He was the only general I have ever seen actually cheered by his men on the field of battle." For 5 long months they fought their desperate delaying action until at last what remained of the general's command retreated to the offshore island of Corregidor from whence they gave the world, more particularly the rudely awakened and remorseful United States, a picture of human fortitude and tenancity with few parallels in modern warfare and reminiscent of the Spartans at Thermopylae and the Texans at the Alamo. One correspondent on the scene wrote only half in jest:

"We're the battling bastards of Bataan
No momma, no poppa, no Uncle Sam,
No aunts, no uncles, no nephews, no nieces,
And nobody gives a damn."

Subjected to a merciless artillery and air bombardment (which at one point placed one 500-pound 240 millimeter shell on the

2-square-mile island every 5 seconds for 5 continuous hours), decimated by disease and malnutrition, the gallant defenders held out for 27 days of hell until the Japs had landed and pushed to within a hundred yards of the Malinta tunnel where Wainwright and the pitiful remnants of his army had at last been forced. Only then, in an effort to spare the sick and wounded men under his command, did the weary general surrender, after a last message to President Roosevelt:

"With broken heart and head bowed in sadness but not in shame I report to Your Excellency that today I must arrange terms for the surrender of the fortified islands of Manila Bay. * * * There is a limit of human endurance and that limit has long since been past. Without prospect of relief I feel it is my duty to my country and to my gallant troops to end this useless effusion of blood and human sacrifice.

"If you agree, Mr. President, please say to the Nation that my troops and I have accomplished all that is humanly possible and that we have upheld the best traditions of the United States and its Army."

On May 6, 1942, the white flag of defeat flew over the battered island and the ordeal of 39 months of brutal captivity had begun for the men who had already drunk so deeply of the cup of suffering, many of whom would never again see the homeland for which they had so heroically fought. During this trying and seemingly interminable time Wainwright was again forced to call on all his reserves of courage and perseverance, this time in a different fight—the fight for life. During his imprisonment he lost some 50 pounds and at the time of the Jap surrender carried only 120 pounds on his 6-foot, 2-inch frame. Constantly maltreated by his captors and suffering from dysentery and assorted other ailments, he yet lived to "witness the greater misfortune of my enemy" on September 2, 1945. And so the message written in the blood of her sons had not been lost upon America, and from the ruins of Corregidor had sprung the resolve which found its culmination on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay 3 long years later.

If this was a triumph of victory, it was also a triumph of defeat, more especially the defeat of a man whose ideals of military devotion sustained and inspired his Nation in its darkest hour. The medals (CMH, DSM, DSC, and many others) awarded him by a grateful people are incidental to the real magnificence of his own victory—a soldier's victory, which all the white flags, surrender articles, or personal indignities could not dim.

He returned to receive the adulation of the American public which he so richly merited and so modestly accepted. At last, permanently weakened from the long ordeal he had borne with such fortitude, his frail body died on September 2, 1953, 8 years to the day after the Japanese surrender. He was laid to rest in the tradition of the Cavalry he loved, with an orderly leading a riderless horse behind the coffin, boots reversed in the stirrups. And now perhaps at least he could take his place in the old cavalryman's paradise of which he had often sung:

"Half-way down the trail to hell,
In a shady meadow green,
Are the souls of all dead troopers
Camped near a good old-time canteen,
And this eternal resting place
Is known as Fiddlers Green."

The motto on the West Point shield today shines with a little more luster from the sacrifice of her loyal son. In the words of one of his classmates, "He did his duty with honor for his country." One can ask no more from any man and can perhaps only add, with grateful heart, "Be thou at peace."

A Letter to Bankers and Insurance Executives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, entitled "A Letter to Bankers and Insurance Executives—Why the Nation Needs Your Activity in Politics," published in Human Events, on August 19, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Human Events, Aug. 19, 1959]

A LETTER TO BANKERS AND INSURANCE EXECUTIVES—WHY THE NATION NEEDS YOUR ACTIVITY IN POLITICS

(By the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES)

In recent months various corporations have announced their intention of becoming active in politics. Programs have been established to encourage employees to register and work for the party of their choice. Political activity once frowned upon by many corporations as too controversial is now being accepted as one of the civic responsibilities of Americans.

Intelligence has recently been received from the great metropolitan centers of the United States that insurance and banking institutions are also becoming concerned with the importance of political activity on the part of their employees.

It seems clear that the votes of the great numbers of blue and white collar workers offer the only hope of balancing the various political pressure groups including the extremes of the labor movement.

It is encouraging, therefore, that bankers and insurance men have determined to discard the ancient antipathy toward politics which has characterized these professions and are launching a program to protect the public interest. This is a very laudable activity and in the words of Shakespeare:

"'Tis a consummation devoutly to be wished."

While the grand master plan for political activity is being designed, however, politics continues as usual in Washington, D.C. It is for this reason that I am writing to you.

It happens that the most vital problems which face our Nation at this time concern matters which lie within your domain of special competence. Never before has your guidance and sound advice been so desperately needed by our legislators.

The problems of inflation, deficit financing, interest rates, the role of the Federal Reserve System and the question of gold supply, et al, are complex and confusing to the average Senator and Congressman.

Crackpot plans and panaceas are being daily advocated by those who little realize that most of their suggestions have in the past caused economic collapse of civilizations. All too often those who are uninhibited by the facts grab the spotlight and get the publicity.

May I respectfully submit to the banking and insurance fraternity, therefore, a list of items now pending before the councils of our Government, which need immediate, aggressive and enthusiastic attention by men like yourselves who are experts in the field:

1. The President and the Treasury Department have requested permission of the Congress to remove the fixed interest rates on Government borrowings.

Demagogues have attempted to make this request appear as an insidious conspiracy against the "little man" and for the benefit of the Wall Street bankers' vested interests.

It is clear to you that if we are to have a free economy, we must maintain a free money market. Government bonds must be sold on the basis of their safety and their yield and must compete for the purchaser's dollar with other investments available. Accordingly, interest rates in a free society can never be fixed by anyone except the prospective buyer.

It would be very helpful if bankers and insurance executives would testify to this fundamental, economic truth before the various committees of Congress concerned with the problem.

It would be a great public service if bankers and insurance men all over the country communicated with their local, State and Federal representatives and dispelled the smokescreen of socialistic propaganda on this subject.

This question of interest rates is immediate and pending business before the Congress.

How many of your colleagues have made their feelings known? How many of your correspondent banks have been actively recruited in this struggle?

Certainly Congressmen WILBUR MILLS and RICHARD SIMPSON, of the House Ways and Means Committee, and Senators HARRY BYRD and JOHN WILLIAMS, of the Senate Finance Committee, would appreciate a statement of your views.

There is still time to be effective, but there is no time to be leisurely.

Every sizable community in the United States has some type of banking and insurance facility. In addition to providing a repository for the funds of the people and financing local projects, do you agree that your profession has some responsibility for the economic education of your customers?

If so, haven't we reached the time when local bankers and insurance brokers should be organized on a national basis in order to carry the message of the importance of fiscal solvency throughout their communities?

Is it not desirable for local bankers and insurance men to utilize every opportunity before the service clubs, fraternal organizations and civic meetings to emphasize the present dangers of irresponsible and socialistic monetary and fiscal policies?

Is it not necessary for informed people like you to tell the parents of your community what is being done to the legacy of their children?

In modernization programs of banking and insurance institutions, in which the business machines play such a large part, have you allowed finance to become so impersonal that the customer has ceased to be a man and is merely a number?

The traditional and honored role of economic counselor and adviser to the local community must not be lost by bankers in the whirring of electronic machines.

2. It has been said that, "Those who know better should say so."

Officials of financial and insurance institutions do not normally write letters to the editor; but who else is to challenge the fallacious schemes which are proposed daily in both editorial and news columns by persons who are generally unqualified and ill equipped to speak on monetary and fiscal matters?

A recent editorial in the St. Petersburg (Fla.) Times, for example, advocated the hackneyed, repudiated theory of escalation

clauses for Government bonds. This would provide that Government bonds at maturity would be redeemed for face value plus a sum equal to the amount of inflation which had occurred since the date of issuance.

To those who have difficulty with thinking this proposal might have some appeal: Should it go unchallenged in the public press; or should the bankers and insurance executives of Florida, independently and collectively, register their professional opinion concerning such an absurd proposition?

It is difficult to select at random a metropolitan newspaper without finding some items of false economics to which the bankers and insurance men of America should address themselves.

3. At the present time an assault is being aimed at the Federal Reserve System in an attempt to use this agency as an instrument to promote cheap money and easy credit.

The scheme is patently preposterous, but how will the people of America ever know unless professionals like yourselves inform them?

4. There is presently an organized campaign to promote a little inflation.

Left-wing economists and socialistic politicians are trying to convince the public that creeping inflation is inevitable, necessary, and desirable.

Yet, with blatant intellectual dishonesty, they add that this inflation will be controlled at a level of from 2 to 4 percent a year.

Obviously, if inflation is inevitable, once it starts spiraling it cannot be controlled at any annual percentage level. The ultimate reckoning of creeping inflation has always been collapse and chaos.

Only the bankers and insurance men of America are in a position to inform the people as to hazards of the weird economic propositions with which we are being bombarded daily.

May I emphasize that in no way do I advocate your activities be characterized as partisan politics. Your professional colleagues throughout the Nation belong to both great political parties.

In the House of Representatives and the Senate of the U.S. Congress, there are many Members from both political parties who realize the importance of the matters which we are here discussing. Unfortunately, they are not in the majority. However, they have steadfastly opposed irresponsible fiscal proposals. These individuals need all the support and assistance which you can give them.

National solvency and sound fiscal policies transcend partisan politics. They are not legitimate matters of debate. They are matters of fact. They have been established by the entire history of man's social and economic organization.

Eventually our survival may depend upon the action we take in respect to these problems.

Other nations of the world such as Japan, Argentina, Germany, Great Britain, France and, in fact, the entire European Economic Community have awakened to the necessity for putting their fiscal houses in order.

As members of the banking and insurance professions you now have the strategic opportunity to be of inestimable service to the Nation and to the world.

Please assert yourself now and speak out with vigor and authority before it is too late.

(STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is the ranking Republican Member of the U.S. Senate, ranking Republican member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. His most recent article to appear in Human Events was "The American Heritage," June 3, 1959.)

Progress on White House Conference on Children and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the designing of a more effective program to provide ever greater opportunities for our youth is a major challenge confronting the Nation.

As we recall, President Eisenhower directed that a Sixth White House Conference on Children and Youth be held in March 1960. This golden anniversary conference, scheduled to be held here in Washington from March 27 to April 2, 1960, has been called the greatest single undertaking of our time in behalf of our young people. Bringing together some 7,000 delegates from all over the Nation, it will provide a springboard for a concerted attack on virtually every question that effects the well-being of the next generation and hope for a more rewarding tomorrow. It has as its stated purpose the promotion of opportunities for children and youth in order for them to realize their full potential for a creative life in freedom and dignity.

We remember that this forward-looking program had its beginning back in 1908, when Theodore Dreiser and James West called on President Theodore Roosevelt to discuss the plight of orphaned children. So impressed was the President that on Christmas Day he personally addressed 200 invitations requesting people from all over the country to attend a White House Conference in January, of 1909.

Recognizing the importance of a sound program to improve the outlook for the Nation's youth—its most valuable resource—it is gratifying to note that progress is going forward on the conference, designed to deal with the major problems and challenges in this field.

I am particularly happy, also, to note that not only the State governments, but also a substantial number of organizations throughout the United States are participating in the conference.

Recently, I was pleased to have forwarded to me a copy of the Conference Reporter, outlining the latest steps of progress. Well realizing that this task of brightening the outlook for the Nation's youth is a challenge of deep concern to all of us, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from this publication printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE ADOPTS PROGRAM STRUCTURE AND DELEGATE QUOTAS

FORMAT STRESSES FLEXIBILITY

The overall program structure adopted by the executive committee for the 1960 conference expresses two important aims: (1) To achieve interdisciplinary treatment of conference theme and material; (2) to make it possible for people to meet and discuss, and to reach findings or conclusions in small, intimate groups.

Action of the executive committee at its May 7–8 meeting in Washington made official the following specific features of the program format:

A plenary session will open the conference on the evening of Sunday, March 27.

Each morning theseafter, 5 concurrent theme assemblies will open the day's sessions, each assembly accommodating from 1,000 to 1,500 delegates. The theme assemblies will permit development of major aspects of the conference theme, the issues and challenges.

Specific aspects of conference content will be introduced daily at 20 concurrent forums for 350 delegates each. The forums will include panel presentations and floor discussions dealing with facts, findings, and issues. They will be the flexible unit of the conference structure, providing for a two-way flow of thinking from theme assembly to work group and return.

The work group will afford the delegates their best opportunity for continuous participation—deliberation, discussion, and debate. There will be more than 200 work groups meeting each day. A maximum of 30 delegates will be preregistered for each of these work groups on an interdisciplinary basis and members will continue to meet in the same work group throughout 5 days.

In work groups delegates will reach findings and arrive at conclusions. When 10 work groups meet together as a forum, they will reconcile conflicts, sharpen distinctions, and reach majority and minority viewpoints.

The program committee headed by Dr. Philip S. Barba of Philadelphia was responsible for formulating details of the program structure.

NATIONWIDE QUOTAS ANNOUNCED

The executive committee has approved plans for quotas which will govern distribution of 7,000 invitations to the White House conference, March 27–April 2, 1960, in Washington, D.C.

State committees have been allotted a total of 2,900 delegates. National organizations will share 1,700 invitations. In addition, 600 invitations will be assigned to public officials, including members of the Cabinet, Congress, the Supreme Court, and Governors. International guests will receive 500 invitations. The balance will be allocated to Federal Government representatives, members of the working press, the President's National Committee and its subcommittees.

The plan for State participation, approved by the executive committee at its May 7–8 meeting in Washington, is as follows:

"States will each be allocated a minimum quota of 20, and the remainder of the quota of 2,900 for State committees will be allocated on the basis of the population of each State as a percentage of the population of the United States."

(See p. 7 for a chart of State quotas.)

This plan was based on a recommendation of the National Council of State Committes, headed by Dr. Donald S. Howard, of Los Angeles, a member of the President's National Committee.

The national organization allotment of 1,700 invitations will be distributed as follows:

Each organization in the Council of National Organizations on Children and Youth will receive a minimum of two invitations. In addition, 300 will be reserved for youth representatives from 16 through 21, and another 200 for young adults from 21 through 30. The remainder of the 1,700 organization invitations will be distributed on a formula

that takes into consideration organization size and relation to conference theme.

State youth quotas

In a recent memorandum to the chairman of every State committee, Dr. Howard explains the policy regarding youth delegates from the States as follows:

"Because of the importance attached to participation of youth in the forthcoming conference, State committees have been asked to assure attendance of at least 400 young persons (aged 16 through 20)." This would represent 14 percent of each State committee quota.

"Although it is suggested that 'youths' be interpreted as young persons aged 16 through 20, it is recognized that a State committee may want to nominate particularly outstanding young persons even if under 16 years of age. Similarly, a State committee may also want to include in its youth quota a person of 21 or more who may actually be serving as a leader of young people, such as the president of a student body at a college or university."

Criteria for delegates

The President's National Committee has urged that participants in the conference be "broadly representative of the citizens of the United States.

To achieve this end, State committees are urged to take into account a balance among and between:

(1) Youth and adults (as described above).
(2) Lay and professional persons.
(3) Men and women.
(4) Persons from rural and urban areas.
(5) Representation from various racial or other minority groups.
(6) Representation of business or industry and organized labor.

ACTION: STATE BY STATE

Alaska: Dr. R. Roland Armstrong, chairman, reports five committee members appointed in State. Governor being asked to appoint cochairman for Juneau. Each State agency asked to name resource person to provide guidelines for Alaska study.

California: 300 town meetings to be held throughout State as a result of Governor's call for citizen participation. Each town meeting asked to submit findings and recommendations to Governor by October 8.

Fact book for committee being prepared by 11 State departments.

San Francisco mayor calling meeting of youth from all junior and senior high schools, to follow meeting of Governor's White House Conference on Children and Youth in September.

Colorado: County commissioners designated ex officio members of county committees.

District of Columbia: Causes of family irresponsibility being analyzed by special subcommittee consisting of judge, educator, doctor, social worker, lawyer, youth representatives, and laymen.

Florida: Committee working for 100 percent participation of every State voluntary organization as follows: a copy of Topic Guide goes to liaison person of each State organization, suggesting that organization conduct study in area of special interest, utilizing local chapters and branches. Reports of such studies to be included in State Committee's final report.

Same procedure being followed with departments of State government and State and regional offices of Federal Government.

Hawaii: Values and ideals receiving spotlight, with philosophers, psychologists, sociologists, educators, and laymen taking part in preliminary study.

Illinois: Countywide surveys seeking to determine effect of cultural, social, and economic changes on growth and development of children.

Solid background facts provided to every county committee through "working papers" prepared by leading authorities within framework of factfinding committees.

Item from Illinois "working papers": "It is more important, in many respects, for the people of a community to be informed about the facts locally, than to have made a study of national trends."

Indiana: Richard Emery, chairman, reports that State legislature has voted financial support to Indiana Council for Children and Youth and its program * * * Conference held May 13 in Indianapolis.

Eighteen regional workshops and hearings to be held throughout State.

Iowa: Youth employment reported as a priority concern. * * * Vocational guidance and training programs being studied. * * * New services to migratory youth developed through State Youth Employment Service to be described in State report.

Louisiana: Louisiana Social Welfare Association cooperating fully with State committee. Each of association's 10 regions to sponsor workshop focusing on areas of study established by State factfinding committees. Local members of all statewide organizations to be included in these workshops.

Key persons for conference interpretation work appointed in five main regions of State. All newspaper, television and radio material channeled through these representatives, with effective results reported.

Maryland: "Little" White House conference to be held before mid-September at University of Maryland.

Massachusetts: Committee (Dr. Martha M. Eliot, chairman) held its first meeting June 12 in Boston with Governor delivering personal greetings.

Michigan: Detroit Free Press ran series of seven major feature articles, tying in local problems of children and youth with themes and topics of national White House Conference.

Minnesota: Every mayor in State has received questionnaire asking local communities for information about services to children and youth. Results of survey will make up part of Minnesota's conference report.

Missouri: Colleges playing important role: Directors of departments of sociology, psychology, philosophy, home economics, etc., formed into special committee. White House Conference topics will receive focus in discussions, papers, theses throughout next year's classroom study.

New Jersey: Outline for county committees developed by State committee offers practical suggestions for those working through county units.

Ohio: Will hold State conference on children and youth November 19 on Ohio State University campus in Columbus, open to general public.

Oklahoma: Five State colleges in different parts of State to be scenes for regional meetings, cosponsored by State committees and colleges.

Representatives from all high schools, both public and private, will attend youth conference in fall to report on activities and make recommendations to State committee.

Directors of community council throughout State serving as cochairmen of committee on change.

Oregon: Special committee formed to establish criteria for selection of State's 38 delegates to conference.

Puerto Rico: Individual members of Puerto Rico's committee will make personal visits to local committees for consulation.

South Carolina: All statewide studies completed and brought to State committee by May 1; one of first States to finish this phase of conference preparation.

South Dakota: Special subcommittee making basic study of State's migrants, with respect to problems of children and youth.

Mr. Don Rasmussen, chairman, cited in McCall's for outstanding achievement in field of education.

Texas: All junior and senior high schools throughout State will be surveyed through questionnaires prepared by the State's youth participation committee. Results will play part in Governor's meeting and in State report.

Six hundred twenty-five Texas newspapers carried questionnaire for State interpretation commitee, seeking response from all regarding areas of concern. Replies will go to Governor's office.

Texas anticipates that 1 million citizens of State will be involved in preparation for White House Conference.

Utah: 700 letters sent to organizations, youth groups, individuals, inviting them to participate in conference planning.

State department of education has loaned its director of health, physical education, and recreation to serve as executive secretary for Utah White House Conference planning.

Wyoming: The Governor has scheduled State white house conference to be held in Cheyenne latter part of August.

MATERIAL COMING FROM NATIONWIDE SOURCES

Reports and papers on a wide variety of professional and lay activities are reaching Conference headquarters from many sources. The following suggests the type of material already received or forthcoming:

1. A first report on findings of "Project Talent" is expected in time for the Conference. This project was planned and is directed by Dr. John C. Flanagan, professor of psychology, University of Pittsburgh, and President, American Institute for Research, Pittsburgh, Pa. Objectives: a profile of the abilities, skills, and interests of half a million American youngsters in grades 9 through 12, and—over a period of 20 years—a record of how they use their abilities, develop their skills and pursue their interests.

2. The Child Welfare League of America will soon publish a book-length report on its monumental study of adoption and foster-home placement. Findings from this major study will be available to the White House Conference.

3. The National Council of Girl Scouts and the National Council of Boy Scouts have recently completed comprehensive studies of youngsters in the age range served by Scout programs, and of youth leaders.

4. Through their education division, the Seventh Day Adventists are conducting in this country an experiment already run off with success in Japan. It is a method for making work experience an integral part of education from the elementary level. The objective is to teach values and ideals through personal experience of the satisfactions that come with doing a job and doing it well.

5. The World Federation for Mental Health is organizing the First World Mental Health Year (1960) and Dr. Frank Fremont-Smith, cochairman of the International Committee, reports that preliminary reports on studies relating to children and youth will be available to the White House Conference.

6. "Delinquent Behavior," a recently published report of the National Education Association's juvenile delinquency project, will provide background for the study of problems in this field.

7. The National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers has contributed studies of experiments in delinquency prevention.

8. The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith has sent in reports of field studies in prejudice and desegregation.

9. From the American Jewish Committee have come "Prejudice and Your Child" and "The Fears Men Live By."

10. The American Heart Association has contributed an interim report of a pilot project in vocational counseling for children with heart disease.

11. A study of major problems affecting the education of the mentally retarded has come from the American Association on Mental Deficiency.

12. "Child Protective Services in the United States" gives a nationwide survey prepared by the American Humane Association.

13. The American Social Hygiene Association's researches on adolescent sexual behavior, now under way, will be available before the Conference.

14. A survey of educational systems by the National Congress of PTA's will also be available.

NEW WHC LEAFLET OFF THE PRESS

A first printing of the new pocket-size White House Conference information piece came off the press the end of May. Copies already have been distributed to State Committees, national organizations and others.

The leaflet describes the themes and purposes of the Golden Anniversary Conference, explains its history, how it is organized and who will attend. It gives points for participation and lists the names of members of the President's National Committee.

A second printing has been scheduled.

FINANCE DIRECTOR APPOINTED

Ephraim R. Gomberg, Executive Director for the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth, has announced the appointment of Dr. Eugene Hotaling as Finance Director.

In making the appointment, Mr. Gomberg said, "The Finance Committee has specifically recommended the creation of this position in view of the very substantial proportion of Conference cost that must be met through private rather than Government sources."

Dr. Hotaling brings a wide background of experience in the field of business administration and fund raising to the White House Conference staff. For the past 2 years, he was affiliated with the Cancer Institute at Miami, Fla., and the United Fund of Dade County.

STUDIES TO PROVIDE HOMEWORK FOR DELEGATES

Before attending conference sessions in Washington next March, each delegate will have a chance to brief himself thoroughly on background data and points of view relevant to the conference program.

This homework will reach the delegate in the form of working papers, reports and volumes being prepared on recommendations of the Committee on Studies, headed by Dr. Eli Ginzberg, professor of economics at Columbia University's Graduate School of Business.

Each conference delegate will receive, when he registers, a working paper prepared for use of the work group in which he is enrolled. There will be about 50 working papers, each relevant to the topic of four or five work groups. Each paper will deal with specific, concrete and factual data, designed to serve as resource material for work group discussions. Specialists in a variety of fields will write these papers.

As further background material, the data-gathering now in process by State committees will be compiled and edited in a single, digest volume. It will give a nationwide picture of conditions affecting children and youth today.

Similarly, the work of national organizations, as reflected in the materials they are forwarding to conference headquarters, will be put into a summary report volume. This will record and evaluate what lay and professional organizations have done during the past 10 years in all fields relevant to the conference.

For further homework, the Studies Committee has planned a prospectus of research recommendations for the coming decade, which will be prepared as part of the general summary of the conference.

Dr. Ginzberg and his committee will take responsibility for compiling three additional volumes of background papers—essentially philosophical in nature—to be written by authorities in various fields. These volumes will deal with "Perspectives," "Trends" and "Issues," and will round out the delegate's study in approaching the conference.

September 1 has been set as the target date for receiving all studies source material, so as to provide adequate time for editing and printing the mass of data prior to the opening of the conference.

STATES LIST THEIR PRIORITY CONCERNS

As the State committees go about the task of preparing for the 1960 White House conference, they have been reporting the problems relating to children and youth that concern them most.

Lists of such priority concerns have come from 24 States: Alaska, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming, and from Puerto Rico and American Samoa.

The concern most frequently mentioned is the treatment, rehabilitation, and education of handicapped children, be they physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, mentally ill or retarded. Seventeen States and Puerto Rico have listed this as a priority concern.

Juvenile delinquency ranks almost as high among major problems. Fifteen States and Puerto Rico have mentioned their concern with delinquency prevention and with the need for improving legislation and law enforcement, court procedures, social services, and correctional institutions. Four States have also listed specifically the growing number of unwed teenage mothers and the rising venereal disease rate among teenagers as aspects of delinquency.

Next in frequency of mention is the need to expand employment opportunities for middle-adolescents and to improve guidance services and vocational training, especially for school dropouts.

Education is the fourth high-priority concern among the States reporting. Eleven States and Puerto Rico are interested in better schools for all mental leavels. Five more States want particularly to provide a greater challenge to gifted children.

In 10 States the expansion and improvement of welfare services has a high priority. For many States this means especially more day-care facilities for the children of working mothers, more homemaking services and family-counseling services to maintain and strengthen family life, improved adoption and foster-placement procedures.

Other State priority concerns include the strengthening of religious and spiritual life, greater recreation facilities, the special needs of migrant children and minority-group children, community and school health services, and school libraries.

COUNCIL OF NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH ANNOUNCES ROSTER OF MEMBERS

Any national organization having a major interest, emphasis, or concern in children and youth and wishing to participate in the Golden Anniversary White House Conference on Children and Youth is urged to communicate with the Council of National Organizations on Children and Youth, Mr. Robert E. Bondy, chairman, room 300, 345 East 46th Street, New York 17.

Organizations are reminded that September 1 is the target date for completing the roster of council membership.

Those that have joined but have not yet designated an official representative are urged to do so immediately.

With this issue the Conference Reporter begins an alphabetical listing of the national organizations which have qualified for membership in the council and have designated their official representative:

AFL–CIO Community Service Activities.
Allergy Foundation of America.
American Academy for Cerebral Palsy.
American Academy of Pediatrics.
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.
American Association of Instructors of the Blind.
American Association for Jewish Education.
American Association on Mental Deficiency.
American Association of University Women.
American Baptist Convention, Board of Education and Publication.
American Baptist Home Mission Society.
American Camping Association.
American College of Chest Physicians.
American College Health Association.
American College of Osteopathic Surgeons.
American Correctional Association.
American Dental Association.
American Dietetic Association.
American Educational Research Association (NEA).
American Educational Theatre Association.
American Farm Bureau Federation.
American Foundation for the Blind.
American Friends Service Committee.
American Hearing Society.
American Heart Association.
American Home Economics Association.
American Humane Association.
American Institute of Family Relations.
American Jewish Committee.
American Jewish Congress.
American Legion National Child Welfare Division.
American Library Association.
American National Red Cross.
American Nurses' Association.

With Fingers Crossed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very timely editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on August 11, 1959:

WITH FINGERS CROSSED

The national head of the American Legion didn't think Khrushchev should be invited to visit the United States. Other prominent men also expressed disapproval.

At no time in history was such an exchange of amenities conducted under such wierd circumstances. The project is greeted by all informed Americans with fingers crossed. They do not propose to overlook the fact that the Kremlin boss is guilty of gross international crimes and that he continually promises his followers that the United States shall be eventually brought under the Communist yoke.

Very likely the Kremlin bosses also have their fingers crossed but in a different mood—that of sardonic satisfaction over what they hope to convert into a diplomatic coup. They probably depend upon a good-natured handshaking exhibition to soften up American opinion.

Landrum-Griffin Bill Would Punish Many for Guilt of Few

SPEECH
OF
HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no" on the Landrum-Griffin bill, which a majority of my House colleagues saw fit to approve as a substitute for the committee's labor reform bill. It is my personal conviction that this bill caters to industry and big business, and is strictly unfair to the rank-and-file laboring man. I promised my constituents I would vote for a bill designed to correct the abuses found in a few of the labor unions, but not for a bill which would inflict unjust punishment on those fine citizens of our working class who are trying to make an honest living by the sweat of their brow. I kept that promise.

A long and hard-fought battle, stretching over many years, gave organized labor the right to arbitrate and negotiate for a higher standard of living. Are we prepared to live with our consciences if we now turn around and take these rights away from them?

I feel certain that all of my distinguished colleagues who voted "no" on the Landrum-Griffin bill share my own sincere desire to rid organized labor of racketeering and corruption—and feel just as strongly about it as any of the Members who cast their vote in favor of this bill. But I refuse to believe that this can be accomplished only by stripping union members of their legitimate rights—rights earned and enforced through peaceful and democratic methods practiced in all free nations.

I want no part in setting a precedent for harsh, restrictive Government interference in the private and internal affairs of labor unions. There will never be a time when honest and just union functions should be endangered and curtailed by unjust Government action. We should not punish organized labor for all time to come because a few men have violated the faith of the labor union members, as well as the entire American population. If we operated on this basis, we would be equally justified in effecting governmental action to control the private and internal affairs of business and industry, where the misdeeds of a very few men also have resulted in widespread notoriety.

Another reason for my opposition to the Landrum-Griffin bill is my firm belief that its passage by the House may well destroy all chances of enacting any labor reform legislation during this session of Congress. The Senate, by an overwhelming majority, already has approved a far less restrictive bill. If they reverse this decision, even under almost unbearable pressure from outside sources, the Members of this distinguished body will leave themselves wide open to charges of hypocrisy. Our Nation may have to wait another year for labor reform, and the gangsters and hoodlums will laugh up their sleeves, free to continue their corrupt practices.

I do not feel that the backers of the Landrum-Griffin bill can honestly state that their only goal was to rid the unions of racketeering. Too many sections of the bill show total disregard for the hard-earned rights and privileges of the plain, honest, everyday, rank-and-file workmen who make up the backbone of the labor movement, and have done their earnest best to give organized labor the highly respected status it enjoys today—at least with thinking people everywhere who pay more attention to the good record of the many than they do to the bad record and bad reputation of a corrupt and arrogant few.

I want to emphasize to my many friends in business and industry that I would be just as adamant about refusing to vote for, or condone, any legislation aimed at undue interference in the lawful operations of business and industry.

It seems that too many people have forgotten that each of the three—labor, business, and industry—need each other to exist, and legislation aimed at destroying one can end by injuring all three.

I do not want labor legislation calculated to help put the economy of the Nation on a level where a few get rich, and the others get poorer. We cannot move back into the 19th century, politically or economically, any more than we could do it scientifically. This is legislation that deals with the bread and butter of millions of Americans, and it most certainly should be designed for 20th century living.

I ask the people of my home district in Kansas to judge me solely on this basis—that I consider legislation on its merits, and I do not vote in response to pressure from either side—but only on my personal conviction that the way I am voting is in the best interest of this great Nation. I firmly believe that if the Landrum-Griffin bill becomes law, we have betrayed organized labor to satisfy vested interests—and it will be something we will live to regret.

I certainly hope that House-Senate conferees will be able to present us with a just and equitable bill that will put an end to corrupt labor practices without doing massive harm to the entire labor movement.

Poland Is Thorn to Soviets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am today inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what I consider to be one of the best analyses of the situation in central Europe, particularly regarding Poland, that I have seen in a long time by any American correspondent. This article appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times on August 17 and was written by one of the Nation's outstanding foreign correspondents, Miss Marguerite Higgins.

I call attention to this article because it points out so graphically what I have said here on this floor on many occasions: that America's real secret weapon in containing the Soviet Union's plans for spreading international communism; and preventing world war III is our ability to keep the captive nations of Europe at least spiritually on our side, even though today, against their will, they are forced to be ruled by Communist regimes.

Miss Higgins makes it clear that the only reason the Soviet Union has not touched off world war III is because Khrushchev and the Kremlin leaders know that they cannot count on the people of these captive nations for any substantial support, even though the puppet Communist governments in these nations may profess their loyalty to Moscow.

It is my sincere belief that Miss Higgins' penetrating analysis of the situation in Poland makes even more appropriate the resolution which I introduced last week in this House, calling for the Congress of the United States to reaffirm its belief that the captive nations must be given full freedom through peaceful means before there can be any lasting peace in Europe.

In view of this article, I renew my plea to this Congress that we adopt the resolution which would call upon President Eisenhower to make it clear to Nikita Khrushchev when he comes to this country that the West must continue to view all Soviet foreign policy moves with suspicion so long as the Kremlin insists on keeping these captive nations of Europe behind the Iron Curtain against their will.

While Miss Higgins describes primarily the situation in Poland, I am confident that the people of Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria would undoubtedly display the same spirit in the cause of freedom as the Poles if they had the opportunity.

Miss Higgins' article follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Aug. 17, 1959]

POLAND IS THORN TO SOVIETS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WARSAW, POLAND.—A Scandinavian diplomat who witnessed the outpouring of pro-American emotion during Vice President NIXON's stay in Poland had these comments:

"This demonstration was the final proof to me of something I have long suspected. It is this: If a war broke out tomorrow between the Soviet Union and America, the Russians would have no other course but to immediately put all of Poland under Red army occupation. Despite their Communist leaders, the feelings of the Polish people would make this country a liability, not a help, in any Soviet conflict with your country."

AN EXCLAMATION POINT

And in the opinion of an impressive number of neutralist observers in this part of the world, what is true of Poland is also true, though to a lesser degree, of large sections of Communist-dominated Eastern Europe.

The bold, almost disconcerting floods of pro-Western sentiments that greeted NIXON in Warsaw were but the exclamation point to the conclusions on this score that have been building for some time.

The Hungarian revolt, the explosions in East Germany and Poland itself have helped to form these opinions.

CURTAIN FILIGREED

Also, the Iron Curtain has become gradually an iron filigree letting in some light, some tourists, and permitting a few frank opinions to flow back and forth. So it is possible to see how astonishingly little all the years of Communist brainwashing accomplished in these areas which were attached to the Soviet empire after World War II.

This does not means—and this is a vital point—that a Communist leader such as Poland's Wladislaw Gomulka is not sincere in his pledge to Moscow to keep his country a loyal part of the Russian military pact. Gomulka's pledge is sincere and is possible of fulfillment in times of cold war or even when international tension boils to its occasional moments of great crisis.

"GOMULKA, A REALIST"

But as another neutralist observer put it: "Gomulka is far too much of a hard-headed realist not to understand that if the issues were halfway clear, a country like Poland in any conflict between the Russians and Americans would turn itself into a fast guerrilla movement snapping at the heels—and if possible—at the vitals of the Soviet Army.

"RECALLS SHOWDOWN OF 1956

"And the Russians know it, too. That's why you Americans are so foolish to let Khrushchev bluff you with his talk of rockets and sputniks. Do you know what deters the Russians from starting a so-called local war over Berlin or indeed over anything else in this part of the world? It certainly is not just American atomic bombs. It's the very real risk that the Russians, in the event of military showdown, might see Eastern Europe turn against them."

Short of wars, however, the historically difficult relations between the U.S.S.R. and such countries as Poland are likely to stay on the even keel that became the order of the day after the momentous showdown of 3 years ago between Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev and Gomulka.

It was in October 1956 that Khrushchev sent Soviet tanks rolling in the direction of Warsaw in an effort to assert Moscow's will and the continued rule over Poland of Soviet Marshal Konstantin K. Rokossovsky. But in this case Gomulka's will proved stronger than Khrushchev's. The Soviet bluff was called when the Poles told them to call off their tanks or find themselves at war with the Polish people.

MODEL OF INCONSPICUOUSNESS

Since then the Soviet Army in Poland has been a model of inconspicuousness. To a foreigner and even to the Poles themselves it is hard to remember that the Russians are stationed in considerable force in strategic points. For the Red army soldiers stay strictly to themselves.

In Warsaw, for instance, not a single Red army officer or enlisted man is any longer to be seen on the streets. The time when Moscow set the pace for all things Polish from agriculture to architecture also has ended.

Connecticut National Guard Unit Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, each year the outstanding company-size unit in the Connecticut National Guard is selected to receive a special award known as the Eisenhower trophy. It is a singular mark of reward for the effort shown by members of the unit during the year toward proficiency and training in military subjects. I request unanimous consent to include a clipping from the Hartford Times on the 1959 Connecticut award:

Maj. Gen. Frederick G. Reincke, state adjutant general, Monday presented headquarters and the headquarters detachment of the National Guard with the Eisenhower trophy, given annually to the best unit in the State.

Receiving the award was Capt. William E. Meagher of Salem Street, Hartford, commander of the Hartford unit. It was given at a dress review attended by three other units also undergoing 2 weeks summer training here.

The units were headquarters battery, 1st Missile Battalion, 192d Artillery Regiment; headquarters battery, 1st Missile Battalion, 242d Artillery Regiment; and the Connecticut Military Academy.

The award, given by the National Guard Bureau, is based on training, Federal inspection, attendance, weapons qualification and overall performance.

MATS Mission, Support Our Fighting Forces—ATA Mission, Destroy MATS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the pressure activities of the Air Transport Association regarding the modernization of the Military Air Transport Service. In particular I refer to the latest paper they have circulated to selected persons in Congress opposing $30 million for the modernization of MATS contained in the Senate supplemental appropriations bill.

In the original budget for the Department of the Air Force there was a request for $53 million to be used for the modernization of our Military Air Transport fleet. Largely because of the efforts of the Air Transport Association this request was denied by this body and then the Senate. However, it was agreed in the Senate that such item would be included in the supplemental appropriations bill. Senate amendment No. 34 to the supplemental appropriations does contain an item for the modernization of MATS in the amount of $30 million. The amendment was introduced by Senator CANNON, of Nevada.

The Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Mr. Douglas, strongly supported Senator CANNON's amendment in a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations dated July 22, 1959.

The Air Transport Association in its latest effort has again attempted to becloud the strategic airlift requirement of Air Force by stating that the aircraft to be obtained would be used in the "regular MATS mission which the Air Force views as an airline type of scheduled operation all over the world." Nothing could be further from the truth. The Air Force has repeatedly stated the need for modern transports capable of carrying cargo to critical areas in time to meet the requirements of our strategic and tactical jet forces.

I am amazed and disgusted that an association of the caliber of the Air Transport Association would so lower itself in such an obvious attempt to flaunt the best judgment of our military planners and congressional action resulting from classified information.

The Air Transport Association must realize that the development of modern cargo jet aircraft and suitable turbofan propulsion is of vital military necessity. At the same time they are urging ever and ever increasing participation of our airlines in Department of Defense business they must know that our Nation's airlines are not equipped to carry the multiplicity of cargoes required by our military departments at speeds required in modern warfare.

The funds which the Air Transport Association are fighting are of vital necessity to the Department of the Air Force and in turn such jet cargo development will serve to advance the capabilities of our civilian airlines. When the supplemental appropriations bill is considered I strongly urge that each Member of this House support the $30 million appropriation for the development and modernization of our military transport fleet.

In closing I ask unanimous consent that the article "MATS and the Mission" from the August 1959 issue of the Armed Forces Management magazine be incorporated in the RECORD at this point. I regard this article as an excellent summation of the Military Air Transport Service, its abilities, and its problems.

MATS AND THE MISSION

(By Bill Borklund)

(Although the importance of its mission is the key to its entire operation, the Military Air Transport Service has been caught this year in a never before equaled barrage of diversionary charges—most, if not all, of them secondary and misleading. Until the underbrush is cleared away, MATS, and the Air Force, are going to have a hard time reaching, with much desired commercial airline help, a much needed program for use of all U.S. support air power in the time of war.

Bombed, badgered and besieged as were few military outfits this year, the Military Air Transport Service enters the final round, this month, of a summer-long congressional hassle over how much money it should be spending on commercial airlift, how much of its military job it should do itself.

At the same time, undaunted by the battering it has taken, MATS is reentering the Washington, D.C., arena with two far-reaching proposals of its own. One: A $53 million supplemental appropriation request for 10 jet powered aircraft (which Capitol Hill whacked out of the original Defense money request) to start the long-overdue MATS modernization program. Two: a proposal that Defense start airlifting all personnel overseas (present levels—37 percent of Army, 50 percent of Navy, 94 percent of Air Force), double the amount of oversea shipping by air of high value hardware.

Either idea will be enough to start the whole argument again, an argument that

centers around what MATS does and why. Strangely enough, all the mountains of obfuscating manuscript produced this year have done little to clarify the MATS mission, key to the whole argument. The result: means are discussed as ends, the result is called the cause and headline-hunting critics have led a big chunk of Congress (and most of the American public) down a bramble-strewn path of misinformation.

Among the baubles: MATS is the world's largest airline. It isn't even close. Soviet Russia's Aeroflot is No. 1 among the real leaders. In addition, only about 30,000 of MATS' 120,000 Navy, Air Force, and civilian personnel and half its 1,198 assigned aircraft handle the strategic air transport mission. The rest take care of MATS' less-publicized services—Air Weather, Air Photographic and Charting, Air Rescue, Airways and Air Communitions, and Aeromedical Evacuation.

MATS runs a plushy airline. The three VC–137A jet passenger planes which prompted this blast are indeed plushy, were built for the Air Force to fly the President, Congress, and high level U.S. dignitaries around the world, are actually off-the-shelf Boeing 707's with standard executive interiors. Assigned to MATS for administrative purposes only, the aircraft are actually under control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization. Nearly all other MATS passengers travel the austere equivalent of commercial tourist class.

MATS is competng with commercial airlines for passengers. Total passengers carried by MATS last year amounted to less than 1 percent of the 49 million annual passenger load carried by U.S. airlines alone.

MATS, like any other military organization, has a wartime mission, assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The mission: be ready to move troops, missiles, and other heavy weapons and supplies in any war emergency to support other Air Force components, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. JCS estimates wartime airlift requirements specifies those that are critical, i.e., must be handled by military aircraft and crews, pegs the rest essential, i.e., can be done by either MATS or civil carriers.

Given a half-day to reach predesignated spots around the globe to cover the "critical" tasks (primarily resupplying Strategic Air Command bombers returning from their first bombing run), MATS keeps an alert force in on-the-flight-line readiness, runs the rest of its airfleet through practical training exercises. It is, in essence, a SAC-like supply operation with one exception. SAC must take pictures rather than drop its bombs. MATS can haul and process in peacetime training the same supplies it will actually carry if the big war should start.

To handle the bulk of the "essential" role, it has organized a Civil Reserve Air Fleet. Primary CRAF duty, at the moment: hauling passengers. CARF list of planes varies depending on predicted requirements, is currently (fiscal year 1960) made up of 242 aircraft under assignment from 27 different civil carriers—primarily DC–4's for cargo, DC–7's for passengers. There is a slight hooker: For MATS to use any of the CRAF planes, under current agreements with the airlines, it must take them all. Result: MATS must take care of most limited war situations pretty much on its own.

To MATS its "realistic training" program is an absolute necessity if it is to have any chance at all of meeting its wartime obligation. Said one colonel, "Letting pilots fly the aircraft is the very tiniest part of this whole training effort. We've got to train the traffic people, the maintenance men, cargo handlers, the whole crew.

"We have to know what we can move where and how efficiently. (Biggest problem right now is the terminal operation.) You can't mothball an operation like this, any more than you can SAC, then push a button and have it spring into operation in the wink of an eye—which is how fast we'd have to get going on D-day."

Requesting 6 hours originally, MATS is allowed a 5-hour per day per aircraft utilization rate for training, has reasons for believing this isn't enough. Studies by Rand Corp., and such men as Dr. Paul Cherington of Harvard Business School indicate MATS could not boost this training rate to that required if a hot war started, far less than the 10 hours demanded by JCS, and MATS could maintain this rate for at best 30 days. Their own Korean war experience tends to corroborate this finding. Asked for a 10-hour per aircraft per day operating rate MATS, in the initial and crucial stages of the war, was able to boost its 2.8-hour prewar level to only slightly over 4 hours.

Thus, they are being asked to do what some of the best brains in the country say can't be done. In spite of this, MATS maintains it has the capability the JCS says it should, but, added one officer (in reference to oft-quoted ex-Army Chief of Staff Maxwell Taylor's demand for more troop airlift), "We don't have the capability to move everything everyone wants us to move."

MATS supply backlog, one mark of efficiency, in any given airport is running less than 3-day maximum currently acceptable to MATS headquarters. They're thinking of revising that goal to 1 day. And, in response to the Capitol Hill charges that MATS is running scheduled flights overseas along the same routes as commercial carriers, one officers snorted, "A schedule is nothing more than a program any good manager uses to see if he can do what he says he wants to do. As for the routes, although we don't use the same bases, there's usually only one efficient economical way to cross an ocean. We use the same route as the airlines for the same reason."

Beyond its realistic readiness training and the supplemental CRAF program, MATS, in its role as single manager for military air transport, buys a large chunk of commercial airlift. Among the reasons: military air transport demands are higher than the by-product—airlift—of MATS training program can handle; MATS wants only to be able to do its assigned war mission, wants a strong civil air fleet ready to back it up after the first few days or weeks of an all-out war.

Of the $200 million paid by Defense to civil carriers for contract, charter and common carriage airlift in fiscal year 1959, MATS signed signed the tab for over half ($105 million). Of that qantity, $70.8 million was Congress-appropriated money spent backing up MATS own peacetime operation. The rest it spent as procurement officer for Logair, Quicktrans and the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

Even if the requirement for airlift does not increase (and it's likely to), MATS will soon be spending more of Defense's airlift dollar as it phases in Northeastern North America intertheater airlift overseas, eventually will be responsible for the whole $200 million. All procurements are advertised, all carriers are eligible to bid. Commented one procurement officer. "We don't care, initially, what capability they have."

When the contract is let, however, MATS keeps two things in mind:

1. Placing as much business as possible on a fixed, long-term basis (to get better pricing, make contract administration easier for both the carrier and MATS).

2. The report of MATS Capability Survey Committee which visits carriers' facilities, verifies that they can produce as they say they will. We want to make awards only to responsible and capable carriers. To a good many commanders buying airlift, performance is a lot more important than cost.

But, if MATS has as good a case as any other military organization for existing, that $70.8 million, and growing, prize has been too much for the commercial airlines to view with clearcut business acumen. Strangest twist, to MATS officers, in the whole Capitol Hill cacaphony is that the very people in Washington who should be helping MATS sell increased use of airlift are, instead, pounding MATS with every brickbat they own.

Like a recalcitrant bulldog, the commercial airlines, through their powerful association lobbyists, are leaning hard on Congress to get them a bigger share of the large MATS business—in spite of MATS boss Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner's statement that "there just is no more business—unless MATS flies its aircraft empty."

And if MATS flies empty? Ignoring for the moment its crippling effect on MATS preparedness, the cost of Defense airlift to the U.S. taxpayer would skyrocket to nearly $1 billion—something the Pentagon thinks he would take a rather dim view of. Even though MATS used 80 percent of its passenger, 74.8 percent of its cargo capacity during the last fiscal year, commercial airlines still hauled 40 percent of MATS' passengers, 10 percent of its cargo.

This is a far cry from MATS commercial augmentation in 1955 when it spent only $4.5 million on civil airlines to haul 1.5 percent of its passengers, 6.6 percent of its cargo and mail. In the past 5 years, MATS has reduced its airfleet by 107 planes, cut its personnel strength some 2,400 persons. Yet, charges of MATS' persistent expansion, to the detriment of commercial airlines, persist.

False charges are not MATS' only headache. Attracted by the mushrooming market, MATS' bidders list has jumped from 41 carriers in 1957 to 86 this year, is expected to reach 122 in 1960. Most of the additions are briefcase operators with one or two obsolescent aircraft, at most, purchased solely to get MATS business.

Operating under a part 45 certification (called one of the great rackets in the aviation industry by Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONRONEY) and not subject to Civil Aeronautics Board control, these "tissue paper" firms come under the benevolent protection of a Small Business Administration umbrella—and most of the unreliable outfits spotted by the contract survey committee are in this category.

Said one procurement officer, "These small business set-asides are encouraging the use of old aircraft, discouraging the forward looking companies—and, on top of all that, we figure we pay about a 10-percent premium to give them business."

These quick-hit-and-die operators have prompted an intramural fight among the carriers. But, as reflected in a Congress trying to keep everybody happy, the fight has become something far more omnious. Said South Carolina's Senator THURMOND, "Excessive (governmental) concern with commercial aviation has caused us to progressively nibble away at the Military Air Transport Service."

MATS' request for 10 C-jets (estimated cost: $53 million) hit a blank wall first time around—for precisely the same reason MATS has been in trouble all summer; national defense mission keeps being obscured by politics and considerations of false economy.

To MATS the argument for C-jets seems pretty clear cut. Says Tunner, "We need both a racehorse and a workhorse." They are getting the workhorse, the C–133. For the other: "It doesn't make much sense to us to try to support a 600-knot-an-hour bomber with a 190-knot transport. We're trying to support a rocket (SAC) with a kiddie car."

Adds Tunner, "The transport plane now in the inventory, being piston driven would be many hours distant from the friendly base with needed materiel and personnel at the time the SAC bomber arrived. It is

precisely the difference in speed between a jet-propelled plane and a piston-driven plane. The SAC plane would therefore be threatened with immobilization after one strike at a target."

And there's the advantage of economy. Ten C-jets will do the same job as 42 of the C-124's which comprise the bulk of today's strategic transport fleet, are nearly obsolete and costly to maintain.

MATS has already heard, in the wings, the yells of the civil airlines. "What they tell us basically," said one MATS officer, "is they want us to do a good job—but not too good." Tunner insists that MATS is not fighting the commercial airlines: "We need them. We are counting on a strong airline industry to backstop us in time of war." But if MATS is not in a fight, it is showing a lot of unexplainable bruises.

What rankles MATS men most, and some of the most knowledgeable men in the airlift business today are in Tunner's organization is that the MATS record is about 180 degrees opposite from the picture painted of it by commercial interests; is, in fact, far better than the so-far performance in war situations of private carriers demanding they be given more of the job to do.

Among the quotable:

On claims industry could do the job cheaper: "Assuming the same operational training level, if we split the cargo-passenger business equally with the civil carriers, Defense airlift bill would jump another $300 million. If we flew empty, the taxpayers would shell out $750 million more."

Could do it better?: "Ten times during July, August, and September last year MATS went looking for commercial airlift augmentation, couldn't find it. During the Lebanon and Far East crisis, all bids in some offerings were so high they all had to be rejected. We had to haul the supplies and people ourselves working overtime. It was the tourist season, if you'll recall. During 1 week last November when they were on strike, all but four TWA scheduled flights were handled by MATS. We do not consider this the proper way to maintain military readiness."

MATS' "competitive" setup is preventing civil carriers from developing a cargo capability: "They want us to give them the money to build the aircraft, then guarantee them a profit on the business. The airlines built an incomparably efficient passenger service under a free enterprise system. Passenger business in this country is a drop in the bucket, compared to the commercial cargo they could haul. Why don't they go out and develop it instead of going to Washington looking for a Defense Department dole?"

What about Congress?: "If they buy this civil carrier idea to pare down MATS even more, they'll be behind the biggest eight ball they've ever seen. We already have letters indicating every transport outfit in the country, steamship lines, railroads, busses, will jump on the bandwagon—and you couldn't blame them."

MATS FOUR ENGINE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

C-97	48
C-118	126
C-121	71
C-124 (troop carrier)	143
C-124	310
C-133	23
Total	578

Ruinous Grain and Livestock Buildup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to point out to my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the August 1, 1959, issue of the Wallaces Farmer and Iowa Homestead newspaper. Current reports show that our feed grain and livestock supply is far ahead of the demand for these commodities, and all indications point to the fact that by this fall this imbalance will become greater than ever before. For example, Iowa hogs which last year sold for over $20 a hundredweight are now priced under $14 a hundredweight, and the normal, heavy runs to market which usually drive the price down have not yet started. I believe that we should all become vitally concerned about this Nation's agricultural problems and steadfastly work for good, sound farm legislation which will correct the injustices done to the American farmer.

The editorial follows:

RUINOUS GRAIN AND LIVESTOCK BUILDUP

The farm surplus crisis is getting worse. Our unwieldy and still mounting grain stocks are just 1 to 3 years ahead of unwieldy supplies of eggs, hogs, and beef cattle.

We're headed for real trouble unless some remedial action is taken soon.

The July crop report confirmed our expectations of a huge corn crop. Total feed grain production this year will be 2.5 million tons higher than last year—enough to produce an added 5 million hogs.

Cattle numbers increased 3½ million last year, are expected to go up another 4 to 5 million head by January 1, 1960. This will give us about 102 million head, a record number, and an increase well beyond that of our human population.

Wallaces Farmer has been trying to point out the lurking danger in our productive might for some time. But some economists and agricultural leaders are still minimizing the problem, saying things will soon work themselves out.

We were glad to see Iowa Farm Bureau leaders give public acknowledgment of our looming crisis. In an open letter to Secretary Benson, the board of directors of the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation spelled out their momentous concern about the following:

"The present imbalance between the supply of food and fiber and the effective demand.

"The immediate future prospects for farm income, particularly for the livestock producer.

"The current effort to cast farmers as pampered and greedy wards of the Government."

The farm bureau letter stated that agriculture's bargaining position must be strengthened if we are to compete successfully with industries' protective tariff and labor's monopoly exemptions.

The group asked for: the reduction or elimination of Government reclamation and other programs which actually increase agricultural production;

A land retirement program large enough to balance current production with demand; the use of surplus farm commodities in a practical program to benefit our allies; a sizable transfer of USDA funds to speed research on new industrial uses of farm products.

This concern for our plight by Iowa Farm Bureau is a far cry from the stand usually taken by the American Farm Bureau Federation. We hope the Iowa group will have some influence in changing the farm policy approach taken by the national organization.

Walter Hornaday Writes About the General Accounting Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the General Accounting Office has done and is doing a wonderful job in cooperation with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman. They have been of great assistance to me as well as to my Committee staff in various phases of investigative work we have undertaken for the purpose of legislating certain of the veteran fields. I have from time to time conveyed my thanks and appreciation for their efforts to the Comptroller General as well as to individuals in his employ.

However, it has taken a veteran newspaper reporter, Mr. Walter Hornaday, of the Dallas Morning News, to bring their story to life, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Hornaday's story which appeared in the August 9 issue of the Dallas Morning News:

FOUND: A FEDERAL AGENCY WHOSE OBSESSION IS THRIFT

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—While almost everyone in Washington connected with the Federal Government is spending money hand over fist, a little-known Federal agency is working tooth and toenail to save all it can.

The average citizen has never heard of the General Accounting Office, and if he has he usually has little or no knowledge about what it does.

But to Federal bureaucrats who tend to become careless in handing out the taxpayers' money, the GAO is a power to be reckoned with.

Briefly, the GAO is the watchdog of Congress. Its job is to see that the money that Congress appropriates is spent for the intended purposes and handled honestly and wisely.

Heading the GAO is the Comptroller General. His term is set for 15 years, so he will be less likely to yield to political pressure, and he can't be reappointed. The Presi-

dent appoints him, subject to Senate confirmation, but the Comptroller General's agency is a legislative one, not an executive.

Joseph Campbell, the present Comptroller General, describes the GAO this way:

"A nonpolitical, nonpartisan agency • • • created by the Congress to act in its behalf in examining the manner in which Government agencies discharge their financial responsibilities with regard to public funds appropriated or otherwise made available to them by the Congress and to make recommendations looking to greater economy and efficiency in public expenditures."

The sum of $67,649,522 was actually collected by the GAO during the 12 months ended June 30, 1958, in refunds for overcharges and other improper costs. It's estimated that about as much more was saved the Government by warnings, payment stoppages and the mere fact that Federal officials knew the GAO was looking over their shoulders.

Since its establishment in 1921, the GAO probably has been responsible for savings of at least half a billion dollars.

The far-flung activities of the GAO have sometimes become a pain in the neck to agencies where carelessness, even outright wrongdoing have been uncovered. Some officials feel that it is prying into matters it has no business being concerned with.

The late President Roosevelt became so irritated with the GAO that he left the post of Comptroller General vacant for 3 years by failing to appoint anyone to succeed the first GAO head, John R. McCarl, of Indiana. It was common talk then that Roosevelt hoped the agency would be abolished.

Lindsay Warren, a Congressman from North Carolina, agreed to take the job only after Roosevelt promised not to try to do away with the GAO.

Comptroller General Campbell and the 5,000 "watchdogs" in the GAO don't wait for money to be lost on Government contracts or through improper methods. Every department and agency is under constant auditing and investigation.

Reports are made throughout the year to Congress, its committees, and to agencies involved. Investigators are regularly assigned to committees of the House and Senate to aid them in their duties.

The Defense Department is the GAO's biggest headache. The sheer size of military spending (Congress recently appropriated almost $40 billion for the next 12 months) is partly responsible for more wasteful methods being found there than in other agencies.

But GAO officials have learned that many military people are inherently careless about money. The Defense Department also is riddled with contracting officers who are not fitted for the job because of lack of training, in the opinion of some GAO investigators.

A recent report on 12 prime contracts negotiated by the Navy noted that prices $12,200,000 in excess of actual costs had been accepted. The GAO was able to get back much of these excessive costs.

The GAO and Congress had clashed head-on with President Eisenhower over refusal of the International Cooperation Administration, which handles foreign aid, to furnish requested information.

Congress tacked on a provision to the foreign aid appropriations bill requiring the ICA to supply all information wanted by Congress, and to cut off funds if the data is not furnished. The bill is now before the Senate appropriations group.

The White House has given notice that it won't permit the mutual aid agency to comply, on the basis such a law would be unconstitutional and invade the Executive's power to withhold such matters as evaluation reports, which House and Senate committees and the GAO want to see.

Incidentally, the White House and the Budget Bureau are subject to GAO audits, all except the special fund of the President.

Congress' watchdog agency itself is not immune from congressional probing. The GAO maintains offices all over the world where Federal money is spent.

Regional offices for field operations also are located in 19 American cities, including Dallas.

Strong Support for No Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with reference to my bill, H.R. 7692, to remove Federal controls from agriculture in an attempt to end the current madness in the field of farming, I include a letter to the editor of the New York Times by the distinguished economist, Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, published in the New York Times of August 14, and an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 17, 1959, quoting President Charles B. Shuman of the American Farm Bureau of Federation:

TO CURTAIL FARM SURPLUSES—ENDING SUBSIDIES WITH ECONOMIES USED TO CUT TAXES PROPOSED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Five of the most overproduced commodities in the United States are wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. And yet we persist in paying large subsidies to keep up the overproduction of these goods.

The Government takes the surpluses off the hands of the producers and stores them at enormous expense—at the cost of about a billion dollars a year. So large are the accumulated surpluses that the problem of finding physical facilities in which to store them has become acute. And yet the payment of the huge subsidies to induce still more production of the overproduced commodities still goes on.

What should be done? It is obvious that the United States is losing an important opportunity to raise its standard of consumption. The amount of labor and capital now devoted to finance the production of surpluses could be devoted to increasing the supplies of goods that are scarce and that people would consume in larger quantities if the goods were produced and were available for consumption. How can this diversion of resources from producing unwanted wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco be brought about?

A simple way to accomplish the shift would be for the Government simply to stop paying subsidies and to use the money thus saved to cut taxes. Consumers would then decide how the released production power would be used because tax cuts would enable them to step up promptly the buying of a vast variety of goods.

GRADUAL ELIMINATION

The additional demand by consumers would pull workers and capital out of the wheat, cotton growing, corn, rice and tobacco industries into more productive uses. In order to mitigate the problems of transition it would probably be desirable to eliminate the subsidies by gradual steps over a period of about 4 years. In order to provide new sources of demand to pull resources out of the excessively expanded industries, the tax cuts should be timed to coincide or slightly precede the subsidy cuts.

But though tax cuts could provide alternative demand for that now supplied by subsidies, the Government would not need to use all of the savings from the termination of subsidies in this way. The country has enormous public needs. It needs more schools, low-cost housing, better roads, flood control, pollution control, more hospitals, more recreation areas with roads to them, its cities need much replanning and rebuilding.

Hence, the Government would be wise to divide the savings from terminating subsidies into two parts—one part going to individuals in the form of tax reductions, the other part going to the public in the many forms of public works that the country badly needs but cannot now afford.

SUMNER H. SLICHTER.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 17, 1959]

VIEW FROM THE FARM

"Today's burdensome surpluses with their fantastic storage costs are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected the business of agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control."

Now, people reading those words might conclude they came from some city slicker so ignorant of the farm he thinks prize-winning calves always come in pairs a couple of inches above some shapely ankles.

Not so. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was the speaker. The Farm Bureau Federation represents 1.6 million farm families throughout the country, but does not, of course, claim to speak for all of them. It can speak for a considerable majority of its members, however, for frequent polls the federation holds invariably show opposition to the support programs.

The farmers would be vastly better off, Mr. Shuman told an audience recently in New York, if the Government would permit them to use the free marketplace to supply consumer needs. Government subsidy programs based on parity serve neither the interests of the consumer or the farmer, he added.

Nor of anybody else, for that matter. Consumers and farmers pay taxes (somebody once figured out that there are 51 taxes hidden in one loaf of bread) and the taxes they've paid for the monstrous farm program might be enlightening to some who don't realize the figures. Since 1954, and including 11 months of fiscal 1959, the farm program has realized losses of $5.8 billion.

In addition to paying farmers for things they grew and for things they didn't grow, the Government also spent some pretty impressive sums of money the farmers didn't get a dollar of.

For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation reports for the 11 months ending last May 31 that carrying charges alone on crops amounted to $495 million, interest amounted to $145 million and general overhead—that euphemism for a bureaucracy that has moved in on the farmer faster than a corn borer through the lower 40—has cost the taxpayer $39.3 million in the same period.

Well, if a wasteful program such as this isn't even liked by farmers it's supposed to benefit, what in the world keeps it going?

Mr. Shuman had an answer for that one, too. "Though farmers often have asked that these programs be changed, the Congress has not yet taken effective action."

And that, so far as letting the public know who is really to blame for the follies of the farm program, ought to help separate the sheep from the goats.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following is my newsletter of August 15, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

The labor bill passed, unbelievably the strongest of the three bills considered, and by a lopsided resounding vote, 303 to 125. A victory for Senator MCCLELLAN and his committee (through its disclosures), for the President, for the minority Republican House leadership, and for the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats. By their own statements against the bill, it was a defeat for the House Democrat leadership, the AFL–CIO, the Teamsters, and the dedicated House liberals. But, most of all, it was a victory for the people, both in and out of unions, who by letters and wires demanded labor reform and an end to the abuses and excesses of the power of labor leaders.

The bills considered and their sponsors: (1) The Teamsters sponsored the weakest bill, the Shelley bill (defeated 245 to 132). (2) The Democrat House leadership (and AFL–CIO indirectly) sponsored the committee bill. (3) The administration, most business interests, the minority House (Republican) leadership, and southern Democrats sponsored the bipartisan Landrum-Griffin substitute bill, passed with 156 Democrats and 147 Republicans for, 122 Democrats and 3 Republicans against. Oddly enough and yet understandably, the excesses of labor and of proponents of labor's legislative demands brought on their own downfall or correction. These excesses include (1) unwillingness to concede that effective labor reform legislation was needed; (2) intemperate and inaccurate criticism of the substitute bill; (3) accusations of management's lobbying (galleries full of labor representatives and most lobbying by labor as usual); (4) sponsorship of committee bill that would actually weaken present labor law (example: exempt from boycott provisions 88 percent of truckers now covered); (5) those against the committee bill were accused by Democrat leadership of being "labor haters" and partisan.

The debate raged around the differences of the three bills (see last week's newsletter). On study I found arguments for the substitute bill outweighed the arguments for the Committee bill (after Shelley bill was eliminated). Arguments for committee bill include: (1) It's stronger than Shelley bill; (2) It goes as far as possible without hurting labor movement; (3) The substitute bill is "punitive" and goes too far. Rebuttal by proponents of the substitute bill (see last week): (1) Only the substitute bill covers the main areas of abuse: (a) Workers' bill of rights (b) union finances (c) No man's land labor disputes jurisdiction (d) Blackmail picketing (e) Secondary boycotts and hot cargo; (2) the substitute bill is not punitive and will eliminate from labor movement only the undesirable.

The debate was the most stimulating of the year—the air almost crackled with excitement, intemperate statements were hodgepodged with studious presentations, tempers flared, laughter greeted many exchanges. Debate highlights, humor or oddities include: (1) Threats by labor proponents that dire political consequences would befall those voting against organized labor's wishes, that this would be the "Congressional Retirement Act of 1959"; (2) The disclosures of brutality, violence, and coercion by John L. Lewis, Hoffa, and Reuther; (3) The intemperate charges of partisanship by House Democrat leadership, even as Republicans and Democrats smoothly joined (the "coalition") to put through the Landrum-Griffin bipartisan substitute; (4) The union-member Congressman who pleaded for labor reform to protect working people which he claimed only by the substitute bill could provide; (5) The attempt by labor's spokesmen to sabotage the substitute bill by tagging it NAM (National Association of Manufacturers) or Chamber of Commerce-sponsored; (6) The liberals' amendment to include no discrimination in union membership because of race, color, creed or sex, contrary to AFL–CIO desire to select membership by their own rules,[1]—and many others. Volumes will be writted describing this 4-day debate and its legislative outcome, a landslide of popular opinion for correction of labor's indiscretions.

My own belief is that even here we are attempting to doctor the surface sores rather than cure the basic illness. The boycotts, financial embezzlements, violence, and other abuses are the sores; the basic illness stems from the monopolistic power of unions which further result in dictatorial power of the national union leaders. The shutdown nationally of the steel industry (Hoffa's power to tie up transport nationally), prevention of piggy-back trucking, price-fixing, limiting of new businesses entering trades, limitation of new products' use such as prefabricated window, door, and building units or plastic pipe, all these and more are situations that cannot be cured short of antitrust law. Why shouldn't labor be treated as equal to business which is under antitrust law? I presented this viewpoint in suggesting my bill H.R. 8003, which would: (1) Return control of local unions to local union members and their elected officers; (2) end monopolistic practice of industry-wide bargaining by professional labor bosses at national and international level; (3) unions no longer could fix prices, restrict uses of new processes and products. Enforcement would be injunctive relief in Federal court (not criminal prosecution). I predict that, though the bill just passed was the best before us, the abuses, excesses and dangers of organized labor's power will not be curbed until and unless labor organizations are placed under antitrust law. Only then will union members, the consumer, and management-labor relations be really protected. Because I believe this, I predict that the national labor leaders will never rest until I am removed from office, no matter how greatly my bill would benefit union members. As always, it is up to the people. The victory of the labor bill resulted from aroused public opinion communicated to Congressmen.

[1] Senator MCCLELLAN's endorsement of the substitute bill.

Kindness to a Stricken Family

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 23, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, recently a news story, originating in Idaho Falls, Idaho, told the tragic tale of a stricken family. The following editorial from the Deseret News—Salt Lake Telegram, published at Salt Lake City, Utah, on August 7, 1959, discloses a previously unpublished chapter of that story. It teaches a fine Christian lesson, for which all of us are indebted to the organizations, business firms, and individuals who participated:

KINDNESS TO A STRICKEN FAMILY

The brutality of two world wars and the coarsening effect of the aftermath have taken their toll of the gentler virtues. So have the new oppressions and tyrannies of our day. Even in our country which has suffered comparatively little from the direct effects of war and has never been trampled under the heel of tyrants, there are tensions and stridencies which tend to make people less likely to be kind than harsh.

"So shines a good deed in a naughty world," wrote the "bard of Avon" centuries ago and his sage observation might well apply to our time and our people.

It might well apply to the Idaho Falls Junior Chamber of Commerce, the radio and television station of that fine community, Kansas City, Mo., civic clubs, the Lederle Laboratories of New York City and all others who are helping the Kenneth Nelson family, of Kansas City, stricken with botulism (food poisoning) while visiting with Mrs. Nelson's parents on a farm near Idaho Falls.

"Service to humanity is the best work in life and is a part of the junior chamber of commerce creed," said Laddy Dale, head of the "Nelson family survival fund." Because "service to others is the best work of life," the campaign is catching on in numerous western communities and may even become nationwide.

With Mrs. Nelson in an iron lung, Mr. Nelson, their daughter Wanda, 15, and Mrs. Nelson's father, Aaron Cruwell, 74, all dead, and Mrs. Cruwell and three Nelson children recovering or under observation, the sympathy of many persons and communities has been aroused. It is magnificent to see how this sympathy is being transformed into action in behalf of this stricken family.

Lederle Laboratories did a most generous and kindly deed when it canceled out a $7,825 bill for the antitoxin and also paid the air freight costs as the drug was flown in from various parts of the country. The Idaho Falls JC's, the Kansas City civic clubs and others are gathering funds since the cost of treatment for botulism is very great.

There is an old proverb which says, "Kindness is a language the deaf can hear and the dumb can understand." Certainly, everybody understands when trouble hits our friends and neighbors. It is then that we see and understand how our lives flow into the lives of others, especially those who are struck by tragedy.

Dangers Involved in the Use of Coal Tar Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the attention of the Congress a letter which I have just received, similar to others which have come to me, one of which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 27, page A6478, discuss-

ing the dangers involved in the use of coal-tar colors, food, drug, and cosmetic yellow Nos. 3 and 4, as coloring agents for butter, cheese, and oleo. I think that from a health standpoint this proposal should receive the most thorough consideration.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that most of the civilized countries have outlawed the use of these coloring agents in food products. If we continue to use these agents in our foods we obviously stand to lose our overseas markets. For example, Canada has just announced that it will not buy any more butter which has been colored with food, drug, and cosmetic yellow Nos. 3 and 4.

The letter follows:

IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
Ames, Iowa, August 15, 1959.

Hon. LEONARD G. WOLF,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WOLF: We understand there is a bill before Congress, H.R. 6852, which calls for extending the time for certification of food, drug, and cosmetic regulations on the use of Nos. 3 and 4 colors in butter.

If the Federal Food and Drug question the use of yellow Nos. 3 and 4 colors, it is our opinion that there should be no extension for the use of these colors in butter.

Very truly yours,
IOWA CREAMERIES ASSOCIATION,
J. S. QUIST, *Executive Secretary.*

Fishing Under Cover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 14, 1959, entitled "Fishing Under Cover":

FISHING UNDER COVER

Sometimes a congressional committee can justify a closed hearing for the protection of a witness who may be asked embarrassing questions about activities that have not yet been fully examined. In these cases the closed hearing is really a part of the information gathering process preliminary to a full-scale public investigation. But where can any excuse be found for closed hearings to protect the committee members who are doing the questioning? That appears to be the only excuse for the McClellan committee's strange star-chamber probe into the affairs of the United Auto Workers Union.

Senator MCCLELLAN tried to explain the committee's unusual procedure by saying that it was having a preliminary look at evidence which its Republican members wished to present in order to determine whether a full-scale inquiry would be advisable. But this supposed deference to witnesses called in a fishing expedition soon evaporated when it appeared that the chief witness, Richard Gosser, preferred to testify in open session, and Walter Reuther, UAW president, protested vigorously against the closed-door technique. In these circumstances it seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the secrecy was ordered solely for the benefit of the Republican members who were pressing the charges, and that is a wholly unwarranted excuse for withholding from the public and the press what is indubitably the public business.

Robert C. Hill, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the August 9 issue of the Dallas Morning News carried an article on our mutual friend Robert C. Hill, U.S. Ambassador to Mexico.

That portion of his official title "extraordinary" is certainly befitting Mr. Hill, as the following article will testify:

AMBASSADOR POINTS UP MEXICO'S TOUR LURES

(By Joe Goulden)

Robert C. Hill, the U.S. No. 1 "tourist" in Mexico wishes his fellow countrymen would give him some help.

Since being appointed Ambassador in 1957, Hill has spent just about as much time meeting Mexico in person in farflung villages as he has in the more formal Embassy in Mexico City.

He has visited most of Mexico's 31 states and territories. He has met the sidewalk hucksters in Tijuana; he has visited the tiny Isla de Mujeres off the coast of Yucatan.

And the big surprise, in Hill's estimation, is that more Americans haven't done the same.

In Dallas recently with the blue-ribbon group of Mexican businessmen, Hill summed up his reasons in an interview.

"Look at it this way," he said. "Why spend thousands of dollars going to Europe when such a beautiful nation is right in our own backyard?

"The scenery is just as beautiful. The cultures are just as old. The history is close to that of Texas and the Southwest.

"And most of all, the Mexican people want a chance to be friends with and know more about the United States."

A second (and more serious) reason: "Right now the United States is literally fighting a cold war with Communists in some Latin American countries.

"But the more Latin Americans get to know Americans, the less chance the Reds will have. So you might say that tourism is another road to survival."

Ambassador Hill, a hulking man who used to play football at Dartmouth, isn't the type of tourist who wanders gawkeyed with guidebook in one hand and camera in the other.

In fact, judging from descriptions given by aids, at times he must approach being a tourist attraction himself.

His guiding philosophy while making trips is that meeting people and making friends are two different things. Hill would rather make friends.

At a fiesta (he's been to dozens) Hill will don a serape and hat, pick up a guitar, and lustily sing "Cielito Lindo," his favorite Mexican song.

University of Mexico City students had him as a guest at a football game once. Someone asked how Americans kicked footballs.

Hill sent several 50-yard spirals down the field while the crowd stood and cheered.

Nor is Hill a striped-pants diplomat. He believes in finding out things first hand, doesn't balk at getting his feet wet if necessary.

While ambassador to El Salvador back in 1954, Hill, his wife and two children drove the family car over the Pan-American Highway from San Salvador to Washington, D.C.

"I wanted to find out more about the highway, which I consider one of the most important cooperative effects in this hemisphere," he said.

Freedom of the Press

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, Hugh Gallagher, of San Francisco, is known in maritime circles throughout the world for his interest in that segment of the economy. He serves as a special representative to the president of the Matson Navigation Co., and is chairman of the mayor's committee for shipping, shipbuilding, and ship repair.

Hugh looks the part of the stern, business executive but hidden behind this protective shield is the heart of an Irish poet. He is the poet laureate of Pacific coast shipping and here, reproduced from the San Francisco Chronicle, is one of his poems entitled "Freedom of the Press":

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

(By Hugh Gallagher)

'Twas my custom to drop in to Eddie's place,
in those days when the Nation was dry,
As Eddie had news of the waterfront and
Eddie had mighty good rye.
Many's the story, and sometimes a scoop,
came from that famous place
Of ships and people and goings on—and
that man's unforgettable face.
It had the look of a beaten man with nothing ahead but hope,
But not the scum of the waterfront or the
leavings of drink or dope.
He generally sat where he could look on a
beautifully modeled ship—
I'd covered her comings and watched her
sail on many a busy trip.
From time to time he'd come and go—
quiet—and so alone
Like one without "the tie that binds," or
friends to call his own.
Cold and drenched by a storm one night, he
came through an alley door.
My memory stirred—the modeled ship—these
two—somewhere before.
I motioned to Eddie to pour some drinks
and moved a chair to his side
Mumbling some words about the storm—not
wishing to hurt his pride.
He didn't look up nor did he speak as his
glass was filled with rye,
Then he raised it up to the modeled ship
and looked me straight in the eye.
It wasn't a weakling's face I saw, but a
man's—once strong and fine,
With a thousand years of pain and hurt
etched into every line.
His eyes met mine with a steady look, without shame or fear or doubt,
And I knew the sweep of the seven seas, as
my brain reeled round-about.

He nodded his head toward the modeled
ship—then spoke in a tired voice.
"A storm was the end of the world for me—
but a man must take his choice.
Remember the case of the *Rio Del Mar* and
the night she ran aground,
And the hero master who gave his life—
whose body was never found?
I was the chief mate on watch that night and
I got the brunt of the blame,
The world collapsed around my being and
headlines ruined my name.
Maybe I should have told the truth and taken
my chance with the law,
But who would believe what happened that
night, or the things no others saw.
I've had my share of storms at sea—but I
never knew such a night.
I tried to see through the blinding snow but
couldn't make out the light.
The order logged was to call the Master when
Point Arno was abeam,
So I stowed the engines and asked the chief
to keep a good head of steam.
I knocked on his door, then opened it wide,
and there he lay on his bunk,
A stink you could cut—a drooling mouth—
filthy and rotten drunk.
I shook, I cuffed him and twisted his ear—
and tumbled him out on the floor,
Then bodily carried him stumbling, in
through the wheelhouse door.
I tried to get through his sodden brain that
we hadn't made out the light.
But he stood there mumbling stupidly, like
a man half crazed with fright.
Above the noise of the storm outside I could
hear the breakers roar,
And a sailor's instinct seemed to warn we
were much too close to shore.
Then he did a thing no man would do, lest
reason within had fled—
He seized the engineroom telegraph, and
rang full speed ahead.
My heart most stopped at what he'd done,
then gripped with rage and fear,
I grabbed the fool at the telegraph and tried
to pull him clear.
But he was a powerful well-built man and he
wrestled me to the deck
And I felt his angry fingers feel for a hold
about my neck.
We fought like two wild animals all over the
wheel house floor,
'Til the rolling ship took a heave to port, and
tumbled us through the door.
Cursing and clawing like maniacs—drenched
by the heavy seas,
He gripped my throat with his heavy hands
and forced me to my knees.
A cresting wave came over the rail, and I
pried his big hands free.
Then she rolled to port, and with all my
strength, I flung him into the sea.
I crawled half choked to the telegraph and
rang full speed astern.
Calling down in the speaking tube for every
last blooming turn.
For minutes the vessel quivered and shook, as
she fought to come to a stop,
And I clung to the telegraph fighting for
breath, sick and ready to drop.
She seemed to check, then she lifted up, then
down with a grinding shock,
But the engines backed and she freed her-
self from a shelving point of rock.
I kept her turning full speed astern until
sure we were in the clear.
Then—a moment of horror at what I'd done—
I shook with a chilling fear.
A moist moon broke through the tumbling
clouds and I made out a light from
afar.
I knew where we were so I set a course for my
precious *Rio Del Mar*.
She was down by the head and filling fast,
but the bulkheads held real tight,
So we eased her along, and she made her
way, steering as best she might.
We came into port with all hands safe—the
ship and the cargo intact.
Then I was alone with a secret dread, and
the ghost of my guilty act.
The headlines screamed of a captain brave,
who perished to save his ship,
And a careless mate who was all at fault was
damned by a flippant quip.
'Asleep on watch,' I recall it well, it seared
and it cut till it bled,
My years at sea were at an end—all hope
within was dead.
I was in charge of the watch, they held—
I was the man to blame.
No one could help, and the grisly truth
wouldn't serve to clear my name.
Friends passed my by—no more to sea—
my wakeful nights were hell
And dreary days when I faced the world,
with that secret I dare not tell.
So now I drift from job to job, doomed with
the living damned,
The careless mate—asleep on watch—the
ship he dreamed to command.
So thanks, my friend, for this welcome talk
and the warming glass of rye.
Somehow I'll feel that I have one friend,
when others pass me by."
Then he touched my hand as he turned to
go out in the storm and the cold,
My insides gripped and I felt all sick—sud-
denly tired and old.
I looked away for I wouldn't dare to let his
eyes meet mine.
I hadn't the guts to let him know—that I had
written that line.

Representative Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include a recent editorial from the Washington Evening Star concerning the recent amendment to the stadium law for the District of Columbia.

The editorial commends our colleague and my good friend, OREN HARRIS, for his work on this measure. Having been formerly associated with Mr. HARRIS on the District of Columbia Committee, I can testify to the great effort and amount of work exerted by Mr. HARRIS in this regard. We here in the Congress as well as the people of the District of Columbia owe him a debt of gratitude for his untiring efforts and deep interest in District affairs.

The editorial is as follows:

STADIUM AMENDMENT

Thanks largely to the earnest and intelligent efforts of Representative HARRIS, of Arkansas, the House has passed an amendment to the stadium law which deserves quick passage, also, by the Senate. The amendment, by specifying the amount which may be spent for such collateral projects as parking, access, and other important stadium facilities, sets at rest reports that too much money would be allocated to such accessories.

Earlier, Interior Department officials indicated the facilities might cost as much as $5.6 million, an estimate which rightfuly brought charges that the designs were "grandiose" and "utopian." Actually, it turned out that the work involved a number of improvements in nearby federally owned areas which were not directly related to the stadium. In order to rule out any such inclusions, Mr. HARRIS' amendment limited expenditures for parking lots, approach roads, and utility facilities to $2.6 million—a realistic figure arrived at recently in conferences between Interior, congressional, and civic participants in the project.

The bill also clears up any further question about the legislative authority of Interior to construct the facilities—a matter which had been queried by the Genreal Accounting Office. It is imperative that this new legislation be approved this year so that the design and financing of the 50,000-steat stadium can proceed. We hope the Senate District committee sends it to the Senate floor promptly and that swift approval follows.

Poison in Your Water—No. 155

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of May 24, 1959, entitled "Dirty River: Big Swallow Dangerous":

DIRTY RIVER: BIG SWALLOW DANGEROUS
(By Watford Reed)

Pollution is turning Portland Harbor and the lower Columbia River into something approaching an open sewer.

A big swallow of water from Portland Harbor or the Columbia downstream from Hayden Island contains enough germs to make a person deathly sick. If enough persons should drink it, an epidemic could be started overnight. So far, luck has prevented conditions from being ripe for that, but luck may run out.

The U.S. Public Health Service has found that one big swallow of water from the Columbia at the lower end of Hayden Island in late summer contains 23,300 coliform bacteria—the type that live in the intestines of humans and warm-blooded animals.

In Portland Harbor, the germ count in the summer ranges from very low in some places to 70,000 in others, with an average as high as 24,000.

So polluted is the Columbia at one point—near the lower end of Hayden Island—that the Public Health Service is concerned about repeated exposure of spray to motorboat occupants and water skiers. It could reach a point where it would be dangerous.

The Columbia and Portland Harbor are 97 times as polluted as accepted standards for swimming. Those standards call for an average of fewer than 240 coliform bacteria per 100 milliliters—the equivalent of a big swallow—in water used for swimming, 1,000 for boating and fishing, and 200 in water for domestic use after conventional treatment.

The U.S. Public Health Service declares flatly:

"The bacterial contamination of the lower Columbia River constitutes a health hazard to those who use the water for domestic water supply, for swimming and water skiing, and for activities that involve boating, such as pleasure boating, fishing, hunting, trapping, navigation, and log transportation."

The Service has found that even in months of high water on the Columbia, bacterial pollution is twice as great as standards for boating and fishing.

And 89 percent of the bacterial pollution in the lower Columbia comes from Portland.

In Portland itself, 80 outfalls still pour untreated sewage into the Willamette.

This is true in spite of a $19 million sewage-disposal project which put 90 percent of Portland sewage through a treatment plant.

Columbia water is almost completely pure before it reaches heavily populated areas. The Public Health Service reports only 51 coliform organisms per 100 milliliters downstream from Bonneville Dam.

No other big city in the United States has such a tremendous river of almost pure water only 40 miles away. But sewage discharges upstream from the Portland-Vancover area raise the coliform count to 1,200, too much for swimming, boating or fishing, by the time the water reaches the metropolitan area.

Besides menacing health, pollution has threatened to wipe out one phase of the Northwest's rich fishery which yielded commercial fishermen in Oregon alone more than $30 million a year for 1948 through 1953. The river also contributes heavily to the State's $150 million a year tourist industry.

Sewage and industrial pollution have combined to threaten the fall run of salmon in the Willamette with extinction. In 1954, only 370 fall chinooks were counted over Willamette Falls at Oregon City. In 1955 there were 75 and in 1956 only 21. In 1957, the pathetic number increased to 53. Figures are not available for 1958.

The fish commission believes that sport fishing is only a tiny factor in the destruction of fall chinooks.

Pollution makes Portland Harbor a virtual death chamber for migrating fish in low water periods.

Twice in 1957, dissolved oxygen in the Willamette River neared the vanishing point, and that summer salmon fingerlings died as far upstream as a moorage near the Sellwood Bridge.

Last year oxygen content of the Willamette was reported higher because industry—mainly paper mills—had begun abating pollution.

But the bed of the Willamette below Oregon City must be the equivalent of a desert for fish seeking food. Sewage and paper mill wastes have wiped out most underwater plant life of the kind that feeds fish. And the water is so dirty that little light could reach vegetation to keep life processes going.

Portland is not alone in its despoliation of the once beautiful Willamette. Salem, Eugene, Oswego, Newberg, and other cities pour inadequately treated sewage into the river. The Oregon Sanitary Authority has ordered them, like Portland, to abate the nuisance, and Oswego has a project under way.

A Rose by Any Other Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I see by the August 4, 1959, issue of Aviation Daily that "members of the Association of Local Transport Airlines have adopted a resolution to refer henceforth to subsidy payments as public service revenues. It is reported that the idea was first set forth by Allegheny Airlines which used the expression in its latest annual report. Reasoning is that subsidy is actually the cost of providing a public service."

A subsidy is a subsidy no matter what you call it. The only justification for any subsidy is that a public purpose is served. Sometimes the public service aspect of the public service is rather direct and sometimes it is rather indirect. Sometimes it is nonexistent.

Subsidy payments may or may not be public service revenues. This is something that should be examined carefully and constantly in the interests of the taxpayer and the welfare of our country. I do not approve this attempt to obscure plain language by Madison Avenue sugar coating.

Cut Out the Expensive Pamphlets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial suggestion from the Massillon, Ohio, Evening Independent, to the Department of the Army. All Government agencies will do well to take this advice to heart:

CUT OUT THE EXPENSIVE PAMPHLETS

The mailman left quite a package on our desk the other day.

It must have weighed all of a pound or more and it was carried from Washington to this city without the payment of postage—official Government business, you know.

Inside the package were six pamphlets, all of slick surfaced paper—the expensive kind—and with the covers beautifully decked out in two- and three-color designs.

All had to do with the activities of the U.S. Army.

Two carried the title of "Official Army Information Digest, U.S. Army Magazine." One was issued in April, of this year and referred the reader, if there would be one, to the Army budget. The other, issued early this month, carried this notation: "The Chief of Staff Reports."

Another bore this imposing title: "The Professional Army Missile Expert—A Soldier First." Titles on the other three were: "Army Missiles Rockets, Department of the Army Pamphlet No. 355-13, May 1959"; "This Is the Army 59; America's Most Versatile Fighting Force," and "Progress 58, U.S. Army Reports."

Now these six pamphlets probably were distributed to many publications and other news media and perhaps to other organizations and individuals throughout the United States.

It required the work of a lot of people to compile and lay out these various pamphlets. The printing and art work is of the best. It also must have cost a heap of money to have them printed and Uncle Sam's postal service derived not a penny though being assigned the chore of delivering them to their destinations.

And, of course, the taxpayers of the country, as usual, footed the bill.

Now we do not want to leave the impression that we are taking a stand against the development and training of an adequate military force to defend this country if the need ever arises. We would be the last to argue against such a thing, what with the cold war still a matter of grave concern and Russia becoming more belligerent by the day.

But in these days of $40 billion defense budgets, which are taxing the American people's ability to pay, we wonder if some of the activities of the Armed Forces, such as flooding the mails with a lot of pamphlets very few people will read, could not be dispensed with in the interest of greater economy in defense spending and greater efficiency in our military preparations.

With newspapers, magazines, television, and radio ready to give the fullest coverage, as they always have been, to all activities of our Armed Forces, which have not been labeled as "top secret" so Russian spies can steal them, we believe our Federal Defense Department could save millions of dollars by eliminating some of its nonessential spending, such as the pamphlets we are writing about.

We believe any vital information about our Defense Department and the progress it is making in shaping a strong defense for this Nation can be adequately relayed to the American public through this country's newspapers and other news media.

And this not only applies to the Defense Department. All other departments in our Federal Government, now swarming with bureaucrats eager to spend every dollar they can squeeze out of the taxpayer, also could save millions by eliminating a lot of their nonessential activities, such as flooding the country with pamphlets no one takes the time to read.

Yes, the American taxpayer could be saved a lot of money and all branches of our Federal Government strengthened if more attention was paid to the things that are essential and eliminate the many that are nonessential.

And by the way, anyone interested in reading the Army's pamphlets can have them by calling at this office in the next few days before we consign them to the round file.

Mr. K

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an editorial written by Mr. Parker M. Merrow, publisher and editor of the Carroll County Independent, Center Ossipee, N.H., on Friday, August 14, 1959, entitled "Mr. K."

This is a most interesting and able statement on the coming visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States:

MR. K

With all the fanfare in the press about the impending visit of Mr. Ksrushchev, we feel that one point has been badly missed, namely, that the visit will give ample opportunity to show the gentleman just what is the United States.

There is good reason for certain segments of our population to hate him bitterly and there is no reason why any of our people should feel it necessary to roll out the red carpet or hit the fatted calf between the eyes with a small sledge hammer.

But it has been repeatedly reported that Mr. Khrushchev has no real concept of the

strength of the United States. Comment has been made that he does not realize either the actual or the potential strength of our Nation. It is felt that if he knew the truth, he would not be rattling the saber of threatening to release forces which could wipe out civilization.

Obviously he has read all manner of reports on the United States. But reading a dry report and seeing for one's self, right on the spot, in person, are two different things entirely.

That is why our great corporations, our military and our governmental agencies, are continually sending their people out, to all parts of the world, to see things as they actually are.

You can read all the statistics you want to about the great New Jersey Turnpike, but you will never know the vital flow of people and good till you stand beside that road on a warm spring morning and hear the almost never ending hum and rumble that is the Jersey Pike, and watch the strings of vehicles, carrying everything from Florida bound vactionists to lumber for New York, roll in endless lines.

You can read all you wish to about the vitality of Chicago, but until you have ridden in 5 o'clock traffic on Lake Shore Drive, you cannot appreciate what that city is.

You can read about Pittsburg, but until you have driven through Pittsburg and then the coal towns of Pennsylvania, you just do not have the concept of that great area.

Until you have flown on a clear night over the Washington-Baltimore, Wilmington, Philadelphia, Newark, New York complex you simply cannot visualize the greatness of the area.

You can read and look at pictures for 8 hours, all about our auto industry, but until you have driven through Detroit, you just cannot understand.

All too many of us have our concepts of nations and of national character from old school geographies, stylized funny books and hackneyed movies and TV shows.

From the books of our childhood, we still visualize Russia as a land of great snow-covered plains where horses at a dead run pull sleighs filled with frightened people and a pack of wolves is just three jumps behind.

Of course we have all seen many photos and news reels since those early days, and know far better, but still lingering in the back corner of our mind, is that childish concept of Russia.

W would bet a really good hat that in the back of his mind, Mr. Khrushchev still thinks of the United States as a country where cowboys still chase Indians, where Negroes named Uncle Tom are beaten by cruel masters and where gangsters in snap brim hats, chewing cigars and wearing form fitting Chesterfield coats, step into saloons and cut down the patrons with tommyguns.

There is nothing like a dose of reality, of getting one's feet right on the ground, to know and understand a problem. That is the beginning of wisdom.

We cannot lose anything by wheeling Mr. K. around for a few days. And quite possibly the eyes of the gentleman might be opened.

The Roadbuilding Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, an editorial that appeared in this morning's New York Times on the question of the roadbuilding tax merits the attention of my colleagues, and I therefore take the liberty of inserting it in the RECORD:

THE ROADBUILDING TAX

The House Ways and Means Committee did not find it easy to take the responsible way of financing the interstate highway building program, but it finally came around. Three days after it had voted 15 to 8 against a temporary increase of 1 cent a gallon in the gasoline tax it reversed itself and voted 16 to 9 to accept a compromise formula that includes the tax rise. So fiscal soundness wins a victory, as does President Eisenhower.

The solution chosen involves imposition of the tax increase from September 1 to June 30, 1961, when the Federal tax on gasoline would return to 3 cents a gallon. On that expiration date the highway trust fund would begin to receive the benefit of a diversion of $2,500 million (over a 3-year period) in taxes on automobiles, parts, and accessories which now go into the Treasury's general fund. Allocations to States for highway construction would be somewhat cut back in the next 2 years, a disappointment, but one that apparently must be weathered.

So the principle applied to this program from the start, that it would be kept on a pay-as-we-build basis, is maintained. The departure from principle suggested July 29 by the committee, involving a billion-dollar bond issue, and accompanied by diversion of excise taxes needed for Federal budget balancing and drastic reduction of aid allocations for roads, has been repudiated.

The Government would have been better off, and the highway-building program would have been better served, if Congress had approved several months ago immediate imposition of the 1½-cent gasoline tax rise long ago advised by the President. But if it accepts this committee compromise it will have repaired most of the damage. The situation can be reviewed in early 1961 to see whether the Federal budget's condition warrants diversion of automobile excise taxes to the roadbuilding program. If not, the gasoline tax should be raised again.

A Major Event in International Scientific History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Chancellor Glenn T. Seaborg, of the University of California at Berkeley, with reference to the Century 21 Exposition, a scientific and cultural exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., from May 1961 to October 1962. We will soon consider H.R. 8374 by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON BROOKS], which would appropriate $12,500,000 for construction of a hall of science at the Century 21 Exposition, for various exhibits and for other allied costs.

Chancellor Seaborg is the Nobel prize-winning professor of chemistry and associate director of the radiation laboratory at the University of California. Under permission to extend remarks, I include his letter in which he gives his full endorsement to the Century 21 Exposition:

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COHELAN: I have learned that legislation concerning the Century 21 Exposition may be considered in the House of Representatives next week. As a scientist and as a member of the National Science Planning Board of Century 21 Exposition, I feel certain that this exposition will be a major event in international scientific history. The quality of the exhibits and the international participation in their planning and display will certainly justify, in my opinion, every effort made to provide support for the exposition.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG.

Ukranian Congress Committee of America Appeals to American Conscience Against Visit of "Hangman of Ukraine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting news release issued by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, in opposition to Khrushchev's visit to the United States:

NATIONAL GROUP WILL DEMONSTRATE PEACEFULLY—APPEALS TO AMERICAN CONSCIENCE AGAINST VISIT OF "HANGMAN OF UKRAINE"

In a statement sent to President Eisenhower on the visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee, and also a member of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, deplored the invitation as "another Russian cold war victory which Moscow is already celebrating as Khrushchev's triumph." He also declared, "This planned action appears now as a cynical sequel to our first observance of Captive Nations Week." A professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University, Dr. Dobriansky originated the Cative Nations Week resolution which precipitated Khrushchev's outbursts during the Vice President's visit in the Soviet Union. On the real effectiveness of the Captive Nations Week resolution, he pointed out that Khrushchev had to hurry down to Ukraine, while NIXON was in Russia proper, to give a self-reassuring speech.

ANOTHER COLD WAR DEFEAT FOR UNITED STATES

The statement stressed that the invitation constitutes "another cold war defeat for the United States by placing the cloak of respectability and legitimacy on a political criminal, no matter how he is painted. Moreover, Mr. President, it so obviously contradicts your own test, put so often before our people, that you would not meet with Khrushchev unless there were some encouraging progress at Geneva. There was none. What this and a forthcoming summit meeting amount to are a dangerous retreat from the policy you so admirably upheld against all short-sighted pressures when Secretary Dulles was alive."

"This step really ushers in a new phase in our foreign policy," the professor said. "We now seem to be reducing our last and most

potent weapon of clear-cut superiority, our discriminating moral world leadership. Secretary Dulles must have rolled in his grave when this invitation was announced."

TAKE A LEAF FROM THE SCANDINAVIANS

In issuing the statement, Dr. Dobriansky said that "knowing the facts about Khrushchev's crimes, every God-revering American should from here on strongly protest the visit of the Hangman of Ukraine. We Americans can still take a leaf from the Scandinavian peoples and with an equally strong moral conscience disapprove the propaganda and cold war visit of the Hangman."

Appealing to the moral conscience of America, the Ukrainian Congress Committee, with headquarters in New York, is committing its resources to bring these ghastly facts to the American people in order to permit their consciences to decide on how to receive the Hangman. The committee speaks for about 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry and has branches in New York, Boston, Pittsburgh, Newark, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Cleveland, Detroit, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Minneapolis, and other major cities.

"Along with other Americans," the professor said, in issuing the statement, "we'll put these questions to the conscience-aroused minds of our fellow citizens:

(1) Would you invite a criminal to your home? Then why Khrushchev to our national home?

(2) Would you have favored Hitler here 20 years ago? Then why the Hangman of Ukraine whose career is based on the genocide of millions of various national patriots, Christians, Jews, and Moslems?

(4) Does a God-dedicated people pay respects to a professional atheist who denies God as the ultimate source of human and national freedom?

SOME CRIMES OF THE HANGMAN OF UKRAINE

The professor's statement to the President emphasized that "it is incredible that a genocidist and political criminal should be extended the official hospitality of this home of the free." It explained why Khrushchev is widely known in Eastern Europe as the Hangman of Ukraine by citing some of his crime:

(1) As a party functionary in the early thirties, he played a brilliant role in the Moscow manmade famine in Ukraine that resulted in the annihilation of some 5 million lives;

(2) For his excellent performances, he was elevated to high party posts in Ukraine and had a hand in the genocide of some 11,000 lives in Vinnitsa, Ukraine, before the war;

(3) Although a Russian, he paved the way to leadership in the party in Ukraine by conducting many purges;

(4) Following World War II, he was specially dispatched by Stalin to quell the patriotic resistance in Ukraine.

"Terrorism comes easy with the Hangman of Ukraine," said Dr. Dobriansky. "He showed it also in Georgia, Poland, and Hungary in 1956. Through his puppets, he showed it in Tibet. Only last month it was against the Ukrainian underground in the Carpathian mountains. Fooling many of our Americans today as Stalin did before fully entrenching himself over 30 years ago, the Hangman continues this terrorism by less conspicuous but more effective methods in the Soviet Union."

ARGUMENTS FOR VISIT INSULTING TO AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE

The Dobriansky statement also rejects the arguments given for Khrushchev's visit here. It states: "It is almost insulting to the intelligence of the American people that we are deemed by some as being naive enough to believe that Khrushchev does not already understand what the United States represents and possesses. Clearly, it didn't take the Russians long to understand where our atomic and missile secret were. Khrushchev understands our country far more than many of us understand his empire in the Soviet Union itself and his centuries-fashioned methods and techniques. Those, like our visiting Governors to the U.S.S.R., who speak in mythical concepts of the Soviet people and the Soviet nation, and with callous disregard of the Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian, and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., may well learn from the late Secretary of State Dulles. 'The Soviet bloc,' he said on October 10, 1955, 'represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally constituting more than 20 distinct national groups.'"

The statement also points out, "It is an illusion to think that this visit and the later calculated summit meeting will relieve pressures on Berlin, the Middle East, Laos, free Korean, free China and, indeed, upon our United States. This action shows how woefully unprepared we are to cope with Moscow's cold war challenge. More than anything else that Khrushchev now wants its respectability and legitimacy to consolidate his empire. He is behaving in a tradition developed long before the Russian Revolution, and we have not even begun to learn the lessons of Russian empire building. Some of us may just as well pay tribute to Ivan the Terrible who was the first to use the friendship and peace tool in his cold war conquest of the Khanate of Kazan in the 16th century."

COMMITTEE'S GROUPS TO DEMONSTRATE PEACEFULLY

"Upon the arrival of the Hangman of Ukraine to this country," said Dr. Dobriansky, upon issuing the statement, "our groups will join with other Americans, churches, veterans in peaceful demonstration of protest and righteous condemnation against the hangman. The tolling of church bells, and wearing of black bands in mourning of the millions the hangman sent to their graves will be urged. In his historic proclamation of Captive Nations Week, the President urged all Americans to study the plight of the captive nations. There is no better occasion for this than now. We call upon all to pass the word. No violence but no approval. Our motto is D.D. with B.B.—dignified disapproval with black bands."

THE STATEMENT TO THE PRESIDENT

AUGUST 7, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America again cannot thank you enough for your historic proclamation of Captive Nations Week. By act of Congress and your splendid proclamation, the United States has officially recognized for the first time the existence of the many captive non-Russian nations within the empire known as the Soviet Union. This represents a great stride in our real understanding of the prison house of nations parading as the U.S.S.R. It was most significant that while the Vice President was in Russia proper, Khrushchev had to hurry down to Ukraine to give a self-reassuring speech.

We are, however, gravely disturbed by the invitation extended to Mr. Khrushchev to visit this country. In our judgment, this invitation cannot but be deplored as another Russian cold war victory which Moscow is already celebrating as Khrushchev's triumph. To countless Americans, this planned action appears now as a cynical sequel to our first observance of Captive Nations Week.

In the view of this committee, the invitation constitutes another cold war defeat for the United States by placing the cloak of respectability and legitimacy on a political criminal, no matter how he is painted. Moreover, Mr. President, it so obviously contradicts your own test, put so often before our people, that you would not meet with Khrushchev unless there were some encouraging progress at Geneva. There was none. What this and a forthcoming summit meeting amount to are a dangerous retreat from the policy you so admirably upheld against all shortsighted pressures when Secretary Dulles was alive.

This step really ushers in a new phase in our foreign policy. We now seem to be reducing our last and most potent weapon of clear-cut superiority, our discriminating moral world leadership. Secretary Dulles must have rolled in his grave when this invitation was announced. The pressures that sought to oust him over a year ago, have now, but momentarily, won their first round.

To us, who follow closely developments within the multinational Soviet Union, it is incredible that a genocidist and political criminal should be extended the official hospitality of this home of the free. His record in part shows: (1) as a party functionary in the early 30's, he played a brilliant role in the Moscow manmade famine in Ukraine that resulted in the annihilation of some 5 million lives; (2) for his excellent performances, he was elevated to high party posts in Ukraine and had a hand in the genocide of some 11,000 lives in Vinnitsa, Ukraine, before the war; (3) although a Russian, he paved his way to leadership in the party in Ukraine by conducting many purges; (4) following World War II, he was especially dispatched by Stalin to quell the patriotic national resistance in Ukraine. This partial record explains why he is widely regarded in Eastern Europe as "the Hangman of Ukraine."

Terrorism comes easy with the hangman of Ukraine. He showed it also in Georgia, Poland, and Hungary in 1956. Through his puppets, he showed it in Tibet. Only last month it was against the Ukrainian underground in the Carpathian Mountains. Fooling many of our Americans today as Stalin did before fully entrenching himself over 30 years ago, the hangman continues this terrorism by less conspicuous but more effective methods in the Soviet Union. To assert, as some do, that peaceful methods have featured his regime since the 20th party congress belies the facts.

This committee, doubtless in addition to millions of Americans, regards the arguments offered to justify Khrushchev's visit here as spurious. It is almost insulting to the intelligence of the American people that we are deemed by some as being naive enough to believe that Khrushchev does not already understand what the United States represents and possesses. Clearly, it didn't take the Russians long to understand where our atomic and missile secrets were. Khrushchev understands our country far more than many of us understand his empire in the Soviet Union itself and his centuries-fashioned methods and techniques. Those, like our visiting Governors to the U.S.S.R., who speak in mythical concept of the Soviet people and the Soviet nation, and with callous disregard of the Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., may well learn from the late Secretary of State Dulles. "The Soviet bloc," he said on October 10, 1955, "represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally, constituting more than twenty distinct national groups." The untutored harm some of us do to the freedom aspirations of 110 million people making up the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. cannot be too strongly emphasized. The blemish this places on our own traditions and the reciprocal harm it incurs for our own security interests need hardly be stressed.

It is an illusion to think that this visit and the later calculated summit meeting will relieve pressures on Berlin, the Middle

East, Laos, Free Korea, Free China and, indeed, upon our United States. This action shows how woefully unprepared we are to cope with Moscow's cold war challenge. More than anything else that Khrushchev now wants is respectability and legitimacy to consolidate his empire. He is behaving in a tradition developed long before the Russian Revolution and we have not even begun to learn the lessons of Russian empire-building. Some of us may just as well pay tribute to Ivan the Terrible who was the first to use the friendship and peace tool in his cold war conquest of the Khanate of Kazan in the 16th century.

In the light of these facts and reasoned judgments, our conscience moves us to join with other Americans in peaceful demonstration of protest and righteous condemnation against the "hangman." The Russians—and, indeed, the Vice President traveled only in the Russian part of U.S.S.R.—had no crimes to denounce. By any stretch of logic, the "hangman" is no parallel case to our Vice President. We, as indeed many other Americans who will in time voice themselves, cannot but share the moved feelings of Richard Cardinal Cushing, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Congressman WALTER JUDD and many other outstanding leaders in our society.

In full confidence of your understanding and with God's many blessing upon you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

If You Believe!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the July-August issue of U.S. Lady, published for circulation among service wives, is an excellent description of the accomplishment of the Capehart housing program, started in 1954:

IF YOU BELIEVE!

(By Bonnie Fein Thompson)

Do you believe in miracles? I was somewhat of a skeptic until the first of July 1958 when we moved baggage, six children, boxer dog and ourselves into four-bedroom completely furnished, single house with the label "Navy Quarters."

The miracle began to materialize in the summer of 1957 at the Point Mugu, Calif., Naval Air Missile Text Senter.

An architect who believed in California living at its fullest took the 122 acres the Navy had allotted for a 360-unit Capehart housing development and designed ranch style, single family dwellings in 17 diversified architectural plans. He also separated the houses, giving each unit a large front and back yard.

The Capehart bill itself allotted enough money per unit to build large family-size homes and not just adequate housing.

Then, best of all, an interior decorator had the foresight to order different styles and colors of furnishings. Thus the completed units resemble their next door neighbors neither inside nor out.

We watched the houses being built from the day the workmen first poured the concrete slabs until they began nailing the roof boards. We suffered with the contractor when the torrential spring rains delayed construction and we felt almost a maternal pride as the ground was raked and grass seed was sown.

How will they assign the houses? When will we be able to move? I wonder which house will be mine? These are some of the monumental questions which faced not only the people who were to occupy the houses but the naval coordinators on a base where there had previously been 16 family quarters.

Finally "the word" was out. "Sunday and Monday the houses will be open for inspection."

My husband was called. He was luckily one of the first 20 enlisted men allowed to choose his quarters.

Yes, all the rumors of modern conveniences and good planning materialized when we opened the front door, tested the chimes and entered our miracle.

Each bathroom (every house has at least two) has glassed-in tub and shower enclosures, walls and floors of ceramic tile, and overhead radiant electric heating elements.

The kitchen, a magazine dream kitchen, glistens with built-in ovens, countertop ranges, double sinks, and easy-to-keep-clean natural birch cabinets.

I had to keep pinching myself to believe that this was Government housing and the rent would be only the forfeiture of our quarters' allowance.

Looking through the empty house our 6-year-old son stopped testing the sliding doors in the closets long enough to chastise his younger brothers and sisters.

"You better keep your dirty hands off-a those walls," he scolded. "This is a nice house."

The date of our actual occupancy was still another month off, but, like a new home-builder, we would pack the family in the station wagon each weekend to investigate how everything was progressing. It certainly was a thrill the time we saw a "Do Not Enter" sign on the front door, peeked through the window and spotted the freshly laid oak block flooring. Then the next weekend we discovered that both the electricity and the hot and cool air systems were already connected.

On July 1, the first set of quarters was occupied. From then on the sight of moving vans and lamps sticking out of car windows became as familiar as the ice cream man, who seemed to have advanced knowledge of a new sales territory.

Civilian movers were authorized under the little known Joint Travel Regulations to transport families' household effects from their civilian homes to the Capehart units. This Department of Defense Bulletin states that when any serviceman moves into Government quarters, he is entitled to have his household goods moved in for him.

What a pleasure it is to have a house with enough storage space. The hall closet is more than 4 feet wide and extends from the ceiling to the floor. I must admit I felt pretty foolish when I inquired of the Navy inspector what the table-level "breadboard" was doing in the linen closet. Still, as I think back, I'd not been in many homes which even had a linen closet, let alone a board to lay the towels and sheets on while placing them on the shelves.

The ceramic-tiled vanity-type lavatory in the family bathroom covers a large storage closet which is perfect for soaps, tissues, and bath towels. The bedroom closets are large enough to both hang clothes and place a large chest of drawers inside. The master bedroom has a double closet. For once my clothes are not squashed between winter greens and summer whites.

In the kitchen every available nook is storage space. This includes a broom closet large enough for the mops, buckets, furniture polishes, ironing board, vacuum cleaner and the broom.

Even the garage is oversized enough so that, with our large station wagon inside, my husband has room for his tool bench and for the storage of our innumerable footlockers, suitcases and the boxes and boxes of things labeled Christmas, Easter baskets, Halloween costumes, and for later reference.

For a while everything was quite hectic. I must have chased the children off the tender new grass every 5 minutes, and I'd peel the potatoes into the trash can before I'd remember that we had a garbage disposal.

Of course 2 days after we moved the twins contracted intestinal flu; I had an accident with the car, putting that out of commission; there were boxes and barrels yet to unpack, and the Navy sent my husband off to sunny Hawaii for 7 days.

This of course is the rule, not the exception.

Conversation over morning coffee in the early weeks of occupancy was filed with talk of drapes, patio furniture, and the excellent reception of the television sets under the master antenna system.

For days I couldn't get over the sensation of indoor-outdoor living. The perpetual spring-summer atmosphere of southern California is especially accented by wall-to-wall, ceiling-to-ceiling windows and sliding glass doors leading to our own private cement patio.

Most of the plans allowed for attached garages but where the garage is a separate building it is bound to the house by a roofed breezeway.

Even more important than the closet space, the built-in kitchens and the pre-softened water, is the fact that for the first time in our 8 years of service living, we finally have privacy.

Every unit sits on approximately a quarter acre and is turned in such a manner that no one actually meets his neighbor when leaving via the back or front door.

Although the lawns were seeded and sprouting, the landscaper watered the growing grass two and three times a day. With twin infants I found it almost impossible to dry diapers in between sprinklings. Then about August 1 the rumor that automatic washers would be installed came true so we "beat the sprinkler man" and put a new electric dryer right beside it.

Installation of modern laundry equipment is simplified because the utility rooms are fitted with both gas and a 220-volt electrical outlet.

The Navy ordered a half million dollars worth of furnishings—enough for 220 of the 360 quarters—almost a year ago, but like many Government contracts it wasn't all in the warehouse when the houses were finally opened.

Many families of all ranks who did not have their own furniture slept with their springs and mattresses on the floor, with no rugs and with clothes still in boxes instead of drawers.

During August and September the furniture started arriving by the freightload and the sight of Navy trucks unloading overstuffed contemporary American furniture in every possible color was a common one. Everything from foam-rubber cushioned sectional couches, walnut bedsteads, maple Mr. and Mrs. dressers and all types of room-size nonskid rugs began to be part of the new homes.

There were 17 furnishing plans to correspond with each individual house plan. Living room, dining room and bedroom furnishings were coordinated according to wood, size of rooms and colors of walls.

A sample master plan of a four-bedroom enlisted man's house reads like this:

Living room: Gray tweed sofa; light olive tweed easy chair; cinnamon tweed high back chair; cinnamon and walnut occasional chair; olive leather brass-studded lamps; two floor, two table; gray tweed rugs throughout house; desk; corner table; end table; coffee table.

Dining room: Walnut table, buffet, arm chair, five straight chairs.

Bedrooms: Two bunk beds, two twin beds, four Mr. and Mrs. dressers, double bed, chest of drawers (wood, light cherry).

Kitchen: Gray chrome dinette set.

Our house is furnished just like this master plan. Only the pictures on the walls, the doilies on the tables and the dishes, the blankets and clothing are ours.

Even the new community is beginning to form. Point Mugu is in the unique position of being located more than 10 miles from the nearest shopping center. It does not yet have any dependents' facilities except a small exchange. For a cut finger or a loaf of bread it is necessary to drive into the Port Hueneme, Calif., C.B.C. base.

Both the Point Mugu Officers' Wives and the Navy Wives Clubs are conducting fundraising activities to start organizing both a teen-age club and a child care nursery. The Boy Scouts are forming troops in all age brackets as are the Girl Scouts, and the C.P.O. Wives are in the process of making up hospitality kits for the use of incoming families.

We've heard rumors of a commissary and out-patient medical care on the base, and we hope this will soon come to pass.

A new house, new furniture, new appliances and gracious living at its fullest. What more could any woman ask for?

On what used to be wasted swampland a beautiful, active, business-like community has developed—a place I am proud my children call home.

U.S. People and Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial by David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Star, Washington, D.C., on August 6, 1959:

U.S. PEOPLE AND KHRUSHCHEV: CITIZENS' DISSENT AGAINST VISIT BY DICTATOR HELD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country? President Eisenhower assumes that they do. The governments of Sweden and other Scandinavian countries recently issued a similar invitation, but the Soviet Premier, after accepting it, decided not to go there because it was evident the people didn't want him to come.

What happened in Sweden between the time the invitation was extended and the announcement that Khrushchev had given up the idea for the present? A letter from Dr. Bela Fabian, written from Geneva a few days ago, tells the story. He is chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners and was in Sweden at the time of the planning for the visit of the Soviet Premier. Dr. Fabian writes:

"Naturally, Major General Zacharov, deputy chief of the Soviet security police, knew that the 'August committees' were preparing mass meetings and demonstrations. In Sweden ten meetings were to be held simultaneously on August 13. The one thing he did not know was whether the Swedish people would demonstrate by ostentatiously staying at home, so that the streets would be empty and there would be no one there except the police, or that there would be enormous crowds who would turn their backs on Khrushchev."

Dr. Fabian writes that the August committees contained a large number of members, among them prominent intellectuals, several Nobel Prize winners, university professors and writers. Many student organizations were represented.

Already there are varying points of view in this country as to what the reaction of the American people will be in the cities to be visited by Khrushchev. Certainly any disorderly demonstrations would only result in worldwide criticism on the theory that the Americans were not as courteous to the Soviet Premier as the people of the Soviet Union have been toward Vice President NIXON. But inside the United States—unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where everything is controlled by the government—the people have a right under the Constitution to speak. They have a right to picket peacefully, if they like, with placards expressing their ideas.

If the Scandinavian plan were put into effect in the United States by boycotting the parades or by viewing in silence the public events where Khrushchev makes his appearance, an orderly protest could be registered.

There may be some in this country who are willing to "let bygones be bygones," but, among the hundreds of thousands of Americans who came here originally from the lands which now are held captive by the Communist dictatorship, there will be no suppression of emotions. Their point of view toward the Moscow autocracy which has ordered the murder or exile of so many innocent people in the last several years is deeply rooted. They cannot forget.

It is true that, after wars are over, friendly feelings toward former enemies often are developed. But the governments which ruled in Nazi Germany, in militaristic Japan, and Fascist Italy have been removed and free governments established. No such change has occurred in Moscow, where the same kind of regime is in power today as the one that broke the pledges given at Yalta in 1945 and at Geneva in 1955.

"Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all," wrote Dr. L. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in a letter to President Eisenhower dated July 31. The Georgetown professor was the originator of the resolution adopted by Congress to proclaim Captive Nations Week. Expressing the hope that Khrushchev would not be invited to America, Professor Dobriansky added:

"It is patently naive to believe that a visit by the 'hangman of the Ukraine' would add anything to what he already knows about our country. * * * Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires in order to extend his empire."

There is talk now of arranging a parade of hearses in each American city where Khrushchev appears. On each hearse would be placarded the statistics of the number of persons murdered or exiled from each of the 14 captive countries in recent years. This is one type of orderly demonstration.

Another which is being suggested is that memorial services be held throughout the Nation to carry out the spirit of the resolution in behalf of the "captive nations" adopted overwhelmingly last month by both Houses of Congress. Nationwide prayers for the liberation of the "captive" peoples, as well as memorial tributes to the many who have been enslaved or killed by the ruthless Communist dictators, would at least let the rest of the world know that, however polite the Government has to be to any visitor, the people here have the right of free speech. They can express their dissent from the position of their Government, which has invited to free America at this crucial time the man who has threatened war unless the Western forces surrender Berlin and who has never withdrawn that threat.

Industry's Stubbing Its Toe on the Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Laurence Laurent, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald issue of August 13, 1959, is one with which I completely agree.

If ever there were a need for the equal right to discuss an important public issue, it was in connection with our very recently passed labor legislation.

It is my judgment that the networks behaved badly and did much to undermine the confidence which I had in their objectivity and their fairness. The article referred to follows:

INDUSTRY'S STUBBING ITS TOE ON THE HILL

(By Laurence Laurent)

The television industry, whose spokesmen are highly effective in congressional hearings, manages to fall on its face when dealing with political realities. This falling has been particularly noticeable this summer, with the TV-radio industry trying to persuade the Congress to change the equal political time regulations.

The industry has a good case. There is general agreement that the Federal Communications Commission goofed when it ruled that equal time applied during political campaigns to newscasts. Industry spokesmen have already persuaded the Senate that it should pass amendments to the Communications Act which execpt newscasts.

But when the same legislation came before the House of Representatives, the industry began taking pratfalls.

Members of the House are much more reluctant than Senators to give the radio-TV operator addition freedom. The Representative runs for reelection every 2 years, and, thus, is constantly concerned about the treatment he gets from news media.

First, there was the incredibly badly managed "Face the Nation" incident with Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, Democrat of Minnesota. His friends announced that he would be a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination, an announcement that could have been a surprise only at, say, Manus in the Admiralty Islands.

CBS canceled Senator HUMPHREY's appearance, "on the advice of attorneys." The advice—to many Congressmen—was bad. Senator HUMPHREY, technically, is not a candidate and, technically, section 315 does not apply.

This incident has been interpreted by several members of the powerful House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as coercive. They feel that CBS was trying

to force them to amend the equal time law by the threat of a blackout on all candidates.

One Democratic committee member cited last Sunday's two-network performance by Vice President RICHARD NIXON and said: "It may be news to CBS, but everyone else in the country knows that the Vice President hopes to get the Republican presidential nomination in 1960."

He objected to NIXON's network hour, only in the light of the HUMPHREY cancellation.

The current fight over labor reform legislation is causing more bitterness against the networks. First, time was provided for the President to express his views; and this, surely, is beneficial to the public. But when Democrats asked for equal time in the name of the Speaker of the House, the request was denied. Instead, the networks provided forum-programs. This served only to prove what policians have long felt: Some equal time is more equal than other equal time.

For the most adept hairsplitter, section 315 does not apply to political issues, only to candidates. The sad part, however, is that the TV-radio industry missed a splendid opportunity to show the Congress how well it is prepared to meet its responsibilities.

Worst of all, the mistakes are being made during the summer when the airwaves are filled with tedious repeats. It is the perfect time for lively, controversial public affairs programs. It is the time when radio and TV can best afford to be generous.

DAV Services in Nevada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Nevada citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Nevada, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran-organization of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these services officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV national service officer in Nevada is Mr. Melvin L. Jacobsen, located at the Veterans' Administration Regional Office, 1000 Locust Street, Reno. The department commander is Mr. Charles F. Hardin, 130 North Virginia Street, Reno, and the Department adjutant is Mr. Charles E. Jackson, 1853 G Street, Sparks, Nev. The DAV VAVS representative is Mr. John Haley.

The Veterans' Administration hospital located in Reno is a 166-bed general medical hospital.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $6,108,000 for its veteran program in Nevada, including disability compensation to its 2,094 service disabled veterans. The amount of $1,848,614. These Federal expenditures in Nevada furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 12 percent, 253 are members of the 5 DAV chapters in Nevada.

This 12 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Nevada veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	5,995
Claims folders reviewed	4,996
Appearances before Rating Boards	2,243
Compensation increases obtained	319
Service connections obtained	167
Nonservice pensions	125
Death benefits obtained	18
Total monetary benefits obtained	$178,984.57

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the Central Office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Nevada veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, et cetera. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disabality becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impression or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued and reduced, as to

about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About one-tenth of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Nevada with a consequent loss of about $28,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Nevada to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tag—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 1,354 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Nevada residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as well as enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all "serviced" claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100 equivalent to about $5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Nevada by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Unsound Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the Easley Progress, Easley, S.C.:

THEY LAUGH AT THE U.S. DOLLAR

An Easley citizen, traveling over in Canada, writes: "We ate dinner in one of the small resort towns. They had a big sign on the cash register telling us that our money was not as good as their's and that we would be charged the difference. When we paid our bill he attached 5 percent extra and was very careful to give us our change in the sickly U.S. money. It gives you a strange feeling when folks tell you your money isn't any good, and laugh at you about it."

The Greatest Satellite Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to call attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Shreveport Times, Shreveport, La. This fine editorial should be of interest to all of us in this space age:

THE GREATEST SATELLITE SUCCESS

Successful launching of the missile and satellite, Explorer VI, probably is the most important achievement in space rocketry thus far by any nation—this because of the completeness of the electronics laboratory carried in the satellite and the efficiency with which the laboratory has been functioning as its container orbits the earth at a speed of 22,000 miles an hour and at distances ranging from 150 miles to 25,000 miles from the earth.

(And even as this was being written, another American satellite, Discoverer V, was put into orbit.)

But what may be even more important in the whole rocket-space picture from the standpoint of national security was the announcement at the same time by the Navy of the success of its Project Tepee, hitherto probably the most guarded secret possessed by the American military. Through Project Tepee, the Navy stated, it has been able to detect instantaneously more than 95 percent of all atmospheric nuclear weapons tests and rocket launchings anywhere in the world for several months. Actually, the project has been underway since 1954 and has had some success ever since that time.

Tepee still requires refinement, but it is unlikely that, even now, Russia could fire a single missile as a test or as the opening of war without Tepee recording it instantaneously.

The Navy states that it has a number of Tepee stations in operation in various places, but the locations are closely-guarded secrets.

With as much simplicity as can be put into any explanation of functioning of electronics. Tepee operates this way: Radio signals are sent from earth stations against the ionosphere, an ionized layer of upper atmosphere. The radio signals ricochet off this layer of outer space and come bouncing back to earth and then back to the ionosphere—and so on—each bouncing being at an angle so that the radio signal actually travels around the earth's surface in its skip-and-jump course.

The same result comes when the radio signal hits the gases of a rocket trail or any other interference created by rocket launchings and missile or satellite flights. While it has taken quite a few seconds to present even this inadequate explanation, the radio signals would have recorded any interference with their course instantaneously and those on the ground at the Tepee stations would know what it was the signals were recording.

Tepee has been used successfully in literally hundreds of American missile firings, satellite launchings and other space probes from experimental stations in Florida, California and far out into the Pacific since early in 1957. Its possibilities in detecting enemy space action, experimental or otherwise, are almost unlimited.

As for Explorer VI—in no way related to Tepee—unless something goes wrong it will provide at least a year's flow of invaluable

outer space information hitherto unattainable through any electronic devices. It will report particularly concerning radio activity in areas enveloping the earth, information that is essential in planning flights of man into outer space. Such information is essential not merely in that individual project, but to success of many major space objectives which the United States is seeking. It is expected, also, to send back considerable information on the ionosphere—the ionized area against which Tepee bounces its signals.

Just where Explorer VI puts the United States in the space race with Russia is impossible to say and not too important by itself. The United States and Russia are seeking certain space objectives, but by ways vastly different in some instances. What is important to this Nation is whether the objectives are being obtained as rapidly as possible and whether everything needed to further them is being done.

Russia sends dogs into the air and the United States sends monkeys and mice. Russia is concerned with the size of what it sends into outer space where the chief concern of the United States is information that comes back. The end result sought by each is exploration of outer space and thus, in all probability, control of it, particularly from the military standpoint.

If Russia has anything like either Explorer VI or Project Tepee, it has not yet done any boasting about that fact and, if American scientists are right in their assumption, Russia has a long way to go to catch up in the fineness, the delicacy, the accuracy and the capabilities of tiny electronic devices already proven successful in tests by the United States. But the Soviet still seems to have greater thrust—power of propulsion—for its rockets.

Nikita Ought To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Neosha (Mo.) Miner & Mechanic containing some suggestions for the Khrushchev visit:

NIKITA OUGHT TO SEE

A full-fledged convention of the AFL–CIO, where the workers of America get things off their chests;

A formal Presidential Press Conference, where the leader of the greatest Nation on earth answers the barbs and bites of questions to which no Kremlin is ever exposed;

A stormy stockholders meeting of the New York-New Haven Railroad;

A debate between Senators PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona;

A session of the Oklahoma Legislature;

A movie of Cal Coolidge in action, and of Gov. Earl Long, in person;

The Hoover Dam and Lake Mead;

A Billy Graham rally in Los Angeles Coliseum;

An American election campaign;

Display of the New York Times and Daily Worker, side by side on a newsstand;

A Sunday comic section;

A conversation between Casey Stengel and Charles Van Doren;

Elvis Presley, before and after;

A USAF firepower demonstration at Eglin Field, Fla.

If seeing is believing, Nikita ought to see all that there is to see of the Nation he says can't win in the cold war.

Mud in Your Eye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune, dated August 15, 1959, entitled "Mud in Your Eye":

MUD IN YOUR EYE

Milwaukee, which has been paraded insufferable self-righteousness in opposing Federal legislation to grant Chicago a slight boost in water diverted from Lake Michigan, has closed seven of Milwaukee County's bathing beaches. The reason: Pollution from sewage processed through a municipal system which Wisconsin's two Senators only last Friday were describing as the "acme of sewage disposal in the United States."

Those were the words of Senators WILEY and PROXMIRE, but the Milwaukee City Health Commissioner, Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, does not agree. He says that Milwaukee's sewage disposal system can only be brought up to snuff by an expenditure of half a billion dollars, and that that is economically impossible.

Dr. Krumbiegel intimated that two of the closed beaches will remain permanently shut down because of pollution from human and animal refuse. The county superintendent of parks, Russell Kurtz, stated that the closing orders were necessitated because of the uncertainty of water conditions at the beaches, which was explained more definitely by the health department as endangering the public through exposure to amoebic dysentery and typhoid. Dr. Krumbiegel said that the geographical position of Milwaukee, which returns its treated effluent to the lake, forms a natural cesspool during the summer months.

Now, we do not mention these conditions with any intention to gloat. Indeed, we sympathize with Milwaukee's difficulties in dealing with sewage disposal and maintaining health. This, we might add, is more than Milwaukee is willing to do in considering Chicago's problems, which do not involve any pollution of the lake, inasmuch as the effluent from Chicago's sewage treatment works is discharged through the Illinois Waterway because we had the foresight to reverse the flow of the Chicago River.

But the difficulties of our neighbor to the north do emphasize certain facts which deserve to be underscored. One is that Chicago is no unique culprit, handling its sewage disposal problem in disregard of the welfare of its neighbors and of other States. The movement of the lake current, on the contrary, is likely to dump some of Milwaukee's pollution on our lake front.

Another factor is that Chicago, unlike Milwaukee, has never claimed perfection in its efforts to dispose of wastes from an enormous and highly industrialized area covering 920 square miles and populated by more than 5 million persons. But it does contend that it has made prodigious efforts at great cost to deal effectively with this tremendous problem, and that it has attained a very large degree of success.

The Tribune, in its own independent survey, has not endeavored to conceal that the sanitary district has not been 100 percent effective. But it has established that the district has been 90.6 percent successful in removing impurities from the tremendous volume of waste that is treated.

That a problem remains seems to us to provide only additional justification for the city's request that Congress authorize an increase of 1,000 cubic feet of water diverted each second from the lake. We are now restricted to a modest 1,500 cubic feet, and the added allowance is initially sought only for a test period of 1 year. Yet Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin, beset by a much more grave problem of pollution, begrudge us this minimal help.

The difficulties of Milwaukee point up the fact that there has been no small amount of hypocrisy in the opposition voiced against Chicago in Congress and before its committees. The bill authorizing increased diversion will be before the Senate Public Works Committee for decision Monday, having already been approved by the House. We trust that the responsible Senators will take due note of the imperfections of some of the bill's holier-than-thou critics.

Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Sylvia Porter should be studied by each of us:

FOREIGN IMPORTS SWAMP U.S.-MADE PRODUCTS

(By Sylvia Porter)

The other evening I went to a stimulating but deeply disquieting dinner party. For, my partner from the start to the good night was Cyrus Ching, head of the Federal Mediation Service under President Truman, and through the hours we debated not only the threat of the steel strike but also the threat of steel imports to our economy.

"The long-range problem is the rising importation of steel," said Ching. "Competition to our steel industry and to steelworkers from lower-cost foreign producers of the metal is what we must face up to * * *. It is in this sphere that U.S. industry will get a climactic test."

With my mind pondering the implications of Ching's warnings, I came home and headed for a midnight snack. On the kitchen table I put a plate, a glass pitcher, a glass, and an ash tray—all purchased since June. Before I sat down, I moved from my chair a laundry basket in which there was a cap my husband had picked up a few days ago, my new bathing suit and a silk robe. And suddenly my eyes saw something I hadn't see before.

Every product I had touched in those few minutes in the kitchen had been an import—the plate, glass, and pitcher from England; the ash tray from Denmark, the basket and cap from Japan, the bathing suit from France, the robe from Italy.

And after I had finished racing through the house to check what we had bought in the past 6 months, I got an even greater shock.

OVER 60 PERCENT

Over 60 percent of our recent purchases had been imported from abroad. I, living in a typically American home and buying with a typical American's attention to quality and

price, had gradually become a buyer of foreign products on a scale I hadn't dreamed of.

Then Ching's warnings about steel imports came into focus.

Imports are pouring into our land. This year alone, the National Foreign Trade Council has just estimated, imports to us will total a record $15 billion, up $1.6 billion from 1958. And the imports are not just the obvious cars, cameras, radios, etc. Stores and factories from coast to coast are loaded with foreign goods which are well-designed, well-made, attractively priced compared with similar U.S. products.

We created this competition for ourselves in the most grandiose gesture of generosity any nation ever made. For, when World War II ended we began pouring billions into the rebuilding of the ruined or obsolete factories of Europe and Japan. With the aid of our dollars and know-how, many countries have now come back and are operating with modern factories, materials, and machines and at much lower wage scales.

WHAT'S THE SOLUTION?

"OK," I mumbled to myself as I sat in the kitchen and mentally continued my debate with Ching. "What do we do about it?"

Raise tariffs and slap on quotas until we force out the competition? Hardly a satisfactory answer.

Freeze wages? Also hardly an imaginative answer.

What then? In all humility, I suggest the answers must be:

1. A much sharper, faster and a sustained rise in modernization and efficiency of production. With increased efficiency, we'll be able to turn out goods competitively priced and still raise wages.

2. A powerful drive for new inventions and improved products—meaning greater emphasis on research. With new inventions and superior productive capacity, we can keep and expand our markets.

3. A realization by all of us that we are into an economic war for the markets of the world—including our own. I'm not proposing an aggressive "Buy American" program, but I readily admit there'll be no more of that 60–40 ratio in purchases I make.

We won't meet the important competition by flinching from it, ignoring it, or putting up walls against it. We will meet it when we vow to lead the world in inventing, modernizing, selling. We'll meet it when we wake up.

The Proposed Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, there has been much discussion regarding the coming of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. I feel that the following editorial which appeared in the Witness of August 6 would be considered good reading by many people who are concerned with this impending arrival:

THE PROPOSED KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

The announcement by Mr. Eisenhower of the forthcoming visit of Mr. Nikita Khrushchev to this country carries with it many serious complications.

We firmly believe this country could and would prosper bountifully without having the Premier of the Soviet Union visit our shores. We believe also that world peace does not hinge on a visit by one man to this country. We should not be made to dance to the tune fiddled by the Soviets.

Mr. Khrushchev is not going to change his mind about Marxism after a short social call to this country. When he returns home he will be more determined than ever to destroy the system which has given generations of millions and millions of Americans the peace and liberty denied the more than 800 million people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

The visit will, of course, be tremendous propaganda fodder for the Soviet Union. But how will we ever explain to the captive hordes our decision to entertain this international scoundrel?

And who would ever venture a guess what price the American people will have to pay for such a visit.

The present on our shores of a man whose contempt for the basic decencies of life is so well known, will prove embarrassing for the majority of our American citizens. It will be disheartening to the thousands of refugees from communism who have found formerly denied freedom on our protecting shores.

Mr. Khrushchev's disdain for religion will seriously sadden the millions of Americans who daily worship their God freely and openly.

What about the feelings of national groups in this country? The Hungarians, the Czechs, Poles, Lithuanians, and former residents of both Russia and East Germany, whose fatherland now breaks with the burden of communism.

The security problem of protecting a man such as Mr. Khrushchev will be overwhelming.

But will Mr. Khrushchev learn anything when he visits this country? He has been described as an outmoded Marxist. Yet the basic problem remains that he is a Marxist of the first dedication, outmoded or not.

Our progress, our efficiency, our mode of living is awesome to foreigners of any country. Seeing the sights of America will only provide him with information to bark more fiercely about the progress communism will continue to make.

It must be recalled that the Soviet Premier canceled his proposed trip to Scandinavia after the free press and free public opinion criticized it.

If the visit goes through as planned at this stage Khrushchev should be shown the real America. We are told he is ignorant about many basic things which exist in this country. His criticism of the American exhibition in Moscow would seem to confirm this.

It is hard to describe what is typically American. But we sincerely feel that the things denied the Russian people, and which we take so much for granted, should be emphasized very strongly. Let him see the religious fervor of our American people. The great number of churches and church-conducted schools should be displayed to him. Let him know our religious heritage of yesterday and our dedication and determination today to follow the law of God is what has made us free and strong.

Let him see the freedom of the press and freedom of speech. He should be made to taste the genuineness of our liberty and the wealth of opportunity offered our young.

Take him to the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor where he can read this inscription: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

(Incidentally, the reference for the correctness of the above quoted quotation was the World Almanac, the book recently banned by the Soviets at our exhibition in Moscow.)

Mr. Khrushchev won't learn much of the real America by looking at skyscrapers and gadgets. He can learn if we prove by fact and deed that we have concern for all races, creeds and color. Housing for the poor, equal rights for Negroes, and social security benefits for millions will make him realize ours is truly a thrice-blessed Nation.

If Nikita Khrushchev comes to the United States it will be difficult for the American people to see the heads of our Government entertaining a man who doesn't even deserve the title of a gentleman.

It will not be easy to have our shores darkened by the image of a man dedicated to destroying us. It will be even more trying to face a man whose crimes have shocked and stunned the entire civilized world. It would take many volumes to detail the havoc and misery this man has cast upon mankind. Josef Stalin, who deported and exterminated 6 million kulaks (farmers) described it as "socialist construction."

Nikita Khrushchev dismisses people from the face of the earth describing their crimes as "socialist illegality."

Tens of millions of people have suffered from the hands of Communist rulers. Yet in trying to justify his terribly evil system, the Soviet dictator says, "some innocent people suffered." He will never admit the crime of the system itself.

If and when the Soviet Premier visits America, Catholics especially should recall, as indeed all Christians should, that this man has spent most of his life fighting religion.

In March of 1958 he is quoted as saying, "I think that there is no God, and for a long time I have had such an idea. I am an adherent of a scientific outlook. Science and the belief in supernatural powers cannot go together, especially if you have a thoroughly logical outlook."

September will not be the usually charming month this year that it most generally is. American Christian hearts will be heavy. For all Christians the time of the visit of Mr. Khrushchev should be a period of intensified prayer, asking God to send the grace of conversion to a man determined to destroy all things men of good will love and cherish.

Charity demands we love our enemies, and those who persecute us. The dictates of charity must be in evidence during these future hectic days.

The Watumull Foundation Contribution to East-West Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson-Burns bill, now title VI of the Mutual Security Act of 1959—Public Law 86–108—provides for the establishment in Hawaii of a center for cultural and technical interchange between the Western and the Eastern Worlds—in other words, it provides for the establishment of an East-West university.

It was my high privilege to cosponsor this bill with the very able, knowledgeable and prescient majority leader of the Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON of Texas. The able Congressman D. S. SAUND joined in sponsoring the measure in the House.

The purpose of the bill was to utilize to the maximum extent possible the outstanding abilities and to develop to the maximum the exceptional capabilities of the great Americans of Hawaii whose ancestors came from the nations of the Orient, or who themselves came from the Orient.

The geographic position of Hawaii between the shores of Asia and North America accentuates the cultural meeting of East and West in the peoples of Hawaii. Thus, the State-to-be of Hawaii was a most natural locale for the institution envisioned by the very great majority leader and myself—an institution which we sincerely believe can do more to bring peace in the world than any other means, which we believe, is the only means by which true peace in the world can ever be attained.

Ample evidence of the part that the people of Hawaii can play in bringing understanding between the peoples of the East and the West is afforded in private and public efforts already underway in Hawaii as a result of the initiative and vision of the people of Hawaii.

One of the outstanding of these endeavors is the Watumull Foundation. This foundation was founded by G. J. Watumull in 1942 and incorporated in 1956. It is presently administered by a board of trustees whose chairman is Mr. G. J. Watumull, with Mr. Milton Cades, president; Miss Doris E. Bennett, Mr. J. Russell Cades, Mr. Hugh C. Tennent, Mrs. Ellen J. Watumull and Mr. David Watumull as trustees.

On July 10, it was my privilege to attend a special award luncheon of the foundation at which Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, Vice President of India, and Dr. Charles A. Moore, sponsor of the recent outstandingly successful East-West International Philosophical Conference, were honored by the foundation with special awards by the Watumull Foundation.

At this luncheon there was presented a history of the Watumull Foundation as well as an account of their awards activities which I included herewith as an example of how the East and West do meet in Hawaii, and the great potential Hawaii has as the bridge between the nations of the East and our own great country.

The Watumull Foundation is indeed a tribute to the initiative, resourcefulness, and charity of Mr. G. J. Watumull and his family.

It is also a tribute to the Watumull family's great love for the United States as well as for their mother land.

The part played by the Watumull Foundation to understanding between India and the United States cannot be underestimated.

HISTORY OF THE WATUMULL FOUNDATION

The Watumull Foundation was established in 1942 by G. J. Watumull of Honolulu with three purposes in view: (1) To promote better understanding between India and the United States (India's independence at that time was only a remote possibility); (2) to increase India's national efficiency (for only 5 percent of her industrial potential was developed at that time, and both agricultural production and educational development were woefully inadequate); and (3) to support cultural, charitable, and educational programs in Hawaii.

In order to promote better understanding between India and the United States, the Watumull Foundation has sent several distinguished Americans to lecture in Indian universities or to carry on special projects furthering this purpose. Dr. John Haynes Holmes, the great American friend of Mahatma Gandhi, Mr. Merle Curti, the American historian and authority on Federal constitutions, and Dr. Paul Arthur Schilpp, editor of the Library of Living Philosopher series, including "The Philosophy of Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan," are a few who have visited India sponsored by the Watumull Foundation. The most eminent Indian whom the foundation has brought to the United States is Dr. Radhakrishnan, our guest of honor today. He lectured in 14 of our great universities in 1946.

The Watumull Foundation has provided funds to about 30 American universities and colleges for the purchase of books about India for their libraries, available to undergraduate as well as graduate students. And books for similar libraries in India have been purchased in the United States, in order that students and readers in India may know our country. However, most of the books sent to India are technical, medical, and professional, and in no sense propaganda material.

The foundation has also supported special lectureships held by Indians in the United States, notably the American University and the Catholic University of America, both in Washington, D.C.; New York University and the University of Hawaii.

In furtherance of its second purpose of increasing India's national efficiency, the Watumull Foundation initiated a program of bringing fine Indian scholars, mostly university professors, to the United States, for postgraduate studies or postdoctoral research for 1 to 3 years in nation-building fields such as education, medicine, agriculture, dentistry, engineering, chemistry, physics, veterinary medicine, etc. Thirty-five men and women came under this program. Many of them now hold top posts in their fields not only in India, but in Africa, Malaya, WHO, FAO, and even in the United States. The foundation has given innumerable grants-in-aid to Indian students in American universities; has given over 200 scholarships to displaced Sindhi students in India (86 in the past year alone), has given 6 beta ray eye applicators to strategic hospitals in India, gave the first spectrophotometer, the first cornhusker, the first electric compost grinder to India. The foundation has had the cooperation of several American industries in providing industrial training for about 10 Indians, has had 18 Indian doctors, men and women, trained in contraceptive techniques at the Margaret Sanger Research Bureau. It also initiated the Third International Planned Parenthood Conference held in Bombay in 1952, which was inaugurated by Dr. Radhakrishnan.

BOOK PRIZE

The foundation program of especial interest to this gathering is the biennial book prize awarded through the American Historical Association to the best book about some phase of India's history, politics, economics or related subjects, published in the United States in the 2-year period preceding the award year. A committee of distinguished historians, all members of the association, select the prize-winning book or books. On three occasions the award has been divided between two authors. The prize was first awarded in 1948 to:

1. "Chanhu-Daro Excavations," by Ernest Mackay (awarded posthumously).

2. (a) "A Pageant of India's History," by Gertrude Emerson Sen; (b) "John Company at Work," by Holden Furber.

3. (a) "Life of Mahatma Ghandi," by Louis Fisher; (b) India in the New Era, by T. Walter Wallbank.

4. (a) "The White Umbrella," by D. Mackencie Brown; (b) "The United States, India and Pakistan," by W. Norman Brown.

5. (1958) "Sources of Indian Tradition," edited by Wm. Theodore de Bary.

In addition the Watumull Foundation has on occasion given special awards to works about India, other than historical or political books, notably one by Swami Nikhilananda dealing with the Great Scriptures—and religious and philosophical teachings of the country.

VIVEKANANDA, HIS LIFE AND TEACHINGS

Another special award was given to Miss Juliette May Fraser of Honolulu for her beautiful book "Ke Anuenue."

The foundation also purchases books for distribution to college, university, and public libraries both in the United States and India if, in its estimation, such a book will create better understanding, at least of some aspect of life, between the two countries. A few years ago a philosophical work entitled "Epitomization" by Dr. George Conger was sent to a number of libraries, especially in India. Three authors whose works have received recognition, either by awards or distribution, are with us today—Dr. D. Mackenzie Brown, Dr. George P. Conger, and Swami Nikhalananda.

We are gathered here today to present a special award to the editors of "A Source Book in Indian Philosophy," edited jointly by Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan and Dr. Charles A. Moore, and published in 1957 by Princeton University Press. In it are included "the chief riches of more than 3,000 years of Indian philosophical thought—the ancient Vedas—the Upanishads—the epics—the treatises of the heterodox and orthodox systems—the commentaries of the scholastic period—and contemporary writings."

Dr. Radhakrishnan, the Vice President of India, and certainly the greatest living Indian philosopher, belongs to the world, not only to his own country. His philosophical works are many, beginning with his first book, developed from his M.A. thesis in 1908. They number nearly 200 including almost 30 books.

His honors also are many, including a knighthood, and honorary degrees from many universities, including the University of Hawaii. His academic career is long and distinguished with professorships in several Indian universities and also at Oxford. He has been vice chancellor of two Indian universities, India's ambassador to the U.S.S.R. from 1949 to 1952, president of UNESCO in 1952, and vice president of India since 1952. In recognition of his great contribution to better understanding between East and West, the Watumull Foundation takes great pride in presenting its citation and accompanying award to Dr. Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, scholar, philosopher, diplomat.

The Watumull Foundation on this occasion also wishes to recognize the splendid contribution made by Dr. Charles A. Moore, to the "Source Book in Indian Philosophy," for it was he who did the long, painstaking work of choosing the selections, editing them, proofreading the book and raising the funds for its publication. Dr. Moore spent a year at Benares Hindu University in India and in England at Oxford, working with Dr. Radhakrishnan. While in India he also conferred with many other distinguished philosophers, with the result that this work contains the finest selections, in a compact form, of Indian philosophical thought ever brought together in one volume. This book is a must, especially for Western students of Indian thought.

Dr. Moore's talents lie not only in the field of philosophy but also in the administrative field, and it is due to his efforts, in large measure, that three great international phil-

osophical conferences have been held in Honolulu at the University of Hawaii in 1939, 1949 and 1959.

The Watumull Foundation takes great pleasure, therefore, in presenting a citation and special award to Dr. Charles A. Moore, professor of philosophy of the University of Hawaii and director of the Third East-West Philosophers' Conference.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*	
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.*	6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J*	
Albert, Carl, *Okla*	5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C*	
Alford, Dale, *Ark*	
Alger, Bruce, *Tex*	
Allen, Leo E., *Ill*	University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont*	911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala*	3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y*	
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill*	4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*	
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C*	
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J*	113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans*	
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*	
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*	
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn*	
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif*	
Barden, Graham A., *N. C*	2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev*	
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind*	Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa*	
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y*	3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H*	
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*	
Bates, William H., *Mass*	
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*	
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y*	
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex*	
Belcher, Page, *Okla*	
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla*	1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich*	3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich*	
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak*	118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*	
Blatnik, John A., *Minn*	
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*	
Boggs, Hale, *La*	
Boland, Edward P., *Mass*	
Bolling, Richard, *Mo*	3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.*	2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C*	Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y*	
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio*	4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn*	
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala*	The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill*	
Brademas, John, *Ind*	
Bray, William G., *Ind*	
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans*	
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md*	
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr*	
Brooks, Jack, *Tex*	
Brooks, Overton, *La*	4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*	
Brown, Charles H., *Mo*	3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*	Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga*	Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va*	
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y*	
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*	
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak*	
Burke, Frank W., *Ky*	
Burke, James A., *Mass*	
Burleson, Omar, *Tex*	2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa*	
Byrne, James A., *Pa*	
Byrnes, John W., *Wis*	1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J*	
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J*	
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo*	
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo*	
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*	
Casey, Bob, *Tex*	
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich*	
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y*	The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*	
Chelf, Frank, *Ky*	
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo*	
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill*	1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa*	3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*	
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*	
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif*	2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill*	
Colmer, William M., *Miss*	
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass*	
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*	
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C*	2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa*	
Cramer, William C., *Fla*	6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr*	4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa*	
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass*	3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo*	
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn*	
Dague, Paul B., *Pa*	
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J*	
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn*	4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga*	
Dawson, William L., *Ill*	
Delaney, James J., *N. Y*	
Dent, John H., *Pa*	
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind*	
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y*	
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill*	
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*	
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich*	
Dingell, John D., *Mich*	
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah*	1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y*	
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass*	
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y*	
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y*	
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C*	
Dowdy, John, *Tex*	
Downing, Thomas N., *Va*	
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif*	3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y*	
Durham, Carl T., *N. C*	The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*	
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla*	
Elliott, Carl, *Ala*	
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn*	
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn*	5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md*	
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y*	
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla*	
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*	
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa*	3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y*	
Fisher, O. C., *Tex*	Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa*	The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis*	
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga*	
Fogarty, John E., *R. I*	1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md*	
Forand, Aime J., *R. I*	4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich*	514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga*	
Fountain, L. H., *N. C*	The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.*	Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.*	3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md*	
Fulton, James G., *Pa*	
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*	
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md*	
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va*	
Gathings, E. C., *Ark*	6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa*	
George, Newell A., *Kans*	
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn*	
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J*	Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y*	
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*	
Grant, George M., *Ala*	4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill*	
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg*	
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa*	
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich*	
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*	
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*	
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif*	
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif*	
Haley, James A., *Fla*	
Hall, David M., *N. C*	
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind*	4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y*	
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va*	
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans*	
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind*	
Harris, Oren, *Ark*	1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va*	
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio*	1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y*	
Hébert, F. Edward, *La*	26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va*	
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C*	
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*	
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla*	
Hess, William E., *Ohio*	
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif*	
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich*	100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill*	
Hogan, Earl, *Ind*	5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif*	
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa*	
Holt, Joe, *Calif*	
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y*	
Horan, Walt, *Wash*	
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif*	
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*	
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo*	
Ikard, Frank, *Tex*	
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn*	The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif*	
Jarman, John, *Okla*	
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va*	
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa*	2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich*	
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo*	
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif*	
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis*	
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md*	
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C*	
Jones, Paul C., *Mo*	1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala*	
Judd, Walter H., *Minn*	3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo*	
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn*	
Kasem, George A., *Calif*	
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*	
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa*	Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*	
Keith, Hastings, *Mass*	
Kelly, Edna P. (Mrs.), *N. Y*	
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y*	The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y*	
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex*	3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex*	4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif*	
King, David S., *Utah*	
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*	
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C*	
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill*	
Knox, Victor A., *Mich*	
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn*	
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa*	
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis*	
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga*	

Appendix

Khrushchev's Forthcoming Visit to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there has been much comment from people in public life and from the press regarding Mr. Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to this country. Some of it has been too optimistic, some too pessimistic.

I believe that a particularly sensible and intelligent editorial appeared in the Amarillo Daily News of August 14, 1959, which gave recognition to the views of my friend, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial entitled "Nikita May Be Curious To See United States of America, but Many Want To See Him, Too," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIKITA MAY BE CURIOUS TO SEE UNITED STATES BUT MANY WANT TO SEE HIM, TOO

What do we show Soviet Premer Nikita S. Khrushchev? To some extent the Soviet Communist Party boss has answered the question for us: we show him what he wants to see. It is known he has made certain definite specifications. He wants to visit Washington, naturally, and New York, Chicago, and San Francisco—always a favorite with foreign visitors.

Less specifically, he wants to go to California, Texas, Florida, and some farm State in the Middle West. And he would like to see something of smalltown life, say, President Eisenhower's boyhod home of Abilene, Kans.

Other stops on the itinerary will be worked out between the State Department and the Soviet Embassy in Washington. So many invitations have been tendered that this intrinsically unwanted guest begins to appear a social lion. Foy D. Kohler, the veteran Foreign Service officer given the job of coordinator of "Khrushchev's tour, is scarcely to be envied.

Khrushchev's desire to see an example of American agriculture could well be satisfied by an invitation to the Coon Rapids, Iowa, farm of Roswell Garst, who has twice visited Soviet Russia and says of Khrushchev, "It's his turn to come to our house." The Soviet Premier will see America's farms at their booming best despite the brakes of Government controls. He will see lush fields of high-yielding corn, cattle at a record peak in numbers, hog production at a peacetime high, bins crammed full of surplus corn, the most highly mechanized grain harvest in the world.

Khrushchev also wants to see U.S. industry, and the State Department is considering two of the Nation's heaviest industrial complexes, the Pittsburgh and Detroit areas. Here again he will see capitalism booming, with industrial production—at a new peak at midyear—65 percent greater than the average of the 3 years immediately prior to the Korean war. A settlement of the steel strike would make a welcome addition to the picture of overall prosperity.

What might, indeed, most impress Khrushchev would be a flight over one of our great industrial areas, with thousands and thousands of automobiles—worker's automobiles—packed tightly inside plant parking lots.

Invitations continue to come in from hamlets, from villages, and from counties as well as from cities, many of them from chambers of commerce inspired by local pride. At least one plea has been made—by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, the Oregon Democrat—that Khrushchev be shown "the gentler, more compassionate, and more human side of America."

NEUBERGER says he believes the Communist leader would be more moved by American schoolchildren or by an American seeking an answer to the grim riddle of cancer than by "a panorama of American weapons and factories." To those suggestions could be added many other kinds of individuals and groups who make up our diverse society—labor unions in the meeting hall, granges, PTA's, college students in the healthy frenzy of a football rally. The list is endless; only the brevity of Khrushchev's time here imposes the discipline of selectivity.

Vice Adm. G. D. Murray, USN

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Navy, throughout its great career, has had many outstanding officers, whose names are an important part of the history of our country, and an important part of the history of the U.S. Navy. One of these officers, now deceased, is Vice Adm. G. D. Murray, who gave his entire life in the service of our country, for a period of more than 50 years; from the time of his appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy in 1907 until the time of his retirement. Vice Admiral Murray was not only a great naval leader, but a warrior, and a fighter, and a great American.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article about Vice Admiral Murray, which appeared in the Golden Gate Federal News of February–March 1949:

VICE ADM. G. D. MURRAY, WESTERN SEA FRONTIER CHIEF, HAS ILLUSTRIOUS CAREER

Vice Admiral Murray, born in Boston, Mass., July 6, 1889, attended Henry L. Pierce Grammar School and Mechanic Arts High School in Boston before his appointment to the U.S. Naval Academy from his native State in 1907. Graduated in June 1911, he served at sea, as then required by law, before he was commissioned ensign, March 7, 1912. He was promoted to lieutenant (junior grade), March 7, 1915, during the World War received temporary promotion to lieutenant and lieutenant commander, was commissioned in the latter rank February 11, 1922, and subsequently was promoted as follows: Commander, June 4, 1931; captain, July 1, 1939; rear admiral, May 7, 1942; and vice admiral, November 29, 1944.

After graduation in 1911, Vice Admiral Murray served consecutively in the U.S.S. *Virginia* and the U.S.S. *Ammen* until December 1914. Following instruction in aeronautics at the works of the Burgess Co., Marblehead, Mass., he reported in February 1915 to the Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for flight training. Designated naval aviator No. 22 on September 20, 1915, he has served continuously with naval aviation since that time. Detached from the Pensacola Station in January 1916, he had duty for 3 months as naval inspector of aeronautical material, works of the Burgess Co. at Marblehead, and later at Boston, Mass.

TRANSFERRED

In April 1916, Vice Admiral Murray was transferred to duty as inspector of aeronautical material, works of the Gallandet Aeroplane Co., Norwich, Conn., and was serving in that assignment when the United States entered the World War in April 1917. He had duty at the Naval Air Station, Naval Operating Base, Hampton Roads, Va., from January to July 1918, when he became Commander, Naval Air Station, Anacostia, D.C., the first commanding officer of that station. Detached from command of the Anacostia Air Station in November 1919, he served as executive officer of the Naval Air Station, San Diego, Calif., from December of that year until August 1921 when he joined the aircraft tender *Aroostook*. Assigned duty with squadrons attached to that tender, he later commanded Spotting Squadron 5.

CHIEF INSPECTOR

Detached from the *Aroostook* in September 1922, Vice Admiral Murray served as chief inspector, Naval Aircraft Factory, Philadelphia, Pa., the first line officer (naval aviator) to serve in that capacity, until November 1923 when he reported to Aircraft Squadrons, Battle Fleet, San Diego, Calif., for duty in connection with organizing Torpedo Squadron 20. On December 5, 1923, he assumed command of that squadron, the first aircraft squadron ordered to Asiatic station, attached to the U.S.S. *Huron* and later the U.S.S. *Ajax*. For his services in organizing and administering Torpedo Squadron 20, an assignment which extended to May 13, 1925, he received a letter of commendation from the commander in chief, Asiatic Fleet.

In June 1925, Vice Admiral Murray reported for duty in connection with the inauguration of the course in aeronautics at the Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., serving as senior naval aviator for the indoctrinal flight training of midshipmen until December of that

year. He then had duty in the Plans Division, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., until September 1927, with additional duty in the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations during the latter part of that period. In October 1927 he reported for duty as aviation aide on the staff of Adm. (now retired) Louis R. de Steiguer, U.S.N., Commander in Chief, Battle Fleet, U.S.S. *California* flagship, continuing that duty when Adm. (now retired) William V. Pratt, U.S.N., succeeded to the command in June 1928. A year later he joined the U.S.S. *Wright*, flagship of Aircraft Squadrons, Scouting Force, serving as her executive officer until December 1929.

From January 1930 until May 1933, Vice Admiral Murray was assistant naval attaché at the American Embassies in London, England; Paris, France; Berlin, Germany; and the Hague, the Netherlands. During that period he was technical assistant for the Navy of the American delegation to the sixth session of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in November 1930. After his return to the United States in June 1933, he served for 2 years as head of the air department of the aircraft carrier *Saratoga*, flagship of Aircraft, Battle Force, and Carrier Division 1. In June 1935 he returned to the Pensacola Air Station as superintendent of aviation training when aviation cadet training was established. In June 1936 he became executive officer of the Pensacola Air Station, serving in that capacity until May 1937 when he rejoined the *Saratoga* as executive officer. A year later he assumed command of the U.S.S. *Langley*, converted in 1937 from an experimental aircraft carrier to a seaplane tender. He commanded the *Langley*, operating with Scouting Force, U.S. Fleet, until June 1939 when he again had duty in the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy Department, serving as head of the personnel division until March 1941.

COMMANDED

Vice Admiral Murray commanded the aircraft carrier *Enterprise* from March 21, 1941, until June 30, 1942. During that period the *Enterprise* was engaged in 1941 in transporting planes and squadrons from the United States to various island bases in the Pacific. Late in November of that year, as part of a force under command of Fleet Adm. (then Vice Adm.) William F. Halsey, USN, she transported Marine fighter planes to Wake Island and was returning to Pearl Harbor at the time of the Japanese attack, December 7, 1941. Delayed by a storm, the *Enterprise* launched planes from her air group 6 that Sunday morning for a scheduled landing on airfields at Pearl Harbor. These planes ran into the midst of the surprise attack and thus became the only carrier-based aircraft to participate in that action and the subsequent unsuccessful search for the fleeting enemy.

"ENTERPRISE"

In February 1942, the *Enterprise*, under command of Vice Admiral Murray and flying the flag of Admiral Halsey, launched her planes in the successful raid on the Marshall and Gilbert Islands. In this, the first combat test ever participated in by an American aircraft carrier and the first offensive blow in the war against the Japanese, her flyers effectively proved the potency of air attack from a mobile, floating base, accounting for 35 Japanese aircraft, 13 auxiliary and patrol vessels, 1 cruiser, 1 seaplane tender and numerous storehouses, hangars, and other land targets. Later in February she participated in the successful raid on Wake Island, in enemy hands since December 22, 1941, and in March made a successful raid on Marcus Island. In April she escorted the carrier *Hornet* to within 800 miles of Tokyo for the *Hornet's* launching of 16 Army bombers for Lt. Gen. James Doolittle's famous first raid on the Japanese Capital. In the Battle of Midway, June 4–6, 1942, in which the carriers *Enterprise*, *Hornet*, and *Yorktown* took part the air group from the *Enterprise* sank the large enemy carriers *Kaka* and *Akagi*, and together with the *Yorktown* air group, sank the Japanese carrier *Soryu* and damaged an enemy battleship in an engagement which marked the first decisive defeat suffered by the Japanese Navy in 350 years, put an end to the long period of Japanese offensive action and restored the balance of naval power in the Pacific.

For his services in command of the *Enterprise*, Vice Admiral Murray was awarded the Navy Cross, and also received a facsimile of, and is entitled to wear the ribbon for, the Presidential Unit Citation awarded the *Enterprise*. The citations follow.

NAVY CROSS

"For distinguished service in the line of his profession, as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Enterprise* when, on February 1, 1942, his ship was under a heavy bombing attack in enemy waters. By his courage and resourcefulness he saved his ship from serious damage."

PRESIDENTIAL UNIT CITATION—U.S.S. "ENTERPRISE"

"For consistently outstanding performance and distinguished achievement during repeated action against enemy Japanese forces in the Pacific war area, December 7, 1941, to November 15, 1942. Participating in nearly every major carrier engagement in the first year of the war, the *Enterprise* and her Air Group, exclusive of her farflung destruction of hostile shore installation throughout the battle area, did sink or damage, on her own, a total of 35 Japanese vessels and shoot down a total of 185 Japanese aircraft. Her aggressive spirit and superb combat efficiency are fitting tribute to the officers and men who so gallantly established her as an ahead bulwark in defense of the American Nation."

Gilbert and Marshall Islands raid, February 1942.

Wake Island raid, February 24, 1942.

Marcus Island raid, March 4, 1942.

Battle of Midway, June 4–6, 1942.

Occupation of Guadacanal, August 7–8, 1942.

Battle of Stewart Islands August 24, 1942.

Battle of Santa Cruz, October 26, 1942.

Battle of Solomon Islands, November 14–15, 1942.

On July 17, 1942, Vice Admiral Murray assumed duty as Commander, Carrier Task Force 17, with the U.S.S. *Hornet* as his flagship. He was abroad that carrier in the Battle of Santa Cruz, October 26, 1942, when his task force wrecked the Japanese invasion fleet bent on driving American forces out of Guadacanal. In that battle the *Hornet* was so severely damaged that when it became apparent she could not be saved, she was sunk by our own naval forces. For his leadership at Santa Cruz, Vice Admiral Murray was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal with the following citation:

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL

"For exceptionally meritorious service to the Government of the United States in a position of great responsibility as commander of a task force in the Battle of Santa Cruz Islands on October 26, 1942. Displaying great tactical skill and outstanding leadership, Rear Admiral Murray directed the excellently coordinated and determined action against Japanese forces with the result that heavy losses were inflicted on enemy ships and air groups, thereby contributing immeasurably to the success of our forces in this engagement. The distinguished service rendered by Rear Admiral Murray and the devotion to duty of the units under his command reflect great credit upon the U.S. naval service."

In November 1942, Vice Admiral Murray returned to the Pensacola Air Station, where he had won his wings in 1915 to become the first commander of the Naval Air Training Center established there, and at the same time Chief, Air Intermediate Training Command. He relinquished these commands in January 1944 to organize and command the newly created Naval Air Training Command at Pensacola, created to coordinate and direct the entire training program. For his services in these assignments, which extended to August 1944, he was awarded the Legion of Merit with the following citation:

LEGION OF MERIT

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service to the Government of the United States as Chief of Naval Air Intermediate Training and Commandant, Naval Air Training Center, Pensacola, Fla., from November 26, 1942, to January 20, 1944, and as Chief of Naval Air Training from January 20 to August 4, 1944. Charged with the urgent task of expanding the intermediate stage of the pilot training program, Vice Admiral (then Rear Admiral) Murray handled the many complex problems of his vital assignment with skill and foresight, developing and maintaining the efficiency of his command with no sacrifice in quality of training, and subsequently, assuming the duties of Chief of Naval Air Training, directed the integration of all stages of the program. By his outstanding ability as an organizer, an administrator and a leader, Vice Admiral Murray contributed essentially to the successful training of large numbers of pilots to meet the requirements of the naval service during its most critical expansion period and to the prosecution of our sustained fleet operations against the enemy."

On August 16, 1944, Vice Admiral Murray became commander, Air Force, Pacific Fleet, charged with assuring that the Navy's aviation units in the Pacific be supplied with personnel and material. For this service in that command he was awarded a Gold Star in lieu of the second Legion of Merit, with the following citation:

GOLD STAR LIEU SECOND LEGION OF MERIT

"For exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service as Commander Air Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet from August 1944 through July 1945. He efficiently handled the administrative responsibilities of this great force, and displayed exceptional ability in supervising its organization, and the planning for effective utilization of the material and personnel under his command. He frequently inspected forward operations in order that aircraft requirements might be better understood and complied with; and that advanced methods, gained from everyday experience with a relentless and devising enemy might be developed and incorporated into training programs. His experience and sound judgment were invaluable assets in providing for the improvement and maintenance of fleet aircraft and material. His energetic initiative, professional excellence, and devotion to duty contributed materially toward our defeat of the Japanese Empire, and were at all times in keeping with the highest traditions of the U. S. naval service."

In July 1945, Vice Admiral Murray became Commander, Marianas, and on September 2, 1945, acting for Fleet Adm. Chester M. Nimitz, U.S.N., Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean Areas, accepted the formal capitulation of Truk atoll, the wartime command headquarters for Japanese holdings in the central Pacific. Ceremonies were held aboard the light cruiser *Portland*.

In January 1946, he was ordered to duty as a member of the General Board, Navy Department, Washington, D.C. On March 22, 1946, he assumed duty as Commandant of the Ninth Naval District, Chicago, Ill., and as Commander of the Midwest Naval Area. On July 18, 1947, he was detached under orders to duty as Commander, 1st Task Fleet, to report on August 14, 1947.

Vice Admiral Murray was detached from duty as Commander 1st Task Fleet on October 9, 1948. On October 20, 1948, Admiral Murray assumed duties as Commander Western Sea Frontier and Commander Pacific Reserve Fleet with headquarters at Treasure Island, San Francisco. Admiral Murray was assigned additional duty as Commandant 12th Naval District until relieved of that additional duty on December 8, 1948.

In addition to the Navy Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit with Gold Star, and the Presidential Unit Citation Ribbon, Vice Admiral Murray has the Mexican Service Medal (U.S.S. *Ammen*), the Victory Medal, and is entitled to the American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp (U.S.S. *Enterprise*); the Asiatic-Pacific Area Campaign Medal with Stars for the Marshall-Gilbert raids, Wake Island, Tokyo raids, the Battle of Midway, the defense of Guadalcanal, and the Battle of Santa Cruz; the American Area Campaign Medal; and the World War II Victory Medal.

Retired four-star rank.

Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], appeared before the Senate Finance Committee in support of H.R. 10. This is the bill designed to provide self-employed persons with a voluntary pension plan similar to that now accorded employees covered by employer-financed pension, and is identical to my bill, S. 944.

I am very glad to see the able Senator from Utah giving his invaluable support to this proposal. It is a field that has been too long neglected, Mr. President.

Since the Senator from Utah presented such an excellent case for the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Senator's testimony.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE, AUGUST 11, 1959

Re H.R. 10, Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of H.R. 10, the Self-Employed Individual's Retirement Act of 1959.

On June 17 of this year, Mr. David A. Lindsay, Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, appeared before this distinguished committee. As spokesman for the major opponent of this legislation, he said, "The Treasury recognizes that present law does not give self-employed persons tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans."

In view of this statement, I don't believe it is necessary for me or other proponents of this legislation to waste your valuable time discussing whether or not an inequity exists. The Treasury Department admits it.

The people of Utah are greatly concerned about this situation, and many of them representing an excellent cross-section of the self-employed farm folks, small retailers, lawyers, dentists, doctors, and many others have written me on numerous occasions urging the enactment of H.R. 10.

Naturally, they have given a lot of thought to their old age, and the vast majority of them say that they have nothing other than OASI to live on once they retire. They can't understand why they are being penalized because they are self-employed and do not work for a corporation. Gentlemen, with but few exceptions, these are the average people of my State, the middle-income group often referred to as the backbone of this great country of ours.

I am concerned about this inequity and I believe that the majority of our colleagues feel it is time to remedy it.

H.R. 10 was first introduced in 1951 and has been before the Congress for 8 years. It has always had bipartisan support from Members who feel that enactment of the bill is the best way to deal with this unfair situation.

While the Treasury Department has advanced a number of objections to the bill, their major argument is the one generally offered when all others have failed—"let's wait until the budgetary situation is more favorable for tax reduction." As part of this reasoning, they emphasize a revenue loss of $365 million, which to the best of my knowledge they are unable to substantiate. Because of my constituents' interest in this legislation, I have read a good part of the hearings on this bill and am inclined to feel that the maximum impact would not exceed $100 million the first year.

Gentlemen, I am very definitely interested in keeping our economy in a healthy state, as are all the Members of this Congress. Surely the effect of the tax loss in the case of H.R. 10 is small compared with the favorable effect it will have on the 10 million self-employed of this country.

These people are not asking local, State, or Federal governments to take care of them in their retired years. They are asking simply for a postponement of tax liability so that they may be able to set something aside for their old age. They are willing to put up the money when they are able to spare it from the demands of their business. All they are asking of us, the Congress of the United States, is that we offer them the same tax consideration that 18 million corporate employees are receiving, so that they can provide for themselves.

In my opinion, it is imperative that H.R. 10 be enacted in this 86th Congress.

Thanks for your courtesy.

Browbeating House Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Northern Virginia Daily published at Strasburg, Va.

Wednesday's Washington Post editorial calls the House Ways and Means Committee members cowardly for their action in opposing both the increase in the gasoline tax for interstate highway financing and the issuance of bonds to further increase the debt of the Federal Government. Such browbeating tactics are distasteful to citizens who are honestly seeking an equitable solution to the problems of government.

The Washington newspapers have a peculiar opportunity to interpret the news of the National Capital, and therefore a greater influence upon the thoughts and actions of the Government than other newspapers throughout the Nation. It is unfortunate when that privilege and opportunity is abused by tactics which smack of intimidation.

Virginia has long suffered from the invasion of its rights by attempts to impose the will of the editors of Washington newspapers upon Virginians. One of the sore spots which has existed throughout the years is the fact that Virginia has furnished national leaders who believe in sound fiscal policies, and governmental honesty in its economic policies.

The Interstate Highway System is important, but so are the highway systems of each State. If there is an increase in the Federal gasoline tax of 1½ cents this will mean the States will have to match more Federal Interstate Highway money. Where will the various States obtain their increased proportion? Certainly the States cannot add another gasoline tax increase.

The argument that the Interstate System will increase highway travel in general, and therefore gasoline taxes to pay for them is fallacious. The overall effect of the system, when completed, will be to cut mileage and reduce gasoline consumption to some small extent. There should naturally be a gradual increase in use of gasoline as the population increases, if the economy remains at its present level.

There are arguments on both sides of the highway finance question, and our Washington editor friend should not assume that all who disagree with him are cowards.

The Farmer's Public Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, some adroit people in our country have what might be called a good press. The American farmer, of late, has been suffering what might be called a bad press. This is described in a thoughtful editorial, entitled "The Farmer's Public Relations," which was published in the Pendleton East Oregonian of Pendleton, Oreg., of August 13, 1959. The editorial admits that some farmers have been amassing considerable wealth. But the editorial also emphasizes that the average farmer has not done well, and it calls attention to the per capita income of American farmers in 1958 of only $1,027, as compared with $2,040 for nonfarm residents.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this informative editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FARMER'S PUBLIC RELATIONS

Practically no one at all who's interested in the subject will disagree that the present farm program isn't working as well as it should. Nor are there many, farmers included, who will disagree that it deserves honest criticism. Plenty of people, legislators among them, say they have solutions to the problem.

Too many of these so-called solutions are predicated on the theory the farmer is living in clover and Cadillacs. The answer, too many of these self-styled agricultural experts say, is to chop the farmer off at the pockets by taking away the trough into which—if you believe these pronouncements—practically every farmer has his snout.

"Pull him down to the level of the average wage earner," seems to be the theme.

Hell's fire and blue mud. If the truth were realized, any leveling-off process to bring the farmer's salary into line with his city-dwelling cousin would have to raise the farmer's income.

Last year, for instance, the average per capita income of farmers was $1,027. This princely sum compared with $2,040 for nonfarm people.

To carry this situation a bit further, those who find the farmer living exclusively off Government handouts, and who allege the price of food is soaring because of the farmer, might take a look at the investment the farmer has in his job in comparison with the investment the average Joe has in his. The price of machinery and other necessary items being what it is, it doesn't take much thinking to get the point.

No, the farmer isn't starving. In fact, he's doing pretty fair in a lot of instances, despite the drawbacks. Here and there you even find one driving that Cadillac every one of them supposedly has. The farmer isn't going to fold up, in most cases, and head for the employment office.

But unless a lot of officials, including the Secretary of Agriculture, don't start telling both sides of the story, farming is going to be the most maligned business the public has heard about in a long time.

One of the most succinct understandings of the problem was voiced by a Pendleton man who said: "I think we all understand that it is exactly that way (the farmer being pictured as on one big gravy train when that's not true) but how to get the 160 million people in the United States to understand it is one that confuses most of us."

He went on to say something with which a majority of farmers probably agree: "Of course, as we all know, our good Secretary of Agriculture has done more to publicize the farm subsidy in a bad light than any other one person that I know of. He has used this publicity to further his farm program ideas. I am not too opposed to many of his ideas and promises for solving some of our farm problems. But I am opposed to his methods of publicity in which he builds up all this bad press and public relationships for the farm people."

The same thing was said in another way recently by Ed Lawrence of Waitsburg at a public relations school for county association of wheatgrowers officials at Spokane. Lawrence is a wheat farmer and chairman of the Washington Association of Wheat Growers Committee on Public Relations. Said he, in part:

"The bombardment aimed at farmers is bewildering when you consider that net farm income slipped from $17 billion in 1952 to less than $14 billion in 1957. In the meantime labor and industry are enjoying bigger and better prosperity. The prices of farm products has declined 20 percent in a few short years and yet we're all pictured as rural tycoons.

"Agriculture is still the economic basis for smalltown America. The prosperity of Main Street merchants is largely dependent on how the surrounding farmers make out.

"We want to say that farmers aren't living high on the hog these days and that the corporation-type farm is a rarity. Most of our food production comes from middle-sized farms and they are feeling the pinch of lower prices and higher costs. And the future looks ever worse.

"We should bring out that research, which leads to higher yields, is benefiting the consumer as much or more than the farmer. If we still farmed with the techniques of 1940 there would now be a food shortage in this country and the Nation's food bill, it is estimated, would be $8 billion higher than it is now.

"It is confusing why so many writers want the farmers to get off at economy junction while most everyone else keeps riding the gravy train. I hear no viewing with alarm the fact that there is now an $8 billion pile of price-supported metals. It involves almost as much Federal funds as farm surpluses. People aren't perturbed over the Armed Forces $50 billion stockpile of manufacturer goods, which we might suspect help labor and industry. Both of these accumulations have the advantage of coming under the handy heading of 'national defense.'

"By law, 500 million bushels of wheat are supposed to be reserved for national emergency, but strangely enough no one has ever set it aside. All the wheat the Government has is called just plain 'surplus.' It's all chalked up to the account of the farmer.

"It is unfortunate that the word 'subsidy' seems to be gaining such a poor reputation. Actually there have been subsidies given to certain groups since the founding of our Republic."

There it is in a nutshell. Now if the squirrels could only be made to understand.

Polish Americans Hit Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter to the public by Rt. Rev. L. A. Sikora, national director of the Polish American Congress:

POLISH AMERICANS HIT KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

Millions of Americans do not approve of Khrushchev's visit. Strong voices objecting are heard from the average American citizenry. Religious leaders, both Catholic and non-Catholic, voiced their strong objections. Not a few of our Congressmen and Senators do not see any benefit resulting from this visit. Six million Americans of Polish ancestry know the background of Nikita. That is why we object to his visit here. It is an insult to all subjugated nations for whom America is the ideal of democracy, a beacon of hope. We have followed the rise of bolshevism and its insidious conquests and its propaganda of infiltration.

We recall how the Soviets stabbed Poland in September 1939, how the Soviets forcibly evacuated 8 million inhabitants of eastern Poland to Siberia and to labor camps. From that time Soviet hands are covered with new bloodsheds. We remember the Katyn murder of 12,000 Polish Army officers. Our own congressional investigating committee made a report on July 1952, calling it the most inhumane massacre of our times.

The defense of Warsaw and the infamous stalemating of American aviators by the Soviets is well known. The subjugating and absorbing of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and other small nations has shocked the American public. It is not revenge that we seek, but the correction of injustices and the return of freedom and liberty to the nations in bondage, conquered and occupied by the Soviets.

We feel this more keenly because this invitation came so soon after Mr. NIXON'S visit to Poland, where he was received with such great enthusiasm as a representative of our great democratic Nation. America is the only ray of hope for Poland in this bewildered world. United States of America is their only beacon of freedom. At the American Embassy, Mr. NIXON told the Polish people that he was happy to visit Poland and that relations between our countries have improved and that "we" are working together in the economic area.

After placing a wreath at the Polish Unknown Soldier's tomb, Mr. NIXON wrote in the guestbook: "In tribute to the epic courage and sacrifice of Polish soldiers throughout history." Here a great crowd broke out in emotional shouts: "Long live NIXON. Long live Eisenhower. God bless America." And next day we hear of the invitation extended to Nikita Khrushchev. We fear another Yalta, when Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill sold Poland and other nations down the river. One could not do business with Stalin, nor with Hitler, nor can one do business with Khrushchev, who is their natural offspring.

One cannot argue, neither can one convince those international evildoers, set on the conquest of the world. To fight evil, we must be strong, we must pray as we combat moral evils by vigilance and prayer fortified by fasting.

On the vigil of the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of World War II, may we be vigilant, firm with Nikita Khrushchev, and pray that some good may result.

Rt. Rev. L. A. SIKORA,
National Director, Polish American Congress.

Tribute to Judge Clem McClelland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Houston Chronicle gave recognition to a distinguished jurist and civic leader of Houston, Tex. He is Judge Clem McClelland, who has been judge of the Harris County probate

court for over 9 years. Judge McClelland was appointed to the court shortly after it was created in 1949, and has been elected four times since then, without opposition.

Judge McClelland is widely known and respected for his ability and his compassion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Houston Chronicle of August 14, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEIGHBOR OF NOTE—JUDGE GIVEN COLD WELCOME

(By Bill Porterfield)

It was a freezing New Year's Day, 1940, when Clem McClelland came to Houston to make his mark.

He had a new law degree, and the high dreams of all young men who find themselves searching the great stone faces of the cities. The thought of failure never entered his head.

The towering figure of the Georgia boy appeared at law offices throughout the city, only to be turned away.

Such jobs were scarce, he was told. There was war in Europe.

SAW MOVIE

McClelland bought a paper and read that Finnish ski troops were mopping up Russians on the Arctic front. The new year looked dreary, but only for a moment. McClelland threw the paper in a trash can and went to see Wallace Berry in a movie at the Uptown.

Four months later after filling part-time jobs, McClelland opened his first law office in the then Second National Bank Building, hired a secretary, and started looking for clients.

He married the former Doris Cook, a legal secretary, in 1941.

People in trouble found McClelland to be sympathetic, hardworking and honest. He had one other qualification. He knew law.

In 1947, County Judge Glenn Perry, bogged down in the disposition of probate matters, hired McClelland as an assistant. McClelland buried himself in a study of probate law, took the load off Judge Perry.

APPOINTED TO BENCH

In 1949 the legislature created the first probate court in Texas history.

McClelland was appointed to the bench of the new court here.

He was sworn in January 3, 1950, exactly 10 years and 2 days after setting foot in Houston.

McClelland has held that post through four elective terms without opposition.

He has been a force in overhauling antiquated State probate statutes.

Ask him how he feels about being a judge, and he may tell you, Sir Thomas Noon Talfourd once wrote:

"Fill the seats of justice with good men, not so absolute in goodness as to forget what human frailty is."

McClelland has said he learned tolerance from his father, now a professor at the University of Arkansas.

He was inspired to enter the law profession by an uncle, a successful attorney in McClelland's birthplace, Griffin, Ga.

McClelland did undergraduate work at the University of Arkansas and completed his law degree at the University of Texas.

Off the bench, Judge McClelland is a tireless civic and fraternal leader. At present, he is illustrious potentate of the Arabia Temple Shrine, a member of the city's youth commission, a member of the Masonic Lodge and the Scottish Rite bodies, and the First Presbyterian Church. He is also active in Little League baseball.

The judge lives at 4514 Ivanhoe with his wife and three children.

Lake Diversion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Public Works Committee has voted out the O'Brien bill, H.R. 1, and in considering the merits of this piece of legislation a recent editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune should prove both informative and instructive in evaluating the meritorious request for additional water from Lake Michigan on a 1-year trial basis.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Aug. 17, 1959]

COMING TO COURT WITH CLEAN HANDS

The Senate Public Works Committee is to vote Monday on legislation authorizing Chicago to divert an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second from Lake Michigan for purposes of improved sanitation and navigation. This authority, already voted by the House, is on a 1-year experimental basis. The additional water would supplement the present authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic second feet.

We trust that the committee itself will not be diverted from Chicago's pressing needs into consideration of the emergency that has arisen at Milwaukee through pollution of the lake. All of that city's lake beaches have been ordered closed because effluent from the Milwaukee sewage treatment works has made the lake a "cesspool," as conditions are described by the Milwaukee health commissioner.

Not that Milwaukee's difficulties are not relevant to Chicago's petition for more diversion to help its sewage treatment program. Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin have been the most vociferous opponents of help for Chicago. Their spokesmen have represented the Milwaukee treatment program as perfection.

In view of the conditions that have developed on the Milwaukee lake front, we believe it pertinent that the Senate committee review some of the Wisconsin statements and objections to determine whether they are truthful and were made in good faith.

Here is a statement from Oscar Muegge, Wisconsin State sanitary engineer: "Records of the Milwaukee sewerage commission show that the effluent of adequate, properly operated activated sludge plants will contain less than 5 percent of the bacteria initially present. Laboratory tests further show that pouring disinfectants 4 parts per million with 8 to 10 minutes' contact will reduce the bacteria remaining to one-half of 1 percent or less * * *. There is every reason to believe that equally effective purification could be obtained at Chicago."

But Milwaukee bathers are warned that to enter the lake from which Milwaukee obtains its drinking water may expose them to typhoid or amoebic dysentery.

Gov. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin charged in his statement that Chicago "held down taxes by drifting along with an outmoded sewage disposal system." Yet the Milwaukee health commissioner, Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, conceded that it would cost $500 million to eliminate pollution at Milwaukee. He termed the remedy "economically impossible."

Mayor Frank Zeidler of Milwaukee offered facts which he asserted proved that Chicago's sanitary district "is not taking enough vigorous steps to reduce industrial pollution and * * * has not operated its works at greatest efficiency." He held up the threat that it might be necessary to federalize the Chicago sanitary system. What are the mayor's views about the desirability of federalizing Milwaukee's sanitary system, now that it presents a menace to public health?

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, in his testimony, displayed a jar of liquid taken directly from the pipe the effluent goes in at Milwaukee. He said, "I understand that some people drink this. I am not going to drink this this morning, but I would like to show it to the committee because, as you can see, in the first place it is transparent, there is no color to it. In the second place, this is sealed, but I can assure you there is no odor. It is stable, and we discharge that effluent within a couple of miles of where we take in our drinking water."

The Senate committee should require Senator PROXMIRE to demonstrate his faith by drinking this Milwaukee tonic. From the character of all this Wisconsin testimony, it should be able to establish whether the attack of that State and of the city of Milwaukee on the Chicago diversion plea is honest. Then it should vote Chicago the help it needs to prevent a repetition of the Milwaukee experience.

A Parent's Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the Wichita Falls (Tex.) Record-News is known for its fine reporting and distinguished editorials.

Because of my interest in the problem of juvenile delinquency, I took a particular interest in an editorial entitled, "A Parent's Responsibility," which appeared in that newspaper on August 13, 1959. This editorial takes a close look at the meaning of the word "discipline" and I think it shows clearly that freedom and discipline can be properly balanced, and that this is in a child's best interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PARENT'S RESPONSIBILITY

It's an old story that people in this country love children. It's also getting to be said a little too commonly that Americans are ruled by their children.

No one can quarrel with the basic feelings and attitudes that prompt deep concern with the wellbeing and future of our youngsters. Yet some observers do question whether enough of us act upon that concern in the most sensible way.

They argue, to start with, that it is a mistake to "live for the children" almost entirely, as some parents seem to do.

Any human being worth his salt must have a life of his own. He does not exist merely to guide and provide for his children. He has a responsibility to himself, to develop his personal interests and talents for his own as well as others' enrichment.

Suppose he chooses to live for the kids alone, and they in turn do the same as they grow up. This means that individuals are being born and raised to bear and raise others, and so on, without end.

While this may sound wonderfully unselfish, observers will contend with good sense that it takes too much of the self out of life. If your own individuality is served only when you are young, then your maturity is nearly empty of meaning to you.

Nor, it is argued, is it necessary to the proper development of children that they be given so much room to roam in free of restraint.

A notion has grown up that the ordinary disciplines are somehow old fashioned, that the big thing is to let the child exercise his own free will, to show his creative possibilities, etc.

When discipline does in fact go out of fashion, life will have fallen into complete chaos. Children need much love and encouragement and free rein. They also need the tight rein, and many, many hard lessons. If they do not learn them when they are young, they will suffer them bitterly when they are older.

Parents who do not provide the hard as well as the loving guidance do their children no real favor. They simply pass to the children themselves, and others in society, the painful tasks of training for life's realities.

Rather than living for our children, it seems a better idea to learn to live well for ourselves.

Aid Program in Vietnam Not a Fiasco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1959, I had taken the floor to advise the Members that the Subcommittee on the Far East and the Pacific of the Foreign Affairs Committee would hold hearings to be fully briefed on the situation of our aid program in Vietnam, with particular reference to the series of articles written by Mr. Colegrove and appearing in the Scripps-Howard chain.

The hearings conducted by the subcommittee on the Colegrove articles were completed last Friday, August 14, and at that time I issued the following statement:

The Subcommittee on the Far East has been conducting a continuing review of our aid programs in the area under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. In an effort to be fully informed about progress achieved in this field, the subcommittee has conducted on-the-spot investigations, and supplemented them periodically with hearings.

The U.S. aid program in Vietnam, being within the area of the subcommittee's jurisdiction, has received close and continuing attention.

The series of articles which appeared recently in one of the local newspapers, alleging that the aid program in Vietnam is a fiasco, and that the administration of that program has been fraught with corruption, mismanagement, and other abuses, has received the subcommittee's immediate attention.

After reviewing these charges in an executive session on July 27, the subcommittee decided to examine them thoroughly. The author of the charges, Mr. Albert Colegrove, Government officials responsible for the administration of the aid program in Vietnam, and other interested persons were invited to testify before the subcommittee.

The hearings which the subcommittee has conducted have thus far failed to bear out the charge that our aid program in Vietnam is a fiasco, and that it has been administered in a scandalous manner.

These accusations, as well as specific charges of wrongdoing, have not been substantiated to date. Many of these charges have been traced to sources which I, for one, must regretfully consider to be less than reliable.

In contrast, the testimony which the subcommittee received from reliable observers who had first-hand knowledge of the aid program in Vietnam, and from executive branch witnesses, indicates strongly that the aid program in Vietnam has been constructive, successful, and responsibly administered.

Because of its desire to be as thorough as possible in examining Mr. Colegrove's charges, and to correct any weaknesses or waste in the aid program, a special study mission of members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, headed by Congressman PILCHER, Democrat, of Georgia, will conduct an on-the-spot investigation of certain items which have not been substantially explained.

The results of the subcommittee's inquiry and its findings will be referred to the Special Subcommittee for Review of the Mutual Security Programs for further examination and appropriate action by that investigating body.

The Atlantic Congress in London

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the U.S. delegates to the recent Atlantic Congress, which met in London last June, was the Reverend Alan J. Davis, minister of the North Royalton Methodist Church, North Royalton, Ohio.

Reverend Davis has sent me five articles which he wrote for the Cleveland Press giving his impressions of the congress. Reverend Davis points out that "The NATO countries must develop into more than just a military alliance."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLES IN THE CLEVELAND PRESS REPORTING THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS IN LONDON

(By the Reverend Alan J. Davis)

AREA PASTOR WRITES OF HIGH HOPES AS DELEGATE TO NATO CONFERENCE JUNE 8, 1959

Members of NATO must tighten their political ties to fight communism successfully, Editor Edward J. Meeman of the Memphis Press-Scimitar told the Atlantic Conference today.

"Hitler would never have struck if the Western democracies had been unified," the Scripps-Howard editor told the 650 delegates.

Of that total, 130 are from the United States. We Americans have been divided into 5 study groups to look into the economic, educational, cultural, scientific, and political cooperation among the 15 nations making up the alliance.

The Atlantic Congress was designed to evaluate the worth of NATO from a nonmilitary point of view. In my study group—the cultural and spiritual committee—are a priest, a rabbi, a college president, and leading laymen of three faiths.

On the plane trip to London, I sat next to economist Leon Keyserling, and while we were winging over the Atlantic at 19,000 feet, I asked this well-known economist what he expected the Atlantic Congress to accomplish.

He said he did not expect it to accomplish many specific things but that there was great value in bringing together 650 citizens to exchange views and to make personal contacts.

NATO is thought generally to be merely a military alliance; it is much more, as this Congress hopes to dramatize.

Fourteen years ago to the very week, I had arrived in London on furlough from Germany. V–E Day and touched off wild celebrations among the Allies. The war had been won.

In the intervening years we have found ourselves in a cold war with a new foe.

ATLANTIC CONGRESS STRESSES SPIRITUAL VALUES
JUNE 10, 1599

The Atlantic Congress, meeting here to assess the value of the NATO alliance, has listed my study group—"The Spiritual and Cultural Values of the Atlantic Community"—as "A–1." What designation could be higher?

The value assigned to us symbolizes the effort made by congress leaders to keep values straight.

These spiritual and cultural values were discussed by Queen Elizabeth in her address to the 650 delegates meeting from 14 of the NATO countries. (Iceland refused to send delegates because of its differences with Britain over fishing rights in North Atlantic waters.)

Said the Queen:

"Two elements have long been the main principles of enlightened European thought and action: Respect for the freedom of the individual and the dignity of human nature and a simple faith in God.

"These principles show more clearly than anything else that the things which divide us are very small and unimportant compared to the things which unite us."

An A–1 speech.

Incidentally, I wondered if the Queen wrote her speech or whether she was told what to say—as is the case when she delivers messages from "Her Majesty's Government."

My new-found British friends were of the opinion that she indeed had spoken her own thoughts, but that she had consulted her husband and advisers before addressing us.

The Congress also heard the Archbishop of York, who also stressed spiritual values. He said:

"We turn to those things first which are not transient but eternal—the things of value that point beyond themselves to a source of divine power."

Again, an A–1 message.

Attending these congress sessions with me are six other delegates from Ohio: Miss Sally Sue Witten of Cleveland, who represents the Girl Scouts; Congressman Wayne Hays (Democrat, Flushing) cochairman of the meeting; Congressman Walter H. Moeller (Democrat, Lancaster); Prof. Howard White of Miami University; Prof. Earl Warren of

Ohio Wesleyan; and Mrs. Eleanor Stevenson of Oberlin.

London, we have already found, is a fascinating city. But I find one thing lacking—drinking water.

British restaurants do not offer you a glass of water unless you ask for it. Public drinking fountains are scarce, althought there are plenty of places you can quench your thirst in other ways.

So I'm always looking for a glass of water.

AREA MINISTER WANTS CONSCIENCE IN NATO
JUNE 11, 1959

Our subcommittee here at the Atlantic Congress—on the spiritual and cultural value of the NATO alliance—is concerned with the interpretation which non-NATO countries will place on the purposes of the general meeting.

We know that the congress, made up of 650 delegates, is designed to assess the nonmilitary aspects of the alliance. But what will others think of us?

We want to set forth a statement of spiritual ideals that will capture the minds and hearts of the entire world—especially those people in underdeveloped areas where freedom of the individual is still a vision in the future.

I have been reading reports of how this Atlantic Congress is being interpreted by the Communist press. In its view, the congress is an act of aggression in the cold war.

In an attempt to reach our goal and formalize our statement, I made two speeches in committee debate.

The first was a call to implement the spirit of the NATO community by establishing a permanent section in this organization to serve as the conscience of the Atlantic community.

I told of the recent Indianapolis auto race in our country. After months of preparation the starting time was approached; the gun sounded, the cars sped down the track—all except one that did not move. It was left sitting at the starting line.

NATO can be like that unfortunate car if we are not careful. The structure looks fine. The spirit is there to drive it ahead. But the power must be communicated to the rest of the mechanism if it is to move.

We must prepare to implement our statements of ideals and principles in a way that they may be brought directly to bear on the larger decisions of NATO.

In the second speech I objected to the way concern for trade unionism and assistance to underdeveloped nations were always referred to as the great issues before our committee. It seemed to me the great moral and spiritual issue we were ignoring was NATO's own dependence on atomic weapons.

I argued for a statement in our declaration that would clearly say that we were against the irresponsible use of the armaments of war and uncompromisingly concerned solely with the preservation of peace.

This brought some applause, even from those who probably were not sure just what I had said.

After the evening session I talked with Maurice Van Glabbeke, of Belgium, a member of Parliament. He said, in French, "Let me shake the hand of Reverend Davis, who is from beautiful Ohio."

He had been in Cleveland, he said, at the time of the tragic Cleveland Clinic fire. But from that disaster, laws to regulate hospital safety were enacted all over Europe. He has always given Cleveland credit for this.

MANY FEEL GLOOMY ON NATO, JUNE 12, 1959

As the Atlantic Congress nears its final meeting, I and others among the 650 delegates sense a growing pessimism.

We doubt if NATO as a military structure is strong enough to defend the free world if suddenly attacked.

We also doubt the depth of the friendship we have been counting on from our NATO colleagues.

There is a growing nationalism in Europe reflected here. Even the smaller countries like Denmark and Belgium feel no great dependence upon America, even though we have so greatly assisted them in rebuilding their countries.

I spoke today of this problem with former British Prime Minister Clement Attlee. He senses the same shift in European opinion. "Let America help us," people are saying, "but don't think she can buy our friendship."

The delegates, who last night saw the hit play "My Fair Lady," today have whistled "I Could Have Danced All Night"—one of the songs from the show—but it's just whistling in the dark if we think all's right with NATO.

THREE GOALS DIRECTED TO NATO, JUNE 17, 1959

Circling the domed ceiling of the assembly hall where the Atlantic Congress met were these words etched in gold leaf: "Holy is the true light and passing wonderful, lending radiance to them that endured in the heat of the conflict."

How much true light came from the Congress?

In his closing remarks J. J. Fens of The Netherlands, the presiding officer, rightly said that only history can judge. But we have outlined a program for NATO to follow in the next decade. It is now up to the Parliamentarian's Conference to implement these plans.

As I view it, three concerns have emerged:

The NATO countries must develop more than just a military alliance. There must be much greater integration of our political, economic, and cultural interests if we are to build an Atlantic community.

There must be intensified efforts to help the underdeveloped areas of the world help themselves.

Excessive nationalism on the part of NATO countries must not be allowed to confuse our common goals.

So the Congress has ended. The 650 delegates are scattering to their homes.

The most amazing fact of the conference to me was this: the total cost to the international committee of the Atlantic Congress equaled the price of one helicopter or two-thirds the price of one military tank.

Lush Living in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Foreign Affairs Committee has received a letter from Mrs. James W. Bayne of Nha Trang, Vietnam, addressed to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Since it is the reply of an American citizen living in Vietnam to the charges of lush living in Vietnam, under leave to extend my remarks I include the letter and commend it to the attention of the Members of the House.

BOITE POSTALE 70,
NHA TRANG, VIETNAM,
August 10, 1959.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: As I read "The Times of Vietnam" I get angrier by the minute. This Colegrove fellow and his articles are truly to be deplored. I am an American housewife, and have been here in Vietnam since June 16 and though I don't pretend to know all the answers, as evidently Mr. Colegrove does, there are a few things I do know firsthand for a fact, and they are:

Any American child of schoolage here pays $100 for 3 months of school. We have three children. It is a known fact here that there are three prices for anything bought, a regular price for the Vietnamese, a bit higher for the French, and the prices are doubled or tripled for the (rich) American. My husband makes $650 base pay a month, and we, as his dependents are allowed over here, paying our own way to the tune of over $1,500 (after first depositing $2,000 for guarantee fare home). We pay $170 a month rent plus utilities, we have cement floors in our bedrooms and kitchen, have to carry water from the sink to the washing machine (when the well is dry we carry it from the neighbors), and the city electric is so minute that the refrigerator drips all the time. Our food we buy at the American Commissary in Saigon and have it flown up to us. The only one time we have had lettuce we had to buy 6 heads it was so rotten. (We can't eat local lettuce as we'd get the bug—which is a serious case of dysentary.) I was able to make one small bowl of salad. I haven't received the bill as yet for that rotten lettuce but just you figure it out, how much would you say it's going to be? I'm not griping about all this with the exception of the school. Since we left Saigon before the school term began we got our money back, but those Americans in Saigon are still paying—having to pay through the nose for schooling. Now we have sent for the Calverts course ($125 per child), and I'll have to teach the children myself. We pay taxes on three pieces of property in California, but now I ask you if this wouldn't make you angry? I'm not against lend-lease, but how about some of our money we are sending you in the line of taxes going for some schooling for our own children here? I pick up the paper and read Mr. Colegrove's preposterous allegations—can't something be done in regards to newspapermen?

To be an attorney, one must pass the bar exams and abide by rules. To be a doctor, one must first pass a test. Even to operate an automobile, one must pass a test and abide by rules which are made to protect others. These things are so for the good of all—then why not a few rules for the press? To me I think this especially essential since the privilege of reporting actual facts in these crucial times should not be let to just anyone. If ever in the past it were true that "these are the times that try mens' souls," it, as never before, is true now. And of a certainty the American press, what they say and their opinions are repeated the world over. These people believe in us and look to us as their savior, and it is a very sad day for us, as Americans, when we take lightly our responsibility toward them. I have lived all my life in the United States and had never realized before how some other people live. Not only in poverty but in fear. To these people death, sickness and want are common, yet their tears are as real as yours or mine. Truly we owe them more than half-hazard reporting. My husband works for Johnson Drake & Piper of Vietnam, Inc., building a road here, and if there is lush living I haven't seen it. He leaves the house at 4:45 a.m., and comes home at 5:15 p.m. He works 6 days a week. And there are few recreational activities here. One single feature movie on Saturday and one on Sunday night, both of which are shown at a friend's house. There are four eating places here. At one place the flies are so thick they blacken their displayed wares. (They tell you if you go

at night you don't notice them so much as you eat by candlelight.) One other is owned by a man who was convicted of serving cat and dog in his cafe in Choln, and the other two are fairly clean. But we live lush, do we? Mr. Colegrove must have had a 5-day visa. Please, a few rules for better reporting.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JAMES W. BAYNE.

Some Reflections on a Trip to Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, Donald E. Cummings, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Eustace H. Cummings, of Lebanon, N.H., is a young man who grew up in my hometown, graduated from Harvard and Tuck School at Dartmouth, and is a successful businessman in New York. He has recently written a report on his travels in Europe entitled, "Some Reflections on a Trip to Russia." Included in this report is a very striking and clearly phrased reference to the effect of 30 years of socialism on the Scandinavian nations. I commend this brief, well-written article to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME REFLECTIONS ON A TRIP TO RUSSIA

(By Donald E. Cummings)

A visit behind the Iron Curtain is quite an experience—stimulating, enlightening, disheartening, frightening. It was my privilege to be invited to accompany a group of business leaders from Michigan (including my brother) on a visit to Moscow, Leningrad, and Prague, in addition to several Western European cities, for a tour emphasizing a look at industry abroad. With the assistance of American Embassy representatives and local civic and industrial leaders in each of the cities, we were treated to factory visits, lectures and informal talks by qualified officials, as well as a personal look-see at economic and social conditions in free enterprise, socialistic and communistic nations. Recognizing the fact that a quick visit cannot make one an expert on the affairs of Europe, I nevertheless feel that some of my observations, culled from discussions with these individuals, could be of interest or value to others.

The European Common Market Community, comprised of Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, West Germany, France, and Italy, presents a very encouraging prospect for the future of these nations in solving some of their individual economic problems by pooling their resources and coordinating their endeavors. To have stifled their long-founded and understandable emotional differences sufficiently to permit this joint effort to develop is a great credit to the nations involved. It is not inconceivable that other Western European nations may finally join the Common Market, and the strengthening of their economic position thereby should constitute good news to our country, which has long sponsored reconstruction programs abroad. The obvious hope is that political joint ventures might grow from this cooperation, but the age-old resentments, the pride of language and customs of sovereignty, the evident urge to protect their unique identities—these comprise strong forces which will probably never permit a situation where, for example, a German might enjoy lawful jurisdiction over a Dutchman. To observe the consequences of the wars and the hatred that developed from the personal and public atrocities wreaked by one people upon another, is to learn understanding and patience for the very real problems these nations face as they strive to deal cooperatively with one another without sacrificing national pride, searching out for themselves a worthy place in a small world of great powers.

The Scandinavian nations after more than 30 years of socialism do not present an enviable picture, despite the pleasantness of these especially appealing people and the admirable program of modest security for the aged which our group surveyed. A national lethargy has developed with the passing of real incentives to work, and the oppressive tax program, now necessarily being levied in full force on the average earners, makes for general discontent, embodying at present a serious problem for these countries. Our own legislators might well be better informed on the dangers of the welfare state and better equipped to vote on related programs if they paid a thoughtful visit to these countries.

The Soviet citizens we encountered informally are as nice as any group of human beings, yet there is no question but that they are fully oriented to respond automatically, as one, to any edict from the hierarchy. Not being satisfied merely to follow the program laid out for us by the Soviet Government travel bureau, Intourist, I wanted to see how the middle class people lived and what they were thinking. Finding the means to slip away from our official watchdog guide, I succeeded in spending 1 full day in the company of Russian students from the University of Leningrad. Education, particularly scientific education, is greatly emphasized in urban Russia, and correspondingly neglected in satellite nations such as Chezchoslovakia. I learned that a man's suit of clothes costs about 2 months' average wages; I ate poor food with these students in a public restaurant where a meal for four cost the equivalent of 10 percent of the average Russian's monthly pay. Against official instructions, they took me to their parents' apartments where I found several families sharing apartments built many years ago to accommodate a single family. A professional photographer for a national magazine, his wife and 20-year-old son live in one room, sharing kitchen and toilet facilities (without bathtub) with 2 or 3 other families. Their homes can easily be likened to a slum apartment on Manhattan's lower East Side. It is small wonder that as they engage in one of their few means of recreation—walking along the sidewalk—these people present such a drab, unpressed, unwashed, slovenly appearance.

Virtually all women in the Soviet Union work laying brick, digging ditches, spreading concrete, driving steam rollers, while their younger children are trained in pioneer groups—described to us by our Intourist guide as "away at camp." Uninformed, innocent and naive, Soviet citizens believe they are free, for they cannot recognize that conditions they have so long dealt with constitute for them an absence of personal freedom. They are conditioned to privation, confident that their only hope for protection against the imperialistic intent of capitalistic exploitation lies in their faithful obedience to the directives of their champion leaders. They want peace and friendship, but this is only a dream, and they must be militarily strong to defend themselves against attack from the atomic bases with which the Americans have surrounded them. They strive resolutely toward 1965 when, they are told, the 7-year plan will bring consumer goods into their lives. Dissenters are few and dare not talk; to think they could revolt is folly.

These ordinary folk will never travel far from home—the Leningrader is unlikely to be afford an opportunity to see how Moscow has been dressed up as the Soviet showplace while impoverished Leningrad has been neglected. But the young zealots and party faithful will be treated to a Moscow trip as a prize and, simultaneously, for further subtle indoctrination. In the cultural exchange program, the visitor to the United States will be the carefully selected, dedicated, 100 percent indoctrinated Communist, whose faith in the Soviet command is his only religion. This visitor can view and still not see, so conditioned is his mind. No basic discontent can be expected to grow from his exposure to the comparative wealth and freedom of the U.S. average man, for he is equipped and trained to believe only what he is told by given authorities. The high-ranking Soviet official, however, is to my mind no dedicated idealist. He is strictly a power-hungry individual, taking full advantage of his position to add to his own ugly record. This is the man who should, I suggest, be invited to make a free style visit to our United States, where with his discerning eye he may reappraise his careless opinion as to the strength and determination of a truly free society, in order that he may return sufficiently better informed from personal observation to make him more wary of undertaking irretrievable steps.

The Soviets' campaign to promote trade with the West was vividly emphasized in the course of our meeting with a ranking authority of the Ministry of Foreign Trade in Moscow. It is significant that this is the area of officialdom to which they chose to expose us, and the message they pressed was the supposedly simple question of, "Why won't you trade with us—we are anxious to trade with you." They are very pleased to note that Great Britain has already signed an agreement for limited trade with Russia. On visiting the Volman Machine Tool plant near Prague in Czechoslovakia, our group was particularly forceful in plying questions which brought to the front such facts as—

(1) Management of industry is appointed by and reports to a central Communist party body;

(2) The workers of a plant are organized into a so-called trade union specifically to keep them under control by management-appointed officers; it is these officers who answer to management on questions of productivity within the plant and who dispense discipline on the everyday level to the workers;

(3) No one is free to leave his work without permission, and obtaining reassignment is an involved and lengthy process which may or may not come to fruition.

It appears likely that the near-slave labor output sphere will eventually be widely competing abroad with U.S. production. The European Common Market Community, with its developed steel program, is also an economic force that will need to be considered. Our powerful figures in organized labor, who are certainly more socialistic than democratic, may insidiously lead our inflated economy to a point where our strong competitive position will deteriorate and economic defeat will pave the way for the comparatively peaceful spread of communism in the world. Our average citizen, supporting the wage-price spiral and ultimately undermining our international competitive strength, could turn out to be the unwitting

handyman of men like Nikita Khrushchev. This is the terrifying picture that sticks in my mind—the proposition which I believe deserves serious cogitation by all of us, particularly at this time of rising stock market activity and of seemingly unlimited economic growth in our country.

Mr. G. J. Watumull, East-West Symbol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the 17th, I inserted in the RECORD a brief history of the Watumull Foundation, including a capsule account of some of their activities. Later on the same day I received information that the founder of the Watumull Foundation, Mr. G. J. Watumull had passed away.

From Hawaii's largest evening newspaper comes an editorial which I include herewith for printing in the RECORD. The editorial is a fitting tribute to the story so often written in the pages of America's history of the land of opportunity that is the United States, and the remarkable and splendid people who have contributed so much because they had benefited so greatly.

Mr. G. J. Watumull is indeed an inspiration to those of character and integrity who possess ability and determination. His life is in the best traditions of America and a convincing proof that America is still the land of opportunity for those who are willing to set their sights on a star. Mr. Watumull's philanthropies light the way for others.

The editorial follows:

HE FOUND SUCCESS AND FRIENDSHIP IN HAWAII

Hawaii mourns today the death of G. J. Watumull, 68, businessman, philanthropist, and civic leader.

His early life in his native Hyderabad, India, was one of struggle and hardship following an accident which incapacitated his father.

He managed to complete a 2-year engineering course and was working on an irrigation project in India when and older brother, Jhamandas, called him to Hawaii in 1917 to take over management of a small oriental goods store he had established in Honolulu.

The East India Store prospered and, later known as the Watumull Stores, expanded. The Watumull family acquired other business interests. As Mr. Watumull took an increasingly lively interest in civic affairs, he saw many educational and cultural opportunities to share his good fortune.

And so, in 1942, the Watumull Foundation was created. It has given help to such institutions as the Honolulu Academy of Arts and the Honolulu Symphony. It has helped to educate Indian students. It has helped to provide American-Indian lecture tours. It has encouraged birth control in India.

Mr. Watumull lived to see the achievement of two of his most cherished goals—Indian independence, and a new naturalization law giving Indians the privilege of becoming naturalized American citizens.

Mr. Watumull had taken out his first citizenship papers in 1922, but the Oriental Exclusion Act blocked his naturalization at that time. When the naturalization laws were amended in 1946, he was the first Indian to achieve American citizenship.

Much of his civic work was in the field of international understanding. He was a valued member of the World Brotherhood organization and a life member of Lions International. He participated actively in the recent East-West Philosophers' conference at the University of Hawaii.

His high moral principles, his unassuming, cultured, friendly demeanor won him the admiration and respect of all who knew him.

Here was a man of exemplary character who, from humble beginnings, achieved material success and generously shared the fruits of his efforts in projects for the cultural enrichment of his neighbors and the educational advancement of talented scholars.

Hawaii owes much to G. J. Watumull, not only for his philanthropies, but for the example he has set in personal achievement and in East-West friendship.

Retirement of Dr. Alfred Hall as Director of Forest Products Laboratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 31, 1959, Dr. J. Alfred Hall will retire as director of the Forest Porducts Laboratory in Madison, Wis.

Al Hall has had a distinguished and a varied career, so there is little I can say on this floor of the Senate which will add to the luster of his accomplishments.

As a native Oregonian, I am proud that Al Hall has adopted our State. He served long and well as the Forest Service research director in the Pacific Northwest. His selection of Oregon for his permanent home speaks well of the attractiveness of Oregon and for the judgment of Dr. Hall.

I am doubly pleased today because I can announce that a native Oregonian, Dr. Edward G. Locke, will become the able new director of the laboratory.

The Forest Products Laboratory is one of our most important forestry research centers. It has and will continue to make outstanding national contributions to better wood use.

My warm compliments go to Dr. Hall for a pleasant and rewarding future. To Dr. Locke go my congratulations on his new position, and my best wishes for the success I know he will have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an informative article from American Forests for August 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article is entitled "Locke Succeeds Hall at Madison Lab."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKE SUCCEEDS HALL AT MADISON LAB

The U.S. Forest Service will lose one of its most colorful directors on August 31 when Dr. J. Alfred Hall retires from his post as head of the world-renowned Forest Products Laboratory in Madison, Wis. Dr. Edward G. Locke, chief of the institution's division of wood chemistry for the past 8 years, will be the new director.

The retiring director plans to settle in Portland, Oreg., so that he may specialize in "duck hunting on the Pacific flyway." Informed sources hint, however, that he may soon become a consultant for one of the Nation's largest industrial forestry firms.

Dr. R. E. McArdle, Chief of the Forest Service, expressed much regret over Dr. Hall's sudden decision to retire, saying, "During Al's tenure as director, the laboratory made significant progress, especially in the development of the cold soda pulping process. We are looking forward to continued achievement under Ed Locke, an eminent scientist in his own right."

The cold soda process is one of the most important pulping developments in recent years because it permits much greater use of low-grade hardwoods for the production of newsprint. The process is already in commercial use at the Bowaters plant in Tennessee and the Coosa River mill in Alabama. For this achievement the Pulp and Paper Division of the Forest Products Laboratory received a distinguished award, the first such award ever given to a governmental unit.

In addition to paper research, the laboratory also covers all aspects of timber utilization, from harvesting and milling to construction, engineering, preservation, packaging, seasoning, gluing, and laminating, chemical processing, and related fields.

Dr. Hall retires as the fifth director in the nearly half a century that the laboratory has been in existence. He began his Forest Service career in 1930 as a biochemist specializing in resin production of southern pines. At that time he predicted the conversion of the naval stores industry's 1,000 or more individual fire stills to the present-day centralized steam distillation plant with its superior product.

After tours of varying duration in the California and Central States Forest Experiment Stations, Dr. Hall served as a research specialist in the Washington office of the Forest Service during the World War II days, and then became director of the Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station.

Dr. Hall is a native of Paoli, Ind. He attended Earlham College, Indiana University, and the University of Wisconsin, receiving the B.A., M.S., and Ph. D. degrees in biochemistry from the latter institution.

Dr. Locke is a native of Portland, Oreg. He majored in chemical engineering at Oregon State College, and received a Ph. D. in organic chemistry from Ohio State University in 1932. After several years as a chemist for the Ohio State Highway Commission, he became assistant professor of chemical engineering at Oregon State College, serving also as technical advisor for the Oregon Forest Products Laboratory. From 1942 to 1944 he was a chemical engineer in the Bonneville Power Administration.

Dr. Locke joined the Forest Service in 1944, working first upon a wood hydrolysis process for production of ethyl alcohol. In 1945, he spent 5 months in Europe investigating the chemical utilization of wood in Germany. Following World War II he became chief of the Forest Utilization Service in the Pacific Northwest Forest Experiment Station.

Since coming to the laboratory 8 years ago, Dr. Locke has supervised a broadly ex-

panded program of research in production of industrial chemicals from low-grade wood, including residues from harvesting and milling. The scientists under his direction have concentrated on breaking wood into its component parts in order to transform it chemically into useful products. One of the most promising achievements has been the isolation of furfural, an oily substance, as a raw material for nylon manufacture.

Dr. Locke is a past national president of the Forest Products Research Society, and a member of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers, the American Chemical Society, and the Cosmos Club.

Congress Blocks Seat for Red China in U.N.

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 369—expressing the sense of Congress against seating Red China as a member of the United Nations, is good commonsense, straight and to the point.

It is clear, forthright, and faithful to American concepts of peace with justice.

The way that our national self-respect has been melting in recent weeks. I was dreading the day when the administration would invite the leaders of Red China to be the honored guests of the United States, and to enjoy our deferential hospitality.

The facts on Red China cannot be hidden. They cannot be changed by any wishful thinking.

Red China has trampled on every human right.

It has violated with cynical contempt, every principle of international law and morality.

The United Nations, after deliberate consideration, found it guilty of aggression against Korea. Every intelligent person knows that Red Russia instigated that attack, encouraged and supported it. But the U.N., frustrated by Soviet vetoes, and intimidated by Soviet threats, did not follow through and indict Red Russia as well as Red China.

The Peiping regime sent troops pouring into Korea to fight against the United Nations. It has failed to obey the mandate of the U.N. and clear itself of aggression by withdrawing its material support of the North Korean Reds.

It wants to gate-crash the U.N., and then blackmail that organization once it gets inside.

This outlaw nation, which is responsible for the deaths of tens of thousands of young Americans, and still keeps American civilians in illegal confinement, scorns all standards of civilized behavior.

Mainland China must never be accepted into the family of nations until the Chinese people purge their country of the brutal Communist oppressors who torture them, and who seek to extend their power by conspiring against the governments of neighboring nations. This fanatical desire to enslave people is a form of mental derangement. It is a menace to the world.

With no respect whatever for the sanctity of human life, the new class called communism, with its tightly organized power elite in Red China is more repressive and cruel than any emperor or war lord of the old days, because it perverts all the modern knowledge and facilities at its command, to serve evil.

Its power is based upon lies, betrayals, and merciless regimentation of all the human resources under its whip. It is not the chosen government of the Chinese people. It does not represent their true and honorable interests.

I have only one reservation regarding Resolution 369.

It does not go all the way.

Instead of merely expressing opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, it should seize the initiative and denounce Red China for its crimes against humanity.

However, it still has the courage to close the door to an aggressor.

That is a rare and valuable quality in this strange summer of appeasement.

This resolution, by the Congress, will tell the world that the American people are not backtracking.

We know that this world will never be safe for ourseles and other free peoples, and for those who aspire to freedom, until communism mends its ways—if ever—and gives conclusive evidence that it has abandoned permanently, the use of force and subversion as instruments of national policy.

No words will suffice.

We must have guarantees subject to the supervision and effective control of a grownup United Nations.

Until that day, Red China must be quarantined, to protect the uncertain peace.

I consider it a privilege to vote for this resolution that sternly rejects any proposal that Red China should even be considered for admission to the U.N.

Let us make it unanimous.

Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a special Senate subcommittee was established this month to study the migratory worker problem in this Nation, and to recommend legislation which may end some of the difficulties which now face these men, women, and children who work for a few weeks or months in one county or State before moving on to farms in other areas. Scheduling of hearings is not yet completed, but it is hoped that the committee will gather facts from many parts of the Nation.

Some help for the committee's members was given in a very effective way this week by the New York Herald Tribune.

In these articles from the New York Herald Tribune, Mr. Braestrup points out the difficulties and complexities faced by county agencies and church groups in efforts to cope directly with some of the problems. And yet, despite these problems, these articles show that some progress can be made at a local level.

Until we have more awareness that there is a problem, however, and that many steps must be taken to end it, we shall not progress very far in any plan, on a local or a Federal level.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the articles from the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THE MIGRANT WORKER—FARM HANDS FIND SUFFOLK COUNTY CONDITIONS BAD, BUT NOT THE WORST

(By Peter Braestrup)

RIVERHEAD, LONG ISLAND, August 15.—"I could get me a steady job down in Virginia," says Robert Lee Hill, "I'd never go on the season. But a man's got to live."

From Huntington to Greenport to the Hamptons, the annual influx of some 5,000 southern Negro and 1,000 Puerto Rican migrant workers to harvest eastern Long Island's crops is hitting full stride.

Suffolk County, famed as a resort area, is also the Nation's No. 3 potato-producing county, and New York State's biggest employer-recruiter of seasonal, low-income farm labor.

As part of the migrant influx, Robert Lee Hill, 37, last month brought north a group of 15 persons, including his wife and three daughters, aged 4 to 9, to a migrant "camp" outside Riverhead.

They came from Suffolk, Va., by way of the May-June strawberry crop in Salisbury, Md., where they earned up to $40 a week. The strawberries picked, Robert Lee loaded his group aboard his secondhand 1949 Dodge truck, with their pots, pans and bedding, and, avoiding costly toll roads, headed north for his second summer on Long Island, his 15th "on the season."

Lean, serious, soft-spoken, Robert Lee Hill was first recruited for potato picking in Long Island by a Suffolk County farmer last year down in Delaware. This season, that farmer had no work for Robert Lee, and he wound up parking his truck at Charles McKay's camp, on the fringes of a permanent Negro slum a few miles outside Riverhead and only a dozen miles from the beach resorts of Peconic Bay and the Hamptons.

"I got no complaints about the facilities," said Robert Lee's wife, May, "but the rent do seem high."

The drab barrack into which Robert Lee, 10 other adults, and 5 usually barefoot children are crowded is above average for Suffolk County migrant housing: five small bedrooms and a kitchen boast electricity, a refrigerator, hot-and-cold shower (required by law), a gas stove. Not required by the migrant camp law is a bathroom; the group must use a privy.

For this, the cut is $50 a week plus utilities or over $200 a month, roughly four times what comparable, rent-controlled housing

(with indoor plumbing) costs in mid-Harlem. At $3 a person a week, the rent is average for migrant housing in eastern Suffolk County.

The high rent, coupled with little work due to the rains, discouraged Robert Lee and his group. Mr. McKay had no work for them at all. Two of Robert Lee's men left to seek jobs elsewhere. Then Mr. McKay, although he refused to advance Robert Lee any grocery money, agreed to let him pick and grade potatoes for other farmers, at roughly $1 an hour.

"We make enough to get by on." Robert Lee says. "I hope the potatoes get good soon." Otherwise he will move on.

If all goes well, and the picking's good, Robert Lee hopes to clear $350 or so for his family by October's end, when he returns to work for the winter at a peanut-processing plant at $1.10 an hour, in Suffolk, Va. For most migrants, such a steady, if seasonal job down South is unusual; moreover, Robert Lee is both close enough and concerned enough to send his children back home to school while he stays out the harvest.

What about working year-round in Long Island? "Maybe a good inside job," says Robert Lee skeptically. "But it gets cold here, man, and I can't stand the cold."

Chances are that except for Sunday churchgoing ("we sometimes go three times a day") and a rare movie ("costs too much") in Riverhead, Robert Lee and his family will depart Suffold County as much strangers and outsiders as when they first entered. Robert Lee is resigned to this and to his own life as a migrant. "Everything," he says cautiously, "is all right up to so far."

Of Robert Lee and his fellow migrants, Ray Jefferson, head of the Suffolk County Farm Bureau, representing most of the county's 1,400 farmers, has this to say: "We have to have 'em. There just isn't enough local labor available that wants to do the job."

Suffolk County's seasonal workers—like most of the Nation's estimated 500,000 domestic migrants now "on the season"—still suffer the lowest living standards, welfare benefits and wages (average 1957 income: $892), of any Americans. Only Mexico's wetbacks and workers imported from the British West Indies do worse. The domestic migrant continues to be what Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell calls living testimonials to the neglect that is possible in a wealthy and aggressive economy.

In New York State, with 35,000 migrants due this season (versus 19,000 in 1949), press exposure of poor conditions in upstate migrant camps has led, since 1956, to some tightening of sanitation and health codes, despite Farm Bureau opposition. But minimum legal living space allowances (as little as 30 square feet a person over age 2) still permits severe overcrowding; and privies and shacks still remain the rule rather than the exception.

NOTES GAPS IN LAW

"The new laws are an improvement," says Eulalie Torres, farm placement director for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in New York City. "But serious gaps still remain in local enforcement."

Suffolk County, according to Mr. Torres and interested private groups such as the National Council of Churches, rates better than most areas. Says Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "Suffolk's not good, but whatever's bad there is 200 percent worse in many areas upstate."

A Herald Tribune survey of migrant conditions in Suffolk County showed that while considerable improvement has been made since 1957, especially in areas policed by local health officials, wage and living conditions remain in marked contrast to those enjoyed by this prosperous county's year-round population.

CAN EARN $50 A WEEK

Hourly wages, as reported by both farmers and workers, range between 75 cents and $1 for fieldwork, up to $1.15 for grading potatoes in processing plants. Piece rates vary. Working 10 to 12 hours daily 6 days a week, the relatively well paid Puerto Rican workers at the Steve J. Doroski farm and processing plant outside Greenport can earn up to $50 in a busy week. On slower weeks, earnings drop as much as 50 percent.

Unlike local church and welfare groups, Paul Erwin, State farm placement officer in Riverhead, takes a sanguine view of migrant wages: "Hell, a man on the farm earning $45 a week is as well off as a city man making $85."

Putting migrant workers under a $1 minimum wage law, as urged by Secretary of Labor Mitchell, would severely jolt Suffolk farmers, says Mr. Jefferson. Farmers are already smarting from last year's potato market, worst in Suffolk history, he adds, with uncertain prospects for 1959.

As Robert Lee's case shows, however, low wages, coupled with the workdays lost to rainy weather, make the Suffolk County migrant's lot even more chancy than the farmer's. The migrant is still unprotected by the benefits that most city workers now take for granted: The above-mentioned minimum wage, unemployment payments, workman's compensation, union fringe benefits, local housing codes, access to public health and education facilities.

Interviewed while resting after a day's potato picking, Robert Lee's lanky nephew, George, 15, made plain his determination to get out of the migrant stream: "I'm going to stay in school, and learn a trade, maybe go on to college. Being on the season gets you no place. On the season, you are nobody."

THE MIGRANT WORKER—SUFFOLK HEALTH DEPARTMENT TRIES HARD TO ENFORCE LAW AT FARM CAMPS

(By Peter Braestrup)

RIVERHEAD, L. I., August 16.—"We have the migrant workers here, we need them here for the potato harvest, and we have to be concerned with them," said John L. Barry, Suffolk County Public Welfare Commissioner and chairman of the county's migrant labor committee.

"Housing and better community relations remain major problems," said Mr. Barry, although, he added, "there has been great improvement."

Policing migrant housing in Suffolk County is the job of the county health department, whose camp inspectors are led by Sidney Beckwith. Roughly 40 percent of the county's estimated migrant population (5,000 southern Negroes, 1,000 Puerto Ricans) benefits from Mr. Beckwith's jurisdiction: Those in the county's 140 camps housing 5 or more persons. These camps, under newly tightened State codes must have a health department permit, hot and cold water, bathing facilities, good drainage, safe heating and cooking facilities. Privies and shacks, however, are still permitted and still prevail.

BEATING THE LAW

To escape State regulations and Mr. Beckwith's jurisdiction, many farmers resort to what Inspector Edwin Werner calls "the magic number game;" placing migrant workers in scattered camps housing fewer than five persons apiece. Other operators open bigger camps without permits—often without water, heat, or even privies. Three such operators have been caught in Suffolk already this season, and persuaded to mend their ways.

"There are still those farmers," said Mr. Beckwith, "who think of the migrants not as fellow Americans but as just an economic commodity. These farmers try to get by with the minimum."

Local and State farm bureau organizations have steadily opposed both local zoning and building laws—designed to upgrade all housing—and tighter State migrant camp codes. "We look at this from a practical point of view," says Ray J. Jefferson, executive secretary of the county farm bureau. "Every new regulation means a cash outlay for the farmer. You can't turn a migrant camp into a Waldorf-Astoria."

SOME ARE GOOD

A New York Herald Tribune survey of some two dozen representative migrant camps showed that the Waldorf has little competition in this area. However, some camps—and camp operators—demonstrate what can be done.

Among the migrant camps visited by this reporter, one of the best was David F. Wicks' camp off Route 25A in St. James. It housed a crew of a dozen Negro workers from Georgia, and far outshone most other camps elsewhere in Suffolk County.

Resembling a good motel, the white, stuccoed Wicks building, on the edge of the potato fields, provides a fully equipped kitchen, curtained casement windows, hot air heating, indoor toilets and showers for each sex, three high-ceilinged, spacious furnished bedrooms for married couples, a big bunkroom for the single men. All for free: Mr. Wicks reward: the experienced crew returns every year, causes no trouble or turnover, works hard, keeps the place clean. Off season the bunkroom is used to store machinery.

GOOD TREATMENT PAYS

"This is the ideal," said Mr. Werner, "and there is no reason every camp couldn't be like this. The expense is minor compared to other farm costs. Wicks treats his people like human beings and it pays off."

Something of a contrast is Suffolk County's largest migrant camp—the Eastern Suffolk Cooperative, Inc., isolated village at East Cutchogue, northeast of Riverhead. With a capacity of 267 persons, its drab wooden barracks and cabins house families and single men from Mississippi, the Carolinas, and Florida who have been recruited by the co-op, contacted through the State employment service, or arrived as "walk-ins" on their own. Many of the buildings, says Mr. Beckwith, should "be bulldozed under," even though occupancy ratios 30 square feet per person) and other criteria match State minimums.

The East Cutchogue camp has its own store—selling beer and plenty of chicken, Vienna sausage, rice, and beans—and its own messhall-style restaurant, the Dixie Belle Inn. Central latrine and shower facilities complete the layout.

UNIQUE SCHOOL

The camp showplace is the spotless school and day care center for migrant children, financed by both public and co-op funds. Migrants leave their children here while the adults work from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m. in the fields. The children play games, rest, and get snacks and cod liver oil to offset what is usually a chronically unbalanced diet. The elementary school enrolls children of migrants who stay on into the fall grading season; it is the only such school in the State.

For workers averaging under $1 per hour, with work interrupted by rain, the cost of living runs high at East Cutchogue. Weekly rent is $3.50 per person; if meals are eaten

at the Dixie Belle Inn, another $12 is added. Workers are paid off and these costs deducted in the camp office, says John Murphy, camp supervisor, "otherwise I'd never get any money." Most family groups do their own cooking in their crowded quarters.

Despite the dearth of adult recreation facilities and the camp's isolation, the recurring migrant problems—Saturday night drunkenness, occasional violence, and gambling—are no longer serious, according to Mr. Murphy.

Many farmers, like Charles McKay of Riverhead, charge similar rent, averaging $3 per person per week for camps with privies but sometimes waive this rent when they cannot provide tenants with work.

Among the other camps visited by the Herald Tribune, many were in worse condition. One young Mattituck farmer, admitted that he expected to house two or three Negro migrants (one was already there) in an 8-by-8-foot shack that not only lacked even a privy, but also stood some 400 yards from the nearest watertap. When a health department inspector said such conditions violated local sanitary laws, even if the migrant camp code did not apply, the farmer expressed surprise: "They got all kinds of new rules."

"There aren't any local building codes or housing inspectors out here," said Mr. Beckwith. "We're about the only protection the migrant and the public has. Within the legal limits, we do pretty well."

THE MIGRANT WORKER—SUFFOLK CLERGY AIDING SHACK FAMILIES

(By Peter Braestrup)

RIVERHEAD, L.I., August 17.—Here in Suffolk County, where 5,000 southern Negroes and 1,000 Puerto Ricans have come north to harvest potatoes and cauliflower, young local churchmen are seeking greater community effort to relieve the migrant family's abnormal living conditions, lack of recreation, and general isolation.

Says the Reverend Harry T. Cupp, chairman of the Suffolk County Council of Churches: "The situation has greatly improved, but it has a long way to go."

"One of our major problems here is apathy," said another leading member of the church council. "The established residents—Negro and white—would just as soon ignore the migrant. It's not hard to do. The camps are mostly out of sight, and many migrants are reluctant to venture out of them."

Nevertheless, the Council of Churches is hard at work. Among the projects in which it is involved:

1. Operating a 1-month summer school for some 30 migrant children, ages 6 to 12, at the Riverhead Congregational Church, with two full-time teachers, free transportation and hot lunches. Along with regular classes and games, Rev. Kenneth Nelson, in charge, is stressing simple hygiene education (washing regularly, brushing teeth). "This," he says, "is something which is also needed."

2. Recruiting children for a similar summer session, financed by the New York State Department of Education in the East Cutchogue public school, under the direction of Alfred E. Dart, school principal.

3. Teaching reading and writing English to adult migrants in night classes at the Congregational Church at Acquebogue.

Supplementing these church-state activities is a flourishing community-financed child daycare center for smaller children in Bridgehampton.

Backing up these local efforts is the Reverend Clyde Williams, a chaplain sent out by the Migrant Ministry of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Driving a green Migrant Ministry "Harvester" station wagon, Mr. Williams visits his parish, which is the camps themselves. His parish is large; some 130 camps were issued permits last year, and this season the total is expected to go even higher.

For the majority of his parishioners, Mr. Williams and his volunteer aids, provide the only outside human contact—aside from Health Department and State Police inspectors.

Mr. Williams shows movies on social security benefits, offers information on migrants' rights and duties, helps out on family problems and organizes singing groups and games of volleyball, baseball (a Puerto Rican favorite) and horseshoes. To draw a crowd to religious services at a camp, reports Mr. Williams, "we sometimes start off with a good western movie, then start the service."

SLUMS SPRING UP

Not only have churchmen led efforts to ameliorate the migrants' present condition, but they have also led an uphill fight against a major byproduct of the annual migrant influx: clusters of slums and shacks outside Riverhead, Bridgehampton and Greenport which provide the only housing available to the estimated 2,500 Negro migrants, who, over the years, have decided to stay on.

Biggest of the slums is a 200-family development on Riverside Drive outside Riverhead. Bordering the Peconic River marshes it is owned by Hollis V. Warner, once reportedly the world's biggest duck farmer.

Here many tenants are crowded into converted duck brooders next to sheds where thousands of ducks are still being raised by a local cooperative. Rentals run up to $70 for four small rooms, with cold water and a distant privy. One 50-family section, "Tin City," is totally inaccessible to fire equipment.

OWNER COMMENTS

Interviewed on the premises, Mr. Warner confided: "With integration and all that, that's why they (the Negroes) are all up here. I don't blame those southern Senators for getting upset about it (desegregation). If 90 percent of them (the Negroes) came up here, you'd see how these northern Senators would act."

As a matter of fact, Mr. Warner indicated, he was doing his tenants a favor: "No one else is going to give them a place to live."

He refused further comment.

His son John, interviewed later, admitted that "the conditions here might shock someone like you or me. But they (the tenants) are a different class of people. They're all happy with what they have here."

TENANTS DISAGREE

Tenants interviewed vehemently disagree; Riverhead's advisory committee on slum clearance, headed by the Reverend Herbert E. Perry, has condemned Mr. Warner's housing as a fire hazard.

In Bridgehampton, however, sparked by a lawyer, Bryan Hamlin, prospects are brighter. With Kenneth Gibson, president of the Bridgehampton Council, and other community leaders, Mrs. Hamlin has secured public support for a day camp for children in the town's 100-family Narrow Lane slum, helped organize a self-help civic improvement association, got State help on plans for building codes and, possibly, a local housing authority.

"Our task," said Mr. Perry in Riverhead of himself and his fellow ministers, "is to awaken the individual consciences of the community to what needs to be done. We keep trying."

A National Park To Honor the Minutemen of Concord and Lexington

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is timely.

We need to be reminded of our heritage, and to be inspired by it.

H.R. 5892, has been introduced by Mrs. ROGERS, who represents the district where the war for American independence began.

It will provide for the establishment of Minute Man National Historical Park to honor and perpetuate the scene of these stirring events.

At Concord and Lexington, a few men with faith and determination dared the impossible and won.

They did not take the easy way.

And they did not invite the oppressor of those days to visit the Colonies in the hope that they could persuade him to make a deal that would relax the tension.

They showed that they would not make peace at any price.

Guided by their heroic example that would not compromise with despotism, our Nation has become great and strong, not in material things alone, but in the devotion to liberty for which we are known and respected throughout the civilized world.

The scene of the events that gave birth to the American spirit, is in danger of being overrun by ranchhouses, suburban shopping centers, and express highways.

The bulldozer is practical.

It is unmoved by anything except petroleum products, and the man in the driver's seat, who takes orders from the construction superintendent, who follows specifications.

Is the liberty road useful?

Is it profitable?

Who cares for anything else?

The bulldozer is advancing upon the shrine of American independence.

People who understand the imperative need of strengthening the human spirit against the challenge of materialism are supporting this bill to establish a Minute Man National Historical Park in Massachusetts.

Where we can see unspoiled by modern overlay the scene, and the events associated with it, that the people of Massachusetts honor each year by the celebration of Patriot's Day.

Where the villagers and the farmers, on the 18th and 19th of April, 1775, fired the shots heard 'round the world for the cause of human freedom.

We must rekindle this spirit today, to save our Nation from the complacency and the compromises that threaten our national will and purpose.

We do not have much time.

The bulldozer, symbol and instrument of impersonal materialism, is leveling everything before it.

Need more be said?

Every American who cherishes the memory of those courageous and self-reliant minutemen of 1775 will support this bill to establish a national historical park in Massachusetts.

The Smokejumper Brigade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on August 14 there was published in the Christian Science Monitor an article entitled "Smokejumper Brigade." I wish to point out that the genesis of smokejumping occurred in my hometown of Missoula, Mont. Because of the many improvements which have been made in smokejumping since then, greater effectiveness has been developed in fighting forest fires, which have been so difficult to control in many sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMOKEJUMPER BRIGADE

(From a roadside marker, U.S. Route 10, Montana: In 1910 this was a remote neck of the woods and hard to reach. Forest fire protection was relatively new. That dry summer many small fires started. Public apathy together with manpower shortage, lack of organization and good equipment, and inaccessibility permitted them to spread and join.

(Pandemonium broke loose in August. Whipped by 50-mile gales, the combined blaze covered 3,000 square miles in 3 days. Animals were trapped, 87 human lives were lost, settlements and railroad trestles were destroyed, 6 billion board feet of timber burned like kindling. The pungent smoke pall stretched to eastern Montana.

(Some good came from this costly debacle due to inadequate organization, funds, and public understanding. Legislation was enacted, appropriations were increased, cooperative effort was developed, and public became forest-fire conscious.

(Now U.S. Forest Service lookouts and aerial patrols discover fires while small, then smokechasers by trails and smokejumpers by parachutes reach and control most of the fires in record time.

(This devastated area has been restocked with trees that will again produce commercial timber, and provide homes for wildlife and recreation for people.

(Fire-protection methods, equipment, and organization capable of handling future threats of dry summers will pay off in healthy watersheds and abundant forest products. An uncontrolled forest fire is a terrifying, destructive thing. Please be careful with your matches and campfires, won't you?)

(By Harlan Trott)

MISSOULA, MONT.—Where there's fire there's a smoke-jumping crew ready to hit it in less than 20 minutes. That's as long as it takes Earl Cooley's elite corps of parachute firefighters to grab their packs and be off the runway of the U.S. Forest Service's aerial fire depot on the wide-open outskirts of this mountain-rimmed city in northwest Montana.

Missoula's highly trained airborne firemen stand summer-long guard over some 8 million roadless acres of Federal forest lands in Montana and Idaho. And the depot's northern forest fire laboratory is working on a year-round basis developing new equipment and new techniques to combat the menace of forest fires.

When the new forest-fire laboratory is finished next summer, Missoula will become the testing ground for surmounting critical forest and range fires. In fact, it will be a research center for nationwide forest-fire problems as well as special fire problems on 335 million acres of forest and watershed lands encompassing the whole intermountain West and Alaska.

SUNDAY DINNER AT MESS HALL

In a long two-story concrete dormitory, some 150 members of Missoula's airborne forest-fire brigade were sitting down to Sunday dinner in what was for all the world like a military mess hall and barracks.

Ranging from 18 to 28 years old, these seasoned young parachutists are recruited mostly from the colleges. Here they undergo the intensive training, and if need be the hard experience of airborne counterattacks on the forest-fire lines.

Nearby in the riggers' loft young Hal Samsel, of Missoula, a Marine Corps veteran, was overseeing the meticulous work of folding some used parachutes.

He hardly seemed old enough to be assistant loft foreman of this strategic aerial fire depot. But pinned to his GI fatigue cap was the Forest Service's mark of distinction: a little gold emblem of encircling wings with a gold parachute superimposed on a sky-blue enamel background, and the little gold numerals 50.

This signifies that Hal Samsel is a veteran of 50 drops in the skilled and arduous calling of a forest smokejumper.

Some dozen or so in the present force of 150 have earned this badge. They are a tough, seasoned nucleus—the first team, so to speak—in Earl E. Cooley's taut command. The project superintendent is himself a veteran smokejumper. He had 44 jumps to his credit before his promotion to head man.

RECRUITS HANDPICKED

Now he heads a force which averages six jumps a season per man. They are handpicked recruits from 33 States, Hawaii, Cuba, and the Philippines. Although the smokejumpers have to carry a 47-pound pack when they jump, they are about average in size.

When the reporter remarked that they looked lean and wiry rather than beefy, Mr. Cooley grinned, explaining that a zest for hard work and know-how is what pays off in the hard and hazardous work on the forest-fire lines. "It may surprise you," he added, "but we have very few college athletes here. There's no substitute for enthusiasm."

Actually, the best crews, Mr. Cooley recalls, were the World War crews of 1943, 1944, and 1945. They were Middle West men slightly more mature than the normal crop of summer recruits. All were members of the Civilian Public Service, the wartime group that gave constructive noncombat occupation to conscientious objectors.

"They were mostly Mennonite farmers, Brethren or Friends," said Mr. Cooley. "One was a professor of engineering from Purdue. All had at least 2 years of college. I never saw their equal before or since. They learned quickly and worked hard. They never knew when to quit."

NO PREMIUM PAY

Out of 600 applicants this year, 50 were selected. Another hundred are holdovers from last year's campaigns. Recruits are given a year's trial elsewhere in the Forest Service, then if they still wish to volunteer for smokejumpers, they are considered on the basis of their seniors' personal recommendations.

They get paid $2 an hour for an 8-hour day. They draw no premium pay for being parachutists. And their hourly pay for work on the firelines in excess of 8 hours is the same straight $2 wage.

Asked if this has been a good year so far for smokejumpers, meaning have there been fewer than average fires, Mr. Cooley nodded, then added wryly, "but the boys don't think so."

Trained smokejumpers, they react like firehorses when the loudspeakers call them to combat. They don't seem to mind that straight overtime pay, either. Most of them are earning money to keep them in college.

It was just 19 years ago this month that the Forest Service's chief smokejumper jumped onto his first fireline in the Nez Perce Forest of western Idaho.

Everything here is in spectacular and heartening contrast to those times. In the historic 1910 summer, Missoula sent 50 volunteer firefighters afoot to the Selway Forest's fire. It was 10 days before anybody heard from them in the roadless wilderness. Smoke alerts in the Selway today mean that one of Mr. Cooley's teams of two, four, six, or eight smokejumpers can hit the fireline in half an hour.

RECORD OF COUNTERATTACKS

In the big forest blaze north of the Salmon River in Idaho last summer, Missoula's aerial fire depot dropped 50 men. Last year, this station, headquarters of region 1, made about 100 drops altogether. The Forest Service record for smokejumpers is 360 drops in a season.

Region 3, at Deming, N. Mex., has hit 13 fires so far this year. Theirs is a longer dry season. Here at Missoula, June 15 to September 15 is the normal fire season—just right for the college recruits' vacation time availability.

Besides having its own airstrip adjoining Missoula's county airport, region 1 maintains a warehouse big enough to feed and supply airborne supplies for an army of 5,000 forest fighters.

That's how many bedrolls are stacked up in readiness for a major battle. And shovels, messkits, and a whole long checkoff list of tools and miscellaneous items to equip and keep 5,000 men on a major fireline.

Its immaculate shops are constantly working to refurbish the gear. There's even a "grinding room" where the smokejumpers' two-edged pulaskis are sharpened. A pulaski is like a double-bitted ax except it is forged with one blade turned at right angles like a hoe.

SPECIAL EQUIPMENT

Every smokejumper carries a pulaski and a long-handled shovel. The warehouse here is stacked rafter high with special equipment that is parachuted into a sustained battle area. Portable pumps and radio transmitters, bales of canvas flies for shelters, oil stoves, kitchen boilers—you name it.

Bed rolls are free dropped. Practically everything else goes in by parachute. If a chute is snagged in a tree with a man in it, a 100-foot let down rope lands the smokejumper. To retrieve his chute or a stranded bundle of supplies, leg spurs, such as telephone linemen use to limb poles, are dropped at the site. Spurs are dropped in long slender cartons with the four sides of the lid secure horizontally so the package will spiral down. There's fiberboard, latticed

edgewise, in the bottom to cushion the landing.

Research, research. All the time, Mr. Cooley's laboratory force is testing new wrinkles in applied smokejumping.

When hungry grasshoppers started feasting on silk parachutes, Missoula came up with a low-porosity nylon fabric. Frank Derry, one-time chief rigger here, designed a chute with slots on one side the better to steer the smokejumper over the target area by accelerating the parachute's forward speed. A Derry even lets a smokejumper turn a full circle aloft.

SAFETY STRESSED

And safety above all is important for the daring young man who wants to finish his college education. In literally thousands of man drops, the U.S. Forest Service has never lost one. Some parachute innovations perfected at Missoula are now standard safety doctrine in military airborne methods.

That's why the Northern Forest Fire Laboratory is so important. Already the concrete foundations are laid. When the building opens in 1960, its fire-combustion wing will inject a new dimension into man's knowledge of forestry's worst enemy.

Forest-fire meteorology research equipment will be an important new adjunct to the aerial fire station President Eisenhower dedicated here in 1954.

Lightning, a major cause of fire in the West's forests, will be studied with the aid of new atmospheric measuring equipment. A radar room will tie in with a new U.S. Weather Bureau radar unit to be installed on the summit of an 8,000-foot peak a few miles north of this spacious meadow.

Mr. Cooley fought the 1949 fires. He remembers how his crew hit a wisp of smoke, started trenching the blaze, then saw the tree crowns "explode" and engulf 6,000 acres in 2 hours. The new laboratory has special meaning to these veteran smokejumpers. They discuss the expansion program with some pride and satisfaction.

Why Helping Hand for Khrushchev?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the August 7, 1959, edition of the Catholic Bulletin of St. Paul, Minn., written by Archbishop William O. Brady:

WHY HELPING HAND FOR KHRUSHCHEV?

MY BELOVED PRIESTS AND PEOPLE OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF ST. PAUL: The people are rarely told what it is that our diplomats are really after. Sometimes we wonder if they know themselves. Our national line is so knotted up with misinformation that we face the coming weeks with dismay.

Our national stomach ought to be all butterflies at the impending visit of Mr. Khrushchev. The feeling is the same that any one of us knows when fear, uncertainty and frustration are mixed. Add now the realization that our diplomats seem blind to the realities of the latest Soviet maneuvers.

That the plans of Mr. K. have matured exactly as he hoped for, who can doubt? If the United States has been blind, the people of Europe have not.

The responsible people with whom the archbishop talked last May pinpointed what our Government still does not grasp. Mr. K. has been leading from weakness, and he has bluffed us again. Most of all, he has wanted a cloak of respectability and we are going to wrap him in it, at our own suggestion.

How stupid can we get, especially when, almost without understanding why, we had Mr. K. on the defensive? We had a knife in him in a most sensitive spot. It hurt.

But no one has had the sense to follow up the thrust, to twist the knife around, to take advantage of the opportunity and to push the blade in further until it touched a vital spot.

Instead we have pulled back our hand and kissed the scratch.

Never in many years has the Soviet squealed as they have recently done over the action of our Government on the Captive Nations Week. That hurt. The Commies showed they were hurt. Mr. K. was more than annoyed. He was angry.

He let his rage fly openly. Why shouldn't he? We had touched a spot he could not defend. The ring of captive countries is restless and was hopeful. If there has been any laughter in them of late, it was to watch Mr. K. squirm on the TV, froth at the mouth on the radio, and try to turn into a joke what the whole world knows as Communist colonialism and Communist tyranny.

But what did we do about it? Our legislature passed resolutions and they were better than the legislature realized. A Captive Nations Week was organized. The churches were solicited to join prayers to proclamations. The plight of the captive nations was mooned over and moaned over, but just for a day.

Meanwhile, our statesmen did not let the people know the truth. They themselves did not know the sharpness of the steel they had forged.

Our top men began to make toasts, to pour in oil and wine and to cancel their advantage by inviting Mr. K. to a visit which blasts the hopes of captive people everywhere and strengthens the hand had holds them down.

Oh, the shame of it all. As the captive nations notion caught fire, the archbishop began to reproach himself that he had not publicized it more and given an added push to the evident advantage which our beloved but befuddled country sorely needs to have.

But now the archbishop is glad that he did not. The Captive Nations Week proposal has been a fraud. The diplomats did not mean it.

Meanwhile Mr. NIXON smiled and apologized without vigor and explained almost nothing. He knew what was happening. We did not.

He could have followed up the captive nations thrust with some pointed questions, such as why Russia has violated more than 50 of her agreements with us, why there has been no explanation of the shooting down of our planes, why the Soviet forces are in Hungary, in Germany, all through the Baltic and lately come to Albania.

But no. He was extending invitations. He was expressing pious but impractical hopes.

We are now committed to smiles and handshakes, to welcome ceremonies and amiable diplomatic chitchat, all of which will soothe Mr. K.'s wounds and tighten the chains on the captives he has as well as those he plans to secure. It is enough to make one sick at heart.

There is evidently no refuge in statesmanship. Let us continue to take refuge in prayer.

Devotedly in Christ,

WILLIAM O. BRADY,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

H. A. Dunn, of the University of Texas, Distributed Books to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the example of the life of H. A. Dunn has inspired many people—particularly young students both at the University of Texas and in other countries.

For 30 years Mr. Dunn has been superintendent of various buildings at the University of Texas, including the law building. He is now retiring from his official position, but many former law students will always carry with them memories of his part in the life of the university.

He is a warm friend of many students in many other countries as well because of an unusual service which Mr. Dunn has been rendering our world. He has helped fill a hunger for books by collecting in America and forwarding to the rest of the world nearly 700,000 volumes.

Mr. Dunn was affectionately called Dean by the students at the University of Texas.

Dunn's warmly human action in initiating the distributing of books to the world was showing his real feeling of the people of the world and of the concern which Americans feel for people in other countries. This is person-to-person diplomacy.

In addition, Mr. Dunn also collects and distributes toys and clothing to needy youngsters at Christmas.

H. A. Dunn is a man with ideas of helping others and the ability and willingness to work to bring his dreams to fulfillment. He is a man of action as well as a man of dreams. He has actively aided me in contests for good government in Texas. He is a worker for idealism in action, and for integrity in government.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Austin (Tex.) American for Wednesday, August 12, 1959, entitled "Dean Dunn—Lifter Is Lifted at Fete."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American, Aug. 12, 1959]

DEAN DUNN—"LIFTER" IS LIFTED AT FETE

(By Anita Brewer)

It will take more than 69 years and a day chock full of parties to retire H. A. Dunn.

The slight, kindly, and always cheerful man of many talents was honored at a special law school assembly and reception at the University of Texas' Townes Hall Tuesday as he retired after 30 years as superintendent of various buildings at the university.

He still has 2 days to go at his job as superintendent of the law school building, but

he already has future plans enough to fill up another three score and nine years.

"I may write a book," he says. "If I do I'll name it 'The Uppish Boy.'"

To those who know him that sounds a bit autobiographical, and he admits it. "Folks always said I was a fa'ward young 'un," he says.

And forward he's always been. It takes a special talent, a special forwardness to accomplish all he has. Perhaps he is widest known as the collector and distributor of three-quarters of a million books to reading-hungry peoples all over the world.

Each Christmas he collects and distributes clothing and toys for less fortunate children in East Austin, and he intends to continue his mission work in that area. He has high hopes and dreams of improving the lot of scores of unfortunate children.

Thomas J. Gibson, assistant dean of the law school, was master of ceremonies at a noon assembly Tuesday honoring Mr. and Mrs. Dunn. In tribute he said:

"Because of Dean (they always call him Dean at the law school) Dunn, the United States has many friends behind the Iron Curtain we would not have had if it had not been for him." It is to those countries he sent thousands of books.

Bob Larkin on behalf of the Law School students presented Dunn with a bronze plaque of appreciation.

Law School Dean W. Page Keeton paid the faculty tribute to Dunn. Paraphrasing Oliver Wendell Holmes, Dean Keeton said, "Mr. Dunn has brought to his task a mighty heart and a genuine interest in his work." He presented Dunn with an engraved desk set from the law school faculty and called him the law school's "best public relations."

In acknowledging the honors of his associates, Dunn said:

"I like young people, middle-aged people, old people. In fact, I like people."

He quoted the message he carries on a card in his pocket all the time: "We make our living from the things we get. We make our lives from the things we give."

Although Dunn's life has been and will continue to be one of service, he has been honored at other times—by the great and by just folks. He has letters of praise from U.S. Senators, from heads of state throughout the world and from Drew Pearson.

Ten years ago Pearson said of him: "Dunn's project (the book project) was all his own; no sponsors, no organized drive, no money to help him—which makes him, in this column's eyes, a real servant to brotherhood."

But Dunn says all his work has been successful because of the help of others. Kind and generous people furnished the money—lots of money—to ship the books to embarkation points from where U.S. ships carried them to their destinations.

Although he values the letters and praise from the mighty, the letters that have brought tears to Dunn's eyes have come from students and the hungry—those who needed more than bread.

One such letter came from the Philippines:

"You really lighten my misery."

Another from a student in Brazil:

"I can't just believe that in our days, when everywhere people are speaking of war and other terrible things, there is a man like you, who thinks only of how to help poor foreigner students."

A poet once said there are two kinds of people—the ones who lift and the ones who lean. Dunn is one of those who lift, and that is why hundreds of his friends honored him Tuesday at a noon assembly and at a 2-hour reception in the afternoon.

Statement by Bishop Griffiths on Population and Future U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a thought-provoking statement by a high Catholic Church leader has just come to my attention which, I believe, should be of considerable interest to my colleagues. It is a statement on "Population and Future U.S. Policy" by Bishop James H. Griffiths of New York.

Bishop Griffiths' statement is an analysis of an issue raised in the Draper Committee Report on Foreign Aid pertaining to proposals that the Federal Government sponsor birth control programs as part of assistance provided to foreign governments. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert Bishop Griffiths' statement:

POPULATION AND FUTURE U.S. POLICY

I.

The problem

For some 10 years a Neo-Malthusian doctrine—of obvious Anglo-Saxon-Scandinavian inspiration—has been gathering steam in United Nations circles and in organizations interested in United Nations affairs with the apparent purpose:

1. Of influencing national and personal opinion in favor of family planning programs in populous countries;

2. Of utilizing United Nations agencies, i.e., World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, Technical Assistance Program, UNICEF to assist such countries and their citizens in effecting such programs;

3. Of obtaining world recognition for the morality of such a doctrine and the right to hold and propagate it. Public opinion in the United States is crucial for this purpose. Churches, women, wealthy businessmen, and scientific scholars are being effectively mobilized to produce and guide it.

The underlying fact

The introduction into underdeveloped and mainly agrarian countries by the United Nations and other aid agencies of mass health measures (against malaria, tuberculosis, yaws, infant mortality) and feeding and relief programs has reduced mortality rates significantly without affecting the high fertility rates.

This is especially true of Asia, which is presently most heavily populated, and also of Latin America; official prognostications are for geometrical and frightening increase in two generations. The economic gap between developed countries where scientific progress leaps forward, and the underdeveloped countries, does not lessen but widens.

Arguments advanced by proponents of family planning

Economic: The argument goes that there is not sufficient opportunity for these countries to amass capital, train people, industrialize, and thus raise the general level of living because all available resources go into providing mere subsistence for the ever-increasing number of dependent mouths to be fed. Even bare necessities such as food must be imported. There are no opportunities to export in relation to the imports necessary. Hard-won advances in economic development are thus wiped out.

Political: This condition of treadmill poverty, it is contended, leaves the way open to Communist agitation, penetration, and eventual domination. People will barter liberty for bread. The example of China, which through its oppressive slavery can produce more food for its vast population than democratic India does by gentler methods for its vast population, is feared. Help to India to slow up its population growth becomes a must.

Racial fear: Rarely admitted, but expressed in his inaugural address by Prof. Robert Matthey, zoologist and new rector of the University of Lausanne, last November, is perhaps an unconscious motive of most Western Neo-Malthusians.

"Overpopulation is a general phenomenon whose rhythm in Asia, Africa, and South America is a rumbling threat to Europe. In the next century * * * there will be four Asians to one European. Surely it is a duty for us Europeans to preserve our human community and save ourselves from being diluted by the tide of peoples whom the ancient Greeks would have called barbarians: Is it really our role to offer ourselves like resigned victims and prepare our succession? Genocide is hideous. Autogenocide, or collective suicide, would it not also be hideous and stupid? So, 2,000 years after the Christian revelation, 100 years after the message of Darwin, the thinker must choose between the scientific law of struggle and the moral law, which for us Europeans means our progressive eviction from the world scene."

Professor Matthey, obsessed, like other scientists and economists, by this danger of overpopulation which he links to the yellow menace, went so far as to deplore the success of the scientific methods of preserving the prolonging life initiated by Pasteur, and to incriminate medicine, hygiene, and social legislation. Losing all sense of human values, Professor Matthey even laments the fact that a growing number of the population is taken off the productive circuit to care for the sick and the old who refuse to die. Finally, he condemns in the name of science, the influence of the soft religions which inculcate a love of one's neighbor and a code of ethics whereby victory is given not to the strong but to the peaceloving. Professor Matthey maintains that he is a Christian.

Economic assistance: In this interdependent world, where aid by the richer to poor countries is necessary for political freedom and world prosperity and trade, apparently many comfortable and wealthy businessmen in the United States regard the undisciplined fecundity of the poorer nations much as their forebearers regarded the large families of slum areas—an unproductive and thoughtless drain on their generosity—"money down a rat hole."

Personal freedom: However mixed the motives of some proponents may be, credit for sincerity must be given to sentimentalists (this includes the great majority of American non-Catholic clubwomen) who see women in Asia and elsewhere with a pitiably low status as to personal freedom (arranged early marriage, polygamy, etc.) and as to educational and economic opportunities chained to an apparently endless routine of slavelike childbearing and economic and social misery.

Undoubtedly there are some planned parenthooders in this group, although their favorite arguments are population pressure

and fear of communism. Since fear of communism is now the style, they are linking it for popular appeal, to their cause. This group is gaining respectability and influence. It sends people all over the world to promote its programs, in many cases receives government subsidies, e.g., British West Indies and Singapore.

Parental responsibility: Many Protestant churchmen maintain that parents do not exercise their responsibilities if by having too many children they cannot afford their education and training. This responsibility they maintain extends to the community (by not imposing an unnecessary burden on it), to the future world (by ensuring standing room), and to world peace (by preventing armed quests for lebensraum a la Germany and Japan). The Protestants are elaborating the notion of responsibility into a theological doctrine which envisages birth control within the married state as the will of God. Chief agitator in the United States for an ecumenical movement among the churches in this regard is Richard Fagley of the National Council of Churches of Christ. The Lambeth Conference for the Angelicans on a world scale, the new Anglican bishop of Southwark who is a crusader for the cause and various national or local groups of Lutherans, and other denominations have gone already on record in favor of birth control. Mr. Fagley includes in his ecumenical concept "millions of Catholic laymen who disagree with their church on this matter and who thus provide an effective counterpoise to the erroneous official Roman Catholic position."

The methods used and contemplated to achieve the goal

Local and State Action

Planned Parenthood announced a number of years ago that it would work to get incorporated into every local and State health and welfare board. It has tried also to get accepted on community chests. The measure of its growing strength is not merely acceptance on such boards, but the legal or administrative victories its proponents have won in New York hospitals and the Pittsburgh Board of Public Assistance.

At its recent meeting in New Delhi the International Planned Parenthood announced it would concentrate on getting the repeal of hostile national or State legislation or the enactment of actual new enabling legislation, which would permit sterilization, etc. The North Carolina case is an example of progress. The single-minded (and well-financed) efforts of this organization leave no room for doubt that there will be increasing cases on the local and State level for legal and administrative action to introduce birth control, sterilization, etc., into public institutions as accepted social practice. This will be done apparently not only for the good of these local communities but also to build up national sentiment and precedents so that birth control could be constructed to be a respectable national policy. The work of the churches (both Protestant and Jewish groups) already invests this aim with the mantle of morality. The appeal of responsibility and sound family life, with overt or veiled references to the Catholic Church's benighted lack of interest in the terrifying facts of population increase and their implications among its adherents, contrives to make the church appear an enemy of the people.

National Action

The United States is undoubtedly the key to the hopes of those who would like to give official birth control aid to the populous yellow, brown, and black, or even the Catholic light tan, countries. Therefore, the ultimate target is Congress, which holds the purse strings. Because there is already some sentiment (United States, United Kingdom, or Scandinavian induced) in favor of birth control aid in the U.N.—Japan, India, Ceylon, Pakistan—it may be hoped to secure action in the U.N. with U.S. backing.

Early efforts to introduce birth control policy in the World Health Organization and the Population Commission were defeated largely, in the first case by the International Committee of Catholic Nurses in Geneva, and in the second, by the World Union of Catholic Women's Organizations in New York. The official policy of the U.N. Secretariat is not to make any formal recommendations in this field. However, Secretariat studies on social progress, health, economic development, and population abound in references which can only be interpreted as allusions to the need for population control by family planning. In regional meetings and seminars, proposals by Government participants have been made, e.g., Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, the Bangkok Seminar on the Participation of Women in Civic Life, but no formal action taken.

Activity Within U.N.

Actually there have been two U.N. projects related in an exploratory way to family planning. At the request of India, the World Health Organization sent Dr. Abraham Stone (recently deceased), a pioneer "birth controller," to that country to study the effectiveness of the rhythm method in limiting families. (He reported it was a dismal failure, so now India has artificial birth control and sterilization as a national policy.) The U.N. Technical Assistance Administration sent a mission to study the effectiveness in family planning services in Barbados. (Conclusion: "highly efficient from the economic point of view as compared with other measures to relieve overpopulation" but will affect the birth rate little "unless and until it reaches younger women with smaller families.") This is a personal conclusion of the expert.

The 12th General Assembly passed a resolution in 1957 asking for studies on the relationship between demographic and development (economic and social) problems of underdeveloped countries. This was introduced by a Peruvian. It can safely be predicted that pressure of facts and studies backed by a growing public sentiment will increase the danger of U.N. involvement.

Official U.S. policy thus far is "hands off."

Activity in U.S. Circles

Many U.S. delegates to the U.N. unofficially but more or less publicly, hold that birth control is necessary. Thus, (1) U.S. delegate to the Population Commission, Kingsley Davis of the University of California, laments in the New York Times magazine, Foreign Affairs, and undoubtedly elsewhere, that the United States is prevented from giving help to dampen the population explosion by a medieval obscurantist minority (i.e. the Catholic Church). (2) Years ago (1952) the chief U.S. economic adviser frankly stated in an off-the-record briefing in Paris that overpopulation in Italy was an invitation to the Communists and regretted that only an under-the-counter method to control population could be used. (3) The present U.S. delegate to the Human Rights Commission, Mrs. Mary Pillsbury Lord, comes of a wealthy business family which heavily subsidizes the International Planned Parenthood Federation and makes no secret of her own sympathies to control the terrible population explosion. She travels unofficially extensively in Asia and Africa; her targets for human rights matters are mostly women. The State Department naturally opened all doors possible.

(4) The most recent example of this ill-advised but calculated campaign may be found in the interpretations given by leading U.S. press agencies to recommendations of the Presidentially appointed Draper Committee on Foreign Aid (see UP story as appearing in Washington Post, July 24, 1959; also New York Times story, same date) to assist economically underdeveloped countries which are experiencing rapid population growth.

The committee chairman, William H. Draper, Jr., is quoted in the UP story, July 24, as saying, when asked if this country is supplying (birth control) information * * * "I presume so—informally, not formally."

(5) Mr. Fagley, executive secretary of the commission of the churches on international affairs of the World Council of Churches and International Missionary Council (who is the world council's representative at the U.N. for technical assistance and economic development matters) states his belief in a constant stream of writings and speeches that birth control should be a part of the U.N. technical assistance program. He does not blame the Congress or the U.N. for not adopting birth control, as long as the churches did not make their will known. He is now in the process of directing that will, with the results noted above.

(6) The Planned Parenthooders of Washington, D.C., recently went on record (meeting in an Episcopal church to hear among others a representative of the New York Council of Churches) as seeking World Health Organization programs in birth control for underdeveloped countries—and our own.

(7) The U.S. committee for the World Health Organization (heavily loaded) met in May to consider among other things the population problem.

(8) The Foreign Policy Association, a private, nonpartisan, educational organization, each year puts out an analysis of foreign policy issues to help American citizens realize more fully the responsibilities they must exercise if this Nation is to act in world affairs with * * * wisdom and * * * realism * * *. It disclaims a position on any questions raised. These issues are debated in numerous groups throughout the country in which many Catholics participate. In its 40th anniversary statement (November 1958) it raises the "population explosion" question. Among possible solutions relating to emigration, resettlement, food, water, housing, etc., under the title "Was Malthus Right?" the questions are asked: "Should the United States give financial and scientific support to the intensive search now being made to discover inexpensive contraceptives? To what extent does our experience with Puerto Rico—and with immigrants from that island—serve as an example of what might be accomplished elsewhere?" Newspaper chains and publications throughout the country continue in this vein and exploit the psychology of terror.

II

Some observations on these arguments

From all that has been written above, it will be seen that there is abundant evidence of a systematic, concerted effort to convince U.S. opinion, legislators and policy makers that official U.S. national agencies as well as international bodies, particularly the U.N. should provide, with public funds and support, assistance in promoting artificial birth control for underdeveloped countries. The purpose, as often remarked, is allegedly to prevent a "population explosion" engendered by advance in health techniques and services which has cut down the mortality rate. Although it is recognized that industrial, social and cultural advancement is usually accompanied by a decrease in fertility, the proponents of artificial birth control maintain that the "population explosion" presently endangers economic development and therefore, political freedom and world peace. Their mathematical projections of birth increase take little account

of other factors, including economic, social (e.g., position of women, high rate of illegitimacy, and polygamy) and cultural factors and changes. Moreover, if they claim the right to project population increases, they must concede the right to project production increases of foods as well.

U.S. Catholics and the moral issue

The position of U.S. Catholics in relation to the growing and needy population of the world is grounded in the natural law and respect for the human person, his origin, freedom, responsibility and destiny. They believe the goods of the earth were created for the use of all men and that men should not be arbitrarily tailored to fit a niggling and static image of what they are entitled to by those who are more fortunate, greedy or lazy. The hidden reservoirs of science and of the earth will be uncovered and offered to humanity by the optimists with faith in mankind, and not by those seeking short cuts to comfort.

U.S. Catholics believe the promotion of artificial birth control would be a morally, humanly and politically disastrous approach (ineffective even for its own aims) to a problem, the real solution of which requires sustained effort in a sense of human solidarity. They are prepared to dedicate themselves to this effort, already happily begun in official national and international circles, as well as by nongovernmental groups.

U.S. Catholics will not support any U.S. public assistance to other countries to promote artificial birth control, abortion, sterilization, for whatever purposes, whether through direct aid or by means of international organizations. Nor will they support international technical assistance, health or economic aid agencies or organizations which include such projects in their programs.

The basic reason for this position is conscientious objection to promoting a moral evil.

U.S. Catholic attitudes toward other aspects

However, quite apart from the moral issue there are practical reasons why Catholics would not wish to see any official U.S. favor given such specious methods of assistance.

Social: Man himself is the most valuable productive agent. Therefore, economic development and progress are best promoted by creating conditions favorable to his highest development. Such progress implies discipline, self-control and the disposition to postpone present satisfactions for future gains. The widespread use of contraceptives would hinder rather than promote the acquisition of these qualities necessary for the needed social and economic changes in the economically underdeveloped countries.

Immigration: Immigration and emigration have their role to play as a factor in solving the population problem. Both must be made more free between nations. Likewise, the migration of people from place to place within the same country must be facilitated. Many places lack manpower for economic development. Others have it in excess. Often migration of the surplus is impeded by lack of railroads and road systems. Hence, improvement of communication is an objective also to be studied. It has been said that migration to other countries is no ultimate solution because of difficulties of absorbing populations into other economies. But migration has de facto helped as a solution in the past. Sixty million people migrated successfully from Europe to the Americas in the last 150 years. When the nomadic Indians roamed the uncultivated plains of North America before the coming of these immigrants, the entire country with its estimated Indian population of only 500,000 and shortage of food, according to the norms of present day planned parenthooders, would have been regarded as overpopulated. Yet, the same plains today are being retired into a land bank because they are overproductive in a land of 175 millions.

Economic: It is a recognized duty for the richer countries to help needy nations so that their people and their nations may live and develop and themselves aid and enrich the worldwide community of peoples. The possibilities of this aid in the form of financial and technical assistance, trade agreements, commodity prices, marketing possibilities, migration opportunities have only begun to be explored by the United States or the United Nations. Technical and scientific advances in our country and other developed States offer ever new possibilities to men of good will and a modicum of imagination and effort. What, for instance, has happened to the food-for-peace plan, and how much is the United States paying to store its surplus grain? Could these rental costs be used instead for transportation costs of the grain to needy areas?

Bad economics too: Despite the promises of birth-controllers, contraceptives in terms of the yearly incomes of the citizens in underdeveloped nations are not cheap. In the United States, as far back as 1942, the contraceptive industry totalled $2 billion. India has recently allocated $10 million dollars for the promotion of contraception and is attempting to arrange for the construction of two separate factories for the distribution of contraceptives. It has 700 clinics distributing birth control information. It is certainly uneconomic to invest heavily in such nonproductive industry when capital is so badly needed for agricultural and industrial development. The educational drive needed to propagandize for the use of contraceptives could be far more effectively used to change ineffective ancient agricultural practices and to promote technical training.

Political and psychological: Soviet Russia in its wooing of underdeveloped countries does not press artificial birth control propaganda on them as a remedy for their ills. It offers education, loans, technical assistance and trade, and boasts that its economic system is able to use human beings in constructive work and to meet all their needs. The Russian delegate to the recent meeting of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East said, "The key to progress does not lie in a limitation of population thrugh artificial reduction of the birth rate, but in the speedy defeat of the economic backwardness of these countries." It has been speciously alleged by planned parenthooders that contraception will thwart communism. A little reflection will explode the fallacy of the prophets of "population explosion." Granted that the Soviets have proven in the past to be callous and unscrupulous in liquidating millions of their own population, the great masses in the underdeveloped countries do not know or do not remember this. Hence, their reactions must be as simple as this: If communism tells these presently highly sensitized groups: "The imperialists want to cut down your growth because they are afraid of your increasing numbers and because of the inadequacy of their economic system. We shall feed you no matter what your numbers," while on the other hand, the free world says, "You are overpopulated and cannot be fed. To eat, to live, to progress you must cut down your families and we'll give you the know-how"—shall we be able to blame the gullible and undiscerning if in the future they cast their lot with the Communist bloc?

The question is asked: Why do Americans spend so much time, effort and money seeking a short-cut inherently contemptuous of the human person, when they are continually airing their surplus food problem and their luxurious standard of living while their neighbors are crying for material, moral, and spiritual solidarity and assistance? If this solidarity and assistance are forthcoming, the dangers of their adopting communism and war as solutions are minimal.

Racial: The West in its passion to control the population is suspected of harboring the same fear and motives expressed recently by Prof. Robert Matthey, rector of the University of Lausanne to whom reference has already been made. This narrow vision of humanity and human relations, and the suspicion that this racist, selfish attitude dominates that part of Western opinion intent on limiting Asian, African, and Latin American fecundity, hurts Western and more specifically U.S. prestige and impedes friendship perhaps even more than stories of racial discrimination in the United States.

Asian women visiting the United States on Government exchanges have been programed to birth control organizations. Suspicion of motive follows on such a directed tour of what may be sold merely as the American way of life.

Concern for the human community and the sound development of international organization

The United States is an important member of the United Nations, which thus becomes a part of U.S. policy. Great numbers of U.S. Catholics, from motives of patriotism and from a sense of the universal solidarity of the human race, wish to see the United Nations improved and perfected and increase its effectiveness as an instrument of international justice: Of defense of the human person and his dignity, and of world peace. These persons do not wish to ignore or minimize the problem of population pressure. But these U.S. Catholics do deplore and object to the efforts of all those and especially Americans, who, however sincerely mistaken, would prostitute the United Nations and its agencies to unworthy and uncertain programs by using every fantastic argument, every hysterical fear and terrorism, bland misrepresentations of data, naive misunderstandings of real issues to bolster the fixations of birth-controllers.

These latter, for example, do not place in proper focus the idea of increasing the acreage and the acreage yield to meet the food demands of an increasing population, by stating that this requires extensive education, a lengthy period of time, new distribution methods, and the elimination of apathy, greed and superstition. This is pure begging of the question. It never seems to dawn on them (or does it?) that in a chronic condition where we have more people than food, the logical answer would be, not to decrease the number of people but to increase the food supply (or as G. K. Chesterton put it: We cannot solve the problem of uncovered heads by cutting off the heads but only by producing more hats). Is this too much work—or—do people simply not count? * * * especially if they are peoples of pigmentation?

If the problem of population is simply the one of feeding people, the potential is almost unlimited. Estimates of land areas which could be brought under cultivation vary from 4 to 11 billion acres. With scientific methods acreage yields can be increased to fabulous proportions. Rarely if ever are mentioned the equally expert opinions of renowned scientists. By way of example, Prof. Colin Clark of Oxford University concludes that the earth could now provide a standard of living comparable to that of Holland for a population of 10 times the present population of the world. This type of agricultural development is already at hand despite the fact that a relatively small amount of money has been invested in agricultural research. Total agricultural research in the United States has a budget of about $100

million, roughly the cost of one atomic submarine.

CONCLUSION

In these observations we have attempted to face realistically the problems connected with a growing world population within a morally acceptable framework. We have made no allusion to the marvelous discoveries which are just around the corner. For example, we shall soon be able to convert sea water for industry and irrigation at a price competitive with present water supplies. We have not even touched on the tremendous potential of atomic energy. We have not spoken of farming the seas as they can now be farmed for plankton. The problem would seem to be primarily economic, and not genetic unless the goal is genocidal. We must not permit the United States to be stampeded or terrorized into an international policy inimical to human dignity, based on the unilateral "guesstimates" of special pleaders who could win for us from underdeveloped peoples, the accusation of suavely and hypocritically plotting for them a form of urbane, furtive but nonetheless effective genocide.

The Need for Refugee Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the August issue of the American Federationist contains an excellent article by Hyman H. Bookbinder clearly presenting the need for refugee legislation. It points out how desperate is the situation of the 2 million refugees and how urgent it is that we participate in World Refugee Year by a modest program such as is contained in the Walter bill in the House and the Kennedy bill in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the American Federationist]

LET'S HUMANIZE OUR IMMIGRATION LAWS

(By H. H. Bookbinder, AFL–CIO legislative representative)

Since July 1, 52 nations around the globe—including the United States—have been observing World Refugee Year. The result of a resolution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly, World Refugee Year is a "human year"—in contrast to the scientific aspects of the recently concluded International Geophysical Year.

"What a refugee wants most is to cease being a refugee."

This is the way the tragic problem of the world's millions of refugees was summed up by Claude de Kemoularia, special representative of the U.N. Secretary General for the World Refugee Year.

"We have a home, sir. What we need is a house to put it in."

This the way it was summed up to visitors to a refugee camp by a 10-year-old who with her family had lived all her life in the camp.

And another girl, one who probably has already become the world's best known and most honored refugee in modern times, has summed up both the despair and the prayers of the world's refugees. Anne Frank, the 13-year-old escapee from Hitler Germany, wrote in her diary, 8 months before her death in a concentration camp:

"It's really a wonder that I haven't dropped all my ideals, because they seem so absurd and impossible to carry out. Yet I keep them, because in spite of everything I still believe that people are really good at heart. I simply can't build up my hopes on a foundation consisting of confusion, misery, and death.

"I see the world gradually being turned into a wilderness. I hear the ever-approaching thunder, which will destroy us, too. I can feel the sufferings of millions. And yet, if I look up into the heavens, I think that it will all come right, that this cruelty too will end, and that peace and tranquility will return again.

"In the meantime, I must uphold my ideals, for perhaps the time will come when I shall be able to carry them out."

Anne Frank's words of hope should inspire us all to redouble our efforts during World Refugee Year.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., dean of the Washington Cathedral, is chairman of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, the group which has the major responsibility for American participation in World Refugee Year. AFL–CIO President George Meany serves as vice president of the committee and Joseph Beirne, chairman of the AFL–CIO Community Services Committee, is a member of its board of directors.

On the last Sunday before July 1, Dean Sayre devoted his sermon at the Cathedral to World Refugee Year. In a special litany for refugees, Dr. Sayre reminded us of the many areas in the world which cry out for help:

"For those who await salvation in the camps of Europe;

"For Chinese who have abandoned familiar paths to seek freedom among strangers;

"For children of Arabs whose lives are enclosed in barricades of bitterness;

"For pilgrims of Tibet who brave the mountain passes to keep their souls in liberty;

"For Algerians and Koreans fleeing from the ravages of war:

"For Jews and Gentiles who struggle against tyranny and oppression;

"For the destitute migrants of India and Pakistan;

"Lord, hear our prayer."

The U.S. Committee for Refugees has formulated a modest governmental program for American participation in World Refugee Year. AFL–CIO President Meany has endorsed this program as "the very least that the administration and the Congress should approve."

Needless to say, it cannot be expected that the world's millions of miserable, homeless refugees will find complete solutions to their problems during the next 12 months. But it can be hoped that during this period there can be an acceleration of our efforts so that a sizable number of refugees can begin to live in dignity, in comfort and, most of all, in hope.

During this World Refugee Year, moreover, it is to be hoped that a greater understanding of the refugee problem can be achieved among all the peoples of the world, including the United States, and that the proper basis may be laid for helping us meet our continuing responsibility in this crucial area for years to come.

In a recent statement before the Senate Judiciary Committee, the AFL–CIO testified that the most meaningful, most lasting and most appropriate thing Congress could do during World Refugee Year is to liberalize and humanize our basic immigration policies.

Immigration reform is only one facet of the total refugee problem. Relatively few of the world's homeless will ever have the opportunity, or the desire, to come to the United States. Their hopes lie rather in finding a secure haven either in the land where they now are, in some other land culturally and otherwise bound to the country of their birth, or in returning to their native land.

But just as immigration is only part of the broad refugee problem, so refugee relief is only a part of the broad immigration problem. Even if there were no homeless groups of human beings driven from or escaping from all types of tyrannies, or the tragic consequences of wars, the United States would still be faced with the challenge of modifying its immigration laws.

Our basic immigration law, the Walter-McCarran Act of 1952, has not reflected either the humanitarian, compassionate, democratic convictions of most Americans or the actual practices of the United States Government.

During the period since the adoption of the Walter-McCarran Act, over a Presidential vetc, there have been many harsh words spoken about that act—words spoken by both its defenders and its critics. As is so often true in political debate, neither side has been the model of objectivity.

If it is true that the act reflects discredited notions of racial superiority, as I believe it does, it does not follow that its authors or its supporters are "bigots" or "racists."

And, on the other hand, if it is true that the act's critics desire to change the law in order to allow more people, with less difficulty, to get to the United States, as I do desire, it is not true that we advocate unlimited numbers of immigrants or that we don't care whether subversives or criminal elements come in.

Although there are significant differences between these defenders and these critics of our basic immigration law, I do not believe that the differences are so irreconcilable that we cannot make substantial progress in bringing our law into harmony with American humanitarianism and actual American practice.

The AFL–CIO, from its very formation in 1955, has called upon Congress to "revise and liberalize the Walter-McCarran Act to reflect the democratic and humanitarian traditions of our country and to provide an immigration policy attuned to the present requirements of our Nation and of the entire free world."

The AFL–CIO believes that the number of quota immigrants admitted annually can be increased from the present quota of 155,000 to 250,000 without undermining employment opportunities for American workers.

The AFL–CIO is fully conscious of its responsibilities to its membership when it makes this recommendation. We do not overlook the fact that there are still more than 3 million American workers totally unemployed. It does come to our attention every now and then that a recent immigrant is working at a given job while an "American" is without work. But we are just as conscious of the fact that other "Americans" are at jobs created by some creative, imaginative "immigrant."

We do not forget that thousands of "Americans" are able to retain their jobs because thousands of "immigrants" are buying shoes and milk and television sets and are going to the movies and eating in restaurants and sending their laundry out.

What are we talking about when we talk about 250,000 immigrants? We are talking about one-seventh of 1 percent of the present American population. We are talking about 1 new American added to 700 other Americans.

We are talking about one-sixteenth as many new Americans from outside our bor-

ders as will be born inside our borders. Yes, we are talking about 250,000 persons born all over the world to join with 4 million born each year to American parents here at home.

It is difficult for me to understand why our rapidly expanding native population is listed by economists and other observers of the social scene as an unmitigated blessing, but an increase in our population one-sixteenth as great looms in some people's minds as a national calamity.

In this connection, it must not be forgotten that only a portion of all immigrants—sometimes no more than a fourth or a third—are jobseekers. But every immigrant is a potential customer for the products of American workers.

And, of course, every employed immigrant is a producer who contributes to our total wealth, and with his earnings he becomes the customer for himself and his family.

To put it another way—what makes America the prosperous Nation that it is? It is the combination of its labor force and the material resources of the Nation brought together by creative management. The more there is of each of these factors, the greater is the wealth potential of the country. This is not just theory. The great waves of immigration to this country were always followed by great gains in our national prosperity.

The key to continuing prosperity in the United States does not lie in protectionism—neither the protectionism of tariffs nor of immigration restrictions. It lies rather in keeping our economic system properly balanced between production and consumption, so that the full production potential of the factors of production are properly matched by the consumption demands of our people.

We do recognize, however, that a sudden, major increase in our labor force could cause dislocations. We no longer have uncrossed frontiers. Automation has eliminated many jobs. There are dozens of economically distressed communities. For these reasons, the AFL–CIO does not advocate unrestricted immigration. We cannot be indifferent to short-run distress of our people. But we can afford to be much more generous than we are now.

The heart of our present immigration policy is the "national origins" quota system. It is significant that this approach was enacted following the First World War and was reenacted following the Second World War. During both of these periods this country was experiencing reaction to international entanglements, suspicion of foreigners and general intolerance of new ideas.

The essence of the national origins quota system is that quotas are assigned to the nations of the world in proportion to the numbers of Americans in 1920 who came from or are descended from those who came from those countries. As a result, countries like England and Germany and Ireland have large quotas which never get filled, while countries like Poland and Italy and Greece have never been able to meet more than a small part of their requests for visas.

The national origins quota system, regardless of the conscious motivation of some of its backers, is based upon two false notions which the AFL–CIO thoroughly rejects: (1) that the population "mix" of 1920 is exactly right and anything else is "un-American," and (2) that there are some nations in the world which will provide better Americans than others.

As to the first, that America as it was in 1920 has some very special virtue, this is arrogance and unrealism of the worst sort. The population of America before 1920 was different from what it was in 1920, and the population after 1920 has changed every year since then. And it will—as it should—continue to change.

One of the unfortunate things in our history is that almost every generation of Americans has viewed succeeding ones with suspicion. The English immigrants distrusted the Irish; together they suspected the Germans; then all of them joined together in vilifying the Italians, and then the Slavs, and then the Chinese, and the Jews, and the Greeks.

Despite this history of initial distrust of new peoples, the record of adjustment, of integration, of accommodation is a glorious story. What we once used to refer to as the melting pot of America is now more appropriately and accurately described as the mosaic of American culture.

Assimilation and integration do not mean uniformity. It means that generation after generation America has shown its ingenuity in working out harmonious relationships between different cultural strains. Together, these strains have given us a composite known as American.

If there is anything like a purebred Anglo-Saxon American, he is probably like Martin Arrowsmith, whom Sinclair Lewis described as a union of German, French, Scotch-Irish, perhaps a little Spanish, conceivably a little of the strains lumped together as Jewish, and a great deal of English, which is itself a combination of primitive Briton, Celt, Phoenician, Roman, German, Dane, and Swede.

For more than 400 years, starting with Christopher Columbus and his fellow voyagers, each wave of immigrants has brought something to add to the American story. There have been many great periods in American history. But only 1 year in its long and proud history is numbered 1920. What is so particularly attractive about that year?

Perhaps even more appropriate than the mosaic, the true image of America is the kaleidoscope. It is a mosaic of human beings that is always changing but encased in a basic framework of freedom, of brotherhood, of tolerance, of creativity.

The fact is that we couldn't retain the 1920 "mix" even if we were all determined to do so. The large quotas assigned to some countries just do not get filled, while those of other nations are always exhausted. Special acts by Congress have permitted large numbers of refugees and relatives of American citizens to come in, without regard to national origins quotas. And even if we closed our borders completely and let no immigrants come in, we could do little about assuring a continuation of the existing "mix."

Hitler's plans for preserving the racial pattern in Nazi Germany were crude and inhuman. But his nonsense about the so-called Aryan race is based upon the same myths which explain the initial formulation of the national origins quota system.

Every serious study of this question has concluded that there is no such thing as racial superiority. Each race and each people produces a wide range of ability and intelligence. Behavioral patterns reflect the tensions and the opportunities of the respective societies.

There is nothing in the individual's genes which explains criminality or intolerance or subversiveness. For every criminal or subversive with a foreign-sounding name, the records are replete with hundreds of scientists, musicians, industrialists and every other type of positive contributor to the American way of life.

The national origins quota system has no place on the American statute books. It reflects an un-American policy of racial superiority; it fails to reflect the needs of a democratic America in a changing world.

In the absence of unrestricted immigration, there must be some criteria for selection of those who can be admitted in the place of the national origins quota system. We would support any standards which flow from this basic consideration:

Which people does America need most, and which people need America most?

Earlier this year Congress itself most eloquently rejected the philosophy of the national origins system when it voted to admit Hawaii as a State. Our newest State has an Oriental majority. Of the 600,000 Hawaiians, 38 percent are Japanese and only 20 percent are white. Among these whites are not only Americans but Norwegians, Germans, Russians, Poles and Portuguese. And there are Filipinos, Chinese, Puerto Ricans and Koreans.

All of these Hawaiians have lived in peace and in harmony for many years. Now they will continue to do so, but as full-fledged American citizens.

Because of the belief—a belief which we hope is unjustified—that Congress is not ready to make basic changes in the immigration law at this time, most of the bills in the 86th Congress deal with only limited aspects of the problem. Only two bills (the Celler bill in the House and the Kennedy bill in the Senate) strike directly at the national origins quota system, although almost all proposals would strike at it indirectly by giving special consideration to certain groups of applicants.

Almost every one of these "halfway" bills contains worthwhile improvements in our present law. Some would increase the number of immigrants; some would permit the "pooling" of unused quotas and thus yield extra numbers to some countries; some would provide special arrangements for refugee-escapees; some would facilitate family reunification.

The AFL–CIO hopes that this Congress will defy the predictions of the pessimists and vote a basic immigration reform. If it does not do so, we do want to see progress toward that goal. When the suffering of human beings is involved, when families are waiting to be united, when refugees who have never seen a private home continue to yearn, we would not advise Congress to wait until a completely satisfactory bill can be passed. But we do earnestly hope that Congress will give its serious consideration to basic changes in the law and then go just as far as possible in the development of an immigration law consistent with democracy and humanitarianism.

Oneonta (N.Y.) Star Describes Work of Hébert Investigating Subcommittee as Well Worth Pursuing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the work which the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee under the chairmanship of the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] has been doing in looking into defense contract practices has gained the attention of the whole country.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a thoughtful analysis of the work of this committee which appeared editorially in the Oneonta Star of August 17, 1959:

[From the Oneonta (N.Y.) Star, Aug. 17, 1959]

HÉBERT COMMITTEE PROBE IS WELL WORTH PURSUING

The billions spent on military equipment and supplies are acknowledged to be an essential part of the price we pay for defense in an uncertain world. Because of this, few Americans object to these tremendous expenditures. The very magnitude of defense contracting heightens the chances of abuse, however.

Instances of overcharging of the Government have come to light in recent months. Now it appears that other kinds of unethical behavior in connection with defense contracts may also be widespread.

A House Armed Services Subcommittee of which Representative F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, is chairman, has started to probe the activities of former military officers and Defense Department employees now working for defense contractors. The committee wants to know what kind of work such persons do, and whether there is a connection between their employment and the defense contracts their firms get.

The mere fact that an investigation has begun does not mean that there has necessarily been wrongdoing. The number and variety of complaints about possible defense contract maneuvering suggest, however, that something is wrong. The Hébert committee probe is will worth pursuing.

University of Wisconsin Researchers Plan More Antarctic Trips

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that in view of the worldwide efforts of communism to gain footholds wherever it can, it is important that we keep a watchful eye on its progress all around the globe.

Too, it is important that we protect U.S. rights, as well as promote efforts to assure that new lands and resources be utilized, insofar as possible, for peaceful purposes to serve mankind.

Today, I refer specifically to the Continent of Antarctica. My colleagues will recall that earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 764, to establish a commission for coordinating our antarctic program—until now, unfortunately, scattered among 14 different agencies of the Government. The purpose of the proposal was to provide the foundation for as effective a policy as possible in relation to Antarctica.

Currently, a recommendation is under consideration to put our antarctic program under the National Science Foundation. The transfer would provide the Foundation with authority similar to that provided in my bill S. 764.

If the transfer occurs, I sincerely hope it would succeed in adoption of as effective a policy as possible for protecting U.S. rights on the Great White Continent.

I am, however, adopting a wait and see attitude.

In view of the fact that the Soviet Union is extremely active in Antarctica, I believe it imperative that we be alert to protect U.S. interests.

As a matter of fact, I am frank to say that, in the past, I have had some misgivings about the lack of a clearer definition of our antarctic policy.

Despite this hazy situation, it is gratifying to note that U.S. exploration of the area is going forward. Recently, the New York Times carried an article entitled "U.S. Explorers To Map Unknown Antarctica." The article reveals a number of the explorative projects underway, including greater emphasis on exploration relating to geology, cartography, and biology of the antarctic region.

Particularly, I am proud to point out that the University of Wisconsin has played a significant role in research of the continent at the bottom of the world. Recently, the Milwaukee Journal, also, carried a fine article by Laurence C. Eklund entitled "University of Wisconsin Researchers Plan More Antarctic Trips."

As fine illustrations of the research and exploratory programs, I ask unanimous consent to have the articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 17, 1959]

U.S. EXPLORERS TO MAP UNKNOWN ANTARCTIC—SCIENTISTS TO STUDY NEW FIELDS ON TRIP—START IN OCTOBER

(By John W. Finney)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—The United States in the coming year will explore unknown areas of Antarctica, attempt to determine if the frozen continent is divided, and study the birds and fishes of the polar region.

These plans for the exploration in 1959–60 were announced today by the National Science Foundation, which has been given responsibility for directing the U.S. antarctic research program.

The program for scientific exploration, beginning in October, calls for greater emphasis to be placed than in the past on geology, cartography, and biology of the antarctic region.

In explaining the shift in sicentific emphasis, Dr. Alan T. Waterman, Director of the Foundation, pointed out that during the International Geophysical Year, the investigations had been primarily in the field of geophysics.

"Many very basic questions about the Antarctica remain unanswered, as for example the locations of mountain ranges and the types of marine life around the continent," he said. "Work during the forthcoming year will attempt to fill in many of these gaps in our knowledge."

The Foundation announced the award of $3,170,069 in grants to support the program of scientific research and exploration. The funds will go for 29 projects ranging from extensive oversnow traverses of the continent to a study of the nasal discharges of the penguin.

Logistic support for the scientific program will be provided once again by the Navy, which is preparing to send another fleet of supply ships and icebreakers to Antarctica as part of Deepfreeze 60. The naval support force will be under the command of Rear Adm. David M. Tyree.

Two Navy icebreakers will attempt to penetrate the previously unexplored waters of the Bellingshausen Sea. Aboard the ships will be a team of scientists to gather information in biology, geology, cartography, oceanography, and glaciology.

The U.S. research program will be carried out at seven installations in Antarctica, some of which are operated jointly with the Governments of New Zealand, Argentina, and Australia. Thirty-five U.S. scientists will remain through the 1960 antarctic winter. Twice that number will be doing research in the coming summer.

The research program will get underway in October—the start of the antarctic summer. Two oversnow traverses by snow tractors are planned for the summer.

One traverse party, consisting of seven or eight scientists, will climb the Skelton Glacier from McMurdo Sound for a 3-month survey of Victoria Land. This is a desolate, ice-capped expanse, 7,000 to 8,000 feet high. Seismic sounding and gravity, magnetic and glaciological studies will be made along the route in addition to geological investigation in the Skelton and Hallet areas.

A second party will leave Byrd Station in October for a 1,200-mile traverse of Marie Byrd Land to the coast near the Amundsen Sea. Geological and geodetic studies will be conducted in the executive committee and Hal Flood Ranges.

In addition, there will be an airborne traverse. On this, scientists of the University of Wisconsin will land by plane at 8 to 12 points along the 88th West Meridian between Horlick and Sentinel Mountain.

They will carry out seismic, gravity, and magnetic investigations, these may establish whether the continent is divided by a trough running between the Weddell Sea and the Ross Sea.

The Foundation also announced that preparations are underway for two traverses in the 1960–61 season. One of these would go from the Byrd Station to the coast of the Bellingshausen Sea and the other penetrate the high polar plateau in the area between McMurdo, the Soviet station Vostok, and the South Pole station.

As part of the biological research program, studies will be made on the ecology of the Ross Sea area, the fish in McMurdo Sound, the sexual behavior and orientation of the Adélie penguin. Also to be studied is the theory that salt taken in by the penguin is eliminated through nasal discharges.

The programs of U.S. scientists during the 1960 winter season, starting in March, will be as follows:

Byrd Station: Eleven scientists will winter at Byrd Station pursuing studies in atmospheric noise, aurora, geomagnetism, glaciology, ionospheric physics, meteorology, and seismology.

Amundsen-Scott Station: Nine scientists will carry out investigations in aurora, geomagnetism, glaciology, ionospheric physics, and seismology as well as special studies in solar radiation, ozone measurements, carbon dioxide, and nuclear radiation.

Naval Air facility, McMurdo: Four scientists will investigate cosmic rays, conduct glaciological measurements, perform seismic soundings, and operate the biological laboratory there.

Hallett Station: In cooperation with three New Zealand scientists who will carry out auroral, geomagnetic, ionospheric, and seismic observations, two U.S. civilian meteorologists and three naval aerographers will make daily upper air and surface weather observations and conduct research in solar radiation.

Ellsworth Station: With Argentine scientists, who will operate the station, four U.S. scientists will do research on the aurora, cosmic radiation, geomagnetism, ionospheric physics, and meteorology.

Wilkes Station: Australian and U.S. scientists will carry out projects in auroral investigation, biology, geomagnetism, ionospheric physics, meteorology, and seismology at this Australian-operated station.

Scott Station: At this New Zealand post, two U.S. oceanographers will investigate the waters and the ocean bottom of McMurdo Sound. A U.S. physicist will work with a New Zealand scientist on problems of auroral physics.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 16, 1959]

UW RESEARCHERS PLAN MORE ANTARCTIC TRIPS—SCHOOL HAS BECOME ONE OF THE NATION'S IMPORTANT CENTERS IN SUCH STUDIES

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The University of Wisconsin has become one of the most important antarctic research centers in the country as the result of the allocation of more than $700,000 in Federal funds to the university.

The National Science Foundation, which allocated a total of $3,170,069 for scientific research in Antarctica, beginning October 1, granted the University of Wisconsin $566,985 to prepare for geophysical traverse programs in 1960 and 1961. The money will be spent for field work as well as research at Madison.

One traverse will leave the Byrd Station in the antarctic in November 1960, for the Bellingshausen seacoast, through a region never before explored.

Another traverse will seek to penetrate the high polar plateau between the U.S. Navy air facility at McMurdo Sound and the Russian station Vostok.

NOW AT WILKES STATION

Plans for those field studies are being worked out at the University of Wisconsin under the direction of Drs. G. P. Woollard, Charles R. Bentley and Edward C. Thiel, a native of Wausau, Wis.

Under a second grant of $135,930 to the university, the same three investigators will continue to reduce the seismic gravity and magnetic data collected on the traverses.

A third grant of $20,023 to the University of Wisconsin will finance a study of the climatology of the antarctic by Dr. Glenn P. Trewartha.

Richard L. Penny, who is working on a Ph. D. degree at the University of Wisconsin, is now at the Wilkes Station in the antarctic investigating orientation in the Adélie penguin and the parental and sexual behavior of the Adélie.

Penney's work will be carried on during the new exploration year beginning October 1 at the U.S. Hallett Station. The Wilkes Station was established by the United States but the American scientific program there is now being carried on cooperatively with the Australian Government.

HOPE FOR PROFILE

Probably the most dramatic undertaking of the new expedition will be an air borne traverse for seismic, gravity and magnetic investigations to be put into the field by the University of Wisconsin.

This project could determine whether the antarctic continent is divided into East and West Antarctica by a deep, ice filled trough between the Weddell and Ross Seas.

Dr. Thiel, who will direct the project, will be flown with two assistants along the 88th west meridian between the Horlick Mountains, named for the Racine (Wis.) malted milk family, and the Sentinel Mountains.

Their plane will be equipped with instruments, recently developed and refined, which, it is hoped, will enable them to take a profile of the land mass below. Thiel and his assistants will be landed at from 8 to 12 points along their route.

Thiel, now 31, got his doctorate at the University of Wisconsin in 1955. Before that he studied glaciers in Alaska. In 1956 he took a leave of absence from a teaching job at the University of Utah to do scientific work at the Weddell Station.

On that expedition Thiel, while on a traverse, used seismic soundings to detect a deep trough extending inland toward the Ross Sea from the Filchner ice shelf.

The bottom of the trough was found to average almost 4,000 feet below sea level, and Thiel's traverse party reported that the trough continued beyond the southerly limits of the traverse, swinging toward the southwest.

This may represent the Weddell Sea side of the hypothetical transantarctic trough.

DEPTH OF 4,400 FEET

More recently Bently led a traverse from the Byrd Station to the Horlick Mountains in a further effort to solve the problem of the trough's existence and exact location.

The newest evidence that the continent is separated by a trough was the discovery recently of the greatest bottom depth yet found beneath the Ross ice shelf.

A traverse party led by Albert P. Crary, chief scientist of the U.S. antarctic program, measured a record depth of 4,400 feet below sea level by a seismic sounding.

The existence of the trough was first suggested by Griffith Taylor, geologist with the 1901–04 British national antarctic expedition, led by Robert F. Scott.

Taylor's theory was based on studies of antarctic geography and the geology and geography of the nearby continents of South America and Australia.

The trough's existence is also suggested by the deep penetration into the interior of Antarctica of the Ross Sea on the Pacific side and the Weddell Sea on the Atlantic side.

THREE THOUSAND MEN INVOLVED

The Navy said Saturday that Operation Deep Freeze '60, the new name for its antarctic operation in support of our scientific program, will get underway this month.

Eight ships, three dozen aircraft and 3,000 men will be involved. There will be four icebreakers, two cargo ships, a tanker, and a destroyer escort.

Most of the scientists, including those from Wisconsin, are expected to fly to Christchurch, New Zealand, whence they will be flown to McMurdo Sound about October 1.

TASS REPORTS EXPEDITION

Ships of the task force will begin their unloading and loading operations December 10. They will all stage through New Zealand ports.

The icebreakers *Glacier* and *Burton Island*, said the Navy, will attempt to penetrate the Bellinghousen-Amundsen seacoasts in February to obtain oceanographic, cartographic and geological data of that unknown area.

Tass, the Russian news agency, said last week that the All-Union Arctic and Antarctic Research Institute in Leningrad had begun preparation for the Soviet Union's fifth expedition to the Antarctic, where the Russians maintain five stations.

Rear Adm. David M. Tyree: New Commander, U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctic

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a statement to the House of Representatives on July 28, 1959, I included a biographical sketch by Harry W. Frantz, distinguished foreign correspondent of the United Press International, of Rear Adm. George J. Dufek, the retiring commander of the U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica.

A sequel to that news story is another informative biographical sketch also by Mr. Frantz of United Press International of Rear Adm. David M. Tyree, who, on April 14, 1959, succeeded Rear Admiral Dufek as commander of this important task force for antarctic exploration.

Under leave to extend, I quote the indicated news story, which is most informative:

REAR ADM. DAVID M. TYREE: NEW COMMANDER, U.S. NAVAL SUPPORT FORCE, ANTARCTICA

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON.—Rear Adm. David M. Tyree foresees an era of development on the Antarctic Continent, leading toward permanent human habitation and utility to world science, communications, and economy.

Tyree became commander of the U.S. Naval Support Force, Antarctica, at New York on April 14, 1959, relieving Read Adm. George Dufek, who commanded Operations Deep Freeze I, II, III, and IV. He also serves as U.S. antarctic projects officer, by Presidential appointment.

He is now making the plans for Deep Freeze 1960. The Roman numeral system has been abandoned in favor of identification by fiscal years: thus 1960 is the 12 months ending June 30, 1960.

Tyree will leave Washington September 10 for New Zealand, and on October 1 will fly to the U.S. McMurdo Sound Base. In the approaching antarctic season, 8 ships, 35 airplanes, several helicopters, and about 3,000 men will be engaged in the support operations for the scientific program sponsored by the National Science Foundation.

The year is considered extremely important in the evolution of Antarctica's future. Twelve countries which engaged in antarctic projects during the International Geophysical Year, 1957–58 intend to continue their antarctic researches.

They presently cooperate through an international special committee for antarctic research. On October 15, representatives of 12 nations including the Soviet Union will meet at Washington to attempt negotiation of an international treaty, proposed by President Eisenhower, for cooperation in scientific and other peaceful purposes. Territorial claims in antarctica would be kept in the status quo.

Like his naval predecessors in the antarctic support operations, Admiral Tyree is not directly involved in antarctic diplomacy which is handled by the State Department, except as technical advice is required.

Tyree already has brought unusual technical viewpoints and a novel philosophy to bear upon the United States outlook toward Antarctica.

"We are approaching a new era in Antarctica, and looking to the future," he said to the United Press International. "If the new international treaty is concluded, there will be a long period of international scientific cooperation.

"We would hope that in the years to come we could organize our efforts on an economic basis, and obtain the scientific knowledge that the world needs. Who knows what Antarctica may mean in the coming 'space age'?

"There will be a rising interest in the future need for air routes across Antarctica, such as have already been established in northern polar regions."

Tyree believes that nuclear reactors, to be used for heating buildings and to melt

ice for clean water supplies, could greatly increase the possibilities of permanent human habitations at the Antarctic stations. There is a possibility that a nuclear reactor may be installed at the McMurdo Sound Base early in 1961.

The admiral said that for a century world interest in Antarctica was chiefly directed to the geographical exploration of the unknown continent. Later there developed a combined interest in exploration and the advancement of scientific knowledge, which culminated in the International Geophysical Year program of 1957–58.

"Now," he concluded, "we are on the threshold of what may be called an era of development, with prospects for completion of the exploration and many opportunities for advances in scientific and other peaceful enterprises."

Apart from his distinguished service as a line officer in Pacific theaters during World War II and the Korean conflict, Admiral Tyree is especially known in the Navy for his technical contributions in the field of explosives and propulsion materials. A graduate at Annapolis in 1925, he later received the degree of Master of Science at the University of Michigan in 1934, and he also had advanced courses in the National War College.

His official duties have involved long contact with scientific institutions and with technical establishments of the Navy. His reputation for successful collaboration with scientists was an important consideration in his appointment as commander of naval support operations in Antarctica.

The continent is sometimes called a great scientific laboratory. Good will and effective collaboration between the scientists and the Navy is indispensable to maximum success of the U.S. program.

International cooperation in Antarctica puts a premium on diplomacy. Admiral Tyree is a quiet-mannered man who thinks before he talks. While under his command, the U.S.S. *Renville* in the Java Sea was used for the successful cease-fire operations between the Netherlands and Indonesia under auspices of the United Nations.

The Government of the Netherlands awarded him the Order of the Orange of Nassau, rank of commander.

Admiral Tyree was born in Washington, D.C., January 23, 1904.

In 1943 he was awarded the Legion of Merit for participation in all phases of the Solomon Islands campaign and fulfillment of extremely hazardous assignments at the occupation of the Russell Islands and the assault on New Georgia.

In 1944 he was commended for his staff services in training, planning and conducting operations of the Third Amphibious Force against the Japanese at islands in the Bougainville area.

In June 1944 he was assigned to the Bureau of Ordnance, Navy Department, and in the same year he was Navy member of the Army's Chemical Warfare Committee. He was commended by both services.

For operations of the U.S.S. *New Jersey* during the Korean conflict he was cited for brilliant leadership, sound judgment and inspiring devotion to duty.

Improving Housing Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we give further consideration to the housing legislation, I would like to call attention to provisions relating to the loan authority for the FHA program.

Over the years, the FHA has performed a splendid service to the people of the country. During its lifetime, the FHA—through its mortgage insurance programs—has helped to provide homes for millions of American families, and housing for hundreds of thousands of other families in rental and cooperative projects.

In Wisconsin, over 3,000 home mortgages, amounting to over $37 million, were processed in 1958 alone. During the period 1935–58, the FHA insured 39,671 mortgages in our Badger State.

Overall, this program has helped to make it possible for three out of every five American families to own their own homes. Although a federally sponsored program, it is significant to the American taxpayer that the FHA is self-supporting.

Important, to, is the fact that there have been relatively few loan delinquencies. As a matter of fact, a nationwide survey recently indicated that currently, the delinquency rate for FHA—as well as the GI home loan program—has been at an alltime low during the 3-month period preceding June 30, 1959.

Although I frankly feel that the FHA authorization should be put on a permanent basis—as recommended by the administration—the amendment adopted yesterday to provide an additional $8 billion loan authorization and extend the program until October 1, 1960, will at least carry the program forward.

At this time, I am pleased to point out that my home State of Wisconsin—not continually looking to Uncle Sam to meet the problems of its citizens—has sponsored a fine housing program that, too, is helping folks in our Badger State to own their own homes.

Recently, this program—permitting second mortgage loans to veterans, at liberal repayment terms—celebrated its 10th anniversary. During its 10-year lifetime, it has helped more than 20,000 Wisconsin veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict to get additional money for home purchases.

Recent editions of the Milwaukee Journal carried two articles:

First. Showing the low rates of delinquencies under the FHA and VA programs; and

Second. Outlining this fine State-sponsored program for assisting veterans and their families to own homes.

I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 16, 1959]

FHA, VA LOAN DELINQUENCIES LOW

Home buyers in the United States with GI mortgages and Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insured loans set new records for keeping their loan payments current in the 3-month period ending last June 30.

In a nationwide survey of 2,664,688 loans the Mortgage Bankers Association of America (MBA) said that the overall delinquency ratio for FHA and GI loans was at an all-time low for the 3-month period.

Only FHA loans that were 3 months overdue were more delinquent this year than last, the survey showed. The MBA said the delinquency rate for 1,128,792 GI loans studied was the lowest since the survey was started 6 years ago.

The MBA said that only 1.83 percent of all GI loans were 1 month overdue, 0.37 percent for 2 months and only 0.28 percent for 3 months. At the same time last year, GI delinquencies were 2.06 percent for 30 days, 0.42 percent for 60 days, and 0.34 percent for 90 days.

Only 1.30 percent of the FHA insured mortgages surveyed were 1 month overdue, 0.24 percent for 2 months and 0.17 percent for 3 months, up slightly from last year. Last year's figures were 1.43 percent, 0.27 percent, and 0.13 percent, respectively.

Comparable figures for the State were not available from the Milwaukee offices of the FHA and Veterans' Administration (VA). As of July 31, there were 138 FHA-type home loans in the State reported in arrears, compared to 128 last year. There were 995 GI loans delinquent so far this year, compared to 857 at the same time last year, the VA said.

While spokesmen for both agencies here estimated that the Wisconsin delinquency ratio probably was near or lower than the national average, they said they had no figures on their total number of loans still outstanding to develop percentages.

On conventional loans, the MBA's survey showed a 1-month delinquency rate of 1.01 percent; for 2 months, 0.26 percent, and for 3 months, 0.16 percent.

The national delinquency rate on all types of loans was 1.98 percent as against 2.19 percent a year ago, the association said.

[From the Milwaukee, Wis. Journal, Aug. 9, 1959]

STATE AIDED 20,000 GI's TO GET HOMES

(By Chris Lecos)

The 10th anniversary of a State program that has helped more than 20,000 Wisconsin veterans of World War II and the Korean war get additional money to buy houses slipped by last week with little fanfare.

It was on August 5, 1949, that former Gov. Oscar A. Rennebohm signed into law the bill that permitted the State to make second mortgage loans to veterans at liberal interest and repayment terms.

Between then and June 30, 1959, the State made 20,251 loans to Wisconsin veterans for a total of $54,193,353—an average of slightly less than $2,700 per loan.

Slightly more than one-fourth of the number—5,189—were loans made to Milwaukee County veterans for a total of $14,525,326.

Approximately 35 percent of all loans being made at the present time are going to Milwaukee County applicants, according to Gordon A. Huseby, Madison, director of the State Department of Veterans' Affairs, which administers the program.

Several major changes have been made in the law in the last 10 years. At the start, a veteran could borrow only up to $2,000. He now can get up to $3,500. The original interest rate—2 percent a year on the unpaid balance—and the maximum term—20 years—has been unchanged.

When the law was passed it limited State second mortgage loans to the "purchase, improvement or construction" of a house that did not exceed $10,000 in price, including the cost of the land.

In 1951, the limit was raised to $15,000. A legislative attempt to boost that to $17,500 last year failed to get out of committee.

Basically unchanged over the years have been these provisions:

The veteran must have at least one dependent—wife, parent, etc.

He must have been honorably discharged after at least 90 days of service from August

27, 1940, to July 25, 1947, or from June 27, 1950, to January 31, 1955. A veteran discharged because of a service connected disability but with less than 90 days service is eligible also.

The veteran must have been a resident of the State when he entered service, or he must have lived in Wisconsin 10 years since his discharge and must not have received a veteran's bonus from another State.

RECORD SET IN 1951

Statistics provided by Huseby showed that more veterans received loans in the first few years of the program than in more recent years.

For example, from October 1949 to June 1951 (while the price ceiling was $10,000), the State made 2,715 loans. The year the State boosted the ceiling to $15,000—1951—the largest volume was recorded—6,752 loans for a total of $20,367,000.

Since then, the number of loans made each year has dropped. Between 1953 and 1959, the number of loans ranged between a high of 2,663 and a low of 1,201. In the fiscal year ending last June 30, the total was 1,614 loans.

Huseby said the drop in volume was not entirely due to lack of veteran interest. The inability of some counties to continue making loans contributed to the dip, he said.

LAW HAS BEEN CHANGED

During the peak 1951 period, 12 of the State's 71 counties exhausted allocated funds and had to stop making loans. By 1957, the figure had risen to 32 counties. Last year, 11 more counties ran out of funds.

The legislature took steps this year to provide a "more reasonable distribution" of funds.

It amended the law to provide that all the counties must turn in leftover funds to the State for redistribution to the 71 counties each March. Redistribution still will be on the basis of the veteran population in each county. Milwaukee County now gets the largest single share—26.59 percent.

The first allocation under the new law was made April 1, when Milwaukee County received $1,261,000, slightly more than it had actually turned in, said Jack Luban, Milwaukee County veterans service officer.

SIX HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND DOLLARS ON HAND

Only once in the 10-year history of the program has Milwaukee County run out of funds, Luban noted. That was between August 1952 and December 1953, he said. At present, the county has an estimated $662,000 for loans to veterans.

Luban cited several factors that could tend to deter or prevent some veterans from obtaining loans from the State.

One is a rise in home prices, particularly in the Milwaukee area. Since the $15,000 ceiling covers the house and lot, plus well and septic tank costs, if these are required, the veteran has a smaller field of housing to choose from, it was indicated.

Luban said the great majority of the loans were used for purchase of an existing house.

Also, the need for State secondary financing aid may not be as great, he observed. Some veterans undoubtedly have been able to find satisfactory financing through the low down payment loans backed by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) or the Veterans' Administration (VA), Luban said.

INCOME REQUIREMENT

Other potential borrowers could be blocked by a requirement that total monthly payments for both the first mortgage and the State loan cannot exceed 25 percent of the veteran's gross monthly income, he added.

Overtime pay, part-time earnings and even a wife's income cannot be considered. Luban added that "excessive" indebtedness also could affect a veteran's eligibility.

But, despite the various factors that affect volume, officials said, the program has helped veterans, particularly those who wanted low priced houses and who had the required minimum 5 percent of the total cost available as a down payment.

The program has "probably been one of the prime and best factors of rehabilitation that the State has developed in getting a veteran into his own home," Huseby said. "We believe that home ownership is a very potent factor in getting a veteran stabilized as a self-supporting citizen in his community, because that is where his rehabilitation must take place."

Wisconsin veterans have proved to be reliable risks. Last October, Huseby told the legislative council's judiciary committee that only 47 out of 19,332 second mortgage loans made by the State had been written off as losses.

How Scandinavia Solved the Khrushchev Embarrassment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that more and more of the people of America are beginning to share the concern I expressed in my remarks of August 10 with respect to the impending visit of Nikita Khrushchev, and the impact such a visit will have here and abroad. That was also the attitude of the people of the Scandinavian countries when he was scheduled to visit them in July. However, in the case of Scandinavia before things went too far respected persons in religious, court, and parliamentary circles exerted their efforts and their influence to alert public opinion and forestall the visit. The results gained world wide publicity.

At this time I would like to insert a part of a statement from the MRA Information Service bulletin of August 1, 1959, which relates the sequence of events which led to the cancellation of the Khrushchev visit to Scandinavia.

Facts which led to the cancellation of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's trip to Scandinavia were given July 21 by Bror Johnson of Sweden at the Summit Strategy Conference for Moral Rearmament, Mackinac Island, Michigan. He is the son of Bishop Bengt Jonzon, one of the men whose ideological stand made the Soviet Premier change his plans.

In an official Soviet report the Moscow Government said it believed now is not the opportune moment for the visit of the Soviet Premier in view of the position taken by the press and certain personalities in the northern countries. The Government hopes that the atmosphere will be more favorable in some years' time.

Among the personalities referred to are James Dickson, a Member of the Swedish Parliament and a Chamberlain to the King of Sweden; Bishop Jonzon, for 19 years bishop of the largest Swedish diocese including the strategic iron ore mines of northern Sweden; and Ole Bjorn Kraft, Vice President of the Danish Parliament, former Foreign Minister and Chairman of NATO during 1952–53.

Dickson issued a statement at the summit Strategy Conference at Mackinac, widely quoted in the Swedish and world press, that he had made a serious mistake in Parliament last year when he said he would not oppose Khrushchev's visit to Sweden this summer.

"Khrushchev should not come to Scandinavia and the invitation should be withdrawn," said Dickson. "His visit is not meant to be merely a social visit. It is part of the ideological war he himself has proclaimed. This time it is against Scandinavia. Next time it might be against the United States. So America should be prepared.

"I had not considered how such a visit would affect the nations of Africa and Asia. Our official invitation would set a precedent of acceptance to other areas of the world to entertain communism and its leaders."

Ideological trap. Dickson went from Mackinac to the parallel meeting of the summit strategy conference at Caux, Switzerland, where he met with Bishop Jonzon and other Nordic leaders. They planned how to alert public opinion to the ideological trap concealed in Khrushchev's visit.

Bishop Jonzon then issued an open letter to the leadership of Scandinavia simultaneously from Caux and Mackinac 2 weeks ago. He said, "Inviting Khrushchev to our country is the same as letting the enemy through the frontline in a shooting war. It is wrong, unwise and stupid. The only alternative to communism is to choose moral rearmament and live it as individuals and nations."

Bishop Jonzon said in his statement, "People say peaceful coexistence is possible, but the third world war—ideological war—is being waged now, and the Communists believe they will carry it to victory even by military means if necessary.

"Every word and action of Khrushchev serves a definite purpose; to split the free world, to confuse our judgment, to break down the will to resist, to encourage defeatism, through trade to bind our economy to the Communist bloc and finance our final incorporation in the Soviet system.

"It was shaking to see with what supreme skill Mikoyan played on every string during his visit to America—idealism, love of peace, sentimentality, naivete, sensation, vanity, business sense, Mammon.

"There are two world centers where people are planning and working night and day to make God's will effective in the life of every nation in order to break the materialism in West and East, and create an ideologically sound world for free people. These places are the MRA Assembly centers at Mackinac Island, Mich., and Caux, Switzerland.

"If we don't choose to live moral rearmament both as individuals and as nations, we choose communism as Khrushchev wants and intends by his visit. For as William Penn said, 'Men must choose to be governed by God or they condemn themselves to be ruled by tyrants.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that an informed and aroused public opinion can have its effect, even upon so insensitive a person as Nikita Khrushchev. Let us hope that a similar outcry from the people of the United States will let him know that he is not welcome here. Perhaps it would induce him to become conveniently indisposed and force him to call off his plans to impose his undesirable presence upon us.

Forests Take Vision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the August edition of American Forests magazine, there is an article by a West Virginian which gives a good illustration of the myriad of benefits which can accrue from home-style, do-it-yourself forestry.

The article recounts how the author, Robert E. Bowers, and his partner purchased 123 acres of timber in Roane County, W. Va., and have nurtured it into manifold productivity. It also tells of the great personal satisfaction which the two have received from working in cooperation with the Mother Earth.

Mr. President, I am a strong supporter of nationwide forestry efforts; I am a cosponsor of the wilderness bill and the Youth Conservation Corps bill, and I have worked for broadening of our national forest system. Yet, I feel that it is also important that the American people, as individuals and as owners of woodland property, should actively partake in the preservation and management of the green heritage which we have been given in our forests. Such personal endeavor and responsible ownership can greatly assist our Federal efforts to meet the mushrooming forest demands of the years ahead.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Forests Take Vision," may be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORESTS TAKE VISION

(By Robert R. Bowers)

For as long as memory can recall, autumn has been my favorite season. The painted forests have drawn me into the hinterlands on every occasion possible, for truly there is no time of greater natural beauty. Last year, however, the trees in Roane County, W. Va., seemed a bit brighter; the beauty somewhat more glowing; the air slightly sweeter. Sugar trees were a deeper gold; hickories slightly browner. Across the valley and up the mountain, the richness of the season was more pronounced and the woods were more enticing. In seasons before, I had walked upon these lands, but the soil and the trees had belonged to somebody else. Last fall, the land upon which I ambled and the trees which I admired were all my own.

It is difficult to express the feeling of such ownership to a man who has never owned anything but a city lot. But the responsibility I felt for my land and the pride it gave me were something which I had never before known.

Sentiment, you ask? Hardly. This land with all its fascinations is now a business. The beauty of it is something extra which cannot be evaluated on any business ledger, but which is certainly a part of the venture. And it is not taxable.

Sentiment? Sure, forest land has sentiment with it, and if it doesn't it resolves itself into just another impersonal business investment. Too often forest land is nothing more than "a business" which must produce the most revenue as quickly as possible with the least effort in the long run. To me, however, my forest is my son and daughter's future education, and their children's education as well, and that's about as personal as a man can get.

If somehow people more than 50 years old could impart their hindsight to youngsters, the future of our children and our natural resources would be secure. That is a conclusion reached by my partner, Walter Mitchell, and me after little more than a year of managing 123 acres of forest land. We bought the land with no hope of realizing any monetary return for more than 10 years, and with the possibility that it would take 15 years. Our children are now about to reach school age. Our plan was to improve our timber through thinnings and plantings, figuring that our first timber sale would coincide with the entrance of our youngsters into college.

Walter and I have tried to enlist the aid and advice of every man or agency who has dealt with forest problems. We have had problems, but professional guidance should keep us from any catastrophic occurrences.

We bought our 123 acres of timber from an oldtimer who was indeed a rare individual. He, despite his age, could see merit in waiting for his forest land investment to pay off. "If I were 20 years younger," he told us, "I'd never have let that land go." Unfortunately, most landowners in this same county don't look at their forests that way. They own them now, and many always have owned them. But to the average man, his timber is either "worthless brush" or "ready to cut." There is no in between. Most of these people cannot see beyond the immediate sale of timber.

The land we purchased had been cut some 7 years before. The timber cutters had high-graded it, and slaughtered the young stuff in the process. When they left, it must have been a desolate sight to behold. However, the land was coming back. Young yellow poplars had shoved through the slash and debris, reaching for the sun from the moist valley floor. The field where the sawmill had been contained several dozen husky 7-year-old black walnut trees, which stood nearly 10 feet tall. Another 3 years and they would bear their first harvestable crop of nuts.

Along the drier ridges and on the thin soils of the southern exposure, white oak and hickory predominated. The oaks formed a heavy coppice on every stump, while a few 8-inch trees had the markings of future timber. Intermingled with the poplars were young beech, walnuts, and locusts. Down in one hollow, an abundance of azaleas flowered in profusion, adding a touch of color. We earmarked them for future house plants. Everybody loves flowering plants, and healthy wild ones of this variety have special enticement. Ten acres of 16- to 18-inch beech appeared sound and offered some immediate potential for timber.

A county road crosses our land, separating 3 acres of goldenrod and bramble from the woods. It borders on 1,500 feet of the Little Poca River, a fine smallmouth bass and muskie stream.

Each time we walked over our land we learned something new about it. Soon each rock and stump and tree took on a meaning within itself. The land soon became more personal, and its potential and problems more apparent. We are proud of our choice of areas. It was not the best in the country; neither was it the worst. One might have called it typical of most cutover land in the eight-county area surrounding us. If we could make a go of our project, make it pay, and cite it as an example, there was a good chance of making forestry prominent in our section. We were, and still are, completely confident that we can. In fact, nearly a dozen individuals just like us have begun investigating land for future purchase, simply because they have been convinced that we know what we are talking about. That, in itself, is a sign of progress.

In 1 year's time, our enterprise has proven the wisdom of our judgment. During that time, however, many frustrations lay in our path.

First of all, we were attempting to operate a business while living 75 miles from our homes. Such a distance kills working hours one could put to good use by taking them up in travel. We had considered this before we invested, but since land is somewhat less expensive at that distance from Charleston, limited funds forced us to buy it there. We got the same quality property for about one-half the price of similar land within 50 miles of our homes.

Secondly, we encountered a minor difficulty the first time we visited the area. We were caught in a heavy rainstorm and became lost for nearly 3 hours. That just about washed out our enthusiasm. Later on, during the winter freezing and thawing, our cars became mired axle deep in mud four times. Each time, however, some kind soul pulled us out.

Our land is typical of the 5 million acres of West Virginia. It is neither good land nor bad land. Nor does its potential differ greatly from any area in the surrounding counties. Yet, we wouldn't sell our 123 acres for $50 an acre now, while much of the land surrounding us could be purchased for $30 or less per acre.

Most of the land around us is owned by farmers who have spent their lives there. Some have been there for generations, yet we can draw a more detailed picture of our woodland than most of them. Their woodlands have been nothing more than fence-posts or firewood to them these many years. When someone offered a price for the big trees they sold for what they could get. Thereafter, the brush that seeded in was forgotten or cleared away to make room for grass. Fortunately, these people are not inclined to burn every spring and fall.

We bought our forest; these people got theirs by inheritance. Ours was intentional; theirs was accidental. Theirs was taken for granted; ours was to assure our children a college education 15 years from now. They see little future in their woods; our 123 acres will pay off the mortgage in 10 years. From then on our harvest will be profit. Most of these forest owners sit and hope for a buyer for their big trees; we go looking for markets for every product from our land, and there is certainly much more than timber.

When we bought our land in 1958, the mines were down. This killed one major market for 4- to 10-inch oak and hickory saplings. Most timber owners closed their shops to await return of the good times again. We studied every product we had, from timber to nuts to flowering shrubs. Then we inquired about markets in all directions.

The first nontimber use we recognized was our black walnut crop. There are about 100 large walnut trees on the area. They are gnarled, and are bypassed by the cutters. Yet, they have produced from 1 to 20 bushels of nuts per year, averaging about 5 bushels per tree. Walnuts sell in West Virginia for $3 per hundred pounds. That meant that our annual crop had a potential value of approximately $400. Time involved in harvesting, distance from market, and transportation costs would eat into this gross

value heavily, but the future would work these problems out.

A survey indicated that we could cut 10 cords of firewood or mine props per acre without hurting the growing stock. This amount could be removed in our initial improvement cuttings, which were aimed at increasing the growth increment of the trees left for future timber. There is an excellent firewood market in my home town, but 75 miles is a long way to haul timber. Nevertheless, more than 1,000 cords at $16 to $18 per cord cannot be overlooked. One drawback has faced us constantly. We can get enough orders for firewood, but we don't own a truck. We don't dare hire a truck and then look for orders, and we can't take orders in advance as we may not get enough to pay the transportation charges. The solution: we are going to get a truck, but not for awhile.

The need for the improvement cutting was exemplified by a 14-inch chestnut oak which had been released to some degree back in 1951. A core drilling showed that during the 10 years preceding the 1951 cut, the oak had grown one-quarter inch on a side. After release, it had grown three-quarters inch in 7 years. Such findings expedited the initial improvement cutting. We contacted the Agricultural Conservation Program office in Spencer. We hoped to sign up under the cost-sharing plan, for 25 acres the first year. The ACP pays up to $10 per acre for labor costs involved in timber stand improvement. At that time, we were the only ones to sign up for timber-improvement during 1958, which pointed up the lack of understanding among the people for their forest potential. The ACP man decided he would allow us 15 acres, instead of 25. We were disappointed, but left the office eager to get started. When the approval came through it was for only 10 acres. At that rate it would take us 12 years to improve our entire 123 acres. We accepted the acreage figure as approved, and planned to sign up for 25 acres in 1959.

It was probably just as well we only got 10 acres approved, because the work had to be done by December 31, 1958. Our approval arrived on December 12. Vacation time, weekends, and free time of our neighbors were imposed upon, but we finished our work with axes under the deadline. Blisters and calluses covered our hands and feet, and scars from flying chips pock-marked our arms, but we did it!

Within 30 days a check arrived for $114 as repayment for the labor involved in the stand improvement. This was our first return from the property, even though more than that had been spent for labor, travel and equipment. When we bought the area we didn't have one tool. We now have three double-bitted axes, two shovels, one brush hook, and a rake. We hope to purchase a powersaw before starting the next cutting. An office man just can't stand to sit all week then cut trees with an axe all day on weekends.

As quickly as the check arrived, we signed up under the ACP program for tree planting. We had some erosion problems and about seven acres of bramble land that needed planting. This spring we planted 7,300 conifer seedlings, for which we are to receive $20 per acre, or $140, from the ACP. By the time the trees were in the ground, more than $238 had been invested: $139 for a three-man crew to plant them, $86 for the trees, and $12 for a man to plow furrows in the bottomland for planting.

This planting was done for three reasons: beautification, Christmas trees, and pulpwood. Beauty would take a year, Christmas trees 6 years, and pulpwood at least 15 years. Because we try not to be too optimistic, we count on only two-thirds of the trees surviving to maturity or at least to useful size. Christmas trees at 6 years of age should bring an average of $1 per tree, if properly pruned and shaped. Our hope is to harvest about 500 Christmas trees in 6 years, 500 in 7 years, and 1,500 in 8 years. From these we hope to obtain $2,500 in gross income. The remaining pines, white, Scotch, red, and Virginia, will be left to grow into pulpwood, which should produce about 20 cords per acre in 15–20 years. The 750 Norway spruce will be lifted at about 5 years of age and sold alive for house base plants and lawn decoration. We hope to harvest 500 for this purpose at an average of $3 per tree. Good ones will bring $5, but the average will be $3. Our spruce should bring us a total of $1,500 in 5 or 6 years. This market is almost assured, as there is heavy demand for such decorations in our area.

The pessimists have told us that the Christmas tree market will be flooded by the time our trees mature. I don't believe it. We'll have competition. Here's hoping we'll have plenty of it by then. In fact, if we had our way, every eroded hillside in Roane County would be competing with us in the next 6 years. We hope our example will sell farmers on planting those barren, nonproductive slopes to trees of some kind. We hope they will see the wisdom in it by our example. So far as competition is concerned, however, we don't worry about it. West Virginia is now growing several million Christmas trees, but still two-thirds of our annual purchases come from other States.

Our first appraisal was quite like anybody else's. But after a closer look we began to consider our acreage as a group of units, each having its own personality and characteristics which had to be considered for maximum yield and income.

For instance, we could slaughter the beech and sell it cheaply, because at present there is not a great market for it. We think that there will be someday, and we can wait. If not, we'll have a beautiful squirrel woods, and that is worth something. So we'll thin the beech and let it grow. It is fair-sized now; it will grow faster in the future.

When we started a critical analysis of our property, we envisioned it as a multiple use area in which every possible outlet must be considered. Improvement of the stand was our first consideration, with the thinnings as firewood and possibly pulp. Of course, we hoped for some sideline hunting during the interim. That was one facet we really underestimated. One month after buying the area, we jumped a covey of 18 quail and 2 grouse one morning not 50 feet from the road. On opening day of the squirrel season, six of us killed 13 squirrels and spotted nearly 50 on a 10-acre plot of beech hickory. By afternoon we had killed nearly 20. More than this, that October day the four visitors, whom we didn't know until then, caught a nice string of smallmouth bass and panfish from our river. If nothing more, we had purchased a really fine hunting and fishing area which in itself is rewarding in these days of hunting and fishing pressures and posted land.

One of the frustrations of our venture came from our hunter friends. Four of them stayed all night in our shack and we had to sleep in our car. That wasn't bad, but they also had our stands by the time we got into the woods. We forgave them. Next day, they had a notion about running us off our own property, until they found out we owned it. When we requested that they clean up the garbage around the shack before they returned to hunting, they all agreed nicely. We returned to the woods to hunt. Upon our return, our friends were gone but the garbage remained. In fact, bottles were broken, the shack floor had been used as a bathroom, and the place was an unsightly mess.

Walter and I decided that the vandals were not typical, so the land remains open to anyone who cares to hunt or fish. After all, one doesn't write about brotherly love among landowners and sportsmen for 8 years, and then lose his religion at the first infringement upon his property rights. My faith in humanity was dimmed for awhile, but I recovered.

Watching the squirrels work on hickory nuts opened up another aspect of forest ownership which we will investigate to the fullest. We have about 300 hickory trees, and at least 50 of them produce a heavy crop of nuts. These are relatively thin shelled shagbark nuts which taste almost like pecans. Market possibilities are in doubt at present. If, however, there is no demand, we will create one. The nuts are just too good to waste.

Walter and I each spent 20 hours removing grapevines and suppressing growth from 3 dozen healthy young walnut trees last fall. The trees had seeded in naturally after the logging operation 8 years ago. They should be producing nuts in 2 or 3 years, which we can add to our growing list of possible sales. We are cultivating them for the future. They are close to the road and accessible, which adds incentive to our project of releasing special trees.

Speaking of nuts, last November we planted several hundred Chinese chestnut seeds. This spring they came through the ground in fine fashion, and we should have several hundred seedlings for sale this fall or next spring. We hope to use the money to buy fertilizer to put on the chestnut trees we keep for our orchard. On June 1, 1959, our seedlings stood almost a foot high. They should be from 2 to 3 feet high this fall. The squirrels dug up a few, but that's part of the price you pay for having a multiple-use area. We already have a half-dozen orders for our young chestnut seedlings this fall.

It is not my claim that I was born with any special wisdom about land and trees and such. Nor it is my claim that I have any great ability to predict the future. In fact despite hard work and planning, this whole venture may fall flat on its face, but I doubt it. My one claim is that I know something about land and something about trees, and my faith in both is as deeply implanted as the roots of a 300-year-old white oak which marks a corner of our land. And I believe in my State and in my Nation. There is no sounder investment than land and forests.

Personal Guilt of Communist Dictator Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in a Senate speech last week I tried to point out the personal guilt of Communist dictator Khrushchev for a series of atrocities against the people of Hungary and their leaders in the revolt of 1956.

Today's Washington Post and Times Herald carries a report of eight additional murders to be charged against Khrushchev.

Eight additional murders do not constitute a large entry in the record of one who is involved either directly or indirectly in the murder of millions. But I call it to the attention of the Senate

as one more reminder of the kind of man we are welcoming to our shores as an honored guest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the August 18 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNGARY EXECUTES EIGHT LINKED TO 1956 REBELLION

BUDAPEST, August 17.—Communist Hungary has executed eight men recently convicted of political crimes, according to an unconfirmed report circulating today among Western diplomats.

The report of the executions is the final chapter of a secret trial story that has been heard in Western circles since last spring. It has been impossible to verify the reports through official sources.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman would neither confirm nor deny the reports of the executions.

The trial rumors never clearly spelled out the charges on which the men were supposedly brought to court. They allegedly stemmed from the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

According to the most persistent reports, the men involved were mostly workers from Ujpest, an industrial suburb of Budapest.

Ten were reported sentenced to death in the original trial but two of these sentences were reduced to life imprisonment in an appeal hearing last month. About 15 other persons reportedly received prison sentences.

Sources for the execution reports were unable to give any names.

Poison in Your Water—No. 156

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Oregon Journal of Portland, Oreg., of May 26, 1959, entitled "Dirty River Cleanup Job Partly Done."

DIRTY RIVER CLEANUP JOB PARTLY DONE
(By Watford Reed)

Portland residents sighed with pride early in 1955 when the city neared completion of its $19,000 sewage disposal project. They thought the job was done.

It was as though a football team reached its opponents' 10-yard line, the rooting section sang the school song and the team trotted off the field while the opposing team kept on playing.

The job was only partly done.

With the Columbia River and Portland Harbor polluted 97 times above accepted standards for swimming, Portland is exposing its residents and neighbors who water ski or use the streams for other purposes to the threat of serious illness.

A small part of Portland's woes have been inherited. The annexation of Garthwick in 1950 added 300 residents whose sewage still is dumped straight into the Willamette. The annexation of the Vermont Hills area added a few hundred, although most of the district's sewage is treated by a plant built before the area joined Portland.

The city's sewage disposal plant provides only primary treatment for the sewage that is poured into the Columbia. Primary treatment means screening and sedimentation, which takes 30 to 35 percent of the total organic matter and about 65 percent of the suspended matter out of sewage.

State officials say that henceforth secondary treatment will be required of all sewage where the effluent is dumped into the Willamette. This kind of treatment, which depends mainly on the work of bacteria, can remove from 85 to 95 percent of the organic matter in sewage, depending on the degree of treatment—and almost 100 percent of the germs.

Milwaukee, Wis., makes commercial fertilizer from its sewage to avoid contaminating Lake Michigan. The sale of the fertilizer reduces the cost of treatment to the city, although it does not yield an overall profit.

In the case of Portland, sanitary officials would be satisfied at present if the city would chlorinate effluent dumped into the Columbia.

Nor is Portland the only city on which Federal and State authorities are "lowering the boom." The public health service has taken steps involving St. Joseph, Mo.; Washington, D.C.; Omaha, Nebr., and Council Bluffs, Iowa; Kansas City, St. Louis, Sioux City, Iowa, and others. Most of the cities have cooperated.

In Portland, city officials estimate the cost of covering those last 10 yards to the goal line at $5 million. They profess to believe that the city's voters would rebel at proposals to spend that much more.

Yet $5 million is slightly more than the cost of 1 mile of city freeway, and scores of miles of freeway are projected for Portland.

City officials may be right, however, for Portland voters have shown a preference for frills that look nice over necessities that are not conspicuous. In 1956, for instance, they voted down a $5 million proposal to rebuild overloaded sewers that already had burst and flooded basements. And at the same election they joined the rest of the county in voting money for a new western approach to the Hawthorne bridge.

City officials believe that the voters were against spending money for sewage disposal when they killed a $39,500,000 "package" plan last November. State officials are convinced that the voters would have approved the $5 million items for sewage disposal if it had been on the ballot alone.

All over the country increasing numbers of people are becoming convinced that if mankind is going to use nature's gifts, such as streams it has a duty to keep them in condition almost as good in that in which human beings first found them.

And whether the State wins or loses its legal action to force Portland to abate pollution, the issue cannot be delayed much longer.

Harry Golden Pays Tribute to the Late Harold Duane Jacobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the Carolina Israelite for August 1959, the noted editor and author, Harry Golden, has paid tribute to a newspaperman of integrity and ability, the late Harold Duane Jacobs of the Baltimore Post. All who knew Harold Jacobs—as I was privileged to do—respected his devotion to the cause of the fourth estate. He practiced journalism as a great profession, and to it he brought genuine distinction and credit.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial entitled "Harold Duane Jacobs of Grey Rock," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAROLD DUANE JACOBS OF GREY ROCK

In 1946, about 4 years after I had founded the Carolina Israelite, I received a letter from a subscriber who introduced himself as Harold Duane Jacobs. He lived in Pikesville, Md., 20 miles outside of Baltimore. Mr. Jacobs said he had been a managing editor and closed with, "Boy, what I could have done with you if I were still a managing ed." In this business it is not the money. You can always borrow a few hundred from someone, or exchange postdated checks with a friend. What is important is to receive letters from a man like Harold Duane Jacobs who tells you you are on the right track. It is hard to explain but a letter of this kind is like acquiring a partner whose investment solves all your financial problems. I am not exaggerating. An oldtime professional newsman tells you you are making a contribution to American journalism. That is what is important, and you go on.

Harold Duane Jacobs came to Baltimore in the 1920's. He edited the Baltimore Post. He started from scratch. Before he left, the Post had a daily circulation of 90,000.

Just a few years before the publication of my first book, "Only in America," I met my subscriber, Mr. Jacobs for the first time. He invited me for a weekend to his home. Mr. Jacobs and his wife, the former Ethel Epstein, gave me a stimulating and gracious weekend. The winner was held in my honor in the main dining hall of their famous colonial estate, Grey Rock. The Governor of Maryland came, Federal Judge Sobeloff, the mayor of Baltimore, the chief of police, and many of the editors and civic leaders of that great city. At the head of the table sat the grand old master of the American essay, Gerald Johnson, who introduced me. This was my connection with Harold Duane Jacobs, who died a few days ago.

I mourn his loss.

Veto of Oil Leasing Bill for Alaska Unwarranted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that President Eisenhower's veto of H.R. 6940, a bill which would have increased the maximum allowable acreage for oil and gas leasing in Alaska from 300,000 acres to 600,000 acres was ill-advised and uncalled for. Alaska's size, equaling five western States, plus the need for incentives to bring about exploration of remote areas subject to the high costs which prevail

in Alaska, requires an increase from 300,000 to 600,000 acres.

The fast that the Department of the Interior expresses preference for a package bill to increase lease rentals and abolish the existing waiver of rentals for the second and third year has nothing whatsoever to do with my bill which has been vetoed. Interior's package plan could, in the wisdom of Congress, be put into effect regardless of the provisions of H.R. 6940. The maximum allowable acreage in Alaska has nothing to do with rental rates and waivers or nonwaivers of rentals. It is admitted that this veto will deprive the State of needed income by curbing increased leasing at this time, but is piously justified on the theory that it will be better for the State and the Nation in the long run.

The Interior Department made only a meager showing regarding the bill during the House and Senate committee hearings, expressing no firm position regarding monopolies, and could not justify its proposal that a separate leasing area be established for that part of Alaska north of the Brooks Range. That this is true is evidenced by the favorable reports made by both the Senate and House committees which conducted the hearings. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, was unanimous in finding that the increased acreage would not be monopolistic and that the legislation would be conducive to orderly, yet accelerated development of the oil resources of Alaska. The evidence also showed that there was no unanimity of opinion within the Department of the Interior itself, and that the opinion expressed by the witness for the Department, at the hearings, that there should be a separate leasing area north of the Brooks Range, was only a makeshift.

The President's action is a reflection of departmental arrogance directed at the House and Senate Interior Committees—and the Congress of the United States—for having the temerity to legislate with a slight variance from the conclusion submitted by the Interior Department. I consider this veto to be an unwarranted overriding of congressional discretion and judgment.

Ninety-Cents-on-the-Buck Come-On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am privileged to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham (Ala.) News of Sunday, August 9, 1959, entitled, "90-Cents-on-the-Buck Come-On." This editorial, as its title implies, deals with the proposal of President Eisenhower to increase the Federal gasoline tax an additional 1½ cents per gallon. I recommend this editorial to the careful study of every Member of the House:

NINETY-CENTS-ON-THE-BUCK COME-ON

The great attraction of the Federal highway program, now underway, is that Uncle Samuel puts up 90 cents of every dollar spent on this nationwide project.

Right now the Federal Government finds itself without necessary funds to insure continuation of the program. In State after State the howls are going up because the pinch is being felt or is about to be felt. Such highway funds generally are committed some time in advance, since highway development is a long-time piece of business.

To provide the needed money to keep up this gargantuan program, Mr. Eisenhower has asked for a 1½-cent gasoline tax hike, which would put the Federal levy at 4½ cents. The House Ways and Means Committee has refused to go along with this. Instead it recommends a billion-dollar bond issue and cutting the annual expenditure rate to $600 million next year with a graduated increase. This would see the sum of $2,200 million allocated not until 1969. But the Public Works Committee, responsible for deciding how far, how fast, is stiffly turning down this plan. The Public Works Committee wants construction maintained at $2,200 million a year steadily.

The Ways and Means Committee proposal also would stretch out the construction beyond the 1972 terminal date of the program.

We have no idea how best to find the money, though we see little to recommend the Ike-asked gas tax increase. The bond issue Ways and Means proposes would be paid for by transferring one-fifth of the present 10-percent manufacturers' new auto excise tax from the general fund to bond retirement. One-fifth of that tax would come to about $250 million a year. Obviously we would be paying for the new highways for some time; that is not necessarily bad for they would be used for a long time.

The entire situation is muddled by the fact that the program got going hastily when unemployment was up, there were recession evidences all about, and the highway program seemed a good pump primer. As it is, though, we now find ourselves short of money and face the question whether we want to go in debt more. Our own tendency would be to cut the program back. If it seems we would be turning our backs on a 90-percent Federal handout, let us ask ourselves whether we ever will stop Federal spending in gigantic figures unless we make do with something less than the maximum. You can't keep dishing it out at a high rate and ever expect to control Federal spending.

A Man and His Wealth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, a great American passed away. The individual of whom I speak is the late Michael L. Benedum, who during his lifetime perhaps was responsible for the discovery of more oil than any other man living or dead. He was a great humanitarian and philanthropist. His love for his native State of West Virginia, while evident during his lifetime, has become all the more evident upon the spreading of his last will and testament upon the record.

That last will and testament is a monument to America and all that we seek to safeguard here in these great Halls of Congress.

Thomas O'Brien Flynn, the editor of the editorial page of the outstanding West Virginia paper, the Wheeling Intelligencer, has set out in a brief article, "A Man and His Wealth," several paragraphs of this great man's last words which I want to include in my remarks and respectfully urge my colleagues in the House to take a few minutes to read. This editorial should confirm to all of us here that while our jobs are most difficult and trying at times, that as long as America has men such as Michael L. Benedum, ours is an easy undertaking:

A MAN AND HIS WEALTH

Those who share the divide-the-wealth views of some of our modern social planners who would limit the personal acquisition of riches either through direct limitation of income as proposed by the late President Roosevelt or by the imposition of punitive taxes or other Government restrictions, would do well to read the last will and testament of the late Michael L. Benedum.

In disposing of a fortune estimated at $100 million, Mr. Benedum made some observations on the subject of property and its use which the prophets of a new social order might consider with profit.

"If I could have looked upon my material goods as personal property," wrote Mr. Benedum, "belonging to me alone, my task would have been immeasurably lighter. But I have never regarded my possessions in that light. Providence gives no fee simple title to such possessions. As I have seen it, all of the elements of the earth belong to the Creator of all things, and He has, as part of the divine purpose, distributed them unevenly among His children, holding each relatively responsible for their wise use and disposition. I have always felt that I have been only a trustee for such material wealth as providence has placed in my hands."

Can anybody seriously believe that laws or a political system which would have made impossible the career of a Mike Benedum or a Henry Ford or an Andrew Mellon or a John D. Rockefeller or an Andrew Carnegie would be in the public interest? Because these were wise men who took their responsibilities seriously, their management and disposition brought benefit to untold millions. The wealth of others who were not so wise or who were succeeded in its management by lesser men, has been dissipated. In either case, the millionaire's personal use of the wealth he had amassed was relatively trivial, the benefit to others, directly or indirectly, immense. The point is that under a political system denying these men the freedom of action they enjoyed much of the wealth which their genius created and managed, and which in the last analysis went to the benefit of others, never would have come into existence.

Letter to the French Ambassador

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on August 6, 1959, a story was published in the press that 16 Members of the House of Representatives urged the French

Government to enter into negotiations to end the Algerian war and my name was listed as one of the 16 House Members. I have no knowledge of having signed such statement and do not subscribe to the views as expressed in that statement.

I have informed the French Ambassador that I am not in accord with the contents of the statement. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the text of my letter to the French Ambassador as follows:

AUGUST 13, 1959.

His Excellency Mr. HERVE ALPHAND,
Ambassador of France,
French Embassy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: Since writing to you on August 4, my attention has been called by my good friend Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, and also by Mr. Joseph M. Levy, that on August 6, 2 days after writing to you such letter lauding President de Gaulle, I allegedly joined 15 other Congressmen in a statement concerning Algeria.

I have no knowledge of signing such letter and am unable to check whether my secretary signed such statement without my knowledge, since she is presently away on vacation.

However, since the contents of such statement has now been made known to me, I wish to state emphatically that I am not in accord with its contents since it demonstrates interference with the internal and domestic policies of our great ally, the French Republic.

I repeat that, regardless of what my feelings toward France may have been prior to President De Gaulle, I am now convinced and have been since President de Gaulle came into power, that we are dealing with a new France, with a united country under the splendid leadership of a great friend of the United States and a stanch foe of communism.

With warm regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

County of Los Angeles Board of Supervisors Urge Congressional Committee To Expedite Approval of Federal Aid to Highway Bill, Making Funds Now Available for Critically Needed Highway Improvements, Dated Tuesday, August 11, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of a communication received by me dated August 11, 1959, from the Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County, Calif. The great 23d district which I represent, in this my 13th year of membership in this great legislative body, is all located geographically within the great county of Los Angeles. Hence, my receipt from the board of supervisors of this communication dealing with the very present and urgent need of Federal aid to highways.

The text of the resolution speaks loudly and clearly of the urgency of the subject matter regarding the continued immediate financing of the federally aided highway program. It is to be noted that the motion for this resolution was proposed by Supervisor Hahn, whose supervisorial district geographically is located partially within my congressional district.

RESOLUTION URGING WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AND OTHER COMMITTEES, TO EXPEDITE APPROVAL OF FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS BILL MAKING FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR CRITICALLY NEEDED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

On motion of Supervisor Hahn for Supervisor Bonelli, unanimously carried, it is ordered that the following resolution be and the same is hereby adopted:

"Whereas a stalemate has occurred between Congress and the administration regarding financing of the Federal highway aid program; and

"Whereas this stalemate has resulted in a halt of all new State highway construction in California until the details of financing the Federal program are resolved; and

"Whereas approximately $200 million of highway construction in California are affected by this stalemate, including $90 million in Los Angeles County alone; and

"Whereas these amounts include in excess of $15 million for the Golden State Freeway, excess of $5 million for the San Bernardino Freeway, excess of $15 million for the San Diego Freeway, excess of $14 million for the Glendale Freeway, excess of $34 million for the Santa Monica Freeway, $250,000 to improve U.S. 101 Alternate, and $350,000 for Palmdale Boulevard: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, That the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives and other appropriate congressional committees be urged to expedite approval of the Federal aid to highways bill making funds available for the critically needed highway improvements in Los Angeles County; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to Vice President RICHARD NIXON and members of the Los Angeles County congressional delegation urging their support of an expeditious settlement and passage of the Federal Aid to Highways Act."

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution which was adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, on August 11, 1959, and entered in the minutes of said board.

HAROLD J. OSTLY,
County Clerk of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, and ex officio Clerk of the Board of Supervisors of Said County.
By GORDON T. NESVIG,
Deputy Clerk.

Walter Lee, Legislative Assistant to the House Committee on the Judiciary, To Retire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I was sorry to learn that Mr. Walter Lee, legislative assistant to the House Committee on the Judiciary, will soon retire from this position which he has held for more than 21 years.

The name of Walter Lee is synonymous with warm friendship, wholehearted cooperation, and diligent, effective work for the committee to which he is assigned and for the membership of the House as a whole.

During my public service, I have never know a finer more sincere, more devoted, more dedicated public servant than Walter Lee, and I am profoundly grateful to him for his outstanding service and for the many instances in which he has personally assisted me with my work. He has indeed made noteworthy contributions to vital work of the Congress.

I heartily congratulate him and his family upon the completion of his magnificent service and wish for them every success and happiness in the future. Godspeed and good fortune to our dear, able, and esteemed friend, Walter Lee.

Birmingham, Ala.: A Name and a Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HUDDLESTON, JR.
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Southern Railway System magazine, Ties, for August 1959. The article deals with the founding of the city of Birmingham, the hub of my district and also the industrial center of the Southeastern States:

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.: A NAME AND A PROPHECY

Better known as the Magic City and the City of Destiny, Birmingham, Ala., could with equal justice be called the City That Grew From a Railroad Crossover.

The steel capital of the South was incorporated as a city on December 9, 1871. But almost 4 years before that, while it was nothing more than an expanse of fields and swamps, a president of one of Southern's predecessor lines prophetically referred to the mineral-rich area in which the city was later built as destined to be the Birmingham of America.

The railroad pioneer who made the remark was Sam Tate, fourth president of the Memphis & Charleston Railroad (now Southern's Memphis division). He foretold not only the name but also the city's future growth in an annual report to the M. & C. stockholders for the year ended July 1, 1867.

While his railway was not directly involved with the coal and iron fields of north central Alabama, Tate envisioned increased traffic for his road through a connection at Decatur with the South and North Alabama Railroad (now part of the Louisville & Nashville) which was to be built from Decatur southward through what is now Birmingham to the State capital of Montgomery.

The location of Birmingham was actually determined by the crossing of the South and North Alabama and the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad (now Southern's Alabama Great Southern) then being completed between Chattanooga and Meridian.

After the intersecting point of the two roads was definitely set about 2 miles east of the town of Elyton, a group of businessmen and financiers—including Sam Tate—formed the Elyton Land Co. and bought a large section of land around the proposed crossing. They reasoned correctly that transportation was the key to the vast underground mineral wealth which, though long known, had been hardly scratched.

Particularly fitting for a city built on, by and with the ingredients of steel, Birmingham began with a steel backbone. The act of incorporation defined the city limits as "All the territory within 3,000 feet of the Alabama and Chattanooga Railroad on each side of the same extending from 26th Street in said city to the eastern boundary of the city of Elyton." (Elyton, which later became a part of Birmingham, is sometimes mistakenly referred to as Birmingham's predecessor.)

Today the city named for the seat of iron and steel manufacture in England is served by nine major railroads (including two divisions of the Southern). Among its hundreds of railroad crossovers it would be difficult to find the original one from which the city grew. But Birmingham, the second largest city in the South, has well carried out Sam Tate's prediction in his annual message to the Memphis & Charleston stockholders in 1867 when he said, in part: "* * * this vast field of mineral wealth * * * will open up new sources of wealth and employment, that will draw to it millions of capital, and an immense population of industrious and enterprising citizens for its development."

Not Our Friend, Just Our Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, one of the country's outstanding Polish language newspapers is Obywatel Amerykanski, the American Citizen. On August 13, 1959, the American Citizen published a front-page editorial entitled "Not Our Friend, Just Our Guest," which discusses the forthcoming visit of Soviet Premier Khrushchev to the United States.

In view of the multitude of reasons which the Polish people have for their distrust and hatred of Soviet communism, reasons which are shared by other Eastern European peoples who have also suffered from Soviet domination and tyranny, I commend this editorial to our colleagues as a most significant example of sound commonsense, great restraint, and an impressive ability to understand the real issues involved in the visit.

At the time President Eisenhower invited the Soviet Premier, I commented in response to a newspaperman's question that "we do not propose to honor Khrushchev, we propose to inform him." This same distinction, I believe, is admirably set forth in American Citizen's editorial.

Since the American Citizen editorial contains such a wealth of wisdom and good judgment, it should be allowed to speak for itself.

The editorial follows:

NOT OUR FRIEND, JUST OUR GUEST

The Presidential invitation to Nikita Khrushchev to visit America presents many problems with as many overtones. Crushing Poland's freedom, the brutal extermination of Hungary's brave fight for freedom, the violent eruption in Korea, the repeated Communist threats to the whole world, the lies and double talk of Soviet diplomacy—are only a few of the problems that immediately arise in dealing with any Communist.

The whole hydra-headed history of communism comes to the surface with every Communist meeting.

However, President Eisenhower's invitation to Premier Khrushchev is the act of the head of the free world to try to maintain peace and to save the world from total annihilation by war.

Most of us will have to exercise great restraint when Khrushchev visits America. But this we owe to the President, to man's eternal hope for peace, and to the constant search we must maintain for a solution of the wide differences between free peoples and the Communists.

Every avenue must be explored for the search for a stable peace. The President must be encouraged in this search.

Americans have learned the hard way that the Communist only understands one thing—strength. For that reason, we will always have to be armed to the teeth so long as communism exists, whether in Russia, China, or any place else, for that matter. The President may pacify Khrushchev, showing him the road to peace, but the virus of communism has already been implanted in another potential giant—Communist China. So, even if the world could miraculously expect peace from Communist Russia, it still has to face the virulent virus that has been implanted in China.

The free world, if it is to remain free, must remain strong. We can never let our guard down, even in our search for peace.

The face-to-face meeting between President Eisenhower and Khrushchev may ease many tensions. For that reason alone it should be encouraged. For some, it may be a complete waste of time, accomplishing nothing. For others, it may be the beginning of negotiations; for others still it may mean the real hope for a lasting peace.

The grim reality of history tells us that not one of these will be accomplished by the visit.

One thing will happen, however, the Russian dictator will be able to talk about the kind of peace the Americans expect. This he will not only hear from the President, but he will hear it from the American people, too.

We do not want a peace that will make Russia strong and us weak; that will allow Russia to gobble up Europe and Asia, isolating us in the narrow rim of our own freedom. We do not want a peace that would place communism at our back door in South America.

We want a peace that the free world can live in, move in, breath in without fear and with self-respect.

Mr. Khrushchev will learn that we want to keep the door open to peace, even have it ajarred more. But we do not want appeasement for peace, capitulation of our ideals and love for freedom for peace, that we have solemn obligations to ourselves and the free world that we will not trade for peace.

Mr. Khrushchev will learn that we have many weaknesses as free individuals, but that as a Nation we are strong and determined to stay that way.

The Communist game has been played out. We have learned too much from the brutal lessons of our recent history to be fooled again, again, and again. It's time for Mr. Khrushchev to learn this, too.

For the moment, therefore, we should subdue our feelings of the past and be ready to treat him as the head of a state who has been invited to visit us by the head of our Nation. He may not be our friend, but he is our guest and our conduct should be governed accordingly. He has yet to prove that he is our friend—only deeds can prove that.

Schenectady (N.Y.) Little League Baseball Team Once Again New York State Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming almost a habit, and I may say a very pleasant habit, for me to rise to point out to my colleagues in the House the fact that another baseball team from my district has been accorded outstanding honors. Only the other day I pointed out to the Members of the House that the Babe Ruth All-Star team from Johnstown, N.Y., had been declared the winners of the New York State Babe Ruth League championship tournament. Today it is my pleasant duty to advise the Members of this House that the Schenectady Little League All-Stars from my home city of Schenectady have clinched the New York State Little League championship and move on, on Thursday, to the regional games scheduled to be played at the Hy Turkin Memorial Field, Staten Island, at 3:30 p.m.

Perhaps one of the reasons why we develop such excellent baseball teams in the 32d Congressional District is that our district, as I have frequently mentioned, includes the home of our great national game, Cooperstown, N.Y., where the national baseball Hall of Fame and Memorial are located.

The Schenectady Little League team carries on this year, Mr. Speaker, in a great tradition. The Schenectady team in 1954 won the Little League World Series, and I am confident that this year's team will make an equally excellent showing.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a news article from the Schenectady (N.Y.) Union-Star of Monday, August 17, describing the game in which the Schenectady team won the State championship:

STATE CHAMPS, SCHENECTADY LITTLE LEAGUERS, HEAD FOR REGIONALS

(By Larry Serrell)

POUGHKEEPSIE, August 17.—The Schnectady Little League All-Stars, New York State champions via a 4–1 victory over Elmont, Long Island, Saturday, make their regional bow Thursday afternoon at 3:30 on Hy Turkin Memorial Field, Staten Island, against the Barry, Vt., versus Brockton, Mass., winners, the latter contest being played tonight at Franklin, Mass.

In the regional opener at 1:30, Suburban Chester, Pa., goes against the East Rutherford, N.J.-Bridgeport, Conn., victor. Regional competition is one step away from

the Little League World Series at Williamsport, Pa. There, representatives from the Pacific, Europe, Canada, Latin America and the north, east, south and western portions of the United States will open the new Little League Stadium. Should Schnectady take the regionals they will meet Canada or Latin America, minus Mexico City, which recently was disqualified after being national champions for 2 consecutive years.

Billy Neidel was the mound winner in Schenectady's victory over Elmont. The righthander worked five and one-third innings, allowed three hits, walked one and fanned six. He pitched one-hit ball over the first five frames.

First Baseman Mike McGarry turned pitcher in the sixth inning with the tying run at the plate and one out. He struck out Jimmy Smith then got Tom Reilly on a soft fly to Stan Stringham at second base to end the game. McGarry has yet to give up a hit, run, or walk in all-star play.

Schenectady faced its toughest mound opponent since it beat Bellevue's Dick Pidgeon, 1–0, in the first game of the section 12 playoffs in the person of Elmont's Smith. The lanky right-handed curve baller set a personal record for walks, five in the contest, and couldn't get needed support in the Schenectady second. He already had thrown two all-star no-hitters this year.

Elmont drew first blood in the top of the second when Reilly was safe on Stringham's error at second. Jack Brink cracked a single to center that DiNola let go through his legs, Reilly scoring. Neidel settled down and ended the inning by striking out Neil Silver, Ed Schunk, and Tom Fagan.

The winners came back with three in their half of the frame. Doug Wilkins got on through an infield single, went to second on Russ Moskal's sacrifice and third on Bill Jahnel's grounder to the shortstop. Tom Piotrowski bounced a ground-rule double over the right field fence to bring Wilkins across. Neidel sent what could be considered the winning run home on a single, then went to second on the throw and third on a wild pitch.

An error, a safe bunt, and a hit batsman loaded the bases in the fourth inning for Schnectady. Tom Wood brought the last run home on an infield grounder.

Elmont's threat in the sixth developed after one out. Tommy Pugh walked and Paul McGarry singled him to second. That's where McGarry came in and Schnectady left for Staten Island.

Labor Begins To See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial in the New York Mirror, under date of August 18, under the caption "Labor Begins To See."

The editorial is a flat endorsement of the idea that we need more protection for American industries and American jobs.

The editorial follows:

LABOR BEGINS TO SEE

Organized labor has, in a large measure, in recent years, been responsible for supporting the Rooseveltian policy of reciprocal trade agreements which have worked out so disadvantageously to the United States.

Already one effect of these treaties is that last year as many automobiles were imported as exported and the United States is importing such a product as steel.

The real sufferer from these treaties, agreements, quotas, exchange arrangements, etc., is the American worker.

For many years, conservatives have been cautioning labor that they have embarked on a dangerous course when they supported political measures disadvantageous to them. But having adopted labor internationalism, they would not retreat.

However, some unions are beginning to realize their peril. What they call imports from sweatshop countries have always been coming in from the same sweatshop countries. The only difference was that during the war and the early postwar years, businessmen were afraid to go to those countries, invest American capital in them, and then ship the goods back here to compete with the American worker, who generally lost out.

It is interesting to note that the great free trade unions, the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; the United Hatters, Cap & Millinery Workers International, and the Textile Workers are leading in this reconsideration of a policy that has always been disadvantageous to the American worker.

A few points need to be made concerning this:

1. Most mass production work can be done as efficiently by low-wage workers as by high-wage workers. Therefore, unless the high-wage worker is in some manner protected, he will outprice himself;

2. In the semiskilled industries, the ability and efficiency of the workers play a small part in the total product; the bigger part is contributed by the machine which can be operated as well by less efficient workers, thus making the product cheaper to sell in the American market;

3. Since the Roosevelt regime everything has been done to make the phrase "Buy American" unpopular, with the result that Americans buy what is made in Hong Kong or Japan or Czechoslovakia as readily as they buy American goods.

It is nonsense for American unions to believe that they can solve this problem by stimulating campaigns in other countries to increase wages there. They will be told to mind their own business. Not all standards of living are the same and not all people approve of the American standard of living which includes many inflationary factors.

The soundest protection against the dumping of cheap goods into the world's greatest market is a protective tariff—and it would be startling, but it is foreseeable, that American labor will come to that.

A Symbol of Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, the publisher of the Philadelphia Jewish Times, Mrs. Esther Klein, raised a very interesting question in her weekly editorial of August 14, 1959, concerning the effect which the proposed visit of the Soviet leader may have on our people. She asks whether the invitation will aid or deter the world peace which we are seeking. Is the invitation to the leader of Soviet Russia a boost to his position in the world, as well as to the Communist philosophy?

Mrs. Klein's questions are searching, her position on the subject is good food for thought, and I hope her editorial, which appears below, will be read and seriously considered:

THE PUBLISHER SPEAKS

(By Esther Klein)

Nikita Khrushchev has accomplished his aim. He has been invited to the United States. He is being hailed as a symbol of peace.

This belligerent bully, whose entire career has been indicative of cruel and barbarous treatment, in a few short hours, has become the saviour of world peace. In a startling new diplomacy he has achieved an open door to our choicest American citadels.

In a carefully planned dramatic vehicle, Khrushchev emerged the hero rather than the villain he has enacted before the world for years. Nixon's tour of Russia with a barrage of brilliant American newspaper men and women, radio commentators, and television experts, obtained a million-dollar publicity campaign for Khrushchev.

All the horrors of the Hungarian debacle, the Tibet betrayal, and the vicious Soviet colonization as well as desperate state of the vast Russian population, were lost in the benign hospitality extended with fanfare to our American delegation. Each day of the tour was fraught with incidents to arouse publicity for the hosts.

It wasn't surprising that the Soviet leader, whose personal travels have been concentrated on Soviet territory or in countries behind or within the Iron Curtain, should seek an invitation to the United States. He obtained the invitation simultaneously with the conclusion of our allies meeting in Geneva. He was ready with his acceptance and also specified the cities he wished to visit. He had contrived to get firsthand inspection of certain American metropolitan centers.

Our gullible State Department thought a coup had been accomplished by getting Khrushchev here but it was a carefully contrived Soviet plan. It is beyond my comprehension that our American leaders are rejoicing that this new exchange of visits will bring about world peace. Is this plan of "you entertain us and we'll have you back" the straw of hope to prevent the world from drowning in another flood, this time induced by nuclear weapons?

When Khrushchev announced the cities for his tour, there was no mention of Philadelphia, the cradle of American liberty. He had no desire to touch the Liberty Bell, the symbol of freedom that brought our country into the world as a democracy. He has no reverence for the Declaration of Independence that inspired the freedom-loving colonists to rebel against a cruel and vicious monarch.

What effect has the proposed Soviet leader's visit had so far on our people? They are being lulled into complacency. Now that the American and Soviet rulers are becoming buddy buddy there will be no war, certainly the cold war is of the past. Look at the effect on our stock market. Defense stocks which had been zooming are down. The stock market is the criterion to indicate the relaxed status of our people.

Forgotten are Khrushchev edicts opposing religion, the threatened destruction of the Jewish and Catholic faiths in the vast Soviet territory. Forgotten also was the opportunity for the American delegation to attend services during the tour. There was no mention of the officials or the attending press stepping within the holy confines of the

cathedral or the synagogue. This was the golden occasion to emphasize a great American privilege, freedom of religion.

Khrushchev's often repeated prediction that our grandchildren in the United States will live under communism, was frequently reiterated during his talks with NIXON. Having this shocking statement made 5,000 miles away in the confines of Soviet Russia strikes terror to our hearts. Giving this conniving world leader the opportunity to come here and repeat it constantly to our American citizenry is a deplorable situation.

When Khrushchev and company arrive, he will achieve his international objective of spreading communism at the invitation of the greatest democracy in the world. Could such an aggressive act aid or deter the world peace that we are seeking?

The Khrushchev-Eisenhower Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on August 7, 1959, Mr. Frank H. Bartholomew, president of the United Press International, spoke to the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco; and I am sure excerpts from his very able presentation will be of interest to everyone:

"WE SEEM SUSCEPTIBLE TO ANY OLIVE BRANCH," SAYS BARTHOLOMEW, BUT SEES HOPE IN KHRUSHCHEV-IKE VISITS

(Address by Frank H. Bartholomew, president, United Press International)

At Geneva, I could not but be impressed by the attitude of the Swiss nation. They have escaped two world wars; have had, I think, no war in 500 years.

This is not because of any deals, but because they apparently are ready at all times to defend themselves.

They have one of the largest standing armies in Europe; my impression is the largest.

Friends of all, they have no intention of dropping their guard.

Contrast this with the emotional attitude of our own people. We are wont to think of the Latins as being emotional, but we ourselves are subject to gigantic swings of popular feeling.

We seem to be susceptible to anyone who extends an olive branch.

This was illustrated in Korea after World War II, when, in a seeming calm, we withdrew General Hodges and his three divisions. The vacuum was almost immediately filled by Communist invaders from the north.

Russia wanted a Geneva conference, insisted on it, got it, and then set about preventing one single facet of accomplishment.

We Americans usually credit the Russians with deviousness; with following a policy line so deep we cannot understand it. I'm beginning to wonder if they don't baffle themselves as much as the rest of the world!

I talked with Secretary Herter at the end of the third day. He said he expected no accomplishments, had not been optimistic beforehand, and therefore was not disappointed.

I was in Berlin the day the Russian ultimatum expired. Khrushchev had launched the crisis by giving us 6 months to pull out of Berlin.

INTERVIEWED ULBRICHT

On the day the ultimatum expired, I had asked for an interview with the chief of the Communist Party of East Germany, Walter Ulbricht.

On the way we passed Hitler's bunker, under an upended slab of concrete which was sort of a memorial to Hitler and all he stood for. In East Berlin we went through block after block of ruins.

The gloom and darkness of the headquarters building seemed to express the drabness of communism. We were escorted down a long corridor, crisscrossed every 10 feet by neon lights, but only 1 of 12 was lighted.

Ulbricht may loom large in world events to come. He is an odd little man and could be extremely dangerous.

Ulbricht was a colonel in the Russian army of occupation. A German, he lived in Russia so long he speaks German with a Russian accent.

COULD BE DANGEROUS

There is no question that Khrushchev thought he had hit upon the perfect device for blackmailing the West out of Berlin by turning it over to East Germany.

This does not mean any real government, but an organization that remains in power only because of the nearness of the Red army. It could not stand an election or a plebiscite.

TOOK IT SERIOUSLY

While Khrushchev may have looked upon his ultimatum as a means of blackmailing the West, Ulbricht took it seriously.

I have no doubt that he pressures Khrushchev at every opportunity to bring about the removal of the West. Unquestionably he opposes the suggestion of a 2-year extension because he cannot survive 2 years.

West Berlin was formerly a suburb which has been converted into a metropolis. East Berlin was the main city. The contrast is embarrassing to the Communists of East Germany.

MILES OF NEW APARTMENTS

Anyone can go from East to West Berlin and see what capitalism has done for West Berlin. The control is not on casual visits but on the families who remain.

First impression of Moscow was of the large airport and cavernous concrete buildings. We traveled a bumpy concrete road into the city.

On every side were mile after mile of new apartment buildings just completed or under construction. There is nothing like it in the world.

I was told the engineering and architecture was good, but the construction workers were not up to the design. Plaster was off the walls, floors buckled. But the apartments are occupied, with up to four in a single room.

Moscow has jumped from 1.5 million to 5 million inhabitants in a brief time. Therefore traffic into the city has been cut off. No housing permits are issued, and the migration is stopped.

I expected to see a drab city, but not so. They are doing a lot to beautify it. Buildings have been taken out and shade trees planted.

The people are too well fed. With the lifting of food rations, they eat too much and are too fat.

But they are badly clothed. None of the women are chic, and they don't seem to care too much. Yet when a beauty parlor was proposed at the U.S. exhibit, exhibitors were advised it would create a riot beyond the ability of the police to cope.

SHORTENED COURSES

The minister of education told me they had to shorten courses to accommodate the thousands and thousands of youngsters desiring an education.

Until recently, apparently, any Russian could have the equivalent of a college education and become a doctor or scientist, but now they have had to divert two-thirds of the students into the factories at the equivalent of a high-school education.

There is nothing in Moscow to evidence that the Russian people have been conditioned for a war. In all Moscow there is not an air-raid shelter or a siren. They have never had an air-raid drill.

The papers are filled with the achievements of the 7-year plan—people are urged to help fulfill the 7-year plan, and the Government will undertake to see that the Western warmongers do not attack.

Khrushchev seems to have bet on his ability to guarantee peace.

This must mean a dual policy: one of peace at home and one of threats and bluff for export—bluff, except for the fact that they do have atomic weapons.

I am personally convinced the Russian people would be the most surprised in the world if they found themselves in a war today.

NO DAMAGE, SOME GOOD?

My own conclusion is that no damage and some positive good may come from the exchange of visits between Khrushchev and Eisenhower. Bill Knowland, and Adm. Charles M. Cooke,[1] whom I profoundly respect, disagree.

* * * * *

If we don't drop our guard, I think the effect of Eisenhower's personality on the Russian people—his warmth and sincerity will far outweigh any Russian gain.

The fall of 1959 holds improved hope for peace. These are precarious times, times of great tensions, but let us, in the shadow of Theodore Roosevelt, walk softly but carry a big stick.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question (L. B. Worthington): "Will NIXON visit result in any lasting improvement?"

Answer: "Yes. Most valuable result was to force Soviet papers and radio to carry large portions of what he said. This is the first time Russians ever heard anything like that."

Question: "Did NIXON get through to Russian people?"

Answer: "Large sections were in Pravda and Isvestia, which have tremendous circulations. Chances are a good deal got through."

Question: "How were newsmen who accompanied NIXON selected?"

Answer: "For the wire services, generally on their knowledge of NIXON and ability to get the news out (very important for a foreign correspondent). Normally in Russia a correspondent must write in quadruplicate; he gets back the fourth carbon showing how his dispatch was censored. Some say, deletions are made to change the context; others that additional deletions are made. Some stories never get through."

Question (Hilary H. Crawford): If Russians cut our corridor to West Berlin, why not get allies to close Dardanelles and back them to limit?"

Answer: "Put my name on that and send it to Pentagon. If we'd do more to take the initiative rather than counter or defend, there'd be better balance."

Question (Mike Ranney): "Manpower shortage?"

Answer: "Stortage of technicians very evident. People were busy."

Question: "Herter?"

Answer: "I had felt his nomination was half-hearted. Now I think he has great moral strength and willpower; won't be pushed around. He may go down in history as a great American statesman."

[1] Former commander, 7th Fleet, who addressed club last Sept. 26.

U.S. Passport Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, appeared today before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and presented an excellent statement on proposed U.S. passport legislation. Many bills have been filed to limit the travel of certain U.S. citizens abroad, whose travel and activities might be detrimental to the security and basic foreign policies of the United States.

Congressman LINDSAY is well qualified to appear as an expert witness on passport legislation because of his top-level legal background and experience. He has served from 1955 to 1957 as executive assistant to the Attorney General of the United States. Mr. LINDSAY is a graduate of the Yale Law School and as an outstanding attorney, is admitted to the New York bar, the bar of U.S. Supreme Court, and the District of Columbia bar.

Mr. LINDSAY is a member of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York State Bar Association, and the American Bar Association. Mr. LINDSAY is making a fine record as a Member of the 86th Congress.

I am submitting this material for my colleagues in the Congress as well as the people of the United States so that these views can be carefully considered in working out the constitutional basis, and the correct legal method in obtaining good legislation in this important field of passport authorization and issuance.

The above mentioned follows:

U.S. PASSPORT LEGISLATION

(Statement of U.S. Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY of New York before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, Tuesday, August 18, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for the opportunity to appearing before this distinguished committee. I share your concern, and that of the Department of State whose representatives have already testified, over the absence of legislation, consistent with the decisions of the Supreme Court in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases, to authorize the Secretary of State to exercise some measure of discretion in the issuance of passports. I am aware as we all are, that the matter of passports and their issuance, is necessarily an aspect of the conduct of foreign affairs, and in that sense, bears upon national and international security.

But in approaching the problem of devising legislation, I start with the premise that we are dealing here with a constitutional right. I am in firm agreement with the opinion of the Supreme Court in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases. While not deciding those cases on constitutional grounds, the Court nevertheless stated that "the right to travel is part of the liberty of which a citizen cannot be deprived without the due process of law of the fifth amendment." I agree wholeheartedly with that statement. I believe also that the right to travel is conjoint with and part of the first amendment—freedom of speech and assembly. I believe it to be the duty of this committee to study the substance of the right to travel with great care, realizing that any measures restricting this right are certain to be tested in the courts sooner or later—probably sooner. And I am particularly disturbed by what I feel are constitutional inadequacies in the legislation endorsed to you by the Department of State.

What is the right to travel? In my book it is one of the most fundamental liberties that we have. The Supreme Court tells us that it is "part of the liberty protected by the due process clause of the fifth amendment." The Solicitor General of the United States conceded as much in his argument before the Court in Kent and Dayton. But, as I stated at the outset, I would suggest also that it is a part of the first amendment. Of all the freedoms that we have, the one I should most hate to lose is freedom of speech. Speech is communication, and communication in this modern day is impossible without locomotion. Speech is meaningless unless thought of in the context of the physical and social aspects of human existence.

Constitutional sources strongly suggest that early Americans recognized a freedom to move beyond national frontiers. However uncertain its basis may have been, however unclear its limitations, the English recognized that freedom long before they crossed the Atlantic. The people of the Colonies, moreover, evidently took the freedom for granted; witness the constant movement between Colonies and to the West. That may explain why the freedom was not more clearly recognized in writing. The Declaration of Independence goes no further than to list as a grievance the restrictions which George the Third placed upon emigration. The Articles of Confederation merely guaranteed free movement between different colonies, though the Colonies, not yet joined in a more perfect union, were more like foreign countries to each other than the United States are today. Perhaps the most direct documentary evidence is to be found in the Pennsylvania Constitution of 1790 which declared "that emigration from the State shall not be prohibited."

These sources, taken together, and viewed in the light of the ninth amendment, warrant the assumption that omission of the words "right to travel," was not intended to eliminate the right. Nor is the omission inconsistent with a specific intention to include the right in free speech. The Constitution was designed to guide the United States for an indefinite period of time. It would have been impossible to enumerate the variety of ways in which free speech might be abridged—and the framers recognized this in the generality of the first amendment's language.

The specific problem your committee must wrestle with, Mr. Chairman, is that of finding a constitutional way of preventing hard-core, dedicated Communists from abusing the travel right by actively striving against our most supreme national interests.

Now let me make it absolutely clear that we are not here talking about anyone who is under indictment for the commission of any crime, or is under restraining order of any kind by any court, or has been stripped of any right or liberty by due process of law. As to these, we all agree that the right to travel ought to be, and can constitutionally be, curtailed. The nonindicted, non-court-restrained Communist present a more difficult case. There may well be risks inherent in allowing a member of the Communist Party, or one identified as such by our intelligence units, free exit from our shores to travel abroad. But it is necessary to point out that this is true when Communists travel from Chicago to New York or from New York to the Bahamas, or from Dallas to Mexico, or from San Francisco to Buenos Aires or to any other South American country, none of which places requires a passport for exit or entry. It should be pointed out also that under the McCarran-Walter Act we are required to deport alien members of the Communist Party and we go to elaborate efforts to secure their removal after they have been traveling freely in this country for years. Well and good enough. Yet under our passport procedures, until the Supreme Court decided otherwise, we have insisted that it is essential to the national security to keep citizen members of the party confined to our shores. The point is that there could possibly be something wrong with our reasoning; and when we are dealing with limitations on constitutional rights it is important that our reasoning be compelling and logical. You must consider whether the bills before you will in fact accomplish their purpose of confining trained subversives to these shores. You must remember, also, that the President has in the past stressed the importance of taking every reasonable step that will facilitate international travel and exchange, e.g., the abolition of the requirement of finger printing for transients through, and temporary visitors to, this country.

I do not differ to widely in substance from the position taken by the administration, as presented by the State Department through its spokesman, Mr. Hanes in his testimony here. I shall come to the differences shortly, and although seemingly small, they are important ones. I do differ widely in emphasis. I would emphasize the obligation of the Department of State—for that matter, of every executive department—to scrupulously avoid to the greatest extent possible any intrusion on the precious rights of American citizens. The right to travel, although it has been around a long while, is just beginning to be articulated. We must be careful not to let a cavalier approach lead us to legislative decisions which the courts may undo, and quite properly so.

I agree with the State Department that it is indeed fundamental that the liberty guaranteed by the Constitution is not absolute. "Civil liberties," says the Supreme Court "imply the existence of an organized society maintaining public order without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of unrestrained abuses." Freedom to travel, like other liberties, is subject to reasonable regulation and control in the interests of the public welfare. I am not sure that it is possible to draw up absolutely fixed rules which will in advance strike a proper balance which will meet the exigencies of every case, protect the public interest, and yet stay within constitutional limitations. Circumstances and the times vary and "due process of law has never been a term of fixed and invariable content." But let's make sure we don't "throw out the baby with the bath." I should like therefore to restate what I believe to be the guideposts which should guide the Congress in its consideration of this subject:

First, the right to travel—to communicate—is a constitutionally protected right which may not be abrogated by the State except under the general war power, which normally may be invoked only in time of extreme emergency, usually involving armed conflict between nations. The right is a concomitant of, and conjoint with, the first amendment of the Constitution. A denial of a passport therefore, may result in violations of both the fifth and first amendments.

Second, neither the right of the citizen to have issued, nor the right of the Secretary of State to deny issuance of, a passport is an absolute right.

Third, a general standard under which the Secretary of State is authorized to deny the issuance of a passport whenever he finds that its issuance would be contrary to the

national welfare, safety or security, or otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States is too indefinite a standard when applied to a right as firmly grounded among our basic liberties as is freedom of speech and assembly. In the past we have too often seen examples of executive arbitrariness under the umbrella of the national security and the conduct of foreign relations.

Fourth, a refusal to issue a passport may not rest upon confidential undisclosed information, under a blanket, unlimited authority to use the same. Such a refusal would, in all probability, be a denial of due process of law under the fifth amendment. The authority to use confidential information in the administrative process, under imprecise standards, coupled with the power to delegate authority to subordinates, and without full judicial review, can result in a breeding ground of arbitrariness in the course of which innocent people may, and undoubtedly will, suffer.

You will note that I have spoken here of blanket, unlimited authority to use confidential information. There may be room for an exception to cover the hard core Communist case, under which the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary, personally, will certify, first, that disclosure will expose a "double" or "buried" agent of tested and known reliability; second, that such exposure will be prejudicial to the national interests, and third, that the case may not be decided without resort to such evidence. But even then, full access to the evidence in question should be given upon judicial review to the court, under seal, for examination by the court in camera.

Thus the two important points of difference between the Department of State's views and mine are (1) I would permit confidential information to be used only upon certification at the highest level of its special necessity, and (2) I would require that the whole of the confidential information be laid under seal before the reviewing judge in chambers. In my judgment, anything less might violate the due process requirement of the fifth amendment.

Turning then to the bills before this committee, to the extent that time has permitted me to review them, I believe that H.R. 7006, which the State Department has endorsed, is lacking in the necessary procedural safeguards of a constitutional right. Since H.R. 2468 contains no review provision at all, it seems deficient in this respect, as well as in the others enumerated by the Department. Nor does H.R. 5455 provide such safeguards in my judgment.

I find that H.R. 55, in its present form, contains the words "on the record" at line 11, page 3, which are ambiguous. I understand from Mr. Hanes' statement that there is legislative history behind these words, and if they can fairly be deemed to mean "on the record, open and closed," that bill contains, at least in part, the standards I should like to see applied.

The best approach to the procedural problem of the bills presently before you, in my opinion, is contained in title III of H.R. 8329. In its requirement in section 306(b) that the Secretary of State himself make the final administrative determination upholding a refusal to issue, or a revocation of, a passport, it goes far toward providing for due caution in the evaluation of confidential information. And its section 307 provides what no other House bill I have examined does: the kind of judicial review necessary, in my judgment, to meet the constitutional test of due process.

I have not in this discussion tried to spell out an entire code to govern the issuance of passports, or to draft legislation. My purpose here has been only to state my views on some of the fundamentals, and I would hope that consideration of this matter in the Congress would be guided by those fundamentals. Neither have I touched upon the whole subject of area restrictions, except indirectly. Here I would recommend the report of the special committee to study passport procedures of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, an excellent report, prepared by a distinguished committee of lawyers. Its conclusion on the subject of area restraints is as follows:

"Travel abroad by all U.S. citizens may be prohibited in areas where the Secretary of State determines that such prohibitions should be imposed in the national interest, but only in situations of exceptional gravity. The imposition of area restrictions should be accompanied by a statement by the Secretary of State setting forth the reasons therefor. Exceptions to general area prohibitions, permitting travel by particular individuals or groups, may be made by the Secretary of State in his discretion."

In closing, I should like to make reference to a document of great importance which is too seldom invoked. It is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which this year celebrated its 10th anniversary. Article 13 of the declaration reads as follows:

"ART. 13. (1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state. (2) Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country."

The United States along with the other member nations, has pledged itself to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect and observance of the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in the declaration. Let us in the United States be faithful to our pledge.

MATS Mission—ATA Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HQUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 17, 1959, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I entitled my extension "MATS Mission, Support Our Fighting Forces—ATA Mission, Destroy MATS." Included in the above-mentioned extension, Mr. Speaker, was a statement emanating from the office of the Air Transport Association entitled "H.R. 7978." This circular was designed to deprive MATS of money vitally necessary to modernize its present MATS fleet. This circular was given to selected members of the Appropriations Committee. It was written so as to persuade Members of Congress that the private airlines can do the job for which MATS is designed. Mr. Speaker, this is an insidious, hypocritical, and unpatriotic effort on the part of those responsible in ATA to put the dollar before the security of the Nation.

For some unknown reason this circular did not appear in my remarks. It disappeared between the Capitol and the time the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was published the following day. Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include this circular entitled "H.R. 7978." I want the Congress and the Nation to know that the mission of the MATS is to support SAC, the fighting men and women of this country, and the Armed Forces of the free world. The mission of the ATA is to destroy MATS in its capacity to fulfill its wartime mission. I leave it to the Nation to decide whether the MATS is set up to serve the Nation or whether the ATA places the dollar before the security of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the MATS mission as referred to in the above article so that both the circular of the ATA and the mission of the MATS can appear as originally intended so that the reader can understand exactly what faces the Military Air Transport Command in its fight for survival. Mr. Speaker, there is not any way under the sun that the private airlines can undertake and fulfill the mission which the MATS does. There is not any way on earth for a private airline to be ordered into a combat zone. There is not any way on earth for a private airline to fulfill rescue missions which MATS undertakes. There is not any way on earth for the private airlines to do the weather service which MATS does. Mr. Speaker, MATS is a combat force designed to serve America. The hauling of passengers and freight is just incidental to MATS' global and astronomic mission. ATA wants to get the passenger and freight business of MATS and leave the other responsibilities to a nonexistent skeleton.

H.R. 7978

Senate amendment No. 34, to the supplemental appropriation bill, is an item of $30 million for modernization of the Military Air Transport Service fleet. This item should be eliminated.

It had already been turned down by both Houses in the regular defense appropriation bill. However, while the regular defense appropriation bill was pending in conference, the Air Force requested, and Senator CANNON made a personal plea to the Senate Appropriations Committee for, inclusion of $50 million for the procurement of jet aircraft for MATS. The committee included $30 million.

Testimony indicates that the Air Force plan calls for two or three squadrons of jet aircraft of essentially the same types as have already been bought by the airlines. Aircraft of this type cost between $5 and $6 million each and the amount initially required here would be only the beginning of a large expenditure. Testimony further indicates that the aircraft would be used mainly for the regular MATS mission which the Air Force views as an airline type of scheduled operation all over the world. This expenditure, if allowed, will be only an initial downpayment on a bill which may be expected to reach as much as a billion dollars.

The regular scheduled transportation of Defense personnel and cargo can be met without capital investment by the Government. At a cost of over $2 billion of private capital, the scheduled airlines are already acquiring a huge fleet of jet aircraft for the transportation of passengers. In addition, many of the airlines have already ordered modern turbine-powered cargo aircraft. They will acquire additional airplanes with private funds if they are given the opportunity to carry Defense Department traffic. If the Air Force would use the airlines to perform the scheduled transport needs of

the Defense Department instead of running the MATS airline in competition with the civil airlines, MATS would be better prepared for emergencies. Under its present system of operating, it is not well prepared.

MATS AND THE MISSION

(By Bill Borklund)

(Although the importance of its mission is the key to its entire operation, the Military Air Transport Service has been caught this year in a never before equaled barrage of diversionary charges—most, if not all, of them secondary and misleading. Until the underbrush is cleared away, MATS, and the Air Force, are going to have a hard time reaching, with much desired commercial airline help, a much needed program for use of all U.S. support air power in the time of war.)

Bombed, badgered, and besieged as were few military outfits this year, the Military Air Transport Service enters the final round, this month, of a summer-long congressional hassle over how much money it should be spending on commercial airlift, how much of its military job it should do itself.

At the same time, undaunted by the battering it has taken, MATS is reentering the Washington, D.C., arena with two far-reaching proposals of its own. One: A $53 million supplemental appropriation request for 10 jet-powered aircraft (which Capitol Hill whacked out of the original Defense money request) to start the long-overdue MATS modernization program. Two: a proposal that Defense start airlifting all personnel overseas (present levels—37 percent of Army, 50 percent of Navy, 94 percent of Air Force), double the amount of oversea shipping by air of high value hardware.

Either idea will be enough to start the whole argument again, an argument that centers around what MATS does and why. Strangely enough, all the mountains of obfuscating manuscript produced this year have done little to clarify the MATS mission, key to the whole argument. The result: means are discussed as ends, the result is called the cause and headline-hunting critics have led a big chunk of Congress (and most of the American public) down a bramble-strewn path of misinformation.

Among the baubles: MATS is the world's largest airline. It isn't even close. Soviet Russia's Aeroflot is No. 1 among the real leaders. In addition, only about 30,000 of MATS' 120,000 Navy, Air Force, and civilian personnel and half its 1,198 assigned aircraft handle the strategic air transport mission. The rest take care of MATS' less-publicized services—Air Weather, Air Photographic and Charting, Air Rescue, Airways and Air Communications, and Aeromedical Evacuation.

MATS runs a plushy airline. The three VC–137A jet passenger planes which prompted this blast are indeed plushy, were built for the Air Force to fly the President, Congress, and high level U.S. dignitaries around the world, are actually off-the-shelf Boeing 707's with standard executive interiors. Assigned to MATS for administrative purposes only, the aircraft are actually under control of the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization. Nearly all other MATS passengers travel the austere equivalent of commercial tourist class.

MATS is competing with commercial airlines for passengers. Total passengers carried by MATS last year amounted to less than 1 percent of the 49 million annual passenger load carried by U.S. airlines alone.

MATS, like any other military organization, has a wartime mission, assigned by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The mission: be ready to move troops, missiles, and other heavy weapons and supplies in any war emergency to support other Air Force components, the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. JCS estimates wartime airlift requirements specifies those that are critical, i.e., must be handled by military aircraft and crews, pegs the rest essential, i.e., can be done by either MATS or civil carriers.

Given a half-day to reach predesignated spots around the globe to cover the critical tasks (primarily resupplying Strategic Air Command bombers returning from their first bombing run), MATS keeps an alert force in on-the-flight-line readiness, runs the rest of its airfleet through practical training exercises. It is, in essence, a SAC-like supply operation with one exception. SAC must take pictures rather than drop its bombs. MATS can haul and process in peacetime training the same supplies it will actually carry if the big war should start.

To handle the bulk of the essential role, it has organized a Civil Reserve Air Fleet. Primary CRAF duty, at the moment: hauling passengers. CRAF list of planes varies depending on predicted requirements, is currently (fiscal year 1960) made up of 242 aircraft under assignment from 27 different civil carriers—primarily DC–4's for cargo, DC–7's for passengers. There is a slight hooker: For MATS to use any of the CRAF planes, under current agreements with the airlines, it must take them all. Result: MATS must take care of most limited war situations pretty much on its own.

To MATS its realistic training program is an absolute necessity if it is to have any chance at all of meeting its wartime obligation. Said one colonel, "Letting pilots fly the aircraft is the very tiniest part of this whole training effort. We've got to train the traffic people, the maintenance men, cargo handlers, the whole crew.

"We have to know what we can move where and how efficiently. (Biggest problem right now is the terminal operation.) You can't mothball an operation like this, any more than you can SAC, then push a button and have it spring into operation in the wink of an eye—which is how fast we'd have to get going on D-day."

Requesting 6 hours originally, MATS is allowed a 5-hour per day per aircraft utilization rate for training, has reasons for believing this isn't enough. Studies by Rand Corp., and such men as Dr. Paul Cherington of Harvard Business School indicate MATS could not boost this training rate to that required if a hot war started, far less than the 10 hours demanded by JCS, and MATS could maintain this rate for at best 30 days. Their own Korean war experience tends to corroborate this finding. Asked for a 10-hour per aircraft per day operating rate MATS, in the initial and crucial stages of the war, was able to boost its 2.8-hour prewar level to only slightly over 4 hours.

Thus, they are being asked to do what some of the best brains in the country say can't be done. In spite of this, MATS maintains it has the capability the JCS says it should, but, added one officer (in reference to oft-quoted ex-Army Chief of Staff Maxwell Taylor's demand for more troop airlift), "We don't have the capability to move everything everyone wants us to move."

MATS supply backlog, one mark of efficiency, in any given airport is running less than 3-day maximum currently acceptable to MATS headquarters. They're thinking of revising that goal to 1 day. And, in response to the Capitol Hill charges that MATS is running scheduled flights overseas along the same routes as commercial carriers, one officer snorted, "A schedule is nothing more than a program any good manager uses to see if he can do what he says he wants to do. As for the routes, although we don't use the same bases, there's usually one one efficient economical way to cross an ocean. We use the same route as the airlines for the same reason."

Beyond its realistic readiness training and the supplemental CRAF program, MATS, in its role as single manager for military air transport, buys a large chunk of commercial airlift. Among the reasons: military air transport demands are higher than the by-product—airlift—of MATS training program can handle; MATS wants only to be able to do its assigned war mission, wants a strong civil air fleet ready to back it up after the first few days or weeks of an all-out war.

Of the $200 million paid by Defense to civil carriers for contract, charter and common carriage airlift in fiscal year 1959, MATS signed signed the tab for over half ($105 million). Of that quantity, $70.8 million was Congress-appropriated money spent backing up MATS own peacetime operation. The rest it spent as procurement officer for Logair, Quicktrans and the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

Even if the requirement for airlift does not increase (and it's likely to), MATS will soon be spending more of Defense's airlift dollar as it phases in Northeastern North America intertheater airlift overseas, eventually will be responsible for the whole $200 million. All procurements are advertised, all carriers are eligible to bid. Commented one procurement officer. "We don't care, initially, what capability they have."

When the contract is let, however, MATS keeps two things in mind:

1. Placing as much business as possible on a fixed, long-term basis (to get better pricing, make contract administration easier for both the carrier and MATS).

2. The report of MATS Capability Survey Committee which visits carriers' facilities, verifies that they can produce as they say they will. We want to make awards only to responsible and capable carriers. To a good many commanders buying airlift, performance is a lot more important than cost.

But, if MATS has as good a case as any other military organization for existing, that $70.8 million, and growing, prize has been too much for the commercial airlines to view with clear-cut business acumen. Strangest twist, to MATS officers, in the whole Capitol Hill cacaphony is that the very people in Washington who should be helping MATS sell increased use of airlift are, instead, pounding MATS with every brickbat they own.

Like a recalcitrant bulldog, the commercial airlines, through their powerful association lobbyists, are leaning hard on Congress to get them a bigger share of the large MATS business—in spite of MATS boss Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner's statement that "there just is no more business—unless MATS flies its aircraft empty."

And if MATS flies empty? Ignoring for the moment its crippling effect on MATS prepardness, the cost of defense airlift to the U.S. taxpayer would skyrocket to nearly $1 billion—something the Pentagon thinks he would take a rather dim view of. Even though MATS used 60 percent of its passenger, 74.8 percent of its cargo capacity during the last fiscal year, commercial airlines still hauled 40 percent of MATS's passengers, 10 percent of its cargo.

This is a far cry from MATS commercial augmentation in 1955 when it spent only $4.5 million on civil airlines to haul 1.5 percent of its passengers, 6.6 percent of its cargo and mail. In the past 5 years, MATS has reduced its airfleet by 107 planes, cut its personnel strength some 2,400 persons. Yet, charges of MATS' persistent expansion, to the detriment of commercial airlines, persist.

False charges are not MATS' only headache. Attracted by the mushrooming market, MATS' bidders list has jumped from 41 carriers in 1957 to 86 this year, is expected to reach 122 in 1960. Most of the additions are briefcase operators with one or two ob-

solescent aircraft, at most, purchased solely to get MATS business.

Operating under a part 45 certification (called one of the great rackets in the aviation industry by Oklahoma's Senator MIKE MONRONEY) and not subject to Civil Aeronautics Board control, these "tissue paper" firms come under the benevolent protection of a Small Business Administration umbrella—and most of the unreliable outfits spotted by the contract survey committee are in this category.

Said one procurement officer, "These small business set-asides are encouraging the use of old aircraft, discouraging the forward looking companies—and, on top of all that, we figure we pay about a 10-percent premium to give them business."

These quick-hit-and-die operators have prompted an intramural fight among the carriers. But, as reflected in a Congress trying to keep everybody happy, the fight has become something far more ominous. Said South Carolina's Senator THURMOND, "Excessive (governmental) concern with commercial aviation has caused us to progressively nibble away at the Military Air Transport Service."

MATS' request for 10 C-jets (estimated cost: $53 million) hit a blank wall first time around—for precisely the same reason MATS has been in trouble all summer; national defense mission keeps being obscured by politics and considerations of false economy.

To MATS the argument for C-jets seems pretty clear cut. Says Tunner, "We need both a racehore and a workhorse." They are getting the workhorse, the C-133. For the other: "It doesn't make much sense to us to try to support a 600-knot-an-hour bomber with a 190-knot transport. We're trying to support a rocket (SAC) with a kiddie car."

Adds Tunner, "The transport plane now in the inventory, being piston-driven would be many hours distant from the friendly base with needed materiel and personnel at the time the SAC bomber arrived. It is precisely the difference in speed between a jet-propelled plane and a piston-driven plane. The SAC plane would therefore be threatened with immobilization after one strike at a target."

And there's the advantage of economy. Ten C-jets will do the same job as 42 of the C-124's which comprise the bulk of today's strategic transport fleet, are nearly obsolete and costly to maintain.

MATS has already heard, in the wings, the yells of the civil airlines. "What they tell us basically," said one MATS officer, "is they want us to do a good job—but not too good." Tunner insists that MATS is not fighting the commercial airlines: "We need them. We are counting on a strong airline industry to backstop us in time of war." But if MATS is not in a fight, it is showing a lot of unexplainable bruises.

What rankles MATS men most, and some of the most knowledgeable men in the airlift business today are in Tunner's organization is that the MATS record is about 180 degrees opposite from the picture painted of it by commercial interests; is, in fact, far better than the so-far performance in war situations of private carriers demanding they be given more of the job to do.

Among the quotable:

On claims industry could do the job cheaper: "Assuming the same operational training level, if we split the cargo-passenger business equally with the civil carriers, Defense airlift bill would jump another $300 million. If we flew empty, the taxpayers would shell out $750 million more."

Could do it better?: "Ten times during July, August, and September last year MATS went looking for commercial airlift augmentation, couldn't find it. During the Lebanon and Far East crisis, all bids in some offerings were so high they all had to be rejected. We had to haul the supplies and people ourselves working overtime. It was the tourist season, if you'll recall. During 1 week last November when they were on strike, all but four TWA scheduled flights were handled by MATS. We do not consider this the proper way to maintain military readiness."

MATS' "competitive" setup is preventing civil carriers from developing a cargo capability: "They want us to give them the money to build the aircraft, then guarantee them a profit on the business. The airlines built an incomparably efficient passenger service under a free enterprise system. Passenger business in this country is a drop in the bucket, compared to the commercial cargo they could haul. Why don't they go out and develop it instead of going to Washington looking for a Defense Department dole?"

What about Congress?: "If they buy this civil carrier idea to pare down MATS even more, they'll be behind the biggest eight ball they've ever seen. We already have letters indicating every transport outfit in the country, steamship lines, railroads, buses, will jump on the bandwagon—and you couldn't blame them."

MATS 4-ENGINE STRATEGIC TRANSPORT AIRCRAFT

C-97	48
C-118	126
C-121	71
C-124 (troop carrier)	143
C-124	310
C-133	23
Total	578

Against Seating Communist China in U.N.

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the best that can be said about the resolution before us, in my opinion, is that it shows questionable judgment and reflects an astonishing lack of self-confidence.

We are told that the single purpose of this resolution is "to reaffirm the attitude of the Congress that it is opposed to the seating of Communist China in the United Nations." The same proponent goes on to point out that since 1948, the House on 15 occasions has approved language opposing the admission of the Communist regime in China to the U.N.

This is an average of 1.3 times per year for the past 11 years, Mr. Speaker, and I am constrained to wonder if this almost routine expression of opposition is really necessary or desirable.

Does the legislative branch of our Government so distrust the executive, which is charged with the conduct of our foreign policy, that it finds it necessary to continuously reestablish and emphasize such guidelines as contained in the resolution before us?

I have not noticed any tendency on the part of the administration to be soft on communism or to favor the admission of Red China to the United Nations, either in the past or at the present time. For this reason, the resolution before us appears to me to be totally unnecessary.

But maybe I am wrong about this, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the drafters of this resolution detect a slight quavering on the part of the administration in its conduct of the cold war. If so, then there might be a very real question as to whether 1.3 times per year is actually often enough for us to express congressional opposition to Red China's admission to the U.N. If the distinguished Committee on Foreign Affairs detects such a quavering, perhaps we should incorporate an expression of congressional opposition as part of our daily routine. Just after the morning prayer or perhaps prior to adjournment each day.

Mr. Speaker, I can see where some Members may feel that a difficult question is raised by the House record of 15 protestations on this subject in the last 11 years. After all, if we do not continue to maintain a batting average of 1.3 protests per year our constitutents may find cause to question our resolve and determination in freedom's fight against totalitarianism.

I am happy to say, Mr. Speaker, that I don't think the people whom I have the privilege of representing in Ohio would be terribly upset even if our batting average falls to less than one resolution on this subject per year. Nor do I think that our neighbors in the U.N. would construe such inaction as an affirmative indication that the United States wants China in the United Nations. Our position is perfectly clear on this score and there is no reason whatever to suppose it in doubt.

The resolution, as I see it, is undesirable as well as unnecessary. It is undesirable because it interjects Congress into the conduct of our foreign affairs in a manner which serves no constructive purpose whatever. If we persist in this kind of nonsense, Mr. Speaker, every vestige of flexibility in the conduct of our foreign policy stands to be destroyed. It is time we recognize that such infringements by Congress upon Presidential authority can lead to confusion, if not disintegration, in the implementation of an affirmative foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, many of us here are vehemently opposed to the admission of Red China as a member of the U.N. at this time. But it does not follow that we must therefore cast an affirmative vote for the resolution before us. I am sure that if the membership of the House is careful to distinguish between the question of whether Red China should at this time be a member of the U.N. and whether or not the legislation before us can serve any proper or useful purpose, an intelligent decision on the resolution will be reached.

Roads to Nowhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the Mansfield News-Journal, of Mansfield, Ohio, is a fine independent newspaper, which truly strives to come to grips with

many of our problems. Most of all, it deals with major national issues in simple, everyday terms that make it possible for our citizens to think clearly about complex subjects.

On Sunday, August 9, 1959, the Mansfield News-Journal carried an editorial entitled, "Roads to Nowhere," which I believe is well worthy of the consideration of my colleagues, who shortly will be considering legislation to finance the needed highway program. Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting this editorial, written by my friend Ken Woodman.

The material follows:

[From the Mansfield News-Journal, Aug. 9, 1959]

ROADS TO NOWHERE

Is the United States going to be full of stretches of fine double highway that start nowhere and wind up at the edge of a cornfield?

It will be if the Democrats in Congress don't quit squabbling about the Federal highway program.

Ohio has already called off bidding on all contracts where Federal funds are involved. A serious crimp has been put in the State's public road program.

California stopped advertising for bids in May and put $187 million worth of projects on the shelf.

South Dakota is stymied on plans for $36 million in highways.

Thus it goes across the Nation.

Big highways half-built; needed highways stopped cold on the planning table. And why? Largely because the Democrats in Congress who are perfectly willing to give away $3 billion in U.S. money to foreign lands, will not come up with an adequate program for financing this essential improvement at home.

Last January, President Eisenhower saw that the road program was going into the red, mainly because the Democrats had jumped it from $2.2 billion to $2.5 billion last year to "prime the national pump"—without providing any additional taxes to foot the bill.

Mr. Eisenhower suggested a 1½-cent hike in the gasoline tax to keep the road program rolling. With a Presidential election coming up next year the Democrats wanted no part of a tax increase. Issue bonds, they said. But with Federal spending outstripping Federal income and the debt soaring, nobody is rushing to buy Government bonds.

On July 1, the Federal Government was supposed to begin passing out this fiscal year's $2.5 billion to the States, but it had only $500 million.

If Congress lacks the courage to levy necessary taxes (preferably on road users through a gasoline tax), then it should shut up shop on roadbuilding and let the States take over.

Ohio, for instance, could readily finance an adequate major highway program. The wealth to do so is here. It cannot be done, however, in the face of uncertainty as to what the Federal Government will do.

And since the Federal program is started, there may be valid reasons to continue it—if it is soundly financed.

Is this a vague, uninteresting problem to you?

Just drive out and take a look at beautiful Ohio Route 1. Completed, it would take you to the Ohio and New York turnpikes so that you could drive from here to New England or Wisconsin without ever encountering a traffic light. Now it goes nowhere. It fizzles out north of Medina and somewhere south toward Columbus.

It's an expensive road to go nowhere. It would be a highly valuable road to us all if it were open and completed.

This story is being repeated all over the country. And just in case our Congressmen don't know it, the folks back home are going to be pretty sore when they see what legislative dalliance has done.

Family Life With the Strategic Air Command

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article entitled "Family Life With the Strategic Air Command," by Mary Lee O'Neal, appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of August 17. Outlined in the article are some of the everyday events that are faced by the wives and families of the crew members of SAC. To a great number of Americans who themselves must shoulder the burdens of everyday life the sacrifices of that one particular group, who constantly are on the alert to protect American shores, are distant, impersonal. Yet, Americans will always be grateful to those whose devotion to duty make it possible for us to go about our assignments with a feeling of added security—and our appreciation is extended to those loved ones who day in and day out anxiously await the return of these heroes:

The article follows:

FAMILY LIFE WITH THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

(By Mary Lee O'Neal)

"Next week we are going on alert." "Our crew is going to Europe next month." "Don't save dinner for me." And so it goes. Familiar words to an Air Force wife married to a pilot in the Strategic Air Command.

Familiar words, repetitious words, tiresome words, depressing words. But they are words we have to live with. They comprise the highs and lows of our daily existence.

Recent newspapers have carried items about the possibility of SAC's going on a partial alert wherein a certain portion of its force would be in the air 24 hours a day. I have often wondered if the average citizen reading such items realizes how SAC families are affected by the alerts and missions already in effect.

In the past 2 years, in addition to his regular flying missions, my husband has been gone from home on several reflex trips abroad, and has been confined to the air base with his B–47 crew on frequent home alerts.

He has been gone from home on Father's Day twice, on a birthday, our anniversary, Memorial Day, Labor Day, and the 4th of July. We have eaten months of dinners without him, and he has missed many of the little triumphs and tears mothers like to share with fathers concerning their children.

One week he left home as the baby was tentatively stepping out alone. When he returned 3 weeks later he found a sure-footed little girl. All the fun in between he never saw.

There are parties I have not attended, shows I have missed, and meetings I have been forced to forgo. I couldn't go minus a husband, or I couldn't find a baby sitter.

Recently we moved into a new home all our own. My husband lived in it for 2 days. Then he went on home alert for a week. Two days later he was off to an oversea station. Three weeks later he was home for 3 days; then he was off to Oklahoma and was delayed there 6 days. Upon his return he flew a night mission, and 3 hours later he went on home alert. And so the year goes.

Last month I waited for him to find time to help me plant morning glories for a trellis on my back stoop. It became evident to me he might be here to help me build a snowman, but if I wanted morning glories I would have to dig out the rocks, sift the dirt, and prepare the flowerbed myself. I did.

I have painted furniture, hung pictures, burned garbage in the snow, trudged across town with two tired children to complete Christmas shopping, waited in numerous barbershop chairs for my son's haircuts, serviced the car, coped with it when it wouldn't start, stacked belongings above floodwaters in our basement, and made all sorts of decisions. Perhaps many wives do these things anyway, but when he is home my husband does them, and I miss his help.

Our little girl, just learning to talk, doesn't say "Dada," but adds "Dada br-r-r-r," which is her way of saying Daddy has gone bye-bye in an airplane. She has accepted his being gone as normal; his coming home as something special.

On the other hand, my son misses his father acutely, and it is a continuous challenge to me to compensate for his father's absences. There are times when a boy needs a male influence, and mothers are poor substitutes.

Last Christmas Eve when families were gathering together to share this night of nights, I was sitting in a squadron dayroom waiting for a plane that would be my husband's—waiting for my Christmas to begin. Finally the truck brought up my husband's crew from the snowswept ramp where they had landed their big jet bomber, and I knew our little family would have Christmas after all. It didn't matter that my husband reached home too late to see the children hang their stockings, or that he was too tired from having flown the Atlantic to know it was Christmas. He was with us.

Many times I ask myself why we have to live like this and how much longer it will go on. There is little security in living day by day knowing our plans will go awry at any moment; that vacations may be canceled; that holidays will never be shared. It helps me little to realize that since civilization began wives with husbands in the service of their country have existed like this. Somehow the bonds of the centuries bring little comfort.

There are times I wish I were married to a businessman who caught the 5:15 every night of the week, walked in the door precisely at 6:04, and sat down to dinner with us at 6:30.

And yet there are other times when I wonder if I would want my life to be any different.

It is on the special occasions when we wives are allowed to wait out on the ramp and watch our husbands land their aircraft upon their return from overseas. Here are no ordinary businessmen returning from a cushioned job. Here are no workers returning from the regular grind. As that huge swept-wing plan descends, we know it is carrying men who have gone beyond the normal routine. They have been pursuing the cause of peace in a way only they themselves can know.

They are warriors who haven't fought any battles. They are heros who haven't done anything heroic.

And when my husband waves to me from the canopy of his jet bomber, that's when I am really sure. I wouldn't want my life to be any different.

Abundance Results From Impartial Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 21, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following article by Byron Brinton, editor, Record-Courier, Baker, Oreg., and member of the Oregon Water Resources Board. The article, "Abundance Results From Impartial Development," appeared in the August 1959 issue of the Powder River Sportsmen. Mr. Brinton's article clearly demonstrates his keen and thorough understanding of the multiple-use principle of resource management. Need I add that I am in complete agreement with this article? It is imperative that selfish and inadequate development of all our natural resources cease and that a national policy of comprehensive planning and impartial multiple-purpose development be adopted.

The article follows:

ABUNDANCE RESULTS FROM IMPARTIAL DEVELOPMENT, SAYS WATER BOARD MEMBER

(By Byron C. Brinton)

In the past the pursuit of abundant conditions for fish and game has not been a pursuit at all but a retreat. It has been a thrill to go up beyond the road and cast a fly into virgin water, unspoiled by an advanced civilization.

But we have had to go farther and farther back to escape the advance; and the next few years—sooner than Oregonians realize—even in our great Northwest we will become an area where we too must enhance our lives by developing water supplies and not by despoiling what we futilely have or grasping for the return of natural conditions.

The value of water is not peculiar to the sportsman alone, in fact he is probably the last to put a practical value upon it because until recently he has been unique among all people in not specificially appropriating land or water for his use. He has watched others appropriate it by placing such values upon the resources as to warrant investing in dams for diversions upon the stream or improvements upon the land, essentially for other purposes than recreation. He has not been able to compete for appropriation, but has won marked recognition for the principle of multiple-use in recent years. And oddly enough, particularly in developed storage, he has discovered that a share in a conserved and plentiful resource is of far greater benefit to him than bitter controversy over scarcity resulting from resource competition and inadequate and selfish development.

Once you accept the logic of the development approach to resource conservation you become one who realizes there is work to be done, you cease to be one who fights progress, you no longer want to turn clocks back, you want to hasten your objectives and not merely dream of your utopia.

The development approach is not a charted route. In the fields of big game it is almost sure to incur the immediate ire of the rancher, or in the field of intensified range management, it is almost sure to arouse the ire of the sportsmen. Yet the common objective of maximum use of the dwindling per capita land, soil, and water resources calls for the most understanding tolerance of divergent interests. In the field of fish, the development approach upon our waterways has amounted upon some streams to open warfare. Yet the crying need for water conservation through implementation is so critical that if the fish resource keeps pace with the development approach upon the streams of Oregon it must undertake the most intensified research effort in history. The search for compatible conditions must not be clouded by divergent competition but it must be stimulated by the common purpose of the achievement of maximum results from our water—maximum storage control, maximum irrigation, maximum power, maximum temperature and quality conditions, maximum consumptive supplies, and maximum fish life production and recreational advantages.

I am not one to say that some game range must not be acquired but it must be accompanied by a recognition of commensurate intensification in domestic stock capacity on other areas. I am not one to oppose the increase by fivefold through improvement the carrying capacity of the stock ranges, but I always point out that this potential only emphasizes that if the sportsman is to maintain equal values on his behalf he must demonstrate a know-how and an ability to apply equivalent improvement to enhance the capacity of all multiple-use acres or reserved lands assigned to game. I am not one to oppose high storage dams in our rivers, but never have I advocated less than the maximum attention to tolerance for fish while I have favored these great conservation projects. You cannot under any circumstances pull out of the mud with the power only on one wheel.

The development approach must be kept in balance. Fish and wildlife agencies are fully aware that their tasks of rationing and regulating are so tremendous that little, if any, effort has been permitted them in the fields of basic research. Without this specific factual data equivalent to the justification by other claimants through appropriation for the State's water values, the protection of the recreation values in water can only be generalities and we can only cry for moratoriums and temporary expedients. Without facts, a full water program for Oregon cannot be developed including adequate provision for fish life. Without facts desirable conditions with respect to spawning beds and flows and impoundments and passages cannot be advocated. And, without participation, recreation cannot claim its full share an multiple-use equality under development projects.

Impartial development is the only route to the abundance of resources for fish and game. As intense competition sets in for soil and water we must be impartial, we must be tolerant. Opposition to multiple-purpose water resource projects is all too unnecessary.

Decisions of the Supreme Court That Have Attempted To Alter and Revise the Constitution of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include therein a series of three Washington reports made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES B. UTT, of California. These reports treat with the dangers of this Republic by reason of a long line of judicial decisions handed down by the Supreme Court over the last several years which tend to decrease the sovereign powers of the several States by denying the States the right to legislate in areas not under the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. UTT also attacks the Court for attempting to write new words and phrases into the Constitution which are not there, and which if accepted as law would greatly weaken the Constitution which is the very foundation of the political life of this Republic.

The above-mentioned Washington reports follow:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 6, 1959.

For some time I have been torn between two admonitions of significant virtue; one by my father when he said, "Son, if you can't speak well of someone, don't speak at all," the second one by Abraham Lincoln when he said, "To keep silent when one has the duty to speak out is a sin." Believing that tolerance can be a sin as well as a virtue, I have resolved this dilemma by accepting the Lincoln doctrine as a responsibility of the highest magnitude. There is aways a straw which breaks the camel's back and a catalyst which sets off a mental or physical explosion.

The catalyst in this case was the undignified performance of Chief Justice Earl Warren at a Sunday evening cocktail party in which he called Earl Mazo "a damned liar" when Mazo denied that in his new biography of Vice President NIXON he was spotlighting NIXON at the expense of the Chief Justice. Mazo asked the Chief Justice if he had read the book. The Chief Justice replied "No," and Mazo's rejoinder was, "I hope to God for the sake of the country that your decisions are based on much more full and accurate evidence than judgments on a book you haven't even read."

This last rejoinder must have struck a tender spot, as it must be recalled that in the desegregation opinion which overthrew the 58-year-old Supreme Court doctrine, the Chief Justice, after citing certain authorities, added, "And see, generally, Myrdal, 'Our American Dilemma.'"

While I am opposed to segregation, I am unalterably opposed to having the Supreme Court rely upon sociology instead of legal authorities. The Swedish sociologist, Gunnar Myrdal, in his book cited by Warren's opinion as an authority, also stated that the Constitution of the United States is "impractical and unsuited to modern conditions, and that its adoption was nearly a plot against the common people." What hogwash. What poppycock. And what a slander against our Founding Fathers. Any student of our Constitution should know that it was founded upon Judaic-Christian religion, with a profound reverence for the Greek philosophers, B.C., the Roman law, and above all, the Magna Carta of 1215, and the Common Law of England, and was beamed to protect and increase the freedom and dignity of the individual under a God-ordained universe.

At this point I wish to make it abundantly clear that I am not attacking the Supreme Court as an institution, but rather my remarks are leveled at the members of the present Court and their sociological philosophies upon which they have based so many of their opinions, in some of the most amaz-

ing decisions ever handed down by that august body. Contrary to popular opinion, the Supreme Court rulings are in no sense the supreme law of the land. The supreme law of the land is referred to in an article of the Constitution which does not even mention the Supreme Court at all.

Article III provides: "The judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one Supreme Court, and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish." The judicial power is not indivisible. Article III, section 2, says that "The Supreme Court shall have appellate jurisdiction, both as to law and to fact, with such exceptions and under such regulations as the Congress shall make." Congress, therefore, is given the sole right to divide this judicial power between the Supreme Court and the lower courts. The Constitution and some of the amendments are full of limitations upon the Supreme Court.

Article VI defines the supreme law of the land by saying, "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof, and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land." You will note that the Supreme Court is not even mentioned in this definition. No Federal court is given any authority under the Constitution to change it by a single word nor to evade it by subterfuge, and any attempt to do so is as unlawful as rape, and just as despicable, even though perpetrated by prima donnas.

Speaking of prima donnas, in 1957 when the American Bar met in London to pay tribute to the signing of the Magna Carta by King John, the Chief Justice was an invited guest. After accepting the invitation, he heard that Vice President NIXON was also an invited guest, and the Chief Justice notified his London host that if NIXON was going to be there, he, the Chief Justice, would decline to attend. The reason? Under protocol, the Vice President outranks the Chief Justice. How horrible. The Chief Justice was not the least concerned over the embarrassment this caused his hosts in making it necessary for them to recall their invitation to the Vice President of the United States. However, if it were not for this trait, Mr. Warren would not be Chief Justice, because when he was promised the first vacancy on the Supreme Court, and that vacancy was created by the death of Chief Justice Vinson, he demanded this appointment as Chief Justice, and would not accept an appointment as an Associate Justice.

The Supreme Court has no authority to question the wisdom of any law. It can only determine its constitutionality. It is an equal and coordinate branch of our Government, and therefore has no authority to invade the jurisdiction of the executive branch, nor the legislative branch, and yet an examination of a score or two of the decisions of the present members of the Supreme Court establishes a record of invasion upon the rights, duties, privileges, and immunities of the other two branches. More than that, examination will prove that the Court has entered upon an attempt to repeal and rewrite many articles and amendments to the Constitution.

This duplicity is so outstanding that it comes within the purview of Lincoln's admonition that "to keep silent when one has a duty to speak out is a sin." A partial list of these decisions and their effect upon our Constitution will be included in next week's report. These decisions strike at the very heart of our Government, and tend to destroy the right of the individual to have a voice in his government at the State and community level.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 13, 1959.

In my report last week I indicated that I would cite several recent decisions of the Supreme Court which strike at the very foundation upon which our republic is built, and which create a sociological philosophy that the Constitution was created to defend the Court rather than that the Court was created to defend the Constitution. The Constitution must be supreme over the Court, and not the Court over the Constitution.

The Constitution is a document of strict limitations, and prohibits the Federal Government from doing anything not permitted by the Constitution. The 10th amendment states: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Now comes the Supreme Court with the opinion that none of the States can enact and enforce laws dealing with Communist subversion and antisedition laws, because Congress had legislated in that field, and therefore preempted it. This decision involved the case of Steve Nelson who was convicted under Pennsylvania antisedition laws. He was an admitted Communist leader, but the Court held that because Congress had passed the Smith Act (an antisedition law) any State law dealing with this subject was henceforth null and void. Under that decision the previous convictions of the 10 top Communists in California, which were under appeal, were automatically reversed, and these Communists were set free. The Smith Act in no sentence or pargraph indicated that Congress intended to preempt this field, nor are such laws prohibited to the States by the Constitution. How then could the Supreme Court reach such a conclusion?

Under this "doctrine of preemption" no State could enact and enforce a little Lindbergh kidnaping law, because Congress has legislated in this field, and the enactment and enforcement of our State narcotics control laws are likewise in jeopardy under this doctrine.

The great political strength of this country lies in the fact that it has 50 separate States, each with its constitution, its own legislature, its own constabulary, and its own legal department, so that just in case the Federal Government should be subverted there would yet remain 50 distinct entities with exactly the same character. No "coup" could take place in this country such as have taken place in many countries, and for the very reason just stated.

In *Sweezy* v. *New Hampshire* the Supreme Court held that the attorney general of that State had no right to question a college professor about subversive activities, and held further, in *Raley et al* v. *Ohio* that the State could not punish a witness for contempt for his refusal to answer questions by its legislature regarding his subversive activities. This line of decisions has given aid and comfort to the Communists, and follows the social philosophy of some members of the Supreme Court rather than the rule of law.

I said last week that the Supreme Court had no authority to add one word nor to delete a word from the Constitution, yet in the Watkins case it attempted to do just that. Congress had voted a contempt action against John T. Watkins for refusing to answer questions of the Un-American Activities Committee. In the opinion written by Chief Justice Warren, he said, "* * * nor can the first amendment freedoms of speech, press, religion, or political belief or association be abridged." Now the first amendment does guarantee freedom of speech, press, religion, and assembly, but where, oh where in the first amendment are listed freedoms of "political belief" and "association"? These words simply do not appear in the Constitution, and yet the Supreme Court is attempting to solidify this into accepted law.

I could cite a dozen other cases which I feel constitute a frontal attack against our Constitution, and it is shocking to know that none of the Justices of the Supreme Court has ever taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution, as members of the other branches of government do, and as required by the Constitution itself. They simply sign a watered-down version to administer justice according to the best of their ability and understandi ig, agreeably to the Constitution and laws of the United States.

I have introduced legislation to require all Federal judges and justices to take the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, and which I have taken as a Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman JAMES B. UTT)

AUGUST 20, 1959.

This report concludes a series of three, relative to decisions of the Supreme Court that have attempted to alter and revise the Constitution of the United States. Additional opinions to those heretofore cited are set forth in this final report. I do not believe that the general public is aware of the serious effect which has resulted to law enforcement agencies and others by striking down the right of the States to legislate and enforce laws which rightly fall within the jurisdiction of the State. Until the effect strikes you individually, you will continue to be complacent.

The Mallory case is one in point. After Mallory was convicted of rape, and there was no question of his guilt, as he had confessed, nevertheless the Supreme Court ordered him freed because the arresting officers had detained him for questioning before indictment. It was impossible to have a new trial because the same defense would obtain, and there was nothing to do but wait for Mr. Mallory to strike again, which he did within a few months after his release. If it had been your daughter who was the victim of this assault, you would not feel kindly toward the judges who released him, knowing that he was guilty in the first instance.

In the case of Clinton E. Jencks, who had been convicted of Communist activities, he was released by the Supreme Court because the trial judge refused to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation open its files on the matter. In this case there could have been a new trial had the FBI been willing to open its complete files. The Justice Department felt that it would reveal its sources of evidence on other investigations, and would destroy the effectiveness of the FBI. So, rather than comply with the admonition of the Court, they did not bring Jencks to trial again. Mr. Jencks is now attending the University of California under a foundation grant for the purpose of obtaining teacher's credentials qualifying him to teach your children and mine, and under the rulings of the Court he cannot be denied a teacher's certificate on the grounds of Communist association.

This is one area where the present Supreme Court has reversed an interpretation of the free speech amendment which has long been an accepted doctrine. In *Gitlow* v. *New York*, U.S. Reports, page 667, the opinion by Justice Sanford reads in part: "And, for yet more imperative reasons, a State may punish utterances endangering the foundations of organized government and threatening its overthrow by unlawful means. These imperil its own existence as a constitutional State. Freedom of speech and press * * * does not protect disturbances to the public peace or the attempt to subvert the Government. It does not protect publications or

teachings which tend to subvert or imperil the Government or to impede or hinder it in the performance of its governmental duties." In other words, it has always been the rule that the right of free speech guaranteed by the first amendment did not give sanctuary to those people whose purpose is to overthrow the Government by force and violence, thereby destroying the Government which gave them the right of free speech. However, under the recent rulings which include cases of subversion and cases involving the right to teach an idea, even though that idea could be adultery, as in the "Lady Chatterley's Lover" case, sabotage, or effective methods of overthrowing the Government by force and violence, the limit of free speech is not breached until an overt act has been committed, implementing the teaching of the idea. In other words, you can teach the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, but you are not a criminal until you light the fuse.

One final case of incompetency of the Court was revealed in one of the shortest opinions on record. In the matter of the Evetts Haley, Jr. case, reversing Federal Judge T. Winfield Davidson's decision, the opinion in full is herewith stated: "The judgment is reversed. *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, 317 U.S. 111." It is my candid opinion that any freshman in law school who would cite *Wickard* v. *Filburn* as an authority for reversing the Haley case would be washed out of school as an incompetent. I do not say that the Court might not have reached the same conclusion under the broad powers granted under the "commerce" clause of the Constitution, but surely the reversal of Judge Davidson's decision merited more than four words.

The Haley case involved the planting of wheat and its consumption on the farm without an allotment from the Department of Agriculture. The Government had imposed a fine of $506.11 against Haley because he grew 43 acres of wheat on his 1660-acre cattle ranch. Mr. Haley had never received any subsidies for anything on his farm, and in the case which the Supreme Court cited as authority for reversal, the defendant, Filburn, had received subsidies by way of parity payments, and fed his wheat, grown on the surplus acreage, to his livestock. In that case, the Court used 23 pages of opinion to arrive at its conclusion, and on page 131 of that decision stated, "It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes." On page 133 of that decision the Court concluded "that appellee is the worse off for the aggregate of this legislation does not appear; it only appears that, if he could get all that the Government gives and do nothing that the Government asks, he would be better off than this law allows."

There you have it. The Filburn case was based on the Government's right to control that which it subsidizes, and in the Haley case, no subsidy whatsoever was involved, and for the Court to cite the Filburn case as an authority for reversal is simply juvenile.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the August 1 issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun, following the return of Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., from an extended business trip to Europe:

HARDLY PAUSES TO REFRESH: JIM FARLEY, ON THE GO AS ALWAYS, SELLS COKE AND GOOD WILL ABROAD

James A. Farley returned to New York this week from a 6-week trip to Europe. This dispatch by a British writer presents a fresh view of the veteran business executive-political figure.

(By Patricia Lewis, London Express staff writer, special to World-Telegram and Sun)

LONDON, August 1.—"Have a Coke?" beamed the receptionist, bustling to a giant cooler, selecting a bottle, opening it and spiking it with straws in one well-practiced movement.

I sipped and explained I wished to track down James A. Farley, chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., for a chat about the part his product is playing in making friends all over the world.

"Well, now, Mr. Farley's itinerary is very tightly packed," said the girl consulting a sheaf of papers. "He is in Oxford today, Stratford tonight, Norwich the next day, but maybe he can fit you in breakfast time day after tomorrow."

When I met Mr. Farley—a tall, well-set-up tycoon in a light navy suit—we had neither breakfast nor cokes. Instead this quick-actioned, swift-thinking, 71-year-old reeled off a list of the 19 places, 22 cities he'd visited on his trip to see the Pope. He also met various ex-kings and current dictators.

PICTURE WITH POPE

Chuckling at the memory, Jim Farley said of Pope John: "We had our picture taken together and * * * as you can see * * * I'm quite a big fellow. Well, when the photographer started to get busy he just moved over and stood on a dais. That made him a bit taller than me—it also made a pretty good picture."

Spain is another important call on Mr. Farley's list, and this usually includes a talk with Franco * * * "through an interpreter, of course, but somehow it's all so easy it doesn't seem as if the interpreter's there."

Dinner with ex-King Umberto of Italy * * * you'd think it's amazing what a man can do with a soft drink in one hand and the say-so for opening new plants in the other. But with Jim Farley it's more than that. For Farley is a politician, too.

He mused a moment.

"I hope I'll live to see next year's Democratic Convention in Los Angeles because if I do I'll have been to every one this past 40 years. Hmm—40 years."

SEEMS TIRELESS

There's no doubt in my mind that Mr. Farley will be in there pitching come next July. He seems tireless. ("I've never had a holiday in my life—and if you think traveling is a vacation just follow me around.") He doesn't smoke * * * he doesn't drink ("just Coca-Cola and lots of coffee and milk") * * * he's a widower with nine grandchildren * * * and he wears a straw-boater with just as much aplomb—if not more—than Maurice Chevalier.

From his connections with American politics you might think Mr Farley a golf addict. But walking and studying advertisements are, he considers, more worth while.

"Golf's a terrible timekiller," he told me. "The men I know take it so seriously they get no relaxation—most seem to get more tense about their scores than about their work.

"Walking is the best thing—Harry Truman always used to walk miles each morning and I don't think he was any the worse for not playing golf."

But if golf fails to fascinate Mr. Farley—one of our British ads certainly does.

"I think the one with the man holding up a whale on his finger is very good," he said. "It does what the product does—it gets that feeling of strength over. Our aim, you know, is to sell Coke as a cool, refreshing drink—not that you use enough refrigeration over here."

Suddenly I realized Mr. Farley had been looking at his watch for quite some time. "Got some people to see * * * then a lunch * * * then a lot of reading to catch up on before I fly back to New York," he said. "And once I'm there I'll be straight in the office to get through 6 weeeks' accumulated mail—enough to keep five secretaries busy."

Effective Legislation in the Field of Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, as one who has supported the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House, I am very much interested in the enactment of effective legislation in the field of labor before the adjournment of this session of the 86th Congress. The battle is not over and I hope that the people of this Nation who demanded, and received from the House, effective labor-reform legislation will not celebrate a premature victory. The fate of this measure is now in the hands of the House-Senate conference committee, and I trust that an effective measure will soon be reported back to both Houses of the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 17, 1959:

LABOR REFORM—LEGISLATION ISN'T CERTAIN YET

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is still too soon to say that the public has won its victory for a labor-reform law despite the fact that both Senate and House have acted favorably.

Because there are now two versions of the same legislation with appreciable differences between them, these two bills must go before a House-Senate conference to be reconciled, merged, or diluted.

Most correspondents expect that an acceptable compromise will be reached. But this is not certain and it is only realistic to report that anything can happen—or nothing.

These are the possibilities:

Either the Senate, which passed almost unanimously the less ambitious Kennedy-Ervin bill, will accept a substantial part of the stronger provisions of the House's Landrum-Griffin bill;

Or, the conference and the House and Senate will let themselves get into an irreconcilable wrangle resulting in no compromise, no legislation, nothing.

In the wake of the mounting disclosures of the McClellan committee on how racketeering and corruption have bludgeoned their way into many unions and in face of an alerted public opinion which, if much longer

frustrated, may well demand sterner measures, it would seem to me egregiously unwise and harmful to the country, to labor, and to both parties to let labor reform law go down the drain of an election-minded political stalemate.

The argument which the Democratic congressional leaders used against the House Republicans only a week ago is now equally applicable to the new and unexpected position in which they find themselves.

You may remember that the Democratic contention was that the Republicans, under the whiplash leadership of House Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK, was implacably and partisanly intent upon an all-or-nothing strategy. The Democrats said they could see plainly that HALLECK was aiming at the goal of either getting exactly as tough a bill as he wanted or preventing any bill at all from being enacted.

Well, the administration bill is now the majority will of the House, passed by the decisive vote of 305 to 125, and it is certainly pertinent to ask of the Democratic leaders, who did not want the Landrum-Griffin version, whether they are going to take the position which they recently accused HALLECK of taking or whether they are going to take their own advice.

In other words, are Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, now denied the kind of labor bill they most wanted in the House, going to yield to the strategy they condemned and say to their followers: Since we can't have our way, let's block the way to any bill? Or will they act to thwart their own extremists and help bring about a constructive compromise?

For RAYBURN and JOHNSON to pursue an all-or-nothing policy and try to block a reasonable compromise would seem to me wholly out of character.

It would be my judgment that the labor reform bill which passed the House reflects not only the majority will of Congress but the majority will of the country. I doubt if many, but the irrevocably committed, will be impressed by the epithets—like punitive and antilabor—thrown at the Landrum-Griffin bill by some union leaders.

Labor isn't weak; it is powerful. Big labor has shown that it needs some regulation just as big business showed it needed some regulation a quarter century ago. Now is the time to do it.

From Poland's Heart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a recent editorial from the New York Times entitled "From Poland's Heart" which recounts Vice President NIXON's reception in that great nation.

All lovers of freedom can take great encouragement from the spontaneous reception which Poland accorded to our able and distinguished Vice President.

This warm and wholehearted welcome was something more, of course, than a personal tribute.

It was a demonstration of affection for our own Nation as the leader of the free world, an outburst of enthusiastic support for the freedom we represent and a fervent plea for our continued sponsorship of liberation and freedom for the captive nations. It was a great showing of confidence and admiration we must never betray.

The Polish people trust the United States. They know we seek no selfish territorial gains, that we stand for freedom and humane treatment for all nations, great and small.

In this great demonstration of loyalty to our cause, trust, and affection for our Nation and its people, Poland again stretches out its hands in friendship and devotion appealing for our sympathy and help. From their hearts and on their knees, the Polish people plead and pray for our help.

If we as proud Americans, sons and daughters of freedom, a people favored by the Almighty, above all others are to be true to our blessed heritage, if we are to be responsive to the promptings of our own souls, we must not fail them and the other captive peoples who remember our commitments for self-determination, universal freedom and a free, peaceful world.

[From the New York Times]

FROM POLAND'S HEART

Americans must be deeply moved by the incredible reception the people of Warsaw gave Vice President NIXON yesterday. In the heart of Communist-ruled Eastern Europe, in a nation with Soviet troops on its soil and with Soviet troops on its eastern and western borders, about 100,000 people turned out spontaneously to cheer and throw flowers to the Vice President of the United States.

This happened in a city which but a few weeks ago gave only a tepid welcome to Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, for whose reception the Polish Government had mobilized all its resources. Once again truth has shown itself to be stranger than fiction.

No one planned it that way, but yesterday's outpouring of friendship from Poland's heart toward our country symbolized by Mr. NIXON was the most effective answer possible to Premier Khrushchev's gibes at our celebration of Captive Nations Week.

The Polish Government is a member of Moscow's Warsaw pact. Wladyslaw Gomulka and his fellow leaders have time and again associated themselves with Khrushchev's denunciation of American "imperialism" and his threats against the West's position in Berlin. For nearly a decade and a half the Polish people have been indoctrinated with Communist propaganda from almost every possible organ of education and communication. But yesterday the people of Warsaw gave Mr. NIXON what may well have been the warmest welcome an American leader has received in a foreign nation for a decade or longer. The political implications are unmistakable and will be understood by peoples and leaders wherever the facts are known.

At the end of World War II we did not use our power to compel Stalin to live up to his promises of a democratic Poland, but instead permitted him to enslave its people and destroy all public opposition. And almost 3 years ago, in October 1956, we contributed nothing but verbal encouragement to the Polish people as they defied Khrushchev's threats and set a new course, of which Gomulka was then the symbol. Nor have we done anything of crucial importance these past 3 years, in which the concessions of the Polish October have been steadily whittled away or abolished. Yet, as Warsaw proved yesterday, the Polish people still see in us the beacon of their hopes for a better tomorrow.

The cynical may argue that nothing really important was changed yesterday. Poland's unenviable geographic position between occupied East Germany and the Soviet Union was not altered by an inch. The harsh realities of the nuclear age which make any talk of liberation by force of arms unthinkable are as terrible this morning as they were yesterday before Mr. NIXON arrived in Warsaw.

But the cynics are wrong; something of great importance was changed yesterday. By their welcome the people of Warsaw destroyed the propaganda campaign which has sought so hard to prove that Communist totalitarianism has won over the people of Eastern Europe so there can be no more talk of captive nations. In 1 hour of truth, as the NIXON caravan rode from the airport to the city, the friends of freedom and democracy gained new courage and new heart, which cannot but affect profoundly the world political scene.

Secretary of State Herter at Santiago Ministers' Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter at the fifth meeting of the Foreign Ministers of the American States, at Santiago, Chile, on August 12, 1959, in response to the address of welcome by President Jorge Allessandri Rodriguez of Chile and in behalf of the Foreign Ministers:

Your Excellency, in behalf of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs meeting here in this hospitable capital I am honored to be entrusted with our collective expression of gratitude for the welcome extended by you and your Government. Your cordial words of greeting warm our hearts. No place could be more appropriate for sessions consecrated to preserving the peace and freedom of America. The devotion of the Chilean people to Pan American ideals of peace and cooperation, their dedicated efforts and achievements in economic and social progress, and their firm adherence to democratic principles, are widely recognized throughout our American community of nations. As long ago as 1541, when this noble and beautiful city of Santiago was founded by Pedro de Valdivia, that far-sighted hero struck a prophetic and truly American note when he declared in a letter to the King that Santiago would grow and flourish provided only that nobody should be sent out from Spain or from other areas of the New World to interfere with its affairs.

Against the heroic background of Chilean history looms Chile's cultural achievements. It is no accident that in her universities were trained many political and intellectual leaders from other American countries. The agricultural and technical development here has been accompanied, indeed has been stimulated, by the imaginative energy of a creative people. It is an augury of success that our sessions are being held in such an environment.

I appreciate Your Excellency's expression of Chile's sympathetic interest in the efforts of the great powers to seek a stable world peace through discussion of their differences. As you know, I have just returned from a meeting of this kind in Geneva. In contrast

to that gathering, however, I think the issues to be decided at the meeting of Foreign Ministers in this city appear more capable of early solution. Your Excellency brilliantly summarized the issues before us by stating that we should seek a formula that harmonizes our heartfelt desire never to see human rights violated with our absolute respect for the principle of nonintervention, thus guaranteeing an international liberty indispensable for living together harmoniously and sanely in this hemisphere. As Your Excellency states, this international democratic policy can be fortified by the fullest utilization of our economic capabilities.

At their informal meeting in Washington last year the Foreign Ministers of the American Republics reaffirmed their recognition that inter-American solidarity is an essential factor in the stability not only of our hemisphere but of the world. They likewise affirmed the present need for a renewed dedication by our peoples and our governments to the inter-American ideals of independence, political liberty, and economic and cultural progress and for a renewed faith in our capacity to achieve them. On December 24, 1958, the Eighth International Conference of American States approved "the Declaration of Lima." That declaration begins with the forthright statement "that the peoples of America have achieved spiritual unity through the similarity of their republican institutions, their unshakeable will for peace, their profound sentiment of humanity and tolerance and, through their absolute adherence to the principles of international law, of the equal sovereignty of states and of individual liberty without religious or racial prejudice." It closes with a provision for meetings of con ultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics when deemed desirable and at the initiative of any one of them.

We may say that the Declaration of Lima comes of age this current year, the 21st since its adoption. During these 21 years, our 21 Republics have convoked 5 meetings of consultation of their Foreign Ministers for the purpose of maintaining the peace and independence of the hemisphere and preserving our freedom and progress toward a better life.

That has always been the American ideal. Peace is our chosen environment, freedom and progress our chosen way of life. The American peoples have never believed that one could be valid without the other. Our Republics are founded on the concept of independence with law, freedom with order. Our revolutions were fought—all of them—to attain a freedom both for states and for individuals dedicated to the development of the progress which can be achieved only through peace.

It is in response to that undeviating concept—peace with freedom and progress—that we are met in this historical capital of a free progressive and peace-loving country. The convocation of a meeting of consultation of the Foreign Ministers is in itself evidence that a crisis exists. It is at the same time proof of our united belief, supported by our experience, that the crisis can be met and its problems solved if dealt with cooperatively in a spirit of reason and good will.

Let us remember that there have been in all the course of our common history very few armed conflicts across national boundaries in this hemisphere. No comparable area of the world so large in extent, so great in population, with so many basic mutual interests, affording nevertheless such varied surface points of difference, has ever developed into an international neighborhood like that of the Americas. The unguarded frontier is a commonplace of national life with most of our peoples. The Christ of the Andes represents not only a lofty international ideal but a customary international relationship, the same ideal and relationship which farther to the North—Mexico, Canada and my own country attest to with bridges across the boundary rivers.

Just as there is no comparable area of the world living so harmoniously with its neighbors as the American Republics, there is none other that has so long a record of freedom. Our 21 nations, neighbors by the accident of geography, free and independent by instinct and by choice, have been closely and freely associated friendly peoples. From their republican beginnings, independence has been fortified and augmented by cooperation through increased contacts between our peoples in all fields of life. We have developed wider areas of mutual understanding. Cooperation in economic and social fields has been intensified, moving forward with both national and international efforts toward the achievement of greater productivity and higher living standards for our peoples. The progress made this past year in this field of inter-American economic cooperation, particularly under the inspiration of Operation Pan America, has been highly significant and holds out the promise of further gains in the future.

Nor has any other comparable area achieved an international organization like ours—an organization voluntary, continuous, and potent as a matter of historic fact. We all know that the development of the United Nations and other international organizations owed much to the experience of the Organization of the American States, precisely because of the proved effectiveness of our own inter-American experience. The 21 American Republics became charter members of the United Nations. In that body's councils, year after year we have stood together in defense of the free world and in the maintenance of peace and security.

Our inter-American system has worked well. At various times in its history it has faced crises and surmounted them with renewed vitality and increased capacity for constructive achievement. The balance of peace with freedom and progress that has characterized our system has constituted an inspiring demonstration to the entire world of how nations large and small may live and work together toward the common goals of humanity.

Our present meeting here in Santiago comes at a time when our inter-American system again faces a critical moment in history. We are called upon as we have been called upon in the past to renew and revitalize in the light of present conditions and forces the principles that have made our great achievements possible.

Four of these principles which are expressed in the charter of the Organization of American States are particularly pertinent to the situation facing the Organization today. There is first the principle of nonintervention, which has served as a foundation stone for the relations between our countries. Second is the principle of collective security. Together these two principles form the basis for peace and independence on this continent. Third is the principle of the effective exercise of representative democracy and respect for human rights. Fourth is cooperation for economic and social progress. This is of particular pertinence to our time. Together these latter two underlie the achievement of freedom and progress. Our problem today is to restore the traditional balance between peace on the one hand and freedom and progress on the other by giving a proper emphasis to each of these four outstanding principles. We have recognized these four principles as valid in themselves and have learned that our separate, no less than our mutual well-being depends in large measure upon them. When any of these principles is threatened, the individual independence and the collective peace of the American peoples is threatened as is their capacity to progress toward better human life. Against such threats the American nations must at all times marshal their collective effort to insure their continued progress.

We are gathered together here to examine and analyze in a spirit of objectivity and with a common purpose. We will not let ourselves be deluded into mistaking a temporary disorder for a cancer in the heart of peace or for a permanent paralysis of the sinews of freedom. Neither will we permit ourselves to be deceived into dismissing negligently symptoms of a disorder that might adversely affect us all. The American hemisphere is a community of freedom under law and so it must remain for our own generation and for our children's children.

This year in my country we are celebrating the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, whose faith in freedom and devotion to peace have caused other American countries to commemorate his anniversary. At the outset of our proceedings at this meeting we may well recall his exhortation: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us; our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere."

Hunger Amidst Plenty: Caribbean Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, today is expected to mark the close of the American Foreign Ministers meeting in Santiago, attended by our Secretary of State. From reports, there will emerge from these discussions the reactivation of a peace commission originally established in 1940, to investigate reports of trouble in any country in the Caribbean threatened by revolution or aggression and to examine the relationship between economic underdevelopment and political instability.

Timely and pertinent to these reports is an editorial from the Miami News which I proudly call to the attention of my colleagues. Bill Baggs, editor of the Miami News, is one of our better known and highly respected international writers. He is outspoken and blunt in his criticism of "revolution for the sake of revolution" where it is not accompanied by some tangible improvement in the living conditions of the people. In presenting this frank statement on the paradoxical situation of people living in one of the most fertile and naturally endowed areas of the world being in desperate need of medical care for their sick, better schools for their children, more food and more opportunities for all the people, Bill Baggs ably expresses the frustrations of many of us who want to and try to help but feel that new, more effective ways must be found.

It may be that the peace commission is the answer to the tragedy of the Caribbean paradox thoughtfully presented in the editorial which follows:

HUNGER AMIDST PLENTY: CARIBBEAN PARADOX

(By Bill Baggs)

Everyday living across the street in the Caribbean neighborhood is not bad. It is ridiculous.

Millions of the people are hungry and yet they live on some of the most fertile lands of the earth.

Several of the countries in the Caribbean are very nearly bankrupt and yet their hills and mountains are treasuries of minerals needed by the industrial societies of the world.

A most kind climate presides over the Caribbean. There is fresh water. Magnificent harbors.

POOR, HARASSED

Looking down on the lovely green countries under the sun in the Caribbean, a visitor to earth might think that the people who live there are certainly fortunate people. Well, they should be. But they are not. They are poor, harassed human beings. The Indians who resided there five centuries ago enjoyed a much finer life.

It is tragic. But most of all, it is ridiculous.

At the moment, revolution or the threat of revolution can be heard in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, Guatemala, and Haiti.

Mostly, the people who plot to overthrow the governments of these countries are no better than the present proprietors. Worse, they manage a turmoil which has become the customary atmosphere in the Caribbean.

POINTLESS REVOLTS

If one measures by history, it was inevitable that revolt was coming to the Caribbean. The people have lived in somewhat of an economic and political jailhouse since the Europeans came to settle the countries four and a half centuries ago. But the shame of what we are seeing today is that these revolutions so often appear pointless. Or almost pointless.

For instance, what benefit for the people of the Dominican Republic if they sacked Trujillo in a revolution and got a leftwing dictatorship to succeed the present rightwing dictatorship? Would these mean better schools, medical care, more food, more opportunities for the people?

A Somoza succeeded a Somoza in Nicaragua. Violence in Haiti and then a new president. In Guatemala, the old liberals were heaved out and new conservatives came in, people died and others suffered hunger and privation, but is there more food, more schools, better jobs?

Revolts simmer in Honduras, but very little changes. Also in Panama.

Then, the largest example, which is Cuba. Who would argue that Batista promoted a better life for more Cubans? I certainly would not. The list of crimes against democratic ideals when he presided is long and dreary. Under Castro, at least the wanton torture has stopped, but once again, do the people have more food, what about better schools for the children, medical care for the sick?

Revolution for the sake of revolution, or revolution which does not change affairs for the better, is a horrible event.

LESSON FOR CASTRO

In Mexico, there was a revolution which carried on a social change and Mexico slowly emerges as a strong, stable society in our hemisphere. The same in Costa Rica. And now in Venezuela. Ah, there is a lesson in Venezuela for Fidel Castro and all the other revolutionists.

A few days ago, Betancourt announced a land reform program for Venezuela. There was not the burly, nasty, and vicious reaction which greeted Dr. Castro's land reform program. Why? Simply because Betancourt did not attempt to reform land ownership over the weekend throughout Venezuela. He is taking it slow, and making his steps certain.

IS IT NECESSARY?

Someday, the millions of abused people out there across the street in the Caribbean neighborhood are going to back off from these revolutions and ask themselves a question:

Is this one necessary?

If so, where does this revolution lead? What is the point of this revolution? How will it make the lives of the people better?

Only then can we end this great paradox of people impoverished living in wealthy countries, because only then will revolutions become instruments to develop the lands for agriculture, the mountains for mines, the harbors for ships.

The Invisible Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the first scene is the White House, Washington, D.C., United States of America.

It is an evening late in June 1959.

The quiet hum of motor cars in the distance has the beat of time, rising and falling, as the cars come and go.

The President is alone at his desk.

It is a warm, humid twilight. Even the sightseers have been forced to seek air-conditioned relief from the accumulated heat of the day.

One motorist turns on his lights prematurely, eager for the help of night.

The President is tired. He has worked a long, hard day, and the news has not been good.

He picks up a dispatch from his desk.

"Soviet delegate won't yield an inch. Geneva Conference adjourns in stalemate. No progress expected when talks resume."

The President reaches for a sheet of White House stationery. The time has come to do something different. Perhaps a face-to-face meeting with Khrushchev will soothe his pride and make him more cooperative. If I invite him to the United States and arrange for him to view our industrial might and our military power, and let him see all the comforts and luxuries that our people enjoy, he will realize that our people are happy in their personal progress, and have no thought for anything else. That should impress him as to our peaceful intentions. The friendship approach will accomplish more than months of stiff, formal, and fruitless debate.

He starts to write, then looks up quickly, listening.

It sounded like a cry out there—a man's cry—suddenly choked off.

But as far as he can see in the deepening dusk, there is only the chain of passing headlights, broken by the bushes and the trees that are more substantial than the night.

He waits but the voice does not cry out again.

Where did it come from?

He listens but there is no human sound above the hum of the motor traffic, rising and falling, like mechanical breathing.

"Strange. That cry in the night. I'd swear that someone was trying to warn me, but I must be mistaken. Just nerves," he said to himself.

The President frowned, then relaxed.

And went on writing the invitation to Khrushchev.

Scene 2, the Kremlin, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

It is after 9 p.m. in Washington, but 4 a.m. of the following day in an office within the fortress walls of the Soviet capitol.

Red Square is empty.

Except for the security police and the guards who are blended with the night, there is no sign of life. But the people of Moscow, after replenishing their energies through sleep, will soon rise and breakfast and hurry to work. They will continue their heroic efforts to strengthen Mother Russia and protect her against the aggressive plots of the capitalist warmongers. Or so they will be told, over and over again, by their Communist bosses. But they will work hard. They are used to it. They have no other choice.

The bald-headed man who got up early to digest the evening-before news from Washington, pushes his chair away from the desk, and folds his hands across his paunch which is round and firm, like half a globe. His voice is vigorous and jubilant.

"Comrade Secretary, you are the first to know of the great Soviet victory."

The Secretary, who was sifting papers on the desk, dropped them in his surprise and confusion. Was the leader of Communist imperialism in earnest, or was he joking? One could never be sure. And it was dangerous to guess wrong.

"But, if you will excuse me, Comrade Khrushchev, there has been no special report from Deputy Premier Kozlov in Washington."

Khrushchev smiled at his aid's ignorance and bewilderment. When people are uncertain and afraid, like this honest bureaucrat, they can be manipulated so easily.

Khrushchev wagged his finger. "One must be ahead of developments, with the nose to smell them before they can be seen. The President of the United States is going to invite me to visit Washington because I planned it that way."

The Secretary stared, not knowing what to say.

"I can see, Comrade, that you do not understand the efficiency of our methods." Khrushchev said. "With these Americans, who are thin on patience, it is only a matter of time before we wear them down. Gromyko has done well at Geneva. He has been our Gibraltar, a face of stone, deaf to the arguments of the Western diplomats, causing them frustration and loss of confidence. And when the Americans cannot find a solution, they think that friendship will 'melt' us. How childish. They have so

much to learn, but they are so impatient. They think that I will be impressed, like some peasant, when I see their luxuries. But I will be using them, and I will be exploiting their weaknesses every minute, for the greatest propaganda triumph in the history of Communist Russia."

"Would you say then," the Secretary began, but stopped, dazzled by the prospects.

"Go on, Comrade."

"Would you say that this marks the strategic breakthrough for your psychological war against the West?"

Khrushchev grinned.

"We have induced the United States to tranquilize itself. The President and his advisers do not know that we have fooled them into making the invisible retreat."

Shoreline Recreation Areas for Public Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1959, I introduced H.R. 8445, which provides for Federal acquisition of 10 shoreline recreation areas located on the Atlantic, the Pacific, the gulf, and the Great Lakes. Among the areas to be acquired and the maximum authorized acreage are Cape Cod, Mass., 30,000 acres; Padre Island, Tex., 60,000 acres; Oregon Dunes, Oreg., 35,000 acres; Lake Michigan Dunes, Ind., 5,000 acres; Point Reyes, Calif., 35,000 acres; Cumberland Island, Ga., 25,000 acres; Huron Mountains, Mich., 90,000 acres; Channel Island, Calif., 76,000 acres; Pictured Rocks-Grand Sable Dunes, Mich., 100,000 acres; and Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich., 25,000 acres. The bill also authorizes the Park Service to make studies of the possibility of including in the Government acquisition the following areas: Fire Island, N.Y., 3,450 acres; Cape Flattery, Wash., 16,000 acres; Leadbetter Point, Wash., 4,250 acres; Mosquito Lagoon, Fla., 9,700 acres; Pigeon Point, Minn., 6,400 acres; Debidue Island, S.C., 8,400 acres; Kiawah Island, S.C., 7,300 acres; Popham-St. John, Maine, 1,100 acres; Parramoure Island, Va., 6,250 acres; and Smith Island, N.C., 11,900 acres.

Enactment of this bill or substantially identical legislation into law is made imperative by the fact that shorelines available for public use are being developed and subdivided at an astronomical rate. An interesting point is that public shore on the east coast amounts to one-half inch for each person within 50 miles of the beaches. Over the entire Nation there is only one-third of an inch of undeveloped shore per person, or a mile for about every 220,000 people.

In 1935 some 70 miles of beach on the Delaware-Maryland shore could have been acquired for $2 a front foot. Most of this beach is now beyond reach having been long since subdivided and developed.

The bill authorizes appropriations not to exceed $10 million as required from year to year for assistance to the States in acquiring shore areas for public use and authorizes appropriation of a sum not to exceed $50 million to acquire the above-mentioned areas. The total cost of all areas concerned will be some $85 million if the bill is enacted and the purchases made promptly. It is hoped that the Park Service can secure the $35 million between the authorized sum and the needed sum through gifts and public donations.

Similar legislation has been introduced in the Senate sponsored by the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and 16 cosponsors.

I ask permission to insert a letter received from the Izaak Walton League of America in support of this measure:

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1959.
The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The Izaak Walton League of America wishes to congratulate you on the introduction of H.R. 8445, a bill to save our shorelines.

Studies made in recent years by the National Park Service and comparable State agencies reveal the appalling fact that the public is fast losing the opportunity to use beneficially our great shorelines of the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, the Great Lakes and major inland waterways. More and more shoreline areas heretofore available to the public for recreation have been lost to private development for industry, commerce, and community expansion. At the same time the population burgeons, leisure, and real wages increase with a more than corresponding increase in public demand and need for shoreline recreation.

It is clear that a comprehensive and coordinated Federal-State program will be required, if we hope to preserve even some of these opportunities for present and future generations. Moreover, it is clear that except as we do implement very quickly such a program as H.R. 8445 proposes, the chance to do so may be lost entirely or rendered infeasible due to constantly rising costs of shoreline real estate. To put it crudely, such lands, however costly, can never again be acquired as cheaply as today. Senator MURRAY has cited the instance of an area the Park Service could have acquired 20 years ago at $9,000 a mile which would now cost $110,000 per mile, illustrating what has already occurred. In this connection, I noted recently an advertisement offering a Florida property, stated to be the last 5-mile stretch of undeveloped shoreline between Miami and Daytona Beach, for "$1 million down, terms for the balance."

The bill approaches the problem on three important fronts: (1) It lists several areas which have already been studied and proposes their consideration for authorization; (2) proposes a cooperative program by which the States can be assisted in expediting their State park and shoreline programs; and (3) lists additional areas for study to determine whether they are suitable for national or State shoreline designation. We are pleased that the bill recognizes that regulations established for national shoreline areas should permit continuation of present recreational uses such as hunting, fishing, water-fowling, and the like where appropriate. In effect, then, the legislation would establish in the park system under congressional policy a new category of public area, so successfully pioneered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

We are pleased that the legislation sets fairly broad acreage limitations on the areas to be considered for authorization within which, if authorized, the Secretary of Interior may acquire lands. This is a sound method as has been demonstrated at Big Bend, Cape Hatteras, Everglades, Virgin Islands, Fort Clatsop, Shenandoah, and other national parks and monuments established under similar or identical procedures. During the course of hearings, of course, the committee will be able to study specific boundaries in more detail and may, if it appears desirable, describe them with more preciseness. We note also that the Secretary, before designating any authorized area, would be required to consult with the Governor of the State concerned, and to hold local hearings. Beyond this, and before the Secretary could spend any Federal funds for land acquisition, he would be required to come before Congress, in the usual appropriation process, for funds. This provides Congress with still another opportunity to assure itself that the program is being carried out soundly and within the congressional intent. These appear to be adequate safeguards against any possibility of abuse of administrative authority. At the same time it provides means at the administrative level whereby the most sensible areas can be worked out in terms of national, State, and local interests.

It is an unfortunate fact that the Nation's national park system protects and preserves in the broad public interest little of our shoreline. This great gap has been filled to only a slight degree by State park programs, splendid as they are. The save-our-shorelines bill is designed to expedite Federal and State programs cooperatively before it is too late. It is a most worthwhile objective in which all thinking Americans should and will, I am sure, join forces to support.

Sincerely,

J. W. PENFOLD,
Conservation Director, IWLA.

Smathers-Keogh-Simpson Legislation: Retirement Savings for the Self-Employed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a most interesting and very illuminating article on a subject matter that has been under consideration by the Congress for several years which concerns a tax inequity discrimination against self-employed individuals. This well-stated review was written by Attorney F. Joseph Donohue, a member of the District of Columbia bar for 34 years who was formerly from Lynn, Mass. He served as Chairman of the Board of Commissioners for the District of Columbia, and has taught economics and law at Catholic University and economics and banking at the American Institute for Banking. He has also served as chairman of the American Bar Association Special Committee on Retirement Benefits and also chairman of the executive committee of the American Thrift Association.

This dissertation that appeared in the American Bar Association Journal of

August 1959 will be of interest to all members of the bar but will also be most helpful to the Members of the Congress:

SMATHERS-KEOGH-SIMPSON LEGISLATION: RETIREMENT SAVINGS FOR THE SELF-EMPLOYED

(By F. Joseph Donohue of the District of Columbia Bar)

(Mr. Donohue traces the 9-year legislative effort to correct an admitted tax inequity which discriminates against self-employed individuals. Legislation to remove this inequity has passed the House of Representatives and is pending before the Senate Finance Committee. He highlights the arguments advanced at recent hearings before the Senate Finance Committee and gives reasons why this legislation, which is supported by the American Bar Association and over 60 other national associations, should be enacted by the 86th Congress without further delay.)

As a practicing lawyer, you are among the millions of self-employed persons who by law cannot do that which may be done by every other working individual. Economic pressure is being applied against you because of your status as a self-employed individual. There is at present before the U.S. Senate legislation (H.R. 10) to correct an admitted inequity in the tax laws which discriminates against self-employed individuals.

An example of the present tax treatment of retirement savings clearly illustrates this inequity.

Assume that a practicing lawyer, or other self-employed person, age 35, married, has a taxable income of $10,000 after deductions. If he were to earn an additional $1,000, his tax on this would be $260, leaving $740 in actual income. Assume that he invests this $740 each year for 30 years at a 4-percent compound interest rate. He would accumulate, by age 65, a total of $36,900.

But if he were employed by a company, and his employer deposited $1,000 for him in a qualified pension or profit-sharing plan, and had the same 4 percent interest, the fund would be $58,300 at age 65.

Under H.R. 10, this lawyer could have $58,300 rather than $36,900 at age 65. The retirement income, of course, would be subject to tax as paid out. By the enactment of H.R. 10, the attorney, farmer, merchant, or other self-employed individual would no longer be forced to give up his status as a self-employed person in order to have an opportunity to build up retirement savings comparable to that which he could enjoy as an employee covered by a pension plan approved by the Treasury Department.

In 1942 the Congress, cognizant of the desirability of encouraging the establishment of private retirement funds to supplement social security benefits, revised the provisions for private pension plans by amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 to allow substantial tax benefits to corporations and their employees in the establishment of pension plans. Actually there have been provisions for pension plans since the 1924 Revenue Act. The 1942 revision was reenacted with some modifications in the 1954 code. Specific rules set forth in detail the circumstances under which a pension plan may be set up and qualified. The tax effects of such plans when qualified by the Treasury Department are: (1) The contributions by the employer, although in the nature of additional compensation, are not taxable to the employee until the retirement benefits are actually received; (2) at the time the contributions are made they are tax deductible to the employer, and (3) the earnings from the funds are tax exempt until distributed. This is an obvious advantage to the employee since he would normally be in a lower tax bracket when the benefits are received. The full employer payment, without being reduced by taxes, is available to earn income to the fund. A tremendous growth in pension plans has resulted since the 1942 act. Over 45,000 plans, covering more than 18 million employees, are now in existence, and coverage is increasing at the rate of approximately 1 million employees yearly. In 1957, contributions to such plans totaled $4.6 billion, 85 percent of which was contributed by employers. This was 15 times greater than the contributions in 1940. Total reserves amounted to $34.8 billion.

It was not long until the self-employed persons realized that they were apparently forgotten under this new law, since they were the only group precluded by law from the privilege of deferring taxes on contributions to retirement plans.

By 1950, an American Bar Association committee undertook a study and legislation was drafted to correct the tax discrimination against the millions of self-employed. In 1951, Congressman EUGENE KEOGH, Democrat, New York, and the late Daniel Reed, Republican, New York, introduced legislation to allow tax deferment for a limited amount of income set aside by a self-employed person into a restricted retirement fund. Since its original introduction this legislation has had strong bipartisan support.

When Representative Reed became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Thomas Jenkins, of Ohio, a ranking Republican member of the committee, joined with Congressman KEOGH in the introduction of identical bills which became popularly known as the Jenkins-Keogh legislation. This legislation was overwhelmingly passed by the House of Representatives on July 29, 1958, but was not acted on by the Senate Finance Committee during the closing days of the 85th Congress.

In the 86th Congress, RICHARD SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, ranking Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, cosponsored the legislation with Mr. KEOGH. The committee gave early approval to H.R. 10 and the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed the measure on March 16, 1959.

Senators KEFAUVER, Democrat, Tennessee, MORTON, Republican, Kentucky, and SMATHERS, Democrat, Florida, introduced Senate bills similar to H.R. 10. Senator SMATHERS, a member of the Senate Finance Committee, introduced S. 1979, identical to H.R. 10 as passed by the House except that it would be effective for the taxable year 1961. In explaining his proposal, Senator SMATHERS said:

"Many in the Congress, while favoring the principle embodied in the legislation have a reluctance, in view of the Treasury Department's opposition, plus the high cost of Government today, to support the measure in their desire to bring about a balanced budget. Theirs is an attitude of postponement until such time as the budget becomes balanced.

"To meet this objection, which appears to be the major obstacle in the path of its adoption, I have modified the proposed bill so that it will be effective for the taxable year 1961. This would remove from the consideration of those thinking along this line, any feeling that they would have a further unbalanced budget this year, and yet make it possible for them to adopt a principle of fairness and tax equality for all of our citizens. Discrimination in our tax laws cannot morally be perpetuated indefinitely when a just and economically defensible revision is warranted."

The Senate Finance Committee conducted hearings on H.R. 10 on June 17 and 18, 1959. This was the first opportunity for proponents to present their views to the Senate committee on this legislation since its original introduction in 1951. Approximately 50 organizations representing self-employed persons requested an opportunity to testify before the committee. Some 20 witnesses were heard in the 2-day hearings, and the committee determined that further hearings would be necessary to obtain the views of all interested parties.

The Treasury Department has consistently opposed this legislation, its principal objection being revenue loss. Yet Treasury officials concede that there is an inequity in the tax treatment of retirement savings which discriminates against self-employed persons.

On June 17, David A. Lindsay, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, appearing before the Senate Finance Committee, stated:

"The Treasury recognizes that present law does not give self-employed persons tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans. Employee pension plans, if arranged on a nondiscriminatory basis, receive favorable tax treatment.

"At present, employers are permitted to take current deductions in computing their taxable incomes for contributions which they make to nondiscriminating pension funds for the benefit of their employees. No tax is imposed on the employee until the pensions are received after retirement. The opportunity to postpone the receipt and the taxation of income currently set aside in pension funds makes it possible for employees who are covered by such plans to secure larger net retirement incomes after tax from any given payment by an employer.

"Qualified pension trusts have a further tax advantage. The investment income earned on the funds held by the pension trusts is tax exempt until received by employees as part of their pensions. There is, in effect, a tax-free build up on nontaxed earnings. Though there is no final tax exemption of the income paid by employers, or of the income earned on accumulated funds, the advantages of postponement of tax on both are important, and combine to increase materially the net retirement income of employees."

In spite of this recognition of preferential tax treatment under qualified pension plans, the Treasury has made no proposal to correct this inequity.

The Treasury has estimated the revenue loss under H.R. 10 to be $365 million on a full year's basis. About $100 million of this would be accounted for by the extra deductions granted to those already 50 years of age or over on the effective date of the bill.

In discussing the impact of H.R. 10 on revenue before the Senate Finance Committee on June 18, Dr. Roger F. Murray, a foremost authority in the field of savings and pension plans, professor of banking and finance, Columbia University, and director, pension research project, National Bureau of Economic Research, appearing for the American Thrift Assembly, stated:

"We are being asked to consider this bill on the assumption that in the next year or two, self-employed individuals will make payments to restricted retirement plans in amounts of $1 billion a year.

"What about this as an assumption? It seems totally unrealistic. Experience shows that it takes many years of aggressive promotion to develop anything like this flow of funds. Because saving habits are slow to change and because new plans require education and personal solicitation, it is a conservative statement to say that this level of deposits under restricted retirement plans for the self-employed is not likely to be reached for 5 years or more. * * * A billion dollars in average deposits of, say, $1,000 means that a million self-employed will have to be educated and sold on this new savings plan. * * *

"For the first year following adoption of this plan, I would estimate the tax deferral at $75 to $100 million as a reasonable upper

level of estimate. In the light of the record of experience with savings plans, the time required to make the necessary arrangements to receive deposits, and the results of our survey on the subject, it seems clear that the Treasury Department's estimate of a $365 million tax deferral is unrealistic and inadequately supported by objective evidence. Actual experience is likely to be similar to that in Great Britain where the tax deferral in the second year of a similar plan turned out to be about one-sixth of the Inland Revenue's advance estimate. I should add that my estimate is supported by leading economists who have studied the question."

That there is an inequity in the tax treatment of pension plans is no longer in dispute. It could be argued therefore that even if the legislation would defer revenue amounting to $365 million, an estimate which is not supported by any survey or experience, the Federal Government is not entitled to this revenue, since it is unjustly obtained. It also has been estimated that the revenue loss resulting from existing pension plans exceeds $1.8 billion per year. It is difficult to understand why the Treasury is concerned with revenue loss only when tax savings would benefit the self-employed.

Another objection brought forth by the Treasury Department is that this legislation does not cover the pensionless employed. On this point, Ross L. Malone, president of the American Bar Association, told the Senate Finance Committee on June 17, that in connection with the 1955 hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, the Treasury Department, while conceding that both the pensionless employed and the self-employed were being discriminated against under existing law, said that on balance it might be better to limit the benefits of any new provision to the self-employed since employees, at least potentially, may benefit from qualified pension plans set up by their employers. "Tax relief," the Department said, "seems most clearly indicated for self-employed individuals who do not have even potential tax benefits under existing law in providing themselves with retirement income."

H.R. 10 has been criticized because it would not cover the employees of self-employed persons. In answer to this contention, Dr. Roger Murray stated to the Finance Committee:

"This is obviously true for the simple reason that such employees already stand to benefit under existing legislation providing for the deferment of taxes on their employers' contributions to qualified pension plans. This encouragement is already provided under the Internal Revenue Code. In any event, it is difficult to imagine anything more encouraging to the establishment of such benefits for the employees of the self-employed than to permit the self-employed to have their own retirement programs.

"If the Treasury Department is sincerely concerned about the people not now covered by programs other than OASDI, it would seem that the extension of the tax-deferment benefit to the self-employed should be welcomed as a plan to encourage supplemental old-age protection to the largest single group not now being reached in increasing numbers. Is it not reasonable to rely upon competition in the terms of employment and existing legislation to assure the continued spread of coverage to the employed?"

Congressman KEOGH, commenting before the Finance Committee on this contention, said:

"Mr. Chairman, much has been said today about requiring the self-employed to include their employees in such plans. That is a radical and novel departure from the basic and historical concept of retirement legislation. The 165 plans under the 1939 code, the 401 plans under the 1954 code, have never been made compulsory. Those are voluntary plans. This is the typical, historical American way of permitting one person voluntarily to do for himself that which people more and more want the Government to do for them.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that we are dealing with this group of seven million people for whom nothing has been done. And certainly, obvious equity and fairness should impel us to do something for them before more is done for those for whom so much more has been permitted."

It has even been stated that this is class legislation; that is, the principal beneficiaries are said to be professional persons in the upper income brackets. On this contention, Dr. Murray told the committee:

"With a highly progressive personal income tax structure, it is, of course, self-evident that the application of any uniform pattern of tax deferment will provide greater dollar and proportionate benefits to those in the higher income brackets. But is this a relevant argument? Is not the correct comparison between the successful self-employed individual and the successful employed individual? This bill is designed to place them on the same footing, except, of course, for the eliminations in the case of the self-employed. It is designed to remove the economic pressure which is being exerted against working for one's self.

"I think that we need to be very careful in interpreting any of these figures on income distribution. The individual who might qualify for the full $2,500 deduction this year may have spent 20 or 30 years of his life earning substantially less than $25,000 a year. His lifetime benefit can hardly be appraised on the basis of his peak earning capacity. The groups classified by income are by no means static, particularly among the self-employed. We are in danger of misreading the facts if we do not recognize this to be true. Furthermore, the breadth of support for this legislation suggests that numerically we are discussing a proposal predominantly for the benefit of middle-income groups."

And, in answer to a question on this point, David Lindsay, spokesman for the Treasury Department, told the committee: "I think so long as you have progressive income tax rates where the more you make the more you pay, it is not unfair to have the benefits go in the same direction where there is an appropriate deduction."

It should also be pointed out that only 1 person out of 17 who are self-employed is from the legal-medical-dental professions.

There has been some criticism of H.R. 10 because it does not extend to contributions made by employees. But this is not the issue raised by this measure. The purpose of H.R. 10 is to allow a tax deferment on the employer contribution. Since the self-employed is both employer and principal employee, H.R. 10 seeks only to provide for the self-employed person tax treatment comparable to that enjoyed by the employee with respect to the employer's contributions.

The 10 percent contribution allowed under H.R. 10 is not an unreasonably high employer contribution. This is apparent when a comparison is made with qualified corporate plans. Most corporate pension plans are noncontributory; that is, the employer pays the entire amount to maintain the fund. Under a qualified profit-sharing plan, an employer may contribute up to 15 percent of an employee's salary. In the case of qualified pension plans, there is no definite limit; if it is actuarily set up, the employer contribution could be as high as 25 percent of an employee's salary.

For example, an employee earning $7,000 could have contributed annually for him over $1,000 in a qualified profit-sharing plan of as much as $1,750 under a qualified pension plan. H.R. 10 would limit the deductible contribution to the self-employed person earning $7,000 to 10 percent or $700. In the case of a person earning $50,000, the difference is much greater. The self-employed is limited under H.R. 10 to a ceiling of $2,500. Yet the $50,000 executive could have contributed for him each year by his company as much as $7,500 in a qualified profit-sharing plan or $12,500 in a qualified pension plan, and the tax would be deferred on such contributions until paid out as retirement income.

One other contention which has been made is that consideration should be deferred until general tax reduction is possible. This completely disregards the fact that a general tax reduction would not remove, but would only perpetuate, the present discrimination against the self-employed.

After reviewing the arguments brought forth during the hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, one would conclude that this legislation is a fair and reasonable approach to the correction of an admitted inequity in our tax laws which has existed for more than a quarter of a century. The passage of H.R. 10 by the U.S. Senate is not only of direct concern to the lawyer, but is of equal importance to the many self-employed businessmen and farmers in his community.

There is a definite trend away from the professions and small business into corporate and government employment, due in a large part to the retirement advantages and other fringe benefits which are not available to self-employed persons. Certainly it is not unreasonable to expect the Congress to remove a gross inequity in our tax laws and thus encourage individual enterprise, initiative and thrift.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Santa Clara University Engineering Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, recently I inserted, under leave to extend my remarks, a résumé of the history of the University of Santa Clara, and a report on the splendid course of study which is currently offered students at this oldest institution of higher learning in the State of California.

I am proud to say that this university is not resting on its laurels but is constantly improving and building for the future. Today I should like to present portions of a publication which presents plans for the new and modern engineering center at Santa Clara:

SANTA CLARA UNIVERSITY ENGINEERING CENTER

One hundred and eight years ago a Jesuit priest, Father John Nobili, arrived at the Mission Santa Clara with $150 in his purse to lay the foundations of a new college.

Today we are blessed with the fruits of his labors—the oldest institution of higher learning in the State of California, founded in 1851, chartered as Santa Clara College in 1855, and as the University of Santa Clara in 1912.

Here thousands of students have studied, worshiped, and lived, emerging as men imbued with the Christian ideals and the trained intellect envisioned in the university motto:

"To mold men after the model of the Man-God, and thus form them to serve their fellow men, their country, and their God."

A CENTER FOR CREATIVE THINKING

Another milestone in the development of an old and great university is the start of construction of Santa Clara's new engineering center—a monument to the spirit of creative thinking which has long permeated the historic campus.

While the enrollment will continue to be highly selective, the new facility will make possible the acceptance of twice the current number of candidates for undergraduate engineering degrees, provide room for expanded research activities, allow initiation of graduate programs in engineering, and offer additional services to the engineering profession.

Modern in design, complete in facilities, the engineering center will give to the Far West a new facility for training the truly creative engineer—more than a draftsman, more than a skilled technician—a professional man in the finest sense.

AN HISTORIC DATE: APRIL 29, 1959

The historic ground-breaking date selected for the new engineering center—April 29—has long had special significance at Santa Clara and in the scientific world.

Just 54 years ago to the day, the first pilot-controlled glider flight in history came to a successful conclusion with a landing on the old Eberhard tannery property across from the University of Santa Clara.

The cornerstone of the engineering center will be set where the 45-pound glider—designed by a Santa Clara professor, John J. Montgomery, and flown by an adventurous Irish employee of the university, Daniel Maloney—completed the first flight of a heavier-than-air craft to a designated spot.

April 29, 1905, marked an event hailed by Victor Lougheed (pronounced "Lockheed," as in the aircraft firm which now bears his name) as the "greatest single advance in the history of aerial navigation."

The same day in 1959 will be commemorated by future generations as the beginning of a new era in the training and development of men for outstanding and specialized engineering careers.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOROUGHLY TRAINED ENGINEERS READY FOR POSITIONS EVERY YEAR

Purpose of the new engineering center is to provide sufficient facilities to graduate each year 150 men—trained in the Santa Clara tradition.

These graduate engineers will not only possess the finest technical education possible, but also will have been taught basic principles of living, such as respect for authority, willingness to take responsibility, and the return of a full measure of work for the salary received. Santa Clara's engineering center will continue to be one of the few nationally accredited colleges of engineernig—under Catholic auspices, but open to students of all faiths.

CURRICULUM FOR A PROFESSION

Offering degrees in civil, electrical, and mechanical engineering, the engineering center curriculum naturally will continue the Santa Clara tradition of thorough grounding in mathematics, physics, and chemistry.

As in the past, the curriculum will include a sound liberal arts program so that students can properly express themselves orally and in writing, and gain a broad knowledge of the humanities, including social sciences and philosophy.

Finally, the upper division program will offer the faculty, classrooms, laboratories and other facilities to make possible further development in distinctive phases in the basic branches of engineering.

Add to these the requirement that students spend at least two summers on practical engineering work; also that they write an acceptable senior thesis on a subject approved by the college, and you see emerging each year from the new Santa Clara Engineering Center, 150 graduate engineers intensively trained to assume positions of responsibility in their particular field of creative thinking.

For the more talented students there will be "premasters" and "predoctorate" courses. These lead to the possibility that Engineering Center graduates may seek advanced degrees oriented toward research and development, or to engineering management. Because of the wealth of nearby industrial firms with strong engineering programs, it would be possible to make use of qualified industry-employed instructors, and to schedule graduate work at hours convenient to industry and business employees.

EXPANDING TO INCREASE OPPORTUNITY

Despite its great accomplishments of the past, the College of Engineering now is physically inadequate in the light of present and future needs.

The Montgomery Laboratories, built in 1924, the second floor added in 1930, and the Alumni Science Hall, built in 1924, are not only outmoded, but also limit enrollment, faculty research and addition of new courses.

Construction of the new Engineering Center will make it possible to add new and desirable engineering laboratory facilities which will allow expansion of the senior thesis program. These facilities will further enrich the undergraduate education through research in such fields as electronics, nuclear physics, municipal design and planning, data processing and high energy propulsion.

It is almost tragic, in light of the demand for trained engineers and scientists, to note that although the present freshman engineering class had the highest academic standing of any in the history of the college, a number of highly qualified and equally promising applicants could not be admitted.

NEEDED: A LARGER PLANT

This calls for construction of four engineering units, a science annex and the provision of utilities for them.

The planned units will form a quadrangle. One side will consist of a two-story unit of classrooms, lecture hall, and administrative and faculty offices. Opposite will be the mechanical engineering laboratories. The third and fourth sides of the quad will be occupied by the electrical and civil engineering and mechanics laboratories. Total space will be 70,000 square feet. These buildings will double classroom space, provide reading rooms, drafting rooms, seminar and conference rooms.

CREATIVE THINKING: A SANTA CLARA TRADITION

The University of Santa Clara always has endeavored to attract and hold outstanding lay and Jesuit teachers. Its history is marked with distinguished men: Rev. J. Neri, S.J., who installed San Francisco's first arc-light system; Rev. Joseph Bayma, S.J., professor of mathematics, who John Tyndall said "is a hundred years ahead of his time in the science of mathematics"; Rev. Richard H. Bell, S.J., whose experiments in wireless telegraphy verified those of Marconi; and Prof. John J. Montgomery who designed and flew the first heavier-than-air machine, antedating the Wright Brothers flight by 2 years.

Added to the list of Santa Clara greats should be Rev. Jerome S. Ricard, S.J., "Padre of the Rains," famous for his sunspot theory; and still active, the world-renowned "Glacier Priest," Rev. Bernard Hubbard, S.J.

A half a century ago, the first lectures in engineering were instituted at Santa Clara; 4 years later, in 1911, the college of engineering was established.

Thus, as construction begins on a new engineering center at the University of Santa Clara, we find that creative thinking already is a university tradition, with a long record of accomplishment.

Our Responsibilities and America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very fine address entitled "Our Responsibilities and America's Future," delivered by the Postmaster General in the city of Washington, D.C., on August 12 of this year, wherein he addressed himself to our responsibilities and America's future.

The address was delivered before the 55th Annual Convention of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, in Washington, D.C., on August 12, 1959.

It is such a fine address that I am sure many people in the country would like to have the benefit of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR RESPONSIBILITIES AND AMERICA'S FUTURE

(Address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, on occasion of the 55th National Convention of the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, Washington, D.C., August 12, 1959)

It is a real pleasure to be with you tonight. I know that you have been amply welcomed before, but let me just say again that we are very happy for this opportunity to get together with you.

The rural letter carriers of the U.S. Post Office Department are a vitally important part of the great service we are proud to render to our Nation.

Over the years, your faithful performance of your duties, your very warm and neighborly relationships with the people on your mail routes, and your leadership as outstanding citizens in your community's affairs, have added greatly to the prestige and traditions of the Post Office Department.

And may I also express our admiration and respect to your splendid ladies auxiliary, which over the years has contributed so much to better civic life.

The presence here tonight of so many Members of the Congress is a well deserved tribute to your organizations. I join with these distinguished leaders of the Congress in saluting you as good Americans and outstanding public servants.

We are delighted that you have come here to your great Nation's Capital for your convention. I know that your stay has been inspiring as well as most pleasant and highly informative.

I am well aware of the fact that you are citizens in the fullest meaning of that word. I know that you maintain a deep interest in matters of importance not only to the postal service, but to the strength and progress of our Nation.

It is for this reason that I should like to discuss with you tonight three subjects that go beyond their immediate concern to us, to be of utmost significance to all our people.

These are, first, the Department's crusade against the most insidious racket of our time—the sending of obscene materials through the mails, especially to the children of America.

Secondly, I should like to discuss with you briefly the critical problem of inflation, and the means of successfully meeting it.

And third, I believe this evening you would like me to touch upon the future of the U.S. Post Office Department, the world's greatest communication system, of which you are so much a part.

You are familiar, I know, with the war we have declared on the use of the U.S. mail for the conduct of mail-order business in obscene and pornographic material. Many of you have taken an active part in this campaign in your communities.

This vicious business—the mailing of filth to children—is a challenge to every decent-minded American citizen. And it can be met only by the firm, positive action of our people, in all parts of the country.

It gives me some satisfaction to report that our efforts against this racket have made encouraging progress. This progress is due, in large part, to the broad support we have received from the Members of Congress, from the Nation's newspapers, radio and television commentators, civic-minded organizations and the public.

Congress has intensified its serious study of the problem, and many Members have taken active leadership in bringing this matter to the attention of their constituents.

Throughout the country, the press has not only described the growing menace of mail-order obscenity in the news columns, but has urged the public to action in editorial columns as well.

Civil and religious organizations, deeply shocked by the concentration of this racket on children, have mobilized their members for programs to help meet the challenge.

Within just the past 2 months, I have had determined verbal expressions from the leaders of many of these organizations. I have received copies of resolutions adopted by many groups which pledge their vigorous assistance in this effort.

We are deeply gratified by this support.

I think you will agree that this, indeed, is a good start. But I cannot emphasize too greatly the importance of conducting this war to the finish. Persistent, intelligent, intensive action on a nationwide scale will be absolutely necessary for a long time to come, to cope with the determined plans of the filth racketeers to continue expanding their operations.

Even as we are striving to rally the American people to put them out of business, these vicious racketeers are continuing to violate the homes of the Nation with complete arrogance.

Our inspection service estimates that as many as 1 million children will receive obscene material in the family mailbox during this year. This is 1 out of every 35 school-age children in America.

In large part, this smut will be sent to children without their advance knowledge or consent, in the form of lewd solicitation literature seeking to sell them even more obscene trash.

The volume of business done by these racketeers has tripled since World War II; it has doubled in just the last 5 years; and unless we put a stop to it, it can double again over just the next 4 years. In that event, it would amount to over $1 billion a year.

In due time, if we do not fight to rid ourselves of this blight, we may expect that organized crime will take over the obscenity racket, with its vast revenue, to a far greater and more vicious extent.

It will victimize more and more of our children, adding to the already swollen rolls of juvenile delinquency. The undermining of the moral fiber of our young people will spread, with the poisoning of increasing millions of minds.

Sex crimes will become far more prevalent than they are even today.

And overall, as the effects spread throughout our society, we could expect an ultimate breakdown in moral strength and order and decency in this country.

My friends, this monstrous crime has got to be stopped.

How can we do it? What do we need to meet this problem?

We need legislation adequate to deal effectively with these vile criminals.

We ned the conscientious support of law enforcement authorities and courts.

We need the dedicated efforts of you who make up our postal service.

And, of course, we need the support and cooperation of parents and decent-minded citizens throughout our country.

To this end, we are carrying forward a continuing program that is fourfold:

1. To draw maximum public attention to the menace of this racket;

2. To urge parents to help us apprehend the mailers of filth to their children;

3. To help mobilize community support behind adequate law enforcement of local ordinances or State laws when these purveyors are apprehended and brought to court;

4. To rally public opinion behind new and stiffer legislation on obscenity.

With respect to this fourth point, I should point out that Congress last year passed legislation which has been extremely helpful, and that the current Congress is giving earnest and sympathetic attention to proposed legislation which can close loopholes and help further to bring the mail-order obscenity racketeers to account.

In the past, these smut merchants have had little difficulty evading punishment.

In certain large cities, the courts set a pattern of soft rulings which established virtual sanctuaries for them.

Usually, even those few offenders who were convicted were let off with a slap on the wrist—a light fine or a brief jail term. To racketeers operating on a big scale, this kind of sentence is nothing more than a minor discomfort.

If we are to drive these vultures out of business, we must convince them that they are no longer going to be tolerated or coddled anywhere. A consistent pattern of stiff sentences, wherever they are convicted, is the one sure way to meet their defiant challenge.

I would ask that all the members of this organization continue to take part actively in this crusade, working in your own communities to further the four points of this program. I know that the ladies auxiliary has been active in this effort. I want to compliment all of you on what you are doing, and to urge you to continue your good and most essential work. We dare not fail.

May I turn now to another problem which also demands the attention and earnest effort to all of us.

Over the past year, I have taken every opportunity afforded me to urge that every American serve in the battleline against inflation.

I feel that especially I should not neglect the opportunity to discuss this vital subject with you.

I know I do not have to persuade this audience that the American people must maintain a sound economic philosophy, within which the Government must provide sound economic policies.

But I do want to emphasize the utter importance of keeping these convictions foremost in our minds, and in the minds of all our fellow citizens.

We know how inflation has wrecked other nations in the past.

We have seen what the ravages of this deadly force can do here in our own country.

We have seen it make our money worth less and the things we have to buy cost more.

We have found it boosting our cost of living by 100 percent in a period of 20 years.

We have seen it rob our dollars of their real value—and rob every American of that value in the process.

We have seen inflation feed on the incomes and savings of every individual, every family and every enterprise in America.

We have observed how it deals most cruelly with those who can least protect themselves.

I suspect almost everyone in this room knows of someone whose savings, insurance, social security, or retirement income—carefully nurtured through half a lifetime—now is tragically inadequate to meet his needs.

As rural community leaders, you are only too well aware of what inflation brings in rising costs and taxes.

And finally, I would point out that the problem affects in equal measure the cost of maintaining the operations of our Government.

Never have the American people faced a greater challenge than this one of bringing a rampant inflationary momentum under control.

Over recent months, our people have rallied vigorously to the fight to do all that must be done.

There is now a vast public consciousness of the scope of the menace that inflation presents. There is ever-increasing expression of the desire for fiscal policies, on the part of our people and our Government, that will keep our country on a sound, strong, and progressive economic course.

At present, our Nation has reached the highest level of prosperity in our history. We have the healthiest, strongest economy America has yet known.

Our people are enjoying higher wages and better living standards than ever before.

Overall output is at record levels, and rising steadily.

Employment is rising steeply. Unemployment is falling sharply.

For more than a year, the cost of living has remained generally stable.

The battle for a sound dollar is closer to success than at any time in the past two decades.

These are bright and encouraging facts, but we cannot allow them to mislead us.

They do not mean that our battle against inflation is over. Rather, they mean that we have gained a strong vantage point from which to carry on the offensive.

We face constant, heavy pressures for a continuation of the inflationary process. As a people, we must be sure to move together along courses that we know will surmount these pressures.

I believe our people are in wide agreement as to our Government's role. Our Government must maintain sound fiscal policies, with respect to spending, balancing the budget, taxation, financing, debt management—in short, throughout its vast economic operations.

This applies every bit as much to local and State governments as to our Federal Government.

Our governments must meet all the legitimate needs of our people. But this must be done within the framework of prudent spending, on a pay-as-you-go basis, without extravagance, without incurring deficits which add to the already staggering public debts that exist.

We must, in fact, maintain as one of our prime goals the reduction of the national debt.

It is vital, also, that we practice good sense in our civilian economy—our business economy—to keep prices from spiraling upward.

We must insist upon real statesmanship by all who are in position to influence the factors that bear on prices, and thus the cost of living.

I urge you to keep these matters in mind as you go about your activities at home. As good citizens, building your own future and the future of our country, stand up strongly for fiscal wisdom—for the same sound financial practice in Government that you follow in your own economic affairs.

In this you will contribute to the strong and steady growth of our country. And we are indeed a fast-growing nation. We can see this fact quite clearly in the demands upon the postal service.

With this in mind, let me devote the remaining time to my final subject—a brief look into the future of the Post Office Department and the better mail service it can, and should, render in the years ahead.

In any consideration of the future, one paramount fact overshadows all others: our constantly growing volume of mail is expected, in 25 years, to double today's enormous annual load of over 61 billion pieces of mail, and more than a billion parcels.

Any plans for the future must, in my judgment, be based on this fact—that adequate facilities, post offices, terminals, and other means, must be available to handle twice as much mail by 1985. And it must be done with the efficiency that the American people well know and deserve in the years ahead.

As you know, some 3,000 new post offices have been built in the past 6½ years, financed by private industry and leased to the Department.

Many of you are now working out of these new post offices, and you know intimately how much better and more efficient they are than the obsolete structures they replaced. You are also familiar with the greatly improved working conditions in these new facilities.

This program, of course, is on a nationwide basis. To meet the needs that face us, it will be necessary to modernize, replace or build in new communities, from 12,000 to 15,000 post offices in the years immediately ahead.

Not only do we need to replace obsolete post offices in expanding communities, in every State of the Union, but we must mechanize the sorting and distribution of the mails—especially in the large gateway post offices, which handle such a large proportion of our volume.

Fortunately, we have reached and moved beyond the breakthrough stage in mechanizing postal operations.

The essential first step was the development of modern methods, comparable to those so effectively used by industry.

This has been done to an impressive degree, as I believe anyone will agree who visits our post office here in Washington, D.C. This is now the world's most mechanized post office, but even it does not represent a plateau in our program. In that same building you will find even more advanced machines under test in our new laboratory operations.

If there are any of you who have not visited the post office here, I would urge you to do so. I am sure it would be one of the most important and enlightening highlights of your visit.

From the development of these modern methods, the next step is to apply them in key post offices throughout the country.

This, of necessity, will take time and funds.

But the important fact is that, after many years of neglect in research, engineering, and equipment development, a responsive Congress is cooperating with the Post Office Department in launching a major long-range program.

The time has come when we have put a full-scale effort underway to provide the best, most modern and most efficient service of which the Post Office should be capable.

Many people do not fully realize how important this development is to the provision of better mail service to people who do not live in the large metropolitan areas.

In Michigan, for example, nearly two-thirds of all the mail going into that State passes through the postal facilities in Detroit.

In Oregon, about one-half of the State's mail goes through the postal facilities of Portland.

In Pennsylvania, approximately three-fifths of the State's mail flows through the postal facilities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

It is readily apaprent that any improvement in the handling of mail in these gateway facilities will result in better and speedier service in the smallest communities.

Modern mechanization of mail handling is so vital to better service that our Department now has under contract, for completion by the fall of next year, a completely new working-laboratory post office in Providence, R.I.

Serious consideration is being given to another laboratory post office, using different concepts and techniques, in another part of the country.

Engineers and postal experts in these two post offices, as well as those in our laboratory here, will be constantly developing and checking mail handling machines and methods—so that the U.S. Post Office, the world's greatest communication system, will keep abreast of the opportunities provided by modern science and industry.

As you know, the ultimate goal of your Post Office is the next day delivery of letter mail.

The Nation is now nearly blanketed with our new metropolitan plan, which assures netx day delivery of letter mail in the large metropolitan areas.

By next June, we estimate that 85 metropolitan areas, serving some 125 million people, wil be providing next day delivery.

We are confident that we have established the know-how to provide next day delivery throughout our service. We feel certain that, with the help of a cooperative Congress, ways will be found to finance the necessary expenditures to asure this service to the American people.

My good colleagues in the Post Office Department, let me sum up now by saying just this:

All of us believe that our people will continue to build the strongest, freest way of life the world will know.

We are determined that our grandchildren will inherit this way of life, and no other.

To assure this future, we must keep our Nation morally and economically strong.

We must give our children a wholesome climate, of dignity and decency, in which to mature into tomorrow's citizens.

We must continue to build a sound and solid economy, free of inflation, which assures the greatest opoprtunities for all our people.

We must continue to advance in science and technology, in Government operations as well as industry—an advance in which our postal progress will be an important part.

Communications are the soil in which knowledge is rooted, and we who operate this great communications system have a high responsibility indeed.

Let us make certain we uphold this trust. Let us continue to add luster to the proud traditions of the U.S. Post Office Department.

I know you will do your part—and more. And in the doing, you will have the gratitude of 175 million fellow Americans you help to serve so well.

Private Industry and Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, the question of redevelopment over large sections of our country is a situation almost daily discussed in the Congress by either the other body or the House. This morning there came over my desk a release addressed to the industrial realtors and bankers. This went on to say that under the auspices of the Pennsylvania Power & Light, a group of these businessmen were going to be conducted over one of the major areas needing redevelopment in the country—that is, the Pennsylvania hard coal fields. The reading of this enclosed notice will give you an idea of what they are going to do. It is quite commendable.

This is an approach to the situation which I think may enable these districts to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps with a limited amount of aid from the State and Federal Government. I commend this to your reading as I think it is something new, worthwhile, and should produce results. It is as follows:

INDUSTRIAL REALTORS, BANKERS TO TOUR AREA COMMUNITIES

One of the largest promotions in years to attract new industry and payrolls to this area will take place August 27 and 28 when approximately 70 industrial realtors and bankers will tour communities in the Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Hazleton, and Williamsport areas to inspect available shell buildings and industrial parks.

The industrial realtors and bankers will be brought here from the New York, Philadelphia, Newark, and Baltimore areas under the sponsorship of Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. After arriving here, they will be the guests of local chambers of commerce.

Many of these industrial realtors and bankers represent large, nationally known industries in their real estate and new plant transactions. Such people are, therefore, highly important to the area's industrial development and economic expansion.

Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. personnel and the cooperating chambers of commerce plan to dramatically demonstrate the industrial potentials of these communities with the aim of attracting reputable and financially sound new industries. The tour features the fact that better buildings are available in central eastern Pennsylvania at costs which are less than in comparable areas, and that the available shell buildings and the growing industrial parks are suitable for almost all types of industry.

The tour has been so scheduled that communities will be given sufficient time to promote and sell their communities and facilities. Detailed data and information on all industrial parks as well as outstanding, available buildings and sites will be supplied all the visitors. A chartered, 80-passenger airplane, will provide transportation so that the group may spend the maximum amount of time in its inspections.

The industrial realtors and bankers, together with their Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. escorts, will arrive at Avoca Airport, Thursday morning, August 27, to inspect the Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, and Hazleton areas.

The tour will include a new shell building in Old Forge. The group will then travel by bus to Wilkes-Barre to inspect Crestwood Industrial Park, and the Wilkes-Barre Chamber of Commerce will host the group for lunch at the Sterling Hotel. In the afternoon, the group will go by bus to Hazelton to tour Valmont Industrial Park. An inspection of an available industrial building in Freeland will follow. Dinner has been arranged at the Scranton Country Club with the Scranton Chamber of Commerce as host. The visitors will spend the night at the Hotel Casey, Scranton.

Friday morning, the visitors will enplane for Williamsport. There, they will inspect a shell building in the Williamsport Industrial Park; the new, most modern plant of Vidmar, Inc. If time permits, they will also visit the Williamsport Technical Institute. In the afternoon, the group will attend the Little League world series, followed by dinner at Williamsport Country Club with the Greater Williamsport Chamber of Commerce as host. Immediately following the dinner, the tour guests will be flown back to Philadelphia and Newark airports.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, by and large the people of my State and the daily newspapers which are circulated in my State favor passage of a strong and effective labor reform bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sampling of editorial comment from various newspapers on the recent passage by the House of Representatives of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. These editorials are as follows: "The People's Victory," from the August 14, 1959, issue of the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C.; "Six Congressmen Vote Right on Labor Bill," from the August 16, 1959, issue of the State, Columbia, S.C.; "The Solid Front," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C.; "Georgian in the Spotlight," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, Augusta, Ga.; "House Vote on Labor Bill Responds to People's Demand for Reforms," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C.; "Now Up to U.S. Senate," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Charleston Evening Post, Charleston, S.C.; "Will of the People Pays Off in Congress," from the August 15, 1959, issue of the Spartanburg Herald, Spartanburg, S.C.; "Plenty of Back-Home Support for Curbing Union Racketeers," from the August 16, 1959, issue of the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C.

In addition I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news column by the distinguished writer, Mr. David Lawrence. It appeared in the August 15, 1959, issue of the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rock Hill (S.C.) Evening Herald, Aug. 14, 1959]

THE PEOPLE'S VICTORY

When the U.S. House of Representatives yesterday approved the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, many newspapers termed it a smashing victory for President Eisenhower.

It is not Eisenhower's victory. It is a victory for the people and for union members.

Eisenhower certainly had an instrumental part in the victory. His nationwide television address in which he threw his support behind the bill was undoubtedly a major factor in passage of the bill.

The bill is a comparatively strong piece of legislation aimed at ending corruption in labor unions. The bill contains clauses intended to protect the rights of rank-and-file union members, to ban blackmail picketing and to require union financial reporting.

What separates the Landrum-Griffin bill from others and makes it the toughest of the lot is that it goes further than the others. It would forbid most forms of organizational picketing, would ban all secondary boycotts and all forms of hot-cargo agreements, and provide criminal penalties for union officials who violate members' rights.

The bill is a comparatively tough one but apparently it is one which is needed to curb the power of the likes of Jimmy Hoffa of the Teamsters Union.

The real winners yesterday were the people who need to be protected from union leaders who use their power for their own benefit.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 16, 1959]

SIX CONGRESSMEN VOTE RIGHT ON LABOR BILL

We commend the six Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina for their forthright "yes" vote on the labor reform bill.

ASHMORE, DORN, HEMPHILL, MCMILLAN, RILEY, and RIVERS, each answered in the affirmative when the roll was called. And they are to be praised for being in their seats and casting weight on the right side.

Encouraging is the fact that when the bill came up for passage on Friday the margin of victory was considerably wider than when on Thursday the House had substituted the administration-backed proposal for the milder measure supported by Democratic policy leaders. On Thursday the vote was 229 to 201, but on third reading Friday the House sent the tougher bill to the Senate by a 305 to 125 decision, a majority gain overnight of from 28 to 86. This, we hope, is a significant omen.

The question of labor reform is now up to the Senate. Let's hope the upper House will do as well as the lower. Let's hope we can say that the South Carolina delegation in the Senate—JOHNSTON and THURMOND—voted as a unit, too, in favor of the stronger legislation.

In the House it was a coalition of southern Democrats and Republicans that brought about this great victory. Let's hope the southern Democrats and Republicans will team up as effectively in the Senate. It would be a blow to good government for the House-approved bill to fail in the upper body.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Aug. 15, 1959]

THE SOLID FRONT

South Carolina's six Congressmen are to be congratulated for their unanimous vote in favor of the antiracketeering union bill which was passed by the House Friday.

By their vote, the Representatives struck a heavy and necessary blow at the corruption, brutality which has invaded the union movement, and they moved the Federal Government toward restoration of balance in management-labor disputes.

It was, we are sure, not an easy vote for some of them to make. The House Democratic leadership, and the labor union bosses themselves, bitterly opposed the bill and used every device at their disposal to put pressure on all Members.

The six South Carolinians are all Democrats, but they are South Carolinians first and they knew that what their constituents wanted was not a "sweetheart" bill like the one proposed by the Democratic leadership but a really meaningful one; one with some teeth in it to gnaw away at the Hoffas and the Dios and the monopolistic unions which already hold life-and-death power over much of the economy.

The bill is much stiffer than the one passed by the Senate, and it now has gone to a Senate-House compromise committee. It is not likely that any compromise can be reached, and it seems likely that the House-approved version will come before the Senate for action sooner or later.

The battle there promises to be as hot and furious as it was in the House. And the prosepct for Senate approval is not at all reassuring in view of the number of liberals on the Democratic side of the aisle.

The eyes of South Carolinians will be directed on their two Senators and their vote on the union-control measure. Senators JOHNSON and THURMOND have a handy guide to show them the way; the unanimous vote of their colleagues in the House.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Aug. 15, 1959]

GEORGIAN IN THE SPOTLIGHT

Georgians are proud of the fact that a Georgian is one of the cosponsors of the labor reform bill passed in the House of Representatives this week. Representative PHIL M. LANDRUM, Jasper, Ga., attorney, is not as widely known nationally as are some other Members of Congress. The chances are, however, that he will be more and more in the forefront of national affairst from now on.

Mr. LANDRUM has already gained a reputation in the inner circles of Congress as a hardworking representative of the people, quite capable of making sound decisions and of acting courageously to sustain his convictions.

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, cosponsor of the labor reform bill, also is expected to forge farther forward into the national spotlight. He is a Republican and LANDRUM, of course, is a Democrat. They made an effective pair when they teamed up to get action on needed labro reforms.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, of course, does not cover all angles of the labor problem but it does go farther than any of the several other bills which were introduced in the House. It will, if Senate concurrence can be secured, curb some of the evils that beset the Nation in connection with the abuse of power by labor union leaders.

If the Senate should decide to adopt the House bill, the measure could be sent on quickly to the White House for the President's signature. Predictions have been made, however, that the Senate will not endorse the House bill. In that case a conference will be needed to secure an agreement on a compromise bill. The prediction has been made that no strong bill can be passed in the Senate.

That remains to be seen. It is now up to the Senators of the United States to prove to the People that they are not the stooges of labor union leaders who boast of their power to control legislation and utter threats against those who oppose their dictums.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 15, 1959]

HOUSE VOTE ON LABOR BILL RESPONDS TO PEOPLE'S DEMAND FOR REFORMS

No matter what course the Senate takes, approval of the Landrum-Griffin bill by the House of Representatives has brought stern pressure on labor leaders to reform. The House vote reflected an uncompromising popular demand for new standards of justice in union dealings with employers, employees, and the public.

Of the 303 Representatives who joined the conservative coalition to support the Landrum-Griffin bill, a substantial number might have ridiculed such a suggestion a few weeks ago. They have been underestimating the force of public sentiment favoring an anticorruption measure with teeth.

As late as Thursday morning, the day of decision, experienced political observers failed to count correctly the number of Representatives whose minds were changing in response to demands from back home. Informed opinion held that the vote might go either way. The prediction was for a margin of victory razor thin. The bill passed by 178 votes.

It is not surprising that the temper of the Nation was so misjudged. Forty years have passed since the behavior of labor unions was called into question by substantial numbers of voters. The signs of a changing climate have been forgotten.

It is fitting that the Members of the House should have been the first to recognize and act in accordance with the new sentiment. That was the way the Founding Fathers hoped things would work. They arranged the structure of the Constitution to make the House sensitive to the wishes of the people.

The shock of the setback handed to the union bosses may be felt even in the Senate. There the people's representatives are insulated to some extent from the currents of popular opinion.

A straw in the wind is a hint from Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of Massachusetts. Senator KENNEDY has steadfastly opposed the tough provisions of the Griffin-Landrum bill. He is a contender for the presidential nomination. Naturally he prefers the Kennedy-Ervin bill, a weaker measure already passed by the Senate which he helped to write. After hearing results in the House, Senator KENNEDY began to talk of compromise.

Sitting with Senator KENNEDY in the Upper Chamber are other Senators who are presidential hopefuls. Some of them may consider that the House action puts them in an awkward spot.

Before making up their minds how they will vote, they will study the character of the groundswell of public opinion which is battering the labor bosses. Though it was slow to gather, it has developed great force. We predict it will be slow to recede. The people will remember for a long time how their Senators vote on this crucial issue of effective labor regulation.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) Evening Post, Aug. 15, 1959]

NOW UP TO U.S. SENATE

If the U.S. Senate concurs with the House of Representatives an effective blow will be delivered against corruption and other abuses in labor unions.

The House, backing President Eisenhower's plea, passed a bill aimed at vicious practices that have been exposed in certain fields of labor-management relations.

If enacted into law, it will ban secondary boycotts, blackmail picketing, and hot cargo agreements; and it will provide criminal penalties for union officials who violate members' rights. These evils have been particularly flagrant in the James Hoffa Teamsters' regime, but by no means confined to his organization. It is a matter of protecting not only union members, but nonunion workers, employers, and the general public also.

A milder bill was passed by the Senate some weeks ago. Thus differences remain to be settled between the two legislative bodies. The fight has thus been shifted from the House to the Senate. It may be that widespread public sentiment favoring the House bill will prompt the Senate to adopt the latter measure. The House majority resisted tremendous pressure from union lobbyists, which suggests that the lawmakers had heard from the folks back home. AFL-CIO President George Meany opposed even the milder Senate measure and a tepid bill approved by a House committee. The bill voted by the House had been introduced on a bipartisan basis, by Representatives PHIL LANDRUM, Georgia Democrat, and Representative ROBERT GRIFFIN, Michigan Republican.

The outcome of the House vote was another demonstration of the power of a coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats. Most of the 95 Democrats who backed the bill on the first and crucial test were from this section. They included all six representatives from South Carolina, and we believe they merit strong commendation.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Aug. 15, 1959]

WILL OF THE PEOPLE PAYS OFF IN CONGRESS

The will of the people has had its day in Congress.

The House dramatically reflected the force of public opinion in its adoption of the Landrum-Griffin bill Thursday. This was the only effective, and the strongest, labor reform bill introduced.

The victory was in the face of such opposition as:

1. Such powerful Democratic leadership as House Speaker Sam Rayburn, who usually has his way.

(2) Concentrated Big Labor lobbying, the like of which seldom has been witnessed on Capitol Hill.

3. A Senate bill of much milder nature, championed by the crusading Kennedy brothers; and the threat that strong House bill would invite uncompromising opposition, resulting in no reform bill at all.

But these forces were out of step with the American people. The people are fed up.

They have seen enough of Big Labor leaders' arrogance and contempt for the rights of individuals—union and nonunion alike. The crime, cruelty, crookedness and ugliness they have seen emerge from high union officers has sickened them.

The hierarchy of Big Labor, even the "clean" leaders, have shown their scorn of public opinion by an insistent stand against any effective legislation. They have not cleaned up the outrages we have seen, and we have seen too much.

Southern Congressmen deserve commendation from their people for standing strong on this issue. The Herald particularly congratulates the six representatives from South Carolina. All of them stood for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

They are Representatives ROBERT T. ASHMORE, ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, L. MENDEL RIVERS, JOHN J. RILEY, and JOHN L. MCMILLAN.

The scene now shifts to a Senate-House conference committee. Its duty will be to compromise the labor legislation passed by the two branches and recommend a single measure.

But the Senate itself is more the center of battle. The voice of the people has become more urgent, and easier heard, than

it was when the Senate passed its compromising legislation.

Senators and through them the members of the committee will do well to listen again. The people are fed up and they are looking for action.

South Carolina's Senator J. STROM THURMOND is firmly on record in favor of effective labor reform legislation. The position of Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON is not so clear.

We hope they get the same opportunity to be counted as the House Members did. And the vote of the House should provide a good clue as to how the people back home feel about this thing.

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Aug. 16, 1959]

PLENTY OF BACK-HOME SUPPORT FOR CURBING UNION RACKETEERS

House approval of the Griffin-Landrum labor bill marks a bipartisan victory for the people over the union czarism threatening to strangle the Nation at a crucial period in history.

The House was confronted by three versions of legislation. Proponents claimed each version was sufficient to curb racketeering by labor union leaders.

The House Labor Committee's version, known as the Elliott bill, had the support of the House leadership.

The Shelley bill was a creature of the labor unioneers.

The Griffin-Landrum bill, authored by Representative LANDRUM, of Georgia, a Democrat, and Representative GRIFFIN, of Michigan, a Republican, was the "tough" version; i.e., the bill with sufficient teeth to change the pattern of union activities in the disorderly fields of mass picketing and escondary boycott, just the kind of two-fisted legislation needed to cope with this problem.

Terrific pressure was exerted by the labor unioneer leaders to block this bill.

In addition to proposing curbs for union excesses, the bill also provided a say-so in union affairs for rank-and-file members.

If there is one thing the unioneer bigwigs do not want it is democratic rule within the unions, from the locals on up.

While millions of American workers belong to unions—in many cases they are forced to belong if they want to work—they have steadily lost voice in the way union affairs are run.

The legislation passed by the House is designed to return some measure of union control to the workers, where it belongs. The bill had plenty of back-home support among union members themselves, or else it never would have passed.

The South Carolina House delegation voted solidly for the Griffin-Landrum measure, the Third District's Representative BRYAN DORN among them.

We commend the South Carolina delegation for its stand on this vital issue.

The time has come to call a halt to union abuses.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Aug. 15, 1959]

FAILURE TO ENACT LABOR REFORM BILL WILL RESULT IN UNDERWORLD TYRANNY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Are the American people really aware of the disgraceful conduct of certain labor-union leaders and of the menace which they present today to this country? Will the public be fooled by the claim that corrective legislation is not needed because there are only a few gangsters and by the propaganda cry that legitimate unionism might be harmed by new laws?

The answers to these questions deal with a phase of human rights that is more important than any other problem now before Congress. For if public opinion falters after the sensational disclosures by the Senate Investigating Committee headed by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, then a period of labor anarchy and underworld tyranny may be expected to develop in the coming years.

President Eisenhower has appealed to the Nation to back him as he asks that Members of Congress, irrespective of party, be told by the people that the country wants strong legislation to correct abuses. The type of thing which, unfortunately, the labor unions themselves have been unable to remedy is fully explained by the report of the McClellan committee. In commenting on the affairs of the Teamsters Union—the largest in the country—the committee report says in part:

"The power of the Teamsters Union president is so extraordinary that the committee finds the fact this power is now lodged in the hands of a man such as Hoffa tragic for the Teamsters Union, and dangerous for the country at large. * * *

"In fact, the 1958 hearings produced testimony of an even more sordid nature than that of the previous year.

"Ignominy was piled on ignominy as the testimony wove through stories of violence, financial manipulations, callous repression of democratic rights and racketeer control.

"This is an ugly situation. The continuing attitude of Hoffa and other teamster leaders that they are above the law can only serve to intensify the apprehensions of decent union members and decent people throughout the country. * * *

"Time and time again the committee has found Hoffa to be faithless to the members of his own union. He has betrayed these members so frequently that it has become abundantly clear that Hoffa's chief interest is his own advancement and that of his friends and cronies—a great number of whom are racketeers. * * *

"In addition, Hoffa has used union funds for his own benefit and that of his friends.

"Hoffa has consistently supported the interests of racketeer friends over those of his own members.

"Hoffa and his chief aids have consistently repressed democratic rights within the union. union.

"Hoffa has connived with and maneuvered union insurance to racketeer friends, bringing these friends gigantic profits. While the cost of insurance has risen, the benefits to the members of his union were drastically reduced.

"In the history of this country it would be hard to find a labor leader who has so shamelessly abused his members or his trust. * * *

"The committee is convinced that if Hoffa remains unchecked, he will successfully destroy the decent labor movement in the United States. Further than that, because of the tremendous economic power of the teamsters, it will place the underworld in a position to dominate American economic life in a period when the vitality of the American economy is necessary to this country's preservation in an era of world crisis. This Hoffa cannot be allowed to do."

What have the decent labor-union leaders done about all this? They have, of course, criticised Hoffa and have deplored what he has done. But they are not willing to back the kind of legislation President Eisenhower says is really needed to prevent Hoffa and his ilk from continuing to exploit the rank and file of American workingmen.

No group likes restrictive legislation. Big business doesn't like antimonopoly laws, and big unionism doesn't like the prospect of any restriction either. But it is the public as a whole which is damaged by any abuses of power exercised by private groups.

It will be interesting to see whether the majority in Congress will rise to the occasion or whether the labor unions, with their political pull and promises of bigger campaign contributions to those who do their bidding, will be able to scare Members of the House and Senate away from the legislation that ought to be passed in order to end the rule of dictators, tyrants and crooks inside the labor-union movement in free America.

Puerto Rico Is Different

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, by any human measure of ability and character Luis Muñoz-Marín is one of the giants among the world's leaders. In an article in the New York Times Sunday magazine, August 16, 1959, he discusses why "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State," which under unanimous consent is included hereafter.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug 16, 1959]

PUERTO RICO DOES NOT WANT TO BE A STATE—DESPITE THE EXAMPLES OF ALASKA AND HAWAII, SAYS GOV. MUÑOZ MARÍN, ITS PRESENT COMMONWEALTH STATUS BEST SUITS BOTH THE ISLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

(By Luis Muñoz-Marín)

(Luis Muñoz-Marín became the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico in 1948. He was reelected Governor in 1952 after the territory had been designated a Commonwealth.)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Puerto Rico, now a vigorous self-governing Commonwealth within the American political system, would be smothered if some of its misguided stateside wellwishers, like Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico and Representative VICTOR ANFUSO of New York, had their way. They have introduced or proposed to introduce bills for Puerto Rican statehood. The bills have no chance of approval in Congress, and only minority support in Puerto Rico.

Recently, in the lobby of a Washington hotel, an old friend greeted me, "Well, Governor, pretty soon we should be seeing you up on the Hill as a Senator from the 51st State." He meant it as a high compliment to Puerto Rico, and I was touched by both his warmth and enthusiasm. In the wake of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, a similar status for Puerto Rico seemed logical, simple, and desirable to him. He melted into the milling crowd of the lobby before I had an opportunity to outline to him the great complexities of Puerto Rico's circumstances, which make statehood neither logical nor desirable for Puerto Rico or the United States.

When I say that it is far better for Puerto Rico to remain a Commonwealth, it is with no insensitivity to the high honor which statehood implies. Nor is it because we seek independence—we definitely do not. Nor does it mean we are content to be less than a federated state—because, definitely, we are not less, but only different. Nor is it because we do not wish to share in the common expenses of the Federal Union, of which we are a part in a new way—since Puerto Rico is now proposing a formula by which it would begin to pay into the Federal Treasury as its economic growth allows it to do so.

Puerto Rico's history has been far different from that of Alaska and Hawaii, and the understandable tendency to speculate on possible statehood for Puerto Rico after the

rapid accession of Alaska and Hawaii can lead men of goodwill far astray. Puerto Rico was a populous island with a long history and well-defined culture when it first came into the American orbit in 1898 following the Spanish-American War. Alaska and Hawaii, on the other hand, were sparsely settled and ripe for colonizing from the mainland.

Alaska and Hawaii became incorporated Territories, clearly destined for cultural integration and eventual statehood. Puerto Rico's special circumstances were early recognized when it became the first unincorporated Territory, which implied that it would not be slated for statehood. At the same time it would have been obviously contrary to the American spirit that Puerto Rico should remain a colony forever.

Economic factors were very different, too. Both Alaska and Hawaii have been for many years notably wealthier than Puerto Rico is even now after 14 years of rapid economic progress since the end of World War II. The net annual average income of Hawaii, and probably of Alaska, is more than $1,800, very little below the 1957 national average of $2,027. Puerto Rico's per capita income of $470 is still less than half of that of the lowest income State of the Union, Mississippi. Puerto Rico has little land in relation to population, no fuels, no significant mineral resources. That is why we have called the program by which we progress Operation Bootstrap.

These economic and cultural factors have, since 1898, made Puerto Rico's political evolution unique, and clearly different from that of Alaska and Hawaii. Indeed, as late as 1940, many sober, informed men in the United States considered Puerto Rico's economic and political problems insoluble, and were resigned to Puerto Rico's being a dependent poorhouse on a kind of permanent dole from the Federal Treasury, a place where poverty and hopelessness would constantly churn up social and political instability.

It took a double-barreled attack on these problems in Puerto Rico itself to lead to the relative prosperity of today, and to the visible social and political health and vigor of the island. First came the attack on poverty, temporarily foreclosing political debate. Only when Operation Bootstrap was well under way did Puerto Rico address itself to finding a political status which answered the needs of its special relationship with the United States and its own economic and cultural circumstances.

To those who forget that peoples are the creators of political formulas and not their slaves, Puerto Rico seemed to have no way to turn. Continued existence as a Territory or colony was impossible. The corrosive effects of colonialism, even a benevolent colonialism, could no longer be accepted, especially in the post-war period. Neither dignity, nor the swift course of history, nor commonsense, nor the American tradition, would permit the continuation of such a system in the American context.

In contemplation of the inevitable end of colonialism, a sterile debate had raged for many years in the island between adherents of independence and those of statehood. The great majority of Puerto Ricans rejected independence on two counts: Puerto Rico's economy was by then so integrated with that of the United States that separation would have meant economic suicide and, equally important, Puerto Ricans had developed a deep and genuine attachment for their fellow United States citizens and for United States political institutions.

The great majority also rejected the possibility of statehood as totally unrealistic. Economically, statehood then would have meant another form of ruin for Puerto Rico—and still would, as we shall see in a moment.

The circumstances called for the same kind of political pioneering which created the Original Thirteen States themselves—a new projection which would be in the spirit of the 20th century, taking due recognition of the mutual interests of both the United States and Puerto Rico. The concept of a self-governing commonwealth had been foreseen as long ago as 1912 by Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War under President Taft. With farsighted statesmanship, Stimson observed that he saw no inconsistency between U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans and the ideal that Puerto Rico should have, when ready, for it, completely autonomous local government within the American system.

This is essentially what happened when Puerto Rico became a commonwealth in 1952. The official Spanish translation is Estado Libre Asociado—Associated Free State: Puerto Rico, in the generic sense of the term, is a new kind of state. Puerto Ricans are U.S. citizens, sharing with their fellow citizens in the continental United States a common defense, a common foreign policy, a common market, a common currency, and the operation of practically all Federal laws. Puerto Ricans differ from other Americans in that they do not vote in national elections, have no voting representation in Congress, and have, on the other hand, autonomy in directing their local affairs, including the collecting and spending of their own taxes.

Nearly 7 years after its hopeful inception, how is the Commonwealth doing? It is doing remarkably well, I am happy to report. "Operation Bootstrap" has raised the per capita income from $121 in 1940 to today's $470. Living standards have virtually doubled in 15 years, perhaps the most rapid economic advance in any underdeveloped region in the world.

Certainly development has been dramatic enough to attract high officials, technicians, and students from all over the world to study our methods. Nearly 9,000 visitors from 107 different countries—from Nepal to Saudi Arabia, from Morocco to Bolivia—have studied how we have raised life expectancy from 46 years in 1940 to 68 years today, how we are rapidly winning the fight against illiteracy and how a whole people can be raised, in a few years, from despair and deepest poverty to relative prosperity and dynamic purposefulness.

The creation of the Commonwealth had political as well as economic lessons for the world. It was a notable achievement, in the postwar era, to end a colonial relationship in such a constructive, fruitful manner, devoid of the bitterness and violence which characterized the end of colonialism in many parts of Asia, the Near East, and Africa. Puerto Rico clearly gave the lie to the persons (Communists and others) who are always ready to raise the cry of "imperialism" against the United States. It was patently impossible to square imperial exploitation with a people who are self-governing, who sent 40,000 of their sons into the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict (90 percent of them volunteers) and who are so effectively dramatizing the quality of U.S. democracy to thousands of earnest observers from all over the world.

The dignity of self-government has not only engendered an explosion of energy in economic affairs in Puerto Rico but has seen a lively ferment in cultural realms as well. No one who has visited Puerto Rico recently can be immune to the feeling that things are happening. The Casals Festival, lively drama, ballet, opera, and symphony orchestra seasons are all part of the energized local scene. Puerto Rican painting and writing are in obvious renaissance. A people with new pride and new confidence and new creativity are clearly on the march.

In the light of this progress, it may seem strange that the sterile debate regarding possible statehood at any time in the foreseeable future should have been revived in Puerto Rico. Certainly persons who make any serious study of Puerto Rico's economics are aware that statehood, at this time, or for many generations to come, would mean a fatal crash for the island. It would be like a fully loaded airplane about to be airborne having half its motors suddenly stopped.

Federal taxes would about double the already high taxload that the Commonwealth must impose upon itself in order to keep its public works and public services in line with its rapid economic development. Federated statehood would mean either breaking the back of the taxpayer and thus making further economic development impossible or cutting the public services so drastically that their decay would constitute a bottleneck for private enterprise and economic development.

There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about. And while this progress has been notable enough to attract interest in many countries, our living standards, as I have indicated, are still far below those of the mainland United States.

The Federal Government has long been cognizant of the different economic situations of Puerto Rico and the harsh handicaps imposed by a population concentration of 658 persons per square mile in a mountainous island with virtually no resources. Never, since Puerto Rico was first associated with the United States, has the Federal Government applied Federal taxes here. This was to give the island a chance of economic development as well as to honor the principle of "no taxation without representation." Without this to compensate for the other disadvantages I have mentioned, Puerto Rico would still be in deepest poverty.

Most Federal grants-in-aid apply in Puerto Rico. These grants, like those allowed to the States, are apportioned on the theory that they will benefit the United States as a whole. Matching funds for building certain roads and for hospital construction are cases in point.

The United States tariff is collected in Puerto Rico on foreign imports—which, by the way, are few, since most of our trade is with the United States—but the receipts go into the Commonwealth treasury after the cost of collection is deducted. In this way American manufacturers are protected from foreign competition while the Puerto Rican treasury is benefited. This is important because Puerto Rico is one of the world's greatest per-capita consumers of United States products, spending $700 million a year on them. The Federal excise tax on Puerto Rican rum, while it serves to protect American distillers, also reverts to the Commonwealth.

On the other hand, our association with the United States imposes some penalties on the Puerto Rican economy, for which our treasury is not compensated. Under the Sugar Act of 1946, for example, Puerto Rico loses considerable potential income by being denied the right to refine more than 11 percent of its own sugar production. In addition, shipping rates between Puerto Rico and U.S. ports are artificially high because they are governed by the coastwise shipping laws confining cargoes to American vessels. While these laws have the legitimate objective of subsidizing U.S. shipping for defense purposes, in practice they place a heavy share of this defense load on Puerto Rican consumers.

From the U.S. point of view, the accession of a state unable to pay Federal taxes except at the cost of economic ruin is obviously inconceivable. Puerto Rico, which as a Commonwealth is a showcase of American de-

mocracy before the world, would, as a federated state, become exactly the opposite: an economy in shambles, having to be kept alive by a W.P.A. type of charity, with a people far more hopeless than during the worst of the great depression.

Nor has the United States the desire or interest to force the cultural assimilation of Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Indeed, the fact that Puerto Ricans are probably the most bilingual people in the hemisphere, with deep understanding of and ties to both their fellow U.S. citizens and their Latin neighbors, has made Puerto Rico a valuable meeting place for people and ideas at a time when Latin America is in a state of farreaching flux. Its unique position has been an undoubted assets for the United States in sensing changing currents in Latin America, and in translating its hemisphere policy into action.

But even now, however limited our means, Puerto Rico wants to make it clear that it intends to begin contributing to the Federal Treasury as its economic circumstances permit. There is now a bill before Congress whose purpose is to define the permanent association of Puerto Rico with the United States. One principle is clearly established: That Puerto Rico wishes, of its own accord and within its abilities, to help shoulder the Federal burden by contributing money to the Federal Government and by performing some functions in Puerto Rico now underwritten by U.S. taxpayers.

Puerto Rico is not looking for a free ride. On the contrary, it is just as anxious to carry its share of the financial load as its sons were to risk their lives in Europe and Korea—as a matter of pride and dignity, as our contribution to the whole.

When the strident chorus of nationalism begins to fade in Europe, Asia, Latin America and Africa, some ingenious formula may permit the rational regrouping of new and old sovereign units on a sounder economic basis, just as the United States and Puerto Rico found a workable formula. The world has become too small, too complex, too interdependent to permit indefinite political fragmentation at the price of widespread poverty. Where blind insistence on rigid, 19th century style sovereignty exists in defiance of economic logic, new forms of federalism are called for. Puerto Ricans are proud that they are contributing to the American political system a new form of federalism.

In dedicating the Puerto Rico Supreme Court Building, Chief Justic Earl Warren expressed this in words that remind us of the creative political genius of the United States:

"In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but the means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—so the new institutions of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represent an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes."

A new way of abolishing colonialism has been born.

Problems of the Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald published this week three articles which should be of interest to all who are concerned about economic and social justice. The author, Laurence Stern, discusses the migratory workers of Maryland. He tells why most citizens ignore the problems of migratory workers, and why a few are deeply concerned. He also describes the initial moves made by the Maryland Commission on Migratory Labor.

I ask unanimous consent to have the first two articles of this series printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald]

MARYLAND'S MIGRANTS HIT BY BAD WEATHER—HUNGER SPECTER RAISED FOR VAST FORGOTTEN HORDE

(By Laurence Sterm)

Tally McNeil lives in a dingy, one-room shack on the Eastern Shore with his pregnant wife, five children and his worries.

They share three cots, a two-burner stove and a gnawing uncertainty over where the next dollar will come from.

"In the last 2 days I ain't picked more than $2 worth of tomatoes," said Tally, head hunched between his husky shoulders. "That don't buy us much."

When the harvest is good, a migrant picks until his knees are sore and his back aches. In a bad season, there is the specter of empty stomachs for himself and his family.

Maryland's newly established Commission on Migratory Labor is looking into the living and working conditions of thousands of migrants like Tally who annually pour into the Shore's great truck farming belt.

DROUGHT, RAINS HALVE CROP

This summer the Shore has been hit by a devastating combination of drought and heavy rain. Because of the weather, there has been only half the usual crop of tomatoes, cucumbers, beans and peppers.

Nevertheless, Tally McNeil, his parents, five brothers and two sisters will be back from Pompano, Fla., next year to gamble again with nature, just as they have for the last 11 years.

Last summer 5,455 migrants swarmed into Maryland to pick the crops and haul them to canneries and other markets. Most are Negroes from Florida. Others come from Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana.

The tri-State Eastern Shore lies along one of the three broad corridors through which some 1 million American and foreign migrants stream northward each year as crops ripen.

Another waves moves upward through the tier of Midwestern States and a third comes up through California.

Waddell's Migratory Camp, where the McNeils live, was built by the Federal Government to house Bahamians and Jamaicans brought there during the war years to relieve the farm manpower shortage.

It was taken over by the Dorchester County Truck Growers Association and is operated by the State department of employment security.

BETTER THAN MOST CAMPS

Waddell's may be worse than some camps in a three-county area surveyed by the Washington Post. But it is better than most.

There are 53 weathered frame shacks jammed into a large, circular clearing. As many as 140 laborers, their wives and children make their home there during the peak of the 4-month harvesting season.

The camp yard is littered with empty half-pint bottles, beer cans, and other debris. A group of children play around a smoldering pile of leaves.

Inside a cabin you hear a woman singing and several pairs of hands clap in rhythmic unison.

At each corner of the camp stands a row of outdoor privies, doors yawning open.

Living accommodations at Waddell's and nearby Preston camp come in two sizes.

Most of the migrants live in small shacks, 8- by 10-foot cubicles equipped with cots, a small cook stove and a light bulb. Rent, $2 a week.

LARGER FAMILY MODEL

The model for larger families is almost double the floor area and has a higher roof. Rent $4.

This price distinction is not respected by the swarms of mosquitoes and flies which infest the camps. Officials say that all the cabins were once screened.

Sometimes screens are ripped out so that it is easier to toss out garbage or dirty dishwater. Or else they just deteriorated.

"The migrants have become adjusted to this life," said the Rev. Carlton W. Veazey, a 23-year-old Howard University divinity student. As a member of the National Council of Churches migrant ministry, Mr. Veazey has five migrant camps under his supervision.

"I know deep in my heart that they want better things. They are doing an important job in harvesting the crops. I feel they are entitled to better facilities," he said.

With the help of the camp managers, the young minister fixed up a room for religious services where half of the camp's inhabitants come to worship each week.

Across Route 331 from Waddell's camp a group of pickers combed a field for small "Italian" tomatoes—the remnants of this year's spoiled harvest.

A picker gets 15 cents a basket for small tomatoes and 10 cents for large ones. An additional 3 to 5 cents a basket goes to his crew leader—the man who recruited him and brought him North.

ONE HUNDRED BASKETS A HEAD

When the harvest is plentiful a hardworking crew will pick from early morning to twilight, averaging as much as 100 baskets a head.

"You crawl along on your knees," explained William McNeil. "When they begin to hurt you stand up and pick. When your back starts bothering you, down on your knees again."

Beulah Simmons, a graying, dignified woman in her mid-forties keeps count of the baskets. Other women and children pick in the fields along with the men.

"We can't count children as workers," explained one camp official. "But whether we count them or not, they'll be picking in the fields with their parents."

For infants and toddlers, makeshift nurseries are set up in the trucks and buses which carry the migrant to the fields.

Geraldine Simmons is a bright, attractive 13-year-old. She had to drop out of her sixth grade class in Apaka, Fla., 2 weeks early to come north with her parents.

Next month she will enroll at Hurlock School, some 3 miles from the camp, until they leave for home in mid-October.

"Do you have much trouble catching up with your schoolwork when you get home?" she was asked.

"Naw," she replied. "Not too much."

MARYLAND'S MIGRATORY WORKERS—CREW LEADER'S ROLE PUTS HIM IN MIDDLE

(By Laurence Stern)

Each spring, crew leader John Graham loads up his battered schoolbus with workers and hauls them from Florida to Maryland's Eastern Shore.

To the 55 pickers in his crew, Graham is a combination of policeman, father, banker and boss.

A grizzled, friendly man of 50, he has a reputation of dealing fairly with his workers. Some crew leaders, on the other hand, are known to exploit their crews ruthlessly.

Crew leaders like Graham form the elite of an army of 1 million migrant workers who harvest the Nation's crops. The farmer depends on him for manpower and the picker looks to him for a livelihood.

I talked to crew leaders and pickers alike in the three Eastern Shore counties where Maryland's migratory population is most heavily concentrated, Dorchester, Somerset, and Caroline.

One leader at Somerset Migratory Camp near Princess Anne drives a shiny, new Oldsmobile and owns a fleet of six trucks. Another was barely scraping along with a dilapidated moving van.

PEOPLE PENNED IN TRUCKS

Most of the trucks in the migratory camps had neither seats nor benches. As many as 40 men, women and children are penned into these vehicles for the 900-mile trip. If they are lucky they may find a bean hamper to sit on.

In June, 1957, a truck carrying 41 migrant workers crashed in North Carolina. The death toll was 21.

Six months later the Interstate Commerce Commission adopted a safety code for transportation of migrants. Among other things, it requires that a secure seat be furnished for each passenger.

Each winter Graham and other crew leaders sit down with Maryland employment officials in Florida and chart a work schedule for the following year. The labor procurement agent is armed with a list of work orders from farmers back home.

A crew leader's earnings may run as high as $10,000 in a season or as low as $800, depending on the quality of the harvest and the size of his work force.

The basic economic cards of the migratory labor system are stacked heavily in his favor.

GETS FLAT COMMISSION

A crew leader is paid a flat commission for each basket of tomatoes. This share varies from 3 to 5 cents a basket. The picker gets 10 cents.

By the season's end the crew leader may earn more than 10 times as much as one of his laborers. In the field he oversees the workers but does not do any picking himself.

Migrant workers first came to the Shore during World War II when the pinch on agricultural manpower was at its worst. They have been coming back ever since.

Until the farmer can harvest his tomato, bean, cucumber, and pepper crops by machine there will always be a market for the migrant.

He is the cement that holds the Shore's farming economy together. The farmer is first to admit it.

"Without the migrant our canning industry would just have to shut down," maintains Robert McWilliams, who runs 6 farms sprawling over nearly 1,000 acres in upper Dorchester County.

CANNERY IS KING

In the Eastern Shore's agricultural breadbasket, the cannery is king.

Not everyone agrees that the migrant is either necessary or desirable, least of all Charles Cornish who is lone Negro member of the Cambridge city council.

"The migrant undercuts our domestic labor," said Cornish. "These people are being exploited by their own crew leaders. If the farmer was willing to pay a decent wage, he would be able to get plenty of local help."

Cornish owns a bus service. In the days before the migrants arrived he carried local farm laborers to the fields.

"A good many of the local Negroes feel the way I do," said Cornish. "The migrants have taken something away from them."

Soviets in Secret Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Los Angeles Herald Express calls attention to our peculiar inclination to show off our innermost secrets to our worst enemies. The editorial also pays tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, for his protest to the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission for allowing visiting Communists to see and photograph our industrial secrets.

The editorial follows:

SOVIETS IN SECRET PLACES

In these modern days when the tendency in some quarters is to hand the Communists (American and foreign) whatever they desire, it is encouraging to know that we have at least some congressional watchdogs on the job.

Los Angeles Congressman GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB has protested sharply to the State Department and the Atomic Energy Commission, and has demanded to know who authorized the tour of the University of California Radiation Laboratory by Soviet Deputy Premier Kozlov.

Declaring that "we're just too soft," Congressman LIPSCOMB remarked:

"It is ridiculous for us to go ahead blindly showing them all over the Nation when there is no place they go that they are not looking for information to advance their cause—the destruction of our form of government."

It seems like playing with fire to invite our enemies into our A-laboratories, even though some officials assert the Soviet visitor only saw "fundamental unclassified research equipment." If it was so unimportant, why not just show him the Golden Gate Bridge?

Adding fuel to the fire were other dangerous incidents.

Soviet photographers were allowed to photograph at close range in steel and automobile factories, focusing on intricate automation and other machinery, which one steel official called industrial espionage.

They also photographed industrial and defense areas which easily could become pictorial targets of destruction in the event of a Soviet-United States war.

And it was clearly evident that anti-United States propaganda for the Russian people was being produced in wholesale quantity, with the Soviet cameramen photographing only hovels, slums, poorly dressed children and older people as illustrations of "living standards."

Meanwhile, Vice President NIXON is getting a cautious reception from Soviet officials to his request to be allowed to visit Russian areas rarely opened to foreigners.

And Soviet Premier Khrushchev continues to voice loud threats of Soviet destruction of the United States unless we toe the proper marks.

Mr. NIXON correctly analyzed the situation when, at the recent dedication of the Los Angeles Sports Arena, he declared:

"While Kozlov is talking peace here, Khrushchev is talking war and blackmail in Moscow. * * * We should be courteous but under no circumstances fail to stand up for what we believe."

Mayor Mariani, of Detroit, and Governor Williams, of Michigan, may not have been so adroit or diplomatic in their reception of the Soviet visitor. But they made it plain that many Americans do not go along with the attitude of some official and private bigwigs who scrape and bow every time a Soviet higher-up deigns to smile at them.

Dam at Rampart on the Yukon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the public works appropriation bill, an excellent bill, which we trust will shortly become law, contains an item of great importance not only to Alaska but to our entire Nation. It is a $50,000 appropriation for further studies leading to the construction of a great dam at Rampart on the Yukon.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject of this dam entitled "The Big One," by Harold L. Moats, Chief of the Civil Works Planning Branch of the Corps of Engineers, which was delivered at the eighth annual meeting of the Alaska Rural Electric Cooperative Association on August 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BIG ONE

It has been said that without dreamers there is no progress. I would like to spend a few minutes discussing a dream which is truly fabulous.

For some years people have spoken of a dam in Rampart Canyon on the Yukon about 100 air miles northwest of Fairbanks. Lots of talk, but nothing accomplished.

It was not until the Corps of Engineers started our report on the water resources of the Yukon and Kuskokwim River Basins in the fall of 1954 that any serious consideration was given at this site.

With a small staff and little money we have made a preliminary evaluation of the water resources of the Yukon and Kushokwim River Basins. The report is now nearing final form and we expect that it will be submitted in late November or early December. In our studies of the water resources of Alaska we have found it possible to develop about 18,500,000 kilowatts of hydropower. This, compared to the 25,500,000 installed hydropower in the smaller 48, provides our long-range planners with some interesting facts to play with.

The major part of this potential power, some 11,300,000 kilowatts, is found at nine sites in the Yukon and Kuskokwim River basins.

This morning I would like to tell you of some of the things our preliminary studies have revealed about the big one.

The Rampart Canyon site on the main stem of the Yukon River can be developed to produce about 3,700,000 kilowatts of prime power. The installed capacity would be 4,760,000 kilowatts. A concrete gravity dam 1,300 feet long at present water level, 2,700 feet long at the crest and 500 feet high will develop a usable head of about 440 feet. The regulated flow would be about 118,000 cubic feet per second.

Big figures alone mean little to most of us; let us relate them to others that most of us have seen.

At Rampart Canyon, the dam, with only about three-fourths of the volume of the dam at Grand Coulee, will impound enough water to warrant an installed capacity of 4,760,000 kilowatts; about 2½ times the present installed capacity at Grand Coulee.

The area and capacity of the reservoir is interesting. The reservoir will cover an area of about 10,700 square miles, or an area about 10 percent greater than Lake Erie. Due to the great area of the reservoir, it is anticipated that the seasonal drawdown will be under 4 feet. The total reservoir storage will be about 1,300 million acre-feet, better than 40 times the storage at Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam.

There are many interesting areas of speculation that open up as we study this tremendous project.

What, if any, will be the effect of this large reservoir on the climatic regime? It is almost certain that this area of water would increase precipitation to some extent. The water mass would cause the mean annual temperature to rise—how much we cannot say—but assuming that it might be 2 or 3 degrees, it is interesting to note that a few days longer growing season would enhance the agricultural potential of the region.

It has been said that the reservoir area contains enough timber to sustain a small pulp mill during the filling period.

The short but extremely pleasant summer weather of the region might well induce recreational activities here that would compare favorably with those at some of the popular reservoirs in more populated areas.

Let us look more closely at the structure itself. The dam will be a gravity arch structure with adequate fish-handling facilities. Cargo-handling facilities would be constructed in lieu of locks. Because of the huge reservoir capacity, it is anticipated that a spillway, required for safety, will never be used, and it is tentatively planned that the spillway function will be provided by a rupture section in the low earth levee which will close the saddle in the Texas Creek drainage opposite the main dam.

Power will be developed by seventeen 280,000-kilowatt generators.

It is anticipated that ultra high voltage transmission, probably about 500,000 volts, will serve ice free industrial sites at Valdez, Anchorage, Whittier, and Seward. Fairbanks and other interior communities, as well as many mining operations, will be served by conventional transmission lines.

The construction of the dam in stages will probably not prove feasible because of the high cost of mobilizing men and equipment. Our tentative plan therefore is to initially construct the entire dam and to install four or five of the 280,000-kilowatt generators. Installation of the remaining generators will follow as the load develops.

Preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of this initial installation, including transmission to one ice-free tidewater industrial site will be about $900 million and that the delivered cost will be about 5 mills per kilowatt-hour. The total installation will cost about $1,340 million and the kilowatt hour cost at the tidewater sites mentioned above will be reduced to about 3½ mills.

Based primarily on these results of our preliminary studies, the Public Works Committee of the Senate, at the request of Senator GRUENING, on April 24 of this year, directed that the Corps of Engineers make a detailed study of the Rampart Canyon hydroelectric site. We anticipate that this study will require 4 years to complete and that we will receive an initial allotment of funds to start the work this fiscal year.

Many times during the last few years I have been told we were wasting our time and the taxpayers' dollars, dreaming of a dam that would never be built.

Years ago, skeptics talked just like that about development of the Columbia River and the Pacific Northwest. It is my firm belief that industrialists are just as alert as they were 25 years ago. I know that the power demand is now much greater than it was then and it is inconceivable that this mighty giant will continue to lie dormant in the face of such need.

Rampart Canyon, the big one, is Alaska's most valuable resource, and as it is developed Alaska will take her rightful place in the family of States contributing richly to the economy of the Nation and to the welfare of the whole free world.

What I Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., which appeared in the June 1959 issue of the Atlantic Monthly:

WHAT I BELIEVE

(By James A. Farley)

(A lifelong Democrat who was born at Grassy Point, N.Y., 71 years ago, James A. Farley received his first appointment under Gov. Alfred E. Smith as port warden of New York in 1918. He served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee from 1932 to 1940, and he bore the heaviest political responsibility in the advent and development of the New Deal. He mastered the complexity of party organization with a direct, man-to-man approach. In this article he tells how he went about it.)

I was born at Grassy Point, N.Y., on the west bank of the Hudson. My parents were of Irish descent and profoundly religious. I inherited from both a strong physique, a good home, and I hope, some sense of humor. While I was still a very young boy, my father died as the result of a kick from a horse. But the benediction of his affection and the example of his personal honor had already descended to his children. My mother never faltered as the full burden of responsibility fell upon her young shoulders. She taught us that working was part of living and both were the gift of God. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread" was not God's punishment to Adam but the first step to man's salvation, at least as taught in the Farley household.

Of course, we didn't have much choice, but under my mother's leadership we spent no time or energy lamenting the lack of it. At that time, the principal way to improve your affairs was by improving yourself. Some expensive psychological excuses have been developed in the latter decades, but I am old-fashioned enough to think that the most reasonable of excuses are not substitutes for Ben Franklin's yardstick of actual performance.

I early became interested in politics. Grassy Point was a misnomer, politically; it was the one thing neither party allowed to grow under its feet. This was particularly true of a Democrat in Rockland County. Grassy Point is a community in the town of Stony Point, up which Mad Anthony Wayne was carried on a litter to victory. All of his sentries together couldn't have marched as many miles as I did, door to door, in the forlorn cause of the Stony Point Democrats. And General Wayne couldn't possibly have felt a fuller flush of victory than I when I was elected town clerk. This face-to-face personal contact I believe to be the heart and core of the American system. There is no substitute for it. In the week prior to the 1936 election I mailed more than 8,000 letters to every county chairman, vice chairman, city chairman, State chairman, and the members of the Democratic National Committee. In a few weeks following the election I sent more than 26,000 letters of congratulation and thanks to the successful Democratic candidates for county, city, State, legislative, congressional, and senatorial offices. I knew the contents of the letters, which I signed myself because many were going to men and women whom I knew intimately and who were active in the Democratic Party and instrumental in its great victories. I signed all the letters "Jim" because I realized that the personal touch would be helpful and, incidentally, save time instead of signing my full name. At any rate, no one had to instruct me on the importance of the postal system when I became postmaster general.

On the east bank of the Hudson, some time before the loss of my father, another young boy, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, had lost his father. We were to be joined by the flow of events, far more than by the river which flowed past our doors. Oddly, we were to separate eventually (against a third term) into which his grandfather had been born and into which my grandfather had come as an immigrant.

So much has been written about the split between F. D. R. and myself that our long years of close cooperation are often overlooked. Actually, when Mr. Roosevelt took office to handle the crisis of 1933, the Jeffersonian concept of complete unity of legislative and executive departments through a party responsible to the people was the modus operandi. The President delegated the passage of legislation to me as chairman of the Democratic National Committee. It is interesting to note, as Speaker RAYBURN has pointed out, that of the hundred and more major acts passed at that time, not one has been repealed and by far the overwhelming majority have been accepted by both parties as basic legislation.

But here and now, I should like to identify the philosophy, as I saw it, behind that social legislation. On March 4, 1933, when Mr. Roosevelt took his oath of office, there were serious flaws in our national patterns, moral as well as economic. By moral, I mean that a vast preponderance of the American people over the age of 60 were dependent upon relatives for support. Also, millions of children who should have been at school were working. Collective bargaining was a theoretical illusion. Company towns and company stores were a polite expression for economic serfdom. We eliminated these sinkholes. But it seems to me that the philosophy underlying these programs has been badly twisted out of its original meaning and intent. More particularly, to build a floor over a community of quicksand is quite different

from putting a ceiling over the productive and creative elements of the individual. It is one thing to put in a minimum wage level, it is quite another to put a ceiling on personal incentives, which our present hodgepodge tax system does.

At cradle and for some time after, and at graveside and for some time before, a human being often needs assistance. People occasionally need crutches, too, but these aids are only a substitute for the moment when the person can stand on his own two feet. Accordingly, to see purely remedial measures transformed into a cradle-to-grave philosophy under the so-called security programs of welfare states is, in my opinion, as silly as to argue that crutches were invented as substitutes for legs. Welfare states develop a wheelchair philosophy in able-bodied people, and I am against both. It seems to me it is American to hate dependence of any kind. The Indians no longer accept the idea of the Great White Father at Washington; indeed, they now have good reason to know there never was one. Idols, including welfare states, notoriously have feet of clay. The best insurance against the clay feet of idols is to stand on your own.

Ironically enough, because I have favored—and favor—every bit of progressive legislation to distribute risk, the conservatives regard me as a liberal. And because I insist that the distribution of common risk can never be a substitute for individual effort, the liberals regard me as a conservative.

A great deal has been written about the personal teamwork of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and myself, much of it inaccurate. I know the warm comradeship which existed between us, and he was as close a friend of mine as I was of his. We fought together in his first two presidential campaigns. During those first two terms we worked side by side, and there was never a question of either, as a man, being below or above the other.

But when our paths separated in 1940, our different backgrounds were contrasted in reams and reams of copy. Those who had no insight into the facts offered the erroneous explanation that a great social gulf had always existed between us. I practically had to repel the continued suggestion that I was the injured underdog, a barefoot boy done wrong by an unfeeling Grotonian. What particularly irked me were the background articles emphasizing my quote humble unquote beginnings. I am an American of Irish descent. I have known many people of Irish descent. Fat, thin, tall, short—loquacious, taciturn, ebullient, and morose—but never in my life have I met a humble one. It just doesn't run in the strain. The fact is that I have met few men of Irish descent who were not their own figurative secretaries of state. Whatever else they may lack, it isn't opinions or the willingness to fight for them. As to authenticity as Americans, while the *Mayflower* passenger list will be combed in vain for their names, 16 Kellys, 17 Murphys, and hundreds of others of old sod ancestry have won the Congressional Medal of Honor—enough to assure even the unfairminded that the credentials of Americans of Irish descent are in order.

And, frankly, I resented the inference that those whose fathers' homes happened to be more propertied than my mother's were more endowed than I. As to material advantages, the same three R's were taught at Grassy Point as at Groton and St. Marks. There is no royal road to learning, whether your seat is in the family kitchen or in an endowed library. It is the individual himself who counts. A youth who isn't willing to make an effort via the commuters' train to New York isn't very likely to make much more of an effort in the marble halls of a great university. As Mr. Lincoln demonstrated, if a person has the will to improve himself, the back of a slate will serve as a writing pad. In any event, I want to make it clear, if only for the future thinking of my grandchildren, that while my mother couldn't afford my tuition to college, I wouldn't exchange her teaching for the biggest financial endowment in the country.

Actually, it seems to me that it is as hard for a boy to survive his advantages as it is his adversities. I often thought when I was chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission that having an important family name is somewhat like being a champion fighter. That is, all a title can do is get a man into the ring. But when the gong sounds, the title doesn't fight—the man must win by himself. Rich or poor, the test of a champion is his heart, his ability to get up off the floor and go on to win. To become Governor of New York, Al Smith of Fulton Fish Market and Nelson Rockefeller of Pocantico Hills had to fight the same fight in the same ring; and in the great American tradition of fair play the people of New York judged each on the size of his fighting heart, not on his banking account.

Human beings, like political parties, have basic platforms. I consider myself an indomitable, and careful, optimist. As a human being, I think this is my fundamental approach; only an egomaniac could be a cynic about mankind, particularly in the 20th century. Every jet in the sky, every miracle drug, every electronic device testifies to the miraculous progress of the race as a whole. On the other hand, no intelligent man can be other than a skeptic. This is nothing more than saying that for every experiment which produces a magnificent discovery a thousand fail. The courage of one's convictions is noble; uncoupled with the vigor of one's doubts, however, it is static and hence frequently fruitless.

For example, the great sweep of a suspension bridge across a bay is a majestic sight. To most people it appears as almost a symbol of effortless grace and character. But it seems fair to suppose that a bridge engineer sees far more than the beauty which meets the eyes of the layman, and additional beauty not on its apparent strength but on its nonapparent resiliencies, its flexibilities, and its expansions, without which its arches would crash. Built rigidly for either the summer's heat or the winter's cold, and without regard to the wind, its great towers would topple.

So it seems to me a nation, any nation, is like a supension bridge, whose rigidity and flexibilities must be and are in a constant state of balance and rebalance, though not readily apparent to the naked eye.

Now, to carry the bridge analogy further, what makes the American Republic the most beautiful political structure in the history of man is not only the lofty intellectual towers erected by the Founding Fathers but the magnificently ingenious built-in devices of flexibility by which each succeeding generation could bring its own faculties to bear on its own problems. The beauty of the American Republic is that the past provided for the future by permitting the present to take care of itself. It is argued that it is not businesslike. It wasn't intended to be. Constitutional friction was designed to provide the continuing sparks of liberty.

Naturally, this concept can scarcely be described as a tenet of the Republican Party or for that matter a guiding concept of the Democratic Party, but it most certainly is the reason why James A Farley consistently urged the value of the two-party system. Of this, a few scholars who have taken the trouble to read my papers are thoroughly aware, although that great American President and my close firend, F.D.R., was not among them. Fundamentally, it was upon this concept that we parted. As I see it, the conservative needs the pressure of the liberal to expand, and the liberal needs the pressure of the conservative to keep from shattering by explosion. The reciprocal pressure of each upon the other is needed by a healthy state, the liberal to provide the yeast of growth and the conservative to insure the continuity of form. Great oaks from little acorns grow; between the liberal demanding a full-grown tree and the conservative reluctantly yielding each new advance, continued form and reasonable predictability are part of a wholesome growth.

Since I believe that such ordered growth of the Nation does not depend on one party, I obviously still less would subscribe to the thesis that it depends upon any one man, and it was on this basis that I resisted the third term of F.D.R. Even more particularly, I refused to bolt the party when I failed. I thought, and I think, that the two-party system is more important to the effective expression of the American people than F.D.R. and certainly James A. Farley.

Accordingly, I view with satisfaction the 22d amendment, which prohibits a third term, on the premise of reciprocal action which I have set forth. Furthermore, I reject the hypothesis that the whole equilibrium and hence continuity of the American state should be predicated on the heartbeat of any one mortal man. It is the fundamental character of the American people from which is derived the mightiness of the American state. The American people will be out of character, and the American state will be out of balance, if the tragic day ever comes when they accept the belief that their character is derived from the mightiness of their state and, even worse, any single man who runs it.

Any declaration of principle on the body politic ought to be accompanied by some definition of terms. What, then, is the American democracy? To me, it is the guarantee of an equal chance to every citizen. But an equal chance is a long, long way from enforced equality; indeed, it is quite the oposite. I conceive of our democracy as an equilibrium of human beings, not an equality of mass distribution. Thus I think of our democracy as a system by which a person rises or falls according to his own worth, talents, and industry. If this definition is accepted, it follows that the American democracy is the only system which allows for the bloodless rise of an aristocracy based upon effective functioning.

It seems to me that to say that the 20th century is the era of the common man merely points to the great benefits derived from the common heritage of broadening culture. For example, an ordinary citizen can buy at a corner drugstore, for a very small sum, a magic drug for which Louis XIV would have given half of France. But the fact that this is the so-called century of the common man does not mean that being average should be held forth as an ideal to our youth. This term, "century of the common man," marks the debt of us average human beings to the very uncommon men whose genius makes this modern world possible. By any standard, Edison, Marconi, Pasteur, Burbank, and Salk were more gifted than us ordinary mortals, and certainly we all enjoy the fruits of their genius. Accordingly, it will be a sad day for our country if the only ideal before our youth is to be an ordinary man in the century of the common man. Our youth should have before it the ideas of deepening its talents, in order to excel and to compete, with the bright possibility that devotion and perseverence may result in a contribution to the general culture to which we are all so deeply indebted. In simple terms, what man could weave his own suit or construct his own electric light? Yet all these things are at an American's elbow. These con-

veniences, boons, and unearned rewards are so much a part of our daily lives that while I concur in our national motto, "In God We Trust," it seems to me that each individual citizen's daily prayer should be "Forgive me, O Lord, for taking so much for granted."

It follows that I deplore the entrance into our language, particularly; for the young, of the word "security." In the first place, if this means a safe-conduct pass through life, there is no such thing; and, in the second, if there is, it is alien to the American spirit. There was precious little security for the signers of the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, and what little there was was thrown to the winds when John Hancock picked up his pen. Gen. George Washington forsook the material security of Mount Vernon for the chance bullets of Bunker Hill and the snows of Valley Forge. In the 19th century, no Americans looked for safety on the decks of the *Constitution*, nor were the prairie schooners breaking out in the new frontier safe fortresses of comfort for the magnificent men and women who made the West. It is time that the grand old colonial adage, "Beaten paths are for beaten men," be dusted off and placed before American youths. The fact is, the greater the responsibility and duty the less the security. After all, every man in a battle fleet knows exactly what he must do except the admiral who must give the command. To him comes the agony of responsibility in constantly reviewing the calculated risks. Chance—and therefore insecurity—is the heavy price of command. Chance means challenge. A person who refuses the challenge of life has died without ever living.

Politics to me is the supreme challenge of American life. Some men find full expression as professional engineers; I find full expression in affairs of state. I recognize that "politics" is an unpopular word. However, I consider the science of government at least as useful and honorable as, and in most respects more difficult than, any other calling. Certainly a profession which numbers among its practitioners Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, F. D. R., Churchill, and Adenauer has little for which to apologize.

I regard politics as among the highest and most useful callings open to American youth. It is my further opinion that there is no line of endeavor more mobile, and by this I mean none in which merit rises so quickly to its proper recognition. I believe that in the long run, counting all factors and even hard luck, the better man will win.

From this, I hope it appears that however much people may disagree with me, neither friend nor foe need guess where I stand. To my own satisfaction, at least, I have never stood in the middle of the road, as a result of which I have never been very far from the middle of the fight.

Maryland Migratory Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the third article in a series by Laurence Stern of the Washington Post and Times Herald concludes a discussion of Maryland migratory workers. I believe that this article gives a clear account of some of the difficulties facing all who would do something to end or ease the hardships often faced by these wandering workers. The concluding paragraph, I think, sums up an important truth.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 18, 1959]

MARYLAND'S MIGRATORY WORKERS—FEW CONCERNED OVER CONDITIONS

(By Laurence Stern)

Robert McWilliams bought an abandoned church camp at Shiloh, Md., last year and converted it into housing for his migrant labor crews.

The effect on the good villagers was electrifying.

They swooped down on the Dorchester County Commissioners with complaints that the migrants would infect their community with crime, filth, and disease.

Yet migrants have been working in the fields near Shiloh since World War II when local farm manpower became scarce. Several labor camps have operated for years just a few miles away.

Most of the camps are hidden away along side roads on the outskirts of town. Many migrants live right on the farm at which they work.

It's easy for the average citizen to forget about the migrant's existence—until he reads about a stabbing or sex attack in a labor camp or finds an empty half-pint bottle on his property.

WELL-BEHAVED AND EDUCATED

The farmer sometimes talks about the migrants with touching solicitude.

"He's a human being, just as civilized, well-behaved and educated as our local workers," said McWilliams, who is Dorchester County's biggest employer of migrants.

Nevertheless the farmer is first to howl against any effort to guarantee minimum standards of decency to the migrant in housing, health, or education.

This summer McWilliams bought 70 beds, 100 mattresses and paid $100-a-month electrical bills for his migrants. The water they drink, he insists, is just as good as his own.

McWilliams cannot understand why anyone wants to force him to observe minimum housing standards.

In 1957 the Maryland Department of Health made an exhaustive study of migrant living conditions. It found that 66 percent of the camps had unapproved water systems. Privies in 72 percent of the camps were below minimum sanitary standards.

Housing in general was found to be in an unsound and dilapidated state.

A survey of the three Eastern Shore counties, Dorchester, Caroline and Somerset, which depend most heavily on migrant labor, did not refute these findings.

HEALTH OFFICIALS POWERLESS

Yet health officials are powerless to act since labor camps are not under their control. Without a vote, the migrant is readily overlooked by the politician.

"I've never been in a migrant camp in my life," said Senator Frederick C. Malkus, who has represented Dorchester County in the legislature for 13 years. Malkus thinks the migrant is a local problem in which he, as a lawmaker, should not meddle.

If a migrant is hurt on the job, there is no formal machinery for getting him into a hospital. At best he gets medical attention through the back door, with the help of a minister.

Local citizens, who know the migrant cannot pay his hospital bill, are resentful.

As a nonresident agricultural worker, he is exempt from workmen's compensation, unemployment and minimum wage safeguards. Organized labor sometimes looks sympathetically at his plight, but has made no serious attempt to do anything about it.

Maryland this year took its first step toward opening a window into the forgotten world of the migrant. Last winter the legislature and Governor J. Millard Tawes created a Commission on Migratory Labor similar to agencies that exist in 23 other States.

MINIMUM HOUSING CODE

This group 2 weeks ago proposed a minimum housing code, such as Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, and New York have already adopted.

When it is unveiled at public hearings, it will probably be denounced by the Eastern Shore's growers.

There have been a few exceptions to the general apathy over the migrant's lot. Foremost is the National Council of Churches which has attempted, through its "Migrant Ministry," to cultivate "a sense of personal worth, belonging and responsibility" in the migrant.

"Considering the amount of work the migrant does and the money he brings into an area, State and county officials should take more responsibility for his welfare," said the Reverend Carlton W. Veazey, a 23-year-old Howard University divinity student serving on the Migrant Ministry.

At Westover Camp near Princess Anne the council runs a model day care center for migrant children. Two more are in operation at Hurlock, Md., and Staytonville, Del.

CENTER IS IMMACULATE

The Westover center is staffed all summer by two Somerset County teachers. Each child has a desk and clean cot. The center, once a ramshackle farm cabin, is kept in immaculate condition. But most migrant children who are too young to pick still wait for their parents in the bus or the truck which carries them to the field, just as other children have for years.

At Preston in Caroline County, the State Health Department has opened a clinic for expectant and new mothers. Migrants are also being tested for venereal disease and tuberculosis.

"There are still many gaps left uncovered," said the Reverend Samuel A. Snyder, Jr., the Migrant Ministry's southeast regional director.

"The basic problem of the migrant is his nonresident status," added Mr. Snyder. "Help comes to him only on an emergency basis."

Invite to Khrushchev—The Pearl Harbor of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, in ancient times, an army was laying siege to a walled city.

Finally realizing that it could not conquer the city by direct attack, it conceived the stratagem of building a huge wooden horse and presenting it to the people of the city, as a sign of friendship and coexistence.

Impressed, the people pulled the generous gift inside the walls, but made sure to lock the gate. That night, when all but the guards on the walls were asleep, secret doors in the hollow horse were opened, and armed men poured out to capture the city from within.

Our Government, in 1959, says: "Why not make it easier?"

And so it has opened the gates and has invited the besieger—Khrushchev—to come in and enjoy the hospitality of his intended captives. Wearing the mask of friendship while respectability is conferred upon him by those who are so anxious to appease, he will score the greatest propaganda victory in the history of communism.

Not all Americans or editorial writers agree with this open-the-door policy toward communism.

The Lawrence Sunday Sun, published in Lawrence, Mass., believes this invitation to be a political blunder that is similar to the visit of two Japanese diplomats in 1941 who were talking peace at the very moment that their air fleets were taking off to bomb Pearl Harbor.

I recommend for your attention the hard-hitting editorial titled "The Baby Kissers," from the August 16 issue of the Lawrence Sunday Sun:

THE BABY KISSERS

Not too long ago, some wag in the newspaper field typified the provincial American politician as an arch baby kisser, on the presumption that seekers of public office could win more votes by paying attention to youngsters in carriages than by direct vocal appeal to the parents. It could be that this holds true today, because most adults like to bask in the imagined sunshine of the fellow who happens at the moment to hold the center of the stage.

In center stage today is a character known as Nikita (Nick) Khrushchev, the No. 1 figure in Russian politics.

Nick is preening his feathers and strutting around the international barnyard in preparation for his visit to the United States of America next month, on which occasion the powers-that-be in this land of the free will roll out the long Red welcome mat and spread the board lavishly with vodka, caviar, champagne and all the other fixin's which are a familiar part of our way of doing things on this side of the world. Thankfully, we have plenty of these items. The bill for them will be included in the national budget and you and we shall find ourselves picking up the check.

Nick will grow fat during his stay in our dining room. He will feast on the best things of life. More importantly, he will dine to the gorging point on the propaganda which the world will pour over his communistic head.

We'll qualify that last statement. He will wax fat on the tears of all the millions of people of the far-off places of our sphere who have been existing under the heel of and in the yoke of the most brutal government and political philosophy in all of history.

Looking back nearly 20 years, we have fresh in our memory a "friendly" visit by two Japanese diplomats to Washington. While they were here on a mission of good will, the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, setting off a worldwide armed conflict that cost millions of lives.

Do you remember how long it took Russia—Red Russia—to get into that fight? The wily Commies waited until they were sure of which side was winning, and they stepped in and grabbed all the glory that was lying around—grabbed all the booty they could get, and that was plenty.

It has been estimated that some 10 million Russians died in that war; not necessarily men bearing arms, but the people of the bombed-out cities; the women and children enslaved by Nick and his gang. Even "Uncle Joe" Stalin was a sacrifice to the insatiable Commie lust for gain.

Is there any reason why we should trust Nick today after the manner in which we placed our innocent confidence in the two Japanese delegates who were patting Roosevelt on the head while their bombs were dropping on our Pacific Fleet and on Henderson Field nearly two decades ago?

Nikita Khrushchev is a rat representing a swarm of rats in the gang which has set itself up as the representatives of the good people of Russia. He and his mob figure there is a lot of choice cheese in the United States of America, and that once they have tunneled their way into this almost-last bastion of democracy, they can undermine it and pull the rest of the world down with it. That is the avowed aim of communism: To dominate the world. It's not a new objective by any stretch of the imagination. Ages ago, Genghis Khan tried it and slaughtered his way to the gates of Rome, all away across the blood-drenched fields from the Orient to the seat of Western culture.

The Caesars tried it and eventually came to doom, only to be overrun by the Huns they set out to vanquish.

Napoleon ventured into the matter of world conquest and eventually was smeared.

The infamous Kaiser Wilhelm responded to the urge to subjugate the world and what happened to him is still fresh in the minds of multiple millions of people living today.

The Japanese Empire fell into the same terrible trap.

The Communists are still riding high, wide, and handsome—tall in the saddle—over the graves of millions of people slaughtered in the now enslaved little nations of our increasingly small world.

Now, in a futile gesture to give some assurance of peace within our time, we are going to entertain Nick-the-Knifer in this wonderful, free land of ours in exchange for the welcome given RICHARD NIXON in Russia—a visit that backfired even on the propaganda experts of the Commie regime. Let us give him as his only welcoming "honor guard" the Hungarian refugees who have sought sanctuary here.

The Great Disillusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that an important battle between freedom and communism is taking place in the vast reservoir of land, natural resources, and people in Asia.

With cultural, educational, religious, philosophical, and other traditions differing from our own, Asia has been a particular challenge for the free world in terms of combating communistic penetrations, by efforts to present our own ideas and ideals of freedom.

Fortunately, a substantial number of countries and people of Asia speak the language of freedom. Through these voices, as well as through our own policies and programs, efforts are underway to counter the offensive of communism.

Unwittingly, the Communist ideology, itself, sometimes serves as its own enemy. The crushing of the people of Tibet by the Chinese Communists is a prime—but terrible—example of communistic ruthlessness that is rudely awakening the Asian people to the dangers of communism. In addition, among Asiatic nations there is an increasing awareness of the real threat which that despotic, atheistic way of life poses for them.

Although the signs of a new awakening in Asia to the dangers of communism are heartening, we must not delude ourselves that victory will soon be achieved—and all by itself. Rather, our policies and programs designed at blocking expansion tactics of the Communists must be continued—and, as necessary, expanded—to deal effectively with the challenges in that area of the globe.

The New York Times of August 17 published an informative editorial entitled "The Great Disillusion." The editorial outlines the ways in which the Asian people and nations are becoming increasingly aware of the great dangers of communism. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT DISILLUSION

The great change in Asian attitudes toward communism since the days when Premier Chou of Communist China beguiled the Bandung conference of 1955 with his pleas for peaceful coexistence is demonstrated anew by some of the latest developments. The change, building up slowly as Asia watched China sink into slavery, received a tremendous impetus from the Chinese Communist rape of Tibet, which was to Asia what Czechoslovakia and Hungary were to the West. Now more and more Asian countries begin to feel the hot breath of the Chinese Communist dragon and are beginning to look to their defenses.

The most notable convert to this new attitude is Prime Minister Nehru of India, long a defender of Communist China and still a proponent of its admission to the United Nations. Having had to oust the Communist regime in the Indian state of Kerala, he now sees the Chinese Communists massing troops in Tibet, violating Indian trade agreements with that country and vowing to "liberate" Indian territories while at the same time launching a virulent propaganda campaign against Indian imperialism. As a result, despite continued caution Mr. Nehru has been compelled to tell Parliament that he has protested to Peiping against both the propaganda and the violations and to serve notice that India will defend its borders against any Communist encroachment.

Increased defense measures against Communist infiltration from Tibet have also been announced by Premier Koirala of Nepal.

In Laos, which is actively fighting a Communist rebellion and a Communist invasion from North Vietnam, crowds at the national capital cheer Premier Phoui and roar defiance to the Communists. Burma, after 6 years of rejecting it, has now asked for American aid. And even in Indonesia, where President Sukarno has been flirting with the Communists, the tide is turning and the Communists have been told by the military authorities to cancel their party congress.

This recognition of a common danger has not yet ripened into a common defense front. But the way the wind is blowing is indicated by Premier Kishi of Japan who, after studying the collective defense arrangements in Europe, is pressing for a firm military alliance between his country and the United States in which Japan would assume added defense responsibilities. And talks are apparently underway for a new alliance linking Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, and Taiwan. Asia is awakening, not to Communist siren calls but to the Communist thunder, and the free nations are beginning to see more clearly eye to eye on the great issue confronting them.

Widespread Significance of Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, although the issue of home rule for the District of Columbia has played a prominent part in the news reporting and editorial comment and in reporting by other news media in the District of Columbia, it has not been a matter given major coverage in most other parts of our country. Nevertheless the vigor of the basic principles upon which our great Nation was founded continues unabated throughout our land, as manifested by the following resolution adopted by the City Council of Anchorage, Alaska, urging action by the Congress to bring about home rule for the District of Columbia. The resolution follows:

CITY OF ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, RESOLUTION 1059 URGING ADOPTION OF HOME RULE LEGISLATION FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas local self-government is the bedrock of free government;

Whereas the rights and benefits of local self-government should be available to all American citizens;

Whereas the residents of the District of Columbia are denied the rights and benefits of local self-government;

Whereas the Congress of the United States has the authority to assure local self-government by granting home rule to the District of Columbia;

Whereas the principle of home rule has been endorsed by a substantial majority of the residents of the District of Columbia;

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have unanimously endorsed proposals for granting home rule to their city; and

Whereas the Senate has passed a home rule bill for the District of Columbia five times during the last 10 years, while in the same period such measures have been bottled up in the District Committee of the House of Representatives, and no hearings held: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska:

1. That the Congress be, and it is hereby, urged to approve home rule legislation to assure local self-government to the residents of the District of Columbia; and be it

2. *Resolved further*, That members of the House of Representatives be urged to sign a discharge petition so that the Commissioners' bill, otherwise known as the Territorial bill, be brought on to the floor of the House so that the full membership can have the opportunity at last to vote on the measure; and be it further

2. *Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the State delegation to Congress.

Publication of this resolution shall be made by posting a copy hereof on the city hall bulletin board for a period of 10 days following its passage and approval.

Passed and approved by the City Council of the City of Anchorage, Alaska, the 11th day of August 1959.

HEWITT V. LOUNSBURY, *Mayor.*

Attest:

B. W. BOEKE, *City Clerk.*

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, yesterday I offered for insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorials from daily newspapers which are circulated in South Carolina on the subject of the need for favorable Senate action on a strong and effective labor reform bill.

Since that time another editorial from another South Carolina newspaper has come to my attention. The editorial entitled "House Action on Landrum-Griffin Bill Promises Labor Legislation" was published in the August 18, 1959, issue of the Florence Morning News of Florence, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, Aug. 18, 1959]

HOUSE ACTION ON LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL PROMISES LABOR LEGISLATION

After the House passed the Landrum-Griffin bill by a safe majority, on a vote said by the Democratic whip to have been the largest in that Chamber's history, the conference committee should encounter no insurmountable difficulties in reconciling it with the Senate's Kennedy-Ervin measure.

For one thing, the size of the total vote serves notice that the American people want a labor reform law and will have little patience with any deadlock over anything that to them might appear relatively minor. For another, the House debates and several votes have made clear how close together the three bills—the Landrum-Griffin, the Elliott, and the Kennedy-Ervin—have been in all save one major area. All three have dealt in relative degrees of firmness and detail with safeguards around union funds, democratic procedures in conduct of union internal affairs, and against convicted felons occupying official positions in unions, in employer associations, or as labor-management consultants.

The major area of difference now pertinent between the House and Senate measures embraces secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing. The former extends Taft-Hartley prohibitions to all industries and to threats as well as to actual strikes against secondary employers. By an extraordinary, prearranged colloquy with the sponsors of the Landrum-Griffin bill the House put into the record for the guidance of courts and, no doubt, of the conference committee, a clue to its intention not to draw a hard, fast line around its definition of secondary.

As for blackmail picketing: The two bills differ chiefly in the length of time they require after a representation election before any union not thus chosen may picket for recognition.

By amendments the House made a move toward the Senate's position by striking out injunctive authority in enforcement given the Secretary of Labor, and away from the text (although toward the tone) of the Senate bill by reducing the severity of criminal penalties for violations of the bill of rights.

The Senate had dealt lightly with secondary boycotts and picketing, hesitatng to write restrictions that might upset the balance in bargaining strength between industry and labor. The House evidently felt that these tactics have been so exploited by the wrong kind of union leadership to keep itself in posts of power that they should be curbed in the interests of decent unions and honest labor-management dealings.

But the Landrum-Griffin bill is not a watered-down bill as industry should view it. And, reconciled with the Kennedy-Ervin bill, it should not be a tough, certainly not an unfair, bill from the standpoint of labor. Much will depend on how the precise wording of the final product works out as applied to specific stuations. The administrative bodies and the courts are usually reasonable. And should major revision later prove needed there will come other Congresses.

Irresponsibility in the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Irresponsibility in the House," described the action taken in the Ways and Means Committee on interest rate ceiling, a matter of grave importance to our Nation. I submit it to my colleagues and to the people as an accurate and brief analysis of the facts:

IRRESPONSIBILITY IN THE HOUSE

The House Ways and Means Committee last week voted 15 to 10 in favor of a compromise bill giving the President authority, for 3 years, to lift the present 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on Government bonds when necessary. Behind this was the simple fact that going market rates are above 4¼ percent, meaning that the Treasury has been unable to market long-term securities—the only ones to which the ceiling applies. Yesterday the same committee suddenly reversed itself, voting 14 to 11 to pigeonhole the measure it had previously approved. All 14 votes for pigeonholding were cast by Democrats.

From the start congressional Democrats have treated the interest rate issue as a political football, hoping to use it as a means of pinning on the Republicans a phony "high interest party" label.

But interest rates are merely the price of borrowed money, and are set by the forces of a free market. Without freedom to adjust to these forces the Treasury hasn't the means to manage the national debt soundly. Yesterday's action was not only fiscally imprudent but politically irresponsible.

Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, one of the most successful projects of the Roosevelt administration was the establishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps. And I am glad to know that the experience we gained from the job the CCC did prior to World War II in giving useful employment and at the same time rehabilitating and improving our national forests and parks has not been lost. I refer, of course, to the bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which passed this body last week.

Sponsored by the senior Senator from Minnesota, the ideas embodied in the original CCC have been updated to solve the growing conservation needs of our nation and, at the same time, help our youths who are faced with uncertainties as to employment as they leave school.

I believe this extremely worthwhile program will insure a better future for many Americans.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Camden Courier Post of August 19 which describes the job this corps can do.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIVED CCC MIGHT DO GREAT JOB

By the narrow margin of 47 to 45, the Senate has voted to approve a program that would amount to a revival of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It may be recalled that this was one of the most successful New Deal projects in the early administraton of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The program would start with 50,000 boys between the ages of 16 and 21, and grow to 150,000. It would be a Federal-State operation, with participating States required to match Federal expenditures. The latter are estimated at $125 million for the first year, growing to $375 million in the third and later years.

Youths enrolled in the program would receive $60 a month plus subsistence, with increases for those who reenrolled, for leaders, and for those showing special skills.

The program is sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, 19 other Democrats and 1 Republican. Its principal objective is declared to be the development and conservation of natural resources and maintenance of rest and recreational facilities in the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges.

Second, the program is advanced as "an investment not only in conservation of natural resources, but in the conservation of youths who face uncertainties as to employment as they leave school." Its proponents say the number of youths in the 16–21 age group is increasing faster than employment opportunities. This, they say, creates the chance of a large number of them being turned out on the streets to become potental juvenile delinquents.

"The corps would not be juvenile delinquency oriented," says one sponsoring Senator, but "is not intended to exclude young men because they have been apprehended by juvenile authorities."

Recruits for the corps would come in part from areas of substantial unemployment and in part from other areas under a State-by-State quota system.

Opponents of the plan, mostly Republicans, say it would amount to instituting a depression program during an era of prosperity. They claim it is deceptive in that its main aim is actually to help solve the delinquency problem, not conservation of natural resources as its advocates assert. They predict that President Eisenhower will veto the bill if the House passes it.

The prediction may turn out to be erroneous. Both the objectives of the bill seem worthy enough. It doesn't particularly matter which is the man objective and which the secondary.

The CCC did a great job of giving useful work to idle hands during the years prior to World War II. It also did a great job, which has not been adequately done since, in rehabilitating and improving our national parks and forests. The money the Senate has proposed to spend in reviving this youth corps might turn out to be exceedingly well spent.

Amending Section 5801 of the Internal Revenue Code

SPEECH
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H.R. 4029 is to amend the National Firearms Act to eliminate the proration of the occupational tax on persons dealing in machineguns and certain other firearms, to reduce the occupational and transfer taxes on certain firearms, to make the transferor and transferee jointly liable for the transfer tax on firearms, and to make certain technical changes in the definition of the term "firearm."

The National Firearms Act—sometimes referred to as the Machinegun Act—was enacted by the 73d Congress in 1934 to provide a making and transfer tax of $200 on machineguns and certain specified firearms which has become a national crime problem in the prohibition era. In addition to machineguns, the act applies to a silencer for a firearm and to sawed-off rifles and shotguns. The law does not apply to pistols and revolvers or to ordinary sporting rifles and shotguns. Any weapon defined as a firearm by the National Firearms Act is required to be registered with the Department of the Treasury and becomes subject to the prohibitive tax provision of the act. Several technical provisions of the law have resulted in a severe hardship on law-abiding gun owners and particularly gun collectors without adding to the effectiveness of the act as a crime prevention measure. Also, at least one provision in the law has left open a loophole by means of which unscrupulous persons have been able to evade the tax which Congress decreed should be placed upon the transfer of machineguns. It is the purpose of my bill to correct these technical shortcomings.

The National Firearms Act provides in part that a shotgun or rifle having a barrel of less than 18 inches in length is a firearm and subject to the $200 making and transfer tax, except that rifles of .22 caliber are exempt if the barrel length is 16 inches. An area of inequity arises here from the fact that a number of popular sporting rifles and a number of rifles having great value to gun collectors have barrel lengths just slightly under 18 inches. While such rifles could not be considered concealable, and while they do not enter into the crime picture, they still must be classed as a firearm subject to the taxation provisions of the law. It is one of the purposes of my bill so to amend the definition of the term "firearm" under the law that it will not apply to any rifle which has a barrel of at least 16 inches in length. This will mean that all rifles having a barrel length of at least 16 inches will be exempt from the law, not .22-caliber rifles alone as at present.

Another area of inequity from the standpoint of law-abiding shooters and gun collectors arises from the provision in the law which defines as a firearm, in addition to a machinegun or sawed-off rifle or shotgun, "any other weapon, except a pistol or revolver, from which a shot is discharged by an explosive if such weapon is capable of being concealed on the person." It is apparent from this language that Congress did not intend the prohibitive tax provision of the Machinegun Act to apply to pistols or revolvers. The law, however, does not define the terms pistol or revolver; and it, therefore, becomes a matter of administrative interpretation as to what is a pistol, excepted under the act, and what is any other weapon, prohibited under the act. We see here a complex administrative problem. If a particular weapon is clearly recognizable as a pistol or revolver, it meets a specific exception in the National Firearms Act. However, if the weapon is concealable and is not clearly recognizable as a pistol or revolver, then it must fall into the loose category of "any other weapon" and become immediately subject to a prohibitive $200 transfer tax.

Highly valued items to gun collectors are the guns which mark stages in the development of firearms from their earliest beginning. In the process of experimentation, trial and error, and plain American inventiveness which have led to the modern pistol and revolver, many strange firearms have had brief moments on the scene. Some are clearly recognizable as a step in the development of a modern pistol; others are not. Many, by administrative edict, now fall in the "any other weapon" category under the National Firearms Act and are, therefore, subject to its prohibitive controls.

Since pistols and revolvers make up the vast majority of weapons capable of being concealed on the person and, since for good and sufficient reasons the Congress felt that pistols and revolvers should not be included in the Machinegun Act, it would seem just and equitable that the full $200 transfer tax not be applied to the very small minority of concealable weapons which may be interpreted to be neither a pistol nor a revolver. To the contrary, it would appear that the purpose of the act would be better served by a nominal tax on this category of weapon which would permit them to be possessed and traded by gun collectors while retaining the records and controls now maintained by the Department of the Treasury under the National Firearms Act.

Experience through the years has demonstrated that the type of concealable weapon controlled under the National Firearms Act which has most frequently figured as a crime problem is the weapon that is made from a rifle or shotgun by cutting it down in length so as to make it concealable on the person. Under the present law, if a rifle or shotgun is altered by cutting off the barrels so that the barrel length is less than that prescribed in the definition of a "firearm," then the weapon clearly becomes subject to the criminal provisions of the law. In many cases, however, the criminal not only cuts off the barrel of a conventional rifle or shotgun but also may cut off the shoulder stock and thus create a one-hand weapon of greater concealability than had he sawed off the barrel alone. In the past, criminals apprehended with such weapons attempted to avoid prosecution on the ground that the weapon they created by cutting off the barrel and the stock of a shotgun or a rifle was in fact a pistol since it was a one-hand weapon. In the view that it was just this type of criminal weapon that Congress sought to control in the National Firearms Act, I am suggesting an amendment to the definition of the term "firearm" by adding the language, "or any weapon made from a rifle or shotgun—whether by alteration, modification, or otherwise—if such weapon as modified has an overall length of less than 26 inches."

The National Firearms Act provides for an annual $200 tax for persons engaged in the business of dealing in machineguns and those categories of weapons defined as "firearms." At present the payment of this occupational tax may be prorated on a monthly basis established on the fiscal year. It has been called to my attention that certain persons other than bona fide dealers have been able to take advantage of this provision to avoid the payment of the transfer tax on machineguns by paying the dealers' occupational tax for 1 month only. A person engaged in the business of dealing in machineguns and who has qualified for and paid the occupational tax provided for in the law is permitted an exemption from the transfer tax. As the law now stands, a man may qualify as a machinegun dealer in June by paying only one-twelfth of the normal $200 dealers occupational tax. He may then purchase machineguns without paying the $200 transfer tax and, at the end of June, may simply elect not to renew his dealer's status by paying his occupational tax for the following year. It is one of the purposes of my bill to remove the pro rata feature with respect to the occupational tax so that a person qualifying as a dealer, engaged in the business of dealing in machineguns, will pay the $200 occupational tax for a year or fraction thereof.

Another weakness in the present language of the law has been that the transferor alone has been responsible for the transfer tax on machineguns. If, through false pretenses, an individual not actually a bona fide dealer has been able to secure a machinegun transfer tax exempt, the Government has no recourse since no liability for the tax rested on the transferee. The purpose of my bill is to correct this by providing that, if a firearm is transferred without payment of the transfer tax, the transferor and transferee shall become jointly and severally liable for the tax.

The amendments I suggest will improve the enforcement of the National Firearms Act with respect to machineguns and sawed-off shotguns and will at the same time, alleviate some of the inequities that plague gun collectors and shooter-sportsmen without contributing to the effectiveness of the law.

Visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from the mayor of Bristol, Conn., the Honorable James P. Casey, a letter which was characterized in the Connecticut press as an attempt to dissuade me from my opposition to the visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country.

Mayor Casey's letter is an illustrative example of the widespread misunderstanding of the position of those who oppose this visit, and it is representative of what I consider to be the confused thinking of many well-meaning and influential Americans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mayor Casey's letter and my reply be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF BRISTOL,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Bristol, Conn., August 11, 1958.

The Honorable THOMAS J. DODD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR TOM: Remember when Harry Truman in 1948 was counted out by the political wiseacres and Tom Dewey enshrined in the White House even before voters went to the polls? In a "give 'em hell" campaign the former President got up off the deck and proceeded to knock the stuffings out of Dewey with a total disregard for the Marquis of Queensbury rules.

It was a grand, rough and tumble brawl. The American people responded with cheers and huzzahs for the little guy who took on the Republican behemoth, then Governor of New York State. As I recall, you were the only politician in Connecticut who gave Truman a chance in the elections, and, in fact, seconded his nomination at Philadelphia. The rest of the Connecticut delegation floundered around ready to throw its support to any one but the man who made it—even to one man name of Dwight David Eisenhower.

It seems to me that, lacking a crystal ball, no one can predict the results of Nikita Khrushchev's grand tour of the United States. The Communists after 40 years of intensive propaganda, brainwashing, and wholesale butchery have failed conspicuously to convert the people in the satellite countries to the joys to be had in the workers paradise.

Consequently, I don't think that at this point the American people are going to be infected by the Communist virus if Nikita in the Kremlin shows his face in America. A look at the greatness, the power and the glory of the United States and a realization of the spiritual forces which inspire men and women here may deter him from throwing his Sunday punch. After all, a talkathon between President Eisenhower and the Russian Premier is preferable to extermination by a hydrogen bomb.

This brings us to DICK NIXON and the union of the United States and Poland, and Lord knows how many more of the enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia. NIXON took on Khrushchev in the latter's own back yard, on the home grounds so to speak, not in a contest of haughty words and stinging phrases, with 5,000 miles separating the combatants. NIXON slugged it out toe-to-toe with Nikita and the "you-don't-know-everything" retort was a crack heard round the world.

NIXON's tumultuous reception in Poland was also a startling revelation. Americans have always felt confident and sure that, in an abstract way, the people in that benighted country were on our side. The instant, spontaneous expression of love and friendship, in the face of their oppressors, I believe, however, to be unprecedented in the whole history of mankind. The Poles love the United States and its people. They want to identify themselves with us and this in defiance of the Kremlin gangsters. NIXON was a symbol of America and, while it truthfully may be said that any other man, officially representing the United States as Vice President, would have been received in like manner, the fact is that it was he who brought it off.

Poland, like Ireland during the massacres in the mid-17th century, has through history suffered one terrifying blood bath after another and, in each instance, has emerged more than ever determined to fight for a freedom that is so essential to man's salvation.

In the Warsaw demonstration there has been unveiled a secret weapon on the Communist front that scientific research or inventiveness can neither create nor destroy; namely, the spiritual fire which consumes a devout people in its fight for peace, freedom and justice. It is as though the old and neglected Christian virtues had taken on new life and vigor in an age wherein materialistic values have seemed to be transcendant.

Americans cannot help but rejoice with the Polish people in their collective, bulldog resistance to the power and barbaric tyranny of the Communists. Newsmen with NIXON

have reported that, with the exception of Moscow, the American entourage was warmly and enthusiastically received in cities throughout Russia and this in itself should give pause to the more reckless impulses of Nikita and the bureaucrats in the Kremlin.

Khrushchev had better take another look into the mind and soul of his Russian subjects and those in adjacent areas before he embarks on further adventures in his quest for other worlds to conquer.

Your many friends in Bristol hope and pray that you have recovered from the food poisoning which recently caused you to be hospitalized and that as of now you are well.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES P. CASEY.

AUGUST 14, 1959.

The Honorable JAMES P. CASEY,
Mayor of Bristol, Conn.

DEAR JIM: I have received your letter after already reading the published version of it in the Connecticut press.

You say that you don't think "the American people are going to be infected by the Communist virus if Nikita in the Kremlin shows his face in America." Apparently you are suggesting that this is my view. If that is your inference, then I must say that it is an absurd caricature of the position which many of us hold concerning Khrushchev's visit. I do not believe the American people will be infected or converted by Khrushchev, but I do feel that they will be disarmed and put off their guard.

I oppose the visit for a number of reasons.

First, a White House summit meeting with Khrushchev represents a major diplomatic defeat. Our Government, which has insisted that there could be no such meeting without prior concessions by the Communists, has backed down, and the world knows it.

Second, it is a major moral defeat. Our people are asked to welcome to our shores as an honored guest an infamous dictator who was personally responsible for the murder of countless thousands and who is the embodiment of the system of atheistic tyranny which is the mortal enemy of all decent people.

Third, it is a major propaganda defeat. Khrushchev's visit will be made to appear as a great personal triumph which will discourage our friends in the satellite nations, confuse and soften up the people of the free world, and signify to the people of uncommitted nations that communism is legitimate, accepted, and in the ascendancy.

Fourth, it is a major ideological defeat. Our response to the challenge of communism has been ineffective because so many of the world's people do not understand the essential evil of communism and the inherent good of freedom. Visits by Khrushchev to the United States and other non-Communist nations will further blur understanding of the fundamental antithesis between communism and freedom.

Fifth, it will have the effect of a major military defeat. It will help delude the free world into thinking that all is well and that there is no need for the heavy sacrifices required to build up military strength.

I do not share your admiration for the conduct of Vice President NIXON in Russia. I thought that far too many of the Vice President's statements were superficial and weak.

He told the Russian people that Khrushchev was "a self-made man who worked himself up from the bottom," as if it were unimportant that he had done so through mass murder, treachery and the betrayal of his own people. He placed primary emphasis on the luxuries and conveniences which our people enjoy, when he should have been talking about our freedom and our faith in God.

I am surprised that you should consider the pro-American reception which NIXON received in Poland as a startling revelation. Anyone who has followed conditions in Poland should have expected it. Approval for the United States was one way in which the Polish people could publicly express their hatred for the Communist system which has enslaved them. The NIXON reception was merely a verification of what many of us have been trying to bring home to the American people for many years. I am sure that our act of welcoming Khrushchev to the United States will dishearten the Polish patriots who greeted NIXON.

This morning's Washington Post carried an account of the arrangements which our Government is now making to procure Communist flags which will be flown all over Washington during Khrushchev's visit. You perhaps regard this sort of thing as a step forward but I do not share your enthusiasm.

I know that you must have spent some time in preparing your letter and I have, therefore, tried to answer it in detail.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. DODD.

Paying as We Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, may I call the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to an excellent editorial appearing in the August 14, 1959, edition of the Oxnard (Calif.) Press-Courier, entitled "Paying as We Go":

PAYING AS WE GO

Yesterday's news from the House Ways and Means Committee indicated that the Federal highway program would be continued without fastening a new bonded debt upon the Nation.

The compromise the committee agreed to would sustain the principle of pay-as-you-go highway building. The gasoline tax would be increased from 3 cents to 4, for a period of 22 months, beginning September 1. Then a part of the automobile excise tax would be diverted from the general fund to the highway fund.

The higher gasoline tax maintains the practice of asking the motorists who use the highways to pay for them. They don't object too much, although the automobile associations and the oil companies and the automobile makers don't like it.

By agreeing to take a bite out of the excise tax on automobiles the House committee, in effect, said that there would be no early reduction or elimination of this tax. That, too, is a continuing hardship on the automotive industry, which would like to eliminate the excise tax and thus save the customer 10 percent of the cost of the automobile.

But what would you do? There is a clamor for the Federal highway program. The traffic load on the highways grows daily—and so do the risks of motoring. The ambitious Federal program will do much to relieve this congestion. Continuing the program will continue employment and help the industries that supply the materials. The Governors a few days ago in Puerto Rico, when they got down to business other than weighing Nelson Rockefeller's presidential chances, asked that the highway program be maintained, suggesting bond issues.

If we want these desirable things, we ought to be willing to pay for them. If we need them badly, then again we ought to be willing to pay the cost to satisfy the need. It is a sorry custom to pass on to our children and grandchildren the burden of payment. They have no voice in accepting or rejecting the burden.

The compromise agreed to by the committee may not get through Congress, which is still largely populated by Members who want to order all kinds of projects "for the public good" without providing ways of paying for them.

The compromise on the highway program is not all that the President wanted. He asked for a straight cent-and-one-half increase in Federal gasoline taxes. It is not what the gay spenders wanted; they tried to think of financing measures that would postpone paying the bill with no tax hike. The compromise finally agreed to provides at least for using cash and not promises to pay in the future.

There could be another benefit, although only an optimist would hope it will come to pass. When part of the automobile excise money is taken from the general fund and devoted to the highway program, the general fund will be shorted millions of dollars.

How will that be made up? The optimist will say that when this fund diversion begins, in about 2 years, Uncle Sam will cut down on some of his spending from the general fund, because he won't have as much cash as he has been accustomed to.

That may be a foolish hope. And yet economic sanity is gaining support, bit by bit. If the next President will fight for it as wholeheartedly as President Eisenhower is doing, the highways may yet be built and finished, and be paid for when they are done, and the national debt won't have a few more hundreds of millions of dollars piled on to the present staggering total.

Monroney's Brainchild

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely article on the proposal of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] as carried in the Washington Post and Times Herald of August 19, 1959. The program of loans, not grants, is the key point in the setting up of in International Development Bank—IDA—as originally propounded by Senator MONRONEY several years ago. Carroll Kilpatrick refers to it—and it is—"MONRONEY's Brainchild."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONRONEY'S BRAINCHILD—PROGRAM OF LOANS, NOT AID, KEY POINT OF INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANK

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

Secretary of the Treasury Robert A. Anderson's proposal for a billion-dollar Inter-

national Development Association (IDA), which will be the chief subject of debate at the annual meeting of the World Bank here next month, has three principal objectives:

1. To provide a new source of free world funds for the underdeveloped countries.

2. To persuade Western European countries and Japan to put more capital into these development programs.

3. To make fuller use of the so-called "soft" currencies which the United States is accumulating at an increasing rate every year.

IDA is the brainchild of Senator A. S. (MIKE) MONRONEY, Democrat, Oklahoma, who first conceived the idea several years ago after a trip to Southeast Asia.

FROM AID TO LOANS

MONRONEY thought it was important to shift from a program aid to one of loans. At the same time, he was impressed by the growing accumulation by the United States of foreign currencies, mainly from the sale of surplus commodities.

If these currencies could be used, MONRONEY argued, they would help promote American foreign policy without in any way hurting the American taxpayer. The United States is now holding about $2 billion in soft currencies. MONRONEY has estimated that in another year the total may reach $5 billion.

"A valuable new source of development funds may be opened," MONRONEY said. "With 30 or 40 local currencies to choose from, borrowers can work out ways to use larger quantities of these currencies by shopping in the world market for items they require for their development projects."

At first, the administration was cool to the MONRONEY idea. It began to take it seriously after the Senate Banking and Currency Committee held a series of hearings and strong support developed in the Senate.

Anderson's acceptance of the idea has drawn considerable criticism, however, mainly along these lines:

Most of the foreign currencies which the United States has accumulated really are of very little value, particularly when it comes to using them for purchases to help develop the backward countries.

The Europeans and Japanese won't put up enough capital for long-term, low-interest loans to have much effect on the tremendous need for capital that exists in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

A lending institution with a capital of only $1 billion can make only a token effort. MONRONEY himself is on record as saying IDA should have "2 billion or more in hard currencies."

It is misleading to contend that a loan repaid in a soft currency is in fact fully repaid. It would be more honest to call the loan a giveaway in the first place.

All these questions have been argued back and forth for almost a year between Treasury officials and representatives of foreign countries. The debate will be continued when the annual World Bank meeting convenes here September 28.

AGENCY OF BANK

Anderson has sent a "guidelines paper" setting forth this country's views to the 67 other members of the Bank. Under the proposal, IDA would be established as an agency of the Bank to be administered by President Eugene R. Black, who has the full confidence not only of American officials but of many foreign financial authorities as well.

The World Bank makes loans on a strictly bankable basis. They must be repaid in 20 or 25 years at 5¼ percent interest, and repayments must be in hard currency.

IDA would be authorized to make loans repayable perhaps over 40 years at rates as low as 2 percent in a mixture of hard and soft currencies. According to MONRONEY, the World Bank "needs this secondary institution." It would serve to supplement hard loans with second mortgage financing, he said.

"The borrowing nation might be short on dollar or other hard currency earnings, and thus unable to repay 100 percent of the project cost in these scarce currencies over the short repayment time," MONRONEY said. "It would be permitted to repay IDA's second mortgage loan over a longer time at lower interest, partly in hard currency and partly in its own or other local currencies.

"An important part of this proposal is that IDA would mix hard and soft currencies when necessary in its loans and be repaid in a similar ratio."

Some of the sharpest critics of IDA are found in the World Bank's sister institution, the International Monetary Fund. Their criticisms may be reflected in the debates at the Fund and Bank annual meetings next month. But apparently Anderson believes that he has overcome the major resistance both in Europe and Japan and in the soft currency countries.

Not Sufficient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as we drone on to an uneasy adjournment, it might be well to look back and note how successive Congresses have piled monetary agencies and committees one on top of the other until no one is responsible for anything and we have develped the greatest "buck passing" carousel in all history. How and why did we get into such a situation?

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the following editorial in the Wall Street Journal of August 19 gives the answer: "Not Sufficient."

And at the last, the power and wealth of the United States may prove to be not sufficient:

NOT SUFFICIENT

Once upon a time there was established the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund.

This was during World War II and the idea, in case you have forgotten, was to provide a capital fund for economic development loans and for currency loans to the war-torn countries and the underdeveloped countries of the world.

But this did not prove sufficient, and so we had the U.S. loan to Britain, the U.S. loans and grants under the Marshall plan and the U.S. loans and grants under the many names of what is now the International Cooperation Administration.

But this was not sufficient, and so we increased the resources of the U.S. Export-Import Bank.

But this was not sufficient, and so we set up the U.S. Development Loan Fund to make "easy" loan repayable in local currencies.

But that was not sufficient, and so the World Bank was broadened to include an International Finance Corporation to invest in special enterprises in underdeveloped countries.

But this was not sufficient, and so we are now organizing a Latin American Bank to make special loans south of the border, and we have proposed a similar Middle Eastern Fund to make special loans in that part of the world.

But this was not sufficient, and so this week the United States launched a campaign to establish a $1 billion world agency to be called the International Development Association. It will be used to spur economic development in underdeveloped countries on easier terms than those poor countries can get from the World Bank, the Monetary Fund, the Export-Import Bank, the U.S. Development Loan Fund, the Latin American Bank or the Middle Eastern Fund or the International Finance Corporation or from the International Cooperation Administration.

We just thought you'd be interested in knowing, since all of these roads lead directly to the U.S. Treasury, of what might be called the U.S. Taxpayers Cooperative Funds. The question in the end, we suppose, is whether that fund will be sufficient.

Eulogy to U.S. Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address given in my home State, New Jersey, by Lee A. Wiley, at Atlantic City on July 7, and "Eulogy to U.S. Flag," by a former Member of this body, the Honorable Albert W. Hawkes.

There being no objection, the address and eulogy were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE APRON OF FREEDOM

(Address by Lee A. Wiley, illustrious potentate, Crescent Temple, A.A.O.N.M.S., Trenton, N.J., at the opening services of the 1959 imperial council session in Atlantic City on July 7)

Most worshipful grand master, imperial sir, illustrious sirs, distinguished guests, nobles, and ladies, I bring you the greetings of the more than 11,600 Masons who are members of Crescent Temple. Many of them are in Atlantic City for this great meeting of our Imperial Council of the Shrine of North America. They are prepared and eager to help you in every way possible.

At the parades, in the hotels, along the boardwalk and on the beaches, activity and happiness of every kind beckon you and your gracious ladies and we sincerely hope your stay here will be a most pleasant one in every way. Even though our beautiful mosque is located 75 miles away in the capital city of Trenton, Atlantic City is an important part of the oasis of Crescent Temple. On behalf of our Nobility, we cordially invite you to visit the Delaware Valley area as you return home from this pilgrimage. On your way up the Delaware River, you will find Burlington, the location of our beautiful Masonic home. In historic Trenton, you will find, in addition to our magnificent mosque, the oldest Masonic temple still standing in the State of New Jersey and one of the oldest along the Atlantic seaboard. It is used now as a museum and stands next to the present handsome Trenton Masonic Temple in close proximity to our

state house. After leaving Trenton, and on the outskirts of Philadelphia, you will see the Philadelphia unit of our Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children.

We extend these invitations with pride because Crescent Temple has grown to be the tenth largest in our great fraternity in an area fraught with history and filled with indications of thoughtfulness of others.

The Shrine was formed, we are told, to find a means to relax from the more arduous work in the symbolic lodges. But no matter what relaxation the Shrine has given, Shriners themselves owe and give their first devotion to the most honored badge in the world, which we have chosen to call at this convention, the apron of fredom.

The Reverend Joseph Fort Newton in his book "The Builders," perhaps expresses the sentiment best. He said:

"Some day, when the cloud of prejudice has been dispelled by the searchlight of truth, the world will honor Masonry for its services to freedom of thought and the liberty of faith. * * * Down through the centuries * * * often in times when the highest crime was not murder, but thinking, and the human conscience was a captive dragged at the wheel of an ecclesiastical chariot * * * always and everywhere Masonry has stood for the right of the soul to know the truth. * * * Not freedom from faith but freedom of faith has been the watchword, on the ground that as despotism is the mother of anarchy, so bigoted dogmatism is the prolific source of scepticism. * * * Against those who would fetter thought in order to perpetuate an effete authority, who would give the skinny hand of the past a scepter to rule the aspiring and prophetic present and seal the lips of living scholars with the dicta of dead scholastics, Masonry will never ground her arms. Her plea is for government without tyranny and religion without superstition."

Government without tyranny and who has fought through the years for this great precept? We must say the fight has been by those who wear the apron of freedom.

Here in the United States, we are all well aware of the tremendous contributions made by Masons in the founding and development of our great country. In every country and in every clime, when tyrannical men raise their ugly heads to whip a docile people into submission, the first organization to be banned is the society of Freemasons. From Jacques DeMolay to Hitler and communism, it has been Freemasons, banded together by their esoteric symbolism, who have clung tenaciously to truth and freedom, and have fought to preserve them. God willing, it will always be true.

But more than political freedom, wearers of this apron of freedom have sought to bring other types of freedom to their fellowmen. In all elements of human freedom, education, medical research, and the relief of the distressed, our brethren of grand lodges, the York Rite and the Scottish Rite have done a tremendous amount of good.

To this we may add the great contribution that we are wearers of the red fez and this proud apron, have added with our work in freeing thousands of crippled children from their unfortunate bodily defects. Without the great work already accomplished, in the process of being done, and being planned by all of our brethren in various bodies, countless thousands would be unable to enjoy true freedom.

Channing said, "The only freedom worth possessing is that which gives enlargement to a peoples energy, intellect, and virtues. * * * Progress, the growth of intelligence, and power, is the end and boon of liberty." And so, Freemasonry has shown and is showing that it does believe in freedom, an all-inclusive freedom that is worth possessing. Masonry teaches love of our fellowman, a love that is translated in the help Freemasons ever have given to those less fortunate, whether they be members of our order or not. The blue lodges, the rites, and the Shrine have given of themselves and their treasuries that the glow of happiness might shine from the faces of those they touch.

The apron of freedom is not within the gift of prince or potentate; of commoner or president; of rich or poor; of saint or sinner. It must be sought by those who have faith that the light of truth must eventually prevail; that love of neighbor must be greater than love of self; that the soul is immortal and is the property of the individual, not the state. And once sought and received, it must be remembered that the receipt of this apron does not make a man a Mason, it only means that he is a member of a Masonic lodge.

Listen to these words from the Scottish Rite: "To sow that others may reap, to work for those who shall labor after we are dead, to be an inspiration in the lives of men yet unborn, to bless with the glorious gifts of truth and light and liberty those who will never know the giver * * * this, is the true office of a Mason and the proudest destiny of a man." And so there hangs on this stage a badge, a symbol—one of the greatest the world has never known—the apron of freedom, the theme chosen by our Imperial Potentate to permeate this session of the Imperial Council of the Ancient Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine.

Thank you.

EULOGY TO U.S. FLAG

(By Hon. Albert W. Hawkes, former U.S. Senator from New Jersey)

I salute our beautiful American flag, emblem of each of our citizens and symbol of liberty, justice and human dignity.

In this dark hour of history, when the ungodly, brute forces in man are seeking to impose their evil will, on people of good will, thereby destroying life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and equality under a rule of laws—your stars and stripes shine out more beautifully than ever.

Your silence is golden—you do not speak in words, but in the deeds which created you. Your 13 stripes of red and white, with a star for the sovereignty of each State, stand for decency in human relations, unity and strength, honor, loyalty, and courage to make the supreme sacrifice whenever necessary to preserve the principles announced in the Declaration of Independence and recorded in our Constitution, then guaranteed by the Bill of Rights.

The flag, speaking as it waves aloft, says to each citizen:

"I represent you all in honesty, justice, and the spirit of the Golden Rule. I can be no more, than you by your deeds, make me. Remember, up to date all nations which have ascended to leadership have ultimately failed and disappeared on the horizon of history. Perhaps, because they put the mad race for money, place and power in first place, and relegated character, morals, adherence to principle, and their trust in God to second place.

"I will remain with you always, if you keep faith with the principles under which I was born, and if you and each succeeding generation teach the next to do the same. Teach them never to forget the little white markers all over the world, and to keep faith with those men, and the millions of others, who offered to make the supreme sacrifice. Teach them the only way to keep faith with those who created our blessings and freedoms is to exercise their right of suffrage intelligently and have eternal vigilance, coupled with action on time.

"You will survive to do good on earth in perpetuity, only if you follow the rules of equity that flow from God's Commandments and the Golden Rule; only if you make our way of life good enough to impel any fair-minded citizen to make the supreme sacrifice, when necessary to preserve it.

"We have been blessed with fine neighbors to the North and to the South, whose announced objectives are similar to ours.

"God grant us and others the power to put first things first—avoid temptation—and in His name help humanity to rise to higher levels and better standards in Freedom's institutions here on earth."

A Bill To Expand the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation From Five to Six Members

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, when the St. Lawrence Seaway Act was approved on May 13, 1954, it provided for certain administrative officers and an Advisory Board consisting of five men. There are eight States which are directly affected by the St. Lawrence Seaway—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Illinois, Minnesota and Indiana. Every one of these States fronts either on the Great Lakes or on the seaway. When the Seaway Corporation was put together the Advisory Board was made up of men from Michigan, Wisconsin, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York. Illinois was represented by the Administrator and Minnesota was represented by the Deputy Administrator. Of all the States having a direct interest in the seaway, only Indiana was omitted.

I have this date introduced a bill which expands the Advisory Board of the St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation from five to six members. I am advocating this expansion in the hope that the sixth man will be chosen from the State of Indiana, so that Indiana can be represented in the development of this enormously significant undertaking.

The St. Lawrence Seaway still faces a tremendous number of problems. The locks are probably not as large as they should have been; the Welland Canal is proving a bottleneck that only permits a maximum of 28 ships a day to pass through its locks; and the canal itself is too narrow to permit the safe passage of ocean vessels moving in opposite directions. No one knows for certain whether or not the seaway will turn out to be as successful as we all hope.

The State of Indiana has a vital stake in making this seaway successful. I believe that it deserves to be represented on the Advisory Board.

The Halbouty Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Michel T. Halbouty of Houston, Tex., is an oustanding pioneer and leader in his profession—the oil industry. His activities have helped provide this Nation with the vitally needed petroleum products to keep the wheels of industry and—when necessary—weapons for freedom operating.

Mr. Halbouty has showed his leadership in many fields; geology, research, mechanics, and other phases of the complex industry.

Recently, the Inch magazine told the story of Mr. Halbouty's outstanding contributions to the oil industry. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the spring 1959 edition of the Inch entitled "The Halbouty Story."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HALBOUTY STORY

Genius, someone has said, consists partly of doing the right thing at the appropriate time.

In the oil business, Michel T. Halbouty is known as something of a genius. Whether it's taking just one more core, drilling in an area surrounded by dry holes, or risking millions on leases in an untested oil domain, Mike Halbouty seems to make the right move instinctively.

As a result, the dynamic Mr. Halbouty is recognized as one of the most outstanding geologists and petroleum engineers in the Nation, and is internationally respected for his scientific ability to find oil and gas. An authority on the geological and engineering problems of the gulf coast of Louisiana and Texas, he ranks as one of the top experts on the geology of piercement-type salt domes, those underground monuments to the earth's eccentricity that have trapped so much petroleum.

Rounding out his reputation as a triple-threat oil man, Halbouty is one of the most aggressive and successful independent oil operators in the country. Geologically responsible for the discovery of oil and gas fields and extensions all over the world, he is one of the growing number of producers who supply natural gas to Texas Eastern Transmission Corp.

A fearless individualist, Halbouty has become almost a legend in his own time by his refusal to develop preconceptions about Mother Nature. He doesn't subscribe to geological theories simply because others accept them. What's more, he always backs up his sometimes revolutionary experiments with his own money. On an amazing number of occasions, his ideas prove out.

Statistically, how does Halbouty stack up in a competitive, high-stake game where the dice are loaded 9 to 1 against finding oil or gas with a wildcat well? Pretty fair, according to the record. Over the past 10-year period, he's hit 44 percent of his wildcats, 86 percent of field development wells, and 67 percent of all wells drilled. Hardly anybody has taken such tremendous strides toward making an exact science of geology, generally considered an inexact one.

It's a giant step from a newsboy's bailiwick to a position of prominence in the rugged oil business. Mike Halbouty made it with a combination of scientific preparation, dogged perseverence, supreme confidence in his own judgment, and—as Halbouty is the first to admit—a generous helping of good luck. To understand how he did it, you have to go back 50 years. It's quite a story.

Born Michel Thomas Halbouty in Beaumont on June 21, 1909, Mike was one of six children of a hard-working Lebanese grocer. He grew up in a town where the smell of oil was heavy, and the wooden derricks of Spindletop were not too far distant. People stood on street corners and spoke of the geologic derring-do of Patillo Higgins and Capt. Anthony Lucas just as they do today.

When he was 6 years old, young Halbouty became a newsboy for both the Beaumont Enterprise and Journal. Even then, he was a hustler and a two-fisted scrapper. Some of the other newsboys didn't like the way he parted his hair (which, even today, is distinctly right down the middle). More especially, they didn't like the fact that his hawking spot, the old post-office corner, was the best in town. But Mike didn't relinquish that corner until several years later, when he went to work at the Magnolia Refinery, loading gondolas with coke in his spare time.

When he was 14 and a junior in Beaumont High School, Mike took his first job (a summer one) in the oilfields. It was 1925, during the second boom at Spindletop, and Halbouty hired on as a dollar-a-day waterboy with the Yount-Lee Oil Co. Even then, Mike wanted to be a scientist—a geologist and an engineer—in the oil business.

So, at 15, giving up a contract with the old Beaumant Oiler Baseball Club of the Texas League, he headed for Texas Agricultural & Mechanical College. There he earned a bachelor of science degree in geology and petroleum engineering in 1930, and a master of science degree a year later, having been granted a fellowship for outstanding scholastic work. Twenty-five years later, in 1956, he was to receive a professional degree in geological engineering from his alma mater (the first to be conferred by Texas A. & M.).

On the College Station campus, he was president of five undergraduate societies and editor-in-chief of the yearbook which won all-American honors as the best college or university annual in the country. While an undergraduate, Halbouty further distinguished himself by working out the geology of Atascosa County, and making the first base map of the Charlotte-Jordanton-Leming fault system, where Humble Oil & Refining Co. was later to discover two major oilfields.

The story of Halbouty's first big break already an oil industry classic, has a strong Horatio Alger flavor. Just out of college, Mike had taken the lowliest job in the oilfields as rear rodman on a surveying chain gang and later moved up to roustabout and roughneck. Then, at High Island salt dome in Galveston County, it happened.

A drilling crew of Yount-Lee Oil Co. had hit what they thought was "suitcase sand" and were about to abandon site. But Halbouty noticed a small oil stain at the bottom of the last core and begged the drilling superintendent to take one more core. "Can't do it," said the superintendent. "My orders are to tear the rig down."

Undaunted, 22-year-old Mike Halbouty jumped into his model-T and raced 60 miles across rough country roads to talk to Mr. Frank Yount himself. Yount, already a famous wildcatter, was giving a garden party at his Beaumont mansion for Jan Paderewski, world-famous pianist and Polish premier. Halbouty barged right in and cornered Yount in the kitchen. "Mr. Yount, there's oil down there," he said. "Let me prove it."

Yount had given birth to the second Spindletop boom in 1928, and probably knew more about gulf coast salt domes than any other man alive, but he liked the headstrong spirit of this brash young man. "All right," he said, and then he called High Island to order another core. The result was the discovery of an overhang in the old salt dome and a rich oil reservoir was found.

Halbouty, as he himself puts it, was in. Yount made him chief geologist and petroleum engineer, built him the finest geological laboratory in the Southwest, gave him a free hand in research, and was his frequent companion. During this period, the Yount-Lee Oil Co. was the largst independent oil company in the world, and discoverer of many fields on the Texas-Louisiana gulf coast.

While he headed up Yount-Lee experimental lab, Halbouty was responsible for the development of a complex set of drilling mud formulas. These formulas, worked out to solve the company's "heaving shale" problem, were never patented. If they had been, Mike guesses he would be making more money off them today than he is from his many oil wells. As it is, he derives a great deal of pride from the fact that his mud formulas have become standard throughout the drilling industry.

With the untimely death of Mr. Yount, Yount-Lee Oil Co. was sold to Stanolind, now Pan American Petroleum Corp. Halbouty, figuring a major company would cramp his style, wasn't in the bargain. Instead, he took the advice of W. E. Lee of Houston, Yount's surviving partner, and entered business with Mr. Lee's son-in-law—another phenomenal young man who was destined for big things in the oil business. His name: Glenn McCarthy.

Halbouty, who had attended Texas A. & M. with McCarthy, was Glenn's chief geologist and petroleum engineer, vice president, and general manager for 2 years. Halbounty recommended Anahuac, where McCarthy made his first million, and then West Beaumont, which was even bigger. There was also North Cotton Lake, and Palacios.

"Glenn and I made a good team," says Halbouty, "because we were much alike in some ways. But then the time came for the parting of the ways, and we did."

Halbouty still holds the greatest respect for the dethroned king of wildcatters, especially for his uncanny business intuition. Mike tells the following story to illustrate the point:

"We had just found the West Beaumont field, and we went out to check on our second well. Everything seemed fine, but Glenn was uneasy. Nothing I said shook him out of his premonition that something was wrong.

"That night he paced and repaced the floor of our hotel room. He was unable to sleep and full of worry about the well. Finally, he woke me up and excitedly pointed to a red reflection in the west. I told him it was probably just a gas flare, but Glenn didn't agree. At that precise moment, the telephone rang. It was the company toolpusher saying our No. 2 Longe had blown out and caught fire."

Out on his own as a consulting geologist and petroleum engineer in 1937, Halbouty saved enough to stake his first wildcat, in the Cedar Bayou structure of Chambers County. That first venture is a dramatic portrayal of the fact that the oil game is a gamble, and no bed of roses.

"The first well was a dry hole," Mike remembers. "So was the second, third, and fourth. By that time I had blown $125,000, was flat broke, and had to go back to consulting work. And you know something?

Right this minute there are 52 flowering wells in the same area I had to leave for lack of money. "That," he says with a shrug, "is the oil business for you."

Then came World War II. Immediately after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Reserve Officer Halbouty was ordered to Fort Benning, Ga., Infantry School. Earlier, he had brushed aside civilian status via an "essential occupation" deferment. At Fort Benning, in competition with regular Army officers, Captain Halbouty was the top graduate of the battalion commanders and staff officers school.

Just before Halbouty was to ship out overseas, the War Department's Joint Chiefs of Staff stepped in to name him chief of the production section of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board, with duties to coordinate foreign and domestic oil production. It was a big job and Halbouty performed it well. By war's end, he had a lieutenant colonel's rating and a good part of the credit for boosting production in Carribean and South American oil fields, at a time when vast quantities of oil were vital to Allied victory.

Halbouty returned from the service determined to make a go of it as an independent oil operator. After one dry hole, he drilled his first successful wildcat in Natchitoches Parish, La., and found the Ashland oilfield at 3,228 feet of the Woodbine sand (the only field yet found in Natchitoches Parish). It was Louisiana's first well for the year 1946, coming in but 4 minutes after midnight on January 1. A few months later, he brought in another wildcat in Red River Parish. Then at old Pine Island field he completed 48 wells, using a new acidizing idea in getting production from the old sands.

In the 13 years since he has been drilling wells as an independent oil operator, Halbouty has discovered 33 new oil and gas fields and extensions on the Texas-Louisiana gulf coast. They include such prolific oil producing fields as the South Boling field, Wharton County; the northeast and northwest extensions of the South Liberty field, Liberty County; West Saratoga field, Hardin County; Pheasant and Citrus Grove fields, Matagorda County; Port Acres field, Jefferson County; Fostoria field, Montgomery County; and the Orange field, Orange County—all in Texas. There are also the West Hackberry field, Cameron Parish, and the South Bell City (Cibicides Zone) field, Calcasieu Parish—both in Louisiana. Halbouty owns an interest in and operates producing wells in 40 oil and gas fields in Texas and Louisiana, and there are more than 200 producing oil and gas wells on these leases.

The hub of Halbouty's farflung operations is a rambling, T-shaped office building in southwest Houston. Built at a cost of $400,000 in 1956, it reflects Mike's aesthetic taste, both in architecture and interior decoration. A tile mosaic cross section of the Spindletop salt dome in vibrant greens and blues dominates the colorful and functional outer lobby.

Mike's personal office is a far cry from that of the old days when he worked out of a one-room cubbyhole in Houston's Shell Building. Visitors are awestruck by a massive mural on one wall which depicts the search for oil in the gulf coast area. Mike dreamed up its design himself. At one corner of the mural a hand out of nowhere is grasping a rock. "Symbolizes the never-ending challenge of finding oil," Halbouty explains.

Another wall holds one of the best petroleum libraries in the country; still another is covered with dozens of framed photographs of Mike's family, friends, and business associates; and the fourth, of glass, looks out onto a palm-surrounded patio.

Mike, the man, hardly fits the popular conception of the Texas oil millionaire. Conservative in dress and manner, he might be taken for a banker or a real estate executive. He is, in truth, both of these. Dark, handsome, and graying at 50, Halbouty is a dynamo of human energy. Even when sitting still (which isn't often) he's a man who seems to be in a hurry. He doesn't smoke, he says, because he simply doesn't have the time.

Keeping his hustling organization in high gear in nine States and Canada, from Louisiana to Alaska, Halbouty makes or receives more than 100 telephone calls each day and puts in 40 to 50 flying hours each month. A January itinerary took him to 15 major U.S. cities on business matters. He has his own airplane, but it goes aloft only in the best of weather.

Despite his rigorous schedule, Halbouty finds time to be active in 15 professional societies, a number of social organizations, and many civic functions. Ex-president of the Houston Petroleum Club, he is a member of the board of trustees of St. Luke's Episcopal Hospital, where he donated a special ward for premature babies. Education, too, is close to his heart. In 1948, he established three Texas A. & M. scholarships in geology and petroleum engineering. He also backed an educational TV series "The World and Physics," narrated by Dr. Edward Teller of the University of California.

If Halbouty has a pastime, it's golf. Shooting a good game, he still comes in second to his attractive wife, an excellent amateur tournament golfer. She is the former Fay Renfro of Shawnee and Tulsa. Their two children are 9-year-old Linda Fay, and Tommy Kelly, 28, who is a resident geologist for the Halbouty firm in Anchorage, Alaska.

Right-hand man in the Halbouty organization is George C. Hardin, Jr., with the title of manager of exploration, production, and lands. Hardin is a noted geologist and engineer in his own right; many technical papers, in fact, carry the double byline of Halbouty and Hardin.

Members of the Halbouty executive team, all recognized as dynamic men in their respective fields, are James Ward, drilling superintendent; Ted Dobson, chief engineer; Jim Etheridge, head of the land department; John Walters, division geologist; Abe Wagner, division geologist; James Noel, general counsel; Frank Bruce, manager of the Halbouty Alaskan investments; Neil Parks, comptroller; and Louis Darilek. In all, 130 employees work for Halbouty; 62 of them in the Houston headquarters.

That Mike Halbouty believes in sharing scientific knowledge is evidenced by his many papers in professional and trade journals. He has written and published 48 technical articles as well as a scientific book with the jaw-breaking title of "Petrographic and Physical Characteristics of Sands From Seven Gulf Coast Producing Horizons."

He's something of a petroleum historian, too. With his Beaumont boyhood pal, James A. Clark, he is the co-author of "Spindletop," the story of the well that ushered in the modern oil industry and one of the best-selling books on petroleum ever written. Halbouty and Clark are currently at work on two more books. "The Last Boom" is the story of the fabulous east Texas oil field, and "The Book of Oil" will be a layman's handbook on the oil industry.

Oil Writer Clark, whose "Tales of the Oil Country" column appears in a Houston newspaper, knows Halbouty as no other man does. "The first time I say Mike," Clark recalls, "he was pulling a gang of rowdies off me. I sold newspapers in Beaumont, too, and my corner was almost as good as Mike's."

Clark attributes Halbouty's success to boundless energy, a high degree of intelligence, and a burning enthusiasm for any job he tackles. "He would have made a go of anything he tried. Journalism. Sports. Politics. You name it."

"Another thing that sets him apart," says Clark, "is that meticulous honesty of his. He'd go a thousand miles out of the way and lose money to be sure he's doing the right thing by everybody. His word is his bond. That's the mark of a majority of our great independent oil operators."

Mike, much in demand as a speaker before industry as well as nonoil groups, is an eloquent spokesman for the new breed of independent oil men who believe in the scientific approach to oil-finding. In an era when many are sounding the death knell for the independent, Halbouty says the species is not dying out—not the good ones.

"Independents are the heart of the domestic oil industry," he says. "They drill 80 percent of the wells and find two out of three new oil fields. Those who modernize their operations and update their own thinking are the ones who will survive. The oil patch is not a protected playground. It's a tough and changing world."

Halbouty scoffs at predictions that the country is running out of oil. "I believe there are thousands of major untapped sources of oil right here in this country," he says. "The old salt domes, for instance, have given up only a fraction of what they will give up when man finally learns to solve all of their mysteries."

Halbouty began to realize the potential of natural gas early in his career, when it was being flared as a waste product. Today, he is even more emphatic about its future. "Natural gas is destined to become the greatest of all natural energies—with the possible exception of solar and atomic energy. Oil, in many cases, is rapidly becoming secondary. There's no question that natural gas will be the greatest immediate source of energy for the next 20 years."

Mike's newest project is the multimillion dollar Halbouty Alaskan Oil Co., christened Halasko. One of the first Texans to become interested in the newest State, he and his associates own substantial acreage in oil leases covering some of the more promising geological basins. Halbouty was also the first independent to move a rig into Alaska during the present boom; his first well is now being drilled on the Kenai Peninsula.

Halbouty, who plans to build a skyscraping hotel and office building overlooking Cook's Bay in Anchorage, believes Alaska is America's last frontier. "I believe the Klondike gold rush was child's play compared with what is coming," he says. "Alaska has 31 of the 33 strategic minerals, and none of them have been developed to any extent." Hardly anybody doubts that Mike Halbouty knows what he is talking about.

Mike admits he is an incurable optimist. "Maybe," he explains, "that is because I can't think of a single pessimist who ever succeeded in the oil business, and only a few realists who have made the grade. That is because of the surprises you are bound to find in any quest into the unknown. And hunting for oil and gas is an unknown."

If Mike Halbouty has a personal philosophy about the search for oil, it was expressed a couple of years back by Father James Keller when Halbouty appeared on the Christopher television program alongside singer Giselle McKensie and actor James Cagney. Father Keller, whose Christopher theme maintains it is better to light one little candle of hope than to curse the darkness, said he believed that God placed oil and gas in the earth for men of faith to find and help make a better life for mankind.

In the oil business, Michel T. Halbouty—geologist, petroleum engineer, and independent oil man—has already lighted some mighty big candles. The biggest and most brilliant, probably, are yet to come.

Americans Should Know the Answers to Communists' False Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, leading citizens have called attention to the need for more teaching in our schools about the differences between communism and democracy.

It is shocking to read a news report, under a Los Angeles dateline, stating that a majority of high school seniors, when asked to choose a statement best representing their ideas of an economic system, quoted Marxist dogma: "From each according to his ability, and to each according to his need." What kind of teaching have they received?

I include as part of these remarks my newsletter of August 12, 1959, which comments on the above, and cites other examples which indicate the need for better teaching about communism and about our heritage of freedom and democracy, as follows:

Half the Americans over here in Europe have not the slightest idea of why they are Americans or what a democracy actually is. Most of them cannot say a word against communism. * * * The American schools * * * have missed the basic issues with those civics courses. * * * We are told over here that the only person the Communists fear is the one who thoroughly understands the system.

So wrote a chaplain in the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in Berlin. He was expressing his support of Cardinal Cushing's proposal that young people should be taught about communism and the answers to its false doctrines. A previous newsletter quoted from the Cardinal's television address on that subject.

A news story from Los Angeles published here gives striking confirmation of the need. Under the headline, "Students' Attitudes Called Shocking," it said:

In a survey of 86 high schools, members of the senior classes were asked to indicate their preferences for various statements descriptive of economic systems. Fifty-five percent selected the old socialist slogan, "From each according to his ability and to each according to his need."

This slogan is Marxist dogma, and could be enforced only by police state methods. Who would determine whether people were contributing according to their abilities, or what their needs were? Imposition of such a system would require a Communist form of government. Apparently these students did not have the background of information necessary to figure that out.

Further confirmation of the need for teaching about the answers to communism was given by Mr. Lloyd Wright of California, former president of the American Bar Association, and recently chairman of the President's Commission on Government Security. Testifying this spring before a Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security, he said:

Our children are not being taught in the schools sufficiently the true philosophy of our Government. They have been brainwashed with infiltrated textbooks, some of which go so far as to advocate that it is wrong to be proud to be an American citizen, but rather you should consider yourself a citizen of the world.

Patriotic Americans will surely support and applaud the timely suggestion that young people should be taught about communism.

The cost of living was recently reported at a new high. At his news conference, the President said that even a tiny increase could bring about "a new high," but that since 1953 "the curve of increase has been so much less."

High prices and dollar devaluation are two sides of the same coin. Taking the 1939 dollar as 100 cents, the course of its devaluation has run as follows: 1942 85.2 cents; 1945, 77.2 cents; 1948, 57.8 cents; 1953—under Eisenhower—51.9 cents; 1957, January, 50.3 cents; 1958, January, 48.6 cents; 1959, January, 48 cents; 1959, June, 47.7 cents—the most recent figure and the publicized "new high."

In other words, during the 14 years before Eisenhower became President the value of the dollar dropped about 48 cents, and during nearly 7 years since he became President, it has dropped about 4⅓ cents. The President is fighting to stop this drift and maintain a sound and stable dollar.

The heat is really on Members of Congress in connection with labor legislation. We have to remember former President Truman's warning: "If you can't stand the heat, you had better get out of the kitchen."

As Castro and Communists Take Over Cuba's Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an article from the U.S. News & World Report of August 17, which deals with the problem of Communists in Cuba taking over that nation's unions. This article relates how followers of Fidel Castro working with Communists now run the unions and how former labor leaders have been placed in jail or have fled the country in exile. The article states that organized labor has become a tool of the Government and that Communists are seen gaining stadily in prestige and power within the Cuban unions.

I likewise send to the desk an editorial from the State of August 14 dealing with the general situation of the Castro regime in Cuba. I think the editor of the State sums up precisely and correctly the situation in Cuba. I quote from that editorial:

Today, the Castro regime stands revealed as another dictatorship, but potentially the most dangerous movement that has gained success in Latin America to date.

Mr. President, 2 years ago I filed a report in the Senate dealing with the threats of communism in Latin America. At that time the large liberal newspapers such as the New York Times ridiculed my position. They promoted the Castro revolution declaring that it was one of freedom loving people and that there was no Communist element among its followers. Today we know better but I fear that it is too late.

I hope that the Santiago, Chile, conference will be able to cope with the extremely dangerous situation that has developed in the Caribbean. If the elements of war are not deterred in the Caribbean, I fear that the situation there will spread to other areas in Latin America and our Pan American Union will fall apart at the seams.

Nothing would please the Communists more and nothing would give them a greater advantage to move into other nations in Latin America and build up the threat to our security.

Mr. President, I ask that the article from the U.S. News & World Report entitled "As Castro and Communists Take Over Cuba's Unions" and the editorial from the State entitled "Revealing Himself" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 17, 1959]

AS CASTRO AND COMMUNISTS TAKE OVER CUBA'S UNIONS

(Take a look at what has happened to labor unions in Cuba since the revolution. Castro's men, working with Communists, now run those unions. Former labor leaders are in jail, or in exile. Organized labor is becoming a tool of the Government. Result, for United States and Cuban employers: Labor troubles of all kinds are mushrooming.)

HAVANA.—Fidel Castro and the Communists now are completing a joint conquest of Cuba's once independent labor unions—and troubles here are mounting for employers.

Elections going on at present in the 33 national labor federations show this:

Two-thirds of the federations, so far, have voted. In each case, slates organized by Castro's 26th of July movement have been swept into office.

CASTRO MEN AND REDS

These slates usually are made up of a combination of Castro's followers and Communists. Reds now are estimated to hold as many as one-fourth of all the posts in the various federations. They also have a foothold in the powerful Cuban Confederation of Labor, which controls the 33 federations and Cuba's 1.2 million organized workers.

Today, organized labor is becoming a tool of the Government.

The Castro government has given itself power to settle any and all labor disputes by decree. In one such ruling, it ordered junior officers and other key employees in both foreign and Cuban-owned banks to join the bank employees' union.

Employees are forbidden to fire workers, no matter how inefficient they may be or

whether there is any need for them. Some companies have been forced to rehire all workers fired—whatever the reason—during the regime of former President Fulgencio Batista. One sugar company reportedly had to take back 100 former employees.

MORE SICK LEAVE

An executive of this company said that the volume of sick leaves in his mills is five times what it used to be. He added:

"Quiet a few of our men have been pretending that they're sick. They have the right to send a substitute who gets full pay. The 'sick' man gets full sick pay—and we know that substitutes often kick back part of their pay to the regular employee."

In the past, he explained, workmen claiming to be "sick" had to be certified as ill by the company physician or have a letter from a local doctor. That provision can no longer be enforced.

Under Batista, unions were relatively nonpolitical and were considered stronger than most unions elsewhere in Latin America. Now Castro's 26th of July Movement has barred opposing political movements in unions, except for a small Catholic group.

EXILED LEADERS

At least 95 percent of the men who ran unions during the Batista regime have been eliminated. About half have escaped the country. The former secretary general of the confederation is hiding somewhere in Europe.

The Castro government has jailed, on three different occasions, Ignacio Gonzales Tellechea, who had been reelected last December to his third term as president of the Inter-American Labor Organization. He is now in hiding. A visiting official of that organization found that 25 to 30 other former labor leaders are being held in jail here with no charges entered against them. Still others have been expelled from unions—some for 10 years, others for life.

These included many leaders, particularly in the electrical, transport and telephone workers' unions, who had been against Batista for years but were not affiliated with Castro's rebellion.

ANTI-AMERICAN LEFTIST

Now emerging as the single most important man in Cuban labor is David Salvador, acting secretary of the Cuban Confederation of Labor. Once he belonged to the Communist youth organization. Some say that he has been expelled from the party, but it is widely agreed that he is still a leftist revolutionary—and virulently anti-American.

When Castro came into power, a 22-man directorate headed by Salvador and including five known Communists ran the confederation. Then the group was reorganized into a nine-man body. Known Communists were dropped—but Salvador remained.

When all of the federations have held their elections, they are to call a national congress to elect an executive council of the confederation. As most observers see it, Salvador is certain to be elected secretary general of the confederation.

BIG TROUBLE AHEAD

All of this is seen as raising serious problems, not only for American and Cuban employers but for the nation's economy. The sugar industry now is paying wages based on an assumed price of 4.7 cents a pound—at a time when the average price is only about 4 cents.

No end to this squeeze is foreseen at the present time. Communists are seen as gaining steadily in prestige and power within the unions as they become instruments of Fidel Castro's government.

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 14, 1959]

REVEALING HIMSELF

In the early days of his guerrilla campaign against the Batista government, Fidel Castro was praised by many as a man who wanted to restore democratic government in Cuba. The State noted that Castro was an unknown quantity, and that he might be no improvement.

Later, there was some fairly widespread hope that Castro himself might be less dictatorial than Batista, but this hope shortly dimmed when it was learned how many avowed and suspected Communists were serving as Castro lieutenants and advisers.

The executions of Batista followers shocked a good many people who had been supporting Castro, partially because the executions were staged as big shows for the masses. Public opinion apparently forced Castro to drop the matter momentarily.

Now it appears at least 3,000 "counter-revolutionary plotters" have been rounded up. Their fate is unknown. However, it is known that the Communists and pro-Communists in the Castro regime are gaining influence and power. Government announcements reflect more and more the language and concepts of Marxism.

Castro and his subordinates are imposing a rule quite as harsh and arbitrary as the one they fought to depose. In fact, economic conditions are said to be much worse than they were under Batista. And there have been no elections since the "revolution."

Today, the Castro regime stands revealed as another dictatorship, but potentially the most dangerous movement that has gained success in Latin America to date.

Resolution of Town Council of Bloomfield, N.J., in Support of H.R. 5596

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a letter from Mr. H. Joseph North, town clerk of Bloomfield, N.J., and a resolution adopted by the Town Council of Bloomfield in support of H.R. 5596:

THE TOWN OF BLOOMFIELD, N.J.,
August 6, 1959.

The Honorable PETER W. RODINO, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. RODINO: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution adopted at the meeting of the town council held August 3, 1959.

Respectfully yours,
H. JOSEPH NORTH,
Town Clerk.

"Whereas by virtue of the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1958 it is permissible for certain railroads to discontinue passenger service of interstate trains (or ferries) without first applying to the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission and without public hearing with respect thereto; and

"Whereas Senate bill 1331 and a companion bill in the House of Representatives (H.R. 5596) are pending and such bills would amend the Transportation Act of 1958 to provide for public hearing before an approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission to discontinue passenger service; and

"Whereas it appears that the aforesaid amendment is salutary and in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Town Council of the Town of Bloomfield, N.J., That said council expresses its approval and urges the passage of the two bills pending in the Federal Legislature and known as Senate bill 1331 and H.R. 5596; and, the town clerk is directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the Senators from New Jersey and to the Member of the House of Representatives of the 10th Congressional District."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was duly adopted by the Town Council of the Town of Bloomfield at a meeting of said town council held August 3, 1959.

H. JOSEPH NORTH,
Town Clerk of the Town of Bloomfield.

I hereby approve the above resolution.

DONALD H. SCOTT,
Mayor of the Town of Bloomfield.

Parkinson's Law and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent editorial "Parkinson's Law," which was published in the Washington Daily News, a member of the Scripps-Howard league of newspapers, on August 17, 1959, is worthy of careful study.

This great newspaper and the entire Scripps-Howard league have long been aware of the waste and the danger in our civil defense program, and have repeatedly called for its complete overhaul.

I believe the editorial presents convincingly the waste of taxpayers' money on an ever-increasing futile bureaucracy which will only perpetuate the already useless and inept Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It points out clearly the danger in allowing any further expansion of tihs bureaucracy along the line of its present and past operations.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARKINSON'S LAW

Give the House credit for a stout fight against a $12 million boondoggle which may yet be avoided.

This is the proposal to finance a new army of civil defense employees, working at the State level, paid half by the States, half by the Federal Government.

The Senate has approved the project. The House turned it down yesterday, for the third time. Something has to give. The item is part of the independent offices appropriation bill, containing money for a variety of essential Government operations.

We hope the House holds the line because this $12 million is only a foot in the door, opening the way for still further expansion of this especially futile bureaucracy.

Insistent pressure for this needless addition to the public payroll is best explained in terms of the law expounded by C. Northcote Parkinson, Raffles professor of history at Malaya University in Singapore, as follows:

"In any public administration or organization, the number of new subordinates increases at a predictable rate, irrespective of any variation in the amount of work (if any) to be done."

A Minority View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, several months ago the Joint Economic Committee issued a report evidencing the alarm of some people about the economic future of our country. At the time this report was published, not much credence was given to the minority report. Today, Mr. Speaker, the minority report has proved to be overwhelmingly sound and has without doubt let the air out of the alarmists who wanted to go on a big spending spree. Following is an article which appeared in the August 17, 1959, issue of the New York Times:

A MINORITY VIEW—AN APPRAISAL OF THE DISSENTING STAND IN A CONGRESSIONAL REPORT

(By Edward H. Collins)

"The New York Times has published two or three very thoughtful editorials and your column" writes a correspondent, "which have discussed the errors in the majority findings of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I am respectfully puzzled as to why you have never given credit or identification to the minority report, prepared by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican of Missouri, which proved to be correct."

There is a good deal to be said for the point raised by this correspondent. That fact is strongly confirmed when one rereads this document today, 5 months after its publication, over the signatures of, besides Representative CURTIS, Representative CLARENCE E. KILBURN, Republican, of New York; Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, of New Jersey; Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, Republican, of Connecticut; Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, and Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York (who concurred with reservations and attached a statement of certain additional views of his own).

A STRIKING CONTRAST

In one vital area in particular does the closely reasoned argument of the minority contrast strikingly with the air of wishful thinking and straw-grasping that permeates the statement of the majority. This is its trenchant discussion of the nature of economic growth, and its development of the thesis that, if one accepts its premises on this point—premises that are hardly open to serious dispute—then the conclusion that sound fiscal policy calls for a balancing of the Federal budget in 1960 becomes logically inescapable.

The majority report had contended that "principal emphasis on public policy this year should be placed on prompt and full recovery from the 1957–58 recession. Achieving maximum employment and production, therefore, should be given the highest priority." To its authors what did this mean in terms, let us say, of monetary and fiscal policy? With respect to monetary policy it meant, one finds, that the Federal Reserve should abandon what the report referred to as its "restrictive" program, and that it should resume the pumping of additional money into the economy on the scale traditionally reserved for periods of recession. As to fiscal policy, this typical passage is perhaps illustrative of the majority's general attitude:

"While a balanced budget, or even a surplus, is desirable in times of maximum employment, neither the soundness of our money nor our potential for economic growth and stability * * * necessarily depends on balancing a $77 billion budget in fiscal 1960."

For their part the authors of the minority report argued:

"In our opinion, the surest way now to provide additional job opportunities is precisely that called for under the Employment Act of 1946, namely, to create a climate in which industry, agriculture, and the service trades will be enabled to expand, thereby creating jobs and the purchasing power with which the products of maximum production may be moved."

As to the question of economic growth, the minority had no quarrel with the definition of the majority as "the process of capital accumulation." However, it had very definite ideas concerning the conditions prerequisite to achieving this process. Capital accumulation (or formation), it pointed out, requires two things. "It requires (1) the incentive to invest * * *, and (2) the real savings needed to finance such investment." It added: "It is useless to urge a higher rate of growth for the economy if we are unwilling to take the steps necessary to provide the conditions under which private investment incentive and real savings will be adequate for this purpose." On the closely related subject of inflation it observes:

"Stabilizing the price level is not an alternative objective to achieving a higher rate of economic growth. On the contrary, it is a basic requisite for continuing growth without violent swings in the level of employment in a free economy."

Commenting on the President's proposal for a balanced budget and its bearing on stable prices, the minority finds the latter is fundamental to achieving this aim. "The consensus of the experts testifying before this committee," it notes, "was that the economy would reach high and record levels of employment, production, and purchasing power in the period covered by the President's budget. Failure to achieve a balanced budget under such conditions of record-breaking prosperity, as the minority sees it, would be regarded as a green light by everyone who was looking for a sign from the Government as to whether it was genuinely determined to leave no stone unturned in its fight on inflation.

GROWTH AND INFLATION

The August issue of the Monthly Review of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York carries the third of a series of studies dealing with the relationship between economic growth and inflation. The two earlier studies were titled, respectively, "Creeping Inflation" and "Growth Without Inflation in Britain." The current inquiry concerns the incidence of inflation on one specific category of countries—the underdeveloped countries. While the observations of the minority committee on the Economic Report are not similarly confined, they become particularly impressive when considered against the background of this pioneering piece of research. After considering the case histories of 16 more or less typical and diversified examples of underdeveloped countries over the period 1950–57, the authors of the study find justification in its results for two broad, though qualified, generalizations. They find that (1) in countries where price advances have been comparatively nominal or nonexistent, rates of economic expansion, "which, by and large were steady," clustered around an average of 6 percent. They find that (2) by contrast, in countries where sustained inflationary pressures developed during the period, rates of growth showed widely varying and somewhat sporadic gains. Average rates of expansion ranged from less than 1 percent to as high as 7 percent, with the group average about 4 percent. In short, if these studies have any meaning, the report concludes (in words that are almost an echo of those employed by the minority report of the congressional Economic Committee), it is that they lend no suport to the contention that price stability (in underdeveloped countries at least) is incompatible with rapid economic expansion. On the contrary, they would seem to confirm the view that, while stable prices tend to promote an orderly and fairly rapid expansion in output, inflation tends to lead to uneven and often lagging, rates of overall growth.

Admiral's Flags Are Furled

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
AND
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the death of Adm. William F. Halsey has saddened all Americans and many friends of Americans in other nations.

In Elizabeth, N.J., the news was particularly poignant because this was the admiral's home city, the city of his youth.

Since both of New Jersey's U.S. Senators are residents of Union County, and because we are proud to live in a county where Admiral Halsey once lived, we ask in this joint statement for unanimous consent to have this editorial from the August 18 issue of the Elizabeth Daily Journal printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Aug. 18, 1959]

ADMIRAL'S FLAGS ARE FURLED

The admiral's flags have been furled. Never again will they wave in triumphant glory from his beloved *Enterprise*, the flagship he loved so dearly and fought in vain to preserve. Adm. William F. Halsey is dead.

The square-rigged old salt, who took his place among the greatest naval heroes of all time and who became an inspiring symbol of the American fighting spirit when he cleared the Pacific of the Japanese fleet in the Second World War, died with his "boots off" and in his sleep. It was a prosaic ending for the warrior who had lived so close to death in so many places since he went off to don the Navy blue of an Annapolis midshipman.

What stories have been revived for the hometown folk since the news of his unexpected death reached Elizabeth Sunday—the old Brewster home in West Jersey Street,

where his mother lived until her marriage to Lt. William F. Halsey and where the admiral himself was born; his own home around the corner in Chilton Street, where "Billy left the gate open" and his unattended younger cousin, Henry Bayard Clark, got a memorable tumble; the Pingry days, Annapolis, and the solid middy in his summer whites returning for a stay with his maternal grandparents and to visit the family of his father's brother, Charles H. K. Halsey, the bank president.

Always there were those home ties, the ties of family, of the native health remaining strong and calling him back no matter where duty sent him and regardless of honors. One of the touching human interest stories of the Second World War was the meeting far out on a Pacific island between Admiral Halsey and Pfc. Christy DeMaio, the stout boy from Peterstown, fondly remembered by prewar boxing fans as the "Pants House Kid." But let Christy tell it again.

"I'm standing by the side of the road and I give the thumb to a car coming straight at me. Then I'd like to die. It stopped and who looked out at me, but the big boy from Elizabeth himself—Admiral Halsey. So, he said, 'All right, soldier, get in.' And when he found out that I was from Elizabeth too, boy, did we cut it up for 25 miles. Real pals, we were. No brass. What a guy he is."

"What a guy" he was to the thousands who claimed every possible vantage point to see and cheer our greatest hero on that memorable November 7 in 1945 when Admiral Halsay returned to his own people and his old hometown while the rest of the country looked on in envy. We were bursting with pride that autumn afternoon and bursting with promises that have not been fulfilled.

We are bursting with pride now, even as we grieve, while newspaper headlines the world over tell the story of the Elizabeth boy who led naval forces in exploits President Eisenhower has termed "a brilliant part of American military history"—of whom Adm. Chester Nimitz has said "he has left for all of us a shining example of courage and service."

What has he left us here in Elizabeth aside from the reflected glory of his immortal deeds? Is it enough that we clogged the streets, 100,000 strong to cheer when he returned a hero acclaimed by the world? Is it enough that we swell with the pride of possession as the same world bows in sorrow at the passing of the Pingry lad who scaled heights few attain?

It is not enough. If ever a community was mandated to perpetuate through fitting memorial the example and the inspiration Admiral Halsey has left available for all the future generations of hometown boys Elizabeth has been given its directive. If we have forgotten the promises of 1945, Elizabeth now has the charge anew to erect a living memorial to the native son a few remaining oldtimers knew as "Billy" Halsey. But make it a living memorial. The marble shafts have never been more than just resting places for pigeons.

The Khrushchev-Eisenhower Visits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the world was electrified by the announcement that Khrushchev and our President were trading visits.

I, like many others, had very mixed emotions on this visit.

On August 18th the American people were informed that Hungary executed eight men who had been involved in the freedom fight in that unfortunate country.

Now does anyone have any idea that the philosophy of government in Russia or the satellite countries has been changed by these impending visits?

Mr. Speaker, I am worried that the American people may relax when this smiling and happy extrovert, Mr. Kruschev has completed his tour of America.

I want to believe these Communist countries want peace but such demonstrations as this in Hungary prove once again that this tour of America—I fear—is just a new disguise for Communist world domination.

I include the following news item:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 18, 1959]

HUNGARY EXECUTES 8 LINKED TO 1956 REBELLION

BUDAPEST, August 17.—Communist Hungary has executed eight men recently convicted of political crimes, according to an unconfirmed report circulating today among Western diplomats.

The report of the executions is the final chapter of a secret trial story that has been heard in western circles since last spring. It has been impossible to verify the reports through official sources.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman would neither confirm nor deny the reports of the executions.

The trial rumors never clearly spelled out the charges on which the men were supposedly brought to court. They allegedly stemmed from the Hungarian revolt of 1956.

According to the most persistent reports, the men involved were mostly workers from Ujpest, an industrial suburb of Budapest.

Ten were reported sentenced to death in the original trial but two of these sentences were reduced to life imprisonment in an appeal hearing last month. About 15 other persons reportedly received prison sentences.

Sources for the execution reports were unable to give any names.

Why Special Loyalty Oaths for Students Only?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful editorial from the Medford Mail-Tribune of July 28, 1959, on the question of special loyalty oaths in the national defense scholarship bill.

This editorial quotes two eminent and outstanding Americans in support of repeal of such an oath—Senator John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts, and ex-Gov. Charles A. Sprague of Oregon. One of these leaders is a Democrat, the other is a Republican, but both are men of wisdom and sound and intelligent liberalism.

The author of the editorial in the Medford Mail-Tribune is Eric Allen, managing editor of that daily newspaper, which is published in Medford, Oreg.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPRAGUE, KENNEDY AGREE

Quite by coincidence, statements by two writers concerning the so-called loyalty oath now required of recipients of educational aid from the Federal Government, came across the desk yesterday morning.

Also coincidentally, the writers are of opposite political faiths. One is Charles A. Sprague, editor and publisher of the Oregon Statesman in Salem, former Republican Governor of Oregon. The other is JOHN F. KENNEDY, U.S. Senator from Massachusetts and a leading contender for the Democratic nomination for President next year.

Both, Republican ex-Governor, and Democratic Senator, are highly intelligent, literate, and thoughtful men. And both think the loyalty oath is silly.

Here are excerpts from Sprague's editorial:

"After the national defense education bill was passed last year, colleges woke up to the fact that it required students receiving loans or scholarships and fellowships to take a loyalty oath. * * * It is not the simple oath pledging loyalty to the Constitution and laws but one of those abjuring oaths which have caused serious commotion in academic circles—professors are willing to take oaths of loyalty * * * but dislike swearing to some negative oath. * * * Affirmative loyalty oaths, yes; negative oaths, no."

Senator KENNEDY'S views were contained in a letter, a portion of which follows:

"It seems to me that we must encourage the development of all the best minds of our Nation, regardless of student tendencies toward nonconformity or other personal objections to signing this vague, unworkable and almost meaningless declaration. Though there are still those who favor reverting to the age of the test oaths that were already discredited when our Constitution was written, it is dangerous to permit such anachronisms in this hour when building up our intellectual resources has become crucial."

He also referred to attempts to repeal the oath as an important step toward the elimination of the atmosphere of suspicion and fear that has for many years enveloped many of our national attitudes.

We agree with both of these distinguished men. Disloyal people have no objection to signing a perjured oath. But many honest and conscientious people do object to the negativism of the present requirement.

The sad postscript is that last week the Senate voted, 49 to 42, to send the repealer bill back to committee, thus killing it for this session.

The Foreign Aid Funnel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I want to insert an editorial from the August 7, 1959, issue of the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News deal-

ing with a subject, foreign aid, which I feel is most pertinent and should be brought to the attention of my colleagues.

This editorial is entitled, "Taking a Harder Look," and I believe it accurately reflects the fears of many, many individuals that too much of our foreign aid money has been frittered away, either through outright errors on important, needed projects, or careful expenditures of funds in countries where we should not be spending the money in the first place. Many of the countries that have been getting our help actually are using this capital to get into a position to undercut U.S. producers in their own home market and to push them out of auxiliary foreign markets. Thus, U.S. workers suffer through the competition of our own capital.

I commend this editorial to my colleagues.

The material follows:

[From the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News, Aug. 7, 1959]

TAKING HARDER LOOK

Evidence of public restlessness over the vast expenditures for foreign aid and congressional suspicion of the manner in which specific sums are being dispensed and handled have caused Congress to take a harder look at the whole foreign aid program at the current session.

Any fairminded person will agree that foreign aid is necessary as a means of holding the free world together and putting itself in a position to fight back effectively if attacked.

But there are widespread reports that a great deal of the money is being wasted by both dispensers and recipients of the aid money. That is not fair to the American taxpayer out of whose pocket comes every penny of the funds sent to foreign countries.

Neither is it fair to give economic aid to those countries whose economics are already in such flourishing condition that they have become competitors of the United States in world markets. Every time a sale of competitive products is made by a foreign country, which has been supported by American money and which would have ordinarily gone to an American industry or business, it deprives American interests of revenue and American workmen of jobs.

If they can compete with us in world markets, including the United States, they most certainly should be able to stand on their own feet, economically speaking.

Military aid is an entirely different matter. There are few free world countries, outside the United States, which can afford to support great military machines without levying taxes to the point where decent living standards could not be provided by their peoples.

America needs the military strength of these nations to back it up if war should break out and arming allied countries is multiplying our own strength to the extent that foreign allies are able to increase their own power.

There are exceptions, of course. These exceptions are poverty-stricken nations where human beings are slowly starving to death and where disease, due to lack of proper medical care, is taking a heavy toll. They should be helped for purely humanitarian reasons.

But there seems to be no question that there has been great waste in our foreign aid programs. Congress is particularly concerned about this. Foreign aid legislation now on its way through the legislative halls provides for a $19,000-a-year inspector general and comptroller for the International Cooperation Administration, the agency now in charge of distribution of foreign aid money.

If he can eliminate the major share of the waste reputed to exist he will have earned his salary many times over, plus the undying admiration of the American people.

YDC Told of Pitfalls at Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two newspaper accounts of a speech delivered by Senator GALE MCGEE, of Wyoming, on August 8, 1959, at a statewide rally of Young Democrats in Durham, N.C. Senator MCGEE delivered a thought provoking and inspiring address that was unusually well received.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Aug. 8, 1959]

YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS TOLD OF PITFALLS AT RALLY—TALK BY MCGEE HEARD BY GROUP

(By Guy Munger)

DURHAM, August 8.—Senator GALE W. MCGEE, Democrat, of Wyoming, tonight urged Democrats to develop a long-range national program and not try to build a political party on the blunders of the Republicans.

MCGEE was the principal speaker at a dinner which concluded a summer rally of State Young Democratic Clubs here. We were introduced by North Carolina's Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN.

Governor Hodges and numerous State officers and legislators were among the more than 200 persons who attended the dinner.

MCGEE said that "while the temptation will be great to get even with the Republicans for winning two presidential elections" in 1952 and 1956, Democrats should resist any "mink, pinks, and stinks" attacks such as the GOP used in its campaigns.

"I don't think you can build a political party on the mistakes of the opposition," the freshman Senator said.

OUTLINES ISSUES

In an interview before the speech, MCGEE outlined some of the issues that he thought should be included in the long-range Democratic program:

1. An honest balanced budget, not a Madison Avenue balance. MCGEE said the Democrats should survey the Nation's needs, considering national security and demands of a growing population, then draw up a budget that will do the job.

A. An effort to solve the problem of the so-called surpluses in agriculture. MCGEE said the surpluses were really failures in distribution.

3. A foreign relations program that will accentuate the positive. For too long, said MCGEE, the United States has had a foreign policy which is primarily a negative reaction to the Russian threat. He said the final test will come, not on how the United States has responded to Russian initiative but on how this Nation has approached the problem of living standards, human beings, people, helping others to help themselves.

MCGEE also called for passage of a moderate civil rights bill and effective controls on labor unions. Despite criticism of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON by some Democrats, MCGEE said he thought JOHNSON had done a masterful job as Senate majority leader in putting together the variety of opinions of all segments of the party.

[From the Durham Morning Herald, Aug. 9, 1959]

MCGEE URGES SPEEDUP AGAINST REDS

(By Herald Staff)

The United States must take a more positive stand in foreign relations and make a dynamic expansion in its domestic economy if it is to meet the challenge of Communist Russia, Senator GALE MCGEE, Democrat of Wyoming, asserted here Saturday night.

MCGEE, addressing a statewide rally of young Democrats, pointed out that the Soviet Union has been increasing its productive capacity at a rate of 10 percent a year while the U.S. economy has been advancing a mere one and a half percent.

He called for a speedup rather than a slowdown of American production, both industrial and agriculture.

As for international affairs, MCGEE warned that the United States too long has taken only a negative stand against communism, "as we should have," but had failed to stress this Nation's own political and economic stature.

"Our resources," said MCGEE, "are not armies or jets. The greatest weapon in our armory is ideas."

In an era of awakening peoples, MCGEE said, "our Declaration of Independence has fired more revolutions than the Communist manifesto ever did."

What former colonial peoples want, he added, "has nothing to do with Karl Marx or communism or Mr. K."

Rather, he contended, they want the kind of political freedom for which the American colonies fought.

Adding his encouragement to exchanges with the Soviets, the Senator said that "what we have is infectious."

His recommendation for American tourists visiting Russia was that they carry Montgomery Ward catalogs and American magazines—even such Republican periodicals as Time.

MCGEE, who visited Russia 3 years ago, praised North Carolina's Gov. Luther Hodges and eight other American Governors who recently urged the upcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits.

Hodges, who attended the Young Democratic Clubs rally, commended MCGEE for his blunt address and commented: "That's the kind of talk I would like to hear in the keynote speech at the Democratic convention next year."

The Governor gave the Senator momentoes of North Carolina, including a package of Bull Durham, which made this city and this State famous.

MCGEE was introduced by Tar Heel Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN.

Other political leaders here for the rally included Attorney General Malcolm B. Seawell, Labor Commissioner Frank Crane, State Treasurer Edwin Gill, and Insurance Commissioner Charles Gold.

Mrs. B. B. Everett of Palmyra, national committeewoman, and Mrs. Mary Laurens Richardson of Raleigh, vice chairman of the senior party, spoke briefly at the banquet.

Art Vann of Durham, State Young Democratic Clubs president, presided.

The Young Democratic Clubs executive committee chose Asheville as the site for the State Young Democratic Clubs convention to be held October 1, 2, and 3.

In his advocacy of an expanding American economy, McGEE recalled the World War II days when people thought Franklin Roosevelt was crazy for demanding 30,000 planes a year.

Actually, noted the Senator, F.D.R. got 50,000 planes in the all-out effort by American industry.

McGEE also recalled that "another crazy man, Henry A. Wallace" had called for 60 million jobs in postwar America.

Actually, the Nation's industries are employing many more than Wallace's prediction, the Senator pointed out.

The need for expansion, the Senator argued, is imperative because the Soviet Union has gone from the ox cart to the space age in one great leap.

Aid to Federally Impacted School Districts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. MOELLER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made this morning before the Subcommittee on General Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor. That subcommittee is now considering administration proposals to weaken the benefits presently available to school districts with a school age population which includes a substantial number of children of employees of Federal installations. I believe that the effect of these damaging proposals in my district is of sufficient interest to warrant publication in the RECORD as a means of helping to forestall approval of the proposed legislation.

The statement follows:

FEDERAL AID TO IMPACTED SCHOOLS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the privilege of appearing before you this morning and testifying in behalf of the school systems in my district with respect to proposed changes in Public Laws 874 and 875. I know that you have received a great deal of testimony on this most important problem and I do not wish to take up too much of your time. However, because of the adverse effect the proposals made by the administration to reduce benefits would have on the schools in my district, I do wish to make this brief statement.

Approximately 20 separate school systems in my district have been receiving Federal funds to help support their schools because of the increased school enrollments caused by the influx of people employed by Federal establishments or firms having defense contracts with the Federal Government. These include schools operated by cities, by local school districts, and by certain of our counties. The total amount involved each year, about $102,000 according to the figures I have at hand, is not large by the standards of many areas or when compared to the total amount of such assistance rendered to all the schools in the United States. However, it bulks extremely large in the tax structure of our local areas which are not among the most prosperous in this country.

Approximately 1,200 school age children of parents employed directly or indirectly by the Federal Government provide the basis for this aid to our schools. By far the largest percentage of these are the children of parents who work in Federal installations not actually located in the school district. The few others are the children of people employed by defense contractors. In any event, they are all so-called B category cases.

Thus, the effect of the administration proposals embodied in the Kearns bill, H.R. 7140, would be to cut the funds our schools are receiving almost exactly in half—from $102,000 to $51,000 per year. To impose such an additional tax burden on these 20 school districts would be extremely difficult. I fear that the net result would be a lowering of the standards of education instead. This penalty would apply to all of the children alike, whether their parents were or were not newcomers to the district or were or were not employees of the Federal Government. It is manifestly unfair to ask the citizens of my district or of any area to assume such a penalty, or to shoulder an additional burden of taxes to maintain the standard of education in their schools, when the increased cost of operating the schools can be traced directly to a Federal activity, which must be the case under the present terms of Public Law 874 to make them eligible for the aid they are now getting.

The problem is similar with respect to funds for equipping new school buildings in these areas under Public Law 815. It is expected that increased school enrollments will require abandoning some of our smaller schools and the construction of new consolidated schools to accommodate to the changing conditions. At least a part of such increased enrollments are traceable to the Federal activities of which I have been speaking. I strongly oppose any changes in the present law which would deprive us of the minimum amount of Federal aid in financing this new construction to which we are entitled under the present law.

To address myself for a moment to the philosophy behind Public Laws 874 and 815, it seems to me self evident that when the Federal Government engages in an activity which has among its results the addition of an appreciable number of children to the school rolls in an area, then the citizens of that area have every right to expect that they shall not be required to bear alone the cost of providing for the education of such children. After a great many years, when all the effects of this radical change in the community structure have worn off; when the employment at the Federal activity has been stabilized for a long period of time; when the newly arrived Federal employees have become property owners and have been absorbed into the community completely, with particular respect to their bearing a full share of the tax load; and when the costs of expanded school operations have been completely amortized; then we may think of reducing the amount of Federal aid required. At present, however, the funds we have received from the Government do not begin to pay the fair share of the additional cost which might be expected.

Certainly the time has not yet come when school districts located adjacent to or near other districts in which a Federal installation is actually located should be discriminated against. Where large installations are involved particularly, such as Lockbourne Air Force Base and Whitehall Army Depot near my district, the problem raised is actually greater than that for a school district which may have a part of the installation within its geographic area. These establishments are of such size and employ so many persons that it would be physically impossible for any large percentage of their employees to live in a school district which at the same time overlaps the installation's boundaries. Thus, the heavier burden is thrown on those nearby communities which house the employees. This is the case for communities in Fairfield County in my district and in Lancaster, the county, seat, where I reside. To a lesser extent it involves also school districts in Hocking, Jackson, and Athens Counties.

For that reason I am particularly opposed to the aspects of the Kearns bill which give preferential treatment to school districts within whose bounds a Federal property is located.

As a supplement to these remarks I wish to introduce for the record of these hearings two letters I have received from Mr. J. E. Brown, Superintendent of Schools in Lancaster, Ohio, and from Mr. Paul R. Cummins, Superintendent of the Fairfield County Schools, which give more explicit details with respect to the situation in their jurisdictions.

Thank you Mr. Chairman for your courtesy in hearing me this morning.

Report No. 1's Disturbing Goal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Donald I. Rogers, business and financial editor of the New York Herald Tribune. Mr. Rogers' article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 19, 1959:

REPORT NO. 1'S DISTURBING GOAL

(By Donald I. Rogers)

Most Americans were unaware, undoubtedly, of the existence of an august little Washington group known as the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, an operation headed by none less than the United States and dedicated to the attainment of a utopian existence in some misty economic Shangri-La.

There has been presented, now, report No. 1 from this Cabinet Committee, for the edification of the rest of us who are presumed to be less thoughtful than those who have spent months contemplating the functioning and malfunctioning of the economic machinery of the land.

The 1,600-word initial document issued by the Cabinet Committee, was entitled "What Do We Really Want From Our Economy?" In case you don't know what you want, it tells you what you should want, if you're a normal American who wants something from his economy.

If you are not a normal American and don't want anything in particular from your economy, it won't benefit you to read the treatise, anyway, chances are you read something like it, or even wrote something like it when you were in high school.

According to a spokesman for the Cabinet group—as you know Cabinet-rank spokesmen must be protected from identity—the primary concern of the committee is to promote the growth of the economy.

This reassuring attitude on the part of the administration will be welcomed by all who might have feared that some Cabinet members were opposed to growth in the economy.

LISTS THREE GOALS

The Nixon task force has come to grips with the whole terrible problem of business

administration in a free society. It decided that rather than come right out with some suggestions, it should first condition us with some educational discussions on the subject. It lists three economic goals of the Republic: (1) Economic growth—that is, a large and expanding output of goods and services; (2) maximum employment opportunities, meaning not only a chance to work, but a chance to hold a kind of job that suits you best; (3) reasonable stability of the price level.

The first two of these goals, revolutionary though they are, sound vaguely familiar. Personally I can't see myself, at my age, doing much about expanding my own output of goods and services. And as for the job that suits me best, I am positively sterling at clipping coupons.

It is the last goal, however, which is disturbing.

Price stability should be no real objective in a truly expanding economy. The words sound nice, like that wonderous bearded phrase of predepression days, "sound fiscal policy," and they're just about as meaningful.

OUTLAWED BY COUETS

The courts did away with fixed prices. They were found unfair and unsatisfactory. Prices that are not fixed are generally "unstable" in the true meaning of the word.

If prices fluctuate in this free economy, it's no more than we can expect, for we do not want to discourage other factors from fluctuating—like wages and production costs.

If what the Nixon committee means is that we should be wary of a too-rapid increase in prices because of inflation, or a too-rapid decrease in prices because of resulting recession, then they're on the right track.

But nowhere in the report is the word "inflation" mentioned.

Maybe it'll be in lesson No. 2.

Slave Labor in Russia Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, when Mr. Khrushchev is visiting America, I am wondering if anyone in a high place will have the courage to call on him to explain why this peace-loving government which he heads continues the terrifying practice of slave labor.

On this subject I would like to include here an open letter to Mr. Harriman which is taken from the American Bulletin which is published by the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

The letter follows discussing slave labor:

OPEN LETTER TO MR. HARRIMAN

Threats were hurled at Mr. Averell Harriman, former U.S. Ambassador to the U.S.S.R., by Mr. Khrushchev himself.

Prior to the interview, Mr. Harriman had written a number of articles on his Russian visit to the New York Times. One dealt with a visit to Krjukovo near Moscow, a "correction center" (June 3). Mr. Khrushchev assured the American visitor that forced labor camps had been dissolved.

Khrushchev's statement is flatly denied in an open letter by Dr. Frank Polak, an escapee from Communist Czechoslovakia, who had spent 7 years in Soviet slave-labor camps.

"Nikita Khrushchev knew why he permitted Mr. Harriman to inspect the camp in Krjukovo and not a slave camp in Vorkuta, the Urals, or Siberia where millions of inmates still work on construction projects and communications, in factories and mines. In Siberian Norilsk hundreds of thousands of Soviet slaves still work under incredible living conditions. Instead, Mr. Harriman was shown a model labor camp near Moscow where 1,000 inmates live behind barbed-wire fences and work in the camp factory or on constructions. The security chief did not explain, however, that by camp discipline he meant 'the discipline of work,' a favorite Soviet practice of withholding food from a worker if he fails to fulfill his quota, and that nonobservance of the working order is punished by the cat-o-nine-tails treatment, solitary confinement up to 5 days, or transfer to one of the other stricter camps. He did, however, inadvertently admit that there are camps with much harsher regimes. Another important confession unwittingly made by the camp chief concerned work compensation for it shows that there is no difference whatsoever between forced labor camps and the newly labeled 'colonies of correction.' If an inmate completes his norm, he is paid 200 rubles a month from which the authorities deduct 92 rubles for food and clothing (poor as it is). The work output of colony inmates is as high, and ofter higher, as that of the free workers whose monthly wages, according to Soviet statistics, amount to 700 rubles. In other words an inmate receives only 35 percent of a free worker's wage. The difference between forced and free labor wages is clear profit for the regime and for this reason the Soviet Union does not intend to give up slave labor. Furthermore, without forced labor it would be impossible to colonize and exploit economically the far north and other remote regions."

"The question of forced labor in the U.S.S.R. and the satellites cannot be solved by denying its existence or by giving it another name," writes Dr. Polak, author of two books on slave-labor camps and Communist practices in the Soviet Union. "If the Soviets have dissolved forced labor camps, as they claim, why not permit an impartial Western commission to investigate conditions? The last time the Soviets made such a claim, the United Nations Commission found the opposite to be true and a resolution, condemning Soviet practice, was passed by the General Assembly on December 7, 1954. There the matter rests as nothing has changed."

Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, along with my colleagues and many friends of Walter Lee, I am sorry to learn of his retirement at the end of this session of Congress as Legislative Assistant to the House Subcommittee on Claims.

I have known Walter Lee ever since his arrival on Capitol Hill some 21 years ago. I have always found him to be most affable, most friendly, and most helpful to Members and their staffs. His straightforward advice with regard to the merits of any proposed legislation was always appreciated. I will miss Walter from the Capitol Hill scene, and I know it will be so with many others, but in his well-earned retirement I wish for him and his family many years of good health and happiness.

Hon. Ken Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, we in the Texas delegation lost a good friend last week with the passing of our former colleague, Ken Regan. Ken had a brilliant and colorful career and under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include an article from his hometown newspaper:

HON. KEN REGAN

Former U.S. Representative Kenneth M. Regan, 66, died at 7 a.m. Saturday in a Santa Fe, N. Mex., hospital after a long illness. He underwent extensive surgery in Washington last April from which he never recovered.

The colorful Midlander had maintained a home in Santa Fe as well as this city since 1958.

Funeral services will be held at 4 p.m. Monday in the First Presbyterian Church of Midland with the pastor, Dr. R. Matthew Lynn, officiating. Interment is planned in Resthaven Memorial Park.

TEXAN SINCE 1920

The body will be brought overland to Midland Sunday. Newnie W. Ellis Chapel has charge of arrangements here.

Last January, Regan returned to Washington as a representative of Texas railroads.

The former Congressman had come to Texas in 1920 after service as a Signal Corps flier in World War I. He first studied dentistry but decided against drilling teeth and came to Texas to drill for oil instead.

His first well found oil but produced only briefly. Then came a succession of dry holes, but finally he struck and got on his feet.

The wildcatter was elected Pecos city alderman and then served several terms as mayor. He went to bat for ranchers in Austin over an adverse Supreme Court decision on mineral rights, and the ranchmen helped elect him to the Texas Senate.

In the senate, he played an important part in adjustment of inequalities for land left vacant by early surveys and refunds to cotton farmers for pink bollworm protection. He also had a part in acquiring the first land for the Big Bend Park.

Regan served 4 years in the senate, starting in 1933, but did not seek reelection. He was given the unusual honor of being elected president pro tempore as a freshman member. The honor usually goes to a veteran.

WORLD WAR II CAPTAIN

In World War II, Regan was an intelligence officer in the Air Corps, rising to captain. After the war, he moved to Midland, where he continued oil operations. The family home is at 1207 West Texas Street.

The tall, affable Regan went to Congress in 1947 after winning a special election to fill the vacancy when R. Ewing Thomason, of El Paso, resigned to take the Federal bench. He won his first term in 1946, serving the 19-county 16th Congressional District two more terms. He was defeated by

the present Representative, J. T. Rutherford, of Odessa.

NATIVE OF ILLINOIS

Regan was born in Mount Morris, Ill. After coming to west Texas, he acquired farm and ranch lands along with extensive oil properties.

Active in civic circles here, he was a chamber of commerce director, a Mason and Shriner, and a Rotarian.

Survivors include the widow, Roberta, and two brothers in California.

Debt Management Legislation Debacle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 8, 1959, the President sent a message to the Congress outlining a legislative recommendation designed to provide for economical management of the public debt. Since that time the Committee on Ways and Means has conducted 3 days of public hearings and spent 11 days in executive session which have, by virtue of a Democratic House leadership decision, produced absolutely nothing. That decision of the majority party came to light yesterday when the majority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, with one exception, voted to suspend any further action on the President's legislative request.

I sincerely regret that the majority party has taken this irresponsible attitude in regard to this urgent legislation. The Democratic decision to do nothing means that the holders of series E and H bonds will be denied a fair return on their investment in America's future, means that the Federal Government will have to continue to finance the huge public debt in the short-term money market in competition with the borrowing needs of small business and consumers, and means that the cost of debt management will be higher than it would have been if this proposal had been favorably acted on.

The Democratic Party must take sole responsibility for this decision. The Democrats have thwarted endeavors by the Republican members of the committee to have favorable action taken on this legislation, and they have rebuffed Republican pledges of support to the leadership on this important proposal.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's New York Times there was an editorial dealing with this subject. This editorial should receive the thoughtful consideration of the public and certainly of those individuals in positions of responsibility on the Democratic side of the aisle who refused to deal responsibly with this important issue of debt management and fiscal policy.

The editorial follows:

INVITING INFLATION

The House Ways and Means Committee acted yesterday to pigeonhole the request of President Eisenhower that it authorize him to raise the prevailing ceiling on Government bond interest rates, which are 4¼ percent in the case of marketable securities and 3.26 percent for savings bonds.

This move, which reverses the committee's approval of such a request only last week, comes not only as a complete surprise but as an extraordinary example of fiscal irresponsibility. It makes strange reading, indeed, when one considers it against the background of the general directive the committee included in last week's approval of the President's request.

"It is the sense of Congress," declared that directive, "that the Government shall take into account * * * the importance of achieving the maximum sustainable rate of economic growth, maintaining reasonable stability of the purchasing power of the dollar, and assuring that the cost of managing the public debt is kept to the minimum consistent with these vital objectives."

In the early postwar years, when the Treasury was insisting on the maintenance of "pegged" rates on Government securities, at least it confined its arguments to (1) the low cost at which the Treasury was able to raise its money, and (2) the bugaboo of a possible collapse of the Government bond market if the "peg" should be removed. Its policies were indefensible in terms of fiscal policy, but at least the Government was not hypocritical enough to argue that it was pursuing this program in the knowledge and belief that it was furthering the policy of "achieving the maximum of sustainable rates of economic growth" coincident with "the maintenance of reasonable stability in the purchasing power of the dollar."

What yesterday's action by the Ways and Means Committee means is that, by denying the Treasury the authority to liberalize the terms under which it can raise the funds it has to raise in the months ahead through the sale of long or medium long securities, thus tapping to that extent the savings of the people, it has compelled it to raise such funds through the sale of short-term paper. Since such paper finds its way largely into the commercial banking system, it is "purchased" by credit created for the purpose—that is, by an inflation of the supply of credit.

Amending Section 5801 of the Internal Revenue Code

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years there has been a need for clarification of firearms legislation to remove inequities which have been shown to exist in present laws. I am very pleased to see the bill which is now before us and which comes to the House with a unanimous favorable report of the Committee on Ways and Means. Identical bills were introduced by me and by other Members of the House following a series of conferences between representatives of the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, the National Rifle Association, Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers Institute, American Gun Dealers Association, Importers Association, National Chiefs of Police Association, Metropolitan Police Department, and many individual sportsmen and collectors. It was as a result of these meetings that the legislation now before us was written. I believe that a much better understanding now exists between the various segments of the firearms industry and that there is general agreement that the proposed legislation will be beneficial.

It has taken several years of hard word to get this bill to the floor. One problem has been the difficulty of getting a favorable report from the Treasury Department where there seems to have existed a great deal of misconception regarding the purposes of the legislation and the need for a revision of present legislation. Fortunately, there does exist a better understanding in that agency at this time and I am very glad to note the cooperation which the agency is now giving.

Collectors and sportsmen will benefit in particular from the new language; there can be very little, if any, loss of revenue to the Government by virtue of the reductions of some excessive fees which presently are charged and I can see nothing in this bill that would provide any measure of satisfaction for the criminal element or open any loopholes to them which they do not now possess. In fact, some loopholes will be closed.

The amendments which were added by the committee are in my opinion sound and I trust that the bill as it now appears will speedily be adopted by the House and the Senate and that it will become law.

Politically Potent Rural Postal Men Heartily Welcomed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post and Times Herald:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 16, 1959]

POLITICALLY POTENT RURAL POSTAL MEN HEARTILY WELCOMED

(By Jerry Kluttz)

A relatively small group of Federal employees which packs a big political wallop is the independent National Rural Letter Carriers' Association.

Official Washington, from the President down, went out of its way to give hearty greetings to the nearly 3,000 delegates to NRLCA's 55th annual convention which ended over the weekend.

Few organizations of any kind have come even close to matching NRLCA's long list of distinguished and influential guests who attended its banquet at the Sheraton-Park.

Vice President RICHARD NIXON praised the public service of the group in recalling the extra little favors by the rural carrier who served his family for many years in Whittier, Calif.

But it was House Speaker SAM RAYBURN who expressed the sentiments of many of the 21 Senators and 150 House Members present. Said he:

"Rural carriers are most popular. They take the farmers something they want and they never ask for anything. But when you give them something they always let you know they appreciate it. In contrast, some other groups will say you should have given it to them sooner."

Robert Ramspeck, the toastmaster, recalled that when he was first elected to Congress 30 years ago a politically wise Member had advised him "to stick to the rural carriers because they have more friends than anyone else."

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and his top postal staff were generous in their praise of the rural carriers and their organizations. Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON, Democrat, of South Carolina, and Representative TOM MURRAY, Democrat, of Tennessee, the respective chairmen of the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, joined in heaping praise on the group.

The NRLCA, an organization of 37,000 members, or nearly all active rural carriers, has the respect and good will alike of Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives. It works quietly and effectively with the different political factions to gain its goals. It refuses to indulge in name calling when someone disagrees with it.

NRLCA doesn't give its president a chance to entrench himself and to dominate it. Its presidents usually serve 2-year terms and they return to their rural routes. Half a dozen former presidents, most of them back carrying mail, attended the convention.

Another interesting fact is that rural carriers usually are not selected under a pure civil service system, although their jobs are under the merit system. In fact, the selection process is politically tainted in most instances. The political party in power usually manages to appoint its followers to rural carrier openings in spite of the civil service system.

Charles R. Larson was reelected president for a second 1-year term; Tommy Martin, vice president, and John W. Emeigh, secretary, by the convention. They have offices here in the Warner Building.

Here We Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certain a recent editorial printed in the Record-Courier of Baker, Oreg., will be of interest to my colleagues. Many of them will recall a contention made by the Idaho Power Co., during the Hells Canyon fight, that private development of the Middle Snake River would be accomplished "at no cost to the United States."

Yet legislation is now before Congress which would pay a Federal subsidy to the Idaho Power Co. and to other private upstream dam operators for alleged benfits received by the Government at Federal downstream projects. I am unalterably opposed to such legislation and, as I pointed out in my statement before the House Subcommittee on Communications and Power—

It was a mistake to grant a Federal license to this company [Idaho Power Co.] to underdevelop this stretch of the Middle Snake in the first place; it would compound the tragedy to play Santa Claus again and hand the Idaho Power Co. an unanticipated windfall amounting to millions of dollars.

Mr. Byron Brinton, editor of the Record-Courier, is to be commended for his excellent editorial on this subject. I trust his comments will be carefully read by my colleagues:

[From the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier, Aug. 6, 1959]

HERE WE GO

During the heat of the recent river resource battle in which a private utility was given Snake River damsites, there crept into the discussion the then-pending legislation which wold have granted upstream power companies financial benefits for any water that subsequently went through public project generators lower down the river. The legislation was sidetracked, obviously, so that Idaho Power Co. could avoid any charge that they intended to exert control over the river, because part of the low dam issue was whether the private Wall Street financiers or the people would control the Nation's water.

Sufficient time has now elapsed that the financial interests, thinking the public has forgotten and acting through President Eisenhower's Federal Power Commission, have now reactivated the legislation which would not only permit upstream utilities to have their dam sites and all the power they produce, but would also have the lower power projects belonging to the people pay the non-Federal utilities for the public water that goes through the private dams.

As these ghosts of the Hells Canyon fight come up, we are privileged to from time to time to remind the area that "we told you so." Idaho Power Co. then denied any contention it was seeking a water right. Now the claim to downstream benefits is based on the assumption it has a claim on the water. If that claim is validated by legislation it will cost the public millions of dollars to use its own water for which some of us at least fought so hard to try to get the public to keep.

Not only do the non-Federal utilities expect to exert the water rights granted them—even though they promised they wouldn't, but also they intend to make the taxpayer pay through the nose even though the private low dams were supposed to be a gift of private enterprise to the Nation at no cost to the taxpayer.

And a third ghost of the bitter dam fight is also incorporated in this new effort to gouge the public to the benefit of the private dams. It has to do with the sacredness of obligations. The FPC license has only a few things in it as to what the low dams are to do. One of them in a feeble way attempted to compel the utility to make good its boast that its low dam would be a comprehensive, full development of the river. The license required the company to operate the project and its system in coordination with the Northwest power pool. Now the non-Federal utility people through water legislation are attempting to make the public reimburse them from downstream for water stored upstream when in fact their very license, as one of the conditions of the low-dam grant, required them to coordinate the project hydraulically.

Here we go again. One year it was a river giveaway, then a quick tax writeoff, then a 40-percent tax-free dividend gimmick, now a downstream benefits bill. Thanks to a few of our Congressmen and Senators some of these raids on the taxpayer by the low-dam scheme have not worked. But give the financial crowd time and lower the guard and they'll own the whole river, Grand Coulee, Bonneville, and all. That's the big plum. The little raids on the taxpayer—like the claiming of water rights, tax-free dividends, etc.—are merely little battles along the way—to make the public so calloused it won't know what the big job looks like when it does come.

Politics and the Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, I include Columnist Joseph Alsop's article on labor reform legislation in the Washington Post of August 19, 1959. In this and previous analyses, Mr. Alsop has thoughtfully outlined the key points of view bearing on this issue and, for this reason, his remarks should be made part of the permanent RECORD:

POLITICS AND THE LABOR BILL

(By Joseph Alsop)

The next act in the great labor bill drama is going to be dominated by two forces, one obvious, the other as yet unseen. The force that has emerged already is the conviction of the Congress that the voters want a strong labor reform bill.

The other force will emerge soon. It is the determination of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, to fight to the end against the specially severe prohibitions of organizational picketing and secondary boycotts that the House of Representatives included in the labor bill.

As the author of the original labor reform bill, and as chairman of the Senate conferees, KENNEDY has the power to deadlock the Senate-House conference. He does not want to do so. He is not opposed to regulation of organizational picketing and secondary boycotts. He wants a compromise. But KENNEDY is convinced that in their present form, the picketing and boycott clauses in the House bill go decidedly too far and are even, in patches at least, doubtfully constitutional.

"What everybody ought to understand," he says, "is that these clauses in the House bill won't make a dime's worth of difference to big labor, including Jimmy Hoffa and his Teamsters. What they will do is bring the union movement in the South to a dead, screeching halt. And I'm not going to vote for that, much as I want labor reform."

If he can get no compromise of the sort he wants, KENNEDY can deadlock the conference, because he can be sure of the support of the Senate's other Democratic conferees. By the same token, a majority of the House conferees will surely support their leader, Representative GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina. BARDEN wants the labor reform bill to be as severe as possible, and is far from adverse to impeding the unionization of the South.

As KENNEDY will deadlock the conference if he cannot get a compromise, the question really is whether BARDEN and company will offer a compromise. The answer quite largely depends, in turn, on the estimates of the legislative temper of the House and Senate reached by BARDEN'S Republican allies, such as Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona.

The most natural result of a deadlock in conference will be to present the Senate with a choice between no labor reform bill at all, or acceptance, en bloc, of the labor bill passed by the House. If GOLDWATER thinks the Senate will take the unchanged House bill, he is likely to want a conference deadlock. It is not at all impossible that just this conclusion will be reached by GOLDWATER and his fellow Republican conferee, Senate Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois.

Besides all the sectional and labor-management strains, the labor reform bill is also supercharged with presidential politics. On the Republican side, the House's affirmative response to President Eisenhower's plea for a strong bill was very fine ointment, but there was a civil rights fly in it all the same.

House Republican Leader CHARLES HALLECK almost tearfully, and quite unconvincingly, denied any deal to obtain southern support by helping to block action on civil rights. Almost within minutes, the Republican-southern Democratic coalition downright pridefully exhibited its unity and power. This kind of thing is not a source of unalloyed delight to Republicans like Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who think civil rights ought to be a vote-getting Republican issue.

On the Democratic side, Senator KENNEDY'S position is painful, but it is slightly less painful than the positions of his rivals. He and his brother, Robert, have worked hard and successfully to make labor reforms their family issue. If KENNEDY votes against the House bill on a matter of principle, he can still hope to retain much of the support he has gained by his own and his brother's work. For the Senate's other Democratic presidential aspirants, however, the choice can lie between being against labor reform, which the country wants, or being against labor, which will have much power at the Democratic convention.

The choice is especially painful for the leading unavowed and inactive candidate, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. His State is so desirous of a strong bill that most of the Texas Congressmen, including the Member from JOHNSTON'S own district, refused to support their revered chief, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN. Yet labor opposition, if added to JOHNSON'S southern handicaps, would be a severe blow to JOHNSON'S presidential hopes.

As JOHNSON is in the middle, however, and as he has a genius for finding ways out of dilemmas of this sort, a compromise both he and KENNEDY can vote for may perhaps be agreed on somehow.

The Labor Bill

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN J. McFALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with what I believe to be the overwhelming desire and determination of the people of the United States and the Members of this House to put an end to the racketeering and abuses in the field of labor-management relations as exposed by the McClellan committee.

I long have been ready and am prepared today, if given an opportunity, to vote for a strong and effective bill to drive out the racketeers, chiselers, and hoodlums who have established themselves in the labor movement against the wishes and over the opposition of the great number of legitimate and honest leaders and members of organized labor.

I am equally determined to do all I can to put an end to the just as despicable activities of conniving, bribing, and extortion by middlemen and management in the field of labor relations, as are the overwhelming number of legitimate and honest businessmen.

However, I will not vote for any legislation that, in the guise of racketeering reform, would actually cripple the legitimate activities of millions of honorable union officials and workers.

Last year I voted for the Kennedy-Ives bill which was designed to cure the abuses exposed by the McClellan committee. This bill was approved by a 88 to 1 vote of the Senate but it died in the House on a 190 to 198 rollcall when certain interests decided they would prefer to have an election issue rather than labor legislation .

Of the measures before us today, it is generally agreed that there are really only two choices—the Elliott committee bill, H.R. 8342, and the substitute Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400.

Robert F. Kennedy, chief counsel for the McClellan committee, and the man who knows the abuses uncovered by the committee better than any other man, has given his all-out support to the committee bill.

Kennedy, whose opposition to labor racketeering has reached the point of a personal crusade, said yesterday that the committee bill would carry out all of the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

Kennedy said the committee bill would provide:

First. Safeguards for union funds, with appropriate penalties for the falsification or destruction of union records and the embezzlement of union dues.

Second. Safeguards for union member rights and democratic procedures, including secret ballots, regular elections and an opportunity for opposing nominations.

Third. Safeguards against secret conflict of interest transactions by, or loans to, union officers.

Fourth. Safeguards against employer payoffs to interfere with union organization, or for sweetheart contracts.

Fifth. Safeguards against the abuse and prolongation of union trusteeships.

Sixth. Safeguards against the use of felons as union officers.

Seventh. Safeguards against the use of picket lines to extort money.

Eighth. Safeguards against hot cargo contracts and fictitious unloading fees.

Ninth. Safeguards against surreptitious and improper activities of undisclosed management middlemen.

While differing in some detail, the Elliott bill and the Landrum-Griffin substitute, as well as the Shelley bill, all agree pretty well on the above points. Page after page of the language is identical. The issue of corruption is well handled in each of the measures.

But the issue before us today is not shall there be labor-racketeering reform. On that point we are all agreed.

The issue is whether or not we should follow the dictates of those whose economic position would be bettered by handicapping the union movement to place in the law under the excuse of "labor reform" legislation that would cancel out the historic balances of basic labor-management relations that over the years have resulted in the greatest opportunities, the greatest advances, and the greatest prosperity for both business and unions that this Nation has ever known.

The same forces that have tried to foster the right-to-work philosophy on this country want that kind of a bill.

The Landrum-Griffin substitute is their bill.

Among other defects, this proposal would virtually put an end to legitimate organizational picketing, a historic right of unions, even under the Taft-Hartley Act. It would impose impossible criminal penalties for actions in the internal working of union meetings. It would leave the vast majority of small unions and managements in the so-called "no man's land" without any uniform relief from the NLRB.

I am in favor of the middle-of-the-road approach advocated by our Speaker and will oppose the unduly restrictive Landrum substitute.

There are three areas in which it is most oppressive:

First. No man's land: The Landrum language on the no man's land is conflicting and generally unsatisfactory. It would pass on to the States the authority to arbitrate cases that the National Labor Relations Board did not accept. Uniform justice would not be possible under this setup. More than half the States now have no machinery for such action. State laws vary widely. The committee bill takes the reasonable approach that every union and management, no matter how small, should have the right to NLRB processes, and calls for the expansion of the NLRB and directs it not to refuse to handle any case.

Second. Hot cargo and secondary boycotts: The Landrum substitute, by unqualifiedly barring hot cargo contracts in all trucking, makes strikebreakers out of all Teamsters and requires them to cross picket lines of any union. The Elliott bill had the same provision applicable to interstate carriers but added wording to specify that the hot cargo contract ban did not apply to a member's right not to cross a primary picket line without losing his job and did not re-

quire a union member to cross a primary picket line.

The Landrum bill made illegal all secondary boycotts in all industries and even banned a union from encouraging individual members to engage in a secondary boycott. Acting in concert to encourage secondary boycotts is banned by present law, which forbids secondary boycotts.

Third. Picketing. The Landrum language would make it virtually impossible for an honest union to picket for organizational or recognition purposes, to advertise by peaceful picketing as "unfair to union labor," despite Supreme Court decisions that permit this as an exercise of free speech.

Specifically, it would outlaw recognition or organizational picketing if the employer recognized another union, if there was a valid election in the past 12 months, if the union could not demonstrate a "sufficient showing of interest"—signed cards of 30 percent—to support a petition for a recognition election or where picketing had been going on for a reasonable time—up to 30 days—and no petition for election had been filed. It contained no provision for a defense if the employer was charged with unfair practices in the election.

The Elliott bill restricted organization picketing but not so severely. It outlawed organizational picketing by a union only if another union was validly recognized by the employer or the picketing union had lost a recognition election within the preceding nine months, and could not show that it had since come to represent a majority of the employees. A charge that the employer had engaged in unfair labor practices in the election would be a defense against an allegation of illegal picketing.

Extortion or blackmail picketing would be banned by both bills.

Should the Landrum-Griffin substitute be finally adopted, the bill will go to conference along with the Kennedy-Ervin bill adopted by the Senate earlier this year.

It is my deep and sincere hope that reasonable minds and responsible attitudes will prevail and out of this conference will emerge a sound, workable and fair bill which will bring about real reform in the labor-management field but which will not destroy the ability of labor to achieve its legitimate objectives.

Labor Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in view of the concern over labor reform legislation among Members of Congress, I would like to call attention to a resolution on labor reform adopted by the Board of Social and Economic Relations of the Methodist Church on April 23, 1959. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the full text of this comprehensive resolution:

LABOR REFORM

The disclosure of corruption, racketeering, and collusion in labor-management relations is of concern to the Christian conscience. The historical teachings of the Judeo-Christian tradition of justice and righteousness call the Christian to appraise the ethical issues involved. The church early recognized the right of workers and employers alike to organize to safeguard and promote their interests (par. 2020, "the Methodist Discipline"). The church has a like concern when irresponsibility and malpractice is uncovered in labor-management relations. The concern of the church is not alone with the intentional graft and abuses that have been uncovered but also with some of the unintentional abuses that can creep into every organization and can be overlooked or concealed by the complexity of the institution.

The values of a materialistic society are revealed in the disclosed racketeering and violations of trust in some labor unions. This same behavior can be found in certain segments of the business community as well. The church calls an entire society to repent when society stresses the status of those who are affluent, rewards those who "get ahead" and are a "success" regardless of the means employed; when society places social approval on acquisitiveness for its own sake and rewards the gaining of profit regardless of the social effects. These are the temptations of other segments of society beside the labor unions. However, this can in no way become an excuse for the labor unions to fail to remove the abuses and corruption for which they are responsible.

It is important to recognize that though we are rightfully concerned with the evident abuses in labor unions, these evils are not a general practice of most labor unions and are found only in a minority of cases. The Senate committee investigating labor-management corruption cautioned in its published report that it, "in no way intended to reflect on the overwhelming majority of the labor unions and businessmen of the Nation, of whose integrity the committee is firmly convinced." We should beware of the danger that in suggesting reforms we go beyond those which are necessary and wise and actually hamper and harm the legitimate role labor unions play in the development of our economy.

Among the abuses that need correction within certain sections of labor-management relations are:

1. Lack of democratic procedure in some unions.

2. Unwarranted control by an international over local union.

3. The misuse of union funds, particularly expense accounts, pension funds, and health and welfare funds.

4. Collusion between employers and union leaders.

5. Illegal and improper actions by certain managements, unions, and certain industrial relations consultants.

6. Infiltration of gangsters into some unions.

7. Lax policies of law enforcement.

If these problems are to be met adequately and in ways by which a continuing program of correction is made possible, both now and in the future, reform will have to take place at least on four levels:

I. PERSONAL INTEGRITY

When dealing with labor reform, no legislation by the Government nor changes within the corporate structure of the union are ever a substitute for the basic need of personal integrity. This need for personal integrity and responsibility is universal and is most needed in people elected to positions of leadership. The church must encourage men of integrity who are presently in leadership in labor unions and encourage others of similar qualities to be willing to accept leadership. There is also a need for personal integrity and responsibility on the part of the rank and file of the union members. A responsible union is one in which the members do actively participate. Only with basic integrity on the part of union members and leaders will the labor movement continually be able to play its proper and constructive role in our economic life.

II. WHAT THE UNIONS CAN DO

We recognize and wish to encourage the move on the part of unions to institute internal reform measures, such as, AFL–CIO Ethical Practices Committee, the Appeal Board of the International Upholstery Union, and the Public Review Board of the UAW.

There are other reforms which unions can institute:

1. Giving honest respect to opposition within unions by creating a climate of free discussion and debate where minority viewpoints are freely welcomed. (This may demand that some unions will have to remove from their constitutions any provisions which prohibit criticism of leadership and limit the freedom of members during union elections. This would demand specific guarantees in the constitutions of these unions of freedom of speech, expression and right of petition.)

2. Regular elections of officers by secret ballot.

3. Full public disclosure of union funds, and particularly such as pension, health and welfare funds.

4. Creation of public review agencies to which aggrieved union members can appeal.

III. ENFORCEMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

(Federal and State)

Enforcement of existing laws is sometimes bypassed by both labor and management. At the same time both seek legislation to control their opposites while decrying legislation affecting themselves as meddling in the affairs of free men.

Regulatory laws, Federal and State, are in existence which if properly enforced would control many of the malpractices which have developed in labor-management relations.

Just laws serve the Nation and protect and extend the freedom of persons in the community. Their effective enforcement will aid in the development of good labor-management relations.

IV. SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR NEEDED LEGISLATION

There are areas of labor-management reform which should be covered by new legislation if the public good and the welfare of workers and management is to be protected. Existing statutes regulating these relationships should be amended in the light of 12 years of court and agency decisions. Constructive legislation to provide for labor-management reform should include:

1. A requirement for all unions to hold elections at regular intervals (not less than every 4 years) conducted by secret ballot, without restraint and upon due notice and to conduct the business meetings of the union according to customary democratic procedures.

2. A requirement for all unions to file with the Department of Labor, and/or proper State authorities adequate financial reports, these reports to be furnished to all union members.

3. A requirement for financial reports of all pension, health, and welfare funds, including those administered by management, to be filed with the Secretary of Labor and/or proper State authorities. For example, the report should include the amount of rebates

and commissions and to whom and when paid.

4. In order that there be no conflict of interest, a requirement for unions, union officers, and employers to file with the Secretary of Labor and/or local State authorities reports of any financial transactions between them other than bargaining agreements.

5. A requirement for a clear delineation of the rights and authority of the international and member local unions one to another.

6. A requirement for a secret ballot on all strike votes with due notice to the entire membership.

7. A requirement that striking union members may participate in decertification elections.[1]

8. A requirement that unions may strike "farmed-out work."[2]

9. A requirement that there be proper supervision of union trusteeships.

---

[1] When a manufacturer or producer accepts work from a plant on strike, then the union should have the right to use sanctions against that producer or manufacturer.

[2] When in a strike situation an employer hires new workers to take the jobs of those on strike, the striking workers should have the right also to participate in an NLRB election to determine the legitimate bargaining agent.

Pandora's Box in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the Dominican Republic in the last couple of years, both good and bad, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and in the press. Peter Edson, in the Washington Daily News for August 14, 1959, has summed up the two points of view rather neatly. If we could leave the box he speaks of unopened and just enjoy the outside, it would be pleasant indeed. However, it is perfectly natural to want to see what the box contains, and inside we find the sordidness described with some restraint by Mr. Edson.

Under a previous consent I include his article:

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC RIDDLE

(By Peter Edson)

The United States is in something of a box over its relations with the Dominican Republic.

The outward appearance of the box shows this little country costing the United States less money and trouble than any other Latin American government. Its aid program is under $200,000 a year. This all goes to 13 Americans giving technical assistance in education.

The United States signed a military assistance agreement with the Dominican Republic in 1956. It had a U.S. Air Force mission for 5 years. Now there is only a 13-man naval mission, running a training program on antisubmarine warfare. Arms shipments to the Dominican Republican are embargoed.

The United States has made no loans to the Dominican Republic. Its economy is one of the solidest in Latin America. Up to now it has had a favorable trade balance with the United States exporting principally sugar, coffee and cacao.

Private American investments in the little country—under three million people in an area about the size of Vermont and New Hampshire, east of Haiti on the Island of Hispaniola—are $100 million. There are 6,000 Americans there, many of them Puerto Rican.

Diplomatic relations are correct under the U.S. policy of maintaining friendship with all Latin American countries without intervening or implying either approval or disapproval of their internal form of government.

That is the good side of the United States-Dominican Republic relations — the outside of the box, so to speak. The inside of the box makes an entirely different story and it smells terrible. This may come out at the current Santiago, Chile, conference of Latin American foreign ministers, with dire consequences.

U.S. relations with the Dominican Republic's dictator Trujillo regime began to go to pot in 1956 over a succesion of incidents.

First was the disappearance of Gerald Lester Murphy, an American pilot believed to have flown a drugged revolutionary leader, Jesus Gallindez, back to an unknown fate in the Dominican Republic.

Second was the failure of Rafael L. Trujillo, Jr., son of the Dominican Republic's Generalissimo, to win a diploma from the U.S. Army Command and Staff School at Fort Leavenworth. This followed his goings-on with Kim Novak and Zsa Zsa Gabor in Hollywood.

This caused the Dominican Congress to pass a resolution denouncing all U.S. aid agreements. This was never put in effect by the Dominican executive branch of government and it was later revoked.

But in October 1958 it was revealed that the Dominican Secretary of Commerce had written eight U.S. chambers of commerce—with copies to the State governors—recommending action against Congressmen "villifying the Dominican Republic."

Finally, the Dominican Republic granted asylum to dictators Juan Peron of the Argentine, Perez Jiminez of Venezuela, Fulgencio Batista of Cuba and Rojas Pinilla of Colombia. This did not endear Trujillo in Latin America.

Liquor on Airplanes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of discussion in regard to the serving of liquor on the airlines, and I would like to take this opportunity to let my colleagues know my feelings on this matter.

Effective regulation of the consumption of alcoholic beverages on domestic airplane flights has become increasingly difficult since the practice has become more prevalent. This fact has been attested to by those who should know best, namely, the Airline Pilots Association and the Airline Stewards and Stewardesses Association. It is their contention that the practice of serving alcoholic beverages on airplanes is a deterrent to the efficient operation of the crew and that it creates a potential safety hazard.

There are also many passengers who object to the serving of alcoholic beverages in the close confines of an airplane where they can neither avoid the obnoxious inebriate nor can they be certain that the disgusting "drunk" will not be a danger in the event of an emergency. He may, in fact, even create an emergency.

Strict regulation, or curtailment, of the practice of selling or serving alcoholic beverages on airplanes has been urged by these groups, then, not on moral grounds as a prohibition measure, but because the practice causes unnecessary discomfort to other passengers, interferes with the efficient operation of a flight, and constitutes a potential safety hazard.

In hearings held by the 85th Congress about this same problem, the testimony of many witnesses supports the view that self-regulation by airlines has not appreciably remedied the situation. The airlines usually adopt one of two codes in an effort to control alcoholic consumption on flights. One code specifies that only two drinks may be sold or served to any one passenger. The other code places no specific limitation on the number of drinks which may be sold or served to any one passenger except that only two may be sold to any passenger who appears to have become intoxicated. In all codes, however, the airline crew is cautioned to be careful never to imply to a passenger that he is intoxicated. According to the testimony of airline crew members, this latter stipulation has rendered the administration of most rules controlling the consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages on flights virtually impracticable. For instance, the present regulations which allow the serving and sale of alcoholic beverages on flights have left effective control of the passenger who brings his own alcohol on board in a virtual "no man's land." When alcoholic beverages are sold on a plane it is also very difficult, if not impossible, to refuse to allow a passenger on board who has obviously been drinking unless he is intoxicated. Two drinks for this pasenger may be too many.

It is true that the captain of a plane has the authority to deplane an obnoxious or unruly imbiber. But the physical operation of this rule makes it a "last resort" in that obviously, it is not always possible to land a plane immediately. The very fact that alcohol is served on airplanes makes such rules ambiguous, and, of necessity, the crew is more lax in invoking the measure of either deplaning an inebriated passenger or refusing him aboard the plane.

According to pilots', stewards', and stewardesses' testimony, the present regulations do not afford them a truly practicable means of controlling alcohol in the air. For instance, in one of the few incidents cited in which an inebriated passenger was deplaned, this procedure was invoked because the man was waving a gun and had become violent. An-

other inebriated passenger removed himself voluntarily when he mistook the main cabi.. exit for another door.

The problem of controlling the unpleasant or even potentially dangerous results of allowing the consumption of alcoholic beverages on flights is uniquely related to compact size of an airplane. There can be no separated club car or an isolated lounge as there can be on a train or an ocean liner. Only one obnoxious drinker may cause extreme embarrassment and difficulty on an airplane, whereas on an ocean liner or a train, the situation may be remedied more readily as there are more facilities for separating such a passenger from others.

An airplane is built and manned with a view toward maximum efficiency and safety. Yet the actions of one inebriate may even require that the pilot leave the controls to cope with him. This clearly is neither safe nor efficient, but it has occurred on those flights which serve alcoholic beverages. Although there has been no airplane accident which was conclusively attributed to the actions of an inebriate, it was pointed out by many qualified witnesses during the hearings that it hardly seems necessary to wait for an accident before we make any provisions to prevent one.

I share the opinion of many, including the majority of airline pilots, stewards, and stewardesses, that the only effective way to control the unique problems resulting from the consumption of alcohol by passengers on airplanes is to completely prohibit it. It is, I am convinced, the responsibility of this Congress to provide the necessary legislation to prevent a practice which affects the safety and well-being of many Americans and their families.

Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Herbert Hoover is one of the greatest men in the history of the world. His life and service is an inspiration to me personally in my work here in the Congress. I doubt if any contempory world figure could have endured the false charges and abuse with the same dignity, lack of vindictiveness, and total absence of bitterness. Mr. Hoover's character, patriotism and forgiving spirit should be emulated by every young American. The following article by Jim Bishop is a great tribute to our former President on his 85th birthday. I wish for Herbert Hoover many more happy birthdays and years of outstanding service to the United States.

The article follows:

HERBERT HOOVER: A BIRTHDAY SALUTE

(By Jim Bishop)

The pencil whirls, dances, pirouettes. It fashions the letters, the words, the sentences, the thoughts of the man behind it. He sits impassively at a catercornered desk 31 stories above Park Avenue in New York City, writing another book. He does all of his own writing. Herbert Hoover, at the age of 85, has four books in the making. He is, from any angle, a 170-pound slab of stone which only a mining engineer could identify.

This is an enduring rock, one which has known the crashing foam of adversity and the warm flow of public acclaim. The edges of the rock have been worn smooth by these contrary actions and now, in the late years, Herbert Hoover appears to be a bigger, better, sounder statesman than ever.

The pencil stops. The 31st President of the United States stands. He selects some finished sheets, and gives them to the little lady with the big eyes, Miss Bernice Miller. She is Mr. Hoover's longtime chief secretary. She is also his fence of barbed wire against the rude instrusions which plague all authors.

"I will file these papers," Mr. Hoover says. He lifts some from his desk and drops them into a wastebasket. "My filing cabinet," he says, looking solemnly at Miss Miller. He walks around the edge of the desk to one of the two radios in the room. There is a steady, deliberate quality in almost everything that Mr. Hoover does.

His step is brittle, but the face and frame have not aged in keeping with the tick of time. Any child who studies American history would be able to pick the face of Herbert Hoover out of a crowd. The thick shock of hair is now white and thin and combed straight back. The brows are thicker and heavy with frost. The face is square, as always, and the skin is like a polished apple. The blue eyes, now more deeply set, twinkle with humor. The stiff collar has been replaced with a soft one, but the tie, as always, hangs slightly to the right of center. The hands, big and well muscled, are as certain reaching for his pipe as they once were reaching for a piece of quartz.

Hard work and curiosity, it would appear, keep the ex-President young. He puts in 10 or 11 hours at work in any normal way. If, in the middle of the night, he awakens with what he thinks is a good thought, he will get out of bed, walk into the combination living room and office in the Waldorf Towers, and write. But he says most 4 a.m. thoughts go into the wastebasket at 9 a.m.

His curiosity, especially in the field of public affairs, is insatiable. He listens to news broadcasts almost as frequently as a foreign monitor. Sometimes, he will tune in on the hourly news and then, 30 minutes later, listen to another broadcast hoping for later dispatches.

Added to this, he uses all mealtimes to invite statesmen, domestic and foreign, for conversation and an exchange of views. The Chief, as almost everyone calls him, is a good listener and an able oral fencer. People are invited to sit with him at breakfast, at lunch, and at dinner.

He seldom listens to television, unless a public affairs program is shown, or a baseball game. Mr. Hoover is a San Francisco Giants fan. That is his hometown. Long ago, in college, The Chief played shortstop. He could not have been clever because, as a matter of fact and tact, his teammates talked him off the field by offering to make him manager.

He sits near the radio, facing an oil portrait of Lou Henry Hoover, his late wife. The blue eyes flicker over the sweet face, but not a word of sentiment passes the lips of this man. His personal feelings are his own, and he shares them with no one. She died 15 years ago, and the portrait remains young as he grows older and older.

Miss Henry was a good student at Stanford. She, as well as her future husband, earned a bachelor's degree. He was a young and very serious mining engineer. She became a whiz at languages, including Chinese. The first book Mr. Hoover published was "Principles of Mining" still a college textbook. But more important was a translation from the Latin of "De Re Metallica," a book about mining written in 1556. The translation bears Mrs. Hoover's name as well as his.

There were 44 years of marriage before Mrs. Hoover died in 1944. There are two sons, both engineers. Herbert Junior was Under Secretary of State; Allan is with a banking firm. There are six grandchildren; nine great-grandchildren.

Mrs. Hoover's blue Chinese porcelain pieces now stand in his livingroom, cherished cups and bowls hundreds of years old selected over a long period during and after the time they lived in China. Mr. Hoover studies them, smiles a little, and says: "They belong to my daughters-in-law. I'm allowed to keep them as long as I live here."

This man, gracious and impersonal, first came to public attention in World War I, when he was 43. President Woodrow Wilson appointed him to be U.S. Food Administrator. Hoover fed millions of undernourished people in Europe so well that President Wilson, a Democrat, moved the young Republican up step-by-step in his economic councils.

Hoover did not hold press conferences, make claims or take bows. He was the cloistered monk of the Wilson and Harding regimes. Even today, if his name comes up in conversation, someone is bound to say: "Love the way he runs that FBI."

This particular Hoover always had a couple of jobs running simultaneously. In 1921, he was Secretary of Commerce. At the same time, he was Chairman of the Colorado River Commission, a member of the Federal Narcotics Board, on the Federal Board for Vocational Education, on the Committee on Organization of the Executive Department and a member of the Advisory Committee for the Limitation of Armaments Conference.

Mr. Hoover cut down on his outside work when he served as President of the United States in 1929–33. Many people blamed him personally for a worldwide depression which was in the making before he assumed this high office. From 1933 until 1946, when the Democrats mentioned his name, it was with malicious glee. The Republicans tried not to think of him.

Then Harry Truman brought the chief out of obscurity. The Missourian has respect for anyone who holds high office and, although it is hardly in the province of a Democrat to resurrect a Republican, Mr. Truman asked Mr. Hoover to be Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The chief, then 73, thanked him and went to work. He served in the same capacity again in 1953–55 and did himself and his Nation proud.

Little by little, the Republican Party began to take the chief to its heart. Convention by convention, the welcomes became louder, more vociferous. Herbert Hoover was one of the two living former Presidents in 1956, when the Republicans in San Francisco gave him a bigger ovation than they did Eisenhower.

Still, work is the last of Herbert Hoover's old friends. He labors a full day in his hotel suite and covers a few miles walking from

his desk to the other parts of the office. The suite of rooms is large and comfortable. As Hoover's activities grew in the post-Presidential years, so did the space requirements. Four of the rooms are offices. There are two bedrooms (one for visiting children), a dining room, a living room and a service kitchenette. Mr. Hoover works in the south side. The staff is on the north side.

There are seven persons—all women—working for Mr. Hoover. Miss Miller runs the office. Mrs. Loretta Camp, of Florence, N.J., has been secretary to Mr. Hoover for 20 years. Miss Marietta Fuller of Brooklyn and Miss Ellen Brumback of Toledo, Ohio, assist him in research. The others are assistant secretaries. Among former secretaries of Mr. Hoover who did well in life are Lewis Strauss, Robert A. Taft and Christian Herter.

Appointments are kept to the minute. Should a friend be invited to lunch at 1 p.m., Mr. Hoover doesn't expect him at 12:55 or 1:05. He is as conscious of time as a navigator. His daily life is an instrument of precision with little tolerance.

He is out of bed shortly after 7 a. m. Most men of his station have a valet; a man of 85 would be expected to have some assistance. Mr. Hoover does everything for himself. By 8 he is in the living room reading the morning newspapers. He reads them column by column, page by page.

At 9, his guests are present for breakfast. It may be a foreign minister, a university president, a journalist—it may be all three. The Chief talks softly, steadily, eyes veiled under the brows, a small part of his attention devoted to the food. The others speak a little loudly, because Mr. Hoover's hearing is impaired. He does not wear a hearing aid.

Within an hour, the breakfast is over and the morning mail ready. Letters are stacked on his desk in four piles. The first is fan mail; he reads practically all of it. Invitations are in a second pile; across some of these, he scrawls, "decline with thanks," across others, "decline gently." Mail which does not require his immediate attention, but is written by people known to the Chief, is in a third pile. Important mail makes up the fourth pile.

He disposes of this chore quickly. Neither words nor minutes are wasted. He knows what is in his mind to do, and there is no hesitation. When it is done, he reaches into a deep dish filled with yellow pencils. He picks one, sets out some sheets of paper, and marshals his thoughts. No phone calls except the most urgent are put through as Mr. Hoover works on his book.

This one is called "An American Epic," and treats of American relief work in Belgium and France and, more than that, will deal comprehensively with American relief all over the world in the last 45 years. He works steadily, referring to charts and statistical tables and published research. Should he tire, or the fluid thought congeal, he stops, stands and tunes in a news broadcast.

Or he may do a little work on the Boys Clubs of America, of which he is chairman, or put in a little work on a few of the dozen charities, scientific institutions and universities of which he has management responsibilities. After he passed his 80th year, Mr. Hoover tried to trim his workload and resigned from all 12 temples of learning and science. Not one would accept the resignation.

"The idea behind the Boys Clubs," he says, "is to teach young boys that it is better to join a team than a gang." When the Chief assumed the direction of these clubs—most of which are located in slum areas—the organization included 50 clubs. It now has 529 clubs with an increase of from 140,000 boys to over 600,000.

"In one part of Chicago," he said, "the court required 10 men just to book juvenile delinquents, and 85 percent of the boys were in the hands of the police during a year. We put a Boys Club in that area. Not long ago I was in Chicago. The magistrate called on me. He said that only one man is needed for work in juvenile delinquency and the crime rate was under 12 percent."

At 1 p.m. lunch is served in the dining room and a few guests sit with Mr. Hoover for up to an hour. At 2, he moves off to his room for a nap. At 3 he is back at work with a fresh pencil.

Word by word, page by page, the new book comes to life. He seldom indicts anyone, even a political enemy. No one hurt Hoover more than Franklin D. Roosevelt, who not only defeated him in the campaign of 1932, but who also blamed him for the depression. Still, in the Hoover books, he quotes the Roosevelt charges and says with gallantry, he was "misinformed"; he was "mistaken."

In spite of the great humanitarian work Mr. Hoover has done for the world, he is one of the least known of American Presidents, and this is his fault because the side he has chosen to present to the public is one of cold dignity. I sat talking with him one noon about the ovation he received at the Republican National Convention in 1956 at San Francisco. He smiled a little. "Yes," he said softly, looking down at his napkin, "that was immediately after the autograph incident."

"The autograph incident?" I said.

He nodded. "At the foot of the ramp, behind the speaker's platform, two men were ready to escort me up. The music started. A spotlight was turned on. At that moment"—he looked up, the twinkle was back in his eyes—"a lady came up to me and asked if I would give her my autograph.

"I said 'Yes, if you have a pen and some paper.' The men were pulling at me and the lady was rummaging through her purse. She found a pen, but she couldn't find a piece of paper. It was embarrassing. I said that I would have to go on. She looked at me and held up one of her knees and smoothed the hem of her skirt on it. 'Would you please autograph this?' she said."

Mr. Hoover chuckled.

"Tell me," I said, "did you autograph the hem?"

"Of course I did," he said laughing. "At my age a man doesn't get many joyous moments like that."

He works unremittingly until 5:30, when the afternoon newspapers are brought in.

At 7:15 guests arrive for dinner. A dry martini is served, and Mr. Hoover sits happily and expectantly, like a schoolboy at a picnic. He enjoys the exchanges of ideas with people who have earned his respect. An entire hour is given to this meal.

By 8:30 Mr. Hoover and his guests are in the living room. It is always a small group, from three to five persons on the average. If there are more, and two or more speak at once, he cannot understand and it irritates him to miss anything.

Sometimes he will suggest a game of canasta. Sometimes the guests will sit on the broad settees and talk. At 10 p.m. the guests begin to make their farewells. Coats and hats are brought in, and the Chief leads the way to the door. His right hand comes up in half-salute and he bows to the ladies. In a half hour Mr. Hoover is in his room getting ready for bed.

He is alone, yet not lonesome. He is accustomed to doing his own thinking, and his own work. At the age of 85, no one helps this man—this rock—with his shoes or his tie. He believes in God and he subscribes to the credo that God will help those who help themselves. Don't forget, he plans to complete four more books.

Freedom in the Western Hemisphere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a most interesting and impressive article from a recent edition of Latin American Events entitled "A Brief Sketch of Editor Dr. Nunez Portuondo."

I think that we will all agree upon the great desirability and the need of maintaining the most cordial, friendly, and mutually helpful relationships with our Latin American neighbors.

We are bound together as members of the Western Hemisphere community of nations and we truly cannot do too much to further and advance the great cause of hemisphere friendship and solidarity.

Nor can we do too much to combat the malignant and evil activities of the Marxists conspiracy whose minions are so busily engaged in trying to divide us from our Latin American friends so that communism can destroy free institutions and control and dominate free nations.

We must be deeply interested, too, in supporting and helping honest and sincere democratic governments and leaders in this hemisphere dedicated to the high aims of preserving our free religious, economic, social, and political institutions.

We must not only view with alarm the presence of terror and ruthless dictatorship, murder, anr corruption, but as a matter of national policy, we must be committed to join with all truly liberty-loving God-fearing, democratic-minded peoples to safeguard and preserve the free heritage of democracy and justice which is currently so gravely threatened and imperiled by monolithic communism.

We must ever continue to recognize that freedom is the central theme of the all-American political systems. Wherever it is threatened or repudiated by force, violence, and conspiracy, that great, priceless freedom of ours is in danger.

The article follows:

A BRIEF SKETCH OF EDITOR, DR. NÚÑEZ PORTUONDO

After a lifetime dedicated to international problems and principally devoted to the annihilation of the most damnable plague of the centuries—communism; and after trying to bring about a better understanding between the countries and Governments of Latin America and the United States of America, I have come to the conclusion that the majority of mistakes, many of which have caused incalculable damages to the solidarity between the Americas and have facilitated the development of Russian imperialism, that they are the result principally of the lack of adequate information about the problems and aspirations of these countries and governments.

For the last 7 years I have been the permanent representative of Cuba to the United Nations; I have been, during a 2-year period, a member of the Security Council of the United Nations and of its Disarmament Com-

mission. I have presided at each body on two occasions: in the difficult days of the conflict for the Suez Canal and during the barbaric invasion of Hungary by the Soviet hordes. For 3 years, I also represented my country in the Socio-Economic Council of the United Nations. I have attended, as a delegate of Cuba, a great many inter-American conferences.

I have always been of the opinion that it is necessary to unite all the countries and governments of the world to stop the advance of international communism. I feel, for many reasons, the United States of America is the natural and logical leader for the democratic cause and freedom throughout the world. Precisely because I have held firmly to this opinion, the spokesmen of the Moscow government has singled me out as the No. 1 enemy of international communism in Latin America. They have pictured me through their press, magazines, radio, and television as an unconditional servant of the United States of America and its foreign policy. Of course, this accusation is false. It is enough to read the minutes of the diaries of the sessions of the General Assembly, of the Socio-Economic Council, and of the Security Council of the United Nations to prove that no state no matter how powerful has acted in a more independent manner than Cuba in the last 7 years. I never undermined a vital interest of the United States because I feel that anything that may weaken it in these tragic times in which we live means helping the Soviet Union, her satellites, and secret allies so that they will succeed in their objective to convert all the world into a vast concentration camp.

With the same sincerity I must offer my opinion that I have been able to ascertain that the American people and its ruling bodies, as a general rule, lack the proper information about the existing problems beyond the confines of their geographical frontiers. This ignorance about Latin America and its political affairs, economic and social problems, is surprising and sad. There are some in America who consider us semi-savages with a very low standard of civilization and culture, incapable of enjoying the fruits of freedom and democracy.

The main obstacle to the rightful understanding between Latin Americans and North Americans is the erroneous concept of many American citizens that think that their way of life, their culture, their philosophy, and their science are unique and perfect. These groups of Americans feel that we must follow their guidance because we are incapable of doing for ourselves. They cannot see that the Anglo-Saxon countries have to be different, in virtues as well as in defects, from the Latin Americans, of Latin origin. Different but one not necessarily better than the other. This is also the main obstacle between a better understanding between the rest of the world and the United States of America.

I believe that the United States has made the mistake of not appreciating adequately the importance of Latin America, from the political point of view as well as from the economic point of view. Military alliances of great importance may be made outside America, but it is quite obvious that in case of war with the Soviet Union, the position of the United States would be untenable without the loyal adherence of all the Latin American nations. To count with this loyal adherence as a sure thing and unconditional is an error of incalculable consequences.

When a pro-Communist and anti-American regime took over in my country and I resigned irrevocably the office of Ambassador from Cuba to the United Nations, I find it a duty, following the trajectory of all my life, to try to inform in a truthful and impartial way the public and the ruling bodies of the United States what I think are the true conditions in the countries and governments of Latin America. I will also inform the Latin Americans of the true intentions of the United States in their relations with us.

To this end we are going to start our task by publishing a weekly letter, in English, which we will send to anyone interested in knowing our opinions, and facts about our America, and on some occasions we will give our opinions on world problems. Later, we will publish weekly letters in Spanish with different contents, trying to inform the different Latin American countries about events and decisions of the Government in Washington which may require explanations so that they can be rightfully interpreted. Fundamentally, because we think it is the most important, we will expose the gigantic maneuver which the Kremlin is undertaking to gain important factions of the public opinion and territories in the Latin American nations.

Labor-Management Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, what we are voting on today is the industrial survival of the North. Let us put the cards face up on the table.

Our distinguished colleagues from the Southland know exactly what they are doing, and at least they are loyal to their constituents. If they can hoodwink Republican Congressmen of the North into joining with them in the raid on northern industries, I cannot withhold the compliment of saying that they are smarter than their allies.

And yet, Mr. Chairman, while they are smart on one front, I sometimes wonder if on another front they exhibit the same evidence of awareness.

While to the industrial advantage of the South in its economic cold war with the North they are playing cronies with northern Republicans, very quietly, very cleverly, very effectively northern Republicans have infiltrated into ownership and control of the great newspapers of the South. Today most of the great daily newspapers south of the Mason and Dixon line are owned and controlled by northern Republicans. Temporarily the local managements of these Republican-owned newspapers play the southern game, taking on the garb of virtuous independence and seemingly adopting southern viewpoints, but when the shots are called on matters that count the command comes from Republican ownership north of Mason and Dixon.

I am not quarreling with the march of progress. I merely am pointing out the outlines of that progress that those who take the trouble to note what I am saying may make their own appraisements. The fact is that the old southern editors, men like the late Col. P. J. H. Mooney of the Scimitar in Memphis, are gone. Northern Republicans call the shots.

So when I see northern Republicans march up the aisle with southern Democrats, who no matter how much they may differ with their northern brethren in some areas do have a common share in the democratic heritage of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson, I wonder really who is being hoodwinked and who is being duped.

PRICE OF THE PRESIDENCY IN 1952

It may gain a temporary political advantage for northern Republicans to gang up with southern Democrats to speed the departure of mills and factories from Illinois, Michigan, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and the other States in the Middle West, the East, New England. Conceivably in the election of 1960 the alliance might bring a repetition of 1952 when Southern States gave their electoral votes to General Eisenhower and the price was paid in full by northern Republicans voting with southern Democrats to give to four Southern States the tidelands oil potentially worth twice the amount of the national debt and which thrice the Supreme Court of the United States had decreed belonged to all the people of the United States.

In those tideland oils was the wealth to carry the heavy load of popular education for all the children of all the States in the Union. There was the wealth, once the properties were developed, to pay off the huge national debt and restore this country to a condition of solvency, when every citizen could go to bed at night in the calm reflection that his country owed to no man as much as 1 red penny.

The alliance still holds that gave these properties, thrice by the Supreme Court of the United States declared to be the properties of all the people, to Southern States for their exclusive use and advantage.

I see no inconsistency with what is happening now with the giveaway of the tidelands oils properties to pay a Republican political debt.

SOUTH CONSCIOUS OF GREAT CHANGES

A great change is taking place in our United States, and of some of the repercussions the South is conscious and its Members in the Congress are alert. I am not as sure as the Republican leadership that the North is asleep in its complacency. There is too much talk in my own city of Chicago of industries planning the hike southward to contradict the Republican gamble on a complacent North. What happened to the textile industry of New England can happen to the industry of the Middle West.

From 1946 to 1954 there was an alarming migration of textile plants to the South.

In the Mid-Atlantic States—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania—some 190 textile firms employing 56,000 textile workers were liquidated in that period. These figures only refer to liquidations and do not take into consideration the hundreds of firms whose plants in 1954 were only operated from 50 to 75 percent of normal operations. In fact, the textile industry which employed around 1,280,000 in 1948, 6 years later employed some 950,000, a total loss of some 330,000 jobs.

In a speech before a meeting of the American Management Association in the fall of 1955, John C. Whitaker, chairman of the board of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. of North Carolina, condemned some southern communities for trying to lure plants from the North with promises of cheap labor and tax concessions.

"Such companies do not make good employers or first-class neighbors, no matter where they are located," Mr. Whitaker was quoted as saying in the New York Times of September 29, 1955.

Since 1955 the drive has been intensified. Its threat holds over the city of Chicago. It is a real, an immediate threat. As industrial plants need modernizing, just as the textile plants faced that need, Southern States reach out for them with the inducement of tax exemptions and cheap nonunion labor. Let my Republican colleagues from the North who today are voting with the South to take industries from the North and replant them in the South not underestimate the intelligence of our northern people.

MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR DRIVE

I have said that inducements to northern industry to run away to the South are: First, financial help in relocation and exemption from taxes, and second, low nonunion labor. From the northern standpoint, one is bad enough, the two together can be fatal.

Newsweek in its edition of February 11, 1957 said:

> In the multi-billion-dollar contest for new plants, every (Southern) State except two has a tax-supported agency to sing its siren song.

Tennessee offers tax-free factories to new industries through issuance of municipal bonds which are exempt from Federal taxation. There the taxpayers throughout the United States unwittingly give a subsidy to industries moving into Southern States.

Mayfield, Ky., offered $9,500,000 in industrial building revenue bonds for constructing an industrial building project "to be leased and used by the General Tire & Rubber Co."—Bond Buyer, April 4, 1959.

Delhi, La., offered $200,000 in bonds for the purpose of "acquiring an industrial plant building and providing necessary appurtenances therefor to be used for the purpose of manufacturing boats and trailers and leased by the town to Delhi Manufacturing Corp."—Bond Buyer, March 21, 1959.

Mississippi: As of 1955 built 99 new plants with the aid of a municipal bond issue. January 31, 1959, Bond Buyer listed industrial bond sales for the State totaling $1,790,000.

FIFTY-CENT-AN-HOUR WAGE SAVING

Challenge, December 1955, reported that Greenville Mills, Inc., saved $170,000 a year in municipal taxes and 50 cents an hour on average employees' wages, and was able to set higher work quotas because of the absence of organied labor.

Gainesville, Fla., is financing the construction of a Sperry plant with funds from the city employees' retirement fund.

Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi all allow tax exemption of new manufacturing establishments.

South Carolina allows a 5-year exemption on all but school levies.

Arkansas permits a 7-year tax exemption in textile mills. Source: National Municipal Review, March 1957; Dunn's Review, and Modern Industry, April 1958.

This is only part of the picture. It is sufficient, however, to show to our people in the industrial North that this is no child's play on the part of the South. The South is playing dead earnest and for keeps. Newsweek describes it as a multi-billion-dollar drive. My distinguished northern Republican colleagues, who either unwittingly or to grasp for a fleeting political advantage, are aiding and abetting, it seems to me are gambling pretty recklessly that their constituents are not smart enough to read the writing on the wall. I know men and women in the North pretty thoroughly. There are not any smarter people anywhere in the world and when you give them the facts you can bank your life on their common sense.

LOW WAGES THE CLINCHER

So much for the financial help and tax exemption part of the South's drive on the industries of the North. That threat, serious as it is, and certainly not to be laughed off, in itself would not be sufficient. The North might be forced to meet money with money, tax exemption with tax exemption, all of which would place greater and ruinous tax burdens on our States and communities.

But the clincher in the South's drive is the other half of the lure—cheap nonunion wages.

I want every section of our great country to prosper, and I want every section of our country to share in the bounties of the greatest land on earth. But I want every section to get its share in fair competition with other sections. I do not like what is now happening. I do not like to see Northern Republicans, in their grasp for a passing political advantage, walk up the aisle arm in arm with a Southern bloc that has the objective, worthy enough from the Southern standpoint, to take from the North its industries. Nor do I think that it is healthy in a democracy for any section of our great country to swap away control of its newspapers, which are expected eventually to influence if not control public sentiment, for a bunch of run-away factories.

In the Middle West our industries are unionized. Collective bargaining has given to our workers wages and working conditions that we wish to maintain. They cannot be maintained if the goods they produce must come into competition with the wares from factories where each individual worker must deal with his employer and accept what he is offered or go unemployed.

GOOD WAGES BENEFIT EVERYONE

Everyone in the Middle West has a stake in the outcome of the present economic cold war between the North and the South. Management and labor, of course, but in equal measure the merchants, who benefit from the buying power of a well-paid labor force. If organized labor should be crushed the clock in every home in Chicago would be set back half a century or more.

Hence in Chicago we have a real, a personal interest in the enactment of strong legislation that will strike effectively at crooks, scoundrels and racketeers, whether they operate within labor or within management. Because so many of our people are members of unions, and because all our people share in the benefits to our economy, we want to back up honest and responsible labor with legislation that will assure, as far as it is in human power, absolute integrity and full opportunity for democratic participation by the rank and file.

Our distinguished colleagues from the South who are backing the Landrum-Griffin bill do not have that interest. Their interest is not in remedying labor abuses, but in no unions at all. As long as the South can keep out the labor organizations, it will have a powerful weapon in the economic cold war with the North. My colleagues from the South know exactly what they are doing. I give them credit for astuteness.

LITTLE KNOWN ABOUT BILL

The Landrum-Griffin bill came from goodness knows where. It was never presented to the committee. It has been discussed very little in this debate, and then only in broad outlines. Busy as he is, I would venture to say the President of the United States has never read the bill. That is no reflection on the President. There are not many Members on this floor that have read the bill. And everybody who has read the bill seems agreed that it will require interpretation by the Supreme Court to determine what some of the language really means. It is probable that the Court will hold that under the terminology of the bill all peaceful picketing is prohibited. Some smart lawyers say so. I do not know. No one knows. In fact, no one knows very much about the Landrum-Griffin bill in detail.

But it does two things that have no relation to labor abuses and that bear directly on the issues of the economic cold war of the North and the South.

First, it makes almost impossible the unionizing of runaway plants from the North by providing that no work of organizing such as the posting of a peaceful picket line shall proceed until 30 percent of the employees have come out in the open. Under such circumstances, workers when their jobs are at stake, and their families may suffer, are not likely to venture far in bringing up their

wages to those of the North. If southern industries do not pay the same wages as northern industries to workers doing the same work on products that meet in competition on the national market it is self-evident that either the North will lose its industries or that low nonunion wages will be forced on the North to the tragic ruin of our economy.

The Landrum-Griffin bill throws every roadblock in the way of legitimate union organization. And until labor is organized in the South as it is in the North, so that one American worker gets the same pay for doing the same work, regardless of the State in which he works, the North will be under an unfair disadvantage. Provisions tucked in the Landrum-Griffin bill stack the cards against both management and labor in nothern industry.

SOUTHERN COURTS TO DECIDE

Secondly, the Landrum-Griffin bill will take certain labor disputes from Federal jurisdiction and throw them into State courts for determination. That, as a writer in one of Chicago's great daily newspapers says, in the South probably could mean the end of many unions. In a State determined to keep out unions in order to attract industries from the North, the legal means are supplied for plenty of discouragement to labor organizers.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried sincerely to be fair to my colleagues from the South. I think they realize that the time will come when industry in their section will be organized as it is in my section, but in their justifiable ambition to have an industrial South they understandably want to ward off the inevitable long enough to get a full haul of Northern factories with the lure of low wages, no unions.

CURRENT NEWS FROM SOUTH CAROLINA

If the North is not alert, there is every evidence of alertness in the South. I have in my hand a copy of the Charlotte Observer of August 7, 1959. That is certainly current—the news up to a week ago. Permit me to read from a dispatch in that newspaper from its correspondent at Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. Here is the dispatch:

Can a community discourage one plant with union affiliation and encourage another with union ties?

This is a problem that may confront this South Carolina capital soon.

It is a problem that could grow out of the way Columbia handles its present problem.

For this industry-hungry city is now tempted by a choice morsel to which it may have to say: "No thank you."

The possibility has been raised with the prospect that one of the Nation's largest shirt manufacturers, Cluett-Peabody, may locate a sewing plant here.

The company, maker of Arrow shirts, is highly reputable and responsible. But its plant would be the first unionized sewing shop in an area where other established plants have resisted the unions.

Suppose Cluett-Peabody was politely and courteously told about the local problem and asked to look elsewhere.

And, suppose a week later a giant Detroit automobile manufacturer would announce plans to build a plant here.

Would that industry be welcomed?

The automobile plant would bring more jobs, more money. It would be a tremendous shot in the arm to the local economy.

But it would bring in bigger and stronger unions.

AND A LETTER FROM MISSISSIPPI

That, Mr. Chairman, is the current situation in the fair city of Columbia in the great State of South Carolina. But the lure of low wages, no unions has been held out to northern industrialists from the very beginning of the economic cold war. Here is a letter of 5 years ago from a town in Mississippi, photostatic copies of which have been published:

PELAHATCHIE, MISS, *June 10, 1954.*

MR. HOBART J. HENDRICK,
President, H. B. Ives Co.,
New Haven, Conn.:

Greetings, Mr. Hendrick, as we cordially invite you to visit our beautiful community. We want your company to have the harmonious and highly successful experiences of operating in a veritable industrial paradise, and see how our wholehearted cooperation will do it for you.

For either a main or branch plant, we will provide the site and building just as you want them, make the carrying charges easy—eventually becoming as low as $1 per year, with taxes being exempted up to 99 years, and you make no capital outlay for them.

Then our wonderful labor, 98 percent native born, mostly high school graduates, will lower average hourly industrial wage rates 6 to 49 cents below other Southern States, and from 50 to 95 cents below Northern States. You will also get a much higher man production, some plants even getting double what they got in their northern plants. This labor is truly American, not inflicted with the something-for-nothing idea and works together joyously with management for the success of both.

Here you will also enjoy savings in power, fuel, utility, tax, and other costs. Raw materials are convenient, transportation facilities are good. No one will tell you whom you must employ and all detrimental State laws for industrial operations have been repealed. The closed union shop has just been outlawed in Mississippi.

You would be located in the heart of the entire southern area with its great markets for your products and not much competitive production of them in it. For a number of years ahead, the percentage of growth of these markets will probably be greater than in any other section of the United States. With the large savings in wage, production, and operating costs, while your plant is operating peacefully and successfully, it will put your company into a most favorable competitive position not only in the entire South but also over most of the country.

Our deep spirit of warm, friendly cooperation always behind your company will surely be an inspiration to your for its phenomenal success, which many industries in our State now enjoy. So we again most cordially invite you to visit our wideawake town. When you visit us, you will be delighted to see how we can make good on this and you, too, may like very much to join with us and together achieve and enjoy that phenomenal success. Will you come?

Sincerely,

TOWN OF PELAHATCHIE, MISS.
H. C. RHODES, *Mayor.*

TURNING BACK THE CLOCK

Mr. Chairman, I have finished. The Landrum-Griffin bill seems assured of passage. I shall vote against it, and I shall hope and pray that when the bill goes to conference with the Senate the good in the bill will be left, and the bad, or the ill advised because inadequately considered, will be extracted.

I am 77. I have been through the fight of our people of many long years to bring the wages and working conditions of labor in the North to the present standards under which the worker enjoys dignity and the community benefits from the buying power of labor. I will not be a party to turning back the clock. I have put too much of my life into a cause which, to me, has been worthwhile in broadening the horizons of human contentment.

The South has advantages in climate, nearness to international markets, many advantages, and industry inevitably will be divided, according to the circumstances and requirements of each industry, between North and South. The economic cold war between North and South will terminate in advantage to both. But it will reach no such termination until the worker in the South receives, for the same work, the same pay as the worker in the North. Nor will the economy in the South be on the same wholesome basis as that in the North; nor will the southern merchant benefit from the same market with similar buying power, until organization of honest labor has rescued the southern worker from the condition of bargaining individually with his employer and accepting what he is offered or going unemployed.

Today the average annual income of an American in the State of Mississippi, after personal taxes and basic expenditures, is $418 as compared with $5,691 in the State of Illinois, according to the 1958 report of the U.S. Department of Commerce. When I was Lieutentant Governor of Illinois in the period beginning in 1913, and chairman of a commission investigating the wages of the workers of our country, the average annual wage of all workers in Illinois was slightly over $600. But for organized labor we would still be in a condition comparable to that now of Mississippi.

With all respect for the loyalty to the South of my southern colleagues, I must respectfully remind them that in the present economic cold war the loyalty of the gentleman from Illinois is to Illinois and his constituents in the city of Chicago.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

A Portrait of Individualism: The Student Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, every State is proud of its university, and particularly of its State university. Texans are proud of the University of Texas for many reasons—for its progressive educational policies, for its stimulating atmosphere, and for its distinguished faculty.

The University of Texas has, in addition, an excellent newspaper, and I ask unanimous consent that an article from that paper, the Daily Texan, of August 14, 1959, entitled, "A Portrait of Individualism: The Student Is" which describes life at the university, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PORTRAIT OF INDIVIDUALISM: THE STUDENT IS

(By Jo Eickmann)

We are the students of the University of Texas.

In one respect we are all alike—we are students, in the United States and, more specifically, in Texas. This you can say about us all. But here you must stop. For this is the point at which classification breaks down, at which you must no longer refer to us as the student body as a whole but instead as the student body individually.

For one thing is certain. We are individuals. Those who seek to pigeonhole us with the words, "beat, irresponsible, going to the dogs, conformists, security seekers, radicals" or any other of the thousand oversimplified labels, do so because they do not know us.

Being American students, we form a cross section of our society. We cannot be justly compared to our contemporaries in Europe. They are often the intellectual elite or the economic aristocrats of their countries. We are not.

Do not sneer and say that we are not as politically conscious, as well-informed, as thirsty for knowledge as they. Some of us are. Do not look for all 18,000 of us to unite in some great student movement to protest this action or to lead the fight against that injustice. Chances are that we will not.

Don't look for any action by the whole student body. The entire student body will never act, only individuals or groups (sometimes large) of individuals within it. When you look at us as a whole, we are deceiving. We appear to have no causes to support, no ideals to fulfill, no goals to seek. When you look at us as a composite picture, we cancel out each other's attitudes and beliefs—the segregationist is balanced by the integrationist, the liberal by the conservative, the States-righter by the civil righter.

We are a plurality, not a unity.

Oh, there are trends that unite us, ideas that we hold in common, fashions of thought and action that bind some of us into "a majority of the students."

For instance, we are weary of a good many of the things that were the essence of college life in our parents' days. We are not as interested as we "should be" in the activities that people think we should be concerned about. The raccoon coat and college pennant are not gone, but they certainly are hidden in the closet. The school spirit that we haul out each fall at football games is as much of an act as the frightening poise with which some of us meet the "older generation."

Without really being blase, we are not ready to get excited about things. We are not so anxious to picket the President's Office or march on the Capitol as we once might have been. We have fewer "causes" and are less willing to support tenaciously any single idea or plan of actions as "the only way."

Perhaps it is because we are complacent. Many of us are having too much fun to be concerned about anything. But some of us are vitally concerned about—international politics, religion, art—a thousand interests. Still, we are less intense than we might be, less fanatical than the traditional view of the student. Perhaps this is because our worlds have broadened, because we are more cosmopolitan.

At the university we meet people not only from all parts of American life, but also from most of the cultures and countries of the world. Provincialism has to yield, if only a little bit, under the influence of these contacts.

There are unifying norms of "accepted" behavior that bind us together with a common slang, a Saturday football game, a coffee break, and a school "uniform". We wear our white socks and fraternity pins in a frantic search for acceptance and group identity. There is a security in this superficial conformity that most of us find comforting.

But always some of us find the accepted patterns stifling and become loud rebels. Like fetishes we wear our "individualism" on the sleeves of our boat-necked tee shirts and form our own, equally rigid code of behavior; organize our own groups.

Perhaps because the university is big, we can never become the student body as a whole. Perhaps we can never establish a bond of spirit to unite us in a common purpose. You see, many of us never see the university as a whole. For 4 or more years we isolate ourselves from the big picture by revolving in our own little spheres of activity.

We stick our noses deep into our special corners of the campus—athletics, sorority or fraternity, boardinghouse, church foundation, library—and take care never to come out. Thus we live in a vacuum, and some of us are contented. Some of us are lonely. But right or wrong, we are isolated.

Yet even in our isolation, we are a paradox, for superficially we are the friendliest, most open people in the world. Our loneliness, our inability to communicate with one another are hidden behind a smiling facade of southwestern hospitality and American informality.

There is not, of course, the warmth of a small college atmosphere about the 40 acres. The university is too large for that. But the "big hello" is practiced by more students than campus politicians, and a smile from a stranger is not too hard to come by. Granted, one must make the first effort but friendship is there for the taking if one seeks it out.

The openness, however, is only smile deep. For love of privacy or fear of being hurt, many of us sharply close the door on more meaningful friendships. We keep our souls a secret, and are afraid or unable to tell each other about the things that matter most to us.

Some of us don't care. Some of us are content with bridge playing or beer-drinking buddies. For some, "college is a blast, man, and what's this bit about communicating anyway?"

But deep inside, after all the endless talk about quizzes, dates, sports, and sex is over, some of us are still unsatisfied knowing how lonely we are. So we talk more. And perhaps we find the right people to talk to. We feel accepted, and we know that with these few friends at least, no one will reject us for anything heretical or disappointing that we may say.

These are the times when we stay up all night discussing and questioning—our existence, our society, our religious beliefs. Perhaps for the first time we really share our dreams and ambitions and feel satisfied—knowing that someone understands.

We have come to the university for a thousand different reasons—because we wanted an education; because Mom and Dad wanted us to come; because "a college education is a good thing to have;" because "you need a degree to get a good job;" because we wanted to get married.

Too many of us have come here with only the after-commencement future in mind. We see the university as 4 more years of an educational period separate from living, not as a vital part of life itself. When we get out, probably we will be not so much interested in a better world as we are in a more comfortable one.

A few of us have come to learn. We are excited by knowledge. We will sometimes abuse the sacred cows of class routine to explore books and ideas on our own. For us graduation will be commencement—a beginning of a continuing process of learning.

Some of us will starve for knowledge in the midst of its abundance simply because no one has ever awakened us from the complacency of getting by.

Some of us are good students who deceive our friends and professors into thinking that we are exceptional because we have learned how to regurgitate enough facts and ideas to make good grades. Others are on sco pro because we are hopelessly unprepared for college work.

There are those of us here who will discover the university in its totality, who will graduate having tasted of the finest things Texas has to offer. We will have known and loved university traditions. We will have found the rich human personality of the campus in a hundred scrub women, professors, secretaries, campus policemen, deans, and newsboys. From the university's libraries, art galleries, and cultural events, we will have taken the equipment for enjoying a full life in a world full of beauty.

On the other hand, some of us will be lost here. Overwhelmed by the idea of being one in 18,000, we will learn to know only a handful of people. When we leave, it will be with a sigh of relief that it is over.

We are the students of the University of Texas. Being people, we are different from each other. Rich, poor, world-weary or eager, we blaze our paths or follow our ruts in the world—individually. And you cannot classify us justly, for we are, first of all, ourselves.

A Bill To Eliminate Stock Dividend Exclusion Provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill in the House today which would eliminate the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which allow an individual to exclude from his gross income for income tax purposes the first $50 of dividends received in a taxable year. In other words, what this amounts to is a repeal of section 116 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

I would like to explain my reasons for introducing this particular piece of legislation. First, let me go into the circumstances which led to the presence of this provision in the 1954 act. It was put there not so much as a benefit to the individual taxpayer as it was a gesture toward eliminating double taxation on corporate profits. Now, I am as much against the idea of double taxation as anyone else, where it can possibly be achieved. However, this particular provision is not of any real help to the taxpayers who derive benefits from stock dividends. The amount which is allowed for exclusion is entirely too small to be of benefit either to the small investor to the large. In fact, there is no real distinction that can be made between the benefits that each one gets, except perhaps that it is proportionally greater for the small investor than for the large one. So what we are really doing under this section of the act, Mr. Speaker, is depriving the Federal Treasury of several million dollars per year in the rather empty gesture, as I said before, of attempting to avoid double taxation. And yet we are not really being of any material assistance to the individual taxpayer. Hence, my reasons for introducing this bill.

Now, to get to the crux of the matter, I completely agree that we should avoid double taxation on corporate profits. However, I think this should be done by either completely exempting stock dividend funds of corporations, or we should levy the full tax upon such funds prior to their distribution, and then after distribution, exempt the individual taxpayer from having to pay any taxes on the money he received.

I am aware that the House Ways and Means Committee is going to undertake a thorough reexamination of our Internal Revenue Code during the adjournment of Congress. I therefore realize that this bill and others which I have introduced affecting our present tax structure will probably never be enacted into law. However, I want to have these particular things a matter of record, and I sincerely hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will see fit to take all pending bills affecting the Internal Revenue Code under study at the time that they deal with this complex but highly important problem.

Payment in Lieu of Taxes to Communities Where Federal Property Is Located

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that today the high costs are hitting not only the individual American and Uncle Sam, but also State and local governments attempting to meet the needs of ever-increasing populations.

As a matter of fact, a great many local communities are having difficulties in finding the tax money to provide needed water, sewage and other public services.

The difficulty becomes particularly acute in areas in which there is substantial amount of Federal, non-tax-paying property. The existence of such property not only deprives the community of a tax source; it also amounts to an expense since often the area must be provided regular community services.

We recall that earlier this year, the Government Operations Committee held hearings on a bill S. 910—which I was pleased to cosponsor—to provide that under certain conditions the Government would make payments to communities in lieu of the taxes that would normally have derived from Federal property in the area.

As I understand it, the Treasury Department has now withdrawn its objections to enactment of this bill. I would hope, therefore, that the Government Operations Committee will find it possible to give consideration to it as early as possible.

We are aware, of course, that Uncle Sam, too, is having difficulties in finding enough income to meet the outgo. However, the question arises as to whether or not Uncle Sam's money problems can justify the existence of an inequitable situation in which communities are deprived of tax sources as the result of Federal non-tax-paying property. As a matter of fact, such Federal property not only results in loss of revenue, but in addition, adds expense to the local community by requiring public services.

I am aware, of course, that there is on the calendar a bill, S. 2026, which would establish a commission which would have as one of its objectives resolving these problems between local, State, and Federal Governments.

Frankly, I feel the establishment of the commission would contribute toward clarification of these intergovernmental relations. Meanwhile, I would hope that expeditious consideration could be given to the bill S. 910 which would initiate action toward providing greater equity to communities where Federal property is located.

We recognize, of course, that this is extremely important to local governments throughout the country.

This morning, I received a telegram from Mr. B. F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of County Officials, urging action on S. 910. I ask unanimous consent to have the telegram printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *August 19, 1959.*

Senator WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Administration through Treasury Department now supports payments in lieu of taxes bill, S. 910. Major breakthrough. As cosponsors of S. 910 counties urge you request immediate favorable action by Government Operations Committee.

B. F. HILLENBRAND,
Executive Director, National Association of County Officials.

Textile Imports From Low-Wage Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 13, 1959:

OFF THE RECORD

A point made: This week 245,000 Japanese textile employees went on strike for a 15 percent increase in wages On the basis of American pay scales, this is a whopping big demand. But the Japs, who are averaging only $40 a month, are asking just a $6 monthly raise.

Japanese textile manufacturers oppose the increase. They say it would cause a 2 or 3 percent rise in the cost of Japanese textile products and that this would seriously impair the competitive position of the mills in the world market.

Even if this claim of the Jap mill owners is only partly true, it sums up a situation which Congress and the administration in Washington have persistently ignored. Japanese mills have been modernized and rebuilt since World War II. They can buy American cotton under the subsidy program at 8

cents less a pound than can American mills. And, as the strike demands indicated, Jap labor can be hired at $9.25 a week, or less than the average American textile employee earns in a single day.

If the Japs, with all these factors in their favor, fear for their competitive position in the world market, then it should be obvious that the American mills have no competitive position whatever. They can sell in the world market only those products the low-wage countries are presently unable to supply.

American aid programs are working around the clock to build up textile production in the underdeveloped countries. As each mill begins spinning and weaving, the output of that mill must be added to the supply of textile products available in the world market. Because these are low-wage products, the demand for American textiles will be reduced in direct ratio. Japan and India may compete for sales with other low-wage countries but America will be out of the running.

Loss of export sales will be a serious blow to the American textile industry. But even this is minor compared to the damage that will result if Congress and the administration permit any serious invasion of the domestic market by the textile products of these low-wage countries. Japan has already demonstrated her ability to wreck prices in the United States. Imports of textiles must be strictly controlled unless the American textile industry is to be written off as expendable.

Death of Dr. Irvin B. Hill, Director, Fairview Home for Retarded Children, Near Salem, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, not all heroes serve on the field of battle, amidst shot and shell. Some are in surgeries, hospital wards, and even nurseries. Such a man was Dr. Irvin B. Hill, superintendent of the Fairview Hospital for retarded children, in our State. Dr. Hill died last week at the tragically young age of 44.

He was a frail, wisp of a man whose physical strength had been sapped by an early bout with tuberculosis, from which he never wholly recovered his original health. Yet he carried on indomitably, dedicated to his young patients and to their eventual return—if at all possible—to mental stability and full recovery.

As a member of the Oregon State Legislature, my wife, Maurine, worked closely with Irvin Hill in sponsoring legislation for the benefit of the retarded children in his care. She and I mourn his passing. We wish we had the benefit of his brave spirit in helping us to promote, at the Federal level, bills which I have introduced to increase grants for the training of teachers who will assist retarded boys and girls.

Mr. President, an eloquent tribute to the gallantry of Dr. Irvin Hill was published in the Oregon Daily Statesman of Salem for August 18, 1959. This editorial is entitled "Well Done." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in memory of our friend, Irving B. Hill, doctor of medicine and friend of mankind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELL DONE

Dr. Irvin B. Hill's figure was so thin it seemed as though a strong wind would carry him away. While he had to live under a careful regimen due to an earlier bout with tuberculosis, actually he kept himself quite fit for his duties as superintendent of Fairview, the State's home for subnormal persons. That is, until this year when he suffered from pneumonia. He returned to duty, but a combination of pulmonary trouble and a weakened heart claimed his life Monday.

As superintendent of Fairview, Dr. Hill carried very successfully a heavy load of administration. He supervised its postwar expansion which brought many notable improvements: a new hospital, new administration building, new cottages. The enrollment kept growing too, but Dr. Hill's goal was to provide facilities so the applications would be kept current. Dr. Hill combined professional skill and administrative talent with human sympathy which is indispensable in ministering properly to the inmates of Fairview, mostly children and youth. Called from duty at the comparatively early age of 44, he deserves the accolade, "well done."

Unjustified Delay in Confirming of Presidential Appointees to the Federal Bench

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] performed a service when he spoke out in protest against the continuing delay on the part of the majority side of the Senate in respect of the confirmation of 19 Presidential appointees to the Federal bench.

The protracted and wholly unjustifiable delay in the southern district of New York is particularly outrageous. President Eisenhower has nominated three outstanding members of the legal profession to the Federal bench in New York. To the U.S. Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, he nominated Henry Friendly, one of New York's most distinguished lawyers. Incidentally, the Senate subcommittee has not even seen fit to call a hearing for Mr. Friendly. This particular court, because of the volume and type of appellate cases it hears, is not exceeded in importance by any other.

Two other distinguished lawyers, Charles M. Metzner and Lloyd McMahon await confirmation to the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York. This court is the busiest Federal trial court in the country. As of June 30 of this year there were 10,937 civil cases pending in this court as yet untried. Under present circumstances it will take 2 years for any one of these cases to reach the top of the trial calendar. This is a condition which has existed for a long time and which everyone agree requires immediate attention. Everyone agrees that justice delayed is justice denied. Everyone agrees that not only should these vacancies be filled, but that additional Federal judges are needed. Nor, is it disputed, even by those who share in the responsibility for feet-dragging on these confirmations, that the nominees for this court, as in the case of Mr. Friendly for the court of appeals, are eminently qualified.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that these remarks are directed toward the hardship caused the public by this inordinate delay. It is worth noting, however the personal and professional hardships caused these distinguished gentlemen who have been nominated for these posts.

Mr. Speaker, it is beginning to look as if those Senators on the majority side who are in a position to push the buttons which would spring loose these nominations from the political web in which they are ensnarled are satisfied to let the matter drift as long as there is an absence of outraged public indignations. If public pressure and indignation are necessary to make the powers that be bestir themselves, then let us start generating it. The public—and that includes me—has had enough "politicking" with the administration of justice.

Southwest Texas Dean Nolle Retiring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, after 40 years of service, Dr. Alfred H. Nolle is retiring this fall as dean of Southwest Texas State College at San Marcos, Tex.

This school, Mr. President, is my alma mater.

To me, as he has been to thousands, Dean Nolle was a guide, a counselor, a friend, and a great inspiration.

Announcement of this good man's approaching retirement was carried August 16, 1959, in the Austin (Tex.) American Statesman, in an article entitled "Southwest Texas Dean Nolle Retiring," and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHWEST TEXAS DEAN NOLLE RETIRING

SAN MARCOS.—Dr. Alfred H. Nolle, dean of Southwest Texas State College, will retire this fall after 40 years of service to the college, 37 of them as dean.

Dr. Nolle came to Southwest Texas in 1919 as a professor of German and became dean of the college in 1922.

Dr. Nolle, a native of Missouri, earned both the bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degrees in education at the University of Missouri. At the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., he received his master of arts degree. He earned his Ph. D. degree from the University of Pennsylvania.

Before coming to Southwest Texas, Dr. Nolle studied at the Universities of Berlin and Jena in Germany, where he met his wife, the former Brenda Stewart Wilson, of Washington, D.C. She was a piano student at the Stern Conservatory.

The Nolles have one son, Alfred H., Jr., who is now professor of physics, research scientist (consultant), defense research laboratory; and director of research in properties of liquids and solids at the University of Texas.

Dr. Nolle has taught German at the Universities of the South, Pennsylvania, and Missouri. He wears the Phi Beta Kappa and the Alpha Chi keys, and is a member of Phi Delta Kappa and Phi Mu Alpha.

While in Missouri, Dean Nolle was an instructor in the Student Army Training Corps, the World War I equivalent of ROTC and held the rank of major. He was a charter member and one-time chairman of the Conference of Academic Deans of the United States. He was a charter member of the San Marcos Kiwanis Club and a member of the Kiwanis Legion of Honor.

Dr. and Mrs. Nolle are members of the St. Mark's Episcopal Church in San Marcos. Dr. Nolle, a lay reader, has been a member of the executive board of the diocese of west Texas, and chairman of the West Texas Diocese Committee on the State of the Church.

Highlighting his recent years was the presentation of the honorary doctor of laws degree at East Texas Baptist College in 1957. The dean received many letters of congratulations on that occasion, which have been bound and presented to him.

He carried the nickname "Knuckles Nolle" due to a story about a suspected (though false) "ring of card sharks and gamblers among the progressors" which appeared in the Southwest Texas newspaper in 1947. He was presented a pair of brass knuckles with his name engraved on them.

The dean is quick to correct any notion that his retirement will be inactive. He will move from his present office in the administration building to a new one in the library, where he will attend his duties as executive secretary of Alpha Chi.

He will also continue as the Alpha Chi representative on the National Honors Council and chairman of the committee on standards and classification for the Association of Texas Colleges, of which he has formerly been secretary, vice president, and president.

The Panama Canal and the Monroe Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Bulletin of the Southern States Industrial Council, dated August 15, 1959, and written by Mr. J. Clifford Miller, Jr., president of the council:

THE PANAMA CANAL AND THE MONROE DOCTRINE

In its recent declaration of policy the council emphasized its opposition to any surrender of the ownership of the United States in the Panama Canal, and it urged the Congress not to surrender in any degree the jurisdiction over and control of the Canal Zone vested in this Nation under its contract (1903) by treaty with the Panamanian Government.

This course was prompted by action of the Republic of Panama through its National Assembly, incited by Nationalists and other politicians, over the protest of the United States, in extending its territorial waters from the internationally recognized 3-mile limit to a 12-mile limit, and thus asserting control over a 9-mile stretch of ocean between the canal terminals and the open sea.

On January 9, 1959, Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, Democrat of Pennsylvania, a recognized authority on the Panama Canal, told the House of Representatives that this is only one of many recent moves by Panama to undermine our control of the canal. He said:

"This is a matter that cannot safely be ignored. We must not permit the creation of another Berlin at this artery of world commerce."

According to an article by Demaree Bess (Saturday Evening Post, May 9, 1959.) "The Panama Danger Zone," "However, other Members of Congress did ignore his warning. Not one of them publicly commented on his speech, and it did not get a single line in Washington and New York newspapers which specialize in foreign news."

The only other voice we have heard raised on this situation is that of Senator THOMAS E. MARTIN, of Iowa, who, on May 12, 1959, had excerpts from the Demaree Bess article referred to printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On July 7, 1959, Mr. FLOOD again brought this matter to the attention of the House, and put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of July 4, 1959, which began with this challenging statement:

"For some reason it has been difficult to arouse much concern, among either politicians or the public, about what is going on to the south of us in Latin America."

And it continues, if "a Communist beachhead is being attempted in this hemisphere" the challenge "would have to be met by this country on the principle" of the Monroe Doctrine.

There can be little, if any, question about the dangers confronting us all over the Caribbean. And the fact that we are either ignorant of these disturbing elements or just don't care about their effect on the future of our country is highly disturbing.

Have we become so absorbed in our effort to save Europe, the Mideast, and Far East from communism, that the spirit, as well as the letter of the Monroe Doctrine are as dead as the proverbial dodo? If you say the Monroe Doctrine applied only to European imperialism, I ask, was that imperialism more dangerous to our liberties than is the imperialistic slavery sought to be imposed on this hemisphere by international communism?

In the words of the Monroe Doctrine, we "declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere, as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Sincerely yours,

J. CLIFFORD MILLER,
President.

Reclamation Projects Yield Wide Variety of Essential Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, most of us here in the Congress understand why western reclamation is of economic importance to the whole country as well as essential to the development of the West. But not all of our national press does, particularly in the East.

No writers can express the point more clearly than the editors of the McClatchy newspapers in California which publish papers in Sacramento, Modesto, and Fresno. As an excellent statement of the reasons for continuing and expanding western reclamation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Sacramento Bee of August 9, 1959, entitled "Reclamation Projects Yield Wide Variety of Essential Benefits."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Aug. 9, 1959]

RECLAMATION PROJECTS YIELD WIDE VARIETY OF ESSENTIAL BENEFITS

In this drought year of 1959, when the main rivers of California would be a series of dry sandbars were it not for projects such as the Shasta and Folsom Dams, it is no less than amazing that there are those who are critical of the western reclamation program.

A recent Washington, D.C., Post editorial deserves note because it reflects the astigmatic view shared by many in the East that the Federal program should be reexamined on the ground it brings more land into agricultural production while the Nation has large surpluses in wheat, corn, cotton, etc.

This is totally fallacious and shows a lack of knowledge of the true nature and overall purposes of these projects.

A quick answer, of course, is to point out the fact the crops largely produced on lands irrigated by those big Federal dams are not in surplus and are not under any Government program. That in itself should be enough but there is much more to the story.

These great multipurpose projects provide a vast variety of benefits aside from irrigation.

They provide flood control. Without Shasta, Folsom, Friant, and other dams, California would have been subjected to a series of catastrophic floods during the last decade. The floods which did occur happened because projected dams had not been built.

They produce electric power. They aid navigation. They hold back the salt water from the sea which otherwise might spell ruin for the fabulously rich Sacramento-San Joaquin delta. They provide recreation for the people. And of extreme importance, they give many communities dependable supplies of domestic and industrial water.

Without the reclamation projects the great development of the West would have been seriously restricted. For example, without its allocation of 390 million gallons a day from Colorado River water stored behind Hoover Dam, Los Angeles would have

reached the maximum of its population and industrial growth some time ago.

To a large extent the reclamation projects in California have not added significant acreages to agricultural production.

They have provided surface supplies to already producing lands which had been irrigated by pumping but which were threatened with extinction due to the failure of the underground supplies.

And in some cases the introduction of reclamation water has made it possible to transform land formerly devoted to grains, which are in surplus, to the production of fruits and vegetables, which are not.

The Post says it is time Congress gave thought to retiring land from cultivation instead of adding more. And by inference one could gather the Post believes it might be a good thing to let the area to be served by the proposed San Luis project dry up.

It is hard to imagine anything more foolish. If ample water were provided, much of the land growing grain and cotton inevitably would be turned to orchards and vegetable crops.

But even were cotton to be the chosen crop, the Post's point still falls flat. The San Joaquin Valley produces a long staple cotton which is in much demand, and the per acre yield is from 5 to 10 times that of some cotton-growing sections of the South.

If there is need to retire cotton land from production, it certainly would make more sense to retire some of the poor and tired land in the South than to let the extremely fertile acres in the San Luis area revert to a desert, which they will without San Luis water.

Moreover, in respect to the Federal San Luis project, while it is designed primarily for irrigation, it also is to be an integral part of a bigger plan to transport water to southern California where it will be needed for domestic and industrial purposes a little more than a decade hence.

The Post is generous enough in its appraisal to say the reclamation projects for the most part pay for themselves.

They do, and more. Not only do the users pay for the projects but the great developments which spring from these projects contribute vastly to the economy of the Nation in general and to the Federal Treasury in particular in the way of taxes.

For one to say the reclamation program is a case of the Government putting out money to which the Government must put out more money is missing the point at both ends. Such a statement either is due to ignorance or is rank misrepresentation.

Youth Conservation Corps Act Would Fill a Vital Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other body recently adopted S. 812, an act providing for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps, a group which would serve not only to train young men in healthful outdoor conservation activities at a time when employment prospects in many sections of our country are low, but which would also contribute greatly to the promotion of reforestation and conservation projects in many of the key outdoor mountain areas of our country.

Some weeks ago I introduced similar legislation in the House, H.R. 7686. I believe that no finer job could be performed by Congress than passing this legislation before we adjourn for this session.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a thoughtful editorial from the Oneonta Star of August 18, 1959, stressing the positive contributions of such a corps in the beautiful mountain and outdoor regions of Otsego County in New York State, and also an editorial which appeared in this morning's Washington Post:

[From the Oneonta Star, Aug. 18, 1959]

SENATE CONSIDERING BILL TO ESTABLISH YOUTH CORPS

The Senate is again considering a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps which would enable thousands of young men to work in Federal parks, forests, and wildlife areas, and on other conservation projects. The only sensible argument thus far advanced against this measure is that such a program would be expensive.

In evaluating this argument, one must consider what the program is intended to accomplish, and what it might in fact accomplish. The new youth corps is patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of two decades ago, but some of its objectives are different from those of the old CCC. The differences are important.

The CCC was essentially an economic measure, a plan to give employment to young men who otherwise would have been idle. It did have great side benefits for the public; some of the work done by the CCC youths, such as tree planting at Gilbert Lake State Park, is valuable to this day. The Youth Conservation Corps now envisioned would be mainly that—a means of getting young men off the streets and into healthful, productive, character-building outdoor work. And as before, the work done would be of general public benefit.

It is true that the program would be expensive—$375 million annually after the first couple of years. This must be balanced against the benefits in terms of the conservation, both human and material, that would result.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 20, 1959]

YOUTH AND THE LAND

The plan approved by the Senate to establish a Youth Conservation Corps similar to the depression-born Civilian Conservation Corps deserves to be judged in broader terms than its opponents, including the President, have apparently employed so far. Their objections to the cost of the venture need to be considered, of course, but we cannot for a moment believe that the expense would be anything like the astronomical scare figures cited by Senate Republicans. Indeed, is it not possible that the plan would result in some real—if not bookkeeping—economies?

The proposal is to enlist volunteer boys from 16 to 21 years of age for work in the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges at basic pay of $60 a month. Make work ought of course to be avoided—but considering the enormous public land holdings and the growing public demands upon national park facilities this ought not to be difficult. An efficiently administered program should increase the value of the parks and refuges in a most economical way, at the same time affording exceptional opportunities for young men to learn useful skills and to round out their own mental and physical development in a wholesome atmosphere. We think the plan could be a happy blending of two of the country's greatest assets—its land and its youth—and that the measure ought to be enacted.

Nixon Missed Great Opportunity in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I send to the desk an editorial from the Anderson Independent newspaper of Anderson, S.C., of August 19, 1959, entitled "NIXON Missed Great Opportunity in Russia."

I believe this editorial has pointed up a tremendous advantage that the United States missed in teaching the Russian people a lesson that we Americans depend on God in our daily living.

This editorial points out that no news came from Russia to indicate that Vice President NIXON attended church on Sunday while he was in Russia. There is no criticism of Mr. NIXON personally for not having attended church, because we all know he is a regular attender of church in the United States; the point is that Mr. NIXON missed a terrific propaganda opportunity when he failed to attend church in Russia.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anderson (S.C.) Independent, Aug. 19, 1959]

NIXON MISSED GREAT OPPORTUNITY IN RUSSIA

Mr. NIXON, who has drawn nothing but praise for his travels in Russia, in our opinion missed one great chance to show the Russians the solid rock upon which this country has built its greatness.

To the best of our knowledge he did not go to a church service while over there.

We read in detail about his spending one Sunday at the country dacha or villa of Premier Khrushchev, the boat rides on the river, the walks in the flower gardens, and all that. If he had been in Washington he and his family would probably have been at church, for he attends regularly. Once, on tour of Florida, he worshipped in beautiful Christ Methodist Church, St. Petersburg, of which Dr. Paul R. Hortin, well known in Anderson, is pastor.

If Mr. NIXON had simply told his Russian hosts that he would like to go to one of the few churches that are left in Russia and in fact had insisted on it and gone, we believe there would have been a different feeling toward him and this country than there is today. The Russian leader may not have liked this procedure, but we believe that he would have appreciated his visitor all the more.

America owes all its greatness to the goodness of God. Its founders realized this gift and acknowledged it. They looked upon God as a partner in their efforts toward liberty and freedom. "In God We Trust" is our motto. America's churches are its strongest

bulwark against any anti-God rule, such as Russia has today.

We don't know what the plans are for Mr. Khrushchev, but we do hope that someone guides him toward a church on a Sabbath morning where he can see freedom-loving people worship according to the dictates of their conscience and in their own way. We have an idea that the Premier, who claims to be an agnostic, but who is a smart man withal, would understand and maybe appreciate the service. We could recommend a large number of churches here in this favored region that would give him a quick insight into the power that religion wields in our lives.

Mr. NIXON could have set the pattern by going to church in Russia even though the Russians might have scoffed at him. Most of all he could have shown the Russians that Americans depend on God in their daily lives.

Deplores Lack of Empathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, a letter which appeared in the August 8, 1959, issue of the Waukesha Daily Freeman vividly illustrates the lack of empathy among so many of us. The author, Mr. Tom Miglautsch, chides the editor of the Daily Freeman, which is an outstanding newspaper published in my congressional district in Wisconsin, for his criticism of the Kennedy-Morse bill to raise the minimum wage to $1.25 and of the Forand bill to provide medical and hospital care for our senior citizens. However, it seems to me that Mr. Miglautsch's comments should be read by all of us in Congress, since our inaction on these matters, perhaps, indicates an equal lack of empathy. It is for this reason that I am inserting his thoughtful letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The letter follows:

HAPPY FREEMAN HAS DISCOVERED EMPATHY

To the FREEMAN:

It is gratifying to note that the Freeman has editorially discovered the word "empathy"—I quote "the imaginative projection of one's own consciousness into another being (putting yourself in the shoes of someone else)." During years of reading the Freeman editorially, I have been frustrated by the lack of that very quality—empathy.

For example: In recent weeks you have had not one, but two editorials criticizing the proposed increase in the Federal minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 an hour as "inflationary." Now $1.25 an hour—that's $50 for a 40-hour week, or about $40 a week take-home pay—is roughly $2,000 annual salary. This is inflationary? Management salaries run to $50,000, $100,000—even $500,000 a year. No Freeman editorial has criticized them—they presumably are not inflationary. If the Freeman editors lack empathy for the person or family that must subsist on $2,000 income a year, they are obviously not completely without empathy.

Recently the press reported the suicide of an elderly couple. The woman left a note explaining that they were both desperately ill and had no money for medical care. Her closing remarks were, "For God's sake do something to give medical care to old people." Well, the "do-gooders," those "spenders" down in Washington are trying to do just that. They have a bill—the Forand bill—which would provide free medical and hospital care to those retired on social security. Our elder citizens in their day worked—not 8, but 10 and 12 hours, 6 days a week to build this productive America which now gives most of us an abundant life with increased leisure. Yet most retired couples live on less than $1,000 income per year. If it were not for social security (that Socialist bill passed by the "spenders")—millions would be absolute destitute. It takes "empathy" to feel the plight of these aged citizens. The Freeman? They editorially attacked the Forand bill as "the opening wedge to socialize medicine." The American Medical Association (AMA) triggered its members to flood Congressmen with letters against this free medical and hospital care for the aged—the bill died in committee.

I have often wondered why the great American free press has largely gravitated into the hands of those who have such empathy for the well-to-do taxpayer, and so little for those in the lower third of our society. Any student of economics knows that a basic reason for our recurring depressions is the lack of adequate purchasing power among the lower one-third to buy needed goods to clear the retailers' shelves so the inventories don't back up to the factory and throw men out of work. From the very practical and selfish standpoint of keeping ahead of Russia, which has no unemployment, we should subsidize our less privileged citizens if necessary to keep consumption equal to production. It would be so much more gracious if such generosity were inspired instead by empathy—or by that old-fashioned term by which I know it—Christian love of one's fellow men. Nevertheless, it is gratifying that the Freemen editions have become poignantly cognizant of "empathy"—may it be more generously reflected in future editorial policy.

TOM MIGLAUTSCH.

OCONOMOWOC.

Politics Is Still Hobby of Former Governor Hobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Texas is fortunate in having seven living ex-Governors.

Included in this notable group is former Gov. W. P. Hobby, a man whose achievements in both public and private life have already secured for him memorable recognition in the history of my State.

Some of these achievements are recounted in an article by Frank X. Tolbert in the August 17, 1959, Dallas Morning News, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS IS STILL HOBBY OF FORMER GOVERNOR HOBBY

(By Frank X. Tolbert)

HOUSTON, TEX.—A close friend of William Pettus Hobby, Sr., said: "To show what kind of a modest, good-humored fellow Will Hobby is his favorite nickname is 'Guv.' To me this illustrates why he was one of Texas' greatest Governors. He ran the State the way he runs a newspaper in an informal, casual and yet very efficent fashion."

Before a biography of the 1917–1921 Governor of Texas was published recently, Will Hobby told the authors, James A. Clark and Weldon Hart, that he'd like the book to be called simple, "Guv." Finally, he was talked into another title, "The Tactful Texan," which is also very descriptive of this smiling, 81-year-old natve of Moscow—the cty of Moscow that is in the pine forests of Polk County, Tex.

Mr. Hobby is primarily a newspaperman. Today he is chairman of the board of the Houston Post. He joined that paper on Texas Independence Day, March 1892, at $8 a week. He was in the circulation department yet his real interest was in the editorial staff. The boy's favorite of the Post's newswriters was a fellow named William Sydney Porter. Some years ago, Guv was guest columnist for the Post Card while the regular columnist, George Fuermann, was on vacation. And the publisher wrote in affectionate detail how he used to visit the little cubicle office of the future short story writer, and O. Henry would often send the boy out for coffee and sandwiches and they would have dinner together.

Will Hobby calls politics his hobby. He has an almost incredible knack for analyzing the outcomes of political races. His biographers say that a prominent El Paso politician named Adrian Pool used to call Will Hobby every election day eve to get his predictions. "Almost invariably Hobby called the turn," said Adrian Pool.

Politics might have continued to be Mr. Hobby's hobby if he hadn't been argued into running for lieutenant governor in 1914. He didn't get into the race until near the deadline for filing. He was elected by about 20,000 votes and made such a good record he had no opposition for a second term. The reluctant politician became Governor on August 25, 1917 after James E. Ferguson was impeached from that office. Ferguson ran against Hobby in 1918. And Guv won by 461,479 to 217,012 votes, the most onesided victory in the Texas Governor's race up to that date. Some said this was because Will Hobby appealed to the ladies, who were getting to vote for the first time.

In the early part of this century, Mr. Hobby rose from that $8 a week job to managing editor of the Houston Post. He left the Post to become editor and eventually full owner of the Beaumont Enterprise. In 1922 he came back to the Post, as publisher and part owner. And this is now very much a Hobby enterprise.

His famous wife, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby, is president and editor, and works with the same dedication she gave her former jobs as World War II commanding officer of the Woman's Army Corps and as a member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet. Their daughter, Mrs. Jessica Hobby Catto, is a director. Will Hobby, Jr., is an associate editor, and has his desk in the midst of the busy city room. And Will, Jr.'s attractive wife, Mrs. Diana Poteat Hobby, edits one of the better book sections in the Southwest.

Home for Oveta and Will, Sr., is a huge, 3-storied brick mansion at No. 2 Remington Lane in Houston, and the former Governor has the whole third floor for an office. This was once the home of an early day Houston oil pioneer, J. S. Cullinan, a fellow who flew a skull and crossbones flag from his oil company headquarters. (The Jolly Roger was flown at half mast from Houston's Petroleum Building when Mr. Cullinan died.)

When he lived in the mansion, Mr. Cullinan had the driveway 75 yards from the front gallery because he didn't like to smell the gas fumes of early day automobiles. When Will Hobby bought the house in 1947 he moved the driveway in closer to the gallery.

"The Guv didn't want his friends to have to hike when they came to see him," said close friends.

Crime Ratio of 13 Major Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a statement from the Federal Bureau of Investigation giving the crime ratio in 13 of the cities in the United States with a population of 500,000 to 1 million. We are all delighted to see that the Washington Metropolitan Police force has made an excellent record in solving crimes here in the Nation's Capital.

We all fully realize that the Police Department in the city of Washington is confronted with problems different and of a greater magnitude than the police department of any other city. We have embassies from every country in the world located here in the city of Washington and we have people from every country in the world and every State in the Union. We also have the NAACP headquarters, the heads of all the labor unions, the heads of all the Government departments and the Congress located here in the Nation's Capital.

We realize that we have far too much crime in the Nation's Capital at the present time; however, it is refreshing to know that our excellent police force is solving the majority of the major crimes committed in the city of Washington. We really should have a larger force since crime seems to be increasing in all sections of the country.

Crime index offenses reported,[1] cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, by calendar years

City	Calendar year					Percent change			
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1954–58	1955–58	1956–58	1957–58
Baltimore	15,322	16,330	17,151	15,424	15,303	−0.1	−6.3	−10.8	−0.8
Boston	6,122	8,551	10,195	11,439	11,393	+86.1	+33.2	+11.8	−.4
Buffalo	3,367	3,406	3,457	3,706	3,628	+7.8	+6.5	+4.9	−2.1
Cincinnati	3,869	3,869	4,113	4,082	3,998	+3.3	+3.3	−2.8	−2.0
Cleveland	6,477	5,174	6,741	8,261	7,994	+23.4	+54.5	+18.6	−3.2
Houston	9,355	9,968	10,675	13,274	15,620	+67.0	+56.7	+46.3	+17.9
Milwaukee	3,717	3,493	4,444	5,057	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Minneapolis	6,221	5,435	6,380	6,406	7,437	+19.5	+36.8	+16.6	+16.1
New Orleans	7,532	8,391	12,123	12,277	13,905	+84.6	+65.7	+14.7	+13.3
Pittsburgh	6,961	8,252	9,247	10,500	11,466	+64.7	+38.9	+24.0	+9.2
St. Louis	16,866	18,177	19,458	21,628	23,354	+38.5	+28.5	+20.0	+8.0
San Francisco	12,480	14,281	15,391	15,762	17,088	+36.9	+19.6	+11.0	+8.4
Washington	12,036	11,357	10,038	10,169	9,629	−20.0	−15.2	−4.1	−5.3
Average percent change [3]						+32.1	+24.4	+12.7	+6.0

[1] Includes murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny ($50 and over), and auto theft. The FBI did not report forcible rape data for individual cities prior to 1958; therefore, that category is omitted from this report.

[2] Data for Milwaukee for 1958 not reported by the FBI.

[3] Milwaukee is excluded from computation of the average percent change.

Source: FBI reports.

Offenses known to police

[Crime Index of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Calendar Year 1958]

CITIES 250,000 TO 500,000 POPULATION

City	1,000 population 1950 census	Crime index offenses	Offenses per 1,000 population
Akron	275	3,956	14.4
Atlanta	331	9,516	28.7
Birmingham	326	5,408	16.6
Columbus	376	7,088	18.8
Dallas	434	7,904	18.2
Denver	416	10,974	26.4
Fort Worth	279	5,187	18.6
Indianapolis	462	7,842	17.0
Jersey City	299	2,538	8.5
Kansas City, Mo.	457	4,538	9.9
Long Beach	251	7,979	31.8
Louisville	369	8,244	22.3
Memphis	407	5,254	12.9
Newark	439	11,948	27.2
Oakland	385	5,516	14.3
Omaha	251	2,457	9.8
Portland	374	6,511	17.4
Rochester	332	2,425	7.3
St. Paul	311	3,669	11.8
San Antonio	408	9,501	23.3
San Diego	494	6,555	13.3
Seattle	468	10,220	21.8
Toledo	304	4,497	14.8

CITIES 500,000 TO 1,000,000 POPULATION

City	1,000 population 1950 census	Crime index offenses	Offenses per 1,000 population
Baltimore	950	15,300	16.2
Boston	801	11,457	14.3
Buffalo	580	3,644	6.3
Cincinnati	504	4,083	8.1
Cleveland	915	8,044	8.8
Houston	596	15,730	26.4
Milwaukee	637	(1)	
Minneapolis	522	7,453	14.3
New Orleans	570	14,022	24.6
Pittsburgh	677	11,560	17.1
St. Louis	857	22,574	27.5
San Francisco	775	17,232	22.2
Washington	802	9,087	12.1

[1] Not reported.

Offenses cleared by arrest, calendar year 1958

Classification	Percent cleared	
	District of Columbia	National Average [1]
Murder, nonnegligent manslaughter	97	94
Manslaughter by negligence	100	90
Forcible rape	84	73
Robbery	78	43
Aggravated assault	90	79
Burglary, breaking or entering	62	30
Larceny—theft	44	20
Auto theft	41	27
Total	57	(2)

[1] Average clearance rate of 1,972 cities reported By the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

[2] Not reported.

Crime index offenses reported,[1] cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, by calendar years

City	Calendar year				
	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
Baltimore	15,322	16,330	17,151	15,424	15,303
Boston	6,122	8,551	10,195	11,439	11,393
Buffalo	3,367	3,406	3,457	3,706	3,628
Cincinnati	3,869	3,869	4,113	4,082	3,998
Cleveland	6,477	5,174	6,741	8,261	7,994
Houston	9,355	9,968	10,675	13,247	15,620
Milwaukee	3,717	3,493	4,444	5,057	(2)
Minneapolis	6,221	5,435	6,380	6,406	7,437
New Orleans	7,532	8,391	12,123	12,277	13,905
Pittsburgh	6,961	8,252	9,247	10,500	11,466
St. Louis	16,866	18,177	19,458	21,628	23,354
San Francisco	12,480	14,281	15,391	15,762	17,088
Washington	12,036	11,357	10,038	10,169	9,629

[1] Includes murder, nonnegligent manslaughter, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny ($50 and over), and auto theft. The FBI did not report forcible rape for individual cities prior to 1958; therefore, that category is excluded from this report.

[2] Not reported by the FBI.

Source: FBI Reports.

Offenses known to police, cities 500,000 to 1,000,000 population, calendar year 1958

	1960 population, 1,000	Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter	Forcible rape	Robbery	Aggravated assault	Burglary	Larceny over $50	Auto theft	Total
Baltimore	950	100	96	798	2,224	3,807	3,923	4,451	15,399
Boston	801	27	64	523	448	3,113	2,739	4,543	11,457
Buffalo	580	19	16	191	247	1,184	330	1,007	3,644
Cincinnati	504	30	85	242	288	1,379	1,141	918	4,083
Cleveland	915	73	50	1,107	524	2,939	1,026	2,325	8,044
Houston	596	117	110	597	1,130	7,790	2,593	3,393	15,730
Milwaukee	637	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Minneapolis	522	8	16	389	95	3,449	1,948	1,548	7,453
New Orleans	570	55	117	1,191	625	4,417	3,059	4,558	14,022
Pittsburgh	677	27	94	884	671	4,499	2,378	3,007	11,560
St. Louis	857	91	220	2,222	2,432	9,543	4,583	4,483	23,574
San Francisco	775	34	144	1,518	1,217	6,087	2,303	5,929	17,232
Washington	802	74	58	639	2,329	3,316	1,548	1,723	9,687

[1] Only 11 months of reports received by the FBI. Source: FBI reports.

The White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are receiving literally thousands of letters in support of the Great White Fleet proposal which was advanced in a resolution introduced by myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and in the other body by Representatives EDMUNDSON and BATES. The editorial support of the Great White Fleet proposal is broad and enthusiastic. One of the good editorials which has come to my attention on this subject was published in the Faribault Daily News, of Faribault, Minn., on July 31.

Mr. President, I asked my staff this morning how many communications we had received on the Great White Fleet proposal. The number is more than 11,000. So the proposal has had a considerable amount of enthusiastic support as a result of the publicity given to it and the information about it which was published in Life magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Faribault (Minn.) Daily News, July 31, 1959]

AN IDEA WORTH CONSIDERING

The Great White Fleet idea to foster world peace through humanitarian service has been revived and the idea deserves wholehearted consideration from all citizens.

In 1907 President Theodore Roosevelt sent 16 American battleships on a cruise around the world. The "Great White Fleet" (American warships were then painted white in peacetime) carried its intended message: That the United States was emerging from an era of preoccupation with recovering from its own great civil conflict and with developing a continent under a network of railroads—from an era of taken-for-granted security behind the British Navy—and that it now was a world power.

Today an idea initiated by a young Navy commander, Frank Manson, and now sponsored by Senators Humphrey, Minnesota, and Aiken, Vermont, and Representatives Bates and Edmondson—a bipartisan group—is being framed into a resolution asking President Eisenhower to recommission from ships now in mothballs a modern "Great White Fleet."

This would carry aid to disaster-stricken areas throughout the world and technical assistance to nations which welcome it.

There are, of course, practical problems to be solved. Except for emergency rescues, care of the injured, food and shelter, the needs arising from disasters vary greatly. And the fleet could be a long way off from the place it would be needed. But these difficulties are not wholly unsolvable. Even tardy, partial aid would not necessarily be futile. And technical assistance (instruction) could be a continuation service.

As a dramatic, impressive, traveling advertisement of Americans' dominant desire to be helpful, not warlike, the idea has enormous possibilities.

It certainly should be seriously explored and considered.

Need for Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution calling for the creation of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy.

I sincerely hope that the resolution, which has also been introduced by a number of my colleagues, will be approved at this session of the Congress.

There is an urgent need, Mr. Speaker, for the Government to formulate a fuels policy. We have an oil and gas policy and a policy for the development of atomic energy. But the Federal Government has never determined just what the national policy for coal should be. Nor has it determined just how each of these fuels shall be fitted into a national picture.

Tremendous demands for fuels of all kinds can be expected in the future. The United States has a rapidly expanding economy. And we can all agree, I am sure, that adequate fuels are essential to the national security.

The National Coal Policy Committee is strongly supporting this resolution. This new organization represents all segments of the coal industry—mine operators, miners, coal-carrying railroads, and machinery manufacturers.

The new Coal Policy Committee is naturally interested in the growth and development of the coal industry. But more importantly, it is interested in seeing that a national policy, making full use of all of our fuels, is worked out.

I can think of no better way to accomplish this objective than by entrusting the difficult job to a joint congressional committee.

Exchange of Classroom Teachers Would Aid International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, while peace is fought with different weapons than war, man-to-man contact is an essential factor in both.

In recognition of this fact, our Government has sponsored or supported a series of programs designed to better acquaint people of other lands with America and increase knowledge on the part of our citizens of different nations. Experts in a multitude of fields have been sent abroad to exchange views with their counterparts in another country. Similarly, the United States has played host to numerous foreign delegations. The result has been better understanding.

One field where such meetings have realized spectacular success is education. Many myths regarding Russian education have been dispelled due to knowledge gained by American educators who visited the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, at the annual convention of the National Education Association held in St. Louis earlier this year, the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers approved a resolution which I believe would increase our opportunity to gain from exchange visits. The resolution urged that groups of classroom teachers be sent abroad to communicate directly with teachers of other lands.

I think this is an excellent proposal. I hope that the Office of Education will act upon it. As Ewald Turner, president of the Department of Classroom Teachers and a resident of Pendleton, Oreg., in my State, stated to me in a recent letter:

We feel that selected classroom teachers, by the very nature of their professional experience, are uniquely experienced in the field of human relations and could do much toward building international understanding.

I subscribe to Mr. Turner's sentiments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution approved by the NEA Department of Classroom Teachers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association]

INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

The department believes that improved human relations are vitally important to the increasingly significant role our country is playing in world affairs and that it is the responsibility of each teacher to develop and foster in American children respect for the cultures of other peoples.

The department commends the U.S. Office of Education for sending educational officials abroad to study school systems and to promote international understanding. It respectfully proposes that the U.S. Office of Education and other agencies give consideration to sending groups of classroom teachers abroad to observe educational methods and instructional procedures in classrooms and to communicate directly with teachers of other lands.

The Venue Provisions of the Federal Employers' Liability Act Should Be Changed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California, Mr. Speaker, under the present provisions of the Federal Employers Liability Act an action against railroads for wrongful death or personal injuries may be brought in a district court of the United States, in the district of the residence of the defendant, or in which the cause of action arose, or in which the defendant shall be doing business at the time of commencing such action. The jurisdiction of the courts of the United States under this act shall be concurrent with that of the courts of the several States, and no case arising under this act and brought in any State court of competent jurisdiction shall be removed to any court of the United States.

The bill I have today introduced would provide somewhat different venue in actions brought in State and Federal courts. Under the bill an action could be brought only in a district court of the United States within or in a State court of competent jurisdiction of first, the State in which the action arose, or second, the State in which the person suffering injury or death was a resident at the time the cause of action arose. The bill adds a proviso to the effect that if, at any time within the period during which suit on any such cause of action shall not be barred by limitation, the railroad against which the cause of action is asserted shall either not be doing business within the State in which the cause of action arose or shall not be doing business within the State of which the person suffering injury or death was a resident at the time the cause of action arose, in that event such suit may at such time be brought in any district court of the United States within, or in a State court of competent jurisdiction or, any State in which such carrier is doing business.

The purpose of this legislation is to bring to an end the widespread and ever-increasing practice of solicitation and transportation of lawsuits to jurisdictions remote from the localities in which the causes of action arose. It will result in lawsuits being handled by the local lawyers in the communities where the accident occurs rather than by a few soliciting lawyers who improperly take advantage of the unique provision now contained in the Federal Employers' Liability Act.

The public interest will be promoted by the elimination of a practice which has proved to be unjust and burdensome and which has interfered in many instances with efficient railroad operation.

As long ago as June 1946 the Bar Association of Knoxville, Tenn., became aroused as the result of the flagrant practice of solicitation of cases and passed a resolution in favor of limitation of venue under the Federal Employers' Liability Act. Subsequently the Tennessee Bar Association passed a similar resolution. These resolutions led to the introduction in the 80th Congress of H.R. 1639, the so-called Jennings bill. That measure, while not identical with the bill here introduced, contained substantially similar provisions.

Subsequent to the introduction of the Jennings bill, the American Bar Association and the bar associations of 39 States went on record as endorsing the principles of the bill. In addition, hundreds of city and county bar associations and hundreds of practicing lawyers endorsed the bill.

Hearings on H.R. 1639 were held before the House Committee on the Judiciary. The bill, in amended form, was reported and passed the House of Representatives. A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held hearings and favorably reported an amended bill to the full committee, but the Jennings bill never reached the floor of the Senate.

Many railroads operate through 8 or 10, or more, States, and maintain offices and officers in still other States. It follows, under the law as it now stands, that a suit may be filed in a jurisdiction hundreds and even thousands of miles from the locality where the injured person lives and the accident happened. There is thus afforded an opportunity for abuse by unscrupulous "solicity" lawyers.

The testimony presented at the hearings on the Jennings bill revealed that these opportunities of misusing the judicial processes has not been overlooked. Both the House and Senate committees found that certain unethical attorneys solicited cases under the Federal Employers' Liability Act and transported them to far-distant places for trial and that such lawyers employed runners or touts to solicit business for them, all to the detriment of the legal profession, the railroad workers, the railroads and the general public. The evidence at the hearings showed that the legal business under this act was concentrated in the hands of a relatively small number of practicing attorneys in the United States and that such actions were customarily brought in a restricted number of communities in the country. This situation which was shown to exist in 1947 has not improved. If anything it is worse today than ever before.

Disbarment proceedings have been filed against various attorneys wh have degraded their profession by the solicitation of personal injury status against railroads, and injunction proceedings have been instituted against other attorneys to prevent their further prosecution of other cases. Many attorneys have been censured, some have been disbarred, and others have been ordered to return fees which they have collected. While such actions are of some effect, it is only through the legislative process that lasting relief from these vicious practices can be obtained.

The railroads are also the victims of the pernicious practice of solicitation and transportation of causes of action. The difficulties of trying a lawsuit in a jurisdiction from the community where the cause of action arose are obvious. The bringing of a lawsuit in a distant forum, so chosen by the plaintiff, places the railroad at an unfair disadvantage. As only one example, in order to obtain an adequate and reasonable presentation of the facts in the case the defendant railroad must bring its witnesses for long distances in order that they may testify. Because witnesses who live in one State cannot be compelled to testify in the courts of another State, their attendance can be obtained only by meeting their own terms of compensation and expense allowances; and the cost of procuring their personal attendance in a foreign State may be and frequently is excessive, burdensome, and out of all proportion to the actual value of the claim in litigation.

It should be added that in virtually every case in which an action is brought against a railroad for wrongful death or personal injuries many of the railroads' witnesses are persons engaged in actual railroad operation. That operation is necessarily impaired, and the public interest suffers when those witnesses are required to be absent from their regular duties for long periods of time for the purpose of attending trials at far distant points.

There can be no doubt but that the bringing of lawsuits far from the place

where the cause of action arose constitutes an undue burden on interstate commerce and an unreasonable interference with efficient operation of the national transportation system.

In correcting the evils referred to above, the proposed legislation does not deny to claimants the opportunity to have their cases tried in an appropriate forum. One of the traditional guarantees of a fair trial under our Anglo-Saxon system of law has always been that the trial shall take place where the act complained of occurred, before a jury composed of the peers of the parties. This procedure would save much expense to litigants. It would seem both unusual and extraordinary if, as a general proposition, it would not be to the advantage of a claimant to try his claim in the area in which he lived or in which the accident accurred. The bill here introduced meets these traditional concepts of venue and provides the only choice of a forum which a claimant or his attorney should, in the interest of the parties and the orderly and economical administration of justice, be permitted to have in the enforcement of his rights.

Life at Airbase in Turkey Interesting to Texas Girl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 14, the Amarillo Daily News published an article entitled, "Life at Airbase in Turkey Interesting to Texas Girl." I found this article most interesting and I recommend it to all Members of Congress for good, objective, descriptive reporting.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE AT AIRBASE IN TURKEY INTERESTING TO TEXAS GIRL

(By Bob Beames)

Life for an American in Turkey is described as "difficult, but interesting," by an Air Force officer's wife who has spent the past 17 months in Turkey. A huge smile was sufficient to express her feelings about returning to America for a visit.

Mrs. Archie A. Acree, formerly of Wichita Falls, currently is visiting her sister, Mrs. Porter Oakes, 2605 Travis, here. She is the wife of Maj. Archie Acree, now assigned as a technical adviser to the Turkish Language School in Izmir, Turkey. The couple received the assignment in February 1958, and this is Mrs. Acree's first visit home since then. The duty tour to Turkey will end next March.

The trip home for Mrs. Acree was a birthday present from her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Earl Clayton of Pampa. She also has been visiting them and plans a trip to Wichita Falls before returning to Izmir on August 27.

The vivacious visitor admitted that the American military wives in Turkey suffer no real hardships while living in Turkey, but added that many conveniences are lacking. Among the items she missed most are telephones, abundant pure water and head lettuce and corn.

Sanitation in Turkey was described as being greatly inferior to American health standards. For instance, U.S. military personnel stationed in Izmir are allowed to eat no Turkish meats except lamb, and are required to soak fresh vegetables in a strong solution before cooking.

Americans there also must boil all water. This, says Mrs. Acree, is because the sewer and water lines are laid side by side and the frequent earthquakes cause seepage in the lines.

Another major difference between the two countries is in bathing facilities. Because the equipment is not adequate, the visitor said baths are much less frequent among Turks than among Americans.

Military personnel going to Turkey are required to take a 2-year supply of clothing, Mrs. Acree said. She explained that Americans bought few if any clothes there because of style and quality differences. But she mentioned that the PX there has some clothing in stock. Discussing the poor cleaning service available in Izmir, Mrs. Acree said "I send all of my cleaning home for service."

Transportation in the Near East country was described as crude and composed mostly of horses, donkeys and carts. Although there are not enough roads there, Mrs. Acree said most of them were good. However, she added that animal traffic clogged the roads and made travel dangerous.

The illiteracy rate in Turkey is high, says Mrs. Acree, and after the first few years of public education the students are charged a fee to continue. "Of course, the fee is high to these people."

Inflation was described as a major difficulty in Turkey, and Mrs. Acree said it got a big boost some 8 months ago when the lira rate was changed. It is now 9 to 1 and "when it was doubled the prices also were doubled."

Television is unknown in Turkey, but there is some radio available and "the Turks love movies," she said. She added the American wives there generally made their own recreation, usually bridge or similar games. There are some nightclubs in Izmir, but regulations on Turkish food and drinks keep most American military families away, she added.

One fascinating sight in Turkey related Mrs. Acree, is the "public oven." The Turks, and most other living there, have only a one-burner stove. For baking, they use publicly-owned public ovens where one and all bring their food. She described the Turks as good cooks and said "they manage nicely with what they have."

Tobacco was mentioned as the big thing in Turkey and much of the country's economy is built around it. Another big crop is olives, but Mrs. Acree said the Turks can grow almost anything. She described the climate as ideal with little or no rain falling from May through October. "The summers are hot, but the winters are more mild than here," she said. When asked if the dust blew there, she said, "That's an understatement."

Major and Mrs. Acree live, as do most other Americans in Turkey, in an apartment. Pictures of the apartment give the idea that nothing more could be desired, but she said the housing was not at all adequate. Particularly, she dislikes the two to four flights of stairs that must be climbed, and injected the fact that there are only three elevators in town.

Izmir is located on the west coast of Turkey and is surrounded on three sides by mountains. Much of the country is rocky and land is at a premium. With a population of more than 200,000, Izmir is one of the three major cities in Turkey and is a pretty town, according to Mrs. Acree.

Although Turkey is a strange and distant land, it is relatively close travelwise. Mrs. Acree left Izmir August 2 and arrived in Amarillo the next day. During the two-day flight she passed through Athens, Istanbul, Rome, Paris and New York City. She plans to return to Izmir on August 27.

"Yes, I've enjoyed it; I've loved it," she said, but continued "there is nothing like the 'land of the big PX'," as military personnel there refer to the United States.

Need Law To Halt Appraisal Abuse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the Congress switched the Federal-State matching formula from 50–50 to 90–10 in the highway program, many people felt that this was an invitation to the States to not be too careful about expenditures. A possible indication of this being the result is now coming to the fore in St. Louis County where appraisers' fees, mostly in regard to the interstate program, have been exorbitant.

The primary point is that the State highway commission which could have appealed these cases failed to appeal them. One local circuit court judge was quoted as saying: "I don't know why everyone should get so excited. After all this is just Federal money."

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of August 18, 1959, calling attention to this abuse. I agree that there certainly should be State law to govern appraisal fees but above all we need to change the 90–10 formula so that there will be a greater incentive on the part of the States to police expenditures.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 18, 1959]

NEED LAW TO HALT APPRAISAL ABUSE

A conference next month of the eight St. Louis County circuit judges is a discerning approach to a situation that over the past 3 years has become greatly imbalanced—to a point of public protest.

This is the matter of excessive fees to condemnation commissioners in fixing land and property values in highway construction projects. The Globe-Democrat in recent days has pointed out the wide variance between proportionate fees paid in St. Louis and those paid in St. Louis County.

Congressman THOMAS B. CURTIS finds the amount of the county fees shocking.

Some of them are. The situation as it has been permitted to develop is appalling. These high rates of pay, in one instance almost 25 percent of the determined value of the property, have been made for relatively brief periods of the appraiser's time, or far in excess of established average rates paid elsewhere in Missouri.

In a few cases the appraisal fee was many times greater than value put on the property.

The State Highway Commission's general counsel has requested an exploratory conference with the county's circuit judges. It will be held after the judges have conferred en banc on their awards, which have been publicized in detail in the last 2 weeks.

This situation would not have developed had there been a regulatory standard by which remunerations to the condemnation commissioners could have been judged.

What is needed is a definite yardstick which can be applied easily and fairly in every condemnation proceeding.

The situation calls for a state law establishing a fee not to exceed $100 a day for each day of a commissioner's time on the appraising job. This we propose in order to revise the indiscriminate court-applied payments.

Such a basic compulsory fee would be fair to all. It would eliminate out-of-line awards through political preference or favoritism. It would eliminate spiraling precedents.

In short, it would relieve courts from the responsibility of arriving at an arbitrary figure.

It should prevent such variances as these: $22,500 in fees to a three-man commission for 10 days of work in appraising 28 acres valued at $216,250; $13,500 in fees for appraising 54 parcels of property valued at only $46,520; $34,500 in fees for 41 parcels of State-acquired property with a valuation of $1,305,350; a $900 fee for establishing a nominal value of $8 in a Daniel Boone Expressway right-of-way dispute.

By contrast in the city, $1,500 was paid for work on property valued at $176,020, the same amount for property valued at $316,500, and $5,250 for property valued at $880,455.

These are among the more disproportionate of the county cases, but they illustrate the difference between the 1-percent rate usually averaged in the city and the much higher rate of the county.

Not all of the condemnation commissioners are, by any means, trained, experienced appraisers. The courts have shown an inclination to appoint political friends and acquaintances, attorneys, State legislators, subsequent holders of county and city offices, and leaders of political parties.

Expert appraisers, members of the American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, receive $100 a day, and usually $50 to $75 per parcel.

State law provides the commissioners are to receive a reasonable compensation. A fee of $100 fixed by State law would meet that requirement. It certainly would put a halt to the arbitrary manner in which fees have been determined in the past.

The eight county circuit judges are meeting today in an informal discussion preliminary to September's en banc session. It will be an excellent time to consider such a law.

Appraisal fees awarded by the courts are paid by the State highway commission out of State funds. The commission and taxpayers have been abused by the excessive fees in past cases. Further abuses cannot be condoned.

Southerners Can Steady Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the past few days I have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from almost every newspaper in South Carolina on the subject of the need for a strong and effective labor reform bill. I ask unanimous consent to have another editorial entitled "Southerners Can Steady Country" printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. This excellent editorial was published in the August 18, 1959, issue of the Columbia Record, Columbia, S.C., which is ably edited by Mr. Henry Cauthen.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Aug. 18, 1959]

SOUTHERNERS CAN STEADY COUNTRY

Regardless of the forthcoming action of the Senate, pro or con, on the labor reform bill, the demonstration of good sense and its recognition of excesses by the House of Representatives will remain an important development.

One branch of the Congress moving to restore order and restraint to the sphere of trade unionism discloses importantly an interest in the country as a whole. For some years now what have been regarded as the interests of labor, only, have enjoyed favor in the Congress.

It should not be forgotten by the people, and especially by the rank-and-file members of unions, that laws strongly favoring trade unionism will remain on the books. The whole structure of contemporary trade unionism is supported by these laws, many of which are regarded as decidely unfair to everybody else and some of which, despite Supreme Court approval, are held to be unconstitutional.

The action of the House of Representatives in passing what is regarded as a "strong" labor reform bill could represent a decisive change in this country. It could reflect the country's recognition of too much power for any one group and the people's desire to see correction.

How deeply this will impress itself upon the Senate conferees and the Senate itself remains to be seen. But the decision there is likely to show once more that southerners are sound, that they consider the stability of the country as a whole and that much of the generally adverse verdict as to the South by outsiders has not been a just verdict.

The South and its people offer a nucleus for a return to reason in this country. It is notable that the leaders of labor who are most concerned about the action of the House are men who time after time have attacked the South and have joined in the crusade to change, by force, our section of the country.

Perhaps not all southern Senators will vote for an effective labor reform bill in the Senate. There are some whose past records strongly indicate they will join the northern and western "liberals" in the Senate to reduce the House bill to one of weakness.

We believe those southern Senators who would so vote are not correctly reading the minds of thousands in their own section of the country.

They would seem justified, as southerners, in joining in what could be a southern leadership of the country—and in the right direction. Meanwhile, they would be supporting, not opposing that which they have always purported to support.

Southern Members of the House of Representatives, in concert with Republicans, passed the reform bill in the House, with all of South Carolina's six Members voting for it. This was admirable, and the sample of steadying influence for the country.

Current Activities of Communist Party, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALLEN SMITH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the Communist Party, U.S.A.:

CURRENT ACTIVITIES OF COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

The Communist Party, U.S.A. is currently intensifying its agitation program, designed to weaken America's national security. A close examination of recent Communist moves indicates that the Party is working on a well-planned program. Every American citizen should be acquainted with these sinister moves in order to protect our democratic freedoms.

VISITS OF COMMUNIST LEADERS IN RUSSIA

Since January 1959, a number of ranking American Communist leaders have visited in Russia. This is most significant since it enables the Soviets to personally issue instructions to Communists in the United States. Moreover, this new development is reminiscent of the personal contacts between American and Russian Communists in the days of the Comintern when Party leaders in America, such as Earl Browder and William Z. Foster, streamed to Moscow. This obviously means a much closer affiliation between the Communist Party, U.S.A., and the Kremlin. The highest ranking American Communist to visit Moscow was James Edward Jackson, Jr., presently head of the Negro Affairs Committee. In fact, Jackson, as an official delegate of the Communist Party, U.S.A., addressed the 21st Congress of the Soviet Union on February 2, 1959. At that time, he expressed fraternal greetings to the Soviets and stated that Communists in the United States found great inspiration in the Russian Party. He promised that the Communist Party, U.S.A., would struggle to help in the so-called fight for peace (which is Moscow's presented propaganda line). Jackson was also at the Third Congress of the Polish Communist Party. This visit occurred after leaving Russia. The Worker on April 12, 1959, reported that Jackson, in a speech before the Polish Party Congress, predicted that the day will come when the "workers" in the United States will bring socialism to this country.

AFTERMATH OF JACKSON'S VISIT AMONG COMMUNISTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Jackson's visit to Soviet Russia has served as an invigorating tonic to communism in the United States. Actually, Communist activity has been greatly stimulated with the party (1) consolidating its own internal organizational structure, and (2) increasing agitational activity against non-Communists. It appears obvious that the Communist Party, U.S.A., is presently implementing instructions received in Moscow.

Among indications of increased Communist activity in the United States are the following:

1. Party schools: The party is conducting a number of leadership schools among its membership. The Communists realize that a strong party is based on strong leadership. Leaders must be well versed in Marxist-Leninist principles. This means that they must be thoroughly indoctrinated in party history, Marxist ideology and organizational techniques.

Hyman Lumer, national education director of the party, has recently conducted a number of party schools throughout the country. For example, in June 1959, he conducted a party school in New York City; later that month in Detroit, and Los Angeles, and in July, in Seattle. Topics taught included, among others, class struggle, imperialism, socialism, Communist Party organizational problems and Negro questions. Basic Communist classics were utilized such as the works of Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin.

2. Youth activities: Historically the party has always been interested in young people. The party must recruit, train, and influence young people in order to survive. Plans are underway for a Communist-sponsored youth conference in the fall of 1959. Likewise, the party is interested in starting a Communist youth organization for the purpose of working among young people.

3. Strategy in industry: The party is increasingly interested in infiltrating the Nation's basic industries. Primary targets include, among others, the railroad, steel and automobile industries. The party realizes that to exert influence it must have members in labor unions and in strategic positions in industry. Currently national party headquarters is instructing local units to increase efforts to consolidate party influence in industry.

As proof of the party's interest in this field, a number of party "commission" meetings have been held where specific problems of infiltration have been discussed. The non-Communist industrial leader probably does not realize how closely the party will study his company for the purpose of locating an opportunity to infiltrate. Party leaders are constantly alert for a chance to "get a job" for a Communist member in some strategic industry.

Further proof of the party's interest is the activity of a national labor secretary who is exclusively devoting his time to party industrial work.

As is well-known, labor unions are a favorite target of the Communists. In the past the party has achieved considerable strength in certain unions. During the post-World War II years, much of this strength was lost. At the present time, the party is working strenuously to recapture positions of strength in the labor movement.

4. Negro matters: Another favorite field of communism is the Negro. The party is always attempting to represent itself as the protector of the Negro. Today the party is again trumpeting its so-called interest in Negroes, hoping to build party strength among Negro groups. However, the party is never sincerely interested in the Negro, but only hoping to exploit Negroes to build Communist strength.

5. Future plans: At present the Communist Party, U.S.A., is planning to hold another national convention, the 17th, in December. The party organizational apparatus is being geared to that end. Very recently a national committee meeting of the Communist Party was held which discussed, among other things, plans for the national convention. The party is proposing to publicize a draft program which will set forth the party's line on current national and international issues.

A national convention is always used by the party as a technique to drum up enthusiasm among the membership. Delegates are elected from various party units and they come to the convention to vote on party problems. The occasion is used to increase party financial contributions and propaganda.

Of course, a party national convention is certainly not a true convention in the sense of the operation of free government. Actually the delegates vote slavishly as the leaders indicate. Discussion is limited to minor details, for the convention will adopt the program desired by the leading clique. In other words, the national convention is actually a window dressing designed to show the party as a democratic organization.

INFILTRATION INTO MASS ORGANIZATIONS

The party is increasing its tempo of infiltrating non-Communist mass organizations. The purpose in this technique is to increase party influence and power.

As recently as June 1959, for example, the press carried dispatches concerning an individual by the name of Mr. Sidney T. Efross who had been elected as president of the Glen Haven Elementary School (Silver Spring, Md.) PTA. Efross was summoned before the House Committee on Un-American Activities to answer allegations that he was a former Communist member. At that time Efross invoked the fifth amendment 39 times and later submitted his resignation as president of the PTA.

At the House committee meeting, a sworn statement of a former FBI informant in Ohio was read into the record. The informant, in this statement, identified Efross as an individual whom he had known as a Communist and as head of a faction of the steel cell of the Communist Party.

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

William Z. Foster is currently chairman emeritus of the Communist Party, U.S.A. He is an old-time party leader and has been a prominent voice in American communism ever since the founding of the party.

In 1948 Foster, along with 11 other leaders of the Communist Party, was indicted for violation of the Smith Act. Foster has never been prosecuted because of ill health.

Foster is now advanced in years but still is able, despite his claims of ill health, to carry on many party activities. He is a prime policymaker and has stood for a strong Marxist-Leninist base for the Communist Party, U.S.A. To show Foster's current activity, for example, Political Affairs (theoretical publication of the party) has carried feature articles under Foster's name in six of the seven issues published during 1959. If a man is able to write so consistently, he must not be in such bad health. It seems that there has been a miscarriage of justice in not bringing William Z. Foster to trial. Foster is presently endeavoring to secure court permission to go to Moscow, ostensibly for medical treatment.

FIDEL CASTRO

To read press comments concerning events in Cuba, the average American may gain the impression that he is witnessing a flamboyant circus—often with more than the traditional three rings. He hears about giant rallies of Cubans, with overtones of drama; the ousting of high officials in the Government on short notice; high-sounding speeches in which neighbors are threatened.

In fact, the Castro regime is a circus—a very deadly and serious circus. It is a "circus" in the sense that Americans have been greatly attracted by what is going on. It is a serious matter in that Fidel Castro may represent a very great danger to the security of the United States. From all indications, this young, bearded revolutionary is greatly influenced by communism. This means that America may wake up some morning and find the island of Cuba a Communist bastion on our very doorstep.

The fact must be remembered that Castro gained power, not by democratic processes, but by the sword—a revolutionary military campaign. As is well known, Castro's revolution was based on a small but disciplinned minority. From a mere handful of some 12 men, a military group sprang which led to the overthrow of the legitimate government. The Castro government is living proof of the ability of a small but dedicated minority to overthrow governmental institutions. Press dispatches indicate that Fidel Castro has associated with individuals who have Communist affiliations. For example, his brother, Raul Castro, reportedly addressed the Communist-directed International Conference for Defense of the Rights of Youths in Vienna in 1953. Later, he reportedly attended the World Festival of Youths and Students at Bucharest. On his way home he visited other Iron Curtain countries. As a student in Havana he associated with Communists.

Another associate, Ernesto "Che" Guevara, also reportedly is of Communist sympathies. He reportedly was active in the Russo-Mexican Institute of Cultural Relations and is believed to be the primary link between Fidel Castro and international communism.

Still another associate known to be connected with Communists is Camilo Cienfuegos y Gorriaran. This individual was arrested in January 1956 while serving as the director of the Havana Communist front, "frente popular."

The leftwing connections of these individuals point out the dangers America faces. Likewise, the Castro regime has brought forth violent anti-American agitation. This country should have the very best of relations with our neighbors. To hear Fidel Castro and his henchmen criticize the United States is to realize that Cuba is a trouble spot which may cause America much grief in the future.

Preston J. Moore, national commander of the American Legion, last June brought valuable facts to the American people concerning Fidel Castro. He said:

"The Communist Party, previously outlawed, now enjoys Government recognition and encouragement.

"The army is peppered with Communists. An ardent Communist commands it. Another has directed the execution of more than 600 Batista henchmen and enemies of the revolution, as the charge was sometimes phrased.

"Communists and fellow travelers dominate a number of national labor unions. Known Communists control some of the largest newspapers. In the communications field—radio and television—and in education at every level, there is active Red penetration. History textbooks for use in the schools are to be rewritten—under the guidance of a commission headed by a fellow traveler.

"This is not hearsay. It is a boiled-down, composite picture of the present situation in Cuba as reported by veteran American newsmen and others on the scene."

Mr. Moore asked this pertinent question:

"What would a Communist Cuba mean to us? It would mean, at least, a massive staging center in our front yard from which Moscow could direct economic and political broadsides against the Americas. It would place an intolerable pressure upon our military defenses in the Caribbean and Panama Canal areas. It would lead inevitably, I believe, to the active commitment of our Armed Forces.

"Pray that the power of our Government and of an aroused public opinion will be asserted to head off these eventualities. When the Red Chinese threatened to take over a couple of islands half a world away from us, we stood up and were counted. We shouldn't need a Communist gun in our ribs to remind us that Cuba is less than half an hour away."

Branch Rickey: Key to the Success of the Continental League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a key to the success of the third major league

is its newly appointed president, the irrepressible Branch Rickey. Mr. Rickey with his rich background of baseball experience and his proved ability as a pioneer, provides the know-how the Continental League needs to become a reality.

Not the least of Branch Rickey's attributes is his charm—a quality which was displayed very prominently to us during the recent hearings of the Senate Subcommitte on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation. The Rickey charm and eloquence will be important factors in the progress of the Continental League and will particularly stand in good stead in the new league's dealings with Congress.

These and other facets of Branch Rickey's personality and career were dealt with in an interesting column written by Jimmy Powers, the outstanding sportswriter of the New York Daily News. I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Daily News, Aug. 19, 1959]

THE POWERHOUSE

(By Jimmy Powers)

One of the criticisms of the Continental League was that it did not have experienced baseball men in its top echelon. This flaw was promptly removed yesterday by the appointment of Branch Rickey. The man who brought the Negro into baseball and who founded baseball's great incubating system, is an ideal choice as president. He knows how to organize, how to direct, and how to deal with the backstage maneuvers so necessary to any going circuit but most vital to a new one.

With all due respect to Bill Shea, the original sparkplug of the new setup, Bill is not in the same class with baseball's elder statesman. In his field Bill is excellent. He can round up the capital and smooth the way politically through the various city councils along the route. But Rickey is the man with the tremendous prestige needed to guide the Continental in what will probably be a long series of conferences with Commissioner Ford Frick, the American and National executive committees as well as congressional subcommittee members.

This last group is most important. Rickey with all his charm will need the power of Congress behind him if he is going to make any headway at all. And by the same token, if Rickey cannot pull it off, no one else on the immediate horizon can.

Anyone who has suffered any illness and is along in years will agree with Rickey's philosophy that he feels he will live just as long active as inactive. It was this philosophy that prompted President Eisenhower to resume his duties in the White House and to continue to play his usual 18 holes of golf.

HE'S NO OUT-OF-WORK VETERAN

Bill Shea is not hiring an out-of-work veteran standing on the sidelines hat in hand. Rickey's $50,000 a year contract at Pittsburgh still had 16 months to run. Although 77, Rickey could be well worth every penny of that and more.

Rickey has a reputation of installing a system so well his successors were able to coast along for years under the momentum he set up. In 1917, when he went to the Cardinals as general manager, he and the new owner, Sam Breadon, found the club $175,000 in debt. It was a challenge the bushy browed former lawyer and Chautauqua temperance speaker accepted with relish.

He was unable to compete on even terms with the big money clubs, so his clever mind devised the farm system. He developed it and expended it to the point where the Cards rosters were soon overflowing with talent.

He not only left the Rickey stamp on Rickey-trained players, but on Rickey-trained executives as well. He gave Larry MacPhail his first baseball job at Columbus. He started Warren Giles at St. Joseph, Mo. Gabe Paul, George Trautman, and many, many others followed.

He didn't always have a favorable press, but this did not deter him. He came up with a National League championship and won the World Series in 1926 and from that point on his record was one of new challenges and new successes.

Until he left the Cardinals in 1942 the team finished out of the first division only three times. They collected five more pennants and won three of the next 4 years after he left.

This last is highly significant. When he left St. Louis the momentum was so great and the organizational work so sound the team won without him. When he left the Dodgers the momentum was equally as great and the key farm figures were so shrewdly stationed that the Dodgers won without him.

If he can organize the Continental League and can install league supervisory personnel of his training and choosing then the old gentleman can bow out in a few years secure in the knowledge that the new organization can stand on its own feet and weather any storm.

Rickey always has an eye out for emergencies. He knows how to take appropriate steps. He came to Brooklyn during World War II and immediately began signing bright young men to contracts before they entered the service. When the war was over he had an ample supply of talent. These green youngsters, mixed with a sprinkling of veterans, were good enough to give the Dodgers their second penant in 27 years in 1947.

RICKEY STARTED DODGER SUCCESS

The Dodgers finished no worse than third until Rickey left in 1950. The Dodgers have been a threat ever since and most sideliners agree Rickey put the organization on its feet and is deserving of some credit for its subsequent success.

Rickey sold his Brooklyn stock for $1,025,000 and signed a 5-year contract with the Pirates at $100,000 a year. He spent $496,000 for talent in his first year, but the Pirates did not immediately improve. Rickey quit as general manager and at the end of his 5-year contract took a reduced salary as chairman of the board.

Rickey still may be vindicated. The Pirates finished second last year. They are in the first division this year.

Rickey may be persuasive enough to induce certain National League owners to cooperate with him in noncompetitive areas. He can charm entire boards of directors. He has demonstrated great success specializing in raising underdogs into challenging positions. He is too big to be snubbed by Frick, the National League or the American League. They wouldn't dare. He knows where too many bodies are buried.

This Continental League may be right down his alley. If anyone is going to put it across, it has to be a man with Rickey's ability to con the help, con the boss who writes the checks, and con the customers who turn out to see the new show.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert in the RECORD an editorial from the August 10, 1959, issue of the Salt Lake City Deseret News, which strongly supports the plan for Indian self-help which I have copied from Operation Bootstrap in Puerto Rico. The editorial is as follows:

OPERATION BOOTSTRAP FOR INDIANS

The Government of the United States has spent $180 million on Indian welfare programs during the 1959 fiscal year and this amount is expected to increase rapidly in future years. Yet, some 535,000 Indians remain our "poor country cousins," living on remote agriculturally-based reservations, virtually untouched by our vast industrial economy.

The time has come to do something about industrializing and diversifying the Indian economy—if these, our original Americans, can be said to have any economy. Many of them are permanently on relief, because so few jobs are available to them. Approximately 80 percent of our reservation Indians have little or no job opportunities.

Representative E. Y. BERRY (Republican of South Dakota), whose home is on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation, the old stamping grounds of Sitting Bull, has been living with this problem for upward of 10 years. He has come up with a plan which seems to us a logical and practical solution. The South Dakotan proposes a program that would put the Indian in business, a setup something after the order of Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap.

Puerto Rico launched Operation Bootstrap in 1946, a facility under which the Commonwealth government offered long-term tax exemptions and long-term sales or leases on industrial plants to bring new industries to the island. Some 600 new industries have located in Puerto Rico under its now-famous bootstrap program. Now, instead of being "the poorhouse of the Caribbean," Puerto Rico has the second highest standard of living in Latin America. The island has risen from a burden on the U.S. Treasury to sixth place as a major customer for American goods.

It is reasonably certain that Operation Bootstrap could be fashioned to meet the needs of the American Indian. After talks with Puerto Rico's Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, Representative BERRY introduced a bill in the House, which would authorize the tribes to sell or lease property for industrial plants on a long-term basis. Of course all this would be subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. Any industries moving in on Indian lands would receive complete exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes for 10 years.

If the setup appears a bit impractical, it should be remembered that Puerto Rico has proved to the world that such an industrialization can be made to work. No question about it, most Indians on a reservation, especially the young folk who have had the advantage of the new schooling opportunities, would gladly swap a Government dole for a weekly paycheck.

The splended thing about the Berry Indian program is that it requires nary a dol-

lar of the taxpayers' money. If it can change the status of our Indian citizens from dependents on the Federal Treasury, to self-supporting producers, as it did the Puerto Ricans, it should be given prompt and preferred consideration by the Congress.

World Challenge to American Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, we know that Medico—Medical International Cooperation—was organized by American physicians for the fundamental purposes of voluntarily giving their professional services on the most basic physician-to-patient level to peoples of the world in need of these services. As a division of the International Rescue Committee, Medico offers to other peoples the great strength of this Nation, not only in medical knowledge, skill, and materials, but in the humanitarian instincts, the generosity, and the compassion of our people.

Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, the distinguished Secretary-General of Medico, recently composed an editorial for the July 1959 edition of Medical Annals of the District of Columbia. Speaking from the background of his experiences with Medico, Dr. Comanduras in this editorial concisely and clearly spells out "The World Challenge to American Medicine."

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Comanduras' article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD CHALLENGE TO AMERICAN MEDICINE

(By Peter D. Comanduras)

Alfred North Whitehead, the late mathematician-philosopher, said at one time, "No period of history has ever been great or can ever be that does not act on some sort of high idealistic motives. Idealism in our time has been set aside and we are paying the penalty for it."

An opportunity and a challenge are being presented to the American medical profession today to espouse idealistic and humanitarian motives, worldwide in extent, and universal in their implications. This opportunity is offered by the organization known as MEDICO, or Medical International Cooperation. MEDICO was organized a little over a year ago, on February 4, 1958, as a division of the International Rescue Committee. A national group of American physicians, devoted to international good will, and acutely conscious of the appalling discrepancy between medical care and practice in this country and the distressing medical conditions prevalent in the rest of the world, especially in the newly developing countries of Asia and Africa, decided to go into effective action.

One of the compelling reasons for initiating MEDICO was based on the shocking appreciation of the fact that one-half of the world—over 1 billion people—from the moment they are born until they die have no access to medical care at all. There are areas in the world where the physician-population ratio runs from 1:20,000 to 1:200,000 and over. (The physician-population ratio in the United States is 1:700.) More than three-fourths of the people of the world, with the exception of Western Europe, the North American Continent, and Australia, are born in poverty and misery, eke out an existence during the greater part of their lifetime in semistarvation and semipollution, and, if not crippled, blinded, or deformed during infancy and adolescence by diseases long since preventable, die prematurely from illnesses which are curable in other more fortunate parts of the world. Epidemics of smallpox, diphtheria, cholera, and typhoid fever, which are practically never seen in this country, rage sporadically and extensively in the villages and cities of Asia and Africa, taking an awesome toll of human life. From the Mediterranean to the Pacific, across the entire land mass of Asia, tuberculosis is the No. 1 health problem in every country.

These constitute only a partial segment of some of the medical facts of 20th century life in the larger and more populous sections of the world. They cannot be easily dismissed or quietly deplored. They must be met realistically and pragmatically. The privileges of freedom and democracy cannot remain viable in an atmosphere of poverty, illiteracy, and consuming and persistent disease. The vast and wide chasm that separates the daily life of the American people from the despicable existence that constitutes the burden of the individual in more than three-fourths of the globe is a dire and dangerous situation that has not been sympathetically acknowledged or properly understood and noted by the great majority of the American people. There is not sufficient awareness that in the 20th century when we boast of our scientific advances, the largest element of humanity on this planet does not enjoy the minimum needs of basic subsistence. This is the medical and humanitarian challenge which presents itself to the American medical world today, and which MEDICO accepted 1 year ago when it was founded.

A part of this challenge has been met by international medical organizations such as WHO, ICA, and some private foundations. However, the main emphasis of all these existing medical organizations, with the exception of the religious missionary groups, has been along the line of public health, preventive medicine, and medical education. Until MEDICO came along, there had been no existing international medical machinery to utilize the services and talets of practicing physicians and private specialists in the United States. Here was a large, impressive pool of close to 200,000 physicians lying fallow while the world fairly shrieked its demands for more doctors for its unfortunate and sick millions. It is difficult to imagine and impossible to believe that American private medicine possesses little or no social conscience, no evidence of altruism, no humanitarian tendencies, and no regard for the medical problems in more than three-fourths of the world.

In MEDICO a means now exists which provides opportunities for the expression of these beneficent human qualities. MEDICO is acutely aware of the obvious fact—that the world has shrunk too much in the modern jet age to allow Americans to live "in an isolated mansion in the midst of world slums." MEDICO is fully cognizant that medicine has become a powerful instrument for international friendship. With medicine we can project our humanitarian impulses across national boundaries in a way often unrealizable by the desperately needed but frequently impersonal Government aid programs. The rising expectations of the peoples of Asia and Africa for a better and a longer life have become the most dynamic human force in the world today. We can ignore this universal demand for freedom from disease, privation, and suffering only at the peril of our humanity, and our national existence.

The hand of the healer from time immemorial has inevitably formed firm and lasting bonds of friendship and affection between men. These emotional, intimate bonds between man and man are needed today more than ever. The men of medicine, in the spirit of Schweitzer, through the direct efforts of MEDICO, are extending their hands to peoples all over the world, offering no erudite philosophies, no shining utopias, no ultimate panaceas, and no economic supremacy. The men of medicine extend their hands hoping that the gesture will be accepted by the peoples of the world in kindness and in amity, in mutual respect, tolerance and understanding. In the achievement of these goals, the hopes for world unity and world peace will be inevitably advanced.

Buffalo Heroes Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently the city of Buffalo was honored in having a heavy cruiser, the U.S.S. *Macon*, visit its port. The *Macon* is the flagship of the Operation Inland Seas fleet of the Navy, and one of the first great ships to transit fresh waters.

An impressive ceremony was held aboard the *Macon* to honor two Buffalo heroes. One was Adam Plewacki, the first Buffalo soldier to fall in World War I, and the other was Raymond Pawlowski, a Buffalo sailor who died aboard the U.S.S. *Arizona*, along with 1,100 other crewmen of the battleship when the Japs unleashed their attack against 88 ships at anchor in Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Invited aboard the *Macon* to pay respects to Mr. and Mrs. Robert Pawlowski, parents of Raymond, was a delegation from the Adam Plewacki American Legion Post 799, named after the World War I hero, which included Post Commander Robert Gredzicki and Past Commanders Walter Sokolowski, Matthew Stukowski, and Leonard Jaskowiak.

Others attending the ceremony were Henry Polanski, Sons of Legion chairman; Raymond Bazamowski, Erie County American Legion finance officer; Eugene Kayne, past 8th district Legion commander; Mrs. Helen Bojanowski, post auxiliary president; Under Sheriff B. John Tutuska; and Representative THADDEUS J. DULSKI of the 41st District. The new generation was represented by a group of 25 young men enrolled in the Sons of Legion.

On behalf of the Secretary of the Navy, Capt. J. C. Wylie, commanding officer of the *Macon*, presented to the parents of Raymond Pawlowski a flag

which had been flown over the sunken *Arizona*. Flags fly from the devastated battleship's superstructure which rises from the wreckage. A Marine guard saluted the flag presentation ceremony.

Young Plewacki, buried in the American Cemetery at St. Mihiel, was killed in action near St. Mihiel April 3, 1918, shortly after he had received the Croix de Guerre from the French Government. He had lived at 753 Best Street and was among the first in the city to enlist.

Oregon: The Permanent Memorial to Gen. Joseph Lane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in this session of Congress, while Oregon is still celebrating its 100 years of statehood, it seems to me an especially fitting time to call to attention the accomplishments of Gen. Joseph Lane, whose colorful military career and leading role in the fight for statehood for Oregon, followed by many years of statesmanlike leadership in the political life of the young State, qualify him for an honored niche in the history of Oregon and of the Nation.

An outstanding and respected member of the Legislature of Indiana for 24 years, Lane gave up the security of his position to enlist in the Army, at the age of 45, as a private. Two years later, as a general, he was appointed by President Polk as Territorial Governor of the vast Oregon territory, and from that time until his death more than 30 years later, he unfailingly served the interests of his adopted home.

In the selfless efforts of the many who have worked for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii during the past years, we have a reflection of the task which confronted Joe Lane 100 years ago, and in their success, we see more clearly the achievement of Joseph Lane, who gave himself completely, first as Territorial Governor and later as Territorial Delegate in Congress, to that objective. For this service to his State, he was rewarded with election as one of Oregon's first Senators; for his service to his country, he was given the Vice Presidential slot on the Democratic ticket which opposed Lincoln in the crucial election of 1860.

Concrete memorials to this man are few: There is a county in the State of Oregon today called Lane, in memory of and honor to him; his tomb, in Roseburg, Oreg., has been restored by a historical organization, the Descendants of Gen. Joe Lane. Yet a single grand unique symbol of his life and achievements stands as a kind of monument to him—the State of Oregon. The people of Oregon pay special tribute this year to General Lane and those like him, who laid the foundations upon which we are building our State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a biographical sketch of Gen. Joseph Lane, prepared by Mrs. Marjorie Lane Shantz of Wenatchee, Wash., a great-granddaughter of Joseph Lane, and secretary of the Descendants of Gen. Joe Lane.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. JOSEPH LANE

(By Marjorie Lane Shantz)

I

Joseph Lane was born in Buncombe County, N.C., in 1801. When he was 4 years of age, his family moved to Kentucky and located near Henderson on the Ohio River. At 17 years of age, he moved near to Evansville, Ind., where he worked for various people in stores, etc., and he was very soon elected to the Indiana Legislature. For the next 24 years, he represented his district in the Indiana Legislature, and became a very prominent and influential member of the same.

In 1846, when war was declared with Mexico, he volunteered as a private, and was almost immediately appointed colonel of the Indiana 2d volunteer regiment by the Governor of Indiana. His regiment was moved to Texas, and placed in Gen. Zachary Taylor's army. He fought in the battle of Buena Vista with great distinction, and was badly wounded in the right arm. Because of his ability and bravery, he was commissioned by President Polk a brigadier general. He also engaged in several other battles, participating in the capture of Monterey.

The strategy of the Mexican War changed, and Vera Cruz was picked as the point of landing in order for the American troops to capture Mexico City. General Scott landed and set out for Mexico City. President Polk, in order to reinforce Scott, ordered General Lane's brigade to Vera Cruz, and in spite of every effort being made to keep General Lane from moving from the mouth of the Rio Grande to Vera Cruz, General Lane, on his own initiative commandeered some boats and sailed to Vera Cruz with his brigade. In Vera Cruz, he plunged immediately into the interior of Mexico to help relieve several groups of American soldiers that were surrounded by guerrillas, and even General Scott and his army were having trouble. General Lane, through his ability and the courage and splendid bravery of his troops, fought many battles throughout central Mexico, winning them all, and clearing the country of practically every guerrilla band. He was highly commended by General Scott, and was brevetted major general. Due to his wonderful campaign in central Mexico, he was referred to as the "Marion of the Mexican War." In his brigade he had Indiana troops, Ohio troops, Texas troops, and a few regiments of Regular Army personnel. After the war was over, he was given a tremendous welcome throughout Texas, and at Cincinnati, Ohio, he was proclaimed the outstanding general of the war, and a tremendous reception was held in his honor. Indianapolis and various other Indiana towns vied with each other in entertaining and honoring him.

II

During this time, President Polk was able to come to an agreement on the boundary line between England and the United States as to the disputed Territory in the Northwest known as the Oregon Country. As soon as this was completed, the United States acquired by this treaty all of the territory from the California line to the present Canadian line, and from the crest of the Rocky Mountains to the Pacific Ocean. This was known and labeled the Oregon Territory. It included all of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, some of Wyoming and some of western Montana. President Polk was very anxious to have the Oregon Territory set up and operating during his term of office and he immediately picked General Lane as the Territorial Governor of this Oregon Territory, and he was notified in August of 1848 of his appointment by Joseph Meek, who had been sent by President Polk to tell him and give him his commission. They left Evansville, Ind., as soon as possible, went by boat to St. Louis, where General Lane and Joe Meek were met by Joe Lane's oldest son Nathanial, who joined the party, and they proceeded to Independence, Mo. At Independence, he contacted the commander of the Army post, and requested an escort, to make the trip to Oregon Territory. The commander informed them that due to the coming winter, they could not move out any troops until the next spring. General Lane then, using his rank as general, secured 25 mounted cavalry soldiers as an escort, and immediately set out for Santa Fe, N. Mex.

Upon this journey it was learned that gold had been discovered in California, and upon their arrival in Santa Fe this was confirmed, and after they had left there on the way to San Francisco, many of the men deserted in order to get to the gold fields. Regardless of the loss of men, they made the trip and finally arrived in San Francisco with seven men. General Lane was able to secure a boat sailing for Astoria at the mouth of the Columbia River. The party now consisted of three men, General Lane, Marshal Joe Meek, and Lieutenant Hawkins, U.S. Army. Upon their arrival at Astoria, they secured canoes to take them to the mouth of the Willamette River, and thence to Oregon City, which was to be the seat of government. During this trip, General Lane personally took his turn at pulling on the oars. They arrived there March 2, and immediately General Lane issued a proclamation and set up the Territorial government in Oregon, thus accomplishing President Polk's desire of having Oregon Territory legally set up during his administration.

President Taylor, who was a Whig, succeeded President Polk, a Democrat, and immediately, because of his jealousy and dislike of General Lane, looked around for another man as Territorial Governor. It was first offered to Abraham Lincoln, but he rejected it, and it was then offered to another man who started out on the journey but failed to complete the trip, and finally a Mr. Gaines was appointed, but, due to the delays and the long overland trip, Governor Lane was not relieved until August 1850. General Lane was then elected as Territorial Delegate to the U.S. Congress. During the time he was Governor he was also the Indian agent and was in charge of the armed troops in the Oregon Territory. He was instrumental in bringing to trial the Cayuse Indians who were accused and hanged for the massacre of Marcus Whitman, his wife, and many others. In addition to handling the Whitman massacre, he engaged in many Indian fights, and was very successful in making treaties. He became known throughout the Territory as a friend of the Indians.

Upon the election of President Pierce, General Lane was reappointed Territorial Governor. However, at this time he was deeply interested in securing statehood for the Territory of Oregon. So he resigned as Governor and recommended his friend Curry for that position, which President Pierce agreed to, and Lane ran for Territorial Delegate to Congress. He was elected and went again to Washington, D.C. There was a move on foot to divide the Oregon Territory along the line of the Columbia River from the Pacific Ocean, and the Territory of Washington took over the northern part of the

original Oregon Territory. General Lane was instrumental in having President Pierce appoint his very good friend, Isaac Stevens, as the first Territorial Governor of the Washington Territory. General Lane and Governor Stevens were both Democrats and very close friends. During his time as Territorial Delegate he was instrumental in putting through claims for the soldiers and settlers who had suffered at the hands of the Indians, as well as to protect, at the same time, the rights of the Indians in the two Territories.

III

Upon the election of James Buchanan in 1856, who was one of General Lane's admirers and supporters, he immediately commenced using every possible connection and friendship to secure statehood for Oregon. Through his efforts, in 1858, the Senate approved statehood, but the House adjourned before the bill could be acted upon. However, immediately upon Congress' meeting in January 1859 General Lane again pushed with all his influence for statehood for Oregon and was successful in getting the Congress to accept Oregon as a State, and President Buchanan made it official on February 14, 1859. General Lane then returned to Oregon and was elected one of the first Senators from the State of Oregon. Two Senators were elected, one for 6 months and the other for 2 years. General Lane secured the 2-year election.

In the presidential campaign of 1860, the Democratic Party was faced with one of the greatest splits that had ever occurred in American history. The northern Democrats, headed by Stephen Douglas of Illinois, were believers in compromise and concession to the fanatical demands of the abolitionists. The so-called border States believed in any compromise between the slave States and the free States, and was headed by Bell. But the southern Democrats, composed of the outstanding leaders of the Democratic Party, stood on the Constitution of the United States, and the rulings of the Supreme Court, which especially in the Dred-Scott decision decided that property, whether it be money, material, or slaves, was entitled to full protection in any part of the United States or its Territories, which was what the Constitution granted. This latter group picked upon Vice President John C. Breckenridge of Kentucky as their candidate for President, and Gen. Joe Lane as their Vice Presidential candidate. During this convention of the Democratic Party in 1860, Governor Stevens of Washington Territory acted as chairman and worked with General Lane in efforts to unite the party. General Lane was picked for this important nomination because of his strong stand for the Constitution, and the rights of the various States and the people of those States, as granted especially in amendments 9 and 10; which was, and is, and should always be fully protected.

Due to the thre-way split in the Democratic Party in the 1860 election, Abraham Lincoln, although a minority candidate in the number of votes cast, was elected. Gen. Joe Lane accepted this defeat, and on March 2, 1861, made a masterful explanation on his stand at those troublesome and critical times in his final speech in the Senate of the United States as the Senator from the State of Oregon.

IV

He then returned to Oregon where he retired, and being 60 years of age, and his right arm because of wounds practically useless, he did not participate in the War Between the States. He was offered a brigade in the southern army, and of course still retained his commission as general in the Union Army. In addition to his age and his disabled right arm, he could not, and would not, fire upon his relatives and close friends that were in the southern army, and he would not fire upon the flag of the United States after he had fought so gallantly and heroically for it throughout his active life. He passed away in 1881, at the age of 80 years. His tomb is located in Roseburg, Oreg., and has been restored by the organization known as the Descendants of Gen. Joe Lane.

Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev's impending visit to this country is rightly viewed with deep concern by many thinking Americans.

On August 13, in a notable speech in the Senate, the junior Senator from Connecticut gave forceful expression to this concern.

A former member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, Senator DODD is recognized as an outstanding authority in this field, and his views must be given serious consideration.

Since Senator DODD's speech was not widely covered by the press, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report as it appears in the August 24 issue of Time magazine. I commend this to the attention of those Members who may not have read the speech in full:

FOREIGN RELATIONS—MINORITY VIEW

For all the general cheering that greeted its announcement, the U.S. visit of Nikita Khrushchev is packed with political dynamite. Republican Presidential hopeful RICHARD NIXON, for example, is certain to be blamed if the Khrushchev trip turns diplomatically sour—even though it was arranged by President Eisenhower with little or no real reference to NIXON'S presence in Russia. No one recognizes NIXON'S problem more than New York's Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, who has himself said noncommittally: "We want to contribute to an easing of tensions, but we want it known we are not letting our guard down." On that platform, "Rocky" is in a position to jump either way, depending on how the Khrushchev visit turns out.

Many another U.S. politician has followed "Rocky's" example, either remaining quiet or simply making meaningless noises. But last week Connecticut's able freshman democratic Senator THOMAS DODD delivered the most forceful expression so far of the opposition to a Khrushchev visit. DODD'S speech was made to a near-empty Senate and went virtually unreported by the press—but if the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange does turn out badly, then DODD'S words could become the battle cry in one of the decade's hottest political controversies.

"What," asked Connecticut's DODD, "would the Senate and the country have thought if in 1939 President Roosevelt had invited Adolf Hitler to a barnstorming tour of the United States, fresh from conquest of Czechoslovakia, Austria, and Poland and in the midst of his extermination of millions of Jews?" Extending the comparison, DODD said: "Khrushchev rose to Communist prominence as the hangman of the Ukraine. He has maintained himself in power as the butcher of Budapest."

HOPE OF LIBERTY

DODD'S strongest point was that the very fact of the visit would enhance Khrushchev's prestige and position at home and in the Soviet satellites—even while weakening the Western alliance. Said DODD: "We can be certain that the satellite peoples, who still cling to the hope of liberty, will be flooded with photographs of Khrushchev being wined and dined, flattered and applauded by the leaders and people of our country. Khrushchev's visit will be interpreted as a reflection of American acceptance of permanent Soviet domination of their lands."

In the free world, said DODD, the U.S. decision to opt for Big Two talks might seem like appeasement, might have a divisive effect upon U.S. allies fearful of secret deals. U.S. allies under the guns of communism in West Berlin, Formosa, South Korea would interpret Khrushchev in the United States as a softening of our determination to resist. Said DODD: "Those who have been soft on communism will grow softer. Those who are unconcerned about the Communist menace will become more indifferent. Those who have been sounding the alarms will find their difficulties multiplied."

TRUE PEACE

Democrat DODD offered specific recommendations for "salvaging something from this debacle in the hope of limiting the harm wherever possible." Among them: the President should (1) mince no words with Khrushchev on the issue of Europe's captive nations; (2) insist that Khrushchev withdraw his 1958 ultimatum on Berlin before engaging in further negotiations on Germany; (3) declare null and void all the concessions the United States tentatively offered to the Russians at the Geneva Conference, e.g., decreasing Western propaganda activities; (4) emphasize to Khrushchev unmistakably the absolute U.S. determination to defend West Berlin.

In broader terms, DODD had definite notions about how the U.S. people should greet Khrushchev, "I hope," he said, "that during Khrushchev's visit we shall hear church bells in the land, tolling their remembrance for the murdered millions behind the Iron Curtain. I hope there will be public observances of prayer. I hope there will be peaceful demonstrations of our dedication to that true peace which can only be achieved by spreading freedom and justice throughout the earth. Let there be no cheers for the Red dictator, no crowds assembled to greet him, no flattery or flowers. Let our people be civil but silent."

Housing and Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, published in the August 18 issue of the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N.H., entitled "Housing and Youth."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING AND YOUTH

In two votes last week Senators BRIDGES and COTTON not only upheld the President but again demonstrated economy is something more than the subject for a political oration.

Both Senators upheld Eisenhower's veto of the housing bill. Both opposed establishment of a Youth Corps, reminiscent of the old Civilian Conservation Corps of depression days and dedicated to much the same purpose.

It was almost a foregone conclusion the Senate would not override the housing bill veto. The Democratic leadership has gained nothing from forcing the issue to a vote. It has added to the President's unbroken record of never having his veto overridden during the six and a half years in office.

Eisenhower has made clear he is open to compromise on a housing measure and Congress has an opportunity to write a passable program that will aid many large cities.

It is in spending that the principal differences lie. It can be argued that a college building plan included in the vetoed bill more properly comes under grants to education, and that more study is needed on proposals to house elderly persons.

The Senate by a vote of 47 to 45 passed the Youth Corps bill. The basic idea is development and conservation of the country's natural resources and upkeep of recreational facilities and wildlife refugees in public parks.

Supporters claimed the proposal is an investment in conservation of youth. They said it would provide useful work for youngsters between 16 and 21 and reduce juvenile delinquency.

Opponents claimed the Youth Corps is an expensive boondoggle and a depression program in an era of prosperity. They are skeptical of its value and how attractive it will be to those it is designed to help.

Beginning with 50,000 young men and women at an estimated cost of $125 million for the first year, participating States would be required to match Federal expenditures.

The bill now goes to the House, where its approval is seen as unlikely. In any event, it is probable that if it is passed the President will veto it.

Making jobs available to youngsters is something that appeals to politicians. However, it is questionable in these times if this should be the concern of the Federal Government.

Interest Cost of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, Paul Peters, for 40 years a collector of statistics and one who can put them together so they are understandable to the average man, has collected some interesting data on the cost of foreign aid other than the direct appropriations.

Here is a table worthy of study to those who care to understand this terrific burden of foreign aid:

Analysis of cumulative and current interest cost of moneys borrowed by the Federal Treasury to finance foreign aid programs, fiscal 1941 through fiscal 1959

Fiscal year	Net foreign aid in dollars	Interest rate	First year cost	Cumulative yearly cost	Cumulative interest
1941	$545,418,062	$0.02518	$13,733,626		$13,733,626
1942	7,745,797,011	.02285	165,993,461	$179,727,087	193,460,713
1943	11,603,826,483	.01979	229,639,726	409,366,813	602,827,526
1944	19,753,800,439	.01920	381,050,810	790,417,623	1,393,245,152
1945	17,803,448,810	.01936	344,674,768	1,135,092,391	2,528,337,543
1946	5,763,513,843	.01996	115,039,736	1,250,132,127	3,778,469,670
1947	6,734,885,336	.02107	141,904,034	1,392,036,161	5,170,505,831
1948	5,715,000,000	.02182	124,701,300	1,516,737,461	6,687,243,292
1949	6,543,029,206	.02236	146,302,133	1,663,039,594	8,350,282,886
1950	5,842,592,000	.02200	128,537,024	1,791,576,618	10,141,859,504
1951	6,263,188,000	.02270	144,444,367	1,936,020,985	12,077,880,489
1952	4,595,477,000	.02329	107,028,659	2,043,049,644	14,120,930,133
1953	6,336,000,000	.02438	154,471,680	2,197,521,324	16,318,451,457
1954	4,855,495,000	.02380	115,560,781	2,313,082,009	18,631,541,466
1955	4,219,351,000	.02351	99,196,942	2,412,278,951	21,043,820,417
1956	4,648,000,000	.02576	119,732,480	2,532,011,199	23,575,831,616
1957	3,908,000,000	.02730	106,688,400	2,638,699,599	26,214,531,215
1958	4,661,000,000	.02638	122,956,180	2,761,656,180	28,976,187,395
1959	4,088,623,836	.02867	117,224,850	2,878,904,279	31,855,091,674

Sources: Computed annual interest rate from annual reports of the Secretary of the Treasury. Net foreign aid from reports on Foreign Transactions of the United States compiled by the Office of Clearing Information in the Department of Commerce.

NOTES

For the fiscal years 1941 through 1945 the foreign aid includes lend-lease after deducting reciprocal credits for reverse lend-lease and dollar returns.

For the postwar period 1946 through fiscal 1959 the net grants and credits extended under the so-called Marshall plan and other relief measures approved by the Congress.

Since in most of the wartime and postwar years the surpluses were not sufficient to pay the interest on the public debt and also furnish the dollars for the foreign-aid programs, in most years the Treasury had to borrow the moneys to meet the cumulative interest costs of over $31,800,000,000.

With a deficit in fiscal 1960 probable the annual interest burden on the American taxpayers due to the foreign-aid programs will approach $3,000,000,000 which will be a continuing burden until the Treasury is able to retire a portion of the public debt. In short the foreign aid programs cost $3,000,000,000 in interest on top of the appropriated funds.

Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Grain Terminal Association Daily Radio Roundup of Friday, August 14, 1959.

There being no objection, the daily radio roundup was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 14, 1959

What's the best fed country in the world? Got any idea? No, it's not the United States. And it's not Canada, although the farmers in those two countries grow more food than farmers in most other lands.

The nation where the people eat the most, believe it or not, is Ireland. That's according to a report by the Foreign Agriculture Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Right after Ireland came Denmark, New Zealand, Switzerland, and Australia. You're down in 11th and 12th places before you run into the United States and Canada, respectively.

So the Irish eat the most, measured in calories, although not necessarily the best. You all know what's been happening in the United States as more and more people begin fighting the battle of the bulge. They shy away from fat meat and potatoes, pie and pastries. They eat more fruits and vegetables. And they can take their pick because probably no country in the world has farms that produce so much good food of all kinds at such reasonable prices. The USDA's survey shows that Canada and the United States lead the world in dinner table bargains.

In this country, for example, food accounts for only 24 percent of family spending. It's down to 23 percent in Canada. Of the 30 countries surveyed by the USDA's Foreign Agriculture Service, the families in these two countries eat, maybe not the most, but the best for the smallest percentage of income.

It's tough going for families in South Korea and in Ghana (that's in Africa) because there it takes 57 percent of income to eat. It's 50 percent in Ceylon and Honduras; 49 percent in Ecuador, down to less than 30 percent in Australia, Belgium, and Denmark.

Of course, the people in the United States and Canada probably have more income per capita than people in most other nations. But at the same time they are getting food at bargain rates. This all adds up to a larger share of income left over for such things as automobiles, new houses, television sets, vacations, speedboats, and so forth. That's a tremendous boost for business and industry anyway you want to look at it.

That's why we've said so many times that farmers deserve a pat on the back and national recognition for the multi-billion-dollar contribution they are making to the Nation's economic stability. But pats on the back don't pay bills, and that's where the farmers are having trouble. The only thing that will pay bills is more money. And as long as farm operating costs stay skyhigh the only way that farmers can get more income is from higher prices for their products.

What about the consumers, then? Could they still get by with spending only 24 percent of income for food? The truth is that a substantial boost in farm prices would have very little effect on consumer food prices. Economists tell us that a 10-percent increase in farm prices would increase the net income of farmers by 50 percent but food prices by only 4 percent.

This is another farm report from GTA—the co-op way.

The Carey Letters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the two letters printed below were received by Members of Congress this morning.

I hope Mr. Carey is not speaking for Mr. Meany. If his position is that of the AFL–CIO, it will harm the great labor movement. Threats are not appreciated by Members of Congress or the American people. Good union members will not approve of Mr. Carey's tactics.

Letter No. 1 was sent to Members of Congress who voted against the Landrum-Griffin amendment. Letter No. 2 was sent to those voting for the amendment:

[Letter No. 1]

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On behalf of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, I wish to express our deep appreciation for your vote against the Landrum-Griffin bill on August 13, 1959.

We are aware that terrific pressures were brought to bear on you to support that vindictive and oppressive measure in order to weaken and disrupt the trade union movement. Your vote was a concrete demonstration of your understanding of the basic issues involved, and of your courage in acting on your convictions in this matter.

This action, along with your continuing support of a progressive legislative program will, I am confident, assure you of support by the working men and women in your district.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

[Letter No. 2]

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D. C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, respressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,
JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

United Jewish Welfare Fund: What It Means

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, my attention was called recently to a very fine address by Dr. Max William Bay, 1959 general chairman of the Los Angeles United Jewish Welfare Fund. In an appearance in May of this year at the Mormon Los Angeles Stake Center, Dr. Bay told of the meaning and objectives of Jewish philanthrophy in general and the United Jewish Welfare Fund in particular. It is a stirring statement on man's obligation to his fellow man, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Bay's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND: WHAT IT MEANS

(Address by Max William Bay, M.D., 1959 general chairman, United Jewish Welfare Fund of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles, to the Los Angeles Stake of the Church of the Latter Day Saints (Mormon) on May 9, 1959)

I am deeply grateful to all of you for this privilege. It is an honor to be asked to participate in this program. I am particularly grateful to Dr. and Mrs. Sheranian and to Mrs. Rose Marie Reid for suggesting this get-together and for their inspiration and encouragement. I know that you are interested in fostering better intergroup relationships—that is best accomplished through the understanding which comes from learning all that we can about each other. We share much in common. We are full and equal citizens in a land blessed by the bounty of divine providence and basically we share a spiritual faith. Each of us is a minority in this land. We have each known the sorrow of oppression and we have wandered in search of a land where we could follow the dictates of conscience in freedom and in dignity. And yet there are dissimilarities, but these may not be great.

I am to talk to you about the United Jewish Welfare Fund. It is not my purpose to ask you for contributions. This is not a fund-raising event. I do want to consider with you the philosophic basis of our devotion to this community endeavor. What is its meaning? What is its purpose? We will talk about the spiritual foundation on which it rests and the practical matters it accomplishes. I must confess that I do not feel altogether comfortable in my present role. I am not a rabbi nor a social worker, and I prefer to leave the pulpit to the rabbis and ministers. But, in the tradition of our faith, it is the rabbi's duty to teach and it is the layman's privilege and obligation to affirm what he has learned—and this points up another principle we share. I know of no more proper place than a synagogue, church, temple, or chapel to speak about matters which concern the welfare fund and no more appropriate person to carry the responsibility of speaking than the chairman of the campaign.

HOLINESS THROUGH SOCIAL JUSTICE

A passionate belief in and concern for justice for all men is inherent in Judaism. It stems, not alone from the immortal utterances of the Biblical prophets, but from the fundamental nature of the Jewish faith. It stems first and foremost from the Jewish concepts of God, His universe and His greatest creation, man. In our faith, we are taught that man is created in the image of God. Therefore, man is fundamentally good and he must seek for personal holiness. In some spiritual faiths, men believe that they may attain that holiness in their devotion to God and through acceptance of the sacrifice of a man who through his sacrifice cleansed them of all sin. But in our faith, man's relationship to man may even transcend in importance his relationship to God—man's transgression against his fellow man cannot be atoned by devotion to God nor by the sacrifice of another man—he must atone to the man whom he has transgressed. Man can attain the holiness he seeks only through social morality and justice. Man is privileged to take an active role in determining the direction he follows in the path of life—he may follow the path of good or of evil. He is not the victim of predetermined destiny; he does have the right to choose his course. Man seeks the better life for himself and his family—this privilege he may enjoy only so long as he accepts a responsibility, the obligation of consideration for the rights of his fellow man. This, in simple terms, is the meaning of the fundamental concepts of our spiritual faith. This, in essence, is the tradition of Judaism, and of America.

From the fundamental concepts of individual dignity and freedom, of equality, and of universal brotherhood has grown the concept of tzedakah, the Hebrew word which means righteousness. In classical Hebrew, there is no word meaning charity. In the Torah, our Bible, and in the Talmud, there is no reference to anything meaning charity—there is reference only to tzedakah, which means righteous or just giving. So we speak only of tzedakah, not the benevolence of the generous, nor the bounty of the arrogant, but the righteousness and moral behavior of the fortunate and the humble. What we do is not pure altruism—it is the correction of inequity—the fulfillment of justice. Man is only the custodian of his worldly goods—he has the obligation of sharing his good fortune with those who are less fortunate and even he who receives, he who may be on relief, has the obligation of sharing with him who is even less fortunate.

ABUNDANCE IMPOSES RESPONSIBILITY

Through all the years of recorded history there have been assaults on our concepts of freedom and dignity. Our spiritual forefathers understood the course of history and knew well how to teach it. They taught their children, and admonished them to teach their children in turn, and to continue to repeat the story each Passover, so that each of us would remember that we were once slaves in Egypt and the Almighty brought us forth into freedom and dignity, not alone the generations of antiquity, but even you and me in this generation. Is there any more effective way to teach us humility? Is there any more compelling reason for remaining alert and on guard against the onslaughts of those who would enslave by dictatorship, persecution, or oppression? Do we, who understand justice and mercy,

need to be reminded that we must be concerned about the poverty and disease of others, of whatever color or creed, in our own midst or in distant lands? Do we need to be reminded that we must be concerned about the economic and political enslavement of others? Should we not be concerned about the status of Jews everywhere and for their security and survival in Israel? Do we not share a spiritual heritage, a common interest, and a common destiny? Does not the security of all of us and the peace of the world depend upon these concerns? Does not our own abundance and the abundance of America impose a responsibility?

And so we are guided by the moral concepts and precepts of our spiritual faith and by the principles of American democracy; we understand our responsibilities and believe in them and we demonstrate that understanding and belief by voluntary participation in and contribution to the welfare fund. Through 166 agencies, 90 of them local and national, we heal the sick; we rehabilitate the handicapped; we feed and clothe the destitute; we promote better intergroup relations; we strengthen our spiritual faith through education; we contribute to the culture of America and promote good citizenship; and, we rescue those who seek to leave the oblivion of communism. Thus we strengthen our local community, Jewish and non-Jewish; we strengthen our Nation through protection of the civil rights and liberties of all citizens; and we contribute to world peace through an extension of foreign aid and through our support of the democracy of Israel.

COMMUNITY SERVICES MAKE FOR BETTER AMERICANS

I want to mention only briefly a few of our activities in our local community. Through our health institutions, such as the Cedars of Lebanon hospital, we provide facilities for care of physical and mental illness for those who cannot afford to pay and for those who can, for Jew and non-Jew alike. We train young physicians and we contribute to knowledge through research. Through the Bureau of Jewish Education, we subsidize many of our religious schools and thus assure our children of the knowledge, blessings and security of our spiritual faith, and through our centers we make a contribution to the culture of America, and to the understanding and maintenance of good American citizenship.

Bigotry and persecution recognize no national or State boundaries. When these go unchecked, they lead to a breakdown of law and order, and lawlessness ultimately engulfs every person and every group. Few of us are made aware of the dangers which face us constantly. The bigot and hatemonger is constantly at work and alert to opportunity. If he attacks the Negro or the Jew, thinking them most vulnerable, and if he is successful, he will attack the Catholic next, and all other groups in turn. Adolf Hitler did not stop with the Jews—in fact, he attacked the Jews because they represented the very fountainhead of the Judeo-Christian civilization which he was determined to destroy. I do not need to belabor the segregation issue in the South, nor the bombings of Jewish temples and centers—these dangers to law and order are self-evident. The issue of segregation is not a Jewish issue—it is a moral issue for all Americans. When our human relations organizations, the American Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and others, speak out on this issue, it is because we cannot remain silent—we cannot ignore our spiritual heritage. If we permit impairment of the rights and liberties of any minority, we endanger the security of all. We must keep alive the hope and dream and reality of American equality and freedom.

Now I wish to talk about our activities in the overseas area. Through the United Jewish Appeal we give aid to peoples in 25 countries outside of Israel. I visited Morocco in February. One does not begin to visualize the full meaning of squalor and filth and stench until one visits Morocco. Even a doctor can hardly appreciate the utter destructiveness of widespread communicable disease until you see the people of Morocco. One doesn't understand the degradation of abject poverty nor the hopelessness of broad ignorance until one views Morocco. The activities of our agencies which care for the health, rehabilitative, nutritional and educational needs of the destitute Jews of Morocco are truly awe-inspiring and thrilling. Only the most phlegmatic and callous could fail to be affected by the scenes I saw. Our Government considers Morocco of tremendous political and strategic importance to the free world. I have talked to American consular and embassy officials in Morocco, France and Austria on a number of occasions during the three trips I've made in the past 5 years. They regard our activities warmly and consider them an extension of the foreign aid program carried out by our own Government.

ISRAEL A BASTION OF DEMOCRACY

What does Israel mean to America and the free world? When the ancient land of Israel was laid waste and its people dispersed, barbarism struck the very cradle of Western civilization. For 19 centuries the spiritual heirs of that civilization were assaulted and bruised for no reason other than their adherence to a faith which their assailants professed but did not practice. The carnage wrought by Nazi Germany finally outraged the conscience of the civilized world. How could man be so mad? How could the civilized world stand by and remain indifferent to the slaughter of millions of innocent men, women, children and even babies? Could we ever fully atone for this transgression? The blood of Abel did indeed cry out from the ground. Justice and mercy demanded the establishment of a land where the oppressed and persecuted could be permitted to fulfill their lives in dignity and in freedom. No event in recorded history can match in magnitude and significance the prophetic reestablishment of the State of Israel. No people in history has suffered the oppression and persecution meted out to the Jews. No people in history has had the spiritual strength to withstand such abhorrent assaults and still arise from the ashes of despair.

Ours is indeed a generation of good fortune to have lived to see the day of redemption and to have had some part in its realization. Israel is a bastion of democracy in a corner of the world which has been troubled for 2,000 years. Israel is shining proof of what even a small nation may achieve under freedom. Israel lay desolate and was virtual desert 50 years ago. It had hardly begun to show much sign of development 25 years ago. Eleven years ago when the state was reestablished, it had a population of 600,000 Jews and 200,000 Arabs. Since then it has been able to develop and thrive despite two wars and despite taking in and absorbing nearly 1 million people who had no other place to go. That is, they had little choice if they wished to survive. In the past 5 months alone, it has accepted 20,000 newcomers from Eastern Europe. Comparable figures for our own country based on relative populations would mean an immigration of 1,750,000 in only 5 months. Even we in mighty America might find the absorption of such a large number in such a short period difficult.

WHAT ISRAEL MEANS TO ME

I have visited Israel twice in the past 5 years. It is a tiny land with a mighty spirit. I have seen the miracle in action. How does one summarize Israel? Should I describe the beauty of its landscape which resembles our own familiar California—the sheer beauty of Haifa, Mount Carmel and the port which looks like San Francisco—the beauty of Lake Kinneret, known as the Sea of Galilee, which resembles Tahoe—the white sandy beaches of Tel Aviv, Herzliya, and Natanya—the lush green growth of the Jezreel Valley which is Israel's breadbasket—the heavenly majesty of Jerusalem and its hills which resemble nothing else in the world—the sheer virgin beauty of the Negev viewed from the air, mountains and rocks and desert much like our own, or the flat beach and little more than primitive port of Eilat where within 1 or 2 miles one looks at Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia as one turns in different directions?

Shall I describe the degree of industrialization which includes manufacturing or assembling all the things necessary in a modern civilization patterned on our own? Should I talk about the simple clean beauty of its homes of white, pink, or blue stucco with tiled roofs of varying colors, or the magnificent reinforced concrete apartment houses or the country club at Savyon near Tel Aviv? Shall we talk about the farms, individual, and cooperative, and the orange groves which look and smell like ours used to before we began to subdivide them?

Shall we talk about the kibbutzim and their meaning in the development and defense of Israel? Shall we talk about the development and use of natural resources, water, mining, and oil? Shall I tell you about medicine and hospitals, homes for the aged, youth Aliyah homes and camps where thousands of homeless, displaced and orphaned children returned from Europe? Shall we talk about education—the schools and universities, the breathtaking view of the new campus of the Hebrew University at Givath Ram just outside of Jerusalem—the wonderful new campus of Technion on Mount Carmel where important research work in engineering is going on, including projects under the auspices of the U.S. Navy, or the basic scientific research, including atomic research and nuclear physics, going on at the Weizmann Institute amongst the orange groves of Rehovoth?

Shall I tell you about the culture of Tel Aviv, the theater, music, and art? Shall we talk about the democratic Government of Israel, its Parliament where Jewish and Moslem representatives sit together? Shall I try to describe the emotions felt when one views Mount Zion where the tomb of King David supposedly lies, or the distant view of Bethlehem across a green valley of Jordan, or the Dead Sea scrolls in the guarded vault of the Hebrew University, or the simple well of Abraham in Beersheba, or the drive down the Via Maris which was the ancient highway between Egypt and Mesopotamia where so many historic battles were fought, or Ashkelon where lived the Philistines, or Nazareth, Cana, and Galilee so dear to the hearts of Christians, or the Crusader towers and the Roman Aqueduct, or the fortifications of Acre which Napoleon stormed unsuccessfully, or Beat Shearim near Haifa where the tombs of the Northern Sanhedrin have been uncovered in the past 3 years and where supposedly lie the sarcophaguses of two of our great rabbis, Hillel and Judah the Prince of Safad, the medieval city to which Spanish Jews returned after the Inquisition, or the simple tomb of Maimonides in ancient Tiberias?

Shall I describe the sturdy army of young men and women, the navy in the Mediterranean and Red Sea and the air force flying in modern machines over the ancient land of the prophets? Shall we talk about the unhappiness and frustration of the 90 percent on whom is imposed the burdensome dogma of the unyielding 10 percent of orthodoxy? Shall I tell you about the

miserable slums of the maabarot, the transition camps, where 18,000 families still live, or, the squalor of the oriental Jewish squatters in the slums of Jerusalem? Israel is all of these things, but above all it is people, oriental and Western, old settlers, new immigrants and refugees. But even more, it is youth, magnificent youth, born of pioneers, dedicated to a glorious cause, people of character, bearing, courage, fearlessness, and determination. All humankind must take pride in the courage, dedication, and selfless devotion of this people. Only a mind distorted by hate and fear can fail to understand the importance of Israel in the family of free nations. Only a soul without mercy can fail to want to play a part in the rebuilding of such a nation. The United Jewish Welfare Fund is devoted to that purpose.

WE CHOOSE REDEMPTION

I wish there were time to tell you about the recent exodus of Jews from Rumania. Twenty thousand people have reached Israel in the past few months and although emigration from Rumania has temporarily ceased, we have much evidence and feel assured that possibly 100,000 may reach Israel this year. The story of this exodus is a dramatic one. The impact of this tremendous mass movement of people struck us this past January—the tremendous responsibilities for ourselves and for Israel appeared heavy indeed and it was for that reason that I visited Vienna in January so that I could see for myself just what was happening. I will not go into much detail. These people are, in the main, young and vigorous, possessing extraordinary professional and scientific skills, people who have lived under communism and have seized the opportunity to reject it.

They arrive penniless in Vienna—ours is the burden of transporting them to Israel, to feed and house them, to provide for their education in Hebrew, the language of Israel and to help Israel absorb them into the economy of the nation. The financial burden on the people of Israel is tremendous but their sacrifice is gladly given. This exodus is far from being tragic. For years we have talked about cracking the Iron Curtain, about liberating the millions of enslaved souls imprisoned behind it. In the days of Hitler, the vast majority of Jews were trapped—there was precious little that we were prepared to do for them and there was no country which would admit large numbers without restriction—6 million of them were slaughtered—since then the Communists have kept the remnants of them impounded—now there is an opening in the gate, and there is an Israel which bids them to come.

Are we now to be the ones who say to them that they cannot leave lands of oppression because we refuse to help? We do not need to reopen the ovens of Hitler to see things in clearer perspective. Our choice is clear—we choose life not death—we choose redemption not oblivion.

If my talk has seemed emotional in part, I offer no apology. I believe that a little emotion helps to clarify thinking. Human reason which is not touched by human emotion often functions like a machine which has not been lubricated. Many of us do not wish to be reminded of the sordid chapters in history. We do not wish to relieve the squalor—the filth—the stench of the concentration camps and despicable brutality of the inhuman Nazi butchers. I do not suggest that we should relive these constantly but we are not permitted to forget entirely because our world has not yet reached the millenium—there are people living under despotism and there are people who are desperately hungry and ill and naked.

THE UNITED JEWISH WELFARE FUND: A WAY OF LIFE

I think it important from time to time to search one's mind for meaning and purpose in living. When in November 1957 my wife and I stood before the Paris memorial monument to the 6 million martyred Jews and viewed the documentary evidence of Nazi butchery, we wept, because these were our kin who were slaughtered. We would have been terribly angered if they had been Chinese, but we were both angered and anguished because these might have been our parents and they might have been us and our son. We were determined to do something to prevent this from happening again. There must be more in living than a constant feverish desire for oozing comfort and dripping prosperity. The words of Micah come to mind:

"He has told thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Can we who have so much be so unmindful of our brothers, of whatever color or creed, who need so little? We must have a sense of perspective and a balanced sense of values; we must serve our fellow men and make our contribution to the continued blessing of a world at peace. Only then can we assure these blessings for ourselves and for our children and for all others. This is not a burden—it is a responsibility. The United Jewish Welfare Fund is more than the fund-raising arm of the Jewish community. It is a great unifying force. It expresses the mind and conscience, the heart and will of the Jewish community. It serves us all, rich and poor alike. It asks of us only understanding and compassion. This we give with full sincerity. We do count our blessings. We are glad that we can help.

Traffic Safety Postage Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years a Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has been investigating the tragic deaths on our Nation's streets and highways. These investigations have certainly proved beyond a doubt that there is an urgent need for promoting safety on the highways. No one will deny that our most precious asset is the lives of our people—yet no war or calamity has taken so many of those lives as traffic accidents.

The Safety First Club of Maryland, a nonprofit organization dedicated to traffic safety, consists of a group of citizens and officials of Maryland who are doing an excellent job of making people conscious of the need to stop the slaughter on our highways.

However, traffic safety is not just a Maryland problem. We need to make each and every automobile driver conscious of the fact that it is personal responsibility to drive safely for the protection of himself and his fellow citizens.

The Traffic Safety Club of Baltimore has adopted a resolution urging that a commemorative traffic safety stamp be issued to focus the attention of the Nation on the need for safety on our streets and highways. I heartily concur in this idea and urge that the Postmaster General give this matter serious consideration. I would like to point out that a special stamp was issued to promote wildlife conservation, and certainly human life is of even greater importance.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION FOR A COMMEMORATIVE TRAFFIC SAFETY POSTAGE STAMP ADOPTED BY SAFETY FIRST CLUB OF MARYLAND, INC.

Whereas grim statistics show that 1,081,600 people lost their lives in the United States of America between January 1, 1925, and January 1, 1958, according to the National Safety Council; and

Whereas the tragic traffic toll for 1958 comprised 36,700 fatalities, 2,825,000 injuries, with 1 out of every 61 Americans killed or injured on the highway; and

Whereas the Safety First Club of Maryland, Inc., nonprofit organization crusading for safety on our streets and highways, is campaigning that "Murder, Incorporated" of the highways must be arrested: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Safety First Club of Maryland, Inc., goes on record to urge the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp on the theme of traffic safety, in keeping with the idea originated by the Wisconsin State Legislature.

The Safety First Club of Maryland, Inc., recommends such a traffic safety stamp be issued so as to focus the attention of the American people on a great problem, and stimulate all citizens to join the crusade for safety to protect their own lives, their dear ones, their neighbors, and their fellow Americans.

Crucial Housing Problem Confronting Elderly Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative and effective editorial from the Oregon Journal of Portland of August 16, 1959, entitled "Housing Problem for Elderly."

This editorial effectively emphasizes the wisdom of the Senate in retaining within the new housing bill, S. 2539, the provision for a $50 million revolving fund to provide some measure of shelter for families of low income over 62 years of age.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING PROBLEM FOR ELDERLY

The 10 percent sample survey of housing units now occupied by the 5,000 elderly Portland residents who are dependent wholly or in part on old age assistance shows that 75 percent of them are substandard dwellings that violate one or more city codes. In large

measure these people live in housing that fails to meet ordinary Federal, State, and local regulations requiring "decent, safe and sanitary" quarters.

This shameful disclosure, made by Gene Rossman, manager of the Housing Authority of Portland, which made the survey at the request of Mayor Schrunk and with the cooperation of the Portland Development Commission, indicates the need for up to 200 additional units of low-rent public housing for the elderly. With other factors, it shows the need for up to 400 units. And that is without reference to persons displaced by the new urban renewal program in southwest Portland and the new freeway program throughout the metropolitan area.

The survey shows that our elderly old age assistance recipients now occupy 107 dwelling units infested with vermin, rodents, debris, filth or garbage. It disclosed 161 cases of inadequate ventilation, 137 units with unsafe stairways, 49 with sinks not in working condition, 47 with inadequate plumbing and 168 with walls and ceilings in bad repair. More than 30 percent of all dwellings checked are in violation of three or more building code requirements.

In announcing results of the survey, Rossman also disclosed that the monthly old age assistance benefits of those checked ranges from around $73 to $140 with the average gross monthly family incomes of the aged old age assistance recipients running just under $100. Thus it will be very difficult to find decent, safe, and sanitary housing within their means, unless low rent public housing is provided.

On the basis of this sample survey, it is felt by housing authority and development commission staffs that there is an actual and critical need for additional low rent housing, especially for the elderly, starting on the close-in West Side, where the largest number of old age assistance recipients is located.

Thus the housing authority is proceeding with studies of possible West Side sites, probably for multilevel structures, with the assistance of an advisory study committee made up of representatives of social agencies and community service groups.

The Journal has recognized that the housing problems of the elderly, low income group have been serious, aspecially since large numbers of them have been or are being displaced by the Memorial Coliseum project on the near East Side, the urban renewal project in the South Auditorium area, and the new freeway projects. But it had not realized until results of the on-the-ground survey became available that the problem already compels prompt remedial action without relation to displaced persons.

Now that we have the facts, the city, operating through Housing Authority of Portland and the development commission, should waste no time in completing its search for sites and the type of public housing that is suitable and feasible for its elderly, displaced, and needy citizens who cannot possibly find enough privately owned, decent, safe, and sanitary housing within their ability to pay.

Reappointment of Admiral Burke Is Tribute to His Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Evening Tribune of August 8, 1959.

REAPPOINTMENT OF ADMIRAL BURKE IS TRIBUTE TO HIS LEADERSHIP

The reappointment of Adm. Arleigh A. Burke to an unprecedented third, 2-year term as Chief of Naval Operations is good news.

It is welcomed by all Americans who like to see top-notch talent in top-level jobs.

It is welcomed by the admiral's many friends in San Diego and around the Nation who see in the reappointment a well-deserved tribute to Burke's handling of a complex job.

He has been Chief of Naval Operations since August 17, 1955. He was reappointed in 1957, and today for a third term which will run until 1961.

These years cover a period of fantastic technological development and of swiftly changing defense concepts.

Burke, as Chief of Naval Operations, has been an effective exponent of the Navy's expanding role in the changing world of today and tomorrow.

He has always been articulate when it comes to the Navy, the Marine Corps, and national defense.

It is fortunate that his tours as Chief of Naval Operations have coincided with the rapid development and employment of missiles. He is no newcomer to this field which is assuming an ever-larger place in the Nation's overall defense concept.

And the Navy will need a knowing and effective spokesman in working out its role in the use of missiles. Already it has proposed to the Joint Chiefs of Staff the establishment of a Joint Space Command.

This proposal makes sense. It is based on the same philosophy as the Joint Chiefs, whose combined experience and specialties give this country's defense so much vitality and flexibility.

It is a means of insuring that the looming space and missile picture won't be hogged by a single service—the Air Force, to mince no words—but that all will have a part to play in the best defense of America.

We should remember that the mere conception of a space vehicle uses a "technology which is quite familiar to the Navy."

The Navy pioneered nuclear propulsion with its atomic submarines. The nuclear-powered space vehicle of the future will draw heavily on the know-how which the Navy was first to learn and use.

The suggestion by the Air Force that the Navy's Polaris fleet ballistic missile be put under its command is the tipoff on a trend that the Navy intends to reverse with its soundly conceived unified space command.

The perils to peace, the responsibilities to ourselves and to other free peoples, are too enormous to permit the Navy, or the Army, to be relegated to brushfire organizations.

The Navy can do this job, if called upon. And it is superbly prepared for the bigger roles, too, if necessary.

Admiral Burke is the right man, as Chief of Naval Operations, to see that this capability is unimpaired. And the American people can be grateful that the right man continues to head the first line of defense in trying times.

Rioting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an editorial entitled "Law of the Land Forbids Rioting," published in the Greenville (S.C.) News of August 15, 1959.

I think the editorial makes an excellent presentation of the general breakdown of respect for law and order in areas where integration has been forced upon people. The editorial emphasizes in a concise manner what I have been saying to the Senate for several weeks now. I sincerely regret that I have been forced to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate various outbreaks of violations, hatred, and prejudice which have occurred in the large metropolitan areas where forced integration is practiced, but I know of no other way that I can best convince the Members of the Senate from those areas that forced integration is wrong.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Aug. 15, 1959]

"LAW OF THE LAND" FORBIDS RIOTING

A large number of organizations, whose activities are coordinated in many instances, are working, so they say, for the improvement of the lot of minority groups. The best known of these are the NAACP and the Urban League.

But the great weakness of these organizations is that their efforts are devoted almost entirely to forcing Negroes into the society of whites where they are unwelcome and where the Negroes would be ill at ease at best.

They would do it despite the fact that, in the case of the schools, integration brings about a deterioration of educational standards which deprives the whites of their rights to the best possible education and helps the Negro pupils little if at all; in the case of housing, it brings only riotous protests from the whites in the invaded neighborhoods and improves the living standards of the Negroes not one bit.

These are the people who tell whites all over the country that they should integrate the races in the schools and everywhere else, wholesale and forthwith. But they heed not the fruits of integration. They have done little or nothing to prepare the people they pretend to be trying to help for social change.

They say, to the South in particular, that integration is the "law of the land" and must be obeyed.

But what say they to the repeated assaults in New York City's black Ghetto, Harlem, on police officers trying to enforce not only the law of the land but the law of the city?

Last Sunday, a mob estimated to number as many as 300 Negroes attempted to interfere with New York City police officers as they sought to arrest a Negro man and woman on whose premises they had found a large quantity of bootleg whisky. The pair, who had different names and could not have been man and wife, already were under bond for a similar charge.

Before reinforcements could be brought in, the two officers attempting to make the arrest had been manhandled, one of them was almost stabbed with a pair of shears and their clothing partly torn from their backs.

Several weeks ago, two white police officers were injured by shots from one of their own pistols as a Negro mob tried to keep them from arresting a drunken Puerto Rican woman who had gone berserk in a restaurant.

This is the kind of thing Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina has been

bringing to the attention of the U.S. Senate in his heated exchanges with the liberal New Yorker, Senator KEATING.

The brutal truth is that these incidents are but symptoms of restlessness and disrespect for law and order (indeed, ignorance of what constitutes law and order, is a more accurate description). New York is ripe for the worst racial strife this country has ever seen.

Integration is not the answer to these problems. Nor is public housing to replace the slum dwellings, for the record shows that transplanted slum dwellers soon turn new public housing units into slums.

These incidents and the conditions which form their backdrop constitute a challenge to those who are genuinely interested in the advancement of colored people.

If they could forget integration lawsuits for a while and channel the funds they would thus save into educational programs, the NAACP and the Urban League would begin to make real progress. They could even count on contributions for such purposes from those who are now opposing them in the courts.

They should teach their people to cooperate with law enforcement officers in the discharge of their legitimate duties. They should attack the underlying causes of the excessive rate of illegitimate births among Negroes and the crime rates which are out of all proportion to their numbers in the total population.

Had they done this from the beginning, instead of fomenting lawsuits based on false premises to force mixing of the races, they might have achieved equal rights for all without court decrees.

President Eisenhower Should Keep a Scorecard on His Sure-Fire No. 1 Issue for Winning in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it would be well, I think, if the President would keep a scorecard on his very own administration's record of economy which he recently described to a $100-a-plate Republican dinner in Washington, D.C., as the most important single issue for winning the election in 1960.

Here are several items which he would certainly have to include on such a scorecard. I am, of course, very interested in economy myself, and so I am quite willing to help the President keep score. In fact, I invite all of my colleagues to help me in keeping a complete account of the President's performance in respect to the issue of economy.

It is reported that the Air Force and the Navy have decided to abandon the program for the development of a high-energy aircraft fuel. The administration, according to reports, based their decision, in part at least, on the ground that they had no further requirement for the project.

Chairman OVERTON BROOKS, of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, said the other day:

> Our committee is interested in determining why it took the services 5 years and some $200 million to determine they had no requirement for the fuel.

This is, indeed, a most interesting subject. All of us, of course, are aware that President Eisenhower told the Congress earlier this year:

> Research and development in high-energy fuels for air-breathing engines continues to be a high-priority program in which NASA and other Government agencies are cooperating.

This is, indeed, a most fascinating subject. All of us, of course, received the report on the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration which the President forwarded to the Congress earlier this year in which it was stated:

> Research and development in high-energy fuels for air-breathing engines continues to be a high-priority program in which NASA and other Government agencies are cooperating.

In the planning stage is the transfer of a program for building 720 M–60 tanks from the Chrysler Delaware defense plant in Newark, Del., to Detroit.

The Defense Department pleaded for months for the Congress to authorize a spending program of nearly $40 billion in the current budget.

Now that the Congress has authorized their budget the Defense Department is spending this money like it grew on a money bush.

The move from the Lenape ordnance plant at Newark would probably add as much as $5 million on the order for 720 M–60's.

If the President really believes as much in economy as he says, he is going to have to do more than make speeches on the subject to $100-a-plate rallies of the Republican Party in which he points out what a fine winning issue it is.

It is a winning issue, certainly, but if the performance rating of this administration is as low as these two items and many others we are all familiar with clearly indicate, then the President may not be on the winning team next year.

A third item which President Eisenhower should certainly look into is the recently revealed extravagance in running the White House itself. President Eisenhower spends twice as much to run this as President Truman did. During Truman's last year, his operating expenses came to $2,467,000. This is "small potatoes" compared to the $5,013,750 which President Eisenhower spent in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959.

Or, President Eisenhower might well investigate the fact that whereas President Truman spent only $6,703,000 on the entire Executive Office—which includes the Budget Bureau, Office of Defense Mobilization, National Security Council, and the Council of Economic Advisers—this cost the country $52,736,250 last year, and the President asked the Congress this year for $91,880,000.

Another place where President Eisenhower could save money—if he really was interested in saving money and not in just trying to make a partisan issue of economy—is in the 99 limousines and heavy sedans which have been assigned to leading officials of this administration. These are the cars they use when they come to the Congress to plead for $40 billions for the defense budget, and for other billions.

At the present time, not only do the President, the Secretaries of the several Departments, and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have limousines, but the Pentagon has a total of 37, of which 14 alone are assigned to various Assistant Secretaries.

If this practice were extended to the Members of Congress, and it is the Democratic Members of Congress whom the President accuses of being "spenders," then there would immediately be 436 limousines for the Members of the House of Representatives and 100 limousines for the Members of the Senate.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN revealed recently that 20 big corporations get one-half of all defense contracts. Actually, official figures reveal that 100 firms get 74 percent of all defense contracts.

The costs of all defense contracts have skyrocketed. They have, in fact, gone higher and further than any American missile which the Defense Department has launched at Cape Canaveral, Fla.

Part of these costs, which the administration has done absolutely nothing to stop, are due to the entertainment which the companies which get these multi-million-dollar contracts lavish on high officials of this administration.

As a matter of fact, testimony was heard in Washington last week that inside influence and maneuvering by big companies was responsible for letting the Soviet Union get their sputnik missiles into the air months before we did.

It has been brought out by the investigating subcommittee headed by our colleague, Chairman HÉBERT, that the "munitions lobby," made up of over 700 high-salaried retired generals and admirals, enjoys rare and expensive privileges which are often paid for by the public.

It has been brought out that this group of high-ranking brass draws pensions as high as $12,000 annually, to which their contributions were nil. In addition, they are permitted to hold down industrial jobs paying as much as $75,000 annually.

But if some poor fellow drawing social security earns more than $100 a month on the side, he is no longer entitled to social security benefits. Incidentally, he contributed to his pension.

This is class legislation of the kind we would expect to find only in the Soviet Union.

It is a matter of record that the Congress in the past 5 years has reduced President Eisenhower's budget by $10,600 million.

The President has constantly warned about back-door financing by the Democratic Congress, but, as a matter of fact, has actually requested $6,400 million in such funds.

This session of the Congress will soon be over, and the score will be added at that time. The Eisenhower record will

be shown to be one of free spending, rather than economy.

As a political issue in 1960 the Eisenhower economy record will not be worth a plugged nickel.

Text of Declaration of Santiago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Organization of American States completed its conference at Santiago yesterday.

Upon adjournment, the Foreign Ministers endorsed a declaration "expressing the general aspirations of the American people to live in peace under the protection of democratic institutions, free from all interference and totalitarian influence."

Although the conference faced serious and difficult problems, I believe that, overall, it marks real progress among the nations of the Americas toward resolving differences, cementing relations and laying the groundwork for dealing with difficulties in the future.

Once again, our Secretary of State, Mr. Christian Herter, has turned in a top performance. In a brief tenure of office, the Secretary has faced most difficult problems—first at Geneva, and now at Santiago. Through these experiences—during which great responsibility rested upon his shoulders—the Secretary has demonstrated high qualities of astuteness, remarkable capability, and sound judgment. All in all, during the assumption of the position of Secretary of State under conditions which would have tried the mettle of any man, and which bore one of the great responsibilities in world diplomacy, the Secretary has continued to do honor to his high office.

The progress that was made at Santiago, I am sure, is also a tribute to the relentless efforts and dedication which he brings to his job.

We recognize, of course, that we in the Western Hemisphere still face complex problems in promoting ever-better relationships between our countries—particularly in instances where forms of government differ.

Rightly, the declaration of Santiago stressed the desirability of all governments adhering to the precept of noninterference in the affairs of other nations. Moreover, it again emphasized—as has been our own U.S. policy—that, to the greatest degree possible, the people of a nation should be allowed the greatest maximum amount of "voice in the operations of their government."

Recognizing that the conference marks one more step of progress toward resolving Western Hemisphere problems and promoting security and progress for the future, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the Declaration printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 19, 1959]

TEXT OF DECLARATION OF SANTIAGO

SANTIAGO, CHILE, August 18.—Following is the text of the Declaration of Santiago approved today at the Conference of Foreign Ministers of the American States:

The fifth meeting of consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs;

Expressing the general aspiration of the American peoples to live in peace under the protection of democratic institutions, free from all intervention and all totalitarian influence; and

Considering:

That the faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy is the best vehicle for the promotion of their social and political progress (Resolution XCV of the 10th Inter-American Conference), while well-planned and intensive development of the economies of the American countries and improvement in the standard of living of their peoples represent the best and firmest foundation of which the practical exercise of democracy and the stabilization of their institutions can be established (resolutions of the special committee to study the formulation of new measures for economic cooperation);

That in Resolution XXXII, the Ninth International Conference of American States, for the purpose of safeguarding peace and maintaining mutual respect among states, among other things, resolved to reaffirm their decision to maintain and further effective social and economic policy for the purpose of raising the standard of living of their peoples, and their conviction that only under a system founded upon a guarantee of the essential freedoms and rights of the individual is it possible to attain this goal, and to condemn the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and, in particular, the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine;

That in Resolution XCV, the 10th Inter-American Conference resolved to unite the efforts of all the American States to apply, develop, and perfect the principles of the inter-American system, so that they would form the basis of firm and solidary action designed to obtain, in a short time, the effective realization of the representative democratic system, the rule of social justice and security, and the economic and cultural cooperation essential to the mutual well-being and prosperity of all the peoples of the hemisphere;

That harmony among the American Republics can be effective only insofar as human rights and fundamental freedoms and the exercise of representative democracy are a reality within every one of them, since experience has demonstrated that failure to adhere to such principles is a source of widespread disturbance and gives rise to emigration that causes frequent and grave political tensions between the state the emigres leave and the states that receive them.

That it is advisable to democratic regimes constitutes a violation of the principles on which the Organization of American States is founded, and endangers the peace and harmony of the hemisphere, and

That it is advisable to denounce, in a general way, a few principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere, so as to permit national and international public opinion to gage the degree to which political regimes and governments conform to that system, thus helping eradicate forms of dictatorships, despotism, or tyranny, without weakening respect for the right of the peoples freely to choose their own form of government declares,

1. The principle of the rule of law should be assured by the separation of powers, and by the control of the legality of governmental acts by competent organs of the state.

2. The governments of the American Republics should be derived from free elections.

3. Perpetuation in power, or the exercise of power without fixed term and with the manifest intent of perpetuation, is incompatible with the effective exercise of democracy.

4. The governments of the American States should insure a system of freedom for the individual and social justice based on respect for fundamental human rights.

5. The human rights incorporated into the legislation of the various American States should be protected by effective judicial procedures.

6. The systematic use of political proscription is contrary to American democratic order.

7. Freedom of the press, of radio and television, and, in general, freedom of information and expression, are essential conditions for the existence of a democratic regime.

8. The American States, in order to strengthen democratic institutions, should cooperate among themselves within the limits of their resources and the framework of their laws so as to strengthen and develop their economic structure, and achieve just and humane living conditions for their peoples, and

Resolves, This declaration shall be known as the Declaration of Santiago de Chile.

Diagnostic Clinic for Aged Established in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there was recently dedicated in my district in northeast Philadelphia the first geriatric clinic to be put into active use in the United States. In these days when the life expectancy of Americans has been increased and when we have thousands of senior citizens where formerly we had only dozens, it is of great advantage to us who must pass upon legislation bearing upon these older people to have the history of this clinic, its organization and its fine work before us. The following is the history of Philadelphia's Northeast Community Geriatric Clinic:

DIAGNOSTIC CLINIC FOR AGED ESTALISHED IN PHILADELPHIA

A retired electrical engineer in Schenectady, N.Y., discerned when he read in the Schenectady Gazette of a community geriatric clinic begun in Philadelphia, what it was that made this clinic not only a worthwhile enterprise, but something different. In his congratulatory letter to Mrs. Dora N. Schatz, secretary of the newly established Northeast Community Geriatric Clinic as well as of the Disston Senior Citizens Club, he emphasized that too many projects are started by and operated by "well wishers" outside the "golden age" group. He is a strong believer in the older citizens doing things for themselves. He point out that the "golden age" group represents quite a large segment of our present population,

and urges them to exert what political and social strength is inherent in this situation.

And it is true that the unique diagnostic clinic set up in northeast Philadelphia is largely the result of the active concern and hard work of the oldsters themselves. Mrs. Schatz and her fellow members in the Diston Senior Citizens Club had often discussed the need for a facility where those on social security or on otherwise limited incomes could obtain a complete physical checkup. Experience had shown them that too often older persons neglect to obtain thorough checkups periodically because they simply cannot afford it; then, when serious illness strikes, they find that disease has made advanced inroads which could have been checked if discovered in time.

Active help in establishing such a facility finally came through a group of Christian laymen in the community who had organized the Northeast Council for Christian Social Action not too long before this need was presented to them. Individuals interested in the social application of the Christian Gospel in which they believed, this group represented various Protestant denominations in the community. Recognizing that a socially relevant Gospel could not be confined to one congregation, they had attempted to find a way of carrying their influence to the entire community through education and action in what ways they could. They had sponsored two successful community forums, one on the subject of juvenile delinquency and one presenting a Negro leader from Montgomery, Ala., with a message intended to emphasize the power of aggressive Christian love in overcoming even such obstacles as racial tensions.

These were well received by the community and represented a real contribution from an educational sense, but they had not been able to put the "action" part of their program into practice.

Mrs. Schatz read in a community paper a statement of the council to the effect that they aimed at acting as a live part of the conscience of the Christian Church in the community on social issues, and emphasizing their readiness to work with other groups, regardless of race or religious affiliation. She called the article to the attention of her senior citizens group, and urged that a delegation should present their need to the council for consideration. At the June 1958 meeting of the council, she spoke for her group and enlisted the interest of the council which agreed to establish a committee on problems of the aging and asked Mr. Schatz to chair it.

The committee made a study of what was being done in various parts of the country in this field and discussed it at later meetings of the council. In general, they found very much interest in government health circles. They found several States promulgating legislation particularly aimed at helps of one kind or another for the aging. When they consulted with local and State health authorities, they found that there was no present possibility of health department funds being used to operate a diagnostic clinic. Authorities agreed in general that such a facility was needed and expressed the opinion that public health funds would eventually be appropriated for such use—but the life expectancy of those in the senior citizens group did not tend to make them satisfied with a hope of help 10 or 15 years in the future.

Encouragement was obtained when Mrs. Schatz visited a free community clinic for children privately sponsored by Bethel Lutheran Church in Philadelphia. This clinic has operated successfully over a period of 12 years depending upon the generosity of local osteopathic physicians who staffed the clinic without fee, and donations from interested citizens and the church itself.

The council sent Mrs. Schatz to appear at a meeting of the local ministerium asking the clergy of the community to consider the possibility of donating space in one of the churches. After discussing it with their official boards, three churches volunteered space. Mainly because of its proximity to the home of the senior citizens club, the council accepted the offer of Tacony Baptist Church, and started to work on real plans.

Fortunately, Mrs. Schatz' own doctor, Sidney Richman, was extremely interested in the proposed plan and extended his active help in recruiting further doctors. In addition to other osteopathic physicians who agreed to work with Dr. Richman, offers were received from a local dentist, an eye specialist, and a foot specialist.

As soon as it appeared that the oldsters' dream might become a reality, it was decided that a separate organization should be set up. In early 1959, a board of directors was formed including representatives of the Northeast Council for Christian Social Action and Diston Senior Citizens Club as the cosponsoring organizations, doctors from the volunteer staff, and the pastor of the church where the clinic was to be located. The name "Northeast Community Geriatric Clinic" was choen. Jay B. Hurst, Jr., a member of the Christian Social Action group, was named president of the new organization, Dr. Seymour Piwoz was named medical director, and Mrs. Schatz was made secretary-treasurer. Conscious of the potential value of well-handled publicity, the group appointed one of its members (an industrial editor) to handle public relations.

Directors immediately set about soliciting funds with which to equip a small clinic. Even minimum equipment (examining tables, sterilizers, electrocardiogram, etc.) would cost a few hundred dollars. The northeast council spent what small funds it had making minor but necessary renovations in the donated space and on small equipment. The senior citizens donated their treasury of $50. Several local churches and individuals responded with donations, so that by mid-June 1959 enough equipment was on hand to open the doors.

Local business and political leaders joined nearly 100 older citizens of the community in a dedication ceremony at which Protestant clergy and a Jewish rabbi participated.

News of the planned clinic had been carried in local community newspapers, and, the week before opening, Mrs. Schatz received a call from Harriet Smith, feature writer for the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin—one of the big-city papers—asking if she could bring a photographer and do an article on the opening session. She came and interviewed the three patients scheduled for examination the first day, talked to Mrs. Schatz, the doctors, and to Hurst, and wrote a sympathetic and very effective two column article which was carried on page 3 of the Bulletin and put on Associated Press wire service to papers throughout the country.

With this national publicity came a deluge of letters from all sections of the country. Other "golden age" groups wanted to know how it was done, schools wanted stories, an Army chaplain in Annapolis, Md., sent a donation in memory of his mother, a 70-year-old man in Florida wrote to say he was planning a trip to New York and asking if he could stop off in Philadelphia for an examination, a New Jersey man wrote claiming that doctors gave him "the brush-off" when he asked for a thorough physical examination claiming that they did not have time. He wanted to come. A heartrending letter came from an elderly widow in South Dakota who evidently understood that the clinic offered resident care and offering to contribute $50 a month from her social security if she could come and be cared for. A generous friend of Hurst's in Chicago had sent a $200 donation to help the clinic get started. When the publicity was released, he wrote Hurst that he had mentioned the project to his friend, Col. Jake Arvey, nationally prominent political figure, and enclosed a check for an additional $100 from Colonel Arvey.

Originally set up to interview three new patients at each weekly session, the clinic found it had a backlog of nearly 100 applicants within the first 3 weeks. More volunteer doctors were recruited and the clinic is now doubling its capacity—but this involves additional and expensive equipment too, and general expansion is planned.

Hurst comments, "The initial success of our effort has far exceeded our anticipation. When this sort of project was first suggested to our council, I must admit it was received with a jaundiced eye by some of us to whom the obstacles seemed to loom so large that they overshadowed the challenging objective. We are thankful that we accepted the challenge nevertheless, and that God has prospered us in all ways. Considering the inadequacies and limitations of many of us who have been working with this idea, accomplishment of our objective seemed humanly impossible at times. Perhaps the fact that this objective has been essentially accomplished is simply further proof that with God all things are possible."

Diagnostic service only, not treatment, is offered to women over 62 and to men over 65 regardless of ability to pay. Where possible a nominal fee of $1 is collected. At least in the early stages of the clinic, it has not been necessary to establish any qualification except age. It is hoped that the work can be continued on that basis; however, the board recognizes that some qualification as to ability to pay may have to be established if the service is abused by those well able to pay. But they express the feeling that they will wait and see, hoping that it will not be necessary for a staff social worker to screen applicants on this basis.

In addition to general physical checkup, specialists on the staff offer gynecological examinations, cancer smear tests, and other special services. Arrangements are made for chest X-rays. Eye diseases are common among older people, and an eye specialist is on the staff. A local dentist will check on mouth or gum ailments discovered by the staff.

It is now planned for the clinic to incorporate as a nonprofit organization, and a lawyer has been the latest appointee to the board of directors, offering his services free of charge. Through incorporation, it will be possible for donations to be accepted on a tax-exempt basis, the clinic will be classified in a category enabling it to participate in Government and other help aimed to assist charitable, nonprofit organizations, and legal responsibility of the clinic and those working with it will be fixed.

All this is possible only because these doctors contribute valuable time and services without charge, because Tacony Baptist Church donated space, because many friends have cared enough to contribute toward the financial expenses involved. But, most of this became a reality because a group of older citizens acted.

World Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, August 20 marks an occasion of great significance to those of the Catholic faith and indeed the entire Christian world. This is the date of

the opening of the Quinquennial World Congress of Sodalities in the archdiocese of Newark, N.J. It is only the second time in history that such a congress has been held—and for the first time outside of Rome.

I think New Jersey has been particularly honored to be selected for this second world gathering of what promises to be one of the most important and impressive gatherings of Catholic clergy and laymen in history.

More than 50,000 persons, representing 32 countries, are expected to take some part in the meetings and workshops to be held on the campus of Seton Hall University in South Orange during the 4-day conference. The deliberations will concern themselves with the role of the sodalist in a world torn by crisis and unrest.

The world will be watching these proceedings dedicated to the interest of mankind and humanity with great interest. And on behalf of all of the citizens of New Jersey I would like to extend a note of welcome and sincere good wishes for the success of this congress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Advocate of Thursday, August 13, on this subject.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark (N.J.) Advocate, Aug. 13, 1959]

TWO CARDINALS COMING HERE FOR CONGRESS

NEWARK.—An event, historic not only for the Archdiocese of Newark, but also for the entire United States will occur here starting August 20, with the convening of the second World Congress of Sodalities of Our Lady. The first congress was held in Rome in 1954.

An episcopal host to the congress to be attended by representatives of 32 nations, Archbishop Boland will be celebrant of a Solemn Pontifical Mass at 9:30 a.m., August 20, in Sacred Heart Cathedral. The sermon will be preached by Auxiliary Bishop Leo C. Byrne, of St. Louis, executive episcopal moderator of the National Federation of Sodalities of the United States.

The Mass will formally open the conclave whose deliberations, including addresses by religious and lay dignitaries and panel-type workshop sessions, will take place on the Seton Hall University campus in South Orange.

The final event of the congress will be the World Congress Marian demonstration to be held August 23 at Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City, with more than 30,000 attending. Auxiliary Bishop Fulton J. Sheen of New York will speak.

The importance given the congress is stressed by the fact that among the active participants will be 2 cardinals, 8 archbishops, and 25 bishops.

Most of the members of the hierarchy, led by Cardinal Spellman of New York, and Cardinal Cushing of Boston, will have specific assignments during the meeting. Cardinal Spellman will preside at the Marian demonstration closing the congress on August 23. Cardinal Cushing will preside at the public symposium Friday evening, August 21, at Seton Hall University.

The congress promises to be one of the most important and impressive gatherings of Catholic clergy and laymen in history. More than 50,000 persons are expected to take some part in the meetings, workshops, symposium and demonstrations during the 4 days. From 32 nations, representatives from Ceylon, India, and other Asian nations will join fellow Catholics from Africa, Europe, North and South America to discuss and plan their respective roles in a world torn by crisis and unrest.

Following the mass August 20 the delegates will assemble at Seton Hall University. Archbishop Fernando Ruiz y Solorzano of Yucatan, Mexico, who heads a delegation of 350 Sodalists from his country, will be moderator of the opening session.

Highlight of the first session will be the broadcast of a tape-recorded message from Pope John XXIII. The opening address will be given by Archbishop Joseph Gawlina, director of the World Federation of Sodalities. He will speak on the theme of the congress: "The Vocation of the Sodalist in the Crisis of the Modern World."

Both the Pope's message and Archbishop Gawlina's address, as well as all other major talks and documents of the congress, will be simultaneously translated into the five official languages of the conclave—English, French, German, Italian and Spanish.

Following the general session, delegates will break up into workshop groups to discuss various aspects of the general theme. Workshops will be held in each of the five congress languages.

In the evening, the National Federation of Sodalities of the United States will be host at a reception for the foreign delegations.

Procceedings on Friday and Saturday will be similar to those on Thursday, with workshops following general sessions.

A special aspect of the theme will be examined and discussed each day.

The public symposium on Friday evening at which Cardinal Cushing will preside will be one of the highlights of the conclave. The topic will be "Sodalities in International Life." Rie Vendrik, president of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations, will be chairman, and Rosemary Goldie of Australia, secretary of the Permament Committee of the Lay Apostolate in Rome, will be secretary.

Participants will include M. de Hablicht of Hungary, secretary of the Conference of International Catholic Organizations; Martin Work, executive director of the National Council of Catholic Men; Mrs. Mark Theissen, president of the National Council of Catholic Women; and Rev. Louis Paulussen, S.J., director of the International Secretariat of Sodalities in Rome.

Saturday evening will be devoted to "The Night of Nations" in which delegates from many countries of the world will demonstrate some facets of their native culture.

On Sunday delegates will meet in executive sessions before and following a Mass celebrated by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter of St. Louis, honorary episcopal moderator of sodalities of the United States. In the afternoon they will hold the final general session of the congress at which conclusions will be read and officers installed. They will then depart by bus for the closing Marian demonstration at Roosevelt Stadium, Jersey City.

Catholics and non-Catholics throughout the East are invited to the closing ceremonies at which the message of the Holy Father will be rebroadcast.

Latin American Events

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, St. Joseph's-on-Carrollton Manor, Frederick, Md., with which he forwards three articles from Latin American events of Monday, August 17, 1959. The articles are: "Reunion in Santiago"; "Secret Negotiations on a Loan to Cuba"; "News and Commentaries."

ST. JOSEPH'S-ON-CARROLLTON MANOR,
Frederick, Md., August 17, 1959.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Washington, D.C.

ILUSTRE AMIGO Y GRAN PARLAMENTARIO: Your splendid leadership, upholding freedom and decency in the domain of inter-American relations, prompts me to suggest that you consider, for possible inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the three articles I have marked in Latin American events. You are free, if you see fit, to mention that the material was brought to your attention by your undersigned friend, "the Padre."

Everything in these articles coincides with the evidence you brought to the notice of your distinguished colleagues on Thursday, August 13, 1959, by inserting the piece by Edward Tomlinson in the RECORD. I wish more U.S. leaders would become active in this cause.

In this connection, I would like to add that I have known Dr. Emilio Núñez Portuondo, former president of the Security Council of the United Nations, for many years. He is a proved friend of the United States of America and a freedom fighter of worldwide renown. No one in the U.N. worked more ardently for the brave Hungarian patriots at the time of the slaughter of people in Budapest by the Soviets.

Hoping to see you soon, I remain,
Your friend and admirer,
(El Padre) JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate editor of World Affairs.

[From Latin American Events, Aug. 17, 1959]

REUNION OF SANTIAGO

When in 1954, I represented Cuba in the Inter-American Conference held in the city of Caracas it became my duty to denounce before all the Americas the Communist government of Guatemala headed by Colonel Arbenz, who now directs all the conspiracies inspired by the Moscow government from Montevideo. I remember vividly that, in an animated debate with Dr. Torriello, Foreign Minister of the Red government of Guatemala, I exposed the danger that the whole continent would be subjected to by an economic-political offensive of the Soviet Union. I advocated strong measures to repress Communist infiltration in our countries.

In this Inter-American Conference the Caracas declaration was approved, by 17 votes in favor, 1 against, that of Guatemala, and 2 abstentions, that of Mexico and Argentina under Juan Domingo Perón. It was made clear in the most exact terms that the establishment of a communistic regime in the geographic boundaries of the Americas constituted a threat to its internal security. All the Latin American States were committed to comply with the obligations imposed by the passage of said declaration.

The Caracas declaration was received by international public opinion as a diplomatic triumph of the United States, who had been its most stanch supported. I remember that I privately warned the late illustrious Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who was attending the conference, that the main responsibility for keeping it in force fell on the United States of America for obvious reasons: because they were the ones mainly interested in preventing Communist infiltration in America and fundamentally because the United States was the only Nation with enough material and economic resources to

face the Soviet Union with any assurance of victory. In my judgment, even though we were dealing with a multilateral obligation, its chance for success or failure depended upon the vigor with which the U.S. Government would back the declaration.

The Caracas declaration went the way of all declarations among the thousands that are approved in inter-American conferences and are never applied. Since 1954 until this moment when I am writing these lines, it cannot be denied that international communism has made the most extraordinary advances in the great majority of Latin American States. To deny its existence is like trying to obliterate the sun with your finger. It is enough to cite the Communist regime now existent in Cuba, and the preponderant situation enjoyed by the Communists in Venezuela, and the advantages gained in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Guatemala, Panama, and Ecuador to realize that I am speaking the truth. This tragic situation does not seem to be generally known by the people or by the ruling bodies of the United States and it is essential that they realize the imminent danger that we are all undergoing.

The foreign ministers of the Americas are now in session in Santiago, Chile, in an extraordinary session in order to deal with the existent tensions in the Caribbean. We feel that if the United States does not assume the responsibility in presenting the problem in its whole magnitude, declaring in all sincerity that the tensions are primarily due to Communists and the activities of fellow-travelers who follow blindly the dictates of the government of Moscow, the conference in Santiago will fail miserably and will spread discouragement among those of us who are fighting to liberate our peoples from the totalitarian and cruel yoke. A way must be found to prevent the attention of the foreign ministers to be diverted from Communist engendered arguments; that the real cause of the problems in Latin America are primarily economic in nature when all of us know that the present situation in the Caribbean is mainly political.

With a new declaration nothing practical will be gained. We must act with vigor and insist that the declaration of Caracas must be upheld. We must do this or confess our complete failure. We must close the door to international communism in the Americas with energetic and effective measures or we will confess to the world that we are impotent to defend ourselves. If this happens and we are really incapable of stemming the Communist tide we will witness the fall of each Latin American State, one by one, under the influence of the Moscow government. Realistic and effective, we could call this form of action in order to defend ourselves. To postpone such action would be an error of incalculable consequences to the cause of democracy and liberty in this hemisphere.

SECRET NEGOTIATIONS ON A LOAN TO CUBA

Before coming to Washington just recently the Prime Minister of Cuba, Fidel Castro, assured a multitude of his followers in Havana "that he was not coming to the United States to solicit money because he did not need it, and that he would never undermine the Cuban economy with onerous obligations." These very words he repeated in Washington on many occasions.

In spite of this statement by the Prime Minister, during his stay in Washington, the Secretary of the Treasury, Rufo Lopez Fresquet and the president of the National Bank of Cuba, Felipe Pazos, began talks with representatives of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, where they expounded on Cuba's hazardous economic situation and explored the possibility of receiving a loan. The chief difficulty in obtaining a loan is that we are dealing with a provisional government, not elected by the people, without a constitution, and a regime where one man's word is law to the point where he seats and unseats presidents at will, without regard for the Cuban public opinion. The negotiations for the loan apparently failed.

The economic situation in Cuba deteriorates more each day. The expropriations, the confiscations, the brutal laws, like the lowering of rents and the agrarian reform have produced a chaotic state and each day the government has more and more difficulties in meeting their most necessary obligations. This is well known in Cuba and the United States even though the press does not echo this situation.

Two new avenues for negotiations have been opened: Negotiations directly between the government of Cuba and Washington and in New York with private American banks. A loan of $300 million is being sought to stabilize the Cuban peso, which, in the last 6 months has lost 30 percent of its value in relation to the dollar and also the money is being sought to speed up the agrarian reform but on a much larger scale.

It is unbelievable that these negotiations could be entertained with the U.S. Government and private American banks. You could cite more than a hundred public statements by Fidel Castro which are insulting to the Government in Washington and to the United States. In a recent radio broadcast from Cuba on the anniversary of the July 26 movement (that we personally heard) he called the North American Senators that formed part of the Subcommitee of Internal Security, "Gangsters."

The Agrarian reform law robs the citizens of the United States and many American corporations of thousands of acres of land worth millions of dollars without adequate compensation. The new tariffs place onerous taxes on North American products such as automobiles, refrigerators and other hard goods. It would not make sense to give this loan to pay back in dollars those North Americans affected by the expropriations of the agrarian reform. They would be paying themselves with their own money.

There is adequate explanation for the aid that the United States gave Yugoslavia and Poland, because Tito defied the imperialistic designs of the Soviet Union and Gomulka removed Poland from direct influence of the Soviet Government. Fidel Castro, however, moves closer each day to the Soviet orbit. Recently the Excelsior, a Mexico City newspaper, said that Cuba will soon establish diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union and that it has committed itself to vote favorably or to abstain on the question of the entry of Communist China into the United Nations when the General Assembly meets in September.

There would be no rhyme nor reason to the Government and peoples of Latin America, anti-Communist, and friends of the United States, for a loan negotiated without consent of the people of Cuba and given to the most pro-Communist and most anti-American country in the Americas. It would set a tragic precedent and would cost billions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States.

NEWS AND COMMENTARIES

Guatemala: There are persistent rumors that there is a subversive movement afoot to oust President Idigoras Fuentes who has always been a strong enemy of international communism. This movement is being organized in several Latin American countries and is being directed from Montevideo by Ex-President Arbenz who aspires to take over.

The election to the mayor's office in Guatemala City of one of Arbenz's old cronies and the known, as well as underground activities of the Communists in Guatemala together with the split among the political parties have made the sheep from Moscow think that this might be the appropriate time to undertake the coup.

Of course if the Army, as it is hoped will remain loyal to President Idigoras, this maneuver will end in a miserable failure. The experts fear, however, that the President might be too confident and that the hurricane will unleash without enough time to avoid its disastrous effects.

Venezuela: Unemployment grows in Venezuela in spite of the promises of President Romulo Betancourt. The Venezuelans complain that President Betancourt devotes more time to activities outside Venezuela than to the grave social and economic problems that are current in the land of Marshal Sucre. News of the development on a grand scale of the deposits of oil in the French Sahara and in other places, which until now have bought Venezuelan oil is disquieting to the people and businessmen of Venezuela.

Haiti: The situation in Haiti gets more complicated every day primarily because of economic reasons. With a great over population and a land which is unfertile, the truth is that poverty is extreme in the Haitian population. In order to solve this problem rapidly, international cooperation, but principally that of the United States, is needed. It is true that the Washington Government has rendered some aid to the Government of Haiti, but hunger is still prevalent in that country.

The present tensions in the Caribbean and and the internal political dicotomy contribute in aggravating the situation. There are intense conspiracies against President Duvalier inside and outside Haiti. The difficult impasse between Cuba and the Dominican Republic, the latter invaded from Cuban territory without success, places Haiti in a dangerous position because it does not have sufficient military forces to defend itself. The plans to invade the Dominican Republic via Haiti have been prepared very cautiously and carefully. They have not been put into effect for reasons known to all. This was explained in a letter to President Eisenhower from President Duvalier and handed to him personally by the Haitian Ambassador in Washington.

Haiti is actually the key point in the peace in the Americas.

Chile: A distinguished politician and diplomat has just written me a very interesting letter in which he makes the following interesting observations about the forthcoming visit of Nikita Khrushchev to the United States.

"The only justification that the Government in Washington has offered, to invite Khrushchev, the most cruel tyrant and the most bloodthirsty of our era; the fearsome executioner of the peoples of the Ukraine and Hungary, was to prove to him during his visit the military might of the United States. This proof would stop him from unleashing Soviet aggression. The truth is that Khrushchev has already said to the press in Moscow that 'he would not accept any invitations to visit any military installations while in the United States.' Why the visit then which makes all the captive peoples in Europe, and Asia lose their hopes of liberty?"

PARTIAL LIST OF KNOWN COMMUNISTS OR FELLOW TRAVELERS THAT OCCUPY IMPORTANT POSITIONS IN CUBA

Positions in the military

Augusto Martinez Sanchez, Minister of Defense.

Raul Castro Rux, Chief of the Armed Forces.

Comandante Juan Almeida, Chief of Air Force.

Armando Acosta, Chief of Navy.

Montes de Oca, Chief of Military Intelligence.

Manuel Rodiles, Second Chief of the National Police and Chief of the Bureau of Investigations.

William Galvez, Inspector General of the Army.

Comandante Garcia Morales.

Capitan Choy, Chief of Havana Prison.

Capitan Garriga, Chief of Press and Radio of the Cuban Army.

Comandante Ernesto Che Guevara, (Argentino), Chief of the Cuban Fortress.

Teniente Lavandeira (Who was in the Communist Government of Arbens), Chief of Army Espionage.

Comandante Faure Chaumont, Chief of the Student Revolutionary Directory.

Comandante Enrique Oltuski, Minister of Communications.

Comandante Odón Alvarez de la Campa, Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Capitan Ingeniero Fresneda, Chief of the Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Comandante Antonio Nuñez Jimenez, Director of the Agrarian Law Institute.

Jose Luis Masó, Chief of Publicity of the Institute of Agrarian Reform.

Positions in the administration

Dr. Oswaldo Dorticós, Provisional President of the Republic.

Carlos Franqui, Director of the Newspaper Revolution, official organ of the Government.

Vicentina Antuña, Director of Culture of the Ministry of Education.

Eduardo Corona, Secretary of the General Accounting Office and Paymaster General.

Alfredo Guevara, President of the Institute of the Movie Industry.

José Perez Lamy, president of Indemnity Board of the Civil War.

Señora Irene Viuda de José Maria Perez, secretary of the Indemnity Board of the Civil War.

Celestino Fernandez, president of the retirement fund for sugar workers.

Baudilio Castellanos, magistrate in the paymaster office.

Rosa Rivero, official lawyer of the district court in Havana.

Raquel Perez, Minister of Social Welfare.

Armando Hart, Minister of Education.

Positions in the labor movement

David Salvador, secretary general of the Workers Union of Cuba. Indoctrinated in Moscow for 3 years.

Juan Armesto, secretary general of the omnibus syndicate.

José Martinez Leira, secretary general of the shoe industry.

Juan F. Esquerra, secretary general of Shoemakers Union in the Province of Havana.

Miguel Quintero, secretary general of the Club and Beach Workers Union.

Alfredo Rancano, secretary general of the Cooks, Chefs, and Food Workers Union.

Pedro Fumero, secretary general of the Construction Workers Union in Havana.

Agapito Figueroa, secretary general of the Metal Workers Union in Havana.

Francisco Lopez, secretary general of Graphc Arts Union.

Angel Espasandez, secretary general of the Public Entertainment Workers Union.

Amado Hernandez, secretary general of the Barbers, Hairdressers, and Manicurist Union in Havana.

Ricardo Rodriguez, director of the group which controls the railroad federation.

Jesus Soto, secretary general of the Textile Workers Union.

Hector Carbonell, secretary general of the Needle Workers Union in Havana.

Luis Moreno, secretary general of the Tobacco Workers Union.

Monroney Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the unusually able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has made a fine contribution. It was from Senator MONRONEY that the idea came of using our accumulating piles of foreign currencies for international development. The Eisenhower administration has now endorsed his plan, and proposed it to other countries.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, published in the Baltimore (Md.) Sun on August 17, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Aug. 17, 1959]

NEW DEVELOPMENT TOOL

After a slow start Senator MONRONEY seems now to have lined some of the right people up behind his plan for a new world bank to make local currency loans. Local currency is a polite way of describing the money of countries which can't readily convert it into other moneys. It stands to reason that such money doesn't make very good lending material for an international bank. The reason is that a country with nonconvertible money is likely to have little to sell and so little to offer in the way of capital materials.

But while a country with nonconvertible money may not be able to provide steel and tractors, nuclear reactors and hydroelectric equipment, it may well have other goods, even if in limited supply, which would help its friends in a development program. If it had a rice surplus, say, it might provide rice for a developing neighbor country and enable that country to turn some of its manpower from food production to more direct development employment. The new kind of bank Mr. MONRONEY has in mind would mobilize such secondary development resources. At first savored rather coolly by the international development people, the plan is now being taken up by the bankers and by the U.S. Treasury itself.

The proposed local currency bank would be set up in affiliation with the World Bank. This institution now makes strictly hard money loans on bankable terms payable in hard money in the classic business tradition. But the possibility is now seen of what you might call blended advances, with hard money from the World Bank to supply the capital equipment available only in such countries as the United States, Britain, West Germany, and local currency through the new local currency bank for such goods as were available in the more modest countries. In this way every last potential and degree of development capital would be mobilized for effective use. Were Congress, after appropriate study, to authorize American collaboration in such a plan the overall cause of world development would undoubtedly be helped.

Labor Reform a Necessity

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8342) to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that this Congress pass a strong and effective labor reform bill.

The American people are rightfully demanding an end to the disgusting tactics of racketeers such as Dave Beck and Jimmy Hoffa.

We all know that the overwhelming majority of our labor leaders and union members are honest, loyal Americans. But a small element in the labor-management field have fallen into the use of corrupt and strongarm tactics that are a disgrace to our free enterprise system.

Actually, the rotten apple in the labor barrel should have been removed long ago. The Congress was given a chance to take a long stride in that direction a year ago when the Kennedy-Ives anti-racketeering bill passed the Senate with only one dissenting vote but was choked off in the House by a cross-fire of propaganda from extremists on both sides of the issue—those who wanted no reform at all and those who wanted to use Dave Beck as an excuse to put a legislative shackle on the entire labor movement.

I believed last year, as I do now, that the overwhelming majority of the American people want legislation that is strong enough to put hoodlums like Hoffa out of business. On the other hand, the same Americans would be just as strongly opposed to the schemes of labor haters to destroy honest labor organizations. That is why as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor last year, I did my best to secure passage of the moderate Kennedy-Ives bill.

Although I transferred from the Education and Labor Committee to the Committee on Agriculture this year, I have not lost my interest in effective labor reform legislation. Neither have I changed my belief that the public interest lies between the two extremes of either doing nothing or passing a bill designed to punish all labor, honest and dishonest alike.

For this reason, I again supported the position of moderation represented by legislation reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor and sponsored by my respected colleague and friend, Congressman ELLIOTT, of Ala-

bama. To the left of this bill was a second bill backed by the AFL–CIO and introduced by Congressman SHELLEY, of California. On the right is the third bill now before us, backed by the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, introduced by Congressman LANDRUM, of Georgia, and GRIFFIN, of Michigan.

All of the men who have introduced these bills are respected, highly competent Congressmen who act in good faith. Actually, the Shelley bill and the Landrum bill are patterned after the Elliott committee bill in most of their provisions. All of the bills contain tough, effective machinery for cleaning out corruption, rigged elections and racketeering. The differences come on matters relating to the scope of the National Labor Relations Board, picketing, boycotts, and the "hot cargo" practice. Although the Landrum bill is virtually a copy of the committee bill in more than 80 percent of its language, it contains highly restrictive language and heavy penalties which many labor lawyers and Members of Congress sincerely believe would jeopardize legitimate collective bargaining. Robert Kennedy, the McClellan committee's able legal counsel has strongly backed the moderate Elliott committee bill as the most practical of the three bills.

Our distinguished and beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, who supports the committee's middle-of-the-road bill, put it this way:

> To cut out the cancer of corruption, we used a surgeon's scalpel instead of a butcher's cleaver.

Those of us who are doing our best to resist pressure from both sides and take a moderate position in support of the committee bill have been hit from both left and right. Quoting further from Speaker RAYBURN:

> Every time that Congress takes up the subject of labor-management relations, powerful interests move in and try to twist the legislation to give them an undue and unfair advantage in the age-old struggle between management and labor. Each side tries to shape the laws so that the Federal Government's great power will be put to work on its behalf in this continuing struggle for economic power. This is not right, for the Federal Government should serve as an impartial umpire between these great economic forces, seeking to maintain fair and free competition.

The man who has served as Speaker of the House longer than any other man in American history, speaking for those of us who support the committee bill, added:

> This middle road, the road of reason and fair play, is a hard one to walk, but more often than not it is the path of common sense and justice. When a bill is being fought by both Jimmy Hoffa and the labor haters, that, in itself, is a pretty good recommendation. * * * Let us reform without punishing. Let us cure without crushing.

Although I have preferred the committee bill, now that the Landrum-Griffin bill has been substituted, I am voting for this substitute measure on final passage.

It is essential that labor reform legislation be passed by the House. If there are errors in the legislation, let us hope that they can be corrected in the conference between the House and Senate versions of labor reform bills.

The important task for us to accomplish before the adjournment of this Congress is the passage of legislation that will set the power of the Federal Government against the racketeers without crushing legitimate collective bargaining and the rights of our working men and women.

While I have disagreed with some of my constituents who have written me on both sides of the labor reform issue, I believe these good people know that I am as sincere in my convictions as they are in theirs. I believe they know, too, that I will do the best I know how to cast my vote on the side of fair play for both management and labor and for the American people as a whole. I am most grateful for the fact that I have enjoyed the support of both labor and business, as well as the great farm population of South Dakota. I see no conflict between the best interests of all three of these basic elements of our economy, and I trust that my public record will be fair to each of them.

Trees Can Help Control Smog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, almost everybody likes trees. And I am sure that everyone who lives in or near any of our large metropolitan centers hates smog. Yet it is possible, according to a novel scientific theory which has come to my attention, that by planting more trees and foliage we can reduce air pollution. The authority for this statement is Dr. Chauncey D. Leake, dean of the college of medicine of Ohio State University, who is the new president-elect of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Maybe that is one reason why we have a great deal less smog in Washington, D.C., than we do in Los Angeles. Both cities have great numbers of motor vehicles discharging large volumes of carbon dioxide and other contaminants into the atmosphere. Both cities have a share of foggy mornings. But humid Washington has a great many more trees and natural foliage than arid Los Angeles. You may recall that the mild smog spell we had here in the District in early June was dispelled before noon. If Dr. Leake's theory is proven correct by further scientific study, it could mean a great deal to many smog-plagued metropolitan areas which are virtually devoid of trees.

Dr. Leake gave a scholarly address on certain social aspects of air pollution at the national conference held in Washington last November. He recently has extended his point of view with the suggestion regarding the use of trees in fighting air pollution. An interesting article on the subject was published in the Oregon Statesman of Salem, Oreg. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S KEEP OUR BALANCE

(Chauncey D. Leake, Dean, College of Medicine, the Ohio State University)

Every great application of science carries its cost. Take the matter of transportation: Look how we have advanced from weary leg plodding, through oxcart and horse and buggy, to steam carriage and automobile, now to diesel engine, airplane, and jets. This tremendous advance has occurred within the last 50 years. It has revolutionized the world. But at a price.

The millions of automobiles, trucks, and airplanes, which we now have running all over the earth, burn up oxygen. This is a great danger. Oxygen has accumulated on the earth as a result of the photosynthesis of plants. In this process the carbon dioxide which accumulated during the days when volcanoes blew off all over the earth was converted by sunlight to sugar and oxygen. It is this oxygen that makes possible the land animals such as ourselves. We cannot live without oxygen, and we get in trouble if we produce too much carbon dioxide.

All modern transportation moves on combustion; that is, the burning of fuel with oxygen to produce carbon dioxide. Incidentally, a lot of other poisonous materials are produced also, but let's just stick to the carbon dioxide picture.

For millions of years the earth has been in a wholesome balance between oxygen and carbon dioxide: The plants use up the carbon dioxide that comes into the air from burning, or from the breathing of animals, and produce sugars and oxygen, so that animals can live. This is a very delicate balance. It is involved in maintaining the stability of weather. It is important in keeping just the right balance for heat capture from the sun and for the preservation of a balance in our water distribution, between the icecaps on the poles and the water vapor in the air. If this exquisite balance is disturbed, things can go bad.

We are disturbing this balance in a sudden and startling way. We are dumping tons of carbon dioxide, along with a lot of other poisonous material, into the air from the engines that run our automobiles, trucks, and airplanes. Meanwhile, we are also cutting down our trees, destroying our forest lands, and making deserts in our cities. We are in a fair way to get badly out of balance before we know it.

Carbon dioxide helps to build heat. With only a slight increase in the overall carbon dioxide of our atmosphere, we might add just that bit more heat that could upset our weather balance. Think what might happen if the polar icecaps were really to melt away.

Before it's too late, let's start planting trees. Certainly for every automobile we produce, we should have at least a dozen trees planted to take care of the carbon dioxide that we produce and to put back the oxygen that we need. For every truck, we need probably a hundred or more trees to keep the balance. For every airplane, and now for jets, we probably need several hun-

dred more trees. Let's start planting them; let's keep our balance.

Meanwhile, our cities are becoming more ugly, our landscapes are becoming more barren, our whole civilization is losing the natural beauty that belongs to all of us in the good regions of the earth. Let's get the trees back to preserve our watersheds, to give us the oxygen we need to breathe, to remove the carbon dioxide, dusts, and other poisonous material from the air, and let's get trees back into our cities to hide the ugliness of our buildings.

H. L. Mencken, that sharp-tongued Baltimore wit, wrote once, "On certain levels of the American race there seems to be a positive libido for the ugly * * * Here is something that the psychologists have so far neglected: The love of ugliness for its own sake, the lust to make the world intolerable." One has only to take a little stroll about any one of our big cities to see the ugliness we tolerate. Maybe our libido for ugliness is unconscious, but it certainly is there, or else we would try to bring some beauty into our cities.

This can best be done by trees. Trees can be planted and maintained along our main streets, in our business areas, in our commercial and industrial areas, as well as in our residential sections. We need lots more trees, green places and parks in our cities.

Even Vitruvius, the great architect under Augustus Caesar in ancient Rome, realized the value of trees. He indicated that they help to keep the air clean and fresh, and are more needed in the cities than they are in the country.

Trees would help enormously in our motor age. Planted along our highways they would relieve monotony and lessen fatigue; they restore natural beauty; and help maintain the roadside, particularly in the prevention of erosion and they are thus economical; they reduce noise, dust, and take out carbon dioxide from the air; they can effectively screen off the ugliness of industrial areas, and they can afford rest places for safety and recreation.

More importantly are trees needed in the cities. Here they can help in reducing noise and dust, in providing cool shade in the summer, and in hiding the ugliness of our buildings both in summer and winter. They give a refreshing look to our streets, and they can provide a lot of employment in connection with their care and maintenance.

Certainly if we are to preserve our balance in connection with our wasteful use of oxygen from the air, and with our appalling increase in the amount of carbon dioxide we are dumping into it, it can best be done by planting trees; at least 10 trees for every automobile, at least a hundred trees for every truck, and at least a couple of hundred trees for every airplane. This would promote beauty, stabilize our weather pattern, and help maintain our land in the beautiful natural way that we all enjoy.

Mrs. Helen Fleming Czachorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride and inspiration that I call to the attention of the Members of Congress the achievements of a distinguished woman attorney in my district, Mrs. Helen Fleming Czachorski. Mrs. Czachorski is a unique and outstanding woman and I wish to take this opportunity to acquaint you with her background and qualifications.

Helen Fleming Czachorski was born April 27, 1828, in Buffalo, N.Y., the second of five children of Mr. and Mrs. Teofil Fleming. She was educated at Masten Park High School, Buffalo, and then entered Buffalo University, from whence she received her LL.B., the first female graduate of that university's college of law, in June of 1908. She was admitted to practice November 16, 1909, before the Supreme Court of the State of New York. Her first position was as an associate of Samuel Harris, later to become a judge of the Supreme Court of New York.

In 1914, she married Dr. John A. Czachorski of Chicago, Ill., and was admitted to legal practice in Illinois. In the same year she was elected attorney of the Polish Women's Alliance and remained general counsel of that national organization until 1936.

In 1941, Mrs. Czachorski was elected national president of the Polish Bar Association, being the first woman to hold said position. She was the founder of this association. She was also one of the founders of the Chicago Advocates Society, a local branch of the national group.

Mrs. Czachorski is unique in that she is believed to be the first woman of Polish extraction to be admitted to the practice of law anywhere in the world. It is also believed that she is the only mother associated in a law partnership with her sons. She and her sons, Eugene and John, have their law firm at 100 North La Salle Street, Chicago. Previous to this association, she was engaged in the practice of law with her brother, Edward E. Fleming. She was attorney for the Hegewisch Federal Savings & Loan Association, Hegewisch, Ill., for many years.

This most distinguished woman has been active in many civic, charitable, and professional organizations throughout the years. She is a member of Women's Bar Association, South Chicago Bar Association, Polish Women's Alliance of America, Polish Roman Catholic Union, Polish Welfare Association, Women's Auxiliary of Chicago Polish Medical Society, attorney for Polish Women's Alliance of America for 21 years.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Helen Fleming Czachorski is certainly a rare and outstanding professional woman and is truly deserving of all the civic as well as personal tributes that she will receive on her 50th anniversary of legal practice.

Hawaii Day in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Governor Meyner, our distinguished Governor of New Jersey, has proclaimed today Hawaii Day in New Jersey. I would like to join in the celebrations and extend a most joyous welcome to our new State.

I had the memorable pleasure and honor to participate in the vote for statehood for Hawaii in March. This was a living demonstration of democracy in action. It is proof of the vitality of the United States. It is the fulfillment of hope that we have long held out to the loyal people of Hawaii. The vote for statehood demonstrates that the United States offers more than the hope of freedom to the world. It is proof that the United States of America is synonymous with the word "freedom."

To my colleagues from our new State, I extend a most sincere welcome. May he find it as rewarding an experience as I have.

The Impact of Science on Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include an address which I delivered at the 96th commencement of Bryant College on July 31, 1959. The address is entitled "The Impact of Science on Our Society":

THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON OUR SOCIETY

(Address of the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Member of Congress from the Second District of Rhode Island, Veterans Memorial Auditorium, Providence, R.I., at the 96th commencement of Bryant College)

Gathered here this morning are several hundreds of young men and women who have successfully met another in the long series of challenges by which each human being is measured, from his first learned response to his last influence before or after his death.

Gathered here, too, are several thousands of men, women, and children for whom this commencement also signifies the successful meeting of a challenge. For the award of a diploma to an individual is not just tangible recognition of that individual's academic accomplishments; it is also, symbolically, recognition of the accomplishment of parents and loved ones who have given much of themselves in order that a new and potentially valuable member may be added to the family of man.

Bryant College has witnessed many occasions such as this. Thousands of students have studied here and, enlightened and enriched by the experience, gone on to productive, rewarding careers. For nearly a century, the college has been a source of pride to the community it serves by blending specialized education in business techniques and administration with the more general education required for useful citizenship in our complex and dynamic society. It has had the vision and courage to pioneer in educational methods and curriculum. Yet it has never lost sight of its primary mission: To educate the individual.

The educated individual is the key factor governing the strength and effectiveness of our democracy. The incredibly rapid sweep of events in the 20th century places a special responsibility on all of us, not only to keep abreast of our times, but in a sense to keep ahead of our times.

This is nowhere more evident than in the field of science. That is why I have chosen to share with you today some thoughts on science and its impact on society.

What image do you have in your mind when you think of the term "science"? Is it the picture of nuclear power for instruments of peace and weapons of destruction? Is it manned missiles encircling the earth or exploring the surfaces of the moon? Is it probing the depths of the ocean, the molecular structure of metals, the chemistry of the cells of the human body?

This is the kind of image most people have when they think of science. They endow science with qualities that tend to remove it from the society it serves—to set it apart as something mysterious and almost frightening in its potential for engendering sudden and unpredictable change in our way of life. In the same vein, scientists are commonly viewed as obsessively motivated, highly intellectual, socially naive individuals who spend their lives satisfying their intense curiosity to understand the phenomena of the world and the universe about them.

Such images tend to create barriers to public understanding of science, and public understanding is essential if science is to be an even more effective force for the achievement of goals that are set by society.

Textbooks tell us that the essence of science is the facts or principles or rules which are used to explain or hold together what man knows, and to help him discover what he still does not know. The abstract sciences deal with things that cannot be touched, like numbers or thoughts; the natural sciences deal with things in nature, such as men and stones and stars; and the human or social sciences deal with the way we think and act, alone or together. No mater how it is classified, however, science is characterized by what is known as the scientific method. And the application of the scientific method to the study of man and his universe has been a primary force directing and conditioning the growth of civilization as we know it.

It is easy for us today to look back over those relatively few years in which man on this planet has recorded his history and see how primitive science has evolved into modern science. The use of metals—the control of fire, the domestication of animals, the planting and harvesting of crops, the discovery of the wheel, the invention of written language—these were scientific accomplishments which had a marked effect on the subsequent history of mankind.

In the forward movement of science through the intervening centuries—movement associated with such names as Aristotle, Archimedes, Copernicus, Galileo, Kepler, Newton—there is evidence of a characteristic of science that must be understood by all of us who live today in a world that is rapidly becoming a scientific world. This characteristic is, if you will, the fallibility of science. It is the only source of knowledge whose truth can be tested by experiment. Its methods and results must be reliable or they are discarded. But what is called scientific truth is not, and must not be thought to be, always absolute and final. Often the information on which scientific conclusions are based is incomplete. Thus scientific knowledge is continually growing and continuously being revised. Science cannot answer, and it is not the answer to, all of the questions of society. It cannot tell all about man, where he came from or where he is going. It cannot tell all about the universe. And while we build and strengthen science because we expect it to build and strengthen our society, it is important that we recognize both the limitations of science and the dangers it brings along with its many blessings.

I shall not try to summarize the ways science affects our daily life. Directly and indirectly, it has made us richer—not only in material and technological miracles that are accepted as commonplace, but in leisure time, tools for study, and opportunity to create things of beauty. The tempo of scientific discovery in the 20th century has been incredibly rapid. All sciences have moved forward and literally hundreds of new sciences have been generated. Terms like supersonics, thermodynamics, plastics, biochemistry, nuclear physics and astronautics become meaningful parts of our vocabulary. And we invest heavily in programs seeking greater control of power, new forms of matter, freedom from hunger and disease. Yes, science is a dominant force in our society. Its evidences are everywhere—in our homes, in our industrial and agricultural economy, in our transportation and communications systems, in our communities, in our places of work and of learning. One has only to think of the ways science and scientific advances have influenced your own chosen field of business administration and practices to realize the extent to which science is interwoven into the total fabric of our society.

We tend to think of the product and influence of science in positive terms. But just as in the scientific process each major advance highlights other scientific problems that require solution, so the total forward movement of our scientifically oriented society is threatened by dangers which must be recognized and met.

Can we, for example, find ways to use for human betterment the powers that science has given us for weapons of destruction?

Can we use our advanced communications systems to achieve the kind of understanding that will lead to peace among the peoples of the earth?

Is there a solution for the situation which find some nations producing in excess of their nutritional needs while other nations are starving?

Although science can make nearly everything necessary for life out of certain raw materials, not all nations have a supply of these raw materials. Can we learn to share them so that no nation will have to go to war to win its share of needed substances? Moreover, there are just so many raw materials in the earth and no more. Can science find substitutes for old sources of energy before the earth's resources are depleted?

Can we find certain ways to protect ourselves against the environmental hazards and stresses that we ourselves have created?

Can we eliminate or bring under control the diseases that cause crippling and premature death?

Is there a way for society to manage its affairs so that everybody has an equal chance? Can economic and social and political forces learn how to avoid peaks and depressions in a total economy?

These are the kinds of challenges we face. Under a broad and comprehensive definition of science, they are scientific challenges—or, more precisely, challenges in the ultimate application of the scientific method.

Whether the challenges will be met is dependent upon man himself. Man lifted himself above the level of animals because he alone, of all the forms of life on earth, was able, by thought and work, to gain control over the forces of nature. He lifted himself from savagery and barbarism to civilization. This has not been a steady gradual process. Social organization and moral ideals have lagged behind the control over nature. We must use all of our talents and capacities to bridge the great gap that exists between the scientific accomplishments of man and his much less advanced social thinking and action.

This is one of the reasons why the individual and his education are of such critical importance today. For each individual member of our society is a precious resource, to be nurtured, challenged, and given every opportunity to make a contribution to the solution of the great and small problems that beset society as it moves ahead to meet—as I know it will meet—the challenges that lie ahead.

There are many ways in which the functions of an elected representative of the people to the Federal Government permit him to contribute to the achievement of the goals we all share. I, for example, have served the people of the Second District of Rhode Island for nearly two decades in the House of Representatives. There are three general ways in which that responsibility is reflected in my actions.

First, it is my responsibility to act for and on behalf of the people of my district. This means I must know them, their views, and their wishes, and faithfully reflect them on all matters of interest to my constituency.

Second, it is my responsibility to take an active and informed part in all matters of national and international consequence. In this sense, each elected representative serves the people of the Nation as a whole, as well as his own constituents.

Finally, it is my special responsibility to review and recommend appropriations for the activities of two departments of the executive branch—the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This committee assignment gives me an opportunity to study in depth the work of many Federal agencies that have a direct and personal effect on the lives of all of us. Out of the complex of activities in these Departments, I have chosen to mention here today two that bear on my topic "The Impact of Science on Society."

Within the U.S. Office of Education, there has recently come into being a program which loans funds to brilliant young students in order to help them acquire higher education in the physical sciences. Called the National Defense Education Act and now in its second year, this program will help recruit and train a number of young people for careers in one segment of our Nation's total scientific endeavor.

While I gave my support to this program, and would do so again under the present circumstances, I know I will not be misunderstood if I say I wish it had not been necessary for this legislation to be enacted.

In the first place, such emergency programs are always less efficient and effective than the orderly and sustained growth in depth and in strength of the total educational system. A nation such as ours should be well able to afford a system of elementary, secondary, and higher education which would have the capacity routinely to meet our national needs; more than this, we cannot afford not to have such a system. But there are grave present inadequacies in our educational system—inadequacies which threaten to become critical deficits in the years ahead. Our educational facilities are being outdistanced by population growth and change. The salaries and other compensations for teachers are not commensurate with their services, and the teacher shortage becomes increasingly acute. And higher education is fast becoming out of reach for too many of our young men and women who should have an opportunity for such education.

The crisis in education is a local, State, and national problem. The public has a right to expect vigorous, enlightened leadership from Washington so that our full resources can be directed to its solution. I regret to say that such leadership has not been forthcoming. The administration has toyed

with the problem but has backed away from any affirmative action. As a result, little bits of the problem—like the special impetus to science education to which I just referred—have been touched. But the heart of the problem remains, and will remain until the people of the United States decide how much importance they attach to sound education and make their views known to their representatives in government at all levels.

A second scientific activity of the Federal Government with which I am closely associated is medical research. In this activity, I am happy to be able to report that the public interest is being well served. During the past 15 years, there has been gratifying and sustained growth in the Nation's investment in medical research, with about equal support from Federal and non-Federal sources. What began in 1946 as a spotty, uncertain program has emerged into a comprehensive, stable, productive effort of which every citizen can be proud. We are now able to provide for the needs of most of the competent scientists who have sound research ideas and work in an established research environment. At the same time, recognizing that investments in science are long-term investments, we have an active program for the advanced training of medical research scientists and another to assist in the construction of medical research facilities.

I am proud to say that my name is closely linked with that part of this effort which has Federal origin, particularly the National Institutes of Health, a bureau of the U.S. Public Health Service in Bethesda, Md. I have supported this program because of my deeply rooted conviction that the health of our people has a direct correlation with the strength, well-being, and productivity of our Nation—a conviction that has been borne out by the progress that has been made since we embarked on a renewed medical research activity after World War II.

There are all sorts of objective measures of the advances which have occurred when knowledge derived from medical research has been applied in medical and public health practice. There are increases in life expectancy. There are diseases that can be prevented, conditions that can be ameliorated or cured, lives that can be saved. In the health sciences as in the other sciences, an endless succession of ever more complex problems stretches out ahead. But we can be glad that we have taken and are taking and will take the necessary steps to assure that one by one, as scientific knowledge permits, the major health issues of today will crumble before the diversified and brilliant attack of our medical research workers. Perhaps not in my lifetime, but almost certainly in yours, we will see better ways to prevent or cure cancer, better ways to control heart disease, better ways to protect against and treat certain of the mental illnesses.

It is this thought—this awareness of the intimate relationship between medical research and the people's health, and between science and the fulfillment of man's total aspirations—that I would leave with you today.

You who are being honored here for the completion of your work at Bryant College have essential roles in our complex world of tomorrow. Science has made all of us world citizens. It has enlarged our spheres of activity so that neither we, our community, nor our Nation can be in fact separate or independent. This places a high premium on the responsibility of society to provide an opportunity for each of its individual members to reach his full potential. And it emphasizes the responsibility of the individual to use his full potential for the betterment of the society of which he is a part.

To you who are graduating from this fine institution—best wishes in whatever you do in the years ahead. You have been well educated here. Use your education.

To your parents and friends who have come here this morning because they love you, are proud of your accomplishment, and would not willingly be anywhere else when you are being singled out for recognition—to them, congratulations for a different kind of accomplishment, a kind you will understand better when it is your sons and daughters who are graduating from college.

To those who administer and instruct at Bryant College—a special word of gratitude. There is no finer contribution that an individual can make than to educate.

And to all of you—students, parents, staff, and friends—may I convey the abiding respect and confidence that is shared by all who have reason to know Bryant College and its graduates. The people of Providence and of Rhode Island are proud of Bryant's long and distinguished service and are proud, too, that it is numbered among this little State's large family of educational institutions.

I am sure that those who are graduating today will do honor to Bryant College as, in their work and in their daily lives, they reflect what they have learned here.

Plaudits to Bob Murphy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Pittsburgh Press of Sunday, August 16, 1959:

PLAUDITS TO BOB MURPHY

Robert D. Murphy has been sworn in as Undersecretary of State for political affairs—making him No. 3 man in the Department, after Secretaries Christian Herter and Douglas Dillon.

This is belated recognition of an extraordinarily competent diplomat who has been a career officer for 39 years. Bob Murphy has been aptly called Uncle Sam's favorite troubleshooter.

Warships and tough infantry regiments have a tradition of inscribing on their quarter decks or battle flags the names of all engagements in which they have participated. If Bob Murphy were to attempt such a roster, it would be longer than both his arms, North Africa, Trieste, Tokyo, Lebanon—to name just a few—and everywhere he has been sent he has left a good measure of tranquillity wreathed in his broad Irish smile.

When Mr. Murphy won this year's Notre Dame Laetare Medal for achievement he was accorded the usual privilege of selecting a Latin epigram for inscription on the medal. Characteristically, he chose Martial's "Ride, si sapis"—"Laugh if you are wise."

Wise, good humor has been his redeeming safeguard in the countless crises and emergencies of foreign affairs he has faced. He is not likely to relinquish his motto now in his higher post and it will stand him in good stead.

Full Steam Ahead on the Arkansas River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, this week the Congress sent to the President the public works appropriation bill for the 1960 fiscal year, following adoption of the conference report by the House last Friday and by the Senate on Monday. This action is another momentous and historic milestone in the development of the Arkansas River Basin program of navigation and flood control—for appropriations in excess of $45 million are included for this great program for the last major undeveloped river in the United States.

Under this bill, construction funds are provided of $13.4 million for the Eufaula Dam on the Canadian River in McIntosh County, Okla.; $12.5 million for the Oologah Dam on the Verdigris River in Rogers County, Okla.; $10 million for the Keystone Dam on the main stem of the Arkansas River near Tulsa, Okla.; $3.4 million for the Dardanelle Dam in Pope and Yell Counties, Ark.; and $5 million for Arkansas River bank stabilization work in Arkansas and Oklahoma. The John Redmond—Strawn—Dam on the Grand—Neosho—River in Coffey County, Kans., will receive $1.3 million in construction funds. Also included in the bill is $2.5 million for recreational facilities at completed Corps of Engineers projects in the United States, and it is expected that more than $150,000 of these funds will be spent for recreational facilities at completed projects in the Arkansas Basin during the coming year.

In addition, the sum of $900,000 is provided for general engineering studies by the Corps of the Arkansas River and its tributaries—something of basic importance to the entire program.

In this connection, one of the finest and most thought-provoking speeches I have ever read concerning the Arkansas Basin program was made by Brig. Gen. William Whipple, Southwestern Division Engineer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, when he spoke to the Rotary Club at Pine Bluff, Ark., on August 4, 1959.

Mr. Speaker, since General Whipple's speech was a most excellent and detailed analysis and report on the progress of the Arkansas Basin program and since it should be of great interest to every American who is deeply interested in the development of our national water resources, I should like to insert this most informative speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM WHIPPLE, DIVISION ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY ENGINEER DIVISION, SOUTHWESTERN, DALLAS, TEX., TO THE ROTARY CLUB, PINE BLUFF, ARK., AUGUST 4, 1959

It is a pleasure to be with you in Pine Bluff. You already have a fine city here and the Arkansas River program should give you

an even better outlook for the future. Mr. Sanders has long been a prime mover in this undertaking and other citizens have joined with those up and down the valley to present a solid front on this far-reaching improvement. Senator MCCLELLAN, with the great respect accorded him across the Nation, continues to maintain the development of the Arkansas River as a prime objective and, rather than letting the increasing scope of his responsibilities dim his enthusiasm for this program, he applies his enormous prestige to bring progress to this basin.

We have well qualified district engineers in Colonel Jacoby at Little Rock, Colonel Walsh at Vicksburg, and Colonel Penney at Tulsa, along with experienced staffs, to carry on this challenging task. As you know, General Carter, with offices in Vicksburg, has responsibilities for the Arkansas from this point downstream. I feel most fortunate in having a man of his capabilities and an old friend and classmate besides as a teammate on this important work.

Reviewed in its simplest terms this entire project will provide barge navigation from the Mississippi River to Tulsa, a considerable degree of flood control, hydroelectric power, channel improvements, bank stabilization, improved low flows, reduction of sediment in the river, recreation oportunities and the general advantages of a controlled and developed river basin.

This will be brought about by three major storage reservoirs in the upper reaches of the integrated system, a series of navigation dams, on the main stem, cut-offs, dredging and other channel work, dikes and revetments.

The Keystone Reservoir, on the main stem above Tulsa, and the Eufaula Reservoir, on the Canadian River near its confluence with the Arkansas in eastern Oklahoma, are critically important to the whole system. These reservoirs, although they only control one-third of the stream flow above Dardanelle, control three-quarters of the sediment. It is necessary to cut off this source of sediment before we could close the downstream dams and initiate the final adjustment of the river. Closure of the Dardanelle project is not to be made until after closure on Eufaula and Keystone, in 1964, which is phased in with the overall completion date of 1972 which we use for planning purposes.

The Keystone Reservoir is reaching the point where progress will begin to show. Relocation of highways, railroads and utilities, which will constitute more than half of the $135 million cost of this project, are well underway, as is the construction of the first stage cofferdam. In all, almost $5 million in construction contracts are in effect, in addition to the work already accomplished on access roads, project buildings, land acquisition and much time-consuming planning and engineering. However, best of all, we are now in a position to advertise the first of next month for a major contract for the main dam itself, a contract of the order of $25 million.

The Eufaula Reservoir is similar to Keystone, except that it will have an initial power installation, and as yet has less construction under contract. It will cost $153 million. Bids for the three generators will be opened August 13. We expect to advertise a principal dam contract about November of this year. Completion of this project, as well as Keystone, is scheduled for 1965.

The Oologah Reservoir, a $35,100,000 project in northern Oklahoma, is further advanced, with a completion date of 1962. It will regulate flows on the Verdigris River which the navigation channel will follow from Muskogee to the vicinity of Tulsa.

The Dardanelle Dam, with which you are probably more familiar, will function for navigation and hydroelectric power and is necessarily scheduled for completion later than the storage projects upstream. Except for this lock the project will be completed in 1966; the lock will be completed in 1970. Its total estimated cost is $94,600,000. On my way to Pine Bluff this morning, I inspected the work under the $3 million contract which got underway in May. This contract is for the first stage of diversion of the river and the initial construction on the lock and dam proper. Because there was a considerable period of uncertainty in the early stages of this program, I know that many of the proponents were greatly encouraged by the fact that this contract included part of the navigation lock as well as the left bank portion of the dam. This was interpreted as conclusive evidence of the inclusion of navigation in the program under construction. There is in my own mind no doubt that navigation and all the other functions of the multipurpose program have been directed and confirmed by the Congress, and will be completed successfully at an early date.

Some indication of the growing impetus of the program is given by the appropriations being considered this year. Based on the House version of the bill, $44,200,000 will be included for the various elements of the work. Last year $30,230,000 was allotted and the year before $13,950,000. Even if the House versions are adopted, it will make a total of $124,300,000 which has been provided for this program. While the entire improvement will cost about $1.2 billion, the funds appropriated and in prospect for this year leave no doubt in our minds that this is a going program, and our only thought is to prosecute the work with all vigor. This is an answer to those who thought that Congress might never appropriate funds to complete this work.

The breakdown of the House figure for this year is $900,000 for general studies, $3,400,000 for Dardanelle, $13,400,000 for Eufaula, $10 million for Keystone, $12,500,000 for Oologah, and $4 million for bank stabilization. By districts the bank stabilization funds are $1 million for Vicksburg, $1,300,000 for Little Rock, and $1,700,000 for Tulsa. However, the Senate figures are $8 million for bank stabilization, which we can very well use.

I consider it good fortune to have been assigned to the southwestern division last year, at the time when some of the most interesting engineering questions in water resources development history were coming up for solution. There is a tendency to think of imposing structures as the most challenging for the engineer. The Arkansas River program includes the Eufaula Dam, which will produce hydroelectric power and form a very large reservoir, but the structural problems of this and other individual structures are routine compared with the interrelated complex of channel problems. I will say without qualification that the problem of how to develop the Arkansas River mainstem has been the outstanding engineering question in the entire southwestern division for some time past. One of the first things I did as coordinator for this multipurpose Arkansas project was to set up a sediment board, made up by three distinguished engineers, Dr. L. C. Straub, of the University of Minnesota; Dr. H. A. Einstein, of the University of California; and Mr. D. C. Bondurant, of the Missouri River Division of the Corps of Engineers. As an indication of the importance which I attach to this matter, I participate personally in all meetings of the board. The studies of the board are coordinated with studies in the district and division offices and with model studies at hydraulic laboratories.

Nature sets up a delicate balance in the regimen of a stream. Many forces are joined together to establish the pattern and changes in the various forces alter the pattern. Because there are so many factors involved and there are possibilities for so wide a range of change in each, it is difficult to talk about the subject without getting into technical terms. Yet, because it is such an interesting subject and means many millions of dollars in this program, I will discuss it with you today. Since your interest is in the essentials rather than in technical analysis, I will resort to oversimplification to some degree.

There will be basic changes in the regimen of the river in any event. After the multipurpose reservoirs are in operation, there will be less severe and less frequent flooding and there will be better sustained low flows. The reduced sediment loads will be carried more uniformly rather than being scooped up in great quantities by quick rises and dumped in bars by rapidly falling stages. While changes in the channel characteristics of the Arkansas are inevitable, their nature and the amount of time required to complete them are subject to some degree of control. The objective is to balance out the most economical combination of final river and structural characteristics.

If the bed of the river were to remain unchanged, the problem would simply be one of spacing the dams close enough to build up navigable depths throughout each navigation pool. These dams must not be built high enough to inundate appreciable amounts of productive land, so that the top evaluations of the dams are relatively fixed and any flexibility must come in spacing the dams and in changing the bottom elevation of the channel. We know that the regulated flows with greatly reduced sediment load will cause eventually considerable degradation in the streambeds. This natural effect, called degradation, could attack the banks and undermine our structures if not controlled; our problem is to make it work for us instead of against us.

If the new regimen of the Arkansas can be made to dig a deeper channel and keep it relatively clean, the necessary depths for navigation can be created with dams spaced further apart. This would result in fewer dams, fewer lockages for navigation and less operating cost.

The best way to make the river work for us is a two phase program. As a first phase, starting now, we will expedite the bank stabilization and contraction works which have already been advanced some way under emergency authorities. I testified to the congressional committee this spring, and I repeat to you now, that there are sound engineering reasons to get on with this work. By contracting and realining the channel now we have exactly 5 years, and that is none too much, prior to closure of Dardanelle, to complete the major portion of the work with the full natural supply of sediment, which helps us close the old chutes and meanders. After closure of Dardanelle and the upstream reservoirs, the regulated stream will rapidly scour itself deeper. In the first 2 years' time, with average stream flow, the changed river will scour out and remove from 40 to 50 million tons of sand; and if we have done our work well, a large part of this scour will be in the parts of the river where we want it to be removed.

We can then move to the second phase of the work. We will excavate, by dredging, the remaining sand in the upper depths of the pools, anticipating the further scouring of the bed which would take years if we had to wait for it. This will mean many millions of cubic yards of dredging, in fact a really major dredging program, but its cost will be much less than that of the dams which it will make unnecessary.

How can we know that the excavated channel will not fill up again after passage of the first flood?

The answer is that it would do just exactly that except for one thing—we will plan the final stabilization works so as to increase the degree of contraction in the upper ends of the pools. With a relatively slight degree of contraction, and some special features at the river crossings, the contracted channel will increase the velocity enough to hold the new condition with reasonable maintenance. It appears that, compared with previous tentative plans, we may be able to reduce the number of navigation dams between here and Dardanelle from seven to five and possibly one less above Dardanelle. The Tulsa district has already planned to reduce two dams in Oklahoma. Also General Carter is considering the possibility of eliminating one downstream from here in his reanalysis of that section of the river. These various possibilities could have considerable effect on overall costs. Just because we will be spending more than a billion dollars on this program, we have not become unmindful of economy. There is the possibility of saving many millions of dollars and producing a superior system.

I have talked primarily about channel slopes, but there are important and related questions with regard to the trace of the channel. We are studying certain new forms of channel contraction expecially for the crossings. I will not go into these today other than to say that contraction works and all other means of controlling the river must result in economical improvement of the resource before we are willing to adopt them.

We have had constructed at Vicksburg a new movable bed model reproducing 11 miles of river between here and Little Rock, and we will test in this channel in the next few months all the new plans for channel improvement which I have been talking about.

In this rosy picture of future progress there are still three big question marks. The first is the question as to whether we will satisfactorily complete the general engineering studies for which we were given $900,000 last year and again this year. This is a large amount of money; but the problems to be solved were many and complex. I believe we will complete these studies satisfactorily and on time, and produce the necessary complete solutions, including those of which I have today suggested as scheduled, of the first low-head navigation locks and dams.

The second big question is money. The appropriation indicated for this year is the largest so far and will allow fine progress. Up to now we could not have used larger appropriations except for limited features of the work. However, beginning next year and for some years thereafter, very much larger appropriations will be required if the program as a whole is to be completed as scheduled. Appropriations at the next session of Congress will therefore be of critical importance in indicating whether the work will continue with maximum economic speed for completion in 1972 or will taper off to slower progress.

The third big question mark, and I know how keenly you are interested in it, is the decision as to whether we should follow the river route or the North Bank Canal route between Pine Bluff and Arkansas Post.

As you know, a complete restudy of this entire problem has been made. I told the congressional committee this spring that I expected this question to be resolved before next year's hearings. While this matter has to be referred to the Chief of Engineers personally, I believe we will have an answer this fall.

While the corps has been concentrating on the engineering problems, we remain acutely aware that the end objective of all this work is to make the resources of the Arkansas Valley more useful to its people and the Nation. In the broader objective there is much to be done beyond the construction of river control works. Every element of Government, every unofficial organization concerned with economic advancement, and every individual with an interest in a more abundant way of life—all of us throughout the basin in each of our capacities have a stake and a responsibility in this great undertaking.

The controlled river will give you new advantages on a year-to-year basis within the present economic structure of the region. However, if this improvement is to be put to full use, you must visualize in full your new opportunities. Recreational possibilities seem more significant when considered in the light of the great national wave of interest in outdoor life. The level pools of the new dams will provide excellent water for boats. The fish and wildlife aspects of the river will be enhanced by the reduced sediment content of the water. The system will add a useful increment of hydroelectric power to the systems serving the region. The additional flood control will give new security to both urban and rural areas. The bank stabilization program will not only protect the navigation channel but will eliminate an imminent threat to many thousands of fertile acres up and down the valley, and make the protected banks more attractive as potential sites for industry. The improved low flows will offer more dilution for the urban and industrial wastes that offer a serious problem in many rapidly growing areas. The reduction in sediment will facilitate potential use of the water of the Arkansas for many purposes. Without looking too far into the future, the Arkansas Valley has a great deal to offer to new industries which must have water and waterway facilities.

Two-thirds of the benefits of the Arkansas River program are estimated to come from navigation. Water transportation can be a magnet with an active force to attract a new pattern of expansion. Barge transportation is making a phenomenal gain; in the 5 years ending with 1957 there was an increase of 22 percent in tonnage on the inland waterways of the United States. The Arkansas ties directly into the Mississippi River system, which almost doubled the national increase during the same period. I cannot say right now just how Pine Bluff will profit from this navigation; but I urge that you gentlemen get to work to evaluate the business opportunities that may appear.

This is an impressive package of new opportunities coming your way. Let me urge that you examine them and plan your course to take the best advantage of them. I would not suggest that you expect the basin to be suddenly transformed overnight, but neither would I suggest that you prepare to preserve the status quo. I have every confidence that you will pursue a sound course to a greater era in the Arkansas Valley. With you, as with us, it's full steam ahead on the Arkansas.

The Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 3, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we are soon to be visited by one of the most powerful men in modern history—Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev. It is of the utmost importance that while we are greeting Khrushchev, we also maintain our perspective on world affairs.

The hard job of building the peace of the world will still be ahead of us, regardless of Mr. Khrushchev's recent smiles.

I agree with President Eisenhower that Khrushchev should be treated courteously, but I know the President does not want us to close our eyes to the menacing threat of communism. Certainly, our international problems will not disappear overnight simply because Khrushchev has decided to visit us.

Mr. Khrushchev is the same ruthless dictator who ordered Russian tanks to smash the Hungarian freedom movement. He is the same tyrant who presides over a godless tyranny that no true American can ever tolerate.

While we have enough faith in our democracy to be courteous even to those whose doctrines we despise, we want to make it clear that beneath our courtesy our sense of justice cries out against the evils of Communist tyranny.

It is far better that we talk to Khrushchev than get into a nuclear war with him, but peace cannot be built simply on well-publicized trips between Moscow and Washington.

It will take all the patience, courage, and imagination that we can muster for decades to lay the basis for a durable peace.

Modern Army Readiness Through Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the U.S. Army, delivered such a striking and timely address to the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army on August 4, 1959, at the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., that I am extending this address into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. General Trudeau, in statements that permit him to use vision and foresight, outlines the developments of the future U.S. Army in an age of scientific progress and space development. In such an address oftentimes scientific developments seem weird and chimerical, but in the light of progress, what may be exotic today is commonplace and ordinary tomorrow.

The address of General Trudeau is a challenge to the forward-looking personnel in the U.S. Army and certainly is worthy of our most careful study. It is as follows:

MODERN ARMY READINESS THROUGH RESEARCH

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army, Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., August 4, 1959)

Members of the Association of the United States Army, ladies and gentlemen, the Research and Development Panel is delighted to be your host this morning to discuss with you the contribution of research to the modern Army. This is a most challenging subject at a time when science and engineering are striving to fashion new advances in power, electronics, and space while the sinister shadow of a godless, powerful opponent reaches across the oceans and the continents.

Since all of the panel members may not be familiar to you, I would like to introduce Dr. James McRae, Chairman of the Army Scientific Advisory Panel and vice president of A.T. & T.; Maj. Gen. August Schomburg, Deputy Chief of Ordnance; Mr. Tom Morrow, group vice president, Chrysler Corp.; Col. Robert Partridge, Headquarters, CONARC; and Sfc. Joseph Conroy, Headquarters, CONARC.

Our program today consists of my brief report to you on the overall Army research and development program and then answers by the panel to questions from me and from you, the audience.

Army research and development has the objective of providing effective weapons and equipment for the future Army organizations and requirements.

This objective is accomplished first by designing future weapon systems and materiel in support of our concept of new organizations and tactics, from known enemy capabilities and from our own sicentific breakthroughs and technological progress or "state of the art." Then we must be able to integrate the weapons, organizations, and missions to test and insure their effectiveness for predicted combat missions. The result is a continuing effective force to meet any future enemy threat.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that we must know the enemy. We must know what he is developing in weapons and equipment and exactly what his military capabilities are. We cannot risk basing our national defenses on his supposed intentions.

We must not forget why our strength must be maintained in the free world today. The Communist threat has increased immeasurably since World War II. They have conducted a relentless campaign to nibble the peaceful countries of the world to death—piecemeal.

Their intention is to dominate all the nations of the earth and they are coming close to having the means to accomplish their objective. Where once only America possessed the power of massive deterrence, today America and the Soviet Union share this mutual massive capability. Either side can well nigh destroy the other. With this situation in effect, Soviet air and naval capabilities coupled with the superiority of the Soviet bloc's military land forces over ours are a matter of grave concern and Soviet control of space would make this power overwhelming.

Within the framework of this Communist threat, the Army must develop the weapons and equipment to win in battle—the means to move, shoot, communicate, and defend ourselves regardless of enemy aircraft or missiles; to close with enemy ground forces and destroy them if forced into war and then to occupy the enemy homeland pending the establishment of a free government, and thus to control the land. Despite conflicting theories of strategy, I know of none brash enough to maintain that hostile or contested territory can be controlled in absentia.

Let us turn from the threat, to the Army research and development program which is my special responsibility on the Army General Staff. The scope of this research and development mission covers an extremely wide spectrum of developments and we feel our responsibility very keenly whether we are seeking better mobility, communications, firepower or logistical support. Let me review a few points:

Why is research and development important? Because it determines the future weapons and equipment that soldiers will use in combat. I have mentioned the type of threat that we can continue to expect and I would now like to describe the rest of the environment that determines the direction of our developments.

The battlefield of the next decade will be much larger than ever before and with even less clear-cut boundaries between units. Real mobility will be the key to success and combat units will move fast, concentrate to destroy the enemy, and then disperse rapidly. Soldiers will move in aerial vehicles just above the "nap" of the earth and carry with them new types of lightweight but potent weapons using not only conventional ammunition but also atomic rounds. Communications will be increased by new radios and relay systems using the latest techniques of earth satellite transmission and of bouncing signals off the moon.

Science and technology are other prominent factors in the research and development equation. Our basic research program continues to investigate the latest discoveries and inventions so that they can be integrated into the development part of the program which results in the hardware that rolls off the assembly lines of industry. We contract basic research out to industry and some 181 colleges and universities. Ten major fields and 74 subfields are covered from mathematics, human factors and medical projects to polar and arctic research. We will continue to stress this type of work because without it there would be little future development. As a matter of fact, our technological progress today is the chief determinant of the state of the weapon art during the next decade and beyond. We need to expand our basic research in the present technological race with the Communists.

What are some of the more promising results of this program that we can expect to see incorporated into future equipment? New metals with amazing characteristics have been created under extremes of temperatures and pressures. They promise to open a whole unexplored field of alloys that will be stronger, more heat resistant and lighter than anything else that we know of today. Missiles, space vehicles, and even tanks will benefit from such advances. Electronics is another field that has seen a quantum jump in the last 10 years and can be expected to surge beyond the boundaries of our imagination in the next 2 years. Electronic parts have been reduced in size through micromodularization so that instead of 7,000 parts per cubic foot we can put 700,000 parts in the same space. Applications of solid state physics have resulted in radios and electronic computers of miniature size that can perform all manner of operations to enable information to be gathered more quickly and accurately in combat.

The next step in the cycle is what we call applied research and development. The results of basic research are incorporated into weapons or equipment designed by the industrial engineer guided by the requirements of the military. This has resulted in a large spectrum of developments in the fields of mobility, communications, firepower, space and those designed to support the individual soldier.

We have some interesting vehicles under development to give us the mobility that we require for the future battlefield. On the ground we look to the "Goer" type of equipment used in the construction industry, where large wheels and tires give true, off-road mobility. New tanks and armored personnel carriers are to be operational soon to back up the striking power of powerful new weapon systems.

In the air we are looking for the type of vehicle that gives us the takeoff and landing characteristics of the helicopter and the advantages of the fixed-wing aircraft in forward flight. You have probably seen pictures of some of our flying test beds that look like disks or platforms propelled by unusual powerplants. These are the vehicles that will give us the answer to flying low and slow and quietly just above the battlefield.

Communications and electronics have enabled the Army to increase its command and control capabilities to the degree required by mobility and dispersion. Included in this area, also are the surveillance drones that will penetrate enemy lines to send or bring back information recorded by radar, infrared, photographic and TV equipment. This information will then be sorted and evaluated by automatic data processing systems to give the commander the facts needed for a decision.

Firepower is always a critical part of our programs. We have improved rifles and other small arms soon to be operational that outperform anything we have now and still better ones are in the offing. Many types of guided missiles are under development to supplement or replace those that we have now. For instance, Sergeant will replace Corporal and Pershing will replace the workhorse of our missile arsenal, Redstone. In addition, Lacrosse units now being organized will back up frontline infantrymen. These are all surface-to-surface weapons fired at ground targets.

The Army has an important mission in the air defense field, as you undoubtedly know. We have under development a shoulder-fired missile, called Redeye, for the soldier to use against attacking aircraft along with the field mobile Hawk missile to be employed against low flying aerial targets. Probably our most important contribution in the future will be Nike-Zeus, the only weapons system presently designed to attack incoming ballistic missiles. We have just successfully fired the sustainer rocket motor for this missile and are now approaching the testing stage of the complete system. In the near future we hope to fire it against our own IRBM's and ICBM's to establish its effectiveness for the air defense of our country. There is an urgent requirement for such a weapon while we are faced with the ballistic missile blackmail of the Communists. We are confident that Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's.

Another thought-provoking addition to our arsenal is in the chemical field. If the Communists ever use chemicals with which they are equipped against us, we must be prepared to meet such an attack. On the other hand, recent tests with nonlethal gases have shown the really humane nature of such a weapon that incapacitates without killing, even leaving no harmful aftereffects on humans or the works of man. This is certainly an advantageous way to capture an objective without destroying needed buildings, bridges and other manmade structures.

The Army's contributions to the national space program have been substantial and we have enjoyed a good share of success in our projects for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Advanced Research Projects Agency. Probably the most noteworthy of these were the space probe last March, still orbiting the sun as I stand here now, and the recent flight of the monkeys in a Jupiter missile. We look forward to participating in the Mercury astronauts' trips in space and to launching more satellites and other experiments in the future.

There is one other area that I assure you we are most concerned with. And that is with the most important factor of any battlefield at any future time—the soldier. We firmly believe that the man on the ground, well trained and well led is the key to success and still is the most necessary and most fundamental part of our national military posture. He is the man for whom we hope to develop new methods of preserving foods by radiation, requiring no refrigeration; for whom the Medical Corps has developed a "bone glue" that will enabel a soldier with a broken leg to walk out of the hospital in 48 hours; and to whom we are constantly striving to give every possible advantage in future combat so that he can perform his vital missions.

I have covered the research and development program in view of the Army staff responsibility and by describing some of the more promising results. At the same time I have deliberately omitted parts of the complete cycle which goes from the concept of the idea to production of the proven, finished hardware. The role of science, of the technical services, of industry and of the using troops is an interrelated one and essential to the accomplishment of the research and development objectives.

At this time I would like to begin the panel discussion with a series of questions intended to amplify the complete research and development cycle. After my question to each panel member, I will open the discussion to the floor before we move on to the next member. After the entire panel has had a chance to discuss their areas of interest and experience, general questions of a pertinent nature may be directed at any of us. Remember that anything that is said by the panel this morning will be on an unclassified basis, and we would appreciate that your questions be asked along those lines.

DAV Service in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that an organization in the State of Washington has furnished service to thousands of citizens without any charge for such service. This service is of a humanitarian nature and not always sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, either directly, or indirectly. This organization is a congressionally chartered veteran organization which has a State department and local chapters in Washington. This organization is the Disabled American Veterans. The Disabled American Veterans is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States or of some country allied with it during time of war.

The Disabled American Veterans was formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx; DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer N. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities, some 2 million, the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claiments.

The three DAV national service officers in the State of Washington are Perry E. Dye, David H. Kays, and David W. Lloyd, located at 803 Shafer Building, 523 Pine Street, Seattle. The department commander is Harold Yager, 5606 44th Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.; the department adjutant is Merle Dihel, 3235 62d Avenue SW., Seattle, Wash.

The 5 hospitals in Washington are a 904-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at American Lake; a 320-bed general medical hospital at Seattle; a 501-bed general medical hospital at Vancouver; a 200-bed general medical hospital at Spokane; and a 407-bed tuberculosis hospital at Walla Walla. DAV representatives are: American Lake, Homer L. McLaughlin; Seattle, A. R. Thompson; Spokane, James W. Reed; Vancouver, Otto Weise; Walla Walla, Harvey Knifong.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $85,488,000 for its veteran program in Washington, including $22,557,003 disability compensation to its 28,906 service-disability veterans. These Federal expenditures in Washington furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 12 percent—3,312—are members of the 29 DAV chapters in Washington. This 12 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Washington veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	54,090
Claims folders reviewed	45,075
Appearances before rating boards	26,452
Compensation increases obtained	4,118
Service connections obtained	2,039
Nonservice pensions	1,936
Death benefits obtained	599
Total monetary benefits obtained	$2,686,638.05

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Washington veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death, or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service-connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their power of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 0.014 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Washington, with a consequent loss of about $392,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Washington to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 4,871 of whom during the last 8 years, were Washington residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100 equivalent to about $5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Washington by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

The Constitution: More Than a Legal Document

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, a young man from Arlington, Va., in my congressional district, has written the winning speech in the department of Virginia division of the 22d annual national high school oratorical contest sponsored by the American Legion National Headquarters.

The rules of this contest, in which an estimated 350,000 high school students throughout the Nation competed, required that the speeches be the original efforts of each contestant and limited them to approximately 10 minutes in length. The assigned subject was a phase of the Constitution of the United States which gives emphasis to the attendant duties and obligations of a citizen to our Government.

Richard John Shaker, the author of the winning speech, is an honor graduate of Washington-Lee High School in Arlington. He was valedictorian of his graduating class this June, winner of four awards, including two for the highest overall marks in English and mathematics, and has been honored by several northern Virginia organizations as one of the outstanding students of the year. As a recipient of a scholarship, he will attend the University of Chicago this fall, and I anticipate a bright future for him in any of his endeavors.

I know the membership of this body will join me in congratulating young Mr. Shaker on this speech, and that they will profit, as will all who read it in the RECORD, from the thoughts and convictions of this representative of truly outstanding American youth:

THE CONSTITUTION: MORE THAN A LEGAL DOCUMENT

There is, at the present time, prevalent throughout this Nation, a false belief—a dangerous myth, one that could have, as its final result, the complete and utter destruction of every ideal for which the U.S. Constitution has become a symbol. This belief manifests itself in the feelings of many individuals across the country, who hold that the Constitution is simply a legal document and thus is subject to legal evasion.

It is true that the Constitution is and represents the supreme law of the land. This the document states itself, in its sixth article. If the citizens of America are not willing to accept this statement as fact, then they cannot, in good faith, accept any of the balance of the document. But while

expressing belief in the national supremacy clause, the people of this Nation must not and cannot afford to lose sight of the basic moral principles that resulted in the drafting of this document.

It is true that the Constitution represents the culmination of 700 years of British legal tradition. It is more important, however, that it represents the first powerful government to depend upon the consent of the governed for its sovereignty.

The basis of the Constitution did not originate in stuffy courtrooms. It was born in the minds of those visionary thinkers, who first realized that a government of, for and by the people was not only a plausability, but a necessity, if the dignity of free men was to survive.

The Constitution provides for a working system of government based on this ideal of the complete sovereignty of the people. It is not a perfect system. It is not 100 percent efficient. It may be evaded through various ingenious schemes. Possession of the Constitution within our boundaries does not guarantee that democracy will flourish throughout this Nation.

But more important than its legal shortcomings is the fact that the Constitution has become a symbol to millions of people in all parts of the world. It is the final answer to all those who held that the mob was not fit to rule. It is the vindication of the dreams of the earliest proponents of democracy, as represented by such men as Locke and Rousseau.

If then, you ask, the Constitution is all this, why cannot it in itself act to safeguard our liberties? The answer is simple. Political opportunists are willing and eager to twist the words of this document for their own personal benefit. These selfish men ignore the adverse effects their actions have on the security and well-being of this Nation.

No individual has the right to subordinate the U.S. Constitution to his own personal gain. Too many men have sacrificed their lives, their fortunes, their sacred honor for one man to nullify its purpose.

The Revolutionary patriot did not hold his position on Bunker Hill so that a voter could offer his ballot to the highest bidder.

The young militiaman did not set up a barricade of cotton bales at New Orleans so that two legal theorists could argue over whether Congress has the right to pass laws which are proper but not necessary.

The war-weary Kentucky veteran did not take up arms against his brothers so that a rebellious legislature could attempt to seize full control of governmental functions by impeaching the chief executive.

The tired doughboy did not march into the Belleau Wood so that a group of vocal solons could take advantage of legislative tactics to forestall the will of a majority.

The wounded marine sergeant did not raise Old Glory over Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima so that a corrupt judge could interpret the Constitution according to the political pressures and influences exerted upon him.

The GI did not charge up Porkchop Hill so that State officials and individuals could openly defy sections of the Constitution that had no ready means for enforcement.

What were these men fighting for? Certainly not for a mere scrap of paper encased in helium. No, these men were fighting for something more than a mere scrap of paper. They were fighting for something more than a mere collection of laws.

On the other hand, the voter, the lawyers, the Congressmen, the Senators, the judge, the State officials, and the individuals whom I have mentioned were providing their country a great disservice. Their selfishness clouded their vision. When they gazed upon the Constitution, they saw not the great collection of American liberties but instead visualized a mass of legal details. They saw means by which they could evade these details, in a legal way of course, and thus felt that what they were doing was right. These selfish men ignore the first 10 Commandments and instead substitute an 11th one, do anything you can legally get away with. In so doing, they jeopardize the security and well-being of this Nation, for by concentrating on words they lose sight of the basic moral principles that it is the duty of every American to defend.

If these people ever become a majority; if the voters of this Nation, as they have done in the past, place these people in positions of high trust; if these people are allowed to guide this Nation's destiny; then those who lived, fought, and died in defense of the Constitution will have lived, fought, and died in vain. The paper will remain, but the true Constitution will have died.

This Nation is presently locked in a life-and-death struggle with a country whose social, religious, political, and economic ideology is in direct opposition to those principles brought forth in the Constitution. It is a battle between religion and atheism, between capitalism and communism, between democracy and totalitarianism.

But yet, the conflict between freedom on the one hand and tyranny on the other cannot be resolved through a mere comparison of the two constitutions, for the differences are not there to be found. The millions of people behind the Iron Curtain live in a police state because they have been unable to maintain the ideals they first proclaimed when they overthrew their foreign and domestic oppressors. How can we preserve our ideals?

The annual assemblage of a Congress will not necessarily safeguard our liberties. The Politburo convenes annually in the Soviet Union.

The presence of a judicial system will not necessarily safeguard our liberties. A "supreme court" is an integral part of the theoretical Russian governmental setup.

The existence of a Bill of Rights will not necessarily safeguard our liberties. The Soviet Constitution of 1936 contains such an appendage.

And finally, as I have stated before, the mere presence of a Constitution within our boundaries cannot in itself safeguard our liberties. The Soviet counterpart is as idealistic as our own. But, a conscientious legislature, representative of an appreciative and interested populace, can act as a tremendous deterrent against the rise of totalitarianism.

A militant judiciary, willing, and eager to defend the rights of those who have been infringed upon in a lawless manner, can see to it that all Americans, regardless of racial, social, political, or economic status, receive "equal justice under law."

The Bill of Rights, upheld by the combined powers of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government, can nip in the bud any attempt by a would-be dictator to seize control over individual liberty.

But it is the Constitution which still stands as our first line of defense against tyranny. However, before the Constitution can act as a shield, it must be revitalized.

After all, it was written and ratified some 170 years ago. It may or it may not still be representative of the thoughts and ideals of Americans. Whether it is or isn't can only be demonstrated by the action taken by Americans of today in defense of it.

Therefore, it is the duty of every American to recognize that his Nation and his way of life are presently being challenged as they have never been challenged before.

It is the duty of every American to help prepare to meet this challenge by studying his Constitution, paying attention not so much to specific details as to those basic moral principles that have resulted in the Constitution becoming a beacon of freedom throughout the world.

It is the duty of every American to transform his faith in the democratic system into action to help preserve it.

It is the duty of every American to defy and oppose unconstitutional statutes.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, it is the duty of every American to help dispel the myth that this Nation can afford to let selfish individuals work in direct opposition to those principles brought forth in the Constitution and still maintain national security.

For only when the myth is dispelled, only if the myth is dispelled, can the Constitution, the true U.S. Constitution, survive.

The Death of Admiral Halsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the death of Adm. William F. Halsey has ended the illustrious career of one of the Navy's most colorful and inspiring leaders in World War II.

His loss will be deeply felt, not only by his family whose grief all those who knew him will share, but by many others throughout the country. For "Bull" Halsey did not let retirement dull the edge of his forceful, generous personality. His fight to preserve his old flagship, the gallant carrier U.S.S. *Enterprise*, will not be forgotten. As one who joined in this effort, I know it was worthy of this great seaman and good man.

The memory of Admiral Halsey will be especially cherished, however, by those of us who take pride in thinking of ourselves as his fellow townsmen, residents of his home town, Elizabeth, N.J., and his neighbors throughout Union County.

Speaking for the people of Elizabeth, and in words of fitting eloquence, the Elizabeth Daily Journal—"Bull" Halsey's hometown newspaper—has engraved this fighting man's memory in an editorial that deserves the widest circulation.

The Journal said of the admiral, in part:

Always there were those home ties, the ties of family, of the native heath remaining strong and calling him back no matter where duty sent him and regardless of honors. One of the touching human-interest stories of the Second World War was the meeting far out on a Pacific island between Admiral Halsey and Pfc. Christy DeMaio, the stout boy from Peterstown, fondly remembered by prewar boxing fans as the "Pants House Kid." But let Christy tell it again.

"I'm standing by the side of the road and I give the thumb to a car coming straight at me. Then I'd like to die. It stopped and who looked out at me, but the big boy from Elizabeth himself—Admiral Halsey. So, he said, 'All right, Soldier, get in.' And when he found out that I was from Elizabeth too, boy, did we cut it up for 25 miles. Real pals, we were. No brass. What a guy he is!"

And "'What a guy' he was," the Journal editorialist echoed, as he recited the

story of Elizabeth "bursting with pride" on that memorable November 7, 1945 when Admiral Halsey returned to his own.

Continuing, the editorial commented:

We are bursting with pride now, even as we grieve, while newspaper headlines the world over tell the story of the Elizabeth boy who led naval forces in exploits President Eisenhower has termed "a brilliant part of American military history"—of whom Adm. Chester Nimitz has said "he has left for all of us a shining example of courage and service."

The same spirit of pride motivated editorials in other newspapers in the Union County area.

The Plainfield Courier-News, for instance, had the following to say:

Union County residents were particularly proud of Admiral Halsey and his brave exploits because he was a native son of Elizabeth. True, he lived there only until about 11 years old, but nevertheless, he was a local boy who made good in the minds of Elizabethians and Union County citizens as well. As a result, he was honored on several occasions for his enviable record as the man who chased the Japanese Navy all over—and off—the Pacific.

Admiral Halsey's record should be an inspiration not only to our younger men who follow that branch of the military service but to all Americans who place loyalty to their country above all.

And the Newark Evening News concluded its editorial this way:

Admiral Halsey, who was born in Elizabeth, was a legend years before his death at 76. His passing ends a colorful career, but the legend will live as long as fighting men roam the seas in defense of liberty.

Centennial Year Sightseeing in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include a most interesting article by Paul Laartz which appeared in the August 9, 1959, issue of the Oregonian. Mr. Laartz points out the many scenic attractions of Klamath County in my congressional district. The historical data included in his article is especially interesting and I hope it will encourage my colleagues to visit Oregon during our centennial year observance.

CENTENNIAL YEAR SIGHTSEEING IN OREGON—KLAMATH COUNTY SCENIC LURES COUNT CRATER LAKE

(By Paul Laartz)

Klamath and Lake Counties are among Oregon's southern gateways, and through them have been pouring thousands of visitors—many more than in years past—to share in the State's centennial year.

Though similar in general characteristics, the two counties are distinctive in the tourist and scenic features they have to offer.

Klamath County, the first treated in this two-part series, is well known, of course, for its lumbering and business—as a leader in these fields in southern Oregon.

But it's rightfully proud of its beautiful lakes and scenic attractions.

CRATER LAKE FAMED

Topping the list is its world-renowned Crater Lake, a national park since 1902. However, along the broad back of the Cascades are also scores of other lakes, notably Diamond, Crescent, Odell, Lake of the Woods, and in the center, of course, Klamath Lake.

These lakes, along with fine fishing streams, are favorites of sportsmen, as well as the growing numbers of out-State visitors.

Another major tourist attraction in the general area, across the border in northern California, is the famed Lava Beds National Monument—scene of a crucial Indian battle that figured in early-day Oregon history.

TOURIST GAIN NOTED

All of these scenic spots are not far distant from Klamath Falls, key city of the area, and thousands of tourists are pouring northward into Oregon to view them and continue on northward and eastward to other scenic Oregon spots.

The Oregonian-Oregon State Motor Association white motorlog car found solid evidence of this tourist gain at Crater Lake. There a park ranger noted that visitors to this famed spot are up 45 to 50 percent over last year.

And the big gain, he added, is "all due to the Oregon centennial celebration."

Though all these lakes are gems in their own category, the best known of these jewels is unbelievably blue Crater Lake, the deepest lake in North America.

LAKE FORMED IN CALDERA

It's only 56 miles north of Klamath Falls, via the lush Wood River Valley—which some term one of the richest cattle-feeding areas in the world—past historic Fort Klamath and Klamath Agency, and up on the spine of the Cascades.

Crater Lake was created several thousand years ago when mighty Mount Mazama, a 12,000-foot volcano, discharged a tremendous quantity of ash and lava. The mountain top collapsed, creating a caldera which contains today's Crater Lake.

The awesome lake is about 6 miles wide, 20 square miles in area and has about 20 miles of shoreline. The uneven crater rim—about 7,000 feet elevation—towers as much as 2,000 feet above the lake.

MANY STATES REPRESENTED

Increasing thousands visit this creation of nature annually. On any day, one can see auto licenses from Virginia, Kansas, Texas, Alaska with California and Oregon predominant.

Included, too, among the visitors are many who speak accented English, here from Europe and Asia to view this internationally known spectacle of nature.

In the days before the white man, Indians regarded it as the battleground of the gods and visited it rarely, then only with awe.

It was discovered June 12, 1853, by John Wesley Hillman, a young prospector, who on his return to the early-day mining camp of Jacksonville in the Rogue River Valley, named it Deep Blue Lake.

Other discoverers later named it Blue Lake and Lake Majesty, but in 1869 the name was changed to Crater Lake by visitors from Jacksonville.

At Crater Lake, or Rim Village, there are accommodations at the lodge, dining room, campground, store, cabins, picnic area and all the necessities for the tourist. Launches and rowboats are available on the lake. Private boats are not permitted on the lake.

To the north, some 20 miles, is Diamond Lake, another beauty in the chain of lakes up and down the backbone of Oregon's Cascades, and a mecca for fishermen. Rainbow and Kamloops trout are plentiful. There are lodge, restaurant, camping and like facilities.

LAKE OF WOODS POPULAR

A longtime favorite among southern Oregonians and northern Californians is Lake of the Woods, some 35 miles west of Klamath Falls.

It's beloved for its water sports, camping, family outings.

However, one of the most amazing stops on this Oregon State Motor Association Oregonian Motorlog was a visit to the Lava Beds National Monument, 41 miles south of Klamath Falls and near Tule Lake, Calif.

Not only does it show off nature's flaming wrath of centuries ago, when volcanoes in what is now northeastern California spewed forth great masses of molten lava, which in cooling left weird and rugged masses of rock.

NATURAL FORTRESS USED

But it incorporates what might well be described as an infantry soldier's nightmare. It was in these twisted, misshapen lava belches—in 1872–73—that one of the Pacific coast's last and most famous Indian wars was fought. It was also one of the most costly Indian campaigns engaged in by the United States.

Into these lava masses, which had formed natural trenches and strongholds in solid rock, some 71 fighting Modoc Indians, under a leader known best as Captain Jack, fought off a U.S. cavalry unit 15 times their number.

The Modoc war started in 1872 when a small band of Modoc Indians, angered at having to share a reservation with their hereditary enemies, the Klamaths, clashed with U.S. troops near Lost River, in Oregon, near the Oregon-California border.

INDIANS WIN BATTLES

After raiding adjoining settlements, Captain Jack's crew retreated to the natural lava bed fortresses and, safe in the rock-ribbed trenches and caves, withstood all attempts of the whites to dig them out.

The Indians, in the process, won two battles. In one, two-thirds of the white command was killed or wounded.

Gen. E. R. S. Canby was killed during a parley with Indian leaders under a flag of truce. The Canby Cross was later erected there to his memory.

VISITOR HAS TO WALK

It was only when the white men were able to cut off the Indians' water supply that they won the final battle. The Modocs got their water from Dry Lake, since pumped dry by the white man's Bureau of Reclamation.

A few weeks later, Captain Jack was captured. In the fall of 1873, he and three other leaders of the band were hanged at Fort Klamath.

These Modocs were unlike the usual Indian bands of early western history. They eschewed the red man's beaded buckskins and instead, wore white men's clothing, spoke the white man's tongue, and used his ways.

Only on foot can today's tourist see these fortresses—a hearty walk. But it's well worth the climb up and down through these jagged lava trenches and caves.

An infantry soldier would understand clearly how the Modocs, though obliged to care for their women and children and live off the country, kept an army of regular soldiers and volunteers 15 times their number at bay for months.

The battlegrounds are said to be practically the same today as they were in 1873. Rock forts used by the Indians and white men alike still mark the struggle.

Nearby are pictographs of two types. One type of Indian symbolic writing includes paintings of red, yellow, and green mineral pigments on the walls and caves and sides of natural bridges. The other includes carvings (petroglyphs) which are confined entirely to the rocky bluffs in the Tule Lake Peninsula.

Hon. James G. Polk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein letters and eulogies sent to the widow and family of our late beloved colleague the Honorable James Polk, who so ably represented the Sixth District of Ohio for a great many years.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Mrs. Nixon and I were very saddened to learn of your husband's passing and this note brings with it our deepest sympathy.

I realize that words mean very little at times such as this, but I did want you to know our thoughts and prayers are with you in the days ahead.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

THE STATE OF OHIO,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Columbus, April 29, 1959.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Jim's loss will be felt by all of us, but of course not in the same way or degree as you will miss him. He was without question one of my favorite people. Kind, generous, cooperative, and extremely able. I hope that your sense of loss will be minimized in some measure by the knowledge of the great contribution he made to public service. If I can be of help to you in any way please let me know.

Sincerely,

MIKE,
Michael V. DiSalle.

JOHN W. DONAHEY,
Columbus, Ohio, May 1, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Rural Route 1,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Mrs. Donahey and I were in Washington last Monday and stopped by Congressman Polk's office. We were so sorry to hear that his illness was of such a serious nature.

Then, of course, we were deeply saddened when we learned of his death. You and the family have our deepest sympathy.

I know that Congressman Polk's services in Washington will certainly be missed. He had the home-spun qualities that made everyone like and respect him. These qualities are rare in political circles today.

If there is anything we can do to ease your burden, Mrs. Polk, please don't hesitate to ask.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. DONAHEY,
Lieutenant Governor.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Rural Free Delivery 1,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was indeed saddened to read about Jim's untimely passing, and want you to know how awfully sorry I am.

We served together in the House, and I considered him among my good friends. He was an able legislator and will be greatly missed by his many colleagues in Congress.

Nancy joins me in deep and heartfelt sympathy.

Most sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 14, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS POLK: Your husband was an esteemed friend of mine and I share your great sorrow. You and all of his loved ones can well be proud of the life he lived and the record he made. As you know, Jim and I served as members of the House Committee on Agriculture for many long years. At all times he was courteous, gracious, and kind and yet with foresight and vision he represented the people of his district. We, of course, knew of his long suffering, but the last sad news came as a great shock.

Enclosed is a copy of a resolution adopted by the members of Jim's committee. Madeline joins me in extending to you and your loved ones our very warm and sincere sympathy.

Cordially yours,

HAROLD D. COOLEY.

JAMES G. POLK

Whereas James G. Polk, for 21 years representative of the Sixth District of Ohio in the Congress devoted the full measure of his talents and his energy to the improvement of agriculture, especially for the betterment of the living standards of the farm families of America;

Whereas the ultimate achievement of a parity position of agriculture, with the other great segments of the Nation's economy and society, will be a monument to his memory; and

Whereas, serving with the House Committee on Agriculture and having progressed to a high rank and position, he won respect for his ability and was held in esteem by his colleagues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the committee has learned with profound sorrow and a sense of deep loss of the untimely death of James G. Polk; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee express its very sincere sympathy to members of his family; and be it further

Resolved, That the committee clerk communicate this resolution to the family of the deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 30, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I have been immeasurably saddened by the untimely passing of your distinguished husband who was my good and respected friend.

In the years in which I have been privileged to serve with him on the House Committee on Agriculture I have come to prize his friendship and to respect him for his outstanding contribution to the public welfare.

I know that the solicitude of even his closest friends cannot lessen the sorrow which is now yours and I can only commend you to an abiding faith in the divine assurance that we shall some day be reunited with those whom we have lost for awhile.

Mrs. Dague joins me in this word of sympathy and it is our prayerful hope that you will be given the courage and strength that will be so sorely needed as you face this grievous loss.

Sincerely,

PAUL DAGUE.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was terribly sorry to learn of Jim's passing for he was my good friend for many years. I hasten to extend to you and to your family my deep and heartfelt expression of sympathy on what I know is a very great loss for you all.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

GENE KEOGH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It was with much sorrow that I learned the sadness of your husband's death. He was a very near friend of mine and I share your grief in his passing.

Jim had rare qualities of character such as modesty, friendliness, and a devotion to duty which will make him long remembered among his friends and colleagues.

Mrs. Rhodes joins me in extending deepest sympathy to you and other members of the family.

Sincerely,

GEORGE M. RHODES.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: One of the best friends I had in the Congress was taken when Jim died. I am grieved and saddened. However, my loss cannot compare with that of you and the children.

Each of you has the satisfaction of knowing that Jim lived a fine and useful life, and that the world is better by his having lived in it.

I wanted you and the children to know that you are in my thoughts and in my prayers in this, your hour of great sorrow. May He who loves and cares for all of us hold you and each of your loved ones always safely in the hollow of His divine hand.

Sincerely,

JIM TRIMBLE.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

On behalf of the U.S. Air Force as well as Mrs. Douglas and myself I extend deepest sympathy to you on the passing of your husband.

JAMES H. DOUGLAS,
Secretary of the Air Force, Office Secretary of the Air Force.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

I am greatly saddened to learn of the passing of your husband on behalf of the officers and airmen of the U.S. Air Force, I extend to you our deepest sympathy.

THOMAS D. WHITE,
Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, April 30, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Mrs. Fisher and I have learned with sadness of the death of your husband. While there is little one can say or do in times like these to ease your feeling of sorrow, we should like you to know that you have our profound sympathy.

Sincerely yours,

W. P. FISHER,
Major General, U.S. Air Force, Director, Legislative Liaison.

APRIL 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. POLK: Permit me to express my deepest regret to you on the passing of your husband, the Honorable James G. Polk.

As Secretary of the Army, it was my privilege to observe the patriotic devotion to duty and the sincere concern for his fellow man that motivated your husband. His passing is indeed a great loss to our country.

I wish to extend my heartfelt sympathy to you in this time of bereavement and hope that this may in some small way serve to assuage your grief.

Sincerely,

WILBER M. BRUCKER,
Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It is with profound regret that I have learned of the passing of your husband, the Honorable James G. Polk. May I extend my deepest sympathy to you in your bereavement.

Sincerely,

J. H. MICHAELIS,
Major General, GS, Chief of Legislative Liaison.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was saddened to learn of the passing of your beloved husband, and you have my heartfelt sympathy in your great loss. While I realize that words are most inadequate at a time like this, I hope you will gain some comfort from knowing that your many friends are sharing in your sorrow. If there is anything at all we can do to be of assistance, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Sincerely yours,

J. EDGAR HOOVER.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: Our deepest sympathy to you in your great loss and my personal condolences at this time of great sadness. Congressman Polk will be sorely missed by our party and our country for his dedicated efforts on behalf of the people.

Sincerely,

PAUL M. BUTLER.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
R.F.D. 1, Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I was very sorry to note in Wednesday's New York Times the account of the death of your distinguished husband.

I knew him very well and our paths crossed frequently when I served in Washington as Postmaster General. He was a fine public servant and a fine gentleman and highly respected by all with whom he came in contact.

I know words are meaningless at a time like this but I do want you to know that you have my deepest sympathy.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES A. FARLEY.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
JAMES DICKEY POST NO. 23,
Portsmouth, Ohio, April 28, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It is indeed with a sense of deep shock that I read in the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, the report of the death of your husband, James G. Polk.

I have known Mr. Polk for a good many years and have had the pleasure of having voted for him each time he ran for Congress, and knew him personally, not alone in politics, but very closely in matters pertaining to veterans' benefits.

Mr. Polk and myself have corresponded quite frequently through the years, to and from his Washington office, in matters pertaining to individual veteran's and their claims for benefits, and never once have I ever known Mr. Polk to fail to do all in his power in each case I brought to his attention.

So from a personal standpoint, I too feel that I have lost a very great and good friend, for not only myself but for the veterans on whose claims we have worked jointly, to attain the benefits desired.

Please accept my deepest sympathy in your bereavement, and you can feel assured that God will make a place in Heaven for a man so conscientious and clean living and honest as was Mr. Polk.

I will remember Mr. Polk in my prayers.

Yours very sincerely,

LOUIS T. KRICKER,
Service Officer.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF JAMES G. POLK

Ever since I first became acquainted with Congressman Polk, in 1932, he has been my warm, personal friend even though we were in different political camps, so to speak. He was a likeable person, a type all his own—one whom we could and did call "Jim" because of his outstanding democratic manner—never aristocratic.

After his first election and departure for Washington, I was his successor as teacher of the adult Bible class in Highland Methodist Church which I then attended, being a resident of Highland at that time.

James G. Polk, our good neighbor, will be more than missed by his many friends and by his constituents whom he has so ably served in Congress so long. His repeated reelections testify to the high esteem in which he was held by people regardless of political faith. James G. Polk was an American before he was a partisan and the effects of his good works will long follow him and be remembered.

LEESBURG, OHIO, *April 30, 1959.*

S. A. RINGER.

NICHOLS, SPEIDEL & NICHOLS,
Attorneys at Law,
Batavia, Ohio, May 2, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I hoped that I might be able to attend the funeral services for Mr. Polk today but circumstances will prevent me from doing so, and I felt that I must express to you my deep appreciation for the life and services which Jim has rendered to the people of this district and my sympathy to you and your family for this untimely death.

He has been my good friend over many years, and if my personal experience means anything, he certainly has been the most thoughtful, helpful, and devoted public servant this district has ever had in Washington.

With kindest regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

RUSSELL F. SPEIDEL.

WOOSTER, OHIO, *April 29, 1959.*

DEAR MRS. POLK: My wife and I learned with sincere sadness of the death of your husband. We served many terms together in the Congress. There was no more modest or hard-working member than he was. The farmers find in Jim a true and a reliable friend. He might not always agree with the members of the various farm organizations but these farmers learned that Jim had a reason based upon his long experience and knowledge and soon learned to rely upon him.

He clearly and patiently presented farm bills upon the floor of the House. With confidence I always voted with him. He will be terribly missed both for his personality as well as for his great contribution to the legislative program.

Bob Jameson—a former pupil of mine in Wooster High School told me today that he coached the teams at Hillsboro High School while Jim was either principal or superintendent. Bob told me how wonderfully kind he was and how easy it was to work with him. All of his friends will have something good to tell you about him and I am sure this will make you proud and less sad.

I am sorry that we could not join with his many friends in paying tribute to him at his funeral. Abi joins me in this our very deep expressions of sympathy and in hoping that you will have good health and many years in which to enjoy the memory of a fine American, your husband Jim.

Most sincerely,

JOHN MCSWEENEY.

THE PENN MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE CO.
Philadelphia, Pa., April 29, 1959.

DEAR MRS. POLK: I'd like to express to you and your family my deep regrets over the death of Jim. He was a fine husband, father, educator, legislator, and one of my earliest and best friends.

How happy I was to have him as my principal for 2 years in Hillsboro High School, 1927–29.

I visited him in his office in Washington a few times and he was a statesman and a real American and an excellent farmer.

Most sincerely,

R. B. JAMESON.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORP.,
Washington, April 29, 1959.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. POLK: It was a great shock to learn of the passing of your distinguished husband, Congressman Polk. We served together for many years, having both been elected in 1930. He was a devoted public servant and served his district and the country well. He will be greatly missed and his place will be hard to fill.

We realize the futility of words in such an overwhelming loss, but we want you to know that you are in our thoughts and prayers in these dark hours. We know that a word of comfort strengthens our faith in the rightness of the divine plan, and helps us to carry on in these difficult times.

Grace and I wish to extend to you and your fine family our sincere sympathy.

Sincerely,

JESSE P. WOLCOTT.

SPRINGFIELD, OHIO.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio:

Fifty thousand members of the United Automobile Workers of Region 2–A extend our deepest sympathy. We shall always cherish the memory of the Congressman who gave his all for all of the citizens of these United States.

EDWARD B. HELLKAMP,
Assistant Director, Region 2–A, UAW.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mrs. JAMES POLK,
Highland, Ohio:

We extend our sincere sympathy to you in your hour of bereavement. America and its

people also lost a dear friend when your beloved husband passed away.

GEORGE FECTEAU, *President,*
ANGELO G. GEORGIAN,
Secretary-Treasurer, General Executive Board, United Shoe Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

[From the Evening Star, Apr. 28, 1950]

JAMES G. POLK DIES; OHIO REPRESENTATIVE

Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, of Ohio, who was as proud of being a farmer as he was of being a lawmaker, died today at Walter Reed Hospital of cancer. He has been ill several months.

Mr. Polk listed himself in the Congressional Directory as one of the few legislators whose sole occupation was farming. A member of the House Agriculture Committee, he served for 20 years in Congress in two tours of duty.

He was first elected in 1930, the first Democrat to be sent to the House from Ohio's present Sixth District. He served five successive terms. He did not seek reelection in 1940.

From 1942 to 1946, Mr. Polk was a special assistant in the Agriculture Department. He went back to farming fulltime before running again for Congress, in 1948. He was elected, and had served ever since.

Born on a farm in Penn Township, Highland County, Ohio, Mr. Polk attended the village school in Highland and went to high school at nearby New Vienna. He graduated from the Agricultural College of Ohio State University in 1919.

After college, he became principal of the New Vienna High School in 1919, and later was superintendent of schools there until 1922.

Following a period in farming near Highland, he returned to his studies, receiving a master of arts degree from Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, in 1923.

For 5 years after graduation from Wittenberg, Mr. Polk was principal of Hillsboro (Ohio) High School, serving until 1928. Two years later he ran for Congress.

He was a member of Kappa Phi Kappa, a national education fraternity, the Masons, the Elks, and the Methodist Church.

Speaker of the House RAYBURN today called Mr. Polk "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around." He announced the House would adjourn out of respect to the Ohioan after eulogies.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Apr. 29, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE POLK DIES; 20 YEARS ON HILL

Representative James G. Polk, Democrat, of Ohio, a veteran of 20 years in Congress who prided himself on being "one of the few members whose sole occupation is farming," died of cancer yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital.

The Congressman, who was 62, had been ailing for more than a year and had been a patient at Walter Reed since March 21.

Agriculture was the Ohioan's chief interest in Congress where his only current assignment was on the House Agriculture Committee.

Representative Polk, the first Democrat elected from the present sixth Ohio district, divided his congressional service in two tours. First elected in 1930, he served from the 72d through the 76th Congresses. He did not seek reelection in 1940 in order to return to fulltime farming near Highland, Ohio.

Two years later, he was named a special assistant to the Agriculture Department and held the job until 1946. He returned to the "Hill" for the 81st Congress and had served there since.

The Congressman was born on a farm in Penn Township, Ohio, and graduated from the Agriculture College of Ohio State University and from Wittenberg College, with a master's degree, in Springfield, Ohio.

Dividing his time between farming and teaching in the 1920's, he served as principal of the New Vienna (Ohio) High School, superintendent of schools in New Vienna and principal of the Hillsboro (Ohio) High School.

He is survived by his wife, Mary Polk; a son, William A., and three daughters, Martha Wilhite, Helen Vara, and Lois Taylor, all of Washington.

Services will be held Saturday at the Highland Methodist Church in Highland, Ohio.

Putting aside scheduled business, dozens of House Members paid tribute to the veteran lawmaker. Speaker SAM RAYBURN described him as "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around." Agriculture Committee Chairman HAROLD D. COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, read into the RECORD a special committee resolution, especially praising Representative Polk's efforts to raise living standards for farmers.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Apr. 28, 1959]

OFFICIALS, FRIENDS JOIN IN MOURNING POLK DEATH

State and district officials joined congressional leaders and local friends of James G. Polk today in mourning the veteran Congressman's death.

They praised Mr. Polk's long service as Representative from Ohio's Sixth District and expressed a feeling of personal loss at his passing.

Democrat leaders said his knowledge and experience in legislative matters will make him difficult to replace.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN (Democrat, of Texas), announced in Washington that the House will adjourn out of respect to Mr. Polk. The Speaker called Representative Polk "a fine Member of Congress, a gentleman all around."

Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, informed of the Representative's death, issued this statement in Columbus:

"The people of the Sixth District have suffered a great loss. Ohio and the Nation share in this deep feeling.

"Jim Polk was a kindly, able and sincere public official. He worked hard for the people of his District and he was devoted to his obligation to the national interest.

"While I was in Washington, he was serving as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. His sense of fair play was so evident that I became a great admirer and a close personal friend."

George D. Nye, of Waverly, State Democratic Committeeman from the Sixth District said he was shocked and saddened by Representative Polk's death.

Mr. Nye said, "The Sixth District has lost one of its very finest citizens. Jim Polk was a representative of all the people. He was always trying to help our county and your county and the entire area, both industrially and economically."

Arlie N. Barker, Scioto County Democrat chairman, said, "Mr. Polk certainly did his job the way it should have been done. Those who knew him well will consider his death as very much of a personal loss."

Robert R. Leedom, county commissioner, called Mr. Polk "a very good representative of the people."

"He knew what the people wanted and he always kept that in mind," Mr. Leedom said. "He will be hard to replace with his knowledge and closeness to the people."

Attorney John Alden Staker, Democrat member of the county election board, remembers Mr. Polk's first campaign visit to Scioto County in 1930.

"He never dreamed then that he had any chance of winning," Mr. Staker recalled. "He has been an able and conscientious official and has enjoyed great popularity throughout the Sixth District."

William Staiger, president of Local 2116 of United Steelworkers and president of Shawnee District, AFL–CIO: "The death of Representative James Polk comes as a shock and a feeling of deep regret to our officers and members. Representative Polk has been a true friend and excellent Representative of all people in this district.

"His always friendly approach and intelligent devotion to duty marked him as a fine example of public servants dedicated to perpetuate the American form of government. Although others will take up his work and carry on, the passing of Representative Polk leaves a void in our hearts that can never be filled."

Attorney Laurence Kimble, county Democratic leader and long-time friend of Representative Polk, said, "Mr. Polk was a great friend and advocate for the development of Scioto County and southern Ohio.

"He is irreplaceable. Personally, I feel keenly the loss of a dear friend."

Republican Municipal Judge Lowell Thompson said, "Everyone regrets the death of Congressman Polk after his many years of faithful service to the Sixth Congressional District."

REPRESENTATIVE JIM POLK DIES—SERVED FOR 20 YEARS

WASHINGTON.—Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, Ohio, died of cancer today at Walter Reed Army Medical Center.

Polk had been ill for several months.

He had served in Congress for 20 years, in two tours.

First elected in 1931, he served five terms, then was out during the 77th through 80th Congresses.

Polk, whose home was in Highland, 10 miles north of Hillsboro, served the nine-county Sixth Congressional District of southwestern Ohio.

The counties in the district are Adams, Brown, Clermont, Fayette, Highland, Pickaway, Pike, Ross, and Scioto.

He listed himself in the Congressional Directory as one of the few legislators whose sole occupation was farming.

Polk was the third Member to die since the House was elected last November. The other were Daniel Reed, Republican, New York, and George Christopher, Democrat, Missouri.

Polk's death left the House membership at 282 Democrats and 152 Republicans, with 2 vacancies. Christopher's successor was chosen in a special election.

Under Ohio law, no replacement will be named for Polk until the next regular election.

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, Texas, announced the House would adjourn out of respect to Polk, following the usual eulogies. RAYBURN described Polk as "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around."

Colleagues said Polk had been in and out of hospitals for the past 2 years and that he entered Walter Reed for the last time 2 weeks ago.

Polk divided his time between farming and school teaching after his graduation from Ohio State University's College of Agriculture in 1919.

He served briefly as a high-school principal at New Vienna, Ohio, and later was superintendent of schools in the same city; from 1923 to 1926 he was a high-school principal at Hillsboro, Ohio.

Polk didn't seek reelection to Congress in 1940 so he could return to farming. Two years later he was named a special assistant in the Agriculture Department, a job he held until 1946. He was reelected to Congress in 1948.

Representative Polk, who was a lifelong resident of Highland County, was the first Democrat ever to be elected to Congress from his district. He never was beaten in either a primary or general election.

Although he formerly was a school principal and superintendent his only business activity since 1928 had been operation of his farm near Hillsboro.

The Representative was a descendant of Robert Bruce Polk who came to Maryland from Ireland in 1672. His grandfather moved to Highland County in 1826 and his father, William A. Polk, was a banker and conducted a cattle feeding operation near Hillsboro.

Survivors are the widow, Mrs. Mary Polk; a son, William A. Polk of Washington; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Wilhide of Washington, Mrs. Helen Vera of Highland, and Mrs. Lois Taylor of Silver Spring, Md.; a half brother, Robert T. Polk, and a half sister, Miss Fannie Polk, both of Carreytown, Ohio.

Funeral services will be held in the Highland Methodist Church at 2 p.m., Saturday. Burial also will be at Highland. The body will be at the Patterson Funeral Home in Leesburg after noon Friday.

Unlike the case of a U.S. Senator, Governor DiSalle has no powers to appoint an interim Representative. He is empowered to call an election to fill the vacancy, at his discretion. A special primary could be held in the Sixth District any time so long as it is 15 days before a general election. Thus, it would be possible for a new Representative to be elected in the November election.

In Columbus, Gov. Michael V. Di Salle, informed of the Representative's death, issued this statement:

"The people of the Sixth District have suffered a great loss. Ohio and the Nation share in this deep feeling.

"Jim Polk was a kindly, able, and sincere public official. He worked hard for the people of his district and he was devoted to his obligation to the national interest.

"While I was in Washington, he was serving as a Member of the House Agriculture Committee. His sense of fair play was so evident that I became a great admirer and a close personal friend."

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Apr. 29, 1959]

CONGRESSMEN PAY TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE POLK—FUNERAL SATURDAY AT HIGHLAND; SPECIAL ELECTION LIKELY

Funeral services for Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, of Highland, will be held at 2 p.m. Saturday in the Highland Methodist Church. Burial will be in Highland.

Mr. Polk's body will lie in state in the Patterson Funeral Home in Leesburg after Friday noon until noon Saturday.

Masonic services will be held at the funeral home at 8 p.m. Friday.

Representative Polk died Tuesday in Walter Reed Army Medical Center at Washington, D.C., of cancer.

The House of Representatives was adjourned Tuesday afternoon out of respect for Mr. Polk. About 25 Members of the House, including most of the Ohio delegation, eulogized Mr. Polk. Speaker SAM RAYBURN adjourned the House after the eulogies.

Gov. Michael V. DiSalle probably will call for a special election to name a successor to Mr. Polk.

Political observers said the Governor may call for the primary election to be held in October at which time the parties will select a candidate for the general election.

The special election for Congress would be held November 3, concurrent with the general 1959 elections. The successful candidate could take office a few days after the election.

Governor DiSalle said he will sound out sentiment for a special election in the nine-county district, in light of the election expenses involved. However, he said, "it probably would not be good for the district to have no representation in Congress all through the 1960 session."

The law provides that the Governor may call for a special election, the primary of which could not be held within 15 days of the general election.

Since the party is at the height of its State and local power, Democratic leaders are expected to insist upon a special election, feeling they can elect a Democrat this year.

An incumbent has an edge on the office-ballot, hence the winner of a special election would have a better opportunity to capture the full term in the 1960 election.

Frank E. Smith, former postmaster and veteran Democratic leader, is considered a top choice of many Democrats. He is widely known throughout the district, having campaigned for himself and the party in all the counties.

Since the GOP debacle in the sixth district last November no outstanding candidate for the party nomination has emerged.

It is not considered likely that Elmer Barrett of Chillicothe, the 1958 candidate would be interested, observers said.

Mr. Barrett is now president of Photoramic, Inc., an internationally known highway engineering firm founded by Everett S. Preston, now State highway director.

Mr. Polk had been in ill health in the last 2 years. He was critical in the summer and early fall of 1958 following a major operation.

He rallied, campaigned a little and appeared on the road to recovery. In January he suffered a relapse and was hospitalized for examination.

He improved and resumed his duties. March 14 he entered the medical center for examination and treatment and carried on his office duties from his hospital room.

Mr. Polk first was elected to Congress in 1930 and served until 1940 when he decided not to seek reelection. He became a candidate again in 1948 and subsequently was reelected, winning his 11th term in 1958. He was serving his 21st year in Congress.

Mr. Polk is survived by his wife, Mrs. Mary A. Polk; a son, William Polk of Washington; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Wilhite of Washington, Mrs. Helen Vara of Highland, and Mrs. Lois Taylor of Silver Springs, Md., and a half-brother, Robert T. Polk, and a half-sister, Miss Fannie Polk, both of Careytown, Ohio.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, Apr. 29, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES G. POLK

Somewhere along the line in the last quarter century James G. Polk became known as the "people's representative."

He was proud of the designation and in a nutshell it sums up why the Highland County Democrat was unbeatable in Ohio's Sixth Congressional District.

He threw his hat into the political ring in 1930 as an unknown in a district that until then had been represented in Congress only by Republicans.

He astounded even his own supporters by unseating the veteran incumbent and becoming the first Democrat elected from this district. From that time to his last campaign last fall Representative Polk never lost an election.

The key to his political success was his representation of the people. Never spectacular, always in the shadow of more colorful contemporaries, Representative Polk kept in close touch with his constituents, regardless of political affiliation.

His conservative stand in the 1930's won for him Republican support which never was shaken.

He won and retained support of business and industrial leaders. He was solid with and was supported by organized labor and the farm vote.

Among the farm folk Representative Polk was synonymous with agriculture. It was his chief congressional interest and he served on the House committee in that field.

His retirement from politics in 1940 was to enable him to return to farming. And he was one of the few legislators who listed his sole occupation as farming.

Locally, Representative Polk worked quietly but efficiently to help obtain the Portsmouth Area A-plant, the city's flood defenses, the Scioto County Airport, aid for schools, surplus commodities and improvements through WPA and PWA work.

Representative Polk had been in failing health for some months, but he remained on the job in Washington representing the people who elected him.

James G. Polk had the respect of his friends and foes alike. House Speaker SAM RAYBURN calls him "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around."

That is exactly how his constituents thought of him.

[From the Greenfield Daily Times, May 4, 1959]

POLK EULOGIZED FOR "LIFE OF SERVICE"

Seven Members and two officials of the U.S. House of Representatives comprised the congressional delegation to last rites for Representative James G. Polk held Saturday in Highland Methodist Church.

Mr. Polk died April 28 in Washington.

Rev. C. S. Thompson, minister of the church, in his sermon eulogized Mr. Polk as a plain, righteous, and humble man who devoted his life to the service of others.

Revs. Jack Ellsberry and C. A. Arthur offered the prayer and scripture reading. Mrs. Leroy Larrick, Sr., was at the piano.

The large congregation was accommodated by placing extra chairs in the church and on the front lawn.

Burial was made in the family lot in the churchyard cemetery. Pallbearers were James Rhodes, Charles Blackburn, Carl Fetters, Vannie Fry, Tom McFadden and Heber King.

The congressional delegation included Representatives William E. Hess, Wayne L. Hays, Gordon H. Scherer, Thomas L. Ashley, Charles A. Vanik, Robert E. Cook, and Samuel L. Devine; and Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., Sergeant at Arms, and Kenneth R. Harding, Deputy Sergeant at Arms. They were appointed by Speaker SAM RAYBURN.

Highland and Leesburg police officers and State highway patrolmen directed traffic.

Several hundred persons paid their respects during visitation at the Patterson funeral home in Leesburg.

Following the service, Patterson's sent many of the floral pieces to the VA Hospital at Chillicothe, and to the Greenfield, Washington C.H., and Hillsboro hospitals.

[From the Manchester Signal, Apr. 30, 1959]

CONGRESSMAN JAMES G. POLK, VETERAN LEGISLATOR DIES TUESDAY IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Death wrote finish to a long and active political career Tuesday morning at 10:48 a.m., when Representative James G. Polk died of cancer in Walter Reed Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

The Highland County Democrat, representative of Ohio's Sixth Congressional District, was 62 years of age.

He had been in poor health for quite some time, having entered the hospital March 21. After examination, it was an-

nounced he was suffering from lymphoma, an inflammation of the lymph node.

Polk, after being seriously ill in the fall of 1958, recuperated in time to make a successful campaign for reelection.

His home was in Highland, 10 miles north of Hillsboro. His Sixth District is comprised of Adams, Brown, Clermont, Fayette, Highland, Pickaway, Pike, Ross and Scioto Counties.

The veteran campaigner had served 20 years in Congress. First elected in 1931, he served five terms and retired in 1940. After sitting out the 77th through 80th Congresses, he came back in the 81st and had been in the House since.

Political observers feel Gov. Michael V. DiSalle probably will call for a special election to name Mr. Polk's successor. If he does, the primary will probably take place in October to give parties an opportunity to select a candidate for the November finals. The special election for Congress would then be held November 3, with the general 1959 elections. The successful candidate would take his seat in Congress a few days after the November election.

Mr. Polk was a "people's representative." He watched over his constituents in the district with constant attention, and no matter what political affiliation a voter in his district professed, he always received the same courteous, prompt reply to a problem from Mr. Polk's office.

Survivors include his wife, Mrs. Mary Polk of Washington, D.C.; a son, William A. Polk; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Willhide, Mrs. Helen Vara, and Mrs. Lois Taylor; half-brother, Robert T. Polk and a half-sister, Miss Fannie Polk.

Funeral services will be held in Highland Saturday.

[From the Hillsboro (Ohio) Press Gazette May 1, 1959]

RITES PLANNED FOR SATURDAY—SERVED 20 YEARS AS REPRESENTATIVE

James Gould Polk, 63, of Highland, who had served 20 years as Sixth Ohio District Congressman, died of cancer about 10 a.m. Tuesday in Walter Reed Army Hospital, in Washington, D.C.

Funeral services will be held Saturday at 2 p.m., at the Highland Methodist Church, with the Reverend C. S. Thompson and the Reverend C. A. Arthur officiating. Burial will be made in Highland Cemetery under the direction of Patterson Funeral Home of Leesburg. Friends may call at the funeral home after noon, Friday.

The Representative had been in failing health for some time. He first entered the hospital last January 16, for examination and reentered the hospital on March 21 for treatment. Relatives said that he was believed to have had cancer for several years but periodic checkups failed to reveal it until a few weeks ago. He was born on Oct. 6, 1895, a son of William Alexander and Isophena Ockerman Polk. He was a veteran of World War I.

He made his home at Highland when Congress was not in session and engaged in farming. He was the owner of a 285-acre farm and took an active interest in its operation.

In Columbus, Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, informed of the representative's death, issued this statement:

"The people of the Sixth District have suffered a great loss. Ohio and the Nation share in this deep feeling.

"Jim Polk was a kindly, able, and sincere public official. He worked hard for the people of his district and he was devoted to his obligation to the national interest.

"While I was in Washington, he was serving as a member of the House Agriculture Committee. His sense of fair play was so evident that I became a great admirer and a close personal friend."

Tuesday in Washington, 25 Members of the House of Representatives, including most of the Ohio delegation, Democrats and Republicans alike, eulogized him on the Chamber floor before Speaker SAM RAYBURN called for adjournment out of respect for the gentle, soft-spoken Ohioan. "He was a fine Member of Congress, a gentleman all around," RAYBURN said. Several Senators, Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, Ohio, among them, spoke of his passing. Flags on all Government buildings in Washington were at half mast.

He was born on a farm near Careytown in Penn Township of Highland County. His parents and three of his grandparents were born in the same county. The Congressman was a direct descendant of Robert Bruce Polk, woh emigrated from Scotland to Ireland, where he married and later came to the Eastern Shore of Maryland, in 1672.

Joshua Polk, the Congressman's great-grandfather, came to Highland County from Maryland in 1826 and bought a 330-acre farm in Penn and Fairfield Townships.

His ancestors were pioneer residents of Highland County. Their principal occupations were farming, teaching, and preaching. Three of his mother's cousins were ministers of the Church of the Brethren and one of his father's brothers was a minister of the Universalist Church.

The Congressman's late father, William Polk, was for many years one of the most extensive cattle feeders in Highland County and president of the New Vienna Bank.

[From the Bethel (Ohio) Journal, May 7, 1959]

JAMES G. POLK

In the death of Representative James G. Polk, the Sixth Ohio District has lost a devoted public servant. He was held in high esteem by members of both political parties.

First elected in 1930, he served for five successive terms. A humble man, his biography in the Congressional Directory refers to him as being "one of the few Members of Congress whose sole occupation is farming." He was deeply interested in and concerned about farm problems. For a time he was a special assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan.

After laying politics aside for 10 years, in 1948 he again ran for Congress, won back his congressional seat and, never being defeated, he continued in office until his death.

In the passing of James G. Polk, the Sixth District has lost a capable, honest public servant who was completely dedicated to the duties of his office and to the service of his constituency.

[From the People's Defender, West Union, Ohio, May 7, 1959]

THE LOSS OF CONGRESSMAN POLK

The death of Congressman James G. Polk, of the Sixth Ohio District, which came as a shock last week, is one of the greatest losses this section of Ohio had in many years.

Congressman Polk was an outstanding and well liked representative with a record in Congress that will stand for many years to come. His knowledge of the Sixth District was one that was thorough and he understood the needs of each county he represented.

As a member of the agriculture committee, he did not hesitate in asking information from his voters of the district before he came to casting his ballot on each particular issue. His interest in the burley allotment program was something that will remain in the minds of the growers forever.

His colleagues in Congress paid the highest tribute to him and said he was "kind, able and a Christian man." He had won the respect of both the Democrat and Republican members of the body.

It will be many years in the future before the Sixth Ohio District will again have such representation in Congress.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, May 4, 1959]

THREE PASTORS PAY FINAL TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE POLK—FRIENDS OVERFLOW CHURCH AT RITES FOR CONGRESSMAN

HIGHLAND, OHIO.—U.S. Representative James G. Polk, (Democrat, Highland), was laid to rest here Saturday afternoon on the family plot in Highland Cemetery.

The career of the 62-year-old Democratic Representative came to an end last Tuesday in Walter Reed Army Medical Center, Washington, D.C.

Final services were conducted at the local Methodist Church where Representative Polk and his family worshiped when he was at home here.

The church was filled with flowers and people and many other persons were seated on chairs which had been placed on the lawn outside the edifice. A public address system was used to carry the funeral services given by three ministers who had served the Polk family.

Rev. C. S. Thompson, current pastor of the church, used the 17th psalm, 15th verse * * * "I will behold thy face in righteousness: I shall be satisfied, when I awake, with thy likeness."

SERVED OTHERS

Reverend Thompson said Representative Polk's aim was "to always serve his fellow man well. He always thought first of others, himself last."

In his tribute of the legislator, Reverend Thompson cited his service in Congress and also to the church, such as when he taught Sunday school here.

Reverend Thompson was assisted by Revs. C. A. Arthur and Jack Ellsberry.

The body of the Congressman arrived at Patterson Funeral Home in Leesburg Friday morning and from noon that day until the time it was moved to the church a steady stream of persons paid respects.

Present for the funeral were six Members of the House of Representatives, the Sergeant at Arms and the Deputy Sergeant at Arms.

The Representatives—WILLIAM E. HESS, WAYNE L. HAYS, GORDON SCHERER, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CHARLES A. VANIK, and SAMUEL L. DEVINE—acted as honorary pallbearers.

LOCAL FRIENDS PALLBEARERS

The pallbearers were friends of the Polk family. They were James Roads, Carl Fetters, Charles Blackburn, Heber King, Tom McFadden, and Vannie Frye.

Letters, cards, and flowers were sent to the family from members of both political parties throughout the Sixth District, the State, and Nation.

"He was an American before he was a partisan," said one of his political opponents.

Similar eulogies came from his associates in Congress as they filled some seven pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last week.

The nearly 100 baskets of flowers sent were given to area hospitals and to the Veterans Hospital at Chillicothe.

Masonic services were held at the funeral home in Leesburg Friday night. He also was a member of the Elks, the Grange, the Farm Bureau, and the Farmers Union.

Farming was closest to his heart as he served on the House Agricultural Committee and owned two farms locally.

Representative Polk divided his time between farming and school teaching after his graduation from Ohio State University's College of Agriculture in 1919. He earned his master's degree at Wittenberg College in Springfield. He was graduated from there in 1923.

HEADED SCHOOLS

He served briefly as a high school principal at New Vienna and later was superintendent of schools.

From 1923 to 1928 he was high school principal at Hillsboro.

Representative Polk was born at Careytown, about 3 miles west of here, October 6, 1896, a son of William A. and Amy Isyphenia Ockerman Polk.

Surviving are his wife, 3 daughters, a son, a half-brother, a half-sister, and 11 grandchildren.

Those from Scioto County attending the funeral were:

Vernal Riffe, Jr., Arlie N. Barker, Everett Wilkerson, J. Alden Staker, Hymie Canter, Frank Smith, Russ Burns, Cleo Wiltshire, Mr. and Mrs. O. Carson Barklow, Mr. and Mrs. William Burch, and Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Peterson. Mr. and Mrs. Oscar Pyle, formerly of Portsmouth and now living in Oak Ridge, Tenn., also were present. Mr. Pyle was Representative Polk's secretary during the first 10 years of his career in Washington.

RESOLUTION BY UNION PRAISES POLK

The following is a resolution passed by the members of the Highland County Farmers Union:

Whereas Congressman James G. Polk was an active member of the Highland County Farmers Union, and a wholehearted supporter of Farmers Union policies, and

Whereas, as a member of this organization, as a farmer, as a Member of the Congress of the United States for 20 years, and as a member of the Agriculture Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, he rendered distinguished service to agriculture, and

Whereas he regarded agriculture as a way of life, and was always a champion of legislation which would preserve and strengthen the family farm as a fundamental unit in rural life, and

Whereas his personality was a combination of those qualities of courage, kindness, friendliness, and humility which caused him to be respected and admired by all who knew him: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the Highland County Farmers Union deplore the loss of the Honorable James G. Polk, and that this resolution be adopted in tribute to him, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Highland County Farmers Union send a copy of this resolution to Mrs. Mary Polk, his widow, to the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the press.

[From the Miami Valley News, May 7, 1959]

POLK BURIED AT HOME IN HIGHLAND

The body of Congressman James G. Polk was brought from Washington to the Patterson Funeral Home at Leesburg where it lay in state last Friday afternoon and evening and Saturday morning.

Final services were conducted at the Methodist Church in Highland, the Congressman's home town two miles west of Leesburg, at 2 p.m. Saturday.

Surviving are the widow, Mary Smith Polk; a son, William Polk, Washington; three daughters, Mrs. Martha Wilhite and Mrs. Lois Taylor, Washington, and Mrs. Helen Vara, who has just returned to Ohio from Germany where her husband is serving with the Army; a brother, Robert, and a sister, Fannie Polk, both of Highland.

JAMES G. POLK DIES; OHIO REPRESENTATIVE

Representative James G. Polk, 62, Democrat, of Ohio, who was as proud of being a farmer as he was of being a lawmaker, died today at Walter Reed Hospital of cancer. He had been ill several months.

Mr. Polk listed himself in the Congressional Directory as one of the few legislators whose sole occupation was farming. A member of the House Agriculture Committee, he served for 20 years in Congress in two tours of duty.

He was first elected in 1930, the first Democrat to be sent to the House from Ohio's present Sixth District. He served five succesive terms. He did not seek reelection in 1940.

From 1942 to 1946, Mr. Polk was a special assistant in the Agriculture Department. He went back to farming full time before running again for Congress, in 1948. He was elected, and had served ever since.

Born on a farm in Penn Township, Highland County, Ohio, Mr. Polk attended the village school in Highland and went to high school at nearby New Vienna. He graduated from the Agricultural College of Ohio State University in 1919.

After college, he became principal of the New Vienna High School in 1919, and later was superintendent of schools there until 1923.

Following a period in farming near Highland, he returned to his studies, receiving a master of arts degree from Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio, in 1923.

For 5 years after graduation from Wittenberg, Mr. Polk was principal of Hillsboro (Ohio) High School, serving until 1928. Two years later he ran for Congress.

He was a member of Kappa Phi Kappa, a national education fraternity, the Masons, the Elks, and the Methodist Church.

Speaker of the House RAYBURN today called Mr. Polk "a fine Member of Congress; a gentleman all around." He announced the House would adjourn out of respect to the Ohioan after eulogies.

[From the Hillaboro (Ohio) Press Gazette, May 5, 1959]

TRIBUTES PAID TO REPRESENTATIVE POLK—SOLONS JOIN IN HONORING COUNTIAN

When James Gould Polk, 63, who represented Ohio's Sixth District in the U.S. House of Representatives for 21 years, died April 28, many of his colleagues paid him tribute both in the House and the Senate.

Ohio Senators FRANK J. LAUSCHE and STEPHEN M. YOUNG headed the list of those who spoke in glowing terms of their association and knowledge of Polk's service and ability.

LAUSCHE introduced a resolution memorializing Polk in the Senate and similar resolutions were adopted in the House, all unanimously.

LAUSCHE described Polk, a Democrat from Highland, as a "humble, unostentatious person * * * devoted to the people he represented. He was beloved, not only by those who believed in his philosophy but also by those who disagreed with him."

Said YOUNG, "He was a gentleman of the sweetest character. He had represented his constituency with fidelity and zeal."

Senate majority leader LYNDON JOHNSON said that Polk was "one of the good and great men I have known."

KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, New York, who had served with Polk in the House, said, "I found him one of the soundest and most helpful Members in that body. He wore no man's colors."

Many more tributes were added by House Members, both Ohioans and those from other States.

MICHAEL J. KIRWAN of Ohio's 19th District, announced POLK's death to House Members and said:

"The people of the Sixth Ohio District loved and trusted Jim Polk, and held him in the highest esteem. He never raised his voice in anger and distinguished himself as an able, conscientious representative of his people. They understood and respected him."

Other tributes from Ohio Representatives included:

CLARENCE J. BROWN, Seventh District: "He was a true gentleman, a man of great character and ability. Jim was a kindly man; a Christian gentleman, if ever there was a Christian gentleman on this earth of ours."

WAYNE L. HAYS, 18th District: "I have never known a person more kindly than Jim Polk. He was the kind of a man that I think all of us would like to be."

THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Ninth District: "It has been said that Jim was a kind, gentle man. And, indeed, these were his virtues. But he was endowed, too, with a rare courage. * * * There will be few who will be remembered with greater love than Jim Polk for the wisdom and for all that he gave."

DELBERT LATTA, Fifth District, who, as a Member of the House, served with Polk on the Committee on Agriculture: "Jim Polk's many years of experience in the field of agriculture would have been invaluable to me. His wise counsel in this field will surely be missed by the entire Congress."

House Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Democratic whip JOHN MCCORMACK also paid tribute. Said RAYBURN:

"He served his district and his country well * * * was a fine man, of splendid ability, of the highest character."

Added MCCORMACK:

He exercised a "powerful influence in the House * * * as a result of the recognition of his unusual ability, his logical mind, and his sound advice."

RESOLUTION EULOGIZES CONGRESSMAN POLK

The following resolution eulogizing the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District, submitted jointly by Representatives James W. (Bill) Collins, of Highland, and Jackson, Kruse, Shoemaker, Riffe, Gaines, Leist, Hook, and Wallace, was adopted by the Ohio House of Representatives, Monday, May 4, and entered in the journal of the House:

RESOLUTION

Relative to the death of the Honorable James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District.

Whereas the members of the House of Representatives of the 103d General Assembly have learned with deep regret of the passing of a long distinguished Member of the U.S. House of Representatives; and

Whereas Mr. Polk was elected to Congress in 1930 and served five consecutive terms (1931–41), when he voluntarily retired to become associated with the U.S. Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C., during the World War II period, only to be elected once again to Congress in 1948 where he served for five more consecutive terms, including the current 1959–60 term; and

Whereas Mr. Polk was graduated from the College of Agriculture, Ohio State University, and from Wittenberg College, served his country during World War I, and taught school before entering Congress; and

Whereas his public career has been marked by conscientious application to duty, sincere dedication to the service of his fellow man, and a devotion to public service of such superior quality as to demand the respect and esteem of all those who were so fortunate to come in contact with him, including fellow servants in Government and the many others in various walks of life and fields of endeavor: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the members of the House of Representatives, with the sorrow and grief that inevitably follows the deplorable loss of a remarkable man, pay tribute to the

Honorable James G. Polk, and that this resolution be adopted by a rising vote and a copy thereof be spread upon the Journal; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit an authenticated copy of this resolution to Mrs. Mary Smith Polk, his widow.

LAST RITES HELD FOR CONGRESSMAN

Congressman James Gould Polk, who served the Sixth Ohio District for nearly 21 years in Congress, was eulogized in brief, simple rites Saturday at 2 p.m., the Highland Methodist Church.

Officiating at the last rites were the church pastor, the Reverend C. S. Thompson, the Reverend C. A. Arthur of Leesburg, and the Reverend Jack Ellsberry, former pastor of the church. Burial was in the church cemetery.

Masonic services for the late Congressman were held Friday night at the Patterson funeral home in Leesburg. Hillsboro members conducted the service.

An estimated 500 persons attended the services for the Congressman, who had served 11 terms in Congress, 1931–40, and 1949–59.

In addition to many county, district, and State officials, friends and relatives, a delegation of Ohio Congressmen was in attendance.

These included WILLIAM E. HESS, WAYNE L. HAYS, GORDON H. SCHERER, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, CHARLES A. VANIK, ROBERT E. COOK, and SAMUEL L. DEVINE. Zeake W. Johnson, Jr., sergeant at arms of the House of Representatives, and Kenneth R. Harding, deputy sergeant of arms, were also in attendance.

Pallbearers included Carl Fetters, Jim Roads, Charles Blackburn, Heber King, Vannie Fry and Tom McFadden.

Special music during the service was provided by Mrs. Leroy Larrick, Sr.

[From the Portsmouth (Ohio) Times, June 23, 1959]

CORN TO PROVIDE CHURCH ORGAN AS POLK MEMORIAL

HIGHLAND, OHIO.—A memorial to the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District, will be purchased from funds obtained in a community project.

The project is the raising of corn on the Polk land at the family home here. Fertilizer and seed corn has been donated by various citizens while others have prepared the fields and planted.

Mrs. James Roads, a member of the finance committee, said that half of the money raised from the project will be used to purchase an organ for the Methodist Church in memory of Mr. Polk. She said he was a strong supporter of the church and worshipped there when he was home.

Mrs. Roads said that 46 acres have been planted.

COMMUNITY PROJECT IN HIGHLAND FOR MEMORIAL TO LATE CONGRESSMAN POLK

A part of the money from a community project in Highland for the Methodist Church will be used as a memorial to the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District.

The project, raising corn on the Polk land at the family home in Highland, is one in which the labor and materials are donated.

Mrs. James Roads, a member of the church's finance committee, said 46 acres have been planted, or will be by the end of this week.

She said half of the money will go to the church fund and half will be used to purchase an organ for the church in memory of Mr. Polk. He was a strong supporter of the church and worshipped there when he was home.

Mrs. Roads said the plowing, discing, planting, etc., has been handled by Don Ingersoll, Jim Roads, Bob and Bill Manuel, LeLarrick, Jr., George Roads, John Adams, Heber King and Tom McFadden, who also has donated some fertilizer to the project.

She said others can help by donating money to buy fertilizer.

The seed corn was donated by Tom Miller, Mr. Ingersoll and Winter's Service Station.

[From the Manchester (Ohio) Signal, June 11, 1959]

CHURCH MEMORIAL TO HONOR POLK

HIGHLAND.—Part of the money from a community project in Highland for the Methodist Chuch there will be used as a memorial to the late James G. Polk, Congressman from the Sixth Ohio District.

The project, raising corn on the Polk land at the family home near Highland, is one in which labor and materials are donated.

Mrs. James Roads, a member of the church's finance committee said 46 acres have been planted.

She said half of the money will go to the church fund and half will be used to purchase an organ for the church in memory of the late Congressman. He was a strong supporter of the church and worshipped there when he was home.

[From the Chillicothe (Ohio) Gazette, May 11, 1959]

SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS OF UTAH LAUDS POLK AT DEMOCRATIC RALLY HERE

Utah's Senator FRANK E. MOSS spoke with admiration for the late Congressman Polk. "Though Jim Polk and Harry Truman were cast from different molds, they fought with equal effectiveness for the same principles," he said.

"* * * Polk was a quiet, reserved man, but a thorough, balanced, and fearless legislator. I want you people of the Sixth District to know I share your grief in his passing and I can wish you no greater blessing than the nomination and election of a Democratic successor who is even half as dedicated and effective as Jim Polk."

Municipal Court Judge William B. Brown delivered a "memorial" to the late Congressman Polk.

"Those who didn't know James G. Polk wondered why he was such a success—that quiet, unassuming, friendly man. Those who did business with him became quickly aware that outward appearances are disarming and deceiving. Those of us who knew him were devoted to him, elected him and reelected him, for, as our Representative * * * he truly labored in the vineyard."

WITTENBERG COLLEGE,
Springfield, Ohio.

Mrs. JAMES G. POLK,
Highland, Ohio

DEAR MRS. POLK: For the college and its alumni I extend sincere sympathy in the loss of your husband. His death was a great loss also to our Nation which he had served so faithfully for many years.

We at Wittenberg appreciated the generous support he gave to the college year after year and the ready manner in which he responded to various calls for help. I can recall no time when he failed to do his full share on any task we placed before him.

We were always especially proud of his honest, forthright stand on matters of principle. Our Nation, we are sure, would be stronger were it fortunate enough to have more men like him in the Congress and other positions of great responsibility.

Mr. Polk's greatest monument will be his record of loyalty, honesty and devotion to duty as he saw it.

Sincerely yours,

W. EMERSON RECK,
Vice President.

PRAYER AT FUNERAL SERVICE FOR MR. POLK

Almighty God, our Father, from whom we come, and unto whom our spirits return; Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Thou art our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Grant us Thy blessing in this hour, and enable us so to put our trust in Thee that our spirits may grow calm and our hearts be comforted. Lift our eyes beyond the shadows of earth, and help us to see the light of eternity. So may we find grace and strength for this and every time of need; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR MR. POLK IN THE HIGHLAND METHODIST CHURCH, REV. JACK ELLSBERRY READING THE SCRIPTURES

Jesus said, I am the resurrection and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.

The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms.

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

The righteous live forever, and the care of them is with the most High; with His right hand He shall cover them, and with His arm shall He shield them.

For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, and house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

THE 23D PSALM

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.
He maketh me to lie down in green pastures;
He leadeth me beside the still waters.
He restoreth my soul; He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.
Yea, though I walk through the Valley of the Shadow of Death, I will fear no evil; for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.
Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.
Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life; and I will dwell in the House of the Lord forever.

A PORTION OF THE 90TH PSALM

Lord, Thou has been our dwelling place in all generations.
Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.
For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night.
Thou carriest them away as with a flood; they are as a sleep; in the morning they are like grass which groweth up.
In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up; in the evening it is cut down and withereth.
So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.

High Hope for the Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority self-financing bill, and the approval by President Eisenhower with assurance of a clarifying amendment, was hailed by millions of citizens in my home State and throughout the TVA area, along with champions of public power throughout the United States.

As an indication of the importance of the self-financing bill to the valley area, I cite two of many editorials which appeared in Tennessee newspapers immediately after the measure was signed by the President.

One article, entitled "High Hope for the Valley," appeared in the Chattanooga Times on August 7. The second excellent editorial was printed in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on the same day. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chattanooga Times, Aug. 7, 1959]
1959]

HIGH HOPE FOR THE VALLEY

Presidential approval of the TCA self-financing bill, which has had a fantastic journey through Congress to the White House, has many facets of meaning. But surely the broadest, the one which means more to most people, is that the valley can now look forward to an adequate supply of electric power to serve an expanding economy.

A tremendous program of construction by the Authority itself is in the cards, given impetus by the right to issue up to $750 million in revenue bonds. It will be needed, and quickly, to pull the area from beneath the shadow of a potential power shortage in the next few years.

This is the threat with which the valley has lived for too long. It has been imposed by hostility and misunderstanding, inside Congress and out, which denied TVA the funds and the flexibility necessary to meet the rising power demands of its service area.

Happily, those binding restrictions have been removed in the measure which President Eisenhower signed despite reservations, and in the amendment which congressional leaders have promised him to remove the cause of those reservations.

The whole affair is an unusual demonstration of good faith and cooperation between the executive and legislative branches. For the valley, it couldn't have come at a better time.

Mr. Eisenhower objected to provisions which required him to transmit TVA's construction program plans to Congress without change. Congress could modify them if it chose. The President saw in this a threat to the balance of power between the executive and legislative branches, and gave notice of his intent to veto the bill for that reason.

An amendment freeing TVA from control of its construction program by either branch was proposed and found favor, but there was no feasible way to get it to the President within the time he had to act on the bill. Agreement was reached for him to sign the bill anyway while Congress rushed consideration of the amendment.

We are convinced the President was mistaken in his original distaste for the bill, and find it somewhat surprising that he agreed to a solution which relaxed congressional control without strengthening the executive reins. But we'll not quarrel over that.

The end result will be to give TVA greater freedom of action than it has ever proposed. In that sense, it imposes a new and heavier burden of responsibility upon the board of directors, one which we are confident they will discharge with integrity of purpose and efficiency of operation.

Actually, TVA is, and will remain, under the ultimate control of Washington. It is a creature of Congress with directors who are appointees of the President and responsible ot him. All the Authority or its friends have ever asked was that degree of independence and flexibility vital to the successful operation of a sole supplier of power to a growing, expanding region.

This is what the law of 1959, when it is finally on the books, will give TVA.

The region will be the immediate beneficiary, to be sure, but the Nation will feel the effects and reap the rewards of the sound growth prompted by this legislative turn.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Aug. 7, 1959]

TVA COMES OF AGE

With a stroke of his pen yesterday President Eisenhower gave the Tennessee Valley Authority freedom and self-determination.

In short: TVA has come of age.

It is a tremendous economic victory for our area. It is a personal triumph for our own Representative DAVIS and all the other Congressmen from the Midsouth who backed the bill to permit TVA to do its own financing—the bill the President signed.

Although nothing can be completely divorced from politics, the bill takes TVA close to that, closer than anyone thought possible 4 years ago when CLIFF DAVIS first tackled the job getting it through the Congress.

That is not to detract from the steering it got from Senator ALBERT GORE in the Senate, or from the other sympathetic solons from Southern States. The House was the arena of doubt this time and it took expert handling to get it by in the form agreeable to the administration.

And at long last the President fulfilled his original promise, made in 1952, that he would not knowingly do TVA harm. His action yesterday permits TVA to proceed in its endeavor to serve the region for which it was intended without further encroachment on private utilities' territory. It answers the accusations of tax free rides. It stands on its own two feet.

Indeed, TVA has come of age. And the South beams with the fondness of parenthood.

Dancey Returns From Russia—Wants Khrushchev To Visit Peoria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial by George E. Sokolsky appearing in the August 20, 1959, issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Sokolsky refers to the fact that Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, has returned from Russia and would like Mr. Khrushchev to visit Peoria, Ill. In so doing, Mr. Sokolsky points out, that Mr. Khrushchev would, on his trip through the Midwest, see the greatest industrial complex in the world. The editorial follows:

HOW TO SEE AMERICA

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Usually when guests of the Nation come to this country, the State Department works out an itinerary which often includes the big and spectacular cities and such places as are of special interest to the visitor. There are dinners and luncheons, and speeches are delivered. Obviously, the man who is guarded by secret police and FBI agents and the local police and who moves through the country in a storm of confetti learns very little about the American people, what they think, how they live, and what they really believe to be true. The mass demonstration for Vice President RICHARD NIXON in Warsaw gave evidence of a spontaneous friendliness to an American, but neither NIXON nor anyone in his entourage sat down to a glass of tea with a few simple proletarian families, just as Khrushchev will not have occasion to do anything like that in this country.

Charles L. Dancey, editor of the Peoria Journal Star, has made an interesting suggestion for Khrushchev's visit. He, of course, wants to have Khrushchev brought to Peoria. What, at least, could be done is to fly the Russian low from Pittsburgh to Cincinnati where he can see the greatest industrial complex in the world. He could be put down in the smaller cities of this area; it should be possible for him to visit homes. He might pick and choose so that he could not suspect that the show was set up for him.

He would find many Russian and Polish-speaking people in these areas who could tell him of their lives in this country. He would find many whose ancestors were Ukrainians. He would discover how descendants of a great many races and nationalities manage to live and work together, retaining some of their inherited customs; but in the third generation, he will find that a new breed is emerging, an American breed, somewhat different from their sires but also different from what he might see in New York or Washington, in New Orleans or Chicago, in San Francisco or Los Angeles. The Middle West like New England is the America he ought to see, in many respects more surprising than the larger cities.

There is no American type as there is no Russian type. Certainly a Kalmuck is different from a Georgian, as a Ukrainian is different from a Uzbek.

In the United States, these differences are more pronounced because here for about 300 years, races of man have been mixing in a veritable melting pot. In some areas, the basic stock was Anglo-Saxon; in others, it was French or Spanish.

There was no time, from the earliest settlements until today, when there was not an influx of Germanic peoples into this country. It is difficult to trace this kind of statistics, but there have been as many German, Dutch, and Scandinavian migrants into the United States as Anglo-Saxon. It is estimated that there are about 12 million descendants of Italians.

The Jews first arrived in 1653 and there have been Jewish immigrants ever since; also, Jews have since the earliest days been assimilated into the general population and have disappeared as Jews. That trend is impossible to study thoroughly because of

intermarriages and the Anglicization of names, but in certain areas, it must have been notably active.

All Russians have been led to believe that the Negroes are a brutally treated minority nationality without rights, practically enslaved. And if Khrushchev is taken to Harlem in New York City, he will be in the ugliest ghetto in the world where Negroes live in crowded tenements and are usually exploited by Negro and white politicians. However, there are cities in the South and in the West where Negroes live comfortably and even advantageously because they are Negroes. It would be an act of patriotism for Negro labor leaders to establish to Khrushchev the fact of the equality of pay for identical work in cities like Detroit and Pittsburgh. He should be taken to universities where he can see Negro boys and girls preparing for national leadership. The lies that have been told in Russia by American Communists need to be exploded. Perhaps Khrushchev can still learn something about the United States and the American people.

If we want to show off, this is the kind of showing off we need to do. If this visit is not for showing off purposes, what is it for? We need to establish the fact that here live some 50 races and nationalities of man in mutual interest without accentuation of differences, but with freedom to pursue their differences if they so desire. We need to show him that in our freely demonstrated differences lie our strength.

Discrimination and Mutual Security Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, sometime ago I announced in the Senate that when the mutual security appropriation bill reached the floor of the Senate I would offer again the amendment which I offered at the time the mutual security authorization bill was before the Senate, which sought to place the Senate on record as being opposed to entering into mutual security foreign-aid agreements with countries such as Saudi Arabia, which follow a policy of discrimination against American citizens because of their religious faith.

At that time my proposed amendment lost by a vote of 47 to 43, but I was satisfied at the time that a considerable number of votes against the amendment were cast by those Senators who had not been present on the floor of the Senate during the debate and who were not fully aware of the import of the amendment. Several Senators who voted against my amendment at that time have come to me since and said that is exactly what happened; that they voted without fully understanding the significance of the amendment I offered.

I shall offer the amendment again, Mr. President, when the mutual security appropriation bill reaches the floor of the Senate.

In support of that amendment, Mr. President, the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in their 64th annual national convention assembled in New York City, August 5 to 9, 1959, passed a resolution. I am pleased to have the support of this resolution, which I shall refer to again in the course of the debate at the appropriate time.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISCRIMINATION AND MUTUAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Whereas it is our understanding that certain foreign nations, some of them beneficiaries of our country's mutual security assistance, exercise discrimination against U.S. citizens, based upon race or creed, which inhibit or nullify rights of personal, commercial, diplomatic or military access to these countries, rights which are, according to our fundamental American concepts, due to all U.S. citizens without distinction; and

Whereas remarks made on the floor of the U.S. Senate as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 8, 1959, indicate such restrictions specifically obtain in Iceland, which discriminates against Negroes; Norway, which discriminates against certain Catholic clergymen; and Saudi Arabia, which discriminates against Jews; and

Whereas these discriminations are repugnant to the principles of American democracy, the Constitution of the United States of America, and are derogatory to the rights of American citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America in 64th annual national convention assembled in New York City, August 5–9, 1959, That we urge the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation pertaining to the mutual security appropriations bill which would prohibit disbursing any appropriated funds to any countries which practice such discrimination; and be it further

Resolved, We urge that in no instance should these practices or prejudices, with their evil consequences be permitted to become a part of the practice of any of the agencies of our Government.

Statement by David J. McDonald, President, United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, we recently were favored by receiving a report on the facts in the steel strike as the Secretary of Labor saw them.

I ask now that the House be given a chance to read President David J. McDonald's, of the United Steelworkers of America, statement on the same subject:

STATEMENT BY DAVID J. MCDONALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

The steel mills of the nation have been idle for 2 weeks because the steel companies have refused to discuss the needs of their employees until they "generate economic progress" for the companies. People who are not familiar with the astounding profit record of these companies have been given the impression that the steel industry has been suffering from a lack of economic progress. United States Steel Corp., the Nation's leading steel company, has now reported its 1959 profits. The facts disclosed by the report serve to demolish all of the claims made of inadequate progress by the steel corporation.

United States Steel Corp. reported net profits, after taxes, of over $254,900,000 in just the first half of the year, a new, all-time record high. These profits were almost 88 percent greater than a year ago and were $23½ million higher than the previous record for a 6-month period. For the first time in history the corporation succeeded in pushing its profits before taxes over the half-billion-dollar mark in half a year. And this was accomplished despite the use of several "extra charges" against profits, such as almost $16 million charged off against profits in the second quarter alone for "accelerated" depreciation not deductible for tax purposes under the law.

The criticism by the corporation of its employees' supposed lack of efficiency is best evaluated in the light of the spectacular growth of the corporation's profits on the work of each employee. Last year, the corporation's profits amounted to $2,625 per employee. In the prior record profit year of 1957, profits were $3,045 per employee. This year, in 1959, United States Steel's profits are equal to an annual rate of $4,345 per employee, an increase in profit per employee of $1,300 a year over the best previous record in 1957.

The corporation's current profits on an hourly basis are even more revealing of the hoax which United States Steel is attempting to perpetrate. The corporation tells the American people that its profit margin does not permit an increase in the hourly wage rates of its employees. But, whereas last year its profits were equal to $1.47 for every hour worked by each of its employees, and in the prior record profit year of 1957 its profits were $1.61 per man-hour, the corporation's 1959 profits are over $2.28 per man-hour. In other words, the profit margin is now over 67 cents per man-hour above the prior alltime record of just 2 years ago. This profit growth of 67 cents per hour in 2 years stands in sharp contract to the corporation's claims of inefficiency and lack of economic progress by the corporation.

In reporting on its earnings and operations in the most recent 3-month period United States Steel understandably neglected to comment on the fact that record production was achieved with fewer employees than in any year since 1939, except for recession 1958. This is understandable because the corporation's own report gives the lie to its vicious attack on the performance of its own workers. In the most recent 3-month period in 1959, the corporation shipped steel products at a record annual rate of 30.9 million tons with 250,310 employees. As recently as 1953, a good production and profit year, the corporation employed 301,560 workers and shipped 25.1 million tons, a record up to that time. In the space of 6 years, employment has been reduced by more than 51,000 and steel shipments increased by 5.8 million tons a year—an increase in steel shipments per employee of 48 percent in 6 years. In the last 2 years alone, since the prior record profit year of 1957, employment has been reduced by about 21,000 and steel shipments have risen by more than 32 percent. It is indeed shock-

ing that the corporation spreads propaganda of inefficiency and lack of corporate economic progress when its own reports disclose a record of relentless reduction of jobs, increased production and soaring profits.

Year after year the corporation has pocketed the lion's share of tremendously increased productivity and, on top of that, has piled one unjustified price increase after another (23 of them since World War II) on helpless steel consumers. The proof of this unprincipled behavior is found in the corporation's own financial reports. Although protesting that price increases have been required to meet added costs, the corporation's profit margin on each dollar sales has grown relentlessly, accompanying a fantastic growth in total sales. With total sales running at the rate of over $5 billion a year, the corporation is making a profit on each dollar of sales which is more than double the rate of profit earned on each dollar of sales when total sales were less than $1 billion a year, as in 1939. Further evidence of United States Steel's enrichment at the expense of the consumer is found in the record profit on each ton of steel shipped. If, as the corporation claims, price increases were required to meet added costs, the record would not show an ever-increasing profit per ton of steel. But the record shows precisely this fact—a profit per ton of steel shipped in the first half of 1959 which has increased by more than $3.50 a ton since the prior record profit year of 1957, by about $10 a ton since 1955, by over $17 a ton since 1953, and by almost $27 a ton since 1947. This profit record has brought the corporation's return on net worth up to the present level of 15.7 percent—a rate of return which is more than five times greater than 20 years ago.

Because of evident embarrassment at being required to disclose its phenomenal profits at a time when it is posing as the Nation's savior by forcing on its workers the hardships of a strike, United States Steel is attempting to pass off its profits as a temporary phenomenon brought on by unusual demand for steel in the first half of this year. Again the corporation's own report demonstrates that this is not true. The corporation's amazingly high profits in the first half of 1959 were achieved with about 12 to 13 percent of its capacity lying idle. United States Steel operated at between 87 and 88 percent of capacity in the first half of 1959, a rate of operations which was exceeded in 1947, 1948, 1950, 1951, 1953, and 1955. In addition, its rate of operations in 1952, 1956 and 1957 was only fractionally under its 1959 rate. Thus in 9 out of the last 12 years, the corporation's rate of operations was only fractionally under, or was in excess of its 1959 rate. Clearly this does not support the corporation's claim of an unusually high rate of operations in 1959.

The corporation's spokesman here made much of an alleged wage-cost push in their attempts to explain their opposition to sharing any part of their tremendous gains with their workers. Therefore it is not surprising that United States Steel did not comment in its report on the reduction in its employment costs in 1959. In the prior record profit year of 1957, the corporation's total employment costs amounted to 42.2 cents per dollar of sales. In the first half of 1959, this was reduced to 39.8 cents and in the most recent 3 months these costs were only 37.1 cents. This decline in employment costs in relation to sales, of course, reflects the consistent trend of reduced employment and increased production. As the reports of the American Iron and Steel Institute reveal, fewer and fewer man-hours are employed to produce a ton of steel. In the prior record profit year of 1957, a total of 16.1 man-hours were employed for each ton of steel shipped. In the most recent month for which figures are available, May 1959, only 13.3 hours were required. As a result of this constant trend, total payroll costs per ton of steel shipped are $3 a ton less than in the prior record profit year of 1957. It is pertinent to note that, despite the reduction in total payroll costs, the price of steel today is more than $7 a ton higher than it was in 1957.

What is indicated by these facts is not only the tremendous profitability of selling steel at current prices, but also the certainty of a growing profit margin as technology and efficiency steadily reduce the cost of producing each ton of steel. Accordingly, the statement of United States Steel's chairman of the board that he does not intend to raise the general level of steel prices this year is not quite the hold-the-line position that he pretends. This is so because, first of all, sharply rising productivity reduces the cost of producing steel month by month and, therefore, even a fixed steel price will result in a constantly increasing profit margin since the corporation never shares this growth with steel consumers. Secondly, it is not a hold-the-line position because steel dividends are at a new all-time high and are about to be raised still further; the compensation of supervisory employees (management incentive plan) in the steel mills is rising month after month as the result of bonuses gained as a reward for adding additional steelworkers to the ranks of the unemployed; and the compensation of steel executives, because of stock options, grows by leaps and bounds every day that the market price of steel equities rises.

As the market price of United States Steel stock rose from about $90 to $105 in the last few months, for example, the chairman of the board of United States Steel with stock options of 32,000 shares has gained about $480,000. For each 1-point rise in the price of United States Steel stock, his options increase in value by about $32,000. If he can succeed in holding the line on wages, he must be comforted by the thought that profits and stock equities will rise even further. Consequently, a successful hold-the-line policy on wages guarantees the opposite result for the chairman of the board—an increase in income from stock options, half of which is tax free. Finally, steel consumers can find little comfort in a statement that the general level of steel prices will be held this year because United States Steel is an old and practiced hand at obtaining sizable price increases without ever raising the general level of steel prices. By raising the charges for what are known as extras, the corporation has succeeded in the past in raising the average price of steel by as much a $5 a ton without ever putting into effect a general price increase.

Only those facts contained in the financial reports of United States Steel and the lesser steel corporations and in the reports of the industry's own American Iron and Steel Institute are necessary to establish that the crisis in steel has been created, for reasons known to the steel corporations, in complete disregard of those facts and of the welfare of the entire Nation. The entire position of the steel corporations in this crisis having been refuted by their own reports, it is no surprise that the steel industry shuns fact-finding and public disclosure of its sham like the plague. Sometimes truth takes time. But the union is confident that the truth will prevail.

The Atlantic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the July issue of the NATO Letter, official publication of the Information Service of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, states that the meeting of the Atlantic Congress held last June in London and attended by delegates from this body shows that NATO is growing into a community of peoples sharing common ideals, policies, interest, and activities.

"This development, as the Congress also showed, is coming about in the sturdy and healthy way that is possible among democratic people," the letter states.

Mr. President, I believe the letter is important in pointing up, as it does, the real spirit of the Congress, which drew representative peoples from all the NATO nations together, to consider their common aims and aspirations. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the publication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC CONGRESS

The really important feature of the 5-day Atlantic Congress, which was opened by Queen Elizabeth II in Westminster Hall on June 5, was that it was a conference not of allied governments but of allied peoples from the countries composing the North Atlantic Alliance. It showed that the alliance between countries in Western Europe and North America which started 10 years ago as a defense against Soviet military and political encroachment in Europe, is growing into a community of peoples sharing common ideals, policies, interests, and activities.

This development, as the Congress also showed, is coming about in the sturdy and healthy way that is possible among democratic people. It is taking place, not under orders from governments and governmental officials, but through the initiative and hard work of individual citizens of the NATO countries who believe that an Atlantic Community is both natural and necessary. As the Queen said in her opening speech: "The Atlantic Community is the first real effort to give practical form to a growing desire of the peoples of this part of the world to work more closely together for their mutual security and benefit." Her Majesty went on to say that the Congress began its work "with two great advantages, for the Atlantic Community shares a common interest in security and progress, and a common European heritage. The many elements which make up this heritage are too complex to describe and too subtle to define. We cannot list them, but we know them when we meet them. However, there are two which have long been the main principles of enlightened European thought and action: respect for the freedom of the individual, for the dignity of human nature and a simple faith in God. These two principles show more clearly than anything else that the things which divide

us are very small and unimportant compared with the things which unite us. These two principles also demonstrate to our fellow members of the Commonwealth and to all our friends throughout the world that the Atlantic Community is not an exclusive club, but itself belongs to that wider brotherhood which comprises all men of good will."

The idea of holding the Congress derived from a resolution in 1957 of the annual conference of Members of Parliament from NATO countries—a nongovernmental body founded in 1955 to foster the political and economic development of the Atlantic Alliance. The preparatory work was carried out under the direction of a small international committee of Members of Parliament and other prominent people. Similarly constituted committees were responsible for national planning in the member countries of NATO.

The 640 members of the Congress came not as delegates of their governments or parties, but in a private capacity, speaking only for themselves. About one-third were Members of Parliament, others were prominent in the fields of science, technology, education, culture, religion, labor, industry and finance.

They set themselves to consider, from the experience of the first 10 years of the Atlantic Alliance, the ways in which it might develop toward a community over the next decade. They discussed the future course of relations between the NATO countries themselves, they paid even more attention to the relations of the alliance as a whole with the rest of the world. Convinced that the alliance has a positive role to play in the world, they were especially concerned in its future relationship with underdeveloped countries, particularly the newly independent states of Asia and Africa.

One of the early speakers was a distinguished Negro from the United States, the President of Howard University in Washington, Dr. Mordecai Johnson. Speaking as the child of a slave, he appealed for much greater economic aid for the peoples of Africa and Asia; aid on a scale sufficient to free them from the struggle for existence.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 25th, 26th, and 27th of a series by Editor Charles L. Dancey appearing in the August 13, 14, and 15 issues of the Peoria Journal Star respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 13, 1959]

WORD "SIBERIA" STUNS CROWD

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TBILISI.—There was some kind of an East German delegation in Tbilisi while I was there—also, of course, located at the Intourist hotel.

One of them in particular, a short, square, middle-aged man with thin straight hair latched on to me, eager to talk. (Mostly German, which is surprisingly easy to understand when spoken slowly. Or maybe it isn't so surprising for one raised in Pekin?)

He kept asking, every few minutes: "Are you sure you are an American?"

I would reply: "Peoria is about as American as anyone can get."

Finally, he grabbed me by the arm, leaned over, and said slowly: "East Germans are no different than West Germans—except that the way things are we have to be smarter." And then words, unmistakably in German and in intensity of manner, "Don't worry. Our day will come."

If he thought he was reassuring me, I must confess that it did not have that effect. At one point, he referred to the Russians as "those animals." This much intensity of hate, which can't be conveyed in mere words, is as disconcerting as an occasional example of unbelievable continuing fear.

Also in Tbilisi I attended a modern Russian play, in Russian, for an audience made up largely of local Russians, apparently. This time there was no special propaganda—it was a kind of romantic comedy.

At one point when two women were wrangling over the hero, one of them told the other sharply: "If you want a man why don't you go to India and marry an Indian."

For some reason, this made the audience almost hysterical. It was apparently the funniest line in the show—the idea of this good-looking blond Russian girl marrying an Indian.

This reaction hardly jibes with the government policy and propaganda line about the Russian people's true attitude toward orientals and other races.

With all the guff I'd taken from Professor Rai of India I could not help but maliciously wish he could have been there to hear what these great humanitarians really think of him.

On the other hand, I should have been very embarrassed if an Indian gentleman named Suomi, and a fine fellow, had been there.

Also in this play, home living was pretty realistically shown so far as my own limited experience and conversations indicated.

The setting was a home—i.e., a room, and there the actors, male and female, entertained, ate their meals, did their homework, and also slept (two on cots that were part of the furniture, one on a folding cot). And they were not supposed to be poor.

The third very revealing part of the play came when the hero, who was dodging marriage every which way, finally told his sweetheart that the truth was he had a job in Siberia.

Now, the move to Siberia is propagandized as a great patriotic effort in which the people are joining and volunteering with great enthusiasm.

But when the word "Seveer" (Siberia) was finally spoken on stage—although not dramatized in the stage action—the hush that fell over the audience was like a heavy curtain falling over the theater, and then a woman in front of me began sobbing.

There is more than one way to find out what feelings and emotions stir a strange, isolated people like the Soviets. I think this play was one of the most effective and revealing.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 14, 1959]

NIGHT FLIGHT HIDES RED MISSILE BASES

(By Charles L. Dancey)

TASHKENT.—I flew from Tbilisi to Tashkent in Russia's famous TU–104 jet, but this time we took off after sundown and landed before dawn, going the whole way in darkness.

One of the stewardesses, betraying the usual giggling curiosity about Americans, sat down with me after we were airborne and began asking questions. The plane was almost empty.

When she had been quizzing me for a while, I asked a few questions myself—personal questions such as what connection did the plane make at Tashkent, and therefore, where did she fly from there, and where did she live, etc.

From this, it was revealed that this is in fact a shuttle flight between Tbilisi and Tashkent. It doesn't go anywhere else. It doesn't connect with anything else. Yet it is scheduled all at night.

Why?

(When I returned to the United States I learned—it is no great secret that we can track them—that this Caspian Sea area is where the Soviet rocket missile range and launching area is located).

The landing in Tashkent was again on a lone paved strip, and again I saw about 50 Mig fighter planes parked on the ground as well as many commercial planes.

I was met by another intourist guide, this one named Lida, who couldn't find much to show me in this central Asian city in the center of the Soviet cotton and textile area.

There is some new construction underway here, but very little, and hardly any completed. Lida explained that Stalingrad and the other cities that were destroyed in the war had to be rebuilt and this delayed housing projects in Tashkent which was unharmed in the war.

We drove through miles and miles of low, flat, mud huts, which looked like Pueblo Indian villages that were started but never got beyond the first or second story. Rarely does one see a window, and then it is just an open space in the wall with a number of sticks propped in it.

Most of the roofs are flat, and apparently earthen, too, and covered with heavy, brownish, tough-looking grass or weeds.

Lida says that when these were built the Moslems who built them and lived in them did not believe in having any windows facing outward.

She says this is a city of 1 million people of whom 60 percent are tilt-eyed oriental-Arabic Uzbeks, 15 percent Russian, and the rest Tartar, Tadjek, Armenian, and Kurd and others including various Afghan tribes.

She says there are 9 million people in Uzbekistan, and 90 percent are Uzbeks.

There are no screens here either—and plenty of flies. The central square, however is beautiful, with a fantastic hotel fronted by many statutes and blue glazed tile designs. It is new. It faces a park-like square, with a big fountain in the center, and on the other side is another very impressive new building—the Government building.

This and a few adjoining blocks, however, are a modern Russia island in a sea of mud hut Moslem homes—which Lida blithely says will all be torn down and replaced.

When, I wonder? Not in 7 years.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 15, 1959]

GONE IS WEALTH OF SAMARKAND

(By Charles L. Dancey)

SAMARKAND.—A short hop from Tashkent lands you at Samarkand, the fly-bitten, sun-baked, God-forsaken end of the world which once was famous from Greece to Cathay for its riches and its beautiful blonde women.

Here Alexander the Great reached the borders of his conquests when he rode his horse into the river and turned back. Here he became so enamored of Asian luxury (and married Roxanne of Samarkand) that he abandoned Greek customs and habits—and murdered his best friend and general for protesting.

Where that great walled city stood, however, is still barren and sun-baked hills today. For Genghis Kahn laid siege to it and was bitterly resisted. The final insult came when the Sultan of Samarkand with 1,000 picked horsemen sallied out one of the old city's many gates, surprised the Golden Horde, cut his way through and escaped.

The great Khan leveled the city stone by stone, slaughtered its inhabitants and plowed the earth where it had stood.

Beside these barren hills, however, rose a new city, now numbering 200,000—a city which a century after the Mongols razed it became the capital of a fabulous empire that included most of what is now Russia, Turkey, all the Arabic countries, North Africa, Persia, Afghanistan, and most of India. The empire of the dreaded Tamerlane.

Tamerlane still lies buried here. In a crumbling tomb, across a barren courtyard, under a blue-tiled dome with grass growing out between the tiles stands a solid block of gleaming black nephrite—the biggest single hunk of this precious stone in the world—marking the place where Tamerlane lies.

On this is written: "Were I alive today, the world would tremble!"

The world isn't paying much attention, except that a few years back the Russians took out Tamerlane's skeletal, mummified remains, found his thick red hair and beard still preserved, checked his crippled bones (from which he got his name) and stuck him back in the crypt.

Around this crumbling tomb are the familiar cluster of mud huts with narrow baked-clay street, ditched in the middle, chattering half-naked Uzbek children, and shrouded Moslem women.

This was the Pad Square of another day—only more so. Today it is a curiosity to a visiting American, but not much else to anyone.

My guide in Samarkand is Udiol, a big, strapping handsome Tartar boy whose grandfather was a mullah of Islam.

Besides the tomb of Tamerlane, he showed me the Moslem "holy place" second only to Mecca, where three pilgrimages "purify" the believer, and a cluster of the tombs of great men when Samarkand was the world center of Moslem culture.

Many of these mosques and tombs, all in ruins or half-ruins, were built by slave labor and by architects whom Tamerlane spared from the city populations he slaughtered across half the world.

In one such great tomb built for the purpose of gaining special favor with Allah according to Moslem law, the slave workers or architect had managed to blend into the shadow effects of the fabulous tile designs—the shadows of animals at each of the four corners. This, to a Moslem (had they known the animal pictures were there), turned the tomb from a holy place into an accursed place.

In others, clever architects had worked their own names in Arabic into the complicated tile designs—thus desecrating those shrines even as they were newly built.

Udiol got a great kick out of telling me how these slaves of the dreaded Tamerlane had betrayed him and fooled him.

Castro Kills While United States Keels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will be recalled that immediately following the Castro revolution in Cuba, which brought Fidel Castro into power, the senior Senator from Oregon was the first in the Senate of the United States to take the floor and protest the blood bath which Castro was inflicting at that time upon Cuba, as a result of violating all the rules of morality with respect to the treatment of war prisoners. The senior Senator from Oregon was roundly criticized for characterizing the unconscionable conduct of Mr. Castro as a blood bath. However as chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which deals with Latin American affairs, I was briefed frequently as to what was happening in Cuba, and I knew whereof I spoke.

I was soon joined by other colleagues in the Senate whose support I deeply appreciate.

From time to time, Mr. President, I have pointed out that Cuba has had visited upon it an exchange of dictators, an exchange of government heads who adopt police state methods. I think the RECORD now amply supports the forewarnings of the senior Senator from Oregon, made during those early days of the Castro regime. One does not have to have very much evidence to judge the character of a man. When it became evident that the new leader of Cuba was one who would give no heed to those principles of morality set forth in the Geneva Convention with respect to providing fair trials, I then knew that no democrat had taken over the administration of Cuba.

There has been more and more recognition of that point of view, Mr. President, in the periodicals and in the press of this country. I have noted a recent column in the Valley Times of Monday, August 17, 1959, George Todt's Opinion, entitled "Castro Kills While United States Keels."

I appreciate very much the references in the column to the early position which I took in regard to the conduct of Mr. Castro. I wish to say that I think this column is one of about four or five Mr. Todt has written in recent weeks bringing attention to the course of action which is being followed in Cuba, a course of action which certainly has not been in the interests of the United States or in the interests of the cause of freedom in Latin America.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that George Todt's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO KILLS WHILE UNITED STATES KEELS

(By George Todt)

"Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." (Genesis 9: 6.)

Will there be another bloodbath in Castro's Cuba?

Is there to be more slaughter of human beings by drumhead courts-martial and trials which reek with lack of elementary justice for the rights of the accused?

Are we to see once more the inhumanity of man to man as expounded by Fidel Castro and his strange band of Reds and near-Reds in the wake of the recent Cuban uprisings?

It will be something in the nature of a miracle if the Caribbean would-be dictator—he even sports the fanatical mysticism of a Hitler albeit he is admittedly of pint-size proportions—doesn't go overboard again where his passions are concerned and provide the world with another modern Roman circus with all its innate cruelty.

It is too bad for that part of humanity which still remains decent in this rapidly decaying world, where morality continues to count for less and less with the passage of time, that the Cuban revolution against Castro didn't succeed. This Communist stooge is playing it right down the middle for the Kremlin and when Nikky Khrushchev visits our man after his American tour of triumph—well, more puerile doubts should become erased from the blank looks of the lunatic fringe who are unable to spot the nose on a Commie face at 10 paces.

What is the matter with us, anyway? We are the most powerful Nation on earth and still we permit punks like Castro to expropriate illegitimately and without payment the property of our nationals—and even entertain the crumby notion to give him the money from the American taxpayers to pay off other American taxpayers in the future.

Have we lost our marbles?

Why doesn't anyone speak out against such outrages?

Are we so affaid of the ants that we have become pacifists in the world jungle we are living in today?

Forbearance to use overwhelming power is to be admired, cowardice is not. Sometimes there is only a very fine line, in appearance, between the two. Let us make sure our Nation is not accused, with reason, of the latter. It could be fatal to our role as leader of the free nations on the world stage at this point of history.

With regards to the pipsqueak, Castro, one U.S. Senator is continuing to look better with the passage of time. And that is Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, Oregon, who was one of the first to raise his voice in public doubt about the controversial figure.

Last January 20, and again on January 27, Senator MORSE arose in the Senate to put the finger on the Castro brand of firing-squad justice then being imposed on the defeated of the fallen regime and their friends. He was the original solon to do so, although others are fast joining the chorus.

We may be sure that more would have done so by now except for their very healthy respect of the incredible—and extremely powerful—coalition of misguided Americans who aided Castro to power.

All of which ought to be properly investigated by the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee before too much grass grows underfoot.

Be that as it may, we are indebted in large part to the Oregon Senator for turning the spotlight of disapproval and condemnation on Castro's methods of applying justice in Cuba.

"Those of us who rejoiced at the political demise of General Batista have, for the most part, been appalled in turn by the terror turned loose by Castro," he told his Oregon audience in a January 27 radio broadcast. "Within hours after Batista fled the country, the firing squads of the rebels were lining up dozens of members of the police and the army who had been accused of crimes by the local population.

"These men had no trials whatsoever; in less than 3 weeks, Castro's execution squads killed 250 persons in what amounted to a horrible blood bath. When many of us protested against this drumhead justice, we were told, in effect, by the spokesmen for the rebels that everyone in the community knew of the guilt of these men—and so it was perfectly fair that they should be executed at once."

Senator MORSE made it abundantly clear in his earlier speech before the Senate that any military-type trial is simply a mockery of justice unless it guarantees to a prisoner four items: (1) qualified counsel, (2) right to call witnesses, (3) use of an interpreter wherever necessary, and (4) defense counsel to have at least 2 weeks to prepare the case for the accused and be furnished the necessary facilities for this purpose.

This is included, incidentally, in the Geneva Convention under articles 105 and 106.

While it is true that the Cuban rebellion was not a war between nations, and the Geneva Convention did not therefore technically apply, we might say that it reflects the moral law in this case.

But what cares the bearded one for morality, comrades?

Just a reactionary bourgeoisie expression, Nyet?

So-Called Fair Housing Legislation—The Rhode Island Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the National Economic Council, Inc., with headquarters in New York City, issues at regular intervals its Economic Council Letter. The Economic Council Letter No. 460, dated August 1, 1959, is devoted entirely to so-called fair housing legislation. It gives the facts regarding the Rhode Island story, and the action in Rhode Island regarding this misnamed "fair housing bill." The story is written by Mr. Robert B. Dresser, of Providence, R.I., who is a nationally known lawyer.

The foreword to this Rhode Island story gives the background of the activity in the State of Rhode Island. It is a part of Economic Council Letter No. 460, and I have included is as a part of the insertion.

Under unanimous consent previously granted I insert the entire contents of Economic Council Letter No. 460 herewith as a part of these remarks:

SO-CALLED FAIR HOUSING LEGISLATION—THE RHODE ISLAND STORY

(By Robert B. Dresser)

Early last January leaders of both political parties in the Rhode Island Legislature introduced in both branches a so-called fair housing bill prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion or national origin in the sale or rental of housing accommodations or land, or in making loans with respect to such property.

Under the bill an owner is forbidden (1) to make any written or oral inquiry concerning the race, color, religion or national origin of a prospective purchaser or tenant, (2) to refuse to sell or rent his property for any such reason, or (3) to discriminate against an individual on any such ground in the terms of sale or lease. There are similar provisions regarding loans. Enforcement of the act is placed in the hands of the commission against discrimination, which is empowered to act on its own initiative or on complaint of an aggrieved individual or an organization chartered for the purpose of combating discrimination or racism, or of safeguarding civil liberties. Failure to obey a decree of the Court entered to enforce an order the commission is punishable by "fine or imprisonment, or both."

In short, the bill deprives a property owner of the right to enjoy the benefits of property ownership, and the right to choose for himself the persons with whom he associates in connection with his own property—both of them basic rights in any free society.

The bill was sponsored and promoted by an organization called Citizens United for a Fair Housing Law in Rhode Island, of which Irving Jay Fain is the chairman. Members of the organization include the leaders of both political parties, prominent bankers, educators, and many of the clergy of all faiths.

A substantial number of the members have since resigned.

The bill has had the vigorous support of Rhode Island's leading newspaper, the Providence Journal, which has by far the largest circulation of any paper in the State.

During the legislative session editorials supporting the bill were published by the Providence Journal, as well as a considerable number of news articles declaring the need of better housing facilities for Negroes and calling for an end of discrimination in the sale or renting of houses because of race, color, religion or national origin and for the passage of the so-called fair housing bill.

Also, numerous letters were written to the editors of the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin regarding the bill. A majority of them supported the bill, doubtless because the proponents were well organized and had the support of many of the clergy of all faiths.

The movement is nationwide. A bill of this character has been introduced in some 13 or more States. It indicates a trend toward the ultimate abolition of the right of private property, which is the aim of socialism.

While it has been made to appear by the proponents of the measure that the controversy is purely a Negro question, this is not the fact. The bill applies to all races, and they are forbidden to discriminate against one another under penalty of fine or imprisonment.

The opponents of the measure take the position that if any race wishes to live together in a house or community, whether they are English, Irish, Italian, Jewish, Yankee, Negro, or any other race, they should be permitted to do so. They likewise hold that if individuals prefer living in mixed racial households or communities they should be allowed to do so. The rule, they say, should work both ways. It is government compulsion to which they object.

The opponents of the measure say that if a person is to be deprived by Government order of the right to choose his own associates and to have full enjoyment of his own property it is entirely logical to expect that he may eventually be deprived of freedom of speech and other rights which he now enjoys on the plea that the exercise of these rights is against the public interest. They ask, "Where is the line to be drawn?"

In their view the issue is much broader than that of housing. It is whether the American people shall have liberty or eventual serfdom imposed by Government dictatorship.

The first opposition to the bill appeared in a letter written by me to the editor of the Providence Journal, which was published on January 11, 1959, from which the following is quoted:

"This, I submit, is an outrageous and unconstitutional interference with the right of private property and personal freedom. These rights, guranteed by the Constitution of the United States, constitute the basic difference between a free society and a socialistic or communistic society in which the government dictates and the people obey.

"If a law of this sort can be passed, it is but a short step to extend it to owners who rent rooms or take in boarders. Or does the bill apply to those who rent rooms? (This paragraph was stricken from the letter as published by the Journal.)

"Is there no longer any respect for the Constitution or for the concept of private property and personal freedom?

"Have we at last reached a stage in our country's history when a person is no longer allowed to choose his own associates—no longer master of his own house and undisputed owner of his own property?

"If so, a major step has been taken toward the destruction of the great American experiment in individual liberty.

"The issue is not whether any racial or religious group is superior or inferior to another. The issue is whether a person, regardless of his race or religion, is to be free to exercise certain fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. On this there should be no difference of opinion."

This was followed by a series of articles which I had published as advertisements in the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, from certain of which I quote as follows:

1. Advertisement dated January 26, 1959, and published February 3 and 8:

"The so-called fair housing bill is based upon the premise that there are many people in Rhode Island who are living under depressed or substandard housing conditions, and that this situation can and should be cured by prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or rental of housing accommodations or land, or the taking of mortgages on such property.

* * * * * *

"The only offense committed by the unfortunate owner is the exercise of what has heretofore been regarded as inviolable personal rights, namely (1) the right to choose one's own associates and (2) the right to enjoy the benefits of property ownership.

"If these are not rights protected by the Constitution of the United States, I am certain that it is a very different Constitution from what its authors intended and students of the Constitution have for generations supposed. It is not surprising that in the words of the Providence Journal, 'No other State in the Union has such a law.'

"And let there be no mistake, if this breach in the wall of constitutional protection is permitted, it will be only a beginning. It would be but a short step to extend the law to owners who rent rooms in their own homes or take in boarders. The history of legislation of this character is that it seldom ends with the original act. This is but a beginning.

"The restrictions upon the use of private property cited by the proponents of the bill, such as zoning legislation and the forbidding of nuisances, are obviously of a very different character.

"Who would have thought that in this land of much-vaunted freedom serious consideration would ever be given to a proposal to deprive a person of the right to sell or rent his house, or an apartment in his house, to a respectable, law-abiding citizen of his own choice, and to put him in jail if he did so? And yet this is precisely what this bill does.

"I wonder if all those who have endorsed the bill have fully understood its provisions and its possible consequences. Have they by any chance felt that they were not in a position, or not likely to be in a position, where the law would affect them?"

2. Advertisement dated February 23, 1959, and published February 25 and 26:

"Efforts are still being made to confuse the real issue involved in the controversy over the so-called fair housing bill.

"In an editorial published in the Providence Sunday Journal for February 22 under the heading 'Lippitt Hill Challenges Opponents of the Housing Bill,' it is stated that 'finding housing for 450 Negro families displaced by the Lippitt Hill redevelopment project will not be an easy job.'

"After observing that it is unlikely that the fair housing bill will be passed in time

to meet the emergency, the editorial continues: 'This fact provides an excellent opportunity for oponents of the bill to prove by their own action their thesis that the Negro housing problem can be licked without a law.'

"What an amazing statement.

"The great mass of opponents of the bill are people of modest means—the owners and occupants of small homes, many of them two and three family houses. A goodly portion of these people have invested their life savings in these houses, and are dependent upon the rents for their support. These are the people who the Journal says must provide the housing for the displaced Negroes, and not the supporters of the bill whose names appear in the literature of the Citizens United for a Fair Housing Law as the members or supporters of that organization. These include some of our leading citizens—persons of substantial means with large single homes, who no doubt feel certain that the bill will not affect them. I wonder how many of them have read the bill.

"I wonder too if they were not induced to join the organization by its appealing title 'Citizens United for a Fair Housing Law,' without realizing what they were getting into. Who could be so depraved as not to be in favor of fair housing? It is, of course, always open to a person to resign from such an organization if he feels he has made a mistake.

"It is about time that this bill be called by its right name 'A bill to destroy individual liberty and create disunity in the United States of America.'

"As I have again and again pointed out, the issue is not whether relief should be afforded the unfortunate people who need it. Of course it should be provided—but by the usual government and charitable channels, and not by the people who own houses.

"The issue, and the only issue, is whether the individual should be deprived of rights which are essential to his freedom, the loss of which would constitute a major step toward the establishment of a full Socialist state.

"If an owner, regardless of his wishes, must under penalty of fine and imprisonment accept as a purchaser or tenant a person he does not want, how can it be said that such a person is free? This is the one and only issue, and people should not be misled by all the propaganda to the contrary."

3. Advertisement dated March 17, 1959, and published March 22:

"Letters to the editor continue to be published urging the passage of the so-called Fair Housing bill and denouncing its opponents. These letters persist in ignoring the real issue, which is the right of private property and individual freedom. They continue to harp on the plight of the Negroes and the need of providing better housing conditions for them, which is not the issue at all. They further insist on integration in housing which means forcing people to live together whether they want to or not. If people wish to live together, they should be permitted to do so, but they should not be forced to do so against their will.

"'The same old line that human rights are more sacred than property rights is continually stressed, although a moment's thought would reveal the utter absurdity of such a distinction.

* * * * *

"'The Housing bill strikes at the right of private property which is the keystone of our economic system of private enterprise and of our system of constitutional government. Destroy that right and we descend to the degradation and despair of the despotic Socialist state.

"'Don't think that this is just a figment of my imagination. A very competent judge of such matters in our Nation's Capital, commenting upon the Rhode Island bill, recently wrote as follows:

" 'I had heard that similar legislation was pending in several of the States. It is, of course, competely destructive of the right of property and is a form of nationalization of private property.

" 'This assault upon the right of property in this country has prevailed in some areas and I predict that it will be quickly followed by other efforts which can but eventuate in a nationalization of property and a dictatorship akin to that which prevails in Soviet Russia.'

* * * * *

"The issue involved in the present controversy is far greater than the impact of this legislation upon the people of Rhode Island. As a countrywide movement it constitutes a serious threat to our entire economic system and our system of constitutional government under which the United States has become the richest and most prosperous country in the world with the widest distribution of wealth among its people that the world has ever known.

"Are we going to scrap this system or preserve it? Those who believe it should be preserved will oppose the housing bill, in any form whatsoever, no matter how 'watered down' it may be.

"It is unthinkable that any legislature composed of conscientious, patriotic Americans would ever pass the housing bill, whether in its present form or any other form. Even though 'watered down,' it would constitute but a beginning and the pressure would be continually renewed in the future to extend it to the utmost limits."

4. Advertisement dated April 2, 1959, and published April 5:

"An article in the Providence Sunday Journal for March 15 states:

" 'Rhode Island, which is considering fair housing legislation, is only 1 of 13 States in which similar legislation is pending.'

"And the States are named.

"It is significant that in Colorado and Massachusetts, two States in which legislative action has been taken, there was little or no opposition. The reason undoubtedly was that the real purpose and effect of the measure were not understood and that the legislation was slipped through without the people or the members of the legislature being aware of its true character. There is grave danger that this will happen in other States."

5. Advertisement dated April 27, 1959, and published April 29 and May 3:

"MASSACHUSETTS BILL

"In articles published in the Providence Evening Bulletin on April 23 and 24, the story is told of how the bill was passed by the Massachusetts Legislature on a voice vote without debate, with no recorded opposition and with little or no public opposition. The strategy used by the proponents, the Massachusetts Committee for Fair Housing Practices Legislation, was similar to that used by its counterpart in Rhode Island. The passage of the bill in Massachusetts is hailed by the proponents of the Rhode Island bill as a great victory and as establishing a precedent that should be followed here.

"Of course, the bill passed, and the reason was that the Massachusetts public did not understand its real nature and its consequences. Had they understood, the bill never would have been enacted.

"The Bulletin articles commend the clever way in which the matter was handled by the proponents. Credit for the success is attributed in large measure to the quiet gradualist approach. By 'quiet' is meant, I suppose, that as little publicity as possible was given to the matter. By 'gradualist approach' is meant the acceptance of a less drastic bill than desired as a beginning with the expectation of more later. As I have pointed out in earlier articles, this is the usual course of legislation of this sort—a small beginning with further expansion from time to time until the ultimate objective is fully achieved. Such legislation must be stopped at the beginning. It must not be accepted in any form, however harmless it may appear.

"All that is required to prevent the enactment of such legislation is for the people to understand its nature and effect. What has happened in Massachusetts and earlier in Colorado could not, I am convinced, happen here, for the reason that the public of this State are aware of the evil nature and consequences of the proposed legislation and are overwhelmingly opposed to its passage in any form.

"Incidentally, it should be noted that similar legislation failed to pass in New York this year.

* * * * *

"INTEGRATION IN HOUSING

"The proponents' continued insistence on forced integration in housing displays a callous disregard for individual freedom. To force people to live together against their wishes is a gross violation of a basic right without which a person cannot be said to be free.

"LOSS OF FREEDOM

"For some years we have seen the rights of the individual in this country being steadily whittled away and the powers of government increased. And now we have this major assault on the right of private property. Unless this trend is promptly checked, the inevitable outcome will be the abolition of the right of private property, loss of the people's liberty and the establishment of a fully socialized state with its autocratic government.

"What an end this would be to the greatest experiment in individual liberty ever tried by man.

"Seven and a half centuries ago, the barons at Runnymede wrung from King John the Magna Carta, regarded as the beginning of individual liberty among the English-speaking people. During the centuries following, a continual struggle was waged to free the individual from the domination of the state and make the people, not the government, the master.

"Our Declaration of Independence was a demand for less governmental interference in the lives of the citizens, and the Revolutionary War was fought for the purpose of enforcing this demand.

"But now in the last several decades we have witnessed the amazing and distressing spectacle of a trend back toward autocratic government advocated and promoted by persons who call themselves liberals and who denounce their opponents as reactionaries. Had anyone prior to this recent period suggested that King John was a liberal and that the barons at Runnymede and those who have since carried on the struggle to limit the power of the state were reactionaries, he would have been regarded as a fit subject for an insane asylum. How easily are the people fooled by mere titles.

"Socialism has never worked. It will ruin any nation that adopts it.

"Freedom, the antithesis of socialism, has been well defined as 'the right of the individual to work out his destiny, with whatever capacities he possesses, without interference from government beyond that necessary to prevent him from interfering with the freedom of others.' ('The Freeman,' September 1954.)

" 'Americans will not vote themselves out of freedom with their eyes open. But with their eyes half open they can be fooled and bit by bit the right of private ownership can be pulled gently away from them.' (Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College.)

"This must not be allowed to happen here."

6. Advertisement dated May 7, 1959, and published May 10:

"NATURE OF OPPOSITION

"There appears to be a misunderstanding on the part of some of our citizens as to the nature of the opposition to the so-called fair housing bill. It is not in any sense a matter of emotion that will disappear with the passage of time.

"The opposition is based upon a firm conviction that the real issue is the preservation of individual liberty. This was the issue that prompted the Declaration of Independence. It was the cause for which the Revolution War was fought.

"That people should be indignant at an assult upon their freedom should cause no surprise. A burglar who tries to break into a house will be resisted by any redblooded owner with all the power at his command. Further attempts will be met with like resistance. It is not a matter of emotion, but a matter olf self-defense.

"MISLEADING TITLE OF HOUSING BILL

"In these days when there are so many important and complicated issues before the country, it is understandable that persons, misled by the appealing title of a proposal, such as 'fair housing,' should endorse it without a full examination of its terms. It is to be hoped, however, that all such persons, when they have become fully aware of the facts, will withdraw their endorsement, as many have already done.

"PROPERTY RIGHTS VERSUS HUMAN RIGHTS

"The proponents of the housing bill still continue to declare that human rights are more sacred than property rights, despite the absurdity of the distinction. Property itself has neither rights nor value, save only as human interests are involved. There are no rights but human rights, and what are spoken of as property rights are only the human rights of individuals to property.

" 'The ownership of property is the right for which, above all others, the common man has struggled in his slow ascent from serfdom.

" * * * * * *

" 'A man without property rights—without the right to the product of his own labor—is not a free man. He can exist only through the generosity or forbearance of others.' (Essay by Paul L. Poirot, of the Foundation for Economic Education.)

"PERMANENT ORGANIZATION

"Many have expressed a desire to form a permanent organization to safeguard individual liberty and to oppose the passage of legislation designed to destroy or restrict that liberty. The housing bill in its present or any other form is a measure of this character.

"Such an organization should be formed. It would, I am confident, attract the support of thousands of our citizens who would on all occasions and without regard to political affiliations make the preservation of individual liberty paramount to all other issues.

"It is my intention to submit for consideration a plan for such an organization."

During the legislative session a petition opposing passage of the so-called fair housing bill in any form whatsoever was circulated, and coupons were attached to newspaper advertisements expressing the individual's opposition to the bill and his desire to join in the petition against it. By means of the petitions and coupons over 5,400 signatures were secured. Mimeographed copies of the petition with the signatures obtained from time to time were sent to the Governor of the State, to the members of the general assembly, and to certain other individuals. In all, seven batches of signatures were mailed to this list.

Also, an excellent pamphlet containing a list of questions and answers on the so-called fair housing bill was prepared for the Rhode Island State Association of Real Estate Boards and the Home Builders Association of Rhode Island by John V. Kean, a law partner of mine. This was published as an advertisement during March, and was also widely distributed.

On May 26, 1959, the general assembly ended its session without the bill being reported out of either the senate or house committee to which it had been referred.

The proponents, however, have publicly stated that they "are more determined than ever" to push for its passage next year.

During the legislative session the proponents were given two hearings before the house judiciary committee.

The opponents were given a hearing before that committee on February 20. It was an evening hearing, held in the house chamber, and was attended by more than 500 persons, the largest number ever to attend a legislative committee hearing in the State of Rhode Island. Twenty persons spoke against the measure.

On February 10 the Pawtucket Real Estate Board voted 26 to 2 to oppose the bill. Frank A. Martin, Jr., the president, and Charles H. Lawton, Jr., a prominent member, with a number of other associates, became greatly interested, and with John V. Kean played a prominent part in defeating the legislation. One of the highlights of the campaign was a mass meeting at the Tolman High School in Pawtucket on the evening of March 25, arranged by them, which was attended by about 500 persons.

Throughout the controversy very effective work against the bill was done by Edwin T. Scallon, of Providence.

The proponents of this legislation are well organized, apparently well financed, and determined to secure the enactment of this legislation throughout the country.

An organization called National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing, located at 35 West 32d Street, New York City, appears to be taking a leading part in the movement.

The following is quoted from a letter sent out by that organization under date of May 26, 1959, signed by Eleanor Roosevelt and Jackie Robinson:

"DEAR FRIEND: Have you heard the good news? Colorado, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Connecticut have just joined New York City and Pittsburgh in passing State laws barring discrimination in private housing. Ten years ago even the most starry-eyed would not have predicted this.

"Today communities across the Nation are stirring, neighbors are organizing, articles are appearing in national magazines. There is a coast to coast movement to break down the barriers.

"The National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing has for 10 years played a key roll in alerting, educating, informing, and stimulating communities over the Nation to combat residential segregation.

"We believe the NCHD program is basic to the whole civil rights challenge."

On the reverse side of this letter appears the following list of the committee's member organizations:

"Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, AFL–CIO; American Civil Liberties Union; American Council on Human Rights; American Ethical Union; American Friends Service Committee; American Jewish Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Newspaper Guild, AFL–CIO; American Veterans Committee; Americans for Democratic Action; Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith; Congregational Christian Churches, Council of Social Action and Race Relations Department, Board of Home Missions; Cooperative League of the USA; Friendship House; International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL–CIO; International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO; Jewish Labor Committee; League for Industrial Democracy; The Methodist Church, Woman's Division of Christian Service; Migration Division, Puerto Rican Department of Labor; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials; National Council of Negro Women; National Council of Churches of Christ, Race Relations Department; National Urban League; Presbyterian Church, USA, Department of Social Education and Action; United Auto Workers of America, AFL–CIO; United Steel Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

This legislation is also supported by the National Lawyers Guild, as appears from the spring 1958 edition of its publication, the Lawyers Guild Review, "Special Issue on Integration in Housing."

An organization called the Committee for Individual Liberty has just been formed in Rhode Island, having as its initial objective "to prevent the passage of any measure prohibiting discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin in the sale or renting of housing accommodations or land, or in making loans with respect to such property."

The issue is one of the most important before the country today. It involves no less than the preservation of individual liberty.

This legislation can be defeated if a sufficient effort to inform and arouse the people is promptly made. Otherwise, its passage is inevitable.

Certainly there must be enough people in the various States to provide the leadership and organization necessary to check this movement.

A Report to President Dwight D. Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered earlier this year I talked about the importation of Japanese stainless flatware and the destructive effect of unfair competition on American industry and American jobs.

Recently, the flatware producers of America addressed an open report to the President.

If any Member of Congress doubted my figures or questioned my conclusions, I would suggest reading the attached statement by these American industrial representatives:

A REPORT TO PRESIDENT DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

On January 10, 1958, the U.S. Tariff Commission was unanimous in finding serious injury had been caused the domestic flatware industry, by imports of stainless steel flatware and made certain recommendations for relief.

On March 7, 1958, you wrote the Tariff Commission stating you thought it inadvisable to take action on the Commission's recommendations at that time. You further stated:

"I request the Commission, however, to keep this matter under review and to report to me as soon as practicable after December

31 with particular reference to the experience of the domestic industry in 1958 during which the Japanese limitations on exports to the United States will have been in effect."

Tariff Commission report of July 1959 proves:

1. The Japanese 1958 voluntary quota was a failure: Quota, 5,500,000 dozens; receipts, 8,760,874 dozens.

2. Japanese stainless flatware took a greater share of U.S. market in 1958 than in 1956.

3. The domestic industry's position deteriorated still further between 1956 and 1958.

We first formally asked the U.S. Government for relief from the serious injury caused by excessive imports of stainless steel flatware on July 18, 1956. It is now August 10, 1959. Three years have passed during which time the U.S. Government has failed to take any action to remedy this serious injury. Instead the injury has increased year after year. An expensive, disillusioning, and disheartening experience for this U.S. industry and its employees.

The Japanese poured 2,739,442 more dozen of stainless steel flatware into the United States in 1957 than they did in 1956, reaching the fantastic total of 10,200,000 dozens in 1 year.

The bulk of the extra 2,739,442 dozen was shipped after the escape clause hearing on July 16, 1957 and during the time the Japanese Government was negotiating a voluntary quota for 1958.

The Tariff Commission, on January 10, 1958, basing its decision on the record through 1956 when Japanese imports totaled 7,460,558 dozen, was unanimous in finding the domestic industry seriously injured by imports of stainless steel flatware.

At the Tariff Commission second hearing April 21, 1959, citing the drop in receipts of Japanese stainless flatware in 1958 from 1957, the Japanese claimed the "voluntary restraint was and continues to be effective."

This in spite of:

1. The deliberate buildup of shipments in 1957.

2. The fact that receipts in 1958 were 1,300,316 dozen in excess of 1956 imports on which the Tariff Commission declared the U.S. industry to be seriously injured.

3. The fact that receipts in 1958 were 3,260,874 dozen in excess of the 5,500,000 dozen quota which they themselves proposed.

Mr. President, on January 10, 1958, the U.S. Tariff Commission unanimously found the U.S. flatware industry to be seriously injured by imports. This decision was based on the record through 1956. In July 1959 the Tariff Commission stated:

"The most important factor tending to increase losses and reduce profits from (U.S.) stainless steel table flatware production in 1957 and 1958 was competition from imported Japanese flatware."

We believe there is no justification for prolonging further the well-established injury to the U.S. flatware industry. We believe the facts prove this industry is justly and legally entitled to immediate and effective relief. We ask you to provide such relief in the only form it can be truly effective, by proclaiming a global quota of 4 million dozen annually on all imports of stainless flatware having a foreign value up to and including $3.50 per dozen.

Very respectfully,

U.S. STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

The following table tells a graphic story of the disaster that must obtain to an American union if this impracticable and utterly simple misconception of reciprocal trade continues:

Stainless steel and silver plated flatware serve the same market—U.S. consumers buy one or the other—Japanese stainless steel flatware rapidly absorbing total U.S. market

	Total U.S. consumption, stainless steel flatware	Percent Japanese of total U.S. stainless consumption	Percent Japanese to U.S. manufacturers' sales	Total U.S. consumption, stainless steel and silver-plated flatware	Percent Japanese of total U.S. stainless and plated flatware consumption
	Dozens	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Dozens*	*Percent*
1951	11,626,000	3.3	3.3	27,389,000	1.4
1952	9,474,000	2.9	2.9	21,298,000	1.2
1953	11,563,000	6.5	7.0	24,520,000	3.1
1954	12,050,000	9.1	10.2	24,334,000	4.5
1955	18,081,000	17.3	21.4	29,027,000	10.7
1956	22,309,000	33.4	51.8	31,856,000	23.4
1957	23,725,000	43.0	77.2	30,473,000	33.5
1958	22,775,000	38.5	58.8	29,253,000	30.0

Japanese stainless flatware took an even greater share of U.S. marekt in 1958 than in 1956. Japanese 1958 percent of total U.S. stainless consumption was 5.1 percent more than in 1956. Japanese 1958 percent to U.S. manufacturers stainless sales was 7 percent more than in 1956. Japanese 1958 percent of total U.S. stainless and plated flatware consumption was 6.6 percent more than in 1956. The situation in stainless flatware is not unique nor isolated. This is becoming the "story of our tradition and life" in this country.

Very respectfully,

U.S. STAINLESS STEEL FLATWARE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION.

Medical Societies Versus Polio Vaccine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald, in the Drew Pearson column, was an account of a very serious situation which has developed with respect to the dissemination of Salk vaccine. It will be recalled when the Salk vaccine, the wonderful discovery of Dr. Salk, was first made available to the American people, the senior Senator from Oregon proposed on the floor of the Senate that we set up a Government program of distributing it and making it available, in the interests of the general health of the American people, under a Government distribution system. The Senator from Oregon was roundly criticized because he was seeking to interfere with the rights of the private practice of medicine.

The Senator from Oregon said then, Mr. President, that the public interest was so great that the medical profession should be told, and told very clearly, the public interest should come ahead of the financial interests of the medical profession. I predicted then, Mr. President, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, that we would have difficulties with regard to this program, unless a course of action such as I proposed at that time was followed.

I read Mr. Pearson's column with a great deal of interest, Mr. President, because it bears out a good many of the things which I forewarned of at the time. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of Mr. Pearson's column dealing with the Salk vaccine problem be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEDICAL SOCIETIES VERSUS POLIO VACCINE

(By Drew Pearson)

The American public isn't being told the whole story about the shocking rise of polio which caught the Nation with a Salk vaccine shortage in many areas.

Officially the U.S. Public Health Service explains the situation by saying that community inoculation drives, spurred by the rising incidence of polio, have drained off vaccine supplies.

However, what the people aren't being told is that the alarming increase of the crippling disease, plus the vaccine shortage, might have been avoided, or at least lessened, if many local medical societies had not blocked mass Salk vaccine immunization.

One of the worst outbreaks of polio this year occurred in Des Moines, Iowa, where 2 years ago the Iowa State Medical Society went on record against mass immunization without (doctor) fees for administration.

In other words, the Iowa Medical Society wanted Iowans to go to the office of each individual doctor and pay a $4 or $5 fee for each Salk vaccine shot, rather than have the shots administered on a mass, cut-rate basis by nurses under the supervision of a doctor.

It is a well-known fact that many people, especially lower-bracket families, will not go to a doctor's office to be inoculated against polio or any other disease.

A similar situation occurred in Washington, D.C., in 1957, when the District of Columbia Medical Society balked at supplying

medical supervision for the antipolio inoculation of 1,600 Capitol employees. They claimed it was socialized medicine. The Navy Department finally had to provide an attending physician.

Dr. Leroy Burney, Director of the U.S. Public Health Service, when interviewed last week on NBC, did not reveal that the opposition of medical groups to mass Salk vaccine immunization—so-called socialized medicine—was the chief reason for the current polio epidemic. And NBC did not press him. In fact, commentator Morgan Beatty stated that Salk vacdine shots have been free—which was anything but the case in most cities until the present emergency.

However, public health doctors working under Burney are less discreet. They are emphatic that had the medical societies of all States cooperated in mass inoculation programs, instead of crying about "socialized medicine," there would be no polio epidemic today. Also, with planned mass inoculations, the supply of Salk vaccine would be more closely stabilized to demand, since manufacturers can then gage the market.

(NOTE.—Not all doctors oppose mass vaccinations. In some States, notably North Carolina, local medical groups enthusiastically endorsed the idea.)

Pittsburgh Press Favors Kennedy-Ervin Bill Provisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, July 22, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

NO MAN'S LAND

Practically everyone, including the AFL–CIO, seems to agree that Congress has to do something about the no-man's land of labor relations. Several plans have been suggested. The one most likely to work is in the Kennedy-Ervin bill, passed by the Senate.

There are literally thousands of labor disputes which the National Labor Relations Board declines to handle because they are too small or have too small an effect upon interstate commerce. The States are forbidden to intervene under a Supreme Court decision. This leaves both employees and employers without orderly, legal recourse in case of differences. It encourages strikes and protects racketeers.

The House committee bill would meet this situation by adding two members to its regional directors and requiring it to handle all cases over which it has jurisdiction. Provisions of the Shelley bill, which was rejected by the House yesterday, were similar.

While this might be an improvement, it has two main flaws: (1) It would enlarge an already unwieldly Federal bureaucracy, and (2) there would be question of its jurisdiction over cases obviously not involving interstate commerce.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill and the Landrum-Griffin bill are a lot alike, differing in one important respect. The Landrum-Griffin bill would permit State agencies to handle all cases refused by the NLRB, under State laws and with appeal to State courts. The Kennedy-Ervin bill would require the State agencies to operate under Federal labor law, with appeal through the Federal courts.

Either system could be made to work. The Kennedy-Ervin plan seems preferable because it would establish a uniform system for handling all disputes. Under the Landrum-Griffin plan there would be two sets of regulations in each locality, possibly leading to confusion and a sense of injustice. It would mean, in effect, one set of laws for the big companies and another set for the little ones.

Indians Angered by Prime Minister Nehru's Appeasement of Red China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story written in India by the correspondent of the Manchester Guardian. Many in India apparently are learning the hard way what it took so long for others also to learn; namely, that attempts to please or appease Communists leads to more trouble with them, not less.

The article follows:

INDIANS WEARY OF NEHRU'S WISDOM, ANGERED BY APPEASEMENT OF CHINA

(By Taya Zinkin)

BOMBAY.—For the first time since 1937, when Jawaharlal Nehru became India's expert on foreign affairs, Indian opinion has affirmed itself instead of waiting to hear what Nehru wants India to do. It is not a case of the chick teaching its mother to suck eggs but a measure of the extent to which Indians are fed up with China and weary of Nehru's wisdom.

The issue are twofold: the admission of China to the United Nations and India's policy toward China on the one hand, and developments in Laos on the other.

On Laos the Times of India is categoric. "Mediation is no more to the point than in Tibet," it says, going on to prove that the Pathet Lao crisis is entirely China's and North Vietnam's making and that there is "nothing to justify exaggerated references to Laos as an American base."

The paper concludes by warning the Indian Government, which is keen to negotiate and resuscitate the International Control Commission, that "a commission of sorts might have its uses in certain conditions, but as things are it is surely advisable to avoid any course that imparts even by implication a definite status to the Pathet Lao insurrectionaries."

Distaste for China has gone deep. The Indian Express, in a leading article on India and China, launches a direct attack on Nehru's foreign policy over the years and accuses him of making India the laughing-stock of the world by meekly turning a new cheek to every Chinese slap. It says:

"The Prime Minister confessed in Parliament that China has dealt most perfunctorily with our protests against Peiping's treatment of our nationals in Tibet. What else did we expect after our humble gestures in the tradition of appeasement which Mr. Nehru so roundly condemned two decades ago."

The Times of India lists step by step India's appeasement of China over Tibet, from the recognition of suzerainty and preventing United Nations discussion by an assurance of the restoration of peace, to believing the assurance from Chou En-lai about Tibetan autonomy. It adds:

"Experience, they say, is the name men give to their mistakes, but experience seems to have taught our rulers nothing. Now, with Indian currency declared illegal in Tibet, with Indians being bundled out of the country and Indian traders harassed, New Delhi has thought fit to sponsor Peiping's admission to the United Nations. Why? Is there no limit to the humiliations, we are prepared to accept at China's hands?"

In the Hindustan Times the news that the Chinese want to liberate Sikkim is prominently displayed. The paper's special correspondent states that, according to reports reaching Delhi, the Chinese have begun a propaganda war for the absorption of Sikkim, Bhutan, and Ladakh, and that Chinese troops have been massed along the border of Sikkim and Bhutan, which are both Indian protectorates.

The correspondent does not say that Delhi has been trying to suppress the news that the Chinese have built a road in Ladakh and occupied a chunk of Ladakhi territory.

Dancey in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the 28th, 29th, and 30th—the last—of a series of articles by Editor Charles L. Dancey on his 30-day tour of the Soviet Union appearing in the August 16, 17, and 18 issues of the Peoria Journal Star, respectively:

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 16, 1959]

DRUNKS FOUL STREETS TAMERLANE RODE IN GLORY

(By Charles L. Dancey)

SAMARKAND.—At Samarkand, my Tartar guide, Udiol, showed me besides the Moslem shrine and the tomb of Tamerlane, all that is left of the ancient observatory of one Ulug Bek.

Ulug Bek, at this place, charted the stars in the sky, cataloging accurately more of them than Isaac Newton of western fame cataloged when he launched modern science—and Ulug Bek lived 500 years before Newton.

Udiol said that legend tells us that the Moslem priests murdered Ulug Bek, chopped off his head, and tore down his observatory—all but the great underground arched sextant that he used. This they simply buried.

It has been dug out again— and the arch of this sextant is 150 feet long, carefully notched and marked with accurate figures, with a double track in the stone for carrying the instrument along its curved length.

In charting the courses of earth and sun, Ulug Bek calculated the actual length of the solar year to within 1 minute of the exact length only accurately figured in recent years.

When the great tombs hereby were exhumed a few years back (the same time Tamerlane was taken out and restored), the tomb of Ulug Bek was opened. Sure enough, the skeleton revealed a sharply cleaved neck bone—the skull was beside the body instead of at its top—and the body was clad in silk, not linen wrappings, in short—he was not only murdered but buried as an unbeliever, not as a Moslem.

The Soviets, of course, are interested in making a hero of him, and of attacking the

Moslem religion as in conflict with science and as brutally stamping out true knowledge.

Only now is an archeological effort beginning here, plus the rebuilding of some of these buildings apparently as tourist attractions eventually—and antireligious propaganda opportunities.

These efforts a few weeks hence turned up ancient ivory chessmen dating back to 500 years before Christ but the Soviets were really excited over one glass chess knight of the same vintage because this indicates that at that ancient date not only rich nobles played chess, but also there were cheap chess sets.

What of modern Samarkand?

Like Tashkent only more so. A small modern area, with a rather nice park, no nice buildings—a miserable, dirty, fly-infested hotel (a plywood public toilet was all that was available in filthy condition with torn-up newspapers as the only towels or tissue provided.

The rest—the same endless mud huts crawling with people. Many, many people here wear either Uzbek national dress or Moslem white headpieces.

I saw a great many crippled men, arms or legs cut off, four men so drunk they were lying helplessly on the sidewalk mumbling, others staggering about, and several beggars.

Here were fewer police than anywhere.

But the Tartar guide, Udiol, was good-looking, clean, young, smart and eager for knowledge, like most of the young folks I met.

People with his drive and desire could work great changes in the years ahead—but I wonder how many like him there are in this miserable place.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 17, 1959]

WEATHER IN MOSCOW SEEN AS COVERUP

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Moscow.—The flight from Tashkent to Moscow took 8 hours even in the TU-104 jetliner, but they went hundreds and hundreds of miles out of the way to land at Sverdlovsk in the Ural Mountains.

There's something peculiar about that. We landed and a woman boarded the plane, came to me and escorted me out while everyone else waited. I was told the stop would take 40 minutes.

My occupation there was a good deal different than Vice President NIXON's recently. I was taken into the airport, through the lobby, up a stairs, through two sets of doors, through another door that had to be unlocked, and advised that I should wait there, "it would be cooler."

There was an iron grille design on a sort of inside window where I could sit and watch the activities in the lobby, which I did for 40 minutes. Then the lady returned, led me back through the empty rooms, down the steps, through the lobby and back aboard the plane. The rest of the passengers then boarded. It was exactly the same group as before.

And off we went to Moscow.

Landing at Moscow, a little girl aboard, about 2 years old, began to cry and hold her ears. They fussed around for a while, and she kept crying and holding her ears. Finally, I went up and gave her a piece of gum and told her to chew with big bites.

She chewed with wide, wet eyes fixed on me, quit crying, and everybody relaxed. When we had landed, this curly-haired tot walked off waving a tiny hand and saying, "Dos v dahnye" (goodby).

Everyone smiled and nodded.

At the Ukraine hotel in Moscow, I ran into Mr. Peoples whom I had last seen at Sochi. I asked if he had made it to Tashkent, as he had also planned. He said he had.

In the ensuing conversation, he remarked on the way back to Moscow on the jet from Tashkent, they had word of "weather" in Moscow, and detoured to make a 40 minute stop at Sverdlovsk.

This was about a week before we had the same kind of weather for exactly the same amount of time on my trip.

Only 2 days remained before my visa would expire, and checking in at this last stop I am finally completely stripped of my trip documents. They have taken my passport, the last of my papers relating to the paid contract for meals and hotel space, and even my foreign plane tickets home.

Actually, except for my tickets on the U.S. airline, they've done this every place, but by this time one becomes a bit fed up with the repeated propaganda themes plus this bland way of stripping you of your credentials, any evidence of your status, and even your means of assuring transportation back to the United States.

After almost a month here, it doesn't worry me but it annoys me—and it is a practice that sets many tourists on their ear completely.

It just caused me to be a little nasty to the poor little girl who was my guide in Moscow.

For example: She took me inside the Kremlin walls, through the fantastic museum there, and the great cathedrals.

In the cathedrals with their rich and costly icons, she gave me the tired old standard pitch about how silly, wasteful, and worse it was to spend the people's money on this fancy stuff.

When we left there and got on the subway, she proudly showed me the marble subway or Metro station with its mosaic pictures over the long row of arched openings to the cars—and asked me what I thought of it. These all showed Communist themes.

"I think you people still like icons," I said.

It was not a popular remark.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Aug. 18, 1959]

SOVIETS CAN TEACH LESSONS IN WASTE

(By Charles L. Dancey)

Moscow.—My harassed Moscow guide took me to the big Soviet trade exhibit where thousands of people poured through to see the wonders that are someday to be theirs in the workers paradise.

My disposition was still not as good as it had been through most of the trip, and when the guide pointed out to me the wonders of synthetic materials in one exhibit—the new wash and wear—I agreed with her that this was wonderful stuff and remarked that both the slacks and shirt I was wearing were made of such material.

It didn't help that this exhibition was in the outskirts of the city and our car didn't arrive for 4 hours from when I was scheduled. We called the Intourist office and all they could do was insist that it had left on time. After a few hours they might have suspected something had gone wrong, but there is no two-way shortwave radio system in the Intourist or any other taxi setup in Moscow.

We took the Metro finally.

Again, another fantastically ornate station. Now the Metro is a remarkable achievement with tremendous 150-foot-long escalators sliding underground at a steep angle and great speed. The trains run like clockwork with great efficiency. However, the stations are ornate to the point of the ridiculous.

Like their river canals, like the Black Sea resorts, like the sanitariums, they put out a great deal of material, time, and skill into making monuments out of these useful projects. The piles of statuary, and other ornate decorations lauding the regime for these great accomplishments are especially irksome when one sees that there is so much that needs to be done for these people—and ought to come before fancy decorations.

So, when my guide asked if we have anything like this in the United States I said that if any government built anything this ornate there would be a scandal and they'd be drummed out of office for wasting the people's money on show.

(I forgot about the new Senate Office Building.)

I got a surprise. Instead of being insulted again, she replied: "Khrushchev is ending the waste in building. There will be no more 'sky-buildings' for example. Too much is wasted on fancy construction."

(Moscow University, and the Ukraine hotel where I stayed, are two of Moscow's six sky-buildings.)

This last evening in Russia, I took a stroll in the hotel area, and a young man with horn-rimmed glasses fell in step.

"You're an American," he said.

"Yes."

"I can always tell. European coats have no split in the bottom at all. The English have two. The American ones split in the middle."

Then he tried to persuade me to sell him American dollars offering me 20 rubles for the dollar.

When I turned this down, he asked if I had any extra clothes to sell.

When I said "No," he asked if I had any books in English to sell.

Then, he suggested again the dollar-ruble deal saying I could buy fine old silver with the rubles and sell it at good prices in the United States.

I asked him what use he could make of dollars in this country.

He said: "I've a friend who's leaving the country."

Me, too.

Red China Unfit for Membership in United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of August 19, 1959. It is the best brief statement I have seen of the reasons why Red China must be kept out of the United Nations because of its own lawless behavior:

UNFIT FOR MEMBERSHIP

By a vote of 368 to 2, the House has once again placed itself on record as opposed to Red China's admission to the United Nations. In and of itself, this carries no legal weight internationally, but it does reaffirm with great and significant vigor a sentiment which Congress as a whole has repeatedly expressed in the past. And it is a sentiment shared by both the executive branch of our Government and the overwhelming majority of the American people—a fact that cannot be shrugged off elsewhere in the world, on either side of the Iron Curtain.

The reasons for the House action are not hard to find. They are as obvious as they are compelling. To begin with, as our State Department has made clear on numerous occasions, the Communist regime in Peiping has yet to meet the primary qualifications for U.N. membership—namely, that the applicant must be peace loving. The Chinese Reds simply do not measure up on that

basis. On the contrary—wholly apart from their unpurged crime of aggression in Korea and their continuing threatfulness in the Formosa area—their recent brutalities in Tibet and their current pressures on Laos leave no room for doubt that they are still bent upon becoming masters of all Asia through a policy of subversion and naked armed force.

In such circumstances, the United States cannot possibly acquiesce in having Communist China become a U.N. member unless or until the Peiping Government changes markedly for the better—a prospect that seems remote in the extreme right now. Accordingly, when the General Assembly convenes in New York next month, and when the issue is revived again by proadmission countries like India, our American representatives will have to do everything they can—including possibly even a resort to the veto—to prevent favorable action. This is the more true because such action, almost as much as if America were to extend diplomatic recognition to the Chinese Reds, would have a profoundly demoralizing psychological effect throughout Asia.

This is indisputable. For any such recognition would so enhance Peiping's prestige that the Chiang Nationalist Government on Formosa would suffer a mortal blow, and nearly all the free nations on Red China's perimeter would experience a terrible new sense of abandonment and desperation. More than that, the so-called oversea Chinese in the affected area would feel impelled to shift their allegiance to Mao. These are basic realities. They explain why it is imperative for our Government to act in keeping with the resolution just enacted by the House.

Jefferson Through the Fog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Julian P. Boyd of Princeton University, enclosing a copy of the address delivered by Mr. James Russell Wiggins, publisher of the Washington Post, at Monticello on April 13, 1959, on the anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth. Mr. Boyd is a member of the Board of Directors of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation.

THE PAPERS OF THOMAS JEFFERSON,
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY,
Princeton, N.J., August 13, 1959.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I am most grateful for your kindness in making an inquiry of Colonel Poutre at Tobyhanna Signal Depot, and for letting me know.

The enclosed address by Mr. James Russell Wiggins of the Washington Post, delivered at Monticello last April on the anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth, may be of interest to you.

With much gratitude for your thoughtfulness, and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

JULIAN P. BOYD.

JEFFERSON THROUGH THE FOG

(An address delivered at Monticello, April 13, 1959, by James Russell Wiggins)

Of this spot, Richard Rush in 1816, in the letter only recently come into the possession of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, wrote. "The fog * * * never rises to the level of his mountain."

It is a pleasure and a delight to stand here on a day, and in a time, when the fog upon lower elevations is especially impenetrable. This eminence in such times is seen through the mists that shroud its approaches with new advantage. No one could hope to bring to an audience that would gather here on this day anything new about Thomas Jefferson or any hitherto undiscovered thing that he said.

Our annual reexamination of Jefferson will divulge to us nothing changed or new in him. Still, each day in our round of years brings us to a new perspective from which to look toward that elevated place in our history which he continues to occupy; just as when we traverse the plain below this mountain, and see from time to time, through valley mists and spring foliage, a hitherto unperceived delight in the architecture of Monticello.

This is what brings us back, again and again, to read the same Jeffersonian documents. So frequently, the weeks and months and years since last we read them give them a new application and meaning, so at variance with earlier understanding and appreciation that, although well aware of having previously perused the same texts, we read again as in a fresh discovery.

It may be said of Jefferson as Sir John Myres said of Homer; "it is we, and our tools and methods that change, not the genius of Homer."

When we repair to the genius of Jefferson for advice and counsel in the causes of our day, we need to be warned that a man out of his generation may be as misleading as a paragraph out of context. And those who quote such scriptures to their own purposes run the double risk of lifting wisdom out of its time and out of its place.

So much depends upon time and place and context that the application of Jeffersonian truths to contemporary problems leaves the individual latitude enough so that each of us, in a sense, can have his own Jefferson. I apply to the fogs of our day, I warn you, my own Jefferson; and if you do not like him, I cheerfully give you leave to summon to your own examination of contemporary problems, your own Jefferson.

In the State of Virginia, on April 13, 1959, it would be to deny the universality of Jefferson, if one did not repair to what he said and did for illumination upon the issue that has produced, in the last few years, more agitation than any other. That issue, however it might distress him, in a curious way would gratify him. He surely would not be dismayed to discover that Virginians are spending a great deal of their time in arguments about education. They could argue about things of less consequence. It is some consolation that they think it important enough to argue about, and I believe Jefferson would be wryly pleased about that.

The common impulse of so many Virginians, of all shades of belief, to preserve the educational institutions of this State, in spite of all hazard, surely must have arisen in part from the foundations that Thomas Jefferson laid. The Virginians who labored so long and so hard to salvage the educational system struggled in a cause that Jefferson commenced in 1776. Neither Virginia, nor any other State, has yet caught up with the ideas that Jefferson put into his "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge." As everyone knows, he thought this the most important of all the revisal bills and put upon it a higher estimate than he placed upon his bill for religious freedom.

In the difficult months through which Virginia has just passed, many of her citizens must have repaired to the Jefferson papers to read the admonition he voiced to his friend George Wythe in 1786, in a letter in which he said:

"Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils and that the tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests, and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance." [1]

In his emphasis on education, he never wavered. In his second administration as President, he recommended that the accumulating Federal surplus be spent for a system of education (even though he had some doubts on constitutional grounds). We are still trying to catch up with him, in this area. Recent events in Virginia and the Nation, indicate, however, that his beliefs have widely pervaded the thinking of our own generation and his admonitions and injunctions have not been wasted.

Partisans in contemporary political disputes always mine the papers of Thomas Jefferson at their own peril because his mind was not fixed in its outlook or inflexible in its commitment, but open to the persuasion of discovery, invention, imagination, information, and fresh argument.

At first, he thought America's role in the world should be that of a primary producer, and its polity that of a rural society of independent husbandmen, free of the complications of urban masses. His hostility toward manufactures subsequently was overcome and in the years preceding the War of 1812 he took delight in the country's industrial growth. Antipathy toward Great Britain was a Jeffersonian constant from revolutionary days until long after he left the White House; but when the proposals of Canning were laid before Monroe, he became an advocate of the Monroe Doctrine. Once he rejoiced in the country's isolation from the broils of Europe, but he foresaw a future time when this policy might change, and he did not hesitate in the midst of his philosophical infatuation with isolation, to advocate an 18th century sort of NATO to cope with the pirates of north Africa.

His views on racial problems greatly changed, over the years. He incorporated into his revisal of the laws of Virginia the most inhumane features of the colonial slave code. He did so because he thought there were real distinctions which nature has made between the races. While making allowancs for differences of condition and education, he felt the Negroes were an inferior race. He was for the gradual extinction of slavery, but wished to settle the freed slaves abroad because he pessimistically thought that 10,000 recollections by blacks of injuries they have sustained would make it impossible for the races to live together under the same government. The editors of "The Papers of Thomas Jefferson" note that though Thomas Jefferson endeavored to view this problem with the reasoned humanity that characterized his liberal thought in almost all other realms, he was, on this issue, inflexible in opinion and conservative in legislation.

Many of his contemporaries found him conservative in these matters. David Ramsay, on May 3, 1786, wrote him:

"I admire your generous indignation at slavery; but think you have depressed the

[1] Papers of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 10, p. 245.

Negroes too low. I believe all mankind to be originally the same and only diversified by accidental circumstances."[2]

As early as 1785, evidences of a slightly changing view began to appear. In a letter of Chastellux, written on June 7, 1785, he declares:

"I believe the Indian then to be in body and mind equal to the white man. I have supposed the black man, in his present state, might not be so. But it would be hazardous to affirm that, equally cultivated for a few generations, he would not become so."[3]

By 1788, he was making a very remarkable proposal to Edward Bancroft. Bancroft had written Jefferson to confirm a conversation about some reportedly unsuccessful experiments in manumission in Virginia. In his reply, written January 26, 1788, Jefferson said:

"Notwithstanding the discouraging result of these experiments, I am decided on my final return to America to try this one. I shall endeavor to import as many Germans as I have grown slaves. I will settle them and my slaves, on farms of 50 acres each, intermingled, and place all on the footing of the Metayers of Europe. Their children shall be brought up, as others are, in habits of property and foresight and I have no doubt but that they will be good citizens."

Some of his letters indicate his delight at the discovery of evidence that his earlier apprehensions as to the innate racial inferiority of the Negro were mistaken. To the Marquis de Condorcet, he wrote on August 30, 1791:

"I am happy to be able to inform you that we have now in the United States a Negro, the son of a black man born in Africa, and a black woman born in the United States, who is a very respectable mathematician. I procured him to be employed under one of our chief directors in laying out the new Federal city on the Patowmac, and in the intervals of his leisure, while on that work, he made an almanac for the next year, which he sent me in his own handwriting and which I enclose to you. I have seen very elegant solutions of geometrical problems by him. Add to this that he is a very worthy and respectable member of society. He is a free man. I shall be delighted to see these instances of moral eminence so multiplied as to prove that the want of talents observed in them is merely the effect of their degraded condition, and not proceeding from any difference in the structure of the parts on which intellect depends."

He traveled quite a distance from 1776 to 1791 and his intellectual journey was accomplished in a society that changed its deeply held views in these fields even more slowly than such views are changed in our own time. I own to the relatively optimistic view that, in spite of all the trying difficulties of which we know, these problems will be solved. I am more worried about another race—the race to which all of us belong—the human race.

Does it stand upon the edge of extinction? Has its scientific and mechanical ingenuity outrun its political invention so far that its destruction awaits nothing but a mishap or a maniac? Have we stumbled upon forces so far beyond control that a mere miscalculation might alter our planetary environment in such a way as to make it unfit for human habitation? These are questions that must plague any thoughtful and reflective citizen. And the more he is plagued by them, the more he must wish that we could have Jefferson at hand in the 20th instead of, or as well as in the 18th century.

We have often comforted ourselves by the reflection that Providence has seemed to produce for this country, in each of its crises, men fitted by nature and experience to deal with each of them.

The right man has appeared at the right place in the right time, generation after generation. But when we look at the combination of difficulties that now confront us, it must be borne in upon us that what we really need is Jefferson. Of all the men who occupied the White House, he was the foremost in his knowledge of science. Of all the men who led the Nation in a crisis, he was certainly among the first in his diplomatic experience and facility. Of all our national leaders, surely he was unrivaled in his ability to articulate the political aspirations of free people. What we have now is a crisis compounded of dangerous international political rivalry, diplomatic difficulty, and scientific challenge.

Now that all the living Democrats—or nearly all of them—have been nominated for the Presidency—I trust it will not be offensive if we proceed to some no longer living. But, of course, we cannot do that. We cannot trade Thomas Jefferson's 18th century political career for a new one in the 20th century. And we cannot have him in both centuries. We cannot nominate him to lead us in a time, the perils of which seem curiously devised to call forth precisely those gifts of leadership in which he excelled.

Were he available, I think we could cinch his nomination—and election—with a single letter—that which he wrote on June 18, 1799, to William Munford. In it speaks the scientist, the sociologist, the politician, and the patriot—in a combination the like of which I cannot discover in the current political lists. He wrote:

"I have to acknowledge the receipt of your favor of May 14, in which you mention that you have finished the 6 first books of Euclid, plane trigonometry, surveying, and algebra, and ask whether I think a further pursuit of that branch of science would be useful to you. There are some propositions in the latter books of Euclid, and some of Archimedes, which are useful, and I have no doubt you have been made acquainted with them. Trigonometry, so far as this, is most valuable to every man, there is scarcely a day in which he will not resort to it for some of the purposes of common life. The science of calculation also is indispensable as far as the extraction of the square and cube roots; algebra as far as the quadratic equation and the use of logarithms are often of value in ordinary cases. * * * There are other branches of science, however, worth the attention of every man: astronomy, botany, chemistry, natural philosophy, natural history, anatomy. Not indeed to be proficient in them; but to possess their general principles and outlines, so as that we may be able to amuse and inform ourselves further in any of them as we proceed through life and have occasion for them. * * * I am among those who think well of the human character generally. I consider man as formed for society, and endowed by nature with those dispositions which fit him for society. I believe * * * that his mind is perfectible to a degree of which we cannot as yet form any conception. It is impossible for a man who takes a survey of what is already known, not to see what an immensity in every branch of science yet remains to be discovered, and that, too, of articles to which your faculties seem adequate. * * * While the art of printing is left to us, science can never be retrograde; what is once acquired of real knowledge can never be lost. To preserve the freedom of the human mind, then, and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom; for as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think, the condition of man will proceed in improvement."[4]

When we find utterance such as this commonplace among the public men of our 20th century, we can have more confidence in our ability to surmount our problems. Perhaps it is true that not since the 18th century has there been a time when a single man could hope to get a glimpse of the sum total of human knowledge, and acquire, as did Jefferson and Franklin, a speaking acquaintance with all that was best in art, literature, science, and philosophy. The ideal of the complete man of the 20th century indeed may be unattainable. I sometimes think I would settle for the complete man of the 18th century. I am not sure that he would not tower like a giant upon the public stage.

Are our public men diminished by the awful dimensions of the problems of the nuclear age so that they seem less than they are against the vastness of the challenges that confront them? Perhaps.

Still, it is not possible to prowl the papers of Jefferson and his colleagues without sensations of disquiet. One must make allowances for the greater distractions of modern life—but can you avoid wondering if Americans today think as hard, work as hard and worry as much on public problems as did the Americans of the 18th century.

There are plenty of public officials today who are wearing themselves out in the country's business, but I am not talking only of the transactions of public office during intervals of public employment. To Thomas Jefferson and literally hundreds of his colleagues, life, from beginning to end, was a process of learning and studying, of thinking, and reflecting on the affairs of society. From earliest youth onward, an astonishing proportion of waking time was spent in the contemplation of the country's welfare. The consideration of public affairs occupied hours of rest, recreation, and leisure. Conversation centered upon the business of the State and the Nation, wherever citizens were drawn together.

Not the least of the things that made Thomas Jefferson's contribution so great was the sheer habit of industry—from earliest youth until declining age. Native wit, genius, and perception he owed to fate—but the discipline which made his waking hours productive for himself and for society was his own.

These habits continued into his declining years and a letter he wrote in 1810 discloses how he identified even his "repose" with a level of usefulness few men could maintain now in the prime of life. I would like to quote a little from this letter:

"I am retired to Monticello, where, in the bosom of my family, and surrounded by my books, I enjoy a repose to which I have been long a stranger. My mornings are devoted to correspondence. From breakfast to dinner, I am in my shops, my garden, or on horseback among my farms; from dinner to dark, I give to society and recreation with my neighbors and friends; and from candle light to early bedtime I read. My health is perfect; and my strength considerably reinforced by the activity of the course I pursue; perhaps it is as great as usually falls to the lot of near 67 years of age. I talk of ploughs and harrows, of seeding and harvesting with my neighbors, and of politics too, if they choose, with as little reserve as the rest of my fellow citizens, and feel, at length, the blessing of being free to say and do what I please, without being responsible for it to any mortal. A part of my occupa-

[2] Papers of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 9, p. 440.
[3] Papers of Thomas Jefferson, vol. 8, p. 186.
[4] Original in Teachers College Library, Columbia University.

tion, and by no means the least pleasing, is the direction of the studies of such young men as ask it. They place themselves in the neighboring village, and have the use of my library and counsel, and make a part of my society. In advising the course of their reading, I endeavor to keep their attention fixed on the main objects of all science, the freedom and happiness of men. So that coming to bear a share in the councils and government of their country, they will keep ever in view the sole objects of all legitimate government."

Well, we cannot nominate either Jefferson or any of his colleagues for 20th century roles. The best we can do is to repair to their accumulated wisdom, and there discover if we can the secrets of their greatness. What we cannot nominate, we can imitate. Thanks to the endeavors of historians who are now at work upon the orderly presentation of the papers of our 18th century intellectual and political giants, we can put before us a fairer and a clearer model of Jefferson and his contemporaries.

Thanks to the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation and the University of Virginia, young men, now as in 1810, in the words of Jefferson "place themselves in the neighboring village" of Charlottesville to profit by his instruction. The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Professorship, now held by Dumas Malone, is giving to several Thomas Jefferson fellows, our generation's closest possible approximation of the 1810 opportunity to share in Jefferson's counsel and to become a part of his society.

May they keep their attention fixed, as did the young men who studied with Jefferson himself, upon the "main objects of all science, the freedom and happiness of man."

How appropriate it is for Monticello to sustain a teacher and to bring young students of history and politics from all parts of the country to sit under him. This is the kind of memorial Jefferson himself would have most esteemed. It is the kind of memorial that is especially fitting for a man who among all his distinctions was first of all a great teacher.

It is through our historians and teachers that we can avail ourselves of the 18th century's Thomas Jefferson in this our own 20th century.

We cannot place him at the conference tables where the fate of mankind upon this planet may be at stake; but we can place his philosophy there.

The power of that philosophy to influence the hearts and minds of men is undiminished by either the passage of time or the progress of science and may yet make a contribution to our survival more profound than all the material resources that the inexhaustible wealth of a continent can amass.

Against Seating of Communist China in the U.N.

SPEECH
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the only reason I take this time is because I think there ought to be in the RECORD a more accurate statement of what the position of the United States on Red China is, and why.

To begin with, it is the same under this administration as it was under the previous administration. When the Communist attacks on Quemoy began a year ago, the former President of the United States, Mr. Truman, was among the first to identify himself with the policy of the present President on this issue.

Those favoring membership for Communist China in the United Nations generally give about three major reasons. Two of them have been mentioned today. One is the realism argument. Red China is there, it exists, it is a fact; therefore we should admit it to the United Nations to represent the Chinese people in that organization. It is said that not to do so is unrealistic; we are hiding our heads in the sand; or, as the gentleman from Vermont has put it, we are trying to deny its existence. Now nobody denies the existence of Communist China. We are very acutely aware of its existence and its danger. That is precisely why we do not want to build it up. We recognize it for what it is—a dedicated enemy of the United States. Every instinct of self-preservation—that is, realism—requires that we not do anything to make it stronger or give it greater stature, influence, power—as acceptance into the U.N. would certainly do.

Gangsters are a fact in some of our own cities. Should we, therefore, take them into the FBI, the agency charged with maintaining law and order against the gangsters? Does anyone ask, How can the FBI plan its operations against the gangsters unless it has the gangsters in it to help it plan and carry out its operations against the gangsters? Of all courses, that would be the most unrealistic.

No one in this Government denies the existence of Red China. On the contrary, we have been dealing with it officially for years. We have had 87 official negotiations with its representatives in the last 4 years, at Geneva and at Warsaw. We have negotiated with it on two main issues, and only two. First, we have been trying to get the Chinese Reds to release American prisoners of war captured in Korea, or to account for them. We have tried to get them to do that in accordance with their pledges at Panmunjon, for two reasons. One, we care about our boys. Two, we would like to find out if, just once, they will keep their word. We accepted a military draw in Korea, the first time in our history that we ever took less than a victory. Part of the reason was in order to get back thousands of American boys who were in their cruel hands. Everybody remembers Little Switch and later Big Switch. But they held back on some 900 men. Little by little word has come through that at least half of those are dead. But there are still 450 who we know were in their hands at one time, and alive. They spoke over the Communist radio from Peiping in their own voices, and their folks here heard them. They sent postal cards home at Christmastime in their own handwriting. When John Jones was released he said that Bob Smith was in the bunk next to his, but Smith could not be exchanged because his leg had just been cut off. And so on. We know they had them. Why will they not release them? Maybe they are all dead now. But their mothers will not believe that. Why will not the Reds account for them?

Mr. Speaker, we paid a great price in exchange for those promises. We have been trying to get them to keep the promises. If just once they would do that, then the question asked by the gentlewoman from Oregon about changing our policy would be more pertinent. There might be some sense then in going on to a next step.

The other issue on which we have been negotiating with them is the issue of conquest by the use of force. We have tried to get them to agree to refrain from using war as an instrument of national policy in the Taiwan Straits and in Asia, without prejudice to their positions on the various disputes there. They have adamantly refused to renounce force as the way to get what they want, and yet they demand membership in the United Nations.

That brings up the second argument, namely that the United Nations is a universal organization and therefore all existing governments should be members. Of course the United Nations was never intended to be a universal organization. That idea was debated and rejected at San Francisco. It was to be a union of peace-loving nations which would accept certain obligations. They are very plain; you can read them.

Article IV reads:

> Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving nations which accept the obligation contained in the present charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

What is the first obligation?

> All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means.

And—

> All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

We have been trying to get them to agree to accept those obligations. They would then be eligible for membership.

The United States is not stubbornly, capriciously, arbitrarily keeping Communist China out of the United Nations as you are told by some. It keeps itself out. It simply will not qualify. Whenever Red China is willing to qualify by accepting the obligations of the charter and will demonstrate in a dependable way that it is able and willing to carry out its international obligations under the charter, it will unquestionably be admitted at the next session of the U.N. General Assembly.

You may argue if you wish that the United Nations ought to be a universal organization. Then you should work to amend the charter and make it that. But please don't nullify the charter and make a mockery of it. Do not drag the United Nations down to the level of the lawless, but call upon the lawless to bring their conduct up to the standards of the charter, if they want the benefits of membership.

Somebody will raise the objection, "If you are not going to let Red China in, why do you not kick out the Soviet Union?" That is a fair question; but it is a useless question. Because you cannot kick the Soviet Union out. She can veto her own expulsion. So there is no use arguing about what cannot be done.

When the Soviet Union was admitted at the formation of the U.N., she was pretending to be democratic and peace loving. She agreed to accept and carry out the obligations of the charter. Her breaches of faith came after her admission. It is bad enough to have been fooled by Russia then. What excuse is there for taking in Red China now, when we know before admission that she had no intention of keeping the obligations of the charter? At the negotiations last year at the time of the Quemoy aggression, she insisted on four goals: Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, and expulsion of the United States from the Western Pacific.

No one can appease Red China by giving it Quemoy, or even Formosa. It is destruction of our position in the Western Pacific that it is after, in order then to take over the rest of Asia, easily.

Mr. Speaker, ours is not an arbitrary action of prejudice or stubbornness. It is, first of all, hardheaded concern for the security of the United States.

It is said that since the Chinese are the most numerous people on the globe, they are entitled and ought to have representation in the U.N. Certainly, but the Peiping government does not represent the Chinese people. It is not working for their well-being. It is making war on them and on everything they hold dear, on order to use them for its world objectives. When a person becomes a Communist, he ceases to be a Chinese patriot, or a French patriot, or an American patriot. He is a world revolutionist. A Communist government does not operate in terms of national interests; it operates in terms of an international conspiracy.

Whenever the Reds will let the Chinese people choose their own representatives in free elections, these representatives will promptly be admitted to the U.N.

Let me ask three questions.

First. Would admission of Communist China to the U.N. make that regime weaker or stronger? The answer is obvious. Why would every Red sympathizer in the world be moving heaven and earth all these years to get Red China admitted if such admission would weaken the Communists?

Second. Would admission decrease or increase Red China's prestige, power, and influence with its neighbors in Asia—Japan, the Philippines, southeast Asia, India—and the neutrals everywhere? The answer again is obvious.

Third. Would admission make Red China a lesser or a greater danger to ourselves and to genuine peace in the world? Once more the answer is obvious.

To build up an avowed enemy, as admission to the U.N. would undeniably do, could only be described as an act of folly. The future of our Nation and the cause of free men everywhere require that this not happen, unless or until the Communist government in China is willing to qualify for admission by meeting the requirements for admission, particularly the requirement of "refraining from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state."

It is not a blind and stubborn United States that is blocking admission; it is Red China's stubborn refusal to change her lawless international conduct.

Let me sum up the reasons why the United States resolutely opposes admission of Communist China to the United Nations. They are not founded on emotional prejudice. They arise from the true character of the Chinese Communist regime.

First. Such admission would destroy the United Nations as an effective instrument for justice and freedom and peace in the world. It would make a mockery of both the letter and spirit of the charter.

Almost all Americans want to see the United Nations succeed as an instrument to insure justice, and security, and peace in the world. To convert it from a union of peace-loving nations into a league with lawless gangsters could only destroy it.

Second. Admission of Communist China would weaken our own security and that of the free world. The Communist world conspiracy is openly dedicated to our destruction. We are at war with it in every sense except open hostilities. If we are not at war with it, then why are we straining ourselves so dangerously to help about 60 other countries in the world build up their strength and maintain their security against its pressures and threats? If we are at war with it, then how can anybody justify our taking an action that would greatly strengthen it?

Admission to the United Nations would give the Communist dictatorship in China legitimacy, respectability, enormously increased prestige, and influence, and power. It would lead to recognition by most, probably all, other governments and thus enable Peiping to turn every Chinese embassy and consulate in the world into a center of espionage, sabotage, and conspiracy against the governments and peoples still free and independent.

Third. Admission of Communist China to the United Nations would represent the bandonment to Communist enslavement of almost one-fourth of all the human beings on this planet. That we are not willing to do.

We cared enough about freedom of choice for Communist prisoners of war to delay the Korean truce for months, secrificing thousands of American lives in the process. How can we accept for 600 million Chinese people the enslavement we rejected for 15,000 Chinese prisoners of war in Korea?

Such a course would be not only morally wrong, it would be shortsighted and a foolish abandonment of the national character that has given us greatness and the terrible responsibility of world leadership.

Century 21 Exposition Waste of Taxpayers Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congress voted on a bill, H.R. 8374, which would authorize the expenditure of over $12.5 million for participation of the Federal Government in the Century 21 Exposition to be held in Seattle, Wash., beginning in 1961.

I feel that this is a waste of the taxpayers money. The project is not one which has particular merit and has little, if any, international significance.

I would have voted against this bill if a rollcall would have been taken on it. I am a bit dismayed that a rollcall was not taken on this bill which will cost the American taxpayers over $12.5 million for what amounts to little more than a State fair.

I believe that the Federal Government should participate in all activities which promote cultural and scientific understanding between nations of the world. This necessarily includes participation in activities such as international expositions, cultural and scientific exchanges.

However, I do not believe that the Federal Government should participate in programs, such as the exposition contemplated in this case, which are not, in fact, a part of the fiscal year budget of the Federal Government.

If the Department of Commerce was seriously interested in this project it would have made the request as part of its yearly budget. Indeed, it is very unusual that a department would send a bill down to the Congress asking for an authorization of money (in this case $12.5 million) without including that amount in its yearly budgetary request in view of the fact that the Bureau was aware of this item when planning the budget.

Certainly no one will argue that this is must legislation in the sense that school construction is must legislation, or housing development is must legislation, or road construction is must legislation, or economic foreign aid is must legislation, or urban renewal and slum clearance is must legislation.

Yet the Congress is placed in a position where it is supposed to support a project which is clearly not a necessity, and its national or international significance is dubious on its face. Under the terms of this authorization, $7.5 million would be used directly for the construction and supplying of scientific exhibitions whereas $5 million would be used for building an exposition building.

I have been informed that public buildings already exist which could be used for such scientific exposition on the proposed grounds. Hence, I must question the need for building another such building. Furthermore, upon comple-

tion of this exposition in 1962, it is unclear as to what the status of that building would be. Under the present arrangements it may well be necessary for the Federal Government to buy the land from the city of Seattle if it is to protect its $5 million investment in the building. If proper safeguards are not taken, it can be safely predicted that the building will be sold at a great loss by the Federal Government at the close of the exposition.

Therefore, I submit that an expenditure of money such as is contemplated in this bill is a questionable use of the taxpayer's money when we are trying so hard to balance the budget. There is no need to build a $5 million building for this exposition; and any $7.5 million administration request for authorization of a scientific exhibition such as the one contemplated here should appear in the President's budget.

Supposedly Smart and Hardheaded American Businessmen Continue To Be the Easiest Pushovers for the Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following disturbing article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer:

ON WORLD AFFAIRS—COMMUNIST, AMERICAN BUSINESS "DEAL" SEEN

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

If as an American citizen you have been perplexed by the cordial, even enthusiastic welcome shown to Bolsheviks Mikoyan and Kozlov by part of the American business community and are sadly wondering just why the President of a business administration in Washington should be turning out the red carpet for a sworn enemy of the United States, I call your attention to a remarkable document which has just come to my desk.

It is a market letter dated August 4 by Shields and Co. of the New York Stock Exchange, penned by one Walter K. Gutman. This presumably routine letter reveals, it seems to me, not only what is behind the perverse pro-Soviet attitude of the Canadian-American tycoon, Cyrus Eaton, but the kind of thinking that is inspiring the relaxed attitude toward the Soviet danger by the businessmen who horsed about with Mikoyan and Kozlov—and will, if given a chance, do the same with the bloody handed Khrushchev.

Here are excerpts from Mr. Gutman's analysis of the situation:

"Vice President NIXON's trip revealed that East and West don't want to fight. Just as the Communist people have revealed to us their true feelings and these feelings seem to have a depth which cannot be ignored by their leaders, so NIXON has revealed to them our true feelings which have greater depth than we have been aware of.

"NONEMOTIONAL

"What NIXON revealed was that the new leaders of American politics do not have the same emotional dislike of communism that the old leaders had. The new leaders don't approve of communism and will resist its spread insofar as it threatens us, but they don't have the emotional feeling of the old generation that it must be exorcised.

"To the new leaders communism is just a practical thing. The old leaders felt communism was unethical—they felt it was evil not just because it suppressed individual liberties—after all some of our best allies have demonstrated a remarkable ability in this respect—but because it challenged our teleology. Over the years just what this was has gotten lost.

"Both sides now agree, although they may not be entirely aware of it, that material success * * * cannot be a total solution. However material success * * * is a good thing. What has happened is that the competition between communism and capitalism has been reduced to a sporting event. It is a tremendous sporting event—greater even than the America's cup—and we might get mad enough to fight—but after NIXON's visit it does not look that way.

"If this analysis of what NIXON's trip revealed is correct * * * there will be a growing willingness to acknowledge Russia's preeminent interest in certain geographic areas. This will depend upon Russia's tact in asserting these interests. However, if Russia can develop the same sort of tact which we have developed in Latin America, we will withdraw not only from Berlin but from the eastern Mediterranean.

"We are still strong enough to force Russia to stop where she is if she plans to take over the Near East militantly but we don't have the will to contest the issue if it is done in a sporting manner and if our purely commercial interests are not jeopardized. It is obvious that if such a spirit of practicality develops, armament expenditures will be cut back."

This, I repeat, is the prediction of things to come made by a Wall Street forecaster. Obviously, he has no feeling of the enormity of what he describes as a spirit of practicality. For he does not appear to grasp that such a division of the world is what the U.S.S.R. has planned since World War II; that it would gradually cost us all our Allies beginning with Greece and Turkey and force us back upon Fortress America, that the present Communist bloc plus West Europe is far stronger than the Western Hemisphere can become in any foreseeable period, and that after we had retreated "in a sporting manner," Moscow's monstrous empire could compel us to fight or submit to Communist tyranny.

Nor is it (yet) true that our leaders foresee any such retreat. Certainly the Pentagon does not, the State Department does not, and I cannot believe that the President does.

What seems more likely is that a portion of the American business community—the same that applauded Mikoyan and Kozlov and will be charming to Khrushchev—hopes for such a development and that by describing their hope as the wave of the future, Mr. Gutman is helping make it come true.

KEY PHRASE

I fear the key to this aspiration lies in the phrase "if our purely commercial interests are not jeopardized." Well, that is the spirit in which fat merchants brought Carthage to ruin. That is the spirit which Lenin tipped off the comrades they could always take advantage of. That is the spirit which the wily Khrushchev hopes further to promote during his visit.

It is the spirit with which some American businessmen welcomed the advent of Adolf Hitler in 1933—"good for Germany and a stabilizing influence on Europe."

It is the spirit which led short-sighted British business circles to blunder into World War II. It has regularly led to disaster, yet here it bobs up again in the United States.

One can therefore be thankful to Mr. Gutman for bringing it into the open where the still sound part of American business may recognize it as defeatism and move to counter it in time.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed bill on State taxation of interstate commerce, adopted resolution on FNMA mortgage exchanges, and took up military construction appropriations.

House passed bill extending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15083–15090

Bills Introduced: Five bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2570–2574; and S. Res. 168.

Pages 15084–15085

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2500, authorizing the reappointment of Elwood R. Quesada, former lieutenant general, USAF, retired, to the grade of major general, and to retire him in the grade of lieutenant general, with amendment (S. Rept. 748);

S. 1712, to extend the application of the Motorboat Act of 1940 to certain possessions of the U.S. (S. Rept. 749);

H.R. 5067, to repeal section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, relating to international freight forwarders (S. Rept. 750);

H.R. 7948, to declare nonnavigable a part of the west arm of the South Fork of the South Branch of the Chicago River (S. Rept. 751);

H.R. 8575, fiscal 1960 appropriations for military construction, with amendments (S. Rept. 752);

S. 2390, to authorize exchange of lands in or near Everglades City, Fla., for use of Everglades National Park, with amendments (S. Rept. 753); and

S. 2181, proposed Mineral Leasing Act Amendments of 1959, with amendments (S. Rept. 754). **Page 15084**

Bill Referred: One House-passed bill was referred to appropriate committee. **Page 15083**

Bill Placed on Calendar: H.R. 4576, suspend import duties on book bindings and covers, was ordered to be placed on calendar. **Page 15083**

Social Security: Senate insisted on its amendments to H.R. 213, providing additional time for certain State agreements under section 218 of Social Security Act to be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees. Senate then agreed to hold conference requested by House, and appointed as conferees Senators Byrd (Virginia), Kerr, Frear, Williams (Delaware), and Carlson. **Page 15097**

National Order of Science: H.R. 6288, to establish a National Order of Science to provide recognition for individuals who make outstanding contributions in science and engineering, was taken from desk, passed without amendments, and cleared for President. **Page 15090**

Senators From Hawaii: Majority leader announced that the newly elected Senators from Hawaii will be sworn in next Monday, August 24. **Pages 15090–15091**

State Taxation of Interstate Commerce: Senate passed (motion to reconsider tabled) S. 2524, to prevent, under certain conditions, States or political subdivisions from imposing a net income tax on income derived from interstate commerce, after taking the following actions on additional motions and amendments:

Adopted: Kerr amendment to exempt sales offices within the State, the "sole" purpose of which (as distinguished from "primary" purpose as bill is worded) is to serve representatives of company engaged in solicitation of orders within the State for tangible personal property by 65 yeas to 29 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Talmadge amendment (motion to reconsider tabled), to eliminate language that would deny to the States the right to tax nonresident corporations which maintain offices and do business within the States; and

Rejected: By 31 yeas to 62 nays, McCarthy amendment to eliminate all language of the bill except that providing for committee study of the problem of State taxation of interstate commerce; by 37 yeas to 56 nays, Sparkman amendment to limit duration of bill to taxable years which begin before July 1, 1962; Long amendment to confine bill to relatively small concerns and setting up a formula based on volume of business as test; and by 36 yeas to 62 nays, Carroll motion to postpone further action on the bill until March 1, 1960.

Pages 15091, 15097–15107, 15108–15136

Appendix

Higher Export Subsidies No Panacea for Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a very penetrating and significant piece of writing on this country's agricultural difficulties, particularly with regard to cotton, appeared in the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller of August 14, 1959. This editorial, entitled "Higher Export Subsidies No Panacea for Cotton," demonstrates effectively that our farm program must be geared to face economic and political realities, international as well as national.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHER EXPORT SUBSIDIES NO PANACEA FOR COTTON

Another exercise in the treatment of the symptom rather than the disease that afflicts the economy of King Cotton began this month. It is designed to recapture at least part of our sadly dwindling export market, but it appears to have no greater prospect of success than have other experiments in the field.

On August 1 the Department of Agriculture began offering an export subsidy of approximately $40 a bale for American cotton. The experience of the past in this connection has been a melancholy one.

Approximately 2,800,000 bales of cotton were exported last year when a subsidy of approximately $32.50 a bale was offered. In the same previous period ending July 31, 1958, 5,700,000 bales were sold abroad, and in the same period ending July 31, 1957, 7,600,000 bales went to foreign buyers.

The source of the difficulties being experienced by American cotton producers in finding a market—other than Government warehouses—for their cotton is simple to define. It arises from the Government price-support program which consistently kept the price of American cotton above the world market price. This has brought a twofold reaction: (1) It has speeded the development and use of synthetic fibers, and (2) it has brought competition for markets, through increased acreage, from new and old producers of cotton in many parts of the world.

The agricultural economy of south Texas is inevitably involved in this and any new approach to the problem of growing cotton surpluses. Obviously if the United States is to protect its domestic producers of oil, machinery and minerals, to name but three, it cannot escape granting its cotton producers a measure of protection. The vital question relates to the nature and extent of that protection.

Increasing restiveness on the part of Congressmen representing urban areas is a warning sign that few farm leaders have ignored. The danger increases that the whole farm price-support program will collapse of its own weight, bringing a grave crisis to agriculture throughout the Nation. A workable farm program addressed to economic and political realities rather than to blind politics is urgently needed. Even the bare outlines of that program appear remote at this time.

Basic Elements of Land Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an open form letter published in the August 9, 1959, issue of the Des Moines (Iowa) Sunday Register written by the Right Reverend Monsignor L. G. Ligutti.

Monsignor Ligutti, the executive director of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference with headquarters in Des Moines, and the permanent observer for the Vatican with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, is known and respected throughout the world.

His letter follows:

One of the most widespread topics for discussion in the American press has been the Cuban land reform law enacted by Castro and now, supposedly, becoming operative. The Cuban law is of greater interest to us because of our closeness to Cuba and because of the financial implications involved in land ownership and sugar production. However, Cuba is but one Latin American country where land reform is the big political and economic question of the day.

Victor Gymenez, Minister of Agriculture in Venezuela, has just presented the draft for an agrarian reform law in behalf of the Betancourt Government. Senor Pedro Beltram, Peru's new Prime Minister will be considering the report of the commission just back from Italy where they studied the Ente Maremma reclamation and colonization projects.

In Colombia, a committee of Catholic bishops is calling a meeting to study the land reform proposals in the light of Christianity and the national welfare. Mexico's Ejido system is now old enough to be studied for results and implications. Jose Figueres of Costa Rica is being looked upon as a leader in Central America's agrarian legislation. Peron's downfall was in great part due to his pressure on the big ranchers. Guatemala and Bolivia are still suffering from ill-planned reforms.

CONTRAST AND PROBLEM IN BRAZIL

Brazil's vast resources present a contrast and a problem: terribly overcrowded in some parts where, for the sake of a few square meters of inheritance, fratricide is committed; while, not too far away, millions of acres of productive land can be had for the asking.

But, of course, this is only history repeating itself. Have we not right here in the United States our own agrarian problems: surplus production, soil bank, parity payments, meat grading, braceros, sharecroppers, vertical integration, etc. "Nothing new under the sun" runs an old adage. It's as old as the hills.

FOUR REQUISITES FOR SUCCESS

Because of our closeness to South America and our interest in its general economic and social conditions, it would be well for us to consider the basic philosophy, economics, and social implications that must underlie and permeate real land reform schemes.

Having studied the history of land reform and having visited personally almost every general type of land use practiced in the world, may I outline what I believe to be the four basic and essential elements for the success of land reform any place and under any circumstances?

1. Agrarian reform must be economically sound: Land distribution is but a step, not necessarily the first or even the most important. Proper use of land, availability of capital, and marketing facilities are of the essence. What may be sound in one place might probably prove a failure elsewhere under different material and cultural conditions.

2. Agrarian reform must be morally just: Two wrongs never make a right. However, a situation is not morally just because it happens to exist here and now. Neither is it right to eliminate one moral evil by creating another evil. No matter how good the intentions, stealing is wrong, even by Robin Hood who would comfort all in distress.

No antiquated, unjust system of land tenure and use should be continued, but neither should a complete upset be attempted. National and international rights must be respected. To stall a needed reform is wrong and to rush itno it without moral considerations is equally wrong. A middle course is the safest and, in the long run, the most effective.

3. Agrarian reform must be socially democratic: It cannot be based upon decrees and unkases from on high. Man must first be reconstructed from within. He must develop his God-given personality and become conscious of his social responsibilities. It's a slow process, one filled with pitfalls and disappoinment, but it's the only sure and lasting way.

4. Land reform must be for today and not for yesteryear: That implies the application of up-to-date physical as well as social sciences. It means the possession of imagination and vision coupled with good horsesense.

If the four standards briefly outlined above are used as a measuring stick and guide for land reform, no matter where or by whom, society cannot go far wrong even though the process may be slow.

Americans Need To Crystallize "Image" of Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relating to interchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We recall that during the recent trip of Vice President NIXON to Moscow Premier Khrushchev challenged the United States to a battle of ideas.

Frankly, I think we should take them on. I am confident we will be the victors.

However, I believe the American people today face a real challenge in the need to reevaluate, sharpen up, and crystallize their image of our way of life.

Unfortunately, the benefits of our system are, all too often, taken for granted and thus are hazy in the minds of the American people.

In a peaceful world, this kind of lackadaisical attitude might get by. Today, however, in a world in which communism is challenging our system on practically every front—military, scientific, economic, political, cultural, educational, and others—the time has come to sharpen up our thinking and prepare to defend ourselves in the battle of ideas; or better, to take the offensive in proving the superiority of our system for providing a better life for our people.

INCREASED UNITED STATES-SOVIET TOURIST TRAVEL

The Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits—subsequent to the Nixon trip to Russia—may well be followed by increasing exchanges on a people-to-people, as well as on the government-officials level. As a matter of fact, the flow of persons is stepping up.

During 1958, for example, an estimated 6,000 U.S. citizens traveled to the Soviet Union. By contrast, in the first half of 1959, more than 8,000 Americans have already visited the U.S.S.R.—a rate of more than twice the previous year.

At the same time, the flow of Soviet tourists to the United States is expected to increase. Although only 66 Soviet tourists came to the United States in 1958, it is anticipated that this peaceful invasion is likely to number several hundreds this year.

The Communists—including Mr. Khrushchev and his proteges—can be expected to be well-schooled on their own system as well as knowledgeable of our weak spots.

Consequently, it will be increasingly important that we sharpen up our image of the United States in the minds of our people. We must ask ourselves: "What does our way of life really mean to us? About which of its aspects should be best informed?"

HIGHLIGHTS OF OUR WAY OF LIFE

Among the highlights, I believe, should be included:

A thorough knowledge of our governmental system.

A picture of benefits which the average citizen and his family enjoy; including living standards, wages, ownership of such items as homes, automobiles, television sets.

Opportunity for each person, regardless of place or station of birth to seek and obtain in accordance with his capabilities, the goals he seeks in life—including a vacation of his own choice.

A system of laws that not only aims at maintaining peace and order, but also recognizes and respects individual dignity, rights, and privileges—as opposed to the Communist system which subjugates all rights and personal interests of people to the dictatorship of the State.

Recognition of freedom of thought, including self-selected religious, philosophical, political, or other ideas—so long as adherence to such does not jeopardize, or interfere with, similar privileges of other citizens.

Economic security within our system, including such programs as retirement benefits, unemployment compensation, job opportunities, and others.

Respect for maintaining traditional family relationships—the foundation of our way of life—often either strained or destroyed under communism.

Ability to defend our foreign policy; and also to explain such domestic policies as conflict with the Communist ideas.

Reaffirm the peaceful intentions of our leaders, unity of our people behind our leadership, and to correct the misconceptions of our way of life which have been presented to the Russian people.

Above all, I believe it is important to stress that we are dedicated to attempting to live in peace and harmony with other nations; that we are willing to contribute ideas—yes, even a "helping hand" materially—toward assisting lesser developed nations to resolving economic, social, security, or other problems; but that we do not seek to impose our way of life on any country, but rather, strive for a world in which peoples can, by self-determination, select their own systems of government.

Fortunately, the Russian people—as I'm sure is true of all people—demonstrated, during Vice President NIXON'S tour that—despite years of false propaganda by the Communist machine—they gratifyingly remembered the "helping hand" given Russia—both in terms of military and nonmilitary aid, including food—prior to, and during, World War II.

In countering the Communist ideological offensive, I believe, too, that we must learn more of the Soviet system. By so doing, we will be able to hold up to the light of logic and reason and Communist political, economic, social, and other ideas and reveal their weaknesses and inadequacies.

TRAVELERS TO THE SOVIET UNION

A United States traveler to the Soviet Union—as an ambassador of our country—bears a particularly heavy responsibility.

The reports of visitors within the Soviet Union as—well as the experiences of our U.S. guides at the exhibit in Moscow—confirm the fact that the Americans in the Soviet Union will be the target for a wide variety of questions by the Russian man-on-the-street, as well as the "planted" Soviet inquisitor.

To the degree possible, therefore, the U.S. traveler should be fortified with intimate knowledge and information of our way of life. In addition, he should know something, if possible, of the Soviet system, so as to be able to present his ideas in terms the Soviet people can understand.

In view of the importance of getting our story across—now that we are finally penetrating the Iron Curtain—we might well examine the possibility of providing U.S. travelers to the Soviet Union with either briefings, or at least access to utilizable information, prior to journeying to the Soviet Union.

CONCLUSION

With the opening of what may well be a new era of increasing interchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union, it is especially important that we crystallize our image of the United States and be well prepared to meet the Communist challenge of a battle of ideas.

I am confident that we have the system, reservoir of ideas and ideals, record of accomplishments, and real prospects for an ever-better life that will come out on top in a freedom versus communism conflict.

Hanson W. Baldwin Cites Injustices to Retired Officers of Army, Navy, and Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us have been disturbed over the injustice to retired officers of the Army, Navy, and Air Force in the military pay bill enacted in 1958.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post for August 8, 1959, the noted military editor of the New York Times, Hanson W. Baldwin, has written an article entitled "Our Fighting Men Have Gone Soft." While I cannot evaluate the basic theme of Mr. Baldwin's article, I think there should be called to the attention of the Senate two or three paragraphs from his very challenging presentation which emphasizes the injustice done by Congress and the President to retired military officers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these paragraphs from the article in the Saturday Evening Post by Hanson W. Baldwin, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Even more important is the feeling in the Armed Forces of discrimination by Government at the expense of the services. Pay rates have been raised, and various benefits authorized; but nearly always grudgingly, never without major effort, and usually far less percentagewise than the raises the unions have succeeded in imposing in civilian life, or the increases and privileges which Congress has voted itself. One of the worst blunders the administration and Congress have made was the passage of a clause in the 1958 service-pay act, which has been widely interpreted by many officers as a breach of faith on the part of Government. In the past, service retirement pay always has been keyed to active-duty pay on a fixed percentage basis; if the pay of active officers was increased, the pay of all retired officers and enlisted men was increased by the same percentage formula. But the 1958 pay act violated this principle—which had always been one of the inducements to a service career—and provided only a nominal cost-of-living increase to all retired personnel who took off their uniforms prior to its passage. But those who retired after it was passed received the full benefits, thus creating two groups of retired officers—one of them "second-class citizens" economically. In some cases the monetary difference amounted to $157 a month between retired officers of the same rank and same length of service.

West Berliners Placid in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., has returned recently from a tour of the NATO countries. In reporting on his trip, Mr. Milne has captured a vivid impression of the hopes and fears, the potentials and the role of these our allies. He brings an objective eye to that which we have established as our first line of defense and depicts a very real picture of what this country is doing as a member of that organization.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the first of a series of articles which appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal of June 28, 1959, entitled "West Berliners Placid in Crisis":

WEST BERLINERS PLACID IN CRISIS—MINISTER SAYS PEOPLE DOUBTED MOSCOW WOULD START SHOOTING; SEES DANGER OF WEST TIRING OF PROBLEM CITY

(By Edward J. Milne)

BERLIN.—In the midst of crisis, Berlin seems a city of almost unbelievable calm.

How can that be?

Joachim Lipschitz, who lost an arm on the Russian front in World War II and is now West Berlin's Senator (Minister) for the Interior, has some ideas.

"In the awful days of last November," he says, "no Berliner believed a world war would be started over Berlin. Lots of Berliners polled on May 27 had absolutely forgotten it was the day for which the end of the world had been forecast. They had forgotten because in their hearts they had never believed disaster would come."

On November 27, 1958, the Soviets demanded that the Western powers pull their troops out of Berlin at the end of 6 months.

It is true, Senator Lipschitz acknowledges, that the balance of power, nuclear power, has shifted since West Berlin withstood its last great ordeal in 1948, when the United States and allied airlift broke the Berlin blockade. But talk of Berlin and nuclear power in the same breath does not impress him.

QUOTES AMERICAN

"I might quote an American officer," he says, "who told me the Russians had so many nuclear weapons as to destroy the world three times over and the United States so many as to destroy it five times over. I was interested to know that the earth can be destroyed eight times over, although in my opinion once would be quite enough. Why on earth should we in Berlin fear this awful thing any more than the people in Washington or London—or Moscow?"

When the Soviet ultimatum came out of the blue last November, the United States, Britain, and France repeated the Berlin guarantees of 1952 and 1954 to treat any attack on Berlin as an attack upon themselves.

"And now since Geneva," Senator Lipschitz says, "we know all the more that the West is adamant on not giving up its position in Berlin."

Another reason for the apparent serenity of the west sector of this great green city of gardens and parks and woodlands is psychological, Senator Lipschitz suggests.

COOK WITH WATER

"This is not the first time we have been exposed to Soviet attacks," he reminded visiting American reporters. "They attacked us before the blockade, during it, and after it. We are beginning to believe, as you say it, that the bark is worse than the bite. The Russians also cook with water."

A danger facing Berlin today, he believes, and this is not such a one as to create panic but only to demand a sensible response, is that the Federal Republic is compelled to say no to practically every suggestion the Soviets make.

"The rest of the West could come to regard us as 'cold warriors,'" he says, "and tend to get sick of this troublesome city."

Therein lies a reason that there does not seem to be in West Berlin an optimism matching its calm.

Several West Berlin editors told the reporters they did not expect Germany or Berlin to be reunited in their lifetime.

It is true that many of the ingredients of optimism abound in West Berlin today. There is freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion. The occupiers are not oppressors. And all one has heard about the contrast between the West and East sectors of the sprawling metropolis—it is almost 20 times the area of Providence—is as true, physically as politically and spiritually.

RUINS LIE TO EAST

On the west side of Brandenburg Gate, one of the border check points between what the Communists call the "democratic" and the "capitalistic" sectors, much of the physical evidence of war has been removed. Great and splendid new buildings are rising. But pass through the gate into Unter den Linden and turn into the Wilhelmstrasse, the old center of government, and the war might have ended last night—acres and acres of huge broken hulks of the stately old buildings, wild flowers growing on the site of Hitler's chancellery, only Goering's air ministry ironically standing untouched while the shattered remains of the German and French cathedrals, for example, and the national theater lie in fields of ruins.

But all that is an oft-told story. What matters today is the outlook for the divided city. It is the fashion in the West to call West Berlin an island of freedom in a sea of totalitarianism, and like names. Yet the freedom leaves much wanting.

In place, Senator Lipschitz says, of the West Germans' maximum demands for a reunited Berlin as the capital of a united Germany, "we are putting forward minimum demands to get out of this mess which has been thrust upon us by the Soviet authorities."

The first of these is that none of the means of access to the city from the west—four highways, three railroads, three air corridors, and two waterways—be denied.

WORKERS CROSS LINE

The second, looking to improvement rather than maintenance of the status quo, is an arrangement for better west and east sectors. Thirty thousand Berliners live in the east sector and work in the west; 17,000 live in the west and work in the east. Ninety-eight streets cross the border. Fifty-seven of them may be used by vehicles, all by pedestrians.

Municipally, three agencies move back and forth—the subway system, the interurban elevated, and the sewage system. But there are separate heat, light, gas, bus, street car, police, fire, and telephone systems. West Berliners are warned not to use the elevated, however, because at points it leaves the east sector of the city and passes into the Russian zone outside the city, and the careless rider could find himself under arrest for traveling without authority. And they do not have to be warned about the hazards of automobile travel. Were one to get a flat tire in East Berlin, he would have to telephone his garage in West Berlin by a long-distance call via Leipzig and Frankfurt.

"CITY IN COUNTRY"

West Berlin has some 7 square miles of parks, 30 square miles of forest or woodland, 12 square miles of lakes and other water surface. It has been called the "City in the Country." It might seem small hardship that the city's 2,100,000 inhabitants are denied by the Soviets access to the beautiful areas beyond the city limits.

But Senator Lipschitz, a Socialist, says that one of the most inhuman measures the Russians have taken has been the denial of kitchen gardens beyond the city limits to some 40,000 workers' families. These modest vegetable plots used to be a prime source of sustenance to the workers' families.

"That is what the 'state of workers,' as they call themselves, has done to the workers on this side," he says.

Last Speech in the House of Representatives of Hon. John A. Burns, of Hawaii

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN A. BURNS
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the opposition who met in the inner sanctum so often, let me say I formed during that proceeding the very highest admiration for the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii. Not only that, I can truthfully say that it was because of this admiration for you and the love you had for Hawaii that final passage of Hawaiian statehood was obtained. Many people from my area of the country supported statehood for Hawaii. I can say that it was the gentleman's leadership, his sagacity, his ability to look ahead, more than any other factor that led to the overwhelming victory for statehood for Hawaii.

Delegate BURNS, I want you to know when you visited in my home last year you formed a great friendship there among the press and among the people of my district and the deep Southland that will go with you and your great State as long as you live. I feel sure that those people, those friends whom you met, are with you here tonight, and in speaking for them, I wish you well in any undertaking you might pursue, and hope you will some day represent the great State of Hawaii in the Senate of the United States.

Let me say further that Mrs. Dorn joins me in wishing for you and Mrs. Burns the very best.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, and may I make this observation to him. I do not know of any people in America who are not fair and just. I do not know of any part of the United States that was actually opposed to the admission of Hawaii into statehood. Maybe some of

them did not understand the facts as well as others did, but no one was opposed. There was no ill will from anybody in the United States toward the people of Hawaii. As for southern support for statehood, I point out that the Honorable James T. Morgan, of Alabama, did everything possible to make a Hawaii a State instead of a Territory in 1900. The Honorable Henry Larcade, of Louisiana, was the chairman of the committee making the first favorable report on statehood.

The gracious hospitality of the people of your district, Mrs. Dorn, and yourself, and the genuineness of your friendship will always be remembered by my assistant, Dan Aoki, and myself.

West Berlin Sustained by Hope of Becoming Capital of Reich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the second in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Evening Bulletin, of July 1, 1959, and is entitled "West Berlin Sustained by Hope of Becoming Capital of Reich":

WEST BERLIN SUSTAINED BY HOPE OF BECOMING CAPITAL OF REICH

(By Edward J. Milne)

BERLIN.—All that keeps West Berlin going, Western observers here believe, is the distant prospect of becoming once again the capital of a reunified Germany.

This frail hope is sustained not only by the security guarantees of the Western Powers but by the political and economic policies of West Germany.

Although it is isolated in East Germany and not a geographical part of the Federal Republic, it has been declared a state of the Republic, and its capital. The last West German presidential election was held here in 1954 and now, despite growls out of East Berlin and Moscow, Parliament has convoked the electoral college to elect the next President here Wednesday as a major gesture of loyalty to the city.

Economically, the city is propped up at every point by the actions and policies of the Federal Republic. While West Berlin is West Germany's biggest industrial city, it constitutes only about 3½ percent of West Germany's industrial capacity. At the end of World War II its manufacturing capacity had shrunk to 15 percent of prewar levels, recovery did not get fairly underway until 1950, and the city remains a drain on the economy of West Germany.

West Berlin's trade is chiefly with West Germany, from which it imports about 5 billion marks ($1.19 billion) worth of goods annually and to which it exports only about 4 million marks ($952 million) worth. A billion-mark deficit in the city government is made up by direct grants by the Federal Government, and that has the effect of financing the city's deficit in the balance of payments.

(Maybe the Federal Republic ought to do more. On the lawn outside the tax office in one of the boroughs here is a statue of two pelicans—"greedy birds," Berliners explain. And their nickname for a heroic statue of a nude athlete is "The Last Taxpayer." "You see," they say, "he has lost everything.")

American occupation authorities feared in November last year that the Soviet ultimatum would have a dampening effect on West Berlin's economy. But the Federal Republic stepped in in December with tax concessions to stimulate commercial construction and industrial plant and equipment outlays, and West German businessmen put on a special campaign to increase purchases from West Berlin factories.

As a result, unemployment has continued to drop—it is now between 6 and 7 percent of the labor force—and new orders are up between 10 and 16 percent over a year ago. American economists are a little nervous, however, because savings deposits, up steadily from 1950 through the fall of 1958, leveled off in November and have drifted down since then. The drop is not significant statistically, they say, but the fact that the upward trend has stopped may be.

The East Germans have been threatening a new blockade of West Berlin to show their displeasure over a new presidential election here. Almost everything the city eats, wears, and otherwise uses must be brought in—about one-third of it by 10,000 trucks a month, one-third by about 400 freight trains, one-third by about 600 barges.

The estimate here is that the city could survive a new blockade 6 months to a year without an airlift, but the emphasis is on "survive." Industrial and export activity, which hardly existed in 1948, could be ruined.

Since American high policy is to assert the West's right of land access to West Berlin, U.S. officials here talk only guardedly and reluctantly about the possibility of sustaining the city's economy through a new airlift.

"Can you keep the economy going through an airlift?" one was asked recently.

"If you had a big enough airlift," he replied.

But the fact is that a big enough airlift is probably impossible. In 1948, when it was only a question of keeping the city from being starved out, the U.S. Air Force controlled Templehof Airdrome, Hitler's masterpiece in the center of the city, handled about two-thirds of the traffic. Its facilities were saturated by the job, and so were those of the airports in the French and British sectors. Airport capacity has not been increased since, and so the turnaround and reloading problem implicit in trying to keep an export-by-air trade alive seems insoluble.

Meantime, Berliners graze sheep and mow hay on the grasslands between Templehof's landing strips and hope the problem won't come up.

Meantime, too, a flame burns in Bismarck Square in commemoration of the East German uprising of June 17, 1953, and the victims of the Russian tanks that crushed it. It is to burn until the day of German unity arrives.

"We hope the gas lasts," West Berliners say wryly.

Diplomats are divided on whether concessions offered to the Soviets by the West at Geneva represented a retreat from the steadfast position on Berlin assumed last November or a shrewd maneuver to prove to the world that the allies are fairminded and conciliatory.

West Berliners are happy that no reduction of the Western Powers' 11,000-man garrison force was proposed. Any considerable reduction might be disastrous to civilian morale, they feel, on the ground that it would be considered the first step on the West's way out of Berlin.

If the allies' offer to limit the garrison to its present size is renewed when the foreign ministers reconvene, West Berliners feel the allies should be careful to avoid a rigid ceiling that would let the Russians demand, say, that two lieutenants go home for every two that come in. That would give the Russians a veto over the allies' clear rights of occupation, West Berliners feel, and set a precedent for Soviet control of the free city in other respects.

One of the allies' proposals at Geneva was for a limitation on propaganda and subversion. Here again the West Berliners sound a warning signal. The West's most powerful voice in eastern Europe today is a 300,000-watt radio station, six times more powerful than any in the United States, which the U.S. Information Service operates out of West Berlin. Known as Radio in American Sector (RIAS), it is largely operated "by Germans for Germans." For West Berliners it is a local radio station. For East Germans it is a strong link with the free world.

The Russians and the East German Communists keep up incessant attacks upon it, coupling it with agents provocateurs and bridge blowers. American officials of RIAS contend that nothing proposed at Geneva would mute this voice. But West Berlin officials say that RIAS would be the first on the Russians' list of what must go if any limitation on propaganda were not drawn specifically to protect it.

West Berliners believe careful conditions would have to be set on the proposal to transfer control of access to West Berlin from the Russians to the East German People's Police. They don't care whether Russians or East Germans man the check points as long as it is clearly stipulated that responsibility for access without let or hindrance remains with the Russians.

Motorists' Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a thoughtful and valuable suggestion for promoting highway-safety practices comes to us from England by way of the Tyler (Tex.) Morning Telegraph. On August 15, 1959, that newspaper printed an editorial entitled "Motorists' Prayer," regarding a suggestion by the Reverend Vyvyan Watts-Jones, of Staffordshire, England, for a motorist's prayer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTORISTS' PRAYER

Much has been said and written on the subject of "practical religion," meaning putting faith into practice in everyday life as well as within the sanctuary and on other ceremonial occasions.

Such a consideration probably caused an English minister to suggest that prayer might be the answer to the problem of keeping safety on the highways these days.

The Reverend Vyvyan Watts-Jones, of Staffordshire, wants every driver, before he starts his car engine, to spend 10 seconds in prayer.

He has devised the following prayer, which he asks motorists to copy and paste on the dashboard:

"Help me, O God, as I drive, to love my neighbor as myself, that I may do nothing to hurt or endanger any of your children. Give to my eyes clear vision, and skill to my hands and feet. Make me tranquil in mind and relaxed in body. Deliver me from the spirit of rivalry, and from all resentment at the actions of others, and bring me to my journey's end."

McGraw-Edison Sets Example of Civic Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one matter about which I think we all agree is the importance of Americans keeping themselves well informed about vital issues and taking an active part in their Government. This is not a new problem, but something new has happened in recent months in the way of a remedial approach to this situation which deserves laudatory comment.

Businessmen, who once placed a "hands off" label on politics, because of its controversial aspects are now actively encouraging participation in civic affairs. A leader in this field is the McGraw-Edison Co., of New York, spearheaded by the former New Jersey Governor, Charles Edison, chairman of the board of directors.

Mr. President, the example set by this company was the topic of a recent editorial which was published in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader. I ask unanimous consent that this fine editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCGRAW-EDISON SHOWS THE WAY

A sterling example of civic responsibility has been set for all American businessmen by the McGraw-Edison Co., of New York. This newspaper frankly believes the company, through action of its board of directors, led by former New Jersey Gov. Charles Edison, has provided the answer to that perennial question one hears from the lips of countless American businessmen—"But what can I do to effectively combat communism?"

One answer, we feel, is to follow the fine example set by McGraw-Edison: Appoint a committee on public affairs and authorize that committee to take effective action to inform executives and employees of the company on current events and movements which may be either helpful or detrimental to that society which permits these same business organizations to survive and prosper.

Here is how McGraw-Edison accomplished that task. On August 21, 1958, the board of directors adopted this resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the president be authorized to appoint a committee of not less than three or more than five members to be known as the Committee for Public Affairs; that the function of this committee shall be (a) to keep the company informed as to governmental or pressure group actions inimical to the preservation of our form of government as set forth in the Constitution (b) or to the preservation of the concept of private property, and free competitive enterprise or (c) that are hostile to the best interests of the company and its stockholders. Further, that the committee may cooperate with, or take an active part in, activities designed to safeguard the matters referred to, with due regard to legal restriction on company activities in this field."

The committee has operated with great effectiveness, publishing a monthly confidential newsletter describing movements detrimental to company interests; a monthly bulletin devoted exclusively to State and Federal legislative matters; and sending sample copies of Human Events, National Review, American Opinion, the Freeman, and other such periodicals to interested parties. The committee also advises its constituents of books it feels are especially pertinent; recommends activities to be carried out within the community by its constituency, and in general serves as an information center for company employees.

This newspaper has examined copies of the McGraw-Edison newsletter and bulletin and we frankly believe they are the finest of their type we have seen. We feel certain that local firms desiring to put this program into effect in our community will find the McGraw-Edison Co. eager to lend a helping hand.

Duluth Befriends British Seaman—Even in Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every once in a while something happens which makes one realize how much genuine goodness there is in this world. All too often these acts of mercy, kindness, and compassion go unnoticed. Fortunately, the editors of the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune did notice an act of friendship and kindness which took place in Duluth, Minn.

I am sure that Duluth is all the better because of the good deeds of some of its citizens. There is nothing which makes a day brighter or a life more meaningful than an act of kindness. Indeed by helping others we help ourselves.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Duluth Befriends British Seaman—Even in Death" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, Aug. 16, 1959]

DULUTH BEFRIENDS BRITISH SEAMAN—EVEN IN DEATH

DULUTH.—"We are only a small dot on a very large-scale map," read the letter from Middleton-on-the-Wolds, Driffield, Yorkshire, England. "To us, Duluth, then, was another dot on a big map of the world. Now we regard it as part of us—with our son, Peter, there among so many friends."

Peter Dixon, 21, was a Britisher, the second son in a family of five who grew up among the rolling hills of Yorkshire. He was determined to go to sea. At home, his mother kept marking the map where his freighter, the *Deerpool*, was due. The last marking on the map will forever be Duluth.

In the warmth of a mid-June day, the young sailor went for a swim in the Duluth-Superior Harbor. He dived in, and never came up. His three companions swam deep, trying to find him. Harbor authorities were called.

For days, the area was dragged. The master of the *Deerpool* delayed his sailing date. Finally, the freighter could wait no longer. Next day, Peter Dixon's body was recovered from Superior Harbor.

That much was a news item, brief, and saddening. But the understanding hearts of Duluth people who never knew Peter Dixon wrote another chapter.

The shipping line's agent in Duluth called the New York office of the company. Soon, from London, came a phone call to Mrs. Dorothy Dixon, the young sailor's mother.

In an hour, Middleton heard that Peter had drowned in some far-away place called Duluth. Only 300 people live in that Yorkshire village. Everyone knew the boy and his family.

The shipping line had offered to fly Peter's body to New York, where the *Deerpool* could then take it home. The Dixons talked into the night about that. Why not give the lad peace?

"Could you please find an Anglican church and have services for our boy there?" Mrs. Dixon asked. "It seems right to us."

The Reverend John Hildebrand, rector of St. Paul's Episcopal church in Duluth, was called. Would he conduct the services at Crawford chapel for this boy? There were no relatives, no friends of the sailor.

"Perhaps some of you would care to attend the services tomorrow," Rector Hildebrand told his congregation the next Sunday. "We hope you will."

Over that weekend, Jim Crawford, at the mortuary, received several phone calls from Great Lakes seamen.

"Are they going to take care of this fellow right?" asked one. "We'll get together and do what we can. We didn't know him, but we figure what it would be like if this happened to us in some foreign port. A guy would need friends."

Next afternoon, Peter Dixon had more than 100 friends.

"If I died right now, I wouldn't have such people," Jim told me. "There were men and women from every section here. Some of the old families were represented. Three British girls who became GI brides were here. Parents of boys who were killed in Britain, or in flying from British bases in World War II came by."

The front of the chapel was banked with flowers from strangers. The mourners heard the words of Mr. Hildebrand. Then the procession of cars moved to Forest Hill Cemetery. Jim Crawford's staffmen were pallbearers.

"Some 75 people came out to the graveside," Crawford remembers. "It was a moving thing. We see many funerals, but this was unique. You'd think all those people had known young Dixon."

With the group was a woman who phoned her florist later that day.

"I want to be sure there will be flowers to mark that boy's grave," she said. "Will you see to it, please? The friendship I've seen today is something that ought to stay

green. Keep a plant, or flowers, on that grave from now on."

The next day, in that tiny Yorkshire village, memorial services were held for Peter Dixon.

"Everybody knows everybody and our little church was packed," Peter Dixon's mother wrote.

Winging across the Atlantic, at that moment, were letters from the strangers who had attended the young sailor's funeral and burial. A packet of pictures, taken by Jean Basgen, Duluth photographer, showed the Dixon family what had happened. Here were the faces of unknown friends, come to give friendship to the boy they never knew.

Every one of those letters is bringing an answer from Mrs. Dixon. To Mr. Hildebrand she wrote:

"My husband and I wish to thank you for writing so quickly and sympathetically. All we ever expected was official information of Peter's burial. Instead we have been overwhelmed with kind letters from you and American and English residents of Duluth. They have helped lighten our load.

"Peter was our second son. We have been very proud of our fine healthy family.

"We always knew before where Peter would travel. I followed his movements from maps."

That distant dot on the very large map, the city at the head of the seaway, is far, far more than that to everyone in Middleton-on-the-Wolds.

It is a wonderful place where understanding people befriend a stranger—even in death.

Hon. John A. Burns, of Hawaii

SPEECH

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I just want to add to the words already spoken in tribute to the statesmanship of the gentleman who has so ably represented Hawaii during his period of service here. I think the tribute which has been paid already is one that could be echoed many times over on this floor, without disagreement by anyone.

I would like to add one word of personal appreciation of JOHN BURNS, not so much as a statesman or legislator, but as a man. In service with him on the committee and in friendly visits outside the committee room I have been deeply and profoundly impressed by the qualities of the man, by his breadth of vision, by his simple and kindly humility, and humanity, by his gentleness and sweetness of character and by the very manly way in which he has accepted a tough setback in a truly impressive career and has with very good grace, I think, confronted the situation. JOHN BURNS continues to speak with genuine friendship of the people of Hawaii, as well as of the colleagues he served with here in the House.

I know that what has happened is merely an interruption, and we hope of very brief duration, in a distinguished public career. I hope and trust that the gentleman will once again return to Washington to serve his Nation ably in the future as he has in the past.

Mr. BURNS of Hawaii. I thank the gentleman.

"Howdy, Hawaii"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at 4 p.m. today, Hawaii will join this indissolvable Union of indestructable States. Speaking for the Lone Star State, I would like to extend a warm welcome.

This new State has a long tradition of Democratic self-government and will be a valuable member of the United States, leading our growth in new areas and directions. I was privileged to be a cosponsor of the bill which admitted it to the Union.

In the language of the islands, "Aloha, Hawaii," or, in the language of my State of Texas, "Howdy, Hawaii."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times for Wednesday, August 19, 1959, entitled "Hawaii Will Join the Union Friday," and an article by Elsie Carper from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Wednesday, August 19, 1959, entitled "Ceremony at White House at 4 p.m.—Hawaii Becomes 50th State Friday When President Signs Proclamation."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, August 19, 1959]

HAWAII WILL JOIN THE UNION FRIDAY—PRESIDENT TO PROCLAIM ENTRY OF 50TH STATE AND SHOW DESIGN OF NEW FLAG

WASHINGTON, August 18.—Hawaii will be the Union's 50th State at 4 p.m., Friday.

At that time President Eisenhower will sign the official proclamation. His press secretary, James C. Hagerty, announced today that the President would fly back from his farm in Gettysburg for the ceremony.

Mr. Hagerty said that the President would also disclose on Friday afternoon the design of the new 50-star flag of the United States. It will not be flown officially, however, until next July 4.

The proclamation will clear the way for the new State's two Senators and one Representative to take their seats in Congress. But formalities may delay that step a few days.

Under the rules, no Member can be seated unless he shows a certificate of election. The new State government of Hawaii cannot issue the certificate until it comes into existence formally on Friday.

A cable from the Hawaii government to Congress might serve as a temporary substitute for the certificates, allowing the three new Members to be sworn in Friday. But no one at the Capitol today was sure they would be here by then.

INVITED TO WHITE HOUSE

The Senators elected in Hawaii last month were HIRAM L. FONG, Republican, and OREN L. LONG, Democrat. DANIEL K. INOUYE, a Democrat was elected to the House.

Mr. Hagerty said today that all three would be invited to the White House on Friday.

Hawaii will have its own ceremony at the same hour—10 a.m. Hawaiian time. Presiding there will be William F. Quinn, the Republican who won an upset victory for Governor.

The three Hawaiian Members of Congress will take office just in time to take part in what seems likely to be a sharp battle over civil rights near the end of the session. In both the Senate and the House civil rights advocates are pressing for action before adjournment.

The new Senators from Hawaii, with its mixture of oriental and western racial strains, will unquestionably add a little weight for civil rights legislation and against any southern delaying tactics. This has been one factor in the general southern opposition to Hawaiian statehood in past years.

The lineup in the Senate after the new Members are seated will be 65 Democrats and 35 Republicans. In the House, it will be 283 Democrats, 153 Republicans and 1 vacancy.

Permanent law fixes the number of seats in the House at 435, but the acts admitting Alaska and Hawaii gave them one Representative each beyond that total.

After the next census, unless the law is changed in the meantime, the number of House seats will drop to 435 again and others will have to lose seats to make way for Hawaii and Alaska. Hawaii's population will probably entitle it to two seats.

Alaska was admitted by Presidential proclamation last January 3.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 19, 1959]

CEREMONY AT WHITE HOUSE AT 4 P.M.—HAWAII BECOMES 50TH STATE FRIDAY WHEN PRESIDENT SIGNS PROCLAMATION

(By Elsie Carper)

President Eisenhower formally will proclaim Hawaii the Nation's 50th State in ceremonies at the White House on Friday.

Press Secretary James C. Hagerty said yesterday the President will return to Washington from his farm at Gettysburg to sign the proclamation at 4 p.m.

At the same time he will issue an order designating a new 50-star flag.

Hagerty said the ceremony will be similar to the one held January 3 when the President signed the proclamation admitting Alaska. He helped unfurl a flag with 49 stars at the conclusion of that ceremony.

The new 50-star flag will not become official until next July 4, the 184th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

Officials invited to witness the historic ceremony will include the two Senators and one Representative elected by Hawaii to represent the islands in Congress.

Hawaii sent HIRAM L. FONG, a Republican, and OREN L. LONG, a Democrat, to the Senate, and DAN K. INOUYE, a Democrat, to the House.

They will be able to take their seats after the Governor of the new State is sworn in and certifies their election.

The Eisenhower-appointed Governor, William F. Quinn, a Republican, was elected to retain that office. He will remain in Hawaii and preside at a celebration to be held at 10 a.m. Friday, Hawaiian time, to coincide with the ceremonies at the White House.

Signing of the proclamation on Friday will permit the State legislature to convene in special session a week from Monday, 10 days after Hawaii officially enters the Union.

A commemorative 7-cent airmail stamp also is to be issued on Friday, the Post Office

announced. The stamp, printed in red ink, shows a Hawaiian warrior extending a lei of welcome to the star of statehood.

Tribute to Michael Shimkin, Government Cancer Fighter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is always gratifying when a leading newspaper takes notice of the outstanding work of one of our Government's civil servants.

In a recent issue of the New York Post an article by Barbara Yuncker about Dr. Michael Shimkin tells the story of this remarkable man.

It was my privilege to travel with Dr. Shimkin this past year during our visit to the Scandinavian countries and the Soviet Union. Dr. Shimkin is a highly respected scientist and doctor. His work in the field of cancer research has earned for him a fine reputation. I know Dr. Shimkin not only as an outstanding scientist, but also as a good friend and neighbor. I was delighted to see the article in the New York Post. It tells of Dr. Shimkin's background and of his tremendous contribution to the field of medical research, particularly in the field of cancer.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MICHAEL SHIMKIN, GOVERNMENT CANCER FIGHTER
(By Barbara Yuncker)

"The thing we Americans have got to learn is that the Russians aren't 9 feet tall. But they're not 3 feet tall, either. They're just our size."

That's Michael Boris Shimkin, M.D., cancer specialist, expert on Russia, enthusiast for international medicine, talking about sputnik and about Soviet medicine.

The tart and voluble Dr. Shimkin epitomizes a species of bureaucrat new to our age of science, the specialist little known to the public whose expertese lies behind the official pronouncements.

Shimkin was adviser-interpreter to HUBERT HUMPHREY a few months ago when the Senator proposed an International Health Year to Nikita Khrushchev.

When the Senate Government Operations Subcommittee called recently for a worldwide campaign against cancer, it was the National Cancer Institute's Biometrics Branch, of which Shimkin is chief, that supplied the data. (Biometrics applies the tools of statistics to the problems of biological sciences.)

If the currently stymied bill for international medical research, within the National Institutes of Health, gets pried loose and passes the House (it has Senate approval under the shepherding of Alabama's LISTER HILL), the zeal of public servants like Shimkin will rate a large vote of thanks.

What kind of man is this scientific civil servant? For one thing, he gives the lie-direct to the cliches about Government time-servers and patterned thinkers. His opinions fairly crackle, with no apparent awareness of sacred cows.

On catching up with the Russians, for example: "The trouble is our Government wants instant science. And science to them is hardware, military hardware. They think by pouring out money they'll get results, like pouring hot water on instant coffee. They're just not oriented to human values yet."

On an International Health Year: "It's a great idea, a wonderful thing. But don't be under any illusions. Some nations will oppose it because it is against their leader's self-interest to have a healthy educated people. Not everybody buys our happy doctrine."

On the level of Soviet science: "They're ahead on rockets, generally a bit behind in medicine, perhaps a dozen years. We've made such tremendous strides in financing research." He stresses the word "financing."

On our posture before the world: "We've let the Russians steal our revolution. If we finally lose, that may be why."

On smoking and lung cancer: "They keep saying it hasn't been proved and talking about all those smoking mice which didn't get lung cancer. Well, maybe mice just don't know how to smoke too well; maybe it's the puff that does it. If the mice had got cancer the tobacco industry would have said it only proved mice shouldn't smoke.

"They threw a lipstick off the market because it produced lesions on the backs of mice. Mice don't use lipstick but most of us accept the fact that if it irritates mouse skin, it's an irritant. You can go around the circle both ways."

Shimkin completes this comment with a cross between a chuckle and a snort. He smoked heavily for 25 years, gave it up 5 years ago when the statistical reports started coming in.

Shimkin, a round-faced jovial man of 46, was born in Tomsk, Siberia, and became an adopted California at 11, having spent the intervening years mainly in Java. He has kept his Russian but his once-fluent Dutch got lost in the middle of his efforts to learn English and German. His English is excellent and totally unaccented.

Despite his exotic background and the international ramifications of his professional life, he describes his Chevy Chase, Md., homelife with his schoolteacher wife, Mary, in slick magazine terms.

His hobbies, he says, are "chauffeuring the kids around and mowing the grass. A suburban husband is a yardman with sex privileges."

The "kids" are 19-year-old Peter, a premed student at Brown; Ann, going on 16 and a high school senior, and Philip, 7, a pencil-and-crayon artist whose interest in illustrating has just shifted from cats to the Civil War. His creations decorate his father's office walls in Silver Spring, Md.

Amid Shimkin's concern with particular bits of research (he has nearly 150 published scientific papers in his bibliography), the NCI official pursues two giant goals: the war on cancer and the fight for international understanding.

"I like what I am doing," he says. "Anybody who has any part in fighting cancer has a job as great as landing on the moon.

"But important as cancer may be and as important as landing on the moon may be, the most important thing is how human beings get along with human beings. Mankind can live with cancer—though we hope some day he won't have to—but he can no longer live with international war."

NATO's Specialists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the third in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 8, 1959, and is entitled "NATO's Specialists":

NATO'S SPECIALISTS
(By Edward J. Milne)

VERONA.—Both north and south of the Alps, the U.S. Army in Europe has highly specialized forces ready for action if NATO finds itself in the war-by-miscalculation that is the only kind of war our commanders seem to expect.

GUERILLA WARFARE

Not far from Munich, for example, is the otherwise unidentified headquarters of a tough bunch of paratroopers newly trained in guerilla warfare with the mission of aiding and abetting revolt in the satellites. The guerillas are part of the U.S. 7th Army, the Nation's major contribution to NATO land forces. Headquartered at Heidelberg, the 7th claims to keep 50 percent of its men combat-ready in 30 minutes, 35 percent ready in 2 hours, and only 15 percent on leave or on pass.

Again, this ancient northern Italian city is the headquarters of the U.S. Army in Europe's Southern European Task Force. A short helicopter hop away across the hilly vineyards that lie between the Alps and the Po, the Army's first oversea missile command, the task force's fighting arm, is in readiness at Vicenza to give atomic fire support to the Italian Army. It has formed the U.S. Army's first "sky cavalary" and has just completed, in June, the training of two Italian battalions in the use of Honest John rockets that also can carry atomic warheads.

ITALIAN MISSILEMEN

Col. Melville B. Coburn, boss of the missile command, tells the story of the creation of the Italian units. It goes back, he says, to 1954, when U.S. military advisory groups throughout the NATO area and the Pentagon in Washington were studying the possibilities of the forces of other nations taking over some of the Americans' commitments.

Political questions had to be answered first. Would the U.S. State Department agree? Would the Italian Government agree? It was not until the summer of 1958 that all agreements had been reached, for the Italians had to wrestle with tooth-and-nail opposition from the Communists to a United States-Italian collaboration in the atomic weapons field.

Once the agreements were reached, Colonel Coburn says, "the Italians did a magnificent job." They "practically drained their artillery of men who could get security clearance and do the mathematics. They finally assembled a training cadre, some of whose men had learned their English in prison camp in the last war."

The training began in January of this year, was completed in June, and the Italian units

are now "operational in the Italian Army," with "probable" commitment to NATO if war comes.

MATTER OF MOTIVES

With the formation of the Italian battalions, the 1st U.S. Army Missile Command lost its own two Honest John battalions. The United States controls the atomic warheads, the Italians now having only the conventional ones.

Maj. Gen. John P. Daley, commander of the task force, is a little impatient with questions about the Italians' fighting qualities. He has studied Italian military history, he says, and he points out that before the Italians broke at Caporetto in World War I they "fought 12 great battles and lost a million men." That they later reformed on the Piave was "almost a miracle," he says, and goes on:

"I've served with French, Dutch, Korean, British, and others. I'm convinced that men will fight as long as they have something to fight for. In World War II, the Italians weren't fighting for anything. I don't think their hearts were in it. Now they have got something to fight for. And every time they turn out another Fiat they've got something to fight for."

The Honest John rocket, with a range of 15 miles, is a modern fire support weapon described as "amazingly accurate within a few hundred yards." Retained by the 1st U.S. Army Missile Command are two battalions of Corporal guided missiles. Colonel Coburn says it would be a waste of time to train the Italians in the use of those more sophisticated 75-mile-range weapons.

In the first place, it has taxed the Italian resources of skilled manpower to form the Honest John units. In the second, and more important place, the Corporal, he says, "is obsolercent if not obsolete. The Corporal is like a woman driver. It either goes all out or slams to a dead stop. It will either be right back on the target or 100 miles off in the wrong direction. It was formerly called the WAC Corporal."

Colonel Coburn would like to have his battalions armed with the newer, lighter, more accurate, and less expensive Sergeant missiles of the same range, but General Daley says that the arrival of the Sergeant on the Italian front "if not in the dim future, is not tomorrow, either." He says this would be "a lovely place," too, for Pershing 500-mile missiles but knows of no plans to place them here.

Besides its Corporal units and their security forces—one U.S. infantry company and one company of crack Italian Alpini troops—the 1st U.S. Army Missile Command has a company of engineers and its unique sky cavalry company. Budget cuts have recently whittled down both outfits.

DEMOLITION EXPERTS

The engineers are trained in atomic demolition. Their wartime job, with Italian acquiescence, would be to blow up mountain pass invasion routes.

The sky cavalry is a target-finding unit equipped with planes, helicopters, radar, and other modern means of telling the rocket and missile groups what to shoot at, and where. Teams of 6 to 12 men can be flown in low behind enemy lines by helicopter or dropped by parachute, to radio back target information.

Are not these men expendable?

"We hope to recover them," Colonel Coburn says, "either by helicopter or by having them work their way back across the mountains. They're good, and they're tough. In training, they've worked their way back past screens of Italian police and Italian troops, and they've all got back undetected after many days in the cold."

There are many other examples of cooperation between U.S. and Italian forces here. But General Daley observes:

"I am completely conscious that we could have the best military command in the world and still be worthless if we did not get along with the Italian people. I think we are accepted and generally well liked. We certainly work at the job. We try to be part of their community family and help them all we can. The headquarters company here has in effect adopted an orphanage. Our worst headache is automobile accidents. If you kill somebody in one, you've lost friends."

SYMBOL OF POWER

Colonel Coburn has a complimentary observation about the presence here of the Southern European Task Force.

"Hardly a day goes by," he says, "that SETAF doesn't appear in the Italian papers. There is hardly a person north of Rome that doesn't hold SETAF symbolic of U.S. atomic power and Italian national security. The 6th Fleet's planes may have 100 times the atomic power of our missiles and rockets, but up here they don't see the 6th Fleet." The 6th roves the Mediterranean.

If the time comes, he says, when it seems advisable to put U.S. intermediate range ballistic missiles into Italy, the Italians will have their answer to protesting Communists.

"They will say," he says, "that SETAF already has atomic missiles, so why the fuss? It makes no practical difference whether those missiles are 75 miles or 1,500 miles."

A good deal of what one hears at task force headquarters sounds as if the preparation is all for a bigger, fiercer version of the ground campaigns of World Wars I and II. Colonel Coburn promptly concedes it.

"None of this is applicable," he says, "to all-out nuclear war. But life would be academic then, anyway."

GOP Pressures for Punitive Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal said in the press and on the House floor regarding alleged improper lobbying by representatives of labor. That there has been such lobbying there can be no question. Yesterday's letter by Mr. James B. Carey of the AFL–CIO has been greeted everywhere by loud and indignant shouts of outrage.

But there is another side to this coin. Mr. Speaker, I want to describe, not in my own words, but in the words of the chairman of the Republican National Committee, some of the highly improper pressures that were brought by the administration and the Republican Party to defeat fair and effective legislation and insure the adoption of punitive legislation in its place.

It is not my desire to make unfounded allegations. I am merely going to place in the RECORD a newspaper interview with the chairman of the GOP National Committee. Chairman Morton's disarming frankness about administration manipulation has the undimmed virtue of complete frankness. At least there should be no doubt left about the type of lobbying which resulted in the vote of August 13.

The article is from the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, August 15. It reads as follows:

MORTON SUGGESTS FEDERAL INSTALLATION CLEARINGHOUSE

Senator THRUSTON B. MORTON, chairman of the Republican National Committee, sees a need in the Eisenhower administration for a clearinghouse to review proposed closing of Federal installations.

He said yesterday the party is trying to "get a setup, I don't know whether it will be in the White House, or not, where if any installation has to be closed they will let somebody with political savvy look at it."

"If the action can just as well wait until after an election, let us do that," he proposed.

But MORTON urgently felt the need for such a clearinghouse Thursday. He said he was trying to persuade two Members of the House, both from labor districts, to support the administration's labor bill. One declined flatly, claiming it would be "political suicide." The other reluctantly agreed.

Before the day was over, MORTON related, an announcement was made that a Federal installation would be closed in the district of the Member who was supporting the bill and that a new installation would be opened in the other Member's district.

"We got to that one just in time and got it straightened out," he added.

National Farm Safety Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under approval granted by the House I am including a timely statement delivered by Mr. Maynard Coe, director of farm safety, National Safety Council, at a meeting of this organization held in Washington in July. Mr. Coe is a director of education for the prevention of accidents on the farms of our country. He is an authority on this subject matter. Mr. Coe is known for his leadership in the farm safety movement. His contribution to the cause of the prevention of accidents is immeasurable. His statement follows:

Education in the principles of accident prevention for agricultural leaders and through them for the 20 million farm residents is the essence of the work of the farm division of the National Safety Council. Farm safety is the responsibility of all agricultural agencies and leaders. The job to be done is so enormous that no organization, no matter how large, can do the job by itself. However, with all agencies and leaders that influence farm life, working together in behalf of accident prevention real results can and are being accomplished.

Many agricultural organizations and agencies are cooperating. Each organization attacks problems or makes contributions it is best equipped to make, while the council provides the machinery for cooperation and coordination. Thus, the farm division collects information from statistical bureaus on one hand and distributes it to engineers and educational agencies on the other. The farm division enlists the support of farm-equip-

ment manufacturers in providing educational films and materials and in turn distributes such films and materials to other agencies and organizations. The farm division seeks out successful activities and disseminates information on the methods employed.

Cooperators in farm safety includes the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and other farmers' organizations, the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, the farm-equipment industry, the 4–H Clubs, the Future Farmers of America, State agricultural colleges, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, many commercial organizations closely related to agriculture, and other groups who desire to have a part in this important program that is basic to the welfare of agriculture.

There are more than 500,000 4–H clubs in America, 10,000 FFA chapters, more than 300,000 farm women's groups are organized throughout the United States. There are 200,000 rural schools and there are approximately 75,000 other rural organizations. To facilitate the cooperation of al these groups the farm division of the National Safety Council assists in the formation of State and local farm safety committees. Thus far 43 States have established State farm safety committees, and in Kansas, Minnesota, Ohio, and a few other States, reductions in accidents have occurred annually since the formation of these committees. Thus the pattern for making definite reductions in accidents is being established.

The farm division recognizes that an adequate farm safety program must include the development of safety techniques for the major jobs in farming. Farm equipment manufacturers are doing splendid work in safeguarding farm equipment. As practical methods are developed additional safeguards will be adopted and the farm division will assist in the stimulation of farm people to make maximum use of all safety devices and equipment. Demonstrations and exhibits are required also and the farm division assists in the preparation of such exhibits and other materials.

A bimonthly publication, the Farm Safety Review, is published to inform and aid agricultural leaders. Special publications such as program manuals and discussion outlines are produced, fortnightly releases to agricultural colleges and others are provided, regular news releases to newspapers, feature articles for magazines, and periodic mailings of radio material are prepared and distributed by the farm division.

National Farm Safety Week (July 20–26) is a publicity springboard which mobilized to an unusual degree the public educational facilities of the Nation in behalf of farm safety.

The farm division recognizes that farming is a family proposition and that it is imperative therefore that all members of the farm family be made safety conscious. This includes recognition of the danger spots around the farm, what constitutes major hazards, what are the dangerous practices in the handling of machinery and livestock, how children can be safeguarded, what are the risks in the use of electricity, efficiency in fire prevention, up-to-date knowledge of first aid, and a host of other items. The farm division maintains intensive efforts with Federal, State, and local extenson organizations and individuals and with vocational agricultural and home economic schools as well as with the 4–H Clubs and farm women's groups. It promotes farm safety contests for youth groups, for farm publications, for radio stations to stimulate more and better work against accidents. It provides awards and recognitions for those doing the best job.

The farm division is constantly adding to the materials that are available. These are not only instructional, but includes also inspirational materials to assist in the carrying out of farm safety programs by organizations and others.

Cooperation is extended toward the farm safety specialists who are leaders of farm safety in their respective States. Assistance to agricultural colleges also constitutes an important phase of the work of the farm division. Other work includes the setting up of more unified plans for safety in various agricultural contests, the development and stimulation of research in farm safety, adequate testing and proving grounds for safety devices.

The farm division is alert to the ever present need of expanding the program to include needs as they develop, thus giving leadership and coordination to the entire movement. Through its leadership the farm safety movement is making its contribution to the permanent progress and welfare of agriculture.

Discussion of Dangers to Mankind of Biological and Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a press release issued today, relating to an exceedingly important conference of scientists at Pugwash, Nova Scotia. The release reads as follows:

PUGWASH, NOVA SCOTIA, August 21, 1959.—Twenty-five of the world's leading scientists will gather in this simple seaside community next week to discuss the dangers to mankind of biological and chemical warfare. Sponsor of this nongovernmental meeting, the fifth in a series initiated in 1957, will again be Pugwash-born American industrialist, Cyrus Eaton. The four earlier scientific session, which were concerned with the perils of nuclear war, have been credited with laying the groundwork for last summer's first official Geneva understandings.

The Pugwash Conference of International Scientists on Biological and Chemical Warfare, as the new private meeting is designated, runs from August 24 to 30 and includes participants from both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. Represented will be approximately 60 percent of the world's population.

Purpose of the latest conference, as planned by the Pugwash continuing committee under the chairmanship of Lord Bertrand Russell, is to "examine the potentialities of biological and chemical warfare, both as weapons of mass destruction and as factors in increasing international tensions through the possibility of smaller countries producing such weapons."

Members of the committee, in addition to Nobel Laureate Russell, include top scientific minds from the United States of America, United Kingdom, and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, prominently identified with such noted institutions as Great Britain's Cambridge University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Johns Hopkins University, University of Illinois, and the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

Topics to be discussed by the Pugwash participants range from use of communicable diseases as biological warfare to theoretical possibilities of disease agents produced through guided mutations, and potentialities of chemical weapons such as internal and external visicants, incendiary substances, and physiological poisons.

Conferees will meet in the paradoxically ultra modern new Pugwash District High School, while being housed in Eaton's centuries' old family home, now familiarly known as Thinkers Lodge, as well as in comfortable ancient neighboring homes of the quiet community's leading citizens. The Pugwash population of 500 will be increased at least 10 percent by members of the conference and associates.

Pugwash's original scientific meeting took place in July 1957 at the combined instance of Eaton and Lord Russell, the renowned British mathematician and philosopher. The two started laying plans for such a conference with the late world famous physicist, Albert Einstein, shortly before his death. Subsequent symposia have been held under the Pugwash name at Lac Beauport, Quebec, and in Austria. In turning from nuclear perils to the threat of biological and chemical warfare, Lord Russell's continuing committee stated, "Some scientists believe the destructive potentialities of biological and chemical warfare are now even greater than those of nuclear warfare. Others disagree. Whatever the true position, an authoritative statement on this subject is certainly of the utmost importance particularly in view of the tight secrecy which it is surrounded by the governments concerned. Biological warfare, even if not so dangerous as nuclear warfare, could be of great nuisance value in wars between small nations. In the present state of the world, this might easily lead to global conflict."

The statement points out that "the Pugwash movement deals with all consequences of science that may affect the fate of man. It is quite possible that the potentialities of biological warfare may radically after the conditions necessary for the establishment of stable peace."

Mr. President, we shall be watching for the observations made and the conclusions reached by these 25 scientists on this general subject, which is of such vital importance to the future welfare of mankind—namely, biological and chemical warfare and what we can do to bring reason to bear, before it is too late, by bringing to an end the danger that any such war would ever be started.

Mr. President, I ask that the release which I have read and these remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mediterranean Patrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the fourth in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 10, 1959, and is entitled "Mediterranean Patrol":

MEDITERRANEAN PATROL

(By Edward J. Milne)

ABOARD U.S.S. "INTREPID."—Give a map of Europe a quarter turn clockwise and the continent's peninsula character becomes

strikingly plain—along, in the Navy's opinion, with the necessity of controlling the waters around it.

A big part of the job of controlling the Mediterranean's 2,000-mile sea flank of Europe has been assigned to the U.S. 6th Fleet. A big part of the 6th Fleet's job is done by its Attack Carrier Striking Force, consisting of 2 large carriers, 2 to 3 cruisers, and 20 destroyers.

One of the carriers at present is U.S.S. *Intrepid*, which—according to one's point of view—is either a miracle of modern sea warfare or a beat-up old tub.

At any rate, she's a gallant veteran of the Pacific in World War II, when she took both torpedo and kamikaze hits. She went into mothballs in 1946, came out in 1954 fitted with steam catapults to allow her to launch the ever bigger and heavier planes; 2 years later, she was fitted with an angled deck to increase her plane recovery capacity. Now she can launch and take back all but the biggest of the Navy's retaliatory strike atomic bombers, and some of those she does handle can carry any weapon we have.

Her air group today varies all the way from the fighter bombers, jet and prop, to all-weather supersonic fighters firing guns or missiles to helicopters for sea rescue duty that can pull a ditched pilot out of the water and put him on deck in 5 minutes.

While it ceaselessly prowls the Mediterrean, the 6th Fleet is based on the east coast of the United States—Newport, Norfolk, and so on. It has no major dependence on southern European ports, although its ships constantly visit them on good-will missions, because it is supplied by the oilers, refrigerator ships, and other supply vessels of its own service force.

Depending on whether her planes are nuclear-loaded or conventionally armed, the 6th is ready for all-out war, if that is what comes, or brush-fire war. The fleet has received an estimate from the British, old tenants of the Mediterranean, that from 750 to 1,000 merchant ships a day, not counting countless fishermen, ply the Mediterranean. Every one of these shows a return on radar, and that, the Navy thinks, would give the Russians one devil of a job trying to identify the 6th's widely dispersed units.

"The memory of Pearl Harbor," says the 6th Fleet, "is still with us," and that, plus training needs, is the reason the fleet is constantly churning the Mediterranean's blue waters at 600 to 700 miles a day and its carriers' planes are so much aloft. On June 29, for example, *Intrepid* shot 61 planes into the skies in day and night exercises, setting a new monthly record of 1,504 sorties and bringing the total of sorties since conversion to angled deck to 35,891.

Officers of *Intrepid* and the 6th Fleet have been briefing newspapermen on the missions, capabilities, and problems of the fleet. The missions are plain enough and agreed upon—to join the U.S. Strategic Air Command and United States and other NATO tactical air units in Europe if the Supreme Allied Commander Europe calls for a counterstrike against hundreds of Russian targets; to wage conventional warfare in support of national policy; i.e., handle localized outbreaks; and bolster the confidence of Turkey, Greece, and Italy, the alliance's southern anchor.

But capabilities and problems are something else again.

There's the problem, being fought at higher levels in Washington, of new carriers for the Navy.

"Why do we need new carriers?" one briefing officer asked. "Because the majority we have now are of World War II vintage. Their hulls are fast approaching the point of overage. Maintenance costs are approaching operating costs. In addition, as aircraft increase in speed and size, we need larger launching and recovery areas. The Russians don't use second-line aircraft, and we can't afford to."

Intrepid's engineering officer, a hard-bitten, zealous and obviously sincere commander, said 60 percent of the equipment below decks should be replaced or renewed. *Intrepid* will be going into the yards soon, he said, but a lot of what needs doing to her won't be done because of shortage of both money and skilled personnel.

"I am convinced," he said, "that a Navy board will find the ship is in no fit condition to go to war. It's true of 95 percent of our ships. Should the showdown come today, I wonder if we could count on all our carriers."

Briefed, in turn, on this briefing, neither *Intrepid's* skipper, Capt. Paul Masterton, nor Vice Adm. Clarence E. Ekstrom, commander of the 6th Fleet, endorsed it enthusiastically. Said Captain Masterton:

"I am sorry he made that remark. He is not competent to comment on the fleet or even on the combat capabilities of this ship. The record shows that we have made all our commitments."

Admiral Ekstrom responded in more general terms.

"It is true," he said, "that we have lost ground in modernizing the fleet in the last few years. Korea was an extra charge, and because of it most of the destroyers, of World War II vintage, suffered maintenancewise. But we are in good shape and ready to go.

"We would like to have new and better ships, radar, sonar, and so on. But it cannot all be done at once. The French air force in 1935–36 was the most modern in the world, but they had committed so much to it that by the time World War II started it was reaching obsolescence."

Besides ships, a Navy has sailors, and here there are problems, too. Cmdr. Malcolm W. Cagle, *Intrepid's* Washingtonwise executive officer, undoubtedly knows that the Navy has a little publication, "Facts About the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean," which lists, among others, the fact that "Duty with the 6th Fleet is widely regarded as the best in the seagoing Navy."

"Our enlistment rate," Commander Cagle said frankly, "is not good. We have only 13 re-enlistments on board." (*Intrepid* has a ship's company of almost 3,000.) "These kids can't take it, and you can't blame them. When we go to sea, they sometimes have to go for days without baths. They sleep in those old-fashioned tiered bunks. The heat down there is intense. There's almost no place for them to sit down to have a game of cards."

Yet, there are things that make him proud of his boys. The Navy indoctrinates them with the idea that they are their country's ambassadors in port and urges them to behave themselves ashore. They seem to be doing so.

So far this year, Commander Cagle said, 30,302 sailors have been ashore in Mediterranean ports, and there have been only 19 shore patrol reports—"and 15 of the 19 were for fights at the fleet landing. The kids work like animals and live like animals, and we expect them to go ashore and behave like Little Lord Fauntleroys."

But life aboard is no bed of roses, either, for *Intrepid's* officers. Sixteen- and 18-hour days, even longer, are common. There are times when Captain Masterton, no youngster any longer, is lucky to be able to nap 10 minutes at a stretch in any 24-hour period.

And, at fleet level, Admiral Ekstrom would be a lot easier in mind if he had his hunter-killer task force aboard at all times. Part of the Atlantic fleet, the hunter-killer force, consisting of a carrier, specialized air, and destroyers, is the 6th's antisubmarine screen. Russian submarines and manned aircraft are deemed the greatest threat to the 6th Fleet's striking forces.

"If things got warm it would take the hunter-killer group 7 to 8 days to get here from the east coast," Admiral Ekstrom's staff says. "We feel much better when it's here."

Progress in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, few nations have had to struggle against such odds as has the Republic of Korea. Since its formation in 1948 that country has faced staggering economic problems, a bitter war, and the continued threat of annihilation from enemies to the north.

When one considers the great burdens borne by the Republic of Korea, it is a wonder that it has been able to survive. But the amazing fact is that the Republic has not only survived, but it has been making significant progress.

In the August 3 issue of Newsweek the noted foreign policy analyst, Ernest K. Lindley, reports on the encouraging developments taking place in that country and on the strength and spirit of its people. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article entitled "Korean Comeback" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I have spoken out on certain actions in the Republic of Korea which were not compatible with a free society. Evidence of strong-arm tactics by the majority party cannot be excused or ignored.

Yet despite such shortcomings, we must remember that the Republic of Korea has attempted to work within the framework of the 1948 Constitution, which is patterned in large measure after our own form of government. It maintains a popularly elected assembly, its President and Vice President are elected by the people each 4 years, and its judiciary is an independent branch of the Government.

The Republic of Korea strongly favors unification of Korea. It cherishes the hope that some day the whole of Korea will be united under a republican form of government. This is a hope which is shared by the people of all the free nations of the world. Communist-controlled North Korea stands as a threat to the freedom and independence of the Republic of Korea. It stands also as a symbol of the ruthless aggression and terrorist methods of the Communists.

The Korean comeback, as reported by Ernest K. Lindley, involves much more than the struggle for achievement of the brave people of this tiny country; it involves also the worldwide struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc. The Republic of Korea is in the front line trenches, both literally and figuratively speaking, in this common struggle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Aug. 3, 1959]

KOREAN COMEBACK

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

SEOUL.—If all free Asians were as sturdy as the Koreans, the Communist offensive would be at a dead end. Not only naked force, but intimidation, beguilement, economic penetration, diplomatic trickery—all the devices in the arsenal of Red expansionism—would be obviously futile.

Almost every able-bodied ROK youth does 3 years of military service, for less than cigarette money. The truce line is defended by 18 ROK divisions and 2 American (containing many Koreans), half on the front, half in reserve. Behind this line, the Republic of Korea has risen from the debris of war and is making significant economic gains. Most of the damage to Seoul has been repaired. Industrial production has risen 70 percent in 4 years. Farm output has risen much less but has enjoyed two successive good crops. Per capita income is estimated at roughly U.S.$100, medium for free Asia. The standard of living is probably well above North Korea's, although the latter, with more resources and fewer people, is making industrial gains.

Since mid-1957, inflation has been substantially checked. Bank deposits have soared. So have tax revenues—they are nine time what they were in 1953, when the truce was signed. Good progress appears to have been made in curbing corruption and misuse of American goods. Lt. Gen. Song Yo Chan, ROK Army Chief of Staff, has cracked down hard on thefts of military supplies. Pressure toward petty corruption was relieved last October by doubling Government salaries, both military and civilian.

GOOD MANAGEMENT

As long as it has a heavy military burden, the Republic of Korea must have large-scale aid. However, a ROK soldier costs only one-tenth as much to maintain as an American. In administering our general aid two special devices are used to good effect. One is the Combined (American-Korean) Economic Board, which allots funds and verifies their end use. The other is the aid control law, with prison penalties for misuse of aid money. Relations between key Koreans and Americans, both civilian and military, are excellent. "We are like brothers," one Korean minister said to me. Men such as Song In Sang, Minister of Finance, and Kim Chong Yol, Minister of Defense, are highly esteemed by our representatives.

The apparently everlasting President Syngman Rhee (now 84) remains impatient to unite his country, by force if necessary—although he knows the United States will not permit the ROK to take any military initiative. He also remains implacably hostile to Japan. Japan has been sticky in its dealings with Korea and blundered in proposing to send to North Korea some of the Koreans now in Japan. But Rhee's unwillingness to forget the old Japanese tyranny impedes a rapprochement that would serve the interests of both nations.

BETTER PLANNING

Internally, there is discontent with Rhee and his Liberal Party, and this is probably augmented by their tendency to use strong-arm tactics on their opponents. Next in line to Rhee as Vice President is a member of the opposing Democratic Party, John M. Chang, who lives in semiseculsion because of attempts on his life. Rhee's own chances of winning the national election next year are rated better than his party's, if the choice is completely free. Democrats complain of all sorts of discrimination, including press curbs. They favor unification of Korea by peaceful means only and differ with the Liberals on certain constitutional questions. But they seem to be no less friendly to the United States.

Korea still has unemployment and underemployment. It needs a well-coordinated economic program and more money for education. Our 1-year-at-a-time system of dishing out aid handicaps orderly development. A 5-year commitment would help Korea more and probably save money for us. Experienced Americans say that Koreans, given a chance, learn new skills as quickly as the Japanese.

These are an intrepid people. Their severe war losses, in life and property, appear to have stiffened their spirit even more. They have both the will to fight if necessary and the ability, with our aid, to make their country a telling frontline illustration of the superiority of the free way of life.

Thors for Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the fifth in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 14, 1959, and is entitled "Thors for Britain":

THORS FOR BRITAIN

(By Edward J. Milne)

LONDON.—Come all-out war, a United States-British team could blast back at Russia today with atomic ballistic missiles.

Both U.S. Air Force Strategic Bomber Command and British Royal Air Force Bomber Command spokesmen say that on an emergency basis the Thor intermediate range ballistic missile, American-made and British-operated, is ready to be "fired in anger" if need be.

Four widely dispersed bases from East Anglia north almost to Scotland are nearing completion as Thor launching sites, and the British are expected to announce within a week or two just when they will be fully operational. In the meantime, SAC says its training role should be completed, and the British ready to take over lock, stock, and barrel, by next spring. The United States will retain control of the warheads.

Thor is not an intercontinental missile in the commonly accepted sense, in America, of a 5,000-mile vehicle. But it becomes intercontinental, for all practical U.S. purposes, when shot from these islands.

President Eisenhower and Harold Macmillan, the British Prime Minister, agreed in March 1957 that until Britain could produce her own, U.S.-built ballistic missiles should be stationed here in the heart of the second most formidable NATO power. The British, overcoming strong antinuclear feeling, have pressed ahead with the job of base construction and missile squadron training.

The Thor-for-Britain program is probably unique in world political and military history. For the first time the United States has supplied a friendly power with a major weapon before putting it to work in its own Armed Forces. For the first time, too, the United States is sharing operational control, and that at an eventual minimum, with another power.

"Mr. Thor" in England, is Maj. Gen. W. H. Blanchard, SAC's 7th Air Division Commander and principal American adviser to the RAF on the missile program.

Scattered over the four Thor bases, he says, are 20 dispersed launching sites with three of the big "birds" on each.

"So we are completely dispersed," he says. "One bird on each location would be the optimum dispersal. But there never was any weapon system in the free world as completely dispersed. If you put in 60 more birds there wouldn't be much of England left."

Since ground was broken for the Thor program last year, construction of two of the four bases has been completed. In one of the two, the missiles have been installed and checked out; in the other, the installation and checkout phase is about to be completed. In both of these, RAF crews got their individual technical training in the States and are now completing their training as crews here in England.

To speed the process, while the third and fourth squadrons' base construction is being completed and the installation and checkout phase is underway, all individual and crew training is being given in the States so that the squadrons will be ready to take over operationally as soon as construction and installation are complete.

There is no room in these tight little islands for test firings of the Thor, and the first two RAF squadrons will be back in the States for that job in a few weeks. The two others will not be far behind.

If the British made a big political decision to go ahead with the Thor program, the Americans made a tremendous financial and physical effort to carry it out. Dollar figures are not available, but they can be sensed from a mere mention of SAC's Ballistic Missile European Task Organization: a force of 1,000 people, military and civilian, moving up and down the English countryside in trailers, managing construction and supervising installation. The British met the cost of the launching pads and accessory construction.

The Thor is roughly in the 1,500-mile range class. The British are working on their own IRBM, the Blue Streak, which will have a greater range than Thor—"2,000 miles would be a serious underestimate," they say—and could be fired from underground. They regard Thor as an addition to, not a substitute for, their retaliatory bombing planes. They offer no date on when their own Blue Streak may become operational, but when it does, they expect it to replace, not supplement, some of their manned aircraft.

Duncan Sandys, the British Minister of Defense, and other military people here agree with the American estimate that in the next 12 months, "provided we maintain the unity and strength of NATO," there is "no likelihood of war at all."

But in any event, he says, "not at any time since the end of the war has the partnership of Britain and the United States in the military field been more intimate and effective than it is today."

General Blanchard has been in the atomic game since before the first bomb was dropped over Hiroshima. He says that by "scrambling everything we have," meaning RAF, USAF, and technical representatives of the American manufacturers of Thor, Feltwell, the most advanced of the four bases in the English lowlands, has had the capacity since last December 31 to fire Thors should they have been needed as part of the first wave of all-out retaliation. Today, he says, there is "reasonable emergency capability in any of these locations," although the operation would "not be as fast and smooth as later on."

Each of the 4 Thor bases carries 15 of the missiles, and these in turn are scattered,

3 to a site, among the main base and satellite bases. Seventh Air Division training forces are fast disappearing from the scene at Feltwell, as they will be doing soon at the three other bases, and when the British are ready to take over, only skeleton U.S. crews will remain to maintain the warheads.

These, under U.S. law, must remain in U.S. Air Force custody until the President releases them. General Blanchard says no one knows just when he might do so. In a period of acute tension, when all the political signs pointed to the possibility of a major Russian thrust, he might do so well in advance of actual attack alerts, General Blanchard says—2 or 3 days, perhaps, or a week.

But even then, U.S. control would be complete up to the moment of decision to fire. The "two key" system makes this possible. The British have the key that starts the 15-minute countdown for launching a Thor. But sometime within the first 12 minutes of the countdown, a U.S. "authentication officer" would have to turn the second key or there would be no lift.

This two-key system is the ultimate satisfaction of American atomic energy law requiring U.S. control over its nuclear weapons. In a nation with an atomic capability of its own, such as Great Britain has, the arrangement has suffered some unpopularity politically.

But as a practical military matter, RAF Bomber Command people treat it lightly. They can hardly conceive of a situation in which the British would want to unleash a nuclear counterattack and the Americans would not, or vice versa.

In any event, what is important to them, however, is the mere existence of these sleek, powerful birds roosting in eastern England. For the British, like the Americans, believe that the more symbols the West displays of instant and overwhelming retaliatory power, the less likely are the Russians to risk challenging it.

A Legislature for American Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, students from 390 member schools of the United States National Student Association will meet from August 24 to September 3 at the University of Illinois. Their National Student Congress will mark the 12th anniversary of the United States National Student Association; the congress will also be a clear-cut demonstration of student responsiveness to challenges.

The congress, called the Nation's most significant student meeting, will offer workshops on issues ranging from "International Awareness on the Campus" to "Higher Education and the Federal Government." The students will try to predict "The Goals and Directions of Higher Education." Their legislative committees will examine issues which show the wide range of United States National Student Association interests: First, The Student and the Educational Process; second, Human Rights and Academic Freedom; third, Student Self-Government; fourth, The Campus and the Greater Community; fifth, International Student Relations.

The association president Robert R. Kiley, of the University of Notre Dame, put the purposes of the Congress succinctly in his letter of greetings to delegates: "By acting as a legislature for American students on all United States National Student Association campuses, congress delegates also have constructed a basis for the development of national programs of lasting importance, while functioning as the only unified voice for the American student community."

Mr. President, the voice of our students is an important one, particularly at a time when we are asking our educators whether we can meet the challenge of future competition with nations that do not educate as we educate, that do not permit the freedom of thought which we permit.

An answer to those who ask that question is provided in part by this Congress and by the activities of the USNSA within the past year.

In the 12 months since the last National Student Congress the USNSA has completed these programs:

Campus consultations. USNSA staff members have traveled to over 150 member and nonmember campuses, providing local student leaders with help in evaluating their own performances and in improving their liaison with their counterparts in other areas of the country.

Completion of the first year of the student responsibility project, a major innovation in educational programing financed by a $25,000 Ford Foundation grant, and involving experimental programs on 15 pilot campuses and in 2 pilot regions. The responsibility project stressed three areas: student responsibility in college teacher recruitment, student responsibility in counseling and tutoring, and better utilization of existing educational resources.

A series of four summary publications are now in preparation.

A southwide student conference on human relations, which brought together 150 southern student leaders from November 28 through 30 at Pfeiffer College in Meisenheimer, N.C. A result of suggestions from the area's student leaders, the meeting was designed as an open conference stressing discussion and solution of problems.

A student editors' conference on international news coverage, cosponsored with the Overseas Press Club of America. Approximately 120 student editors and 60 club members met at the club headquarters in New York City on March 13, 14, and 15.

The association has recognized the importance of understanding among nations. Among their 1958–59 international programs were these:

Participation in the International Student Conference, held in February in Lima, Peru. As a member of the International Student Conference, USNSA was one of 66 national unions of students represented.

A long-term academic exchange agreement negotiated by representatives of USNSA and the Polish National Union of Students. Two American students now are enrolled in Polish universities under the terms of this exchange, with one Polish student attending the University of Michigan and one more scheduled to arrive in September.

Contributions for academic scholarships for 12 Algerian refugee student leaders have been secured, with the program now in operation.

USNSA's foreign student leadership project entered its fourth year of operation, with special scholarships provided for 16 foreign student leaders from underdeveloped areas. The students spent a full academic year on selected American campuses with reduced study loads, in order to study the structures and operation of American campus organizations.

The seventh International Student Relations Seminar. Fifteen outstanding student leaders have been selected from member school applicants for an intensive 9-week seminar in international student relations, now in progress at USNSA's international commission office in Cambridge, Mass.

The students elected as officers for the 1958–59 year are individuals who apparently have a deep awareness of individual responsibility. These officers are:

Robert R. Kiley, 23, president. He served as student government vice president in 1957–58, after graduating with honors from the University of Notre Dame where he was named outstanding student.

Diane Hatch, 20, executive vice president, will be a senior at Brigham Young University in 1959–60. At Brigham Young, she was a student government officer for 3 years while taking a premedical course. She also served as chairman of USNSA's Utah region for 1 year.

Willard Johnson, 23, international affairs vice president. He served as 1957–58 educational affairs vice president, the position he won at the 10th National Student Congress after serving as UCLA's student body president.

Reginald H. Green, 23, educational affairs vice president, is a former Whitman College newspaper editor and is now a graduate student on leave from Harvard University.

Fred Werner, 22, student government vice president, is a graduate of Trinity College where he was campus newspaper editor.

James J. Harrington, 20, student affairs vice president, graduated in June 1959 from St. John's University in Brooklyn, where he was student body president.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD messages of encouragement received at the August 1958 congress from government and leaders. To give further indication of the importance of this confederation of student government of colleges, I ask, too, for unanimous consent to have printed the names of member schools and members of the National Advisory Council of the U.S. National Student Association.

There being no objection, the messages and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGES RECEIVED IN AUGUST 1958

Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States:

"To all attending the 11th National Student Congress, I send greetings. The young men and women now studying in American colleges and universities are sharing in a great democratic heritage. With renewed dedication to the principles of free inquiry and the discipline of truth, I am confident that your deliberations will add to both the vitality and the stature of American higher education.

"Best wishes for a memorable congress."

RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States:

"It is a pleasure to extend greetings to the delegates and guests attending the 11th National Student Congress.

"During this past academic year the attention of the Nation has been fixed as never before on the subject of education not only in the public schools but also in our colleges and universities. More than ever we realize that education determines our social, cultural, moral, and economic progress and may even decide whether this land shall remain free.

"The National Student Association and its members have willingly entered into efforts to improve the quality of our schools and colleges and have also carried the story of the importance of education throughout the land. By its serious purpose and dedication to the ideals of democracy, it has served a real function in our society.

"With every good wish for a most successful convention."

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Senator, Texas:

"Texas is proud of the part her students have played in the founding and continued growth of the National Student Congress. Believing that an educated citizenry is the only true safeguard of a democracy, I have coauthorized the National Education Act of 1958. Having implicit confidence in the youth of America I extend my warmest congratulations to the congress and urge you to push your leadership of American college students to the end that our people will be the most enlightened in the world. Give to student bodies a tone of nobility and dedication to the great challenge which encompasses us on every side. God be with you."

Robert B. Meyner, Governor, New Jersey:

"My best wishes to the officers and delegates of the U.S. National Student Association on the occasion of your 11th congress. Discussion about our schools cannot be carried on as if education is unrelated to the kind of society we have created on this continent and which we want to cherish and improve. In the worldwide conflict which we have come to describe as the cold war, the moral amor of a people dedicated to freedom, individual liberty and self-government, may in the long run prove to be the most important strength in our national arsenal.

"Our reach sometimes exceeds our grasp. Too often, perhaps, we fail to measure up to the best that is in us. Nevertheless, as a people, we do stretch out our hands to raise our practice to our precept. We believe everyone deserves an equal chance. Furthermore, we believe that people deserve more than one chance. A single failure is never final. Our concern is with the person on whom we place the ultimate value. We encourage truth to compete with error in the market place of debate and discussion, confident that a free people enlightened by education can tell the difference between the real and the counterfeit, between good and evil. The record of American students acting through USNSA over the past decade indicates that our faith has not been misplaced.

"May your discussions and resolutions of this next week be fruitful to yourselves and your colleges and instructive to us, your fellow citizens."

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Wallace M. Alston, president, Agnes Scott College.

Ralph J. Bunche, Under Secretary, United Nations.

John Ciardi, poetry editor, Saturday Review.

John Cogley, staff administrator, the Fund for the Republic.

Christine Y. Conaway, dean of women, Ohio State University.

James M. Debbs, president, Southern Regional Council, Inc.

Rev. T. M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president, University of Notre Dame.

Russell Kirk, editor, Modern Age.

Robert H. Shaffer, dean of students, Indiana University.

George N. Shuster, president, Hunter College.

Harold E. Stassen.

Howard E. Wilson, dean of the School of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.

O. Meredith Wilson, president, University of Oregon.

NATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. Charles W. McCracken, dean of student personnel services, Trenton State College.

Mr. Paul McMinn, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Phil Berry.

Mr. Philip H. DesMarais, executive vice president, St. Mary's Dominican College.

Prof. Warren Ashby, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

Dr. Gordon Klopf, visiting professor of education, Columbia University.

Mr. James Lewis, vice president, University of Michigan.

Carl M. Grip, dean of men, Temple University.

Kathryn L. Hopwood, dean of students, Hunter College.

Dr. Charles Gadaire, dean of students, American International College.

Three hundred and ninety colleges and universities, with a total enrollment exceeding 1,300,000 students, constitute the U.S. National Student Association.

UNITED STATES NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP, AUGUST 1959

California-Nevada-Hawaii: Immaculate Heart College; Los Angeles State College; Mount St. Mary's College; University of California, Berkeley; University of California, Los Angeles; University of Hawaii; University of Southern California; Whittier College; Church College of Hawaii; Chaminade College.

Carolinas-Virginia: Atlantic Christian College; Averett Junior College; Belmont-Abbey College; Bennett College; Bridgewater College; Claflin College; Clemson Agricultural College; Columbia College; Converse College; Davidson College; Duke University, Women's Student Government, Men's Student Government; Fayetteville State Teachers College; Furman University; Greensboro College; Hampton Institute; Hollins College; Lenoir Rhyne College; Lynchburg College; Mary Baldwin College; Mary Washington College; North Carolina College; North Carolina College of Agriculture and Engineering; Queen's College; Randolph-Macon Women's College; Flora McDonald College; South Carolina State College; Salem College; Sweet Briar College; University of North Carolina; University of South Carolina; Winthrop College; Wofford College; Women's College, University of North Carolina; Limestone College.

Great Northwest: Cascade College; Central Washington College of Education; Eastern Washington College of Education; Maryhurst College; Reed College; University of Alaska; University of Portland; University of Washington; Washington State College.

Great Southeast: Agnes Scott College; Barry College; Clark College; Morehouse College; Morris-Brown College; Savannah State College; Shorter College; Spring Hill College; University of Miami; Florida A. & M.

Great Southwest: Arkansas A.M. & N.; Arkansas A&M; Dillard University; Houston-Tillotson College; Oklahoma City University; Our Lady of the Lake College; Phillips University; Southern University; Southwest Texas State Teachers College; Southwestern University; St. Mary's of the Dominican; University of Oklahoma; University of Texas; Xavier University; Wayland Baptist College.

Illinois-Wisconsin: Illinois State Normal College; Augustana College; Barat College of the Sacred Heart; George Williams College; Lakeland College; Milwaukee-Downer College; Mt. Mary College; Mundelein College; National College of Education; North Park College; Northwestern University; Rockford College; Roosevelt University; Rosary College; Southern Illinois University; University of Chicago; University of Illinois; University of Wisconsin-Madison; University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee; Wright College; Shimer College.

Iowa-Nebraska: Briar Cliff College; Central College; Iowa State College; Simpson College; State University of Iowa; University of Dubuque; Wartburg College; Nebraska Wesleyan College; Westmar College.

Kentucky-Tennessee: Berea College; Bellarmine College; Carson-Newman College; Centre College of Kentucky; Fisk University; George Peabody College; Georgetown College; Kentucky State College; King College; LeMoyne College; Maryville College; Nazareth College; Siena College; Southwestern at Memphis; Transylvania College; University of Louisville; Vanderbilt University; Pikeville College; Tennessee Wesleyan College.

Mason Dixon: Catholic University of America; College of Notre Dame of Maryland; Coppin State Teachers College; Dumbarton College of the Holy Cross; Howard University; Maryland State Teachers College, Frostburg; Maryland State Teachers College, Towson; Morgan State Teachers College; Trinity College; University of Baltimore; Washington College; Wesley College.

Metropolitan New York: Brooklyn College; Barnard College; CCNY, Baruch Day; CCNY, Baruch Evening; CCNY, Main Day; CCNY, Main Evening; College of New Rochelle; Columbia College, Columbia University; Fordham School of Education; Good Counsel College; Hunter College, Bronx; Hunter College, Park Avenue; Long Island University, C. W. Post; Manhattan College; Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart; Marymount College, New York City; Marymount College, Tarrytown; New York University (Heights); Notre Dame College of Staten Island; Queens versity, Long Island; St. John's University, Long Island; St. John's University College; St. Joseph's College; Sarah Lawrence College; Yeshiva College; Long Island University, Brooklyn; Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn.

Michigan: Kalamazoo College; Bay City Junior College; Central Michigan College; Flint Junior College; Ferris Institute; Hope College; Marygrove College; Mercy College; Michigan State University; Michigan College of Mining and Technology; University of Michigan; Wayne State University; Alma College.

Minnesota-Dakotas: Augsburg College; Bethel College and Seminary; Carleton Col-

lege; College of St. Benedict; College of St. Catherine; College of St. Teresa; College of St. Thomas; Concordia College; Dickinson State Teachers College; Gustavus Adolphus College; Hamline University; Huron College; Hibbing Junior College; Macalester College; North Dakota Agricultural College; Southern State Teachers College; St. John's University; St. Mary's College; University of Minnesota, Duluth; University of Minnesota, Minneapolis; Yankton College.

Missouri-Kansas: Bethany College; Central Missouri State College; Cottey College; College of Emporia; Harris Teachers College; Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg; Lincoln University; Marymount College; Maryville College; Mount St. Scholastica College; St. Benedict's College; University of Kansas; University of Kansas City; University of Missouri; Webster College; William Jewell College.

New England: Albertus Magnus College; American International College; Amherst College; Babson Institute of Business & Administration; Bennington College; Bradford Junior College; Brandeis University; Colby College; Colby Junior College; College of Our Lady of the Elms; Dartmouth College; Eastern Nazarene College; Northeastern University, Boston; Bates College; Emmanuel College; Fisher Junior College; Garland Junior College; Harvard-Radcliffe Graduate Council; Hillyer College; Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mitchell College; Mount Holyoke College; Mount St. Mary's College; Newton College of the Sacred Heart; Pembroke College; Quinnipac College-Radcliffe College; St. Joseph's College; Regis; Simmons College; Skidmore College; Smith College; Springfield College; State Teachers College, Framingham; State Teachers College, Bridgewater; State Teachers College, Castleton; State Teachers College, Keene; State Teachers College, Salem; State Teachers College, Westfield; Trinity College; University of Bridgeport; University of Maine; University of Rhode Island; Wellesley College; Wheaton College; Wheelock College; Worcester Junior College; Yale College; University of New Hampshire.

New Jersey: College of St. Elizabeth; Douglass University; Drew University; Fairleigh-Dickinson College; Jersey City Junior College; Jersey City State College; Monmouth College; Rutgers University; Rutgers Graduate Council; Rutgers South Jersey; Montclair State College; Trenton State College; Seton Hall University; St. Peter's College; Newark State College; Upsala College; Newark College of Engineering.

New York State: Alfred Agricultural & Technical Institute (of State University); Alfred University; Bard College; Canisius College; Clarkson Institute; College of St. Rose; Cornell University; D'Youville College; Erie County Technical Institute; Harpur College; Hartwick College; LeMoyne College; Niagara University; Oneonta State Teachers College; Orange County Community College; Rochester Institute of Technology; Rosary Hill College; State Teachers College, Buffalo; State Teachers College, Cortland; State Teachers College, Fredonia; State Teachers College, New Paltz; State Teachers College, Plattsburgh; State Teachers College, Potsdam; Union College; University of Buffalo; University of Rochester; University of Rochester, School of Nursing; Vassar College; Ithaca College.

Ohio-Indiana: Antioch College; Ashland College; College of Wooster; Defiance College; Denison University; DePauw University; Penn College; Penn College, evening session; Indiana University; John Carrol University; Muskinggum College; Oberlin College; Ohio State University; Otterbein College; St. Mary's College; Taylor University; University of Notre Dame; Ursuline College; Western College for Women; Wilberforce University; Wilmington College; Youngstown University.

Pennsylvania-West Virginia: Alderson-Broaddus College; Allegheny College; Alliance College; Beaver College; Bethany College; Bryn Mawr College; Cedar Crest College; Chatham College; Chestnut Hill College; Dickinson College; Drexel Institute of Technology; Gannon College; Grove City College; Hershey Junior College; Immaculata College; Juniata College; Lincoln University; Lycoming College; Mercyhurst Colledge; Mount Mercy College; Philadelphia Textile Institute; Rosemont College; St. Francis College; Seton Hill College; Sheppard College; Swarthmore College; Temple University; University of Pennsylvania, Woman's Student Government; West Virginia University; West Virginia Wesleyan College; Villa Maria College; Harcum Junior College; Waynesburg College; St. Joseph's College; Moravian College; Muhlenberg College.

Rocky Mountain: Colorado State College (of Education); Colorado Women's College; Loretto Heights College; Regis College; University of Colorado; University of New Mexico.

Utah: Brigham Young University; College of Southern Utah (of Utah State University); University of Utah; Utah State University; Weber College.

Un-American Attempt To Intimidate the Congress of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, much has been written and said during the last few weeks about labor reform legislation, especially the Landrum-Griffin bill. I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, and postcards on this subject from all parts of the Nation. None of these contained a threatening tenor, except for the form letter I received this morning from James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers. His threatening communication is a reflection on the citizens of the United States and an un-American attempt to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD my reply to Mr. Carey:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 21, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: I have received your form letter of August 18 endeavoring to intimidate me because of my favorable vote on August 13, 1959, in support of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which also was supported by President Eisenhower as well as by 303 of my colleagues out of the total membership of 436 in the House of Representatives.

It is interesting to note that you have described this legislation as "a punitive and repressive measure." This phrase characterizes the tenor of your letter. In my judgment your action constitutes a grave and intemperate misuse of the money of the rank-and-file of labor union members. By your ill-considered threat you are exposing the labor boss practice of the denial of the basic rights and democratic processes of your union members. A threat from you is no more terrifying to me than would be a threat from Mr. Hoffa, although I believe even he would be inclined to use better judgment than you have demonstrated.

By your act you have caused me to realize more than ever that I was correct in voting for the Landrum-Griffin bill. I am sure my voting record has proven to my constituency that I am interested in individual rights and democracy more than in the concentration of power in the hands of big business, regardless of whether that big business be the management boss or the labor boss.

The people of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan will not yield to the unthinking dudgeon of any labor leader when they are exercising the right to mark their ballot in secret for the candidates of their choice. Similarly, I would not, and did not, yield to any pressures from the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, as you allege, when I cast my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

I have always supported legislation that would protect the rights of labor union members and would rid the unions of the practices of corruption, breach of trust, gangsterism, violence, and abuses of power. The political hoodlumism that you imply will be brought to bear against me does not dismay me, and I am sure it will not be persuasive with the thinking people of my congressional district.

In order that my constituency may be aware of your activities I am sending a copy of your letter and my reply to all individuals on my mailing list. I respect the intelligence of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and know that they too will realize more than ever the real need for the enactment of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Yours truly,

VICTOR A. KNOX,
Member of Congress.

United States Loses, Other Nations Win With Export Credit Guarantees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, a number of Members have expressed concern about declines in U.S. export trade. I have been particularly interested in the recent decline in U.S. trade with Asian countries. During 1958, U.S. exports to the Far East and south Asia dropped 24 percent below the previous year—imports dropped 4 percent. We have grown so accustomed to having export surpluses it is unusual, to say the least, to see our exports and imports approaching a balance. In context, this recent decline follows an increase in exports to Asia of some 25 percent between the end of the Korean war and 1957. To some extent, the decline in exports to Asia since 1957 may be attributed to the cutback in the volume of aid goods to such recipients as South Korea, Formosa, and South Vietnam. Another more recent factor is the increased energy with which other countries are developing Asian markets.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose today to discuss the many complex factors affecting U.S. trade with Asia. I would, however, like to invite the attention of the Senate to one aspect of the competition. A number of west coast exporters have expressed concern over the fact that foreign competitors are able to make the sale, often for the reason that the competitor is able to offer more attractive credit, both in terms of interest rates and period of repayment. He can offer these attractive terms of credit for the sole reason that many foreign governments guarantee or insure a wide variety of export risks, including export credit. The U.S. investment guarantee program covers some risks. The Development Loan Fund provides reasonable interest rates and terms of payment for transactions through the Fund. The Export-Import Bank satisfies the needs of still another type of transaction. There is a large gap, however, placing many American exporters at a disadvantage. In this connection, I call attention to an editorial in the July 31 edition of Business International. The editorial describes in some detail this disadvantage to American exporters. I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LOSES, OTHERS WIN WITH EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES

Are foreign competitors offering more attractive terms to oversea buyers than U.S. manufacturers are able to offer? This is not a new question. But the continuing deficit in U.S. international payments (suffered every year since 1950, except 1957) and the recent, serious drain on U.S. gold reserves make it imperative for the answer to be found now—and a course of action agreed upon.

It is oversimplification to assert that the United States is pricing itself out of world markets. In many cases, in terms of quality, design, performance, appearance, and service, this is just not so. But there is a great deal of evidence that oversea buyers are swayed by foreign competitive credit terms which the U.S. manufacturer cannot match. In many cases the buyer must have credit—or not buy at all. In some countries the government will grant foreign exchange only if the foreign seller offers credit.

Many foreign governments provide export credit insurance policies against a wide variety of both business and political risks. They include the risks of inconvertibility, insolvency, protracted default, promotional losses suffered by the exporter, preshipment losses (if political events prevent shipment, for example), catastrophe and other risks. These guarantees generally apply both to consumer goods and capital goods—and to short-term as well as long-term credits. And they make possible the lending of money by private banks.

Private banks provide most of the export credit for U.S. manufacturers, although normally this is done with recourse to the U.S. supplier. But obviously U.S. banks cannot match the terms offered by foreign banks which enjoy government-backed guarantees. While the Export-Import Bank actually lends money for export credit without recourse to the supplier, its loans (except for cotton) are confined to capital goods. Credits to individual U.S. manufacturers are not offered by Eximbank to countries in balance-of-payments difficulties.

EXIM HELP OF LIMITED VALUE

Most of Eximbank's money has been used for developmental loans in countries suffering balance-of-payments troubles—Indonesia, Argentina, Brazil and India, for example. And these developmental loans have been enormously helpful to U.S. capital goods manufacturers who otherwise would not be able to sell to these countries. But this does not mean that any U.S. capital goods manufacturer can get export credit to accommodate a customer in Indonesia. Far from it. It merely means that those U.S. manufacturers making certain specified goods for the special project in Indonesia which the Eximbank is financing may compete for the order, and if successful, get the credit. All others are frozen out.

The Export-Import Bank has been holding conversations with private banks about offering limited guarantees against political risks in certain countries. But no program has yet been announced that would enable U.S. manufacturers to meet foreign competition on even terms.

Some bankers and manufacturers argue that the whole idea is unsound—that such guarantees underwrite financial mismanagement by foreign governments, or, more brutally, that they finance the balance-of-payments deficits of other countries. In response, proponents of export guarantees argue that no one can foresee the future, and that it could just as easily be said that life insurance companies underwrite unhealthy living.

Whatever one's philosophy in this matter, the grim fact is that foreign manufacturers (including U.S. firms with plants overseas) and their private bankers are protected against more risks, in more countries, and on more goods than are U.S. manufacturers. Here is a summary of export credit facilities and insurance schemes now operated by six foreign governments.

The United Kingdom's Export Credit Guarantee Department (ECGD) of the British Board of Trade offers the world's most complete coverage of capital and consumer goods against all risks except loss from exchange fluctuation. Coverage is for up to 85 percent of loss when due to insolvency or protracted default and up to 95 percent in all other cases. Terms are up to 3 years for consumer goods, 5 for capital goods, and 7 for aircraft. As a further aid, the ECGD offers exporters to the dollar area the opportunity to recoup a portion of their expenditures for market research and promotion in those countries.

The Japanese Government is giving considerable encouragement to exporters, both through credits and insurance from the Japanese Eximbank and by granting tax relief up to 80 percent on export earnings from new markets or in lagging industries. The bank's insurance agency will guarantee up to 80 percent on all losses (including exchange fluctuations) for both capital and consumer goods, and it will also cover any promotional loss suffered by an independent export drive anywhere. Premiums range from 0.48 to 1 percent. Unlike Britain's ECGD, Japan's Eximbank also provides direct export credit, at rates of 4.5–6.5 percent. Additional export incentives include preferential Government treatment of exporters' requests for information, licenses, etc., and permission to exporters to retain 3 percent of their foreign exchange earnings.

In France and territories of the French Community, the semipublic French Export Insurance Company (COFACE) provides coverage (usually 80 percent) against all risks for up to 6 months on consumer goods, 5 years on capital goods. Premiums range from 0.4 percent upward. In addition, COFACE will cover 50 percent of promotional losses incurred by an exporter expanding or seeking new oversea markets. The French Government also usually exempts exporters when special credit restrictions are introduced, permits accelerated depreciation rates, and allows retention of foreign exchange (12 percent of sales to the dollar area, 8 percent for other exports. Special exporter cards are issued by the Government to companies which export 20 percent or more of their production. Card holders receive privileged treatment by Government agencies and are allowed to retain an extra 3 percent of foreign earnings.

West German Government guarantees are given through Hermes Kreditversicherung, and sureties covering sales to foreign governments are given through a special agency. Both groups cover all risks except default and, with few exceptions, exchange loss. Guarantee extends to 80 percent for political risk (which may soon be hiked to 95 percent for special cases), 70 to 75 percent on other risks. Preshipment coverage is available for capital goods. Insurance premiums average about 1 percent for both capital and consumer goods. Other public banks purchase exporters' bills and provide long-term (8-year) financing. In addition, the Government grants turnover tax rebates ranging from a minimum 0.5 to maximum 3 percent.

In Belgium, L'Office National Ducroire, a Government bank, offers risk coverage up to 90 percent for consumer and capital goods produced in Belgium or the Congo. Insurance against political risks costs from 2 to 10 percent and other risks from 3 to 5 percent. The Banque Nationale de Belgique also offers special visas to exporters enabling them to receive favorable discount rates from private banks to finance export operations.

In Italy, the National Insurance Institute (INA) guarantees or insures credits to exporters of capital equipment and some high-value consumer goods against political disturbances, catastrophe, cancellation, and transfer risks, but not default unless the debtor is a foreign government. Insurance coverage runs for up to 5 years on amounts not exceeding 85 percent of value. Rates vary from 0.2 to 2.5 percent. Although more limited than those of the UK, Germany, and France, the Italian export credit insurance system is developing. The ceiling on guarantees granted by INA was just raised from $160 to $240 million. A bill now before the Parliament would extend coverage to all Italian exports. The Central Institute for Medium-Term Credit (Mediocredito) grants 4- to 5-year credit, covering up to 63.75 percent of the export value for a rate of 3 percent. In addition, the Foreign Affairs Ministry provides special export services to spur export of capital goods. The Government also waives turnover taxes on many exports.

Miss Elizabeth Allen Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted by the House, I am including herewith a statement by Charles X. Hutchinson, Jr., president, National Temperance and Prohibition Council, concerning the career of Elizabeth A. Smart, who passed from this life on August 16 in Washington, D.C.:

The notable career of Elizabeth Allen Smart came to a quiet end on August 16 at the Washington Sanitarium. The victim of cancer, she had battled for almost a year to win her fight with the disease. Im-

mediately following the 1958 convention of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union held in Washington, she entered the hospital with no idea of her precarious condition. She lingered between life and death for several weeks, and with great courage and infinite patience won her way back to partial health. Returning to her apartment, she took up her work with surprising energy in spite of her apparent weakness. After a period of weeks, she recognized that her condition was deteriorating, and made her plans to return to the hospital. She did not go until Bishop Hammaker had gone to his summer home and Mrs. Hutchinson and I had sailed for Europe. She did not want to give us any uneasiness. We found a beautiful bouquet from her in our stateroom when we boarded the *Queen Elizabeth*, and did not know that she had reentered the hospital on that very day. On our return, there was only time for a few precious conversations with her at her bedside. Her strength was gone and she spoke in a whisper. She awaited in faith her blessed release.

Elizabeth Smart was the daughter of the parsonage. Her father, the Reverend John Gardiner Smart, was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Schoharie, N.Y., when she was born. She attended Smith College, graduated cum laude, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. She decided to enter the law and matriculated in the New York University Law School. She was admitted to the New York State bar in 1915 and was a practicing attorney in that State. Her special interest at that time was "business law" which was the title of a book of which she was coauthor. She became interested in journalism as the medium through which public opinion is shaped and motivated and launched a career as editor and publisher, and later owner, of the oldest weekly in New York State, the Washington County Post, of Cambridge, N.Y. In law and in journalism her concern was the direction in which our society was drifting, and she supported every movement for moral and social betterment. It was during that period that the conviction crystallized that beverage alcohol was at the root of most of our social ills, and from that time Elizabeth Smart's name became synonymous with temperance reform.

In 1940, Elizabeth Smart came to Capitol Hill as the director of legislation for the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Her legal and journalistic background had prepared her for her public relations task as she made her approaches to the Members of the Congress in behalf of pending moral and social, particularly temperance, legislation. She looked upon herself as the voice of the thousands of women in her organization. She had a sense of "calling" that few, if any, lobbyists have ever had. Her penetrating mind and judicious temper won the respect and confidence of congressional leaders. She was far removed from the doctrinaire reformer. She had an understanding of the difficulties of the legislative process in a democracy. She used her power of persuasion in urging the Members of Congress to move in the direction she was convinced we had to go for the sake of the moral health of the Nation. She kept her constituents informed as to what was happening in Congress through her Washington Letter in every issue of the Union Signal, the national journal of the W.C.T.U. She never wearied. She was always patient. She took her defeats in her stride as temporary setbacks. She lived and died in the faith that her cause would ultimately triumph because it is right.

Elizabeth Smart was related to many organizations including the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Bar Association, the National League of American Pen Women, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Her most active interest was given to the National Temperance and Prohibition Council which includes 23 organizations working in the field of temperance reform. She was the secretary for many years, and was chairman of the legislative committee at the time of her passing. She has been the key person in the organization for so long that her death is almost an irreparable loss.

Above all, Elizabeth Smart was a good woman. No finer or truer thing could be said. During the years we worked together, my regard for a gallant lady grew, and my affection deepened. For she was great as a person. We shall miss her sadly, but we shall carry on in her faith that—

"Though the wrong seem oft so strong,
God is the Ruler yet."

U.S. Guides at Moscow Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUART SYMINGTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, some of our most able representatives abroad now are the 75 guides at the Moscow Fair.

These young men and women are engaged in hand to hand combat in the war of ideas. They symbolize our way of life to hundreds of thousands of Russians who, until now, have been deprived of personal contact with Americans.

I am proud that one of these guides is from my home State, John D. Levan, Jr., of Springfield, Mo.

In two recent articles, the New York Times reported on the fine work being done by these young Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles from the New York Times be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The constructive work these young people are doing is but another argument in favor of the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy which would train thousands of people in language skills and other knowledge so essential for those who would act as effective American ambassadors of peace.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. GUIDES STAR AT MOSCOW FAIR—RUSSIANS FIND TALK IS MORE REWARDING THAN EXHIBITS

(By Max Frankel)

Moscow, August 14.—The full burden of describing, explaining, defending and selling the United States and its ways at the American National Exhibition here has fallen on the shoulders of 75 young guides.

Chosen carefully from 19 States and the District of Columbia for their knowledge of Russian and familiarity with the American scene, the guides have needed both—and their wits—more than anyone had foreseen. Less than halfway through the show, most are weary but unbowed.

The guides, 27 of whom are women, were to have been adjuncts of the exhibition, to translate for exhibitors and to provide answers to questions not covered on hundreds of explanatory placards.

But in fact the young Americans with large red, white, and blue buttons bearing the word "GID" have become the show.

When they can, they make use of the millions of dollars' worth of props around them, or direct visitors to written explanations. But they are never quite successful in diverting attention from their extensive, often good-humored, and endless talk about how Americans live, work, play and think.

"A hundred times a day I ask the crowds whether they didn't really want to move on, to see other exhibits," says Alexander Kucherov of Washington, D.C., who normally works at the paperback book rack. "Invariably the answer is, 'No, we want to talk to Americans.' And who can deny such a request?"

Richard Leed, of Lititz, Pa., and Titiana Akhonin, of Washington try to explain the features of a model house but end up discussing social security and the cost of groceries with pressing knots of Russians.

Mrs. Natasha Carlton, of 749 West End Avenue, New York, stands behind a freezer and before rows of canned goods in a section of supermarket. She is discussing overseas bases and the chances of war.

Curtis Kamman, of Tucson, Ariz., stands in the living room of a model apartment, microphone in hand, with 500 Russians looking in from two floors. He is explaining why there are so few Negro millionaires in the United States.

On the edge of a large turntable bearing a Thunderbird car stands George Feifer of 175 Claremont Avenue, New York, also with microphone, before 300 persons. He gets five questions about his family budget for every one about the car's horsepower.

AN INTERNATIONAL PRINCIPLE

"And if you don't have all that money to buy a Thunderbird?" asks a young Russian into the extended microphone.

"If you don't have the money and don't want to buy on installment, you don't buy," the guide replies. Seeing a few smiles, he adds: "I think this is an international principle."

Now there is widespread laughter, and the guide decides to make a further, unsolicited point:

"I own a Ford, a simple Ford, like the one over there without a crowd around it," he says "And I can buy used cars for half the original cost, and less."

Invariably, the guides have found, when crowds gather and the banter and give-and-take becomes particularly good-natured and informative, there appears from somewhere someone determined to show up the American.

"And do the Negroes in slums own such cars?" the man asks. Or: "Why don't you tell us about the soup lines?"

Normally, the guide tries to answer and to carry on. Usually, the man persists in the same spirit.

"I answered the same question for you 2 hours ago," the guide will say, when pertinent. Or, if really antagonized: "For someone who has never been to the United States and who cannot get our newspapers and magazines, you seem to know much about us."

HECKLERS MEET REBUKES

Often the man comes with five or six friends and then there are not only sharp, aggressive questions but derision and scorn for the answers.

"Why do you persist in asking if you don't believe me?" the guide will remark. And frequently others in the crowd will begin to shout for recognition, openly demanding to hear the American instead of the things they always hear.

"The other day I spoke for 2 hours about everything under the sun," Mrs. Carlton recalled. "When I just couldn't go on without getting hoarse, a few in the crowd who

hadn't budged since I started thanked me and told me to rest. And suddenly, for the first time since we opened, there was a burst of applause. You can't imagine what it meant. It just made everything worthwhile, even the bouts with the hecklers and the terrible mob scenes."

The guides have found that virtually every day brings something unexpected, even though the bulk of the questions from Russians are amazingly repetitious. But there is nothing like the monolithic reaction or response they had expected, nor is the full range or depth of the Russians' curiosity to be foreseen:

"Do you jam foreign radio broadcasts?" "Are Marx and Engels banned or published only with critical annotations?"

"Is abstract art really taken seriously or is it just meant for fun?" "What does that statute mean?"

"Are there many Russians in the United States?" "Are they being detained against their will?"

"What are slums?" "Are they all underground?"

"Is it true you publish 'Anna Karenina' in 12 pages?" "Are all paperback books comics?"

"What is the tallest building in the United States? "Do most Americans live in skyscrapers?"

"What is the purpose of the 'Family of Man' exhibit?"

"Did you not bring heavy machinery because you were afraid we would copy it?"

A QUIZZICAL REACTION

The guides say there is no telling how much of their answers is believed. Most difficult, they find, are explanations of the diversity of opinion, of prices, or products and of ways of doing things in the United States.

They find that most Russians are not starry eyed over the wealth of consumer goods on display. Many a Russian remarks that those things don't count for much.

On the other hand, as Alton S. Donnelly of Berkeley, Calif., explains, "Many are attracted to our ways, but they also seem genuinely afraid of what they have heard about unemployment, high medical bills, and rents."

A good number of the guides are surprised at the freedom with which some Russians have expressed frank opinions, especially when conversing in small groups. They have heard unexpected words of admiration for the exhibition and of grumbling about life here. The guides are surprised, too, by the frequent approaches for private conversations, at their hotels or elsewhere off the grounds.

Thousands of the Russian visitors appear willing to stand and hear the same questions answered over and over again, by guide after guide. Often the guides have the feeling that the words of one are measured against the words of others.

ANSWERS KEPT AD LIB

But the guides deliberately resist standard, rehearsed answers and generally give freely of their own views and experiences. They tell about the lives of their friends and neighbors. Or they say they themselves don't really like abstract art.

Such divergence of view, they say, especially in a foreign country and at a propaganda show is the most effective demonstration of the freedom they are trying to suggest.

No question is too personal for the Russians. Most find out soon after they reach the exhibit that the guides earn $16 a day, and most are impressed with this. They know also that the guides work 6 days a week, from 11 a.m. to 10 p.m. and from 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. on alternate days.

The guides have been given wardrobes—suits, shirts, sweaters, dresses, shoes, and accessories—that enable them to wear different clothes each day, but all dress alike on any given day.

They pay about $3 a day for rooms at a hotel on the outskirts of town and pay for their own food and expenses. As promised, they find the wage covers them, but little more.

A HASTY LOOK AT RUSSIA

The guides range in age from 20 to 35. Most are college and postgraduate students. Many have never before been in the Soviet Union, and they dash in their few free hours to museums and theaters. Some have been to Leningrad for a weekend. Others are planning trips after the exhibition closes September 4.

Whatever they learn on their own, however, they seem to agree that nothing will ever quite match the grueling but rewarding holding forth at the exhibit. And most agree that they have learned two very important things about themselves.

"You learn quickly," one of them remarked, "that when that smile disappears and your sense of humor with it, you are no good to anyone, least of all yourself and your country."

"And, you know," said another, "the average American, until tested under fire, is not really accustomed to articulate America."

RUSSIANS REPEAT QUESTIONS AT FAIR—U.S. GUIDES IN MOSCOW LIST TEN QUERIES PUT TO THEM MOST FREQUENTLY

Moscow, August 14.—Soviet visitors, eager to know more about the United States, have been addressing a great variety of questions to the guides at the American National Exhibition here.

Many of the questions recur frequently. In general terms, following are the 10 questions the guides feel are asked most often and the answers given to these questions:

"Question. What does the average U.S. worker earn?

"Answer. About $90 a week. A family often earns more if there is more than one member working.

"Question. How do your unemployed live?

"Answer. Most guides explain the temporary nature of unemployment, averaging about 3 months. They cite unemployment benefits available in different States. They also try to explain other benefits, varying with union contracts. They stress assistance available in finding work. Sometimes, too, they are called upon to explain why there are periods of relatively high unemployment. They point to the problems of an interdependent but not centrally controlled economy.

LIVING COSTS EXPLAINED

"Question. What do you pay for rent?

"Answer. The guides describe their own living quarters and rents. They generalize by saying most Americans figure they can spend up to one-fourth of their income on rent and another fourth on food. At various displays, the guides also offer explanations of public housing, cooperative housing and private home ownership and mortgage financing.

"Question. What does education cost?

"Answer. The guides explain public and private elementary and secondary schooling available in the United States and describe State and private colleges, varying tuitions, availability of scholarships and jobs for students to supplement their budgets. Most also cite their own experiences.

"Question. Why are Negroes discriminated against?

"Answer. The guides describe the extent of segregation and discrimination and their history in the North and South. They cite progress in various fields and problems remaining, describe antidiscrimination laws of different States, the Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in schools, and the problems of enforcing this ruling and the reluctance of the United States to force social changes violently. Several of the guides are Negroes.

FREE PRESS IS A TOPIC

"Question. Are Americans free to read Soviet publications?

"Answer. The guides explain that Soviet newspapers and magazines can be bought openly in most big cities and that they are available in most university libraries and major public libraries. They also describe English-language publications that carry translations from the Soviet press and the extensive reprints of Soviet speeches and documents in American newspapers.

"Question. Are Americans free to travel out of their country, and is it true they carry no internal passports and need not register with the police when moving into a city?

"Answer. The guides explain the absence of passports and registration except for criminals on parole, the procedure followed for obtaining a passport to travel abroad, the freedom to move from city to city and from job to job.

U.S. BASES QUESTIONED

"Question. Why has the United States surrounded the Soviet Union with bases?

"Answer. The guides say this is a political question, which they are not expected to discuss. However, if pressed, they try to answer briefly by citing fears of Americans that they will be attacked and that they could not effectively retaliate from their own territory.

"Question. How does the average worker live, what vacation does he get, what does he spend for medical care, what pension does he get, and how much tax does he pay?

"Answer. The guides usually relate the life of a family they know to be living within a budget of $5,000 to $6,000. They explain medical insurance plans, social security, union and company benefits, housing, resorts, and other details.

"Question. Where did you learn Russian, what work do you do, how much do you earn, how do you live, do you have a car?

"Answer. There are 75 answers available at the exhibition to these questions, as many as there are guides. All of the answers are honest and they are usually related with humor and a wealth of corroborative detail."

NATO Dig-in Plan Seen as a Gigantic Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the sixth in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Evening Bulletin of July 15, 1959, and is entitled "NATO Dig-In Plan Seen as a Gigantic Job":

NATO DIG-IN PLAN SEEN AS A GIGANTIC JOB

(By Edward J. Milne)

NAPLES.—United States and allied North Atlantic Treaty Organization forces in Europe appear to be digging in for a gigantic holding operation.

A tour of NATO defenses in Germany and Italy leaves the impression that there is

no end in sight to the grim and expensive business of building an atomic retaliatory capacity designed to discourage the Russians from making military inroads to the West.

At Ramstein Air Base in west central Germany, two important air headquarters are centered. One is that of the Fourth Allied Tactical Air Force, a NATO command with French, Canadian and U.S. components. The other is the combat headquarters of the U.S. Air Forces, Europe. For all practical purposes the two are the same, with the same American general in charge.

At the NATO command they say:

"Our aim is an atomic delivery capability which will allow us to deliver the Sunday punch."

At the U.S. command, they say:

"We are SACEUR's private air force."

SACEUR is militarese for Supreme Commander, Europe—once Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower and now U.S. Air Force Gen. Lauris Norstad.

U.S. Maj. Gen. Gabriel P. Disosway is the deputy commander of both USAFE, the U.S. actual operational air force in Europe, and 4ATAF, the NATO force that will go into action if the bell rings.

"Our first and foremost task," he says very simply, "is to execute an atomic strike. SACEUR has placed the highest priority on this."

General Disosway and his superiors on up to General Norstad are not without their problems, including finding new bases in Germany or the United Kingdom if the French rule atomic bombs out of France. But despite the political uncertainties, he says:

"We have a sizable force, entirely atomic-capable, able to deliver a retaliatory strike."

In south central Germany, the U.S. Army, Europe, built around the billion-dollar-a-year 7th Army and its tough armored cavalrymen and even tougher paratroop guerrillas, is headquartered at Heidelberg. While the Air Force cons the skies to the east with radar, the 7th Army's mounted cavalry patrols the East German and Czechoslovakian borders with tanks, jeeps and helicopters.

The 7th Army is equipped, too, with Redstone and Corporal missiles, both atomic-capable, and with what it still thinks of as "the ultimate weapon—the man on the ground," the infantryman.

But it sees no early use for its missiles, its foot soldiers, its guerrillas.

"Soviet strategy," says Maj. Gen. Ralph M. Osborne, its intelligence chief, "has been based on the estimate that Russia would either lose a general war or suffer too much to make such a war worthwhile."

The U.S. Army in Europe, he says, thinks Russia will not attempt even limited hostilities in Europe because the chances the conflict would become general are too great.

The Army's estimate of Soviet short-of-war aims, he says, is this:

1. To force, by threat of military might, Western acceptance of continued division of Germany.

2. To weaken NATO solidarity, likewise by threat of military might.

3. To keep the West back on its heels so that any eventual negotiation of a permanent European security arrangement will be most favorable to Russia.

"We believe," a spokesman says, "that no war in Europe can now be controlled as a limited war. As soon as the Russians who have great numerical superiority, try to overrun our NATO forces on the ground, we'll be in a major war. If they make any kind of move that can be construed as an attack on Europe, it will be by miscalculation. It is our judgment, and we think theirs, that any war in Europe would become an all-out war in which the Russian motherland would be decimated."

A natural enough question from a layman is why, if the Russians fear a war by miscalculation, they don't pull back and make sure it won't happen.

The Army's answer is that if the Russians turn around and walk away they will suffer a loss of prestige that will defeat the political aims enumerated above.

Cross the Alps and come down here into southern Italy, where NATO's main concern is protecting Turkey, Greece, Italy, and the Mediterranean lifeline, and the thinking is much the same.

The NATO boss here is U.S. Adm. C. R. "Cat" Brown, recently commander of the U.S. 6th Fleet. His NATO command consists of ground, air, and sea forces from six countries—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, Greece, and Turkey—whose chief difficulties are linguistic.

This Mediterranean theater is one in which the assumption must be made that any part of it could be hit today by Russian intermediate ballistic missiles. Admiral Brown's people profess not to know whether the Russians have that capacity actually or only theoretically.

But whether by bomber, missile, or land movement, any attack on the Mediterranean flanks of NATO could not be confined to a limited war, Admiral Brown thinks.

"Anything that strikes any NATO country would develop into a general war in a hurry," he says.

"Don't forget, the basic NATO concept is that an attack on one is an attack on all. I don't mean some irresponsible border skirmish. I mean a move to take or subdue territory."

It is Admiral Brown's view that for the Russians to start a war in his sector, just as in Germany, "would be an act of insanity." But here, as along the front to the north, the Allies cannot afford to let down their guard "and invite the Russians to walk in."

A Forward-Looking Community Establishes a Nursing School at Dumas, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most acute personnel shortages in this country today is in the field of trained nurses. They are vitally needed to help maintain the good health of our people.

At Dumas, in Moore County, Tex., a new school has been established to train vocational nurses. This new school, set up at the county-owned Memorial Hospital is another step in the progress of the area's forward-looking citizens. As one writer put it, the hospital itself is "not yet in its teens." Now it is doing something many larger and older hospitals have not done.

Mr. President, as a salute to these civic-minded people and their newest step forward, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from The Moore County News for Sunday, August 16, 1959, entitled "Memorial Hospital Plans To Open Nursing School—Registration To Begin September 1," and an editorial from the same publication entitled "A Do-It-Yourself Plan."

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORIAL HOSPITAL PLANS TO OPEN NURSING SCHOOL—REGISTRATION TO BEGIN SEPTEMBER 1

A state-approved program for training vocational nurse candidates has been established at Memorial Hospital in Dumas, according to its manager, Frank Cheevers.

In making the announcement Cheevers said this is the first year the county-owned hospital has been able to extend its operations into the broad field of vocational nurse training.

A minimum of 1 year study is required in the course, which includes approximately 600 hours of actual classroom (at the hospital) study, completing a well-rounded week of from 40 to 42 hours of combined study and nursing.

Because of limited facilities for training, only 12 or 15 trainees will be accepted in the initial year, Cheevers said. Applicants from this immediate area will be given first consideration, the manager added.

Upon successful completion of the course, and after passing the required examination given by the State Board of Vocational Nursing in Austin, trainees will be issued their LVN license (licensed vocational nurse) by the State.

This program, Cheevers said, should not be confused with other types of nursing now practiced in Dumas and in other towns. Other nurse units at Memorial include those of young nurses' aids, usually high school girls employed in training through the school-State ICT program; and the ranks of the RN (registered nurse) staff, a license held only by those who have completed an extensive 3-year course of study.

Requirements for entrance in the nurse training program include age of between 18 and 50; good health; a high school graduate; and possess such personal traits as may be desired by the screening board. Selection of candidates will be made by a board consisting of two doctors, the director of nursing service, the director of nursing education, and Frank Cheevers, all associated at Memorial.

"The training program is twofold," Cheevers said. "It will give us (Memorial Hospital) an opportunity to train nurses within our own organization, providing adequate personnel for the future from a field of trained nurses in whom we have confidence; and, the new service of actual nurse training will benefit the community and help meet the growing demands for trained nurses all over the country."

Cheevers said the present nurses staff at Memorial consists of 14 full-time RN's, 4 vocational nurses, and 6 nurses aids.

Training under the newly formed program locally will be supervised by current ranking nurse personnel at Memorial.

Trainees will receive slight payment as they take their study. A typical study day during the first 30 days, Cheevers said, will include at least 7 hours in class and lecture sessions. Modified facilities at the hospital will be used for classroom area. During the next 30 days the classroom work will be cut to about 4 hours and more time will be given to nursing duties. After the first 60 days, 2 hours of class study will be given daily, and the remainder of the time will be devoted to practical training.

A tuition fee of $35 per student will be charged applicants. "We estimate that each nurse trainee completing the course will receive a training schedule costing a minimum of $100. With books and uniform fees, she should pay only about $75 for the year of study," Cheevers added.

Applicants may inquire about the new program at Memorial Hospital. Deadline for applying is September 1, and classes will begin on September 8.

A Do-It-Yourself Plan

We congratulate Moore County's Memorial Hospital, and its planning board, for what we think is a progressive step, sparked by vision.

At a time when the declining ranks of qualified, well-trained vocational nurses appear to pose a threat to efficient hospital operations everywhere, those persons directing policy of our hospital decided to do something about it.

Starting in September, Memorial Hospital in Dumas will to several nurse candidates become a virtual back-to-school miniature medical college.

Using only what facilities are presently available at the hospital, and these are adequate, the first class of would-be vocational nurses will be given a thorough, 1-year education in nursing which is a compact, accelerated study course containing more than 600 hours of actual classroom study in addition to practical nursing duties.

The fact is fairly common that Memorial Hospital, not yet in its teens, is one of the State's few in-the-black hospitals which are county owned. This commendable record has been achieved despite a constant program of expansion and construction of new facilities to keep pace with the growing demands of our area.

We think a large amount of credit for this status is due to the efficient management of Frank Cheevers who, having been handed the task of maintaining hospital policy, has executed the planning by the county hospital board.

Because of faith in this community, and because of future needs seen years ago, Moore County now enjoys one of the finest hospital facilities in the Southwest. The beautiful, modern, and well-equipped facilities at Memorial are second in value only to a full staff of the outstanding caliber of registered nurses and doctors which make our hospital the envy of other towns.

Dumas and Moore County are growing. Memorial Hospital has kept the pace and now it has stepped out front by meeting challenges of the future.

It is large enough, and select enough, to train its own licensed vocational nurses. The people of Moore County can be proud of their hospital.

Planes Switch Serious for NATO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the seventh in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal of July 19, 1959, and is entitled "Planes Switch Serious for NATO":

PLANES SWITCH SERIOUS FOR NATO—ACTION DICTATED BY DE GAULLE'S DECISION PRESENTS BOTH MILITARY AND POLITICAL PROBLEMS FOR PLANNING AGENCIES

(By Edward J. Milne)

PARIS.—No attempt is made here to gloss over the serious implications, military and political, of the decision to move 200 American fighter-bombers from bases in France to Britain and West Germany.

U.S. Air Force General Lauris Norstad, the North Atlantic Alliance's Supreme Commander in Europe, made the decision in response to French President Charles de Gaulle's refusal to allow the planes' nuclear bombs to be stockpiled in this country.

It is NATO doctrine that reaction to an all-out attack from the East must be immediate, swift, and, if possible, decisive. The planes involved would be part of the first retaliatory wave. General Norstad felt he could not afford to have the planes separated from their weapons.

Seven of the nine squadrons involved will be shifted to Britain and two to West Germany. That means the front over which they should be dispersed to reduce their vulnerability as targets will be substantially reduced.

In addition, there will be "some loss," the degree not indicated, of offensive effectiveness because the NATO command will have less flexibility in stationing its "sword forces," which are principally the planes and missiles of the U.S. Air Force and the Royal Air Force.

SMALL LIKELIHOOD OF SOLUTION SEEN

Those are both apparent permanent losses—short of some political solution of which no one seems to see an immediate likelihood. There will be, in addition, at least temporary difficulties. Planes, weapons, and personnel will have to be reshuffled on a large scale, with probably some shifting of units between Britain and West Germany as well as from France to those two countries.

Both the British Isles and West Germany are relatively small and densely populated. German Air Force officials told reporters while the move was under consideration at the political level that the difficulty of acquiring new bases is among the chief problems of their fledgling force. The deputy commander of U.S. Air Forces, Europe, said flatly the transfer would mean "an overcrowding of bases" in Germany because "there are no bases in Germany underutilized now."

Base development has been a large problem for U.S. airmen in England, too. British law makes it much more difficult for the government there to acquire land from reluctant farmers, and instances were cited of its taking as much as 18 months to put together land for a 1,000-foot runway extension.

PERSONNEL TRANSFERS WILL TAKE 6 MONTHS

Some 6,000 U.S. officers and airmen and a like number of dependents are involved in the transfers, which are expected to start, substantially, about September 1 and require some 6 months to complete. The move admittedly will be costly, but not to the point of having to ask Congress for more money to foot the bill.

To keep the temporary disruption of combat effectiveness at a minimum, the moves probably will be staged squadron by squadron, so that eight of the nine will be at the ready all of the time.

It is difficult here to get a firm opinion on just why the French have forced this expensive and militarily distasteful move on the biggest and strongest partner in the alliance. A French Air Force general told reporters recently that he would be satisfied if the American nuclear bombs were stockpiled at the French bases under the same terms that American bombs are stockpiled at the British bases.

Under the U.S.-British agreement, the consent of both governments is required before the U.S. planes can be "flown in anger," nuclear bomb-loaded. A similar agreement governs the firing of the 1,500-mile Thor nuclear missiles, 60 of which the United States is supplying to British squadrons now reaching a state of operational readiness.

FRENCH GET OFFER BRITISH ACCEPTED

It has been widely printed that the United States has declined to give President de Gaulle the same veto power over use of the bomb that the British enjoy. But it is flatly said here that such statements are incorrect, that the French received precisely the same offer that the British accepted.

If that is so, it can only be assumed that the de Gaulle government has insisted on the greater U.S. concessions that he has been reported seeking since the almost daily discussions began last January. These appear to include the unrestricted sharing of atomic weapons and secrets with France, against which Congress has balked because it does not want to expand the family of nuclear nations.

The British, of course, have their own nuclear capability. One of their top diplomats suggested a possible key to the French feeling recently when he discussed Great Britain's own case.

The sole reason the British want nuclear strength of their own, he said, is that if there should be any serious deterioration of Anglo-American relations, Russia could dictate at will to a Britain without nuclear arms. By themselves, he acknowledged, the British would not have the strength to deliver a knockout blow at Russia, but they would have at least enough to make the Russians think twice about starting any rough stuff. Even a little nuclear deterrence can go a long way in this age.

FRENCH AIRMAN MAKES HIS POINT

The French airman, who holds an important NATO command, arrived at much the same point, albeit by a somewhat different route.

"You are refusing to us things that are well known to the Russians," he said. "You are refusing to give to your friends what your enemies have. You are our allies, and we trust our allies. But situations can always arise where judgments differ."

He pointed out that the French, unlike the British, made no attempt from 1946 to 1957 to develop nuclear weapons. That was because of a basic decision not to disturb the peace, he said. But the French view now, he said, is that the nation's self-interest demands full great-power status in the nuclear age. Even if there should one day be an East-West agreement on nuclear test suspension, he said, France in its present mood might well go ahead on her own with tests in the Sahara.

It would be a mistake to leave any impression that NATO's military and political problems are regarded as insoluble. There is always the hope, for one thing, that President Eisenhower and President de Gaulle may still work out an agreement for NATO-committed nuclear muscle for France. And while the strength of NATO's "shield forces" in Europe, the ground divisions may leave much to be desired, there is growing satisfaction with the "sword" or strike forces despite the French base problem.

ROLE OF SHIELD FORCE MAY BE PSYCHOLOGICAL

One gets the impression that the importance of the shield forces may well be greater politically or psychologically than militarily. Great stress is placed on showing the world that NATO is a truly defensive alliance, without aggressive intent. That means the ability to display ground forces able to respond to aggression with something less than allout nuclear retaliation—not only an ability but a desire.

But all the way up the line to the military peak at NATO is the repeatedly stated belief that no limited war is really possible in the hot area of Europe. NATO military leaders are determined to use all the weapons available to them in any mission of defense that calls for them, whether the other side uses them first or not.

This determination would be applied with equal force in a serious situation involving West Berlin. There is a feeling here that there are extremely dangerous possibilities in the Berlin situation. There is profound

hope, with the Big Four foreign ministers' conference now resumed at Geneva, that the diplomats can find some formula for a peaceful solution.

Twice, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have asserted their responsibility for the welfare and security of the people of West Berlin, and twice NATO has associated itself with the tri-partite declarations. Any attack on West Berlin is to be regarded as an attack on the Western Powers' occupation forces there, and any attack on the Western forces is to be regarded as an attack on NATO.

And it goes almost without saying that the response to such an attack would not be, because it could not successfully be, on the ground.

Proposed Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Gainesville Daily Sun of August 16, which deals with proposed labor legislation.

I think this is a fair and perceptive, although brief, analysis of the proposed labor legislation and I know it is thoroughly representative of the thinking of the people of Florida with respect to the need for labor legislation.

This editorial was written by Mr. William M. Pepper III, one of the State's most vigorous, articulate, and sensible editors. I commend it to the attention of all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPES HIGH FOR GOOD LABOR LAW

Passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill by the House of Representatives is a sign that the pendulum which has swung so wide and handsome in favor of labor union excesses is about to be checked. For the first time in many a Congress, the guiles of the powerful labor union lobbies backed up by threats of political extinction from the union bosses failed to check strong and realistic legislation in the labor relations area.

Popular sentiment for such legislation was at a peak as our own Congressman D. R. (Billy) MATTHEWS, in the forefront of Landrum-Griffin proponents, will testify. Cards, letters, telegrams, and communications poured in to Congressmen from tens of thousands of citizens sick and fed up with corruption, racketeering, denial of individual rights, secondary boycotts, blackmail picketing, and other high-handed abuses. The response of the House last week was a tremendous endorsement of the wisdom of our democratic government.

It is imperative that every grateful citizen remember for a long time those Representatives who responded to the call for sound labor legislation. Now is the time for tens of thousands more communications to the Florida congressional delegation showing support for the action of the House.

It is to be hoped, of course, that the salient points of the Landrum-Griffin bill will not be watered down in Monday's conference between House and Senate. We believe the Senate will vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill. After all, the same Senate voted for the McClellan amendments to the Kennedy bill, reversing itself only after certain civil rights provisions in the amendments became onerous to the southern solons. In fact, the Kennedy bill with the McClellan amendments was, in many respects, as strong legislation as the Landrum-Griffin bill. It is essential that those citizens who are in favor of enforceable rights for rank and file union members, against racketeering and for the rights of those millions of workers who have chosen not to join unions communicate their feelings to Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS.

Shift in Emphasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the second report of the President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability has puzzled many observers who remember the first Cabinet committee report. The first report emphasized the perils of inflation; the second report would like us to forget, for the moment, what the first report emphasized so vigorously.

Senator KEFAUVER analyzed the situation well earlier this week and reminded us that the consumer may still be concerned by rising prices despite White House "deemphasis."

An editorial which appeared in the Newark News on August 18 also asks questions about the second report. An article in the Christian Science Monitor of August 17 joins the questioning and suggests a few answers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the editorial from the Newark Evening News of August 18 and the article from The Christian Science Monitor of August 17.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Newark Evening News, of Aug. 18, 1959]

SHIFT IN EMPHASIS

The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth set up by President Eisenhower to educate the public on the nature and dangers of inflation apparently is no longer worried about inflation. Its latest report indicates the committee has shifted its emphasis to economic growth.

In fact, the committee, which is headed by Vice President NIXON, doesn't even mention the word "inflation." Instead, it uses the phrase "rises in general price level" on the theory that the public is a little confused about the meaning of inflation.

The public may be a bit further confused when it recalls that only 7 short weeks ago the committee was greatly disturbed by the threat of inflation. In an interim report sent to Mr. Eisenhower on June 28, the eve of the steel strike, the committee warned of the dangers of a settlement that would mean higher wages and prices.

In any case, price stability has now been placed at the bottom of a three-point program offered by the Nixon Committee. In first place is a large and expanding output of goods and services. Next is maximum employment opportunities, meaning not only a chance to work, but a chance to hold the kind of job that suits you best.

Curiously enough, that is approximately the idea advanced by the liberal Democrats in Congress. But the Nixon committee's switch may have a basis much simpler than any political considerations. The steel strike is entering its sixth week today and the economy is beginning to feel the pinch. The Federal Reserve Board reports that its index of industrial output in July fell 2 points to 153 and attributes the decline to the strike's impact. If the strike continues much longer, we'll all be worrying about economic growth, not inflation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 17, 1959]

UNITED STATES SHIFTS ECONOMIC TARGET

(By Neal Stanford)

WASHINGTON.—Economic growth now has become the major economic aim and interest of the Eisenhower administration.

This represents a sharp and dramatic change in administration thinking from 2 months ago, when the same Cabinet Committee which is reporting this week warned repeatedly against spiraling inflation.

This Cabinet Committee, headed by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and set up last February by the President, in this, its second report appeared relatively optimisitc about price-stability prospects.

Rather than steps to halt inflation, its second report said: "What we want and need is sound sustainable economic growth."

There are several explanations for this change in the administration's attitudes toward the national economy.

One is that it feels that the battle against inflation is being won and that therefore attention can be directed to other problems.

INFLATION BRAKED

This explanation is supported by the figures making up the united consumer price index trend (the criterion of inflation). These show a rise of only slightly more than one-half of 1 percent in the last year.

However, this does not explain why only 7 weeks ago the committee reported that the nation's economy was "at a critical juncture" and that the Nation was confronted "with overwhelming evidence" that prices might start spiraling upward.

Another explanation is that the administration, feeling that it now would get much of what the President wanted from Congress, was downgrading the threat of inflation. Congress, for example, seems certain to give him an increase in interest on Federal bonds and an increase in the gasoline tax—both anti-inflationary measures.

COMMITTEE CRITICIZED

A third reason relates to the criticism from Democratic liberal economists who followed the committee's June 28 report. They had accused the committee of ignoring the importance of economic growth in its concern over inflation.

And a fourth explanation relates to growing evidence that the Soviet Union's rate of economic growth is double or triple that of the United States and that while the level of U.S. production is still ahead of that of the U.S.S.R., the Soviets in time will catch up with and surpass the United States unless the United States steps up its rate of economic growth.

THREE GOALS LISTED

According to the Nixon committee report there should be three economic goals for the country:

1. Economic growth—through a large and expanding output of goods and services. It sees this being achieved only through im-

provements in health, education, and skills; the development of natural resources; expansion of natural science and technology; and improved equipment and organization.

2. Maximum employment opportunities—meaning not only a chance to work but a chance to hold the kind of job that suits one best.

The committee avers that maximum employment opportunity is a more appropriate goal that simply maximum employment because people should be free to choose for themselves among a variety of occupations.

3. Price stability—referring rather to the general level of prices instead of specific prices.

PRICE FREEDOM BACKED

Actually, the committe said, the freedom of individual prices to change is essential to economic efficency, for prices are messages to producers and sellers telling them what things should be made in greater or smaller quantities.

This 1,600-word statement from the committee is the second, but not the last, that it will put out. The next one, it is expected, will deal with this matter of economic growth in some detail.

This 8-man cabinet committee includes, beside the Vice President: Secretary of the Treasury Robert B, Anderson; Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson; Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell; Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller; Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield; and Raymond J. Saulnier, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. W. Allen Wallis is executive vice chairman of the committee, a special assistant to the President, on leave from his post as dean of the University of Chicago's School of Business.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER, Mr. Speaker, the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade has successfully completed its remarkable 20th century trip from Independence, Mo., to Independence, Oreg.

From time to time I have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a daily account of that trek which has been written by Rudy Roudebaugh, driver of the Drain covered wagon. The record is a bit behind the actual trek, but the accounts today will bring us more up to date. I hope to conclude this fine record by Mr. Roudebaugh soon. Many people have learned about Oregon and our centennial through the efforts of the sturdy 20th century pioneers who were members of the cavalcade. I salute the caravan members and all of the men and women who made this historic venture a reality.

Mr. Roudebaugh's account follows:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, July 23, 1959]

RUDY TELLS OF SAGEBRUSH, HEAT, DUST, AND WARRANTS

(By R. "Rudy" Roudebaugh, driver of Drain covered wagon, now on his final leg in the 2,000-mile trek from Independence, Mo., to Independence, Oreg.)

The Twin Falls sheriff's posse escorted us through Twin Falls. Gail Hopkins and his friends put out Drain letters for me on their bicycles on both sides of the street. There were more people on the trail than any other day yet. Sunday Jan got three new shoes; two in front, one on the right rear. The peas and beans that are grown around here are used for seed.

(Notes that were left out last week.)

July 13: 6:06, we are on Highway 30 going northwest. 6:26, Janell and her girl friend have gone back to bed. Ki is on cook shift. 7:07, the sun is out bright and hot. 7:22, crossed deep creek. 8:35, Janell and Claudia have got up. We are going through hills and sagebrush on both sides of the road, very little farmland here. 8:47, starting down Hagerman Valley and crossing Salmon Fall Creek. 9:16, going along the Snake River with rock walls on each side. 9:40, stopped to water at the 1,000 Spring resort.

Jan and Doc each drank 2 pails of water. The spring water here is supposed to be from some hidden body of water. It has been tested and is the same as water from the Arctic. Last week I wrote that the Pendleton Indians gave us safe passage, but that's wrong—they gave us just the opposite passage. 9:58, rolling again. 10:38, leaving Twin Falls County crossing over the Snake River entering Gooding County. 10:44, big boulders cropping out of the ground all over the fields on both sides of the road. 11:32, entering Hagerman, population 520. 11:46, camped at the city park and rodeo grounds and ball park.

Tim Miller and family from Yoncalla were here to visit us this evening. The mayor broiled steaks for us last night and the drugstore donated ice cream yesterday. It was 105 in the shade. Made 21 miles today.

July 14: 5:55, same story—waiting for Roy again. 6:03, heading northwest. 6:24, crossed Billingsly Creek. This is a pretty little valley with popular trees 125 feet tall. The valley is about ½ mile wide. 6:53, Malad River. The ground is rocky on both sides and we're going up out of the Hagerman Valley. 7:31, we are on top, sagebrush and rock on both sides of us. Weather is cooler with the sun out bright. 8:12, entering Bliss, population 126. 8:44, going into the desert. 9:04, Janell is just getting up. She has a rope burn on her neck from playing cowboy. Ki is still on cook shift. 9:31, stopped to water. Doc and Jan each drank a pail of water. 10:39, entering Elmore County, leaving Gooding County. 11:40, going by the 101 ranch. It produces rodeo stock. 12:22, camped at Graham general store and trailer court about one-half mile from Kings Hill. Ki and I are doing our laundry here at the store and also had a nice tub bath.

Grandma (the one who is walking to Independence, Oreg.) stayed at this place Saturday night. The people of Kings Hill are going to give us a chicken dinner tonight. Mr. Graham has loaned his station wagon to the wagon train bunch to go back and forth to town in. Made 24 miles today.

July 15: 6:00, just sitting here waiting for Roy. I wish he'd hurry the nats are bothering Doc and Jan. (Editor's note: guess an old logger like Rudy is too tough for the nats to gnaw on.) Jan goe one new shoe on left rear food. 6:12, going west and the weather is cloudy and hot. 6:17, entering Kings Hill (unincorporated). It lays in a narrow valley with the Snake River and UP railroad on the south side. There are very few farms around here. Hay is about all they raise. 7:05, Ki just got out of bed. Janell got up early this morning and is riding in the Carnine wagon or Roseburg wagon. 7:49, we are going a quarter of a mile from Glenn's Ferry. Now 130 miles from Oregon border. 7:56, crossing Little Canyon Creek. 8:00, leaving Highway 30 going on a rock road. 8:42, sagebrush and hills on both sides of us. You can see the Three Island crossing of the old Oregon Trail where they rafted across the Snake River. 9:53, stopped to water. Each mule drank a pail of water. 10:11, on our way again. My tire on the left rear wheel is getting loose.

A big horse fly just bit Jan and she raised cane. I got off and killed it. 12:05, stopped for the day at the Jack Hendly ranch. The people at Glen's Ferry took up a collection and gave us a roast beef dinner. By some misunderstanding we almost had to leave our campsite. They even contacted the sheriff, but we are still here so I guess all is well.

July 16: 6:02, all hooked up. 6:10, westward again. Nothing but sagebrush. 6:30, on oil again. Thank gosh. The dust was pretty bad. 8:10, here is a policeman with a summons for us. Don't know for sure what it's all about. I suppose over our campsite. Tell you later. 8:45, stopped to have pictures taken for the Oregon Journal. Also the State police are here teasing us about our trouble. 9:00, I guess they're through with us for a while as we are on our way again. 9:20, here comes Mount Home Rough Riders and also 4-H Club riders to meet us and escort us to Mount Home. 10:05, stopped to water at Mount Home sale barn. Doc and Jan were pretty dry. 10:23, heading west and entering Mount Home. It lays in a small valley. Hay and grain is about all that is grown here. I think the whole town is out to see us. 10:32, on highway 30. 10:31, leaving highway 30 and going on an old highway.

We've had State police escort all morning. Here comes a pickup with a loud speaker from Nyssa, Oreg., to welcome us to Oregon. They are going to have an all-girls rodeo for us at Nyssa. 12:51, entering camp at the Crater station. Made 23 miles today. Our trouble earlier didn't amount to much. By noon everything was taken care of by the wagonmaster, Tex Serpa. Our lunch today was furnished by the people of Mount Home, population 4,552.

July 17: 5:58, ready to go but looks like we are going to be held up. 7:59, finally got started. As I said, "People that came West years ago had their ups and downs and we sure had ours this morning, but all seems well again." It's sure sultry out. We were 2 hours late getting started this morning. It is going to be a long, hot day. 8:20, on gravel. 8:44, crossed over onto the brand new highway, three lanes in each direction. 9:05, we now have a police escort. 8:24, crossing Samar Creek. 9:56, stopped to water. Doc drank one pail and Jan guzzled two.

Our lunch was passed out because we'll be late getting to camp. 10:14, we're still on the fertile desert; in the near future this land will all be under cultivation. 11:44, entered Ada County. Stopped to water for the second time today. Doc and Jan drank two pails apiece. 1:02, rolling again. 1:16, back on Highway 30 about one-half mile. 1:24, on the old highway and Janell is feeling lonesome for Christine Stols. Janelle was looking out the wagons and two girls in long centennial dresses were waving at her. They were Kathy and Sharon Lupher, also John and Mrs. Lupher and Cub's sister, Henry. The two girls rode into camp with Janell and I. Ki rode with Virginia and John. 2:52, arrived at the Lloyd Hanson ranch. Army helicopter dropped bread, pop, milk, cottage cheese to us. They also brought the mayor. We went to the Y for showers. Janell and I went to the Snake River Stampede at Nampa. Ki was the only woman that stayed at camp. She gave out about 500 letters. The six women on the trail received gifts from the Welcome Wagon club.

July 18: Here is Cathy, Sharon, and John to ride with us. 5:58, all hooked up. But we are waiting again. 6:20, rolling northwest again. 8:06, a sign says "Welcome Wagon City." 8:46, crossed over the New York canal. The reason I have mentioned these canals is they are responsible for the development of this country. 8:55, met by

the Ada County Sheriff Possee as we entered Boise, population 34,392. It is the largest city in the world without the main line of a railroad. 8:59, crossed the Rideabough Canal. 9:54, arrived at the capitol to meet some old pioneers. Ki has gone with Virginia to wash and iron at Cub's sisters. Thanks to her we have clean clothes again and we had a very nice visit with them. They brought us a huge bunch of fruit and we sure enjoyed it. 10:24, leaving the capital. 10:04, crossed back across the river. 10:44, stopped to water at the Beasten Plumbing Co. in Boise. 11:01, westward again. 11:12, entering Garden City, population 1,459. We stopped and had cold drinks and the chief of police shook hands with us and welcomed us to the town. 12:14, turned off the highway. Weather is windy and hot. 12:24, arrived at camp at the A. Coffey ranch. Mrs. C. G. Estell was at the wagon when it stopped at Capital (she is Mrs. Bill Gasser's sister). We went out to the Mission Inn for dinner celebrating our 3 months on the road. We passed out about 3,000 letters yesterday. Janell went to the jalopy races at Meridan last night.

This account in the July 30, 1959, Drain Enterprise starts with July 20, a Monday. The next day the sturdy modern-day pioneers arrived back in Oregon.

As Rudy Roudebaugh observes in his diary:

July 21: 6, all hooked up, but as usual waiting. 6:26, here we go. We'll soon be in dear old Oregon.

And it has been a long trip since the train left Independence, Mo., April 19. President Harry Truman was on hand to start the train. Another former President, Herbert Hoover, was invited to greet the cavalcade at journey's end in Independence, Oreg., but he was unable to attend.

Mr. Roudebaugh's account for July 20 through July 25 follows:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, July 30, 1959]

WAGON TRAIN ENDURES 121° HEAT WAVE TRAVELING THROUGH IDAHO

(By R. R. Roudebaugh)

July 20: 6:07 a.m., waiting again, 6:16, rolling west. 6:31 hit Highway 20. 6:59, going by the Joplin Cemetery, which is very old. 7:15, here is the 7 Mile store and inn. 8:21, there is a whole field of seagulls come in from Drain to greet us. 9:20, crossed the Phillip Canal. 9:14, leaving Ada County and entering Canyon County. Being met by the sheriff's posse to escort us. 9:44, stopped to water at the Botts service station. Doc and Jan drank very little water. Ki just got out of bed. Jerry Carnine is riding with us today. We met Mrs. Jim Whipple's brother and sister-in-law at Boise, Mr. and Mrs. Bob Wilcox. 10:04, have left our watering spot. 10:14, crossing the Highline Canal. 10:20, crossed 10 Mile Creek.

10:46, going past the spot where the Ward Massacre occurred. Out of a party of 20 only 2 small boys survived. 11:30, crossing and recrossing the Notus Canal. 11:34, entering Caldwell, population 10,487. 12:00, entering Memorial Park where we are making camp. The mules are staying at the rodeo barns. This park is beautiful, but my mules like dust to roll in. As I recall an old saying that a mule is worth $100 everytimes it rolls over, Doc rolled over four times and Jan three. That makes them worth $700 today. This part of the country is good for dairy farming. Also a lot of corn is grown for ensilage for silos.

We had dinner this evening with Mr. and Mrs. Ben Rohnert and family. I graduated from high school with Mrs. Rohnert.

Ki met a nice woman in Boise who presented us a scrapbook filled with news stories of the wagon train. She and her husband are going to come to Drain to see us.

July 21: 6:00, all hooked up, but as usual waiting. 6:26, here we go. We'll soon be in dear old Oregon. 6:40, pulling onto Highway 20. 6:50, crossing Riverside Canal. 6:54, crossing the Boise River. 6:59, crossing Farmers Coop Canal. 7:20, as we are going close by the railroad tracks Ki counted 125 cars going by.

The most asked question is: How are you going back to Missouri? We have to explain we're all Oregon residents and that we'd only started from Missouri for this trip.

Caldwell was really seeking keepsakes from us. More than any place we've been so far. They were raiding our wagon and even cut a piece of tarp from one of the wagons. 7:27 entering Notus, population 313. 9:21, crossing Sand Hollow Creek. South of us looks like wild hay or pasture. North of us is mostly sugar beets and a little corn. I gave away about 2,000 letters yesterday. Ki is supposed to be on cook shift, but all meals today are being served to us. There is more beets grown around here than any other part of Idaho we've been. 10:07, here is the Canyon County Sheriff's Posse to escort us to Parma. 10:30, stopped to meet Mayor Jim Watson. We picked up a little boy named Harley Noe. His father is riding with the Posse and is a good friend of Gail Carnine. 10:35, entering Parma, population 1,525.

A boy on the street called to me, "Pull off that fake beard!"

I believe the whole town is out. 10:56, stopped and watered the livestock. We were served pie, ice cream, lemonade and iced tea. 12:13, leaving Parma. There is hundreds of cars and people here to see us at the bridge bidding farewell to Idaho and hello to Oregon as we cross the Snake River bridge. 1:27, in Malheur County. While we were on the bridge, John Wilder from Pleasant Hill was there to meet us. We arrived in camp at 1:49 at the Nyssa high school. It was 111°. The horses and mules were taken about a mile from camp to the rodeo grounds. They were right out in the sun—what a day.

This evening, Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Hickethier and Mrs. Shaw and son and Mrs. Irvin Freeze and daughter and son came to visit the wagon train. We were pleased to see them.

July 22: Up at 3:30 to go to rodeo grounds to take care of my mules. Ki is on cook shift so I lit the stoves for her. 6, after I was hooked up we were called together to have a talk with Howard Appling Jr., secretary of state for Oregon, and Dick Smith, president of the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade, 6:25, ready to take off and roll for home. We are going to have National Guard escort the rest of the way home. 7:14, going through the country here reminds me of Idaho. 8:35, hitting the first Oregon desert and its like Hades. 10:10, cold drinks and cookies were given to us by Mr. Spaulding, county road superintendent. 10:31, rolling again. 10:56, stopped to water, but the water truck never showed up. 11, here comes the Malheur County sheriff's posse to escort us in. 11:59, we stopped at the grave of John D. Henderson for a small prayer given by Rev. Vincent Egar the only cowboy priest. He is the only known priest to get permission from the Pope to wear cowboy boots. 12:10, forded the Malheur River. We made out just fine. The water came up to the mule's stomach. This was an original trail. Then we circled through Vale and back to the city park at 12:39. Diner was given us by the American Legion, Lions, Women's Club and Rebeccas. I took a hot steam bath at Dr. Dale N. Scheer's Therapy Springs. He is one of Forrest Johnson's friends. Many other friends of the Johnsons send their regards.

July 23: 5:36, all hooked up and ready to leave, but waiting on the Roseburg wagon and Tex. Our breakfast was served to us by the Vale C of C. 6:08, here we are starting out and heading across Oregon Highway 26. We have a young photographer, Norris Niccum, riding with us a couple of days. He works for United Press International Newspictures.

The weather is just plain hot. I guess I forgot to mention before, but right out of Boise it was 121°. And we were right out where the sagebrush was short—no shade. We all had our tongues hanging out.

9:16, here comes the 4–H riding club to escort us into Jamison. We are also entering Willow Creek (just post office, general store, tavern). We have been going through a valley about 3 miles wide. 9:25, crossing Willow Creek.

Here is a combine at work. The first one we've seen since we have been gone. They are harvesting wheat and barley. 10:04, stopped to water. The mules were really ready for water. They each drank two pails. The drivers were in luck today. They each got an orange. 10:02, about 7 more miles to camp. It's 100 today. 11:20, went through Jameson and hit gravel road. 11:41, going along the foothills. 11:54, we have made camp for today at the Floyd McBride Farm. Mrs. McBride came and took our laundry home to clean for us.

We just found out that no one has been buried in the old pioneer cemetery out of Vale since 1930.

July 24: 6, ready but waiting on Dave. His horse is lame this morning.

As I was talking to the people visiting the wagon train last night, I looked up and here comes Janell riding a cow right out of a barn. I don't know what I'm going to do with her. Ki is riding on the water truck today. I guess she was scared to cross the mountains in the wagon.

Doc got one new shoe on his right front foot. Jan got one on her left rear foot last night. 6:15, rolling northeast through sagebrush and up a canyon. 7:40, stopped to rest the mules for 10 minutes. 8:24, the hills are brown with beef cattle grazing on them. 9:36, we are locking our wheels to go down this steep hill. Moving across Burnt Creek and by old ranchhouse. 9:55, stopped to water. Dewight Lockett and Ellis Allen are guides that came to the wagon train last night to take us on our trip for today. 10:14, rolling northeast again. 10:46, Jan threw her left front shoe. 11:26, we have stopped to rest on a hill as we have been on dirt road all morning. We stopped and rested 10 minutes three different times coming up this hill. 11:40, going out on a hogsback and down the longest hill on this trip to far. 12, we are at the bottom of the hill waiting on Roy Brabham.

We have entered Huntington. The wagons went through main part of town and back to the high school where were are making camp at 12:19, potluck lunch was brought in by the whole town. They put on a small program and we were introduced to all the oldtimers of Huntington and Baker County it seemed.

July 25: Up at 5:30. Went to Howell Cafe for breakfast. 5:57, ready to roll. 6:05, rolling out of Huntington and through Oregon on Highway 30, the Oregon Trail. We have the State police, National Guard, and Baker County sheriff's posse all escorting us today. 6:31, crossing the Burnt River. The weather is windy and cooler this morning. The oil is slippery for the mules today. Jan got one new shoe on her left front foot. She rolled into the fence yesterday and tore the shoe off. 7:28, at Lime, where Portland

Cement Co. has a manufacturing plant. 7:40, going through Dixie, just a wide place in the road. 8:32, passing Weatherby, old pony express station. 8:51, crossed Burnt River again for the last time. Our route previously crossed this river at least 20 times.

A group of 4–H youths on horseback have joined us to ride to Durkee. 9:14, stopped to water at Rattlesnake Springs, one of Oregon's rest areas. 9:54, picked up JoAnne, 6, and Suzanne, 8, daughters of Mr. and Mrs. Lowell Anderson of Yoncalla. They will ride to camp with me. The wind has went down and getting hot. 10:52, arrived in Durkee, which has only a few stores. The town lies in a pretty valley 1 mile wide and 10 miles long. 10:06, crossed Pritchard Creek. 11:24, arrived at camp at Vincent Kirby Ranch, where they had moved in feed bunks filled with hay. This is the first place we have found feed waiting for our livestock when we arrived at camp. Durkee grange is providing us oats, dinner, and entertainment. We are also provided transportation into Baker, 22 miles away, for showers, shopping, public dance at community center, and rodeo tonight.

Besides Mr. and Mrs. Lowell Anderson, of Yoncalla, other north Douglas County visitors at the wagon train encampment at Durkee, Saturday, were Mr. and Mrs. Rufus Pfister and Mr. and Mrs. Arlo Thomas, of Drain, who arrived about 5:30 p.m.

Housing Act Would Meet Many Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as we await final decisions on the compromise Housing bill of 1959, it might be well to explore some of the bill's provisions which have not received as much attention as the urban renewal and other widely publicized programs.

An article from the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News of August 14 discusses the housing shortage which exists at Rutgers—the State university. One of the Housing Act provisions is intended to help colleges deal with such conditions. Rutgers officials have, in correspondence to me, clearly indicated the need for housing bill provisions which would deal with this and other college needs.

The other article, from the Camden Courier-Post of August 17, describes how one relatively small program of the housing bill has been discontinued, for all practical purposes, until a final word on a veto is given. Good municipal planning, of course, is essential in these years of growth in the suburbs. It is unfortunate that there should be any slowdown of planning activity, particularly at a time when many municipal officials have worked for years to effect just such planning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, the article from the Courier-News, Plainfield, N.J., of August 14 and the article from the Camden Courier-Post of August 17, 1959.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-News, Plainfield, N.J., Aug. 14, 1959]

ROOM FOR STUDENTS SOUGHT BY RUTGERS

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Rutgers' housing officials today appealed for help from New Brunswick area householders in finding rental rooms for some 275 students presently on the waiting list for dormitory places.

Housing Director Joseph F. Nolan said that as of August 6, 112 freshmen and 128 upperclassmen at the colleges for men remain on the waiting list, along with 17 graduate women students and about the same number of graduate men.

Nolan said that the waiting list remains after the conversion of the basements of three dormitories to sleeping quarters (which will be rented at half price) the preemption of all study rooms in the three big canal bank dormitories for use as sleeping rooms, and the addition of 55 units to be vacated this month when the college infirmary moves from the "Quad" dormitories to the new student health center.

TEMPORARY USE

The lounge room on each floor of the six-story canal bank dorms will be temporarily used in September as emergency sleeping quarters, but will be vacated as soon as other rooms can be found.

The university's own facilities at the men's colleges will house 1,835 men this fall, with some 700 more living in fraternity houses. Upward of 800, it is estimated, will be commuting to New Brunswick daily from homes in a radius of 25 miles or more.

Douglass College, which this fall will put in use a new dormitory for 240 girls, will have all its quarters at capacity.

Students now pay $300 per year in dormitory rentals and Nolan said rooms in local homes renting at about that level would be ideal for student use.

"Overcrowding is no longer a hypothetical problem," Nolan emphasized, "the rush of students has hit us with a crash and far sooner that we had expected."

ESTIMATES INACCURATE

He explained that last spring's best estimates of this fall's campus population indicated that the addition of space in dormitory basements, the freed infirmary space and the conversion of study rooms would amply meet the needs of informing and returning students.

Rooms in homes within 5 miles of the campus are suitable for students, Nolan said, particularly if bus service is conveniently available.

Nolan said local residents may write or telephone him at Voorhees Hall on the men's college campus to list accommodations and that students would then be given copies of the lists of available rooms. His office, he pointed out, serves only as a referral point for nonuniversity housing.

[From the Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, Aug. 17, 1959]

HOUSING VETO STALLS STATE PLANNING AID

TRENTON, August 17.—Local planning assistance applications from 30 municipalities are being held by the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development until sufficient Federal funds are made available.

Conservation Commissioner Salvatore A. Bontempo said today, "In light of the recent Presidential veto of the 1959 omnibus housing bill, it has been necessary to notify local administrators that processing of 701 applications will be delayed until authorized funds are appropriated. The limited funds remaining from last year's authorization may permit four New Jersey applications currently pending Federal approval to be authorized. However, lack of funds makes it necessary to hold all current requests."

Aided by the enabling 1954 national housing legislation, New Jersey has conducted the largest local planning assistance program in the United States. Planning personnel of the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development have and are acting as consultants in the preparation of 17 of the 116 municipal master plans included in the program.

The $20 million authorization contained in the vetoed housing bill for the urban planning assistance program would have enabled the State to continue its local planning assistance program at its current pace. Commissioner Bontempo said, "The Department's Bureau of Planning is geared to continue providing proper planning guides and recommendations for the physical development of our many communities. The enabling legislation would permit us to offer our services to approximately 300 more municipalities if the program is continued."

The vetoed legislation, amending the 1954 act, also provided Federal funds for local planning assistance for communities whose population was 50,000 or less in the 1950 census. The existing legislation limits applications to municipalities whose population is 25,000 or less. B. Budd Chavooshian, chief of the bureau of planning of the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development, said, "The omnibus housing bill would enable 21 more communities to be included in the State's program. Thus, all but 13 of New Jersey's 567 municipalities would then be eligible for local planning assistance."

The communities affected are Teaneck, Garfield, Hackensack, Vineland, Belleville, Bloomfield, Maplewood, Montclair, Nutley, Orange, West Orange, West New York, Kearny, Plainfield, Linden, Woodbridge, New Brunswick, Perth Amboy, Hamilton Township, North Bergen, and Union.

NATO Leaders Put Trust in German Ex-Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the eighth of a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Journal of July 24, 1959, and is entitled "NATO Leaders Put Trust in German Ex-Enemies":

NATO LEADERS PUT TRUST IN GERMAN EX-ENEMIES

(By Edward J. Milne)

WASHINGTON.—Mixed emotions pursue the observer on an inspection trip through the NATO countries across the ocean and remain upon his return to the States.

If, for example, there is a tendency to look upon all the planes and tanks and men and regret the tax dollars that are required to keep them in the field, it is quickly swallowed in the realization of the tremendous strides that have been taken towards build-

ing the security the dollars are designed to provide.

Again, one reads of a recent public opinion poll in France indicating that while some 70 percent of the French are for more economic and political unity with the Germans, 70 percent likewise still fear or are uneasy over the Germans.

This recalls a visit to a bustling base of the new German Air Force in upper Bavaria and the questions that flash through the mind upon seeing American-made jet fighter-bombers squatting there with Maltese crosses proclaiming the rebirth of German airpower on a field that was put out of action by allied bombers in World War II.

WORLD WAR II ACE

One of the builders of the German's new Air Group South at Erding, a few miles northeast of Munich, is Brig. Gen. Johannes Steinhoff. Now 48, he was a World War II ace with more than 100 planes reported to his credit, but when he is asked how many, he replies:

"I prefer not to remember. I think you will understand."

General Steinhoff's face was badly burned in a wartime crash. He wears dark glasses that serve to hide any emotion his eyes might otherwise reveal as he insists that the new German Air Force is entirely tactical and defensive, with neither strategic capability nor strategic plans.

As Gen. Lauris Norstad, NATO's commander in chief for Europe has pointed out, the nuclear bomb has virtually wiped out the distinction between tactical and strategic aircraft, but the Americans who work so closely with the Germans at Erding and other NATO bases seem largely willing to accept the West Germans' disclaimer of any but defensive intent.

HOPE FOR ALLIES

American airmen have a standing joke that they never meet a German who fought anywhere but on the Russian front in World War II. Yet they seem in general to have a hope, amounting almost to a firm belief, that the Germans will prove as stanch allies as they once were implacable foes.

At its peak in World War II the Luftwaffe had some 7,000 to 8,000 pilots. There were about 6,000 surviving pilots when the war ended. Only about 60 of them are flying in the new German Air Force, reborn in 1956. About 200 of them are in the new force as instructors and administrators.

The new air force has two wings operational today and expects to have six operational by the end of the year—four fighter-bomber, one fighter, and one support. It has about 40,000 officers and men, including about 1,000 pilots and 350 combat planes. Its goal is 100,000 officers and men, 3,000 pilots, and 1,000 combat planes by 1964.

Starting from scratch in 1956, the Germans had a target, permitted by treaty, of 1,364 combat planes by 1962. Several factors account for the cutback in size and the setback in time. One of the main difficulties has been a lack of experienced instructors and maintenance and other technical personnel. The United States is still supplying much of such skill, and the Germans expect to have to rely upon such assistance well into the 1960's.

EXPECT NIKE MISSILE

The Germans see little net loss in the reduction from almost 1,400 to 1,000 combat planes. They are expecting Nike missiles to replace some of the fighter planes, and they are expecting faster, longer range, and more powerful fighter-bombers than envisioned in 1956.

With an assist on parts from the United States they hope to produce in their own plants by 1962 most of the ultramodern fighter-bombers for their force, to acquire others here.

General Steinhoff says the new Luftwaffe had recruiting difficulties at first because of widespread reluctance in West Germany to rearming. But volunteers are now sufficient, he says. Pilot trainees must sign on for 6 years.

There is scattered opinion among the allies that the Germans should be pressing forward faster than their present timetable and have their full force combat-ready earlier than 1964. The rebuttal argument is that the more deliberate pace means a succession of better-trained airmen coming into service with more up-to-date planes each year between now and the completion of the buildup.

Competent American opinion seems to agree with the soundness of the West Germans' position. It is reasoned that no one is in a position to realize more than the Germans the need for speed in forging the NATO sword and that what they are giving up is not speed but haste.

Perhaps underneath the American attitude is the deep satisfaction U.S. and NATO officials feel with one other aspect of the cooperation with the West Germans. That is the no-strings-attached arrangement under which NATO nuclear air might is stationed at German bases, ready for instant retaliation if Russia starts the big one.

The issue of trust in the new German allies was put to President Eisenhower at his press conference Wednesday. A reporter asked what assurance we hav(that "a rearmed and restored Germany" will "not turn against the West as it has twice in a generation?"

What this country must do, the President said, is "decide where your greatest danger is" and give that "your attention at the moment."

"Now this doesn't mean," he said, "that you shouldn't have your eye on future potentialities, but particularly when those potentialities look as low in the—as I think they are along the line that you were suggesting about a hostile Germany, and rearmed, I would say I would rather have Germany strong and my friend today."

The Metropolitan City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we already have heard much about metropolitan problems throughout the United States. A bill to establish a Federal Commission on Metropolitan Problems is now under study by the Government Operations Committee.

In press and magazines we read daily about the troubles caused by the amazing growth of our suburbs. One medical author even wrote recently that our insistence on shifting to mortgaged homes outside our cities has caused an alarming increase in physical and mental ailments. In Life magazine last week an author paid much attention to methods which may be needed to preserve open land in the relatively rural areas near our cities.

All of these developments are, I think, indicative of the need for a Federal Commission which will study our metropolitan areas.

Another good argument for the Commission is an address given by Frederick G. Gardiner, Q.C., chairman of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Mr. Gardiner spoke on June 16 in Plainfield, N.J., before a meeting of the Metropolitan Regional Council. He described how the municipality of Toronto has applied regional government to that area. To the Metropolitan Regional Council, this was particularly significant, because this informal group of elected officials from cities and counties in or near New York City is seeking some form of regional government cooperation for their own 22-county area.

Mr. Gardiner did not mention the proposed Federal Commission on Metropolitan Problems, but he very clearly described a situation which causes a need for clear-cut answers to vital problems. The closing paragraphs give a very pertinent warning about the need for some kind of action. Mr. Gardner warns:

In these days, emergencies in both domestic and foreign affairs develop with startling rapidity. There is seldom time for an exhaustive examination of all possible solutions in the hope that you can discover the perfect answer.

I think we should pay heed to this warning at a national level and at State, county, and municipal levels. Mr. Gardiner is the first to say that the Toronto experiment may not offer the precise pattern which will fit all metropolitan areas, but his understanding of the overall urban area problem is one which, I believe, is worthy of some study.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the closing paragraphs of Mr. Gardiner's address. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials which discuss the Metropolitan Commission introduced by the distinguished and knowledgeable Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLARK.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Perhaps you are saying to yourself: "It's all very well to come down here and talk as though you came from Texas but what have you learned from your experience that might be useful to us?" Ladies and gentlemen, we have learned quite a bit. May I make it perfectly clear that I am not here to suggest that a metropolitan system such as ours is the solution to the problems of all metropolitan areas. What may be the answer in one area may not be the answer in another. The probability is that the solution in each case must be designed to suit the particular situation which exists and varying conditions are not likely to lend themselves to any simple or standard formula. We have found that you have to be a large shareholder in a company known as "Patience and Persistence Incorporated"; that you have to take a step at a time; that there are many obstacles to be overcome; and that it is just as bad to try to do too much too soon as it is to do too little too late.

We have found that you can line your shelves with reports, plans and models but eventually you must choose those projects which commonsense tells you are most important, give them the necessary priorities and, as Robert Moses would say, put in the steam shovels and the bulldozers. Then

and then only will you know that your project is on its way.

Perhaps our most important accomplishment is that the metropolitan council has adopted the metropolitan concept. Subject to human nature being what it is, and neither you nor I will ever change that, members of council consider projects in relation to their value to the whole area rather than in relation to the advantage they might have upon their respective individual municipalities.

We found that we must spend many millions of dollars to provide the area with the services it needs. We recognize that such expenditures are investments in the plant and equipment which our rapidly expanding metropolitan area must have if it is to remain attractive to industrial and commercial development without which it cannot hope to exist.

One comment which I think is appropriate is that there is probably a more urgent need for action than is generally appreciated. In these days emergencies in both domestic and foreign affairs develop with startling rapidity. There is seldom time for an exhaustive examination of all possible solutions in the hope that you can discover the perfect answer. In our case we had arrived at a stage where our three rapidly expanding residential municipalities were finding it difficult to finance their requirements. When you can't sell your bonds you do not have the time and the composure to undertake an academic discussion into what is the perfect solution.

Under such circumstances the time required for extensive investigations of the problems which have arisen and the solutions which have been adopted in other areas might better be devoted to securing an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the facts of your own situation. This should be followed by a careful description of the general scheme and its fundamental principles in the simplest possible language so that it may be understood by the general public.

As to any plan which may be proposed it should be based upon two fundamental principles. The first is a realization of the vital interdependence which exists between the local units comprising any metropolitan area. No one local municipality in a metropolitan area can be sufficient unto itself. Secondly the history of both our countries has taught us that local responsibility in local affairs is a vital element in our democratic system of government.

In our case the necessity for certain services required by the whole area became more and more pressing. We discovered that it was not difficult to determine what should be done. You could find a common denominator with respect to what was needed but we found it to be impossible upon a voluntary basis to establish a common denominator as to how the things that should be done would be paid for.

There are many, and I confess to having been one, who thought the problem could only be solved by complete amalgamation of all of our constituent municipalities into one big city. I expounded the arguments of overlapping jurisdiction, and the administrative efficiency and economy that would result from large-scale production, but I have learned from experience that there were those who understood the fundamental issues better than I did and who presented a better solution than complete amalagamation. I cannot say that there is not some duplication of administrative staffs and services nor can I say that dollarwise there may not be some increased costs but I can say that if there is some overlapping and duplication it is minor in degree and if the costs are greater that they are only slightly higher and that the accomplishments are worth many times the increased cost.

In our case the vigorous opposition of 11 out of the 12 suburbs to the city's application for amalgamation surprised the ardent and highly vocal advocates of outright consolidation. Amalgamation seemed like a simple and logical solution of our problem. Like many simple answers, it was deceptive. It would have tended to destroy true local government rather than to improve it.

One recommendation I would make is that you should not wait until you have convinced everybody that you have the perfect solution. No one has ever achieved the acme of perfection. Make a start. Many of the matters which you are apprehensive about will never occur and if they do they will not have the cataclysmic effect you think and time and experience will be your best teacher.

In closing may I say that in the course of our experiments we receive many criticisms and many complaints, but that we are proceeding in accordance with the advice inherent in Abraham Lincoln's words which I paraphrase as follows:

"If I were to attempt to read let alone answer all the criticisms and complaints I receive I would have no time for any other business. From day to day I do the best I can and will continue to do so to the end. If in the end I come out all right then the complaints and criticisms will make no difference, but if the end brings me out wrong, then 10 angels coming down from heaven to swear that I was right would still make no difference."

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, Aug. 3, 1959]

A HOPEFUL NEW APPROACH TO METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

A bill to set up a U.S. Commission on Metropolitan Problems is before the Senate, and there is gathering interest in its passage. The proposal was introduced by Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, a former mayor of Philadelphia, who won the respect of many municipal executives for the imagination and vigor he brought to bear on city problems.

Senator CLARK wants an 18-member commission, named by the President and by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate. The legislation would guarantee representation by the minority party in both branches of Congress by Governors with major urbanization problems and by mayors of American cities.

The job of the commission would be manifold. It would review present and prospective needs of metropolitan areas for public service; it would study the capabilities of the different levels of government to meet these needs; it would pinpoint the extent of existing Federal support in satisfying those needs.

But its most useful job, it seems to us, would be the review of means for improving coordination of Federal, State, and local policies and programs that affect metropolitan areas. In effect, the commission would be able to put together a blueprint indicating avenues of approach to the solution of metropolitan problems.

Metropolitanization has been a matter of discussion and concern for several years, and the first successful attempt at metropolitanization in Dade County, Miami, has attracted continuing attention. That area had to hurdle early opposition to metropolitanization and a later attempt to hobble metropolitanization severely.

But a major trouble in getting started in any one area on the job of solving metropolitan problems is the lack of experience in the field. The problems are so large and involve so many layers of government that it is difficult to lay hold of a method to untangle the snarl of rights, duties, powers, and authorities.

If the commission did no more than outline a new and effective pattern of interrelated Federal, State, and local policies and programs for handling of metropolitan problems, it would earn the gratitude of many a governor and mayor, as well as the citizens of the crowded, fast-growing metropolitan centers of the nation.

The commission would have no power to impose a thing on Congress or a State and its subsidiary governments. It would be asked to make recommendations to the President and Congress by February 1, 1961, and it would be clothed with enough authority and given enough money to do a meaningful job for the Nation.

We hope Congress approves Senator CLARK's bill. The opportunities for the commission are tremendous in just the one field, for instance, of urban renewal. It could start from the firm basis of the Hoover Commission findings on governmental relations, and it could pioneer with recommendations of great value to the cities of America.

[From the Erie (Pa.) Times-News, Aug. 2, 1959]

CABINET HELP FOR CITIES PROPOSED

New York's Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, is the latest to propose a Cabinet-level department at Washington catering to an urban clientele. No figure of speech is intended; the Department of Urbiculture—the name suggested several years ago by Representative J. ARTHUR YOUNGER, Republican, of California—is frankly conceived as a counterweight to the Department of Agriculture, whose name it imitates, and to such other client agencies as Labor and Commerce.

Despite fine theories to the contrary, political scientists generally regard Government agencies as spokesmen more or less for the groups they oversee. The "more or less" may cover an enormous range and leave room, let's say, for a Secretary Benson as well as a Secretary Brannan, but in general Agriculture Secretaries are expected to expound the farmer's viewpoint and Commerce Secretaries the businessman's.

City spokesmen have long complained that nobody understands their viewpoint—at least nobody high enough to matter. Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in support of his own bill to establish a Department of Urban Affairs, told the American Municipal Association last December that its job would be "to listen to representatives of groups like this one, understand their problems and reflect that understanding in the policy forming processes within the executive branch."

Recently, urban strategists have been softpedaling demands for a separate Federal department. Instead they are concentrating their energies behind proposals for a Hoover-type study of metropolitan problems. Senator CLARK is himself following this course (with public encouragement from Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON), and the U.S. Conference of Mayors at its mid-July convention skipped over its earlier endorsement of a Cabinet post in favor of the study plan.

The big point is, however, that the plight of the established cities finally has been recognized and something is going to be done.

Statewide Poll on 45 Questions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 21, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, last month I sent out a questionnaire to con-

stituents in my State. Forty-five questions of national interest were asked. Replies came back in great numbers. As a matter of fact, a total of 1,581 questionnaires were filled out and mailed back to me. They came from every part of the State and from every walk of life, on a fairly proportionate basis. In my opinion, these 1,581 answers to each of the 45 questions present a representative cross section of public opinion.

The results, which have been tabulated and reduced to percentages, are informative and interesting to study. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the results of the poll printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poll was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Percent]

	Yes	No	No answer
1. Do you favor integration in schools?	51.6	43.4	5.0
2. Do you favor integration in housing?	30.2	59.4	10.4
3. Do you agree with the scientists who say that the danger from nuclear explosion fallout is negligible?	41.7	36.4	21.9
4. Do you favor changing the law which requires that "equal time" on radio and TV be given to opposing candidates?	52.6	36.9	10.5
5. Would you have voted to confirm Admiral Strauss' nomination?	67.3	17.9	14.8
6. Would you vote for the measure which would provide that a Federal law does not strike down a State law unless Congress specifically says so?	60.1	26.3	13.6
7. Do you favor legislation or constitutional amendment to curb the Supreme Court's power?	40.3	50.9	8.8
8. Would you favor giving the residents of the District of Columbia full voting rights permitting complete home rule?	65.8	26.5	7.7
9. Do you favor the 8-year limit on a President's tenure of office?	68.7	25.2	6.1
10. Are you in favor of equal-rights-for-women legislation?	70.6	17.9	11.5
11. Do you favor liberalizing our immigration restrictions?	31.3	58.2	10.5
12. Do you favor all possible speed in our space program?	62.9	21.5	15.6
13. Do you think that high tariff is better than low tariff for our national economy?	37.4	43.7	18.9
14. Would you favor a program designed to return the farmers to the "law of supply and demand" which would embody the stopping of price supports and the lifting of acreage and production limitations?	84.1	9.8	6.1
15. Do you favor labor legislation to restrict activities of labor officials?	90.8	3.9	5.3
16. Do you favor continuing the McClellan hearings?	76.7	7.8	15.5
17. Do you favor the "open shop"?	71.9	12.9	15.2
18. Are you in favor of raising the minimum wage to $1.25?	35.4	52.8	11.8
19. Do you believe that raising the minimum wage would be inflationary?	55.7	35.2	9.1
20. Are you in favor of a pay boost for steelworkers?	8.1	81.1	10.8
21. Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?	42.2	46.3	11.5
22. Would you support the use of Federal funds for paying teachers' salaries?	21.3	69.8	8.9
23. Would you favor increased retirement benefits under social security?	51.3	39.1	9.6
24. Do you favor further extension of veterans' benefits?	22.4	64.5	13.1
25. In the program of "matching funds" for the aged, blind, and disabled, do you favor the Federal share being increased?	37.3	45.9	16.8
26. Do you think that unemployment benefits are too extensive?	51.0	36.9	12.1
27. Do you favor TVA and other public power projects?	31.1	52.4	16.5
28. Are you in favor of more "socialism" or government paternalism than we have at present?	6.2	80.7	13.1
29. Would you support the President's efforts to keep spending in line with the budget?	84.6	9.5	5.9
30. Do you think that heavy Government spending, without regard to the budget, helps our national economy more than it hurts it?	16.3	66.0	17.7
31. To pay for the highway program, would you favor boosting the gasoline tax rather than boosting other taxes?	68.1	22.5	9.4
32. Would you favor raising taxes to pay for a bigger housing program?	12.0	76.9	11.1
33. Would you favor a tax increase to offset a deficit resulting from increased Federal expenditures?	27.1	60.5	12.4
34. Do you favor indefinite extension of sales, or excise, taxes?	24.0	64.5	11.5
35. Do you think the Geneva talks, now in recess, are likely to solve anything basic?	10.7	76.2	13.1
36. Do you favor a "summit" conference if the Geneva Conference fails?	30.8	55.4	13.8
37. Would you favor our withdrawing from West Berlin?	5.5	83.5	11.0
38. Should we place restriction on the activities of Soviet officials in this country, 80 percent of whom are engaged in spying, according to FBI Chief Hoover?	80.8	9.7	9.5
39. Would you favor the admission of Red China to the Olympic games?	26.0	61.8	12.2
40. Are you in favor of granting passports to known American Reds?	15.4	71.4	13.2
41. Do you favor our dropping the traditional rule that in war the United States "never strikes first"?	44.4	39.6	16.0
42. Do you think we should stop all nuclear tests regardless of what Russia may do or "promise"?	9.9	79.9	10.2
43. Would you favor making France an equal partner, as is Great Britain, in nuclear information and facilities?	37.7	42.7	19.6
44. Do you favor foreign aid?	56.1	28.5	15.4
45. Do you think our mutual security program is paying off?	45.4	25.6	29.0

Miss Elizabeth A. Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD H. REES

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time to announce the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart who died in a hospital in Washington, D.C., last Sunday, August 16.

Miss Smart was well known to Members of the House and Senate, as well as others on Capitol Hill. They knew her especially because of her championing the cause of temperance. She represented the Woman's Christian Temperance Union in Washington. No one, to my knowledge, was more diligent and more effective in opposition to the sale and distribution of intoxicating liquors.

She was highly respected by everyone who knew her, even those who disagreed with her views. She was deeply religious, she was sincere, she was a great Christian character.

Even though Miss Smart has passed from this life, her influence and her effectiveness will live on in the years to come. The great organization she represented and the country have suffered a distinct loss of a great American.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

The Preservation of Freedom in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Minister Pyo Wook Han of the Korean Embassy before the Kiwanis Club of Richmond, Va., June 8, 1959. At a time when we hear so many criticisms of the newly independent countries of Asia as they struggle against almost insuperable odds, it is important to look at some of the truly remarkable achievements. Korea is a brilliant example because the gains have been made while a state of war still exists, under an uneasy armistice.

The address of Minister Han is also notable for the fine tribute he pays to Walter S. Robertson of Richmond who was recently forced to retire because of health reasons, after more than 6 years of extraordinarily brilliant service as Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East. The valiantly struggling new government of old peoples in Asia understand even better than we just how great have been the contributions made by Mr. Robertson to the freedom, stability and progress accomplished in the Far East, with great benefits to their countries and to our own.

The address follows:

THE PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM

It is a great personal privilege—perhaps more than you realize—for me to have this opportunity to speak here in Richmond, especially at this time. Richmond is, of course, one of the most interesting and attractive cities of the world; and in this season of the year it is surely one of the most beautiful. Also it is a city which has always taken a lead in its opposition to communism and in its defense of world democracy.

But I have an even more immediate and pressing reason why I am more than delighted to be here with you today.

One of your greatest sons—the Honorable Walter Robertson—is retiring at the end of this month from his position as Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East. I myself came to the Korean Embassy in Washington a few years before he assumed his high duties in this most important office. It has been one of the delights and rewards of my life to enjoy his friendship, just as it is now a great privilege to pay tribute to the dedicated and high service which he has rendered, at great cost to himself, to the freedom and democracy of Asia, to my own country particularly, and to the security and ideals of the United States.

The responsibilities of the office of Assistant Secretary of State for the Far East are vast. It is his responsibility to deal with the destinies of fully half of the human race. He has had to guide the relations of your great Nation with more than a score of Asian nations, many of which have just recently emerged or re-emerged into freedom. He has had to lead the battle against Communist aggression on its most vital battlefront—for it has long been Communist dogma that the conquest of the Far East is the essential road to the eventual conquest of the world.

I think few diplomats have ever had to confront more difficult or delicate problems than those which circumstance have imposed upon Walter Robertson. To his eternal honor, he has acquitted himself superbly well.

Mr. Robertson learned about Communist intrigue and ruthlessness the hard way, when he was attached to General Marshall's mission in China in 1947. He learned then that the Communists simply will not negotiate in good faith—and that they make promises only to break them. He learned that their policy is guided by only one aim—the destruction of freedom everywhere.

To this knowledge he has added the great attributes of personal courage and clear wisdom. He has never faltered in his fight against admitting the Chinese Communist regime into the United Nations—for he knows that to do so would be to strike a mortal blow against the whole cause of democratic liberties in the entire Far East.

When Quemoy and Matsu were under attack, and when the resolution of free peoples around the world wavered, Walter Robertson was a tower of strength. He knew that the only way to combat Communist terrorism is to stand firm—and his position has been vindicated.

During and following the war in my own country, Mr. Robertson has always been a friend upon whom we could solidly depend. We always and forever have found him to be a gentleman of the highest standards of personal honor and integrity. Through him our own small country has been able to deal with the great and powerful United States in a spirit of mutual respect and regard which has well served the common cause of freedom.

His greatest memorial is the high regard in which he is held by the vast majority of the more than a billion human beings with whom it has been his responsibility to deal for these past years.

I am happy to attest, too, that I know the man who has been named as his successor; and I am glad, as I know Mr. Robertson is, to feel assured that the wise policy of firmness and justice which Walter Robertson did so much to shape and maintain will continue to be upheld.

For the problems that afflict our part of the world are far from being solved. Perhaps they never will be solved in our lifetime—for the problems of humanity, especially in this era when totalitarian dictatorship is rampant, are numerous and continuous.

In Korea the fighting was ended with an unjust armistice—an armistice that was violated by the Communists as soon as it was signed—but there is no peace. Our nation is still half occupied by foreign aggressors. A military force of awesome proportions has been built up against us in the northern half of our own country, and we are constantly threatened by infiltration and subversion.

Seoul is a city of more than a million and a half inhabitants—and every one of them lives under daily threat from the jet warplanes that are based just less than 100 miles away. The defense of our security is our very first responsibility—a responsibility that imposes itself upon every aspect of our personal and national life.

Every Korean youth is inducted into the armed forces when he reaches the age of 20 to serve for 3 years of active training, and then to be transferred into the active reserves.

Despite the enormous needs for rehabilitation and development, our principal efforts must all be directed into defense. For the freedom and independence—the democracy and progressive development—to which our government is pledged all depend first of all upon preserving our security against the constant Communist threat.

In many ways the pressure of the Communist will to conquest imposes itself into our national life. Scores of Communist agents have been arrested in our territory—armed with large sums of Korean and American currency and supplied with detailed instructions concerning the subversion of our newspapers and other agents of public information.

It is naive of those who appear to think that the Communists fight only with guns, or with threats of attack. Actually a very large part of their program of world conquest consists of propaganda and infiltration. Their agents are carefully trained to make instant and loud appeal to the very laws that are designed to protect democratic freedom. In this way they hope to win regardless of what happens. In some instances their subversive tactics may succeed. In other instances their agents may be apprehended and found guilty of subversion—but when this happens there are always misty-eyed and innocent idealists who will cry out that freedom is being violated when these agents—who, of course, pretend to be sincere critics—are arrested.

Your own country suffers and has suffered to some extent from these tactics. Our nation, which lies divided right across the world's major battlefront, is much more vulnerable. We are vulnerable to Communist infiltration—and we also are vulnerable to the slashing criticism of some so-called liberals in the West who denounce any action we take for internal self-protection.

Because of these criticisms against the necessary defensive operations of our own government, I want to read to you an official and most careful assessment of the progress of genuine democracy in my country—a statement which I quote from the latest report of the United Nations Commission on the Rehabilitation and Reconstruction of Korea. After 10 years of continuous observation of democratic processes in southern Korea, this is what the Commission says:

"The Republic of Korea was established in 1948 and, in the Commission's view, the foundations of democracy have been progressively strengthened during the past 10 years, despite the difficulties encountered, including the division of the country, the destruction of war and the problem of rehabilitation and reconstruction."

We are especially proud of the democratic developments in our own country because of some of the things we have been able to accomplish—despite all the enormous handicaps. And I am particularly happy to

enumerate some of them to you—for they are your achievements, too. Nothing that we have done would have been possible without the generous aid program of your country. What has been accomplished is, I feel, a proof positive that our kind of international cooperation truly works.

Here, then, in brief summation, is a part of the record:

1. When the Japanese were defeated, after 40 years of unjust colonial rule of Korea, some 80 percent of all our people were illiterate. Today the illiteracy has been reduced to about 6 percent. Of the children aged 6 to 11, 95 percent are now in school. And we have no fewer than 90,000 students in our 78 colleges and universities. This is, I believe, one of the most far-reaching and successful educational revolutions in all history.

2. When the Japanese grip was pried loose from Korea, some 54 percent of all our farmers were tenant farmers, and another 25 percent were partial tenants. One of the first acts of our new Government was to end this system of farm tenancy. We devised a system whereby every tenant farmer became the independent owner of the land he cultivates—with payment made over a 10-year period from the products of his fields and labor.

3. When our Government reverted to our own hands, we devised a constitutional democracy that insures absolute political equality to women and to every adult above the age of 21. This democracy really means something to our people—as is shown by the fact that on the average in all our elections the turnout of eligible voters is 84 percent.

4. In 1948 when our Republic was inaugurated, we had no real political party system. Today we have two major political parties, with the balance of political power fairly divided between them. Our Liberal Party controls the presidency; our Democratic Party the vice presidency. Some 60 percent of the National Assembly is composed of Liberals, some 35 percent of Democrats—the rest being Independents.

5. In 1948 our nation was the victim of a near runaway inflation—a condition rendered far worse by the war. For some 12 years after the Japanese defeat in 1945, our annual rate of currency inflation amounted to more than 220 percent. This means, in your terms, that a bottle of milk that cost 20 cents on January 1 would cost some 45 cents by December 31. Obviously this was a factor of ruination that struck a deadly blow at the welfare of every family in our country. Now I am happy to say that for the past 3 years the inflationary spiral has been cut back to a mere 4 to 6 percent increase a year—a figure somewhat comparable to that in your own and in European nations.

All these factors—plus improvements in the welfare of our agricultural and fisheries population, and the great expansion of our wholesome diplomatic relations, constitute a very substantial gain for Korean and world democracy. We are proud of them, and we look to the future with hope.

But there is another side of the picture that must not be overlooked. Much has been accomplished—but a vast amount yet remains to be done.

The other day, a distinguished American said that in his judgment the most fateful fact in the world today is the great disparity in living standards between the West and the Orient. I can highlight this for you by saying that, in American terms, the average per capita income in southern Korea is now about $105 annually—whereas, in the United States it is over $2,000. These figures mean just what they say—that on the average Americans live perhaps 20 times better than do our people in Korea.

Here is the great challenge of the future—of the immediate future—of today and of all the upcoming tomorrows. This is a problem that can only be dealt with through a combination of American resources, financial and technical, and our own Korean determination. We are willing and eager to make every sacrifice and every effort. But we must move ahead into the benefits of the 20th century. There is no other way.

This is the way we shall defeat communism. This is the avenue to a richer and better life—for us, for you, and for all the world.

Review of Record of 1st Session of 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the weekend, I was pleased to comment over Wisconsin radio stations on the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Naturally, it is possible in a broadcast to touch only the highlights of the manifold, complex legislative actions in Congress.

Generally, however, I feel that—when Congress winds up—the record of accomplishments will be moderately good, particularly in two major fields of which have been required bipartisan cooperation:

First, keeping the peace; and

Second, successfully recovering from our economic setback.

I was privileged, also, to review the tasks still ahead of us upon which constructive action is needed prior to adjournment.

And finally, the broadcast covers problems that—as we all recognize will remain unresolved in a number of fields.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SAYS KEEPING PEACE AND RECOVERING FROM RECESSION ARE TWO MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF NATION—EVALUATES RECORD OF 86TH CONGRESS MODERATELY GOOD

(Address by Senator WILEY over Wisconsin radio stations.)

Friends, I welcome the opportunity to be with you.

As you know, the adjournment of Congress is not far away.

In reviewing our progress in Congress, and as a nation, it is important to take a look at the record.

Insofar as it reflects bipartisan accomplishments, I believe the record is moderately good.

With adjournament there will, of course, be efforts—often "colored" in a partisan manner—to evaluate its record by either attempting to take credit for the accomplishments, or, conversely attempting to blame the other party for failures.

Without engaging in such partisanship, however, I would like to review the record briefly, including achievements we have made as a nation.

Question. Senator WILEY, what are the major marks of progress?

Answer. Although there have been advancements in a great many fields, I believe that two major accomplishments stand above the rest in the record. These include: keeping the peace; and successfully recovering from the economic recession.

PREVENTING WORLD WAR III

First of all, we have supported policies and programs that have helped to keep the peace; for the most part, this means preventing the cold war from degenerating into a hot war.

By and large, our foreign policy has had bipartisan support. Naturally, honest men may differ on national policy.

Overall, however, I believe the Nation can be gratified that the majority of its leaders—both Republican and Democrat—have been big enough to rise above lesser considerations and work for what is best for the country.

We are aware, of course, that keeping the peace and promoting greater security is not something that can be achieved—then forgotten. Rather, this is a continuous task.

Although there has been a superficial "thaw" in the East-West relations, we must remain alert and keep our powder dry.

Around the globe, the Communists are continuing their efforts at penetration of more areas and seeking control of more people.

Consequently, we must not be deceived by the words of peace of Khrushchev or any other Communist; rather, it will be necessary to keep up our guard—until words of peace are backed up with actual deeds.

Among the steps that Congress still must take is the approval of an adequate mutual security program—to further strengthen the alliance of free nations.

UNITED STATES MAKES ECONOMIC COMEBACK

Question. What is the second major accomplishment, Senator WILEY?

Answer. I believe the fact that we have successfully recovered from the economic recession is a real victory for the country.

Contrary to predictions of the prophets of gloom and doom, the Nation—despite an economic setback—did not succumb to a major depression. Instead, the Congress, administration leadership, and, most important, the confident outlook of Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen, demonstrated the spirit and zeal necessary to prevent what might have been a serious depression, with ultimately disastrous international results.

Again, it is gratifying to acknowledge that—though there were differences of views at times—the leadership of both parties again rose to the challenge.

Now, it is true—that, economically speaking, inflation still plagues us—the cost of living is high—and there are still a number of unemployed. However, there also is a number of factors that brighten the outlook.

Question. What are these, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Today, the Nation is experiencing new highs in the economic field. These include the gross national product—that is, the value of all goods and services—amounts to about $485 billion; and national income is at a record high of $374 billion; civilian employment is at a peak of over 67 million.

In Wisconsin, too, the outlook is brightening.

According to a recent survey, the State hit record high levels in a great many facets of the economy.

Employment has hit a high level of 1,582,300—although this still leaves about 2.5 percent of the labor force unemployed (as compared, however, to 5.4 percent this time last year).

Average weekly earnings for production workers in our manufacturing industries are earning an average of $94.57 weekly—an increase of 7.1 percent over last June.

The trend in homebuilding is up over last year;

Sales of cars and trucks are well above comparable 1958 levels;

Department stores sales gained 12 percent in the 5-month period beginning in January;

Business and corporations have set a new record—up nearly 50 percent over last year.

We recognize, of course, that we still have economic problems—including the need for action to reach an early settlement of the steel strike. Based on the record, however, I believe we can continue to deal with these successfully.

There has, of course, been real progress, also, in a great many other fields.

Question. Senator WILEY, we appreciate a quick look at the record of major accomplishments. Now, looking ahead, what are the jobs that must still be completed by the 86th Congress prior to the adjournment of its 1st session?

JOBS STILL TO BE ACCOMPLISHED BY 86TH CONGRESS

Answer. There are, of course, a number of major tasks ahead of us. These include:

Providing financing for the highway program;

Enacting an effective labor reform law;

Strengthening our civil rights status;

Enactment of a good housing program;

Approval of funds to strengthen our mutual security alliance.

In addition, there are a substantial number of other bills still pending on the calendars in both the Senate and House of Representatives that deserve the consideration of Congress.

WHAT CONGRESS—OR THE COUNTRY—FAILED TO ACCOMPLISH

Question. Are there any fields in which it looks like Congress—and the country—still must face serious challenges in the future?

Answer. Yes. Unfortunately, solutions have not yet been found for a number of problems. These include:

First, the farm problem. Despite high costs, the economic outlook for the American farmer has not been substantially improved, nor have surpluses been reduced;

Second, we need tax reform, along the lines recommended in the Wiley bill, S. 1885, to establish a Hoover-type Tax Commission to make an overhaul of the overall tax system.

Third, the economy has not succeeded in mustering forces to block inflation. Regrettably, this economic hazard is still reducing the buying power of dollars, diminishing value of savings, investments in bonds, and life insurance; making it extremely difficult for folks on modest retirement incomes to meet the high costs of living and otherwise plaguing the economy.

Unfortunately, this general but brief review does not provide an opportunity to touch upon activities in a great many other important fields. These include: conservation, veterans' programs, education, programs for the aging, brightening the outlook for youth, and a great many others.

COMPLETION OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Prior to closing, I would like to mention one more significant major mark of progress; that is, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Dedicated in June of this year, there has been a tremendous increase in the first-season traffic through the improved, deepened, and modernized waterway.

As a sponsor of the seaway law, I am particularly happy that the completed project promises fulfillment of the great expectations which we envisioned in enacting legislation for U.S. work on the St. Lawrence program.

STOPPING THE "CHICAGO WATER STEAL"

Question. Senator WILEY, now turning to a closely related subject, we recall that the bill, H.R. 1, proposing to divert more water from Lake Michigan, was favorably reported out of the Public Works Committee this week.

Answer. Yes; unfortunately, the measure is now before the Senate. As things look now, it may come up for consideration next week.

Question. What is your strategy, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Naturally, I shall fight the bill. Among other things, I shall attempt to have the measure recommitted to committee; this time to the Foreign Relations Committee, where it rightfully belongs.

Question. Why do you say that, Senator?

Answer. In the U.S. Senate, legislation affecting our relations with other countries, and relating to treaties with other nations, should be handled by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The dangerous water diversion bill touches upon both these criteria in these areas of activity.

First, it threatens to jeopardize our relations with our good neighbor, Canada, by diverting waters of the Great Lakes in which Canada has a vital interest; and secondly, the unilateral action to divert dangerously large volumes of water threatens to violate our treaty with Canada relating to the utilization of common waters between the two countries.

Time after time, the Canadian Government has resoundingly voiced its strong opposition—and wisely, I believe—to the proposed water steal legislation.

The Congress of the United States, I believe, ought not to let go unnoticed the voice of a friendly government in such a critical matter.

There are, of course, sufficient reasons at home why the bill should not be enacted. If this is done, it will seriously jeopardize safe shipping, reduced tonnage carried on the lakes, damage lakeshore property, and impair dock facilities and port and harbor development projects. In addition, it would endanger the St. Lawrence Seaway and threaten to damage beaches and resorts.

CONCLUSION

Question. Thank you, Senator WILEY, for this preadjournment review of the record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Answer. I have been happy, once again, to have the opportunity to discuss with you a variety of programs, issues, and challenges.

Now, this is your senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY, saying "Thanks for listening."

Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present for the RECORD a resolution recently adopted at the 41st Annual Convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, held in Parkersburg, W. Va., in which the department unalterably opposed H.R. 7650, recently passed by the Congress.

I respectfully invite my colleagues to take a few minutes to read this resolution:

RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA

The following resolution was adopted at 41st annual department convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virgina, held July 24–26, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.:

"Whereas H.R. 7650, the new proposed pension bill has been passed by the House of Representatives, and is now under consideration by the Senate Finance Committee; and

"Whereas the national organization of the American Legion has advocated enactment of this legislation; and

"Whereas contrary to the position taken by the national organization, the Department of West Virginia is unalternably opposed to the pension bill H.R. 7650 in its present form for the following reasons: (1) The bill under consideration is an abrupt change from the historical concept of veterans pensions, and places the recipient of such benefits on the basis of public dole rather than honorable assistance in time of need; (2) it creates more inequities than it proposes to eliminate; (3) this proposed legislation would after July 1, 1960, have two rates of payment for veterans who are identical in service, age, income, and need. This difference caused only by the time the pension was granted: And, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, assembled in convention in Parkersburg, W. Va., this 24th, 25th, and 26th of July 1959, urge that the senatorial delegation of the State of West Virginia expend every effort to defeat H.R. 7650, now pending in the Finance Committee of the U.S. Senate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copy of this resolution, as adopted, be forwarded to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD, Members of the House of Representatives of West Virginia, and to the national commander, Preston J. Moore."

I, Tommy E. Jones, do hereby certify that I am the duly elected, qualified, and acting adjutant of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, and that the above is a true and correct copy of the resolution adopted at the 41st annual department convention of the American Legion, Department of West Virginia, on Saturday, July 25, 1959, in Parkersburg, W. Va.

Given under my hand this 12th day of August 1959, at Charleston, W. Va.

[SEAL] TOMMY E. JONES,
Department Adjutant.

Where the Public Good Goes It Steps on Toes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Waco, Texas, News-Tribune published a thoughtful editorial on the subject of the public good in conflict with personal property rights.

This intelligent editorial echoes the utilitarian writings of Jeremy Bentham, the 19th century philosopher, who held that the "greatest good for the greatest number" should be the aim of just and fair legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled, "Where the Public Good Goes It Steps on Toes," from the Waco News-Tribune of August 19, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE PUBLIC GOOD GOES IT STEPS ON TOES

No matter what the project may be—as long as the ultimate goal is for community betterment—we must face the fact that personal property rights in some cases must give way to the greatest public good, yet with fair and reasonable reimbursement for those rights.

As a case in point, hardly a week goes by that we do not hear some rumor about Lake Waco property-owners having a hassle with the Corps of Army Engineers about the value of lands that the new reservoir will inundate. So far as we're able to learn, the only serious rumors are traceable to the curbstone gang, none of whom owns as much as a square foot of lake property—they just like to talk about it.

Certainly, there may be some disagreement as to value, for there are some owners who would like to get more for their holdings. (And who wouldn't?) But, for the most part, those who have completed their negotiations are agreed that the settlement prices have been fair.

Whether it's a flood-control measure, the construction of a new highway system, urban renewal or whatever, no project of any such magnitude can be completed without stepping on a few toes. Somehow, progress has a way of avoiding "no-man's land," and it's probably a good thing—no man would benefit thereby.

Address of the Honorable Alf M. Landon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, the following is an address delivered by the Honorable Alf M. Landon to the AFL–CIO Second Annual Kansas State Convention on July 16, 1959 at Topeka, Kans. After reading Mr. Landon's remarks, I am convinced every Member of Congress will find such of interest:

ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON TO AFL–CIO SECOND ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION, TOPEKA, KANS., JULY 16, 1959

I deeply appreciate your invitation to address the duly elected representatives of 150,000 fellow Kansas citizens.

I am going to discuss this morning not only some of labor's problems from your point of view but also from the public's point of view—which I do not believe are well understood.

Revolutionary changes have taken place in industrial conditions and labor organizations in my lifetime that affect every American.

I can remember when the standard work week was 72 hours and father and mother discussing the reduction of the 12-hour day to the 10-hour day—6 days a week. I can remember talking to a superintendent of a steel plant in 1922 when President Harding had persuaded the steel industry to adopt the 8-hour day in place of the 12-hour day. He said it might work in other industries but it would never work in the steel industry. A year later, talking to the same superintendent, he said he wouldn't go back to the 12-hour day if he could.

When I was a student in the University of Kansas—some 50-odd years ago—the fight in the Congress and State legislatures was to abolish child labor in industry and for protective legislation for women in industry. That fight was led by the American Federation of Labor. The argument against that legislation was that it was unconstitutional—that women and little children had a right to work—if they wanted to. At that time there was no limit to the hours that a train crew had to work. That was corrected by legislation led by the late Senator Robert La Follette, Sr., and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen to the benefit of not only labor but for the safety of the passengers as well as the equipment—because the physical reactions of a man who had worked 18 or 20 hours or longer were not adequate to the demands of his job.

That's when I became a believer in the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively. And I have never seen any reason to change my mind.

That does not mean that I believe labor organizations—their leadership and their policies—have always been right or above public concern.

I believe strong labor organization supplements a sound capitalistic economy. In the beginning—labor was organized along craft lines exclusively. Then came the unique American development of massed production. That brought about the massed unionism of today. The growth of single companies spread from one plant to—first—scattered nationwide plants. Many of these branch plants are larger today than the original factory. Second—in the last few years many American corporations have branch factories located all over the world and in different nations.

As American corporations have grown in size—so has the AFL–CIO and United Mine Workers.

I believe it can be argued with validity that the natural evolution of massed unionism to meet massed production provides a needed check and balance on economic power in our Nation's life. Without that we would have a chaotic condition similar to other countries in the world today.

Look at the two extremes—from Russia where labor is not free—to England where it is a major political party and as such is involved in a conflict of interests. Right now England's labor party is split wide open on its H-bomb policy in the coming campaign. Faced with the responsibility of government it must take a position on that question of national security that does not involve primary labor economic and social policies.

I do not think a labor political party will ever be successful in America because of our 50 States. And I do not think labor unions will ever take over either one of our political parties for the same reason. They may—in effect—take over some political party temporarily—in one State or another—because of the ineptness of the leadership of the other major party in failing to develop a political philosophy adequate to meet the problems of today.

But that is not a new development in the political life of our great country.

In the nineties we had the Populist and the Farmers Alliance that temporarily dominated several State governments and elected Members of the Congress.

It is significant that most of the policies of that agrarian movement—that scared the pants off a lot of people at that time—have long been written into State and National legislation. What was socialism and revolutionary then is ultraconservative now.

There was one fundamental difference between the political activity of that old agrarian political bloc and Labor's Committee on Political Education. The farmers did not have the cash available for campaign funds that the labor organizations have. What money there was in the country in the eighties and nineties available for campaign purposes was all on one side. Now there is a balance.

We have not developed a practical and successful way to check the unhealthy growth of campaign funds because the Congress and State legislatures have refused to enact legislation providing for accurate and complete public reporting of political campaign contributions—both by parties and candidates.

There is much to be said about that. I do not believe campaign funds are being used to buy votes as they were only a comparatively few years ago in too many cities. Today the rising expenditure of political campaigns is the increased costs of television—radio and printing.

And there is nothing new in our history about the charges of pressure groups like those made against the political activities of the AFL–CIO and the United Mine Workers.

There have always been pressure groups in our history.

In our early history it was charters for toll roads, canals, and land grants. Then came railroad charters, defense contracts, power projects—not to mention such perennial standbys as tariff and river and harbor legislation, known as the pork barrel bills.

Again—when I was a student at the University of Kansas—the battle in the legislature was for an antipass bill—primary and popular election of U.S. Senators to curtail the political influence of the railroads and to establish the Interstate Commerce Commission and State Corporation Commission.

Whatever influence the labor leaders have used has not been confined entirely to the problems of their organizations.

I have been familiar with the work of Kansas Legislatures for 40 years. And in all that time I have never known of more public spirited lobbyists than the representatives of labor.

They have always been for better education, better roads, and streets, better conservation and flood control, improved recreational facilities and better sanitation and safety measures.

All of which today are highly important factors in securing industrial plant locations.

The farmers of the State would not have the REA facilities they do today without the vigorous support from start to finish of that legislation by the labor organizations.

Today the struggling labor unions of my youth have grown in strength and most of them in responsibility.

Because of their size their leaders live in a goldfish bowl just as all public and big business figures. Their character and activities are of public concern.

Arguments as to who has the greatest economic power are fruitless. A strike to settle that by two powerful giants like steel unions and corporations has appalling consequences on all America. If it lasts long enough—more union workers will be laid off in other industries—than are on a strike in steel. Our national defense program is threatened.

Yet not one official word of the final points in dispute has been made public. Why the mystery?

The public ought to know and has a right to know what it is all about.

There are published stories and comments on the points at issue but no official statements by the men who did the talking.

Why not? What were the problems and the needs of both sides as stated to each other and what are the facts to back them up as claimed by both sides?

I believe that both Union President David McDonald and R. Conrad Cooper—spokesman for the steel industry—should sign a joint statement for the public on the points of difference.

Can there be any doubt that the pattern of the negotiations between big steel and big union is as important as any debate on the floor of the Congress?

Therefore, can there be any doubt as to the obligation of both union and management to make public their demands?

It became necessary for Government—by new regulatory legislation—to protect the public as well as investors against the frenzied finance—insurance scandals of past years—inside deals by management—and unconscionable contracts between corporations with interlocking directors.

Big business resisted that kind of legislation as labor leadership is resisting it today for labor organizations.

But there is one very fundamental difference between the two. Big business made little effort to clean its own house. The AFL–CIO under the wise leadership of President George Meany is making a vigorous attempt to do just that and is entitled to receive wholehearted support from public officials, management, and the public that he is asking for.

If your leadership does not succeed in that and unless better labor management relations are established by sincere objective and factual recognition of each other's problems and needs, Government is bound to step in sooner or later, just as it did with big business by increased regulatory powers over both unions and management. That means creating new Government bureaus and endowing Government with new powers.

In this complex industrial life of ours I recognize the necessity of regulatory legislation covering big labor just as I believe that is necessary to cover big business. But I believe such legislation should be held to the minimum essential to public protection—else we will have a cumbersome Government bureaucracy that entangles both labor and management in endless redtape and confusion of administrative laws.

I also recognize that the administration of that regulatory legislation with equity and justice is all important.

But I am opposed to any legislation aimed at weakening the principle and structure of collective bargaining through strong and responsible labor unions.

Now may I speak of the responsibilities confronting you and ahead of you—outside of your organization's problems and policies.

The greatest contribution labor organizations have made to the general welfare—not only to all freedom loving Americans, but to freedom in the world—is their stanch and unrelenting opposition to communism. The future historian, writing of this period, will give more credit to men like George Meany and John L. Lewis for the defeat of the imperial Soviet's plans for world conquest by the sword, slave camp, assassination, and subtle subversion, than they will to any other American civilian.

There is no stronger civilian bulwark anywhere in the world against the Soviet tyranny and slave camps, than the AFL–CIO and United Mine Workers. Massed unionism is democracy's negative answer to the Lenin-Trotsky-Stalin expectation of a proletarian revolution.

I am sure I do not need to warn you patriotic and devoted Americans that the fight will go on probably beyond the lifetime of the youngest delegate present. Either that or civilization will be "booped," like a quail on a rail, in hunting season.

Nowhere in the world is there a Communist government resting on popular support.

Every Communist government in the world rests on bullets instead of ballots and with no choice or freedom of action on the part of the individual.

We must be prepared at all times to offer either the hand of equity and justice to the Soviet, that makes for an orderly and peaceful world, or the mailed fist.

We must be willing and able to give them their choice, without threats or without fear.

The appalling and tragic confusion in the Pentagon, between the heads of our armed services, that has existed under both Democrat and Republican administrations, is a national scandal and menace.

On several occasions our President promised to bring order out of chaos in the so-called General Staff. He has failed to do so.

If he does not—the Congress can and should. There is a vital need for a thorough objective reappraisal of our overall defensive strength. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor—retiring Chief of Staff—says he has tried to get that done since 1953.

Inflation is as great a threat to our national security as the intolerable and unsatisfactory conduct of our defense affairs. Inflation is the greatest boon to communism and it's a politician's paradise when they do not have to levey taxes to meet public spending.

Inflation by government is like a thief in the night robbing you—while you are asleep—of your earnings—your savings and your pensions.

Up until 1933—except in war—it was unknown legislative procedure to appropriate funds without accompanying revenue measures.

Both major parties—in recent national platforms have pledged expanded Government services—lower taxes and a balanced budget.

Well, I won't go so far as to say that both Democrat and Republican platforms were fooling the citizens. Because a rigid application of the pruning knife on our overstuffed bureaucracy—a rigid and sound decision of what should have priority as between what was desirable and what was necessary—could accomplish wonders in reducing the cost of our National Government. But that was too much in the nature of a miracle to occur.

The fight I had with the resolutions committee at the 1936 Republican Convention for sound money was with the so-called conservatives. They were all for a little snack of inflation then. But there isn't any such a thing. Planned inflation by deliberate Government policy has never worked because the controls never work. Since 1933 we have been steadily debasing the value of the American dollar by our Government's financial policies.

The place to stop the incipient flight from the dollar is in our Government's fiscal policies—either by reducing spending or increasing taxes until the twain do meet. That must be done one way or the other if we are to avoid the destruction of our money and credit.

The solution of the financial mess some 29 States are in—and countless municipalities—is just that simple.

The hope for America is that labor will wake up to the fact that it has more at stake in sound money than capital. The owner of a patch of land or some good common stock or merchandise—has some hedge against soft money. But those who have neither are like ducks on a pond.

Capital is fluid. It can shift around all over the free world and some of the Communist colonies as well. Labor cannot. The nimble speculator can always take care of himself. And that's going on right now.

As other countries of the free world have got on their feet—by America's aid—the American dollar is weakening in foreign exchange. That is partly due to fear of the stability of the American dollar and partly due to trade conditions and also the availability now of other countries for investments—whose governments have sounder fiscal policies.

Another illustration of the effect of our unsound fiscal policies is the invasion of our domestic market by foreign products. As you well know, taxes are a major factor in the cost of every product.

German casing and tubing—made according to the American Petroleum Institute specifications—can be bought in Kansas for $30 a ton less than American tubular pipe. German structural steel is being laid down in Kansas City for $40 a ton less than American steel. With the enlarging of the St. Lawrence Seaway the lower transportation costs will probably be reflected in lower prices. Belgian barbed wire is selling in Kansas for approximately $1.75 a spool less than American barbed wire and it is just as good. Recently our American Navy bought some steel plates from Japan $4 per ton less than American quotations. But on checking it was found that our U.S. Government lost about $6 a ton in taxes. So Uncle Sam was $2 a ton net the loser. American textiles are facing increasing competition from foreign textiles. You all know how foreign automobiles are taking the market away from American cars.

The completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway—lowering transportation costs to the seaboard—makes all of Kansas—with its great natural resources—educational and recreational facilities—more advantageous for industrial development.

I realize our foreign policies—our military disorganization and our imbecile fiscal policies are not on this convention's program. But they are of vital concern to every American. I mention them because they are policies that we all should be thinking about and talking about.

I have discussed with you this morning not only some of the issues in labor-management areas—but also the wider field of public policies.

It is obvious that big business and big unions are here to stay. Therefore, we must seek methods to adjust that development—to our American way of life.

Surely the America that developed new political—social and humanitarian values and principles that revolutionized the governments of the world—and the America that developed new methods of massed production that revolutionized industry all over the world—surely that America is capable of realistically facing and solving the complex problems of our industrial structure.

The American people must never forget the fact that our great Republic was founded on the concept that the average man and woman develops under responsibility and education.

I would like to see Labor's Committee on Political Education do more in the way of public relations such as the luncheon for representatives of statewide organizations and management arranged by Vice President James Yount last year on the educational problems of our great State.

I would like to see labor and management meet occasionally under different circumstances than strictly bargaining—based on who has the biggest club.

Several years ago your secretary—Floyd Black—issued invitations in Topeka for a joint meeting of labor-management and the press for an objective discussion of the problems affecting the growth and development of a better community to live in and do business in.

The relaxing visits during the social time of those meetings provided even a better opportunity for free and frank exchange of views.

I believe the pattern of those meetings is worthwhile for other communities and the State. Eventually regular meetings of that kind will contribute to the education of all the parties concerned. I mean not only labor and management—but the public as well.

It is evident that a better understanding of our existing mutuality of interest and interdependence would be a great asset for all Americans and the free world as well.

We must build our new industrial society on the capacity and the desire of the average man and woman to do what's right.

We must never lose confidence in each other or in the political capacity of each other.

Unless that be true—I mean, unless the mass is capable of exercising responsibility—there is no breath in popular government.

Our perceptions may be imperfect—but there must be and is—more good than bad in our combined intelligence.

The Eyes of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, all of us know the exciting, heroic story of how the United States got its National Anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner." But I do not believe many people are aware of the colorful history of the song, "The Eyes of Texas," which, although not the official State song of Texas, is the best known ode to the Lone Star State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Eyes of Texas," from the magazine article, Texas Parade, of August 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Texas Parade, August 1959]

THE EYES OF TEXAS—MUCH BETTER KNOWN THAN "TEXAS, MY TEXAS," THE OFFICIAL STATE SONG

(By Joe Tucker)

One moonlit night some 50 years ago, a young student slowly walked across the University of Texas campus to B Hall dormitory, climbed two flights of stairs to his small corner room, and on the back of a piece of laundry wrapping paper scribbled what are probably the most famous words ever written by a Texan.

Those penciled phrases are now sung as lyrics to one of the most typical and well-known college songs of America—"The Eyes of Texas." Written as a joke for a minstrel show, almost entangled in a legal battle involving a U.S. Senator, translated into 10 languages, "The Eyes of Texas" mirrors a unique rags-to-riches success story.

Although "The Eyes of Texas" certainly is not the national anthem—nor even the State song—many Texans jump to their feet when they hear it. It is the school song of the University of Texas and radio station KVET in Austin signs off at midnight with it instead of "The Star-Spangled Banner." The song is played before the beginning of all athletic contests of the University and is the theme for many welcoming committees in the East.

The song has been sung at many a hard-fought football game, by servicemen on lonely Pacific isles, and even by German infantrymen during World War II. An American medical officer in Tunis watched in amazement as German PW's of Hitler's defeated Afrika Korp filed down a dusty road singing "all the livelong day."

Many words have been exchanged and humorous situations arisen over the similarity between the song "Ive Been Working On The Railroad" and the more recent "The Eyes of Texas."

Years ago when the University of Texas Longhorn Band appeared in the East, a radio announcer said: "Here comes the University of Texas band dressed in its white and orange uniforms playing 'I've Been Working on the Railroad.'" The following week, the station was flooded with letters pointing out the error.

On November 22, 1948, at 6:45 p.m., over radio station WFAA in Dallas, the following news broadcast was heard:

"There was another slap taken at Texas today—and by a foreigner no less. It came from a gentleman—so-called—by the name of Harmon Nichols, who does some writing for the United Press up in Washington. Nichols sat himself down in front of his typewriter to do a piece on the fact that there aren't very many original tunes kicking around anymore. And the very first thing he took a swipe at was 'The Eyes of Texas'—suh. Rather than get involved we're going to quote this man Nichols directly. He writes:

" 'The Eyes of Texas'—anthem of the proud Lone Star State—is billed as original: PFFFT. That's Pfff. It's a theft from 'I've Been Working on the Railroad,' which in turn is a theft from 'I've Been Working On the Levee.' "

An immediate defense of the song came from a loyal and indignant ex-student of the University of Texas, Ed Nunnally, of San Angelo, Tex. "Hah," said Nunnally, "as for the 'Levee Song' or the 'Railroad Song,' those tunes were hardly known until John Lang Sinclair, the beloved author of 'The Eyes of Texas,' wrote his immortal words."

However, Nunnally admitted the copyright governed only the words. "But," he said, "without them you'd only have just another tune, or a folk song, if you like."

The battle for the song's copyright made interesting reading in newspapers around the country in 1936.

In the fall of 1935 Nunnally led a movement to have the song copyrighted, but an investigation led to the discovery that a former director of the University of Texas Glee Club, J. Oscar Fox, and a Boston publishing company had already secured a copyright. A major battle followed. The Texas attorney general and Senator Tom Connally came to the rescue of the State university.

Fox defended his copyright, saying, "It's simply like finding a steer that has gone unbranded for years." However, Fox relinquished his rights to the university, after it threatened suit, and Nunnally received a letter in March 1936 from the Director of Copyright Division of the Library of Congress successfully ending the 4-month contest.

The copyright protects the song on two counts:

1. Whenever the song and the "Texas" words are used in movies, plays, on records, radio, or television it will be played only to reflect credit to the university and command the respect of the audience.

2. Money collected in royalties and movie rights will go into a fund, half of which will go to the University Students' Association and half into a John Lang Sinclair Eyes of Texas Scholarship Fund.

Despite the fact that the song officially became the property of the University of Texas, the copyright was not enforced. In 1951 the song was used in the MGM movie "Go for Broke," a story of the 36th Infantry Division. The committee wrote MGM asking where they obtained permission to use the song. They answered they had obtained the right from Broadcast Music, Inc., who in turn stated they had received the right from a deceased Boston music publisher. In 1952 a contract was negotiated between the copyright committee of the University Student Government and BMI.

As a result of the new arrangement, a $675 check was obtained for rights to "Night Train to Galveston"—a Columbia Pictures western production. A grand total of $1,600, minus BMI's cut, was subsequently received for "Go for Broke" rights. In 1951 the song brought in $2,400 on the copyright with several suits pending against firms who had violated the copyright. Dick Powell of movie, radio, and television fame made a record of it in swing time.

In 1964 the copyright will run out. It may then be renewed again for 28 years. In 1992, 89 years after its composition, the most popular song a Texan ever produced will cease legally to be the property of the University of Texas where it was born.

But despite its widespread popularity through the years, love for "The Eyes of Texas" has not always been equally shared by everyone. Several years ago, a newspaper reporter interviewed Frederick Jagel, Metropolitan Opera star, who at that time was raising eyebrows around the country by declaring "The Star-Spangled Banner" was no good as a national anthem. He was asked:

"Mr. Jagel, how do you like 'The Eyes of Texas'?"

"The eyes of what?" the singer replied.

"Why 'The Eyes of Texas,' " the reporter returned. "You know, the college song."

"I don't believe I know how it goes," came the reply.

The reporter sang a few phrases before Jagel came to his defense.

"Yes, of course, I do remember it," he said. "No," he said kindly, "that's not the proper kind of rhythm for a national anthem. It has qualities for getting crowds together but would never be inspiring enough to arouse enthusiasm. Noooo, I don't think it would do. But, it's a fine song—just a little lame."

In spite of its wide acclaim and universal popularity, the song's father, John Lang Sinclair, a red-faced, blue-eyed gentleman with quizzical eyebrows, pooh-poohed the idea he had written "The Eyes of Texas" for a college hymn.

"It was just something dashed off for diversion," he said. In New York City he was considered an authority on stocks, bonds, and income taxes. His interest before his death in 1947 was primarily statistical—not musical.

However, Sinclair's lyrics were not conceived by accident.

"In 1903," Sinclair said, "I was closely connected with the musical organizations at the University of Texas, being a member of the band and glee club. Some of the boys got up a show—University Minstrels—and asked the glee club for a selection. We didn't have anything new or good and we were in a pretty bad fix up to the last minute. A classmate, Lewis Johnson (a retired Jacksboro, Tex., rancher before his fairly recent death) said I would have to make up a song of some kind, so it was a case of do or die. I was very fond of that old son 'I've Been Working on the Railroad' so I decided to write new words."

The lyrics actually sprang up from a campus joke of the time. Referring to criticism leveled at the University of Texas, Col. William L. Prather, university president, in

a speech to a group of students that year, said:

"Young ladies and young gentlemen, the eyes of Texas are upon you." The statement might have been forgotten had not the colonel picked up the same phrase in subsequent talks. Soon the phrase "eyes of Texas" became a campus jest leveled at the president. In thinking up words for his new song, Sinclair decided on "Eyes of Texas."

Instead of being peeved by the song, Prather took it as a considerable honor and laughed with great glee. It touched a tender spot in his heart to his dying day.

In one of his customary addresses delivered at the June 1905 commencement, the Colonel gave his usual fatherly advice and as he closed an otherwise serious speech, the characteristic twinkle came into his eyes and he brought forth a thunderous applause by saying, "and in the words of one of our own poets, remember young men and women, the eyes of Texas are upon you, till Gabriel blows his horn."

Four weeks later Colonel Prather died.

When planning the funeral, those in charge asked that the song might be used in the services. The family answered they thought it appropriate, reverent, and considerate, knowing as they did, how dear to his heart the song's sentiments were.

And from that day, "The Eyes of Texas" changed from a campus joke to a revered college hymn.

Footnote on Western Capitalists Trying To Do Business With Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following illuminating news item from the report of the company meeting of Paton & Baldwin, Ltd., as it appears in the London Economist of August 1, 1959. It illustrates vividly the folly of imagining it is possible to do business with Communists except on their terms and insofar as it helps them prepare for final liquidation of the West. Lenin said that capitalists would cooperate in their own destruction. Some in America, also, seem to want to prove him right.

[From the Economist, Aug. 1, 1959]

SHANGHAI

Developments over the year have made it plain that continued operation of the company's factory in Shanghai, China, is a fruitless if not impossible task. There is no true modus vivendi between Communist and Capitalist regimes, at least not within the borders of the totalitarian state, and with the growth of China's own productive resources the need for continued toleration of foreign-owned enterprise within China has become less and less. The Chinese authorities were, therefore, approached with a view to the company being relieved of further responsibilities for running and maintaining our plant and personnel and in the hope of obtaining proper compensation for the surrender of our assets.

An agreement has been come to in recent weeks which will not be fully implemented until the end of 1959. Another announcement will be made to stockholders as soon as is appropriate in the circumstances, but I can say now that it would be unrealistic to expect that the settlement of affairs will bring much material benefit to the company.

Resolution Adopted by Aviation Post No. 651 of the Illinois American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Aviation Post No. 651 of the American Legion for the State of Illinois.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF AVIATION POST NO. 651, AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF ILLINOIS

Whereas Aviation Post No. 651, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, has in the past, been the recipient of the good graces of the Rt. Reverend Bishop Ezekiel of the Greek Archdiocese of North and South America, and who is presently the Archbishop of Australia and New Zealand; and

Whereas the late and venerable Archbishop Micheal has been called to eternal rest, and has been succeeded by his Eminence, Archbiship Iakovis, whose wisdom and zeal is known throughout the Christian World; and

Whereas for the last 6 years, our post has been favored with a representative of the Greek Orthodox faith, to give the invocation and convocation at every large public function, commencing with your past President, John Manos, and thereafter by the personal and most gracious participation of His Grace Bishop Ezekiel; and

Whereas because of the close collaboration with this dearly beloved, cultured, compassionate, and truly great divine leader, Aviation Post, has through its Public Relations counsel, been most articulate and outspoken in its denunciation and condemnation of the forces of evil that have plagued our Greek brethren in Turkey, Cyprus, and other parts of the world, resulting in action by the President of the U.S. State Department, United Nations and other governmental agencies, and bringing great Americans, Governors of many States, generals and admirals of our Armed Forces to participate together with outstanding representatives of Greek organizations; and

Whereas the Greek American Progressive Association is recognized as a great, compelling force for good, that has supported many educational, philanthropic and worthwhile undertakings, and has done all in its power to preserve the traditions of its great Hellenic heritage, and has contributed to the education of American-born young men, to finance their schooling in theology in Greece until the establishment of the present seminary, and has further succeeded in integrating and preserving the ancient and modern Hellenic philosophy which makes them better Americans and better men and women; and

Whereas, in addition thereto, the Greek Americans Progressive Association have have pledged $100,000 to the Greek Archdiocese Foundation, for the building and establishing of a much needed Home for the Aged, which was the dream and hope of His Eminence Archbishop Ezekiel, and those stalwart individuals, whose sincere contributions in time, effort and devotion, are bringing this dream into reality; and

Whereas the Honorable Andrew Fasseas, Director of Revenue, has embarked upon a "Road Building Machinery for Greece Program," and, which Aviation Post feels is one of the most needed enterprises to help our great ally in every war since the First World War: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Aviation Post No. 651, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, hereby pledge our unqualified support, first, to bring to the attention of our Government, through the Congress of the United States of America, by resolution and personal effort, such aid and assistance as is necessary on matters of legislation, in the purchase of surplus property, such as farm implements, machinery, tools, surplus vehicles and parts, to follow the peaceful pursuits for farmers, artesans and others, needing such assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That we herewith pledge to maintain a helpful attitude in furnishing speakers on Americanism and citizenship as related to the ancient Hellenic philosophy, and to render such services to the Greek American Progressive Association as is humanly possible and in keeping with the principles of the American Legion, free from partisan politics; be it further

Resolved, That we extend our felicitations and good wishes for a long, useful, successful and healthy life to his Eminence Archbishop "Iakovis" of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America, and much success to all of the officers and members of Greek Americans Progressive Association, and the future Bishop of the Greek Orthodox Diocese of Chicago, Ill.

Dated at Chicago, Ill., this 21st day of July A.D. 1959.

A. HENRY GOLDSTEIN,
Public Relations Counsel.
ODD MEYER,
Commander Aviation Post No. 651, the American Legion.

NATO's Nuclear Power Grows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include the ninth and final in a series of articles by Mr. Edward J. Milne, Washington correspondent for the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin of Providence, R.I., concerning his recent tour of the NATO countries. This article appeared in the Providence Sunday Journal of August 9, 1959, and is entitled "NATO's Nuclear Power Grows":

NATO'S NUCLEAR POWER GROWS
(By Edward J. Milne)

WASHINGTON.—The North Atlantic Alliance passes a new milestone tomorrow in the development, always slow, frequently frustrating, but on the whole steady, of its sword forces, or nuclear strike capacity.

On that day, August 10, there becomes effective the last of new agreements with

four of this country's NATO allies designed to allow them to sharpen the sword by achieving the capability of turning today's terrible weapons against a common aggressor.

The agreements are among six which President Eisenhower proposed to Congress this year as the result of the lowering of some—but by no means all—of the barriers to exchange of atomic information during last year's session. Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, chairman of the committee which handles international agreements in the atomic energy field, steered them through Congress under a ground rule which permits them to become operative if Congress does not adopt a resolution rejecting them.

The agreement which becomes effective tomorrow is that with Greece. Late last month, agreements became effective with Turkey, which forms with Greece the southeastern anchor of the alliance, and with West Germany and the Netherlands, key nations to the West and North.

MANY HANDS NEEDED

To see British speeding smartly through "dry runs" of launching Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles is to understand two things: That with NATO, the United States is far from alone in building the defense of the West; but that to reach optimum effectiveness, the alliance must be sure that as many as possible of the partners have the modern modern deterrent weapons.

Despite years of angry warnings from the Kremlin, the NATO heads of government accepted the principle of nuclear armament in December 1957. Congress relaxed the strict law on sharing of atomic secrets a few months later, accepting, with no substantial resistance, the argument that this country could not expect NATO to remain a going concern, politically or militarily, if our allies were required to remain in a condition of inferiority.

Our secret-sharing is not extended to all the allies on the same basis. We are much more open-handed with the United Kingdom than with any other for the simple reason that she already had such knowledge in the nuclear-weapons development field that we were not making it possible for her to become an atomic power, but simply easier, cheaper, and quicker for her to do so.

FRANCE LIMITED

An agreement with France was among those becoming effective this year, but it is far more liimted than any of the others. Unlike the United Kingdom, France does not have the ability to design, develop, and build nuclear weapons.

On the other hand, unlike others of the allies, she thinks we should help her acquire that ability, and she thinks, too, that she should have a say in the use of such weapons by this country. Last year's changes in the law were carefully tailored to prevent our telling France how to make the weapons. With so many high United States-French political problems unresolved, the new agreement with France provides only for a sale to her of nuclear fuel for use in a prototype submarine reactor.

But Greece, Turkey, West Germany, and the Netherlands for all practical purposes don't care whether they are told how to make nuclear weapons as long as they learn how to use them. As the law stands, and as the agreements provide, they would never be able to use them without the specific authority of the President of the United States.

EXCLUSIONS CITED

Here is what the four agreements do not provide: They do not involve the transfer of atomic weapons, the nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, nuclear materials, or information on the design, development, and fabrication of such weapons.

Here is what they do provide: The exchange of information necessary to the development of defense plans; to the training of personnel in the use of and defense against atomic weapons; to the evaluation of the nuclear capabilities of potential enemies; and to the development of delivery systems capable of carrying atomic weapons (i.e., planes and missiles). Finally, the agreements allow the transfer from the United States to each country of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems.

The information which may be passed on to the four nations is strictly limited to that necessary to enable their military forces to use the weapons, not to design or build them. As someone has pointed out, an artillery man doesn't have to know the formula for gunpowder or how to make it in order to use a shell effectively. But he does need to know how to load and fire a shell and what it will do when it explodes on target.

DEFINING NONNUCLEAR

The nonnuclear parts of weapons systems do not include any part of the atomic warhead. Rather, they are such things as lugs, pylons, and other devices for attaching the missile or bomb to its launcher or carrier, other accessories for handling the weapons, and control systems for checking out bombs or warheads to make certain they are safe and in operating condition.

Training in the elaborate launching and electronic checkout procedures would be accomplished with dummy weapons.

On the whole, the path of the four agreements through the Congress was a smooth one, but the administration and Senator PASTORE had to meet a number of objections during the hearings. Chairman ANDERSON, Democrat of New Mexico, of the Senate-House Atomic Energy Committee was one of the doubters.

He was disturbed lest the extension of U.S. atomic capabilities to new NATO allies would be countered by transfer of nuclear weapons by Russia to its satellites. Senator PASTORE's rebuttal: That what the Russians do about arming the satellites doesn't depend "for a minute" on what we do.

Senator ANDERSON was worried, too, about the "stability" of some of our own allies. "This is like a Paul Jones dance, you don't know who you will be dancing with when the music stops," he said.

"God help us," Senator PASTORE retorted, "if that is the situation in NATO."

Thrift and Rates of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Blow Against Thrift," published in the Hartford Courant of August 23, 1959, and also an article entitled "Tight Money Likely To Get Tighter," written by Harold B. Dorsey, and published in the Washington Post of August 24, 1959. These two items deal with the subject of thrift and rates of interest.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Aug. 23, 1959]

BLOW AGAINST THRIFT

Early last week a duly constituted committee of Congress decided to disdain the repeated pleas of the administration for permission to raise the ceiling on interest rates for Government bonds. Whether or not this was the final word of the 86th Congress on this subject, it was a serious economic mistake. Of greater interest to most Congressmen, probably, is the fact that it eventually may prove a political boner as well.

The decision to cling to an outgrown ceiling affected, in the first place, all new issues of marketable bonds of more than 5 years maturity—those intended for such institutions as banks and insurance companies and for big individual investors. By refusing to lift the top rate beyond 4¼ percent, Congress has greatly handicapped Secretary Robert Anderson in managing the ever-growing public debt with the least possible stimulus to inflation.

But that is not the whole story. More significant to the average citizen is the fact that the resounding congressional "No" will prevent the Treasury from raising the long-outdated interest rate on E and H saving bonds. And these are securities that one administration after another has been persistently trying to sell to the American public for some 18 years.

In the past the Treasury has succeeded in winning from Congress occasional modest increases in the interest it can pay on savings bonds, to keep the return roughly commensurate with that available from other conservative investments. On E bonds held to maturity, for example, the yield has inched up over the years from 2.9 percent to 3.26 percent. Meanwhile however, the rate paid by commercial banks has risen as high as 3 percent. Savings banks have gone to 3¼ percent and within a few months some will step up again to 3½ percent. Some savings and loan association, for their part, are paying 4 percent.

Yet the U.S. Government, by decree of Congress, is unable to keep pace. The inevitable result has been a steady cashing in of savings bonds by their holders. The Treasury has just disclosed that cashins of E and H bonds had outrun sales for 12 successive months through July. For the first 7 months of this year, redemptions outstripped sales by $613 million. Furthermore, Treasury officials said that unless the arbitrary ceiling is lifted, the whole savings bond program is "in danger of collapse."

It could be. Most Americans bought these bonds in the first place out of patriotic zeal, and a desire to back the boys on the firing line in every way possible. When the guns fell silent, many persons continued to buy them, as a form of regular savings, for their safety and perhaps even for their steady if unspectacular yield. But with the continued march of inflation all that has changed. Few savers are going to put money into government bonds that pay a scant 3¼ (and that only if held to maturity), when other institutions offer higher rates along with a government guarantee of the principal. Under today's circumstances, moreover, saving in any form has become a dubious procedure. Hence the popularity of the high-flying stock market, as a possible, if risky, hedge against the rising cost of living.

If it is to halt the ravages of inflation, Washington must act forcefully on several fronts. But it surely will not succeed if it persists in penalizing the saver. That is exactly what Congress is doing by clinging to an interest rate that was adequate 10 years ago, but is clearly inadequate now.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

TIGHT MONEY LIKELY TO GET TIGHTER

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

Now that the House Ways and Means Committee has pigeonholed for the balance of this session legislation permitting the Treasury Department to issue Government bonds with an interest coupon higher than 4¼ percent, business analysts are trying to figure the consequent effects on business activity and the credit market.

Their analysis must start out with the fact that short-term credit is very tight. Small business borrowers are beginning to complain that their bankers are "pretty well loaded up," meaning a bank's ratio of loans to deposits is just about as high as the banker wants to see it go. And, as a generality, it may be noted that this ratio for the total of all of the commercial banks at the end of July was at a high level.

It is against this current status of the banking system that business analysts have to project conditions, which must include a normal seasonal increase in the demand for bank credit between now and the end of the year, to finance harvests, Christmas inventories, and the higher rate of business activity that usually develops in the fall and winter.

On top of the already tight situation, plus the rising seasonal needs for short-term credit, we now have to superimpose the credit needs of the Federal Government. The latter is being forced to borrow in competition with business for the available supply of credit in the short-term and intermediate-term markets. Thus simple arithmetic strongly suggests that the present tight credit situation threatens to become extremely tight over the next several months.

The failure of Congress to give the Treasury Department more flexibility in solving its financing and refinancing problems is going to place a considerable penalty on legitimate business borrowers, large and small—but, as usual, more severely on the small rather than the large.

All of which presents some very difficult problems for the monetary authorities at the Federal Reserve. One of their primary responsibilities is to exercise credit controls in a fashion that will prevent an inflationary abuse of credit. In the past year they have been discharging that responsibility with excellent results and without retarding sound business expansion.

That reminds us that another primary function of the monetary authorities is to provide the economy with a bank credit base that will be sufficient to permit sound economic expansion. There probably is no group of men in the country that is more anxious to see a rising trend of business activity, providing, of course, that the prosperity does not contain those excesses which cause a boom-and-bust pattern.

It appears that the monetary authorities in the next several months must try to find a very delicate solution for a set of unusually rough problems. It would seem that they will have to ease credit policies to a sufficient extent to prevent the extreme tightness now indicated for the fourth quarter of the year, or else the soundly expanding economy might be threatened by a deficient supply of credit. Simultaneously, the Treasury Department's demands for credit will have to be handled in such a fashion as to prevent an inflationary expansion of money supply, or we will be threatened with the development of a boom-and-bust pattern.

From a security market viewpoint, when credit is this tight it certainly is not bullish, and usually it is the reverse. The condition means: (1) That there are less funds readily available for buying securities, (2) it leads toward an increase in the relative yield attraction of bonds over stocks, and (3) it could have a dampening effect on business activity. In most earlier cycles, this combination has frequently led to downswings in both the trend of business and the trend of stock prices.

But in none of those earlier instances were the nonfinancial economic forces operating as strongly in the direction of sustained business activity as they are now. In those earlier instances, the tightness of the credit situation reflected the presence of an overexpanded economy and an abusive use of credit. The nonfinancial economic factors were set for a downswing to a much greater extent than they are now. Present indications suggest quite strongly that there will be a good snapback of business activity when present work stoppages are terminated. As a corollary, fourth-quarter earnings of a great many companies promise to be excellent.

In brief, the money situation is bearish, so far as common stocks are concerned, and the business situation is bullish. It was because the money situation had been bullish in the presence of a fairly severe inflation scare that high price/earnings ratios and low yields have been recorded in the stock market, especially for "quality" stocks and some of the extremely speculative issues. It is because the business and earnings situation for numerous cyclical groups of companies had been bearish that some of the stocks in this category do not appear to be high in relation to the earnings and dividend improvement now indicated by business prospects.

Shutdown in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I thought the statement made by the AFL–CIO executive council on August 17, 1959, concerning the shutdown in steel, would be of interest to the Members:

SHUTDOWN IN STEEL

(Statement by the AFL–CIO executive council)

The shutdown in steel is now in its fifth week. This is no ordinary strike. On the surface the issues may appear to concern wages, fringe benefits, work rules, and similar issues. But, as Roger Blough, chairman of the board of the United States Steel Corp. has said, this strike involves more than those issues. It represents the focal point of an effort by corporate management of this country to reverse the whole pattern of labor relations in industrial America by converting unions into subservient tools of management.

The crisis in steel is but the latest in a series of events which illustrates the determination of corporate management in this country to achieve this result. The position taken by the automobile companies in negotiations with the United Automobile Workers in 1958, the position of the manufacturers of electrical appliances in response to the legitimate requests for employment security programs in that industry, were forerunners of the frontal assault upon cooperative labor management relationship which is now taking place in the basic steel industry.

The story in steel began in April of this year. At that time the steel companies proposed to the United Steelworkers of America that they agree to a 1-year freeze on wages and other benefits. This meant giving up both the cost of living protection which was contained in the Steelworkers' agreements and giving up the annual improvements which were contained in the existing labor agreements.

The supposed basis for this proposal was the necessity of preventing inflation. That this was not the real basis was immediately demonstrated when the Steelworkers Union proposed an agreement that there should be no increase in steel prices but such improvements in wages and other benefits be negotiated as could be justified by the industry's increased profits and the increased productivity of the workers in the industry. The industry rejected this proposal out of hand.

The more than 2 months of negotiations which followed were completely fruitless. Despite their own knowledge that their profits were increasing at an exorbitant rate, the representatives of the steel industries refused to abandon their preconceived position that those increases and the increases in worker productivity must be reserved solely for the companies.

The steel industry knew full well that neither the United Steelworkers of America nor any other self-respecting union could accept its proposition. They knew full well that by their adamant insistence upon that position they would create a crisis in steel.

But to make assurance doubly sure, they injected into the negotiations during their closing weeks still another issue, the union must agree, they said, to the abolition of clauses in the agreements protecting individual working conditions and must give management a full rein to take any action at whatever cost to the individuals, if such action would result in an increase in profits.

The result was the result which the industry anticipated. Although the union, in a final effort to avoid a test of strength, agreed to a 2-week extension of the expiring contracts, the companies still maintained their position, and the strike began on July 14.

That the inflation issue which the companies had posed was a false issue became obvious when the companies reported publicly, as they are required to do, their profits for the first half of 1959. Without exception those reports showed that the industry could not possibly claim that any reasonable increase in steel wages or other benefits would provide the basis for increase in prices and thus further inflation. The reports demonstrated equally the falsity of the companies' claim that existing agreements prevented increases in efficiency.

Thus, for example, United States Steel showed a profit after all costs were paid, before taxes, of more than $2.28 for each man-hour worked in the first 6 months of 1959, as compared to the prior record profit year of 1957 when its profits before taxes per man-hour were $1.61. Profits for each hour worked had grown by 67 cents an hour, despite the wage increases which were placed in effect in 1958, despite the cost of living increases which had been placed in effect in that period and despite the fact that the operating rate had actually dropped. Profits per man-hour, after taxes, for the first half of 1959 are $1.11.

There was also given the lie to the industry's position by the phenomenal increase in worker productivity shown by the 1959 reports. In the last 3 months in which work was performed in 1959, United States Steel shipped steel products at a rate almost 6 million tons greater than in 1953 but with 51,000 less employees. Nor was this phenomenal increase in profits and productivity necessary to bring steel up to general levels in profits. United States

Steel earned a return on net worth after taxes of 15 percent in the first 6 months of 1959 and a return on sales, after taxes of 10.1 percent.

These figures make it perfectly plain that the steelworkers' case for an increase in wages and other benefits without a price increase in steel is an overwhelming one. But the figures do more than that. They make it plain, because they are so overwhelming, that there can be no reasonable dispute concerning the ability of the steel companies to absorb reasonable increases. They make it plain, therefore, that the struggle in steel is not solely, or even primarily, a question of economics.

The issue in steel is one which involves all of American labor. The corporations of America have determined that this is the time to attack the American labor movement. Utilizing the genuine concern about inflation which is existing in America, and what they think is the attitude of the public generated by the exposition of the sins of a small minority of labor leaders, the companies have decided that this is the time to weaken, if not to destroy, the organizations which have compelled them to give up some portion of their unlimited prerogatives in dictating the terms and conditions of employment. And the steel industry, because it is an industry which has just emerged from a period of heavy unemployment, but one in which the companies continued to enjoy profits, was the place to have that fight.

The steel companies have found that the workers in the steel industry, despite their recent unemployment, are nevertheless determined not to yield their hard won union protections. American industry should understand that the labor movement of the United States is fully cognizant of the fundamental nature of the issues involved in this strike and they will rally wholeheartedly to support the Steelworkers' Union.

The executive council of the AFL–CIO understands the nature of the issues in steel. The executive council of the AFL–CIO recognizes that at issue in this strike are not only differences over wages, fringe benefits, work rules and similar issues but the whole course which labor-management relations will take in major industries in this country in the future. For this reason, the executive council of the AFL–CIO on behalf of all of the unions represented in the AFL–CIO pledges to the United Steelworkers of America not only its full moral support but also every assistance that can possibly be rendered to that union in its struggle with the basic steel industry.

I Did My Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that, from time to time, it is desirable to pause in our busy cycle of day-to-day activities—to reevaluate our progress—to gain new perspective—perhaps just to be inspired by the words or deeds of those who, having attained notable planes of accomplishment in their fields, have crystalized ideas worthy to be considered by their fellowmen.

I am aware, of course, that there are those who feel that the consideration of philosophical concepts is not the mission of political bodies. Yet, the actions of each of us—and the caliber of the jobs we perform—are determined, to a significant degree, by the ideas and concepts in which we believe.

Consequently, I feel that a new look at those philosophical ideas which underlie our actions, as well as new thoughts, can well be beneficial.

Yesterday, This Week magazine published brief excerpts from a speech by the Honorable Learned Hand, a notable, respected, and revered jurist, who has carved a unique role in his field. Under the title, "I Did My Best," his eloquent words—excerpted from a collection entitled, "Spirit of Liberty"—convey a thoughtful philosophy which, if more broadly applied, may well help men and women to better travel their respective roads through life.

I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpts printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I DID MY BEST

(By Judge Learned Hand)

Man is a projector, a designer, a builder, a craftsman. His reward is not so much in the work as in its making; not so much in the prize as in the race. We may win when we lose, if we have done what we can; for by so doing we have made real at least some part of that finished product in whose fabrication we are most concerned: ourselves.

And if at the end some friendly critic shall pass by and say: "My friend, how good a job do you think you have made of it all?" we can answer: "I know as well as you that it is not of high quality; but I did put into it whatever I had, and that was the game I started out to play."

How To Go Places by Team Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Malvina Lindsay's column in the August 21, 1959, issue of the Washington Post which is not only a humorous, but rather factual description of how to rise to the top in Washington.

HOW TO GO PLACES BY TEAM TACTICS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

I had long worried over my inability to go everywhere and at the same time to do my work. People who amounted to anything, it seemed, missed nothing in the way of mass gatherings.

What was more puzzling—especially from my taxpaying point of view—was how high public officials with supposedly demanding jobs could be regulars on the party circuit, the television screen, and at all public affairs.

I had a feeling I was off the main current of American life. Hence I sought the advice of my public relations counsel, Dr. Gulliver Shrugg, operator of Shrugg's Specter and Spy Service, and top ghostwriter for both sides in all major controversies of the last 25 years.

Things were humming at Dr. Shrugg's office. "It's the chance of a lifetime, this Khrushchev visit," he exclaimed. "Anybody can get his name in the papers—with comment supplied by us. Members of Congress can keep in the spotlight after they go home. Besides, I have a new gimmick in campaign training."

I broke in to tell of my own problem. Dr. Shrugg looked at me severely. "You probably have the obsolete idea that a person should do his own work."

"But who else——"

He waved me to silence. "You probably even stay home at times with a good book."

"I would like some time," I admitted, quoting Yeats, " 'to sup at journey's end with Landor or with Donne.' But I never get around to it."

"It might be a little more excusable if you had said with Jack Kerouac or James Jones. However, even that sort of thing is out of date, as even you should know. My office can supply you with authoritative cocktail-party comment on any best seller——"

"But how do I get to the cocktail party?"

"The way most big shots do—by having others do your work. Now, if you expect to get anywhere in this town, you must begin to organize your team."

"My team?"

"Yes. Your secretary, researcher, speechwriter, magazine writer, bookwriter, scriptwriter, television coach, 'think' man, or woman, promotion director——"

"Wait. How do I pay these people?"

"You work up to that. Perhaps your first investment should be in a promoter. If you are sufficiently promoted, you'll get a salary raise or a better job. Then you start hiring your team to do your work. You begin to go places, to be seen more publicly. People will think you important. You will make advantageous friends, make more money, hire more teamworkers."

"I draw the line at hiring a thinker."

"Why? Greater figures than yourself have had their names attached to other people's ideas. It's been a practice since the Monroe Doctrine, and no doubt long before that. Most historic Government programs that bear the names of prominent men have been created or thought out by obscure persons."

"I still say it's dishonest not to try to do your own thinking——"

"There isn't time any more. Your smartness now is gaged by your ability to assemble a capable unobtrusive team. All public men who go places are adept at this."

"Then we should not judge a presidential candidate on whether he's wise or has the capacity for greatness."

"Those things don't hurt. But what counts is what kind of a team does he have? Who, above all, are his 'think' men? You don't elect a man any more; you elect a team. That system is reaching down through business and social life. You start with the promoter——"

"And you end with an animated facade, shopworn from public exposure."

"You end with an efficient front man—one who knows how to select good thinkers, writers, etc., how to use them effectively, how to put their products across with the public. That's why I'm starting a new course for political candidates in front-man techniques." He handed me a leaflet. "It can also help anyone go places professionally or socially."

"I don't have the aptitudes, or the energy," I sighed. "It's easier to go back to my office and tackle that piled-up desk."

Invite Mr. Khrushchev to the TVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as I have already stated, I am glad that Premier Khrushchev is coming to this country. I do not expect his visit to end the cold war, or even substantially to melt it. And I recognize, as have others, the inherent risks of such a tour. But I nevertheless believe that the advantages outweigh the disadvantages, and that therefore the President was wise in extending his invitation.

Perhaps the most fruitful result of Mr. Khrushchev's stay will be his increased awareness of American strength and increased understanding of American life. Many suggestions have been offered for the Russian leader's itinerary. I know of no better illustration of America's strength than the humming complex of dams and plants and rivers and mountains in the Tennessee Valley region. And I know of no better example of America's life than the strong, freedom-loving inhabitants of the valley.

An excellent editorial appeared in the Knoxville Sentinel of August 5, 1959. Entitled "Sure, Expose Mr. K. to Valley People," it forcefully expresses two of my own views. It compellingly states the benefits of a visit by Mr. Khrushchev to TVA, and it reminds him, and us, that the most important knowledge to be gained from the forthcoming visit is not about the power of our industry, military and technology. It is about the power of the American people, which the Tennesseans in the valley so well represent.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SURE, EXPOSE MR. K. TO VALLEY PEOPLE

A good idea, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER has, in urging President Eisenhower to suggest that Russia's Khrushchev be taken on a tour of TVA installations when he comes over here.

If the main purpose of inviting the top man in the Communist hierarchy to America is to expose him to this Nation's strength, technological skills, industrial wealth, tenacity to the principles of freedom, and love for peace, we don't know of any better place for the exposure.

We say let Mr. K. take a long look at the TVA hydro and steam plants, the natural resource conservation program covering the whole valley; let him visit some farmers, factory workers, and industrialists.

Take him right into the top-secret areas at Oak Ridge (as a nonscientist he couldn't steal any secrets); let him see the Air Force's wind tunnel at Tullahoma, the fertilizer pilot plants at Muscle Shoals. Show him through a typical all-electric home of a modestly paid white-collar worker.

Here in the Tennessee Valley, where there are those who trace their ancestors to soldiers in the Battle of Kings Mountain, Mr. K. would come face to face with the real American.

The people of this valley are a cantankerous, argumentative, and sometimes ill-tempered breed. Some of them are tight-fisted; others profess to hanker after so-called mountain ballads sung in a high nasal monotone. Some vote "dry," go to church on Sunday and drink a beverage distilled from corn mash that looks, smells, and tastes like bad vodka. (Mr. K. might go for it.)

But by golly, there's one thing Mr. K. will find that is a great common denominator in this magnificent land of lakes, mountains and lush valleys.

It is a fierce and unwavering defense of liberty, fairplay, and love of this country.

Mr. K. couldn't help from being impressed. Send him in, we say.

Those of us who have been traveling about this country recently, on business or vacation, return to our desks tremendously impressed with this land and its people—its wealth and richness, its strength and vitality, its growth and change.

This is reflected in myriad ways—by the great superhighway developments, by the mushrooming of huge suburban shopping areas, by the number of new schools, churches, and other public buildings—not to mention uncountable new factories and residences.

Seeing them will help Khrushchev estimate how quickly he can match and surpass the Americans.

Health Coverage Needed for Retired Career Federal Civilian Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide voluntary health benefits coverage for retired career civilian employees of the Government. I do so in recognition of my responsibility as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

My bill is a companion bill to the bill introduced Friday in the Senate by Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has rendered such an outstanding service to the Government and Federal civilian employees in developing the legislation which became S. 2162, providing a comprehensive governmentwide health benefits program for 2 million active Federal civilian employees.

My bill provides health coverage for career retired civil employees on the same basis that active employees and those who will retire after June 30, 1960, are covered in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, which passed the Senate on July 16 by a vote of 81 to 4 and early this week was unanimously reported by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

ANNUITANTS AND GOVERNMENT SHARE COSTS

This bill would provide health benefits coverage for approximately 260,000 retired Federal employees, Federal employees disabled while in service for the Government, and their spouses and minor children. The premiums under this bill are the same as provided for under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and are not to exceed $3.80 per month for an annuitant who enrolls for himself only, and $9.20 for an annuitant who enrolls for himself and members of his family. These premiums would be matched equally, on a 50–50 basis, by the Federal Government. The retired annuitant may have a free choice of plans: a service benefit plan, such as offered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield; an indemnity plan, such as offered by the insurance industry; a group practice prepayment plan, such as offered by the Kaiser Foundation on the west coast and Group Health Asosciation here in Washington, D.C.; and an employee organization plan, such as offered by national employee organizations.

CONTRACTS, COVERAGE, ANNUITY DEDUCTIONS

Specific health benefits would be negotiated by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, as the administering agency, with the various carriers. Annuitants would have 90 days after July 1, 1960, to elect coverage, and those who had not elected coverage within this period would lose the opportunity to do so. The annuitant's contribution, which would equal one-half of the cost, would be withheld by the Civil Service Commission from the annuity check.

COSTS

Reliable figures as to the family composition of the presently retired annuitants of our Government are not readily available and, of course, the cost of such a program could not be ascertained until this information is studied by the Civil Service Commission. Another factor in determining costs would be the number of annuitants who might elect coverage under this voluntary health plan. However, reliable estimates place the first year's cost of health coverage for retired Federal civil employees at around $40 million, which cost will be shared equally by the Federal Government and by the annuitant. The first year's cost will be the greatest since the presently retired and those who retired prior to July 1, 1960, is a group which inexorably will decline in size.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY PROTECTS RETIRED EMPLOYEES

The Federal Government cannot ignore the progressive examples of many large private employers who sponsor health benefits programs and have included in these programs persons already retired. These number, for example, the Arkansas Power & Light Co., B. F. Goodrich Co., Eastman Kodak Co., Goodyear Tire Co., Firestone Tire Co., Gilmore Belt & Rubber Co., American Sugar Refining Co., Swift & Co., Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and the First National Bank of Oregon.

If present retirees are not included in health benefits legislation on the same basis as future retirees will be included under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, large groups of retired employees may be penalized be-

cause they may lose such health insurance as they now have, or if they do not lose it, the premiums for continuing the insurance may be so greatly increased and become so high that it will be difficult for them to continue it. The reason for this is that many retirees are now insured in small local groups or under the plan established by the National Association for Retired Civil Employees—NARCE—or other plans composed of active employees which allow them to continue such coverage after retirement. When the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 becomes effective on July 1, 1960, the presently active employees may promptly abandon these policies and seek coverage under the favorable terms of the new act. Without an influx of new members and newly retired members, the rates for these policies would become prohibitive, since the group would continue with only the presently retired, who, of course, become older each year.

It is my opinion that the need of older people in our area for voluntary health coverage has long been neglected. Providing health coverage for presently retired Federal employees would prove an important step forward in meeting the health needs of our older people. It is well known that the need for health services is extremely critical in older groups. We must not shut our eyes to this urgent need.

CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION RECOGNIZES NEED

Chairman Roger W. Jones of the U.S. Civil Service Commission, in a letter to Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER dated May 18, 1959, stated:

> Anyone who expressed indifference to the plight of our already retired employees in being unable to obtain adequate health insurance at a price they can afford to pay would be callous indeed. * * * To require retirees to assume all or a major portion of the cost would put the insurance out of their financial reach. The only possibility which suggests itself would be to consider already retired employees as a separate group from active employees and try to work out separate legislation for them.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE FAVORS

The report of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on S. 2162 contains the following statement:

> In making this recommendation, we have not overlooked the fact that the bill does not address itself to the problem of health insurance for those who are already retired, a fact that has given us much concern. We consider it essential that legislation for active employees and future retirees be supplemented in the near future by providing similar protection for those already retired. While we recognize the complexity of the problems involved in providing effective health benefit coverage to those already on annuities, the pressing health insurance needs of retired Federal employees suggest the importance of an early formulation of ways and means to meet their problems * * *. The Bureau of the Budget advises that it perceives no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

NEW YORK PROVIDES HEALTH COVERAGE FOR ITS RETIRED STATE EMPLOYEES

The State of New York has wisely made health benefits coverage available to its retired State employees as of June 1, 1958, with the State paying 50 percent of the cost of the coverage for the retired employees. I am pleased also to report that our northern good neighbor, the Dominion of Canada, has adopted a national hospitalization program which includes its already retired senior citizens.

Health coverage for retired employees on a voluntary basis also has been endorsed by the insurance industry and the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plans. I am also pleased to report that the Government Employes' Council of the AFL–CIO, representing over 600,000 Federal employees who are members of the AFL–CIO affiliated unions, have endorsed coverage for retired Federal civil employees.

As chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, it is my hope that health coverage for presently retired Federal civil employees and those who retire prior to July 1, 1960, will take effect on July 1, 1960, the same date when coverage begins for active and future retirees.

Legislation to provide voluntary health coverage to our career retired Federal civil employees is of vital importance and our Government, the Nation's largest employer will be following in a pattern already established by progressive private industry and our most populous State, the State of New York.

Credit Union Movement in America Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the year 1959 marks the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the first credit union in the United States, and the 25th anniversary of the Federal Credit Union Act.

Today there are some 20,000 credit unions in this country with a total membership of about 11 million persons. Their assets total $4.4 billion.

In my own State of Oregon, the Oregon Credit Union League represents 188 credit unions with 91,000 credit union members.

America's credit unions have performed a highly beneficial service over the past 50 years in making available credit to persons of limited financial resources.

Last week the Senate Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported legislation to modernize the Federal Credit Union Act. I hope such a bill will come to the floor soon. The value of the credit union program has been proven. Congress should give every assistance to insuring its effective operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the August 17, 1959, issue of the Mail Tribune of Medford, Oreg., by United Press writer Elmer C. Walzer, discussing the growth of credit unions in the United States be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROWTH OF CREDIT UNIONS REACH ABOUT 20,000 IN THE UNITED STATES

(By Elmer C. Walzer)

NEW YORK.—Credit unions, according to Alexander Hamilton Institute, are growing at a faster rate than any other financial institution in the Nation.

These do-it-yourself institutions might be compared to banking somewhat as investment clubs are to the stock market. There is one difference. Bankers aren't too fond of them. The stock market loves the investment clubs.

Credit unions take business away from banks. Investment clubs brings business.

The two groups are thrift institutions and each is growing rapidly in scope and in the money invested.

ELEVEN MILLION CUSTOMERS

There are some 20,000 credit unions in the Nation with a membership aggregating 11 million persons. Their assets total $4.4 billion. They have $3.1 billion of loans outstanding. Membership averages 550 persons.

These unions pay 4 percent interest on deposits and charge 1 percent per month on the unpaid balance on loans.

A credit union is described as a group of people organized into a sort of bank to save their money together and make loans to each other at low interest rates. Loans include those for auto purchases, home modernization, and the like.

The unions are subject to regulations and must maintain reserves. In their formation they must obtain charters. They maintain their own insurance for members—mutual insurance society—which has $4.2 billion of insurance in force.

The Alexander Hamilton Institute made a study of these unions. It found their history dates back to 1849 when they were first organized in Germany.

The institute found that a French-Canadian legisaltive reporter, Alphonse Despardin, became interested in the European experiment and after a long period organized the first credit union in North America at Levis, Quebec, in 1900. In 1906, the Quebec legislature passed the first credit union law in the Western Hemisphere.

Despardin helped to form the first credit union in the United States in Manchester, N. H., in 1909.

Meantime, Edward A. Filene, Boston department store owner and philanthropist, came into contact with credit unions in India. He gave around a million dollars to further the idea in the United States.

The U.S. Federal Credit Union Act was passed in 1934. By that time legislative approval of credit unions had been attained in 39 States.

Today, the Alexander Hamilton Institute estimates, the 20,000 credit unions serve better than 6 percent of the U.S. population. Of the total number of unions, almost a third have been organized by employees of manufacturing companies, independent of labor affiliations.

Government employees have organized 19 percent of the total and another 10 percent has been formed by employees in transportation or utility services. Church groups, teachers, and school maintenance employees, labor union locals, and employees of wholesale and retail establishments complete the membership picture.

Three Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Founding of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the capital of New Mexico, Santa Fe, celebrates next year the 350th anniversary of its founding. It is the oldest seat of government within the United States. Santa Fe was the capital of a farflung empire—and had been so for a decade—before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock. For generations it was the object of overland travelers, fur trappers, traders, and emigrants.

Therefore, Mr. President, it was with some astonishment and dismay that the residents of the State, the Southwest and the Rocky Mountain regions—not to mention students of history in the South and East—learned of the Post Office Department's recent refusal to issue a special stamp commemorating this anniversary on grounds that it is only of regional interest.

Such a statement is ridiculous, especially when weighed against some of the stamps which have been issued for other reasons. To date, editorials replying to this Post Office Department decision from four great newspapers have come to my attention. They are from the Santa Fe New Mexican, the Denver Post, the Dallas Morning News, and the Shreveport (La.) Times. Others, in the United States and abroad, have noted the occasion and deplored the Post Office reaction.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have editorials on this subject from the New Mexican, and the Shreveport Times printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Santa Fe, New Mexican, Aug. 17, 1959]

DON'T THESE GUYS READ HISTORY?

Santa Fe's request for a special stamp to commemorate its 350th anniversary has been turned down by the Post Office Department screening committee on grounds that the event is of only regional interest.

Evidence to the contrary is beginning to build up. In Sunday's edition, we reprinted an editorial from the Dallas Morning News—one of the biggest and most influential newspapers in Texas—which reflected the interest of our big neighbor to the southeast concerning the committee's ruling.

Below you'll find the opinion of our big neighbor to the north—an editorial entitled "Don't These Guys Read History?" from the Denver Post.

"A citizens committee which makes recommendations to the Postmaster General regarding the issuance of commemorative postage stamps has—believe it or not—turned thumbs down on a request that a special stamp be issued next year in honor of the 350th anniversary of the founding of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

"The reason given for the committee's action was that it is contrary to established policy to issue stamps in celebration of events which are of only local or regional interest.

"Do tell.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe is the oldest seat of any government in the area now comprising the United States?

"We believe it is—except, perhaps, to a few provinical easterners who think of the Alleghenies as the western border of civilization.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe has the oldest public building in the United States—the Palace of Governors, built in 1610, which housed public offices under Spanish, Mexican, Confederate and U.S. jurisdictions?

"We believe it is.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe was the terminus of the oldest before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock?

"We think so.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe was the terminus of the oldest highway in North America—the Turquoise Trail, the original trade route between Mexico City and New Mexico?

"Of course it is.

"Among special stamps issued by the Post Office Department recently were those commemorating the completion of Mackinac Bridge in Michigan, the 200th anniversary of the establishment of Fort Duquesne, and the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Missouri University School of Journalism.

"We have no quarrel with any of these issues but we can't understand why those events should be worthy of special stamps if the founding of Santa Fe is to be brushed off as a local event of no national significance.

"We understand Mayor Leo T. Murphy of Santa Fe is protesting the decision of the Citizens Stamp Committee to Postmaster General Summerfield, who has authority to overrule the committee. He should do so."

[From the Shreveport Times, Aug. 17, 1959]

THE POST OFFICE PEOPLE SHOULD STUDY HISTORY

The Post Office Department has turned down the plea of the city of Santa Fe, N. Mex., for a special postage stamp commemorating the 350th anniversary of the founding of that metropolis. The reason given by the Post Office Department is that "It is contrary to established policy to issue stamps in celebration of events which are of only local or regional interest."

Well, whatta yuh know?

Perhaps the gentlemen in the Post Office Department, where commemorative stamps have been issued for such things as the opening of a bridge in Michigan, the establishment of an anti-Indian fort, and the 50th anniversary of a school of journalism, should read a bit of history. The way we got it from our books, Santa Fe is:

1. The oldest seat of any government in the area now comprising the United States (a claim sometimes questioned by hinterlanders who think of the Alleghenies as the western border of civilization).

2. The present site of the oldest public building in the United States—the Palace of Governors, which has housed public offices under Spanish, Indian, Mexican, Confederate and U.S. jurisdictions, and was built in 1610.

3. The only existing city which was established as a capital before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock.

4. The terminus of the oldest highway in North America—the old Turquoise Trail, the first trade route between the nation of Mexico and what now is New Mexico.

The Post Office Department nonchalantly bypasses such history as this, yet it probably would rush into print with a new commemorative stamp if someone should come up with a chicken that walked backward.

Moscow Discloses the Fakery of Its New Peace Disguise by Blaming United States and Laos for the Disturbances There Directed by Itself

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times. Moscow, as was to be expected, interprets as weakness our desire for a civilized settlement of world issues, and rewards our efforts by blatant charges that we are responsible for the troubles in Laos which it and its minions there have organized and are directing:

MOSCOW'S HAND IN LAOS

State Department suspicions that the Soviets, under cover of Premier Khrushchev's projected visit to the United States, are helping to stir up new trouble in Southeast Asia involving this country are confirmed by an official statement broadcast by Moscow.

The statement, issued by the Soviet Foreign Ministry, not only supports the Communist attack on Laos but, with typical Communist effrontery, presumes to make the victim the guilty party. It accuses the Laotian Government of violating the neutrality provisions of the Geneva truce agreement of 1954 by admitting American military personnel and bases and thereby risking a "civil war" that could shatter the peace of all Southeast Asia. More bluntly Soviet propaganda accuses the Laotian Government of seeking to suppress a "democratic," meaning a Communist, movement, and Communist North Vietnam boasts that the Communists have already "liberated" vast areas in Laos.

The facts are, of course, otherwise, and back the assumption that the Soviets and their Communist allies are trying to use the apparent easing of world tensions due to the Soviet-American exchange of visits for a breakthrough in Southeast Asia as they used the "Geneva spirit" of 1955 for their breakthrough into the Middle East. Neither Laos nor the United States has broken the Geneva agreement; there are no American military bases in Laos and the American supply of arms and a few instructors in their use is wholly in keeping with that agreement.

It is the Communists who have violated all agreements. They have staged a revolt against the 1957 agreement between the Royal Laotian Government and the Pathet Lao integrating the Communist-dominated provinces and forces with those of the rest of the country. And they have backed this revolt with men and arms from North Vietnam. The 1957 agreement supplanted the Geneva agreement and the truce commission it created, and the Soviet demand for reactivation of this commission is merely an attempt to nullify the 1957 agreement and to repartition Laos as a step toward a Communist conquest of it. Neither the United

States, a member of the Southeast Asian collective defense treaty that protects Laos, nor the United Nations can permit this to happen.

Hays Says TVA Has Made United States $12 Billion Richer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article containing several statements by the Honorable Brooks Hays, who is now a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which appeared in the Chattanooga Times of August 15.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAYS SAYS TVA HAS MADE UNITED STATES $12 BILLION RICHER

(By Fred Hixson)

The U.S. Treasury is some $12 billion richer and the people of the Tennessee Valley have been saved many millions of dollars in flood damage and in costs for electric service because of the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority, Brooks Hays, junior member of the TVA Board of Directors, said Friday.

The former Arkansas Congressman, who took his seat on the TVA board July 1, was here "for a family gathering" with key members of the agency's Chattanooga division. He had luncheon with the TVA Friday Luncheon Club on his first official visit here since he took office.

Hays explained to newsmen at a conference before the meeting that "I'm new on this job—I don't feel sure of myself on a lot of questions." However, he sailed into the questions shot at him and showed that he apparently had learned much about TVA while a member of the House of Representatives, where he was considered a staunch congressional supporter of the agency.

Hays' reference to the $12 billion supplement to Federal income came when he was asked to comment on the current advertising campaign of private utilities against public power. The ads are appearing in a number of national periodicals.

Hays referred to these advertisements as "Madison Avenue superficialities" and charged that they ignore the pertinent facts about the "real benefits TVA has brought during the 26 years of its existence." He added that the benefits are too numerous to cover in a single interview and emphasized that "they cover many, many fields."

Hays was accompanied here from Knoxville by TVA General Manager A. J. Wagner and Information Director Paul Evans. He was joined here by G. O. Wessenauer, manager of the power division; C. E. Wilkerson, TVA coal procurement officer, and Louis Marks, reports officer.

Wagner, Evans, and Wessenauer helped Hays with statistical information. He explained they were more familiar with detailed information of that kind than he, since he has been a Director for less than 2 months. He sidestepped questions about his future, declaring:

"I am enjoying a vacation from politics." He added that "I am devoted to the nonpartisan and nonpolitical character of TVA."

Asked if he would be willing to continue as TVA Director "as long as the President and Senate want you to serve," Hays answered:

"It would be presumptuous for me to assume they will want me to serve when my 11 months are up." He is serving the unexpired term of Dr. Frank J. Welch, dean of the College of Agriculture of the University of Kentucky, which will expire May 18, 1960.

Later, in answer to a question, Hays said he still maintains his legal home in Arkansas.

He sidestepped questions about the possibility of his becoming a candidate for Governor of his native State in 1960, emphasizing that "I have no political plans whatsoever."

The $12 billion Treasury supplement he referred to, Hays said, resulted from improved economic conditions in the seven-State area served by the Tennessee Valley Authority. During the 26 years the TVA has been in existence, great economic gains came to this area, resulting in heavy increases in Federal tax collections from the area, he said.

Hays said the TVA has served "all elements of life in the valley well." Even the "private utility companies which seem anxious to destroy it have materially benefited by TVA operation," he continued.

"Let the record speak," Hays continued. "The average common-stock earnings of private electric utility companies all over the United States have increased three times what they were in 1937 when the TVA started its power operations.

"The average common-stock earnings of private companies serving areas surrounding the TVA territory have increased eight times what they were in 1937.

"Now with respect to rates. The record shows that the private companies having the lowest rates also had the highest earnings on their common stock. Of course, this applies to private companies operating in territory surrounding the TVA territory.

"In 1932, the year before TVA was created, residential electric rates in Tennessee and surrounding areas were among the highest in the United States. In 1959 residential rates were lowest in the TVA area in the east, and in the Bonneville Dam area in the west. Rates become progressively higher as distance from the TVA area increases, and by the same token, earnings on common stock of these companies decrease with distance from the TVA area."

Hays also challenged the contentions made in advertisements that TVA is being subsidized by taxpayers over the Nation.

"The TVA is paying its way, liquidating the Federal investment in power facilities and earning an average of 4 percent on that investment," Hays declared.

He said it would cost the American taxpayers $50 million a year to "adjust upward, by 1 mill per kilowatt-hour, the Federal Government's bil for electricity to operate its atomic energy program."

SAYS FACTS IGNORED

"Consider, for instance, how much the TVA has haved the people of Louisiana by controlling flood waters in the Tennessee basin and keeping them off of the low lands of that State," Hays continued. "It is easy to distort facts, such as is being done by the advertisements being publicized about public power these days.

"After all," Hays said further, "the people who are paying rates to the companies which are doing this advertising, are actually paying for this propaganda. I don't believe the officers of the companies are passing the hat among themselves to pay the advertising bills. They are charging it against rates.

"The TVA has never engaged in that sort of a thing. Why should the ratepayers of the private companies have to bear the expense of this advertising campaign?"

Leyden, Mass., Celebrates Its 150th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the township of Leyden, Mass., is celebrating its 150th anniversary. Last weekend a special celebration, including a parade and a special service at the Methodist Church, were held in Leyden to mark this historic occasion. And next month a monumental history of the town, written by W. T. and Masha Arms of Leyden, is scheduled to be printed.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article from the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette describing this important event in the history of Leyden, a town which I am honored to represent in the Congress:

LEYDEN HISTORY, WRITTEN BY ARMSES, LABOR OF LOVE SPANNING 3 YEARS

(By Ken Walker)

Distilling old memories, combing facts from legend and resurrecting the long-dead infancy, youth, and manhood of an old Franklin County town—this has been the labor of love spanning more than 3 years for W. T. and Masha Arms of Leyden.

The Arms project is "History of Leyden," to be published late next month in a 224-page clothbound book by Carl P. Bradbury of the Orange Enterprise and Journal.

Leyden's chroniclers conceived the idea of a town history a decade ago after investigating the life of Leyden native H. K. Brown, who died in 1896, after painting Arms' grandfather's portrait.

Most of the research and writing going into the history has been done over the past 3 years, approximating 5 man-hours daily, 6 days a week, for a total of more than 6,000 hours, including initial historical research in Boston and Cambridge in 1955.

Mr. and Mrs. Arms credit Leyden townsfolk with a share of the success of the venture, furnishing the links of history from family memory, letters, diaries, and old photographs and maps. Particularly helpful were Harold V. Campbell and Edith M. Howes.

Included in the history are three specific re-creations of the township, showing all roads, boundaries, and public buildings as of 1794, 1830, and 1871. Also between the orange covers will be 11 other halftone illustrations and linecuts.

Every man, woman, and child who lived in Leyden in 1781 and the location of their residences will be included as well as a listing of all individuals now residing there. Peak population in the 1880's was about 1,100 compared to 350 now.

Stamped on the book's cover in gold foil will be the town seal. The covers will be orange, Arms explained, because the town was named for Leiden, Holland, which at one time was international headquarters for the House of Orange.

In addition to digging into dusty records in Leyden and Bernardston, the Greenfield courthouse, and Boston, Mr. and Mrs. Arms have hunted old cellar holes to place accurately former structures. They have found many, including the site of the old Dorril place.

The Dorrilites were a religious sect which flourished briefly in Leyden under tutelage of William Dorril, former British soldier under General Burgoyne.

"The Indians didn't live here too extensively," Arms related. "They lived in lower elevations and hunted through this area each fall. We've found several Indian artifacts, including the remains of a campfire."

The geographic history of the white man's Leyden starts in 1734, according to Arms, when "Fall Town" was included in a land grant. This was composed of the present Bernardston and East Leyden.

An additional grant was made in 1743, including West Leyden and East Colrain. East Colrain was made part of Colrain in 1779. Leyden was named in 1741, became an official district in 1784, and became a township in 1809.

The latter date determines the sesquicentennial date of Leyden, to be celebrated Saturday and Sunday. Sesquicentennial events will include recording of excerpts from the history and placing a historical marker at the former site of the Dorril place.

The Armses came to Leyden from Greenfield 14 years ago to make their home on Eden Trail Road in the eastern part of town.

The history has not been writer Arms' only project during these past few months. Although weakened by illness and confined to his home, he has assisted Mrs. Arms in planning this weekend's celebration.

With the exception of this story and two others on this page by Dorothy Howes, Arms wrote every word in today's Leyden anniversary suplement of the Recorder-Gazette. He has also turned out countless news stories to publicize both the history and the celebration.

One might think he has been so busy the new beard he sports on his lower jaw was the result of being too busy. But not so. This is Bill Arms' way of joining in the fun of the town's birth.

Indiana Dunes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald this morning be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The letter is from Freeman E. Morgan, Jr., whose family once owned most of the Indiana dunes. It is a plea that the dunes be saved from being taken over by steel mills, and made into a national park.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORY OF THE DUNES

I have watched with interest and some alarm the struggle to save the Indiana dunes for the people waged by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and other friends of nature. Interest, because I have known and loved the dunes since I first saw them in 1917. Alarm, because of the general apathy I find on the issue which must be changed if we are to overcome the selfish forces of political power and big industry.

A century ago the dunes belonged to my family. My great-grandfather, Lansing Morgan, cut millions of feet of pine there that was used to build Chicago into the great city that it is. With the timber gone for a while, the lumber industry moved on and most of the 8-mile Morgan tract reverted to the State. One mile was saved for future development and soon after the turn of the century it began to flourish as a recreation center for people from Fort Wayne to Chicago.

Cottages were built by the hundreds and picnickers swarmed to Waverly Beach (as the Morgan estate was then known) by the thousands. In the middle 1920's the property was purchased by a syndicate of public-spirited millionaires to form the nucleus of a State park. The Chicago Prairie Club property and another mile of undeveloped property were added to the Morgan estate to create the Indiana Dunes State Park.

In the early days of the park, the Governor of Indiana had a summer capital there. A beach hotel was erected to accommodate weekend visitors. Several acres were developed as a second-to-none swimming beach and the rest retained in its natural setting.

The sand is cleaner than on any other public beach I have ever seen. The water is clean with a sand bottom. From Memorial Day to Labor Day, the temperature of the water is ideal for swimming.

Most of the time the dunes are quiet and tranquil, offering the nature lover a relaxed respite from the cares of the world. But I love it best when the Lake Michigan storms whip up 25-foot waves that come crashing far up the beach and the wind whistles through the trees with a mournful tune. Then it is that we see nature's triumph over man, glorified and majestic.

We have camped in parks from Florida to Ontario and from Connecticut to Minnesota, but my family prefers the dunes to any other campsite. The new turnpikes have made the dunes available to travelers from all over. For a half century it was the playground of a relatively limited area. Now it is only 10 minutes off the main route for any Indiana Turnpike tourist. It is a wonderful place to rest and relax.

Let your Congressman know that you would rather visit a dunes park on your next trip west than another steel mill.

FREEMAN E. MORGAN, Jr.
TAKOMA PARK, MD.

White Fleet Supported

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, just a month ago the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I introduced in the House, and Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and GEORGE AIKEN introduced in the Senate, concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies to disaster and distress areas throughout the world.

On August 4, under extension of remarks, I described in some detail the moving response of the American people to this bright new concept for peace, which is the idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, of Tahlequah. Life magazine, in its July 27 issue, threw its full support behind the Manson plan for a Great White Fleet as a "bold proposal for peace" and devoted its cover to a striking picture of the proposed fleet and also devoted its lead story to the proposal and endorsed it in an editorial. Since that time Life magazine has followed up on this story, and favorable comment has come from almost every corner of the land.

Massive mail has been received urging establishment of the Great White Fleet by every sponsor of these concurrent resolutions, and I have received in my office alone more than 1,470 communications from every State in the Union, including Alaska and Hawaii, favoring the proposal. Less than 1 percent of the mail I have received has been unfavorable to the Manson plan.

I am informed that at the present time 47 Members of the House have sponsored concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of the fleet, and that 35 Members of the other body are cosponsoring the Senate concurrent resolution calling for the establishment of the Great White Fleet.

Since my report to you on August 4 I have received many other communications of strong support and offers of help, financial, technical, or personal, in the activation of the Great White Fleet.

Mr. Speaker, as an example of the type of endorsement and support which has been forthcoming in connection with this plan, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point an editorial by Mr. Bruce Palmer, news director of television station KWTV in Oklahoma, which was broadcast over that station on August 18, and also to salute Mr. Palmer for giving this fine message, in the form of an editorial, to his many listeners.

Last evening we observed that the United States has just begun to smarten up in terms of international propaganda. We are learning how to give a somewhat better account of ourselves in the word war between the free world and the Communist world. But we need new devices to make our propaganda messages more effective.

Within the last month, an imaginative project to focus world attention on the United States as a friend to all mankind has been suggested by a native Oklahoman. Comdr. Frank Manson of the U.S. Navy, who hails from Tahlequah, proposes to form up a new Great White Fleet, reminiscent of the one President Theodore Roosevelt sent around the world in 1907.

But where the Great White Fleet of 52 years ago had the mission of impressing the world with American naval power, Commander Manson's ships would carry hope and help to areas of the world struck with poverty, disease, or starvation. They would carry supplies and equipment necessary to bring relief to people of all nations in times of emergency or disaster.

The ships would come from Uncle Sam's mothball fleet, their crews from the Navy or the merchant marine, and the food, medicines, and other relief items from America's great store of all those items.

Commander Manson offers a bold approach to our national problem of making and keeping friends around the globe. The

Great White Fleet could quickly become an international symbol of American concern for the destitute everywhere. It could carry medicines to India to combat the annual onslaught of dysentery, or to Indonesia, where malaria is frequently epidemic. Its helicopters could rescue thousands from flooded areas, as the Navy's choppers did in 1957 when the cruiser *Princeton* was dispatched to the inundated island of Ceylon. Its supply ships could carry wheat and other foods to lands where crop failures threaten mass starvation, as was the case in India in 1951. Its potential for extending a helping hand is enormous.

As Commander Manson says, a new White Fleet would not bring peace to the world in one sweeping movement. Progress toward peace will come only a bit at a time. America may never be able to bring peace to the world by herself, but American leadership can prevent the people of the world from losing hope.

As the good idea of an Oklahoman, Commander Manson's proposal deserves Oklahoma's support. If you think that some of America's fighting ships might well be transformed into ships of peace and assistance to make the benefits of the free enterprise system available to the entire human race, here again is an opportunity to let your Congressman know about it. A new Great White Fleet could give the United States a tremendous victory in that propaganda war.

Approval of Senate Resolution 21

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recall that on August 21 the Senate approved Senate Resolution 21, expressing the sense of the Senate relating to making of loans by the REA.

As we know, Senate Resolution 21 states that it is the sense of the Senate that the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, continue to be interpreted to authorize the making of loans for the construction of facilities to, first, bring electric service to persons in those areas defined in the act as rural areas if such persons are in fact not receiving central station service, and, second, continue to serve those who are presently being served with the aid of funds loaned under the act.

Today I received a resolution from the Rural Electric Cooperative of Columbus, Wis., expressing approval of the resolution and thus, in effect, endorsing the Senate action.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE COLUMBUS RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, COLUMBUS, WIS.

"Whereas the Comptroller General a year ago on July 21, 1958, issued a ruling imposing an unprecedented restriction on the Rural Electrification Administration's loan-making authority, and completely reversing congressional intent as set forth in the 1936 law, and ignoring a historic precedent of 23 years' standing; and

"Whereas this ruling, in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture General Counsel and other lawyers conversant with the REA program, would, if enforced, destroy the REA loan program and jeopardize hundreds of loans previously made; and

"Whereas protests registered by the Department of Agriculture, Members of Congress, rural electric cooperatives, and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association have caused the Comptroller to make no fundamental change in his original disruptive and destructive ruling; and

"Whereas Senator AIKEN and 13 of his colleagues in the Senate have recognized this as a potential dagger pointing at the heart of REA and have therefore introduced Senate Resolution 21 designed to reaffirm the original congressional intent with respect to REA loans; and

"Whereas prompt and favorable action on Senate Resolution 21 will contribute measurably to the strength and stability of the rural electrification program: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the board of directors of the Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative here assembled do urge our own Senator A. WILEY to actively support and promote Senate approval of the Aiken resolution (S. Res. 21)."

This is to certify that the foregoing resolution was unanimously approved by the board of directors of the Columbus Rural Electric Cooperative at its regular monthly board meeting on August 12, 1959.

LESTER WELCH,
Secretary.

A Proud Record for Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, every man has an intense pride in his home State and this is intensified when as a Member of Congress his whole effort is devoted to serving a part of that State. My own pride in Indiana is one which words cannot adequately express, but among the many attributes which contribute to that pride is the great industrial potential which exists in this State which has come to be known as the crossroads of America.

This feeling of satisfaction which I have is shared by my constituency and is forcefully expressed in the following editorial recently published in the Marion Chronicle, one of the outstanding newspapers of my district.

A PROUD RECORD FOR INDIANA

Indiana has just outdistanced 48 other States in an important popularity contest.

Mill & Factory, a trade magazine, recently conducted a national survey asking industrial firms of all types and sizes which State they would choose for the location of a new plant.

We finished second, 1 percentage point behind Illinois.

Of the 133 firms participating in the survey 9 percent picked Illinois and 8 percent chose Indiana. Ohio was third choice.

The industrialists were also asked: Which States do you think are doing the most to attract new industry?

Indiana tied for third place on this point with Ohio and Florida. Pennsylvania was first with Georgia second.

It is interesting to note that 15 percent of the firms said they plan to move plants in the near future.

What does industry look for in new locations?

The survey produced these significant answers:

1. Favorable labor climate.
2. Favorable tax policies.
3. Nearness to market.
4. Adequate transportation.
5. Nearness of raw materials.
6. Adequate water and power supply.

Another question asked: Which States do you think are doing the most to discourage new industry? The replies listed Michigan, New York and Massachusetts in that order.

Indiana can be proud of finishing second in choice for new plant locations and tying for third in doing the most to attract new firms.

But Indiana must keep its industrial climate favorable. Industry—as the poll shows—is on the move.

If Indiana retains its sensible, fair, and independent outlook on State government and if our cities maintain their aggressive efforts to attract new plants perhaps we'll even pass Illinois.

Texas Loses Dr. James I. McCord to Princeton University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this fall Dr. James I. McCord will take another step in his distinguished career of education, theology, and service. He will become president of the Princeton Seminary.

Dr. McCord, dean of the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary and who has been associated with the University of Texas in some capacity since 1939, has an outstanding record on which is based the admiring respect accorded him by all who know him. He served as an instructor in philosophy at the University of Texas and has served as dean of the Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary since he was 24. In addition, he assisted with the Presbyterian Bible chair at the University of Texas; has served as temporary pastor for The University Presbyterian Church in Austin and is a member of the executive committee for the Presbyterian World Alliance.

This man's example of religious leadership, moral example for students, and working citizenship has helped many students find a pattern for their lives. His leadership in the fields of education and theology is widely recognized. I have been stimulated by his comments and intellectual boldness as a member of Austin Town and Gown.

Princeton made an excellent selection for its seminary president. Texas' loss is Princeton's gain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Richard M. Morehead, an able Texas writer, which was published in the Alcalde, the University of Texas alumni magazine, for May 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Alcalde, May 1959]

DR. JAMES I. MCCORD

(By Richard M. Morehead)

The new president of Princeton Theological Seminary is going to miss seeing the Longhorns gallop across the turf of Memorial Stadium next fall.

Dr. James I. McCord will leave Austin with a deep sense of regret. But he is stepping into the presidency of the largest Presbyterian seminary in the land and one of the greatest of the Protestant world.

When he wasn't tripping to Europe or other distant spots doing the Lord's work, Jim McCord was usually on hand to watch the Texas football team play.

While noted most for his keen intellect, the churchman-teacher keeps tab on sports, politics, and other worldly affairs.

Take, for example, the time when Malcolm Kutner, Texas' All-American end of the early 1940's, was a student in a philosophy class which McCord taught at the University of Texas.

"Kutner met his wife in my class," McCord recalls with pleasure. "The girl, Marilyn Tillery of Beaumont, was a Presbyterian. He was a Baptist from Dallas. Now he's an officer in the Presbyterian Church at Lubbock."

Jim McCord came to the university as a graduate student in philisophy in 1939–42, holding one degree from Austin College at Sherman. He received his master's degree here in 1942. He served as an instructor in philosophy and a Charles Oldwright Fellow for 2 years, 1941 and 1942, and remembers well that his class included part of the great Texas football teams of those years.

But McCord's admiration for the University of Texas is based upon deeper things.

"This university has in Logan Wilson one of the outstanding educators in the country," McCord commented. "He has brought to Texas more vision than any educator I know—and I think education in Texas is developing in every way in recent years."

The churchman believes that the state university has a duty of leadership in the whole educational structure.

"And the most powerful force for lifting the educational standards of Texas is the alumni of the University of Texas," he continued. "It ought to be the main objective of every ex-student to interpret the University of Texas' program to the people of the State."

McCord's words take added meaning because he has been a student, faculty member, and an observer of the university at close range for 19 years. Yet he can take the impartial view, for his career has been largely in church-sponsored education.

"It is impossible to carry on theological education without a great university," said McCord. The Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary, where McCord became dean at 24 and served until called to Princeton, sends its students to the University of Texas for nontheological courses.

McCord also taught hundreds of Texas students while assisting the late Reverend Samuel Joekel in occupying the Presbyterian Bible chair. Every major denomination maintains off-campus facilities where students can take specified Bible courses for university credit.

This frank and keen-minded minister-educator once made a speech that could well be repeated to those who look upon The University of Texas as a Godless place.

"As an alumnus of this University and as one who has been privileged to have a connection with it for years, I do not subscribe to the oft-repeated charge that godlessness and irreligion characterize a great State institution," McCord said during a Religious Emphasis Week address on the campus.

"I want to acknowledge publicly my debt to the spiritual inspiration I have received from my association with students, faculty and administration. From you I have learned lessons in discipline, openmindedness, and dedication to purpose."

McCord also disputes the idea that religion and the natural sciences conflict.

"While they may represent different ways of looking at the same reality, there is no necessity in opposing these two ways," he said. "It has been especially from men in natural sciences, like Dr. Roger Williams, that I have learned most and in them I have seen most clearly the ideals of scholarship coupled with singleness of purpose and devotion to truth."

The man tapped to head Princeton's training school for ministers has touched many lives, from Austin to Central Europe.

Twice he served as temporary pastor of the University Presbyterian Church in Austin. As such, he was pastor to the largest congregation of Presbyterian students in the Southern Church which ordained him. No other Presbyterian Church in the South serves so many students as the one situated one block west of the university campus.

On the larger front, he is a member of the executive committee for the Presbyterian World Alliance, which represents 47 million members of the church.

The seminary which he will head at Princeton has approximately 500 students from many nations. McCord believes it can and must serve to promote church union as well as to train young ministers. Many Protestant faiths are represented at the Princeton Seminary.

"I hope at Princeton to help serve as a bridge between northern and southern Presbyterians," McCord told a questioner. "I have always favored church union."

Princeton is operated by the recently merged Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. and the United Presbyterians. The new name is the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. The Presbyterian Church, U.S. (southern church), remains separate.

People at Princeton will come in for a real treat from their new theologian.

He speaks with a voice of authority. His positive manner prompts some Presbyterians to refer jokingly to McCord as "the Bishop"—although his church does not have bishops.

McCord is a strapping 6 feet 2, weighing 204 pounds. He keeps the weight distributed by brisk walking, often 5 miles a day. This posed a problem in Geneva, he added, "because it's hard to walk 5 miles in Geneva without crossing into France."

McCord is a lover of serious music, preferring Berlioz. His wife is an accomplished musician. They have three children.

Recent Earthquake in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the catastrophic force of nature which was centered in the west Yellowstone area of Montana a week ago is impossible to portray in words.

A destructive slide and great physical damage resulted from the earthquake in a part of Montana separated by but a few miles from my own State. Many citizens of my State own summer homes and cabins on the portion of the Hebgen Dam Lake and in the canyon below it. It has been a wonderful recreation area. One of my friends in Idaho, who owns such a home, has written to me a letter giving his personal experience in the earthquake.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from this letter, which so vividly tells the reactions of one family to the violent natural forces that struck in the fateful night of August 17.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO,
August 20, 1959.

Hon. FRANK CHURCH,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRANK: My wife and I went to our cabin on Hebgen Lake on June 12 this year and have been there ever since until day before yesterday. It literally took an earthquake to convince us we should return to Idaho Falls.

We were right at the focal point of the quake, and it was an experience neither of us wish to repeat. We were asleep when the quake struck, and awakened to find ourselves being tossed around the bedroom like a chip on the ocean, our bed sliding from one wall to the other and back again. There was a terrific rumbling noise, then crashes and a high moaning sound. My first coherent thought was that we had been struck by a tornado and the cabin had been deposited out in the middle of the lake and we were tossing around on the waves. As soon as the first shock passed we jumped out of bed, I turned on the light and started out into the living room, but stopped abruptly and stared at the havoc. Our fireplace was down in a heap on the living room floor and there was a great hole in the wall where it had stood, and it appeared that not one brick was in place on top of another. The room was a shambles with broken glass, crockery, pictures, and furniture strewn all over the floor. The kitchen and dining room floors were 6 inches deep in broken dishes, broken catsup bottles, jam, jelly, and supplies, the fixtures in the bathroom had torn loose from the walls and water was streaming out of broken pipes. I never saw such a terrible mess.

We ran out of the cabin in our night clothes, barefooted, and then the second shock took the ground out from under us and we sat down and held on till it passed. The big pine trees were swaying and groaning, the water in the lake was churning and rushing by like a mill race. It was bright moonlight and the eerie feeling was increased by the roaring sound, like water going over a high falls. Boats, trees, and debris of all kinds went sailing by in the lake at a good 10 to 15 miles an hour and the water was dropping out of the lake so fast that it appeared it would be dry in an hour or so. Our boat stayed tied to the dock and was up high and dry in just a few minutes.

As soon as we could collect our senses we went back in the cabin, dressed and started out to see if any of the other summer residents were hurt or needed help. Your wife's cousin, Harrold Holden was in a trailer at Aunt Mercede's Cabin just east of us, with his wife and family. You probably know that he is a judge of the superior court in

California. We talked with all of them a while and then went on up the shore line and looked at the rest of the cabins. All fireplaces were down, anything made of brick, stone, or concrete blocks, was shaken to pieces, but the cabins themselves withstood the shocks quite well. My cabin was moved off of its foundation about a foot, and twisted toward the east, but believe it or not, as Ripley says, not a window was broken. Some of the other cabins did not fare quite so well in this regard. No one was hurt in our section and another miracle—not a single fire started. It is almost unbelievable with all the fireplaces down, kitchen stoves torn loose, etc. If a fire had started, the whole forest would probably have gone up in flames, as dry as everything was.

I was proud of everyone, there were no women screaming, no children crying, and while everyone, including myself, was scared and frightened beyond words, we all took it calmly, at least outwardly, and decided to remain right where we were until we could learn of a safer place to go. We turned on the radio to try and learn how extensive the damage was, but there was nothing until nearly 5 o'clock the next morning, and then only sketchy reports. We worked like beavers all through the night trying to clean up the worst of the mess, although continuous tremors occurred at from 1 to 3 minute intervals, some of them quite sharp.

The next morning, after the sun came up, Harrold and I took pictures of most of the cabins, and then after the roads were cleared we piled in our cars and started for home. I was about the last one to leave at about 11 that morning.

Am sorry this letter turned into such a long epistle, but thought you might like to have an eyewitness report on just what happened. The newspapers have given a very good factual account, but it is almost impossible, even for one who was right there, to describe the catastrophe so that others can understand the confused and jumbled feelings of fear, awe, and yes—panic, that swept over all of us.

With kindest regards to yourself and wife, I remain, your loyal and admiringly grateful constituent,

ED HOLDEN.

Appraisal of Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two pertinent questions submitted to the column of Edgar Ausel Mowren, and his very cogent answers—what we should not do in dealing with Khrushchev, and what we should do.

"Don't you think showing Khrushchev the reality of American power will cause him to call off his ambitious imperialism?" (J.S., Monterey, Calif.)

No, it may cause him to substitute honeyed lies for threats and promises. But as a Soviet realist, he knows that more important than military and economic power is the will to use it in time.

Unless the President and other American contacts convince Mr. K. that we shall stand no more nonsense from him, he may go home convinced that by small aggressions he can not only secure what he wants in Berlin but gradually disintegrate NATO and force the U.S. forces out of Europe. Any way you look at it, the invitation to Mr. K. was a desperate gamble.

"Since you don't seem to fancy negotiation with Khrushchev, just what would you do?" (A.L., Provo, Utah.)

Accept the cold war, study the blatant weaknesses of the adversary and use the weapon of nationalism to break up the Soviet empire, as it uses this force to break up the empires of our allies.

Sewage-Disposal Problems of Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as we all know, the Senate will shortly have to pass upon H.R. 1, the O'Brien bill, providing for a 3-year study of sewage-disposal problems of Chicago.

It is also known that most of the Lake States are insisting that Chicago should not return its sewage into Lake Michigan, where it would contaminate the drinking water and close the bathing beaches.

In view of these arguments, I think it is appropriate that various articles and editorials from newspapers indicating that this same practice, pursued by other cities on the Great Lakes, is resulting in the pollution of the waters of the lake and the closing of bathing beaches, be printed in the RECORD. Among those cities are Milwaukee; Green Bay, Wis.; Toronto, Canada; and sundry other cities as well.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles and editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 18, 1959]

SANITARY DISTRICT CHIEF HAILS OK OF DIVERSION IN SENATE

The president of the sanitary district Tuesday hailed the approval by a Senate committee of a bill to permit Chicago to take more water from Lake Michigan for sewage disposal.

"The favorable action by the Senate Public Works Committee Monday on lake diversion is another step toward victory in this long-drawn battle," said Frank W. Chesrow.

The bill will permit Chicago to experiment with taking more water from the lake for additional sewage disposal problems.

Chesrow said that the study of lake currents and the operations of the sanitary district proposed in the bill will do much "to remove the hysteria and fear which have surrounded this subject in the minds of our neighbors on the Great Lakes and in Canada."

The bill has been hotly opposed by six Great Lakes States and Canada who have expressed the fear that it would lower the lake level.

Meanwhile, the Chicago-Milwaukee feud over lake pollution continued.

Chesrow ordered sanitary district engineers to make a study of currents along the lake to see if they could carry pollution from Milwaukee to Chicago.

Milwaukee withdraws water from the lake for sewage disposal and then returns the water to the lake. The city recently had to close seven beaches because of pollution.

Milwaukee's Mayor Frank Zeidler said Chicago has nothing to fear because studies show that lake currents near Milwaukee don't come near Chicago.

The Army Corps of Engineers said that two surveys made shortly after World War II show that certain currents do bring sand and silt from upper regions of the lake and deposit them along the Chicago shoreline.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 18, 1959]

GREAT LAKES CITIES DIRTY OWN WATER, BUT FIGHT CHICAGO—DAILY NEWS CHECK BARES SHOCKING LEVEL OF FILTH

(By Nicholas Shuman)

MILWAUKEE.—"No swimming" is an increasing sign of the times northward from Chicago on Lakes Michigan and Superior.

At the metropolitan centers, the Great Lakes are becoming choked with filth-sewage, industrial waste and ship pollution.

Bacteria counts in "the land of sky blue waters" are soaring to levels that Chicago medical experts consider shocking.

All this was revealed in an on-the-spot inspection by the Daily News of lake cities in Wisconsin and Minnesota.

These are two of the six States that are demanding in a Supreme Court suit that Chicago dump its treated sewage in the lakes—as their cities do, treated or raw.

Milwaukee, though the most recently publicized, is by no means the only afflicted city. Serious problems also were found in Duluth, Minn., and Superior and Green Bay, Wis.

In all these cities—once blessed with miles of sparkling clear waterfront for the recreation of the masses—beaches have been closed.

And the unlucky burghers are being forced to pay for new pools or take their families on voyages to inland lakes.

"Considering all the water we have, bathing beaches here are very poor—there's no question about it," said Dr. Mario Fischer, Duluth's commissioner of health.

His city has only one authorized beach on 25 miles of waterfront.

In Superior, E. W. Berg, director of public works, said, "The only place my kids go swimming is out at the cottage, and that's the way it is with most people here."

Superior has one authorized beach, and it is often closed because of pollution. The city began treating its sewage only last year. Until then it had gone into Superior Bay—which opens on the lake—raw.

In Green Bay, Karl A. Mohr, deputy health commissioner, said:

"Bay Beach—our only beach—was at one time a beautiful place, but it has been closed since 1942. And as far as fish are concerned, there just aren't any for 22 miles up the bay."

For its drinking water, Green Bay must go 29 miles by land across Door County to the open lake.

But in terms of population, Milwaukee is in the worst shape for bathing facilities.

There, four city beaches and three others in the county were closed recently on the recommendation of Dr. E. R. Krumbiegel, health commissioner.

Two of the beaches—South Shore and Bay View—have been barred to the public permanently. They catch the heaviest load of raw and treated sewage washed out at the Milwaukee River's mouth on south-flowing currents.

Krumbiegel said dourly, "I can't see anything that will cause the quality of our water to improve. It's going to deteriorate."

He is recommending that the city build swimming pools on the lake shore—a bitter irony.

The health commissioner acted after the coliform bacteria count at South Shore Beach on July 27 hit 110,000 per 100 cubic centimeters of water (about 3.3 ounces).

The coli are bacteria that exist in the colon. They indicate the presence of human or animal waste. Swallowing water containing them can cause diseases such as typhoid and dysentery.

And Krumbiegel pointed out that it's usually child bathers who swallow water.

The Illinois health department specifies that a coliform count of 500 is safe and anything over 10,000 is definite evidence of sewage pollution.

Shock at Milwaukee's 110,000 figure was expressed by Dr. Gerald Atlas, Chicago Park District health director.

"When we get a count of 240 at the beaches on the far north side, we consider that high," he said.

A high count at Calumet Beach—which gets its pollution from outside the city limits—is 1,100.

Krumbiegel said ship traffic and a rising number of pleasure craft are responsible for Milwaukee's woes.

But he said "the biggest single factor in producing beach contamination is the overflow of raw sewage from the city's combined sanitary-storm sewers and treatment plant during storms."

Chicago has this problem, too, but its sewers have a larger capacity, carry a higher volume of water before overflowing.

Krumbiegel noted that sewage in the water is retained at the city's shoreline by breakwaters that form the harbor.

Ray D. Leary, general manager of the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage Commission, was bitter about the health commissioner. He said that his own coliform counts—taken farther out in the water—showed no change.

"Krumbiegel is trying to get you your increased diversion," Leary said, adding that this remarks was facetious.

The reference was to the Chicago Sanitary District's frustrated efforts to get more Lake Michigan water to purify its treated sewage—which is washed into the Illinois waterway and not the Great Lakes.

Milwaukee is fighting Chicago on the issue in Congress.

But Leary tacitly admitted that something could be done about his own problem. He said a plan is in the talking stage to pipe his plant's effluent (treated sewage) from the shoreline, where it is now dumped, out beyond the breaker.

In the meantime, on a hot August day at beautiful South Beach, not a single carefree foot splashed in the lake's water.

It was a sickly gray, and it coated the stones with a green slime.

[From the Chicago American, Aug. 19, 1959]

NOW GET THE FACTS

The Senate Public Works Committee's decision to send the Lake Michigan water diversion bill to the Senate floor opens the way for a vote on the measure, and it seems likely that it will pass. Both Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, the Senate leader, and Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, the Republican leader, favor it.

The vote is expected to come next week, and we hope it will. A vote on last year's diversion bill was delayed until the closing days of the session. The shortness of time made it possible for Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, to kill the measure with a filibuster, and no doubt he would be happy to try it again if the vote were delayed long enough.

PROXMIRE, who has been demanding that Chicago be required to follow Milwaukee's system of sewage disposal, does not seem to have been subdued by the fact that Milwaukee has had to close its Lake Michigan beaches to prevent epidemics of typhoid fever and amebic dysentery. PROXMIRE is opposing Chicago's diversion measure as noisily and as illogically as ever.

Wisconsin, five other lake States and the Canadian Government have been protesting that it would cripple lake shipping and reduce the Canadian production of electric current at Niagara Falls if an additional 1,000 cubic feet of water a second were taken out of Lake Michigan at Chicago. The U.S. Army Engineers say it wouldn't have any effect either on navigation or electric power production.

The argument has been going on for years with no result except to generate bad feeling. This year's diversion bill is designed to settle it. It provides for increasing the withdrawal of water into the Illinois Waterway from 1,500 cubic-feet per second to 2,500 for a 1-year period and then conducting a 2-year study to determine exactly what effects the increase has, if any.

We hope the Senate, understanding that this is the only possible way to get at the facts, will quickly pass the bill, as the House already has done. And we hope President Eisenhower, who has vetoed two other diversion bills because Canada did not like them, will sign this one if it comes to him. The health of the millions of Americans who live in Chicago and along the Illinois Waterway is more important than the preferences of the Canadian power interests.

The chief reason why Chicago and Illinois need a little more Lake Michigan water is that Chicago's sewage disposal system, although it is the finest in America, cannot get quite all the impurities out of the sewage it treats. No disposal system can. So more fresh water is needed to dilute and purify the effluent discharged into the Illinois Waterway from the disposal plants.

More water is needed also to keep enough water in the Illinois Waterway, which is indispensable to the whole Nation, so that it can always be navigated safely and without delay.

Those are real and legitimate needs, and they should not be denied because of the insincere and unreasoning opposition offered by other lake States and Canada.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 19, 1959]

WASTE IN RIVER GIVES GREEN BAY ODOR ALL ITS OWN—YET WISCONSIN SENATORS HIT CHICAGO'S FIGHT ON POLLUTION

(By Nicholas Shuman)

GREEN BAY, WIS.—Citizens of this northlands city are literally choking on their own industrial wastes.

Ask anyone who has to cross the nauseous East River downtown as it makes it junction with the bay-bound FOX River.

On a summer's day the rotten-egg odor of hydrogen sulfide gas rises from the charcoal-brown surface of the water, which bubbles from the decomposition of organic matter below.

Green Bay has a problem. But it is not alone.

An one-the-spot inspection to the Daily News revealed that metropolitan centers on the lakes are having sewage problems all the way up the Wisconsin coast and to Duluth, Minn.

Oddly, Wisconsin's two Senators have been among the most outspoken critics of Chicago's sewage system in that city's fight for increased Lake Michigan water to purge Illinois Waterway of pollution.

Both Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, and Senator WILEY, Republican, argue that Chicago shouldn't be allowed another drop because its sanitary district is doing a poor job of treating sewage.

The fact is that virtually every city on the Great Lakes except Chicago—pick your State or county—dumps its sewage into the lake, whether treated or plain, raw muck.

And the fact is that none of them has a sewage disposal system that does a better job of treatment than the sanitary district.

This is shown by the standard sanitation yardstick—BOD, or biochemical demand—which measures the organic matter in water.

Last year the sanitary district removed 90 percent of the BOD in Chicago's sewage before dumping the remaining effluent into the waterway. Here are the corresponding figures elsewhere.

Duluth, 36 percent; Racine, Wis., 38 percent; Superior, Wis., 40 percent at best (no average because the plant is new); Green Bay, 70 percent, and Sheboygan, Wis., 84.8 percent.

Percentagewise, only Milwaukee topped Chicago, with a reading of 94 to 95. But on the basis of actual waste remaining in the treatment effluent, Milwaukee's record is poorer.

The BOD of its effluent is 18 parts per million, against only 10 in Chicago.

The reason for this is that Chicago's sewage is diluted in the sewers before treatment by a much higher water content, thus only about half as much pollution remains in it after treatment.

Green Bay's 70-percent BOD reduction looks fairly good.

But Karl A. Mohr, deputy commissioner of health, pointed out that all of the industrial waste from three downtown pulp mills is pumped directly into the rivers.

The sewage plant is bypassed "because of high volume and the difficulty of treating pulp mill chemicals."

Mohr said that the three mills empty 45 million gallons of waste water a day into the river, and this represents "sulfites with a terrific BOD."

By contrast, the average daily flow of domestic sewage and other industrial waste is only 11 million gallons.

According to Mohr, the biggest of these mills, the Marathon division of American Can Co., is about to undertake a million-dollar cleanup project.

Basins and pumps are to be erected to settle out its waste and dump the effluent into the already filthy bay instead of the river.

The treatment plant stands on the bay, within a mile of what once was the town's only waterfront swimming area, Bay Beach Park.

The plant was opened in 1935—and the beach was closed forever in 1942.

There, in comparative isolation on a hot day, children frolicked in a small wading pool. For adults there was nothing but a scum-coated shoreline overgrown with weeds.

The twin ports of Duluth and Superior are gunky with their own waste, that of other towns up the St. Louis River and the pollution of ships in th world's second busiest harbor.

But its own industrial pollution is substantial.

For example, Dr. Mario Fischer, Duluth commissioner of health, said that the American Steel & Wire division of United States Steel Corp. "uses more water than the whole city combined and washes it all back in the river with its chemical byproducts."

"Minnesota has a State water pollution commission," Dr. Fischer said, "but they haven't done anything about the St. Louis River."

Carl Lund, assistant director of the city's sewage department, said his system's sewers serve a connected population of 90,000.

But the sewage of another 20,000 persons—including whole suburbs, goes into the bay raw, and thence into Lake Superior.

Duluth is now building three new sewage plants at a cost of $500,000. Nobody in town mentioned this, but across the river in Superior, a city official said: "They had to do something, because sewage was getting into their water supply."

Henry Wick, operator of Duluth's sewage treatment plant, was asked if he didn't think 36 percent BOD reduction was pretty low—even for that part of the sewage that was treated.

His answer—and the philsosophy of officials all up and down the deteriorating lakes—was:

"Any more treatment would be unnecessary. We are fortunate in having a large body of water to dump into."

Superior has a year-old treatment plant. Before it was constructed, the city dumped its sewage raw into Superior Bay, which also flows into Lake Superior.

E. W. Berg, director of public works, said: "The bay is unfit. We've been dumping sewage there for 60 years, and we're not going to clean it up overnight."

According to A. W. Ecklund, head of the health department laboratory, the city's one authorized beach—Billings—is closed because of pollution toward the end of nearly every other season, "but the kids swim there anyway."

What if they don't want to take a chance on catching a disease?

"Pattison State Park is only 10 or 12 miles south of town, and the swimming there is fine," said Joseph T. Leszcynski, Superior's beach-poor director of parks.

Racine and Sheboygan so far are blessed with clean bathing waters, though both have cloudy rivers.

According to Thomas F. Hay, superintendent of the Racine sewage plant, he's treating "16 million gallons of sewage a day, though the plant was designed to handle only 12 million."

Obviously, the efficiency of the treatment suffers, though not to a critical degree here.

Sheboygan is seeing better days. Like Manitowoc, it was pressured into adding secondary treatment to its primary works recently by the State board of health.

But all these plants, whether their treatment is good or bad, are dumping the sewage that remains after treatment into the Great Lakes.

Only Chicago can say that it doesn't.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Aug. 20, 1959]

SEWAGE BACKS UP, TORONTO BEACH UNSAFE—SHIFTING CURRENTS OF LAKE BLAMED

(By Eugene Griffin)

TORONTO, ONTARIO, August 19.—Toronto's entire waterfront on Lake Ontario has been polluted by wastes from the city's sewers.

All beaches have been posted as dangerous to the health of swimmers.

Donald P. Scott, Toronto deputy works commissioner, said the biggest cause of the current pollution is that a shift in lake currents has carried Toronto's sewage back inshore to the waterfront, instead of out into the lake.

Dr. A. J. Boyd, health officer for Metropolitan Toronto, who ordered the beaches declared unsafe, said the lake water was filthy and highly dangerous.

Signs warn swimmers that they enter the water at their own risk. Few have taken the chance to step into the lake, even during sweltering heat waves in recent days.

Untreated sewage emptied into the lake by Toronto has been found on half a dozen beaches in the city, and in suburban Scarboro and Mimico, by health inspectors. Some beaches on Toronto Island, a summer resort in the harbor also have been polluted.

NINTH CLOSING SINCE 1945

Toronto's sewage treatment plants are not efficient enough for their job. The largest plant gives only primary treatment to sewage, removing only some of the solids. When lake water is warm, the germs multiply rapidly as the Toronto sewage is pumped into it.

This is the ninth time since 1945 that Toronto beaches have been closed because of pollution in the lake. The colon bacilli count, considered dangerous at 2,400 for 100 cubic centimeters of water, reached 380,000 in 1952.

Toronto has 30 miles of lakefront, and the sewage is a health hazard for 50 miles down the lakeshore to Hamilton.

"Untreated and partly treated sewage has turned one of the world's great fresh-water bodies into a health menace," the Toronto Globe and Mail said in an editorial.

FIND DEAD CATS

Even dead cats have been washed ashore. Dysentery, infantile paralysis, and all manner of stomach ailments may be caught from the germs in the water, health authorities have warned.

Miss Jean Newman, member of the Toronto City Council, who visited some of the beaches, said they "smell like an open sewer."

Toronto plans to expand its sewage treatment system, at a cost of several million dollars, but the expansion is not expected to be completed for another 2 or 3 years.

The city is a center of Canadian opposition to Chicago's attempts to divert more water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway.

Public officials and newspapers agree here that the answer to Toronto's sewage problem must be more efficient treatment before the sewage is emptied into the lake. More or less water in the lake here will not affect the situation.

If Toronto, or other Ontario lakefront cities, wanted higher lake levels, they could get it by allowing the power dam in the St. Lawrence Seaway near Cornwal, Ontario, to store more water upstream.

At present, this dam lets 10,000 cubic feet of water a second run off as waste, in excess of the water needed by the power generators. Chicago wants to divert only another 1,000 cubic feet a second from Lake Michigan.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 18, 1959]

CLOSE WILMETTE BEACHES—LAKE BLUFF AREAS CHECKED

Bathing beaches at Wilmette and Lake Bluff were closed Tuesday because of pollution.

The beach at Lake Bluff was later reopened, but a special laboratory report was ordered.

Other suburbs along the North Shore and the Lake County (Ill.) Health Department were keeping a sharp eye on bacteria count in water off their beaches.

The Wilmette beaches were ordered closed when the bacteria count was found to be more than four times above the permissible level, Frank Le Jeune, beach director, said.

Under study was the possibility that sewage from Milwaukee, where all beaches have been closed because of pollution, had floated southward.

The chief sanitary officer of the Lake County health department, John Morris, said bacteria counts go up when the wind blows steadily from the north.

"However, I don't think we can say that it is necessarily attributed to Milwaukee," he added.

Chicago health authorities reported meanwhile that beaches here were not in danger of pollution.

Drinking water was also ruled out of danger by health officers in the entire North Shore area.

Ye Jeune said the Wilmette pollution was discovered in a routine check by the village water department late Monday. Another report was expected late Tuesday.

The beaches would remain closed until the pollution had cleared, he added.

The permitted level of coliform organisms varies among health departments, Morris explained.

His office doesn't consider a beach polluted until the level has reached 3,000 organisms per 100 milliliters. A milliliter is a tiny measure, less than an ounce.

In Wilmette the permitted level is 1,100. The count was 4,630.

[From the Toronto Globe and Mail]

MORE DISEASED BEACHES

There must be an immediate and exhaustive investigation into the conditions which necessitated the closing of the eastern beaches yesterday. It is disgusting that pollution has again been permitted to deprive Toronto citizens of the pleasures of this city's greatest natural asset, Lake Ontario.

Pollution on the eastern lakefront would be bad enough as an isolated incident, but it is shocking when viewed in conjunction with what has been happening all along the shore from here to Hamilton. Untreated and partly treated sewage have turned one of the world's greatest freshwater bodies into a health menace. There is now no beach left within the city where swimming can be officially and safely tolerated—and this at one of the hottest periods of an unusually hot summer.

Many millions of dollars were spent to make the eastern beaches safe by expanding the nearby Ashbridge's Bay sewage treatment plant, which had been shamefully overloaded. The recurrence of pollution there justifies the most drastic action to fix responsibility and take whatever remedial action is required to make the beaches safe again.

Extension and Amendment of Public Law 480

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill H.R. 8609, which would amend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480) as amended, by extending the authorities of titles I and II, and adding the program of disposals through barter, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, is one of the most helpful and far-reaching pieces of legislation in behalf of agriculture that has been passed by the Congress in over a quarter of a century.

This is the only legislation on agriculture which has become famous and well known outside the continental limits of the United States. This is true because this law provides for disposal abroad of U.S. agricultural surpluses other than those that are sold for cash dollars.

I consider my efforts in the enactment of this law in 1954 to have been thus far the best legislative contribution I have made since I have been in the Congress. Because of the impact of this law upon agriculture, I have traveled in its behalf in some 27 countries and in excess of 35,000 miles. I believe I understand not only what the law has meant to agriculture in the United States, but also its effect upon needy and hungry people in every part of the world.

We have sold in excess of $8 billion in American agricultural surpluses in the 5 years the program has been in operation. These sales have been made in 28 countries, from Japan to Spain and from Iceland to Argentina.

The act now consists of three titles. Title I authorizes the sale of surplus agricultural commodities overseas for local currency of the purchasing country. By the end of this year we will have sold $6,250 million in surplus produce overseas under this title.

Title II of the act authorizes donations of surplus agricultural commodities "on behalf of the people of the United States to friendly peoples in meeting famine or other urgent or extraordinary relief requirements." Under this title the United States will have contributed over $800 million in surplus commodities through the year ending December 31, 1959. Some of these donations have met the needs of countries where conditions near famine have existed. No greater act of mercy has been shown in history than in some of the donations made under this title.

Title III authorizes principally the barter of surplus agricultural commodities for strategic and other materials of value to the United States. We have disposed of approximately $1,165 million in surplus under this program. Of special significance at this time are the records which show first that the materials acquired under barter are worth more today than the price the United States paid for them in surplus commodities and second that the annual cost of storing these materials is $105 million less than the annual cost of storing the surpluses given in exchange.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL FOR 1959

Under the 1959 extension now under consideration by the House, we hope to sell in the coming year $1,150 million worth of surplus agricultural produce outside the continental limits of the United States. This is an ambitious program but one which can be achieved.

LONG-TERM SUPPLY CONTRACTS

For several years after the enactment of the law in 1954, I appeared regularly to testify before the House Committee on Agriculture for authorization in this bill to include long-term supply contracts. I am happy to see a provision for long-term supply contracts contained in the 1959 bill for the first time. I consider this provision to be the major step in the last 5 years in improvement of Public Law 480.

Under the provision of this new title which would be added to Public Law 480, the President would be authorized to make agreements with foreign nations under which the United States would undertake to finance the export of surplus commodities over periods of up to 10 years and to accept from the country payment in dollars over periods of up to 20 years at an interest equivalent to the cost of money to the U.S. Treasury. I believe that such a program will fill a major gap in our existing export operations and result in a substantial increase in our agricultural exports.

It has been my observation in studying Public Law 480 operations and agricultural exports in many parts of the world that as a nation concentrates its efforts on industrial and economic development, its demands for food and agricultural products almost always overload the ability of its domestic agriculture to produce. This is for two major reasons: First, increased individual purchasing power from commercial and industrial development creates a greater demand for food and agricultural products and, second, capital, labor, and management are drawn from agriculture into industry and commerce, and in many instances agricultural production actually declines, at least for a temporary period.

In numerous instances, officials of countries which are experiencing these "growing pains" of economic and industrial development have expressed their urgent need for some long-term assurance of adequate agricultural supplies during their development period. These nations expect to be able to pay for these commodities, and they are willing to pay in dollars, but they need all their existing resources, and particularly their foreign exchange, to carry out the industrial and commercial development programs they have planned. It is with this type of situation particularly in mind that the Committee has included the provisions for long-term supply contracts in this bill.

In addition, this new program will open up markets that are not now available on other than a strictly cash basis. I feel sure many nations which are now buying surplus commodities under title I would prefer to take advantage of the extended dollar credit authorized in the new long-term supply contract provision.

A new section 8 has been proposed by the Department of Agriculture and adopted by the committee. It will authorize inclusion of agreements for a relatively small stockpile of surplus commodities to be established in recipient countries, under the ownership and control of the recipient country, to be later used for emergency relief donations or for sale under the regular provisions of Public Law 480. Definite language was added to make it clear that full responsibility for the condition of the commodities and for handling and storage charges shall be assumed by the recipient country upon transfer of title and the placing of the commodities in storage.

Two points I would like to make fully clear. First, we make no claim to perfection in this program. We have done and will continue to do our best to reduce a large portion of the accumulated surplus of farm products by disposal overseas. Second, the U.S. surplus disposal program is not entirely altruistic. We believe it to be just as much in the interest of the American farmer to reduce accumulated stocks. In this we hope to improve the economic position of the American farmers. I realize full well that an economically strong and progressive agriculture is vital to the United States. This program is strengthening agriculture and providing a market beyond our borders for the food surpluses of this country. It is a practical program geared to 1959. It is a program that deserves not only the commendation of the farmers of this country but the approval of every Member of this House who is genuinely interested in the future of American agriculture.

Wilderness and Wildlife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the June issue of Montana Wildlife, the official publication of the Montana Fish and Game Department contains an excellent editorial supporting the need for wilderness areas. Because the wilderness bill, now being considered by the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee is one of the more important pieces of legislation we have before us this Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILDERNESS AND WILDLIFE

We are becoming increasingly aware of the important part wilderness is playing in our wildlife program in general and specifically in the preservation of several important game and fish species.

Big game hunting is earning an important place in Montana's outdoor recreational program. Much of the high-quality aspect of this sport, particularly in regard to hunting the rarer species, is due to the remote regions in which these animals are found. A great deal of the finest sport hunting in the State today lies within the boundaries of designated wilderness and wild areas.

In regard to specific species, the grizzly bear population has reached a critical low in the United States. Total elimination has taken place throughout the greater part of its former range. It has been found that the grizzly shuns areas dominated by man's activities. The chief hope, therefore, for the survival of this highly prized game species lies in the preservation of a reasonable amount of wilderness range.

The native black-spotted cutthroat trout is in jeopardy in Montana. The disappearance of this valuable game fish is directly attributable to habitat destruction as well as the introduction of nonnative fishes. Only a few waters, and they mostly in remote areas, still have pure strains of the original cutthroat.

It is an important and practical consideration of fish management that these rare strains be preserved. They will be needed for introduction into waters that are presently barren and will be the raw material for creating improved strains as needs arise. Then, too, cutthroat are important for the particularly rewarding type fishing they provide.

The salvation of these native strains of cutthroat lies in the more remote inaccessible waters and, in particular—wilderness areas. Here the habitat will be preserved and incompatible exotic fish excluded. It is very evident that those who seek native cutthroat will not hesitate to expend the necessary energy to reach these more remote regions. This is clearly testified by the resident and nonresident fishermen enjoying this sport in wilderness areas.

A further value of wilderness has often been realized. This is the importance of having undisturbed plant and animal communities available for scientific studies. It is felt that only with such controls can the effects of man's many modifications be properly judged, and unwise practices avoided.

In summary, we feel that we are obligated to furnish the highest quality hunting and fishing possible. This is becoming an increasingly difficult task in the face of rapidly mounting hunting and fishing pressures and the continual shrinkage of the more desirable areas in which these activities may be enjoyed.

We look, therefore, to a planned wilderness preservation system as insurance that we may continue to provide outstanding recreational opportunities, so important to Montana and the entire nation. We agree with principles expressed in the proposed wilderness legislation. We believe that this program may be accomplished without jeopardizing other important uses of public lands. We sincerely hope that national wilderness preservation may soon become a definite policy of Congress.

Annual Training of Reservists and Citizen Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, after Congress adjourned for the week, I had the opportunity to visit Camp Meade, Md., at Odenton, Md., for an afternoon and evening. The occasion for my visit was the fact that a group of citizen soldiers from my area, together with the contingent from the State of Kentucky, are on active duty for annual training in compliance with LTR O T 6-952 XXI USACR, IGMR, Pa., dated June 23, 1959.

A great number of us are too prone to take for granted the value of our so-called reservists and citizen soldiers who leave their homes and occupations to go back into an intensive 2-week training period in order that they may keep abreast of the latest developments in our national defense.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of Congress that this is not mere play-acting but downright serious business. These men, most of whom are family men, are dead serious and in earnest about the training they receive.

In talking to them, from private on up to our own Maj. William Wolinsky from Greensburg, Pa., who in private life is the chief of police of that city, and his officers under him, Louis P. Antolini, Jeannette, Pa.; Frank O. Bavdek, Latrobe, Pa.; George J. Caperelli, Greensburg, Pa.; Russell H. Ault, State College, Pa; Cleo M. Wildasin, Hanover, Pa.; Jean T. Fuqua, Mayfield, Ky.; and Malcolm R. Boaz, Mayfield, Ky. Not forgetting, of course, Captain McKetta from New Kensington, Pa., who is one of our very capable officers in our State police force in Pennsylvania.

I learned that these civilian soldiers are very proud and doing their very best to fulfill their obligations to our country by better preparing themselves for any eventuality. I was particularly struck with the serious manner in which they go about their duties and their apparent desire to strive for perfection. I was happy to greet many of the men whom I have known for years and I admit frankly, that as a Member of Congress, I was not aware of the very important role they play in our overall picture of defending this country. They are entitled to a special commendation because no matter how you look at it, this tour of duty is, in most instances, a personal sacrifice, and one which they willingly make without complaint. I believe that they are all entitled to a special note of thanks from this Congress because it could very well be that devotion to this duty carries out the admonition of Thomas Jefferson when he said: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." They rate a special salute, and in passing, I would like to name the citizen soldiers of these two great States and to thank them for receiving a Member of Congress with the spirit and with the understanding that we too are part of the defense of this Nation. The following is a list of assigned enlisted personnel of the 394th Military Censorship Detachment:

Assigned enlisted personnel

Grade	Name and home address	Service No.	Branch	Security clearance	TPA auth.
Sfc (E-7)	Rager, Robert D.,[1] 32 Maple Ave., Blairsville, Pa.	ER33017107	AI	Secret	Yes.
S. Sgt (E-6)	Creighton, Donald K., 802 Ash St., Irwin, Pa.	ER13493980	Arty	do	No.
S. Sgt (E-6)	Seranko, Robert J., R.D. No. 2, Latrobe, Pa.	ER52250986	MPC	do	No.
Sfc (E-6)	Petroy, Anthony J.,[1] 1520 Poplar St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER13473394	AI	do	Yes.
S. Sgt (E-6)	Howard, Donald E., R.D. No. 1, Greensburg, Pa.	ER13492586	QMC	do	Yes.
Sgt (E-5)	Derubis, Gilbert, 184 East Market St., Blairsville, Pa.	ER13540761	Inf	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Baughman, Ronald C., 47 Lincoln Way East, Jeannette, Pa.	ER13541503	AI	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Cherubini, James A., 1424 Poplar St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER13541492	AMed S.	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Peters, Wayne C., R.D. No. 1, Jeannette, Pa.	ER52324668	MPC	do	No.
Sp5 (E-5)	Tamewitz, William E., Box 195, Oak St., Westmoreland City, Pa.	FR13522728	AI	do	Yes.
Sp5 (E-5)	Williams, Gerald I., 2d St., Westmoreland City, Pa.	FR13573538	AI	do	No.
Cpl (E-4)	Zigler, Ronald L., 2354 Locust St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER23777412	Inf	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Baughman, Robert C., III, 317 Vernon Dr., West Newton, Pa.	ER52325922	FI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Gidick, Gary L., Box 88, Sutterville, Pa.	ER52324667	MPC	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Conrad, William R., 333 Concord Ave., Greensburg, Pa.	BR13601692	AI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Erny, Thomas C., 1701 Dailey Ave., Latrobe, Pa.	BR13601696	AMedS	do	No.
Sp4(E-4)	Fontana, Vincent F., 544 George St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER52325919	Arty	do	No.
Sp4(E-4)	Johnson, John A., 423 East Pittsburgh St., Greensburg, Pa.	ER52325912	Arty	do	No.
Sp4(E-4)	Kipp, Donald C., R.D. No. 1, Jeannette, Pa.	ER52327700	CE	do	No.
Sp4(E-4)	Musick, Merle L., R.D. No. 1, Latrobe, Pa.	BR13612590	AMedS	do	Yes.
Sp4(E-4)	Pallitta, Joseph A., 218 Offutt Ave., Greensburg, Pa.	ER13578001	AI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Remaley, Clarence R., 505 East Pittsburgh St., Greensburg, Pa.	BR13612600	AI	do	No.
Sp4 (E-4)	Myers, Leroy B., Jr., 337 Depot St., Latrobe, Pa.	BR13601695	AMedS	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Caperelli, John M., 1431 Elm St., Greensburg, Pa.	FR13619175	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Caruso, Angelo, 226 Irving Ave., Latrobe, Pa.	ER52325920	Arty	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Hoza, Robert R., R.D. No. 3, Mount Pleasant, Pa.	ER52325925	Arty	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Lash, Wayne R., R.D. No. 1, West Newton, Pa.	BR13612605	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Mickinak, Michael W., 221 John St., Latrobe, Pa.	BR13612591	AMedS	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	O'Malley, John P., 15-2 North Braddock Heights, North Braddock, Pa.	BR13613592	CE	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Peer, Donald R., 226 Brinker St., Latrobe, Pa.	ER52324670	MPC	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Policastro, Joseph E., 60 South Hamilton St., Greensburg, Pa.	BR13619172	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Snell, Earl E., R.D. No. 3, Irwin, Pa.	BR13619173	AI	do	No.
Pfc. (E-3)	Vallozzi, James A., 918 St. Clair Way, Greensburg, Pa.	BR13612602	AI	do	No.

[1] Ordered active duty for trng as Adv Det, 12-29 Aug 59, per 1st Ind, 394th Mil Cen Det, to LO# 6-952 (ANADUTRA XXI USACR dtd 23 Jun 59.

I would also like to pay my compliments to the 321st Military Censorship Detachment, Mayfield, Ky.:

Assigned enlisted personnel

Grade	Name and home address	Service No.	Branch	Security clearance	TPA authorization
SSG-6	Boyd, Byron P., Jr.	ER15565165	AR	Secret applied for	Present.
Sgt-5	Tucker, Donald R.	ER52388687	MD	do	Do.
Sgt-5	Wilson, Jerry L.	ER52388690	AI	do	Do.
Sp5-5	Price, James S.	FR15552306	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Billington, Daniel	BR15565580	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Billington, James M.	BR15565584	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Billington, Mason G.	BR15565582	MP	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Mathis, Walter C.	ER52435273	Inf	do	Do.
Sp4-4	Windsor, James E.	ER26257807	EN	do	Do.
Pfc-3	Bell, Jimmy D.	BR15575559	In	do	Do.
Pfc-3	Gossum, Richard F.	BR15575880	In	do	Do.

JEAN T. FUQUA, *Major, QMC, USAR, Commanding.*

Nixon Journeys Contrasted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Mr. George Todt, noted west coast columnist and commentator, whose column originates on the editorial page of the Valley Times which covers the San Fernando Valley out in California, has come up with some highly interesting observations growing out of Vice President NIXON's visits to Russia and Poland.

I think many Americans will share Mr. Todt's conviction that the existence of the Iron Curtain is not so much to keep news, and facts and people from getting behind the Iron Curtain as it is to prevent people unhappy with communism from fleeing their homelands.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON JOURNEYS CONTRASTED

(By George Todt)

What may very well have been the most significant feature of Vice President RICHARD NIXON'S recent trip to Moscow and Warsaw seems to have been lost on many writers and observers who covered this event.

For the warm reception he received behind the Iron Curtain indicated pretty conclusively that those who know communism best receive most affectionately those who fight against it the hardest.

Conversely, NIXON'S trip to South America a little more than a year ago—where and when he was stoned and spat upon—shows us the other side of the coin: Those who know communism the least are, at the same time, also the most antagonistic to those who oppose its expansion at the expense of free nations around the world.

There is a lot of difference between those who can afford to seat themselves on the sidelines and preach theoretical communism as an attractive ideology for their fellows—and others who are forced to live under its godless tenets as a working formula.

Let's think this one over for ourselves, shall we?

Speaking along such lines as we have been discussing here, Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, one of the wisest and most solid of the solons on Capitol Hill, recently had this to say:

"I believe that several lessons can well be learned from the short interval of history which took the Vice President of the United States on the big jump from rocks in Venezuela to roses in Warsaw, on his good will mission for the people of the United States."

"I think the first lesson is clearly this: Communism has its greatest appeal to the people who live farthest from it.

"The second lesson is that to people living under communism, but once enjoyed freedom—as is true in the case of the people of Poland—the existence of freedom and its demonstration anywhere in the world, as exemplified by Vice President NIXON'S visit to Warsaw and to Russia, is a cause of great rejoicing.

"The third lesson is, I believe, that the more one knows about communism, or the closer he lives to it and the more intimate his connections with it become, the more he detests and abominates it—both as a philosophy and a way of life."

As so often is the case, the well thought out words of Senator MUNDT add up to commonsense and reason. The difference in the receptions afforded the Vice President at Caracas and Warsaw amply illustrate the point he has made for us.

The inhabitants of the first city, in Venezuela, are happily not infested, infected or otherwise inflicted with the plague known as Marxist communism: How easy for them to sit around and prate of what an excellent system of government it might be.

But the more practical denizens of the capital of Poland, which is Warsaw, are not the unrealistic theorists of the South American variety who, to put it in the words of the overrun Poles, may be said to have "never had it so good."

The liberty-loving people of Poland have had the Red colossus on their backs since the end of the Second World War. Although the cream of the Polish patriots and democratic elements of the stricken country have long since been liquidated by the Communists—first notable instance of Marxist mass murder there was the Katyn Forest massacre of 14,000 army officers while the late war was still in progress—those who yet remain have forgotten neither their former freedom nor hatred for the Communists who took it away from them.

The real reason for the Iron Curtain today, as it has been in the past, is not so much to keep us out—as it is to keep the poor, miserable wretches on the other side from running away.

Do we need look any further than West Berlin to see that this is so? Actually, several millions of grateful East Germans have succeeded in gaining freedom for themselves via this escape route.

But how many West Germans—or how few—have gone the other way?

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the newsletter of August 22, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

AUGUST 22, 1959.

The first session of the 86th Congress is struggling to a close, many Members think, although in the next breath some concede the possibility of endless debate ahead. Here's a roundup.

Controversial issues to be carried over include minimum wage, aid to education, aid to depressed areas, Federal unemployment compensation, Federal health insurance, social security expansion, interest rate ceiling removal (and others?).

Controversial issues considered earlier and scheduled for further action include labor reform, housing, and the farm program. New items for House debate include Public Law 480, (surplus food disposal), civil rights, highways and gasoline tax increase, and foreign investment tax incentive (H.R. 5).

Controversial clashes of viewpoint continue and include the political front, for example, who's for big spending, and the balanced budget; our international policy embodied in foreign aid (including food surplus disposal) and the Khrushchev visit.

Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954, to dispose of surplus commodities, with amendments, was the week's big floor debate, centered around a barter provision. The big question—should the United States dispose of our surplus food products in exchange for strategic materials for our national stockpile rather than sell for foreign currency, which currency may or may not be of any use to the United States. If not, then the food in effect becomes a gift. The complicated, confusing, and at times self-defeating nature of this program led me to observe in debate that the problems confronting us arise because of a very basic problem, quite overlooked; namely, that the Federal Government is not set up nor intended constitutionally to be in the distribution of food, clothing or other necessities, neither at home nor abroad. The original emergency nature of disposal of farm surpluses has now, in my view, been distorted so that surpluses are encouraged, Government regulation fostered, and the free market destroyed in the United States and throughout the world. The fact is, our surpluses endanger the economies of other nations, too. This basic fault of the program itself was not debated. Government has been accepted as a food distributor at the taxpayers' expense. All I can hope to do is to keep the criticism alive, until the people demand an accounting. This I have done and shall so continue.

Civil rights, already through the Senate, will probably be before the House soon. The Democrat leadership is committed to advance in this field. The questions to be resolved: (1) A tough bill or a relatively innocuous one? (2) This year, or next (election) year? Odds are, in my opinion, an innocuous bill this year, because: (1) Few can show any real need (other than political in some districts) for further legislation; and (2) many Republicans may feel constrained to cooperate with those Southern Democrats who helped in enacting a legitimate labor reform act. I expect a bill to extend the Civil Rights Commission and give the Justice Department a little greater authority to investigate local election practices. The gasoline tax increase may take time, now that the Ways and Means Committee has voted out a 1-cent increase for 22 months and a later 5-percent excise tax allocation to highways. I am among those opposing a tax increase. (See newsletters of July 25 and August 1). Highways can be built without more tax, I believe.

Earlier controversial issues yet to be resolved are headed by labor reform, which is now in conference between the House and Senate. Housing could continue as a tremendous struggle in view of the veto, the Senate's attempt to override (both Texas Senators so voted), and the legitimate needs embodied in the earlier outrageous bill, that require that a bill be passed. The present suggested compromise is only a lesser degree of the faults of the vetoed bill, including more public housing direct loans for college classrooms (backdoor Treasury financing beyond Congress' control), urban renewal (though reduced), and others. As before, this bill probably will be held until the last minute and then railroaded through. As for agriculture, the general recommendations of the President for reduced price support levels and eased acreage requirements will get little if any attention, I believe, even though the President may urgently so request of Congress.

The interest rate ceiling's removal (see newsletters of June 13, 27, and July 11) so urgently requested by Treasury Secretary Anderson to reduce the cost of Government

financing has become a political football. By a party line vote (Democrats for, Republicans against), the Committee on Ways and Means voted to shelve such needed action until next year. The Government thus is forced to continue to compete with families and small business men for the available money in the short-term loan market. As I see it, it is wrong for Congress after spending the money to tie the hands of the Secretary in financing the Government debt.

So Congress struggles on, not all good, not all bad, but just like people. Congress will improve only as the people force improvement by demanding right action. Adjournment date is anyone's guess.

The Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I insert in the RECORD a recent article written by George E. Sokolsky on "The Captive Nations":

When NIXON and Khrushchev held their now famous debate in the American-style kitchen at the American Fair in Moscow, the cause for Khrushchev's unruly anger was that Congress had passed a joint resolution on July 17 providing for a Captive Nations Week. The President approved the resolution the same day. Several times, during NIXON's visits with Khrushchev, the latter referred to the "captives"—his captives. After his anger, it struck him as funny. It is not so funny for millions of human beings.

The nations referred to in the resolution are as follows: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others.

This is a long list of areas conquered by Soviet Russia, mainly during World War II and after. Some of them have been incorporated within the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics; others are so-called people's republics. It is a record of imperialistic success of the Kremlin. The resolution further states:

"These submerged nations look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, and other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties."

This resolution seems to have bothered Khrushchev more than any criticism that has been made of his brutality or rudeness because it is a wholly true statement of fact. Following the theories of Treitschke, Stalin set out to establish a number of satellite countries that would take the first brunt of war.

To Soviet Russia, the captive nations represent a Chinese Wall against the West. However, that wall is realistically rubble now that war must be conducted by airborne bombs, rockets, and missiles. Nevertheless, it has been characteristic of Russian history that what the Russians take, they never give up willingly. Russia has been like a rolling snowball, gathering size as it rolled on and on.

Men's memories are short. We, in America, forget, for instance, that the United States brought into existence the most progressive Slavic state, Czechoslovakia. It was the great friendship of three men, Woodrow Wilson, Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk, and Charles R. Crane that carved out this nation, liberated it from the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and obtained its independence at the Paris Conference after World War I. Czechoslovakia became a democratic republic with Prof. Thomas G. Masaryk as President and Dr. Eduard Benes as Prime Minister. Hitler seized this country on the ground that the Sudeten Germans (Bohemia) were ethnically Germans and therefore belonged to him. The Kremlin succeeded to Hitler's ownership. Czechoslovakia is now practically an integral part of Russia with no life of its own.

Americans were excited when Hitler marched into this peaceloving country of hardworking, energetic people. We are not excited today when Czechoslovakia is, for all practical purposes, a province of Soviet Russia.

In fact, it has become fashionable to go to Russia. Those who do not go there are not "in." I cannot imagine what they are "in" or not "in" but they all went to Russia this summer like bees swarming together. This winter, we shall be hearing all about Russia from 10-day experts who saw the Red Square in Moscow, the Nevsky in Leningrad, and whatever it is they can see in Kiev—possibly the ancient cathedral. They will all tell of the wonders of the one big department store in Moscow—something like Gimbel's basement. They will say that all Russians smile when they see Americans. It looks more like a belly laugh watching the fools part with their money.

Controversy Still Waxes Warm Over Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in the past few days, I have made several comments to express just how I feel about the prospect of Premier Khrushchev's visit to America. I have tried to emphasize that I, for one, do not wish to extend any festive welcome and great show of comradeship for this international tyrant.

As a sort of footnote to my previous remarks, and to illustrate that quite a number of other Americans feel as I do in this respect, I would like to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a group of letters to the editor which were published in the August 17 issue of the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROVERSY STILL WAXES WARM OVER KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

It is surprising that few people question the assumption that Khrushchev is in many ways ignorant of conditions in the United States. Harriman returned from Russia stating that he found the Soviet leader badly informed; NIXON took up the same line; then the President said he would like to show Levittown to Khrushchev so he can see that the U.S. housing exhibit in Moscow is typical. A little thought ought to convince Americans that Khrushchev cannot be so uninformed. Consider the size of the Soviet Embassy staff in Washington; consider the mass of reports that are surely being sent to Moscow; consider the ease with which information of such a nature can be obtained in the United States from personal inspection, newspapers, official sources. Khrushchev's purpose is quite transparent. He wants to minimize the effect of the housing exhibit on the Soviet people, make them think Americans are not as far ahead of them as is actually the case. How Khrushchev must chuckle when he sees how this simple ruse has pulled the wool over some eyes.

H. C. NEAL.

Khrushchev is coming. Where are the Paul Reveres? One if by land, and two if by sea, and three—the manifesto calls for us to be brought down as a free nation.

With some, I think of the peoples of the world who will see pictures of the hammer and sickle flying over our land. Why don't we keep the flags after Khrushchev leaves so as to have them ready when he comes again as victor instead of as visitor?

I am one citizen of this country who does not wish to see diplomatic courtesy extended to this man who has bragged of our forthcoming demise.

BETTY M. BONNETT.

Premier Khrushchev's visit and President Eisenhower's return visit should not be considered as "missions of peace," but merely as opportunities to examine more thoroughly and closely conflicting world policies.

To interpret these informal talks as gestures of good will would be a misconception. However, it is hoped that Americans will pledge their full-fledged support to the President and demonstrate to Premier Khrushchev that we are peace-loving people, educated, informed, and enlightened as to the international variances at stake.

SUZANNE R. STALLING.

All the way from Union Station
And along the city's parks
The crowds sing their hosannas
For the salesman of Karl Marx.

The day is warm and sunny
And brimming with good will
But in J. Edgar's dwelling
There's an autumnal chill.

He looks out of his window
And he views with jaundiced eye
The hammer and the sickle
Beneath the summer sky.

But then, let's all be jolly
And let no one frown
For Khrushchev's in the White House
And the Reds are on the town.

HYMEN R. KAPLAN.

We see that for Premier Khrushchev's first American visit it is planned to fly the hammer and sickle flag from Washington lampposts. In his plan to bury us, we can only assume that he will hang statesmen, Congressmen, and reporters from lampposts on his second visit to Washington.

JURI BARTHOLD.

It was a shock to me, and I believe it was to the average citizen, when our President gave out the news that he had invited a criminal like Khrushchev to become a guest of the United States. How low have we sunk when our Chief Executive can shake hands with and entertain a man who has murdered thousands of people and has boasted that he will bury us?

Why should the taxpayers and decent citizens of this country have to put up the money to entertain and actually protect the life of this murderer?

LINDA MCCLURE WOODS.

It is too late now to consider the wisdom of extending to Khrushchev an invitation to visit our country, but we can do certain things when he comes. We can, and should, treat him with punctilious curtesy because he is an invited guest. Since few people in the United States, however, wish to consort with a murder, a liar, and a thief, it follows that we should not honor him further than has already been done by asking him here is a guest. It is unthinkable to me that he should be the guest of honor at functions not strictly and solely official, such as are being proposed by businessmen and others throughout the Nation.

I would ike to see Khrushchev confronted with a wall of complete indifference, except for reporting the actual facts of his visit. There should be neither praise nor censure, and everything possible should be done to prevent him from making his visit a basis for his well-known propaganda, of which he is a master. Because we are a reasonably honest and fairminded people we cannot excel or even match him in the field of propaganda and, at all costs, we should avoid being taken in by any of his proposals until they have resulted in positive, clear-cut action; for the man is a consummate liar and from all indications has no comprehension of what we mean by honesty.

E. R. BALLINGER.

It is regrettable that when Khrushchev arrives in Washington in his official capacity as Prime Minister of the U.S.S.R., Congress may no longer be in session. However, this unfortunate situation may very well be remedied by inviting Mr. Khrushchev to appear before one of the congressional commitees, thus keeping him in the limelight.

The Committee on Internal Security would be the most appropriate one to extend the invitation. Mr. Khrushchev, as chairman of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and boss of the world Communist movement, could perform a signal service to the cause of peace and friendship by supplying many a missing link in the investigations of the committee which has amassed evidence on incidents of Communist subversion, sedition, spying, arousing of interracial hatred, etc. in this and other countries. An additional point: As a foreigner, Mr. Khrushchev could not claim the privileges of the fifth amendment.

CHARLES COLLINS.

The President pulled the biggest blooper of the century by inviting Khrushchev here, thereby skyrocketing his waning prestige at the expense of the oppressed, enslaved peoples of Europe and Asia.

Of all the naive reasons for having the Russian dictator here, that of visiting strategic air bases is the most inane. Naturally, Khrushchev rejected Secretary McElroy's invitation, for the Soviet leader doubtlessly has seen them in pictures and movies brought to him by his diplomatic couriers. Then, too, he doesn't want Eisenhower looking at his.

As for seeing how the West lives, don't you suppose Khrushchev knows? On his visit there several years ago, Khrushchev saw England's cottages, manors, industrial complexes, and cities similar to those in America. Angry sullen crowds greeted him and he returned to the Kremlin in disgust. Yes, he knows how the west lives. And he knows too, he must bury it if communism is to survive.

CHARLES P. BEASLEY.

It came as a great shock to read that the President is extending to Dictator Khrushchev a courtesy he has chosen to withhold from some of our friends—that of meeting him at the airport. If, in the general interest, this persons must be permited to enter our country, it sems to me our conduct should be no more than formally courteous, considering the numerous outrages committed not only with his consent but at his order.

Our sudden switch in policy resembles the switches called by Khrushchev himself, which switches have always brought from us comments of amusement or contempt. It sems that we are not only doing business with the devil—we are doing it on his terms.

DORIS STIVERSON.

The Speaker's Rebuke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from Business Week for August 1, 1959.

This editorial relates to a statement made recently by our distinguished Speaker, and I feel that it is most appropriate that it be put into the RECORD so that those in the executive branch who take the time to read of our activities and statements here will realize the necessity for thinking before they start talking. I believe our distinguished Speaker gave a needed rebuke to some spokesmen for the Federal Reserve Board.

The editorial follows:

THE SPEAKER'S REBUKE

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has a sharp tongue, but there was considerable justice as well as sharpness in the rebuke he administered last week to some of the more vocal supporters of the Federal Reserve Board.

"I have been forced to the conclusion," RAYBURN declared, "that the Federal Reserve authorities have reached a point in their thinking where they consider themselves immune to any direction or suggestion by the Congress, let alone a simple expression of the sense of Congress."

Speaker RAYBURN's voice is a powerful one in Washington, and when he says something like this, it is worth listening to. In fairness, though, his rebuke should apply not to the Fed itself but to some of its more ardent champions who have rushed to attack the proposed "sense of Congress" amendment to the bill raising the ceiling on the interest rate the Federal Government can pay.

The merits of the amendment itself may be arguable—though it can be remarked in passing that the language is moderate and the principle has been supported by some highly qualified students of central banking.

But whether the amendment is wise or foolish, the right of Congress to give these or any other instructions to the Fed should be beyond question. The Fed itself has always acknowledged this. But some of its partisans with their charges of a "political foray" seem to have forgotten it.

It is a basic principle of our Government—and an excellent principle—that the expert administrator operates not by divine authority but by virtue of his ability to persuade duly elected representatives of the laity that he knows what he is doing.

Regardless of what happens to the "sense of Congress" amendment, it will be a sad day for the country—and for the Federal Reserve System—if we ever try to operate on any other basis.

The Senate's Responsibility for Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, generally, will be interested in reading the August 10 lead editorial in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of St. Louis, Mo. It places upon the U.S. Senate the direct responsibility for enacting effective labor reform legislation in this session of Congress and it supports the point of view which I presented in the more than 2-hour debate on this subject on Monday, August 17. In other words, the Post-Dispatch urges the Senate to follow the constructive action of the House by enacting the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. President, if the conference committee can agree upon a better and more effective piece of labor reform legislation than the Landrum-Griffin bill, let it bring such legislation to the floor of the Senate. If it cannot agree, let it act in conformity with the commitments made on the Senate floor last Monday and give the Senate itself the opportunity to vote to instruct its conferees to carry out its wishes and desires.

The conferees have now had this legislation before them for a week. We are 1 week closer to adjournment. Time is marching on. I hope that within the next few days the Senate will be given an opportunity to register its views on effective labor reform legislation, either by adopting a conference report containing such provisions—if the conferees will accept such provisions—or by voting to instruct the conferees of the Senate to conform with the House provisions on the areas of disagreement.

Mr. President, this Post-Dispatch editorial merits careful reading on this issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 10–16, 1959]

THE SENATE'S RESPONSIBILITY

Enactment of strong labor reform legislation at this session of Congress now is up to the Senate. The House of Representatives acted Thursday with commendable speed and statesmanship in voting 229 to 201 to approve the Landrum-Griffin bill, which carried administration indorsement. There is no question of a veto if the Senate goes along with the House, and Senators should examine carefully the meaning of Thursday's rollcall and insist that their conferees conform to it.

It is fair to say that in this crucial vote the House succumbed to pressure, but it was the

pressure of public opinion and not of a special interest. In following the wishes of the people the House repudiated the most severe and potentially the most politically damaging pressure from organized labor that has been brought to bear in the present Congress. Those Members who stood against it are entitled to a vote of thanks.

The House opened debate with three bills before it. One was the Landrum-Griffin bill, given final approval Friday 303 to 125 after passage was assured in the key vote the day before. At the opposite extreme was the measure backed by organized labor. In the middle was a version of the Senate-approved Kennedy-Ervin bill, which emerged from a House committee and which had the support of the Democratic leadership. Thus the House rejected the alternatives and chose the toughest of the lot, and did so by a comfortable margin despite the last minute efforts of AFL–CIO lobbyists to hold down the winning vote as a lever for use in the expected Senate-House conference. A close tally would have provided argument for a weakened compromise.

Each of the three measures before the House had its topflight supporter; each advocate took his case to the country by radio. President Eisenhower put his prestige behind the Landrum-Griffin bill; AFL–CIO President George Meany appealed for the labor bill; House Speaker SAM RAYBURN asked support for the committee bill. What happened to RAYBURN was surprising and significant. When the venerable MISTER SAM resorts to the unusual step of arguing publicly for a piece of legislation, his colleagues in the House pay careful attention. But in this case he lost control even of his own Texas delegation; of 21 Democrats, 16 voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

It was to be expected that Mr. Meany would denounce the House action. "A victory for antilabor forces," he called it. The same comment was made by labor leaders at the time of the Taft-Hartley battles in the forties. John L. Lewis termed Taft-Hartley a "slave labor act." Yet anyone who thinks Taft-Hartley damaged the labor movement is sadly out of touch with the times. The Landrum-Griffin bill, which in many ways merely tries to end the abuses of Taft-Hartley, would not hurt honest unions or legitimate organizing practices.

There is one aspect of the House vote that Senator KENNEDY, the presidential aspirant, and other influential Senators would do well to ponder. It is this: Something has happened since last April when the Senate passed the mild Kennedy-Ervin bill 88 to 1. Certainly organized labor went all-out in its effort to defeat the Landrum-Griffin bill. It failed. Does that mean that labor's actual political power is a great deal less than it appeared only a week ago? Or does it mean the public is insistent on a good reform measure? Both elements figured in the House vote, and should make it easier for the Senate to concur.

There is little room for compromise between the Senate and the House bills. The compromises have already been made. The only course for the Senate to follow is to accept the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mission With Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George W. Healy, the editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip behind the Iron Curtain. He has now completed a very penetrating series of articles about that journey. I commend the series to all the Members of the House and the Senate.

The series is written in an informative and lucid style. The articles are most timely in light of the approaching visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

Mr. Healy is a distinguished journalist and is the recent past president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. During World War II he had an outstanding record as director of all domestic activities of the Office of War Information.

The first of the series follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 9, 1959]

NEW YORK-MOSCOW FLIGHT LIKE NEW ORLEANS-SAN FRANCISCO TRIP—CROSSING SO RAPID IT'S HARD TO BELIEVE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—What's it like to fly the 4,800-plus miles from New York to Moscow in a record 8 hours 53 minutes?

It feels about like flying from New Orleans to San Francisco—only you don't stop at Dallas, and the plane is almost twice as big and climbs twice as high as the largest airliner now in regular service in Louisiana. It's quieter, too, and the seats are almost as wide as a divan.

This 707–321 intercontinental jet transport carrying its first payload for Pan American World Airways, "raced" an older, smaller 707–121 plane flown by the Military Air Transport Service (U.S., that is) from the Atlantic coast to Moscow.

NIXON OFF FIRST

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and part of his official party left Friendship Airport, Baltimore, July 22 about 9 p.m. aboard the MATS plane. Those of us assigned to the newer 707–321 took off from Idlewild Airport, New York, about 10:30 p.m.

Less than 9 hours later were were on the ground in Moscow, waiting for the Vice President's plane, which had refueled in Iceland, to come in for a landing. Just ahead of us had been a Russian jet, returning Nikita S. Khrushchev from Poland.

Every plane in the air near Moscow was "stacked" until Khrushchev, the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, was on the runway. A commercial jet, coming in from Copenhagen, with William R. Hearst, Jr., and Frank Conniff, the editorial director of Hearst newspapers, among its passengers, was held up an hour to permit the Khrushchev plane and the two Nixon party planes to get on the ground.

CROSSING SEEMS FAST

The Atlantic Ocean, Norway, Sweden, Latvia and a sizable part of Russia are crossed quickly when friends are with you aboard a roomy plane and you can spend about 5 hours in sleep.

So rapid is the crossing that it's hard to believe that it has been accomplished.

Before takeoff Juan Trippe, president of Pan American, and Alfred F. "Mike" Flynn of Pan American entertained at Idlewild's new International Hotel.

When the plane got in the air old friends had held reunions, and strangers had been introduced. Fortunately, many of the 73 official party members and press, television and radio correspondents in the cabin were old friends.

Ruth Montgomery of Hearst headline service and Bob Considine, columnist, talked about Ruth's recent series about Gov. Earl K. Long when I stopped at their seats. Westbrook Pegler reminisced about a "Roman holiday" party given in Washington at the peak of World War II. "Peg" was in the hotel where the party was given, but didn't attend. He wanted to give the party a working over in his column—and did.

Jinx Falkenburg, the model and actress, was aboard in a new role—as correspondent for Newsday, Alicia Patterson's Long Island tabloid. She wondered out loud what the Moscow streets might do to her new shoes.

Demaree Bess of the Saturday Evening Post asked about Charley Nutter of International House, with whom he worked in Russia 20 years ago.

John Charles Daly strolled the aisle—looking for a candidate for "mystery guest."

Most representatives of the press, television and radio who planned to file "spot" copy wondered about how long it would take to pass their stories and pictures through the Iron Curtain. They soon found out: about 8 hours for stories and longer for pictures.

I wondered how much time my duties as a member of the official party and of the President's advisory committee for the U.S. exhibition in Moscow would permit me to write and to file copy. I found that out, too; very little; and when I waited 6 hours for a long-distance telephone call to go through to New Orleans and it never went through, I resolved to file little but write much—for use on return.

The country around Moscow looked just about like the rolling land around Alexandria or Jackson, Miss., as we made a steep bank and sharp turn while coming in for our landing. Farmhouses, though, were in clusters—not widely separated.

From the air the Moskva River, winding through the city, seemed slightly wider than the Red or the Pearl, but not as muddy as either. Its banks are reveted with concrete, like the Works Progress Administration reveted the banks of Bayou St. John.

WELCOME CORDIAL

Our welcoming crowd was neither as large nor as enthusiastic as the one that receives the Zulu King on Mardi Gras. The official hosts, it seemed to me, were formally cordial.

The drive from the airport to the Ukraina Hotel started on a black-topped road like the old Chief Menteur Highway. About every 70 yards was a policeman in a white coat, and in between were groups of Russian men in boots and trousers and jackets resembling army fatigues and women in coveralls.

Occasionally we saw a woman in the field, cutting grass with a scythe.

As we came closer to the city our procession of automobiles moved faster—with pedestrians scurrying to the sidewalks at every intersection. Every principal street in Moscow apparently is as wide or wider than South Clairborne Avenue. None that I've seen has a neutral ground or winky lights. Autos, most of them owned by Intourist, the official travel agency of the Soviet Union, run through red lights faster than through the green.

Russians may work together and play together, but on the streets it's every man for himself.

Wide Honor for Benson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the South Bend Tribune recently had an editorial entitled "Wide Honor for Benson." Be-

cause I think it contains much food for thought, I include it herewith:

WIDE HONOR FOR BENSON

The "prophet without honor in his own land" axiom comes to mind as a set of guiding principles drafted by farm economists representing 25 nations comes into the news. These economists are working under the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

When the full membership of the FAO meets later this year, these guiding principles may be presented to it for consideration as farm price policy in the 76-member nations. If so, it will mean that things for which Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been berated in the United States will be recommended for adoption in those 76 nations.

The FAO agricultural economists don't mention Secretary Benson in their declaration of principles. But, obviously, they are impressed by his farm price support reform program.

They advocate price supports below levels that tend to encourage surplus production. That is a Benson objective. They state that price supports should not be based on farm prices and costs in a remote reference period. Secretary Benson recommends abandonment of the 1910–14 "reference period" in the U.S. support system.

In some other respects also the FAO economists rule out things that Secretary Benson has refused to endorse.

Of course, our Secretary of Agriculture isn't entirely without honor at home. But where propaganda and practical politics are concerned, he has been given the worst of it for a long time.

It is highly significant that international endorsement of his farm price support principles is developing.

Courage and Heroism of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, M.D., Medical Missionary in the Jungles of Laos and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have spoken before in the Senate of the humanitarian dedication of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, the American doctor who has devoted his career to caring for natives in the jungles of Laos and Vietnam. I have written in magazines of Dr. Dooley's courage, skill, and tender care. And I have said that this man is the type of ambassador whom our country needs—indeed, whom humanity needs.

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley also emphasizes the wisdom of the proposal by a number of us in the Senate, and by the editors of Life magazine, to send a Great White Fleet of hospital ships across the seven seas bearing American doctors, nurses, and medicines. If one man in the steaming jungles can accomplish what Dr. Dooley has accomplished, then think of the horizons of mercy and healing open to an entire flotilla of Dr. Thomas A. Dooleys.

But now Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, age 32, has cancer, and he has returned to the United States for care—this time not for others, but for himself. His illness, and his typically heroic reaction to it, are described by his personal friend, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, in the New York Times for August 23, 1959. It is a moving tale of sacrifice, valor, and dedication. Everyone reading it will want to help at once Medico, a division of the International Rescue Committee, which helps to send doctors like Thomas A. Dooley, M.D., on their missions of mercy and kindness.

As a person who has suffered from cancer himself, I have special sympathy with Dr. Thomas A. Dooley. As a person whose own doctors are very encouraging with respect to his recovery, I feel confident and hopeful the same recovery will await this dedicated man, Dr. Dooley, who is needed so urgently by the backward and underprivileged races of mankind. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, from the New York Times, entitled "Dr. Dooley's New Fight," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. DOOLEY'S NEW FIGHT—PHYSICIAN RELUCTANTLY LEAVES JUNGLE HOSPITAL TO BECOME A CANCER PATIENT

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Late last Thursday, one of America's leading unofficial ambassadors, Dr. Thomas Dooley arrived in New York from his jungle hospital in Muong-Sing, Laos, 5 miles from the border of Communist China. At a hurriedly called press conference, the razor-thin (he has lost 28 pounds), driving and dynamic Dr. Dooley calmly announced that he had been ordered back from his post to start the toughest fight of his life. He had cancer.

Three months ago, while on a mission into the interior and while traversing almost inaccessible footpaths, Tom Dooley fell and injured the right side of his chest. The soreness persisted, but he was too busy to pay much attention to a "minor ailment" when there were so many people to treat and so many births to be attended to.

Two weeks ago he noticed a small growth on the chest wall; it had been the size of a pea and now was the size of a walnut. When a visiting surgeon happened by, Dr. Dooley asked him to remove it and take it to the nearest laboratory in Bangkok, Thailand, for examination. It proved to be malignant, but Dr. Dooley would not leave his post.

The Peiping and Hanoi radios had been calling daily for the natives of the villages he served to kill "this American spy." The American Ambassador in Laos had urged him to leave because he was in great danger. Dr. Dooley refused, for he did not want to leave "his people," nor let the Communists feel that they had driven him to cover.

CONFIDENCE IN AIDS

His greatest anxiety now is not the impending surgery nor the pain, but the time it takes and the fear that his patients will feel he has deserted them. He is confident, however, that his 2 assistants, Dwight Davis and Earl Rhine, 2 young premedical students from Austin, Tex., and 23 Lao students and the 5 Lao-trained nurses can carry all the services except major surgery.

Dr. Dooley, who is 32 years old, was a Navy physician in Indochina in 1954 after the fall of Dienbienphu, when Vietnam was partitioned into the Communist north and the free south. Dr. Dooley's mission was to render medical aid to thousands of Vietnamese who chose to abondon their homes in the north and find freedom in the south. After his discharge from the Navy, he spent almost 2 years in Laos, where in 1956 he established his first hospital at Namtha, under the auspices of Medico.

Medico, a division of the International Rescue Committee, 255 Fourth Avenue, N.Y., is a nonprofit, nonsectarian voluntary organization, set up to facilitate scientific communication and to provide health services throughout the underpriviliged parts of the world.

Today, Dr. Dooley feels greatly heartened by the change in this primitive jungle area during the past 3 years. More than 14,000 refugees from North China have come across the border, some seeking and obtaining help at his medical outpost, the only on in that part of the world.

The natives who 3 years ago knew nothing of communism have learned from these refugees, and from information sent out by the Laotian Government, what Communist aggression really means. They learned what has happened in the communes, and they know too that for the last 3 months no refugees have got across the border.

Dr. Dooley, who speaks the native language, points out with great pride that his is not a government operation nor an American operation; it is a partnership. The Government of Laos pays all the internal expenses: food, gasoline, coal, oil; the salaries of physicians, students, nurses; and provides whatever medicine it can. The rest comes from contributions from the American people, who have learned that there is no better tool to promote international understanding than help to the sick and the crippled.

Last year this one American doctor and his staff treated more than 36,000 patients at a total cost of $35,000, less than $1 a year for each patient. Drugs, supplies and surgical instruments were provided by generous American manufacturers. When the Dooley team moves to establish drugs and supplies are left, and natives carry on the services they have been trained to give.

OTHER MEDICO PROJECTS

Dr. Dooley's mission in Laos is only one of a number of Medico projects. More than $500,000 worth of drugs was shipped by Medico to Dr. Albert Schweitzer's hospital in French Equatorial Africa, Dr. Addus Samad's hospital in Karachi, Pakistan, Dr. Gordon Seagrave's hospital in Namkham, Burma, and to Dr. Theodore Binder's hospital in Peru.

Last December, a team of six specialists from the John Hopkins Medical School spent 6 weeks on a teaching mission in Jordan. Working with Jordanian physicians, they diagnosed and treated more than 12,000 patients, leaving behind them not only healing, but understanding.

Medico is Tom Dooley's creation, now and for time immemorial. His own fight against cancer he considers just a skirmish, when the tools of health and healing can combat the international cancer of communism.

His work and his fight against disease and communism must continue. Industry must help; labor must help; the average citizen must help. Congress could help by passing the health for peace bill this session, to establish a new Institute for International Research.

Possibly new clues that would help Dr. Dooley win his fight against cancer might be found in the farflung laboratories of the world, which for lack of funds have not been able to develop their new ideas or new discoveries. But time is of the essence; next session, next year may be too late.

Much that is irresponsible has been said and written about so-called ugly Americans,

Many splendid Americans are daily preventing disease and death, relieving pain and assisting others in the struggle for freedom and a better life. Tom Dooley is truly the splendid American.

Air Landing Rights: New Facts of International Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues a very timely article which appeared in the August 17 edition of Time, relative to the current competitive problems being experienced by U.S.-flag international airlines.

The article follows:

AIR LANDING RIGHTS: NEW FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

As U.S. international airlines enter the jet age the United States is junking a belief as outdated as its piston planes. The belief was that U.S. flag carriers could hold their lead over a growing flock of aggressive foreign competitors without a drastic change in U.S. air policy. Last week the U.S. airlines got a new warning of the onward march of foreign competition. From the State Department came an announcement that Air France will get an additional U.S. gateway at Baltimore and a polar route to the U.S. west coast. BOAC will get the right to land at Tokyo on its San Francisco-Hong Kong run, which is expected to take $7,800,000 yearly away from U.S. lines. A CAB examiner recommended that Air India be authorized to fly into the United States.

But the biggest threat is Russia's Aeroflot, the world's largest commercial airline. Its 1,600 planes fly 350,000 route-miles, serve 500 airports from Kamchatka to London. Airmen expect that one of the points of discussion between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev will be yet another jump for Aeroflot—the right to carry passengers to and from the United States.

If Aeroflot gets rights into New York, Pan American World Airways will fly into Moscow. But the exchange does not tell the whole story. Aeroflot, which now matches International Air Transport Association rates (though it does not belong to IATA), is expected to behave for a while. But airlines fear that, as a totally subsidized State airline, it will eventually cut fares to aid Russia's economic offensive.

Despite last week's OK on new competition, U.S. lines found some cheer in the decisions. They showed a real change in U.S. policy to conform to the new competitive facts. What made the decisions different was not so much what the United States granted—BOAC, Air France, and Air India were entitled to the routes under reciprocal exchanges—as the manner of giving. France had formally denounced its bilateral air route agreement with the United States 13 months ago, insisted on getting "double trackage" rights, i.e., the right to serve any U.S. city where a U.S. carrier originates a flight for France. The State Department flatly refused.

CAB and the State Department have not always been so alert to protect the interests of U.S.-flag lines. When Great Britain and the United States laid down the basic postwar air route pattern in Bermuda in 1946, the United States was the only nation equipped with planes to operate long-distance service. It campaigned for a free competition agreement, but the plane-short British forced a compromise that provided for an equitable exchange of traffic between nations signing a bilateral pact. Since then the United States has often ignored breaches by foreign airlines, drawn criticism from U.S. carriers for giving out fat new routes without getting much in return.

Now the State Department and the President, who has the final say about what international routes the United States gives out, are ending the giveaway period in favor of more horse trading and stricter rule watching. The new trend was forced by the awareness that U.S.-flag lines could follow the downward path of the U.S. maritime industry. Though 70 percent of all air passengers between the United States and foreign countries are U.S. citizens, the share of traffic carried by U.S. carriers has fallen from 75 percent in 1949 to 60 percent today. In the first quarter this year, BOAC nudged out Trans World Airlines as the second biggest transatlantic carrier (No. 1: Pan American), the first time a foreign-flag line has flown ahead of a U.S. line.

Foreign carriers have rushed into the United States in such numbers that 40 now draw from the U.S. market versus 22 in 1949. Most of them get far more than U.S. carriers out of the bargain, often add extra flights to siphon off as many passengers as possible in violation of the spirit of the Bermuda agreement. In return for permitting Pan American to serve Amsterdam, KLM flies into New York and Houston. Result: last year KLM collected $29.4 million on 86,225 U.S. passengers, while Pan Am got only $1,700,000 from 2,842 Dutch passengers. While cutting into U.S. markets, foreign carriers are strengthening themselves against inroads into their home territory; e.g., European carriers got IATA to place a special tariff on transatlantic jet flights because they do not have jets to compete with the Boeing 707.

As the only private, nonsubsidized air fleet in the world, U.S. carriers must find a better way to face competition if the United States is to keep its place as a powerful air nation. The most obvious solution would be Government subsidy, but most airlines themselves admit that this is a last resort. What they want is for the United States to show a tougher stand in route bargaining and in enforcing current agreements. In the next 5 years the jets will force a revamping of virtually all of the 54 bilateral agreements between the United States and other nations. Unless the United States trades much more shrewdly with foreign airlines, U.S.-flag carriers may not be able to compete in the jet age.

How Crime Rings Seek To Exploit and Widen the Already Perilous Traffic in Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a most significant interview with Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield appeared in the New York Times for August 23, 1959, regarding what he describes as the effort of organized crime rings to dominate a multi-million-dollar mail-order traffic in sordid and obscene materials.

I think I am as broadminded as any body about censorship. I abhor dictation and control of what people should read and see. But, Mr. President, literature is one thing and outright obscenity and pornography is quite another thing.

With some of my colleagues on the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I recently accepted the inventation of the Postmaster General to observe some of the materials which he and his subordinates have taken from the mails. I can only describe the exhibits as sickening. They were not art, they were not literature. They were disgusting attempts to pander to such degrading impulses as masochism, sadism and to virtually every form of perversion. One only can image the impact of these fiendish materials on the minds and habits of children, and it is toward young people that many of such obscenities are directed and sold, according to the information we received from Mr. Summerfield.

Because the Postmaster General has emphasized that crime rings are seeking to exploit this dangerous distortion of youthful minds, I believe the Senate and House should be alerted to his warnings. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from the New York Times of August 23, entitled "Mobsters Linked to Smut Traffic," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 23, 1959]

MOBSTERS LINKED TO SMUT TRAFFIC—LUCRATIVE MAIL-ORDER TRADE IN FILTH LURES RACKETS, SUMMERFIELD WARNS

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield says organized crime rings appear to be moving into the multimillion-dollar, mail-order traffic in obscenity.

In an interview Mr. Summerfield said the chief postal inspector had evidence indicating the mobsters were trying to get a share of what already is a $500 million-a-year racket.

Mr. Summerfield started a nation-wide drive against the racket last May 5. L. Rohe Walter, a special asistant to the Postmaster General, said the department estimated that 1,500,000 children in the United States would become victims of the filth distributors.

The text of the interview with the Postmaster General follows in part:

Question: "Mr. Summerfield, you have said commercialized pornography has doubled in the past 5 years. How do you account for this expansion in the business?"

Answer: "Many factors have caused this increase. First, there is the lure of fantastic profits—which run into very high percentages—attracting more and more promoters into this filthy business. We should remember, too, that until recently promoters were, in many cases, given only light sentences by taking refuge behind legal technicalities in certain large cities."

TECHNIQUES IMPROVED

Other significant reasons include technical developments in photographic and printing equipment in recent years. More material can be turned out in less time, at less cost and in less space. Today, for instance, a small dwelling, or even a basement can

house modern machinery that turns out a sizable quantity of obscene material.

Question: "Is there any evidence bigtime, organized crime is getting into the business?"

Answer: "Yes. Our chef postal inspector, David H. Stephens, has reason to believe organized crime has entered the mail-orders obscenity business.

"Not long ago, in New York City, a multimillion dollar mail-order business in obscene and pornographic films, slides, pictures, and circulars suffered a devastating blow with raids in which our inspectors played a prominent role.

"Three of the East Coast's largest dealers were involved and more than 17 tons of pornographic material were seized in one dealer's place of business."

ADS FROM ABROAD

Question: "There have been reports of ads for mail-order pornography from sellers abroad. How can these overseas merchants be controlled?"

Answer: "There is a substantial amount of mail from overseas soliciting the sale of pornographic or obscene material.

"When this department discovers that a foreign operator is advertising the sale of obscene material by mail to this country, resulting in a formal com-issued.

"This order is sent to our postmasters at ports of entry which handle the mail from the particular foreign country from which the foreign operator conducts his business.

"Under this order the postmasters return all mail addressed to U.S. residents by the foreign pornographers, marking it unlawful."

Question: "Last year Congress authorized the Post Office to prosecute those in the business of mail-order pornography in the communities where the material is received, as well as at the points of mailing. How has this new power been used? Is it making a dent on the racket?"

Answer: "The new authority, giving the power to prosecute in home communities all over America where the damage is actually done—rather than in a few big cities where pornography operators have become entrenched behind legal technicalities—is the most effective weapon yet devised against the mail-order obscenity business.

"However, the new law is important in another respect. Not only does it make more prosecutions possible, but sentences are stiffened."

Soviet Bosses Tolerate but Discourage Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the second in a series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, and who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 10, 1959]

SOVIET BOSSES TOLERATE BUT DISCOURAGE RELIGION—OLD FOLK GO TO CHURCH, HAVE NO JOBS TO LOSE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—The Soviet regime tolerates religious activity and at the same time discourages it.

Officially, in Russia, no good stems from any source but the Communist Party. The party doctrine is that there is no God.

Intourist, the official and only travel agency of Russia, employs many young men and women as interpreters and guides. They are trained carefully to see that visitors hear and see what the Government responsible for Intourist wants them to hear and see.

Twice while I was riding in an Intourist automobile, with an Intourist guide, we passed churches. On both occasions I asked the guides if they attended church. Each answered, "I do not believe in God."

NONBELIEVERS

When I asked one of these guides if her mother and father believed in God she replied, "No, my mother and father are Communists."

The first Sunday we were in Moscow members of our party volunteered to report to me what they heard and saw in the churches where they worshiped.

Ernest Barcella of United Press International attended Roman Catholic services in St. Louis Church.

"I was never so depressed in my life," he said when he returned to the hotel. "The congregation was very small and consisted almost entirely of very old women and a few old men. I saw no young people at all. Even the priests were old."

Another Roman Catholic service in a residence was attended by several members of our group. There, Bob Considine, the Hearst columnist, told me, the priest was younger and some young people were at mass.

Ray Scherer, NBC news commentator, went to a Russian Orthodox church. His report was like that of Ernie Barcella—there were no young people in the church, only old ones.

BAPTISTS CROWDED

The brightest picture was painted by Ralph McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution, who went to a Baptist service. The church was crowded, he said, with young and old people. The music, according to Ralph, was magnificent.

When I talked with old Russian hands about this I got three explanations.

One said the Baptist service was well attended because the Soviet hierarchy hasn't "lowered the boom" on that denomination.

Another said the Baptist attendance has picked up since Billy Graham's recent visit.

The third gave what seemed to me a logical explanation. When the last of the czars, Nicholas II, through the official church, appealed to the people to stop the revolution, he got no response. The excesses of the czars, of which there is ample evidence in Moscow museums, had alienated the people beyond redemption, and when the official church tried to stop them from overthrowing Nicholas, they rebelled against both czar and church.

ATHEIST MUSEUM

A museum in which exhibits which advocate atheism are displayed is recommended to tourists by the official Intourist guides. I didn't see it.

I'm sure that it's there, because I had the opportunity to talk with young people of Russia.

When we were in the air between Moscow and Sverdlovsk one of our party looked at his watch and remarked, "God being willing, we'll be on time today."

A young Aeroflot hostess, overhearing him, said, "God has nothing to do with it. If the weather permits we'll be on time."

Because I wanted to confirm what Ernie Barcella and Ralph McGill had told me, I spent the early part of our second Sunday in Moscow in shabby, rundown churches.

Without benefit of Intourist guide, I got a taxi driver to take me to the Baptist church. In front of the church was a Russian in his late twenties who approached me and said in English, "Welcome to our church. We are glad to have you."

EVERY PEW FILLED

I had been told at the hotel that the first service at the Baptist church was at 8 a.m. The young Russian who met me, explaining that he spoke English because he had studied in a seminary in England, told me that the first service would not start until 9 a.m. but that I was welcome to join the crowd in the church.

It was then 7:40 a.m., but I went with my escort—the young seminarian—to the balcony of the church. When he took me to a vacant pew I was amazed to find that the church was crowded—every pew filled, except the single one to which I was taken. A throng was in the center aisle.

"When did these people start coming into church?" I asked.

"The church was filled at 7 a.m. It is communion day, but we have seats for guests," he said. "You will sit where Billy Graham sat when he came to our church."

I explained that I could not remain for the 9 a.m. service but that I would like to sit for a few minutes to observe the congregation. Most of its members were old women—handkerchiefs on their heads. The seminarian was the only young person I saw.

Leaving the church, I asked him to explain to my taxi driver that I wanted to go to the St. Louis Roman Catholic Church.

NO ALTAR BOYS

The scene at the Catholic church, as Ernie had reported, was depressing. The priest was old, and there were no altar boys. I had to leave before the Mass ended, to attend Mr. NIXON'S final conference in Russia. Ernie told me that old men performed the services of acolytes.

Bob Considine, who is a Knight of Malta, told me that young people want to go to St. Louis—but if they go they or their parents are forced out of whatever jobs they may hold.

The old people can't work. They can afford to go to church.

Defense Education in Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago yesterday, on August 23, 1958, the House approved the conference report and sent to the President, H.R. 13247, which was signed into law on September 2, 1958, and became the National Defense Act of 1958. Mr. Speaker, this program could well be one of the most significant achievements of the 85th Congress, or for that matter of any Congress in recent years, for it strengthens one of the greatest and most important lines of defense we have in this era of the cold war and this age of spectacular and fast-moving developments in science.

With the launching of the first Russian sputnik, this country and the rest of the free world were shocked into the bitter realization that in some of the most urgently important phases of education and science, the Soviet Union had

not only reached our level but had surpassed us.

This rude awakening, unpleasant as it was, brought forcibly home to us that our freedom and our very survival were at stake. Accordingly, we immediately undertook a crash program, stepping up by a tremendous degree our then-existing activities in the field of guided missiles, and in the field of space and astronautics.

Mr. Speaker, while I recognize fully the vitally urgent need for stepping up our actual programs in national defense and believe they should be increased, I also should like to point to the fact that such programs as undertaken under the National Defense Act of 1958 strike at something basic and fundamental to our future, and is perhaps as important in the long run as the present defense program itself. This is true because this act looks to the long-range future, and is helping to prepare our youth and our schools to provide us with the brains, the technical knowledge, and the ability to cope with the scientific problems of the future. Mr. Speaker, the program under the National Defense Act is now underway, and it needs to be strengthened even more, but it is starting out to do a wonderful and most critical job and needs and deserves all the support that we can give.

As an example of how this program works, and of how it is being received across the Nation, I should like to point to an article appearing in the Bartlesville (Okla.) Examiner-Enterprise for Thursday, August 20, 1959. This article, which was written by Harry Culver of United Press International at Oklahoma City, describes the impact on the State of Oklahoma of the first 6 months during which the National Defense Act program got underway. I commend this article as excellent reading for every American who is interested in the workings of one of the finest programs established in recent years as a result of legislation passed by the Congress. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert this article in the RECORD at this point:

DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT IMPROVES STATE SCHOOLS

(By Harry Culver)

OKLAHOMA CITY.—The National Defense Education Act got off to a million-dollar launching its first 6 months in Oklahoma, the State department of education reported today.

Under the act, which didn't get into operation until early this year, 340 school districts in 75 counties have already started improvement programs, principally in the field of science.

"It has really given science training a real shot in the arm," said Dr. Oliver Hodge, State superintendent of public instruction.

POINTS UP RESULTS

While the full effect will take years to measure, Earl Cross, administrator of the program for Oklahoma, pointed to these concrete results already appearing:

Many small and middle-sized schools have added physics, chemistry, and foreign languages to their curriculums.

Four to six schools are expected to teach Russian this coming year.

A spot check of 26 schools showed a 1,300-percent increase in the amount spent for laboratory equipment.

FUNDS MATCHED

Cross said he has been amazed and gratified by the response and results, which have been financed by only a handful of dollars in relation to the millions spent on common school education in Oklahoma.

Under the act, Oklahoma is expected to receive $844,000 per year for 4 years to buy equipment and facilities for improvement in science, mathematics, and foreign languages.

This amount must be matched dollar for dollar by the local school district.

The first Federal grant to an Oklahoma school was authorized March 9, 1959. Between then and June 30, $532,000 in Federal cash was approved for schools in every county of the State except Cimarron and Jefferson. Matched locally, this provided for a $1,062,000 program.

STRESSES MATH, LANGUAGE

Hodge said the $312,000 left over can be added to the current fiscal year's fund. This will make possible a $2.3 million program for the 1959–60 school year.

Cross said science projects received priority the first year. The coming year, equal emphasis will be given to mathematics and foreign languages.

"The science laboratories in most Oklahoma high schools were in a deplorable condition," Cross said. "Moreover, the elementary science curriculum had amounted to little more than reading text materials."

He said most schools were so poorly equipped that first year expenditures went for very basic equipment, and for remodeling that included such items as running water, electricity and gas for laboratories.

"SEVEN UP" CONGRESS

In the mathematics field, purchases have included TV sets, films, slide rules, measuring instruments and geometric figures to "liven up" courses.

On the language front, money has gone for tape recorders, disk records, reference reading material and film. The step-up in this program is shown by approvals for 1959–60 for a $30,000 project at Enid and a $75,000 project at Midwest City.

While this fiscal year has barely started, 114 schools have already applied for $217,000 in Federal money for the coming term.

Hodge said Oklahoma is far ahead of most States in starting the program because the administrative machinery was set up in the Sooner State even before the Federal money because available.

WISE SPENDING PROMPTED

He said the act has provided a terrific incentive to improve training. And Cross pointed out the local dollar-for-dollar matching requirement encourages a school to spend its money wisely.

Cross said a random check of 25 schools showed they spent $1.24 per pupil for laboratories in 1957–58 and $16.54 in 1958–59.

Ardmore boosted its expenditure from $1,061 to $28,000, Bethany from $135 to $3,044, Clinton from $576 to $6,234, Duncan from $813 to $19,030, Vinita from $350 to $5,024, Beggs from $44 to $1,000, Lawton from $710 to $22,882, Elk City from $259 to $6,430.

A separate phase of the act sets up $72,000 per year in Federal funds for testing and guidance. Sixty-seven districts in 42 counties received $69,000 in Federal funds under this program up to June 30.

"Obviously," Cross said, "conditions more conductive to learning will soon prevail in most Oklahoma public schools."

Itinerary of Annual Official Tour of the Fourth District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, with the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I am preparing for my annual official tour of the Fourth District of Indiana, to meet with the constituents I am privileged to represent.

This year I am planning to visit a number of the post offices in the district and will be available for conference and interviews at each of these places. I believe this will be convenient for persons who desire to discuss legislative or governmental matters with me.

These official tours of the district are always most helpful. They afford a first-hand opportunity of obtaining views of constituents on the most important legislative issues of the day and at the same time of furthering the understanding between the people and their Representative in Congress.

Upon the completion of the tour, I will then have my district office—room 925, Lincoln Tower, Fort Wayne—open to carry on my official duties while I am home between sessions of the Congress. Meanwhile, my office here—room 1511, House Office Building—will be open as usual for the conduct of official business.

I cordially invite my friends and constituents to call upon me for whatever service or assistance I can render with respect to their problems relative to legislative or governmental matters, either while I am on the tour or in my office.

The itinerary of my official tour is as follows:

October 14, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Ossian.

October 14, 11 a.m.: Post office, Bluffton.

October 14, 2 p.m.: Post office, Decatur.

October 14, 4 p.m.: Post office, Berne.

October 15, 10 a.m.: Post office, Garrett.

October 15, 11:30 a.m.: Post office, Auburn.

October 15, 2:30 p.m.: Post office, Butler.

October 15, 4:30 p.m.: Post office, Waterloo.

October 16, 9:30 a.m.: Post office, Columbia City.

October 16, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, South Whitley.

October 16, 4 p.m.: Post office, Churubusco.

October 20, 10 a.m.: Post office, Angola.

October 20, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Fremont.

October 20, 4 p.m.: Post office, Lagrange.

October 21, 10 a.m.: Post office, Albion.

October 21, 1:30 p.m.: Post office, Kendallville.

October 21, 4 p.m.: Post office, Ligonier.

A Bill To Make Civil Service Retirement Available to ASC Employees on a Voluntary Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which proposes to extend to the employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation committees the opportunity to come within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act. I am joined in the introduction of this bill by the other Democratic Members of the House from Iowa, the Honorable MERWIN COAD, NEAL SMITH, and LEONARD WOLF.

All of us have, in recent weeks, received considerable mail from ASC people in our congressional districts of Iowa in which they have protested a ruling by the Iowa State ASC Committee making retirement mandatory at age 65. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the retirement age under civil service is specified at 70 years of age.

It seems to me somewhat shortsighted to force these men into retirement at age 65 when they have accumulated such a wealth of experience and when they still have several years of valuable service they could render to the program. Furthermore, such a mandatory ruling fails to take into account a man's individual capabilities and makes chronological age the only criterion of his value and effectiveness in his profession.

I want to emphasize that this bill would not force people to come under civil service retirement who do not desire to do so. This is intended to be purely a voluntary matter. The proposed piece of legislation is designed simply to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to make civil service retirement available to the persons desiring to take advantage of it.

I wish to point out that the Department of Agriculture has no policy which will prohibit a man in the ASC service from working until the age of 70 years.

I should add that my understanding of this matter is that the State committees are presently authorized to request and obtain an employee's resignation for reasons of unfitness or inability to perform his duties. Therefore, such a bill as I have proposed here would not preempt any prerogatives that the State comittees now have in the area of personnel management. The purpose of the bill is simply to establish certainty as to retirement from ASC service where such certainly does not now exist. Judging from my mail, the ruling by the Iowa State Comittee has had an unsettling effect on the morale of ASC employees, and it is simply my wish to restore that morale and at the same time make it possible to utilize the professional capabilities of ASC employees to the fullest extent.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 8774

A bill to bring employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees within the purview of the Civil Service Retirement Act

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, employees of the agricultural stabilization and conservation county committees shall be held and considered to be employees of the Government of the United States.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and issue such regulations as may be necessary to provide a means of effecting the application and operation of the provisions of such Act with respect to such employees.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, annuity benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act resulting from the operation of the first section of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

The Trouble With Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent editorial from the Oregonian on the steel strike. I commend it to all Members to be read by them:

[From the Oregonian, Aug. 21, 1959]

THE TROUBLE WITH STEEL

Steel management and the Steelworkers Union are alike in claiming that Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell's factual report on the strike favors their case. A careful reading of this document, however, will cause the American public to cry out, in the words of Shakespeare's Mercutio, when mortally wounded, "A plague o' both your houses."

Beginning in World War II, with the big steel formula, and continuing thereafter—sometimes with the help of big Government, sometimes by union-management negotiation, sometimes after strikes—management and union have jacked up wages and profits until these are out of line with industry generally.

One consequence has been to open the doors to importation of Japanese, British, and German steel, to destroy the competitive position of American steel in foreign markets, and to encourage the displacement of steel by aluminum alloys, plastics, and other products now on their way to giving the steel industry real competition in automobiles, appliances, and other goods.

Steel management did not show much outward concern with halting inflation before it took its stand before this strike. Our belief is that steel is much more concerned now with the future of the industry, from the standpoint of competition, than it is about inflationary wage and price increases. But the union leadership refuses to heed the warnings, although steel hourly and monthly earnings are the bellwether of industry.

A notable section of the report shows that although there has been only a slight rise in the number of production workers in steel, there has been a substantial increase (50 percent, or 34,000, in the first half of 1959) of research, administrative, professional, and clerical workers in steel. This anticipates improvements in technology and output per man-hour, which are essential if steel is to maintain its economic importance.

Steel imports now exceed steel exports, for the first time. The Japanese, particularly, have drastically lowered their prices. The British steel industry made a 2 percent reduction. Other steel countries are working toward an invasion of the American market. Aluminums and plastics are moving ahead.

The best thing that could happen to the steel industry would be a wage and price freeze, as previously pointed out on this page. Instead of encouraging the adamantine union, the Mitchell report should give the membership a clear view of the hazards ahead, even though high steel profits are evident this year. The steel strike should be settled quickly on the basis of minimum changes, if any. Whether it likes it or not, basic steel may be forced to reduce prices to hold its position in the marketplace.

Bridging the Wide Missouri

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Kulm Lions Club of Kulm, N. Dak., pointing out the necessity of a bridge across the Missouri River:

"Whereas public interest has been directed to the necessity of a bridge across the Missouri River somewhere between Mobridge, S. Dak., and Bismarck, N. Dak.; and

"Whereas two bridges across the Missouri in South Dakota have been declared surplus since they had to be replaced by longer bridges because of Oahe Reservoir, and that these bridges have been suggested for relocation upstream from Mobridge, S. Dak.; and

"Whereas the distance between Mobridge, S. Dak., and Bismarck, N. Dak., is approximately 140 road miles, and that a point on the Missouri in Emmons County west of the city of Linton would be approximately half way between Mobridge and Bismarck, and that the stretch between these two cities is the longest stretch on the Missouri River without a bridge in either North or South Dakota, and that a public free bridge between these two points would be for the benefit and convenience of the public: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Kulm Lions Club, representing the merchants and professional men of the city of Kulm, N. Dak., That we go on record urging and requesting the Federal Government in cooperation with the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at some point in Emmons County west of Linton, N. Dak.; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the State highway commissioner, U.S. Representatives DON L. SHORT and QUENTIN BURDICK and U.S. Senators MILTON R. YOUNG and WILLIAM LANGER."

The foregoing resolution was adopted at the regular monthly meeting of the Kulm Lions Club, held on August 18, 1959.

HAROLD LUCK,
President.
GOTTLIEB SCHOCK,
Secretary.

Russians Grim Generally, Enjoy Fun at Right Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the third in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

RUSSIANS GRIM GENERALLY, ENJOY FUN AT RIGHT TIME—PROVE CORDIAL WHEN OCCASION OPPORTUNE

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

MOSCOW.—Life in the capital of Russia is neither all drab nor all gay.

The report that Russians seldom smile is fiction. They are grim at work and on the streets, generally, but at the right times and in the right spots they have their fun. Some American tourists in Russia seldom smile.

Tourists now traveling from the United States to Russia must move under the auspices of Intourist, the official and only Soviet travel agency. Guides employed by the agency serve as companions and interpreters for the tourists. Theoretically, payment, in advance, to Intourist of a fee of 300 rubles per day entitles the tourist to room, food, Intourist guide services, and 3 hours' use of an automobile per day.

I saw some tourists who had been in Moscow 2 weeks without obtaining use of an Intourist automobile. They got the guide service all right, but had to hire taxis because when they asked for Intourist cars they were told that all had been engaged in advance.

When 11 other newspapermen and I made our first trip to the Kremlin, where Vice President NIXON was making his first official calls, we were accompanied by an Intourist agent. While we were waiting at the Russian equivalent of the White House, within the Kremlin walls, I suggested that I'd leave the group—and the guide—and take a walk through the central area of Moscow on my own.

UNGUIDED STROLL

Ray Scherer, the television and newsman, advised against it. Without an interpreter, he said, I might have difficulty.

I walked alone across Red Square and past the Moscow Hotel. Between the Moscow Hotel and the Nacional Hotel I met Bill Hearst, the publisher, who was making his third visit to Moscow. He also was out for a stroll without Intourist guidance.

Using his directions, I had little difficulty finding several shops and making my way to the Hotel Ukraina, where our party was quartered. Incidentally, this hotel looks like the Singer building.

On the walk through downtown Moscow I received no smile from a Russian. The women who were walking, most of them on the heavy side, all had big bags in which they seemed to be carrying results of shopping and a week's wash. Without exception, they were in a hurry—staring straight ahead and walking fast. There were few men on the streets at the time, shortly before noon.

I then got the impression that Russians don't like to smile. It was a wrong impression, for a few afternoons later when Arnold O. Beckman, the California instruments manufacturer, and I went to the Russian agricultural and industrial exhibition—an elaborate permanent installation—every Russian we saw seemed to be having a good time. They paid little attention to us unless we bumped in a crowd. Then they were cordial.

After we caught up with the Vice President, who had gone to the exhibition from the embassy, we saw a real demonstration of cordiality. Walking with the Vice President through the exhibition grounds was like crossing Canal at Royal at noon on Mardi Gras. He wasn't exactly mobbed, but he was close pressed by hundreds of Russians who smiled and waved at him.

Russians can be and are gay when the occasion is appropriate.

Russians like night life too, in addition to the ballet; and an incident in the night club of Praga restaurant, very much like scores of night clubs in the United States, created something of a sensation.

The time we visited this night club was our first evening in Moscow. The band was alternating between American music, with plenty of Dixieland and Strauss waltzes.

There were two parties of Americans in the restaurant, Tom Deegan, the New York railroad and public relations man, was host to one party. Tom should be remembered in New Orleans as the man who brought the Duke and Duchess of Windsor on Mardi Gras, 1950. Merle Oberon, the motion picture actress, and her husband were hosts at the other American table.

All others in the night club, which is sizable, were Russians.

ATMOSPHERE CHANGES

Russians danced with Russians and remained with Russians and Americans danced with Americans until Mrs. Robert H. Montgomery, who writes as Ruth Montgomery, and I did a Charleston. Russians stopped dancing to stare—and then started to try to do the old dance themselves.

A young Russian, well dressed, without tie, came to our table and asked Mrs. Montgomery to show him the step. She did, and thereafter Russians and Americans got "buddy buddy."

Richard Davies, an escort for the vice president's party, told me that an incident of this kind would have been unheard of 5 years ago. Dick Davies lived in Moscow from 1951 to 1953, when, he said, Russians did not speak to Americans in public places.

The first two things about Russia that seemed unusual were these: at this season there's little darkness, and men don't step aside to let women enter elevators or buses.

In July and August it is light enough to play baseball, without artificial illumination until 10 p.m. and it's light again at 3 a.m. I didn't stay up until 3 a.m., but know that it's light at that hour because I didn't pull the curtains on my hotel window the first night in Moscow.

Bootstrap for Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD two very fine editorials on my program, "Operation Bootstrap, reservation style."

Following is the editorial from the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz.:

[From the Arizona Republic, Aug. 17, 1959]

BOOTSTRAP FOR INDIANS

Puerto Rico, once "the poorhouse of the Caribbean," now boasts the second-highest standard of living in Latin America. It ranks in sixth place as a customer of American goods. Since 1940, the annual per capita income of the islanders has increased fourfold and life expectancy has jumped nearly 20 years.

This miracle of economic growth is attributed to Operation Bootstrap, a far-reaching plan started in 1946 to industrialize the Puerto Rican economy and diversify its single agricultural crop of sugar. The heart of Operation Bootstrap is long-term tax exemptions to new industries and long-term leases of plants to industries that will move to Puerto Rico.

Representative E. Y. BERRY, a Republican Congressman from South Dakota, visited Puerto Rico last year and examined the results of Operation Bootstrap. He was so impressed that he now wants to apply the same sort of program to American Indian reservations, which are certainly among the most depressed areas in the United States.

Mr. BERRY represents 30,000 Indians living on four Sioux reservations in South Dakota, but his plan would extend to reservation Indians everywhere, including Arizona. It would give industries moving onto Indian reservations complete exemption from Federal, State, and local taxes for 10 years.

Representative BERRY points out that the U.S. Government now is spending about $180 million a year on Indian welfare programs. The amount undoubtedly will increase, since four out of five Indians on reservations cannot get jobs. However, if industries could be lured onto the reservations by tax exemptions, the average Indian would "gladly swap a Government relief check for a weekly pay check," says Mr. BERRY.

Arizona's Navajo Indians, in the Four Corners area, are enjoying the first fruits of an economic boom, due to gas, oil, power, and uranium developments. But industrialization has been slow on the Navajo as on all other reservations. If tribal councils could offer tax concessions, as proposed in the Berry bill, the basis would be laid for a Puerto Rican-type development on Indian reservations.

Congressman BERRY calls his project "Operation Bootstrap, Indian style." It has been endorsed by Indian tribal chairmen, Indian agency superintendents, church groups, and mission priests. It deserves the closest study by Congress at the soonest possible time. Certainly the United States owes as much to its first citizens, the Indians, as it does to its oldest Territory, Puerto Rico.

From my home State of South Dakota, the Mitchell Daily Republic has commented favorably on the proposal as follows:

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Aug. 18, 1959]

INDIAN-STYLE BOOTSTRAP

West River Congressman E. Y. BERRY reports enthusiastic response to his bill (H.R. 7701) "Operation Bootstrap, Indian-style," patterned after a successful Puerto Rican plan by which that commonwealth vastly improved its social and economic position.

BERRY hopes that approval of his measure will bring about similar improvement for American Indians.

Puerto Rico's Operation Bootstrap, as reported in Congressional Quarterly, is designed primarily to industrialize and diversify the island's rum-and-sugar economy by encouraging new industry to locate there.

Back in 1950 Congress passed a bill exempting Puerto Rico from U.S. individual and corporate income taxes, excises, estate and gift taxes and permitted the commonwealth to retain proceeds from its customs duties.

As a result, Puerto Rico was able to exempt new industries from municipal, corporate, partnership and personal income taxes for 10 years; from taxes on dividends or profits for 7 years, and from taxes on property from 5 to 10 years.

The Commonwealth government will sell or lease a plant on a long-term basis to new firms and offer them technical assistance. These exemptions go to industries never in operation in the island prior to June 2, 1947, to 34 specified industries ranging from animal feed to tinware manufacture, and to tourist and commercial hotels. Under this plan 600 industries have located in Puerto Rico.

Other changes made by Operation Bootstrap include its rise from a burden to the U.S. Treasury to sixth place as a major customer of American goods. The island now buys more from the United States on a per capita basis than Canada. In the past 20 years, Puerto Rico has increased per capita income fourfold. Life expectancy has increased nearly 20 years and infant mortality has been halved.

Patterning a plan for American Indians from Operation Bootstrap can work wonders on reservations where it is impossible to support, without Federal relief, the increasing population, BERRY believes.

His measure would authorize tax exemptions on Indian reservations the same as were allowed in Puerto Rico; it would authorize Indian tribes to set up corporations empowered to construct plants to sell or lease to industrial firms on a long-term basis, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Interior. The plants could be built with tribal funds, Federal loans, or through commercial loans to tribal corporations.

Industries moving onto reservations would receive complete exemption from Federal, State and local taxes for 10 years, the right to amortize property eligible for depreciation on a 5-year schedule, a deduction for 5 years from any Federal tax in the amount equal to three times the annual welfare payments paid to an Indian prior to his industrial employment, and Government aid in conducting on-the-job training for Indian employees.

BERRY contends that most Indians on relief "would gladly exchange a Government relief check for a weekly paycheck."

"Operation Bootstrap, Indian-style" would be a step in the right direction. Training and employment for the Indian people on their own reservations could lead to the elimination of Federal relief program, could improve their health and living conditions, could make them an economic asset instead of an economic liability. It deserves serious consideration.

The Expanded Highway Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, at the time General Eisenhower became President of the United States in 1953, the National Government was collecting about $850 million a year from the Federal gasoline tax. It was expending $550 million of that gasoline money on highway construction and diverting about $300 million to use for other purposes including foreign aid.

President Eisenhower felt that all Federal gasoline revenues should go into building more, better, and safer roads for the motorists who pay the gasoline taxes. President Eisenhower recommended that be done.

In the Republican Congress of 1954 this was accomplished by Congress providing grants to the States for highway building purposes of $850 million a year or just about the amount of the gasoline tax revenues.

The result was a substantial speedup in highway construction.

But the President did not believe even this $300 million a year increase in road funds was enough to do the road building job that must be done to provide the Nation's growing millions of motorists the roads they require.

THE EXPANDED HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Great as was the advance made in the first years of the Eisenhower administration in increasing highway building it was not great enough to satisfy the President's desire. He named a Commission to study the highway problem—the Clay Commission. The Commission recommended the building of 37,000 miles of the Interstate Defense Highway System into four-lane divided highways that would connect and serve nearly all cities of great population in the Nation. The Congress backed up the Commission's recommendation.

Under the leadership of Chairman GEORGE FALLON, of Maryland, of the House Subcommittee on Highways, legislation was drafted and enacted to fulfill the Commission's recommendations.

It is said, and I think correctly so, when this highway program is completed in about 16 years the American motorist can drive from the Canadian border, north of Bangor, Maine, to the Mexican border, south of San Diego, Calif.—a distance of about 4,000 miles—on a four-lane divided highway on which there is not a single road crossing or a single traffic light.

The same freedom from cross traffic over four-lane divided highways will prevail on many other highways running east and west and north and south across the Nation.

Most cities will be bypassed, the roads going around and not through the towns.

Instead of the $550 million a year spent in 1953 and previous years and the $850 million spent in 1954 and again in 1955 on highways, the National Government now is spending in excess of $3 billion a year on building more, wider and safer highways. This is in addition to what the States spend.

WHO WILL PAY FOR THE ROADS?

Who will pay the cost of these new roads?

There has been some increase, of course, in the tax on gasoline and upon tires to finance this gigantic expanded highway program.

The road program, however, in the long run will pay for itself. Everyone using these highways will escape great wear and tear on their tires and cars. They will be safeguarded from being involved in accidents that usually involve expensive automobile repair bills and often even more costly doctor, hospital, and medical bills.

Each year about 40,000 Americans are killed in traffic accidents. The Safety Council estimates that the four-lane divided highways with no cross traffic will cut these fatal accidents in half. Also, the motorists by traveling over wider and better alined highways will be able to bypass cities and will save much time in getting from place to place.

ROADS PROGRAM HELPS PROSPERITY

The great road program the Eisenhower administration and the Congress has developed during the past few years also is playing an important part in keeping employment high, unemployment down, and adding to the general prosperity of the Nation.

Tens of thousands of American workers are finding employment in helping to build the new and additional highways.

In addition, other thousands obtain employment in the factories and businesses engaged in supplying the materials required in highway construction, such materials as cement, gravel, steel, lumber, and plywood. Still others gain work in factories engaged in producing roadbuilding equipment. Because of the highway program, there is less unemployment than there otherwise would be.

As in all great adventures, everything has not gone in the enormous roadbuilding program as expected.

Too much emphasis, for one thing, has been given to taking care of big city needs first and letting the building of roads in rural sections go until later. The result has been that in the first years of the program too much money has gone into buying costly rights-of-way for highways and not enough into actual construction. Most of this, however, is now behind us and we can expect highway construction to go forward much more rapidly.

How enormous this highway program really is can be understood by a look at what the program is doing for our State of Washington.

In 1953 and previous years Washington State received about $8 million a year of Federal aid for highway building. Under the first Eisenhower road program, started in 1954, Washington began receiving $12 million a year of Federal funds for roads. This year, and in the years ahead, Washington State will receive grants in excess of $50 million a year for highway building. Our State of Washington is receiving six times as much Federal money now for roads as it did a brief 7 years ago when President Eisenhower first came into office. Similar increases have been made to all other States.

America's expanded highway program unquestionably is the greatest public works undertaking in all the history of mankind. It should be continued to completion at the present rate and level of construction. By doing that the greater safety of American motorists will be insured and prosperity and employment will be kept at a high level.

Labor Bill Fight Leaves No Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, among the commentaries on the recent House action on labor reform legislation, the following article by Columnist Marquis Childs which appeared in the August 21 edition of the Washington Post is one I wish to include in the RECORD under permission to extend remarks:

LABOR BILL FIGHT LEAVES NO HEROES
(By Marquis Childs)

No matter what the final outcome in the dispute between House and Senate over labor reform legislation, the political wounds opened in the Democratic Party will be long in healing. The result, it is generally agreed, has been to widen the split between the liberal-labor wing and the conservative southern wing of the party.

A smouldering resentment remains, with the unhappy conviction that presidential ambitions took precedence over the welfare of the party. As to the welfare of the Nation, it was obscured by the fierce, knife-throwing factionalism that tore the House apart as the tough Landrum-Griffin bill was passed.

Politically speaking, it now appears that if a labor bill is finally adopted at this session—coming out of the Senate-House conference—the credit will go largely to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, the majority leader. To put it another way, the leading Democratic presidential aspirant in the Senate, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, will get at best a mark of passing on labor legislation.

The suspicion is strong in the House that JOHNSON planned it that way. If the Kennedy-Ervin bill, as approved by the Senate, had been matched by a moderate bill in the House, then JACK KENNEDY would properly have been identified as the father of labor reform.

The suspicion of LYNDON JOHNSON goes to the fact that 17 of the 21 Democrats from Texas in the House voted for Landrum-Griffin. At the same time they were, in effect voting against their leader, Speaker SAM RAYBURN, who had staked his reputation and prestige on stopping the so-called tough bill and putting over the moderate Elliott bill. A switch of 15 votes would have killed Landrum-Griffin. Why, House Members who got badly battered in the fight are asking, could not the great and powerful LYNDON JOHNSON have exercised some authority with the delegation from his own State?

It must be said, however, that opinion in Texas tends to be strongly antilabor, and the volume of mail pouring in on Texas Congressmen was overwhelmingly for a strong bill.

If organized labor made just about every mistake that could be made, overplaying the hand in an outrageous way, the northern wing of the party with its strong labor element will nevertheless have at least a veto at next year's Democratic convention. The Republican-southern Democratic coalition with Texas in the vanguard, so ably led by Republican leader CHARLES HALLECK, has left an indelible mark.

When the shouting of the victors has died down, the effect of this coalition on political fortunes next year may be more significant than anything else to come out of the controversy. By their victory the Republicans blunted an issue which in the past they have exploited to the hilt—the charge that organized labor runs Congress and dictates the kind of legislation that is to be passed.

Not only President Eisenhower, who will not be running for office next year, but Vice President NIXON, campaigning for the Presidency, and his closest allies in the Government did yeoman work for a victory that the National Association of Manufacturers claims as its own. NIXON met wavering Republican Congressmen at breakfast on the morning of the test. His able and loyal lieutenant, Attorney General William Rogers, provided help in the big administration push.

It may be, of course, that the crime and corruption exposed by the McClellan committee had conditioned the public, including many trade union members, to accept what has been widely propagandized as a strong bill. But, quite possibly, there may be some early disillusion over just what has been achieved.

The comment of James R. Hoffa of the Teamsters Union, target of the most violent feeling, should not be overlooked. Hoffa said that with only minor changes his union could live with the bill passed by the House.

This bears out what Senator KENNEDY has been saying about the "tough" Landrum-Griffin bill. That is, that it will not substantially affect the big, powerful labor unions such as the Auto Workers and the Teamsters. But it penalizes smaller unions and the task of organizing, particularly in the South, will be all but impossible.

Perhaps, in view of this, the laurels of victory now being distributed will fade rather rapidly. By 1960 they may be as dust and ashes.

The Nation's Financial Troubles Similar to Those of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, thinking a suggestion from an able Michigan State senator—because the Nation's problem is similar—might give me an answer which would be helpful here, I wrote to my home senator, the Honorable Edward Hutchinson, of Fennville, Mich., who, for 13 consecutive years, has ably served the State, as both representative and senator, asking why Michigan, a prosperous industrial State, was in trouble financially. I received the following-answer:

THE SENATE,
STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, August 13, 1959.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLARE: You have asked me why Michigan, a prosperous industrial State, is in its present financial difficulty.

The reason is this: Michigan has not been living within its means. The present tax structure, unduly charged as a patchwork, is essentially geared to the State's economy. When times are good and the economy expands, so do the dollars of tax increase. When the economy contracts with recession, so do the dollars of tax decrease.

The trouble in Michigan is that Governor Williams and his administration failed and refused to reduce expenditures during the recent recession. He was directed to do so by the legislature but ignored the law.

Now the legislature is called upon to exact more of the people's goods, not alone to balance a new budget but to pay a deficit as well.

To accomplish this purpose, Republican senators propose a penny increase in the use (sales) tax. House Democrats, in Michigan's divided legislature, insist on writing into our tax system the philosophy of an income tax. They want just a little—a foot in the door. Each side is strong enough to block action. Neither side is strong enough to take action.

In Michigan, our economy is as fluctuating as automobile production. We need a stability in our tax revenues. Sensitive as our present tax structure is to the economy of the State, we would suffer even a greater feast or famine situation if our State revenues were tied to an income tax.

The Federal income tax system has been made to work successfully, only because the Federal Government has unlimited constitutional borrowing power. Michigan has no constitutional power to borrow money. Its operation is wholly dependent on tax collections. We Republicans maintain that changes in our tax system should be to provide a greater stability of tax revenues, and a State income tax in any form would defeat that principle.

Sincerely,

EDWARD HUTCHINSON.

Inter-American Development Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today.

KEENOTES BY REPRESENTATIVE ELIZABETH KEE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

WASHINGTON, August 24, 1959.—Quite often Congress passes significant legislation which is largely if not completely ignored by the press and the public. A case in point is the Inter-American Development Bank which was recently created by Congress with a capitalization of $1 billion.

The United States will provide $450 million of the capital. Latin American nations will provide $550 million and will be represented on the governing board.

The significance of the new Bank lies in the fact that it marks an entirely new departure in our economic relationship with friendly nations to the south. Economic aid, in the form of direct grants and gifts, are to be played down. Instead, our Latin neighbors will look to the new Bank for loans to provide the capital necessary for economic development.

The United States is prone to forget just how important Latin America is to this country. Trade between the two areas runs into the hundreds of millions each year. Also, it is important to our national security to make sure that Communist regimes do not gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere.

All of our neighbors to the south, with the possible exception of Mexico, are experiencing dangerous economic difficulties. All of them need to expand trade and to speed up industrial development. The United States cannot provide all of the capital that is

needed. Even if we could, it would not be good policy to do so. The countries themselves need to feel they have a vital stake in their own developmet programs.

The new Bank will fill this great need. It is going to be a businesslike operation. Borrowing nations will have to come up with sound programs which bank officials can accept as having a good chance of paying off.

This is a cooperative venture. Direct grants or gifts are too one sided to be completly effective.

This shift of emphasis in our economic aid program in Latin America is significant. I hope it will point the way to a gradual elimination of the economic aid program on the present basis.

Also, this year Congress approved another far reaching international financing plan which attracted very little attention. This was the International Development Association which is to be an adjunct of the World Bank.

It is hoped this new Bank can put to useful, productive work much of the $3 billions in foreign currency which the United States has acquired since the end of the war. It would work like this: Country X applies to the World Bank for a loan of $50 million. The World Bank feels it cannot loan but $30 million. The new organization would then make a secondary loan of $20 million, almost all in foreign currency of various kinds which can be used to buy materials in all parts of the world.

The new organization should make it possible for the World Bank to greatly step up its operations. And the more the Bank can loan, the less will be the need for direct grants of money by the United States to underdeveloped nations struggling to build a sound economy.

The people are getting tired of Congress voting billions each year for gifts to foreign countries. The new loan programs offer a sound, workable alternative and they should be much more successful. It puts our economic relations on a sound, businesslike basis and should in the long run help end the annual drain on our Treasury.

We've Done This Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, one of America's outstanding correspondents, Ernest K. Lindley, has made an excellent summaton of his findings in Asia during his recent tour. While many individuals are looking at minute details of a particular program in a particular country, Mr. Lindley has brought into focus some of the fundamental accomplishments not only of our own program but of the activities of the Asians themselves. I am happy to insert his column that appears in the magazine Newsweek for August 24, 1959:

WE'VE DONE THIS RIGHT
(By Ernest K. Lindley)

The favorable turn of the tide in free Asia is not due exclusively to reaction against the Communist policies and deeds which I cited last week. Side by side with more realism about the Communists I found on my recent tour a better understanding of American purposes and, more widely than before, friendly attitudes toward us. In talks with Asians from one end of the continent to the other I sought the reasons for this. Some are rather general, a few specific. Among the more important:

1. Time and experience have gradually convinced many doubting Asians that American policy really is anti-imperial, that it sincerely seeks to help the free peoples of Asia preserve their independence and achieve a better life. For a time many Asians tended to lump us with their former European masters. Increasingly, they have come to see us as a distinct breed (however, Asian feelings about Europeans, have been improved by Britain's enlightened colony-into-commonwealth policy and, recently, by the free choice that De Gaulle gave the French colonies). There is also less of a tendency to regard American capitalism as a form of imperialism. Most Asian governments now want the help of American private capital and management, although not all have taken the steps necessary to attract them.

2. Our policy of extending economic and technical aid, with no political strings attached, to the neutralist countries has improved their attitude toward us.

3. Year by year, there are more Asians who have had part of their education or training in the United States or under American guidance in their own countries. There are now scores of thousands of them—military officers, public-health experts, agricultural specialists, teachers, all manner of occupations. Overwhelmingly—a few go sour—they are friendly to us and give others a sympathetic view of America.

4. With the passage of time and the completion of some projects which took several years, the results of our economic-aid program are more visible and more widely appreciated. We have made mistakes (I will discuss these in a later column) but overall our aid program is a success.

5. Our defensive alliances and military-aid program have helped to generate confidence and stability, especially in the front-line countries. Generally there is a good, comradely relationship between Asian officers and the Americans who work with them. SEATO is increasingly valued even in some of the nations which for various reasons have not joined.

6. We further reassured our friends by two actions last year: Sending troops into Lebanon and supporting Nationalist China in the Red assault on the offshore islands. Our Asian allies sometimes wonder whether we will come when needed. Evidence that we will bolsters them. They find reassurance also in the SEATO military exercises, in which Western forces take part.

7. Our refusal to recognize the Peking regime is paying better dividends, now that the commune system and Tibet have shocked so many formerly neutralist Asians.

8. Many more individual Americans and Asians have come to know and like each other. Most Asians like American informality. Americans find that most Asians, when approached as equals and in a friendly way, respond cordially. Gradually we have built up a corps of people who understand the various Asian peoples and have won their confidence. Officially we are well represented. We have sent some misfits in the past and undoubtedly have some in Asia now. But on this last tour I encountered only a few and they were in minor posts. With two exceptions—one a gifted and respected semipro, Ellsworth Bunker, in India—every American Ambassador in Asia is a career officer. In some places a politician with a flair for public relations might do better than a professional diplomat. But we have a competent lot of Ambassadors in Asia, and some are very, very good. USIS has many very capable and experienced men, and I was favorably impressed with scores of other official Americans I met.

It is time to discard the ugly fiction that we have bungled in Asia. We have made mistakes but, on the whole, our policies are sound, reasonably well executed, and productive of heartening results.

A Time for Maturity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, a timely message on individual responsibility was delivered by the president of one of the leading educational institutions in Tennessee, David Lipscomb College, to the graduating class of George Peabody College for Teachers, in Nashville, Tenn., a few days ago. Under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an editorial from the Nashville Banner which contains excerpts from Dr. Athens Clay Pullias' challenging address. I believe each Member of Congress will want to read the editorial, and it follows:

A TIME FOR MATURITY

Human progress is the sum of individual achievement, the contributions of men measuring with mind and heart and hand to the challenge of individual responsibility; not herded as sheep, or goaded by collectivists, into a pattern of intellectual conformity called mass thinking.

That vital concept of individual responsibility was the timely message of Athens Clay Pullias, president of David Lipscomb College, addressing the Peabody College graduating class—the warning that when individualism is in peril the future welfare of mankind is endangered, and that the only answer to this threat is mental and spiritual maturity.

One could note that it was that maturity of great minds that grasped the realities of individual worth and dignity—and of that principle founded a system of government recognizing unalienable rights. It accented the freedoms which brought into existence great institutions to enhance, by individual preparation and opportunities, the betterment of all mankind. And again, this age is the beneficiary of its labors.

Yet, as Mr. Pullias warned, in spite of this: "Changes of our time have led to a breakup of the foundation of values—including the moral and the ethical. A worldwide atmosphere of fear prevails * * * (and) finally and most serious is the threatened destruction of the individual by the State, the machine, the organization and general spirit of collectivism in our time. The individual is in peril."

That individual being is the basic unit in society. Achievements of the past and the threats to our future have meaning only in terms of the individual. The meaning of life itself—as he eloquently pointed out—is centered in the individual person, not in the state, or in some unfeeling social organization. "A nation makes war—but it is the individual boy who dies, and a lonely mother who weeps over his grave."

Every forward step by the human family in the long and painful climb out of the darkness toward the light has been taken by developing and freeing the individual person.

As he said, the most serious threat in modern life is that of destroying the dignity and value of the individual person. In the to-

talitarian state this destruction is accomplished directly by force; in the Western World it may come by more subtle processes—including the pressure for conformity, the leveling power of the group, the highly touted mass thinking.

"The only power which can save the individual from this destruction is for him to become the quality of person who can live with distinct purpose—free, strong, and fearless—at home with self, fellow man, and God * * * a mature person.

"Such a person can freely work together with other people of good will to promote the general welfare of mankind and the glory of man's Creator. But he will do so of his own free will and choice, not under the lash of group control."

That is the challenge to individuals in a free land—a message comporting with the ancient and fundamental spirit of America. It honors a creed founded in conscience which only the exchange of birthright for a mess of material pottage could disestablish.

Khrushchev Attacks Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is no accident that the Communists are stepping up their timetable of conquest in southeast Asia along with the Khrushchev visit to the United States. The facts in the following article should startle us into a realization of the real purpose of the Khrushchev visit:

FLOWERS FOR THE HOST
(By Joseph Alsop)

Nikita S. Khrushchev has now followed his acceptance of the President's invitation to the White House with an open display of contempt for his future host.

There is no other way to read the new Communist aggression in Laos. The situation there can become very serious, indeed, touching off another Far Eastern crisis of Quemoy-like intensity. If the Communist aggression is not repelled, moreover, all the neighboring countries—South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand—will at once find themselves in danger.

Nonetheless, the indication of Khrushchev's contempt for President Eisenhower and the Nation he leads is probably the most disturbing feature of the very disturbing Lao trouble. On this point, the facts speak for themselves.

In brief, the President's announcement of the coming Khrushchev visit was made on August 3. Very nearly simultaneously, the attack on Laos began. The attack took the form of border crossings from Communist North Vietnam into Laos by Communist infiltration units trained and armed for the purpose by the North Vietnamese. Such obscure guerrilla movements in those jungle-clad mountains can hardly be precisely dated. Yet the major border crossings quite certainly began after Khrushchev's mid-July acceptance of the President's invitation, even if some occurred before the public announcement.

The timing of this opening of the attack on Laos is inescapably significant. Yet a good many people in this increasingly wishful city, and especially a good many of the people around the President who had pinned their hopes on the Khrushchev visit, are still trying to escape the meaning of this timing of the Laos attack. "It is Peking's enterprise, not Moscow's," they argue.

On this point, too, however, the facts speak for themselves. The attack on Laos was hardly underway, when Khrushchev received the organizer of the attack, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, Ho Chih Minh, for an extended state visit in Moscow.

While Ho was in Moscow, an obviously planned series of statements was issued. First, Ho's government in Hanoi blamed the trouble in Laos on the presence of a 150-man American mission to train the small Lao army. Then Mao Tse-tung's government in Peking virtually threatened war unless the U.S. military bases in Laos were instantaneously abolished. Finally Khrushchev's own Government in Moscow spoke out in clear terms, refraining from direct denunciation of the United States, but strongly supporting the North Vietnamese-Chinese Communist position in Laos.

From these facts, it may be possible to argue that the prime impulse for the attack on Laos came from Mao Tse-tung. But whoever was the prime mover, it is certainly not possible to argue that Khrushchev was anything but a knowing, willing accomplice in the Lao enterprise. The Ho visit to Moscow and the subsequent Moscow statement are the clearest proofs of Khrushchev's active complicity.

Khrushchev's purposes can be variously interpreted. The Communist interpretation was given by a high official who told this reporter, "It's the old tactic of the carrot and the stick." (When asked what was the carrot, he replied, "Why the Khrushchev visit"—which seems an unattractive sort of carrot.)

Khrushchev's aim perhaps is to extract from the President in the White House new terms for Asia as well as new terms for Berlin. In this, it must be added, Khrushchev is likely to have the indirect help of the British and Canadian Governments. Both are not merely summit-drunken but fixed in their idea as well that everything in Asia will be rapidly fixed up if we are just a little nice to Mao Tse-tung.

In any case the contrast between this time and last time is horrifyingly strong. Last time Khrushchev talked with the President of the United States, in 1954, he paid for his ticket of admission with the liberation of Austria and the dramatic though temporary restoration of normal relations with Yugoslavia. This time, crude threats to Berlin paid for the ticket; and as soon as the ticket was in Khrushchev's pocket, Laos was attacked.

No one who is not absolutely flannelheaded can see in this pattern anything but a display of the most profound, unalloyed and arrogant contempt. Whatever its sources, Khrushchev's contempt is a desperately serious political phenomenon. The sources need urgent investigation. But no search for sources is afoot, no doubt because careful search would reveal a distinguished soap manufacturer pouring out soft soap, which is still constricting the American defense efforts 2 years after the sputnik, under stringent orders from budget-obsessed higher authority.

Reply to the Carey Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I place in the RECORD a copy of my reply to the form letter sent to many Members of Congress by Mr. James B. Carey last week:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1959.

JAMES B. CAREY,
President, IUERMW,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have your letter of August 18 regarding my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400. You do not like my vote on that bill and, of course, I take no exception to your so advising me.

I take strong exception, however, to your suggestions that I voted to punish or repress or weaken all labor unions, or that I yielded to pressure from any business organization. Those suggestions have no basis in fact.

My vote was determined by my own judgment, exercised in the light of my own conscience as to what was needed to protect the public and particularly union members and their families and small business against such abuses of power, whether by management or union officials, as have been exposed in various committee hearings. The foregoing statement has special importance in connection with the provisions in H.R. 8400 which relate to the Bill of Rights, organizational picketing, secondary boycotts, hot cargo, and no man's land. Enactment of H.R. 8400 will not, in my judgment, interfere with any legitimate union activity of which I have been informed.

You may be sure that I studied the effects of H.R. 8400 before I decided how to vote upon it. In that process I carefully considered the views of all who had written to or talked with me about abuses of power by either labor officials or management, and I talked with union officials and everyone else who came in to discuss H.R. 8400. Some union members who live in my district think that H.R. 8400 does not go far enough to protect them against loss of their union cards—and that means their livelihood—without a fair hearing.

Many union members and their families live in my district and you may be sure I advised union officials who had talked with me as to how I would vote.

Members of unions in my district are good citizens. They will resent and reject, as do I, your notion that if unions are to be strong, their officials must be allowed to continue abuses of power of the kind which H.R. 8400 seeks to prevent.

Taken as a whole, your letter confirms the need for legislation such as H.R. 8400.

Yours truly,

JOHN H. RAY,
Member of Congress.

A Story of a Good Samaritan in the U.S. Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, an incident has been called to my attention which warrants recognition.

Last January the wife and four children of T. Sgt. Roy G. Cauthern were en route through the South Plains area of Texas to join Sergeant Cauthern in Seattle, Wash. On January 18 Mrs. Cauthern and her children were in an

automobile accident. Mrs. Cauthern was hospitalized at the base hospital at Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Tex.

Maj. John W. Arnett, base administrative officer at Reese, learned of the predicament of the mother and four children, and he and Mrs. Arnett took the four children, ranging in age from 1 year up, into their home and clothed them, fed them, and kept them together until the airman was able to obtain leave and come to Reese Air Force Base.

The Arnetts have a couple of youngsters of their own, but they insisted upon keeping the four Cauthern children together, feeling that this would contribute to their welfare and to the convalescence of the mother in the hospital.

It makes one feel good to know that we have people in our country and in the armed services who have not forgotten the old virtues of thoughtfulness and sacrifice. It is good to live in a country which produces people like Major Arnett and his wife. I quote in part a letter of appreciation written through Sergeant Cauthern's commander to Lieutenant Colonel Mays and to Maj. John W. Arnett:

DETACHMENT 1,
14TH AVIATION DEPOT SQUADRON,
U.S. AIR FORCE, APO 942,
Seattle, Wash., March 12, 1959.

Subject: Letter of appreciation.

To: Commander, Detachment 1, 14th Aviation Depot Squadron, APO 942, Seattle, Wash.

1. I wish to express my appreciation to the commander, Reese Air Force Base, to Lieutenant Colonel Mays, base hospital commander, to Maj. John W. Arnett, base administrative officer, to Captain Range, base hospital, and to the other personnel of Reese Air Force Base for the hospitality you showed to my family, and to me, when my wife was injured on January 18, 1959, while en route to Seattle, Wash., to join me at my present assignment.

2. Major Arnett's taking my children into his home until I arrived and until my wife was able to depart, Lieutenant Colonel Mays personally greeting me at the hospital, Major Arnett's offering me the use of his private car while I was at Reese Air Force Base, his personal coordination of the rescheduling of my family's MATS' flight out of Seattle, and the many other courtesies shown to me while I was at Reese Air Force Base was treatment I had previously thought reserved only for very high-ranking officers.

3. It gives me a sense of pride in being in the Air Force to have been associated with the commander, Reese Air Force Base, and the personnel of his command.

ROY G. CAUTHERN,
AF14034171, Technical Staff Sergeant, Detachment 1, 14 Aviation Depot Squadron.

Mr. Carey's Contribution—Arrogant—and Stupid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials from the August 21, 1959, editions of the Washington Post and the Washington Evening Star, respectively, which represent both a liberal and conservative journalistic appraisement of James B. Carey's threatening letter to the Members of Congress who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 21, 1959]

MR. CAREY'S CONTRIBUTION

James B. Carey's letter to the 134 Republican and 95 Democrats who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives was obviously written in anger and ignorance. His anger can be understood, but, as president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers and a vice president of the AFL–CIO, he should have been aware of how Congressmen respond to threats or anything suggesting threats. His naivete on this point may serve to stiffen the labor reform bill that the conference committee is hammering out and may swing dozens of votes to that measure in the final test.

Mr. Carey might have learned a lesson from the gas lobby, the utilities lobby, or Ambassador Hanihara, who represented Japan in Washington during the twenties. Ambassador Hanihara and the Coolidge administration were eager to dissuade Congress from enacting a Japanese-exclusion law, and they seemed to have a good chance of doing so until the Ambassador inadvertently referred, in a letter to Secretary of State Hughes, to the "grave consequences" which such a law would bring about in the relations between Japan and the United States. The Ambassador was merely forecasting what did in fact happen, but his words were interpreted as a threat and Congress voted the exclusion law almost unanimously.

It makes little difference whether Mr. Carey deliberately sought to intimidate Members of the House. His letter had a ring of arrogance that irritated friends as well as foes of labor. It marked for political liquidation all legislators who did not bow to the dictates of the unions on this issue regardless of how well they may have served their districts and the country in general. Such a crude and tactless challenge almost forces Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill to stand by it in order to prove their independence. And many citizens may be expected to cite the letter as confirmaiton of their belief that labor is riding too high.

Of course none of this is cause for a punitive attitude on the part of the conference committee. If there is reason, as we think there is, to modify some provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill so as to avoid unjust restrictions on union organization in certain areas, Mr. Carey's offensive behavior ought to make no difference. But the inevitable result of his bluster—perhaps intended to impress members of his union—is to make objective consideration of the labor bill far more difficult.

[From the Washington Star, Aug. 21, 1959]

ARROGANT—AND STUPID

It is an arrogant exercise in attempted intimidation that is contained in the letter from James B. Carey, AFL–CIO vice president and head of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers to the 303 House Members who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. Mr. Carey promises (threatens) that "we shall do all in our power" to see that political retribution comes to those who so voted.

Obviously, Mr. Carey overlooks first of all the fact that approval of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House reflected a strong and deep public sentiment in favor of some restraint upon the labor racketeering and corruption that have been revealed so clearly in recent months. And apparently he overlooks also the likelihood that public sentiment "at the ballot box" is very apt to end up on the side of those who are target of such heavy-handed efforts at political blackmail. Mr. Carey's letter will do no good for organized labor, and may punish his friends in Congress (as well as those whom he threatens) by picturing them as bending to his will by "voting the right way."

White House Issues Text on Flag of the United States of America, Its Use and Background, Issued in Connection With Proclamation by President Eisenhower on Admission of Hawaii as the 50th State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of a statement issued Friday, August 21, 1959, by the White House giving the background history of the flag of the United States of America. This official statement was issued in connection with the addition of the 50th star to the flag of the United States on the official admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union.

This statement is so informative and pertinent to the development of the flag of the United States as the symbol of our beloved Nation now that two additinal stars have been added to the blue background of our national emblem on account of the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as the 49th and 50th States, respectively, that I am sure the within text, as issued by the White House will not only be of interest but of historical value to all Americans.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I commend to all interested that they obtain copies of Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. These, I am informed, may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

WHITE HOUSE TEXT ON FLAG LISTS ITS USE AND BACKGROUND

(Text of a statement issued Friday by the White House giving background on the history of the flag. The statement was issued in connection with the addition of a 50th star to the flag on the admission of Hawaii as a State.)

THE NATIONAL FLAG

In connection with the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, the President today issued an Executive order adding the 50th star to the Union of the flag. The new flag will supersede the 49-star flag which was prescribed on the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

By law, the new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States on July 4, 1960, the birthday of the Union. Display of the new flag before that time would be

improper. However, it would not be improper to display the 48-star flag or the 49-star flag after that date; with limited exceptions agencies of the Federal Government will continue to display the 48-star flag and the 49-star flag so long as they remain in good condition and until existing stocks of unused flags are exhausted. It is appropriate for all citizens to do the same.

Following is certain information with respect to the historical and symbolic aspects of the national flag:

History of national flag

Before we became a Nation, our land knew many flags. Long ago, the Norsemen probed our coastal waters sailing under the banner of the black raven. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of Great Britain. The Dutch colonists brought their striped flag to New Amsterdam. The French explored the continent under the royal fleur-de-lis. Each native Indian tribe had its own totem and insignia. Immigrants of every race and nationality, in seeking a new allegiance, have brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores.

During our Revolution, various banners were used by the not-yet-united colonies. A green pine tree with the motto, "An appeal to Heaven," was popular with our young navy. The rattlesnake's warning "Don't tread on me," was displayed by aroused colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. The Moultrie liberty flag, a large blue banner with a white crescent in the upper corner, rallied the defenders of Charleston, S.C., in 1776. The Bunker Hill flag was a blue banner with a white canton filled with a red cross and a small green pine. The flag of the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope." Strikingly similar to the Stars and stripes was the flag carried by the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont at the Battle of Bennington on August 16, 1777.

When Washington took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge, Mass., in 1776, he stood under the Grand Union Flag which continued to show a dependence upon Great Britain. The canton of this flag was filled with the crosses of St. George (England) and St. Andrew (Scotland).

The first Stars and Stripes was created by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed nationally as Flag Day.

In this flag the 13 stars, representing a constellation, were arranged in a variety of designs. The most popular—with the stars in a circle so that no State could claim precedence over another—is known as the Betsy Ross flag, in honor of the seamstress who is supposed to have sewn the first one.

As the American frontier expanded, two new States were added to the Union, and these were incorporated into the flag. This meant that 2 stars and 2 stripes were added to the design—making a total of 15 each. It was this flag that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort McHenry, Md., September 13–14, 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, the Congress, feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes.

Since 1818, each new State has brought a new star to the flag. This growing pattern of stars could be said to reflect the growing dimensions of America's responsibilities, as the 13 stripes reflect the constant strength of our country's traditions.

The 50 States and the dates of their entry into the Union:

Alabama, December 14, 1819.
Alaska, January 3, 1959.
Arizona, February 14, 1912.
Arkansas, June 15, 1836.
California, September 9, 1850.
Colorado, August 1, 1876.
Connecticut, January 9, 1788.
Delaware, December 7, 1787.
Florida, March 3, 1845.
Georgia, January 2, 1788.
Hawaii, August 21, 1959.
Idaho, July 3, 1890.
Illinois, December 3, 1818.
Indiana, December 11, 1816.
Iowa, December 28, 1846.
Kansas, January 29, 1861.
Kentucky, June 1, 1792.
Louisiana, April 30, 1812.
Maine, March 15, 1820.
Maryland, April 28, 1788.
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788.
Michigan, January 26, 1837.
Minnesota, May 11, 1858.
Mississippi, December 10, 1817.
Missouri, August 10, 1821.
Montana, November 8, 1889.
Nebraska, March 1, 1867.
Nevada, October 31, 1864.
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788.
New Jersey, December 18, 1787.
New Mexico, January 6, 1912.
New York, July 26, 1788.
North Carolina, November 21, 1789.
North Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Ohio, March 1, 1803.
Oklahoma, November 16, 1907.
Oregon, February 14, 1859.
Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787.
Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.
South Carolina, May 23, 1788.
South Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Tennessee, June 1, 1796.
Texas, December 29, 1845.
Utah, January 4, 1896.
Vermont, March 4, 1791.
Virginia, June 25, 1788.
Washington, November 11, 1889.
West Virginia, June 20, 1863.
Wisconsin, May 29, 1848.
Wyoming, July 10, 1890.

Customs and usage as to flag of the United States

Laws have been written to govern the display of the flag and to insure a proper respect for it. Custom has decreed certain other observances in regard to its use. As a symbol of the Nation, standing for our heritage of liberty and justice, the flag is naturally held in highest honor by all citizens.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States of America has drawn together "The existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag." These can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. Copies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

Cash on the Barrelhead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article by David Lawrence, as published in the New York Herald Tribune of August 24, 1959, should make interesting reading for all concerned:

CAREY NOTE TO LEGISLATORS RECALLS LEWIS' SPENDING

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, August 23.—When the labor union bosses raise money to contribute to the campaigns of Members of Congress, must those who are elected disregard their personal convictions on the merits of proposed laws and do the bidding of the groups that furnished the funds? This issue seems to have been projected by James B. Carey, one of the top leaders of the AFL–CIO, whose recent letter to Members of Congress has caused a stir. He expresses gratitude to those who voted as labor wanted and wrote in bitter sarcasm to those who, having accepted campaign contributions from labor interests, voted against their wishes on the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Carey threatens reprisals at the ballot box and apparently the labor unions will withhold contributions next time from those Members of Congress who refused to consider a campaign contribution as a bribe.

JOHN L. LEWIS' VIEWS

There is nothing unusual about Mr. Carey's letters to Members of Congress. He should not be criticized as being alone in his viewpoint. For what he has written is in line with CIO policy for years. Indeed, John L. Lewis, while active in the CIO, was characteristically frank about the meaning of a contribution from laboring men to the campaigns of candidates for office.

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, having accepted big contributions from labor unions for his 1936 campaign, said in the midst of a strike in 1937 something that the labor union leaders didn't like, Mr. Lewis declared publicly:

"It ill behooves one who has supped at labor's table and who has been sheltered in labor's house to curse with equal fervor and fine impartiality both labor and its adversaries when they become locked in deadly embrace."

PAID CASH FOR FAVORS

In a biography of Mr. Lewis written by Saul D. Alinsky and published in 1949 by G. P. Putnam & Sons, the author tells of an interview with the labor leader during the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Lewis is quoted as having said:

"Everybody says I want my pound of flesh, that I gave Mr. Roosevelt $500,000 for his 1936 campaign, and I want quid pro quo. The United Mine Workers and the CIO have paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation that we have gotten.

"We have the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act cost us many dollars in contributions which the United Mine Workers have made to the Roosevelt administration with the explicit understanding of a quid pro quo for labor. These contributions far exceed the notions held by the general public or the press. Is any one fool enough to believe for one instant that we gave this money to Roosevelt because we were spellbound by his voice? It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three-quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the $500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price, but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money.

OTHER EXPENDITURES

"Certainly there was a quid pro quo—the right for labor to organize. But there was more than that. The sums we spent in 1936 were not only cash contributions that were made to the Democratic Party, but also were money expended in terms of salaries for organizers and other personnel who worked full time organizing and electioneering for Roosevelt. Radio time purchased, billboards, handbills, literature and all other paraphernalia that are part and parcel of the process of being elected President of the United States didn't come gratis."

The same interview reveals that in 1938 when the tensions between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt had eased off somewhat and the Democratic President was trying in primary contests to "purge" certain Southern

Democratic Senators who appeared also to be antilabor, the United Mine Workers chief rendered a helping hand. Again Mr. Lewis is quoted in the Saul Alinsky book as follows:

"Where did the money come from that Franklin D. Roosevelt siphoned into those Southern States to try to bolster up the fight against the anti-New Deal Senators? Where did the money come from?

MINERS PAID

"I'll tell you where it came from. Right here, from the coffers of the United Mine Workers of America. It came by request of the President of the United States through one of his trusted aids. You tell this to the President, and if he questions it, and I'm certain that he will not, you may inform the President that I am perfectly willing to name names and sums, chapter and verse, to satisfy any slight amnesia that there might be on this particular issue.

"You ask me for gratitude in terms of an administration that we have literally poured our life's blood into supporting. You wonder that I do not express the feeling that one should have for a great champion of labor. I say that labor's champion has to a large extent here been a bought and paid for proposition. There is nothing we should be grateful for when we paid cash on the barrelhead at the price demanded for it."

PHILOSOPHY UNCHANGED

So the philosophy of the money raisers in labor's ranks hasn't changed much in the last 20 years since John L. Lewis spoke. In the 1958 congressional campaign when the labor unions boasted that a majority of the House of Representatives was elected through their help, the Federal records show a relatively small sum was contributed. Big amounts were, however, donated largely to State organizations which do not come under the Federal laws requiring the reporting of contributions. It is estimated that labor raised approximately $10 million. Much of it was spent to uphold laws compelling workers to forego their civil rights and join unions.

Soviet Line Unchanged in 12 Years, Healy Finds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fourth in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 12, 1959]

SOVIET LINE UNCHANGED IN 12 YEARS, HEALY FINDS — CITES EHRENBURG-KHRUSHCHEV STATEMENTS

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—The Soviet party line regarding freedom of information, so far as my personal observation is concerned, hasn't changed since shortly after World War II.

At the end of that war, Ilya Ehrenburg was the editor of Isvestia, one of the two powerful official organs of the Soviet Government and Communist Party. The editor's chair now is held by the son-in-law of Nikita S. Khrushchev.

Mr. Ehrenburg, on official invitation, visited the United States. One of his stops was New Orleans.

RAPS ADVERTISERS

Driving one day he noticed several billboards on which were war messages sponsored by various advertisers.

"You shouldn't do a think like that," said he. "Think of letting some capitalist advertiser run a message for the government. It's disgraceful."

"How would you do it?" I asked.

"We would put up our own government billboards," said he. "Why ask people to buy war bonds or join the Marines? Tell them what to do."

My brief conversation with Mr. Khrushchev at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow was reminiscent of the conversation with Ehrenburg a dozen years earlier.

HEALY MEETS NIKITA

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Mr. Khrushchev had argued and debated in the modern home. Then they had exchanged pleasantries in the formal opening of the exhibition.

After the formal opening, the Soviet boss and the Vice President walked into the "glass house" of the exhibition, followed by their official parties. Again they started a debate, this time about free speech and free criticism of governments. Mr. NIXON argued for the virtues of free expression; Mr. Khrushchev dissented. A stable government, it was Mr. Khrushchev's position, should not tolerate public criticism.

Seeing me in the group behind them, Mr. NIXON asked Herbert Klein, his special news assistant, to have me step up and meet Mr. Khrushchev.

Introducing me, he said, "This is George Healy, the past president of the newspaper editors in America. His newspaper criticizes our administration when it thinks we are wrong, as do other newspapers. We think they have a right to criticize us. We also are confident that they will commend us when they think what we have done has been good. I believe George will tell about good things he may see in Russia. He and I are strong for a free press."

Mr. Khrushchev acknowledged the introduction, shook hands with a trace of a smile, said a few words to me in Russian and resumed his argument with Mr. NIXON.

WOULDN'T BALK NIKITA

The interpreter's translation of what he had to say in reply to Mr. NIXON's comment about a free press wasn't fast enough for me to catch it before Mr. Khrushchev hurried to the modern American kitchen exhibit.

From what I have learned in a quick look at Russia, I'm not sure I'd publicly criticize Mr. Khrushchev if I wanted to stick around in Moscow.

To be proclaimed the best disciplined people in the world, Russians—particularly the residents of Moscow—have less respect for police orders than any people I've seen.

COMMAND NOT ENOUGH

Police stopped people from literally running over the party of Vice President NIXON on the day of the opening of the U.S. exhibition in Moscow. But they didn't stop them by ordering them back. They stopped them by physically forcing them back.

When the Vice President was leaving the exhibition grounds, after N. S. Khrushchev and his heavy escort had departed, a crowd assembled around him at the exit. Some members of the crowd asked for autographs—others apparently wanted tickets to the exhibition.

One crowd attracts another, and this was the case here.

A police line was formed to prevent the second crowd from forcing its way into the cluster around Mr. NIXON. A human chain was set up between the two crowds.

WOMAN, 60, DEFIANT

One woman, about 60, anxious for an autograph or a closer look at the Vice President, slipped under two policemen's arms.

Just as she reached the fringe of the cluster around Mr. NIXON a policeman who had not been in the human chain caught her left wrist. He gave her a pull, yanking her toward two policemen, each of whom got a grip on her arm and gave her a tremendous jerk. She spun twice, back through the human chain into the crowd.

She apparently was neither hurt nor resentful. The pull and the jerk were just part of the day's life of a disciplined Russian who doesn't propose to listen to policemen.

As far as it is from New Orleans, Moscow is no place at this season to try to hide from New Orleanians or other old friends.

On our first visit to the exhibition grounds in Sokolniki Park one of the first persons I saw was Rose Kahn, fashion editor of the New Orleans States-Item. That evening, at the dinner tendered by Ambassador and Mrs. Llewelyn Thompson my seating was at the table with Arthur Davis, New Orleans architect, and Mrs. Davis and with Angier Biddle Duke, the former ambassador to El Salvador, who has spoken in New Orleans several times, and Mrs. Duke. In the exhibition is a presentation of the Thomy Lafon school, planned by the Curtis-Davis architectural firm.

William Nichols, editor of This Week magazine, and Mrs. Nichols were in our section at the official opening of the exhibition.

House Antitrust Subcommittee Study Leads to $50 Million Telephone Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the House Antitrust Subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who is also chairman of the parent Judiciary Committee of which I am proud to be a member, is to be highly congratulated for its comprehensive and scholarly investigation of certain competitive aspects of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. This was part of a study of the consent decree program of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division, including a thoroughgoing examination of the oil pipeline decree, as well as the A.T. & T. decree.

The constructive and painstaking approach taken by this subcommittee has now been quickly followed by action of the Federal Communications Commission affecting the pocketbook of every telephone user. Flowing directly from the Antitrust Subcommittee's investigation was a recent FCC directive reducing long distance telephone tolls by a total of $50 million.

Mr. Speaker, it is this kind of legislative surveillance by House committees and cooperation with them by adminis-

trative agencies that is a continuing credit to our form of government and way of life. An article in the current Democratic Digest and an article which appeared in the July 25 issue of the New York Times amplifies the background of this most important event to American telephone users, and under unanimous consent I include these articles in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1959]

PHONE RATE SLASH ON LONG-DISTANCE ORDERED BY FCC—REDUCTION TOTALING 50 MILLION A YEAR APPLIES TO CALLS OF MORE THAN 300 MILES—A.T. & T. SCORES RULING—SEES GOOD RESEARCH, GOOD MANAGEMENT PENALIZED—REVISION DUE IN FALL

(By Richard E. Mooney)

WASHINGTON, July 24.—The Federal Communications Commission has ordered that long-distance telephone rates be cut by $50 million a year.

The Commission announced today that the Bell System would revise its rates effective about September 15. The cut applies only to calls of more than 300 miles.

Two months ago the Commission was criticized by the House Antitrust Subcommittee for failure to act on its own staff's recommendations for rate investigations and reduction. It was also under attack for failure ever to set standards for measuring the adequacy of telephone rates.

The subcommittee, whose chairman is Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of Brooklyn, based its report on an investigation last year into the 1956 settlement of the Government's telephone antitrust suit by consent decree.

PENALTY IS ASSAILED

Frederick R. Kappel, president of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., which is the capstone of the Bell System, issued a statement here on the FCC action. He said that his company was being penalized for good research and good management.

"While earnings on our interstate long-distance business has improved in recent years," he said, "they are lower than they should be and well below earnings of business generally."

He attributed the improved earnings to "technical advances by Bell telephone laboratories, especially on very long circuits; efficient management, and more long-distance calls."

He said that the FCC directive "ignores the long-range interests of the public," which require added investment by the system to improve the quality of service, and add facilities needed for growth and national defense.

"These assignments call for financial strength," he said.

The last long-distance rate change was a $65 million increase in late 1953, which amounted to an average 8-percent increase in toll charges.

There was no estimate available as to what percentage of reduction would result from the $50 million cut. It is not possible to compute it from the 1953 increase because the volume of business has risen.

The actual amounts of reduction will be known soon, when A.T. & T. files with the FCC its new rate schedule, designed to accomplish what the commission has ordered.

A few examples of present long-distance rates from New York to cities more than 300 miles distant are: 95 cents to Portland, Maine, $1.50 to Chicago, and $2.50 to Los Angeles. Those are station-to-station daytime rates, subject to the 10-percent Federal tax.

SCOPE OF RULING

The reduction applies only to normal telephone service. That is, it does not apply to such things as private tielines.

The FCC's action was made known in a brief statement issued in the late afternoon. The Commission said that the order resulted from discussions that the Commission had initiated.

The Commission said that it had telephone rates under continuing review.

The House subcommittee, during its investigation, heard testimony from FCC staff officials to the effect that they had filed at least six memorandums with the Commission in the 1956–57 period on the fact that the rate of return on long-distance service was greater than 6½ percent. At least twice, the subcommittee report said, the staff recommended investigations looking toward rate reduction.

The significance of 6½ percent stems from the 1953 rate increase, which was designed to raise the rate of return to that level.

[From Democratic Digest, September 1959]

CELLER'S PRODDING CUTS PHONE RATES

A $50 million a year cut in long-distance telephone rates, starting this month, is directly traceable to the doggedness of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, New York, and other Congressional Democrats in putting the heat on the Federal Communications Commission.

The FCC had treated the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. and its Bell System like long lost brothers. The Eisenhower administration was in office less than 9 months when the Commission, without public hearings, granted Bell an increase of about $65 million a year in long-distance rates. Frieda Hennock, a Democratic member of the FCC dissented vehemently (and wasn't reappointed when her term ran out). "This is the first general interstate telephone rate increase in the history of this Commission," she wrote. "In passing upon the reasonableness of such a sizable rate increase without sworn testimony and evidence subject to cross-examination, I believe that the Commission is abdicating its responsibilities."

That rate increase was designed to bring Bell's profits on its interstate operations to 6½ percent, although the FCC has never bothered to determine what would be a proper profit. In any event, Bell's interstate profits soared well past 6½—to 7.7 in 1955, to 7.8 in 1956, for example. The Celler subcommittee computed that in 1955–57 long-distance users were charged $159 million more than was needed to produce a 6½ percent return. This year A. T. & T. split its stock three for one and raised its dividend.

Between June 1955 and October 1957 the FCC's own staff called its attention six times to the phone company's fat profits, and at least twice recommended strongly that action be taken looking toward a reduction. Nothing happened.

Then Representative CELLER's Antitrust Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee began poking into the conduct of the FCC, as part of an investigation of peculiar goings-on in the Justice Department with regard to consent decrees. In that connection it brought out the extraordinary story of how Herbert Brownell, when he was Attorney General, took A.T. & T. by the hand and showed it how to go about getting a toothless consent decree that left it in full control of its monopolistic subsidiary, Western Electric, and never mind the antitrust laws. (The Pentagon, under Charlie Wilson, helped out on this pretty little game, letting A.T. & T. people ghostwrite the Defense Department's recommendations that Justice go away and not bother Bell.) But all that is another story.

The point here is that in the course of the consent-decree inquiry the Celler subcommittee dug out the facts about the FCC's ever so casual dispensing of rate increases.

Last May Congressman CELLER dispatched the chief counsel of his subcommittee to see FCC Chairman John C. Doerfer. Several parleys ensued, and finally the FCC announced the rate cuts that go into effect this month—the first reduction in long-distance charges in 13 years. A.T. & T. stockholders needn't fret, since an FCC official is quoted as estimating that the profit on long-distance calls, even with the rate cut, will run from 6.7 to 7 percent.

Moral: never underestimate the value of the patient and unspectacular digging by Democratic Members of Congress and their staffs.

James B. Carey: Humorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, a rereading of the letter I received last week from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, confirms my original conclusion that the man is a humorist. The very fact that Mr. Carey sets out to intimidate those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill marks him as either a man with a sense of humor or as one who is so naive that he thinks Congress will grovel in the face of his awesome threats. Of course, there is the possibility that Mr. Carey is just another arrogant labor leader who is inclined to use his muscles rather than his head but I really do not think so.

In any event I have dignified his outburst to the extent of the following reply:

AUGUST 24, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: Thank you very much for your letter of August 18. I am having it reproduced for circulation among my constituents in order to acquaint them with the ill temper and bad manners of certain labor leaders, which would seem to further justify our support of the so-called Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

Incidentally, I am amazed that you are so poorly informed in regards to the voting habits of the people of my district. In each campaign in which I have sought reelection the leaders of organized labor have hit me with everything in the book. That I have been victorious each time attests to the conservatism of the voters rather than to my popularity.

Again my warmest thanks for the best piece of campaign material I have ever received.

Very truly yours,

PAUL B. DAGUE.

It has always been my firm conviction that the leaders of organized labor have been completely out of step with the thinking of the people in the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. Public reaction, however, to such bald threats as made by Mr. Carey is, in my opinion, accurately reflected in the following editorial which appeared in the Daily Local News of West Chester, Pa., on August 21, 1959:

THREATS

The type of letter received yesterday by Members of the House who voted for the

Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill warning them that labor union members will try to throw them out of office represents the kind of thing that should not be countenanced in this country.

Representatives are chosen to represent all of the people and not the interests of simply one group of constituents. No Member of the House in recent weeks could mistake the sentiment of the people as a whole in regard to the need for curbing certain labor leaders of whom James R. Hoffa is a fair example. Because the public demanded effective labor legislation at this session of Congress, the Landrum-Griffin bill was approved by a margin of 178 votes.

Every House Member who supported that bill received a letter yesterday from James B. Carey, AFL-CIO official, warning them of what union members intend to do because they voted for what the union considers "punitive repressive" labor legislation.

Every properly registered citizen has the privilege of going to the polls at election time and voting for the candidate which he feels is best qualified for the office to be filled. Once elected, the official must be free to vote for legislation which he feels best serves the welfare of the people as a whole. He must be free to do this without fear of threats or reprisals. Otherwise, he could not possibly represent the people as he should.

It is also the privilege of every citizen to keep in touch with elected officials so that they may know how they (the people) feel in regard to current legislation. Officials welcome such contacts. But no official welcomes the kind of communication that has reached supporters of the Landrum-Griffin bill. In effect it said—because you voted for that bill, we're out to get you.

One Representative termed the letter "bitter and ill tempered," and in a reply wrote: "Please do not insult me by threats." That probably pretty well summed up the feelings of the 229 House Members who were the targets of Carey's letter.

The Honorable PAUL B. DAGUE, who represents Chester and Lancaster Counties in the House, told the local News last night when he feels that he must bow to corruption in the ranks of union labor then his effectiveness as a Member of the House is over. Representative DAGUE supported the Landrum-Griffin bill on the first vote when it squeezed through with only 28 votes to spare. He was also in the "aye" column on the final vote. His stand in regard to the kind of labor legislation needed to deal with corruption is thus a matter of record.

James B. Carey also sent letters to 201 other House Members who saw fit to vote against the bill, pledging them his support. That is his privilege. But letters which breathe of intimidation and mailed to representatives who voted in the interests of the national welfare, have no part in a Nation which believes in a free and representative government.

Reds Use Visitor To Give Credence to Party Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the fifth in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 13, 1959]

REDS USE VISITOR TO GIVE CREDENCE TO PARTY LINE—EXTEND FAVORS TO MAKE PEOPLE RESENT TOURIST

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—Tourists in Russia have it better than the home folks in several respects. But let the tourist beware.

Unwittingly, the American visitor may easily be used to give credence to the Soviet party line—that westerners, particularly Americans, are selfish, bloated aristocrats.

There are many ways in which visitors seem to be getting the better of things in Russia.

When Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON made news, that news could be sent to the outside world by correspondents traveling with the Vice President without passing through censorship. However, correspondents stationed in Moscow, including American correspondents, had to submit to the usual cable or wireless censorship.

VODKA RUBLES CHEAPER

The official rate of monetary exchange is 4 rubles for $1. That's what everyone must pay for lodging, meals, and other necessities. But if the tourist wants to buy vodka, go to nightclubs and indulge in other luxuries, he can buy all the rubles he wants at 10 for the dollar. Not black market—legal.

The Sunday we made our second visit to the Kremlin there were no fewer than 10,000 people in double file in a line that extended four or five blocks outside the tomb of Lenin and Stalin.

Did we wait in line?

No. I'm ashamed to say, we didn't.

RUSSIANS STAND HOURS

We were Americans, not Russians, and the Russian Intourist guide insisted that we not go to the end of the line but accompany him to the head. It took us less than 10 minutes to get in and out of the tomb. Many Russians had to stand for 3 or 4 hours to see the bodies of their heroes.

Considering the party line that Americans are plutocrats, what could be more effective than for the Intourist Agency to extend favors to visitors from the West that would make rank and file Russians dislike them?

What would irritate a Russian more than to be kept in line while North Americans were escorted to the head of that line and quickly passed through the tomb in the Kremlin?

Because I wanted to be "on my own," I made minimum use of the guides. The one who took me to a food store gave me the notion that North Americans should regard special favors from Intourist agents in the light of "Greeks bearing gifts."

LINEUPS EVERYWHERE

Everywhere in Moscow, it seems, Russians queue up to pass through the tomb, to buy tickets to the U.S. exhibition (which Soviet officials seem to be limiting to the number of tickets bought by Americans to the Soviet exhibition in New York) and even to buy food.

The particular guide who took me to a food store found about a dozen Russians ahead of me in line at the canned goods counter. The guide told me that I could make my way to the head of the line to buy the caviar that I wanted. I said I'd prefer to wait my turn.

He remarked, "That's good. You'll make friends here."

Obviously, if you make friends by waiting your turn in line with 12 Russians at the food store you don't make friends by permitting guides to take you to the head of the line of 10,000 Russians at the Kremlin.

These are just a few of the incongruities apparent to the casual observer.

The Soviet Government denounces the American Government from day to day—but insists that American, and other, visitors be given privileges that the Russian people do not enjoy.

THEY USE BILLBOARDS

The Soviet Government denounces advertising as a crass weapon of evil capitalism but uses billboards by the hundreds—particularly in outlying areas—to advertise what it claims to be the advantages of communism.

No phase of U.S. Government is exempt from criticism by Soviet officials.

Civil defense proposals were a special target of F. R. Kozlov, first deputy premier of the Soviet Union, in one of his talks with members of the Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's party.

"You talk about building shelters under your buildings to protect you from bombs," he said. "That's ridiculous. The subways I saw in New York are lousy. Why don't you build subways like we have—good subways and deep subways. You could improve your subways and provide bomb shelters at the same time."

If the fashion show at the U.S. exhibition impresses the Russians, there is a billion-dollar market waiting for some manufacturer.

MEN DON'T WEAR TIES

None of the Russian men at a supposedly fashionable party which we attended wore a tie; and, I was informed by lady members of our group, none of the Russian women wore a girdle.

Kindness is not a nonopoly of the people of any country.

Finding a taxicab in downtown Moscow after a party breaks up is just about as hard as getting a taxicab on Broadway when the shows end.

Several of us were in the predicament of having to walk a couple of miles back to the Ukraina Hotel when an occupied taxi passed us. The occupant, observing our situation, halted the driver and had him back up to where we were standing. The lone passenger, a young man, spoke little English and we little Russian, but we managed to communicate that we wanted to be driven to the hotel.

When we reached the hotel we asked to be permitted to pay all or part of the fare. Our new-found friend refused. Nor would he give us his card or his name.

The Need for a Youth Conservation Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, on June 17 I introduced H.R. 7777 to establish a Youth Conservation Corps, a bill which is very similar to the one approved by the Senate last week. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can secure action in the House on this measure during the present session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call your attention and that of our colleagues in the House to an editorial entitled "Youth and the Land" which was published on Thursday, August 20, 1959, in the Washington Post:

YOUTH AND THE LAND

The plan approved by the Senate to establish a Youth Conservation Corps similar to

the depression-born Civilian Conservation Corps deserves to be judged in broader terms than its opponents, including the President, have apparently employed so far. Their objections to the cost of the venture need to be considered, of course, but we cannot for a moment believe that the expense would be anything like the astronomical scare figures cited by Senate Republicans. Indeed, is it not possible that the plan would result in some real—if not bookkeeping—economies?

The proposal is to enlist volunteer boys from 16 to 21 years of age for work in the national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges at basic pay of $60 a month. "Make work" ought, of course, to be avoided—but considering the enormous public land holdings and the growing public demands upon national park facilities this ought not to be difficult. An efficiently administered program should increase the value of the parks and refuges in a most economical way, at the same time affording exceptional opportunities for young men to learn useful skills and to round out their own mental and physical development in a wholesome atmosphere. We think the plan could be a happy blending of two of the country's greatest assets—its land and its youth—and that the measure ought to be enacted.

Russian Versus American Military Code of Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the military forces of the world's two greatest nations have been changing their codes of military justice. This action has been a direct result of the Korean conflict. I believe the following news review of an article by Major Denis A. Cooper in the Air Force Judge Advocate General Bulletin is of much interest. It follows:

WASHINGTON.—The principle that the accused is presumed innocent until convicted by evidence beyond a reasonable doubt is considered "obsolete dogma of bourgeois law" by the Soviet Union. Red servicemen are unaware that the American serviceman enjoys the shield of presumption.

These are the key points made by Maj. Denis A. Cooper, Headquarters, USAF, in his article on military codes of conduct—United States and Russia—in the July JAG Bulletin. The new issue of the publication, put out by the Air Force JAG, was distributed this work.

Major Cooper in comparing the two "codes" says that the Soviets, as did this country, developed its code following experiences learned from the Korean war:

"The U.S.S.R. * * * appears to have watched the performance of some of our military personnel during captivity as well as their courtmartial trials after liberation." He said Soviet leaders were struck by the newly discovered necessity for new rules of behavior for a soldier in captivity and that modern but barbaric methods of warfare, revived by their own allies in Korea, had outdated their earlier code of military justice.

In their new code, Cooper said the Soviets laid down the following punishments for crimes of their servicemen taken prisoners:

1. Confinement from 3 to 10 years for voluntary participation "in works of war significance or in any project which he knows may result in prejudice to the Soviet Union or its allies, if it lacks the elements of treason against one's country * * *."

2. Confinement for from 3 to 10 years for violence to fellow POW's or "cruel treatment of them, if committed by a prisoner in the position of a superior * * *."

3. Confinement for 1 to 3 years for commission of acts intended to harm other prisoners * * * for mercenary motives or in order to secure benevolent treatment for himself by the enemy.

The new publication contains separate articles on (1) applicability of the Hiss Act to court-martialed persons, (2) evolution of the Toth Doctrine, and (3) limitations on retired Regular officers when contracting with the Government.

Maj. Gen. Reginald C. Harmon is Air Force's judge advocate general. The JAG Bulletin is published bimonthly to provide a means for exchange of ideas and information of the JAG department.

It also discusses important legislation and special cases.

The July issue reports on General Harmon's "preventive law" program, which is designed to keep servicemen out of trouble by informing them in advance of legal pitfalls.

Welcome to Grand Master of California—An Address by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, Imperial Potentate, June 29, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 5, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an address by Imperial Sir George E. Stringfellow, imperial potentate of East Orange, N.J., on the occasion of Grand Master Phil Myers being created a Shriner on June 29, 1929:

WELCOME TO GRAND MASTER OF CALIFORNIA

Good evening Illustrious Les White, gracious and effective illustrious potentate of Al Malaikah Temple, under whose auspices tonight's dinner is being held. Good evening Most Worshipful Grand Master Myers and good evening to all the others who are assembled in the Town House in Los Angeles to honor the great Masonic leader of California who was recently elected to membership in Al Malaikah and who was created a noble of the Ancient Arabic Order of Nobles of the Mystic Shrine a few hours ago.

A word about Al Malaikah Temple. Seventy-one years ago this month Al Malaikah was chartered as the 40th Shrine Temple of North America. Today, Al Malaikah is second in membership and ranks very high in the councils of the 166 temples. Al Malaikah has provided the Shrine with three of its most outstanding imperial potentates, in the persons of Fred A. Hines, 1910–11; Leo V. Youngworth, 1929–30; and Harold Lloyd, 1949–50. All of these nobles did much to elevate Al Malaikah from the 40th position in membership to second. All of these nobles did much to spread the gospel of the Shrine not only in sunny California but throughout North America. The Shrine owes them a debt of gratitude which it can never repay. I now refer specifically to my good friend and colleague, Imperial Sir Harold Lloyd, who in his modest and effective manner placed the Shrine in the show windows and who currently is rendering a great service to our fraternity as chairman of the wills, bequests, and gifts committee and as a member of the board of trustees of the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children.

I indeed regret that I cannot be with you tonight to personally welcome the most worshipful grand master of Masons of California into membership in our fraternity, but I believe our friendship, established in the sacred precepts of Freemasonry is of such strength that he will accept my welcome, as head of our fraternity, from across the continent.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall leave for Atlantic City to attend the 85th session of the imperial council which will begin its deliberations next week. It is my hope that I may be privileged to greet the grand master and other officers of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of the great State of California at this year's imperial council session.

I believe the Shrine has a destiny within the framework of our human society. The destiny of the Shrine, as I conceive it, is to provide fraternal relaxation among men of honor and integrity who already have experienced the intellectual and emotional rituals of Freemasonry and the rites; men who have learned that in Masonry and the rites there is hope for a better tomorrow.

The responsibility and destiny of Freemasonry is (as I conceive it) to perpetuate the principles of freedom and dignity of the individual for which our Masonic forefathers fought so valiantly. Our lives, our fortunes, and our honor are indelibly tied to the "Apron of Freedom" which is the theme of our 1959 session and which will be on display in Atlantic City as a symbol of Masonic honor.

Brother Myers and I have discussed the need of greater unity in Freemasonry—not uniformity, but unity.

There is need for the rites, as well as basic Masonry. There is need for the Shrine and all the constituent Masonic bodies which stem from the Blue Lodge. Since Freemasonry was introduced into North America, great men have served our fraternity. To mention a few—there was Washington, Franklin, Hancock, and Pike. They made their contributions to a better way of life through our fraternity. It is a historic fact that our way of life was largely created in the atmosphere of Freemasonry.

Dr. Walter M. Fleming, an eminent Mason, conceived the idea that there are times when Masons should get together just for the fun of being together. Doubtless it is that thought that prompted your meeting in Los Angeles tonight. Fleming wrote the ritual for the Shrine which is now on display in the Shrine rooms in the George Washington Masonic Memorial in Alexandria, Va.

Our way of life today faces an organized attack by a godless philosophy called communism. If it should succeed, our fraternity would be the first to be destroyed. There is no group of men in North America who are better qualified to meet this attack than Freemasons and, in my opinion, we will be unworthy of our heritage if we do not meet the challenge. The challenge is being met in a modest way behind tiled doors. Let us say publicly that the purposes of Freemasons of America have not changed from that of the members of St. John's Lodge of Boston who assembled in the Green Dragon Tavern, painted their faces and dumped the tea in Boston Harbor.

I am conscious of the fact that partisan politics has no place in Masonry or the Shrine. I submit that communism is a conspiracy to destroy our way of life and if we are worthy of our liberty, we will not be diverted by the assertion that Masonry and the Shrine should stay free of politics while this conspiracy destroys our liberty.

Worshipful Sir, I hope you are as happy today on being created a Shriner as the 800,-

000 Shriners are to welcome you into our fraternity.

Good night to one and all, and may God bless and keep you well and happy.

Soviet Jets Used by Nixon Party Held Inferior Type

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the sixth in series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

SOVIET JETS USED BY NIXON PARTY HELD INFERIOR TYPE—LENINGRAD FOUND MORE ATTRACTIVE THAN CAPITAL

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

LENINGRAD.—Because the Soviet Government declined to permit U.S. jets to travel around Russia, members of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's party used planes of the official Russian airline, Aeroflot, for flights within the Soviet borders.

The party, greatly augmented by Russian, French and British news correspondents who joined us at Moscow, was assigned three Aeroflot TU–104B jets for the journeys to Leningrad, Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk.

These planes cruise at about 500 miles per hour, compared with the 555 miles per hour averaged by our Pan American 707–321 transport on the record flight from New York to Moscow.

The Russian planes are powered by two jet engines built into the backswept wings. The American plane has four jet engines, suspended slightly below the wings.

Actually, the three Russian planes assigned to us were bombers. They are capable of quick conversion from passenger transports to military use. They have their bomb bays and their bomb hatches ready for action.

Cabins of these three planes were less comfortable than that of the 707–321. Ventilation is inadequate, and when the planes were on the ground—at this season—the heat was intense. Moreover, they carried their own house flies—even at 30,000 feet.

Each TU–104B carried approximately 100 passengers, 3 on one side of the aisle and 2 on the other.

STRAIN ON BELTS

They come in fast for a landing, or—in the language of aviators—"very hot." Their jet engines apparently are not reversible, because braking is supplied by release from their tails of two parachutes. When the parachutes open, passengers and crew have a sensation of "Whoa." It's a sudden strain against seat belts.

After leaving New York the Nixon party, or parties, established the practice of applauding loudly as the wheels touched ground on each succeeding landing.

Applause on one of the Russian jet landings was very sparse. The pilot hit the runway hard, and as the plane bounced several members of the party shouted, "I'm not going to clap for that one."

Leningrad, in my opinion, is a far more attractive city than Moscow. The latter is monotonous, except for the skyscrapers erected during Stalin's regime; and most of them are grotesque.

Comparing Leningrad with Moscow, it seems to me, is like comparing New Orleans with one of America's new oil cities. Leningrad is mellow and has a distinct character.

Its people, reflecting Nordic influence, also are attractive and seemed to me better dressed than those in Moscow. Buildings along the Neva River, which flows through Leningrad to the Gulf of Finland, have real charm.

My most interesting assignment in Leningrad was to board the icebreaker *Lenin* with Vice President Nixon, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and 11 other newsmen. We went aboard to inspect the vessel which the Soviets say will break ice through use of atomic power.

HEALY FIRST CHOSEN

With 300 newsmen on hand, including Russians, North Americans, British, French, and others, there just wasn't enough room on the *Lenin* for all correspondents to go aboard. A pool of 12 men was formed, 6 representing morning newspapers or electronic media and 6 representing afternoon newspapers or electronic media.

Through the luck of the Irish, when a drawing was made for the pool my name came out No. 1.

Admiral Rickover spoke briefly with the pool members before we boarded the ship. He understood that the Rusians expected her to break ice to a depth of about 8 feet while steaming at 2 to 3 knots.

We had been told by the Russians that no photographers would be permitted aboard. No Western photographers were allowed on the ship, but her decks were swarming with Russian photographers when we climbed abroad. I thought they were newspaper photographers, but one of my colleagues said he suspected some of them were police.

ENGINE DISCUSSED

At any event, the inspection party held a discussion with its Russian hosts before going below deck.

Engines of the ship apparently are just like the engines of any modern steam-turbine electric ship. Sole difference is that the energy or heat to make the steam for the *Lenin* is to come not from coal or oil but from an atomic reactor. At least, that's the way this layman understands it.

The *Lenin's* engines were operating when we went aboard, but they weren't driven by atomic energy. A pipe carrying steam from a landside installation crossed the wharf to the *Lenin's* engineroom.

Because I know very little about an atomic reactor and because it was very hot below decks, I excused myself from the inspection party after we passed through the engineroom.

Just to see whether it could be done I climbed alone to the bridge. Three officers there seemed not at all startled to see me. None, however, spoke English, and I spoke no Russian beyond a few phrases.

OFFICER DIDN'T KNOW

When I returned to the main deck the first officer was standing at the boarding ladder. He spoke a little English. I asked him if he would tell me about the ship.

In reply to my question about the thickness of ice which the *Lenin* might break, he held up his thumb and middle finger and said, "We don't know if she'll break ice this thick or"—raising his hand high above the deck—"ice this thick. We just haven't tried her. She's a new ship."

The Soviets have made great propaganda capital of the building of the *Lenin*—having exhibited motion pictures showing how she is expected to perform.

The only unusual thing about the *Lenin* which impressed me was the extensive use of plywood in its construction. Doors, wardroom ceiling, furniture and other equipment of the ship is made of plywood. Metal shortage may be an explanation, or there may be some other reason.

NO AIR CONDITIONER

No evidence of any air conditioning was apparent, but then there's probably no justification for an icebreaker to be air conditioned. Certainly not when she's in service.

As a member of the icebreaker news pool, I was expected to speak to all the newsmen at a briefing after we returned to the Europa and Astoria hotels.

Anything I had to say, of course, was anticlimax when Admiral Rickover made his report.

He believes the *Lenin* is good for what is expected of her—but represents no advance in the reactor art.

Philosophy of a Maverick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, BILL MEYER, of Vermont, calls them as he sees them. He is the first Democrat to win national office from Vermont in more than 100 years. His philosophy is courageous and refreshing. He has many friends among his colleagues. We appreciate his sincerity. We appreciate his concern for peace and his willingness to take action on his behalf.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues a fine article about BILL MEYER appearing in Labor on August 15, 1959, which under a previous consent is included at this point:

[From Labor, Aug. 15, 1959]

"MAVERICK" HOUSE MEMBER CALLS PEACE THE BIG ISSUE

"I see great dangers for any country whose prosperity is based on a war economy, like ours," declared Congressman WILLIAM H. MEYER, Democrat, Vermont, leaning back behind his desk, as he talked with a reporter for Labor this week.

Tall, husky and soft-spoken, Meyer created a minor sensation when he won Vermont's lone House seat last November. He was the first Democrat to win National office from the Green Mountain State since 1850.

Moreover, MEYER was identified as a pacifist. Actually, he says, he is not one. Instead he sounds more like an old-fashioned antimilitarist. Meyer is distinctive also in his resolve to speak out his full views, let the chips fall where they may.

Labor sought out the Vermonter this week to find how much effect he thinks this maverick-style approach has had in the session of Congress nearing its end.

MUST NOT DRIFT TO WAR

"To me," MEYER said, "the question of war and peace is the important issue today. That's why I entered politics. I say that we dare not let ourselves drift into war by hoping passively for peace while lacking the courage to work for it.

"In this session," he continued, "I've many times felt discouraged, as though I were working for a lost cause. But I think I've had some effect. I believe I've encouraged some fellow members to take more action on peace questions. Maybe I've made Congress think more."

MEYER estimated about 20 Congressmen agree personally with most of his "radical"

views on foreign policy, and about 50 agree with some of them. But few House Members, he indicated, have been willing to speak up.

"This whole place," said MEYER, "is pervaded with the idea that a Congressman's first job is to get reelected. Therefore, many of the things Members would like to do they don't do, because of the great political risk. But I feel that if you compromise right away, you'll get out of the habit of taking a stand."

COULD KILL DEMOCRACY

On foreign policy, MEYER said he believes that "we can't rely almost entirely, as now, on military deterrence, because it will probably result in the disaster of nuclear war." He believes that neutral zones should be created through mutual United States-Russian withdrawal of forces from world areas of friction.

He said he favors admission of Red China to the United Nations. He also favors halting nuclear weapons tests and a big push for mutual disarmament. Some national defense is needed now, MEYER said, but he recalled that a war economy "was the background of Hitlerism, too. It could kill American democracy and lead to a military dictatorship here."

On other issues, MEYER said, his stand generally resembles that of other progressive Democrats. For example, he noted, there aren't too many union members in Vermont. "But," he said, "three out of four times I would probably vote in a way organized labor would call favorable—because of my own views of what's right."

MEYER, a 44-year-old forester by profession, concedes that his independence—and his party label—may make it hard to get reelected. "They say being this way is no way to have a political career," he remarked. "But I must be true to myself."

Poison in Your Water—No. 157

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of May 25, 1959, entitled "Dirty River Once Stank, Killed Fish":

DIRTY RIVER ONCE STANK, KILLED FISH

(By Watford Reed)

The Willamette River supplied water to cities along its banks early in the century.

By 1944 it was so foul that it stank.

Up to 1912 or 1914 swimming meets were held in Portland harbor. That ended when towns on the Willamette dumped in their sewage without treatment.

So it was that Portland, Salem, and Oregon City had to build expensive water projects high in the mountains, take over broad areas of watersheds and forbid human entry.

Industry grew as population increased, and by 1926 pollution was so bad in the low water months of the late summer and fall that there was no oxygen in the water in Portland harbor. Fish died when they reached the harbor.

Shortly before the United States entered World War II, the State game commission dramatized the situation by lowering a cage of lively fish into the harbor while newsmen watched. Within a few minutes the fish were dead—suffocated by lack of oxygen.

A group of men sat on a raft in the river at Portland for days as a stunt to spur the city to meet its quota in a war bond drive. The men's only complaint:

"The stench of the rivef makes us feel sick."

In 1944, two Oregon State College engineers made a survey and reported:

"Pollution in the Willamette River system is a State shame. This magnificent river is in part an open sewer in which tremendous quantities of untreated human sewage and industrial wastes are disposed. Pollution, along with other detrimental activities, has depleted a world-famous commercial and game fish fauna."

No fewer than 51 outfalls discharged raw sewage into the Willamette at Portland and 11 into Columbia Slough.

In the 1930's, several attempts were made to get an antipollution law through the State legislature. All failed.

In 1938, advocates of clean rivers put an initiative on the ballot to set up the Oregon sanitary authority. The voters approved by a 3 to 1 margin.

In 1944, Portland voters approved a $12 million bond issue and a charge for the use of the sewers. Other cities followed suit under the prodding of the sanitary authority.

At the end of the war, only 4½ percent of the sewage that entered the Williamette had any kind of treatment. Not a single town on the main stem had a treatment plant.

Nor was any treatment given industrial waste.

By the end of 1957, almost 94 percent of the sewer-using population of the Willamette Basin was served by sewage treatment plants. Eighty public and semi-public such plants were in operation.

Industry cooperated in several ways. Some paper mills dug lagoons and poured their waste sulfite liquor into them for dumping into the Willamette at high water stages when it would do no harm.

The Crown Zellerbach mill at Leba .on began to evaporate and burn waste liquor.

Publishers Paper Co. at Oregon City, lacking ground for lagoons, gives away waste liquor for use as a road binder. Because of it, miles of dirt roads no longer are dusty in the summer.

Long tanks that look like oversize silos—each containing 120,000 gallons of sulphite liquor—are pushed on barges to the Columbia River, where the papermill waste is drained into the bigger stream. This process, praised at first, now has begun to arouse criticism because of industrial pollution of the Columbia.

Portland and other Willamette Valley cities have spent a king's ransom—more than $30 million—to clean up their stream.

Yet the State sanitary authority reports pollution only 16 percent less than it was in 1939.

The reason is twofold: Increasing population and growing industry.

In the words of Kenneth Spies, deputy State sanitary engineer:

"We haven't seen the end of either."

Industrial wastes have increased by 41 percent since 1950 and 93 percent since 1939, and the sewered population has increased by 73 percent.

A joint study by the sanitary authority and the pulp and paper industry brought out estimates that the five papermills on the main stem of the Willamette would have to reduce their pollution loads by 74 to 83 percent to maintain five parts of dissolved oxygen per million in Portland harbor—the minimum needed for fish life. They have reduced their pollution by an average of 67 percent.

Spies says: "The effluents of these five papermills were primarily responsible for the serious oxygen depletions which occurred in both the South Santiam River and lower Portland harbor in 1957."

Friendliness to Visitors Rises Far From Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the seventh in a series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 15, 1959]

FRIENDLINESS TO VISITORS RISES FAR FROM MOSCOW—GREETING IS ENTHUSIASTIC AT NOVOSIBIRSK

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

NOVOSIBIRSK, SIBERIA.—The greater the distance from the Kremlin, the greater the show of affection by the Russian people for the people of the United States.

This is the observation of an amateur diplomat after a week in Russia.

Whereas the reception given the party of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, was on the chilly side in Moscow and warm in Leningrad, the reception given him and every member of his group in Novosibirsk was really hot. It was enthusiastic.

This city, 2,000 miles east of Leningrad, is less than 75 years old. It got its start when the Trans-Siberian railroad was under construction, in 1893. Now it is the largest city in Siberia, larger than New Orleans—with a population of about 900,000.

At the moment Novosibirsk is pushing a "balance agriculture with industry" program.

INDUSTRIAL ADVANCES

Its mayor, or his equivalent, who greeted us, emphasized that Siberia no longer deserves the bad name it bore for many years. Siberia, he insisted, is no longer a place for outcasts to be sent to die in salt mines.

A glimpse of this city and the nearby countryside supports the mayor's contentions.

Its traffic on the Ob River, which looks about like the Ohio at Louisville; its new hydroelectric plant 12 miles above the city; its machine stamping plant, which uses planning equipment and hydraulic presses made in the United States and Great Britain and sent to Russia in the days of lend-lease, and its other mills are impressive.

However, not one of these physical assets was as impressive to me as were the people of Novosibirsk. To use a word frequently uttered by Mrs. Nixon, they were "tremendous."

Very few Americans have visited this Siberian city of cold winters and hot summers. Among the few was Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, who came here several years ago.

CROWD JAMS STREETS

The Nixon party probably was the largest group of Western visitors ever received in Novosibirsk and the city really turned out. It was like Third Street in Baton Rouge on inauguration day.

Probably the finest building in Novosibirsk is its opera house or ballet theater, and when the Vice President went there for a presentation of "Swan Lake," the plaza in front and the streets on the sides were jammed.

Graciously, Mr. NIXON left the theater between third and fourth acts to speak to the crowd. I remained outside the theater after he returned to his seat.

Within minutes I was surrounded by thousands of interested or curious Russians, many of whom had never before been close to a North American. A young man pushed his way to my side, said he spoke a little English and offered to try to interpret for me.

I said I'd be happy to try to answer any questions about America.

ANSWERS QUESTIONS

The first was: "Why do you have to pay a doctor for medical service in your country?"

My reply was to the effect that people with means pay for medical service in the United States and that fine hospitals were available to give free treatment to those who cannot afford to pay.

The second question was: "Why do some young men and women in your country fail to get an education because they have no money?"

I explained that, in my opinion, any young man or young woman in the United States who desires an education can get it. I pointed out that many members of our party had worked their way through college.

As many questions were put to me and many answers given, my volunteer interpreter would brief the crowd.

CROWD OPENS WAY

When I saw that my bus was about to leave the front of the theater I asked that the crowd give me a lane to return to the bus. Very respectfully, the Russians stepped back, and I shook hands with 40 or 50 of them on my way to the bus.

My volunteer interpreter followed me to the bus, telling me that several members of the crowd, while shaking hands, had said, "We want to be your friends."

I gave him my card and asked him to write his own name and address for me. Although I had been cautioned that Russians and Siberians would be hesitant to establish any means of communication with members of our group, he quickly wrote his name, address, occupation and place of employment. He said he would like me to send him two articles from New Orleans.

If they'll go through the mails, he'll get what he asked.

Traveling behind the Iron Curtain, particularly beyond the Ural Mountains, with the Vice President of the United States is not all caviar and vodka.

IN OFFICIAL PARTY

When the official Nixon party was organized, two newspapermen were included for transportation to and from Europe and Asia by jetplane. Edwin Russell, publisher of the Harrisburg, Pa., Patriot and Evening News, was one. I was the other. Both of us qualified as members of the official party by virtue of our membership on the President's advisory commitee for the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

However, neither Ed Russell nor I traveled in the same plane with the Vice President, except on the leg of the journey between Warsaw, Poland, and Keflavik, Iceland. On this leg the Vice President rode the press plane. The listing of the official party carried an asterisk after our names—indicating that we were traveling on the plane or planes which carried the news correspondents.

This was entirely proper, because had we traveled with the Vice President and stayed at all times with him and other members of the official party, we doubtless would have had advantages the other newspapermen on the trip did not enjoy. Ed and I wanted to cover the story like the others, and that meant that we should take the same chances and treatment as the other correspondents.

We may have made a mistake, but I doubt it.

The official party, with the exception of us two, was quartered everywhere in comfortable, almost luxurious dachas—or country homes. In two places we visited, quarters for the newsmen were primitive.

CONGESTION GROWS

Our accommodations in Moscow were average, with each man or woman given a single room and bath. At the Europa Hotel in Leningrad we started to quadruple. My assignment with with three other newsmen to what had been a parlor and bedroom suite. When we reached Novosibirsk, the congestion was real. I shared a room with seven other correspondents—with no running water.

The Russians apparently got mixed up on all room assignments, because Mr. and Mrs. Walter Ridder of the Ridder newspapers found themselves assigned to a room with two men; and Jinx Falkenburg, representing Newsday, found herself assigned to a room with seven men. After a reshuffling, rooms for men generally were occupied by six or eight men, and two rooms used by the women were occupied by four or five women in each case.

Standing in line, in 17th place, waiting to shave at a down the hall cold water tap in hotel No. 2 at Novosibirsk, I was joined by James "Scotty" Reston of the New York Times, in 18th place.

"Pretty rough, isn't it?" I said to "Scotty."

"You're just learning again how it is to be a reporter," he replied. "You editors just get too soft."

Then, as an afterthought "Scotty" added, "I wish a certain official of your State could see you here. He'd ask, 'Who's crazy now?' "

To have the opportunity to be a reporter again and to meet the fine people of Novosibirsk was worth any discomfort we experienced—many times over.

Ed Russell and I would do it again—with 20 in a room, if they could be crowded in—which they couldn't in hotel No. 2.

Milton Eisenhower, after our departure from Novosibirsk, spoke to me about the rough time he was having—sleeping in luxurious quarters but having to get up at the same time as the rest of us.

"What we've got is rougher," I said to him, "but I'm sure it's a lot more fun."

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the on-to-Oregon cavalcade is back home in Oregon. The following daily accounts of the wagon-train journey takes the adventurers from near Baker, which is in Representative ULLMAN's district, to The Dalles, still a part of the Second Congressional District, the largest district in our State. The trip through AL's constituency is warmly described by author Rudy Roudebaugh of Drain:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, Aug. 6, 1959]

WAGONEERS WELCOME ICE IN BLUE MOUNTAINS AFTER IDAHO HEAT WAVE

(By Robert "Rudy" Roudebaugh)

July 26, Sunday: Had church services at 8:30 and spent rest of day passing out letters and answering questions.

July 27, 5:05: All ready to go and Roy is just starting to harness. 5:10: Heading west and crossing Alder Creek. Doc got one new shoe on his left front foot yesterday. 5:37: Left the valley and going up the Blue Mountains. 5:59: At Oxman, not even a wide place in the road. 7:29: There are big rocks all over the hills with short sagebrush and small cedar trees spotted on the hillsides. 7:40: Pleasant Valley (motel, cafe, service station). This valley is about one-quarter mile wide and 2 miles long. Hay and cattle raised here. 8:40: Going down hill and I'm using the brakes. 9:10: Stopped to water. Doc and Jan didn't drink very much as it's cool, making traveling easy. 9:24: We are on our way again. Janell got off to ride in an Army Jeep.

10:58: Entering Baker, population 9,529. 11:02: Baker County sheriff posse came to escort us in. Free pop was given to us by the Beefburger Fountain and Cafe. 11:26: Crossing the Powder River. 11:35: Recrossing the Powder River. 11:44: We are camped at the city park at Baker, elevation 3,440. The lunch was served by the JCettes. At dinner we were personal guests of the Livestock Association. I met an old friend from Lexington, Ed J. Nauenburg. He is now living in Baker. It was cold last night with a real strong wind. Ki and I had about 3 hours rest yesterday which is something if you don't believe us ask Andy. Janell, Ki, and I were on KBKR ratio station for about an hour this evening. You folks will be hearing it as the tape will be sent to Eugene.

July 28, 4:30: Pancake feed at old town in Baker, sponsored by the historical society. 5:05: All hooked up and ready to roll. There was dew on the grass and it was pretty cold. We are waiting on Roy. 5:52: Betty Herizi rode with me this morning. Ki and Janell never even got up for breakfast. 5:57: Crossed Powder River heading south on Cambelle Street on Highway 30. Logging trucks are all heading for the woods. The Baker Valley is about 30 miles wide and about that long. Mostly hay and grain grown here with cattle and sheep raised. 6:51: Can see timber in the south hills. Powder River follows the north foothills. 7:39: A load of 15 pine logs just passed us. The cattle along here are mixed shorthorns, Angus, whiteface. 8:38: Stopped at Haines, population 325, and watered. Was served coffee and cookies (special guest) and went through the Hitching Post Museum. 9:37: Leaving Haines and Roxie Cutting from Nehama is riding with us.

11:18: Crossed 45th parallel which is halfway between the Equator and North Pole. Most common tree through here is pussy willow.

11:36: Entering Union County and crossing North Powder River. 11:49: Entering North Powder River, population 425. Making camp at the high school. We have a big welcome sign here that says, "Oregon Centennial Wagon Train—North Powder Welcomes You in 1959—Come Again in 2059." Lunch was served to us by the North Powder Grange. They will also supply us with dinner.

July 29, 5:50: Ready to roll. Ki is on cook shift and (naturally) this was the best breakfast I've had since I've been on the trip. North Powder is supported by sawmills, beef cattle. Our feed and grain was donated by North Powder Grange. 5:57: Rolling out across Powder Valley.

We had ice all around us last night. It was a big change after the heat. Doc got one new shoe on his left rear foot. 8:15: Leaving Powder Valley. 8:26: At the summit and small pine trees on each side of us. 9:12: Met by the 4–H Riding Club. 9:58: Going down through a canyon. It has warmed up some. 10:02: Stopped to water. Jan and Doc each drank a pail of water. 10:18: Going west again. 10:34: We dropped off into Grande Ronde Valley. 11:30: Met by the LaGrande Maverick Riding Club. We must have about 100 riders with us now. 11:35: Queen Darlene and two princesses Pat and Karen of Joseph, Oreg., Rodeo.

12:10: Entered La Grande, home of Eastern Oregon College. 12:46: Arrived at armory. Lunch was served by the Salvation Army. Ki and I were invited to Neil Anderson's for the afternoon to bathe and rest. Neil is the sports editor of the paper here. Dinner was by the Lions Club.

July 30, 5:58: Perched up here on the wagon seat like a big ape and ready to take off. We had breakfast this morning by the Union Chamber of Commerce. 6:10: Rolling through the Grande Ronde Valley. Ki is still on cook shift. 6:28: Going through a grove of small pine trees. The sun is out and there is a small breeze. 6:42: Crossed the Grande Ronde River and going up a canyon with rocky hills on each side. 7:08: Crossed over the Grande Ronde River for the last time. Still in the canyon with pine trees on both sides. 7:16: Crossed 5 Point Creek. This part of the highway is under construction. 8:10: We have just pulled a long grade and stopped to rest for 15 minutes. 8:43: Hit the new superhighway, three lanes each way.

10:10: We dedicated the new highway. The Blue Mountain Boys came out to meet us. 10:31: We are camped at Strickland Flats. This place is just like any place a mile from Drain. We felt just like we were home. Mr. and Mrs. Lyle Hill were here to visit us this evening. We had a nice visit.

July 31, 5:36: Ready to go and leave Strickland Plate. 5:48: Finally pulling out. 7:30: Crossing railroad overpass going into Meacham, population about 50. It is a small place with a general store, post office combined. It's in the heart of the Blue Mountains, also the summit. 8:19: Emigrant Springs State Park. 9:03: Umatilla Indian Reservation. 3:59: Going over Deadman Pass. 10:42: Arrived at camp at the Umatilla Reservation.

August 1, 5:50: All ready to go. 605: Headed for Pendleton. We have five riders to ride in with us already. 6:22: We are coming into the wheat country; a little timber in the draws. 8:07: Came down a 7-mile hill. I guess Ki can breathe now as we are at the bottom. My brakes weren't too good, but didn't have any trouble. Wonder what happened to the National Guards, they aren't out to escort us. 8:45: Waiting at truck scales to take care of the traffic. 9:00: Here we go again. 9:54: Leaving Umatilla Indian Reservation. The Pendleton wagon just got in the lead. Population 15,174.

10:03: Entering Pendleton. Here is the Main Street cowboys of Pendleton to meet us. This is the oddest shaped town we've been in. 10:22: The band is out to greet us. It's a big deal here. 11:57: Entered the rodeo arena. Lunch served to us by the Ladies Pioneer Club and a beef dinner by the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Mr. and Mrs. Merlin Allen of Waitsburg, Wash. (old home Yoncalla), were here to visit us; also Bob Cellers and wife Ginger were here last evening.

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, Aug. 13, 1959]

WAGON TRAIN MEMBER "HUNG" FOR HOSS STEALING IN EASTERN OREGON

(By R. "Rudy" Roudebaugh)

Theda Clemens (Honalin) of Pendleton was a visitor of the Drain wagon. She wants some of her friends in Drain to write her at 116 S.E. 10th, Pendleton, Oreg. Joe Huckins and family from Portland were also visitors.

August 3, 5:49: All hooked up. 6:03: Leaving Round-up City. Going by Empire Machine Co. Biggest piece of equipment for sale is a D–7. 6:14: Crossing Umatilla River. We are in Umatilla County. 7:16: Just pulled up a 4-mile hill, 8-percent grade and the oil is slick. The mules are having a time standing up.

This is rolling country with wheat as main crop. It's about to be harvested. 10:14: Stopped to water Doc and Jan. They drank a pail apiece. We can see Mt. Hood from here. It's right straight north of The Dalles. 10:28: On the road again. 11:57: Crossing the Umatilla River again. We are hitting irrigation area—raising corn, alfalfa. 12:22: Making camp at the Ervin Mann ranch south of Stanfield 6 miles. Made 24 miles today. The Chamber of Commerce of Hermiston gave a banquet for us. There was a speaker there from Walla Walla on Oregon history.

August 4, 5:22: Ready to roll. We had about 4,000 people around here last night. Ki is on cook shift today. 5:57: Crossed a small river, but didn't get the name. Its pretty windy and cold this morning. Lots of beef cattle grazing along here. Can still see Mt. Hood today. 6:55: Going over a little rise about a mile long. Nothing but sagebrush on each side of the road. 7:14: At junction of Highway 207. 7:26: Crossed over Butler Creek. Hay and corn is raised along here. Corn is used for ensilage. 7:34: Lost nut on left front wheel, but it was found before the wheel fell off. 8:27: Entering Umatilla Ordnance Depot. 8:38: Entering Morrow County, leaving Umatilla. 10:04: Stopped to water, Doc and Jan drank a half a pail apiece. 10:16: Westward again. This area here reminds me of the sand hills of Nebraska except there is sagebrush here. 11:22: Queen Sheron and her court, Judy, Susy, Janet, Joan, from Heppne Rodeo, rode out to escort us into town.

12:24: The sheriff came out and picked up Gail Carnine for hoss stealing. He had to stand trial and was hung by the neck as punishment (all mock of course). You will probably see it on television. Got our first glimpse of the Columbia River. 12:42: Made camp at Boardman public school on the football field. Lunch was served by all different club in Boardman. Dinner given by the Hug Water Melon Association.

August 5.—We had breakfast at Joe Patone's Hitching Post Cafe. The queen and her court also had breakfast with us and rode to H Junction with us. 5:57: Waiting for Tex, he's decided to ride today. 6:07: Heading west. The trees through here are locust, cottonwood, poplar, and willow. The crops grown here are alfalfa, wild hay, corn for ensilage. Doc had his shoe reset on left rear foot. They seem to raise lot of Hereford cattle around here. 7:32: Going through a small desert, rocky, with sagebrush along the Columbia River. 9:40: Leaving Morrow County, entering Gilliam County. 9:50: Left the new Highway 30 and now on old Highway 30. 9:50: Crossed Willow Creek, and stopped to water. 10:16: Heading up a canyon. There doesn't seem to be any breeze and its pretty stuffy. Second Lieutenant Domly is riding with me. He is the officer in charge of escorting us. 12:05: Camped on the George Shane and Sons ranch, 3 miles east of Arlington. He also donated the grain for us. Smokey Swape donated the hay (he's from Arlington). We were all given hotel rooms for baths and had dinner at the Pheasant Cafe, all donated by the chamber of commerce. Jan got a new shoe on her right front foot.

August 6, 5:45 and all hooked up. 5:57: Headed for home once again. We didn't have breakfast at camp this morning, we will stop at Arlington for breakast with a choice of three cafes, all on the chamber of commerce. 6:57: Entering Arlington, population 680. We have had our breakast and ready to roll again.

8:02: Leaving Arlington. We have a rock ledge on one side of us and the Columbia River on the other. The river is between two railroads; it looks odd for two trains to run along side each other with the water between them. 10:11: Bialock, it's a small place and they seem to raise a lot of peaches here. 10:36: Philippi and family are here to take us to our camping spot. They are the people that own the ranch we will stay on. 10:48: Stopped to water and met John and Evelyn Lindol, friends of Wally and Ida Dysert of Drain. 11:05: Here we go again. It's really warmed up. 12:09: We have arrived at camp.

Ray Stratton and his Drain Black Sox team stopped to see us today on their way home and said they'd see us in Independence. Arlington will be under 20 to 40 feet of water in 6 years. It's such a pretty little town and old homes and young and old orchards will soon all be gone. The residences will be moved about half a mile up a hill. I guess I better mention why this all is going to happen; they are building a dam to be called John Day Dam, and this townsite will be flooded.

August 7, 5:53: All hooked up. 6:01: We are rolling homeward. Jan got two new shoes; right rear and left front. 6:26: We are going through rocky country. The rocks look like they have been burned.

Last night Ki visited the ruins of an old Indian village where it has been dug up and sifted for relics. She found two arrowheads. She was really impressed with this place. 8:27: Leaving Gilliam and entering Sherman County and crossing the John Day River. Janell just got out of bed and Ki and Jean Marshall from Roseburg just went back into the wagon for a nap.

8:21: We just heard the terrible news about the Roseburg explosion and fire. There is some wind this morning, but the sun is hot and it doesn't do much good. 9:05: Passing by the site of the John Day Dam. They have already started working on it on the other side of the river. 9:22: Just made a pull over a hill. 9:43: Entering Rufus. The farming area around here is one-half mile wide and 2 miles long. Doc and Jan had a ball last night. I never tied them up and they wandered all over. At 3 o'clock in the morning I had to get up in my shorts and feed and water them. They wouldn't leave me alone until I did. You see I sleep with my head on the tailgate within easy reach of anyone or animal. 11:50: We are pulling up over second rock ledge over the river and are wondering how the pioneers ever made it. They must have disassembled the wagons and lowered them piece by piece consuming many days. 11:04: Going through Briggs Junction. 11:15: Entering Briggs. 11:25: Stopped to make camp along the Columbia River.

Made 21 miles today. 11:27: We are stopped in front of the city hall. The president of the chamber of commerce is giving a welcome and accomplishment speech. This town is the end of the Oregon Trail.

August 8, 5:50: All hooked up and ready to roll. 6:01: And we're on our way. Last night we had a real surprise. Judy and Al Hollaman showed up. Friday night we had a family-style dinner given us at the Frontier Cafe at Rufus by Sherman County Club. The Dallas Industrial Club started out with us today, so we are well escorted. 6:45: Fulton Junction. 7:14: Entering Wasco County and crossing the Deschutes River. Leaving Sherman County.

Here comes a real Indian chief to meet us and take us to their village. Had a brief ceremony at the Indian village. 7:32: Leaving the Indians and on our way again. As we came through, Ki was given a pair of Indian beads and jar of something. 8:51: Jean Marshall crawled in the back of our wagon so she could get some sleep. Janell is

riding with Judy and Al. 9:08: Ki and I are looking up a rock ledge above 400 or 500 feet and wonder what's holding some of the rocks up there. Mount Hood sure shows up today with timber lying below that we have been looking for now for 4 months. 10:16: The Dalles Dam entrance. 10:29: Fifteenmile Creek. We are now crossing it. We just went by a fruit stand and they came out and gave each of us a basket of cherries. 11:06: The Dalles, population, 11,250.

11:48: As we were coming into the city park to camp we had a real steep hill to climb. The blacktop was so slick none of the wagons could make it. Guess what? A Jeep came to the rescue.

United States Steel Battles School Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article by the distinguished columnist Drew Pearson. It seems to me that the United States Steel Corp. has much explaining to do if the statements of Mr. Pearson are correct:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

UNITED STATES STEEL BATTLES SCHOOL TAXES

(By Drew Pearson)

Not all the facts were told in Secretary of Labor Mitchell's revealing figures on steel profits and steel wages. What he didn't tell—and perhaps didn't know—is the battle of the giant United States Steel Corp. against school taxes at local levels.

To get the full story you have to go to Montgomery, Ala., and Morrisville, Pa. In each case United States Steel lined up its legal and lobbying might against better education, despite the fact it's just netted the biggest profit, during the last 6 months, in history—a quarter of a billion dollars. Here are two chapters in the story:

Pennsylvania chapter: In rural Bucks County, Pa., on the banks of the Delaware, United States Steel acquired 4,000 acres of farmland, built one of the biggest steel mills in the world, and upped school enrollment from 20,000 pupils in 1950 to over 50,000 in 1958. In Falls Township, where the Fairless plant is located, school enrollment increased by 943 percent.

To take care of the increase, Falls Township built 239 new classrooms in 5 years. Nearby Bristol built 263 classrooms.

To pay for them Falls Township borrowed so heavily that it now pays interest at the rate of $689,275 a year. In 1950, before the Fairless plant was built, the town had no debt. Now 14.5 percent of the cost of the schools goes for interest on the debt. Meanwhile, taxes in the county have been increased 100 percent.

Taxes on the United States Steel property, however, have not been increased. The huge, sprawling plant is assessed at $23 million though it cost around $600 million. The U.S. Government even gave United States Steel a tax writeoff of $200 million.

But efforts to increase local taxes for United States Steel have been stalled. For 5 straight years the school board has appealed the low tax rate, and for 5 straight years the Bucks County commissioners have appeared to favor United States Steel.

The commissioners are: John T. Walsh, chairman, Democrat; Adolph Andrews, Democrat; and Thomas R. Lewis, Republican. They also serve as the board of assessment and review of taxes. Thus they themselves sit in review of their own assessments.

Because of this the school board appealed to Judge Edwin Satterthwaite, Republican, to force United States Steel to produce costs. But Judge Satterthwaite ruled that it would cost United States Steel too much.

NOTE.—Bucks County, onetime stronghold of Senator Joe Grundy, high-tariff Republican, has voted for the GOP since the Civil War—until 3 years ago when it went Democratic. A lot of voters now say they don't see much difference.

Alabama chapter: Down in Alabama, United States Steel's Tennessee Coal and Iron Division operates the biggest steel plant south of the Mason-Dixon line. Gov. John Patterson took it on in a bitter fight. In order to improve Alabama schools, Patterson proposed a sales tax of 1½ percent on new machinery, also a reduction of the consumers' 3-percent sales tax to 2½ percent.

Arthur Wiebel, president of United States Steel's operations in Alabama, has potent friends in the Alabama Legislature. He used those friends. He also came out with a public statement attacking the sales tax on machinery. Governor Patterson didn't backtrack. After a protracted legislative debate, he won.

DEFENSE EXCESS PROFITS

Congressman ALFRED SANTANGELO, the New York City Democrat who has already sparked the investigation of the munitions lobby, is now doing some personal investigation of his own. He has unearthed the fact that some of the biggest defense contractors owe Uncle Sam money on excess profits taxes and are refusing to pay.

Yet the Defense Department is heaping new profits on these same companies. Naturally the Congressman wonders how much the retired admirals and generals who work for these corporations have to do with this nose-thumbing of the Treasury.

Careful probing by the Congressman has unearthed the fact that a total of $105 million in excess profits taxes is due the Government. But a battery of high-priced tax attorneys are resisting payment every inch of the way.

"These recalcitrant companies are led by North American Aviation," says SANTANGELO. "It owes the taxpayers $29 million of excess profits through 1953–55. Yet in 1958 the Defense Department awarded North American contracts totaling $647 million and in the first half of 1959 contracts totaling $570 million.

North American has hired 27 retired military officers.

Other contractors against whom 1953–55 excess profits claims have been filed and who are still resisting payment are Boeing Aircraft, $27.5 million due; Fairchild Engine, $2 million; Lockheed Aricraft, $12 million; Martin Co., $9.7 million; Douglas Aircraft, $12 million; and Grumman Aircraft, $8.5 million.

All these companies continue to get huge slices of defense business.

Can We Do Less?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor speaks out for a continuation of the cessation of atomic tests. It points out that the Soviet Union has promised that it will not be the first to resume testing and it asks, "Can the United States and Great Britain do less?"

Under a previous consent here is the text of an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for August 13, 1959:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Mass., Aug. 13, 1959]

PROLONG THE HALT IN TESTS

A cessation of atomic tests is already in effect. Unless one of the atomic powers is cheating, testing has been in abeyance since last fall. Continuation of this halt and the speedier development of ways to guarantee it are feasible targets for public pressures at this time.

The Soviet Union has now promised it will not be "first to resume testing." Can the United States and Great Britain do less? Are the risks involved in refraining from testing greater than those of a resumption? It seems to us that the answer to both questions must be No.

When the United States halted testing last October President Eisenhower indicated that it might be necessary to resume unless negotiations for a test ban produced agreement on an effective inspection system within a year. Progress on such a system has been made at Geneva. But the conferees are still stalled on some aspects of inspection.

One hitch was caused by discovery that underground blasts were more difficult to detect than had been believed. Now Washington has rather belatedly announced steps to offset this difficulty with more sensitive measures of detection. This useful move should be urgently pursued.

Pressure should also be applied to get action at Geneva on proposals to overcome differences between Soviet and Western representatives over the number, composition, and procedures of inspection teams. One hopeful suggestion from Prime Minister Macmillan would permit some reduction in the number of inspections but make them unexpected. Any inclination to cheat would face the risk of exposure by a surprise visit of international inspectors.

The nature of the Soviet system and its power to maintain secrecy impel the Western atomic powers to extra care to insure effective policing of any ban. However, there is reason to believe that Moscow has a real interest in limiting the nuclear club and a test ban is a first step.

France is already knocking imperatively at the door, with major nuclear tests scheduled within a few months. China is expected to insist on having its own atomic arsenal. A British-Soviet-American agreement to conduct no more tests and to set up an inspection system might not dissuade other nations from pushing their own tests. But whatever leverage it did provide would be far more than is now available.

Moscow knows that American policy on tests has been at a disadvantage because of divided counsels. The Pentagon feels that more tests are needed to perfect small atomic weapons and missile warheads. It has the backing of one group of nuclear scientists. Others have looked more favorably on a test ban. For a year and a half this second group has had the ear of the President. But so far American policy has not expressed the boldness and urgency required by the situation.

If the nuclear club is to be limited and vital progress made toward arms control, time is of the essence. A reasonable program would be to continue the holdback on new tests while more vigorously exploring every possibility of detection and effective inspection. This is a minimum basis for any effort to persuade France and others to join the standstill on tests.

Appendix

Education: The Federal Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday evening, August 20, I had the privilege and honor of addressing the national convention of the American Federation of Teachers, meeting in Minneapolis, Minn.

Because of the attention directed in this address to legislation now pending before the Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my address, entitled "Education: The Federal Role."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: THE FEDERAL ROLE

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the National Federation of Teachers, Minneapolis, Minn., August 20, 1959)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a singular privilege to be asked to speak to you tonight.

You know, I always feel at home with teachers. After all, I'm a sort of refugee from a classroom. And in the realm of public affairs, I honestly try to carry on what you begin in the classroom.

I salute you as teachers; I salute you also as an important and articulate part of the American labor movement. It is heartening to find teachers who say, as you do, "our strength is our affiliation with the AFL–CIO." And it is heartening that the teachers in their embattled struggles, from Calumet to New York, have had the support of the labor movement, which for years has been in the forefront of the struggle for public education as an essential requirement for political and economic democracy.

This is more than just a matter of mutual aid among those who work for a living, regardless of the color of their collars. Teachers in their fight for professional standards and for their rights as employees are also fighting the battle of the community for better schools. In this they have earned the support of all of us.

Within the labor movement your union has been a symbol of the importance of education and social progress, and a powerful force against the corrupting influence of those who have betrayed the labor movement from within. Congress will act this year to eliminate corrupt practices without crippling legitimate union activities. In treating the disease of corruption in unions, we do not want to prescribe a treatment that maims the patient in trying to cure the diease.

Many years ago, when I worked in the field of workers' and adult education, I learned to appreciate all the more the crucial importance of public schooling in our democracy. I learned that the decisions of men and women as citizens, as voters, as union members rested in large part on the basic education they received in our schools.

This is true even more today than it was 20 years ago. For all the importance of science and technology in our educational system, in our lives and in our progress and survival as society we will stand or fall by our ability to cultivate human beings and train citizens. In the crucial competition for the preservation and triumph of freedom, we will stand or fall by our quality as a nation of citizens. This is the true meaning of educational systems to which you are devoting your lives. If you succeed, we cannot fail.

The greatest asset of any education system—along with its students—is not the classroom, nor the laboratory, the library nor the playing field. Its greatest asset is its teachers.

And, by the same token, an educational system cannot rise above its teachers. Through them flows the essence which a society imparts to its children.

The perilous world in which we live today forces us to reappraise both the educational structure and the educational tasks of our American society. We know that we are not doing as well as we can.

But to do better, we must understand clearly why we need to do better.

There is of course the direct competitive challenge of the Soviet Union. In fact, the very fact of Premier Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to the United States is a vivid demonstration of what a determined and well-financed educational drive has done to take a backward nation to a position of enormous strength and prestige in the world.

Among those of us most concerned with the massive challenge to our society from the Soviet Union have been our own scientists and engineers. Dr. Edward Teller and Adm. Hyman Rickover have repeatedly warned us that Soviet advances in science and engineering threaten actually to surpass achievements in our country.

It is not merely a question of what we ought to be doing in education. It has come down to a categorical imperative: We must consider education in terms of the life and death struggle among nations.

It should be sufficient to emphasize that we should set higher priorities on education because it is the right thing to do—because education is an indispensable means for enriching the lives of people—for raising the levels of human capabilities and for deepening understanding.

Yes, we are falling behind the efforts of other nations; and, equally important, we are falling behind our own needs, our own potentials. We are fall behind our own ideals.

Our own true needs and purposes, everywhere in the world, are to fulfill the real traditions and promise of America. As we do this, we grow stronger everywhere. As we fail to do this, we grow weaker everywhere.

I do not intend to discuss with you what you ought to teach, or how you ought to teach. These are questions of the greatest public importance, to be determined professionally within your profession. They are not within the scope of Government. The prime responsibility of Government is to marshal effectively the material resources of the Nation so that what ought to be taught can be taught, taught well, and taught to every American—taught to every American up to the highest level of education he can attain.

I have no doubt that, if we can provide the material means, the education system and particularly its teachers can shape the content of education to express our highest intellectual and moral values.

In saying this, I do not imply that the quantity of education can take the place of quality. But quantity is everywhere a precondition of quality. When there are not enough classrooms and teachers, when teachers are grossly underpaid, when many students of ability are excluded from the educational process through lack of means, to talk only about quality of education without reckoning its costs and accepting responsibility for meeting those costs would be a fraud.

On the contemporary scene, my friends, our quantitative defaults in education are surcharged with qualitative defaults. When we say, as a nation, that we cannot afford to be better, that it would be "inflationary" to spend more for education, we are not talking sound economics. We are talking nonsense, and worse, downright immorality. We are saying that we value frills and luxuries more than the goods and services most vital in our lives. And when our productive resources of manpower and machines, if fully used, could give us both the essentials and the luxuries, the moral default of idle resources becomes even more apparent.

I know that all of you here are familiar with this default. But evidently, the Nation at large is not, or it would take arms in righteous indignation. And so I trust you will bear with me, while I bring a few facts to the strengthening of your cause.

You all know the dimensions of our classroom shortage in the public schools of the United States.

The number of classrooms built was not much more than those required to accommodate increased enrollments and replace classrooms abandoned as unfit or obsolete. A 200,000-classroom shortage today would be a conservative estimate.

To eliminate this shortage within 5 years, to replace classrooms abandoned and to cover new enrollments of more than 1.2 million students a year, requires about 107,000 new classrooms yearly during the next 5 years. This would require a 5-year construction program of about $4 billion.

The States and localities, despite heroic efforts, have in recent years been able to expend about $2½ billion a year for classroom construction. If, by the greatest efforts, they should average about 3⅛ billion annually over the next 5 years, they could build 82,000 classrooms a year. This would still be about 25,000 short of the minimum need. By 1965 we would still be about 125,000 classrooms short.

If the Murray-Metcalf bill were enacted, and if funds thus made available were apportioned by the State and localities between capital outlays and teachers' salaries in accord with customary patterns, there would be about $900 million available for classrooms each year for the next 4 years. This would just about close the gap.

Second, as to the shortage of public school teachers and the inadequacy of their pay.

In the spring of 1959, the consensus among leading educators was that the shortage of teachers in our public schools was about 140,000. Of this, about 40,000 were needed

to reduce the student-teacher ratio to workable levels. And about 100,000 were to replace teachers with insufficient training.

The task over the next 5 years, if realistically faced, is to recruit about 60,000 teachers a year to meet accumulated and accumulating needs, plus about 70,000 new teachers each year to replace those leaving the public school system. With this level of entrants into the teaching field, provided they are of high standard, it is estimated that the current qualitative shortage might be substantially eliminated 5 years hence.

It has been found impossible to recruit qualified teachers at this rate at prevailing levels of teachers' pay. Average pay in the public schools is now estimated at $4,775; nearly one-fifth of all classroom teachers receive less than $3,500; and only one-fifth receive as much as $5,500. If we want the number and quality of teachers we need, we must be prepared to pay for them.

For the sake of justice, as well as for the sake of recruiting qualified teachers, we need to increase teachers' pay in the public schools over the next 5 years about 50 percent. Such an advance would bring teachers' salaries close to parity without advancing pay in other comparable areas of work.

States and localities cannot carry all of this increased burden, even if they expand their efforts more rapidly in the years ahead than in recent years. The Federal Government, with greater resources of national revenue, must act in the national interest to assert the priority of the Nation's education system. To do this, Federal contributions toward teachers' pay will need to become an established part of the finance base for education.

Enactment of the Murray-Metcalf bill, of which I am a sponsor, would go a long way toward meeting the needs.

As we look to our school system to lay the base of a competent and informed citizenry, so we look to our colleges and universities for the development of our intellectual leadership. And here, too, we are falling short.

The task of education in a democracy is to develop every intellect to the utmost of its capacity. It is a national disgrace that perhaps as many as 150,000 of our most gifted young people are barred from college because they cannot afford the cost.

The Defense Education Act of 1958 only scratches the surface of the need. At the time it was passed, I protested vigorously but in vain against its niggardly terms and grudging conditions. This is why I have proposed my students' aid bill, with appropriations for scholarships rising gradually to $184 million a year by fiscal 1963. I have also proposed tax credits, up to $450 a year for parents paying college tuition and fees.

Federal funds are also needed to assist the expansion of physical plants at colleges and universities, and for related purposes.

My friends, what are the main objections to an expanding educational program along these lines? Especially, what are the objections to the Federal participation which is essential to this expansion?

The first objection is an offspring of the spirit of segregation. My views on this subject are known to you all. I am happy that the AFT has taken a similar view. As a one-time teacher, I share your pride in your firm advocacy of the advancement of school desegregation. I do not see how anyone who is true to the vows of this profession can take any other position. I note, too, that it has cost you the support of some who would otherwise be your adherents. This is something else that you and I have in common.

The second objection is that Federal aid would mean Federal interference in the education process. In fact, by providing Federal grants to the States, which then could use the money for either classroom construction or teacher salaries, we can restore local control. How much control over education does a local school district have when it is bonded to the limit, operating on split shifts in aging, inadequate buildings with underpaid teachers who do not have minimum teaching qualifications? The legislation I have introduced to give Federal aid to States for school construction and teacher salaries expressly prohibits any Federal control. In 1950, as chairman of the Senate School Construction Subcommittee, I sponsored the bill which became law and now provides money for school construction in areas where families in Federal service put too heavy a burden on local school facilities. Since that time Congress has appropriated more than $1.8 billion for construction and operations of schools in such areas. There has never been the slightest hint of Federal control in the administration of this money.

The third objection is that we cannot afford the cost. This merits close attention, because of the fog of cultivated ignorance on this subject.

What is the Federal Government now spending for education? The amount proposed in the President's original budget for fiscal 1960 comes to only $2.68 per year for every man, woman, and child in the United States. It comes to only about six-tenths of 1 percent of the total proposed Federal budget. It comes to less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the estimated total output of goods and services of the United States.

This is indeed a sad commentary upon our scale of national values, as registered by the budget of the Government of all the people.

We are told, however, that there are so many other essentials in the Federal budget that there is room only for a token payment toward our educational needs. This is far from the truth. The truth is that, as we have the needs, so too we have the resources, if we will but use them.

There is no true economy in neglecting the greatest priorities of our national needs, among which education ranks very high. It has not been sound economy, even by the narrower and more traditional economic tests. The same restrictive thinking which has neglected the great priorities has led to policies which have repressed our general rate of economic growth.

The slowdown in the rate of economic growth since the end of the Korean war has meant idleness of men and machines which has cost the country tens of billions of dollars. As a consequence, tax revenues of Federal, State, and local Governments, during the period 1953–58 along, were $30 to $35 billion less than they would have been under conditions of full employment and normal economic growth. With these additional revenues, we could have met the great priorities of our national needs, without budgetary deficits or inflation.

Those of us who have urged policies for economic growth for the past 3 or 4 years have been scoffed at, laughed at, and chastised from the highest official places. Now I am glad to see that we have made some converts in those same places. The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, under the chairmanship of the Vice President, which at the end of June was sounding the alarums of inflation, now, less than 2 months later, has discovered that the "inflation" has been brought under control after all and solemnly proclaims the importance of economic growth. Now that we have converted them, I hope they succeed in converting those who make the budget and the economic policies of the Government.

We should know, by now, that we cannot protect the Federal budget by neglecting the needs of the Nation.

So, where should we go from here—and how?

Where would the money come from to do this job?

There are those who say that we should cut back on nonessentials, at at least on luxuries, in order to get the things we need most. If this were necessary, I would favor it.

There are those who say that we should raise tax rates or impose new taxes to support these essential programs. If this were necessary, I would favor it.

I would vote for either of these if that was the only way to get the schools and other things we need so greatly. But this approach seems to me to neglect the productive power—the new technology—which is the hallmark of America.

We cannot afford, in the space age, to divide scarcity. We need instead to plan to share abundance. Our needs are not for one kind of public service, but for many. Our needs are for more public services, as well as for more private economic progress.

What makes democracy stronger than totalitarianism is not superior power to suppress one kind of progress in order to attain another. Our greater inherent strength, the great strength of democracy, is in the ability of free people to plan and use their free system, to sustain their values and serve their needs more fully than the totalitarians. We do not seek to excel them in the taxes which the state, in one form or another, imposes. We can excel them in the energies which we voluntarily release and put to use in the service of all men.

But this voluntary release of our energies requires purposefulness and planning. It requires a concert of action at all levels, private and public, local, State, and Federal.

If we attain this concert, we can activate and maintain the 5-percent average annual growth rate urged by the Rockefeller report and other competent studies. This growth rate would yield us, for the period 1958–64 as a whole, about $400 billion more of national output than would result from the low average annual growth rate of less than 2½ percent from 1953 through 1957.

It would yield about $70 billion in Federal, State, and local revenues, at existing tax rates. In Federal revenues alone, the yield would be more than $50 billion.

On this basis, we could not only do the education job; we could also enlarge social security, improve health services, clear slums and redevelop urban areas, expand national security efforts, and participate in international economic cooperation on a worthy scale—and without inflation.

A Federal budget geared to these tasks, in a fully expanding economy, while it would increase in dollars, would steadily shrink in relation to the total economy. The budget would thus become less burdensome, easier to balance, and less inflationary.

We have the resources to meet our needs—and then some. The only question is whether we use them or let them languish. The only question is whether we can expand our thought, expand our action, expand our concept of private and public responsibility, to the challenge of the times.

We live not only in the space age of missiles, but also in the space age of economic and technical capabilities. We must lift our vigor and our courage to space-age proportions.

As we do so, our goal is not to outstrip another country or another society. Our goal is to realize, fully and freely, the best of ourselves.

Our aim is not to outstrip an adversary. It is to show the world what a free society is capable of, not only in material things but in the riches of mind and spirit which have been the greatness of democracy.

Our task is to make ourselves strong, not to fight a war but to prevent one—not to flaunt our strength, but to show that the strong can be also wise and patient and firm and persistent in the pursuit of peace.

The Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to extend the strongest possible endorsement for the amendment of Public Law 480 to include the food stamp proposal submitted by Representative SULLIVAN. From the human standpoint, I fail to see how there can be valid objection to this proposal. I have no quarrel with the operations of Public Law 480 itself. Presumably it has met a need to the satisfaction of a majority of my colleagues during recent years. At this point, however, a new need has arisen, and this is a domestic American need which should be closest to our hearts.

I believe most of us are familiar with the facts of the case, the millions of Americans who now receive surplus agricultural commodities, and the relationship between those millions and the number of millions of Americans who are chronically unemployed, the victims of technological advance in industry.

Some of us may be less familiar with the human conditions created by the need to subsist for periods of a year or more on a diet of three or four surplus commodities, as has been the case in the past. Careful inquiries among the long-term unemployed in certain depressed communities in my District have established to my satisfaction that families in these circumstances are receiving less than half of the necessary quantities of nutrients required to sustain health.

Ever since the opening of this session I have been very much disturbed by these findings, and particularly by the implications of those findings as applied to the children of needy families. In our deliberations since January we have discussed hundreds of bills and resolutions which were aimed at some improvement in the social, economic or political conditions prevailing in our country. In the climate of a growing wave of material prosperity, however, we have not undertaken to deal with the problems of those who do not presently share in improved economic conditions.

Area redevelopment legislation appears to be stalled, and this is a development which I believe we will have cause to regret. The number of areas with surplus labor is growing, rather than declining. The number of needy persons receiving surplus agricultural commodities is increasing. The number of communities whose industry is failing to keep pace with technological advance is also growing. One day we must deal effectively with this situation. For the moment, however, we must, as a minimum acknowledgment of our responsibilities to fellow human beings, act to make available to the needy at least such foods as will maintain a dietary standard sufficient to maintain sound health. If we do not, these needy will become a progressively greater charge on their communities and on this Government.

Many of us have submitted bills calling for the appropriation of funds for the purchase of a wide range of foods for distribution to the needy. None of these bills has received committee consideration, and prospects for them are bleak. The food stamp plan is another approach to the same problem. For those who doubt that it will work, I say, we have no choice but to try it, in lieu of the failure of this Congress and the administration to offer anything else.

There are some 75 Members of this House who represent districts in which there are located depressed areas, and in which the distribution of surplus agricultural commodities is an important economic and political factor to be reckoned with. I cannot speak for all of them, but for myself, I congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] for the skill and determination with which she has led the fight to bring this proposal before us, and for the dignity and patience with which she has borne defeats during several previous efforts to accomplish this same purpose.

Futile Farm Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the task of finding the most practical and effective farm policy possible for this country is difficult. I do not believe that it is impossible.

Recently, the Fort Worth Star Telegram, of Fort Worth, Tex., published an interesting editorial entitled "Futile Farm Control." It is with the examination and study of all points of view that reasonable men arrive at the best possible solution to a problem, and this editorial represents a significant and important view.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Star Telegram, Aug. 18, 1959]

FUTILE FARM CONTROL

A major factor in the frustration of efforts to end the agricultural surplus problem in this country by acreage allotments has been the increased proficiency of the modern American farmer. When his planting areas have been reduced, he simply has got busy and found ways of getting the same or bigger yields from less land.

The solution to this problem, however, is not merely to order more drastic acreage cuts. Or at least that seems to be one inference that can be drawn from some facts picked up by a group of Texas ranchers making a tour of Scotland. The Texans have been amazed at the high standards of cultivation and the unbelievable productivity of the land tilled by the Scotsmen. "You just don't waste land here," one of the Texas visitors marveled. "I should say it has twice the productivity of ours."

Another Texan estimated that the British farmer must be getting as much out of each 300 acres as the Texas farmer gets out of a thousand. In northeast Scotland, the group saw wheat that was expected to yield 100 bushels to the acre, whereas 50 bushels is considered excellent in Texas. And this despite the fact that the Scotsman's soil has been under cultivation without interruption for 400 to 500 years.

Of course, in the case of Britain, the high productivity is essential because of the scarcity of land on which to grow food to supply the huge and ever-increasing number of mouths. But there can be little doubt that the American farmer would react with a similar stepup in production if an artificial shortage of land were created in an effort to cut down on the burgeoning surpluses.

With this information at hand, it should be clear that the farm problem can never be solved by acreage controls, and the sooner the puzzle is approached from another angle, the better will be the hope of finding an answer.

Greed, Waste, and Extravagance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the more one learns of the manner and the methods by which defense contracts are entered into and of the greed and selfishness on the part of the contractors as well as the failure on the part of the Pentagon representatives to consider the taxpayer, the more one wonders if the United States is not traveling in the same direction and to the same ultimate end as did Rome centuries ago.

An editorial, Mr. Speaker, appeared in the Lawrence Daily Journal-World on July 18, 1959, which points to just a small item of waste in the overall defense program, which I include with my remarks:

[From the Lawrence (Kans.) Daily Journal-World, July 18, 1959]

A CLOSER LOOK

There is a lot more tragedy than mere unemployment in this matter of the Callery Chemical Co. and its high-energy fuel contracts with the Federal Government. In view of the events of the past week, one finds himself wondering more than ever just exactly how much tax money—real big tax money—the Government wastes each day, let alone each week, month, or year, through sheer foolishness.

The past week saw officials of the Callery Chemical Co. plant here forced to sever about 100 from its 180-employee payroll. Reason: Government contracts are expiring ahead of schedule and, until the local plant can achieve full-time commercial operation, there won't be enough work.

This is bad, for the people involved and their community. But the local plant was built by the company, at company expense, thus the firm will try to get it into all-out commercial production as soon as possible.

Though the worker total will be much smaller than anticipated for a while, the plant won't be abandoned and will continue to shoulder its burden of the tax load.

But take the case of the recently completed and dedicated $38 million high-energy fuel plant the Navy built at Muskogee, Okla. While Callery is the operating contractor there, the plant was built with Federal funds, produced by tax money, expressly for the Navy.

Word is that the Defense Department is having a special agency study the current fuel needs to see if the country needs both the Muskogee plant and Model City, N.Y., Air Force plant, which was recently built at a cost of $45 million. Neither is now producing at more than 50 percent capacity. The question is whether one plant can handle the work for both and then expand when and if the need arises. A decision is due in a month or so.

If the study shows it would be better to have one plant instead of two in operation, the United States will have either a $38 million or a $45 million plant—and a shiny new plant, to boot—standing idle. This could be one of our greatest all-time monuments to stupid planning and wasteful spending. If something like this doesn't arouse the taxpayers and make them express themselves to their Senators and Congressmen, nothing ever will.

Excuses? There are some, as you always get in Government affairs.

Federal officials say the contracts for both plants were let several years ago when it was anticipated the fuel would be needed by the Navy and Air Force. Subsequently, it has developed that the Navy has found diminishing usage for this kind of fuel.

If this has been a progressive thing, and the Navy has been getting more and more aware that its fuel needs would be less and less, why did it allow the Muskogee plant to be completed? Was it too proud to announce that the plant was not needed and should be halted, and that demands could be met at some other plant? Or was it simply a case of having the money and the overwhelming compulsion to spend it?

Some people are funny. They get money, and it burns holes in their pockets. As people try to climb Mount Everest "because it's there," so do some people—especially Federal people—seem to try to spend as much money as they can * * * "because it's there."

Further irritation is provoked by the announcement that transferring the Muskogee plant to the Air Force would be in keeping with the Navy's current policy of gradually getting out of the boron fuel production business. The Lawrence Callery plant was the first to feel the sting of this decision, and locally it was a big sting. Now comes word that the local wound could well appear as little more than a pinprick if the Muskogee plant is mothballed due to foolish planning.

One can look at the Sunflower Ordnance Works on standby here, then take into account that there are similar plants in readiness around the Nation, and wonder why Federal agencies, military or otherwise, don't take better advantage of such facilities instead of building new ones like those at Muskogee.

The best answer to such a question came some time ago when a Journal-World reporter talked to a top eastern executive. At the time there was a good chance Sunflower might be reactivated to meet certain military needs and the executive had been contacted to see if he could shed any light on the subject.

"I'll be the first one to admit that Sunflower could be used for a lot of things they're doing now," the informant said frankly. "The trouble is that it seems everyone in the Government wants his own little pet project and doesn't want to use any facility that might have been used by somebody else. So instead of adapting existing facilities at a lesser cost, they spend a lot more for a new facility just for the pride of having their own special pile.

"There probably are a lot of uses that could be made of Sunflower, but you see it has a handicap to overcome. It has been an Army installation. For some reason, branches like the Navy and Air Force feel this has contaminated it.

"They seem to think it could be below their station to take secondhand something that the Army has had, a sort of a hand-me-down, as it were. So what do they try to do? Out of foolish pride and rivalry they try to get the money to build their own plant. The taxpaying public is stuck for the bill."

And some of us wonder why Government expenditures continue to rise, and our tax bills zoom into orbit right along with them. This, of course, has given rise to the currently popular question: Which will reach the moon first—the national debt or a rocket?

So what are we going to do about it?

Neely Named to Football Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Jess Neely came to Texas in 1940 as head coach and athletic director of Rice Institute in Houston. He has made a reputation of excellence for himself not only in Texas but throughout the country. In the Southwest, where the best in football is generally the prevailing standard, Jess Neely has a reputation for developing teams just a little bit better.

Last weekend, the Helms Athletic Foundation Hall of Fame in Los Angeles named Jess Neely to its membership. No football coach still active in America today has as many victories on his record as Jess Neely.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story from the Houston Press of August 22, 1959, on Jess Neely's election to the Hall of Fame.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEELY NAMED TO FOOTBALL HALL OF FAME—HELMS FOUNDATION HONORS OWL COACH, JIM TATUM, RED SANDERS

(By Bob Rule)

The illustrious coaching career of Rice Institute's Jess Neely was crowned with its greatest honor today when he was named to the Helms Athletic Foundation Hall of Fame.

Announcement of Neely's election came from Los Angeles, site of the international sports shrine, established in 1948.

Honored along with Neely were four other coaches and six players. Included among the coaches honored are Henry R. (Red) Sanders of UCLA and Jim Tatum of North Carolina, both of whom died suddenly in the last year.

Also picked were Warren Woodson of New Mexico A. & M., a 28-year veteran of coaching, and Adam Walsh, who coached for 25 years at Santa Clara and Bowdoin.

The players honored were Frankie Albert (Stanford, 1939–41), Benny Friedman (Michigan, 1924–26), Edgar Garbisch (Army, 1922–24), William Hollenback (Pennsylvania, 1906–08), Nile Kinnick (Iowa, 1937–39), and Harry Smith (Southern California, 1937–39).

In the 12 years the Football Hall of Fame has been in existence, a total of 61 coaches and 61 players have been honored.

On the two lists are the greats of the past. Neely joins such coaching immortals as Bob Zuppke, Fielding H. Yost, Glenn S. (Pop) Warner, Amos Alonzo Stagg, Knute Rockne, and many others.

He also joins the two men who influenced his football career most—Dan McGugin of Vanderbilt, his head coach in college, and Wallace Wade, under whom he played, and coach at Vanderbilt and Alabama.

Neely received the news of his election today in characteristic fashion.

"Well, if you hang around long enough," he quipped, "I guess they feel like they have to do something for you. But I certainly do appreciate it."

No football coach still active in America today has as many victories on his record as Neely, who'll start his 20th season at Rice this fall and his 33d year as a head coach.

His teams at Southwestern of Memphis, Clemson, and Rice have won 176 games, lost 129, and tied 14. Included in those totals are four bowl victories and a single defeat.

Virtually every major honor his profession can bestow has come to the Rice Institute coach. He only recently served as president of the American Football Coaches Association and now is a member of the powerful football rules committee.

With this season, Neely will establish a new Southwest Conference record for the most consecutive years as head coach at a member school.

When he completed his 19th year last season, he tied the record held by Dutch Meyer of TCU, who previously had been voted into the Helms Hall of Fame.

"That's not exactly the type of record I'm interested in," Neely laughed yesterday. "Won and lost records are slightly more important."

Neely has served as both head coach and athletic director at Rice snice 1940, when he came from Clemson College in South Carolina, and under his direction Rice's athletic facilities have become among the Nation's best.

The 70,000-seat football stadium, one of the most beautiful in the country, is one of the city's showplaces and the 6,200-seat fieldhouse is one of the best in the conference.

Both have been completely paid for out of athletic receipts, a tribute to Neely's executive ability.

The Rice coach is energetically preparing for the start of the 1959 season in just 10 days.

"I believe we'll have another good team," he says.

Values of Reclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, recently there have appeared in newspapers of Washington, D.C., articles reporting questions raised on this floor and in the other body about the worth of the Federal reclamation program, and particularly, how it relates to surplus crops.

Similar questions have been raised editorially—I believe by writers not completely informed.

In the Western States we know the value to our areas and to the Nation of this great program and we have able spokesmen to state those values, men who are thoroughly familiar with the actual workings of reclamation projects. On August 9, 1959, the Sacramento Bee and other McClatchy newspapers serving the Central Valley of California presented editorially what I consider to be an able and clear answer to these questions, setting forth true facts about reclamation and surplus crops and the values of the reclamation program. I am submitting this editorial for the information of the Members and, I hope, the enlightenment of those who have questioned the consistency of these programs.

The editorial follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Aug. 9, 1959]

RECLAMATION PROJECTS YIELD WIDE VARIETY OF ESSENTIAL BENEFITS

In this drought year of 1959, when the main rivers of California would be a series of dry sandbars were it not for projects such as the Shasta and Folsom Dams, it is no less than amazing that there are those who are critical of the western reclamation program.

A recent Washington, D.C., Post editorial deserves note because it reflects the astigmatic view shared by many in the East that the Federal program should be reexamined on the ground it brings more land into agricultural production while the Nation has large surpluses in wheat, corn, cotton, etc.

This is totally fallacious and shows a lack of knowledge of the true nature and overall purposes of these projects.

A quick answer, of course, is to point out the fact the crops largely produced on lands irrigated by those big Federal dams are not in surplus and are not under any Government program. That in itself should be enough but there is much more to the story.

These great multipurpose projects provide a vast variety of benefits aside from irrigation.

They provide flood control. Without Shasta, Folsom, Friant, and other dams, California would have been subjected to a series of catastrophic floods during the last decade. The floods which did occur happened because projected dams had not been built.

They produce electric power. They aid navigation. They hold back the salt water from the sea which otherwise might spell ruin for the fabulously rich Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. They provide recreation for the people. And of extreme importance, they give many communities dependable supplies of domestic and industrial water.

Without the reclamation projects the great development of the West would have been seriously restricted. For example, without its allocation of 390 million gallons a day from Colorado River water stored behind Hoover Dam, Los Angeles would have reached the maximum of its population and industrial growth some time ago.

To a large extent the reclamation projects in California have not added significant acreages to agricultural production.

They have provided surface supplies to already producing lands which had been irrigated by pumping but which were threatened with extinction due to the failure of the underground supplies.

And in some cases the introduction of reclamation water has made it possible to transform land formerly devoted to grains, which are in surplus, to the production of fruits and vegetables, which are not.

The Post says it is time Congress gave thought to retiring land from cultivation instead of adding more. And by inference one could gather the Post believes it might be a good thing to let the area to be served by the proposed San Luis project dry up.

It is hard to imagine anything more foolish. If ample water were provided much of the land growing grain and cotton inevitably would be turned to orchards and vegetable crops.

But even were cotton to be the chosen crop, the Post's point still falls flat. The San Joaquin Valley produces a long staple cotton which is in much demand, and the per acre yield is from 5 to 10 times that of some cotton-growing sections of the South.

If there is need to retire cotton land from production, it certainly would make more sense to retire some of the poor and tired land in the South than to let the extremely fertile acres in the San Luis area revert to a desert, which they will without San Luis water.

Moreover, in respect to the Federal San Luis project, while it is designed primarily for irrigation, it also is to be an integral part of a bigger plan to transport water to southern California where it will be needed for domestic and industrial purposes a little more than a decade hence.

The Post is generous enough in its appraisal to say the reclamation projects for the most part pay for themselves.

They do, and more. Not only do the users pay for the projects but the great developments which spring from these projects contribute vastly to the economy of the Nation in general and to the Federal Treasury in particular in the way of taxes.

For one to say the reclamation program is a case of the Government putting out money to produce surplus crops on which the Government must put out more money is missing the point at both ends. Such a statement either is due to ignorance or is rank misrepresentation.

Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine of August 16, 1959, there appeared an interesting article by Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of Puerto Rico, which is entitled "Puerto Rico Does Not Want To Be a State."

I suggest that this article is good reading for pretty nearly everybody. It starts out with the idea that probably if one of our Senators or Representatives had his way, he would introduce a bill for Puerto Rican statehood; but Luis Muñoz-Marín, the Governor of Puerto Rico, demonstrates quite clearly in this article why they are satisfied with the status in which they are.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUERTO RICO DOES NOT WANT TO BE A STATE

(By Luis Muñoz-Marín)

SAN JUAN, P.R.—Puerto Rico, now a vigorous self-governing Commonwealth within the American political system, would be smothered if some of its misguided stateside well-wishers, like Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ of New Mexico and Representative VICTOR ANFUSO of New York, had their way. They have introduced or proposed to introduce bills for Puerto Rican statehood. The bills have no chance of approval in Congress, and only minority support in Puerto Rico.

Recently, in the lobby of a Washington hotel, an old friend greeted me, "Well, Governor, pretty soon we should be seeing you up on the 'Hill' as a Senator from the 51st State." He meant it as a high compliment to Puerto Rico, and I was touched by both his warmth and enthusiasm. In the wake of Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood, a similar status for Puerto Rico seemed logical, simple, and desirable to him. He melted into the milling crowd of the lobby before I had an opportunity to outline to him the great complexities of Puerto Rico's circumstances, which make statehood neither logical nor desirable for Puerto Rico or the United States.

When I say that it is far better for Puerto Rico to remain a Commonwealth, it is with no insensitivity to the high honor which statehood implies. Nor is it because we seek independence—we definitely do not. Nor does it mean we are content to be less than a federated state—because, definitely, we are not less, but only different. Nor is it because we do not wish to share in the common expenses of the Federal Union, of which we are a part in a new way—since Puerto Rico is now proposing a formula by which it would begin to pay into the Federal Treasury as its economic growth allows it to do so.

Puerto Rico's history has been far different from that of Alaska and Hawaii, and the understandable tendency to speculate on possible statehood for Puerto Rico after the rapid accession of Alaska and Hawaii can lead men of good will far astray. Puerto Rico was a populous island with a long history and a well-defined culture when it first came into the American orbit in 1898 following the Spanish-American War. Alaska and Hawaii, on the other hand, were sparsely settled and ripe for colonizing from the mainland.

Alaska and Hawaii became incorporated territories, clearly destined for cultural integration and eventual statehood. Puerto Rico's special circumstances were early recognized when it became the first unincorporated territory, which implied that it would not be slated for statehood. At the same time it would have been obviously contrary to the American spirit that Puerto Rico should remain a colony forever.

Economic factors were very different, too. Both Alaska and Hawaii have been for many years notably wealthier than Puerto Rico is even now after 14 years of rapid economic progress since the end of World War II. The net annual average income of Hawaii, and probably of Alaska, is more than $1,800, very little below the 1957 national average of $2,027. Puerto Rico's per capita income of $470 is still less than half of that of the lowest income State of the Union, Mississippi. Puerto Rico has little land in relation to population, no fuels, no significant mineral resources. That is why we have called the program by which we progress Operation Bootstrap.

These economic and cultural factors have, since 1898, made Puerto Rico's political evolution unique, and clearly different from that of Alaska and Hawaii. Indeed, as late as 1940, many sober, informed men in the United States considered Puerto Rico's economic and political problems insoluble, and were resigned to Puerto Rico's being a dependent poorhouse on a kind of permanent dole from the Federal Treasury, a place where poverty and hopelessness would constantly churn up social and political instability.

It took a double-barreled attack on these problems in Puerto Rico itself to lead to the relative prosperity of today, and to the visible social and political health and vigor of the island. First came the attack on poverty, temporary foreclosing political debate. Only when Operation Bootstrap was well under way did Puerto Rico address itself to finding a political status which answered the needs of its special relationship with the United States and its own economic and cultural circumstances.

To those who forget that peoples are the creators of political formulas and not their slaves, Puerto Rico seemed to have no way to turn. Continued existence as a territory or colony was impossible. The corrosive effects of colonialism, even a benevolent colonialism, could no longer be accepted, especially in the post-war period. Neither dignity, nor the swift course of history, nor common sense, nor the American tradition, would permit the continuation of such a system in the American context.

In contemplation of the inevitable end of colonialism, a sterile debate had raged for many years in the island between adherents of independence and those of statehood. The great majority of Puerto Ricans rejected independence on two counts: Puerto Rico's economy was by then so integrated with that of the United States that separation would have meant economic suicide and, equally important, Puerto Ricans had developed a deep and genuine attachment for their fellow U.S. citizens and for U.S. political institutions.

The great majority also rejected the possibility of statehood as totally unrealistic. Economically, statehood then would have meant another form of ruin for Puerto Rico—and still would, as we shall see in a moment.

The circumstances called for the same kind of political pioneering which created the Original Thirteen States themselves—a new projection which would be in the spirit of the 20th century, taking due recognition of the mutual interests of both the United States and Puerto Rico. The concept of a self-governing commonwealth had been foreseen as long ago as 1912 by Henry L. Stimson, then Secretary of War under President Taft. With far-sighted statesmanship Stimson observed that he saw no inconsistency between U.S. citizenship for Puerto Ricans and the ideal that Puerto Rico should have, when ready for it, completely autonomous local government within the American system.

This is essentially what happened when Puerto Rico became a Commonwealth in 1952. The official Spanish translation is Estado Libre Asociado—Associated Free State: Puerto Rico, in the generic sense of the term, is a new kind of state. Puerto Ricans are United States citizens, sharing with their fellow citizens in the continental United States a common defense, a common foreign policy, a common market, a common currency and the operation of practically all Federal laws. Puerto Ricans differ from other Americans in that they do not vote in national elections, have no voting representation in Congress, and have, on the other hand, autonomy in directing their local affairs, including the collecting and spending of their own taxes.

Nearly 7 years after its hopeful inception, how is the Commonwealth doing? It is doing remarkably well, I am happy to report. Operation Bootstrap has raised the per capita income from $121 in 1940 to today's $470. Living standards have virtually doubled in 15 years, perhaps the most rapid economic advance in any underdeveloped region in the world.

Certain development has been dramatic enough to attract high officials, technicians and students from all over the world to study our methods. Nearly 9,000 visitors from 107 different countries—from Nepal to Saudi Arabia, from Morocco to Bolivia—have studied how we have raised life expectancy from 46 years in 1940 to 68 years today, how we are rapidly winning the fight against illiteracy and how a whole people can be raised, in a few years, from despair and deepest poverty to relative prosperity and dynamic purposefulness.

The creation of the Commonwealth had political as well as economic lessons for the world. It was a notable achievement, in the postwar era, to end a colonial relationship in such a constructive, fruitful manner, devoid of the bitterness and violence which characterized the end of colonialism in many parts of Asia, the Near East and Africa. Puerto Rico clearly gave the lie to the persons (Communists and others) who are always ready to raise the cry of "imperialism" against the United States. It was patently impossible to square imperial evploitation with a people who are self-governing, who sent 40,000 of their sons into the Armed Forces during the Korean conflict (90 percent of them volunteers) and who are so effectively dramatizing the quality of U.S. democracy to thousands of earnest observers from all over the world.

The dignity of self-government has not only engendered an explosion of energy in economic affairs in Puerto Rico but has seen a lively ferment in cultural realms as well. No one who has visited Puerto Rico recently can be immune to the feeling that "things are happening." The Casals Festival, lively drama, ballet, opera, and symphony orchestra seasons are all part of the energized local scene. Puerto Rican painting and writing are in obvious renaissance. A people with new pride and new confidence and new creativity are clearly on the march.

In the light of this progress, it may seem strange that the sterile debate regarding possible statehood at any time in the foreseeable future should have been revived in Puerto Rico. Certainly persons who make any serious study of Puerto Rico's economics are aware that statehood, at this time, or for many generations to come, would mean a fatal crash for the island. It would be like a fully loaded airplane about to be airborne having half of its motors suddenly stopped.

Federal taxes would about double the already high taxload that the Commonwealth must impose upon itself in order to keep its public works and public services in line with its rapid economic development. Federated statehood would mean either breaking the back of the taxpayer and thus making further economic development impossible or cutting the public services so drastically that their decay would constitute a bottleneck for private enterprise and economic development.

There has been nothing automatic about Puerto Rico's progress to date. Only hard, uphill work has brought it about. And, while this progress has been notable enough to attract interest in many countries, our living standards, as I have indicated, are still far below those of the mainland United States.

The Federal Government has long been cognizant of the different economic situations of Puerto Rico and the harsh handicaps imposed by a population concentration of 658 persons per square mile in a mountainous island with virtually no resources. Never, since Puerto Rico was first associated with the United States, has the Federal Government applied Federal taxes here. This was to give the island a chance of economic development as well as to honor the principle of "no taxation without representation." Without this to compensate for the other disadvantages I have mentioned, Puerto Rico would still be in deepest poverty.

Most Federal grants-in-aid apply in Puerto Rico. These grants, like those allowed to the States, are apportioned on the theory that they will benefit the United States as a whole. Matching funds for building certain roads and for hospital construction are cases in point.

The United States tariff is collected in Puerto Rico on foreign imports—which, by the way, are few, since most of our trade is with the United States—but the receipts go into the Commonwealth treasury after the cost of collection is deducted. In this way American manufacturers are protected from foreign competition while the Puerto Rican treasury is benefited. This is important because Puerto Rico is one of the world's greatest per capita consumers of United States products, spending $700 million a year on them. The Federal excise tax on Puerto Rican rum, while it serves to protect American distillers, also reverts to the Commonwealth.

On the other hand, our association with the United States imposes some penalties on the Puerto Rican economy, for which our treasury is not compensated. Under the Sugar Act of 1946, for example, Puerto Rico loses considerable potential income by being denied the right to refine more than 11 per cent of its own sugar production. In addition, shipping rates between Puerto Rico and United States ports are artificially high because they are governed by the coastwise shipping laws confining cargoes to American vessels. While these laws have the legitimate objective of subsidizing United States shipping for defense purposes, in practice they place a heavy share of this defense load on Puerto Rican consumers.

From the United States point of view, the accession of a State unable to pay Federal taxes except at the cost of economic ruin is obviously inconceivable. Puerto Rico, which as a Commonwealth is a showcase of American democracy before the world, would, as a federated State, become exactly the opposite: an economy in shambles, having to be kept alive by a WPA type of charity, with a people far more hopeless than during the worst of the great depression.

Nor has the United States the desire or interest to force the cultural assimilation of Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico. Indeed, the fact that Puerto Ricans are probably the most bilingual people in the hemisphere, with deep understanding of and ties to both their fellow U.S. citizens and their Latin neighbors, has made Puerto Rico a valuable meeting place for people and ideas at a time when Latin America is in a state of far-reaching flux. Its unique position has been an undoubted asset for the United States in sensing changing currents in Latin America, and in translating its hemisphere policy into action.

But even now, however limited our means, Puerto Rico wants to make it clear that it intends to begin contributing to the Federal Treasury as its economic circumstances permit. There is now a bill before Congress whose purpose is to define the permanent association of Puerto Rico with the United States. One principle is clearly established: That Puerto Rico wishes, of its own accord and within its abilities, to help shoulder the Federal burden by contributing money to the Federal Government and by performing some functions in Puerto Rico now underwritten by U.S. taxpayers.

Puerto Rico is not looking for a free ride. On the contrary, it is just as anxious to carry its share of the financial load as its sons were to risk their lives in Europe and Korea—as a matter of pride and dignity, as our contribution to the whole.

When the strident chorus of nationalism begins to fade in Europe, Asia, Latin America, and Africa, some ingenious formula may permit the rational regrouping of new and old sovereign units on a sounder economic basis, just as the United States and Puerto Rico found a workable formula. The world

has become too small, too complex, too interdependent to permit indefinite political fragmentation at the price of widespread poverty. Where blind insistence on rigid, 19th-century-style sovereignty exists in defiance of economic logic, new forms of federalism are called for. Puerto Ricans are proud that they are contributing to the American political system a new form of federalism.

In dedicating the Puerto Rico Supreme Court Building, Chief Justice Earl Warren expressed this in words that remind us of the creative political genius of the United States:

"In the sense that our American system is not static, in the sense that it is not an end but the means to an end—in the sense that it is an organism intended to grow and expand to meet varying conditions and times in a large country—in the sense that every governmental effort of ours is an experiment—so the new institutions of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico represent an experiment—the newest experiment and perhaps the most notable of American governmental experiments in our lifetimes."

A new way of abolishing colonialism has been born.

Bill To Raise Membership Limit in the House Should Be Enacted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 8715, to provide that the permanent membership of the House of Representatives shall be 438 Members in the 88th Congress and each Congress thereafter.

Under the provisions of my bill the temporary increase of two seats authorized by the acts admitting the States of Alaska and Hawaii would be made permanent. In addition, another seat would be added to provide for the additional Representative Hawaii will gain under the reapportionment of House seats that will be necessary as a result of the 1960 census. This procedure is in keeping with the precedent we have followed upon the admission of new States to the Union.

In the August 24 edition of the Twin City Sentinel, Winston-Salem, N.C., there appears an editorial containing a very fine analysis of my measure. With the belief that the contents of the editorial will be of interest to my colleagues, under unanimous consent I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

BILL TO RAISE MEMBERSHIP LIMIT IN THE HOUSE SHOULD BE ENACTED

During the late President Taft's administration New Mexico and Arizona, the 47th and 48th States, were admitted to the Union. As the new States were entitled to representation in Congress, the size of both houses was increased. For the much smaller Senate this involved no problem. But the House, in which representation is based on population, had been steadily growing larger following the census years. So after the admission of the two new States, Congress in 1911 set the permanent membership of the House at 435 members. This was done to prevent the House from becoming too large and unwieldly.

Ever since then, the representation of the various States in the House has been manipulated in accordance with the population figures shown by each decennial census, with the total membership remaining constant. Thus every new representative gained by North Carolina in the last four or five decades has meant losses in representation by other States.

Now two more new States, Alaska and Hawaii, have been added to the Union. In addition a number of States, especially California in the West and Florida in the South, have realized almost sensational population growth since 1950. This means that these States will gain several new representatives after the 1960 census. Meanwhile, permanent representation must be provided for the States of Alaska and Hawaii. One seat has been temporarily assigned each of these new States, but Hawaii is probably entitled to two on a population basis.

If seats for the new States as well as the seats gained by the faster growing States must all be provided under the present limitation of 435 seats, some of the slower growing States may be rather hard hit. So Representative BASIL WHITENER of North Carolina has introduced legislation to boost the membership of Congress to 438. This would take care of the new representation for Alaska and Hawaii. It seems designed primarily to prevent further losses of southern seats in the House.

Even with the enactment of the Whitener legislation North Carolina is expected to lose one Representative after the 1960 census, since its population growth, estimated at about 10 or 11 percent for the current decade apparently is below the national average. But eliminating the necessity of providing seats for the new States within present limitations might assure this State that it would not lose over one Representative. Conceivably if current population estimates are off base, it might prevent the loss of a Tar Heel Representative.

In any event, the Whitener legislation is very moderate and probably should be enacted. It would follow the 1911 precedent of resetting the total membership of the House after the admission of new States. It carries with it the possibility that no further changes on this account will be called for within the foreseeable future. (Puerto Rico may come in someday, but that day seems a long way off.)

It would not add appreciably to the present size of the House. And it might prevent a number of States on the population border line from losing a Representative (and consequently, an important electoral vote).

No Time To Relax—Focus in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is the important news in Laos the several improprieties that have been alleged in the administration of our foreign aid to that border kingdom or is it the increasing Communist threat to the independence of a small nation which has just attained its freedom?

Obviously the latter is the case and we must look to see that foreign aid funds are sufficient to the task. This is the lesson of how we will show that Premier Khrushchev's visit means to us no time to relax.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of August 21 on the matter of mutual security appropriations which will be considered by this body shortly, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME TO RELAX

In the face of a noticeable growth of a new "Geneva spirit" of relaxation due to Premier Khrushchev's impending visit, the 10-man committee of prominent citizens headed by former Assistant Army Secretary Draper warns that the Communist leopard has not changed his spots and that we cannot cope with him unless we keep the free world strong. To that end the committee urgently recommends that the United States, in addition to its nearly $40 billion Defense Establishment, provide at least $2 billion a year in military aid to our allies and friends.

After studying the problem for 9 months the committee holds that Soviet Russia is still bent on controlling the world, that it is growing in economic power faster than the United States, and that the free world can meet the challenge only if it unites in national and individual dedication to freedom, and in hard and constructive work and thought rather than in a search for more comfort and leisure.

This warning is in line not only with the best thought of our military leaders but also with the word brought back from Moscow by Vice President NIXON to the effect that "strength is the only thing the Russian leaders understand," and that a position of strength offers the only hope for reaching agreements with the Soviets. This means both economic and military strength, which, in the foreign field, means continued economic and military aid.

The committee has already recommended various economic aid programs, including a billion-a-year lending program which the Eisenhower administration has sought to realize in the Development Loan Fund within the mutual security program and in the projected billion dollar International Development Association and the Inter-American Development Bank that would enlist other nations in helping underdeveloped countries to strengthen their economy. Now the committee concentrates on military aid, and its warnings are obviously addressed to Congress.

Congress is fully aware of the importance of military strength, and in the matter of our own Defense Establishment gave the President 99.95 percent of what he requested. But when it comes to so-called foreign aid, which buys no votes and contains no local boondoggle but buys more defense at cheaper cost, Congress invariably puts on political blinders. President Eisenhower has requested a total of $3.9 billion for mutual security, including $1.6 billion for military aid, which is $400 million below the committee's recommendation. But in authorizing the program Congress cut down the total by $353 million and the military aid by $200 million. And the House has cut actual funds for the program to $3.1 billion and military aid by another $100 million.

President Eisenhower has appealed to the Senate at least to restore the House cuts, which, if permitted to stand, would seriously damage the country's international position. The Draper committee report powerfully supports this plea.

These Days—Undesirable Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, the recent editorial by George E. Sokolsky entitled "These Days—Undesirable Police Force," is excellent and, accordingly, I desire to bring it to the attention of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 22, 1959]

THESE DAYS—UNDESIRABLE POLICE FORCE

(By George E. Sokolsky)

What is altogether undesirable in this country is a national police, but many who agree to this proposition often advocate measures which must logically bring such a body into existence. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, the FBI, has always resisted the efforts of well-meaning persons to load down the FBI with the functions of the local police.

When a bomb is thrown at a building with the object of destroying it, this is a matter for the local police. During the past year or two, some synagogues and church buildings have been bombed or defaced. There can be little question but that some "hate" organization is responsible for this manifestation of ill will. There are many "hate" groups and they hate different things, although some of them have now reached a degree of antipathy that they hate everything that is different from what they are. There is also no question but that the willful destruction of property is a criminal act, punishable in our courts under existing law.

Representative CARLTON LOSER, of Tennessee, has introduced a measure, which has been approved by the House Judiciary Committee and which would, as worded, require the FBI to investigate any type of fire or explosion or bombing, including labor disputes, if there is a possibility that those perpetrating the act crossed State lines. This would enlarge the functions of the FBI beyond its capacity, either as to manpower or as to budget. It would also delegate to the FBI a task which is strictly local and which the local police anywhere in the United States should be able to handle if they attend to their business and are not fearful of local pressure groups.

The danger of developing a national police force is greater than the danger to the Nation of some bigot managing to evade the local police. The bigot who permits himself to destroy life or property will sooner or later be discovered and punished; however, the national police force can become a permanent institution. It is true that the people of this country have confidence in Hoover and recognize that he does not permit the FBI to be used for political purposes or to suppress opposition to those in power. However, Hoover will not always head the FBI and a national police force could be used by an unscrupulous person for deleterious purposes if he were so disposed.

As the legislation is written, the language is so broad that persons concerned with bombings would expect the Bureau to intervene in every case to discover whether Federal law applied, even if the bombings were the product of gangsters' wars.

Furthermore, it would seem that the FBI is already concerned with the bombing of churches or synagogues because of its duties in protecting civil liberties. One of the liberties which all Americans enjoy is the right to worship God in whatever way each individual chooses or not to worship at all. The denial of religious liberty is the denial of the constitutional right of any person living upon American soil. Therefore, no new legislation is really required to permit FBI intervention in a case involving the bombing or defacing of a church or a synagogue. That duty is already theirs.

It is important that the role of the local police be preserved. The primary responsibility for the protection of life and property must rest with the local authorities. The tendency to drag the Federal Government into every phase of American life has not proved out over the past 20 years.

It is not wholesome for local police forces to develop undue dependence upon the FBI which has no function in labor disputes, contested local elections, gang wars, etc.

Many new problems arise each year, some out of the usual disturbed social conditions after wars, some out of household maladjustments in a transitional period. Such matters as the bombing of churches and synagogues are undoubtedly due to the social changes arising out of integration of Negroes in the South, some persons organizing to withstand the law.

Under present jurisdiction, such questions are limited to the States and local communities and there they should remain, unless there is absolute evidence of violation of constitutional rights of individual citizens whose civil rights are to be preserved.

Settlement of the Current Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the August 20, 1959, issues of the three McClatchy Newspapers of California, the Sacramento Bee, the Modesto Bee, and the Fresno Bee, edited by that fine newspaper man, Walter P. Jones. Entitled "Compulsory Arbitration Is Realistic Instrument," it discusses proposals for settlement of the steel strike and recommends that the public should be recognized as a third party directly involved in such disputes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Aug. 20, 1959]

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION IS REALISTIC INSTRUMENT

U.S. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER's commentary 6 months ago on steel industry-union quarrels over a new contract has become a casualty of time and long forgotten, perhaps, but it remains one of the few truths which have emerged out of all the gobbledegook given voice in regard to this year's strike.

KEFAUVER had proposed to David J. McDonald, president of the United Steel Workers of America, that the union limit its demands if the steel industry would pledge not to hike prices. In reply McDonald told the press he wished KEFAUVER would "keep his nose out of my business." And KEFAUVER retorted:

Mr. McDonald's language dramatizes my position exactly. The price of steel is not just Mr. McDonald's business. It is not just the business of Mr. Roger Blough, chairman of the United States Steel Corp. It is the business of the people.

Exactly. It is the business of the people. And suddenly the people have rediscovered an old truth—that they are defenseless in crises of this scope, even though in the end they will have to foot the bill.

Congress, needled by growing concern by the people, is thinking in terms of giving the public recognition as a third party directly involved. For example, Senators JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York, and GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, say the Nation needs to find some new techniques for "asserting the public interest."

They propose factfinding.

The Nation already has factfinding and factfinding. And still the public is defenseless. Why, pray tell, shy away from the only realistic instrument Congress could create for disputes involving great public interest—compulsory arbitration?

Here are two fundamental truths: A strike or a lockout in an industry of steel's importance to the economy, regardless of how justifiable, works a grave injury to the public good; in the end, are not the public rights far greater than the rights of either disputant?

The same arguments used against compulsory arbitration could be voiced as rationally against compulsory regulation of industry and labor. The Nation determined, in another hour of crisis, that one corporation should not hog all industry and it created the Sherman Antitrust Act. Was this an infringement upon private rights or a builtin protection for the people?

In another hour the Nation—whether wisely or not—enacted the Taft-Hartley Act when it suspected labor was abusing some of its powers. Was this an infringement upon rights or did Congress have the public good in mind?

Society has outgrown the jungle. Or it should have. We are a people governed by law, dedicated both to private and public freedoms. The rights of labor, the rights of management must be jealously protected. But so must the rights of the people.

Anything short of this is kowtowing to special interests in the mistaken image of protecting freedoms. If the day ever comes when Americans cannot live happily under law written for the greater good of the greater number, then on that day will a precious piece of America die.

Seapower Still Vital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there are so many varying thoughts on the part of those accredited with expert caliber touching the merits of conventional and atomic warfare, it is, indeed, interesting—and gratifying—to have the views of a well known and experienced naval officer on the subject.

Reference is made to the article by Capt. Frederick L. Oliver, U.S. Navy, re-

tired, distinguished naval correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, appearing in the June 10, 1959, issue.

Captain Oliver has long been a student of Naval strategy and geopolitics, and is well qualified to speak with authority.

Whatever force for destruction modern weapons may possess, the basic usage of the seas must continue to serve the needs of mankind, as Captain Oliver, in his brief, but illuminating and timely discussion discloses.

The article follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 10, 1959]

SEAPOWER STILL VITAL

(By Capt. Frederick L. Oliver, U.S. Navy, retired)

Few nations throughout the world are today so self-supporting that they can afford to dispense with foreign trade. And foreign trade is largely seaborne, which means cargoes carried in ships traversing the sea lanes which crisscross the oceans.

Oceans cover about 73 percent of the surface of the earth, and from time immemorial have provided highways over which moved the raw and finished materials on which nations have depended for their economic existence.

The need of a nation to utilize the sea lanes depends in great measures on its requirements. A manufacturing nation may require raw materials; an agricultural nation, manufactured goods. But whatever the dependence, an interruption of its seaborne trade can spell disaster to a country.

Strategists long since recognized the vital influence of seapower on national issues in which ocean-borne traffic entered. The Phoenicians, Greeks, and Romans in turn exploited the advantages presented by maintaining adequate seapower. By securing command of the seas, narrow as they were in their day, these nations dominated their world.

Over a period of a great many years, Great Britain's seapower was the keystone in the success of that nation in becoming and remaining a world power.

At no time in history has the importance of holding command of the sea been more forcefully demonstrated than in both world wars. During these hostilities, the very existence of nations depended on who controlled the sea lanes.

Now the Soviet Union's growing appreciation of the importance of control of the seas enters a picture which is further complicated by a rapidly increasing array of new weapons. No nation has better reason to know the importance of holding command of the sea than has Russia. Loss of this control in 1904 paved the way for Japan's victory over Russia's Army and Navy in the Far East.

Lack of access to the oceans of the world was a disadvantage under which the Russian Empire labored for centuries. This disadvantage has continued to exist. So it is small wonder to find that Soviet strategy today has gone into the matter of seapower with a thoroughness that is disquieting to the Western Allies.

Czarist Russia's military efforts were centered in its army. Its Navy was a secondary consideration, with a morale which reflected the inferior position to which it was relegated. A search of history will disclose that the Muscovite Navy had few victories to offset its numerous defeats, the most ignominious being at the hands of Japan's Navy at Tsushima in 1905.

Under the Soviet regime, its navy made little progress until after World War II. Since then it has assumed a prominent role in the Soviet Union's plans.

Communism's avowed goal is world domination. Every move made by the Soviet Government is planned to strengthen its openly acknowledged policy of preparing itself to assume the role to which it aspires.

The growing Soviet fleet is specifically designed to further Communist plans. Foremost among Soviet aims is attaining the means for denying the free world unrestricted use of sea lanes.

For this purpose the Soviets are building a modern navy. Although it comprises a large number of efficient submarines, destroyer and cruiser construction has not been neglected. According to information released by the U.S. Navy, since 1950 the Russians have outbuilt the United States 6 to 1 in submarine tonnage, 9 to 1 in destroyer tonnage, and 14 to 1 in cruiser tonnage.

In view of this striking growth in Soviet naval strength, it is wise to take a look at the foreign import needs of the United States. Contrary to general belief, our country is far fram being self-sustaining. Many years ago we did not have to import much save a few necessities, but needs have changed with the times, and today we lack sufficient amounts of some 66 out of 77 strategic raw materials which go into making today's complex weapons and other means for carrying on a modern war.

For instance, many raw materials vitally needed for producing essentials such as telephones, electronic gear, automobiles, tanks, aircraft and ships, must come from overseas in much greater quantities than is generally realized.

Some idea of these needs can be gathered from a few statistics. We import 75 percent of our bauxite and 80 percent of our asbestos requirements; 90 percent of the cobalt, antimony, and manganese we use; and 95 percent of the tin and chrome needed. In addition the time is in sight when most of our iron ore supply must be imported.

The above and many other needed strategic raw materials flow into the United States over more than 60,000 miles of vital sea lanes, traveled by thousands of merchant vessels. Air transportation cannot begin to fill the needs, nor are submarines able to carry more than a trickle of special materials.

How can it be made certain that the required supplies will continue to be received?

There is but one answer: The U.S. Navy must be maintained in such strength that it will be able to maintain its command of the sea against virtually all opponents.

Special Report on Labor Legislation by Representative Joseph E. Karth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the recent newsletter of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota, Representative JOSEPH E. KARTH.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL REPORT ON LABOR LEGISLATION

WHAT THE PRESIDENT DIDN'T TELL YOU ABOUT THE GRIFFIN-LANDRUM LABOR BILL

On Friday, August 14, the House of Representatives passed the Griffin-Landrum labor bill, H.R. 8400. This bill has gone to a House-Senate conference committee which will attempt to iron out the differences between the Senate passed Kennedy-Ervin bill, S. 1555 and the House bill.

In the past 2 weeks my office has received hundreds of telegrams, letters, and cards expressing opinions on various measures dealing with labor reform legislation. My mail ran as heavy for the Griffin-Landrum bill as it did against that proposal.

As you might expect, those favoring the Griffin-Landrum proposal were mostly businessmen, executives, and professional people. Most of the mail opposing this proposal originated from labor union officials and men and women who are working people. Most of the letters asking for the Griffin-Landrum bill did not cite the need for a "strong labor-management bill"—rather they mentioned only a strong labor bill.

Almost every letter which was directed to me asking for strict Federal control over the affairs of unions, used James Hoffa and the charges against teamsters as the basis for the urgent need for legislation.

On Friday, August 7, I wired James R. Hoffa and asked him to resign his union offices. I sincerely feel that the enemies of labor unions are using him as an excuse to panic Congress into passing an antiunion measure. I am sorry that Hoffa did not accept my suggestion to quit and perform a real service for the labor movement whose interest he professes to want to advance.

A TRUE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM PROPOSAL

Previously, I introduced a labor-management bill, H.R. 8540, which I am sure would have accomplished the avowed purpose of getting rid of crooks and racketeers, but not destroying the legitimate, free, democratic trade unions.

Everyone knows my background as a local union officer and as an international representative for the Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers. I have negotiated labor contracts with huge companies such as the Minnesota Mining and with small companies such as the Sweney Paint Co.

I believe I know what is involved in labor-management negotiations better than most any Member of Congress. I also believe that my experience qualifies me to determine what type of legislation will correct abuses and what provisions will actually be damaging to unions and business and might do serious harm to the functioning of a free, economic society.

THE GRIFFIN-LANDRUM BILL

Let me cite just a few examples of why I could not support the Griffin-Landrum bill.

1. It will discourage, if not stop altogether, responsible people from running for union office. Because of wording in the law, a local union officer can easily be booby-trapped into court action while conducting his union's legitimate business. He must then bear all legal defense costs himself, lose wages for the time he is in court and must wait until acquittal before his union can even offer to reimburse him. Many small locals could never afford to pay his costs in any event.

2. By giving State courts jurisdiction in a labor dispute involving small business, the Griffin-Landrum bill can lead to real trouble. For example, a St. Paul building contractor, who cannot qualify as being in interstate commerce under NLRB rules, may well find that if he wants to do business in Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, or the Dakotas he will

have to check all the State laws, and municipal and county ordinances that may affect relations with his employees. Should he run into legal trouble he might find himself as defendant before a justice of the peace or a municipal judge completely unfamiliar with any phase of labor law. The bill I supported provides specifically that the National Labor Relations Board must handle cases of this type, thereby giving a clear understanding to business and labor as to the laws under which they must operate.

3. This bill imposes undue expense on the small union in its harsh reporting requirements. Only by having the Secretary of Labor review some 40,000 cases can any of them be granted exemption. In my opinion, a proper provision would authorize the Secretary of Labor to demand a report only if he has been informed of abuses or improper procedures.

4. The Griffin-Landrum bill has completely inadequate reporting provisions for employers, thus failing to get at the Sheffer-man-type middleman. Any true reform bill should include safeguards against such foul operations.

5. The Griffin-Landrum bill has a bonding provision which eliminates all but five bonding companies, both within and outside the United States. (These companies are those who bond Federal employees.) If for some reason the five companies should refuse to bond a union officer or employee he could not hold office. It seems to me all legitimate bonding companies should be, eligible. It appears that special interests have been introduced into this bill.

6. The Griffin-Landrum bill outlaws all hot cargo contracts, even those which have nothing to do with teamsters. This will greatly encourage the unscrupulous employer who is making products under sweatshop conditions. In effect, it will make a union man handle products which are being made under conditions that undermine his economic standards, and foster business-wrecking, cutthroat competition. In some cases it could force a worker to go through legitimate picket lines.

7. The Griffin-Landrum bill outlaws all organizational and recognition picketing by an uncertified union under conditions which give no recognition to the many cases where organizational picketing is a vital necessity in a union's legitimate organizing efforts.

In provisions such as this, one can readily see why the southern Congressmen were so eager to join with the Republicans to pass this bill. The South has been looking for means to stop union organization, so that they can continue to lure northern industry to a land of cheap labor. The southerners are not mainly interested in labor reform; they are interested in cheap labor, and the Griffin-Landrum bill will be one more assurance, along with their right-to-work laws, segregation laws, and poll taxes to keeping it that way.

8. The Griffin-Landrum bill makes no provision for voting by economic strikers. Failure to cover this, again points out that eliminating the cause of abuses was not uppermost in the minds of those who want the Griffin-Landrum bill.

9. The Griffin-Landrum bill does not give the Secretary of Labor or the Attorney General the right to bring action against union officers who discriminate because of race, creed or color. Why? Republicans and southern Congressmen joined to defeat such an amendment. Does this indicate they really want to protect the rights of the poor worker?

In addition to these points, I believe that passage of the Griffin-Landrum bill as it now stands will result in legal harassment that will break many unions because of the costs of litigation. You might call the bill a "full-employment" measure for lawyers and a complete confusion bill for small business.

I hope the conference committee will correct the unworkable and unjust provisions of the bills passed by the Senate and the House. If they do not, and these provisions become the law of the land, I predict that the public will be clamoring for repeal within 2 years.

Schenectady Little Leaguers Headed for 1959 World Series

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, the other day I had occasion to invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Schenectady Little League baseball team had won the New York State championship for 1959 and was headed for the regional playoffs. Since that time I am happy to announce to the Members of the House that the Schenectady team has not only won the regional palyoffs, but is now slated for the 1959 Little League World Series to be held in Williamsport, Pa., on Thursday, August 27. This is the third time that a Schenectady Little League team has played in a world series, and this fact alone is a credit both to the boys themselves, and to their parents, their coaches, and their trainers.

Because of the fine work which the Little League baseball team organization does in fostering principles of good sportsmanship, I am happy to bring this latest development to the attention of the Members of the House and, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Schenectady Gazette of Monday, August 24, describing the game in which the Schenectady team won the right to appear in the 1959 world series. Also included is an article from the same paper discussing the background of this award:

SCHENECTADY LITTLE LEAGUERS IN SERIES AGAIN—PLAY CANADA TUESDAY AT WILLIAMSPORT

(By Harry Shave)

WILLIAMSPORT.—Schenectady's Little Leaguers, who presented their hometown with its third Little League world series contender for its sesquicentennial birthday celebration Saturday, arrived here at the birthplace of Little League yesterday. Saturday at Staten Island, Schenectady defeated Bridgeport, Conn., 6–2 for the right to represent the eastern region in this international affair which starts tomorrow.

While Billy Neidel, Schenectady hurler, was scarttering four of six Bridgeport hits, the bespectacled righthander had plenty of help from his teammates' bats. The big blasts from Schenectady's "quiet ones" came from Tommy Dinola, who hit a solo homer in the first inning and Dbugie Wilkins, who drove in two runs with another homer in the fifth inning.

Neidel meanwhile, found Bridgeport his pie for most of the way. He went the full distance, fanning nine batters in the process. In gaining his sixth tourney victory, Neidel was in trouble only when two outs away from the ticket to Williamsport.

In the sixth, when Bridgeport got its two runs and spoiled Neidel's bid for another shutout, the opposition got a double and a home run off Neidel. With one out in the sixth via the strikeout route, Ron Conte doubled to left center and power-hitter Lou Cedrone parked one in the centerfield stands among the TV-decreased crowd of over 7,500 for the two runs.

Little Ken Stewart worked Neidel to a shaky 3–2 count but the Dorp righty got him out swinging for the second out in the sixth inning. The game was a closed book after Neidel promptly fanned Johnny Donoghue for the final out.

This win gave Schenectady an 11–0 tournament mark, the most number of games any team coming here can boast.

After Tommy Woods grounded out and Stan Stringham flied to left to lead off Schenectady's first inning, Dinola cleared the stands in right field to give Neidel a one-run cushion.

Shenectady, showing its keen infield defensive ability, checked Bridgeport in its half of the first. Stringham got the important third out with two men on when he made a fine play at second base on Stewart's grounder.

Schenectady got two more runs in the second for a 3–0 advantage. Starter Donoghue, looking for his fourth tourney win, lost control in the second, hitting both Bob Romph and Billy Jahnel. But the big damage was done when Neidel dribbled one to short and on the attempted putout at third, the ball wound up touching the railing on the dugout, under a Little League rule, both runners were given two bases, thus Romph and Jahnel scored.

One of the gems in the Schenectady infield shone again in the Bridgeport second. With one man on and two outs, first baseman Mike McGarry missed the tag on the runner going down to second on Cavaaliere's grounder. Cooly, and with no effort, he beat the runner to first to retire the side.

Schenectady left two men on in the third but also chased Donoghue in favor of plucky Frank Deltoro. The little Bridgeport redhead got himself out of a one-out, two-on situation in the fourth.

However, Schenectady tagged him for three more runs in the fifth. That was when Wilkins homered over the centerfield fence after Dinola singled and McGarry reached first on an error. Deltoro was promptly relieved by Pete Halecka. Both Chet Godlewski and Jahnel got hold of Halecka pitches but fine infield play by Bridgeport prevented any damage as Schenectady again left two stranded.

In the consolation game at Staten Island Saturday, Chester, Pa., broke a scoreless game wide open in the fifth with a nine-run outburst to whip Barre, Vt., 9–0.

After being outfitted Monday in their new World Series suits, Schenectady opens the finals with a 2 o'clock engagement with Quebec, Canada, Tuesday. This game will be the first ever played at the new Williamsport Little League series site.

The second game on opening day pits Latin America against Hamtramck, Mich. Wednesday's lineup will see California going against Alabama in the first game and Oahu, Hawaii, meeting the European champions. Semifinals are set for Thursday, the consolation on Friday and the game for all the marbles is slated at 3 o'clock Saturday afternoon.

Schenectady-Bridgeport box score:

Schenectady	AB	R	H	Bridgeport	AB	R	H
Wood, ss	4	0	0	S'va'gi, rf	3	0	0
Stringham, 2b	3	0	0	Ahern, ss	3	0	1
DiNola, cf	3	2	3	C'dron, 1b	3	1	2
McGarry, 1b	4	1	0	Conte, lf	3	1	1
Wilkins, 3b	3	1	1	Stewart, c	3	0	0
Romph, lf	1	0	0	Donohue, p, 3b	3	0	0
Godlewski, rf	3	1	0	Atkinson, 3b, cf	2	0	0
Jahnel, c	2	1	1	C'viere., 2b	2	0	2
Neidel, p	2	0	0	Deltoro, cf, p	1	0	0
Bennett, lf	0	0	0	Halica, p	1	0	0
Totals	25	6	5	Totals	24	2	6

Schenectady ---------- 120 030—6
Bridgeport ---------- 000 002—2

RBI—DiNola, Wilkins (3). E—Schenectady 1, Bridgeport 3. 2B—Conte, DiNola. HR—DiNola, Wilkins. DP—Cedrone (unassisted). BB—Off Donahue 1, Deltoro 3, Halica 1. SO—By Neidel 9, Donohue 1, Deltoro 2. Hits and Runs—Off Donohue 1 and 3 in 2; Deltoro 3 and 3 in 3; Halica 1 and 0 in 2. HBP—By Donahue (Romph, Jahnel). Winner—Neidel. Loser—Donahue. U—Gramling, Marino, Seesman, Rosen, Poalicelli, Niesi.

DOUBLE HONOR FOR LITTLE LEAGUE KIDS

(By Harry Shave)

Schenectady Little Leaguers not only won a monumental trophy for its eastern regional supremacy; our 14 little gentlemen were presented with an unprecedented honor at the awards banquet Saturday night at Staten Island. The youngsters were given another team trophy by their hosts—the Wagner College trophy for conduct on the campus.

The award is given to the one team of the four regional finalists which cooperates the best, conducts itself best, and shows the best deportment. In making the presentation to Trainer Lindy Buonome and Capt. Stan Stringham, the island hosts stated: "We were not in any way swayed by the fact that you boys won the championship; your conduct is most deserving of this honor. You are one of the finest, if not the finest, Little Leaguers we have ever had here on this campus."

Some kind of proud history is being made by our bunch from Schenectady. On almost eight counts this 1959 team has honors:

No. 1: Schenectady has earned an unprecedented third crack at Little League world series championship.

No. 2: Schenectady is one of eight teams in the first truly international affair—teams from Hawaii, Latin America, and Europe giving it the international aspect.

No. 3: Schenectady was the first team in regional history to receive both the championship trophy and the trophy for good conduct.

No. 4: To Schenectady goes the honor of being one of the two teams to initiate the new Little League ballpark here.

No. 5: Schenectady is the first team in Little League history to have two brothers, years apart, in world series play. Chuckie Neidel, first baseman with the pennant-winning champs of 1954, and Billy Neidel, present team's ace pitcher.

No. 6: Schenectady has a manager, Mike Maietta, setting a record. He's the first manager to get three teams this far in Little League history.

No. 7: Schenectady goes into its opening game with 11 straight tournament wins—a feat no team here can boast.

No. 8: It's ironic that a Schenectady team has made it here during the year its hometown is celebrating its 150th birthday.

(A fitting birthday present from 14 youngsters.)

Schenectady passed up an airplane trip here by vote of its boys. A 9-hour ride on a $43,000 bus brought us here during a hanging drizzle, skies in Pennsylvania are threatening here today (Sunday). Little League head shrinkers on the national level spend a lot of time studying the strain on little league boys in tourney play. The kids are having a ball—it's the adults who are suffering. Watching tourney games at this level is like having the first half of a telephone number daily double going at Saratoga and sweating out the second half.

Fran Maietta takes on added duties as we progress along this trail. She laundered and pressed our pretty well-beaten and meager clothing allotment, soothes the weary elders with an amazing amount of good humor, makes the hotel reservations, and comes up with some sterling off-hour activities, regulated to quiet seared nerves of the adults.

Little League Commissioner Bill Fitzgerald, first little league fan to lose his voice. It's down to a whisper now after shouting on our kids in the regional. Many of the adults here agree with us that our kids don't exactly fathom just what a tremendous job they have accomplished. To the kids, it seems, all this is just a matter of playing baseball and knocking off a bunch of other kids on the ball diamond.

Dougie Wilkins had struck out twice, in the first and third innings, before he walloped his three-run homer against Bridgeport. It wasn't until he saw his late-arriving parents that he clobbered the ball. His parents had just come into the stadium when Doug was awaiting his turn at bat.

Outfielder Jimmy Bennett was erroneously charged with two errors in the semifinal game at Staten Island. Scorers missed a change in the lineup. Former pro basketball players here—Karl Heiner and Dick (Clubby) Bennett watched the games on the island.

Cenci said: "Mike has everything to win the series—pitching, power, hitting, speed, and a strong defense." Cenci said that Schenectady's defense "is so smooth you don't always notice how hard some of the plays being made are."

Suggestions for the Khrushchev Tour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon Daily Journal for August 21, 1959, has published an editorial entitled "Suggestions for the Khrushchev Visit." The Journal, which is circulated in my home city of Portland, Oreg., supports my recommendations for the qualities inherent in America which the Russian dictator should be invited to see and observe for himself.

I am grateful that the editors of the Journal have decided there is some merit in my suggestions. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Oregon Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUGGESTIONS FOR THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER has made a sensible proposal on sights to be shown Nikita Khrushchev when the Russian Premier visits the United States next month. Here's the list of things which the Oregon Senator believes should be included in the Soviet leader's American itinerary:

1. The National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., where skilled medical researchers are seeking the answer to diseases which afflict Russians as well as all other members of the human race.

2. A typical American grammar school anywhere in the land, so he may know for himself that American children are not different from the children of his own vast nation.

3. The Grand Canyon of the Colorado, because no human being can see that spectacle without feeling awe at the handiwork of Him who created Russians and Americans and all other peoples.

4. A religious service at some small rural church in the American hinterland, so he may at least experience the spiritual atmosphere which moves the people of the United States.

5. A town meeting in which all the citizens of an American community are equal participants in the local government.

As NEUBERGER suggests, these things might move the powerful visitor from Moscow a whole lot more than the sight of belching factories, roaring missiles, and mighty machines.

"Let us show him the gentler, more compassionate and more human side of America," said NEUBERGER in presenting his proposal to the Senate.

It would, indeed, be too bad if the Russian leader's tour included only those things which emphasize the materialistic side of our free society with nothing to indicate the sincere desire of our people for a better life for all the world.

A Negro Mob Versus Two Policemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 16, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include an editorial from the Delta Democrat Times, Greenville, Miss., which speaks for itself and merits the attention of all thinking citizens:

A NEGRO MOB VERSUS TWO POLICEMEN

A mob is a mob, whether its members are white or black and whether it erupts in Mississippi or Missouri or anywhere else.

That ought to be plain to all. But we doubt seriously that the NAACP will denounce the St. Louis Negro mob of 1,000 whose near-victims were not law violators but law officers.

Nor has the NAACP given any protest about similar incidents in New York City, Minneapolis, Boston, and even Memphis. And it is this onesidedness of that organization's concern for justice, its silent toleration of the Negro's record of violence in the cities of the North which make its activities suspect even among the most moderate southerners.

The two white detectives whose lives were saved from the mob only by the arrival of police reinforcements and trained dogs were pursuing a Negro thief in a Negro section. The attack came after they fired at the fleeing man, who escaped. Surely this would be worthy of NAACP attack even if it were the first such incident, which it is not. But don't hold your breath until it happens.

Nixon Leads Presidential Poll in New Hampshire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, every 4 years, national attention is focused upon the State of New Hampshire, which is the first to hold its presidential preference primaries.

At the present time, much is being heard about polls. To those of us who wish to see Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON nominated and elected President of the United States, it is most gratifying to learn that a poll of New Hampshire, taken recently by Opinion Research Corp., of Princeton, N.J., shows Mr. NIXON a 74 percent favorite in our State for the Republican nomination.

An article in the Boston Sunday Herald of August 23 gives the details of this poll. On behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLL PUTS KENNEDY OVER ROCKEFELLER—NEW HAMPSHIRE REPUBLICANS MAKE NIXON TOP CHOICE NOW

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is the overwhelming choice of New Hampshire Republicans for the presidential nomination, with Nelson Rockefeller a poor second.

If the presidential election were to be held today, New Hampshire would go for Nixon over Kennedy, but for Kennedy if Rockefeller were the Republican candidate. Either Republican could defeat Stevenson.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY CAMPAIGN COULD CHANGE RESULTS

These are the outstanding findings of a sample survey of New Hampshire voters just completed by Opinion Research Corp. of Princeton, N.J. A total of 584 voters from 59 areas throughout the State was questioned, to provide a selection representative of the State's entire population.

The researchers warned that their survey, made from July 26 through August 5, does not take into account the effects of campaigning between now and the 1960 elections. In particular, they point out that a candidate who knows he is running second probably will devote more effort than one who is well ahead.

A surprising finding of the survey was that only a few of the Granite State voters said they preferred NIXON because he had done a good job with the Russians. His experience was by far the major factor. Asked their reasons for a preference for the Vice President, 36 percent of the Republicans interviewed and 36 percent of the Independents answered, "Because he is experienced." Only 4 percent of the Republicans and 16 percent of the Independents cited his "good job with the Russians," despite the fact that he was on his Russian tour at the time the survey was made.

SEVENTY-FOUR PERCENT FOR VICE PRESIDENT NOW

The survey showed that if a Republican presidential preference primary were held today with Nixon, Rockefeller, Lodge, Stassen, Case, and Goldwater the names on the ballot, the Vice President would receive 74 percent of the votes.

Rockefeller would be second with 11 percent, and Lodge third with 9 percent.

In a showdown between NIXON and Rockefeller, 80 percent of the Republicans selected for the survey chose NIXON, 15 percent Rockefeller, and 5 percent could not make a choice.

HOW DO REPUBLICANS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE RATE ROCKEFELLER AND NIXON AS PERSONALITIES?

One of the factors influencing voter preference among candidates is their rating of the man as an individual, in addition to his capabilities as on officeholder.

On this score, Republicans in New Hampshire rate NIXON and Rockefeller about equally well, 54 percent giving NIXON a very favorable rating and 50 percent giving Rockefeller a very favorable rating.

Thus, the edge that NIXON has over Rockefeller, at present, among Republicans is due to the influence of factors other than those relating to personality.

The question: "Here is a list of men who have been mentioned as possible presidential candidates for the Republican Party in 1960. Which one would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate for President in 1960?"

The vote of Republicans

	Republicans	Those who said they voted in the 1958 Republican primary
	Percent	*Percent*
Nixon	74	70
Rockefeller	11	11
Lodge	9	10
Stassen	3	4
Could not say	2	2

The question: "And who would be your second choice?"

The vote of Republicans

	Republicans	Those who said they voted in the 1958 Republican primary
	Percent	*Percent*
Rockefeller	28	26
Lodge	28	28
Nixon	14	15
Stassen	11	9
Case	1	1
Goldwater	1	3
None of these	11	12
Could not say	6	6
Total	100	100

The question: "Here's an interesting experiment (hand respondent scalometer). You notice that the 10 boxes on this card go from the highest position of plus 5—or something you like very much—all the way down to the lowest position of minus 5—or something you dislike very much. Please tell me how far up the scale or how far down the scale you would rate?"

All voters[1]

[In percent]

	Nixon	Rockefeller	Harter	Kennedy	Stevenson
Very favorable	46	41	42	48	16
Favorable	24	25	31	26	26
Neutral	21	21	17	18	32
Unfavorable	2	4	1	2	8
Very unfavorable	3	4	1	3	15
Do not know him	4	4	8	3	3
Total	100	100	100	100	100

[1] Voted in 1956 plus a proportion (34) of those too young to vote in 1956 but now old enough. The proportion of new voters used is based on postelection studies of voting participation in elections of the last decade.

Independents asked to choose from among the six Republicans the man they would most like to see the GOP nominee were for NIXON—54 percent. Lodge was second, named by 16 percent of the Independents, and Rockefeller third with 13 percent.

In a showdown choice between NIXON and Rockefeller, 62 percent of the Independents preferred the Vice President, 23 percent the New York Governor, and 15 percent could make no choice.

Thirty-nine percent of the voters who were questioned were Republicans, 28 percent Democrats, 31 percent Independents and 2 percent alined in none of the three groups. Fifty-two percent were women; 48 percent men.

In religion, 53 percent were Protestant and 44 percent Catholic. Thirteen percent were in the 21-29 age group, 45 percent 30-49, and 42 percent 50 or older. By occupation of chief wage earners, the percentages were: Professional and business 20; white collar 10; manual 50; farmer 3; nonlabor force 16; undesignated 1. All were civilians.

The question: "Here is a list of men who have been mentioned as possible presidential candidates for the Republican party in 1960. Which one would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate in 1960?"

The vote of Independents

	Percent
Nixon	54
Lodge	16
Rockefeller	13
Stassen	6
Case	1
Goldwater	1
None of these	4
Couldn't say	5
Total	100

The Question: "And who would be your second choice?"

The vote of Independents

	Percent
Lodge	24
Rockefeller	17
Nixon	14
Stassen	10
Goldwater	4
Case	2
None	13
Couldn't say	16
Total	100

WHO RUNS STRONGER AGAINST KENNEDY IN A TRIAL HEAT FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—NIXON OR ROCKEFELLER?

At this time, NIXON is a stronger candidate against KENNEDY than is Rockefeller.

In a "trial heat" of KENNEDY versus NIXON, NIXON got the vote of 56 percent of the total voting population sampled. In contrast, Rockefeller received 39 percent of the vote in "trial heat" between him and KENNEDY.

Excluding the "Undecided" and "Other" vote the comparative strength of NIXON and of Rockefeller against KENNEDY is as follows:

	Percent
Rockefeller	42
Kennedy	58
Total	100
Nixon	58
Kennedy	42
Total	100

WHOM DO VOTERS BELIEVE CAN BEST HANDLE MAJOR PROBLEMS FACING THE NATION TODAY—NIXON OR ROCKEFELLER?

The following table shows the proportion of all voters who said that NIXON, or Rockefeller, would do the most effective job of handling each problem:

	NIXON	Rockefeller
	Percent	*Percent*
Dealing with Russia's leaders	75	13
Keeping the United States out of world war III	57	10
Dealing with the threat of inflation and increases in the cost of living	44	28
Keeping the country prosperous	41	26
Preventing tax increases	40	18
Racial integration in the schools	40	13

The question: "Which of these two men, NIXON or Rockefeller, if elected President, do you think would do the most effective job of handling these problems?"

All voters

[In percent]

	Nixon	Rockefeller	No difference	No opinion	Total
THE PROBLEM					
Dealing with Russia's leaders	75	13	4	8	100
Dealing with the threat of inflation and increases in the cost of living	44	28	14	14	100
Keeping the country prosperous	41	26	19	14	100
Preventing tax increases	40	18	24	18	100
Keeping the United States out of world war III	57	10	22	11	100
Racial integration in the schools	40	13	24	23	100

WHO RUNS STRONGER AGAINST STEVENSON IN A TRIAL HEAT FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION—NIXON OR ROCKEFELLER?

At this time, NIXON is a stronger candidate against Stevenson than is Rockefeller, although both NIXON and Rockefeller received a majority of the vote in preference to Stevenson.

	Percent
NIXON	74
Stevenson	26
Total	100
Rockefeller	67
Stevenson	33
Total	100

The question: "Suppose the choice for the presidential nomination in the Republican Convention narrows down to RICHARD NIXON and Nelson Rockefeller. Which one would you prefer to have the Republican Convention select?"

The vote of Republicans

	Republicans	Those who said they voted in the 1958 Republican primary
	Percent	*Percent*
NIXON	80	80
Rockefeller	15	16
No opinion	5	4
Total	100	100

The vote of Independents

	Independents Percent
NIXON	62
Rockefeller	23
No opinion	15
Total	100

WHAT ARE THE MOST IMPORTANT REASONS FOR PREFERRING NIXON, OR FOR PREFERRING ROCKEFELLER, AS THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?

The most important reasons for preferring NIXON given by those who named him as their choice for the Republican nomination, both among Republicans and Independents, refer to the experience he has had.

In contrast, those who preferred Rockefeller were more likely to express a general liking for him.

Major reasons given for preferring

	Republicans	Independents
NIXON:	*Percent*	*Percent*
He is experienced	36	36
He has had experience as Vice President	19	16
He is doing a good job as Vice President	13	13
Have heard more about him	10	17
He has done a good job with the Russians	4	16
Rockefeller:		
General preference expressed no specific reason given	28	23
He is capable, can do a good job	17	12
He is doing a good job as Governor	11	9
He is a sound businessman, knows financial problems	6	12

The question: "Suppose the presidential election were being held today. If (name of candidate) were the Democratic candidate and (name of candidate) were the Republican candidate, which would you like to see win?"

If "undecided" respondents were asked: "As of today, would you lean more to (name of candidate), the Democrat, or to (name of candidate), the Republican?"

Voters [1]

	Percent	Percent
Kennedy and lean Kennedy	54	58
Rockefeller and lean Rockefeller	39	42
Other	1	
Undecided	6	
Total	100	100
Kennedy and lean Kennedy	41	42
Nixon and lean Nixon	56	58
Other		
Undecided	3	
Total	100	100
Stevenson and lean Stevenson	30	33
Rockefeller and lean Rockefeller	60	67
Other	2	
Undecided	8	
Total	100	100
Stevenson and lean Stevenson	25	26
Nixon and lean Nixon	72	74
Other	1	
Undecided	2	
Total	100	100

[1] Based on those who say they voted in the 1956 presidential election plus a proportion of those too young to vote in 1956 but now old enough. The proportion of new voters used is based on past election studies of voting participation in elections of the last decade.

Detroit Common Council Supports Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution was adopted by the Detroit Common Council. I wholeheartedly support this resolution:

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas, more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure and we are without any legal limitation on their hours; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the people of Detroit. Unless a national minimum wage standard is established by Federal law, Detroit industries which pay a decent wage scale will suffer unfair economic competition from those in other communities which pay their employees low, substandard wages and are thus able to undersell our industries; and

Whereas there is now before Congress the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488) which would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and include nearly a million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, That we hereby memorialize the Members of the 86th Congress of the United States to enact S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, a bill which would increase the minimum wage and extend protection to nearly 8 million additional workers; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Members of Congress representing Detroit and the U.S. Senators representing Michigan.

Adopted as follows: Yeas: Councilmen Lincoln, Patrick, Rogell, Smith, Van Antwerp, and President Beck, 6. Nays: None.

Hidden Scandal in Vietnam Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we have been hearing a great deal these days about alleged corruption and mismanagement in the mutual security program in Vietnam. I support the Senate investigation of these widely publicized charges. I believe in rooting out any corruption or mismanagement.

But I think the proportion is important, too. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Hidden Scandal in Vietnam Program," which appeared in the August issue of Economic World, published by the Committee for International Economic Growth be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I think this article will help lend perspective to the current controversy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

HIDDEN SCANDAL IN VIETNAM PROGRAM

The most spectacular charges against the mutual security program have a way of coming to light at this particular season of the year—as the Congress moves toward final votes on appropriations to carry on the program.

This year has been no exception. During the last days of July, officials of the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration were on the carpet before a Senate committee—denying sensational charges of waste, incompetence, and scandal in the administration of the program in Vietnam—and explaining that certain mistakes have been made. The hearings may lead to investigations in the field and further reports—perhaps to new charges and countercharges.

In the meantime, here is what happened:

Starting on Monday, July 20, the Scripps-Howard newspapers began a series of six articles by Albert Colegrove which was introduced in the Washington Daily News with the front-page headline "Fiasco in Vietnam: Our Hidden Scandal" and which began with the statement: "The American aid program in little free Vietnam is an outrageous scandal."

The general tone of this and succeeding articles is indicated by Mr. Colegrove's references to "wasted millions"; to "forking over bundles of American cash"; to "reckless, foolish, made-in-Washington policy"; to officials who "looked piously at the ceiling when the money melted away"; to American "bureaucrats who have tucked the damning facts away in secret files" and "desk-bound captains of Government furiously shifting official papers from 'in' basket to 'out'"—and who otherwise reside in "cozy bachelor apartments" or "spacious family villas" when they are not sipping gin and tonic at French-type sidewalk cafes in the "Paris of the Orient."

"The true story of this fiasco," wrote Mr. Colegrove, "has been hidden from the American public, which is paying for it."

THE SENATE INVESTIGATES

Senator MANSFIELD promptly called for special hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

The U.S. Ambassador, the mission chief and the head of the Military Aid Advisory Group to Vietnam flew in from Saigon to testify.

Hearings began on July 30. The more specific charges made by Mr. Colegrove and the replies by U.S. officials are summarized below:

1. That the United States contributed $71 million toward the care and resettlement of 600,000 refugees who fled from Communist North Vietnam after the country was split by the Geneva truce, and that 3 years later $22 million of this money was still unaccounted for, including $8 million alleged to have been burned in a fire in 1955.

Answer: Nearly a million refugees from the north have been resettled and integrated into the Vietnam economy. With 5,000 to 10,000 refugees arriving daily, the United States, French, and Vietnam Government—plus American private agencies—pooled funds and resources to distribute relief before an accounting system could be developed. Some $10 million of these funds cannot now be accounted for. The $8 million cash reported to have been burned was not money but receipts lost in a fire started by a battle between Communist and government forces.

2. That 14 radio towers costing $28,500 were bought over 3 years ago by the United States and "have never been seen."

Answer: In 1956 the United States bought 10 radio towers for Radio Vietnam at a cost of $11,000. They are all installed and in operation. Late in 1958, the United States financed an additional 14 towers which arrived in Vietnam in May and are now in a warehouse in Saigon. Sites are being prepared for eight of them, three others are in the process of negotiation, and three more remain to be selected.

3. That the former Director of Radio Vietnam "burned his books in the alley" before he was apprehended for filching $446,000 in U.S. funds which are still unaccounted for.

Answer: The former Director of Radio Vietnam overspent his budget, requested $446,000 in additional funds from the Government of Vietnam, and was dismissed for incompetence. No funds are missing.

4. That the next Director of Radio Vietnam insisted on air-conditioning the Saigon studios, ordered $27,000 worth of equipment, and paid a contractor in advance for alterations—upon which the contractor "skipped the country."

Answer: There have been delays in preparing the studios for installation of air-conditioning equipment. The government of Vietnam dismissed one contractor and hired another to finish the job which is now expected to be completed in a few months, at which time the equipment will be installed.

5. That Radio Vietnam has three different teletype reporting devices, none of which is used.

Answer: This is true—the result of a "series of mistakes in judgment" by U.S. personnel.

6. That we are "buying jeeps, tanks, guns, tractors, even whole radio networks for an infant farm-economy" with "only 300 trained technicians by its own Government's count."

Answer: The U.S. aid mission has provided technical training for 38,000 Vietnamese and the Military Assistance Advisory Group has trained 33,000 in the military organizations. One of several Vietnam technical societies has over 300 members.

7. That American officials draw $400 to $800 a year in addition to salaries to offset the "fictitious high cost of living in Saigon."

Answer: U.S. military personnel stationed in Saigon receive a 10 percent "cost of living" allowance. This allowance for civilian personnel was discontinued in October, 1957.

8. That "these same officials get up to $319 a month in so-called hardship pay" when "the average Government worker enjoys more luxurious living and fewer tensions than 90 percent of his tax-paying fellow citizens will ever achieve."

Answer: By act of Congress civilian personnel serving in Vietnam receive an additional 20 percent in salary because it is considered a hardship post. Living quarters are provided by the Government in accordance with the law. All Americans living in Saigon have household servants. The United States pays less in rent for its officials than any of six Western embassies surveyed recently. In the first 6 months of this year, 1561 out of the 2400 civilian Americans suffered from dysentery, hepatitis, and other illnesses—counting only those who received treatment at the U.S. dispensary. On July 8, 1958 two Americans on an official mission were killed by a bomb thrown by a Communist.

9. That Americans do almost all their food shopping at the "fantastic horn of plenty"—the U.S. commissary—to the annoyance of local merchants.

Answer: A survey in February 1959 showed that Americans were buying 75 percent of their meat, 83 percent of their fruit, and 70 percent of their vegetables from local merchants.

10. That an American businessman representing "hundreds of U.S. companies" reported the case of a bridge contract awarded to a firm even though the engineering specifications were inadequate; and that a complaint to the aid mission brought a reply which was paraphrased to mean: "Don't bother us; we only hand over the money; how it's spent is no concern of ours."

Answer: The businessman's complaint was investigated. The specifications for the bridge were reviewed by an American bridge engineer who found them adequate. The contract was awarded to the lowest bidder.

POINT OF AGREEMENT

Mr. Colegrove and Government witnesses were in agreement on at least one point—a paragraph in his series of six articles which said:

"True enough, we have accomplished our main mission. We have kept Vietnam from Communist conquest and from economic collapse."

An Organization Liberal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, August 25, 1959, is the first anniversary of the death of the Honorable Charles M. Finley. He died while serving his second term as councilman in the city of Philadelphia. He represented the ninth councilman's district of the city of Philadelphia with great devotion to the people of the district and to the city.

Charlie Finley, as he was affectionately called, was widely known in the city, the State of Pennsylvania, and in the Nation. He was friendly to people in all walks of life and was well regarded by members of both political parties and also by independent voters. He was an organization man and represented the 50th ward in the county committee of Philadelphia for a great many years. He had also represented the sixth senatorial district in the Democratic State Committee for many years, and was a member of its policy group.

In addition to his splendid organizing ability, which developed a highly successful political organization, and his allegiance to the city, State, and National Democratic organizations, he was also popular with independent voter groups and from time to time agreed with positions which they supported, when he felt that it was for the public benefit.

He was very devoted to the development of La Salle College and lent his efforts to support the enlargement of the college and its prestige.

He was a strong supporter of public libraries—and succeeded in acquiring two new city owned libraries for his district—which rapidly became the most heavily used branch libraries in Philadelphia.

He was greatly interested in the spare time problems of the people of his district and obtained for his constituents three new recreation centers, the substantial improvement of one and the purchase of ground for another.

He was especially zealous in his protection of the property rights of his constituents and intervened on their behalf frequently to preserve residential neighborhoods. He served as chairman of the city council committee on municipal zoning development and zoning with

great distinction. The whole city benefited by his intelligent administration in municipal development and zoning problems.

His death was a great loss to his community, to his friends, relatives and colleagues, and to his wife, to whom he was devoted. He left his mark upon the public as a man who was a politician, in the best sense of the word, a liberal, and an outstanding citizen.

Blockading Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems that history is repeating itself in civil rights. At the beginning of the year the President submits a modest proposal, it is criticized by some partisans as being too weak, the congressional year marches on with little being done and then, when an effort is mobilized near the session's end, the cries go up from the opposition that more time and deliberation must be given to the radical civil rights proposals at hand. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 has been constructive in its application and has fortified our constitutional form of government, our individual liberties, and our national well-being, notwithstanding the dire predictions during the lengthy debates 2 years ago. There can be no cogent reason for further delays in consideration and enactment of meaningful civil rights legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the August 21 New York Times which bespeaks the views of many in the Nation who look to the Congress for action on civil rights, prompt and effective, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOCKADING CIVIL RIGHTS

The time has come—in fact, is well past—for action on civil rights in both the Senate and the House in Washington and for public identification of those who are responsible for inexcusable delays.

Last February President Eisenhower sent to Congress a seven-point program to further the progress already made in securing equal rights for all Americans. The proposals were moderate indeed. They included extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, making obstruction of desegregation court orders a Federal offense, preservation of election records and the right to their inspection by the Attorney General, aid to communities in solving desegregation problems, and a Commission on Equal Job Opportunities under Government Contract.

Six months have now passed and no bill along these lines has yet been cleared for action either in the Senate or the House. Formidable roadblocks, manned by those who are opposed to any further civil rights legislation, are standing in the way.

In the Senate Judiciary Committee its chairman, Democratic Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, and the southern Democrats on the committee are stalling off making a report which a majority of the committee wants. And they are doing so in spite of a plea from their Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights that a civil rights measure be promptly sent to the floor of the Senate and in spite of Senate Democratic Leader LYNDON JOHNSON'S pledge that such a bill will be passed before the present session ends.

The House Judiciary Committee finally approved a diluted version of the President's program a couple of weeks ago—one which left out desegregation aid to communities and the Commission on Equal Job Opportunities which the President had called for. This bill must be cleared by the Rules Committee before it can go to the floor of the House. But Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman of the committee and bitter foe of civil rights, seems to be in the extraordinary position of being able to block any such action, with the backing of southern Democrats and some Republican members of the committee.

This sort of fiddling with basic human rights that are part of the American ideal does no credit to Congress or to those who engage in it or tolerate it. We cannot believe that such conduct is good politics any more than it is good morality.

Land Office of the State of New Mexico

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to challenge an insertion placed in the March 10, 1959, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix by my esteemed colleague and friend, Congressman LEE METCALF, of Montana. Articles which he quotes are not only without basis of fact in many respects but, in my opinion, wholly uncalled for with respect to the land office of the State of New Mexico and the present commissioner of public lands, Murray E. Morgan. I honestly cannot believe that LEE METCALF knew of the untruth and gross injustice of these articles concerning our land office because I know him to be a man of integrity and sincerity.

May I quote from one of the articles:

A few States are doing a conscientious job of managing their lands, but the administration of State lands in New Mexico is among those having the weakest record, and in New Mexico the land is administered by an elected land commissioner who generally is representative of the livestock interests.

Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Morgan, the present commissioner, is a former newspaper editor and publisher. His predecessor was a businessman. In fact, of the 16 land commissioners who took office in New Mexico, I doubt if over 2 were ever associated with livestock interests. I have known Murray Morgan quite well for many, many years and I certainly consider him to be a judicious, conscientious, fair, and honest man. My convictions most certainly are borne out by the overwhelming majorities he has enjoyed in both of his races to the elective post of land commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, I contend strongly and with unequivocal basis in fact that the administration of State lands in New Mexico has been a shining example of efficiency, economy, and honesty. In House Report No. 1778 to accompany H.R. 5992 in the 80th Congress, 2d session, New Mexico was specifically cited as a "good example" of how well the States had proven their ability to administer public lands.

In the report our House committee stated:

The evidence is conclusive that private interests operating under State controls have been eminently more successful in developing our oil resources than under Federal control. The State of New Mexico furnishes a good example. There are 11,500,000 acres of State owned lands in New Mexico, while the Federal Government owns in excess of 34 million acres. At the present time over 6 million acres of State lands, or 52 percent are under lease for oil and gas exploration, while only a little more than 2 million acres of Federal lands, or about 6 percent are under lease for oil and gas exploration.

In the five public land States producing oil and gas, the Federal Government owns approximately 36½ percent of the acreage but produces only about 13 percent of the oil and gas produced in these States. The 1946 total production from these lands was approximately 62 million barrels, while the production from State and privately owned lands in the same States was in excess of 380 million barrels. Thus, it will be seen that in these five "public land" States, where Federal and State owned lands are in direct competition with each other, development has been much faster and production has been much greater under State regulation than under Federal control. The total annual production of oil from the vast federally owned domain in 1946 was less than 12 days' production of the Nation. It must be conceded that the Federal Government has made a pitiful showing with respect to the development of public lands for oil and gas purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in the 83d Congress, Senate Report No. 133, to accompany Senate Joint Resolution 13, refuted the "oil grab" charge of the opposition to State ownership of the tidelands by saying:

For years the charge has been made, and it is still being made, that those who believe that the States themselves are best qualified to own and manage the lands and resources within their State boundaries are somehow participating in an "oil grab" as "stooges" of the oil industry. Nowhere in the long and voluminous record is there a scintilla of evidence even remotely substantiating such a charge.

The record of New Mexico's administration of the public lands entrusted to her keeping by Congress speaks for itself and is a matter of pride for the State and a matter of satisfaction to those beneficiary institutions who benefit from the revenues derived from these lands.

New Mexico administers her 13 million acres of State lands on 2½ percent of the revenue from those lands. The Federal Government administers its lands on 10 percent supplemented by additional appropriations by Congress. Last year New Mexico averaged a return of better

than $2 an acre from her 13 million acres of land, while the Bureau of Land Management averaged less than $1 an acre from the lands it administers. I would like to point out at this time that New Mexico, like other Western States, was prohibited from selecting lands known to be mineral in character, and that this remarkable record of earnings is in spite of this fact.

New Mexico, at the present time, through economical administration and efficiency of operation, has accumulated the sum of over $155 million in its permanent funds for beneficiaries of the State land office. Besides this it has over the years given the beneficiaries over $125 million for current operating budgets and the program has been so carefully handled that none of the permanent funds have ever been lost.

Mr. Speaker, may I also point out that unlike the complicated and seemingly slow procedures in the Federal oil and gas lease field, our New Mexico State Land Office has the reputation of expeditious and uncomplicated administration of such important matters. Our State oil and gas leasing procedures are on a strictly competitive basis on known geological structures and the leasehold interest can be depended upon, once it is established pursuant to land office directive. The same is true with respect to sale of State lands for in New Mexico everyone has an equal chance pursuant to advertising and public auction sale to the highest bidder. Seldom, if ever, would there by any possible cloud on title once the land office has completed the sale or issued a lease.

In short, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the record of performance of our State land office clearly refutes any charges that it is in consort with special groups or that it is operating in an inefficient manner.

Increased Civic Participation in NATO Consultations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I have often stated my belief that Government officials—even Senators—do not possess all the wisdom in the world. Indeed, our very system of responsive and responsible government is based in this assumption. In order to meet successfully the domestic and international problems of today, we must tap the intellects and energies of our individual private citizens.

For these reasons, on the international scene, in addition to supporting increased cooperation among our NATO allies' governments, I have also urged increased intercourse among these countries' private citizens.

Mr. Leo Burson, a Memphis delegate to the Atlantic Congress in London last June, is an excellent example of the value of increased civic participation in our NATO consultations. Mr. Burson was one of several Tennesseans who helped to effect the success of the Congress, and he has made some interesting observations on the meeting since he returned with his family.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article that appeared in the Memphis Hebrew Watchman of June 18. This article should serve to point up the important role that spirited private citizens such as Mr. Burson can play in our continuing quest for a just world peace and understanding between nations.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hebrew Watchman, June 18, 1959]

BURSON RETURNS FROM NATO CONGRESS

Leo R. Burson, a Memphis delegate just back from the NATO Atlantic Congress meeting in London lightened the hearts of Memphis mothers by stating categorically that "There seems little likelihood of major East-West war in the next 10 years." Mr. Burson gave as the basis of his reasons the following world developments:

1. The development of the hydrogen bomb.
2. The death of Stalin.
3. The Hungarian Revolution, which demonstrated the unreliability of the East European satellites.

In summarizing the achievements of the Atlantic Congress, Mr. Burson stated that "Six major principles guided our thinking:

"1. The NATO military alliance has, in its first 10 years, preserved the peace of Europe.

"2. Nevertheless, great changes have taken place in this decade that make essential increased cooperation among Atlantic nations in all fields.

"3. No military alliance can endure unless supported by close political and economic cooperation.

"4. The time is ripe for these nations to build an Atlantic community with responsibilities extending to military, political, economic and scientific fields.

"5. The Atlantic nations are interdependent with the other nations of the free world. All these nations want peace and the preservation of their own conception of life. All have a common interest in the development of economic activity and social improvement throughout the world; all people have a common stake and status in a free world.

"6. The Atlantic community has a duty to help less developed countries to help themselves."

Mr. Burson was a U.S. spokesman on the all-important political policies committees. He was coauthor of the negotiation resolution which was adopted by the full of Congress and 2 days later laid the foundation of Secretary of State Herter's pronouncement to Gromyko that the Western Powers would not continue negotiations under the shadow of any ultimatum issued by Gromyko or Khrushchev. The negotiations resolution as adopted is as follows:

"While the primary need is to maintain and develop the cohesion, military security, and economic capacity of the Atlantic countries, because the worldwide Communist threat seems likely to be no less during the second 10 years of NATO than it was in the first, the Atlantic powers are nevertheless urged to undertake continued negotiations with the governments of the Communist bloc for the settlement of differences while rejecting duress, threats, and any kind of ultimatum."

Mr. Burson was accompanied on the trip by his wife, the former Josephine Wainman, their daughter, Linda, 17, and son, Charles, 15.

Mr. Burson said "I feel much good was accomplished at the Congress and expect to see many future, favorable results from it."

Before attending the Congress, they visited Norway, Sweden, Holland, West Berlin, East Berlin, and France.

Interest Ceiling on Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter which appeared in this morning's New York Times deserves the thoughtful reading of all Members of Congress:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The surprise decision of the House Ways and Means Committee to shelve the President's request for removal of the archaic interest rate ceiling on Government bonds should not be dismissed lightly. It is doubly inflationary and it will cause an increase in the servicing cost of the national debt.

The decision is inflationary because it will force the Treasury to refinance over $100 billion of the national debt in short-term securities over the next year. With growing business prosperity the demand for short-term Government securities on the part of nonfinancial corporations will subside, and the Federal Reserve will be compelled to provide extra reserves, beyond the monetary requirements or real economic growth, to enable commercial banks to absorb an ever-larger amount of short-term Government securities.

In addition, the indefinite duration of the statutory interest-rate ceiling will generate further inflationary expectations, with the corresponding increase in the velocity of circulation of currency, and thus still more potential inflation. As an accompanying result there will be added pressures on the yields of outstanding long-term Government securities and on all interest rates.

The decision of the House Ways and Means Committee, if it is not reversed promptly, will accomplish exactly the opposite of its intention.

ADMINISTERED INFLATION

There will be attempts at exonerating the committee's responsibility for the inflationary consequences of its decision. It will be argued that our new inflation is of administered or cost-push kind and therefore unrelated to the national debt management and beyond the reach of monetary policy.

The argument does not hold water. The administered or cost push theory of prices deals only with one set of forces that act on the price level. It is not a general theory, and even in its partial relevance it has not yet been fully developed and demonstrated.

But even if one assumed that all inflation stemmed from cost push forces and corresponding price administration, national debt management and monetary policy would still be relevant in relation to the price level. We have no public policy to deal directly with wage and price administration.

RESTRAINT ON PRICES

The steel industry is a telling case in point. When cost push forces press on prices, monetary and fiscal policies are the only available price-level restraints to be used as public policy for general welfare. Faced with anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies, the cost push forces in our economy must depend on offsetting increases in the velocity of money or, if velocity is checked too, they are saddled with the responsibility for the resulting unemployment.

By forcing our national debt management and monetary policy systematically to over-expand the supply of money, the House Ways and Means Committee's decision has not only caused the resurgence of a potential demand-pull inflation but has also removed the only existing public policy checks on the cost push forces in our economy.

Congress must find a way to correct the dangerous monetary situation before it adjourns. The political leadership that permitted the hasty House committee decision must be made aware of the fact that general economic literacy is not so low that people will fail to detect the source of the grave consequences that will follow if the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds is not removed now.

CYRIL A. ZEBOT.

WASHINGTON, *August 22, 1959.*

Creation of International Development Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, August 25, 1959, a very timely and interesting editorial entitled "The IDA Makes Headway." I ask unanimous consent that this editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE IDA MAKES HEADWAY

It is highly gratifying that under the leadership of Treasury Secretary Anderson negotiations have progressed rapidly toward creation of an International Development Association to assist underdeveloped countries. The Governors of the World Bank will consider the matter further at their September meeting, and it is possible that a specific plan will be laid before Congress next year regarding American participation.

The proposal for this new international lending agency has grown out of the resolution submitted by Senator MONRONEY in February 1958. The purpose of IDA would be to supplement the established lending activities of the World Bank and of individual member nations with a new international source of loans repayable on longer terms at lower interest rates and, when warranted, in local currencies.

Many of the emergent nations of Asia and Africa have found it impossible to qualify for the hard-currency 6-percent loans of the World Bank. The IDA would not only help to meet their needs, but encourage wider participation in such an assistance program by the other industrial nations which would subscribe capital to the institution. If the project continues to be pushed vigorously, as it should be, the IDA ought to be in business in 2 years.

The Two Faces of Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Khrushchev, the Red dictator, has been invited to visit the United States.

This startling fact should warn the American people to be on guard.

The object of this master conspirator is to confuse the White House, and to lull our people into a sense of false security by creating the illusion that peace is just around the corner.

William Randolph Hearst, Jr., with Bob Considine and Frank Coniff, know the real Khrushchev. For their interviews with him and their reports of the way he operates, they have won the Pulitzer Prize and the Overseas Press Club Award.

As a public service, they have started a series of articles about "K" in the Hearst newspapers.

The chapter headings in the first article are revealing: "Has Vast Knowledge of United States," "Shot Them Without Trial," "He'll Be Jolly Good Fellow," "They Wanted Bigger Game," and "Khrushchev Surprised Them."

To prepare the American people for the worst, I include for reprint in the RECORD the first article in this series, published in the Boston Sunday Advertiser, on August 23, 1959. It is appropriately titled: "The Khrushchev I Know: Coarse, Bold, Adroit, Tough, Ruthless":

THE KHRUSHCHEV I KNOW: COARSE, BOLD, ADROIT, TOUGH, RUTHLESS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., with Bob Considine and Frank Conniff)

A historic, Pulitzer Prize winning interview by the Hearst task force with Nikita Khrushchev gave the world its first clear picture of his emergence as the master of world communism.

Now, with the Soviet Premier scheduled to visit the United States, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., and his reporting colleagues present an authoritative, searching analysis of the man, his politics, personality and problems.

They tell you what to expect during his visit and provide the facts you should have in understanding has actions and his motives during his stay here. This is the first of a series of articles which will continue in Monday's Boston American.

I first met Nikita Sergeivitch Khrushchev at central party headquarters, Moscow, on the bitter morning of February 5, 1955. I last talked with him at the American exhibition in Sokolniki Park a few minutes after his stormy scene with Vice President NIXON near the kitchen of our model house, last month.

Over that 4-year span I encountered him a number of times at diplomatic receptions (which he can make very informal) and spent two very long private interview periods with him, accompanied by members of the Hearst task force. The first of these reports, by Kingsbury Smith, Frank Conniff, and myself, won the Pulitzer Prize. The second, with the present task force, won the Overseas Press Club of America's award for best foreign correspondence.

I cite the above simply as a means of presenting our credentials as reporters who have more than a reference-room knowledge of the important subject involved.

You are going to meet this man Khrushchev whether you want to or not. From the moment he sets foot on our native soil September 15 until his departure, he will be all but impossible to escape or ignore.

His rough, calculating peasant's face will stare frankly at you—as if sizing you up—from your newspaper and your television set. His words, no matter how provoking, ill informed or ill advised, will be faithfully recorded and reported by a small army of newsmen. He'll be talking to you, or at you, from all available platforms, ranging from the podium in the General Assembly of the United Nations all the way to a tree stump in an Iowa cornfield.

It is better to know something of this man. To dismiss him as a braying jackass, given to bouts with the bottle, is in our estimate a dangerous evasion. To quake and quaver at his sweeping boasts that he could annihilate us is equally foolish.

Therefore, this and the articles which follow in the Hearst Newspapers during the coming week constitute an honest effort to describe and perhaps even explain, this simple-looking but in many ways complex world leader. In effect, we're going to try to tell you "what makes Nikki run."

HAS VAST KNOWLEDGE OF UNITED STATES

What follows is a distillation of impressions gained through personal and sometimes rough contact with Khrushchev, talks with such soaring authorities as Sir Winston Churchill, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan, briefings by our Embassy people in Moscow and Warsaw, and our own studies.

Khrushchev likes to recall his youth as a simple swineherd, then as a mine boy. But this self-taught man possesses a statistical knowledge of America's industrial and agricultural strengths and weaknesses that will astonish President Eisenhower.

He filled countless little and often humiliating roles during his slow but sure ascent to his dictatorship, including the role of court jester and wild gopak dancer for such influential patrons as Stalin, Kaganovich, Bulganin, and Mikoyan. But once in control, past favors meant nothing. He banished men who made him.

In his historic down-grading of Stalin before the 20th Party Congress in 1956, Khrushchev cried beratingly, "Even if the disastrous tactics of the opposition made it necessary to purge them, it was scarcely necessary to exterminate tens of thousands of Communists."

This was a reference to the big purge of 1937. Khrushchev helped make it big. On Kaganovitch's recommendation, Stalin sent Khrushchev to Kiev, to clean out dissension in the Ukraine, and gave him the title of general secretary of the party at the Ukrainian capital. His first act was to call a meeting of the top 120 members of the Ukrainian Government. When they had assembled, Khrushchev signaled for NKVD goons to enter the hall. He had arranged a simple ambush.

SHOT THEM WITHOUT TRIAL

As Khrushchev read off the names of his fellow Ukrainians, each man was roughly seized and carried off under arrest, then shot without trial. Khrushchev had bagged all the local leaders except Parnas Lyubtchenko,

an accomplished surgeon who headed the People's Council of Commissars in the Ukraine. Lyubtchenko detected that he was being lured into a trap and sped to his villa, where for 4 hours he and his wife held off NKVD forces under Col. Ivan Serov (destined to head Khrushchev's security police years later when Khrushchev ordered the murder of Lavrenti Beria). Lyubtchenko and his wife, running out of ammunition, blew their brains out with their last two bullets rather than face the type of "justice" Khrushchev was meting out to his countrymen.

But this will not be the face he turns to America. His buoyant manner, robust sense of humor, earthy outlook, mastery of the prophetic proverb and corn of personal charm will make him an intriguing visitor to many who prefer to take him at his face value. He'll talk peace morning, noon and night, and with such warmth that the unwary might come to believe it is an invention of purely Russian character.

HE'LL BE JOLLY GOOD FELLOW

He'll talk of peaceful coexistence, too, and the need of more United States-Soviet trade and cultural exchanges. He'll have many and probably amusing comments to make on American women, labor-saving devices, creature comforts and luxuries—some of them all but reminiscent of Will Rogers. At 65, the one time machinist's apprentice and roistering street fighter will wear out all but the strongest young aids assigned to him by the State Department and his own Embassy.

He'll disappoint many who expect him to act the grim part of Communist boss and dictator of a colossal intrigue against mankind's freedom. There will be times during his visit when you may actually catch yourself saying, "This fellow's not dangerous. He's a regular guy."

He'll also disappoint many who expect or hope that he'll arrive with an olive branch clamped in his teeth and be simply overwhelmed by our cluttered capitalistic life of cars, good housing, appliances, freedom of speech and religion, forests of TV antennas and the like. Unless the man has changed a lot since the last time I saw him, he'll sound off on anything that doesn't suit him. No matter what he is shown he will be prone to remark that they do it better in the Soviet Union. You can say almost anything about N. S. Khrushchev—except that he is predictable.

Khrushchev may look as "square" as his suits. Russian intellectuals laugh at his brogue, which still smacks of an unlettered day when he spoke neither Russian nor Ukrainian but a coarse patois that borrowed from both. He could hold his belly and laugh uproariously when a kindly foreign Ambassador attempted to tell him how to act when he called on Queen Elizabeth II at Buckingham Palace.

But no man of any discernment can doubt that he is one of the ablest and most adroit political figures of this century, or perhaps any other era.

He came to the fore so swiftly, as far as the world at large in concerned, that people still have trouble spelling his name, and not too many wholly comprehend the incredible scope of his personal power. One day he was a blurred face in the second or third row of group pictures featuring Stalin, Molotov, Mikoyan, Bulganin, Zhukov, Malenkov, Kaganovich, Voroshilov. The next day (as history is measured) there he was, front and center—undisputed—his enemies scattered to the four winds of the U.S.S.R.

THEY WANTED BIGGER GAME

I witnessed some of the first rumblings of this volcanic political explosion that aforementioned day in February 1955, when Kingsbury Smith, Frank Conniff, and I trooped into his Moscow office.

Frankly, we were looking for bigger game: Molotov, let's say, and Malenkov. We were in Leningrad and on our way out of the country when we learned that Bulganin had succeeded Malenkov as Premier and would see us at the Kremlin. We rushed back.

Khrushchev was "filler" material while we hunted down the bigger names. Certainly, he had been a secretary of the Central Committee since 1949 and first secretary since September 13, 1953. This was the particular job from which Stalin had ruled despotically over his empire for 30 years.

But we were prepared only to have our ears bent by a torrent of dialectics, be gassed by the foggy gobbledegook the party spokesmen dote upon. We knew his background, his years as a party hack, dutiful stooge, willing accomplice and his slow climb to his present position in the days following Stalin's death.

KHRUSHCHEV SURPRISED THEM

Khrushchev surprised us. Ten minutes after our interview began an assistant quietly entered the room and told him he was wanted on the phone. Khrushchev cut him off as with a sabre. "Nyet," he almost shouted, his little eyes blazing. He would take no calls, and we gathered the impression that that meant calls from any of his apparent superiors.

The questioning stayed on party matters for a time, but Khrushchev grew restless. We started to ask questions in fields in which he had no known knowledge or authority. On a question concerning the foreign policy of the Soviet Union we expected him to say, in effect, "You'd better take that up with Molotov." Or, on trade questions, it would have seemed natural for him to refer us to Mikoyan, or on military matters to Marshal Zhukov.

Not Khrushchev. He had all the answers and spoke them in a big, bold voice that should have warned us—an actually did—that there was much greater power here than met the eye. In truth, we were witnessing the emergence of a man who, in the light of his nuclear arsenal and method of delivering war-heads, wields more unobstructed power than any individual in history.

New York City Looks to Its Housing Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the mayor of New York has designated a distinguished citizen of New York, J. Anthony Panuch, to make a survey of city policy and organization on housing problems. Mr. Panuch, an attorney, brings to the task considerable experience in administration and governmental reorganization. The experience of New York's housing programs have been so valuable in national legislation as to make them a matter of common interest to the whole country.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times editorial of August 21 commenting on this appointment, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY'S HOUSING TOPSY

Mayor Wagner has taken the unusual step of going outside the administration, even to the point of enlisting a Republican, for the direction of a survey of city policy and organization on housing problems. He has chosen for this task J. Anthony Panuch, a New York lawyer experienced in administration and governmental reorganization.

Mr. Panuch is asked to develop and submit to the mayor by February 1 "specific recommendations for a comprehensive city policy and program for housing and urban renewal, including correlation of the city's functions, policies, programs, plans, and operations in the field of publicly aided private housing, slum clearance, tenant relocation and neighborhood conservation." He will propose organizational realinements and legislation if necessary.

Among the city agencies or officials operating in this area now are the city housing authority, the slum clearance committee, the urban renewal board, the department of buildings, the city planning commission, the controller's office, the deputy mayor and his assistant, and the bureau of real estate.

Ordinarily this is an assignment that might have gone to the city administrator, Charles F. Preusse. He would undoubtedly have done a good job on it. However, in our opinion it will be beneficial in this case to get a detached, objective inquiry from the outside, completely free of association with the personalities involved, that will look at the problem of agencies that have, to a degree, grown up like Topsy. More correlation seems to be needed, but the case is as yet unproved for one monumental agency of government that will take over all housing action.

While the mayor spared the city administrator this housing job, he gave him only the day before another task of backbreaking size, determination of the feasibility of surveying the whole network of social and welfare services in the city, both private and public. The assumption is that, after consultation with the many agencies that are interested, a broad survey will develop.

Here is a splendid opportunity not only for elimination of duplication, for more effective approach, but also for improvement and enlargement of service to meet unsatisfied needs, as in the area of our aging population. So we shall have, beginning simultaneously, two studies of large importance to the people of New York, and both in good hands.

A Resolution That De Witt Clinton Be Suitably Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the Members of the House to a resolution I have introduced today that De Witt Clinton, one of our great statesmen, be honored by placing his portrait on a revenue stamp, bond, or similar document.

For decades millions of our citizens have carried the picture of an American statesman in their pockets every day.

Almost daily that picture has traveled everywhere on earth—into private homes, into schools and universities, into factories and offices, into royal mansions and national parliaments, on to athletic fields, and on to this earth's bloodiest battlefields. I would say that it is the world's most traveled face. That picture was a portrait-in-miniature and it appeared on revenue stamps on all cigarette packages that are taxed for revenue. And that small picture was a portrait of De Witt Clinton, a New York statesman and one of the most gifted of the Founding Fathers of our Republic.

It is with a certain degree of sadness, that, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I must look to the withdrawal of that portrait from circulating among our foreign friends. De Witt Clinton's picture will not make these universal tours as the U.S. Internal Revenue stamp, class A 20 of series 125 has been dropped this summer from all cigarette packages. In a peculiar way, it will be a loss to the free world as that great American face, framed in blue, preached in his own silent fashion of the dignity and of the opportunities to be had and cherished under the democratic ways of life.

To the host of people who were interested enough in his identity to investigate and make a simple research of his life, De Witt Clinton's career and deeds provoke admiration for our country that could inspire his memorable achievements for her and his fellow men. For incredible, indeed, was this life based on self-sacrifice, service to others, and idealism. And what a pity it will be to let his memory disappear into that shadowy land of almost complete obscurity.

A hasty epitome of his career discloses only too well the solid worth of De Witt Clinton's contributions to the infant democracy that was the America of his day. As a young boy outside of Newburgh, N.Y., he had to do a man's work on the family farm as his father was away fighting as an officer in the patriots army seeking American independence. With the war over and won, De Witt could pursue his studies in a nearby academy. Later he enrolled at Columbia College and graduated from that institution receiving his diploma from the hands of George Washington, the President of the United States. Thus, he is among the first graduates of the now Columbia University, honor man of his class, and he was the graduation speaker—talking for a half hour in Latin on the values of liberal arts.

De Witt Clinton later studied law and was admitted to the State bar in 1790 at the age of 21. His uncle, George Clinton, was called the father of New York State because he was elected the first Governor and served for six successive terms for a period of 18 years. It was but natural, therefore, that De Witt Clinton should turn to politics and he became his uncle's secretary. Later he was elected to the State legislature, then to the senate of the State. In 1802 he was U.S. Senator representing New York here in our Capitol. Resigning his duties in Washington, he ran for mayor of New York City. He was elected mayor and 11 times he was returned to that post by his people. In 1812 he ran for President of the United States and was defeated by James Madison in a close election. Subsequently, he was elected Governor of New York three times and he died while in that office.

In a letter of introduction to President Jefferson when De Witt first went to Washington as U.S. Senator, his uncle wrote, among other things—

> This is my nephew * * * you will not find him without gifts of mind * * * and in politics, his motives are ever pure.

These may be the clues to De Witt Clinton's popularity with the electorate, his many sided gifts and his purity of intentions in their use. They truly made him an outstanding statesman. As a writer—W. R. Alger—once said:

> True statesmanship in the art of changing a nation from what it is, into what it ought to be.

De Witt Clinton seemed to be ever guided by this principle. As a young legislator in New York he helped to overthrow the system of allowing the Governor to propose all names for office holders, and instituted a general replacement of the defeated party members by the members of the party victorious in the elections. As U.S. Senator Clinton, he introduced the 12th amendment to the Constitution to prevent the recurrence of the tie votes for President as in the case of the 1800 elections. As mayor of New York City he promoted public education, city planning, city fortifications, public sanitation, and relief of the poor. He constantly advocated the removal of political barriers on Roman Catholics, the abolition of Negro slavery, and the softening of the severity of punishment for debtors.

When Governor of New York he never forgot the needs and the potentialities of the city he served so well. Nor did he forget the potential greatness of his native State. In 1815 he presented a memorial to the New York Legislature about the construction of a canal that would join the Hudson River to Lake Erie. This was to be the Erie Canal—an amazing dream and a colossal undertaking for that era. The ordinary canal of that day was 30 miles and the Erie Canal was to be 364 miles long. He foresaw the benefits to the people settled in the Middle West. He foresaw his own State grow with great strides through this canal. Towns and cities would be expanded, new ones would rise and agriculture, commerce and manufacturing would increase and wealth would pour into his State from all directions. And his beloved New York City would grow to unbelievable size and become the metropolis of the Nation.

Two years later the bill authorizing the building of the canal was passed. As canal commissioner and Governor, De Witt Clinton unceasingly pushed this project, notwithstanding the constant bitter and unremitting harassments from political enemies and foes of the canal.

Eight years passed and in 1825 the canal was a reality and Governor Clinton had triumphed. In the next 9 years it paid off the State's entire cost with interest—the amount of $8½ million. It cut freight rates from Buffalo to Albany from $100 a ton to $15 a ton, and travel time from 20 days to 8 days. The land boom along its right-of-way alone justified its existence, and the population of New York City soon tripled itself and more.

De Witt Clinton could have gone to greater national prominence; he could again aspire to the Presidency but for the loyal affection and support he held for a man who had flowered forth on the national scene. He loved and advocated the deepest support for Andrew Jackson for President of the United States. He would never oppose him. Sufficient for him were the daily sacrifices and services he could render his people in New York. And these services were multiform. He was completely interested in the arts and sciences, living out the theories he ennunciated on his graduation day. He was interested in education and followed the system of John Lancaster. He was founder and president of the New York Historical Society, president of the American Philosophy Society, and president of the American Science Association. His was a many-sided genius and an intellectual sea that seemed to touch every shoreline of thought.

His uncle, Gov. George Clinton, once wrote of him that his motive in politics were pure. Nothing so proved the point better than those last days of his life. Although seriously ill in bed, he left that sick bed because as Governor he had a duty to perform for justice sake. A condemned criminal had asked for a review of his case and Governor Clinton felt that justice lay on this poor man's side. As a result of this action, De Witt died suddenly soon afterward and he died in debt, leaving his family in want. He who had done so much for his people through sacrifices, service, and idealism, had left nothing for his own burial, and like his Master, he was buried in another man's tomb. Surely his was pure public service, honest statesmanship; he never commercialized his dignity as a public servant by compromise.

As humanity divides itself today into "lifters and leaners" with so many all too willing to lean on others, it is refreshing to recognize a real lifter, a man always willing to shoulder the burdens of office without flinching, and a man who counts not the cost in serving others. Even American historians have been a little unkind to Mr. Clinton and few of our Americans are cognizant of his true greatness. We can at least thank the kind providence that kept his memory alive by a living picture even though it is small and so often taken for granted on a simple cigarette package. There was none so handsome in all Washington when he was here as U.S. Senator.

May we look forward to the day when that picture will appear on our postage, currency, or our savings bonds. As he now leaves those revenues stamps, let us at least take him into our hearts.

His deeds, his words, his genuis for public good and freedom must inspire us all—and most of all our neighbors living under oppression and in political darkness beyond the seas.

School Construction Legislation Needed To Provide More Classrooms for Expanding Pupil Population

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is satisfying to me to learn of the action yesterday of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Walfare in recommending what the news services have called "a compromise bill proposing a billion-dollar, 2-year program of Federal grants to the States for school construction."

In a statement released Sunday, I expressed the opinion that Congress should not adjourn its present session without passing school construction legislation.

It was emphasized, however, that as a cosponsor of S. 2, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which has jurisdiction over legislation in the field of education, I still believe in the need for a comprehensive measure which would include assistance for upgrading teachers' salaries, but I added:

It is not enough for us to merely say we're for legislation of this type. What is more important is that we bring to passage at least that part of the program which has good prospect of being enacted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point a news account of my statement by the Associated Press to its West Virginia member newspapers and published by a number of them in their editions of August 24, 1959.

There being no objection, the news accounts was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Daily Mail, Aug. 24, 1959]

SENATOR RANDOLPH WANTS FEDERAL SCHOOL AID BILL

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia, has called for immediate action to begin the attack on the long-range problem of the shortage of classroom space.

In an announcement from Washington, RANDOLPH said Sunday that Congress should not adjourn its present session without passing a school construction bill. He said he would reiterate that stand for consideration Monday by a Senate subcommittee.

RANDOLPH is a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. That committee has jurisdiction over legislation in the field of education.

The West Virginia Senator said he supports a comprehensive measure which would include assistance for upgrading teachers' salaries.

"It is not enough for us to merely say we're for legislation of this type," RANDOLPH commented, "What is more important is that we bring to passage at least that part of the program which has good prospect of being enacted."

RANDOLPH said that opposition in Congress and from the Federal administration to parts of the comprehensive Federal assistance for education legislation would block what he called "the necessary program of increasing the number of classrooms for our ever-expanding school pupil census." He continued:

"We are all aware of the importance of the American custom of local responsibility and control of public education. But let us at least be clear in our understanding of the origins and the reasons for this tradition.

"The threat of Federal control is a myth, and the fear of it is spun from fantasy and a misreading of our history.

"The quality of education in the United States is a national issue, rather than a merely local one. And yet it is the only national problem that we have not attempted to solve on a national basis."

Khrushchev's Arrogance and Contempt for American Military Power Made Clear in Context of Invasion of Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, I contributed a few observations pertinent to the impending visit of Premier Khrushchev of Soviet Russia to America, scheduled for September. These may be found on pages 14899–14900 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day.

I stated that this visit of the Soviet dictator should be received with an attitude of passive nonacceptance, so far as any official recognition by Congress is concerned.

One of the basic reasons that I expressed for my position on this vital issue is that Khrushchev's visit will be enveloped in an atomsphere and environment of deceit and insincerity. This is already becoming obvious in the news reports from Laos where communistic aggression is pursuing the same old tactics of force and violence.

It is clearly manifest that Khrushchev has been completely advised of Red China's intent to take over Laos. Almost simultaneously with the President's announcement of Khrushchev's visit, the Laos aggression began.

Khrushchev's participation in these plans of Communist aggression cannot be pinpointed but the pattern is clear because it is only another move toward the same objective; namely, domination of the free world.

Khrushchev is one of the master minds in this conspiracy whose target is world power, calling for the subjugation of all who stand in the way.

Congress, remaining in session during the visit of this despot, and indicating passively its nonacceptance of his brand of merchandise by refusing to fraternize with him will fulfill its responsibility of representation of those in America who challenge the policy of diplomatic appeasement which is gaining ground among our current leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the recent column of Joseph Alsop in the Washington Post of August 25, and the letter to President Eisenhower by one of Maine's responsible citizens, Mr. Herman D. Sahagian, of Waterville, Maine, express in further detail my own sentiments.

FLOWERS FOR THE HOST

(By Joseph Alsop)

Nikita S. Khrushchev has now followed his acceptance of the President's invitation to the White House with an open display of contempt for his future host.

There is no other way to read the new Communist aggression in Laos. The situation there can become very serious, indeed, touching of another Far Eastern crisis of Quemoy-like intensity. If the Communist aggression is not repelled, moreover, all the neighboring countries—South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand—will at once find themselves in danger.

Nonetheless, the indication of Khrushchev's contempt for President Eisenhower and the Nation he leads is probably the most disturbing feature of the very disturbing Laotian trouble. On this point, the facts speak for themselves.

In brief, the President's announcement of the coming Khrushchev visit was made on August 3. Very nearly simultaneously, the attack on Laos began. The attack took the form of border crossings from Communist North Vietnam into Laos by Communist infiltration units trained and armed for the purpose by the North Vietnamese. Such obscure guerrilla movements in those jungle-clad mountains can hardly be precisely dated. Yet the major border crossings quite certainly began after Khrushchev's mid-July acceptance of the President's invitation, even if some occurred before the public announcement.

The timing of this opening of the attack on Laos is inescapably significant. Yet a good many people in this increasingly wishful city, and especially a good many of the people around the President who had pinned their hopes on the Khrushchev visit, are still trying to escape the meaning of this timing of the Lao attack. "It is Peiping's enterprise, not Moscow's," they argue.

On this point, too, however, the facts speak for themselves. The attack on Laos was hardly underway, when Khrushchev received the organizer of the attack, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, Ho Chi Minh, for an extended state visit in Moscow.

While Ho was in Moscow, an obviously planned series of statements was issued. First Ho's government in Hanoi blamed the trouble in Laos on the presence of a 150-man American mission to train the small Laotian Army. Then Mao Tse-tung's government in Peiping virtually threatened war unless the U.S. military bases in Laos were instantaneously abolished. Finally Khrushchev's own government in Moscow spoke out in clear terms, refraining from direct denunciation of the United States, but strongly supporting the North Vietnamese-Chinese Communist position in Laos.

From these facts, it may be possible to argue that the prime impulse for the attack on Laos came from Mao Tse-tung. But whoever was the prime mover, it is certainly not possible to argue that Khrushchev was any-

thing but a knowing, willing accomplice in the Lao enterprise. The Ho visit to Moscow and the subsequent Moscow statement are the clearest proofs of Khrushchev's active complicity.

Khrushchev's purposes can be variously interpreted. The Communist interpretation was given by a high official who told this reporter, "It's the old tactic of the carrot and the stick." (When asked what was the carrot, he replied, "Why the Khrushchev visit"—which seems an unattractive sort of carrot.)

Khrushchev's aim perhaps is to extract from the President in the White House new terms for Asia as well as new terms for Berlin. In this, it must be added, Khrushchev is likely to have the indirect help of the British and Canadian Governments. Both are not merely summit-drunken but fixed in their idea as well that everything in Asia will be rapidly fixed up if we are just a little nice to Mao Tse-tung.

In any case the contrast between this time and last time is horrifyingly strong. Last time Khrushchev talked with the President of the United States, in 1954, he paid for his ticket of admission with the liberation of Austria and the dramatic though temporary restoration of normal relations with Yugoslavia. This time, crude threats to Berlin paid for the ticket; and as soon as the ticket was in Khrushchev's pocket, Laos was attacked.

No one who is not absolutely flannel-headed can see in this pattern anything but a display of the most profound, unalloyed and arrogant contempt. Whatever its sources, Khrushchev's contempt is a desperately serious political phenomenon. The sources need urgent investigation. But no search for sources is afoot, no doubt because careful search would reveal a distinguished soap manufacturer pouring out soft soap, which is still constricting the American defense efforts 2 years after the sputnik, under stringent orders from budget-obsessed higher authority.

HERMAN D. SAHAGIAN,
Belgrade Lakes, Maine, August 18, 1959.

President DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am one of that vast body of American citizens appalled and ashamed by the thought that soon we of this great and free country will be called upon to act as host to a man, the dictator of the Soviet Union, Khrushchev, who instead of preparing to visit the Nation he someday hopes to bury, and whose children he foresees someday growing up under communism, ought rather to be standing before an international bar of justice answering for his crimes against humanity.

As an American of Armenian ancestry, as an American then whose parental nation today writhes in the agonizing grip of Soviet Russian communism, of which our guest Khrushchev is today the leading champion and exponent, I am unable to explain either to myself, or to my interested friends, how it has come about that last week we were asked by Presidential proclamation to observe Captive Nations Week, and that this week we are being asked to be civil to the captor himself.

The invitation tendered to the Communist leader merely underscores the obvious cynicism of the great American gesture in favor of those submerged nations [which] look to the United States, as the fortress of freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence. * * * You cannot serve, sir, the great cause of freedom in one breath and genuflect before the tyrant with the next.

I can well imagine the utter terror, yes, the utter terror, that struck the heart of the people of the enslaved nations, of Armenia, of Poland, of Lithuania, of the Ukraine, of the other captive states, when they were told that their oppressor, Khrushchev, had been invited to visit the United States—the same United States—which they had heard over their clandestine radio waves, had just the past fortnight bowed its head in prayer for them, and had vowed to work for their liberation and independence; for Khrushchev's visit, to the 19 enslaved nations of the U.S.S.R., takes from the heart of the people another one of those threads of hope that have sustained them through the dark ages of Russian Communist domination and exploitation.

Khrushchev's visit to the United States of course will constitute a major cold-war victory for the Soviet Union since it will impart a cloak of respectability on the dictator of communism and also on the system and government he represents.

The visit will accord communism, the Soviet Union, and the Communist dictator billions of dollars of free publicity which otherwise could not be purchased. Our newspapers will be full of Khrushchev; every move, every gesture, every word, every whisper, will be recorded. And our guest will bluster around, kissing babes, like every American politician—running a campaign to elect communism in this country. God help us.

Some of us, sir, remember well the thought you expressed in your press conference several weeks back in which you said that you felt you shouldn't meet Khrushchev unless some encouraging progress was made at the foreign ministerial meeting at Geneva. What ever happened to Geneva, Mr. President?

The man we will press to our bosom, sir, is known by our Ukrainian colleagues as "Hangman of the Ukraine." I have been wondering if Americans find it a virtue to invite criminals and hangmen into their homes, that our National Government has invited Khrushchev to partake of our hospitality as a deserving guest?

For instance, I wonder exactly what would have happened if, sometime before World War II, the U.S. Government had announced that Adolph Hitler, the hangman of Buchenwald and Dachau, had been asked to visit us here in these United States as our guest. Hitler and Khrushchev are coequals, sir, for both are guilty of the direct crime of all—national genocide.

As specifically, I find it difficult to believe that a professional atheist, the anti-God himself, will be our guest, and that I am being asked to retain my composure as I observe this man, who, for instance, helped divest the great Church of Armenia of its dignity, piously course through the blessed cities of our Nation. "Religion," said his god, Lenin, "is the opiate of the people."

Has not the U.S. Government a brief on this man, this criminal, this Khrushchev, that it honors him?

Does not the Government know that Khrushchev played a leading role in the Red famine engineered by the Kremlin in the Ukraine to annihilate more than 4,500,000 patriotic Ukrainian peasants? That Khrushchev later directed the genocide of 10,000 additional Ukrainians at Vinnitsa, in order to suppress these freedom-loving people? That, though a Russian, he conducted the great purges in the Ukraine? That he was sent by Stalin after the last war to put down succeeding patriotic demonstrations in the Ukraine—a job which he did with a ruthlessness seldom paralleled in history? That he suppressed patriotic uprisings in Georgia, Poland, Armenia, and Hungary in 1956; sent the armies of his lackey China into Tibet, acted against the Ukrainian free underground in the Carpathia, and just recently, personally ordered massive units of the Red Army to enter Sovietized Armenia to suppress firmly tendencies to oppose governmental policies there—a movement incidentally initiated, on Soviet admission, by disgruntled former Americans who were duped by Communist propaganda into taking up residence in the U.S.S.R.

We have been told that Khrushchev has been invited here so that he might see for himself the full might and invincible spirit of America, and thus to restrain his "impetuousness" and thus ensure the peace.

Khrushchev knows and appreciates after his own fashion the greatness of America—and it is this greatness that constitutes America in Khrushchev's eyes the chief obstacles to the Communist dream of world revolution and world domination. There isn't a thing that Khrushchev will see or hear in this country that he or his intelligence has not already seen or heard. He comes here not to be impressed, but to impress.

I have read with a good deal of interest your personal admonition that America should not demonstrate in the presence of their "guest" to this country, but I know personally that many of our great organizations, as well as our nationality language, religious, and cultural groups are planning dignified demonstrations of protest of the presence in our midst of a man who should be shunned like the plague, rather than be elevated to the dignity of a human being, spotless, pure, and good.

My home will be trimmed in black throughout the days that Nikita Khrushchev is in the United States of America; for I shall pray for those who have fallen to the violence of this man—and to the vile system he represents.

Sincerely,

HERMAN D. SAHAGIAN.

(Copies to Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Senator EDMUND MUSKIE, Representative FRANK COFFIN, Representative CLIFFORD MCINTIRE, Representative JAMES OLIVER.)

The New Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday's New York Times contains an excellent editorial analysis of the second housing bill recently passed by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HOUSING COMPROMISE

The more one looks at the fine print in the new compromise housing bill passed by the Senate after President Eisenhower's veto of the earlier bill, the more one is impressed by how far the managers of the bill have gone to meet the President's objections. To be sure, there is a little more money in the bill than was requested in the President's original program. But most of the objectionable features of the earlier bill have been dropped.

For example, there is no longer a requirement that the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase special assistance mortgages at subsidy prices. A proposed new program of special FNMA loans to mortgage lenders has been removed. The public housing authorization has been limited to roughly

the amount approved for most recent years. There is a special provision to make sure that slum-clearance funds will not all be absorbed by larger cities. The authority for still another and dubious extension of the term of repayment of ordinary Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages has been eliminated.

These are concessions of substance. Compared with the original bills introduced by Democratic housing managers in both House and Senate, and compared even with the bills that passed both Houses originally, the new bill has gone far more than halfway toward the administration's wishes. The House would do well to accept the Senate bill and send it to the President. He in turn would be hard put to it to justify another veto.

Unemployed Versus Unemployable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, some people are out of work because there is no demand at the moment for their knowledge or skill. Farmworkers, and others whose employment is seasonal become unemployed during periods of each year. Industries lay off help during fluctuations within the economic life of a particular enterprise, or during a general economic decline.

These people are out of work temporarily.

Heretofore classified as "unemployed," is another, separate and distinct group known as the unemployable.

We became conscious of their particular problems after World War II. The decline of some older, and unprogressive enterprises that were concentrated in one-industry communities, brought us face to face with the new challenge of chronic labor-surplus areas.

Most of these displaced workers were no longer young. They had been molded by occupations requiring little or no skill. When their jobs disappeared, they had little to offer the new growth industries that might move in to fill the economic vacuum of these distressed areas. In an age of increasing labor skill and labor specialization, they were unwanted.

They became known as the unemployables.

In our efforts to solve this human as well as economic problem, we are developing Federal legislation to assist in the recovery of these areas. Grants to encourage the building of modern plants and to provide the services needed by growth industries are essential. But if we overlook the employables, this assistance will not be productive or constructive. Putting it plainly, they need training in new job skills, in order to be of value to themselves, their families, and their communities. To focus thinking on this problem, I ask consent to reprint in the RECORD this recent editorial from the Evening Tribune, published in Lawrence, Mass.

UNEMPLOYED VERSUS UNEMPLOYABLE

With U.S. employment getting back to the record highs it established before the recession, we find a sharper light focusing on the "hard core" unemployed who have been out of work 15 weeks or more.

Some 900,000 fall into this category, and of them nearly 550,000 have been without jobs more than half a year.

The people in the hard core group are not faceless. Most live in areas that have become more or less permanent pockets of depression—coal mining sectors in Kentucky, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, once thriving textile producing communities in New England, and so on.

The bulk of the chronically unemployed are nonwhites. And for the most part the individuals in this hard core are unskilled workers, traditionally the last to be hired, usually left by the wayside in all but the great booms.

Congress has not yet been able to manage effective aid to distressed regions. But any program would seem limited in promise which did not contain plans for lifting these people out of their unskilled status.

In this increasingly mechanized age, to be unskilled may mean not only being unemployed but being unemployable.

Civil Defense Is Also Peacetime Preparation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, New York City has been recently visited by mechanical failures which resulted in depriving heavily populated areas of my home community of electricity. In our modern, complex, urban society this is a civic disaster of great magnitude. Fortunately, the civil defense organization in New York was able to meet the challenge of the emergency situation which resulted, proving again—to those who may still doubt—that civil defense is prepared to function not only during a military emergency but during a peacetime crisis as well. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of August 21 on this subject.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 21, 1959]

CIVIL DEFENSE ON THE JOB

While the police department took over the principal task of safeguarding lives and property in last Monday night's electric power failure in upper Manhattan, the emergency did provide a small test of the civil defense organization. Sixty-two auxiliary policemen, 22 wardens, and 53 rescue men on trucks were on the streets and in Central Park making themselves useful. The police commissioner's office reports that they responded promptly to call, and were helpful. More men were ready if needed. Civil defense equipment, such as mobile generators, was ready, and some went into use, as in hospitals and for floodlighting.

This was, of course, only a minor foretaste of what a real civil defense emergency could be, if real disaster struck the city. But it gave us something to think about, and was sufficient reason for a review of organization, equipment, sufficiency of funds, and adequacy of volunteer personnel. Civil defense was ready, apparently, for a small emergency. How big an emergency would it be ready for?

Why We Are Losing the Third World War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an address by Peter Wheeler Reiss entitled "Why We Are Losing the Third World War." I was very much impressed by the sound thinking displayed in the speech, and I am sure the Members of the House will likewise be impressed.

The address follows:

WHY WE ARE LOSING THE THIRD WORLD WAR

(Address by Peter Wheeler Reiss, cum laude graduate of Marquette University)

Distinguished Rotarians and honored guests, recently in a letter to the editor appearing in the Sheboygan Press, I was referred to as "a very naughty boy" who yells "communism." Now, I am not sure whether or not this "very naughty boy" label fits me. but I am positive that I shall continue to yell "communism" as long as there are Americans who refuse to recognize the diabolical nature of this international conspiracy. But before I get into the heart of my topic, allowe me to tell a joke—not because I am a particularly good comedian, but because this form of introduction has been made mandatory by local 625 of the International Speakers Union, headed by Jimmy Coffa, of which I am a member. You see, we have a "closed shop."

Well, it seems that at the Teheran Conference in 1943, a picture was taken of Joe Stalin, Winston Churchill, and Franklin Roosevelt. After the picture had been taken, each man made a statement. Joe Stalin stressed that he was the leader of the great proletarian revolution, and that under him the proletariat would smash the imperialistic powers and would actualize the Communist goal, the classless society. Not to be outdone by Stalin, Churchill stated that God had decreed that he should lead the free world into a new era of peace and prosperity. When Churchill had finished, Roosevelt took his prepared speech, ripped it up, and threw it to the ground, saying bitterly, "Winston, I never decreed anything of the kind."

As you know, my topic is entitled, "Why We Are Losing the Third World War." Many of you may question this title; namely, you may say, "What world war?" This is a reasonable question, and I shall attempt to give a reasonable answer.

In my opinion, an intelligent definition of war is "that state of affairs which exists when a nation or group of nations carries out a systematic policy of conquest using force or the threat of force as a weapon."

Now, since 1939, the international Communist movement, under the leadership and control of the U.S.S.R., by using force or by threatening to use it, has gained control of 8 million square miles of territory (an area 2½ times larger than continental United

States, excluding Alaska) and has enslaved 800 million people (a population five times greater than that of our own country.)

From these figures, it becomes evident not only that world war III is going on, but also that we are losing it. Hence, we must proceed to find out why we are losing, for in order to correct our shortcomings, we must first understand what they are.

Our basic shortcoming has not been military weakness. This is illustrated by the fact that from the end of World War II until the early 1950's, the United States had a monopoly on the atomic bomb; yet in spite of this tremendous advantage, the Communists took over control of East Central Europe, Mainland China, North Korea, the southern half of Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands. During this period of nuclear monopoly, we could have said, "Commies, free the people you have enslaved or suffer the horrible consequences." Instead, American mothers and fathers succumbed to Communist propaganda, and cried, "bring the boys home," as if it was logical to spill blood in order to defeat fascism and yet allow its twin brother, communism, to expand. This ostrich act on the part of American citizens brings out the real source of our failure in the third world war; namely, that the responsibility for the unfolding disaster does not rest with our leaders of the past 20 years, bad as they may have been—the blame for our gradual surrender to atheistic communism lies with individual American citizens, since in a free society, government is no better than the people it represents. When mothers and fathers cry "bring the boys home," a Congressman better do so, or he will soon find himself in a political graveyard.

This brings us to the vital question, what is wrong with Americans? The basic answer, in my opinion, is twofold; we are suffering from intellectual and moral decay.

Our deteriorating intellecutal standards can easily be seen in the average movie or TV program. Cowboys, sex, and crime are the usual subjects. But a more serious manifestation of our intellectual decay can be seen in the average American's ignorance of the nature and designs of communism. For instance how many Americans can define the term "dialectic" as employed by Communist philosophers? How many can recognize a Communist-front organization? How many realize that the Reds have sworn to smash us with their clenched fists, once we have been put to sleep by their electrifying peace overtures? Since most Americans aren't aware of these things and do little or nothing to fill these intellectual gaps, it is little wonder that the Reds are beating us to the punch.

However, a more basic cause for our gradual surrender to communism is the moral decay which is presently corroding the foundations of American society. We are getting soft. Materialism is becoming the national religion. The standard of living appears to be our sole yardstick for measuring the state of the Union. Drunkenness, divorce, and artificial birth prevention are looked upon as virtues in many social circles. Worse yet, God has been put in a closet. Besides being abstracted from public education, He is seldom referred to in conversation, unless of course the speakers employ the fashionable pastime of cursing.

Since we are turning away from our eternal end and devoting our attention to purely material considerations, it is little wonder that we are willing to compromise in the face of threats from a dangerous enemy; for it takes real courage, character, and belief in an enternal destiny to sacrifice for truth, justice, and religious principles.

These basic weaknesses have undoubtedly been observed by all of you. The next logical question then which presents itself is, what can be done about them?

First, on the intellectual front leading citizens like yourselves must become expert anti-Communists. In order to achieve this goal, I suggest that you read three books. The first is Louis F. Budenz's "The techniques of Communism," published by Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1954. This book will give you excellent insights into the nature of communism, since the author was a leading Red for many years, and hence is speaking from actual experience. The second book is Anthony T. Bouscaren's "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," again published by Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1958. This book will show you how to become an active participant in the fight against communism. The third book needs no introduction. It is J. Edgar Hoover's "Master of Deceit," published by Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1958. This homework will not be as easy as reading a novel naturally, but it will be much more rewarding. Moreover, to preserve our freedom and to extend it to those behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, sacrifices must be made, and this is one of them.

However, since truth is useless unless one has the will to carry it out, the spiritual front, becomes the most important area for improvement and development. On the spiritual front, every intelligent American must be able to explain why he is Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish, and if he cannot come up with an answer, then he must look for the true religion. Once he has found it, he must live up to its principles. He must be courageous in defending his faith and anxious to spread it; for if one is indifferent toward religion, then the struggle between communism and the free world becomes a ball game between two second division teams; it really doesn't matter who wins.

Above all, let me stress that individual effort is the key to success in the fight against communism. One dedicated anti-Communist can influence at least five other people, each of whom can influence five more, and so on—until this chain reaction transforms America.

Once America has been transformed by such a campaign, then things like the Berlin crisis will no longer trouble us. Instead of talking about these matters at Geneva, we can ask the Commies embarrassing questions such as, why are they afraid to hold free elections in East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Albania, Bulgaria, Rumania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Mainland China, and Russia itself? If they refuse to discuss these matters, then we can break off diplomatic relations with the Communist bloc, hence ending a very unsuccessful relationship and also terminating the espionage system which the Reds have built up around their Embassies in our country.

Meanwhile, we can promote guerrilla warfare in exposed Communist controlled areas, such as Albania, North Korea, North Vietnam, and China. American troops would not have to be used. The Greeks could cross the border into Albania, the South Koreans could slip into North Korea, etc. Now some of you may be saying to yourselves, "this guy is really in orbit—this would mean a nuclear war." In answering this objection, let me again refer to the example given to us by the U.S.S.R. The Commies have constantly taken chances when we could have crushed them. In order for either side to win, risks must be taken. Hence, we must start running plays on the Communist side of the 50-yard line, for a strictly defensive strategy is always tactically and psychologically disastrous. If we were to pursue the policy I have outlined, the U.S.S.R. would have two alternatives, nuclear or limited warfare, since I don't believe it would follow our "do nothing" example of past years. If the Reds resorted to nuclear warfare, their goal of world conquest would literally be smashed, since there would be little left of this planet to occupy. Thus, it appears that limited warfare would be their response, in which case our chance for a complete victory would be overwhelming, not because we are well prepared for this type of war (we need a lot of improvement in this area), but because with the help of effective propaganda the satellites would undoubtedly revolt, along with many in Russia, especially in dissatisfied areas such as the Ukraine.

This is not the only plan which might bring us victory in the Third World War. Probably at present or after you have done some thinking and reading on the matter, you can come up with a much better solution. But always remember the wise statement of Mao Tsetung, leader of Red China, "to compromise is to lose."

And also remember, that an organization like yours with its fine principles of service to community, church, and country, is especially well qualified to participate in such a campaign.

In conclusion, therefore, I urge each of you to become intellectually qualified and spiritually dedicated anti-Communists; for you have nothing to lose but the chains of an onrushing tyranny, and a free, peaceful, and happy world, under God, to gain.

Our Battle Against False Slogans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, early in August the distinguished president of the International Association of Machinists, Al Hayes, was a keynote speaker at a joint conference on the aircraft, missile, and related electronics industry at Kansas City. He addressed more than 400 delegates representing his own union and the United Automobile Workers.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Hayes' address as it appeared in the Machinist paper of August 13, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The title of Mr. Hayes' address was "Our Battle Against False Slogans." It is an excellent address and one which deserves the attention of all of us who believe in social justice.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR BATTLE AGAINST FALSE SLOGANS
(By Al Hayes)

I am sure it's not news to you that we face the most strongly organized opposition in our history. Organized wealth is stopping at nothing in an effort to put organized labor in its place, so that once again industry—including this industry that you here represent—can have the sole right to dictate the terms and conditions of labor.

So thoroughly have the opinion-forming media, the press, radio, TV, and the magazines distorted the truth about labor that today many people seem to believe the chief problem confronting union members is their union. The impression is abroad that if union members had no union they would have no problems.

This impression, false as it is, is being carefully spread, in an effort to develop a hysteria in Washington, in an effort to convert an essentially liberal Congress into an antiunion Legislature capable of exploiting tragic infiltration of crooks in a few unions to push through punitive class legislation that will strip our members of their power to defend their wage rates and their working conditions.

PROFITS AND WAGES

In the steel industry, the distortion is even more absurd. A conscious effort has been made to give steelworkers a guilt complex about seeking a small, well-justified wage increase. A long-term propaganda campaign has so thoroughly misled the public that they now frequently blame high prices on wage rates when, in fact, wage rates have little to do with prices.

I don't have to remind this audience that unit labor costs—not wage rates—influence prices. It's not how much a man earns, but how much he produces, that determines cost.

Somehow, the American people and the Canadian people have been led to believe that high corporation profits are the just due of stockholders—economically desirable and socially admirable. On the other hand, any increase in the wage rates of workers is considered socially unjust and economically undesirable. Higher interest charges by banks and insurance companies are cheered—even when paid by a Government that is admonishing everyone else to reduce their demands for Government funds.

We used to be told that increased purchasing power would help Americans consume the products of our farms and factories. Today we are told that increased purchasing power is inflationary even when our industry is working at less than capacity.

The situation is no more absurd than if we began to believe that night is day and that up is down. Perhaps if enough newspapers and magazines and politicians uttered these absurdities often enough, people would believe them too.

The propaganda barrage, which is today victimizing the steel workers, was not prepared for them alone. We must expect that when our negotiations begin in a few months, the aerospace industry will not be outdone. Then the barrage will be aimed at our members, as today it is aimed at the steel workers.

TRUTH ABOUT INFLATION

Because we must be prepared to meet the same false issue when our negotiations open, let me remind you of the truth about inflation.

The truth is that for 60 years retail prices, in the United States, have edged up on the average of 2½ percent each year. A 2½-percent price increase a year has been normal in the United States. If prices begin to go up faster than normal, we would have some reason for concern and some reason to question our policies.

The truth is that prices have not been rising faster than normal. Over the past 10 years, prices have been going up more slowly than normal. The actual average increase in retail prices over the past 10 years has been 1.8 percent. Instead of more inflation, we have been having less inflation.

The danger of inflation is a false slogan—coined by labor's enemies to talk us out of legitimate wage increases and to frighten away our friends.

FOREIGN COMPETITION

Of course, dangerous inflation isn't the only false slogan we will face. There is also the charge that we are making it difficult for American industry to compete with foreign producers, that if we continue to press for higher wages and other cost items—no matter how justified—we will make it impossible for them to compete.

The instinctive reaction of some management is to blame organized labor for most of our competitive problems.

Whatever the problem may be with foreign competition — and I am not going to belittle a very real problem — American industry will never be able to compete with the Japanese, with the Russians, or even with Germans on a basis of who can pay the lowest wages. That has never been the American way—I doubt it ever will be.

In the past, our industry has competed successfully, despite the fact that it paid the highest wages, maintained the best working conditions and just about the highest standard of living in the world.

Our industry has been able to compete successfully because wage rates do not determine prices. The labor cost in the price of any article is not the hourly wage rate, but the unit labor cost—the number of items the employees can produce or service in an hour.

American industry has dominated the world market because American labor is the most productive in the world — not because it is the cheapest, with the lowest standard of living.

In fairness, let me report to you that some executives agree with me on this. Recently, one—whom I shall not name—told me that after World War II, his company had licensed a Japanese firm to build one of its small planes, thinking the Japanese could best meet a growing demand in the South Pacific. This American company soon discovered that, despite what we would consider miserably low wage rates, costs of manufacturing this airplane were far higher in Japan than they were in the United States.

PRODUCTION IS KEY

Again I remind you that it is the unit labor cost, not wage rates, that influence the price of a commodity. Or, to put it another way, it isn't how much a man is paid but how much he produces that governs the cost.

Improved mechanization, increased ingenuity, and higher productivity are the methods by which we will best the foreign competition—not by reducing the American standard of living.

As a matter of cold fact, American industry has improved its position—wage wise—in the last few years. Wage rates in the United States have gone up proportionately less since 1950 than they have in West Germany, Britain, Norway, and France.

Using 1950 as 100 in the index, hourly earnings in manufacturing industries in the United States are now about 141. In West Germany, the wage index is 166; in Berlin, 165; in Norway, 169; and in France, 202.

They can't successfully blame what is happening in foreign trade on union wage rates. The facts do not support them.

Surely this moment in the world struggle for freedom, for dignity of the individual is no time to give us our fight for economic justice. The strength of the free world, the strength of democracy in the struggle against communism lies in the hope, the knowledge, and the health of free peoples.

Address by Hon. August E. Johansen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Congressman AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, of Michigan, to the 93d annual banquet, State Camp of Pennsylvania, Patriotic Order Sons of America, at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel, Reading, Pa., Monday evening, August 24, 1959:

THE WAR WE ARE WAGING

Mr. Toastmaster, members of the State Camp of Pennsylvania, Patriotic Order Sons of America, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored by the invitation to address your 93d annual banquet, in this 112th year of the Nation's oldest patriotic society of native Americans. I doubly appreciate your invitation because I have been advised that it was extended on the suggestion of two gentlemen whom I regard very highly.

One of these gentlemen is a most distinguished Pennsylvanian, a great American, and one of this Republican's very favorite Democrats, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, on which I am presently privileged to serve.

The other is the brilliant, enormously hard-working and completely dedicated staff director of that committee, Mr. Richard Arens.

The fact that both of these gentlemen are members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America is a tribute alike to them and to the order.

I hope you will pardon one further personal reference. I am happy to report that I have a relationship to the great State of Pennsylvania which I believe can be regarded as advantageous both to me and to the Keystone State.

The obvious advantage which I can claim is that I am a native of Pennsylvania. The advantage which the State can claim is that I was removed therefrom early in my first year of life, thereby absolving Pennsylvania of any responsibility for subsequent developments in my career—political or otherwise.

Mr. Toastmaster, since the subject of my address "The War We Are Waging," has to do with the international Communist conspiracy, and with the resistance of America and Americans to that conspiracy, my remarks would scarcely be realistic or timely if they ignored a major development which has occurred since I accepted your invitation.

I refer, of course, to the August 3 announcement of the impending visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States and the scheduled return visit of the President of the United States to Soviet Russia.

In broaching this matter I am mindful of two admonitions. I recall the words of Ecclesiastes, or "The Preacher" that there is "a time to keep silence, and a time to speak." Perhaps the order in which the two alternatives are listed is itself a broad hint as to the proper priorities. Nevertheless, Ecclesiastes did make it clear that there is "a time to speak."

Furthermore, I also recall the admonition and warning of Abraham Lincoln that "to keep silent when one has the duty to speak out is a sin."

I would not knowingly be guilty of irresponsible or inflammatory speech, particularly in a matter as grave as this. But I believe that there are circumstances in which silence likewise can be irresponsible. I further believe that public silence, if widely and generally imposed or acquiesced in, either as a matter of supposed expediency, or because of moral indifference, or a "father knows best" state of mind, or an atmosphere of blackmail threats, could go far toward snuffing out and suffocating the priceless flame of freedom and honest dissent.

Therefore, I have chosen to speak my judgment and my conscience on this matter again tonight, as I have already done on earlier occasions.

Let me sum up my views on the subject under three main points:

1. I believe the Khrushchev invitation was a grevous mistake. It is a step which I regret and deplore. Having said that, and except as this opinion has a bearing on my views of how we may deal most wisely, firmly, and effectively with the situation we now face. I see no useful purpose in belaboring that point. Let me say only this, that in my judgment Mr. Khrushchev himself had provided, long before the invitation was extended, the most convincing and compelling reason why such an invitation ought not to have been forthcoming.

In the same breath with his warning in 1956 that "we will bury you," Mr. Khrushchev also said, "If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you." I have no doubt that the fact that the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev was extended in the face of this very blunt statement will be exploited to the utmost by Khrushchev and the leaders of international communism, in their propaganda efforts to equate the invitation, and all "courtesies" ensuing therefrom, with American approval—of communism, Soviet rule, Communist interpretations of "peace" as noninterference with nibbling subversion, and approval of the unsavory Mr. Khrushchev himself.

2. There is, as the old adage points out, no use crying over spilt milk. But it is immensely important in this business that we avoid spilling any more milk. I address that comment alike to the leadership of the Nation, to the over-cautious "let's don't do anything that will rock the boat" segment of the public and the public-opinion molders, and to those who are sincerely outraged by the invitation to, and the pending visit of, Mr. Khrushchev.

So far as the national leadership is concerned—including the State Department and some of the cooperative columnists and commentators who obligingly echo its views—I see a grave danger of overzealous efforts to "shush" expressions of disapproval of Mr. Khrushchev, and what he stands for, prior to and during his visit.

Certainly there must be every possible safeguard against violence or threat of violence. That is not only proper, but it is a major obligation of the Government and the American people. But any propaganda effort to regiment, overawe, or frighten the American people into silence is, both from the standpoint of principle and of the practicalities, a grievous blunder.

As an example of what I am talking about I refer to last Saturday's Drew Pearson column. Mr. Pearson claims that the State Department is worried that if there is "too much criticism" of Mr. Khrushchev's projected visit "he might do what he did regarding his proposed visit to Scandinavia." And then Mr. Pearson added—whether he was speaking for the State Department or Pearson probably isn't too important—"Cancellation of the Khrushchev trip to the United States after all the advance buildup would lead to seriously strained relations between the United States and Russia."

I seriously question the accuracy of that conclusion. I believe the statement falls into the same category as most of the arguments for a "peace at any price" approach to Soviet Russia. I believe Mr. Khrushchev will see to it that Soviet-American relations become "seriously strained" or somewhat thawed whenever he thinks either state of affairs will serve his purposes.

Be that as it may, I believe we are here treading on very dangerous ground for quite a different reason. I believe the line of argument advanced by Mr. Pearson, or the State Department, or whoever it is, involves the possibility of "seriously strained relations" between the American people and their Bill of Rights.

I see no significant difference between a blackout on American criticism of international communism, or of Mr. Khrushchev, or of Mr. Khrushchev's visit, on the grounds that such criticism might displease Mr. Khrushchev, and a blackout on such American criticism as a direct result of a demand or decree from Mr. Khrushchev. Furthermore, I don't believe Mr. Khrushchev himself would see very much difference, either.

Somewhere along the line we had better recognize the fiendish skill of Communist blackmail techniques and make it clear to all concerned that submission to such blackmail is too high a price even for a vague hope that world tensions will be relaxed.

If we are going to have anything really important to show Mr. Khrushchev, now that he apparently is coming over here, it is this: Evidence that we understand Communist methods and goals; that we are united as a free people—notwithstanding all of the diversities of free people—in our opposition to both the methods and goals of communism; and, most important of all, that we have a vigor of will and purpose adequate to meet and survive their challenge.

I suspect it is going to take more than the amiability and protocol of a sightseeing tour provided by our leaders, and more than tongue-tied politeness on the part of our people, to accomplish an effective and convincing showing on this score.

3. It is an American tradition and, in the final analysis a practical necessity, that only one voice can speak authoritatively for the Nation in foreign affairs. That is the voice of the President of the United States. That voice is truest, most effective, most powerful when it is evident to all the world—and particularly to those who represent peril to our country—that it speaks the sentiments and will of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

The record is clear that international communism in this present crisis seeks to drive a wedge between the people and their leadership, that it seeks to go over the head of the President of the United States to invoke what the Communist worker calls "public opinion for peace (and) peaceful coexistence * * * the most powerful political force in the world."

Even as international communism adopts this tactic—of which Mr. Khrushchev's visit is a major item—it does not hesitate to denounce the Nation's leadership, and the leaders of capitalism, as "merchants of death" and enemies of peace. That tactic must not be permitted to work.

Neither can those—and I am one—who have questioned the wisdom of the Khrushchev visit permit a difference of judgment on this matter to stand in the way of earnest hopes and prayers and earnest efforts to encourage and support firmness, courage and clarity in the words that the President of the United States will soon be speaking to our friends abroad, to the peoples of captive nations, to Mr. Khrushchev and the leaders of world communism, to the people of Soviet Russia, and I trust to the American people themselves.

A long time ago it was written: "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

May the President of the United States speak clearly and faithfully for the people of the United States in the days just ahead. At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I hope that the President will, with discretion but great firmness and faultless timing, say something like this to all concerned:

"Eagerness to avoid war—if we think no deeper than this single desire—can produce outright or implicit agreement that injustices and wrongs of the present shall be perpetuated in the future. We must not participate in any such false agreement. Thereby, we would outrage our own conscience. In the eyes of those who suffer injustice, we would become partners with their oppressors. In the judgment of history, we would have sold out our freedom of men for the pottage of a false peace."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I voice the hope that the President will courageously speak, both privately and publicly, for "an observance of human rights and an end to subversion organized on a worldwide scale."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President will bring a firm and bold reminder to Mr. Khrushchev that "the American people feel strongly that certain peoples of eastern Europe, many with a long and proud record of national existence, have not yet been given the benefit of (the) United Nations wartime declaration (of the right of peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live)."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President will impress the fact—as his best judgment dictates with respect to time and place—that (for 42 years) "the activities of international communism have disturbed relations between other nations and the Soviet Union" (by seeking) "throughout the world to subvert lawful governments and to subject nations to an alien domination (thereby adding) to distrust and therefore to international tension."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President will not forbear to say to Mr. Khrushchev—in the complete candor of private conference if not in the glare of public discussion—that "in the aftermath of (the subjugation of Hungary by naked armed force) world respect for and belief in Soviet promises (sank) to a new low."

At the risk of seeming presumptuousness, I venture the hope that the President of the United States will emphasize, as earnestly as words can do, that "the Soviet Union has nothing whatsoever to fear from the United States * * * anywhere * * * in the world, so long as its rulers do not themselves first resort to aggression," but that "open measures of armed attack * * * would start a chain of circumstances which would almost surely involve the United States in great military action."

And because you may indeed by now think me unpardonably presumptuous in seeming to put words in the President's mouth let me say that every statement with regard to which I have expressed a hope is a statement which the present President of the United States has heretofore made, and in every instance made publicly, and in some instances made in the presence of Mr. Khrushchev himself.

We, the people, are not of little faith, Mr. President, with respect either to your leadership, or ourselves, or our cause. But we know the value of emphasis by repetition. We need to hear our own will and voice speaking through your voice.

We need, and we need urgently, the unifying and clarifying trumpet call of words telling us, telling Mr. Khrushchev, and telling the world once again that peace can be established "only if we stand uncompromisingly for principles." In the face of the smiles of communism, we need to discipline our own eager friendliness, our sometimes impulsive good will, and even our deep desire for peace.

We need to remind ourselves, to be reminded yet again by our leadership, and to remind those who appear to proffer the hand of friendship, that the smiles of communism

are belied today in the captive nations, belied in Tibet, belied in Latin America, belied in Laos, belied in Berlin, and belied by Communist activities within our own country.

We need to recall the words of Lenin that "as long as capitalism and socialism exist, we cannot live in peace; in the end, one or the other will triumph, a funeral dirge will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

We need to recall, even as he visits us with a display of amiability, that Mr. Khrushchev himself has said: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engles, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

We need to recall the boast of Dmitri Manuilski, onetime head of the Soviet delegation to the United Nations, spoken in the early 1930's:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we will need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep.

"So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clinched fists."

And, finally, as a footnote to all this—and as a reminder that an early President of the United States enunciated the Monroe Doctrine—I point out the statement made last week by Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, to the National Security Commission of the American Legion. I quote:

"The Communict Party of the Soviet Union also gives specific direction on what Latin American Communist Party action should be. For example, the Communist Party of Cuba, called the Popular Socialist Party, has been given guidance on how to penetrate and exploit the government of Fidel Castro. Primary targets for Communist penetration in Cuba are the agrarian reforms, trade unions, and the Army. These targets of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union are so important that back in May of this year they sent under alias to Cuba a Soviet intelligence officer, Vadim Kotchergin, as a member of a Soviet trade union delegation. His assignment was to give guidance to Cuban Communists. Kotchergin has since returned to Moscow."

To my fellow Americans, who offer the sincere but superficial comment that "talking is better than shooting," I offer the double observation: First, that there seems to be quite a little shooting going on today and, second, that no one knows better than the Communists that talk can be as deadly and fatal as bullets.

And, to my equally sincere and superficial fellow citizens who shudder at the prospect of "stalemate," I point out that the Communists themselves with their fondness for the word "nyet" seem much less apprehensive of a stalemate. And, I further point out that an equally firm American "no" holds no graver peril for us and, indeed, is infinitely safer than continued concessions and piecemeal surrender through appeasement.

We know from the record, Mr. President, and there is, I am sure, no occasion to remind you of the fact that "firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right," has been rewarded not once but many times in this administration by lessened pressures and tensions and by receding threats of armed force.

We have the faith that it will continue to be so and that in such firmness—rather than in the undisciplined longing for peace and eagerness to be friends on which the Communist leaders place their openly declared expectations of ultimate triumph—lies the surest and, indeed, the only hope for peace with justice and for the survival of free men and nations.

Passing of an Outstanding Woman: Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, Legislative Secretary of Women's Christian Temperance Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I doubt if I ever met an advocate of a cause who was more fair, more understanding or more gentle and kindly than Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, who died last week of cancer.

Miss Smart was an educated woman of infinite patience, who represented the temperance movement with dignity, integrity, and fairness. She was never intolerant or antagonistic of those who disagreed with her. She never threatened, bullied, or attempted belligerence. A person of brilliance, she made no effort to display her learning ostentatiously. One never learned from Miss Smart herself that she was a distinguished member of the bar, the wearer of a Phi Beta Kappa pin, the author of many learned papers on government and the law. She rarely touted her own prowess.

I counted her as my friend, I shall alway recall with pride that she invited me to be the principal speaker several years ago at the annual memorial services held by the Women's Christian Temperance Union in Statuary Hall in tribute to the historic Miss Frances Willard, of Illinois. I doubt if Frances Willard, herself a person of courage and honor, could have had a more fitting admirer and devotee than Elizabeth Smart. Their qualities were quite similar and parallel in many respects.

Because Elizabeth Smart died of cancer, I shall think of her when I renew my efforts for a crash program of medical research which seeks the answer to the grim riddle of cancer. Having suffered from this disease myself, I have a particular interest in its conquest—especially when we know that it recently has claimed such useful lives as those of John Foster Dulles, Matthew M. Neely, Elizabeth A. Smart, and many others. Friends closer to Miss Smart than I was privileged to be, have told of the characteristic serenity and bravery with which she faced death.

Mr. President, in memory of Miss Elizabeth Smart, of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, of which she was the longtime and capable legislative secretary, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a sketch of her career and causes, which has been prepared at my suggestion by Clayton Wallace, executive director of the National Temperance League, Inc.

Members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union are fortunate, indeed, to have been represented here in our Capital for nearly two decades by this woman of refinement, education, and compassionate motives. All who knew her will continue to honor and respect her memory. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart was a remarkable and gifted person.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELIZABETH A. SMART

Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, who had served since 1940 as legislative secretary of the National Women's Christian Temperance Union, died after a long illness in Washington, D.C., on August 16, 1959. Miss Smart had also been national corresponding secretary of the National WCTU in Chicago from 1948 to 1950 and consultant at the United Nations for the World WCTU.

A native of New York State, Miss Smart was admitted to the New York State bar, and was owner of the Washington County Post, of Cambridge, N.Y., her legal residence. She was a member of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, Washington County, and New York State Bar Associations, Women's Bar Association of District of Columbia, National Association of Women Lawyers, National League of American Pen Women, Phi Beta Kappa, etc.

Miss Smart was for several years the secretary of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council and was chairman of its legislative committee at the time of her death. She was active on Capitol Hill, spending much of her time in contacting Senators and Congressmen on behalf of temperance legislation. She was the author of the Washington Letter which appeared regularly in the Union Signal, giving complete information about bills relating to the problems of alcohol and narcotics and other legislative matters with which her organization was concerned. The Washington Letter was published from 1940 until the present time.

Miss Smart was deeply devoted to the cause of temperance and worked sacrifically for national legislation to ban liquor advertising, and for other measures to reduce drinking and encourage total abstinence. She was able and courageous in her crusade for beneficial laws. Elizabeth Smart will long be remembered as a kindly, conscientious, consecrated, and competent temperance leader whose life was a powerful influence for all that is good.

Panama Canal: "Make the Dirt Fly"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, because the history of the Panama Canal is a subject that tends to become engrossing whenever one has been thoroughly exposed to it, I am always

alert to new angles of its fascinating story.

The latest is an interesting excerpt from the book "Make the Dirt Fly", by Rose van Hardeveld, published in 1956 by the Pan Press, Hollywood, Calif., and reprinted in the August 19, 1959, issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The indicated excerpt follows:

THE CANAL SHAPED ALL OUR DAYS AND NIGHTS

In the rotunda of the administration building at Balboa Heights, the murals done by W. B. Van Ingn, assisted by Berry and Remson, presently depicted the stage of the canal construction which we were now able to watch daily from our house on the very edge of the cut. A group of lithographs by Jas. Pennel, scattered throughout the building, also preserved many of these scenes for posterity.

The 6- or 7-mile gash from Bas Obispo through Empire on a workday was really an awe-inspiring spectacle. Between 40 and 50 huge shovels smoked and whanged at different elevations. Each shovel had its own short spur of track, then the track alongside for the dirt train.

The loosening and digging out of the dirt and rocks was a herculean task, but not much bigger than the disposal of that mass. On the average, 3,700 carloads a day were hauled out of that canyon. I had often wondered in the past which was harder for the housewife: cleaning vast quantities of dirt from a room or disposing of it after she got it out. What a feather in her cap if she could do as the canal diggers did, and use the refuse to form new land for new cities, or to put a solid floor into the ocean on which to build a wall to keep ships from being battered by the elements.

It was quite difficult to realize that there was other work than digging going in the canal construction. The big machine shops at Gorgona and the many men employed there composed another and still different unit of which I knew nothing beyond the fact that they took care of the machine repairs and such machine construction as was done on the zone.

On very infrequent passings-by on the train we could see the huge forms, and knew that thousands of feet of concrete were being poured for the locks. We knew that an immense dam was being constructed at Gatun.

We knew that the course of the Chagres was being changed, and the encroaching water was killing an entire forest. Yet to us, busy with our daily tasks on our particular end of the job, Colonel Sibert's work was hazy and distant, very important of course, but not nearly so absorbing as our work, it seemed to me.

I neglected my housework many times to walk to the edge of the cut to watch the progress of the work and visualize the day when ships would be moving past this very hill on which I stood. Nothing else seemed quite so important as this immense project moving gradually and steadily to completion.

Nearly all the women and children felt the same way, and we would usually encounter our neighbors at one vantage point or another when we responded to the irresistible attraction of the dramatic view. This was our life. All other things were subordinate.

To see water surging through this yawning canyon, ready to carry ships up and down its mighty locks, was the destiny toward which all our days and nights were shaped. (From "Make the Dirt Fly," by Rose van Hardeveld. Copyright, 1956, by Rose van Hardeveld, the Pan Press, Hollywood, Calif.)

Freedom Challenges Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, for many years the United States and the free world have been attempting to break through the Iron Curtain. At last, there are some signs of success. The Nixon-to-Moscow trip cracked the Curtain. The upcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits may serve to widen the crack, provided they can be held in a favorable climate, instead of amidst a rash of brushfire wars created by Communist aggression, such as is now occurring in Laos and Tibet.

The breakthrough, if it can be followed up on a wider scale, has provided an opportunity for Western ideas to get directly to the Russian people, undistorted by Communist propaganda or sponsorship.

Intermittently, we are receiving reports that, time after time, when Russians and Americans have an opportunity for discussion, the Russian people demonstrate an almost insatiable desire to learn more of progress in this country and of the conditions under which we live.

In instances where there have been clashes of ideas—that is, United States versus communism—the presentation of free world ideas have invariably made a tremendous impression upon the Russian people. This has been true of the Vice President's trip, of the U.S. exhibit in Moscow, and even in the experiences of U.S. youth at the Red-sponsored World Youth Festival in Vienna, Austria.

Recently, there have been an increasing number of newspaper reports of this situation: First, the Green Bay Press-Gazette, of Green Bay, Wis., published a challenging editorial entitled "When Communism Meets Free Speech," relating to the Youth Festival in Vienna; second, an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor entitled "Young Ambassadors," outlining the experiences of U.S. guides at the Moscow exhibit, and third an article in the Washington Evening Star entitled "U.S. Exhibit Visitors in Moscow Cannot Believe Our Labor Story."

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials and articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette]

WHEN COMMUNISM MEETS FREE SPEECH

The Red-sponsored World Youth Festival in Vienna is running into a lot of trouble and all because its leaders have tried to keep up the pretense that it runs on democratic principles. Communist youth apparently haven't yet come to realize that their philosophy is successful only when there is no opposition.

The group is meeting for the first time in a free country, apparently with the aim of being liberal. But that immediately means a lessening of control. There are no tours of the wonders of the Communist systems as there were in Moscow last year, although a Soviet sponsored trip through Russia is planned to follow the convention. Defectors have been reported from a variety of satellite countries despite the careful screening processes given the youths. Disgruntled representatives, particularly from the United States, have moved out of the approved barracks where the word can be regulated.

The American problems started on board ship when other college students bound for Europe decided in an open forum that American representatives to the festival were helping Red propaganda machines. Then a Chicago group rose up in revolt against the New York Red-lining leaders although they quite naturally were not recognized as bona fide by the sponsors of the convention.

But the dangers of open debate have really boomeranged on the Reds. A seminar supposedly nonpolitical and dealing with the uses of atomic energy started out as a sneering attack on the United States by the official speaker, Prof. George Vinogradov of the Soviet Academy of Science. But he lost the floor when unable to answer a question by a listener and an American nuclear reactor engineer and then a Munich University law student took over. J. A. Ransahoff, who heads a firm of consultants on nuclear energy in Washington, pointed out how atomic energy has been put to peaceful uses. Then Armin Pollman refuted the Russian charge that the United States had supplied the West Germans with nuclear weapons. Poor Vinogradov never did get back to convince any doubters about the role Big Brother was playing in the atomic field.

The World Youth Festival has always been a Commie gimmick. But if a few more argumentative anti-Reds attend and the meetings are held in free countries, the advocates of the dictatorship of the proletariat are going to look even sillier. After all the losses by the free world in the propaganda war, it's nice to have won a battle.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 19, 1959]

YOUNG AMBASSADORS

Guides at the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow have found that they are asked many more questions about themselves than about the exhibits. Soviet citizens, they discover, are more interested in simply talking to Americans and learning how they live than in examining the fine cars or automatic dishwashers.

The corps of 75 Russian-speaking guides, 20 to 35 years old, mostly college or graduate students, has worked long hours answering questions. They have developed patience and good humor in the face of heckling. They find reward in the attentive listening of groups curious as to costs of living, wage levels, reports of unemployment, opportunities for education, freedom of travel, racial problems, art, literature, and many other facets of life in America.

To be sure, the Soviet press has gone to great lengths to belabor the exhibits as unrepresentative and to magnify any untoward incident. In spite of this, the guides have made a good impression. It is probably only fair to say that the attendants at the Soviet Exhibition in New York found need of tact and poise, and also deserve credit for a hard job well done.

The exchange of such groups of people-to-people envoys is bound to erase many misconceptions on both sides, create a wholesome measure of respect, and find areas in

which Russians and Americans have common interests—quite outside the pros and cons of Marxism.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

U.S. EXHIBIT VISITORS IN MOSCOW CAN'T BELIEVE OUR LABOR STORY

(By Vladimir Chavrid)

(This is an excerpt from a report by a U.S. labor economist, Vladimir D. Chavrid, on his observations at the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow. Mr. Chavrid, who was born in Russia, was assigned to the exhibition by the Labor Department to answer questions about the worker's life in America.)

I wish there were 20 American labor economists here familiar with American economic life. All of them could be busy answering thousands of questions of how the American people, and especially the average American worker, live. For the average Russian the hunger for knowledge, for facts about Americans, must be far greater than his hunger for food.

The questions most frequently asked deal with unemployment, wages, hours of work, living conditions, social security, unemployment insurance, and many others in this general area.

The attacks on the American way of life have been quite frequent and severe since the beginning of the exhibition. For the last few days, however, these have ceased for some reason or other.

The report was written just prior to the announcement of Khrushchev's visit to the United States. To all of us, however, these attacks are one of the real indications of the success of our exhibition.

Do the Russian people believe what we tell them about America? After being here for several weeks and discussing with them our way of life, both at the exhibition and at other places, I am sure that the overwhelming majority believe what we tell them and what the exhibits show them.

At the Labor Department exhibit in the dome when some controversial matter develops between myself and some Russian professional propagandist, the crowd invariably will side with me rather than with him. These professional agitators invariably show up as soon as a sizable group of people begin to listen to my presentation.

For example the other day at the labor exhibit I was explaining to a group of some 50 Russians the American social security programs. The group was vitally interested. Immediately a professional agitator broke in and told the crowd that this social security program did not apply to Negroes or foreign-born persons, that opportunities for these people in America were very poor.

This was an excellent opportunity for me to tell the crowd about myself—how I came from Russia some 30 years ago and how I was able to obtain an education in the United States and also a responsible job in the Labor Department. The agitator kept breaking in that I had already answered his question, but the crowd kept saying I should tell about myself and other groups like myself in the United States.

Frequently the agitator becomes embarrassed and disappears. It may be of interest to know that as soon as the Russian visitors learn that I was born in Russia of modest parentage, they are extremely sympathetic and I could stay and talk there, as I often do, for as long as 4 hours at a stretch. It is often physically impossible to break away from the crowd.

When I leave the stand many continue to follow me asking questions that they might have been uneasy to ask in the presence of the professional agitators. Many thank me most profusely for answering their questions while others apologize for their professional agitators. It is literally impossible to stop and answer a single question of one Russian without attracting a crowd of 50 or more Russians within a few seconds. Such is the hunger for knowledge about the United States.

Text of the Two Public Laws of the United States of America Governing Rules and Customs Pertaining to the Display and Use of the Flag of the United States of America—Also Correct Flag Courtesy Suggestions Issued by Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) as Handy Reference for Pocket Use

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the full text of the two statutory provisions of Congress governing the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

On account of the coming into the Union of the United States of America of the two newest States, to-wit, the State of Alaska and the State of Hawaii, and the resulting addition of two stars to the flag of the United States of America, making a total of 50 stars therein, it appears very pertinent, appropriate, informative, and guiding to all concerned that these two public laws, to-wit, 829 of the 77th Congress and 107 of the 83d Congress, be now made available to yourself and all the Members of this great legislative body. No doubt they, as the case with myself, are receiving many inquiries in the premises.

Furthermore, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have appropriately published a very neat vest pocket size card entitled "Correct Flag Courtesy." And so, I am pleased to accompany the text of this card with this extension.

The above-mentioned matters follow:

CORRECT FLAG COURTESY

This is a reminder of how to properly pay tribute to the American flag. It has been specifically designed by the VFW as a handy reference that you can carry in your pocket at all times.

During the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag, or when the flag is passing in a parade or a review, all persons should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute.

Those present in uniform should render the right hand salute.

Men not in uniform, should remove their headdress with the right hand and hold it at the left shoulder, the right hand being over the heart.

Men without hats should salute in the same manner.

Women should place the right hand over the heart.

The salute to the flag in a moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

When the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music.

Those in unform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note.

All others should stand at attention, men removing their headdress.

When the flag is displayed, all present should face the flag and salute.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 359

Joint resolution to amend Public Law Numbered 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America"

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law Numbered 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

"SEC. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

"(b) The flag should be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously.

"(c) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement.

"(d) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, fourth Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

"(e) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

"(f) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

"(g) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

"SEC. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

"(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (i).

"(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be

fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

"(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

"(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

"(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

"(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

"(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

"(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

"(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed.

"(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

"(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform, it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform.

"(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

"(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads or flagstaffs in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

"(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

"SEC. 4. That no disrepect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America; the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

"(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

"(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

"(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

"(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

"(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

"(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on any part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

"(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

"(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

"(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

"SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag, or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand, holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

"SEC. 6. That, when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed, all present should face the flag and salute.

"SEC. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

"SEC. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation."

Approved, December 22, 1942.

S. 694

An act to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(c) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", approved June 22, 1942, as amended (36 U.S.C., sec. 175 (c)), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations."

Approved July 9, 1953.

Francis Cardinal Spellman Praises Humanitarian Program for Social Welfare of Fraternal Order of Eagles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on August 6 the Fraternal Order of Eagles, one of the most progressive and social-minded organizations in the United States, held their international grand aerie dinner in Toronto, Ontario, as part of their 61st annual convention. Because the Eagles always have stressed brotherhood among nations, it was appropriate that this convention should be held on the soil of our good neighbor to the north, Canada. I am proud, myself, to be a longtime member of the Eagles.

The principal speaker at the banquet was His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York. Cardinal Spellman stressed the theme of social responsibility and moral law. He discussed, eloquently, the Ten Commandments and demonstrated how the social welfare program of the Eagles has upheld the highest ethical concepts of the Ten Commandments. Because I have so long admired the Fraternal Order of Eagles, for their advocacy of such humanitarian programs as social security and jobs after 40, I would like to read to my colleagues this particular paragraph from the moving address by Cardinal Spellman:

You have shown constant and compassionate interest in the welfare of all—those innocents orphaned by the malice of men and those made fatherless by the guns of war; persons of all ages from the high chair to the rocking chair, the bedridden slowly wasting away, the neglected and the crippled desperately needing understanding and rehabilitation, as well as the healthy in body but sick in soul or in mind—all these have shared the strength of the Eagles, all have known the warmth of their deep, personal devotion and assistance. Deeply and humbly grateful am I for the signal honor you bestow upon me, you who are yourselves distinguished by courageous sacrifice in the service of your fellowman.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address given at the 61st international grand aerie convention dinner of the Eagles in Toronto by Francis Cardinal Spellman.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS GIVEN AT 61ST INTERNATIONAL GRAND AERIE CONVENTION DINNER, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA, AUGUST 6, 1959, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, BY HIS EMINENCE FRANCIS CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Dear friends, there are no words richer or more meaningful than the Ten Commandments; and, there is one Commandment which I believe, if honestly lived by men could bring true happiness and a just and enduring peace to all peoples and all nations of God's earth. It is the most sacred and greatest declaration of all time, in which our Lord commands us fully and faithfully to love Him and Him alone, and plainly tells us that each is his brother's keeper: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy whole heart, and with thy whole soul, and with thy whole mind * * * and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

It is upon this commandment that your Fraternal Order of Eagles was founded, the humane organization whose members, for more than 61 fruitful years, have tirelessly, selflessly served the sick, the sorrowing, the maladjusted; the very young, the aged and the teenager. And the only measure of the Eagles' giving is the need of their neighbors—their brothers.

You have shown constant and compassionate interest in the welfare of all—those innocents orphaned by the malice of men and those made fatherless by the guns of war; persons of all ages from the high chair to the rocking chair, the bedridden slowly wasting away, the neglected and the crippled desperately needing understanding and rehabilitation, as well as the healthy in body but sick in soul or in mind—all these have shared the strength of the Eagles, all have known the warmth of their deep, personal devotion and assistance. Deeply and humbly grateful am I for the signal honor you bestow upon me, you who are yourselves distinguished by courageous sacrifice in the service of your fellowman.

Since I have known it was to be my privilege to be with you this evening I have meditated upon your many-faceted, merciful works, especially the preservation of our countries' youth. I do not say "guidance" because the difficulties of our youth daily become more acute until we are now faced with the task of actually saving our young people before we can effectively guide them.

The Ten Commandments award has unique significance when applied to the youth of our present day society, because the Commandments constitute a communication from Almighty God, a code of conduct given to us by our Creator. Actively to employ the commandments in our plans for the salvation of our children as God created and intended them to be, holds the only key to the achievement of a successful program of hope and help for today's children, the mothers and fathers of tomorrow.

In these perilous days the Biblical narrative of the Ten Commandments has special significance. You will recall how Moses went alone to the top of the mountain to receive this divine communication and how in his absence the people grew restive and created for themselves a god of their own, a golden calf. And they worshiped his graven image. You have raised the tablets of the commandments on the Clark County Courthouse lawn ever to stand a reproach to all those in our age who have created their own god whom willfully they worship while constantly endeavoring to convert our Nation's youth along the pathways of their own degraded, godless living. For adults to desert God is tragic, but to teach children to abandon Him constitutes a heinous crime, the brutal rape of souls.

There are many forms of this perversion and perhaps the most widespread and popular is the perversion of "freedom". When hypocrites apply this sacred term to contemptible schemes in order to prey on the weaknesses of unformed characters under the banner of "freedom of speech," or "freedom of the press," they are victimizing not only our children, but endangering our Nation's treasured heritage preserved for us by the precious blood of generations of our beloved sons, fathers, brothers and husbands.

Who can measure the damage to the souls of our youth when our freedoms are violated by traitors of true liberty and are twisted and wrought by them into weapons for our own destruction? Those who raise their voices in defense of the innocent, attempting to filter the moral smog from the atmosphere of today's degenerate, amoral society, in order to protect our young from the vipers who feed upon and fill their pocketbooks from the demoralization of our children, are often accused of witch-hunting and censorship. And censorship has become a repugnant word. But censorship there must be—censorship of conscience—fashioned in the spiritual mold of the Ten Commandments.

Pictures and books which corrupt and destroy the moral fiber and ideals of youth, these dangers must be eliminated if we are to discharge our sacred duties to our children. Thousands of dedicated men and women are striving by example and concerted efforts to protect and preserve our youth, our countries and our civilization from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, despite the determined efforts of vicious, venal enemies of youth, those evil men and women who deny the one true God and live in open defiance of His Ten Commandments.

When discussing moral problems endangering our children, people often limit themselves to the consideration of obscene material. Actually the problem is much wider in scope, striking at the very roots of man's allegiance to God. Perversions cause unspeakable evils, but equally disastrous is the failure of justice to enforce laws to prohibit these evils.

What then are we to do, what action shall we take to preserve and guide our children to godly living and love of neighbor? Shall we pass more laws to break, make more and longer speeches, cry "doom" in a louder voice? The time has long passed for such efforts as these. The only effective solution will be found when adults strive to live God's Ten Commandments conscientiously and constantly, making each and every one of us "his brother's keeper," which means too, keeper of his own soul. The Ten Commandments must be explained and demonstrated to our youth in the laboratory of daily living and the instructors must themselves be inflamed by love of God and neighbor, and thus by their own example save our Nation's children from degeneration and destruction.

For more than 61 years the Fraternal Order of Eagles has worked for the welfare of our youth. This is perhaps the most important of your manifold activities because the object of your concern in the preservation of the real wealth of our nations—the salvation of our children living in freedom under God.

These, dear friends, are my reflections on the credo expressed in your manual: "Freedom under God's law in our world is the Eagle's goal." May God bless your work. May He give you the strength to carry your ideals to yet higher peaks on the wings of your Eagle—God's Ten Commandments.

(Commenting on the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to President Eisenhower, the Cardinal concluded: "I think it would be a wonderful thing of Mr. Khrushchev would have an opportunity of reading, studying, meditating, and with an unusual, extraordinary grace of God, believing and practicing the Ten Commandments. I think it would be wonderful. What a tremendous transformation would take place in this war-ravished poverty-stricken, fear-enshrouded world. A miracle such as has not taken place since the time of Christ Himself would be worked and the hearts of suffering human beings everywhere would be uplifted. * * * I certainly shall pray that Almighty God will work a miracle to save our world from imminent threatening destruction.")

The Housing Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the New York Times of August 24, 1959:

THE HOUSING COMPROMISE

The more one looks at the fine print in the new, compromise housing bill passed by the Senate after President Eisenhower's veto of the earlier bill, the more one is impressed by how far the managers of the bill have gone to meet the President's objections. To be sure, there is a little more money in the bill than was requested in the President's original program. But most of the objectionable features of the earlier bill have been dropped.

For example, there is no longer a requirement that the Federal National Mortgage Association purchase "special assistance" mortgages at subsidy prices. A proposed new program of special FNMA loans to mortgage lenders has been removed. The public housing authorization has been limited to roughly the amount approved for most recent years. There is a special provision to make sure that slum-clearance funds will not all be absorbed by larger cities. The authority for still another and dubious extension of the term of repayment of ordinary Federal Housing Administration insured mortgages has been eliminated.

These are concessions of substance. Compared with the original bills introduced by Democratic housing managers in both House and Senate, and compared even with the bills that passed both Houses originally, the new bill has gone far more than halfway toward the administration's wishes. The House would do well to accept the Senate bill and send it to the President. He in turn would be hard put to it to justify another veto.

Policeman Is West Virginia Historian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, a recent edition of the employees' magazine of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. contains an article about a West Virginia native who has become an outstanding authority on West Virginia history.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICEMAN IS WEST VIRGINIA HISTORIAN—MATHENY'S LIBRARY UNIQUE

(By Bob Hathaway)

H. E. Matheny leads a double life. On the job, he is a Goodyear policeman—off the job, he is a well-qualified history scholar.

His specialty is West Virginia history, and his library on the subject is better than any other—even those of the West Virginia Department of Archives and History and West Virginia University.

It consists of approximately 1,500 books with an auction value of $20,000.

More than 100 of his books are "unique," a term used by collectors to describe a book that is one of its kind and irreplaceable.

A native of Parkersburg, W. Va., Matheny came to Akron at age 15. He says that Parkersburg, in those days, was a "Saturday night town." Everyone from the surrounding countryside would put on his best clothes and go to town on Saturday evening.

Fifteen-year-old Matheny, after his first week in Akron, was feeling homesick. When the first Saturday night rolled around, he dressed up and headed for the center of Akron. Nothing was happening.

Assured that Akron was the dullest town in the world, he was even more lonesome for West Virginia. With nothing to do, he went into a book store and asked for a history of West Virginia—that started a hobby that has lasted and mellowed since 1925.

Matheny's collection includes books, manuscripts and printed materials of all descriptions. One volume, dated 1793, is a copy of the first book ever printed in West Virginia.

He has 10,000 file cards that cross-reference and triple index the material. Among the most interesting reading are his broadsides or posters designed for making public announcements.

Although many single items are worth $100 or more, Matheny's favorite volume is one that has little value to other collectors. "The Memories of a Little Girl" by Maggie Alice Matheny is a handwritten account by his mother describing a covered wagon trip that she made as an 8-year-old to Oregon and back.

Matheny has 31 county histories of West Virginia, each worth more than $25. He is one of four serious collectors in this field.

Matheny does not restrict his activities to collecting. The books that line the den in his home serve as references for numerous articles and stories he writes for West Virginia newspapers and popular magazines.

Recently Matheny completed a book titled, "Bishop Alexander Campbell, Editor, Printer, Publisher, and Bookseller." Publishing of the book is being sponsored by the Disciples of Christ Historical Society.

Campbell was one of those exceedingly dynamic men of the 1800's whose interests and influence ranged from farming to theology and whose life was perfectly suited to tickle the fancy of a biographer.

Many books and publications of all kinds that came from Campbell's publishing house are included in Matheny's library. Matheny's next literary effort will be a book on Civil War Gen. Thomas M. Harris, of Harrisville, W. Va.

Matheny started at Goodyear in 1928 in final inspection and went with the police department in 1942. His wife, Sceva, worked in the balloon room during World War II. They live in Uniontown.

Statement of Senator Richard Neuberger in Support of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by this Congress in approving House Joint Resolution 115, which authorizes the purchase of land and architectural competition for the erection of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Memorial, has been a most heartwarming experience for me and the members of my family.

I wish to take this means to thank my colleagues, and particularly the members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, for making possible this everlasting tribute to my father.

Mr. Speaker, among those who took an active interest and part in this endeavor is my admired friend and colleague, Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, a member of the Commission.

May I say I was most impressed by his clear presentation of the facts before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. And I might add, his remarks about Franklin Delano Roosevelt mean much to me and my family, as does the action of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, who introduced the resolution during the early days of the session.

I deem it a personal privilege and honor, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity to insert in the RECORD the complete text of Senator NEUBERGER's statement of August 19, 1959, in support of the F.D.R. memorial.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, OF OREGON, BEFORE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 115, AUGUST 19, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear today in behalf of House Joint Resolution 115, which is vital to the paying of an overdue tribute to a great American, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. As a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I should like to review briefly the background and provisions of this legislation.

House Joint Resolution 115 was introduced January 9, 1959, by Representative JOHN W. MCCORMACK, a congressional member of the Roosevelt Memorial Commission. It was reported favorably by the Committee on House Administration on March 13, and was passed unanimously by the House on July 23, 1959.

The provisions of House Joint Resolution 115 are simple: It reserves a 27-acre portion of West Potomac Park near the Tidal Basin as a site for the proposed Roosevelt Memorial. It authorizes the Commission to hold a competition for design of the proposed memorial and authorizes not more than $150,000 to be appropriated for expenses in conjunction with the competition.

In considering this measure, these points should be noted:

Planning: In holding the competition, the Roosevelt Memorial Commission will consult with the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, and the National Park Service. The proposed memorial will not be a "sore thumb" architecturally in the effective implementation of Washington, D.C., planning.

Indeed, the National Capital Planning Commission not only approved the Tidal Basin site for the proposed memorial, it raised the 10 acres originally recommended by our Commission to 27 acres.

In addition, the House Committee on House Administration, in favorably reporting House Joint Resolution 115 last March had this to say about the site selection:

"In recommending the passage of House Joint Resolution 115, the Committee on House Administration is of the opinion that no more appropriate site for the proposed Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial could be chosen than the one recommended in West Potomac Park. The erection of the memorial in that particular section of the Nation's Capital would be fulfilling the postwar goal and dream of the late President that the temporary buildings erected on the Mall and adjacent parklands, many of them dating back to the First World War, would be removed as soon as possible after the conclusion of World War II. Most of these temporary buildings still remain in this area although the purpose for which they were erected is no longer valid.

"The Committee on House Administration commends the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission for its painstaking efforts which have resulted in recommending that portion of West Potomac Park which lies between Independence Avenue

and the inlet bridge as a most proper location for this memorial."

The Advisory Committee to the Roosevelt Memorial Commission has recommended, and House Joint Resolution 115 specified, that the proposed memorial shall harmonize in all respects with the Washington Monument, Jefferson Memorial, and Lincoln Memorial. Chairman of this Advisory Committee is the eminent American architect Pietro Belluschi, who was formerly a resident of my State of Oregon and is now dean of the School of Architecture and Planning of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The other members of the committee, who will assist our Commission on conducting the memorial design competition, are similarly distinguished architects and planners.

Finally, the design chosen will be submitted to Congress for approval.

Financing: The $150,000 authorized by the resolution will be used for expenses in the conducting of the design competition and for cash prizes to winners of the competition. If architects had been retained to submit designs for the memorial, the cost would have been approximately the same, if not more.

Erection of the memorial itself is proposed to be financed through private subscription.

Mr. Chairman, these briefly are the cold details of this legislation. There are, however, more than just a few facts involved in the measure which the committee is considering today.

It is not sufficient to say that Franklin Delano Roosevelt served as President of the United States longer than any other man has served or likely will serve in the capacity. Neither is it sufficient to say that he guided our Nation through 12 of the most difficult years in our history—out of a great economic calamity and through most of the world's worst conflict. Words are not capable of carrying the meaning of Franklin Roosevelt's service to this land.

A monument cannot completely convey this meaning adequately. But it can indicate to future generations some of the depth of the respect and love of a grateful people for a great leader.

Mr. Chairman, the paying of this deserved tribute has been overly delayed. In the 14 years since the Nation mourned the death of Franklin Roosevelt, we have seen many men honored—not unjustifiably—for lesser service. Formation of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission was authorized by Congress in 1955 for the purpose of proposing a memorial. The Commission has met and submitted three interim reports. We now come to the action phase.

The House has acted unanimously. As the days of the session of Congress wane, I need not stress the necessity for swift approval on the part of the Senate. I urge that this committee give rapid and favorable consideration to House Joint Resolution 115 in order that we may proceed with the overdue honoring of a great American.

Imbalance Seen in Tax Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, my colleagues will recall that earlier this session I introduced a bill, S. 1885, proposing to establish a Hoover-type commission to carry out an overhaul of the tax system.

Today, the Nation is having money troubles. The Federal Government is having difficulty balancing its budget. State governments, too, are finding it increasingly hard to pay mounting bills. Local communities experience difficulty in locating sources of revenue to provide community services and meet other costs.

With these ever-greater demands on our available tax sources, it is increasingly important that we (a) avoid undue overlapping of Federal, State, and local taxes; (b) attempt to assure that the tax burden is equitably distributed; (c) make an effort to bring our tax laws up to date in relation to our changing economy; and (d) revise the tax laws to knock out special privilege clauses wherever these are not merited, and, insofar as possible, write new tax laws that would stimulate—not curb—economic progress.

As I understand it, the House Ways and Means Committee is now planning to undertake study on various aspects of the tax structure. This committee—as the taxwriting body of the Congress—has, for the most part, done a splendid job in its efforts to carry forward legislation for improving laws in this field.

In proposing a tax commission, however, I have felt that Mr. John Q. Public, too, should have a voice in the modification of our tax laws. As will be recalled, the proposed 12-member Commission would include at least 6 persons from private life.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor carried a thought-provoking article entitled "Imbalance Seen in Tax Policy." Although I am not in agreement with all the conclusions reached in the article, I believe that this commentary by Mark E. Richardson on some of the defects in our tax system merits the attention of thoughtful men concerned with challenges we face in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMBALANCE SEEN IN TAX POLICY

NEW YORK.—During the course of the maneuvering before congressional committees discussed in my first article, the executive branch of the Government has played a very strange part which is not generally understood by the taxpaying public.

The executive, through representatives of the Treasury Department and taxpayer groups, to the extent that they are organized, have presented opposing points of view on many proposed changes in tax law.

The congressional committee has considered the opposing points of view and drafted a statute giving effect to its decision between the parties. The taxpayer is through. He has either won or lost.

Not so with the Treasury Department. Resting in its hands is the right to draft the regulations which will control the administration of the law as written. Given the least confusion or ambiguity, the Treasury has an opportunity again to have its way even though it might not have prevailed before the committee.

Few taxpayers are conscious of the innumerable occasions when an apparent congressional intent has been perverted by regulation. Of course, the taxpayer has the right of ultimate recourse to the courts, but here he encounters doctrines of "presumption of right" pertaining to the Government's findings or of "protection of the revenues." This latter doctrine always means the protection of Government revenues—not of the individual taxpayer's revenues.

ECONOMY SHIFTS

Before summarizing any comments or suggestions for a better tax policy, there is one other important matter which has received very little attention.

During the early years of our income taxes, the rates were quite low, and the amounts applied to all classes of taxpayers were very similar. The corporate form of business enterprise was not as prevalent at the time of the enactment of the income tax, in 1913, as it is today. A much greater percentage of business than at present was carried on then by sole proprietorships, joint enterprises, and even trusts.

As the nature of our economy changed, the advantages and disadvantages of different forms of business became more important. Our tax structure did not keep pace with economic changes. The Internal Revenue Code today is full of provisions which vary so greatly in their application that sound business judgment must give way to tax expediency when a business is being formed, changed in nature or location, or liquidated.

A sometimes simple business decision to form a subsidiary or to combine two old companies now is influenced primarily by available exemptions, possible tax on the shareholders or unrealized gain, the effect or availability of carryovers and carrybacks, the treatment of tax purposes of intercorporate debt and dividends, available credits, ad infinitum.

IMBALANCE CRITICIZED

A very drastic change which might be made in our tax policy would be to reconstruct our tax law in order to eliminate the undue influence upon business decisions of the imbalance in tax applications.

Why should the income from any business—grocery store, delicatessen, pharmacy—be taxed differently if it is run by a sole proprietor than if it is run by a corporation owned completely by the same proprietor? More pertinently, why should such income be taxed once in one form and twice or more in another?

It would seem that income, for tax purposes, should be divided into three classes: income from personal services, income from investment, and income from the production, processing, or merchandising of commodities.

Investment income that represents distribution of income previously taxed should be exempt; that which represents a cost to others in determining their own tax should be taxed to the recipient. This type of income classification would not be nearly so complicated as those under which we now labor.

REVISION AWAITED

The tendency to rewrite the technical provisions of the code or to materially change them at each session of Congress is one which the Members of Congress ought to deplore rather than implement. It now is almost axiomatic that any change in the tax law necessitates the development of other changes at a rate approaching geometric progression.

While a recodification of the Internal Revenue Code has taken place several times in the last generation or so, a true reconsideration and rewriting of the code still awaits accomplishment despite all of the lip service paid to it. Once such a rewriting is accomplished, subsequent changes in rate

structure to meet considered budget requirements should be simple, without revision of the technical provisions.

Elimination of the "second chance" given to the Treasury to have its way would materially increase the confidence of taxpayers and expedite settlement of their tax liabilities. The drafting of regulations interpreting congressional enactment should not be vested in the executive branch.

LONG TENURE URGED

The Office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, a stupendous administrative job, should not be subjected to change every time there is a change in national administration: the Commissioner should have long tenure of office (possibly 15 years) and should be responsible directly and only to the Congress for drafting of regulations and the administration of the tax laws.

Removal from office should never be at the whim of the administration but only subject to provisions similar to those now applicable to the Comptroller General.

Above all other considerations, the tax rate structure should be so flexible as to be almost automatically adjusted upon the determination of the Federal budget requirements.

Changes in the budget as submitted by the executive branch of the Government should only be concurrent with changes in tax rates estimated to produce required revenues. The haphazard, independent development of appropriations and tax laws, without immediate conformation, should be stopped.

Carey Letter Is Unworthy of U.S. Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, along with many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives, I received a threatening letter several days ago from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers.

Because Mr. Carey resorted to outright intimidation, he has been justifiably criticized in the press and by many people, regardless of their views on labor reform legislation.

I am sure that, in addition, Mr. Carey received many answers to his letter from the Members of Congress he vowed reprisal against. As one such Member, I sent him my answer on August 20.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Carey's letter and my reply:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,
JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

AUGUST 20, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: Throughout the day I have been rereading your threatening letter of August 18.

I can't tell you how sorry and disappointed I am to receive such a letter from a man who has been elected to a very high position in the labor movement. The letter is not only unworthy of you, but it embarrassed the great membership you are obliged to represent.

Up to now, the mail I received on labor legislation has been extremely helpful. The great majority of letters, cards, and wires were from people in the first district who favored the Landrum-Griffin bill. But I must say that the people who supported the Elliott and Shelley bills were just as kind and considerate as they could be in their letters to me.

People who are just as partisan in their opinions as you, Mr. Carey, were courteous, reasoned, and balanced in their judgments.

For example, until you wrote nobody implied that I was uninformed, stupid, or a tool of special interest groups. I was not threatened in any way until your letter arrived. The people who have disagreed with me have managed to tell me so without shaking their fists—in a spirit of the interchange of ideas, without resorting to abuse.

Since the Landrum-Griffin bill has passed, the response has been gratifying. Even folks who are still unconvinced that the Landrum-Griffin bill was the best we could do, share, in a sense, the belief of the Washington Post and Times Herald which says editorially today:

"We do not think the labor movement will suffer any real loss. * * * Nor will any union be killed by a reasonable compromise of the present Senate and House bills—unless it be some racket-ridden units that are a disgrace to organized labor in any event."

You did not ask me why I supported the Landrum-Griffin bill, but I believe you deserve to know why. I feel the bill provides the best means by which we can correct the abuses which exist in some areas of the country, and still remain true to the goal in not being punitive to the many unions which have been dealing fairly with their memberships.

Your letter is really unique, Mr. Carey, in that you have not given me your views on the important subject of labor legislation. Its purpose was to convey a threat. I am not, in any way, afraid of what you pledge to do to me because I believe that such a threat, underscored as it is with anger and revenge, will get nowhere.

But, if I may, I would like to give you a word of advice. You hold a very responsible position in the labor movement, and I am sure that the many fine people you represent are looking to you for leadership. You owe it to these people to be an effective spokesman for labor. Because you wrote the letter you did, you damaged your effectiveness greatly. I believe that you owe your constituents—the rank and file electrical, radio, and machine workers—a great deal. You might begin repaying their confidence by exercising the reasoned, temperate leadership they have a right to expect.

Sincerely yours,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

REA Proves To Be Sound Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a column from the Greenville News of Greenville, S.C., of August 23, 1959, by J. M. Eleazer, Clemson extension information specialist, entitled "REA Proves To Be Sound Investment."

Mr. Eleazer, well-known writer and friend of the farmer throughout South Carolina, has done a magnificent job of condensing the tremendous good that rural electric cooperatives have done for this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for it is one I believe every Member of Congress would enjoy reading.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA PROVES TO BE SOUND INVESTMENT
(By J. M. Eleazer)

A little over a thousand to one.

That's unusual odds. Yet it applies to the 1,082 REA Cooperatives that are up with or ahead on their repayments to the Government.

Yes, when these great rural service organizations celebrated their 24th anniversary the past May, only one was in arrears on its scheduled repayments.

To help get electricity to the farms and far places in this country, the Government has loaned these farmers' cooperatives $3.8 billion. Repayments on principal amount to $599.7 million, interest payments $357.6 million, and advance payments ahead of due dates amount to $141.7 million.

This remarkable record prompted REA Administrator Hamil to say:

"In the late 1930's, a lot of people were wondering if those new rural electric systems were going to be able to meet the payments on their Government loans when due. Today they have their answer. The rural electrification program has proved one of the soundest investments ever made by the people of this country."

Back when REA came on the scene, few farms had electricity. Private companies have been active in this field, too. And now

few farms are out of reach of this great boon to rural life.

Even those most optimistic did not at first dream of the increasing use electricity would rapidly find in the rural areas. So the result has been that most rural lines had to be rebuilt or modified to carry the greater load, and it's still increasing. For electricity is more and more becoming the house servant and the handyman for every family.

At first electricity was mostly for lights and maybe the radio. Then came cooking, hot water, motors, refrigeration, air-conditioning, and maybe heating will be next. And the puny wires of the early days just couldn't carry the current that's needed now.

On a cold night the other winter our current went off. Lights went off. Supper stopped simmering on the stove, and company was coming. The furnace went off and the house started getting cold. The radio and television went dead. And we were just about on dead center there until it came back on. Yes, electricity has grown into one of the necessities of life in this day and time. The REA has sure played a big part in bringing it to the hard places.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a portion of a letter Mr. George V. Labadie, Sr., of Pawhuska, Okla., has written and is circulating to both Indians and non-Indians regarding my Indian self-help bill which I have dubbed "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style."

The author, George Labadie, is one of the outstanding Indian leaders of the country. His untiring efforts in behalf of H.R. 7701 demonstrates his grand decision to be of service to the Indian people.

Part of his letter is as follows:

I am enclosing a bill introduced June 12, 1959, by Congressman E. Y. BERRY from South Dakota. Also attached to the bill is a full explanation concerning same.

READ CAREFULLY

I firmly believe the program under this bill is the solution to the most important phase of the Indian problem. Congressman BERRY, author of the bill, is from South Dakota, has been a Member of Congress for 9 years and comes from an Indian country. He is on the Committee on Indian Affairs in the House, known as the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and as such member has rendered valuable services to the Indians.

The Osage Tribe of Indians in Oklahoma, of which I am a member of the Osage Tribal Council, has received splendid support and cooperation from Mr. BERRY in all our tribal business and legislation before the Congress of the United States. If the Indians in this country want progress and advancement from their present pitiful economical position, then let us all get behind H.R. 7701, which is the title of the proposed legislation introduced by Mr. BERRY.

I have been before the committees of Congress for 42 long years beginning in 1917 and during those years many plans have been initiated by the Indian Bureau and also the Congress of the United States concerning the welfare of the American Indians.

PRACTICALLY ALL OF THESE PLANS HAVE FAILED

Under this bill, H.R. 7701, generations of Indians can learn a trade, receive compensation for their services and become self-sustaining and independent from relief from their Government. But most important, this bill will restore their self respect and allow each Indian who participates in this program a decent standard of living for himself and his family.

Manners for the Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, all of us are troubled by the approaching visit of Mr. Khrushchev. I found the course of conduct recommended by an editorial in the Catholic Standard of August 21, 1959, a most responsible one. I believe the country would benefit from its counsel, and for this reason I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANNERS FOR THE VISIT

It is certainly understandable that the President should wish that Khrushchev be given a polite reception by the people of this country. It is understandable also, once the President had made his decision, that he should wish to contrive somehow a "friendly atmosphere" in which to conduct his conversations.

It is just as true that the President could not and would not expect Americans to be hypocritical or to deny their principles by hailing our self-appointed executioner who has bluntly boasted that he "will bury" us. We cannot conceivably be true to the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution which proclaims men to be free and equal by right of God's creation and cheer Khrushchev, covered with the blood of freemen, who only recently in Poland blasphemed God. It is very difficult to see how any loyal American can honestly cheer Khrushchev.

We feel also that the incisive speech by Senator DODD on this subject, to which so little press notice was given, contained a very apposite paragraph, "The American people, confronted now with exhortations to give Khrushchev a friendly reception, are being propagandized into a position of either applauding the Communist dictator or of appearing to hinder efforts to relax tensions." The Reds can use either or both of these effects to their own devastating advantage.

It is completely irrelevant to state that Americans should cheer Khrushchev because the Vice President was cheered by the Russians and the Poles. The Vice President is not Khrushchev. The Vice President was rightly hailed by the Russians and Poles because of the Nation he represents as well as his personal merits. Khrushchev represents the world's bloodiest tyranny and is himself a willing, guilty leader of that conspiracy. Long before he was the "Butcher of Budapest" he was the butcher of the Ukraine where he, in the land of his birth, supervised the ruthless suppression of his own section at the estimated cost of 4 million lives.

Regardless of the undeniably good intentions of the President and those who favor Khrushchev's visit, how can one compose the contradictions of free Americans cheering Khrushchev along Constitution Avenue? Is this a service to freedom and peace? Or is this a subversion of freedom and peace? Can cheers for the man who wears the red mantle of Stalin, appropriately killing and exiling his rivals, as he rides next to our President possibly advance the cause of justice, the basis of peace, as our President has acknowledged? Is there any conceivable legerdemain that could make the victims of Khrushchev believe that the cheers are not not for him and his villainy but for the Russian people and peace?

This is not to imply that a demonstration against Khrushchev would be advisable. The only deportment consonant with our principles, we feel, is a cool, formally correct reception that permits no denial of our heritage.

Interest on Government Savings Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received the following telegram from Reno Odlin, National Chairman of the Savings Bond Advisory Committee.

This points up the critical problem of the ceiling on savings bonds interest.

I urge my colleagues to give this telegram a thoughtful reading because I am convinced that before Congress adjourns consideration should be given to this most vital problem:

TACOMA, WASH.,
August 25, 1959.

The Honorable THOMAS M. PELLY,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

I earnestly hope the House will act to remove the ceiling on savings bonds interest. You know my long association with this program. I can feel the demoralization and letdown that is going on all over the country on account of the utterly unrealistic rate which now prevails. In my work as national chairman I am getting reports of this nature from all over the country. This is a program that affects over 40 million people and comprises over $42 billion of the Treasury's debt management problem. Whatever you and your associates may think about other aspects of the fiscal and monetary situation, the savings bond program surely merits realistic treatment to keep the thing going. I hope this session will not conclude without giving us the tools to work with. Momentum in a program of this magnitude once lost is very hard to regain. Revision of these rates to a level that makes sense in the present market will revive the whole program and give us an opportunity to be extremely helpful in the overall problem of distribution of the national debt in a noninflationary manner. It will also play fair with those millions of people who have bought bonds and are holding them, and with the millions who continue to buy them

from month to month on the payroll savings plan. I ask your cooperation in urging this upon your colleagues.

RENO ODLIN.

Our Confused Civil Defense Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, a recent column by Sidney Andorn published in the Cleveland News of August 12, 1959, clearly indicates the confused and muddled status of our civil defense program.

Mr. Andorn correctly points out that subaverage planners are drawing big salaries to head up the very confused Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. As a result of their activities and service, the Nation has spent nearly $1 billion of taxpayers' money and has less security than when the program began.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IT'S EVERY MAN FOR HIMSELF

(By Sidney Andorn)

It isn't indifference or apathy which has us so seemingly unconcerned about civil defense, Mr. President.

It's disgust.

Disgust with stupid leadership.

In a letter to New York's Governor Rockefeller you said the average American's indifference to civil defense must be overcome for the Nation's protection.

You should become better acquainted with the average American, Mr. President.

We don't want to be killed.

PLANNING BELOW AVERAGE

If you're really concerned about the Nation's protection you'd better look into the subaverage planners drawing big pay to head up civil defense.

Planning analyst for the evacuation of metropolitan centers in Ohio is working on expectation of 3 hours' attack warning.

Navy's new Project Tepee hopes to extend warning time from the present 15 minutes to 30 minutes.

Navy says Teepee won't be working for another couple of years.

WHAT ARE ACTUAL FACTS?

So what is it, Mr. President? Three hours' warning time in which to evacuate millions, or 15 minutes' warning time in which to say our prayers.

Or is it evacuate or go underground? New York has tossed out the evacuation program as useless.

New York's plan now, which your letter commends, calls for a voluntary program of providing shelters.

So after we've spent millions on civil defense it's every man for himself.

WAGER THEY'RE ALL SET

Now we're to get out our little shovels and our sacks of cement and dig ourselves shelters.

Nobody, however, tells us where to dig, how much cement, how deep to go, how big to build.

Nobody tells us where to get the dough for these diggings.

Don't you find it significant, Mr. President, that none of our visitors to Russia report on the Commies' civil defense?

You can bet it's not, as with us, that they're caught with their plans down.

View From the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, as one who has respected and admired the American Farm Bureau for the position it has taken on agricultural programs, I submit the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 17, 1959. The farm bureau is one of the great organizations of the country and its members come from small as well as large farms. I have personally witnessed local meetings of the organization where issues are debated and voted on. The results of the votes are forwarded to the State headquarters and ultimately to the national office.

When Mr. Shuman speaks it is fair to assume therefore that his views coincide with the thinking of the majority of farm bureau members. For that reason, they are entitled to every consideration.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 8, 1959]

VIEW FROM THE FARM

"Today's burdensome surpluses with their fantastic storage costs are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected the business of agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control."

Now, people reading those words might conclude they came from some city slicker so ignorant of the farm he thinks prize-winning calves always come in pairs a couple of inches above some shapely ankles.

Not so. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was the speaker. The Farm Bureau Federation represents 1.6 million farm families throughout the country, but does not, of course, claim to speak for all of them. It can speak for a considerable majority of its members, however, for frequent polls the federation holds invariably show opposition to the support programs.

The farmers would be vastly better off, Mr. Shuman told an audience recently in New York, if the Government would permit them to use the free marketplace to supply consumer needs. Government subsidy programs based on parity serve neither the interests of the consumer or the farmer, he added.

Nor of anybody else, for that matter. Consumers and farmers pay taxes (somebody once figured out that there are 51 taxes hidden in one loaf of bread) and the taxes they've paid for the monstrous farm program might be enlightening to some who don't realize the figures. Since 1954, and including 11 months of fiscal 1959, the farm program has realized losses of $5.8 billion.

In addition to paying farmers for things they grew and for things they didn't grow, the Government also spent some pretty impressive sums of money the farmers didn't get a dollar of.

For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation reports for the 11 months ending last May 31 that carrying charges alone on crops amounted to $495 million, interest amounted to $145 million, and general overhead—that euphemism for a bureaucracy that has moved in on the farmer faster than a corn borer through the lower forty—has cost the taxpayer $39.3 million in the same period.

Well, if a wasteful program such as this isn't even liked by farmers it's supposed to benefit, what in the world keeps it going?

Mr. Shuman had an answer for that one, too. "Though farmers often have asked that these programs be changed, the Congress has not yet taken effective action."

And that, so far as letting the public know who is really to blame for the follies of the farm program, ought to help separate the sheep from the goats.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials concerning the steel strike be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Aug. 21, 1959]

MITCHELL STATES THE FACTS—STEEL REPORT A WARNING TO INDUSTRY AND UNION

Taken together, Secretary of Labor Mitchell's factfinding report on the steel strike and his comments upon releasing it must be considered a solemn warning to both the industry and the union to come to terms soon or risk Government intervention.

Mr. Mitchell's report is restrained and objective—so much so, in fact, that each side interprets it as supporting its own position. It is also so comprehensive and balanced as to leave the general public, for whom it was ostensibly designed, lost in a sea of statistics and unable to make up its mind.

Some of the statistics appear to back management points in the 5-week-old controversy, while others support the union argument. In general, the report shows that steel wages and prices are ahead of those in industry generally.

The careful balancing and counterbalancing of fact in the 40-page document surely indicates a Government view that there is room for giving ground on each side.

While the Secretary carefully refrained from taking sides, it is significant that at his news conference he strongly underlined his belief that neither management nor union representatives have bargained as intensively as they should.

His idea of bargaining is that they should meet continuously and not on a 2- to 4-hour basis with a Friday to Tuesday weekend.

"Both sides," he warned, "should realize that they have a responsibility to the Ameri-

can public to settle this as expeditiously as possible."

How soon he thinks the strike problem will reach the critical stage may be inferred from his comment that very serious shortages of steel will begin to appear if a settlement is not reached by the latter part of September or early October.

As a one-man committee appointed by the President, Mitchell has made a soft beginning. But the tenor of his remarks indicate that as time goes on the Government will start exerting pressure for a settlement.

Mr. Eisenhower has repeatedly stressed his desire that the administration should not intervene in the dispute. Despite inferences to the contrary, it is reasonable to believe that he has been concerned not so much by political considerations as by a clear knowledge that he cannot properly invoke the Taft-Hartley law until the public interest is deeply involved.

Such an involvement would occur if a serious steel shortage should develop, as Mr. Mitchell suggests, a month or so from now.

One point in the report bears closely on one of the crucial issues in the strike, which is the question of output per man-hour. The steel companies have argued that steel prices have been forced up because increases in employment cost have exceeded increases in output per man-hour.

According to the Mitchell report, the industry's rate of annual increase in hourly output per worker since the war has been only 3 percent, compared with 3.7 percent for the economy as a whole and 3.1 for manufacturing plants.

This has occurred despite an increase in capital investment per production worker from $9,000 in 1947 to about $20,000 in 1957.

The administration has insisted all along that any steel settlement arrived at should not be inflationary. Mr. Eisenhower has held also that any wage boost granted should be tied to productivity.

While there is nothing that is new in any of the material assembled by Mr. Mitchell, the mere bringing it all together for reexamination and public appraisal may serve to throw new light on the complex issues involved.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Aug. 21, 1959]

THE STEEL INDUSTRY AS EMPLOYER

Secretary of Labor Mitchell's compilation of the facts regarding the steel industry as an employer ought to prove helpful in ending the steel strike. He and his department deserve credit not only for assembling a mass of relevant material but also for presenting it in readable form.

Probably neither union nor management will be overjoyed. Mr. Mitchell's facts show that both sides have exaggerated their claims and their grievances. Steel labor is well paid by any standard of comparison that can be employed. Steel profits are high this year but they are not as outrageously high as the union has tried to make them appear and over recent years they were actually below the average for comparable industries.

On the other hand the union's featherbedding, however damaging it has been, has not blocked all efforts toward increasing the efficiency of the mills. The union can show from Mr. Mitchell's report that output per man-hour of the wage earners in the mills has increased by 3 percent a year, a higher rate of increase than is credited to the rest of the working force in the steel industry. Management can reply by quoting Mr. Mitchell's figure of an average gain of 3.7 percent in output per man-hour for all the Nation's economy.

Probably the most serviceable section of the report is that dealing with wage settlements in recent months in other industries. What this shows is that about half the wage earners concerned in the new contracts received increases of at least 7 or 8 cents an hour, with some additional fringe benefits, or, to put it the other way around, half received less than these amounts.

It does not follow necessarily that the steelworkers union will settle for the median amount but that would be a pretty good place to start the bargaining, especially in view of the fact that the employers have given numerous indications that they regard the figure as reasonable. The featherbedding problem will remain, but Mr. Mitchell's figures have placed it in perspective.

Some day this strike is going to end and, if negotiations follow the usual course, it will end with concessions on both sides. Meanwhile it is costing millions of dollars to wage earners and companies alike, giving both an incentive to reach a settlement. The possibility of Government intervention under the Taft-Hartley law will become a probability as the Nation's economy is squeezed for lack of steel. Mr. Mitchell's facts and figures should help speed the reopening of the mills.

Nice Words About Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, recently I received the following letter regarding the National Music Camp located at Interlochen, Mich. While this is not in my district, I am proud of my whole State and her accomplishments:

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS,
AUTHORS AND PUBLISHERS,
New York, N.Y., August 20, 1959.

The Honorable MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: On August 10, as the immediate past president of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), I was invited by Dr. Joseph Maddy to attend the dedication services of the scholarship lodge our society contributed to the National Music Camp at Interlochen, Mich.

As a professional songwriter for many years, I had heard much about Interlochen and what this camp has done over a period of 32 years for the youth of America. This was my first visit. There is an old saying "Seeing Is Believing" and what I saw is something I will long remember. I saw the Interlochen student of today becoming the teacher of tomorrow in schools and colleges throughout the Nation. I saw the epitome of discipline in this great operation and what's more important I saw approximately 1,200 youngsters being guided by able and conscientious counselors, whose sole aim is to make them—good citizens of the future. As a dyed-in-the-wool New Yorker, and a former showman who has traveled all over the country, believe me the State of Michigan can be justly proud of this camp's success.

No doubt the Members of Congress have given their support, directly or indirectly, to this wonderful achievement. For this you are to be commended. If more States throughout the Union could boast of a comparable activity, I am sure there would be less juvenile delinquency.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of everyone connected with music when I say that although Michigan is the center of the automotive industry, it is also a great cultural center educating the youth of America in the arts and particularly in the universal language—music.

Hope I haven't taken up too much of your time, but I just couldn't resist telling a Michiganite how a New Yorker feels about your National Music Camp.

Respectfully yours,

PAUL CUNNINGHAM.

Visit of Premier Khrushchev in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, upon several occasions, I have made statements in criticism of the administration's invitation to Premier Khrushchev to visit this country.

As another supplement to my earlier remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two letters from readers which appeared in yesterday's issue of the Washington Evening Star. These letters express some of the shock and disgust felt by American citizens. How much greater must be the disillusionment of the millions of enslaved persons behind the Iron Curtain, and the victims of communism throughout the world, when they find that America, the bulwark of freedom, is embracing with open arms, as it were, the tyrant chief of world communism.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 24, 1959]

As a taxpaying citizen, I am curious to know whether President Eisenhower consulted with the immediate families and relatives of the pilots shot down over Turkey on September 2, 1958, as to the advisability of inviting Mr. Khrushchev to this country. As near as I can gather, the correct reason as to why this plane was shot down has not been forthcoming, nor has the State Department been able to secure an explanation although two very important Russian diplomats recently visited this country.

I would also like to know if the President has asked the families and relatives of some of the prisoners now held behind the Iron Curtain, whom the State Department has been unable to release, and likewise, the families and relatives of many of the men lost in Korea.

In the diligent quest for peace, it is hardly necessary to shake a murderer's hand.

J. KEITH CROMER, M.D.

Does Khrushchev's visit signal the final step in the master plan of the Communists to take over this country and to establish a world totalitarian dictatorship? A Russian Communist leader predicted that it would be so.

Dimetry Manuilsky, a prominent Red Party leader speaking before the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1930, declared: "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 to 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise.

The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fists."

A few years ago inviting a dictator to this country to be wined and dined would have been considered treason—or, at best, unpatriotic. Where are the voices of the "anti-Fascists" of the early forties who called out against appeasing Hitler? Would the Nazi Hitler have been invited to visit America? Are not both Khrushchev and Hitler dedicated to establishing a totalitarian world dictatorship?

Congress should force President Eisenhower to rescind the invitation to Khrushchev immediately.

KENT COURTNEY.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Mission With Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 10th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union.

The article follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 18, 1959]

MISSION WITH NIXON—RUSS SCRIBES PUT IN PLACE AT FINAL MOSCOW MEETING—HEALY TELLS OF RESTON QUERY THAT DID TRICK

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

(Tenth of a series)

WARSAW, POLAND.—Sunday, August 2, was a great day in my life.

That's the day I saw a U.S. newspaperman put a crowd of Russian newspapermen in their places, and it's also the day I got out of Russia.

After going to two churches, I had the great privilege of watching James "Scotty" Reston of the New York Times handle the Russian press at Spaso House.

Spaso House is the U.S. Embassy, scene of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S final public appearance in Russia.

When we were driven to this final conference we found all the front seats occupied by Russian reporters and photographers.

NIXON IMPARTIAL

Mr. NIXON, wisely, I think, recognized as questioners just as many Russians as Americans or British. The Russian questions were translated into English by an interpreter of the Russian Government, who in turn translated English questions into Russian for the Russian group. The answers also were given in two languages.

Most of the Russian questions weren't really inquiries—but speeches, pressing the Communist Party line.

As an example, here is a "question" by a representative of the Moscow radio named Zorin:

"Mr. Vice President, I have the impression that the conditions are such that representatives of the Soviet press have less opportunity of putting questions to you than foreign correspondents. The foreign correspondents you have with you on the trip have better opportunity of putting questions to you than the Russians. I want to insist that you give us Soviet correspondents the same opportunity to put questions to you. I am a representative of Moscow Radio, and my name is Zorin. I have a question. The Soviet Union has repeatedly suggested a ban on nuclear weapons to eliminate the arms race among nations and to put an end to war. The Soviet Union has made the same proposal after 1949 when it became known that the Soviet Union was the possessor of the nuclear weapon. The demand became stronger after 1953 when the Soviet Union became the possessor of thermo-nuclear weapons. Why, then, does the United States so persistently not want to put an end to all the atomic and nuclear weapons and eliminate all stocks of such weapons? My second suggestion is closely connected with the first one. In your television speech last night you touched on the open-sky plan. Why, since the Soviet Union accepted that suggestion in a form which excluded the using of that plan for intelligence purposes, the United States would not hear?"

WOULD STOP TESTS

Mr. NIXON'S reply, of course, was that the position of the United States was that it seeks not simply the writing of a paper but the stopping of the tests.

Then a representative of Pravda, official paper of the Soviet Union, a man named Litoshko, came in with a "question" similar to that of Mr. Zorin.

"Scotty" Reston got in his lick: "Mr. Vice President, in view of the questions put to you here by our Soviet colleagues, may I ask whether during your conversations you discussed with Mr. Kruschchev the aggressions in Korea or Indochina, or the Hungarian uprisings?"

The Vice President ruled out the Reston question as improper—in view of his policy of not disclosing the specific substance of discussions, on Russian soil, with top level Russian officials.

Although the question, technically, was improper, I suspect the Vice President was glad that it was asked.

I was.

PASSPORT HELD UP

It looked for awhile like I was not going to make the trip to Warsaw. As a matter of fact, it looked like I wasn't going anywhere.

Shortly before packup time on Saturday afternoon, August 1, I got the bad news from Tommy Tuck of the United States Embassy in Moscow that no visa had been issued for me to visit Poland and that my passport had not been returned. In other words, I had no permit to travel.

Others in the Nixon party were ready to go—visas and everything set.

When it was announced at a "briefing" that I had not been cleared to stay with the party everyone in the group was sympathetic. Some made suggestions as to how I should make my way back, alone, to the United States.

Naturally, I wanted to stay with the group. When you're in Russia or Siberia the phrase "collective security" comes to have real meaning. You're glad to be there with American friends, but you'd hate to be there all by yourself.

Representatives of the United States Embassy questioned me as to whether I had done anything which might be considered offensive to the Polish Government. I thought of a brush which I had with some Poles in Washington during World War II, but it didn't seem to me that this should have any bearing on my request for a visa.

Tommy Tuck and Richard Davies, State Department escort officer, went into action. At Tommy's request, the U.S. Embassy in Moscow telephoned the U.S. Embassy in Warsaw. Special action by the Polish foreign office was requested.

HALTED SECOND TIME

After several hours' suspense, I was told that my visa might still come through. I told our State Department representatives that I planned to go with the group to Warsaw—passport or no passport.

Late Saturday, my passport, with a Polish visa, was returned to me; but that was not the end.

At the Moscow airport Sunday I had to surrender this passport, with passports of other members of our party, for a final clearance before we could board the plane for Warsaw. When passports of the other members of the party came out with clearances, mine remained with the Russian officials.

Whatever the reason, clerical mistake or otherwise, I didn't get my passport and visa back for almost 2 hours. Our charter flight from Moscow to Warsaw was scheduled to depart at 3 p.m. We didn't get off the ground until 3:45 p.m.

I was the last man on the plane—holding up the bridge game for the championship of jet stream Russia, Siberia, and Poland.

West Virginia Legionnaires Active in National Convention; State Legion Memorial Address Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the American Legion, now holding its annual convention in Minneapolis, Minn., doubtless is providing a forum for the advocacy of the best in Americanism by sincere men and patriots who have given much of themselves that it shall be perpetuated.

More than 100 West Virginia Legionnaires are in attendance, headed by Department Commander Bonn Brown of my home city of Elkins. I forwarded to Commander Brown today the following telegram, which is of vital interest to veterans:

Senate Resolution 19, to establish a standing Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs, of which I am a cosponsor, has been favorably reported by the special subcommittee of Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. I am on record with a forthright statement to the full committee supporting this resolution and I am attempting to have the measure reported for action by the Senate at the earliest date possible.

The Highlanders, a noted bagpipe band composed of 26 members, including the color guards, received merited recognition during the famed Legion parade yesterday. This musical organization from the H. W. Daniels Post in my home county is under the leadership of my fellow townsman, I. H. Gainer, with C. S. Kump in charge of the color guard.

In this connection, I am reminded of the memorial address by Department Chaplain George L. Cutlip before the recent State convention at Parkersburg, W. Va., in which he spoke of the Bill of Rights as our "crowned jewels," our "treasured freedom which we are privileged to display through the affairs of our country."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the memorial address by Chaplain Cutlip.

There being no objection, the address was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CROWN JEWEL—MEMORIAL ADDRESS AT THE AMERICAN LEGION CONVENTION, DEPARTMENT OF WEST VIRGINIA, JULY 26, 1959, PARKERSBURG, W. VA.

(By George L. Cutlip, department chaplain)

Being a minister, it is difficult to begin an address without a text. Therefore, I have selected two sentences. In Psalms 56: 3–4 are these words, "When I am afraid I put my trust in Thee. In God, whose word I praise, in God I trust without fear," and, also, in the Psalm 72: 11, "Ye, all kings shall fall down before Him; all nations shall serve Him."

We have observed a beautiful ceremony, "The Post Everlasting." This we do to honor those who have paid the price for freedom. But in keeping with the theme of Abraham Lincoln, in his Gettysburg address, "It is for us, the living, rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Thomas Wolfe, in his book "You Can't Go Home Again" states: "I think the true discovery of America is before us. I think the true fulfillment of our spirit, of our people, of our mighty and immortal land, is yet to come. I think the true discovery of our own democracy is still before us."

David Douglas Duncan writes a story of a young soldier in the Korean war. The soldier was cold, beardy, clothes were showing signs of battle wear, and he had taken time out to eat his meal of a can of frozen beans, you know, those famous canned beans, and he was breaking each bean loose with his fork—and weighing the situation with all seriousness. He was asked by a passerby soldier what would be your request right now, if you had the privilege. His reply, "Give me tomorrow."

As the psalmist faced the many hardships of life, fears overshadowed him. He felt the tread of the enemy, the piercing of the arrow and the battleax, yet behind all these fears that crept into his life there was something that led to a trust in God. In our preamble, we say, for God and country, we associate ourselves together. We associate ourselves together for specific purposes. One is to overcome the fears that haunt our Nation, fear of world conflict, conflicts more destructive than those we have experienced. Here, we honor our comrades who have fallen in the many wars of the past, praying that no such an experience may befall our children. These are among the fears and unrest that haunt us each day as we read our papers and listen to the news on our audio-visual communication.

But again the psalmist said that all nations shall serve Him. This was the hope and dream of the psalmest as he wrote his beautiful songs. However, experience throughout the long period of human history teaches that liberty must be won in every generation and can be had only by "eternal vigilance." The Ten Commandments, the Magna Carta, and the Bill of Rights have each come into being at a time of great distress. They clearly represent the desire of a people who had paid a high price for their independence and were determined to keep it.

There is the story of a group of boys who built a shack in the woods. Each boy contributed his share of old lumber, nails, and covering. With a lot of pounding, sawing, and sweating a little shack was erected and the boys were very proud of the achievement. This was a magic example of cooperation. By pooling all their resources, a cozy retreat had been erected that protected them from the winds and rains.

But there were only a few days of the peaceful cooperation before one of the fellows became dissatisfied with the arrangement and began to tear off his boards and take them home. Each fellow joined in with his exasperations and likewise tore off his boards. Soon the cooperative enterprise was over, and only a trampled patch of weeds marked the place of the efforts of a neighborhood of boys.

Why have I told you this story? You say that happens with any gang of boys. Yes, it does, and it makes about as much sense as we do sometimes with our reasoning regarding our freedom and safeguarding against our fears. It is the united effort of every one of us that makes our Nation great and wards off our fears of destruction, fear of the might hand of tyranny, fear of the destruction of our American way of life.

Like old Caleb at the age of 85 years, when he was given the privilege to select the best of the land under the command of Joshua, he replied, "Give me the hill country." Thomas Wolf challenged his readers that much lies ahead for America—that the true democracy lies ahead. These are prophetic words, yet they bear much consideration.

We gathered here because we have had a common experience of at least two wars, and some three—World Wars I and II, and the Korean war. Our freedom has been challenged. We have come to realize that not all nations have learned to serve a God who is sovereign; nor to respect the rights of others, even though we may differ in certain idealism.

Our treasured freedom is the Bill of Rights—our "crowned jewels" which we are privileged to display through the affairs of our country.

They provide that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the government for redress of grievances."

Freedom is a man at a lathe, or at the desk, doing the job he likes to do, and speaking up for himself. It is a man in the pulpit, or on the street corner, speaking his convictions.

It is a man puttering in the garden in the evening, and swapping talk with his neighbor over the fence. It is the unafraid faces of men and women and children at the beach on Sunday, or looking out of the car windows speeding along a beautiful highway.

It is the man saying "Howdy," without looking cautiously over his shoulder.

Freedom is the air you breathe and the sweat of your toil. It is you, every American like you, with your chin up, daring anybody to take your Americanism away from you. It is you, unafraid—with an unfaltering trust in God. "For God and Country we associate ourselves together"—"In God we trust without a fear." This is the freedom—this is the America our comrades died for that we might live as free men. It is to us, the living, to be dedicated—unafraid—to the unfinished task remaining before us, and to discover the true democracy that lies ahead.

Poles Dressed Up—Smiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 11th in a series of articles by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union.

The article follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Aug. 19, 1959]

MISSION WITH NIXON—POLES DRESSED UP—SMILING—MASSES APPEAR MORE FREE THAN THEY ARE IN RUSSIA

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

(Eleventh of a series)

WARSAW, POLAND.—Although some of us had come to regard the Ukraina Hotel in Moscow as akin to a second home, moving from Moscow to Warsaw was like crossing from a forbidding swamp to a promised land.

Switching from the Russian Aeroflot jets to the Trans World Airways 707–171 was comparable to leaving an old local accommodation mixed train to board the Panama Limited.

The flight from Moscow to Warsaw passed swiftly. Only an absence of trunk highways made the terrain below, seen occasionally through the overcast, appear any different from the rolling country of northwest Louisiana.

Our reception in Warsaw, to put it conservatively, was sensational—and unexpected. The Polish city did everything it could to make us feel welcome, from carpeting Vice President NIXON'S automobile with flowers to applauding all of us every foot of the way from the airport to the Grand Hotel.

Practically all the men and women and many children in the lines along the highway and streets through which we rode were well dressed—western style. Few men were without ties. All smiled or waved a cordial welcome as we passed.

When the NIXON automobile was alongside, the shout was "NIX-OON" or "Pat."

Through the 10-plus miles from the military airport to the hotel I heard not a single "Go home, Yankee," and saw not a single unfavorable gesture.

That more than 250,000 people turned out was remarkable, considering there had been little advance notice of our coming. The Warsaw newspaperman, a stanch Socialist, who estimated that the NIXON crowd exceeded 250,000 told me that Nikita S. Khrushchev attracted about 100,000 3 weeks earlier.

Our first night in Warsaw was memorable. The nation's association of newspapermen, comparable with the National Press Club in Washington, or with IBI in Rio de Janeiro, entertained at a cocktail party and buffet. On the program was presentation of a motion

picture showing steps in the restoration of Warsaw.

Although it was more than 14 years ago when the last bomb fell on the city, Warsaw still has heavy war scars. Just across the street from the Grand Hotel is a vacant lot, with scattered bricks reminding that a building once stood there. Coming from the airport we passed several bombed buildings whose ruins cry for demolition. The walls lean dangerously.

People of Warsaw with whom I talked expressed optimism as to the outcome of the Nixon visit. The president of the journalists' group (I can't spell his name), who was in New Orleans in 1957, suggested that the visit will bring much closer ties between the United States and the Polish People's Republic.

Thousands of Poles who went to the airport to inspect our TWA 707–171 jet were disappointed. They found the military airport closed to civilians. Before its ramp was removed at the Moscow Airport, more than 5,000 Russians had passed through this plane.

To the U.S. visitor, Warsaw definitely is a warmer city than Moscow, figuratively speaking. Its people extended the same kind of welcome to our party that was extended in Siberia—where visitors seldom are seen.

Poles definitely have more freedom than the masses in Russia. Their churches and church schools apparently are functioning normally.

European editions of U.S. newspapers, the New York Times and the Herald Tribune, are on sale here. In Russia they are not available, the official explanation being that demand for them is not great enough to justify their importation.

Poles, I found early, aren't enthusiastic about either Russian culture or the Russian language. When I said to a waiter, "spaseebo," the Russian word for "thank you," he frowned. Poles whom I met prefer to be spoken to in Polish, in French, or in English.

The Polish newspapermen were particularly helpful to our party. They provided each of us a list of editors and reporters of Warsaw newspapers and periodicals who can speak English. On the list were 61 names, with telephone numbers. As in Moscow, there apparently are no telephone directories in Warsaw. At least, we couldn't find one.

Trybuna Ludu, the organ of the Central Committee Party, expressed to us the feeling of the leaders of Poland regarding our visit.

This newspaper, which I was told is just as official for the party in power in Poland as is the official organ of the Communist Party in Russia, resurrected a phrase which long has been in mothballs—the phrase "coexist." We heard of coexistence once in Russia, when Mr. Khrushchev spoke at the U.S. exhibition.

"The Polish People's Republic and the United States are states with different social systems," said the Polish official organ. "Independent, however, of the social-political differences, both states and their nations can and should coexist between themselves in harmony and friendship, developing a mutual cooperation particularly in the economic and cultural fields, doing everything which is possible within their power to make peace permanent on earth and to prevent the most horrible of catastrophies which an atomic war could be for humanity."

This newspaper reminded us that while the United States with a capitalist system has developed the world's greatest productive capacity, the Polish nation "when it lived under a capitalist system in the period before September 1939, not only could not raise itself from economic backwardness and improve its welfare, rather, the system pushed it further into greater poverty and misery."

We were left no room to doubt that Poland prefers socialism to capitalism—this on the basis of what we read in the Polish papers and what we heard from Poles with whom we talked.

Although Poland is a Russian satellite, we hear in Warsaw no mention of communism.

My horseback opinion is that Poland differs from Russia in official attitude toward other nations. The Kremlin unquestionably would like to impose communism on the whole world. Polish leaders, barring stooges of Khrushchev in Warsaw, aren't interested in what kinds of government other nations have so long as those nations permit Poland to have its socialism.

Increase of Acreage Limitation of Oil and Gas Leases in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I have received a letter from a person eminently well qualified to discuss the merits of recently vetoed H.R. 6940, a bill providing for the increase of acreage limitation of oil and gas leases in Alaska. The author of this letter, Mrs. Irene E. Ryan, is a graduate mining engineer, the first woman graduated in that field from the New Mexico School of Mines, a senator in the Alaska State Legislature, and chairman of the Alaska State Committee on Natural Resources.

I ask unanimous consent that Mrs. Ryan's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD:

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF ALASKA, SENATE,
Juneau, Alaska, August 19, 1959.

Hon. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: The act of the President in vetoing legislation granting an acreage increase for oil leasing in Alaska did not come as a surprise to Alaskans. The testimony given in opposition in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the adverse statements originating from the Secretary's office in the Department of the Interior led us to expect the President's action.

There is no question in my mind that the result will be detrimental insofar as oil and gas exploration programs in Alaska are concerned. It would be impossible to evaluate just how detrimental for the simple reason that we cannot know the cuts that will be made in the exploration programs the several hundred oil companies and independent producers had been considering for the State. It will have an immediate effect upon anticipated revenues from lease rentals that would accrue to the State for two reasons:

1. The amount of new acreage taken under lease will be materially restricted;

2. Leases now going into their fourth and fifth years of rental payments and held by individuals—most of them Alaskans—will expire and return to public domain.

The individuals simply do not have the money to pay continuing rentals; nor do they have the money to pay for the initial geological and geophysical exploration work which might show them if the leases are, in fact, worth keeping. They are now foreclosed from turning over the leases to companies able and willing to do such work because such companies and independents have already saturated their acreage allowable. Many people have asked me why the adverse report was given by the Department of Interior and why the President vetoed the bill. Obviously, the Peraident depended upon the advice of one of his Cabinet members, the Secretary of the Interior.

I cannot agree with the reasons given by that Department for their nonsupport of the bill. I have read their testimony before the committee with extreme care and find that it hinges entirely upon the statement that they do not believe the increase would be helpful or desirable or that it would promote the development of oil and gas in Alaska as contemplated by the Mineral Leasing Act.

In hearings held in Alaska and attended by the general public as well as the industry, it was made abundantly clear that the present acreage limitation was, in fact, hampering the exploration and development program in our State. The reasons were given with great detail by specialists in the industry and in such a manner that they were grasped by all attending. It was also evident at the hearings that the desire for an increased and realistic acreage limitation in this great State was not the desire of one or two major companies but was the solid and uniform thinking of the 21 major oil companies represented and approximately 30 independent operators. These are the people who are not only leasing lands in Alaska, but budget funds which run into the millions annually for geological and geophysical exploration in the State.

The State has two present and future sources of revenue from its petroleum resources. They are land lease rentals and royalties from oil or gas produced. In comparing the possible return to the State from these two sources, it is obvious to anyone who cares to play with the figures that royalties from two or three major fields would far surpass rental payments. It is also obvious that if discoveries are not made, revenues from lease rentals will decrease rather than increase. However, it is further evident that for the next several years the lease rentals will be an important factor in balancing the State budget. We must then, for the immediate revenue need, encourage continuing leasing and, for our long term hopes, keep the industry's interest in exploration in Alaska active. We know that the industry must balance the possible returns from money spent in Alaska with the same dollars spent anywhere else in the world, not only this year but in future years. We are most anxious that our laws and the Government administering them keep Alaska in a reasonably competitive position.

We find, then, that the Department of Interior does not believe the increase would be helpful or desirable, whereas the industry that will actually have to spend the money for exploration and development testifies that it is needed.

It may not have been so intended, but the expertly prepared and profuse testimony in opposition to this bill which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 4 and August 6 leads to several wrong conclusions on the part of the average reader. They are points which I have been asked to explain and are as follows:

1. That, were the acreage increased, a major company could lease 600,000 acres at a very low cost, have the advantage of listing it as a reserve in their assets, and would therefore not spend any money in explora-

tion and development. This is not a true picture of the facts:

(a) Completely wildcat acreage cannot be listed as a reserve. Oil company reserves are known and quantitatively measured pools of oil and gas. It is quite possible that a 600,000 acre lease block in Alaska actually contains no oil or gas in commercial quantities.

(b) Furthermore, the 600,000 acres allowed would be leased under a Federal noncompetitive lease which is issued for a period of 5 years with a possible 5-year extension. An exploration program to properly evaluate the 600,000 acres would take a minimum of 5 years in Alaska. Any company holding such acreage knows that it will have to explain to its board and stockholders the ultimate value of the holding to the company. Since its value can actually be found only after extensive geological and geophysical exploration and since it would take in the neighborhood of 5 years to acquire this basic information, there would be no such thing as holding and freezing land under lease.

(c) Geological and geophysical exploration in Alaska is expensive. It also leaves dollars in Alaska and ultimately acquires for the benefit of the State the information obtained. This phase of an exploration program is divided into (1) rough geological reconnaissance, (2) rough geophysical surveys, and (3) detailed geophysical surveys and geological mapping.

I have before me the costs of one of the companies operating in Alaska. They have spent $340,000 in rough geological reconnaissance to look at 30 million acres, a cost of $0.0114 per acre. They have spent $177,000 for a rough geophysical survey to evaluate 1,152,000 acres, or a cost of $0.155 per acre. They have spent $850,000 in a detailed seismic survey to evaluate 300,000 acres, or a cost of $2.84 per acre. Even the detailed seismic survey is not the final step in this phase of the exploration program. Continuing seismic surveys, together with a well drilled for stratographic information as much as for finding of oil is necessary before the company can make a decision if the acreage is worth retaining for a further search for oil.

2. That, were the acreage limitation increased, a major company could then be in a position to control the oil industry in Alaska.

(a) There is no industry, in spite of the giants within its ranks, that is so competitive as the oil industry. The only way, even with the increased acreage allowable, that any one company could control the oil industry in Alaska would, in fact, be if the only field in the State existed under their acreage block. Considering the extensive probable petroleum provinces within the State, this possibility seems to me rather remote.

3. That there will be fewer wells drilled if this acreage limitation is increased rather than requiring the companies to apply for nonchargeability through development contracts.

(a) It is true that the final answer to the question of whether particular acreage does embrace commercial deposits of oil and gas can only be found by drilling. However, to require the drilling of a well as a primary and mandatory provision of obtaining a lease would result in such an expensively wasteful program that the cost of each barrel of oil found in Alaska would be priced right out of the market. Drilling is the final and the most expensive step in a long and expensive exploration program.

(b) Every dry hole drilled is a discouragement to the industry. Even after applying all the scientific techniques available in studying an acre of wildcat ground, the ratio of successful wells, industrywide, remains 1 in 10. It is important that the industry's experience in this regard in Alaska does not develop a lower ratio if we are to keep their interest here. Mandatory and indiscriminate drilling requirements could easily, at the present time, bring about this result and could, in fact, result in a completely wrong conclusion; i.e., that there is little commercial oil in the State.

4. That an oil company can increase its acreage holdings without any limitations under development contracts and unit agreements.

(a) The development contract is a useful means of securing nonchargeability of acreage, but it is not the sole answer to the present problem in Alaska. In the first place, although a development contract granted to a single company may embrace hundreds of thousands of acres, not all the acreage within its defined borders is necessarily owned by nor controlled by the company.

(b) To obtain a unit agreement, the company must have completed a sufficient geological and geophysical program to support an immediate and mandatory drilling program.

(c) This means that the company will have already spent from $2 to $5 an acre on lands, including those over which it has no ownership or control and which, by the time the program has reached the point that the company is willing to embark on a unit agreement, have been leased by other individuals and companies.

The testimony given to the Senate Interior Committee already points out that the size of Alaska and its potential oil provinces scattered in some seven geographic areas demands special consideration if equity with the other States is intended. Despite the President's veto and the action of the Department of Interior, I still believe this legislation is necessary and good for all the people. Senator ALLOTT's testimony indicated that his objections to the bill would be removed if other legislation pertaining to amending lease rentals, wiping out option provisions, and other amendments to the oil and gas laws, which are now in Senate Interior Committee, were considered at the same time. I would urge the early consideration of these measures with full hearings and recommend that one of them be amended to increase the acreage allowable to 600,000 acres without geographical division in the State of Alaska.

Very truly yours,

IRENE E. RYAN.

Address by Dr. T. Keith Glennan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a very able address of Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, delivered on August 24, 1959, to the fourth U.S. Air Force technical symposium on ballistic missiles and space technology held in Los Angeles, Calif.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. T. KEITH GLENNAN, ADMINISTRATOR, NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION, BEFORE THE 4TH USAF BMD SYMPOSIUM ON MISSILES AND SPACE TECHNOLOGY, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AUGUST 24, 1959

It is my purpose this morning to discuss with you some of the conclusions that we of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration have reached after almost a year of operation. There could be no more appropriate forum for such a discussion than this fourth technical symposium on ballistic missiles and space technology. The members of this audience represent a solid core of the science-industry-Government team that is responsible for the acchievements of our national space effort to date. I hardly need add that you make up the team upon which the vital space work of the future must depend.

There is a tried and true formula for speech preparation that runs something like this—tell them what you are going to say—say it—and then tell them what you have said. I am going to attempt to follow that format this morning as I speak out on basic problems that confront us—problems that are common to all who labor in these missile and space technology fields.

Specifically, I want soberly to examine with you the present state of the art in these fields. While I yield to no one in the extent of my enthusiasm about the future in this business, I will not be painting a rosy, pie-in-the-sky picture of manned space transports, civilian colonies, and manned military bases on the moon or other planets, warehouses in space and the like. There seems to be a contest going on in this country in which substantial numbers of people are attempting to outdo each other in predicting exotic accomplishments in space in the next few years. In my opinion, there is need for more commonsense and good technical judgment to be injected into this picture. While there are others more able than I to handle such an assignment, my position as Administrator of NASA compels me to state my convictions in these matters as part of my responsibility of keeping the Congress and the public fully and currently informed.

As you know, it was just 1 year ago last month that the President signed the bill establishing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Building on the foundation of organization, personnel, plant assets, programs, and problems transferred from the NACA, ARPA, and the military services, NASA was a going concern from the day we announced that we were in business, the 1st of October 1958. We lacked, as did all of the others engaged in the space business, a full realization of the complexity of the technological problems facing us. And we were neophytes—probably still are—in our understanding of the costs to be incurred in a hard-hitting, broadly based national space program. But we had—and we still have—enthusiasm and real zeal for the great adventure that still lies before us: the discovery of new knowledge about our universe and the application of that new knowledge and supporting technology for the benefit of mankind everywhere.

Now, what have we learned from our successes and failures of the past year? And what are we planning for the future as a result of our experiences—both good and bad? Remember, please, that I am speaking about the civilian space program—not the military program. However, they are closely related—and are interdependent in many ways and it is probable, therefore, that some portion of my remarks may have applicability in the military area, as well.

In the first place, we have learned that we are not nearly as far advanced in space technology as we had thought or hoped. Our experiences in the space vehicle field have been less than completely satisfactory. The ratio of successful launches to what has been termed by some as "successful failures" has not improved very much in the past year. And as soon as we began to plan for second generation experiments we found that we were facing some hard facts of life in the propulsion and guidance fields. Even today, every shot we make—either by the military

or by ourselves in NASA—is a shot in which there is little or no margin for even a slight deviation from planned performance parameters. In thrust capability, in guidance-injection, midcourse and terminal, in thrust control—in all of these areas there is much that must be learned and applied before we undertake the difficult missions we all talk about so glibly.

Secondly, it is becoming clear that we cannot and should not attempt to undertake all of the hundreds of projects that are being recommended to advance our understanding of the space environment. We haven't the manpower, the facilities or the funds. More important than any of these, however, is the fact that it seems to me that we will make progress faster if we move at a rate that will enable us to understand a bit more about the things we have already done and the information we have already acquired from successful experiments that are behind us.

Probably more than any other single matter, the question that plagues all of us is one of reliability. When will we be able to count on being successful in launching and placing into orbit or on the desired trajectory in deep space as many as three out of four of our intended experiments? We should admit, quite frankly, that with distressingly few exceptions, we have not achieved complete success in any mission to date—success in the sense that the payload has been injected into orbit or into a deep space trajectory within reasonable limits of the planned flight objectives and in the sense that the payload has performed its mission satisfactorily.

Now lest you think I am being unduly harsh, let me hasten to say that our competitors in the U.S.S.R. have reported only their successful flights to date. We know they have had failures. We don't know, in any instance, whether even their announced successes have really come any closer to the intended objectives than have ours. And I am mindful of the truly great accomplishments that the United States has managed in the past 2 years in the space field. Indeed, I am proud to be one of those associated in a responsible way with this national effort where success or failure may well have implications far beyond the immediate civilian or military utility of the experiments we attempt.

We are the one nation in this world which has developed its position of leadership through the application of science and technology to the alleviation of man's back-breaking burdens while continuing to protect the rights of the individual citizen. For us to play second fiddle in this space business is to admit that we have lost a part of our genius for experiment—for taking a competitive risk—for searching out new facts about nature that ultimately will improve the well-being of mankind everywhere. No; we cannot and I am sure we will not fail to demonstrate once again that free men—when challenged—can rise to the heights and overcome the lead of those who build on the basis of the subjugation of the rights of the individual as they dictate to him the path he must take in response to the demands of the state.

Now that may seem to be a bit of histrionics to the sophisticates in this audience but it is the creed by which we must guide our actions in the days ahead. And we are not going to achieve our goals by wishful thinking about difficult technical problems.

But I'm afraid I'm being carried away by my own convictions about the basic capabilities that reside in our people while the realities of this business await attention. Having told you very, very briefly about the more important bits of realism that have been impressed upon us during the past year, let me now tell you something of our thinking about the future.

First, as to program—we have had to face up to the fact that we simply cannot do everything that is proposed either by members of the scientific community, other agencies or by our own people. Some of the firing schedules we developed 9 months ago lacked the realism that now characterizes our planning.

Within the next year, I think you will be able to note an orderliness about the attack our people will be making in the space sciences area. Thus far we have been engaged in completing experiments planned for the International Geophysical Year. In fields such as astronomy, meteorology, and the physical sciences, we are developing a determined and well-planned program. Lead times for most of these experiments will be long and will call for continuing high levels of effort and support. Unless we can achieve this goal, we will lack, ultimately, the underpinning for the entire space program and may miss the really important discoveries that now lie hidden from our view.

We plan to concentrate our initial efforts in deep space on lunar missions—rear miss, orbiting and hard and soft landings of payloads. In this program we will develop the techniques necessary to accomplish missions into deeper space and will use them for such missions as their reliability and the opportunity permits.

Second—as to basic research and advanced technology—we expect to support greater effort in the universities, other nonprofit institutions, and in industry in both basic research and in advanced development of systems components. In the development of better methods and devices in the fields of guidance, control, telemetry, auxiliary power units and sensors of all types—in all of these areas, we see the need for greater concentration of effort. Through such actions we hope to improve the reliability of the systems which will employ these components.

Third—as to booster systems—it is becoming increasingly apparent that greater efforts must be placed on simplification and reliability. As a corollary, it seems quite clear that continued attention must be given to reduction in the number and varieties of rockets and rocket booster systems for use in the space business. It is unlikely that these systems will become off-the-shelf production items in the foreseeable future. With limited numbers of firings in prospect, reliability can be expected only if the variety of systems is kept at a minimum. It will be cheaper to waste payload space in using an oversize booster that becomes reliable through continued use than to tailor boosters for each specific mission with the attendant lowered reliability that surely will result from infrequent use.

As we move ahead in our program, using newly developed vehicles of larger size and with more stages, the problems of achieving successful flights will increase. Recognizing the statistical success thus far achieved with the single- and two-stage missiles and the number of firings required in their development period, we must ask the question as to the probable success of a seven-stage vehicle required to land a man on the moon and return him to earth. Clearly, major advances in research and development techniques leading to greater vehicle reliability must be accomplished. Both the cost and development time will be prohibitive if vehicle development depends, as it does now, so heavily on "trial by fire." As a part of our program we are currently studying methods for development that might lead to earlier success of our flight vehicles, and the progress we make here may well determine how long it will take to do the advance missions that we are all so anxious to accomplish.

Finally—as in most other advanced technologies—a vast new area of materials research is being opened up by our space exploration requirements. As you well know, many materials exhibit different properties when used in radiation fields and in the vacuum of space. These materials must be improved or other materials found or developed to replace them. Magnesium, for example, sublimates in a vacuum—and effectively disappears. Another phenomenon—two moving metal surfaces in a vacuum tend to weld together by molecular adhesion. Our engineers and scientists are facing many such problems, but the list is far too long to catalog here.

My point is simply this: We have used up much of our missile technology. We have drawn heavily on our capital—the knowledge and experience accumulated by the military services, by industry and by NACA and others over the past 10 years or so. We must replenish that capital with new knowledge. From here on out, space research is going to be a matter of the same determined plugging away that has characterized aeronautics research—and, indeed all scientific endeavor.

As for Russian space achievements, we have learned that while they use their successes effectively for propaganda—and are able to hide their failures—their public claims have been, to the best of our knowledge, factual. Their scientists, however, are not the giants they would have us believe—they simply started working in this particular field 6 or 7 years before we did. It would be tragic if we had to admit they were working harder today than we. But they have set for us some targets by the success of their efforts thus far announced.

For instance, while we have no information which lead us to believe that the Russians have solved all of the guidance problems I mentioned earlier, obviously their guidance is good and obviously they are not standing still.

One of the most sensible men in our business today is my good friend, Dr. Lee DuBridge, president of the California Institute of Technology. I presume that most of you have read his article in the August issue of Harper's magazine. I think that he offers the most reasonable analysis of our present situation that I have seen lately.

Dr. DuBridge reminds us that conditions in space are completely outside all human experience up to now. He points out that the essential elements that sustain life—among them air, water, and food, as well as fuel for the craft—are missing. All these things, including instruments and other kinds of equipment, will have to be carried along with the astronaut, creating the biggest problem in logistics that has ever faced an expedition into the unknown.

Dr. DuBridge goes on to say that at the presently unattainable rate of 93,000 miles per hour—the speed required to overcome the gravitational attraction of the Sun—it would take 3 weeks to arrive at Mars, more than 3 years to visit Neptune, and 28,000 years to reach Alpha Centauri, the nearest star.

He emphasizes that maneuvering in space calls for totally new techniques of motion. No object in orbit can overtake another one, or lie in wait for it. Instead, it must be intercepted by a trajectory based on complex calculations, and on adjustments in course and speed of the utmost exactness.

The energy requirements for space vehicles are most formidable, and Dr. DuBridge cites the problem of sending a single man with a minimum amount of equipment (weighing in all about 1 ton) on a trip to the moon and back. A rocket with about 300,000 pounds of thrust—and we have such rockets—will carry him to the vicinity of the moon. But the weight of fuel needed to

land him on its surface will treble the necessary thrust raising it to 900,000 pounds. To bring him back and land him safely on the earth increases this to at least 5 million pounds of thrust—several times the amount provided by the biggest single rocket engine now under development by NASA.

In spite of these difficulties, and others equally challenging to engineers and physiologists, Dr. DuBridge is not discouraged; nor am I. We share the belief that space exploration by mankind within the solar system is both feasible and necessary—that it is indeed inevitable—and that it may offer rewards enough, in knowledge and in practical benefits yet unknown, to keep humanity occupied for the next hundred years. We recognize that the total cost will be colossal, but that the unforeseen—and unforeseeable—dividends, spread out over the years, will justify the cost.

Some Americans, as I and no doubt many of you have learned, have quite a different outlook. The other morning I had breakfast in the coffee shop of a Washington hotel. Two men were at an adjoining table. One was in a table-banging temper. When he mentioned what he called "this space folderol," I naturally pricked up my ears. I confess that I eavesdropped a little which wasn't hard since he had a powerful voice and made no attempt to lower it.

Among other things, he said—and I quote—"We had a 3-inch rain in Washington last Saturday. So what happened? The drains need working over so badly that a good deal of the city was flooded. People had to swim away from their cars.

"Now," he went on to say, "with a situation like that, right here in Washington, why in the name of commonsense are so many millions being spent on such nonsense as shooting a lot of hardware to the Moon? Who cares about the Moon? There's plenty to do down here without wasting money on things like that."

There is, of course, a fundamental difference between solving the problem of overloaded storm drains and sewers in Washington and conducting research and development in space. For the drainage problem there is a ready solution needing only money to complete the loop. Research in space and the development of useful applications of knowledge gained through that research requires imagination, courage, and lots of money. It may well prove to be one of the most exciting and profitable ventures of all time. But it is so easy to be carried away by our own enthusiasms to the point where we begin to ignore realities. It is obvious that the man I overheard is not convinced that research, and particularly research in space holds much promise for him.

Naturally, I do not agree with the gentleman's opinion about this matter. I do, however, concede that he had a right to his opinion and I am afraid that there are many others like him—persons who are less than excited over trips to the Moon and the building of way stations in space. Our problem—yours and mine—is to be as responsible as possible in our public utterances in this field. Overstatements of wonders that are to come may be exciting to some people—but I seriously doubt that those on whose understanding we must depend for continuing support will be thus convinced.

Speaking of support—you will note that I have said nothing directly about costs. That is a story in itself with which most of you have some familiarity. I would say only that space program costs will increase substantially in the years ahead if we are permitted to carry out the programs now believed to be desirable and necessary in both the civilian and military fields.

If you term this a sobering picture, I have made my point. But I do not intend it to be a pessimistic one. Our horizons will be bounded only by the limits of our imaginations, our ability to perform responsibly the tasks we undertake and by our ability thus to convince the Congress and the public of the worth and urgency of our programs. It is high adventure we are experiencing—let us be worthy of our trust.

Depressed Domestic Mining and Mineral Industries

SPEECH

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to add my word of commendation to the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee for bringing this resolution not only to the committee but to the House floor for action.

Certainly no harm can come from the passage of such a resolution, and possibly a great deal of good may result.

While this resolution is directed to the executive branch of Government, I am confident nothing will be accomplished until Congress itself decides to protect the American mining industry from complete destruction through the importation of foreign mineral products.

It is the importation of foreign minerals that has destroyed the American mining industry and will continue to destroy the American mining industry until tariffs and quotas are levied on such imports. Congress sits idly by and condemns the executive branch for not protecting the industry through the peril point and escape clause in the Reciprocal Trade Act.

With one hand the Congress directs the executive branch and the State Department of the executive branch to contract with these foreign countries for the imports of their mineral products, and then on the other hand when these imports do come in and do flood our market and put our mining industry out of business, they condemn the executive branch for not invoking the peril point and the escape clause provisions of the act.

The responsibility, Mr. Chairman, is that of Congress. It is Congress that represents the people of these United States and the industries of these United States. It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to levy import tariffs, quotas, and duties. That authority, that responsibility, and that duty is placed upon the shoulders of Congress, and we cannot shift it to some other branch of Government.

Those who espouse the one-world philosophy contend that we must keep our borders free to all foreign imports, and if we have an industry which cannot compete with foreign competition, the companies engaged in such industry should go out of business and the people employed in such industry should find work elsewhere because, they contend that Americans, with all their ingenuity and efficiency, must be able to compete with countries less fortunate than ours.

This argument, Mr. Chairman, does not take account of the fact that our industries and our mines are not given an opportunity to compete on the same basis with foreign industry and foreign mines. This argument does not take into account the fac. that the cost of operation of a mine or an industry in the United States cannot start on an equal footing with its foreign competitors.

That argument does not take into account the fact that the cost of operation of a domestic mine or a domestic industry, which must be added to the cost of the product before we can hope to begin to compete, are such items as salaries, taxes, and foreign aid.

Competitors of the American mining industry operating foreign mines are able to hire help working for one-half or one-third of the salary that must be paid to American workmen. Not only that, but they are working 12 hours a day 7 days of the week, where labor in the United States operates under wage-hour laws, minimum wage laws, a cost-of-living standard that is being forced higher and higher annually. The labor expense, which is a large part of the domestic mining cost cannot be offset by efficiency in operation.

The second thing the internationalists forget in their contention that domestic industry must be more efficient to compete with foreign industry and foreign minerals, is taxes. The internationalists would like to have us forget that our foreign competitors are not required to add onto the cost of their production, the defense of their country. The American taxpayer defends them. The American mine and the American mining industry carries a heavy burden of taxes to defend their competitors in these foreign countries. American labor carries a heavy burden of taxes to defend, if you please, the laborers in these foreign countries who are in competition with them. Yes, the American producer is required to add to his product the cost of the defense of not only the peoples of these foreign countries, but the very industries that are in competition with them. This cost must be added to the cost of the domestic product, all of which is free to the foreign competitor.

Not only is the domestic mining industry and domestic labor defending them, but they are at the same time required to finance these countries for the operation of their own government. Through foreign economic aid and public assistance, we are constructing public powerplants and reclamation projects for the nations within whose borders the competing mines are located. They are not required to pay taxes to finance these

programs in their country. The American taxpayer, the American miner, and the American laborer are carrying that burden for them—a burden which must be added to the product we are producing and must be added to the cost of our minerals before we are permitted to even begin to compete with foreign imports.

The third unfair competition the American mining industry is required to meet, and which is added to the cost of the product produced domestically, was brought out forcefully on the House floor last week when we were debating the extension of Public Law 480.

Not only are the American industrialist, the American laborer, and the American miner required to pay taxes to maintain the agricultural support program, but in addition to that, we turn around and give to the people of these competing countries the food and fiber necessary for them to be able to live on a starvation wage that is being paid by the mines in these foreign countries.

Not only is the domestic mining industry required to pay taxes to maintain and defend his foreign competitor, and at the same time compelled to compete with low salaries and low standards of living, but in addition to that, he is forced through Public Law 480, through our foreign aid program, and through these other assistance programs to provide the food, free of charge in many instances, that goes into the household of the laboring man employed by these competing industries.

No, Mr. Chairman, the internationalists argue that if the American industrialist and the American miner are not able to compete with foreign industry and foreign minerals through greater efficiency, greater per capita and greater per hour production, then they should go out of business.

Equalize these burdens, Mr. Chairman, and American industry and American mines will meet the competition of any country in the world. Equalize the variance in the standard of living, equalize the variance in the salary differential, require them to pay for the food that the American taxpayer has purchased from the American farmer, require them to levy their own taxes to finance their own public works programs, and, Mr. Chairman, require them to levy their own taxes to pay for their own defense and the defense of the rest of the free world, and our mines and our industries will compete with the mines and industries of any country in the entire free world.

Until that is done, it is the duty and the obligation of this Congress to levy upon the foreign importer the cost of this unequal burden that is levied upon the American producer, the American laborer, and American industry, through an import tariff or an import duty, or at least, Mr. Chairman, an import quota.

I sincerely hope this House will pass this resolution. I hope some good will come from it, but I know, as every Member on this House floor must know, that this Congress cannot shift its responsibility and that this problem cannot be solved until Congress is willing to fulfill the obligation and duty reposed in it by the Constitution and protect these industries as the Founding Fathers provided they should be protected and, as we have learned by experience, they must be protected if the economy of this Nation and the strength of this Nation is to be preserved.

East, West Comparisons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 13th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, Aug. 21, 1959]

EAST, WEST COMPARISONS—FINDS FRIENDLY SPIRITS, MATERIAL WELL-BEING

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

(Thirteenth of a series)

WASHINGTON.—It would have been very easy to have had breakfast in Warsaw, lunch in Keflavik, and dinner in New Orleans the day we returned to the free world.

Our TWA jet left Warsaw about 10 a.m., Polish time, was in Iceland about noon and in Washington about 4 p.m. An Eastern Air Lines turbojet was scheduled to take off from Washington at 6 p.m., Washington time, and to be in New Orleans before 8 p.m., New Orleans time.

Instead of making this connection, I stayed in Washington to get rest, to write a summation for the Associated Press and to reflect.

What had we found in Russia, Siberia, and Poland that we did not expect to find?

How were the lives of people in Moscow, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Sverdlovsk, and Warsaw different from the lives of people in New Orleans?

All members of our party, I believe, feel that we found a much more friendly spirit—outside Moscow—than we expected to find.

On my own part, I found Russia's life much more capitalistic—outwardly—than I expected to find it. Although hotel employees and guides, all employees of Intourist, the official travel agency run by the Government, declined tips, I found none who refused the gift of an automatic pencil or of chewing gum. All seemed interested in earning rubles to buy things for their own use.

For years after the revolution of 1918, I was told, Gum's—Moscow's largest store—was closed. It had been operated as a capitalistic venture for the profit of its owners. As I understand the situation, the Communists closed this big store because it was a symbol of capitalism and because the people should be taught to obtain necessary goods by cooperative effort. The purchase of luxury goods was forbidden.

Gum's (it's pronounced Gooms) is open again and its shelves are loaded with luxury goods. I won't vouch for the quality of these goods, but Russians are buying them. Gum's is owned and operated by the state, but for all intents and purposes it seems to be run just like big department stores in the United States.

As to dress, nowhere save in Warsaw were men and women as well clothed as are the men and women in New Orleans. Even with Warsaw, I believe New Orleans has the edge.

Physical facilities in no city which we visited can compare with physical facilities in New Orleans. Take the airports, for instance. There, at Moisant International Airport, the passenger is told at what gate he should board his plane. At Moscow Airport and the others we visited, there was just one gate. When that gate is opened you walk out on the big ramp and try to find a plane with a large number on its fuselage matching the plane number on your ticket.

The large hotels which I saw have one entrance and exit. You can't walk in the Baronne Street entrance and go out at University Place or in the Gravier Street entrance and out the Common Street side. One member of our party expressed suspicion that this single entrance-exit makes it easier for somebody to keep tabs on somebody.

The Russian jets, as mentioned earlier, don't reverse their jetstream, as do modern American jets, to achieve braking. They release two parachutes from the tail section to serve as brakes. I believe the technical name is drobechutes.

If there is a variety of food in Russia, I looked in the wrong places. It definitely is possible to get tired of borsch, caviar and vodka. Restaurants where we ate in Poland offered a greater variety.

Aside from physical things, I found a pride on the part of Russian people in their workmanship and in their plants which I had been told I would not find.

No man could have escorted a group of visitors through an industrial pant more proudly than a superintendent escorted us through the stamping mill at Novosibirsk.

That was the day the party was split in several parts and several of our drivers got lost. The bus I was riding, fortunately, reached the main entrance to the plant. Standing on the steps there was what appeared to be an official reception committee. Vice-President NIXON, however, was not with our group.

Austin Kiplinger, the Washington magazine and newsletter man, nattily dressed and wearing a hat, walked up to the reception committee. He and the rest of us were greeted warmly. Our inspection of the big plant was started, with hundreds of off-duty workmen following us. Halfway through the inspection we met Mr. NIXON, surrounded by a handful of followers.

I suspect his driver took him to the wrong entrance. The plant superintendent who was showing us the works, I believe, thought Mr. Kiplinger was Mr. NIXON.

A Constituent Writes About the National Science Foundation Summer Institute Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a thoughtful letter from Kingsley W. Wightman, of Oakland, Calif.,

who participated in a summer institute in Utah this year under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. This is a sincere and unsolicited endorsement of a Federal program. As such, I believe it will be of interest to all Members of Congress, and under permission to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: As a participant in the summer institute program of the National Science Foundation, I wish to report to you my impressions of this program.

This summer I attended a science institute for secondary schoolteachers at Brigham Young University in Utah. I firmly believe that this institute provided one of the finest programs in secondary science education any teacher could possibly have. My background in chemistry, physics, and geology has been vastly broadened and deepened by what I learned this summer, and I feel much more qualified to instruct my students now than I did before I attended the institute.

I also feel that Brigham Young University is particularly suited for offering a program of this type because of its outstanding facilities, its excellent staff, and its comfortable living quarters.

I sincerely believe that the summer institute program of the National Science Foundation should be carried on indefinitely. In my opinion, it is one of the finest pieces of legislation for the improvement of education that has ever been enacted.

Cordially yours,

KINGSLEY W. WIGHTMAN.

Rockefeller and Stassenism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in a previous insertion on page A6694 of the August 3 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I called attention to the fact that the type of thinking going on in the Rockefeller camp is not only contrary to the facts and the polls, but is countering the cohesive forces of the Republican Party which have been steamrolling into action, and, moreover, have been more recently, leveling some very difficult obstacles.

I also stated that the type of public relations being produced by the Rockefeller forces is a great disservice to the Governor. I do want to reiterate and reemphasize this fact by pointing out that the statements made by his aids, and subsequently by Rockefeller himself, smacked of Stassenism, or in other words, a pathetic attempt to initiate another "dump NIXON campaign."

I think Rockefeller should take a lesson from history and read the papers which have recorded the sad story of those who made previous, and similar blunders. One article in particular which I cite as a case in point was written by Ralph McGill and appeared in the August 24 issue of the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include at this point, the article by Mr. McGill:

ROCKEFELLER'S DENIALS RAPPED—REPUDIATION OF STATEMENTS ABOUT POLLS IS LINKED TO CONFERENCE WITH DEWEY

(By Ralph McGill)

Fiddling Bob Taylor, who once was Governor of Tennessee and later a U.S. Senator, was good at a hoedown or a verbal knockdown.

He was a Democrat, and once, in campaigning in Republican east Tennessee where political factionalism was about to break the safety valve on the emotional boilers, he flung out, in his opponent's hometown, the damning verse:

"Oh, he wiggled in and he wiggled out
And left the people all in doubt
As to whether the varmint that made the track
Was going out or coming back."

The lines of this biting quatrain were hardly said before mountain pistols were out, but cooler heads prevailed and there was no bloodshed.

It grieves me to say that I thought of this little doggerel on reading the political dispatches from Albany, N.Y., in which Gov. Nelson Rockefeller issued categorical denial of statements attributed to him in one of those not-for-direct-quotation chats while he was in Puerto Rico at the national conference of Governors.

For a couple of weeks, without denial, statements had been attributed to the Governor as follows:

1. He had set a November deadline for making a decision as to what he would do about becoming a candidate for the GOP nomination.

2. He would make his decision on the basis of the public opinion polls at the time—the polls would be the controlling factor.

In a press conference in Albany, following a weekend meeting with former Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who seems to be masterminding the unofficial Rockefeller campaign, Mr. Rockefeller repudiated the attributions. They were, he said, not true.

Now, I am one who worries and bites nails about what seems to me to be too frequent lack of responsibility by a free press. But if the Governor will pardon me, I do not believe that the able, experienced newspapermen who covered the Puerto Rican conference could have been so far off base as to be slapped down with a complete denial. Governor Rockefeller is, I am sure, a charming gentleman, but he looks even worse in denial than he did before.

It was no secret that the statements about polls being a controlling factor was an unwise one. It is not yet possible to take the pulse of the American people by polls and be confident of the right answer. The mood of the people changes with events. Polls are one reason why the campaign of Senator JOHN KENNEDY is not advancing, but standing where it was some months ago. He has relied too much on too many polls in too many categories of age, occupation, etc.

One readily can understand that Governor Dewey would be alarmed about any reference to polls as the determining factor. Polls selected him President of the United States in 1948. And a lot of newspapermen, in the cold gray dawn of the morning after, took an oath that as long as they thereafter lived they would go out and see for themselves rather than depend on the statisticians.

It was politically necessary for Governor Rockefeller somehow to manage to change the image of himself as having no capacity for decision until informed by the facilities of Madison Avenue poll takers. But the method of it and the outright denial means simply that he is saying veteran political reporters at Puerto Rico were utterly and completely in error. He didn't have the grace to say he may not have made himself clear.

This, if the Governor will pardon me, is difficult to accept. It is especially so since he did not make up his mind to deny the attributed statements until he had taken a poll of Governor Dewey, one of the most pragmatic of political advisers.

If the press at Puerto Rico was, indeed, entirely in error, there should have been an immediate correction on the day following their publication. The opinions attributed to the Governor assuredly should not have been allowed free circulation for 2 weeks to be, finally, denied after a conference with Governor Dewey.

"Nelse," as the public relations humanizers seem to be asking us to call Governor Rockefeller, doesn't look too good in this little controversy. The image of him is more fuzzy than before.

Good To "Be Back Home" in Moscow After Siberia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the ninth in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

GOOD TO "BE BACK HOME" IN MOSCOW AFTER SIBERIA—ROUGH LANDING FAILS TO DAMPEN ENTHUSIASM

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

Moscow.—If anyone had told me 2 weeks ago that I'd ever be talking about it being great to "be back home" in Moscow, I'd have told him he was off his rocker.

After 4 days in Siberia, that's the way most members of the party accompanying Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON were talking.

When we took off for Novosibirsk most of us kept our rooms in the Ukraina Hotel, Moscow. Aeroflot, the Russian airline, cut our baggage weight allowance, and we had to have some place to keep our gear.

Our rough landing returning to Moscow failed to dampen the enthusiasm of members of our party about getting back to the Ukraina. It doesn't compare with first-class hotels in New Orleans, but it's a happy home compared with Hotel No. 2 in Novosibirsk and the Bolshoi Urals in Sverdlovak.

At least you have your own shower, with hot water, at the Ukraina.

LONG WAY TO GO

The Russian people have no illusions about living standards in the United States being higher than those in the Soviet Union. Their master's voice, that of Nikita S. Khrushchev, repeatedly tells them that the United States is ahead but that the U.S.S.R. is catching up—fast. In 7 years, he has said, the U.S.S.R. will be ahead.

Just a few casual observations lead me to believe that Mr. K. is wrong—definitely. The U.S.S.R. has too far to go.

People in the United States have not just hundreds of things that people in the

U.S.S.R. don't have, but literally thousands of things.

A case in point is the telephone book. No Russian city I visited had a telephone directory. If you didn't know the number of the person or company you wanted to call, you just didn't call them.

It took most of our group a couple of days to learn how to work the eccentric dial telephones in the Hotel Ukraina. Then, when we moved to Siberia there were no telephones or telephones that didn't work.

ICEBREAKER "LENIN"

Cameras sold as luxury goods in Russian stores apparently are not up to date. Workmen at the hydroelectric station we visited near Novosibirsk obviously had never seen a Polaroid camera before Walter Ridder, of the Ridder newspapers, took their pictures with Vice President NIXON and immediately delivered prints to them. They were amazed.

Reports that Russian women carry big bags because the stores have no paper in which to wrap their purchases are false; but the paper used in the country is of inferior quality.

On the basis of a layman's observation, it appeared to me that the Mississippi Shipping Co.'s liner, *del Mar*, launched soon after the end of World War II, is a more modern vessel than the pride of the Russian maritime service, the icebreaker *Lenin*, which is about the *del Mar's* size. The *del Mar* certainly presents fewer fire hazards than the *Lenin*, with its heavy use of plywood.

This comparison, of course, doesn't apply to method of propulsion—inasmuch as the Russians say they are going to run the Lenin with atomic power.

OUT OF REACH

Thousands of things Americans accept as everyday necessities rather than luxuries apparently are out of the reach of most Russians. The United States of America has many wonderful things about which Russia apparently is yet to learn.

In all of Moscow, I saw not a single filling station. I did see a taxi driver take a can of fuel from the trunk of his taxi and pour its contents into his gasoline tank. I also saw another taxi driver pumping up a flat tire with an old-fashioned hand pump.

"Old hands" in Moscow told me that gasoline is obtainable at depots operated by the Government and that the price is astronomical. Russia unquestionably has made great progress in recent years and continues to make progress.

Still, on the basis of Mr. Khrushchev's public utterances, I believe that his country is a great deal farther behind America than he thinks.

If ever I go back to Russia, I'm going to write to Mr. Khrushchev, or his successor or assigns, before I go and say:

"Please, in your next 5-year plan or 7-year plan won't you include: A telephone book with every telephone; a stopper for every washbasin; restaurants where the patron doesn't have to wait interminably for service?"

RUSSIAN BUREAUCRACY

Westbrook Pegler, who remained in Moscow while we went to Siberia, told me that the longer he remained the more he was convinced that the Russian bureaucracy is the most inefficient in the world.

Bob Considine, another columnist, went stronger. "If these guys run their military establishment like they run the rest of their business," he said, "they couldn't lick Peru."

Remembering the terrific fight the Russians made in World War II, when men wise in Russian affairs were predicting that they could not stand up to the Nazis, I can't go along with opinions which hold that the Soviet Union is weak.

The Russians must be spending a large part of their budget for new weapons. Mr. NIXON mentioned 25 percent of national income. To the best of my knowledge his estimate was not challenged.

Despite heavy military spending, Russia is improving living standards. The tragedy is that most of the people seem to credit communism alone for their improvement and to give no credit to their own industry.

Russians are reminded constantly of the people's suffering in the reigns of the Czars—just as Poles are reminded of the evils of autocratic regimes in that nation.

What both Russians and Poles have today probably is better than the serfdom of earlier years; but what the people behind the Iron Curtain don't know is how well off they really would be if they enjoyed freedom.

They're moving; but I don't think they're moving fast enough to catch us.

HOUSING DESPERATE

The housing situation in Moscow seems more desperate than in other cities we visited. Scores of flats are under construction, but the work seems slow.

Esthetically, these buildings leave much to be desired. They have the disadvantage of looking like Harlem tenements, with the advantage of being placed with some open ground around them.

Russians living in other parts of the country can't move to Moscow, the Soviet showcase, unless the Government grants them a special permit.

BRIDGE OVER SIBERIA

Bridge players generally get together, no matter in what part of the world they may be.

It wasn't long on this trip before Frank Holman of the New York Daily News, produced two decks of cards and the game was on.

Jinx Falkenburg, of television and Newsday; Ruth Montgomery, of the Hearst headline service; Alfred F. "Mike" Flynn, of Pan American World Airways, and I were the most avid devotees of the game. Occasionally, Alan L. Otten, of the Wall Street Journal, "cut in."

Because she has long legs and is athletic, Jinx was designated to be first on the plane after every stop and to "grab" the four seats of the Aeroflot plane with a table.

The teams of Falkenburg-Flynn and Montgomery-Healy played for the bridge championship of Siberia at 40,000 feet over Europe and Asia.

We know it was for the championship, because a Russian kibitzer—who knew where every member of our party was every hour—seldom took his eyes off the game, but obviously didn't understand it. If he didn't know bridge, nobody in Siberia did.

Back in Moscow, as we planned to forsake the Aeroflot planes to travel to Poland in a Trans World Airlines 707–121 jet, an arrangement was made to save Jinx Falkenburg the run to the ramp every takeoff time. Ruth Montgomery saw her old friend, Charles Thomas, former Secretary of the Navy and now president of TWA, in a restaurant and made a deal with him. Either those seats with the table were going to be reserved for the bridge game or TWA was going to have some new hostesses.

The match was seesaw for days, with first one team and then the other in front. After more than a score of rubbers were played, over a distance exceeding 12,000 miles, the Falkenburg-Flynn team was the winner by a bare 200 points.

Public Law 480 Through the Looking Glass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the August 20, 1959, issue of the Journal of Commerce concerning the recent extension of Public Law 480:

OUR KIND OF PEOPLE

"It really looks as though the Americans are going to extend Public Law 480 once again." The Mad Hatter laid down his newspaper and stared fixedly over his bifocals at Alice.

"Is that good?" Alice asked.

"Yes and no. I daresay the Americans think it's good. It means they can trade more of something they don't want and can't use for more of something else they don't want and can't use. Sometimes I suppose it's better to have more of something else than more of just plain something."

"Stop. You're talking in circles again," Alice said sharply. "What has all this nonsense got to do with public law—what was it?"

"Four eighty. Let me explain this: The Americans grow a lot more wheat than they can eat or sell; other things, too, but let's take wheat. The Government buys what they can't use or get rid of. It's been doing that for years. Now it has so much wheat and other crops there's hardly any place left to store it. Soon there'll be no room for people."

"Dear me! Why don't they stop growing so much wheat, then? Or people?"

"I knew I should have never broached this subject to a woman," the Hatter said angrily. "That's very complicated. I'm talking about Public Law 480. Under Public Law 480 the Government can dispose of some of this by * * *"

"Dispose of it? Does that mean give it away?"

"Well, no. They give some away, but they can't give it all away. Like I said, it's very complicated. Some North American farmers still sell their wheat overseas. So do some other countries. But the American Government pays very high prices for the wheat it buys; it does that to keep prices up. So if it gave away all its wheat, prices would break because nobody is going to buy anything he can get for free. Then the farmers and other countries producing wheat would be very angry. They are angry anyway, of course."

"Then you mean they sell it?"

"Well, yes, by which, of course, I mean no. Let's say the Americans 'sell' $100,000 worth of wheat they don't want to Wamaria: you remember Wamaria? Splendid little country. Well, the Wamarians either pay for it in metals or in $100,000 worth of their own currency, the wampa."

"Oh, this is beginning to sound very tiresome," Alice said impatiently. "Then the Americans do sell it. What's so unusual about that? They can use the metals or go out and spend the wampa someplace else."

"Not so fast," the Hatter said, raising an admonishing finger. "Not everything is as simple as it looks. The Americans don't need or want Wamarian metals any more

than they want or need their own wheat. So far as the wampa is concerned, it isn't worth much anyplace outside of Wamaria; it isn't even worth much in Wamaria. Do you follow?"

Alice looked thoughtful. "It is beginning to sound interesting, now."

"Yes, and what happens is, instead of just being stuck with surplus wheat the Americans are now stuck with metals they don't want, with wampa or both. Sometimes, though, they'll use some of the wampa to build, say—a road in Wamaria. Then they'll loan or give the road to the Wamarian Government."

"That is very curious," Alice replied. "Now let me think. If they want to give Wamaria wheat, why not give them that and forget the road? Or if they want to give them a road, why not build the road and forget the wheat? Why make it so complicated?"

"You just don't know the North Americans, my dear. To know them is not only to sympathize with them but to like them. Whether they sell their wheat is of no importance to them. What is important is to get rid of it; and, in the process of getting rid of it to look like they're selling it. Remember, appearances are very important in North America."

"Still, it still make some sense," Alice said. "I suppose they put all those wampa aside for a rainy day; then when they need them they'll spend them."

The Mad Hatter laughed uproariously. "Indeed they won't. Yes, they accumulate them, just like they accumulate wheat. But the only way they got any wampas out of Wamaria was promising that they wouldn't spend them, except when and if the Wamarian Government said it was OK, and that will probably be never."

Alice sighed again, smoothed down her dress and looked dreamily up into the trees that arched above the garden. "You know what, Hatter," she said after a minute, "I think I'd like North Americans. They sound like our kind of people."

Home to Freedom: Some Conclusions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 14th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent tour of the Soviet Union:

HOME TO FREEDOM: SOME CONCLUSIONS—MORE GOOD THAN BAD WILL COME FROM THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

(By George W. Healy Jr.)

Back home and, thank you, singing "God Bless America."

Looking back on 2 weeks behind the Iron Curtain—2 weeks that seemed a long, long time—calls for expression of some opinions and conclusions.

Among other things, it seems to me that most Americans—and I certainly was one of them—have underestimated the economic growth of the Soviet Union.

Prior to the revolution of 1917 the industrial output of Russia was one-eighth of the industrial output of the United States. Nikita S. Khrushchev told us that Russia's industrial output in 1958 had risen to one-half of the U.S. industrial output. Our personal observations indicate that he was not exaggerating—much. Observers better qualified than I to judge industrial capacity have estimated that Russia's production is about one-third of that of the United States.

"We are confident that the day is not far off when our country will overtake our American partner in the peaceful economic competition," said Mr. Khrushchev, "and then will at some point come alongside America, salute her with a signal and move on."

Russia may catch the United States in industrial production, but I don't believe that the day when she will do it is not far off.

Mr. Khrushchev, who impressed me as a cross between an old-line ward heeler and a Hoffa-type labor boss, unquestionably is cocky. As a consequence, I believe that he underestimates the U.S. capabilities.

This brings up the matter of the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev.

We first heard of arrangements for this exchange while we were in Russia. Since the announcement came from the White House and from the Kremlin, some of our group expressed fear that Mr. Eisenhower had "pulled the rug out from under" Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON. This was not the case. Discussions looking toward the exchange had been in progress for some time, and I am sure the Vice President was informed of these discussion just as the President was kept informed of Mr. NIXON's activities on the trip.

The suggestion that the President had assigned his brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to make the trip to "take the play away from" Mr. NIXON was published by some columnists before we left America. I believe there was no truth in this suggestion. Dr. Eisenhower made the trip for precisely the same reason several others of us made it. We were members of the President's Advisory Committee for the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow and, as such, were invited to become members of Mr. NIXON's official party.

I might add that if Dr. Eisenhower took any play away from Mr. NIXON, or attempted to take any play away from him, it happened while I was looking the other way. I'm sure it didn't happen.

Should Mr. Khrushchev have been invited to come to the United States?

Many Americans object to Mr. Krushchev's coming. A New Orleans pamphleteer, Kent Courtney, contends that the coming visit "is the second biggest step forward for world communism since the Russian Revolution of 1917—second only to the Soviet-United States alliance during World War II."

In this connection, I believe it apropos to quote the conclusion of an editorial from the St. Louis Review, a Catholic publication:

"Our perspective * * * is somewhat different. It is based on the fact that Saul would not have become Paul unless he had taken the trip to Damascus.

"Obtuse as Nikita may be to the American way of life, he knows a great deal about industry and science, mines and the military, competition and enterprise. All that we can show him will only enable him to make a comparison between communism and capitalism. Khrushchev does not need a comparison—he needs a conversion.

"In heaven's name let us hope that he sees our churches, our altars, our Christians, our spiritual and corporal works of mercy. Let us hope that he sees an entirely new concept of man on his visit to our country. If we let this opportunity pass we may never have another. Let's provide everything but the bolt of lightning that will knock him from his horse—and depend on God for that."

Personally, I think the prospect is that more good than bad will come from the Khrushchev visit. If, as Mr. NIXON believes, the Russian chief has concluded that America is weak he should have ample opoprtunity to see for himself that we are strong.

Mr. NIXON feels that it is better to talk with the Russians than to fight with them.

There can be no question that Mr. Krushchev preaches communism as superior to capitalism. He preached that sermon to us—at the opening of the U.S. exhibition. If he attempts to preach it again on his visit to the United States, I doubt that he will have any more conversions than he obtained in Sokolniki Park—where there were no defections from the West to the East.

As strong as is the desire of the Kremlin to spread communism throughout the world, I don't believe there is any danger of America going Communist through any action by Mr. Khrushchev, Mr. Kozlov, or any other Russian. If America goes Communist, it will be the fault or the doing of Americans.

Our greatest weakness lies in ourselves—in our failure to recognize that all the blessings which we have, which Russia does not have but which Russia seeks, stem from the freedom for which our forebears fought, freedom which we seldom appreciate enough.

I am in agreement with my friend Frank Holeman, of the New York Daily News, quoted earlier in this series, when he says:

"President Eisenhower was dead right when he said we can lose the struggle between free enterprise and a managed economy—and thus lose our freedom—unless all groups in the United States begin to exercise a lot of self-discipline.

"Worse than that, we can lose the economic and political hold if we keep raising prices. We can become a second-class power while we're gaily paying each other higher prices and wages unrelated to the real cost of production. In a few years, the Communists will be flooding world markets at rock-bottom prices, or below.

"As much as anything else, we need to reawaken our deep national pride, which seems to sleep between wars. Many Russians have enthusiasm for their way of life, believe it or not. All over the country are signs 'Work for the victory of communism.' We need the same kind of enthusiasm or more, for freedom."

I agree also that it would be better to die in an all-out atomic war than to live the way most Russians do, in a police state.

I've been there, and I'm glad I'm back.

Carey Letter and Lewis' Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting and enlightening column by David Lawrence on the subject of campaign contributions in retrospect, which appeared in the August 24, 1959, edition of the Washington Evening Star:

CAREY LETTER AND LEWIS' VIEWS—FORMER CIO CHIEF QUOTED ON QUID PRO QUO FOR POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

(By David Lawrence)

When the labor union bosses raise money to contribute to the campaigns of Members of Congress, must those who are elected disregard their personal convictions on the merits of proposed laws and do the bidding of the groups that furnished the funds? This issue seems to have been projected by James B. Carey, one of the top leaders of the AFL–CIO, whose recent letter to Members of Congress has caused a stir. He expresses gratitude to those who voted as labor wanted and wrote in bitter sarcasm to those who, having accepted campaign contributions from labor interests, voted against their wishes on the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Carey threatens reprisals at the ballot box, and apparently the labor unions will withhold contributions next time from those Members of Congress who refused to consider a campaign contribution as a bribe.

There is nothing unusual about Mr. Carey's letters to Members of Congress. He should not be criticized as being alone in his viewpoint. For what he has written is in line with CIO policy for years. Indeed, John L. Lewis, while active in the CIO, was characteristically frank about the meaning of a contribution from laboring men to the campaigns of candidates for office.

When the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, having accepted big contributions from labor unions for his 1936 campaign, said in the midst of a strike in 1937, something that the labor union leaders didn't like, Mr. Lewis declared publicly:

"It ill behooves one who has supped at labor's table and who has been sheltered in labor's house to curse with equal fervor and fine impartiality both labor and its adversaries when they become locked in deadly embrace."

In a biography of Mr. Lewis written by Saul D. Alinsky and published in 1949 by G. P. Putnam & Sons, the author tells of an interview with the labor leader during the Roosevelt regime. Mr. Lewis is quoted as having said:

"Everybody says I want my pound of flesh, that I gave Mr. Roosevelt $500,000 for his 1936 campaign, and I want quid pro quo. The United Mine Workers and the CIO have paid cash on the barrel for every piece of legislation that we have gotten.

"We have the Wagner Act. The Wagner Act cost us many dollars in contributions which the United Mine Workers have made to the Roosevelt administration with the explicit understanding of a quid pro quo for labor. These contributions far exceed the notions held by the general public or the press. Is any one fool enough to believe for one instant that we gave this money to Roosevelt because we were spellbound by his voice? It is common knowledge that we spent approximately three quarters of a million dollars in the 1936 campaign. And you might be interested to know that the $500,000 direct contribution wasn't my price, but was the figure named by the White House, and I was given approximately 48 hours to get that money.

"Certainly there was a quid pro quo—the right for labor to organize. But there was more than that. The sums we spent in 1936 were not only cash contributions that were made to the Democratic Party, but also were money expended in terms of salaries for organizers and other personnel who worked full time organizing and electioneering for Roosevelt. Radio time purchased, billboards, handbills, literature, and all other paraphernalia that are part and parcel of the process of being elected President of the United States didn't come gratis."

The same interview reveals that in 1938 when the tensions between Mr. Lewis and Mr. Roosevelt had eased off somewhat and the Democratic President was trying in primary contests to "purge" certain southern Democratic Senators who happened also to be antilabor, the United Mine Workers' chief rendered a helping hand. Again Mr. Lewis is quoted in the Saul Alinsky book as follows:

"Where did the money come from that Franklin D. Roosevelt siphoned into those Southern States to try to bolster up the fight against the anti-New Deal Senators? Where did the money come from?

"I'll tell you where it came from. Right here, from the coffers of the United Mine Workers of America. It came by request of the President of the United States through one of his trusted aids. You tell this to the President, and if he questions it, and I'm certain that he will not, you may inform the President that I am perfectly willing to name names and sums, chapter, and verse, to satisfy any slight amnesia that there might be on this particular issue.

"You ask me for gratitude in terms of an administration that we have literally poured our life's blood into supporting. You wonder that I do not express the feeling that one should have for a great champion of labor. I say that labor's champion has to a large extent here been a bought and paid for proposition. There is nothing we should be grateful for when we paid cash on the barrelhead at the price demanded for it."

So the philosophy of the money raisers in labor's ranks hasn't changed much in the 20 years since John L. Lewis spoke. In the 1958 congressional campaign when the labor unions boasted that a majority of the House of Representatives was elected through their help, the Federal records show a relatively small sum was contributed. Big amounts were, however, donated largely to State organizations which do not come under the Federal laws requiring the reporting of contributions. It is estimated that labor raised approximately $10 million. Much of it was spent to uphold laws compelling workers to forgo their civil rights and join unions.

Sverdlovsk, Off Limits to Most, Is Industry Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the eighth in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

SVERDLOVSK, OFF LIMITS TO MOST, IS INDUSTRY CENTER—NIXON PARTY WARMLY RECEIVED BY PEOPLE

(By George W. Healey, Jr.)

SVERDLOVSK, SIBERIA.—This old city, where the last of the Romanoffs were killed, is off limits for tourists.

Unless you obtain high level official permission, Sverdlovsk is a closed city. The Intourist Agency has no office here.

Just east of the Uran Mountains, in a natural corridor which provides the easiest passage through those mountains, Sverdlovsk has grown rapidly in recent years—from 140,000 in 1926 to 775,000 in 1959.

The explanation? Simple. Many industrial plants were moved here from combat zones west of the mountains in World War II. More plants have been built in Sverdlovsk since the war—gaining the city the designation of "the Pittsburgh of Siberia."

Although Sverdlovsk is 880 miles west of Novosibirsk, the party of Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, in three Russian jets, made the flight in no time at all. The planes covered the journey in 2 hours and there is a 2-hour time difference between the two cities. Thus we arrived in Sverdlovsk at the same hour that we left Novosibirsk.

Here we encountered a warm greeting—in cool weather, chilly enough at night for trench coats.

Unlike the low buildings of Novosibirsk, the buildings of Sverdlovsk—more Russian than Siberian—achieve heights of six or seven stories.

After Hotel No. 2 at Novosibirsk (and that's the only name we ever knew for that primitive establishment with eight in a room), the Bolshoi Urals Hotel in Sverdlovsk was a palace, even if your room was on the third floor and the shower—with the first hot water in several days—in the basement.

In front of the hotel is a beautiful plaza, complete with fountain.

The last day we were in Sverdlovsk a large crowd gathered in the plaza to see the Nixon party board buses and automobiles for transportation to the airport.

JUST POOR CAPITALIST

Several of us wandered into the plaza and were surrounded immediately by curious Russians. One, knowing a few words of English, principally "don't mention it," started a interrogation. A young woman, who explained that she was a teacher of Russian in a school in a nearby town, volunteered as interpreter.

She translated several respectful questions and my answers before the man who started the interrogation asked her to put a very long question to me. I asked her what he was saying and she told me she preferred not to translate. The man continued to talk and I recognized something that sounded like "capitalistic aristocrat."

I told the teacher that I thought the man was inferring that I was a capitalistic aristocrat and that I'd appreciate her telling him that I was no such thing but just a poor capitalist trying to learn something about Russia.

DRAWS LAUGH

She translated what I said, and most of the men and women laughed loudly.

Then the young woman explained to me that the man, who left when the laughing started, was attempting to start a political argument and that she did not desire to translate under the circumstances.

Jack Steele, Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, told me he had a similar, more violent experience. A man attempted to start an argument with him aboard a public bus in Novosibirsk. A woman on the bus interceded, gave the man a verbal going over and stopped his talk by socking him on the jaw.

Jack said he learned firsthand why Russian women won their recent track meet with American women.

They might do very well in the ring, too.

STORE WELL STOCKED

A visitor to Russia, I believe, expecting a great shortage of consumer goods, might be surprised by offerings of the largest department store in Sverdlovsk. It's a four-story building, with wide stairways but no elevators; and every department seemed well stocked. There was an abundance of luxury

goods (it seemed to me of doubtful quality), and people were buying.

In the men's department were all kinds of ties. None that I examined had any kind of label. And, strangely, I didn't see a single male shopper in the store who wore a tie. That may be the reason the cravat stock was so large.

I asked a young Russian how its people seemed to have so much more money to spend than I expected. "Take my case," said he. "I have a salary of 2,000 rubles a month ($200). My mother, my father, and I live in one of the new apartments. We have two rooms, a bedroom and a parlor and a kitchen and bath. I sleep in the parlor. Our rent is 80 rubles a month ($8). Naturally, I have money to spend for souvenirs."

This in a country where small tomatoes sold for 6 rubles (60 cents) each in Moscow and for 4 rubles (40 cents) each in the remote city of Novosibirsk. Wool caps like the cossacks wore sold for 55 rubles ($5.50), but more modern attire was higher. Cheap-looking raincoats were priced at 500 rubles ($50).

Editors of the western Siberia newspapers called on us at the Bolshoi Urals Hotel and—of course—we treated them to vodka and caviar.

Reciprocating, they invited those of us who didn't care to visit a powerplant to be their guests the following afternoon at a lakeside picnic.

When they called for us in a bus they drove past dozens of well populated, sandy beaches to a desolate spot on the lake—where the shore was all rocks. Crosby Noyes of the Washington Star and I attempted to swim. The air was warm, but the water was like ice. We stayed in only a few minutes.

None of the hosts, including a photographer who doubled as a comedian, could speak any English. Our only Russian words, were dah (yes), nyet (no), zah meer (to peace), spaseeba (thank you) and perhaps one or two others.

The hosts had brought plenty of vodka, smoked salmon sandwiches and caviar; and the comedian-photographer put the emphasis on the vodka when he began serving.

CUPS LEAK VODKA

Either Russian paper cups are not up to the quality of American paper cups, or Russian vodka is more potent than you think. As the comedian-photographer would pour a few ounces of vodka into a cup it would all filter through the cup's bottom before he could hand it to the guest for whom it was intended.

After trying two cups, then three, then four—placed inside each other—our server finally found that seven cups, used as one, would hold a drink.

We never did learn why our hosts drove us past those fine sandy beaches to the forsaken spot where we tried to swim. Maybe they didn't want their friends to know they were running around with Americans.

Chet Holifield: A Man of Atomic Energy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, big issues need big men. Control and development of atomic energy is a big issue. Our colleague, CHET HOLIFIELD, is a big man.

Conscientious, practical, hardworking, warmly friendly and a truly humble man, CHET HOLIFIELD is in many respects a Congressman's Congressman.

It is a pleasure to see the recognition given to our friend in the New York Times, August 24. Under a previous unanimous consent I include the text of the article entitled "A Man of Atomic Energy, CHESTER EARL HOLIFIELD":

WASHINGTON, August 23.—At the age of 15 CHESTER EARL HOLIFIELD traveled from Arkansas to California to seek his fortune. At the age of 19 he owned his own men's clothing business—so was never able to finish high school. Nor did he ever take a formal course in science. But today, at the age of 56, CHET HOLIFIELD, as he is now called, probably knows more about nuclear power, nuclear weapons and missiles than any other Member of the House of Representatives.

As chairman of subcommittees of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, he is the driving force behind reports now coming off Government printing presses on the hazards of fallout from atomic tests and warfare, on the methods of disposing of nuclear waste materials, and on the probable effects of nuclear war.

LITTLE TIME FOR PARTIES

CHET HOLIFIELD rarely goes to parties. He has given up golf and hunting and fishing.

"My wife and my doctor reproach me for it," he says, "but I have no time now."

By day he devotes himself to fighting in Congress for more information on nuclear weapons and warfare, for Government support of nuclear power, nuclear submarine and aircraft projects.

And at night, until 11 or 12 most evenings, he studies.

"It is a continuing challenge to keep on top of these subjects, not to mention other sidelines," he says.

Whether fighting for civilian control of nuclear energy, for public power, against the Atomic Energy Commission or for public shelters against atomic attack, Mr. HOLIFIELD is mild in manner but sharp of tongue.

He demanded the resignation of Lewis L. Strauss as Chairman of the AEC and criticized his successor, John A. McCone, for what he called planning on a pitifully small scale.

And a year ago he asserted that "there is at present no national plan for survival, and there is nothing I can see that will insure the survival of any major segment of our society in the event of an enemy attack."

STILL OWNS BUSINESS

Mr. HOLIFIELD'S forceful personality stood him well in the clothing business, which he still owns, at Norwalk, 12 miles from Los Angeles. The same year he went into business he married the former Vernice Caneer. They have four daughters, all married, and eight grandchildren.

Becoming interested in politics during the depression and the New Deal days, in 1936, Mr. HOLIFIELD managed the successful campaign of Jerry Voorhis, a Democrat, for the House of Representatives. And when the Voorhis district was split up to allow for increased population, Mr. HOLIFIELD was elected as a Democrat from the 19th District of California in 1942. He has represented it since.

Representative HOLIFIELD'S interest in atomic energy was confirmed in July 1946 by his appointment by President Truman to the Commission that went to Bikini in the South Pacific to see, as Mr. HOLIFIELD puts it, "atomic fusion at work."

Three years later he was chairman of a subcommittee that recommended, against powerful contrary advice, that the United States go ahead with production of a hydrogen bomb. In January 1950 President Truman agreed, and in the early fall of 1951 the United States exploded its first hydrogen bomb.

"We beat the Russians by 9 months," Mr. HOLIFIELD recalls proudly.

But along with this sense of achievement came knowledge of the awful power of the bomb, of all the dangers and potentialities of nuclear power.

"I felt I wanted the people to know," he says, "the truth about it, not just wild statements. I wanted the world to get behind the Iron Curtain, too. I have worked pretty hard at it. I guess it's a kind of conscience effort."

Judge Samuel A. Weiss Honored at Duquesne University Graduation Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to call to the attention of Congress a singular incident involving a former Member of Congress, the Honorable Samuel A. Weiss, judge of the Common Pleas Court of Allegheny County, Pa.

Judge Weiss started his political career at the same time I did in 1934 as an elected member of the House of Representatives in Pennsylvania.

From there he was sent to the U.S. Congress where he served with honor and distinction until he was called back home by a grateful constituency to become a judge of the courts of our great State.

He has served long and well and the honor bestowed upon him by Duquesne University, his alma mater, attracts to the respect and affection in which he is held by all who have had the pleasure and privilege of knowing him over these many years.

I submit for the RECORD a reprint from the Pittsburgh Legal Journal, a report on this citation given August 7, 1959:

JUDGE SAMUEL A. WEISS RECEIVES DOCTOR OF LAWS DEGREE—LOCAL JURIST HONORED AT DUQUESNE UNIVERSITY GRADUATION EXERCISES

Duquesne University graduated 171 students, 62 with advanced degrees, at its summer commencement exercises held today (Friday, August 7) on the campus of the school.

The ceremonies marked the end of the 6- and 8-week summer sessions, and were held for the first time in the Mills Auditorium of Rockwell Hall.

Honorary degrees were awarded the Honorable Samuel A. Weiss, Duquesne alumnus and judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County; Sidney V. Levine, president of Ad Press, Ltd., New York City; and Msgr. Robert B. Navin, S.T.D., president of St. John College of Cleveland.

Judge Weiss received the doctor of laws degree; Mr. Levine, doctor of commercial science; and Monsignor Navin, doctor of education. The Very Reverend Vernon F. Gallagher, C.S.Sp., chairman of the board, made the presentations.

Monsignor Navin delivered the commencement address, especially commending the

class "because of the very great sacrifices made to complete your educations—many working full time, and taking courses to fit yourselves better for positions in life and for the service of others."

He also gave the graduates his views on several controversial topics: "The world today is confused and mixed up because it does not recognize or will not accept the truth." This ignorance or rejection, he said, is a "faulty application of the most basic principles of the natural law."

He cited the much-discussed decision in the Chatterly case, referring to the recent lifting of the ban on the novel "Lady Chatterley's Lover," where, he said "one man's 'freedom to advocate an idea,' admittedly immoral, is upheld even though it is in direct opposition to the public good." He suggested that this was a situation where freedom had degenerated into license.

Monsignor Navin concluded by attacking the frequently advocated theory of custom-regulated morality as evidenced in general approval of divorce and birth control. "It is significant," he said, "that the very groups which originally brought about restrictive legislation on birth control information now favor banning all such legislation. If it was wrong then, could it be right now?

"You are saved this confusion and mental mixup because you have a definite philosophy which guarantees you consistency and stability in decision and action," he added. "You are in a position to do an immeasurable amount of good in bringing the truth to others—absolute, unchanging truth. This is the starting point."

Three students, two of whom are nuns, were graduated with honors. They are: Luetta Mae Camp, 903 Stuebenville Avenue, Cambridge, Ohio; and Sisters Mary Angelina Cavalle, S.S.J., and Grace Madeleine Lawley, S.S.J., both of Mount St. Joseph, Wheeling, W. Va.

More than one-third of the graduating class was nuns, the majority receiving bachelor of education degrees.

The exercises were preceded by mass, celebrated by the Reverend Edmund R. Supple, C.S.Sp., of Duquesne, and sung by the Sisters of St. Joseph Choir, from Wheeling.

The citation which was presented to Judge Weiss follows:

"CITATION: HON. SAMUEL ARTHUR WEISS

"Samuel Arthur Weiss, jurist, Congressman, philanthropist, sportsman, dedicated alumnus, friend to all:

"Yours has been a varied and rich career. Persevering industry in the face of many difficulties, carried you through college and law school with distinction. Meanwhile, your athletic ability kept pace with your scholarship when you excelled as captain of the varsity baseball and football teams.

"Your career in law and politics has been one of steady progress. The voters recognized in you a champion of their rights and a man of integrity when they elected you twice to the Pennsylvania Legislature, three times to the U.S. Congress, and twice as a judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Allegheny County.

"People of every race, creed, and nationality have felt the warmth radiating from a sincere and brotherly concern. It has embraced hospitals, lodges, boys' clubs, education, the military services, and religion.

"Because your alma mater is grateful to you and because she takes pride in you as a distinguished citizen, I ask our Very Rev. Chairman of the Board to confer upon you the degree of doctor of laws, honoris causa, with all the rights and privileges thereunto attached, and cause you to be invested with the hood appropriate to that degree.

"Very Rev. HENRY J. MCANULTY, C.S.Sp.,
"Acting President."

Legalizing the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, a prominent attorney of Washington, D.C., and former president of the American Bar Association, has been instrumental in promoting world peace through world law. He is to be commended for his efforts in this important field.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address that Mr. Rhyne delivered to the Junior Bar Conference on "Legalizing the World":

LEGALIZING THE WORLD

(Address by Charles S. Rhyne, Washington, D.C., former president of the American Bar Association, former chairman of the Junior Bar Conference, before Junior Bar Conference, Hotel Fontainebleau, Bal Harbour, Fla., Aug. 23, 1959)

Twenty-one years ago I attended my first Junior Bar Conference convention. The great men of the day were Arthur T. Vanderbilt and John J. Parker. What a thrill it was to see and hear them in action. The great idea they were urging was modernization of courts and legal procedures—judicial administration improvement. They called for traffic laws and courts adapted to automobiles, rather than the horse and buggy. They urged our dedication as lawyers to a program of service to the public as well as to our clients.

At their urging the Junior Bar Conference assumed major tasks in bringing this judicial administration improvement idea to reality. Junior Bar Conference members collected the facts State by State on courts and court procedures. And upon these facts Vanderbilt and Parker built their reform programs.

"Old men for wisdom, young men for action" were the Junior Bar Conference watchwords. Since that time the "wisdom" of Vanderbilt and Parker and the "action" of Junior Bar Conference have brought about tremendous advances in judicial reforms. In the traffic field alone most of the evils then rampant are either gone or going. A Junior Bar Conference national chairman—Jim Economos—has devoted his life to ramrodding this program. And while his hair is graying and his middle rotund, his zeal has never once slackened, nor has his identification with Junior Bar Conference—even today he is "credited" in the minds of most lawyers as a Junior Bar Conference representative.

At my first Junior Bar Conference meeting I never for one moment envisioned appearing before you someday as an old man to seek to harness your energies for yet another great public service crusade. Yet here I am—asking you to help legalize, and thus stabilize and bring order into, the relations between the peoples and nations of the world; to help achieve world peace through application of law, legal procedures and the courts to transnational relations of nations and individuals.

Under the ceaseless prodding and the inspired leadership of Vanderbilt and Parker these past years have witnessed great progress in modernizing judicial administration and legal procedures. Yet were they alive today they would be the first to say that this progress is small when compared to the job to be done. Until their untimely and unfortunate passing they never overlooked an opportunity to call for more and more effort to achieve the great goal of a more perfect justice for all men.

Due to Vanderbilt and Parker and their disciples in the Junior Bar Conference, and the bar generally, nearly all men today accept the need for modernization and reform of courts and legal procedures. Their idea has come of age. They have won the biggest part of their battle. For while their proposed reforms have been slow in coming and the setbacks many, the idea is implanted so firmly that it will never die out. Modern courts and modern legal procedures we have in some places. They will eventually be universal.

Vanderbilt and Parker planted their great idea deeply in the minds of the public as well as in the minds of lawyers. This public awareness and the resulting public opinion pressures are largely responsible for bringing about the improvements which have been achieved. The formula for success has been to spread the idea lawyer to lawyer to public and public to politician so as to bring about essential governmental action. That lesson I would now apply to a program to modernize international law and the international courts so that they can replace weapons as the decision mechanism in resolving international disputes.

World law is in its infancy. Men do not yet fully accept the idea that the rule of law can achieve and maintain order and stability internationally.

But the idea is better known and more widely accepted today by more people throughout the world than ever before. We are in some respects where Vanderbilt and Parker were 21 years ago. I earnestly hope it will not take 21 years to make this idea come of age. We probably do not have that much time before the arms race explodes into world holocaust. Events press hard for action in our quick-moving era. But in this pressurized context no idea holds greater potential for a peaceful world than that of creating legal rules based upon the immortal principles of the rule of law to govern transnational relations.

To make world law come of age we must convince men everywhere that law will do the job internationally that diplomacy, arms, agreements and treaties have been unable to do—at least they have not done it up to now. To convince men, we must prove to them by facts and sound logic that law can supply principles which will provide standards to guide the relationships of men and nations transnationally. We must persuade men and nations to choose to operate internationally under these standards rather than upon the present operational basis of capacity for mutual annihilation.

In the past we have made a mistake in our struggle for peace by going at the matter negatively. We have concentrated on getting rid of war, getting rid of tension and getting rid of armament.

But you cannot get rid of war, tension and armament and leave a vacuum. We will get rid of them only to the extent that we put something else in their places. What is that something? In the human story it has always been the rule of law in every civilized nation.

The concept of a rule of law as a step toward peace provides a positive idea around which we can rally the imaginations and hopes of people everywhere. Law is something everyone understands and practically everybody respects. Law is a concept that has not been spoiled by verbal distortion as have such words as "peace" and "democracy." Law is everywhere known to be the

familiar, the normal—indeed the only—alternative to force in organized society.

What can the Junior Bar Conference do? I propose that the Junior Bar Conference do two things: (1) set up task forces to contact young lawyers in every nation on earth to find out how these young lawyers of other lands think this job can be done and how we can work with them to legalize the world; (2) help collect the facts and experience upon which a world law system can be erected just as we collected the facts and experience for Vanderbilt and Parker on courts and legal procedures.

The job I ask you to do cannot be done in a year or a decade. It is one for continuous effort over the years just as in the case of court and legal reform. We strive for perfect justice always, yet we never quite achieve it. So on world law we must work and strive knowing full well that perfection is not achievable. But a world ruled by imperfect law is so much better than a world ruled by armed might that a choice is not hard to make. And the people will make that choice once the lawyers convince themselves, and then the people, that law is the answer.

The new uncharted, unexplored frontier of today is not in science despite the miraculous accomplishments and the potentials there. The real unexplored frontier of our day is the creation of the legal rules under which nations live together on this earth—each sharing its riches in peace in a world shrunken by fast transportation and communications; peace not on a community, State or national basis, but peace on a worldwide basis.

Little by little we are realizing that our own hopes and destinies are irrevocably linked to the hopes and destinies of our fellow men at home and abroad. To live in peace is beyond question the greatest current desire of all peoples. The cry of "Peace unto you" is and has been the most welcome cry to the ears of man from before the days of Christ until now—as witness Vice President NIXON's outstandingly successful trip to Russia.

The expanding horizons of the world promise fabulous rewards to those who are bold enough to brave the unknown. And make no mistake about it, our greatest unknown is still in the area of procedures, rules, and other machinery under which humans can get along together peacefully. Again, I recall to your minds that a study of civilization's development reveals beyond question that the rule of law is the best idea man has ever developed for this purpose. Our job is to give legal form and expression to this great idea as applied to the needs of the new world of today. The principles of the law can be used to map the way out on this new frontier so that man may harness modern technology for his benefit rather than have it used for his death. Under the rule of law we can live together rather than die together as we most certainly will if the rule of force continues to control the fate of humanity.

No one really knows as yet how to make law prevail throughout the world but we of our generation must be the first to attempt this task.

We can begin our exploration of the unknowns of this frontier with full awareness that the carnage and waste of war constitute the blackest pages in the history of man and that advances in law chronicle the brightest. What war or other killing or enslavement of man compares in the esteem of mankind with the Ten Commandments, the codes of Hammurabi, Solon, and Justinian, the Magna Carta and our own Constitution?

I a asking you to take part in a movement that is now already successfully underway. The march toward a world ruled by law is making electrifying progress on four fronts:

(1) Within the organized bar;

(2) Within the executive and legislative branches;

(3) Within university law schools and research centers;

(4) Within public opinion.

Through contacts with lawyers in 74 nations we have acquainted them with what the American Bar Association is doing and hopes to do in this field and have asked for their cooperation and assistance. Without exception the lawyers of the world have welcomed this movement and many of these lawyers of other lands are already working with us on plans to bring the movement to fruition. Tomorrow we will present a report for the committee on world peace through law to the house of delegates outlining the work and developments during the past year. We will outline the continental conferences, the world conference of lawyers, and a specified agenda for such conferences, which we recommend to capitalize upon lawyer interest and activity throughout the world. We also set forth the concrete steps we recommend to bring transnational relations under the rule of law.

On the executive front the President, the Vice President, the late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, and the Attorney General of the United States have all within the past year made strong statements supporting the rule of law internationally. Such concerted action by four such national leaders is in itself almost unique. In the Congress, by resolutions, speeches and other activity its Members have more and more demonstrated their interest and support for the rule of law in world affairs. And a mere glance at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD indicates that this interest in accelerating on an ever-increasing scale. Governors, mayors, State attorneys general and other State and local officials have also expressed their interest and support.

On the research or university level the creation of the Duke World Rule of Law Center with Arthur Larson as its head, and work of great importance now being done at Harvard, Chicago, Northwestern, Cornell, Southern Methodist, Miami, and numerous other universities all over the world, are spotlighting this subject as never before.

Never before has so much effort and money been expended just to collect the materials in which international law may be found. And finding the law in this field—just as in other legal fields—is one of the big undone jobs we must accomplish. There is a lot of international law—there are many rules that apply internationally—but digging them out can never be done without the basic legal materials. You as young lawyers constantly find the law for your seniors in many fields of domestic law. You could not perform that task at all if the essential books, opinions, etc., were not available. Making international law available is a big task that universities and researchers can perform and are performing. And due in part to the rise in general university interest—and lawyer interest—one finds that law students are more interested in taking courses in international law. This too is a most essential development. In the past this subject has been looked upon as a mysterious field chiefly of interest to a few professors. Now the shrinking of the world in the jet age has thrown nations and people together and suddenly lawyers, law students and others realize that we must have rules to regulate these ever-closer and ever-accelerating contacts.

President Eisenhower's comment recently on the research scientists who produced satellites and split the atom and the researchers in medicine who produced the polio vaccine, that "the apparently visionary researcher is likely to produce unexpectedly practical results," applies equally to legal researchers and workers in the international law field. Their work is being put to more and more practical use daily. Here, as in the case of all great ideas, the idea of a world ruled by law is often labeled impractical and idealistic. In addition to the President's answer, I recall to your minds that our Government under our Constitution was so labeled 170 years ago both at home and abroad; yet it has worked practically and ideally to give man more effective protection of individual rights, more widespread justice, more equality under law, more evenly distributed economic opportunity, more security in person and property and greater personal freedom than any governmental system ever developed in all the history of mankind. The framers of our Constitution included lawyers of the kind that we sorely need now in the international field, lawyers who have, in the words of the late "Bull" Warren, of Harvard, "ideals and a realistic approach to the task of implementing the ideals as a practical matter."

In the area of public opinion, we find that governmental leaders of the world, when the potentials of world law are explained to them, are beginning more and more to express views in accord with those of President Eisenhower on this subject. Prime Minister Nehru, Chancellor Adenauer, Prime Minister Diefenbaker, and many others have spoken out in support of increased reliance upon the rule of law in world affairs. Great lay leaders of our country and the world like Henry Luce, Erwin Canham, religious leaders like Cardinal Cushing and Bishop Pike, to name only a few, have constantly and strongly urged that the rule of law is an answer to the problem of world peace. In the news media field several hundred editorials and news commentaries have expressed favorable views upon this subject. And "Law Day, U.S.A." has given great nationwide recognition and impetus to this development.

We of the legal profession are concentrating on building the necessary legal foundation and framework for the world. More and more people are realizing that if you are ever going to have a world ruled by law that foundation and framework must come first. Talk about disarmament and enforcement is really looking to the ultimate rather than to the first essentials. Disarmament and enforcement will follow if we get the necessary law and the needed judicial machinery. Summit discussions and meetings of leaders of nations may end tensions but they do not erect this legal framework which experience within nations proves we must have to achieve lasting order and stability.

So in asking you to join and aid this movement I am asking you to support an idea many are already pushing with all their capacity. The idea is on its way but it needs all the help it can get from all who sincerely desire a peaceful world. I am sure you have such a desire. I am sure also that no group can do more in translating that desire into reality once you focus upon the problem, acquire the knowhow and develop a program for action. You can perform no greater public service. No greater challenge exists for you as lawyers.

Let us march together again on this new crusade for the benefit of the public good as we have marched so successfully on court and legal reform. Let us see to it that ours is an age of unlimited progress rather than unlimited destruction. Only through making it the age of the law can this goal be achieved.

Sad Poles Wave Goodby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the 12th in the series of articles written by George W. Healy, editor of the New Orleans Times-Picayune, who accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent trip to the Soviet Union:

[From the Times-Picayune, Aug. 20, 1959]

SAD POLES WAVE GOODBY—KITCHEN CABINET BORN HIGH IN 500-M.P.H. JET

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

KEFLAVIK, ICELAND.—Leaving Warsaw was not as pleasant as entering Warsaw.

Like the day we arrived, there were thousands of men and women and children on the streets the day we left. Many of them waved and shouted to us. Some of them, the older ones, wiped their eyes as they waved goodbye.

Although its people are reputed to have more freedom than is enjoyed by the people of any other satellite of the Soviet Union, the Poles in Warsaw—I believe—know that their hundreds of thousands of relatives in the United States enjoy greater freedom than do they.

Perhaps as they waved to us the day we left many of them would have like to some with us.

One of the most competent, and most understanding correspondents riding our press plane was Frank Holeman of the New York Daily News. It was Frank, a very tall young man, who back in 1950 took a tuxedo with him on a quick assignment—to Korea. Naturally, when the assignment turned out to be the coverage of a war, the tuxedo didn't see much service. However, when Frank returned to Washington—having worn thin all the clothes, save the tuxedo, which he had taken with him—the tuxedo served him in good stead. He found moths had feasted on clothes which he had left in Washington, so he wore the tuxedo until his tailor could fit him with new business suits.

Frank's description of the scene of our departure from Warsaw bears repeating.

"We waved goodby to a lot of friendly people in Warsaw this morning on the way to the airport with Vice President NIXON," he wrote. "They laughed and clapped, and some threw bunches of carnations and gladioli. Here and there along the way, though, you'd see a man or a woman wave, smile, then suddenly turn sad. * * * There was really something pathetic about the whole episode. In 12 hours with our big jet transport planes, we would be in a different world, the free world. The poor Poles would still be right there in the Communist world, which many obviously detest.

"We learned a lot of new things about that Communist world in our 2 weeks with NIXON. It may not sound like a long time to you, but 2 weeks behind the Iron Curtain can be a lifetime."

It seemed, indeed, a long time since we had breathed freely—conscious of the protection of the American flag on American soil.

Unlike other legs of our journey, Vice President NIXON rode the leg from Warsaw to Keflavik aboard the TWA 707–121 jet plane. Mrs. Nixon and other members of his official party continued to ride the Military Air Transport Service jet transport which followed us into every airport.

About the time we were over Denmark the Vice President held a conference and organized a new club. All the men and women who flew with him to Russia, to Siberia and to Poland were initiated as members of "The Vice President's Kitchen Cabinet," an organization reminiscent of Mr. NIXON's debate with Nikita S. Khrushchev in the kitchen of the model home at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

Although we were flying high above the clouds the news conference conducted by Mr. NIXON for almost 2 hours was as effective as any I ever attended. Certainly the British and Canadian and American correspondents who heard the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill at the Citadel in Quebec were no more attentive than the homing newsmen questioning and hearing the Vice President as they moved toward the new world at approximately 500 miles per hour.

The scene at the airport before we took off from Warsaw was impressive. There was a large band, and the Polish Army was represented by one of its crack drill teams.

John Charles Daly, the electronic newsman, gave his colleagues justification for loud laughter when, walking preoccupied across a ramp, he got in front of the drill team. When he realized that the drill team was about to run him down he had to break into a run.

Dr. Oskar Lange, vice president of the Polish council of state, was the last official of an Iron Curtain country who spoke to us.

To me, Dr. Lange's words had a ring of sincerity when he said, "In our opinion your visit has been a practical manifestation of that peaceful coexistence which we here in Poland so ardently desire and of the principles which we apply in our policy."

Observing how much the Poles love their families, their homes, their animals, and their flowers—it is difficult to consider them potential enemies of any peace-loving country. Whether the Kremlin has convinced many of them that the United States is not a peace-loving country, of course, is undetermined.

Their attitudes toward the Nixon party indicated to me that the Kremlin has not succeeded in this regard.

If I were called on to choose tomorrow between making a return visit to Moscow, to Leningrad or to Warsaw, I would choose Warsaw without hesitation.

The flowers in the boxes which decorate Warsaw's every light standard are as beautiful as any I have ever seen. Its men are as courteous as true southern gentlemen. Its women are charming and gracious.

It might have been good if some of those Poles who waved could have come along with us.

Red China Should Not Be Admitted to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I considered it a privilege to vote for the resolution that rejects any and all proposals that Red China be admitted to the United Nations.

Red China is an outlaw nation. She poured her Red troops into Korea and by this barbaric aggression plunged the free world into a bloody war that cost tens of thousands of young men their lives. Although that war long since ended, Red China still holds many American prisoners.

It is unthinkable that Red China now should be permitted to crash the gates and gain admission to the United Nations with whose efforts for world peace China repeatedly has manifest she has no sympathy.

Some argue that if Red China is admitted to the U.N. she might reform. To this, I reply let Red China reform first and prove by her actions that she is worthy of membership in the U.N.

It would be a display of weakness on America's part for the Congress of the United States to go on record as favoring admission of Red China, after all her outlawry, into the U.N. I was proud to vote for the resolution keeping the United Nation's membership doors closed to Red China. In that vote I am certain I expressed the almost unanimous sentiment of the constituents whom I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Tribute to Delegate Burns of Hawaii

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying this well-deserved tribute to a great American, John A. Burns of Hawaii, who leaves us shortly to return to the shores of his beloved homeland.

In the relatively short time that Mr. Burns served in this body, he carved for himself a prominent place in the history of our Nation. Two new stars have been added to our flag—two new States—and almost a million residents of Alaska and Hawaii have been granted first-class citizenship since John Burns arrived in Washington only a few years ago. Despite one-sided odds against him in the fight for Alaskan statehood and then for Hawaiian statehood, John Burns—more than any other single person—was the leading architect of the two statehood victories.

By his tireless efforts, persuasiveness, and sincerity of purpose, John Burns won the respect and support of his fellow Members of the House. Enactment of the statehood bills was a joint victory in which all Americans shared.

John Burns has served the people of Hawaii ably and conscientiously as their last Delegate. Those of us who value his friendship will truly miss him in the difficult times ahead. We greet the first Congressman from the State of Hawaii, DANIEL INOUYE, of whom John has spoken of so highly. I trust that in the not too distant future, John Burns will

return to Washington to continue his outstanding record of service to his State and Nation. Until then, John, we wish you good luck and Godspeed.

Poison in Your Water—No. 158

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Madisonville (Ky.) Messenger of October 13, 1958, entitled "Menace of Salt in the River Green":

MENACE OF SALT IN THE RIVER GREEN
(From the McLean County News)

There's another problem to be concerned about on our Green River.

That's the serious problem of contamination from oil wells in Green County.

This situation came to light this week in three different stories on the new oil pool near Greensburg. The pool there differs from most in Kentucky in that the oil lies under a big quantity of salt water. In producing the oil, this salt water is pumped to the top of the ground. It is estimated that 20 barrels of salt water is pumped out for every barrel of oil. This salt is finding its way into Green River and contaminating the river in that area. In some places the water is several times as salty as ocean water.

This new contamination can have several serious results. It can hamper operation of any industrial plants that use river water in processing. This has already happened to the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co.'s gas stripping plant at Gabe. Wednesday reports came that there was damage to the Kentucky Utilities plant at Green River.

The threat of such contamination will certainly be a drawback to obtaining any substantial new industry in this area that would depend on river water.

Another bad effect would be on wildlife, such as fish and ducks, which might be killed or driven away. Upriver farmers who use creeks for water supply have been forced to sell their livestock.

Perhaps the most direct threat is to our city water supplies. Livermore and Calhoun depend entirely on the river for their water supply and a considerable number of farmers in the county also depend upon water purchased from the city systems in dry periods.

Apparently, at this stage there is not much we here in McLean county can do about the problem. This is another occasion on which we must depend on our state agencies to protect our interests. We think they are alert to the situation and will find some remedy.

Meanwhile we should keep a close watch on the situation and support our city governments in any action necessary to safeguard our interests.

The Kentucky Water Pollution Control Commission has given the oil operators 30 days in which to halt the pollution of the streams. We hope the commission will be successful in its efforts.

However, at the rate the pollution is increasing, 30 days may be too late to avoid serious damage.

History of Benedictines in Cleveland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Historical Review of the Benedictines in Cleveland," which appeared in the Slovak News of August 13, 1959:

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE BENEDICTINES IN CLEVELAND

Archbishop Joseph Schrembs, D.D., invited the Slovak Benedictines at St. Procopius Abbey in Lisle, Ill., to establish a foundation in Cleveland. Assigned to St. Andrew's parish at East 51st Street and Superior Avenue, the first Benedictine, Rev. Stanislaus Gmuca, O.S.B., arrived on February 2, 1922, while Rev. Gregory Vaniscak, O.S.B., the founder, remained at St. Michael's Church in Chicago until he was elected conventual prior of the independent priory that was established at 10510 Buckeye Road on September 1, 1929. Meanwhile, Rev. George Luba, O.S.B., had organized Benedictine High School, which first opened its doors at St. Andrew's parish on September 8, 1927. The high school, too, was transferred to the new site at East 105th and Buckeye Road for the fall term in 1929.

Abbot Stanislaus Gmuca, O.S.B., was elected as the first abbot of St. Andrew's Abbey on August 8, 1934, and remained in office until his resignation in 1946. Abbot Theodore Kojis, O.S.B., was elected to office on June 20, 1946. During Abbot Stanislaus' term of office the new Benedictine High School at 2900 East Boulevard was built in the spring and summer of 1940. The new abbey building was completed in 1952 when Abbot Theodore was host to Archbishop Edward F. Hoban, D.D., and Abbot Primate Bernard Kaelin, of Rome, who solemnly blessed the new abbey and an extension of the high school buildings.

Benedictine High School is staffed chiefly by members of the abbey, but approximately 14 lay teachers are employed in the teaching of a thousand boys each year. In addition to winning its share of scholastic, scientific, and journalistic honors, Benedictine High School has won renown in all major sports during the past dozen years. The Bengals won city championships in football, basketball, baseball, golf, and bowling in a decade of athletic glory seldom qualed in Cleveland interscholastic competition. In 1957 the Benedictine gridiron team won the State football championship, an achievement that was the crowning point of a long, uphill struggle to the Bengals' greatest triumph in 30 years of competition against the best high school teams in Ohio.

Behind the scenes of Benedictine's rise to fame and glory, the monks of St. Benedict live their daily lives according to the holy rule of the patriarch of western monasticism in which the motto "Pray and work" ("Ora et labora") is perhaps the predominating feature. Thus, the priests and Brothers work in the advancement of religion and education not only here in Cleveland but elsewhere. Besides administering Benedictine High School, St. Benedict's parish in Cleveland, priests of the abbey are engaged in parochial work in Chicago, East St. Louis, Ill., and Superior, Wis. Chaplains are assigned at the Benedictine Sisters' Convent in Tinley Park, Ill., and in the Jednota Home in Middletown, Pa.

For a quarter of a century several priests (notably the Very Reverend Gregory Vaniscak, Rev. Paschal Kavulic and Rev. George Luba) were editors of the Ave Maria, a religious monthly publication in the Slovak language, which has a nationwide circulation of 5,000 readers. Moreover, the official headquarters of the Slovak News, a semimonthly newspaper (a weekly until July 1, 1957), for the past 10 years has been in the old abbey building. The editors of both the Slovak and English sections of the paper have been members of the Benedictine High School faculty these years. Moreover, Rev. George Luba, O.S.B. (who succeeded Rev. Ivan Kramoris, O.S.B.) editor of the Zenska Jednota semimonthly magazine for 100,000 members of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, has been in that office for the past 22 years.

Members of the Order of St. Benedict here are active in Catholic organizations, societies and clubs, namely, the First Catholic Slovak Union, the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, the Knights of Columbus, the Catholic War Veterans, the Catholic Order of Foresters, the Slovak Catholic Sokol, the Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, the Ladies Pennsylvania Slovak Catholic Union, the Slovak League, the Slovak Catholic Federation, the Slovak Catholic Cadet Union, and the Catholic Slovak Benefit Organization. All of these at some time or other have made financial contributions to the building or maintenance of Benedictine High School. However, at the top of the list of organized benefactors of the school is the Benedictine Dad's Club, which in the past 12 years has contributed more than $300,000 to the school fund. Moreover, the Cleveland diocese through the efforts of Archbishop Edward F. Hoban, D.D., contributed a substantial sum to the extension of the high school in 1952.

Parochial work, especially on weekends, has always been an integral part of the work of the Benedictine priests who feel honored and privileged to serve in an auxiliary capacity in the work of God under the direction of the hard-working diocesan clergy throughout the diocese of Cleveland.

We Must Fight Filth in the Mails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, July 30, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this excellent editorial from the Macoupin County Enquirer:

WE MUST FIGHT FILTH IN THE MAILS

The Post Office Department's drive to stamp out the mailing of obscene materials to children is receiving widespread support from the press, radio and TV commentators, public-spirited organizations and Members of Congress, officials report.

"We are most gratified by the wholehearted editorial support being accorded by the press," Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield said. Good progress toward solution of the problem is being made, he stated, but added that "persistent, intensive action on a nationwide scale will be necessary to cope with the determined plans of the filth racketeers to continue expanding their business."

These plans, he said, are aimed in large part at children. Recent reports, as well as testimony before Congress, have pointed out that the traffic in obscenity has doubled in just the last 5 years, and can double again by 1963 if the parents of America do not take a concerted stand within their own communities to wipe out evil.

There are steps the Postmaster General emphasizes, that every community can take. Alert parents are the most important source for direct action against the mail order "merchants of filth." The minor child need not have indicated interest in the material to receive solicitations through the mail to purchase obscene literature and photographs. It is the responsibility of the parents to take action when such material comes into the hands of their children through the mails.

Parents can work closely with teachers to detect obscene materials in the possession of children and to determine the origin of such material. Such efforts can be instrumental in the prosecution of traffickers in mail-order obscenity.

Perhaps most importantly, parents can cooperate with the schools in taking positive steps to help their children develop wholesome interests in good literature and art—making it readily available to them at home, in the classroom, through literary and library clubs, and through student groups.

The ultimate aim of all concerned, the Post Office Department believes, should be the forging of an active, continuing relationship among the local post office officials, civic organizations, representatives of the local government, the press, the radio and TV, and every parent, by which the community can present a united front in its determination to stamp out the purveying of mail-order obscenity to children.

Momentous Question of Labor Reform Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of my lewsletter because of its relationship to the momentous question of labor reform laws:

HOMESTRETCH

As we enter the homestretch in this session of Congress, many thoughts cross the mind of a Member of Congress.

He wonders sometimes whether, with all of the conflicts, special interests, greed, envy, and sometimes even hate, that we are able to get anything done at all.

It's strange, but true, that the American public only gets the surface news and little of the real background and reasons for some of the actions of Congress and Government in general.

If I would attempt as a Congressman to give you only my views you would still be getting a single viewpoint.

However, during the session, I've tried to keep you informed on as many subjects as time and space would allow.

Behind the headlines and news, there are many angles that just can't be given the coverage they deserve. With your interest at heart, I want to cover our last remaining days and some of the highlights of the actions of Congress.

STRIKES

For many years, since man first discovered he could hire some other person to work and make a profit on his efforts, there has been a continuing economic fight.

One of the weapons used by the working masses in this warfare has been the use of the strike.

There's no question that strikes have at times created havoc with loss of life, injuries, destruction of property, want and hunger as part of the picture.

Strikes haven't always been called for the purpose of gaining wage increases. Sometimes men have had to strike to protect their jobs, especially the older workers who for years were discarded and tossed out to make room for younger and faster producers.

There have been times when strikes were called for overtime pay, vacations with pay, recognition of unions, insurance and welfare benefits, safety devices and almost anything you can think of.

It wasn't always a pretty picture and those of us who come from industrial and mining communities have very vivid memories of cold winter days and barren tables.

It was from this kind of a situation that the Wagner Act emerged and labor found itself blessed with new powers and privileges.

During the next generation, unions grew, wages and fringe benefits climbed and the American economy became the envy of the world.

Much water has gone over the dam since the passage of that act commonly called the Magna Carta for laboring men and women.

It was material for a growing antagonism to crop up on the part of employers and the first major attempt to curb labor ended up in the famous Taft-Hartley Act passed in 1947.

During the years that have intervened from that day to this, new and stronger demands have come forth for more stringent labor legislation, aided and abetted by the strange, illegal, and sometimes outright dishonest records of some of labor's officials.

A distortion of the facts seems to have resulted from the backdrop of Senate hearings by the McClellan committee and the personal political ambitions of Senator JACK KENNEDY, ballooned and favored by the antics of his younger brother on TV, etc.

All of these so-called labor-management control bills are purported to be in the interest of labor peace.

Recently, the Public Affairs Institute, conducted by Dewey Anderson and Associates sent out a timely observation entitled, "Labor Peace?"

I am passing it on to you with the hope that you too will stop and wonder about the facts behind today's events and issues.

"All the time that Congress is feverishly debating what kind of legislation we ought to have to bring an end to labor-management malpractices and to curb the power of alleged union bosses what may be an infiintely more important story is going unnoticed.

That is the story of the steady increase in labor-management practices before the National Labor Relations Board.

Month after month the Board's business mounts. Month after month the bitterness of strife between union workers and their employers mounts.

Instead of labor peace as the authors of our labor-management legislation tell us is their goal, we are getting industrial warfare.

With 500,000 Steelworkers out on strike and another 100,000 workers laid off in related industries in what is obviously one of the sharpest labor-management disputes we have had in many years, it might be a good time to look at the more general picture and see what is happening on the labor front.

Here are some of the recordbreaking highlights:

The General Counsel issued 297 unfair labor practices complaints—the greatest number ever issued in any one quarter.

Unfair labor practice cases filed by employers numbered 563; an increase of 126 percent over those filed during the same quarter a year ago.

Unions filed 1,021 unfair labor practice cases for an increase of 41 percent over those filed by unions during the corresponding period of 1958.

These increases are not something new. They are part of a pattern of increasing tensions and disputes that has shown itself clearly for at least the past year and a half. Why?

Any objective study of the attitude of many segments of industry during the past few years will show an obvious determination to crack down on organized labor.

Both the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have been conducting a never-ceasing campaign against labor, constantly using the timeworn cliches of "labor bossism," "labor monopoly," and "labor corruption."

In this the McClellan committee hearings have been a never-failing and convenient source of citable evidence to be used against all unions whether they are among those which have been investigated or not.

Right-to-work supporters, despite the setbacks suffered at the polls last November, have never ceased to press for harsher States' rights legislation to weaken and perhaps even destroy unionism in the name of protecting it.

In Congress itself there is a group of Senators and Representatives who spend much of their time in the fight to enact legislation that would further restrict union activities and discredit labor.

The drive of business to enter the political field more actively and more openly is a reflection of business hatred of labor strength.

It's all very well to keep pounding away on corruption within the labor movement. But how about a little investigation into the reasons for the recordbreaking charges and countercharges that are overburdening an already overburdened NLRB?

One of the amusing remarks that helped to break the tension when the labor bill was voted upon centered around the fact that the Speaker SAM RAYBURN lost all of the southern bloc except a scattered dozen or so and was supported almost to the man by the northern group of Congressmen.

One House Member was heard to remark "How do you expect to win the fight with a Yankee Army and a Confederate general?"

While mentioning the beloved Speaker, it might be well to note that Sam is no anti-union advocate by any stretch of the imagination.

The Speaker wanted and fought for labor reform and opposed labor annihilation.

Lost in the shuffle apparently are the real issues, minimum wage extension, social security improvements, reduction of income taxes in the lower income brackets, industrial and area redevelopment, decent housing legislation, reexamination of our trade and aid programs recognized now by many as inimical to our economic well-being, Federal standards for unemployment compensation, aid from the Federal Treasury for our hard pressed educational system, military influence peddling in war contracts and the other field of endeavor where the effect upon our daily lives touches all of us in and out of labor.

One wonders whether it wasn't planned that way. By hammering at Hoffa, Beck and unions, the people were made to forget the problems that loomed so high on the horizon in January.

Winter passed, spring has come and gone—summer is in its twilight, fall is waiting in the bullpen, and winter's icy fingers are reaching for our economic throats, yet all that's happened is that Congress has passed a bill curbing the economy of the country, moving completely into the orbit of the corporate semimilitary state and the President has caused Joe McCarthy to roll over in his grave by inviting Khrushchev to visit the White House.

It's been said often that consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds—there are few small minds in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Adlai's Back and Available

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there are three things I wish the people of our great Nation would keep in mind as November 3, 1960, comes closer and we decide on our next President.

These three things also should be kept in mind by the Democrats next July in Los Angeles.

They are: First, Adlai is the best man; second, Adlai is available; third, Adlai will be elected.

There is much evidence for all these propositions but, under a previous consent, I will include only a small part of it to wit, an item from the New York Times of August 22 about his arrival back in the United States, Arthur Krock's column from the August 25 New York Times, and an article from the current Look magazine.

One admonitory word to Fletcher Knebel, the author of the Look article: It is not correct to refer to "Democratic fat cats," but maybe you did not write the headlines. In the text you refer to "well heeled" or "major" contributors. That is better. Republicans have fat cats and Democrats, proportionately speaking, have only slim kittens.

Whatever the breed or size of cat, they prefer Adlai.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 22, 1959]

STEVENSON SAYS EUROPE SEES GAIN FOR KHRUSHCHEV IN VISITS—REPORTS BEWILDERMENT AT REVERSAL OF U.S. POLICY ON HIGH-LEVEL TALKS

Adlai E. Stevenson reported yesterday on his return from Europe that the impending exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Nikita S. Khrushchev was regarded abroad as a great achievement for the Soviet Premier.

The twice-defeated Democratic candidate for President interpreted the exchange himself as a reversal of the policy toward the Soviet Union advocated by John Foster Dulles, the late Secretary of State.

"I was surprised by President Eisenhower's sudden reversal of the Dulles policy," he commented, "and many European leaders, who had little advance notice, were bewildered by the news that instead of rigid resistance to any high-level meetings, the President was himself going to Moscow and Mr. Khrushchev was coming to Washington for intimate talks."

He voiced the opinion that President Eisenhower's visits with the political leaders of Western Europe prior to his meetings with Mr. Khrushchev would dispel any misgivings that the announcement had caused.

DISAVOWS PRESIDENTIAL HOPES

In an hour-long interview after his arrival at New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens, Mr. Stevenson renewed his declaration that he would not seek the Democratic nomination for President next year.

As to a possible draft, Mr. Stevenson commented: "I have never thought for a moment it was possible for me to be drafted in 1960 and I have no reason to think it now."

Commenting on the announcement that New York Democrats would advance Mayor Wagner next year for the vice-presidential nomination, Mr. Stevenson said:

"I have a high regard for Bob Wagner. He is highly qualified for public office, including the vice presidency. But I don't know what his ambitions are."

In discussing the Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits, Mr. Stevenson remarked:

"It is a good thing for our leaders to meet informally without a gallery and get the issues and conflicts on the table. But it will take a long time really to change the false ideas and mistrusts. The tensions will continue to rise and fall, as Russian policy dictates. So let us not expect early results from these meetings."

As for Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON'S visit to Russia, Mr. Stevenson commented:

"I think Mr. NIXON'S visit to Russia was a good thing—especially for Mr. NIXON."

Several years ago, he went on, Mr. NIXON had called him un-American or disloyal for talking about the implications of Russian economic growth.

"Now," he said, "he is saying the same thing. But it is better late than never and I believe in adult education, especially for Mr. NIXON."

While Mr. Khrushchev is in the United States, he should be treated politely, Mr. Stevenson declared.

"I wish he would come to Chicago so that I could return some of the courtesies extended to me in Russia," he added. "I would like to show him around a typical small town, like Libertyville or around my hometown of Bloomington and my farm nearby."

Mr. Stevenson plans to spend the weekend in New York and return to Chicago next week.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 25, 1959]

AN ALMOST IDEAL POSITION TO BE IN

(By Arthur Krock)

The presidential nominee of the last two Democratic National Conventions has returned from his latest trip abroad to a party situation which he should find suitable to whatever ultimate political purpose he has in view.

If he wants the nomination again, Adlai E. Stevenson has the favoring fact that in the event of a deadlock at Los Angeles in July 1960, which is moving from the possible toward the probable, the convention is much more likely to turn to him than to anyone else. If he is adamant against making a third run and/or won't be given the opportunity, the prospect grows that he could exert a major influence on the convention's choice. And if the candidate wins, the way will be open for Stevenson to employ his great talents in high Government office—maybe that of Secretary of State, for which he is admirably fitted. Many who know him well suspect he would be happier in that post than in any other, and that it would fulfill an early ambition from which only a first presidential nomination by a draft unique in American politics could have diverted him.

Perhaps comfortable reflections of this nature were passing through Stevenson's mind as he faced the reporters and the questions as to 1960 he knew to be inevitable. At any rate, the news photographs were those of a man in genuine good spirits. What he said on public affairs had that sensibility and gentility the public has learned to expect from him. And the digs at Vice President NIXON, which are routine for the Democratic politicians whom the party "liberals" especially admire, Stevenson, as is his wont, administered with the gaiety of Cyrano running an opponent through.

It was this turn of his interview that suggested the leader who, though abjuring any activity toward a nomination, not only is available for the highest honor in the gift of his party but wants to be sure his party keeps that availability in mind. The tactic is classic and has been effective when a subsequent convention takes a number of ballots without making a nomination. And mandatory in this tactic is that the politician interviewed brackets himself in the public consciousness with the most probable nominee of the opposition. Stevenson's replies to the questions of the press conformed precisely to these specifications.

But that may have happened because the routine of taking a crack at NIXON has become fixed in the practice of Stevenson, former President Truman and certain other Democrats. Little the Vice President says or does escapes their derogatory, deprecatory or ironic comment.

All of them in the heat of campaigns have said very harsh things about the Republican Party and its standard bearers. For example, Truman charged Eisenhower with having become influenced by the Nazi concept of a master race. In the last days of the 1956 campaign Stevenson called Eisenhower's state of health and vigor into question as capable of meeting the exigencies of a second term; also the activities of those Republicans who had pressed renomination on the President in the circumstances of his medical record.

But NIXON'S specific charge that Communists had been negligently allowed to infiltrate and remain in Democratic administrations, and the graver implication of treason Democrats saw in this charge, have made him personally and permanently anathema to most of their national leaders. The constant professions of these leaders that NIXON would be the easiest Republican to beat might rob them of their fervent wish to prove it in 1960, particularly if this estimate is reflected in recurring sample public opinion polls. Nevertheless, the Vice President continues to be the target to which Democrats who presume to aspire to the Presidency seem to be drawn by some kind of unbreakable magnetic force.

Thus Stevenson in his interview coupled his estimate that NIXON'S visit inside the Iron Curtain was useful with the comment "especially to NIXON." And when he expressed gratification that the Vice President had come around to his view that the chief Soviet threat is economic, Stevenson added he was in favor of "adult education—especially for NIXON."

This may only be the effect of a settled Democratic routine. But routine also, for a politician who wants to preserve his availability, was Stevenson's conditionally negative attitude toward a party Presidential nomination which soon afterward was proved to be wide open by the check New York Democrats administered to the front runner, Senator KENNEDY.

DEMOCRATIC FAT CATS STILL PREFER ADLAI

(By Fletcher Knebel)

Adlai E. Stevenson is the leading choice for the 1960 Democratic presidential nomination among well-heeled contributors to the party. Despite his two defeats by President Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956, Stevenson led all Democratic presidential aspirants in a Look poll of the men and women who supplied most of the financing for the 1956 State and National campaigns.

JOHN F. KENNEDY, the 42-year-old Massachusetts Senator who has been winning most opinion polls of rank-and-file Democrats, rates second as the choice of the party's financial backers.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, is in third place.

Look polled the men and women who contributed $500 and more to various Democratic organizations financing the 1956 campaigns. They gave a total of $2,820,000 to Democratic party groups, according to the Senate campaign spending committee headed by Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat of Tennessee. A sizable proportion gave $2,000 or more, and some contributed more than once. Many family names are old standbys as donors to Democratic war chests over the years. Most can be expected to contribute to the 1960 campaign.

Poll cards were mailed to 1,610 people on the Gore committee's list of Democratic contributors. Returns were received from 728 of them.

The names of the top eight men in the running were arranged alphabetically on the cards. In the space left open for "other" choices, more than 20 Democrats received votes. Only two, however, received more than two votes. They were Senator ESTES KEFAUVER (Tennessee), with four, and Representative CHESTER BOWLES (Connecticut), with three.

In addition to conducting the anonymous card poll, Look also asked contributors for their comments. The remarks of some of those willing to be quoted, along with the amount the Gore committee says they contributed in 1956, follow:

Kenneth T. Anderson, Emporia, Kans., cattleman ($7,000): "I was for Adlai Stevenson twice, and I think the country is paying a high price for not having him in office now. My preferences in order are Stevenson first, Humphrey second, Symington third."

William Benton, New York publisher and former U.S. Senator ($23,657): "My views are flat and pronounced. I'm for Stevenson, and I hope we have the good sense to nominate him."

F. Joseph Donohue, Washington, D.C., lawyer and Senator KEFAUVER's 1956 campaign manager ($1,500): "I'm for SYMINGTON."

Robert W. Dowling, New York real estate executive ($12,500): "My preference is KENNEDY. And I hope he makes it clear that if elected, he would name Stevenson as Secretary of State."

Mrs. Marshall Field of New York, widow of Chicago department-store owner ($9,500): "I might change my mind, but I think I prefer HUMPHREY at this stage."

William J. Fitzgerald, Boston, Mass., executive ($500): "I prefer KENNEDY. I suppose I am slightly prejudiced in that he is approximately my age, a native of Massachusetts and a man with whom I politically agree. He is a man of fundamental integrity, whose intelligence and youth are sorely needed."

Miss Winifred Jones Gladwin, of Santa Barbara, Calif. ($10,000): "My preference is for Stevenson and nobody else."

Louis A. Kohn, Chicago, Ill., lawyer, who is given credit for "discovering" Stevenson 15 years ago ($10, 600): "I'm naturally for Stevenson, although whether he can get it again is a question in view of his two defeats. I just don't know who I'd favor after him."

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, New York philanthropist ($64,400): "I don't have any preference—not yet."

Jubal R. Parten, Houston, Tex., oil executive ($11,700): "I'm for LYNDON JOHNSON. He's extremely well qualified."

Lou Poller, Miami, Fla., businessman and 1956 KEFAUVER backer ($14,500): "I'd be for KEFAUVER if he runs. If not, SYMINGTON and JOHNSON in that order."

John M. Redding, Washington, D.C., public-relations man ($4,000): "There's no question KENNEDY is in the lead now, but I think we'd have fewer problems with SYMINGTON, and he'd make a fine candidate."

Martin Segal, Jacksonville, Fla., investment broker ($5,000): "Several men would make excellent candidates. I think the best possibility is SYMINGTON. If he can't make it, Stevenson."

Dewey D. Stone, Brockton, Mass., business executive ($13,400): "I'm for my friend JACK KENNEDY."

The major contributors to the Democratic Party, it's worth noting, are concentrated in just a few sections of the country. More than a third of the 1956 money was given by New Yorkers. Outside New York, only the District of Columbia and three States, California, Illinois, and Pennsylvania, gave more than $100,000.

The significance of the poll seems to be that roughly one-third of the people who financed the last Democratic presidential campaign are ready to do so again with Stevenson at the head of the ticket. Two-thirds of them, however, would prefer another candidate. Stevenson does a bit better with the wealthy people than with Democrats generally, judged by the Gallup public-opinion polls. KENNEDY, on the other hand, does a bit worse with the contributors than with rank-and-file Democrats.

SYMINGTON is in much higher favor with contributors than with the rank and file. He gets 13 percent of the Look poll and only 6 percent of all Democrats in recent Gallup polls. HUMPHREY also does better with contributors than with the rank and file. Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON stands slightly better with all Democrats than with contributors.

Since few contributors to the party are convention delegates, their influence is debatable. Nevertheless, Democratic candidates and organizations come back to them year after year for money. On this score alone, the party's financial backers do get a hearing.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Industrial Development Abroad: Threat or Opportunity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, unfortunately, the developing unfavorable trade trends—that is, a disproportionately large volume of imports as opposed to the decreasing volume of exports—is a matter of deep concern to industry, labor, and our whole economy.

Realizing the significance of this situation, a number of important questions have arisen in relation to a more effective trade policy:

First. Do our economic aid programs help to create industrial development abroad that will one day, if it has not already, compete with and take over markets of U.S. commodities?

Second. How can we best meet the incdeasing competition from the expanding industrial plants of our allies?

Third. What should be our economic policy in relation to efforts by the Soviet Union, Red China, and other Communist nations attempting to gobble up our markets and undersell us—or dump products, if necessary, to cripple our foreign markets?

Fourth. What should be our policy on imports, particularly as these adversely impact the economy causing slowdowns in industrial activity and loss of jobs?

To find answers to these, and other, complex questions, we need a careful reexamination of our domestic and foreign economic policy; trends in world production; relative competitive position of United States and foreign products on the world market now and in the future; a review of what possible action can, or should, be taken in terms of tariffs and quotas; and other problems.

Naturally, we must not create barriers that would choke off our own economy—and the economies of our allies. At the same time, adequate measures are necessary to protect domestic industries.

Although our economy is now healthy, we had better read the handwriting on the wall. The time to deal with the rising challenges is now—not after we get into a position in which the whole economy — not just single industries—find themselves hard hit by the developing competitive situation in the world market.

Recently, the Research and Education Committee for a Free World for a National Trade Policy, under the direction of Leon Edminister, prepared a special study entitled "The Industrial Development Abroad: Threat or Opportunity." Although the digest — prepared by the Committee for International and Economic Growth—presents no cure-all solution for the increasingly significant issue of competition in world trade, it does, I believe, shed light on factors that need to be considered in relation to our overall trade policy.

I ask unanimous consent to have the digest printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ABROAD: THREAT OR OPPORTUNITY?

Two questions are posed for consideration:

"Does U.S. public or private investment in productive enterprise overseas build up injurious competition for U.S. exports in world markets and invite low-cost competition in our home market?

"Or may it be expected, by increasing purchasing power in other countries, to result in larger markets for U.S. exports and through competition to stimulate increased productivity at home?

"These questions have often been raised in the past. They are being raised again today as the United States and other industrial countries consider the problem of lending the underdeveloped countries the capital they need to build more modern economies with higher living standards."

MAJOR FACTORS

Major conclusions of the study are:

"1. More than half of the exports of manufactured goods from industrialized countries today go to other industrialized countries—this in spite of the fact that the population of the industrial group constituted only about one-fourth of the world population (1953 through the first half of 1956). Per capita exports of manufactured goods from industrialized countries to other industrialized countries are about five times those to nonindustrialized countries.

"As countries become industrially more mature they tend to specialize increasingly in the particular categories and subcategories of manufacturing in which they enjoy a comparative advantage. As their overall productivity increases, their standards of living—reflected in increasing and more selective per capita consumption—also rise. It is this circumstance that accounts for the growth, rather than shrinkage, of trade in manufactured goods among these countries as their industrial economies continue to expand.

"2. Increasing production of manufactured products has been historically accompanied by increased imports of manufactured products.

"It now remains to consider whether there is reason for supposing that there is any strong cause and effect relationship between the increases in production and in imports of manufactured goods.

"There is ample justification for this assumption. * * * Take the case of a country with an almost completely non-industrial economy. When manufacturing is introduced, more of the country's labor supply begins to work for wages. More people live in urban centers. Internal trade between town and country springs up and increases. As industry and commerce grow, the money incomes of population rise. With higher incomes the desires of the people for a greater variety of goods and services to meet their wants can be increasingly satisfied.

"Some of the increased output of manufacturers * * * may be of a kind that tends to displace in the home market or in export markets manufactures previously supplied by the industrialized countries. While particular industries in the older countries may feel the effect of such displacement, other industries will stand to gain from the newly-created and expanding market for a growing diversity of products.

"3. The statistical data appear to indicate that the increase in imports in industrializing countries are not in capital goods alone but also in consumer goods. For the older industrialized countries this is a likely inference from the fact that imports of manufactured goods trended upward along with increased domestic production, most of the time at about the same rate, for the long period of nearly 50 years prior to the 1930 depression. Recent data furnish more concrete evidence. Over-all postwar import figures for Latin America and individual data for Mexico and Canada, distinguishing between imports of capital goods and consumer goods, indicate very definitely that this point holds true for these countries * * * countries that are in the earlier or middle stages of industrialization.

"Future trends

"What are the potentialities for increased trade between developed and underdeveloped countries as the latter industrialize and under what conditions are these potentialities most likely to be realized?

"The potentialities for the growth of U.S. foreign trade are suggested by the following table, which shows the intensity of U.S. trade relations with the industrialized countries as compared with our trade with underdeveloped countries.

"U.S. exports per capita to specified countries in 1957

"Country:	*Dollars per capita*
Canada	235.00
Netherlands	50.00
United Kingdom	21.00
Germany	19.00
Japan	14.00
Iran	4.10
Egypt	1.67
Indonesia	1.28
Pakistan	1.32
India	1.10
Thailand	3.24
Burma	.37
Ceylon	1.45
Ghana	2.12
Ethiopia	.33

"From the data in these tables it is apparent that even modest increases in the incomes of consumers in the underdeveloped countries (say 2 or 3 percent a year) could lead to a great increase in their foreign trade, including imports from the United States.

"On the economic side there are at least three indispensable conditions to the po-

tentialities for increasing market outlets for the industrially advanced countries:

"Necessary conditions

"Continued economic growth in the industrialized countries. The first essential is that the economies of the industrialized countries shall be healthy and expanding. Under these conditions it will be much easier for the industrialized countries to profit from changing patterns of trade and competition. Economic contraction or stagnation in the industrial countries causes rigidity, fear of change, demands for import restrictions, and a reduction in imports which slows or obstructs economic development both in the industrialized countries and elsewhere.

"Maintenance of liberal commercial policies. It is of vital importance that the commercial polices of the free world be such as to encourage multilateral trading and the continuous expansion of international trade. Unless this condition is met it will clearly be difficult either for underdeveloped economies to grow or for the United States and other industrial economies to profit from their growth.

"The continuance and further strengthening of GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) as the chief instrumentality for protecting and enlarging the volume of international trade is of the utmost importance to the United States and the entire free world. Its usefulness would be enhanced by the establishment of a permanent administrative organization to replace the makeshift arrangements under which it is now administered.

"Flexibility in adjusting to and taking full advantage of changing competitive conditions. This is the heart of the matter, upon which all else depends. Will industry in the developed countries make the necessary adjustments to assist and profit by the economic growth of the underdeveloped countries? Will industrial leadership be flexible and resourceful? Or will it be dominated by a purely defensive attitude, and seek to freeze existing patterns of trade in the face of inevitable economic change?

"Conclusion

"Growing industrialization in the less developed countries of the free world will over the years undoubtedly result in increased competitive pressure on some industries in the United States. At the same time, it will open vast opportunities for others. The pattern of trade will change continuously; but total trade and advantage will increase.

"Growing world industrialization is, therefore, a threat only if American industry, business, and Government react to it defensively and with hostility. If we regard it not as a threat but as a challenge and go forth confidently to meet it, it offers an opportunity beyond measure to safeguard freedom and build better lives for all free men."

Address of Gen. Lauris Norstad on Crucial Importance and Present Status of NATO Armed Forces Which He Commands

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given by Gen. Lauris Norstad, Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, at the National Convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn., August 25, 1959. General Norstad, an officer and leader of whom all Americans are very proud, reports frankly on present differences within the NATO alliance and the common interests which unite:

SPEECH OF GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD, SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER, EUROPE, AT THE NATIONAL COMMANDER'S DINNER, 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, HOTEL LEAMINGTON, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

An anniversary occasion such as this 41st Convention of the American Legion is bound to be a time of memories. To have it take place in Minnesota, my native State, makes it particularly so for me. I am glad to be home and I am honored to be with you.

The Legion's part in American life is an important one. Your good works are many, your influence is broad. You are deeply concerned—as are so many of your old comrades in arms in NATO—with the peace and security of the free world. You of the Legion who have served in three wars and in many foreign lands have better reason than most to appreciate the respite of peace and the importance of looking after our defenses.

Therefore, in bringing you the greetings of the soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the Allied Command in Europe, I know I speak for them when I thank you for your understanding and for your help in keeping the free world strong.

The memories evoked by this occasion go back over 40 crowded years to the men of vigor and vision who founded the Legion and laid down the rules by which it has flourished. The names, many of them now inscribed on the long rollcall of history, themselves evoke memories—Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Ogden Mills, William J. Donovan, Bennett Clark, Franklin D'Olier.

But you have not invited me here to speak of the past. Our greatest interest is in the present and the future.

THE MEETINGS IN PROSPECT

The chance of the calendar brings us together at an exciting hour. Events are now in train that are certain to bear heavily on our relations with Soviet Russia and with our allies in Europe, and on the position of the United States throughout the world.

In the curious political lingo of our day, there will soon occur what history may remember as a famous confrontation—President Eisenhower's meeting with Premier Khrushchev. That meeting will bring us, in the person of the President, face to face with the leader of a surging world power that is bent on overturning the world order. Much that is important to all of us here and to, I dare say, the Russians, as well as to the masses whose fate they control, may be influenced by this meeting. If, as Mr. NIXON has suggested, the experience of exchanging ideas with the President, and of looking at America, accomplishes nothing more than to rid the Soviet leader's mind of some of his appalling misconceptions about us, a useful purpose will be served.

Other matters, scarcely less important in themselves, are also in progress. Tomorrow morning the President flies to Europe for talks with a number of national leaders. He will again meet many of the statesmen with whom he has been transacting the business of the North Atlantic Alliance. He will also meet, but for the first time since the war, General de Gaulle, President of France, an ancient nation and our first ally.

In the background of these meetings—one of them with a self-avowed adversary who wants to measure our land and our people, the others with allies who stand with us in common defense of common principles—Americans can discern afresh one of the most urgent needs of our time. That is the need of nations to make themselves understood.

The process of broadening our knowledge of the Russians, and of persuading them that we are not the depression-haunted, power-grabbing monsters that their propaganda has invented, is only one aspect of that problem in national exposition which nowadays is called communication. It is equally important for us to continue trying to make ourselves understood to our allies, while at the same time we heed what they are saying to us in our mutual interest. To be sure, each may speak from his own special approach to changing circumstances, yet our relationship is on the solid ground of common purpose.

There never was a ship, however, stanchly built, that did not creak or groan as she rode the seas. So it is with an alliance. And an alliance that rests uniquely, as does NATO, on the principle that its members shall have equal representation—moral equality—in the common councils, is subject to more than the usual strains. NATO's effectiveness cannot be measured by simply counting up the number of troops and weapons which it is able to deploy. Its true strength depends rather upon steady surveillance of those issues which concern the member nations, great and small, in their pursuit of improvement. Without the sense of unity, of shared purpose, which can be achieved only by unwearied striving, the number of divisions in our order of battle loses all meaning.

There is a continuing charge upon the alliance to stake out the common ground. It is no secret that France, for example, has recently asserted certain new ideas concerning her place among her allies. It is certainly no secret that President de Gaulle seeks for France a larger role in the broad strategy of the West. Thorny though the issues are, they must be grasped. However, before I single out any of these for discussion, let me refresh your conception of the aims which NATO was founded to serve, and the concepts which have governed its evolution over a 10-year period.

THE BINDERS OF THE ALLIANCE

These aims and concepts were set forth in the North Atlantic Treaty, which was signed in Washington on April 4, 1949. That treaty has often been described as one of the shortest and clearest of international documents.

As proclaimed in its preamble, the central aim is "to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilization of their people, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law." Nothing could be more forthright, more admirable. We know what we stand for. And to show, further, that we mean what we say, we as allies have bound ourselves—and I quote again from the treaty—"separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid," to "maintain and develop [our] individual capacity to resist armed attack." Alongside this declaration is a clear pledge by all member nations that an attack on any one will be taken as an attack upon all. These are the binders and the stiffeners in the NATO concept of collective security.

It was, of course, the initial threat to Berlin, more than a decade ago, which inspired these aims and solidified these concepts. Before that, Czechoslovakia had been corrupted from within; and Greece had barely been snatched as a brand from the Communist burning. Even those of us who stood at the center of decision during those harrowing events find it had to recapture the sense of urgency that we then felt. The force and rush of aggressive events startled a world which had thought that the end of

the war marked the beginning of peace. The dramatic emergence of the Atlantic Alliance, combined with the brilliant technical success of the airlift, reduced the pressure on Berlin and on a Western Germany that still lay shattered. The respite was momentary. While the alliance was still debating, a year after its founding, how best to set up and operate its new apparatus of collective security, there fell the sudden blow on the Republic of Korea, and a fresh wave of apprehension swept the world.

The swift return of the threat raised NATO from a hopeful abstraction to the strong and active coalition that we now see. General Eisenhower left his desk at Columbia University to go to France and there set up the headquarters which I now command. It is at SHAPE—Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe—that the military planning for the NATO Alliance is done; there are centered the control of the troops and military resources of 15 nations.

The ideas that have regulated the development of these forces have undergone radical changes since 1951. In this informed company, I need note only three. One was a concentration on the principle of integrated ready forces—formations, whether of land, sea, or air, brought under a central direction, shaped to serve a common strategic plan, and prepared to execute their tasks with that confidence which can come only from close association and long practice.

From the point of view of military planning, the time-space characteristics of modern military weapons have compressed Europe into one-tenth its World War II dimensions. Hence the need for a variety of forces, trained, fused, and ever on the alert. This is what is meant by integration.

Another idea of equal importance was to give NATO forces a nuclear capability. That idea was slow to mature. First there was the problem of supply, a question of quantity and quality. On the American side, there was also the problem of preserving the technical integrity of a weapon that was still novel. Lastly, there was an understandable hesitation about embarking on a defense based largely on such weapons. The Soviet Union, however, was already moving in that direction. The NATO heads of government, meeting in December 1957, took note of the Soviet course when they stated:

"The Soviet leaders, while preventing a general disarmament agreement, have made it clear that the most modern and destructive weapons, including missiles of all kinds, are being introduced in the Soviet armed forces. In the Soviet view, all European nations except the U.S.S.R. should, without waiting for general disarmament, renounce nuclear weapons and missiles and rely on arms of the preatomic age.

"As long as the Soviet Union persists in this attitude, we have no alternative but to remain vigilant and to look to our defenses. We are therefore resolved to achieve the most effective pattern of NATO military defensive strength, taking into account the most recent developments in weapons and techniques.

"To this end, NATO has decided to establish stocks of nuclear warheads, which will be readily available for the defense of the alliance in case of need."

The third idea was to make explicit the task of NATO's ready forces in Europe. Under the definition that evolved, these forces have to perform two functions. First, they must provide a shield for NATO's territory and people. Second, they must contribute to the deterrent and thereby assist in preventing war.

In Europe, the tactical situation is urgent, complex, and acute—more so than many Americans may appreciate, with their fenceless frontiers. There the adversary strains against NATO's fences, throughout the more than 4,000 miles from farthest Norway to eastern Turkey. Along the European fence, strategy must provide a reasonable margin for a response short of pressing the button of catastrophe. Such a margin answers the possibility of an action started perhaps by miscalculation or perhaps by a rashness that would be repented. If the shield forces, with their own striking elements—nuclear weapons included—are powerful enough to cope with the action in its critical developing phase, a pause can be imposed on the adversary. He will be forced into a fateful decision—whether to enlarge an incident into an action, or an action into war, knowing that his so doing would cast into the scales of battle the full weight of NATO's powers of retaliation.

This is the novel element contributed to the deterrent strategy by the forces based in Europe. In my judgment, it is an indispensable element, for it alone could return to statesmanship a final chance before force would take over from reason.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS

Perfection can never be expected of a coalition strategy. Because nations differ in personality, an agreed strategy has to be the product of a painful search for safety through compromise. It has been so in NATO, just as within our own military establishment. Yet, while our differences of opinion have on occasion been sharp, we have always reconciled them. It is hard to quarrel with success. The plain fact is that NATO's strategy has worked. Behind the line that curves from Norway to Turkey, the Western nations have prospered. Nothing—I repeat, nothing—has been lost.

This is not to suggest that the pressure has relaxed. Again last fall Khrushchev tightened the screw on Berlin. For the moment, while the statesmen confer, the danger seems to have receded. When, or in what guise it may return, we cannot say. Khrushchev leaves us in no doubt that his business in Berlin is still unfinished. Only the other day, he said the position of Germany within the Western Alliance and the related situation of Berlin is the question of questions, the problem of problems.

Question and problem remain in suspense. That they do so is proof that a position of strength, resolutely maintained, is the surest guarantee of a continuing equilibrium. Plainly, our strength in place has enabled us to impose a second pause in the Soviet's maneuverings against Berlin and the German Republic beyond.

We can draw confidence from the course of events so far. At the same time, certain happenings remind us that our alliance must be patiently cultivated. For example, the French search for a stronger position has led to differences. Disquieting as these differences are, they are not nearly so important to France herself or to her allies as are the bonds that hold them to the alliance. In the Berlin crisis, France stood solidly with her allies. For me, an international commander, this was a heartening experience in the mutual support that can be achieved when matters of great moment are at stake.

CERTAIN FRENCH ISSUES

The new issues which France has raised are both political and military. Because of their dual character it would be unbecoming for me, the servant of 15 countries, to intrude my own opinion. It is enough for me to identify certain of these issues. The French desire for a stronger voice in the strategy of the West is a broad one and includes a particular interest in her exercising a major influence in any decision involving the use of atomic weapons. In the field of NATO interests, all members have subscribed to the principle that the voice of one nation would receive as much attention as that of its neighbor. Anything beyond this must necessarily be worked out by the allies having common interest.

France has stated her desire to become a nuclear power in her own right, and to have the United States share its nuclear secrets with her, thus saving her time, effort, and expense in developing her own weapons. Affecting the solution of this problem is, of course, the existing U.S. law, which is explicit about the conditions on which nuclear information and equipment can be given to other countries. Behind the law lies a concern as to the effect that wider dissemination of nuclear knowledge might have on the great issues of peace and war. The fact that under this law France is not receiving American technical assistance in the development of weapons has made for a sense of grievance.

The requirements of NATO in the nuclear field are responsive to the facts and circumstances of the hour. Knowledge refuses to be contained. Ideas are in flux. Military requirements necessarily reflect changes—technical, tactical and political. It may well be that policies will have to be adapted to new facts and circumstances; that the nuclear responsibilities of NATO authority will have to be broadened.

A symptom of existing differences, of developing French interests, was the inability to reach agreement on the matter of storing nuclear weapons in France for the general defensive needs of the alliance. From this failure stemmed my decision to move from France certain air squadrons which had been based there. These squadrons were and are essential to our NATO strategy. At a time of mounting tension—the Berlin crisis—we could not accept a situation that left a considerable part of our defense force indefinitely separated from its weapons. A shield strategy is an effective instrument of deterrence only in the degree that its capability to strike back is ever in place, ever ready. The transfer of the squadrons was therefore essential, but it was greatly regretted by the two nations most directly concerned: the United States and France. It was certainly regretted by me.

Another aspect of the French situation deserves our study. This is the harsh and bitter war in Algeria, which is drawing a great part of France's Army, her efforts and her wealth. To achieve a peace, to find a solution, is scarcely less important to the stability of the alliance than it is to France herself. For the Algerian war colors and conditions the French outlook not alone on domestic questions but also toward the great Atlantic security system whose center is the geography and spirit of France.

THE NATO BUCKLER

Happily, the issues that now concern us will soon be discussed by men who are no strangers. Eisenhower and de Gaulle, who dealt with each other 15 years ago as generals in the heroic enterprise of liberating France, now meet as Heads of State. Their mutual esteem, and the traditional friendship of their two great countries, give promise that matters will be approached in a breadth of spirit that will enrich the ancient association of France and America, and enhance the parts they play in the great alliance.

In conclusion, I quote a distinguished French statesman-scholar, André Francois-Poncet, who wrote only the other day, "The buckler of peace, the rampart of liberty in the world, is the Atlantic alliance."

So long as men think that way, so long as they have the insight to pierce through the momentary surface distractions, the great end which all of us seek through collective security—a life without war, without fear and without slavery—will still give noble purpose and direction to our generation.

Our Medical Research Investment—Is the Salk Vaccine Worth $1.26?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the National Health Education Committee, with headquarters in New York, is doing an excellent job in providing the American public with much-needed information on the vital subject of medical research.

One of the committee's recent high-quality publications points out, in dollars-and-cents terms anyone can understand, just how much we are spending on lifesaving medical research, in contrast to the amounts we spend on amusements to help us enjoy life. The study notes that the Government medical research expenditure of $215 million a year amounts to $1.26 a person, less than the per capita spending of Americans for cosmetics, liquor, tobacco, greeting cards, and numerous other items.

The dramatic story of the statistics contained in the National Health Education Committee pamphlet is well summarized in an excellent and challenging editorial published in the Eugene Register-Guard, of Eugene, Oreg., for August 13, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled, "Is the Salk Vaccine Worth $1.26," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THE SALK VACCINE WORTH $1.26?

It is a proper function of Government to assist the citizen in protecting himself against a foreign invader. That our Government does, to the tune of some $39 billion every year. Is it not an equally proper function of Government to help the citizen protect himself against other enemies—the germs or deteriorations that cause tuberculosis, cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and cerebral palsy? This is the question that comes up when one leafs through a beautifully put-together brochure issued by the National Health Education Committee. The argument of the committee is not that the Government should provide medical treatment, but that it should play a greater part in making possible the research that will lead to cures.

The 39 billion we spend to ward off possible enemy attack is money well spent. But it is spent to save lives that might not be endangered. Yet we knew that 1,636,000 Americans will die this year—1,147,270 of them from heart disease and cancer. To meet this threat of certain death the Government spends only $215,800,000. That is for all medical research. The same Government which spends only $26 million a year for research into arthritis and metabolic diseases spends $157.8 million a year for research into the diseases of plants and animals. Mental illness, the leading cause of disability (as contrasted with death), afflicts 16 million Americans and puts a patient in every second hospital bed in the country. For research in this field we spend $27 million a year. For the geological survey we spend $38 million. Somewhere we have lost our sense of values.

Nor is it only in the public area that our values seem to have been twisted out of shape. Look at what we do privately:

That $215 million the taxpayers spend for medical research amounts to $1.26 a person. For face cream, lipstick, face powder, and make-up bases, we spend $1.39. Tobacco costs us $34.30, liquor twice that much. Foreign travel costs us $14.10 a year, greeting cards $2. And the figure again for medical research—$1.26.

The small amounts we have spent for research have paid off. Since 1944 deaths from pneumonia have decreased 24 percent. Maternal deaths have decreased 83 percent. Percentage declines since 1944 in other death rates include nephritis, 65 percent; syphillis, 74 percent; influenza, 74 percent; appendicitis, 78 percent; tuberculosis, 81 percent; and acute rheumatic fever, 83 percent.

These battles are not won, but they are being won. Now, thanks to research, we have 18 compounds that cause temporary regressions in patients with various types of cancer. Another 10 cure (that's right, cure) in varying rates transplantable animal cancers. As these battles go on, as cures and near-cures are discovered, Americans live longer, work longer, earn more money, pay more taxes.

Since 1944 research has been such that 1,823,175 lives have been saved. Thus is the country that much more populous than it otherwise would be. These people work. In 1957 they paid $623 million in Federal taxes.

Figures can be tricky, but the figures from this vantage point make it appear that medical research, far from being subsidized by the Government, is helping to support other programs. These people who, by 1944 standards, would now be dead, paid $623 million in taxes. The medical research program that kept them alive cost us only $215 million. That is as good a return on an investment as the American people will ever make.

The Salk vaccine alone, even without the money return, would have been worth more than $1.26.

Democrat Lists Nixon Virtues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Long Beach Press Telegram of August 16 carried the following letter to the editor which seems pretty well to sum up what a lot of Americans—both Republicans and Democrats—think of our fine Vice President:

DEMOCRAT LISTS NIXON'S VIRTUES

EDITOR: The writer has long been intensely interested in helping get the right men at the helm in high offices of our country. It is so important. It does seem that Theodore Roosevelt was practically flawless for his high office and now RICHARD NIXON looms up the same way, but what his chances are remains to be seen.

Please allow me, a Democrat, to list his qualifications:

1. Brought up right in a Christian home; had to work hard.

2. Finished college; lawyer, popular debater.

3. Has ideal wife and family, with harmony.

4. Was a good U.S. Senator and battled some Reds at core of our Government into prison. Splendid southwest Pacific war record. Lieutenant Commander, U.S. Navy.

5. Had 6 years close up under Ike, where he has learned much, and has been most productive vice president we ever had.

6. A proven fighter, yet shows perfect self control and tact; when Ike was ill he conducted himself most admirably.

7. He has proved that he knows more about dealing with Russians than any one, unless it is Ike himself. We need him there and they know and like him.

8. He looks like somebody; not old, not too young.

9. He can dish it out, sharp, cutting and clear, justly, and he can take it with a smile.

10. He doesn't pollute his system with cigarettes.

The man is head and shoulders above anyone in either party for the all-important job when Ike leaves.

JEFFERSON JONES.

House Victory for Food Stamp Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, Missouri is extremely proud of Representative LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis, and the State is highly gratified that Mrs. SULLIVAN's fight for a food stamp bill has met with success in the House. The entire Nation owes Mrs. SULLIVAN a debt of gratitude for her 5-year struggle in this field of legislation and I ask unanimous consent that two newspaper editorials dealing with food stamp legislation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 24, 1959]

MRS. SULLIVAN'S BIRTHDAY GIFT

The House of Representatives gave Mrs. LEONOR SULLIVAN, of St. Louis, a welcome birthday gift when by a vote of 232 to 127 it adopted the food stamp plan for which she has been battling the last 5 years. If approved by the Senate and not vetoed by the President, it will be even more welcome to the country's needy families.

Under the Sullivan plan, the Secretary of Agriculture in his own discretion could issue stamps good for up to $1 billion a year in designated surplus foodstuffs. The Republican objection has been that it would put the Department of Agriculture into the welfare business. Why should it not—especially since the Department already makes some commodities available for distribution?

To avert a veto, Mrs. SULLIVAN this year presented her plan as an amendment to a bill which authorizes the distribution of an even greater quantity of surplus foods overseas. The Senate and the President will find it difficult to advance a valid reason for not giving food—food which otherwise might rot—to the Nation's hungry.

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Aug. 23, 1959]

HOUSE VICTORY FOR FOOD STAMP PLAN

Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, like most members of her sex, has a sturdy determination, which after 5 years has put through the House of Congress her plan to

distribute surplus food through grocery stores by means of stamps. The plan is intended to provide food items for needy families.

Her proposal was tacked on to an oversea food dispersal program, which the House voted 323 to 127, and which now goes to the Senate.

We have supported Mrs. SULLIVAN in this proposal because of the basic excellency of the idea. It may not be adopted at this session of Congress, and many problems will be encountered in developing such a plan—among them, persuading the Secretary of Agriculture to put it to work under the discretionary power the proposal gives him.

It has been opposed by the administration, which brands it costly and unwieldy and contends it would make the Department of Agriculture a "welfare" unit.

But we think Congress is beginning to see the merit in Mrs. SULLIVAN'S idea, which is to provide for our own ill-fed citizens with portions of the vast stores of surplus edibles in the Nation's bins and warehouses. The country has long deemed it humanitarian to feed the needy in foreign lands.

Mrs. SULLIVAN may be overly optimistic when she says the Senate is more favorably inclined to passage of a stamp plan. However, she has exhbited some smart political manuevering in geting her 5-year-old proposal this far.

No one has produced a better plan or fought any harder for its recognition.

Congress should support Mrs. SULLIVAN in her persistent efforts toward outlawing hunger.

Taxation of Certain Retirement Benefits of Nonresident Aliens

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of H.R. 135 which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exclude from gross income amounts paid by the United States to certain nonresident alien employees or their beneficiaries.

Earlier this year Mr. KEOGH, the author of the above bill, introduced H.R. 135, and I later introduced H.R. 6847 which was identical. These bills had the same objective but the State and Treasury Departments both opposed their enactment. In opposing the bill the State Department suggested similar legislation which had been previously recommended by the Treasury Department after consultation with the Department of State and the Civil Service Commission. Upon receipt of a copy of this report from the committee chairman, I immediately introduced the suggested legislation which became H.R. 7673.

After receiving favorable reports from both State and Treasury Departments on my bill H.R. 7673, the Ways and Means Committee decided to amend H.R. 135 in such a manner as to made it identical to H.R. 7673 and report it favorably.

By way of clarifying the objectives of this bill, Mr. Speaker, the purpose is to provide tax relief for nonresident alien individuals receiving civil service annuities after retiring from U.S. Government employment abroad. Since such persons are classified as nonresident aliens not engaged in trade or business in the United States, their earnings from such employment are exempt from income tax. Upon retirement, however, that portion of the civil service annuities in excess of the allowance for investment in the retirement fund is subject to the flat rate of 30-percent withholding tax imposed on income derived by a nonresident alien from sources within the United States.

Speaking as one who spent several years in the Foreign Service, I can assure you that the imposition of this tax upon the annuities of nonresident aliens has caused great hardship and in some instances has engendered resentment against the United States because of its failure to comply with what is assumed to be its contractual obligation to pay retired alien employees a pension not subject to withholding tax. Actually, nonresident alien employees consider their pension as deferred compensation, and since their earned income is not taxable, they expect their pensions also to be tax free. When one realizes that in many cases these pensions amount to $600 or less per year, it is indeed unfortunate that it is subject to a 30-percent tax and I certainly feel that it makes our Government look somewhat ridiculous in the eyes of foreign governments.

I would like to quote from a letter I received under date of June 29, 1959, from Mr. Marciso San Agustin, president, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Chapter 9, Cavite City, Philippines:

> Your great and magnificent Government had done much in our country. The independence that we now enjoy was due to your magnanimous generosity. We, your former employees, are highly grateful for our retired status, and only claim and beg for a little more compassion to our distressed situation in our retired status, now that we are old, mostly infirm, almost crippled, unable to devote ourselves to any useful or gainful occupation with which to increase our small income, now being slashed by the inexorable 30-percent levy from our annuities. We only ask to be allowed to enjoy a little sunshine in our miserable homes during the remaining years of our lives.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to take favorable action on H.R. 135 and remove this 30-percent tax from the annuities of our retired nonresident alien employees abroad.

Early Drillers Wanted Water When They Brought in Oil in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texans of an earlier day were plagued by a black liquid which kept bubbling up when they drilled water wells.

Today that black liquid, oil, is eagerly sought after. And it has helped build the growing economy of the State of Texas. Oil wells have given rise to dozens of related industries and have generally helped increase Texas' economy. Tomorrow is the 100th anniversary of the discovery of oil in the United States which has meant so much not only to Texas but to the Nation and the world.

Mr. President, as part of a salute to the oil industry and related businesses in Texas and the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by John Lakeman, printed in Texas, the rotogravure magazine of the Houston Chronicle for Sunday, August 23, 1959, and entitled "Texas' First Oil—They Wanted Water."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS' FIRST OIL—THEY WANTED WATER

The driller threw his hat to the ground, stomped it hard, and muttered angrily. A dirty black liquid bubbled up through the pipe he was poking into the ground to get water for thirsty Corsicana.

He had finally struck artesian water, but oil gurgled up with it. To the driller and his crew, that meant extra hours of hard work. They had to shut out the contaminant so the water would be fit for Corsicanans to drink.

Before the job of casing off the oil was finished, the news had spread over the countryside. Oil.

The original purpose of the well was forgotten by the excited crowd that gathered to see the greasy fluid that soaked through the soil around the well pipe. But the driller was still more concerned with water than with oil.

He did not realize, on that hot summer day in 1894, that he was witnessing the birth of a new Texas industry—one that, in a few decades, would become the greatest single source of wealth in his State.

That industry 65 years later would provide jobs directly for one out of every eight persons in the State, and indirectly for additional thousands who would supply the services and equipment it would need. It would also provide millions of dollars in tax money and royalty payments to build Texas schools and roads.

But the future was not so bright for the water well drilling rig that gave birth to the State's petroleum industry. A careless smoker in the knot of spectators contributed his bit to history by touching off the State's first recorded oil blaze, a fire which destroyed the derrick. Despite precautions, the same fate befell the second and third wells drilled in that area, and the driller who unwittingly served as midwife at the birth of Texas oil almost went bankrupt.

In spite of those early setbacks, more wells were drilled, yielding just enough crude to fan the sparks of excitement. The quiet farming center became the State's first boom town. Speculators thronged in to lease farm land and city lots for drilling. Every bed and cot in town was rented.

By 1897, Texas production of crude oil reached 65,975 barrels, with Corsicana accounting for almost all of it.

Corsicana was indeed the birthplace of Texas oil—the scene of the first discovery and exploitation of the resources in commercial quantities. The first refinery in the State was built there. However, this was not the first time oil had been found in the State.

In 1543, Spanish explorers in DeSoto's expedition found petroleum asphalt float-

ing on the waters of a bay near Sabine Pass. They used that tar to paint the bottoms of their storm-battered ships so they could sail safely on to Mexico.

Even before the Spaniards came, Texas Indians knew of magic springs where greasy bubbles popped to the surface and a dark film spread across the waters. Indian legends say those springs had strange medicinal powers and were capable of healing all manner of ills, both internal and external.

The fact is, the Corsicana well was not even the first successful oil well drilled in Texas. In 1866, just 7 years after Col. Edwin Drake drilled the famous first well in Pennsylvania, a Texan named Lynis T. Barrett sank a shallow oiler near Nacogdoches. And Barrett's discovery was no accident like the one at Corsicana. He was actually looking for oil.

His well doesn't count as a commercial producer, however, although Barrett made a pretty good living peddling the 10 barrels a day he bailed out of the hole. His neighbors bought it to cure their ills and quiet their squeaking wagon wheels.

Compared to what was to come in the early 1900's, Barrett's oil was only a drop; Corsicana's, only a trickle.

The 20th century was a few days old when, on a small hill near Beaumont, a green stream shot 200 feet into the air. The gusher at Spindletop spouted 100,000 barrels of crude oil a day—many times more than any previous well, and Beaumont exploded into another boom town.

Spindletop was the result of the faith of one man and the resourcefulness of two brothers. The man whose faith led to the discovery was Pattillo Higgins, a one-armed Sunday school teacher. On outings with his class of youngsters, Higgins would poke his cane into the soil on the hill and set fire to the escaping gas. Higgins knew there must be oil beneath the knoll. He worked for years to get a test made, and lived to see so many drilling rigs in operation.

The resourceful brothers who drilled the difficult hole were Al and Curt Hamill, veterans of the Corsicana boom and pioneers in rotary drilling. They were the first oilmen to use drilling mud in their operations, mixing the soupy fluid by driving cattle through their slush pit.

After Spindletop opened Gulf Coast production, the story of Texas oil shifted to the north and west. At Electra, in north Texas, cattleman W. T. Waggoner drilled for water for his herd. It was 1904, and the range was dry. When his fourth consecutive water well filled with oil, Waggoner lost his temper. "Damn the oil," he shouted. "I want water."

At Thrall, in 1915, another "water well" spouted oil. At Burkburnett, farmer S. L. Fowler decided to make one try for oil before selling his land. He hit the big Burkburnett townsite pool in 1919.

Oil came to west Texas in 1923, when the Santa Rita wildcat, named by Catholic backers for the Saint of the Impossible, accomplished the impossible. The drillers brought in a gushing well in Reagan County—in a region geologists had marked off as completely unsuited for oil production. Much of the West Texas crude came from lands owned by the State university system and brought millions in royalties to Texas colleges and universities.

Boomtowns sprouted all over the Texas oil patch. Some still live as thriving cities. Others died when the oil that nurtured them trickled out.

Many men willing to take chances tried their hand at the oil game. Some won and became rich and famous. A larger number lost everything they owned, or could borrow. A few early winners later lost their fortunes, but by persisting in their efforts, became winners again.

One of these men was Columbus Marion (Dad) Joiner. Seventy-year-old Dad Joiner had made and lost two fortunes in the Oklahoma booms before he moved to Texas. His first two attempts to find oil on his 1000-acre lease in Rusk County failed.

The third well, stopped once when he ran out of money and restarted with funds scraped from every available source, blew in October 3, 1930, during the dark days of the great depression.

That well opened the prolific east Texas field—the greatest oilfield ever discovered in the United States—and swung the petroleum pendulum back to the east.

A boom to end all booms hit east Texas. Longview almost split at the seams. In less than 15 months after Dad Joiner's discovery, more than 3,600 wells dotted the field, and production reached 110 million barrels. The producing area proved to be 43 miles long and 5 miles wide, and eventually contained nearly 30,000 wells.

East Texas oil flooded the market plummeting prices so low that producers had a hard time selling their oil for 10 cents a barrel. From that period of economic chaos and waste sprang the necessity for State control of oil production to conserve the valuable natural resource that was spilling upon the market—and upon the ground.

Because it had controlled the flow of oil and developed a tremendous reserve producing capacity, Texas was able to open the spigot during World War II and supply 80 percent of the Nation's increased wartime oil needs. If another war breaks out, the State may be called on to repeat that feat.

In recent years, the waters off the Texas coast have been probed for oil. As yet no large deposits have been found. In fact, not enough oil has been tapped to pay for the costly exploration and drilling operations carried on at sea.

But east Texas oilmen are still looking, on land and at sea—and with a sharper, better-trained eye than their forebears possessed. Science has reduced the odds they face to some extent, but the oil business is still a big gamble. One well out of 9 may hit oil or gas; about 1 in 44 a field of commercial size.

However, there is always the possibility that another Spindletop or east Texas lies waiting to be tapped. That's what keeps exploration crews hunting and drill bits boring throughout the State.

Sioux City: Largest Stocker-Feeder Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal of August 24, 1959:

SIOUX CITY: LARGEST STOCKER-FEEDER MARKET

Arrival the other day of one of the first fall shipments of fine feeder cattle from the western ranges reminded us that Sioux City is the largest stocker-feeder market in the world. In 1958, for example, 679,636 head of stocker and feeder livestock originating mainly on the ranges of Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska were sold on the Sioux City market. They went to thousands of feeder buyers in 20 States in the Corn Belt and elsewhere throughout the United States.

At Omaha, the large central public market to the south of us, only 512,462 head of stocker and feeder cattle were handled last year. That poses a logical question: Why is Sioux City the leading market for this type of livestock, instead of Omaha or Kansas City?

We put the question to Ray Rodeen, president and general manager of the Sioux City Stock Yards Co., and here's his answer:

"We believe that there are many reasons for Sioux City excelling as a stocker and feeder market, among them being more aggressive commission firms and programs for soliciting business by the market as a whole; our proximity to the heart of the Corn Belt, where the largest share of the cattle in the United States are on feed; the ability of livestock feeders to purchase livestock out of first hands direct from the commission firm, who is the agent for the rancher at Sioux City.

"Approximately three-fourths of the feeder livestock are purchased by farmers in the commission firm alleys rather than through a group of dealers, as is the case in some markets.

"At Sioux City we truly have an open competitive market on which all buyers and all sellers have an equal opportunity to operate."

Those are some of the reasons Sioux City tops the Nation's markets on this type of livestock—a natural geographical advantage plus a go-getting attitude on the part of commission firms and a free competitive system of buying and selling.

The importance of the stockyards to our area is readily apparent. And to those Siouxlanders who never have visited the yards, we suggest they take an early look. It's an impressive sight to see thousands of cattle, sheep, and hogs gathered together in the sale pens. It proves that we live in the center of the finest agricultural area in the world.

The Fight Against Mastitis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, an article on a disease affecting the dairy herds of this country has been brought to my attention. The disease is mastitis. Believing the article dealing with the disease and its control will be of interest to my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FIGHT AGAINST MASTITIS

Every citizen who drinks milk or consumes milk products has a stake in the battle now taking place on the Nation's farms. The battle is against mastitis, a bacterial disease that attacks the udders of cows. Currently, it is the No. 1 farm disease, and costs the dairy industry $252 million every year in lost milk, diseased animals and medication. This cost, naturally, is reflected in the price we pay for milk.

Ten years ago mastitis was most commonly caused by streptococcus germs which

could be controlled by medication. But the common cause of mastitis has changed.

Today, the most common cause of mastitis is staphylococcus bacteria, which resist even the most powerful antibiotics. This is the same resistant staphylococcus germ which is causing infectious outbreaks in hospitals, sometimes resulting in human deaths.

But mastitis isn't just a farm problem. There are signs it may become a human menace as well. Scientists do not regard pasteurized milk as a source of staphylococcus infection in man, but they say that 'staph' germs can develop in the cow's udder and infect persons who contact the animal.

In the udder, these germs may develop increasing resistance to drugs because of improper medication. A new breed of infectious germ, as yet unknown to science, might develop if this trend continues.

The implication of this danger is clear. Mastitis must be stopped. The history of dairying shows that if a concerted effort is made, the disease can be licked. Not too long ago, tuberculosis and brucellosis were more dreaded than mastitis. Dairy farmers, veterinarians, county agents, and processors got together and whipped these diseases. They can do the same with mastitis.

Definite steps have been taken in this direction. Early in 1958, experts in dairy science and veterinary medicine met at a 2-day mastitis symposium in Chicago at the invitation of the Jensen-Salsbery Laboratories, Inc.

These authorities agreed that good herd management, routine veterinary inspection, proper diagnosis, and specific treatment were essential for mastitis control. They pointed out most emphatically that do-it-yourself treatment by the dairy farmer is not the answer, and may even contribute to the spread of the disease.

In the first place, these experts said, the farmer cannot diagnose all cases of mastitis, and, consequently, can treat only the obvious cases. Many hidden cases go undiscovered, and remain to spread infection.

In the second place, the farmer cannot select the proper medication or administer the proper amount. What worked for him 10 years ago may not work today. By giving the wrong medication, he can make the disease worse.

The problem of incorrect medication has been recognized by the Food and Drug Administration. It has limited the dosage of penicillin, the drug often used to treat mastitis, to 100,000 units, and has forbidden farmers to use milk from cows until 72 hours have passed after the last treatment.

Unless these precautions are followed, there is danger of penicillin being included in market milk and endangering the health of nearly 17 million people in this country who are sensitive to penicillin.

Recognition of sound mastitis control programs has now been followed by two important developments. The first is the availability of new mastitis compounds which contain no penicillin.

The second development is the organized enlistment of county agents to help the fight against mastitis. There are 3,500 county agents in this country whose work is both Federal and State supported. Their job is to acquaint farmers with the latest agricultural methods, and help them solve their farming problems. To the farmer, the county agent is a most important person.

The county agent's role in the mastitis battle is vital. He must convince the farmer to adopt scientific mastitis control procedures. The county agent is the person who must instruct the dairy farmer in the changing character of mastitis causes, and urge him to consult the veterinarian.

At the same time, the county agent is the only person who can work with the farmer in achieving good herd management that is essential for mastitis control. Clean barns, proper milking techniques, and clean milking equipment are commonsense precautions that some dairy farmers have overlooked, preferring instead to rely on "miracle drugs" to cure mastitis after it breaks out. The county agent is the person who can remind the farmer that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

The outlook is encouraging. Backyard meetings of county agents, veterinarians, and farmers are being held. In several States, 4–H clubs and the Future Farmers of America are sponsoring mastitis control programs to teach farm youngsters how to deal with the disease. Universities and colleges are using their extension services to teach farmers about current mastitis-fighting methods.

As these developments progress, they will mean increased prosperity for dairy farmers. But most important, they will mean a safer, more abundant milk supply for all of us and further conservation of our most precious asset—the Nation's health.

Vice President Nixon's Address on Khrushchev Visit, Given at American Legion National Convention in Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from the address given by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON on August 25, 1959, before the 41st National Convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. NIXON dealt forthrightly with the Khrushchev visits—and how we should conduct ourselves, correctly civil and without demonstrations, in order, if possible, to convince the Communist dictator that the American people and their Government are strong, resolute, and united in opposition to his plans for achieving world domination by force or otherwise:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

I recognize that there are a substantial number of Americans in this audience and throughout the Nation who are deeply concerned about the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. There are many who believe that no good and much harm can come from such a visit.

There is no question but that there are minus as well as plus factors in appraising the possible results of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. On balance, I believe the decision to invite Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States was correct.

In indicating my reasons for reaching this conclusion, may I first remind you of the background from which I speak. I have made a comprehensive study of the philosophy, tactics, and strategy of communism as set forth by Marx, Lenin, Stalin, and other Communist leaders. On the basis of those studies, I know that Communists throughout the world are united in working for one objective, Communist rule over all the people of the world.

I know from experience that the Communist Party in the United States, like all Communist Parties throughout the world, is directed and controlled from Moscow and has in the past and will in the future engage in espionage and subversion in order to serve the interests of Communist governments wherever they are opposed to those of the United States or other free nations. And I can vividly recall that it was just a little over a year ago Communist-led mobs made an unsuccessful attempt on my life in Venezuela.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where I have had the opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Khrushchev and to appraise the present tactics and strategy of the world Communist movement. On the basis of that visit, I can say unequivocally that the only significant change in Communist tactics since the death of Stalin is that Mr. Khrushchev and other Communist leaders now say they will accomplish their objective of world domination without resort to war.

Subversion and espionage in the United States and other non-Communist countries continue to be directed and supported by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The rigid positions of the Soviet Government on such issues as Berlin, disarmament, setting up an inspection system for prevention of surprise attack, and ending atomic tests, are the same now as they were before these visits were announced.

It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal.

We should be under no illusions that Mr. Khrushchev's belief in the superiority of the Communist system will be changed in any significant respect by his seeing the great productivity of the American economy. Everything he sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified so that it fits into the rigid description of free societies which the Communist doctrine has painted for over 100 years.

Nor should we be under any illusions that better understanding between the Soviet leaders and ourselves is all that is needed to resolve our differences and to assure peace. There are some deep and basic conflicts of interest and ideology which all the good will and mutual understanding in the world will not settle. Charm, words of friendship, gracious toasts, are not going to have the slightest effect in deterring Mr. Khrushchev from his basic objectives.

What useful purpose then will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war. And it is because his visit can serve to reduce the possibilities of such misunderstanding that it could contribute to the chance that we can settle our differences without war and, therefore, deserves the approval of the American people.

What does Mr. Khrushchev really believe about the United States and the free world?

Based on my conversations with him and my analysis of the statements he has made, publicly and privately, through the years, here is a thumbnail sketch of a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it.

First, here are some things he believes which are true. He is aware of the fact that the United States has great military strength. While he constantly boasts of his superiority

in the missile field, he has publicly stated in his speech at Dnepropetrovsk on July 28 that no nation today can initiate a war without suffering terrible destruction in return.

He knows the United States is a rich country economically with a high standard of living. He has paid us the compliment of setting as the Soviet goal catching up with and passing the United States in the production of consumer goods.

I believe he is convinced that President Eisenhower is a man who wants peace and who insists that the United States remain strong only because he believes this is the way to keep peace.

But he also has some dangerous misconceptions about the United States and the free world which, in the mind of a man with such awesome power in his hands, constitute a terrible risk to the peace of the world.

Here are some of the things he presently believes about us and our policies:

"Freedom in the United States exists only for those who have money and power and not for the working people."

"Capitalists in the United States have turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor—a kingdom of the dollar, of harst exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists."

"In the United States and other free countries the working people are given the right to vote for various representatives of the ruling class but have no right to participate in the work of the legislative bodies."

"However beautifully the ideologists of imperialism may dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system by which millions of people are enslaved by a comparatively small handful of exploiters, a system in which poverty and mass unemployment reign."

The words I have just quoted are not mine but his—taken directly from his public statements. And these ideas he reiterated to me in my conversations with him. Because he believes these things he has reached other conclusions which he has stated to me and to others who have talked with him: that millions of people in the United States do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression; that both of our major political parties are controlled by a few rich monopolists and are not responsive to the will of the people; that our economy has reached its peak and is on the way down; that the nations of the free world alliance are divided and when the chips are down will not unite in resisting aggression.

Put yourself in his place. If you possessed great military strength with uncontrolled and absolute power to use that strength to accomplish your purposes; if also you were fanatically dedicated to the philosophy that your economic and political system should and would rule the world; and if in addition you believed you were confronted by opponents who were divided an who lacked the will to resist aggression, would you not be tempted to be far more aggressive in your policies than if you had other ideas as to the strength and will to resist of those who might oppose your aims?

Mr. Khrushchev will be here for only a relatively brief time, but, in his conversations with President Eisenhower and in his trip across the country, there is no doubt in my mind but that he will see and hear some things which will change his preconceived notions about the United States and which in turn will give him pause before he embarks on a course of action in the future which might be contrary to our vital interests.

He will find that not only are we strong militarily and economically, but that the American people have the will to use their strength to defend our freedom or the freedom of others any place in the world. He will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people are as dedicated to our system as he is to his. He will find that we will no more tolerate being pushed around than will he.

In a nutshell, if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than one who is isolated in the Kremlin.

But what about the dangers of such a visit? There are some who fear that the American people will be lulled into a false sense of security and trust by this exchange. I think that those who believe this to be the case underestimate the intelligence of both our people and our leaders.

It is true that throughout American history we have a record of being a trusting and forgiving people in our relations with other people, but it is also true that we are a people who do not like our trust betrayed and when it is we react accordingly.

When President Eisenhower meets Mr. Khrushchev, you can be sure he will have in mind: The record of major treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Government—50 out of 52 since 1933; the fact that subversive activities against the United States and the governments of other free nations continue despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. There will be fresh in his memory the fact that Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the commitments made at the last Geneva Conference and instead encouraged and stimulated Communist probing actions against the free world in the Middle East and the Far East. And if there was any doubt that we would go into this conference with our eyes open, the Soviet Government's support of the Communist forces in Laos provides a grim and timely warning of what we should expect.

I have had the rare opportunity of seeing both Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in action both publicly and privately, and I can assure you that the fears of those who believe that President Eisenhower may be taken in or bluffed by Mr. Khrushchev are completely without foundation. There is no doubt whatever but that the interests of the United States and the free world will be vigorously, firmly and aggressively represented by the President in this meeting.

Another objection to the visit is the possible effect on our allies. The President's trip to Bonn, Paris, and London provides a complete answer to this objection. As the President has made abundantly clear, it is not the American way to negotiate, in the absence of our allies, problems that vitally concern their future. We reject the concept that two great powers—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—should decide the fate of other peoples without consultation with them.

A major objection to the visit is the effect it may have on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. You can be sure, however, that under no circumstances will this exchange of visits result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We do not question the right of the people of these countries, or any other for that matter, to have a Socialist or Communist government if they so desire. But we believe that all people should have a right to choose the kind of government they want. The people of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have never had an opportunity to exercise that right since World War II. We recognize that their right of choice cannot be obtained by armed intervention on our part. A so-called war of liberation would liberate only dead bodies and ruined cities. But we will continue to support through peaceful means realization of the objectives that the peoples of these satellite countries be given the opportunity to choose the kind of government they want.

I believe that the American people should give Mr. Khrushchev a courteous reception when he visits the United States. I do not suggest this because I believe a courteous reception is going to affect one way or the other his ideas about our system, but because this is the American way of doing things. Visitors in our country, regardless of how much we disagree with them, should not be subjected to the rowdyism and riots for which the Communists were responsible when I was in South America.

The discussions President Eisenhower will have with Mr. Khrushchev, involving as they do such basic differences and conflict of interest, will be difficult at best. In the cause of the peace with justice that we all want, let us by our conduct see that those discussions are conducted in the best possible climate.

Resolutions of Oregon AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Oregon AFL–CIO, meeting in its fourth annual convention at Seaside, Oreg., August 3–7, 1959, adopted a number of resolutions pertinent to legislation before the Congress this year. I was particularly pleased to note the unanimous adoption, by the group, of Resolution 73, which endorses my bill, S. 1162, to provide an appropriation of $500 million for cancer research through the National Cancer Institute, of the National Institutes of Health.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this resolution—together with Resolutions 31, concerning expansion of social security assistance; 34, concerning use of surplus foods; 51, concerning employment practices; and 81, concerning scrapping of obsolete ships—be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 31

Whereas the Forand bill, entitled H.R. 4700, which would liberalize cash monthly payments and provide hospital, surgical, and nursing home care for persons on social security; and

Whereas the maximum possible allowance provided under social security is inadequate to pay extensive bills arising from illness; and

Whereas such suffering would be avoided and hospitals and public and private assistance would be relieved of a substantial burden; and

Whereas the future well-being and happiness of all of us depends upon the social security provision we establish for widows and elder citizens: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this fourth annual convention of Oregon AFL–CIO call upon Congress and the President of the United States to make the Forand bill into law. We also advise the Oregon congressional delegation to support the passage of this law.

Adopted August 7, 1959.

OREGON AFL–CIO.

RESOLUTION 84

Whereas the Department of Agriculture has been stockpiling various commodities for years in its farm surplus program; and

Whereas these stockpiles of food commodities have created an ever-increasing cost to the Federal Government, and we, as taxpayers, share this cost: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO meeting in annual convention support Senate bill 1884, which would provide the availability of surplus foods for individuals who are in need of more nourishing food, and also to provide a better balanced diet, and that the Oregon congressional delegates be advised to support the passage of such legislation.

Adopted unanimously August 7, 1959.

RESOLUTION 51

Whereas one of the greatest menaces to the economic stability of our country and certainly one of the greatest menaces to the security and well-being of many American families is a continuing lack of job opportunities for many heads of those families; and

Whereas the people who are working have to support those who are not, either through taxes or direct charitable contributions, which impose an additional financial strain on all classes of citizens; and

Whereas organized labor has emphasized its concern over the plight of the 3 million still unemployed during this time of prosperity and has called for immediate, positive action to remedy this situation; and

Whereas we feel that this distress among American families would be most effectively relieved by giving priority in new hiring to the unemployed heads of families; and

Whereas the agencies of government should take the lead in alleviating this dire situation, by setting up a system of priority which wold favor the hiring of family breadwinners, regardless of sex; and

Whereas Postmaster General Summerfield has issued a directive ordering a larger percentage of women to be hired in the postal service, without regard for veterans preference or whether they are the heads of families; and

Whereas we feel this directive is harmful for the following reasons:

1. It disregards veterans preference—both male and female—since the ratio of hiring is to be determined on the basis of sex, which circumvents by Executive decree the law giving veterans preference, which law was enacted to compensate servicemen for being uprooted from their communities and denied, during the period of military service, the ordinary opportunities for advancement which they would have had in continuous civilian employment; and which was further enacted to provide a place for those maimed in the military service.

2. It shows no consideration for the pressing needs of many breadwinners of either sex who are desperately seeking a chance to work so that he or she may support his or her family according to a decent, American standard of living.

3. It will promote dual employment in the postal service since the spouse can coach the applicant in what to expect in a civil service examination. And this when most communities in the United States have many families in which there is a desperate need for work on the part of the family breadwinner.

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO in convention assembled at Seaside, Oreg., August 3 to 7, 1959, go on record as opposing the preferential hiring of women in the Post Office; and be it further

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be requested to rescind the directive for the preferential hiring of women in the Post Office, and that preference be given to veterans and heads of families, regardless of sex, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon delegates in Congress, asking them to use any influence or legislative action necessary to insure preference for veterans and heads of families.

Adopted August 7, 1959.

OREGON AFL–CIO.

RESOLUTION 73

Whereas the Constitution of the United States directs that the Government shall provide for the general welfare; and

Whereas cancer is a cold and calculating disease inflicting immeasurable mental and physical anguish on its victims; and

Whereas two out of every three families in the United States shall be stricken by this disease; and

Whereas almost 2½ times as many Americans died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action on all our worldwide battlefronts, and in 1 year claimed more than 10 times the number of Americans who perished in the 3 years of fighting in Korea; and

Whereas Senator NEUBERGER has introduced a bill—S. 1162—in the U.S. Senate to provide an appropriation of $500 million to be continuing until it is used to fight this killer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO, 1959 convention endorse S. 1162, a bill offered by Senator NEUBERGER to provide an appropriation of $500 million for cancer research to be used by the National Cancer Institute until the fund is exhausted, and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Oregon delegation in Congress.

Adopted unanimously August 7, 1959.

RESOLUTION 81

Whereas the dismantling and scrapping of excess and obsolete ships from the reserve fleets provided employment for our workers in the Pacific Coast States; and

Whereas many of these ships are being purchased by so-called dummy corporations and then towed to Japan for dismantling and scrapping by cheap labor; and

Whereas this practice deprives our workers of employment they should be entitled to; and

Whereas the situation creates unfair competition for local companies employing American workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon AFL–CIO vigorously oppose the scrapping of obsolete ships in foreign countries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our congressional delegation in Washington.

Adopted unanimously August 7, 1959.

Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. HESS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to one of the distinguished military officers on the Washington scene who is soon to leave. Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher, the Air Force Director of Legislative Liaison, is to become in a few weeks the Commander, Eastern Transport Air Force, Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J.

Bill Fisher is an airman for whom I have great respect and admiration. He was born the son of a Congregational minister in Atlanta, Ga. He grew up in Southern Pines, N.C. He graduated as an engineer from North Carolina State College in 1934 after a 2-year interruption of his education to work. He then became a flying cadet in the Army Air Corps. After completion of his flying training he competed for a Regular Army commission which he won in October 1936.

On December 7, 1941, Bill Fisher, then a major of 2 days' standing, was wounded in the Japanese attack on Clark Field in the Philippines. His airplane out of action, he led his squadron, the 28th Bombardment Squadron of the famous 19th Bombardment Group, as it fought on the ground as an infantry unit. But he was soon back in the air fighting the Japanese from Java. After a short interval in the States, he returned to the war as a colonel in command of the 308th Bombardment Group under Maj. Gen. Claire Chennault in China.

During the Korean conflict Bill Fisher commanded the Far East Air Forces Bomber Command until assigned as Inspector General of the Strategic Air Command. He came to his Washington assignment in Air Force Legislative Liaison from the post of Deputy Commander, 8th Air Force.

That firm determination and immense ability which made him a great combat air commander has made him unusually effective as the Director of the Air Force's legislative liaison activities. He has represented the Air Force most ably in its relations with the Congress during the past session. I am convinced he will continue to do big things for the Air Force and the Nation in his new post. I am sure that I speak for the Congress when I wish Bill Fisher every good wish for continued success.

Cities for Men and Motorcars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article concerning city planning for Washington, which I think makes a great deal of sense.

This article was taken from the Athens College Newsletter and, I believe, contains a practical, and yet imaginative, suggestion for this city.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIES FOR MEN AND MOTORCARS

WASHINGTON.—The cities of North America, choking on their growing car populations, are turning to Asia for ways to escape strangulation; or rather, they are turning to a compact, tense Greek who is applying in Asian countries his concepts on how to help man avoid domination by the machines he has created.

This Greek, architect and engineer, Constantine Doxiadis, now 40, is perhaps the foremost world authority on a science, he has named ekistics—the science of human settlement.

He was already chief of town planning for Athens at 23, and Greece's head regional planner at 25. During the Axis occupation he ran a Scarlet Pimpernel band of fellow technicians and achieved the improbable by kidnaping the Italian counterespionage service complete with archives and commanding general.

At the end of the war, Doxiadis became his country's Minister of Reconstruction, survived 21 changes of government in 5 years, and rebuilt much of Greece for far less money than anyone thought was possible. Now he heads Doxiadis Associates, his own firm, which acts as engineering and planning consultants to the Governments of Persia, Iraq, Pakistan, Lebanon, Syria, Ethiopia, India, and Greece for projects which total $500,000,000.

He has been visiting the United States, brought over to advise on planning for the future of Norfolk, Detroit, Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. (through lack of time, he had to turn down an invitation from Cincinnati). The plan which he proposes for Washington gives a sample of the imaginative Doxiadis approach.

Washington lies in the shape of a wineglass formed by the Potomac and Anacostia Rivers. The stem of the wineglass flows south to the sea. At the bottom of the glass, like an undrunk sediment, lies Washington's forgotten area, its biggest slum. This is known as the southwest, bounded to the north by what is now the heart of the city, a broad strip of Government buildings running 4½ miles east and west between the two sides of the wineglass.

Doxiadis proposes that this vast slum should be cleared as the new capital area of Washington. Large buildings, hotels and apartment houses should be erected there, so designed that as the Government grows they can be easily converted to offices. Further growth should be along the stem of the wineglass, downstream along the river to the sea.

The new triangular capital area would be one of large waterfront piazzas like Venice's Saint Mark's Square, and would be approached by water. Giant hydrofoil water buses doing 60 miles an hour would bring the people upstream and to their work. Tourists would board similar buses from the jetties of waterfront motels downstream on the Potomac.

The Potomac River, a giant freeway already built, should be used as the axis of growth for Washington.

Cities are no longer the static organisms they were in the Middle Ages, when they remained unchanged in size for centuries within their walls. And they cannot be built in ever-growing circles, because in a circular pattern, as the city grows and its center grows within it, traffic to and from the center becomes progressively heavier and chokes movement.

The center of a Doxiadis city is like a narrow cone, flaring out in the direction in which the city is moving. The increased traffic does not all try to converge from every direction toward an evermore congested central point, but moves in parallel streams toward a central backbone which grows longer as necessary.

The streets are in a grid that divides the city not in small blocks, as now, but in large rectangles called sectors, which could be 1 mile long by half a mile wide. Streets outside the sectors are superhighways in which the motorists can travel at high speed.

From this grid of superhighways, small access roads stick into the sectors, rather like the black keys on a piano. The houses in each sectorline, the access roads and the perimeter form the frame for a park area where only pedestrian traffic is allowed, and where shops, cinemas, and schools are located in a setting of trees and fountains.

Each houseowner can choose his own style of house, and individual dwellings may resemble one another only in having two doors—one leading to the garage and the superhighways (the door to the machine world) and a second door to the human world, opening onto the interior of the sector.

A Doxiadis city provides for several thousand families in each sector, where privacy is secured by high garden walls and trees, where children are no longer in danger of being run over, where the strain of a mechanized civilization is left in the garage and the colossal waste of man-hours on commuting is ended.

In this design for living, man and his motorcar exist in contiguous but separate worlds. The city does not lose its citizens and revenue to the suburbs, whence people now fleet noise and traffic only to find themselves captives of the car, without which they and their families are immobilized, and in what is not a quiet community, but a mere characterless dormitory.

The Doxiadis cities are already more than dreams. He is building them in Asia. One is the new Bagdad, a city of 100,000 people rising on the west side of Iraq's old capital.

When the People Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bridgeton Evening News, a newspaper published in an industrial area of my district, which very lucidly and concisely summarizes the general reaction on the passage in the House of the Landrum-Griffin labor bill. The editorial follows:

WHEN THE PEOPLE SPEAK

The people have spoken through their leader, President Eisenhower, on the labor reform bill. And Congress has listened.

This is what happened in the House of Representatives last week when the strongest of three labor bills went through on a roll-call vote by a margin of 28 votes.

The astounding victory, which came despite fierce pressure from the Hoffa forces and other union leaders, proved that the President had the people back of him when he castigated bad labor practices in a public address just recently.

Those Democrats from the Northeastern States who went along with labor's cracking whip can only stand up to be counted. They should be listed, but for their own constituents to see.

Unfortunately, the vote wouldn't have been that close if national representatives had been less obligated to the unions—and their political funds at election time. This is also a blight on the free system of America and one that cannot be solved as easily as others.

But at least the House has acquitted itself with credit and honor, thanks to the coalition of Republicans and enough good-thinking Democrats who came through.

The controversial labor bill now goes back to the Senate where it is hoped the great tumult from the people will be heard and recognized by our senior lawmakers, who previously passed a measure that was lacking in punch and purpose. Let Senator KENNEDY, who has been active in exposing the vicissitude of labor evils and racketeering, be man enough to go along with the strong bill that the President endorses, and show the Nation that he has the courage of his convictions, despite the danger of offending the labor vote.

Actually, those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill will get support from the rank and file of labor which has been "taken in" by the money grabbers within its movement. The working man has no time for violence in his union, nor the practice of taking his dues for the support of hoodlums to carry out strong-arm methods.

It was the Hoffa influence and his defiance that helped to bring about passage of this strong labor control measure. The people are fed up with this kind of power which defies the Government and everything decent and good within it.

Senate passage of this new labor bill will serve notice on Mr. Hoffa and his 100 lawyers that the people rule this Nation—through those they elect—and that his will cannot prevail in a system dedicated to free enterprise and love of liberty.

What You Can Do About Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the upcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev—representing a new tactic in East-West negotiations—presents a new challenge to us.

There are, of course, differing ideas as to whether or not the invitation to Khrushchev should have been extended at all. However, President Eisenhower, the standard-bearer of our foreign policy, has made the decision that, in his judgment, will serve the interests of our security and world peace. The American people—in a unified, bipartisan manner—I believe, should give full support to that decision.

This does not, of course, presume an "open arms" welcome to the Soviet Premier.

We realize, of course, that there are a great many people, particularly from the captive nations, who resent, and understandably so, the Premier's being invited to this country.

It should, of course, be made abundantly clear for the public and our allies, that the invitation does not represent approval of communism or of Communist tactics that have resulted in international tensions and threats to world peace.

Nevertheless, I feel that the American people can, should, and will act in a dignified and reasonable manner in attempting to provide the climate in which the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks and

exchange visits may have the best opportunity for positive accomplishment.

Yesterday's New York Times published an article suggesting "do's and don'ts" entitled "What You Can Do About Khrushchev's Visit." As illustrative of provoking ideas on the visit I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT YOU CAN DO ABOUT KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

The decision to have Premier Khrushchev visit this country has been made. Now it is up to the American people to meet the challenge of that decision.

This event may mark a turning point in history. The question is—in what direction? The world is watching and wondering how we will receive this man who has threatened to bury us—the man who did just that to the Hungarian Freedom Fighters.

If he finds us naive, uninformed, and easy to deceive, he might be encouraged to risk adventures leading toward war. But if he finds us realistic, tough-minded, well-informed and united, he may well adopt a more cautious course.

Mr. Khrushchev is not coming to the United States to offer significant concessions or recant his life-long enmity toward us and our values. He is coming prepared to score a propaganda victory, with confidence in his ability to arouse false hopes, weaken our resolves and cause us to make substantial concessions. He must not succeed in such a mission.

You, as an individual American, can do specific things to help make this historic event a turning point toward a better world.

President Eisenhower can tell Mr. Khrushchev that we know the score, that we are not fooled by words without deeds, that we stand fearlessly for real peace with freedom and justice. But only you can make him believe this.

SEVEN THINGS YOU CAN DO

Think of yourself as a participant in this historic event and not a mere spectator. You will then find ways to act effectively. Here are seven suggestions:

1. Keep the reception truthful: Communists, fellow travelers and other extremists must not be allowed to take over and create a false impression. By calmly voicing your views you can encourage responsible, loyal Americans to reflect the true public temper with dignity and self-discipline. Khrushchev should be met with civil silence.

In addition to giving the visitor a polite hearing, you can convey a realistic reaction to his visit. For example, well reasoned, fact-filled Letters to the Editor in thousands of local papers and publications will go a long way toward giving Mr. Khrushchev our views straight from the shoulder. Dignified meetings under responsible auspices at times and places removed from contact with his visit can serve to make clear the voice of countless refugees from captive nations.

You can help make sure that people understand how important it is that Khrushchev's reception be orderly and correct. Street demonstrations by insulting crowds is a familiar tactic he has used many times. Soviet rowdies at the Vienna Youth Festival discredited themselves with such demonstrations a few weeks ago. Non-Communist young people who went to Vienna with plans of their own showed how intelligence and courage can win even against trained street fighters.

2. Know what Khrushchev wants: His major propaganda objectives are revealed in volumes of Communist theory and by years of acting it out. There has been no repudiation by him and he has often repeated the hard core ideas.

Soviet aims are thoroughly documented in the current bestseller, "What We Must Know About Communism" by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet. Here are a few points to keep in mind:

(a) The Soviet Premier wants to lull us into a false sense of security—to make us believe that the kind of peace we want can be had at the next summit conference for the asking. But the last time President Eisenhower met him at the summit—1955 in Geneva—his smiles and joviality were a cover for Soviet penetration of the Middle East, and encouragement of his Chinese allies to start shooting their way to Formosa.

(b) He wants to force us out of West Berlin and clamp down on that island of freedom. He wants to make it appear safe for the Western allies to withdraw, and at the same time dangerous to stay.

(c) He wants to create dissension among free world allies, to isolate us from our friends, so the Soviets can pick them off one by one.

(d) He seeks always to wheedle us into accepting past Soviet conquests and forgetting the plight of the captive peoples. This he considers a basic price for peaceful coexistence.

(e) He continues to demand acceptance of paper agreements banning atomic weapons without any workable inspection or effective control.

(f) He wants us to fear nuclear war so desperately that we will back away whenever the Soviets warn us that standing firm would risk such war. He wants us to believe that the Soviet Empire is now so powerful that we have no choice but to make the bite-by-bite concessions he demands.

3. Know what we want: It is not enough to realize what he wants; we must know what we want and why.

Basically, we want governments to respect and protect God-given rights of the human person, as affirmed in our Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

(a) We relentlessly seek a real peace, one that will assure all peoples freedom from fear of direct or indirect aggression.

(b) We want to strengthen and keep the free world united to prevent any further Soviet takeovers.

(c) We believe in self-determination, and we say that the way to unify divided nations like Germany, Korea, and Indochina is by free elections. The way to find out whether nations we call capitve really want their Communist rulers is to let them choose freely between Communist and non-Communist candidates.

(d) We want to help nations stand on their own feet and achieve their own goals so they can become good neighbors and traders. And we try to strengthen their capacity to resist constant Communist pressures—economic, political, and military.

(e) We want to reduce the burden of armaments by reaching agreements that are enforcible through adequate international controls.

(f) We favor the free exchange of information and ideas between East and West. Soviet acceptance of this idea requires that they stop jamming foreign broadcasts.

4. Know what Khrushchev represents: As Al Smith used to say, "Let's look at the record." You can help spread the facts about the Soviet record from Lenin's seizure of power in 1917, through Stalin's takeover in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, Rumania, and Bulgaria, to the current Communist aggressions in Tibet and Laos.

If Khrushchev's visit serves to draw attention to the Soviet record and sharpens world understanding of what he stands for, it will really mark a significant turning point. It is not enough to be against communism; we have to know precisely what it is and why we resist it. People who know can not be misled or confused.

For example, if each one who knows the facts encourages someone who doesn't to find out, there will soon be no danger of Communists winning propaganda campaigns.

5. Know Khrushchev's personal record: How many people know the bloody story of his rule over the Ukraine in the 1930's? It was so vicious that the people of the Ukraine welcomed the German army as liberators. And in 1944 Khruschev was sent back to punish them.

His speech to a closed meeting of the Supreme Soviets in 1956 exposing some of Stalin's crimes ignored the fact that he was actually a leader in the blood purges and a denfer of Stalin's worst excesses.

Anyone familiar with Khrushchev's biography will never make the mistake of taking him seriously as an apostle of peace and friendship. Knowing the facts is the best insurance against being deceived or used.

6. Know how he distorts, confuses and misleads: Lenin taught: "We must be able to resort to all sorts of stratagems, maneuvers, illegal methods, evasions, and subterfuges * * * to make practical compromises, to make agreements, zig-zags, retreats. * * * " The present line of peaceful coexistence may be just another "zig" that will be followed up by a "zag" to new aggressions. Soviet leaders have shifted back and forth between relaxations of tensions and threats, between peace offensives and ultimatums. Khrushchev sometimes "zigs" and "zags" on the same day, using a mixture of peace and war talk.

Be familiar with the way Communists use the free world vocabulary to mislead. When Khrushchev says "Fascist" or "capitalist" he means everybody who isn't a loyal Communist. When he says "noninterference in internal affairs of other countries" he means "everybody else stand aside and let us 'liberate' our neighbors from their 'Fascist' governments." Take note of Communist phrases like "peace and friendship" (the current slogan) and "people's democracy." Be aware of the Communist way of dodging embarrassing questions: "I've never heard of that * * *," "You are misinformed * * *," "A malicious fabrication by our opponents," "You bring that up to aggravate tensions when I am trying to reduce tensions. * * *"

7. Take personal responsibility for promoting public discussion: Get people in your community to talk over how they can best participate in this event as citizens.

(a) Arrange discussions in homes, churches, clubs, Grange Halls, veterans' organizations—wherever people meet.

(b) Ask your local editors, radio and TV station managers to help provide the essential background information.

(c) Encourage librarians to feature displays of books and pamphlets that will help readers understand the truth about communism.

(d) Urge groups to adopt resolutions expressing their views and to send supporting statements to President Eisenhower.

Is the World To Sit Silently by While the Whole Tibetan Race and Culture Are Being Systematically Destroyed—Genocide—By the Communist Tyranny in China?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post:

THE REDS ARE GUILTY OF GENOCIDE IN TIBET

People in the comfortable countries, including the United States, have grown so used to reading about mass murders in faraway places that it is hard for them nowadays to feel these things as real. Atrocities have become commonplace. Have Red China's army and secret police been killing Tibetans in large numbers? Of course. But murder by Communists is such an old story that most of us merely turn the page to murders by juvenile delinquents.

The Chinese Reds are not simply suppressing a rebellion by taking the lives of the rebels. More than that, they seem to be killing Tibetans because they are Tibetans; thus they commit the crime of genocide, which means the slaughter of a people.

That matter has been investigated by the International Commission of Jurists, an alliance of lawyers with headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland. Its record is one of sharp struggle against tyranny. After the Tibetan uprising in early spring this legal group called on its branch in India to search out the facts.

Experts were appointed by the Indian Commission of Jurists to interview witnesses and collect and study documents. After 2 months of investigation, a report has been rendered by the general secretary, Purshottam Trikamdas, who was once secretary to Mohandas K. Gandhi.

The Indian commission has found "a prima facie case that * * * there has been an attempt to destroy the national, ethnic, racial, and religious group of Tibetans by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm. These acts constitute the crime of genocide under the Genocide Convention of the United Nations of 1948." Prime Minister Nehru, however, has said that, because of the absence of Red China from the United Nations, he doubted that the U.N. could take up the Tibetan case.

However, the charge of genocide was soon made officially by the legal head of the Tibetan Government, the Dalai Lama, speaking from his place of refuge in India. "Complete absorption and extinction of the Tibetan race is being undertaken," he declared. There is "terrible deportation and execution of innocent men."

A former delegate from India to the United Nations, B. S. Gilani, says that Red China has an "ultimate aim. It wants to colonize Tibet."

Hitler similarly wanted to colonize Poland and other countries of eastern Europe. To that end he murdered vast numbers of their inhabitants. Stalin committed genocide repeatedly, long before that term was coined to give the crime a particular name. In two continents, from the Baltic to central Asia and farther north in Siberia, he exterminated, he deported, he colonized. Men and women and children who escaped immediate death were shipped around like low-grade cattle. There are places like Kazakhstan, in Asia, where colonists from other parts of the Kremlin's empire have become the majority; those natives who remain are outnumbered in their own country.

Now Mao Tse-tung and his fellow slavemasters in Peking are apparently committing the same wholesale crime in Tibet. In view of the charges by the Dalai Lama and the Indian Commission of Jurists, the United Nations should make a thorough investigation, even if the guilty nation is not a U.N. member. Otherwise, what good is the U.N.'s Genocide Convention of 1948?

A Texan Serves the Nation—Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever Is Missile Chief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Force Air Research and Development Command, was a pioneer in the field of missiles.

The record of this man, who was born in Germany, grew up in San Antonio, Tex., and graduated from Texas A. & M. College, shows he is well qualified for his post.

Recently Ralph Dighton of the Associated Press, wrote an article telling of General Schriever's colorful career.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Dighton's article as printed in the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald for Sunday, August 23, 1959, under the title "Schriever Stands Up and Is Counted—From Texas Caddy to Missile Chief."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHRIEVER STANDS UP AND IS COUNTED—FROM TEXAS CADDY TO MISSILE CHIEF

(By Ralph Dighton)

Early next month the Air Force hopes to stamp "operational" on the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile.

The expected announcement will mark a significant stride toward eliminating the critical gap—once estimated as 3 years—between the American and Soviet long-range missile programs.

Among the men largely responsible for whipping U.S. missile technology back into the race with Russia is Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, Chief of the Air Force Air Research and Development Command.

Russia first claimed possession of an ICBM on August 26, 1957. The United States had to wait 15 months before the Air Force blasted its first experimental Atlas from Cape Canaveral over the full 5,000-mile-plus South Atlantic range.

Now, less than a year since that test, the Atlas is about to join the Air Force arsenal of weapons. None could feel greater satisfaction over this development than Schriever—who won his present post and his general's stars fighting for missiles.

It was not an easy fight. There were times when he laid his career on the block, an obscure Pentagon colonel and former German emigrant bucking generals who would not believe the space age was about to dawn.

But in little more than 5 years Schriever has rocketed to three-star general and built missile technology into a $2-billion-a-year industry.

HONORED BY TEXAS

Schriever's success was recognized last May by the State of Texas, where he grew up. A joint session of the Texas Legislature honored Schriever's mother for her own and her son's achievements. The legislators gave Mrs. Schriever, now crippled from effects of a stroke, a bouquet of roses and a standing ovation.

Schriever was visibly shaken by the tribute.

"What a wonderful day this is for her," he said to a friend, his eyes dimming with memories. "What a wonderful day."

Handsome and broad shouldered, this man with the sky-blue eyes sometimes is mobbed for autographs by women in the factories he visits on production-spurring tours. Men, too, like him instinctively. His subordinates frequently find their regard bordering on awe.

One of his favorite phrases is, "Stand up and be counted."

"If you believe in something," he says, "fight for it—at least until a decision is reached on a higher level. Then, whether you're right or wrong, stand up and be counted."

MODEST ABOUT ROLE

Schriever is inclined to be modest about his pioneering role in missile development. "It was my job to look ahead, he says.

He has been credited with fighting for missiles since 1950, when they were more closely related to science fiction than military science.

"It just isn't true," he says, with characteristic frankness. "I did not become sold on missiles as weapons until late in 1952, when technological advances showed that nuclear warheads could be made small enough to fit missile nose cones.

"Up to that time I had been more interested in big bombers as a deterrent force. Then the picture changed. With smaller payloads, missiles became practical."

By 1954, when the Air Force decided to set up a missile research and development center on the west coast, it was obvious that the man for the job was the man who had fought for their existence.

First, as a crackerjack engineer, Schriever knew missiles and how they should be made.

Second, he was a topflight administrator, a paperwork genius in development and planning.

MISSILE GROUNDWORK

Schriever, then a brigadier general, was sent to Inglewood, Calif., to lay the groundwork for what was to become the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

In the years since 1954 Schriever has flown hundreds of thousands of miles in this country and abroad in the cause of missilery. He spent much of this time in Washington, selling his program to Congress.

Scriever was among those who pushed the idea for setting up production facilities while development of the Thor intermediate range missile was still underway. He argued that this compression of lead time would mean that the missiles would be ready for deployment much sooner. Thors are now operational in bases in England.

His aide, Capt. Robert Crabbs, says Schriever rarely gets more than 3 or 4 hours' sleep a night when traveling. On a typical cross-

country trip he will take a group of subordinates with him as far as Omaha or Chicago, send them back on another plane, and during the rest of the flight work with another group that has flown out to meet him.

CHECK PRODUCTION SNAGS

Many of the general's trips are to check on snags in production.

Dan Kimball, former Secretary of the Navy, who now heads the missile-building Aerojet-General Corp., says:

"He beats contractors over the head to keep them on schedule. He has even worked some of my executives over with a wire brush—and we keep on schedule."

What drives Schriever so hard?

A clue comes from retired Lt. Gen. Lawrence Craigie, now vice president of American Machine & Foundry, a supplier of missile launching equipment.

"You have to know about his childhood," says Craigie. "Ben seldom speaks of it, but I feel sure one reason he loves this country so much is his early experience, his own personal knowledge that this is a place where a kid who can't even speak English can rise to a position of great trust and responsibility."

BORN IN GERMANY

When Bernard Schriever, born September 14, 1910, in Bremen, Germany, arrived in America in 1917, effigies of Kaiser Wilhelm swung from lampposts across the land.

Through a rising tide of anti-German hysteria, his mother hurried with him and his young brother Gerhard to a haven with friends at the German-American community of New Braunfels, Tex. There they awaited the release of her husband, a German seaman who had been interned at the outbreak of hostilities.

His father died in a factory accident at San Antonio shortly after his release. Schriever's mother went to work as housekeeper for a wealthy family in San Antonio.

Mrs. Schriever's employers gave her a small house on a golf course. The boys operated it part time as a refreshment stand until their benefactors died and Mrs. Schriever took over the stand full time.

Ben began caddying and took up golf with characteristic determination. By the time he reached high school he was a golf prodigy. He still shoots sub par golf.

Harvey Penick, now a professional at Austin, says: "What a waste of talent. Here he is fooling around with missiles when he could have been greater than Hogan."

A. & M. GRADUATE

Ben received a B.S. in engineering from Texas A. & M. in 1931 and joined the Air Force. He has been in the service ever since, except for a brief period as a commercial pilot in 1938. He married a general's daughter (they have three children), became a Wright Field test pilot, took a master's degree in aeronautical engineering at Stanford University in 1942, then flew 63 bomber missions in the Pacific.

After the war Schriever was sent to Washington as Chief of the Scientific Liaison Section. In 1949 he entered the National War College and upon graduation went into the Pentagon. There he demonstrated his ability to handle tremendous detail and inspire those around him.

At 48, as the Air Force's research and development chief, Schriever today is making decisions which could affect this Nation's survival.

If he does his new job well, there may be even higher rewards. Some observers believe he may be marked for the top Air Force job—Chief of Staff.

But it would be difficult for any reward to surpass one he already has—the accolade from the Texas Legislature.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 28, 1959, I testified before the House District Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 4630. My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, JULY 28, 1959

Mr. MULTER. For the record, I am Abraham J. Multer, Representative from the 13th District of New York.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to appear here this morning in support of home rule for the District of Columbia.

At the outset may I say that I understand and respect the views of other Members of Congress who oppose home rule for the District. At the same time I very vigorously and sincerely disagree with them.

It is my opinion that not only should the hearings go forward expeditiously, but that a bill should then be reported to the House so that the House may work its will as to whether or not the District should have home rule and if so the form that that home rule should take.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I take it you do not favor the discharge rule before the Rules Committee that would not permit the House to work its will?

Mr. MULTER. I do not know as of this moment of a discharge petition, if that is what you are referring to.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I am referring to the discharge rule that provides for a 1-hour debate on the home rule bills.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think a discharge petition has been filed yet but, most respectfully, I hope it will be filed and I hope to be one of the first to sign the petition, and I hope in short order the petition will be signed and the legislation will be brought before the House.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Perhaps I misunderstood you. I understood you to say you wanted the House to work its will, and the House cannot work its will on this legislation in the period of 1 hour.

Mr. MULTER. I understand your statement, but I do not agree with it and cannot subscribe to it.

[Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Officer, if anyone attempts any applause or any other demonstration in the room, I want you to see who it is and promptly remove him.

The OFFICER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Proceed, please, Mr. Multer.

Mr. MULTER. Addressing myself further for the moment to Chairman McMillan's remarks, it is my firm opinion that the House can work its will on any bill that is brought before it, whether it comes before it through the committee procedure of being reported by a committee and then by a rule, or without either report from the committee or a rule. And when a discharge petition is filed and it is signed by the necessary number constituting a majority of the House, that is the will of the House that the House shall determine whether they shall pass on the legislation. That is the first question the discharge petition puts before the House. The House can then decide it will not consider the matter, or, on the other hand, if the majority says it will consider the matter, the House proceeds to determine what it will do with the bill and perfect the bill if that is the will of the majority. It is my considered opinion that it is and that the majority will so express itself in favor of home rule for the District and will bring forth a bill that will give to the District a modicum of home rule, probably not as much as I would like to see, and probably not as much as other Members would like to see, but, at the expense of referring to the cliche that maybe this is just a foot in the door, I for one am willing that we get that foot in the door or that toe in the door and move forward from that. If we get some kind of home rule for the District this year, after we have had some experience under it I hope we can perfect it and give to the District more and more home rule.

I have before me the letter from our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. MCMILLAN, dated July 27, which was addressed to me and I believe to all the authors of other home rule bills, in which he states that among other things he will request the chairman of the subcommittee to insist on all authors of bills making an oral statement so that we will be able to get all the information possible on this subject.

Mr. MCMILLAN. That is correct. That letter was sent to the author of every bill because this is an important question and I think every member who thinks enough of this question to introduce a bill should come in and explain how he can get by the Constitution. You are a good lawyer, and we want you to tell us how you can get by article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

Mr. MULTER. I will get to that in a moment, sir.

I would first like to say that this is rather an unusual request. The chairman himself, Mr. MCMILLAN, has been the first to violate it by having the chairman of the subcommittee read his own statement, and I respectfully suggest that other members who desire to file a written statement be permitted to do so and to file it just as though he had made it orally.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Of course, everybody may submit a statement, we will be glad to have it, but we feel any man who introduces a bill should be willing to come in and explain it. I did not introduce a bill.

Mr. MULTER. I understand. I do trust the committee will take the view that when 26 Members of the House introduce an identical bill, if one or more come in here and explain the bill and they explain in writing or otherwise that they support that bill, that would be a sufficient record.

I do not pretend to know all about home rule or all about all the bills that have been submitted, but I think it is high time, after the other body has five times in the last 10 years passed a bill for home rule for the District, it is high time this committee report a bill to the House so that the House can decide by vote if it wants home rule for the District and to what extent.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. McMillan.

Mr. MCMILAN. I do not know whether you were here when we had the bill before the House and the House spent 2 whole days on home rule?

Mr. MULTER. I recall it, sir.

Mr. MCMILLAN. And the bill was not passed.

Mr. MULTER. I recall it, sir.

Mr. MCMILLAN. According to the radio and television and the newspapers it would appear we have never had one before the House.

Mr. MULTER. It has been 10 years since we had one, and I think it is time the House decide whether the people of the District are entitled to the right of representation as well as the burden of taxation. One goes with the other, and without both we do not have the democratic form of government—with a small "d"—that we brag about to the free world and that we like to talk about during campaign time, and that goes whether we believe in States' rights or a central government. That is unimportant. Certainly all should agree that everybody has a right to vote and elect their representatives and their representatives should have a right to participate by voting on every piece of legislation passed or considered which affects their lives and their property and their rights.

I have introduced two bills. One bill, H.R. 4630, is the bill which is preferred by the administration. While I have disagreed vigorously from time to time with the administration on many problems—and probably will again many times before this administration leaves office—this is one time I am willing to go along with them again with the idea in mind that this is half a loaf and this half loaf is better than no loaf.

I will not take the time to discuss each of the sections in that bill. I did place a detailed analysis of the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during the course of a special order I had on February 17. It appears at page 2312 of the RECORD and subsequent pages up to and including page 2317.

The other bill which I introduced, H.R. 8081, is the so-called Morse bill, and it is quite like the one which the Senate has now passed and sent to this body. I will not take the time to analyze that bill either.

The first bill calls for elected local legislators and an appointed Governor.

The second bill calls for an elected mayor and city council and so forth.

Both bills present the primary issue—

Mr. DAVIS. Will you designate them by number?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir. The first bill is H.R. 4630 and the second bill is H.R. 8081.

Both bills present the first and primary issue the Congress must determine, and that is, Shall there be home rule?

Mr. DAVIS. I shall have to ask you to suspend until we can have the noise stopped outside.

(Brief suspension of the hearing.)

Mr. DAVIS. Some of the people who attended the hearing this morning seem to be determined to make this the same kind of situation which prevailed in Havana last week. If we just had the beards and machetes we would have a pretty good duplication of it out in the hall this morning and we apparently would be ready to begin the distribution of land and other property.

We will proceed in an orderly way, and I think you can proceed now, Mr. MULTER.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think before we go much further I ought to direct the attention of the committee to one of the primary rights of citizens of our country. It starts with the Declaration of Independence and it is written into our Constitution with such bold letters and big type that none can misunderstand it, and none should ever forget it, and that is the inherent right of citizens of our country to assemble publicly and to peaceably petition their legislators and their Congress, and that is what these people are trying to do who are in this room and out in the hall, and if there is any disorder the committee must bear the responsibility for it by not providing adequate room for these people to come in and quietly attend the hearing and hear what is being said.

Mr. DAVIS. Will you yield at that point?

Mr. MULTER. As soon as I finish this point.

I submit this hearing should be adjourned to a larger room, if one is available, which I am sure it is, so that we can all, citizens outside, and citizens inside, listen quietly and orderly and give them the orderly hearing I am sure they all want.

I yield, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Multer, as I stated in answer to a question by our colleague, Mr. Wier, a moment ago, we have been able to hear all the legislation that we have had hearings on in this room. We are able to hold these hearings here now and will hold them here in an orderly fashion and will hear everyone who desires to be heard on this legislation.

This is a staged demonstration, as you well know and as all of us well know, and its purpose is not to present any facts to the committee but to bring pressure on it. I do not think it will succeed.

We will be glad to hear you and we will be glad to hear every other interested person.

You may proceed.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and my distinguished colleagues on the committee, although I did not participate in the preparation for this demonstration or in the march on the Hill, I approve of it and I remind you gentlemen that the Boston Tea Party also was a staged demonstration, a demonstration against the King and his tyrannical use of his powers. It did not have its effect. It resulted in a war, a revolution, and the birth of this country.

I am sure that no such demonstration will ever again result in war in this country to attain for the people the privileges and rights that are guaranteed to them by the Constitution, and I am sure the Congress will eventually give them all the rights they are guaranteed by our Constitution, including the right to elect a voting Representative to the House of Representatives and to elect their own local officials.

With respect to the specific question that was tendered by Mr. MCMILLAN of whether or not home rule legislation would be constitutional, may I suggest that in the same article I, section 8, the Congress is given the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof, yet no one denies that the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act are constitutional. They have been tested and found constitutional and I have not heard anybody in recent days argue against the constitutionality of the National Bank Act and the Federal Reserve Act. Both acts take from the Congress, by the Congress's own legislation, and give to the Comptroller of the Currency and to national banks and to Federal Reserve banks the right to do that which is reserved to the Congress in this same article, this same section, with reference to money.

How much more important is it that we give personal rights—the right to vote, the right of representation—to these people by legislative enactment. We do it every time we create a State. I know the answer will be, "But look at the particular language of section 8, clause 17." I do look at it, but I do not overlook when I get to the same article, same section, clause 18, the same Constitution says, "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

I think that is the complete answer to any argument that may be urged that home rule legislation would be unconstitutional.

Mr. MCMILLAN. While you are on that subject, were you in Congress when we had the last hearings on this subject?

Mr. MULTER. I came here in 1947, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MCMILAN. You were not a member of this committee at that time?

Mr. MULTER. No, sir; I was not.

Mr. MCMILLAN. We had a statement from the late John W. Davis, who I am sure you will agree was one of the greatest constitutional lawyers in the United States.

Mr. MULTER. One of the greatest.

Mr. MCMILLAN. He sent down a statement to the committee stating we did not have the right as Members of Congress to delegate our authority in this respect.

Mr. MULTER. I respect the opinion of the late John W. Davis as a great constitutional lawyer. I disagreed with him in this instance, as I have in other instances. Without going into the details, I recall distinctly one case that went to the Supreme Court in which we were on opposite sides. The Supreme Court unanimously agreed with me. And I hope if the home rule bill goes before the Supreme Court it will again agree with me. I think the arguments for constitutionality of the home rule bill are of much greater weight and have more validity than the respected and respectable opinion of the late John W. Davis.

Mr. BROYHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. BROYHILL. We appreciate your stating your views. However, it seems our Founding Fathers went to great lengths to make sure Congress would exercise authority over the District of Columbia, because they added some words to emphasize that language that would otherwise be superfluous. They said Congress shall have power to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever. The language without the words "exclusive" and "whatsoever" would still make sense, but they added the words "exclusive" legislation in all cases "whatsoever." It seems to me their intent was to exercise the authority of Congress over the city.

There is and has been for several years a resolution pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary to grant to the citizens of the District of Columbia who are American citizens the right to vote for President and Vice President.

To my knowledge no consideration has been given by the Judiciary Committee to that legislation. I have not heard of any Member of Congress who objected to that proposal to give the citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, but there does not seem to be the same desire to give them that right—which seems to me to be more important than to give them the limited authority involved here. And it will be limited because whatever bill is passed there will be the question of how much voice the local people would have, but in voting for President and Vice President there would be no question about it, and I am certain the House would pass an amendment to give these citizens of the District of Columbia the right to vote for President and Vice President, and it would go through.

I am wondering why the people interested in this legislation do not start a discharge petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee and bring that bill before the House?

What do you say about that?

Mr. MULTER. I say let us not pass the buck.

Mr. BROYHILL. I am not passing the buck.

Mr. MULTER. I am willing to join with you tomorrow in filing a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of the bill to pass a constitutional amendment to give the citizens of the District of Columbia a right to vote for President and Vice President.

Mr. BROYHILL. Do you not think that is a more important bill?

Mr. MULTER. I think it is a very important bill and I am willing to join in filing a petition to discharge the Judiciary Committee, but I think we should leave no stone unturned to give them both bills.

Mr. BROYHILL. You would eliminate the constitutional question by a constitutional amendment to give them that right.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think you need a constitutional amendment. I agree the weight of authority is with you in saying there is need for a constitutional amendment, but I would risk passing a law and giving the right to them and I would risk what would happen in the U.S. Supreme Court as to whether that bill is constitutional or not.

Mr. BROYHILL. I will not argue with you on that.

Mr. MULTER. I say let us do the two things. Let us do the three things. Let us pass the constitutional amendment, too. By the time the constitutional amendment is adopted I think the Supreme Court would have passed on the constitutionality of the legislation. I am willing to vote for the constitutional amendment because it is one sure method to give them the right to vote, but I would not forgo the right of Congress to give it to them without a constitutional amendment.

Mr. BROYHILL. I am merely suggesting that we eliminate the ambiguity. I do not think that would be difficult if the Judiciary Committee would hold hearings on the legislation before it.

Mr. MULTER. But this is before us now.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. MULTER, would you prefer to finish your statement and then answer questions?

Mr. MULTER. No; I think it is much better that the questions be asked and the answers given as the questions arise.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. MULTER, will you yield?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I want to express my sincere regard for our colleague, who is a very distinguished member of our committee and who is always loyal to his interests.

I think I heard you say you would be in favor of giving the District a voting representative in Congress, and if I heard you correctly, is it your idea that the next step probably that would be undertaken would be to make the District a State with two or more U.S. Congressmen and two or more U.S. Senators, and if that is granted I wonder what you think about giving them voting representatives in the Senate, too?

This is a great concern that I have. We hear so much about taxation without representation. If we grant some kind of home rule would the next step be, "We are still being taxed without representation," and what would be the position of the great city of New York and the State of New York and down the line? That is the question that puzzles me.

Mr. MULTER. It gives me no trouble, Billy, and may I take a moment to say I appreciate the compliment you pay me. It gives me no trouble because I so frequently refer to the history of the city of New York and State of New York and what happened to my town or city of New York. We did not always have home rule there. We do not have complete home rule yet but we have more than many cities. We had to fight for it all the way and today we have more than many other cities.

It does not bother me that you have a bill—I do not think it is on the list but I think our distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. TEAGUE, has introduced a bill that is known as a nonsovereign State bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Do you have the number of that bill?

Mr. MULTER. No, I do not, but the newspapers referred to it. I do not know the number of it but that bill, I think, calls for a voting Member of the House of Representatives and two voting Members of the U.S. Senate.

I do not go for half representation. I say if a citizen is entitled to be represented he is entitled to full representation. If he is entitled to vote he is entitled to vote on everything that concerns him. But I am willing to take this step by step, and I think the first step is to give him some home rule. I do not know of any prohibition against home rule up to 75 years ago. No one tested its constitutionality. It was good at that time. Why could not home rule be good today?

I think the constitutional question is one that should be resolved by the Supreme Court if and when it is tested, but in the meantime I think we should move forward and give the taxpaying citizens of the District of Columbia of the United States of America the right to vote for their local officials and to govern themselves.

And that reminds me of this situation:

If what is said about home rule being unconstitutional is true, and if this language means precisely what it says, that the Congress reserves to itself all the legislative power concerning this District of Columbia, then indeed our Founding Fathers were very foolish and impractical, and I disbelieve that because if that is so everything that is done today by the Commissioners is illegal and unconstitutional. I have not heard anyone say that. Every time you give the Commissioners or the Public Utilities Commission the right to issue a rule or regulation, whether it involves health or sanitation or transportation, that is legislation and a legislative power, and if the Congress did not have the right to give that authority to the Commissioners or to the Public Utilities Commission or any other District Commission, then everything they have done is unconstitutional and everyone who violated an ordinance and paid a fine was fined illegally, and I do not think that is so.

This is my position on these bills and I hope very shortly you will go into executive session and bring forth a bill that can be acted on promptly.

Mr. DAVIS. We appreciate your statement.

I want to ask you some questions about some of the points you touched on.

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. DAVIS. I notice in House Resolution 320 that you are listed as one of the four Representatives which that resolution provides for recognition by the Speaker to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 4630, which is one of the bills you referred to in your statement.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. You are familiar with House Resolution 320?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, I am.

Mr. DAVIS. That resolution provides that all points of order against the bill are waived and it provides that general debate shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by you or whoever requested the rule for consideration of H.R. 4630, and a Member who is opposed to said bill to be designated by the Speaker.

The resolution further provides that no amendment shall be in order to the bill except those offered by direction of the Member requesting the rule, which could be you or one of the three other Members named in the resolution, and that amendments so offered may be offered to any part of the bill but shall not be subject to amendment.

That strikes me as being a very harsh and stringent gag rule.

This bill, H.R. 4630, is a bill which has 83 pages in it. This resolution also provides that it shall be considered as read when the debate has been ended.

What is the reason for all these various provisions?

Mr. MULTER. All the reasons I have ever heard urged since I have been a Member of the House in support of closed rules can and should be urged in support of that closed rule. It is no different from any other closed rule that has been reported by the Rules Committee and adopted by the House, and you know, I am sure, the House does not have to adopt this closed rule.

Mr. DAVIS. It expresses your attitude?

Mr. MULTER. That is right, because I think a bill of this kind ought to be considered just as we can consider bills out of the Ways and Means Committee dealing with billions of dollars under a closed rule without amendment when there is much disagreement. Surely we can consider a bill of this kind under the same rule and determine once and for all the issues it raises in this session of Congress and that is, whether or not home rule shall be given to the District and whether or not they shall at least have the right to experiment under home rule for a while.

Mr. DAVIS. How does the gentleman feel that restricting these debates to 1 hour will further the purpose of having home rule this session? Does not the gentleman know that 1 day's debate or 2 days' debate or any reasonable time would not jeopardize the passage of the bill if the House wants to pass it? I would like to know why you want to restrict it to 30 minutes to those in favor and 30 minutes to those opposed when you cannot begin to touch the various provisions in this 83-page bill in that length of time?

Mr. MULTER. May I be presumptuous enough to suggest that the reason for the limitation to 1 hour is that I do not think if you talked about this bill for 10 days a single vote would be changed.

Mr. DAVIS. Is that the gentleman's attitude about legislation generally?

Mr. MULTER. No; it is not.

Mr. DAVIS. Why does the gentleman say it about this bill?

Mr. MULTER. Because on this particular bill I think every Member of the House has made up his mind whether he is for or against home rule and will vote accordingly regardless of how much debate there is.

Mr. DAVIS. Would you say every Member of the House is familiar with the provisions of H.R. 4630?

Mr. MULTER. Just as he is not now, I would say after 20 days' debate every Member would not be familiar with every provision of the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. You do not think debate would inform him as to the provisions?

Mr. MULTER. Debate would inform those willing to stay on the floor during general debate.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman knows you have a right to get them on the floor and keep them there.

Mr. MULTER. You cannot if there are 100 on the floor, and that is less than one-fourth of the Members of the House.

Mr. DAVIS. I differ with the gentleman as to the necessity to explain the provisions of a bill.

Mr. MULTER. Before we leave the matter of limitation of debate, I have learned the hard way that all good legislation is the result of compromise, and I am willing to compromise if you and others who feel about it the way you do say 1 hour is not enough. I am willing to agree with you on how much time for debate there should be.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me get the gentleman's idea on how much time he thinks would be reasonable?

Mr. MULTER. I have said I do not think any amount of debating——

Mr. DAVIS. You are a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, are you not?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir; I am.

Mr. DAVIS. That committee reports out many bills and the Rules Committee has always allowed reasonable time for debate on bills out of that committee.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. You have referred to tax bills. We all know the reason tax bills come before the House on a closed rule is that experience has demonstrated that is is almost impossible to pass a tax bill unless it comes up under a closed rule.

The gentleman referred to tax bills involving billions of dollars. Appropriation bills also involve billions of dollars and they come up under a closed rule.

Mr. MULTER. Sometimes they do.

Mr. DAVIS. Almost always, but you can offer an amendment any time you want to and get a hearing before the House, and House Members are not prevented from offering amendments and expressing themselves about such amendments as they may offer, and certainly the appropriation bills I do not think can be considered as of lesser importance than the subject matter of this legislation.

What do you say about that?

Mr. MULTER. I say this committee is in charge of that situation. Most of these bills have been before this committee since January. Most of them have been before Congress every session for the last 10 years. I am not accusing anyone of being dilatory, but I am suggesting the answer to any discharge petition is that the committee has had ample time to report out a bill and that the committee can be in control of the kind of rule you wanted brought forth. It is still within the power of this committee to control that.

Mr. DAVIS. Is it your attitude, then, that because the committee has not held hearings on these bills up to this time, to eliminate all the legislative processes and go ahead and adopt these stringent provisions provided for in this resolution which have already been outlined here and assume that this bill, H.R. 4630, is so perfect that no Member of the House other than the four named in House Resolution 320 would be capable of offering an amendment to it that would improve it?

Mr. MULTER. I am sure I can talk for the other three colleagues mentioned in that resolution. None of us claim to know it all, none of us is perfect, and none of us claim we can bring out a perfect bill.

Mr. DAVIS. Why have you restricted it so that the other 433 Members of the House would have no opportunity to offer an amendment or debate it?

Mr. MULTER. Because the discharge petition and the closed rule is as much a part of the legislative processes as the committee system.

Mr. DAVIS. Why have you restricted it further so that if one of these four Members does offer an amendment that no Member of the House will be permitted to amend that amendment?

Mr. MULTER. The same principle applies here regarding the offering of amendments to amendments as to other bills.

Frankly, none of us at this time foresee the necessity for amendments. However, during the course of the debate things may be suggested to improve the bill, and I am sure my colleagues sponsoring this bill will agree to any amendment that will improve the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. But you would not agree that any other Member who disagrees with the propriety of any provision in this bill could offer an amendment?

Mr. MULTER. Most respectively I say to you we had a choice, a hard choice. We could have an open rule and permit amendments until the end of the session of Congress—whether dilatory or otherwise is unimportant—but under an open rule it could go on until adjournment. Or if it is a closed rule it must be a closed rule not in part but completely, otherwise those who want this legislation will see it talked to death.

I say that to you most respectfully.

Mr. DAVIS. Again I disagree with the gentleman most respectfully because I am convinced under the rules of the House there cannot be carried on any such dilatory tactics as the gentleman has referred to. I thoroughly disagree with the gentleman regarding the reason he gives for completely eliminating the voice of the House in passing on the provisions of the bill, which is what this gag rule would do.

Mr. MULTER. If the majority of the House disagrees with us the rule will never be adopted. If it agrees with us it will be adopted. That is the democratic way, again with a small "d".

Mr. DAVIS. I think the gentleman obviously wants to be democratic, but if there has ever been an autocratic gag rule presented to the House in the history of this country, this is it.

Mr. MULTER. I urged the same arguments when I was opposed to the gag rule on bills I did not like.

Mr. DAVIS. Did the gentleman change his opinion?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it should be pointed out that there is a difference in the procedure followed by the Ways and Means Committee in seeking these closed rules and the very stringent procedure that is being followed here; that is, that this bill has never reached the stage of committee consideration.

The bills which come out of the Ways and Means Committee have received careful studious consideration by that committee and must be recommended by that committee before the Rules Committee will even give consideration to granting a rule. I think there is quite a difference in the procedure. This is a bill that has been arbitrarily selected and as a bill which the proponents seek to push through the House without giving the House an opportunity to work its will on the legislation.

There is quite a bit of difference in the procedure.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Kearns.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment my colleague. I think he is very honest and sincere in his conviction. There is also one thing very interesting about him. He always has a very great sense of humor.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. KEARNS. Especially when he said he thought every Member of the House had their minds made up whether or not they would uphold home rule.

I would like the record to show at least some conscientious person living here in Washington did not think so because my telephone rang at 3:30 this morning and at 4:30 this morning asking me to vote for home rule.

I had illness in the family back home so I thought nothing of it and I answered the phone.

There is one conviction I have and I am very sure about it, that when George Washington stepped off this 10-mile square and said, "This shall be the seat of the Federal Government," he never anticipated, neither did we, that the bureaucracies of Government would get to the numbers they are and people would come here as they have, in droves. I share the thinking of my colleague from Virginia about their right to vote for President and Vice President, but in the years that I have had the privilege of serving here on the District Committee, I do not see possibly how the Federal Government can act, be effective in their designated duties being subjected to a municipally controlled government.

I mean it sincerely. Then, too, where are you going to get the money to pay for this? The first year you are going to be in the red. The second year more in the red, the third year more in the red, and coming to Congress every year for money. You do not have the taxable potential here to run as other municipalities do.

There are many things considered. My goodness. You talk about the resolution here. We should have as much debate and read the bill on a subject like this as we would on passing a labor bill here in the Congress. To ever think of getting this through, on that type of thing, my dear friend, I don't think it is fair to the people. I don't think it is fair to the Congress, and above all I don't think it is fair to our concept of our form of Government.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, may I thank Mr. Kearns for the remarks he made about me and indicate to him that I feel as strongly as he does at the anoyance that was tendered to him. I think it was deliberate annoyance and if they did that to me as strongly as I feel about this bill, I might change my vote. That might change my vote faster than anything else. I think that kind of annoyance and nuisance just cannot be condoned. It is wrong.

With reference to the financial situation the gentleman referred to, may I there again call upon my personal knowledge of operations in the city of New York. We have the second biggest budget in the country. There is no budget bigger than that of the city of New York except that of the U.S. Government.

But we do not hesitate to come to the Congress, and our mayor comes down here regularly asking the Congress to help us out financially. And every other city does. Every State does, too. The District of Columbia will be no different then than it is now.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Has the city of New York had any assistance to help operate the city government from the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MULTER. If we take "government" in its all-inclusive term, which I am sure we must, and that is the entire operation of the city of New York, we get money for the city of New York for housing, without which we would have no public housing. That comes from the Congress.

Mr. MCMILLAN. I am talking about operating the city government. I want to get some, too, if you can get some in New York.

Mr. MULTER. Our mayor and our city council, elected by the people of the city of New York, our board of estimate, elected by the people of the city of New York, have their salaries and expenses paid out of the budget which is raised by taxation upon the citizens of the city of New York, those residing and working there.

That does not give us all the money we need with which to operate.

Mr. MCMILLAN. Since the gentleman is one of the leaders in this proposed legislation, I wonder if he could tell the committee who he would provide or give permission to vote here in the District of Columbia.

It seems that we have so many categories of people here as brought out in the last hearings who would not be permitted to vote in the District, I wondered who you would permit to vote.

Mr. MULTER. I would permit to vote in the District any person who has a bona fide legal residence in the District and has had it and maintained it at least 1 year prior to the election in which he participates.

Mr. MCMILLAN. That would exclude Government employees?

Mr. MULTER. Those Government employees are voting back home now. A Government employee comes down here from back home and lives in a house and he registers from the last place he voted. He takes a Government job and he can vote forever and a day from that residence even though the house is torn down.

It is still his bona fide residence according to the law.

Mr. McMILLAN. There are 2,500 people working here on Capitol Hill. Would they be permitted to vote?

Mr. MULTER. If they give up their legal residence back in their home State and establish a bona fide residence here and maintain it at least 1 year prior to election, they should have a right to vote.

Every citizen of the United States should have the right to vote once in a general election but not in two different places, in one place only.

Mr. McMILLAN. How about Navy personnel? Would they be permitted to vote here?

Mr. MULTER. They vote from their bona fide legal residence at home.

Mr. McMILLAN. Who would vote in the District?

Mr. MULTER. They would not vote in the District unless they changed their legal residence.

Every man has that right. If I did it and moved out of the State I would lose my seat in Congress. That is not a right, but a privilege. If I want to give up that privilege by moving out of my home State, that is my business.

I can move anywhere within the State and stil retain my right to vote within that State.

Mr. McMILLAN. We all know that. The record should show who shall be eligible to vote in the District of Columbia should this bill become a law.

Mr. DAVIS. Can the gentleman tell us what percentage of the residents of the District of Columbia would be excluded from voting under his bill by reason of the fact that they maintain a legal voting residence in some other State?

Mr. MULTER. I have no such statistic, sir. I am sorry I cannot give it to you. I don't know if anbody has that statistic.

Mr. DAVIS. That would be quite a substantial number, would it not?

Mr. MULTER. I would not even try to guess, sir. I don't know. I have never seen any figure that attempted to give it to us. I do know that most Government employees have been moving out of the District and living in Maryland, nearby Maryland, nearby Virginia. But how many still live in the District, I have no idea.

Mr. DAVIS. The gentleman, I believe, stated in his initial statement that every person was entitled to have the right to vote for representatives.

Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. MULTER. I did say that although that is not in any of the bills that are before you.

Mr. DAVIS. Why, then, especially in view of your feeling, is that not included in H.R. 4630 and these other bills?

Mr. MULTER. We are trying to get as much support for a bill as possible. We tried to bring forth the least controversial bill and that is why the resolution, H. J. Res. 320, refers to H.R. 4630, which is the so-called administration bill. Frankly, I think if we took the other bill which was passed by the Senate the Republicans in the House would probably not support us. They will support the President's bill, the administration's recommendation and that is the bill which I put in under H.R. 4630. This is one instance where I think we need all the bipartisan support we can get. I am willing to compromise and give up the Morse bill for the administration bill for the Republican support.

Mr. DAVIS. I have read some of the provisions of H.R. 4630, not all of them as yet, although I intend to, but I notice that this bill provides for a Governor and a Secretary. I notice also that although the gentleman has expressed himself very sincerely and earnestly as being in favor of giving the people of the District the right to vote and self government that this bill does not give them the right to vote for the Governor and the Secretary the highest two offices in the bill.

It provides that those officers shall be appointed by the President and also provides that they can be removed by the President at his pleasure.

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. DAVIS. Why does the gentleman wish to prevent the people of the District from voting for those two high officers and yet have the right to vote for certain others?

Mr. MULTER. I think you put it unintentionally in reverse, Mr. Chairman. I do not want to prevent them from doing that.

Mr. DAVIS. Your bill does that.

Mr. MULTER. The bill does not give them that privilege. I hope some day we will get a law that will give it to them but this is, I think, as far as we can go at this time.

Mr. DAVIS. Isn't that one of the most important things you could give them?

Mr. MULTER. It is a very important thing, but it is not the most important thing. In order to get a bill past a Presidential veto I am willing to go along with the President in this instance and let him have the appointive power and hope in 1961 we can change it and have a President who will go along with elective power and give up his own appointive power.

As of today I do not think we can get the President to go along with a bill that will permit us to elect the Governor or the mayor, as the case may be. He will go along with a bill which will call for an appointment by himself or by his successor.

Mr. DAVIS. I have noticed that many people threatened the Congress in recent days and weeks with a possible veto by the President.

I am glad to have your voice added to the list.

Mr. MULTER. Many a time, and the housing bill is one time, when I said, "Let's override the President's veto and let's send him a bill whether he likes it or not, which we think is a good bill," but there there is a difference of opinion as to the contents of the bill, as to whether it is inflationary or less inflationary than that which he wants.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there any further questions?

Mr. BROYHILL. One more question, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Broyhill. I would like to compliment the gentleman for a very fine statement, particularly for his excellent sense of humor.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BROYHILL. As the gentleman knows, when the Federal city was laid out, 100 square miles, a 10-mile square, in 1847 the portion west of the Potomac was ceded back to the State of Virginia, 66 square miles. Has the gentleman ever given consideration to the desirability of ceding a large portion of that part that was contributed by Maryland back to the State of Maryland and let the residential areas and a large portion of the business areas be part of the State of Maryland and then reduce the size of this Federal City?

It was done once before. I wondered if we might cut down some more of it.

Mr. MULTER. Under our system of government you cannot force a gift upon people, and I do not think Maryland would accept the gift. I do not think Maryland would accept the cession.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If you will yield.

Mr. BROYHILL. Yes.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I believe all of our colleagues from Maryland have introduced home rule legislation. I believe I am correct.

I know they are sincerely anxious to give our people voting rights such as people in the State have. I am not so sure of that. I wonder, with their enthusiasm and their active cooperation, if maybe the State of Maryland would not be glad to have the opportunity of gaining so many fine citizens from here in the District of Columbia. I am really serious about that. We were talking a while ago about everybody having different ideas about home rule. I want to say to my colleague I have talked to many Members of the House who say they are in favor of some home rule and actually at least four or five Congressmen have suggested that that fundamental idea is right. I know it is difficult. I know it can't be worked out easily, but they said, "It would get rid of all my objections if we could tie in the District with Maryland." I do not think that is a facetious suggestion. I want to emphasize it. Many a Congressman has spoken to me about it.

Mr. BROYHILL. I want the record to show that over a hunderd years ago Virginia did its share and its part.

Mr. DAVIS. I would like to ask the gentleman, what is the reasoning behind the provisions in this bill, H.R. 4630, which do not or would not give any representation whatever in the Senate to residents of the District?

Mr. MULTER. Again, we have tried to follow tradition and what we think will gather the greatest number of votes, the most support.

Mr. DAVIS. What objection do you see in the residents of the District having representation in the Senate?

Mr. MULTER. I see none, but I do not think we can get that kind of a bill through today. I think what we have to do is first give them territorial status, representation as Alaska and Hawaii had before they had statehood, a nonvoting delegate, the same as Puerto Rico has, a nonvoting commissioner, giving them a nonvoting representative in the House first and eventually give that representative the right to vote.

Mr. DAVIS. Eventually give them statehood.

Mr. MULTER. Whether statehood or not, or simply a right to participate in the right of the Government of the Nation I think is unimportant. I respect all of those who so sincerely urge the States rights theories. I am not a States righter. I think this Government and this Nation of ours can grow and prosper and continue to be the greatest country on God's earth without individual States reserving to themselves all the powers they demand. I think today, with communications what they are, with transportation as fast as it is, when you can get in a matter of hours from one part of the world to the other—not the country, the world—that you do not need this decentralization of Government to the States that we did need many years ago so that whether the District of Columbia has a representative form of self-government is not the test. Every citizen has a right to vote for President and to vote for a Representative in the House of Representatives, and two Senators in the U.S. Senate. I think those are things that they are entitled to. I do not think the Congress is ready to give them to them at this time. Eventually I hope Congress will see fit to do that. I think this bill is as far as we can get a majority of the House to go at this time. The Senate has already indicated they will do this. This is as far, I think, as we can go today, to get a bill to the President which he will sign.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I do not want to belabor that point, Mr. Chairman, but the gentlemen in the other body are so anxious to have us adopt it I wonder why they are opposed to a delegate.

Mr. MULTER. I have said to those who discussed it with me over there, "We will get

two Representatives in your body there some day from the District of Columbia."

Mr. DAVIS. Of course, all this legislation ought to be aimed toward fairness and justice and toward securing the appropriate voice in the Government. I presume that is what is behind it.

The gentleman has just stated he does not see too much need for continuance of States rights. I believe that was the substance of what was just said. If I have misquoted you, I wish you would correct me, but if State lines and State functions are to be eliminated, it would seem to me that that is all the more reason why the citizen should have a stronger voice in the Federal Government, in the concentrated Government here in Washington.

If they are not to have States rights, not to have the rights of a citizen of a State, then if their status is to be changed, they ought to be given as strong a voice as possible in the operation of the Federal Government and if you deny them representation in the Senate, you are just giving them what might be called second-class citizenship. Is that not right?

Mr. MULTER. There is substance of what the gentleman says but I say if we cannot give them all the gentleman suggests we have, let's give them part of it now. I will join the gentleman in giving them the rest of it. I will join the gentleman and anybody else in this House or in the Senate to give them all the complete representation and rights that they should have, including the right to elect a voting Representative to the House, and two voting Senators in the U.S. Senate and to vote for the President and the Vice President. I will go along with anybody who will go all the way and I will also go part of the way part of the time until we can get part of it and gradually move along.

Mr. DAVIS. Inasmuch as the gentleman is the present witness before the Subcommittee I just want to get all these matters stated as clearly as possible.

Are there further questions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I think it might be well for Mr. MULTER to describe to the committee the means by which the Federal contribution to the District Government will be determined, if any, and why there should be a Federal contribution if we are to grant autonomy to the city itself, any contribution other than a payment in lieu of taxes on the same formula as payments are made in the States.

Mr. MULTER. I think a complete answer would be that if you can set up a local home rule government here and you enact legislation which will require the Federal Government to pay to the local government a sum each year in lieu of taxes upon the full appraised or assessed value of all of the operations of the U.S. Government in the District, they will have more money than they will need and they will be able to make a contribution back to the U.S. Government. That, of course, is a fair way of handling the situation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You are referring to a payment on property owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What are you going to do about parks and playgrounds owned by the Federal Government, deed them to the city?

Mr. MULTER. Do you think we in the Congress ought to exercise jurisdiction over them, operate and maintain them?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Quite obviously I do not, but we are doing it at the present time. Do you feel those should be deeded to the city so that they would relieve the Federal Government from paying in lieu of taxes?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, but relieve the Federal Government of its obligation to support them, no, because most of the people who use those recreational facilities in and around the District of Columbia are the tourists, American citizens who come to their capital from all over the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Those tourists bring money into the capital, don't they?

Mr. MULTER. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is not a city in the United States who would not be tickled pink to have these facilities provided for their city by the Federal Government and let them enjoy the benefits of it, is there?

Mr. MULTER. I am not so sure about that. It is an economic situation you cannot argue intelligently about unless you have the exact figures and know precisely what we are talking about. I think we can generalize about it, but it will get us nowhere. The fact is even if we give home rule to the District, the U.S. Government must, in my opinion, continue to make a fair contribution to the maintenance of those facilities in and around the District of Columbia that are used by all of the American citizens.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Isn't that going quite a bit further than the Federal Government does with respect to other cities?

Mr. MULTER. What do we do with our national parks outside the District.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not referring to national parks.

Mr. MULTER. Don't you think the recreational facilities of parks in the District of Columbia are national parks?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let's stick to this situation for a minute. You mentioned facilities. Isn't it your purpose to put the city of Washington on exactly the same footing insofar as possible as Kansas City, New York City, Chicago, or other cities and municipalities?

Mr. MULTER. I cannot say that I can't say that any bill goes that far. I do not think you can ever go all the way in the District of Columbia as long as this is the capital of the country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is the very point. That is the very reason.

Mr. MULTER. I do not think we ought to confuse the issue.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is the reason the fathers gave for setting this aside as a separate district.

It gave Congress exclusive control over it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. They didn't see at that time a country stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the Rio Grande to Canada and they did not foresee all of the difficulties and problems we have today. I am sure one thing they did foresee is that no American citizen should ever be deprived of his right to participate in his own government. I think that is what we should concentrate on here in this bill. We will worry about the financial situations and the financial problems a little later.

Let's give these people their basic, fundamental right to govern themselves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. You think this bill does it even though it does not give them a voice in the Senate nor does it give them a vote in the House?

Mr. MULTER. It gives them only a part of what they are entitled to.

Mr. DAVIS. Are there further questions?

Mr. Multer, you still insist that all of the provisions of House Resolution 320 remain in that resolution?

Mr. MULTER. I am willing to discuss with those who are of a mind to compromise, a compromise resolution in exchange for support for the bill or the resolution.

Mr. DAVIS. What is your position on those things that I asked you about?

Mr. MULTER. As of now, sir, I favor that resolution but my mind is never closed to improvements or amendments that may get additional support for it.

Mr. DAVIS. What would be the method of changing the provisions of this resolution? Has the gentleman studied that any?

Mr. MULTER. First, I think we would have to determine what support we can gain for what amendment. I mean this would have to be a matter of sitting down around the conference table and a matter of give and take.

I think it can be worked out. If there is a will to bring a bill to the House and get it enacted, I think we can work out a method of doing that.

Mr. DAVIS. You won't know whether there is a will to do that or not, will you, until the House votes on this resolution?

Mr. MULTER. We can try to improve it in advance. I think we have a pretty good idea of who is opposed to the resolution, who is opposed to the bill, and if any of those Members are willing to give up some of their opposition in exchange for an amendment, either to the rule or to the bill, I think all of the sponsors of this legislation, including those representing the people in the District of Columbia, I am sure, will be happy to appoint a committee and sit down and discuss with the opponents of the measure how it can be improved so as to eliminate their opposition.

Mr. DAVIS. Does the gentleman have any move in mind of bringing about such a conference?

Mr. MULTER. Frankly, I did not.

Mr. DAVIS. Or such a discussion?

Mr. MULTER. No. I have nothing in mind, because until this morning I had no idea there was any will to compromise or any desire to compromise on the part of the opponents of the measure. If there is such a desire and such a will, we would be very happy to sit down and discuss it.

Mr. DAVIS. But as of now the gentleman does not have any such move in mind?

Mr. MULTER. No.

May I make one more very frank statement about this entire matter, and please believe that I do not intend to offend anybody.

Starting again in my home district, where many people say I come from a one-party district, where in the last election I got some 78 percent of the vote, I might just as well resign or never run again if I voted against a home-rule measure such as these that are before this committee.

I appreciate that many Members in this House and on this committee are in the opposite position, where, if they voted for a home-rule measure, they might just as well resign or not run again. Those are the political facts of life. There isn't much we can do about it, except I think we all, as good American citizens, ought to combine and concentrate our efforts toward bringing something before the House and let the House work its will; and when the majority has spoken, we bow in humility and say, "This is it; maybe we will be the majority next time."

Mr. DAVIS. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Multer.

Mr. MULTER. Thank you, gentlemen, for listening to me.

Oregon's Representative Porter Visits Cape Hatteras, Sees Benefits of Similar Oregon Project

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the able Representative from Oregon's

Fourth District, CHARLES O. PORTER, has returned from a personal inspection of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Area, and has expressed enthusiasm for the development there under National Park Service auspices. Mr. PORTER is sponsoring in the House proposed legislation similar to my own bill (S. 1526) which authorizes establishment of the Oregon Dunes-Sea Lion Caves National Seashore Recreation Area. So the favorable impression he received of the Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was of special interest to me. Mr. PORTER's comments on Cape Hatteras were reported in an article written by A. Robert Smith, and published in the Oregonian of July 20, 1959. I ask consent to include it in the Appendix of the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, July 20, 1959]

TOUR OF NORTH CAROLINA DUNES BUOYS PORTER'S STAND

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, has made a personal inspection of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area and returned more enthused than before about the merits of the same type development at the Oregon Dunes.

Cape Hatteras, on the Outer Banks off the North Carolina coast, is the only National Seashore Recreation Area in the country. The National Park Service hopes to create similar seashore parks at a number of other suitable, scenic coastal sites.

"I was very much encouraged by the operations of the Park Service," PORTER said. "They certainly know how to handle such an area."

PORTER drove the entire 80-mile length of the Cape Hatteras area, saw slides at a park service museum, had a jeep ride over the sands, was escorted about by the park superintendent, and talked with natives of the area.

"Nobody was complaining about it," PORTER said of local residents.

He noted that the State of North Carolina is planning to invest $3 million in a bridge across Oregon Inlet, a body of water which separates two of the islands which make up the Outer Banks.

"That shows how much the State thinks of it," he said.

Viewing Cape Hatteras, he said, gave him a better vision of what could be done at Oregon Dunes. He said he pictured museums of natural history, nature talks and beach walks conducted by park rangers, long beaches untouched by commercialization, swimming in the fresh water inland lakes as well as in the ocean.

"I can see a museum of the sea at Florence," said PORTER.

He obtained a set of slides showing Cape Hatteras which he said he plans to send to Oregon to be shown in the communities in the area of the Oregon Dunes. PORTER hopes to arrange House hearings in Oregon after Senate hearings in October.

PORTER still thinks, however, that the precise boundaries of the Oregon Dunes National Seashore should be described in legislation authorizing it. No boundaries are described in the legislation as introduced by him in the House and by Senators RICHARD L. NEUBERGER and WAYNE MORSE in the Senate.

MORSE has been especially critical of the idea of letting the Secretary of the Interior determine where the exact boundaries should be without Congress having any check over that authority. NEUBERGER has defended the idea of allowing the Interior Department to use its own discretion.

DUNES HEARINGS AWAITED

Joe W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, takes NEUBERGER's side. His conservation organization is promoting the seashore bills. He said: "We are pleased that the legislation sets fairly broad acreage limitations on the areas to be considered for authorization within which, if authorized, the Secretary of Interior may acquire lands. This is a sound method, as has been demonstrated at Big Bend, Cape Hatteras, Everglades, Virgin Islands, Fort Clatsop, Shenandoah, and other national parks and monuments established under similar or identical procedures.

"During the course of hearings, of course, the committee will be able to study specific boundaries in more detail, and may, if it appears desirable, describe them with more preciseness. We note also that the Secretary, before designating any authorized area, would be required to consult with the Governor of the State concerned and to hold hearings.

"Beyond this, and before the Secretary could spend any Federal funds for land acquisition, he would be required to come before Congress, in the usual appropriation process, for funds. This provides Congress with still another opportunity to assure itself that the program is being carried out soundly and within the congressional intent.

"These appear to be adequate safeguards against any possibility of abuse of administrative authority. At the same time, it provides means at the administrative level whereby the most sensible areas can be worked out in terms of National, State, and local interests."

Tobacco Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I warned the House last year time and time again about unfair trade policies. I particularly emphasized the adverse affect of so-called reciprocal trade upon agriculture—especially tobacco. Some of the newspapers in the tobacco area really whooped up support for a 5-year extension of this phony reciprocal trade bill. I predict under this trade law all of our tobacco experts will dwindle away. Not only that but foreign nations will blackmail our State Department into permitting more and more imports of tobacco. All of this being done, Mr. Speaker, to a country that at one time was the only nation in the world growing and exporting tobacco. The following letter indicates what is going on:

LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO CO.,
Durham, N. C., August 24, 1959.

Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Committee for Reciprocity Information has scheduled hearings beginning September 15 to gather information preparatory to forthcoming tariff negotiations with Cuba. Cigarettes and smoking tobacco are on the list of items which Cuba has proposed to renegotiate.

We have not the slightest doubt that renegotiation in this instance will mean a proposal to raise the Cuban tariff still further against American cigarettes. This gives us great concern because of the adverse effect on all those engaged in growing tobacco and manufacturing cigarettes, and we seek your help in pointing out to our officials the hurtful nature of the suggestion.

It would come with ill grace from Cuba to take this kind of step against American cigarettes because the U.S. imports from Cuba nearly 20 times as much tobacco as Cuba imports from the United States. In 1958 Cuba imported $1,900,000 worth of cigarettes, but Cuba sent to the United States cigars and tobacco worth $34 million. Furthermore, the present Cuban duty on cigarettes (well over 150 percent of factory price) requires that they be sold in Cuba at three times the price of the locally manufactured brands. Only 4 percent of the total consumption of cigarettes in Cuba are imported American cigarettes.

In view of the foregoing, we propose to protest most vigorously to the Committee for Reciprocity Information and we hope that you will express to the State Department your interest in this situation.

Yours sincerely,

———— ————,
Branch Manager.

Wilson County, Tex., Farmers Help Christian Rural Oversea Program Build Friends for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, any country is made up of the people who inhabit it. And the more the people of one country know about the residents of another, the more the ideals of understanding and cooperation are furthered.

The Christian Rural Oversea Program, known as CROP, is doing a magnificent job of people-to-people diplomacy. By working with farmers and ranchers in this country, this program sends help and animals and seeds to farmers in other countries. These people are helped to help themselves.

A meeting was held last Friday in Floresville, Tex., to plan the participation of Wilson County in this program. Wilson County has been generous in its support of this program in the past. Last year I attended the Peanut Festival in Wilson County. The peanut growers of Wilson County have an outstanding record of support for our oversea goodwill efforts. Similar meetings are being held in other parts of Texas and the Nation, with gratifying response.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to Mr. Sam Fore, Jr., of the Floresville Chronicle from G. James Huston, Texas CROP executive director, telling of some of the activities of the program. The letter was printed

in the Chronicle-Journal for Friday, August 21, 1959, under the heading "Important CROP Meeting To Be Held at Floresville Courthouse August 21—Appeal to All Wilson County."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPORTANT CROP MEETING TO BE HELD FLORESVILLE COURTHOUSE AUGUST 21—APPEAL TO ALL WILSON COUNTY

Mr. SAM FORE, Jr.,
Floresville Chronicle,
Floresville, Tex.

DEAR MR. FORE: We are again setting up plans for a CROP campaign in Wilson County. I am sure you are interested in this project for helping to relieve the suffering of destitute people overseas. We need your help in making plans and carrying out this campaign.

Last year's collection of $508.50 from Wilson County was used to help send peanut butter to refugee camps in Belgium and France. The people in these camps, because of disease, disability, and age, are not acceptable for repatriation in any country. Many of them have been in the camps since World War II and will remain there until they die. Another part of the shipment was sent to orphanages in Italy.

Our organizational meeting is set for Friday, August 21, at 8 p.m., in the district courtroom in the courthouse at Floresville. I hope that you will be able to attend and that you will help us by giving this meeting all the publicity possible. You may be able to bring others with you who are interested in agriculture and relief. It is important that we have a good attendance at the meeting.

Everyone urged to attend from all parts of the county.

Yours truly,

G. JAMES HUSTON,
Texas CROP Executive Director.

How Big Budgets Get That Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a splendid editorial from the Atlantic City Press, pointing out how the Members of Congress are subject to pitfalls during the session in our efforts to keep the Government budget at a level with spending. The editorial follows:

HOW BIG BUDGETS GET THAT WAY

Earlier in this session, Congressmen's pen pals, the voters, jammed the mails with pleas for the Government to live within a balanced budget. Some sobered solons switched to the side of the savers, and many a big-spending proposal bit the dust.

Now it appears that while the battle is won, the war is far from over.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has unlimbered his adding machine to discover that bills still pending before Congress could increase the Federal budget by $187 billion over the next 5 years—an increase of about $40 billion a year, or 50 percent over the present staggering budget.

Few of these bills are likely to pass this year. It's too late in the session, and the piles of mail are too fresh in the Congressmen's minds. But each of these bills is alive because some powerful group wants the money spent. That the people want the money saved may be beside the point in the long run.

What often happens is that those who are for Federal aid to abattoirs team up with those who want subsidies for xylophone schools and a lot of other organizations with itchy palms. They all agree to support each other's bills, and a giant and powerful spending bloc is formed in the Congress. That's how the civilian budget has gotten so big as it is.

Those who want something will fight long and hard for it. Those who are just generally opposed to senseless taxing and spending usually limit their efforts to pained outcries at infrequent intervals. During the lulls between outcries, the spending gets done.

The only long-term answer, from the taxpayer's point of view, is to elect stingier men to Washington. Oh, it's all right to elect men who are generous with their own money—philanthropists and the like. But the voters had better choose men with the intelligence and courage to say firm "No's" to the countless groups and special interests who covet the taxpayer's money.

If Congressmen would say "we can't afford it" more often, husbands wouldn't have to say "we can't afford it" so often to their own families.

Oregon Citizens Hail Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently I received a copy of a resolution adopted in Portland, Oreg., by representatives of certain Communist-dominated countries expressing their appreciation of congressional passage of Senate Joint Resolution 111, which designated the week following the Fourth of July as Captive Nations Week. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution sent to me by this group be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We Americans of European descent, representing the captive nations of Armenia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and the Ukraine, assembled in a general meeting on August 2, 1959, in the hall of St. John's Ukrainian Orthodox Church, 6401 Northeast 10th Avenue, Portland, Oreg., have adopted the following resolution:

"We are deeply moved by the proclamation of the Captive Nations Week and express our heartfelt appreciation to the Government of the United States. This proclamation is of great significance because it gives a ray of hope of liberation for the millions of peoples enslaved by the Soviet communism.

"The United States, as a stronghold of liberty and the leader of the free world, has embarked upon the only right road in her struggle against communism in order to establish a lasting peace with freedom and justice for all. We pledge our unreserved support to these policies of the Government of the United States of America."

JAMES S. HONCHARIW,
Chairman of the Meeting.
KONRAD DE HACKBEIL,
Secretary.

PORTLAND, OREG., *August 2, 1959.*

The Carey Letter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, as did many of my colleagues last week, I received an intemperate, threatening letter from a prominent labor official criticizing my vote on the Landrum-Griffin substitute labor reform bill. I refer to James B. Carey, president of the powerful International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO. I incorporate his letter in my remarks at this point:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO, AND MACHINE WORKERS,
August 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
President.

Now, generally, I find it hard to stimulate much enthusiasm for a mimeographed or multigraphed form letter, but I read Mr. Carey's missive with considerable care and replied to him as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1959.

Mr. JAMES B. CAREY,
President, International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAREY: I have your form letter of August 18, 1959, a copy of which I understand was sent to all my colleagues who voted for the Landrum-Griffin version of the labor-management reform bill.

Neither your intemperate characterizations, your threat to get me nor your erroneous assumptions concerning my study of the measure impress me as worthy of a high official of a powerful labor organization.

No representative of the National Association of Manufacturers or the chamber of commerce "pressured" me or even contacted me. I believe, however, in the right of petition and would have welcomed their views as I did those of six officials of the Teamsters Union and three officials of building trades unions with whom I discussed at some length the differing provisions of the various proposals.

I heard nothing from you or your union—but would have welcomed any proof you could submit—as I requested of the other union officials—that specific language in any of the various bills would hamper legitimate organizational and collective bargaining activities of unions. My conception of the duty of a legislator requires more than simply voting by labels or adjectives unsupported by fact and logic.

Requiring democratic procedures and honesty in handling funds in labor organizations cannot possibly harm the rank and file union member, though it may well curb dictatorial officials insensitive to their position of trust with respect to the rights and the funds of those they represent. Shielding innocent third parties, managers, employees and consumers, from being drawn into someone else's labor dispute and preventing "sweetheart" contracts and representation not actually desired by the free choice of employees are reforms demonstrated by the McClellan Committee investigations to be necessary and should not impair legitimate union activities.

Consequently, it is a misrepresentation to describe legislation designed to achieve these goals and no other as "punitive," "repressive" or "killer" legislation.

I believe my colleagues, like myself, are far more likely to be impressed by logic than by threats.

To assist in advising the working men and women of my district on this very important issue, I will be happy to send a copy of your letter and of this reply to anyone living in the Second Congressional District of Michigan whose name and address you furnish me.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

Mr. Speaker, as one might expect, Mr. Carey's threats did not go unnoticed by the public. As an example I include at this point an interesting commentary from the August 23, 1959, edition of the Jackson (Mich.) Citizen Patriot:

JAMES CAREY'S MISTAKE

Leaders of organized labor in America apparently have become panicky since their defeat on the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House. And men in that state of mind are likely to make mistakes.

That is probably what James B. Carey, AFL–CIO vice president, did with his "we'll-get-you" letters to Members of the House who voted for the labor bill.

The action is all the more strange because there are precedents which prove that the tactics are wrong.

Labor was unable to defeat the Taft-Hartley bill, even with all the pressure that was applied and with a veto by former President Harry S. Truman.

After the debacle, labor took after the late Senator Robert A. Taft, throwing all of its power into an effort to "get" him.

The result was the greatest political victory in the Ohio Senator's career. The opposition of labor almost made him President.

More recently, the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House showed the ineffectiveness of the Carey type of politics.

Labor lobbyists swarmed over the Capital, applying all the pressure they could. They lost because the people rallied behind the controversial measure.

It is likely that many of the Congressmen followed the wishes of their constituents with some misgivings. They know that the voice of the people is loud, when it is heard, but that the public generally will not remain "steamed up" over a given issue for any great length of time; that the men who work at politics every day in the year can be very effective.

That is why traditional politicians fade out of sight when hit by a successful reform movement. They carefully avoid stirring up any controversy until the reformers lose interest.

Thus Carey's letters handed the Congressmen exactly the ammunition they need to rally support when they come up for reelection. The letters will be carefully preserved to be brought out at campaign time to remind the people that their will prevailed.

And if Carey goes through with his threat to punish "labor's enemies" he will reelect a lot of men who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carey threatens to "do all in our power to prove to the working men and women" in my congressional district, the second of Michigan, that I have cast my "lot against them" and that "they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box." That, of course, means he must conduct an educational campaign.

In my letter, I offered to assist him, by sending a copy of his letter and a copy of my reply to any resident of my district for which he would furnish names and addresses.

Timely Health Topics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles of importance to the Nation's general health submitted by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association, with offices in Washington, D.C.:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Tuesday, July 7, 1959]

DOCTOR WARNS LIVING IN PAST FOSTERS AGING

(By Roy Gibbons)

If you aspire to grow old gracefully, don't yearn for a return of the good old days, the director of industrial relations for the National Chiropractic Association suggested Monday.

"People who live in the past grow old accordingly," said Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, of Washington, D.C., in an interview at the association's 64th annual meeting in the Sherman Hotel.

HOW TO AGE GRACEFULLY

Proper nutrition, correct posture, and self-control head the list of factors that are most important in helping achieve a graceful old age, he said.

Murphy then recommended these additional rules for persons over 40:

1. Slow down. You may be able to go as fast as before, but if you do you are inviting old age to come prematurely.

2. Avoid fatigue. It is a killer. Fatigue produces poisons that injure the nervous system and hasten the onset of old age.

LEARN TO RELAX

3. Learn to relax even while you work. You will be able to do your job more easily and save wear and tear on your nervous system.

4. Don't whip your nerves with your emotions. The habit of making emotional scenes will play havoc sooner or later with your digestion, lead to constipation, high blood pressure, or heart disease.

5. Cultivate patience. You can control yourself. Cultivate an unruffled attitude toward other people, circumstances, and your work.

6. Watch your waistline. Excessive fat after 40 is detrimental.

[From Healthways magazine, August 1959]

POLLUTION: A GROWING HEALTH MENACE

(Edited by A. L. Gregory)

Pollution of air and water was named as a great health menace by Dr. Emmett J. Murphy recently. Dr. Murphy is director of industrial relations of the National Chiropractic Association.

"For years we have been pouring raw sewage and industrial wastes into the rivers and streams of our nation," Dr. Murphy said. "We have spoiled much of our recreational areas, and we have contaminated the source of water for home and personal use. Millions of acres of river banks are not fit for American children to play on, and the stream itself will not support fish or wildlife," he continued.

Pointing to the dangers to public health from polluted air, Dr. Murphy warned that the lungs of the people in the United States are being filled with poisonous gases from exhausts of motors and from the industrial smog created in certain highly populous areas.

The problem of pollution is one which should be attacked at every level of government. In our homes and around our homes, each of us should see that he does not contaminate, clutter, or befoul either land, water, or atmosphere in such a way as to render it less beneficial to ourselves, to our neighbors, or to our children.

Towns and cities should review their practices of sewage disposal, industrial waste carry-off, and any other problems contributing to water pollution. Soil erosion needs to be controlled in agricultural areas.

Ordinances need to be enforced to keep car exhaust and heavy smokes and odors from industries from befouling the air which we breathe.

Urging complete community awareness of the problem and action to control it, Dr. Murphy predicted that the United States could return to being a playground for the coming generation, rather than a land of wasted resources, if contamination of air and water were controlled.

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Aug. 9, 1959]

POISON ON WHEELS

It is good to note that General Motors, in cooperation with the Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, is planning to finance a thoroughgoing study of the actual and potential evils inherent in exhaust fumes from trucks, buses, and private automobiles. The project is altogether timely and very much to the point, and it is to be welcomed and commended as something that ought to stimulate the entire automotive industry into doing far more than

it has done so far in this challenging and worrisome field.

There can be no doubt, in any case, that the contaminating materials released by vehicular exhausts markedly exceed industrial smoke as the principal cause of poisonous smog and other noxious atmospheric conditions in all our great urban centers. Experts like Surgeon General Leroy E. Burney of the U.S. Public Health Service make no bones about the situation. They feel sure that our municipal traffic, because it is the chief contributor to these conditions, must be dealt with as a factor definitely associated with malignant tumors and such afflictions as asthma. In Dr. Burney's opinion, as expressed some months ago to the first National Conference on Air Pollution, "We know that cancer-producing agents are in the air we breathe. * * * We know that lung-cancer rates in the largest cities are twice as high as those in nonurban areas. The case has not yet been proved, but the weight of circumstantial evidence grows heavier as research progresses."

These are words that speak pretty much for themselves. With our population increasing at an explosive rate, we face the prospect of massively expanding motor traffic throughout our country. As far as metropolitan public health is concerned, this makes it all the more important, if not urgent, to carry out just such studies as the one being contemplated by General Motors. Everybody, of course, and not just GM, has reason to take a lively interest in the problem.

The President Must Submit Better, Sounder, and More Specific Proposals to the Congress Than Heretofore if Federal Debt Is To Be Reduced and Stability Restored to the Dollar

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, the President must submit better, sounder, and more specific proposals to the Congress than heretofore if the Federal debt is to be reduced and stability restored to the dollar.

In a single day, recently, the President told a political rally in Washington, D.C., that—

> It is the Republican Party that fights for responsible, sensible fiscal policy.

And sent Congress a message asking:

First. A sky-is-the-limit policy on Federal interest rates. This was turned down by the Congress.

Second. Another increase in the limit on the public debt. This was granted by the Congress.

The President has been talking economy, without calling attention to the performance record of his administration. Actually, the Federal debt has increased by $19 billion in the past 6 years, and the cost of interest on this debt has risen from $5.8 billion to $8 billion during the same period.

Obviously, the President must provide better, sounder, and more specific recommendations to the Congress than heretofore, or the Federal debt will continue to rise, and inflation will destroy the earning power of our people.

I have, therefore, prepared a resolution which I am offering today calling upon the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes.

I include here the text of my resolution, as well as an article from the Democratic Digest, of September 1959, which discusses some aspects of the current economy drive which have been generally overlooked by that part of the press which is oriented toward the Eisenhower administration:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 361

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and requesting the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations, by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies and a corresponding reduction of all Federal income taxes

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the House that in view of the increase in the Federal debt by nineteen billion dollars in the past six years, and the increase in the cost of interest on the Federal debt from five billion eight hundred million dollars to eight billion dollars during the same period there is a pressing need for substantial reductions in Federal expenditures in order to reduce the staggering burden of our ever-increasing Federal debt with its constantly rising interest and refinancing charges and resulting dangerous inflation. The House finds that business and agricultural subsidies to big businessmen and to big farmers, including but not limited to direct grants, disguised grants in the form of nonrepayable loans, postal subsidies, shipping and airline subsidies of various kinds, accelerated tax amortization programs, and indirect grants through long-term, low-interest-rate loans, and other methods and programs, although desirable as a means of assisting these special groups to retain their relative positions in the economy, should be reexamined in the light of the overall need for rigid control and a sizeable reduction of Federal expenditures.

SEC. 2. In view of the foregoing, the President is requested to prepare and transmit to the Congress by January 1960 advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore, to provide (1) for the reduction by not less than twenty-five per centum of all business and agricultural subsidies, together with such other specific proposals, including specific legisaltive recommendations, as he may deem advisable in order not only to prevent further increases in Federal expenditures but to actually reduce them, and (2) for the reduction of Federal income taxes in aggregate amounts equal to the total of the reductions in subsidies effected for the taxable years involved pursuant to such legislative recommendations.

[From the Democratic Digest, September 1959]

THE STATUS QUO SEEKERS: THEIR SCAREWORDS, "INFLATION"; THEIR TARGET, "PROGRESS"

Ever since the great crusade (the great crusade, that is, for the bankers and the big industrialists) came sweeping into Washington under the banner emblazoned with that magic word—Eisenhower—the crusaders have been desperately searching for a way to obstruct the program which the Democrats had designed to improve the welfare and security of the people.

Early in the crusade, of course, the crusaders found that they could not fight the program head on; any direct efforts to deny people the much-needed schools, housing, highways, medical programs, etc., were answered by the people at the polls. Any lingering doubts which the Republicans might have had about this were dispelled by the elections of 1958.

However, never ones to be daunted by the expressed wishes of the people, Republican hucksters continued their search for a way to merchandise an obviously unattractive program. And early this year they finally hit on what is certainly the most effective packaging yet for their negative ideas. They decided that one way to fight the people's welfare programs would be to come up with something positive which the people could be for (a balanced budget). But it might be even better, they decided, to come up with something scary which all the people could be against (inflation).

So they did both.

The first faint stirrings of a skillfully promoted and now mushrooming scare over inflation were heard last January and February when the President began holding press conferences at an unprecedented pace. (After his seventh consecutive conference, the Wall Street Journal, trying to contain its enthusiasm, remarked: "Not in nearly 5 years has Mr. Eisenhower held so many successive meetings with reporters.") The reason for Ike's sudden romance with the press soon became clear: He let it be known that despite the missile gap and the Berlin crisis, the one thing he wanted to talk about at his press conferences was inflation. Sooner or later would come one of his little sermons about the dangers of spending.

The next day, most of the Nation's editorial pages (and the following week such publications as Time and U.S. News) would translate his ambiguous sermons into a grammatically (if not economically) sound, continuing campaign against the Nation's newest scareword. As Don Campbell, business columnist for the Indianapolis Star, wrote: "Add to the Red peril and the yellow menace the name of inflation as one of the key bogeymen of the 1950's."

However, the Republican merchandisers were aware that press conference sermons were not enough. The Wall Street Journal and other papers reported that the President had also launched an all-out letterwriting campaign designed to drum up support for the fight-inflation drive. Secretary Seaton joined in (he was reported to have written about 100 letters) as well as Secretary Ezra Benson and Secretary Arthur Flemming.

The general theme of the letters was that everything must be done to support the President's budget because not to support it would lead to inflation. Most of the letters went to publishers asking for editorial support. As Ike put it: "Help in any way you think proper."

NEEDED NO URGING

Not that the publishers of most newspapers needed any urging. They had been printing editorials about economizing for years. But they were, no doubt, gratified at this new idea of fighting the welfare programs with the bogeyman inflation. And, no

doubt, they were equally gratified that Eisenhower himself was finally going all out in an effort to block the Democratic programs—what the Republican press had helped put him in the White House to do anyway.

At the same time, the Republican national committee joined in the fight—although, considering the administration's failure to balance the budget or curb inflation, it is not clear just who or what the GOP was fighting. Nevertheless, the national committee, certain it had found an effective way to block Democratic programs, picked up the cry of "inflation" and begin coming out with a few gimmicks of its own. An example: The committee made available to GOP Congressmen tapes for a canned radio interview with Budget Director Maurice Stans. The Congressman contributes his voice to the tape by asking Mr. Stans questions. For instance, the Congressman asks: "One final question, Mr. Stans. What can the average citizen do to help maintain a sound dollar and to fight inflation?"

Mr. Stans, in a reply already taped, says there are many things, such as recognizing "the fact that the more the programs that are urged upon the Congress, the more difficult it is to hold the line, and it is important that people not on the one hand ask for or insist on a balanced budget and on the other hand petition their Congressman for new programs of spending of one kind and another."

In other words, the Republican Congressman, with Mr. Stans' help, is saying in effect: "Now folks, no matter how much you think we may need those new schools, or new highways, or to keep up with the Russians in guided missiles, remember if we have those things it will cause inflation and we all know how bad that would be—otherwise, why would Mr. Stans, speaking for the President, be so worried?"

When efforts to promote something reach the point where Congressmen are coming out urging the people not to write in requesting much-needed schools, low-cost housing, improved highways, and a crash missile program, it is high time to ask: Who is really behind this campaign? And the answer is not hard to find, as every day a new barrage of full-page, anti-inflation newspaper ads is fired at the American public.

The real hidden persuaders hiding behind Ike and his constant cry of inflation are the big corporations, the big bankers, and the big insurance companies. They have been spending thousands of dollars (which could well be going into taxes to help offset the Eisenhower budget deficit) on an all-out advertising campaign to establish a fear-of-inflation climate. For instance, Republic Steel, the Young & Rubicam Advertising Agency, the Institute of Life Insurance, and the American Iron and Steel Institute have all joined in the effort to wreck the public welfare programs by trying to frighten people to death with the threat of inflation. (For examples of what the status quo seekers have been saying in their ads see above.)

Other groups joined in: A Sound Dollar Committee was formed with headquarters in New York; the Chicago Tribune launched an all-out drive against inflation and asked the 21-State National Industrial Council to urge newspapers in other States to join the drive. (The Tribune also reported that from the golf course in Augusta, the President said he was following the drive with keen interest and congratulated the Tribune on its efforts.) The Advertising Council, public service unit of the advertising industry, was also approached for help. But the council is still undecided about what to do—partly because of the obviously political nature of the anti-inflation drive.

As Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut, told a college news conference audience: "This has been an extraordinary skillful publicity campaign. I have never seen anything to equal it." Although conceding that there are a lot of honest people genuinely concerned about inflation (including the President), BOWLES said: "There are a lot of other people who have been trying to stop public housing, depressed area bills, social security programs, and all the rest." Both these groups, BOWLES explained, "have joined arms in a great alliance and they have learned they can't lick housing and depressed area bills and social security by a frontal attack so they have tried a flanking attack, so they have equated public housing, urban development, social security, with inflation. It has been extremely skillful."

Meanwhile the hidden persuaders, who have been stirring up so much excitement about inflation, have been reaping the gains of higher interest rates and showing no inclination to lower prices, despite the record profits recorded in many industries. Just recently, for instance, United States Steel announced all-time high net profits for the first 6 months of the year: $255 million. The same pattern held true for the other steel companies: Inland Steel reported a net income of $42.1 million for the first 6 months of 1959—more than double the net income for the same period last year. (For record-setting prices see table below.)

But the steel companies continue to cry that they cannot meet labor's demands without further price increases—which would be inflationary. (The steel companies have in the past always raised prices after a wage settlement, usually two or three times more than would be necessary to offset the increased wage costs. For instance, according to a study made by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER'S subcommittee, although the steel companies raised their prices $6 a ton in 1957, "a reasonable guess as to the magnitude of increased labor costs which have arisen from the July 1957 adjustments in wages and other benefits falls somewhere between $2.50 and $3 per ton.")

Behind the inflation hysteria, of course, is hidden one of the most cynical political maneuvers in history; the attempt to discredit all Democratic efforts to initiate the much-needed domestic and military programs by reiterating the emotional, fear-ridden word "inflation." If the President were really scared of inflation he would be willing to listen occasionally to students of our economy other than the representatives of big banking and big business who make up his numerous bridge and golf foursomes. If he did, he might learn a few things about prices which his big banking and big business friends have failed to tell him—such as the fact that one of the greatest causes of inflation today is the increased interest rates which have helped drive prices up on every item which the consumer must purchase on credit; or the fact that many costs have been held up artificially by "administered prices"—a fact given impressive substantiation by industry's unusually high profits.

However, the President continues to listen only to representatives of big business. Consequently his idea of the way to fight inflation is to come out—as he did recently—against raising the minimum wage to $1.25. But Ike never seems to show the same concern about raising the wages earned by bankers—which is what raising the interest rate amounts to. As Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, said: When Ike took office he must have taken two pledges of allegiance, one of which goes like this:

"I pledge allegiance to the banks,
And to the benefits for which they stand,
High interest, compounded
With tremendous profits for all."

While many are beginning to recognize the great inflation conspiracy as a concerted effort by big business to block the people's welfare programs, Ike persists in seeing a conspiracy working against the people. "I believe the public will soon realize * * *" the President said last February, defending his inadequate budget, "that we are engaged in a contest between the public interest and a wide array of special interests."

IKE'S SPECIAL INTERESTS

Senator JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, replied: "If President Eisenhower's definition of 'special interest' is old folks who have to live in firetraps instead of safe nursing homes; colleges which have no place to house their students; people of low and middle incomes who need a decent place to live; cities full of slums breeding poverty and crime which want to clean out those slums, and veterans who are in need of homes, * * * then I want to urge the Democrats to continue to help those kinds of special interests."

Despite his campaign promises and despite 6 years in office in which he has done nothing to get at the real causes of inflation, the President continues to say: "By golly, we ought to do something about this inflation." Meanwhile, prices continue their upward creep. Recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics announced that at the end of June the consumer price index had reached an alltime high, 124.5. Everywhere, low- and middle-income families were feeling the pinch. "It is just like being pecked to death by gnats," a Los Angeles homeowner lamented to a Time correspondent.

Ironically, the people are beginning to see the swarm of gnats for what they really are, despite the gigantic campaign to make inflation a scareword to be used every time someone mentions a public need. Recently the Gallup Poll announced that in answer to the question: "Which political party * * * do you think is most interested in keeping prices down?" the majority answered, "the Democratic Party."

It is more than possible that of all the phony slogans which the great crusaders have run up the flagpole, the great "fight inflation" campaign will make the loudest backfire yet.

PROFITS OF 428 COMPANIES GAINED 75.6 PERCENT OVER A YEAR EARLIER IN SECOND QUARTER

The columns below show corporate profits reported for the second quarter of 1959, and those for the like quarter of 1958, with percentage changes, by groups. Where individual company reports cover 3-month periods other than calendar quarters, the nearest comparable periods have been used:

	2d quarter, 1959	2d quarter, 1958	Change from year ago
			Percent
10 Aircraft makers	$7,208,000	$18,862,000	−61.8
4 Airlines	13,786,000	13,156,000	+4.8
19 Autos and equipment	543,706,000	135,828,000	+300.1
21 Building materials	122,196,000	70,450,000	+73.4
14 Chainstores	33,707,000	31,023,000	+8.6
19 Chemicals	152,062,000	87,020,000	+74.7
12 Department stores	44,164,000	32,881,000	+34.3
5 Distillers	19,757,000	13,383,000	+47.6
9 Drug makers	26,891,000	23,649,000	+13.7
14 Electrical equipment	87,191,000	66,393,000	+31.3
7 Farm equipment	85,472,000	47,342,000	+80.5
16 Food products	51,200,000	51,067,000	+.3

	2d quarter, 1959	2d quarter, 1958	Change from year ago
			Percent
9 Mining and metals	$52,909,000	$23,717,000	+123.2
5 Office equipment	43,463,000	33,416,000	+30.1
15 Petroleum and products	386,482,000	303,823,000	+27.2
15 Pulp and paper	41,547,000	33,088,000	+25.6
9 Railway equipment	23,063,000	11,385,000	+102.6
8 Rubber companies	41,266,000	25,083,000	+64.5
21 Steel manufacturers	321,077,000	121,894,000	+163.4
12 Textiles	12,638,000	2,028,000	+523.2
6 Tobacco companies	57,293,000	50,162,000	+14.2
17 Tools and machinery	30,156,000	15,564,000	+93.7
97 Other companies	189,462,000	130,041,000	+45.7
Total, 366 industrials	2,386,726,000	1,341,285,000	+77.9
35 Railroads	147,583,000	59,286,000	+148.9
27 Utilities	119,554,000	110,622,000	+8.1
Grand total, 428 companies	2,653,863,000	1,511,193,000	+75.6

Time and Tide Wait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON W. GLENN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, now that we are approaching the end of the session, and with the rush that will probably occur in the enactment of several remaining pieces of legislation, with the resultant raising of blood pressure and heart action, I deem it timely and fitting to insert in the RECORD, an editorial appearing in the New Jersey County Government by the editor in chief and also freeholder of Ocean County, Mr. A. Paul King.

I hope that all Members will give thought to the contents of this editorial during the long awaited recess, and remember it in the 2nd session of the 86th Congress. I am sure if we do this, there will be less reason for Dr. Calver to watch over us, as I have noted recently he is making it a point to be in attendance in the Chamber during the debate of any highly controversial measures.

I might also point out that there is no better time of the year, weatherwise and for complete rest, relaxation and health, than a sojourn on the New Jersey shore during the months of September and October.

The editorial follows:

TIME AND TIDE WAIT

A midsummer day's dream seems to reverse the adage that time and tide wait for no man on the Jersey Shore. But while the clock stops at the zenith of the summer sun on the coast of Monmouth, Ocean, Atlantic, and Cape May Counties, the cash registers keep ringing a tune of prosperity. Another month will tell the tale in the State's biggest industry—a recordbreaking income of a billion and a half dollars.

Such a relaxed calm before returning to the busy, everyday grind is a good time to consider 12 ways of how to join the coronary club. They apply to elected officials as well as to harassed businessmen. Check them off. See if you are ready for your membership card:

(1) Your job comes first, everything else is secondary;

(2) Go back to the office evenings, Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays;

(3) Take the old briefcase home on nights you don't go to the office (this gives you an opportunity to review all the troubles and worries of the day);

(4) Never say "No" to any request, always say "Yes";

(5) Accept all invitations from everybody to anything;

(6) Don't just eat a relaxed meal, plan a conference at mealtime;

(7) Fishing or hunting are a waste of good time and money (besides you never bring back enough fish or game to justify the time or expense);

(8) It is a poor policy to take all the vacation time allowed you;

(9) Golf, gardening, bowling, cards, and most conversation are also a waste of time;

(10) Never delegate responsibility to others, carry the entire load yourself at all times;

(11) If you job calls for traveling—work all day and drive all night to make that appointment next morning;

(12) Promises to your family and friends come last; head down, now—keep charging ahead. Think how efficient you are and how much time you are saving.

Depressed Domestic Mining and Mineral Industries

SPEECH
OF
HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 177) declaring the sense of Congress on the depressed domestic mining and mineral industries affecting public and other lands.

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Chairman, the present sad plight of the hard-pressed miners and mine operators in the lead-zinc areas of my home district make the passage of House Concurrent Resolution 177 a matter of great concern to me. The aims and purposes outlined in this resolution are truly commendable, and are worthy of unqualified support.

We need to make every possible effort to restore domestic mine and mineral production to a high level. We must do something to curb unemployment in mining areas. And above all, we must take steps toward ending the ruinous policy of impoverishing this Nation's mining areas through continued and excessive purchases of foreign imports. Immediate action is imperative.

In April this year, I went along with four of my House colleagues—ED EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma; CHARLIE BROWN and WILLIAM J. RANDALL, of Missouri; and J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, of Colorado—for a firsthand look at the lead-zinc situation in the tristate area of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Missouri. The tour included sections of my own congressional district in southeast Kansas.

The conditions we found were appalling, and they are no better now. Decreased prices because of foreign imports have caused a virtually complete shutdown of the mines for 2 full years. Unemployment in this area is as bad as it was during the worst years of the depression in the 1930's. Two-thirds of the miners and their families have left this once-prosperous region. Many of those remaining are enduring privation and hardship.

In Picher, Okla., alone, we found that more than 700 families were on relief. Many were dependent on Government distribution of surplus foods.

This was once the leading lead and zinc production area in the United States. Now, employment has shrunk from thousands of men to fewer than 100 men. The few that are left are fighting a constant battle, through pumping and maintenance, to prevent mining properties that are still valuable from deteriorating.

We need a full-fledged plan for reorganization of the entire Government-related program. And this should be followed promptly by remedial legislation. Action must be taken to assist this essential industry—reduce economic losses in the mining areas—and put an end to the personal tragedies resulting from unemployment and dire need. This program is an urgent necessity.

It is up to Congress to begin corrective measures at once. The resolution now being considered is a meritorious effort. Its passage would be a long and decisive step in the right direction.

Amendments to War Claims Act Urged by Polish National Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which I received from Mr. Louis L. Slivinski, president, Council No. 86, Polish National Alliance of the West Side, Edwardsville, Pa., urging that amendments be made to the War Claims Act to include claims of victims of Nazi war crimes:

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: There are now living in the United States thousands of victims of Nazi persecutions during World War II. Among them are former prisoners of war, prisoners of concentration camps, forced laborers and internees. Some of them were citizens of the United States at the time of war, many others became citizens later and others are here as permanent residents.

The Nuremberg trial and other war crime trials have proved to the civilized world the guilt of the Nazis of the mental and physical torture and inhuman treatment of these unfortunate human beings. Their claims for compensation were never paid.

There are bills pending in the House of Representatives of the United States to compensate in part the above-mentioned victims of Nazi persecutions; H.R. 2913 introduced by MACHROWICZ, H.R. 6513 by DINGELL, and H.R. 6519 by BLATNIK. Under the War Claims Act of 1948 as amended certain German assets were seized in the United States to be used as compensation for losses suffered by U.S. citizens as a result of World War II.

The above bills are amendments to the War Claims Act as amended to extend its provisions to include the claims of the victims of Nazi war crimes. Under these bills the compensation of these persons would come from Nazi assets seized in the United States and would not burden the U.S. taxpayer.

We respectfully ask you to examine, consider and support these bills and thus help these unfortunate victims of Nazi oppression.

Yours very truly,

COUNCIL NO. 86, POLISH NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF THE WEST SIDE,
LOUIS L. SLIVINSKI, *President.*

Armed Services Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the August 7 edition of the Northern Virginia Sun is of such vital concern to all military personnel, both active and retired, that I submit it here for inclusion in this RECORD.

I know my colleagues will join me and the Sun in extending a sincere commendation to Mr. John J. Ford, of Vienna, Va., and the Navy Times, for his part in making this development in the military retirement situation known to members of our armed services and the American public.

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Aug. 7, 1959]

HIGH COST OF RETIRED PAY

A neat piece of reporting by John J. Ford, a Vienna resident who covers Capitol Hill for the service weekly Navy Times, has turned up a still secret Defense Department study which says military retired pay is going to cost the United States $3.4 billion annually by 1983. Ford pried the story out while investigating the chances of increased retirement pay for military personnel who left active duty before June 1958, when the new pay scales went into effect.

There has been evidence for some time that Congress and the Defense Department were a bit worried about the rising cost of retired pay. The $3.4 billion bill for 1983 is based on present pay scales, too. The figures were compiled by an outside actuarial firm working for the Defense Department.

The completed report may well ruin any chances of the extension of new pay scales to pre-1958 retirees, Ford's article says. He adds that it may lead to a wholesale overhaul in the armed services promotion and retention systems.

There is no question that it will be ammunition for the proponents of longer service careers before retirement eligibility is established. As things now stand, 20 years is the minimum time in uniform required in order to leave via the retired list. Many people believe that an individual should stay in service for 30 years in order to qualify for retired pay. Ford's story certainly will help their case.

Eisenhower Leadership Has Led to Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, in his 1952 campaign President Eisenhower promised to tidy up the national debt. Now we know what he had in mind. On June 30, the fiscal year ended with the largest Federal budget deficit in our history, $12 billion. During the time the President has been in office the public debt has increased from $267 billion to $284 billion.

The cost of interest on the public debt has risen from $5.8 billion to $8 billion, and the President has requested $8.6 billion for debt services in fiscal 1960.

The national debt has indeed been tidied up.

Let us all take note of the fact that the total Federal budget in 1939 for all purposes was only $7.9 billion during the height of the New Deal era under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Obviously, things have been going from bad to worse during the past 6 years.

In order to help bring some soundness and stability to the dollar, and to save the taxpayers money I am introducing today a resolution expresing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and requesting the President to provide the Congress advice, suggestions, plans, and proposals, including legislative recommendations by January 1960, which are better, sounder, and more specific than heretofore to provide for the reduction of all business and agricultural subsidies by 25 percent and for a corresponding reduction of Federal income taxes.

I include here for the information of my colleagues an article entitled "The Fabulous Fiscal Fiasco" which appeared in the Democratic Digest of August 1959:

THE FABULOUS FISCAL FIASCO

The Republican Party, loudly trumpeting farewell to the second Eisenhower recession, is trying to brush under the rug the consequences, past, present and threatened, of its own fiscal irresponsibility. The Democratic Party, thunders the GOP, is the party of budget-busters, of inflationists, of financial hooligans. The din created by the elephant has reached such a pitch and volume as to persuade the unwary that the fellow might have something there. The Digest, therefore, desires to submit some sobering truths about the Eisenhower administration and its banker-minded fiscal policies.

(The statistics at the end of the article lists certain indisputable facts which the elephant is having great difficulty hiding under that rug.)

President Eisenhower, a fiscal innocent who was putty in the hands of his first Secretary of the Treasury, industrial titan George M. Humphrey, and who is equally malleable for the greatest Secretary of the Treasury since Humphrey, namely, Robert A. Anderson, appears to be as trustful today as ever.

If he found it galling that the results of the Humphrey-Anderson advice forced him to ask Congress in June to raise the ceiling on the public debt, and ask it also to abolish the historic 4¼ percent limit on Government bond interest, he took solace in the cry of "inflation, inflation"—a magic word used by all Republican fiscal wizards to explain why they have gotten the Government's financial affairs into such a stew.

The Cabinet of millionaries, inheriting from the Democrats a high prosperity without inflation, had scarcely taken the oath before Secretary Humphrey, with a let-George-do-it nod from Ike, started raising interest rates. The Treasury upped the rate on Government bonds far above the requirements of the market—from the previous Democratic rate of 2½ percent to a charitable 3¼. (Charitable to the banks and corporations, that is.) The effect on interest rates in general was electric—and a vicious circle began to rotate, generating inflation as it turned. "Why, I can remember," Humphrey mused fondly, "when 7 percent interest was normal. We thought nothing of it." (Today the banks' prime rate, the interest charged gilt-edge commercial borrowers, has climbed to 4½ percent—and the price of money is scaled up rapidly for the less favored.)

Humphrey also sponsored a $7 billion tax cut, of which three-quarters was given unfairly and foolishly to corporations and higher income individuals. Foolishly, because this policy caused investment in productive capacity to outrun consumption, with unhappy results. Columnist Joseph Alsop wrote last month: "There would be no budget-balancing problem today, as there would be much less inflationary pressure, too," if Humphrey had not put over this "profligate" tax cut.

Humphrey presided over the first Eisenhower recession (1953–54), and converted the recover of 1955 into the stagnation of 1956–57. The second recession was leering around the corner as he bowed out and returned to his counting houses in the summer of 1957.

The Republicans choose to blot the recessions from memory, and to assure us that all is now rosy. They blithely advise Congress that the fiscal policies under which the recessions occurred should be not only ratified but intensified. To be sure, the vast Eisenhower deficits have cooled off the GOP's infatuation with tax cutting, but the ardor for tight money is unabated. The balanced budget is given precedence by a veto-brandishing President over (1) adequate defenses against an opponent of unexampled might; over (2) the encouragement of a swifter growth by the economy, and over (3) the urgent needs of a multiplying population in such fields as education, housing, urban blight, and conservation of natural resources. (Creeping socialism.) Fiscal management under Eisenhower continues to follow classic Republican theory—as imagi-

native as Calvin Coolidge, as dynamic as Herbert Hoover, as progressive as the trickle-down philosophy of McKinley's day.

The Democratic Party is just as devoted to a balanced budget as the Republicans profess to be—despite their mammoth deficit of fiscal 1959. Speaker SAM RAYBURN pointed out July 2, in a sharp rebuke to GOP propagandists, that the Democratic Congress had already cut $353 million off the Eisenhower budget requests, and he predicted the cuts would reach $500 million to $1 billion. But those savings, basically, are no more than a prudent overseeing of the routine housekeeping of the Government. Let us look beyond such details to the big picture.

In the House of Representatives a few weeks ago Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Democrat, of Connecticut, noted that our animal output of goods and services, remains more than twice that of the Soviet Union. But he quoted Allen W. Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, as a warning that a much greater rate of growth is enabling the U.S.S.R. to close the gap rapidly. He cited this somber statement by Dulles:

"If it is true that our industrial growth (between now and the end of the new Soviet 7-year plan) will be only 2 percent a year, the United States will be virtually committing economic suicide."

The truth is, the average growth rate of our economy in the first 6 Eisenhower years was only 1.3 percent annually.

TIGHT MONEY STOPS GROWTH

Growth is faster this year, but already the administration (abetted by the Federal Reserve Board) is applying the brakes of tight money. Economists of the top rank[1] reported in July that the "repressive policies now in effect might well lead to an average annual growth rate" for 1958–64—the approximate term of the Soviet 7-year plan—of less than half of the 5 percent annual rate which "we need and can readily achieve."

In 1953–58, these economists said, "we fell more than $150 billion short of full production, and suffered about 10 million man-years of unnecessary unemployment. In addition, Federal, State, and local governments collected about $30 to $35 billion less in revenues than a full rate of economic growth would have generated at existing tax rates."

The economists commented: "The erroneous methods used to fight inflation have contributed greatly to this poor economic performance. Especially, the tight money policy and successive retrenchments in the Federal Budget have been powerful factors in the deficient rate of economic growth."

They continued: "Now in 1959, we are moving upward again as we did in 1955. And once again, we are misreading the signs and applying the wrong policies. The Federal Reserve Board is now reactivating with a vengeance the tight money policy, which has proved to be economically repressive and socially regressive, and a very frail weapon against inflation. In accord with the misguided FRB policies, the Administration is asking for the removal of ceilings on interest rates. Budgetary retrenchment is again being given precedence over the neglected priorities of our national and international needs.

"Few, if any, of the fundamental maladjustments which contributed to the erratic and low growth rates of recent years have been corrected. Some of them are now being further aggravated—for example, the further forced decline of farm income, and the immense drive against wage adjustments."

But the President seems content. The oracles of the White House stoop, Messrs. HALLECK and DIRKSEN, are radiant. The Republican National Committee's mimeographs brim with happy tributes to prosperity. The moneylenders are happy, too—

The Federal Reserve Board reports that profits (after taxes) of its member banks rose 25 percent in 1958. Since the last Truman year, bank profits (again after taxes) have increased by 75 percent.

George Champion, president of New York's biggest bank, the Chase Manhattan, says a "prime rate" of interest even higher than the 4½ percent, established last May is possible. (He awaits it with open arms.) Henry Clay Alexander, chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Trust, "looks for a continuing rise in the cost of money." (His welcome mat is out.)

Government programs to help home building have felt the hot breath of tight money. Congress a few weeks ago had to raise from 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent the interest allowable on housing loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. Similarly, the Federal Housing Administration is said to be pondering a raise to 5½ percent in the interest permitted on FHA-guaranteed loans. (Even at the existing rate, a typical FHA mortgage negotiated today would cost $5,700 in interest, against $4,500 in 1952.)

But the GOP, although it has given us more inflation than we ever had before except as a result of war, still insists that high-priced money is the best weapon against inflation. Is it working that way? Perhaps it has deterred some people from buying homes. But look at this—

In May alone, consumers increased their outstanding installment debt by $443 million (seasonally adjusted), the Federal Reserve Board reported in July. That was the biggest jump since September 1955. We may be sure that there was a hidden tax on much of that buying—for higher interest is in effect a tax, imposed by the Government's tight money policies, and payable to lenders rather than to the Government. But the point is, tight money did not dampen the buying urge—hence did not work against inflation.

Actually, higher interest rates are of themselves inflationary, since they increase costs without increasing production. "Few things have contributed as much to inflation as rising interest rates," Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, said recently.

A budget deficit is supposed to be inflationary. Yet Mr. Eisenhower, who loves to denounce inflation, told Congress in June, as casually as if he were asking it to pass the butter, that higher rates necessitated his requesting $500 million more to pay the interest on the public debt than he had asked in his budget message only 5 months earlier.

One penny and part of a second penny out of every tax dime now go to the unproductive cost of carrying the Federal debt. The effect of tight money and inflation are reflected also in the debt burdens of the States and cities, of school districts and of public utilities, of home and automobile buyers—indeed, in one way or another, of every American.

And the Republican Party, failure going to its head, is proud of it.

On June 30 last, the fiscal year ended with the biggest peacetime Federal deficit in history—around $12.5 billion.

Total 6-year Eisenhower deficit—$19.4 billion versus record of first 6 Truman years; $3.7 billion surplus.

Public debt: When Truman departed, $267 billion. On June 30 last, $284 billion.

Cost of interest on public debt: In Truman's last full fiscal year, $5.8 billion. Requested by Eisenhower for fiscal 1960, $8.6 billion (up half a billion from his January estimate). The total Federal budget in 1939 for all purposes was $7.9 billion.

[1] "Inflation, Cause, and Cure," a study directed by Leon H. Keyserling for the Conference on Economic Progress, Washington, D.C.

Progress Toward Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of acting as moderator of a panel of outstanding scientists and experts who discussed "Weather Modification and Space Exploration" at the 46th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, meeting here in Washington.

I consider the information provided by the three speakers so important and timely that I would like to make summaries of their remarks more generally available.

One of these papers is presented herewith. It summarizes the address of Dr. Earl G. Droessler, director of Atmospheric sciences program of the National Science Foundation.

Dr. Droessler's summary follows:

Mr. Moderator, ladies and gentlemen, it is a pleasure to bring you the greetings of the National Science Foundation and our best wishes for the success of the 46th National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. I should like this morning to present to you information on the space exploration and weather modification programs of the Foundation.

First, may I take a moment to introduce the National Science Foundation for we are relatively a new organization, having been established by the Congress in 1950. The Foundation is an independent Federal Government agency dedicated to the promotion of scientific progress through support of basic research and of education in the sciences. Many of your boys and girls attending high schools, colleges, and universities are assisted in their science courses by programs of the National Science Foundation. Their science teachers are encouraged to broaden their knowledge of science and to develop their teaching skills through attendance at a variety of summer institutes which are held at many colleges and universities throughout the country under the auspices of the National Science Foundation. The college students themselves compete for over 1,000 National Science Foundation fellowships each year, and professors at our colleges and universities are provided with grant money to undertake basic research in such fields as mathematics, biology, chemistry, physics, oceanography, and atmospheric sciences.

Each year the Foundation uses the budget moneys received from the Congress to increase the national scientific wealth in terms of improved research environment, research skills, and research facilities. This activity represents a major annual investment in our national prosperity and welfare.

Now, I shall briefly discuss the Foundation's interest in space exploration—I say briefly because this is a new field of scientific experimentation and technology, and the Congress has wisely decided to establish a new Government agency to direct the na-

tional program. The new agency is called the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and I am sure that Dr. Porter, who follows me, will have more to say about the NASA programs and about future prospects in this area.

However, I believe we must understand that with the coming of the space age we did not create new sciences; actually, we still depend upon our trained physicists, astronomers, and upper atmosphere scientists to carry forward our understanding and exploitation of outer space. Inasmuch as many of these scientists are now supported by Foundation grants, we fully expect that we will continue to support their scientific work which, in many instances, will lead into space experiments. Through close cooperation between the Foundation and the new Space Agency, arrangements will be made to schedule such experiments on the high flying rockets and satellites.

On weather modification, I can speak more fully because here the National Science Foundation has received special responsibilities from the Congress. Just about a year ago, July 11, 1958, Public Law 85-510 was signed by the President. The law directs the Foundation "to initiate and support a program to study research and evaluation in the field of weather modification." Public Law 510 was a direct outgrowth of the work of the Advisory Committee on Weather Control which was so ably chaired by our next speaker, Captain Orville. For 4 years the Advisory Committee studied and evaluated public and private cloud seeding experiments and encouraged programs aimed at developing both physical and statistical evaluation methods. The final report of the Advisory Committee was issued in December 1957 and it stressed particularly the importance of basic research and recommended that the Government give full encouragement and support to the widest possible research as the fullest and most direct way to success in any attempt of modifying the weather.

The National Science Foundation moved promptly and vigorously into this new area of responsibility. A program of atmospheric sciences was established and weather modification research and evaluation was placed therein. I should like now to list some of the things we have been able to accomplish over the past 10 months:

First. The Foundation sought the advice and assistance of outstanding scientists and engineers in framing its program; for weather modification is an area of research involving many talents and disciplines. It embodies knowledge of meteorology, statistics, mathematics, physics, chemistry and engineering. Therefore, in October 1958 an Advisory Group on Weather Modification, composed of distinguished civilian experts, was appointed by the Director of the Foundation. The Advisory Group has fashioned general and specific guide lines within which the program has been carried out.

Second. The program has established direct contact with all known private weather engineers and consulting groups in the country. We have informed them of the new weather modification program and have asked for and received full cooperation.

Third. A series of workshop conferences were set up to stimulate and initiate research and evaluation and to bring together interdisciplinary scientific and engineering groups that must be involved in a program expansion. The first of these workshops studied the problem of improved measurements and instrumentation for cloud physics and weather modification. The second brought together mathematicians, statisticians, and cloud physicists to develop new approaches on the design and evaluation of field test programs. The third meeting will call together meteorologists, physicists, and chemists to discuss theoretical and experimental research regarding the scientific basis of weather modification.

Fourth. The Director of the Foundation invited the several interested Government agencies to appoint representatives to the Interdepartmental Committee on Weather Modification. This Committee was formed to keep the governmental activities fully advised of the national efforts in this expanding area of meteorology, and to encourage coordination among them. The Committee will insure a cohersive and effective U.S. program in which other Federal agencies are expected to participate by taking charge of projects suitable to their interests.

Fifth. Last, but certainly not the least, we have done something in a very positive way by launching a full-scaled $1,130,000 research program on weather modification. This was announced by the Director of the Foundation in March of this year. The program consists of 13 grants and contracts for laboratory research, field experiments, evaluation of present theory and practices, and study of modern meteorological methods directed toward weather modification. In announcing this program Dr. Waterman said: "We believe that these investigations are most necessary at the present stage of development of weather modification theory and practice. Until now, weather modification studies have been complicated by a large proportion of trial-and-error experiments of uncertain results, many without the controls necessary to assess their meaning and significance. The work under the NSF program will increasingly move from scattered and unrelated investigations to efforts soundly based on scientific knowledge.

"The National Science Foundation program has the objective of studying more intensively than has been attempted before the scientific basis of weather modification, through support of competent scientists working in cloud physics and allied fields. Under this program a full range of laboratory and field experimental work will be carried out using techniques of physics, chemistry, and mathematics, all of which play important roles in meteorological research."

The 13 research grants and contracts have been made with universities and research organizations and also include one grant to the U.S. Weather Bureau. If you wish to examine the details of this program, I would be pleased to leave a copy of the NSF announcement with the chairman for inclusion in the proceedings of the convention.

What lies ahead in weather modification: First and foremost, we are hoping that the Foundation can keep its program going for a long enough time to be really meaningful, considering the complexity of the problem. This means that we should provide steady support for at least 10 to 15 years. Nothing is more critical and essential to lead man to his ultimate control of weather—whatever that may be—than long term, stable support for the best scientific minds we can bring to bear on the problem.

I know that this convention has a particular interest in water resources, and you want to know how weather modification may fit into your future plans. We should keep in mind that the Advisory Committee on Weather Control found that the seeding of winter-type storms in mountainous areas in the western United States produced an average increase in precipitation of 10 to 15 percent from the seeded storms with heavy odds that this increase was not the result of natural variations in the amount of rainfall. Therefore, I believe that in the planning of water development for these mountainous regions in the years ahead, consideration of the potentials of artificial cloud seeding and weather modification will have to be made.

In addition to precipitation increases, the prospects of weather modification are attractive because of other possible benefits. These include the suppression of hail storms, decrease in lightning storms, a reduction in the frequency and severity of floods, and even a possible diminution of hurricane intensity and damage. The fact that the present scientific basis for expecting such results is meager does not necessarily mean that the longer range prospects are negative, for the scientific examination of the problem has just begun on a systematic basis.

Landrum-Griffin and Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio broadcast of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn., of August 24, 1959:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, MONDAY, AUGUST 24, 1959

Who would have thought that a labor bill, that contains no mention whatsoever of agriculture, would end up by putting farmers behind the legislative eight-ball? But that's just what is happening.

It's no fault of the laboring man, who's working for better take-home pay, just as is the farmer. But, as you know, there's been a big scare over a few bad actors in the leadership of a couple of big unions. That's been the signal for a general attack on labor by nonunion groups. Farmers have seen that same pattern repeated against farmers—under the leadership of the Secretary of Agriculture. By playing off commodity group against commodity group, and city people against farm people, the farm Secretary has raised hob with the farm program and farm prices.

That's the price farmers are paying, and it it not over yet. Now labor is up against the Landrum-Griffin bill, which has passed the House. It wouldn't have passed except that the Southern Dixiecrats joined the Republicans (at least most of them) in voting for the bill, which sincere labor people say will hamstring the unions if it ever becomes law.

The northern city Democrats are plenty sore about that. They want no part of the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, because most of their constituents in the cities work for wages and this tough bill would strip unions of their most effective weapons in the battle for better wages. So the city Democrats are boiling mad at farm district Southeners who voted for the bill, almost as a bloc, as well as at Republicans. In the past, northern city Democrats have been mighty cooperative in voting for farm measures, but now they are inclined to strike out at any farm legislation.

The northern Democrats, and the group of levelheaded Republicans who analyzed the situation and voted accordingly, are trying to patch up these wounds. Maybe they'll be able to, but the city Democrats seized their first chance to hit back at the Dixiecrats by voting solidly against CCC barter provisions in the Public Law 480 bill, sponsored by COOLEY of North Carolina.

So the Dixiecrat vote on the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, which doesn't even mention farmers, has chilled the working relationship in Congress between city Democrats and the

farm-State Members. The situation is serious. Washington farm observers are saying that chances for good farm legislation in 1960 and 1961 are endangered. Maybe it can be patched up before then. We certainly hope so. The farmers have some very capable friends in Congress who are working on it, men like McGOVERN of South Dakota, ANDERSON of Montana, BURDICK of North Dakota, and others.

But farmers need to understand that their margin of victory on the farm bills they've been able to get through Congress has been thin as a thread. That means that farmers, fewer in number each year, need to double and triple their organizing activities. Not one single farmer who wants to be farming 10 years from now can "leave it up to George" to carry on the fight for better legislation and stronger co-ops.

The Late Eugene Meyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include a tribute paid to the late Eugene Meyer, publisher of the newspaper the Washington Post and Times Herald, by the Cuban delegation to the extraordinary session of the Council of the Organization of American States, on July 24, 1959:

HOMAGE BY THE COUNCIL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, WASHINGTON, D.C., JULY 24, 1959, ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF MR. EUGENE MEYER, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD OF THE WASHINGTON POST AND TIMES HERALD

The interim representative of Cuba, Dr. LEVI MARRERO ARTILES. "Mr. Chairman, the Cuban delegation has the honor to propose to this distinguished Council that we observe a minute of silence, on our feet, as a homage to the distinguished journalist, Mr. Eugene Meyer, publisher of the newspaper the Washington Post and Times Herald, who died recently. The cause of democracy in all our countries had ever in Mr. Meyer a large-hearted and firm defender. The people of Cuba found in the Washington Post, under Mr. Meyer's guidance, a broad understanding of its ideals and sacrifices. It is for this reason—and I believe I express the feelings of the Cuban people and their revolutionary government—that I have spoken these brief words of homage to an exemplary journalist and a representative of the highest moral and intellectual values of American democracy. Thank you."

The chairman, Dr. GONZALO ESCUDERO, Ambassador of Equador, "The Chair, agreeing entirely with the remarks of the Ambassador of Cuba, and interpreting the unanimous sentiments of the Council, allies itself to this motion; therefore, let us proceed to observe a minute of silence, standing, in homage of this eminent journalist who has died."

The representative of the United States, Mr. JOHN C. DREIER. "I wish to express the gratitude of my delegation for this homage to a distinguished American, Mr. Eugene Meyer, which the Council has just rendered at the suggestion of the delegation of Cuba."

Woolworth To Mark Kirby Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, of August 19, 1959, which reports that the 75th anniversary of the founding of F. M. Kirby's first store in Wilkes-Barre and the 80th anniversary of the F. W. Woolworth Co. will be marked in Wilkes-Barre by a Kirby-Woolworth Founders' Days celebration in the near future:

WOOLWORTH TO MARK KIRBY ANIVERSARY—EARLY DAYS RECALLED

The 75th anniversary of the founding of F. M. Kirby's first store in Wilkes-Barre and the 80th year of the F. W. Woolworth Co. will be marked in Wilkes-Barre by a Kirby-Woolworth Founders' Days celebration in the near future, according to Everett W. Chance, local Woolworth manager.

Similar events have been held in Lancaster, where F. W. Woolworth's first store was established and in Erie, where Seymour H. Knox, first located his 5-and-10-business.

Simultaneous with the Wilkes-Barre Founders' Days event, honoring the late Fred Morgan Kirby, the Scranton Woolworth store will stage its affair honoring the late C. S. (Sumner) Woolworth, its founder.

DINNER PLANNED HERE

Prior to the start of the local sales event, a dinner will be held on September 18, at the Westmoreland Club.

With over 3,250 stores in operation today in 11 countries of the world, the firm has 1,600 stores advertising in daily newspapers, a trend of recent years in the 5-and-10 chain.

Kirby's original store, located on East Market Street, was put in operation in 1884 with $500 representing his entire savings, plus $100 borrowed from his father, and $600 which Charles Sumner Woolworth, of Scranton, invested with him in the new venture, to be known as Woolworth and Kirby's

To satisfy his desire to have his own store, he bought out Mr. Woolworth's half interest in the next year. But the association between the two continued and they with Frank Woolworth sought each others advice and studied each other's merchandising methods and at times pooled their purchasing power to acquire better values for their customers at 5 and 10 cents.

SECOND STORE OPENED

In 1889 Fred Kirby opened his second store at Williamsport and in 1891 he moved his store in Wilkes-Barre (which he was beginning to consider his adopted home) to the corner of East Market and Washington Streets.

Nine years later, in 1899, while he was opening stores in the Eastern and Middle Western States, the Kirby Building on Wilkes-Barre's public square was built. At its completion, F. M. Kirby & Co. moved into its new, larger accommodations with suitable ceremonies.

In 1908 the Wilkes-Barre store moved to South Main Street. At the opening, the street was jammed for hours. Special police tried in vain to keep the crowds in order, windows and tempers were smashed. The beautiful F. M. Kirby & Co. store, its bigger-than-ever values, the great crowd itself were the talk of the town for weeks.

FIVE AND DIMES

By 1911, five-and-dime stores were familiar sights on the main streets of many American cities. Sumner Woolworth had 18; his brother, Frank Woolworth, had 318; Mr. Charton had 53; Mr. Knox, 112; Mr. Moore, 2; Fred Kirby, 96.

In 1912 they took the next logical step. They combined under the name F. W. Woolworth Co., each partner continuing active in the company management. F. J. Weckesser of Wilkes-Barre, who had begun with F. M. Kirby & Co. in 1895 as manager of the company's Baltimore store, continued as district manager under the merger. He later became a director of the company and continued until his death. Today, Mr. Kirby's son, Allan P. Kirby, railroad magnate and financier, serves as a director of the Woolworth Co.

None of the five founders of the original modern Woolworth Co. is living. The last survivors were Fred M. Kirby and C. S. Woolworth, the boyhood chums of the old corner store.

Mr. Kirby became one of America's leading philanthropists—his contributions to educational, religious, scientific, and recreational groups and institutions has by 1940 reached the vast total of $68 million.

Some of the organizations which have benefited in whole or part from his contributions are Wyoming Seminary Endownment and Sprague Memorial Hall, Guthrie Clinic and Robert Packer Hospital at Sayre; Wilkes-Barre General Hospital, Angeline Elizabeth Kirby Memorial Health Center and Maintenance Endowment, F. M. Kirby Park and Maintenance Endowment; Irem Temple, Wilkes-Barre Institute for Girls (now Wyoming Seminary Day School), Kirby Hall and Endowment of the Chair of Civil Rights, Jewish Welfare Association, American Red Cross, and Leonard Hall of Lehigh University.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, among the most thoughtful and respected newspapermen in the State of Oklahoma is Mr. Milt Phillips, publisher of the Seminole Producer.

In an editorial, August 13, Mr. Phillips urged the public not to be misled by demands for a specific label or a package deal in labor legislation but to concentrate on results—sound legislation to curb the abuses brought out by the McClellan committee:

THE NAMES OF AUTHORS NOT IMPORTANT THING

(By Milt Phillips)

By the time this appears in print the House of Representatives may have concluded consideration of labor reform legislation. As this is written it appears a majority of the House Members in Congress are convinced that legislation curbing abuses of labor union powers must be enacted at this session. It also appears a majority of House Members do not want to enact legislation that will seriously injure legitimate union functions. We have said in this column, and we again reiterate, a vast majority of the people of the Nation do not want to impair

or injure legitimate union activities. It is the abuses of union powers which has brought resentment to a high pitch among the people all over the Nation. It is not an easy job to provide legislation which will effectively curb racketeering and abuse of union powers and at the same time preserve to honest, sincere union members the rights to which they are entitled under this democratic form of government. Of course there are some union leaders and members that want unlimited powers regardless of the effect such powers have upon the Nation and all the people. Likewise there are those who so bitterly oppose any kind of union labor function that they would destroy the unions by legal means or any other means. The vast majority of people in the Nation do not agree with either of these extreme viewpoints.

A problem sincere lawmakers face is the lack of understanding by the average citizen on how legislation is enacted.

For example, this present labor reform legislation was first passed by the U.S. Senate. The bill passed by the Senate was a weak bill with little enforcement powers. Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, tried to strengthen it during Senate debate on the bill.

Senator MCCLELLAN attempted to put into the legislation a "bill of rights" for union members and the public. He was unable to get very much of his proposal into the Senate bill as it was finally enacted.

Senator JOHN KENNEDY, an aspirant for the Presidential nomination, has helped dig up much of the dishonesty, corruption, and malpractices of mobsters operating under union labels. But the Presidential aspirant is trying to ride the fence on the labor reform legislation.

Unlike MCCLELLAN, KENNEDY is trying to appease the union extremists while playing to the demand of the people for adequate laws to control the abuses uncovered by the McClellan and Kennedy committees.

The Senate-passed labor reform, weakened far below the necessary safeguards recommended by MCCLELLAN, was sent to the House of Representatives.

There it was referred to the House Labor Committee for study and hearings.

Under pressure of Hoffa and other leaders of organized labor, the House committee changed some of the weak Senate provisions, and in some ways even softened the already soft Senate bill by lessening penalties for violations of the proposed law.

However, the House committee bill, as finally sent to the floor of the House Tuesday, contained some sound provisions, and if penalties had been imposed sufficiently rigid to provide enforcement, might have helped to clean up some of the abuses brought out in the congressional investigations.

Then President Eisenhower endorsed legislation proposed by two Representatives, one a Republican and the other a Democrat. The Eisenhower endorsement brought some possibility of making the labor reform legislation a partisan issue.

However, Senator MCCLELLAN, an Arkansas Democrat, joined Eisenhower in endorsing the bill proposed by the Representatives, LANDRUM and GRIFFIN.

In the meantime, a California Congressman named SHELLY, a former union organizer, introduced another proposal which was endorsed by many of the labor officials. It gave the unions even more power to abuse.

Thus the House of Representatives faced the problem this week of trying to develop sound legislation which would curb abuse of union power by dishonest and corrupt union officials, and yet would not penalize honest and properly operated labor unions.

The Members of the House of Representatives faced a tough job.

Whatever legislation the House passes this week must be returned to the Senate for concurrence or rejection.

Since the Senate passed a very weak piece of legislation, it is naturally expected that body will refuse to concur in House changes from the Senate bill.

So the Senate will refuse to concur and ask for a conference. A small number of House and Senate Members will be named to a joint conference committee and this committee will attempt to work out a bill satisfactory to both branches of Congress.

Therefore the House Members this week, especially those like TOM STEED and CARL ALBERT, who want sound legislation protecting the public, the union members and the national security, are having a tough time trying to get House colleagues to write a good, sound bill from all of the proposals, and in addition, pass a bill which has some chance of getting Senate approval.

As individual citizens, we folks back at home in the congressional districts, have the problem of trying to show our Representatives how we feel about this labor reform legislation.

Inasmuch as the Landrum-Griffin bill had more real controls and provided more rigid penalties for violation of such things as "hot cargo" clauses in union contracts, "blackmail" picketing, refusal to permit union members to vote secret ballots and other needed legal controls, the public used this specific bill in urging their Congressmen to support labor union reform legislation.

However, what the average citizen—a vast majority or all the people of the Nation—really want is legislation that will curb mobsters and racketeers and assure that members of labor unions will have the right to express their views without coercion and threats from entrenched officials.

The average citizen cares little what name is attached to the legislation.

They want adequate labor reform legislation enacted.

If the House will enact legislation outlawing "hot cargo," prohibit with rigid penalties "blackmail" picketing and boycotts, and give unions back to the membership where democratic processes will prevail, the public is sufficiently aroused that Senate approval will follow.

Citizens must remain alert—not get themselves all tied up with some "package deal" under any name, whether it be Landrum-Griffin or some other name—but insist that the major reforms so urgently needed are included in the final legislation. That will assure progress in cleaning up corruption and dictatorships in the labor unions where these conditions now exist.

Sincere Congressmen in both the House and Senate should be encouraged to do this. Let's not get ourselves all worked up over some specific name or title of legislation.

But let's not relax one iota in insisting that reforms, with enforcement teeth, must be enacted by this present Congress before the Members return home.

Hawaii Teaches a Lesson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the North Adams (Mass.) Transcript which expresses most eloquently the great lesson of toleration and understanding which the State of Hawaii is teaching all America:

HAWAII TEACHES A LESSON

The appearance of the newly elected Hawaiian congressional delegation in Washington will be an auspicious occasion for most Americans. The exceptions will be those persons, mostly in the South, who have been fighting a losing battle for white supremacy.

One of the State's two Senators is the son of an indentured Chinese immigrant. The State's lone Representative, a hero of the famous Nisei fighting unit in World War II, is the son of a naturalized Japanese clerk. They will be the first Members of Congress of Chinese and Japanese ancestry.

We hope Senator HIRAM L. FONG and Representative DANIEL K. INOUYE will be productive Members of the congressional body. Time alone will tell about that. What is most important for the moment is that America has now taken into its national leadership people of Asian ancestry. The impact of that will certainly not be lost in the Far East, where this country's standing has long been harmed by its anti-Asian prejudice.

In the new State of Hawaii more than half of the 80 offices at stake in this week's election were won by Americans of Asian descent. That is as significant as the makeup of the congressional delegation.

Racial snobbery undoubtedly exists in Hawaii, but it is no different than the social and religious snobbery that exists almost everywhere in this country. The Hawaiians, however, have managed to eliminate racial discrimination. If all people are afforded equal rights, the silly pretensions of superiority by one group or another are harmless.

In some ways many of this country's older States have a lesson to learn from its newest member.

Free Elections in East-Central Europe Should Be Made a Condition for Any Future Summit Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Stefan Korbonski, chairman, Assembly of Captive European Nations, New York City, concerning free elections for east-central Eurpean countries:

ASSEMBLY OF
CAPTIVE EUROPEAN NATIONS,
New York, N.Y., August 12, 1959.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: I am glad to convey to you the assembly's appreciation of your excellent address, delivered on July 23, in the House of Representatives, requesting that free elections in East-Central Europe be made a condition for a summit conference.

The subsequent invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States has lent even more weight to your address. The unwelcome and harmful effects of this visit can be, at least partially, offset by confront-

ing the Soviet dictator with a determined attitude of the United States to discuss the case of the subjugated East-Central European countries. Prolonged silence and inaction by the West on these countries, coupled with the increased prestige that Premier Khrushchev will derive from his U.S. tour, would only strengthen the suspicion of the captive peoples that they have been "written off." As for the tragic consequences of final hopelessness and disillusionment in the captive European countries, you have clearly and graphically described them in your address.

We at the assembly have also been very impressed by the resolution on the fulfillment of the wartime pledges requiring free elections in Eastern Europe, introduced by you on the same day in the House of Representatives. When it will be passed—and we are confident that it will—it will mark a new milestone in the long list of your distinguished contributions to our countries' freedom cause.

Sincerely yours,

STEFAN KORBONSKI,
Chairman.

Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award to Senator Frank Carlson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, at the 45th annual meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association at Columbia, Mo., on August 24, the Honorable FRANK CARLSON, Senator from Kansas, received the award for distinguished service to agriculture. Following is the citation used by the president, Fred V. Heinkel, in presenting the award:

Because of your genuine interest and leadership in the encouragement of farmer owned aud controlled cooperative associations and your sincere and demonstrated friendship for farmers; and because of your particular and thorough understanding of the difficult problems involved in the production and marketing of our great wheat crop, and your dedication to finding a solution to these problems, a solution which is of vital importance to the farmers of Missouri, Kansas, and the rest of the Midwest's great Wheat Belt, we feel that you have fully earned and deserve the highest honor and award the Missouri Farmers Association has to offer.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association has voted unanimously to bestow upon you the MFA's award for distinguished service to agriculture.

FRED V. HEINKEL,
President.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the Missouri Farmers Association honored our distinguished colleague from our adjoining sister State. Hereafter follows the speech of the Honorable FRANK CARLSON delivered on this auspicious occasion:

SPEECH BY SENATOR FRANK CARLSON, ANNUAL MEETING, MISSOURI FARMERS ASSOCIATION, INC., COLUMBIA, MO., AUGUST 24, 1959

It is an honor and a privilege for me to appear on your program today. We folks in Kansas have always had a great respect for the farmer in Missouri and especially for your active, hard hitting Missouri Farmers Association.

After accepting your kind invitation to speak here today, I spent some time thinking about a wide range of topics which I would have liked to discuss with you. As you probably know, a Senator becomes involved in so many activities today that he has difficulty in keeping up to date in any one field. After considering several alternatives, I decided to try to organize my thoughts and observations regarding the current impasse which has developed in the farm policy field.

I ask, What, if any, progress has been made in national farm policy in the past 30 years?

I ask, Why do we find it so difficult to reach a common agreement on desirable revisions in farm price support legislation?

And finally, I ask, How and in what manner can we expect to make progress in improving farmers' bargaining power in months and years immediately ahead?

These are the questions that interest me, and I believe they are questions in which you are interested.

When I consider the first question, "What, if any, progress has been made in national farm policy?" it occurred to me that it was just 30 years ago that we first made the stabilization of farm prices a national policy objective. The Agricultural Marketing Act, the first national legislation having as its objective the stabilization of farm prices, was passed in 1929 with the active support of President Hoover.

Those of you who have as many gray hairs as I do will remember that the Agricultural Marketing Act created a Federal Farm Board with a price stabilization fund of $500 million and a charter to assist in the development of regional and national marketing cooperatives. The Board hoped that, with the help of credit from the $500 million stabilization fund, these cooperatives would be able to stabilize market supplies and prices.

President Hoover, especially anxious that this new Board should succeed, prevailed upon Alexander Legge, the former president of the International Harvester Co., to become its first Chairman. Soon after taking office Mr. Legge explained the purpose of the Board in a U.S. Chamber of Commerce meeting in these words:

"Nearly 10 years of discussion, controversy, and compromise led Congress, in its wisdom, to declare that permanent solution of the agricultural problem lies in collective action on the part of the farmers. It created the Farm Board to help producers organize for such action, both as to production and marketing of their crops, the purpose being to enable them to put their industry on economic parity with other industries."

Apparently the chamber of commerce opposed farm price stabilization 30 years ago, just as it does today, for later in the same speech Mr. Legge said:

"Is there any reason why those who have prospered and grown apace through governmental aid and assistance to various industries should object to the farmer getting his?

"You fellows, better organized, got yours while the farmer, unorganized, failed to get anything.

"The farmers have little or nothing to say about what their product brings. Costs of production can be passed along to the buyer by nearly everyone but the farmer. Unorganized, he has to take for his product what the other fellow is willing to give him."

No one knows how successful these first efforts at farm price stabilization would have been under normal peacetime conditions. We know, of course, that they were unable to stem the tide of economic recession which set in in the fall of 1929.

We usually think of the Federal Farm Board as having failed in its price stabilization efforts. But it was this first Farm Board experience which convinced Mr. Legge and other farm leaders that production and marketing controls were essential for the success of farm price stabilization policies.

Mr. Legge, with his background of manufacturing experience, was a vigorous advocate of balancing supplies with available markets. After several years of service, in his letter of resignation to President Hoover, he included this significant sentence:

"While there are still a few of the agricultural leaders who lower their voices when they speak of production control, yet practically all of them have accepted the principle as essential."

The production control programs of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration in the 1930's were a direct outgrowth of the Farm Board's experience. The Secretary of Agriculture in 1933 also inaugurated price-support loans direct to producers. In the fall of 1933 producers of cotton and corn who had kept production in line with their allotments were offered loans on their crops at above-market values. This was the beginning of direct price-support programs as we know them today.

The price support features of the farm program increased in popularity throughout the 1930's. It became increasingly difficult, however, to hold production in line with the volume that could be marketed at the support price levels with continued large unemployment rolls. Just as a matter of interest I looked up the records and found that the loans and inventories of the Commodity Credit Corporation increased from $279 million in 1938 to $1.7 billion at the end of 1942.

I often wonder how our farm price policy would have met this problem of growing stocks in the prewar years if high levels of employment could have been achieved and World War II could have been avoided.

World War II generated economic forces, just the opposite of those prevailing in the 1930's, and gave us an opportunity to try out Government price supports as economic incentives for increased production. The experience of the war period was not particularly revealing, however, for market prices remained well above support price levels most of the time.

Production goals replaced quotas and, to increase production, farmers were given all possible incentives feasible in view of wartime conditions. They responded with such vigor that per capita food consumption (in part associated with fuller employment) increased 6 percent. In addition, large quantities of food were supplied to the Armed Forces and to our allies.

Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, recently said: "In fact, the increase in agricultural production in America was largely responsible for winning the war, and was a feat which was exceeded only by the men in the fighting forces themselves.

"After the war the productive power of American farms was instrumental in putting countries of Western Europe and other parts of the world back on their feet.

"This had hardly been accomplished when the Korean war broke out; and there was increased demand for certain commodities, particularly wheat.

"Again the American farmer responded."

The 6 years following the Korean war have given us a different kind of experience. It has been a frustrating experience for farm leaders, farm program administrators, and farm-minded legislators.

During the last 6 years net farm income has been almost $20 billion less than in the previous 6 years.

Farm prices are now 17 percent lower than 6 years ago and the trend is still downward in spite of the general business boom in progress.

Farm production in 1958 was 15 percent higher than the new record levels achieved in 1952–53, and total producton in 1959 may equal or exceed 1958.

We have bartered, sold for local currencies, and given away at home and abroad $8 billion of farm products.

Government loans and inventories of farm products have increased to almost $9 billion and further increases are expected under present legislation as currently administered.

Net budget expenditures of the Department of Agriculture in the past 6 years have reached $28 billion.

Prof. Dale Hathaway of Michigan State University, who spent 1956 on the staff of the Council of Economic Advisers, made a widely accepted appraisal of recent U.S. farm policy in the May issue of the Journal of Farm Economics. The key points in this appraisal are as follows:

1. The program probably has maintained farm income (both in the aggregate and per capita) at levels higher than would have existed in the absence of a program. (Other reputable economists estimate that net farm income would have been one-fourth or more lower without supports in recent years.)

2. The program that has operated has not seriously impeded agricultural adjustment, especially the adjustment of the agricultural labor force.

3. Aggregate agricultural efficiency probably has not been impaired by the program.

* * * * *

5. Despite the conclusion that our recent program has not been a major contribution to the present difficulties in agriculture, neither has it contributed positively to a solution of the problem.

It (the program) has failed, despite massive expenditures, to bring a solution to the U.S. farm problem.

To Professor Hathaway's appraisal I should like to add the following too often overlooked facts:

Over the past 30 years, with farm price supports in operation most of the time, the cost of food in terms of workers' earnings has dropped sharply. A weekly market basket of food for a family of three which cost 25 percent of the worker's average weekly earnings in 1958 would have cost 48 percent of a worker's weekly earnings 30 years earlier.

Food costs less in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world. Although Government costs of farm price support programs are higher than they should be, they equal only 5 percent of the money spent for food at retail. If the pro rata share of farm program costs had been added to the cost of food, workers in 1958 would have spent only 26 percent of their weekly earnings for a market basket of food as compared with 35 percent for the same food 10 years earlier, and 41 percent 20 years earlier.

Throughout the last two decades, output per hour of farm labor has increased at a rate equal to two to three times that of the nonfarm worker. Largely because of this rapid increase in efficiency, people have left the farms in record numbers in the past 20 years. Yet workers in agriculture, mostly independent farm operators, receive less than half as much for their labor as nonfarm workers. The economic benefits of this increase in efficiency have largely been passed on to the processors and consumers.

When I reflected on the second question, "Why do we find it so difficult to reach a common agreement on desirable revisions in farm price support legislation?" I found it especially challenging. Actually, in the past 6 years I have given a good deal of thought to this question. And I have changed my views somewhat over the period.

In the past several months it has seemed to me that the single most important factor has been the wide difference in views as to the economic facts relating to agriculture. I am told that for the country as a whole, perhaps a third of the farmers believe farm income will drop sharply if effective supply management programs are not adopted soon; an equal number of farmers just as sincerely believe that farm income will be maintained at present levels or will be increased by lower price supports and the removal of production restrictions; and the other third of the farmers are undecided as between these two points of view.

The proportion of farmers holding each of these views differs in the different farming areas. A large majority of the tobacco, cotton, and wheat producers apparently believe in the need for production controls while only a minority of the corn and livestock producers appear ready to accept production controls or believe them to be feasible for their products. There also is a wide diversity of views with respect to the effectiveness of acreage controls and of market prices as incentives in adjusting supplies to available markets.

In my opinion if we could more nearly agree on the relevant economic facts we could rather quickly agree on desirable changes in farm price support legislation. All of us would prefer more, rather than less, individual freedom in our farming operations. All of us would prefer to do away with price support programs and production controls if farm prices and farm income would not fall to disastrously low levels.

I am not an economist and it is not my purpose to attempt a review of all the important facts relating to farm price support programs. There are, however, three misconceptions which I would like to clear up. First, the evidence does not support the often made assertions that control programs have been ineffective and that farm price support programs have stimulated greater production.

Official statistics compiled by the Department of Agriculture show that in the last 5 years production of the basic crops has been held 21 percent lower than the nonbasics, using 1952–53 (the last 2 years before acreage controls and marketing quotas were invoked) as the base period. The production of the basic crops, feed grains other than corn and soybeans (crops increased most by diversions from the allotment crops) in the last 5 years has averaged 2 percent lower in relation to the 1952–53 base than all other (non-price-supported) crops. Obviously production controls have not been as effective as they should have been but they have held production in check, as compared with that of the non-price-supported crops.

Second, the economic facts do not support the propaganda to the effect that the producers of the non-price-supported products, especially livestock, have demonstrated the superiority of free market policies in recent years. In the 6 years 1953–58, on a net basis 94.5 million tons of feed grains and wheat were removed from commercial market channels by surplus disposal and Government storage programs.

Had these additional feed grains and wheat remained in commercial market channels, their outlet would have been livestock feeding. Livestock feed grains supplies would have been 14 percent larger for the entire 6-year period. In the absence of price-support programs on feed grains and wheat, total livestock feeding would have been about 14 percent larger, thus increasing supplies and lowering prices of livestock products generally.

Hogs which would have utilized about half of the increased feed supplies would have been sent to market in about 16 percent larger numbers. An increase in marketings of this magnitude, on the basis of recent Department of Agriculture analyses, would have lowered hog prices one-third or more below what they actually were.

While we are discussing farm surpluses and the effect they have had on farm prices generally, I want to discuss briefly our crop surplus problem in Kansas. Wheat is the basic crop and the farmers are very much concerned and embittered about the continuous reminder to the public about the cost to the taxpayers for the storage of wheat and cost of the program. Wheat is the political football—the whipping boy for those who do not know the farm problem.

Admittedly, we have a surplus of some 120,917,000 bushels of wheat stocks in all storage positions as of August 7. On August 7 corn stocks in the United States were 1,033,431,000 bushels and this figure will go up about 340 million bushels in the next 2 or 3 weeks, or to a total of 1,373 million bushels.

With the present anticipated corn yield this year, corn could also be a great burden in our farm surplus problem.

Stocks of oats on August 7 were 36,495,000 bushels—grain sorghums 269,912,000 bushels.

I mention these figures because the wheat farmers of this Nation have been receiving the brunt of criticism for surplus crops that are not limited just to wheat.

The third misconception relates to the potentialities of market expansion as a solution for the current imbalance between supplies and market outlets.

The evidence does not support the optimism often expressed regarding the widening of markets which will occur with lower prices. Although I have always supported programs for market expansion I believe we should be realistic in our expectations.

In spite of the greatly increased promotional efforts in recent years, 9 percent more American consumers, with 10 percent higher real incomes in 1957, bought 11 percent more food, including more higher cost meats and fewer cereals and potatoes than in 1952. Yet farmers received $600 million less for this food in 1957 than for the smaller quantity taken 5 years earlier.

Prof. Murray Benedict of the University of California, a long-time student of national farm policies, says: "* * * so far as food is concerned, once a nation is as well fed as ours now is, demand can grow only about as fast as population grows."

Official reports show that in the 4½ years of surplus disposal operations ending December 31, 1958, we removed a total of $10.7 billion of farm products from commercial markets by disposal and net storage programs. These disposal and storage programs provided an outlet for $2.4 billion of farm products a year. Had these extra products moved through commercial markets, they would have caused a sharp decline in prices. The most recent studies available indicate annual farm income would have dropped by at least twice this amount.

In my opinion far too small a part of our expanded research programs in recent years has been devoted to an objective study of farm price-support program results.

There has been far too much propaganda based on misconceptions of agriculture's basic economic problems. There has been far too little comprehension of the economic significance of the output—increasing effects of rapid technological change in food production at a time when the peoples of the industrialized Western World already are well fed. There has been far too little understanding of the economic effects on farmers of the market pricing policies of big business and big labor.

I believe that if we could get widespread common understanding of the economic facts and relationships in these fields it would not be difficult to reach agreement on desirable revisions in price support legislation.

This brings us to a consideration of the third question, "How and in what manner can we expect to make progress in the near future in improving farmers' bargaining power?" I hope you won't be disappointed if I fumble this one a little.

Although I am vitally interested in farm problems I am not a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Consequently, I have not become involved in the cross currents of conflicting recommendations which almost overwhelm the members of the Committee on Agriculture.

As I see it, however, producers of the basic crops—with the exception of corn—have a tolerable satisfactory history of price stabilization and supply management through marketing quotas. Producers of the more important perishable crops appear to have learned how to use marketing agreements and marketing orders effectively in stabilizing their market supplies and prices.

Dairymen have been able to stabilize their prices with the help of Federal milk-marketing orders, where the milk goes into fluid use and price-supporting Government purchases as necessary for manufactured dairy products.

While it is difficult to discover any clear trends in recent farm-policy developments, it appears to me that these groups are likely to maintain and improve on such price-stabilization measures as they now have. As technological progress continues to expand the productive capacity of the agricultural plant faster than markets expand, the producers of these other products may be more or less successful in balancing their supplies with market outlets available at stable prices and in diverting their unused resources into feed grain and livestock production.

For the farm economy as a whole we are now producing 6 to 9 percent more products than can be sold in commercial markets at stable prices. Most of this excess capacity is likely to be diverted into feed and livestock production. Since feed grains and livestock products now make up two-thirds of total farm marketings, an expansion of some 8 to 12 percent in feed grains and livestock would be necessary to absorb current excess productive capacity in agriculture.

In addition, stocks of both feed grains and wheat are excessive. Even though exports are expanded as much as possible through continued Public Law 480 programs, it is probable that a part of these excess stocks can only be liquidated by feeding them domestically to livestock.

Every effort must be made to expand our export of farm commodities. The export of these farm commodities means not only dollars for farmers, but it has been, and will continue to be, an important part of a program of bringing closer relationships with countries that do not have an abundant food supply. Food for peace must be more than just a slogan; it can and must be a reality.

Recently the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, reported to the Senate a bill, S. 1771, which is known as the International Food for Peace Act of 1959. I am a cosponsor of that bill.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I know of nothing we can do as a nation that will win friends faster and more permanently than getting food and fiber into the hands of the needy.

The distribution of this food to underdeveloped countries where there are millions of needy and undernourished people is more than a commodity-disposal operation; it has important psychological value. In my opinion, it is one of the most effective forms of foreign aid.

Although attention was centered on wheat in this session of Congress, CCC loans and inventories of feed grains already are 10 percent larger than the loans and inventories of wheat. It seems almost certain that by this time next year CCC investments in feed grains relative to wheat will be even larger than at present. Hog prices will be distressingly low, poultry and egg prices will be less than fully satisfactory, and cattle prices will be starting their cyclical decline as marketings increase.

If there is anything to the old saying that necessity is the mother of invention, I am inclined to believe that in the next year or two increasing Government stocks of feed grains and declining livestock prices will force Midwest farmers to agree upon some program for improving their bargaining power.

Undoubtedly, it will have to include placing a part of our cropland in a conservation reserve. The central issue that should receive a great deal more study and discussion is whether or not more direct market supply management programs will be needed to make a conservation reserve program reasonably effective for feed grains and livestock products.

This has been a rather long statement, but the agricultural problem today is a complex and badly misunderstood problem. We and the public have been confused by the substitution of cheerful and hopeful statements for vital economic facts.

It is my hope that the leaders of our farm organizations, the farmers themselves, and our citizens generally will take a realistic view, with the hope that we may work out a solution which will maintain price stabilization and give the American farmer his fair share of our national income.

Businessmen Receive Government Aid, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, long before I arrived in Congress, I had heard a great deal about farm subsidies. Knowing full well that our Government was the most subsidizing Government in the world, I was amazed to find that people generally were only concerned with and aware of—farm subsidy. Coming from a city district, it was unpopular for me to support high farm price levels. However, in so doing, I pointed out that business generally prospered from subsidies by vastly greater amounts than did the farmer. In fact, the farmer looks like a "piker" in comparison.

Although 90 to 100 percent of parity may not be the answer to the farmers' dilemma, it is the best program at the moment. I do, however, sincerely hope that this Congress will come up with a better answer so the farmer can prosper along with the rest of society. I am mindful of the fact that the farmer is a great consumer of factory-made goods, hence provides substantial employment in cities like the one I represent.

In making my position clear, I have stated publicly I would support the elimination of all farm-price subsidies if all other subsidies, both direct and indirect were likewise eliminated. I still maintain that position, and do not while so doing, consider vital defense work a subsidy.

In reflecting on this subject, I read a most interesting article in the Catholic Bulletin by Father James Vissard, S.J. The article follows:

[Catholic Bulletin, Aug. 21, 1959]

BUSINESSMEN RECEIVE GOVERNMENT AID, TOO

(By Father James Vizzard, S.J.)

"It's no fun to be sober when everyone else is drunk" is the somewhat flippant reply recently given to a business executive who criticized subsidies to farmers. "We're pouring billions of tax money down a rathole," he insisted, "and what have we got to show for it? I'll tell you, mountains of surpluses that nobody wants and on which we're paying more than a million a day for storage."

This business expert had his easy answer to the farm problem: "Get Government out of agriculture. Let the supply and demand of the market determine what farmers will grow and what price they'll get.

"The efficient operators will make money, the others will get out. Food will be cheaper, inflation will be checked, taxes can be cut." To him it's that simple.

What do you say to a man like that? Don't you feel that while he may know a lot about business he understands very little about agriculture and its problems? Aren't you also tempted to give him a flippant or even an angry answer and let it go at that?

Yet we can't afford to ignore him or treat him lightly. He represents the viewpoint of too many millions of voters and too many influential people both in business and in government.

The prevalence of such views proves how bad have been agriculture's public relations. Of course, public misunderstanding and resentment are particularly difficult to overcome when the Secretary of Agriculture is himself one of the farmer's, and the farm program's, chief critics.

So, what answer do you give to the businessman and the millions like him?

Perhaps you don't have time to give him a patient and detailed explanation of why the welfare of over 4 million farm families is important to the Nation, of what problems they alone face of all our economy's primary producers, of how much of the Agriculture Department's budget actually goes to farmers and what portion directly benefits nonagricultural businesses and other parts of our population or of how lower food prices have kept the cost of living down while everything else has been rising.

You might want to tell him that you're not happy either with the present farm program and that you have your own ideas of how it can be improved.

But instead of being too apologetic, why not put the businessman on the defensive? Tell him that farmers pay taxes, too, and that they're tired of subsidizing him. He may say, in surprised protest, that he isn't getting a dime from the Government. If that's true, he's one of a mighty small minority in big business.

Ask him, for instance, if his company has ever taken advantage of the fast tax write-off available to industries related to defense. That subsidy has already amounted to billions. So has the depletion allowance granted to oil and mining companies.

Find out if some of his products are among those purchased by the Government for stockpiling often only a polite name for buying to keep prices up.

No public outcry has been made about that though the government-held hoard of strategic materials cost more than the at least equally valuable, and strategic, stockpile of food he complains about.

Perhaps he benefits from the $500 million yearly post office subsidy given to magazine

publishers—Time, Life, Look, Saturday Evening Post, etc.—and direct mail advertisers.

Or does this free enterprising businessman get his Government help through the grants and other aids to the merchant marine and airline industries?

And then, of course, there are the tariffs and import quotas. These carefully lobbied protections against overseas competition take money out of the pocket of every consumer, particularly the farmer who has to buy price protected goods while he sells in the open market.

If the businessman virtuously protests that none of these Government supports reach him, don't let him off the hook. Find out how much of the $40 billion yearly defense budget is spent in his industry.

If he's in electronics, chemicals, airplanes, missiles, heavy construction, steel, roadbuilding or any of a dozen other major lines the chances are that a large part of his business, and profit, comes from Government contracts, paid for out of farmers' taxes too.

Perhaps the subsidy is a little less direct than some the farmer receives, but ask him what shape his business would be in without it.

In other words, I think it's time for farmers to howl too. They ought to raise the roof. They've been made the whipping boy for all kinds of critics who never turn the mirror to themselves.

If those critics consider subsidies to be dirty they ought, in all logic and decency, to fight to end all Government programs of aid including those which help them. Otherwise they ought to lapse into embarrassed silence and leave farmers alone.

Ceremony Honoring Speaker Thomas B. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Speaker, this morning you very kindly participated with the Maine delegation in the House in a ceremony in the rotunda of the Old House Office Building, in which we presented a new stone pedestal to support the Gutzon Borglum bust of Thomas B. Reed, late Speaker of this body. This presentation fulfills a keen desire on the part of some of us who have long been irked by the hollow plywood base, simulated to look like marble, which has hitherto served as the pedestal for a bust of a noted son of Maine, carved by a noted sculptor. What irked us was not any real or fancied slight, but the un-Maine-like idea of apply cosmetic skill to make wood look like something else. We could tolerate solid wood that looked like wood, or solid stone that looked like stone, but not hollow wood with face of stone.

Speaker Reed himself looked like what he was—a large, hearty, vigorous, and courageous man. With the thought that the membership might be interested in some of the contributions of Speaker Reed, I am inserting the remarks I made at our little ceremony this morning:

Mr. Speaker and honored guests, on this occasion it may be appropriate to note that at one time Maine occupied a position in national politics comparable to that occupied by the State of Texas, today. We are here, today, to dedicate a new pedestal for the bust of Thomas Brackett Reed, Speaker of the House of Representatives in the 51st, 54th, and 55th Congresses. In his last two terms the President pro tempore of the Senate was Senator William P. Frye, of Maine, and Asher Hinds, of Maine, author of "Hinds' Precedents," was Parliamentarian in the House. A little earlier, the powerful combine of James G. Blaine, Nelson Dingley, Reed and Frye controlled the political fortunes in Maine and occupied central positions in the Republican Party on the national level. Then, Maine possessed five seats in the House of Representatives.

Today's dedication is a statewide affair. Speaker Reed represented the first district, Congressman OLIVER'S constituency. The granite for the pedestal was quarried in Stonington, in Congressman MCINTIRE'S district. The cutting and finishing of the pedestal was done in my own district. We are paying tribute to a leader from our State and to the State itself.

Thomas Brackett Reed was born in Portland in 1839. A graduate of Bowdoin, he set out for the West to teach school and practice law in California. Apparently having seen all he wanted of that far land, he returned to his home State to make his career as representative and senator in the Maine State Legislature, attorney general, and finally Congressman from Maine's First District. He was first elected in 1876 and served continuously until 1899, when he resigned.

First nominated for the post of Speaker in 1885, Reed was elected to that post in 1889, when the Republicans controlled the 51st Congress. He was reelected in the 54th and 55th Congresses, resigning in September 1899, in disgust over the Spanish war and the annexation of Hawaii.

Speaker Reed is most noted for his contributions to majority rule in the House. As a member of the Rules Committee he had succeeded in ending filibustering on election cases, and on the tariff bill of 1883. His rules were adopted in the 51st Congress, dropped by the 52d, revived by the 53d, and restored by the 54th. They marked the first in the major steps toward modernization of House procedures and coincided with the compilation of the impressive "Hinds' Precedents."

In dedicating this monument to Thomas Brackett Reed, we are honoring a great line of Speakers who have brought the House to its present stature. Not the least of these greats is our present Speaker, the embodiment of tradition and respect for the need for democratic processes in our deliberations and actions. This pedestal is the product of the Maine coast, a symbol of integrity and an example of the craftsmanship which also marked the career of Thomas Brackett Reed.

I should mention, here, that we are indebted to the Deer Island Granite Co., of Stonington, Maine, and the James P. Murphy Co., of Lewiston, Maine, for the pedestal. They have donated this to the House of Representatives without any cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present to you, for your library in Bonham, Tex., a simple and homely memento of Thomas Brackett Reed. This is a bootjack, designed for colder climes than yours, but suitable, I am sure, for removing the boots for which your State is famous. This was given by Mrs. Frances W. Spencer, owner of the Thomas B. Reed house in Portland, Maine. The jack belonged to Mr. Reed, and may serve as a reminder to all of us that even the mighty must stoop to jack a boot.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I thank you for your cooperation in this, as in so many other matters, and offer to you my own admiration and good wishes for your continued leadership in the House.

Air Landing Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned that during the past several years, the representatives of our State Department engaged in bilateral air agreements with other nations that might have an adverse effect upon U.S. airlines. There is no desire on our part to see this country unfairly or artificially restrict the growth of our foreign-flag competitors, large, or small, provided they are engaged in traffic recognized as primary under the worldwide system of agreements into which the United States has freely and so generously entered.

However, no foreign-flag airline competitor to the U.S.-flag carriers should be allowed to prosper at the expense of the United States by engaging in traffic to which it does not have a primary entitlement. We must look to the future that our survival in the field of international commercial air transport should not be imperiled by the operations of the heavily subsidized airlines of foreign countries.

It is difficult enough for American free enterprise to compete in a field where subsidized foreign aviation has a free reign. The inexcusable thing is to see U.S. free enterprise being stifled by its own Government. It is the clearly announced policy of the Congress, as set forth in the Civil Aeronautics Act, to further the promotion and development of American air transportation systems both at home and abroad.

A very enlightening article appeared in the August 17, 1959, issue of Time entitled "Air Landing Rights," which sheds additional light and presents new facts of international competition. I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this splendid article, which is as follows:

AIR LANDING RIGHTS—NEW FACTS OF INTERNATIONAL COMPETITION

As U.S. international airlines enter the jet age, the United States is junking a belief as outdated as its piston planes. The belief was that U.S.-flag carriers could hold their lead over a growing flock of aggressive foreign competitors without a drastic change in U.S. air policy. Last week the U.S. airlines got a new warning of the onward march of foreign competition. From the State Department came an announcement that Air France will get an additional U.S. gateway at Baltimore and a polar route to the U.S. west coast. BOAC will get the right to land at Tokyo on its San Francisco-Hong Kong run, which is expected to take $7,800,-

000 yearly away from U.S. lines. A CAB examiner recommended that Air India be authorized to fly into the United States.

But the biggest threat is Russia's Aeroflot, the world's largest commercial airline. Its 1,600 planes fly 350,000 route miles, serve 500 airports from Kamchatka to London. Airmen expect that one of the points of discussion between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev will be yet another jump for Aeroflot—the right to carry passengers to and from the United States.

If Aeroflot gets rights into New York, Pan American World Airways will fly into Moscow. But the exchange does not tell the whole story. Aeroflot, which now matches International Air Transport Association rates (though it does not belong to IATA), is expected to behave for a while. But airlines fear that, as a totally subsidized state airline, it will eventually cut fares to aid Russia's economic offensive.

Despite last week's OK on new competition, U.S. lines found some cheer in the decisions. They showed a real change in U.S. policy to conform to the new competitive facts. What made the decisions different was not so much what the United States granted—BOAC, Air France, and Air India were entitled to the routes under reciprocal exchanges—as the manner of giving. France had formally denounced its bilateral air route agreement with the United States 13 months ago, insisted on getting "double trackage" rights; i.e., the right to serve any U.S. city where a U.S. carrier originates a flight for France. The State Department flately refused.

CAB and the State Department have not always been so alert to protect the interests of U.S.-flag lines. When Great Britain and the United States laid down the basic postwar air route pattern in Bermuda in 1946, the United States was the only Nation equipped with planes to operate long-distance service. It campaigned for a free competition agreement, but the plane-short British forced a compromise that provided for an equitable exchange of traffic between nations signing a bilateral pact. Since then the United States has often ignored breaches by foreign airlines, drawn criticism from U.S. carriers for giving out fat new routes without getting much in return.

Now the State Department and the President, who has the final say about what international routes the United States gives out, are ending the giveaway period in favor of more horse trading and stricter rule watching. The new trend was forced by the awareness that U.S.-flag lines could follow the downward path of the U.S. maritime industry. Though 70 percent of all air passengers between the United States and foreign countries are U.S. citizens, the share of traffic carried by U.S. carriers has fallen from 75 percent in 1949 to 60 percent today. In the first quarter this year, BOAC nudged out Trans World Airlines as the second biggest transatlantic carrier (No. 1: Pan American), the first time a foreign-flag line has flown ahead of a U.S. line.

Foreign carriers have rushed into the United States in such numbers that 40 now draw from the U.S. market versus 22 in 1949. Most of them get far more than U.S. carriers out of the bargain, often add extra flights to siphon off as many passengers as possible in violation of the spirit of the Bermuda agreement. In return for permitting Pan American to serve Amsterdam, KLM flies into New York and Houston. Result: last year KLM collected $29.4 million on 86,225 U.S. passengers, while Pan Am got only $1,700,000 from 2,842 Dutch passengers. While cutting into U.S. markets, foreign carriers are strengthening themselves against inroads into their home territory; e.g., European carriers got IATA to place a special tariff on transatlantic jet flights because they do not have jets to compete with the Boeing 707.

As the only private, nonsubsidized air fleet in the world, U.S. carriers must find a better way to face competition if the United States is to keep its place as a powerful air nation. The most obvious solution would be Government subsidy, but most airlines themselves admit that this is a last resort. What they want is for the United States to show a tougher stand in route bargaining and in enforcing current agreements. In the next 5 years the jets will force a revamping of virtually all of the 54 bilateral agreements between the United States and other nations. Unless the United States trades much more shrewdly with foreign airlines, U.S.-flag carriers may not be able to compete in the jet age.

Newsletter of the Honorable James Roosevelt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from my distinguished colleague and friend, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT, to his constituents. What Representative ROOSEVELT has to say in his letter is most worthwhile, and I commend it to the attention of my fellow Members:

AUGUST 1959.

DEAR FRIENDS AND CONSTITUENTS: Since I last wrote to you, the Landrum-Griffin labor bill has been passed by the House, and, thus, almost 6 months of hard work in the labor-management field has gone right out the window. The Landrum-Griffin bill, apparently originally written by Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, is a bad bill, which was put over by the systematic distribution of hokum through virtually all our channels of communication.

For months we have been subjected to a steady drumbeat of propaganda about the need for a "strong" labor bill, which rose to crescendo with Mr. Eisenhower's impassioned radio and TV appeal for the Griffin-Landrum bill. Throughout this long campaign the technique was identical—first a recitation of the evils discovered by the McClellan committee and then the plug for a "strong" bill, thus leading the reader or the viewer to believe that what was meant by a "strong" bill was a bill that would oust the racketeers and thieves and clean out the corruption.

Actually, nothing could have been further from the truth. What the administration and the Republican leadership and some of the southern Democrats and the National Association of Manufacturers and all their assorted payrollers and mouthpieces meant by a "strong labor bill" was a bill that would contain amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act slyly calculated to cripple and penalize perfectly honest, legitimate unions. It was simply a situation in which an old-fashioned, all-out, NAM union-busting drive was being cloaked by a sanctimonious plea for ousting the racketeers.

If you have any doubt about this, just read the three bills that the House fought over: the Landrum-Griffin bill, the Elliott bill, and the Shelley bill, or as it is sometimes called, the Shelley-Roosevelt bill. You wil find that in the areas where the McClellan committee recommended that action be taken, the three bills are virtually identical, except that the Shelley bill extended its penalties to employers and laborbrokers as well as union officials. In other words, the Shelley bill hit everybody that was in any way concerned in labor racketeering or stealing or illegal profiteering at the expense of the worker.

But, because the Shelley bill was an honest, straightforward attempt to correct the abuses found by the Senate committee, and because it did not attempt to use these abuses as an excuse for undercutting legitimate union activity, and because it contained no sly, antiunion phraseology—it was labeled the "weakest" bill; whereas, the Landrum bill, which did not cover nearly the ground that the Shelley bill did in the area of corruption, but which did contain provisions extremely damaging to honest labor activity, was labeled the "strongest" bill and plugged for by everybody from Mr. Eisenhower to the lowliest NAM lobbyist in an all-out, and apparently successful, drive to convince the country that the "strong" bill was strong in the sense of protecting the worker.

Such are the uses of propaganda, and Lord help us all if we don't learn to distinguish between truth and hokum before Madison Avenue swamps us completely in syndicated piffle.

Exactly the same applies to the anguished caterwauling about inflation that emanates from the White House every time Congress considers any type of bill that might possibly do the general public some good. If you spend a dime for a general improvement, says the administration, you add to the perils of inflation. And if you build a school or aid a housing program or add a couple of dollars to a pension to enable somebody to stay alive, then you have breached the dam irretrievably and allowed the floodwaters of inflation to sweep everything before them.

Probably no sillier thesis was ever maintained by presumably sane men but this administration, aided by its corps of publicity experts, is making a lot of people believe it. Meantime, the same administration, having successfully diverted the public attention by yelling about public extravagance, shovels money to the bankers with both hands by progressively raising Federal Reserve interest rates and fighting to raise interest rates on Government bonds.

This is the basic source of inflation and high prices that are hitting us from all sides. Interest rates are raised to primary borrowers, who, in turn, raise rates to secondary borrowers; eventually, the bank rates become too high and less and less money is borrowed for purposes of plant expansion and new products, with the result that new jobs do not open up, new products are not made, and the gross national product is thus arbitrarily limited to approximately what is being produced at the time. But, since the population continues to grow and the demand is consequently ever greater, the price of existing goods goes up and up while profits rise fantastically, the rich get richer, the poor get poorer, and the pensioner has to sleep under a bridge.

My friends, it's time to wake up. This is a bad administration, the like of which we haven't seen since the twenties and which will inevitably wind up in the same place the Coolidge-Hoover regimes did, because it is traveling the same road. When a government pursues a steady policy of squeezing the small businessman and the worker and beating the unions over the head in order that the banker may sit on bigger

and bigger bags of money and charge more and more for the use of some of it, that government is going to wind up in an economic crash, no matter how loudly it meanwhile screams about an inflation that it is itself creating and tries to blame it on unions and spenders. We're heading that way fast.

Fortunately, 1960 isn't far off, but even so, I sometimes wonder if it will get here in time. When it does come, we'd better not fumble it.

Since my last letter, the housing bill has been vetoed, as I said it probably would be. It was perfectly logical that it should be vetoed because it would have helped a considerable number of people and it was not written for the exclusive benefit of the bankers. So it got the ax, with the routine explanation that it was "inflationary." The charge was so preposterous and the veto so indefensible that when Senator SPARKMAN held hearings on it, he couldn't even find a member of the executive staff who would admit having written the veto message. We've gotten pretty well used to government by proxy since 1953, but this was the first time anybody had heard of government by pixie.

I have been appointed by Chairman SHEPPARD of the California congressional delegation, to head a bipartisan delegation committee which will look into the matter of the flood of narcotics which is apparently coming over the Mexican border. Our duties will consist of determining the areas of responsibility so that the proper committees may conduct the necessary investigations and see to it that the necessary liaisons are effected with the proper Mexican officials. We are getting excellent cooperation from both State and Federal officers, all of whom are as anxious as we are to solve the problem speedily. The first hearings will probably be held this month.

Congress is expected to adjourn before too long and it will be good to get home and see you again. Meantime, all best wishes.

Sincerely,

JAMES ROOSEVELT.

Establishment of a National Fuels Policy Is of Utmost Urgency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, a number of Members of the House who represent coal-producing areas have introduced identical concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Joint Committee on a National Fuels Policy.

Those of us who introduced the resolutions are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the establishment of a national fuels policy is a matter of utmost urgency.

This is a matter which does not concern coal only. Rather, it vitally affects all of the other fuels upon which this great industrial nation depends. Also, it directly concerns our national security.

I strongly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the responsibility for the establishment of national policy in a field as important as that concerning energy fuels should rest with the legislative branch.

In the resolutions introduced in the House, the sponsors seek to have Congress carry out this responsibility.

I trust that in the closing weeks of this session of Congress this tremendously important matter will not be overlooked. We need to get on with this job. By passing this resolution now, Congress can empower the joint committee to organize during the recess and be ready to get down to serious business in January.

I urge this House to act upon the resolution before adjournment.

Progress Toward Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of acting as moderator of a panel of outstanding scientists and experts who discussed "Weather Modification and Space Exploration" at the 46th Annual Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, meeting here in Washington.

I consider the information provided by the three speakers so important and timely that I would like to make summaries of their remarks more generally available.

One of these papers is presented herewith. It summarizes the address of Capt. Howard T. Orville, U.S. Navy, retired, whose long career in meteorology includes his chairmanship of the important Advisory Committee on Weather Control, and whose report of this Committee is the Nation's basic document in this field.

Captain Orville's summary follows:

From time immemorial man has dreamed of controlling the weather. His efforts have encompassed three principal areas: religious ceremonies, mysterious rites and rain dances, and scientific research. Scientific research has yielded some potentially important findings during the past 12 years in particular. Weather modification using these techniques promises to be one of our most important sources of water supplies in the future. Small scale cloud-seeding efforts are already producing limited but important increases in snow pack in the western States.

Progress reports of research now underway at the University of Chicago, the Institute of Atmospheric Physics in Arizona, and the Santa Barbara project in California are most encouraging. Increases in precipitation of 10 to 25 percent with new and improved techniques for observing the results are not uncommon. The Navy's effort in developing new techniques with the use of carbon black are indicative of the importance of weather modification, military as well as economically.

The new research program developed by the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Weather Bureau, both of which we will hear about at this meeting, are of the greatest importance to the field of weather modification. Basic and applied research programs which will be undertaken, improved instrumentation, and new engineering techniques hold promise of substantially increasing our knowledge of weather modification, and eventually providing an important new source of water supplies over the entire United States.

More than likely research now being started will lead to successful large scale periodic seeding of entire weather systems which will be of greatest potential economic and military value.

The availability of great sources of energy derived from thermonuclear devices and the possible use of earth satellites may lead to eventual suppression or diversion from their tracks of hurricanes, tornadoes and other destructive storms, becomes a real possibility in the future.

Cancer, Not Guns, Sent Doctor From Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the following AP story was in last night's Evening Star. From time to time in world history a really good man passes across the space of time. Dr. Albert Schweitzer is one of these. So is Dr. Thomas Dooley. The somewhat tragic turn of events in an already sacrificed life made me more than pause in the busy day. I think it will have the same effect on you:

CANCER, NOT GUNS, SENT DOCTOR FROM JUNGLE

NEW YORK, August 25.—Dr. Thomas Dooley, 32, is the sort of man who thinks treating 100 patients a day in a remote hospital in Laos is more important than the treatment of one cancer patient named Thomas Dooley.

He is the kind of fellow who chose to overlook it when the U.S. Government suggested that he had better leave his hospital because the Communists were shooting too close.

He is a member of the generation known as beat, who can say "I feel great," and talk about going back to resume his work in the jungles—right after he has told you that tests show a tumor on his chest is "all loaded" with cancer.

Dr. Thomas Dooley is, in other words, the classic young man with a mission.

And he seems angry at his own condition only because it may cut short the mission.

Five years ago Dr. Dooley was a medical officer on a Navy ship that was assigned to help hundreds of refugees fleeing from Communist North Vietnam. Touched by the sufferings of the Indochinese, he made up his mind to do something to help.

When he left the Navy he helped to found Medico (Medical International Cooperation) and build a three-building hospital at Muong Sing, near the China-Laos border.

The 30-mat hospital ("we don't have beds") now in handling 100 patients a day "and babies day and night." Some of the funds for operating it came from a book the doctor published, titled "The Edge of Tomorrow."

He started another book for the same purpose, and several times came back to the United States to lecture and appear on television—always hunting more money for Medico and the Lao.

His mission was helped along by the fact that Dr. Dooley is not only dedicated—he is also charming, boyishly handsome, witty and outgoing.

In recent weeks the Communists stepped up their offensive in Laos and intermittent action broke out near Dr. Dooley's hospital.

The U.S. Ambassador sent a meassage to the doctor suggesting he leave. He refused.

But 2 weeks ago a surgeon was visiting his hospital, and Dr. Dooley asked the visitor to remove a lump on his left chest. A sample of the tissue was flown here and analyzed. It was malignant. Dr. Dooley received an order he couldn't ignore, from Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, secretary general of Medico.

Dr. Comanduras, who lives at 4512 South 31st Street, Arlington, and Dr. Dooley are old friends whose conferences helped lead to the organization of Medico. Dr. Dooley lived at 4301 Massachusetts Avenue before returning to the Far East in 1956.

Last week Dr. Dooley flew back to the United States. He visited his mother in St. Louis, then flew back to New York for further diagnosis and treatment.

Yesterday he was settling down in his room at the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Research Center at Memorial Hospital.

"This is the most elegant hospital room I ever saw," he commented. "Not a single mat on the floor."

Almost gaily, he described what the doctors had done and planned to do. Tuesday morning, he said, the surgeons would "go in and take a look and see what's there," the first in a series of surgical procedures.

"Then they'll decide on the treatment—whether it will be radiation, or nitrogen mustard, or something else," he said.

As a doctor he has guessed that he may have 5 or 6 years to live with this capricious type of cancer.

As a missionary, he has decided that whatever the other doctors say, he's going to spend the time he has left at the hospital in Laos. He plans to return there in November.

As he relaxed in the big shining city hospital to wait for the ministrations of other doctors, he was asked how he was feeling.

"I feel great," he said with a laugh. "As great," he added, "as anyone feels who has cancer."

Ominous Change in Soviet Activities Based on Shifting of World's Balance of Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a searching analysis of the world's military balance of power is contained in an article by Joseph Alsop, columnist for New York Herald Tribune, Inc., which appeared in this morning's Washington Post.

I think the article is so vitally important to our national destiny that I strongly urge every Member of Congress to read it and ponder the dangers which many of us see facing America in the immediate future if the Red masters in the Kremlin decide the time is favorable for military aggression of their own choosing.

The article follows:

EN ROUTE TO VIENTIANE

(By Joseph Alsop)

These words are written amid the bustle and confusion of homely things that always rise, in any household, when a long journey has to be prepared. This reporter is off to Laos, to have a look at the new Communist aggression there.

Since this country has been fed so long on patented, government-issued tranquilizers, the trouble in Laos has as yet caused hardly a ripple. Maybe the aggression will soon be repelled, although it seems more likely that the key city of Sam Neua will soon turn into another Dienbienphu. In any case, what one will see in Laos probably will not be dramatic, if only because looking for jungle fighting in those particular jungles is usually far worse than searching a haystack for a needle.

Nonetheless, just as a symptom, this trouble in Laos is really dramatically serious. It is very much worse as a symptom of the ill-concealed contempt for the strength and will of the United States and its President that is plainly felt by the President's prospective guest, Nikita S. Khrushchev.

To prove this shocking point, a comparison offered in a previous report may perhaps be repeated. In brief, when Khrushchev first wanted a meeting with President Eisenhower, in 1955, he willingly paid for the meeting with the liberation of Austria and the restoration of normal relations with Yugoslavia. This time, threats to Berlin have got Khrushchev what he has always wanted most of all—an invitation to meet alone with the President, with no bothersome allies at the table. And this time, the invitation to meet was hardly extended by Eisenhower when the Communist attack on Laos was launched with Khrushchev's blessing.

What, then, is the explanation of this enormous and ominous change in the manners and methods of our enemy? In part, perhaps, the explanation lies in Khrushchev's consolidation of his personal power. Yet even in 1955, he needed very great personal power, in order to persuade Vyacheslav Molotov and the other Stalinists to agree to the ostentatiously "peaceful" Austrian and Yugoslav gambits.

Nine-tenths of the explanation of the change in Khrushchev must therefore lie elsewhere. It lies, beyond doubt, in the massive, unfavorable shift in the East-West balance of power that has occurred since 1953. In the Kremlin, the prevailing estimate of the power-balance is always the mainspring of policy. Nothing less than a great change in this Kremlin estimate can explain the great change in Khrushchev.

The stark fact of the change in the power balance is daily drowned, in this country, in floods of official soothing-syrup. Less than a year ago, the then Secretary of the Navy was happily denying that there were any indications of Soviet missile-launching submarines. Now Adm. Arleigh Burke has announced that the Soviets are building a serious force of these vessels.

Our Polaris submarines, Admiral Burke added, will of course surpass the Soviet submarines when we finally get them—several years from now. The admiral did not add that the program that could have given us extremely useful missile-launching submarines now was canceled because of the administration's budget mania. But Khrushchev then gleefully boasted with all the politeness of an oncoming house guest, that the new Soviet underwater craft, which he has now, would cover any target in the United States from the waters of Hudson Bay.

By the same token, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining, was telling all and sundry only a few months ago that the Soviets probably did not have a true intercontinental ballistic missile, because no Soviet ICBM had been tested at full range. With his usual hearty bluffness, General Twining brushed aside the scientists' warnings that the Soviets were using special instrumentations to test their ICBM's over reduced ranges.

But now the U.S. Government has undisputed and, of course, unannounced evidence of at least two full-range Soviet ICBM firings which ended in the Pacific.

These recent ugly surprises for the administration's professional (one might even say careerist) optimists by no means convey the true extent of the shift in the world power balance. It would take a book to tell that story in full. It is an ominous but not yet quite fatal story—a story of diminution of our striking power and weakening of our deterrent balanced by Soviet gains in the same crucial areas.

Much can yet be done to give this story a better ending than now seems likely. But if Berlin and Laos mean anything, they mean that the needed action should not be delayed for another year, or another month, or even another day.

Friendship Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is an elementary proposition, universally acknowledged, that "justice delayed is justice denied."

The delays implicit in the judicial process were primarily responsible for the rise of administrative agencies. But today these administrative agencies are guilty of the same offense they were created to alleviate—delay in deciding cases.

As one of the elected Representatives from the great city of Baltimore, I rise to enter a vigorous and official protest concerning the unusual delay respecting the matter of Washington-Baltimore Adequacy of Service Investigation by the Civil Aeronautics Board, Docket No. 8148.

On May 3, 1956, a petition was filed requesting that the Civil Aeronautics Board investigate the inadequacy of service to the Greater Baltimore metropolitan area in accordance with sections 404 (a) and 1002 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended. The hearings in this matter were concluded on September 18, 1957, and I submit that there can be no justification for the continued delay of the issuance of an order from the Board. It is a well-known fact that in the period of over 3 years since the institution of an investigation for adequacy of service in the Baltimore area, this area has continued to receive far less service than it is legally entitled to. This condition continues in spite of the institution of jetplane service to the west coast by two airlines. By no stretch of the imagination can the institution of this service be construed as providing a pattern of service which is necessary to meet the test of "adequacy."

On July 31 of this year, I wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Board about this matter, so vital to the interests of the large population of Greater Baltimore. In reply the CAB stated:

We agree wholeheartedly with your statement in your letter of July 31 as to the need for a prompt decision in our Baltimore-Washington adequacy-of-service case. Let us assure you that we are striving to make our findings, based on a very ponderous record, as quickly as possible.

As you are aware, and as the record before us makes so clear, the issues in this complex proceeding are of considerable economic consequence to the airlines and to the public. We feel that the fairness and soundness of our decision are equally as important as its promptness.

In addition, scores of matters of many types must be given attention by the Board so that we do not find ourselves able to devote the continuous hours to this case which would be desirable. We have had, for instance, the Northeastern States area investigation before us in which we recently voted tentative approval for service between Washington, Baltimore, and Boston via Allegheny Airlines.

Acknowledging that the record may be ponderous, certainly sufficient time has elapsed since November 7, 1958, when oral arguments were completed, for a decision to have been reached.

As to the "scores of matters of many types [which] must be given attention by the Board so that [they] do not find themselves able to devote the continuous hours to this case which would be desirable," does the Board expect its caseload to lighten? Is it hoping for a slack period in order to devote time to this case? Or is the Board merely offering weak excuses for failure to have performed its function?

Obviously the reasons ascribed do not justify the delay.

The people of Baltimore erected a truly magnificent airport in 1950. The Friendship International Airport was immediately hailed as one of the truly excellent facilities in the world, especially due to the fact that when this airport was planned, the use of fast jet planes was clearly envisioned.

I should like to point out that the CAB's own examiner estimated that well over 75,000 Baltimoreans are obliged to travel to and from Washington's National Airport each year. This proves conclusively that Baltimore does have the present potential of adequate numbers of passengers that desire to travel by air. Also, recent figures of passenger service at Friendship reveal a 36 percent incease over last year—additional and conclusive proof that when the service is here, the passengers are, too.

On August 14, 1959, I again wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Board that I could not understand the reason for the long delay in reaching a decision in this particular case. As a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, I feel that if a decision is not reached by the CAB within a reasonable time, an investigation and searching inquiry would be indicated respecting this matter. The urgent needs of almost 2 million of our citizens must be given due and proper recognition.

The Workmen's Benefit Fund: Providing Mutual Help in Time of Economic Crises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUDWIG TELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, 75 years ago, a group of German-American immigrants founded the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, to provide mutual help in times of economic crises. This year, this organization celebrates its 75th anniversary. Under leave granted I include an address by Mr. Morton B. Lawrence before the 24th National Convention of the Workmen's Benefit Fund of the United States of America, in Atlantic City, N.J., on June 14, 1959:

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

The history of the Workmen's Benefit Fund to work for the common good. It is a familiar story for Americans, but it can never be told too often. For it repeats in its own special way the pattern of America and its growth.

The story begins—like the American story—with a group of men who sought political asylum. With their families they fled the oppressive laws of Germany under Bismarck, the Iron Chancellor, in the 1880's. They came to the United States. They came as freemen—machinists, cigarmakers, and other skilled craftsmen, to work and to raise their families in freedom. A major part of that freedom is the right of men to organize to protect themselves—from political tyranny, from economic exploitation, from the poverty which follows upon the sickness or death of the family's provider.

Wage earners in the 1880's could not fall back upon savings, as their paychecks were small. Neither was there any aid from the Government, or organized charity to which they might turn. On September 24, 1884, a group of those exiled German workers met for the purpose of forming an association which would protect its members in times of sickness or death. Scandals had brought the established profitmaking insurance companies into disrepute. "Order of the day" (the minutes of that meeting read): "self-help." Less than a month later, on October 19, 1884, that association was founded—the General Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of New York and Vicinity.

The beginnings were modest enough: payments to begin when the organization had 75 members; weekly sick benefits of from $6 to $9; a death benefit of $75. These payments seem insignificant in the light of today's wages and the cost of living, but it should be remembered that 70 years ago $7 a week was the salary of a skilled working man. Only a few months after the establishment of the society, it was faced with a dramatic challenge. Two members died. The $150 needed in death benefits had not yet been collected in the treasury. Had the society failed its members in that crisis, it could not have survived. But the enterprising treasurer raised the money by borrowing from friends. The death benefits were paid, and the society's reputation for honesty and reliability was thereby established.

The membership rolls expanded. By 1887 there were 4 branches with 527 members. By the end of 1888 there were 733 members and 15 branches in 3 States—New York, New Jersey and Massachusetts. Growth was so rapid and so extensive that the society's name had to be changed to include the wider territory; it was now called—Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund of the United States of North America. (The designation "North" was later dropped. After 1888, sick benefits were extended to 26 weeks, with another 25 weeks at half benefit, and death benefits were raised from the original $75 to $150 in 1888 and $250 in 1891.

With such rapid growth, there was a sharp need for new administrative machinery. The small group of German workmen who founded the society had provided a completely democratic organization, and the organization proved flexible enough to meet the needs of expansion. Headquarters were expanded too—from a small office on East Fourth Street at $6 a month to a store at $12, and by 1889 the society leased larger quarters in the Metropolitan Savings Bank Building on Third Avenue, which remained its home until 1930 when it moved into its own building at 714 Seneca Avenue in Brooklyn.

The problem of coordinating the activities of the member branches with the main administration was met and solved by holding a convention. The first was held in November 1892 and there all branches were represented. A second convention met in 1895 and a third in 1898. In 1898 the national executive board applied for incorporation of the society. There were now 161 branches in 21 States and over 20,000 members. Eminent personalities began to join the organization, among them the genius in the field of electricity, Charles Steinmetz, who for a time was the financial secretary of one of its branches, Daniel Hoan and Jasper McLevy, many term mayors of Milwaukee and Bridgeport, respectively.

By 1905, the society had grown so large that it needed its own publication to spread news of its activities to its membership. At the convention of that year, a motion was passed authorizing the publication of a paper, Solidarity. Its first issue appeared in April 1906 and it has since been published regularly for half a century as the official organ of the society. Its policy was stated clearly in that first issue: "Our paper shall be a means of enlightenment and conciliation. Its best efforts will be given to that great work of culture: the winning of the workers to the goal which we must set for ourselves. * * * Enlightenment, teaching, education are the prerequisites."

The Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund had been founded by German immigrants, and in its early years it remained essentially German in composition. The convention of 1910 proposed, among other things, the organization of English-speaking branches. During World War I the society, like all German-American groups of the times, was subjected to a certain amount of harassment by self-styled superpatriots. Its loyalty to America, however, was never questioned, and the society grew in strength during the war. Soon after World War I, the U.S. Department of Labor asked the society for permission to scan its records for statistical purposes, because the organization's sick benefit figures were at that time practically the only source of health insurance statistics. The society gladly cooperated with various Government agencies, for it had been an early advocate of a system of Government-run social security. Even to-

day, the society is urging broader coverage and higher benefits under the social security laws.

The postwar period was one of expansion and consolidation for the society. In 1928 the organization adopted new additions to its benefit structure: women could now join the sick benefit group, and children were also admitted to the society. Membership rose to a new peak in 1929. In 1934, when it celebrated its 50th anniversary, it could look back with satisfaction over its half-century with the knowledge that it had survived war, labor unrest, and the great depression. During the period of great unemployment, its relief fund had helped thousands of members to survive. No person was dropped from membership for nonpayment of dues, so that regardless of the members' economic condition, they were eligible for benefits in times of sickness and distress.

In a new era, which recognized the rights and duties of men to organize in their own interests for their security and protection, the society moved ahead steadily. In 1939, at the 18th convention, its name was officially changed from Workmen's Sick and Death Benefit Fund to Workmen's Benefit Fund. Once again, as it had done many times before, the Workmen's Benefit Fund asserted its firm opposition to fascism, nazism, and communism, with their intolerance, hatred, persecution, and destruction of culture, freedom, and peace. At this convention, too, the medical care and hospital plan was adopted on a national basis, following the institution of similar services by local branches a few years earlier.

The Workmen's Benefit Fund continued to expand its activities and its services to members. The 20th national convention of 1943 set up a life insurance program of regular and endowment policies. The emergency relief fund had been greatly strengthened and is constantly being used to help member families that suffer from unemployment or other financial distress, such as that caused by floods or other disasters. District committees were set up to coordinate the activities of the many branches. These include not only the insurance and health benefits, but such varied services as camps for children in various parts of the country, homes for the aged and convalescent. Local branches are, of course, also engaged in social and educational activities and support national and community drives for charitable and health purposes. Many branches provide general practitioner care and, in metropolitan areas, an excellent medical specialist service.

By 1959, the membership had greatly expanded—embracing all economic groups, ethnic and national backgrounds, and religious faiths—with branches in 26 States and the District of Columbia. Its economic strength was reflected not only in the reports of its activities by the Insurance Department of the State of New York which carefully supervises fraternal societies, but in such increased services to members as providing life insurance policies up to $25,000 and the addition of major medical coverage.

With its membership a representative cross-section of American citizens, the organization continued its opposition to all forms of totalitarianism. Publication of a photograph of a 14-year-old Hungarian Freedom Fighter on the cover of Solidarity—soon after the Soviet suppression of the Hungarian rebellion—reflected the membership's violent disapproval of Communist imperialism and the subjugation of free peoples. Many of the new members were refugees from Communist oppression and they needed no reminder that democracy was still the finest form of government.

Over the years of growth there have been many changes, but the fundamental structure of the Workmen's Benefit Fund has remained unchanged. At the 70th Anniversary celebration in 1954, guest speakers Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York and U.S. Senator Herbert H. Lehman, praised the society in glowing terms for its years of dedicated service to democratic ideals and to the enactment of forward looking social reforms and legislation. The editor of its magazine, Solidarity, reiterated briefly just what their organization means to its members: "In itself, the society is a very sober-minded affair, a purely protective institution, organized for self-help on a nonprofit basis. The very purpose gives the organization its idealistic aims. For this reason, progressive thinking men and women of all national origins, and of all occupations, can be active in the Workmen's Benefit Fund as they are active in political, educational and economic organizations."

Release of Rabbi Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Max Hendler, of Brooklyn, has brought to my attention, a letter published in the New York Times of August 6, 1959, concerning Rabbi Alexander Zissu Portugal. If calling the attention of my colleagues to the plight of this self-sacrificing and dedicated man can help in some measure to bring about his release, I do so with earnest hope:

RELEASE OF RABBI URGED—FEAR VOICED FOR HEALTH OF CLERIC IMPRISONED IN RUMANIA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

A large concern for man's fate begins with emphathy with one man's fate. It is in this belief that we feel impelled to call attention to the tragic situation of a remarkable religious figure now under detention in Rumania, and to voice a public appeal of conscience in his behalf.

His name is Rabbi Alexander Zissu Portugal. Since April 23, when he, his son and several friends were arrested on suspicion of "treason," he has languished in prison under investigation by the Rumanian authorities, and without trial. Anyone who has ever known this dedicated man, or who has been touched by his charism, even at a distant remove, can only regard the charge against him as a tragically grievous error.

During World War II Rabbi Portugal was deported by the Nazis to Trans-Dniestria. His first act at the end of the war was to gather orphaned Jewish children and provide a home for them. When the authorities would not let him keep "his" children, he simply proceeded to make them his literally—he adopted them.

He then took a large group of the children with him to the city of Czernowitz, then under Soviet occupation. His fame as a father to children spread widely in the immediate postwar years. At one time he had as many as 40 boys and girls sharing his living quarters. At another point a group of Jewish children in a Russian orphanage in Odessa left that institution to join the rabbi in Czernowitz, as a result of which the Soviet authorities detained him for a few days.

FURTHER ARRESTS

Following this, the rabbi removed to Bucharest, where he taught the children of the Jewish orphanage. When the Rumanian authorities undertook in 1948 to dissolve this institution, the younger children especially pleaded that they be permitted to remain with the rabbi and not be transferred to the State orphan asylums. In consequence, the rabbi was once more arrested and confined for investigation for a period of 4 months.

In recent years Rabbi Portugal traveled from town to town in Rumania, visiting the Jewish communities, dispensing what alms he could gather, counseling the troubled and himself living a life of poverty. He was twice warned that he must cease this activity and stay at home. It was after he had complied with the second warning that he was suddenly arrested last April.

This time he is far less able than before to cope with the harsh circumstances of imprisonment and investigation. He is 65, frail, and sickly; his weight has reportedly dropped to 90 pounds, in part, probably because he has been unable in prison to obtain the kosher food which his faith enjoins upon him.

His very survival, then, may depend on his being released. And this letter is written in the prayerful hope that the Rumanian authorities, aware of the profound concern felt for Rabbi Portugal and mindful of the most elementary demands of humane charity, will be moved to release him and so to spare him the rigors which he cannot withstand in his enfeeblement and advanced years.

REINHOLD NIEBUHR,
Professor of Theology, Union Theological Seminary.
LOUIS FINKELSTEIN,
Chancellor, Jewish Theological Seminary.
NEW YORK, *July 30, 1959.*

Lambert E. Broad Has Served 25 Years as President of Mining and Mechanical Institute, Freeland, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Hazleton, Pa., Plain Speaker of August 19, 1959, disclosing that Mr. Lambert E. Broad has served 25 years as president of Mining and Mechanical Institute, Freeland, Pa.:

LAMBERT BROAD OBSERVES 25TH YEAR AS MMI PRESIDENT

Lambert E. Broad, president of the Mining and Mechanical Institute, Freeland, today marks his 25th anniversary as head of that educational institution.

Broad, who became president of MMI in 1934, graduated with high honors from Lehigh Universtiy with the degree of bachelor of arts. He became a member of Phi Beta Kappa National Honor Society while at Lehigh.

Graduating from the University of Pittsburgh with the degree of master of arts, he became a member and was a former officer of Phi Delta Kappa Graduation Education Honor Society.

A member of the American Association of School Administrators and Secondary School Administrators, he is also active in civic, industrial and church affairs in the Freeland-Hazleton area.

Among these are: president, Freeland Industrial Development Corp.; past president, Freeland Rotary Club; vice president Community Concerts Association; director, Anthracite Motor Club, director, Freeland Chamber of Commerce; past president and director, and chairman of trustees, Freeland YMCA; chairman of trustees, St. John Reformed Church, Freeland; officer and past officer of various Masonic bodies; and member, Valley Country Club.

Before coming to Freeland, Broad was head of the Science Department and director of visual instruction at Aliquippa schools from 1927 to 1934.

Broad's 25th year as MMI head coincides with the school's 80th anniversary. Founded in 1879 by the late Eckley B. Coxe, pioneer coal operator, its initial objective was to make better miners and mechanics out of boys and men, who had little or no primary schooling.

Started as a night school, it evolved into a fully accredited, full-time college preparatory school under Broad's leadership and has received excellent ratings since that time. Over 700 young men have received their diplomas during Broad's tenure.

Hallmarks of Our Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following attached article which appeared in the July 1959 issue of the Tulanian:

[From the July 1959 issue of the Tulanian]

HALLMARKS OF OUR SOCIETY

(By Dr. Rufus C. Harris, president, Tulane University)

American education today should strive to impress young people more with our country's basic freedoms than with its high standard of living.

I refer generally to our civil liberties and particularly to our freedom of thought, expression and assembly. We should show what these mean, and how they apply in daily living.

As a people we have, I suspect, made a mistake in our international posture by boasting too much of our high standards of living and our exciting achievements in technocracy, instead of reflecting the image of a people whose daily life cherishes the exchange of ideas, the give and take of debate, the freedom of learning and the liberty of conscience.

These are more the hallmarks of our Western culture than anything produced from stone, steel, or technocracy.

Our more important efforts in foreign aid should be to strive to assist all peoples, of all tongues and of every race to find the secrets of freedom as well as the secrets of science and technocracy. That could be our best example of world leadership. But it must stem from a basic educational philosophy.

The world today makes it necessary that education produce men of character and principle for it is obvious that our safety cannot reasonably be entrusted to men merely of skill. Skills are neutral and may be employed for good or evil.

How do schools and colleges best build character?

They do so when they require the best academic performance. The conditions conducive to high performance in teaching and learning are precisely those that are chiefly conducive to the development of character and principle. Large or small, wealthy or poor, each educational institution can be such a force if it really wants to.

The principal determinate is the level of performance expected.

The sad part is that on most campuses it is low and only a few persons are performing to full capacity. Where trustees, officers, faculty and students live by the conviction that learning demands excellence, and nothing short of high performance will be settled for, character is strengthened, principle is exalted and students will reflect it.

In fact, all worthwhile ingredients of the college exprience flow from this, including good teaching, the satisfactory curriculum, student responsibility and effective religious responsibility and practice. Where there is firm commitment to academic excellence, college courses gain meaning and relevance, and students today have a greater concern for finding meaning in life than this century has heretofore seen.

We must produce all the superior trained young people we can find to see to it that a historical review of these times does not record that actually we were an immature, irresponsible, and confused people; that revolutionary changes occurred in our generation to which we never really became awakened; that our Nation was propelled into a new educational era to which we did not wisely respond: that there was a convergence of powerful and even marvelous forces on a worldwide scale, which produced an unparalleled necessity for uncompromised excellence in education, but that we lacked either the imagination, the courage, or the maturity to provide it.

Most of the Tulanian readers reside in the great southern portion of the United States. It is the section from which we stem and which we wish to advance. It has our earnest thought and labor and solicitude. It is proper that we ask: Are our youth in this area being educated with proper regard for the needs and opportunities that await them in adult life in the world as it now is, with all of its stresses and competition?

Are the cankers of trivia and materialism which in so many ways are eating at the heart of American society today similarly gnawing at the vitals of our educational standards and vision?

Our solemn purpose must be to liberate the mind and to broaden and deepen the sense of tolerance, personal usefulness and responsibility; to provide this area with the best possible educational institutions; to educate and morally develop its youth; to move them away from prejudice, ignorance, and absorption with self and community trivia toward noble dedications to the great religious and social endeavors; to inspire lofty pursuit in superior learning; and to assure generous and unselfish public performance.

This constitutes our chief, if not our only, obligation to this area.

It constitutes the best measure of our duty to Mr. Tulane and Mrs. Newcomb. It constitutes the South's best promise for advancement; and indeed, it constitutes the best way that our time may be made one of peace.

Everything we do in education for this, experimentally or otherwise, must be measured by high quality levels if we really wish to raise the sights and the performance of southern endeavor.

There can be no compromise with standards and integrity in this.

The integrity of character we strive for within ourselves is dependent upon the measure of our own inner quality. The integrity of any system of education we embark upon inevitably will be the result of the same ingredient.

No educational program can be any finer, deeper, more humane, more qualitative than those who are its architects or those who are taught according to its ways.

In the last analysis the quality of our southern performance in education or anything else is the qaulity of each of us in the South.

Protest on Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Letters to the Editor column of the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of August 19, 1959, submitted by Mr. James J. Walsh, of Wilkes-Barre, regarding the upcoming visit of Nikita Khrushchev to this country:

PROTEST ON KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

The announcement that Nikita Khrushchev and President Eisenhower will exchange visits has stirred the entire Nation.

Only recently, President Eisenhower remarked about the apathy of so many Americans concerning the dangers of communism. And yet, it is this same Mr. Eisenhower who has invited the very leader of this deadly menace to visit the United States.

Just a few weeks ago our Congress adopted a resolution denouncing the enslavement of the captive nations. Perhaps Congress should have added the United States to the list of nations under Red domination. Our leaders have been taken in by the Communists so often, figuratively speaking, we are a captive nation. It would appear the United States is being used as a doormat by the Kremlin.

By dealing with this man of treachery, doublecrossing, mass murders, etc., we are automatically putting a stamp of approval on the status quo in Europe, China, Tibet, etc. Have our leaders lost sight of what happened in Hungary, Poland, Korea, etc? What of those 450 Americans still being held in Communist prisons in Red China? Try to picture the heartache of those boys' parents. I wonder if any of those parents have ever been invited to the White House and been given the assurance that everything possible is being done to bring about their release?

It is shocking, to say the least, to read in our newspapers that Governors, business leaders, and the like are extending invitations to Mr. K., while in this country.

Khrushchev made this statement to Western diplomats at a Moscow reception on November 18, 1956:

"If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

So we invite our self-announced undertaker to call.

As an American, I strongly protest this mass murderer coming to the United States. I fail to see where he has made the slightest concession in the interests of justice and peace in the world to warrant a visit to this country.

Several years ago Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia, sought an invitation to the United States, but he was denied such a visit be-

cause the American people flooded the White House with letters of protest. The American people can do the same regarding Khrushchev. We can take him at his word, "if you don't like us don't accept our invitations, and don't invite us to come to see you," by writing to the President urging him to cancel the invitation.

I'm in agreement with Senator THOMAS DODD (Democrat, Connecticut) when he says: "It's a national disgrace."

Dr. Carl O. McIntire, who heads the International Council of Christian Churches, calls Khrushchev the chief spokesman of the devil who repudiates God. Dr. Clyde Kennedy, president of the American Council of Christian Churches branded the Red tyrant "the bloody butcher of Hungary."

Pope Pius XI and XII warned: "Communism is intrinsically evil and no one can cooperate with it in any manner whatsoever. The fight between the forces of God and anti-God must be fought to a finish."

These are wise words and worth heeding.

JAMES J. WALSH.

WILKES-BARRE.

Oakridge's One-Woman United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, communication may not lead to understanding but understanding cannot come without communication.

The peoples of this earth do not want war. They want peace.

These are propositions to which we all can subscribe. With them in mind we certainly commend my constituent, Mrs. W. H. (Hazel) Walwyn, of Oakridge, Oreg., who corresponds with 200 persons in 41 different countries all over the globe and has been doing this for more than 40 years.

Under a previous consent, I am now including an article from the Eugene Register-Guard for August 5, 1959, written by Ruby Lund, the Register-Guard correspondent at Oakridge, about this remarkable woman and her important hobby. What a different world this would be if we had a Hazel Walwyn in every community.

LETTERWRITER SEEKS GOOD WILL

(By Ruby Lund)

OAKRIDGE.—This upper Willamette Valley community has its own "United Nations" trying to create good will in many foreign lands.

It is a one-woman organization—Mrs. W. H. (Hazel) Walwyn.

She corresponds with more than 200 persons in 41 different countries all over the globe.

Mrs. Walwyn writes long letters to all these people, describing the American way of life. In return, she receives descriptions of the ways of life in the many foreign lands.

Her friends-by-mail include people from many different walks of life—a teacher in Australia, a businessman in Iraq, a professor on the Ascension Island. Among her many correspondents are native North and South Africans and the people on Ascension Island.

To many of these people, Mrs. Walwyn sends magazines depicting America. Many of her friends have hobbies to which she contributes, adding to their collections American examples of the items in which they are interested. Among the things she has sent to the foreign nations are view cards, snapshots, salt and pepper shakers, cups and saucers.

Her home, in turn, contains examples of arts and crafts from all over the world.

Mrs. Walwyn began her unique letterwriting some 40 years ago when she began to collect first issue stamp covers. Her hobby has grown so much since then that now she maintains businesslike records to keep it going.

She has rows of metal filing cabinets which contain all of her correspondence and a large looseleaf notebook which serves as an address record.

In these alphabetical files, she keeps a record showing the interests of each of her friends and data on their families.

Mrs. Walwyn says her hobby isn't an expensive one. All her letters are sent by surface mail. Often it takes them from 6 weeks to 3 months to reach their destination. The same time often elapses before she receives a reply.

The magazines she sends are those she buys anyway as well as some her friends give her to send to one of her correspondents. The gifts are small, inexpensive items representative of the country.

Kennedy and Anfuso Honored by Morgenstern Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY and I were honored today by the Morris Morgenstern Foundation of New York which presented to us, at a special ceremony in Senator KENNEDY's office, parchment replicas of the famous letter written by George Washington in 1790 to the Touro Synagogue in Newport, R.I. These awards were presented to us by Mr. Morris Morgenstern, the founder of the foundation bearing his name, for "their inspirational efforts in combatting bigotry."

Senator KENNEDY and I were privileged to be the first to receive this award, which will be presented annually by the foundation to national figures for their efforts in combating bigotry and persecution. The award has as its text President Washington's statement in his letter of 1790 in which he assured the Jewish congregation of Newport that the United States will give "to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance."

In the summer of the year 1790, after the troubled years of the American Revolution, the first President of the United States made a tour of the country. He came to the little seafaring town of Newport, R.I., in the part of the country colonized by the great champion of religious liberty, Roger Williams. The people of Newport turned out to greet President Washington.

Moses Seixas, sexton of the Hebrew congregation of Newport, who was a friend of Washington's, sent him a warm letter of welcome. Washington's reply to this letter of welcome, addressed to the Hebrew congregation of Newport, is today one of the Nation's most cherished historical documents. It is an eloquent expression of American freedom and religious harmony. In 1946 the Touro Synagogue in Newport, which is now about 200 years old, was dedicated as a national shrine.

The words "to bigotry no sanction" have played a vital role in the life of Morris Morgenstern, well-known millionaire financier, philanthropist, and realtor, who resides in Long Beach, N.Y.

Owner of the original letter by George Washington, in which this quote appears, Mr. Morgenstern is a firm believer that George Washington was the personification of the American ideal of freedom. As long as he can remember, he has been a crusader of the principles of tolerance expounded by our first President.

Through his efforts, the Washington letter has been seen by millions as part of the Freedom Train Exhibition and at universities in various parts of the country. It is now on display at the B'nai B'rith Building in Washington, D.C.

The 78-year-old president of Morris Morgenstern & Son is more anxious today to spread the word of George Washington than ever before.

Morris Morgenstern, as an individual, has probably financed more building than anyone else in the United States. But he is not happy being just a successful businessman. For years he has found time to help good causes and actively support various organizations, regardless of race or religion.

In 1949 he created the Morris Morgenstern Foundation, "to aid men and women of every creed, race, and ancestry to contribute their highest gifts to the development of our national culture."

Through his efforts, the Levittown Jewish Center was enabled to expand from its original facilities accommodating a handful of children to a synagogue of prime status in Long Island.

He was also drafted by the directors of the West Side Branch of the YMCA to be chairman of a committee to raise funds to provide decent recreational facities for the boys living in Hell's Kitchen.

Judge Albert Conway brought to Mr. Morgenstern's attention the fact that atlhough children of other faiths were provided with houses of worship at the Ten Mile River Boys Scout Camp, the Jewish boys were not so provided. Mr. Morgenstern made the necessary funds available for construction of what is now known as the Synagogue in the Pines.

The list of agencies which he helps is endless. They include the Brooklyn Hebrew Home and Hospital for the Aged; the Infants Home of Brooklyn; the Cathedral Club; Yeshiva University; Cardinal Spellman's Foundling Home, among others.

Born in Russia, Morris was brought to the United States at the age of 4. Because his family was poor, he had to give up school and start working. At 14, he borrowed some money and went into the business of manufacturing seltzer bot-

tles. Eventually he began dabbling in real estate and founded the finance firm he now heads.

Mr. Morgenstern — known affectionately as "M.M" by his friends—has been the personal guest of Vice President NIXON. Dr. Jonas Salk, the conqueror of polio, recently hailed Mr. Morgenstern for his humanitarian work. He has received citations from Presidents Roosevelt, Truman and most recently Eisenhower, for his invaluable efforts in behalf of the sick, poor, and needy of all races and creeds.

The text of the George Washington letter follows:

To the Hebrew Congregation in Newport, R.I.

GENTLEMEN: While I receive, with much satisfaction, your address replete with expressions of affection and esteem, I rejoice in the opportunity of assuring you, that I shall always retain a grateful remembrance of the cordial welcome I experienced in my visit to Newport, from all classes of citizens.

The reflection on the days of difficulty and danger which are past is rendered the more sweet, from a consciousness that they are succeeded by days of uncommon prosperity and security. If we have wisdom to make the best use of the advantages with which we are now favored, we cannot fail, under the just administration of a good Government, to become a great and a happy people.

The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given to mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy, a policy worthy of imitation. All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise, of their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

It would be inconsistent with the frankness of my character not to avow that I am pleased with your favorable opinion of my administration, and fervent wishes for my felicity. May the children of the stock of Abraham, who dwell in this land, continue to merit and enjoy the good will of the other inhabitants, while every one shall sit in safety under his own vine and figtree, and there shall be none to make him afraid. May the father of all mercies scatter light and not darkness in our paths, and make us all in our several vocations useful here, and in his own due time and way everlastingly happy.

G. WASHINGTON.

The Late Ken Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. MAHON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to the late Ken Regan, who served in the House from August 1947 to January 1955. I had not met Ken Regan until he came to Washington as the Representative of the great 16th Congressional District, which joins on the south and west the district which I have the honor to represent.

Ken Regan was a man of good will. As colleagues from west Texas we worked together on many problems for the public good. Ken was cooperative, understanding, and effective in his work.

Ken Regan had a big district. He had a big heart. He was big in his thinking. He loved his district and the people of his State and Nation. He served them well in Washington. I wish to join with others in paying tribute to a departed friend. I wish also to extend sympathy to his wife, Roberta Regan, who survives him, and who shared his interests during their years in Washington.

DAV Services in Oregon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Oregon citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Oregon, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Roberts S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is another judge, David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan; and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its National Service Headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The two DAV national service officers in Oregon are Mr. Gerald S. Kelsey and Mr. James W. Hudson, located at the VA Regional Office, 208 South West Fifth Avenue, Portland, Oreg. The department commander is Mr. Dan Cole, 2520 J Street, Springfield, Oreg., and the department adjutant is Mr. T. F. Van Laningham, 429 South West Fourth Avenue, Portland, Oreg.

The three VA hospitals in Oregon are a 1,000-bed DOM hospital at Camp White, a 567-bed GM hospital at Portland, and a 670-bed NP hospital at Roseburg. VAVS representatives: Camp White, Patrick Graham; Roseburg, Charles T. McCoy; Portland, George Youmans.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $52,414,000 for its veteran program in Oregon, including $13,730,806 disability compensation to its 17,408 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Oregon furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Only about 11 percent—1,859—are members of the 27 DAV chapters in Oregon.

This 11 percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Oregon veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimate)	31,357
Claims folders reviewed	26,131
Appearances before rating boards	12,892
Compensation increases obtained	2,634
Service connections obtained	792
Nonservice pensions	828
Death benefits obtained	430
Total monetary benefits obtained	$933,996.15

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Oregon veterans, their dependents and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their de-

pendents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefit, and multifarious other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans, not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, too many times impossible. A claims and rating record board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About eight-tenths of 1 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Oregon, with a consequent loss of about $224,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Oregon to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag department, 3,538 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Oregon residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becaming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans, by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Oregon by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice, the DAV.

Prelude to Annual Report by Congresswoman Edna F. Kelly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, every year it has been my practice to submit a report to my constituents in the 10th Congressional District in New York on important legislation enacted during the session of Congress. In my report, which of necessity is brief, I try to be factual on key legislation enacted. The report this year will only cover the first session of the 86th Congress and should be sent out shortly after the adjournment of Congress. It is, of course, impossible to predict with accuracy when Congress will adjourn and, more important, what specific legislative measures

will be enacted into law. At this point I have, therefore, decided in a preliminary statement to describe to the people of my district the difficult and complicated atmosphere hovering over this session. This, then, is the prelude to my report.

The first session of the 86th Congress convened and will adjourn with war clouds engulfing the entire world. The density of the clouds fluctuated with the actions of the leaders of the Kremlin. As heavy and ominous as the clouds were with the appearance of the sputnik and lunik, they increased with the overt, aggressive actions of the "comrades" in the Middle East, the Far East, Tibet, Latin America, Central America, including Cuba, in Europe again with the Berlin impasse and once more in southeastern Asia, Laos.

A diminishing of the war clouds followed appeasement of the comrades in the Ministers' meeting, a pending but never accomplished summit meeting, and finally plans for an exchange of heads of state.

Thus, it can be said with no exaggeration that Congress met and will adjourn in one of the most trying times in the history of the United States.

The international outlook for the Democratic-controlled Congress was not made felicitous by the Republican-controlled executive branch of the Government. Congress convened labeled by President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the Republican Party, as being controlled by "political radicals, spendthrifts, and gloom-dogglers."

Bear in mind that when Congress convened, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, promised "a sensible posture of defense against the growing might of the Soviet Union," and in the next breath he warned we must "guard against feverish building up of vast armaments." The observing public saw Congress placed publicly between the horns of the dilemma.

Congress was faced with the problem of meeting the Soviet menace, of placating the administration in its request for the highest budget in "peacetime," of grappling with a $9 billion interest on the national debt, of increasing the limit on the national debt, and of passing a Mutual Security Act. Domestic issues became secondary and/or dependent upon the cost of meeting the Soviet menace, balancing the budget and controlling inflation.

The entire policy of the Republican administration was in a state of fluctuation. A cooperative state of mind and action on the part of Democratic legislators was tried to the point of frustration. President Eisenhower requested legislation and then vetoed bills because they were too much or too little. Most of the bills passed to date have been cut below the President's recommendations.

A most astounding turnabout has been the long negotiations for exchange visits of Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. The same man who recently lamented the apathy of Americans in the face of the Soviet menace has invited the head of the Soviet regime to be a guest of the United States. This appears to many to be a colossal swallowing of principle, a betrayal of our civilization, a quashing of the loyalty we owe to American youths who perished at the hands of Soviet treachery, and a gross insult to the millions of once free men enslaved by that dictatorship.

Adherence to the absolute moral principles upon which our country was founded should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to the dedicated enemy of free men and free institutions.

This action, preceded by the humiliation inflicted upon the Western representatives at Geneva, makes it more difficult to understand. President Eisenhower predicated a summit meeting on progress made at Geneva. What progress? The West did not bring up the question of the captive nations. East German observers were given equal status with the observers of West Germany which conferred de facto recognition of East Germany. What happened to the demand that the Berlin and Germany problems be considered as one? The West capitulated and conceded them as separate issues. What happened to the challenge of the blockade of Berlin? This has been shelved. The United States now speaks of "rights of access" after proving that the West had rights of occupation since 1945. Now we are practically conceding that the Soviet has rights to terminate this agreement.

The intended visit of the Soviet Premier is repugnant to me because no credence can be placed upon the word of a Mikoyan, a Kozlov, or a Khrushchev. The gain, if any, does not outweigh the loss of trust by our allies, the creation of more apathy and misinterpretation by Americans, causing a quasi-insecurity among free people everywhere, and the propaganda use this visit will be made of in Moscow and other capitals inimical to the U.S.S.R. All of this created confusion in Congress on legislation without positive leadership from the executive branch.

The reversal of policy and the confused and confusing pattern of weak executive leadership has, in effect, pulled the rug from under the Congress. Despite this background, I predict that the record of the 86th Congress, 1st session, will make history on the positive side of the ledger, thanks to a strong and dynamic democratic leadership.

Dr. Condon's Review of "The Great Decision"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a book review in Science for July 3, 1959, by Prof. E. U. Condon, department of physics, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo. He reviews "The Great Decision," which is subtitled "The Secret History of the Atomic Bomb," and which was written by Michael Amrine. It was published by Putnam's, New York, 1959:

This is a valuable and interestingly written contribution to a particular chapter of the history of atomic energy for military purposes. It begins with the afternoon of April 12, 1945, when Vice President Harry Truman was informed by Eleanor Roosevelt of the death of the President.

That evening Harry Truman was sworn in as President of the United States. Later there was a brief Cabinet meeting, and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson lingered for a private word with the President. That was Truman's first official knowledge of the atomic bomb project, which at that moment had about 100,000 persons working in secret laboratories and factories. The great bulk of these persons were unaware of the overall objective of the factories in which they worked.

This was just 116 days before the whole character of war was changed by Americans when they dropped one atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan. This was followed 3 days later, August 9, 1945, by the dropping of another bomb on Nagasaki, Japan. During the afternoon of August 14, the Emperor of Japan announced his acceptance of the terms for ending the war contained in the Potsdam Declaration, and World War II was at an end.

Michael Amrine has given a brilliant synthesis of the peculiar circumstances of those less than 4 momentous months in history. He has searched carefully and told the story as well as anyone could in view of the fact that not all of the essential information has been made public. He is aware of the incompleteness of his narrative, for he says in the concluding chapter: "We look back, with troubling questions, at these events, which helped so much to set new limits and choices for man. Were the atomic bombings necessary for an early end to the Pacific war? Were the atomic bombs used in haste, without proper thought of the consequences?

"This book was written to help people answer these questions for themselves. There is also a hope that if the available record is set down, as far as it can be, other people who have not yet spoken may tell the full story of their participation. There are official records that should be opened now. Some contain no official secrets. Others contain technical secrets now outmoded. It is time for these records to be opened, but, so far, the doors have remained shut to journalists, historians, and sometimes to former officials, even to famous American officials who lived through these events. A nation, like a man, cannot fully understand its future if it does not understand some of the secrets of the past."

As we begin to appreciate the vastness of the consequences of atomic energy with its millionfold multiplication of war's horrors which now threaten humanity, one of the most important tasks of scholarship becomes the writing of a really definitive history of atomic energy. This is not a project to be undertaken by one or two men; it calls for the coordinated efforts of a major group of physical scientists, social scientists, and historians. These scholars should subject the stories of the various groups to searching critical analysis so that men may know what a great change atomic energy has worked in every facet of their lives.

My part of the project was finished by February 1945 and, in any case, since I was

never associated with it at a level that could influence policy, I have little first-hand knowledge of the story that Amrine gives us. But what I do know confirms the essential accuracy of the story as he tells it. It may be useful to point up some comments on the parts of the story which seem most significant.

A complete history would tell how the project was born in complete and equal cooperation between the United States and Great Britain. We did very little on the project between 1939 and the fall of 1941 while the British accomplished a great deal in spite of the distractions caused by the disaster at Dunkirk and the German's mass-bombing of English cities.

Our scientists were indecisive and ineffectual in this early period. It was mainly the push afforded by the British scientists which led to the organization of a major project in the late fall of 1941. At that time it was agreed that the British would shift their work to this country and that we and they would work together on the project as equal partners.

In 1942 Gen. Leslie Groves was put in charge of the project. The full story has not yet been told of how he worked to hobble and frustrate this cooperation. Amrine mentions it briefly. He tells how, by February 1943, Sir Winston Churchill's irritation reached such a point that he cabled Harry Hopkins the following message: "I should be very grateful for some news about this, as at present the American War Department is asking us to keep them informed of our experiments while refusing altogether any information about theirs."

By August 1943 this had become a major issue and was discussed at the Quebec Conference between Churchill and Roosevelt. After this it was no longer possible for Groves to frustrate cooperation with the British. It was not until that time—but it happened with great speed immediately thereafter—that a large, able group of the best British scientists came to the United States to help in every phase of the project at the many different laboratories and factories.

It was about this time that Churchill, feeling that the Americans under General Groves, were intent on squeezing out the British, made the somber decision to go it alone by setting up an independent effort at Chalk River, Canada. This conduct on our part which, in my judgment, was clearly aimed at hampering Britain's development of atomic energy for industrial purposes after the war, put a severe strain on Anglo-American cooperation.

Another topic that needs fuller exploration, as Amrine indicates, is the kind of specific detail about the bomb that was available to our policymakers at the time policy decisions on how to use the bomb were being made. Amrine tells us (p. 132) that General Groves, in a memorandum to Gen. George Marshall dated December 30, 1944, vastly underestimated the power of the bomb. He estimated the power of the bomb at only 500 tons of TNT, whereas it was actually 20,000 tons when used on Hiroshima. As Amrine says, our military planners "were only given reason to think it was a spectacular improvement in bombs, not another kind of warfare."

Now I know that General Groves did not know enough physics to make his own estimate, and I do not believe that anyone at Los Alamos would have made such a low estimate. How, then, could Groves have erred by a factor of 40? Could it have been intentional, so that the top policy planners would not be aware of the horribly serious nature of the decision they were taking?

It would have been quite easy to mislead the White House, especially since Admiral Leahy, the staff military adviser, who had had a long experience with explosives, long thought the project a gigantic boondoggle because "this bomb did not fit anything he knew about explosives" (p. 134).

Moreover, it would be natural for Leahy to discount the bomb because the thing, if a reality, horrified him. To use it, he believed, was to adopt "an ethical standard common to the barbarians of the Dark Ages. * * * I was not taught to make war in that fashion. * * * These new and terrible instruments of uncivilized warfare represent a modern type of barbarism not worthy of Christian men" (p. 170).

I believe that an erroneous view of the magnitude of their responsibility was planted in the minds of the Nation's leaders by the December 30, 1944, memo of General Groves, and that this erroneous view was not changed by the later brief coded messages. Truman learned of the Alamogordo test on July 17 by this message which was sent to him at the Potsdam Conference, "Babies satisfactorily born." This was certainly designed to minimize the seriousness of a new development of which the President had first become aware in sketchy outline just 3 busy months earlier.

At Potsdam it was decided that Truman should inform Stalin of the new weapon. We do not know exactly what he said when he did this. Truman has written (p. 187), "On July 24 I casually mentioned to Stalin that we had a new weapon of unusual destructive force. The Russian Premier showed no special interest."

But apparently, Truman had not used the key words "nuclear" or "atomic" and, perhaps because of the December 30, 1944, memo, may not have himself at that time fully realized the magnitude of the revolution in warfare that had occurred.

Amrine's account of this affair (p. 190) is fascinating: "No one at Potsdam had time to think much about the lack of reaction from Stalin to the news. Perhaps they thought that (like Admiral Leahy) Stalin found it hard to believe in these superweapons." But had he really been told of a superweapon? "Perhaps, like James Byrnes, he found it hard to understand scientific matters."

The book tells in detail of the sustained efforts of the scientists on the project to get our Government to give some kind of demonstration or warning to the Japanese before actually using the atomic bomb against them. It has often been said that the Potsdam Declaration met this minimal moral demand. But one may very well ask whether it really did so, when this is all that it said that might be so construed (p. 191): "We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction."

The last chapter, "Conscience and Questions," is a searching analysis of the troublesome questions that still perturb the thoughtful, about whether or not the bomb should have been used.

Because the entire attack on Hiroshima involved only three planes, the air-raid alarm was not sounded and people did not take shelter. Amrine writers: "That accidental happening cost the lives of tens of thousands of women and children who were not military targets and whom we had no intention of killing" (p. 229).

Amrine says that his "personal observation is that many Asians and Americans thought differently about Western man's supposed respect for human life. These bombs did not improve our reputation and win us allies in Asia" (p. 233).

It is a sad story, one that many would like to forget or, if possible, never to learn. But it only involved two bombs of the type, now called conventional, which we stockpile by the hundreds or thousands and recklessly issue to our ally, West Germany, where ex-Nazis get greater political power day by day. In the meantime hydrogen bombs, which are a thousand times more powerful than the obsolescent toys of World War II, are in the hands of Americans, British, and Russians, and the means to deliver them halfway around the world are being perfected by both sides.

Thus there is probably no exaggeration in the assertion by Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, in his May newsletter to his constituents when he says: "Two very prominent authorities, one on disarmament and the other on science, stated in my presence the other day their belief that we would all be dead in 10 years and that the earth would be an incinerated relic."

There is no doubt whatever that the technical means of achieving such a goal do exist at the present. Amrine's story of a few months in 1945 gives one a foretaste of how this larger catastrophe may come about, and not as a result of a free choice by the peoples of the world.

Address by Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday evening, August 15, 1959, I had the privilege of attending the reunion banquet of the 4th (Ivy) Infantry Division Association in the Benjamin Franklin Hotel, Philadelphia.

The guest speaker on this pleasant occasion was Maj. Gen. Rinaldo Van Brunt, deputy commander, Second U.S. Army. Because General Van Brunt's address was so timely and so well received, I am including it in the RECORD so that Members of Congress and other interested persons may have an opportunity to read it:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY MAJOR GENERAL VAN BRUNT AT THE FOURTH DIVISION REUNION, AUGUST 15, 1959, AT THE BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOTEL, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

It is a real pleasure for me to have the opportunity to address this 41st annual reunion of the 4th Infantry Division Association. I am particularly pleased to share this occasion with you because I am proud of the Ivy Division, which I had the privilege to command a few short years ago. I know, too, that you are proud of the division because you have come to Philadelphia from all parts of the country for this annual get-together.

To me, the spirit of this gathering represents the spirit that has been a stimulating influence in the division from the time it was first organized in 1917 at Camp Greene in North Carolina. Your division, and mine, has performed meritorious service in combat for our country in World War I and World War II, and it has a fine record as a fighting outfit. For the past 12 years, it has been performing an equally important service to the Nation, and it continues to perform that service today as an element of the Strategic Army Corps.

As an example, I would like to tell you a little of the division's accomplishments during 1955 and 1956. Division headquarters was located in Frankfurt and the regiments were spread out through Butzbach, Friedburg, and

Geinhausen. The engineer battalion was in Hanau, the tank battalion in Friedburg, and the artillery throughout the division sector. We had the job of manning an important sector of the 7th Army zone opposite the Fulda Gap, a critical avenue of approach from the east.

During this period our units distinguished themselves above all others in Germany through their esprit de corps which enabled them to succeed in every mission given them. The spirit of pride carried over into many fields.

Our division virtually walked away with top honors in every USAREUR sponsored athletic tournament. Our marksmanship teams led the list consistently and, gentlemen, this can only be attributed to an esprit which marks a division as a winner in peacetime or in war.

In the field of community relations, the regiments and battalions contributed much to the furthering of German-American friendship and cooperation which is so vitally important today in NATO. Each year at Christmas time, our units organized parties for orphanages where many hundreds of dollars were collected to buy German children gifts and food which otherwise could not have been provided to make the holiday memorable.

In times of civil disturbance such as is caused by fire or flood, the 4th Division was always prepared to aid a stricken community with engineer or medical assistance, and when it gyroscoped in 1956, the entire city of Frankfurt turned out to honor the Ivy Division. The mayor and his staff gave a reception and each unit was represented in a parade through the center of town.

You men who have experienced combat, and you men who are serving with the 4th Infantry Division, do not have to be told why the United States finds it necessary to maintain STRAC and the other Army Forces we have today. You know that the expansion of international communism is the principal threat to the peace of the world and to the national security of the United States. It is a threat that makes use of military strength to promote its political objectives, and it extends its influence over a large part of the globe.

We know that the Communist bloc, led by the Soviet Union, is willing to expend unlimited effort in men, money, and materials to maintain armed forces to support its objectives. These are the formidable forces that exist in the Soviet Union, in Red China, in North Korea and in some of the Communist satellite states. No less an authority than Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, who retired as Army Chief of Staff just 6 weeks ago, has given us an idea of the development of the Communist military forces. In his final report, he pointed out that the Soviet Union has concentrated on improving its armed forces in the last few years. It has spent large sums of money to reequip its army with all types of modern weapons for ground combat. These weapons include a wide variety of atomic missile delivery systems and large tactical air armies. In addition, the Soviet Union has developed a substantial submarine fleet, and it has established a long-range bomber force that could possibly try an attack on the United States.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has made major developments in intercontinental missiles, and it has acquired a significant stockpile of nuclear weapons. With this development, the Soviet Union has acquired a roughly equal atomic parity with the free world that could only result in destruction of both sides in case a general atomic war should break out. At the same time, the Communist bloc continues to follow its technique of military and political aggression to achieve limited objectives. All this adds up to a dynamic military threat that requires the free world to maintain armed forces as a deterrent to war.

The national policy for the deterrence of war has been fundamental in shaping the philosophy and actions of the Army. It is the Army's philosophy that our national deterrent forces operate at two integrated and concurrent levels of effort. One level of effort is directed at the deterrence of general atomic war. The other is intended to cope with the piecemeal type of aggression that could seriously affect our national position if it could not be successfully curtailed.

Those elements of the integrated deterrent to general war must have a range of capability that can make appropriate response to the nature of the threat. They must be so organized, equipped, trained, and deployed so that they can stand up under the first strike of an enemy and then strike back on centers of enemy power with a level of damage unacceptable to him. Of course, such a situation is not likely to occur except through miscalculation or blunder.

Those forces especially suited to deter limited war must be capable of rapid employment within a wide range of military operations. Such operations could vary in degree from small patrol actions to major combat operations of considerable duration and scope. These forces must have the ability for effective combat against limited war action before it can spread into a general atomic war. If deterrence should fail, despite all efforts, these forces must also be capable of reinforcing general war operations.

All the armed services have their respective roles and missions in this deterrent force. We have a powerful force which uses the strategic means of the Air Force and the Navy as visible evidence of our capability to destroy any aggressor who would start a general war. In turn, this striking force has a defensive counterpart in the air defense of the continental United States. Making up this defensive force are the interceptor aircraft of the Air Force and the Army's surface-to-air missile units with supplemental assistance from the Navy and our Canadian allies.

The third essential category of our deterrent forces is the land power we have deployed overseas. The Army is the principal element of this land power, which serves as a shield against Communist expansion on the ground. You all know that any enemy who wants to take control over free peoples will use his ground forces to move in and dominate the people. If we are to defend the free peoples, we, too, must have ground forces which can meet the aggressor's ground forces and defeat them. Their physical presence on the ground is much more effective than the threat of mass destruction weapons that may never be used.

In order to meet its responsibility in this area, the Army keeps forces deployed in strategic areas overseas. These forces serve a double purpose. They show our friends in the collective security system that we stand ready to assist them in defense against an aggressor. At the same time, our Army deployments overseas are a clear sign to any prospective enemies that we will hold firm against attack and that we will fight to keep the aggressor from seizing the land and the people we are obligated to defend.

At this point, I want to mention the splendid work being done by the Army for collective security aside from the Army's operational forces overseas. This is the work being done by our Army advisory groups and military missions in the 42 countries throughout the world. They are performing a vital service by helping our allies to develop their own military resources to the fullest extent. These Army groups and missions not only help the allied armies to expand their effectiveness, but they also make a contribution to a basic element of government stability in allied countries. Stable governments which have capable and well-equipped armies are not open to successful attack by such Communist techniques as subversion, infiltration, or revolution.

Our oversea forces must have strategic mobile reserves to back them up if they should be attacked or to move quickly to other areas of the world that may be threatened by Communist aggression. The Army element of these reserves is the Strategic Army Force in the United States. It consists of units which provide a base for expansion in case of mobilization and which also supply trained unit and group replacements to support the Army forces we have deployed overseas. The combat-ready striking force of this strategic mobile reserve is the Strategic Army Corps, which consists of the 4th Infantry Division and two other divisions together with some combat and administrative support units.

Backing up these forces are the civilian components which the Army trains as a source from which it can draw qualified units and individuals to meet general war requirements or to replace STRAC units that might be called overseas in an emergency. These requirements are met by the Army National Guard and the United States Army Reserve. The primary emphasis throughout the Reserve Program is to attain increasing standards of quality. Considerable progress has been made in this area during the past two years. A major step in this progress is the reorganization of the reserve components to the pentomic concept, which was started early this year. This reorganization gives the reserves the same divisional structure as the active Army, and it seeks to modernize nondivisional reserve units to meet possible mobilization requirements.

Finally, in the fifth category of our deterrent strength are the air and naval forces which must have the capability to keep the air and sea lanes open for deployment and support of the other categories of forces in the event of war.

What I have told you shows that modern military operations are not restricted to any particular element. Instead, our deterrent military operations are an integrated team effort which employs the special capabilities of each of the services. As a member of this team, the Army has the overall mission of providing forces for prompt, sustained combat on land in any type of war. It also has the mission to furnish surface-to-air missile defense of the United States and our forces overseas.

In order to perform its share of the military mission with proper effectiveness, the Army must be as modern in its functional area as the other services. It must have maximum effectiveness in the essential areas of firepower, mobility and communications. If it is to be fully effective in these functions, the Army must first of all have modern weapons and equipment.

The Army's firepower must be versatile and it must have the range of capabilities to deal with those of the enemy which may be directed against it. Army weapons are intended to be used selectively and with discrimination against all types of targets. Weapons ranging from small arms to tactical missiles have been developed which would provide the Army with the ability to meet any degree of force desired or necessary to meet various conditions. However, some have not yet been put in the hands of troops while others are being produced slowly because of funding problems.

The second essential characteristic of a modern Army is mobility, which derives from modern weapons and equipment. Mobility is necessary, both for the protection of our own installations, and for getting the best results from our firepower potential. This mobility is present in our Army weapons, which have the built-in ability to oper-

ate in the field without elaborate installations or launching sites. They are precision weapons which can employ firepower exactly appropriate to the need, and their mobility enables one unit to do the job of several units.

The modern Army's mobility has strategic and tactical aspects. In the area of tactical mobility, it has various types of aircraft which make up Army aviation. These are an important new development in ground force operations. In the past, land forces were limited in their freedom of action by the barriers of the terrain. Now, with the considerable development in Army aircraft, we can look forward to the time when mountains and rivers and terrain features will no longer be obstacles to the Army in the performance of its ground combat mission.

With modern firepower and mobility, we must also have modern communications. The increased ranges and effectiveness of firepower, combined with increased mobility, would involve wide tactical dispersion on any modern battlefield. Consequently, the great dispersion of tactical forces increases the requirement for efficient, reliable and extensive communications. The increased range capabilities of our weapons require that our communications be equal to the job of locating targets at the greater distances our weapons can reach.

In line with firepower, mobility and communications, the modern Army must have adequate logistical support. This is a problem which must be met under modern conditions of extensive tactical dispersion and the complexity of modern weapons. If the Army is to be fully modern and effective, it must meet the specialized requirements of materiel and personnel, and it must overcome the increased danger to logistic operations that can be expected from nuclear weapons.

I have covered the more important requirements of the modern Army, but there is also the most important requirement of personnel. We have all sorts of modern weapons from missiles and rockets to airborne guns and tanks, but they cannot be any more effective than the men who operate them. Man still is the indispensable element who must use these modern weapons and operate this equipment. It is man who must meet the enemy on the ground, defeat or destroy him and occupy his territory before the victory can be a reality.

We all know from history that there have been times when groups of determined, dedicated and well-trained forces have won victories over much larger and much better equipped armies. In the present time, man is just as important in warfare despite all the advances of the nuclear and space age. In fact, he is more important than he ever was before in the history of war because he must be more equal to the challenge of the weapons and equipment he is given to use.

Problems of training Army manpower have increased tremendously as weapons have become more complex and as nuclear-age warfare has revised tactical concepts. A major problem is to find and keep the manpower which has the skills and aptitudes to handle the weapons of the modern army. There is a great need for the development of small unit leaders who are needed to commend the type of units of modern warfare. The Army has made considerable progress in attracting, training and retaining the people on whom it must depend to discharge its responsibilities for national security. While the progress in this area has been gratifying, there must be continuing successful efforts to build and maintain a professional force, which is essential to a modern army.

While I stress the need for a highly trained professional force, I do not mean to overlook the need for Reserve component units to be so equipped, trained and organized that they can take their places side by side with Active Army units after only a minimum of additional training. I can say that our Reserve components, both the National Guard and the Army Reserve, are doing very well and that they have achieved the highest state of readiness they have ever had in our peacetime history. In this respect, the Reserves fulfill their mission in the modern concept of one army which is united in its effort to serve the Nation to the utmost.

In summary, I want to emphasize that land power is an indispensable element of our national military strength and that it is increasing in importance despite nuclear-age weapons development. I also want to repeat that, if the Army is to be fully effective in modern warfare, it must be fully modern in its weapons, its equipment, its organization, its doctrine and its outlook.

The Army depends on the efforts of our civilian leaders and our patriotic organizations throughout the country to support its objectives. Many of our civilian leaders and organizations are doing an excellent job in this regard. One of these organizations is the Association of the United States Army which speaks with a single, strong voice on behalf of the Army and its proper role in our national defense. Every citizen owes it to himself to promote the interests of the Army, and I can think of no better way in which he can do so than to add his voice to the thousands of other friends of the Army who have joined forces in the AUSA. Coming together here is strong evidence of your continuing interest in the Army and representing as you do, the entire country, it is appropriate that I urge you, upon return to your homes, to give the Army your support through active participation and membership in the AUSA.

The Army has achieved significant success in meeting its requirements as a modern Army. It is modern in its outlook and in its thinking. It is modern in its doctrine, in its tactics, and in its organization. It is forward-looking and diligent in preparing itself for whatever it may be called upon to do for the country. The Army faces the future fully determined to perform its service to the Nation with the competence and energy that its essential role in the national defense team demands from it.

World Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to note the meeting of the second World Congress of the Sodalities of Our Lady which was recently held in the Archdiocese of Newark. It was a significant and historic event—for here many thousands gathered to reaffirm their faith and dedication to the highest principles of Christianity.

Delegates to the World Congress have come from all over the world, and many of them have fled from countries behind the Iron Curtain. Their meeting serves as a poignant reminder that all the peoples of the Christian world must constantly be alerted and aware of the Communist danger. We must not permit ourselves to be deluded by Mr. Khrushchev's Communist sophistry. It is a tribute to the great ability and leadership of the Episcopal host of the congress, Archbishop Thomas A. Boland, that it was marked with such acclaim and success.

I am privileged, Mr. Speaker, to insert the following editorial from the Newark Evening News in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WORLD CONGRESS

Catholic delegates from 24 countries, some of them exiles from behind the Iron Curtain, are gathered in the archdiocese of Newark for the second World Congress of the Sodalities of Our Lady, with Archbishop Thomas A. Boland as Episcopal host.

Theirs is a movement designed, in the words of Pope John XXIII, to hasten the inevitable victories of the King of Peace, victories which are to be achieved by striving together to excel in virtue.

The chosen means are the invocation of faith, hope, and charity, the giving of thanks for benefits received, the offering to God of the labors of the day, and the seeking of forgiveness for transgressions.

The universality of the movement is reflected in the faces and voices of the delegates. The Pope's message had to be recorded in five languages. In a world where strength is falsely measured by arms and material possessions, the congress speaks for the greater power of the spirit, that force with which even the most potent of dictatorships must ultimately reckon.

Poison in Your Water—No. 159

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Little Rock (Ark.) Democrat of March 21, 1959, entitled "Biggest, Worst Drainage Channel":

BIGGEST, WORST DRAINAGE CHANNEL

Dumping of raw sewage into the Arkansas River doesn't cause serious problems now, said G. T. Kellogg, chief sanitary engineer of the State health department, but he warned that sewage treatment will be necessary when the river is converted into a commercial waterway.

Then, from Catoosa near Tulsa, down to the Mississippi, the Arkansas will be a chain of lakes. Raw sewage discharged into the pools between locks and dams would create sanitation hazards.

With regard to waste disposal, the river now is the biggest and worst drainage channel in Arkansas. On the river in our State, only Mulberry, Russellville, Morrilton, and Conway already have sewage treatment plants, and Little Rock is building one.

It is incongruous that the papermills at Pine Bluff treat their waste before discharging it into the river, yet the city which has made great industrial gains and hopes for more, has not got around to treating its sewage.

Desiltation units of the U.S. Corps of Engineers projects for the comprehensive development of the river will clear up the stream. Clean looking water will make the stream more desirable for recreation.

High salt content keeps Arkansas River water from being suitable for irrigation and industrial purposes. However, the U.S. Pub-

lic Health Service regional office at Dallas is working on that problem, along with a similar one in the Red River basin, and the day may come when waters of these two streams can be made great assets to agriculture and industry.

A Memo on Mismanagement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a reprint from the August 1959 issue of Armed Forces Management entitled "A Memo on Mismanagement," written by Leland B. Kuhre, director:

A MEMO ON MISMANAGEMENT

To: Armed Forces Management.
From: Leland B. Kuhre, director, Academy of Organizational Science.

Your May 1959 issue reads to me like the bewildered confessional of an old craft admitting its shortcomings under the pressure of advancing new systems all around it. The articles on the mismanagement of time in the Army, the Navy's big reorganization debate, and the random flow of information in a naval ordnance test station—all tell the same story.

The ominous part is that such confessions continue to appear, unabashed, as they have appeared since the military was overtaken by the swift onrush of science, technology, and specialization after World War I. And the insidious thing is the fault-free attitude with which the confessions are made; they appear to have no chargeable responsibility because they are tacitly agreed to be "the nature of the beast."

Starting about the mid-19th century, craft has been steadily overtaken by system in all dynamic structures for using material energy. But, in collective human energy, the military is still using accumulated lore and the master-apprentice method of learning where the head of any collective is, ex officio, an acknowledged master craftsman. He often calls his maxims and proverbs principles even though each has its opposite; he calls his management scientific when the term is really limited to material-system accessories; and he calls his collectives organizations even though they do not contain the organic system which is implicit in the word.

The craft method for devising internal arrangements in a human effort collective has its earliest recorded model in Plato's 400 B.C. model, "one man writ large;" and this is still the craft model today in different words, such as, "it's all a matter of leadership" and "there are no bad companies, only bad company commanders."

Leadership has always been the military starting point for internal arrangement in a collective of people. Leadership is a personal, and therefore, an unknowable and unpredictable thing. Its metaphorical referent acts are four: the whip, the carrot on a stick, personal magnetism, and the palliative. Leadership builds a network of personal tensions that is the so-called structure of the collective.

The network's stability is of the moment, and it has existence only in the minds of the people caught in it. As new functions evolve, they attach themselves at points in the network by evolution, by force of circumstance, or by personal attraction. The so-called organization chart is formed with the rudimentary graphics of the craftsman, and it is limited to formalizing the authority of people over people. The chart cannot possibly, in its present stage, show how a network of personal tensions is supposed to work.

To try to systematize and control the flow of ideas in a network of personal tensions, and thereby really do something about the Army's self-confessed mismanagement of ideas—to do this has less chance of success than trying to systematize the flow of invisible electrons for a purpose in a spider's web.

Before internal-arrangement craftsmanship in collective human effort can become organizational engineering, and thus advance the military from dealing with the nature of the beast to dealing with system, we need a more solid starting point than leadership. We have to change the assumed relation of the force of personality to the force of impersonal ideas. We have to recognize the flow of ideas as the flow of energy which develops organizational power. Then, from a governing law of idea flow, the organizational engineer can design a stable dynamic structure as a purposive systematic whole; and ideas can be formed, dispatched, and transmitted to the point of application for developing needed organizational power.

In such a dynamic system, personality and personal relations become subordinate to impersonal ideas and are adjusted to them. The source of power in the system is, of course, the fully contributing, free mind of each and every individual—executive and administrative, managerial and supervisory, generalist and specialist, professional and scientific, clerical and artisan.

Shall we change a 4,000 years-of-record unbroken tradition of leadership as the thing about which the military revolves, and from which it is supposed to draw its power? Yes, a fundamental change, when man is capable of handling it, is a prerequisite for vitalizing a tired past into a fresh future; and we need, obviously, a burgeoning future progress to overtake the 50-year head start that technology already has over craftsmanship.

Let's answer that question with questions: Can we afford to continue with craftsmanship when the best it has done to date is to bring us to an almost 2-to-1 disadvantage with Russia in the time it takes for an idea to grow to actuality in research and development? If that isn't enough reason, can we afford the man-hours and the money it takes to indulge in the periodic and sweeping reorganizations that take place every 2 or 3 years in the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? And if that still isn't enough, think of the loss due to the inefficient use of manpower, money and material that must go on for a long time before a situation gets so bad that only a drastic, sweeping, and expensive reorganization can palliate it, and then only for a few years.

The choice is clear: Continue with leadership and we continue with craftlore, craftsmanship, master-apprentice-learning, and the kind of structures we get when a craftsman is trying to build something he can't visualize. On the other hand, start with ideas as governing and we can have systematized knowledge, organizational engineering, applied-theory learning, and the kind of structures we get when the engineer designs the skyscraper that the master craftsman could not even visualize, much less build.

Inconceivable? No, I speak from experience. While in the Army I tried the change from leadership to idea flow as governing, and, with the help and participation of thousands of people, worked out the organizational engineering in the proving ground of actual organizations. For 13 years, the predicted results came true, time after time. It can be done.

Cardinal Cushing Alerts Yankee Division to Reds' Cold War Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Cardinal Cushing's stirring address given at Camp Drum, N.Y., on August 16, 1959:

CARDINAL ALERTS YANKEE DIVISION TO REDS' COLD WAR TACTICS

During the past 75 years, warfare as we know it, has been revolutionized three separate times: First, by the machinegun, the trench, and the long-range artillery of World War I; second, by the 1,000-plane raid, the amphibious assault, and the armored spearhead of World War II; third, by the missiles, electronics, and nuclear weapons of today.

We are now embroiled in a third world war—although by past standards it is an unconventional, highly irregular, and undeclared type of war. It is called the cold war. In this unorthodox war, Reserve officers are on the forward edge of the battle area, while Regular officers, in a sense, are on the flanks.

SIX MEN

Because of six men, those trained in psychological warfare, or in any of the tactics of a cold war are on the frontline of defense; while many officers on full-time active duty are barred from some of the most violently contested sectors of the protracted conflict.

Thus the order of battle has been reversed. Who did it? Six men, none of them Americans.

Two Germans—Hitler and von Clausewitz; three Russians—Lenin, Stalin, and Khrushchev; and one Chinese—Mao Tse-tung.

Those six men have so revised the rules of warfare that a cold war can bring about victory whereas a war of bullets and bombs, thanks to scientific progress, could wipe out all the contestants.

Today, in the cold war that is worldwide in extent the masters of ideology, psychology, and every type of deceit are the shock troops in the only battles that may be fought in our lifetime. In the arena of economics, public opinion and the underground wars are now fought and won. If these wars are lost by citizen-soldiers, any shooting war will certainly be defaulted in advance to the enemy.

In the cold war the Communist leaders have forced us to believe that the traditional battlefield is only a small part of modern warfare. To them conflict between nations is not limited to an artillery duel, or a clash between naval vessels and aircraft. The struggle for power is waged in politics with propaganda, fifth column, intelligence agents, intrigue, spies and ideological stockpiles.

SPECIALISTS

From this arsenal the battle is three-quarters over when the guns begin to fire. The truly modern military genius must labor to break his opponent's will to resist, or fight, in advance of any formal declaration of war. Communists try to frighten freemen into inaction and divide all sectors of society into hostile, suspicious groups who cannot stand together.

The masters of the Khrushchev style of warfare cloak their own preparations for conquest in peace offensives or tempting offers to expand trade. They practice subversion and economic infiltration so subtly that honorable men have difficulty in recognizing these threats as aggression.

For the Communists, the front is everywhere; anything goes; whatever advances their cause is legitimate—whatever obstructs it is false. That's the thinking behind the visit of Khrushchev to the United States. He has desired to come here for a long time to further the cause to which he is dedicated. The moral of all this, my frends, is the necessity of thousands of specialists trained in the techniques and methods, the thought and ideology that goes by the name of the cold war. Every foreign visitor of any rank who has come or will come to this country from behind the Iron Curtain is a master of deceit. He is by long and thorough training the best equipped soldier for a warfare of words and treachery and anything else short of the firing of atomic weapons. Hundreds of thousands of Communists in Russia, in the captive nations, in Africa and Asia, everywhere are mastering all the tricks, some of them diabolical, for success in this type of warfare. Their teachers have the know-how. In the Korean war our soldiers were seemingly helpless under their varied form of brainwashing.

It is for that reason that I have been advocating the teaching of communism with a moral directive, and why I urge you to know not only the weapons of a shooting war, but also those of the war in which we are now engaged; the cold war. If we continue to lose this cold war we will lose our Nation. We will be so softened by this enemy of our civilization that their military weapons could find us an easy prey for conquest. The preservation of this Republic must be our ambition and the objective of those worthy of public office and trust.

It is for civil leaders, experts in every lawful phase of propaganda and international leadership to take the intiative in this cold war. For them our greatest weapon is the truth. But they have failed to spread it. Our propaganda programs have been ineffective to say the least. We have lost the initiative. We must attain it.

It is for me to urge you to aspire to moral and spiritual leadership by following the pathway of virtue marked by the Laws of God. The one thing feared by the Communists is Religion. Let me urge those of the Christian faith to duplicate in their lives the life of Christ. A Christian should be a follower of, a double for Christ. Live in accord with the teachings and the precepts of the Gospel. Rich and poor—capital and labor, each one of us must do that and become free men in a nation under God. Otherwise we shall inevitably become slaves in a totalitarian state. Not until we live what we believe about God and His laws shall we assume moral leadership; not until then shall we give the multitudes behind the Iron curtain the hope and courage that they will never get from our boasted material power and wealth.

Marx - Engels - Lenin - Stalin - Khrushchev have made the Communist Man. Christ and His Gospel have made saints; the only ones who have conquered the world and every false ism that ever blighted the world. If we follow Christ and His teaching we will create a revolution more fundamental, constructive, and extensive than Communists ever contemplated. Communism is a revolution trying to change man from a creature of God with dignity a little less than the angels to a creature of the state with the status of a slave. Christianity is a revolution capable of elevating man to the image of the Creator.

As we face the future it is Christ or chaos. Freedom under God or survival under a slave state. Capitalism must reform itself under a program of charity and justice. Communism must go. Every good system must take the road chartered by the laws of nature and of God. It may take 1,000 years to reach the desired goal but let us begin. Man is hundreds of thousands of years old. The Gospel is less than 2,000 years old. We are still in the sowing, the planting season. Let us sow the good seeds of jutice and fraternal charity and stop cultivating by our apathy, our ignorance, our lack of security laws, our cultural exchanges, our red carpet invitations to murderers and liars, the sowers of evil seeds that will result in a harvest capable of destroying this great country and civilization as we know it.

Interesting Angles on the New Ohio Fair Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter sent out by the American Fair Trade Council, Inc., questioning the constitutionality of the Harris fair trade bill, H.R. 1253. Some language in that communication, which is signed by Mr. John W. Anderson, reveals the very interesting fact that even stanch fair-traders question the constitutionality of H.R. 1253 in the following words:

Federal fair trade legislation as proposed in the Harris bill carries even more serious doubts as to its ability, if enacted, to withstand court tests as affecting intrastate transactions—comprising about 90 percent of all retail sales.

The letter follows:

INTERESTING ANGLES ON THE NEW OHIO FAIR TRADE ACT

AMERICAN FAIR TRADE COUNCIL, INC.,
Gary, Ind., August 18, 1959.

To All Members of and Contributors to American Fair Trade Council, Inc.:

Although the record indicates otherwise, some fair trade attorneys give hope that the new fair trade law in Ohio may be upheld when tested as to constitutionality by the courts of that State.

A new statute in Florida, with major substantive changes and a 7-point legislative "Findings of Fact," convinced fair-traders 10 years ago that the State supreme court's objections to previous fair trade legislation had been overcome. The Florida court considered the new statute—then reaffirmed its holding that fair trade legislation as applied to nonsigners was invalid.

Another part of the pattern was Georgia. After the State supreme court's ruling as to invalidity, fair-traders went back to the legislature and a new fair trade law was enacted—one that, in the opinion of most competent attorneys, answered each previous objection of the Georgia Supreme Court.

Hopes were short-lived. A quick court test followed and again the Georgia Supreme Court struck down the fair trade statute as applied to nonsigners. The Georgia Supreme Court said:

"It is argued that this court cannot hold the Georgia fair trade act unconstitutional without questioning the motives of the legislature and imputing dishonesty to that body. We reject this fallacious argument in its entirety. We simply disagree with the general assembly for the reasons pointed out in this opinion."

Obviously fair-traders should have believed Chief Justice Duckworth of the Georgia Supreme Court. When the Georgia fair trade act was held invalid the first time, Chief Justice Duckworth rendered a nonjudicial opinion to the newspapers in which he was quoted as saying that each time the legislature passes a fair trade law the Georgia Supreme Court will hold it unconstitutional.

Thus fair-traders have been left with partially or wholly invalid legislation in Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Michigan, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oregon, South Carolina, Utah, and West Virginia. No fair trade legislation has been enacted in Alaska, Missouri, Texas, Vermont, or the District of Columbia.

In the light of language used by State supreme courts in decisions adverse to fair trade, experienced fair trade lawyers say they believe amendments to State constitutions would be necessary to perpetuate the State-by-State contract system of fair trade. Such amendments are regarded as virtually impossible to achieve.

Federal fair trade legislation as proposed in the Harris bill carries even more serious doubts as to its ability, if enacted, to withstand court tests as affecting intrastate transactions—comprising about 90 percent of all retail sales. Therefore, recent strong shifts—to the quality stabilization concept—in congressional opinion become more and more understandable. Such shifts are evidenced by increasing congressional resistance to the Harris bill.

Reports indicate a growing conviction in Congress that enactment, perhaps in the next session, of a quality stabilization bill, based upon the Madden bill, H.R. 3187, would end, once and for all, costly failures of fair trade litigation and legislation—at both State and National levels.

The State-by-State fair trade system unquestionably has added great strength to our national economy since the enactment of the first State fair trade law in 1931. Except for the ability of leaders of a single industry to dictate, to their particular taste, faulty provisions in Federal legislation affecting fair trade—the institution of fair trade might have grown stronger instead of weaker—over the years—greatly to the benefit of resellers, labor, and the public.

Fair trade proponents in Ohio were undaunted by the case histories of Florida and Georgia. A new fair trade bill was passed by the Ohio Legislature, then vetoed by the Governor. The legislature then overrode—most convincingly—the Governor's veto. Leading the fight for the new legislation which becomes effective October 22d of this year was the Ohio Small Business Committee, a diversified group of resellers.

Some lawyers point to the Ohio constitution itself for hope that the story of Florida and Georgia will not be repeated in Ohio and that the new Ohio statute will survive court tests. They look to article XIII, section 2, particularly the last sentence, of the Ohio constitution, which reads:

"Corporations may be formed under general laws; but all such laws may, from time to time, be altered or repealed. Corporations may be classified and there may be conferred upon proper boards, commissions or officers, such supervisory and regulatory powers over their organization, business and issue and sale of stocks and securities, and over the business and sale of the stocks and securities of foreign corporations and joint stock companies in this State, as may be prescribed by law. Laws may be passed regulating the sale and conveyance of other personal property whether owned by a corporation, joint stock company or individual."

Perhaps the language of the Ohio constitution emphasized in the quote does give a glimmer of hope in that State. Even so, in view of fair-traders' experience in Florida

and Georgia, the situation in Ohio appears, at best, unique.

Cordially,

JNO. W. ANDERSON,
President.

P.S.—Enactment of quality stablization legislation by Congress, as provided in the Madden bill, H.R. 3187, would avoid all uncertainties as to the validity of State laws. Quality stabilization legislation would also avoid the grave uncertainties of a Federal Fair Trade Act based upon the Harris bill, H.R. 1253. Federal quality stabilization legislation, in the opinion of outstanding leaders of diversified industries, offers the only clear and permanent solution of the problem of price stabilization for top value trademarked quality products, not only for Ohio but also for all other States, including States now with disabled fair trade legislation and States with no fair trade legislation.

Hatred, Revenge Cannot Win

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication with our enemies may not lead to peace—but lack of communication certainly cannot lead to peace.

Many of our colleagues and other citizens outside of Congress are deploring the President's exchange of visits with Khrushchev. They interpret this as softness either of the heart or the head or both. It is neither. It is commonsense.

This point is well made in an editorial "Hatred, Revenge Cannot Win," which appeared in the Oregon Journal, August 17, 1959, included here by unanimous consent previously granted:

HATRED, REVENGE CANNOT WIN

An elderly, white-haired gentleman of Polish extraction visited our office the other day.

His faded blue eyes could not hide the depth of his feeling against the Russian beasts who enslaved his fatherland and murdered countless numbers of his former countrymen and against Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, the symbol of aggression and brutality.

In broken English, he related details of mistreatment and enslavement suffered by members of his own family.

Yet his manner was gentle, and his words did not speak of revenge. They appealed rather for some kind of settlement between East and West on the basis of peaceful negotiation. His purpose in coming, he said, was to ask us to write something in approval of the manner in which Vice President NIXON conducted himself in Russia and Poland, and he expressed hope that visits of this kind would have some real influence for good on the Russian people and Russian leadership.

While not overjoyed at the prospect of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, he nevertheless thinks the Soviet Premier ought to be shown common courtesies and ought not to be subjected to ugly incidents. He expressed the hope that Polish-Americans, whatever their feelings, would not create them.

His visit was followed by a telephone call from a man who had come to America from one of the Baltic States with vivid memories of the brutal crushing of those tiny nations. His tone was harsh and bitter. He spoke resentfully of NIXON's performance and of the plan to have "that murderer" Khrushchev come to America. He implied that U.S. leaders have lost their senses in even talking to that man. He hinted that the hatred which millions in this country feel for Khrushchev would find ugly expression when he comes here.

The bitterness which all these people hold is understandable. But if their hope for ultimate redress lies in the violent removal of the Russian oppressors from their fatherlands, they are on the wrong path, for in this kind of upheaval, the civilized world would be destroyed, and nobody would win.

To be willing to talk to the Russians is not to surrender to them or to accept as a permanent condition their occupation of the lands we have mentioned. U.S. policy is based on the hope that gradual changes will come within Russia itself which can lead to freedom for these peoples, not that perfect justice for all past wrongs can ever be won. In this most imperfect of worlds there is no such thing as perfect justice.

The elderly Polish gentleman has thought this matter through a little better than some of the others. Time and wisdom have given him a philosophy which tempers hatred and the thirst for revenge. These passions by themselves are poor answers in an age of nuclear weapons.

John A. Burns, of Hawaii, Great Statesman and Good Friend

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, our association with the Delegate from Hawaii over the years has been warm and pleasant, and it is with sadness that we bid him farewell. I have high hopes, however, that his absence from the Halls of Congress will be only temporary, and that we soon will welcome him back as a member of the legislative branch—the next time with a right to vote as well as to speak.

While JOHN BURNS served in this House as Delegate, he could not vote. Yet no man did more than JOHN BURNS to bring into reality those statehood dreams of Alaska and Hawaii. Had it not been for the energy, the dedication, the statesmanship, and the facing of political realities by JOHN BURNS, it is quite likely that neither the people of Hawaii or Alaska would now have gained their deserved status as first-class citizens of the United States. That the 48 States are now 50 will forever stand as a tribute to JOHN BURNS.

As I extend my warmest wishes and the best of good fortune to JOHN BURNS, I want also to welcome with all my heart the first Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Hawaii, DANIEL INOUYE. We know his great record of service to the United States and to Hawaii, and that he will continue this fine record in the House of Representatives.

America's Greatest Fishing Hole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Center Hill Lake, a Corps of Engineers reservoir, on the Cumberland River, in the district I have the honor to represent, has acquired a national reputation for the number and size of the fish it has yielded to fishermen from every part of the country. When, on occasions, I have mentioned some of the experiences of fishermen at Center Hill Lake, my remarks and fishing stories are sometimes suspect. As evidence of their truthfulness, however, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the article in This Week magazine for August 2, 1959, entitled, "America's Greatest Fishing Hole." This article points out that Center Hill fishermen do not need to lapse into the traditional exaggerations of angling—the article gives the literal truth about fishing in Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD. The article follows:

AMERICA'S GREATEST FISHING HOLE—50 TONS OF FISH IN 30 DAYS—THAT'S NO FISH STORY

(By Robert G. Dundorfer)

CENTER HILL, TENN.—Not long ago a Tennessee doctor traveling through northern Wisconsin came upon a jubilant fisherman loaded down with a string of 2- and 3-pound bass. It was the sort of catch you like to talk about—with pictures. And yet the visiting physician was impressed not at all.

"Doesn't seem right to break up a family by hooking only the babies," he said. "Why, down home around Center Hill we use these little fellows for bait."

The doctor was kidding—but not much. He was talking about Center Hill Reservoir, a great sprawling Government waterway of 23,060 acres, puckered with draws, coves, and rocky inlets. It is the consensus of experts that this is America's greatest fishing hole.

DEEP-SEA FISHING IN A FRESH-WATER LAKE

As anyone who ever developed a backache pulling whoppers out of Center Hill knows, it comes by that reputation honestly. The deep-dredged Tennessee lake yields practically everything. Inventory figures show small-mouth, large-mouth, and spotted bass. The crappie, bluegill, sunfish, sauger, and walleyes are beyond any number, not to mention the muskellunge, brook, brown, and rainbow trout from the feeder streams.

Men, women, and children by the thousands fish the great bulge on the Caney Fork River with everything from flyrods to bows and arrows. What's more, the few hardy sports who bring out deep-sea tackle have just cause. The supply of giant catfish, red horse, carp, buffalo fish, alligator gar, sturgeon, and paddlefish produces an occasional 150-pounder.

Under the circumstances, it isn't surprising that visitors to Center Hill rarely lapse into the traditional exaggerations of angling. The literal truth is hard to improve upon.

Despite those awesome credentials, any number of America's 20 million fishermen have their own favorite spots. Dozens of prize-winning lunkers have come out of neighboring Dale Hollow Lake, the Eagle River country in Wisconsin, Maine's picturesque Rangeley Lakes, the White River

washing through the Missouri Ozarks—just to mention a few.

But with authorities who know dorsal fins best it's Center Hill by 2 to 1. "There isn't any doubt about it," says Tackle Manufacturer Billy Burns, dubbed America's best fisherman by several outdoor magazines. "Center Hill offers more big buster fish of different kinds than any lake in the country."

Bill Padgett, of Paris, Ky.; Shorty Groom, of Nashville; James Long, of Cincinnati; Bob Dykes, of suburban Chicago; and countless others echo that testimonial. Why shouldn't they? What other lake has yielded 50 tons of assorted game fish during an official 30-day audit?

ALL THE LAW ALLOWS

A skillful Carlisle, Ky., addict named Stanley Feeback recognizes the staggering potential of Center Hill. One afternoon last year he started casting a feathered 4-B pork-rind combination toward a rocky ledge along shore. He hadn't spun the reel long before the rod quivered furiously. Up boiled an angry bass, husky as a fullback, spraying water, walking on its tail, flashing in the sun. Moments later Feedback scooped his first fish into the net.

At dusk he returned to Hurricane Dock near Silver Point with 10 whopping bass, all the law allowed. But in spite of his enormous haul, Feeback wasn't happy. His grumpy irritation casts a revealing light on the bonanza at Center Hill. What upset him was the fact that his biggest fish didn't scale much more than 9 pounds.

Plainly, hippy old bass, the dimensions of a man's daydreams, are fairly easy to come by in Center Hill. Young Jim Sarvis, of Cincinnati, established a "believe it or not" of some sort in June of 1957 when he took 10 large bronzebacks in 35 minutes. And a dock owner, intrigued by volume, counted 621 bass between 7 and 11 pounds brought into his pier one season.

The glandular cases aren't confined only to bass. Succulent, sweet-tasting crappie and bluegill grow to outrageous sizes—2, sometimes even 2½ pounds. In Pine Creek and in the tailwaters below the hydroelectric dam anglers hook 5-pound rainbow trout without causing any public demonstrations. The walleyes average 8 pounds, topped by a magnificent 21¼ pounder, an American record at the time.

Catfish—well, it's like this: One misty morning in April, Bill Duke of Silver Point was hauling in his trotline, shucking catfish and bluegills off the hooks. All of a sudden a monstrous thrashing shook the line. For 30 minutes Duke and his partner tugged and strained before a vast flatheaded, whiskered fish turned in the water. Even Duke said the 103-pounder was a fairly respectable catfish.

The secret of all that size and plenty is easily explained. The deep, cold water simply offers an ideal combination of what fish need—good oxygen supplies at various depths, limitless quantities of plankton and soft, bony gizzard shad. Besides, little pollution or erosion muddies the waters at Center Hill.

THE FISH DIE OF OLD AGE

As yet the pressure of heavy year-round fishing and generous daily limits haven't had any effect. The fish are still there waiting to be caught. Just a few weeks ago an experienced Center Hill angler named Ben Wineoke, of Columbus, Ohio, hooked a 10-pound bass. What is the cause of all this plenty? It just seems to be that the fish keep right on breeding at a dizzy rate. After studying tables of harvest, a TVA ichthyologist remarked, "We are forced to conclude that most of the fish never sample an angler's lure, but die of old age."

Not enough of them die of old age as far as the resident wardens are concerned. While wardens in other parts of America get sore arms writing tickets for offenders who take undersized fish, the usual violations at Center Hill show an oddly different picture.

"Too many people get so excited they forget how to count, or so it seems," one young warden told me. "Then we have to go around and pick them up for exceeding the daily limits."

Progress Toward Weather Modification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. B. F. SISK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of acting as moderator of a panel of outstanding scientists and experts who discussed "Weather Modification and Space Exploration" at the 46th annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, meeting here in Washington.

I consider the information provided by the three speakers so important and timely that I would like to make summaries of their remarks more generally available.

One of these papers is presented herewith. It summarizes the address of Dr. Richard W. Porter, chairman of the technical panel of the earth satellite program for the International Geophysical Year.

Dr. Porter's summary follows:

INTRODUCTION

A first step toward the exploration of space has now been taken by mankind in the form of high altitude sounding rockets which carry his instruments well beyond the earth's atmosphere for brief periods of time, and earth satellites which can sustain instrumentation packages at distances all the way from the upper fringes of the ionosphere out to many times the earth's radius. One of the major scientific achievements during the International Geophysical Year, which could not have been accomplished without the use of rockets or satellites, was the discovery of the presence of intense zones of radiation in the vicinity of the earth which consist of rapidly moving charged particles, trapped in the earth's magnetic field. This type of radiation is sometimes referred to as Van Allen radiation after Dr. James Van Allen, of the State University of Iowa, under whose direction the instruments carried by the first U.S. satellite were designed and constructed, and who first provided the correct interpretation of the rather startling measurements transmitted back. Rocket and satellite experiments made during the International Geophysical Year also provided additional data concerning the meteoric dust which pours into the earth's atmosphere by the thousands of tons per year. They made possible significant refinements of our knowledge and understanding of the ionosphere and the fluctuations of the earth's magnetic field and especially of their relationship to the great solar disturbances which occurred frequently during the International Geophysical Year, and they contributed to a better understanding of the interrelation of all these effects with variations in the intensity of cosmic rays, best described as "stripped down," "hot rod" atomic nuclei that seemed to come mostly from the very deep reaches of space outside our galaxy.

A Russian satellite apparently demonstrated the ability of highly organized forms of life, such as a dog, to endure and function effectively for long periods of time without the normal acceleration of gravity. The rather crude space probes successfully launched by both the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. during this period proved our ability to escape the earth's gravitational field and yielded invaluable knowledge about the radiation environment and the magnetic field at greater distances from the earth.

Important though these results may be, the rocket and satellite experiments conducted during the international geophysical year are only a beginning. Plans for the next few years will carry the work much further, and it is difficult to talk about the decade ahead without sounding like science fiction. It is my intention today, however, to limit my remarks to the existing and potential use of earth satellites for scientific experiments in the fields of geodesy and meteorology.

GEODESY

Geodesy is primarily concerned with measuring the size and shape of the earth and deducing from these parameters some facts about the physical structure of the earth. One could theoretically achieve these objectives by carrying out a high precision survey connecting selected points all over the earth's surface. If it could actually be carried out, this process would result in a map of the earth's surface as a many faceted polygon, approximating a spherical figure. The points of the figure, of course, would not be at the same level.

The first complication of geodesy is introduced by this word "level." It implies the existence of a reference figure whose surface is all "at the same level," that is, one which is everywhere perpendicular to the combined force of gravity and the centrifugal force arising from the earth's rotation. Two prominent geodesists, Heiskenen and Meniesz in their book "The Earth and Its Gravity Field," divided the history of geodesy into three periods according to the shape of the reference figure in current use. The first period was the spherical era dating from around the third century BC. The second or ellipsoidal era began with Newton and merged finally with the third or geoidal era of this century.

The geoid is defined as the equipotential surface of the earth's gravitational field at sea level. It is a somewhat wavy or bumpy surface that approximates a mean ellipsoid, the deviation from it being not more than 50 meters upward or downward. For convenience, the location of the geoid is specified by its height above or below the ellipsoid as a function of spherical coordinates. Although the geoid is simple in concept, and although you can actually see it at the seashore, it is quite another matter to tell its actual location with respect to the ellipsoid, or any other standard coordinate system in midocean where there are no triangulation points, or to trace its position under the surface of continents.

Among the principal problems of geodesy to which the use of earth satellites can contribute are the following:

1. The tying together of widely separated geodetic datums.

2. Fixing of the various datums with respect to the gravitational center of the earth.

3. Determination of the shape and size of the earth.

4. Determination of the gravity field of the earth both broadly and in detail.

Perhaps the most straightforward way in which satellites may be used is as a moving triangulation point whose coordinates with respect to each separate geodetic datum may be observed more or less simultaneously. It should be noted perhaps that high alti-

tude rockets can also be used for this purpose, and also have a slight advantage in that they do not move so rapidly, with respect to the earth's surface. However, a single satellite may be used for many repeated observations, thus improving the precision of the observations to any desired extent, whereas the rocket can be used at best for only a small number of observations. A satellite can be observed and photographed against a star background during twilight periods, as was done during the IGY, or it can carry a suitably instrumented flashing light, as had been suggested by a number of people, which will aid in identifying corresponding observations and have the obvious additional advantage that it can be observed at any time during the night. The addition of some sort of precise radar ranging system would, of course, greatly strengthen the fixing of the three dimensional position of a satellite by methods which essentially amount to trilateration.

By an extension of these methods it should be possible to determine the displacement of the geoid from the reference ellipsoid at any desired spot on the earth's surface. This could be accomplished, at least theoretically, by determining the space coordinates of a ground station by precise observations, or back sights, of a satellite whose position is precisely known in a coordinate system defined by a minimum of three standard stations. If the field station is also connected by a geodetic net and precise leveling to the same three standard stations, then its known geodetic coordinates can be compared with its space coordinates to yield the desired transformation from the ellipsoid to the geoid. This procedure will, of course, demand observations of the highest possible accuracy inasmuch as the geoid height is only a few tens of meters at most.

One of the most effective ways in which an earth satellite can be used in geodesy is by careful observation of the perturbations of its orbit. If the effect of the earth's atmosphere can be eliminated, either by selecting an orbit far enough away from the earth to make the effects negligible or by applying appropriate corrections, and the gravitation influences of the sun, moon, and other planets are either corrected for or found to be negligible, it is possible to derive exact mathematical relationships between the motion of the satellite and the earth's gravitational field expressed in spherical harmonics. Thus by careful measurements of a satellite orbit, it is possible to determine the deviation of the geoid from a sphere. This procedure has actually been carried out using the tiny Vanguard test sphere known as 1958 Beta or Vanguard I. One of the startling results of this analysis is the discovery of a third zonal harmonic in the earth's gravitational field having an amplitude on the order of .0047 cm/sec². This gravity variation implies some 15 meters of undulation in the geoid, or mean sea level shape of the earth, in the form of a 15-meter rise at the North Pole, 15 meters of additional flattening at the South Pole and flattening on the order of 7½ meters in the middle latitudes of the Northern Hemisphere balanced by an equivalent bulging in the middle latitudes of the Southern Hemisphere. Thus the shape has been referred to in the newspapers as somewhat resembling that of a pear.

This finding is in conflict with the basic hypothesis of geodesy of Heiskenen and Meniess which assumes that the earth's gravitational field closely approximates that of a fluid in equilibrium and the deviation from such an ellipsoid may not exceed .0030 cm/sec² over an area 1,000 kilometers on a side, a number sometimes referred to as 30 milligals per square megameter. According to 1958 Beta, however, each of the polar areas has a deviation of about 120 milligals per square megameter and each of the equatorial belts deviate more than twice as great. Hence there must be a very substantial force acting on the surface of the earth which would create stresses down to the core of the earth, which implies that the core is solid rather than liquid, or alternatively requires the assumption of stresses in the crust and mantel beyond the mechanical strength this material is usually assumed to have. Another alternative explanation might be large-scale convection currents in the interior of the earth. In any case, I think you will agree that the geodetic value of this minimum satellite has been very great indeed.

METEOROLOGY

Meteorology is one of the more important branches of applied science. It involves the application of knowledge and understanding of the fluid dynamics, thermodynamics and chemistry of the earth's atmosphere to the prediction and eventual control of weather and the climate. The end result to most of us is, of course, weather analysis and forecasting. But progress in the accuracy, dependability and span of forecasts will depend on our ability to extend our knowledge and understanding of all of the processes which go on in the atmosphere. This will require scientific work of the most basic kind.

It might be well to remember that meteorological observations were first plotted on a map for the purpose of obtaining a synoptic picture of weather events only a little more than a century ago. These first weather charts covered an area of only a few thousand square miles. Although the charts were gradually expanded to cover many land areas and oceanic shipping routes, they still cover only a small portion of the earth's surface and until recently failed to depict what was happening above the surface except as it could be deduced from clouds and precipitation. The introduction of balloon-borne, radiosonde equipment has extended the upward reach of the meteorologist; however this marked upward thrust has not been accompanied by a similar expansion laterally into the vast island-free oceanic areas, except along principal airplane and shipping routes. Thus even today somewhat less than one-fifth of the total atmospheric mass is adequately probed by conventional meterological sounding techniques, so that large storms can reside undetected for days in oceanic areas, deserts, or polar regions.

With a proper distribution of meteorological satellites orbiting about the earth and looking downward at the cloud pattern, it should be possible to keep track of each major storm on earth, to note the birth of new storms, and the death of old ones. Furthermore, such cloud observations from satellites will be valuable in meteorological research after they have fulfilled their immediate function in forecasting. For example, they can be used to establish a truly global cloud census for the first time, and to prepare average charts of world cloud cover for studying long-time variations in amount and distribution. No less important will be the contribution of earth satellites to basic knowledge of atmospheric physics, for example, through the measurement of global distribution of net radiant energy absorbed and emitted by the earth-atmosphere system. The effects we know as weather result from winds that are attempting to equalize the nonuniform distribution of energy received from the sun or radiated back into space. It is highly important, therefore, to keep an accurate account of the global distribution of this basic radiant energy which drives the atmospheric heat engine. As our understanding of the way this engine operates is improved it may be possible to formulate a new system of long-range forecasting based on the availability of such information. For example, it is known that Poleward transport of excess energy from the Tropics can vary considerably. When meridianal energy flow persists it gives rise to prolonged spells of the same general weather type, such as fair weather, drought, floods, or storms, depending on the location of the stalled weather pattern with respect to a particular geographical region. Thus radiation balance measurements from a satellite, by enabling meteorologists to note the space and time variations in energy storage and transport, will provide an opportunity for a new quantitative approach to extended weather prediction.

Other types of satellite measurements of immediate importance in meteorology will include:

(a) Radiation measurements in the infrared spectral window in the vicinity of 8 to 11 microns (water vapor) to yield surface temperature and extent of nocturnal clouds.

(b) Measurements of water vapor emission in the 6 to 7 micron region to yield temperature of upper levels of the troposphere.

(c) Frequency of lightning discharges at various portions of the earth's surface.

(d) Radar measurements of precipitation, atmospheric turbidity, and the like, and

(e) Observation of unusual solar radiations, energetic particles, or meteoric dust from space which may be correlated with unusual weather behavior.

The very elementary meteorological satellites were included in our plans for the U.S. IGY satellite program. The first of these, actually launched on February 17, 1959, contained two infrared sensitive photocells looking out from opposite sides of the satellite at an angle of 45° with spin axis. The primary objective of this experiment was to record the distribution of cloud cover over the daylight portion of the sphere's orbit. It was expected that the spinning motion of the satellite would enable the field of view of each photocell to scan a narrow path from horizon to horizon on the earth below. As the satellite progressed in its orbit these paths were expected to be traced side by side in such a way that during one complete orbit the two photocells together would view a belt from 1,600 to 100 miles wide on the surface of the earth below. The output of the photocells was stored on magnetic tape in the satellite for a period equivalent to one complete orbit and telemetered in compressed form as the satellite passed over an interrogation station. A special device was constructed to translate this telemetered information into continuous strips of film which could be fitted together in the manner of an aerial photograph. Unfortunately, as a result of unanticipated dynamic effects associated with the separation of the satellite from the third stage booster rocket, the satellite acquired a motion drastically different from that expected. Thus, although the satellite went into the orbit successfully and telemetered data were recovered, it is now extremely difficult to derive meaningful cloud pictures from the recorded signals. Work is still progressing on this data reduction but it is not certain at present whether satisfactory results can be achieved.

The second IGY meteorological satellite is intended to measure the three significant components of radiant energy seen by the satellite, namely, the total radiation received from the sun, the radiation reflected from clouds and the earth's surface, and the energy which has been absorbed and reradiated as longwave length thermal energy from the earth and its atmosphere. These measurements are made by recording the temperatures of four small spheres placed at the ends of the four satellite antennas. Different coatings and radiation shields make it possible to determine the three components of radiant energy from these four temperature measurements with 1° of redundancy. This satellite should be launched by the NASA in the very near future. We hope for its success.

A third and post-IGY meteorological satellite known as Tiros will carry two television cameras and several infrared sensors in one

package. One of the cameras will cover a path of about 800 miles wide and several thousand miles long with a ground resolution of approximately 2.5 miles. Another camera with a smaller field of view will simultaneously photograph the centers of the larger photographs with a higher degree of resolution. The infrared sensors are designed to measure the infrared radiation from the earth, the total albedo of the earth, water vapor emission in the 6.3 micron belt, and temperature at the earth's surface or at the top of dense clouds by measurements in the water-vapor spectrum "window."

The ultimate meteorological satellite system might include as many as six polar satellites in circular orbits 4,000 miles high and oriented 60° apart. These satellites would be synchronized in such a way that three of them would be moving northward at the same time that the other three were moving southward on the opposite side of the earth. With such a system, no important cloud cover may remain unobserved for more than about 1 hour. In order to obtain more details of fine structure for identification of smaller weather systems, such as fronts, squall lines, thunderstorms or even winds (by tracking the motion of identifiable cloud elements), it might also be desirable to add one or more low-flying satellites at say 600 miles altitude in an equatorial orbit. One such satellite could observe the earth's surface along a belt 30° to 45° in width centered around the equator.

These are but a few examples of the new horizons in meteorology and in meteorological research which will be opened up by the availability of satellite data. The great flow of data which will pour forth from even a small number of satellites will pose many additional problems in communication, data reduction and interpretation, which have not yet received adequate attention. However, it is expected that the satellites themselves will contribute to the overcoming of our limitations in communication capability and the advent of high speed electronic digital computers are making possible the reduction of data in quantities and at speeds heretofore undreamed of.

CONCLUSION

It might well be asked why space vehicles should be used to study the Earth; one might expect perhaps that space research would more probably be directed toward the planets or the stars. However, at the present state of our technology it seems to be easier for us to send our instruments far out into space than it is to penetrate deep into the crust of the Earth. Therefore, if we want to learn more about the inside of the Earth, paradoxically, we must send our instruments out in a satellite in order to gain the synoptic information about the Earth's gravitational field from which we can deduce what we would like to know about the interior of the Earth. Furthermore it is apparent that the disturbances of the Earth's atmosphere which we call weather are caused by external effects, primarily the radiant energy from the Sun. What better means could we find for measuring these external effects on a synoptic basis than the Earth satellite? In fact, as we look more closely, it appears that most of the questions posed by space science affect the Earth and its inhabitants in an important way. A few such questions are: How old is the Earth, the Sun, the galaxy, the universe? How were they created? What is happening to them? Is there other life in the universe? How did life come into being? I think you will agree that scientific explorations into space, like those into the nucleus of the atom are not only of interest or concern to a few scientists, engineers, or military experts, but rather to all of us who live on Earth because they can so profoundly affect our lives and our thinking.

The Specific Issue at Stake in the Sullivan Amendment—Comment on Washington Post Editorial on Food Stamp Proposal

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post carried an editorial today under the heading "Surpluses for the Hungry" discussing the food stamp amendment which I submitted here last Thursday to the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, known as Public Law 480, governing the disposal of surplus food here and overseas. While endorsing generally the idea of getting more of our huge surplus of farm produce to the needy in our own country, the Post raises some questions about my amendment which I am glad to try to answer, and which I think should be answered.

Otherwise, in view of the prestige of the Washington Post and its reputation for fairness, accuracy, and humanitarianism, many of the Members of the Congress who voted for my food stamp amendment last week may begin to wonder whether it was they rather than the editorial writer of the Post who misunderstood what it was we were voting for.

COMMITTEE REPORT COVERED ALL CRITICISMS

All of the reservations about the bill made in the editorial, particularly those quoting opponents on the Republican side, were, I thought, fully answered in the debate which preceded passage of the bill, as well as having been answered thoroughly, I thought, in the report of the House Committee on Agriculture on H.R. 1359, the bill which I added to the surplus disposal bill as an amendment. The committee views are stated in House Report 907.

Taking the statements in the editorial one by one in order, however, might be a good way to set the record straight. The editorial starts out as follows:

SURPLUSES FOR THE HUNGRY

It is easy to see why the House added to the surplus disposal bill the amendment by Congresswoman SULLIVAN authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a food-stamp plan for distribution of surplus commodities to needy families in this country. There is a strong sentiment in Congress behind the use of crops that bulge Government warehouses to help friends abroad. Along with this goes a general feeling that surplus food should also be going into empty stomachs in this country. So the House voted by a large majority to let the Secretary of Agriculture distribute such food, preferably through commercial channels, along with stamps that would entitle needy persons to obtain the food, up to the value of a billion dollars a year.

We think the general principle on which the House acted is unquestionably sound. So long as there are hungry people in the United States, surplus food held by the Government ought to be used to relieve them. It would be strange, indeed, to subsidize the shipment of unneeded farm crops abroad to relieve hunger and deny similar relief to American people. But that is not the specific issue at stake in the Sullivan amendment.

FOREIGN DONATIONS OF FOOD FAR EXCEED DOMESTIC

Mr. Speaker, I interrupt the editorial at that point to say that it is exactly that fact which is and was a specific issue at stake in the Sullivan amendment. We have spent over $5 billion since 1954 in gifts and "sales" of food to nations overseas whereas in the same 5-year period the total of all domestic donations of food—including the school lunch program and food given to State institutions, and so forth, as well as the total value of all food given to needy persons—has come to less than one-tenth of the value of the food given away or "sold" abroad.

I place the words "sales" and "sold" in quotation marks because, as we all know, foreign "sales" under title I of Public Law 480 are sales for foreign currency which is then given or lent back to the country "buying" the food.

To be scrupulously fair about donations as opposed to "sales," the record shows that the Federal Government spent $1,232,419,000 on outright donations of food to the peoples of other countries under title III of Public Law 480 in the 5-year period, and an additional $546,130,000 under title II—famine and similar emergency relief—and in the process we spent $100 million on ocean freight charges alone. This was to help feed the needy of other countries—a very worthwhile cause. But in that same period, of 5 years, we have given away only about $400 million worth of food to all recipients in this country—and the preponderant share of that went to the school lunch program.

In the 1958 fiscal year, $272 million worth of food was given to needy persons overseas, and $75 million was given to needy persons in this country, outside of the school lunch program. They received $76 million worth of surplus food. State institutions received another $33 million. Obviously, therefore, we have not done, and are not doing, enough to help our own needy, compared to what we are doing for those of other countries. The record shows it. This, therefore, was very definitely one of the specific issues at stake in the Sullivan amendment and one of the reasons why 232 Members of the House voted for it.

Now, to continue with the Washington Post editorial, Mr. Speaker, it said:

Representative LAIRD pointed out that 20 million school children and needy persons, in this country, are already benefiting from Federal surplus food. The Government packages food and ships it to the States free of charge, leaving the distribution to local agencies. According to Congresswoman MAY, the Sullivan amendment would do nothing more than relieve the States of the expense of distributing these surplus foods.

REACHING THE NEEDY ON PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. Speaker, to say that we do not need any expansion of the surplus food distribution program in this country because 20 million school children and needy persons are receiving some of the food now is to lump more than 14 million school children into the category of

"needy." This figure includes all the children now participating in the Federal school lunch program. Many of them are indeed from needy families. As the Washington Post's own Eve Edstrom pointed out in her series of articles on hungry children in the District of Columbia, a school lunch would be the only hot and nourishing food some children would get. But most school children participating in the school lunch program in the Washington area or in any other area of the country are not hungry children from substandard homes.

Furthermore, out of the 5 million or so needy people now receiving surplus food under the Department of Agriculture program now in effect, the preponderance are not people on public assistance, but are workers temporarily unemployed in the hard-hit distressed areas. They and their families need the help of this surplus food, that I do not dispute. But less than half of those receiving food are the people on public assistance for whom the food stamp plan is most necessary. Furthermore, the 2⅓ million people on public assistance who now receive surplus food, usually because they live in the distressed areas, make up only about one-third of the total of Americans on various forms of public assistance. As I pointed out in the debate, if you are on public assistance, you can be just as hungry in a city which has low unemployment as in one which has unemployment of a high enough level to justify the expenditure of large amounts of local funds for surplus food distribution.

LOCAL DISTRIBUTION COSTLY AND INEFFICIENT

The food stamp plan would not only save these huge and burdensome local costs—so high as to prevent about two-thirds of the Nation's counties from participating—but would also allow for a more orderly method of distributing the food through the stores, rather than on a once-a-month basis at some central depot. And the Federal Government, in utilizing the regular stores in this plan, could save many hundreds of thousands of dollars in packaging and processing and storing the commodities and shuttling these surplus foods around the country.

Primarily, however, we would get away from this grim spectacle of poor old people once a month being called to line up at a central depot for a great big package of dried and powdered food items for them to lug home however they can. A food stamp plan operating through the stores would permit them to obtain food items as needed, weekly or oftener, and in fresh rather than powdered form.

Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post editorial then adds:

One other factor has been emphasized by Secretary Benson. The Commodity Credit Corporation, he says, is not a giant supermarket. More than 85 percent of its surpluses consist of corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco. Since the CCC could distribute only surplus crops, obviously it could not provide a well-rounded diet. It is not clear how much actually would be gained by a food stamp plan to make the products of a few surplus commodities available in commercial stores.

NOT JUST STORABLE BASIC COMMODITIES

I interrupt the editorial at this point, Mr. Speaker, to say that here the Washington Post has apparently completely misunderstood the purpose of the food stamp proposal and the suggested mechanics of such a plan. The committee report on H.R. 1359, House Report No. 907, went into this whole question in great detail. I included relevant excerpts from the House committee report as part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, prior to House passage of the bill.

Let me acknowledge that Mr. Benson does not want a food stamp plan, or any other plan for expanding the present food distribution program. He has said he does not want it because it would involve some additional expenditures. But on this point quoted by the Post editorial, he cannot be speaking of the food stamp plan contained in H.R. 1359 and agreed to by the House last week as part of Public Law 480. For under my amendment, not only storable items in surplus but all agricultural commodities, including the perishables, in periodic surplus and eligible for removal by use of section 32 funds, could be included in the food distribution. Right now, this could include, in addition to the cornmeal, flour, rice, and powdered milk now being given out, and the butter and cheese previously donated, such items as poultry, fresh—rather than powdered—eggs, pork products, fresh—(rather than powdered—milk, other dairy products, and any fresh vegetables in such temporary surplus as to depress the market. In other words, all of the items the Secretary can now legally donate to the school lunch program under section 32 or sell for foreign currencies under Public Law 480 could also be included in the food stamp plan.

He has limited his use of section 32 funds almost entirely to foods which can be used in the school lunch program. The farmer complains about this, pointing out that section 32 has much broader powers than that Members of Congress from areas now partipating in the surplus food distribution program also complain, pointing out that section 32 funds can be and should be used to provide a greater variety of surplus foods for the needy. Under the food stamp plan, the market for these additional items of surplus foods would be ready made. The need is certainly there from the standpoint of both the farmer and the needy.

Mr. Speaker, the Post editorial states in conclusion:

Probably the flow of these commodities into consumption by needy families ought to be stepped up. But there are substantial advantages in letting the States choose their own means of distributing help to their needy citizens. From the national point of view the important thing is making the food available—not a particular method of distribution.

In reply to that, Mr. Speaker, I might say that nearly all of the Senators who recently testified before the Senate Agriculture Committee on the surplus food disposal program in their areas made the point that adequate help is not getting to the people who need it most because of the deficiencies of the present distribution program. And they nearly all urged a food-stamp plan be adopted.

WASHINGTON POST DEMONSTRATED GENUINE CONCERN

The Washington Post has been an active and effective proponent of feeding our hungry in this country out of the great abundance of our harvests, and I want to make clear that in making these comments on the editorial which appeared today I am in no sense implying any lack of sympathy by the Post for the people who would benefit from a food stamp plan. The newspaper has proved its humanitarianism in many, many ways.

But I know the Post likes to present its case accurately, and in this instance I think it made a mistake in taking as its text for the editorial the casual and inaccurate statements of a Secretary of Agriculture who sees in this surplus food only a big storage and budgetary headache, not the blessing it could be in meeting poverty and want in our midst. His objections to the food-stamp plan were fully reported to the House Agriculture Committee. All of these issues were brought up in the hearings.

The report of the House committee fully explains why the Secretary's objections were rejected. I recommend to anyone interested in knowing both the good and bad things about the present distribution program and the good and bad of the proposed food stamp plan that he read the report of the House Agriculture Committee on H.R. 1359, House Report No. 907.

There is one big fault with the food-stamp bill as reported by the committee and as included as an amendment to Public Law 480. It is that it merely provides discretionary authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to initiate such a program. As I introduced the bill, it would have directed and required him to institute it.

Agriculture: The GOP's Most Expensive Failure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, for 6 years, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has been saying that lower farm prices will discourage production of crops, eliminate inefficient farmers and leave the rest with a larger share of farm income, to the benefit of farmer and consumer alike.

Because I have come to the conclusion that some more realistic programs must be sought if we are to deal with the farm problem I am introducing today a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the reduction of Federal expenditures and calling on President Eisenhower to develop sound proposals for reducing subsidies to big business and big farmers by

25 percent and applying the resulting savings to reduction of the Federal income taxes.

One of the leading spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, of New Jersey, in a recent speech to a group of Republican women, urged reform of the Nation's farm program which he termed "fantastic." According to the New York Times he asked:

How much longer will the American people tolerate a net expenditure of $4,500 million a year for an unfair and self-defeating farm program which constitutes a major obstacle to a balanced budget?

And, he added:

Only a quarter of American farmers benefit from this program. The average American family is beginning to realize, too, that it is hurt as a consumer of foodstuffs by our high price-support program.

Recently the distinguished Prof. Sumner H. Slichter of Harvard University, in a letter to the New York Times, suggested that we stop paying subsidies for farm products and use the savings to reduce taxes. He made the valid point that we are paying to subsidize the overproduction of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. The Government then takes the surpluses off the hands of the producers and stores them at a cost of about a billion dollars a year.

I include as part of my remarks the text of Professor Slichter's letter as well as some information compiled by the Democratic Digest of August 1959, which shows how the Republican farm program has failed, and how it has become the Republican's most expensive failure:

TO CURTAIL FARM SURPLUSES—ENDING SUBSIDIES WITH ECONOMIES USED TO CUT TAXES PROPOSED

TO the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Five of the most overproduced commodities in the United States are wheat, cotton, corn, rice, and tobacco. And yet we persist in paying large subsidies to keep up the overproduction of these goods.

The Government takes the surpluses off the hands of the producers and stores them at enormous expense—at the cost of about a billion dollars a year. So large are the accumulated surpluses that the problem of finding physical facilities in which to store them has become acute. And yet the payment of the huge subsidies to induce still more production of the overproduced commodities still goes on.

What should be done: It is obvious that the United States is losing an important opportunity to raise its standard of consumption. The amount of labor and capital now devoted to finance the production of surpluses could be devoted to increasing the supplies of goods that are scarce and that people would consume in larger quantities if the goods were produced and were available for consumption. How can this diversion of resources from producing unwanted wheat, corn, cotton, rice, and tobacco be brought about?

A simple way to accomplish the shift would be for the Government simply to stop paying subsidies and to use the money thus saved to cut taxes. Consumers would then decide how the released production power would be used because tax cuts would enable them to step up promptly the buying of a vast variety of goods.

The additional demand by consumers would pull workers and capital out of the wheat, cotton growing, corn, rice and tobacco industries into more productive uses. In order to mitigate the problems of transition it would probably be desirable to eliminate the subsidies by gradual steps over a period of about 4 years. In order to provide new sources of demand to pull resources out of the excessively expanded industries, the tax cuts should be timed to coincide or slightly precede the subsidy cuts.

But though tax cuts could provide alternative demand for that now supplied by subsidies, the Government would not need to use all of the savings from the termination of subsidies in this way. The country has enormous public needs. It needs more schools, low-cost housing, better roads, flood control, pollution control, more hospitals, more recreation areas with roads to them, its cities need much replanning and rebuilding.

Hence, the Government would be wise to divide the savings from terminating subsidies into two parts—one part going to individuals in the form of tax reductions, the other part going to the public in the many forms of public works that the country badly needs but cannot now afford.

SUMNER H. SLICHTER,
Lamont University Professor, Harvard.
CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *August 10, 1959.*

AGRICULTURE: THE GOP'S MOST EXPENSIVE FAILURE—HOW THE REPUBLICAN FARM PROGRAM HAS FAILED

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON FARM INCOME

"The Republican Party will create conditions providing for farm prosperity and stability." (GOP platform, 1952.)

"I am for programs to put a firm foundation under farm prosperity and to strengthen the family farm as the mainstay of our agricultural production * * *." (Eisenhower, Columbia, S.C., Sept. 30, 1952.)

"The Republican Party is pledged to work for improved farm prices and farm income." (GOP platform, 1956.)

WHAT THEY PROMISED TO FARM INCOME

	1952 (millions)	1958 (millions)	Percent increase or decrease
Gross farm income	$37,016	$38,000	+2.6
Farm expenses	22,669	24,900	+10.0
Total net farm income	15,337	13,000	−15.5

N.B.—The $13.1 billion farm income in 1958 was $2.3 billion above 1957, $1 billion over 1956, and $1.6 billion above 1955. In the last 4 Benson years (1955–58), farmers' net income has averaged $11.9 billion, compared to the $14.15 billion average in President Truman's last 4 years—a decline of 19 percent.

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON FAMILY FARMS:

"We will seek that improvement boldly, in ways that protect the family farm." (GOP Platform, 1956.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO FAMILY FARMS

	1952 (millions)	1958 (millions)	Percent decrease
Farms under the plow	5.4	4.7	−12.9
Farm population	24.2	20.8	−14.0

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON PRODUCTION

"Farmers increase production of a commodity when the demand for it is strong and just as logically they reduce the output when prices soften." (Ezra Taft Benson, Hearings, Senate Agriculture Committee, March 5, 1954.)

"Does a lowered price reduce production? The answer is 'Yes.'" (Benson, Hearings, Senate Agriculture Committee, February 17, 1955.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO PRODUCTION

Farm output (1947–49=100):

1948	104
1949	101
1950	100
1951	103
1952	107
1953	108
1954	108
1955	112
1956	113
1957	113
1958	123

Source: Farm Output Index, Agricultural Marketing Service.

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON SURPLUSES

"This program [the soil bank] is a sound aid to removing the burdens of surpluses which Democratic programs placed on farmers. It is now moving into full operation" (GOP platform, 1956).

"What this administration has proposed is a direct and effective attack on the surpluses themselves * * *" (Benson, Chicago, March 6, 1956).

"Our major agricultural problem is now surpluses * * * we can lick this problem if we have the sound program the President has proposed" (Benson, Tucson, Ariz., April 4, 1956).

"We have passed the peak of our surplus accumulations * * *" (Benson, Fifth Annual Republican Women's Conference, April 2, 1957).

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO SURPLUSES

The value of the inventory of the Commodity Credit Corporation has increased 5½ times between January 1, 1953 and January 1, 1959—from $1,053,429,000 to $5,448,400,000. It is estimated that 1960 will show another increase of about $3.6 billion (figures from CCC monthly reports).

"* * * there is no positive assurance that he [the farmer] will produce substantially less if price supports are sharply reduced" (Senator AIKEN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1959).

Amounts as well as values of surplus commodities have increased alarmingly, in spite of Mr. Benson's claims:

Commodity	Unit	Amount (thousands)		Percent increase	Value (thousands)		Percent increase
		January 1953	January 1959		January 1953	January 1959	
Wheat	Bushel	132,000	777,000	+588.6	$252,000	$2,192,000	+622.7
Corn	do	279,000	1,167,000	+418.2	447,000	2,037,319	+455.7
Cotton	Bale	236	1,582	+670.0	32,000	226,133	+706.6
Grain sorghum	Hundredweight	194	161,000	+82,969.6	882	407,700	+70,051.5

Source: CCC Commodity Stabilization Service.

The total cost of administering the price support program alone—the total CCC interest, administration, and other general costs—has increased from $34.6 million in fiscal 1952 to a staggering $364.9 million in fiscal 1958 (figures from Senate Agriculture Committee hearings, Feb. 16, 1959, p. 40).

"He [Benson] has not solved the problem of the surplus * * * The surpluses are getting larger despite decline in farm population and the decline in the number of farms under the plow" (Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 9, 1958).

"He chose the device of reducing the support price—the percentage of parity on which the loan is based. The idea was that it would discourage production and encourage consumption. It did neither * * * It did not discourage production because most farmers had no alternative but to keep on producing—in greater volume, if possible, because they got less return per bushel or per bale. The problem became, if anything, worse * * *" (New York Times, Aug. 24, 1958).

"Crop production in 1958 reached an all-tme high—11 percent larger than the previous record" (Crop Production, 1958 Annual Summary, USDA).

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON INCREASING USE OF FARM PRODUCTS

"To me, the answer to this problem suggests itself in letters of fire a mile high: Eliminate as rapidly as practicable ineffective controls and use price supports at levels that will preserve and build markets." (Benson, Senate Agriculture Committee, Feb. 16, 1959.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO INCREASING USE OF FARM PRODUCTS

Civilian per capita food consumption (1947–49=110):

1951	98
1952	100
1958	101

Source: National Food Situation, July 1958.

WHAT THEY PROMISED ON CUTTING COSTS

We have streamlined the operations of the Department of Agriculture—have cut away much costly deadwood and inefficiency—through a major reorganization. (Benson, Boston, Nov. 20, 1953.)

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO CUTTING COSTS

The number of employees at USDA has been increased from 67,406 as of December 31, 1952, to 85,543 as of January 1, 1959—an increase of 26.9 percent.

"Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson seems destined to go down in history as the spendingest Secretary in the Department's history.

"A Library of Congress study shows that Agriculture Department appropriations from 1862 to 1931 totaled $2.4 billion. From 1932 to 1953 expenditures were $25.2 billion. Since Benson took over in 1953 net budget expenditures have reached $31 billion.

"In other words, the present Secretary has spent more than all his predecessors combined." (Washington Post and Times Herald, June 1, 1959.)

THE SQUEEZE IS ON FOR THE FARMER

Cost of farm necessities in bushels and pounds

Item	Cost in bushels of wheat		Cost in bushels of corn		Cost in pounds of cotton	
	1952	1958	1952	1958	1952	1958
Self-propelled combine, 12 foot	2,671.7	4,481.7	3,057.8	5,381.3	142.8	206.3
Power takeoff combine 5- to 6-foot cut	737.3	1,109.7	843.9	1,542.3	39.4	50.1
20- to 29-belt horsepower tractor	1,000.0	1,408.5	1,144.5	1,957.6	53.4	75.0
2-row tractor cultivator	127.7	192.0	146.2	266.9	6.8	10.2
½-ton truck	818.1	1,164.6	936.4	1,618.6	43.7	62.0
Wringer-type electric washer	66.6	87.1	76.3	121.1	3.5	4.6
4-burner gas stove	82.3	107.3	94.2	149.1	4.4	5.7

Source: Crops and Markets, 1953, USDA; Agricultural Prices, July 1958.

"The farmer cannot indefinitely accept higher cost and lower income at the same time." (Representative FRED MARSHALL, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 18, 1959).

THE SQUEEZE IS ON FOR THE CONSUMER

"Consumer prices in U.S. cities rose 0.2 percent between March and April 1959, according to the U.S. Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics. Prices were higher for transportation, medical care, recreation, and personal care, due largely to advances in service rates. Commodity prices were unchanged on the average, despite a slight decline in food prices." (Consumer Price Index for April 1959.) "In short, food alone has kept the Consumer Price Index from leaping from peak to peak during this phase. If food is lifted out of a city family's market basket, the stability disappears." (Sylvia Porter, Washington Star, Apr. 29, 1959.)

"Only the fact that some surpluses are produced holds retail prices for foods as low as they are today." (Senator GEORGE AIKEN, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 13, 1959.)

	1952	1958
Consumer Price Index on food	114.6	120.3
Parity ratio	100.0	85.0

"Retail food costs have risen 20 percent in the last 10 years, the House Agriculture Committee reported Monday, but the prices received by farmers have fallen 8 percent." (Associated Press, the Denver Post, June 1, 1959.)

Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters Voice Opposition to Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two open letters directed to President Eisenhower by Mr. Jozef Mlot-Mroz, president of the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in the United States of America, 18 Boardman Street, Salem, Mass., in opposition to the Khrushchev visit:

OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

AUGUST 2, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The bondage of the enslaved nations of central Europe is one of the reasons causing the international conflict and the real reason for failure of bringing about world peace. As long as the enslaved people will be forbidden to decide about their own fate, so long will last the great war tension in the world. Such was the opinion of the world and that of you Mr. President, just a few months ago.

Your statements on behalf of the enslaved nations at different times, especially your proclamation of the Week of the Captive Nations was an assurance that the miracle of obtaining freedom for these nations among which is found Poland must and should come from the West.

Unfortunately the news, radio, and television announcers for the past few days remark about the cordial invitation extended to Khrushchev to visit the United States. This invitation breaks up the hope of the Polish as well as other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Just at the moment when the Polish people are preparing to celebrate the 20th anniversary of losing their freedom, when Khrushchev wishes to succeed in breaking up this feeling of hope, the eyes of Poland are turned at the United States of America with the hope that it will become their defender. To confirm this we see no better picture than the hearty welcome of Vice President NIXON in Poland.

That is why the visit of Mr. Khrushchev in the United States of America will be a vivid expression of breaking up the hopes of the people as well as the nail added to the coffin of Poland. The hearty handshake with the murderer Khrushchev, the smiles of both leaders will naturally break up the spirit and morale of the people of central Europe and certainly will rule out any American doing in obtaining their peace and freedom.

Therefore as the president of Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in United States of America, I permit myself on behalf of the organization to ask you Mr. President not to invite Mr. Khrushchev to the United States of America.

We, the people of Poland, found in all parts of the world, betrayed Yalta, begrudged a native land, loyal to God and country, beg of you:

It is not proper and permissible to invite Mr. Khrushchev to the United States to break up the spirit and hope of the enslaved nations, to go into partnership with communism, the menace of the 20th century, it is not permissible to join in any work for the coexistence of communism.

It is therefore our duty to safeguard the enslaved nations and bring forth their day of freedom, we must bar the way of communism in their plans of possessing the entire world, embedding within them the communistic ideas, ideas which cripple and destroy the health of the nations.

Only on sound principles will grow up an idea of freedom among the enslaved nations and upon such principles will there evolve a stable world peace and once again will return the peace and happiness for which American people yearn.

These are our pleas which we send to the leaders of the American people.

We, the Polish people of America do not wish that Mr. Khrushchev be invited to the United States. If necessary I will give my life on the altar for the love and freedom of Poland.

Seven days before the arrival of Khrushchev to the United States and in defense of freedom I will go on strike of dry starva-

tion and continue it until I offer my life for my country and freedom.

With respect,

JOSEF MLOT-MROZ,
President, Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in United States.

AUGUST 13, 1959.

SECOND OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The sun of freedom shines the same to all countries, and we must understand the meaning of this motto. There will be no peace at home where harm and misfortune is brought about to our neighbor and friend. Therefore, your friendly clasp with Khrushchev, the Poles may well compare to the Ribbentrop-Molotov pact of 1939, when symbols of communism, nazism, and fascism embedded itself in the hearts of Poland.

The President of the United States should consider that those who now are the enemies of God are also our enemies and therefore there should be talk or even thought of cooperation and unity.

The invitation of Khrushchev to the United States brought about an unfavorable reaction in Congress. The bill of Congressman LANE, who demands public opinion on inviting Khrushchev here, is the voice of a wise and intelligent politic as well as a defender of enslaved peoples.

President Eisenhower should be convinced and aware that communistic Khrushchev through his visit is trying to ease the tension and probably the carefulness of the American people and in this way build up a cradle of peace and bring about an initiative of communistic politics.

Through his visit Khrushchev is trying to lower the morale of the people as well as their desire of courage and firmness in opposition to communstic designs.

The psychological approach for many years taken step by step was a success for Krushchev, and the last resort an invitation to the communistic leader to visit the United States is the most unfortunate step in the career of the great fighter, leader, and politic, our President, Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower must remember that Khrushchev is a murderer who with cold blood sacrified the lives of millions of innocent people just to build up communism. To Khrushchev a human being is nothing more than an animal, a machine, less valuable than modern invented apparatus. Therefore this human being, machine, must be sacrificed for the victory of communistic ideas.

Khrushchev admits that there is no God, he laughs at our feelings and belief, he laughs at the American slogan "We trust in God." Just as Governor Harriman admitted Khrushchev is more dangerous than Stalin.

Khrushchev attempts to possess the world by epitaphs. The first being to force the West to admit the up-to-date communistic ideas of capture, thus to liquidate cold war. Second, to bring about communistic revolts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Third, the gradual overcome of Western Europe and complete preparation to rule the whole world. The fourth, to break down the carefulness and the morale of the American politics during his penetrations into the various countries, that is why Khrushchev so willingly accepts the American invitation.

The invitation is also a sign of our agreement to the continuation of the sufferings of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain.

It is wrong to believe that the Kremlin has changed its tactics in reference to politics and that in the future it promises to live in accordance with the different pacts made. The Soviets only wish to have peace as mentioned by His Eminence Cardinal Cushing, a peace that will give them entire possession of the entire world, and each word of Khrushchev is only an empty phrase. Therefore, there can be no talk of real peace, without freedom granted to the enslaved nations.

O Misery, to this fire of enslavement behind the Iron Curtain President Eisenhower inviting Khrushchev added fuel, therefore further comments are fruitless.

Therefore I call to the conscience of all Americans: America awake, the Red Curtain enfolds you, and the fire of enslavement awaits thee, and you with your Ike dream only of your happiness and success and peace, dream only of clear skies and eternal fairness. Awake America, before it is too late. Khrushchev told you: "We will bury you." This threat can hold only one moral for us: Wake up America—facing Communist danger.

That is why President Eisenhower has no authority to invite and entertain Khrushchev and he cannot confer with him for as history teaches us every such conference is a victory for communism and defeat for freedom. This was affirmed by no one else but Khrushchev who stated that he places the victory of communism above freedom and peace. Khrushchev has the ability and slyness of a fox.

That is why in the name of the Polish people in this country and in all other countries I am not begging for grace or alms but for that what is just and ours. Poland is an alpha and omega of happenings in the world. Help Poland America it was betrayed by you. It is your duty. Helping the suffering nations you defend the future and success of your own country.

The kingdom of this world suffers now, and you wish entertain the greatest enemy of peace? Be ashamed America.

As protest I feel that I must use the only alternative left. As I have stated in my first letter to the President. Seven days before the arrival of Khrushchev I will go on a hunger strike and I will not break it even if I have to give my life on the altar as a sacrifice for the love of my country.

Even though some will consider this a foolish idea, that will not hinder any of my intentions. Only this way and in the face of opposition and foolishness my demonstration is a protest of the feelings of the enslaved nations and the sacrifice of my life is nothing compared to the sufferings of the millions of murdered and being murdered in the Communistic regime.

I place forth the call of all those who are still suffering in defense of their own country, for they cannot do so themselves. I speak on behalf of those murdered by the Communists, the Americans who gave their lives in Korea and those still alive in Communistic prisons. I belief in the justice of truth for which I will sacrifice everything even that what is the dearest wordly happiness, health and life.

My protest in the form of a hunger strike, let it be a verdict for Khrushchev and warning to America. My death on the altar of sacrifice for the love of country may it be an awakening of the Americans who in luxury and success forget the sufferings of others especially the enslaved nations among which is Poland.

With respect,

JOSEF MLOT-MROZ,
President, Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A.

The Costly Vegetable Pest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an article published in the Vegetable Growers Messenger, edited by Mr. Max Chambers, Preston, Md.

Mr. Chambers is one of Maryland's most vigorous and articulate editors. I commend the article to the attention of all.

COSTLY VEGETABLE PEST

One of the biggest and most dangerous problems vegetable growers, and vegetable processors will have to contend with, until controls are found, or some more reasonable attitude is adopted by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, is the tiny vinegar gnat, officially known as Drosophila (Drosahph-ill-ah).

The Drosophila is a tiny flylike insect which has a life cycle of about 8 days. It's the same little so-and-so that lights on your new paint as well as your peaches and apples and occasionally gets up your nose or in your throat.

During a mid-June game this year "Howie" Wilhelm, Baltimore Oriole baseball pitcher, had to stop the game for 16 minutes while umpires fanned and sprayed and finally set off a smoke bomb to get rid of pesky gnats which were swarming in the pitcher's box. Wilhelm is a right hot tomato with eight straight pitching victories.

No one wants to purposely or dangerously adulterate food. It is believed that a great majority of the food processors are anxious to pack a high quality product of which they can be proud. Even Dr. William V. Eisenberg, Chief Microanalyst of the Food and Drug Administration, USDA, Washington, has stated that there is no danger to the public health, welfare and safety, from the insignificant, and up to now, noncontrollable tiny vinegar gnat or its eggs.

Processed foods in cans and jars are automatically heat sterilized which kills any organisms that might accidentally get into the container.

Drosophila's favorite abode is in the crack or skin of a ripe tomato, cucumber and other vegetables. Yet the grape, peach, and wine people in California have much trouble with this pest whose eggs or fragments are difficult to discover without a microscope.

As far back as 1930 the University of Maryland (Dr. Lewis P. Dittman is a national authority) was trying to find a solution to this problem which many feel is highly exaggerated since no one has ever been reported to have been made ill by these microscopic parts, sometimes found in canned foods, no matter how carefully packed.

The Food and Drug Administration has been campaigning hard to keep waste material breeding places from accumulating in the vicinity of the processing plants. Most canneries now have screens but the size mesh screen that would keep out a vinegar gnat would also keep out the air and most of the light. Are the Food and Drug Administration demands leading to air-conditioned fields and processing plants, and the boiling and dehydration of all waste? Most processors feel there must be some better

way and they have high hopes of finding a solution that will give them peace of mind before the 1960 season.

Canners say the old and unintelligent rule of "guilt by association" started this whole problem in the Food and Drug Administration which erroneously thought (and it has been proved to them many times since that they are wrong) that the presence of fly eggs, maggots, and fragments was a positive indication of rotten fruit.

The most troublesome Drosophila month is September, when the swarming gnat invasion hits the East and Middle West. It's October in California. And a cantaloup field half a mile away from a cannery might be the worst breeding area.

It is believed that the problem is not so much one of insanitary conditions as it is one of an uncontrolled and so far uncontrollable insect.

The USDA Beltsville Plant Industry Station has done some research on Drosophila control but some believe the subject has not been allocated sufficient research funds to start a real program to swat this ornery little one.

The USDA 1958–59 budget for investigating Drosophila (which cost one canner $10,000) was a paltry $35,000. It is estimated that for 1959–60 research $100,000 allocation would be sufficient to get an intensive USDA program started to study the gnats' biological aspects (sex life), feeding habits, and reaction to insecticides. Some canners advocate a minimum of $200,000 to get the program into high gear, now.

This year the Government is spending an additional $2 million on fire ant control and $157.8 million on overall agricultural research.

The Food and Drug Administration's total enforcement budget for 1959 is $10,597,000. The President's budget request for FDA for 1960 is $11.8 million ,an increase of $1.2 million. And Congress could increase the allocation.

The National Canners Association has been actively engaged in attempting to find Drosophila controls for years. Dr. Charles Mahoney, states that some NCA investigators and its special committee feel the only sure way to control vinegar gnats is by insecticide spray treatment in the fields and around processing plants, but no spray yet tried will do the job. However, several agricultural chemicals are showing promise.

One NCA report states that the majority of gnat eggs are laid in ripe tomato cracks between the hours of 6 to 8 a.m. and from 4 to 6 p.m., during the dull light and low temperature periods. NCA is urging all canners to put into practice the best known field and plant control methods.

Vegetables processed the same day picked show much lower infestation. Harvested vegetables should not be allowed to remain in the fields overnight. Processing plant refuse dumped in fields should be spread thinly on the surface for rapid drying. All farm baskets, hauling and processing equipment inside and outside the plant should be carefully cleaned daily. Raw stock should be thoroughly culled and washed.

Since this insect does not have any effect on yield, or production in the field, many growers feel that this is a processing rather than a production problem. In several areas last year processing plants were forced to close down several weeks ahead of schedule because they wouldn't take the chance of handling tomatoes infested by the vinegar gnat, or tangling with the FDA. This caused heavy loss to the growers.

It appears that FDA hangs its authority and zealous enforcement attitude on sections 402 and 704 of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. Some inspectors are reported to be young and immature, some of them apparently having little acquaintance with vegetable processing.

FDA inspectors are required to leave written reports with processors, but it has been observed that some of their reports and recommendations have all the earmarks of trying to pick flyspecks out of pepper.

Most canners are reluctant to admit a brush with the FDA or to discuss complaints, or actions filed against them. They are scared to death of this Federal agency because they know it literally has the power to put them out of business, which certainly is not the intent of the congressional act and the opinion of at least one Federal court judge.

In every business there are a few who skirt the law and try to skin the public. For those no defense is intended here.

It has not been possible to get FDA Drosophila tolerances, though court cases indicate that FDA does show a fragmentation go-no-go allowance.

Several tomato canners are believed to have been financially hurt by recent FDA confiscation of 69,000 cases of several canned foods which inspectors said were adulterated with gnat eggs and fragments. Twelve thousand seven hundred cases were destroyed. November is top month for seizures, Pennsylvania leads seizures with 8; New Jersey, 4; New York, 4; 25 seizures were made in 14 plants in 18 months since January 1, 1958.

Federal courts, with two exceptions, have consistently upheld FDA inspectors in their charges. It is estimated that many vegetable canners and cucumber processors across the Nation have been heavily fined, or took the loss without contest (by default) feeling they had no chance to win.

There is reason to believe that most of the seizures and prosecutions have been in the eastern half of the country. This is depriving growers of markets for their vegetables and creating a scar condition.

Processors in several parts of the country who have felt the sting of the Federal court decisions and fines are reported hesitant about opening their plants for the 1959 season.

A caustic example is provided by the closing last year of one of the largest tomato products plants in the East. After spraying fields and plant and operating on short season basis trying to control the vinegar gnat and meet the rigid FDA requirements this national brand packer gave up. It was uneconomical to operate such a large plant on so short a season. A conservative estimate of the loss to the rural and urban community is $1 million a year.

It is interesting to observe that a processing plant spending $100,000 for raw stock also spends another $100,000 for labor and supplies, therefore, making its operation one of extreme economic importance to the agricultural as well as the urban community.

FDA is the government's guarantee to the American public and housewife that the products on the grocer's shelf are good for human consumption.

When an American housewife goes into a store to buy a can of spinach, or tomatoes she knows little about the quality of the product she is buying except to take the word of the canner. On July 1, 1927, Congress established the Food and Drug Administration for the purpose of administering the small group of statutes intended to secure freedom from adulteration, and to require truthful labeling of certain commodities.

Of all the FDA charges filed in the U.S. Federal courts against canners only two have been won, both since 1954, by Marion A. Hoy, a prominent Oak Park, Ill., attorney.

During one of Mr. Hoy's cases, defending an Indiana canner charged with Drosophila violation, in a Federal Court sitting at Chicago, Judge Honorable John P. Barnes said:

"This is not any light charge to make against a food processor. You (FDA) can put them out of business so quick it will make your head swim. I think you ought to keep that in mind. I think a warning (to canners) would have been all right, but I think you are insisting upon an impossibly high standard." "Take this last evidence that came in here. Take all the cases * * * 110. And the average got down to * * * 3.3 vinegar gnat eggs and on the maggots * * * 2. When you (FDA) look at that evidence you know we must be silly; you must not ask us (the court) to be silly. You must not ask me to destroy an industry and approve zeal which I think is misguided.

"And don't ask me to say that flies and maggots are not filth. I think they are, but it is said we all have to eat some dirt. Of course, we don't have to eat it all in tomatoes."

"I don't say these people (canners) should not have been warned; maybe they should be; maybe you (FDA) have to keep warning people (canners) in order to keep up to standard. But this kind of a case can break them, oh so easily."

Serious consequences could result from the growing practice of this kind of bureaucratic power. There is no such thing as a benevolent despot. And there is no denying the FDA is a tough adversary. One related industry observer and bitter critic suggested that Drosophila provides an almost perfect setting for bureaucratic operation and will continue until a more attractive subject is found.

One canner has asked if there is any reason why the FDA (or the Government) shouldn't reimburse a canner for damages which he has suffered because of legal action wrongfully brought against him by the FDA?

In some cases canners' merchandise has been held off the market for 2 years, all the while deteriorating. Canners have had expensive legal fees, gotten a bad name, had working capital tied up, which hampers the purchase of raw stock, factory operation and improvements and community economics.

Congressman THOMAS F. JOHNSON of Maryland (House Office Building, Washington, D.C.) is now actively engaged in investigating some of the actions of the FDA since several Maryland processors are reported to have been seriously handicapped by confiscation and "persecution" and fear of future citations.

Drosophila is an area in which growers and processors could well spend time discussing how to work with researchers and their Congressman, and then the FDA. Something can be done about it. Something has to be done about it.

The Maryland Congressman has suggested that the first step toward a permanent solution could well be a series of carefully planned and prepared high level conferences between canners, growers, and Congressmen. This should lead to constructive planning like a real research program and perhaps even an agreement, a moratorium period, effective until control measures can be discovered and put into practice, or a new crack-free gnat resistant tomato can be found.

Relief for canners, growers and communities from this total problem is long overdue.

Our Government does startling things. Here's a new challenge.

The call is for more research, less fear and pressure.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, R. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Address by Hon. Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas, to the National Convention of the American Legion, at Minneapolis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the very thoughtful and penetrating address delivered today by the capable majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] before the national convention of the American Legion, in Minneapolis. I commend a reading of the address to my colleagues, and I urge that they give it their most serious consideration.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING THE PEACE

Commander Moore, officers of the American Legion, delegates, and distinguished guests, I come to you today fresh from an inspection trip through the heart of America's counterattack forces—the SAC base in Omaha.

It is unfortunate that I cannot describe to you all that I saw. I cannot. There are considerations of military security. And, like most of you, I am not a professional military man. I am a "citizen soldier."

But there is one impression I carried away with me that is unmistakable. It is that I will stake the finest bull on my Texas ranch that the best Nikita Khrushchev has cannot match what I saw yesterday.

The heart of America's striking force is strong—because of organization, men, and determination.

I wish I could say—in good conscience—that everything in America could be described in these terms. The unfortunate fact is that there are many fields in which we must "catch up"—a term that is unfamiliar with most of our people.

STRENGTH OF UNITY

But there is something even stronger than SAC itself. It is the unity and the will of the American people themselves. And that is why I am here to visit with you today.

The American Legion is held together by a commond bond. Comrades all, we have shared in the experience of wearing our country's uniform.

I put on that uniform and went to the Pacific. That was in 1941 when, because we were not sufficiently prepared for an attack, we were taking a heartbreaking beating that—if I can help it—will never happen again.

The Legion is composed of men who did not stop serving their country when they took off their uniforms and put on civilian clothes. You realized that freedom—up to this point—has never been won by a single struggle.

And to that end, you banded together 40 years ago in memory of past comradeship and in anticipation of serve to come.

In the intervening years, you have welded together the unity and purpose of your Legion members and the inspiration and aid of the fine women of the Legion auxiliary.

The caliber and stature of your commanders—past, present, and, I am confident, in the future—exemplify the Legion itself.

A VOICE FOR A STRONG AMERICA

Men such as Comdr. Preston Moore are, have been, and will be an effective voice for a strong America. They have worked for a strong America. And they have worked for a strong Legion. Victory and success are their hallmarks. History will record the full accounting of their achievements.

In this connection, I'm happy to recall the majority support given by the U.S. Senate to the Kerr amendment to the Veterans Pension Act—for which I voted and which was strongly backed by the American Legion.

I am here today largely because of Preston Moore. He thought—and I knew—that I could learn something by this visit. It is our opportunity to exchange views on the most important issue before our people—the survival of freedom in this country.

Although both you and I have a direct interest in our Nation's defenses, I am not here to talk about military preparedness today.

It seems to me that there is another kind of strength which must be considered by Americans. And that is the moral and spiritual strength of our form of government and our order of society.

THE MAJOR ISSUE

All of us know the major issue in our world today: It is whether societies of freemen can maintain themselves. Such societies are faced by the greatest threat to Western civilization since John Sobieski raised the seige at Vienna and Charles Martel crushed the Saracens at Tours.

America is confronted by a brutal power, a totalitarian power, a supremely confident power whose chief spokesman boasts openly that my grandchildren—and your grandchildren—will be Communists. And this same chief of government brags openly that missiles can be delivered on this Midwest city from submarines in Hudson Bay.

If that Hudson Bay threat was intended to scare this Minneapolis Legion meeting, I suggest it was a mistake. Someone fed the brainwashing computer the wrong card.

Within a few weeks the present chief of communism—Nikita Khrushchev—will visit our shores. He will be the official guest of the President of the United States—and in the field of foreign relations that means the American people.

THE BEST INTERESTS

There have been strong expressions of concern and doubt about the wisdom of this invitation. There are those who feel that Mr. Khrushchev's visit is simply an elaborate facade for a two-man summit conference—which has been his publicly expressed goal since he attained power. Mr. Khrushchev's planned itinerary certainly does nothing to dispel this feeling.

But at this point, the wisdom of the invitation is academic. Khrushchev will be here. The issue remaining is whether we conduct ourselves in such a way as to serve the best interests of America.

On this, we must—and shall—stand behind our President.

Personally, I have no fears that Mr. Khrushchev can contaminate the American people. We can take in stride the best brainwashing he can offer, Marxist propaganda, threats of economic competition, limited war in the Far East, subversion in Latin America, submarines in Hudson Bay—or any other fine points of Soviet diplomacy.

In our lifetime, we have been through three wars, depressions and the ravages of cold war. Americans have been hardened to the realities of this world.

Our problem is how to see to it that Khrushchev will have a true picture of our country, a true picture of our people—and a true picture of our purpose.

PRISONERS OF HOPE

I hope that can happen. Because if it does happen that way, Nikita Khrushchev will return to the Soviet Union with his eyes wide open—and we will gain. We will gain because this Nation hs no fear of the truth.

Within the satellite nations are millions of people, most of them prisoners of hope. And that hope must be sustained until the day of freedom becomes for them an actuality.

Mr. Khrushchev has objected to the resolution of the U.S. Congress concerning captive nations. In my opinion, the biggest captive nation in the world today, next to Communist China, is represented in the brainwashed people of Russia. And I strongly suspect that, included among the captives is the ruling class of the Soviets—that keep the rest of the people captive. For we tend to forget that a slave state puts shackles on its masters as well as its subjects. Those who rule are in turn ruled by the channels of information which are open to them.

It is doubtful whether a man in Mr. Khrushchev's position can have a true picture of the United States.

He may know about our military strength. He may know about our economic power. But there are many other things he can learn only by coming to our country and talking to our people.

UNITED DETERMINATION

I want him to know about America's willingness to fight for its freedoms.

I want him to know about America's united determination to preserve our independence.

And I want the Russian people to know about America's desire for peace—the Russian Army which fought so bravely as our ally in World War II; the Russian scholars, such as the Pasternaks and the brilliant Russian scientists; the ordinary Russian people who want, rather than an armaments race, only a few of the everyday consumer goods shown at the U.S. exhibit in Moscow. These are the ones who must ultimately feel the pulse and the heartbeat of America's deep desire for peace.

There are, of course, dangers in this visit to which we must be alert. But I believe our country can withstand exposure to those dangers. Americans are kindhearted; but they are not softheaded.

THE MARKED DECK

It would be tragic if we fell into the illusion that Mr. Khrushchev is coming here with a deal that would mean peace with honor or peace in our time. Because another man—a kindly, good man—once suffered that illusion, you and I had to spend many years in uniform defending our country and millions of people died.

Of course, Khrushchev would like to make a deal. Every dictator would like to make a deal—with a marked deck.

He would probably like to divide the world into two spheres of influence—with a nice, big slice marked out for the Soviet Union.

But the American people are not going to make such deal. We do not believe in a world divided into spheres of influence. We believe in a world in which the people have freedom of choice.

And so long as there is a Soviet sphere of influence which includes Hungary, Poland, East Germany and other satellites, no one can say that this is a world of free choice.

It would be tragic if we suffered from the delusion that Mr. Khrushchev can be charmed into changing his course. I do not know whether he would be amused or insulted by such a suggestion.

I do know that any Soviet official who has survived the Communist blood purges of the past 25 years is not to be beguiled like a schoolchild.

THE GREATEST TRAGEDY

But the greatest tragedy would follow if we came to the conclusion that this visit meant a thaw in the cold war. This is the delusion that could lead us into letting down our guard.

I believe in visits between the American and the Soviet peoples. I am a firm advocate of talking instead of fighting—where possible.

But I think the advice given to our ancestors to "keep your powder dry" was good advice—and applies with especial force today.

We should meet Khrushchev or any other Soviet official in good faith. We should listen to any proposals that are made. We should not permit Communist bad faith or Communist bad temper to tempt us into bad faith or bad temper.

But we should, we must, remember that a few kind words will not release Berlin. A few kind words will not free Hungary. A few kind words will not unite Germany. And smiles and quips—however pleasant—will not bring us the peace we desire nor change Khrushchev's determination to bury us.

The day of true peace can and must arrive. We have devised weapons of such fantastic destructive power that we must either live together or perish together.

That realization will come eventually to the Communists—as it has come to our people already.

THE JOB AHEAD

Until that day arrives, however, we cannot relax America's strength.

We must maintain adequate strategic striking power.

We must maintain adequate capacity to fight limited wars when they are forced upon us in remote corners of the globe.

And we must continue to help other people to remain free.

We do not ask other nations to come under our rule. We ask only that they remain independent.

But no nation will remain independent if we permit the balance of military power to shift to the Soviets. We cannot afford to be second best—even in weapons which we pray we never have to use.

This is the one field in which "second best" means last—and lost.

MAINTENANCE OF STRENGTH

We need not only be sure that we have adequate deterrent power to avoid nuclear war. We must also be sure that we have effective deterrent power against limited war—which might easily become a nuclear war. And this requires that we maintain our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force in such strength that we can land at Beirut if we have to land at Beirut; that we can patrol the Straits of Formosa if we have to patrol the Straits of Formosa; that we can keep the NATO shield intact; that we can deny enemy control of our sea lanes by submarines whether in Hudson Bay or the Caribbean, or on the convoy route to our oversea bases and oversea allies.

We do not live, merely to build weapons. There must be more to life than that.

The day must come when even the most fanatical Communist yields to the pressure for peace. And there are roads to that goal.

There have been a number of Soviet officials parading through our country during the past few months. They have made visits which have been reciprocated.

CRACKS IN THE IRON CURTAIN

Little has been gained from these visits in terms of specific proposals to relax tensions of the cold war. But much may have been gained in opening chinks through the Iron Curtain.

This is the direction in which true peace lies. If Khrushchev can visit the United States, it will be difficult to persuade other Soviet citizens that they cannot visit also.

And at every turn, we should confront Khrushchev and his fellow Communists with a demand to break through the Iron Curtain and let in the light.

We should beset the Soviets at every turn with demands to bring the Russian people the facts about us that have been kept from them. They may respond, if they wish, by presenting their propaganda to Americans.

RAYS OF TRUTH

In a land like ours where speech is free, our citizens are armed against propaganda. But in a nation where the ruling group controls not only speech but thought itself, a few rays of truth are devastating.

We are a people of basic beliefs.

We are a people of basic desires.

For our children we desire a better life than we have lived.

We believe in our country. We believe in our form of Government. We fought for it before and we will fight for it again, if necessary.

We will talk and we are prepared to negotiate, for we are a reasonable people.

But we will not talk surrender. We will not negotiate away freedom—for ourselves or others, now or ever. We never have; we never will.

This has been true of America's past.

It holds true today and forever.

These are the truths for which our forefathers died. Trusting in God and keeping our powder dry, these are the truths by which our children and grandchildren shall live.

Statement on Death of Elizabeth A. Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, a few days ago death came to a good friend of mine—Elizabeth Allen Smart—the very effective and respected legislative agent of the National Temperance and Prohibition Council.

Dr. Charles X. Hutchinson, Jr., president of this fine organization, so capably summarized the story of Elizabeth Allen Smart in the statement which he issued to the members and friends of the national council that I believe his statement should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF ELIZABETH A. SMART

To the members and friends of the national council, the notable career of Elizabeth Allen Smart came to a quiet end on August 16 at the Washington Sanitarium. The victim of cancer, she had battled for almost a year to win her fight with the disease. Immediately following the 1958 convention of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union held in Washington, she entered the hospital with no idea of her precarious condition. She lingered between life and death for several weeks, and with great courage and infinite patience won her way back to partial health. Returning to her apartment, she took up her work with surprising energy in spite of her apparent weakness. After a period of weeks, she recognized that her condition was deteriorating, and made her plans to return to the hospital. She did not go until Bishop Hammaker had gone to his summer home and Mrs. Hutchinson and I had sailed for Europe. She did not want to give us any uneasiness. We found a beautiful bouquet from her in our stateroom when we boarded the *Queen Elizabeth*, and did not know that she had reentered the hospital that very day. On our return, there was only time for a few precious conversations with her at her bedside. Her strength was gone and she spoke in a whisper. She awaited in faith her blessed release.

Elizabeth Smart was the daughter of the parsonage. Her father, the Reverend John Gardiner Smart, was a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church in Schoharie, N.Y., when she was born. She attended Smith College, graduated cum laude, and was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. She decided to enter the law and matriculated in the New York University Law School. She was admitted to the New York State bar in 1915 and was a practicing attorney in that State. Her special interest at that time was in "Business Law" which was the title of a book of which she was coauthor. She became interested in journalism as the medium through which public opinion is molded and motivated and launched a career as editor, and publisher, and later owner, of the oldest weekly in New York State, the Washington County Post of Cambridge, N. Y. In law and in journalism her concern was the direction in which our society was drifting, and she supported every movement for moral and social betterment. It was during that period that the conviction crystallized that beverage alcohol was at the root of most of our social ills, and from that time Elizabeth Smart's name became synonymous with temperance reform.

In 1940 Elizabeth Smart came to Capitol Hill as the director of legislation for the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Her legal and journalistic background had prepared her for her public relations task as she made her approaches to

the Members of the Congress in behalf of pending moral and social, particularly temperance, legislation. She looked upon herself as the voice of the thousands of women in her organization. She had a sense of calling that few, if any, lobbyists have ever had. Her penetrating mind and judicious temper won the respect and confidence of congressional leaders. She was far removed from the doctrinaire reformer. She had an understanding of the difficulties of the legislative process in a democracy. She used her power to persuasion in urging the Members of Congress to move in the direction she was convinced we had to go for the sake of the moral health of the Nation. She kept her constituents informed as to what was happening in Congress through her Washington Letter in every issue of the Union Signal, the national journal of the WCTU. She never wearied. She was always patient. She took her defeats in her stride as temporary setbacks. She lived and died in the faith that her cause would ultimately triumph because it is right.

Elizabeth Smart was related to many organizations including the League of Women Voters, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the American Bar Association, the National League of American Pen Women, and the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Her most active interest apart from the WCTU was given to our National Temperance and Prohibition Council which includes 23 organizations working in the field of temperance reform. She was the secretary for many years, and was chairman of the legislative committee at the time of her death. She has been the key person in our organization for so long that her passing is almost an irreparable loss.

Above all and through all, Elizabeth Smart was a good woman. No finer or truer thing could be said. During the years we worked together my regard for a gallant lady grew, and my affection deepened. For she was great as a person. We shall miss her sadly, but we shall carry on in her faith that "Though the wrong seem oft so strong, God is the Ruler yet."

The value of the life and work of Elizabeth Smart during her many years on Capitol Hill is suggested in the tributes of many Members of the Congress. I close with a few of the testimonies.

"It was my privilege to know Miss Elizabeth Smart personally. I had frequent conferences with her and was greatly impressed with her dedication to the cause of temperance. For nearly 20 years she faithfully and consistently served as director of legislation in the National WCTU and never failed to advance its purposes at every opportunity. She was courteous, intelligent, considerate, and of unimpeachable character. Her memory will live long in the minds of those who knew her as a fine Christian woman, devoted to a righteous cause."—Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia.

"It was with great sadness that I learned of the passing of Miss Smart. She and I have worked together ever since I have been in the Senate, and I have had the highest regard for her. The cause of temperance has lost a great champion, and Miss Smart will be sorely missed by all those who felt as she did." (Senator WILLIAM LANGER, North Dakota.)

"I knew Miss Smart personally and talked with her on numerous occasions regarding her work. I found her to be most energetic in urging legislation which she considered to be of great benefit to our young people particularly, and the country in general. She will be greatly missed, and it will seem unusual here not seeing her testify before congressional committees on matters of moral and social importance." (Senator FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota.)

"May I express my deep regret of the passing of Elizabeth Smart. She was not only one of the most effective legislative agents in Washington, but she was a good friend of mine. It was a pleasure to work with her on the most worthy objectives she championed. She was intelligent, reasonable, and cooperative. I shall miss her." (Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine.)

"It was with much regret that I learned of the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, and I paid my respects at the funeral home because of the high esteem in which I held her. Miss Smart was a fine Christian lady who rendered an outstanding service. I had the pleasure of working with her in our efforts to win passage of my airline safety bill and the Langer antiliquor advertising bill. She was a very able and diligent worker for the cause of protecting the public against the evils of alcohol. She will be missed on Capitol Hill and by all those she so ably served throughout the country." (Senator STROM THURMOND, South Carolina.)

"I was greatly shocked and saddened when I learned of the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart. Miss Smart was a welcome visitor to my office during my entire service in Congress. She had a most gracious personality, and was able to present her cause in a convincing and effective manner. The passing of Miss Smart is an irreparable loss to the temperance movement, and she will be sadly missed by her many friends on Capitol Hill. It was indeed a great privilege to have had her as a friend, and my life is richer because of our acquaintance." (Congressman J. EDGAR CHENOWETH, Third District, Colorado.)

"No exponent of a worthy cause in Washington, during the entire quartercentury of my experience here, has done so much—so quietly and effectively—as Elizabeth Smart. Her devotion to the cause in which her faith never wavered was equaled by an acumen and balanced judgment that never failed to amaze even those who had learned to know how effectively she worked. She lived her beliefs, as well as preached them. When she came into an office, she put fresh vigor and higher level in the whole day's work. I shall miss her sorely; her judgment, her dedication, and most of all, her personal friendship." (Congresswoman MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, 13th District, Illinois.)

"I was deeply distressed at the passing of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart for whom I had a high regard. I am placing your statement concerning her in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today (August 21)." (Congressman EDWARD H. REES, Fourth District, Kansas.)

"Miss Elizabeth A. Smart was a woman of great usefulness and capacity and she will certainly be missed by her friends and all those who came in contact with her. She was zealous and relentless in pursuing the cause of temperance, and yet she was never hostile or vindictive. Certainly she was one of God's great women and we will miss her and her good counsel and effective efforts in the great cause of temperance in the days ahead." (Congressman EUGENE SILER, Eighth District, Kentucky.)

Funeral services for Miss Smart were held in Washington on Wednesday morning, August 19. Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker was in charge as Miss Smart had requested. He was assisted by Mrs. T. Roy Jarrett representing the National WCTU and the writer. Interment was in Cambridge, N.Y.

ADDENDUM

The following tribute to Miss Smart appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1959:

"I doubt if I ever met an advocate of a cause who was more fair, more understanding or more gentle and kindly than Miss Elizabeth A. Smart of the WCTU, who died last week of cancer. Miss Smart was an educated woman of infinite patience, who represented the temperance movement with dignity, integrity, and fairness. She was never intolerant or antagonistic of those who disagreed with her. She never threatened, bullied, or attempted belligerence. A person of brilliance, she made no effort to display her learning ostentatiously. * * * She rarely touted her own prowess. I counted her as my friend. * * * Members of the WCTU are fortunate, indeed, to have been represented in our Capital for nearly two decades by this woman of refinement, education, and compassionate motives. All who knew her will continue to honor and respect her memory. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart was a remarkable and gifted person." (SENATOR RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, Oregon.)

Restoration of UNICEF's Tax Exemption Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement containing information relative to the restoration of the tax exempt status of the United Nations Children's Fund, a status which has been denied by a recent ruling of the Internal Revenue Service.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS TO RESTORE UNICEF'S TAX EXEMPTION STATUS

PURPOSE OF THE BILLS

On July 23, 1959, Senators JAVITS and DOUGLAS introduced S. 2426 which was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. Two identical bills have been introduced in the House (H.R. 8355 by Mr. LINDSAY and H.R. 8583 by Mr. METCALF). The House bills are before the Ways and Means Committee of which Mr. METCALF is a member. These bills would restore to UNICEF donations the same classification they held prior to January 1, 1959. The bills provide that contributions by individuals and private groups in the United States made directly to UNICEF shall receive the same Federal tax exempt status now accorded donations to charitable organizations operating in the United States.

BACKGROUND OF TAX LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The need for legislation proposed in these bills has grown out of the following developments. On February 6, 1959, Mr. Dana Latham, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, notified UNICEF that contributions made to or for UNICEF are not deductible under the provisions of section 170 of the 1954 code. Bequests, legacies, devises or transfers to or for UNICEF are likewise not deductible for U.S. estate tax purposes as provided by sections 2055 and 2106 of the 1954 code. Gifts of property are also not deductible in computing taxable gifts for the U.S. gift tax purposes as provided in section 2522 of the 1954 code.

This ruling reversed the original interpretation of UNICEF's tax status as established July 10, 1947, by Internal Revenue, a ruling made shortly after UNICEF was created (in

December 1946). At this time contributions made to UNICEF were determined to be deductible by donors in arriving at their taxable net income in the manner and to the extent provided by section 23 (o) and (q) of the Internal Revenue Code as amended. Bequests, legacies, devises or transfers to or for UNICEF were deductible in arriving at the value of the net estate of a decedent for estate tax purposes in the manner and to the extent provided in sections 812 (d) and 861 (a) (3) of the code. Gifts of property were likewise provided for in section 1004 (a) (2) (B) and 1004 (b) (2) and (3) of the code.

The reversal of the ruling concerning UNICEF's status for tax exemption purposes comes as a result of the decision that the United Nations Children's Fund is an integral part of the United Nations itself which was designated as a public international organization under the International Organizations Immunities Act (Public Law 291, 79th Cong.) and therefore its tax status must be determined under such act. Internal Revenue concluded from its analysis of this act that UNICEF was exempt from income tax under section 892 rather than section 501 (c) (3) of the code of 1939 which made no provisions for the deductibility by donors of contributions made to public international organizations. (This code was amended by Public Law 7, 80th Cong., to allow deductions for contributions or gifts to the United Nations during the period from January 1, 1947 to December 1, 1947, but only if used exclusively for acquisition of a headquarters site in New York City. The 1954 code contains no provisions similar to those added to the 1939 code by Public Law 7.)

Mention should be made of the fact that the provisions of the Revenue Code affecting UNICEF have not changed since the establisment of the Children's Fund, nor have the functions and operations of the Children's Fund changed in any fundamental respect.

AMOUNT OF MONEY INVOLVED

From the Treasury's point of view, the amount of money involved in contributions to UNICEF, whether the taxes are collected or not, is too small to have any effect on the Federal budget. From UNICEF's point of view, however, the importance of the contributions is twofold:

1. They afford an important, even though relatively small, source of income;

2. More important than the matter of actual financial support, such gifts represent evidence of effective voluntary participation by private citizens. UNICEF has made possible a broad program of aid by which over 100 countries have been able to provide food, medicine, and disease-destroying chemicals to benefit over 50 million children and nursing or pregnant mothers. This humane program has undoubtedly saved the lives of countless children. To remove this sense of direct participation by American citizens in such a program by the deliberate handicap of withdrawing tax deductibility of contributions to it would be a serious mistake in public policy. By its leadership in encouraging nations to learn to help themselves, UNICEF offers charity in the broadest and most enlightened sense of the word.

Since January 1, 1959, when the Internal Revenue ruling took effect, the report for the first 6 months of this year indicates that donations to UNICEF have dropped by more than 30 percent below the figures for contributions for the first 6 months of 1958. Although governments are the principal support of UNICEF, the continuation of individual participation through contributions by private citizens is vitally important and should be encouraged through appropriate tax law provisions.

SUPPORT OF THE BILLS

There is no evidence of opposition to this legislation from any source—State, Internal Revenue, the Congress, or the public.

The Citizens Committee for UNICEF, along with a number of other national organizations interested in the work of the Children's Fund, is deeply concerned for the enactment of such legislation before Congress adjourns. The fact that these bills were not introduced earlier in the session is intensely regretted. However, until very recently the hope remained that Internal Revenue could be induced to reverse again its position and restore UNICEF's previous tax status. A number of tax lawyers seem to uphold the correctness of the Internal Revenue interpretation as it now stands, however, and, therefore legislation showing the intent of the Congress in this case is urgently needed before adjournment in order that the Children's Fund not lose the benefit of possible contributions during the remainder of 1959. Unless action is taken immediately, the impact of the present ruling would inevitably continue well into the calendar year 1960.

A way to insure prompt action would be for the Finance Committee to attach this legislation as an amendment to H.R. 8725, or other bill reasonably sure of passage, now pending before the committee. May we have your support for such action?

Moving Migrants From Overpopulated Countries to Countries Where Manpower Is Needed

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the publication of the George Washington University Federalist, fall 1959, there appeared an article, entitled "An Episode in My Political Career of Which I Am Especially Proud: Moving Migrants From Overpopulated Countries to Countries Where Manpower Is Needed," written by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. There is no man in the Congress of the United States or elsewhere who is better qualified to discuss or write about the subject matter of his article than my close and valued friend from Pennsylvania. In my remarks, it is a pleasure for me to include therein the article written by Congressman WALTER:

AN EPISODE IN MY POLITICAL CAREER OF WHICH I AM ESPECIALLY PROUD: MOVING MIGRANTS FROM OVERPOPULATED COUNTRIES TO COUNTRIES WHERE MANPOWER IS NEEDED

(By FRANCIS E. WALTER, Representative from Pennsylvania)

When the victorious Allied armies liberated Western Europe and entered Hitler's Reich, they found over 8.5 million displaced people. Part of that mass of humanity were slave laborers conscripted into Hitler's war machine. Part were the wretched inmates of concentration camps. Part were refugees from bombed cities and villages milling aimlessly around the countryside and camping under the open skies.

UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration), with the active assistance of the military forces of the Allies, provided food, shelter, and assisted those who could be sent to their countries quickly. By 1946, the number of displaced persons who could not be sent home due to the fact that their homelands were overrun by Soviet forces and Soviet-installed regimes, was close to 1.3 million. It soon became evident that these people would have to be resettled outside of Germany and Austria.

IRO (International Refugee Organization) took over where UNRRA and the military left off. By the summer of 1951, over 800,000 displaced persons found new homes in countries which offered them resettlement opportunities.

However, in 1951, it was realized that with the expiration of IRO scheduled to occur at the end of that year, the problem of resettlement of refugees and displaced persons would not be fully and successfully resolved. More than that, another problem was facing the free Western World: "surplus population," an ugly definition, meaning that there were too many people in Western Europe for whom work and opportunities for a decent livelihood could not be found.

At the same time, many overseas countries—Canada, Australia, and several of the Latin American Republics—indicated their interest in acquiring new settlers in order to increase their agricultural and industrial productivity.

In the late summer of 1951, I gathered in my office a few officials representing various agencies of the U.S. Government and submitted to them a tentative plan calling for the creation of an organization designed not only to take over the functions of IRO with respect to the resettlement of refugees and displaced persons, but also build an efficiently operated machine which would stimulate and carry out migratory movements from Europe to overseas countries.

My idea was to create an intergovernmental organization, outside of the United Nations for the obvious purpose of eliminating Communist interference, and to offer to the countries of emigration and the countries of immigration efficient shipping services, as well as assistance in their selection of immigrants and their vocational preparation for migration.

In a series of sessions, which continued in my congressional office for about a month or two, my plan began to take shape and before the year 1951 was over, we succeeded in obtaining the cooperation of the Government of Belgium, which invited 27 governments to participate in an international conference which convened in Brussels, Belgium, in November 1951.

A provisional organization was created by the Brussels Conference for the purpose of "making arrangements for the transport of migrants for whom existing facilities are inadequate and who could not otherwise be moved from certain European countries having surplus population to countries overseas which offer opportunities for orderly immigration." It was further decided that the new organization would provide and arrange for land, sea, and air transportation, assume responsibility for the charter of ships, work out a shipping program and take over actions as may be directly related to these ends.

The name of the organization is the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration (ICEM). Its headquarters are in Geneva, Switzerland, and its present director is Mr. Marcus Daly, an American industrialist and civic leader. He succeeded two distinguished American diplomats, the late Hugh Gibson and Harold H. Tittmann. I have served as the U.S. delegate at all of the semiannual sessions of ICEM's Council, the organization's governing body.

Since the Conference in Brussels established ICEM, 897,788 European emigrants (including 13,171 European refugees stranded in the Far East) went to 17 overseas countries where they were able to start a new life. In this figure are included both refugees and "surplus workers" who became useful workers in the lands which accepted them. Also included are 110,000 Hungarian refugees who fled Hungary in the aftermath of the 1956 revolution.

The emergency operation undertaken by ICEM in October 1956, in connection with the Hungarian revolution, and the ensuing exodus from Hungary has earned that organization recognition and praise of the entire free world. Practically overnight ICEM's machinery sprung into action, and its helping hand was extended without delay and with the greatest degree of efficiency when and where such assistance was most desperately needed.

ICEM now comprised a membership of 29 nations of the free world. Since its inception, ICEM has spent close to $200 million, of which $72 million was contributed by the United States. What did this money buy? In addition to a wealth of experience, which would permit ICEM to expand its activities in the future and in addition to an imponderable but easily detectable capital of international goodwill, ICEM has created in close to one million hearts the feeling of happiness and purpose in living where war and misery had planted the seed of despair and hopelessness. But these humanitarian achievements do not tell the entire story of ICEM's usefulness. It should be stressed that ICEM is not solely a relief organization. By moving migrants from overpopulated countries to countries where manpower is needed, it achieves three purposes:

1. It relieves pressures on the U.S. immigration quotas by permitting European immigrants to resettle in countries other than the United States.

2. It relieves economic, social, and political pressures in European countries contributing to their stability, thus strengthening the free Western World.

3. It contributes to the economic development of overseas countries by supplying them with European manpower in the most desirable age bracket.

Newsmen See President in Full Command of Office

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column written by Roscoe Drummond, entitled "Newsmen See President in Full Command of Office," published in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, on August 26, 1959. I feel sure this article will be of interest to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSMEN SEE PRESIDENT IN FULL COMMAND OF OFFICE

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Veteran Washington correspondents—not given to overstatement—assessed Dwight Eisenhower's 169th presidential press conference Tuesday as a stirring moment of history.

To one whose White House reportorial experience goes back to the crackling, opinion-laden meetings with F.D.R. and the tense, explosive, yes-and-no hours with Harry S. Truman, this was one of the most moving and momentous press conferences of a quarter century.

If there was any lingering doubt that Mr. Eisenhower is in decisive and full-fledged command of his awesome office—in foreign affairs, in domestic matters, in congressional relations—it was totally removed by this impressive performance.

But it did far more than that. It was moving and momentous—

Because it showed Mr. Eisenhower irrevocably intent upon using his "last atom of strength"—there appeared to be plenty of it—and his "last atom of prestige" to try to bring about a more peaceful world.

Because it revealed the President speaking with such depth of feeling and conviction that few, if any, of the 233 reporters had any doubt that, in the bold peace moves he is now making, there is not a partisan or personal motive in his whole being.

Because it made clear that Mr. Eisenhower is not going to let small-minded arguments of protocol and propriety sway him from his venturesome diplomacy with Premier Khrushchev since, as he put it, the issue is "too tremendous"; it is the survival "of the human race."

Because it disclosed that the President's unabated determination is to find a way to reduce the crushing burden of armaments before they explode in Soviet hands and that, without yielding ideals or principles he will spare nothing of himself to bring it about.

Because it showed that Mr. Eisenhower is zestfully wielding the presidency as at no other time since his first inauguration.

Yes, Mr. Eisenhower still got his syntax a little tangled. Occasionally he would stop a sentence in midstream and then start over. But his ideas didn't get tangled; his clarity of purpose stood out and there was never any doubt about what he meant.

When a correspondent asked whether Mr. Eisenhower thought that his trip to the Soviet Union might "erode the prestige of the President," it was obvious that this question stemmed from Mr. Truman's latest newspaper article in which he advised Mr. Eisenhower not to make the trip lest "it dissipate" presidential leadership.

Mr. Eisenhower's instant response was that while his personal prestige might or might not be eroded, the prestige of no future President would be eroded by anything but his own actions.

Mr. Eisenhower was completely in charge of his press conference all the way. It was clear that he knew what he wanted to say and why he wanted to say it; what he intended to do and why he wanted to do it.

The reason there is no doubt in the President's words is that there is no doubt in his mind and this stems from three factors: (1) The loss of Secretary of State Dulles; (2) the resignation of Sherman Adams; (3) the visible and continued improvement in his health.

All of these factors have contributed to making Mr. Eisenhower a full-length participant in the development of administration decisions. For months now he has had to be part of the staff which does the staff work on major policy decisions. He no longer comes in only at the end.

He did not want to lose Mr. Dulles. He didn't want to lose Mr. Adams. But my impression is that he thoroughly likes the kind of harder work he now has to do.

For the first time Dwight Eisenhower seems to enjoy being President.

Medical Care, the American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the citizens of our Nation have given increasing attention to proposals and plans that would ease the impact upon the family budget of major medical expenses.

With its jurisdiction over tax and social security legislation, the Committee on Ways and Means is devoting more and more time to the study of this problem. It will be recalled that the Republican 83d Congress authorized a significant liberalization of the medical expense deduction available to our citizens in computing their income tax liability. In addition, the 83d Congress, approved legislation protecting the social security benefit entitlements of persons who sustained disabilities. Congress has also provided for the payment of disability benefits and dependency benefits where the primary provider in a family has become disabled.

The Committee on Ways and Means recently concluded public hearings on a proposal to provide medical and hospital care benefits under the social security program for OASI beneficiaries. This proposal has created considerable controversy. It has been criticized on the ground that it is discriminatory in that it would impose on the present working population the cost of medical care for the present aged, on the ground that it would result in bureaucratic Government intervention in the practice of medicine and on the ground that it would interfere with the doctor-patient relationship that is such an important element in the medical care of our citizens. The proponents of medical and hospital payments under the social security program support their position by stating that their proposal represents the most feasible method of meeting this problem. They say that medical and hospital insurance programs are not adequate.

I disagree with this latter contention. In my opinion, our insurance industry and the medical profession are making tremendous strides in their endeavors to assure adequate medical care for all our citizens on a nondiscriminatory basis and within the framework of our free enterprise system. This progress is being made without subjecting the medical profession to domination by the dictates of Government bureaus and without launching our Nation on the discredited path of national health insurance. It is encouraging to me that we have made such remarkable progress in meeting our medical and health needs by individual and collective initiative without reliance on Government paternalism.

An article appearing in the Wall Street Journal today presents some very interesting factual information regarding the gains which have been made in this area. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks the text of this report.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]

HEALTH INSURANCE—MORE PLANS FIND WAY TO BOOST BENEFITS: IGNORE MINOR ILLS—GE'S PROGRAM SETS PACE, AVOIDS RISE IN PREMIUMS; 12,000 OTHER FIRMS FOLLOW BUT AFL.-CIO DISLIKES IT

(By Jerry E. Bishop)

NEW YORK.—In the fast-changing field of health insurance, a new product is beginning to make spectacular gains at a time when

many of the older types of policies are beginning to run into trouble.

Like most successful new products, this one—called comprehensive coverage—has many features not found in the older health policies. But, in one sense, it offers quite a lot less. Under this plan, for example, if a person goes to the hospital for minor repairs for just a day or two he'll probably have to pay all the bills himself.

The theory behind this: By not paying the small claims—whose aggregate cost is very high because they're so common—the insurer can offer more extensive benefits to cover serious illnesses. And he can do this without the frequent, stiff premium boosts which some insurance officials blame partly on a tendency by policyholders to go into the hospital for minor ills that would be treated at home if hospital care weren't free.

FIRST DOLLAR COVERAGE

The new policies are a radical departure from the old philosophy of first dollar coverage that has been the cornerstone of most of the major health insurance plans. First dollar coverage—providing payment of smaller as well as larger hospital bills—was one of the key attractions that enabled the Blue Cross to grow from a small, local experiment in Dallas in 1929 to a mammoth collection of 79 regional associations with more than 54 million members. Private insurance companies also relied heavily on the first dollar idea as they built their hospital and surgical coverage to more than 70 million people in the last 20 years.

Now, however, financial problems are increasing for plans which attempt to cover almost all their subscribers' hospital expenses up to an agreed limit. Last year the Nation's Blue Cross plans ran up a deficit of $40 million after paying out some $1.4 billions in benefits. New York's Associated Hospital Service alone plunged $30 million into the red.

With the cost of medical care rising faster than any other component of the cost-of-living index (it was up 4.4 percent in July over a year ago and now is more than 50 percent higher that it was 10 years ago), employees who are covered in group health plans are being hit with wave after wave of premium increases. Blue Cross plans in Concord, N.H., Atlanta, Chicago, Cleveland, and Detroit have boosted their rates from 20 to 30 percent this year . Similar premium boosts are slated for Pittsburgh and New York City in the next few weeks. Insurance companies, which provide similar health coverage on both an individual and group basis, also have had to increase premiums or to quietly prune out some former benefits from their policies in order to balance dollar intake with rising claim payments.

A RISING BUSINESS COST

Many employers pay part or all of their employees health insurance premiums, so the rising premium rate is also becoming a rising cost of doing business. At the same time, there is growing pressure from unions for more extensive health coverage. Broader benefits are among the major demands being made on the steel and aluminum industries by the United Steelworkers, now on strike against the steel companies. And the big United Auto Workers union is reported to be preparing demands for more liberal health insurance at its next bargaining session.

Meanwhile, pessimism is growing about how present insurance systems can survive without further drastic rate increases. "Ten years from now, health insurance as we know it will be dead as a dodo," one leading insurance executive declared recently in an off-the-record talk. What he and an increasing number of other insurance officials envision as a substitute is a system of medical protection that covers the major expenses of a serious illness, but leaves the minor costs to be met by the individual.

The leader in this new trend is, strangely enough, not an insurance company, but the General Electric Co.—better known for such products as light bulbs, refrigerators and turbine generators.

In 1949, a group of G.E. executives organized a plan to insure themselves against the catastrophic costs of a major illness. The plan was the forerunner of what is known today as "major medical" insurance; it was quickly borrowed by other firms and is now the fastest growing type of health insurance, covering at least 13 million persons. The number of persons covered has doubled each year for several years.

The basic provisions of major medical insurance are: (1) High maximum benefits, ranging from $5,000 to as much as $15,000. (2) A deductible amount. This is a specified amount, $300 to $500 in early plans, which the individual must pay himself before reimbursement by the insurer starts, (3) Coinsurance. This applies to a percentage, usually 20 or 25 percent of covered expenses in excess of the deductible amount. The individual must pay this portion of the covered expenses himself. The plan does not provide reimbursement of this amount.

COMBINATION OF COVERAGES

While major medical insurance has the key advantage of softening the crippling financial blow that a catastrophic illness can deliver to a family, its weakness is that the deductible amount is so high that lower income workers still would be hard hit in case of a severe medical emergency, having to pay out $300 or $500 on their own before insurance payments are received. For this reason, many employers in recent years offered their employees a combination of coverages—Blue Cross and Blue Shield (surgical insurance) for basic medical costs and major medical insurance for the most serious and expensive illnesses, for which Blue Cross and Blue Shield benefits would be insufficient.

It was almost inevitable that an attempt be made to merge the two forms of protection into one. The first major experiment in this direction was attempted in late 1955—again by General Electric. GE sought to cover not just a few executives but all its 250,000 employees and an estimated 500,000 dependents. GE's lead has since been followed, in a variety of forms, by thousands of other firms.

The GE comprehensive plan greatly broadened the benefits formerly available under its employee medical care program. The new plan covers major bills running as high as $7,500 a year or $15,000 in a lifetime. In addition, it poses few restrictions on the kind of medical bills that will be covered. Besides the usual hospital and surgical bills, the plan also covers such items as drugs, nursing care, blood transfusions, anesthetics, X-rays, ambulance services, and iron lungs, which are often extra-cost items for persons with ordinary health insurance. The plan also provides that medical bills will be paid whether they are run up in a hospital, at home, or in the doctor's office.

However, GE requires the employee to shell out some money from his own pocket. Expenses are divided into two classes. On A expenses—hospital and surgical bills— the employee must pay the first $25 himself; the plan pays the next $225 in full and then 85 percent of the balance. B expenses include physicians, nurses, drugs, and use of laboratory and diagnostic equipment. Here, the employee pays the first $50 in a calendar year and the plan pays 75 percent of the balance. If both A and B expenses are incurred in 1 year, the total deductible amount for both is only $50, much smaller than the usual deductible in major medical insurance.

This differs from basic plans which cover most expenses from the first day of hospitalization on, but which also set top limits on the number of days of hospitalization for which they will pay and the amounts they will pay for specific operations. These payments frequently do not cover full costs.

"With our provisions, the individual takes a greater interest in the fees he's being charged and he's not likely to abuse the plan," says Russell Hubbard of GE's employee benefit department.

"Most existing plans force people into a hospital," says another GE executive. "For example, they provide that a $15 diagnostic X-ray is not reimbursable unless the patient enters the hospital, so many doctors will stick him there for a day or so in order to qualify and thus run up a lot of extra costs. In our plan, we've tried to leave it so that a doctor can practice medicine as it should be practiced without prescribing such things as a hospital stay just so the patient's plan will pay the bills."

The $25 and $50 deductibles also eliminate many of the small $5, $10, and $15 claims, which cost just as much to process as a $100 claim. "It doesn't make economic sense for insurance to pay for bills that an employee can easily budget for himself," says the insurance specialist of another company, adding that it sometimes costs his firm $8 to process a $5 claim.

The "coinsurance" feature of GE-type plans, under which the employee pays a percentage of the total bill, also is helping to curb abuses, some companies say. "We know of any number of instances where doctors had two schedules of fees—one for patients with insurance and one for those without insurance," says Gordon Thayer, director of industrial relations of Vitro Corp. of New York, another firm which has embraced comprehensive health insurance recently.

Helping win employees to GE's new plan was the implied promise that the plan, by discouraging abuses of medical insurance, would prevent premium rates from climbing as rapidly as they otherwise would. So far at least, the promise seems to have held good. "Our premium rate hasn't gone up since 1956," comments GE's Mr. Hubbard. Claims, it's true, have increased in average size from year to year but only about half as much as the national average increase in medical care costs. And offsetting this has been a 30-percent decline in the number of petty claims—those under $25.

The broader benefits available under the plan evidently appealed to GE employees right from the start. Given a choice between the new plan and the company's older "first dollar" type program augmented with expanded major medical type benefits, 99.2 percent of GE's eligible employees have switched to the new plan. (For a GE employee earning $6,000 a year, the new plan costs $154 a year, including all dependents, compared to $95 for family protection under the previous plan. For single employees there is no difference, the annual premium being $54 in both cases.) Handling the actual coverage are the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. and Aetna Life Insurance Co.

GE's experience is attracting a horde of other employers to comprehensive plans. The big electrical appliance manufacturer estimates that some 12,000 other companies have adopted comprehensive plans since it set up its program, 4,500 of the new additions coming in 1958 alone. American Cyanamid, Douglas Aircraft Co., the San Francisco Hotel Employers' Association, and Caterpillar Tractor are just a few of the newcomers into the field.

Equitable Life Assurance Society, one of many insurance firms which now are offering comprehensive plans, says it has issued such policies to 327,000 persons, 8 times as many as were covered in 1956. According to the Health Insurance Institute, 5,175,000 persons were covered by comprehensive plans at the end of 1958, compared with almost none 3 years earlier.

Now, the idea of doing away with full coverage of medical bills is creeping into Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans, formerly the stronghold of "first dollar" philosophy.

Late last year, Philadelphia's Blue Cross plan, known as Associated Hospital Service of Philadelphia, began offering a program which, in return for more liberal benefits, calls for the subscriber to pay the first $5 of each day's hospital charges up to 15 days a year. So far, says a spokesman, more than 500,000 Philadelphians have switched to the new co-pay comprehensive plan, or about one-third of the Blue Cross subscribers who are eligible. Deductible provisions in various forms also have popped up in Blue Cross plans in Missouri, Texas, and Kansas.

Officials at New York City's big, deficit-plagued Blue Cross plan, known officially as Associated Hospital Service of New York, concede that they too are considering adding comprehensive features to their coverage. The New York program is under pressure to broaden its benefits, after receiving permission recently from State insurance officials for a 26.5-percent rate increase, which followed a 22.3-percent rate boost in June of last year.

Comprehensive health insurance, despite its recent breath-taking growth, is far from universally popular. "The deductible feature is a very sensitive point with unions," admits an executive of one big industrial company which has been trying unsuccessfully to persuade its employees to switch over. "The coverage of the $6 or $8 claim, because it turns up so often, seems to be more important to most people than coverage of the bigger but less frequent expenses."

Last month, members of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers Union turned thumbs down on a comprehensive plan offered by the Sinclair Oil Co.

The AFL–CIO on several occasions has leveled criticisms at comprehensive and major medical insurance. One charge is that the deductible provision might discourage prompt use of medical facilities and might become an incentive for letting minor illnesses become major ones. Another complaint is that comprehensive medical insurance takes away protection from the many and only seems to give additional protection to the few. According to the AFL–CIO, only 1 out of ever 100 families ever incurs medical expenses as high as $1,000 in a year's time.

Insurance officials are quick to offer rebuttals. Says an official of New York Life Insurance Co., "Health insurance has become a means of spreading small payments over all employees. We have lost sight of the imortant principles of insurance. There is no point to insuring a cost which is apt to fall regularly on the people, because such an item should be allowed for in the family budget, and the cost of insurance administration merely adds to the inevitable basic cost."

General Electric, prior to introducing its plan, held hundreds of meetings with union officials (the big company bargains with more than 100 different unions), salaried employee groups, doctors, and hospital representatives. It still carries on intensive followup work to be sure that costs stay in line. In one midwestern town, it discovered that frequency and duration of weekly sickness and accident claims were more than double the company average. A meeting was held with the local medical society. "Following this meeting the frequency and duration of disabilities were so reduced that the cost was cut in half. Hospital and surgical rates also dropped," says a GE health insurance specialist.

On a national basis, the frequency of hospital admissions for GE employees, excluding maternity cases, is now 90 per 1,000 in a year, compared with about 112 for Blue Cross organizations. Surgical claims average 75 per 1,000 employees, compared to 125 per 1,000 in a typical Blue Shield large city plan.

Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the pending visit of Premier Khrushchev to this country in the minds of our citizens across the country is a major consideration.

In itself, it marks a unique pattern of negotiations between nations with conflicts of interest—as strongly as freedom versus communism—when the leaders of two opposing camps exchange visits.

A big question before the American people is: Just how should he be received?

In view of the fact that Khrushchev is the No. 1 Communist—which represents the most serious threat to our security existing in the world—there are widely differing views on his reception.

Recognizing that the President, in agreeing to the exchange visits, felt that such an interchange might well contribute to solving some of the East-West differences and lessening tensions, the American people, I believe, have a responsibility—which I am confident they will meet—of acting in a way that will provided the best kind of climate for whatever results may be obtained from such an exchange.

Commendably, our mass media—publishing, radio, television—are assuming a fine responsible role in attempting to create the climate that augurs best for the visit.

Particularly, I refer to a splendid editorial recently published in the Janesville Daily Gazette, Janesville, Wis., entitled "Khrushchev's Visit."

Representative of constructive editorializing for the upcoming event, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, Aug. 25, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

Khrushchev's visit to the United States next month will be one of the most extraordinary events of its kind in American experience.

Of all the famous foreign visitors, from Lafayette of Revolutionary War days right down to the recent visits of Baudouin of Belgium and Queen Elizabeth II, there seems to be no parallel.

The Russian leader comes as an official visitor, and the top man of the Russian Soviet, and is thus entitled to all the red carpet treatment accorded heads of state. He has talked like an enemy, but comes as a friend. He heads not only a state which operates under a political and economic system hostile to ours, but also is the nominal head of the entire Communist bloc.

The hostility of many Americans toward Russian communism, of which Khrushchev is the symbol, and especially of newcomers to America recently escaped from behind the Iron Curtain will make security arrangements for the visit particularly difficult. The impending visit has so baffled Congress that it has been tacitly decided to adjourn prior to the arrival of the Russian leader, so that the customary invitation to any visiting head of state to address a joint session may be avoided.

Some Americans hope that the visit here, and President Eisenhower's trip to Russia will improve relations between the two countries. Others regard the exchange of visits as a mere formality, with Khrushchev having the edge of the bargain because of his obvious eagerness to see this country. Certainly it may be predicted that Americans will not change their views toward communism as a way of life because of the visit, and it seems equally certain that Russia will not change either. The gain may be in a degree of understanding on some special problems of today, rather than in basic philosophy.

How then should Americans treat a guest who comes without anything more than a surface and official welcome? The best course, it seems, is to follow the lead of Washington in extending a coldly polite reception, going no further than necessary to meet standards of international good conduct, but being certain to observe strictly the niceties and conventions usually extended to a visitor of his importance.

It will be a trying few days because impulsive Americans can be expected to show their active dislike for Russian communism before its foremost leader, or at the other extreme, react involuntarily with the usual warm greeting ordinarily extended famous visitors from abroad.

Self-control and a degree of reserve are needed because Khrushchev must not be permitted to go home in the belief that Americans are actively hostile toward himself and his country. But it is just as important that he sense the fact that America is completely opposed to those things which he represents, and that his visit here is tolerated rather than sought.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Petroleum Industry

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 100th anniversary of the petroleum industry in the United States. On August 27, 1859, Col. Edwin L. Drake completed the world's first successfully drilled oil well at Titusville, Pa.

The petroleum industry has contributed more than any other single group to the evolution of man from the era of the candle and the horse and buggy to the supersonic jet.

Its achievements are legend; not the least of which was the event which we celebrate today. Although we cannot overlook the contributions of the refiners, the pipeliners, the engineers and technicians, this first 100 years in the petroleum industry shall go down as the century of the wildcatter.

Oil lay valueless in the ground millions of years before the wildcatter found a way to bring it to the surface for others to refine and develop into the thousands of commonplace items in our daily lives.

At the beginning of the second half of oil's first century, petroleum supplied less than 10 percent of the total energy of the United States. Today, less than

50 years later, that industry supplies nearly 70 percent of all our energy needs. The opportunities open to this dynamic industry over the next 100 years are limitless, providing it remembers its birthright of individualism.

Yes, it was the century of the wildcatter. It was the wildcatter who made the petroleum industry the moving force in our lives today and it will be the same spirit of determination to overcome all obstacles, be they natural or manmade, which will lead the industry to the realization of those opportunities.

I am proud that I represent in our Nation's Congress the area in which the first great wildcatter showed the way to those who were to follow. Little did anyone in 1859 dream of the fountainhead of abundance which would spring from that one hole in the ground. Today there are more than 280,500 such wells which have been drilled in Pennsylvania alone. In each instance they contributed to the strength of the industry and the Nation.

In each instance those wells were drilled by men who were instilled with the spirit of the oilfinder, the "Man of the Century" in petroleum's first 100 years.

The assistance and inspiration received from those associated with this vital industry in the 23d District of Pennsylvania, which I represent, have helped to shape Federal policies which have encouraged the wildcatter to take the risks inherent in the development of our petroleum reserves. With this continued help to all in Congress, our Nation can be assured of an abundance of petroleum for peace and throughout any emergency.

I congratulate the industry on the success of its first century and I am confident that it will continue to meet its obligations as it continues to provide the Nation with the blood of its industrial economy and national defense.

Personal Income Gains in the Southeast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Atlanta Journal of August 24, 1959, published an article concerning the national per capita income and the per capita income of the States in the southeastern region. The article points out that during the last 25 years the national advance has been 656 percent, whereas the increase in income in Georgia has been 843 percent.

I wish to point out that Florida, with a gain of 1,794 percent, leads every State in the entire Nation.

We are proud of the economic progress we are making in our State. We are proud of the economic progress we are making in our region. We are also proud, Mr. President, of the economic progress we are making throughout the entire Nation.

While our per capita income in Georgia is still much lower than the national average, I wish to point out it is increasing relatively faster than the national average. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objections, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Journal, Aug. 24, 1959]

DIXIE INCOME GAINS $35 BILLION IN 25 YEARS—GEORGIA'S $5.6 BILLION IS 843 PERCENT INCREASE; FLORIDA'S 1,794 PERCENT LEADS ALL OF NATION

Personal income in the seven-State Southeast increased more than $30 billion—from $3,291 million to $34,896 million—during the past 25 years, the U.S. Department of Commerce has reported.

The increase in Georgia was from $602 million in 1933 to $5,678 million in 1958, according to Merrill C. Lofton, manager of the Atlanta field office of the Federal agency.

Other increases were Alabama, $40 million to $4,364 million; Florida, $440 million to $8,334 million; Mississippi, $266 million to $2,302 million; North Carolina, $678 million to $6,297 million; South Carolina, $305 million to $2,929 million; and Tennessee, $560 million to $4,992 million.

Florida's increase of 1,794 percent was the Nation's greatest gain in personal income during the quarter of a century.

Included in the income computations were wages and salaries, proprietors' income, dividends, pensions, and income from other sources.

Comparing personal income estimates of the Commerce Department's Office of Business Economics for 1958 with those of 1933, Mr. Lofton said the past quarter of a century also brought almost unbelievable gains in per capita income, ranging from a 724 percent advance in Alabama down to 560 in Florida.

In Alabama per capita income went from $165 in 1933 to $1,359 last year; Florida, $284 to $1,876; Georgia, 204 to $1,487; Mississippi, $131 to $1,053; North Carolina, $207 to $1,384; South Carolina, $174 to $1,218; and Tennessee, $204 to $1,439.

In both total and per capita income, the gains made in the Southeast have not only been among the most impressive in the country, but substantially exceeded the average for the Nation as a whole. In total income, compared with a national advance of 656 percent, were Alabama's 892 percent, Florida's 1,794, Georgia's 843, Mississippi's 765, North Carolina's 829, South Carolina's 860, and Tennessee's 791 percent.

In per capita income in the 25 years, all of the gains made in the Southeastern States also forged ahead of that for the Nation. Compared with a U.S. uptrend of 448 percent were the 724 percent in Alabama, 560 in Florida, 629 in Georgia, 704 in Mississippi, 568 in North Carolina, 600 in South Carolina, and 605 percent in Tennessee.

In total income, 4 of the 7 Southeastern States have moved upward among the 48 States of the Nation in rank. Alabama climbed from 28th position in 1933 to 24th last year; Florida, from 28th to 12th; South Carolina, from 34th to 31st; and Mississippi, from 37th to 33d. Georgia, however, slipped back 1 notch, from 19th to 20th; North Carolina, 1, from 17th to 18th; and Tennessee, 2 places, from 20th to 22d.

None of the 7 did too well in change in rank upward in per capita income, however. Alabama remained in 45th position; Florida advanced 1 place, from 29th to 28th; Georgia dropped back from 41st to 42d; Mississippi, from 48th to 49th; when counting the District of Columbia, North Carolina went from 40th to 44th; South Carolina, from 44th to 48th; and Tennessee, from 41st to 43d.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Birth of Hannibal Hamlin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the finger of fate points in curious fashions, for had Hannibal Hamlin of Maine been Vice President during President Lincoln's second, instead of first, term of office, he would have been elevated to the high position of President of the United States.

Destiny's dictate has not, however, served to diminish Vice President Hamlin's stature as a statesman, and he will hold in the future, as he has held in the past, a well-deserved place in our Nation's and the State of Maine's hall of fame.

Today, August 27, marks the 150th anniversary of the birthday of Hannibal Hamlin, and I was privileged to participate in today's ceremony when, in honor of this event, a wreath was laid at the base of Hannibal Hamlin's monument in the Capitol.

Maine newspapers have heralded this 150th birthday anniversary with special articles about Maine's truly great statesman, and because the following article has a political theme, I am commending it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Aug. 22, 1959]

HANNIBAL HAMLIN LETTERS REVEALED—A FENCE MENDER EXTRAORDINARY

(By Frank Sleeper)

Hannibal Hamlin was mending fences in 1847–48.

The man who was to become Maine's only Vice President of the United States had been defeated in his attempt at election as U.S. Senator in 1846. A deadlock in the State senate brought that result.

Hamlin's second term as a Democratic Congressman ran out as 1847 began—and he did not choose to run again.

Instead he ran for and was elected to the State house of representatives. From that perch, he marshalled the antislavery Democrats of Maine and, in May 1848, was elected to the U.S. senatorship he wanted.

There's no better day than Saturday—the day the 150th anniversary of Hamlin's birth is being celebrated in Paris Hill—to throw a little more historical light on the man.

Five letters from Hamlin to Hugh D. McLellan of Gorham are being made public Saturday for the first time. All are political in tone.

They cover the period January 25, 1847 to February 6, 1848. About 10 years ago, a customer gave the letters to barber Frederick L. Grant of 15 Morning Street.

"He was a cabinet finisher and found the five letters in a cabinet on which he was

working. He knew I collected old stamps and envelopes so he brought them to me," Grant explains.

"I can't think of a better time than the 150th anniversary of Hamlin's birth to reveal the contents of the letters publicly," the Casco Arcade barber says.

There's good reason for the political tone of the five letters. McLellan was a leading Democrat in Cumberland County in 1847. He aspired to be speaker of the House of Representatives—and was successful in that quest.

The final letter of the group was written to McLellan in Washington where he was a clerk in the Treasury Department.

That looked like a reward for a job well done. If it was, it's not to be wondered at.

Hamlin speaks in these letters of rewarding McLellan for throwing his support to the future Vice President.

As the Maine historian, Dr. Louis C. Hatch, put it in his "Maine, A History," "He [Hamlin] had entered politics at the time of the triumph of the spoils system and, like most men of his day, including Lincoln, he accepted and used it."

The five letters build to a peak. The fourth is marked confidential. The fifth and last is labeled strictly confidential.

It's a blow-by-blow account of Hamlin's words to a politician whose support he felt was essential to his election as U.S. Senator.

The salient points of the first letter, January 24, 1847, written from Washington, are few.

"Well, we have finally got the House of Representatives in order after a close fight," Hamlin wrote McClellan. "Well, you will be Speaker, I hope. I will do what I can for you with all pleasure. You must work yourself and make your friends do so too," he concluded.

The second letter is dated March 16, 1847, written from Hampden, Hamlin's residence at that time. It was getting closer to legislature time (sessions started in May then) and the letter showed it.

"Charles Stetson of Bangor would like very well to be elected State treasurer if he can be as well as not," Hamlin said. "I write you at the request of his friends to learn what your views are and how you are situated. Will you do me the favor to give me your views and much oblige me by so doing?"

"How comes on the speakership?" the future vice president continued. "I am at home and ready to serve you to the best of my power. I will aid you all I can and you must be elected. You and your friends too must work. Let me know what I can do. I shall be at Augusta at the organization and will do what I can with our delegation and others."

The third letter is dated 8 days later, March 24, 1847. Again it's from Hampden and, again, goes deeper into the Maine political scene of the times.

"I trust you will be finally so situated that you will join with us in electing Stetson State treasurer. You and ——— and a few others can do it," Hamlin wrote. (Apparently, they were not successful or McLellan held with a man from his area because one Moses McDonald of Limerick was named State treasurer in 1847).

"I have written to Johnson of the Age (a newspaper or magazine), Bradbury (U.S. Senator James Bradbury, elected as a compromise candidate in 1846) and Parker, urging them all to go in for you," he continued. "I will do all I can. When I hear from them, I will let you know the result."

And then the future Vice President moved to one of his pet opponents:

"I did suppose that there was no doubt but Governor Dunlap (a four-term governor, arden Bowdoin man and a friend of Hamlin's) would be appointed collector at Portland (he eventually was). I think he will yet but Mr. Anderson, I learn, will press hard for a reappointment." (This was Gov. Hugh J. Anderson of Belfast, the man with whom Hamlin had deadlocked for U.S. Senator in 1846, probably a proslavery Democrat and one of Hamlin's opponents for U.S. Senator in 1848).

"I trust he will be defeated and that Governor Dunlap will be the man. He will fulfill his promise to me in your behalf, I have no fear," and thus Hamlin put McLellan more in his debt.

"Shall meet you at Augusta. Don't be backward in calling on me. Make the demand and it shall be answered if I have the power to do it," he concluded.

The fourth letter—marked "confidential"—is dated May 5, 1847, and was written from Hampden. The legislature was about ready to begin.

"You will have most probably learnt before this reaches you that I have been elected to our legislature. I trust I shall meet you on Monday at Augusta. You shall have my support for speaker," Hamlin declared. (Good support—McLellan was elected speaker.)

Then came a twist—but one which politicians have used before.

"For reasons which I will state when I meet you, I will now say that I should like well to be nominated for that office (speaker) and then decline it. I think too that it might help you. (Hamlin had been speaker early in his political career. Perhaps he wanted the publicity that such a move would bring or perhaps he wanted the eyes of the legislature focused on him by the move.) But let it all be in confidence until I see you when we will fully understand each other and will pull together," the letter ends.

The legislature ended. Hamlin continued mending fences. U.S. Senator John Fairfield suddenly died at the end of 1847. McLellan went to Washington as a clerk in the Treasury Department. Hamlin was backed by the antislavery Democrats in Maine for the senatorship.

There were four against him—Anderson, Nathan Clifford, attorney general of the United States from 1846 until March 1848, Samuel Wells, a former Whig, and John D. McCrate, a persistent officeseeker who liked Hamlin.

On February 6, 1848, Hamlin wrote the following "strictly confidential" letter from Hampden to McLellan in Washington:

"I was pleased to hear from you and to learn that you were not committed to anyone. I was also quite sure I should have your good wishes," he said.

"I hold truly to the doctrine that a representative should follow the wishes of his constituents. That is sound doctrine but the dicta of politicians are not always the will of constituents.

"For some reason, and really I cannot tell what, the office-seeking politicians opposed me in 1846 and will do so now, I presume. All the customhouse influence was against me in 1846, so I suppose it will be now. I suppose it may nearly all go for Clifford, on the ground, in fact, that he will go for them.

"That may be for the personal interest of the officeholders but not for the mass of the party. I have not time to go into an extended review of the subject but I think you will see fully the tendency of the suggestions which I have made.

"So far as I can learn from different sections of the State, my success looks better than it did in 1846. We have no Pillsbury in our delegation this year and I can carry a large majority of the East overall.

"I shall have or may have some of your friends in your county as well as in other sections of the western part of the state. If you shall be willing to give me your influence, you can secure my election and, if elected, I should be in a situation to reciprocate your favor.

"It is said that Clifford talks with all confidence of success. But let me tell you it is all * * *. He does it for effect. He cannot be elected. I may not be but he cannot," Hamlin asserted.

He emphasized that even if someone else were elected U.S. Senator it would not be Nathan Clifford.

"Your position will be such that, with such of the friends in your county as I have, yours can secure me a majority of your county and I secure my election. I think you will rely upon my good faith to you from my past acts. Upon that you may rely with full confidence," the letter ended.

Hannibal Hamlin mended Maine fences well in 1847–48.

He built so well that—with the shift to the Republican Party which he made—he became Vice President and, eventually, one of the most powerful Members of the Senate.

Lack of Public Access to the Nation's Shores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., protesting the lack of public access to the Nation's ocean shorelines.

Because I think the story in the Capital Times contains an eloquent quotation from the Saturday Review, I want to take the time of the Senate just for a minute or so to read what the situation is on public access to our ocean shorelines at the present time.

The Saturday Review writes:

If any explorers landed on our shores today, the way they did several hundred years ago, they'd have a difficult time making their way inland. It's private property. Almost every attractive seashore area on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts has been taken for private or commercial development, according to the National Geographic Society.

The spectacularly beautiful Pacific shoreline of the United States stretches 1,700 miles from Mexico to Canada. In a recent survey, the National Park Service found that 1,448 miles of it are privately owned and not available for public recreation.

Only 240 miles of the Atlantic and gulf coasts—3,700 miles long—are owned by the people as a whole. More than half of that 240 miles is in three places: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (North Carolina); the Acadia (Maine); and Everglades (Florida) National Parks.

Fortunately, the property lines stop at the high water mark. Once you're in the water it's all yours—and the jellyfishes' and the planktons'.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times, Aug. 25, 1959]

STATE BETTER OFF THAN NATION IN ACCESS TO LAKE WATERS

It is just possible that Wisconsin is better off than the Nation in public access to shore areas. A recent survey of ocean shorelines of America shows that if one of the great

explorers like Columbus or Hudson arrived now, he would have to pinpoint his landing with great accuracy, not to land on private property.

Governor Nelson, a champion of greater access by the public to Wisconsin lakes, has estimated that fully 35 percent of Wisconsin's 8,000 lakes do no provide access to the general public.

That's a lot of lakes closed to the public, but many of them are small. Most big lakes have some access, though more is needed.

Here are the figures on the ocean shores, as reported in the August 22 issue of the Saturday Review—appropriately, in the Trade Winds section:

"If any explorers landed on our shores today, the way they did several hundred years ago, they'd have a difficult time making their way inland. It's private property. Almost every attractive seashore area on the Atlantic, Pacific, and gulf coasts has been taken for private or commercial development, according to the National Geographic Society.

"The spectacularly beautiful Pacific shoreline of the United States stretches 1,700 miles from Mexico to Canada. In a recent survey, the National Park Service found that 1,448 miles of it are privately owned and not available for public recreation.

"Only 240 miles of the Atlantic and gulf coasts—3,700 miles long—are owned by the people as a whole. More than half of that 240 miles is in three places: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (North Carolina); the Acadia (Maine), and Everglades (Florida) National Parks.

"Fortunately, the property lines stop at the high-water mark. Once you're in the water it's all yours, and the jellyfishes' and the planktons'."

Voice of Government Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Connie B. Gay by name, has instituted a service worthy of note at this time. Mr. Gay, a man formerly in Government and more recently a well-known figure in the entertainment world, purchased a Washington radio station on June 1, 1959. This station, bearing the call letter identification of WGAY, has been in service since 1945. Up to its purchase on June 1, other than playing phonograph records and an occasional announcement of public interest, the station did little to distinguish itself from the 13 other stations in the area.

On June 1, Mr. Gay instituted an idea and format that should be of particular interest to all of us. Every day this station broadcasts announcements called "Voice of Government Reports." These reports are approximately a minute long and are broadcast every 15 minutes. In addition, Mr. Gay calls his station the Voice of Government People, and as such relays Government news and information to the over 400,000 Government workers in the Washington area. Mr. Gay's thinking is outlined and reviewed in the June 1 edition of the Washington Post and the Evening Star. The results of just 2 months of programing Government reports and exceptionally fine music are reviewed in the Washington Daily News, July 21. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include excerpts from both articles in the Appendix of the RECORD:

[Excerpts from the Washington Post and the Evening Star, June 1, 1959]

A WIDE OPEN WASHINGTON LETTER TO AMERICA'S 5,697 IMPORTANT RADIO ADVERTISERS AND TO THE WASHINGTON AREA'S MOST IMPORTANT MILLION CITIZENS: OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S EMPLOYEES, THEIR FAMILIES, AND FRIENDS

FOREWORD

This is the first personal message I have ever addressed to—and in behalf of—the tremendously important Washington area consumer market * * * in many ways the most important of its kind in America today. Seldom, if indeed ever, in this country's brilliant advertising and marketing history, has a radio station been planned so completely to surround, saturate and sell a market so rich in potential, as the 250,000 Government Employees whose listening ear this station now specifically serves. Those who fail to read the following statement will miss a business message of inestimable value.

CONNIE B. GAY,
President and Chairman of the Board
Radio Station WGAY (Now With Studios in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia).

* * * * *

With the publication of this announcement, there comes to you the first news of an entirely new technique in shaping an advertising medium to exactly, specifically fit a rich, and vitally important consumer market.

It is (so far as is known) the first successful attempt to apply to the great field of radio broadcasting the only basic principle ever found successful in designing a primary consumer advertising medium of any kind.

Nowhere else in America (so far as is known) is there a radio broadcasting station beamed so directly and exclusively at—and for—a large prosperous group of free-spending consumers and their families and friends, as the Washington's new radio station WGAY.

With a specialized broadcasting service that includes news of, and for, the Federal Government and its dedicated Washington area workers, WGAY announces the final triumph of years of careful planning.

Planning which now makes this station—alone of all advertising facilities available to those who wish to advertise in this rich, important consumer market—the finest and most profitable selling medium available.

* * * * * *

But nowhere in the entire Washington market area has there been a radio station or broadcasting facility which is designed specifically and exactly to select, reach, interest, and sell the U.S. Government employee, and his or her circle of family and friends.

* * * * * *

No city on earth, no matter where, is quite like Washington, D.C.

Advertisers and marketers who judge it by other markets, or try to sell in Washington by generally accepted marketing procedures, sometimes miss this fact.

It is the Government employee, at all levels, who makes this so. Washington is a city of government, and of the men and women who make good government in this country possible.

* * * * *

It has been a challenge to me to find a way of providing constant, scheduled, tailormade broadcasting news and comment of and for this market within a market, within the Washington area. The all-important people who help run the U.S. Government.

Recently, with the purchase of station WGAY, this challenge became an opportunity.

* * * * *

We are concentrating specifically on the men and women of Government, and through them, their families and friends, who comprise the market within a market of our great Washington Community.

* * * * *

It is the calculated policy of the new radio station WGAY to broadcast Government news bulletins each quarter-hour throughout the broadcast day.

Plus the kind of good music that has been responsible for the sale of millions upon millions of albums and single records. Records by such great artists as: Perry Como, Percy Faith, Frank Sinatra, Patti Page, Doris Day, Peggy Lee, and scores of others.

In this way, the entire area of governmental activity will become public knowledge.

And employees of Government will, themselves, keep abreast of the activities and decisions of their own agencies, departments, divisions, and offices—whether at home or in the car—by staying tuned to WGAY.

* * * * *

The opportunity of giving function, life, and significance to an idea that has long occupied my time and thought.

By publishing this announcement, I want to pledge the facilities and abilities of station WGAY and its staff to genuine, heartfelt service.

While we hope to entertain and inform many thousands of others * * * our first consideration, and our dedication of service, is to those who serve our Government.

CONNIE B. GAY,
President, Chairman of the Board.

[Excerpts from the Washington Daily News, July 21, 1959]

WGAY PIONEERS IN MAJOR PROGRAMING BREAKTHROUGH

WASHINGTON, D.C.—WGAY, maintaining studios in Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia, has pioneered in two major breakthroughs in present-day stereotyped programing. All newscasts are presented without commercial interruption, and the station features "Music-Casters" playing a wide range of music—from Mantovani to Crosby.

Nearly a million Government employees and their families now have their own "Voice of Government" radio station in this rich Metropolitan area, according to WGAY president and chairman of the board, Connie B. Gay.

Verified figures already obtained from home interviews and car-pool drivers show that over 62 percent of these high income Government people turn first to 1050 on their radio dial (WGAY's better music frequency) to find out what goes on in their own departments. As a result, sponsors are experiencing results unheard of in Washington area merchandising.

Forthcoming Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

an open letter to the President of the United States from the Paterson Evening News. The letter is concerned with the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev and the President's later visit to the Soviet Union.

The letter rightly calls attention to the importance, whatever one's regard for the individual, of courteous treatment of an official guest of our country. For, as this forceful editorial points out, the American people surely expect that the President will be accorded respectful recognition in the course of his state visit to Russia.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, Aug. 24, 1959]

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: A PERSONAL MESSAGE TO GENERAL EISENHOWER ON THE EVE OF INTERCHANGE OF VISITS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Gen. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

You are about to launch the greatest and most far-reaching peace-seeking program in the history of modern man.

Greater than the peace of Versailles, vastly more encompassing in its universality than the treaty at the end of the last war to end all wars.

You were the civilized world's man first in war, first in the hearts of all allied countrymen. You summoned millions of men to battle, you led the forces which crushed the totalitarian dictator who had menaced the free world. You trod the bloody battlefields and suffered with the boys who were your very own from America, fighting at the side of other soldiers who were the allies.

Now you are the civilized world's man of peace.

You are about to launch a new Battle of Armageddon, but this time not on the field of military strife but in tenuous diplomacy, the outcome of which may decide the fate of the universe.

You have invited to our midst the Premier of Soviet Russia, Nikita Khrushchev, who in his world dealings has been anything but our ideal of a statesman or humanitarian.

In turn, you have accepted an invitation to visit in Russia and to bring to those people a message of peace from America from our own man of peace.

Now, there are many, many people in this country who sincerely oppose presence in this country of Khrushchev. To some he stands for the inherently abhorrent communism with which he has threatened to engulf the world. To others, he represents the horrors of oppression, the mass killings in Hungary—hated totalitarianism. For these people and their attitudes we have a complete sympathy. We don't like him, either.

Still others declaim against Khrushchev in America because they are platform hams looking for headline space and playing on the sympathies of minority groups embittered by past Soviet indignities. Add to this a fringe of pinheads with no genuine concept of reason but with an eye to sensationalism.

We believe with you as America's man of peace that anything that can be done to throttle the murmurings of international strife must be essayed. You have decided that an interchange of visits with Khrushchev may help still the storms of world discord and perhaps establish a more ordered existence between nations.

You are our Commander in Chief, in peace as in war. You have decided to receive Khrushchev and in turn, to go to Russia. That's good enough for us, and it should be good enough for all Americans.

We know that certain phases of such an interchange must be distasteful and almost intolerable to you. And yet, in your dedicated desire for peace, you are willing to undergo all the rigors of Mr. K.'s visit here, your own trip to see our allies in Europe to keep them happy, and finally, the trip to Russia.

That's an ordeal, especially for a man who less than 2 years ago was gravely ill, not once but twice.

Under the circumstances do the malcontents, sincere or hypocritical, have a right even to whisper their dissent from what you have planned? For shame.

We in America do not have to stew Mr. K.'s course with archids, nor shout our huzzahs of delighted camaraderie.

But we must be respectful, we must accord him the recognition due him as a head of state.

And above all, we must remember this: As we do to him, his people will do to our President.

Mr. President, we agree with you that it is better that our leaders meet on the field of friendly interchange than on the bloody battlefield of war.

So we respectfully suggest to you, sir, that:

1. You are the man who will be dealing with Khrushchev. You'll inspire more respect and confidence in the man and his people than all the others who visited him combined, and we say this with full deference to the splendid performance of Vice President NIXON. Don't permit politicians or needling newspapers to persuade you to pop off in advance about how and what you're going to tell Mr. K. Keep that to yourself and for your own conversations. In other words, don't make the fellow angry with advance notice of your own toughness before he is able to get it firsthand from you.

2. Before Mr. K. arrives, we earnestly and respectfully urge that you summon all America to sit around their television sets for 5 minutes of a given evening to have a chat with you. And in this chat, we suggest, Mr. President, that you call on all your people to receive Mr. Khrushchev in the spirit in which you have invited him; that he is a guest of this country; that people don't have to love him but that they must not under any circumstances commit an overt act; that they must bear in mind the truth of the commandment that what you want done to yourself, do unto others. That if we want Russians to be cordial to our President, we must respect their head of state.

This personal message from you, on every television set, on every radio, in every newspaper, will hold off the malcontents, will stay the hands of those who may secretly be plotting some nefarious scheme. Heaven forbid a crackpot should attempt an assassination.

You, Mr. President, are our man of peace.

The Lord bless you as you prepare to sail for Europe to meet our allies. May He bless, as well, your deliberations and return you safely to our midst as the man to whom we look, with devout prayer on our lips, for the great peace which has through the ages so tragically eluded us.

Respectfully yours,

THE EDITORS,
Paterson Evening News.

Hope Deferred: Public Welfare and the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, many of us have introduced bills during the present session of Congress dealing with our social security and welfare system. I wish to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of this House to a book which I have just read and which I believe every Congressman concerned with these issues will want to read.

The book is "Hope Deferred," written by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek and Floyd W. Matson, of the University of California, and published recently by the University of California Press.

Although its subtitle, "Public Welfare and the Blind," indicates the specific subject matter with which the book is concerned, "Hope Deferred" goes far beyonod that special province to shed light on many of the most critical and vexing problems of government today. It deals directly, for example, with the issue of federalism: with the question of what in truth the relationship is—the respective rights and powers— of the State and National Governments under our system. The book deals no less directly with the sensitive issues of congressional-executive relations, which are more than ever in the forefront of our attention. Congress now possesses various committees, such as the Committee on Legislative Oversight, for the purpose of reviewing the work of executive agencies; still others of our committees are empowered to seek information from the executive. Most recently of all, the courts have made a renewed effort to define the role of congressional committees generally in relation to the executive branch. On all of these pressing and perennial problems "Hope Deferred" has a close and instructive bearing—not least of all in showing how Congress has come increasingly to exercise a reviewing and supervisory, rather than an initiating, role in developing our public programs and seeking to hold them to responsible account.

On still a different level, this book also casts new light on the relationship of the individual citizen, whether organized or unorganized, to the great programs of welfare and security which have been erected in our country in recent years—as well as his relationship to the executive agencies which administer those programs and the legislative machinery which enacts them.

Perhaps the most signal service provided by this book lies in its demonstration that our entire system of social se-

curity, ever since its adoption in 1935, has been the storm center of a continuous struggle between Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government, in which two theories of the nature of social security have been in direct conflict. On the one hand officials of the social security administration have adhered to a policy of subordinating public assistance to the preferred concept of social insurance, on the assumption that those receiving public aid are a residual element to be minimized and disparaged: a policy utterly barren of any constructive element. This policy is the direct descendant of the medieval poor laws and workhouse, and has preserved that outmoded spirit through the imposition of a rigorous means test—a virtual pauper's oath—which effectually discourages the blind and the disabled from rising above the poverty and dependency that have been the requirements of eligibility for the program. Moreover, the executive theory has sought to enforce absolute Federal control over the assistance programs of the States and to disallow any departures, however legitimate and progressive, from its own administrative precepts—while at the same time permitting the Federal administrator the broadest latitude of discretion in ruling upon the programs. By contrast, Congress has consistently expressed a very different and opposed theory of public assistance, and moreover has held to it despite repeated reversals and opposition by the executive agencies: a theory which has sought to introduce constructive elements into the program, which while placing a floor under relief permits the individual States complete freedom in devising liberal provisions of their own, and which above all is conscious of the need to maintain firm legislative control over the system.

In specific terms, "Hope Deferred" is a study of the most significant social provisions established for the blind over the past generation, most notably the programs of public assistance and vocational rehabilitation. The harsh point of the title is that, despite a number of genuine advances, the hope of the blind men and women of America for a recognition of their real capacities and needs is still deferred in both of these crucial areas. And I may add that there is another deferred hope which emerges from this book: the hope of Congress to have its will and intent, as expressed in some of the most important legislation of our time, carried out in the face of persistent hostility by appointive administrative officials.

Just as significant, I believe, is the evidence this book provides of the pressing need for legislation such as that contained in H.R. 14, which I introduced in the present session, and which was subsequently contained in some 60 bills submitted in the House, along with a similar bill introduced by Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, and 32 other Senators: legislation expressly designed for the purpose of protecting the right of the blind to organize and to be consulted by Federal agencies in the conduct of programs for their welfare. Our bill recognizes the fact that independent organizations of the blind, as opposed to agencies for the blind, have in the past been systematically excluded from consultation in the development and administration of such programs, and indeed that these organizations have found themselves the targets of harassment and threat on more than a few occasions by officials of public agencies making use of Federal funds in their programs. The right to organize, in the case of such disadvantaged groups as the blind, is practically tantamount to the right of free speech and self-expression; and, by the same token, the right to consultation for the blind constitutes a right to be heard in the expression of their needs.

Although "Hope Deferred" does not deal directly with this legislation, it furnishes a convincing argument for it by exposing the negative and backward policies of aid and rehabilitation for the blind which might easily have been avoided if representative organizations of the blind themselves had been brought in for consultation in the formative stages.

On the same score, the opening section of the book in particular should be required reading for all administrators and workers in programs for the blind; for it clearly exposes the false stereotypes about the nature of blindness which have been largely responsible for these mistakes in policy and administration. More affirmatively, the authors draw upon the extensive literature of medical science and social science for a realistic appraisal of blindness and of the capabilities of blind persons. Their conclusion is "that the blind as a group are mentally competent, psychologically stable, and socially adaptable; and that their needs are therefore those of ordinary people, of normal men and women, caught at a physical and social disadvantage." Like other persons the blind "have a need for shelter but not a need to be sheltered: a need for adjustment and acceptance but not a need for toleration or patronage." The authors propose that every social program and institution for the blind be judged by the straightforward test of "whether it meets or defers meeting these needs; whether it presupposes the normality and equality of persons who are blind or presumes their abnormality and inferiority." It is a shocking commentary on the state of our welfare system that few if any of the numerous programs described in "Hope Deferred" come off with a passing grade when put to that test. This is notoriously the case with the sheltered workshops presently supported by the public rehabilitation program, wherein neither the goals of vocational rehabilitation nor the standards of fair employment are remotely approximated. The situation is not much improved in the remaining areas of rehabilitation, and is only beginning to be reformed in public assistance—where the existence of the means test and other onerous conditions of eligibility continues to frustrate the objectives for which the system was devised by Congress.

The authors of "Hope Deferred" are particularly well qualified to undertake such broad examination of public welfare as it affects the blind. Professor tenBroek—who is well known to Members of both Houses for his many articulate appearances in committee hearings—has been for nearly 20 years the president of the National Federation of the Blind, which represents affiliated statewide organizations of the blind in all but four of our States and is almost certainly the largest voluntary association of blind people in the world. Having lost his own sight in childhood, Dr. tenBroek began to play a significant role in organizations of the blind while still a very young man. He helped to organize the California Council of the Blind in 1934, and was the principal founder of the national federation 6 years later. In 1950 he was appointed to the California State Board of Social Welfare, a position in which he still serves and which has given him a solid background of administrative experience in all aspects of public welfare. What is most remarkable about all this is that these manifold activities are only avocations for Dr. tenBroek, whose main career is that of a scholar and teacher. At present he is chairman of his department at the University of California, where he has built a national reputation as a constitutional scholar. He has earned five degrees, most of them in law, and in addition to the present book has written two other substantial volumes and more than 50 articles on various problems of Government and welfare. It would indeed be difficult to find a man anywhere in the land more qualified to write on the particular public issues with which "Hope Deferred" is concerned.

Mr. Matson, who is also a member of the faculty of the University of California, is himself experienced in government and administration as well as broadly trained in the social sciences. He served as a Government analyst under General MacArthur during the occupation of Japan, and later was the administrator of a University of California educational program conducted for our military services in the Far East. He has been closely associated with the National Federation of the Blind for several years, and was a coauthor with Professor tenBroek and E. N. Barnhart of an earlier book, "Prejudice, War, and the Constitution," which 5 years ago won the highest award in political science, the Woodrow Wilson Foundation prize, as the best book on democracy and government.

"Hope Deferred" is, in my view, an equally significant contribution to our understanding of democracy and our knowledge of government. It is my earnest hope and belief that the book will serve to fortify Members of Congress in their efforts to create and maintain a sound system of public welfare; that it will bring an end to the opposition of professional and public welfare administrators to these constructive purposes; and finally that it will be instrumental in giving the general public a true picture of the capabilities of our

blind citizens for normal lives and productive careers in the mainstream of American society.

Stop Fine-Tuning the Economy; Editor of Construction Equipment Magazine Writes Boldly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I believe, as the editor of Construction Equipment magazine, Michael A. Spronck, has written in an editorial for the September 1959 issue of that publication, that "Congress and the administration must stop using construction as a panacea for its fiscal headaches and political bellyaches."

In fact, there is so much that is right and sensible in the editorial by Mr. Spronck that I bring it to the attention of my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STOP FINE TUNING THE ECONOMY

(By Michael A. Spronck)

We said it before and we'll say it again:

Congress and the administration must stop using construction as a panacea for its fiscal headaches and political bellyaches.

Public works are not patent medicines. They cannot be prescribed when business slides into a doldrum, then be withdrawn at the first sign of financial recovery. Nor are they bromides to be dispensed by politicians who seek to still irate voters.

Government officials are ill advised when they listen to economic quacks who tell them that by "adjusting" construction programs and appropriations they can "regulate" the economy. Contrariwise, these shifts induce chaos. They disturb the clockworklike balance necessary in engineering and building public works.

The Federal highway program is a classic example. Virtually every segment of our economy will benefit from a stable long-range highway program. It is vital to our military defense. It will save thousands of lives and prevent hundreds of thousands of crippling injuries. It will stimulate commerce. And through reduction of auto, truck, and bus operating costs will repay more than half of its cost immediately.

Yet just as the program rolls into its productive stage and the benefits begin to accrue the economic adjusters propose we turn it off. Why? It lacks funds, they say. The truth is they are attempting to fine tune the economy, which they now think is moving ahead too fast.

I question their ability to gage our economy with any degree of accuracy. Certainly any significant reduction in the highway program would have a disastrous effect on the construction industry.

The highway trust fund does lack money. But this can be remedied. Congress can stop the diversion of existing highway-use revenues and, if necessary, increase some taxes. Motorists are already paying for modern highways they don't have through needless loss of life, property damage, and high operating costs on obsolete roads. They will not tolerate proposals to sack the interstate program.

At the time I write this Congress has not passed necessary corrective legislation. I am certain, however, that it will do so.

Unfortunately, the protracted debate and threats to the stability of the program has already caused irreparable damage: A halt in new contracts and in right-of-way acquisition. Unemployment. Reduction in capital investments for new plants and equipment. General lack of confidence. And loss of momentum in prosecuting the work. This will impair the efficiency of the program and increase its cost.

It is an expensive lesson—exposing the dangers inherent in a "planned" economy.

As the Nation's leading industry, construction requires judicious, stable public policy. Assured that Government will not default in its public-works programs, construction will continue to contribute to the Nation's prosperity.

It cannot, and will not, serve as the instrument of would-be social planners attempting to fine tune or govern the Nation's economy.

Playing Politics With the Public Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have a responsibility, as members of various congressional committees respectively, to colleagues and to the people of this Nation to do their work which includes understanding, exploring, and solving problems confronting us. The interest rate ceiling removal as an issue before the Ways and Means Committee needs such understanding and exploration. For the information of colleagues and the people throughout this Nation I want to present an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune concerning the interest rate:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE PUBLIC DEBT

The question of lifting the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest rates for marketable Treasury bonds, according to SAM RAYBURN, is a dead issue in this session of Congress. But he did leave the door open yesterday for a possible boost in the ceiling on series E and H savings bonds from the present 3¼ percent to 3¾ percent.

The Democrats have hoped to use the bond issue to tag the Republicans a "high interest rate" party. But it would be politically ticklish to oppose a clearly merited rise in interest rates on savings bonds, which are held by 40 million Americans, most of them voters.

The 3¼-percent rate now makes these bonds a poor buy; for the past 12 months, in fact, sales have lagged behind redemptions. In July $350 million were sold, $507 million redeemed. Not only is the Treasury over a barrel but the small investor isn't getting a fair shake.

Action to provide an equitable rate on these bonds is needed, but action to free rates on regular Treasury bonds is equally urgent. Bonds already issued are selling in the open market at prices yielding more than 4¼ percent, so that new long-term issues (the only ones to which the ceiling applies) can't be sold. Sound management of the Nation's $290 billion debt is one of the pillars of fiscal stability and is impossible without long-term borrowing. Within the next 12 months the Treasury will have to borrow $85 billion to cover maturing securities, redemptions and seasonal cash needs. Unless Congress acts, this will have to be done without access to long-term funds. Speaker RAYBURN knows this. Senator JOHNSON knows it. It's up to them to put politics aside, and act promptly to free the Treasury from artificial and fiscally dangerous restrictions.

Professor's Salmon Crops Migrate to Sea, Return to Washington State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, when my Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee was considering the National Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, we consulted many recognized leaders in the field of conservation.

One of these was Dr. Lauren Donaldson of the Uinversity of Washington. I knew firsthand the work which Dr. Donaldson had done in restoring salmon runs in the State of Washington.

Now Dr. Donaldson's achievements have been saluted in an article published in the Tuesday, August 18, edition of the Seattle Times.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR'S SALMON CROPS MIGRATE TO SEA, RETURN HERE

(By Stanton H. Patty)

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson, of the University of Washington, has proved that man can grow crops of salmon.

Donaldson said today that over a 10-year period he has established runs of choice Chinook salmon that migrate to the high seas and return in quantity to his laboratory ponds at the University of Washington.

This is a major breakthrough in the effort to establish fish farms to produce unlimited numbers of salmon, Donaldson said.

Donaldson is a professor of fisheries and director of the university's laboratory of radiation biology.

STATE GETS FINGERLINGS

The State fisheries department has received 100,000 of Donaldson's surplus fingerlings for planting in the State's new fish farms.

By 1961 some 10 million excess Chinook salmon eggs will be available to the fisheries department from Donaldson's experiments.

"This has been a team operation with Milo Moore, the State fisheries director," Donaldson said.

"Once we get the seed that is needed for fish farms, it becomes the State's job. The university cannot go into the fish farm business."

PROJECT BEGUN IN 1949

Donaldson's project began on a modest scale in the spring of 1949, when he released

40,000 fingerlings in Portage Bay near the Seattle Yacht Club.

Three years later, 42 of the marked salmon returned—a recovery of one-tenth of 1 percent.

Donaldson plugged ahead year after year, multiplying the returns with each cycle.

Last November, 440 of 26,240 chinooks that had been released in the spring of 1956 splashed into Donaldson's ponds.

FISH BIG FOR AGE

But these were no ordinary salmon.

The usual cycle for Chinooks is 4 years. But because of Donaldson's selective breeding, the 1959 returns were 3-year-old adults averaging more than 18 pounds each—larger than full-grown 4-year-olds.

Donaldson expects still more of the "class of 1956" Chinooks to return in the coming fall as 4-year-olds.

Dr. Lauren R. Donaldson, like any cautious scientist, waited several years before announcing results of his experiments at the University of Washington, with Chinook salmon.

Like many another scientist, Donaldson was the target of considerable scoffing as he sought to prove that selected laboratory salmon will return in volume to their birthplaces to spawn future runs.

Success in fisheries research is nothing new to the blunt-talking director of the university's Laboratory of Radiation Biology.

Earlier, Donaldson had toiled patiently for 28 years to develop supertrout weighing many times more than their natural-hatched cousins.

Here is the chronology of Donaldson's Chinook-salmon experiments:

Spring 1949: 40,000 fingerlings were released in Portage Bay near Donaldson's university laboratory.

Fall 1952: 42 of the salmon returned as adults. Donaldson cross-bred these fish and recovered 48,000 eggs—more than his original seed.

Fall 1955: 48 salmon from the 1952-year eggs returned to the university as 3-year-old adults. Forty more returned the next year as 4-year-olds.

The 3-year-olds were the key fish. They included 40 males and 8 females. Donaldson inbred them and selected 26,240 of the offspring for release.

Spring 1956: The 26,240 fingerlings were released as migrants.

Fall 1956: Surprisingly, 52 of the 1956-year fingerlings returned as 1-year jacks weighing about 1½ pounds each.

Fall 1957: 228 more returned as 2-year jacks.

Fall 1958: 440 Chinooks returned as 3-year-old adults. The normal cycle for chinook salmon is 4 years. The 3-year-olds averaged 18 pounds each—larger than most 4-year-olds.

Meanwhile, in the 1956 through 1958 period, commercial and sports fishermen caught about 4,000 of the university salmon released in the spring of 1956.

This meant a total recovery for the cycle of 18 percent.

Donaldson said 16 Chinooks were caught last fall in the Seattle Milk Fund derby. Nine of the 16 were Donaldson's products.

Spring 1959: Donaldson released 261,154 chinook fingerlings.

Fall 1959: Donaldson expects still more of the salmon released in 1956 to return as 4-year-old adults.

The returning salmon last fall included 168 females. They produced 650,000 eggs.

"We had fish everywhere," Donaldson recalled.

About 100,000 of the fingerlings from the 650,000 eggs were given to the State fisheries department for fish-farm plantings. Others were turned over to the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Hanford Atomic Works for experiments.

The 261,154 fingerlings released from the university last spring are about 10 times as many as were turned out in the spring of 1956.

In the fall of 1961, Donaldson expects 4,000 to 5,000 chinooks to return to his ponds. Sports and commercial fishermen should catch 20,000 to 30,000 more of this crop.

Donaldson is enthusiastic about the projected 1961 return.

"That is the first year of the Century 21 Exposition," he said. "If the salmon come back as we expect, there will be thousands of visitors at the university each day to watch them."

FIFTEEN MILLION EGGS EXPECTED

The 4,000 or so Chinooks due home in the fall of 1961 will produce 15 million eggs.

Donaldson plans to keep 500,000 and from that number and select the best 250,000 for release.

"We will keep doing this and build up to the point where we can take 15 million eggs as seed stock each year," he said.

Some 10 million excess eggs from the 1961 return will be made available to the State fisheries department for fish farms.

Donaldson said preliminary studies indicate a survival rate of 60 percent in the fish farms.

"So if 6 million fish can be released from the fish farms, at least 10 percent should survive at sea," Donaldson said. "That would be 600,000 fish for the sports and commercial fishermen to catch.

MONEY GAINS CALCULATED

"Figuring the value of chinook salmon to fishermen at $10 apiece, that means $6 million worth of fish."

Donaldson said the fish farms can be prepared by cleaning out weeds and predators from ponds, lakes, and lagoons. The next step is to add fertilizers to supplement the fingerlings' diet.

The magic of atomic energy can increase the productive capacity of fish-farm waters.

"This is what we call trace-mineral metabolism," Donaldson explained. "Radioactive materials will serve as tracers to tell us what fertilizers should be added to the waters."

Donaldson is talking in terms of fish-farm lakes producing 300 pounds of fish for each surface acre of water.

"In other words," Donaldson said, "you would need only 200 acres of (fish farm) water to produce the 6 million migrants that will return as 600,000 fish to be caught.

"This is all excess, so let them be caught. No escapement is needed. We will have more seed for the future coming to the university."

PLANS WORLD TRIP

Donaldson will leave Thursday for a 4½ month world trip to study fisheries management and the peacetime uses of atomic energy in fisheries.

His itinerary includes Iceland, England, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Turkey, India, Thailand, the Philippines, Hong Kong, and Japan.

Tunkhannock (Pa.) Church Observes 75th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsstory from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of August 18, 1959, which reports the 75th anniversary observance of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary at Tunkhannock, Pa.:

CHURCH TO OBSERVE 75TH ANNIVERSARY—TUNKHANNOCK CATHOLIC PARISH TO CELEBRATE EVENT SUNDAY, AUGUST 23

Parishioners of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Tunkhannock, will celebrate the 75th anniversary of the dedication of the first Catholic Church in that community on Sunday, August 23. Joining them in the celebration will be members of the congregations at the missions at Lake Winola and Lake Carey.

A high mass at 11 will be followed by a jubilee banquet at 1 p.m. in the Tunkhannock Elementary School. Reservation applications, mailed to all parishioners, must be returned by August 20. Others may secure tickets from Mrs. Robert Gaughan or Tony Talerico, Tunkhannock; Mrs. Helen Matalavy, Lake Winola, or Joseph Langan, Lake Carey.

The jubilee will commemorate the dedication of the Church of the Nativity on September 7, 1884, by the Right Reverend William O'Hara. The church building dedicated at that time was constructed by the Presbyterians in 1833 and was used by them for 34 years. It then was acquired by the Baptists, who worshiped in the church until 1884, when it was purchased by the Catholic society. Moved to the rear of the church property when the present church was constructed in 1954, the structure still is used for many parish activities and has served the community as a teen canteen.

RECORDED HISTORY

Recorded history of Catholicism in Tunkhannock dates back much further than 1884, however. In the early 1850's, mass was celebrated in the home of John Code—a contractor on the canal then being built along the Susquehanna River. There also are records of mass being celebrated in Tunkhannock at irregular intervals from 1870 to 1873.

In 1873, there began a cycle which ultimately resulted in the establishment of the Church of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary and the Wyoming Catholic Missions, as they are constituted today. At that time, the first regular series of Catholic religious services was inaugurated, as Father Patrick J. Murphy came from Auburn to Tunkhannock to celebrate mass in the home of Patrick Boyce. These masses were attended by about 15 people, and in addition to the sacrifice of the mass, the Boyce home was the scene of baptisms, marriages and confirmations. The affiliation with Auburn continued through the pastorates of Fathers Felix McGuckin, Michael Shields, Thomas J. Rea and Eward J. Lafferty, until the first Catholic Church was dedicated in Tunkhannock.

In 1876, a hall was rented on the second floor of the building which now houses the Billings Furniture Store, Bridge Street. Mass was said there until 1879, when the congregation became so large that arrangements were made to celebrate mass in Platt's Opera House, which was located where the A. & P. store now stands. After 5 years of this arrangement, with Father Lafferty traveling over primitive roads from Auburn to Tunkhannock, the church building was acquired from the Baptists.

BECOMES SEPARATE PARISH

Some time later, the Tunkhannock church became a mission of Nicholson, and continued as such until 1931, when Bishop Thomas C. O'Reilly purchased the Joseph Wood Platt estate, located next to the church. The Platt home became the resi-

dence of the first resident priest of the Church of the Nativity—the Reverend James J. Reilly—and Tunkhannock became a separate parish.

With the separation of Tunkhannock from Nicholson, the Wyoming Catholic Missions came into being. On June 28, 1931, Father Reilly and his newly-appointed assistant, Rev. Gerald F. Cannevan, began conducting masses at Lake Carey, Falls and Lake Winola.

Rev. James P. Holleran became pastor of the Church of the Nativity in 1932, serving in that capacity until 1944. He was succeeded by Rev. Harold T. Kennedy, who remained in Tunkhannock until 1948.

At that time, the present pastor, Rev. Joseph J. Nallin, was assigned to the Church of the Nativity. During Father Nallin's pastorate, three new churches have been built—the present Church of the Nativity in Tunkhannock; St. Mary's of the Lake, Lake Winola, and the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament, Lake Carey.

Working with Father Nallin and assistant pastor Rev. Patrick D. Healey on arrangements for the celebration are: Charles Charles and Robert Dempsey, co-chairmen; Frank Friedel and Mrs. George Kukucka, program; Mrs. Vincent Bishop and Cecil Krewson, Jr., publicity; Mrs. Eugene Corbett and Mrs. Murray Fisk, entertainment; Mrs. Robert Gaughan and Tony Talerico, tickets.

Mr. Truman's Comment on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev Discussions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Getting Into the Act," from the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1959, relating to the comments by ex-President Truman on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev discussions.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GETTING INTO THE ACT

The President obviously was annoyed, and justly so, by Harry Truman's unsolicited contribution to the Eisenhower-Khrushchev discussions.

One might think that Mr. Truman, as a former President whose own ventures in dealing with the Russians were something less than spectacularly successful, would hesitate, especially in advance of the event, to pour cold water on the Eisenhower undertaking. But that would be out of character. If the spirit moves him, and it generally does, Harry S. Truman is going to speak his piece.

In this instance, Mr. Truman, on the eve of the President's departure for important preliminary talks with our allies, let it be known in an article written for the North American Newspaper Alliance that he thought it was all right for Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States, but all wrong for Mr. Eisenhower to go to Russia. The power and leadership of the Presidency, according to Mr. Truman, should not be dissipated in ceremonial visits.

This brought a sharp retort from Mr. Eisenhower when he was asked about it at his news conference. He didn't mention Mr. Truman by name, but he said he was getting a "little weary" with "facile critics" who are fretting about "this terrible blow to Presidential prestige." He made it clear that he intends to use every bit of his prestige and all of his energy in trying to thaw out the cold war. What is at stake, he added, is the future fo the human race, not prestige, and he thinks that any President who does less than his utmost in such a situation would deserve to be condemned by the American people.

We think that Mr. Eisenhower is right. Of course, his visit to Russia may not produce any tangible result. But the effort should be made, and if it is made in the right spirit and with eyes open there will be no harmful consequences. Mr. Truman should stop worrying about Presidential prestige—and also should stop tossing monkey wrenches into the works.

Assistance in the Construction of Fishing Vessels

SPEECH
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5421) to provide a program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels and to enable the fishing industry of the United States to regain a favorable economic status, and for other purposes.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Chairman, during the past week we have witnessed in this body the growing decline of the free enterprise system in America.

When we consider that the economy of the Nation consists solely of the production and removal, the processing, transportation, reprocessing and disposal of the basic raw materials which come from the fields, the mines, or the sea, we understand how important these basic raw materials are.

Within the past week the House has acted upon three bills, either enacting, extending, or anticipating a subsidy program to prevent domestic production of the three basic raw materials from being completely destroyed by cheap foreign imports:

First. Thursday of last week we extended Public Law 480 by which the U.S. Treasury through gift, barter, or exchange for foreign currencies which are then spent in that country, disposes of domestic farm production acquired under the so-called agricultural subsidy program. This is a program carried on to purchase domestic agricultural products displaced by cheap foreign imports.

Second. Monday we had on the floor a resolution in which Congress asked the executive branch to submit a program for the solution of the domestic mining industry, which industry has been displaced through cheap foreign imports.

Third. Today we are considering a subsidy for the fishing industry, which is the first step in an overall subsidy program to save the fishing industry from being completely displaced through cheap foreign imports.

THE PATTERN

In order that we may have a clearer picture of what is shortly in store for the mining and fishing industries, let us look at the purpose and operation of the agricultural program. Last year we imported $3.9 billion worth of agricultural commodities. These commodities were placed on the domestic market and went directly to the dinner tables of the homes across the Nation.

Those basic raw materials coming from the fields of the Nation were made surplus by the displacement of millions of acres of domestic production through these foreign imports. The Nation was faced with two alternatives, either to stop imports or to buy up the displaced domestic production. The Federal Treasury purchased this displaced farm production, which we term surplus. It is surplus only because it has been supplanted by imports.

In order to dispose of this mounting surplus, the taxpayers through Public Law 480 gave away last year, either directly or indirectly, $1.5 billion worth. Through the International Wheat Agreement and other such programs, the taxpayers subsidized the sale on the world market of another $1.2 billion. This was subsidized at the rate of about 50 cents per bushel on wheat and a related figure on other grains. The rate has been 6 cents per pound on cotton; it has now gone to 8 cents per pound.

In other words, $2.7 billion of the $4 billion agricultural exports from the United States last year were either given away or the sale was very highly subsidized in order to make room for the $3.9 billion of agricultural imports.

OTHER BASIC MATERIALS

The domestic mining industry is in much worse shape than the domestic agricultural industry because foreign mineral imports can be indefinitely stockpiled. If, however, the domestic industry is to be preserved, even on a standby basis, the taxpayers must buy the domestic production at a cost of production subsidized price and then arrange some program similar to Public Law 480 to give away that which is produced in this country.

The fishing industry faces the same fate. Cheap foreign imports have supplanted the best efforts of the domestic industry on both coasts. Either the taxpayers step in or the fisheries step out.

THE PROBLEM

You ask why a great industrial country like America, with the best means of production that modern science can produce and with a class of labor that is the most efficient in the world, cannot meet competition from abroad.

The first answer is that the American farmer the American miner, and the American fisheries are given a serious handicap before they can even enter the race of free world competition.

The American taxpayer, which includes every farmer, every miner, everyone engaged in the fisheries, every processing industry and every laborer, must first pay his pro rata share of defense, not just the defense of America, but the defense of the entire free world. This defense is the first handicap placed upon domestic industry and labor.

The bill for the defense of the free world is approximately $40 billion annually. Broken down on a per capita basis, this annual expense amounts to $800 for every family in America. This $800 must be added to the production cost of every pound of food, every ton of mineral, and every item of clothing or product of industry which is produced domestically.

The foreign producer and foreign laborer has no defense item to add to his product—we defend them.

The domestic producer must raise another $3 to $3.5 billion annually for foreign aid. This amounts to from $70 to $75 annually for every family in the Nation. This amount is not only given to our agricultural and industrial competitors to maintain their defense, but to their governments as well to help keep them solvent, to help run their schools, to build roads, powerplants irrigation projects and every other item of their national expense.

Certainly these people can work for lower wages when the American taxpayer not only foots the bill for their defense but contributes toward the operation of their governmental functions and then puts $1.5 billion worth of food on their tables free of cost.

Can any degree of efficiency, can any technical development met this kind of competition?

THE SOLUTION

In 1936 the Congress of the United States passed a minimum wake and maximum hour law so that one section of the Nation would not have an unfair advantage over the other in trade moving in interstate commerce.

The countries of the world are closer today than were the States in 1936. If wage-and-hour legislation was necessary then for fair interstate trade, worldwide wage and hour standards are just as important today in international trade.

This, you say, is not possible. You likewise contend it is not possible to require the other nations of the free world to contribute their proportionate share of the cost of free world defense. But, Mr. Chairman, it is possible to require them to make their proportionate contribution at least on the products they export into the United States.

Call this an equalization tax or a defense tax, or call it what you please; if they expect the American taxpayer to be their consumer, then they must contribute toward the terrific burden being carried by that consumer as a free world taxpayer.

I do not advocate a punitive tariff; I do not advocate a destructive tariff; I do not advocate a tariff which would place an import wall around the Nation, but I do contend that the Treasury of this Nation cannot long continue to defend the free world, raise their standard of living by subsidizing their governments, financing agricultural, mining, and industrial development in competition to ours, place free food upon their tables, and then subsidize American agriculture, American mining, American labor, and American industry when these foreign products, produced through these unfair competitive means, idle the domestic producers.

The defense of their countries is as important to them as it is to us. Trade with us is vital to them. I see no other means of requiring them to carry even a portion of their share, except to place an import tax upon food, goods, and products imported in competition with domestic production.

The patient is dying with a malignant import cancer. Congress continues to treat the patient by placing bandages over the open sores, but does nothing about the malignancy. It is Congress and Congress alone that is to blame for this condition. When will it face up to the facts and assume the responsibility required of it by the Constitution?

United States Lags in New, Economic Phase of Cold War, McCormick Warns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Charles P. McCormick, chairman of the board of McCormick & Co., and an outstanding businessman and civic leader of Baltimore, Md., was one of the delegates to the Atlantic Congress.

The Atlantic Congress, which was held in London last June, was attended by 650 delegates from the NATO countries, to discuss the future of NATO.

The Baltimore Sun of August 5, 1959, carried an interview with Mr. McCormick, who is also a member of the Business Advisory Council of the Department of Commerce, in which he points out that we must realize that we are entering a new era of competition in the world, in which we have reached a stalemate militarily but during which we are going to be battling for our lives economically.

I ask unanimous consent that this thoughtful interview be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES LAGS IN NEW, ECONOMIC PHASE OF COLD WAR, MCCORMICK WARNS

(By Louis R. Rukeyser)

The cold war has entered a new phase—and America is not winning it, Charles P. McCormick warned today.

"We must realize that we're entering a new era of competition," he declared. "We're not winning the cold war. We've reached a stalemate militarily, but we're going to be battling for our lives economically."

Mr. McCormick, an international businessman and civic leader with headquarters in Baltimore, said industry and labor no longer can afford to be complacent about American technological know-how.

BACK FROM EUROPE

The rest of the world is catching up, he said.

Mr. McCormick has returned from a crowded European trip that included a world food convention, the commencement exercises of the University of Maryland's overseas branch and the first Atlantic Congress in London.

The last-named meeting, a gathering of 650 delegates from 14 NATO nations, was designed to make the Atlantic group something more than just a military alliance.

While the week-long congress ended with only a vague communique about closer cooperation (military, economic, political, and cultural), Mr. McCormick feels that it was a valuable first step in what he considers the new cold-war phase.

"I think we aroused a great many people who had been thinking that NATO militarily was enough to win the cold war," he said.

As for the possible importance of the Atlantic Congress, in the free world's future, Mr. McCormick says: "The average American will not think that this is as important as NATO. But is religion more important than a battleship?

"If you already have the battleship, it may be."

His belief that the cold war is increasingly an economic conflict was intensified at the food convention, where the merchant says he found that the United States no longer has an automatic advantage in packaging and advertising.

He adds: "Five years ago I found Europe very backward. On this trip I was shocked at the activity, the intensity, and the modernization of European industry."

Some products produced by Germany and Switzerland in particular, he said, are well made, well packaged and manufactured and distributed locally at lower cost than in the United States.

UNITED STATES NEEDS BLUEPRINTS

America needs new blueprints if it is going to hold its own in the economic competition, Mr. McCormick maintains.

"Labor and business must realize that foreign manufacturers are getting to the point where they can beat the United States in product, in package, and in price," he adds.

"Otherwise, we are going to have vast unemployment, leading to the creation of a superstate in which we would be even more out of the market.

"Labor must be conscious that strikes are not always good, and business must be wary of excessively high profits. American prices must be lowered—and the interest of the employer and the laborer is exactly the same."

Seeds of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Ap-

pendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 24, 1959:

SEEDS OF DESTRUCTION

What is the future of the United States of America? For more than 100 years it has been a generator of wealth and public prosperity. Has it now reached its peak with only a downhill prospect ahead? Quite a few sensible people have begun to wonder if this is not so.

No nation in all the history of civilization has ever embarked on such a giveaway program as this country undertook after World War II. In the heyday of her empire, Great Britain policed and financed a large part of the world. She furnished the money for development of her colonial possessions and even supplied the bribes for recalcitrant trouble-makers. But all her efforts were devoted to keeping the British Isles top dog in military, naval and commercial.

The United States took over this job after World War II with no clear-cut program in mind. Instead of following the British pattern of enlightened self-interest, the United States encouraged independence and self-development in every geographical and racial subdivision of the world. We have tried, and often vainly, to sell democracy in areas where democracy is an alien philosophy. To make it work, we have provided financial aid, factories, manufacturing know-how and raw material without stint or consideration.

The result has been a Pandora's box of political and economic troubles. No nation has ever applied the Golden Rule more consistently in its international affairs. No nation has ever received less return for this effort. We are receiving in payment, not the greatful thanks of cooperative nations, strong in their democracy, but the strident demand that we open markets in this country for their slave-labor products.

If we follow through on our global do-gooder policies, as the State Department seems determined to do, these low-wage products will shortly replace every major item of American industry in the domestic market.

The Rockefeller Family and Wyoming—How Grand Teton National Park Has Benefited a State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article by Tracy S. McCraken of Cheyenne, Wyo., entitled "The Rockefellers and Wyoming."

In this article Mr. McCraken, who is a distinguished resident of Wyoming, cites the vast benefits brought to his State by the eleemosynary donations of John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his family toward the Grand Teton National Park and the very outstanding lodge and cabin facilities provided there on Jackson Lake.

I am particularly eager to call to the attention of my colleagues the article by Tracy S. McCraken for one reason. Thirty years ago there was voiced against the Grand Teton National Park much of the same argument now used to oppose national seashore parks on Cape Cod, in the Oregon Dunes and Indiana Dunes, and elsewhere along America's scenic shorelines.

Yet, today, an eminent citizen of Wyoming heralds the Grand Teton National Park and the Rockefeller family, whose generosity and public-spirited donations of land helped to make possible not only the Grand Teton National Park but also the exemplary accommodations available there for travelers and tourists.

I ask unanimous consent that this informative article, "The Rockefellers and Wyoming," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROCKEFELLERS AND WYOMING

(By Tracy S. McCraken)

It's the contention of our Mrs. that all during our married life, which really constitutes a spell of time, we've rushed back to home and office from a vacation in advance of the time we'd promised to stay. The allegation is not without some semblance of fact. But there are exceptions. We never abbreviate the time we contemplate spending on our annual trek to Jackson Hole.

That's where this is being written—in our cabin at Jackson Lake Lodge. We came here for the yearly summer meeting of Wyoming University's trustees, a 2-day affair. A desk full of work at home notwithstanding we unreluctantly said we'd stay an extra day. Now it's 3 days later and we're not leaving till the morrow—and then will prolong the safari by 2 days more for a couple of days in Jackson.

Great wealth, as we suspect someone may have said before us, can be a wonderful and fortunate thing for others—if it is used wisely and beneficently, which, as we might superfluously add, it always isn't. However, it's impossible to escape the observation of what wondrous things private wealth can do when one sees first-hand what we have today, including not just the several million dollar Jackson Lake Lodge, but the vast Colter Bay development a few miles down the highway toward Yellowstone.

Between these two places are accommodations and cuisine to fit most anyone's pocketbook. The Colter log cabins (about 100 of them) are excellently, but not plushly furnished. The decor is distinctly western. For a family of four the cost is about $12 a day. We lunched at the Colter cafeteria yesterday. Like the cabins it's spotlessly clean and the food fine. The price of our much too big luncheon which featured chicken livers: $1.10. The trailer park at Colter is something to behold. In it are sites for 112 trailers. Cost per day: $1.50, which includes electricity, running water and sewage and bathing facilities. No less interesting are the camping grounds with 112 sites. There is no chage to campers. Although they must supply their own tents, there are water hydrants and rest rooms within a stone's throw of every site, and a cooking grill for each.

Of course there is divided reaction as to the Grand Teton National Park taking over so much of Teton County. Nor are the adverse comments confined to the fact that by removing so much taxable land from tax rolls the county faces a difficult financial situation. In years past many fine private homes had been built in the area, especially around the lakes. But there's no more of that now; fact is, those there when the Park Service took over (including the late Wallace Beery's) either have been or will be taken over from private ownership.

Which, in a way, seems to bad. Yet it is only by preservation of the domain which is the Jackson Hole that its majesty and its grandeur in its native state can be saved for all the people to enjoy in perpetuity. At least it will never be defaced by countless shacks and hot dog stands such as is the case in the otherwise beautiful Big Thompson Canyon of Estes Park.

The Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., the nonprofit organization endowed by the Rockefellers, as you know, originally bought up and gave to the National Park Service, most of the area now embraced by Grand Teton National Park. It also owns the Jackson Lake, Jenny Lake, and Colter Bay lodges and trailer park facilities. No one dislikes more than do we to see private lands or private business pass to Government control. But only by such procedure and by the untold millions that few if any outside of the Rockefellers could supply in gift form, could this area be preserved in its virgin state. And if in the long run countless millions of people from all over America and, indeed, the world are better for it we too must subscribe to its long-range desirability and feasibility.

Following through in their thinking that the area and its facilities must always be made available for the enjoyment of the greatest possible number of people, the Rockefellers have seen to it that their lodges are open to conventions only in the spring and late summer. So enticing a convention site is Jackson Lake Lodge that it could be booked solidly with conventions all summer long. But that way fewer people could be accommodated. Hence, the restrictions.

Frequently one hears that Jackson Lake Lodge is not the imposing looking structure, exteriorly, that would be expected of a $7 million layout. But that to is on purpose. Its benefactors insisted it be so designed as to blend into the landscape. The same principle has been applied to the spacious grounds. For its cooling and restful attributes about half of the grounds are of rich, green well-manicured grass. But the other half is still in its native condition with an abundance of wild flowers and shrubs.

Not only has a lot of money been put into this huge project, but so has an awful lot of thought. Of both, millions of people have been and everlastingly will be the beneficiaries.

On Air Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial on air safety deals primarily with the problem of mid-air collision. It brings to our attention an important point, namely that even with the development of mechanical devices, the human element, the pilot, remains the most significant safety factor. And this is likely to be the case for many years to come. It is important that the public realizes this, and of course, that our pilots know it. The editorial follows:

VISIBILITY AND VIGILANCE

In March of this year Mr. E. R. "Pete" Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, solicited the cooperation of the Air Force in his continuing crusade against mid-

air collisions. In a letter to the Honorable James H. Douglas, Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Quesada, himself a noted Air Force pilot, points up the need for pilot vigilance. We quote: "I feel compelled to call your attention to the increasing number of reported near-misses of recent weeks. I know that you are well aware of this problem and the responsibilities we all share relating to it and feel certain that the Air Force, by constant emphasis on the importance of vigilance, can materially assist us in their prevention.

"The current rash of near-miss incidents forcibly points out that all pilots must be more vigilant to the presence of other aircraft in the airspace. This is particularly true when operating IFR under VFR conditions. An IFR flight plan, as has so often been indicated, in no way reduces the necessity for continual visual surveillance.

"We must all candidly recognize the existing limitations of our control system and cockpit visibility, as well as the vast mixture and speeds of modern aircraft. We must also recognize that there is no substitute for maintaining a thorough and vigilant watch for other air traffic at all times.

"I am convinced that beneficial results will be obtained from again enlisting the support of the Air Force in a program designed to bring forcefully to the attention of all pilots the necessity for constant vigilance and continuing awareness of this pressing problem.

"While I fully realize that pilot vigilance alone is not the entire answer to the near-miss problem, I am confident that it will serve to lessen the hazard until the positive and constructive program we now have under way to expand and improve our air traffic management facilities becomes effective.

"I want to point out that a similar letter has gone to the other military services and civil aviation organizations to insure that this message reaches all users of the airspace. I am sure that we can reduce the exposure and alleviate to a considerable extent the near-miss hazard."

In answering Mr. Quesada, the Secretary says, in part, "The Air Force is in full agreement with the need for increased pilot vigilance by all users of the airspace. Your letter complements the strong measures, including continual emphasis of pilot vigilance, currently in effect throughout the Air Force.

"While your correspondence is primarily directed toward air operations in the United States and possessions, the Chief of Staff has directed that your letter will be brought to the attention of all Air Force aircrew members and air operations personnel worldwide. You may be assured of continued Air Force emphasis on this subject, and of our full cooperation in your efforts to reduce air collision potential."

In passing the word to Air Force personnel worldwide, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, Vice Chief of Staff, notes that, "The see and be seen concept has recognized limitations. This concept, despite these limitations, will remain a fundamental means of collision avoidance in the foreseeable future of world aviation. Constructive progress is being made in air traffic management; however, the most sophisticated system of air traffic control and airspace management will never entirely replace the requirement for maximum aircrew vigilance.

"The primary responsibility for vigilance rests with the pilot at the controls of the aircraft. Equally important, to offset cockpit visibility and aircraft control limitations, is the vigilance support given to the pilot by his crewmembers and the air operations personnel who control and advise him."

As General LeMay points out, all the concern and emphasis in high places will go for nothing if the individual crewmember doesn't conform. As usual, pilots, it's up to you. To be vigilant is to be awake and on the alert to insure safety or to discover and ward off danger.

The Atlantic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, one of the delegates to the recent Atlantic Congress, held in London last June 5–10, was Paul Van Zeeland, the distinguished former Premier of Belgium. Mr. Van Zeeland has written an article in the August issue of Western World magazine, pointing out the significance of the Congress and calling for the growth of NATO into more than just a military alliance—into a "smoothly running community."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Van Zeeland's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED WE STAND

(By Paul Van Zeeland)

Two main ideas emerge from the meetings of the Atlantic Congress.

The first is that the Atlantic Pact, which up to now has in fact been merely a military organization for European defense, must expand in all directions. It must first be extended to various other fields: political, cultural, economic and social. It should become more than an alliance: a smoothly running community.

The second is that the Atlantic nations are actually related to the other nations of the free world by ties of interdependence which should be taken into account both materially and morally. More specifically, it is their duty to aid the underdeveloped countries.

THE ATLANTIC COMMUNITY

The countries known as the Atlantic nations each have their own customs, distinct regions, widely differing languages, different living standards. Yet, they all share the deep conviction that they belong to one great family of nations. The ties between them are so many and so strong that it may truly be said that culturally and morally a living and striving Atlantic Community exists.

The first of the five great committees constituting the Congress was devoted to the study of the basic elements of this common cultural community. Its conclusions were clear and unequivocal. The Atlantic cultural community is mainly based on a set of moral values, on an ethical code, on a certain way of life, on similar reactions to the fundamental concepts of life and happiness.

One of the most urgent and the most glorious tasks which lies before the Atlantic nations is to point out to the world what exactly is their ideal, their way of life, to restore its dynamism and its prestige of old; to present their way of life to the world, and particularly to the younger generation as a course of action, as a hopeful answer to the destructive, specious and dangerous communist propoganda.

The Congress met to celebrate the tenth anniversary of NATO. On this occasion, NATO wanted to summarize what it had done so far, and especially to discover the new lines along which the Atlantic community should develop in the future.

It can thus be acknowledged in all fairness that NATO did the free world a great service; but it will be admitted at the same time that the present situation cannot last: It is impossible for a military alliance of a defensive nature to maintain its efficiency indefinitely if it remains unaffected by the profound changes undergone by circumstances. It has to grow and adapt itself.

A military alliance like NATO must, if necessary, be able to rely on general and trustful cooperation in political matters. The military alliance had to be completed by a political alliance. Here again, events should determine the extent of such an alliance and the structure that will assure its success.

Extended to the political realm, the alliance urgently needs sound and basic economic foundations. This already was the opinion of those who set up the important groundwork represented by the Atlantic Pact.

As they were all following a hardy and generous social policy, the Atlantic nations could not separate social and economic aspects of the various problems. And that is why in London it was decided that Atlantic cooperation should be extended without delay to the greater aspects of social life. The final declaration contains some very important advice:

"The time has come to set up an Atlantic Community whose responsibilities are to extend to many fields, military, political, economic, social, and scientific."

The Congress studied another aspect of the problem the necessity of tightening the bonds between member nations. It is with this in mind on all occasions that the Congress used the expression "Atlantic Community." No attempt was made to define this term and this very abstention appears to me a proof of wisdom. Actions alone will tell: it rests with the old organizations or with the new institutions that will actually direct the first steps of this community to determine the rules of its functioning and to apply them with realism to changing circumstances.

In any case, it is obvious that the community is superior to the alliance; it contains the foundations and the principles of a tighter, more intimate cooperation.

AID TO LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Having dealt with the main lines of the cooperation which from now on was to exist between them, the Atlantic nations turned towards the outside world. They immediately stressed their interdependence with the other nations of the free world. Each year the Atlantic nations have taken new steps on the road of economic and social progress. But can this gradual enrichment, this rise in the standard of living of the Atlantic countries continue as we wish, if, beyond our borders, other nations of the free world continue to live in poverty, and even in misery? Can the Atlantic nations facing the Communist world be expected to continue in their course if the underdeveloped countries which still believe in liberty are left without help, to struggle alone with their difficulties? Certainly not.

Aid must be given, not only efficiently, but in such a way that what we give will be gladly accepted; we must give, but give without neglecting the cultural and moral aspirations of those who receive and carefully protect their right to make their own decisions.

In the last resort, it is up to these peoples themselves to conduct their affairs as they see fit. The responsibility for their actions lies with them. But we can and we must help them, on a basis of complete equality, by resorting to forms of association convenient and profitable to both parties. This is the meaning of an expression which came up very often during the Congress: what we can and must do is to enable them to solve their own difficulties, in other words, we must "help them help themselves."

We must succeed in reestablishing the general conditions that will induce private capital to invest in foreign countries, however poverty-stricken or remote.

On the other hand, time is an essential factor in the maturing of everything that lives. This is true for mankind as it is true for civilizations and their growth as groups. There are no miracles in economics and politics. The standard of living reached by the countries of our ancient Western civilization is the result of the efforts of millions of men of good will over hundreds of years.

Lastly, and this needs to be emphasized, Western civilization consists not only of capital and techniques, but also of moral values, of conceptions of life and happiness, duty and right, and ethical rules, which are far more important than the purely material level and without which it is impossible to explain the Atlantic nations' strength and progress.

Such an undertaking demands a great deal of good will, mutual understanding, and time. This is no reason why we should delay in putting the most powerful means to work: the time to act is now.

Personally, I had hoped that the Congress would show more daring, more dynamism, more originality particularly in its final recommendations. It seems to me that it could have done this without going beyond the limits of what could reasonably be expected. The Congress could have further developed its mission as a source of inspiration.

We should not forget that it was a gathering of individuals acting on a purely personal basis, on their own responsibility, who had been asked to open the way to new hopes for the Atlantic peoples. In fact the Congress brought together exceptionally eminent men who practically all held or had held positions of considerable public responsibility. They acted and talked with prudence and reserve, which was quite understandable in view of the gravity and urgency of the questions on the agenda. But surely more enterprising and original attitudes would have made a greater impression on public opinion and on governments.

WHAT THE CONGRESS ACHIEVED

However it would be a great mistake to minimize the results obtained during this Congress.

First of all an atmosphere prevailed which was surely far ahead of average government opinion.

In the committees the discussions were keen, even impassioned, they bore evidence of the conscientiousness with which the participants tried to accomplish a task that they had freely set themselves, but they also showed how convinced they were of the gravity of the moment and of the necessity of rapidly promoting the Atlantic community.

That is particularly true of the final declaration voted at the last minute by the Congress in plenary session. The debates of the Declaration Committee, made up of the principal chairmen of the large committees, were long and arduous. More than anywhere else, one could sense in this committee the oppositions which arose as soon as it was necessary to get down to brass tacks.

Besides it would be a mistake to believe that the final declaration represents the sum total of the Congress's efforts. It is but an echo; it attempts to briefly summarize some of the essential points by giving some important examples of what has been achieved. But in order to evaluate what the Congress actually wanted, and summarize the main points, it is essential to take into account the resolutions of the five main committees.

Among the conclusions reached by the political committee, there are some which go as far as one could hope under present circumstances.

Resolution I takes up again the recommendation published by the experts in their report of 1956. The final declaration summarizes this recommendation in these terms: "National governments should not take important decisions affecting the unity of NATO without previous consultation."

If all the governments of NATO, big and small, were strictly to apply this rule of conduct, a real political community between nations would soon ensue. Indeed, from then on, not one of the members of the alliance could by itself take any decisions that might endanger the policy, the security, or the cohesion of the group of Atlantic nations; even if this decision clearly fell under its authority.

On the level of economics, new ways have been opened up which can lead as far as will prove necessary.

Let us take, for example, resolution C of the Economic Report. It is clear enough: not only should governments refrain from any protectionist practices, but they should do all they can to remove the obstacles to trade between Atlantic Nations. Likewise, they should do everything in their power to maintain monetary stability.

The resolution in question gives its blessing to the various organizations which resort to multilateral economic cooperation. Amongst the examples that are mentioned are both the OEEC and the European Economic Community. The text is careful to place on the same level any other economic organizations which might be formed in the future, as long as they strive toward multilateral cooperation. This is a direct and obvious allusion to the free trade zone. The declaration takes its real character from the use of the very clear expression, "economic integration."

It could not be more clearly stated, in the eyes of those who approved the resolution—and it was approved unanimously—that the choice has been made: the Atlantic countries should move in the direction of growing economic integration.

We should also point out the significance of another resolution which would imply that the United States and Canada, which up to now have been simple observers with the OEEC, would become full members sharing the same responsibilities of the European members. This modification would make the OEEC the economic instrument of the Atlantic community, a role to which it seems naturally destined.

On the military level, the opposition of views which exist between the members of NATO naturally found their echoes and repercussions. When the Congress was meeting in London, the French Government reached some unilateral decisions which led to surprise and criticism. Obviously it was not the Congress duty to try to resolve the difficulties which had appeared, nor to set itself up as a judge. As always in such cases, the best policy lies in mutual sincerity.

What the Congress tried to do was to set the bases for an eventual solution; it used some formulas which, interpreted and carried out by men of good will, can lead to rapid agreement.

In any case, the Congress continually stressed that all the Atlantic powers must work toward integration, in a spirit of true equality; none of the members can expect to draw a unilateral advantage from its position, its strength, or its advance in any particular field.

CONCLUSION

If I interpret it correctly, the position adopted by the Congress as regards cooperation on an Atlantic basis appears to me most wise and most realistic.

The Congress takes cognizance of the many organizations of economic cooperation already existing and notes their main achievements. It hopes that new organizations will be set up. One preoccupation seems to underlie all the committees' efforts: to pool more and more closely the resources, the means of action, the ideas, the knowledge, and the resolution of the several Atlantic countries.

But while recommending strengthening the ties between the Atlantic nations, the Congress was careful to point out that the organization set up must remain liberal and that it must remain attentive to the outside world. This appears to me to be a sound position. We should persevere in the organization of Europe. In our eyes the Common Market was and remains a great step forward, and should eventually lead to the creation of a Greater Europe.

Personally, I hope that a free trade area will be created which will work closely with the six countries of the Common Market. Such a wish is far from utopian. It would only take a minimum of good will to find a way that will allow all the nations to work together without either of the two groups losing face or being penalized in any way.

As Scripture says, there are many mansions in our Father's house. That is still true. But we must remember to keep the doors of each open wide to the outside world.

The 6 of the Common Market cannot withdraw into themselves any more than the 16 or 17 of greater Europe. Neither can Europe withdraw within itself. And the Atlantic community too must keep, in its freedom to act, all its contacts with the outer world.

Alas. We are forced to admit how slowly the integration of Europe is proceeding: we are being overtaken. The increase in production is still lower in Europe than in the United States and, with all due allowance, than in Soviet Russia.

Perhaps the creation of the kind of Atlantic community that the committee has been striving for may well short-circuit some of the difficulties which now oppose the Common Market and future free trade area.

In any case, what matters at the present is that the advice given by the Congress should soon be followed by results. The Congress was addressing itself to individual governments and to international organizations; and most of all it was speaking to world opinion.

Representatives to the Congress will warn their respective governments of the urgency of the resolutions passed in London; public opinion will surely support any goverment that undertakes clear and decisive action aimed at the strengthening of the West.

It is for others to carry on the good work. Henceforward, the immediate responsibility for action along the lines proposed rests fully with the governments concerned. But the latter only act when obliged to do so. Herein lies the particular responsibility of all those who are in contact with public opinion. If the general public were to assert their fears, hopes, and aspirations more forcefully, how much more energetic and lively the Atlantic Alliance would soon be. If only this could be so. Every opportunity should be taken and not lost like many of the others.

Before concluding these comments, I should like to mention the hospitality shown by Great Britain to the congress. Its kindness was beyond bounds, cordial, great, comprehensive, and understanding. Some of the ceremonies were impressive. The congress was officially opened in Westminster Hall by Her Royal Highness Queen Elizabeth II with a dignity and simplicity which were both regal and charming.

This was done in keeping with the highest traditions and was so impressive that none could remain indifferent.

Finally, it does seem that the London congress did attain several of its main aims. It served the cause of civilization. Through its work, it has prepared and facilitated the

necessary integration of the Atlantic powers. It has brought new hopes of peace and progress not only to the peoples of the Atlantic nations, but also to all men of good will throughout the world.

The Interest Ceiling Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this morning's New York Times dealing with the interest rate on Government bonds.

Again I remind the House that we have a responsibility to face up to the interest ceiling issue.

The above-mentioned editorial follows:

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed—and in the most emphatic manner—his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interst rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4¼ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationsship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the second Liberty Loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers, since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a compartively limited supply of funds, have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on compartively long issues above 4¼ percent, the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3¼ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not only a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total $50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by $2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues of the U.S. Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

Prison Plight Poses a Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, in my capacity as chairman of the Senate's Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries I have come to know and admire James V. Bennett, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

For many years Mr. Bennett has urged the Congress to ease the explosive situation facing our overcrowded Federal correctional institutions by authorizing and providing the funds for construction of new prisons. Congress has been reluctant to meet this mounting crisis and only this year, after five annual requests, was the Bureau of Prisons granted $2 million to begin construction of a maximum security prison at Marion, Ill.

The danger of overcrowded prisons, Mr. President, is the prison riot and the loss of life and destruction of property which go hand in hand with such riots. Prison riots, unfortunately, have become almost regular events in our Nation's overburdened prison system and they illustrate the need for more penal facilities.

The rehabilitation of prisoners is seriously hampered by overcrowding in our prisons. Without new prisons and with our Nation's prison population increasing annually rehabilitation will soon be a thing of the past. Prison officials simply will not have the time to carry out rehabilitation programs.

This crisis facing our prison system is well documented in an article prepared by Congressional Quarterly. I ask unanimous consent that the article, which appeared in the Kansas City Star, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, Aug. 19, 1959]

PRISON PLIGHT POSES A CRISIS—RISING CRIME RATE STRESSES NEED TO ALLEVIATE CROWDED CONDITIONS—FEAR OF RIOTING GROWS—FACILITIES MUST BE EXPANDED TO HEAD OFF THREAT, OFFICIALS SAY

WASHINGTON, August 19.—The problem of overcrowded prisons is approaching crisis proportions, according to James V. Bennett, director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

And public apathy handicaps penal officials in their efforts to obtain larger budgets to ease the problem.

RIOTS IN 38 PRISONS

A Library of Congress survey of prison riots for 1954–59 reveals that 47 riots occurred in 38 prisons, reformatories, and jails in 24 States.

During this period four prison riots occurred at the Nebraska State penitentiary, three at the Montana State prison, two each at the Washington State penitentiary, the New York women's house of detention, the Bexar County jail in San Antonio, Tex., and two at two Massachusetts State prisons. More than 100 prisoners participated in 18 of these prison riots.

Representative THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois, has said that if additional prison facilities are not provided Uncle Sam is going to have a major prison riot on his hands like that which occurred at Alcatraz in 1946. At that time nearly 300 prisoners attempted a mass escape from "the Rock." Since then two flareups have occurred in Federal institutions, at the Chillicothe, Ohio, reformatory in 1952, and at the U.S. Medical Center for Federal prisoners, Springfield, Mo., in June of this year.

Overcrowding of prisons is due to three main factors: Increased U.S. population, the higher crime rate, and the failure of the States and the Federal Government to build new prison facilities.

CITE CRIME RISE

Preliminary FBI figures indicate a higher increase in crime in 1958 than in 1957, when an 8 percent increase in major crimes occurred. The FBI reported an alltime high of 2,796,400 major crimes were committed in 1957.

Then there's the problem that not enough new prison facilities are being built. After 5 years of making annual requests, the U.S. Bureau of Prisons this year finally got $2 million in its appropriation to build a $10 million 600-man maximum security prison for hardened criminals at Marion, Ill.

A major problem with prison overcrowding is that prison officials have less opportunity to rehabilitate young prisoners. At the end of the 1958 fiscal year the number of prisoners 21 and under comprised a record 18.9 percent of the total Federal prison population.

In recommending expanded prison facilities for young offenders, Senator THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR., Democrat, of Missouri, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries, points out that commitments of youthful offenders aged 18–24 already comprise 28 percent of Federal offenders. And he adds that commitments in the 18–24 age group are expected to increase 52 percent by 1956 and 87 percent by 1970.

White House Text on Flag Lists Its Use and Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a citizen of the United States, a nation that takes so much pride in displaying the flag. In the Washington Post for Sunday, August 23, 1959, there appeared an article which is a statement issued by the White House, giving background on the history of the flag.

On occasion, I have supplied a flag that was flown over the Capitol Building of the United States, to various indi-

viduals for some church, civic, or social function in my congressional district.

Over these years I have become deeply impressed by the closeness of our people to our flag and I thought this article which appeared in the newspaper would therefore be very interesting. So I am taking this opportunity of asking that it be printed in the RECORD in order that others who may have missed it might now have the opportunity of reading up on it.

The article follows:

WHITE HOUSE TEXT ON FLAG LISTS ITS USE AND BACKGROUND

In connection with the admission of Hawaii as a State of the Union, the President today issued an Executive order adding the 50th star to the Union of the flag. The new flag will supersede the 49-star flag which was prescribed on the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

By law, the new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States on July 4, 1960, the birthday of the Union. Display of the new flag before that time would be improper. However, it would not be improper to display the 48-star flag or the 49-star flag after that date; with limited exceptions agencies of the Federal Government will continue to display the 48-star flag and the 49-star flag so long as they remain in good condition and until existing stocks of unused flags are exhausted. It is appropriate for all citizens to do the same.

Following is certain information with respect to the historical and symbolic aspects of the national flag.

HISTORY OF NATIONAL FLAG

Before we became a nation, our land knew many flags. Long ago the Norsemen probed our coastal waters sailing under the banner of the black raven. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of Great Britain. The Dutch colonists brought their striped flag to New Amsterdam. The French explored the continent under the royal fleur-de-lis. Each native Indian tribe had its own totem and insignia. Immigrants of every race and nationality, in seeking a new allegiance, have brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores.

During our Revolution, various banners were used by the not-yet-united colonies. A green pine tree with the motto, "an appeal to heaven," was popular with our young Navy. The rattlesnake's warning, "Don't tread on me," was displayed by aroused colonists along the Atlantic seaboard. The Moultrie "liberty" flag, a large blue banner with a white crescent in the upper corner, rallied the defenders of Charleston, S.C., in 1776. The Bunker Hill flag was a blue banner with a white canton filled with a red cross and a small green pine. The flag of the maritime colony of Rhode Island bore a blue anchor under the word "Hope." Strikingly similar to the Stars and Stripes was the flag carried by the Green Mountain Boys of Vermont at the battle of Bennington on August 16, 1777.

When Washington took command of the Continental Army at Cambridge, Mass., in 1776, he stood under "the grand union flag" which continued to show a dependence upon Great Britain. The canton of this flag was filled with the crosses of St. George (England) and St. Andrew (Scotland).

The first Stars and Stripes was created by the Continental Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed nationally as "Flag Day."

In this flag the 13 stars, representing a constellation, were arranged in a variety of designs. The most popular, with the stars in a circle so that no State could claim precedence over another, is known as the Betsy Ross flag, in honor of the seamstress who is supposed to have sewn the first one.

As the American frontier expanded, two new States were added to the Union, and these were incorporated into the flag. This meant that two stars and two stripes were added to the design, making a total of 15 each. It was this flag that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort McHenry, Md., September 13–14, 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write "The Star Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, the Congress, feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes.

Since 1818, each new State has brought a new star to the flag. This growing pattern of stars could be said to reflect the growing dimensions of America's responsibilities, as the 13 stripes reflect the constant strength of our country's traditions.

The 50 States and the dates of their entry into the Union:

Alabama, December 14, 1819.
Alaska, January 3, 1959.
Arizona, February 14, 1912.
Arkansas, June 15, 1836.
California, September 9, 1850.
Colorado, August 1, 1876.
Connecticut, January 9, 1788.
Delaware, December 7, 1787.
Florida, March 3, 1845.
Georgia, January 2, 1788.
Hawaii, August 21, 1959.
Idaho, July 3, 1890.
Illinois, December 3, 1818.
Indiana, December 11, 1816.
Iowa, December 28, 1846.
Kansas, January 29, 1861.
Kentucky, June 1, 1792.
Louisiana, April 30, 1812.
Maine, March 15, 1820.
Maryland, April 28, 1788.
Massachusetts, February 6, 1788.
Michigan, January 26, 1837.
Minnesota, May 11, 1858.
Mississippi, December 10, 1817.
Missouri, August 10, 1821.
Montana, November 8, 1889.
Nebraska, March 1, 1867.
Nevada, October 31, 1864.
New Hampshire, June 21, 1788.
New Jersey, December 18, 1787.
New Mexico, January 6, 1912.
New York, July 26, 1788.
North Carolina, November 21, 1789.
North Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Ohio, March 1, 1803.
Oklahoma, November 16, 1907.
Oregon, February 14, 1859.
Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787.
Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.
South Carolina, May 23, 1788.
South Dakota, November 2, 1889.
Tennessee, June 1, 1796.
Texas, December 29, 1845.
Utah, January 4, 1896.
Vermont, March 4, 1791.
Virginia, June 25, 1788.
Washington, November 11, 1889.
West Virginia, June 20, 1863.
Wisconsin, May 29, 1848.
Wyoming, July 10, 1890.

CUSTOMS AND USAGE AS TO FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Laws have been written to govern the display of the flag and to insure a proper respect for it. Custom has decreed certain other observances in regard to its use. As a symbol of the Nation, standing for our heritage of liberty and justice, the flag is naturally held in highest honor by all citizens.

In recent years, the Congress of the United States of America has drawn together "the Existing Rules and Customs pertaining to the Display and Use of the Flag." These can be found in Public Law 829 of the 77th Congress and in Public Laws 107 and 396 of the 83d Congress. Copies may be obtained from the Government Printing Office.

Oregon State College Agricultural Specialists Discuss Farmers' Plight, Possible Solutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the most pressing domestic problems of this decade is the economic condition of American agriculture.

U.S. farmers are being drowned in a flood of goods created by their own efficiency.

In 1958 a third fewer farmers produced 55 percent more farm products than in 1938, and accomplished this feat with 30 percent less work and the smallest planted acreage in 40 years.

But net farm income has exhibited a downward trend for the last 10 years and farm production costs have increased almost fourfold since 1940. Hardest hit are small farms.

This situation is of crucial importance to my State. Oregon agriculture ranks as the State's second industry. Our 54,000 farms raise everything from alfalfa to zucchini. Most of the crops produced are not eligible for price support payments.

Mr. President, recently Dr. A. L. Strand, president of Oregon State College, and a group of that school's agricultural analysts, outlined in some detail conditions plaguing farmers in Oregon and throughout the Nation and advanced suggestions for long-range solutions to these problems.

Of particular interest to me was the recommendation that the price support program be re-evaluated. As I have frequently pointed out in the past, the present price support program does little to aid the Nation's small farmers. A complete overhaul of our Federal agriculture program is long overdue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there appear at the conclusion of my remarks, in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article written by Joe Bianco, agriculture editor of the Oregonian, of Portland, Oreg., and which appeared in the August 23, 1959, issue of that daily newspaper.

I think that Mr. Bianco's presentation of the thoughtful comments of President Strand and his associates represents a very concise and cogent summary of the farm situation today, not only in Oregon, but in many other parts of the country as well. I hope that Members of the Senate will have an opportunity to read this article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Aug. 23, 1959]

OREGON STATE COLLEGE AGRICULTURAL SPECIALISTS DISCUSS FARMERS' PLIGHT, POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

(By Joe Bianco)

Oregon is in an agricultural maelstrom that will continue to wipe out small farms, but, when the turmoil is over, a sound farm

economy will emerge in keeping with the time.

This is the opinion of Dr. August Leroy Strand, president of Oregon State College, and some of the college's highly respected agricultural analysts.

The group met with the Oregonian in a 3-hour conference and outlined a recovery program expected to direct farmers through what has been described as an "agricultural revolution."

The program is a reply to an appeal made earlier this week by H. D. Rolph, Sr., president of the Oregon State Farmers Union, who asked the college to investigate the "depressed conditions of agriculture" existing in the State.

Strand issued a brief answer to the OSFU president Tuesday, but enlarged upon it during the conference.

Present with Dr. Strand during the explanation of the school's long-range farm program.

Dr. Grant E. Blanch, professor of agricultural economics; Marion Dawa Thomas, extension agricultural economist; Wilbur Tarlton Cooney, associate dean of the school of agriculture; James Ralph Beck, Assistant Director of the Federal Cooperative Extension Service, and Robert M. Alexander, assistant director of the agricultural experiment stations.

Some of the existing conditions plaguing farmers, and not only in Oregon, were presented in the opening phase of the interview. They are:

1. A trend toward fewer farms and the disappearance of smaller farms.
2. Only 36 cents of the consumer dollar goes to the farmer, compared with 45 cents 10 years ago.
3. Change in eating habits from high calorie diet to low calorie foods, thereby reducing per capita consumption.
4. Dearth of nearby markets for goods.
5. Local markets invaded by outside competition.
6. Increase in cost of operation.
7. Overproduction.

ANSWERS SUGGESTED

Here are some solutions:

1. Retire more land to meet future needs. This should be applied nationally.
2. Oregon farmers should grow more trees, primarily alder and fir, because of the potential in the wood industry.
3. Small land farmers in the latter years of life who are unable to compete should liquidate, lease, or obtain part-time work. Young farmowners having small farms should increase holdings, improve efficiency or try for off-farm jobs.
4. Greater emphasis should be on Oregon specialty crops to eliminate outside competition and ease burden of rising freight rates.
5. Apply new farm technologies.
6. Reevaluate the price support program.

TECHNOLOGY BOOSTS OUTPUT

Blanch explained that the overproduction throughout the country has been brought on by forces growing out of an improved farm technology.

Unfortunately, the demand for agricultural products is inelastic and the surplus can't be absorbed by the consumer. Today's consumer is using his increased buying power to purchase nonagricultural commodities, such as television, cars, boats and other new goods.

"And while we are overproducing, which is required in order to exist in an agricultural economy, we are doing so with fewer farms because of tremendous strides in scientific farming," he added. In 1910, there were 13 million persons working on farms; today, there are 6 million.

Oregon must produce more than it consumes locally because half of the State's agricultural income is derived from products shipped out of the State.

FREIGHT COST ADDITIONAL

The State must maintain these markets and in so doing becomes involved in a highly competitive industry. Our products shipped to outside markets must compete in price with products from the market's local areas.

In addition, the Oregon farmer must pay freight costs to reach the outlets.

It is this situation, which Strand explained, is reason for Oregon farmers to concentrate on crops such as seeds, pears and timber that will not meet so keen competition. No other State is able to produce these products in equal quality or quantity.

The group expanded on its proposal to increase farm land retirement, a major factor in the growing agricultural problem.

Nationally, at least 50 million acres should be retired, and included in this would be 500,000 acres of Oregon farm lands. The States are so interdependent that one State can't solve the problem alone, they said.

ACCEPTANCE DOUBTED

The national figure includes the 22 million acres already in soil conservation. A decrease in land production will not increase farm prices, but allow the fruits of agriculture to be distributed more evenly among farmers.

Whether the farmers will accept this is something else. Too much effort and capital has been invested in the land, it was pointed out.

A major cause of this critical situation seems to have originated with the support price program.

Thomas said that "in an effort to ease the adjustment or impact of the economic forces we (Congress) devised support price programs and other forms of subsidies. From the standpoint of the farmer caught in the light of the line (wheat farmers and others), it was needed because he was threatened with sharply declining prices as competition increase.

"These programs in effect have conflicted with the technological developments that have made it possible for fewer and fewer to produce the needed food and fiber," he explained.

"The supports have tended to keep people in farming who might otherwise have turned to production of other food and services. We might have had a program that would have given the farmers a chance to go into other fields or combine agriculture and industry.

The group concluded by saying that despite these prospects there will be room for good farmers for a long time, perhaps forever. Those able to put new farm technology to work in time, before the rank and file, will be rewarded for their efficiency.

TV Petition Is Opposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, there is presently quite a controversy over the pending allocation of VHF channel 12 in Wilmington, Del. Although this is a local problem, in a certain sense, it has ramifications of Federal import for it serves to illustrate some of the underlying complications in the ETV struggle raging in many areas of the country.

I have been greatly pleased to see the increasing enthusiasm among my constituents for the educational allocation of Wilmington's channel 12. One of the most encouraging aspects of this whole allocation debate occurred during a legislative session of the Delaware Boy's State. The young men of the Boy's State lawmaking body overwhelmingly passed a resolution in favor of operating channel 12 as an educational telecasting unit.

This has been a long and complicated battle, and one which will undoubtedly continue for some time. I have been informed that the Federal Communications Commission will not take up the channel 12 question officially until at least the middle of September, if then. There are four petitions before the FCC at this time for the rights to operate channel 12. Three of them are applications filed by persons who would operate the channel commercially, and one has been submitted by WHYY, Inc., a Delaware-Pennsylvania-New Jersey group which would broadcast only educational programs over the channel.

The most recent petition before the FCC is the one filed by Benedict Gimbel, Jr., of the WIP Broadcasting Co., in Philadelphia. Mr. Gimbel's is an interesting proposal and is one which will be given a great deal of thought by the ETV enthusiasts. Since most of us who are in favor of educational television are approaching this situation realistically, we are aware that the FCC rarely allocates a VHF channel for strictly educational use. If channel 12 were to be operated by a commercial group, Mr. Gimbel's offer is certainly the most attractive of that kind. He has indicated that he would, after obtaining operating rights, delegate 3 percent of the time of the air to educational programs.

I feel it necessary to say, however, as I have said many times before, that a commercial channel which grants a portion of its time to educational use is by no means a substitute for the full-time educational television channel. Commercial channels cannot broadcast educational programs in the evening when these programs would be beneficial to the vast number of adults who would like to watch educational programs. Since many of the TV watchers of the evening hours prefer to be entertained; and since a commercial station, in order to sell the products which sponsor its shows, must give the greatest number of people what they want when they want it; the educational shows are usually relegated to only morning hours.

I do not stand alone with these feelings pertaining to ETV in Delaware. It has been heartwarming to see the effort which is being expended by many Delawareans, Pennsylvanians, and New Jerseyites who feel the need of an educational television channel in the Middle Atlantic States. These public-spirited people have raised $863,000 so far, to support the channel, according to Alexander Greenfeld, president of the Delaware Educational Television Association. Again I offer my support to this project and urge that the ETV proponents keep up the good work in the hope that an

educational channel 12 may become a reality.

Inserted here is an article from the Wilmington Journal-Every Evening of August 12, which describes in more detail some of the local feelings on this matter.

[From the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening, Aug. 12, 1959]

TV PETITION IS OPPOSED—PHILADELPHIA'S WIP TRY FOR CHANNEL 12 DRAWS CONTESTING STATEMENT

The Delaware Educational Television Association board of trustees today issued a statement opposing the application of Philadelphia station WIP for channel 12 in Wilmington.

The statement given by DETVA president Alexander Greenfeld said; "The application of station WIP, which commits 30 percent of its broadcast time to education, does not meet the needs of education in the Delaware community. DETVA maintains that adult education requires a large portion of the broadcast hours between 7 p.m. and 11 p.m. If educational TV is to grow and continue to be creative, participating organizations, and the schoolteachers must have access to studio facilities at all times.

"DETVA is happy to see a recognition of a commercial organization of the necessity and marketability of education on TV, but it does not believe that a grant of channel 12 to WIP would serve the best interests of the State of Delaware."

Others interested in getting channel 12 are the Rollins Broadcasting Co., Wilmington, a midwestern group, and WHYY, Inc., an educational corporation representing Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. The latter is a nonprofit organization trying to obtain the channel to air education programs in the evening.

DETVA's proposal would have broadcasting from 9 a.m. to 11 p.m. From 9 a.m. to 3 p.m., there would be programs into the schools.

Mr. Greenfeld announced that hearings in Washington before the Federal Communications Commission, probably will not be held before October. At the hearing, Mr. Greenfeld said, he, and Delaware educators and leading citizens will testify in behalf of WHYY.

Mrs. Yvonne De Valenger, secretary, reported that the association has already received more than 1,000 signed petitions favoring WHYY's application.

The drive for the petitions will continue until the FCC hearing, Mr. Greenfeld said.

Georgia Bankers Honor Representative Paul Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, no Member of Congress has served with greater distinction to himself or with truer devotion to his constituents and Nation than has the Honorable PAUL BROWN of the 10th District of Georgia. In deserved recognition of Representative BROWN's long and outstanding service in the public interest, particularly in the field of banking and currency, the Executive Council of the Georgia Bankers Association recently adopted a resolution expressing its appreciation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of that resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Executive Council of the Georgia Bankers Association has noted with pride:

1. That Representative PAUL BROWN of the 10th District of Georgia has served with honor for many years as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives.

2. That Representative PAUL BROWN as chairman of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Banking and Currency Committee, first established early this year, has demonstrated outstanding ability for constructive leadership.

3. That Representative PAUL BROWN introduced H.R. 5237 in the 86th Congress, a bill to amend the legal reserve requirements applicable to member banks of the Federal Reserve System to permit, among other things, the Federal Reserve Board to authorize member banks to include vault cash as a part of their legal reserves and that under his skillful direction this bill passed the House of Representatives and was subsequently enacted into law as Public Law 86-114.

4. That Representative PAUL BROWN has introduced much needed amendments to the national bank laws as bills H.R. 8159 and H.R. 8160 and has guided these bills to approval by his subcommittee and the full Banking and Currency Committee and thereafter to passage by the House of Representatives.

In view of the foregoing, the Executive Council of the Georgia Bankers Association hereby expresses its great and sincere appreciation of the notable service which Representative PAUL BROWN has performed in an effort to modernize the banking laws so that the banks of the country may more effectively serve their communities and assist in the economic growth of the United States and instructs the secretary of the association to make this resolution a part of the permanent records of the association and to transmit a copy to Representative BROWN, to the other members of the Georgia congressional delegation, and to the American Bankers Association.

Humanitarian Stricken

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story and an editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Monday, August 24, 1959, announcing and commenting upon the illness of Dr. Thomas A. Dooley, who is characterized as "America's Dr. Schweitzer" for his great and humanitarian work in the field of medicine in the Far East, specifically in Laos:

DOCTOR DETERMINED TO RETURN TO LAOS

ST. LOUIS, August 24.—Dr. Thomas A. Dooley says cancer may let him live only 5 or 6 years, but he is determined to return to embattled Laos. He operates a hospital near the frontlines of Laos battle against Communist rebels.

The 32-year-old physician said a growth removed from his chest has been diagnosed as malignant melanoma.

"The outlook for this type of cancer is bleak," he said, as if he were talking about a common cold. "It usually means you have 5 or 6 years.

"I don't care what the outlook is. If it's 6 months or 16 years, I'm going back to Laos in November.

"The fate of Laos is more important than the Berlin crisis. The future of all southeast Asia rests with the outcome of the situation in Laos."

Dr. Dooley, who visited his mother here, flies to New York today for further diagnosis at the Sloan-Kettering Cancer Research Center.

He expressed concern over Communist reports in Laos that the American doctor had ducked out in "typical American" fashion.

HUMANITARIAN STRICKEN

The Associated Press dispatch from New York, appearing in this newspaper on Saturday, telling of the return of Dr. Thomas Dooley to St. Louis to visit his family before entering a hospital for treatment of cancer in the chest, will be cause for concern in this community, as it will be in many places, particularly in Laos which is taking up a great deal of space on the front page these days.

Dr. Dooley is America's Dr. Schweitzer. Whereas the famous French humanitarian labors in Africa, Dr. Dooley has been conducting a hospital and traveling clinic in the Far East, close to the border of Red China.

Dr. Dooley lectured at College Misericordia in January 1958 before his return to his post in the Orient where he was stricken recently. His moving recital of his experiences made a deep impression on his audience at Dallas.

Only 32 years or age and a former U.S. Navy officer, Dr. Dooley returned to Indochina where he and four fellow Americans, constituting a mobile medical unit, treated villagers and built a bamboo hospital where he looks after at least 100 patients daily and provides natives with an inspiring example of American brotherhood. His only compensation, apart from the honors he has received and the satisfaction of doing a good deed, consists of eggs, fruit and poultry which he shares with the needy. It has been estimated that he has served more than 600,000 refugees from China. He also has trained hundreds of natives to serve as midwives and in other capacities. He has used royalties from two books, as well as contributions from admirers, to buy medical equipment and supplies for his mission of mercy.

And now this unselfish man himself has been stricken. He will have the prayers of millions of his fellow countrymen and of orientals he has befriended for a speedy recovery and a return to his post. The world cannot spare, at this crucial period, one Dr. Dooley or one Dr. Schweitzer.

Hector Says Regulatory Agencies Try To Do Impossible—And Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Hector Says Regulatory Agencies

Try To Do Impossible—And Fail" written by Carroll Kilpatrick, which appeared in the Washington Post of August 26, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article sets forth quotes from a speech made by the Honorable Louis J. Hector, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board before the convention of the American Bar Association in Miami, Fla., pointing out that our regulatory agencies are failing to achieve their purpose by virtue of the out-moded procedures which they are following today.

Commissioner Hector who hails from the great State of Florida leveled sharp, objective and constructive criticism at the present procedures followed by our regulatory agencies and expressed the view that a major overhauling of these procedures is vital if they are to serve the purpose for which they have been established by the Congress. I am pleased to state that the Transportation Study Committee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will look into matters of this nature. I hope we come up with a solution. Solutions to these problems are hard to come up with these days.

What Mr. Hector has said is what many of us have felt for some time. In my opinion, he has performed great public service. The views stated by him deserve the urgent and serious consideration of the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 26, 1959]

HECTOR SAYS REGULATORY AGENCIES TRY TO DO IMPOSSIBLE—AND FAIL

(By Carroll Kilpatrick)

A sharp criticism of the practices of Federal regulatory agencies, together with an indictment of the basic premises on which they were established was made yesterday by one of the leading regulatory officials in Washington.

The critic was Louis J. Hector, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who said in a speech before the American Bar Association in Miami that the regulatory agencies are trying to do the impossible.

His remarks were regarded as especially significant because of their source and because they reflect a growing criticism, from academic sources and from industry, of regulatory agencies and the role they are supposed to play.

Criticism of the agencies since they were created in the New Deal days has been muted. But of late they have been under increasing attack, partly because they have the effect of stifling economic freedom and because they attempt to do two opposing jobs: regulation and adjudication.

CALLS FOR OVERHAULING

"If we tried to make our foreign policy or plan our national defense in this way, we would still be a third-rate power," Hector said.

"And if we keep on trying to plan our national transportation system this way, we will wake up in a national emergency one day and find that it won't do the job.

"Clearly these procedures must be overhauled."

Hector indicated that he was not proposing minor reforms but major surgery. Agencies like the CAB, the Federal Power Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission are trying to combine policymaking and adjudication—in other words, be both Congress and the courts, he suggested. The basic premises are wrong, he charged.

Under growing criticism from Congress and the public and from the businesses they are charged with regulating, Hector said, the agencies have tried to protect themselves by insisting that they are acting more and more like courts of law.

"The paradoxical result," Hector said, "has been not a greater amount of real judicial process but a lesser amount—more judicial trappings, perhaps, but less of substance.

"As an organization tries to give the appearance of full judicial procedure in every matter, both big and small, inevitable compromises and subterfuges are required to get all the work done. These compromises inevitably spread throughout the organization and in the long run there is less true judicial process in any matter, big or small."

Hector recited the history of what is known as the Seven States case recently before the CAB. In 1955, it became apparent that railroad passenger service in the Dakotas, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota was becoming so inadequate that new local air service was essential.

THREE YEARS FOR CASE

In December 1955, the CAB ordered an investigation to develop a new air program for the area. Because of what Hector called "the built-in inefficiency" of the CAB's process of reaching a decision in a matter of this kind, it took it 3 years to conclude the case.

Many witnesses were heard, but "neither the Board nor the examiner had specified just what sort of information they wanted," he said, so a number of witnesses "did not provide very much useful information."

"The Board never went out and actively sought the facts," he said. "Anyone who was interested just came in and brought whatever data he thought might be useful."

In the beginning, the Board gave the examiner "no real policies to guide him in the formulation of a major new local service plan," Hector said. The result was that "he floundered around for 2 years formulating his own plan only to have the Board disagree with him on basic policy and do the whole job over."

BASIC FLAW NOTED

The basic flaw is the belief that administrative agencies can combine policymaking and adjudication, Hector said.

"Administrators and judges have such completely different codes of ethics that a commissioner who tries to act like a judge is accused of trying to regulate in an ivory tower, while one who tries to act like an administrator is accused of becoming too friendly with the litigants," Hector said.

The CAB is now and for 2 years has been engaged in another major case. It involves an overhaul of airline fares. Possibly because he is still sitting as a judge in that case, Hector did not refer to it, but it promises to make the Seven States case seem brief and clearly managed by comparison.

Millions of words of testimony already have been taken in the fare investigation, while the traveling public and the airlines wonder whether one or both is being cheated in the meantime.

Hector urged the critics and defenders of the administrative agencies to recognize the need for major changes.

HE POINTS OUT NEED

"All the critics agree, I think, that adjudication must be performed by men occupying basically the position of judges, and that the executive and Congress must keep their hands off," he said.

"But policymaking is a different thing. This should be made by the executive, it is increasingly felt, within the broad policy determinations of Congress."

He indicated he agreed with critics who say:

"Give to the executive the functions of rulemaking, policy formulation, planning, and routine administration. Give to a special expert tribunal or group of tribunals the task of deciding major litigated cases and of hearing appeals from administrative decisions. If there is a job of prosecution, give it to a separate agency."

Brilliant Address on Maritime Policy by Mr. Ralph E. Casey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very able, penetrating address by our valued and esteemed friend, Mr. Ralph E. Casey, president of the American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., before a panel discussion of the National Security Commission at Minneapolis on August 22, 1959.

I am inserting this learned address in the RECORD with the hope that all Members of the Congress may read it.

Obviously, we have every reason to be deeply concerned by the marked decline in the vigor and vitality of American shipping. Both our economy and our national security have been and are being adversely affected by conditions developed in our great shipping industry since the end of World War II.

To my mind, few things confronting the Congress are more important than the status and strengthening of our great maritime industry.

Truly there is great need today not only for studying America's maritime policy but for taking prompt, effective action to insure that our shipping industry is adequately protected, maintained, and improved to meet our economic and maritime needs in international commerce, to bolster the national defense, and make sure that our prestige in this area is not further impaired.

I congratulate Mr. Casey upon this thoughtful, outstanding address and hope that its contents will be taken to heart and acted upon by the Congress before it is too late. A greatly strengthened and revitalized American merchant marine is one of our most compelling national needs.

The address follows:

THE UNITED STATES-EUROPEAN SHIPPING TALKS AND THEIR AFTERMATH

(Address by Ralph E. Casey, president, American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., at National Security Commission panel discussion, August 22, 1959, Minneapolis, Minn.)

There is one phase of the merchant marine picture to which I should like to devote the few minutes allotted to me here today. I refer to the intergovernmental shipping talks which were held in Washington this past June between representatives of Eu-

ropean shipping nations and our State Department.

Now, some may feel that the crisis to which these talks gave rise is over and that we need worry no longer about this particular threat to American shipping. In my opinion this kind of thinking is not only wrong but dangerous. There is no doubt in the world but that the Europeans are just marking time; waiting for a new and more favorable opportunity to press their case. Before I point out why I know this to be so, let me give you a sketchy background and review of these June talks.

Through the years, the maritime Nations of Western Europe have competed for the great and expanding foreign trade of the United States. They have competed among themselves, and they have competed with merchant vessels under the American flag. During the 20th century the disparity in building and operating costs between American and European shipping has put us at a tremendous disadvantage. As a result the American merchant fleet dwindled to almost nothing twice in a period of less than 40 years, first in 1916 and again in 1939, times when our freedoms and our very institutions were at stake. These lessons convinced each President and each Congress for the past quarter of a century that a strong American merchant marine is absolutely essential to our health and welfare as a nation.

When World War II ended, the maritime fleets of Western Europe were shot to pieces. Over here we had hundreds of comparatively new ships built at the cost of some $19 billion to the American taxpayers. However, so instead of retaining the monopoly on world shipping which this situation gave us, we offered our foreign friends these excellent vessels at the same prices we were asking of our own citizens. In this way, the United States rehabilitated the merchant fleets of every country in Western Europe.

In this postwar period the subsidy program initiated by the 1936 act, became even more essential to the survival of American-flag shipping. In fact, we found that by reason of the strong nationalistic flag preferences and stringent currency restrictions prevalent over there, we were still fighting a losing battle in competition with the merchant fleets of Western Europe. Subsidy is no good without cargoes. So, it was established as only fair and equitable that one-half of all Government-sponsored cargoes—in other words, these goods which were, in effect, being given away to foreign nations—should be carried in American ships.

Well, the Europeans didn't like our subsidy laws and they liked our 50–50 law even less. Foreign shipping journals constantly sniped at these two phases of our shipping policy. The governments of Western Europe got together in a group called the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, known as OEEC, and the sniping became more formidable. They did, however, stay on their side of the Atlantic.

Late last year, they decided to take the gloves off and have it out with our Government face-to-face. A formal request was presented on behalf of the Netherlands, later joined by the other maritime countries, for a series of talks with U.S. Government officials in Washington to discuss certain phases of our shipping policy. It became apparent that these phases were subsidies, the 50–50 law, and the flags-of-convenience or necessity question. Our State Department agreed to these talks, and they were held on June 8–12.

This was a conference in which the United States had nothing to gain and everything to lose. Every segment of our industry was affected—passenger ships, cargo vessels, and tanker companies.

With the storm clouds brewing I went to London for the annual meeting of the International Chamber of Shipping in April. This is an international group of shipping trade associations similar to the American Merchant Marine Institute. By a fortunate coincidence, Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER was on the same ship going over and we arranged to have joint discussions with labor leaders, shipping men and Government officials concerning the purpose of the forthcoming talks in Washington. Not only did we learn the precise nature of the points that would be made in Washington, but even more importantly, we came to appreciate what a serious mistake it would be to take these discussions lightly.

Anyone who knows how these diplomatic conferences are set up and carried out must realize that generally whole Government delegations do not travel 3,000 miles merely to chitchat; generally, there is reasonable assurance in advance that the mission will be successful. That was the case in this instance also; the European governments fully expected to make headway in their long fight to reduce our merchant fleet to rockbottom. Perhaps they were given some measure of hope by the fact that the President of the United States had just ordered a new study of transportation policy. Or perhaps, the intelligence received from their representatives stationed in this country was misleading. At any rate, shipping was down all over the world, cargoes were hard to get, and it was thought abroad that this was the time to strike.

As the time for the talks approached, the chairman of the two congressional committees having cognizance over merchant marine matters warned the State Department against making any concessions in the areas under discussion. The industry, speaking through its associations, asked for representation at the table. This was refused, but arrangements were made for briefing industry representatives during the course of the meetings. I can now tell you that we agreed to confidential briefings very reluctantly. Some thought it better to stay away altogether but, on the whole, we felt that would be taking too great a risk. If any weakening of the U.S. position developed, we wanted to be in a position to know about it.

That no such weakening did develop and that the European delegations went home without anything to show for their efforts to undermine, or at least water down, our basic national maritime policies is greatly to the credit of our Government's representatives and of the congressional leaders who strengthened their hand. In particular, we owe a debt of gratitude to my fellow panelist Clarence Morse, Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board, whose blunt reassertion of the principles under attack set the keynote from which our side of the talks never deviated. Great credit is also due Under Secretary of State Dillon, whose firmness won the applause of an industry which has seldom had occasion to applaud the State Department.

Toward the conclusion of the talks, perceiving that they were not going to make any immediate progress toward changing our merchant marine policies, the European spokesmen proposed setting up a permanent international consultative body before which their objections to U.S. policy could be aired on a continuing basis. When informed of this proposal in the regular briefings, the American shipping industry strongly and vigorously opposed the scheme. Our position was that acceptance of such a plan would imply a lack of conviction as to its own policies on the part of the U.S. Government. It would further expose the welfare of our industry, and indeed the security of the Nation itself, to the fluctuations of intergovernmental debate by diplomats—a game in which we constantly lose our shirts.

Despite our opposition, the idea of such a continuing forum was incorporated in the final communique issued when the talks adjourned. It was considerably diluted and couched in diplomatically vague terms. The participating delegations "agreed to recommend to their governments that favorable consideration be given to informal arrangements which would facilitate discussion and consideration" of the issues before the conference. Our interpretation of this language, based on explanations given by the State Department itself, is that the arrangements in question were to consist, at most, of an agreement under which further discussions might be held at the shipping attaché level in Washington.

There is ample evidence that the European version of what the arrangement was to be is entirely different. On the day the talks ended, the London Daily Express said that Mr. Harold Watkinson, leader of the British delegation, would "report an American agreement to set up a committee sitting in Washington and Paris to consider grumbles about the West's maritime policies, government cargoes, and flags of convenience." Later, the London Financial Times quoted Mr. Watkinson as saying the committee would be on a "reasonably high level" and that if this committee made no material progress within "perhaps a year" another intergovernmental conference with the United States should be proposed. And, the London Daily Mail in spelling out the plan in some detail stated, "The first meeting of the group will probably be held in Washington some time soon to settle organization arrangements and afterwards it is hoped the headquarters will be established in Paris."

This seems rather fantastic, doesn't it? Imagine, an organization set up for the prime purpose of reviewing U.S. shipping policy would be located in Paris. How ridiculous can you get?

And yet very recently the president of the British Chamber of Shipping, Sir Nicholas Cayzer, issued a report calling upon the United States to fulfill the promise, allegedly made during the June talks, to set up machinery for continuing the examination of the matters previously discussed. You will understand now, I am sure, why I consider this threat to our maritime policy to be far from extinct. It could become very real again on short notice.

We vehemently deny the need or, in fact, the propriety of establishing an intergovernmental organization to study America's maritime policy. Our own Government has never hesitated to make such studies whenever they seemed timely or appropriate and indeed more often in the past 15 years than has seemed justified. However, that is our business and we need no help from foreign competitors.

Protests from abroad with respect to merchant marine matters should be submitted through regular Government channels and given no more fanfare and no more special treatment than protests with respect to any other aspect of national policy. We hope the American Legion will stand with us on this as it has in the past on questions of vital concern to the American merchant marine.

The Deceptive Mouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, between June 5 and 10 of this year 650 delegates from the NATO nations including

130 from the United States, met in London in the first Atlantic Congress. The congress was sponsored by the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

I have just read an article in the summer European-Atlantic Review by Earl Jellicoe, member of the House of Lords, who served on the United Kingdom delegation and acted as rapporteur for the United Kingdom at the Atlantic Congress.

Lord Jellicoe's description of the work of the congress, as it points to developments for the future, is the most perceptive as well as complete that has come to my attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DECEPTIVE MOUSE

(By Earl Jellicoe, United Kingdom rapporteur at the Atlantic Congress)

An objective reader, confronted with the final declaration of the Atlantic Congress, 1959, may be forced to the conclusion that the congress mountain, having labored mightily, managed in the end, to produce only a rather small mouse.

Such a conclusion would not be entirely false. The declaration is a poor, weak, thing. It has little punch and absolutely no sex appeal. Reading it, one would not suppose that it was the product of a congress attended by 650 representative and distinguished—on the whole I was one of them—delegates from 14 of the 15 NATO countries, addressed by some of the most eminent of the citizens of those countries. Reading it, one can find little echo of the meticulous preparation and careful planning on which the congress was based. In it there is not the clear lead for which Her Majesty the Queen, in an admirable speech at the impressive opening ceremony, called. In it there is little reflection of the urgency of the challenge of our times.

That challenge is indeed urgent and grave. Something—a great deal—has been achieved in the 10 years since the Atlantic Treaty was signed. Global war has been prevented. The NATO defense structure has been brought into being. Political consultation between the members of the alliance has been developed. The economy of Europe has been restored. In a material sense both North Americans and West Europeans have never had it so good.

But those successes mask grave shortcomings and insistent dangers. On the military side the NATO nations have still to find in a joint atomic strategy an adequate response to the Soviet achievement of atomic parity. In many other vital respects the NATO defense structure is fragile and inadequate. Politically, the increasingly astute, flexible, and resourceful conduct of Soviet foreign policy since Stalin's death has not been matched by an effective, integrated, and positive Western foreign policy. Rather, the NATO nations have tended to dance, belatedly and often out of step, to Moscow's tune. Moreover, with the growing upsurge of nationalism on both sides of the Atlantic, the NATO nations have shown a regretable and possibly increasing tendency to fall out among themselves. Economically, although the achievements have been real, the West has not proved its ability to match the rate of growth of the Communists' economies; nor has it solved the problem of continuing steady and rapid economic progress with stable prices.

These are some of the challenges of our times. The Declaration of the Atlantic Congress contained little affirmative response to them. Does this mean that the Congress was a failure? I do not think so.

I feel this for at least two reasons. The first is that a valuable part of the work of the Congress was done before the Congress even assembled. This work included the preparation of the papers to be submitted by the various national committees to the Congress. Many of these papers—and I am glad to say that not a few among them were British—are of a very high standard. It is a pity that most delegates had little time to read them, let alone digest them, since they embody, in concise form, recommendations which merit the attention of the NATO governments and peoples.

The second reason is that very little of the real work of the Congress really emerges in the final declaration. The donkeywork was, of course, done in the 5 main committees and the 16 subcommittees where discussion was often prolonged and sometimes passionate. It is, accordingly, to the reports of the committees, and subcommittees, that one must turn if one wishes to form any real idea of the ground covered.

Of these committees, three—the Atlantic Spiritual and Cultural Committee, the Atlantic Political Committee, and the Atlantic Economic Committee—were concerned with the problems facing the NATO countries in their relations with each other. These were the inward-regarding committees, and each of them had three or four subcommittees. There were also two outward-regarding committees—the Free World Committee, and the Communist-Bloc Committee. These, too, had three subcommittees each.

These committees and subcommittees achieved, in the way of solid resolutions and specific proposals, quite a lot—as will be seen from their reports which were later debated and adopted by the Congress as a whole.

In the first place the Spiritual and Cultural Committee produced an admirably short and pithy restatement which owed much to the mind and pen of Father Daniélou, of France, of the fundamental credo of the member countries. In words which the Secretary General of NATO subsequently quoted, this statement emphasized that: "Respect for human dignity is the inalienable basis of civilization. The purpose of a political and economic society is to create conditions enabling every human being freely to fulfill his destiny. The guarantee of this dignity is, first the recognition of objective spiritual values which cannot be altered by any human agency but are the expression of a natural or transcendent law governing communities and individuals alike."

Significantly, this statement made it clear that not only must the Atlantic community be outward regarding but also that civilization was by no means the prerogative of the hitherto materially favored West: "Civilization is the common product of all peoples. In particular, Asia, Africa, and Oceania have a part to play side by side with the Western peoples. It is important to realize that the common values of civilization are differently expressed by different peoples according to their various traditions."

This committee also proposed a number of practical means by which the information and educational activities of NATO and the member countries should be reinforced in order that the purposes of the community should be projected more effectively to its own and other peoples. As a nonexpert in this field, these proposals have struck me as eminently sensible and, given the will, quite practical. What is more important, they have for the most part, commended themselves to the NATO experts in these matters. They are varied in scope. For example, they included definite suggestions as to how the role and responsibility of the NATO Information Division should be strengthened and broadened—a request to member governments to devote more funds toward facilitating student and teacher exchanges, and proposals designed to increase the number of Asian and African students studying in western universities and to bring about in 1960 a conference of university teachers from NATO countries concerned with international questions.

In addition the Spiritual and Cultural Committee recommended that a Studies Center for the Atlantic community should be set up in the near future. This proposal, which had strong and well-organized support, was criticized, I gather, by a number of the delegates, especially those from the United Kingdom, who felt that it might involve unnecessary duplication with existing research work and that the project in general was overambitious. They would have preferred a foundation on the American model with more restricted terms of reference. However, the larger project carried the day. It remains to be seen if the scheme has sufficient steam behind it to attract the necessary private and public support. If it has, this Studies Center may well have a valuable role to play as an intellectual focus for the Atlantic community.

The Political Committee dealt with both the political and military aspects of the alliance. In the main the debate on the political side centered around the proposals sponsored by certain of the signatories of the Declaration of Atlantic Unity who acted throughout the Congress and in every committee, as a well-organized lobby. In the end the Committee adopted two of their proposals. The first was that meetings of the NATO heads of government should be held annually. The second was that member governments should be requested to convene not later than the spring of 1960 a conference of 100 leading representative citizens charged with examining and recommending ways and means of developing greater cooperation and unity within the alliance.

It was, moreover, suggested by the Committee that this special conference of 100 wise men should, inter alia, specifically consider three more of the signatories' proposals, namely, the development of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference into a fully fledged advisory assembly, the adoption by the North Atlantic Council of the principle of the weighted vote, and, finally, the possible establishment of a small advisory panel of qualified men of wide experience attached to the bureau of the general secretariat. In addition, the Committee, after noting with satisfaction the growth of political consultation between the member countries, emphasized the need for still greater coordination of NATO governments with the North Atlantic Council on "all questions of common concern." They also drew attention to the desirability of further enhancing the authority of the Secretary General and proposed that a special study group should be set up to examine new methods of conciliation between member states, including the possible creation of a NATO court of justice—an idea which had been strongly canvassed by Mr. Charles S. Rhyne, the former president of the United States Bar Association.

On the military side the military subcommittee, on which representation was exceptionally strong, produced, after considerable discussion, a carefully drafted and delicately balanced resolution. This compromise resolution was designed to pay some regard to the French desire to participate, together with the other NATO powers with worldwide responsibilities (e.g., the United States and the United Kingdom) in the

formulation of an agreed global strategy. It was also meant to take account of current French susceptibilities about the control of nuclear weapons and the exchange of atomic secrets. However, on French initiative, the Committee finally presented to the Congress a much emasculated resolution which the Congress, after a spirited debate, rejected in favor of the original. The resolution, because of its careful balance, should be read as a whole. But among its salient points are the following: the urgent need to bring the European "Shield" forces up to the levels laid down in MC–70; the need for reexamination of the structure and control of NATO's atomic forces; the need for a common NATO armaments funds and the widest possible interchange between the member governments of atomic information and the implied need for a drastic overhaul of NATO's air and naval command structures. All this—and more.

I am no economist and I shall therefore deal briefly with the work of the Economic Committee—more briefly than it deserves. The philosophy behind its resolution was expansionist, derestrictive and cooperative. It called for governments to adhere to policies designed to promote higher levels of employment and living standards. It stressed the need for governments to avoid restrictive economic practices and called upon governments wherever possible, to reduce tariffs and other trade barriers. Above all it stressed the need for closer economic integration within the Atlantic Community and drew attention to the gaps that exist in the existing arrangements for economic, scientific and technological collaboration. With this in mind the committee suggested that governments should consider the possibility of transforming the Organization for European Economic Cooperation into an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation in which not only the West European but also the North American countries would be full members. The proposed new organization would have wide functions. It would be designed to form an economic bridge between the European Economic Community, the economies of the rest of Europe and those of the remainder of the free world. It would promote coordinated polices for the expansion of the North Atlantic economies without inflation or recession. It would also coordinate national policies and develop cooperative policies for accelerating the economic development of the underdeveloped areas of the world.

Before the Congress it had generally been anticipated that much attention would be focused on the relations between the countries of the Atlantic Community and those of the remainder of the free world, many of which are underdeveloped and most of which are uncommitted in the world struggle. This expectation was not disappointed and most committees of the Congress, in fact, dealt in one way or another with this problem. But the report of the Free World Committee itself is rather a disappointing document. This does not mean, however, that the committee, and the Congress as a whole, did not recognize that possibly the most crucial problem confronting the Atlantic Community over the next decade was that of establishing a mutually satisfactory relationship with the new and emerging countries. Speaker after speaker—from the Archbishop of York at the first plenary session to Mr. Gaitskell and Mr. Macmillan at the special plenary session—emphasized this. It was also clear to the Congress that not only was it necessary for the Atlantic countries to adopt the right political stance toward the newer countries, based on a frank and full recognition of their right to political independence, but also that this political independence would be an empty concept unless it was based on solid economic foundations. Because of this massive and sustained aid from the West would be needed over a long period.

There was a general feeling that such aid should be given on its own merits, since we in the Atlantic Community have "a duty to help less-developed countries to help themselves." But there were many who also felt that a massive effort was required to offset the Soviet challenge in this field, given the fact that the new countries are a primary target for Communist penetration.

There was also widespread agreement as to the forms which aid should take. First, the need for a steady, and probably increased, flow of long term capital to stimulate capital investment and growth. (It was recognized that, of necessity, the bulk of this investment would be public investment but there was a strong feeling that steps to stimulate private investment in developing countries should be taken.) Second, expanded technical assistance programs. Third, as Mr. Cahan, the Deputy Secretary General of OEEC put it in a notable speech: "It is very necessary, if we are honestly to develop these underdeveloped countries, to give them an opportunity to sell what they can best produce in our markets. There is no other long-term solution. It is no use pouring money in, it is no use giving them technical help if the resultant product simply has to be burnt or thrown away. I think in this—as perhaps in other things—it is worth looking at what our Russian friends are doing. Our Russian friends, when they give technical assistance and financial aid, do not stop there. This is a very important difference between what the Russians have done and what we have done. The Russians are prepared to take the exportable product of the countries which they wish to help and to take them at almost any price, any quantity and any quality. I do not suggest that we go as far as that, but I think we ought to do a little better than we do now."

There was also widespread agreement that in a program of this nature there was a clear need for greater coordination between the NATO members. Such coordination, it was felt, could well be advanced through quiet consultation within NATO, although there was little support for the idea of converting NATO itself into an agency for channeling aid to the underdeveloped countries. There was less unanimity over the need for new agencies for aid, and if so, what form such agencies should take. Some felt that the proposed new organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation should play a role in this field. Others that private participation in aid programs should be stimulated by the creation of a World Development Corporation. Others again (i.e. the Free World Committee, in a resolution adopted by the Congress) that an International Development Association should be established, broader than and independent of NATO, open to all nations and working "either directly or through existing international and regional associations, including the World Bank and other organs of the United Nations." (It was not clear whether this agency should be designed to encourage the provision of long-term, low-interest loans, as a counterpart to the World Bank's "bankable" loans, or whether it would be wider in scope.) And a strong minority felt that, although increased aid was needed, it should be channeled through existing institutions, especially those linked with the United Nations.

The Communist Bloc Committee reached, with little difficulty, unanimity in their diagnosis of the scope of the Communist challenge. And they were unanimous, too, in their proposals. On the political front, they called for perseverance in negotiations with the governments of the Communist countries, for an increase in East-West contacts and exchanges, and for a proclamation by the Atlantic Powers of their continued determination to do all within their power by peaceful means to enable the satellite countries to achieve self-determination. They pointed out the inadequacy of the West's response to Communist ideological warfare and called for more effective measures, within the NATO framework, for matching it, and also for the creation of an international, unofficial, organization designed to serve the same end throughout the world. Finally, on the economic side, the committee proposed that, to counter the growing Communist economic offensive, a NATO Economic Council should be created as a policymaking, planning, and coordinating body.

What emerges from this plethora of paper—of reports and resolutions and recommendations? It is sometimes a little difficult to see the wood for the trees, and others who have fought their way through the paper jungle of this Congress may have somewhat different ideas as to what constituted the real hard core of the Congress. But, as I see it, these were the four main underlying themes:

(a) The first was the universal recognition of the continuing need for the alliance, coupled with the conviction that if the alliance were to endure, let alone prosper, the concept of the interdependence of the countries of the Atlantic Community must somehow be given real flesh and bones. But beyond that there was divergence. On the one side there are the adventurous spirits who feel that the time is now ripe to give the embryo Atlantic Community an institutional framework, moving toward some form of Federal structure. And they have influential support—M. Spaak, for example, came down personally in favor of the principle of Atlantic institutions taking decisions by a weighted majority vote. On the other side are the more cautious spirits—with whom, I am sure, the majority of our governments are at present in sympathy—who feel that progress toward the greater integration of the Atlantic Community must be cautious and pragmatic and functional. For the present, a meeting ground was found in the recommendations of the Political Committee (which may, of course, lead to a meeting of 100 wise men next spring) and in their expressed belief that the demands of the alliance and our times make some further erosion of our national sovereignties inevitable.

(b) The second theme, to my mind, was the very evident dissatisfaction of the Congress with many aspects of NATO defense—in particular the failure to achieve the force targets laid down in MC–70, to weakness of political control over the "philosophy and practice of war," the failure to achieve any rational interdependence in arms research and production, the holes in the European air defense system, the ramshackle air and maritime command structures, and the weakness of our antisubmarine defenses. The support which the Congress gave to Mr. George Brown's strong words on the subject was significant. It is perhaps more doubtful if significant action by governments will necessarily result.

(c) The third theme (and perhaps the most important) was the universal recognition that the Atlantic Community must be outward looking, that it cannot, and should not, constitute itself a self-regarding club of the rich, white, free nations. With this went a recognition that our countries must speedily create a clear, consistent, and long-term policy toward those countries which lie outside both our community and the Communist bloc, and that such a policy will call for a long-sustained effort on all our parts. But there was some considerable wooliness as to how such a policy should be

applied and how best the efforts of the member countries should be concerted.

(d) Finally, there was an equally clear recognition that all our efforts would be stultified unless our community was able, in concert, to achieve something which has so far eluded it—the combination of sustained economic growth without inflation. With this went a recognition that, possibly, new economic institutions, and, most certainly, a more effective coordination of our economic policies and a greater awareness by our peoples of the issues at stake were essential.

But, all said and done, it can still be asserted that the results of the Congress were rather pedestrian and unimaginative, that the delegates took refuge behind their proposals for a mass of new institutions, and that the Congress, unlike its predecessor at The Hague, sounded no brave, new note. All this is true in part. But the Congress was concerned with the affairs of a going concern—the Atlantic Community—and the affairs of going concerns are usually rather terre-à-terre. True, the delegates did suggest rather a bellyful of new institutions. But, if they had not, they would have been accused of lack of imagination and there are admitted gaps, which need filling, in the economic structure of the free world. It is also true that the Congress sounded no clarion call for action. Partly this is the fault of an unnecessarily mute declaration. But it is also an echo of the times in which we in the West live. If we are honest we must admit that leadership in the West is lacking—and lacking most where it is most needed—in and from the United States. It would have been to ask too much of a Congress of this nature to bridge these gaps in leadership. But it may have pointed a way.

Ultimately, of course, this Congress will not be judged by the paper it produced. A stirring declaration may be a good thing. So are imaginative and practical proposals. But the followthrough is the thing. What is really significant is the seriousness of purpose of the delegates and their determination, on their return home, really to push with their own peoples and with the appropriate national and international organizations and with their governments the proposals which they have backed on paper. This is the yardstick by which this Congress will in the end be judged.

The Captive Peoples Pray for Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, on July 17, the White House issued a proclamation designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week, and urging the people of the United States of America to study the plight of the Soviet-dominated nations and to recommit themselves to the support of the just aspirations of the peoples of these captive nations.

This was an inspiring declaration that raised the hopes of the oppressed peoples within the Communist empire.

Yet, within 2½ weeks, there occurred the most amazing reversal of policy in American history.

On August 3, the White House announced that it had invited Soviet Dictator Khrushchev to visit the United States, and to enjoy the hospitality of the American people.

And the captive nations were plunged into despair.

Would the United States and Soviet Russia agree to noninterference in one another's domestic affairs?

If so, that would mean the end of hope for millions in the captive countries.

What had hapepned to the United States which, from the days when it had won its own independence, had been loyal to the principle of liberty with justice for all?

Who can trust the United States after "Desecration Day," when the officials of the U.S. Government welcome the Red dictator who is responsible for so much of the world's misery?

The victims of Russian communism pray, not in the churches that have been closed to them by atheistic despots, but from behind the locked doors of their homes.

Praying that the unpredictable behavior of the U.S. Government does not represent the freedom-loving American people who would never compromise with evil.

Praying that the voice of the American people will be heard above the vague and vacillating pronouncements of its Government.

"Dear God, we know that the American people are not afraid of the truth. We know that they do not worship materialism, closing their hearts to the cry of humanity. We have seen their courage and their generous spirit. From our own relatives who left our homeland to seek a better life in America and found it there, we have heard how they live up to the responsibilities of freedom.

"Washington, Lincoln, Wilson, Roosevelt, these were the leaders who spoke up for human rights.

"But where is the conscience of America, now, when the Government opens its arms not only to our oppressor, but to the Red tyrant who is also determined to destroy free America?

"The policy of the American Government cannot represent the true beliefs of the American people because they would not change so overnight.

"Father in Heaven, intercede for us.

"Help our pleas to break through the rigid barriers which enslave us, so that they may reach and touch the conscience of the American people.

"We do not ask them for the charity of material things, because we know they would be quick to give it.

"We do not ask them to risk their security and their lives to effect our liberation.

"But we do ask for their moral support, which is the soul of America and its greatest strength.

"When Khrushchev, the master of deceit is visited upon the American people, we ask them to protest in an orderly manner.

"So that firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right will prevail over the counsels of those who seek an accommodation with tyranny.

"When all seems lost, we have faith in the power of prayer.

"Help us to reach the hearts of a great, free people so that they may speak up for liberty with justice, and repudiate the shameful spectacle of 'Desecration Day' that is being thrust upon them.

"We pray for universal freedom under God."

There's a Lack of Interest in the Interest Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, July 28, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, the lack of action by this Congress on the extremely important problem of Treasury bond interest rates is a disgrace. Without a realistic increase in interest rates the Treasury will be put in a nearly impossible debt-management position and the blame will lie squarely with the Congress.

I include three opinions highlighting the great need for action. One is a column by the objective and nonpartisan financial writer, Sylvia Porter, published in the Washington Evening Star of August 26, 1959, an editorial from the New York Times of August 27, and an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 27.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Aug. 26, 1959]

WARNING TO CONGRESS ON BONDS

(By Sylvia Porter)

Warning to the 86th Congress: Before you adjourn, pass a law permitting the Treasury to raise the interest rate paid U.S. savings bonds holders or you will:

Invite an avalanche of cash-ins of savings bonds by little investors who have bought these bonds with the idea of keeping them to maturity, but who are now aware that the top rate they can earn on the bonds is far below what they can get on a deposit in most savings banks;

Drastically curtail the sale of new bonds to wage and salary earners who know that the pay scale on the bonds has become glaringly out of line with the general level of interest rates;

Risk forcing the Treasury to borrow cash via expensive short-term loans in order to get the money needed to pay off bonds presented for redemption by disillusioned holders;

Give corporations which never liked the job of maintaining employee payroll savings programs a perfect excuse to cut off the program;

Undermine the reputation of the Treasury among financiers the world over who are fully informed about our debt management problems.

FORTY MILLION HOLDERS

Over 40 million Americans now own more than $42 billion of these riskless, nonmarketable bonds which pay 3 percent interest if held for 3 years, 3¼ percent interest if held to maturity in 8 years, 11 months. Over

8 million are buying them under payroll savings plans.

The program has been the most successful of all the Treasury's debt management operations since World War II. But it has become increasingly endangered in recent years as interest rates have climbed across the board and the pay scale on savings bonds has become progressively less attractive. Last month redemptions of the bonds totaled $507 million against new sales of only $350 million. For 12 months redemptions have been topping sales—meaning the program has been going in reverse.

In recognition of the interest rate realities, the Treasury in early June asked Congress to permit it to boost the pay scale so the bonds would pay 3¾ percent if held to maturity. The request was included in a package also asking that the Treasury be allowed to sell new marketable bonds with coupons above the legal ceiling of 4¼ percent.

OPPOSITION INTENSE

The opposition to the removal of the 4¼ percent ceiling has been intense—reflecting a combination of honest doubt about the economic effect of rising interest rates and pure politics—and Congress has turned down this request. As a result, the Treasury will have to do all its multibillion dollar borrowing in coming months through new short-term loans. That will be expensive, fundamentally unsound debt management—but apparently that's the way it will have to be.

Despite its "No" on removal of the marketable bond ceiling, though, Congress still can pass a separate bill permitting the savings bond rate increase. The Treasury doesn't want to settle for this, but it will to avert a flood of cash-ins and keep the program alive.

If Congress does this? Then a recommendation of the bonds for basic savings nest-eggs again will be justified.

If Congress does not? Then no one can forecast what might happen. A calling of a special session might be necessary to rescue the program from slaughter.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1959]

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed, and in the most emphatic manner, his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interest rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4¼ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the Second Liberty Loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a comparatively limited supply of funds, have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on comparatively long issues above 4¼ percent the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3¼ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not only a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total $50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by $2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues of the U.S. Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]

THE WAYS OF FOLLY

Figures may be dull things, but as every family man knows they sometimes tell grim stories.

The other day the Treasury borrowed some money to tide it over for the next 13 weeks. For this short-term loan the Treasury had to pay 3.8 percent interest, the highest it has paid since that dark March of 1933 when all the banks were closed.

At the same time, the Treasury issued some I O U's for 26 weeks, and for this loan it had to pay 4.2 percent interest, the highest ever for this series of Government bills.

It is against the background of these hard figures that the country must view the renewed appeal by President Eisenhower for congressional action which will permit the Treasury to borrow more on long-term bonds. This it cannot now do because of the unrealistic restrictions on the interest rate the Treasury is permitted to pay on such bonds.

The story that is told in these figures is one of the Government of the United States, seemingly the richest in the world, getting itself into a financial fix as senseless and as full of folly as the most prodigal of its citizens who cannot manage to live from paycheck to paycheck and finds himself slipping week by week into a deeper financial pit.

Consider:

Within the next 12 months the Government must borrow at least $85 billion. It cannot borrow this with long-term bonds because the law says it mustn't pay more than 4¼ percent whereas the going market rate is much higher than this. So it must try to borrow $85 million by juggling 13-week bills or 26-week bills or 12-month notes, coming back over and over again like the improvident householder, hat in hand, to the finance company.

Now, it is true—and this is the only thing some Congressmen can see—that the interest paid on long-term loans is usually higher than that on short-term loans; a good borrower can normally get money from the bank cheaper on a 90-day note than on a 20-year mortgage. Hence the reluctance of Congress to permit the Government to pay more than 4¼ percent in order to borrow on long-term bonds.

But the Government of the United States is dealing in mammoth figures. The Government's demand for money to support a debt now approaching $290 billion is the major factor in pushing all interest rates upward. They rise not because the President or the Secretary of the Treasury or anyone else wishes it but from inexorable pressure.

What is happening now is that all this demand—the whole $85 billion that must be borrowed this year alone—is concentrated on the available supply of money for short-term loans. Thus, from the same inexorable pressure the interest rates on short-term money as well as long-term money are climbing sharply.

Thus, it is not inconceivable—indeed, it is likely—that if the Treasury is forced to do all its financing in this fashion then the short-term interest rate will itself rise well above 4¼ percent, thus defeating the purpose of interest ceilings anyway. This prospect is sped when Congress serves notice it will not change the law and in effect announces that all future borrowing will perforce be for short-term money.

One consequence of all this, as the President noted, is that the heavy short-term borrowing increases the inflationary pressure that helped force interest rates up in the first place. It does this because holders can treat a 13-week Treasury bill as almost the equivalent of cash and because when commercial banks acquire these short-term securities the effect is an increase in the total money supply.

Another consequence of the reliance on short-term borrowing is that it makes the problem feed upon itself. People are cashing in their savings bonds at a rising rate, and the need for money to repay them increases the size of the demand by the Treasuary for short-term loans. So, too, does the fact that old maturing bonds cannot be refinanced with new bonds. The $85 billion the Treasury must juggle now will grow bigger by the passing months.

And a third consequence is that it keeps the Government of the United States, just like that improvident householder, at the mercy of fortune. Like any man borrowing from debt to debt, the Treasury faces the fact that someday—and that someday may be soon—it will not find enough real money in the marketplace to meet its needs. When that happens the Government will have no recourse but to manufacture money, to run the printing presses, in a desperate and surely futile effort to disguise from the world what is happening.

Frankness must acknowledge that this prospect is not wholly banished by the President's proposal to let the Government put a larger part of its debt into long-term bonds instead of constantly recurring I O U's. For the root of the problem is still the size of the spending.

But every man knows there are sensible and foolish ways of managing the burden of debt. And only an irresponsible Congress will force the Nation of which it is caretaker further along the ways of folly.

Labor Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, before leaving on an official trip to London where I am scheduled to address the Congress of the International Astronautical Federation early in September in my capacity as chairman of the Subcom-

mittee on International Cooperation and Security of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I want to reiterate my views on labor legislation as considered by the House.

During the discussions on the floor of the House, I stated that it was most unfair to strike at legitimate unionism and to foreclose the rights of working people which required many years of hard work and determination to achieve. It was my feeling that enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill would be a decided step in the direction of outlawing or controlling labor because many of labor's rights are denied in that bill. For that reason I voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill.

It was also my view that political motives were behind the effort to adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill, and I could not see the logic or reasoning in making a political football out of the bread-and-butter problem of millions of Americans.

I also opposed the bill because it was a piece of legislation which struck blindly at labor, the guilty and the innocent alike, the racketeers and those seeking to eliminate racketeering. This is a wrong approach. We must not throw all of labor into the discard or cast shadows of doubt upon all of organized labor. The racketeers are a small percent of organized labor and they must be weeded out.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, for example, outlaws all types of picketing, except where a plant or factory is on strike. Organized picketing has been established and recognized over the years as a peaceful and democratic method. By eliminating or outlawing such picketing we actually empower employers to exploit those working for them, paying them low wages, and forcing them to work longer hours. The only type of picketing I would oppose would be in instances where it is used as blackmail or abused for racketeering purposes.

Thus, the Landrum-Griffin bill affords no protection for the working people, but actually opens up possibilities for their exploitation and the denial of their rights which they have gained over the past half century or more. It will only help to depress the working conditions and the standard of living of the laboring masses of this country. In so doing, we shall not bring about a higher standard of living, but we will lower it for huge segments of our population and this will have a tremendous effect on our whole economy. When labor will not be able to buy the things we produce, when its purchasing power will drop, the whole Nation will feel it.

The Landrum-Griffin bill also bans the so-called "hot cargo" provisions, which is nothing more than a device to maintain nonunion conditions. This is an unfair labor practice for it denies unions the right and the opportunity to protect themselves against ruthless employers.

Finally, the Landrum-Griffin bill is hurting legitimate union organization which is seeking to establish the same pay for the same work for all working people in the country.

I hope and trust that when the conference report on the labor bill is brought back for final consideration by both Houses of Congress, all or most of these objectionable features will have been deleted or so amended as not to hurt legitimate labor unions. We must not turn the clock back. The people of America want to see reform in the ranks of labor, not revenge or the destruction of labor's achievements.

Merit Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President has acted wisely in selecting John O. Henderson, of Buffalo, a U.S. attorney since 1953, for the vacancy as Federal judge in the western New York district. This is a merit appointment which has the gratifying support of our entire community.

John Henderson is a dedicated public servant who has acted in the highest tradition of his profession and fully warrants the promotion to the Federal bench.

This is the third time that President Eisenhower has nominated him for Federal office. The Senate twice has confirmed him for U.S. attorney and I am hopeful that the Senate again will act promptly on his nomination.

The Buffalo area recognizes this as an excellent appointment as is well stated in an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on August 24, 1959, as follows:

MERIT APPOINTMENT

Although it was preceded by altogether too much high-powered political maneuvering among New York State Republicans, President Eisenhower's nomination of U.S. Attorney John O. Henderson to a lifetime seat as a U.S. district judge is a clear-cut recognition of merit and experience. It is, in the best sense, a promotion, and we hope that the Senate will so regard it in confirming the appointment before it adjourns next month.

Mr. Henderson has given outstanding service as Federal district attorney throughout the Eisenhower years. His prosecutions of income tax violations have been handled without fear or favor, in the highest traditions of the Justice Department. He has had other exceedingly complex matters before him, not the least being the still-pending Buffalo paving scandal with its tax-evasion angles complicated by a prolonged grand jury inquiry into the possible antitrust law violations.

In fact, this heavy run of pending business in the U.S. attorney's office, which Mr. Henderson will now have to turn over to others as he steps up to the Federal bench, makes a careful and prompt selection of his successor almost as important as was the filling of the judgeship vacancy. We hope that the President will lose no time in getting this office as capably filled as it has been—and that the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has been stalling all too many judicial appointments, will recognize the nomination of Mr. Henderson to succeed the late Judge Justin C. Morgan as so clearly meritorious and nonpolitical that it will recommend swift and unanimous Senate confirmation.

New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, among the many things of which the 17th District of New York is justly proud, the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra has always been one of the first. We in New York are especially proud of this orchestra and its talented conductor for the splendid performances they have given on their current international tour. The excellence of this orchestra is another demonstration to peoples of the world, and in this instance to those behind the Iron Curtain, that America is continuing to provide cultural leadership.

I should like to include at this point an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune:

MR. BERNSTEIN CONQUERS MOSCOW

The acclaim which has greeted Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic in Moscow is gratifying, but not particularly surprising. Without exception, every American musician visiting the Soviet Union has been received enthusiastically—and, for that matter, Russia's musical ambassadors have done right well here, too.

But there are extraordinary aspects to the Bernstein-Philharmonic success story. Mr. Bernstein, whose parents were born in Russia, is himself American-born, bred, educated and trained. He is the most eloquent and exciting spokesman American music has had in many years. And his current excursion to Russia is more than just a tour, it's an education—for the Russians, that is.

For in Moscow on Tuesday night Mr. Bernstein gave his Russian listeners an opportunity they have not had for a generation. He and the Philharmonic played Igor Stravinsky's "Le Sacre du Printemps"—music of worldwide fame since 1913, but proscribed by Soviet cultural censors as "bourgeois" and "decadent." Stravinsky, who was born in Russia, hasn't been back there since before World War I, and has often expressed his dislike for all things Soviet, including music. But the Moscow audience greeted Mr. Bernstein's performance of the Stravinsky work with shouts of acclaim, and it's just possible that one of these days a Soviet orchestra may suddenly be playing it.

In any case, Mr. Bernstein has certainly given Moscow something to remember. Some people—Russians no less than any others—judge a civilization by the way it makes autos; others by the way it makes music. In regard to the latter, the Philharmonic concerts have been an eye-opening experience for the Russians. And it's ironical that part of the revelation should

stem from a composer of their own blood, whose art they have been deprived of by their cultural commissars.

Resolution by Junior Chamber of Commerce on Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our great city of Buffalo was host to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce when it held its national convention there in June of this year.

As a Representative from Buffalo, and a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the junior chamber of commerce at this convention concerning veterans' benefits:

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, in convention assembled, passed a resolution endorsing benefits to veterans, their families and dependents for service-incurred disability or death; and

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, in convention assembled, opposed by resolution payment to veterans of pension benefits based solely on previous military service and pensions or other benefits based on non-service-connected disability; and

Whereas the nature and extent of the Government's obligations to war veterans should be clearly defined: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, a vast majority of whose members are veterans, through its delegates in convention assembled in Buffalo, N.Y., on June 17, 1959, commends to the leadership of this country the following principles as a guide for establishing current and future programs:

1. Military service is an obligation of citizenship. It should not in itself be considered a basis for special privilege and benefits.

2. Veterans' benefits are a means of equalizing significant sacrifices that may result directly from military service.

3. The Government should maintain a positive policy of meeting fully and promptly the needs of veterans resulting from service.

4. Service-connected death or disability benefits should be accorded the highest priority. Readjustment needs are almost equal in importance. Veterans' non-service-connected needs should be met when possible through programs for the general population; the non-service-connected veterans' programs retained only to meet minimum needs not covered by general programs.

5. Veterans with equal handicaps should have equal treatment.

6. Benefits for veterans with similar needs should, in most programs, be uniform throughout the country.

7. We must bear our own responsibilities. We should not burden a future generation with obligations we ourselves are not willing to shoulder.

8. We should keep the whole range of our national needs in perspective so our veterans' programs will be in balance with each other and with other general programs.

9. Our national veterans' policy should be developed in the open forum of public discussion. The people should be given complete factual information on the economic and social status of veterans and their needs; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce opposes any legislation and programs which violate the principles previously stated herein; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Congress of the United States.

Yardstick of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has been justly famed as a land where all men, regardless of their ethnic origin, freely intermingle in a cosmopolitan society. The vigorous Americanism of Hawaii's people is best attested by your endorsement. "The people of Hawaii deserve statehood. They will be an asset to the Nation."

To the native Polynesian, whose ancestors inhabited Hawaii, must go the credit for this harmony between the races, for the native Polynesian welcomed all, regardless of their race, color, or creed. All of Hawaii's people have inherited this spirit of "Aloha."

It should be understood that we are not perfect. Since our society is composed of humans, we, of Hawaii, err as do other humans. Conscious of the fact that our social failures in this regard can only be corrected if identified, Hawaii encourages and welcomes objective appraisals on frequent intervals.

In this connection, I include an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser, of August 22, 1959, which comments rather well upon a recent appraisal and reports the findings, which, in my opinion, will be of interest to the Members of this Congress.

YARDSTICK OF PROGRESS

During the past several days, and concluding today the Advertiser has reprinted the full text of a report on island race relations prepared by the social research laboratory at the University of Hawaii.

The report is a serious inquiry into the claim that in Hawaii racial equality is an accomplished fact.

While this is not yet entirely true, the report says, great progress has been and is being made.

Briefly, these are the major conclusions:

1. There is a strong sentiment for racial equality. The postwar decade saw a further closing of the gap between actual practice and the unwritten code.

2. Before the war a disproportionate number of Caucasians occupied preferred jobs in business and the professions. While they still enjoy an advantage in some areas, the Caucasians are being overtaken rapidly by non-Caucasians. Many of the latter now sit on the boards of major corporations, are preferred for key positions by mainland firms opening island branches.

3. The postwar rise of organized labor has assisted greatly in spreading more widely the fruits of Hawaii's stepped-up economic activity. The labor movement itself is surprisingly interracial.

4. Where Caucasians and Hawaiians formerly dominated the government, now the ethnic composition of the territorial and county offices tends to approximate that of the territorial population. Representation on appointed boards is decidedly more equitable (more) on the basis of personal merit and party affiliation.

5. There is strikingly little interest in fair employment practices legislation. The general public is either unaware of any serious problem of racial discrimination in employment, or there is general distrust of legal methods for correcting such discrimination.

6. Undoubtedly there are violations of the unwritten code, but they become more difficult to verify, the evidence is far less convincing than formerly.

Meantime, intermarriage and fraternization on the social and civic levels are increasing.

The report concludes:

"Thus in one area after another • • • Hawaii's professed ideals of racial equality are being translated into reality."

The report has two great values. It shows us where work is yet to be done in tearing down racial barriers so that we may in truth one day square practice with our ideals. And it encourages us for this work by highlighting the remarkable progress we already have made.

Restrictions on Federal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has sent up a message requesting legislation to remove the limitation which the law now imposes on the rate of interest at which the Federal Government is allowed to borrow money for more than 5 years.

If such legislation is not enacted, the Democratic leadership of Congress must take full responsibility for their failure to heed the President.

The Treasury can pay whatever rates are required by security market conditions for short-term loans, but the 4¼ percent ceiling on 5 year or more maturities handcuffs the Treasury in its debt management responsibility.

Seventy-six billion dollars' worth of Federal securities will come due within the next year. Unless the Government is able to sell long-term bonds, the under 1 year Federal debt will climb to $100 billion. No responsible official would allow such a huge short-term liability to be created which in a crisis the nation might be asked to meet. It is a dangerous situation and fiscally irresponsible for such a condition to be forced on the Treasury. Congress should face up immediately to the debt problem.

mittee on International Cooperation and Security of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I want to reiterate my views on labor legislation as considered by the House.

During the discussions on the floor of the House, I stated that it was most unfair to strike at legitimate unionism and to foreclose the rights of working people which required many years of hard work and determination to achieve. It was my feeling that enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill would be a decided step in the direction of outlawing or controlling labor because many of labor's rights are denied in that bill. For that reason I voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill.

It was also my view that political motives were behind the effort to adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill, and I could not see the logic or reasoning in making a political football out of the bread-and-butter problem of millions of Americans.

I also opposed the bill because it was a piece of legislation which struck blindly at labor, the guilty and the innocent alike, the racketeers and those seeking to eliminate racketeering. This is a wrong approach. We must not throw all of labor into the discard or cast shadows of doubt upon all of organized labor. The racketeers are a small percent of organized labor and they must be weeded out.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, for example, outlaws all types of picketing, except where a plant or factory is on strike. Organized picketing has been established and recognized over the years as a peaceful and democratic method. By eliminating or outlawing such picketing we actually empower employers to exploit those working for them, paying them low wages, and forcing them to work longer hours. The only type of picketing I would oppose would be in instances where it is used as blackmail or abused for racketeering purposes.

Thus, the Landrum-Griffin bill affords no protection for the working people, but actually opens up possibilities for their exploitation and the denial of their rights which they have gained over the past half century or more. It will only help to depress the working conditions and the standard of living of the laboring masses of this country. In so doing, we shall not bring about a higher standard of living, but we will lower it for huge segments of our population and this will have a tremendous effect on our whole economy. When labor will not be able to buy the things we produce, when its purchasing power will drop, the whole Nation will feel it.

The Landrum-Griffin bill also bans the so-called "hot cargo" provisions, which is nothing more than a device to maintain nonunion conditions. This is an unfair labor practice for it denies unions the right and the opportunity to protect themselves against ruthless employers.

Finally, the Landrum-Griffin bill is hurting legitimate union organization which is seeking to establish the same pay for the same work for all working people in the country.

I hope and trust that when the conference report on the labor bill is brought back for final consideration by both Houses of Congress, all or most of these objectionable features will have been deleted or so amended as not to hurt legitimate labor unions. We must not turn the clock back. The people of America want to see reform in the ranks of labor, not revenge or the destruction of labor's achievements.

Merit Appointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the President has acted wisely in selecting John O. Henderson, of Buffalo, a U.S. attorney since 1953, for the vacancy as Federal judge in the western New York district. This is a merit appointment which has the gratifying support of our entire community.

John Henderson is a dedicated public servant who has acted in the highest tradition of his profession and fully warrants the promotion to the Federal bench.

This is the third time that President Eisenhower has nominated him for Federal office. The Senate twice has confirmed him for U.S. attorney and I am hopeful that the Senate again will act promptly on his nomination.

The Buffalo area recognizes this as an excellent appointment as is well stated in an editorial appearing in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on August 24, 1959, as follows:

MERIT APPOINTMENT

Although it was preceded by altogether too much high-powered political maneuvering among New York State Republicans, President Eisenhower's nomination of U.S. Attorney John O. Henderson to a lifetime seat as a U.S. district judge is a clear-cut recognition of merit and experience. It is, in the best sense, a promotion, and we hope that the Senate will so regard it in confirming the appointment before it adjourns next month.

Mr. Henderson has given outstanding service as Federal district attorney throughout the Eisenhower years. His prosecutions of income tax violations have been handled without fear or favor, in the highest traditions of the Justice Department. He has had other exceedingly complex matters before him, not the least being the still-pending Buffalo paving scandal with its tax-evasion angles complicated by a prolonged grand jury inquiry into the possible antitrust law violations.

In fact, this heavy run of pending business in the U.S. attorney's office, which Mr. Henderson will now have to turn over to others as he steps up to the Federal bench, makes a careful and prompt selection of his successor almost as important as was the filling of the judgeship vacancy. We hope that the President will lose no time in getting this office as capably filled as it has been—and that the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has been stalling all too many judicial appointments, will recognize the nomination of Mr. Henderson to succeed the late Judge Justin C. Morgan as so clearly meritorious and nonpolitical that it will recommend swift and unanimous Senate confirmation.

New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, among the many things of which the 17th District of New York is justly proud, the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra has always been one of the first. We in New York are especially proud of this orchestra and its talented conductor for the splendid performances they have given on their current international tour. The excellence of this orchestra is another demonstration to peoples of the world, and in this instance to those behind the Iron Curtain, that America is continuing to provide cultural leadership.

I should like to include at this point an editorial appearing in this morning's New York Herald Tribune:

MR. BERNSTEIN CONQUERS MOSCOW

The acclaim which has greeted Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic in Moscow is gratifying, but not particularly surprising. Without exception, every American musician visiting the Soviet Union has been received enthusiastically—and, for that matter, Russia's musical ambassadors have done right well here, too.

But there are extraordinary aspects to the Bernstein-Philharmonic success story. Mr. Bernstein, whose parents were born in Russia, is himself American-born, bred, educated and trained. He is the most eloquent and exciting spokesman American music has had in many years. And his current excursion to Russia is more than just a tour, it's an education—for the Russians, that is.

For in Moscow on Tuesday night Mr. Bernstein gave his Russian listeners an opportunity they have not had for a generation. He and the Philharmonic played Igor Stravinsky's "Le Sacre du Printemps"—music of worldwide fame since 1913, but proscribed by Soviet cultural censors as "bourgeois" and "decadent." Stravinsky, who was born in Russia, hasn't been back there since before World War I, and has often expressed his dislike for all things Soviet, including music. But the Moscow audience greeted Mr. Bernstein's performance of the Stravinsky work with shouts of acclaim, and it's just possible that one of these days a Soviet orchestra may suddenly be playing it.

In any case, Mr. Bernstein has certainly given Moscow something to remember. Some people—Russians no less than any others—judge a civilization by the way it makes autos; others by the way it makes music. In regard to the latter, the Philharmonic concerts have been an eye-opening experience for the Russians. And it's ironical that part of the revelation should

stem from a composer of their own blood, whose art they have been deprived of by their cultural commissars.

Resolution by Junior Chamber of Commerce on Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, our great city of Buffalo was host to the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce when it held its national convention there in June of this year.

As a Representative from Buffalo, and a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I would like to include, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the junior chamber of commerce at this convention concerning veterans' benefits:

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, in convention assembled, passed a resolution endorsing benefits to veterans, their families and dependents for service-incurred disability or death; and

Whereas the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce has, in convention assembled, opposed by resolution payment to veterans of pension benefits based solely on previous military service and pensions or other benefits based on non-service-connected disability; and

Whereas the nature and extent of the Government's obligations to war veterans should be clearly defined: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, a vast majority of whose members are veterans, through its delegates in convention assembled in Buffalo, N.Y., on June 17, 1959, commends to the leadership of this country the following principles as a guide for establishing current and future programs:

1. Military service is an obligation of citizenship. It should not in itself be considered a basis for special privilege and benefits.

2. Veterans' benefits are a means of equalizing significant sacrifices that may result directly from military service..

3. The Government should maintain a positive policy of meeting fully and promptly the needs of veterans resulting from service.

4. Service-connected death or disability benefits should be accorded the highest priority. Readjustment needs are almost equal in importance. Veterans' non-service-connected needs should be met when possible through programs for the general population; the non-service-connected veterans' programs retained only to meet minimum needs not covered by general programs.

5. Veterans with equal handicaps should have equal treatment.

6. Benefits for veterans with similar needs should, in most programs, be uniform throughout the country.

7. We must bear our own responsibilities. We should not burden a future generation with obligations we ourselves are not willing to shoulder.

8. We should keep the whole range of our national needs in perspective so our veterans' programs will be in balance with each other and with other general programs.

9. Our national veterans' policy should be developed in the open forum of public discussion. The people should be given complete factual information on the economic and social status of veterans and their needs; be it further

Resolved, That the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce opposes any legislation and programs which violate the principles previously stated herein; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each member of the Congress of the United States.

Yardstick of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, Hawaii has been justly famed as a land where all men, regardless of their ethnic origin, freely intermingle in a cosmopolitan society. The vigorous Americanism of Hawaii's people is best attested by your endorsement. "The people of Hawaii deserve statehood. They will be an asset to the Nation."

To the native Polynesian, whose ancestors inhabited Hawaii, must go the credit for this harmony between the races, for the native Polynesian welcomed all, regardless of their race, color, or creed. All of Hawaii's people have inherited this spirit of "Aloha."

It should be understood that we are not perfect. Since our society is composed of humans, we, of Hawaii, err as do other humans. Conscious of the fact that our social failures in this regard can only be corrected if identified, Hawaii encourages and welcomes objective appraisals on frequent intervals.

In this connection, I include an editorial from the Honolulu Advertiser, of August 22, 1959, which comments rather well upon a recent appraisal and reports the findings, which, in my opinion, will be of interest to the Members of this Congress.

YARDSTICK OF PROGRESS

During the past several days, and concluding today the Advertiser has reprinted the full text of a report on island race relations prepared by the social research laboratory at the University of Hawaii.

The report is a serious inquiry into the claim that in Hawaii racial equality is an accomplished fact.

While this is not yet entirely true, the report says, great progress has been and is being made.

Briefly, these are the major conclusions:

1. There is a strong sentiment for racial equality. The postwar decade saw a further closing of the gap between actual practice and the unwritten code.

2. Before the war a disproportionate number of Caucasians occupied preferred jobs in business and the professions. While they still enjoy an advantage in some areas, the Caucasians are being overtaken rapidly by non-Caucasians. Many of the latter now sit on the boards of major corporations, are preferred for key positions by mainland firms opening island branches.

3. The postwar rise of organized labor has assisted greatly in spreading more widely the fruits of Hawaii's stepped-up economic activity. The labor movement itself is surprisingly interracial.

4. Where Caucasians and Hawaiians formerly dominated the government, now the ethnic composition of the territorial and county offices tends to approximate that of the territorial population. Representation on appointed boards is decidedly more equitable (more) on the basis of personal merit and party affiliation.

5. There is strikingly little interest in fair employment practices legislation. The general public is either unaware of any serious problem of racial discrimination in employment, or there is general distrust of legal methods for correcting such discrimination.

6. Undoubtedly there are violations of the unwritten code, but they become more difficult to verify, the evidence is far less convincing than formerly.

Meantime, intermarriage and fraternization on the social and civic levels are increasing.

The report concludes:

"Thus in one area after another * * * Hawaii's professed ideals of racial equality are being translated into reality."

The report has two great values. It shows us where work is yet to be done in tearing down racial barriers so that we may in truth one day square practice with our ideals. And it encourages us for this work by highlighting the remarkable progress we already have made.

Restrictions on Federal Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower has sent up a message requesting legislation to remove the limitation which the law now imposes on the rate of interest at which the Federal Government is allowed to borrow money for more than 5 years.

If such legislation is not enacted, the Democratic leadership of Congress must take full responsibility for their failure to heed the President.

The Treasury can pay whatever rates are required by security market conditions for short-term loans, but the 4¼ percent ceiling on 5 year or more maturities handcuffs the Treasury in its debt management responsibility.

Seventy-six billion dollars' worth of Federal securities will come due within the next year. Unless the Government is able to sell long-term bonds, the under 1 year Federal debt will climb to $100 billion. No responsible official would allow such a huge short-term liability to be created which in a crisis the nation might be asked to meet. It is a dangerous situation and fiscally irresponsible for such a condition to be forced on the Treasury. Congress should face up immediately to the debt problem.

It is particularly desirable to adjust the rate on savings bonds. This form of government loan is anti-inflationary and the patriotic citizens who invest their savings in this security in all fairness should be paid a rate of interest equal to that paid by private savings banks.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the political implications, but here is a case where President Eisenhower says the administration is willing to assume full responsibility for managing the Government debt if allowed to do so free from artificial restrictions.

Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an editorial from the McLaughlin Messenger, McLaughlin, S. Dak., on my program, "Operation Bootstrap—Reservation Style." The editorial, written by Merle E. Lofgren, reads as follows:

Uncle Sam is currently engaged in projects all over the world helping underdeveloped areas. We are spending millions of dollars to start factories, build irrigation projects and subsidize other industries to help people develop these areas so that they can become self-sufficient.

Maybe we are right. In the long run it is probably better to help people to help themselves than to condemn them to either permanent proverty or perpetual dole. People who have a chance to make something of themselves are hardly likely to fall for the Communist line.

While we are helping to get these people on the path to better things it might be well if we would take a little better look at some of our own underdeveloped areas. One of these is the Indian reservations of South Dakota.

Here you find some 35,000 people, largely unemployed and with hardly a goal in life except to live.

No matter how you look at it there is not enough work to make jobs for these people. Agriculture is the only industry and the large scale farming and ranching operations that exist do not take a large labor force.

For that reason we see merit in a bill E. Y. BERRY has introduced in Congress. It is a self-help measure, a "lift yourself by the bootstraps" operation. It would provide that the Federal Government spend money for establishing industry on the reservation and to explore the possibilities of creating jobs for the large labor supply of Indian people.

We are not fond of starting new Government projects or of asking for Federal aid. In this case we think BERRY is justified because tax money is now being spent on the reservations in large amounts for relief, welfare, ADC and for law enforcement. Our Government has spent millions on the reservations.

Yet we are little further ahead, perhaps worse off, than we were when the Great White Father took over the Indian destinies.

We think BERRY's line of thinking should be pursued by the Indian Bureau and the Congress. With a little resourcefulness an "operation bootstrap" might be put in effect in this area at but little greater cost than that of our present multitude of welfare programs. Certainly the cost would not be as great or as hard to justify as is the amount we are now spending in areas with similar problems overseas.

Declaration of Santiago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, much has been published about the mounting tensions in the Caribbean area and the efforts of the governments of the Western Hemisphere to allay these threats to peace and political stability. Culminating in the 10th Inter-American Conference at Santiago, Chile, which was finished on August 18, 1959, this major attempt to restore normal conditions merits wide study.

A summary of the results of the Santiago Conference by Bertram B. Johansson, staff writer on Latin American affairs for the Christian Science Monitor, also the text of the Declaration of Santiago were published in the August 19, 1959, issue of that well-known international newspaper.

The indicated summary and declaration follow:

SANTIAGO WATERS FREEDOM'S ROOTS

(By Bertram B. Johansson)

Veteran delegates to the American Foreign Ministers Conference in Santiago, Chile, are under no illusions that the Santiago Declaration immediately will end Caribbean tensions.

They are hopeful, however, that the Santiago conference, which finished August 18, has at least defined objectives more clearly and strengthened hemispheric resolve that the Caribbean shall not continue as an area of ferment.

Ten thousand words were written into the Declaration of Santiago, issued August 18 by the foreign ministers. The declaration:

Condemns dictators;

Reasserts the principle of nonintervention;

Approves of democratic systems;

States that democracy cannot be forced on a country, especially from the outside, but must come as a natural growth from within a nation;

Revives an Organization of American States peace committee to bring the glare of publicity on tension areas which, in the current Latin American context, means the Caribbean.

U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter said at the end of the meetings he believed the conference will have a long-range effect that will have great significance.

The deliberations, he said, brought into clearer light the problems that face us and have offered a means for their solution.

REBELS HUNTED IN HAITI

In the course of his stay in Santiago, Mr. Herter talked privately with all of the foreign ministers of the 20 Latin American republics. This was of enormous help, he said, in giving him a greater understanding of the hemisphere.

As if to illustrate the problems confronting members of the peace committee which will begin immediately to investigate Caribbean tensions, two "invasions" occurred in the area while the Foreign Ministers Conference was in progress in Chile.

Premier Fidel Castro charged that the Dominican Republic and/or former dictator Fulgencio Batista had launched an invasion effort from the Dominican island against Cuba.

In Haiti, troops still are attempting to ferret out some 30 rebels, allegedly from Cuba, who made a landing early this week.

The Dominican Republic announced it would come to the aid of Haiti, if necessary. Cuba countered and said that though the invaders may have come from Cuba they had been sent by Dominican President Trujillo to embarrass Cuba's position at the OAS Santiago discussions.

Days before the Santiago conference opened, the foreign ministers said they did not plan to umpire the crosscurrents of invasions in the Caribbean. Rather, they hoped to create a climate of opinion that would keep would-be invaders inactive.

COMMITTEE'S ROLE

With the military success of the Castro revolution still fresh in peoples' minds and producing effervescent invasion attempts around the Caribbean, this will take some doing.

It was for this reason that the Inter-American Peace Committee of the OAS was revived to keep watch on the trouble spots, study ways to prevent attempts from abroad to overthrow legal governments, and report to the Quito, Ecuador, conference in February.

The committee may make investigations either at the request of a victim country or on its own initiative. But the committee will have to obtain consent of the country it wants to investigate if it desires to make an on-the-spot check.

The conference resolution did not say what would happen if a country refuses consent to an inquiry, but the foreign ministers could call a hemispheric conference to throw the floodlight of publicity on the refusal.

The peace committee also could make its investigation from the outside and then publicize its report. This, it is hoped, would bring the matter before the people of the Americas and bring public opinion to bear on the troublemaker.

The conference produced one change. Maj. Raul Castro of Cuba, arriving in Santiago after the conference had ended had some kind words for the OAS discussions.

Earlier, in Lima and Caracas, while en route to Chile, Major Castro had said the Santiago conference was farcical and useless, repeating terms his brother, Fidel, had used last week.

Major Castro said in Santiago, however, that after reading reports on the meeting he felt it accomplished something positive by giving serious consideration to dictatorship and poverty in the Americas.

OAS NATIONS RELEASE DECLARATION OF SANTIAGO

SANTIAGO, CHILE.—The text of the Declaration of Santiago adopted by the American foreign ministers in their special conference on Caribbean tensions:

The fifth meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs, expressing the general aspiration of the American peoples to live in peace under the protection of democratic institutions, free from all intervention and all totalitarian influence, and considering:

That the faith of the peoples of America in the effective exercise of representative democracy is the best vehicle for the promotion of their social and political progress

(Resolution XCV of the 10th Inter-American Conference), while well planned and intensive development of the economies of the American countries and improvement in the standard of living of their peoples represent the best and firmest foundation on which the practical exercise of democracy and the stabilization of their institutions can be reestablished (resolution of the Special Committee to Study Formulaton of New Measures for Economic Cooperation):

That in Resolution XXXII, the Ninth International Conference of the American States, for the purpose of safeguarding peace and maintaining mutual respect among states, among other things, resolved to reaffirm their decision to maintain and further effective social and economic policy for the purpose of raising the standard of living of their peoples, and their conviction that only under a system founded upon a guarantee of the essential freedoms and rights of the individual is it possible to attain this goal; and to condemn the methods of every system tending to suppress political and civil rights and liberties, and in particular the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine;

In Resolution XCV, 10th Inter-American Conference, resolved to unite the efforts of all American states to apply, develop, and perfect principles of the inter-American system so that they would form a basis of firm and solidary action designed to obtain in a short time the effective realization of representative democratic system, rule of social justice and security and economic and cultural cooperation essential to the mutual well-being and prosperity of all peoples of the hemisphere;

That harmony among American Republics can be effective only insofar as human rights and fundamental freedoms and exercise of representative democracy are a reality within every one of them, since experience has demonstrated that failure to adhere to such principles is a source of widespread disturbance and gives rise to emigration that causes frequent and grave political tensions between the state any émigrés leave and the states that receive them;

That the existence of antidemocratic regimes constitutes a violation of the principles on which the Organization of American States is founded and endangers peace and harmony of the hemisphere; and

It is advisable to enounce in a general way a few principles and attributes of the democratic system in this hemisphere so as to permit national and international public opinion to gage the degree to which political regimes and governments conform to that system, thus helping to eradicate forms of dictatorship, depotism, or tyranny without weakening respect for the right of peoples freely to choose their own form of government, declares:

1. The principle of the rule of law should be assured by separation of powers and by control of the legality of governmental acts by competent organs of the state.

2. The government of American Republics should be derived from free election.

3. Perpetuation in power and exercise of power without a fixed term and with the manifest intent of perpetuation is incompatible with the effective exercise of democracy.

4. Governments of American states should ensure a system of freedom for individual and social justice based on respect for fundamental rights.

5. Human rights incorporated into the legislation of various American states should be protected by effective judicial procedures.

6. Systematic use of political proscription is contrary to American democratic order.

7. Freedom of the press, of radio, and television, and in general freedom of information and expression are essential conditions for the existence of a democratic regime.

8. American states, in order to strengthen democratic institutions, should cooperate among themselves within the limits of their resources and the framework of their laws so as to strengthen and develop their economic structure and achieve just and humane living conditions for their peoples;

Resolved, This declaration shall be known as the Declaration of Santiago de Chile.

Sale of Commemorative Soil Conservation Stamp. Promoted by Radio Station KWHI, Brenham, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1959, over radio station KWHI, Brenham, Tex., a very splendid radio program was presented promoting the sale of the new U.S. commemorative postage stamp featuring soil conservation in our Nation.

Participating in the program were Mr. T. A. Low, the very fine postmaster at Brenham, and Mr. W. H. Prenzler, vice chairman of the Austin-Washington Soil Conservation District of Burton, Tex. Working with these two gentlemen to make the program so successful was Mr. E. P. Krueger, work unit conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service. This program was made possible through the courtesy of Mr. Tom Whitehead, Sr., publisher of the Brenham Banner Press and owner of the KWHI radio station.

It is significant that two of the important departments of the executive branch of the Federal Government cooperated in this special stamp program to recognize and honor the soil conservation farmers and ranchers of America.

Because of the interest the Members of Congress have in the importance of the soil conservation program, I include the transcript of that program in the RECORD:

ANNOUNCER. A new U.S. commemorative postage stamp featuring soil conservation has been placed on first-day sale at Rapid City, S. Dak. today, August 26. Tomorrow, August 27, the stamp will go on sale at all post offices in the country and in this area. We've asked Postmaster T. A. Low of Brenham and Soil Conservation District Supervisor W. H. Prenzler of Burton to tell us about the new stamp. Let's hear from our postmaster first. Mr. Low, just what is a commemorative stamp?

POSTMASTER. A commemorative postage stamp is a very special kind of stamp. These stamps are used to commemorate national events, such as statehood anniversaries, pay tribute to our national ideals, and mark important national achievements. The stamps remain on sale for a limited time, usually 6 months to a year, or until the supply is exhausted. Normally, we print 120 million stamps of a commemorative issue. In the case of the soil conservation stamp this is $4,800,000 worth. When these are gone, there will be no reprints, and the stamps will become stamp collectors' items.

ANNOUNCER. You told me an interesting fact about stamp collecting—that it has become the Nation's No. 1 hobby. I wonder if you could tell us something about this, and why it is such a popular hobby.

POSTMASTER. It has been estimated that there are upwards of 20 million stamp collectors in the United States. This easily makes stamp collecting the most universal hobby in the country. There are more stamp collectors than there are dog owners. Stamp collecting actually began in 1840 when the first adhesive postage stamps were issued in England. The United States issued adhesive stamps for the first time on July 1, 1847. Incidentally, Washington County had five post offices and Austin County had six post offices in that year. They were surpassed in all of Texas only by Brazoria County.

ANNOUNCER. I sure would like to have a set of these first cancellations from our oldest post offices, some of which are now only names in the history of the county and Texas. How many of these commemorative stamps does the Post Office Department issue nowdays?

POSTMASTER. In recent years the Department has been issuing 12 to 15 a year. You might be interested to know that commemorative stamps are fairly new. They were introduced at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago in 1893. If Grandpa has any of these old Columbian Exposition commemorative stamps around that he bought back in 1893, they have increased a good bit in philatelic value since the time they were first issued.

ANNOUNCER. Does the Post Office Department get many requests for new stamps each year?

POSTMASTER. Yes, we receive hundreds of requests each year, and we now have a backlog of approximately 2,600 suggested subjects. Obviously, since we only issue a dozen or so commemoratives each year, we cannot begin to comply with all the suggestions that come in. But, I want to say right here, that in my opinion, the selection of soil conservation as the motive for a special edition postage stamp is a very befitting and worthy move, and this stamp is very pretty.

ANNOUNCER. Thanks, Mr. Postmaster. Now let's turn to our other guest Mr. Prenzler, as a leader in soil conservation I'm sure you feel honored about the new soil conservation postage stamp.

SUPERVISOR. I certainly do. You know, issuance of this commemorative stamp is actually a salute to farmers and ranchers, their local soil conservation districts, and to the professional conservationists and other agricultural workers who have helped make the United States a world leader in soil conservation. As one of five supervisors of the Austin-Washington Soil Conservation District and as one of the first farmers to cooperate with the district, I feel very proud over this nationwide recognition of the effort which we and others are making in the soil conservation cause. I also would like to say here that as an auxiliary rural mail carrier for many years, I feel very proud over the soil conservation stamp issued jointly by the Post Office Department and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

ANNOUNCER. Have you seen the new stamp, Mr. Prenzler?

SUPERVISOR. I've seen them and I will buy some as well as selling, I hope, many of them. And it certainly is an attractive stamp. It's in three colors, yellow, green, and blue. It portrays a modern farm showing that conservation farming brings beauty as well as bounty to rural living. The stamp shows contour stripcropping, terracing, pasture improvement, tree planting, and a farm pond. In addition, the silhouette of a city in the background symbolizes that urban as well as rural people are highly dependent upon the care and wise use of land as a principal source of food, water, shelter, and clothing.

ANNOUNCER. I suppose you have some local observance planned when the stamp goes on sale?

SUPERVISOR. That's why the postmaster and I are here, to kick off the sales of the conservation stamp in Washington County. The soil conservation district has also published an article and a reproduction of the stamp in its weekly news column in the Brenham Banner Press.

ANNOUNCER. Well, I hope the new soil conservation stamp is a big success, Mr. Low and Mr. Prenzler, and that lots of them are sold. By the way, which post offices in this area are offering the special soil conservation stamp? How about it, Mr. Postmaster?

POSTMASTER. We at the Brenham Post Office have ordered $2,000 worth of the soil conservation postage stamp, as a starter. I am informed that all other post offices in Washington County are also handling a limited supply of this commemorative stamp.

ANNOUNCER. I understand that at one time we had quite a number of post offices in the area, but several have closed down in recent years. Would you tell us briefly something about this and which post offices are now in operation here?

POSTMASTER. The present-day post offices in Washington County and postmasters are: Washington is the oldest post office, Edwin Dickschat is postmaster; next is Brenham, with more than 113 years of postal service, and I am the postmaster here; Old Gay Hill and Chappell Hill are other old post offices with nearly 110 years of service to the public. Mrs. Smith is postmistress at Chappell Hill; and Walter Werchem is postmaster at Gay Hill. The Burton Post Office is a mere youngster, but it too has serviced its area about 88 years now. Mr. E. O. Oslmeyer is acting postmaster there.

There used to be numerous post offices in the past. In 1904 we had 22 post offices in the county, but with the coming of the R.F.D. routes in that the need for some of the offices was eliminated. With the coming of the automobile, better roads, and relatively fewer people left on the land, there followed a steady reduction in the number of post offices.

By the way, this makes me think that the farmers and ranchers still on the land, not only have a greater job of feeding 176 million people in this country alone, and others, but also that their care and conservation of the land is of the greatest importance to all of us and is even more important in 1959 than in former years.

ANNOUNCER. Well, thanks very much gentlemen, for all the good information about the new soil conservation stamp that goes on sale here tomorrow, August 27, and the great cause it sponsors. Our guests today were Will Prenzler, a supervisor of the Austin-Washington Soil Conservation District and T. A. Low, postmaster at Brenham.

Foreign Firms Plague U.S. Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, competition from foreign industrial firms, employing cheap labor, low prices, and American know-how, is plaguing more and more U.S. companies. Finally, the problem is on the very doorstep of Congress itself.

Just recently, I discovered that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, our own medium for recording debates, expressing views, and printing much of the data from which American history will be written, is being stitched with British wire.

Mr. Speaker, I grant that this is a relatively small matter in terms of money, but it illustrates how far foreign competition with American products has gone. In the first 6 months of 1959, all seven awards for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD binding wire appear to have gone to Holdwire, Ltd. During the second half, the Holdwire firm continues to obtain contracts. Some recent awards to the British company were as follows: July 23, 2,200 pounds; July 29, 3,000 pounds; July 29, 2,200 pounds.

Of course, our friends in London purport to favor the reciprocal lowering of trade barriers. It is interesting to speculate, however, on how soon we shall find that the proceedings of the British Parliament are stitched with foreign-produced wire or printed on American newsprint.

Mr. Speaker, the rate at which our manufacturers are losing markets, both at home and abroad, is truly alarming. I might point out that this result was foreseen by many Members who have sought to change our present foreign trade policies. Perhaps this small example in "our own living room," so to speak, will illustrate why the import problem calls for constant vigilance on the part of Congress.

Poison in Your Water—No. 160

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald of March 24, 1959, entitled "Purer River Is Safety Aid."

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) Morning World-Herald, Mar. 24, 1959]

PURER RIVER IS SAFETY AID—TRESTER TESTIFIES ON SIOUX CITY SEWERAGE

(By Gabe Parks)

SIOUX CITY, IOWA.—The treatment of Sioux City sewerage before it is dumped into the Missouri River would be "an added safety factor" for Omaha's water supply.

Ralph Trester, general manager of the Metropolitan Utilities District, testified Monday before a special eight-man board of water pollution officials.

PURITY IS IN EXCESS

The hearing is part of a Federal procedure being invoked by the Public Health Service to get Sioux City to quit polluting the river.

Mr. Trester stressed that the purity of Omaha's drinking water, after treatment, is "far in excess" of State and Federal requirements.

But the risk connected with a possible human or mechanical failure in the purifying process "is in direct proportion of the increased pollution of the raw water supply," he said.

OMAHA COSTS CITED

Omaha Public Works Director George Fisher reported Omaha is spending $5,100,000 for sewerage treatment projects now either in the construction or planning stages.

"The wonderful big Missouri should not be polluted by anybody, including ourselves," Mr. Fisher said.

George Davis, attorney for Sioux City, cross-examined Messrs. Trester and Fisher closely on Omaha's water and sewer programs.

DENISON PLANT BLAMED

Mr. Davis also said the packing plant at Denison, Iowa, is dumping untreated refuse into the Boyer River which empties into the Missouri.

"This is at least twice as close to Omaha as Sioux City," he said.

Mr. Davis said Sioux City is 117 miles above Omaha and "there should be a certain amount of natural purification" in that distance.

Industrial Peace or Conflict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the controversy over labor-management reform legislation has degenerated into a conflict that threatens future labor-management relations and cooperation.

These serious and troubled times call for understanding, good will, and cooperation between these two great forces in our economy. When the spirit of cooperation gives way to bitter strife and hatred, the public and the Nation suffer as well as management and labor.

My opposition to the Griffin-Landrum bill was to its punitive provisions which were deliberately designed to weaken or destroy labor unions and to make impossible the formation of new unions, particularly in backward southern areas. This is the road to a corporate state with the destruction of basic and fundamental rights of American citizens.

It is more than a threat to free unions. It is a challenge to all good citizens who abhor totalitarian tyranny. It is a danger to American democracy.

To reverse this ugly trend calls for the best in both labor and management. It calls for recognition of their own common interest and concern for the public welfare and national unity and strength.

The powerful propaganda drive for a strong labor reform bill, if successful, can be of no real value if such legislation contains unjust, unworkable, and punitive provisions which will lead to widespread strife, disunity, and discontent.

In the past decade labor unionists have worked with leaders of industry and other civic leaders in community projects which have contributed much to the progress and welfare of citizens in towns,

cities, and rural areas throughout the Nation.

It would be a tragedy if this good will and teamwork would be destroyed by ill-considered, unwise, and unworkable legislation designed to fight unions rather than corruption.

The reaction to punitive legislation as contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill is already evident in bitter comment from publications representing the views of decent union men and women. They know and understand the objective of Landrum bill sponsors who see unions as a greater evil than corruption and racketeering.

The following editorials and statements reflect the thinking of union members dedicated to justice and decency in both unions and Government:

[From current issue of the Machinist]

INFAMY

The history of the 86th Congress will be sad reading, for it will contain one of the most shameful chapters of lobbying activity in modern history. This issue of the Machinist gives some indication of how the screws were turned on Congressmen, of why a number of normally liberal legislators lost their nerve, of why they turned on their friends to vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The big corporations, the chambers of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers were well organized and well informed. They were better informed than those Congressmen who voted without having ever read or understood the bill.

That organized employers would pull every trick in the book to get Congressmen to vote for a killer bill could have been expected. They have the same right as labor or any other group to attempt to influence Congress by persuasion and by pressure.

The shocker was the extent to which the big corporations were able to get the highest officials of our National Government to do their work for them. Seldom in American history has the executive branch of our Government interfered so openly with the legislative branch.

Other Presidents have attempted to give leadership on legislation, true. Yet, never in the memory of oldtimers has the logrolling, the patronage promising, the threats of reprisals been applied so brazenly that they could be advertised on the floor of the House during debate.

Normally our press—the great free press of the United States—has been quick to defend Congress against encroachment by the White House and against undue pressures from any lobby. This time, however, many of our newspapers had become part of the lobby. Our largest TV networks were used by the lobby.

With the notable exception of the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, we know of no daily newspaper that attempted to expose the sordid spectacle of the Landrum-Griffin lobby. In our opinion, the Atlanta Journal deserves a Pulitzer prize, for exposing the pressures brought against one courageous Congressman who stood up against them all. The Atlanta Journal's reporting is the more remarkable because the newspaper itself editorially supported the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Unlike the big business lobby, labor's lobby is constantly exposed to the withering scorn and exaggerations of the editorial writers, antiunion columnists, and correspondents.

The report in this issue of the Machinist of pressures that pushed the Landrum-Griffin bill through the House of Representatives is only a partial report. It is not one to make Americans proud.

[From the New Era, Reading, Pa.]

FIGHT NEVER ENDS

Anyone harboring the quaint notion that management wants to get along with labor is suffering from delusions.

That myth disappeared into thin air last week when the true temper of big business emerged during debate on the Landrum-Griffin antilabor bill.

Washington was crowded with lobbyists from the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who put heavy pressure on lawmakers with the argument that this is the time to "put labor in its place."

There used to be a time when labor was lulled into a false sense of security with the management argument that industry accepts labor as a partner on the national scene and that the days of strife are over.

Labor let its guard down—and wham, we got clobbered, but good.

What this latest episode proves once more is that down deep in its cold, calculating heart, corporate America has no use for organized labor. Unions are something that must be "tolerated," only as long as unions are strong.

And meanwhile big business is providing the money, the brains, the propaganda—and, yes, the votes in Congress—to weaken the trade union movement.

At every turn you find a stiffening of big business against labor—in the steel dispute where "inflation" is the propaganda word. In the railroad industry where "featherbedding" is the scare word; in Congress where "reform" touches off a tirade of antiunionism; in the Presidency where Ike Eisenhower goes on TV during the most costly time period to whack the devil out of workers and their unions.

What have we learned from the Landrum-Griffin vote?

In our humble opinion it signals an agonizing reappraisal of labor's attitudes and labor's goals. It calls for a return to militant unionism in which a fighting labor movement is willing to dramatize the issues through sacrifice and sweat.

This militancy on the economic front must be accompanied by organizing effort, more education, and then greater political action.

Anyone harboring visions of labor-management peace for licking the boots of big industry will go down in history as a Chamberlain-type appeaser who merely postponed the day of showdown.

As we said, "nobody gives labor nothing." History shows it's a struggle right down to the wire.

REFORM MANAGEMENT

(Letter to Washington Post editor)

With all the antilabor sentiment erupting from Capitol Hill and that place on Pennsylvania Avenue, it seems appropriate to remember that there is one and only one reason for the existence of labor unions in the first place—the shocking lack of conscience on the part of those who control production.

If industrial management were just, we would need no labor unions and all of us duespaying members would tear up our cards happily. Unfortunately, this is not the case, a fact fully realized by anybody who ever has tried to negotiate a fair contract with greedy, millionaire owners.

As far the gangsterism in unions, a history of labor-management relations shows positively that the door to this evil was opened by management, which hired goons to beat down workers looking for something better than a peasant's existence.

All honorable union men everywhere are in favor of getting rid of the gangsters, but no union man will buy legislation aimed at curbing honorable union activities.

A mere glance at the economic situation prevailing in this country today should convince even a schoolboy that something besides gangsterism needs correcting. While owners are stacking it away by the millions (look at last year's profits earned by the steelmakers), the average workingman still has to have two jobs or send his wife to work to enjoy a minimum of luxury such as a new home and a decent car.

All the idiots are buying that congressional and Presidential baloney about labor reform. Why doesn't somebody try to reform management?

WILLIAM FUCHS.

WASHINGTON.

[From the New Era]

PLACING THE BLAME

There's an axiom in politics that a defeated candidate blames his closest friends for his downfall—they didn't do enough for him. The same kind of thinking apparently has beset some of our top labor leaders since the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition clobbered us last week by passing the antilabor Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives.

Instead of putting the blame where it belongs—on the Republicans and southern Democrats, who are subservient to big business, big money interests—the disillusioned unionists are talking about taking a new look at the Democratic Party.

Now this is kid talk. When you look over the Landrum-Griffin vote, you find that 90 percent of the votes against the harsh killer legislation were cast by Democrats. On the other hand, 88 percent of the Republicans voted against labor and for the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. So, does it make sense to drop the Democrats when they were the only ones to give any support at all to labor's position?

Unfortunately, as long as there is a South and a civil rights issue, there will be Dixiecrats. And the Republicans will continue to sell the Negroes down the river by swapping, dealing, and trading with the Dixiecrats in Congress to control the Government. In this instance the Republicans agreed to duck the civil rights issue, and the Dixiecrats in turn voted for antilabor legislation.

I didn't realize, until Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES called it to my attention, that some southern Democrats really want to keep labor weak so that Southern States with their cheap, unorganized labor can continue to entice industry away from the industrial North. Many of the big corporations are building new plants in backward, right-to work States, mostly in the South. They will reap tremendous profits until such time as unions do win a foothold and overcome the fear which employers are implanting in Southern workers' minds.

So the Dixiecrats sold their party once more for a few pieces of silver. But this is no reason for labor to desert the liberal Democrats just because Dixiecrats betrayed the party that has given them national prominence, prestige, and power unparalled in American history.

Isn't it a tragic thing, when you stop to think about it, that right here in Reading some of the most outspoken advocates of the Landrum-Griffin bill were the most hostile union-haters in the community. What the devil do the managements of giant nonunion industries here in Berks County care about the welfare of union members employed in another plant? You'd think these moneybags employers were bleeding for the "little people," judging from the things they wrote and said while the labor fight was on in the House. The truth is that millions of unsuspecting union members were "used" and

"taken in" by corporate executives who demanded "labor reform" but really want no unions at all.

[From Public Affairs Institute weekly column]

LABOR PEACE?

All the time that Congress is feverishly debating what kind of legislation we ought to have to bring an end to labor-management malpractices and to curb the power of alleged union bosses what may be an infinitely more important story is going unnoticed.

That is the story of the steady increase in labor-management tensions as reflected in the number of complaints of unfair labor-management practices before the National Labor Relations Board.

Month after month the Board's business mounts. Month after month the bitterness of strife between union workers and their employers mounts.

Instead of labor peace as the authors of our labor-management legislation tells us is their goal, we are getting industrial warfare.

With 500,000 steelworkers out on strike and another 100,000 workers laid off in related industries in what is obviously one of the sharpest labor-management disputes that we have had in many years, it might be a good time to look at the more general picture and see what is happening on the labor front.

The NLRB has just issued its statistical summary of its activities covering the second quarter of 1959.

Here are some of the recordbreaking highlights:

The five-member Board issued formal decisions in 699 cases, an increase of 21 percent over the previous 3 months.

The General Counsel issued 297 unfair labor practices complaints—the greatest number ever issued in any one quarter.

Unfair labor practice cases filed by employers numbered 563; an increase of 126 percent over those filed during the same quarter a year ago.

Unions filed 1,021 unfair labor practice cases for an increase of 41 percent over those filed by unions during the corresponding period of 1958.

These increases are not something new. They are part of a pattern of increasing tensions and disputes that has shown itself clearly for at least the past year and a half.

Why?

Any objective study of the attitude of many segments of industry during the past few years will show an obvious determination to crack down on organized labor.

Both the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce have been conducting a never-ceasing campaign against labor, constantly using the timeworn cliches of labor bossism, labor monoply, and labor corruption.

In this the McClellan committee hearings have been a never-failing and convenient source of citable evidence to be used against all unions whether they are among those which have been investigated or not.

Right-to-work supporters, despite the setbacks suffered at the polls last November, have never ceased to press for harsher States rights legislation to weaken and perhaps even destroy unionism in the name of protecting it.

In Congress itself there is a group of Senators and Representatives who spend much of their time in the fight to enact legislation that would further restrict union activities and discredit labor.

The drive of business to enter the political field more actively and more openly is a reflection of business hatred of labor strength.

The NLRB itself had been accused repeatedly by labor spokesmen of showing bias toward business as against unions and certainly it had reversed numerous decisions made by previous Boards which, in turn, had been accused by business of being prolabor.

The result in tension and tendency to rush to the Board shows itself in the statistics.

Employers, emboldened by proemployer decisions, have more than doubled their complaints to the Board as compared with the figures for 1958.

Unions in turn have upped their complaints by more than 40 percent for the same period.

The General Counsel issues a recordbreaking number of complaints.

It's all very well to keep pounding away on corruption within the labor movement.

But how about a little investigation into the reasons for the recordbreaking charges and countercharges that are overburdening an already overburdened NLRB?

HE'S THEIR BOY

[From the New Era]

The President's ability to doubletalk constantly amazes us.

When labor suggested he enter the steel strike situation Eisenhower said: "I couldn't think of anything more objectionable than to put the Federal Government constantly in the business of settling these major strikes."

Yet when it came to sticking his nose into the basic rules under which labor-management relations are supposed to function, the President didn't hesitate one moment to go on the air, read an antilabor speech prepared for him by someone else, and arbitrarily put the Federal Government into the business of labor-management relations.

In other words, he was willing to use his high office for the benefit of big business, but refused to give up even 2 holes of golf to help 500,000 idle steelworkers.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the very able chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau, Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, who was one of the newsmen accompanying Vice President NIXON on his tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland, has written an outstanding series of eight articles on his experiences during the tour and his impressions of the U.S.S.R. and its people. The series appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. Hartmann has presented some very interesting comments and sidelights about his trip and a penetrating "what-makes-it-tick" analysis of the Soviet system which I believe will be of much interest to the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion at this time the first two articles of the series:

NIXON IN RUSSIA: FUSION OF POLITICIAN AND STATESMAN

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 15.—RICHARD M. NIXON, not the *Lenin* which is being outfitted in Leningrad for October trial runs, may turn out to be the world's first atomic icebreaker. Or he may be merely the latest Western recipient of Mr. Khrushchev's uninhibited hospitality when the devil a saint would be.

It's a gamble, and nobody is more aware of it than the California-born Vice President. His final place in history may be a footnote relating the fact he told the Soviet Premier he didn't know everything and talked too much.

But NIXON is not under any illusions about this powerful, peasant-born dynamo of energy and Communist dialectic who bosses half the world. His report to President Eisenhower will make fascinating reading when the secret archives of this administration are someday published, like the Yalta papers.

Meanwhile, though the Vice President has kept scrupulous silence about his private conversations with Khrushchev, the American people and the rest of the free world already have a better picture of the U.S.S.R. than ever before through the words and pictures of nearly 100 newsmen who followed NIXON to Novosidrsk and back. They also have an enlarged picture of NIXON, who will be argued about during the next 12 months in the United States.

These last 6,000 miles of NIXON's amazing total of 150,000 miles of goodwill globetrotting proved nothing entirely new. What they demonstrated most significantly was that he can combine his rough-and-ready whistlestop technique, heretofore seen only on the domestic campaign trail, with his undoubted but previously perfunctory talent for meeting the leaders of 53 nations he has visited. The old and new NIXONS have fused; the politician and statesman were a single self-confident man in Moscow.

It's an ironic fact that the very traits which NIXON's critics have treated most scornfully, a certain icy ruthlessness in verbal battle, aggressive and agile counterpunching rather than direct defense, a lawyer's facility (or trickiness) with words, and the knack of swiftly seizing upon any advantage, served him and his country best in the public (and presumably the private) slugfests he had with the Communist heavyweight champ.

This reporter and others who watched the Vice President in action on this as well as earlier missions abroad are now thoroughly convinced that NIXON's great genius lies in an uncanny ability to size up strangers and situations almost instantly and to exploit them to his maximum advantage, often by shifting to an unexpected tack or darting through a surprise opening.

Whether his football coach or debate coach at Whittier College gets the credit for this, or whether they must share it with Duke Law School, the U.S. Navy, and the hard political road to reelection as Vice President, NIXON showed superb skill in taking the measure of the man who since Stalin's death has been the most worrisome puzzle to Western statesmen.

Only secondary, and rather surprising to everybody, including Soviet leaders (who moved swiftly to keep it within bounds), was the warmth of NIXON's reception by crowds of ordinary Russians. Everywhere except Venezuela his reputation as a crowd pleaser has been confirmed, but inside the U.S.S.R. there was no reason to expect cheers for an avowed anti-Communist American who had just told off their Prime Minister on Moscow radio and television.

Yet NIXON's primary task was not to win the affection of Russian masses in a fortnight, an obviously impossible task, though he lost no chance to plant a few question marks in Soviet minds which are not so much

closed as insulated from the world. He did this by stressing America's desire for peace and hope for higher living standards for the Russian people—standards which their leaders have promised but are slow in coming—and constantly urging more freedom of ideas and information for which they all seem to hunger.

KHRUSHCHEV REAL JOB

But the Vice President's real job was to treat with the man who matters, a point on which most statesmen of East and West now agree. Mr. Khrushchev is a self-made man extremely proud of his maker, much better informed statistically than might be expected but woefully wrong in his conclusions about the West—not so much about its power as about its will to use it.

Like all Russians since centuries before communism, he suffers from a well-founded inferiority complex, but this is not all. He really believes his dogma, and he is 64 years old and in a dreadful hurry to see it come true. Khrushchev knows that the West—even the United States alone—is currently stronger and more productive than the Soviet Union.

But he believes the discipline and the determination to surpass the United States which has spurred his society to such remarkable industrialization over the past 40 years will even the balance.

WANTS SUPERIORITY

Khrushchev wants equality—then superiority. This is the real reason he so desperately sought a summit meeting and an invitation to the United States.

Why, then, give him his way? History may call it a mistake, but this is the administration thinking which NIXON's trial run corroborated:

Khrushchev and his ruling elite (as lordly a class as ever existed though the premier and Kozlov show some signs of enjoying the cheers of the crowd, are somewhat like the chiefs and sachems of a warlike American Indian tribe in the old West. They have somehow gotten themselves guns and occasionally they get some firewater. They don't have any trousers or comfortable houses, they can't read or write, they are savages by the standards of cultivated paleface society.

SERVICEABLE GUNS

But they do have guns—not as many, perhaps, but their's are serviceable; they have firewater in the form of self-intoxicating speeches about their own superiority and virtue, and if they start shooting a lot of people are going to be killed.

It seems necessary, therefore, to send our scouts out ahead to powwow with the big chief, to treat him with respect shown an equal and to decide whether the peacepipe shall be passed around before the war drums sound. Any pact may not last long and treachery is to be expected. Still, the only alternative is massacre.

NIXON accomplished his difficult mission of pioneer scout but the powwow is out of his hands. Khrushchev started out by giving him the business exactly as he has every western caller since he disposed of his principal rivals and found out his missiles would fly. He sailed into NIXON after their first handshake but the Vice President, has, as he told his host, "been insulted by experts."

His rudeness Prime Minister Macmillan suffered with dignity. It silenced Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY for most of 8 hours and terrified ex-Governor Harriman. It merely caused NIXON to conclude, correctly, that Khrushchev's behavior was neither irrational nor inhospitable by Soviet ground rules. Thereafter, NIXON played by those rules.

BULLY CHALLENGED

Details of how the bully was challenged and then conned into showing it on his own television and publishing it to all his people have been fully reported, but this conceals a somber warning. It could never have happened had Khrushchev any serious doubts about his own position, based on both popularity and police power. The relative (though strictly limited) freedom the Soviet Government gave NIXON and his huge American entourage was a demonstration of strength possibly more significant than the first Soviet sputnik, certainly more than any antiquated factory or unfinished project on the Vice President's super Intourist itinerary.

To appreciate this, Americans need to know more about the way the new society of the U.S.S.R. really works, perhaps as badly as Khrushchev needs to learn about the real America.

SOVIET OPEN CITIES NOT TYPICAL OF U.S.S.R.—DECEIVE TOURISTS, RUSS, TOO

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 16.—To understand the Soviet Union it is first necessary to understand Russia, and to understand Russia one must constantly remember that it is mostly in Asia.

These historic and geographic facts, far more than the theorizings of Marx and Engels about communism, make the U.S.S.R. what it is today. In the same category, the Pavlovian theory of behavior popularly associated with drooling dogs is a major key to what makes Soviet society work with ever-increasing efficiency.

CHURCHILL'S COMMENT

It would be presumptuous indeed to pretend to explain what Sir Winston Churchill called a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside of an enigma on the basis of the two short visits, 4 years apart, which this reporter has made to the biggest country on earth. But the second time, viewing things from the somewhat different angle of a semiofficial guest and seeing the forbidden areas of Siberia as well as revisiting the tourist centers, much became clear that was puzzling in 1955. (This is deliberate Soviet policy; the curtain is lifted a little for tourists not to enlighten but to deceive.)

MOSCOW NOT TYPICAL

Moscow, Leningrad, and the other open areas which a steadily mounting stream of American and other free world citizens are seeing each year are not even as typical of the U.S.S.R. as New York and Boston are of the United States. They are, in fact, vast museums—diabolic Disneylands—to impress not only foreigners but the much less sophisticated Soviet tourists from other parts of the U.S.S.R. and Communists or delegates from backward Asian and African lands.

One impression you get from Moscow is that of huge, if tasteless, new construction projects on every horizon; of massive monuments to Soviet "culture" such as the skyscraper university, the Ukraina Hotel and the spotless subway; of broad boulevards, beautiful parks, lavish exhibitions, and superbly staged theater and ballet. Another—equally essential to the deception—is the conviction that most Russians are incredibly slow, dense and maddeningly inefficient.

The European corner of the U.S.S.R., except for the Kremlin and its bombproof basements, was really written off by Soviet planners in World War II when the Germans nearly took it. Moscow is either the best of Asia or the worst of Europe. And so it impresses tourists from both worlds, exactly as planned.

Asians marvel that communism has produced such a capital in a mere 40 years and hurry home to try the same forced progress. Americans go away certain that any people who can't add up a hotel bill or serve tea in less than two hours are never going to "bury" us or convert our grandchildren to socialism.

POLICE DON'T "TAIL"

Western visitors also find, or think they find, a measure of freedom in Moscow and Leningrad which they had not expected. They are not "tailed" by the secret police; they freely criticize Khrushchev and company in their hotel rooms—sometimes in conversations with Russians—and nothing dire happens to them; customs is cursory and people are so honest it is virtually impossible to lose anything, let alone have it stolen. Very few Russians will accept a tip.

Yet, as for everything in the Soviet Union, there is a reason for this. The Communist hierarchy is now secure enough in its almost absolute control that it's a sheer waste of manpower to watch every foreigner, unnecessary, too, when every Soviet citizen is watched already. They have the most monumental indifference in what most foreigners do, say, think or bring, but they are fantastically sensitive to what their own subjects see, hear, think or covet.

STILL MENTAL STRAITJACKETS

Times publisher Norman Chandler concluded perceptively on his visit to the U.S.S.R. shortly after the first summit conference in Geneva that the Iron Curtain was not around the country but around the minds of its people. As the physical barriers have been lifted to travel since 1955, the mental straightjacket has been strapped tighter still. There are occasional signs of encouraging exceptions, such as Moscow students questioning the bloody reprisals in Hungary or the current scramble to see the American fair despite a vicious official campaign to discredit it, but they are very few.

NOT IN SIBERIA

The fact is that the biggest concentration camp in the Soviet Union is not hidden in Siberia today. It is Moscow itself, on display to the world. Most of its claimed 7 million people are the drones and dumbbells of Soviet society, the below-average in ability and ambition who have been rejected by the state, the incorrigibles and misfits who have resisted conversion to the new norm of behavior.

They are good enough as street cleaners, chambermaids, and ice cream vendors, and it makes no difference if some clever rascal from Redondo Beach slips them a forbidden paperback novel or French fashion magazine. Let them be impressed by Cinerama or other aspects of American living at the fair. It doesn't matter, they will never go there or anywhere.

POWER CENTERS SHIFTED

Having switched the penal camps from Siberia to old Russia, the Soviet planners completed the reverse play by switching the real producers and power centers of industrial society from Europe to Asia. The Kremlin and the official bureaucracy remains in Moscow to complete the illusion. But the things that really matter are out east, beyond prying foreign eyes and out of non-Communist earshot.

"Why, this is where all the efficient Russians are," was the frequent comment by members of NIXON's party within minutes after we landed at Novosibirsk, the Siberian boom town that's pushing toward a million people and won't stop there any more than Los Angeles did.

BETTER THAN MOSCOW'S

The airport is far better than Moscow's and its paved runway seems to go on for miles. The hotel, though small, was a model of brisk efficiency laid on for the rare visitors. The food, including the best beef Stroganoff we had in Russia, was infinitely better than anything in Moscow or Leningrad where bureaucrats, ruble millionaires and tourists pay as much as $20 for a bad meal, sloppily served.

Most impressive of all were the people of Siberia. They were usually handsome—mostly Russian in race, for that's who is run-

ning things despite the fiction of 16 autonomous Soviet Republics. They were healthy looking, well fed, clean and as well clothed as any crowds seen in Russia. The ordinary folk on the streets of Novosibirsk and Sverslovsk showed more consciousness of style—though still not in the class with Paris or Pasadena or Podunk—than a visitor to Moscow can imagine.

This is a new metropolis, one cell of a new society terrifying in its implications. For these Siberian people actually appear perfectly happy with their lives. They are working hard and creating something they can see. Their children will have a better life than they; and they know absolutely nothing of the world beyond what is piped in to them by their Government.

UNCONTAMINATED CULTURES

You fly over the barren wastes of Siberia at 500 miles per hour in a Tupelov jet, and all you can see are empty subarctic lands dotted with innumerable lakes. A doubt-tracked ribbon of steel connects these new cities, and now the airplane, but there is no other communication. A dozen cities of 500,000 or more are spotted across this vast continent, like islands in a land ocean. They are the sterilized and uncontaminated cultures where the new society really works.

For the Soviet society to work effectively, the same fundamental rules apply that prevail in any industrial nation. There must be resources, managerial ability, skilled labor and the saving or plowing back of some production into capital for expanding production. The U.S.S.R. is conceded to have the most and probably the most nearly self-sufficient resources in the world. Much managerial and organizing ability perished or was exiled in the 1917 revolution and succeeding Stalin purges, but a new generation of peasants' sons turned engineers is coming up. There still is not enough talent to go around, so it is rationed by the state like everything else, from rare space alloys down to a glass of water.

The Wrong People in the Wrong War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it was clear at the Santiago Conference, as it had been clear many times before, that the Latin American nations do not like Trujillo. Their distaste is based on good reasons and it is not casual.

However, these nations also made it clear they did not want intervention—or filibustering in the earlier sense of that word. I personally advised Fidel Castro last February against any such expeditions against Trujillo. He has ample to do in Cuba. The OAS would be obliged to help Trujillo. Trujillo is on his way out anyway, so why bring death and heartbreak to many families?

The August 17, 1959, Life magazine published an article entitled "How Americans Were Duped Into Bloody Castro Fiasco." From the evidence it looks as though Castro or persons close around him cooperated in the enlisting and training of American citizens. I believe it is correct to say they were "duped" and, I will go further, exploited.

Why involve American citizens? Why but to involve the United States? We are involved because we are part of this hemisphere and because we believe in freedom, justice, and economic security. But we do not hold with the recruiting practices and the revolutionary operations described in the article which I am including here under a previous consent.

Trujillo is an apple ripe to fall any day. No need to shake the tree—the breezes are blowing and becoming stronger each hour:

HOW AMERICANS WERE DUPED INTO BLOODY CASTRO FIASCO

(By Keith Wheeler)

A flamboyant plot, inspired by Cuba's ever-ready Fidel Castro, to conquer the Dominican Republic with the aid of U.S. citizen soldiers of fortune was tracked down last week by a team of Life reporters.

The first clue to this weird and startling story was contained in a vainglorious report by the Dominican Republic's durable dictator, Gen. Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, that his army had repulsed and wiped out an invasion force in June. Giving weight to his words, Trujillo had named the "dead" attackers—among them seven New Yorkers.

Thereafter the Life team worked with fragments of fact scattered from New York to Havana. Last week they found four of the purported corpses alive in New York. Two had apparently died in the Dominican Republic. One was still unaccounted for.

From the living they uncovered a bizarre and brazen recruiting scheme in which, for months, freewheeling Latin Americans had been proselytizing some highly gullible U.S. citizens to fight in the Caribbean.

The story began, apparently, after Castro and his Cuban rebels had seemed to prove, to the satisfaction of the militarily unsophisticated, that the pure in heart could defeat a dictatorship with nothing but hope and a handful of heroes. A wave of euphoria for libertad swept the Caribbean. Its special target, understandably, was Trujillo's iron-fisted 30-year rule of the Dominican Republic.

Castro himself started the real recruiting on a visit to Venezuela after his Cuban triumph. When a crowd cheered him with shouts of "Trujillo next," he plunked his fatigue cap on the speaker's rostrum and started a war chest by dropping a 5-bolivar coin in it. That show alone yielded 500,000 bolivares ($150,000). Soon, inspired with Castro fervor, the recruiters were shuttling back and forth across the Caribbean and up to Miami and New York.

In New York, it developed last week, they operated blandly under the noses of the authorities in the upper West Side of Manhattan, an area densely populated by Puerto Rican Americans. It is now possible to trace their activities, beginning last winter, to several known hangouts.

There were rallies in private apartments on 106th Street and Amsterdam Avenue and at 103d and Amsterdam. Another hangout was a safe run by a man named Hector Américo at 922 Amsterdam Avenue. They even made use of otherwise innocent gathering places, including the Club of the Good Star at 906 Columbus Avenue and the Hamilton Place Hotel at 138th Street and Broadway.

The chief activist and later leader of the ill-fated invasion, now reported dead in the Dominican Republic, was a former Castro guerrilla chief still spoiling for a fight, one Enrique Jiménes Moya. It is known that he moved freely in and out of New York, operating through two Dominican exile organizations.

Now merged under the title "Movimiento de Liberación Dominicana," they were controlled by one Alfonso Canto and a man named Juan Diaz. Canto, too, was a peripatetic plotter, who shuttled back and forth between New York and Cuba on his devious business.

For bait, the recruiters used, first and foremost, the Castro mystic of the out-at-elbows conqueror and the appeal of "the chance to be a hero, too." They made it sound easy. A fortnight of guerrilla practice, a short hop across the Caribbean, then, wham, Trujillo would collapse.

The recruiters also used money—not actual money, but the talk of it. To many a hard-pressed Puerto Rican, condemned to dreary menial jobs in New York, the promise of support for wife, child, or parent proved a powerful incentive.

There is evidence that perhaps scores in the New York area "fell for this guff." It is certain that at least these seven did:

Daniel Chervony, 23, clerk.
David Chervony, 17, delivery boy.
Moises Agosto, 23, odd-job man.
Santiago Carbonell, 27, pants presser.
Pablo Vélez, 23, packer.
Manuel Costa, 29, laborer.
Eugénio Román, 24, handyman.

It was astoundingly easy for the susceptible to fall into the recruiters' hands. On March 1 Moises Agosto, whose natural tendency to somber brooding had been accentuated by his inability to keep a job since leaving Puerto Rico 5 months earlier, was out for a Sunday stroll with his girl.

Moises and Irma Villanueva, who called him "Ruben" because she liked that name better, idly drifted into a basement meeting at the Hamilton Place Hotel. Almost before Irma had noticed, someone had pinned a three-pointed card (blazoned for peace, liberty, and democracy) on Moises' lapel. Before they left, Irma saw him sign something. Two days later, after a series of telephone talks, she was present when he signed what she thought was a contract. On the fifth day he was gone. He said he might be away a year or two.

Irma later recalled sadly that Moises desperately needed money for his mother and two small daughters back in Puerto Rico, and she believed he had been promised $90 a month for their support. Significantly, a relative recalled that Moises, the broody one, had "always wanted to do something big someday. He always wanted to be a hero."

It was the beginning of a fantastic trail. But, although she received 10 letters from him, Irma never learned much of Moises' progress along it. Moises' letters were deliberately vague. Only occasionally did he hint that he was engaged on desperate business. Once he wrote: "I hope, if God wills it, to return soon and bring in my conscience and heart the happiness of a free people. And if I die, I will die content."

Others set off on the same strange journey with equal offhandedness. For Pablo Vélez, who is called "a crazy character" even by his family, it began in a neighborhood bar. Santiago Carbonell fortuitously met the recruiters just when he had been laid off from his pants-pressing job and no longer had means to support his wife and three children. Both of them were fired by a lot of loose talk about the iniquities of Trujillo and boasts that Castros' bravos could bring him down with fewer than 100 men.

Vélez, a former soldier, and Carbonell, an ex-marine, soon found themselves in the 106th and Amsterdam apartment at rallies of Dominican exile patriots who called themselves the "February 27th movement." They were signed up by Juan Díaz, one of the recruiters, and off they went.

The Chervony brothers, Daniel and David, found their way to disillusionment for the one, death for the other through Hector Américo's cafe—since burned down—and grocery store. Américo recruited them on a promise that their family would be supported, according to Daniel Chervony.

He roped another gullible innocent, Eugénio Román. "I will get $10,000. Wow!" Eugénio told his patroness, Dona Amanda Douchkess Lindberg, who had been supporting him as a helper around the Club of the Good Star.

The long and idiotic trail to nowhere has now been blazed by Daniel Chervony and Vélez and Carbonell. In March each of the suckers was given an airline ticket to Havana. Daniel Chervony traveled among a group of 7 recruits, Vélez with a batch of 11.

"We very happy," Vélez recalls. "We going to stay only 15 days in Cuba, make a lot of money and shoot down Trujillo. We laughing all the way. I don't feel bad; I like go fight."

From Havana they were taken to the mountains, installed in training camp in the hills at Mil Cumbres in Pinar del Río. They were given logs and thatch and told to build their own huts. And they were issued weapons, a motley collection of M–1 Garands, Dominican-made carbines and machineguns.

At first it was fun. They went on conditioning hikes and played soldier learning to fire the weapons. Their training officers were Dominicans and Cubans and occasionally they were visited by Jiménes Moya. Although Moya was a glamorous figure, they eventually resented the fact that he apparently spent most of his time living it up with the girls in Havana.

But the promised limit of 15 days passed and there was no action. The weeks began to stretch into months.

"They gave us almost no food—only a little coffee," Vélez laments. "We killed a cow and we eat it but it's no good. We just boil it and we have no salt. But snakes were all right. You cook snake right and it taste like chicken."

"We were treated worse than dogs; we were like slaves," Daniel Chervony says. "I didn't have a bath for 6 weeks."

Eventually, out of disgust and sheer boredom, some of the camp's 200 inmates tried to run away. These efforts came to nothing for they would always run into Cuban army patrols who good-humoredly but firmly herded them back to Mil Cumbres. Gradually, as the time passed, it began to dawn on them that they were prisoners.

The worst of it was when word seeped in from home that the promised payments to families had failed to materialize. It was then that the Americans at the camp staged a rather ridiculous gesture of defiance. Many of the recruits had grown beards in idolatrous emulation of Castro's legendary barbudos. The Americans shaved their beards as an open protest.

Oddly enough this charade seemed to have some effect on the camp bosses. Alfonso Canto, the MLD's suave New York operative, appeared in the camp and promised to go back to New York and pay up. Indeed, some of the families there did receive small sums.

Finally Benigno Chervony, a New York building superintendent, blew the whistle on all this revolutionary hocus-pocus. He wrote the U.S. Embassy in Havana to say that his two sons were in Cuba on some kind of nefarious enterprise and he wanted help getting them out. Shortly thereafter six of the by-now disconsolate buccaneers—Daniel Chervony, Carbonell, Vélez, Román, Agosto, and Costa—sent a letter to the U.S. Embassy in Havana saying they were being held prisoners and wanted to be sprung.

A dogged but frequently obstructed investigation in Cuba got nowhere; besides, it was too late to save those who were doomed.

On June 14, the expedition finally got underway in as slapdash a manner as any invasion that was never planned. First to go was an ancient C–46 cargo plane camouflaged—inaccurately as it turned out—with Dominican Air Force insignia. Jiménes Moya led this first wave—after a long argument with the pilot who eventually turned out to be a spy for Trujillo—to an airstrip in the Dominican mountains called Constanza. Jiménes Moya had 63 men aboard the plane. In a 3-week series of ragged running fights with the Dominican Army he and most of his men were killed—apparently including Agosto and young David Chervony.

The second wave consisted of a couple of antique landing craft which sailed from Cuba with about 200 men. One boat made it all the way to the Dominican Republic at a north coast beach. Its luckless crew also apparently died to the man under the guns and bombs of Trujillo's defenders.

The second boat had the incredible good fortune to be even less efficient than all the rest of this haphazard adventure; it ran out of gas 30 miles off the Cuban coast. After wallowing around without food or water for 4 days, its company of seasick bravos were rescued. Many of them, including Vélez and Carbonell, had a belated attack of good sense and refused to go out again. Finally they were given tickets home.

A few others among the would-be Castros did even better. They simply said they wanted no further part of revolution and, after a few days in a Cuban prison, were disgustedly turned loose and sent home with a warning to keep their mouths shut.

Last week, mourning his brother lost in a reckless adventure, Daniel Chervony was still harassed by fear. His wife had been getting mysterious threatening telephone calls and a group of seven sinister strangers were, from time to time, haunting his home. He was afraid to go outside.

The last act of this never-never-land melodrama may be written this week. Seeking to set its own house in order, the Organization of American States convenes in extraordinary session to consider what to do about unrest in the Caribbean—most of which, quite obviously, originates in Castro's Cuba.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the third and fourth of a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau. Mr. Hartmann accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

The articles follow:

RUSS RULED BY CONTROL OVER MIND

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—The Founding Fathers of the American Revolution, a rather radical affair in its day, boldly proclaimed that government rests on the consent of the governed. And this is true even in a police state like the Soviet Union, though the means of obtaining consent are quite different.

That's where Dr. Pavlov comes in.

In his experiments with dogs, rats, and other animals, Pavlov sought to prove his thesis of the conditioned reflex as the key to human behavior. This is a psychological concept premised on the atheistic Communist belief that man is merely a mentally superior animal but an animal for all that.

PAVLOV THEORY

According to Pavlov, people do things in response to external stimuli and will automatically do the same things under the same stimuli.

Further, by deliberate switching and confusion of the natural pattern of stimulus and response, it is possible to make men do exactly what the manipulator of the stimuli wants them to do.

Not only will they do it—and this is practically important—but they will want to do it. They will truly believe they are doing it of their own accord. Thus, by the influence of Pavlovian thinking on virtually every process of Soviet life from the toddler's day nursery to the brainwashing chambers of the MVD, the Russian masses are slowly coming—as George Orwell predicted in his book "1984"—to the point where they really do love Big Brother.

For the young, the Communists call this free education, for adults, rehabilitation.

There's many a slip in the Pavlovian conditioning. The past ways are not quite dead, and the Kremlin has had to backtrack on some points, notably the perpetuation of the family unit which passes many troublesome folkways along. Religion persists, though in a strictly limited and suspect way. Also, later researchers have shown that conditioned reflexes tend to fade with time and must be constantly recharged.

But in isolated central Asia the experiment is working under optimum conditions. Romantic writers may liken Siberia to the ripsnorting spirit of the old American frontier, but nothing could be more wrong. That was, if anything, a bit too much freedom for the individual with the fastest draw. The Soviet east is a prison so vast and secluded those within it mistake it for the world. They not only have no real freedom but no conception of it and probably do not long for it.

OTHER EXTREME

Poland and the other European satellites, of course, represent the other extreme of Communist conditioning. Even so dyed-in-the-wool a Communist as Gomulka, as dogmatic as Khrushchev, probably cleverer and certainly more worldly wise, doesn't expect to win his battle with the Catholic Church and the 1,000-year-old nationalism of the Polish people in anything short of generations.

The success of 40 years of Pavlovian conditioning on the peasant masses of Central Asia—which were always used to obedience and never much aware of anything beyond the horizon—has been such that Khrushchev is now bold enough to take a few western visitors among the subjects of the experiment. From a boat on the Moscow River he taunted Vice President NIXON (twisting, as usual, the "captive nations week" controversy which applied to enslaved nations and not Russians) by asking "Do these look like slaves?"

CALLS TO SWIMMERS

Then the premier called out to the swimmers "Are you slaves?" and they called back in unison: "Nyet, nyet." Conditioned reflex, not fear, accomplished this, though there's still a large reserve of fear left over from the Stalin terror to reinforce any shaky reflexes.

Once this psychological system is understood, the absolute necessity of Soviet censorship, radio jamming and control of all incoming information is apparent. To keep conditioned reflexes in working order there must be no interference from extraneous stimuli; the word "America" must always evoke a spontaneous link with the word "warmonger" in the Russian mind, not an

image of a land of peace and plenty with no designs at all.

JUST CHIPPING

The word "capitalist" must be coupled with "exploiter"—"Negro" with "lynching"—"foreign bases" with "aggressive designs on the U.S.S.R.," and so on. And this must happen automatically so that the Soviet citizen actually feels he is thinking it out for himself.

Against this massive iceberg (not the thinning ice President Eisenhower spoke of in announcing his invitation to Khrushchev) NIXON'S appeals to open up and don't be afraid of the truth and trust the people and read both sides and reach your own conclusion, were just chipping with an icepick. He knew it and hoped only it might strike one or two unconditioned ears. He also knew everyone in the Kremlin would hear it, where some high-ranking Soviet intellectuals are a bit annoyed with the uncouth manners and crowd-pleasing proclivities of Mr. K.

Members of NIXON'S party, including the newsmen who took their cue from the Vice President and resolutely argued every inch of the journey with Soviet critics and questioners, ran into the same hemispheric mentality.

The Russians are not dumb, nobody could make sputniks, run the world's most efficient secret police and produce a supercolossal stage spectacle like Khachaturian's "Spartacus" and be called stupid. But they live in only half the world, and like our medieval ancestors they have no idea what lies beyond the dropping-off place.

Their kings and priests aren't about to tell them, either.

GET FACSIMILES

However, as the Russians are no less intelligent than any other race, the state must maintain the colossal fraud that the Communist hemisphere in which the Soviet people live is actually the whole world. Thus there exists in the U.S.S.R. a facsimile for everything which free peoples take for granted, such as free communications and a free press.

The curious university-trained Soviet scientist who will live and work in the new "community of scientists" near Novosibirsk, for example, will be able to buy at any street kiosk and freely read newspapers and periodicals from all parts of the world, if he knows the languages.

"What do you mean when you say we cannot get the truth?" a Sverdlovsk journalist demanded at a party given by the local press for the newsmen accompanying NIXON. These vodka-toasting affairs were always scheduled at the same time or immediately after NIXON'S most important activity of the day; as far as I know, Soviet journalists never write or else they do it very leisurely.)

PAPERS AVAILABLE

He went on to insist that even in the Ural Mountains papers are readily available from New York, London, and Paris flown in daily by Soviet jet from Moscow along with Pravda and Izvestia. This is true, but they are the London and New York Daily Workers, L'Humanite and Communist Party papers from other free-world capitals. (This explains why obviously costly Communist organs are kept alive in places where there is virtually no chance of converting anyone or subverting the free government.)

The Russians readily admit all these are Communist papers but, since they believe the Communist Parties in foreign countries actually reflect the aspirations of the common people, what's wrong with that? Only false and misleading papers published by the ruling capitalist circles are, quite properly, kept from poisoning the peace-loving Russian people.

Of course, the Communist papers published in Western Europe and America are vastly more objective than Pravda and Izvestia, though one has to rely on them for news in Russia to appreciate this.

FOLLOW PARTY LINE

They follow the party line, but they must compete with a free press and be plausible enough for free readers. They slant and sneer but cannot utterly ignore or invent the way Soviet papers can and do. For example, in the famous fiction of NIXON trying to tip, bribe or otherwise corrupt a poor Soviet workman on his first day in Moscow, the Belgian Communist paper Le Drapeau Rouge added the explanation of the vice-president's press secretary, Herbert Klein, that what the market workers really wanted was tickets to the American Fair. This was utterly ignored in the Soviet press, as was all advance mention of Nixon's plan to visit Poland.

The average Soviet citizen, even the Soviet educated, thinks he is getting word of what's going on in the world, or at least most of it. He reads news telegraphed by Tass from Washington, New Delhi, Peiping and all parts of the U.S.S.R., and he has his choice of a score of different newspapers in which varying vehemence, brightness of typography, make-up and literary style are substituted for any very profound difference of opinion.

BOSS OF BOTH

He knows, of course, that Pravda is the official organ of the Communist Party while Izvestia speaks for the Government of the U.S.S.R. These are mostly the same people and Khrushchev is boss of both, but the distinction is useful. Izvestia, for example, which recently acquired as its new editor Khrushchev's son-in-law, generally took a more friendly tone toward father's official guest than Pravda.

Pravda sniped constantly at NIXON, whose anti-Communist sentiments are well known at world headquarters. It may have gone too far, for after the 100-ruble fiction appeared on the back page (where sophisticated Russian readers habitually look for items which might have escaped the editor, though they seldom do) the principal NIXON stories carried the byline of Pravda's former editor, Yuri Zhukov, now director of cultural exchanges and the Vice President's ranking escort on his Siberian journey.

Thus the heckling by planted loyal Soviet workers at the doorways of each plant or project on the NIXON schedule and the letters to the editor which showed up contradicting the Vice President and his claim of American prosperity for all probably were not all rehearsed or written by professional party editors.

NATURAL RESULT

In many cases they were Soviet citizens reacting as they have been conditioned to respond to American claims by years of reading Pravda and listening to Moscow radio.

The heckling had a dual purpose: It refuted what NIXON said and the uttering and publishing of it contributed to the grand illusion that free expression exists in the U.S.S.R. as anywhere else.

But for Khrushchev to permit really free intercommunication of ideas and information, as NIXON urged in the shadow of the Soviet Union's most powerful radio jamming transmitters near Novosibirsk, would really wreck the system which has been so carefully erected to permit the Kremlin to control even the subconscious thoughts of its 208 million subjects.

This much, however, may be hoped. If a divine spark does exist within the human soul—as communism denies and we affirm—it will someday burst into flame. As Khrushchev & Co. gain confidence they may relax the reins a bit more, as they have in the economic and agricultural areas already. But there is no sign of any such trend in the intellectual area today.

RUSS OPEN UP VAST NEW LAND

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 18.—The unprecedented invasion of Siberia by some 130 Americans with Vice President NIXON undoubtedly made quite an impression on the isolated Soviet residents of this long-closed area. It also made quite an impression on the Americans.

As a second-time traveler in the U.S.S.R., this reporter was not especially surprised by returning to Moscow and Leningrad on the regular intourist circuit. He noted many changes in 4 years: Hundreds of massive apartments teeming with people stood where only skeletons of stone and cement were before; quality of consumer goods appeared better and more were seen in use as well as in store windows, but prices were still very high and waiting lists long for many items.

WEATHER GOOD

Because it was summer (the weather throughout NIXON'S 11-day stay in the U.S.S.R. was uniformly perfect, cool and sunny) instead of the drab winter of his previous visit, this reporter had difficulty comparing the dress and demeanor of the crowds of Soviet citizens. They seemed more carefree and colorfully clothed, there were more smiles and friendly helpfulness toward foreigners, but in 1955 any foreigner was a rarity. Now even Americans are fairly commonplace.

But seeing Siberia and the Urals redoubt was quite a different and memorable experience. Here is a land where fertile black soil stretches for thousands of miles, of virgin pine forests and vast north-flowing rivers, where the new Communist society has placed its bet for future world supremacy.

Not that the Uralmach, the machine tool "mother of factories" or the steel pipe works near Sverdlovsk or the copper mine exactly halfway around the world from Los Angeles were particularly impressive.

PLANTS FAIR

They are evidently fairly good plants, according to the industrial experts in the Nixon group, but to western newsmen they looked old-fashioned and grimy. (The new steel mill shown NIXON in Poland was far more modern.) Despite Soviet pride, a length of red-hot pipe roling down to a conveyor belt by gravity is not quite what we mean by automation. John L. Lewis' miners generally live better than the management of a Siberian mine.

What impresses you, and must have impressed NIXON, is the potential of this vast land and the bustling energy of its people. They are the producers and pioneers of this new order, encouraged to move eastward by such Marxist heresies as the right to own their own homes and state loans to build them, by opportunity for rapid advancement which a society starving for technical and managerial talent must offer.

MANY SHORTCOMINGS

It would be easy to catalog the shortcomings of these Siberian boomtowns, to belittle the plumbing of the ancient hotel or spotlight the clusters of crumbling wooden shacks which are slums in any language.

This is what a Soviet journalist would see visiting a fast-growing American industrial city; in fact, it is exactly what most condescending British and European writers saw when they ventured west of tidewater in the United States during the 19th century. Most of them found the Yankees to be lawless, ill bred, and unwashed boors whose experiment would never amount to much.

The difficulties faced by the 100 American newsmen covering NIXON were incredible

and unending; no problem ever stayed solved; each battle with the bureaucracy had to be refought daily. It seemed part of the Soviet system to take up every minute of everyone's time so that none remained for mischief or meditation.

BREAKFAST IMPORTANT

This was applied to the NIXON party from start to finish. We soon took to rising extra early to eat all we could stuff down for breakfast; very often it was the only meal of the day. Not that the four daily menus for which we paid cash in advance were not available; but at best it took 1 hour to be served and another to settle one's bill.

Communications were also a problem complicated by constant moves. The Soviet authorities promised that NIXON's dress party could file "freely and without delay." With some mysterious exceptions impossible to explain, it is this reporter's opinion that they tried to keep their advance bargain.

STORIES DELAYED

There were long delays, partly because every word had to be read (and probably photocopied) by Soviet censors even if not tampered with, but also due to the heavy load of outgoing traffic requiring operators familiar with the Latin alphabet, who probably are not numerous in such spots as Sverdlovsk and Novosibirsk.

Often I found myself the only person moving on the empty city streets as I directed a sleepy taxi driver to the central telegraph office, which stays open around the clock. Always, after my name was located on "the list" of NIXON newsmen, which was the password for every privilege, my copy was accepted courteously and only three times failed to reach Los Angeles on time.

RUMORS RIFE

There was one nerve-racking day when the rumor spread around Moscow that the Soviets decreed only 12 of the 80-odd American reporters accredited to the Vice President's party could accompany him through Siberia—the key portion of the journey U.S. editors had paid thousands of dollars to have covered. The reason given was the usual Soviet quid pro quo; only a dozen Soviet journalists had accompanied Deputy Premier Kozlov around the United States. This was argued all day, when suddenly the Soviets gave in and said: "We'll take 100." Though only about 80 were signed up, enough resident Moscow newsmen and wives were rounded up to force the Soviets to make good for the full quota.

This was Herbert G. Klein's finest hour, among many. A San Diego editor, Klein became NIXON's press spokesman in July. Always a calm, quiet-spoken man, his baptism of fire in the U.S.S.R. absolutely inoculated him against any minor difficulties which may arise in the future.

While Klein waged a continuous battle with second-string Soviet officials on behalf of the Western press (including several British, French, and West German correspondents on an equal basis) his two assistants helped newsmen over many a minor hurdle. They were Richard Bean of North Hollywood, Lockheed public relations manager, and Richard Davies, a State Department officer formerly stationed in the U.S.S.R. and Poland who spoke both languages. Davies knew very little at the outset about newspapermen, and Bean very little about Russians, but between the two Dicks most crises were eventually surmounted.

Ordinarily, veteran American reporters and photographers have little need of chaperons. But they are indispensable in the Communist world because there are only two kinds of people recognized in the "classless society": somebodies and nobodies. Any official, especially of a guest delegation, must be listened to and obliged if possible. An official is a somebody. But any nonofficial, like a newsman, is less than dirt and his protest might as well be shouted into the wind. Therefore, every major problem had to be taken up through Klein, and a few required NIXON's personal intervention with his hosts.

The astonishing thing was not the many niggling difficulties and roadblocks placed in our way by lower echelon Soviet officials, but the fact that we operated with as much freedom as we did. The regular Moscow correspondents remained under strict censorship rules all the time. The Soviet authorities arbitrarily held up all unprocessed film for several days and decreed that thereafter only Soviet or East German brands could be used—though tourists freely take U.S. film in and out of the country. But for the most part the NIXON story got told to the world and the invaders retreated from Moscow without a serious incident or any lost luggage.

HOSPITALITY ON TRIAL

Here again, however, there was a reason. Khrushchev knew very well his hospitality was on trial, that if things went reasonably well with NIXON he would get his invitation from President Eisenhower. We were the guinea pigs for the pampered White House press corps; we learned a lot about news coverage in the U.S.S.R. and the Soviets learned a lot about our demanding ways.

There is a sinister postscript to this. At this moment in some Moscow bureau there is a dossier on every American reporter or photographer among the NIXON group. It contains a minute record, possibly augmented by infrared photographs of everything each visitor did during his stay in the U.S.S.R. It may also contain a transcript of everything he said.

The elevator never stops at the 12th floor of the new Ukraina Hotel which was built primarily for foreign visitors to Moscow. This is the tape-recording master control room where any suite in the huge edifice can be monitored through built-in microphones.

The secret police by no means bug every visitor around the clock. But they do know whom to watch, and they can tune in on you any time.

The NIXON newsmen were all given single rooms—a mark of luxury but also keeping them apart. Nobody gives out room numbers in Soviet hotels and ours were scattered all over.

On all group movements we were never out of earshot of an English-speaking Intourist guide or a so-called Soviet journalist, who seated themselves in an obviously prearranged pattern in every bus and plane.

Chances are nothing will ever come of these dossiers, but if anyone made a misstep in Novosibirsk under the illusion they were free and undetected, embarrassing evidence could turn up. It might be used for espionage blackmail, to deny future entry or in reprisal for a hostile account after leaving the country. All Western newsmen permanently in Moscow live under this sword, part of the psychological pressure which never lets up and is inexorably directed toward one goal proclaimed on every hand: "Victory for communism."

REALITY MASKED

"If you tell the truth about this place," one American warned me, "nobody back home is going to believe you. It's too utterly incredible, like life on another planet. But the Russians look like us and it's all wrapped up to look like a somewhat backward form of our society.

"It won't do you any good to try and explain this isn't so, because these guys are so smart they are sending home 5,000 Americans this year who'll tell their friends the Russians are really nice, sweet, somewhat inefficient people who like Americans and want peace. These Americans will even authenticate their accounts by saying some things are bad in the U.S.S.R., that while freedom for the Russians isn't anything like ours, they're getting more all the time. So don't waste your time trying to tell how it really is, they'll tag you for another McCarthy."

Panama Canal Zone: "Peaceful Occupation" Proposed for November 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a revealing news story about projected political plans now being agitated in Panama for November 3, 1959, the 56th anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Panama, was published in the July 14, 1959, issue of the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama.

The news story follows:

[From the Star & Herald, Panama, Republic of Panama, July 14, 1959]

"PEACEFUL OCCUPATION" OF CANAL ZONE PROPOSED FOR NOVEMBER 3

Two opposition politicians sounded a call this weekend for the "peaceful occupation" of the Canal Zone by Panamanians on November 3, 1959, Panama's independence anniversary.

The proposal came from Aquilino Boyd and Ernesto Castillero Pimentel, who also were the first to call for a 50-50 split of the gross income of the Panama Canal between the United States and Panama. Boyd is a former Foreign Minister; Castillero, a former Vice Foreign Minister.

Boyd, featured in a Sunday night radio program "Meet the Press," first broached the occupation idea, saying Panamanians should move into the Canal Zone on November 3 to plant flags. This would be a repetition, on a larger scale, of the "Operation Sovereignty" carried out on May 2, 1958, by university students.

In a prepared statement, Castillero furnished additional details yesterday. He said:

"We can imagine the spectacle. Once the (Nov. 3) parade is over, students and citizens, rather than devoting themselves to the usual festivities and diversions, will walk toward the Panamanian territory known as the Canal Zone, entering through the various streets and avenues, in good order, perhaps carrying national flags, and will occupy the zone symbolically (and effectively). They will sit down on the curbs of all the sidewalks, on the benches of all parks, on the steps of the Administration Building, under the palm trees of the Prado, under the shadow of the banyan trees, at portals, at churches, and in the stadium. Those with automobiles also will go, silently, scrupulously obeying all traffic regulations, without interfering with traffic. This cannot be an act of physical force nor of material violence. It will be a transcendental manifestation of national reaffirmation, a massive demonstration of the unbreakable unity among all Panamanians, without partisan distinctions, in support of the longed-for adjustments."

Castillero compared such a move to the passive resistance movement in India before World War II.

"The independence of India in those days was as utopic and remote as, for example, the ideal of the recovery of the canal by the Republic of Panama is at present. And I call it recovery because the canal once was ours, materially and juridically, from November

3, 1903, to February 26, 1904, the date of the exchange of ratification of the fateful Hay-Buneau Varilla Treaty."

Castillero added that after 56 years of negotiations, Panama has gained nothing. "It is necessary to open a new front—the front on the street, on the public park, on the zone * * *."

In his radio appearance Sunday, Boyd castigated Governor Potter for the latter's pronouncements on U.S. policy in the zone, saying the interpretation of treaties was not within the Governor's function. He added that he resigned as Foreign Minister in President Ernesto de la Guardia's Cabinet because his idea for the 50–50 split of the Canal's gross income was termed "not too realistic" by the administration's newspaper.

Pollution Problem Acute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, my compliments are extended to the Evening Journal, East St. Louis, Ill., for the timely and provocative editorial which it carried in its edition of Tuesday, August 25, 1959, on the subject of our water resources.

The editorial searches wisely for a more appropriate description of what is happening to the Nation's and world's supply than the inadequate word "pollution."

It predicts, and I feel compelled to agree with its prediction, that it is entirely possible that our civilization will drown in a sea of poisonous slime long before it perishes from the effects of radiation.

I have long been interested in the problem of meeting this very serious threat. I have, in the past, been among the original sponsors of legislation dealing with the subject. I have a strong feeling that we are not dealing with it seriously enough, and a far more extensive program should be encouraged by the Federal Government in this area.

The editorial follows:

POLLUTION PROBLEM ACUTE

While public health, government and civilian defense authorities ponder the dangers of radioactive fallout, and old problem poses an ever-increasing threat to our burgeoning population.

Water pollution is not a dramatic or agreeable subject. It is hard to get excited about sewers when there are more exotic dangers to worry about. But "pollution" is getting to be an inadequate word to describe the enormous quantities of detergents, pesticides, and industrial wastes being added to the sewage and garbage flow of cities, small and large.

For lack of adequate facilities, cities dump raw or only partially treated sewage into the nearest convenient river or lake, regardless of the fact that other communities also draw their drinking water from the same body of water.

Even the broad oceans are not free of the menace, and the problem is approaching crisis proportions on many of our major waterways. The Federal Government is pressing for control of pollution on several rivers, particularly the Missouri. Sioux City, Iowa, was enjoined last April from dumping raw sewage into the Big Muddy above Omaha, Nebr.

A Federal sewage control program, in effect since 1956, has stimulated construction, starts or authorization of more than 1,400 sewage treatment plants. A modest authorization of $50 million a year is allocated for Federal aid to community sewage treatment projects. Even this amount is not usually appropriated each year, partly because of the Eisenhower administration's hostility to Federal activity in this field.

Eastern rivers already are largely sewage and industrial waste conduits, devoid of marine life and too dangerous for swimming, boating, and other water sport. The Great Lakes, especially Erie and Ontario, are becoming more polluted each year as cities and rivers pour wastes into them.

Fishing has been wiped out in the Mississippi River for miles below St. Louis, because of sewage, garbage and industrial wastes from the metropolitan area. The pattern is repeated on most of the major rivers.

Usually any city located on a river treats polluted water it receives at a point below the water intake. The communities yet further downstream pay for this—with interest—in the form of still more elaborate water treatment projects.

The problem is becoming acute all over the world. Civilization's effluence destroys the aquatic food cycle on which sea animals depend—and seafood is still the staple diet of much of the world's population.

Radioactive fallout is a potential menace to mankind. Wastes from atomic reactors already contribute in no small measure to water pollution. But it is entirely possible that our civilization will drown in a sea of poisonous slime long before it perishes from the effects of radiation.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—III

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the fifth and sixth articles of a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the Los Angeles Times written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington bureau. Mr. Hartmann accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

The articles follow:

BIG BROTHER NEVER SLEEPS

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—Will it do any good for Premier Khrushchev to see the United States as it really is, in all its awesome industrial and farm productivity and widely distributed prosperity and political power? Neither Vice President NIXON nor anybody who accompanied him in the Soviet Union really knows.

But it would do every American good to see what NIXON saw in the U.S.S.R. though it was only a carefully controlled peep show into the forbidden cities of Siberia. At the very least, every American who has a responsibility for foreign policymaking or informing the U.S. public should go to the Soviet Union not once but several times.

STATE MANIPULATION

Difficult as it is to convey the incredible police authority and all-pervading manipulation of people by the Soviet state to anyone raised in a relatively free climate, it is worth trying. The key to the system is the same Pavlovian concept mentioned earlier in this series, a deliberate and systematic confusion of illusion and reality.

Thus in the Soviet Union one must always operate on suppositions, deductions, and educated guesses. It is never possible to check it out, or establish anything absolutely as truth. Even events within one's own sensual observations, and even they are deliberately distored by chronic fatigue. When, like a rat in a maze, one gets weary of this unrewarding search, Big Brother takes over and shows the way. It is, even for a foreign visitor, almost a relief.

Let me relate two versions of an incident which happened to me firsthand in Siberia, first the way I believe it happened; then the way I think the Soviet manipulators hoped I would conclude it happened.

HOW IT HAPPENED AS I SAW IT

Throughout the time the NIXON party was in the U.S.S.R., because of high-level orders to all cognizant officials, American newsmen were permitted to photograph freely anything they saw without interference.

In Sverdlovsk, where Soviet heavy industry was moved behind the Ural Mountains during World War II, the MVD is extremely sensitive, not about the rather antiquated machinery but because of a complete quarantine of the population from foreign contamination, not possible in Moscow.

After emerging from the tiresome trek through the pipe foundry, waiting by the press bus for NIXON to get in his Zis limousine I spotted a knot of Soviet workers standing a block from the crowded doorway where the Vice President was saying farewell to the plant officials. They were not trying to get any closer, so I walked over to try and talk with them and show some friendship.

CARDS CHECKED

As I got closer, I noticed that one man of obvious authority in civilian clothes was shaking down this group of workers, making each of them produce his red covered identification card which every Soviet citizen must carry at all times.

I was so curious about what was going on I forgot about the camera slung open around my neck until the plainclothesman swung around and saw me. The red cards instantly vanished and the group rapidly broke up.

As the MVD sauntered past me with studied casualness, I remarked: "We may not use our cameras, but we have eyes."

At the next stop, I used the last shot in my camera and reached in my coat pocket for one of the three rolls of film I had put there before leaving the hotel that morning. My pocket was empty.

"Somebody's swiped my film," I muttered, then remembered I had left two more rolls in a Pan American flight bag on the bus. Rushing to the bus, I unzipped the bag only to find the two rolls (which had never left that bag since New York) were also missing though lenses worth several hundred dollars were undisturbed. This all happened within 10 minutes after the MVD man checking unreliable workers thought I had snapped him in action. This is an area in which the Soviets are especially sensitive, and they can move fast when one of their own secret agents is concerned.

Knowing I was in danger of losing the remainder of my film supply or having it all fogged, if not in worse trouble, I at once loudly and publicly protested to NIXON'S

assistant and the AP and UPI reporters, saying the story that nobody steals in the U.S.S.R. is all propaganda, though I had previously believed it. Then I sat down to lunch.

PROTESTS USELESS

Georgi Bolshakov, former Tass bureau chief in Washington, came over and asked me what was the matter. I told him. I also told him that I knew very well nothing is stolen in Russia except on purpose, certainly not simultaneously from pocket and flight bag. I said I thought I knew why it was gathered up but truthfully denied that I took the MVD agent's picture.

"Perhaps you left it in your room," Georgi suggested helpfully. He had no immediate ideas about the two rolls that disappeared from the bus, however.

On the long ride back to the city our press bus was under strict orders not to stop. But there's a common humanity that defies rules, and at the urgent request of some passengers we did halt momentarily by a thicket of trees in the Siberian forest, almost exactly on the watershed that divides Europe and Asia.

FILM PASSED

Screened by foliage and 1,000 feet from the nearest Russian "guide," I swiftly passed the finished film from my camera to another American we shall call Jones. I didn't want to lose it, too, and sooner or later they'd discover it was the one they wanted, not my unused cartons.

Rushing to my room, I unlocked the door, and there on the bed were three rolls of film, apparently unopened. Perhaps I had forgotten to tuck them in my coat pocket when I left hurriedly. Maybe some of my American friends did help themselves to the two rolls on the bus.

I saw my Tass friend and thanked him for his quick work, saying I was willing to forget about the other two, as I might have been mistaken.

Two days later we returned to Moscow. There, some time during the night, two somewhat battered boxes of film turned up in the Pan American fight bag under my hotel bed.

My friend Jones was somewhat cold. He informed me that while in Sverdlovsk someone had stolen all the color film in his hotel room, but missed my exposed roll in his pocket.

HOW RUSSIANS HOPED I WOULD SEE IT

There is just as much freedom for visiting foreigners in the U.S.S.R. as anywhere else; amateur and news photography is permitted anywhere except in specific closed defense areas, for the Soviet people have nothing to hide.

In Sverdlovsk, as in some U.S. defense areas, guests are asked not to make photographs, but nobody seizes visitors' cameras as they do in America. They simply trust the guests not to take pictures inside the pipe foundry (the dumb Russians being unaware that it is at least 50 years behind the times and one couldn't care less about copying it).

While many Soviet workers crowded around to see the American visitor, they were not ordered to do so. Some were so little interested they simply stood apart talking among themselves and didn't particularly care about getting pushed around in the crowd just to say they had seen Vice President NIXON. After all, they were free to do as they liked on their guaranteed lunch hour, with pay.

SLANDEROUS LIE

Eager to find some evidence that would prove the slanderous lie written by American journalists that the loyal Soviet workers introduced to NIXON were selected "plants" primed with party-line questions, one of the visitors quit watching NIXON to snoop around behind the scenes.

The American journalist (who is not even a photographer, but has taken far too many pictures in the hope of discrediting Soviet progress) attempted to secretly photograph a plant security guard.

Ignorantly assuming that the security guard could not understand him the American cursed obscenely in English.

He used up his film and had forgotten to bring any more, having left it on his hotel bed while dressing. The Americans think they are very efficient, but they are not.

Instead of blaming himself, he at once sought to impugn the honesty of hardworking Soviet workers, who never steal anything because they have everything they need.

COLLEAGUES BLAMED

If anything was lost from the bag on the bus it was, after all, full of Americans (including many with 35-millimeter cameras who were running out of color film and begging it from their colleagues). They could have borrowed it even while the bus was under guard and nobody else allowed aboard. When the bus returns to the Bolshoi Ural Hotel, there will be the other three rolls, right where the journalist left them.

Not content to spread his fantasies and lies in the reactionary Los Angeles Times, he tried to spread them to the U.S. wire services and poison the good impression Vice President NIXON had received of Soviet hospitality and desire for peace and friendship with the United States.

WANTED TO BE HELPFUL

As a former Washington colleague and despite the allegation of many Americans that all Tass correspondents are spies and informers, Mr. Bolshakov merely wanted to be helpful when he saw the journalist in distress. He seemed tired, and Mr. Bolshakov diplomatically suggested that perhaps he planned to put the film in his pocket but never actually did so. At any rate, he said he would do what he could to help locate the missing film.

By now suffering hallucinations of persecution brought on by a guilt complex, the American journalist attempted to pass his film to another of his countrymen. This ruse did not accomplish anything since the Soviet authorities were not interested in the slightest in his fumbling amateur photographic efforts. The bus had been ordered to hurry back to the hotel so as to permit the correspondents time to file freely and without delay, as the Soviet authorities promised, and at the request of the Americans themselves, who were in a hurry to return.

Rushing to his room, he unlocked the door, and there, on the bed, were three rolls of film, quite untouched. They were just as he left them when he left hurriedly, and, as for the other two, either they were taken by other Americans or never existed.

JOURNALIST'S SNEERS

The American journalist apologized to his Soviet colleague but was unable to restrain himself from sneering about the two films stolen by his countrymen.

Upon returning to Moscow, where the American group had ample stocks of all kinds of U.S. film, the person who borrowed the two rolls on the bus returned them secretly to avoid embarrassment.

Clearly, this was nothing more than a coincidence, certainly not proof that thievery exists in the U.S.S.R., since none of the other Americans lost any film.

I may never know for certain which of the above versions is true. For one thing, the film has not been processed to see if anything is on it or if it has been fogged by X-rays, a favorite Soviet device. Even if it isn't, what does it prove? That one's imagination runs wild in the U.S.S.R.? Or that big brother is always watching you?

ASIAN-WESTERN CLASH AGE-OLD

(By Robert Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 20.—Ivan Ivanovitch is supposed to be the Russian counterpart of John Smith, just the plain ordinary guy who typifies his country regardless of passing regimes.

But there is a vast gulf between Ivan and his American and European brothers which romanticists—some in high places—seem to ignore when they say what we must do is reach the real Russian people in spite of their wicked government.

Ivan Ivanovitch, though he may be Tovarish (Comrade) Ivan today, is no less a product of Russia and Asia than John Smith, perhaps unknowingly, is the heir of Athenian philosophers, Semitic prophets, Viking pirates, Roman legionaries, Davy Crockett, and the Barons of Runnymede. Unfortunately, Asia (except for its peninsulas) is not as well known as Latin America to most American students.

The big conflict in the world today goes far deeper than communism versus capitalism or freedom verses regimentation. It is not a new conflict at all but a very old one magnified to global dimensions.

AGE-OLD BATTLE

It is the age-old battle of the land people against the sea people.

The land people have to scratch harder for existence than those who can, at least part of the year, farm the sea. They become tougher, hungrier, more indifferent to human life. To survive, to plunder and to protect what they have, the land people tend to think and act collectively, to follow a strong leader like a herd of sheep.

Historically, the human masses of Central Asia are known as hordes, but until one is swept up in the crush of a few hundred garlic-soaked Russian laborers—all headed for a single doorway—he doesn't really get the picture of what Genghis Khan's golden horde must have been.

It is no accident that the present borders of the Communist world from the China Sea to the "gates of Vienna" are substantially those of the Mongol hordes' greatest expansion from their central Asian homelands. That was the best the land people have done in history, but Khrushchev is out to do better with mechanized, industrialized, nuclear-armed horde of his own.

INDIVIDUAL EFFORT

The sea people, on the other hand, have developed along continental coasts and offshore islands and from the beginning their ways have called for individual and small group effort. Seafaring in tiny vessels and hunting with crude weapons cannot be done by a horde. The sea people have also lived by commerce and/or sea raiding, both of which contribute to cross-breeding of ideas, tools, cultures, and techniques. NATO is the current name for the community of the sea people just as communism designates the new horde.

Since the sea civilizes and invigorates human communities, the technically superior sea-people (except while fighting among themselves) have not been seriously threatened by the land-people since the Middle Ages produced spectacular advances in weaponry. The horde, however, has an effective defensive capability which has resisted and exhausted successive attacks on the land-people of Russia and China, though at fearful cost. As late as World War II and Korea the tactics of Communist armies were essentially those of the horde, augmented by tanks and artillery.

LATEST ATTEMPT

Communism as it works today in the U.S.S.R. shares little except its name with the economic analysis of history written by a German-Jewish atheist living in London 100 years ago. It is nothing more than the

latest and most systematic of many attempts by a ruthless and intelligent elite to hold the lid down on the surging masses of Asia, to organize and control the horde and direct its irresistible force toward global conquest.

Soviet communism differs from the rules of the Tartar Khans and the Russian Czars only in thoroughness; instead of depending primarily on terror and fear it seeks to penetrate and change the very minds of members of the horde so they will become manageable without losing their mass power.

Soviet communism disdains the dilettante efforts of Peter the Great and his successors, who wanted to be Europeans in architecture, court manners, and power politics. It aims to organize Asia with the industrial and military know-how of America. From this synthesis will come a unique new order, the Soviet society, to dominate the world.

This is what Khrushchev means, and what the Russian workers in Siberia mean when they cry, "Mir y mira" (peace to the world), and boast of Soviet cultural achievements. Their peace is like the peace of Islam—nonresistance to the will of the all-powerful (not Allah, but the Kremlin). Theirs is not the culture of the Acropolis, the Louvre, or Hollywood Bowl, but something akin to Herr Goebbel's "Kultur," in which the basic ingredient is not genius but conformity.

GRAVE ERROR

It would be a grave error to underestimate this latest surge of the silent, long-isolated land people, for Communist planners know the history of Asia far better than we and have studied the weaknesses of the sea people which they believe will lead to our undoing.

The individuality and free will instilled in the small boats, family cottages, and forest hideaways of the sea people from prehistoric times are to their mass-conditioned minds, evidence of undisciplined weakness. What we call liberty they regard as anarchy, and because of their isolation from the realities of the Western World, they see this as fatal disunity both within and among the free nations.

Khrushchev and his top associates cannot ignore the evidence of the recent past that free peoples and free alliances are capable of determined and united action in time of war. But they believe we are incapable of acting beyond individual self-interest in the absence of immediate and obvious peril. This is the key to the current peaceful coexistence campaign which will, like the cynical Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression pact which Khrushchev recently defended, give the Soviet Union more time to become both invulnerable and invincible.

TWO-STAGE PROGRAM

The Communist method of managing the horde is a two-stage program. The first step is "crowd control," which has been perfected to an amazing degree in the U.S.S.R. The second is "thought control," and the apparent relaxation since Stalin's death indicates that this much subtler and more sinister method of disciplining the mind rather than the body is being gradually substituted for sheer terror and police power. At the present stage both methods are used, but in such insulated and uncontaminated areas as Siberia, thought control is much more relied upon than in European Russia and the minority areas to the south.

Crowd control involves the effective management of the unmanageable horde by compartmenting it and by reinforcing official surveillance by indoctrinating everyone to watch everyone else. Thus Soviet planners are pushing their mass housing program with high prority everywhere; not only to satisfy the people with more modern and sanitary accommodations, but also to collect them in easily controlled increments. Collective farms, collective apartment houses with common bathrooms, kitchens, and restaurants, collective recreational facilities, collective educational and scientific institutions discourage individual thought and attempts to differ from acceptable group behavior.

When this reporter was in Russia 4 years ago he never saw as many as a dozen people idly assembled in public. They were always working, going somewhere, sitting in pairs in well-lighted parks, or attending scheduled events such as athletic meets or theater performances. The main idea seemed to keep moving.

MORE FREEDOM

This time there was more seemingly spontaneous and informal gathering, partly because of the balmy summer weather, but also because the ordinary Russian does feel more freedom and is less fearful of chance conversations or overhead complaints.

But with large assemblies the science of crowd control is still very much in evidence. For each of Vice President NIXON'S appearances, the numbers of cheering Russians were carefully regulated in advance—as they are for all visiting dignitaries and for Khrushchev's own public appearances. This is done in part to achieve the precise degree of welcome desired, and also because of the ever-present fear that too large a crowd will become unmanageable. (In Warsaw, the same technique was attempted, but didn't work.) This, rather than a sly effort to sabotage, probably accounts for the Soviet authorities limiting attendance at the American exhibition to 50,000 per day. Even at this rate, there is danger of the displays being slowly carried away by the human anthill hungering for knowledge and novelty.

READ DISPATCHES

The nearly 100 Western newsmen accompanying the Nixons provided the Soviet authorities with a day-by-day consensus of the success or failure of their efforts to create the desired crowd reaction. If they did not censor our dispatches, they certainly read them carefully and reacted swiftly.

On July 27 in Leningrad, our 5th day in the U.S.S.R., most Amercian correspondents reached that breaking point of exasperation which comes to all first-time visitors. Their cables home were full of angry accounts of frustration and Soviet inefficiency. In 24 hours, from the time the party landed at Novosibirsk, everything suddenly took a turn for the better. Press buses were waiting, hotel assignments were prearranged, telegraphic facilities were on all-night standby a block away, food was good, refreshments were lavishly provided, there was even a pressing and shoe-shining service "while you wait" at a tiny Siberian hotel where such a crew of Americans had never been seen before.

Similarly, when news stories sent to the United States the following day complained that Soviet journalists and "loyal workers" were crowding so close around NIXON, assisted by his MVD security guards, that American newsmen couldn't get within earshot, we were astonished the next day to find manhandling MVD agents smilingly stepping back to let us walk alongside the Vice President while they held the Russians back.

There was even a "spontaneous public demonstration" in the central square of Novosibirsk in which the press bus was mobbed by several thousand Russians to show how welcome was the free American press.

Can We Set "Safe" Tolerances for Cancer-Inducing Agents?—Comments by Dr. Harold F. Blum of National Cancer Institute

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the Senate, on a routine call of the calendar, and without a record vote, passed a far-reaching bill on the use of coal-tar colors and other coloring substances in and on food. It is S. 2197, the proposed Color Additives Amendments of 1959, to authorize the establishment by the Food and Drug Administration of safe tolerances for coal-tar or other coloring substances which are not harmless under the terms of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938.

Demands for such legislation have been increasing among food manufacturers as a result of a combination of court decisions on the one hand and of new testing techniques which now disclose that a number of coal-tar colors used for years under the impression they were harmless no longer can meet that requirement.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has urged enactment of legislation such as contained in S. 2197, and experts from the Food and Drug Administration, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and representatives of the food and chemical industries sat down to draft mutually acceptable amendments to the bill as originally introduced. I am informed no hearings were held on this legislation, however. Now that it has passed the Senate, I understand efforts are being made in behalf of the food and chemical industries to have it scheduled for early action by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO BE INFORMED ON TECHNICAL MATTERS INVOLVED

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that all of us who are interested in the issues this legislation presents should inform ourselves on the details of this legislation. I am reminded that only last March we had a prolonged debate and rollcall vote on special legislation on the use of an other-than-"harmless" coal-tar color, Citrus Red No. 2, on the skin of oranges. Many of us had strong misgivings about the authorized use on a food product of a coloring substance which is not harmless, even though we were assured it is safe in the manner and in the volume used on oranges.

Mr. Speaker, although I took an active role in the legislative drive which led to the Food Additives Act in the last Congress, and although I spoke on and voted against the Citrus Red No. 2 bill we

passed in March, I am the first to acknowledge that I am not a scientist, not a chemist, not a physiologist—and that on these complex technical issues we who are not scientists must weigh and balance the conflicting views and statements of people who do have technical competence.

I am always trying to find reliable scientific information in this field of food chemistry but the difficulty is to be able to understand it when it is available. In this connection, a good friend of mine from St. Louis recently suggested that I look into the studies of a physiologist of the National Cancer Institute who had, she said, published an outstanding paper on the cumulative effects of certain carcinogens.

For the information of the Members, Mr. Speaker, I now include as part of my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the letter which I wrote to Dr. Harold F. Blum of the U.S. Public Health Service's National Cancer Institute and his reply, both of which are self-explanatory and, in the case of Dr. Blum's letter, well worth reading, I believe:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 17, 1959.

Dr. HAROLD F. BLUM,
National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. BLUM: A friend of mine in St. Louis, who is a very active member of the St. Louis Consumer Federation, has written me that she thinks your article in the June issue of American Scientist is the best answer to the question of whether tolerances should be set for coal tar colors in foodstuffs. She warned me, however, that the article is very technical.

Could I have a brief statement in as nontechnical language as possible on the dangers of allowing continued use in or on food—even in very low amounts—of coal tar colors found not in fact to be "harmless." I am interested in this from the standpoint of overall color legislation and such special bills as the one to permit continued use of Yellow 3 and 4 in butter, etc.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,
LEONOR K. (Mrs. JOHN B.) SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress, Third District of Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
Bethesda, Md., August 25, 1959.

Hon. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: This is in answer to your letter of August 17, in which you refer to my article in the June issue of American Scientist, and its bearing on the question of tolerance for coal tar colors in foodstuffs with regard to cancer.

The article (Quantitative aspects of cancer induction and growth; as illustrated in carcinogenesis by ultraviolet light) is based on experimental studies of cancer caused in mice by repeated doses of ultraviolet light. It permits certain conclusions to be drawn regarding the origin and growth of cancers induced in this way. Since comparable studies have not been made using coal tar derivatives or other substances as cancer inducing agents, I cannot say with complete certainty that the same conclusions apply. But what evidence exists, suggests that continued dosage with such agents produce similar results, and I think that until further evidence is forthcoming we are justified in assuming the cases to be parallel.

If this point of view is adopted, cancer induction is to be regarded as a cumulative process which begins with the first dose of the cancer-inducing agent. Whether the cancer will reach detectable size within the lifetime of the animal in which it is induced, must depend upon how fast the cancer grows. Thus, a cancer induced by a single or a few doses of the agent may grow so slowly that it will never be detected, and of course will not seriously affect the animal. If the dosage is continued, however, cancer growth will speed up, and the cancer will reach detectable size before the animal dies. In the case of cancer induced by the more effective chemical agents, a single dose, if large enough, will result in a detectable cancer; but we do not have adequate knowledge of the effect of repeated small doses.

It is probable that there is a "threshold dose" for every cancer inducing agent, that is, a minimum dose below which no cancer is produced; but you can see that it would be very difficult to determine such a threshold if it exists. All one could hope to say would be that a given small dose did not produce cancers in a given kind of animal—say the mouse—within the lifetime of that animal. But one would be without any basis for assuming that this minimum dose applied to any other kind of animal—say man. Thus I cannot see how we have any sound basis for assigning tolerance doses or tolerance levels for cancer-inducing agents. I think this must be the case, whether or not the agent in question produces results exactly comparable to those produced by ultraviolet light.

Viewed in this way it would seem that the only practical answer would be to keep any substances known to induce, or suspected of inducing cancer at as low levels as feasible. The assigning of tolerance limits—which must necessarily be arbitrary—can only give a false sense of security.

I must point out again that these conclusions are, for the most part, based on studies of an agent other than those to which you refer specifically in your letter, and hence may not be completely justified. But until experimental studies have shown that similar relationships do not hold for chemical substances of the kind in which you are interested, I think one is justified in assuming that they do.

I hope that this brief statement will have made my point of view clear. The details of the argument, summed up only briefly in the article you mention, are too technical to present in short space. What I have said here, follows, I think, the experimental data, without bringing in theoretical points that might be more open to question.

I hope that this brief discussion will have answered your questions satisfactorily, but if there are points which I can help to clarify further, I shall be pleased to in so far as I am able.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD F. BLUM,
Physiologist, National Cancer Institute.

Report on the U.S.S.R.—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the concluding two articles of a series of eight articles which appeared recently in the Lose Angeles Times written by Mr. Robert T. Hartmann, chief of the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau. Mr. Hartmann accompanied Vice President NIXON on his recent tour of the U.S.S.R. and Poland.

The articles follow:

KHRUSHCHEV HAS LIMITED HORIZON

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Nikita Khrushchev, Chairman of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. and first secretary of the Communist Party, has good reason to feel he is riding the wave of the future.

He got his invitation to the United States, for which he has been angling since his London visit with Marshal Bulganin (whatever became of him?) in 1955, and he is going to get his second summit meeting after outliving the late John Foster Dulles, who thought the first one a bad mistake.

At 64, his tanned, robust appearance belies rumors of ill health. I watched him drink toasts in vodka, whisky, and California champagne, but he showed no signs of the babbling alcoholic part he once played. Vice President NIXON found him sufficiently blunt and outspoken while cold sober, and less impetuous than many observers suppose.

HAS SEEN BOOM

Khrushchev has seen his country boom, as all backward societies boom at the point in their industrialization when making machines to make machines begins to give way to making machines to make useful products. He takes the credit for it, being a superb politician, and in return appears to have won a measure of real popularity with the Russian people which Stalin never sought or got.

Now he is going to see the United States—including Los Angeles—since he discussed his itinerary with a prominent southern Californian—and he is going to be President Eisenhower's host in the Kremlin. What will this momentous exchange accomplish, and why was it agreed to so suddenly?

TO KEEP RUSS TALKING

In part, it is simply an effort to keep the Soviet Union talking instead of taking one-sided action over West Berlin. The Geneva foreign ministers' talks dribbled off to an inconclusive end, as everyone expected—especially Mr. K., who never intended to let Gromyko settle anything except the time of tomorrow's meeting. Moreover, the invitation is an attempt to impress Khrushchev—the real decision maker in all important matters affecting the Communist hemisphere—with the realities of American power as well as its peaceful intent.

President Eisenhower and his advisers evidently feel that the Mikoyan and Kozlov visits—especially the latter—did break down some Soviet misconceptions about the only nation in the world they regard as really a rival.

But in the consensus of many Americans who have watched Khrushchev closely in his swift consolidation of Stalin's power there is only a very, very long chance of making a very, very small dent in his diametrically different mind.

TRUE BELIEVER

Khrushchev is not using communism as a means to power, as did Lenin, or for the cynical perpetuation of personal despotism, as Stalin did. He is a true believer in the system which brought him success but he is not a Marxist intellectual devoted to sterile dogma that cannot be altered. He has already made sweeping reforms in decentralization of bureaucracy and in agricultural planning. He has a practical peasant's

shrewdness and limited horizon. He is quick-witted and extroverted, but utterly without a sense of sportsmanship or compassion.

Most Western visitors have been struck by Khrushchev's unbelievably inaccurate picture of the United States, though he is thoroughly aware of its industrial and military potential in a statistical way. He has, after all, one of history's most extensive intelligence networks; he is not above learning or asking advice from such close subordinates as Kozlov and Mikoyan, though probably his inner circle is quite limited.

UNAFFECTED BY TALK

Khrushchev is totally unaffected by "sweetness and light"—the kind of international small talk which has been President Eisenhower's long suit since World War II. There is not much evidence after NIXON's 11 hours of hot-and-heavy debate in public and private that he is any more affected by argument.

What he wants is a trade, in which he gets the best of it if he can. Nobody is likely to get anything from Khrushchev—which is to say from the Soviet Government—unless they give him something he wants. Pure self-interest, not in the vain personal sense that drove Nero and Hitler mad but the interest of his own and the world Communist goal (which must be identical in the fully conditioned Soviet man), is all that counts with Mr. K.

Quid pro quo, the direct trade by which all transactions between hostile camps must be made, is the only way to do business with Khrushchev.

BASES BIG ISSUE

What does he want the United States to give? The most frequently heard topic on the Nixon journey was American bases in foreign countries. "Why do you keep such bases if not to attack us?" the Vice President and every American with him was asked by everyone from Khrushchev down. The Premier, in fact, put it this simply: Anyone who favors bases wants war, anyone who is against bases (American bases, that is) is on the side of peace.

While the Captive Nations Week resolution also upset the Soviets, who seized upon it as a convenient needle for NIXON, Khrushchev is well aware that the United States is not going to liberate the Eastern European satellites by force. Hungary proved this fact and pretty well fixed the line between the two worlds, though the Communists are still pushing for something like the Rapacki plan (advanced by Poland's foreign minister) to pull back military forces on both sides of the borderline—which gets right back to the "U.S. bases must go" business.

AT BIG DISADVANTAGE

NIXON was at a severe disadvantage in his encounters with Khrushchev because it had been publicly announced in advance that he had no authority to negotiate and the President had privately opened negotiations on an exchange of top-level visits before NIXON arrived. The Vice President did give Khrushchev a preview of the kind of arguments to expect in America and took home a fair sample of the line the Soviet leader is likely to be peddling over here.

It can be reasonably assumed that neither man changed his mind much on any major East-West difference; both, however, probably modified their impressions of each other. An extra bonus was NIXON's opportunity to get some of his views across to the Soviet people via Khrushchev's own network and newspapers, but this was essentially a long-range and longshot endeavor.

FIRSTHAND LOOK

Khrushchev's firsthand look at the United States, in the judgment of those who helped counsel such a step, will be most effective if it convincingly demonstrates America's will to stand firm for its principles and power positions. Khrushchev frankly doubts that such will exists and unfortunately there is much corroborating evidence in each day's Western newspapers. He is quite respectfully aware of U.S. power—of the NATO sword—but he doesn't think the flabby arm will ever be strong enough to wield it.

NIXON countered that view with straight talk which Khrushchev repeatedly objected to as "threats". But the Vice President deliberately made it clear the United States will not be pushed around and said both publicly and privately that no nation should ever be put in a position where it has no choice but to fight. He didn't use the word "Berlin," but it was understood.

On the other hand, the Vice President tried to assure Khrushchev that the United States has no designs on the U.S.S.R. itself; no plan to liberate adjacent Communist-dominated areas by force. He tried to appeal over his head for more consumer goods for the Soviet people and a sort of Russia-for-the-Russians development under communism if that's how they want it. Such an appeal runs directly counter to the dynamic nature of doctrinaire communism, but there is a bare chance that Mr. Khrushchev might settle for a century of internal development if actually convinced the alternative is nuclear devastation without a moment's moral hesitation and regardless of reprisal.

COEXISTENCE ISN'T ANSWER

(By Robert T. Hartmann)

WASHINGTON, August 22.—Despite the apparent thawing of the cold war beginning in 1955 and climaxed by Vice President NIXON's ice-breaking mission to Moscow and the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev visits, the United States and the Soviet Union are still the polar centers of two completely different worlds.

In seven preceding articles this reporter has not attempted to detail the superficial contrasts between Communist life and what we call western civilization. Instead he has tried to show the deep and fundamental gulf between the mentality of the human horde—the land people of Central Asia—and the individualistic sea people who up to this time has dominated the world.

This prehistoric difference, amounting almost to a division of species, is obscured by such surface affinities as similarity of clothing and skin color, by words which in translation appear to express the same concepts and by the deliberate efforts of the Russian Communists to pattern their productive plant and material achievement after those of America.

HASN'T PROVED SUCCESS

The Soviet system of managing the mass manpower of Asia has not yet proved a total success; in four decades, however, it has achieved such impressive and visible results as to intrigue kindred land people seeking a shortcut to economic equality with the sea people, some of whom have been their masters. This is why Moscow impresses the unending stream of delegates and students from Asia and Africa far more than it does a sophisticated European or American tourist. It makes Lenin's prophecy that "the road to Paris runs through Peiping" take on new and fearful meaning.

When this all-pervading difference of thought, tradition, aim, and action is understood—even half-appreciated—many questions as to why the Soviet Union behaves as it does answer themselves. It explains the almost insurmountable barrier to even the most elementary communication which exists between the inhabitants of the two worlds from the humblest level all the way to the summit. The summit itself embraces quite opposite ideas of political power vested in a constitutional president or prime minister and a Soviet boss.

Yet, we do live on one and the same planet and must therefore answer the ultimate question: Is it large enough for both of us?

It would be a neat and comforting conclusion to be able to answer this question with certainty. The Communists, who have an absolute answer for everything, have already composed theirs. Our planet—and perhaps other planets eventually—will one day be organized into a single Soviet society. In the meantime, until the inevitability of Socialist truth is everywhere recognized, a period of peaceful coexistence may be required.

In short and simple English this means "it's us or you and it's going to be us." The only possible response to it is the same resolution.

ONE OR OTHER

Either the free way of life will encompass the earth or there will be no life left on earth to worry about. When jets fly nonstop from New York to Moscow as we did in less than 9 hours this is just as true as Lincoln's declaration about a "house divided" was on the eve of the American Civil War.

In this reporter's opinion, there is only one line to take toward the Soviet Union, as the guiding center of an historic upsurge of hordes of land people which has communism as its current name. We must either lick them or join them. Coexistence is at best an interim truce and never a solution. Khrushchev & Co. know this, but do we?

We must lick them, without war if possible, exactly as they are determined to lick us without war if possible, but lick us in any case.

MUST UNDERSTAND PROBLEM

How do we go about this? First of all, we need to understand what we are up against. Let me be the first to confess that when it was announced Vice President NIXON was going to Novosibirsk and Sverdlovsk I—and I am sure many of my colleagues who write important foreign policy news daily from Washington—had to look on a map to locate these places. Yet both are cities of more than 750,000 people, laboring mightily to build a new society on the ruins of ours.

There has been much talk recently about foreign languages—Russian is being introduced in a few more U.S. high schools and colleges. But the U.S.S.R. is turning out thousands of students annually trained to speak English—and Urdu and Indonesian and Spanish and Arabic and Zwahili and Japanese.

NOT PREPARED

Americans are not only colossally ignorant of Russia. They are not properly prepared to uphold their own way of life and to preach it to others. Every Communist gets this militant indoctrination from childhood. The newsmen in NIXON's party found themselves unofficial defenders of the faith of free men in almost every conversation with Soviet citizens. But the right words at first were hard to find, since these concepts are taken so much for granted by all of us and, fundamentally, throughout most of the world we know.

We must make a massive effort to leaven Soviet society with at least a touch of the spirit of free inquiry in the hope that someday it will leaven the whole lump. It may not, but we must believe in the triumph of human intelligence as thoroughly as the Communist mass managers believe in the triumph of Pavlovian psychology.

PREPARE INTELLECTUALLY

There isn't any other choice but to prepare ourselves intellectually as well as militarily for years and decades and perhaps even centuries of tough confict and compe-

tition with these vigorous people who are resolved to bury us. Our aim must not be to bury them but to raise them from their living graves.

Americans who travel to Russia or anywhere else where the battle may be joined must know what they are talking about, must know what to say, must never yield a foot of ground to the superbly prepared Communist or Communist-influenced adversary. We have been sending too many patsies with U.S. passports to see the Kremlin.

In the U.S.S.R., it's plain that the war on men's minds has as high a priority as intercontinental missiles; indeed, the missiles' primary purpose may be their effect on our minds rather than upon our cities. The Communists never send a soldier into the idea war without thorough training and full equipment, while we are still mustering minutemen to return their fire with muskets.

As NIXON demonstrated effectively, it is not enough merely to answer the kind of questions which are fired as bullets—not to elicit information but to destroy. Americans must return fire without falling back, must counterattack with even more devastating questions about the new order of Communist conformity. There are channels of "scuttlebutt" and word-of-mouth transmission throughout the Soviet empire by which some of these questions will be relayed.

All of this is more easily said than done, to be sure. But having seen a little of it done by our Vice President, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Admiral Rickover, and most of the other Americans who invaded Siberia for a few days, I know it can be done and must be done.

Mr. Khrushchev dosn't think we care that much. He could be right.

Congress Sideswipes the Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in Business Week of August 22, 1959, entitled "Congress Sideswipes the Treasury."

This is as clear a statement of the political aspects of the fiscal fiasco into which the leaders of the 86th Congress have permitted the relatively simple question of interest ceilings for Federal bonds to fall as I have read. The leaders of this Democratic controlled Congress should take heed and take corrective action before more damage is done to the fiscal integrity of the Federal Government.

The article follows:

CONGRESS SIDESWIPES THE TREASURY

The House Ways and Means Committee has turned down, for this session at least, the administration's request to lift the interest rate ceiling on sales of new Treasury bonds.

This move came after the committee had passed a compromise bill that would have given the Treasury what it wanted. The trouble was that Congress would not accept the compromise. A large group of congressmen—in both the Senate and the House—are critical of the Federal Reserve Board and its Chairman, William McC. Martin. They balked at passing a bill that did not contain some sort of stricture on the Fed; unable to get their way, they worked to have the bill shelved.

This hurts the Treasury more than it does the Fed. For with the Fed pursuing a tight credit policy, outstanding Government issues are selling to yield well above the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest on bonds. If it must confine itself to selling short-term securities, the Treasury will not only force up interest rates but create a potentially inflationary situation.

Congress refusal to act emphasizes the Treasury's subordination to the Fed—rather than giving it greater flexibility and independence. As long as their hands are tied by the ceiling, the debt managers lack the freedom possessed by the money managers.

Thus, the Treasury has become the unwitting and unhappy victim of Congress pique with the Fed. This is the worst kind of politics, because the end result is tighter money and higher interest rates than ever. The Fed can feel justified in going to an even more restrictive policy on the grounds that demand for short-term funds will now be stronger than ever; and the Treasury has no other choice than to float short-term issues. At the same time, investors in U.S. savings bonds are likely to cash them in if short-term rates rise above long-term rates.

There is no doubt that Martin's stubborn attitude has a great deal to do with creating the impasse. But he feels, understandably, that the independence of the Fed is threatened. And he has made one telling point. He has challenged his critics in Congress to make clear the kind of directives that they want the Fed to abide by and proposed that these should be offered as an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act, thus giving Congress as a whole a chance to vote directly on the issue. This would not involve the Treasury but would be a separate fight.

Martin's critics, however, have not taken this challenge. Instead, they have vented their displeasure by turning down the Treasury.

Congress should reconsider the whole problem. Most Congressmen favor giving the Treasury greater flexibility, and should do so. If the attitude of the Fed, which is an agent of Congress, is not all it should be, then Congress can address itself to this problem separately. But for Congress to penalize the Treasury because it is displeased with the Fed is neither politically wise nor economically sound.

Now more than ever, the Nation needs a searching review and reappraisal of our fiscal and monetary system. In the meantime, Congress should consider a minimum program, one that would help the Treasury rather than hurt it.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*	Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*	Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*	6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*	
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*	
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*	
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*	
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*	
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*	
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*	
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*	The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*	
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*	
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*	The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*	Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*	
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*	
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*	4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*	2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*	
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*	
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*	
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*	
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*	
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*	
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*	
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*	
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*	
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*	5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*	
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*	3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*	
Fong, Hiram L, *Hawaii*	
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*	
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*	
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*	
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*	
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*	University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*	
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*	
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*	
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*	
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*	
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*	5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*	
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*	Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*	
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*	
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*	
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*	
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*	
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*	
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*	
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*	3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*	4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*	
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*	
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*	
Langer, William, *N. Dak.*	2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*	
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*	
Long, Russell B., *La.*	
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*	2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*	
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*	
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*	
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*	The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*	
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*	4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*	
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*	4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*	
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*	
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*	122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*	The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*	
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*	
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*	Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*	
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*	
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*	
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*	
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*	
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*	
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*	2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*	
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*	
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*	
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*	
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*	4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*	
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*	
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*	
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*	
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*	2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*	
Williams, John J., *Del.*	
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*	
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*	Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*	

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Martin.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, and Prouty.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Nationwide Demand To Limit Postal Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 4, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I introduced H.R. 8433, a bill to place an annual limitation on publishers' second-class mail subsidies. The bill has since been introduced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] as H.R. 8603 and is cosponsored in the Senate by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] as S. 2536.

The purpose of this measure is to require that the annual postage paid by second-class publications be equal to the Post Office Department's annual cost of handling, processing, transporting, and delivering of the publication to its mail subscribers, subject to a 5-year sliding-scale subsidy limitation formula. A maximum $5 million subsidy per publication would be permitted during the first year of operation, a $3 million subsidy the second year, a $1 million subsidy the third year, a $500,000 subsidy the fourth year, and during the fifth year and thereafter a maximum $100,000 a year subsidy per publication.

As I explained in my introductory remarks—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 28, 1959, pages 13275–13279—profitmaking newspapers and magazines are now incurring an annual postal deficit of more than $200 million. The administration proposes to reduce the size of the tremendous postal deficit, estimated at close to $500 million for fiscal 1960, by raising first-class mail from 4 to 5 cents an ounce, despite the fact that this type of mail is more than paying its own way. If the Post Office Department is genuinely concerned with reducing the postal deficit, it will support our bill and submit a favorable report to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee so that hearings may be held early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, since the introduction of H.R. 8433, I have been overwhelmed by mail from all parts of the country in support of postal subsidy limitation legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a representative group of news stories, editorials, and mail support for this measure:

[From the Reading, Pa., Eagle, July 28, 1959]

RHODES BILL WOULD CUT MAIL SUBSIDIES FOR PUBLICATIONS

WASHINGTON, July 28.—Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat of Pennsylvania, proposed legislation today to cut postal subsidies to large newspapers and magazines. He said they now cost the taxpayers more than $200 million a year.

Rhodes' bill, being introduced today, calls for a gradual reduction in subsidies over a 5-year period.

It would put a $5 million limit the first year on the subsidy to any newspaper and magazine over and above the Post Office Department's cost of handling the publications.

The limit would drop to $3 million the second year, $1 million in the third, $500,000 in the fourth, and $100,000 in the fifth and all succeeding years.

Rhodes compared his proposal to limitations placed on soil bank payments and farm price support loans.

"These publications which benefit most from postal subsidy handouts have been extremely critical of the cotton, wheat, and other farm programs," he said in a statement. "Therefore, they cannot honestly and consistently oppose this legislation."

Rhodes cited Life Magazine as an example of the extent of subsidies to large publications using second class mail. He said post office figures showed that it cost the Department $9,400,000 more to deliver the magazine than Life paid in second-class mail rates in 1956.

The House last year approved an amendment by Rhodes to limit second class mail subsidies to $100,000 a year, but the Senate rejected it by a 57 to 33 vote.

The Pennsylvania Congressman said publishers objected then that the amendment would have too much of an immediate economic impact upon their businesses.

He contended that his new bill would overcome that objection through a gradual reduction in subsidies.

The Berks Democrat vigorously opposed the administration's request for another 1 cent increase in first-class mail, which he termed "an obvious attempt to hide the huge deficits resulting from subsidizing profitmaking newspapers and magazines.

If the post office department is genuinely concerned with reducing the tremendous postal deficit, estimated at close to $500 million for fiscal 1960, it will support this bill," Congressman RHODES concluded.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 29, 1959]

BILL WOULD CUT POSTAL SUBSIDY TO PUBLICATIONS

WASHINGTON, July 28.—Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat, of Reading, Tuesday introduced legislation in the House to place a 5-year sliding-scale limitation on mail subsidies to large magazines and newspapers, which now cost taxpayers more than $200 million a year.

Citing a Philadelphia Inquirer editorial of June 25, 1959, which urged an end to magazine subsidies by the Post Office Department, RHODES called for a limit of Government handouts to publishers.

Under the Rhodes bill each magazine and newspaper using second-class mail would be limited to a maximum subsidy of $5 million in the first year over and above the Post Office Department's cost of handling and delivering the publication.

The maximum second-class mail subsidy would be $3 million for each publication during the second year, $1 million during the third year, $500,000 during the fourth year, and $100,000 during the fifth year and each year thereafter.

When the subsidy limit is reached by any publication during any year, the full rate necessary to cover the Post Office Department's costs for that publication would go into effect.

Ten magazines listed by RHODES have received subsidies exceeding $32 million in 1956. The largest was $9,494,000 and the smallest $1,130,000.

The Inquirer editorial labeled as unfortunate the Eisenhower administration's proposal to again raise first-class mail and air rates. The Inquirer also opposes subsidies to newspapers.

[From the Yuma (Ariz.) Daily Sun July 29, 1959]

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By Jones Osborn)

This business of subsidies is a touchy one in many quarters.

The last time I mentioned farm subsidies, I was told to give my attention to airline subsidies instead.

But there is one form of subsidy that can be discussed without treading on local toes:

The postal subsidy to large newspapers and magazines.

Congressman RHODES, a Democrat, from Pennsylvania, says postal subsidies are costing the taxpayers more than $200 million a year.

RHODES cited Life magazine.

He said postal accountants have figured that it costs Uncle Sam $9 million more to deliver the magazine than Life paid in mail rates in 1956.

So RHODES yesterday introduced a bill calling for a gradual reduction in subsidies over a 5-year period.

The first year, his bill would limit the subsidy to any newspaper or magazine to $5 million.

The second year, $3 million.

One million in the third year.

A half-million the fourth year.

And from the fifth year on, no publication would be allowed more than a $100,000 annual subsidy.

There's another side to this, of course. That is the wish of early Americans to disseminate information about this country's Government and affairs to all citizens, that they might govern themselves more intelligently. And so second-class postal rates for publications were kept low.

But I doubt if our early lawmakers ever expected to put $5 million a year into anyone's pocket.

[From Editor and Publisher magazine, Aug. 1, 1959]

SUBSIDY ON SECOND-CLASS HIT

WASHINGTON.—A proposal to eliminate the subsidy on second-class mail through a 5-year sliding scale for increased rates has been made to Congress by Representative GEORGE M. RHODES, a former printer and labor union executive.

Mr. RHODES contends the larger magazines and newspapers enjoy a $200 million gift from the taxpayers each year. He proposes that limitations be made on each publication to bring rates ultimately to the level of cost-of-service as determined by the Post Office Department. No publication would be carried in the first year for more than

$5 million under the determined cost figure; the figure would drop to $3 million, $1 million, $500,000, and $100,000 in subsequent years. The full rate would apply to overage at each of these stages.

The House voted for the Rhodes "subsidy" reduction last year: $100,000-a-year limit on any company's charges below cost-of-service. The Senate refused to concur.

Mr. RHODES contends increase in mass media and in travel and educational opportunity has obviated the basis on which subsidies were originally granted to printed matter. In any event, he told colleagues, publishers would pass the added costs on to subscribers instead of to the taxpaying public generally. The Pennsylvania Democrat has inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a tabulation showing costs of carrying certain second-class material, amounts paid to the Post Office Department, and losses allegedly sustained. All of the illustrations concern nationally circulated magazines.

[From the Lewiston (Mont.) Daily News, Aug. 2, 1959]

SAUCE FOR THE GANDER

Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, has proposed legislation to cut postal subsidies to large newspapers and magazines which he says now cost the taxpayers more than $200 million a year.

The Rhodes bill would put a $5 million limit the first year on mail subsidy to any publication over and beyond the Post Office Department's cost of handling. The limit would drop in succeeding years to $100,000.

We couldn't agree with Congressman RHODES more.

Some of the larger magazines in this country such as Life have been subsidized long enough. It is one thing for the post office to grant special rates to small weekly newspapers which are struggling to meet their costs and provide news and grassroots editorials to rural folk. It is something else to subsidize Life to the tune of millions annually when that publication is well able to pay its way.

Mr. RHODES in fact cites Life as a prime example. He points out that it cost the taxpayers $9,400,000 in 1956 to help circulate this magazine giant.

Life has been extremely critical of the parity farm program and has consistently denounced Government payments to wheat farmers as handouts. But the so-called "handout" this powerful national magazine begrudges the farmers, it is more than willing to take for itself.

Here is but another dismal example of Government economy being a good thing for the other fellow.

The Rhodes bill deserves to be enacted into law, Life and Mr. Luce to the contrary notwithstanding.

[From Labor, Aug. 8, 1959]

TWO HUNDRED MILLION DOLLARS IN HANDOUTS—RENEWS FIGHT TO CUT BIG SUBSIDIES TO MAGAZINES

A new drive to curb the huge mail subsidies enjoyed by big magazines and newspapers has been launched by Congressman GEORGE M. RHODES, Democrat, Pennsylvania. These subsidies exceeded $200 million a year, RHODES told the House last week.

Life magazine alone gets a $9.4 million yearly subsidy, RHODES said. That's based on the Post Office Department's latest estimate of how much the cost of delivering Life exceeds the second-class postage paid by the magazine.

RHODES cited the yearly cost of postal subsidies to some other big magazines as follows: Saturday Evening Post, $6.1 million; Reader's Digest, $4.8 million; Look, $3.5 million; Ladies' Home Journal, $1.9 million; McCall's, $1.5 million; National Geographic, $1.3 million; Good Housekeeping, $1.3 million.

These figures date back several years, RHODES noted. Since then, he said, the magazines' circulations have increased, "thereby adding to the subsidy they receive."

RHODES introduced a bill providing that the mail subsidy received by any magazine or newspaper shall be gradually reduced to a $100,000 yearly maximum. He noted that this would sharply cut the annual postal deficit.

In contrast, President Eisenhower has asked Congress to raise the postage from 4 cents to 5 cents on letter mail—which already more than pays its way. Ike's proposal, said RHODES, "is nothing more than an obvious attempt to hide the huge deficit resulting from subsidizing profit-making newspapers and magazines."

RHODES' bill was referred to the House Post Office Committee, where little action is expected. However, other ways may be found to bring the subject to the floor of Congress.

INCONSISTENCY CITED

Two years ago, a largely similar measure by RHODES passed the House. But it was then killed in the Senate, RHODES recalled, after "the magazine publishers' lobby conducted an intensive behind-the-scenes campaign against it."

RHODES noted also that the big magazines and newspapers have "carefully kept from their readers" information about their postal subsidies. Yet, he said, "these publications which benefit most from postal subsidy handouts have been extremely critical of the cotton, wheat and other farm programs."

"It is not easy," RHODES said, "to advocate the elimination of any subsidy, particularly one which affects the powerful newspaper and magazine industry. But the time has come, in fact it is long overdue, for Congress to show some courage."

[From the Publishers' Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., Aug. 8, 1959]

RHODES ASKS END TO POST OFFICE SUBSIDIES

WASHINGTON.—That old song about you take the high road will be sung by the mass circulation magazines with some new lyrics if Representative GEORGE M. RHODES (Democrat, of Pennsylvania) has his way.

RHODES wants to take the subsidies for the large magazines and newspapers out of postal rates.

According to the new Rhodes bill, postal subsidies would be limited to large publications to $100,000 a year after 4 years. Publications would be forced to pay their full cost of handling, as ascertained by the Post Office.

RHODES was unsuccessful in 1957 when he sought to pare publication subsidies. He did get his 1957 version adopted on the House floor, but it was killed by the Senate.

The present bill would be costly to the magazine industry. Life alone would be required to pay more than $9 million a year in additional postage.

Representative RHODES told the House that "latest figures show that it cost the Department some $9,400,000 a year to deliver Life magazine than the publication paid in second-class mail rates."

Life magazine, which several years ago made a study of the out-of-pocket cost to the Post Office of delivering each copy of the magazine, disputes RHODES' claim.

In the new Rhodes bill, amount of subsidy would be determined by data developed under the Postal Policy Act of 1958, which requires the Post Office to report to Congress every 2 years on the costs of handling various classes of mail.

RHODES said that it costs taxpayers $200 million each year to make up the difference between the cost of handling such publications and the second-class postage they now pay.

NEW YORK CITY, *July 29, 1959.*

DEAR MR. RHODES: At last. I wish you all success in your effort to make magazines and newspapers pay their own way. In the end we may even get decent mail deliveries in our cities.

MARION HART.

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *July 29, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: I want to thank you for your proposal on the mail rates for large magazines. I'd hate to think that I'm working for the publishers when I'm actually a letter carrier working for the Government.

Thank you.

EDMUND A. SAWKOWSKI.

OAKLAND, CALIF., *July 29, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: Hurrah for you and here's to the success of your bill cutting subsidies to newspapers and magazines. The age of needed support to assure a free press has passed in the U.S.A. Good luck.

Just a little voter.

A. I. MCCARTHY.

MIAMI, FLA., *July 28, 1959.*

SIR: Have just read in today's paper about your proposal to gradually increase mail rates for large magazines and newspapers over a 5-year span.

As a mail carrier of 5 years and as one who believes the Post Office should be on a paying basis, I can only say thanks. Your proposal is the best single idea I have concerning the operation of the Post Office in the last 5 years.

Increased postal rates for magazines seem far overdue. I can assure you, sir, from experience that working with magazines and newspapers takes for more time, and thus money cost, than working with letters. There is no comparison. Of course, working with the larger size third-class flat mail is also much harder to work with than letters. The ordinary first-class letter is the easiest piece of mail to case (work) and deliver.

JAMES O. SHIVER.

HOUSTON, TEX., *July 29, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: I wish to congratulate you on proposing legislation to cut postal subsidies. I am always thankful when a Congressman thinks of a taxpayer. For the people who can't read or will not read, the "picture" magazines could be made smaller.

Mrs. ROBERT NORDIN.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *August 10, 1959.*

DEAR MR. RHODES: I want to very sincerely compliment you on your worthwhile speech of July 28 on "Postal Subsidy Limitation."

Subsidies are right and proper for those who need help but the rich and powerful magazines need no Government help to stay in business.

JOHN T. MENDES.

JERSEY CITY, N.J., *August 18, 1959.*

SIR: I am informed through Labor, the railroad brotherhoods' newspaper, of your action to curb the huge mail subsidies enjoyed by big magazines and newspapers. * * *

I understand the President wants to make [regular mail] 5 cents. With a mere post card at 3 cents, the trash, including that in magazines and newspapers, [is] a means of making money at reduced rates. I think it only fair that advertising be made to pay to clear the deficit and to bring down the rates on personal letters and post cards.

I appreciate your action and respectfully urge steps be taken to set things right, as in a democracy.

HENRY PETERSEN.

LINCOLN, NEBR., *August 8, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: In the Washington Labor weekly is an article telling of your effort to renew a bill reducing newspaper and magazine subsidies. Why not take them away altogether? What is the argument for granting them any?

In an article in a recent Reader's Digest was a scornful attack on the farmer—the total amount of subsidies granted to them—it is a staggering amount. Yet, there are millions of farmers to share the subsidies—not nearly as many magazines and papers. A farmer is asked to stop producing; what would the papers do if they were told to quit advertising? If they were asked to do so, it is my opinion they would be eligible for subsidy.

* * *

Here's power to you and your worthy bill. Surely you have enough Democrats beside you to see this through.

Mrs. E. W. KOENIG.

SUNSHINE PRESS,
St. Louis, Mo., August 14, 1955.

DEAR MR. RHODES: Permit me to congratulate you on the introduction of your post office bill to limit subsidies to $100,000.

As editor and publisher of community newspapers here and as an active member of the Pine Lawn Chamber of Commerce, we have been fighting for more just postal rates for several years.

We have repeatedly pointed out to our friends, readers, fellow members, Senators and Congressmen that second-class mail getting a free ride of about a million dollars a day is grossly unfair to other users of the post office.

We have written numerous editorials to the effect that Life magazine has been getting a $9 million handout yearly.

We have urged our Congressman CURTIS and others to enact legislation as simple as this:

Those who use the post office for profit should pay at least break-even rates for service rendered.

When second class pays its just rate and we quit giving away $300 million a year to gigantic magazine publishers, then perhaps we can put a fairer rate on third class, parcel post, and above all, first-class mail.

You are certainly to be warmly commended on your brave stand and I will be looking forward to news of what happens.

Thanks again,
Sincerely,

AL SONNENSCHEIN,
Editor and Publisher.

SUNSHINE PRESS,
St. Louis, Mo., August 22, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RHODES: I have read carefully the tearsheets from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD about your views on H.R. 8433 and I am happy that you expressed yourself as you did. You are 100 percent right and deserve all the support the people of the United States can give you.

* * * * *

How true the comment: "the time has come for Congress to show some courage by standing up to the publishers who reap the big profits from postal subsidies at taxpayers' expense.

How true, too, Mr. Wolf's comment:

"These magazines have grown fat and saucy because of their help—subsidy—from Uncle Sam."

I have been fighting this injustice, this subsidy to second-class mail, for several years. The Pine Lawn Chamber of Commerce of which I am a director sent a protest along lines of objecting to the huge handout to second-class mail (magazines chiefly) to every Congressman and Senator a few years ago. To no avail. Ed Murrow had a program on TV nationwide and that helped some.

If the Postmaster General and the postal officials do not back you up in your excellent bill, then they should be fired.

May I compliment you, too, on your analysis of postal receipts and average payments. Can anyone justify magazines paying 2½ cents a pound while first-class pays $1.19? Carry this one point further. Weigh a pound of post cards. Multiply by 3 cents. You will note post cards are paying $5.61 a pound—and they are the "poor man's letter."

* * * * *

Sincerely,

AL SONNENSCHEIN.

Meeting the Challenges of Soviet Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Soviet economy is moving forward at a faster rate of progress than it has in recent times.

Regularly, Khrushchev, with an air of braggadocio, states that, before long, the Soviet economy will pass us by.

Frankly, I do not think this will happen.

We recognize, however, that Soviet progress is a real challenge.

These include, first, the military threat to our security; second, efforts at economic penetration of more areas of the world; third, the need for illustrating to the world's uncommitted peoples that a free enterprise system cannot only provide the highest standard of living, but also maintain at the same time the maximum degree of freedom for its citizens; and fourth, the demands of normal growth and the need for economic progress, themselves—discounting the Soviet threat—require constructive measures to stimulate economic progress. In the light of our own needs—as well as the threat to our security—we need to be economically aggressive and creative to meet the challenge ahead.

We have witnessed in Russia, as in other dictatorships, that state control, directing manpower and resources toward specific ends, can make impressive gains in any particular field.

In the long run, however, I am confident that it will be balanced economy—the one that will provide the most for its people with the least restriction on their activities, that will ultimately elicit the confidence of men and nations.

In view of the challenges, both externally and internally, we cannot afford to assume a lackadaisical attitude. It has been said that, for those who would preserve liberty, it must be won anew in each generation. This is true today, as it has been historically. We have been enriched by a heritage of a magnitude beyond understanding. Now, we must strive, with diligence and dedication to make our own contribution to that great heritage—both in terms of progress and security.

Recently, the Janesville Daily Gazette carried an article by James Marlow entitled, "How to Spur Americans to Keep Up With Soviet Progress," representing a major challenge with which we, as a nation, are confronted. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM: HOW TO SPUR AMERICANS TO KEEP UP WITH PROGRESS OF SOVIETS

(By James Marlow)

WASHINGTON.—American leadership is showing a growing concern about the ability of this country—at the rate and in the way we are going—to keep up with Soviet progress.

Time was when Soviet claims to achievement were taken with a grain of salt in the United States.

That attitude began to change when the Soviets showed how far advanced they were, industrially and scientifically, first by making the atom bomb, then the hydrogen bomb, and then beating us into outer space with their sputniks in 1957.

Earlier in the week this writer reported President Eisenhower:

1. Is concerned about the driving urge to get ahead which the Soviets 7-year plan is giving them.

2. Thinks this country needs an incentive toward harder work—something similar to the 7-year plan—which he believes is providing the Soviet people with the moral equivalent of war.

3. Feels Americans must be induced to work harder, think more of achievement, less of leisure and money.

ECHO BY COMMITTEE

Now comes the Draper Committee—a 10-man group headed by the investment banker, William H. Draper, Jr.—which sounds like a direct echo of the President.

Eisenhower created this Committee to study the U.S. program of military assistance to other countries. Its report, made public Thursday, urged even bigger aid and went much beyond talking in terms of weapons alone.

The 10-man group sought to look at the Soviet challenge from many angles—its progress, its productive expansion, its goals, and its tactics—plus the need it creates for American efforts to match Soviet efforts.

The Committee, noting the Soviets are maintaining a higher rate of growth than the United States in industrial production and in their technology and technical education, said:

"Their objective of equaling and exceeding the United States in selected areas of their own choosing has provided an unusual psychological stimulation to their people which we must more than match by dedication to our own cause.

"GREATER DEDICATION

"These trends in the Communist world cannot be ignored. They suggest the need for real concern about our present and prospective rates of progress which will determine our future ability to compete with Communist states.

"All this requires a positive individual and national dedication, greater emphasis on hard constructive work and thought, less rather than more emphasis on leisure, more rather than less application to our tasks."

The similarity between Eisenhower's thinking and the Committee's statement may have been the result of the President having seen the Draper report before it was made public.

But he was concerned about this problem of competition and incentives many months ago. He announced in his State of the Union message last January he would create a committee to study and then propose national goals.

NATIONAL GOAL

The Soviets' 7-year plan is in their case a national goal. Eisenhower is ready to name his Committee as soon as he can find enough private organizations to finance its work. He doesn't want the Government to foot the bill.

But neither Eisenhower nor the Draper Committee has come up with an answer to the question they raise:

How can Americans—people in a free society—be induced to work harder and think less of leisure and money in order to compete with the Soviet people living under a dictatorship which can direct, control and compel them?

The dictatorship controls everything: People's lives; the work they do; where they work and on what and for how long; the luxuries they can have or must do without; their hours; prices; wages; and the means of production and distribution.

We may be entering a period of public breast-beating for our failures to do more and do without more. But self-flagellation is neither an answer nor a substitute for action.

Perhaps Eisenhower's Committee on Goals may produce suggestions for the old philosophical, but now very real, problem of how a free people, with all that means, can compete with a people controlled and centrally directed.

Landrum-Griffin Bill Held No Credit to Legislators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an excellent article by the Reverend William J. Smith, S.J., which appeared in the Catholic Transcript for yesterday, August 27, 1959. The article is entitled "Landrum-Griffin Bill Held No Credit to Legislators." The text of the article follows:

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL HELD NO CREDIT TO LEGISLATORS

(By Rev. William J. Smith, S.J.)

Politicians are supposed to know the mood of the people. It is an important part of their business. They not only keep a wet finger in the air to see which way the wind is blowing; they must also keep their ear to the ground. That is why they seem to assume such awkward positions at times.

The heated, high-tensioned debate which preceded the passage of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill reflected the current mood of the voting public. It is a long time since the country witnessed so tense and hectic a session of the House of Representatives.

The public was in an angry frame of mind about labor reform and the majority vote for the Landrum bill mirrored it. The resentment was not merely a reaction against the Becks and the Hoffas. An untold number of local incidents each added its mite to create an antiunion mood in the mind of the public.

An ironic feature of the debate as it was conducted and controlled by the supports of the bill seemed to pass unnoticed. One section of this bill deals with the democratic conducting of labor union meetings. Heavy criminal penalties are attached to the violation of that section of the law. The irony lies in this: If a union official were to conduct a union meeting and employ some of the tactics alleged against the congressional supporters of the bill at the session, the union official might find himself in violation of the law and be jailed because of it.

Even so inveterate an antiunion protagonist as Representative CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, protested vigorously from the floor the dictatorial tactics of what he called the bloc in control.

I find it a little difficult, however, to express any strong sympathy for the northern Democrat-Liberal Republican bloc in regard to the point. If they had had as tight a grip on the majority as their opponents had, they would have done the same thing. This is "democracy in action" as it has been exemplified on many occasions in both Houses of Congress. Pressure politics reached a new high in this titanic tussle. The lobby laws of the Nation were shamelessly violated on all sides.

Arthur Krock, with a distinctly antiunion article in the New York Times, summed up the struggle as a battle between the labor monopoly and the industry monopoly. With the coming of F.D.R. and the New Deal, Krock contended, a labor monopoly evolved from the expansion of the trade union movement. The new labor monopoly eventually came to dominate the industrial monopoly which had prevailed over the country all the years before. The fight over the Landrum-Griffin bill was simply the industry monopoly again giving challenge and overriding the labor monopoly.

I do not concede Mr. Krock's parallel of what he terms the two monopolies. But I do recognize a conclusion which the noted columnist failed to state explicitly. The conclusion is that with the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, if it becomes law in its present form, the monopoly of industry is again in the saddle.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was promoted and passed in an atmosphere of ignorance and/or hypocrisy. Corruption in union-management relations was the basic point at issue. When the chips were down, however, the issue of corruption was bypassed. A determined effort to curtail some of the economic power of the labor unions crept into its place.

About 80 percent of the provisions of the Elliott bill and the Landrum-Griffin bill were almost identical. They contained hard and tough restrictions on the criminal and the racketeering elements that have infiltrated the labor movement. The administration forces simply ignored these similarities in the two bills. The Republican-southern Democrat coalition was in the saddle and it rode right through.

It cannot be denied that the practice of secondary boycotting and of organizational picketing have been abused by some union officials and some so-called labor leaders. This writer has pointed out these abuses on more than one occasion. But there have been thousands of union officials who have used both these economic weapons licitly and honestly, with the sanction of the Taft-Hartley Law and the interpretation of the Supreme Court. They are weapons of economic warfare used in an economic system which is based on a clash of opposing economic parties, if not on a principle of conflict.

It can be conceded that some reasonable restrictions should have been placed upon secondary boycotting and organizational picketing. To outlaw the practices totally and completely, however, without corresponding restrictions upon the employer, was a direct attack upon the traditional and court-sanctioned use of these weapons of economic war. To make all secondary boycotts and organizational picketing synonymous with corruption and racketeering was to profess ignorance of the character of industrial relations in this country or a blatant surrender to hypocritical pretense. Certainly these two trade union practices were never made a major target of the McClellan Committee. How did they suddenly become the pivotal point for a labor reform bill?

In approving the Landrum-Griffin bill, the House based its vote on a "mood"—not on the objective realities of industrial relations.

The Houston Chronicle and Marquis Childs Favor Padre Island National Seashore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the ultimate authority in our democratic system of government comes from the people. And our Government and we, the Members of Congress, are here to serve the people.

I sincerely believe that one of the finest services which could be rendered to the American people in the field of recreation and conservation would be to preserve the 118-mile-long Padre Island, Tex., one of the few remaining examples of our Nation's rapidly vanishing virgin shoreline, in a National Seashore Area. And I believe the majority of the people favor this move.

People are living longer and have more years for leisure than was true a generation ago.

The natural beauty, abundance of fish and other wildlife, recreational potentials and rich and colorful historic beaches and dunes of Padre Island must be preserved for the enjoyment of future generations. If we do not act now to save this area, which could easily become a winter playground for our Nation, we may find it much harder and it will certainly prove more expensive to acquire it in the future, when private ownership has carved it into plots. There is some private ownerships of the island's tips now, but quick action can preserve the greatest part of the island for the enjoyment of all as a National Seashore Area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle for Tuesday, August 25, 1959, entitled "Let Senate Group Know People Want Park at Padre Island." The Chronicle is one of the largest and most influential newspapers in Texas, and I believe the editorial expresses the opinion of the majority of the people of Texas. The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has been invited to conduct hearings in Texas later this year to see the great potentials of this area for themselves and learn firsthand the sentiments of the people.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very perceptive article by Marquis Childs, one of the most independent of America's newspaper columnists, which points to the need for action now to preserve the Padre Island shoreline as a recreation area. Delay will be costly and may forever take away the opportunity to save this area. Mr. Childs' article was published in the Corpus Christi Caller for Tuesday, August 25, 1959, and entitled "Powerful Lobbies Oppose Park Conservation Moves."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Aug. 25, 1959]

LET SENATE GROUP KNOW PEOPLE WANT PARK AT PADRE ISLAND

Popular sentiment in Texas undoubtedly is favorable to Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH'S bill to create a national park on 110 miles of the 118-mile-long Padre Island. The island should be preserved for public use, rather than letting it be developed privately to the exclusion of the average citizen. The Federal Government has operated a national park system for more than 70 years, so it would be logical to add Padre Island to the system.

But will this popular sentiment express itself if and when the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which is handling the bill, holds a hearing in Texas on it? Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, a member of the committee, said his group wants to hold a hearing in the local area so the people there can have a say in the matter.

In cases like this, opponents usually are the ones who organize and speak most vociferously. Those in favor of it don't take the trouble to go before the committee and urge approval. Thus, to committee members, it appears that popular sentiment is against the project.

There is some small, but strong opposition to the Padre Island project generated mostly by persons who want the beautiful island left for private development.

Organized groups of citizens, like outdoor nature and sportsmen's clubs, should keep in touch with the congressional committee and make plans to produce a showing in strength when the hearing is held.

Citizens who favor making Padre Island a park can help the cause by writing Senator NEUBERGER at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

It would be unfortunate if private interests were allowed to take over such a splendid recreation spot and exclude the general public. Such places already are getting scarce for citizens who can't afford to spend a lot of money on recreation—and, as Abraham Lincoln said, there are many citizens in this category.

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller, Aug. 25, 1959]

POWERFUL LOBBIES OPPOSE PARK CONSERVATION MOVES

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON.—This is the time of year when vacationers begin to take a last, long, loving look at the line of the surf and the generous expanse of sun and sand. They know that all too soon jobs, the city, the old routine will catch them up again.

The vanishing American seashore, source of pleasure, strength, relaxation for millions of Americans is currently the subject of a drive in Congress. Conservationist Senators are pushing measures to save the last remnants of natural shoreline. They are opposed by a powerful lobby of industrial and speculative interests.

The argument of the conservationists is that with America's exploding population there will soon be no shoreline left that preserves the natural beauty and the sense of solitude and lonely grandeur that were part of America's heritage. Unless national parks are created of what remains it will all go into overcrowded beach developments intensively exploited for industrial uses.

The argument of the opposite is simple—the right of private developers to go where they like and do what they please. That, too, is part of the American heritage, a privilege going back as far as the privilege to seek solitude and commune with nature; the right of a Thoreau to be alone on Walden pond.

But with an ever-more crowded America the conservationists are pressing to save a small part of the past so that later generations will have a glimpse of what the earlier America was like. Because it is threatened by imminent industrial development the most urgent pressure is on to save the Indiana Dunes.

The 25-mile expanse of duneland on Lake Michigan between the industrial center of Gary and Michigan City has steadily disappeared as industry, with smoking chimneys and mill towns, has spread. Today approximately 3½ miles remain, which Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, is trying to save as a national park.

He has, however, a powerful opponent in the Bethlehem Steel Corp., which has acquired much of the land for a projected $350 million plant development. With it goes an industrial harbor and related housing developments. Bethlehem acquired the property from a company set up by Clint W. Murchison, one of the Texas billionaires whose speculation in land reaches into every corner of America.

Important political interests are also involved. While he fought the St. Lawrence Seaway, which has opened the Michigan lake shore to steel development, former Senator William Jenner, of Indiana, is now cashing in on it with a company to promote the harbor development. The entire Indiana delegation favors the project.

A Senate Interior Subcommittee failed to approve the Douglas bill. But it is believed that nevertheless the full committee may report it out favorably.

With the bipartisan support of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, a second bill would give the Secretary of the Interior authority to select three shoreline sites to become national parks. If this should pass, the sites selected are likely to be the Indiana Dunes, a stretch of untouched shoreline on Cape Cod in Massachusetts, and the dunes area and Sea Lion Caves in Oregon. These, with a fourth site, Padre Island off the south Texas coast, have been approved by the National Park Service Advisory Board.

Reported to have administration backing, this measure would cost an estimated $15 million. Still a third bill with 18 sponsoring Senators, including such veteran conservationists as CLINTON ANDERSON, of New Mexico, and JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, takes in additional sites and the cost would be $85 million.

Should all of these measures get caught in the jam now promising to develop, with major legislation held up until the end of the session, they would carry over to next session. This is the hope of their sponsors who insist that even if work is started on the steel plant for the Indiana Dunes site it will not be too late to take the land by right of eminent domain and preserve it for the use of the public.

Powerful as are the interests seeking to block any of these measures there are impressive forces on the other side. Out of the great impetus that Theodore Roosevelt gave to the conservation movement, scores of organizations have continued to carry on the fight to stop the spreading blight of urbanism and industrialism that has left only a small remnant of the unspoiled beauty of what was once an almost empty continent.

Address by Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel, of California, at Ceremony Commemorating the Death of Padre Junipero Serra

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address delivered by the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] at the ceremony in Statuary Hall, on August 28, commemorating the death of Padre Junipero Serra.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR THOMAS H. KUCHEL AT THE CEREMONY IN STATUARY HALL COMMEMORATING THE DEATH OF PADRE JUNIPERO SERRA, FRIDAY, AUGUST 28, 1959

These services commemorate the life and labors of a Franciscan friar whose intrepid Christian ministrations were spread throughout a great primitive area before the United States came into being. Junipero Serra, Franciscan missionary from Malorca journeyed to the North American continent in 1750, and in the last 1760's went northward to California.

In that northward trek, both he and his courageous, faithful companions sowed in the hearts and minds of men, the seeds of a new civilization under divine spirit. Father Serra brought with him the mission, which meant the spread of religion in these unknown lands; the presidio, which meant the expansion of the political and military control of Spain; and the pueblo, the town, which meant the establishment of orderly civil government. Here was a tripartite development, both secular and spiritual. The hard trails that his weary feet traversed from mission to mission along the El Camino Real continue today to be the royal road along which are strung great cities, great universities, great industries, and great agriculture—human progress in its every latest attainment.

One hundred and seventy-five years ago Father Serra departed this life. From a primitive unsettled land on the Pacific shore to which he came has developed a majestic center of cultural and economic life, rich in all the bounty of nature, our magnificent State of California.

While we honor Junipero Serra for the blessings of civilization he left in California, we shall not forget that his was a spiritual labor. The missions he built, the agriculture he founded—supported, incidentally, by irrigation systems which excite the admiration of the modern hydraulic engineer—were all means to an end. The sword was there to support the cross and so was the civil authority. But it was the cross which came first. Imbued with divine spirit, charged with an exalted mission, and sustained by an unfaltering faith, Father Serra brought to the Indians the civilizing message of Christian teachings. Here was the solid foundation

upon which all other building rested. It is well to recall this simple fact in our own day. For we, too, have an exalted mission: To hold high the banner of man's freedom, to protect it from all assaults from the ungodly, and to advance it, by an unfaltering faith in the righteousness of our purpose.

U.S. Labor Leaders Can Handle Selves With Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the advent of Premier Khrushchev's visit to this country is stirring a wide variety of reactions among the American people.

Fortunately, our climate of freedom allows for such differences. Constructively, however, I am confident that the American people will demonstrate a unified spirit and conduct during the visit in order to show the real side of what we believe is America.

Views on the visit, of course, differ not only among individuals but among different groups in the economy.

We recall that, recently, the AFL–CIO, representing approximately 13½ million workers in America, decided against inviting Khrushchev to address this great and powerful labor organization.

We recognize that, in many lands around the world, communism has made its greatest inroads in labor.

Fortunately, I believe that America can be proud of the stanch anti-Communist spirit which has prevailed in the U.S. labor movement.

Regrettably, the occurrence of abuses and irresponsible actions among minorities in the labor movement has resulted in the need for reevaluation of our laws relating to the labor movement; as well as legislation to curb abuses.

However, this should not be allowed to reflect unfairly on the vast majority of honest, competent leaders—or the millions of rank-and-file members—who are doing a fine job—in my home State of Wisconsin, as across the Nation—in serving the interests of the working people of America.

Nor should this situation be allowed to, in any way, "hide" the stanch patriotism and loyalty which has so largely prevailed in the ranks of unionism throughout the country.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published a constructive editorial entitled "U.S. Labor Leaders Can Handle Selves With Khrushchev."

The editorial, I believe, presents a thoughtful analysis, outlining in a well-justified way, the competence of our labor movement and its leaders to deal with communism.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. LABOR LEADERS CAN HANDLE SELVES WITH KHRUSHCHEV

President George Meany of the AFL–CIO and his No. 1 lieutenant, Walter Reuther, see eye to eye on communism. They both think it is an immoral and brutal force that suppresses human freedom and democratic rights. Where they differ—and differ vigorously—relative to the forthcoming visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev is over the tactics the labor federation should adopt.

Meany, who opposed President Eisenhower's invitation in the first place, wants labor to snub Khrushchev, to boycott him completely. Reuther thinks that American trade union leaders should talk to Khrushchev "straight from the shoulder."

The other day the executive council of the labor federation lined up with Meany. A resolution was adopted, 22 to 3, declaring that it was "out of the question for the AFL–CIO to give recognition to the head of a government which does not permit its own workers to have free trade unions." But Meany emphasized that the resolution was not intended to stop union officers who wanted to from holding personal meetings with Khrushchev, and arrangements are going forward for such a meeting.

With considerable reason, Meany and other labor leaders were annoyed by hints from Washington that the State Department and White House would be "quite happy" if Khrushchev were invited to address the AFL–CIO convention opening in San Francisco September 17. Khrushchev is going to have ample opportunity to spout off during his 12 days in this country. There is no reason why the AFL–CIO should let him use their convention as a special sounding board.

On the other hand, there are very good reasons why trade union leaders should meet with the Soviet premier and let him know just where American workingmen and women stand. After all, the purpose of bringing Khrushchev to America is to educate him about this country and its people. Labor leaders like Reuther are well qualified to help act as teachers.

Last January, it will be recalled, Reuther and several other labor leaders played host at a luncheon to Anastas Mikoyan, Russia's deputy premier. They came away confident tht Mikoyan was impressed with their arguments that there is no class struggle in America and that American labor has a major stake in capitalism and democracy.

Indeed the success of the luncheon and the demonstrated skill of the labor leaders to handle the slick talking Mikoyan—in contrast to the relative lack of success by businessmen—prompted Vice President NIXON to declare: "I would respectfully suggest that some of the business leaders in this instance could learn a lesson from our labor leaders, who had to fight to expel Communists from their unions and in the process learned how to deal with them."

Operation Bootstrap: Reservation Style

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Tucson (Ariz.) Daily Citizen, under date of August 19, 1959, in which they endorse the Indian self-help, dubbed "Operation Bootstrap: Indian Style."

The editorial follows:

BOOTSTRAP FOR INDIANS

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, oldest territory under the American flag, is offering a helping hand to the Indians, oldest American inhabitants.

Representative E. Y. BERRY, Republican, South Dakota, is proposing a program to industrialize American Indian reservations patterned after Puerto Rico's "Operation Bootstrap," about which so much is currently being said and written.

Prior to the industrializing program launched in 1946, Puerto Rico's jibaro lived in "the poorhouse of the Caribbean." Now he has the second highest standard of living in Latin America. The island has had 600 new industries locate there since 1946. It has risen from a burden on the U.S. Treasury to an economic asset. Puerto Rico now buys more from the United States, on a per capita basis, than Canada.

The American Indian occupies the same place in this country that the jibaro did in Puerto Rico in pre-Bootstrap days. The 535,000 Indians are the poor country cousins living on remote agriculturally based reservations virtually untouched by America's industrial economy. A large number of these are on Arizona reservations; most Tucsonians are familiar with nearby reservations and the social and economic limitations under which Indians live there.

Representative BERRY, who lives with a similar Indian problem in South Dakota, estimates that 80 percent of the reservation Indians in this country have little or no job opportunities. Many are permanently on relief. The U.S. Government spent about $180 million on Indian welfare programs in the last fiscal year, and the amount will increase as Indian population increases rapidly.

There is no logical reason why "Operation Bootstrap, Indian style," providing incentives for industrialization on the reservations, would not be successful and popular. It is a prospect which should command the interest of Arizonians and Arizona Congressmen.

Needed: More Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the August 7, 1959, issue of the Morning Call of Paterson, N.J., there appeared an editorial entitled "Needed: More Doctors," which points out that the United States faces a potential shortage of trained physicians in the next decade unless medical education facilities are expanded. The editorial discusses several suggestions which I have made to aid in solving this problem. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: MORE DOCTORS

It is commonly supposed that medical care in the United States is both the best and the most readily available in any large nation. In general, this optimistic picture is close to the truth. A shadow has fallen across the picture, however—the fact that we are not

producing enough doctors to keep pace with our population rise.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, famous both as an authority on human rehabilitation, estimates that in order to have enough doctors to provide adequate treatment for our population by 1975 we will need an annual net increase of some 5,250 doctors. That figure compares with the present net increase of about 3,000 doctors per year.

One big reason why not enough doctors are being trained is that the cost of medical education has grown steadily and is still growing. Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, who has made himself an expert in this field, wrote recently that "medical education * * * is running an annual operating deficit of between $10 million and $20 million at the present time." This is despite the fact that tuition and other costs have risen until most families cannot see a medical student through school.

Senator NEUBERGER proposes a three-pronged attack on the problem. He wants Congress to appropriate $500 million to build medical teaching and research institutions. He also wants Federal scholarships for qualified men and women, and he proposes an incentive plan to induce gifted medical students and other scientists to enter medical research. The Neuberger proposals may not be the answer, but they are worth thinking about. The longer we delay, the harder it is going to be to catch up with the growing need for more doctors.

The Rambler Looks Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, Tuesday's Washington Evening Star contained George Kennedy at his best as he looked back 20 years in the typical analytical and perceptive style of the Rambler.

I ask unanimous consent that this thought-provoking work be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMBLER LOOKS BACK 20 YEARS

(By George Kennedy)

A quiz question in a Sunday newspaper threw the Rambler.

It was, "What important treaty was signed 20 years ago today?"

He flunked it.

He had no excuse, especially with the covers of news magazines on the stands reminding everyone that World War II started 20 years ago.

It was the Ribbentrop-Molotov nonaggression treaty—the big surprise of the prelude to war. In it the U.S.S.R. and Germany agreed not to make war on each other, which made it "safe" for Hitler to invade Poland.

Flunking the question caused the Rambler to refresh his memory by putting the spool of microfilm containing the August and September, 1939, issues of the Star on the Recordak. As he turned the crank, the front pages of one momentous day after another came on the screen.

The issue of the 23d gave the startling news that Ribbentrop, Hitler's Foreign Minister, had arrived by air in Moscow to negotiate a nonaggression pact. His arrival broke up a British-French military mission's conversations with Red Army leaders on cooperation.

The Star's lead editorial the next day was entitled, "The Zero Hour." It was hard to believe. War had lost is glamour. Millions remembered the trenches and the mud and the senseless slaughter on the western front only 21 years before. British Ambassador Nevile Henderson was telling Hitler that war would mean an "end to civilization as we have known it."

As in many a death watch, there were hopeful bulletins near the end. The headline of the 25th—20 years ago today—was "Hitler Parley Stirs Talk of Peace."

The Clifford K. Berryman cartoon showed Hitler rolling the world over the brink and Roosevelt trying to stop it was entitled "Doing His Bit."

Major wars always cause major changes in the economy. The supermarkets were advertising hams for 23 cents a pound; legs of lamb for 21 and porterhouse steaks, 39.

You could buy a new Ford, Chevrolet, or Plymouth for well under $1,000, and the Pennsylvania Railroad was advertising a round trip to New York and the World's Fair there over the Labor Day weekend for $4.

Washington was wild about the Redskins who had won the world's championship of pro football 2 years before.

The Yankees, sparked by the frequent hitting of centerfielder Joe Di Maggio, were leading the American League. Washington was in fifth place. Cincinnati was leading the National League. Ann Sheridan was starring in the film at the Capitol.

The headlines were giving hope and then snatching it away. On Saturday the 26th it was: "World War Averted, Berlin Reports"; on Sunday, "France Cold to Hitler's 'Peace' Offer." On Tuesday it was "Britain Stands Firm in Reply to Hitler."

Twenty-five years before, in August, Lord Grey of Fallodon, the British Foreign Minister, had seen the same thing happen, and said, "The lamps are going out all over Europe; we shall not see them lit again in our lifetime." At that time Americans found it hard to accept what was happening. This time they knew from experience that it was all too true: War was coming.

On Wednesday the headline was: "Peace or War Up to Hitler—Chamberlain."

The bad news came on Friday. The headline read: "German Planes Bomb Heart of Warsaw."

And on Sunday, September 3, the Labor Day weekend was made memorable by the headline: "Britain Goes to War as Ultimatum Expires."

Premier Pedro G. Beltran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news story, from today's issue of the New York Times, in regard to the Premier of the Republic of Peru, Mr. Pedro G. Beltran.

This article, written by one of the country's outstanding Latin American news experts, Mr. Tad Szulc, has to do with "a quick-tempered, plain-speaking newspaper publisher with a large background of public service," who has taken over the job of directing the destinies of Peru, under the direction of President Manuel Prado y Ugarteche.

Mr. Beltran is an outstanding friend of this country. He understands our people and our needs. After talking to him on several occasions, I know that he hopes that we, in turn, will understand better the needs, not only of his own country, but of all Latin America.

I believe the article written by Mr. Szulc is worthy of the attention of all Members of the Senate.

I certainly hope for the Premier of Peru all the best in the difficult times which confront him in the weeks, months, and years ahead. He is a good man; and if anyone can bring order out of chaos, I think Mr. Beltran will be that man.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW AND INDEPENDENT PREMIER BUILDS PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN PERU—BELTRAN, A CRITIC OF REGIME UNTIL APPOINTMENT, ATTACKS INFLATION VIGOROUSLY

(By Tad Szulc)

LIMA, PERU, August 27.—A quick-tempered, plain-speaking newspaper publisher with a large background of public service appears to be restoring confidence in Peru.

When President Manuel Prado y Ugarteche resolved in mid-July to appoint Pedro G. Beltran, his foremost critic, as Premier, the nation appeared to stand on the threshold of chaos.

Inflation was spreading, the economy was in disarray and there was talk of revolutionary attempts or military coups. Peru's 3-year-old democratic rule faced collapse.

A month earlier, Premier Luis Gallo Porras, unable to cope with mounting deficits, rising prices, constant strikes and increasing pressures from all sides, offered the resignation of his cabinet. President Prado finally turned to Senor Beltran to save the constitutional government.

APPOINTMENT STIRS HOPE

Senor Beltran was not identified with any national party. He was known for his independent views and his almost fanatic belief in sound money and orderly fiscal policies. His appointment was greeted with a surge of hope by most of the public.

But he found unrelenting opponents in the extreme Rightwing groups represented by the newspaper El Comercio and in the Communists.

The new premier, a wealthy landowner and London-trained economist, is an advocate of free enterprise as the basis for solving Peru's economic and social ills with state aid. The Comercio group and the Communists are propounding state control of economic activities, possibly leading to nationalization of the foreign-owned mining and oil industries.

Senor Beltran is also opposed by the small but influential Christian Democratic party and by the left-of-center Popular Action Party. His support in Congress rests on President Prado's Democratic Peruvian Movement and a powerful bloc identified with the left-of-center out anti-Communist APRA Party.

GASOLINE PRICE AT ISSUE

Tonight, the 62-year-old Senor Beltran may join this young Minister of Development and Public Works, Alfonso Rizo Patron, in explaining to Congress last month's decision to almost double the price of gasoline.

He did so because under the old prices, which were among the world's lowest, foreign oil companies had halted drilling in Peru and the threat arose that production would eventually come to a standstill.

The former administration had refused to raise prices in fear of strikes and other disturbances. But Senor Beltran wasted no

time in acting when he took office. He suspended constitutional guarantees for a few days and broke a strike of taxi drivers here.

Now the opposition is hoping to use the gasoline price issue to force a new vote of confidence tonight, in an effort to defeat the Government. Communist deputies have charged that Senor Beltran "sold out" to U.S. oil trusts.

The 1960 Republican Presidential Nomination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate two articles which have appeared recently about Vice President NIXON. One is a long and very thoughtful analysis by Alan L. Otten about the situation with respect to the 1960 Republican Presidential nomination. The other article is an interview in the Christian Science Monitor.

I ask unanimous consent to have these two articles printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 27, 1959]

NOT 1952—THE TAFT-NIXON, IKE-ROCKEFELLER PARALLELS ARE MUCH LESS VALID THAN OFTEN CLAIMED

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—After looking long, but not too hard, at the jockeying for the 1960 GOP Presidential nomination, some soothsayers are falling back on what is becoming a common political aphorism: "It will be 1952 all over again."

But this theory, while neat in its way, will not stand up under close examination.

Behind the assumption lies the belief that, regardless of the outcome, political events are casting Vice President NIXON in the role of the late Senator Taft, and New York's Governor Rockefeller in the role of General Eisenhower. Those who expect 1960 to be a repetition of 1952 state their case thusly: Mr. Taft, while commanding the loyalty of much of the GOP, also had the enmity of many party leaders, led by then Governor Thomas E. Dewey, of New York, who apparently now is masterminding the Rockefeller candidacy. The anti-Taft Republicans hitched their hopes to a bright new star with a nonpolitical aura, and put Mr. Eisenhower across by beating hard on the theme "Taft can't win."

Certainly there are strong similarities between the Taft-Eisenhower struggle and the Nixon-Rockefeller battle that's shaping up. Certainly the Rockefeller backers are getting set to try to torpedo the Vice President's White House ambitions with the same sort of "can't win" theme song they effectively used against the Ohio Senator. The differences, however, are equally striking, even if less well understood.

To begin with, Mr. Taft's opposition within the Republican Party was far more extensive than is the party opposition to Mr. NIXON. Or perhaps more accurately, the Vice President's following among GOP regulars is probably greater than that enjoyed by any other Republican, including Mr. Taft, in recent history. It is true, to be sure, that much of the Vice President's support lacks the fervor that characterized the Taft backers of the early 1950's.

In 1951 and 1952, some Republicans looked upon Senator Taft as an old warhorse, respected and even revered, but suspected as a candidate as being too conservative on domestic economic policies, somewhat arbitrary and a little condescending in dealing with people he did not consider his intellectual equals. Moreover, there were those who sincerely questioned Mr. Taft's views on foreign policy as being "too isolationist" and his qualifications to deal with the overriding issues between the United States and Russia.

MATTER OF BACKGROUND

By contrast, Mr. Rockefeller patently lacks the background and experience on which was built another 1952 Eisenhower slogan, "He knows how to deal with the Russians." Mr. NIXON, to be sure, also lacks the Eisenhower reputation as a war hero and standing as a military-diplomatic statesman in world councils. But the NIXON supporters can and do claim his years as understudy to Mr. Eisenhower and the late Secretary of State Dulles have given him a background that no other Republican today can enjoy. Certainly no one has ever seriously questioned the Vice President's internationalist tendencies, which have been evident at least since his years as a freshman Congressman.

To many people in 1952 Senator Taft was identified with what's commonly called the Old Guard wing of his party, even though politically he was more liberal on some issues—housing and health legislation, for example—than Mr. Eisenhower. Here again by contrast, Mr. NIXON is part of and identified with a very popular President and Republican administration that has widespread support not only among Republican voters but, as well, among Democrats and independents.

Nowhere can the contrasts be more drawn, however, than in the political alinements of 1952 and 1959–60. For one thing, nearly all the former Taft backers are now firmly in the Nixon camp. But so, too, are many groups and individuals who once supported Eisenhower.

Lined up with Mr. NIXON also is much of the former citizens for Eisenhower group including its cochairman, former Under Secretary of Commerce Walter Williams. These once-Eisenhower, now Nixon rooters also include such liberal Senators as HUGH SCOTT of Pennsylvania and JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky, as well as large numbers of GOP House Members. It is also an interesting fact that the Vice President's three principal staff political aides were either actively for or sympathetic with the Eisenhower candidacy of 7 years ago. These are Mr. NIXON'S top assistant, Robert H. Finch; his press secretary, Herbert H. Klein; and Charles K. McWhorter, a special assistant, who was secretary of the National Youths for Eisenhower in 1952.

Moreover, the bulk of Mr. Eisenhower's professional GOP support came from the Nation's 25 Republican Governors. Though there are now only 15 GOP Governors, most of them are lined up solidly with Mr. NIXON. The Vice President's widespread backing among lawmakers in Congress and the Republican Governors illustrates a fact that still is not fully appreciated.

Contrary to widespread impressions, the political "ins" supported Mr. Eisenhower in 1952, while much of the Taft support came from the "outs" who were trying to get "in." There were many exceptions, to be sure, to that generality. But with fewer exceptions now, the "ins" are backing the Vice President, while the "outs" are lining up with the New York governor in hopes of getting "in." Most any professional politician would tell you that this, indeed, is not the strongest political position.

Moreover, it would be difficult to estimate the number of Republicans throughout the country who are deep in Mr. NIXON'S debt. He has spoken and campaigned for Republican candidates in nearly every State over the last 7 years. He has done favors in Washington for hundreds of GOP officials. While Senator Taft was primarily the philosophical leader of his party, functioning mainly through the Senate and only occasionally with grassroots contacts outside Ohio, Mr. NIXON has contacts and debtors everywhere.

And while Mr. NIXON seems to have a kind of party support that Mr. Taft never knew, Mr. Rockefeller would appear to have considerably less backing than did General Eisenhower. Whereas Mr. Rockefeller is largely unknown beyond the borders of his State, every American was familiar with the beaming smile of the World War II commander.

QUESTION OF THE POLLS

The public opinion polls, which were used with such devastating effect against Senator Taft before the 1952 convention, do not thus far seem likely to provide Mr. Rockefeller with similar ammunition. Mr. NIXON has been doing much better in the polls than did the late Senator, both with regular Republicans and independents. And while Mr. Eisenhower started pulling away in the polls once he entered the race, the New York Governor actually slumped after his big post-election showing. Mr. NIXON would have to slump very hard indeed for the opinion polls to give the Rockefeller camp much support for a "NIXON can't win" campaign.

The Vice President, too, is in many ways a more astute political performer than was the Ohio Senator. Mr. Taft had a brilliant mind, but comparatively little finesse with people—and it was a rare moment that he stirred an audience. His speaking style was dry and pedantic.

Mr. NIXON, on the other hand, is almost flawless mechanically: There is much of the actor in him, not that he is insincere, but rather that he has cultivated a dynamic stage presence. He is at ease, he is sure, he is dramatic, and his most recent doings in the international spotlight would seem to attest to these qualities.

The Vice President's press relations are good. He works assiduously at keeping newsmen informed and is deliberately patient under pertinent questioning. Mr. Taft's relations with the press, however, were spotty and unsatisfactory.

Mr. NIXON rarely runs away from hot issues but usually handles touchy subjects with a diplomacy the late Senator could not match. It is difficult, for instance, to imagine the Vice President doing what Mr. Taft did during the 1952 South Dakota primary when he was asked his views on the price of gold. This was a vital subject in the gold-mining area of the State, but Mr. Taft stoutly proclaimed the current price too high. Later, an aid remonstrated with him, thought he had persuaded the Senator he had spoken too harshly, and arranged for the question to be put to the Senator again the following day.

"I answered that last night," Mr. Taft snapped. "The price is too high."

In 1952, it must also be remembered, other candidates were in the wings—Governor Warren of California, perennial hopeful Harold Stassen, favorite sons—who helped deadlock the convention and permit the Eisenhower maneuvering. By all present indications, if Mr. Rockefeller challenges in 1960—and there seems little doubt that he will—it will be a two-man race, with no room to use favorite sons and stalking horses to halt the big first-ballot Nixon strength.

ART OF COMMAND

On the other side, there are several areas in which Mr. Rockefeller does not come up to the 1952 Eisenhower as a candidate. The

New York Governor's newness on the political scene is not counterweighted, as it was in the general's case, with a long period as a popular leader. His brief tenure in Albany has not provided Mr. Rockefeller with the time to demonstrate his ability fully. His move to raise State taxes immediately after taking office did him little good, politically, as he himself admitted. And while it indicated his willingness to command, the uproar the tax boost caused gave evidence the measure did not have wide understanding or support. The art of command is not quite the same as the art of leadership.

It should not be overlooked, also, that the Rockefeller name in many sections of the country does not arouses friendly feelings. The 1952 Eisenhower was a self-made man up from the Kansas cornfields. Governor Rockefeller has a less bucolic background.

After all the evidence is in, a man would have to be downright imprudent to guess who will carry the GOP standard next year. But that same evidence makes very clear how inaccurate is the aphorism: "It will be 1952 all over again."

It won't be. It will be 1960, for the reason that NIXON is not Taft and Rockefeller is not Eisenhower.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 26, 1959]

ELEVATING THE VICE PRESIDENT—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Republican Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, a veteran of eight terms in the House, national chairman of the Republican Party 1948–49, an early (1949) supporter of an Eisenhower candidacy in 1952, and today a supporter of Vice President NIXON for the GOP presidential nomination:

See no substantial difference between Vice President NIXON and Governor Rockefeller on foreign policy, but regards Mr. NIXON as the best qualified candidate in either party in the foreign-affairs field.

Anticipates Mr. Rockefeller would become the GOP presidential candidate and leader of his party after he has served another term as Governor and after a Nixon administration nationally.

Question: "Senator SCOTT, why do you feel Vice President NIXON is the best qualified man for the Republican nomination for the Presidency?"

Answer: "Well, I would say on the basis of experience and temperament, personality. Undoubtedly he is the best qualified candidate in either party in the foreign affairs field, one who has been singularly blessed with the opportunity to meet chiefs of state and of government. His experience and wisdom in handling difficult problems have been demonstrated by the Moscow trip, the Latin-American trip, by the way he conducted himself at the time of the two serious illnesses of the President, and by the degree to which his advice is valued by people experienced themselves in government; for example, in the National Security Council."

Question: "How do you feel Mr. NIXON compares as a votegetter with Mr. Rockefeller?"

Answer: "I think both have demonstrated they are excellent votegetters. They are both attractive personalities who grow in attraction as you have the chance to know more about them. A half hour before this interview I was talking with Governor Rockefeller. He is a most attractive man. I think if he is reelected Governor of New York—and I expect he would be—he would become the next candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency, and I expect, too, that he would probably become the party's leader for a decade or more.

"There is a great place in the sun for Governor Rockefeller and I admire him without reserve. But the situation presently indicates that Republicans would be well advised to close ranks, as there is every indication they are doing, and really go to work along with independents and Democrats to elect a competent, experienced and wise and moderate man in DICK NIXON as their next President."

Question: "Then you don't feel Governor Rockefeller will formally become a candidate for the nomination?"

Answer: "It is my judgment that he probably will not in any real all-out down-the-line campaign. I think surveys among Republican leaders indicate that Vice President NIXON will be nominated on the first ballot, perhaps by acclamation. I hope that when they come around to talking about vice presidential candidates they will give very serious thought to Governor Rockefeller. I think it would be a dream ticket."

Question: "Since you were one of the original Eisenhower supporters, do you have indications from other early Eisenhower men as to their preference now?"

Answer: "Well, I have talked to many early supporters of President Eisenhower and to many Democrats-for-Eisenhower and the greater part of them favor Vice President NIXON as the Republican candidate. There are some who favor Governor Rockefeller and I think rather notably in one or two of the Southern States."

Question: "Would you say there is any substantial difference between Mr. NIXON and Mr. Rockefeller on international policy?"

Answer: "I can't see where such an area of difference would arise. Governor Rockefeller has some edge in South America by virtue of his experience in those countries, but the policy down there would be the same in either event, a good-neighbor policy of nonintervention and of friendly and benevolent cooperation. In the rest of the world, NIXON's experience counts more heavily. The policy of both of these gentlemen is the policy of Dwight Eisenhower."

Question: "What about domestic policy?"

Answer: "In domestic policy I would be inclined to say that the Nixon policy would be, in the future as in the past, adherence to the general Eisenhower program, a moderate, middle-of-the-road policy. Vice President NIXON has shown his convictions on the tough issues, such as civil rights, and in my judgment he has been right and proper in his attitude there. He has, if anything, shown an inclination to go a little beyond the Eisenhower program in some areas, such as housing.

"I think that Governor Rockefeller's record indicates he is perhaps somewhat more on the liberal side in meeting the necessities which the Governor of New York has to meet in the political world, but he is no wild-eyed radical by any means."

Question: "If there is a fight between the two for the nomination do you feel there will be any outstanding issues, or will it be over who is the best leader, over personality questions?"

Answer: "There are some differences on issues, but none that occur to me as the kind which appear in presidential campaigns. If it came to a choice between the two, it would be based on personality, experience, and ability to handle the job."

Question: "Any particular reason why you have made known your preference so early?"

Answer: "The main reason is that I don't want anything. I am sure that when I campaigned so vigorously for General Eisenhower there were many people in the entourage who may have harbored doubts on that score and wondered why I worked so hard and my wife worked so hard. I just wanted to keep on being a member of the House of Representatives. The same thing is true now.

"I am extremely happy; in fact, I am in something of a glow about being a Senator of the United States. It is something I have wanted since I was 13 years old. Why should I want anything else? Not having anything in my mind except the desire to get the strongest candidate for the Republican Party and the best qualified man for the Presidency of the United States, I can afford to come out early."

Contested-Election Expert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the August 26, 1959, issue of Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill. It was written by Mr. Marvin D. Resnick and is entitled "Contested-Election Expert." The article is about Mr. Samuel H. Still, Jr., a native of Blackville, S.C., who attended the Citadel at Charleston, S.C., and was graduated from the George Washington University School of Law. Mr. Still has been in Washington for a number of years and has distinguished himself as a research expert of the American Law Division of the Library of Congress. This article points out that while serving on loan from the Library as legal counsel to the House Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee and as special counsel to the House Special Campaign Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Elections, Mr. Still has probably learned more about election law than anyone else in this country. We, in South Carolina, are very proud of Mr. Still's record of accomplishment and his service to the Congress through the years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTESTED-ELECTION EXPERT

(By Marvin D. Resnick)

At the time of the hectic controversy which surrounded Franklin D. Roosevelt's bid for a third-term election, someone posed an interesting legal question: If F.D.R. won the popular vote, were the presidential electors pledge-bound to elect him?

After much laborious research the answer to that question was clearly revealed—in some States the electors were bound to vote for F.D.R., but in some States they weren't.

At any rate, the question had been sent to the right man. The lawyer who "dug up" the information for that interesting and politically significant question was a man who has worked closely with election laws for many years, a man who probably knows more about election law than anyone else in the country. His name: Samuel H. Still, Jr.

Although Still is actually employed by the American Law Division of the Library of Congress, he has been loaned as legal counsel to the House Elections Subcommittee of the House Administration Committee almost continuously since 1946.

He has also served as special counsel to the House Special Campaign Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Elections.

A 51-year-old, scholarly, gentleman-lawyer from Blackville, S.C., he has been concerned with important election law questions since the early 1930's.

In an area so complex that even a lawyer and most certainly the layman get lost in the maze, Still works with the patience of a saint and the perseverence of an impatient prospector.

As legal counsel to the House Elections Subcommittee, people seek him out with many questions. A Congressman wants to know just how much money he can use in a forthcoming campaign. A potential presidential candidate wants the dates on all the presidential primaries. And members want to know what procedures must be used to recount questioned ballots.

But that portion of Still's work which is most fascinating concerns contested elections. Often, Still travels to different parts of the Nation to make "spot-checks" of election records. A good deal of the time he pores over contested ballots with committee members in room G–53 of the Capitol building.

A contested election involves a very definite and serious procedure, Still points out.

"In an ordinarily contested election," he explains, "the contestant, the defeated candidate, files a notice of contest. This is served on the contestee, the elected representative, who answers.

"Then there are 90 days in which testimony may be taken by the two parties. This testimony is printed and goes to the Committee on House Administration. The elections subcommittee doesn't come into the picture until this testimony comes in."

When the elections subcommittee calls the parties in, a public hearing for both parties is held. Each party is entitled to $2,000 expenses in conducting the contest and has an attorney.

The committee hears the arguments, studies the testimony and then renders a decision. Sometimes it is necessary for the committee to actually examine the ballots.

"As a general rule," Still says, "the committee asks the attorneys for the contestant and contested to stipulate on questionable ballots. The remaining ballots are then examined personally by the committee members and various markings or erasures are ruled on with respect to each ballot.

"Finally, the decision of the subcommittee is made to the full Committee on House Administration which in turn reports to the House.

"The report and resolution are privileged and may be called up at anytime but notice is usually given so that one side or the other may object."

How does the committee actually go about investigating the contested ballots?

"Where the investigation is authorized by House resolution," Still says, "or where an aggrieved candidate complains directly to the elections subcommittee, a hearing is held to determine whether an investigation should be conducted.

"If the Elections Committee decides, after a hearing, to investigate, it usually sends two or more members on the scene for a 'look-see' to determine whether a full investigation should be made.

"The subcommittee members, accompanied by the staff, make a spot-check of ballots, including absentee ballots, and registration books. If an appreciable error occurs, additional ballots and paraphenalia are examined."

Ballots are examined to determine whether they are marked according to State law and voters' qualifications are checked against State laws.

When checking the validity of a ballot the committee leaves no stone unturned. It looks into:

Registration lists or lists where persons are shown as having paid poll taxes in a State where poll taxes are required.

Registers of persons who actually voted, or a list of a register of voters.

The actual ballots cast.

And the ballot stubs or related material.

Also, it checks information relating to registration, including:

Change of address.

Payment of poll taxes.

Persons exempt from payment of poll taxes.

Maiden voters—those persons who have attained the age of 21 subsequent to the last registration date.

Military personnel voting.

Voting in precincts other than where the voter is listed as a qualified voter.

And if there is a write-in candidate who is a serious contender, the manner in which the name is written in is closely scrutinized; also use of stickers may be evaluated.

What are the most common types of election fraud?

"Absentee ballots are used most often to fraudulently defeat a candidate," Still explains.

"But a good many mistakes made in election returns are due to the time element. The voting and the counting take place the same day, with the same set of clerks and judges.

"Naturally, these officials are dead tired by the end of the day, and it is easy to make a mistake. In the old days—maybe as far back as 1875—the people who worked on the ballots had 2 or 3 days to count the ballots.

"The older method was better," Still feels.

But since he's been with the committee, Still points out, the majority of election frauds have not been attributed to the congressional candidates themselves.

"Since I've worked on the committee," he says, "most of the fraud has been attributable to the local candidates."

"For instance, a hot local issue may exist between the 'drys' and the 'wets,' or between candidates for a local judgeship. One of the local candidates may attempt to monkey up the ballots. Some of the ballots, which include the congressional candidates' names, are altered."

"But such fraud," Still concludes, "is disassociated from the candidate for or incumbent Member of Congress."

Because of his study and long experience with elections, Still has strong opinions about corrections which he feels have to be made to rectify the intentional and unintentional errors in election returns.

Still hopes there will someday be a uniform system of registration in every State. He feels that registration should be taken much more seriously than it is now. He feels that there should be a definite identification for a registrar, something like the definite identification necessary for a marriage license or a motor vehicle license.

"It should be a system of registration in which the registrant is clearly identifiable along with his legal residence. Many States don't have this.

"It might be possible to have a picture on the registration card, and the method of identification should be even more perfect in the case of absentee voting."

Still also feels that in the county or State there should be a department of elections which has certified public accountants available to count and audit election returns.

When Still visits an area for an investigation, he almost always receives the highest cooperation from officials, he claims.

"The State officials are most cooperative and I know most of the secretaries of state," he explains.

Of course, he has been in situations where officials weren't willing to cooperate. A city clerk in Battle Creek, Mich., once refused to let him see the materials of a senatorial election. The clerk said a telegram wasn't a correct subpena.

Technically, the clerk was correct. But Still could have easily gotten a correct subpena. Still decided not to press the issue for the moment, though.

But the fact that he was defying a congressional committee must have worked on the man. Shortly, the official visited Still and handed over the material.

While searching for a group of ballots after one election Still was told to visit a certain farm. There he found the ballots placed on top of a high silo.

It took a good deal of climbing but Still was finally able to place a Senate seal on the ballots.

On another occasion, Still opened the ballot box and discovered a most unusual specimen—a jug of corn whiskey. Before Still could decide what to do with it, the owner rushed into the room to assert his right of possession.

In 1958, at the suggestion of Still, the elections subcommittee broke the ice with a new procedure. It voted to go to Minnesota's First Congressional District to inspect a close special election.

Rather than get bogged down in formal procedures, the subcomimttee took quick action by virtue of a House resolution which granted the House Administration Committee powers of subpena. This enabled the committee to report directly to the House concerning an investigation's results.

Previously, redtape procedures blocked such action, and in the last case in which a House Member was unseated (the Jenks-Roy contest), the redtape prevented the legitimately elected candidate from being seated until the last day of the 75th Congress.

To fill the demand for information concerning election laws, Still has authored a number of studies printed by the Government Printing Office.

These include "Federal Corrupt Practices and Political Activities," "Information of Importance to Candidates for Office of U.S. Representative in the 84th Congress," and "Manner of Selecting Delegates to National Political Conventions and the Nomination and Election of Presidential Electors."

The latter work was compiled in collaboration with Richard D. Hupman, head of the Senate library. It grew out of the question concerning presidential electors when F.D.R. ran for a third term.

Working with contested elections always means controversy, but Still learned long ago how to deal with controversy.

Married now and the father of a 21-year-old daughter, Still attended the Citadel military college before he was graduated from George Washington Law School in 1933.

As a junior at the Citadel he wrote an editorial in the school paper which touched upon extremely volatile issues of the time—Al Smith and prohibition.

Still supported Al Smith as a candidate for president and also suggested that prohibition be repealed. He said this is a section of the country where both Al Smith and the "wets" were unpopular.

Talk about controversy. Still, a Baptist, recalls: "I received letters from some 30 Baptist ministers for my stand on prohibition.

Proposed Confirmation of Judge Forman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD

an editorial entitled "Confirm Judge Forman" from the Asbury Park Evening Press. It is one of many which have come to my attention urging action by the Senate.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFIRM JUDGE FORMAN

The Democratic leadership of the Senate of the United States is not enhancing its prestige by the treatment it is according the nomination of Judge Phillip Forman to the third circuit court of appeals. As long ago as last February President Eisenhower offered the name of Judge Forman. The Senate promptly pigeonholed it.

It is significant that in all this delay there has been no suggestion that Judge Forman lacked either the character or the capacity to serve in the high post to which the President has named him. As long ago as June of this year the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee finally got around to interviewing Judge Forman but still, without explanation, it continues to withhold his name. This is not the way to interest capable men in service in the Federal judiciary.

Three days after Judge Forman's name was submitted, President Eisenhower offered the name of a Texas lawyer for a district judgeship. A few days ago the Texan wrote the President asking that he withdraw his name as the delay in confirmation was proving embarrassing. His view is understandable, for when a man is named for high office and the Senate ignores him it is inevitable that some persons will assume that the Senate has some good reason for its failure to confirm. The fact of the matter is that approval is being denied Judge Forman and some 1,800 other presidential appointments, of which 50 are to the Federal bench, simply because the Democratic leadership of the Senate is playing politics and hopes to extract some concessions from President Eisenhower in return for confirming his apopintments.

Judge Forman is a competent jurist. He should not be subjected to the treatment he is receiving.

Proposed California-Pacific Northwest Transmission Intertie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has asked the Department of the Interior to conduct a study of the feasibility of interconnecting Federal power generating facilities of the Pacific Northwest with those in the Central Valley region of California. The committee took this action after holding hearings earlier this year, and the Department is expected to have a report completed before start of the next session of Congress.

Naturally, this proposal has created considerable editorial comment in newspapers of the Columbia Basin region. The able and knowledgeable editor of Northwest Ruralite, Mr. Henry Alderman, reviewed some of the problems connected with the proposal in an editorial which appeared in the August 1959 issue of his publication. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Power Intertie," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POWER INTERTIE

The proposed California-Pacific Northwest electric power intertie reminds us of the proposal to unify Germany. It is obviously the right thing to do; but gosh, how everybody dreads it.

This intertie proposal has a long history. A number of years ago the Federal Power Commission, which has some statutory authority for power planning, recommended that the Columbia River power system (Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other dams) be connected electrically with the California utilities including the big Federal Shasta Dam project on the Sacramento River.

At that time, the Interior Department undertook to implement the Federal Power Commission's suggestion by requesting funds from Congress for the construction of a 230,000 volt interconnecting line. Just at that time, also, the Interior Department was making a study of proposals to send surplus Columbia River water to water-shy California. The combination of these two proposals frightened Northwest people out of their wits. It looked as though the booming State of California was going to hob on to our water and power supplies for its own enhancement, leaving the Pacific Northwest short of two of its basic resources required for future population and market development.

Although it is doubtful that either scheme actually would have operated in this fashion, fears carried the day in the Northwest. The intertie was stopped cold.

Some time later Interior Department through its Bonneville agency managed to convince Northwest leadership and the Congress that a heavy circuit should be built from the Federal system as far south as Klamath Falls, primarily to serve the power market around Klamath Falls, but secondarily to be used sometime in the future to bring in excess California generated power to supplement Columbia hydro as well as to send surplus Columbia River power south to conserve oil fuel in steam electric generators there.

This proposal carried the Congress. Right-of-way was bought. Materials for construction of the line were laid out for use. Then Douglas McKay became Secretary of the Interior. Mr. McKay and the then Oregon Senator, Guy Cordon, promptly put their heads together with the California-Oregon Power Co. and sold out the Government line to that company. Copco didn't want any Federal system in its market territory as a possible threat to its high rate, profit position.

Following this sellout, nothing more was heard of the major line south toward California for several years. Then, last summer, the public utility commissioner for Oregon commissioned a private consulting engineering firm to look into some of the advantages which might accrue to the State of Oregon in the matter of power supply if there were an electric transmission tie between the Columbia River and California.

The consultant's report was published last November. Although cautiously worded it was, in the main, strongly favorable to the tieline.

With publication of this report, everybody in the power business jumped into the act. The California power companies, the big public agencies in the State of Washington, the small public agencies in the State of Oregon and State officials of Oregon, Washington and California, all saw the possibility of considerable profit in the construction of the intertie. Even rough preliminary calculations on the value of such a tie demonstrate great possibilities.

Public power people in the State of Washington are still nervous about the possibility of a Federal intertie being used to export the Northwest power resource when it might be needed here. This is a legitimate fear. It needs to be answered.

The California private power companies obviously have taken a look at the figures and would like to control for their own profit any such facility. Their recent proposal to do so was very narrowly stopped by the U.S. Senate.

Some public agencies and the private power companies in the Pacific Northwest see virtue in controlling a tieline.

There has been some argument made in behalf of the State of Oregon owning and operating it as an insurance against control falling into the hands of California, and as a method for giving the State an equity stake in the Columbia River power resource.

With passing weeks, this ferment has steadily grown.

All these interests in the values of the intertie must be resolved by someone. Fears must be allayed, potential markets measured, and costs and benefits to all parties determined.

The U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs now has attempted to point to an answer to these questions by instructing the Interior Department to conduct a detailed study of the tie's values and of how they might be adjudicated.

But the Interior Department appears reluctant to do this. Interior has little choice in the matter, however, since the Senate committee has told it to do this; but it must be remembered that it is this Department which sold out the beginnings of the tie to a power company about 5 years ago.

To be truly effective, such a study should include a great many factors, not only of a technical and economic nature but of a political nature. A good study will require a great deal of initiative and imagination and an enthusiasm on the part of those making it for finding acceptable compromises among the groups which have interest in it. It is a job which, if handled in a routine and unimaginative manner, will be useless.

Now It's Up to the Russians and Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, just after President Eisenhower left for his highly successful European trip, the State Department announced that the United States will continue its unilateral suspension of nuclear weapons tests for the rest of this year. This, we all believe, is a testimonial to America's own desire for peace and nuclear disarmament.

It is now up to the Russians, in their turn, to prove their own sincerity by agreeing to an international inspections system which will protect the world against further dangerous nuclear weapons tests in all countries.

"It is for this purpose, that our negotiators have sat patiently through many wearying weeks of nuclear negotiations at Geneva," says the New York Times this morning. "And," it continues, "the hitch has always been to what extent Russia will consent to the presence of non-Russians on international inspection teams operating in Russia. If Russia really wants to put an end to the tests, the technical problem is not too difficult. Even today, such tests, in most cases, can be detected."

Let me go one step further: Since it is now up to the Russians to prove their sincerity, what better opportunity can they have than the occasion of Mr. Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to announce their willingness to join us in an effective international inspection system over nuclear tests? I am certain that there is no other subject that means as much to the people in this country, and in all other countries, as the subject of peace and freedom from the fear of nuclear extinction. If Mr. Khrushchev wants to demonstrate his actual good faith in peaceful coexistence, he will have the opportunity, before coming here or during his American visit, to announce Russia's willingness not only to talk about peace but also to do something about it.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the New York Times printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IT'S UP TO THE RUSSIANS

The State Department's announcement that the United States will continue its unilateral suspension of nuclear weapons tests for the rest of this year is a testimonial to our country's honest desire for nuclear disarmament.

It is now up to the Russians, in their turn, to prove their own sincerity, if they can summon such a quality, by agreeing to an international inspection system which will protect the world forever against any more nuclear weapons tests at all in any country.

It is for this purpose that our negotiators have sat patiently through many wearying weeks of nuclear negotiations at Geneva. The hitch has always been to what extent Russia will consent to the presence of non-Russians on international inspection teams operating in Russia. If Russia really wants to put an end to the tests the technical problem is not too difficult. Even today such tests in most cases can be detected.

There are those in this country who argue that nothing can be gained by any government by further experiments with nuclear weapons. From this point of view the weapons already possessed by the United States, by Russia and in lesser quantity by Britain are adequate to perform their terrible task. It is contended, on the other hand, that defense benefits can come from further testing, especially in the field of antimissile weapons. This view is certainly present in the Atomic Energy Commission and in the Pentagon. It is difficult to discuss the merits of these arguments because the technical factors are not and cannot be accessible to the general public. No American, of course, would argue that if further tests contribute to our defense we should remain inactive while Russia moves. It is possible, too, that weapons tests may yield knowledge useful for peaceable purposes.

We must remember, however, that there is a growing worldwide danger of fallout from atomic tests. Russia will suffer from her own tests if she carries them too far, and we will suffer from ours as well as hers if we are forced to continue.

We may profitably turn to a report issued last weekend by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The report is based in part on the testimony of some 30 scientific expert witnesses as well as upon statements presented by many other scientists.

The report, on the one hand, presents a generally reassuring picture of the fallout hazard from past atomic tests. On the other hand, it warns of potential dangers, particularly to generations–yet unborn, if testing were to be resumed on the intensive patterns of the last 5 years. In 1958 the equivalent in explosive energy of TNT of more than 40 million tons of fission products alone was released in the world's atmosphere as the result of tests by the United States, the United Kingdom and the Soviet Union.

Significantly, the report contains no sweeping general conclusions about the damage that can be expected from the tests thus far. While it repeatedly emphasizes that the radiation received from fallout so far is still only a small fraction of that received from natural background radiation in the earth and in the atmosphere, it focuses new attention on the potential long-term genetic damage that could be caused by carbon 14, the radioactive isotope created from the nitrogen in the air by neutrons liberated in both atomic and hydrogen bomb explosions.

In short, the well-being of the human race for generations to come may be affected by the increase of radioactive material in the air and on the ground, and the very existence of humanity might be endangered by an all-out atomic war.

We do not argue that the way to avoid this catastrophe is to give way to tyranny and injustice, and to weaken in our defense. But this is the danger that all the peoples of the earth, the rulers of Russia especially included, must be made to understand.

Historic Harpers Ferry, W. Va., Faces the Nation—To Celebrate Centennial October 15–18

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 28, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, less than a month ago in this Chamber I issued an invitation with these words of injunction: Come to West Virginia and you will find a wonderland.

Then, as an example of but a fraction of the beauties and the attractiveness of our Mountain State, I referred to a historic and scenic area within 1 hour and 15 minutes driving time from Washington, D.C., to Harpers Ferry, W. Va.

It was my privilege, when a Member of the House of Representives, to have been author of the 1944 act by which Harpers Ferry National Monument was established. This facility of the Federal Government, under the administration of the U.S. Park Service, has become a most inviting mecca for tourists. In 1956, the first year during which it was fully developed, 115,000 persons signed the guest book there, and the following year the number grew to 170,000. During the past year the figure rose to 271,000, and I am informed officially that in the first 7 months of the present year the 12-month figure for 1958 had been exceeded, with 287,978 guests having placed their names on the U.S. Park Service roll of visitors. It seems to be a logical prediction that the total for 1959 will exceed 400,000.

But, Mr. President, historic Harpers Ferry, where the centennial observance of the John Brown raid will take place October 15, 16, 17, and 18 with pageantry and beauty on parade, was very appropriately displayed to the Nation Wednesday morning. The interesting and much appreciated showing was by means of the National Broadcasting Co's wonderful morning network show, "Today." Popular Dave Garroway presides over the program. Charles Van Doren has added much recently with his trips, scenes, and narration to overlooked vacation areas.

Through the courtesy of Mr. Garroway, Mr. Van Doren, and the "Today" production staff, as well as efficient personnel of NBC personnel in Washington and New York, the script of the Van Doren-narrated Harpers Ferry portion of the August 26 show has been made available. Because it is an accurate word picture of persons, events, and places which appropriately fitted the scenes of, and were associated with, historic old Harpers Ferry, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the portion of the script referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLES VAN DOREN—HARPERS FERRY—BROADCAST AUGUST 26, 1959, OVER THE NBC TELEVISION NETWORK "TODAY" PROGRAM

DAVE GARROWAY. Charles Van Doren has been doing another of his overlooked vacation spots this morning. So let us take a trip with Charles down to the Blue Ridge Mountains and the historic old town of Harpers Ferry.

Mr. VAN DOREN. Harpers Ferry, at the confluence of two mighty rivers, the Potomac and the Shenandoah—Shenandoah: I think that's the most beautiful word in the American language. A town well remembered for what John Brown did there a hundred years ago. And, incidentally, in October, in and around Harpers Ferry, they'll be celebrating the 100th aniversary of that great event.

But I don't want to dwell on that story. I think it's familiar to all of you. Instead, I'd like to take my cue from a much more famous American than Brown—even than John Brown—Thomas Jefferson.

Standing on this rock, about a century and a half ago, Jefferson said this: "You stand on a very high point of land. On your right comes up the Shenandoah, having ranged along the foot of the mountains a hundred miles to find the vent, and on your left approaches the Potomac in quest of a passage also.

"In the moment of their junction they rush together against the mountain, rend it as under they pass off to the sea. The scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic."

As you can see from the picture, Jefferson's words are still true today. It's a sight no one really should miss, a sight to which neither this picture or my words can do justice.

The past lives in Harpers Ferry, not only in its scenery but in the town itself. This is how Harpers Ferry looked when Jefferson

visited it, and it hasn't changed a great deal since.

As you can see from this picture, the main street of Harpers Ferry is just about as it was at the time of the Civil War and perhaps even prior to it. As you walk through the town you're constantly reminded of the past. For example, by ruins of an old Episcopalian church, and also by the cemetery that will evoke memories of an American and of sturdy pioneers of a long-dead period. Maybe not so long dead. I guess there are still pioneers around.

You'll come across the building where John Brown and his little band tried to hold out against the Federal troops commanded by none other than Robert E. Lee. Everybody remembers the John Brown raid of 1859, but we tend to forget that an important Civil War battle was also fought here in 1862, and another one around here in sixty-four.

Harpers Ferry was important for two reasons—its strategic location at the meeting of the Potomac and the Shenandoah, and because of the large arsenal that Brown had tried to take in 1859, seen here as it looked at the beginning of the Civil War in 1861. Well, as I say, history lives in Harpers Ferry, but I am not sure that's the most important reason why I love the city—the town. If you'll look at this picture, here, I think you'll see why I love it (shows picture).

Since the rivers make a cut through the mountains here, and it's the only place to go west, the railroads come through, too, and you can see two railroads coming across the river here. They cut through a great tunnel which follows the river right underneath this mountain on which these two people are sitting, and the rock walls are very high and precipitious around the rivers, both rivers here at the town of Harpers Ferry.

And when the trains come through there they blow their whistles and it makes the most eerie and mysterious, almost otherworldly sound as it echoes back and forth between those great cliffs. And if you love trains, as I do, I think it might be worth a trip just to hear the sound of those whistles.

You may not hear it much longer. Of course, the whistles are not really steam whistles any more. They're imitations, but they still sound pretty fine.

If you want details on hotel accommodations, meals and so on, write to the Conservation Commission, Charleston, W. Va., for details about Harpers Ferry.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2820 Ordway St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Analysis of Public Works Bill Veto Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, an analysis of the veto message on the public works appropriation bill for 1960—H.R. 7509—shows clearly that the basis of the President's objection to the bill is the unbudgeted construction starts. No reference is made to unbudgeted general investigations and preconstruction planning items. Items in these categories do not represent substantial dollar commitments and the absence of any reference to them in the veto message warrants the conclusion that the President has no objection to them. Unbudgeted items added by the Congress in these two categories are:

Rivers and harbors and flood control:	
General investigations	89
Advance planning	32
Subtotal	121
Bureau of Reclamation:	
General investigations	1
Advance planning	0
Subtotal	1
Total	122

The veto message makes no reference to increases or decreases made by the Congress on budgeted items. It can therefore be assumed that there is no objection on the President's part to the individual project figures in H.R. 7509 for all projects which were budgeted.

The only reference which the veto message makes to power facilities concerns the Trinity River project in California. The statement concedes that funds for starting Federal construction of these facilities are necessary unless partnership development with Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is authorized. In the absence of any other reference to power facilities, it may be assumed that there is no objection to other adjustments made by the Congress in the power program.

The following two lists indicate which unbudgeted items would remain in the bill and which would be eliminated if the veto is sustained:

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained

GENERAL INVESTIGATION ITEMS

Arizona:	
Gila River below Painted Rock Dam	$20,000
Gila River, Phoenix metropolitan area	30,000
Arkansas: Benton Dam survey	5,000
California:	
Dry Creek resurvey	$50,000
Napa River	5,000
Soquel Creek	3,000
Sweetwater River	40,000
Connecticut:	
Connecticut River at Essex	5,000
Popuonock River, Groton	5,000
Delaware:	
Indian River Bay via Peppers Creek to Dagsboro	9,000
Broad Creek River, Sussex County	5,000
Florida:	
Pensacola Harbor	7,500
Tampa Harbor (Ybor Channel)	27,000
Georgia:	
Oostanaula River	25,000
Savannah turning basin	4,000
Tugaloo River, Georgia and South Carolina	26,000
Illinois:	
Illinois River	25,000
Little Calumet River	10,000
Indiana: Michigan City	8,000
Kansas:	
Cow Creek	20,000
Three Mile Creek, Leavenworth	5,000
White Clay Creek, Atchison	8,000
Kentucky:	
Bunches Creek	15,000
Kentucky River	12,000
Licking River Basin	20,000
Louisiana:	
Bayou Bartholomew and tributaries	25,000
Bayou Bonfouca	10,000
Calcasieu River salt barrier	9,000
Maine:	
Kennebunk River	9,000
Monhegan River	2,500
Portsmouth Harbor, Piscatague River, Maine and N.H	9,000
Searsport Harbor	9,000
Stave Island Harbor	8,000
Maryland: Wicomico River	15,000
Massachusetts: Town River survey	9,000
Michigan:	
Detroit metropolitan area	5,000
Holland Harbor: Lake Michigan-Lake Macatawa Channel	13,500
Kawkawlin River	8,000
Ontonagan Harbor	8,900
Red Run-Clinton River	10,000
Traverse City Harbor or Refuge	5,000
Minnesota: Levee Wall at Winona	9,000
Mississippi: Okatibbe Creek	25,000
Missouri: Clarksville	6,000
Nevada: Las Vegas Wash	9,000
Nebraska:	
Missouri River slackwater navigation	10,000
Republican River	15,000
Missouri River bank, stabilization and navigation, Sioux City to Yankton	20,000
New Jersey:	
Newark Bay—Passaic River Channel	15,000
Sandy Hook Inlet (Shrewsberry River, N.J.)	25,000
New York:	
Buttermilk Channel	10,000
Cazenovia Creek	10,000
Hudson River siltation	114,000
Little Neck Bay	9,000
New York State Barge Canal	10,000
New York Harbor deepwater anchorage	10,000
Tonowanda Creek	32,000
North Carolina:	
Rogue Inlet and Swensboro Harbor	$15,000
Cape Fear River	10,000
Rollinson Channel-Hatteras Harbor	6,500
Shallote River	7,500
Wrights Creek	10,000
North Dakota:	
Missouri River bank stabilization, Garrison to Oahe	10,000
Souris River	10,000
Ohio:	
Chagrin River	10,000
Crab Creek at and in the vicinity of Youngstown	30,000
Mad River drainage basin	22,000
Sandusky River basin	60,000
White Oak Creek	10,000
Oklahoma: Oklahoma City floodway extension	6,000
Oregon:	
Rogue River	11,000
Umpqua River, north to Reedsport	11,000
Walla Walla River, Milton Freewater	13,500
Willow Creek	18,400
South Carolina: Santee River and tributaries	30,000
Texas:	
Arkansas-Red River pollution survey	75,000
Big and Little Vince Bayou	21,000
El Paso	20,000
Guadalupe River	11,000
Gulf Intercoastal Waterway Channel to Port Isabel	7,500
Lake Kemp	35,000
Neches River	10,000
Salt Fork and Prairie Dog Town Fork of the Red River	90,000
San Jacinto survey	15,000
West Fork, Double Bayou	2,000
Utah: Great Salt Lake (Saltair)	25,000
Washington:	
Ben Franklin Dam	20,000
Swinomish Slough	20,100
West Virginia:	
Deckers Creek	15,000
Twelve Pole Creek	10,000

ADVANCE PLANNING ITEMS

Alabama: Holt lock and dam	150,000
Arkansas:	
DeGray Reservoir	150,000
Gillham Reservoir	80,000
Illinois: Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Drainage and Levee District No. 1	50,000
Indiana:	
Clinton (deferred for restudy)	5,000
Sugar Creek levee	15,000
Terre Haute-Conover levee (deferred for restudy)	2,000
West Terre Haute	30,000
Iowa:	
Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	75,000
Saylorville Reservoir	200,000
Kansas:	
Frankfort	50,000
Marion Reservoir	25,000
Kentucky: No. 2 Green Reservoir	50,000
Michigan: Hammond Bay Harbor	20,000
Missouri: Marion County drainage district	73,000

Unbudgeted items remaining in the bill if veto is sustained—Continued

New York: Herkimer	$48,000
Ohio: Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	125,000
Oklahoma:	
Lukfata Reservoir	50,000
Pine Creek Reservoir	80,000
Oregon:	
Willamette River basin channel improvement and major drainage: Coyote and Spencer Creek	50,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor	100,000
Pennsylvania: Turtle Creek	$25,000
Texas: Matagorda ship channel: 36-foot channel	150,000
Virgin Islands: Christiansted Harbor (inactive)	3,000
Washington:	
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.: (b) Bingen Barge Channel	10,000
Little Goose lock and dam	450,000
Wisconsin:	
Bad River:	
(a) Mellen Channel	$25,000
(b) Odanah, moving village and raising school	25,000
Eau Galle River	75,000
Saxon Harbor	31,000
FLOOD CONTROL, MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES	
Construction and planning:	
Greenville Harbor	60,000
Lower White River	107,000

Unbudgeted construction items to be eliminated if veto is sustained

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Project	Benefit-cost ratio	Total estimated Federal cost	Appropriation to date	Amount in H.R. 7509
Arkansas: Beaver Reservoir [2]	1.1	$56,100,000	$1,291,000	$1,500,000
Alaska: Dillingham Harbor	1.3	412,000	6,000	406,000
California:				
Mill Creek levees	2.1	1,740,000	107,000	500,000
New Hogan Reservoir	1.7	19,300,000	740,000	1,500,000
Redwood City Harbor: 30-foot depth San Bruno Shoal entrance and Redwood Creek channels	1.6	1,380,000	2,000	1,378,000
San Jacinto River and Bautista Creek	2.1	5,770,000	215,000	225,000
Connecticut:				
Hall Meadow Brook Reservoir	2.4	2,210,000	20,000	250,000
Mad River Reservoir	1.2	5,970,000	18,000	275,000
Florida:				
Apalachicola Bay:				
(a) Channel at East Point: Reimburse	N.A.	[1] 39,100		39,100
(b) St. George Island: Reimbursement	N.A.	[1] 43,000		43,000
Intracoastal Waterway, Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	N.A.	6,860,000	370,000	600,000
Hawaii: Kahului Harbor	2.9	963,000	14,000	140,000
Illinois:				
Drury drainage district	3.7	1,520,000	84,000	540,000
Henderson River: Diversion unit	2.8	1,750,000	150,000	550,000
Hunt drainage district and Lima Lake drinage district	1.8	5,420,000	174,000	1,000,000
Iowa: Red Rock Reservoir	1.5	71,400,000	1,717,000	1,113,000
Kansas:				
Council Grove Reservoir	1.8	12,700,000	303,000	300,000
Wilson Reservoi	1.2	18,100,000	259,000	500,000
Kentucky: No. 2 Barren Reservoir	2.3	23,500,000	214,000	1,000,000
Louisiana:				
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway: (a) Algiers Cutoff, Jefferson-Plaquemine drainage district	N.A.	[1] 1,420,000		1,420,000
Barataria Bay	3.5	2,400,000	85,000	1,000,000
Massachusetts:				
Boston Harbor: (b) 35-foot reserved channel	2.3	829,000	4,000	825,000
Westville Reservoir	1.1	7,450,000	328,000	1,800,000
Michigan: Grand Marais Harbor	N.E.	1,020,000	5,000	300,000
Mississippi: Pascagoula Harbor	1.8	1,248,000	6,000	1,242,000
Missouri: Des Moines and Mississippi Levee District No. 1	2.7	1,600,000	103,000	500,000
Nebraska: Gering and Mitchell Valleys	1.8	$1,400,000	$45,000	$350,000
New Mexico:				
Two Rivers Reservoir	1.2	6,900,000	390,000	75,000
Rio Grande Floodway, Cochiti to Rio Puerco	N.A.	4,400,000	50,000	800,000
New York:				
Buttermilk Channel [2]	N.A.	1,551,000		1,500,000
Hudson River, New York City to Albany 32-foot channel	1.9	36,300,000	65,000	500,000
New York-New Jersey pierhead line [2]	1.4	1,311,000		500,000
Ohio Street Bridge, Buffalo River	N.E.	4,520,000		2,000,000
North Carolina:				
Morehead City Harbor	1.9	1,382,000	12,000	600,000
Wilkesboro Reservoir	1.2	8,350,000	387,000	1,000,000
Ohio:				
Muskingum River Reservoir [2]	N.E.	615,000		500,000
West Branch Mahoning River Reservoir	1.3	6,940,000	261,000	525,000
Oregon: Malheur River, Vale unit	2.3	423,000	70,000	250,000
Pennsylvania:				
Allegheny River Reservoir [2]	1.3	113,000,000	2,733,000	1,400,000
Brookville	2.7	1,340,000	87,000	500,000
Shenango River Reservoir, Pennsylvania and Ohio	1.7	28,000,000	374,000	500,000
Texas:				
Colorado River channel	1.5	1,310,000	54,000	400,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, channel to Port Mansfield	1.1	3,446,000	16,000	150,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway, channel to La Quinta	5.4	[1] 959,000	5,000	954,000
Proctor Reservoir	1.4	17,100,000	325,000	300,000
Virginia: Pound Reservoir	1.2	17,700,000	331,000	2,500,000
West Virginia:				
East Rainelle	2.0	840,000	58,000	500,000
Princeton	1.8	1,085,000	74,000	500,000
Summersville Reservoir	2.6	46,800,000	685,000	2,000,000
Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries:				
West Tennessee tributaries	3.0	8,400,000	170,000	200,000
Wolf River and tributaries	1.3	2,025,000	43,000	300,000
Yazoo backwater	2.2	30,900,000	279,000	50,000
Total, Corps of Engineers (52 projects)		598,231,100	12,728,000	37,800,100

RECLAMATION

California: Trinity power facilities		$59,607,000		$2,415,000
Idaho: Burns Creek		44,616,000		500,000
Washington: Greater Wenatchee Division	7.0	7,579,000		500,000
Missouri River Basin:				
Kansas: Cedar Bluff unit	2.02	4,625,000		400,000
Montana: East Bench unit	2.07	20,597,000		1,000,000
Nebraska: Red Willow Dam	1.87	6,597,000	$214,253	525,000
Upper Colorado River:				
Colorado: Smith Fork	1.2	$4,420,000		$500,000
New Mexico: Hammond project	2.1	3,280,000		500,000
Wyoming: Seedskadee project	1.5	37,885,000		1,354,000
Loan program (6 projects)		17,089,500		6,016,500
Total reclamation (15 projects)		206,295,500	$214,253	13,710,500
Grand total (67 projects)		804,526,600	12,942,253	51,510,600

[1] Reimbursements to local interests.

[2] Resumption of construction.

Long-Range Study of Educational Policies and Problems by Texas Research League

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Orange County, Tex., will soon be the scene of a major, long-range study with regard to educational policies and problems. The study will be made by the Texas Research League.

Because of the novel and interesting approach being taken to educational problems in Orange County, and because of this firm evidence of cooperation at the local level, I ask unanimous consent that an aticle entitled "Historic County Schools Study Starts Soon," published in the Orange (Tex.) Leader of August 23, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORIC COUNTY SCHOOLS STUDY STARTS SOON—TEXAS RESEARCH LEAGUE MAY SET PATTERN HERE

A historic survey of school district organization and related problems gets underway in Orange County in the near future.

It will be made by a nationally known and respected factfinding agency, the Texas Research League.

And it is expected to develop a pattern of approach which can be used by other Texas counties faced with similar school district problems.

Announcement of the official acceptance by Texas Research League of an invitation to make the survey was made yesterday by George D. Craft, chairman of a citizens' shool study committee appointed some months ago by the county board of education.

Craft said a letter was received late last week notifying his committee that the large group of leading Texas businessmen and industrialists on the Texas Research League board of directors had unanimously approved the Orange County survey.

Executives of the research organization had advised earlier that the study would be made if approved by its screening committee and members of its board of directors.

The letter to Craft was signed by B. S. Sines, of Houston, chairman of the Texas Research League board.

It pointed out the understanding of the league that the purpose of its survey is to provide the facts on which the school boards and other school officials of your county may base a sound district organization plan which will assure a good system of education for your children in the most economical manner.

Sines went on to say that the favorable action of the league's directors was taken in the belief that the study will not only benefit the people of Orange County, but will also develop a pattern of approach which can be used by other Texas counties faced with similar school district problems.

He added, "An important factor prompting the league's acceptance of your study request was your committee's assurance that the undertaking has the sympathetic support of your county school board, the various local school boards, your school administrators and the various official taxpayers and other citizen groups having an interest in the problems facing the schools of Orange County."

This was followed by the comment that the success of the survey will depend very importantly on the cooperation which these persons and groups will give the league's research team in its factfinding efforts.

A part of this cooperation will be the payment by Orange County interests of $4,500 toward costs of the survey which are not included in the league's current operating budget. The citizens' committee will meet during the next few days to make plans for raising this money.

Texas Research League will finance an additional $5,000 of the cost out of its own funds, which are provided by the Texas business and industrial firms that support the independent factfinding agency.

According to Sines, the league's research staff will begin the study in the near future. Details of the project are to be worked out by the organization's executive director, Alvin Burger, and the citizens' study committee.

In conclusion, the Texas Research League chairman commented, "The Texas Research League undertakes this survey as a public service. Our board of directors sincerely hopes that the results of the project will contribute to the solution of the financial problems facing your school districts and to the general improvement of public education in Orange County."

Texas Research League was organized by Texas businessmen and industrialists a number of years ago as an agency for doing research work necessary to good government. Its assistance has been officially requested a number of times by the legislature and State agencies and some of its reports have attracted nationwide attention.

The Orange County school study will be the league's first factfinding mission below the level of State government.

The survey was arranged for the committee by Clyde McKee, chairman of a subcommittee appointed for the purpose.

Immediate responsibility for coordination of the project will be in the hands of Jim McGrew, research director for the league at its Austin headquarters.

Fieldwork will be under the direction of Glenn Ivy, research associate. He already has considerable experience in this type of study gained from compiling in 1955 an exhaustive and widely read report on school district organization in the State for the Texas Education Agency.

Ivy also has had extensive experience in property taxes as a result of research work which he did last year while the league was working with the Texas State Tax Study Commission.

Americans Provided Best and Cheapest Food Anywhere in World While Farm Program Has Operated—Benson Works To Destroy This Program—Farmers Enter a New Depression—A Report on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 86th Congress draws to a close, I feel it is my duty, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, to review for Members of the House the work of our committee and of the Congress in behalf of agriculture and to bring into proper perspective for the Nation the general circumstances of our farmers and their families.

In this session of Congress, as in past sessions, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, the chief agriculture officer of our country, has placed roadblocks and obstacles in the pathway of progress.

The Secretary of Agriculture has not provided leadership commensurate with the responsibilities of his high office. On the contrary, he has continued his efforts to divide the agricultural forces of our country and to array consumers against producers and to bring the farm program into disrepute. He has not championed the cause of agriculture nor has he demonstrated a willingness to compose differences with those who do not see "eye to eye" with him. He has been stubborn and unrelenting.

Mr. Benson has not presented a single new thought nor has he proposed a single new program, nor has he been courageous enough to advocate the outright repeal of a single law or program which he has so constantly and consistently criticized. He says that he dislikes the production adjustment programs and the price-support programs but when challenged to do so he refuses to advocate the repeal of either. He seeks only to modify the price-support programs and to lower prices to starvation levels.

"Freedom" and bankruptcy for the farmers of America is Mr. Benson's program.

Unfortunately he does not understand the plight of our farmers nor does he understand their problems, and he is definitely not in favor of a Federal farm program for the farmers of our country. He believes in letting the farmer earn his living "by the sweat of his brow" and to live by the harsh and cruel law of supply and demand without any aid or assistance from the Government, such as are extended to other areas of our economy.

Certainly he should know that the farmers of America have mastered the techniques of production and are now capable of producing more food and fiber than the Nation can possibly consume. Unless our farmers are permitted to exercise some control over production our supplies will be abundant, our surpluses will accumulate, prices will deteriorate, and farmers will suffer. He wants the farmer to go it alone while every other great segment of our economy enjoys a high degree of Government protection.

Our Secretary just does not want to understand the farm program which operated successfully for 20 long years and under which our farmers and the people of our Nation prospered. He wants to destroy the program and to permit our farmers to bury themselves beneath the abundance they are capable of producing.

Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of talk about the administration's farm program.

There is no such thing. I have challenged the Secretary, and I now challenge any Member of this House to tell us what the Eisenhower-Benson farm program really is. We know and we understand the program which operated so long and so well and we know that under that program America has been the best fed nation on earth and we know that the consumers of America have had more, better, and cheaper food than at any other time in all history.

THE CONSUMER

The average worker in the United States in 1958 spent only 25 percent of his earnings to buy the average amount of food consumed by a family of three. Thirty years earlier the same food would have cost the same worker 48 percent of his earnings.

Over the 30-year period, with farm price support programs in operation in worker's earnings has been released by most years, 23 percent of the average lower food prices for other uses—to improve his home, send his children to college, buy an automobile, and in many ways to increase and dignify his standard of living.

Farmers in no other country of the world have lowered food costs, in relation to workers' earnings, so dramatically. Food costs, in spite of sharp increases in processing and marketing charges, are lower in the United States in terms of workers' wages than anywhere else in the world.

This has been made possible by the great forward strides in farmers' production efficiency, and we may credit the farm program as a dominant factor in bringing about this high level efficiency. With this farm program, the earnings of farmers were raised from the former low levels and they were able to invest in mechanization, in soil improvements, in chemicals, in new plant varieties, and in production methods which previously were impossible because the farmers were so poor.

Mr. Speaker, if all farm program costs had been added to the cost of food in 1958, the average worker would have spent only 26 percent of his earnings for food, as compared with 35 percent for the same food 10 years earlier, 41 percent 20 years earlier, and 48 percent 30 years earlier.

Yet, there is a movement abroad in this country to heap ridicule upon all farm price stabilization and production adjustment programs, and upon farmers as well. The movement aims to prejudice nonfarm people against farm people, and thus to destroy and foreclose a workable program aimed at economic justice for the people who produce our food and fiber.

Mr. Speaker, there are sly and insidious political calculations back of this movement, as some politicians bid for the vote of the cities, deserting our farmers because they now are so few.

THE BENSON PROGRAM

Mr. Benson has conjured up a program without real form or substance, which he glibly alludes to at every opportunity as the route to a free, prosperous, and expanding agriculture. In fact, however, the Benson program is an incredibly inadequate proposal involving unlimited free production, higher Government costs, and lower prices to farmers. The nearer he has moved agriculture toward his philosophy, the poorer our farmers have become.

The Secretary during his tenure has spent more money than the accumulated total expenditures by all his predecessors in this office during the prior 90-year history of the Department of Agriculture.

Yet in these 6½ years the net income of our farmers has been almost $20 billion less than in the 6½ years prior to his taking office. The earnings of our people in agriculture have been reduced drastically, while other areas of our Nation's economy have experienced unprecedented prosperity. Moreover, Government investments in surplus farm commodities have increased more than threefold, from $2,452 million on January 1, 1953 to $9 billion by the latest report.

And now the stage is set, as a result of Mr. Benson's dreamworld economic theories, for an even greater farm debacle within the next 2 years. Prices received by farmers are in a new downward swirl. They stand now at a level 17 percent below 1952. Hog prices have joined in the decline, falling in July to the lowest level for that month since July 1944. Economists are predicting a slide in beef cattle prices in the months ahead.

The situation demands action.

THE VETO

But, Mr. Speaker, the unyielding, uncompromising, negative position of Mr. Benson and this administration has brought about a paralysis in Washington where the interests of our farmers are concerned.

The veto power of the President, placed at Mr. Benson's disposal, has been raised as an absolute barrier between the farmers and their Government.

The President himself, in a special farm message shortly after this Congress convened, proposed further retreat of the Government from responsibility in the price stability of agriculture and from farm production adjustment undertakings. He called for outright repeal of the parity principle, which is the only means under law to determine a fair relationship of farm prices and costs to the total of the Nation's economy.

Notwithstanding the President's pronouncements, this Congress set out with earnestness and dedication to arrest the 6-year deterioration of our agricultural economy, and to return our farmers nearer to a parity position in our free enterprise society.

But, Mr. Speaker, it soon became crystal clear that no bill could become law unless it hewed to the line laid down by the President. Our efforts were scuttled by the President's negative power—the veto.

WHEAT NO. 1 PROBLEM

It was evident to the Congress and to the President, when this Congress convened, that the great accumulation of wheat surpluses presented the Nation with its No. 1 farm problem. The Congress passed a bill cutting the wheat acreage in 1960 by 25 percent below 1959. It would have brought wheat plantings down to 41 million acres and would have reduced production substantially. This would have been less than half the 84 million acres our farmers seeded to wheat 10 years ago. The legislation represented a willingness of our farmers to assume great sacrifices to bring down the wheat surplus.

The President vetoed the bill.

He condemned the legislation because it included price supports which sought to prevent great hardships to wheat farmers while they were reducing their crops so severely. He did this in the face of a Department of Agriculture statement that the price support would not influence the price of bread, and despite a sound showing that the legislation would save the Government and taxpayers approximately a half billion dollars over a 2-year period.

By this action the President has assumed full responsibility for the future buildup in wheat surpluses and for the huge costs of financing these extraordinary supplies.

TOBACCO BILL

The Congress passed a tobacco bill, the effect of which was to prevent increases in the support prices of tobacco, so that our tobacco might continue to compete pricewise in world markets. All interests in the tobacco industry supported the legislation.

The President vetoed this bill. I never have understood why.

Our Committee on Agriculture held hearings on long-range farm program proposals in an effort to bring general farm legislation before this session of the Congress. We sought to halt the dangerous decline in farm prices and to restore agriculture to an equitable position in the general economy. We would not accept the administration's proposals for agriculture. As a consequence, we were unable to develop legislation which would meet with the President's approval. The farmer does not now have, in the political alinement existing in the Congress, sufficient strength for a two-thirds vote in both Houses to override a veto of legislation in his interest.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, the deep concern of the Members of this House for the well-being of agriculture is spread vividly in the records of our committee. I have been especially impressed and pleased by the dedicated work in behalf of agriculture by the newly elected Members of this body. Our committee records show that Members of the House have introduced to this date in the first session of the 86th Congress 461 bills dealing with conditions on our farms.

Our committee held 113 sessions.

We reviewed these bills and sent 118 to the Secretary, to determine his position upon them. Mr. Benson approved only eight of these bills, and most of these were of a minor nature. He disapproved, proposed changes, or did not report at all, with respect to all the

others. He rejected all legislation proposing fundamental improvements in the operation of farm laws to increase the income of farm families.

In fact, Mr. Benson's predisposition to oppose everything would be comical, if it were not so tragic.

SCHOOL MILK

He went so far as to send his assistants before our committee to oppose an additional national authorization of $3 million for the special school milk program, without which the program through which milk is supplied to children would have been closed down in many schools before the last school term ended. We passed the authorization bill, Mr. Benson notwithstanding and, not risking a chance of being overriden in the Congress on a milk-for-schoolchildren issue, the President signed it.

CORN GLUT

Early in the session it became evident that Mr. Benson's action drastically reducing the prices of oats, rye, barley, and barley and grain sorghums would severely aggravate the feed surplus situation, by influencing a shift from these small grains to the production of corn. To remedy this our committee developed a bill which would have balanced the price supports of the small grains to their feed value relationship with corn. The Secretary opposed this legislation. And now there is in prospect the largest corn crop in history, to add to the surplus and create graver problems for the livestock industry in the years ahead.

INDUSTRIAL USE RESEARCH

In the Agricultural Act of 1956 the Congress provided for the establishment of a Commission to examine the possibilities of new markets by increasing research in industrial uses of the products of our farms. The Commission made its recommendations. The administration opposed the legislation embracing these recommendations. Our committee worked throughout the session to develop legislation Mr. Benson would accept.

EGGS AND BROILERS

Our poultry industry suffered a price disaster in the spring of this year. It was ironic that the President, in his January farm message condemning the farm price support program, had singled out the poultry industry specifically as an example in agriculture where prosperity abided without the help of Government. Many hundreds and perhaps thousands of family enterprises in poultry were wiped out by the price debacle. The poultrymen appealed to the Congress and to Mr. Benson for help. Mr. Benson opposed legislation to deal with the long-range problems of the industry. He refused to ease the egg market glut by using funds which already were available to buy laying hens, although the product could have been used in a substantial way to improve the school lunch and relief food programs. He did inaugurate a modest egg-buying program, the effect of which came too late to aid many family poultry farms.

REA AND THE VETO

The Congress approved a bill to return to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the full loan-making authority, so that such authority would not rest with an unsympathetic appointee of the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Benson opposed the bill. The President vetoed it. The Senate voted to override, but the House failed to cast the necessary two-thirds vote to set aside the veto.

FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

Many bills were presented to provide for more effective distribution of surplus foods, through a food stamp plan, among needy people. Mr. Benson opposed all these bills.

COUNTRY LIFE COMMISSION

The bill to establish a bipartisan Country Life Commission, to study the most pressing problems of the changing rural scene, drew a neutral report from the Department of Agriculture. This Commission would have been similar in its operations to one appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt in the early part of the century and which made recommendations which brought about substantial improvements in the farm economy and in country living.

HOGS

As the autumn marketing season approached, it became increasingly clear that a crisis was building up in farmer prices for hogs. When July prices for hogs dropped to the lowest level for that month in 15 years there no longer was any doubt that positive measures should be taken to forestall a price catastrophe which might bring grave consequences to the economy of the Midwest and in some other areas of the Nation. Several bills were introduced, proposing various ways of dealing with the situation. Our committee brought up for consideration the bills proposing a program of incentive payments to encourage the marketing of lightweight hogs and thereby ease market gluts. This approach was supported by the National Planning Association, a nonpartisan body. Mr. Benson opposed it. Our committee reported a bill embracing this approach to the hog price problem, but with the opposition of the administration it did not become law.

The Secretary of Agriculture has surplus removal funds already available to initiate a pork purchase program, with the pork to be used in schools and for relief food. It is my hope that he will use his authority and the funds the Congress has provided, in the manner and to the extent necessary, to maintain the maximum stability in the hog markets under the pressures of huge supplies during the impending marketing season. Our bill encouraging lightweight marketings would deal more effectively with the problem, at smaller expense, with the major benefits going to farmers rather than to meat processors; but the Secretary can do an effective job with the authority and funds already at hand, if he will use them wisely.

We have sent to the Secretary, in this and previous Congresses, bills proposing revisions in the present price support and production adjustment program. We forwarded to him bills proposing two-price or domestic parity systems for various commodities which would let these crops move competitively into world markets while maintaining a reasonable price in our domestic markets. We sent to him proposals for production payments, compensatory payments, or marketing equalization payments to farmers. He has returned them with the Department's stamp of disapproval.

In these circumstances I have set forth, Mr. Speaker, we have been unable to put on our statute books the public policies so sorely needed to stop the piling of surplus upon surplus, reduce Government costs and to arrest the new and deeper depression that is settling upon our farms.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

We have, however, brought forward, with the prospect of Presidential approval, legislation to extend and improve Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act. This bill embraces a section calling upon the Secretary to initiate a food stamp plan for a more adequate distribution of surplus foods among needy people. It includes another section which should prevent the destruction of the extra long staple cotton production industry in the United States. I hope that when the President signs the Public Law 480 extension bill it will include these provisions, although his Secretary vigorously opposes any food stamp plan.

We passed and the President signed legislation important to cotton producers, in that it provides a sound base for making cotton acreage allotments.

Legislation was enacted to assure the operation of special school milk program throughout the last school term, and the authorization for this program was increased by $6 million to $81 million for the school term now commencing and by $9 million to $84 million for the 1960–61 school term.

We took steps to improve farm credit operations, crop insurance, pest control and several other laws important to agriculture.

We approved numerous watershed projects, for soil and water conservation.

Mr. Speaker, while our efforts to write general farm legislation have been thwarted by the administration, our studies and our work should be of substantial value in the development of sound farm policies when we have an administration sympathetic to the needs of the people who produce our food and fiber.

I would remind the House that before Mr. Benson became the Secretary of Agriculture we had a farm program under which for 11 consecutive years the average prices paid to farmers were at or above 100 percent of parity. I would point out that this program operated for two decades prior to 1953 at an actual profit of $13 million on Commodity Credit Corporation price supports for the basic crops. CCC operations for all crops including perishables and nonperishables, cost only $1,064 million over a 20-year period.

This program which worked so long and so well, at so little expense, now is a virtual shambles.

THE GOVERNMENT AND FARMERS

Mr. Speaker, our Government has given labor the minimum-wage and collective-bargaining laws. We have clothed industry with the corporate structure and the many Federal and State statutes which regulate competition. With the help of these Government aids and regulations, both labor and industry have built up a marketing structure which maintains price and wage rates at balanced levels while adjusting supply to demand. How, then, can the modern, highly mechanized farmer survive, when he must do all his buying in the protected market of industry and labor, and do all his own selling at auction, with no protection?

Surely our national interest requires that we have a farm program which will enable farmers to adjust their marketing to available outlets and demand—at prices in line with their costs, as is essential in any successful business.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say this:

The well-being of agriculture is a matter of concern to all the people. Our Government research, conservation, and educational programs, combined with the intelligence and labor of our farmers, have given us the most efficient agricultural production in the world. They are giving consumers the cheapest food—in relation to wages—on record. Our farm marketing and pricing machinery, however, is woefully behind the times. Without governmental assistance in the marketing and pricing fields, the exploding production technology on our farms will surely proceed to create a disastrous economic situation for agriculture.

Government cannot now stand by while propagandists cry that all old programs have failed and all new programs are doomed to failure. This Government of ours, representing all the people, cannot say there is nothing it can do to avert the impending economic misery of the farmer. This Government can and must act to salvage some economic justice and stability for farmers—and protect everyone against the ruinous imbalance arising from the abnormal rate of technological advances in production, in relation to available market outlets.

This Government has a moral, an ethical, an inherent, and a constitutional obligation to establish public policies and programs that will open to the men and women of agriculture the opportunity for fair returns on their management, their risks, their capital investment, and their labor on a basis comparable with the workers in all other undertakings in this free enterprise economy and in this democratic society.

The safety, the health, the aspirations of all the people—the strength of our Nation—demand this.

Wisconsin "Tops" Soviet Union in Cheese Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 29, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during these days when the Soviet Union is experiencing growing pains, in the economic, military, scientific, and other fields, we receive repeated reports of bragging about their program.

Among these claims, for example, is that they have made a 500 percent increase in production over pre-World War years of a product for which my home State is famous, that is, cheese.

At this time I want to set the record straight.

Now, it may well be true that they have increased cheese production 500 percent. However, the real facts in cheese production illustrate that my home State of Wisconsin—with only about 2 percent of the population of the Soviet Union, far out-produces the Soviet Union in cheese.

In 1958 the Badger State output amounted to 280,000 metric tons of cheese; by comparison, the production of the Soviet Union totalled only about 150,000 metric tons, approximately 23 percent of the cheese production in the United States.

For a further comparison of cheese production—in which Wisconsin "tops" the Soviet Union—I ask unanimous consent to have the text of a release issued today printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY HAILS WISCONSIN CHEESE OUTPUT AS SYMBOL OF FREE ENTERPRISE TRIUMPH OVER COMMUNISM; WISCONSIN WITH POPULATION OF 3.8 MILLION PRODUCES ALMOST TWICE AS MUCH CHEESE AS SOVIET UNION, POPULATION 208 MILLION

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today hailed Wisconsin's record of outproducing Russia in cheese as a symbol of triumph of free enterprise over communism.

"Currently, the Communist leaders brag about the stepped up production of consumer goods under their system. The Soviets are advertising the fact that their cheese production is up 500 percent since the pre-World War years. The fact is, however, that the State of Wisconsin, alone, now producers almost twice as much cheese as the whole Soviet Union. In 1958, the Badger State output amounted to 280,000 metric tons of cheese; by comparison, the production of the Soviet Union totaled only about 150,000 metric tons—approximately 23 percent of the cheese production in the United States. For further comparison, Russian cheese production amounts to 1.6 pounds per person, while the United States production amounts to 8 pounds per person—according to statistics released earlier this month by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization.

"Globally, the production of cheese between the years prior to the Second World War and 1958 increased about 70 percent. During this same period, American cheese production more than doubled and the United States tops the list of cheese producers. Next in importance are France, Italy, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, the Soviet Union, Denmark, and Switzerland.

"Although the United States is the world's No. 1 cheese producer," the Wisconsin Senator pointed out, "statistics illustrate that the consumption of cheese in some countries far exceeds that in the United States. Here the per capita consumption is approximately 8.5 pounds. This compares poorly with higher consumption of 19.5 pounds in Norway and 18.7 pounds by the Swiss (who were the pre-world war champions but are now outperformed by the Norwegians.)

"Consequently, the United States still represents a large untapped market for the cheese industry. If the challenge of increasing consumption can be met successfully and will result in a per capita increase, this should substantially brighten the outlook for the American cheese industry. This should be particularly important to Wisconsin since it produces about 44 percent of all American cheese.

"The cheese consumption figures for the United States illustrate that what may be considered a luxury in Russia is everyday diet in this country. In the United States, a pound of hard cheddar cheese sells for about 58 cents, which would mean that an average industrial worker would have to put in about 16 minutes of work to buy a pound of cheese. In Moscow, a pound of the cheapest hard cheese sells for 11 rubles, and comparatively, would require 2 hours and 34 minutes of work.

"In attempting to show that the lot of the Soviet workers is not inferior to that of the American working class, the Communist leaders have denied that the American automobiles, the American home, and the American goods exhibited in the Moscow fair can be afforded by the typical American workingman. As usual, the Soviets are unlikely to accept our superiority in production or our ability to better provide the people's needs. Therefore, although I am not in favor of an 'open arms' welcome for Khrushchev when he comes to this country, I would be happy to send him some samples of Wisconsin cheese, which any American can afford, to help him find out for himself what the advantages of free enterprise are, and what the life and diet of an average American are like," Senator WILEY concluded.

Rescue the World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a major speech which he delivered at the 82d annual meeting of the American Bar Association, the U.S. Attorney General William P. Rogers called

for repeal of the so-called Connally amendment.

Under this amendment the United States decides for itself what disputes it will put before the International Court of Justice.

It is this amendment, Attorney General Rogers said, which is partly to blame for the minor role the Court has taken in settling international disputes. In its 13 years of operation, it has decided only 17 major cases.

Those lawyers who heard the speech say it was the strongest plea to date by any top official of the Eisenhower administration for repeal of the amendment.

The Attorney General pointed out that France recently withdrew a similar provision and that now the United States is alone among 10 NATO nations to continue to insist on such a reservation.

President Eisenhower told the Congress in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and I have introduced resolutions calling on the Senate of the United States to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department has endorsed our proposal, but nothing much else had happened until the speech by Attorney General Rogers.

I am delighted that the Attorney General has now come forward to support this important step.

I include here the text of my House Resolution 267, an editorial from the Washington Post of August 24, 1959, and the text of the splendid speech by the Attorney General of the United States to which I have referred:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 267

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the determination of whether an international dispute to which the United States is a party involves matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States, and is therefore not within the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, should be made by the Court itself rather than by the United States; and that any provision of law or resolution to the contrary should be repealed or otherwise nullified.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

RESCUE THE WORLD COURT

What has happened to the movement to rescue the World Court? A few months ago a considerable head of steam was built up behind the demand for repeal of the Connally amendment, which has gravely limited the usefulness of the Court. President Eisenhower had said in his state of the Union message that U.S. relations with the World Court should be reexamined "to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations." Vice President NIXON, Charles S. Rhyne, past president of the American Bar Association, and others stirred up a great deal of interest in the subject. Senator HUMPHREY introduced a resolution to repeal the Connally amendment. The State Department endorsed the resolution in a letter to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in April, and since then the proposal has not moved off dead center.

This is especially unfortunate because it leaves the United States in the position of holding back in the drive for substitution of judicial processes for force in the settlement of international disputes. This country can and does suggest that many international controversies be decided by the World Court, but it is an empty gesture. Through the Connally amendment the Senate asserted the right for this country to decide for itself in each case whether any dispute laid befor the World Court is within its domestic jurisdiction. That gives every other country against which the United States may bring a case in the World Court a similar right to escape a judicial determination by asserting that the case is domestic regardless of what may be involved.

Every reason of justice and self-interest cries for removal of this court-crippling device. It would be especially salutary if President Eisenhower could inform our allies on his forthcoming visit and Premier Khrushchev on his September tour that the United States is accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, without any strings attached.

Responsibility for the present inaction seems to be shared about equally by the administration and the Foreign Relations Committee (which reportedly is reluctant to move because of opposition mail). In any event, the President is in the best position to break the deadlock. Why doesn't he send up a rousing message asking for immediate passage of the Humphrey resolution as a means of striking a blow for world law.

ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 82D ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., AUGUST 26, 1959

It is a great honor and privilege again to address the annual meeting of the American Bar Association. This association is the largest and most influential group in the legal profession. What you think and do has a significant impact on the administration of justice and on public affairs.

We in the Department of Justice have a common objective with you in seeking constantly to improve our system of justice so that it may better serve the people of our Nation. In pursuit of this objective there may be, on occasion, an action taken or a statement made by this association, or one of its numerous committees, with which we are not in full accord. But I want you to know that I am well aware, particularly from reading some of my mail from you, that this occasional lack of togetherness is mutual.

Notwithstanding any infrequent minor differences, we in the Department know that the American Bar Association is earnestly and effectively striving to improve our profession and has made significant and important contributions to that end. The support you have given to the Department of Justice, especially in certain difficult and sensitive areas, has been of the highest order and I want you to know that I, and all of us in the Department, sincerely appreciate it. May I also commend the association for its splendid record of achievement this year under the outstanding leadership of your president, Ross Malone.

What is the responsibility of our profession in today's world? As I see it there are two broad areas to be considered.

First, the administration of justice in the United States is on display in every part of the world. When we talk about competing with international communism in the realm of ideas, we are talking in large measure about the ideas which are the basis of our legal system.

Second, in the long view the main hope for peace is that nations will be wise enough not to rely on sheer strength in dealing with each other but will move toward establishing systems based on considerations of law and justice in the resolution of international disputes. Nations have readily paid lipservice to the soundness of this proposition but progress in this area has been tragically slow.

Dramatic events in the past few weeks and those indicated in weeks to come suggest that we are at a point in our international relations at which our profession will have new opportunities to serve our Nation in these two areas.

As to the first, although Soviet leaders are still firmly committed to the policy of world domination there is hope today that they may be willing to permit a freer flow of ideas between our two countries than they have in the past. For this reason I believe the time has come when we should act and speak more vigorously and effectively for those ideals and ideas which have given this country its strength. People throughout the world, even to some extent in the areas controlled by the Soviet Union, may have an opportunity to get a more accurate picture of America and the meaning of justice and freedom here as contrasted with the Soviet Union.

In this international competition we must not fall into the trap of emphasizing material considerations to the exclusion of all else. To some of the uncommitted nations of the world the Soviet system of state controls and planning may seem attractive. The Russians point to the fact that their economic system has been applied in a country which was initially very backward in technology, with a low standard of living compared to the West. Because a similar situation exists to some degree in several of the new nations of the world, they see a parallel that has some surface attraction.

But the situation is different when it comes to the appeal of ideas. Freedom under law is one of the most powerful ideas ever conceived by the mind of man. Its appeal will continue to grow in the uncommitted nations of the world. It has not been too long since many of these nations completed their successful struggle for independence. With national freedom there has arisen a great awareness of and interest in the concept of individual freedom. Thus the free world has an unusual opportunity in the years ahead to place in bold relief the weaknesses of the Soviet system compared with the strength of ours.

Why does the legal profession have a responsibility for this? Because we are daily involved in the proceses of justice, and its administration is our business. We are officers of the courts of the United States and should be the leading spokesmen for presenting the case of freedom to the world. The merits of the case have to be articulated more effectively than has been done in the past. In the world in which we live it is not enough to be convinced that our system holds forth the greatest promise of individual liberty for people all over the world. We should present the true picture of a system of liberty under law to those who do not fully understand it or who may have been misled by Soviet propaganda. This must be done so that people will realize the importance of maintaining free governments and not succumb to the Soviet scheme for world domination.

These are a few of the truths which need to be dramatized:

1. We cannot rest our case on the size and productivity of our farms, factories, and mines, nor even on the excellent wages and working conditions of the American people. These are important, but they are the by-

product of freedom—not its source. The source of strength in a democracy is the freedom of the individual to think, speak, and do the things he decides to do as long as he does not transgress the rights of others. We must point out, too, that these freedoms are not a matter of grace but are guaranteed and protected by our legal system.

2. The land and the tools of production in our Nation are owned by the people, not by the Government as in Russia. It should be emphasized that our legal system protects this ownership against intrusion by any other individual or by the Government itself. Under this system in which the free initiative of the individual plays the major role the United States has achieved the greatest distribution of wealth among its people and has come closest to the ideal of prosperity for all.

3. We are a government of law, not of men. Regardless of wealth, power or station, no one is above the law in the United States. For this reason our people need never fear that they may become the victims of ruthless political leaders. Thus the fact, now generally conceded by everyone, that under Stalin thousands of innocent victims were killed and tortured in the Soviet Union, seems almost beyond belief to a free people. Yet, because the law in the Soviet Union is what the Communist Party says it is, many of those who acted in concert with Stalin in perpetrating these atrocities apparently have not been prosecuted nor has retribution been made for the wrongs committed.

4. We must constantly emphasize that the will of the people is controlling in the United States. Under our legal system public officials are responsive to the will of the people. Our Nation will never start a war because our people fervently want peace. Anyone who believes that our Nation might act in a manner inconsistent with the will of the people in maintaining peace is ignorant about how our system works.

These are merely a few ideas which can be emphasized. There are a great many others, of course, with which we are all familiar and with which you and this association will be concerned in the future. For the past several years this association has done an excellent job in awakening the public to the significance of the rule of law. I commend you particularly for the vigor and imagination with which you are planning to cooperate in the future with the legal professions of many other nations to intensify interest and support for the rule of law in resolving international disputes.

President Eisenhower expressed the thought well in his letter to Mr. Malone when he said:

"Peace cannot prevail until men and nations recognize that their conduct must be governed by respect for and observance of the law. The American Bar Association by seeking to promote this principle is helping to advance the cause of enduring peace in the world."

In this connection we should keep in mind that there is a good likelihood that the exchange programs between East and West will continue, and may even be expanded in the future. As you know, the exchange programs now in effect include representatives from industry, agriculture, medicine, student groups, the arts and sciences, athletics, and many other fields, but there has been little exchange between members of the legal profession.

It is my opinion that the legal profession should give its support to a carefully planned exchange program of lawyers and judges in order that the Soviets may study our constitutional system and the operation of our courts and that we be given an opportunity to study the system in effect in the Soviet Union. Because of fundamental differences the systems are in no sense similar but exchanges would provide a method for our profession to increase its knowledge of their system. At the same time there may be some value in having the Russians who come to our country judge for themselves the comparative merits of the two systems. In any event the exchanges would provide a means to dramatize more effectively to the rest of the world the contrast between a free system of government and a regimented system under Communist control.

Turning now to the second area, I believe we have a responsibility to work for the establishment of systems of law and justice to deal with international disputes.

In his state of the Union message this year, President Eisenhower said:

"It is my purpose to intensify efforts during the coming 2 years in seeking ways to supplement the procedures of the United Nations and other bodies with similar objectives, to the end that the rule of law may replace the rule of force in the affairs of nations."

The attainment of this high goal will not be achieved by any single stroke or by any single government. In fact, because the Soviet Union seems intent on world domination which is the antithesis of the rule of law, the concept is apt to seem illusory and of no practical importance in today's world.

The point to bear in mind is that there is no other way to travel which provides hope for peace. Despite the discouragements which may arise the United States must take the lead in an effort to make progress along this road. Certainly, in the foreseeable future, if it is necessary to live in a world in which the settlement of international disputes will depend principally on factors of terror rather than on justice, then we should make it clear that such an uncivilized stalemate is not of our choosing.

Following the state of the Union message, and as part of the intensification of effort referred to by the President, both Secretary of State Dulles and Secretary of State Herter supported a proposal in the Senate of the United States to strengthen the International Court of Justice by repealing the so-called Connally amendment.

This Court, as you know, was created by the United Nations in 1945 to decide legal disputes between nations. It sits at The Hague and is composed of 15 judges elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council of the United Nations.

When established, the Court appeared to hold great promise, but through no fault of its own it has played a minor role in the settlement of international legal disputes. In its 13 years of existence it has decided only 17 contentious cases.

The Court has suffered because some nations have refused to accept the Court's jurisdiction at all and as to many disputes it has no jurisdiction unless the nations agree that it has in the particular case. The blame—some might prefer to use the word responsibility—for this latter condition rests in some degree, at least, on the United States.

The United States accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court in 1946. The history of our declaration of acceptance is significant.

The resolution introduced in the Senate with bipartisan support contained a reservation excluding from the Court's jurisdiction "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

Public hearings were conducted on the resolution in this form, and it was unanimously endorsed by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Its report stated:

"The question of what is properly a matter of international law is, in case of dispute, appropriate for decision by the Court itself, since, if it were left to the decision of each individual state, it would be possible to withhold any case from adjudication on the plea that it is a matter of domestic jurisdiction."

Nevertheless, on the floor of the Senate the Connally amendment was adopted adding to our reservation the clause "as determined by the United States of America."

Thus, in the declaration of acceptance by the United States our reservation is that the Court shall not have jurisdiction of "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States of America."

We were the first Nation to provide that the jurisdiction of the Court should be determined not by the Court but by us. Following our example seven other nations made similar reservations.

Furthermore, the rule of reciprocity applies so that any nation may invoke the terms of the reservations of any nation with which it is involved in a dispute.

It is plain to see why the existence of this type of reservation has had an impact on the effectiveness of the Court. Imagine the impairment which would result to the court system in the United States if the defendant in a law suit had the right to determine for himself whether his case was within the court's jurisdiction.

The Court's statute explicitly limits its jurisdiction to international legal disputes. By the plain terms of the grant, it has no jurisdiction over domestic matters. So the "as determined by the United States of America" clause adds up, in the eyes of other nations at least, to a vote of no confidence that the Court will limit the cases it hears to those within its jurisdiction.

There are those who are concerned that the Court might exceed its jurisdiction. It is argued that our sovereignty might thus be impaired. As a practical matter the argument as to possible loss of sovereignty is not persuasive.

The International Court of Justice, in the final analysis, depends largely on world opinion for the enforcement of its decisions—in fact, for the participation of the nations. It has carefully stayed within the limits of its jurisdiction as provided by its basic statute. There is no reason to believe that the Court would invade areas properly reserved to domestic jurisdiction.

In July of this year, France, surely as sensitive as we are in matters of sovereignty, withdrew her reservation containing the equivalent of the Connally amendment.

Thus, today six NATO nations have not even deemed it necessary to make any express reservation with respect to domestic disputes. Three others—Canada, Great Britain, and now France—have done nothing more than make explicit the exclusion of domestic questions from the Court's jurisdiction. Hence, of the 10 NATO nations which have accepted the Court's jurisdiction, the United States is the only one which denies to the Court the right to determine its own jurisdiction.

For more than 50 years our statesmen have advocated an impartial international court to decide disputes between nations. In 1907, Secretary of State Elihu Root, in his instructions to our delegates at the Second Peace Conference at The Hague, said we should develop a permanent tribunal composed of judges who will devote their entire time to the trial and decision of international causes by judicial methods.

In 1925, President Coolidge, in his inaugural address, advocated the "establishment of a tribunal for the administration of even-handed justice between nation and nation." As he put it, "The weight of our enormous influence must be cast upon the side of a reign, not of force but of law and trial, not by battle but by reason."

Every President since World War I has advocated the submission of international legal disputes to a judicial tribunal.

A half century of debate has resulted in little progress. It must be obvious to everyone that action in this field is long overdue. That is why our profession should urge the Senate of the United States to act at the earliest possible time on this important matter of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Finally, let me turn for a moment to the question of international agreements. The nations of the world today are in almost constant discussion and negotiation at the conference table. The purpose of the meetings is to arrive at agreements for the settlement of critical world problems.

From the standpoint of a lawyer, it is discouraging to see how often in important international agreements no provision is made for settling disputes which may arise about the interpretation of the agreement.

And an agreement, as every lawyer knows, may solve a lot of problems or may cause a lot of problems. It depends on how well the agreement is drafted and on the frame of mind of the parties to it.

Lawyers know, too, that it is not possible to draft an agreement to eliminate all possible future differences as to its meaning which might arise.

For that reason, even after exercising all possible care in drafting agreements, we know there must be a court—or at least some method agreed upon by the parties—to resolve disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of agreements.

The same principle, of course, applies to nations. For when two or more nations make an agreement, notwithstanding every effort to make the agreement as clear as possible, they know that disputes about the interpretation of it may arise. If no provision is made for disposition of these disputes, each nation will naturally insist on interpreting the agreement for itself. Thus, rather than resolving differences, the agreement may give rise to new tensions and recriminations.

Last April the Vice President in a significant address urged that the United States take the initiative in future agreements to secure the inclusion of provisions to the effect "(1) that disputes which may arise as to the interpretation of the agreement should be submitted to the International Court of Justice at The Hague; and (2) that the nations signing the agreement should be bound by the decision of the Court in such cases."

Certainly this basic idea deserves our support. A well-understood policy among nations to refer disputes with respect to the interpretation of treaties and other international agreements to the International Court of Justice, or some other impartial tribunal, would be a great step forward on the road to a rule of law among nations.

Knowing that an impartial tribunal would resolve any dispute as to meaning would strengthen the force of the agreement and cause less controversy about it.

The fact that we may not be successful in securing agreement to such a clause in all cases does not mean that we should fail to try. The fact that the Soviets, for example, might not agree to such a policy is no ground for not advocating it. The more often the Soviets oppose reasonable methods to solve world tensions, the more the nations of the world will come to recognize the significance of the Soviet policy of world domination.

For the reasons I have indicated, I hope that the American Bar Association will continue to give its vigorous support to the rule of law in the resolution of international disputes.

No one need point out that because of the present Soviet policy this seems less like a goal than a mirage. Nevertheless, we must believe in it and we must believe it is possible to attain. More than that, we must make some progress along this road.

Our Nation has no goal of world conquest, no intention of infringing the liberties of any people, and no desire other than to deal justly with the other nations of the earth. But there are persons in the world who are skeptical about this. Thus I believe that the members of our profession should make clear beyond any doubt that the United States has but this single goal—that the family of nations may live together in peace under law.

Tendency To Merchandise Candidates Over Television and Radio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a good many thoughtful people fear that Madison Avenue, combined with television, may someday reduce the selection of political candidates not to merit and intelligence, but to superficial appearance and similar ephemeral qualities.

A very perceptive column has been written on this unfortunate trend by Mr. J. W. Forrester, editor of the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, on his editorial page for August 21, 1959. Mr. Forrester not only voices some suggestions to prospective candidates, but he cites the fact that aspirants for some of the highest offices in the land already have been merchandized like shirts or gloves rather than as people who would lead the greatest democracy on earth.

I ask unanimous consent that this column from the Pendleton East Oregonian be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, perhaps as a warning to us and to the American public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS

(By J. W. Forrester)

"The time has come," the Walrus said, "to talk of many things: Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—of cabbages—and kings."

Another election year is just around the corner (enjoy this "breather" to the fullest) and with it comes resumption of the debate that swirls around the place Madison Avenue and television have preempted in campaigning.

Some are convinced the day is not far off when the clever men of Madison Avenue will "sell" a completely unqualified candidate by putting the right words in his mouth and restricting his campaigning solely to television. They will make him sound wise and by freezing him within the confines of television nobody will be able—because they won't we permitted to question him—to find out that he actually is foolish, uninformed and misinformed on all the issues that count.

This is a chilling prospect. We want to think that it can't happen. We want to think that energetic reporters will always be around to give the voters an accurate picture of all candidates.

But, let us not be deluded about the magic of television in politics. The candidate who uses it well can make a lot of hay with the voters. President Eisenhower set an example for candidates who want to use TV and we may be sure the lessons were not lost on them. Robert Montgomery was employed by the Republican Party to teach Mr. Eisenhower how to use TV properly and under Mr. Montgomery's tutelage and the President has shown constant improvement. He has become increasingly effective. If you will recall Mr. Eisenhower's first appearances on TV in 1952 you know that Mr. Montgomery started with a very raw recruit.

We got on this subject after reading a special issue of the County Officer magazine, devoted entirely to county public relations. Several phases of the subject are discussed. An entire section covers campaigning on TV. Because you are going to see and hear many candidates on TV next year we thing you'll be interested in one part of this section on campaigning on TV, as prepared by the National Association of Broadcasters. It deals with your television appearance and says this:

"Personal appearance is of vital importance to the success of your television talk. Your clothing and mannerisms must be pleasing to the eye but not distracting.

"In dressing for television, don't wear sharp contrasts. The male speaker should never wear a white shirt or a white pocket handkerchief, as white "washes out" on the TV screen. Pick a light blue or gray shirt. Avoid large-figured ties; these tend to distract the viewer. If you are bothered with dandruff, don't wear a dark blue or black suit as the camera will pick up the telltale flakes on your shoulders.

"The woman speaker likewise must avoid white dresses or blouses. Don't wear dresses with a large print and take care in selecting your jewelry. Too much glimmering jewelry will reflect the studio lights. You may feel like the breath of spring with a lovely corsage on your dress, but if the flowers are white your viewer will see only a blur on your shoulder.

"Most men do not require makeup for television. However, if your skin is exceptionally oily you may need to use a little powder. Pancake makeup may be required if you have dark shadows around your eyes or a heavy beard line. Consult with the station makeup personnel on this point. And don't forget that bald head. It's apt to shine under the lights, so soften it with a little powder.

"It isn't necessary for a woman to be made up by the studio professionals. You may use your own cosmetics, but avoid heavy makeup, lipstick, etc. Prepare your face as you would normally—the camera has X-ray eyes and heavy makeup looks unnatural.

"If you wear glasses, don't try to go without them during your television appearance. Your eyes are accustomed to the glasses and will react unnaturally without them. The station lighting crew will arrange the lights to avoid a glare from your specs.

"Posture is extremely important to your TV appearance. Generally you will be seated during your talk. Sit on the edge of your chair if possible (this will remove the temptation to slump), throw your shoulders back and keep your head high and chin out. When you drop your chin your hairline is accentuated and this usually is not an attractive feature. If you are seated at a table, rest your arms on the table, but don't rest your weight on your arms. This will throw your shoulders out of line.

"When standing, maintain a relaxed stance but don't look as though you are falling apart. Stand with your feet apart, your shoulders back and your head high. Move slowly, but naturally. You may even want to sit on the edge of the table at times—

this gives you a natural, relaxed air, but keep your back straight, don't slump.

"Keep in mind throughout your talk that no matter how far away the camera may be, it is still possible to take a closeup of your face. You will have no way of knowing when a closeup is being taken, so act accordingly at all times.

"Above all else—relax, be natural, be friendly."

Fiscal Irresponsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, here are three more editorial comments on the fiscal irresponsibility this Congress is exhibiting in failing to grant the necessary flexibility to the Treasury Department in managing the Federal debt by removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds.

These editorials are from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, August 25, 1959; New York Times, August 27, 1959; and New York Herald Tribune, August 27, 1959:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 25, 1959]

INFLATIONARY VOTE

President Eisenhower is reported in dispatches from Washington to be considering a public appeal in behalf of legislation to enable the Treasury to stimulate the Government bond market by raising interest rates above the 4.25 percent ceiling on long-term securities. Needed though the legislation is, such a move seems foredoomed to failure in view of the 14-11 party-line vote by which the House Ways and Means Committee turned it down.

Although we often disagree with Representative RICHARD M. SIMPSON, of Pennsylvania, the top Republican on the committee, in this case he is right in describing the committee action as "incredible folly." As he observes, the Government will be forced to borrow in the short-term money market in competition with State and local governments, business, and consumers. This is likely to force upward the cost of short-term money and to inflate the supply of credit.

The surprise action of the committee is difficult to understand, since it was a reversal of an August 12 decision to approve the measure. As part of that decision the committee included a directive which said, in part: "It is the sense of Congress that the Government shall take into account—the importance of achieving the maximum sustainable rate of economic growth, maintaining reasonable stability of the purchasing power of the dollar, and assuring that the cost of managing the public debt is kept to the minimum consistent with these vital objectives."

The 14 Democrats who voted to suspend action for this session on the legislation must know they voted against "economic growth." The Treasury should be enabled to compete with other borrowers in the money market. The discarded compromise bill would have permitted it to do so for 3 years, a reasonable period. The author of the measure, Democratic Representative HARRISON, of Virginia, joined the 10 committee Republicans in voting for the bill. It is too bad he could not have persuaded two additional Democrats to join him.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 27, 1959]

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed—and in the most emphatic manner—his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interest rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4¼ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the second Liberty Loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a comparatively limited supply of funds, have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on comparatively long issues above 4¼ percent the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3¼ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not ohly a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total $50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by $2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues of the United States Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, August 27, 1959]

PLAYING POLITICS WITH THE PUBLIC DEBT

The question of lifting the 4¼ percent ceiling on interest rates for marketable Treasury bonds, according to SAM RAYBURN, is a dead issue in this session of Congress. But he did leave the door open yesterday for a possible boost in the ceiling on series E and H savings bonds from the present 3¼ percent to 3¾ percent.

The Democrats have hoped to use the bond issue to tag the Republicans a "high interest rate" party. But it would be politically ticklish to oppose a clearly merited rise in interest rates on savings bonds, which are held by 40 million Americans, most of them voters.

The 3¼ percent rate now makes these bonds a poor buy; for the past 12 months, in fact, sales have lagged behind redemptions. In July $350 million were sold, $507 million redeemed. Not only is the Treasury over a barrel but the small investor isn't getting a fair shake.

Action to provide an equitable rate on these bonds is needed, but action to free rates on regular Treasury bonds is equally urgent. Bonds already issued are selling in the open market at prices yielding more than 4¼ percent, so that new long-term issues (the only ones to which the ceiling applies) can't be sold. Sound management of the Nation's $290 billion debt is one of the pillars of fiscal stability and is impossible without long-term borrowing. Within the next 12 months the Treasury will have to borrow $85 billion to cover maturing securities, redemptions and seasonal cash needs. Unless Congress acts, this will have to be done without access to long-term funds. Speaker RAYBURN knows this. Senator JOHNSON knows it. It's up to them to put politics aside, and act promptly to free the Treasury from artificial and fiscally dangerous restrictions.

Eisenhower's Trip to Europe: A Triumph

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a world torn by conflicts, it is always refreshing when events occur to illustrate understanding and good will between people and nations.

Currently, the mission of President Eisenhower to Europe for talks with the heads of the West German, British, and French Governments represent one of those heartwarming events.

Daily, our newspapers are carrying accounts of the accolades showered upon our President first by the citizens of West Germany, then in Great Britain, and we would hope, also, in the upcoming visit to France.

Rarely in history has the head of any nation been so beloved, not only by his own countrymen, but by people around the globe. Our Nation can, indeed, be proud that we have as Chief Executive a man so highly esteemed in the eyes of the world.

From all accounts, the trip may well result in a significant revitalization of the bonds of friendships for the American people, as expressed in the friendly greetings and receptions now being extended to him.

Perhaps this kind of communion between human beings may be successful in accomplishing far more in resolving differences and misunderstandings between nations than more formal conferences of heads of states.

Overall, the art of friendly diplomacy—for which President Eisenhower has a unique talent—will, I am confident, contribute much the world peace—to a lessening of conflict—to an era in which people around the globe can share proportionately of the benefits of the inventive genius of mankind and of the natural resources of the earth—dedi-

cated, not to destructive goals, but to benefiting mankind.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials: "Ike's Triumph," from the Milwaukee Sentinel, and "Eisenhower: Symbol of Peace," from the New York Times, reflecting the wonderful way in which the President has been received on his mission of peace.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Aug. 29, 1959]

AS WE SEE IT: IKE'S TRIUMPH

President Eisenhower has completed the German segment of his mission to Europe in a triumph of unity and purpose. He has begun the British segment in a spirit of warmth and friendliness.

The overwhelming welcomes he received from the West Germans and the English was matched by the accord he has been reaching with their leaders.

To Chancellor Adenauer he proclaimed American determination to bring to an end the tragic division of Germany and until such time to protect the freedom of West Berlin.

These are not new or startling affirmations, put they needed to be said. In this connection, it is our opinion that Premier Khrushchev did the West a favor by sending a note to Bonn, timed to coincide with the President's arrival.

He did not say anything new, either, and as usual the fist was clenched behind the smile. But by warning that Soviet power could crush West Germany and all its allies, including us, Khrushchev called attention to these truths:

That in this cold-war world neutrality is a deadly illusion (as Nehru of India is painfully finding out); and that weaknesses and festering differences among the allies abet the Communist design of conquest.

"Germans trust Eisenhower"—thus read signs that greeted the President.

Let us hope our other allies will be equally convinced they may trust him not to appease communism in his talks with Khrushchev, never to surrender principle to expediency, never to compromise his belief that unity of the western alliance is really the hope for salvation of the world.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

EISENHOWER: SYMBOL OF PEACE

As the 20th anniversary of the outbreak of the Second World War rolls around this week another American President is being hailed in Europe as the symbol of peace and freedom in a manner comparable only with the great ovations accorded President Wilson more than 40 years ago. Like President Wilson, President Eisenhower is trying to cope with the problems resulting from a world catacylsm. His task is even more formidable because the issues go deeper, the stakes are higher and the menace to peace is greater and in the atomic age more terrifying.

But President Eisenhower can draw on the lessons of history to back him up in his enterprise and in the solutions he proposes. Europe blundered into the First World War mainly because of the rivalries of the European nation-states and the failure of European diplomacy to exert itself. Because of the same rivalries, President Wilson not only failed to realize his ideals but also consented to the Versailles Treaty, which Western statesmen today frankly indict as a mandate of unhappy consequences. It bred economic disorder. It gave unexpected aid to the rise of Hitler who, in conspiracy with Stalin and aided by Western appeasement, plunged the world into a new war that enslaved even the nations Versailles had liberated.

It is in the light of this history that President Eisenhower's exertions must be viewed. He is throwing the powers of the American Presidency and his own authority and prestige into the scales in a supreme effort, first to rally the West against further Soviet aggression, and second to ease the cold war by persuading the Soviets to agree to a peace settlement on terms the West can accept.

For the same purpose he seeks to abate the remaining national rivalries in Europe by supporting, as he again emphasized in Bonn, the closer union of Western Europe. This has already led to the miracle of the French-German reconciliation and is also both the key to a solution of the principal outstanding problem, the reunification of Germany, and a herald of a future United States of Europe, in which rests the best hope for the peaceful liberation of the enslaved nations.

In short, he is working for a peace settlement that will rest not on a mandate but on the agreements of all concerned. And in keeping with both American ideals and enlightened self-interest, he is the most ardent exponent of the policy initiated under his predecessor which, instead of squeezing the vanquished to the ruin of all, extended massive aid to victors and vanquished alike and is still extending it to those in need of it to make this a better world for all.

These are the aims, purposes and policies he is presenting to Europe. In comparison with them all tactical or even selfishly national considerations become secondary. He has found full understanding for his endeavor in Bonn, seems to be finding like understanding in London, and should find it in Paris as well.

On Right Track

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the New York Journal American of August 21, 1959:

ON RIGHT TRACK

We congratulate Governor Rockefeller on the excellence of the three-man harness racing commission he has just named to supplant the former one-man czaristic rule.

This is the goal for which this newspaper campaigned vigorously for months until Governor Rockefeller called the legislature into special session to enact much-needed reforms.

The best-known member of the new commission is of course James A. Farley in whom the public has great confidence—and justifiably so. The chairmanship goes to Buffalo Sheriff Robert A. Glasser, a law enforcement officer of proven worth and experience. The third member is Public Service Commissioner Spencer B. Eddy, one of the best-informed men on racing in the country.

We hope the first act of the commission will be to see what unexpected moneys can be recovered from the old harness racing construction fund by which the State was obligated to use taxpayer dollars to refurbish the tracks. These funds, which run into the millions, could better be used for education, hospitals, cancer research, etc.

Bottleneck on Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two more recent items concerning the backlog of judicial nominations in the Senate Judiciary Committee. They are an editorial, "Congress and the Judges," from the New York Times of Sunday, August 30, 1959, and a column by Peter Edson entitled "Bottleneck on Judgeships," which appeared in the Washington Daily News on Tuesday, August 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

CONGRESS AND THE JUDGES

The failure of Congress to meet the urgent need for more Federal judges has become a national disgrace—one that works a grave denial of justice to the American people through delays in undermanned and overburdened courts. Congress has failed in two ways: by not creating new judgeships and by Senate slow motion in approving Presidential appointments to fill existing vacancies.

Long ago the Judicial Conference, made up of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and the chief judges of the circuit courts of appeals, recommended the creation of more than 40 new seats on the Federal bench in areas where calendars are the most congested. Each year for the past 3 years a bill to do this has been introduced in Congress which each year has gotten nowhere.

In the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of which JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi, is chairman, there lie buried by inaction more than 20 judicial nominations, one for as long as 7 months, while incumbent judges on the depleted benches struggle in vain to keep up with their calendars and litigants wait for years before they can be heard. Politics and personal pique have produced most of the gum in the legislature's gears—maneuvering for partisan advantage and resentment over favorite candidates ignored.

Facing up to the need for new judges, Attorney General Rogers has cited a sound principle and at the same time has proposed its violation—but, we must say, in a very good cause. He said that President Eisenhower has always thought "you shouldn't approach appointments to the Federal bench in a partisan way." Then Mr. Rogers pledged, with the President's approval, that if Congress creates additional judgeships the administration will fill half of them with Democrats.

Well, if party politics can't be divorced from judicial appointments in this imperfect world, it is obviously best to strike an even political balance—especially if it will spur Congress to action on the new judgeships measure. And action is what is needed now, both there and on the judicial appointments in the Senate.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 25, 1959]

BOTTLENECK ON JUDGESHIPS

(By Peter Edson)

Plain old politics of the low down variety is held responsible for holding up confirma-

tion of 20 of President Eisenhower's nominations for Federal judges this year. Eighteen of the 20 nominees are Republicans.

The bottleneck is the Senate Judiciary Committee under Chairman JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat, of Mississippi. But Republicans charge that this course of inaction has the approval of Democratic Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas.

This is SPOP—standard political operations procedure. Democrats hold up confirmation of Republican nominees in the hope they can block them completely or force deals to get a few more Democrats on the bench. If this delay can be extended to 1961, when the Democrats hope to have a President of their own party in the White House, then all Republican nominations can be dumped in the ashcan and Democratic substitutions made.

The Republicans played this same game in 1948, when they thought Gov. Thomas E. Dewey was a shoo-in for the White House. The GOP lost on that bet, but it now gives the Democrats a precedent to follow.

The monkey wrenches this throws in the Federal legal machinery, however, slows down the wheels of justice appreciably. When there are vacancies in any court, its docket becomes jammed with untried cases.

What these delays do to the nominees is even worse. A lawyer can't get new legal business if he is being considered for a judgeship. And when an appointment is held up for months by the Senate, it becomes a personal matter which damages the nominee's standing.

John C. Tucker of Beamont, Tex., recently asked President Eisenhower to withdraw his nomination as judge for the eastern district of Texas because of delay in confirmation. This was a case where Senator JOHNSON, who was opposing Judge Tucker, won out.

Thirteen of President Eisenhower's nominations for the Federal bench have been pending 4 to 7 months.

Two were sent up last January. They are George L. Hart, Jr., of Washington, for the District of Columbia and Walter A. Gordon of California for the Virgin Islands.

Five more nominations were sent up in February. One that really hurts is the nomination of District Judge Phillip Forman of New Jersey to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

Others are Bailey Aldrich of Massachusetts to the first circuit, Anthony Julian to Massachusetts, Leonard P. Walsh to District of Columbia, Myron D. Crocker and Fred Kunzel, both of the southern district of California bench.

Three more nominations that went up in March and are still hanging fire are Harold K. Wood to eastern district of Pennsylvania, Lloyd F. MacMahon to southern district of New York, and Judge Henry J. Friendly of New York to second circuit. This last nomination may be cleared soon.

In April, two more nominations were sent up, while in July and August, the list was seven.

In the cases of some five other vacancies on the Federal bench, it is expected that recess appointments will be made after Congress adjourns.

Hon. J. Bayard Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding North Carolinian and a truly great American who has passed to his reward. While it was not my privilege to serve in this body with the Honorable J. Bayard Clark, I know of his long and able public service and have been intimately acquainted with the Clark family through long friendship with his distinguished brother, Jim Clark, of my hometown. Mr. Clark sprang from an illustrious family, and throughout his life demonstrated a keen interest in the affairs of his State and Nation. The works he did in life remain as an imposing monument to his memory.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to his beloved wife, daughters and sons.

"All or Nothing": Editorial on the Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a few days ago there appeared an editorial entitled "All or Nothing." It has to do with the housing bill that recently passed both Houses of Congress by an overwhelming majority and is now before the President awaiting his action on it.

I think it is a very fine editorial. It presents the problem in a very clear, understandable way. I commend its most careful reading to the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL OR NOTHING

It seems plain that if there is going to be any housing legislation in this session of Congress, including new FHA loan authority, the President is going to have to accept the pared-down bill now emerging from Congress. The House decision not to strip the bill of its college classroom loan features, and the refusal to separate the FHA provision as requested by Mr. Eisenhower, indicate that legislators are undeterred by the threat of another veto. It is scarcely conceivable that Congress would make a third attempt to pass a bill if a second failed to obtain Presidential consent.

The choice before the President thus may be an unlovely one from his standpoint, but it is a political reality. Administration representatives and Republican legislators cannot be blamed for seeking to follow Mr. Eisenhower's wishes, but they would be very unwise to advise him again to thwart the majority view. In point of fact, even though substantial parts of his program remain to be finally enacted, Mr. Eisenhower has fared very well with the Democratic Congress through cooperation of the leadership. His budgetary dilemma is a real one, complicated by the administration's reluctance to face the need for a general tax increase; but already Congress has been intimidated too much, we think, in its consideration of national needs by scare talk about spenders.

Neither the President nor Congress can afford to take an all-or-nothing position. Congress is going a considerable part of the way to meet the President on one of his three "must" items with the gasoline tax increase to finance highways. Mr. Eisenhower ought in turn to be willing to compromise on housing. For its part Congress could make the compromise easier by overcoming its pique about administration monetary policy and raising the interest rate on long-term Treasury bonds—something most legislators must recognize is necessary.

Laos and the Big Lie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include an editorial, "Laos and the Big Lie," appearing in the August 24, 1959 issue of the Washington Star. The editorial well states:

At a time when Premier Khrushchev is preparing to visit the United States for the avowed purpose of trying to effect a thaw in the cold war, it seems more than a little strange—to put it mildly—that the Soviet and foreign ministry has gone out of its way to to give full support to Peiping's lie about American operations in Laos.

It is very evident that the attack on Laos is not desultory action, but is an organized military action.

It would be interesting to know, first, how many Soviet and Red Chinese airmen who have been integrated into the North Vietnam Air Force.

Second. How many Chinese Red Army and naval officers and men have been integrated.

Third. The number of planes that have been sent from the Soviet Union.

Fourth. How many jungle tanks.

If our intelligence has no knowledge, they should look into the actions and contributions of Red China and the Soviet Union in this respect and other respects at once.

The editorial follows:

LAOS AND THE BIG LIE

At a time when Premier Khrushchev is preparing to visit the United States for the avowed purpose of trying to effect a thaw in the cold war, it seems more than a little strange—to put it mildly—that the Soviet Foreign Ministry has gone out of its way to give full support to Peiping's big lie about American operations in Laos.

The lie accuses our Government of numerous villainies. These include (1) a conspiracy to stir up civil strife throughout the Buddhist kingdom, (2) the maintenance of military bases there, and (3) imperialistic control of the country's economic and military forces, with a view to undermining the security of Red China. In short, according to Peiping, the United States is using Laos in an aggressive way that menaces the peace of all Asia.

Actually, of course, the truth is that the little kingdom—which is supposed to be free and independent under the 1954 Geneva agreement ending the Indochina war—is in trouble solely because it is gravely infested with Communist rebels armed with modern weapons from neighboring Red China

and Red North Vietnam. These rebels, who may launch an all-out military attack when the rainy season ends in October, have only one objective, which is simply this: To subvert the country and drag its 2 million people behind the Bamboo Curtain for the greater honor and glory of the Mao Tze-tung regime in Peiping.

As for our American position, the fact is that we have no bases of any kind in Laos. More than that, our military aid to the country involves merely light equipment, and only about 80 of our officers—in keeping with agreements altogether justified in terms of international law—serve there as advisers to the government. Accordingly, as our State Department has emphasized, Peiping's accusations against us amount to total falsehoods deliberately contrived to keep the pot boiling in southeast Asia.

Yet, even though it undoubtedly is well aware of all this, the Kremlin has chosen to echo the substance of Red China's lie. Americans must therefore be pardoned if they wonder about what goes on in Mr. Khrushchev's mind as he supports such mendacity in one breath and speaks glowingly, in the next, about how anxious he is to promote friendship and trust between his country and ours.

Business and Community Leaders, Such As Moe Lerner, Symbolize Our American System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there has been much comment in the press concerning the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev as to what we should show him and who he should meet.

It is generally agreed that he should see significant examples of our American way of life—our industries, our small businesses such as the corner drugstore, our homes on different economic levels and other illustrations of our concept which stresses the importance and dignity of the individual.

He should also have an opportunity to meet some of the people who symbolize the fact that it is not as important into what circumstances a man is born as where and how he goes from there.

Here in our beloved land there is almost unlimited opportunities for advancement. There are hundreds of thousands of men and women who have risen from humble and modest beginnings to positions of trust and leadership.

One of these active personalities is Moe Lerner. It has been my privilege to know this dynamic business executive and contributor to community progress for many, many years.

It has been a source of personal satisfaction to cooperate with Mr. Lerner in the Lafayette Square USO Club, Washington, D.C. He is now the chairman of its operating committee.

I wish that the schedule of the top Soviet spokesman would bring him into contact with the "Moe Lerners", who are so typically representative of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article, "Mighty Moe: Man on the Go," by Gusti Buttinelli from the Washington Daily News for August 28, 1959, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGHTY MOE: MAN ON THE GO

(By Gusti Buttinelli, owner, Gusti's restaurants)

Those sleek, long limousines which haul you from the airport to your door, or vice versa, offer a whale of a bargain to those on the fly.

For a buck and a quarter or so, the tab depending upon where you live, the Airport Transport buggies hoist you home from the plane station 24 hours a day in rain or shine.

The outfit's smooth sailing isn't accidental. It is the result of hard work and know-how by Moe Lerner, the energetic guy who owns and operates the business.

Moe has a fleet of 300 vehicles going for him. These cover 7 million miles a year averaging 1,400 trips and 5,000 passengers daily.

The 300 drivers with the company feel their boss is a right Joe. He has set them up with insurance plans, vacations, Christmas remembrances, and many other pluses in their jobs.

Moe's interest in his men stems from the fact that he, too, came up the hard way. His story is the kind that Ike could tell Khrushchev—that of an American kid without a silver spoon in his mouth who made something of himself.

Here was a youngster who began earning his living at 10 selling newspapers in the subways of New York. His father died when he was 14, causing him to become the sole support of his family.

Moe kept himself in top physical shape at a New York Boys' Club. He won the group's bantamweight boxing championship and went as far as the finals in a tryout for the Olympic boxing team.

This recognition got him a job at Finchley's, a fancy men's shop on Fifth Avenue, where he served such people as the Prince of Wales, Jimmy Walker, and Woodrow Wilson.

Later a hobby and a natural skill working with metals led to a silversmith's position with a famous silver company. At 18 he took over the operation of a bankrupt garage in the tough waterfront area. Manager Lerner put in his licks 14 hours a day, 7 days a week and converted the enterprise into a profitable one for which he was given a half interest in the firm. During this period, he learned the ins and outs of truck and car maintenance—a knowledge which stood him in good stead for the future.

Moe eventually built the garage into a succesful trucking, warehouse, and distribution business. He disposed of his New York holdings when he took over Airport Transport in 1946.

If you measure Moe by his legion of friends, you would run out of rulers. The great respect in which he is held here was indicated by the large turnout at a recent testimonial tossed in his honor.

The major factor in Moe's happy life is his sweet frau, Sis, who was his childhood sweetheart. They have two sons, Robert, 19; Joseph, 3; and a daughter, Phyllis, 9. Moe is a charitable and religious man whose creed is best expressed by his actions in helping others.

Whatever he's doing, whether shooting par golf or hustling on the job, you can be sure that mighty Moe is a man on the go.

Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be the year for many changes in key command and staff officers in the armed services. Recently we were informed that Major General Michaelis was leaving his assignment as Chief of Legislative Liaison for the Army. Now, I have been told that Maj. Gen. William P. "Bill" Fisher, Director of Legislative Liaison for the Department of the Air Force has been assigned as Commander, Eastern Transport Air Force, Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, N.J. He will be leaving here about the 10th of September. He is a personal friend and one of my most distinguished constituents.

General Fisher has been the Director since March of last year and has done an outstanding job in handling the very difficult task of providing Congress with prompt and accurate answers to its many inquiries. He has rendered invaluable assistance to the Members of Congress and their constituents in efficiently and effectively helping to solve their innumerable difficult problems.

General Fisher has a long history as an enthusiastic pilot and as a highly respected commander. His impressive combat record is filled with repeated praise of his ability as an outstanding leader and his easy, sensible way of doing things. These attributes were recognized early in his career when he was given command of the 20th Bomb Squadron at Clark Field prior to Pearl Harbor. Wounded during the bombing there, he lead his squadron from Bataan to Mindanao where he became an infantry commander when his unit joined the ground fighting against the Japanese until we were forced to leave the Philippines.

After a short tour in the United States, he went to the China Theater in command of a B–24 Group. This was the beginning of a long series of assignments in strategic bomber operations, including duty with the Strategic Air Command. His duties included those of wing, base, and air division commander, Inspector General of the Strategic Air Command, and Deputy Commander of 8th Air Force.

He served for a year on the faculty of the Air War College and headed the Far East Air Forces Bomber Command during the Korean war. As a command pilot and command observer, General

Fisher has logged more than 6,600 hours in jet and conventional aircraft and flew 59 combat missions during World War II and Korea.

General Fisher's decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit with three Oak Leaf Clusters, Distinguished Flying Cross with one Oak Leaf Cluster, Air Medal, Purple Heart, and Presidential Unit Citation with four Oak Leaf Clusters.

I regret that he is leaving Washington, but know that he is looking forward to commanding another flying organization in one of the combat arms of the Air Force. I am certain that many of us will see more of General Fisher as this outstanding officer assumes positions of increasing importance as the continues his successful Air Force career.

Safeguarding Our Scenic Shorelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has been a leader in the field of conservation of natural resources ever since he entered the Senate in 1955.

True to his tradition, he is now a vigorous and effective sponsor of bills for national shoreline parks in such scenic areas deserving of preservation as Indiana Dunes on Lake Michigan, Oregon Dunes in his own State along the Pacific Ocean, and Padre Island beside the gulf coast.

In the New York Sunday Times for August 30, 1959, Senator NEUBERGER has written an excellent and comprehensive article entitled "Plan for Shoreline Parks," which summarizes the efforts of many of us in the Senate to preserve these lovely shorelines and seacoasts before it is too late. I commend the New York Times for publishing this splendid article. I commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] for writing it.

The Senator from Oregon emphasizes what many of the rest of us know to be true: That this is a nationwide movement to protect our scenic shorelines, because Americans know that each has a heritage in the relatively few outdoor areas beside our oceans and lakes which still are susceptible of being established as national parks, monuments, or seashores.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

PLAN FOR SHORELINE PARKS—U.S. SENATE BILLS WOULD SET ASIDE RECREATIONAL AREAS ON SEACOAST AND IN THE GREAT LAKES REGION

(By RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

Nearly all the great national parks of the United States are in mountain ranges—Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Crater Lake, Rainier, Shenandoah, Yellowstone, Zion, and most of the rest. In the process of setting aside these magnificient upland reserves, the Nation has neglected another realm which is equally alluring to the tourist and the seeker of outdoor recreation. This realm consists of the seacoasts and shorelines of the United States, which are among the most beautiful on earth. Indeed, the first settlers in America found pleasure and inspiration where white-maned breakers spent their strength on sandy ocean strands.

Today, a belated effort is underway in the U.S. Senate to add headlands and beaches to the gorges and alpine peaks which already are part of the national park system. This effort is expressed in an omnibus bill that would create some 10 waterside parks on four picturesque shorelines. The shores are those of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and the Pacific. No major coast has been omitted.

TEN PROPOSED PARKS

Principal authors of the bill are Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the Senate Interior Committee; Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico; Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and the writer of this article. The 10 national shoreline recreational areas proposed for inclusion in the country's park network, with the maximum acreage of each, would be as follows:

Cape Cod, Mass., 30,000 acres.
Padre Island, Tex., 60,000 acres.
Oregon Dunes and Sea-Lion Caves, Oreg., 35,000 acres.
Indiana Dunes, Ind., 5,000 acres.
Point Reyes, Calif., 35,000 acres.
Cumberland Island, Ga., 25,000 acres.
Huron Mountains, Mich., 90,000 acres.
Channel Islands, Calif., 76,000 acres.
Pictured Rocks, Mich., 100,000 acres.
Sleeping Bear Dunes, Mich., 26,000 acres.

The four at the top of the roster—Cape Cod, Padre Island, Oregon Dunes, and Indiana Dunes—have been specifically recommended by the National Park Advisory Board as having qualities worthy of this recognition. It is these four areas around which most of the controversy revolves, because they probably will be reserved first. In fact, along with Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, I also am sponsoring a bill at the request of the Eisenhower administration which would authorize three shoreline parks, to be selected administratively by the Secretary of the Interior.

THE OREGON DUNES

The three probably would be chosen from among the leading four in the omnibus bill, and the Interior Department has gone so far as to disclose that Oregon Dunes would have an excellent prospect of being among these.

The omnibus shoreline bill authorizes $50 million for the acquisition of land for the parks. The administration bill is considerably more modest in this respect—$15 million. Furthermore, the omnibus bill specifies 10 additional seashores or Great Lakes shorelines to be studied by the National Park Service "for the purpose of determining what action should be taken by the United States to save and preserve them." They are these:

Fire Island, N.Y., 3,540 acres.
Cape Flattery, Washington State, 16,000 acres.
Leadbetter Point, Washington State, 4,250 acres.
Mosquito Lagoon, Fla., 9,700 acres.
Pigeon Point, Minn., 6,400 acres.
Debidue Island, S.C., 8,400 acres.
Kiawah Island, S.C., 7,300 acres.
Popham-St. John, Maine, 1,100 acres.
Parramoure Island, Va., 6,250 acres.
Smith Island, N.C., 11,900 acres.

Intensive congressional interest in this question dates from several years ago, when the National Park Service published, with funds given by an unidentified private benefactor, a brochure entitled "Our Vanishing Shoreline." It revealed that, while the Nation's conservationists had been guarding the mountains and hills, the seashore was being exploited and gobbled up.

This survey showed, for example, that of the 3,700 miles of shoreline in the Atlanitc and gulf coasts, only 240 miles were in Federal or State ownership for public recreational uses. And it disclosed that time was running out. Where a lovely 30-mile beach could have been purchased for national seashore park purposes in 1935 at a total cost of $260,000, the cost per mile by 1957 would have been $110,000.

Specific National Park Service studies of the Atlantic and gulf coasts, and then of the Pacific coast, soon followed. These studies furnish the basis for the recommendations contained in the omnibus bill now before the Senate Interior Committee. Senator MURRAY already has ordered public hearings to be held on the Oregon Dunes and Sea-Lion Caves Seashore at Reedsport and Eugene, Oreg., during the first week in October. Hearings are expected slightly later at Padre Island, in Texas. A special Interior Subcommittee headed by Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, recently toured the Indiana Dunes region and made on-the-spot observations.

"Our organization regards the rescue of America's majestic shorelines as the most compelling outdoor issue of this era," declares Joseph W. Penfold, conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. "It is almost too late now. If we delay for many more years, expenditures to purchase the land not only may be prohibitive but steam shovels and bulldozers will have torn away many dunes and beaches, which can never be restored to their former grandeur and solitude. This is a national problem of great and crucial importance."

Practically all the shorelines proposed as national parks have one essential element in common. They offer outstanding recreational opportunities where land and water meet. Otherwise, they are strikingly different in appearance and character. Padre Island and Indiana Dunes are gleaming white beaches which are comparatively flat as a contour.

By contrast, Oregon Dunes are among the highest billows of sand in the world, and timbered mountains loom in the background. The shorelines of the Great Lakes are caressed by fresh water, whereas the Atlantic and Pacific shorelines are rimmed and crusted with salt.

OPPOSING VIEWS

Controversy surrounds some of the national seashore proposals. Although they are 3,000 miles apart in location, both Cape Cod and Oregon Dunes have witnessed protests by cottage owners, who fear they will be displaced, and by taxpayers' groups, who claim that valuable property will be removed from the tax rolls in order to make room for the parks. In addition, at Indiana Dunes, there are claims by Indiana political leaders that the Lake Michigan strands and inlets might more profitably be made the site of a vast steel mill and ore dock.

Interest in the situation is so great that an enterprising newspaper near the Oregon Dunes, the Eugene Register-Guard, assigned a reporter and photographer to study the Cape Hatteras national seashore, on the opposite side of the continent, along the North Carolina coast. This is the only such shoreline reserve thus far established by Congress. It was set aside some 6 years ago. The writer for the Register-Guard, A. Robert Smith, discovered that many of the arguments then voiced locally against the Cape Hatteras Park were almost identical to those opposing Cape Cod, Oregon Dunes, and Indiana Dunes today.

Mr. Smith reported, however, that many original adversaries of the Cape Hatteras seashore had become its enthusiastic backers,

as the years have passed. He also noted that the 100,000 visitors a year who traveled to the area just before the national park was created, burgeoned to 348,000 last year.

A leading banker in the vicinity of the park told Mr. Smith that, while it was true some property had been taken off assessment lists in order to make the park possible, nearby property remaining in private possession had soared in value 50 to 100 times. This more than made up the difference to taxing authorities. "The fishing business is gone," this banker added. "If it hadn't been for the Hatteras Park, I don't know what we would have done."

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, who has been in the Senate since 1934, has been urging his Interior Committee to hurry in its action on the omnibus national seashore bill. He recently told us that, in the quarter of a century since he entered Congress, costs of acquiring some of this shoreline land actually have gone up as much as 3,000 percent.

"In 1935," Senator MURRAY said, "there was a magnificent 70-mile stretch of ocean beach on the Delaware-Maryland Eastern Shore which could have been acquired for $2 a front foot. Most of this stretch is beyond preservation today. It has already been subdivided and developed." And the cost of the Cape Cod national seashore alone is estimated as approximately $16 million, whereas it might have been purchased a few years ago for less than $9 million.

Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, director of the National Park Service, and his associates hope that some private benefactions may help to ease the pressure on the Treasury in buying the land required to safeguard representative scenic sections of the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, Great Lakes, and Pacific coasts. Such a donation occurred in the towering Grand Tetons 30 years ago, when John D. Rockefeller, Jr., and his family bought up the land around Jackson Lake in Wyoming, which eventually became the citadel of one of our most stirring alpine parks.

Between 1916 and 1958, annual visits by tourists to the national parks of the United States soared from 400,000 to 58 million. If this rate of increase should continue, not even the 20 national shoreline parks sought in our omnibus bill will be sufficient to assure Americans of the future the travel opportunities which ought to be theirs.

Pothole Drainage Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the most important waterfowl production area remaining in the United States is localized in the prairie pothole sections of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota. Within some 140 counties in these States, over a million potholes totaling some 4 million acres of wetlands are concentrated. The potholes are water-holding depressions varying in size from fraction acre puddles to shallow lakes covering hundreds of acres. They vary in depth from shallow temporary areas containing a few inches of water in wet weeks of early spring to semipermanent and permanent water areas 6 feet or more in depth which retain water the year round in seasons of normal precipitation. The deeper and more permanent potholes are the less numerous.

In recent years, the tristate area of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota has produced an average of 4 to 5 million ducks annually or nearly three-fourths of the ducks produced in the United States south of the Canadian border.

Because of its importance from a production standpoint, preservation of the U.S. prairie pothole region as a breeding area for waterfowl has been of major concern to the Fish and Wildlife Service. For over 10 years the Service has been concerned with loss of breeding habitat to farm drainage in this area. Studies conducted by the Service during 1949 and 1950 indicated that during those 2 years more than 32,000 water areas valuable to waterfowl were eliminated annually in this region. Estimates for the 12-year period 1943–54 are that about 350,000 potholes valuable to waterfowl were drained. Additional studies have shown that, while the rate of loss declined somewhat during subsequent years, substantial loss of valuable breeding acreage has continued. During the past year the rate of loss has again increased.

A major factor in sustaining the program of farm drainage in the pothole area has been the subsidy payments and the technical assistance provided by the Federal Government. For at least 8 years the Fish and Wildlife Service has studied this situation in an effort to find alternative uses for wetlands which farmers could adopt and other means of discouraging pothole drainage. To date this effort has not been successful. It appears therefore that as long as Federal subsidies and technical assistance without cost to the farmer are available, drainage of farm wetlands and loss of valuable waterfowl breeding habitat in the prairie pothole sections of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota will continue.

Faced with the above situation, the Fish and Wildlife Service, several years ago, began thinking in terms of a more positive program to preserve pothole wetlands as waterfowl breeding habitat. Additional field studies were initiated to determine which of the 140 pothole counties in the tristate area contained the most and best remaining habitat for waterfowl production. As a result of these studies, it was determined that there were 90 counties which contained the best remaining waterfowl production habitat. This total of 90 counties includes 22 counties in eastern Minnesota, and 34 counties each in eastern North Dakota and eastern South Dakota.

The enactment of Public Law 85–585 provided amendments to the Migratory Bird Hunting Stamp Act, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by lease, purchase or other means, small wetlands and pothole areas to preserve them for waterfowl production. The amendments also provided, through the increase of the duck stamp cost from $2 to $3, additional funds to finance the future acquisition of such areas. The Fish and Wildlife Service, through the field staff of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, currently is initiating a long-range program to preserve selected pothole wetlands within the 90-county delineated area in Minnesota and the Dakotas by lease and purchase.

This program of small wetland acquisition has not yet progressed to the point where the degree of its success in future years can be appraised. There is no question, however, that continued Federal subsidies and free technical assistance to the landowner for drainage of potholes will make acquisition of pothole wetlands by the Service for waterfowl breeding habitat more difficult and more expensive than would be the case if they were not available.

The overall problem of preserving wetland habitat for waterfowl breeding and for other wildlife is recognized and appreciated by the State fish and game agencies in the prairie pothole States. The Minnesota Conservation Department has acquired about 56,100 acres of land under its wetland preservation program since October 1951, at a cost of about $1,770,000. The South Dakota Department of Game, Fish, and Parks has acquired about 30,100 acres using $754,327 of Federal aid funds, and in the past 20 years has also purchased about 30,000 acres with its regular funds. North Dakota has acquired about 15,000 acres of wetlands at a cost of about $212,000.

This year we all anticipate a drastic reduction in hunting seasons and bag limits for ducks and coots, especially in the Central, Mississippi, and Atlantic Flyways. These cutbacks may reduce the hunting season to 40 days in the Atlatic and Mississippi Flyways, and 50 days in the Central Flyways.

These drastic reductions will be necessary because of reduced waterfowl breeding this year in the prairie pothole region of the continent. The waterfowl reduction has resulted from widespread drought from the destruction of breeding areas by drainage and other factors. While widespread drought produces a sudden spectacular reduction in duck breeding habitat and in duck production, these losses are temporary and the naturally prolific birds can restore their populations to former levels when normal water conditions return to the prairies.

There can be no such recovery by waterfowl populations from extensive drainage programs. Insofar as breeding waterfowl are concerned wholesale pothole drainage is the establishment of permanent drought.

To those who may question this statement, the State of Iowa can serve as an example. In 1900 numerous potholes and sloughs in Iowa produced vast numbers of ducks, including nearly all of our important game ducks. Today the production of waterfowl in Iowa is but a fraction of that of a short half century ago. The difference in this production lies in the almost total con-

version for agricultural uses of the sloughs and potholes which once constituted some of the finest duck breeding habitat on the North American Continent.

There can be no question but that we must move quickly tho preserve these pothole areas. Ducks and other migratory waterfowl need water—and they need it badly.

Wisconsin's Progressive Rehabilitation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, urbanization, population mobility, postwar restlessness, and other social changes have produced in recent years many problems which this country has not previously known. We have a growing crime rate, a juvenile-delinquency problem, and, in some places, unfortunate racial tensions. The newspaper headlines are often alarming, and at times the impression is conveyed that we are unable to effectively cope with the new problems. But what must be realized is that new problems require new remedies, and only creative thinking and action will produce the needed improvements.

It is, therefore, with great interest and satisfaction that I have recently read the reports on Wisconsin's program of crime correction. Wisconsin, as you know, has a very low rate of crimes of violence, and, in fact, many experts describe Wisconsin as having practically no organized crime in comparison with other States. Even so, there are about 8,100 persons under State supervision for crime, at this time. But it is the way these criminals are dealt with that shows the merits of advanced crime-correction programs.

Now we no longer talk about "crime and punishment," for what we are after is rehabilitation rather than punishment. Society is not any more interested in an "eye for an eye"; instead, it wants to concentrate on turning the criminal violator into a productive and law-abiding citizen. It is in this direction that Wisconsin has made tremendous progress.

Of Wisconsin's 8,100 offenders, only about 3,000 are in correctional institutions. About 2,550 are on parole and the other 2,550 are on probation. These violators are put on probation and parole because the authorities believe that is the best way to restore them to a position of good citizenship. We have learned from a long history of prisons and incarceration that long confinement does not stamp out crime—but quite often encourages recidivism. In putting as many of its violators on probation and parole, Wisconsin in fact demonstrates its confidence in the theory that the best way to restore a man to good citizenship is by giving him another chance, under State supervision, naturally, but in free society rather than in a prison.

Of the total violators released on parole in Wisconsin, about 19 percent have their paroles revoked during the first 6 months and about 24 percent during the first 2 years of probation. Some of the revocations are for new offenses, but a great many are merely precautionary as in cases where parolees have been found in bad company or have given indications that they might be getting into trouble. Still, records indicate that at least three-fourths of those paroled are able to make their way for 2 years, and with that headstart there is a good chance they will be able to go all the way.

Wisconsin's high rate of probation and parole produces not only better results in terms of rehabilitation, but has also a good effect on Wisconsin's expenditures on prisons and prison maintenance. The Wisconsin director of the division of correction, Mr. Sanger B. Powers, says that if all 5,100 on parole or probation were to be imprisoned, the State would need three more institutions which would cost about $51 million to build. The State, in addition, would have to provide $9 million a year more to operate these prisons. The State enjoys an additional savings through the fact that those on parole and probation earn as much as $16 million a year, with which they support themselves and their dependents. If they were incarcerated the State would not only have to provide the money to pay for prison maintenance but would also have to support many of the dependents of the prison population, who would undoubtedly be on relief in many instances.

That Wisconsin's progressive program for the correction of crime and the rehabilitation of criminals is a success has been demonstrated over the past few years. I believe that Wisconsin's parole and probation system is one of the things the State can well be proud of. I do hope that similar creative measures are made available and are applied, both in Wisconsin and elsewhere, in order to solve some of our society's other social ills.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published by the Green Bay Gazette on "Crime and Punishment in Wisconsin."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, July 29, 1959]

CRIME AND PUNISHMENT IN WISCONSIN

Wisconsin has a very low rate on crimes of violence. In fact many experts in this field describe Wisconsin as having practically no crime in comparison with other States. Even so, there are about 8,100 persons under State supervision for crimes at this time. Thus when people say Wisconsin has practically no crime they are referring to the flourishing rackets which make a business of criminal activities in some other States. They are referring also to the collaboration of political figures with known criminals which is common in some States but practically unknown in Wisconsin.

In spite of the comparatively favorable record of Wisconsin the State prison at Waupun with a capacity of 1,200 prisoners is now accommodating 1,523. Likewise at the State reformatory at Green Bay 1,040 inmates are being cared for in an institution built for 678. Even so Wisconsin has fewer persons incarcerated as punishment for crime than most any other State would have under the same circumstances. The reason for this is the extensive use of paroles and probation as the means for rehabilitating persons convicted of crime. Of Wisconsin's 8,100 offenders only about 3,000 are in correctional institutions. About 2,550 are on parole and another 2,550 are on probation.

Thus Wisconsin has a double advantage in that it starts with less crime and it uses prison confinement in fewer of its cases than is the practice elsewhere. Sanger B. Powers, director of the State division of correction, points out that Wisconsin has a great financial advantage through its policy of using parole and probation extensively. He says that if all 5,100 of those on parole or probation were to be imprisoned the State would need 3 more institutions costing about $51 million to build. In addition the State would have to provide $9 million a year more to operate them. He says that the capital investment and the operating costs would pay for needlessly holding people in custody since they are now getting along very well under parole and probation. The State enjoys an additional savings through the fact that those on parole and probation are earning about $16 million a year with which they support themselves and their dependents and on which they pay taxes. If they were incarcerated of course the State would have to provide the money to pay the costs of those in prison as well as to support their dependents who would undoubtedly be on relief in many instances.

Mr. Powers points out that persons convicted of crime are never put on parole or on probation with the idea of saving money. They are so treated because the authorities believe that is the best way to restore them to a position of good citizenship and it is purely incidental but nevertheless important that there is a substantial financial gain for the people of Wisconsin.

In addition to those put on probation before they enter an institution and those paroled because they have indicated they will be able to make their own way with some help, Wisconsin also has a group on mandatory parole. This group is made up of prisoners who have served their sentences less the time off for good behavior and therefore must be released but virtually none of them is released without being placed under supervision for a time.

Of the total released on parole about 19 percent have their paroles revoked during the first 6 months and about 24 percent during the first 2 years of probation. Some of the revocations are for new offenses but a great many are merely precautionary as in cases where some parolees have been found in bad company or have given other indications that they might be getting into trouble. All in all the record indicates that at least three-fourths of those paroled are able to make their way for 2 years and with that start there is a good chance that they will be able to go all the way. Wisconsin's parole and probation system is one of the things this State can well be proud of and citizens should insist that those in the welfare department be given every help possible in maintaining it successfully.

Walter L. "Bull" Durham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, the latter part of last week Walter L. "Bull" Durham, the dynamic voice of the Midsouth farmer for two fruitful decades, died in his sleep in Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. Durham was the agricultural editor of the Commercial Appeal, one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

In his passing not only the Eighth Congressional District of Tennesse, which I have the honor to represent, but Memphis, Tenn., and the Midsouth as well, have lost a great benefactor of all mankind and those who till the soil in our congressional district have especially suffered a great loss.

His work can best be extolled by a statement issued following his death by Mr. Frank Ahlgren, editor of the Commercial Appeal in Memphis, Tenn.:

Mr. Durham's death comes as a great shock to me.

Walter and I have worked together for 22 years now. I like to think of him as I saw him last night (Thursday) while we were both working on the election. He was a newspaperman to the last. There he was as interested, enthusiastic, and vibrant as in the past.

TOUCHED MANY LIVES

His impact on this area was tremendous. He was a good newspaperman, a friend, and a counselor.

I can think of no man who has touched so many lives with his helpfulness and sincerity of purpose. Since 1939, he had directed our plant to prosper program, bringing him into contact with hundreds of thousands—and he was always helping. Only a few days ago he was working on plans for the 16th plant to prosper program.

I have lost not only a close associate but a close personal friend.

Mr. Durham used to entertain his associates with stories of the year he represented Lauderdale County in the Tennessee General Assembly and his work in the Nashville and Jackson, Tenn., bureaus of the Commercial Appeal.

WAS LICENSED LAWYER

Mr. Durham's versatility was shown by the fact that in addition to being a newspaperman, he was a licensed lawyer and a member of the Tennessee Legislature when only 21.

He was born in Mineral Wells, Tex., where his father was superintendent of a hospital. A short time later the family moved to Ripley, Tenn., where his father became county register. They also lived in Henning, Tenn.

Mr. Durham attended school at Ripley, Castle Heights Military Academy at Lebanon, Tenn., the University of Tennessee, and Columbia University where he studied journalism and law.

After college he returned to West Tennessee and published a group of small newspapers. He was elected to the legislature in 1931. He published a weekly newspaper in Bruceton for a while and then worked on the Daily News in New York City.

Returning to West Tennessee again in 1935, he joined the Commercial Appeal and worked in the Jackson and Nashville bureaus before coming to Memphis in 1937. He served as tristate editor and general assignment reporter before being named agricultural editor.

An editorial that appeared in the Commercial Appeal is attached hereto:

WALTER DURHAM

News of the death of Walter "Bull" Durham brought sincere regret to thousands on thousands of men and women in Memphis and the entire Midsouth for a variety of reasons. Unquestionably, the first and keenest reaction was the feeling that everyone who knew him had lost a true friend.

Walter Durham in his years of unselfish service did a great many things that were unusually worth the while and the value of his achievements was invariably enhanced by the great talent he had for sympathetic, kindly, understanding respect and affection for his fellows. We have never known a man from whom the spirit of good will emanated more genuinely and consistently.

The outstanding monument to Walter Durham's life is to be found in the contribution he made to the farm people and agriculture in the Midsouth as a whole and especially in the Arkansas, Mississippi, Missouri, and Tennessee areas that took part in the Commercial Appeal's plant to prosper work. He was director of the plant to prosper bureau for 20 years and in that time touched for good no less than hundreds of thousands of lives. Added to that was the wide influence his farm program over WMC gained and held.

Not many men have come to any undertaking more fully equipped than was Walter Durham when he began his career as friend and mentor of Midsouth farmers. He had worked in high school and college journalism. He had been with a metropolitan newspaper in New York City. He had served a term in the Tennessee General Assembly. He had a license to practice law. He had owned and published smalltown weekly papers and he had some experience of his own on the land. On the Commercial Appeal he had handled a variety of responsible assignments.

Hardly any man of our acquanitance had more constructive curiosity than Walter Durham. He read omniverously for years. He was interested in politics and in economics and in the social order. He was a good companion and an engaging conversationalist who loved a good story as much as anyone. His varied training and his diversified interests enabled him to see his own specialty in true relation to the community as a whole and to serve it the better on that account.

To Walter Durham had come a multiplicity of prized awards from farm organizations and publications and from civic groups for outstanding public service. He was greatly moved by each and every evidence of the esteem of his associates and friends, but he wore his honors with a modesty that was deep and real.

A stream of tributes has come to this office, testifying to Walter Durham's usefulness and goodness. He truly won and richly deserved them all.

Also attached is an editorial that appeared in the States-Graphic at Brownsville, Tenn., edited by Mr. Paul Sims:

"30"

The passing of Walter "Bull" Durham, Memphis newspaper man, who died in his sleep there last Friday morning, removes from the ranks of Tennessee journalism one of its best known and most beloved men.

For many years as director of the Commercial Appeal's plant-to-prosper program, he distinguished himself as a brillian writer and a good friend of the farmers of the tristates area. He loved to visit in the farm homes from year to year and to recount the progress that was being made.

Mr. Durham began his newspaper career on a small newspaper in west Tennessee, a profession he was destined to follow the remainder of his life. A dedicated newspaperman to the end, he spent Thursday night at his office aiding in the handling of the Memphis city election.

It was my good fortune to know him over a long period of years. I was always glad to count him as a friend. His passing is a source of genuine personal regret.

Also an editorial from the Crockett Times at Alamo, Tenn., edited by Mr. Leslie Sims, is included:

The passing of Walter "Bull" Durham, plant-to-prosper director and agricultural editor of the Commercial Appeal, is mourned by a legion of friends throughout the Midsouth.

We became acquainted with him over 30 years ago as a neighbor publisher of the Halls Graphic, one of his first newspaper ventures. He has been a very dear friend throughout the years and we are deeply grieved by his passing.

He was never too busy to assist us in any way or to do us some special favor throughout his long career.

Three times (1947, 1950, and 1953) he presented this newspaper the Commercial Appeal's newspaper trophy for outstanding editorial contribution to the plant-to-prosper program. These trophies are proudly displayed in our office.

The Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials—one from the Boston Herald and one from the Boston Traveler—commenting upon the factual report issued by Labor Secretary Mitchell on the steel strike.

I have been impressed by the support which Secretary Mitchell has received from the Nation's press, including two Boston newspapers represented by these editorials.

Clearly Secretary Mitchell has performed a service to the Steelworkers Union, to the steel industry, and to the American public in releasing this statistical background.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Herald, Aug. 21, 1959]

WHAT THE STEEL "FACTS" DO

We have said that factfinding in the steel strike would settle nothing. And sure enough, both sides, union and management, endorse Secretary Mitchell's statistical findings, without, however, agreeing on what to do about them in the matter of a new contract.

This is because the difference between the two sides is now and has been right along a difference in philosophy and not a difference of factual information. Each side has presented its own version of the facts to win the support of the public. The actual basis of settlement is elsewhere.

The Steelworkers Union believes that the steel companies are prosperous enough to part with more of their profits to the employees; the steel companies do not believe profits should be a measure of wages. This cannot be settled by discussion across the bargaining table. This difference of philosophy can be adjusted only by the contest of economic strength now going on in the form of a strike.

If the factfinding does anything, it will be through the pressure of public opinion. Yet Secretary Mitchell has most carefully avoid d any explicit recommendation that might guide the public to make a decision. If there is, as he says, an area of possible agreement marked out in his report, it is not easily discerned.

Have the steel companies been making such astronomical profits, as claimed by the union's president, that the equity of a wage increase is clear? The Mitchell report does not indicate so. Profits after taxes as a percentage of sales have been higher than for all manufacturing, but such profits must in general be higher in industries with high capital investment (like steel). And net profits as a rate of return on investment have been less than in all manufacturing during most of the postwar years.

Have steel prices been raised exorbitantly, as claimed by the union? Steel prices have indeed, the report says, risen higher and faster than wholesale prices in general and much more than retail prices. And the increase in steel prices has exceeded the rise in employment cost per ton of steel produced. But employment cost per man-hour has risen faster than steel prices. This apparent disparity is the result of increased productivity.

(And it might be pointed out that most of the increased productivity is the result of better tools and techniques made possible by the profits of the industry.)

And what of the comparative scale of pay in the steel industry? Measured in terms of average hourly earnings, steel wages are higher than those in most other industries. Steel wages plus fringe benefits have risen more than output per man-hour.

And what does it all mean? It seems to mean that in the battle of "facts," the steel companies have come out a bit better than the union; that though both sides carefully selected their facts, the union selection was the more unbalanced.

Perhaps this is why Union President McDonald makes his cryptic comment on the Mitchell findings. They show, he says, the ability of the industry to share a portion of its gains in productivity with the public, the workers in the industry and the stockholders. And the stockholders?

Omitted in the report is the factual approach to one problem that has piqued our interest: If steel prices have been increased excessively, what has happened to competition? Is there in truth a way of "administering" prices that escapes the competitive challenge of 250 domestic steel producers, not to mention foreign producers and producers of aluminum, copper, cement, lumber, plastics, and other rival materials?

Omitted also in the report is the problem of restrictive union rules which prevent management from operating with full efficiency. These are losses that everybody has to pay for.

The administration has acted to prevent the American people from swallowing the one-sided facts presented by the union and the industry. In this negative sense, the Mitchell report serves an important function.

But, alas, there remains the great unanswered question: Is the power to close down an entire industry a safe power to entrust to an organized group largely immune from ordinary legal restraints, and does such power tend to favor such a group unduly as against the rest of the economy? It's a question that needs answering.

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 21, 1959]

FACING THE FACTS

The report just released by Secretary of Labor Mitchell on the statistical background of the steel industry is a strong argument for a quick settlement.

Mitchell does not take sides in his findings. But neither does he sugar his facts. He points to healthy conditions on both sides, labor and management alike, and leaves the public more than ever convinced that the strike should end without delay.

Steelworkers' average earnings already are well ahead of industrial earnings in general.

Steel industry's profits after taxes, in relation to sales, have been higher than for manufacturing as a whole.

Thus both sides have been economically healthy. So why the dispute?

Mitchell's impartial report, while drawing no conclusion, leaves the bystander feeling that there's no point in wasting sympathy on either side.

It's time for both parties involved in the strike to stop stalling and to negotiate a sincere approach to a settlement before the damage spreads.

What Tom Dooley Knows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks, I include an editorial relating to Dr. Thomas Dooley, M.D., entitled "What Tom Dooley Knows," appearing in the Boston Globe of August 24, 1959.

As everyone knows, there is no more living person dedicated to this cause of suffering mankind in practically a forgotten area of the world than Dr. Dooley.

The editorial well says:

Tom Dooley, whether he lives 5 months or 5 years or 50 years, has had a life more filled with accomplishments than most men.

How true.

It is the prayers and hopes of countless of millions that the health of Dr. Tom Dooley will improve enabling him for many years to do his great work in the service of God and of mankind.

The editorial follows:

WHAT TOM DOOLEY KNOWS

(By Uncle Dudley)

Tom Dooley says that he's going back to Laos—going back to southeast Asia and the 30-mat hospital, no beds—that he set up on the "edge of tomorrow," where he sought and found how to serve.

The missionary, Dr. Thomas Dooley, will be leaving the safe and comfortable womb of a great specialized New York hospital, where he learned the other day that at 32 he had cancer of the lungs. He'll be leaving to work as long as he can among people who go to bed hungry at night, live in grinding poverty, mostly never have seen a doctor.

(Yet, when he came back to this country last year he wrote never had he seen anyone out there with a neurosis.)

For Americans who have worked themselves into a state of fear about cancer, heart disease, and some of the other killers, Dr. Dooley's case is a horror story. Dr. Dooley himself obviously does not think so. Nor do many of his fellows in the profession.

Here they remember another surgeon, who underwent surgery for cancer in middle age and achieved an international reputation and honors for 17 years more, almost no one the wiser. They also recall the New York doctor, known throughout the world, who lived for years with acute heart disease, slipping off now and then to come to Boston for secret treatment, in the meantime establishing an institution that will be a living monument to his selflessness and courage. Or the Massachusetts octogenarian who was operated on for "inoperable" malignancy and has been blithely carrying on as a family doctor for years. And there's also the internist who faced surgery for incurable disease, was glad that he "had time to set his affairs in order," and then was found to have a harmless obstruction.

This is not to say that every story has a happy ending—to be a pollyanna about ravaging diseases of which we still know, with all our vast programs, far too little. It is to decry the kind of fear in which this Nation, with the most comfort, widespread luxury, the best food, the highest standard of medical care, has steeped itself.

The result tqo often is that we are living scared. We act as though the end all of life is to prolong life and in prolonging life to create insuperable new problems for ourselves.

Tom Dooley, whether he lives 5 months or 5 years or 50 years, has had a life more filled with accomplishment than most men. Perhaps that is why he could take bad news about his body with anger, because it might cut short his mission, and with the gaiety of selflessness and a quip for the irony of the situation in which he finds himself.

In his book, "The Edge of Tomorrow," with which he has helped finance the work of his medical mission, Dr. Dooley said that it is sometimes hard to see God "when you are plunged into bleating materialism." But because of the solitude in the jungle it is easier to see Him "in the tropic rain, in the monsoon mud, in the tangy sweet smell of the earth * * * the frangipani, the tamarind trees * * * the quiet and peace of the hills and valleys."

And he really lets us in on the secret when he concludes that "life can signify much. We must just listen to the voices which are inside each of us. * * * A man working in this world without tapping his own reservoir of spiritual strength is like a twin-engined plane flying with only one motor. He may get there, but it will be mighty difficult."

Agricultural Experiment Stations Contribute to American Life Through Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the launching of the first Russian sputniks

less than 2 years ago gave the words "basic research" special significance for Americans. Today the impact of research—both basic and applied—is manifested in every aspect of our life. We know that when man flies to the moon or conquers cancer or builds a better mousetrap, research will have played an important, if not the most important, role in that success.

Although it does not have the glamour of the launching pad and the countdown and thus has not received the spotlight given technological research, agricultural research has been an important part of American life for many years. The agricultural experiment stations, operated through the Department of Agriculture with the cooperation of many State agricultural colleges, are as significant to rural America as the mail order house or good harvest weather.

I was pleased that the Senate and House increased the 1960 appropriation for the Agricultural Research Service from the $64,240,000 recommended by the administration to $67,722,490.

The causes which these funds will serve are many, Mr. President, even in my own State of Oregon—where pears, peas, and potatoes are among the variety of crops that will be improved through agricultural research. Because it so well describes the value of agricultural experiment stations and their research contributions, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Pendleton East Oregonian for August 4, 1959, entitled "Work of the Experiment Stations," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORK OF THE EXPERIMENT STATIONS

Anybody who looks closely at the economy of Oregon concludes that it will be expanded according to efforts in the direction of full utilization of wood, doing a better job in all facets of agriculture, and putting water resources to full use. It is our opinion the greatest opportunity for expansion is in agriculture.

An obvious need in agriculture is to bring the crops-animal ratio into better balance. Oregon swings too far on the crops side. Another need is to do a better job with those crops we presently produce, to improve quality and boost quantity. And another need is to develop effective cures for the many diseases that attack so many crops.

The job is being approached from several directions and at several levels. The primary responsibility is upon Oregon State College and U.S. Department of Agriculture personnel at the State's experiment stations.

With the committee on agricultural extension service and experiment stations of the State board of higher education we visited four experiment stations last week, three at Medford and the other at Klamath Falls. We saw and heard of two projects that are ideal illustrations of the importance of experiment stations in the agricultural economy of Oregon.

The pear crop of the Rogue River Valley is worth many millions of dollars annually—latest estimate by the Jackson County extension office is that the annual return from the fruit crop in that county is aboutt $19 million. This immense resource is being threatened by a condition that is called pear decline. Pear decline rapidly reduces the crop and finally destroys the trees.

An entomologist from Oregon State College has been working on the problem for about a year. He has reason to believe he may be close to an answer.

In order to increase production many orchardists have increased use of commercial fertilizers and irrigation. Because that seemed sound the entomologist looked in many places for the causes of pear decline before he had to come to the undeniable conclusion that pear decline was most prevalent in orchards that had been heavily fertilized and irrigated. Those orchards lightly fertilized and irrigated showed little or no signs of pear decline. So, he is about to say to the orchardists that the theory that if a little is good a lot is better does not hold true in the raising of pears. If he is right and pear decline can be eradicated the victory will be immensely important.

In Klamath County the potato crop is the county's greatest agricultural money producer. Throughout the county potato production has been dropping, both in quality and quantity.

Agronomists are not quite ready to say that they have the answer but they will tell you that they think they have it. There is a parallel to the pear problem in Jackson County.

For many years it has been thought in Klamath County that the best potato producer was the man who rotated potatoes with alfalfa and clover. It has been discovered that that wasn't true. Rotation of those crops with potatoes was exactly the wrong thing to do. The farmer who was thought to be lazy because he didn't practice rotation has not had the production and disease problems that have hit the fields of the "efficient" farmers.

These are examples of the tremendous importance of experiment station work in crops that are basic to the economies of Jackson and Klamath Counties. The same type of work is going on at experiment stations throughout the State on crops and animals.

Farmers who directly benefit from experiment station work are, of course, the big winners. But it would be shortsighted to look no further. Improving pear production and potato production goes far beyond aiding the economies of two counties and the farmers of those counties. It benefits every resident of the State of Oregon. If all who live in this State are to prosper agriculture must produce more and more.

Caution Needed in Applying for Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, correspondence reaching Members of Congress clearly demonstrates the need for caution in hiring "land locators" or "agents" to prepare applications for public lands.

A new Bureau of Land Management pamphlet, "Information on Public Lands," contains sound advice for veterans and others seeking a tract of public land. Copies may be obtained from local Bureau officers or the Bureau of Land Management, Washington 25, D.C.

Extracts from the pamphlet follow:

See the land and examine it in person. Don't buy or apply for lands you have not seen. The Government usually requires it, and besides, it is good business sense.

* * * * *

Know the law and regulations. Even if someone else is handling the details for you, find out for yourself what he is doing and why. Don't pay anyone to do anything until you know the official requirements.

If you hire someone to locate the land for you, know exactly what services you are paying for. Do not pay for services you do not get or cannot use.

* * * * *

Land locators and filing services have offices in many western cities. For a fee they will examine the status of lands on the public land records, inspect the characteristics of public lands on the ground, fill out application blanks, and prepare supplementary information that may be required with the application.

However, be careful. None of the land locator services is licensed or regulated by the Federal Government. Some unscrupulous operators have led some people to believe that hiring them will result in obtaining Federal land, even though most of the applications they file will be rejected. Before you hire a land locator, you should be sure that you are dealing with a reliable person and that you understand fully the extent of the services which he will provide.

In the real estate business, realtors do not usually earn their fee until the final sale has been completed. Until that time, a person only makes a deposit of earnest money to show his good faith. If the realtor fails to complete the sale, he will return the money deposited. People doing business with land locators or filing services would do well to obtain similar agreements. A person then would not lose his money if his application is later denied. Such arrangements, of course, have to be worked out directly with the locator or filing service.

The Government does not require or encourage the use of land locator services. All applications received by the Bureau of Land Management are considered on their own merits. No one would receive any kind of special treatment or consideration simply because he had filed his application through a land locator. All BLM information, data, records, maps, and other materials which are available to land locators and filing services are also available to anyone who is interested in filing an application. Land locators receive no special or "inside" information that is not available to anyone else.

* * * * *

Buying public lands, like buying any real estate, is a serious investment. For your own protection, you should always see and personally examine the lands.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two issues

of the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the GTA Public Relations Department, St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, August 19, and Friday, August 21, 1959.

There being no objection, the publications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 19, 1959

There's so much loose talk and misinformation being passed around about the farm situation and food prices that it is no wonder many city people are confused. So it is refreshing to pick up a newspaper that's giving out with the facts on this matter. We're talking about an editorial in the August 19, St. Paul Pioneer Press. It's titled "The Other Side to Farm Surpluses," and we thought you'd be interested in hearing some of what it has to say.

First, the editorial warns that the cost of living is not as stable as it looks on the surface. It hints that those national leaders who boast about how they've kept inflation under control have had the wool pulled over their eyes. What's actually been happening, the Pioneer Press editorial says, is a far different story. Here are a couple of paragraphs—quoted directly from the newspaper:

"What made the price index appear stable was the fact that food prices were declining at an annual rate of 5 percent, but other nonfood commodities and services rose 2 percent. Thus a major factor was the abundance and relative cheapness of food items, which offset the rise in the remainder of the items going into the index."

In other words, a farm subsidy to both consumers and business people. But let's read on:

"This is a reminder to the critics of the farm program that, whatever its shortcomings, taxpayers get something back. One of the favorite criticisms is against the payment of crop supports, which keep on adding to the surplus production of the farms," the St. Paul newspaper says. "But at any rate, the country has an abundance of food, and everyone in his capacity as a consumer gets a dividend in the relative cheapness of food. This was the dominant factor in keeping the cost of living from going up," it concludes.

Well, that's no secret to farmers. They've seen it going on since way back in 1952. But we're happy to see city people getting the story straight, at least in some of the big newspapers. It certainly is a contrast to the propaganda coming out of the Secretary of Agriculture's office, telling people that farm prices are too high and that makes food prices high. Neither statement is true, of course, but some people don't question what they read or hear.

And speaking of consumers "getting something back" for their tax money spent on farm programs, we notice in the Wall Street Journal that food surpluses are proving a big help in areas of heavy unemployment. With the steel industry shut down, Uncle Sam is distributing flour, rice, eggs and other abundant foods to workers who are broke. And that helps take quite a relief load off the local taxpayers.

So when the story is truly told and understood, the abundance produced by American farmers is indeed a blessing. Farmers have always been proud of their ability to feed the Nation, with some to spare. What they ask in return is legislative machinery to smooth out the highs and lows in production, and realize a fair return for their labor, investment, and management.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 21, 1959

The harbor at Duluth-Superior, the largest inland port in the world, is bustling with new activity these days. Strange ships, with salt-water crews, are sailing the inland seas all because the centuries-old dream of a St. Lawrence Seaway has finally been realized. For the first time, the grain farmers of the upper Midwest, through their giant GTA elevator at Superior, are loading grain into ships that sail direct to the salty seas.

The seaway is a mighty accomplishment. Some hail it as a magic wand of progress that will transform the economy of the Midwest, maybe even put farmers on easy street. But let's slow down here for a minute, and while we are hailing the seaway's benefits let's look at some of its shortcomings. First of all, the upper leg of the seaway, the part that reaches to the farmer's elevator at Superior, is icebound about 5 months of the year. And the channel is only 27 feet deep, which isn't enough for the big-sea ships so it is the smaller ones that reach Duluth-Superior. We've just been talking with some of our GTA people who handle shiploading at the big elevator and they say that the high-sided ocean ships take sometimes twice as long to load as the long, low Great Lakes boats. That means more expense, of course.

And here's another point. As more grain is being loaded out on the St. Lawrence Seaway, less is being shipped by barge down the Mississippi for loading into ships at gulf ports. It's too early to tell yet whether the St. Lawrence will mean a bigger market or just a shift in shipping points. We notice that southern and eastern Congressmen are concerned enough about this to take action. They're trying for a law to tie up certain Great Lakes grain shipments so their ports will get the business back.

There are other troubles along the big ditch too, but that's enough to give you the idea.

Here at GTA we're primarily interested in how the seaway can benefit the farmer and his family. If it will mean more markets, more total co-op savings, that's all to the good. But nothing of the sort has been proven yet. Researchers say it costs 12 cents a bushel less when grain is loaded in an ocean vessel at Superior, going direct to, say, Casablanca or Rotterdam than when it is shipped by rail to an east coast port before being loaded on a ship. But who gets the 12 cents? Not the farmer. He's already paid to get his grain to the terminal market. And the Seaway hasn't lowered those freight charges a penny.

So it looks like any benefit the farm families get from the seaway will be indirect. The big exception will be the savings that might be realized through the grain marketing businesses that farmers own themselves, their cooperatives. And it has always been true that farmers benefit the most when they do business with their local cooperatives and with GTA the co-op way.

Aid for Redevelopment of Depressed Economic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to make one more plea before Congress adjourns for action by the the House on legislation to set up a program of cooperative Federal-State aid for the redevelopment of depressed economic areas.

Many sections of our Nation are suffering from persistent and substantial unemployment. This is a serious problem that time will not solve. Nor will it go away if we simply close our eyes to it.

These depressed areas need help, Mr. Speaker. They must be given assistance in rebuilding their economy and in attracting new industry that will create permanent jobs.

The Senate has passed an area redevelopment bill. The House Banking and Currency Committee approved a bill last May. The bill is still pending in the House Rules Committee.

If Congress adjourns without acting on this legislation, Congress will have to face up to this problem next year. We cannot escape it.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that in times of unprecedented prosperity for the country as a whole we will permit large pockets of depression to exist.

The people in these areas are suffering. Hundreds of thousands of them depend upon gifts of surplus foods to feed their families. They need help—not handout—to keep their children from from starving but just which will enable them to support their families and lead useful, fruitful lives.

South Korea Skies Clear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Christian Science Monitor of August 19, 1959, by Robert T. Oliver entitled "South Korea Skies Clear" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this excellent article Mr. Oliver points out that never in the 4,300-year history of Korea have the people had such great hopes as are now known in the Republic of Korea. The advances that have been made since the formation of the Republic in 1948 have been most encouraging.

Mr. Oliver notes, for example, that whereas in 1948, 54 percent of all South Korean farmers were tenants on the land, today tenant farmers number less than 10 percent. Educational developments have also been most encouraging. Today 96 percent of all South Korea's farm children are in school from the ages of 6 to 11, and there is not a farm village in the land that does not have its elementary school.

I am confident that the progress that is being made in the Republic of Korea will continue and the people of that brave land will have a continually rising standard of living.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH KOREA SKIES CLEAR

(By Robert T. Oliver)

Like the dim glow that begins to show through heavy banks of black clouds after

a long spell of bad weather, there is promise in sight of a better day coming for South Korea's 15 million farm dwellers.

No miracle is going to bring sudden or substantial prosperity to the hard-working families that slough through the mud of the rice paddies to produce the principal wealth of that ancient and war-battered peninsula. But the upswing rests on solid economic facts. When harvest time comes in October, the month of "high skies and fat horses," Mr. and Mrs. Song Tai Ha (Korea's typical farm family) will be better off, and have better prospects, than ever before.

This summer has been a mixture of good and bad weather. Heavy rains that began on June 30 and lasted for 10 days brought 10 inches of rain to the Seoul area, and precipitated the worst floods in 26 years on the farmlands above Pusan. Damage amounted to 4 billion hwan (approximately $8 million) with 7,000 people rendered homeless and 111 casualties (including 57 fatalities). Some 11,200 acres of farm paddies and other crop fields were laid waste, a tragic loss in a land where the average farm's size is 2½ acres.

KIMCHI BRINGS SMILES

Nevertheless, in a letter from an informed friend in Korea, dated July 16, the news is largely good: "Our rainy season is over and we are enjoying beautiful warm weather. The people are looking forward to a good crop. This year we had a bumper crop of barley and the rain has also been favorable for the round cabbage, squash, and other vegetables, as well as the watermelon. With cabbage so plentiful and cheap everyone can eat a lot of kimchi this year."

When kimchi is plentiful, Koreans, as every GI who has served in Korea knows, are all smiles. This pickled vegetable, heavily spiced with garlic and red pepper, is next to rice the staple of the Korean diet; and even many Americans have found it not only nutritious but also a tasty dish.

For the last 3 years the rice crops has exceeded the pre-1945 average, and it gets better each year. Results are flowing steadily from the repair of war damage, improvements in transportation, increase in the flow of fertilizer (and improved distribution), and steady progress in checking plant disease and improving seed quality.

An even greater impetus was given to the workers in the rice paddies by the sweeping land reform laws that were adopted in 1949, promulgated in 1950, and that have become increasingly effective through the better governmental administration accompanying the general recovery from the wartime conditions.

OWNERSHIP SPURS INTEREST

In 1948, when the Republic of Korea was inaugurated, 54 percent of all South Korean farmers were tenants on the land, and an additional 25 percent were part tenants. Rentals averaged 35 percent of the crop yield. Now tenantry on Korean farms is below 10 percent, and the annual payments-in-kind for the purchase of the land is about 20 percent of the annual harvest.

The difference not only in cash but also in satisfaction and in the release of initiative is enormous. Farmer Song Tai Ha nowadays works in the late fall and early spring to repair irrigation ditches and dikes that protect land that is his own, rather than leaving them to the dubious care of absentee landlords. He takes a new pride in fields that he can now leave to his own eldest son.

How much better off are the farmers of South Korea today than they were 2 or 3 years ago? On the land crops ripen slowly, and real progress has to be measured in decades, not in years. But the facts all point toward better times.

For one thing, over 96 percent of all South Korea's farm children are now in school from the age of 6 to 11. There is not a farm village in the land that does not have its elementary school, with a middle school near at hand, and a high school not much farther away. And there are 78 colleges and universities in the Republic that enroll more than 80,000 students. No longer is the land (constantly shrinking in ratio to the population growth) the only outlet for Farmer Song's sons and daughters.

INFLATION CHECKED

For another thing, the inflation that raced ahead in South Korea for 12 years from 1945, averaging 219 percent per year, has during the last 2 years been brought to a slow pace of only 4 or 5 percent a year. This means lower prices when the rice is sold, but also lower prices for what the farmer must buy.

Moreover, better management of the grain-import program is now resulting in the grains reaching Korea from America in midwinter, when they keep prices from reaching astronomical peaks, rather than coming in late spring or midsummer to compete with the sale of the ripening crops.

Farmer Song now has a small bank account, for 54 percent of all South Korea's extant currency is now on deposit. He may even have a life insurance policy; for renewed confidence in the stability of the hwan has revived the ancient and popular life insurance business.

As in all the developing countries of the world, South Korea's farmers remain among the last portions of the population to experience beneficial effects from our program of economic aid. First transportation and communication facilities must be repaired, then electric power developed, then mines and factories had to be activated. But fertilizer is flowing in; the new Chungju fertilizer plant is near completion and a second is abuilding and the new banking and cooperative developments are meshing Farmer Song into the pattern of general economic improvements.

For old Mr. and Mrs. Song Tai Ha the present rewards are small. But they can look to the future of their sons and daughters with greater hope than has ever been known in the 4,300-year history of their ancient land.

Insult to Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the 21st day of August 1959, I was privileged to witness the signing of the Executive proclamation by the President of the United States officially admitting Hawaii into the sisterhood of States as the 50th State of our Union. Many distinguished Americans, including our honorable Speaker, were present at this White House ceremony.

The absence of another distinguished American, the Honorable John Anthony Burns, the last Delegate to the Congress of the United States from the Territory of Hawaii, was painfully noted. I was shocked to learn that Delegate Burns was not invited by the White House to be present at this historical occasion. Many of those present at this White House ceremony sincerely felt that Delegate Burns, the gentleman from Hawaii who worked tirelessly, courageously, and successfully for Hawaiian statehood, should have been invited to the White House.

I am including herein two editorials from the newspapers of the new and sovereign State of Hawaii that eloquently express the concern of the people of the 50th State over this unfortunate incident:

[From the Hawaii Times, Aug. 22, 1959]

INSULT TO HAWAII

Somewhere in Washington as, amid happy White House ceremonies, a grinning President Eisenhower went through the motions that created the islands of Hawaii into the 50th State of the United States of America a gray-haired man sat ignored by official Washington.

He was John A. Burns, Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress.

Up until the minute that the final stroke of a Presidential pen brought an end to his official office, John A. Burns had represented and served all the people of Hawaii in the Halls of Congress.

That Burns represented and served his people well and with exceptional success is a matter of obvious facts and official records. He championed and fought for the inherent rights of the people of Hawaii. More than any other Delegate before him he made those who operate the U.S. Government realize and appreciate the importance of Hawaii and its people to the welfare of America. He spearheaded the final drive for statehood for Hawaii. And Hawaii, after almost half a century of effort, was granted statehood.

Yet, this man of Hawaii was not extended the simple courtesy of being invited to the White House ceremonies that created the Territory of Hawaii into the State of Hawaii.

This ignoring of John A. Burns—whatever the reason may have been—was unfortunate to say the least and inexcusable. It was a direct insult to all of the people of Hawaii, who twice elected him as their Delegate to Congress.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Aug. 22, 1959]

NOT INVITED

Yesterday at the White House a group of invited guests watched President Eisenhower sign the proclamation admitting Hawaii to the Union.

Conspicuously not among the witnesses was John A. Burns, who with the scratching of the President's pen went out of office and into history as Hawaii's last Delegate to Congress.

He wasn't invited.

He should have been. Burns served Hawaii honorably and well through two terms, the only official under Territorial status elected by all the people.

He personally and the office he held deserved an invitation to attend the moment of triumph he helped to bring about.

Resolution of Loyal Lodge No. 252 of the Sons of Norway, Relating to Proclamation of Leif Erikson Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting resolution recently adopted by Loyal Lodge No. 252 of the Sons of Norway, favoring the proclamation of Leif Erikson Day. We in New York State have new and deeper ties with the great country Norway than we had a short time ago. I am very anxious that the resolution be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution, was ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

LODGE LOYAL, No. 252,
SONS OF NORWAY,
St. James, Long Island, N.Y.,
August 7, 1959.

To Whom It May Concern:

Whereas Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge No. 252, is a membership association duly incorporated under the laws of the State of New York, with its clubhouse and principal place of business or activity at Seventh Street and Fourth Avenue, St. James, Suffolk County, N.Y.; and

Whereas Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge, No. 252, is an association composed of persons of Scandinavian origin and their descendants interested in preserving the history, customs, and traditions of their forefathers; and

Whereas this lodge wishes to cooperate in the movement to have Congress establish Leif Erikson Day as a national holiday in honor of the many persons of Scandinavian heritage who have contributed and are presently contributing to the development of these United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge No. 252, of St. James, Suffolk County, N.Y., respectfully petition the Congress of the United States for the establishment of a national holiday to be known as Leif Erikson Day.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and exact copy of the resolution duly moved and adopted at a meeting of Sons of Norway, Loyal Lodge No. 252, held at the meeting hall of said association at St. James, N.Y., on the 3d day of July 1959.

HARRY TABIASSEN,
ELVIDA THOMASSEN,
Secretary.

Interest Ceiling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter written by Prof. J. M. Culbertson to the editor of the New York Times and printed in the New York Times on Tuesday, August 18, 1959, under the heading "Interest Ceiling Opposed."

INTEREST CEILING OPPOSED—REMOVAL OF TOOLS TO MODERATE BOOM DEVELOPMENT CRITICIZED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

We face now a problem of economic stabilization that is unusual and perplexing, one that could fail disastrously to solve. Since we are in the early stage of a cyclical upswing and the widespread inflation neurosis will tend to exaggerate expansive forces, maintaining economic stability is likely to require in the near future a Government policy of restraint on total demands.

Therefore, this is an appallingly bad time to take away from the Government its tools for moderating boom developments. Yet this will be the outcome if Congress does not remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest rates on Government bonds.

It should be understood that the existence of this ceiling is not a part of any rational system of Government economic policy, but rather is an historical accident. The provision stems from the Third Liberty Bond Act of 1918. It was passed by Congress with reference to particular security sales during the First World War. It has remained on the books so long because it has not mattered; market interest rates have been below the ceiling.

The intervening decades included the 1920's, when repayment of Government debt and price stability contributed to decline in bond yields, the great depression of the 1930's, the period of controlled war finance and the postwar period of supported Government bond prices.

CAPITAL DEMANDS

But now this is past. We have come to a time of high prosperity, strong capital demands and inflationary fears. Consequently interest rates are high. Now, the 4¼ percent interest rate limitation does matter. It is an anachronism that may do serious harm unless it is removed.

Our only ready defense against excessive and inflationary expansion in total expenditures is the monetary policy of the Federal Reserve and the debt management policy of the Treasury. To restrain expenditures with fiscal policy by raising taxes or reducing expenditures can be done only by Congress when it is in session. The chances that timely action of this sort could be achieved are slim.

If the Treasury is debarred by law from meeting the market rate of interest on its bonds it has no choice but to replace its maturing bonds and meet all its other financing needs by selling short-term securities. Such securities are relatively liquid; they serve as a money substitute. This sort of shift in the composition of the Government debt tends to cause easy financing conditions and expansion of expenditures.

Just as the policy of supporting prices of Government bonds earlier made the Federal Reserve an "engine of inflation," so the interest rate limitation can make one of the Treasury.

No valid argument has been offered for permitting the 4¼ percent limitation to become effective, but a variety of motives operate in this direction. Supporting cheap money and twisting the tail of the Wall Street bankers has always been a popular political game in this country. Some Congressmen are piqued at the Federal Reserve for its past actions or words. There is a school of thought that moderate inflation is harmless and Government policy should be less concerned with it.

But, surely, if the Nation is to be committed to some new approach or new theory of economic stabilization, this should be done only after open and conscientious discussion and after there have been established agencies with clear policy directives and adequate powers to carry out the policies.

For the Congress at this critical time simply to tie the hands of the Treasury by leaving the 4¼ percent limitation on the books and then pack itself up and go home—this would be dangerous irresponsibility.

J. M. CULBERTSON.

MADISON, WIS., *August 13, 1959.*

Archer Fullingim Reviews Dr. Cotner's Life of Jim Hogg With Both Barrels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Archer Fullingim, who grew up on the American high plains, graduated from Stanford University and now is editor of the weekly Kountze News in Hardin County in the Piney Woods of east Texas. He is one of the few present day country editors cut in the bold, outspoken, courageous mold of Texas' great country editor, Jim Hogg. And Jim Hogg was Texas' greatest Governor.

Fullingim knows Texas and Texans of this and past generations. So by knowing Texans at the grassroots, he has special qualifications for reviewing a recent definitive life of James S. Hogg, one of Texas' four greatest statesmen. The others were Stephen F. Austin, Sam Houston, and John H. Reagan.

Dr. Robert C. Cotner, of the University of Texas history faculty, has written the definitive life of Hogg in the language of ivy towers, tireless research, and historic accuracy. Now Archer Fullingim, articulate and earthy, has reviewed Dr. Cotner's Hogg in his free-swinging, uninhibited style that Texans love. It is the type of frank, outspoken journalism that was prevalent in Texas in Hogg's day two generations ago, but is largely nonexistent now. Fullingim knows his contemporary Texas like Dr. Cotner knows Jim Hogg. Having grown up in the shadow of the Hogg tradition in those east Texas Piney Woods 12 miles from the place where Jim Hogg lived as a district attorney, I believe I can sense the feeling of the Hogg men, and I believe Fullingim catches the spirit of Hogg in this review.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Archer Fullingim's review of Dr. Cotner's life of Jim Hogg, printed in the Kountze News on July 30, 1959 under the title "The Printer Fires Both Barrels."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kountze (Tex.) News]

THE PRINTER FIRES BOTH BARRELS

It's been 70 years since James Stephen Hogg, the first native to be elected Governor of Texas, was inaugurated on a reform platform that promised to wrest control of the State of Texas from the corporations. And in reading the new biography of Hogg by Dr. Robert C. Cotner, history professor at the University of Texas, one becomes slowly aware that Texas in 1959 is in much the same shape as it was in the 1880's, except that then Texas was the ruthless, greedy grasp of nine eastern railroads, and now is in the merciless, greedy grip of petroleum and gas corporations—which are sending millions of dollars out of the State each

year, just as the railroad companies did in the 1880's, and are trying to saddle a sales tax on the people of Texas. In reading the Hogg biography one becomes acutely conscious of the parallel between the Texas of 1889 and the Texas of 1959. It is as if history were repeating itself with only the names changed to protect the innocent. The sad thing about it is that in 1959 there is no James Stephen Hogg around to protect the people and enforce the law. For the plain people of Texas do not control the wealth of this State in 1959. Theirs is not the ability to pay taxes. The petroleum and gas industry has the ability to pay taxes, as reflected by their huge profits, and through the industry's control of the legislature, particularly the Senate, has haughtily, relentlessly tried to force a sales tax through the legislature for 6 months, in the regular session and two called sessions. The railroads and insurance companies and daily newspapers that fought James Stephen Hogg (and lost) have their counterpart today.

This column has often said as a matter of fact that Hogg was Texas' greatest Governor but this writer has not been alone in hailing the greatness of Hogg. Every Governor for the last 40 years (except Farmer Jim Ferguson and Pappy O'Daniel) has mentioned Hogg in the same breath with Sam Houston and Stephen F. Auston. In 1951, Allan Shivers declared that year as the James Stephen Hogg Centennial Year. The same year, the Dallas State Fair set aside October 12 as James Stephen Hogg day. In 1958 Price Daniel said that "much of our State government as we know it today can be traced to the program of Jim Hogg."

But until Professor Cotner wrote this 617-page biography of Hogg (price: $7.50) Texans did not know exactly why Hogg was such a great governor. Seventy years is a long time, and most of the people who were living and voting in 1890, are dead now, and from now on Texans will have to rely on history for their information about Hogg. The Texas history books touch on Hogg briefly, and his praises are not sung by the daily press for a reason.

The bitterest enemies of Hogg in 1900 were the Dallas News, the Houston Post, and the San Antonio Express, three papers which have always lined up with the corporations against the plain people. And one can make a safe guess as to how the piddling Beaumont papers lined up, just like the rest of the Republican press, for Hogg's enemies always carried Jefferson County. All of these papers, judging by their consistent failure to even mention the gigantic feats accomplished by Hogg, apparently want Texas to forget Hogg, or maybe now they are ashamed of the rascally, lying role they played in the Hogg career, and just as these papers lined up against Hogg in 1890 for the railroads, the trusts and corporations, so are they today lined up against the plain people and for the oil and gas industry and ever other domineering corporation. (If Hogg were attorney general or governor today, the Southwestern Bell Telephone Co. would not last 2 hours.) The same enemies Hogg had in 1890 are the same enemies Price Daniel has down at Austin—only the names have changed—in his battle to tax those who have the ability to pay. But the big difference is that Hogg, a 6-foot-3 giant of a man, weighing 280 pounds, carried the battle to the enemy, the railroads and corporations. He threw everything he had at them, because as he said over and over, "if Texas dose not control the corporations, the corporations will control Texas." Hogg did not use diplomatic language. He called them scoundrels and scalawags.

* * * * *

No governor has been elected in Texas since Jimmy Allred who was not the fair-haired lad of the petroleum and gas corporations.

At this point I am proud to say that I think if Ralph Yarborough were governor, like Hogg, he would not give an inch. He would have already taxed those most able to pay.

One becomes coldly transfixed in learning that back in the 1880's and 1890's, the Dallas News took the lead among daily papers in pinning a Communist label on Hogg. The News actually used the word "Communist." Hogg scarcely knew about communism then but it did not take him long to find out and squelch the Dallas News in his reply.

But why was James Stephen Hogg a great governor? Why is he still an inspiration to the plain people in this year of 1959? Why is it that politicians, bought and paid for by the petroleum and gas industry for 20 years, will hypocritically sing the praises of Hogg but are afraid to take one little timid step to emulate him? So here are some of the things you should know about James Stephen Hogg in 1959, the better to evaluate your governor, your legislators, your President, even your own conscience:

Hogg was born at Rusk in 1851. He was the son of a Confederate general who died in the Civil War around Shiloh. At the time the war started, Hogg's father owned a huge plantation, Mountain Home, 20 slaves and 20,000 acres of land. The Hogg family lost everything as a result of the war. James became a printer's devil on the Rusk Texas Observer and became an expert printer by the time he was 16. In his late teens, he worked on papers at Quitman, Cleburne, and Tyler. He farmed on the halves and then went back to printing. He established a triweekly paper at Longview. He studied law at Tyler and was elected county and district attorney of seven counties. He prosecuted the first man ever to be hanged in Van Zandt County. He won fame as a prosecutor. He attended the famous "car shed" Democratic convention in Houston and made a favorable impression. He gradually acquired a reputation as a reformer and as a man who believed in enforcing the law. In 1887, he was elected attorney general at the age of 36. As soon as he got to Austin, he took out after the railroads and fraudulent insurance companies, both of whom were robbing the people, to put it bluntly. Freight rates were so exorbitant that one marvels how the railroads got by with it as long as they did, but one must remember that a big man in Texas railroads at that time was one Jay Gould, of Wall Street fame, and Hogg took him on too and taught Mr. Gould to stay out of Texas.

The railroads were not only robbing the shippers, but they had seized more than a million acres of public lands illegally. You see, in order to get railroads, the State had given 40 sections of land (a section has 640 acres (for every mile of railroad built in the State, and 16 sections for every mile of switches and sidings. It was under the switches and siding category that the railroads really made a killing, but before Hogg got through with the railroads the State of Texas had recovered 1,300,000 acres of public land for the State.

Hogg established the railroad commission which regulated the railroads, their bonds, rates. Hogg appointed Mr. Reagan the first chairman of the railroad commission. Reagan had been in Jeff Davis' cabinet in the Confederate States of America. Reagan had been a frequent visitor in the home of Hogg's parents before the war—other visitors were Sam Houston and Texas revolutionary heroes. Before the railroad commission went into action, the railroads controlled Texas, but after Hogg and Reagan Texas was master in its own house.

Hogg ran the Waters-Pierce Oil Co., owned by John D. Rockefeller, out of Texas, and made it pay a fine of $1,808,483, for violation of Texas' antitrust law, the biggest fine ever assessed and ever paid in the world. Hogg sent a deputy to New York City to arrest him and bring him back to Texas, and the deputy almost did it, but in the end John D. stayed holed up in New York, but it was a good try and from then on John D. Rockefeller minded his p's and q's when it came to dealing with Texas.

Hogg forced insurance companies to invest 75 percent of their reserve in Texas, instead of taking it back to New York. In 1906, only about $1 million of the $40 million reserve was invested in Texas.

Hogg forced the big land and cattle companies in the Panhandle, including old Charles Goodnight, to give up land they had seized or fenced in illegally, and in doing this Hogg fought the land commissioner, Richard Hall, and the huge XIT (11 counties in Texas) ranch. Hogg refused to accept the capital of Texas from the XIT syndicate, the builders, because it leaked. Hall wanted to pay the syndicate off, but Hogg held out and made the builders fix the leaky roof. Hogg also uncovered the shady dealings of the land commissioner to the extent that Hall lost his office and was never elected to another. One of Hall's most mouthy defenders was the young editor of an Austin magazine, called the Rolling Stone. The editor was William Sidney Porter who later was to gain fame as a short story writer under the name of O. Henry.

(But before O. Henry became famous as a writer he was tried for embezzling funds from an Austin bank and was sent to the Federal pen for it. Some say O. Henry was guilty and some say he was innocent, but after bearing in mind the manner in which he maligned Hogg, I am now ready to believe that O. Henry was guilty.)

When 800 men from California rode a freight train into El Paso, en route to join Coxey's (jobless) army in Washington, D.C., they stopped in El Paso where they were welcomed, fed and feted. The Texas and Pacific railroad refused to let the men ride a freight train out of El Paso. Then all of a sudden the railroad announced it would let the men hop a freight. But about 100 miles out of El Paso, the freight stopped in the desert and put the men off without food or water. Hogg gave the railroad moguls the worst tongue lashing they ever got. He told them he would hold them responsible if any of the men suffered. He ordered the road to take the men back to El Paso or across Texas and be quick about it. The road never obeyed any orders so quickly.

* * * * *

But in view of the grip the railroads and land companies had on Hardin County political bosses of that period, it is understandable that Clark should carry Hardin County which has always had a hard core of conservative leadership that was wont to bend the knee to wealth and privilege. But of course not any more. For Hardin County, the county that voted for Clark, Pappy O'Daniel, and Jim Ferguson, also in the 1950's squelched Allan Shivers, Pappy O'Daniel, and P. Daniel, not to mention Ike, at the ballot box. But back in 1892, the railroads and the big land companies told their straw bosses in Hardin County what to do. Hogg carried Tyler and Liberty, as well as most of the counties in the piney woods.

If you have believed (as I have all my life) that Hogg had two daughters named "Ima" and "Ura," believe only the first half of it. He named his only daughter Ima from the heroine of "The Fate of Marvin," by Tom Hogg, of Scotland, an ancestor of Hogg. There was no sign of a daughter named "Ura." He had four sons.

Hogg was a poor man when he moved out of the governor's mansion in 1894 to a house in Austin, in which city he practiced law. But between 1894 and 1906 when he died James Stephen Hogg amassed a fortune of millions of dollars. He made his first mil-

lion at Spindletop when he and his associates established what later became the Texas Company. Then, before 1900, he bought the Varner plantation near West Columia. It contained about 2,500 acres. Hogg believed so strongly that oil was under Varner that he put it in his will that the land could not be sold until developed for oil. In 1917, oil was discovered at West Columbia and gushed under the Varner plantation. It has been said that at least $50 million of the estate Hogg left has been given to charity and educational institutions.

Did Hogg change in those 10 years after he left the Governor's office? No. He was until his dying day a sincere defender of the rights and liberties of the people. When he became a private citizen he used his own time and money to give leadership to the reform movement he had started and until the time was ripe for the transfer of the progressive leadership to the custody of his boyhood chum, Gov. Thomas M. Campbell. He had previously made another boyhood chum, Horace Chilton, U.S. Senator, not because Reagan, Chilton, and Campbell were friends of his boyhood, but because they believed as he did—they also believed that if Texas did not control its corporations, they would control Texas, as witness the eastern oil and gas lobbyists riding shotgun on the Texas legislature at Austin right this minute. Jim Hogg and John Reagan and Horace Chilton and Tom Campbell put them in their place and kept them there. In Jim Hogg's day, the corporation lobbyists did not have the nerve to ride shotgun on the legislature as the oil and gas lobby is doing now. It made Hogg want to puke to see their faces leering at the legislators and he did not stutter in telling them so, although Hogg was one of the most courteous, refined, and polite men who ever lived.

And when James Stephen Hogg died memorial services were held all over Texas and it was the greatest crowd that ever attended a funeral in Austin. This in contrast with the funeral of Joseph Weldon Bailey, at Gainesville some 20 years later. Bailey who was a villain in Hogg's life, was buried at Gainesville with a handful of people in attendance. Bailey had schemed to take over the senate seat of Horace Chilton, and had been accused of making a deal with Waters-Pierce Oil Co. Bailey lost out when the people of Texas began calling him "Coal Oil Joe."

Would that Price Daniel would read this book and take a leaf from it—it's not too late, Price. You can still make a name for yourself but you never will by being reluctant and hesitating. But you will have to start right now, Price, for time is running out on you. All you have to do is be like Hogg and accept no compromise and tell the lobbists that. Or you can be reluctant and hesitant and go down in history with A. Shivers as the most meaningless governor Texas ever had.

The Coming Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, there can be little doubt that the world can look forward to a series of sensational developments in the coming months. A few weeks ago who would have thought that Premier Khrushchev of Russia would be invited to visit the United States as an official guest of the President? Or that Mr. Eisenhower would pay a return visit to Russia?

A large number of people in the United States are alarmed over this turn of events. They feel that by inviting Mr. Khrushchev to this country we will greatly dampen the hopes of people behind the Iron Curtain for eventual liberation.

Conduct of foreign policy is in the hands of the President. He made the decision to exchange visits with Mr. Khrushchev. He sincerely believes that by meeting Mr. Khrushchev face to face he can alleviate to some extent the tensions which threaten world peace.

Mr. Eisenhower is undoubtedly the most respected world figure now in public life. He is placing his tremendous prestige on the line in the hopes that he can bring about a settlement of some of the world's more serious problems.

I am sure the President recognizes the risks involved. We could be lulled into a state of false security and let up in our determination to counter the Russian's cold war plans. The visits could bring about a split among the Western allies. Mr. Eisenhower's present visit to Europe is an effort to prevent this from happening.

Now that the decision to launch a determined peace offensive has been made, Congress must support the President wholeheartedly. A division at home at this time could be fatal.

I believe the people also have the responsibility to see that Khrushchev is received politely and correctly. Nothing would be gained by insulting him. All of the things he stands for are abhorrent to the American people but let us remember he is a guest of the President and as such he is entitled to a polite reception.

I have stated that on the whole I believe some good can come out of the exchange of visits. Khrushchev's ignorance about America is appalling. He apparently honestly believes that large corporations in this country want war to increase their profits. He also seems to think that workers in this country are enslaved by the "bosses."

If these and other misconceptions can be erased by the visit, it will be worth whatever risks are involved.

Mr. Eisenhower is no babe in the woods at this sort of international diplomacy. Some people in this country have expressed fear that he will be "taken in" by Khrushchev, but there have been reports out of Communist China that the Chinese are fearful Khrushchev will be "taken in" by the President. So perhaps this could cut both ways.

It is important that the world be reminded of the total dedication of the people of this country to peace. Mr. Eisenhower's present trip to Europe and the exchange of visits later are dramatic proof of our desire to build a world in which people can live at peace.

If Mr. Eisenhower can make a breakthrough on this front, if he can reassure Khrushchev that our foreign policy is based solely on a quest for peace, then perhaps some of the suspicions which cloud international relations can be removed.

Let us not kid ourselves that Khrushchev will leave this country a different person. He will still be the ruthless dictator of an aggressive, powerful nation. But perhaps he will understand a little better our hopes for peace and our determination to secure a just and lasting peace even at the risk of using the tremendous power at our command if necessary.

Perhaps he will be more convinced than ever that he cannot win by bluff and that further aggression will be costly to his country.

As patriotic citizens, all of us, I know, hope that Mr. Eisenhower's venture into personal diplomacy will be a resounding success.

Khrushchev Is Swayed by Power, Not Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an article written by Henry Brandon, who is the Washington correspondent of the Sunday Times of London, and who has just returned from a visit to the Soviet Union.

This article, which appeared in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 30, 1959, is entitled "Khrushchev Is Swayed by Power, Not Reason."

Mr. President, it has been my contention all along that when Mr. Khrushchev comes to America for his visit, he should be shown not only the many advantages of our high standard of living, but that he should also be shown our military might. I am not of the school which believes we are second to Russia in military power, for I believe we are far superior to Russia. I believe the general feeling among some quarters that Russia is superior to the United States comes as a result of Russia not knowing exactly what we have, and also because of Mr. Khrushchev's own rantings about what he is going to do if we do not give in to him.

When Mr. Khrushchev comes to town, I hope the President will see to it that he gets an earful and an eyeful of what will happen to him and the Russians if they do not "come across" in negotiations. This is not a one-sided world, and it is time someone told Mr. Khrushchev. As this article points out, he is swayed by power, not reason.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 30, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV IS SWAYED BY POWER, NOT REASON

(By Henry Brandon)

Shortly after my arrival in Moscow, a high Soviet official said to me: "Don't play political chess here; you can do that just as well in Washington and London. Speak to the people."

That was certainly good advice. I have spoken to as many ordinary Russian citizens as were willing to talk to me. A minority simply repeated what they had read in Pravda; an even smaller minority was afraid to talk at all, but encouragingly many, as I reported in my first article, were eager for thoughtful exchanges with a westerner.

One must ask oneself, however, how the international chess game looks from Moscow. Even the intelligent, well-read Russian cannot give you much guidance. He is well aware that he had no influnce on the Government's decisions in that field, and he also senses that his newspapers do not give him enough factual information to judge for himself.

Questions such as "What is the truth about Britain's relations with India?" or "What goes on in Spain, our newspapers never write about it?" were a good indication of how spoonfed the thinking Russians feel.

A STATUS QUO FIRST

There is today, however, fairly general agreement among diplomatic observers in Moscow that Khrushchev has set himself three major aims:

1. To negotiate with the West the acceptance of a status quo in Europe which would enable him to seal off his Socialist camp against Western penetration and consolidate his control over it.

2. To weaken the rear of the capitalist countries in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia by encouraging neutralism and by trying to establish influence in the underdeveloped countries.

3. To promote the Soviet Union to the status of an important international trader, because nowadays the flag follows trade and this would help to reinforce Soviet influence abroad.

Khrushchev's first aim obviously made him demand a change in the status of Berlin. When he launched his diplomatic offensive he did not perhaps expect the West to put up as strong a resistance as it has, and, faced with the possibility that the conflict could lead to war, he trimmed his sails. He is sensitive to the charge of having presented an ultimatum, because he does not want to be accused of creating tension.

Russians are bitter about Western efforts to rearm Western Germany, while knowing little about the rearmament of the East Germans, but they seemed to me unsure who is right over Berlin. On the whole, they think that Khrushchev has a reasonable case in demanding a change in the status of Berlin 14 years after the end of the war, yet they don't think of it as something important enough to go to war about.

Khrushchev knows that the Soviet people are fed up with war; that it would need a massive propaganda campaign to condition them for it. Deeply ingrained patriotism is the most reliable basis of support the Soviet Government has among the people, but it is something the Kremlin can appeal to only in extreme circumstances, such as a direct attack.

NO PLACE FOR MEDIATOR

Khrushchev, calculating and toughminded as he is, is not a man who can easily be swayed by reason—only by the realities of power. In negotiation with him, it is therefore important to be as firm as he is, and as one's own power position allows, but at the same time no less flexible than he is willing to be.

And since the United States likes to be judge of her own power, and Khrushchev will be influenced only by that judgment, it is difficult for third countries to mediate. That is also the reason why Khrushchev wants most of all to negotiate directly with the United States.

Another difficulty in negotiating with the Russians is that they lack a logical mind. They have no difficulty in believing two contradictory ideas at the same time.

Here is one of the causes of disagreement among the Western allies, who cannot agree on what Khrushchev's aims are in the Berlin crisis and therefore have difficulty in framing a common policy, whereas Khrushchev can keep the initiative with or without logic.

Yet another difficulty the West has in negotiating with Khrushchev is that he is convinced that time is on his side, though this is somewhat mitigated by his being himself in a hurry. One high Soviet official I saw who is close to Khrushchev said: "The West has the choice of negotiating with us or eventually with the German People's Republic, and that would mean a loss of prestige for you."

However, the situation is not quite so simple as that. The West's problem is that its juridical correctness is pitted against a perilous strategic situation. Russia's problem, even if she concludes a peace treaty with East Germany, is that she remains nevertheless responsible for the actions of her most dependent satellite.

Khrushchev is said to be not very hopeful of finding some accommodation with the United States now, his theory being that President Eisenhower is the prisoner of his own administration, that he personally would like an accommodation, but not his advisers. This is one reason why Khrushchev is said to be so anxious to meet the President either at a summit or in Washington.

The same high official suggested to me that if only the United States would not tend to back right-wing governments round the world, it would be easier to come to such an accommodation. I retored that it may be the existence of Communist parties abroad which has driven the United States to the other extreme, because Americans believe that Communists owe their allegiance to Moscow.

I then asked whether Communist parties abroad were likely to lose importance for the Kremlin now that Khrushchev is convinced the Communist system will triumph in any case because, he says, the world will recognize it to be the most successful system. But the answer was: "Communists all over the world are a community, just as the Arabs, for instance, feel that they belong together."

Yet, especially in the Middle East it seems that Khrushchev is more anxious to improve relations with the Arabs than to back his Communists in that area. In Iraq he has been careful not to rely too much on the Communist Party, and in Egypt he continued to give Nasser aid in spite of the latter's denunciation of communism. (Nasser, by the way, seems as unpopular in Moscow as he is in London.)

As one of the editors of Pravda put it to me: "It would be of no advantage to have only one or two Communists in Gen Kassem's government. It would mean responsibility without power."

In India, it seems Moscow would much prefer the Communists to lie low, fearing that otherwise Nehru's policy of nonalinement might be jeopardized.

As to the basic question whether the Soviet Union would be prepared to use her military power for ideological purposes, all foreign observers agree that she will use it only to protect her national security. But with the growth of Soviet power, the Russians' concept of what engages their national security has also grown.

In the Syrian-Lebanese crisis for instance, Khrushchev used his military power to halt developments which he believed could have injured Russian national interests.

All this confirms the assumption that Khrushchev has modified two basic concepts of Leninism; he believes that war is no longer fatally inevitable, because of the total destruction involved in nuclear war, and he believes that Russia's growing prosperity and power will become sufficiently contagious to promote world revolution by peaceful means.

For this reason, it is his third great aim to make Russia into a major trading power. He has realized that international trade, as Britian well knows and the United States is reluctant to accept, is a major factor in extending political influence on a worldwide scale. It would also help his 7-year plan.

From the frank disclosures at the last plenum of the central committee, it would seem that Russia's industry needs far-reaching modernization—not an epochal change comparable to the industrialization in the thirties, but a major overhaul which, combined with the steady need for ever-greater expansion, will impose a serious strain on Russian resources.

Aristov's disclosure that in the 15 Russian Republics 400,000 machines have become obsolete and need replacing gives one an inkling of the problems involved. Add the complaint of the leader of Komsomol, the Communist Party's youth organization, that in the last 2 years Russia's institutes have graduated 24,000 historians and only 41 industrial electronic engineers, and it is clear that the manpower for this overhaul is inadequate.

Khrushchev's hopes for overcoming or bypassing some of these vast problems are pinned to what has become in Russia a magic word: automation. There is no doubt that automation of industry, in a centrally planned economy and with a relatively low standard of living, can help in leaping over many stages that other countries had to pass through one by one. The handling of this key problem may well decide the battle between the free enterprise and socialist economies.

Here is something that governments, industry, and trade unions in the West should study carefully before it is too late. The United States refuses to trade with Russia on a large scale in the hope that this will slow down Soviet economic development. But the answer must lie fundamentally in a constructive plan which will increase Western productivity rather than in a defensive atcion that is bound to fail in the end.

The cost calculations, I am told, radically change with automation to such an extent that Russia could not only satisfy her own needs in products to which it can be applied but also some of those of the underdeveloped countries at almost no additional cost.

The problem Russians are most reluctant to discuss is Communist China, partly perhaps because they sense it is an embarrassing one, partly because they are really quite unsure what to make of it.

The Soviet Government is said to be fairly confident that for the present it will be able to "handle" Peking. This is based on the conviction that Russia is bound to remain militarily and economically superior for some years to come. But beyond that no Russian seems to be very sure of the future.

The defeatism of some of the Russians about China's ultimately overtaking Soviet Russia was reminiscent of British forebodings late in the last century about the United States. I sensed the same feeling of inevitability among many Russians today that China one day would outclass the Soviet Union.

But as if to comfort themselves, they added: "But I don't think we will become

enemies." The optimists always said: "China is now going through her Stalin period."

The great problem in East-West power politics will be how to keep international tension on a low flame. It will not be easy, for Khrushchev is a bully, and bullies behave reasonably only when bullied back. His instruments are the bulldozer, the crane and the big earthmovers.

But Russia's need now is not for radical innovations. It needs cautious, patient diplomacy to bring Khrushchev's basic policies to fruition. That would enable her to concentrate on her economic development, on the race with the United States. But it is doubtful whether Khrushchev has the talent for patience.

For the West, a relaxation of tension is also the better alternative. Admittedly, the influence the West could have on developments inside Russia is extremely limited.

However increasingly thoughtful people may be in Soviet Russia, their influence on Government policies is nil except on minor domestic issues. Nor does history show that a higher standard of life is a special safeguard to peace.

There are, however, signs of evolution in the Soviet Union which the West should welcome. There is definitely a need to assure the Russian people of more and wider contacts with the West. Tourism, student exchanges, contact among experts, trade, exhibitions, all need to be extended.

These are small, limited steps but they have already contributed to a remarkable change of atmosphere in the Soviet Union. The changes in Russia will not come from the top, where a "club of vested interests" rules, but from below, however slow such a growing-up process may be. We must think not only of the present, but also of succeeding generations.

Mood Establisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, many of you remember Velma Johnston, better known as "Wild Horse Annie," who recently came to Washington and appeared before the Judiciary Committee in behalf of my bill to prohibit mechanized roundups of wild horses and burros. I believe she won the hearts of every Member, not only the subcommittee but members of the full committee who were in attendance as well.

Certainly everyone who knows Velma loves and respects her. I thought you might be interested to know that in addition to risking her life to break up unlawful raids of our dwindling herd of mustangs, in addition to her love for horses she has championed for so many years, Velma has written prize winning articles and beautiful poetry.

In a recent letter "Wild Horse Annie" enclosed the following poem entitled "Mood Establisher":

MOOD ESTABLISHER
(By Velma Johnston)

The Roaring Twenties were giddy and bright,
Like a golden bubble of sheer delight.
And we who have lived them can recall
The years that were greatest of them all.

With a shimmy, a shake, and a razz ma tazz,
That sizzling decade gave birth to jazz.
And the songs that were written in Tin Pan Alley
Were nasally crooned by Rudy Vallee.

Gershwin gave us the "Rhapsody in Blue."
We danced to the band of Ted Lewis, too.
We had Texas Guinan with her "Hello, Sucker."
And the last of the Red Hots, Sophie Tucker.

Ours was an eat, drink, and be merry nation
Of flappers and shieks and the lost generation;
Of flagpole sitters and dance marathons,
Companionate marriages and a game called mah-jongg.

We wore ourselves out through the Charleston rage.
Mickey Mouse was born in that golden age.
If you played a uke, you were definitely in;
And a great movie star was Rin Tin Tin.

Tom Mix and Tony were a top western pair,
Our hand-cranked Fords always got us there.
A gum-chewing, rope-twirling guy named Will
Crept into our hearts and remains there still.

These things we recall with a sigh or a smile:
Sexy Mae West with her sensuous guile,
The "Big Parade" and "What Price Glory,"
Each one a poignant World War story.

If we had It we were sure to please,
And skirts were worn above our knees.
Raccoon coats and porkpie hats
Were all the go at college frats.

Valentino the Great rode fame to its peak
In a torrid drama called "The Sheik."
We had bootleggers, hip flasks, bathtub gin;
And thrilled to the novels of Elinor Glyn.

Al Capone ruled with a tyrant's hand.
There was Teapot Dome and the Ku Klux Klan.
Coolidge was President for a while.
Will you ever forget Jimmy Walker's smile?

To play at the Roxy on the Gay White Way
Was the dream of each actor in his day.
And income tax was a small donation
To pay the expenses of our own Nation.

From the silent films came something new:
The actors acted and spoke lines, too.
The splendor of color bursts onto the screen
And our eyes fairly ached with what they'd seen.

Lindbergh gained fame with his triumphant hop
From New York to Paris—nonstop.
In spite of predictions we'd all go to hell,
We turned out, it seems, remarkably well.

Sports were their best in this golden decade;
Titles were lost and new heroes were made.
There were Babe Ruth swatting his way to fame,
And the "Galloping Ghost" of the gridiron game.

The famous long count in the prize fight ring
Ended Jack Dempsey's reign as king.
Man O'War ran and won his last race,
Then sired sons to win in his place.

From its crude start as a crystal set
Radio emerged as the best thing yet.
In a mighty crescendo everywhere
Restless America took to the air.

It came to an end, this fabulous time,
With the crash of the market in twenty-nine;
And the era that lived in a glorious blaze
Has taken its place with our yesterdays.

Interview With the Honorable Dorothy McCullough Lee, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the outstanding public officials produced by my State of Oregon has been Dorothy McCullough Lee, former member of the Oregon State Senate and former mayor of Portland. At present Mrs. Lee is chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board. In the Oregon Daily Journal of Portland, of August 25, 1959, appeared a most informative interview with Mrs. Lee written by Alicia Hart of the Newspaper Enterprise Association. Mrs. Lee has described some of her views as chairman of the SACB, as well as some of her experiences which stem from 30 successful years in public life. I aks unanimous consent that this interview with the Honorable Dorothy McCullough Lee, a resident of my home community of Portland, Oreg., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGHT REDS IN HOME, SAYS DOROTHY LEE
(By Alicia Hart)

WASHINGTON, August 25.—The best way housewives can combat communism is to see that the reputation of their communities is as spick and span as the inside of their homes.

Who says so? Dorothy McCullough Lee, Chairman of the Subversive Activities Control Board, ex-mayor of Portland and one-time child prodigy. She believes women should tolerate no condition that degrades or denies anyone his constitutional rights, because the Reds are constantly on the lookout for such conditions to feed their anti-American propaganda machine.

"Women should do their best to make their towns shining examples of what our democracy stands for," she says. "They should make sure that nothing occurs in their communities that violates the democratic concepts on which this country was founded."

One way to put this communitywide housekeeping vigilance into action, she explains, is by organizing and joining responsible groups to correct abuses. "A lot can be done through organizing," she says, "but not everything." She feels that another effective combatant is to personally contact neighbors and alert them to undemocratic situations.

"The more shining examples that other countries can see of the United States and its people in action, the more persuasive we

can be in selling democracy to them," she says.

She regards her service on the SACB as one of the most important and challenging jobs of her life. SACB is a five-member group, appointed by the President. It determines whether groups accused by the Attorney General of conducting Red activities are actually Communist dominated.

Mrs. Lee insists that the job has no place for the so-called woman's intuition.

"The SACB is strictly an open court with all the constitutional safeguards provided," she says. "It's a very meticulous and legalistic operation. The closest thing you can compare my job to is being on the bench.

"In this type of work you can't use intuition. It's a factfinding job. You can't guess. You have got to listen to evidence and decide the case impartially."

Anyway, Mrs. Lee says that she seriously doubts that there is such a thing as woman's intuition, at least the way the term usually is used. "Actually," she explains, "intuition is not a flash out of the blue. I believe it's knowledge that's based on your past experiences in life."

If Mrs. Lee's definition is correct, friends say that she should be one of the most intuitive people in the world. For she has lived all over the globe and worked in a wide variety of important and interesting jobs.

"Since my dad was a naval officer," she says, "I spent most of my younger years globetrotting. I grew up in Hawaii, the Philippines, Japan, China, Guam, and all the European countries except Spain, Greece, and Turkey. I had little formal grade school education. We were never in any place long enough."

Mrs. Lee received most of her early education from tutors. Until she entered high school in Newport, R.I., her only classroom learning consisted of two brief grammar school enrollments in San Francisco, and Switzerland. Nevertheless, she was graduated in 3½ years when she was 16.

By the time she was 22, she had received her law degree from the University of California. In 1929, Mrs. Lee was elected to the Oregon House of Representatives where she served 3 years. Then she was elected to the State senate and served there until 1943.

During her years in the State legislature, Mrs. Lee was also chairman of the Oregon Crime Commission, a member of the Portland Traffic Safety Commission, and a municipal judge. In 1948, while serving as Portland's commissioner of public utilities, she was elected mayor. She stayed in office for the next 4 years.

In 1953, the State Department sent her to Germany as a civil and governmental affairs adviser to German city officials. Later, President Eisenhower appointed her to the U.S. Board of Parole. She joined the SACB in 1956 and became its Chairman the following year.

Mrs. Lee is married and has two adopted children.

Recreation and the Colorado River Storage Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the reservoirs that have been constructed in connection with our Federal reclamation program are today being used more extensively for recreation than any of us anticipated. Literally millions of people are visiting these reservoirs every year and benefiting from their recreational values. In my opinion, recreation should be considered a major purpose in developing the Nation's water resources. In this connection, I would like to include an excellent article from the August issue of the Reclamation Era discussing the tremendous recreation potential that exists in connection with the reservoirs to be constructed as a part of the Colorado River storage project:

RECREATION AND THE COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Today, more than ever before, the out of doors is providing the recreation opportunities people of this country are seeking for their increasing leisure time. In the past 10 years visits to national parks have almost doubled and visits to State parks have slightly more than doubled.

One of the major attractions is water—a lake for boating, fishing or swimming, or to provide a scenic setting for a picnic or a compsite. More and more, recreationists are looking for water where they may launch their boats. It is estimated that more than 7 million Americans now own recreational boats, about three times as many as 10 years ago. Rivers, the seacoasts, and natural lakes help to meet the demand for places to use boats, but in many parts of the country these resources are being supplemented, to an increasing extent, by manmade lakes.

Studies conducted for the National Park Service in various sections of the country have added to our knowledge of preferences affecting the demand for water-connected recreation. In the Southwest, picnicking, swimming, and fishing were found to be the three most popular forms of outdoor recreation. In the Northeast, these forms of recreation were included in the four most popular activities. In studies made in river basins in the Plains States and in the Middle Atlantic region, these activities were also found to be among the five top-ranking activities.

Each of the surveys contained questions designed to measure the extent of unmet recreation demand. Two of the studies provided an opportunity for the individuals reporting to indicate the number of persons not taking part in various activitise who would do so if the activity were readily available. In both of these studies, boating was found to be the top-ranking activity in terms of the number of additional persons who would like to participate. Fishing was in second place, while other top-ranking activities were picnicking, swimming, hunting, and ice skating. These answers, and the answers to similar questions in the other surveys, show a consistent pattern of high popularity for recreational activities that required water areas.

Recognizing the popularity of water recreation and the public demand to use reservoirs for recreation, Congress authorized recreation as one of the beneficial uses of the Colorado River storage project. Here is an opportunity not only to enjoy water-connected recreation but to do so in a region of top recreational appeal.

The scenic and scientific values of the upper Colorado basin have been known since the days of the early explorers. In 1941 the National Park Service undertook an extensive study of the recreation resources of the entire river basin. The report of the survey states: "The Colorado River basin is one of the outstanding recreational regions in the United States because of its great variety of natural scenery, climatic conditions, areas, and objects of scientific interest, and abundant evidence of prehistoric occupation. * * * Here one may enjoy a large amount of sunshine and find perfect climates and settings for various types of outdoor recreation the year around * * *. The majority of the proposed reservoirs * * * will create new recreational resources benefiting the basin."

The Colorado River Storage Project Act provides the broadest authority relating to recreation at reservoirs ever authorized by Congress to best promote recreational development and operation to serve the public interest. Section 8 of the act states:

"In connection with the development of the Colorado River Storage Project by the Bureau of Reclamation, including participating projects, the Secretary is authorized and directed to investigate, plan, construct, operate, and maintain (1) public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for the development of said project or of said participating projects, to conserve the scenery, the natural, historic, and archeologic objects, and the wildlife on said lands, and to provide for public use and enjoyment of the same and of the water areas created by these projects by such means as are consistent with the primary purposes of said projects."

Following enactment of this legislation, the National Park Service began studies and plans for recreational developments and facilities at those reservoir sites where construction of the dams, by the Bureau of Reclamation, was underway or scheduled at an early date. For a number of the areas, only preliminary general development plans have been prepared, because of limited access to much of the area surrounding the larger reservoir basins.

A preliminary general development plan has been completed for the Glen Canyon reservoir area. This reservoir will lie in the heart of the canyon lands of southern Utah and northern Arizona. This area is one of the most rugged, roadless, and inaccessible regions within the continental limits of the United States. Lands on either side of the river canyons present a profusion of greatly eroded winding gorges, ridges, and hills. In the background, sheer cliffs and mesa-topped buttes, broken by an occasional mountainous uplift, complete a landscape of vivid color and awesome space. With the reservoir, relatively easy water access will be available to this outstanding canyon country.

The plan for recreation use of the reservoir area shows three major developments. The major sites, when fully developed, will provide facilities for activities directly associated with water and for camping and picnicking, as well as meals, lodging, and other services to the public.

First to be developed is the Wahweap site, an area a few miles northeast of the dam, in Arizona and adjacent to a new major highway. Adequate topographic data has made it possible to prepare a master plan for the area. The plan has been approved, and construction is underway and will continue as rapidly as funds become available.

Other major development areas are proposed in the vicinity of Warm Creek and the Colorado River and where Bull Frog Creek enters the river.

Minor development sites have been chosen at Hole-in-the-Rock and Shock Bar. These sites will serve the boat traveler and fishermen and offer limited accommodations and services.

The Bureau of Reclamation has provided vista houses and parking areas on each side of the river below the dam and has provided uniformed guides who can give information to visitors interested in the construction of the dam.

It is expected that the Glen Canyon Reservoir area will be administered by the National Park Service as a national recreation area, similar to the Lake Mead National Recreation Area. As a start toward

that administration, Mr. James M. Eden was assigned, in May 1959, as project manager of the recreation area, with headquarters at the Wahweap site and residence in Page, Ariz. As funds became available, additional personnel will be assigned for administration, protection, and interpretation.

The Service estimated an expenditure of $10 million as the cost of Federal recreation development at the Glen Canyon area. Concessioners will, no doubt, spend at least $5 million on capital investments. It is expected that the recreational use of the Glen Canyon area will be well over a million visitor-days annually.

An outstanding point of interest for the recreationists who will be attracted to the reservoir is Rainbow Bridge. This unique natural feature, protected for future generations by establishment of Rainbow Bridge National Monument in 1910, is greater than any other known natural bridge in size, color, and in its almost perfect symmetry. The arch of salmon pink sandstone, curving in the form of a rainbow, rises 309 feet above the bottom of the gorge.

Concern over the possibility that the Glen Canyon Reservoir might actually damage the natural bridge has been based on such factors as the effect of a permanent body of water at the base of the abutements of the bridge, or of wave action against the abutements, the change in the water table, and the composition and porosity of the rock. Authority to take action to avoid the danger of gradual disintegration of the rock foundation of the bridge is contained in the Colorado River Storage Project Act. The act provides that as a part of the Glen Canyon unit the Secretary of the Interior shall take adequate protective measures to preclude impairment of the monument. Under the Secretary's direction, the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service have made joint studies to determine the best means of providing adequate protection.

Among the other areas where general development planning has been undertaken are the Flaming Gorge and Navajo units of the storage project.

Flaming Gorge Reservoir will provide a large body of water in a semiarid region enhanced by outstanding scenic surroundings. Located near the Continental Divide, with its north-south belt of national parks, national forests and resorts, the reservoir will be located in a vacation area long of national interest. Existing recreation facilities in the reservoir area are limited, and recreation facilities will be needed on the shores of the reservoir to accommodate the many thousands of visitors to whom this outstanding scenic area will become accessible.

The Flaming Gorge unit is considered to be of national significance, and recreation planning includes two major development sites north of the national forest, on each side of the reservoir near the Utah-Wyoming State line.

Recreation development along the shores of the Navajo Reservoir will help meet the rapidly increasing needs for outdoor recreation in the San Juan River Basin, an area long known for outstanding recreational appeal. The dam is being constructed in a deep canyon on the San Juan shortly below the mouth of its tributary, Los Pinos, and the reservoir located primarily in northwestern New Mexico will extend into Colorado. Major recreation development are proposed on each side of the reservoir a short distance from the dam. Among these is the Currecanti, a main unit of the development located in Colorado, which will consist of two or three principal dams creating reservoirs for additional recreation.

The recreational opportunities to be afforded by reclamation reservoirs are discussed at only three such sites in this article. However, it is anticipated that the Colorado River storage project will provide similar opportunities at an estimated total of 15 reservoirs ultimately. These will be located in the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

The phenomenal recreational use of reservoirs indicates that these recreation developments will result in significant monetary benefits to the surrounding area, as well as providing substantial recreation opportunities.

Generosity of Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, with all of the waste and extravagance which has been unearthed with respect to contracts entered into by the Pentagon, it is encouraging to read an editorial such as that contained in the Kansas City Times—the morning Kansas City Star—of August 24, 1959.

This newspaper is known for not holding any punches in its editorial columns. The writer of this editorial appears to be far more generous in commenting upon the Pentagon's contracting procedures and planning than are many Members of Congress.

One of the greatest wastes on the part of the Defense Department is its failure to utilize existing facilities, and an outstanding example is the one-half-billion-dollar Sunflower Ordnance Plant near Lawrence, Kans.

Evidently one branch of the service is not concerned with property, facilities, or equipment in the hands of another branch of the service which could be used to the advantage of the Government and at a saving to the taxpayer.

Since I have been extremely critical of the Pentagon for betraying the interest of the taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, I feel it is only fair that this editorial be included in my remarks and printed in the Appendix of the RECORD so that all Members may have an opportunity to read it:

A HOPE FOR FEWER ABANDONED DEFENSE PROJECTS

Within 10 days two defense projects that cost hundreds of millions of dollars have been dropped. The taxpayer is likely to wince and ask: Is this sort of thing necessary?

Well, it probably has been necessary in some cases. But certainly not in all. The well-known enthusiasm of military careerists for their own service undoubtedly results in some ultimately abandoned projects which never should have been started.

In fairness to defense leaders, however, they are responsible for keeping the country out in front with new weapons, planes, and other equipment. As Rear Adm. John T. Hayward, the Chief of Naval Research and Development, said recently, the experts in his line of work can never afford to be satisfied. It is their job to prevent possible lags behind. Russia, insofar as they have the resources. And they point out that even canceled projects usually contribute important knowledge for futture projects.

Technical developments are bound to antiquate some programs. Two of those recently discarded illustrate the problem. Several years ago the Navy and the Air Force agreed on a need for high-energy aircraft fuel for future speeds of 2,000 miles an hour. Now, after 5 years of effort, the construction of five specialized plants and an outlay of $200 million, the Pentagon has decided that it no longer has a requirement for a fuel of this kind. Advances in the field of ballistic missiles have reduced the needs for faster manned aircraft.

Achieving Price Stability as a Basis for Economic Growth in a Free Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under permission heretofore granted, I am glad to bring to the attention of all readers of the RECORD a significant and timely address delivered last week before the corporation, banking, and business law section of the American Bar Association, by the Honorable Raymond J. Saulnier, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. The title of Dr. Saulnier's address is "Achieving Price Stability as a Basis for Economic Growth in a Free Society."

In line with Dr. Saulnier's emphasis upon the importance of maintaining price stability, I am introducing today a bill to amend section 2, the declaration of policy, of the Employment Act of 1946, by adding at the end of that section the words "under stable prices."

Dr. Saulnier's address follows:

ACHIEVING PRICE STABILITY AS A BASIS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN A FREE SOCIETY

Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, I am pleased to have this opportunity to talk to members of the American Bar Association. The brief remarks I have to make I shall direct to a problem in which I know you are keenly interested: How best to achieve stability of prices in our economy:

There are special reasons why this problem should be of particular concern to the Nation's lawyers. The avoidance of inflation is vital, not only to the achievement of orderly and balanced growth in our economy and to the progressive improvement of our economic well-being, but also to the permanence and vigor of the political and social institutions for which you have a kind of trusteeship responsibility.

A continuing upward trend of prices, even if it proceeds only slowly at first, would have the effect of quietly abrogating all contracts involving stated money sums. As lawyers, you know the variety and scope of such contracts, and the harm that is done when, for reasons beyond the control of the parties immediately involved, such contracts fail to work out as planned and as expected.

The erosion of contractual commitments which even a slow inflation brings about is bad enough; but there are other consequences that are worse. If we were to resign ourselves to the continuance of a moderate degree of inflation, the actual persistence of this condition would in time, and probably without long delay, have a

seriously adverse effect on confidence. What had started as a slow rise could then become a rapid upward sweep. We would see not just higher consumer prices, but also the assignment of unreasonable money values to equity interests of all sorts. I doubt that anyone seriously believes that such a surge of inflation, and the speculative excesses that would accompany it, could end in anything but a drastic corrective adjustment.

There is a grave danger, also, that an upward creep of prices, if it persisted for any length of time, and even before it turned into rapid inflation, would incite clamor for direct governmental intervention. No one should fall into the error of thinking that direct controls would succeed in controlling inflation. Instead, they distort and damage the economy without reducing the inflationary pressures which are the root cause of the trouble. And, if direct controls are carried far enough, they do critical and irreversible harm to our free institutions.

An inflationary trend also has consequences for our world economic position. The harmful effects of cost and price inflation on our ability to engage in the international competition—which, whether we like it or not, does exist—is increasingly clear. Whatever the possibilities of rigging our home economy with escalator devices in an effort to escape the differential impact of inflation, gadgetry of this kind is not available to us in our international economic relations. Nor can we find a viable solution by raising tariff walls or placing restrictive quantitative limitations on our trade with other nations. How could such actions do anything but harm to the free world community in which lies security and hope for the strengthening and further spread of freedom and democratic institutions?

Fortunately, the principal areas of policy to which we must look for the actions that will help prevent inflation are clear. So also are the approaches to policy that should be taken in each of these areas. What is needed most is a good public understanding of the problem and, based on that understanding, public insistence that the needed policies are in fact pursued. I welcome the opportunity to speak before this group on the broad approaches to policy which, in my judgment, are appropriate to the task of achieving price stability as a basis for economic growth in our free society.

There is no single area of policy on which we can place full reliance in a program to achieve price stability. Action is required in a number of areas and the only effective strategy is to harmonize policies in all of them, so that they reinforce one another. Let me begin with the area of monetary and credit policy.

Under our governmental organization, general monetary and credit policies are formulated and administered by the Federal Reserve System, established by the Congress as an independent agency. The continuing task of Federal Reserve policy is to see to it that the Nation's money supply expands sufficiently to facilitate the growth of the economy, but not so fast as to permit, let alone to induce, an inflation of costs and prices and of money values generally.

It is not an easy task to tell, year in and year out, where the line is that divides the increase in money supply needed to help promote economic growth from the increase that will permit or, still worse, promote speculative excesses and an inflation of costs and prices. This is a difficult technical problem, and in a dynamic economy such as ours judgments will often differ, even among seasoned experts, as to what tactic is right and what tactic is wrong. But there is a more fundamental problem here. It lies in the fact that monetary policy questions assume a distinctive cast or form in a high-employment economy such as ours. It is absolutely vital that we understand this form of the problem if we are to fight inflation in ways that are consistent with our traditional institutions. Briefly, the problem is this.

When demands for credit and capital are high and rising, as they are in our economy today, they tend to outrun savings and, in consequence, interest rates tend to rise. This is not a contrived result, but the normal reaction of a competitive market. Yet it inevitably occasions protests against what is alleged to be an excessively restrictive monetary policy, or tight money. There are things that Government can and does do to make credit more readily available in areas of the economy where such steps are needed, but we must avoid like the plague the pseudoremedy of seeking to lower interest rates by permitting an inflationary expansion of credit. The problem cannot be solved by substituting more money and credit for an increased supply of real savings. This will only cause prices to rise and, by undermining confidence in the value of money, actually cause interest rates, so far as they are free to move, to rise still further.

This is the easy money solution to the savings shortage problem, and it will not work. It is the inflationary solution, and it must be resisted at every turn. The right way to resist an upward trend in interest rates, and the only way that is consistent with the avoidance of inflation, is to promote the higher rates of savings that are needed for accelerated economic growth. And this is a case in which we gain strength from success. By following a monetary policy that avoids inflation, we eliminate one of the major factors making for higher interest rates, which is the expectation by investors that the value of the dollar they lend will fall as prices rise.

The way we manage our Federal debt is the second major element in an adequate program for preventing inflation. The total of this indebtedness stands today at close to $290 billion; on a net basis, Federal debt is equal to about half the net private debt in the United States. It is no wonder, then, that public debt transactions are the most significant single factor influencing capital and credit markets. In the fiscal year 1959 the public debt increased by $8.4 billion, but the Treasury's refinancing requirements were, of course, much larger. In the fiscal year 1960, with a balanced budget there will be no increase in the public debt, but refinancing needs of publicly held securities, excluding regular weekly Treasury bills, are estimated to amount to around $20 billion.

These large amounts of funds must be borrowed economically, of course, but they must also be borrowed with an eye to the effect of the financing on the inflation problem, and thus on our chances for achieving balanced and sustainable economic growth. It would be entirely false economy to borrow at artificially low interest rates today and, in so doing, to create inflationary pressures that would sooner or later increase costs and prices generally, including the costs of operating the Federal Government.

This can happen if Federal obligations are placed in excessive amounts in the commercial banking system, and the more so when they are placed directly in the central banking system. This so-called "monetization" of the debt, if it occurs on a scale that involves an increase in money supply by more than is warranted by the growth of the economy's real output, can create a serious inflationary potential.

In order to avoid this result, Government must be free to compete in the capital markets with other borrowers, public and private, at competitive interest rates. When there are effective limitations in the way of its doing so, Government may be compelled to do excessive amounts of financing—whether new borrowing or the refinancing of maturing obligations—on a short-term basis through the banking system. This is not the way to hold back inflationary pressures. It is not the way to hold prices steady. It is not the way to promote balanced, sustainable economic growth. Our laws should not, as they do at present, put the Federal Government in the position of having to manage its debt in ways that may create inflationary pressures.

Third, I come to the Federal budget. I do not put this critical area of public policy in third place because it is less important than the two I have already discussed. Indeed, the importance of proper tax and expenditure policies is such that we may properly regard them as the sine qua non of effective public policy in preventing inflation and promoting economic growth. Their importance lies partly in the kind of taxes that are levied on individuals and business concerns, and the kinds of spending which Government does. It lies also in the relationship between aggregate revenues and aggregate expenditures.

For present purposes we need consider only the budget or fiscal policy that is appropriate to a period of high economic activity and rapid growth. Under such conditions—with the Nation prosperous, with production, employment, and incomes rising, and with capital and credit demands heavy—what is needed is a budgetary surplus. This would yield a number of significant benefits. Thus, when its budget is comfortably balanced the Federal Government avoids being an additional claimant on funds in the capital markets. Government becomes, on balance, a supplier of funds, thus tending to ease the pressure of demand on savings and moderating whatever tendencies there may be for interest rates to rise.

Furthermore, a budgetary surplus limits the Treasury's financing needs to the meeting of seasonal requirements and the refinancing of maturing obligations. This reduces the chances of Federal debt being monetized and creating a potentially inflationary expansion of the money supply. It also gives the Federal Reserve authorities a freer hand in the administration of monetary policy.

Finally, a budgetary surplus would bring closer to hand the opportunity for constructive tax reform and reduction. From such measures we can expect to gain a powerful stimulus to economic growth.

But a budget surplus at a time like this would have another, and in some respects even more important, beneficial effect. The budget is uniquely the mirror of government. We are judged in large part by our attitude toward fiscal questions and by the way we manage the financial affairs that are reflected in the budget. A balanced budget at this time would be a sign to the world that we not only know what the right fiscal policy is, but that we have the skill and the willingness to pursue the right policy.

These are the three areas of public policy most significant for the prevention of inflation. But there is a fourth that should be mentioned. I believe it is less well understood than the others.

Over the years, the Federal Government has developed a number of programs that have a more or less direct bearing on costs and prices. I shall not try to list them all, but let me mention a few.

For one thing, we limit the flow of goods into our country by tariffs and by other restrictive devices. By reducing supply and insulating domestic production from foreign competition, these measures keep prices

at higher levels than would otherwise prevail.

Also, the Federal Government is itself a very large buyer of goods and services. Indeed, in some parts of the economy its procurement, or that done by its various tiers of contractors, virtually dominates the market. Even apart from the magnitude of procurement demand, the methods which Government follows in letting contracts and executing purchases may also invite cost and price increases that could otherwise be avoided.

In addition, the Federal Government has, for various reasons, entered into large stockpiling programs. Beyond their direct budgetary impact, these programs have the effect of raising prices or of holding prices of many key materials at higher levels than would otherwise prevail.

Finally, the Federal Government has entered into enormously expensive programs for the support of agricultural prices.

This is not an exhaustive list, by any means, but it will suffice to illustrate what I mean by Goverment activities that have a bearing on costs and prices. The fact that much of the impact of these activities is inadvertent makes them all the more deserving of attention. The various programs were established to achieve specific purposes and they must continue to be operated with these goals in mind. But is it not also reasonable to expect that their cost and price increasing impact should be held to the minimum necessary for the achievement of program goals?

As you may know, a special group was organized recently within the executive branch—the Committee on Government Activities Affecting Prices and Costs—to study and follow these programs on a continuing basis. I would expect this group to be an increasingly important arm of governmental policy in seeking to achieve reasonable stability of prices.

So much for the major areas of Government policy that are important to the prevention of inflation. Let me turn now to some questions having to do with policies and practices in the private sector of our economy. I shall restriot myself here to two important matters: the pricing policies of business concerns, and the impact of wage increases on costs and prices.

In many manufacturing industries, companies are reputed to have a wide range of discretion in price setting, but this power to "administer" prices, as it is commonly called, may well be exaggerated. The initial or listed price is not necessarily the final or the actual one. This fact, however, does not diminish the importance of pursuing pricing policies that will help widen markets, help keep the cost of living steady, and help promote sustainable economic growth. True, prices cannot be set or changed without due regard to cost, but it is essential to the effective operation of an enterprise economy that business concerns explore and exploit the opportunities they have, within cost limitations, to reduce prices while maintaining a satisfactory profit rate. In this connection, pricing formulas that may be based on experience in a sellers' market that no longer exists, or on invalidated beliefs as to the habits and preferences of consumers, should be reviewed and, if necessary, revised. But as I have already noted, prices cannot be set, or reduced, without regard to costs. And, since labor is embodied in materials and equipment in addition to being used directly in production, it is idle to think that prices can be reduced significantly without due regard to unit labor cost (including the cost of fringe benefits).

This brings us to the important question of productivity, which inevitably arises when wages and prices are discussed in connection with inflation. The connection between productivity and prices is a simple one. It is the concept of productivity that enables us to translate wages or average hourly earnings into unit labor costs, and it is the movement of unit labor costs (including the cost of fringe benefits) that is relevant to the trend of prices. If a rise in average hourly earnings (adjusted to reflect fringe benefit costs) occurs at the same rate as productivity improves, unit labor cost remains constant, and the opportunity to hold prices constant is enhanced. On the other hand, if this adjusted average rises more rapidly than productivity, unit labor cost rises, and pressure is created for prices to rise. Conversely, if this adjusted average rises less rapidly than the improvement in productivity, unit labor cost falls, and room for price reduction is created.

It is clear, then, that from the standpoint of inflation control the achievement of stable unit labor costs for the economy as a whole is a virtual necessity. This means that, for the economy as a whole, increases in labor compensation, on the average, should equate to productivity improvements, on the average. It does not mean that increases in the rate at which labor is compensated should match productivity improvements in every industry. Productivity gains vary a good bit from one part of the economy to another; and, since wage increases and fringe benefit improvements tend to be more uniform from one employment to another, stability of unit labor cost for the economy as a whole requires that increases that are almost certain to occur in some sectors should be offset by declines elsewhere. Clearly, these declines should come where productivity gains are especially rapid. And it is in these industries that it is most reasonable to expect the price reductions that are essential for the achievement of price stability over the economy generally. We should aim in these industries, not merely to hold prices steady, but to extend part of the benefit of productivity improvement to the general public in the form of price reductions.

When we consider the hardship that individuals suffer from inflation, it is not surprising that the case for a reasonably stable price level is frequently developed primarily on grounds of equity and fairness. But it is equally important to recognize that overall price stability is an essential condition for achieving steady and balanced economic growth. Far from being a goal that is competitive with economic growth, overall price stability provides the best framework for achieving sustainable growth. Could anyone believe that our chances of achieving a high and stable rate of economic growth in the months and years ahead would be improved if prices were expected to rise more or less continuously. Is it not clear that such an expectation, if widespread, would lead to even more rapid increases than were at first assumed? Is it not clear that it would tend to drive savings into speculative uses to the detriment of the more routine, but in the end more productive, uses of thrift? And is it not clear that an expectation of continual price increases would lead to imbalances in our economy which, while they might appear at first as an acceleration of growth, would lead in the end to severe economic reverses?

Fortunately, very considerable progress has been made in the fight against inflationary forces in the last year, and I think we can say that the outlook for price stability over the months ahead is favorable. We can be gratified that consumer prices have been relatively stable for the past year or more. But it would be a grave mistake to think that the threat of inflation has been permanently disposed of. The plain fact of the matter is that the threat has not been dispelled and that our vigilance respecting inflation must not be relaxed. If we are to achieve reasonable price stability we must not expand Federal expenditures without regard to revenues and pile up new budgetary deficits. We must not permit excessive credit expansion. We must avoid public debt financing of a potentially inflationary character. And we must not indulge in a wave of wage and fringe increases that outrun the productivity improvements that we can reasonably expect to be sustained over any significant period of time. Indeed, the formula for effective inflation prevention in our country today is exactly the opposite. The right national formula is to live within our means, to follow a prudent monetary policy, to conduct our public debt financing operations on a noninflationary basis, to hold average wage and fringe increases within the limits of average productivity gains, and to promote still higher levels of efficiency and thrift.

No one can give guarantees as to the effectiveness of particular policies, much less than he can give guarantees that needed policies will in fact be adopted. But I do feel entirely confident in saying that, if we pursue policies such as I have outlined here today, we can be reasonably certain they will keep inflationary pressures in check. And I feel entirely confident in saying that success in this effort will be a powerfully favorable factor in promoting the growth of our economy and the progressive improvement of economic welfare.

I look for success. Public understanding of the inflation problem and of the policies needed to prevent a persistent upward drift of costs and prices has improved enormously of late. It is on this improved public understanding that I base my belief that right policies will prevail, and that through right policies we will go forward to still higher levels of economic welfare.

Critical Counsel for Hébert Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Special Investigations has been conducting hearings now for several weeks on the subject of "conflict of interests" as they affect retired officers of the Armed Forces.

One of the most perplexing problems which has confronted our committee is how to differentiate between "sales" and "technical liaison" activities of retired officers employed by defense industries.

Rear Adm. Chester Ward, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, has prepared a most interesting legal opinion on this question in which he concludes that—

Existing legislation expressly prohibiting retired officer participation in supplies and materials sales and sales contracting or negotiating activities, does not by implication prohibit their participation in the technical liaison process.

Admiral Ward's views have been brought to the attention of the Armed Forces and the farflung defense industries of the Nation in the August 29 issue of the Army Navy Air Force Journal.

Whether or not individual Members of the House agree with the Judge Advocate General's conclusions, they will find much food for thought in his comments on this complex matter, and I recom-

mend that they read his statement in the Journal.

I believe Members also will be interested in the Journal editorial on Admiral Ward's testimony. The editorial follows:

CRITICAL COUNSEL FOR HÉBERT INQUIRY

No single presentation, in our estimation, will provide the Hébert subcommittee with more effective assistance than the analysis which has been made by Rear Adm. Chester Ward, Judge Advocate General of the Navy. We are publishing his study at length in this issue and hope it will be read widely on Capitol Hill, at the Pentagon, and by industry.

Admiral Ward illuminates the difference between sales of consumer items—for example, beer—to Armed Forces installations and the development of weapons programs. He documents brilliantly the vital requirement for participation of retired military officers, with tifeir matchless experience, in the technical liaison process to assure U.S. weapons supremacy.

There is no doubt that one of the major issues to be tackled by the Hébert group in its report early next year will be a definition of "sales" activity limitations of retired officers. At present, the regulations vary among the services.

The Navy Judge Advocate General's presentation will provide a solid basis for the Hébert report to provide unified safeguards against any "sales" activities that are deemed improper for retired military people, but at the same time to insure that the national defense effort will be provided with the continued service of retired officers in the technical liaison field, which is where the vast majority of retired officers are making their contributions to industry.

The comprehensive inquiry being conducted by the Hébert subcommittee points to publication of a report which could very well broaden—not restrict—activities of retired officers. Admiral Ward's report is certain to strengthen support for their effective use in defense industries. Beyond this, the Hébert hearings have brought to light the urgent need to repeal of outdated "dual employment" and "dual compensation" laws, which are hindering employment of retired officers by Federal agencies concerned with defense requirements.

Carey's Arrogance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE MEADER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the threatening letter written to Members of the House who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill, from Mr. James B. Carey, president of the Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a further excellent editorial on this subject appearing in the Adrian (Mich.) Daily Telegram of August 29, 1959:

CAREY'S ARROGANCE

The threat of political vengeance made by James B. Carey, AFL–CIO vice president, to 229 congressional supporters of the Griffin-Landrum labor bill passed by the House is remarkable for its arrogance and also its emptiness.

It is arrogant because it assumes that the House Members will reverse their votes for a measure designed to curb labor racketeering and protect the rights of rank and file union members. It is arrogant because Carey wrote that "we wish to assure you that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that * * * they should take appropriate action at the ballot box."

Carey was one of the labor bosses who fought so bitterly the adoption of the Taft-Hartley law. He declared that it would destroy the labor movement. He called it a "slave labor" law. But that law has been tested by time without the dire consequences he foresaw. Indeed, the labor union movement has been protected by it.

Carey's threat of vengeance against those who voted for the pending Griffin-Landrum bill is empty. It is empty because it is yet to be shown that Carey and his colleagues are able at will to deliver the votes of labor union members. Certainly they were not able to in their effort to unseat the late Senator Taft in Ohio. Instead Taft was reelected. And in that strong labor State his election had to come from the votes of hundreds of thousands of union members.

Carey calls the Griffin-Landrum bill a "vindictive assault on the labor movement." Is the requirement that unions must hold periodic elections with secret ballots such an assault? Does Carey think union members are incensed by the provision making it a crime to steal union funds? Or does he think union members should not like the provision to prevent their being intimidated by union bosses? The facts are that the bill is designed for the protection of members from overbearing union brass.

Also included in the measure are protections for the public against some of the unsavory things which the McClellan investigation has revealed. And the public is deeply interested. That was shown by the response to the President's address calling for a strong labor control bill. The House knew that response. It voted for the bill. It voted for it because the public wants such a bill. And it is the people who elect the Congress.

Our New Diplomatic Policy: Desperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, following is an editorial which appeared in the August 28 issue of the New World, official newspaper of the Archdiocese of Chicago. I believe the author of this editorial raises an interesting question about our new foreign policy.

The editorial follows:

OUR NEW DIPLOMATIC POLICY: DESPERATION

(By W. F. Graney)

The reciprocal visits of Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower have drawn a great deal of crossfire criticism. The man who naturally must stand in its midst is the President for he was the one who extended the invitation. He must withstand criticism of his visit to Russia and of Khrushchev's visit here, even though the critics might think one side or the other of the reciprocation to be profitable.

But even his critics are caught in the crossfire for some others have blasted the criticism of the President as negative and not in the best interests of the commonweal.

President Eisenhower made an executive decision which took him off the narrow path between right and wrong. The critics of the criticism seem to have an unrealistic appreciation of a democracy if they think all Americans are going to back all executive decisions, even those made by a popular President.

The question of Khrushchev's visit to our country touches upon our national honor. We can reasonably expect then that a great deal of emotion will be mixed into the criticism or defense of the President's invitation.

The President himself has responded with emotion to the criticism by stating that he was giving the last atom of his strength in the cause of world peace. Surely there should be no critic of the President who questions the nobility of his motives or his patriotism. His record is a living proof of these.

What is questioned is the prudence of his decision. Perhaps the President could clarify his views for the Nation and tell us what he hopes the exchange of visits will gain for our Nation and the cause of world peace.

Until then we are reduced to exploration of what others tell us are possible advantages. We hear that Khrushchev will come to know better our military and economic strength and so appreciate the power of our bargaining position in world affairs. We are told his visit will impress upon him the high standard of living which we enjoy in America; so he will better understand our willingness to defend our country.

These and similar hopes seem to be based on efforts to talk to the Communist in materialistic terms with which he should be familiar and willing to accept. Perhaps this is the only approach, but haven't we abandoned too easily our insistence on spiritual values, especially the one great political spiritual value of freedom?

Shouldn't we keep on insisting that we would fight for freedom even though it didn't bring so many of our material advantages? Shouldn't we be constantly bringing up the captive nations of the Communist empire who are deprived of freedom?

Even though our gullible Nation has been conditioned to publicity buildups, we can be fairly sure Khrushchev will not sell himself to Americans in 2 weeks. He has received too much adverse publicity to wipe it all out with 2 weeks of smiles and handshakes over vodka cocktails.

While our Nation may be able to withstand the propaganda, the other nations of the world are not in the same situation. The archbishop of Bologna, Italy, Giacomo Cardinal Lercaro, who has been a successful battler of the Communists in his See city and who is accustomed to the infighting, said here this past Sunday that the people of Italy, for instance, were left "sad and bewildered" by the invitation extended to Khrushchev to visit the United States.

Those people who are looking for a convenient peg upon which to hang the compromise of their conscience if they accept communism find it now in this invitation. They say, "Look, communism cannot be too bad if the President of the United States invites Khrushchev for a visit."

And who is able to measure the effect of this invitation on the morale of the people subjugated throughout the world to the Communist domination? Is this the last straw that will break their spirit? At least we can suspect many will be as confused as the Americans who do not understand the invitation.

If the Communists had ever given evidence of good faith, we could have hope that such an invitation could be of some help in preventing war. All the evidence, however, points to the fact that the Communists are not relinquishing their aim of world dom-

ination. If war serves their purpose, there will be war.

The invitation indicates a shift in our diplomatic policy that is confusing. For no apparent reason we seem to have stumbled back from the brink into a diplomacy of desperation.

No Logic in Politics, as TVA and Now Trinity Project Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, to quote a sentence from an editorial of August 5, 1959, which appeared in the Grass Valley (Calif.) Union, is to point up an unfortunate and tragic truth, which we have seen proved again in recent weeks:

That logic has no place in politics is made glaringly clear in a couple of matters that currently figure in national politics, one of which is of special interest and particular importance to the California economy, namely the development of the Trinity River's natural potentialities.

I feel that the expansion of this thought merits the consideration of each of us, and I ask that the editorial be printed in its entirety, as follows:

[From the Grass Valley (Calif.) Union, Aug. 5, 1959]

NO LOGIC IN POLITICS, AS TVA AND NOW TRINITY PROJECT SHOW

In most political conflicts it is usually futile to look for logic or even disinterested consideration of opposites.

That just isn't the way of politics, which is not a long-studied and hard-won science but more a game of skilled maneuvering when it doesn't descend to outright horse trading or temperamental fight of unyielding fanatic ideologists.

This is proven daily in different ways in the widely varied matters pertaining to contemporary life that came before the great legislative institution in Washington.

That logic has no place in politics is made glaringly clear in a couple of matters that currently figure in national politics, one of which is of special intrest and particular importance to the California economy, namely the development of the Trinity River's natural potentialities. The other is whether the Tennessee Valley Authority should be allowed further uncontrolled expansion and be allowed to create its own debt outside the Federal budget by issuance of $750 million of its own bonds.

To take this matter first. TVA was created in 1933 as a Government corporation to administer a navigation and flood control project. In the 26 years since then the Government has invested in this project $2,047 million. But most of this has not been for the original purpose, flood control.

It was understood that TVA should generate some hydroelectric power as an "incidental byproduct." By skillful political maneuverings this incidental byproduct has been made the main purpose, and TVA is now primarily a power producer.

The "incidental byproduct," hydroelectric power, amounts in reality to about 10 percent of the activities of TVA. That is all the water will permit. But in spite of that another 70 percent of TVA activities is power production—by steamplants.

All this—$2 billion worth—has been done by interest-free money taken from all the taxpayers of the United States and without giving back any taxes to the Treasury. And it has been done in direct competition with private power companies in the region who have to pay not only interest on working capital but also 52 percent taxes annually.

There is certainly not much logic in that.

As to Trinity River:

In 1937 Congress authorized the Central Valley project. Trinity River was included in this to prevent its water from going to waste by diverting it through a tunnel system (now being constructed) into Sacramento River.

In the course of development of these plans, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. offered to finance construction and operation of the Trinity power facilities and pay the Federal Government for use of the project's falling water: $60 million for construction and $4½ million a year for the falling water. Besides that, Pacific Gas & Electric would over the usual 50-year period pay $145 million in Federal, State, and local taxes.

The Department of the Interior, on direction from Congress, studied this proposal, and 2 years ago Secretary Seaton, with reference to President Eisenhower's then recently published partnership idea, urged Congress to accept the Pacific Gas & Electric offer as not only financially sound in relieving the Federal resources to the tune of $300 million but also advisable because it would speed up the completion of the entire Central Valley project.

This plan appears perfectly logical and full of plain commonsense. But, naturally, it meets political opposition from legislators that, come hell or high water, adhere to the tenet that public ownership and operation of productive facilities should be continued and expanded regardless.

What could be more sensible than a genuine get-together of governmental agencies and investor-owned business in a partnership to put the country in a sound and safe condition to go full speed ahead.

The President's Veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I was more than deeply distressed over the action of the President of the United States in vetoing the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1960. In view of the fact that the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate appropriated funds for these flood control projects after full and complete study, and the fact that each project was found to be fully and completely justified, it is my earnest hope that the Congress of the United States will override the President's veto. Unless we are successful in our efforts, our American taxpaying citizens residing in these affected areas will continue to suffer unnecessary flood damages. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will continue to do all within my power to see that this measure is passed over the President's veto by the necessary two-thirds majority.

Little City, Dream Community for the Mentally Retarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me extreme pleasure today to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech recently made by my colleague, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, at the dedication ceremonies of Little City, a dream community for mentally retarded youngsters, which is being built on the outskirts of Chicago's great Northwest Side.

I should like to associate myself with the penetrating remarks of Congressman ROOSEVELT and congratulate those wonderful people of Little City, Inc., who have undertaken this great project of mercy for the mentally retarded children of America. To these fine sponsors of this project go the heartfelt thanks of parents throughout this country who so frequently recognize the problems of a retarded youngster but tragically are unable to find adequate facilities for relief.

I am proud that Little City lies practically in the shadow of my district, and I am sure that in due time, from its humble beginning will rise an institution of mercy for the mentally retarded youngsters of America who need help so urgently.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROOSEVELT's remarks follow:

LITTLE CITY, DREAM COMMUNITY FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED

Ladies and gentlemen, Little City is a magic word for all of us here today. For some it represents weeks and months and years of planning and hard work. For many this community is a single avenue of hope in an otherwise gloomy landscape. For still others like myself, Little City represents a monumental achievement, a soul-lifting experiment.

Today we humbly dedicate this new community. I stress the word community for this is not merely a home, a hospital, a school, or a center, but a little city for mentally retarded children. This city will not limit its assistance to the 50 or 60 children who will enter this fall. Plans have already been made to expand the facilities to care for 500 children. The opportunities for research in this environment will extend the benefits of this community to countless numbers of mentally retarded children and their families in this and other countries.

These 60 acres of land on Algonquin Road will be a paradise for mentally retarded youngsters. Here they will be able to develop to the fullest extent their abilities in a sheltered and peaceful atmosphere. This community as part of the larger community will be a testimony to the shared responsibility of individuals in our society for this problem. Three out of every one hundred children in this country are born retarded, and the parents of these children will know that they now have the assistance and support of others. They have already accomplished so much through their own volunteer organizations, and I think it is high time that such a project be undertaken by the whole community.

I was very much interested in learning about a study conducted by the Public Institutions Committee of the National Association for Retarded Children. May I quote a passage from the foreword of this 1958 study. It states:

"It is bitter irony to tax parents for the unavoidable misfortune of having a retarded child. We must wonder if it is consistent with American social philosophy to require that parents of mentally retarded children pay taxes to support public education facilities which exclude their children, when there is a price tag on their attempts to obtain equal benefits for their children in public institutions."

This study revealed that only 3 States make no financial charge for the care, training and treatment of persons in State institutions; that 2 States allow for voluntary charges; and that the other 42 States having such institutions levy charges. The study further showed that most parents of handicapped children expect to assume financial responsibility for the basic support of their child. However, they need assistance in meeting some of the extraordinary demands created by the handicapped condition. Often the financial strain of meeting costs of needed services before placement in a State institution leaves the family resources well drained. Many feel that the care and training of a person in an institution should be regarded in lieu of public school education.

These facts are not new to those of you here today. I am sure you have struggled with these realities and attempted to put across your points of view to public and private groups. May I say that I am encouraged each year to find that the public awareness of these problems is constantly increasing. The very achievement of this dream community is an indication of greater understanding by the community as a whole of the needs of the mentally retarded.

One of the most inspiring aspects of Little City from my point of view is that here at last the total needs of the mentally retarded will be met. So many of the existing programs are what we have been accustomed to term "half a loaf" programs. That is they go part of the way in meeting a special problem, but then they stop. For instance, a family may be able to provide their mentally retarded child with a little education. But this is not enough if proper medical care and vocational guidance cannot be obtained. To turn to another example, much excellent research is currently being carried on in mental retardation. If this research is conducted in an ivory tower or does not reach the people who can use it, the efforts will have been largely wasted.

In Little City these problems will not be present. Here mentally retarded people of all races and creeds will have a home as long as they need or desire it. There will be no fear of expulsion upon reaching a certain chronological age which may bear no relation to individual development.

Every individual will learn at his own rate, will set his own pattern, will live in a community where his behavior is the norm. No longer the outsider, he will participate as a member of his own little city. Fields, orchards, and gardens for some to cultivate; schools for those who can benefit or a home tutoring service when this is more profitable; community church, movies, square dancing, playground—all these will make up a rich and full life for these youngsters.

Of course, these plans require financial support, and many of you have already been asked to contribute or have solicited others for funds. It is my belief that this is one project which sells itself. The ingenuity and intelligent planning of such persons as Mrs. Deliah White, Ben Sears, and the many others who have so carefully thought through every detail of this program, will be rewarded, I feel certain, by the wholehearted support of the entire community.

Your Federal Government has also shown its special concern for the mentally retarded in a number of ways. Today I would like to discuss with you some of these programs. It seems to me that constant awareness and recognition of these activities are essential to their continued successful operation. Only through the enlightened experience of citizens and parents such as you who are present will we be able to judge whether the programs on a national scale are meeting the real needs of the mentally retarded, are being efficiently administered, and are generally available to those who need them.

The very existence of governmental programs to aid the mentally retarded is open acknowledgment by the national community of their responsibilities in this area. These programs are prompted by the same kind of civic spirit which has moved you to build Little City. There are nearly 5 million mentally retarded individuals in this country and they cannot and must not be ignored. To use the words of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in describing its various programs:

"From a number of standpoints progress is being made in the field of the mentally rearded as outgrowths of an increased public awareness and understanding of the problems both in Government and in private life with individuals and voluntary organizations and the increasing advances being achieved in medicine, welfare, education, rehabilitation and related fields. The cross-fertilization and collaboration of many disciplines are also bringing to pass the more effective knowledge concerning the prevention of the handicaps together with improved understanding, treatment, care, and prognosis of those who manifest the several difficulties in the functional sphere."

Responsibility for the Government programs aiding retarded individuals is lodged in the several agencies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. You here in Little City are blessed with the opportunity of meeting nearly all the demands of the children who will come under your care. Unfortunately the Department can in no way approach this goal for all the mentally retarded children throughout the country. They have attempted to utilize their existing programs in the best possible way to assist these handicapped children. Legislation over the years has continued to increase the responsibilities of the Department in various areas.

The Department is most conscious of the need to have a balanced approach to mental retardation. They have formed a departmental committee composed of representatives from various operating agencies to cooperate in and coordinate their programs.

I, and a large number of my colleagues, have found these governmental programs most encouraging and we have continual reports of their fine accomplishments. Many of you have had direct contact with some of these programs and for you I hope that what I have to say will not be too repetitious. It is my hope that a description of the national impact of these programs may be of interest and that perhaps there will be some aspect of these activities with which you are not familiar and about which you would like to be informed.

The Federal Government has been especially active in five areas: education, vocational rehabilitation, medical research, Children's Bureau assistance to the States, and direct benefits under social security. These programs correspond to certain of the needs of the mentally retarded. Needless to say, it is difficult to categorise them, and it is perhaps more meaningful to talk about some examples of their activities.

The Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has performed a vital task in preparing, collecting, and distributing information on all exceptional children as well as mentally retarded and has prepared exceedingly valuable reports on curriculum and classroom methods as well as numerous other aspects of education of the mentally retarded. This is an attempt to aid the State and local school programs by making available to all the very latest developments in this rapidly growing field.

The second major responsibility of this department and one which is important in all phases of work with the mentally retarded is the securing of qualified personnel. No amount of knowledge on modern teaching methods, no increase in the number of facilities will compensate for the lack of qualified personnel. The closing days of the 85th Congress were exciting days for those interested in this problem, for with the passage of Public Law 85-926 came the authorization for a program to train personnel to teach the mentally retarded. One million dollars for this program was included in the President's budget for fiscal 1960 and this sum has been appropriated by Congress. The Office of Education has been actively engaged in preparing to administer this project and three conferences with interested parties have already been held. This program will go a long way in narrowing the glaring inadequacies in the provision of education for mentally retarded children in this country.

In another area, that of vocational rehabilitation, mentally retarded individuals have been eligible for Government services since 1943. It is estimated that in the next 2 years alone, over 2,600 persons will be rehabilitated into gainful employment. This is difficult task but the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is constantly striving to meet the challenge of rehabilitating the mentally handicapped. Cooperative programs with State vocational rehabilitation agencies and public school systems have been important. In two States "halfway houses" or "rehabilitation houses" have combined rehabilitation with living arrangements. Of course the mentally retarded children who come to Little City will have all this and a lot more. Perhaps some of the results of your experience will be an inspiration to the Federal programs.

In the field of rehabilitation too, there has been a shortage of qualified personnel. To meet this problem, the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is granting funds to educational institutions all over the country for the training of personnel in this field.

Among the most encouraging activities in this field are those being carried on in Bethesda, Md., at two of the National Institutes of Health—the Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness and the Mental Health Institute. Here research scientists are struggling with the perplexing problem of what causes mental retardation. I feel certain that all of you in the audience today await a more complete answer to this question with bated breath.

Surgeon General Burney has recently announced a 5-year survey of 40,000 women to find the causes of mental retardation and kindred defects. Already investigators in Puerto Rico have recorded brain damages in monkeys cut off from a supply of oxygen at birth. This has prompted intensive study of the relationship between asphyxia and mental retardation. Scientists are also studying the effects of encephalitis and German measles in the causation of mental retardation. Geneticists are studying family records to determine the influence of congenital malformations.

The National Institute of Mental Health is conducting a valuable research program through the awarding of research grants to

qualified applicants. Approximately 50 different projects are now being supported. The Institute is also a central point for the collection of data on patients in resident institutions for the mentally retarded throughout the country. This information has been tremendously useful, and, as a matter of fact, formed the foundation of the study of the National Association of Retarded Children which I mentioned earlier. The Institute also carries on training programs and provides assistance to the States and communities through its Community Services Branch.

The Children's Bureau also aims to help the States and communities. Activities include public information, consultation, and the provision of grant-in-aid programs to encourage the extension of existing State and local service. Demonstration projects have been especially useful in showing the kinds of services needed for the preschool child. These have included casefinding, evaluation and diagnosis, followup care and home training.

Finally, I turn to a Federal program which has filled a desperate need for financial assistance for so many families. This is the protection available under social security for the mentally retarded. According to the provisions of various States, the mentally retarded receive assistance under the program of aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the public assistance program. Coverage under old-age and survivors and disability insurance is also an important source of assistance. The 1956 and the 1958 amendments to the Social Security Act broadened coverage to make childhood disability benefits available for seriously disabled persons whose disability began before age 18 and has continued without interruption since that time, and whose parents died insured or are receiving retirement benefits. Mentally retarded persons are heavily represented among those who qualify for these benefits. The importance of making the public aware of these provisions cannot, of course, be overestimated.

So at the national level, as in Little City itself, a variety of professional disciplines and resources are being used to meet the tremendously complex problem of mental retardation. For much of this century retardation was a wholly neglected field. Mental retardation was assumed to be a single disease entity largely determined by heredity and unresponsive to treatment. Today we know these precepts to be false. At last we are building up our community services, our institutions, our educational facilities. Little City is a bright star in this development. You are in the vanguard of progress, and let us hope that you will soon be followed by many others.

You have understood the message of Mrs. Pearl Hurwitz, a leader in the field of mental retardation, who, writing in the Radcliffe College Quarterly for February 1957, attempted to explain the great upsurge of popular interest in mental retardation. She said: "It is because the world is very much with us today. We know (many of us subconsciously) that if our way of life is to survive, every individual, be he handicapped or whole, be he white or black, be he a privileged American or an underprivileged peasant in India, every individual must be counted an individual and accorded his place in the sun.

"For every person who is discounted, by so much do we allow for the spread of discontent; for every person whom we help to attain his life stature, by so much do we prevent the spread of strife.

"We are becoming aware that preventive hygiene must expand beyond total inoculation from communicable disease to total service for every disabling condition, or we are liable to be afflicted by the consequence. The social loss or the social gain is shared by all."

Today we dedicate Little City, a living example of the shared responsibility of many for the needs of the mentally retarded.

Address by Vice President Richard M. Nixon at American Legion Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, a current topic of interest, and of great debate throughout our good country, is the approaching visit of Nikita Khrushchev.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent speech by Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON at the convention of the American Legion in Minneapolis, Minn., last week:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 41ST NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., AUGUST 25, 1959

I recognize that there are a substantial number of Americans in this audience and throughout the Nation who are deeply concerned about the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. There are many who believe that no good and much harm can come from such a visit.

There is no question but that there are minus as well as plus factors in appraising the possible results of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange of visits. On balance, I believe the decision to invite Mr. Khrushchev to come to the United States was correct.

In indicating my reasons for reaching this conclusion, may I first remind you of the background from which I speak. I have made a comprehensive study of the philosophy, tactics and strategy of communism as set forth by Marx, Lenin, Stalin and other Communist leaders. On the basis of those studies, I know that Communists throughout the world are united in working for one objective—Communist rule over all the people of the world.

I know from experience that the Communist Party in the United States, like all Communist parties throughout the world, is directed and controlled from Moscow and has in the past and will in the future engage in espionage and subversion in order to serve the interests of Communist governments wherever they are opposed to those of the United States or other free nations. And I can vividly recall that it was just a little over a year ago Communist-led mobs made an unsuccessful attempt on my life in Venezuela.

I have just returned from the Soviet Union where I have had the opportunity to speak at length with Mr. Khrushchev and to appraise the present tactics and strategy of the world Communist movement. On the basis of that visit, I can say unequivocally that the only significant change in Communist tactics since the death of Stalin is that Mr. Khrushchev and other Communist leaders now say they will accomplish their objective of world domination without resort to war.

Subversion and espionage in the United States and other non-Communist countries continue to be directed and supported by the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R. The rigid positions of the Soviet Government on such issues as Berlin, disarmament, setting up an inspection system for prevention of surprise attack, and ending atomic tests, are the same now as they were before these visits were announced.

It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal.

We should be under no illusions that Mr. Khrushchev's belief in the superiority of the Communist system will be changed in any significant respect by his seeing the great productivity of the American economy. Everything he sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified so that it fits into the rigid description of free societies which the Communist doctrine has painted for over 100 years.

Nor should we be under any illusions that better understanding between the Soviet leaders and ourselves is all that is needed to resolve our differences and to assure peace. There are some deep and basic conflicts of interest and ideology which all the good will and mutual understanding in the world will not settle. Charm, words of friendship, gracious toasts, are not going to have the slightest effect in deterrring Mr. Khrushchev from his basic objectives.

What useful purpose then will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war. And it is because his visit can serve to reduce the possibilities of such misunderstanding that it could contribute to the chance that we can settle our differences without war and, therefore, deserves the approval of the American people.

What does Mr. Khrushchev really believe about the United States and the free world?

Based on my conversations with him and my analysis of the statements he has made, publicly and privately, through the years, here is a thumbnail sketch of a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it.

First, here are some things he believes which are true. He is aware of the fact that the United States has great military strength. While he constantly boasts of his superiority in the missile field, he has publicly stated in his speech at Dnepropetrovsk on July 28 that no nation today can initiate a war without suffering terrible destruction in return.

He knows the United States is a rich country economically with a high standard of living. He has paid us the compliment of setting as the Soviet goal, catching up with and passing the United States in the production of consumer goods.

I believe he is convinced that President Eisenhower is a man who wants peace and who insists that the United States remain strong only because he believes this is the way to keep peace.

But he also has some dangerous misconceptions about the United States and the free world which, in the mind of a man with such awesome power in his hands, constitute a terrible risk to the peace of the world.

Here are some of the things he presently believes about us and our policies:

"Freedom in the United States exists only for those who have money and power and not for the working people.

"Capitalists in the United States have turned the society in which they rule into a paradise for the rich and a hell for the poor—

a kingdom of the dollar, of harsh exploitation of millions of people to enrich a handful of monopolists.

"In the United States and other free countries the working people are given the right to vote for various representatives of the ruling class but have no right to participate in the work of the legislative bodies.

"However, beautifully the ideologists of imperialism may dress up the capitalist system, it still remains a system by which millions of people are enslaved by a comparatively small handful of exploiters, a system in which poverty and mass unemployment reign."

The words I have just quoted are not mine but his, taken directly from his public statements. And these ideas he reiterated to me in my conversations with him. Because he believes these things he has reached other conclusions which he has stated to me and to others who have talked with him; that millions of people in the United States do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression; that both of our major political parties are controlled by a few rich monopolists and are not responsive to the will of the people; that our economy has reached its peak and is on the way down; that the nations of the free world alliance are divided and when the chips are down will not unite in resisting aggression.

Put yourself in his place. If you possessed great military strength with uncontrolled and absolute power to use that strength to accomplish your purposes; if also you were fanatically dedicated to the philosophy that your economic and political system should and would rule the world; and if in addition you believed you were confronted by opponents who were divided and who lacked the will to resist aggression, would you not be tempted to be far more aggressive in your policies than if you had other ideas as to the strength and will to resist of those who might oppose your aims?

Mr. Khrushchev will be here for only a relatively brief time, but, in his conversations with President Eisenhower and in his trip across the country, there is no doubt in my mind but that he will see and hear some things which will change his preconceived notions about the United States and which in turn will give him pause before he embarks on a course of action in the future which might be contrary to our vital interests.

He will find that not only are we strong militarily and economically, but that the American people have the will to use their strength to defend our freedom or the freedom of others any place in the world. He will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people are as dedicated to our system as he is to his. He will find that we will no more tolerate being pushed around than will he.

In a nutshell, if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than one who is isolated in the Kremlin.

But what about the danagers of such a visit? There are some who fear that the American people will be lulled into a false sense of security and trust by this exchange. I think that those who believe this to be the case underestimate the intelligence of both our people and our leaders.

It is true that throughout American history we have a record of being a trusting and forgiving people in our relations with other people, but it is also true that we are a people who do not like our trust betrayed and when it is we react accordingly.

When President Eisenhower meets Mr. Khrushchev, you can be sure he will have in mind: The record of major treaties and agreements broken by the Soviet Government—50 out of 52 since 1933; the fact that subversive activities against the United States and the governments of other free nations continue despite Soviet protestations to the contrary. There will be fresh in his memory the fact that Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the commitments made at the last Geneva Conference and instead encouraged and stimulated Communist probing actions against the free world in the Middle East and the Far East. And if there was any doubt that we would go into this conference with our eyes open, the Soviet Government's support of the Communist forces in Laos provides a grim and timely warning of what we should expect.

I have had the rare opportunity of seeing both Mr. Khrushchev and President Eisenhower in action both publicly and privately, and I can assure you that the fears of those who believe that President Eisenhower may be taken in or bluffed by Mr. Khrushchev are completely without foundation. There is no doubt whatever but that the interest of the United States and the free world will be vigorously, firmly, and aggressively represented by the President in this meeting.

Another objection to the visit is the possible effect on our allies. The President's trip to Bonn, Paris, and London, provides a complete answer to this objection. As the President has made abundantly clear, it is not the American way to negotiate, in the absence of our allies, problems that vitally concern their future. We reject the concept that two great powers—the United States and the U.S.S.R.—should decide the fate of other peoples without consultation with them.

A major objection to the visit is the effect it may have on the captive peoples of Eastern Europe. You can be sure, however, that under no circumstances will this exchange of visits result in statements or actions on the part of the United States indicating our approval or acquiescence in the status of the peoples of Eastern Europe.

We do not question the right of the people of these countries, or any other for that matter, to have a Socialist or Communist government if they so desire. But we believe that all people should have a right to choose the kind of government they want. The people of the satellite nations of Eastern Europe have never had an opportunity to exercise that right since World War II. We recognize that their right of choice cannot be obtained by armed intervention on our part. A so-called war of liberation would liberate only dead bodies and ruined cities. But we will continue to support through peaceful means realization of the objective that the peoples of these satellite countries be given the opportunity to choose the kind of government they want.

I believe that the American people should give Mr. Khrushchev a courteous reception when he visits the United States. I do not suggest this because I believe a courteous reception is going to affect, one way or the other, his ideas about our system, but because this is the American way of doing things. Visitors in our country, regardless of how much we disagree with them, should not be subjected to the rowdyism and riots for which the Communists were responsible when I was in South America.

The discussions President Eisenhower will have with Mr. Khrushchev, involving as they do such basic differences and conflict of interest, will be difficult at best. In the cause of the peace with justice that we all want, let us by our conduct see that those discussions are conducted in the best possible climate.

Economic Statesmanship in the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a significant statement bearing on the fundamental foreign policy of this country, recently caught my attention. I refer, in this instance, to a brief summary of a speech delivered by Mr. Herbert L. Barnet, president, Pesi-Cola Co., New York, whose international operations extends to 81 countries. This company has opened 30 new plants in 21 countries in 1959, and plans additional expansion in nine countries in 1960.

As summarized and as highlighted, Mr. Barnet called upon and exhorted the business and industrial leaders of our country to exercise a higher degree of "economic statesmanship" in support of the foreign policy commitments of the United States to underdeveloped countries in Asia, such as our close friend and ally, the Republic of the Philippines.

While Mr. Barnet in his speech directly asked the business and industry leaders of our country to support the current efforts of our sister republic in Asia in her march toward national progress and economic prosperity, yet, the valid concepts that he developed, particularly on those relating to an active participation by our leaders toward the development of the so-called underdeveloped areas on a private-initiative basis, indicate his broad grasp of the fundamental bases of our foreign policy and marks him for that stature of an economic statesman. It is an enlightening statement, and the press release issued at that time follows:

PRESS RELEASE BY CONSULATE GENERAL OF THE PHILIPPINES

AUGUST 27, 1959.

Herbert L. Barnet, president, Pepsi Cola Co., yesterday (Wednesday, August 26), called on American firms having business interests in the Philippines to take a more firm and positive approach toward contributing to the economy of that nation which is the bastion of democracy and freedom for the free world in Asia.

Mr. Barnet spoke yesterday at a reception at the Overseas Press Club of America where he received a Lions International Public Service Award "for his contributions toward fostering valuable Philippine-American relations" from Minister Raul T. Leuterio, Philippine Consul General in New York, on behalf of the Manila Lions Club.

Mr. Barnet proposed the formation of a committee of American business and civic leaders to assess the current Philippine economic situation and to provide the necessary cooperation in assisting the Philippines to bolster its economy.

Offering his own services and those of his company for such a committee, Mr. Barnet said:

"This form of economic statesmanship, the assistance of government by private enterprise certainly is no issue of politics or partisanship. It is a manifestation of the

democratic ideals that bind together the United States and the Philippines. The success that we seek is common and commonly beneficial. It will immensely bolster the position of the free world in Asia.

"Our organization has a big investment in the Philippines which started immediately after the end of World War II. We made that investment based on our faith in the Philippine people, its Government, and the Philippine economy. We are happy that we made it and plan not only to maintain what we now have but to add to it, through a planned program of expansion.

"Under this program we are anxious for Philippine nationals to continue to take an active part in the management of Pepsi Cola plants and distribution operations in the archipelago. We are in the Philippines for good because we feel that we belong there and are part of its growth and development as a young democratic nation."

Mr. Barnet further said that since the beginning of operations in 1946 in the Philippines there are now Pepsi Cola bottling plants in Manila, Bacolod, Cebu, Iloilo, and Tarlac with distribution points set up in strategic locations in the archipelago.

The Pepsi-Cola executive concluded his brief remarks by "reaffirming his faith in the Philippines." He exhorted "Americans to remember that the Philippines, who stood by the United States in our darkest hour in the Pacific, continue to be our best friend and ally in Asia." Barnet revealed that "his company was embarking upon a continuing international program of information and cultural exchange between the two countries designed to bring the American and Filipino peoples closer together." He expressed the hope that other American business firms should adopt similar programs along the line of public service. Such activities would not only contribute to better international understanding but is, from the practical point of view, good business.

Other recipients of the Lions International award included Public Relations Consultant Louis Weintraub of Louis Weintraub Associates; Newsmen Robert B. Considine of Hearst Headline Service; Ralph Teatsorth of United Press International; Robert I. Queen of Columbia Broadcasting System; Eddie Martelino, Philippine press attaché in New York; and Maj. Jose Ma. Guerrero of the Philippine Embassy in Washington.

Funny Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Daily News of August 28, 1959:

FUNNY MONEY WINS

Stubborn refusal by Congress to consider the bond interest bill requested by the Treasury is a triumph for funny money and inflation.

Funny money because the Treasury will be forced to write up increasing billions on the books of the commercial banks, a process which manufactures credit and is little different from running the printing presses.

Inflation because this process waters down the dollar and raises living costs.

The people who say that, in refusing the Treasury request, they are holding down interest rates, know better.

Actually the Treasury must pay market rates, law or no law, and these rates now are above the 4¼ percent limit placed by law on long-term bonds. The most recent Treasury issue of bonds went at 4¾ percent. Even 90-day paper is up to 3 $\frac{8}{10}$ percent, an increase from 3 $\frac{4}{10}$ percent in the last 10 days.

Reason for the rapid rise is the big demand for this kind of credit and the Treasury must borrow $85 billion in the next year, mainly to refund older issues falling due.

If the Treasury can't bid for savings in form of long-term loans from such sources as pension funds, charitable foundations, etc., it must go to the banks with short-term paper upon which there is no interest ceiling.

Congress, under shadow of the veto, has done a fair job of holding down expenditures and thus counteracting inflation. Its failure to act on interest rates can neutralize all of the good effects of this saving, and more. There certainly must be, in the congressional leadership, enough understanding of simple arithmetic to get something done about this bill.

A Report on Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of a letter received from one of my constituents as I feel that others should know of the conditions in Russia, other than those shown to the ordinary tourist, as reported by Mr. and Mrs. George Wheat, or Santa Ana, and Mr. and Mrs. Albert Launer, of Fullerton, Calif.:

I saw Mr. and Mrs. George Wheat, of Santa Ana, last evening. They had just returned from a trip to Russia in a party of 36 that traveled in a bus almost the total distance while in Russia and for a good many days. Several other from Orange County were in the party including Mr. and Mrs. Albert Launer, of Fullerton, whom I am sure you know because he is a fellow lawyer.

They recommend this type of travel for anyone wanting to find out what Russia looks like, instead of flying directly to the big cities and being shown the nicer spots. Of special interest was their observations:

That, outside of buses, trucks, and autos owned by the government, there is practically no motor vehicle travel outside the large cities and very little of it there.

In the Minsk area, for instance, the farmers had piled their grain on the roads, the only dry place, covering about half of the road; and nobody thought it unusual.

Sanitary conditions were very bad, except of course in the big hotels they stayed in. They were afraid to drink or eat along the road and sanitary facilities were very sparse.

The farmers on the collective farms lived in grass covered huts of very poor construction, with dirt floors and the only house that had a painted roof was that the party man in charge.

All goods were costly, but some of the services were cheap. George got a haircut for 20 cents and Mrs. Wheat a hairwash and set for 75 cents. But a pair of shoes was a month's wages, etc.

George said that some of the refrigerators in the American exhibit were not plugged in and that he thought the people just didn't know what they were. He was an executive with the Edison Co. for years. He looked at refrigerators in stores and found they were ancient models with a sort of open recess in the top for the machinery. Their electric ranges in the stores were the type that one turns a burner on or off with a hand-switch * * * like we had around 35 years ago. He also had a low opinion of the craftsmanship of Russian construction workers, especially on such things as tile work, stone work, plastering, etc. He told of a fine parquet floor in a fine hotel, newly built, where they apparently didn't treat the fine wood with anything, the dirt penetrated the floor, the workers scrubbed the floor and the finished faded and buckled.

This was really a very short conversation with the Wheats, but I thought it would add a mite to your knowledge of Russia. It did to mine.

I believe you know the Wheats; they retired some year ago; are wealthy enough to do extensive traveling and have been over a large portion of the world. But they are also very practical and observant people.

Sincerely,

C. J. MARKS.

Highway Carnage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an excellent editorial on the subject of highway safety, written by Sgt. J. R. Williams, and published in the Astorian-Budget of August 15, 1959:

HIGHWAY CARNAGE

(Guest editorial by Sgt. J. R. Williams, Oregon State Police)

During the past weekend the carnage on our Oregon highways approached the number killed in the recent explosion and fire at Roseburg that shocked the Nation. Little stir was caused by the traffic deaths. As of midnight August 12, there have been 39 deaths in Oregon as compared to 19 for the same part of August last year. For the year 1959 to date 277 deaths, 1958 to date 243. It's easy to see the death toll is running well ahead of last year and threatens to make this a record year. This alarming increase concerns all law enforcement personnel and every means is being used to stop this killing of our friends and neighbors.

A review of the primary causes of most fatal accidents reveals that there are three primary causes that result in this tragic toll. These causes are: (1) Speed too great for conditions; (2) initial behavior; (3) delayed perception and faulty evasive action.

In explaining the three causes, the following might be noted:

Speed may cause an accident in three primary ways, such as making it impossible to follow the desired curve, making it impossible to take effective evasive action, and presenting an unusual element of surprise to other drivers or pedestrians by not allowing them their normal reaction time and stopping distance.

Initial behavior is that unusual or illegal action by an unthinking or careless person that creates a hazardous situation, such as

passing on the crest of a hill or suddenly stopping on the highway.

Delayed perception is failure to see the danger of the situation in time to avoid it even though it is obvious. This results from inattention or distraction.

Faulty evasive action or dodging technique usually results from a lack of driving skill or understanding of those defensive driving principles that permits a driver to avoid an accident.

Four objectives of the enforcement officer are to slow down the fast driver, correct the initial behavior of the nonconformist, attempt to alert the inattentive, and educate the unskilled. This can be done by vigorous, objective enforcement, with the cooperation of our courts and the public.

Travel on our highways will continue to increase until after Labor Day; therefore, our Salem headquarters has requested a continued review of the accidents and to keep every available patrolman alertly patrolling our highways during periods of high accident frequency.

Laos, Some Critical Comment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article in the Appendix of the RECORD by Paul Harvey. The article, entitled "Looking Into Our Guns," suggests that we had better reevaluate our policy in southeast Asia before it is too late. Our policy of "little thought and too little too late" is one which had better be replaced with a mature, responsible, and realistic foreign policy.

The article is as follows:

LOOKING INTO OUR OWN GUNS

(By Paul Harvey)

Most Americans don't know where Laos is, don't care. Khrushchev knows and cares.

Laos is a country in southeast Asia. It was the "Berlin" of 5 years ago, caught in the vise between two worlds. The Communists demanded that the French get out of Laos, make it an independent state. As they now demand we get out of Berlin, make it a free city.

WE RUSH IN AID

So the French got out. And the United States rushed in with foreign aid. Forty million dollars a year. Your dollars. What happened?

The money we spent to "keep Laos' economy strong" and to "keep the Lao Army armed" had just the opposite effect.

The flood of money into Laos hiked prices (doubled the cost of living between 1954 and 1959), and led to profiteering by Lao Government leaders. This knavery, thievery; discouraged loyalty, encouraged communism.

LOSING ALL AROUND

Today, the Lao army which we armed and equipped is getting whipped on all fronts.

Our Joint Chiefs of Staff told the White House 5 years ago that no amount of money would make an adequate fighting force out of these lethargic Lao, but the Joint Chiefs were voted down by our State Department.

Our aid to Laos, economic and military (according to the House Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs), has been destructive of any stability, political, or economic.

Today, as elsewhere where U.S. dollars have been dumped on the inflation fire, Laos, desperate, is preparing to further devalue its currency.

COMMUNISTS ADVANCE

As I write this, Communist forces are active in 8 of Laos 12 provinces, are pressing to within 50 miles of its capital city. Strategic communications and supply routes are threatened. Laos will be split at least, doomed at worst.

And the $40 million a year which Americans unwillingly paid because our State Department demanded it will end up in Communist hands. Our guns will end up in Communist hands, too.

We can write off Laos. Now what about Berlin. Similarly, the Communists are trying to talk us out of Berlin, to leave that city defenseless.

In 1954, Russia was using the identical arguments for getting us out of Laos. Accused us of "foreign interference in internal affairs," insisted that Laos "must become a free and independent nation."

And so Britain and the Soviet Union signed the infamous Geneva Agreement of 1954 and all our guns and all our gold have been unable to erase that tragic mistake.

Again the State Department has us looking down the muzzles of our own cannon.

Helping Reduce Waste—Watchdog To Eye Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from Glendale News-Press dated Monday, August 24, 1959:

HELPING REDUCE WASTE—WATCHDOG TO EYE FOREIGN AID

There is bound to be some monkey business when thousands of individuals in dozens of countries start dealing in billions of dollars of U.S. foreign aid.

This has been true ever since the United States got into foreign aid operations on a big scale with the Marshall plan in 1948.

Since then we have spent about $50 billion on farflung and complex programs of military assistance and economic aid.

But this year Congress has made a foreign aid program by creating the new effort to tighten up the multi-billion-dollar job of inspector general and comptroller. The official in this job will be authorized to make audits on all operations of the International Cooperation Administration.

There is merit in placing a watchdog over the spending of such a large share of the American taxpayers' money.

Not only is colossal waste abhorrent to the thrifty, but there is a moral side to this business, to. In numerous cases, our outpourings of large sums of money into immature economies have had a corrupting influence on native leaders.

But however good on paper the idea of a general overseer appears, only time and practice will show whether it is a workable idea.

One area of our foreign aid operations, in which waste and bungling are just as likely to happen as in any other, will be off limits to the inspector general. This is the arms aid program, where mistakes can be swept under the rug of military security secrecy.

There is another loophole through which waste and corruption could continue. In cases of wrongdoing, the United States can only take action against U.S. firms and citizens caught in the cookie jar. Many transactions are made by the governments to whom the aid is given.

In many instances, the native governments take a more lighthearted view of foreign aid shenanigans than we do.

Steel's Pyramid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. VANIK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as the steel strike proceeds beyond the 48th day, the great debate continues over the relationship between steel profits and wages in the steel industry. Proponents on each side of the issue have endeavored to rationalize the circumstances surrounding the dispute.

Mr. Edward S. Byers, a Cleveland attorney, who has taken time and patience to express himself on public issues, submitted a splendid statement in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on August 27, 1959 entitled "Steel's Pyramid," in which he analyzes the annual reports of the United States Steel Corp., to show the true profit picture:

STEEL'S PYRAMID

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER:

SIR: In your issue of August 14 you published a letter to the editor over the signature of Lewis E. Zender, district director of public relations, United States Steel Corp. Time and space will not permit detailed analysis of this letter but, as I read it, it was the kind of thing which has come to be known as Madison Avenue propaganda to mislead the public.

It discussed dividends and profits of the United States Steel Corp. and was undoubtedly calculated to convince that both have been very reasonable indeed. As matter of fact, the profits of the steel industry, as they have grown under the system of administered prices which made its open appearance under the Eisenhower administration, have been fantastically exorbitant.

The following facts and figures, the latter all from the steel corporation's annual reports, may be of some interest:

In 1949, just 10 years ago, United States Steel Corp. had 8,703,000 shares of issued common stock. In that year a so-called split of this stock was effected by corporate action, with result that certificates for three new shares were issued to the holders for each old share they had held.

When this legerdemain was completed the corporation had 26,110,000 issued shares of common stock, representing precisely the same equity in the assets and business of the corporation which had previously been represented by the 8,703,000 share original issue.

The highest price for which any of these new shares were sold in the market in 1949 was $26.75. So we find that the highest value placed by the market upon the total number of the issued common shares of

United States Steel just 10 years ago was under $700 million ($698,442,000).

In 1955 there was another split of the common shares, and this time the shareholders received two new shares for each of the 26,110,000 shares outstanding after the first split in 1949. The corporation then had 52,220,000 shares representing the common stock equity in place of 8,703,000 shares as issued before the first split in 1949, and to holders of the original shares had 6 shares for 1. Again, all of this had not added $1 to the assets of the corporation nor had anything whatever been added to the several interests of the holders of the original shares in the corporation's assets and business.

United States Steel presently has 53,909,000 shares of issued common stock. It has issued a considerable number of shares at favorable prices to executives and favored employees, this practice enabling them to avoid a considerable part of the income tax on their actual earnings.

Recently United States Steel common stock sold on the New York Stock Exchange for a fraction above $105 per share. At this price, $105, the total evaluation which this market price has placed upon the common shareholders' equity or interest in the business and assets of United Stats Steel Corp. is $5,660,445,000 or more than 8 times the value placed upon this equity by the highest market price of the shares in 1949.

To have added nearly $5 billion to the value of this equity in 10 years the corporation would have had to have earned an average of about $57 per share per year, net after taxes, and have paid nothing out of such earnings in dividends.

Of course, it didn't have such earnings. But the corporation did earn in 1957 about $44 net after taxes for each of the original shares, and for the first 6 months of 1959 it reports earnings which, if applied to the number of shares before either of these splits, would mean earnings at an annual rate of $54 on the common shares outstanding originally in 1949 and for many years prior to 1949.

All of this should convince the reader, as Mr. Zender attempts to do, that our steel industry is just a patriotic, unselfish, public-spirited business, concerned only with the welfare of the country in its time of peril and that union labor, which knows all about all this and has participated in and profited by acquiescence in it, is unreasonable to ask for a bigger share of the take.

But be sure of this: No matter what the division is to be, for so long as Mr. Eisenhower is in office the consumer is going to pay administered prices, this being a polite term for illegal restraint of trade.

EDGAR S. BYERS.

CLEVELAND.

Unionist Carey Threw a Boomerang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it is utterly unfortunate that before Mr. James Carey wrote his threatening letter to all Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill, someone did not commend to his attention this tune that was popular just a few short years ago: "I'm Going To Sit Right Down and Write Myself a Letter."

An editorial in the Bangor Daily News, an outstanding daily published in Bangor, Maine, under date of August 24, 1959, is most appropriate:

UNIONIST CAREY THREW A BOOMERANG

So AFL–CIO Vice President James B. Carey is out to get 225 Republican and Democratic Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill.

Since President Eisenhower supports the measure, we suppose Carey would also undertake to get him, too, except that Ike is not in line for reelection.

Carey's angry arrogance ends all remaining doubt that certain leaders of organized labor in this country have become too big for their britches. By threatening in individual letters to do all in our power—meaning the well-heeled political machine of the AFL–CIO—to defeat the legislators at the polls in 1960, Carey has shown his true colors and those of his ilk. He is demanding that the Congress of the United States be a servant of a few high-handed union bosses instead of a servant of the American people, whose numbers are some 175 million.

Carey's boldness will boomerang. His intimidations will only strengthen the determination of the 225 Congressmen to see that the Nation gets a strong labor reform law. It should also open the eyes of legislators who have until now favored a mild labor measure. It should make them wonder whether they want to remain allied to a cause that includes such a whip-snapping person as Carey.

Most of all, Carey's action will arouse the American people. Americans don't like to be pushed around. They don't like bullies. And they are already impatient for Congress to correct the union abuses exposed by Senate investigations. Events will show that Carey has put organized labor in a bad light.

Mrs. Alexander Harbert Gray, National President of the American Legion Auxiliary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, last week I had the honor and privilege of attending the national American Legion convention in Minneapolis where Mrs. Alexander Harbert Gray of Brownsville, Tenn., was installed as national president of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Mrs. Gray is a resident of the Eighth Congressional District of Tennessee which I have the honor of representing in the House of Representatives. Her selection as president of the American Legion Auxiliary was largely because she had proven her ability and her understanding of all programs of this organization. Her qualities of leadership, her deep religious and patriotic convictions, her sincere desire to serve, and her pleasing personality qualify her for the office of national president.

Mrs. Gray has been a unit member of the American Legion Auxiliary of Tennessee since 1926 and has served as president of her unit four times. She has been president and vice president of the department and chairman of various committees as well as serving as executive committeewoman, national vice president, and on national committees.

We are certainly proud of Mrs. Gray and her achievements throughout the years, and as I attended her reception on Tuesday night and saw over 2,000 members of the auxiliary pass through the receiving line from every State in the Union I could not help but be impressed with the wonderful work and devotion to the veterans and to the people of this Nation that this organization has given.

I insert here the speech that Mrs. Gray made on Thursday, August 27, after being elected as national president:

Madam Installing Officer Hope, my National President Ce; national officers, past national president, delegates, and guests to this convention; I come before you now breathless with humility and beaming with pride. Humility because of my imperfections—pride in being chosen to further the splendid work of those dedicated women who have preceded me. Thank you—all of you—for giving me this opportunity to serve as your national president.

To my Department of Tennessee, to my American Legion, and to my American Legion Auxiliary, let me express my abiding love. Through the years, they have been my strength and inspiration.

To my family, to my husband who is here with me this morning, I pay tribute for their loyalty and understanding. They have made many sacrifices, but have always believed in this great organization and in me.

To the members of Nashville Post 5 band, my heartfelt thanks for their beautiful music and for the hours of practice spent in preparation for this occasion.

As we begin a new auxiliary year, America faces a grave crisis. Atheistic communism stands on our doorstep, precipitating grave problems, international in scope, but yet of very real, very personal importance to each of us and to the future of the great Nation which we are pledged to uphold.

Today the problem is survival, and so I give you the theme of my administration, "Serving and strengthening America."

World tensions now demand ever-increasing allegiance and personal sacrifice on the part of each of us if we are to preserve our present way of life. We must convince our Federal Government to place national security ahead of tax dollars. We must lead the way to establishing and maintaining an effective nationwide civil defense program. We must strengthen our ties of friendship with our Pan American neighbors. We must shore up the religious faith of our fathers. Our very existence now depends on the strong moral fiber of this Nation.

As we forge an invincible defense to protect our freedoms, so must we simultaneously make our history and heritage of freedoms a part of the lives and character of today's youth—tomorrow's citizens.

We must continue to rehabilitate our disabled veterans and restore them to a normal and productive life. We must preserve the integrity of the family home. We must meet the needs of the whole child.

All of our auxiliary programs are aimed at strengthening our organization and our country through dedicated service.

As you return to your homes, I urge you to strive to make the people of your community increasingly aware of the work you are doing day after day, year in, year out—of the work still to be done for the veteran and his family—for the security of our beloved America. There is no better way than inviting them to join you in your work.

In the year ahead, I see a million dedicated, patriotic women serving and strengthening America.

Better Understanding Between the Peoples of the Far East and the Citizens of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant, to permission granted I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter sent by Messrs. Thomas W. N. Chun and Herbert N. Fukata of Honolulu, Hawaii, to Dr. L. Edward Shuck, U.S. State Department representative in Hawaii.

This letter demonstrates the eagerness of the people of Hawaii to assist in the bringing about of good will and better understanding between the peoples of the Far East and the citizens of the United States:

HONOLULU, HAWAII,
August 21, 1959.

Dr. L. EDWARD SHUCK,
State Department, Honolulu, Hawaii.

DEAR DR. SHUCK: Today, Hawaii was admitted into the Union as the 50th State. It is the culmination of a long and persistent struggle for admission into a great family of States. We in Hawaii are proud of our wonderful achievement and humble of our newly acquired stature.

The time for wild spontaneous acts of jubilation to celebrate Hawaii's gain has passed. We feel that now is the time to tell the world what the United States has done by the act of granting statehood to Hawaii.

The great bulk of the people in the mainland know of our cosmopolitan population living in peace and harmony. We in Hawaii are proud of our spirit of aloha. We in Hawaii take pride that we have found the solution to the problems of living in peace and friendship among the peoples of all races of the world. We in Hawaii would be happy to participate in a venture to offer visual proof to the people of the Far and Middle East, the fact of our diversified group.

The specific project that we have in mind is a Far East good will tour. This tour would be composed of the Royal Hawaiian Band, a hula troup, and others. The tour group would visit and entertain the people of the East and Americans stationed throughout the countries in the itinerary. The purposes for the tour are as follows:

1. To educate and acquaint the people of the East of the different racial groups living in the 50th State of the United States and thus point out their probable origin of ancestry.

2. To publicize and induce the students of the Orient to matriculate at the East-West Cultural Center envisioned and established by the Johnson-Burns Act.

3. To entertain the U.S. troops stationed in these areas.

4. To ease world tension by continuing the exchange of visits between East and West. Russia sent a tour group to the United States to boast of her artistic accomplishments, we can send a tour group to boast of our ability to assemble diverse racial groups and live together in peace and harmony, and

5. To celebrate the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

The tentative list of places to visit and entertain would include: Guam, Philippines, Vietnam, Indochina, Thailand, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Formosa, Okinawa, Japan, Korea, and Russia.

A tentative list of members to be included in the tour group comes to a total of approximately 75 persons made up of the following: Members of the Royal Hawaiian Band, hula troupe, project coordinators, State Department representative, State officials from Hawaii, doctor, historian, photographers, billeting manager, equipment managers, transportation managers, and others.

We believe that this good will tour will strengthen the prestige of the United States in the eyes of the free world and would greatly soften the attitude of the people of the East toward the people of America.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS W. N. CHUN,
HERBERT N. FUKATA,
Project Coordinators.

Anatomy of a Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the last two weeks there has been a great deal of discussion both in and out of Congress about lobbying activities in behalf of or against labor-management reform legislation.

It is significant to me at least that the loudest protests about lobbying activities have been voiced against the representatives of America's labor movement. I am sure that if those who have been so loud in their denunciation of labor's part in this complicated legislation would take the time to study the mail of an average Congressman, they would find that most of the hysteria regarding reform legislation has come from, or has been generated by, the various lobby groups for business and industry. I have been told by veterans in this legislative body that they have never experienced the kind of pressure that has been put on them by big business and industry in support of harsh labor reform legislation.

I should like to call to your attention a bulletin which I received recently from the Illinois Retail Merchants Association. This bulletin is prepared by one of the most highly respected spokesmen for the retail industry in America, Mr. Joe Meek, director of this association.

I am submitting this bulletin today because I think it so succinctly describes the anatomy of a lobby group, and while I have no quarrel with the valiant efforts of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association to protect their rights, I think anyone who will take the trouble to read Mr. Meek's graphic description of how his organization functions will probably better understand why this Congress was stampeded into passing labor legislation which goes beyond the scope of getting the crooks and, in effect, if finally adopted in its present form, will impede seriously legitimate efforts of honest unions.

I think that Mr. Meek deserves the highest commendation for his frank analysis of how his organization functions, and I think there can be no question in anyone's mind after reading his bulletin that the merchants of Illinois who belong to his association are certainly getting more than their money's worth.

The "Retail News Briefs," as published by the Illinois Retail Merchants Association and prepared by Mr. Joe Meek, follows:

RETAIL NEWS BRIEFS
(By Illinois Retail Merchants Association)

Your ripple makes a big splash. What does your Illinois Retail Merchants Association dollar do for you; what chain reaction starts?

First, that dollar helps unite thousands of Illinois retailers into a common cause—a common voice. In the fields of merchandising advice, consumer relations, new markets, rules, regulations, vital statistics, legislation, contacts with governmental departments, employee sources, prestige, the Illinois Retail Merchants Association swings into action with over 100 years of combined experience from all of us—Chuck Barker, Fred Goerlitz, Hugh Muncy, Jack Leland, Herb Thompson, Margaret Dowd, Frances Palanca, Barbara Parks. Nearly 200 fine local retail divisions (chambers of commerce) are happily put to work, contacted, alerted.

Thirty solid trade associations are pulled into the team with their abilities intact and not the slightest check on their own effectual programs of work. Illinois retailing gets together.

It talks up as 40,000; not as 1 or 10 or even 1,000.

Second, your dollar helps unite tens of thousands of U.S. retailers into that common cause. The American Retail Federation, as strong as its 38 State "fingers," moves into action, the national counterpart of what we attempt at the Illinois level. Here, your dollar puts to work such veterans as Rowland Jones, ARF president; Jim Michaux; Joe Lovett; Bill McCamman; Art Sturges, and others. IRMA's counterpart in 38 States gets lifeblood, unity of purpose, action—New York, Arkansas, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, Utah, California—on and on your dollar rolls.

Third, your dollar commands not alone the ARF and its State strength. It nudges and moves the might of national retail trade associations: National Retail Merchants Association, furniture, hardware, food, implements, shoes, jewelry, and more. Veterans such as John Hazen, Derek Brooks, Henry Bison, Phil Shindel, Bill Noble, Bill Cheyney, Lou Rothschild, Eddie Atkins, trade association leaders always in and round Washington, strike out for action—for you. These are the members of the other ARF hand, the national trade groups.

Fourth, your dollar reaches out, builds the finest prestige, commands the finest brains smart store retailing can buy. Across Illinois, in a hundred towns, top merchants go to work for IRMA——for you. Across America, in a thousand cities, top merchants duplicate that effort. Across State and Nation nationally known executives contribute their solutions to your problems—labor, climate, taxes, tax laws, legislation, planning, controls, promotions, distributive education, farm and community relations, press and radio contacts, etc.

This is a part of the commodity your dollar buys in retailing's own across the Nation. It is the biggest money's worth any

association, including organized labor, offers today. With the help of others, now free-loading on you, this combined strength of retailing could be the greatest thing ever for the consumer public—a country in balance, paying its bills, enjoying free markets, utilizing price in its right role, playing the people's politics. Swing on—now. If ever retailing is to get near the summit of its potentialities for the good of the Nation which gives it life, that time is now.

Passports to Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John W. Hanes, Jr., Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, U.S. Department of State, which appeared in the American Legion magazine of September 1959:

PASSPORTS TO TROUBLE

(By John W. Hanes, Jr.)

I don't know exactly how many members the Communist Party of the United States now has. The estimates run from 10,000 to 20,000. But whatever the number, each and every party member as of today can obtain a passport from the Department of State. The exceptions are those rare instances in which the applicant happens to be ineligible for some other reason, such as being a fugitive from justice.

Since this dangerous loophole in our laws was shown to be open last year, many notorious American supporters of the Communist movement have traveled abroad to campaign against us on the world battlefield. Their names and their activities are matters of public record.

What do they do when they get abroad, these "Americans" now happily traveling on their U.S. passports? Let James Jackson, secretary of the National Committee of the Communist Party, U.S.A., give part of the answer in his own words. He went to Moscow this past February and there addressed the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. According to Radio Moscow, Jackson said:

"Communists the world over will welcome the ideological contributions and profound insight in Comrade Khrushchev's report for the solution of a number of problems of the struggle for peace, democracy, national freedom, and socialism. * * * We are building our party in the firm principles of Marxism and Leninism. * * * On the occasion of the 21st Congress, the Communist Party of the United States extends its warmest fraternal greetings to the great CPSU which, boldly applying and developing the principles of Marxism-Leninism, is leading the Soviet people to ever new Socialist accomplishments and onward to communism."

At present we are forced to issue passports to people such as these—passports which not only permit, but greatly aid, their travel to and in foreign countries. Their passport clothes them abroad with all the dignity and protection that our Government affords U.S. citizens. And yet the dedicated purpose in life of every Communist is to destroy our Government and our freedom.

Surely this situation is a perversion of the liberty which our Constitution and our laws are meant to guarantee us.

Our own Government has long recognized how important American passports are to the Communist conspiracy. The Communist underground has for years maintained workshops devoted to the wholesale forgery and falsification of passports and other documents. However, genuine American passports were particularly prized at intelligence headquarters in Moscow, according to a former chief of Soviet intelligence in Europe.

During the Spanish civil war, Communist leaders assiduously collected the passports of the several thousand Americans in the International Brigade, and the bulk of these passports eventually found their way to Moscow for alteration and possible use by Soviet agents. In fact, so many American passports were collected from this source that, as a countermeasure, the United States had to replace every outstanding passport in the world with a new document.

In 1949, 11 members of the national board of the Communist Party, U.S.A., were convicted of conspiring to advocate the overthrow of the U.S. Government by force or violence. In 1950 American Communists were actively supporting the enemy position in the Korean war. Congress, recognizing these dangers, passed the Internal Security Act and found that: "* * * travel of Communist members, representatives, and agents from country to country facilitates communication and is a prerequisite for the carrying on of activities to further the purposes of the Communist movement."

Congress also said that Americans who participate knowingly in the world Communist movement "* * * in effect transfer their allegiance to the foreign country in which is vested the direction and control of the world Communist movement."

Yet allegiance is the touchstone of the right to a passport.

The Secretary of State, charged by law with the issuing of passports, could hardly have ignored these congressional findings. In 1952 Secretary Acheson issued regulations establishing the criteria for refusing passports to Communists and Communist supporters.

The publication of these regulations triggered a violent attack by the Communists through their press and through the courts, utilizing every device of law and procedure. Their clever campaign gained respectability because many sincere persons who have no sympathy whatever with communism became disturbed by the argument that the regulations permitted the Secretary of State arbitrarily to restrict a citizen's rights. These were the regulations which in 1958 the Supreme Court struck down by finding that they had not been specifically authorized by Congress.

I think it might be well to put into perspective exactly how these regulations operated and what their practical effects were. To do so, I should like to present some statistics on the numbers of Communist supporters who were refused passports under them and the number of Americans who received passports. For the 2 calendar years preceding the Supreme Court's decision (1956 and 1957) 1,145,000 passports were issued or renewed. During that same period the Passport Office limited the passport privilege of 51 persons because of Communist grounds. Every one of those persons had access to an elaborate and impartial appeal mechanism, and many of them utilized it. From the time this mechanism was set up in 1952 until the Supreme Court's decision in June 1958, the Secretary of State—and it must be the Secretary personally—refused passports to only 15 persons on Communist grounds after full hearings. A number were granted passports after hearings; some others, of course, did not contest the Passport Office's denial, and undoubtedly many active Communists never bothered to apply at all, knowing they would be scrutinized and required to make a sworn statement about Communist Party membership.

I believe it is important to remember these figures when statements are made about the "arbitrary" action of the Department in passport matters.

Much of the meaning of even the very few but very important refusals became academic, of course, in June 1958, when the Supreme Court's ruling was handed down. Since then, as we anticipated, there has been a flood of applications from persons with records of Communist affiliations or activities. Some of them had previously been denied passports, but many had never previously applied. Many we know a great deal about, but the Department of State is no longer in a position even to inquire, much less investigate, whether any such applicant is a Communist Party member or how dangerous he may be. There is quite a difference, for example, between a known courier and a relatively harmless fellow traveler.

This flood of applications continues today. The Communists are getting passports while they can. Naturally, in all these cases the Department's previous policy has had to give way and passports have been issued to all these people.

Immediately following the Supreme Court decision, Secretary Dulles sent Congress a draft bill to provide the specific legislative authority which the Court held was lacking. He wrote to the Congress:

"I think there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that we are today engaged for survival in a bitter struggle against the international Communist movement. * * * This movement seeks everywhere to thwart U.S. foreign policy. It seeks on every front to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States and eventually by every means, including violence, to encircle the United States and subordinate us to its will. The issuance of U.S. passports to supporters of that movement facilitates their travel to and in foreign countries. It clothes them when abroad with all the dignity and protection that our Government affords. Surely, our Government should be in a position to deny passports to such persons."

President Eisenhower urgently endorsed the legislation, saying, "Each day and week that passes without it exposes us to great danger."

What must such legislation do?

Again, the President has expressed it well. He said:

"In exercising these necessary limitations on the issuance of passports, the executive branch is greatly concerned with seeing to it that the inherent rights of American citizens are preserved. Any limitations on the right to travel can only be tolerated in terms of overriding requirements of our national security, and must be subject to substantive and procedural guarantees."

Simply stated, what we need is legislative authority which will allow the Secretary of State to deny passports to hardcore supporters of the international Communist movement. We believe such denial should occur under due process of law, including judicial review.

We do not seek statutory passport authority to stifle criticism of this Government or its policies. We do not believe that the passport should or can be used to restrict the movement of people who hold political, social, or economic opinions which are not to the orthodox American variety.

We do not seek or want authority to deny passports to any whose travel or activity abroad is merely an embarrassment to our country. I believe that the United States is strong enough to survive embarrassment if we must.

Neither do we wish to penalize loyal Americans who at one time, before the nature of the Communist conspiracy became

as crystal clear as it is today, may have sympathized with Communist theories or even belonged to Communist organizations in this country.

All we seek, and what I feel we must have, is the capacity to protect ourselves by denying passports to those relatively few hard-core, active Communist supporters who are not ordinary American citizens and whose travel abroad constitutes a danger to the United States.

In the case of passports "due process" means that the Secretary of State cannot be arbitrary or capricious but must have sound reasons for restricting an individual's right to exit. It means that he must tell the individual the reasons for his action in sufficient detail and under such circumstances that the individual may have an opportunity to show the reasons untrue. Such circumstances should include a full hearing and review within the Department of State and ultimately, of course, the right which now exists to appeal to the courts.

There is one other essential of passport legislation which is much misunderstood; and that is the necessity for the Government to be able to utilize confidential information as part of the basis of its decision.

I can say bluntly that any legislation concerning denial of passports to Communist supporters would be meaningless and would not achieve any purpose if it prohibited the Government from utilizing confidential information. Almost without exception, dangerous cases involving communism also involve confidential information and investigative sources. Indeed, the more recent and meaningful our information is, the more likely it is that it has come from current confidential investigative sources within the Communist movement.

The Government has a legitimate and overriding interest in maintaining the security of these investigative sources and methods. If faced with the unpalatable choice of exposing and thereby destroying a valuable and continuing source of information about the activities of the Communist conspiracy or issuing a passport to an individual member of that conspiracy, the Government has no alternative but reluctantly to issue the passport as the lesser evil.

Some people feel that the use of confidential information in such cases means using vague and unsubstantial gossip or allegation that will not stand the light of day. This is nonsense. In the first place, if one is prepared to believe that the Secretary of State, who must personally decide passport appeals cases, would actually base a considered decision upon anything less than substantial and corroborated evidence, then one must believe that our country's security is in far greater danger than from the capricious denial of passports. In the second place, confidential information is almost always a small part of any total case, although usually essential because of the clear proof it provides. Most of every case can be fully and publicly disclosed.

Beyond this, however, we believe, based on a careful review of the Communist cases we have had in the past, that in every case the Government can provide a fair summary of even the confidential information, both to the applicant and to the courts. Such a fair summary would include all the pertinent reasons for which the passport is denied and would exclude only those details required to protect confidential sources of information.

I would have no objection to any legislation requiring the Government in all cases to provide such a fair summary of the content of any confidential information relied upon.

One other thing should be clear. What we are talking about is not a criminal proceeding in which someone is being tried or punished for past actions. Instead, it is an administrative process which attempts to predict someone's future course of action, if he travels abroad, and to balance its potential danger to the United States against the desirability of facilitating the travel and giving him protection while he is performing it. These are services which the Government should extend to its citizens, but they are not inviolable rights which the individual can demand no matter what the menace to society may be.

Even having said this, however, much about this subject remains repugnant to Americans. The use of "confidential information" in any kind of proceeding, judicial or not, and indeed any sort of governmental restriction, whether on travel or passports or any other activity of the individual—these are things which we will never like and which, I hope, we never accept apathetically.

Here, however, I believe we must face squarely one fact which is inherent in every aspect of the subject of passports and travel restrictions: That is, that our Nation, although not technically at war, assuredly is not at peace. We face, almost on a daily basis, actual threats to our national security and to our very existence which very clearly are the equal of any threats we have ever faced in peace or war. One need only think of the implications of Berlin today or the countless crises of the past decade to realize how perilous our situation is.

This uneasy condition of "not peace, not war" is something entirely new to our experience. It places a tremendous strain upon our governmental and constitutional institutions, for it blurs lines which had previously been considered sharp and clear.

It used to be that when our Nation was not at war it was truly at peace. Certain rules obtained and governed our lives in peacetime. These rules were evolved over a century and a half by and for a free people who since the earliest days of their history had been faced by no serious external threat to their freedom or their national existence. Occasionally war came, and there was a clear line of demarcation. War was declared and waged with certain formalities. During wartime certain special rules obtained because the Nation temporarily required the subordination of individual desires to the overall national effort. These special rules, while repugnant, were considered tolerable for the limited duration of the war. When the war was over, other prescribed formalities occurred; the Nation was at peace again, and the special wartime rules, which were usually incompatible with complete constitutional freedom, were dropped.

This sharp demarcation between peace and war does not exist today. International communism has thrown away the rule book. It does not consider itself ever at peace. It is always totally mobilized to advance its aim of world domination. It does not recognize any of the accepted rules of international or legal or human conduct except when, and only for as long as, those rules may suit its purpose.

This situation creates an unprecedented threat both to our liberty and to our very existence. Our response must include a recognition of these changed circumstances, or we risk the loss of existence and liberty together.

The threat, moreover, will continue to exist, perhaps for many years in the future. This makes it imperative that whatever response we do adopt must be one that we can indefinitely sustain and without endangering the strength or the integrity of our basic and cherished institutions which we are seeking to protect.

I believe that such a response is possible to a free people. I believe that our institutions—our Constitution, our laws, and our form of government—are strong enough and flexible enough to adjust to these changed circumstances, just as they have adjusted to changes in the past.

I have tried to illustrate what I mean by suggesting, in the liimted but important field of passport policy, a procedure which meets these criteria. It meets, I believe, the most pressing requirements of national security. It does so by law and under the Constitution. I think, for the reasons I have given, that adequate passport legislation is essential to our security. But let me be very clear. I do not believe that such legislation will eliminate all the dangers which we face from the Communist conspiracy or even all those which it is intended to counter.

I do believe that adequate passport legislation is a necessary and integral part of the screen of weapons we have raised against the conspiracy and that it will seriously cripple the effectiveness of that conspiracy.

I do believe, finally, that all our weapons together, wisely and effectively used, will contain the internal menace of the Communist conspiracy within tolerable limits while our military strength deters its worldwide menace and our foreign policy seeks to replace its threat with a just and durable peace.

Significant Comments by Lawrence, Truman, McCormack, and Walter on Khrushchev Visit

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable comment about the exchange of visits by Premier Khrushchev to this country and President Eisenhower to Soviet Russia. Among these the following by David Lawrence, former President Harry Truman, and our distinguished colleages, the majority leader, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, and the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, as reported in U.S. News & World Report, are especially significant; and under unanimous consent I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE ONE BIG DANGER

(By David Lawrence)

Missiles and nuclear bombs are in themselves no menace to mankind—nor are the conventional weapons which can inflict widespread destruction. The menace is the man who, in disregard of the wishes of his people, can order the trigger pulled.

The one big danger in the world, therefore, is one-man rule—autocratic government.

The basic cause of World War I and World War II was the power of an autocratic one-man government to make war on other nations.

Despite public appeals in 1912 for a naval holiday, one man—the Kaiser—started the war in 1914.

Despite the peace talk and appeasement at Munich in 1938, one man—Hitler—started the war in 1939.

What, then, are we doing to remove the menace of one-man government? Will we remove it merely by showing Khrushchev our might—a sort of veiled threat—or even by President Eisenhower's politeness in making a return visit to the Soviet Union?

We shall not make progress by enhancing the prestige of the dictatorship government in Moscow.

We shall not make progress by abandoning our position in West Berlin in favor of a "deal" that satifies the material carvings of some of our allies for more trade with the Soviets but robs us of our self-respect and, indeed, reveals us as irresolute and faltering.

We shall not make progress by oversimplifying our dilemma with the Soviet Union as we give an impression that, by temporarily restraining the hand of the mad man, we have accomplished peace for the world.

There has been too much emphasis on the "one man" idea as the answer to the current crisis. Personal diplomacy cannot be of avail against an autocratic system that rules only through intimidation and terror.

Nikita Khrushchev is accustomed to brutishness, to murder—"purges"—and to the exercise of whatever force seems necessary to him to gain his ends.

We must use the occasion of the Khrushchev visit to talk over his head to the peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The protests from groups of citizens in our midst will be made, but there must be forthcoming also from the Government of the United States a restatement of the case for democracy.

Warning must be given that democratic governments cannot "peacefully coexist" alongside an autocratic government that keeps on threatening to destroy us.

This is not just an internal question—it is external in its global effects. The lives of free men evrywhere are at stake. As long as an autocratic government is in power in Moscow, there can be no disarmament agreement, no treaty to bar aggression, no written pledge that will be worth the paper on which it is written.

Only when peoples are able, in free elections, to choose their leaders and to remove them at will can there be an assurance of peace in the world. Peoples don't make war—only dictators do.

Until the people of the Soviet Union and the peoples of the neighboring countries of Eastern Europe are free, there can be no relief from the burdens of armament. Tension cannot be relaxed anywhere while the murderous regime in Moscow keeps its conspiratorial agents in every part of the world and its troops quartered in supposedly independent countries.

The menace is one man rule. We should be courageous enough to tell Nikita Khrushchev that we cannot feel safe as long as his people are enslaved and that we will feel secure only when the peoples of the many nationalities that make up the Soviet Union have successfully asserted their right to individual freedom. This may not happen soon, but we must not lose sight of the longrange goal—the removal of autocratic governments from a position that enables them to endanger the peace of the world.

TRUMAN: "I QUESTION WISDOM OF IKE'S VISIT"

(One of the criticisms of the Eisenhower-Khrushchev program was written by ex-President Harry S. Truman, and appeared in newspapers a few hours before the President's news conference. Full text of Mr. Truman's article is given here:)

(By Harry S. Truman)

I seriously question the wisdom of President Eisenhower's going to Moscow. If this journey leads the world to expect that peace can be advanced by the mere exchange of visits between heads of government, then we all face certain disappointment.

The President already has declared that he has no intention of conducting separate negotiations with Khrushchev. If that is the case, why could not the amenities be confined to Khrushchev's visit to the United States, where he will be received with the consideration due him?

When a President of the United States leaves the country it should be a momentous occasion in the exercise of the unique authority of his office. The power and leadership of the Presidency should not be dissipated in ceremonial visits so reminiscent of those days when diplomats and rulers traveled back and forth on their balance of power visits, which marked this, the bloodiest century of history.

President Eisenhower is leaving shortly for Europe to dispel from the minds of our allies any anxiety they may have that the United States and the Soviet Union would engage in separate negotiations. I am sure that President Eisenhower would be quick to resent, and rightly so, any suggestion that he is embarking on a course of the United States going it alone with Russia.

The critical problems we continue to have with the Kremlin are how to get it to keep the commitments and to stop it from interfering and plotting in the internal affairs of other nations.

There can be no durable peace until we make some progress in those two areas.

From Yalta to Potsdam to Geneva we have had many meetings, all of which have resulted in failure—not because of any acts of ours—but solely because the Communists have not lived up to their promises.

An exchange of visitors holds no more promise of success than we have had in conferences and diplomatic negotiations. The President probably will meet the same Khrushchev in Moscow that he met in Geneva and will meet again in Washington—a man with an unyielding ambition and fixed purpose.

Khrushchev is not coming to Washington to learn anything about us or our strength that he does not know already. The real purpose of his visit is to appraise our determination and will to stand up and resist Communist aggression and mischievous probings around the world.

Khrushchev's main objective, I believe, is to see whether he can divide us as a people and lure us into compromising our rights. He would also seek by every means to divide us from our allies and then go about picking them off one by one. Since Khrushchev has the initiative to make war, he also has the advantage of beguiling us with offers of peace. This is where Khrushchev is most dangerous and why we have to be exceedingly careful about maintaining our strength and never letting down our guard.

It would be most unfortunate if, by the exchange of visits, we allow the Russians or the world to gain the impression that we are being lulled into complacency.

I hope that Khrushchev, when he leaves here, will have a clearer understanding of what he and the Kremlin are up against in American determination to stand with our allies. Let us be sure that it is a more accurate and realistic evaluation than either Mikoyan or Kozlov (Anastas I. Mikoyan and Frol Kozlov, Soviet Deputy Premiers) seemed to have got out of their visits.

Disregarding all the ceremonies that will be connected with Khrushchev's visit—a visit that I have favored—it is in Washington that Khrushchev must learn conclusively where and how we stand.

The reception accorded the President in Moscow will have little bearing on Khrushchev's decisions and acts, and that is why I feel that little purpose will be served and a great deal of misunderstanding might arise from the President's return of Khrushchev's visit.

There are all sorts of interpretations that can be given to a visit by a President of the United States, and such a journey to Russia could be distorted for propaganda purposes beyond the announced intent. The claim that the tensions of the "cold war" between the East and the West could be lessened by such visits is to ignore the basic reasons for the cold war.

I do not think the Communists are impressed by anything except force. They do not respond to tough talk unless that talk is backed by force. The only way to insure peace is to make certain that they who threaten understand that we will fight if given no other choice.

Up to now I see no evidence that the Communists have changed their goal, which is to impose their rule on the world. This we have to prevent.

One place where we must make that clear to Khrushchev is at the White House. Equally important is that our Allies and friends should never have reason to entertain any misgivings as to the firmness of this resolve. I think it would have been more in keeping with our responsibilities and our leadership to have invited the heads of allied governments and the Secretary General of NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] to come to Washington before Khrushchev's visit to this country. This would have been an opportunity to remind the world, and ourselves as well, that our security and peace are mutually interdependent.

But, in his decision to visit Bonn, Paris, and London in preparation for his meeting with Khrushchev in Washington, the President has the complete support of a nation united.

I cannot say it too often that the proper place to conduct any negotiations affecting the peace of the world is in the United Nations. The world has had all it ought to stand from the maneuvering and bickerings of nations seeking to exploit others. The United Nations has played an increasingly important role in focusing the light of world opinion on transgressors.

In this period of transition from old, exploitive colonialism to independence and nationalism, let us not overlook the growing menace of a new brand of colonialism—the Red exploitive colonialism.

If Russia is sincere in her professed desire for peace, Khrushchev ought to come before the United Nations to try to work out a constructive plan for disarmament and control of nuclear weapons and to cease interfering in the internal affairs of other nations. But from experience we ought to know that plans, resolutions, and agreements made by the Communists up to now are meaningless.

What the world needs is a show of good faith by peaceful acts and deeds by Khrushchev and not through visits, fanfare and gala performances.

While we are striving to achieve some common working ground for peace with the Communists, we are compelled to maintain and build our military might, no matter what the cost.

REMARKS BY HOUSE MAJORITY LEADER JOHN W. MCCORMACK, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS

The invitation by President Eisenhower of the Soviet dictator, the head of the world-wide Communist conspiracy and also Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev, to visit the United States, has been received with sharp discussion and much concern by our people, and properly so. It is my opinion that time will show that President Eisenhower made a serious mistake. It will be interesting to note "the law of natural and probable consequences" operating as a result of the President's invitation and the coming visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

REMARKS BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN OF HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

(In a Letter to President Eisenhower)

Your attention is respectfully directed to two phases of the total war which the international Communist conspiracy is waging against the free world with the United States the principal target.

The first phase is the extensive current Communist espionage operations in this country.

The second phase is the flood of Communist propaganda which is being sent into the United States at an ever-increasing rate.

May I conclude, Mr. President, by quoting the words of Dimitry Z. Manuilsky given in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow in 1931: "So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice and cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star says the issue of interest rates has been made a political football.

In that regard, I will refrain from expressing an opinion, but I will say I agree with the Star in that it is time for the responsible leadership of Congress to demonstrate its understanding as a matter of major importance to the national welfare.

The editorial in question from the August 28, 1959, issue of the Star follows:

CONGRESS SHIRKS ITS DUTY

The Congress will be guilty of dangerous imprudence and irresponsibility if it fails to take action on President Eisenhower's recommendation, repeated in a special message this week, that authority be given for removing the statutory ceiling on Treasury bond interest rates and for raising the rate payable on savings bonds. The House Ways and Means Committee, after an earlier decision to approve the necessary legislation, reversed itself last week and voted to table it for this year.

Although U.S. Government securities generally are considered the safest in the world, the current situation is this: The Treasury Department is unable to sell its bonds—obligations maturing in more than 5 years—at the maximum 4.25 percent rate of return which was fixed by law many years ago. As a consequence, it has been forced to meet its tremendous financing needs through the marketing of short-term securities—bills and certificates—on which there is no interest ceiling. Only recently a 1-year issue of bills was marketed at a near-record rate of 4.728 percent—the lowest the Government could find by competitive bidding in a free market. Short-term securities are held mostly by commercial banks and are employed in the banking system for an expansion of credit which, in effect, increases the supply of money and is directly inflationary as a result.

As both the President and Secretary of Treasury Anderson have emphasized, the picture of this seemingly deliberate policy of contributing to inflationary pressures raises grave questions both at home and abroad about "our sense of responsibility in our fiscal management." It is quite possible, from that point, to question whether our money—the U.S. dollar—should continue to be "practically the standard for the whole world," as it has been for so long. If and when it ceases to be, our entire economy is in jeopardy.

As for the savings bonds, even the most politically motivated individual should be responsive to the implications of the present problem. Approximately 40 million persons hold these small-denomination securities to a total value of $42 billion. They have been urged by their Government to buy them, but the current maximum rate of interest of 3.26 percent neither gives a fair return on today's savings nor offers a cash-in value that is commensurate in purchasing power with their original price. For this reason, cash-ins have exceeded new purchases for months past.

This issue of interest rates has been made a political football on Capitol Hill. It is time for the responsible leadership of Congress to demonstrate its understanding and its interest in a matter of major importance to the national welfare.

Congress: Please Do Not Increase Federal Gas Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, throughout the country, there is widespread opposition to the idea of increasing the Federal tax on gasoline as a means of helping to finance the highway program.

Among the many newspapers which have taken a stand on this matter is the Hopewell News, of Hopewell, Va., which is in my congressional district. The editor of this newspaper, Mr. A. Robbins, Jr., has engaged in considerable research on the subject and is contributing a great deal to the proper understanding of the issue involved.

On August 26, he wrote a fine editorial entitled "Congress: Please Do Not Increase Federal Gas Tax," which contains some enlightening facts and positive thinking on the subject. I would like to commend Mr. Robbins for his editorial and to commend it to the reading of the Members of the House.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS: PLEASE DO NOT INCREASE FEDERAL GAS TAX

This newspaper has been opposed to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax to keep the interstate highway program going at the present rate.

The Federal gasoline tax is already 3 cents a gallon and here in Virginia the State tax is 6 cents a gallon, making a total of 9 cents on every gallon of gas we use.

We have said repeatedly that if there had to be any increase in the gasoline tax we would much rather see an increase in the State tax than in the Federal tax. These Federal interstate highways are fine, but they do not benefit us very much. We would rather see more money spent on the primary and secondary roads in Virginia.

When the Federal interstate highway program was set up by the Congress we commended the efforts of Senator BYRD, who led the fight to set up a separate highway fund for it. The Congress upped various taxes on motorists and directed that this money go into the highway fund.

RUNNING SHORT

Now it seems that this special highway fund is running short of money and that the interstate highway program will have to be sharply curtailed next year unless something is done.

This is mostly the fault of the Congress. Last year Congress stepped up the program and passed a law setting aside the trust fund agreement for one year. Thus the highway fund got extra money from the Treasury and helped to pile up the $13 billion deficit for the past fiscal year.

Then when the Congress set up the special highway fund it did not set aside all the Federal taxes on automobiles, trucks, tires, gasoline, and accessories for that fund. Far from it. Billions of dollars of Federal taxes paid by motor vehicles still go into the Treasury general fund.

We call your attention to the article on this page today by George J. Marder, UPI Washington correspondent. This explains the compromise that is being hammered out. However, Mr. Marder said that about 90 percent of the program is paid by the Federal Government. Actually only 85 percent is paid by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. The Congress said that the Federal Government should pay 90 percent, but there are certain expenses that the Bureau of Public Roads refuses to pay, so the State share is about 15 percent instead of 10 percent. This has been a serious burden on the Virginia Highway Department.

NEVER TAKEN ON

It might not be so bad to up the Federal gasoline tax for 1 year if we could feel certain that the extra penny would come off at that time. But we have seen too many taxes imposed for limited periods, which never did come off. Congress just keeps extending them. So we are dead set against any increase in the Federal gasoline tax.

The compromise proposal was to place a larger share of the Federal excise tax on automobiles, parts and accessories into the special highway fund at the end of a year. Why not go ahead and do that right now? As far as we can see, it would not run the budget into the red, and if it would, then the thing for Congress to do is trim some more unnecessary spending from the budget.

One of the most interesting proposals was made by Senator GORE, of Tennessee. He said to return all the motor vehicle taxes to the special highway fund, then to balance the budget cut one percent from all Federal spending, except fixed charges, such as interest, veterans pensions, etc. This would be more than enough to fill the cofers of the highway fund and balance the budget. In fact it would leave something next July to pay on our huge Federal debt.

But, please Congress, whatever you do, don't increase the Federal gas tax.

International Association of Personnel Women To Celebrate 10th Anniversary Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, in 1951, in Cincinnati, Ohio, a group of personnel executives met and founded the International Association of Personnel Women. During these past years, this

organization has grown and it now has local affiliates in most major cities in this country as well as members throughout the free world. These women have dedicated themselves to furthering better labor-management principles and to the advancement of modern personnel practices.

Next year, the International Association of Personnel Women will hold its 10th annual conference in New York City at the Statler-Hilton Hotel commencing on April 27 and continuing through April 30. I am very pleased that this event will be held at a site in my district and take this opportunity to welcome the officers and members of the International Association of Personnel Women and wish them success on the occasion of their 10th anniversary year.

One World: A Step Closer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the 7th of August, this year, the city of Roseburg suffered tremendous damages when an explosion in the downtown business district gutted several blocks. The toll of lives may never be known exactly. The city manager of Roseburg, Mr. John Warburton, tells me that some 20 percent of the city's assessed valuation was destroyed.

I am glad to report that the citizens of Roseburg are making valiant efforts to overcome this terrible disaster. They are being helped by many people and groups. Today, I want to call to the attention of the House and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter sent to the city fathers of Roseburg.

This letter came from Horst Mahncke, of Hamburg, Germany. Horst describes his reactions when he read of the disaster at Roseburg. He says, in part:

> Dinner didn't tast[e] so good any more after we heard this news.

His next step was to send some money to the city to help. He writes:

> I have opened by piggybank. Although not much was in it, I am sending it to the city of Roseburg and hope that many other people will do likewise. Many, many small coins add up to a lot.

I will insert the full text of his letter a bit later. Right now I want to say "thank you" to Horst Mahncke for extending this helping hand across the Atlantic Ocean and nearly across the North American Continent.

Radio station KRNR out in Roseburg has come up with a good idea. One coin sent by Horst is being auctioned to help boost the Roseburg Disaster Fund. I know bids would be welcomed.

The letter follows:

HAMBURG, *August 8, 1959.*

To the City Fathers of Roseburg.

GENTLEMEN: I have just returned from the beach where my friends and I have been swimming. While eating dinner, father and mother read from the paper the report of the disaster at Roseburg where the dynamite-loaded truck exploded. Dinner didn't taste so good any more after we heard this news. We had to think about those poor people who suffered so much. It seems so terrible when something so unforeseen and unpredictable happens in people's lives. Have children been involved? Have children lost their parents? How sad it all is. America has always been the land of my dreams, especially the beautiful State of California with the good and beautiful fruit. I sure hope to see it sometime during my life. I sure hope the city will help those poor people who suffered in the disaster.

I have opened my piggy bank. Although not much was in it, I am sending it to the city of Roseburg and hope that many other people will do likewise. Many, many small coins add up to a lot.

Hoping that you will realize that this small amount has been given from my heart, I remain with best greetings from Hamburg, the city of the Old World at the other side of the ocean.

HORST MAHNCKE.

The picture is showing my mother, my sister Silvia, and myself. Please return the picture.

Enclosed: 2 deutsche marks (2 German marks—equal to about 50 cents).

A Time for Anger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Mr. Albert Whitehouse, director, industrial relations department, AFL–CIO. It was delivered on April 16, 1959, at the public relations seminar, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. The text follows:

A TIME FOR ANGER

(By Albert Whitehouse)

Not long ago, a prominent New Jersey racketeer committed suicide. He was blessed with a society wife and was known as the No. 1 man in lucrative rackets. Why he chose to hang himself may someday make an interesting research paper for some aspiring Ph. D.

Although he was a known racketeer, this man was reported to have connections with the high and the mighty of our world and to command their respect.

Among other things, the Jersey racketeer was reported to be the head of a $100 million steel company. He still retained his control in the underworld but had graduated to the heights of American enterprise.

In years to come, some novelist intent on movie and TV rights will probably romanticize this man as "Scarface" has already been romaticized. In the national scheme of things, it appears to be success alone that counts, no matter how attained.

While the business community wasn't much putout about the suicide of our New Jersey racketeer neither was it at all squeamish about dealing with him while he was alive. After all, business is business and the so-called neutral market is said to have no ethical values.

The Wall Street Journal reported some time ago that the Justice Department is planning a drive against the blue-chip bosses of the underworld. These are big financiers who operate out of fancy New York office suites and who, among other things, are middlemen bringing together the nether world and respected enterprise.

These are well-known facts in American life, but they hardly appear to get anybody excited, least of all the NAM, the chamber of commerce, or the heads of our big corporations.

In truth, respectable America seems to be unable to get mad at anything, even the Soviet leadership. There is, of course, one exception. Big business, the press, and our more reactionary Congressmen have whipped up a storm over organized labor. Our unions—clean or corrupt—have become the very convenient target for the ire of middlebrow and middle-class America.

When a racketeer operates within the framework of a business, he is simply a crook—not a business racketeer. Let the same man change his operations to a union and he becomes a labor racketeer while his activities are used to smear even the average union member.

Nobody has proposed to close up the banks because some midwestern banker recently swindled the depositors out of $450,000 through an embezzlement scheme. Nor has anybody proposed to shut down industry because the New Jersey racketeer was also chairman of a big company.

The underworld's connections to legitimate enterprise are well known. Nobody has proposed to do anything about it and few seem even disturbed at the extent of organized crime in America. Revelations of organized crime seem to lead only to feeble efforts at law enforcement.

Crime in America is a cancer eating at the vitals of our society. Attorney General William Rogers has placed the cost of crime in 1958 at a staggering $20 billion—more than we spend on schools, roads, or wage increases.

Bank president and bank clerks are equally involved in crime. Embezzlers in the high places are proportionately as common as petty thieves in the low. The excuses of the petty crook and the big time operator are about the same.

MADE IN THE MARKETPLACE

The social values of today's world are made in the marketplace. When the State of New York last year established a division of consumer frauds and protection, it was swamped with complaints.

Sales Management, a trade magazine, reported last year that the payoff is customary in American business and that, in one form or another, it has become an expected part of sales practices.

Last fall the Harvard Business Review carried an article by Dr. Theodore Levitt, prominent marketing and economic consultant who, among other things, is adviser to Standard Oil of Indiana.

Dr. Levitt's article was entitled "The Dangers of Social Responsibility." He declared that the worst thing that can happen is for the businessman to develop a sense of social responsibility for his product and his marketplace conduct.

The businessman, according to this industry spokesman, has no responsibility for his product nor is he answerable for consequences, just so long as he remains within the letter of the law. If he manufactures gimcracks that won't last, it's up to the buyer to beware. So far as Mr. Levitt is concerned, the businessman's sole responsibility is to see that the price is right and that the product sells.

"If what is offered can be sold at a profit (not necessarily a longrun profit), then it's legitimate. The cultural, spiritual, social, etc., consequences of his actions are none of the businessmen's business," this oracle of the marketplace proclaimed.

Dr. Levitt's views are not the exception in American enterprise. They are justified by what is described as the "neutral" market—a bazaar with laws of its own making.

Far too often, the businessman addresses himself to the marketplace as if it were motivated by some force akin to the nether gods of Viking folklore. And like the Vikings of yesteryear, today's businessman seeks to propitiate his marketplace gods with incantation and sacrifice.

The myth of the neutral market is as hollow as the outlook of those who proclaim it. The very same persons who proclaim the neutrality of the market are first to seek to corrupt society with hidden persuaders intended to make fools of all of us.

The February 1959 issue of Dun's Review carries another indictment of today's business morality. Here, business is damned unknowingly by one of its more ardent wooers, Mr. Martin Mayer of "Madison Avenue, U.S.A."

Mr. Mayer places a stamp of approval upon style obsolescence in durable consumer goods—urging substitution of empty style change for true improvement in the product.

Mr. Mayer has also declared that planned obsolescence of goods through premeditated materials failure is good business practice. In plain language, the market is to be loaded down with junk if that's the best way to assure sales at prices that industry seeks to exact.

This author asks that subjective judgments be set aside in considering the issue.

"It is clear," he pontificated, "that a pattern of successful style obsolescence must eventually be reinforced by a decrease in the durability of the product."

America's resources aren't endless and trouble lies ahead if they are expended on such swindles as planned obsolescence. Quite apart from even this consideration, planned obsolescence imposes enormous hidden costs upon the consumer and robs him of higher living standards.

I have heard charges of featherbedding against organized labor until I'm weary. To listen to the righteous fathers of the NAM, our workers are loafers and our union members want triple pay for standing around.

* * * * *

By comparison, industry featherbeading is monstrous. What's worse, society justifies and accepts it. The cost of phony style obsolescence and planned materials obsolescence adds billions to the bills of our consuming public. Honest investigation will show that this has more to do with rising price levels than any wage increases.

We have accepted the morality and success standards of the marketplace and they color our every action. Recently on TV, Groucho Marx facetiously asked a young co-ed of obviously good home about the kind of man she wanted to marry. Her choice was a stereotype—good looking, good clothes, and good income. Integrity and decency apparently had little or nothing to do with the case. Youth's sole rebellion in these days of prosperity appears to be in the direction of juvenile delinquency. In view of our elders' values, who can blame the juveniles?

How can industry expect its employees to bleed for it, if it treats the public like so many suckers? The corporation board that winks at stock deals, yachts, hunting lodges, expense account living, and highjinks for its executives shouldn't be horrified at pilferage among the rank and file.

In the twenties, Texas Guinan, the showgirl, had a word for it, "Hi, Sucker." Today, the idea that only suckers really work is imbedded in our society. Why should the average employee overexert himself, after all, if he's to be considered a square?

AMERICA'S DOUBLE STANDARD

There's a double standard in America—one for the boss and one for the worker; one for labor and one for everybody else. Organized labor has become a whipping boy for our every ill. No longer does there seem to be hard thinking about ourselves or our institutions—even within our universities.

Such is the state of affairs that when organized labor erects a modern structure to house its staffs, there is a lifting of eyebrows. But nobody even blinked when the National Geographic Society announced recently that it was junking its impressive marble halls in favor of a multimillion dollar structure of modern design.

Some time ago, I was at a gathering of polite people in an upper middle income suburb. The locale could have been outside of any large city in the United States of America. The group was all professional, of middle age and upward—doctors, lawyers, government careerists, and their wives.

To hear these good people, organized labor is to blame for virtually everything from the Berlin crisis to nationalist outbursts in Nyasaland. What bothered me most was that all the disagreement was virtually as polite as the agreement. Nobody got angry; nobody had a point of view truly worth fighting about.

These professionals seem to have forgotten the past, although some suffered in the depression and others had been caught up in yesteryear's war tides.

A strange myopia afflicted the crowd, or so it seemed to me. The doctors were remarkably unconcerned over the kind of closed shop enforced by the American Medical Association. The rising costs of medical care, the pushing up by doctors of their fees, or other unsavory aspects of organized medicine. The lawyers were equally unconcerned about the activities of the American Bar Association, even the recent ABA attack upon the Supreme Court because it had upheld traditional civil liberties.

Organized labor is not holy or beyond reproach. In some cases, unions have been entrapped by the same corruptions that have afflicted other organizations and groups. Of course, action must be taken to root out this corruption. Labor itself recognizes the dangers better than any other group within our society and it is doing something about it.

I think I can say in all honesty that labor is almost alone in its lack of smugness toward this and other major problems of our day. I don't mean either that our halo's on too tight. Nor do I mean that some among us haven't grown smug and self-satisfied.

But organized labor is one of the last places where a nonconformist can still hold a job. It is one of the few groups which has refused to stand by while freedom is traded away in the name of some imagined security. Had it not been for labor's protests, the Defense Department's security program might have degenerated into a nightmare, especially in the day of McCarthy.

Where else in America, other than in the labor movement, are the ethics of the marketplace subjected even to critical appraisal?

Who, in America, other than labor, now speaks up for the underdog?

Who else in America dares even remind big enterprise that the primary purpose of production is a better life, not better profits?

Like every other organization subjected to the erosions of time, organized labor has been affected by institutionalism. The fighting idealism of yesterday has been lost in some cases. But the institutional drives remain and these are drives that are good for America because they compel the union to represent the interests of the average man. Despite the press, these are not just mouthings. Our fight for a better minimum wage is real, so is our fight for better housing and so is our struggle for racial equality.

Much of organized labor's idealism remains. If you don't think so, go to a local union meeting where unpaid officers administer the affairs of struggling organizations far removed from the power politics of Washington. Or go on the job where stewards—average Joes and Janes—take up the cudgels for their fellows as an accepted part of their unpaid assignments.

Come south along with me. Here, the struggle for organization goes on in the face of terrible odds. Here, organizers are still beaten up and run out of town, as happened only recently to a Texile Workers Union organizer and one from the Hosiery Workers.

Despite the odds, men still go back into the Southland with the union message. These men who work for struggling unions could get jobs elsewhere. They return after defeat because they know that only the union can answer the problems of the exploited worker. Call this misplaced idealism in an age of cynicism, if you will. But thank God, as well, that there still is some small share of it in the land.

If, by big labor, you mean big unions, then there is big labor in America. But just remember that when a strike takes place, it is individual working people who rally to their organizations. The biggest union in the world couldn't make its strike instructions stick if workers weren't convinced that without the union they would be nothing.

Contrary to the popular view, most of our unions are anything but big. Many are still struggling for bargaining rights in unequal battles with employers. And while strikes are won, they also are lost. Yet the battle goes on, and it will continue as long as labor must fight the morality and the values of the marketplace.

SOMETHING IS MISSING

Something seems to have gone out of American life. It's a sense of sympathy for one's fellow man, a sense of integrity, an understanding of the other fellow's right to human dignity.

There was a day when the picket line of underpaid textile workers commanded sympathy. There was a time when the plight of the farm worker was of national concern. There was a day even when the Nation cared about its poor, and that wasn't so long ago.

The latest figures show that millions of workers remain unemployed, and the projections show that joblessness will remain high. Congress doesn't seem to care, and the President appears perfectly willing to sacrifice the welfare of the jobless to budget balancing and economy.

Like the weather, a measure of unemployment now seems to be taken for granted. A few years ago the rate was 4 percent. Now 6 percent of our manpower willing and able to work is jobless, and only labor really seems to give a tinker's dam.

A few years back labor was informed that the key to jobs and prosperity is high productivity. In the abstract, that's absolutely correct. Labor responded with a will and produced more than ever.

When automation came along, we raised no objection. Some of us wondered what the social consequences might be, but the experts pooh-poohed our fears and told us that automation would create more jobs than it would destroy. What's more, we were promised that these would be highly skilled jobs that would pay better.

We are also told that service and white-collar employment opportunities would expand and that there would be plenty of new jobs in these areas. Every man, it seemed, would be free of drudgery and, what's more, the new technology would automatically bring about shorter hours.

A few who doubted cited the case of the farmer who then, as now, was being overwhelmed by his own productivity. We agreed that there ought to be more production and higher productivity. All we asked

was assurance that this be transformed into prosperity for everybody.

Automation, we were told, would bring about a brave new world in which all our social and economic problems would be solved with the precision of an electronic computer. All we had to do, the experts said, was leave it to the corporations and to nature.

Nature's way, it appears, hasn't been good enough. Today, fewer manufacturing workers are turning out about 50 percent more goods than a decade ago.

Where are those jobs in the service trades? Where are the white collar jobs? And where, for that matter, are all those skilled jobs?

The same process that has cut down jobs in manufacturing is cutting down job opportunity in the service trades and in white collar. If this is the age of the atom and of automation, it is also the age of the computer. The same computer that has made possible the robot factory is also making possible office, warehouse and store automation.

In the steel industry, some 100,000 jobs are gone forever. In autos, the situation is even worse. Year after year, more and more farmers are tractored off the land. Year by year, the workforce grows as the war babies of the forties enter the job market.

By 1965, over 1,250,000 new workers will enter the job market annually. At this time, the Nation will have a workforce of 78 million. Even if gross output expands at a rate higher than today, the mid-sixties will be a time of high joblessness.

THOSE ROSY PROMISES

What happened to the rosy promises of yesterday?

What kind of future can we offer today's unemployed and tomorrow's eager youth?

Who cares? Certainly not our corporate employers. And, this administration appears to care even less. I wish I could say that the leadership of the Democratic Party truly cares but even they don't seem much concerned. Certainly, Congress has yet to come forward with a program that will put the Nation back to work.

This is the great immorality of today—an immorality worse by far than the hand in the till. Nobody seems to care very much any more—nobody but organized labor and the jobless.

Today, in Clearfield County, Pa., in Hightop, W. Va., in Washington, D.C., and in other cities and counties in most of our industrial States, children and their elders are eating mollygrub.

"What's mollygrub?" you may ask.

It's a diet of Federal surplus foods. Millions in this country are dependent in some measure on this diet.

In Washington, D.C., a family of one to five persons dependent on public assistance or living in abject poverty is eligible for one unit of mollygrub. That unit consisted, some time ago, of a monthly allotment of 10 pounds of flour, 5 pounds of cornmeal, 5 pounds of cheddar cheese, 5 pounds of rice, and 4½ pounds of powdered milk. The total value of this package has been estimated at $6.

Some 7,000 children in the Washington, D.C., public schools are hungry each day and so far there has been only talk of feeding them, since our National Congress hasn't seen fit to appropriate extra funds for their lunches. A Washington, D.C., newspaper recently ran a series on poverty in our Nation's Capital. It found that 31,000 families—over 100,000 men, women, and children—live in dire want.

Side by side with hunger at home and with even worse hunger abroad are whole are whole warehouses full of surplus food. Year by year we stockpile this food as a monument to the folly of our marketplace morality.

As the idle miners of Hightop, W. Va., eat their sparse surplus food diet of dried milk and rice, the Government warehouses are bursting with wheat, corn, butter, eggs, dried fruits, peanut butter, dried meats, and almost every other variety of food.

By next July the United States will have invested $9 billion in surplus foods. Under the flexible farm support program of Ezra Taft Benson the surplus grows year by year. Flexible supports meant more intensive cultivation of the land last year and another 300 million bushels of wheat were surplus. This year there will be a bumper corn crop, which should mean meat in plenty even for the jobless.

The peoples of the entire world know about our farm glut. If they become anti-American, this food surplus that they cannot touch may have something to do with it. The reasons will have much more to do with hunger than procommunism.

* * * * *

Because we are fools, we have geared our food surplus program to the market. Today, the food cannot be passed out to those in need even at home unless this will stabilize prices. The chase for higher farm prices, like the chase for the hard dollar, is the excuse for denying food to the hungry.

That's the law, and the law, after all, must be respected even though it makes jackasses of us. The thought that the law might be changed so that the hungry might be fed seems to send shivers down the spines of respectable businessmen who look upon this as the backdoor to socialism.

This year, $4 billion are being spent for price supports to carry out "Uncle" Ezra Benson's flexible farm price policy. Another billion will be required simply to pay storage costs for our mountain of surplus foods.

If just the amount of money now going to pay for storage were spent to feed the hungry of America, a big dent would be made in food surpluses. This would do more to stabilize prices than any support program since the expenditure would permanently remove millions of pounds of food from the market. This could be done without entering into competition with our usual food distribution outlets.

Senator WAYNE MORSE recently charged that "we do a better job of feeding our livestock" than we do in feeding our hungry children. The Oregon lawmaker pointed out that "when cattle starve, half the U.S. Air Force flies hay to them."

The surplus food program is financed by 30 percent of the receipts of all customs received by the United States under terms of a law enacted in 1935. Last year, the Department of Agriculture could have spent $220 million for this purpose and could also have dipped into $300 million of unobligated balances carried forward from previous years.

Such was the state of morality in the recession year of 1958 that Secretary Benson turned back unspent to the Federal Treasury $83.5 million which will be forever lost for this purpose.

This money was deliberately withheld from the poorest and weakest of our society. When Benson turned it back to the Treasury, he virtually took food from the mouths of hungry babies.

This is the same man who, in the name of economic good sense and marketplace morality, ran up the agricultural budget to $7 billion.

The crime of Benson is far more serious than that of the New Jersey racketeer I mentioned at the start of this talk. Benson, however, acted within the framework of law and in the name of morality.

Even as Benson turned back his surplus funds, a local union president from the Textile Workers Union had this to say in testimony before the Congress:

"We have read in the papers that the (Agriculture) Department does have funds to buy more surplus commodities. If this is the case, it is a national scandal that hungry children, to say nothing of their parents, in communities like ours are not receiving sufficient nourishing and palatable foods to meet their urgent needs."

Here is an indictment that speaks for itself. Ask yourselves who are the guilty in our society and answers the question honestly. The answer is hardly pleasant.

OUR ADVANCED CIVILIZATION

Yes, ours is an age of advanced civilization and one of advanced technology. We cower in the shadow of the H-bomb and despite big talk, we refuse even to meet our responsibilities in harnessing the energy of the atom for peaceful purposes.

A major problem for the industrial workers of the new age will be protection from the killing effects of radiation. Great new problems are appearing in this area—problems both of adequate safety and of compensation to those injured on the job.

Recently, industry spokesmen appeared before a joint Congress committee to state their views. The head of a big insurance company urged no Federal action to set safety standards until the States prove that they will not or cannot do the job. How many must die or suffer the pangs of radiation sickness before industry is convinced of the need for uniform safety and compensation standards?

Here, too, the same old arguments of statism and cost were raised by industry on the same old basis as in yesterday's world. So callous were industry spokesmen that Representative CHET HOLIFIELD finally declared: "You are talking about a material that throws rays through 5 feet of concrete and kills people."

This is the morality of our day. It is a morality that permits the $150,000-a-year executive to cut himself into a stock melon while condemning a 20-cents-an-hour, union-won wage increase as inflationary. A recent report of the State of New York showed that there are now 45 persons in that State alone with incomes of over a million a year. The wealthy are very much still with us and they probably get a big bang out of seeing labor blamed for so many of today's ills.

Labor is blamed today for the results of the administered prices of big business—for an inflation that has its roots in a business policy geared to maximum unit profits instead of maximum production. Labor has become the whipping boy for the outlandish profits of our monopolistic corporations. To blame the factory worker with his average wage of $87 weekly for inflation is nonsense. This worker is the victim of inflation, not its cause.

It is strange that we hear little today about the mad speculation in Wall Street, and its effects upon inflation, but then the profits made there don't go to working people. Today's land speculation is fantastic, but the speculators don't work in auto or steel plants and they aren't unemployed, so their profits must be perfectly kosher.

Nor has anybody even talked about the growth of a technical and middle management bureaucracy that fattens on itself and adds significantly to costs. In these days of upper-middle-income suburbia, it just wouldn't do to talk about these cracks in management's picture window.

Hundreds of thousands of displaced workers stand as a monument to today's productivity and this productivity unemployment is the best answer to those who lay featherbedding, high wages, and inflation at labor's door. The plain fact is that unit labor costs in key industry haven't gone up significantly and that management has recouped wage increases through the rise of output per man-hour. What we need is ever wider markets for goods, not stagnant wage levels.

It is time for a stocktaking in America and for ending senseless stockpiling. It is time to take up the cudgels against the pres-

ent dead level of conformity and for plain old-fashined decency. The American people need once more to understand that righteous wrath is not only permissible but desirable. America needs, above all, fewer pitchmen and more angry men. We need, possibly, fewer whitewashing detergents and more soapboxes.

Small Business Investment Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Small Business, published by the National Small Business Men's Association, carried an article in which this organization recommended legislation which would, through tax benefits and greater flexibility, enhance and speed up the organization of small business investment companies.

The suggestions incorporated in this article are of interest to those concerned with the welfare of small business. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit this article for the benefit of the Members of Congress and others:

NSBMA URGES NEW TAX BENEFITS TO SPEED INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Greater tax benefits * * * and increased fiscal flexibility. This was the gist of NSBMA recommendations to beef up the Small Business Investment Act.

And in presenting his testimony to the House Select Committee on Small Business, President Harry E. Brinkman was hopeful that the act might yet provide a needed flow of private capital for small business starts and expansion.

The Investment Act last year was a key aid measure as Congress tossed out a legislative lifeline to small business. Through it, a nationwide web of private investment companies was to be established. And they were to provide the sorely needed long-term debt and equity capital which is a major problem of most small firms.

But the rush to form investment companies has not been forthcoming. At presstime, less than 20 have been licensed. And the main deterrent seems to be that of the act's tax benefits which some critics have labeled "confusing" and "downright misleading."

With this in mind, NSBMA's testimony recommended:

1. That investment companies be allowed to establish a reserve for losses of up to 20 percent of their assets—and that this be tax deductible;

2. That dividends paid on preferred and common stock of such companies be deductible from earnings before taxes are computed;

3. That dividends paid on preferred and common stock issued by investment companies be tax free to the recipient, up to $5,000;

4. That investment companies be given greater flexibility by allowing them to purchase preferred and common stock, or any other equity interest that may be authorized by the Small Business Administration which supervises and licenses companies formed under the act.

Three main tax benefits were included in the original 1958 law. Through them:

1. Dividends an investment company receives from the stock of a small business are exempt from the corporate income tax;

2. Investors in the stock of an investment company who incur a loss on that stock may take an ordinary loss deduction—rather than a less advantageous capital loss deduction;

3. Investment companies which have a loss on an investment in a small business may take an ordinary loss deduction rather than a capital loss.

One other major "gripe" with the act's requirements is that of requiring a small business to "share" its ownership with the investment company making it a loan.

Most necessary amendments to the act already are incorporated in bills to be considered by both Senate and House this year.

From what we can learn, the consensus on Capitol Hill points toward passage of remedial legislation this session.

A Solution Needed for Food Surplus Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 86th Congress draws to a close, there are some tough problems that have not been solved. Among the unsolved problems is the farm program. For many years, Federal legislation has only complicated and worsened the situation in relating supply with demand in the farm program. The extent of this imbalance because of Federal tampering might well be assayed by checking reaction to the following article which outlines a discovery of "Way Found To Grow Winter Grains in Tropics in Third of Normal Time." How welcome will be additional grain production when present surpluses bulge our warehouses?

A solution sooner or later to the farm mess must be found. If Congress will not provide the leadership, the people may well force Congress to take action by supporting the administration's request for a new and corrective farm program. After all the people forced a labor reform bill through the House.

The article follows:

NEW SOURCE OF FOOD FOR MILLIONS—WAY FOUND TO GROW WINTER GRAINS IN TROPICS IN THIRD OF NORMAL TIME

PASADENA, CALIF., August 30.—A way of growing winter grains in the winterless Tropics—and thus opening a new source of food for millions—was disclosed today by the California Institute of Technology.

For the first time, the institute said, winter rye plants have been made to produce grains without the benefit of winter and in a third of the normal time.

There is evidence the same thing can be done with barley, wheat, and other winter grains, the school said.

"Generally if you find something that changes the growth habits of one member of a family of plants it will work for the whole family," said Harry R. Highkin, research fellow in biology at the institute.

An announcement by the institute said Highkin and two associates made the rye produce grain in 2½ months. The usual period is 6 months, including a winter cold spell of 6 to 8 weeks.

"The method is simple and practical commercially," Highkin said.

The scientists used a spray of gibberellin, a hormone that plants secrete to induce stem growth, on rye plants grown in a constant hothouse temperature of 62 degrees.

Highkin waited until the plants had 10 leaves and were about a month old. Spraying at this time caused the plants to grow rapidly and produce grain within another month and a half.

Highkin believes two things happen to grains normally during winter, and that spraying them with gibberellin eliminates these phases and speeds up seed production.

One is the secretion or accumulation of some substance so that gibberellin can be formed in the plant's growing tip at the end of the cold period. The other is the formation of additional hormones, called florigens, which scientists believe the plant secretes to produce grain.

Unworkable Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an editorial by Mr. Robert Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette Times of August 17, 1959, on the farm support program:

UNWORKABLE PRICE SUPPORTS

Unsound, unworkable Government price supports are threatening to put the Nation's farmers in the public opinion "doghouse," says Charlie Shuman, a Sullivan, Ill., grain and livestock farmer. And Shuman is also president of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

At a meeting of women's editors in a Chicage hotel recently, the gentleman farmer from downstate Illinois declared that farmers resent "being made the goat of a series of unworkable Government farm programs." Then he pointed out that farmers have often insisted on these programs being changed but the Congress has not as yet taken effective action.

It's difficult to understand the line of reasoning of our Senators and Representatives in this case. If the price-support program is so distasteful to the majority of our agriculturists why doesn't the lawmaker choose to go along with his constituents back in the hustings?

Pointing to the unsound, unworkable farm programs, Shuman says he does not subscribe to the idea that it is good public relations to apply the whitewash, use high-pressure propaganda or resort to sweeping dirt under the rug. "These programs have been bad and we know it," he exclaimed.

Farm Bureau's objective, as we know it, is to create conditions under which farmers can earn and get a high per family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and eliminate Government regulation of individual farming operations. The current farm program doesn't further that objective.

We've often wondered whether the individual farmer is sick of the setup that Ezra Taft Benson himself lambasts as occasion presents itself.

Shuman says that today's burdensome farm surpluses are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control that is spreading to other American walks of life.

We marvel that the taxpayers, ever on guard against increasing levies for educational purposes, have not awakened to the fact that Federal contribution to our schools is gradually encroaching where it should not to the detriment of local interest in schools. We're so everlastingly beset with Federal aid that we aren't able to stand alone without it, not only in our school system but in many other systems that used to function on their own initiative.

There's a sinisterism we fear in the handouts the Government insists on providing and the condition the farmer finds himself in now as regards the subsidized Federal program. It's something like dad setting son up housekeeping and then telling him to go right ahead on his own. Dad, instead of leaving the son with full responsibility, every so often slips him a check gratis and thereby weakens the son's family headship.

Incident to beliefs in some quarters in and out of farm circles which would defend excessive Government farm expenditures on the grounds that many other groups in our economy are subsidized, Shuman pointed out that the farmers are not out for revenge. Their primary purpose is, rather, to serve the best interests of farmers, and Government subsidies cannot do this.

If the Government insists on slowing farm production, on telling the farmer how much he can and can't grow, on furthering dictatorial subsidizing, we'll soon have an agricultural power potential group on a dole.

Food in the United States is the best buy in the world, Shuman told the women at the Chicago hotel session. He was continuing to sing the praises of the tremendous production strides made by agriculture under the nonsubsidized program they themselves instituted when horse and mule farming was being discarded in favor of power farming and highly sensitized, utilized, and fertilized truck farming.

Today a factory worker can buy a month's supply of food for his family—an average size household—for 40 hours of work in contrast to 51 hours of work necessary 7 years ago to purchase that much.

Given proper Government supervision and encouragement without dictatorial coddling, and American agriculture can produce under an economic program of supply and demand a most satisfactory form of existence on the farm, in the home of the factory worker, or the millions in neither group whom we classify as white-collared workers.

Golden Remembrancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a tribute to the founders of California written by Mr. John C. Crowe:

GOLDEN REMEMBRANCER

Let's roll out the golden carpet. On September 9, 1959, California will be 109 years old as a State in the American Union.

This writer is a grandson of California pioneer parents who sailed into the Golden Gate during the gold rush—Mary Ann and Caleb Coakley. Their first child, Mary Ann Coakley (this writer's mother) was born at Stockton, in March 1853. I heard from their lips the glorious story of the sacrifices and hardships that the pioneers endured to reach and establish the State of California. In 1849 our Nation was composed of 30 States—15 of which legalized human slavery, while the other 15 did not. The scales on human slavery was evenly balanced until the 100,000 daring young men who founded the State of California threw their weight into the scales forever against slavery. Because of their bold and forthright stand, California met with fierce opposition in her request for statehood.

But the 100,000 daring young men of 1849 who had actually bet their lives to reach this golden State, had the moral stamina to meet and overcome the opposition and won statehood for California on September 9, 1850—giving star 31 to our Nation's flag—and, forever, setting the American pitch against human slavery.

JOHN C. CROWE.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Conservation and Management of Migratory Marine Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem regarding the conservation and management of migratory marine fish has been brought to my attention. At my request, the Department of the Interior has informed me of the phenomenal growth of recreational salt water fishing in recent years, which growth has created many problems in the field of management and its relationship to commercial fishing.

During the year 1955, 4½ million sportsmen participated in this popular sport for a total of 59 million days and spending $489 million.

I have been advised that the annual sport harvest may now approximate a half-billion pounds of fish and may double in the next decade.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that future study and consideration be given to authorizing a comprehensive and continuing study of migratory marine fish of interest to recreational fishermen of the United States.

The purpose of such a study would be to develop wise conservation policies and constructive management activities.

It is my belief that a cooperative program of research between the States involved and the Federal Government would be a logical approach to the problem. The Federal Government could supply funds in equal proportion to those supplied by the States for this purpose, limited to 50 percent of the cost of the program. I would recommend that not more than $100,000 be made available, on a 50–50 matching basis, with any one State in any one year.

Federal funds employed on a joint Federal-State level have in the past proven to create greater State financial participation and interest in planning research programs of this nature.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that in the next Congress we may establish a continuing research program for the conservation and improved management of migratory marine fish in the United States and contiguous waters.

For the purpose of studying this problem, I am introducing H.R. 8968. I welcome any and all comments from interested conservation and sportsmen's agencies on this proposed new program.

How Can We Stop the Communist Drive in Laos?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week I brought to the attention of Members of the House the critical situation which has been created in the faraway country of Laos with the initiation there of a new Communist attack designed to take over another key sector of southeast Asia. I expressed my own view that, though it was important that we give assistance in terms of money and weapons to the people of Laos defending themselves against one more act of Communist penetration, I was fearful that this type of assistance might not be enough and I suggested that we must also be prepared to send our own forces, including a detachment of marines and a U.S. Navy carrier, to this troubled part of the world to demonstrate our determination, just as we demonstrated it at Lebanon, not to permit the Communists to upset further the balance of power in any part of the world.

Of course, this suggestion raised some serious questions. But by the same token the fact of Communist aggression, the difficulty of dealing with it effectively, and the natural hesitancy on the part of Americans to commit themselves promptly in this kind of a situation have also raised some serious questions. Yesterday, August 30, there appeared in the New York Times a thoughtful editorial which I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House. I thoroughly endorse its statement that, in order to protect ourselves against Communist aggression we must "recognize a grave menace when it appears, and not shrug it off lightly because it happens to be on the other side of the world." The editorial follows:

LESSONS FROM LAOS

The situation in Laos is proving, once more, that the free world has given inadequate attention to its means of defense against the Communist conspiracy. Communist raiding parties have now struck within 16 miles of the capital. At least three areas in the northern part of the country are already under Communist control or in

a state of chaos. The survival of free government in this newly independent kingdom is at stake.

Laos is a member of the United Nations, but the Secretary General admits that he is powerless. He cannot even send in observers unless they are requested by both sides in the controversy and naturally the last thing in the world that the Communists want is observation. The United Nations cannot take any forceful and immediate action without the authority of the Security Council where the Communist veto is expected, automatically.

The United States, acting independently, has announced its intention to airlift some small arms and ammunition to the tiny Laotian Army. It may be possible to bring its effectives up from 25,000 to 29,000 men, to withstand the assault of North Vietnam and Red China, whose manpower and firepower are not under such modest limitations.

Even that little bit of help is joyfully welcomed by the free Laotians as a symbol of the fact that at least someone, somewhere in the world, is concerned over their survival. And naturally it has drawn a prompt and bitter denunciation from the Communists in North Vietnam on the ground that "U.S. imperialists are seeking to expand the civil war in Laos into a real shooting war." This is no time for humor, but one may be forgiven a wry smile at the concern of foreign Communist North Vietnam over a civil war in Laos.

What all this demonstrates is that we have not yet developed any effective techniques for meeting the by now well-known Communist tactics. We don't want a big war and the Communists know it. So they can keep up this unremitting process of hacking away at human liberties, knowing that the United Nations is powerless and that most members wish to keep the peace.

Some changes in the mechanism of keeping the peace and preserving human liberties are obviously needed. Perhaps the first change that is required is in our own thinking so that we can recognize a grave menace when it appears, and not shrug it off lightly because it happens to be on the other side of the world.

Soldier of God

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Presbyterian Life magazine of September 1, 1959:

SOLDIER OF GOD

(By James W. Hoffman)

(On the battlefield, in prison camp, in the corridors of the Pentagon, Chaplain John K. Borneman's job has always been the same—to be a pastor to the men and women of the armed services.)

In Australian in 1942, a U.S. Army chaplain fresh from the States was talking with a young airman who had been through the battles of Pearl Harbor, Bataan, and Corregidor.

"Those chaplains sure did a job," the pilot said. "Know what one of them did? Let me see, what was his name? Borneman—that's it—John Borneman. It was just before Christmas, and we were all wanting to get messages home, and plenty bad. He knows it, so he goes around asking us if we want to send a telegram to the folks at home. Boy oh boy, is he a mind reader—so he collects our messages and makes the trip back to Manila, and it's plenty dangerous, too. But he gets the messages through—and comes back to get more."

"What do you suppose," the chaplain asked, "has happened to him?"

"Probably captured by the Japs."

The pilot was right. Jonathan Wainwright, in his book, "General Wainwright's Story," tells about watching the Death March of Bataan winding by the hotel in which he was being held prisoner by the enemy.

"Among the marchers, with his chin in the air, was Chaplain John K. Borneman, a valiant soldier of God and the United States."

Chaplain Borneman was one of the survivors of that 186-mile tramp in the broiling sun. He has survived many other ordeals as well, including battles on land and in the air, a train wreck, an airplane crash, and 2½ years in a Japanese concentration camp.

Retired from the Army in 1950 because of wounds received in action, Chaplain Borneman is now executive secretary of the Department of Chaplains and Service Personnel of the United Presbyterian Church, which serves 205 Presbyterian chaplains and around 75,000 laymen in the Armed Forces.

He began his military career during World War I, as a fighter pilot with the 72d Pursuit Group. Although those were the days of canvas-covered biplanes, when guns jammed and motors died with no apparent reason, Lieutenant Borneman came through the war without a scratch.

After demobilization John Borneman returned to Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Pa. Here he took all the courses in science he could fit into his schedule, as he planned to become a doctor. Since childhood he had been torn between two vocations, medicine and the ministry. For generations the men in his family had been doctors or dentists; how the notion of entering the ministry first came to him, he doesn't remember.

DISILLUSIONMENT ABOUT MINISTRY

He made his decision to study medicine after knowing several ministers who didn't seem to be doing much of a job. This disillusionment was almost offset, he says, by remembering an Army chaplain he had known in World War I—"a wonderful fellow, a Lutheran named, believe it or not, MacIntosh."

While he was in college, Borneman met other ministers who impressed him favorably, and his resolve to follow medicine wavered. Finally, in his junior year, he attended a student conference on vocations at which several clergymen spoke persuasively of the demands and opportunities of their work. The scales tipped, and John Borneman revised his academic plans to point himself toward the ministry.

He studied at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, and took graduate work at the Universities of Pennsylvania and of Buffalo, N.Y. In 1925 he became pastor of Bacon Memorial Presbyterian Church, Niagara Falls, N.Y. He married the former Elizabeth Goos, of Lancaster, Pa., the following year.

The Niagara Falls church was strategically located for giving young Borneman a nudge toward his destined career. Nearby was the Army's Fort Niagara. "The military," Borneman explains, "either gets in a man's blood or it doesn't. If it does, he can never get away from it for long." Pastor Borneman began hanging around Fort Niagara, and presently found himself, for all practical purposes, as much a chaplain as parish minister.

In 1929 he entered the Army Chaplain Corps, and through the following 10 years served many installations in the United States. The chaplaincy, he felt strongly, offered a chance to minister to men who were all too often neglected by the churches and their people in settled congregations. As he has said many times since, "it is not surprising when servicemen forget their obligations to God, if the church has first forgotten its obligations to them."

When the United States entered World War II, Chaplain Borneman had already been in the Philippines for 2 years. He was the first American chaplain to be wounded in action, receiving a hail of bomb fragments in his legs just 22 days after Pearl Harbor. Less than 3 months later he earned his second Purle Heart when a shell fragment lodged in his head. When a grenade exploded in front of him less than 2 months after that, gashing his chest and abdomen, Chaplain Borneman was hospitalized for the third time in less than 6 months of war.

AMERICANS CAPTURED

Two hours after Borneman was taken to the hospital, the American forces surrendered to the Japanese. Sixteen days later he was taken from the hospital—"The Japs made us well by order"—and forced to join the death march. Fifteen thousand Americans and fifty thousand Filipinos made up that wretched parade, a wholly unnecessary cruelty, for ample motor and rail transportation was available to the conquerors.

John Borneman was then 43 years of age. For the next 2½ years he was a prisoner at infamous Camp No. 1, at Cabanaturan.

In the Japanese military philosophy, an officer is responsible for everything done by anyone in his command; for this reason the officers at Camp No. 1 endured the most frequent and most brutal punishments. Chaplain Borneman was forced to witness the murder, after 24-hour beatings, of 12 line officers. The chaplains—all officers, of course—made themselves special targets of their captors' wrath by their boldness in demanding better conditions for the prisoners and by holding religious services without permission. Malnutrition and disease killed even more of the Americans than did the direct action of their jailers. Of the 33 chaplains imprisoned, only 15 lived to be rescued.

Chaplain (Major) Borneman, second in command among the chaplains at the time of their capture, became supervisor of religious activities after Chaplain (Colonel) Alfred Oliver, a Methodist, had his neck broken during a beating and remained too ill to continue his work. For his unyielding efforts to keep the truths of religion alive in the prisoners' hearts, Chaplain Borneman was beaten many times. On one occasion all the teeth in his upper jaw were kicked out; on another, his arm was broken.

During his 30 months' imprisonment Chaplain Borneman contracted dysentery and beriberi; he is still troubled by periodic returns of these diseases, and will never be completely cured, physicians say. Naturally a rugged stockily built man, he weighed only 95 pounds when rescued.

To the prisoners, the camp authorities' policy on religious work seemed vacillating and inconsistent. After originally forbidding worship services, the Japanese rescinded this ruling, but required that sermons be submitted to headquarters for approval. As paper was scarce and wildly expensive, the chaplains used can labels and other scraps for writing their sermons.

Graveside services for the dead were forbidden; the chaplains circumvented this prohibition by stealing into the morgue and holding services—for as many as 75 men in 1 day—over the bodies before the burial party would arrive. Of the 5,700 prisoners in Camp No. 1, 2,666 died.

Not one of the chaplains in Camp No. 1, Protestant, Roman Catholic, or Jewish, ever shirked an opportunity to serve the prisoners, even though the penalty for doing their

proper work was frequently beating and torture.

Bible classes were forbidden, but were conducted by the chaplains secretly in a drainage ditch where the prisoners were laboring. Guards were posted to give warning of the approach of a Japanese. Usually instruction could go forward only a few minutes at a time, then be interrupted until the coast was clear.

In the second year of imprisonment, chaplains and laymen of eight denominations organized the Protestant Christian Church of Military Prison Camp No. 1 of the Philippine Islands. This congregation was strongly evangelistic; more than 250 men were baptized into the Christian faith. The membership of 1,600 included men from every State in the Union and 17 other nations.

The church held night classes in such subjects as the life of Christ, philosophy of the Christian religion, the life of the apostle Paul, and Christian ethics. Borneman was teacher of the course in Old Testament history. For a period of over a year the classes had no electric light; laymen cut bottles in half, made a wick of cloth, and floated it on coconut oil. This homemade lamp enabled the teacher to see his notes, but the students sat in darkness. In spite of this handicap, classes were well attended; several hundred men in each course was normal enrollment.

Clark Lee, a war correspondent who survived to report his experiences, wrote of Chaplain Borneman that "his parents and teachers must have forgotten to teach him the word 'fear'."

"We had to act as though we weren't afraid," Borneman explains. "The only way to get anywhere at all with the Japs was to talk up—and back—to them. If they sensed that a man feared what they could do to him, he hadn't a chance."

Only his faith in God, Borneman says, enabled him to keep going during those years. He remembers two hymns especially that he kept going over in his mind when he was in sharpest need of strength to withstand his ordeals: "Lead On, O King Eternal," and "O Jesus, I Have Promised To Serve Thee to the End."

SOME DESIRED DEATH

The men who brought no faith with them, and failed to acquire it, didn't last long. "We saw many men die because they had lost the will to live. With so much evil all around us, faith in a righteous, loving God wasn't easy for some men. And as the months dragged into years, it was easy to believe what the Japs kept telling us—that America was finished, that we'd never be rescued. Many men willed themselves into death just to escape."

But so many others the manmade hell of hunger and pain proved to be God's opportunity. "With death at our doorstep all the time—you never knew when a Japanese soldier might get the impulse to raise his rifle and shoot you—men began wondering about the meaning of life." The prisoners were pathetically eager for assurance of some better experience after this life ended. Chaplains were always answering questions about immortality, then working from that to other aspects of religion.

For most of the men, what they learned in prison was not the shallow faith which later came to be called, derisively, foxhole religion. With many, Chaplain Borneman says, it was the decisive turning point of life. "I know six men who are now Presbyterian ministers whose first serious thoughts of religion came while they were prisoners at camp No. 1. And of course a number became clergymen in other churches, and many more became really dedicated laymen."

Chaplain Borneman regards his years in the concentration camp, the lowest in his life from a personal standpoint, as the high point in his ministry. "The men really needed us chaplains, and they knew it. They were desperate to receive what we were trained to give them." In spite of the starvation diet and other obstacles, the chaplains were busy all the time—"most of us had never worked so hard in our lives."

Toward the close of 1944, American airplanes began passing over the camp, with increasing regularity, to bomb Japanese installations. As the prison authorities realized that surrender was not far off, brutalities and killings increased. In a burst of fury the commandant told one of the chaplains, "You all pay. If Americans come, you not be here to see."

Yet, when a large American flotilla was sighted in January 1945, the Japanese simply abandoned the camp, warning the prisoners that if they ventured beyond the barbed wire, they would be shot on sight.

For 3 weeks the prisoners lived on the food left behind by their captors. Then one night they heard gunshots outside the camp. Several chaplains lay on their stomachs in the dirt as the shooting increased. They agreed that the Japanese, as a final gesture of defiance, had returned to kill the prisoners.

Chaplain Borneman made a decision. He was a noncombatant and a minister of God. He had not raised a weapon against another man since World War I. He searched his conscience and found nothing in military law or Christian ethics that forbade him to defend himself against murder.

Borneman raced to the kitchen and picked out a huge meat knife. Then he stood by the door, the knife raised above his head, and waited.

Finally there were footsteps, and the door opened. It was an American Ranger. "Anyone else in here?" he asked calmly. Borneman whispered, "Thank God," and dropped the knife.

The prisoners were free.

HOMECOMING HONORS

Chaplain Borneman's heroism did not go unrecognized at home. Senator James M. Mead of New York, addressing the Senate about the war record of the chaplains, cited two examples: "The Navy's O'Callahan and the Army's Borneman, both of whom survived the war, are among those who will live forever in the hearts of Americans." Borneman received three Silver Stars for Gallantry in Action, two Bronze Stars for heroism, three Purple Hearts, and three Distinguished Unit Citations.

He was returned to the Philippines and sent to Japan as a witness in the war crimes trials. In 1955 he received the rank of brigadier general, retired. Although he has met Japanese people in professional or social situations since then, he admits that it is still hard to forget that the Japanese he knew in the concentration camp behaved in a way that seemed hardly human.

After 5 years in the Philippines, John Borneman saw American church life with new eyes. He couldn't forget the ragged, emaciated members of the Protestant Church of Military Camp No. 1, ready to suffer like the early Christian martyrs for their faith. Somehow the well-dressed, overfed worshipers in stateside churches didn't stand up too well in comparison. Something was missing.

In a magazine article published in 1946 Borneman wrote: "Here we still find, possibly in an increasing measure, selfishness, greed, lust for power, and petty politics. This is true among churchmen as well as in the lay professions. I have seen Washington churches filled each Sunday, and as I worship I wonder how much of an actual impression the service makes on the soul of each one present. How much is carried out into the actual battle of life where the Christian spirit counts?

"I am confident that each chaplain who served among the war prisoners of Cabanatuan and has made the supreme sacrifice could conscientiously face his Master—and did receive the words 'Well done * * * enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.' Are we concerned about serving men through the spirit of Christ, or are we more concerned about rank, knowing meh of influence, exercising the power of petty politics? That I have wondered about since my return."

These observations, Borneman admitted, were not new. But to men who had seen war at its worst, "they stand out to us now as a magnesium flare thrown from an airplane on a dark night."

When Army doctors at Walter Reed discharged Chaplain Borneman in 1950 with the recommendation that he retire from the service, they told him he had only 5 more years to live. Characteristically, Borneman decided to give those 5 years to the church. Fifty-one was too young to go on the shelf.

But that was more than 9 years ago, and Chaplain Borneman is still at work on a job that keeps him constantly on the go. He visits all the seminaries where Presbyterians study, talking with young men interested in the chaplaincy. He works with military bases in all the services anywhere in the world where Presbyterians are serving. In 1958, for example, he spent 271 days on the road—or more accurately, in the air, for he still loves flying and does most of his traveling by plane. He has kept his private pilot's license since youth, and recently "checked out in jets"—one of the few private jet pilots in the country. On three occasions on the job he has hired planes, and flown them himself, when commercial or military transport was not available.

On January 15, 1953, Borneman was traveling by train from his Philadelphia office to his other office in Washington. The train failed to slow down as it approached Union Station. Brakes gone, the engine smashed into the station and plunged through the floor. Forty-one passengers were injured, eight of them critically. Chaplain Borneman was thrown into the aisle; he picked himself up, found no broken bones, and set about seeing what he could do for the injured.

Not long after that the airplane in which Borneman was a passenger departed from Cleveland Airport. But shortly after takeoff a motor dropped out. "The pilot did a marvelous job of crashlanding," Borneman says. But one passenger was killed, several injured. Borneman came through unharmed.

Tropical diseases and his many wounds have taken a heavy toll on Borneman's health. In spite of his full schedule of work, those who know him personally realize that some of his appointments are tentative. Although he begins his working day at 9, there are some mornings when it's just not possible to be on deck that early. "With all the aches and pains I've got," he recently confided to a friend, "it would be easy just to lie down and die."

But although he talks now and then of turning the headship of the chaplains over to a younger man, he has no notion of retiring from the ministry. If he leaves the chaplains' department, he will take some other job in the church. John Borneman has an ironclad conviction that the Lord has kept him alive and able to work only because he wants to keep on working.

World Coffee Production

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, the results of two recent surveys on world coffee production and U.S. coffee consumption are of great interest to those of us concerned with inter-American trade relations.

These surveys were published by the Pan-American Coffee Bureau, an instrument of 13 Latin American coffee-producing nations. One survey relates to coffee consumption in this country, the largest coffee importing nation in the world, from 1950 to 1959.

The studies are detailed and authoritative. The bureau has published its annual statistical review of world coffee trade for the past 22 years. It has conducted regular surveys of U.S. coffee consumption since 1950. This year, the U.S. survey was made by an independent research agency, Corby Research Service of New Rochelle, N.Y.

The report on coffee consumption by the people of the United States is a study in depth of the current market in this country. It reveals that since 1950 our people have increased their coffee drinking by 100 million cups a day, from 290 to 390 million. It further shows that 75 percent of our population, 10 years of age or over, now drinks coffee on an average of four cups a day.

The report states that the most striking increase in U.S. coffee drinking in the past decade is a spectacular rise of 100 percent in the number of cups being drunk between meals—that is, during coffee breaks. The coffee break has become well established as a national institution and now accounts for 28 percent of our total coffee consumption.

Americans between the ages of 30 and 40 comprise the largest category of coffee drinkers, according to the report, consuming an average of more than four cups daily. On a regional basis, the far West leads the Nation in its coffee consumption, followed by the Midwest, the East, and the South.

For the inveterate coffee drinker, the most interesting aspect of this study relates to what might be termed the "quality gap" between U.S. coffee consumption and U.S. coffee use. While we now consume 35 percent more coffee than we did 10 years ago, we are using only 10 percent more pounds. This means, according to the report, that "Americans are drinking a much weaker brew—than the average cup of coffee being served in U.S. homes today is being brewed at a rate of nearly 65 cups to the pound, whereas the recommended rate for the best flavor and maximum body is 40 cups to the pound."

The report explains that the trend toward weak coffee began a few years ago when coffee prices were high and has not yet reversed itself, even though coffee prices are again at 1950 levels or below. In this connection, the survey also points out that while wholesale and retail coffee prices are back to 1950 levels, 87 percent of all eating places now charge a dime per cup, while in 1950 more than half charged a nickel.

All of this is, of course, interesting sociological data, but it is more. For those concerned with inter-American trade relations and the economic welfare of our hemisphere, these statistics have a special significance. This can best be illustrated by relating the information supplied in the U.S. report to that included in the Bureau's statistical review of world coffee trade.

During 1958, the world review informs us, six Latin American countries relied on coffee for more than half of their foreign currency receipts. For Guatemala, Haiti, and El Salvador, the proportion last year exceeded 70 percent. For Colombia, 85 percent. And for Brazil, which in a recent year obtained almost 70 percent of its foreign trade receipts from coffee exports, the 1958 level fell to 55 percent, due to relatively low shipments.

To further realize the dependence of our Latin American coffee-producing neighbors on U.S. imports and consumption, consider these economic factors:

First. In terms of dollar volume, coffee remains the most valuable agricultural commodity imported into this country, ranking second only to petroleum products in total import value.

Second. Of total world exports of 36½ million bags of coffee in 1958, the United States imported approximately 20 million. Latin American producing nations supplied 72 percent of the world total and 85 percent of the U.S. total.

Third. In turn, Latin American coffee-producing nations comprised nearly 20 percent of the total U.S. export market, purchasing nearly $3½ billion worth of merchandise from this country.

Fourth. Because nearly a million more tons of coffee were grown than were consumed last year, foreign exchange earnings of the Latin American producing nations continued to decline, since coffee accounts for an average of 24 percent of the exchange earnings of the area.

Fifth. Between 1957 and 1958 the decline in dollar earnings from U.S. imports from Pan American Coffee Bureau nations amounted to nearly $205 million. As the report points out, where this reduction occurred in countries depending heavily on dollar earnings, and where it was relatively substantial, the result in hemispheric trade relations was more balance-of-payments and internal fiscal difficulties.

However, the report states, despite overproduction and accumulating surpluses of green coffee, an orderly market was maintained during 1958 through concerted action by all of the Latin American producing countries. Credit is given here to the operation of the Latin American Coffee Agreement, which went into effect October 1, 1958.

These two reports shed light on Latin American coffee's role as the indispensable denominator of inter-American trade and a healthy hemispheric economy. If any conclusion is to be drawn from these studies, it is that the United States, as the world's largest coffee importer and as the good neighbor of Central and South America, has a definite stake in the efforts being made to solve the growing world coffee crisis.

We cannot stand detached while the economies of 15 Western Hemisphere nations struggle for stability and survival, nor can we safely adhere to a wait-and-see attitude. For, as I have said before, events are moving swiftly in Latin America, and our own self interest dictates that we must anticipate rather than react to consequences.

Our Latin American coffee-producing neighbors have taken giant strides with considerable sacrifice toward solving their dilemma. But it is not simply their problem, it is ours as well. Only through an active interest in this problem and through continued cooperation can we of the United States maintain the symbol of coffee as the cup of friendship in the Americas.

Prince Hall Americanism Day Proclamation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, a fine organization, the Prince Hall Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons of Michigan, whose grand master is a dear and close friend of mine, Mr. William O. Greene, recently proclaimed September 13, 1959, Prince Hall Americanism Day as a memorial to the founder of Negro Masons in the United States. The proclamation is of great merit, and for that reason I insert it into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PRINCE HALL AMERICANISM DAY PROCLAMATION

The history of the American Negro, while inextricably interwoven with the history of the United States, has received far too little mention in documents of the recorded past. This omission has denied the educational values to the masses, of facts pertaining to the American of color, and has inadvertently led to the belief among many people that the Negro has made little or no significant contribution to the founding, growth, security, or well-being of this country.

The one phase of history that does emphasize the Negroes participation, is in that area, which in reality should be underemphasized, slavery. Because this era of our national life, besmirches its vaunted ideals of democracy and exposes the blackest blotch on the escutcheon of the United States rectitude of national conduct.

The psychological effects, resulting from the denial of the acknowledgment of the credits due the Negro, are inescapably bad. He is looked upon by the uninformed of the dominant group as a welfare subject. Primarily because the records give sparse notice to the heroes of his race, their exploits, or

their contributions. Thus, it is commonly assumed that he has not earned a just portion of the fruits of democracy, and is therefore obligated to receive naught, but the dole of tolerance meted out patronizingly to those who are without earned claim to the benefits that the land provides.

Another of the serious effects, emanating from the lack of group information about the true historical facts, are those imposed most strongly upon the Negro himself. He being exposed to the voluminous elaborations of the heroes, exploits, and contributions of other ethnic peoples, and so uninformed by folklore and the absence of accounts of his groups historical background, feels the depressive effects of frustration and inferiority very keenly. And too often to compensate, he commits compulsive acts, that violate social standards, and creates, where understanding does not prevail, a sterotype of a primitive or delinquent personality.

The Negro child, most pathetically victimized by this deficiency in historical inspiration, reacts more pronouncedly to the effects noted, and with his immature mind unable to understand the reasons, he too acts in roles so often repugnant to others, but sufficient and justifiable to him, to prove that "I am somebody."

Fragmentary evidence of the scope and value of the Negro's contribution can be found, only, after diligent exploration and search. However, when the accumulated evidence is put together in readable form and sequence, the amazing results are these in part:

Ever since Christopher Columbus, one of whose pilots was a Negro, discovered the New World, men of color have contributed in ever greater measure to its steady development. Especially so, since the establishment of the United States, from Colonial possession to an international or world entity.

The irrefutable loyalty and courage of the colored citizen has long been traditional. Early tested, during the infamous incident of the Boston massacre, in 1770, when the first American to fall for the then revolutionary cause of freedom was a patriot of color, Chrispus Attucks. He was felled dead on the Commons of Boston by the leadened ball, from the muskets of red-coated British soldiers. Negroes renewed their show of loyalty and courage again during the civil conflict of 1861, when more than 200,000 fought to maintain the Union of the States, and to purchase their freedom from the shackles of slavery.

He has thus shown his loyalty in every national emergency, including the more recent incident, the so-called police action of the Korean affair of 1948–50, where his life's blood flowed more copiously than in any previous military engagement involving his country. His courage, most vividly demonstrated by Doric Miller of naval fame, and Cortney Stanley, of the land forces, whose commanding officer declared him to be "the bravest man I have ever seen." His courage has been unquestionable.

Notable and salutary contributions to the development of this country, and for the advancement of its people, has been made by him in many diversified areas of endeavor.

In the field of medicine and surgery, no name stands out more demonstratively of the Negroes contribution than does that of Dr. Daniel H. Williams, who performed the first successful surgery on the human heart. Or that of George Washington Carver, the miracle scientist of the peanut fame. No name deserves the plaudits of this Nation more emphatically than does that of Benjamin Bannaeker, the inventor of the clock, the surveyor who laid out the cite that now contains the Capitol of our great Nation, Washington, D.C., and whose formula for world peace could, even now, resolve much of the tension that besets our war-jittery world.

What name stands out in bold relief against a background of ignorance more spectacularly than does that of Booker T. Washington, or Mary McCloud Bethune, educators.

Does not the field of diplomacy count among its great, Frederick Douglas, and Ralph Bunche. A list of heroes, by incidence of birth, Negroes, but whose contributions to our national well-being, gives credit to the Negro race, would include Jackie Robinson, the athletic pioneer, Dr. Allen Drew, the creator of the blood bank process and a host of others. A list that would extend to inexhaustible limits.

And finally in presenting such a list, the archives would not produce a more worthy person for historical accolade than that of a man named Prince Hall, for he undisputedly was the forerunner of all of those Negro historical characters, whom history should revere, and to whom memory should pay tribute.

Prince Hall, a Negro, freeborn and of good repute, an American by self-adoption, was a patriot of the early founding days of this Nation, during the Revolutionary period. A man of deep understanding, compassion, and vision. He saw, with his prophetic minds eye, the inevitable need for the preparation of his black brethren, so that they would be ready for the time, when the bonds of slavery would be removed, and they would be spilled into the common stream of American life.

First, the history of Prince Hall tells us, that he became, by self-preparation, one of Americas first religious leaders of color, a minister of the Methodist faith in Massachusetts.

Second, his abiding belief in the inestimable values of brotherly love, relief, and truth, inspired him to seek admission into the most ancient of institutions promoting such tenets in the world, the Masonic fraternity. The records show further, that because of his understanding of the benefits to be derived from association in Masonry, that he interceded in behalf of all Negroes who may qualify for membership. Thus, in 1784 he received permission to organize a masonic lodge in Boston, from the fountainhead of freemasonry, the Grand Lodge of England, to be known as African Lodge No. 459. The first and only legitimate source for free masonry among Negroes in America, even unto this day.

Third, and in subsequent order, Prince Hall did organize the first school for the formal education of the Negro. The political history of the Massachusetts Legislature records Prince Hall did appear before it, and with eloquence of speech with the logic of a humanitarian, did cite the evils of discrimination, protest the un-Christian-like promotion of slavery, and pray by petition for the eradication of these evils in the Commonwealth of his Colony.

When the tyranny of the British reached that intolerable stage, and the people of this new land could no longer bear the inequities in representation and the other enforced restrictions that the English imposed upon them, declared war; Prince Hall, so history relates, did with fervency and zeal petition the Commander in Chief of the Revolutionary American Forces, Gen. George Washington, for the right of men of color, to fight, and if God so willed, to die for this country.

These exemplary acts of Prince Hall, denoting his traits of Americanism, these deeds of positive evidence, conferring historic stature on this illustrious character in American life, should excite the imagination and exalt the pride of people everyhere, but more especially those whose fraternal lineage bind them to him, designated as Prince Hall Masons.

Thus, it is by virtue of these citations that, they who cherish such fraternal kinship, do by annual custom, present to the world at large, and to this Nation specifically, Prince Hall's Americanism record for accreditation to his people; to justify their earned right to claim the full benefits of democracy; to give their young an inspirational figure, a hero of color to emulate; to fill in those blank spaces of history that fail to include the name of this outstanding American. Prince Hall Masons do these and sundry other things, during the birth month of Prince Hall, September. At which time they pay homage and invite public scrutiny to evaluate the continuous efforts of the several thosands of Prince Hall Masons of today, in keeping with their rich American heritage, passed on to them from generation to generation.

Therefore, let it be known, that I, William O. Greene, with high respect and deep adherence to the formentioned practices, do, by the powers vested in the office of Grand Master of Masons, proclaim to all obedient to the Most Worshipful Prince Hall Grand Lodge, of Free and Accepted Masons of Michigan, that—

1. Sunday, September 13, 1959, shall be, and is hereby designated as "Prince Hall Americanism Day," to be celebrated in such manner and form, as shall be hereinafter described.

2. Further, it is decreed that each related body predicating its prerequisites for its membership on the statute of Prince Hall Masons, shall be, and is hereby cordially enjoined to participate in the aforementioned celebration.

3. And lastly, it is by petition of prayer, that we request all members of the Prince Hall family to promote the attendance of their friends, neighbors, and associates of other organizations, to which they may belong, and to the public at large, to share in the festivities of the day.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the M. W. Prince Hall Grand Lodge, F. & A. M. of the State of Michigan, this 1st day of September in the year of light, 1959.

WILLIAM O. GREENE,
Grand Master.

Attest:

DONOVAN A. DOSEY,
Grand Secretary.

Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher, Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in September 1959, a familiar Air Force figure will be missing from Capitol Hill, Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher is being assigned to the Military Air Transport Service after completing his assignment as Director of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force.

General Fisher has provided outstanding service to both Houses of Congress as Director of Legislative Liaison since March 1958. Members of Congress have great responsibilities pertaining to our national defense in these turbulent times,

and General Fisher has been most helpful with his sincere and clear representation of the U.S. Air Force capabilities and requirements. His insight and experience has especially been of unusual assistance in military personnel matters, such as the officer promotion program, to name but one area out of hundreds.

My colleagues in the House join in wishing General Fisher much success in his assignment. We, in Congress, lose a capable and effective liaison officer, but the Military Air Transport Service gains a leader for its Eastern Transport Air Force.

Poison in Your Water—No. 161

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Salt Lake City (Utah) Desert News and Telegram of May 26, 1958, entitled "Clean Up on Sickness":

CLEAN UP ON SICKNESS

This week, the State is facing an alarming increase in the incidence of infectious hepatitis. This disease, commonly known as yellow jaundice, is a serious, debilitating one that takes months, sometimes years to throw off. It is usually associated with polluted water or inadequate sewage disposal. Utah has seen 96 cases so far, compared with 26 at this time a year ago.

This is a disgrace for a State living in the 20th century when methods of prevention of this and other diseases associated with unclean water are thoroughly understood.

Methods of prevention were, in fact, being discussed by official groups even as the hepatitis report was released. One group of officials called for a new Federal study of water pollution in Big and Little Cottonwood Canyons in relation to growing recreation pressures on the canyons. And another group released a report after extensive studies of four Utah rivers. Three of them are serious health hazards, carrying raw human sewage through populated areas.

The two problems are different, of course. No one knows just how much recreational development can be allowed in the canyons without endangering the Salt Lake Valley water supply. A fine treatment plant is finished at the mouth of Big Cottonwood Canyon and construction will soon begin on a plant for Little Cottonwood. How much additional recreation these plants will make possible, if any, is not known. Of course pure water comes ahead of any other consideration, but we certainly should have a competent study to find out how much recreation we can have in the canyons and still be sure of pure water.

But there's no doubt at all about the other problem, that of the shocking pollution of the Jordan, Price and Weber Rivers, and of other streams in the State. Any raw sewage dumped into a stream is too much.

To this problem, there's just one solution. Money is at the root of it. Utah's growing communities simply cannot continue letting their sewage go untreated.

A number of Utah County communities have shown the way. Sick and tired of the way the recreational possibilities of Utah Lake were being lost by its use as a cesspool, they took action, built sewage treatment plants and are on the way to rehabilitating the lake.

What they can do, others can do—and must do. And now is the time to do it. Building now can create much-needed jobs. The recession means that contractors are sharpening their bids. The bond market is good. Inflation shows no sign of ending. A time may never come when sewage treatment can be obtained as inexpensively as it can right now.

The growing threat of shameful pollution-caused disease should be a most effective warning to hurry up.

The Threat of Communism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article in the Appendix of the RECORD by Paul Harvey. This article deals with the problem of communism in Latin America. Mr. Harvey's point is well taken. No doubt we should concern ourselves with communism in Asia, but we should not forget about the threat of communism in Latin America. It behooves the United States to formulate that policy which will channel the revolutions of that area into democratic ends.

The article follows:

A TROJAN HORSE IN CARIBBEAN

(By Paul Harvey)

I'm concerned, frankly anxious, about Latin America. And I get the frightening impression that hardly anybody else is.

U.S. intelligence has irrefutable evidence that Cuba's Communists are getting their orders direct from Moscow.

I mean Moscow sent one of its own Soviet intelligence officers to Cuba to "direct the penetration and control of the Castro government."

UNDER ANOTHER NAME

In Russia other Latin American Communists are being secretly trained to return home and set up Red dictatorships in our hemisphere. And this is important: Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of our Central Intelligence Agency, says: "In Cuba the Communists presently call themselves the Popular Socialist Party."

The Castro brothers now vigorously deny that they are Communists. Moscow directs those denials.

The Moscow directive specifically calls for concealing Communist influence in Latin America so that the United States will not be prematurely alerted.

Further, Red China is establishing a newspaper in Havana. The Red China party line is charging that "the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 was a plot by U.S. gangsters to dominate the Americas. U.S. imperialism has a dirty history of over 100 years of infiltration and aggression and plunder of Latin America."

NOT LOCALLY WORRIED

For some strange reason Americans are inclined to become more disturbed about Red moves in the Far East than about similar inroads in our own hemisphere.

I ask associates, "Why are you unconcerned about this penetration of the Caribbean?" They reply, "We can handle it."

Americans who are inclined to tolerate this cancer off the coast of Florida, assuming, "We can take care of it," are basing their assumption on the fact that we always have.

But our previous experience with periodic revolutions in these republics predates the Moscow-directed worldwide conspiracy.

Things are different now. It is not a recurrence of isolated brush fires any more. It's a vast blaze which already has engulfed a third of the earth and is licking at our own shores.

MOVING IN NEXT DOOR

The Organization of American States tried, those six desperate days in Santiago, to organize an effective force of firefighters. Already, however, they have been denied access to Cuba, which is the present Red beachhead—the springboard for creation of Castro's "Congress of Latin American Peoples."

This congress was blueprinted in Moscow and delivered to Castro by Soviet agent Vadim Kotchergin. The arch thieves of modern history have now moved in next door.

Coincident with Khrushchev's visit to the United States, Castro will launch his own peace offensive. And many naive Americans will fall to see behind the beard.

Communism (the government taking care of everybody) has a special fascination for the Latin American who is not traditionally industrious. Somehow we must let him know that Moscow does not promise freedom to loaf. But that communism uses that promise as bait until it puts the loafers to work in chains.

The Farmer Is Still an Important Citizen—Let's Not Count Him Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I believe Members of Congress, as well as others will be interested in a well written and informative editorial that appeared in the August 30, 1959, issue of the Kansas City (Mo.) Star. It concerns the general farm situation as it relates to other industries and especially its importance to the human race.

The article points out that although we now have a surplus of food in America, food is more important to humanity than any other product. Attention is also called to the importance of the farmer in this day and age. The editorial follows:

THE FARMER IS STILL AN IMPORTANT CITIZEN

As we near the end of summer, this growing season is producing crops that approach last year's alltime record. Let's take our hats off to the farmer and take a good look at what he is doing for this country. For

the moment let's deemphasize agriculture's price troubles.

The farm problem has dominated the agricultural scene for so long that it has become almost a legend. The public has become accustomed to day-by-day argument over farm programs, surpluses, subsidies, and parity. No wonder many people who are not fully familiar with the situation look upon the farmer as a man who can't run his own business and one who is always looking for a handout from the Government.

He does have his troubles, let's not deny it. But does America have any greater asset than its farmers?

Food is more important to the human race than any other product. In America, we haven't the slightest worry about where it is coming from. A great highway building program, industrial expansion, the production of luxury items, all can be undertaken with confidence in adequate manpower. Each year more and more people can be spared from the farm. This isn't true in many countries.

If our major worry were producing enough food we couldn't spare the manpower to turn out the many things that are a part of the modern American way of everyday living. Even in war, this country has not gone hungry. It has been the breadbasket for its allies.

Our farmers are producing this abundance with fewer and fewer workers. In the earliest years of the Nation, nearly all people were farmers. A man, who had the help of his family, produced enough for that family. Today's farmer produces enough for himself and 23 other persons. This point can't be overemphasized. If we are to be an industrial nation, these other 23 people must have plenty of food and fiber. Economic progress halts whenever a nation fails to produce the necessities of life with less and less labor.

The farm surpluses, troublesome to farmers and the Government, are in effect insurance. We are virtually guaranteed an abundance for months and years ahead. These surpluses bear down upon farm prices. It is ironic that the farmer efficiency which produces the surpluses is so often costly to the farmer. In effect the farmer pays for the insurance against hunger in this country instead of collecting on it at the marketplace. We don't want continued surpluses that are too big to handle.

While the housewife may regard food prices high at the store, farm organization authorities point to the fact that an hour's work will buy more food today than ever before in history. Also, more and more of the cost of food is represented in the expenses of delivery, processing, retailing, and built-in maid service.

No longer do you buy a live chicken and take it home to be killed and cleaned. In fact, more and more foods are fully prepared for cooking or even serving on the table. These services all add to the food bill.

Farmers resent charges that their prices account for the high cost of living. The reverse is true. In the cost of living index food prices have either held stable or dropped. If food had been going up, like everything else, obviously the cost of living today would be much higher than it is.

Last year Americans spent $57.7 billion for food. The farmers who grew it received about 36 percent of that amount.

So much has been said about farm subsidies that the average person may well believe that farmers alone have benefited from Government largess. Here again farm organizations, some of which are clearly unsatisfied with current farm programs, point out that farm subsidies are only a part of the benefits handed out through Government channels to American business. The tariff, they suggest, is the greatest subsidy ever granted business and labor. Its costs are hidden as the public pays through prices at the market rather than in taxes as in the case with farm subsidies.

Subsidies helped build the railroads, ships and airlines. Government payment of postal deficits subsidizes mail costs of magazines and other publications. Government contracts assure profits to manufacturers of war materials. In fact, an extremely impressive list of subsidies can be developed by those who wish to make the point that farmers are not alone in getting financial assistance from Uncle Sam.

Of course, the fact that some one else has or is receiving a subsidy does not automatically indicate that farmers, also, should be put into a Government program. Neither does the amazing job of producing food necessarily suggest that they should have Government aid. The Nation faces a practical problem of finding a workable plan. The farmers are dissatisfied with their present lot, despite 30 years of Government programs. This fact indicates that subsidies do not automatically solve their problems.

Too many people are ready to suggest adoption of any kind of a Government price support program on the theory that "others are getting theirs, too." Conceivably, if farmers were better off without any programs, it would be logical to eliminate the programs. We don't think this is going to be done, but the theory holds just the same.

Agriculture is tremendously important to the economy of the Nation. Kansas City always has realized this fact. It was given a forceful demonstration in the spring of 1958 when improving conditions on the farm sparked a strong pickup in business.

Agriculture is a dynamic industry despite its price troubles. Since 1940 total farm output has increased 40 percent. During the same period the number of farmers or farm workers has dropped faster than at any time in history. Today's farmer produces as much in an hour as he did in 2 hours in 1940. Nonfarm labor and manufacturing productivity, on the other hand, have increased slightly less than 50 percent in the same period.

Recently C. Peairs Wilson, director of the School of Agriculture at Kansas State University, compiled data to show the status of agriculture in the American economy. He found among other things:

"Agriculture is the biggest buyer, seller and borrower in the United States.

"The inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the assets of the American steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry.

"Agriculture uses 6½ million tons of finished steel a year—more than is used in a year's output of passenger cars. It consumes 17½ billion gallons of crude petroleum—more than is used by any other industry—and 285 million pounds of raw rubber—enough to make tires for 6 million motor cars. Agriculture takes 22 billion kilowatt hours of electrical power—more than enough to serve Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston for a year.

"Each year farmers purchase farm supplies worth about $16 billion.

"The agricultural plant each year increases its use of capital, of science and technology, of management and research.

"There are twice as many jobs in industries that serve farmers as in farming."

The U.S. population is increasing rapidly. Right now it is about 177 million. A conservative estimate used by Government authorities is that the population will grow from the present 177 million to 230 million by 1975. This means total farm production must be increased another 35 to 45 percent by that time. No one doubts that it will be done. Presumably there will come a day in the distant future when this country, along with all others, may face food shortages. But this generation in America has no fears.

What does this summation of the farm situation suggest?

First, we should not discount the importance of farming to the Nation just because we have no worries about food or because farmers presumably are always caught in price troubles. Per capita income on farms is about half the income of nonfarm employment. This is disparity. A way to change it must be found.

In its delemma agriculture requires the understanding of the urban population. In fact, it also demands greater understanding from farmers themselves. Agriculture is involved in vast changes—declining farm population, the increase in the size of farms and mechanization. The changes bring problems of adaption of technology, of staggering surpluses and increased costs. The complex situation perplexes the experts.

Because of their strength, industry and labor unions have been able to a large degree to take care of themselves. Farmers, as individuals, have turned to the Government in the hope of getting a better share of national income. Years of dissatisfaction suggest that the Government programs to date have not been successful. More changes are in order.

Let's not count the farmer out. He's a mighty important fellow to have around.

Consequences Can Be Disastrous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Cyril A. Zebot, professor of economics at Georgetown University, recently addressed a letter to the editor of the New York Times. In this letter, Professor Zebot points out the inflationary consequences that will flow from the failure of the Congress to remove the interest rate ceiling on Government bonds.

This letter, published in the New York Times of August 25, 1959, should be "must" reading for every member of the majority party. It should be remembered that the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee have unanimously supported the request of the President to remove this restriction which hinders the proper management of our huge national debt. The responsibility for failure to act in this matter and the consequence of such failure rests completely on the Democrat majority in the Congress.

The President in his message to you of last Tuesday said:

The administration is willing to assume full responsibility for managing the Federal Government's debt if it is allowed to do so free from artificial restrictions and on a parity with other borrowers.

If the requested legislation is not enacted, those in the Congress who are unwilling to pass it must assume full responsibility for the possibly serious consequences.

I will repeat what I said to the House last July 23:

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our Republican membership on this side of the aisle would almost unanimously support the rec-

ommendation of the President and the recommendation of the Treasury in this respect. It is not my desire here and now to make this a political issue, but I would point out that if this is to be a political issue, we on this side of the aisle, the President, and the Secretary of the Treasury, are willing to take responsibility for the consequences of giving the Treasury the authority requested.

But if the Democratic majority ties the bill up in committee and fails to act, it must accept responsibility for the consequences that will flow from such failure to give the Treasury the tools it needs. They must assume responsibility for the consequences which will face the country if they fail to act. And I repeat the consequences can be disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, before this matter is allowed to die, please read this letter of Professor Zebot:

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The surprise decision of the House Ways and Means Committee to shelve the President's request for removal of the archaic interest rate ceiling on Government bonds should not be dismissed lightly. It is doubly inflationary and it will cause an increase in the servicing cost of the national debt.

The decision is inflationary because it will force the Treasury to refinance over $100 billion of the national debt in short-term securities over the next year. With growing business prosperity the demand for short-term Government securities on the part of nonfinancial corporations will subside, and the Federal Reserve will be compelled to provide extra reserves, beyond the monetary requirements of real economic growth, to enable commercial banks to absorb an ever-larger amount of short-term Government securities.

In addition, the indefinite duration of the statutory interest-rate ceiling will generate further inflationary expectations, with the corresponding increase in the velocity of circulation of currency, and thus still more potential inflation. As an accompanying result there will be added pressures on the yields of outstanding long-term Government securities and on all interest rates.

The decision of the House Ways and Means Committee, if it is not reversed promptly, will accomplish exactly the opposite of its intention.

ADMINISTERED INFLATION

There will be attempts at exonerating the committee's responsibility for the inflationary consequences of its decision. It will be argued that our new inflation is of administered or cost push kind and therefore unrelated to the national debt management and beyond the reach of monetary policy.

The argument does not hold water. The administered or cost push theory of prices deals only with one set of forces that act on the price level. It is not a general theory, and even in its partial relevance it has not yet been fully developed and demonstrated.

But even if one assumed that all inflation stemmed from cost push forces and corresponding price administration, national debt management and monetary policy would still be relevant in relation to the price level. We have no public policy to deal directly with wage and price administration.

RESTRAINT ON PRICES

The steel industry is a telling case in point. When cost push forces press on prices, monetary and fiscal policies are the only available price-level restraints to be used as public policy for general welfare. Faced with anti-inflationary monetary and fiscal policies, the cost push forces in our economy must depend on offsetting increases in the velocity of money or, if velocity is checked, too, they are saddled with the responsibility for the resulting unemployment.

By forcing our national debt management and monetary policy sytematically to overexpand the supply of money, the House Ways and Means Committee's decision has not only caused the resurgence of a potential demand-pull inflation but has also removed the only existing public policy checks on the cost push forces in our economy.

Congress must find a way to correct the dangerous monetary situation before it adjourns. The political leadership that permitted the hasty House committee decision must be made aware of the fact that general economic literacy is not so low that people will fail to detect the source of the grave consequences that will follow if the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds is not removed now.

CYRIL A. ZEBOT.

WASHINGTON, *August 22, 1959.*

Strengthening the Foundations of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, Under Secretary of State, at 82d annual banquet, American Bar Association, Americana Hotel, Miami Beach, Fla., Thursday, August 27, 1959:

STRENGTHENING THE FOUNDATIONS OF FREEDOM

It is a distinct privilege to address this distinguished gathering and to join with you in honoring Mr. Grenville Clark, who received the American Bar Association Medal tonight in recognition of a lifetime of public service which culminated in his monumental work, "World Peace Through Law."

The achievement of world peace through law is a goal which motivates the conduct of our country's international relations. It was eloquently stated by a lawyer and diplomat of great stature, the late John Foster Dulles, when he called, in his last public address, for the substitution of justice and law for force. The realization of this ideal objective, toward which Mr. Dulles labored throughout his lifetime, has been substantially advanced by the American Bar Association during the past year. Thanks to your initiative, lawyers in many parts of the world are now working to formulate an action program designed to help move mankind nearer to the goal of peace through law. This increasing consciousness of international problems in the legal profession is a significant contribution to efforts of the United States to strengthen the foundations of freedom throughout the world.

Freedom has a value which the American people down through history have cherished above all else. The preamble to the Constitution submitted to the States in 1789 stated as one of its principal purposes "to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity." But this declared purpose was not enough to satisfy the people. They refused to accept the Constitution until the essentials of freedom had been specifically guaranteed in the first 10 amendments: The Bill of Rights. Thus, we have held freedom—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and of the press, and all the other individual freedoms—to be a prior condition of government itself.

We conceive of freedom as being within the context of the rule of law. Our Founding Fathers associated natural rights with natural laws. This linkage between freedom and law is explicit in our approach to international problems. We feel that freedom and law are as indivisible as freedom itself is indivisible.

Today, on the world scene, freedom is locked in a fateful contest with the formidable challenge of Communist imperialism. Hundreds of millions of human being in Soviet Russia and Communist China never taste the blessings of freedom. In the satellite countries, ancient freedoms are being ruthlessly suppressed. This new absolutsm is more formidable than any in modern history because it coincides in time with the tremendous and continuing advance of science and technology. It is not only in the military field that Communist leaders are drawing upon science and technology to strengthen their position. They are also utilizing science and technology to strengthen their economic position.

If the economic planning of Soviet leaders was aimed basically at raising the living standards of the Soviet citizen, we would cheer them on. For we sincerely wish the Soviet leaders every success in their efforts to improve the drab lot of their own people. It is not the economic progress of the Sino-Soviet bloc that concerns us. What we are concerned with—and what we firmly oppose—are the efforts of the Communist leaders to dominate other countries by a combination of economic cajolery, subversion, and artful propaganda, backed up, when opportune, by military power.

We and our allies have both the military might and the determination to meet the threat posed by military power in the hands of Communism's leaders. Frustrated by our strength and firmness of purpose the Communists are turning more and more to economic, political, and psychological penetration of the underdeveloped areas in order to achieve their goal of world domination. They are pounding home the doctrine that communism is the best way to produce material progress. Constant repetition of this thesis has emerged as a major weapon in Communist efforts to subvert free societies beyond their borders. We delude ourselves if we do not recognize that in many of the miserably poor and overpopulated lands of the less-developed world, this doctrine can carry a dangerous appeal if their peoples fail to recognize the dreadful cost of communism in terms of human misery and degradation.

But communism can make little headway in even the poorest countries so long as their people have hope of realizing their mounting expectations for a better life under free institutions. For the appeal of freedom is irresistible when it goes hand in hand wth economic and social progress.

We sometimes fail to remember that the political revolution which created the United States has had a greater influence for good on the rest of the non-Communist world than any other single political event in history. That influence is still visibly strong and vital. Since World War II, nations comprising a billion people have found inspiration in our example in establishing the framework of their new, free societies. They now look to us for assistance in realizing the material fruits of freedom.

If we are to help the newly emerging peoples to resist the spurious lure of communism—and, by so doing, safeguard our own liberty—we must continue to uphold the supremacy of freedom as a standard of human value. For we know that in the long run, our freedom depends upon the freedom of others. This awareness goes far back in our history. Even during our so-called pe-

riods of isolation, our sympathies and moral support were with those elsewhere in the world who were upholding freedom.

However, if we are to meet the 20th century challenge to freedom in the newly emerging countries, we must extend more than sympathy and moral support to their peoples. We must continue to extend technical and financial assistance until they can make a real start toward progress. We must devote substantial resources to this effort and we must cast our thinking in terms of perseverance over a long period of time.

We must also, in company with other more advanced nations of the free world, so organize our material and human resources that we continue to outperform communism. We must demonstrate that the economic systems which flourish under freedom can and will, in every country, promote the fullest development of human life—not only in material aspects, but in spiritual terms as well. At the same time, we should stanchly uphold the principle that there is diversity in freedom. Unlike the Communists, we do not seek to impose our system and our institutions upon other peoples. Rather, we seek to help them work out their own destinies, in their own fashion, in freedom, and under law. We do not seek the re-creation of our own image. Our only aim is to help develop sound, independent societies capable of joining us if they so choose in securing peace and progress in the world.

To succeed in this task, we must enlist the combined resources of our Government and of our private citizens and institutions. There is much that we are doing today to meet the challenge of international development. Our response, in which the mutual security program plays a major part, is broad and varied—one in which the American people can take justifiable pride:

Through technical cooperation we are helping to create the human skills so conspicuously lacking in the less developed countries.

Through grant assistance we are providing some of the funds urgently required to maintain stability in the face of the military and economic pressure of the Sino-Soviet bloc.

Through a variety of institutions, we are providing part of the capital needed for the basic facilities essential to growth. The Development Loan Fund is our newest financial instrument. And we are continuing to provide financing through the Export-Import Bank and through our long-term participation in the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, which institutions are now expanding their resources as the result of an American initiative.

We are now actively exploring the possibilities of giving the World Bank a new and more flexible tool for development through the creation of an International Development Association.

We have recently taken a leading part in creating the Inter-American Development Bank, which will soon begin to play an important role in the progress of Latin America.

Our Public Law 480 program provides resources in the form of foods and fibers.

Currently, through tax and other incentives, we are exploring every practicable way to stimulate the flow of private American investment, with its many accompanying technological skills, to the less developed countries.

All of these actions taken together provide a coherent and rounded attack on the greatest problem of our time: the development of the less fortunate areas of the world. They are complemented by our continuing efforts to break down barriers to trade so that the peoples of the less developed lands may find markets for the goods which they must sell if they and we are to prosper.

We also know that in a free society, economic progress can be achieved only under legal standards and in accordance with the principles of justice. There is a recent development in this field which I regard as highly important and in which your association has played, and will continue to play, a leading role:

On November 6, 1958, the American Bar Association accepted a planning grant from the International Cooperation Administration to study the feasibility of a conference of lawyers from many nations "to consider and recommend means of developing and strengthening within and among nations, legal concepts, standards and institutions which will contribute, through facilitating the expansion of the flow of international investment and trade and otherwise, to the economic growth of such nations and which will facilitate peaceful settlement of disputes within and among nations."

This grant was made in accordance with our deep conviction that government help, important as it is and will continue to be, cannot do the whole job in promoting development. Private capital, carrying with it management techniques and abilities, not only contributes directly to economic growth it also provides the picture of our free enterprise system in action. And we must remember that the reservoirs of private capital are far larger than anything that is likely to be available to government.

In short, if the free world is to stay free, if the spark of international economic progress is to be fanned into growing health, there must be greater activity overseas by private investors. Therefore, we were very pleased when this study was entrusted to a special committee on world peace through law, which had a distinguished membership under the chairmanship of your former president, Charles S. Rhyne.

In the committee's report, which was submitted on May 18, 1959, the committee recommended, among other things, the holding of an international conference of lawyers. Two of the agenda topics suggested by the committee deal directly with the problems of development. They are the following:

"Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for arbitration of disputes between governments and of disputes growing out of concessions contracts and international business transactions between governments and individuals and between private parties.

"Extension and improvement of institutions and procedures for the improvement of legal framework for the economic advancement of all nations and the removal of the legal uncertainties and fears which now block such advancement."

Because of the Government's interest in promoting the security of private investment abroad, we support the objectives in these two agenda items. The International Cooperation Administration is prepared to join with you in discussing plans for an international conference of lawyers and the sharing with private foundations and other organizations in its cost.

I look forward with great anticipation to the results of such a conference of lawyers. There is a pressing need to promote a better respect for the rule of law in international relations. But that is only a beginning. The function that lawyers such as yourselves can best perform in this field is to develop and propose concrete measures which will in actuality bring this about. I hope and trust that the proposed world conference will make real progress toward that goal.

Now I have been speaking of our own American programs to help promote international economic growth. Since we, for better or for worse, are now the largest and most powerful industrialized country in the free world, our example and leadership are indispensable in this effort. But, fortunately, we are not alone. It has become a cooperative venture in which we are being joined with increasing vigor by more and more of the other industrialized nations of the free world which have successfully completed their postwar economic recovery. In addition to their participation in the effective work of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, and Japan last year made further governmental contributions to development through either grants or loans. Significant aid is also being provided by Australia, Canada and New Zealand. In the field of private investment, businessmen from these other industrialized countries have been very active—in some areas even more so than our own businessmen.

It is our view that the flourishing economies of the other materially favored Nations of the free world enable them to assume a growing share of the responsibility for assisting the newly emerging countries. We believe that they will accept increased responsibility according to their capabilities. We also feel that the time has come for better coordination of free world development efforts, and we intend shortly to initiate conversations to bring it about. An expanded and truly cooperative effort with our allies can lead to a new era in international development. For nothing is beyond the capacity of the combined economic power of the free world.

This, then, is the central task of our foreign policy: The advancement of peace and freedom by promoting economic and spiritual development throughout the world within a framework of law.

It is not a narrowly conceived policy of fighting communism. It is a broadly conceived policy of strengthening the foundations of freedom by enriching the daily lives of half the human race.

It is not a negative policy of waging economic warfare with the Sino-Soviet bloc. It is a constructive policy of economic growth and development, of continuing progress, of providing hope for the future.

It is a task in which the legal profession has an important part to play. For the process of economic development under free institutions cannot take place in chaos or in disorder. It must have the security provided by law.

The American Oil Consumer Pays for Using American-Flag Ships but He Does Not Get Them

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the United States has become a major importer of raw materials, particularly oil. In 1946 we imported some 20 million tons of oil. Last year we imported over 85 million tons of oil—more than $800 million worth. According to figures published by the Chase Manhattan Bank, our oil imports alone will double in the next 7 years. During the same period of time, our merchant marine has been virtually excluded from participating in

the international oil trade. American ships carried 76 percent of our oil imports in 1946, and today we are carrying less than 2 percent.

As a major oil importer, it is essential both for commerce and defense for the United States to have its own tanker fleet. Without our own ships the real cost of oil is increased, since we also import the value of the transportation. The absence of our own merchant fleet means that we cannot choose the source of our supplies.

I am pleased to find that the American tanker operators and the American maritime unions have formed the Joint Committee for American-Flag Tankers to seek a solution to this very vital and perilous problem—the disappearance of the American flag from the international oil trade on which we depend now for nearly 15 percent of our petroleum and petroleum products. Everyone interested in America's future economic well-being will welcome this affirmative move by management and labor to work together for the national interest, which demands and requires a healthy and secure American-flag fleet.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following announcement of the formation of the Joint Committee for American-Flag Tankers:

THE AMERICAN OIL CONSUMER PAYS FOR USING AMERICAN-FLAG SHIPS BUT HE DOES NOT GET THEM

Mr. Joseph Curran, president of the National Maritime Union of America and Mr. Paul Hall, presidnt of the Seafarers International Union, announce the formation of the Joint Committee for American-Flag Tankers composed of American-flag tanker owners and operators and the American maritime unions. Mr. Curran and Mr. Hall will serve as directors of the committee, representing labor, and two additional directors will subsequently be named representing management.

The objective of this committee is to achieve conditions whereunder American-flag tankers will be assured of profitable long-term employment. It is not merely, the interests of American seamen and American tanker owners that are at stake, however, because the perilous situation now confronting the American-flag tanker industry endangers our vital national interest, national defense, and foreign policy as well as endangering the free world.

Because of the un-American policies of the major international American oil companies, the American-flag tanker has been virtually excluded from participating in the carriage of oil imported into this country. American-flag participation in our oil imports has declined from 76 percent in 1946 to less than 2 percent at the present time. If something is not done, this exclusion will become permanent and the independent American-flag tanker will be destroyed.

The program will bring the facts to the attention of Congress, the administration, and the public. It encompasses a recognition of the following accepted principles:

1. An American-flag tanker fleet is necessary for our national defense and in order to assure that our commercial imports will be carried at fair and reasonable rates.

2. An independent American-flag tanker fleet cannot continue to exist unless these vessels are assured of a reasonable participation in the carriage of our petroleum importations.

3. The exclusion of American-flag tankers from our import trade imperils our foreign policy in the Middle East as well as jeopardizing our national defense and security.

4. The American consumer is actually paying for using American-flag tankers but they are not being used.

Unless these facts are recognized the American-flag tanker industry is bankrupt. The use of American-flag tankers for a reasonable portion of our oil imports will cost the American consumer nothing. He already pays for the use of such vessels to the major oil companies. The major oil companies, however, expropriate this payment for themselves.

Middle East oil, imported by the major oil companies, is approximately one-half as expensive as domestic oil. The posted price of oil in the Persian Gulf (the price at which oil companies sell oil to themselves) is $13.44 a ton, while domestic oil costs $26.46 a ton in Texas. Current tanker rates from the Persian Gulf are not $13.02 a ton but less than $3.25 per ton. The difference of nearly $10, amounts to 72 percent of the posted price of Middle East oil. This is pocketed by the oil companies, who have in addition already made—after all taxes—from $10 to $12 a ton profit in the Middle East in the production of the oil.

The American consumer pays these companies exactly the same price for Middle East oil as for domestic oil. In round figures, he pays $13 a ton to the major oil companies for ocean transportation. This is more than sufficient to employ American-flag tankers and still leave the oil companies a substantial profit, but the oil companies pay only $3 a ton for transportation on cheap foreign-flag vessels and pocket the difference. Of course, this policy is calculated to destroy the American-flag tanker fleet because it cannot compete with tax dodging cheap-labor foreign flag vessels. It is a policy of arrogance and greed that puts profits and tax dodging above patriotism and the American national interest.

High Gas Tax Rate Is Attacked

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, the gasoline tax has proved an effective device in providing funds for developing our highway system. Considerable caution should, however, be exercised before any upward adjustments are effected in our already high gasoline tax rates, for, as the following article by Leroy Snowdon so effectively points out, such increases in rates might very well result in lower total income as a consequence of reduced consumption:

[From the Portland Sunday Telegram, Aug. 23, 1959]

HIGH GAS TAX RATE IS ATTACKED—LEVY POLICY SHOULD BE REEXAMINED, OIL OFFICIAL DECLARES

(By Leroy Snowdon, executive secretary, Maine Petroleum Association)

This year marks two anniversaries of significance to the petroleum industry and its customers.

One is the birthday of the industry itself—the 100th anniversary of the drilling of the 1st commercial oil well at Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1859.

The other is the 36th anniversary of the levy of the first gasoline tax by Maine, July 7, 1923.

In retrospect it seems certain that neither the founder of the oil industry, Edwin L. Drake, nor the originators of the gasoline tax had any idea of the future magnitude of what they were starting.

In its first year, the American petroleum industry produced a mere 2,000 barrels of crude oil. Some 2,461 million barrels were produced last year.

Coming along 64 years after the industry's founding, the gasoline tax showed the same capacity for growth. In its first year this tax produced only a little more than $500,000 in revenue. Last year this taxation brought in a total of $22,500,000 to the State of Maine.

The people who hit on the idea of taxing gasoline found a way of taking in barrels of money from the oil business without running any of the risks that are entailed in prospecting for oil. The gasoline tax represents almost sheer profit for government, since the oil industry is saddled with the responsibility of collecting this levy from its customers. And over the years this tax has become a tremendously heavy load for the industry's principal product to carry.

Maine's 7-cent rate is exceeded by no State in the Union and equaled by only 10 others, principally in the South.

In 1932, when the Federal Government entered the gasoline tax field with a temporary emergency levy of 1 cent a gallon, it was scheduled to expire within a year. Instead of expiring, however, this levy followed the same course as the State tax, rising to its present 3-cent level—or triple the original rate.

Now Congress is faced with a proposal to increase the Federal tax 1 additional cent, bringing the Federal levy to 4 cents. This, too, is being described as a temporary emergency measure.

As a result of both the State and Federal trends, the combined tax on gasoline now totals 10 cents a gallon. This is equivalent to a sales tax of about 50 percent of the average retail price that a consumer pays for regular grade gasoline.

The rate trend, however, tells only part of the stroy of the tremendous impact that the gasoline tax has had on both the petroleum industry and the consumers of gasoline. Starting out as a relative trickle of revenue, the tax has become a multimillion-dollar revenue source. Over the years since 1923 this one tax has cost Maine's motor vehicle owners over $300 million and the ante has shown a startling rise in recent times.

By 1933, the end of the first decade, this tax had cost Maine motorists $22,547,000. During the next quarter century it had gained enough momentum so that the collections in 1 year, 1958, were $22,562,000, or slightly more than taken in during the first 10 years.

Part of this revenue growth can, of course, be attributed to higher rates, but another very important factor has been the increase in motor vehicle ownership and use. There is a tendency to think that rates must be raised to obtain more money from the gasoline tax. But the record shows that the tax has a built-in growth factor, and that the same rate of tax has produced an enormous increment in revenue over the years because of increased consumption.

This is illustrated in the following tabulation, which shows the amount of revenues generated by each penny of the gasoline tax imposed by the State over the years: 1940, $1,564,000; 1946, $1,821,000; 1950, $2,259,000; 1954, $2,721,000; 1958, $3,323,000.

As this tabulation shows, each cent of the State gasoline tax imposed in 1958 brought in two times as much revenue as the same levy produced in 1940, and almost twice as much as in 1946, the first postwar year.

Expressed another way, it would have taken a State gasoline tax rate of about 14½ cents a gallon in 1940 to produce the same amount of revenue the State now is collecting from a tax of 7 cents.

It is significant, however, that as taxes on gasoline in recent years have been pushed to ever and ever higher levels, the rate of consumption has slowed down considerably. In the first 5 years following the end of World War II, for example, highway use of motor fuel showed an average annual gain of over 5 percent. In the last 5 years, however, this rate of increase was cut in half, and in 1958 highway consumption of gasoline was only about 2 percent greater than in the previous year.

This same trend is evident in automobile travel statistics. Whereas formerly there had been a pronounced upsurge, annual travel per vehicle in recent years has shown a declining tendency, falling from an indicated level of about 10,000 miles in 1946 to around 9,500 miles in 1958.

Coupled with this is the growing popularity of smaller automobiles, particularly the foreign variety, which feature fuel economy as one of their main attractions.

All these developments indicate clearly that the motoring public is becoming extremely conscious of the cost of gasoline. What the public does not seem to realize, however, is the fact that the increase in the price of gasoline itself in recent years has been quite moderate. The average retail price of gasoline in 1958, exclusive of taxes, was only 5.9 percent above the 1949 level, whereas in the same period retail prices for all consumer items, as compiled by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, had risen 21 percent.

But, while the average price of gasoline moved up less than 6 percent during the decade, the national average tax jumped more than 36 percent. In other words, taxes on gasoline during the period went up at a rate of six times as great as the retail price of the fuel.

It is important to also note the gasoline consumer has been getting a continually improving product. One measure of this quality is the octane number of the fuel. Between 1950 and 1958, U.S. refiners improved the average octane rating of regular grade gasoline by about 9 numbers. As a result of these and other major improvements in the fuel, the motorist today can buy regular grade gasoline that has a higher quality than the premium gasoline of only 5 years ago, at little or no increase in price. Even more remarkable, today's improved gasoline sells at the same price, 21 cents (excluding tax) as it did 36 years ago when the taxation started in Maine.

On this 36th anniversary of Maine's gasoline tax, it would seem timely and appropriate for government to reexamine its policies with respect to this tax, in the light of indications that it would be a grave mistake to continue to regard this levy as a boundless bonanza. For the gasoline tax cannot be exempted from the law of diminishing returns.

Special Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, although I have been very busy with the committee working on the labor legislation, I have tried to pick up a few pertinent facts on the trade issue.

It seems to me that in our desire for investment and trade profits we are completely overlooking the disaster lurking in the shadows of unemployment, lost jobs in production industries, and the apparent unawareness of labor, Main Street, and the smaller manufacturers.

Recently one of our leading metropolitan newspapers, the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wednesday, August 19, 1959, published an editorial entitled "Labor Awakening." I present the editorial verbatim:

Organized labor has, in a large measure, in recent years been responsible for supporting the Roosevelt ian policy of reciprocal trade agreements which have worked out so disadvantageously to the United States.

Already one effect of these treaties is that last year as many automobiles were imported as exported, and the United States is importing such a product as steel.

The real sufferer from these treaties, agreements, quotas, exchange arrangements, etc., is the American worker.

For many years conservatives have been cautioning labor that they have embarked on a dangerous course when their supported political measures are disadvantageous to them. But, having adopted labor internationalism, they would not retreat.

However, some unions are beginning to realize their peril. What they call imports from sweatshop countries have always been coming in from these same sweatshop countries.

The only difference was that during the war and the early postwar years businessmen were afraid to go to those countries, invest American capital in them, and then ship the goods back here to compete with the American worker, who generally lost out.

It is interesting to note that the great free trade unions, the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union; the Amalgamated Clothing Workers; the United Hatters, Cap, and Millinery Workers' International, and the Textile Workers, are leading in this reconsideration of a policy that has always been disadvantageous to the American worker.

A few points need to be made concerning this:

1. Most mass-production work can be done as efficiently by low-wage workers as by high-wage workers. Therefore, unless the high-wage worker is in some manner protected, he will outprice himself.

2. In the semiskilled industries the ability and efficiency of the workers play a small part in the total product; the bigger part is contributed by the machine, which can be operated as well by less-efficient workers, thus making the product cheaper to sell in the American market.

3. Since the Roosevelt regime, everything has been done to make the phrase "Buy American" unpopular, with the result that Americans buy what is made in Hong Kong or Japan or Czechoslovakia as readily as they buy American goods.

It is nonsense for American unions to believe that they can solve this problem by stimulating campaigns in other countries to increase wages there. They will be told to mind their own business.

Not all standards of living are the same, and not all people approve of the American standard of living, which includes many inflationary factors.

The soundest protection against the dumping of cheap goods into the world's greatest market is a protective tariff—and it would be startling, but it is foreseeable, that American labor will come to that.

For the record I want to put this important message before the Congress and if I could, before every worker, employer, banker, and professional individuals in this country.

The warning contained therein is one that none of us can overlook. There is no secret or mysterious formula for national prosperity. The answer is simple—production with wages sufficiently high to meet the costs of living, pay doctors and hospital bills, buy insurance, shop on main street for necessities and a few extra luxuries, keep a savings account, buy and maintain a car, maybe a small boat, send your kids to school, take a 2-week vacation, keep your church and charities obligations, and last, but not least, buy a radio, refrigerator, TV, washer-dryer, freezer, air conditioner, get your wife a modern step-saving kitchen, feed your kids the latest vitamins, and whatever else we are told we must have to maintain our way of life.

If we do not have most of these things within the reach of our working people the rest of the economy will fall flat on its face.

Without wages to carry this market-place load, the professional individual, the banker, and the press, all service industries and businesses will die on the vine.

I will always remember my early youth in a small coalmining and brickmaking community on the banks of the Allegheny River in western Pennsylvania. The history of this town is a case in point.

This was a normal, small American town with its professional services, elected officials, its lawyer, doctor, barbershop, its hotel, stores, railroad station and telegraph office, with its painters, plumbers, and the tradesmen that are usually found in a going community.

Its community of 400 or 500 families prospered because the coal mine and clay mine provided payrolls which fed the whole economy. Then one dark day the mine shut down, the payroll stopped. In a short period of time, all commerce and business stopped. I recently visited this site, and nature has again taken over—there are no houses standing, no business places, and no people. The years have erased all of the things that once marked a thriving community. The town was a ghost town.

This then points up clearly and vividly that tradesmen, professionals, Main Street and Back Street cannot survive on their own. There must be production, because production produces payrolls, and payrolls produce prosperity. This lesson I have never forgotten, without production this town died and I am convinced that without production this Nation will die.

Somewhere, somehow, we have been sold a bill of goods. We are told that trade means peace and therefore even if it means unemployment, hardship, foreclosures, and shutdowns, it is worth it. Up to a point any sane person agrees.

However, will the results be what we are told they will be, or will the greedy, mercenary profiteers of other countries contrive to take advantage of our soft-

ness and further flood this country's domestic market with low-priced goods made by low standard wage earners and in most cases, from American designs and all too often bearing American trade names.

I cannot conceive of anything more damaging than to keep up this idiotic program that allows a nation like Japan to embargo the import of automobiles into the country while at the same time, dump their cars onto the American market, or for England to embargo turbines and generators while selling to our own Government agencies.

Again, we find Mexico putting an embargo on many products such as piston rings, forcing American companies like Perfect Circle to buy into their domestic industries in order to market their products in that country.

I mentioned Perfect Circle, and its Mexican experience; for the record I present the full story as well as a little noted item about the prosperity of the London stock market while the American market continues its erratic but definitely downward slide. The stock markets of Germany, Italy, Japan, and Belgium and other beneficiaries of our national trade suicide policy are reported doing well.

PERFECT CIRCLE TO BUY 45-PERCENT INTEREST IN MEXICAN FIRM

CHICAGO.—Perfect Circle Corp., Hagerstown, Ind., piston ring manufacturer, announced it has entered into an agreement to purchase 45 percent of the stock of Engranes y Productos Industriales, Mexico City, for approximately $800,000. A Perfect Circle spokesman said about two-thirds of the purchase price will be paid in piston ring manufacturing machinery.

The Mexican firm will be licensed to manufacture and distribute Perfect Circle piston rings and other products in Mexico, W. B. Prosser, Perfect Circle president, said in the announcement. A meeting of Engranes y Productos Industriales stockholders has been called for August 28 to ratify the agreement and to change the name to Industrias Perfect Circle S.A. The firm will continue to produce hydraulic automobile jacks, irrigation pump parts, and other replacement parts, according to the announcement.

A spokesman for Perfect Circle said the move was made because the Mexican Government banned piston ring imports. The company had planned to begin production in Mexico at some future time, but had to accelerate its program because of the governmental order cutting off the imports, he said.

He said the company had been forced to make similar moves in Argentina and Brazil when those nations closed their borders to the company's product.

All the way up and down the list of imports we find examples of restrictions, high tariffs, and outright embargoes against American-made goods.

This country prospered so long as it was a Democratic-capitalistic system of operation, but it is fast becoming a purely capitalistic system which cannot survive in free competition with nations that have no governmental mandated costs of production such as social security, unemployment compensation, exorbitant taxation, both personal and business.

In line with the above editorial, it might be good for all of us to take stock before we vote for H.R. 5, which will open the floodgates of American investment in foreign countries, and in a few short years, the domestic market will be lost completely to American-made goods.

What is our interest—American made goods, or American financed goods?

How long will the foreign worker allow himself to be exploited by American absentee investors?

Will we be building goodwill, or will we be sowing the seeds of discontent, distrust and instead of promoting peace will we unwittingly be harvesting a crop of bloodshed, devastation, and catastrophic war?

In a recent survey of the results of our ill-advised 4-year extension of the nonreciprocal Reciprocal Trade Act, we find the following very brief summary of results in just a few of the affected fields of production.

These statements of facts and logic have been given on the floor of the House, on the air and in many of our leading periodicals and newspapers.

Many Members of Congress are becoming aware of the seriousness of the situation and there is unrest and doubt never before so apparent amongst the membership.

Many of us wonder whether Congress was wise when it abdicated its constitutional prerogatives and turned over to the President the tariff and duty making powers which rightfully belong to Congress.

ESCAPE CLAUSE BOX SCORE

"Oh, but industry does have an official remedy," exclaims the liberal-trade enthusiast to import-wounded industries. But let's ask the man who sought one. Here's the January 1954 to May 1959 record:

Industries seeking remedy from Tariff Commission	45
Remedy denied by Commission	19
Remedy recommended by Commission to President	[1]26
But denied by him	17
Remedy granted by President	8
But drastically diluted by him	6
Full recommendation granted (out of 45)	2

[1] 1 in process.

FOREIGN CARS

Japan's Batsun, plastic-body sports car, speed of 86 miles per hour, now in order-taking stage and slated soon for United States market. Also targeted for United States in their tiny Subaru-360 at $1,100.

European-English cars captured 17 percent of Canadian market first 5 months of 1958; now up to 23 percent for same period in 1959. Imports here running about 10 percent of market.

SHIPPING BOTTOMS TAKE BEATING

U.S. shipper's share of American foreign commerce had rough sailing since World War II (military excluded):

Year:	*U.S. share (percent)*
1946	68.0
1951	43.0
1952	35.0
1953	30.0
1954	28.0
1955	22.0
1956	20.0
1957	18.0
1958	13.0
January 1959	[1]8.7

[1] Latest.

BINOCULARS

Jap binocular industry, principally geared to U.S. market, produced over 1.5 million units in 1958; United States purchased two-thirds of total output.

TYPEWRITERS

Nineteen million nine hundred thousand dollars of imported typewriters and parts in 1958 outstrip U.S. exports of $14.7 million first time in history.

CAP IMPORTS

National Cap and Cloth Hat Institute, joint labor-management group, seeks escape clause action to increase duty on Jap caps. Self-imposed Jap annual export quota of 15 million caps too large for U.S. market to absorb without serious damage, reports Institute. Comparative prices: Jap caps, 20 cents; U.S. caps, $1.

CLOTHING WORKERS CONCERNED

Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, formerly strong trade agreements supporters, adopt resolution attacking destructive imports. Cite "cutthroat" competition in every branch of male apparel threatening thousands of jobs. Knit glove industry well on the road to destruction, as imports now 250 percent of U.S. production.

COPPER AND BRASS

Copper & Brass Research Association's study of causes in decline of domestic brass mill industry reveal: First year after sharp tariff cuts, imports multiplied 42 times preceding year level; imports almost 100 percent of U.S. tubular plumbing goods market; U.S. industry in 1958 operated less than 45 percent of 1943 capacity; United States converted from exporter to importer of brass mill products.

WESTERN EUROPE'S GOLD MOUNTS

Gold and dollar reserve holdings in Western Europe increased from $7 billion in 1950 (December) to $18 billion in 1959 (March).

LUXURY LINER LAMBS

Indicative of price differential in foreign-U.S. competition was arrival at San Diego of 30,000 Australian lambs on converted luxury liner Wesorarlia. Estimated delivery price: $10 a head or half of U.S. price. Importer's yearly goal: 100,000 head.

STEEL: "THE BIG SQUEEZE ON LITTLE STEEL"[1]

"In 1957, the United States exported 5.2 million tons of steel-mill products, and imported 1.1. million tons. But this ratio of almost 5 to 1—in favor of steel-mill exports—dropped to less than 2 to 1 in 1958, when exports fell to 2.7 million tons, and imports reached a high of 1.7 million tons (1959 steel imports running double U.S. exports. NWC).

"Because of these developments, we appear to have lost much of our foreign market, and a portion of our domestic market is in jeopardy. For example, the United States exported 721,000 tons of semi-finished steel in 1957. This dropped to 124,000 tons in 1958—a decrease of 83 percent. Exports of structural shapes decreased from 453,000 tons in 1957 to 292,000 tons in 1958, while exports of plates declined from 604,000 tons to 249,000 over the same period—a drop of 59 percent. Exports of tinplate, an item in which the United States has long had a preeminent position, fell from 538,000 tons to 244,000 tons—a decrease of 54 percent. * * *

"In the domestic market we are at a competitive price disadvantage in such products as rods, barbed wire, nails, reinforcing bars, and other items. * * *

[1] Excerpts, address by A. F. Franz, president, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., to American Iron and Steel Institute, New York, May 28, 1959.

"Within the past year or so, a number of specialty wire products have arrived on the American market in alarming quantities. * * *

"These are facts. * * * The American steel industry in certain areas is no longer competitive with the rest of the world."

U.S. AUTO EXPORTS-IMPORTS

Since 1955, U.S. auto exports dropped 50 percent, from over 200,000 annually to expected 100,000 in 1959 * * * 370,000 foreign car imports sold in United States in 1958; present rate indicates 600,000 this year.

UAW AROUSED

A. J. Mattes, president of local 239, UAW, wrote Baltimore Mayor Grady that over 300 General Motors workers in that city were laid off and remaining 1,500 are working less than 40 hours a week because of increasing number of foreign car imports. Thirty-five thousand autos imported via Baltimore the first 5 months of 1959 could have given employment to 2,500 workers at Chevrolet plant there, working two 8-hour shifts for 13 weeks.

AUTO PRODUCTION ABROAD

Daily output at Fiat's Mirafiore Works over 2,500; Volkswagen heading for 3,000 at Wolfsburg. Plymouth's mammoth Detroit lines turns out 1,100 daily; Rambler at modern Kenosha plant about 1,600 units.

ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT

Florida Power & Light Co. ask foreign producers of heavy electrical generating equipment to bid on two 200,000-kilowatt steam turbogenerators * * * probably first effort by foreign manufacturers to penetrate private utility market, following successful efforts on Federal-State projects. Domestic firm salvaged contract on basis of delivery date.

TURBINES

English Electric bids 30 percent under nearest American competitor to win Army Engineers' contract for eight hydraulic turbines for Big Bend Dam, S. Dak. *

SEWING MACHINES

Brief filed with Tariff Commission reveals foreign sewing machine manufacturers now control about 75 percent U.S. market; e.g., U.S.-imported Jap machines up from 64,000 in 1950 to about 1 million in 1958.

WATCHES

Ranks of American watchworkers steadily reduced from 16,000 to 6,000 employees as foreign imports take 70 percent of annual domestic market; or 14 million out of 20 million units.

THE GOLD FACTS

United States now has $19.6 billion in gold, smallest reserve in over a decade, but foreign organizations and individuals have dollar claims of $15.1 billion against reserve.

TUNA FLEET

Imports of Jap tuna reduced ranks of San Diego's tuna clippers to 125 ships from 1952 high of 214. Sales sliced from about $40 million in 1954 to expected $19 million this year.

U.S MANUFACTURER LITERALLY LOSING HIS SHIRTS

National Association of Shirt, Pajama, and Sportswear Manufacturers went on record opposing State and Commerce Departments' representations on behalf American business and declared in favor of congressional regulation of foreign trade. Shirt imports from Hong Kong-Japan alone totaled 1.75 million dozen in 1958, equivalent to $15 million in U.S. wages for 6,000 American employees.

TOURISM: DOLLAR SOURCE

Frequently overlooked as dollar source to foreign nations is tourist industry; Americans spent $2.1 billion on foreign travel last year * * * 10 percent jump from 1957.

STEEL: "WHAT'S BEHIND THE RISE IN FOREIGN COMPETITION?" [2]

"Let me cite the predicament of one American industry. * * * The industry is that which makes table flatware * * * and recently stainless steel ware. * * * This is a new industry in Japan; flatware such as we use is not used generally in Japan.

"By 1955, imports had reached 3,134,000 dozen against U.S. production of 14,654,000 dozen; * * * in 1958, Japanese imports amounted to 8,444,000 dozen, with U.S. production of 14,740,000 dozen. * * *

"While this rise in imports was going on, the gentlemen of GATT progressively reduced tariffs.

"The big reduction was made in 1950 but further reductions were made in 1956, 1957, and 1958, after this industry had really been hurt.

"Japan, fearing action by the United States, voluntarily announced a quota limit to the United States of 5,500,000 dozen for 1958. * * * Up to this time, this industry has been given no relief and employment is off 25 percent. In spite of the announced quota of 5,500,000 dozen, 1958 imports were 8,444,000.

"The time will soon be here when we have completely lost our entire export business in steel, except for a few specialty items which are not made elsewhere."

You will note the seriousness of the situation by taking time to read further on the new and mystifying attitude of American business, bankers and leading administration leaders in Washington.

One wonders if they understand the philosophy behind reciprocal trade, foreign aid, and mutual security aid that seems to have perverted by profit-seeking individuals and corporations that have found Government sponsorship for running away from national taxes, high wages and national responsibility.

Now let us look at another serious threat to American economic well-being and the wide-open deception being practiced upon the American consumer by well established American producers.

Lately the following announcement appeared in the magazine Business Week August 22, 1959, page 56:

TRANSISTOR-RADIO MAKERS WILL MARKET JAPANESE MODELS UNDER U.S. LABELS

In the past year, the U.S. electronics industry has watched Japanese manufacturers grab more than half the market here for transistor radios—largely by sales under Japanese labels. Now, some companies have decided to meet the foreign competition by marketing Japanese-made radios under their own U.S. trade names.

Latest transistor-radio manufacturer to join the importers is big Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp. Through its international marketing subsidiary, Emerson has concluded an agreement with Tokyo's Standard Radio Corp. to import 100,000 radios in coming months. Emerson officials say it is making the move because Japanese companies are making radios and parts too small to be produced competitively in the United States. Emerson, which will sell the imports under its Jefferson Travis label, follows Motorola, Inc., as the second big radio maker to move into the Japanese import field.

Meanwhile, Toko's Ministry of International Trade & Industry is spurring Japanese efforts to make electronic computers. MITI plans to sponsor a company, 50 percent privately owned—to produce 50 computers next year, and more than that in each succeeding year.

We will soon find ourselves with shelves full of foreign made "American brand" goods that will defy detection by even an expert, let alone an innocent housewife buying in the American marketplace.

She may well be buying a Japanese-made product labeled by the company that has just furloughed her husband.

It will not be long now before the people in this country awaken to what is happening and the repercussions in the political field will shake the foundations of our democracy.

It is one think to talk peace, but it is another to deprive an American workman of his right to earn a living while at the same time profits are not impaired, but in fact, are increased.

The steel strike is a case in point. While our bankers are pressing the crown of gold upon the brow of labor, the foreign producers, in many cases with American money, American machinery, American know-how and American connections for marketing, are running wild.

The following appeared in an August 1959 issue of Business Week:

FOREIGN STEELMAKERS BOOST OUTPUT, ENLARGE THEIR SHARE OF WORLD MARKET

With the steel strike in its 6th week, executives of the struck U.S. mills are closely watching the speedy progress of steelmakers in Western Europe and Japan. Foreign steel companies are boosting their share of world steel markets—including the United States.

Steelmakers in West Germany and Japan are enjoying the liveliest boom. But steel output is also curving upward in France, Britain, and Italy.

In West Germany, steel producers are headed for a new output record of more than 30 million tons. Renewed capital investment and machinery exports have helped boost demand this year.

In Japan, the industry has been setting records all year, thanks to rising exports and a capital spending boom. With production likely to top 15 million tons this year—about 2 million tons over 1958—Japan threatens to displace France as the world's fifth largest steelmaker. Some of Japan's steel companies are getting ready to ask the World Bank for loans for a $300 million expansion program to raise capacity to 25 million tons in 1965.

In Britain, steel output has reached 80 percent of the industry's 26 million ton capacity. While investment still remains low, an upsurge in autos and appliances is adding to steel consumption. Auto production, in fact, has been gobbling up steel so fast that a shortage of sheet is feared.

In France, steel production has climbed almost 5 percent above last year's record level. Aided by devaluation, the French industry has managed to improve its share of Europe's growing steel market by being able to offer lower prices.

In Italy, steelmakers also enjoy expanding sales because of the Common Market. One sign of expansion is the government's proposal to establish a new 1-million-ton steel plant in southern Italy.

This picture of steel production is not, as proponents of the Reciprocal Trades Extension Act say, an isolated case. Rather than being the exception, it is

[2] Excerpts, address by W. H. Diewel, senior vice president, Crucible Steel, to the American Management Association, New York, May 20, 1959.

becoming the rule. Let us look at another portion of the record contributed by many members, including WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, from South Carolina:

Steel imports are increasing at a fantastic rate. So are imports of glassware, pottery, chemicals, machine tools, textiles. In fact, every job in America today is threatened by unfair imports from foreign countries.

The farmer is likewise a victim of our unfair trade policies. Some years ago we exported a large portion of our wheat crop. American wheat was in demand beyond the seven seas of the world. We exported 60 percent of our cotton crop. At one time we exported a vast portion of our tobacco crop.

We were once the only nation in the world that grew tobacco. But under this trade program in Washington today the American farmer grows less and less, surpluses pile up while foreign countries grow more and more. For instance, in Canada the average tobacco farmer can plant 30 acres of tobacco, in Rhodesia 65 acres. But in the United States our farmers can plant an average of only 2.9 acres. They are not permitted to expand and grow in the American tradition.

Many cotton farmers in the United States can plant only 4 acres of cotton. No farmer can possibly clothe, feed, and educate his children on such an unbelievable income. There is distress in our land today by reason of our unfair foreign trade policy.

In foreign countries, farmers are often exempted from land taxes if they will grow more farm products, such as in Rhodesia. Turkey has exempted certain of her farmers from income taxes if they will grow more. Yet we have billions of dollars' worth of farm surpluses piled up in warehouses costing the taxpayers millions of dollars.

We need to free our farmers so they can plant more and have an equal opportunity with farmers in foreign nations. We need more foreign markets, not less. We should sell more cotton and wheat abroad, not less and less.

It is the duty of the State Department, the Congress, and the President to give to the American farmer and the American worker the same advantages and protection as offered by foreign countries to their farmers and workers.

There is nothing reciprocal about our present so-called reciprocal trade policies. There is no "sip" in it for the American work nor the American farmer.

No one would ever dream of asking Brazil to import coffee, nor India to import tea, nor Honduras bananas, nor the Mayala States rubber. Yet the one-worlders, the dreamers, and idealists running our present trade program are demanding that we import textiles, steel, and automobiles. How ridiculous can we get?

UNFAIR IMPORTS LAYING AMERICA WASTE

The original idea of reciprocal trade was to sell automobiles, textiles, steel, wheat, and cotton to the other countries of the world and buy tea, coffee, rubber, cocoa, and products we need. Never before in the history of the world has a nation been required to import things it already has in surplus. Unfair imports have created disaster areas, ghost towns, unemployment, and distress.

Many foreign nations do not permit American automobiles to be sold in their countries. But, they sell theirs here. They put on import quotas which eliminate the sale of American products, but, at the same time, they demand that our State Department and the U.S. Government lower its tariffs and permit their goods to flood this country.

Those products we produce in surplus and those traditionally American should be protected by import quotas. These jobs should be saved for American workers and farmers.

This trade policy of the State Department is a foreign aid program. It is not designed to help the American farmer and the American worker. It is designed to help the foreign worker and the foreign farmer.

Along with the taking of the American worker's job and the farmer's acreage, we are being forced to pay the highest taxes in the history of the world to support a stupendous foreign aid program.

Yes, my friends, 43,000 employees to show the world how to make automobiles, how to make steel, how to grow cotton, how to grow wheat, how to grow tobacco. Technicians to show them how to pack it and ships to haul it to America in competition with the products of the American worker.

Incidentally, it takes 37½ percent of our foreign aid appropriations to pay our employees' salaries and expenses to give away our money.

They talk in Washington about $70 billion foreign aid. It is nearer $200 billion, starting before World War II in the form of lend-lease and other such programs.

The free traders and one-world State Department striped pants boys are saying that foreign aid must continue for 50 to a 100 years. They go further than that and take your money, ladies and gentlemen, to build steel mills, automobile plants overseas, and then turn around and give these people free water and free electricity and guarantee them a profit.

During the debate last year in Congress on foreign aid, it was brought out that the American foreign aid representatives went to the leaders of the textile industry and asked them to go to Indonesia and other countries of the world and build textile plants—telling them that no risk was involved, profits could be guaranteed with cheap labor, Government water and electricity, all of this furnished by the American taxpayer indirectly.

In other words, just close your American plants, fire your employees and we'll help you set up overseas where you can get cheap labor. Our textile people are loyal, patriotic Americans who believe in their workers. They want to keep their factories and jobs at home, so, in the main, they have refused these attractive offers.

I understand that some of the great manufacturers who came to Washington last year and participated in the President's conference favoring these unfair imports are now expanding their plants overseas and are bringing these goods made with cheap labor back to the United States. But, this does not help the American worker, nor the small businessman. They cannot move overseas and compete with this cheap labor. The only alternative for our laboring people is unemployment and breadlines.

Exports of machine tools have fallen off from 30 percent of U.S. production to 10 percent. In 1954, the United States imported 656,000 barrels of oil every day. In February of 1959, daily imports totaled 1,626,000 barrels daily. Yes, our great oil industry is being threatened.

Foreign nations pay their workers such a low wage that our lead, zinc, mercury, coal, copper, tungsten, iron ore industries are being threatened by floods of imports from abroad. The same applies to the glassware, sewing machine, camera, and typewriter industries.

IMPORTS PILE UP—EXPORTS DROP

The plywood industry is in serious trouble. Hardwood plywood imports from Japan, for instance, have increased from 1½ million square feet in 1951 to 659 million square feet in 1958. This is an increase of 12,950 percent. During the same period, domestic production declined even though domestic consumption more than doubled.

In 1956, the United States imported 107,000 foreign cars, and 400,000 in 1958. Present indications are that imports will run between 500,000 and a million this year. For the first time in history, we are importing more automobiles than we are exporting. This is shocking when we stop to think that the automobile industry first started in the United States.

The textile industry of foreign nations is expanding with American aid, while we have 345,000 unemployed textile workers and 300 closed textile mills. The Japanese can buy American cotton 7½ cents per pound cheaper than the American manufacturers can buy the same cotton. Then, the Japanese are permitted to send that same cotton after it is made into cloth back into the United States in competition with that of the domestic manufacturers.

In 1947, the United States exported $748 million worth of textiles and imported only $24 million worth. In 1955, under this fallacious trade program, textile exports fell to $242 million; while imports increased to $125 million.

Under the proper trade program our people should be employed. We should be selling these products abroad and we should be helping foreign nations by buying coffee, tea, cocoa, rubber, and those products we need. This is true reciprocal trade. Our present trade policy is a trade program for the benefit of foreign workers and foreign farmers. Foreign aid takes money from American farmers and workers. Our trade policy takes his job, too.

The idealists in the State Department tell us that we must buy from foreign countries in order to stop communism. America is the heart and core of the free world and has been the arsenal of democracy. If our industries are liquidated and our workers unemployed, I fail to see how this can stop communism.

If industry is built up with American money around the borders of Russia where it can be grabbed by the Red army or bombed by the Red air force, I do not see how this can stop communism.

On the other hand, it will help communism by weakening America and by building up those areas which the Communists can take over. One American worker and one American plant in the United States is worth more than a dozen within a day's march of the Red army.

What can we do about all of this? I am thankful that we live in America where we can vote for our President and our Representatives in Congress. Next year is election year.

The foreign aid program just passed the Congress. The so-called reciprocal trade program passed last year, for 4 years. The only hope we have to save our jobs, to save our industries, to save our farm acreage and domestic markets is to participate in the political elections of 1960.

We must start now at the precinct levels in both political parties to organize so that our program can be properly considered. A strong plank must be adopted at both national political conventions that will save the American worker, save the American farmer, save the American businessman from unfair foreign imports.

To accomplish this, a better trade and foreign aid program will have to be brought up at the precinct level, at the county and State conventions, and at the national conventions.

The time has come to put back into Congress the power to set tariffs and quotas.

An interesting observation that further peels away the false cover of the "trade for peace" slogan is contained in this excerpt from a Life editorial of recent date:

The public might better play along with Blough, who at least offers a way to keep prices level. His terms for this promise—no

White House intervention—are a good idea anyway this year. Previous steel strikes, especially that of 1946, occurred in a chaos of price movements when nobody knew where the value of the dollar ought to settle. In all that yak, the White House had a right to the last word (Life, Feb. 4, 1946). Not so now. There is a well established world market for steel in which the U.S. industry is being pushed competitively not only by foreign steel but by other metals. Hitherto a prime source of inflation, the steel industry has discovered it can no longer afford inflation, and its battle is therefore more nearly the public's battle than hitherto. If it takes a long, tough strike to put Roger Blough and Co. in a position to keep steel prices down and meet their market, then a long, tough strike it should be.

One wonders if Life has bothered to look at the income angle, as well as the wage angle.

I will give you three figures from the Secretary of Labor Mitchell's report on Steel Facts and let you draw your own clusions:

Wages of production workers:

1950	$32
1959	44

Per ton figures, wages, and executive salaries:

1950	$40
1959	58

Price of steel:

1950	$129
1959	173

You be the judge as to whether labor is driving steel business away or rather that profit is the culprit. Profit earned here and abroad.

One cannot in one breath talk American and in the other buy foreign.

Trade is a two-way street, but we are only traveling one way, into international oblivion.

A record of trade that leaves out the reciprocity. The following detailed account gives a rather dismal picture of the increasing problems Americans are facing every day in the field of foreign trade:

In March of this year our imports reached a record high level above any previous month in our history. In June the March record was surpassed. Also in June our imports exceeded our commercial exports. The first half of 1959 saw our imports run 18 percent ahead of the first half of last year.

Our exports on the other hand have declined. In 1958 they dropped 16 percent from the preceding year and during the present year they have declined roughly another 5 percent.

These trends are being explained by liberal trade proponents as being temporary and abnormal. They say that the high imports this year are swollen by heavy steel imports attributable to the steel strike, the popularity of the small foreign automobile, and several other extraordinary factors. When the steel strike is settled and when the domestic automobile industry brings out its so-called compact car, imports will presumably level off. Last week Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns in a press conference expressed the opinion that our exports would rise; and he doubted that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets.

As for exports, the freer-trade apologists expect cotton exports to spurt and jet plane shipments to zoom, and thus to raise the export level.

If we examine these explanations and hopes we find that even though steel and automobile imports have risen, coffee and petroleum imports, which are among the highest of all, have suffered a decline in dollar value. If coffee prices rise this year imports will again loom larger. Also, it may be questioned whether steel imports will fall substantially after the strike. They began rising over a year before the strike was called and price comparisons with the foreign product would indicate a continuation of imports at a level considerably higher than in the past. If a judgment can be based on the experience with other products, imports that have a distinct price advantage will continue to increase; and steel should be no exception.

The same reservation applies to the small foreign car. It may be found that imported cars have established a market for themselves that will not readily yield to the smaller American car. Of course, even if the automobile industry, with its mass production techniques, should succeed in stemming the import tide without resort to import restrictions, this would offer little comfort to other industries that do not possess the vast resources of this giant among American industrial wonders. The test even with automobiles, however, is still to be met.

It should also be pointed out that the petroleum imports that helped swell the total import volume for the first half of 1959 began to decline after March when mandatory import quotas were established. This again would indicate that total June imports of all products were not abnormally high. Petroleum and coffee imports, both of which were down from previous levels, have been the No. 1 and No. 2 imports in dollar value for several years. Therefore the increased steel and automobile imports that are used as explanations to account for the surge in our total imports do not of themselves succeed in making the high import levels of recent times abnormal. They are offset by declines elsewhere that may be of a temporary nature. Morever, high steel and automobile imports may continue.

That exports of cotton may increase seems assured with the increase in the export subsidy that went into effect August 1. Such an increase in exports will, however, be an artificial rather than a normal and healthy expansion, since the subsidy amounts to about 30 percent of the price. An increase of this kind should not be counted as a sound commercial development nor should the upward surge be listed as reflecting the capacity of the American economy to compete in the world market—quite the contrary in fact.

The anticipated increase in plane exports may also help to boost exports. This is expected to be in the magnitude of $400 or $500 million per year and will represent commercial exports. However, a sharp decline has been registered in coal exports within the past year, and this does not appear to be headed toward a reversal. An increase in exports in some other field, such as the expected rise in sales of planes abroad will indeed be needed to offset this loss.

Steel exports have recently been exceeded by imports at a ratio of 2 to 1 or more This is a startling development. In 1958 imports of typewriters for the first time also exceeded our exports. In many other fields, such as electronics, sporting goods, fishing tackle, cameras, sewing machines, farm tractors, etc., imports have increased sharply. Machine tools have also had the experience of increasing imports and falling exports; and this is very significant because machine tools are of themselves sources of technological development. Greater self-sufficiency abroad, as indicated by the decline in our exports, combined with the ability of other countries to export machine tools to us, are more than straws in the wind to be blown out of the way by the words of Assistant Secretary Kearns.

In the textile field exports have been declining for several years while imports have risen greatly. The trend to higher imports was halted, temporarily at least, by inducing Japan, the principal source of imports, to impose export restrictions on her shipments to us. That such restriction was necessary in order to save the domestic industry demonstrates once more the weak competitive position in which we find ourselves in the foreign field.

It should be clear enough all around that the increasing imports since 1957 plus the decline in exports since that time reflect, not an abnormal and passing condition, but bespeak yet greater competitive trouble for many of our domestic industries in the future.

There is yet further evidence of the uncomfortable position in which the United States finds herself in the foreign trade field. In 1958 we experienced a deficit of $3.4 billion in our total foreign account even though our merchandise exports exceeded our imports by more than $3 billion. Actual gold shipments abroad covered some $2.3 billion of this deficit. This drain on our gold has continued through the first half of 1959 during which period we lost another $955 million in gold. Our gold stock in Fort Knox has fallen below the $20 billion mark, the lowest level since 1940. The National Foreign Trade Council recently estimated a deficit of nearly $5 billion in our total foreign account for 1959.

The foregoing facts will not be vaporized by glib assurances of the freer trade elements. The latter seemingly have lost their contact with reality.

There is much else beside the statistics of imports and exports and figures on gold drain and falling U.S. gold reserves that should indicate even to the blindest that the United States has come into a highly vulnerable competitive position in the world. Even our great mass production industries, these giants that have been in the technological forefront and in the vanguard of automation are now finding themselves beset by a competition that is beyond their reach.

There should be no element of surprise in this at all. Other countries have imported or otherwise obtained from us through foreign aid approximately $30 billion of modern machinery in the past 11 years, $21 billion of it in the past 6 years. Installation of this machinery abroad has brought with it a great boost in foreign productivity. During these same years in the neighborhood of 10,000 foreign productivity teams have been given access to our factories.

The increase in foreign productivity, while uneven, has obviously been startling in many instances. Modern machinery superimposed on a low level of technology or primitive machinery, as has happened in many foreign production centers, has meant a boost in productivity not experienced in this country. We have saved a number of countries a generation of research and development by making available to them our latest technology.

This is not said by way of complaint; but we should at least have sufficient insight to comprehend the probable consequences of our policies. The echoes are now coming in from many directions.

Not least among our difficulties is the fact that foreign labor unions have yet far to go to equal ours in bargaining capacity. They are hobbled psychologically no less than ideologically. Therefore increasing productivity shows up in lower costs abroad more readily than in this country.

Not only is the trend in our trade in the past 18 months not abnormal; the competitive situation on which it is based is not a

superficial one. The cause is deep seated and was long in the making. The higher costs of production in many of our industries compared with foreign costs are the result of developments that will not be undone overnight. In seeking to adjust to them an increasing number of our industries have been arranging for foreign production. Some of them have established branch plants in other countries; others are in the process of doing so and still others are studying the possibilities. In other instances licensing arrangements are made with foreign producers whereby our patents are made available on a royalty basis. Then again some of our companies have bought foreign concerns outright or purchased a substantial interest in them. Others are still shopping for production facilities in a number of countries.

The purpose is to gain the advantage of lower wages and thus to become competitive in foreign markets. In some instances as in the case of automobiles, tractors and typewriters, the foreign branches or subsidiaries ship the foreign-made product into this country itself. Principally, however, the purpose has been to hold the export position or rather to make up for the loss of exports by supplying foreign markets from foreign sources.

This trend toward partial emigration represents an adjustment by our industries to the competitive facts of life. As imports encroach on the market in this country and deprive our own industries of ever increasing shares of their accustomed market, industry is driven abroad as a matter of self-defense. Since capital has mobility this is not only a possible move but in many instances an unavoidable and sometimes a profitable one.

What is wrong with it?

There is nothing wrong with the self-defensive movement of itself; but there is something disturbingly wrong with the conditions that have brought forward this type of economic defense as a competitive necessity.

It is often said that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. This may be admitted without placing the blame on any particular factor of the domestic economy. Many will say that it is our high wages; but it would be just as easy to say that foreign wages are too low. Certainly heavy contributing factors of our high costs are the war expenditures and postwar defense outlays, the heavy national debt, price supports for agriculture, social security, etc. Our wages are admittedly high but we should not overlook the fact that they provide the tremendous purchasing power that has kept our economy at a high level. If foreign wages were higher than they are in relation to foreign productivity our higher wages would not creat a competitive disadvantage, such as is now the case.

If foreign wages could be increased our competitive troubles would disappear; but there is no present method that can be employed by us to accomplish this objective immediately or very soon.

The question then arises what can be done.

There are those who, though recognizing the difficulty, say that tariffs are not the answer; and, of course, tariffs are not the complete answer. They say that we must invent and modernize and sell more vigorously; we must mechanize all possible production and in general become more efficient.

All these years we had been told by the liberal trade advocates that we were in the forefront in technology, productivity, know-how and efficiency. Now, it appears, this is no longer true and we need to buckle down to hard work, take in our belts and reinvigorate our economy. Very well, but other countries are mechanizing too, and since they have a lower starting base they can easily outstrip us in raising their productivity. They too are buckling down and inventing and selling. Moreover, we are still assisting some of them technologically and financially and putting our techniques at their disposal.

The prospects are not bright for a pull-away by this country. Not at all. The other countries now have all that it takes to catch up with us, including the creation of mass markets. The question is how their catching up is to be accomplished. Must we be torn down in the process, or can we hold our own while the other countries come up?

We need a holding defense. This can best be contrived through a combination of tariffs and quotas, by the use of which suitable shares of our market can be opened to imports while reserving the remainder for ourselves. We can thus recognize the need for a high volume of trade without placing our industries on the sacrificial block as pawns in the shifting currents of international politics.

American industry is exposed competitively to imports to a degree not previously experienced. Our defenses are down, with an average tariff protection about 80 percent below the level of 25 years ago; and there is virtually no remedy today against injury from low-cost imports.

For these and other reasons it would be high folly to consider the present foreign trade situation as a passing phase of an abnormal development. Most of the pointers indicate otherwise. Therefore, we should prepare for what appears to be ahead.

Chuck Percy and the Committee on Programs and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to attend the last bull elephant meeting of this session on Thursday, August 20, and to have the added pleasure of hearing Chuck Percy speak to the group on the subject of the Committee on Programs and Progress which he chairs as an appointee of the President.

Drafting of the committee's final report is now underway and there are many of us anxiously looking forward to its publication date. In talking with Chuck Percy, and after hearing him expound at the bull elephant session I believe there is reason for real optimism as indicated in a recent column by Rosco Drummond which I include at this point:

[From the Peoria (Ill.) Journal Star, Aug. 27, 1959]

MR. PERCY'S TIME BOMB

(By Roscoe Drummond)

At first it looked impossible—the idea that the 43-member Republican Committee on Program and Progress could ever agree on anything but a collection of refurbished and resounding cliches.

Most Washington correspondents yawned when this committee sat down at the piano. They figured that either no tune would be forthcoming or that each hand would be playing different music.

Don't spread this about, but my information is that under the persuasive, do-things chairmanship of Charles H. Percy of Kenilworth, Ill., president of Bell & Howell Co., the report is going to break exciting new ground for the Republican Party. Far from being "reactionary, negative, and against," it will be progressive, positive, and for a wide range of urgent actions.

There's no doubt about it, the report isn't going to please everybody. In fact, that is the secret of the committee's success. It soon saw that if all it could do was produce the lowest common denominator of controversy between, say, Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, and Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York, it might as well submit the dictionary (all the words are there) and close up shop.

Instead Chairman Percy, who is himself something like a quite atomic reactor, persuaded his colleagues to accept these premises.

That the committee was not drawing up a national platform designed to unite dissident elements of the party.

That its purpose was to look forward, not backward, that it should define the major problems the Nation must solve in the next 15 years and offer practical solutions.

That if these tasks require the committee, in Lincoln's words, "to think and act anew," well and good, let it be done but let's not avoid the hard problems and the hard answers by pulling the covers up over our heads.

That while this undertaking involves political risks, the only way the Republican Party can become the majority party is by taking risks; the way things now stand, the only direction it can go is up.

The committee, therefore, began asking itself these questions: "What kind of country do Americans really want? What kind of people do Americans want to be? What kind of life do they want for themselves?"

"We need to think in terms of the future," Mr. Percy put it to his fellow Republicans, "and we need to develop a program that will clearly demonstrate that the Republican Party is thinking in terms of the future. * * * We must ask questions we don't ordinarily ask and we must not shrink from answers that are novel and upsetting. This is only to acknowledge that we live in novel and challenging times. The Republican Party must show that it is sensitive and alert to the problems of our time as they relate to the individual—that we are a party with a heart as well as a mind."

While the Percy Committee report is still in its final drafting stage—it will be ready about October 1—there is no doubt that most other Republicans and many others will find it a novel and upsetting document. That's good. It would expect that in mood and direction:

It will avoid political labels like "liberal," "conservative," "radical," "right" and "left," and center on what needs to be done and how best to do it.

It will deal with the Soviet Communist challenge but will stress that doing what needs to be done anyway in defense, education, science, and economic expansion is the best way to meet the Communist challenge.

It will contend that we can't afford not to assume we can afford whatever is needed to spend for defense.

It will favor freer trade and will support expanded trade in consumer goods with the Soviets.

It will indulge in no wishful thinking about tax reduction.

Many Republicans are going to say "Hurrah." Some will say "ouch." But one thing is sure; this is no report to file without reading. Already it sounds like a time bomb.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared for White House bill continuing appropriations.

Senate cleared for White House bill on Spokane Valley project and continued on Lake Michigan water bill.

House passed 45 miscellaneous bills and received public works veto message.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15917–15946

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2619–2626; and S. Res. 182–184.

Page 15919

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1502, providing a 10-percent increase in annuities of retired Foreign Service officers and their survivors, with amendment (S. Rept. 837);

S. Res. 182, referring S. 2496, a private bill, to Court of Claims (S. Rept. 838);

S. 1696, 1822, 2129, and 2319, private bills (S. Repts. 839–842);

S. 2347, authorization of acquisition of land in the vicinity of Federal prisons for health or safety purposes (S. Rept. 843);

S. 2321, 231, H.R. 1665, and 2946, private bills (S. Repts. 844–847);

H.R. 2978, to permit additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs, with amendment (S. Rept. 848); and

H.R. 3801, 3816, 4134, 5873, 7745, and 8277, private bills (S. Repts. 849–854). **Pages 15918–15919**

Temporary Appropriations: Senate took from desk and passed without amendment (clearing for President) H.J. Res. 510, continuing temporary appropriations until September 20, pending enactment of certain regular appropriation bills. **Page 15918**

Spokane Valley Project: S. 994, authorizing construction of the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, was cleared for President's signature when Senate adopted conference report thereon. **Page 15967**

Century 21 Exposition: By unanimous consent, the name of Representative Fulton was authorized to be added to the conference report on H.R. 8374, relating to the Century 21 Exposition, to be held in Seattle in 1961 and 1962. **Page 15923**

Lake Michigan Water: Senate continued consideration of H.R. 1, Lake Michigan water diversion, taking the following actions on motions and amendments thereto:

Adopted: Fulbright amendment to Case (South Dakota) motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report it back not later than April 1, 1960 (the Case motion would have required report back by January 15, 1960); and

Rejected: By 38 yeas to 42 nays, Mansfield motion to table Case (South Dakota) motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report it back not later than January 15, 1960 (motion to reconsider tabled); and by 41 yeas to 46 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), amended Case (South Dakota) motion to refer the bill to Committee on Foreign Relations with instructions to report it back not later than January 15, 1960.

Pending at recess was question on adoption of first committee amendment.

Pages 15946–15951, 15955, 15956–15959, 15962–15967

Record Votes and Quorum Call: During Senate proceedings today, two record votes and two quorum calls were taken, which appear on pages 15917, 15946, 15947, and 15948.

Program for Tuesday: Senate met today at noon and recessed at 5:55 p.m. until 11 a.m. Tuesday, September 1, when Senate will continue consideration of H.R. 1, Lake Michigan water diversion. **Pages 15966, 15968**

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

MINERALS POLICY

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on S. 1537, H. Con. Res. 177, S.J. Res. 107, S. Con. Res. 63, measures to establish a national mining and minerals policy, with testimony from Royce A. Hardy, Assistant Secretary of the Interior (Minerals Resources).

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the nominations of Walter A. Gordon, of California, to be judge of the U.S. district court for the Virgin Islands; Carl A. Weinman, to be U.S. district judge for the southern district of Ohio; Gordon E. Young, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Arkansas; and J. Smith Henley, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas; H.R. 2978, to permit the court to allow additional peremptory challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs; H.R. 8461, to extend the life of the Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure; H.J. Res. 403, granting consent of Congress to an interstate compact creating the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency; and S. 2347, authorizing acquisition of land in the vicinity of Federal prisons for health or safety purposes; ten private immigration bills (S. 231, 1696, 1822, 2129, 2319, 2321, H.R. 1665, 2946, 3801, and 3816); and six private claims bills (S. 2496, H.R. 4134, 5873, 7225, 7745, and 8277).

Committee indefinitely postponed further action on three private immigration bills (S. 820, 2067, and 2214); and eight private claims bills (S. 1107, 1656, 1726, 2049, H.R. 1517, 2280, 6273, and 7038).

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 40 public bills, H.R. 8946–8985; 7 private bills, H.R. 8986–8992; and 5 resolutions, H.J. Res. 512–514, and H. Res. 367 and 368, were introduced.

Pages 16023–16024

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 8343, acquisition of cropland by eminent domain, filed on August 27 (H. Rept. 1074);

Disposition of executive papers (H. Repts. 1075 and 1076);

S. 1973, to extend the validity of the passport to 3 years (H. Rept. 1077);

H.R. 5054, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 with respect to the marking of imported articles and containers (H. Rept. 1078);

H.R. 5920, to amend the Social Security Act relative to recomputation of social security coverage (H. Rept. 1079);

H.R. 6132, relating to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies (H. Rept. 1080);

H.R. 6785, to fix a tax of 1 cent per pound on certain laminated tires produced from used tires (H. Rept. 1081);

H.R. 7947, relating to the income-tax treatment of nonrefundable capital contributions to Federal National Mortgage Association (H. Rept. 1082);

H.R. 8578, to permit cutting of hay from soil bank land, amended (H. Rept. 1083);

S.J. Res. 25, to change the name of Roosevelt Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant in Arizona to Theodore Roosevelt Dam, Lake, and powerplant (H. Rept. 1084);

H. Con. Res. 393, to promote peace through the reduction of armaments (H. Rept. 1085);

Report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics entitled "The First Soviet Moon Rocket" (H. Rept. 1086);

Report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics entitled "Space Propulsion" (H. Rept. 1087);

Three private bills, S. 1149, 1891, and 252 (H. Repts. 1088–1090, respectively);

S. 2220, Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Personnel Act of 1959 (H. Rept. 1091); and

Eleven private bills, H.R. 1540, 4546, 4965, 6712, 6885, 7260, 7932, 7935, 8110, 8801, and H. Res. 266 (H. Repts. 1092–1102, respectively). Pages 16022–16023

Temporary Appropriations: By a voice vote the House passed H.J. Res. 510, continuing temporary appropriations through September 30 pending enactment of certain regular appropriation bills. Page 15969

President's Veto Message—Public Works: Received and read a veto message from the President on H.R. 7509, fiscal 1960 appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The message was ordered printed and further action on the veto message was deferred to Wednesday. Pages 15969–15970

Printing: Adopted H. Res. 356, to authorize the printing of additional copies of the joint committee print entitled "Summary-Analysis of Hearings on Biological and Environmental Effects of Nuclear War." Page 15970

Seamen's Wages: Adopted the conference report on S. 1958, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect to wages of U.S. seamen, and sent the legislation to the Senate. Page 15972

Consent Calendar: Passed the following bills on the call of the Consent Calendar:

Cleared for the President:

River basin study commission: S. 300, providing for appointment of a study commission of separate representatives for the Guadalupe and San Antonio River Basins, and of a representative of the Texas Board of Water Engineers;

Indians: S. 417 (in lieu of H.R. 3144), placing in trust status certain lands on the Standing Rock Sioux Reservation in North and South Dakota;

Louisiana streams: S. 551, to declare portions of Bayous Terrebonne and LeCarpe, La., to be nonnavigable streams;

Oregon reclamation: S. 1221 (in lieu of H.R. 4952), to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands in Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon;

Lincoln's birthplace: S. 1448 (in lieu of H.R. 5764), relating to Abraham Lincoln Birthplace National Historic Site, Hodgenville, Ky.;

Iowa land conveyance: S. 1453, conveyance of land to Keosauqua;

Tennessee lands: S. 1521, relating to use of Cumberland County, Tenn., lands;

Parole credit: S. 1645, to amend the U.S. Code relative to computation of good-time allowances for prisoners;

Offenses against U.S.: S. 1647, relative to penitentiary imprisonment resulting from offenses against the U.S. or by court martial;

Customs Court: S. 1947, relating to the Customs Court to appoint employees;

Vessel construction: S. 2013, extending the time for commitment of vessel construction reserve funds;

Indians: S. 2029 (in lieu of H.R. 6790), authorizing a per capita distribution of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Confederated Tribe of Siletz Indians in the State of Oregon;

Sea safety: S. 2118, authorizing the Coast Guard to prescribe regulations covering lifesaving and other safety equipment;

Veterans—World War II: S. 2334, transferral of functions respecting World War II insurance benefits and disability payments for seamen;

Indians: S. 2339 (in lieu of H.R. 8317), amending the law relating to the distribution of the funds of the Creek Tribe;

Indians: S. 2421 (in lieu of H.R. 8501), to amend the Klamath Termination Act relative to acquisition date of Klamath Marsh; and

Indians: S. 2435 (in lieu of H.R. 8344), relating to funds transfer to the Ute Mountain Tribe, Colorado.

Resolution adopted without amendment:

Private claim bill: H. Res. 309, providing for sending the bill (H.R. 4583) for the relief of the county of Cuyahoga, Ohio, with accompanying papers, to the Court of Claims.

Sent to the Senate without amendment:

Veterans—deafness: H.R. 268, providing additional compensation for veterans having service-incurred disability of deafness of both ears;

Wheat acreage: H.R. 4874, relating to wheat acreage history;

Utah land conveyance: H.R. 5270, conveying certain lands located in Salt Lake County, Utah;

Foreign agents registration: H.R. 6817, to amend sections 1 and 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938;

Indians: H.R. 7437, authorizing the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma;

Prison land acquisition: H.R. 7571, authorization for the Attorney General to acquire land in vicinity of any Federal penal or correctional institution; and

Indians: H.R. 8514, authorizing the sale of 40 acres of land owned by the Creek Tribe of Indians.

Sent to the Senate amended:

Montana land transfer: S. 53 (in lieu of H.R. 8726), to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Montana, to School District No. 24, Huntley project schools, Montana;

Soil bank contracts: S. 2457 (in lieu of H.R. 8043), to amend Agricultural Act of 1956 relative to equity under soil bank contracts;

Mudd memorial: H.J. Res. 80, providing for the erection of a memorial tablet at Garden Key, Fla., in honor of Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd;

Bi-State Development Agency: H.J. Res. 465, to approve certain additional powers conferred upon Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois;

Indians: H.R. 24, relating to lands in trust for members of the Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation, Nev.;

Veterans disability pensions: H.R. 283, relating to increased compensation for certain service-connected disabled veterans;

California land conveyance: H.R. 2247, authorizing the conveyance of certain real property to Sacramento County, Calif. (by a record vote of 203 yeas to 94 nays the bill was ordered engrossed and read the third time);

Alabama land conveyance: H.R. 2386, to convey to the city of Mobile, Ala., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land;

Minnesota land lease: H.R. 2449, relating to leasing of a portion of Twin Cities Arsenal, Minn., to Independent School District No. 16, of Minnesota;

Surplus property donations: H.R. 3722, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations;

Lighthouse Service: H.R. 5431, to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

Wabash Valley Compact: H.R. 5711, granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact;

Arkansas Post National Memorial: H.R. 6108, establishing the Arkansas Post National Memorial, Ark.;

Indians: H.R. 6128, providing for the division of the tribal assets of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina among the members of the Tribe;

Louisiana educational lands: H.R. 6669, relating to use of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College lands; and

Missouri property lease: H.R. 8315, directing the Secretary of the Army to lease without consideration certain property in Missouri for school purposes.

Bills not considered:

Passed over without prejudice: H.J. Res. 441, H.R. 57, 766, 2565, 6672, 7045, 7379, 8074, and 8591.

Objected to: S. 107 and H.R. 5571.

Pages 15973–15997

Unanimous-Consent Passages: Pursuant to unanimous-consent requests the following bills were called up, considered, and passed:

Boating safety: H.R. 8728, to amend the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to extend the effective date of certain provisions of the act (amended);

Flood prevention: H.R. 4781, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to provide that its loan provisions shall be applicable to certain other projects; and

Vessel sales: H.R. 8042, to authorize the sale of two vessels to the Government of the Republic of China (amended). Pages 15996, 15997–15998

Private Resolutions: H.J. Res. 406, 444, and 445, private resolutions, were cleared for Presidential action by House agreement to Senate amendments thereto.

Pages 15998–15999

Spokane Valley Reclamation: Adopted the conference report on S. 994, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws, and sent the legislation to the Senate. Page 15999

Coal Research: H.R. 6596, to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, was cleared for Presidential consideration by House adoption of conference report thereon. Page 15999

Bills Referred: Two Senate-passed bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Page 16021

Quorum Call and Record Vote: During the proceedings of the House today one quorum call and one record vote developed and they appear on pages 15972–15973 and 15975.

Program for Tuesday: Adjourned at 4:48 p.m. until Tuesday, September 1, at 12 o'clock noon, when the House will call the Private Calendar and consider 14 bills under suspension of the rules (for titles of bills to be considered see page 15986).

Committee Meetings

D.C. LEGISLATION

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee No. 2 ordered favorably reported to the full committee H.R. 6123 (amended), to amend the law relating to indecent publications and gambling in the District of Columbia. Also held hearing but took no action on H.R. 3855, for the licensing of public adjusters in the District of Columbia.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS MISCELLANY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Met in executive session and ordered favorably reported to the House the following bills:

H. Con. Res. 393, to promote peace through the reduction of armaments;

H.J. Res. 496, to invite foreign countries to participate in a world's fair, New York, 1964;

S. 252, a private bill;

S. 1973, to extend the validity of the passport to 3 years;

H.R. 8582, to construct and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Los Indios, Tex.;

H.R. 8694, to construct and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande, at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H.R. 8911, to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay; and

H.J. Res. 511 (amended), to amend the joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Inter-American Children's Institute.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Committee on Government Operations: Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations heard testimony from Agriculture Department officials with respect to cotton transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Hearings adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

Joint Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Conferees met in executive session to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 8575, fiscal 1960 appropriations for military construction, but did not reach final agreement, and will meet again tomorrow.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

Conferees continued, in executive session, to resolve the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 1555, Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, but did not conclude their work, and will meet again tomorrow.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 213, relative to providing social security coverage for nonprofessional school district employees. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate-passed version of this bill.

TAXATION

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of S. 2524, to prevent, under certain conditions, States from imposing on a person a net income tax on income derived from interstate commerce. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate version of title I of the bill, with minor amendments, and agreed to accept the House language of title II of the bill amended so as to designate the Senate Committee on Finance and the House Committee on the Judiciary as the committees to conduct studies authorized by such title.

TAX REFUNDS

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 2906, extending period for filing claims for credit for refund of overpayment of income taxes resulting from renegotiation of Government contracts. The conferees agreed to accept the Senate-passed version of this bill.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

(*All meetings are open unless otherwise designated*)

Senate

Committee on the District of Columbia, Public Health Subcommittee, on S. 2438 and S. 2439, D.C. teachers bills, 9 a.m., 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, executive, on committee business, 10:30 a.m., room F–53, Capitol.

Committee on Government Operations, special subcommittee, on S. 2095, Passport Reorganization Act of 1959, 10 a.m., 3302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, executive, on calendar of bills, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, executive, on committee business, 10 a.m., 5110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, executive, on S.J. Res. 126, antipoll tax, S.J. Res. 11, repeal of 22d amendment, and on other subcommittee business, 10:30 a.m., 404 Senate Office Building;

Subcommittee, on H.R. 5747, relating to certain bankruptcy proceedings, 10:30 a.m., 2300 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee for Special Investigations on retired military personnel inquiry, 10 a.m., 313–A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, executive markup on H.R. 55, passport bill, 10 a.m., G–3 Capitol Building.

Committee on Government Operations, executive, on pending legislation, 10 a.m., 1501 New House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, executive, on pending highway legislation, 10 a.m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Committee on Science and Astronautics, on the Pentagon's decision to abandon its program for the development of a high-energy fuel, 10 a.m., 214–B New House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive, to conclude consideration of miscellaneous bills, 10 a.m., committee room, New House Office Building.

Joint Meetings

Conferees, executive, on S. 1555, Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, 10:30 a.m., room P–63, Capitol.

Conferees, executive, on H.R. 8575, military construction appropriations for fiscal 1960, 9:30 a.m., room F–37, Capitol.

BILLS PROVIDING APPROPRIATIONS AND OTHER NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY, 86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

TABLE I. APPROPRIATION BILLS

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates to date	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's budget estimates to House	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's budget estimates to Senate	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
	1959 SUPPLEMENTAL														
H.R. 5016	2d Supplemental	$2,864,954,526	Mar. 20	$2,479,522,494	Mar. 24	$2,657,402,994	$2,900,799,370	Apr. 18	$2,820,040,054	Apr. 30	$2,843,902,805	$2,764,700,380	−$136,298,990	May 20	86-30
	1959 APPROPRIATIONS														
	SUPPLEMENTAL														
H.R. 7978	Supplemental	888,931,417	June 26	632,568,845	June 29	609,843,845	1,218,090,555	July 30	1,076,186,108	Aug. 3	1,076,186,108	977,345,608	−240,744,947		
H.J. Res. 439	Temporary (July)		June 25		June 30			June 30		June 30				July 1	86-76
H.J. Res. 475	Temporary (August)		July 24		July 29			July 29		July 29				July 31	86-118
	REGULAR														
H.R. 5676	District of Columbia	(246,698,000)	Mar. 13	(237,186,112)	Mar. 16	(237,186,112)	(245,990,000)	May 21	(241,569,402)	May 28	(241,702,402)	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)	July 23	86-104
	Federal payment	34,218,000		27,218,000		27,218,000	34,218,000		29,218,000		29,351,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000		
H.R. 5805	Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	Mar. 18	4,628,097,000	Mar. 20	4,628,097,000	4,688,327,000	May 21	4,663,158,600	May 28	4,664,027,600	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000	June 11	86-39
H.R. 5915	Interior	491,101,400	Mar. 20	472,198,800	Mar. 23	472,198,800	491,101,400	June 5	487,211,025	June 8	487,211,025	481,809,100	−9,292,300	June 23	86-60
H.R. 6769	Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	Apr. 28	3,915,084,181	Apr. 30	3,915,084,181	3,756,848,581	June 23	4,124,460,581	June 24	4,124,460,581	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400	Aug. 14	86-158
H.R. 7040	Independent offices	6,584,188,000	May 8	6,438,839,800	May 11	6,457,657,800	6,584,188,000	June 22	6,559,348,600	June 23	6,559,348,600				
H.R. 7175	Agriculture	4,081,364,863	May 15	3,939,165,498	May 20	3,939,165,498	4,081,364,863	May 28	3,975,505,148	June 3	3,975,774,848	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190	July 8	86-80
H.R. 7176	General government	13,608,500	May 15	13,338,500	May 27	13,338,500	13,608,500	June 22	13,568,500	June 24	13,568,500	13,463,500	−145,000	July 8	86-79
H.R. 7348	State-Justice-Judiciary	682,387,600	May 21	649,896,700	May 27	651,896,700	682,387,600	June 22	650,614,700	June 23	650,924,700	648,941,200	−33,446,400	July 13	86-84
H.R. 7349	Commerce	732,191,000	May 25	674,687,300	May 28	675,297,300	732,191,000	June 16	715,328,500	June 18	715,328,500	712,672,900	−19,518,100	July 13	86-88
H.R. 7453	Legislative	105,460,005	May 28	100,279,350	June 1	100,279,350	133,648,180	June 16	128,797,380	June 18	128,797,380	128,797,380	−4,850,800	Aug. 21	86-176
H.R. 7454	Defense	39,248,200,000	May 28	38,848,339,000	June 3	38,848,339,000	39,248,200,000	July 7	39,594,339,000	July 14	39,594,339,000	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000	Aug. 18	86-166
H.R. 7509	Public Works	1,185,406,259	June 2	1,185,406,259	June 9	1,185,906,259	1,185,406,259	July 8	1,265,565,559	July 9	1,265,565,559	1,215,477,808	+30,071,549		
H.R. 8283	Atomic Energy	2,718,715,000	July 17	2,660,529,000	July 21	2,660,529,000	2,718,715,000	July 30	2,711,829,000	Aug. 3	2,711,829,000	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000	Aug. 18	86-164
H.R. 8385	Mutual Security	4,436,277,000	July 24	3,209,782,000	July 29	3,191,782,000									
H.R. 8575	Military Construction	1,563,200,000	Aug. 7	1,285,002,700	Aug. 10	1,285,002,700	1,563,200,000	Aug. 20	1,428,178,700	Aug. 21	1,428,178,700				
	Total, regular	70,321,493,208		68,047,864,088		68,051,792,088	65,913,404,383		66,347,123,203		66,348,704,993	57,770,859,542	+4,843,159		
	Total, all bills	74,075,379,141		71,159,955,427		71,319,038,927	70,032,294,308		70,243,349,355		70,268,793,906	61,512,705,530	−372,200,778		

TABLE II. NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED OUTSIDE THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS (SO-CALLED BACKDOOR FINANCING)

Bill No.	Title	House					Senate					Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease made by the Congress	Date approved by President	Public Law No.
		President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed	President's requests	Date reported	Amount as reported	Date passed	Amount as passed				
H.R. 4452	Bretton Woods Agreement														
S. 1094	Act	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 25	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 18	$4,550,000,000	Mar. 19	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000		June 17	86-48
S. 57	Housing Act of 1959	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 27	(1,975,000,000)	May 21	(*)	(1,650,000,000)	Feb. 3	(2,625,000,000)	Feb. 5	(2,525,000,000)	(1,300,000,000)	(−$350,000,000)	Vetoed	
S. 2539	Housing Act of 1959	1,650,000,000	Aug. 25	825,000,000	Aug. 27	825,000,000	1,650,000,000	Aug. 13	825,000,000	Aug. 18	825,000,000	825,000,000	−825,000,000		
S. 1	Aid to airports														
H.R. 1011		200,000,000	Mar. 2	297,000,000	Mar. 19	297,000,000	200,000,000	Feb. 5	565,000,000	Feb. 6	465,000,000	126,000,000	−74,000,000	June 29	86-72
H.R. 2256	Veterans' Housing Loan Act		Jan. 29	300,000,000	Feb. 4	300,000,000		Feb. 3	300,000,000	June 16	100,000,000	100,000,000	+100,000,000	June 30	86-73
	Total	6,400,000,000		5,972,000,000		5,972,000,000	6,400,000,000		6,240,000,000		5,940,000,000	5,601,000,000	−799,000,000		

NOTE.—*Authorized $1,975,000,000 to be appropriated.

Grand total, all bills, tables I and II	$80,475,379,151		$77,131,955,427		$77,291,038,927	$76,432,294,308		$76,483,349,355		$76,208,793,906	$67,113,705,530	$1,171,200,778		

Saturday, August 29, 1959

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate met briefly.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15911–15915

Bill Introduced: One bill was introduced, as follows: S. 2618. Page 15912

Century 21 Exposition: Senate adopted conference report on H.R. 8374, relating to the Century 21 Exposition, to be held in Seattle in 1961 and 1962. Pages 15911–15912

Lake Michigan Water: H.R. 1, Lake Michigan water diversion, was briefly debated. Pages 15915–15916

Program for Monday: Senate met today at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 10:19 a.m. until noon Monday, August 31, when it will continue consideration of H.R. 1, Lake Michigan water diversion. Page 15916

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, August 31, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

D852

Appendix

Books and the Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement entitled "Books and the Cold War," together with a letter from Mr. Harry Tyson Carter, of the U.S. Information Agency, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

I eshould like to recall for the RECORD the discussion about books and Soviet censorship which took place on the floor of the Senate near the end of last month.

At that time we were enlightened by spokesmen of both the conservative and liberal wings of the Republican Party who stood together in advising us that the administration had in response to the Soviet Union's demand removed certain books from the American exhibition at the Moscow Fair.

Of course, the administration was really not blamed. The role of other villains was stressed.

The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], representing the conservative wing of the Grand Old Party, entitled his remarks: "Wanted: A Liberal Crusade," and his open attack was on liberals in the Senate and throughout the Nation who were not riding to battle against the Soviet censors as he thought they should. He asked:

"Now the Soviet Union is openly and bluntly censoring the books in our American exhibit in Moscow. Do we hear the liberal bugles sounding the call to battle: Is the air filled with expressions of indignation and invective?" (p. 13306).

With that provocation the senior Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator did reply in order to establish, successfully I think, that in reality the removal of books was an administration decision, and if it represented a retreat, that it was an administration retreat.

Also in the course of that debate, I took the position that the primary responsibility of liberals is the defense of civil liberties and the protection of free access to information here in the United States. We are unable to control what is done everywhere in the world. Our first obligation is to set an example at home. Although we can protest censorship abroad and should give support to those who oppose it, it is not our basic responsibility.

I also had some reservations about the administration's responsibility. If the administration officials were guilty of cowardice, then, of course, that action should be protested. But it seemed to me that the critics should have heard the administration's side, so I wrote to the U.S. Information Service for the information on the contract under which the displays were agreed upon. A fair for the mutual exchange of exhibitions of "Science, Technology, and Culture" is not primarily the place for political debate. We are under no obligation to have cultural and scientific exchanges, but if we agree to attend them usually there are conditions attached.

I have received a reply to my letter from Mr. Harry Tyson Carter, General Counsel for USIA, and from his account of the terms of the agreement between the administration and the U.S.S.R., it seems to me that our friends on the other side started clamoring too soon for a liberal crusade. Mr. Carter writes that while there was no specific agreement on the books to be exhibited, "the agreement did specify with respect to souvenior buttons, emblems, mementos, and samples to be distributed (par. 5) and with respect to motion pictures and slides to be shown (par. 13) that each party would be given an opportunity to make, each to the other, recommendations with respect to the items to be distributed or to be shown.

"It was within the spirit of these provisions that Mr. McClellan received the objections of Soviet officials to the display of certain books. The United States has not accepted these objections as prohibitions, but merely as recommendations, reserving the final decision as to whether specific books will, or will not, be displayed.

"In this connection it should be pointed out that more than 8,000 books arrived in Moscow for the book exhibit. Some were immediately considered by Mr. McClellan to be inappropriate to the purposes of the exhibition."

I attach herewith a letter Mr. Carter wrote. The point is clear, I think.

I should now like to quote a few lines from the actual agreement between our Government and the Soviet Union. In the preamble it is stated that:

"As a mutual declaration of the spirit and intention which shall govern the interpretation and execution of the terms and conditions of this agreement, mention is made of the fact that the success of this exchange of exhibitions requires a substantial degree of flexibility and discretion for each party hereto to determine the scope, nature, and content of its exhibition. * * * There is also, on this account, required and proffered, each to the other, a high degree of trust and cooperation to the end that each exhibition will be facilitated and made successful in furtherance of the mutually advantageous purposes of the above mentioned exchange agreements."

Section 13 of the agreement contains this sentence:

"Each party may show at its exhibition site such motion pictures or slides as it deems appropriate which would be cultural and nonpolitical in character, devoted to an objective presentation of various aspects of its science, technology, or culture."

These excerpts make clear, I believe, that the exhibition was to be nonpolitical in character and that there was an implicit obligation for each government to act in conformity with these general terms. Mr. McClellan, general manager of American exhibit, had the duty to exercise his judgment as to whether books selected fitted in with the spirit of the exhibition agreement. Mr. Carter also notes that as of August 7, with the exception of five books which Mr. McClellan had under study, "all books ever placed on the shelves at the exhibition (including those temporarily withheld during the process of final selection) have now been placed on public display."

I do not always find myself able to uphold the administration, but in this case I am happy to do so. I think the report indicates that Mr. McClellan exercised good judgment and acted in a manner consistent with American tradition and good manners. I trust that Mr. Carter's letter will show that this small tempest in a bookcase did not have the makings of a hurricane. The attack of Republicans in Congress should not have been directed at liberals or at the administration.

On the other hand, I believe this incident does highlight the important fact of the great value of books in the cold war. The use of the power of books to convey ideas and reflect and preserve the richness of American intellectual life and political thought is as important as our economic and military tactics.

Mr. Khrushchev has boasted that the Soviet Union will outproduce us. They may. It way well be that the Soviet Union is ahead of us in satellites. It may catch up with us in washing machines and color television. But the Soviet Union can never, without changing its system, catch up with us in the realm of ideas and the free expression of them. In this contest, our greatest strength is our intellectual creativity, including political thought, and books are the principal means of exporting our ideas. The one area in which the Soviet Union cannot compete and cannot even afford to try to compete is in the area of ideas. Books and the free discussion of the ideas they contain are decisive points of distinction and contrast between the democratic and the totalitarian way of life.

So while I do not think we can expect to use an official exhibition at the Moscow fair as the place of distributing books with liberal ideas, we can and should greatly expand our efforts to make books available to people all over the world.

To this end, I am pleased to see that Ambassador Lodge recently signed the Florence agreement for the United States. This agreement, which provides for the reciprocal elimination of trade barriers on the importation of educational, scientific and cultural materials, was approved by the General Conference of UNESCO in Florence, Italy. It has already been ratified by 31 countries. Contracting states to the agreement grant duty-free entry, under prescribed conditions, to a wide range of materials, including books, publications, and documents. The agreement has been in effect since 1952 and we should have been among the first to ratify it. It will greatly facilitate the exportation of books and other scientific and cultural materials from the United States to other countries. It will be also benefit our own citizens, since they will be relieved of the 5 percent ad valorem U.S. tariff on current books in the English language and the 7½-percent tariff on printed music.

The Florence agreement was received by the Senate last week on August 25 and has already been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. As one of the Senators appointed by the Secretary of State to the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, I urge its approval. Against the background of the importance of books in the cold war, the

ratification of the Florence agreement will be a significant step.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY,
Washington, August 13, 1959.

The Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MCCARTHY: This is in reply to your letter of August 5, 1959, concerning the book exhibit at the American National Exhibition in Moscow.

As regard your specific inquiries, there was no agreement in advance concerning the books to be exhibited. The exchange of exhibitions with the Soviet Union grew out of the basic agreement on cultural, technical, and educational exchanges signed in Washington on January 27, 1958. A protocol agreement of September 10, 1958, called for an exchange of exhibits in the summer of 1959 devoted to the demonstration of the development of science, technology, and culture. This protocol agreement was implemented by a more detailed agreement between the United States and the All-Union Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.S.R. executed on December 29, 1958. A copy of this agreement, which is the basic document relating to this exhibition, is enclosed.

As you will observe, there is no reference whatsoever to books in this agreement. The basic understanding as to the content of the reciprocal exhibitions (always within the framework of "science, technology, and culture") is expressed only in the preamble to the agreement.

However, the agreement did specify with respect to souvenir buttons, emblems, mementos, and samples to be distributed (par. 5) and with respect to motion pictures and slides to be shown (par. 13) that each party would be given an opportunity to make, each to the other, recommendations with respect to the items to be distributed or to be shown.

It was within the spirit of these provisions that Mr. McClellan received the objections of Soviet officials to the display of certain books. The United States has not accepted these objections as prohibitions, but merely as recommendations, reserving the final decision as to whether specific books will, or will not, be displayed.

In this connection it should be pointed out that more than 8,000 books arrived in Moscow for the book exhibit. Some were immediately considered by Mr. McClellan to be inappropriate to the purposes of the exhibition. Certain others were sent to the exhibition site and placed on the shelves for the purpose of selection and arrangement, but were withdrawn prior to public display. It was principally these books which were involved in the controversies reported in the press. Mr. McClellan could not personally check these books overnight and thus postponed judgment on some selections until after the exhibition officially opened to permit adequate study.

Subsequent to the opening of the exhibition, Soviet officials requested that five books be withdrawn. Mr. McClellan removed these five from the shelves for review in order to consider the Soviet recommendation.

As of August 7 Mr. McClellan reported that, with the exception of the five books referred to above, all books ever placed on the shelves at the exhibition (including those temporarily withheld during the process of final selection) have now been placed on public display.

The titles of the five books under review are as follows: Wallbank's "Man's Story"; Miller's "Archeology in the Soviet Union"; "World Topics Year Book of 1959"; "Britannica Book of the Year 1959"; "85th Congress, 1st Session, Soviet Economic Growth: A Comparison with the United States."

The criteria which Mr. McClellan will apply in deciding whether or not to return any or all of the five books to the shelves is simply a commonsense judgment as to whether or not display of the books is in furtherance of the intent and objectives of the agreement for a reciprocal exchange of exhibitions.

In closing I might note that reports from Moscow consistently rate our book exhibit as one of the most effective of the entire exhibition. No doubt you have noticed this in the press.

If we can be of further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

HARRY TYSON CARTER,
General Counsel and Congressional Liaison.

Health Insurance to Persons 65 Years of Age and Older

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a letter I received from the executive vice president of the Michigan Hospital Service in reply to a query of mine regarding the new Blue Cross-Blue Shield plan which would provide health insurance to persons 65 years of age and older. In view of the great amount of interest in the matter of providing medical care and hospitalization for our elderly citizens, I think that this program offered by the Michigan Hospital Service should be of interest to all Members of this body and, in my opinion, is a fine approach to this problem:

MICHIGAN HOSPITAL SERVICE,
Detroit, Mich., August 10, 1959.

The Honorable ALVIN M. BENTLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR MR. BENTLEY: Thank you for your letter of August 4. I will be glad to tell you about our Blue Cross-Blue Shield senior certificates. I cannot send copies of the contracts because they are not yet printed. We will print them as soon as we get final approval from the department of insurance and I will forward copies then.

The enclosed copy of an article in the Detroit News on August 2, which describes the plans in some detail, is factual and objective. Our own descriptive literature is being printed and will be available shortly.

I wish I could say I thought our new program would fully answer the health care needs of the aged, but, of course, it will not. Our boards of trustees did not feel that we could burden all of our present Blue Cross subscribers with the additional load of the older people who had not joined Blue Cross-Blue Shield during their younger and more active years. The great majority of the people over 65 who will enroll in the new program are expected to be those people who had some form of commercial insurance coverage which was not continued after retirement or which may have been canceled because of age.

Michigan Blue Shield is making its new M-75 contract available to these older people. The Blue Shield board and a special committee of the Michigan State Medical Society deserve great credit for making this possible. Michigan Blue Cross-Blue Shield now have some form of protection available to everyone in the State.

You will be interested to know that we now have approximately 135,000 people over 65 years of age enrolled in Blue Cross-Blue Shield in one of the following ways:

1. As active members of an enrolled group.
2. As retirees of an active group. In this case the retiree gets exactly the same benefits as the active worker and pays the same rate. In most cases, however, the employer does not pay any part of the monthly charge for the retiree. The total amount is deducted from the pension check.
3. As direct pay subscribers. These are people who joined Blue Cross-Blue Shield through a group and who then continued their coverage on a direct-pay basis after leaving the group. These subscribers pay 10 percent more than the group rate for somewhat reduced benefits.
4. As nongroup subscribers who joined at some time during the past 10 years when they were under 65 years of age. They may, of course, continue regardless of age once they have enrolled.

While the new senior plans are not as good as our other programs, I feel safe in saying that they will provide better coverage at a more reasonable rate than is available to these people from any other source. We have planned the program on a break-even basis as a service to this segment of the public whose health care problem has not heretofore been properly recognized.

I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

Very sincerely yours,

WM. S. MCNARY,
Executive Vice President.

Prayers, Not Cheers, for Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of New Hampshire's most outstanding weekly newspapers, the Hampton Union, which has stanchly opposed inviting Khrushchev to visit this country, last week endorsed the proposal of Americans for Constitutional Action that the forthcoming visit be offset by prayer.

In his fine editorial, Publisher Edward Seavey urges that prayers be raised instead of cheers when the Soviet Premier arrives. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYERS, NOT CHEERS

Nikita Khrushchev's 12-day itinerary in the United States appears already to have been worked out in considerable detail—with official Washington taking the brunt of it and the only other cities to be infected

being New York, Pittsburgh, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The Soviets themselves have turned down more elaborate and extensive inspection of the Nation for the fairly obvious reason that they do not wish to be obligated to show President Eisenhower very much of the people's paradise.

Included among the turndowns, we assume, is the ill-advised invitation by the president of the New Hampshire Weekly Publishers Association for the "Butcher of Budapest" to attend the fall meeting of the New England Weekly Publishers to be held at the Crawford House for which the Granite State editors are serving as hosts.

This newspaper's position on the Khrushchev visit is too well known to bother with disassociating ourselves with any such invitation and misguided concept of the value of a free exchange of ideas.

To speak of freedom and Khrushchev in the same breath is the height of foolishness. The Soviet leader is the living symbol of communism—an ideology that recognizes no personal dignity or freedom and which is dedicated to destroy everything America stands for. And no visit to our free land is going to alter that course one iota.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES ably summed up our feelings on the matter in a statement this week from Washington:

"My position in regard to the visit of Khrushchev to this country is well known. I am opposed to it, and I have been opposed to it. The invitation, however, has been extended and accepted, so we must view the visit in the light of this situation. The courtesy of proper protocol must be observed and the bad manners heckling which Vice President NIXON underwent must not be repeated here.

"On the other hand, we should not let the traditional optimism of a free people, living a life of abundance, become the inadvertent launching pad for a Soviet propaganda missile aimed at our destruction.

"All people of the free world must realize that in inviting Khrushchev here, and in a proposed return visit to Russia on the part of President Eisenhower, a calculated but nonetheless grave risk is being taken. We must not again fall into the error of personal diplomacy, which led us into the tragedies of Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Let any agreements that may be reached in these visits be a matter of public record immediately.

"From the recent Nixon talks with Khrushchev, it is apparent that Russia suffers from a vast inferiority complex and that Khrushchev is the personification of that national feeling. The rationalization of an inferiority complex is a subconscious tendency to overestimate one's ability. Khrushchev's visit to this country can be of value in demonstrating to him our military and economic strength, on the one hand, and on the other, the solidarity of purpose of the American people. Such an education, while it might not halt his tirades against this country, would at least establish the fact that he spoke in terms of falsehood rather than plain ignorance.

"A return visit by President Eisenhower would again demonstrate to the Russian people, as did Vice President NIXON's visit, that we are interested in solving world problems on a peaceable basis and not as the warmongers, their Kremlin masters, picture us.

"The dangers, on the other hand, are many. Already there are those who would relax somewhat in our all-out effort on the basis of the fact that visits have been tentatively scheduled. This is utter folly since no one can foresee the attitudes and issues which may develop. The exchange will be fraught with propaganda pitfalls which the Russian leaders are only too willing to distort to their own advantage.

"The American people must view the exchange of visits as an experiment or a new approach in dealing with the Soviet Union. The invitation to Khrushchev, for which he has angled for some time, should not be hailed as a positive accomplishment in the area of our relations with the Soviet Union. It would be tragic indeed if the lessons of sputnik melted away in the thaw of a Khrushchev smile."

While there are those who hope that a mighty public protest against the visit may still cause its indefinite postponement, most Americans have resigned themselves to the eventuality and all sorts of suggestions have been forthcoming as to how we should receive the Russian demagog.

The best to date, we believe, is the thinking and planning of Adm. Ben Moreell, USN (retired), who, as chairman of Americans for Constitutional Action, is urging that the blight of the Khrushchev visit be offset by prayer.

In a letter to churchmen, Admiral Moreell reported that they had invited members of 19 patriotic organizations representing 10 million Americans to discuss with them an appropriate posture regarding the Khrushchev visit.

"There was general agreement," he wrote, "that since we are a people whose trust is in God * * * the moral implications of the visit far outweight all the others.

"The question arises then whether, by inviting this visitor to our shores, we give implied moral sanction to his past record and whether, by our action, we endorse the extreme cruelties visited by the Soviet Union on enslaved peoples.

"In light of these thoughts, there was general concensus that, while we should refrain from any demonstrations of hostility, it would be right and proper that Mr. Khrushchev's arrival * * * be set aside as a day of prayer in all the churches of the land. * * * In like manner, special church services should be conducted in each city on the day of Mr. Khrushchev's visit."

Swift approval of the Moreell plan came from Evangelist Billy Graham who said: "I heartily endorse Admiral Moreell's proposal that Premier Khrushchev's day of arrival should occasion a day of prayer on the part of the Nation. * * * May this be an occasion that we conform our national life with our usual boast that God is our trust."

And finally, may those who love their country and detest the things Khrushchev stand for, do their very best to see that this ogre is paraded through empty streets.

General Accounting Office Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion to examine the recent General Accounting Office report on the Air Force purchase of the Wherry housing projects, and it is my belief that this report is misleading and based on false premises.

The report not only artfully avoids the principle question necessarily arising in cases of this sort—namely, did the Air Force receive full value for the dollars spent—but, in fact, it also chastises the Air Force apparently for following the Department of Defense directive calling for direct negotiation rather than condemnation procedures. At no time does the report consider what the results would have been had the Air Force resorted to condemnation of the property.

Considering these points in reviewing the case of particular interest to us—that of Barksdale Air Force Base—we find that the Wherry housing units there had been completed in 1951 and 1952 at an approximate cost of $9,164 a unit. This project consists of 692 two- and three-bedroom housing units for airmen and officers, 544 of which were completed in December 1951 and 148 in February 1952. The original estimate of replacement cost was $6,331,699, or approximately $9,164 per unit. The Air Force, we find, paid a total of $6,256,199, or $9,039 per unit. But the same project if built in 1958 would have cost $8,231,209, or $11,913 per unit. These prices are based on leading surveys which show that a 30 percent increase in construction costs occurred between January 1952 and January 1958 for similar areas. This would have resulted, therefore, in an increase of about $2,850 more per unit. In addition, the owners had even put an additional $100,000 investment into their houses several years after completion in order to improve the electrical systems.

It appears to me, then, that the Air Force received full value for every dollar spent when it paid for the Barksdale and other projects at 1951–52 prices. The Air Force carefully inspected these projects before acquisition. I don't believe there is any one who could buy real estate today for the price it was worth 7 years ago.

Now, had the Air Force not negotiated for the property or if the owners had not accepted the Air Force offers, the Air Force would have had to resort to condemning the property. It would have been necessary to pay today's full value since a court is concerned with the present value of property and not whether a builder will be making a profit from the sale. The results of a number of condemnation trials in connection with disposal of Wherry projects are shown in the attached chart. From these figures, it appears that the results in the courts have been much in excess of the maximum formula price which in turn is limited to original FHA replacement costs. The Constitution requires that just compensation be paid when a property is appropriated and nowhere does the question of profit over original investment enter into the determination of just compensation for condemned property.

The owners apparently were satisfied with the price paid them, preferring to settle for the lower 1952 in order to obtain their money immediately, thereby avoiding a wait of several years for the conclusion of a condemnation action with all of its subsequent expenses.

By this record of negotiated acquisitions as against acquisition by condemnation, the Air Force carried out the congressional intent of the Wherry leg-

islation as well as that of the recent armed services special subcommittee—that is, to negotiate up to the maximum price, if necessary, before going into condemnation proceedings.

Not to have negotiated where possible, therefore, would have meant ignoring congressional policy and executive responsibility to buy the Wherry projects and improve them where necessary to bring them up to current public quarters standards—a goal having priority with the Air Force at this time. Millions of dollars have been lost in training personnel at great expense only to have them leave the service because of inadequate living conditions. The Cordiner Committee, General LeMay, and other high officials have long recognized the fact that a professional Air Force capable of meeting today's defense needs cannot be established if families are required to live in public quarters not commensurate with their quarters' allowance.

This goal will be helped toward realization, it is hoped, by the Wherry acquisition program as well as by the Capehart housing program now underway.

Wherry condemnation award results

Project	Units	Equity formula price	Equity fair market value	Court award	Type of trial	Award to formula equity (percentage)	Award to fair market value equity (percentage)
Air Force:							
Chanute, Ill	800	$954,948	----------	[1] $1,168,296	Judge	122	----------
Travis, Calif	980	1,555,711	$706,000	1,250,000	Jury	80	177
Hamilton, Calif	505	702,281	846,000	1,800,000	do	256	213
McDill, Fla	800	1,587,661	929,000	2,100,000	Commission	132	226
Army:							
White Sands, N. Mex	235	230,037	225,500	440,000	do	191	195
Fort Benning, Ga	800	1,106,864	941,000	2,171,487	Jury	196	230
Huachuca, Ariz	500	527,845	250,900	614,898	Judge	116	245
Belvoir, Va	459	632,314	277,700	740,000	Commission	117	266
Redstone, Ala	120	160,968	100,000	262,420	do	163	262
Fort McClellan, Ala	140	95,074	63,000	257,491	do	271	409

[1] Includes $214,296 interest on judgment.

Memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt: A Fitting Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, I am highly pleased that Congress has now passed and sent to the White House a joint resolution providing for the design of a memorial to President Franklin Roosevelt, and reserving in the District of Columbia a site upon which to locate it.

Not only did President Franklin Delano Roosevelt serve the people of the United States as their President longer than any other man, but during his four terms in office he guided our Nation through 12 of the most difficult years in our history—out of a great economic calamity and through most of the world's worst war.

Mr. President, the paying of this deserved tribute to President Franklin D. Roosevelt has been overly delayed. Whatever may be one's opinion of our 31st President, it will be readily acknowledged that he left a significant and lasting mark on this land. A very excellent editorial from the Northern Virginia Sun, of Arlington, Va., for August 26, pays tribute to this great man, and concludes that the Nation's Capital is incomplete without a remembrance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, "A Fitting Memorial," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FITTING MEMORIAL

Congress has now approved and sent to the White House a measure providing for the design of a memorial to President Franklin Roosevelt.

Whatever one's opinion of President Roosevelt, it may be readily acknowledged that he left as indelible a mark on America as any President in this century, at least, and perhaps in the last 100 years.

That he not only became the first person to break the two-term tradition but went on to win election to a fourth term is a measure of the respect held for him by the American people.

He steered the country through perhaps the worst economic crisis in its history and, under the stimulus of that crisis, instituted more economic reforms and changes than any other modern President.

When he came to office, America was essentially an isolationist country. It was his personal leadership, as he watched dictatorship and brutality flourish in Europe, that wrenched the Nation out of its indifference to the rest of the world and prepared it to meet the obligations of world leadership both during and after World War II.

One need not detract in any way from the abilities of the late Senator Taft by saying that his impact on America cannot be compared to Franklin Roosevelt's. If the bell tower on the Capital grounds that memorialize Senator Taft is fitting, then surely the Nation's Capital is incomplete without a similar rememberance of Franklin Roosevelt.

Federal Aviation Agency's Position on Serving Alcoholic Beverages in Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include my letter addressed to the Federal Aviation Agency and the reply received from Mr. E. R. Quesada, the administrator:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 22, 1959.

Re proposed amendments sections 40.371, 41.135, and 42.65 of the Civil Air Regulations.

Mr. JAMES T. PYLE,
Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PYLE: Pursuant to the notice set forth in the Federal Register, page 5424, Friday, July 3, 1959, my comments, suggestions, and recommendations relative to the foregoing matter (drinking and serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft) are set forth below:

It is obvious to all that the common carriage of passengers by air entails certain risks and dangers peculiar to that form of travel. It is therefore incumbent upon everyone and especially your agency, which is concerned with safeguarding the lives and safety of passengers, crews and others, to discover, eliminate and prevent wherever and whenever possible all hazards to safe air travel.

The foregoing duty is required not only as to known hazards but also for the elimination of potential dangers, dangers which are obvious and apparent to people of ordinary and reasonable prudence. Any failure to eliminate such potential dangers is not only inexcusable but also culpable should injury or loss of life or damage to property result therefrom.

An intoxicated person is irresponsible and his behavior is unpredictable. Space on board an airplane is limited and confining and there is no room to avoid him, no policeman to restrain him and opportunities for imperiling the lives and safety of all aboard and on the ground are varied and many.

The mischief he can do and the tragedy that can ensue is irremediable and inexcusable.

The hazards and dangers to which all are exposed by the presence of an intoxicated person on board an airplane is clear and obvious and incidents have been testified to and your Agency is cognizant thereof.

A drunk on board an airplane is a clear and present danger to the lives and safety of everyone, everywhere, whether the inebriety is brought on by liquor carried onto the plane and there consumed or by liquor purchased on the airplane from the carrier by one who does not "appear to be intoxicated."

I feel that in recognizing the dangers that flow from intoxication aboard an airplane your Agency should adopt regulations that eliminate them by eliminating all possibility of intoxication on board the airplane.

The effect of the proposed regulation is not to eliminate the risk but simply to place the responsibility, in the event tragedy flows from it, onto the shoulders of anyone other than this Agency.

As long as you can regulate you can eliminate. There is no actual need for intoxicating beverages during flight nor is there a demand for such. All airlines would gladly discontinue serving such beverages provided the discontinuance would be complete for all airlines.

The Air Lines Pilots Association and the Stewards and Stewardesses Association have brought this subject up at their national conventions. Each has called for regulations forbidding the serving of alcoholic beverages on planes because it is a potential nuisance to passengers and crews alike and a threat to the safety of all.

In the opinion of those who serve and in the opinion of those being served there is no place for liquor in airplanes during flight.

The language of the proposed regulation could easily imply that: only airlines can serve nonintoxicating alcoholic beverages, the airlines derive a sizable revenue from the sale of intoxicants, and you encourage the consumption of intoxicants sold by airlines.

The proposed regulation places an unfair and unjust burden on the airline personnel by requiring them to determine if a person requesting service "is or appears to be intoxicated."

I fail to see how the proposed regulation eliminates the possibility of tragedy that can arise from a drunken act by one made drunk from being served intoxicants by the airline although he did not appear to be intoxicated when served.

To avoid an anomalous situation created by this Agency I recommend that the regulation be amended to read as follows:

"No person shall drink any alcoholic beverage aboard an air carrier aircraft while in flight within the United States."

The actual amount of time in flight is so short that the total prohibition of the use of intoxicants during flight will create no hardship on anyone, even the habitual user.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1959.

HON. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LANE: This is in reply to your letter of July 22, 1959, concerning proposed amendments to sections 40.371, 41.135, and 42.65 of the Civil Air Regulations.

I enclose for your information a copy of a statement presented by the Federal Aviation Agency to the Subcommittee on Aviation and Transportation of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on July 28, 1959. It was directed to several bills now pending in the Congress. These bills are designed to prohibit the sale or furnishing of alcoholic beverages on aircraft while in flight between points in the United States. The statement contains the reasons which led to the proposed amendments to the Civil Air Regulations referred to above.

Under the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, this Agency is charged with fostering development and safety in civil aviation. Section 601 of the act vests broad general responsibility for, and control over, safety in flight in civil aviation in the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Therefore, this Agency's approach to the practice of serving alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft has been directed to the question of whether there was any safety problem involved. To date, no factual information has been discovered which demonstrates that the practice of serving alcoholic beverages while in flight directly affects safety in the operation of air carrier aircraft.

As indicated in the statement, some incidents have been discovered which could have had an adverse effect upon safety. These were caused by passengers who drank from their own bottle during the course of a flight, or by those who had consumed a considerable quantity of alcohol prior to boarding a flight. The proposed amendments to the Civil Air Regulations are designed to provide the necessary control in these needed areas with a minimal interference to personal freedom. This Agency feels that issuance of amendments to the Civil Air Regulations referred to above will constitute an effective deterrent, and discharge our responsibility with respect to safety.

If future experience demonstrates that safety considerations require further regulation, this Agency can and will issue such regulations.

Thank you for your interest in this important matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. PYLE,
Deputy.
FOR E. R. QUESADA,
Administrator.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JAMES T. PYLE, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY, PRESENTED TUESDAY, JULY 28, 1959, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION AND TRANSPORTATION OF THE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, WITH RESPECT TO H.R. 169, 3716, 7135, 7643, 1075, 6824, 7270, AND 8076

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is James T. Pyle, Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. The Federal Aviation Agency is happy to have the opportunity to appear before this subcommittee for the purpose of commenting with respect to all of these bills which deal with prohibiting the sale or furnishing of alcoholic beverages by air carriers to passengers on aircraft while in flight between points in the United States.

Each of these bills would amend section 610 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 by adding a new subsection which would prohibit the practice of selling or furnishing alcoholic beverages to airline passengers and crews while in flight within the United States. There is some variation in the language in the different bills, but the effect and intent of all of them is the same.

The Federal Aviation Agency believes that the question of controlling the serving of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft is an important one. It has been given careful consideration and study by this Agency. Our approach was not directed to drinking as a social problem, but rather to determine whether there was a safety problem, since this is the concern of our Agency.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration, one of our predecessor agencies, conducted a survey to determine whether the practice of serving alcoholic beverages while in flight might in any way have an adverse effect upon safety. The results of this survey did not reveal any factual information or specific incidents which were found directly to affect safety in the operation of air carrier aircraft. However, some instances were discovered, with respect to passengers, which were of a type that could have an adverse effect upon safety. A study of such instances indicated that almost uniformly they were caused by passengers who had either consumed a considerable quantity of alcoholic beverages prior to boarding a flight, or by those who drank from their own bottles during the course of a flight. No such problem was found with respect to crews or flight attendants.

As a result of our study, it does not appear necessary to prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages by passengers aboard air carrier aircraft in order to meet the safety requirements. This Agency feels that safety needs can be satisfactorily met by permitting consumption of such beverages by those who wish to have them, but providing sufficient control so that no hazard will be created. By so doing, we will interfere as little as possible with the personal freedom of passengers and at the same time prevent abuses that would possibly create a hazardous situation.

Under these circumstances this Agency felt that some regulatory control may be required for safety purposes. This can be done under present law. Section 601 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 vests broad general responsibility for, and control over, safety in flight in civil aviation in the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Under this broad responsibility, safety regulations are promulgated. This Agency recognizes that as larger and faster aircraft come into service with an increase in the number of passengers carried, drinking among passengers might conceivably result in situations where flight attendants and crews would be distracted from their duties. This could create a safety problem.

Accordingly, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency has issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking which will result in the promulgation of a safety regulation unless good cause is shown to the contrary. This regulation would prohibit the consumption of alcoholic beverages aboard air carrier aircraft, unless such liquor is served by the air carrier, and would further provide that no air carrier shall serve alcoholic beverages aboard an aircraft to a person who is in a state of intoxication, or appears to be intoxicated. Violations of this regulation by either passengers or an air carrier could result in the infliction of a civil penalty under section 901(a) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 which could mean a fine not exceeding $1,000.

The above regulation would constitute an effective deterrent. If in the future it can be demonstrated that safety considerations require further regulation of the use of alcoholic beverages by passengers during the course of a flight, then this Agency can and will issue such regulations.

It thus appears that the purpose for which all of these bills have been drafted can be accomplished by regulation under existing law. Therefore, the Federal Aviation Agency can see no need for the enactment of any of these bills.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it interposes no objection to the submission of this statement to your subcommittee.

Letter of Effective Citizens Organization, New York, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Arizona, Senator GOLDWATER, and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received from the Effective Citizens Organization, which was formed in 1954, as a nonprofit, bipartisan organization, to promote good government on all levels.

The views expressed in this letter and the objectives sought to be achieved are those in which all of us can concur.

It is our view that the contents of the letter deserve the thoughtful consideration of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECTIVE CITIZENS ORGANIZATION,
New York, N.Y.

The Honorable GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMATHERS: With the pronounced evidence of interest by businessmen in the political arena it seems appropriate to apprise you of the work of this organization in its role as a pioneer in translating this interest into positive action. Because you are chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, we are particularly anxious for you to be cognizant of our efforts. This same letter is being sent to Senator GOLDWATER, of this Republican Party.

The Effective Citizens Organization (ECO) was formed in 1954 as a nonprofit, bipartisan organization. Its objective is to create an awareness in our business community that good government at any level must always rest upon a substructre of good politics. Business for too long has taken a "hands off" attitude toward political activity. We are sure you agree that democracy cannot survive when otherwise responsible citizens are indifferent, uninformed or just plain lazy.

ECO's original efforts quickly indicated that to arouse interest was not enough. A wide gap existed between interest and effectiveness, and to bridge this gap our practical politics workshop was designed. The first workshop was conducted at Princeton University in 1956, and to our knowledge was the first such workshop ever held in this country. The growth in interest has stepped up ECO's pace to a point where it is conducting workshops at a rate of better than two a month. Since then one or more workshops have been held on college campuses in 22 States. The workshop faculty includes political leaders from both parties, professional teachers and businessmen.

The purpose of the workshop is threefold: First, to create an awareness of the importance of the contribution the businessman can make in the party of his choice; secondly, to learn and discuss some of the techniques of practical politics to demonstrate how the individual can become active and effective; thirdly and lastly why corporate policies and programs should be established to encourage better citizenship.

In the last 3 years nearly 800 representatives from over 600 firms have participated in these workshops. The results and accomplishments are manifold and encouraging. Some of the men now hold elective office; others have attempted to do so. They are, of course, exceptions. Far more encouraging are the great numbers that have assumed political responsibility and position at the precinct, ward and township level. And even more encouraging are the corporations, large and small, which have in the past frowned on political activity, but are now openly encouraging employees to assume greater citizenship responsibility.

This organization does not presume that it should receive all of the credit for the political awakening of business. It is proud, however, to have been the first group to enter the field, and to have assisted the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association of Syracuse and others in similar efforts. Our position toward other programs is not competitive; we have designed sessions to train leaders on how to use these programs.

It is hardly news to you that 1960 is a big political year. Many important issues will be decided, in the American way, at the ballot box. Both political parties must soon begin to staff-up for this big effort. We hope that you will encourage your colleagues in the Senate, the House, and your party's leaders to take advantage of this new source of manpower. Many have gone to work already, but far more will respond to a little encouragement. Not only may they play an important role in the routine but also so important aspects of winning elections, but many possess talents that should be used to advantage. These talents include leadership, public speaking, selling, training, finance, advertising and public relations know-how. Their help and work will make our parties stronger and more representative. The result should be inevitable and most desirable: better government for all.

Sincerely yours,

W. V. MERRIHUE,
President.
H. BRUCE PALMER,
Chairman of the Board.

What Goes on Here?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, a year or two ago Columbia County, N.Y., was complaining of unemployment and the local chamber of commerce of Hudson, N.Y., embarked upon a program of industrial development and with some effort raised funds for the purpose of encouraging new industry to come to that locality.

The following article from the front page of the Hudson Register-Star of August 27 indicates some of the difficulties encountered by that worthy organization with appropriate reference to pending labor legislation.

Assuming that this incident does not represent the actions of responsible unionism it would seem to be an excellent argument for good workable labor-management legislation:

UNION ACTIVITY HERE HALTS NEGOTIATION FOR GARMENT FACTORY

Union activity in this city has been blamed for a Catskill firm withdrawing their negotiations for purchasing a building and setting up a garment factory employing approximately 75 residents.

Leo Katz, owner of the Helene Manufacturing Co. of Catskill, told a Register-Star reporter today that, "If anything, union activity has delayed the negotiations. More likely it has stopped them. I was planning to purchase the Pontiac Building opposite the new motel there in town. Union activity there is stopping the plans."

Mr. Katz said he has been carrying on negotiations with the Greater Hudson Chamber of Commerce but has stopped them when he found the union was planning a last minute effort to unionize the garment plants not under union organization. His plant is presently under what he called a secondary picket line.

Secondary picketing is when the factory is not actually on strike, but the union sets up a picket line with people from other areas. U.S. Congress is presently acting on a bill to outlaw secondary picketing. This, according to Mr. Katz, is forcing the unions to make a last minute attempt to unionize all plants.

A half a dozen or more women appeared suddenly in front of the Sim Garment Co. at 515 Columbia Street this morning, carrying signs protesting unfair acts against the union.

The group, led by John Ricardi, union representative from the Kingston office of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, were gone from in front of the door of the building an hour later.

Harry Sim, owner of the firm stated, "I know this may sound silly buy I don't know what they were doing out there. None of the girls were from the factory down the street."

One factory worker said she had recognized several of the girls and said they were from as far away as Newburgh. Mr. Katz said the two pickets in the line in front of his door this morning were from this city.

When asked why they are there, Mr. Katz said, "The unions are seeking any excuse in their attempt to get us into the union. Hudson has union factories and they are putting pressure on the nonunion plants, trying to get them to join before the law is passed."

Executive Secretary Gus Kramer, from the chamber of commerce, said today, Mr. Katz has not been in contact with him about the purchase of the Pontiac Building.

Attorney Charles Alonge, representing the owner of the building, was unavailable for comment.

Eventful New Book About Dr. John McLoughlin, of the Hudson's Bay Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Significant Book on Northwest History," from the Oregon Journal of Portland of August 26, 1959. The editorial heralds one of the most thoughtful and thorough chronicles ever written about the historic figure, Dr. John McLoughlin, chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Co. The author of the book is Dr. Burt Brown Barker, of Portland, a leader in the Oregon Historical Society, and vice president of the University of Oregon. Dr. Barker has long been known as an eminent custodian of the rich pioneering background of the Pacific Northwest. In this centennial year of Oregon's statehood, I believe many of my colleagues will be interested in this editorial from the Oregon Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Aug. 26, 1959]

SIGNIFICANT BOOK ON NORTHWEST HISTORY

Dr. John McLoughlin, chief factor of the Hudson's Bay Co. at Fort Vancouver, Wash., was the outstanding and most influential personality of all the great figures who dominated the stage in the occupation and

early settlement of the Oregon country. We think none will dispute this appraisal of the stalwart physician who became administrator of the widefiung fur buying operations of the Hudson's Bay Co. and who was by his character, integrity and diplomacy wielded a virtual despotic, if kindly and beneficent, rule over the area now substantially encompassed in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, western Montana, and the Province of British Columbia.

The chief factor's decisions were essentially unwritten law for English, Scots, French-Canadians, Indians of a score of tribes and the first Americans who penetrated the great Northwest wilderness. Every biographical recital of Dr. McLoughlin's vigorous regime reveals some new facet of capacity and talent—and some of his flaws. Inside the huge log stockade now laid bare for all to see at the eastern edge of Vancouver, Dr. McLoughlin entertained world travelers and scientists, conducted a sort of medieval realm and made imperishable history.

Consequently, McLoughlin has attracted most of the highly skilled researchers. Chief of these is Dr. Burt Brown Barker of Portland, attorney, educator and historian, who has given devoted years to preservation of our contacts with the days when McLoughlin, Peter Skene Ogden, David Douglas, Dr. and Mrs. Whitman, Jason Lee, and their fellows trod the wilderness of the Oregon country.

Barker, like Herbert Hoover, his warm friend since their early manhood at Salem, also defies age and aging. Barker was a leading figure in establishment of the McLoughlin house at Oregon City. He more recently led in restoration of the home of Dr. Minthorn at Newberg, where Hoover spent his boyhood with aunt and uncle. Dr. Barker is no armchair researcher. After he began his earlier studies on McLoughlin, he studied the Hudson's Bay Co. archives in London. Subsequently, he edited and published, "Letters of Dr. John McLoughlin, Written at Fort Vancouver, 1829–32," and later, "Financial Papers of Dr. McLoughlin," together with many articles in the quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society, of which he was president two terms.

Thoroughly convinced that there must exist letters written to McLoughlin's family, all prominent members of the community near or in Quebec, Dr. Barker delved there until he found a splendid and valuable collection in the hands of an understanding descendant.

And now Dr. Barker has done it again. In this Oregon centennial year, he has just authored the most significant publication on Northwest history to appear in many years, entitled, "The McLoughlin Empire and Its Rulers," which tells the fascinating story of Dr. John, his brother Dr. David and their sister Marie Louise. Dr. David McLoughlin, educated in Scotland, achieved fame as a leader in Paris medical circles and as physician to King Louis Phillipe until his overthrow, when David removed to London to continue to lead his profession. As Sister St. Henry, Marie Louise became mother superior of the influential Ursuline convent and girls' school in Quebec. Thus the Seine, the St. Lawrence and the Columbia were closely linked in letters exchanged between the three grandchildren of Col. Malcolm Fraser, a Scot who had fought under Wolfe at Quebec in 1759 and was granted an estate (seigniory) on the St. Lawrence as reward for his bravery.

This book of 370 pages, handsomely bound, is a great tribute to the enthusiastic scholarship of Dr. Barker. It contains the rich cache of 118 family letters, some shown in excellent photostats. There is also highly valuable additional McLoughlinia. A color plate of the McLoughlin and Fraser coats of arms and clear photographs of family paintings or pictures are included.

The thanks and appreciation of Oregon historians and residents go to Dr. Barker for his magnificent contribution and tremendous historical research. Much disclosed here is new and Oregon and American archives are richer for the acquisition of these McLoughlin family letters.

Warning to Congress on Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Sylvia Porter from the August 26 issue of the Owosso Argus-Press urging that the Congress pass legislation to raise the interest rate scale on U.S. savings bonds. Since this is one of the most vital problems before us, I hope that the Congress will take prompt action in this matter. It is extremely difficult for the Federal Government to have an adequate debt management program when it is continually forced to go into the short-term money market for funds:

WARNING TO CONGRESS ON BONDS
(By Sylvia Porter)

Warning to the 86th Congress of the United States: Before you adjourn, pass a law permitting the Treasury to raise the interest rate scale it pays to the millions of Americans who today hold or are buying U.S. savings bonds or you will:

Invite an avalanche of cash-ins of savings bonds by little investors who have bought these bonds with the idea of keeping them to maturity but who are now aware that the top rate they can earn on the bonds is far below what they can get on a deposit in most savings banks;

Drastically curtail the sale of new bonds to wage and salary earners who would like to buy the bonds for their basic nest eggs but who also know that the pay scale on the bonds has become glaringly out of line with the general level of interest rates;

Risk forcing your own U.S. Treasury to borrow billions of IOU's in order to get the cash via expensive short-term money needed to pay off bonds presented for redemption by disillusioned holders;

Give corporations which never have liked the job of maintaining employee payroll savings programs a perfect excuse to cut off the programs and thereby deprive employees of the greatest medium for regular, disciplined savings ever devised in our land;

Undermine the reputation of the U.S. Treasury among financiers the world over who are fully informed about our debt management problems.

It is inconceivable that our Congress does not appreciate the importance of a thriving savings bond program to the Treasury and realize the place the bonds play in the financial lives of millions of families.

Over 40 million Americans now own more than $42 billion of these riskless, nonmarketable bonds which pay 3 percent interest if held for 5 years, 3¼ percent interest if held to maturity in 8 years, 11 months. Over 8 million are buying them today under payroll savings plans.

The program has been the most successful of all the Treasury's debt management operations since World War II. But it has become increasingly endangered in recent years as interest rates have climbed across-the-board and the pay scale on savings bonds has become progressively less attractive. Last month redemptions of the bonds totaled $507 million against new sales of only $350 million. For 12 months redemptions have been topping sales—meaning the program has been going in reverse.

In recognition of the interest rate realities, the Treasury in early June asked Congress to permit it to boost the pay scale so the bonds would pay 3¾ percent if held to maturity. The request was included in a package also asking that the Treasury be allowed to sell new marketable bonds with coupons above the legal ceiling of 4½ percent.

The opposition to the removal of the 4¼ percent ceiling has been intense—reflecting a combination of honest doubt about the economic effect of rising interest rates and pure politics—and Congress has turned down this request. As a result, the Treasury will have to do all its multibillion dollar borrowing in the coming months through new short-term loans. That will be expensive, fundamentally unsound debt management—but apparently, that's the way it will have to be.

Despite its "No" on removal of the marketable bond ceiling, though, Congress still can pass a separate bill permitting the savings bond rate hike. The Treasury doesn't want to settle for this, but it will to avert a flood of cash-ins and keep the program alive.

If Congress does this? Then, a recommendation of the bonds for basic savings nest eggs again will be justified.

If Congress does not? Then no one can forecast what might happen. A calling of a special session actually might be necessary to rescue the program from slaughter.

Congress dare not shrug off the risks inherent in inaction. A body of responsible lawmakers dare not ignore what is at stake here.

Importance of Oil Industry to Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this year—1959—marks the centennial of the American oil industry.

Since the first commercially successful well, opened at Titusville, Pa., on August 27, 1859, the oil industry has had a tremendous impact upon the economy of our Nation.

Although Wisconsin is one of the 17 States that produces no petroleum or natural gas, the industry has nevertheless been of extreme significance to our economy. Among other things, it is estimated that about 54,000 men and women are employed by the industry in Wisconsjn.

From time to time, I have differed with the industry on our oil, as well as natural gas, policy.

Nevertheless, I well recognize the significance of the fine contribution of the oil industry to progress in the Nation's economy.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial entitled "State Produces No Oil, But—," revealing the significance of the industry to our Badger State; as well as reflecting the importance of the industry to the entire Nation. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 28, 1959]

STATE PRODUCES NO OIL, BUT—

Wisconsin is one of 17 States, not counting Hawaii and Alaska, that produce no petroleum or natural gas. (Though who is to say that valuable supplies are not locked somewhere below the State's rolling surface?)

Still, oil and its derivatives have had so tremendous an impact upon Wisconsin and Milwaukee that Governor Nelson was thoroughly justified in joining in proclaiming the centennial of the American oil industry. The industry was born when Col. Edwin L. Drake brought in the first commercially successful well at Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1859.

Imagine Wisconsin without petroleum. Few automobiles, trucks, buses, or farm tractors—and those clumsily run by steam, alcohol or charcoal. No airplanes. Few of the factories that produce autos, auto parts or internal combustion engines.

An estimated 54,000 men and women are employed by the oil industry in Wisconsin. More thousands hold jobs dependent in one way or another on oil. A million and a quarter automobiles are registered in Wisconsin, plus a quarter of a million trucks and buses. According to the fact book of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, these drivers and all those who heat with oil or natural gas or use petroleum products in other ways consume the equivalent of 2.7 billion gallons of oil a year—better than 700 gallons per man, woman, and child. Fuel and vehicle taxes collected exceed $100 million a year.

For Milwaukee's expanding port, petroleum products represent a major part of the tonnage handled—roughly 2½ million of the port's better than 8 million tons. Oil and gasoline are pumped directly from tankers to storage tanks on Jones Island and from there distributed throughout Milwaukee and parts of Wisconsin.

Progress Toward Tax Rate Reform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on January 21, 1959, my friend and distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Tennessee, HOWARD H. BAKER, and I, introduced companion bills, H.R. 3000 and H.R. 3001, to reform Federal tax rates and methods to accord with the economics of progress. We were most gratified when identical bills subsequently were introduced by our esteemed colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative BRUCE ALGER, of Texas (H.R. 3607); and Representative JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr., of Tennessee (H.R. 4266); and also by the distinguished Members of the House, Representative O. C. FISHER, of Texas (H.R. 4584); Representative J. CARLTON LOSER, of Tennessee (H.R. 6776); and Representative C. ROSS ADAIR, of Indiana (H.R. 8765).

In the intervening months, we have received many expressions of encouragement and support from Members of the Congress, from our constituents and other citizens from all sections of the country, from various organizations including many State and local business groups, and from editorial writers and columnists.

The most constant theme of these expressions has been the practical, commonsense nature of the legislation. As would be expected, greatest interest has been expressed in the reform in the graduated rates of individual income tax, which now climb so steeply through the middle and higher brackets. Over 5 years, these rates would be compressed downward with reductions of over 50 percent in the middle brackets, and the top rate coming down from 91 to 47 percent to coincide with the new top rate of corporate tax under the legislation. The first bracket rate would be reduced from 20 to 15 percent, giving all individual taxpayers a minimum tax reduction of 25 percent. We are attaching to this statement a table by which tax liability in each bracket can be computed as of the end of the reduction period compared with present law.

The climate favoring tax rate reform over increased Government spending has been strongly evidenced by the enthusiasm for the basic concept of the legislation, namely, priority in use of revenue increase from economic growth—which should run from $4 to $5 billion a year—to moderate the tax obstructions to growth. This enthusiasm has extended to the essential procedure of the legislation, namely, the forward scheduling of rate reductions with postponement in event of budget unbalance.

Great interest has also been displayed in the other features of the legislation—the 1 percentage point annual reduction over the 5-year period in the corporate tax, down to a new top rate of 47 percent; the reduction of approximately 25 percent over the 5-year period in the maximum required property lives for depreciation purposes; the deferral of tax on transfer of capital from one investment to another by individuals; and the uniform reductions in the rates of estate and gift taxes, down to a new top rate of 47 percent on estates and 35.25 on gifts.

The response we have received reenforces our conviction as to the soundness and urgent necessity for enactment of this legislation, and that the overwhelming majority of our citizens would welcome such action by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in this statement, our purpose is not to repeat the full explanation of the provisions of our bills, and supporting facts, which were included in our introductory statement of January 21, but to state in brief form some of the key points involved in this approach to tax rate reform. In subsequent releases we will elaborate on some of these points.

First, there is the goal of the legislation. It is not primarily to provide tax relief merely for the sake of relief, as important and justifiable as that would be. Instead the fundamental objective is the release of tax brakes on economic progress. More specifically, by permitting the more rapid accumulation of new capital out of current income, and moderating the tax destruction of capital already accumulated, our bills are designed to bring about the achievement of higher economic growth; improvement of old jobs and creation of better jobs; more rapid advance in living standards; starting and development of new businesses; control of inflation through greater production and productivity; strengthening of our economic system and our position of leadership, prestige, and influence in the free world.

From the standpoint of our own citizens, those now in the lower income levels have the most to gain from increase in the flow of capital into the expansion of industry and the resultant improvement of old jobs and creation of better jobs.

Second, despite the benefits which will flow to all citizens from enactment of this legislation, we purposely avoided seeking our goals through the shifting or reshuffling of tax burdens among various segments of our citizens. Our approach reflects only one judgment on the tax law, namely, that rates climb too steeply and are much too high for the good of our economy and the well-being of our citizens.

Third, the goals sought can be attained if the leadership, in the Congress and in the executive branch, makes a very simple decision, namely, that, barring a new military emergency, fundamental reform of tax rates and methods is of much greater importance to the future strength and well-being of our Nation than any and all proposals for increase in spending. In other words, by giving priority to the use of revenue increase from economic growth for the reform of tax rates and methods instead of increased spending, we can achieve a tax rate structure within 5 years which will enable our economy to make much more rapid economic progress than has been the case over recent years. There are three important figures to keep in mind in this respect. A 1-percent increase in gross national product, the commonly accepted measure of economic growth, will produce a revenue increase of approximately a billion dollars a year. For 60 years before the depression of the 1930's, our economic growth averaged out at approximately 4 percent a year, which if achieved hereafter would mean revenue increase of approximately $4 billion a year. The revenue effect of our bills would average about $3.5 billion a year. Thus, if upon enactment of our bills the growth rate should no more than equal the historic average, there still would be a surplus available for debt retirement of approximately one-half a billion dollars a year. Actually, there is no reason why upon enactment of this

legislation our economy should not begin to move upward toward a steady growth rate in the order of 5 percent instead of 4 percent. Such a rate of growth is clearly possible because of the speed of technological advance and the fact that a higher income economy can save more than a lower income economy—if not restrained by punitive tax rates.

Fourth, the procedure of our bills, forward scheduling of rate reduction linked with postponement in the event of budget unbalance would enable the Nation's leadership to make the necessary decision without fear of a return to a period of deficit financing. This point cannot be stressed too strongly. In the current session of Congress, we have witnessed and supported the determined effort exerted by the leadership of both national parties in the Congress and the administration, to reduce and control the spending level. Enactment of the pending legislation would add both strength and greater meaning to this effort, since it would offer on a continuing basis over its life a clear choice for the public between greater spending or a more moderate tax rate structure.

Fifth, over the years ahead enactment of fundamental tax rate reform legislation will not prejudice debt retirement. To the contrary tax rate reform inevitably will pave the way to greater and more consistent reduction in the Federal debt. We are completely sympathetic to the laudable aims of debt retirement, but we want to keep the horse before the cart. The public debt is now in the order of $285 billion and, even if $3.5 billion a year were applied to its reduction over the next 5 years, it would still be in excess of $265 billion—leaving the major job still ahead of us. By contrast, the application of the same amount of revenue dollars to fundamental tax rate reform over this period would mean that a greater part of the tax reform job would be behind us. This not only would mean that the annual revenue gain would be greater and more consistent thereafter, for whatever division between debt retirement and further tax reforms that might be decided—it also would mean greater revenue gain and hence some opportunity for debt retirement during the 5-year period itself. In short, the debt retirement job is, of necessity, a long-range one, whereas the tax rate reform task can be substantially accomplished over a relatively few years. Its accomplishment, therefore, is the first step toward insuring maximum and consistent reduction in the debt over the long run.

Sixth, our bills would contribute to broadening of the Federal tax base, an aim which is of great concern to all Federal tax policymakers and authorities in this era of high public spending. The great interest in this area is the base of the individual income tax, which tax provides roughly 50 percent of Federal revenues. In 1957, the base of this tax, defined as "taxable income," was approximately 43 percent of total personal income, as compared with 34 percent only 10 years earlier. The reason for this growth in the tax base is that without material change in exemptions, credits and deductions, taxable income increases roughly 50 percent faster than the increase in personal income. Thus, achievement of higher rates of growth and of increase in personal income, which would be brought about by enactment of the pending legislation, would accelerate expansion of the tax base.

Seventh, in permitting an increase in the rate of new savings, and by moderating the destruction of capital already saved, our bills would strike at the roots of the inflation problem, and also at the interest rate problem as it has been highlighted in the contemporary controversy over lifting the ceiling on interest rates of Federal bonds. The inflation of this era essentially reflects a greater demand from all sources for the combined product of economic activity than can be provided by capital formation under present tax rates. The constant upward pressure on interest rates is simply a reflection of the inadequacy of new savings to do all of the things which all of our citizens want done to enhance their economic well being. Stated differently, a greater rate of new savings is the only route to greater rates of increase in production and productivity, which in turn are the means to better satisfaction of competing demands on the economy while dampening inflationary pressures.

Eighth, there is the matter of job creation and betterment. We are moving into a period in which there will be significant step-up in the numbers of new workers coming each year into our labor force, reflecting the very rapid increase in population trends starting from World War II. The question is not just one of providing jobs, since people can always be put at doing things which essentially result in sharing the work and hence reducing average living standards, instead of steadily increasing those standards. Better jobs, more good opportunities for old as well as new workers, can come about only by the availability of more capital which is the only means for translating into effective use the benefits of technological progress. Related to this subject alone, the pending legislation might well be called the Job Betterment Act of 1960.

Ninth, we come to a matter which ranks high in the interest and concern of every Member of Congress, namely, the starting and development of new businesses. There can be no doubt as to the forces which hold back the full flowering of the American genius for striking out on one's own and for improvement and expansion of an enterprise once begun—the shortage of capital, essentially of the venture variety, and stifled incentives, both resulting from our present tax rate structure. All the reforms provided in our bills would contribute toward the release of tax obstructions to business development from the starting stage onward, but the most important reform in this respect would be the compression of the individual tax rate scale under the umbrella of a reasonable top rate. Here is the key not only to a substantial increase in the accumulation of new venture capital, but also to making it much more worthwhile from the incentive standpoint both to use capital so accumulated and to transfer other capital into new and more venturesome enterprises. The individual income tax is the special cross of small business. On the one hand, it chokes off the traditional source of venture capital for the starting and development of new businesses, whether or not such businesses are conducted in the incorporated or unincorporated form. On the other hand, some 85 percent of business units in the country are unincorporated, and hence are the particular prey of the ruthless graduation of the personal income tax rates.

Tenth, there are the self-employed professional people, whose incomes also are subject to the ruthless graduation of the individual income tax. The only fundamental solution of the tax problem of these key members of our society is substantial compression of the individual tax rate structure as provided in our bills.

Eleventh, in a time when the American free economic system is held out as a showcase for the free world, our Federal tax system is an exceedingly poor model for export. For many years, we have endured gross contradiction of policies in this respect. On the one hand, we have sent untold billions of dollars of taxpayers money abroad—and encouraged private investment abroad—to aid and spark the development of the economies and to raise the living standards of free world nations. On the other hand, we have continued a tax model at home which both inhibits the formation of new capital and destroys capital once accumulated; a model, which when copied or continued abroad simply tends to perpetuate the need for foreign funds to build up economies, especially in the so-called less-developed countries. Who could doubt that enactment of tax rate reform legislation in this country based on the concept of moderate rates at all points would set a pattern for similar action in other countries, thus significantly reducing the need for foreign aid funds over the years.

Twelfth, there are the challenging twin problems of the Russian bid for world economic leadership and the growing success of Western European and other countries in competing with us everywhere including our own domestic markets. Certainly, if we are to lead effectively, and to compete successfully, in a period of dynamic economic growth throughout the world, we need to rid ourselves as rapidly as possible of the tax shackles which are binding our free economy.

Thirteenth, the key provision of the legislation, the compression over 5 years of the steep climb of the graduated income tax rates down to moderate and reasonable levels considered alone does not present a significant revenue problem. This is so because the graduated part of the rate structure provides only

14 percent of the revenue derived from the individual income tax or about $5 billion a year.

And, finally, the test of fairness of a reformed income tax rate structure must be found in the relative burden of taxes after enactment and not in the relative percentage cuts applied to preexisting rates. In this connection, it is often overlooked that the measure of regressivity, proportionality or progressivity of a tax is the relation of tax to total income, not to the base of the tax, that is, taxable income as regards the individual tax. This relationship is known as the effective rate of tax. The point is that exemptions provide substantial protection from payment of tax to people in the lower income brackets, protection which diminishes rapidly as income increases. Under our bills there would be a range of effective tax rates from only 1 or 2 percent in lower levels of income subject to tax, up toward 47 percent at the top. Certainly such a range of progression would satisfy all but the most extreme advocates of this form of taxation.

Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that this statement will contribute to a more general realization that the fundamental reform of tax rates and methods as provided in our bills is practical and feasible, as well as urgently needed in the national interest; that there will develop before the Congress convenes again in January an insistent demand that there be no further delay in congressional action; and that the Nation's leaders, in the Congress and in the executive branch will give the subject the priority it deserves.

Tax computation tables—individuals

If the taxable income [1] is—	The tax	
	Is (present law)—	Will be (when legislation fully effectuated)—
Not over $2,000	20 percent of the taxable income	15 percent of the taxable income.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$400, plus 22 percent of excess over $2,000	$300, plus 16 percent of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$840, plus 26 percent of excess over $4,000	$620, plus 17 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,360, plus 30 percent of excess over $6,000	$960, plus 18 percent of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,960, plus 34 percent of excess over $8,000	$1,320, plus 19 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,640, plus 38 percent of excess over $10,000	$1,700, plus 20 percent of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$3,400, plus 43 percent of excess over $12,000	$2,100, plus 21 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$4,260, plus 47 percent of excess over $14,000	$2,520, plus 22 percent of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$5,200, plus 50 percent of excess over $16,000	$2,960, plus 23 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$6,200, plus 53 percent of excess over $18,000	$3,420, plus 24 percent of escess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$7,260, plus 56 percent of excess over $20,000	$3,900, plus 25 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$8,380, plus 59 percent of excess over $22,000	$4,400, plus 26 percent of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$10,740, plus 62 percent of excess over $26,000	$5,440, plus 27 percent of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$14,460, plus 65 percent of excess over $32,000	$7,060, plus 28 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$18,360, plus 69 percent of excess over $38,000	$8,740, plus 29 percent of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$22,500, plus 72 percent of excess over $44,000	$10,480, plus 30 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$26,820, plus 75 percent of excess over $50,000	$12,280, plus 31 percent of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$34,320, plus 78 percent of excess over $60,000	$15,380, plus 32 percent of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$42,120, plus 81 percent of excess over $70,000	$18,580, plus 34 percent of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$50,220, plus 84 percent of excess over $80,000	$21,980, plus 36 percent of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$58,620, plus 87 percent of excess over $90,000	$25,580, plus 38 percent of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $150,000	$67,320, plus 89 percent of excess over $100,000	$29,380, plus 41 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$111,820, plus 90 percent of excess over $150,000	$49,880, plus 44 percent of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$156,820, plus 91 percent of excess over $200,000	$71,880, plus 47 percent of excess over $200,000.

[1] After deductions and exemptions.

How To Treat Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the problems created by the recent invitation extended to Nikita Khrushchev are not restricted to those of us in public life. Indeed, the forthcoming visit by the Soviet Premier has given birth to a sticky situation for every American.

A recent editorial by Nicholas J. Mahoney, Jr., editor and publisher of the Newport (N.H.) Argus-Champion, comments on the quandary in which the general public finds itself regarding Khrushchev's visit. I believe this is a fine editorial and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO TREAT NIKITA

Too many persons have set themselves up as experts in advising Americans how to behave when Nikita Khrushchev arrives next month for his much heralded visit. We are exhorted by some, including Vice President NIXON to be courteous. Others suggest we refrain from lining the streets along which his motorcade will travel. We are told to picket him, to ignore him, to give him the bronx cheer, to be hospitable, to greet him enthusiastically, to regard him with stony faced indignation.

We are reminded that he holds high office in a country that once was our wartime ally, that he is a murderer, a liar, a ruthless dictator.

We are in fact being told to mind our manners by a variety of self-appointed experts.

All the free counseling we are receiving, however, probably will have little or no effect on our conduct.

When Nikita arrives, Americans are apt to act pretty much as their consciences dictate.

There will be those who turn their backs on him with undisguised disgust. There will be fawners who wine and dine him, toast his health and the spirit of communism. There will be hecklers and toadies and pickets pro and anti. Emotions will run the gamut from sheer hatred to near adoration and there undoubtedly will be a monumental display of hypocrisy.

The behavior of Americans during the Khrushchev visit will be most enlightening.

But, to many, one of the prime pleasures of life would be to have a couple of overripe tomatoes and a clear shot at Nikita's mush.

That conduct is easier to understand than that of those who toast his health and shake his hand, dine with him, and show him top secret military installations, information about which is denied even to loyal Americans.

Fight Against Import Tide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the fight against the tide of foreign imports that is threatening our basic economy is still on.

In this connection, I would like to offer for inclusion in the RECORD, an article by Mr. John Herling which appeared in the Washington Daily News on August 4. Mr. Herling presents the problem in a masterful way, and I am sure Members of the House will appreciate the need for taking early action to correct this situation so ably pointed out by Mr. Herling.

The article follows:

FIGHT AGAINST IMPORT TIDE
(By John Herling)

A cloud no bigger than a coat and a pair of pants now threatens the prosperity of the men's clothing industry. The source of the danger comes up like thunder from Japan and Hong Kong. The Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, the chief U.S. labor organ-

ization of the men's apparel industry, and the employers have decided to make common cause to ward off the danger of imports.

After the war, the Marshall plan and similar systems of aid restored the industrial economies of many countries. Today these countries have not only become self-sustaining, they are now competing with our industries in the American and Canadian markets. For example, auto imports, once a trickle, pour in from Europe so that Detroit knows that this is no longer kiddie-car competition. Steel companies find that steel imports are mounting and the current strike will stimulate the flow of steel from abroad.

More than one hint has been released that it might be well for management and unions to close ranks against an immediate challenge to business and jobs. Even the textile industry, long split by bitter labor-management struggles, has synchronized, if not integrated, its efforts against the rising import tide.

All this is very distressing to many Government, industry, and union leaders because organized labor for a long time espoused the long-range position that what's good for the world's economy is good for the United States. Among the most articulate advocates of this principle has been the Amalgamated Clothing Workers. Now its president, Jacob Potofsky and its executive board charges that the United States and Canadian clothing industry is being "threatened by unfair competition from sweated labor abroad."

Here is the roster of amalgamated grievances:

"The volume of apparel imports, particularly from Japan and Hong Kong has increased enormously. From 1954 to 1958 shirt imports, for example, have expanded over 800 percent. The U.S. knit-glove industry is well on the way to destruction. Imports of pajama robes, underwear, pants, raincoats, outerwear, sporting apparel and equipment are rapidly increasing.

"Tailored clothing is arriving from abroad in ever larger quantities. Hong Kong's mail-order business is tailored clothing with customers in the United States and Canada expands. For the first time in Japan's history a ready-to-wear tailored clothing industry is being developed to export to the United States and Canada.

"We now find that the hard-won labor standards of our members, and ultimately their jobs, are threatened by the evils of starvation wages and sweatshop conditions imported from abroad. The competitive advantage of imported apparel is rooted in substandard wages, the equivalent of 10 cents an hour and degrading working conditions. It is based on long hours of work—60 hours a week for women and children—homework, shameful exploitation of the labor of the young, the aged, and infirm. No apparel manufacturer in the United States or Canada can hope to meet this kind of competition, and one one should be expected to meet it from Japan, Hong Kong, or anywhere else."

Where does this leave the international trade policy of this—and perhaps other—unions? Answer: "This union has long favored improved trade relations among the nations of the world. It has been a stanch suporter of the reciprocal-trade programs ever since the early days of the New Deal. But reciprocal trade was conceived as a middle-of-the-road approach to liberalizing international trade without injurying the domestic industries of any nation. It was never intended to be an instrument for destroying an important American industry by unfair competition from sweated labor abroad."

Additional Commendation for Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it may well be that the passage of the Captive Nations Week resolution will turn out to be one of the most important actions of this session of Congress. The yelps of anguish emanating from the Kremlin as a result of the proclamation of this week, and the tremendous repercussions it has had among friends of those behind the Iron Curtain, testify eloquently to the effectiveness of the resolution.

This reaffirmation of America's traditional bonds with the peoples now enslaved by the Communists and our renewed pledge to work for their freedom and right to self-determination mark an important milestone in the free world's efforts to promote justice and fairplay throughout the world.

I am proud of my cosponsorship of the Captive Nations Week resolution and proud of my part in speeding it through Congress. I am convinced we cannot pound too hard or too often on the perfidy of the Communists in subjugating the noble peoples behind the Iron Curtain and denying them the right to choose their own form of government. We cannot too often call the attention of the world to the systematic opposition to religion of the Soviets and their atheistic way of doing things.

It is my hope that Captive Nations Week will serve to spur men of good will everywhere to redouble their efforts to work and pray for the day when the captive peoples, including the various groups within the Soviet Union, will once more take their rightful place among the free. Until that day, none of us should rest.

I recently received an interesting letter and resolution adopted by the Paris Bloc of the League for the Liberation of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R., commenting on Captive Nations Week. The league feels that the week was an "event of historical importance" and applauds it heartily. They emphasize particularly its importance to the enslaved nations of the U.S.S.R.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE PEOPLES OF THE U.S.S.R. (THE PARIS BLOC),
Paris, August 9, 1959.

DEAR MR. KEATING: The League for the Liberation of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R., which comprise representatives of the peoples enslaved by Soviet Russia, has the honor of sending you a copy of the declaration adopted at the league's annual conference held in Munich on July 29-30, 1959. From the text of this declaration, you will see that the league warmly welcomed the decision of the U.S. Congress to request the President to proclaim a Captive Nations Week and the action of the President in doing so on July 17, 1959. The league regards the proclamation of Captive Nations Week as an event of historical importance, for by this act the representatives of the great transatlantic democracy have not only expressed once more their traditional sympathy with the nations oppressed by Soviet imperialism, but also drawn attention to one of the most critical elements in the policy of the Kremlin—the oppression by Moscow of the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet empire, who constitute more than half its total population.

On behalf of the League for the Liberation of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. we should like to take this opportunity of expressing our gratitude for your initiative in championing the cause of our peoples.

Very truly yours,

MIKOLA ABRAMTCHIK,
Chairman.
SAHAK TER-TOVMASSIAN,
Secretary.

DECLARATION OF THE LEAGUE FOR THE LIBERATION OF THE PEOPLES OF THE U.S.S.R. (PARIS BLOC)

In the course of the last 40 years, an enormous colonial state has come into existence in the East. This is the U.S.S.R., which threatens the whole of Western civilization and aims at reducing the entire world to submission. The duel now proceeding between the Communist dictatorship in Moscow and the free world on the Berlin issue is one of the episodes on the path leading to the sovietization of the world. Yesterday, it was the Near East; before that, it was the Far East. In both cases, Moscow succeeded in seizing positions suitable for her further advance. Whether she will succeed this time or not, one thing is certain: Moscow cannot stop, but will continue to advance resolutely. At the present time, the curve representing the entire foreign policy and strategy of the Soviet Government continues to rise. This rise must be halted: only the inflexible will and firm determination of the West to resist by all the means in its power the extension and consolidation of the Soviet empire can prevent this catastrophe. As every day passes, it becomes clearer that the free world is faced with a dilemma: either to be forcibly drawn into the orbit of the Soviet empire, which would mean the end and the ruin of Western civilization or, by displaying a resolute will and a determination to put up a heroic resistance, to save the civilized world from the mortal danger which hangs over it. Living moral points for the application of this crusading will of the West may be found in the captive peoples of the U.S.S.R. The West has hesitated and still is hesitating openly to acknowledge and proclaim the right of these peoples to dispose of their own fate, to assert their sovereignty and to recover the freedom and independence which were wrested from them by force.

On the historical and legal plane, the situation of our peoples is as follows. The Tsarist Empire, like all empires in the past, was created by means of conquest. The nations doomed to form part of this empire, the peoples that were mentioned in the now celebrated proclamation of President Eisenhower of July 17, 1959, were conquered by a force from outside, i.e., Tsarist Russia. Having seceded from the empire after the revolution of 1917, these peoples formed their own democratic states. From the point of view of international law, the in-

ternational identity of these peoples was revived. Their states were recognized de facto and de jure by other states already in existence. In some cases, recognition also came from Soviet Russia. Soon afterward, these countries under the pressure of Soviet Russia's superior forces, were individually reconquered after a prolonged and desperate resistance. The disintegrated empire was restored by fire and the sword.

Thus, from the point of view of international law, the general situation now reigning in the East is as follows. The so-called national union and autonomous republics, which were formely independent states and which now form part of the Soviet Union, are occupied by a forcing power—the Soviet Russia. The problem of these peoples is thus an international one, since these states were once given diplomatic recognition. We are therefore faced with the question of removing the occupying forces and securing liberation from foreign domination. Even now, these states, in accordance with articles 13–18 of the Soviet Constitution, are regarded, formally speaking, as sovereign. The democratic principles regulating life in the civilized world demand the unqualified recognition of the right of these peoples to sovereignty, the right to restore their independence and freedom.

If the free world continues to ignore the facts of history and the standards of international law, thus sacrificing the very foundation of its civilization to the unreal and essentially false idea of peaceful coexistence, which presupposes the permanent and separate existence of two worlds—if the free world harbors the illusion, harmful for the future of all mankind, that by sacrificing over 200 million captive persons to the Moloch of Communist tyranny it will secure the freedom and welfare of the rest of mankind, then it will condemn itself irrevocably to destruction.

We repeat now, and are prepared to repeat again, that the idea conceived in Moscow of a high-level conference and Khrushchev's determined attempts, especially recently, to go to Washington, to set foot on soil which has never been trodden by an oppressor of the freedom of nations, to transform his meeting with the President of the United States into a conference of the Big Two, can cause worldwide embarrassment, and among our peoples in the Soviet empire will provoke silent protest and deep disillusionment.

President Eisenhower's declaration, mentioned above, is an event of great importance. We express the profund hope that it will prove a turning point in the entire policy of the democratic West, and that the latter will realize that Moscow's imperialist policy of expansion must be opposed by a policy based on the principle of liberating the peoples at present under the yoke of Communist tyranny.

The violent reaction which this declaration provoked from Khrushchev, who denounced it as interference in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union, shows what a powerful weapon this sacred idea, the idea of our time, can be. Through it, we can finally unmask the jailers of the world's last colonial empire, who hypocritically present themselves as liberators of the enslaved and colonial peoples.

At this, its annual conference, held in Munich on July 29–30, 1959, the League for the Liberation of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. which champions the cause of more than half the population of the Soviet Union, warmly welcomes the proclamation of the President of the United States, and addresses the following appeal to all freemen: at a time when so much is being said about colonialism, may the free world not forget that the peoples on the other side of the Iron Curtain are groaning beneath the yoke of a most wily and cruel colonialism, which is persistently knocking at the door of Europe and the West. Having rejected the harmful idea of the evolution of dictatorship, may humanity remember that its own freedom and welfare may in the final analysis be guaranteed only by the liberation of these peoples. World freedom is one and indivisible. May the free world bear in mind the torments and sufferings of our peoples.

The cult of the elder brother, created by Stalin, is now increasing under Khrushchev. The economic exploitation of the oppressed peoples is being intensified. Vis-a-vis the younger brothers, Russification is gaining momentum. The systematic transfer of population within the U.S.S.R. continues, and threatens some of the smaller peoples with complete extinction and absorption in the Soviet nation. In these circumstances, the growing tension in international relations and the deliberate fanning of national dissension by the Kremlin are a heavy burden for the liberation movement. Addressing our peoples, the League for the Liberation of the Peoples of the U.S.S.R. expresses its profound conviction that President Eisenhower's proclamation establishing Captive Nations Week by confirming the right of these peoples to freedom and independence, will be received by our compatriots at home as an expression of support for their burning hope and faith in a free future and as a call for calm and unshakeable confidence in the final triumph of national justice.

We hope that this struggle will also prove a struggle for the liberation of the Russian people. The Russian people are also exposed to the political and social oppression of Bolshevik tyranny. They, too, are experiencing the burden of the Soviet regime, and paying with the loss of their freedom and with their toil for the senseless imperialist policy of a clique in the Kremlin. We therefore express the hope that at the decisive moment, the Russian nation, following the noble example of its most worthy sons, will choose the only path that is compatible with its national dignity and join with the captive peoples of the U.S.S.R. in a united struggle for liberation, in creating a world front for liberty.

Our peoples have already won an honorable place in this struggle, having repeatedly declared their inflexible will for freedom, democracy and independence.

The moral support and sympathy of the entire free world for the captive nations of the U.S.S.R., an eloquent manifestation of which is the noble voice of the President of the great Transatlantic democracy—this charter of hope for the whole world—may in the end become a guarantee that the sacred national aspiration of our peoples will be realized.

Manion: Constitutionality of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, August 20, 1959, Clarence Manion appeared before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and made a statement concerning his views on the constitutional aspects of the foreign aid program. I am inserting Dean Manion's statement in the RECORD so my colleagues may have an opportunity to study his views:

My name is Clarence Manion. I am a practicing lawyer with offices in South Bend, Ind. For more than 25 years I was professor of constitutional law at the University of Notre Dame, and from 1941 to 1952, I was dean of the College of Law at Notre Dame. Presently, I am a member of, and counsel for the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before you in opposition to the pending appropriation for foreign aid.

This committee, like other committees of the Congress, has heard a great volume of criticism concerning the wastefulness, maladministration and basic misdirection of the foreign aid program. I have followed this criticism in the previous, as well as the current reports and records of the Congress, and I would subscribe to much, if not to all of it.

However, to avoid redundancy and to conserve the valuable time of this honorable body, I shall attempt to restrict my remarks to three aspects of the foreign aid program, which have been largely ignored by previous witnesses, and concerning which, by training, experience and recent observation, I may claim some special competence to testify. As concisely and as briefly as the gravity of the allegations will permit, I will try to support the three following conclusions concerning our foreign aid program:

1. Foreign aid, as it is presently constituted and executed, is not authorized by the Constitution of the United States.

2. The foreign aid program is being maintained by the Congress in defiance of the wishes of the great majority of the people of the United States.

3. The Government of the United States does not have sufficient tax income to support the foreign aid program, consequently our Government has been, and is now, forced to borrow the money that it gives away to foreign governments.

I will proceed to support these three propositions in the order in which they have been stated.

SECTION I. FOREIGN AID IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL

It is basic and elementary law that the Government of the United States has no inherent power to do anything. The existence, and authority of the Federal Government are derived from the Constitution of the United States.

The Constitution is the creature of the people of each of the several States of the Union. In turn, the Congress, the Federal executive and the Federal courts are the creatures of the Constitution. There is no valid power in any branch, division, or officer of the Federal Government that does not rest in some provision of the Constitution of the United States. As Chief Justice Marshall remarked at the dawn of our constitutional history: "We must never forget it is a Constitution we are expounding" (4 Wheat. 316, 407. 1819).

By its own terms, the Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land. All U.S. Senators and Representatives have taken a solemn oath to support the Constitution as such. The President's single sworn duty is to "preserve, project and defend the Constitution." (U.S. Constitution art. II, sec. 1.)

The Constitution begins with the declaration that "all legislative powers herein granted, shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." (U.S. Constitution, art. I, sec. 1.) Thus Congress has no powers other than those enumerated in the Constitution.

This raises the basic question: Where in the Constitution does Congress find its power to appropriate the American taxpayers' money for the aid of foreign governments? On the floor of the U.S. Senate last July 2, one of your distinguished colleagues, the Honorable SAM ERVIN JR., who for many years was an associate justice of

the North Carolina Supreme Court, addressed himself to that very question.

Said Senator ERVIN: "I believe that under the Constitution of the United States we have no right to take tax money and spend it for any purpose except that which is calculated to promote the general welfare of the United States. I do not think we are empowered to take tax money and give it to neutrals, merely to advance their economic welfare. I do not believe we should use tax money to pay neutrals to remain neutral, because that does not advance the welfare of the United States as a government. If the United States were an eleemosynary institution, operating charities instead of operating a government which depends upon tax sources for its finances, then I would say it would be all right for the United States to act as a universal Santa Clause. * * * Our Government is not an eleemosynary institution and the Constitution does not authorize it to act as such."

How far can the Congress go in confiscating the income of the American people and encumbering their remaining capital assets with ever-increasing, high interest-bearing debt in the name of the general welfare of the United States? Where is the constitutional authorization for debt reduction for the governments of Austria, Greece, Denmark, France, Netherlands, Norway and the United Kingdom of Great Britain at the expense of the American taxpayer? (See testimony of Secretary Dillon, hearings on mutual security appropriation for 1960, subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, pp. 352, 353.)

As Chief Justice Marshall said, "We must never forget it is a Constitution we are expounding." Congress has no plenary power to tax and spend at its political pleasure. The Constitution says that "the Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts, and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States (art. I, sec. 8). It is the debts of the United States that are to be paid with the American taxpayers' money, not the debts of foreign governments. It is for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States, that the Congressional power to tax and spend is to be exercised by the Congress. Thomas Jefferson said that "They [Congress] are not to lay taxes ad libitum for any purpose they please; but only to pay the debts or to provide for the welfare of the Union" (vol. III, "Writings of Thomas Jefferson," pp. 147–149, library edition, 1904).

What is the general welfare of the Union, as distinguished from some special welfare for some particular part of the country, or for one parcel of its population, has been debated by constitutional lawyers ever since the Constitution was adopted. That question has not yet been determined by any court. The Supreme Court of the United States has held that neither a State nor an individual taxpayer is entitled to a remedy in the courts against an unconstitutional appropriation of the Federal funds by the Congress. (*Massachusetts and Frothingham v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 1923.) The purpose of the congressional appropriation that was challenged in these cases was the reduction of infant mortality in the United States—not the reduction of Government debts for Netherlands or Norway.

The Court bypassed the contention that infant mortality was unrelated to the general welfare of the Union by declining to take jurisdiction of the case. The decision of those cases left the taxpayers powerless to invoke the protection of the general welfare clause in the courts of the country, but the protecting language of the Constitution is still there nevertheless, and every Congressman and Senator takes a solemn oath to respect it. The obligation of that oath is all the more serious in view of the fact that there is now no legal appeal from the decision of the Congress on the question of expenditures for special rather than general welfare, or from congressional determination to spend the taxpayers' money for world welfare rather than the prescribed welfare of the United States itself.

At his press conference on Wednesday, July 29, the President challenged the so-called informational force-out provision of the pending foreign aid appropriation bill as an unconstitutional invasion of his executive powers by the Congress. I am glad that the question of constitutionality has at last been raised by the President concerning the expensive matter of foreign aid. I would like to point out, however, that the Constitution was not created for the purpose, merely, of protecting the authority of one branch of the Government against invasion by other branches.

The Constitution was designed to prevent every branch and all branches of the Government from invading and violating the God-given liberty and hard earned property of the people of the United States. Whether Congress has impinged upon the authority of the Executive is a matter of secondary importance, constitutionally speaking, in a bill that misappropriates the property of American citizens for foreign aid, and in some instances, for palpably un-American purposes and projects. Once more, I urge you to remember that it is a Constitution we are expounding.

SECTION II. FOREIGN AID IS OPPOSED BY A GREAT MAJORITY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

The fact that foreign aid is unpopular has been admitted time and again by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, who apparently believes that the wishes of the American people should be ignored when they clash with the professional opinions of State Department experts. On the floor of the Senate last July 8, Senator FULBRIGHT said: "Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. The members of the Appropriations Committee are honorable men and fine citizens. The point I have in mind, which dominates this situation, is that given the kind of country we have, with 435 constituencies, many of which are remote from world affairs, it is natural—even inevitable—that the representatives of these constituencies should give priority to the immediate local interests of those who have shown their appreciation of their services by voting for them. This is especially true of those who find political life agreeable and wish to remain in it." At that point in the debate, the Senator was contending for single-shot long-range foreign aid spending. He was afraid of exposing this global grand-design periodically to such people as "the voters of the Fifth District of Nebraska or the Third District of North Dakota." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 8, Senate, p. 11811.) On another occasion, Senator FULBRIGHT said: "I realize that the foreign aid program is an unpopular program; it does not have local appeal * * * many persons have misunderstood it. They consider that it is not in the interest of the United States. * * * I recognize it is unpopular; it does not represent votes in Arkansas or anywhere else." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate, July 1, p. 11338.) And finally said Senator FULBRIGHT: "Of all the bills which come before the Congress, this one is the most difficult to explain in such a way that the results may be understood by the people whose taxes support it." For this taxpayer's money, the Senator can say that again. The July 6 Chicago Tribune reported it this way (editorial): "During the Senate debate, Senator FULBRIGHT was driven to confess that the taxpayers are sick and tired of the whole foreign aid racket. He admitted that the giveaway is unpopular but took the position that the Senate knows best. Members of the Foreign Relations Committee over which he presides, said FULBRIGHT, were discounting or ignoring the risk of offending that formidable body of opinion which opposes spending, particularly abroad.

There is not the slightest doubt in my mind about the fact that the formidable body of opinion which opposes foreign aid spending is the overwhelming majority opinion of the people of the United States. For the past 5 years, I have conducted a weekly radio forum over a nationwide network that reaches into every corner of the country. As a result of these broadcasts, I have received tens of thousands of letters from listeners dealing with all important matters that come before the Congress of the United States. Many of these correspondents disagree sharply with the views expressed by some of our speakers. I have discovered that there are two large, articulate sides to practically every important public question—except foreign aid. Out of all the thousands of letters that I have received, less than a dozen speak favorably of foreign aid and two or three of these were written by officials of the State Department. This 5-year experience has convinced me that if either of the political parties took a forthright antiforeign aid stand in the 1960 election and nominated a candidate who would stress that point of view, that party and that candidate would sweep the country. I am likewise convinced that the devotees of foreign aid know this as well as I do and that is precisely why they will never give the American people an opportunity to express themselves on this issue at the ballot box. Since Senator FULLBRIGHT has sensed this widespread unpopularity of foreign aid and dared to admit it on the floor of the Senate, I am at a loss to explain the continuing support given to this measure by scores of Senators and Congressmen who obviously do not share the bright-eyed internationalist idealism that propels Senator FULBRIGHT in this and other matters.

SECTION III. WE CANNOT AFFORD FOREIGN AID

Every dollar of the pending foreign aid appropriation will have to be borrowed at the highest rates of interest ever paid by the U.S. Government. The House of Representatives deliberately rejected a proposal to amend the bill by making it illegal to use borrowed money for foreign aid. The realistic Congressmen apparently decided that borrowed money is all we now have left to spend for foreign aid. This bill is a proposal to borrow money in order to give it away for an unconstitutional purpose that is opposed by a great majority of the people of the United States. This time-honored travesty is about to be repeated in the midst of a nationwide antispending, antiinflation campaign that has literally flooded Congress with protests against Federal extravagance. Responding to this campaign, Congress has cut domestic appropriations and the President has vetoed some of them because they were not cut deeply enough. Our national highway program is stymied for lack of money. If the Government is too poor to build highways in the United States without levying additional taxes, then why is the Congress about to authorize the construction of highways in the four corners of the earth for other people?

Last June 21, the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, told the "Manion Forum" nationwide radio audience that in the past 18 months "our fiscal situation has deteriorated faster than in any comparable peacetime period. The Federal Government is now paying its bills by increasing debt

and inflation." For the purpose of the Soviet Russians, Senator BYRD said: "The fiscal and economic suicide of this country is far more desirable than a military attack upon us. This, the fiscal and economic suicide of the United States is consequently the prime objective of our Communist enemies." ("Manion Forum" broadcast No. 247.)

May I ask this distinguished committee how our Federal Government—that cannot afford to wipe out so-called temporary excise taxes on telephone bills, passenger transportation, and other essentials—taxes that were put on years ago to pay for the Korean war—how can a Government as poor as that afford to subsidize foreign industries to compete in the American market for American products and American jobs? Why must you raise our Federal debt limit to the highest point in history—a debt on which the American taxpayer now pays the highest interest in history, when we can afford to give foreign governments millions of American dollars to reduce their government indebtedness? Financial service publications now declare that big bond buyers are no longer interested in U.S. Government securities that are more than 1 year away from maturity? Does this mean that we are just 1 year away from the repudiation of our Federal debt by inflation or otherwise? If these portents are reliable, then it might be advisable to turn our foreign aid pipeline around and use the unexpended billions for the reduction of our own debt and for the stiffening of our own rapidly softening currency.

I wish to thank you again for this opportunity to express these opinions on behalf of our Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-nine and Nineteen Hundred and Thirty-nine: The Contrast and the Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "1959 and 1939: The Contrast and the Hope," which is an excellent review of the national situation.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From The New York Times Magazine, Aug. 30, 1959]

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE AND NINETEEN HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE: THE CONTRAST AND THE HOPE

(By Barbara Ward)

Twenty years have passed since Hitler sent his troops across the frontiers of Poland and plunged the world into war. And his aggression, in turn, came 20 years after the peace treaties which had put an end to the first worldwide struggle.

Today, however hopefully men may pray for a constructive outcome to the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchanges, the very eagerness with which the talks are awaited betrays an underlying fear of renewed conflict, an anguished question whether by some fundamental failure of political wisdom or rational grasp, mankind has involved itself in a fatal coil of violence, each conflict leaving unremedied the conditions which created it and thus leading with blind fatality to the next.

In short, are we, 20 years after Hitler's war, already advancing inevitably to a new holocaust—with more terrible weapons and against a more formidable enemy? Or is there any sign that there has been some break in the baleful chain of causality binding the end of one conflict to the beginning of the next?

One thing seems clear. In 1934—20 years after the outbreak of World War I—the drift to war was already irreversible and for the simple reason that every factor that had led to war in 1914 was present in an exaggerated degree. Nothing had been basically cured or changed by the appalling carnage of 1914 to 1918. Virtually the same conditions existed, only they were worse.

In shorthand, one can say that among all the interrelated causes of the First World War four were decisive. First was the neurotic nationalism of the Germans, last of Europe's "tribes" to achieve nation-statehood. This nationalism was exaggerated by relatively late industrialization and by Germany's entry after 1870 into a general struggle for markets accentuated by the ups and downs of the business cycle. The struggle spread to the outside world with Germany's determination to seize colonies and jostle the older imperial powers. Finally, when all these overlapping causes of friction had exploded into one international incident after another, the Germans were not checked in the decisive summer months of 1914 by the knowledge that a worldwide coalition would oppose them. Britain's entry into the war was uncertain to the last. America was as distant as the moon and as neutral.

By 1934 these four root causes of the 1914 struggle had all reappeared. The nationalism of the Nazis—a hateful, racist, lunatic nightmare of blood and soil—made Germany's national ferment of 1914 look sane by comparison.

The background of economic uncertainty was far greater than it had been in 1914. Hitler himself was in some measure a product of the devastating depression of 1929, when 11 unemployed had helped to swell the ranks of unreason in Germany. In Europe, generally, each nation was seeking to protect its small, separate, national economy behind higher barriers of tariffs and quotas and each contributed to the contraction of the rest. Once again, Germany's probing for markets in Central and Eastern Europe was accompanied by complaints that German business was stifled and that the people must have lebensraum—including "the open lands and granaries of the Ukraine."

The same pressure was transferred to the imperial scene outside Europe. In 1934 the Germans were beginning to claim the return of their colonies. In that year, too, the Italians precipitated the dispute with Ethiopia which led a year later to full-scale colonial war. In the East Japan, under the impact of the depression, had abandoned liberal policies and completed the conquest of Manchuria. The rivalry between the so-called haves and have-nots grew yearly in intensity and the three have-nots—Germany, Italy, and Japan—precipitated the series of incidents in East and West which finally made war only a matter of time.

Even so, their adversaries could not combine. The first formal attempt at collective security in the League of Nations collapsed once Japan and Italy had successfully flouted it. Britain practiced appeasement to the very brink of the struggle. America was as remote as ever. Russia finally precipitated the fight by joining the aggressors.

It may be that no coalition, however strong, could have checked the lunatic Hitler. But the coalition did not come into being until the war had already ravaged a continent and enslaved or massacred millions of its people. It is thus clear that on virtually every count the war of 1939 was simply the repetition in aggravated form of the struggle of 1914. It was in a sense the same war with a lull in between. Twenty years after 1914, the lull was coming to an end and the combatants were once again mustering their armies and men. Only the date of the new outbreak was still unsure.

It is equally clear that, whatever dangers threaten the human race today, it is not still involved in a precise repetition of the old aggressions. The world of 1959 is almost wholly discontinuous with that of 1939. Twenty years after, the landscape of politics has changed as by a seismic convulsion. The risks are new, the opportunities are new, there is no sense of automata involved in some dreadful process of repetition, of sleepwalkers following an old road to an old doom.

Take each of the root causes of war in 1914 and 1939. All have lost strength, some have almost withered away. In Western Europe, the first home of the nation-state, nationalism is at last on the decline. Even the arch-enemies, France and Germany, are reconciled and seek to fuse their sovereignty.

Nor are economic pressure and uncertainty reviving old disputes. It is still perhaps too soon to say whether the extremes of the business cycle are banished forever; the last American recession, though short, had uncomfortable repercussions, at least among the primary producers—the jute growers of India, the coffee growers of Brazil, the copper miners of Rhodesia. But methods of regulating the severity of the cycle are being learned and no nation has resorted to the total protectionism which so enforced national separateness and hostility in the 1930's. On the contrary, the whole direction of Western policy since 1945 has been toward lower tariffs, wider markets, and freer trade.

As for the old imperialist background to Europe's struggles, it has virtually disappeared. Asia is free, most of Africa is moving toward freedom. And this movement has been accompanied by an entirely new phenomenon in the history of mankind—the first tentative acceptance of international economic responsibility wholly unlinked to political control.

In the past, colonies have often been developed by their imperial masters. But today there are signs that the new policy of economic development is seen not as a by-product of imperialism but as a responsibility to be borne by the wealthy industrialized nations. It will be their new task to help the peoples who have not yet achieved modernization and to do so without demanding any political *quid pro quo*. This is, in a real sense, an extension of the idea of "the general welfare" to all mankind.

Above all, the issue of collective security, of defense against possible aggression, has changed decisively since 1939. The United Nations has at least not foundered. It has checked a small war in the Middle East and acted as organizing principle in the bitter war defending South Korea. America, the most powerful Nation in the world, is no longer aloof. And it has joined with its European allies in NATO to insure that no thought ever tempts Mr. Khrushchev or any other potential aggressor into suicidal war.

At this point, the critics may well protest that the analogy with 1939 misses the point. The trouble about 1959, they will argue, is not that we are still in the aggressive cycle of 1914 and 1939. It is that we face something much more formidable. Communism is worse than nationalism, even than national socialism. Communist economic policies may well become more disruptive than the old business cycle. Communism is a more subtle and hence a far more dangerous form of imperialism. Above all, as Russia—and China—outpace the West in mis-

siles, atomic weapons and vast land armies, the risk of total destruction becomes much greater than in 1939. How can one say that the old fatalities have vanished when new and worse ones have taken their place?

The argument, in short, is that although the protagonists in the drama may have changed, Russia eclipsing Germany and China taking Japan's place as aggressors and instigators, the same conditions of international rivalry, competitiveness, imperial pressure and naked force exist today as they did in 1914 or 1939 and it is only a matter of time before they erupt once more into universal war.

These risks cannot be minimized. There are obvious ways in which communism is more truly formidable than Hitler's Germany could ever be. In Russia it is based upon a solid established state power that has carried its people through a vast expansive revolution, not upon a power-drunk lunatic Nazi party able only to plunge the nation into total war within 7 years of seizing the apparatus of government.

The Soviet Union commands vast space and resources equal to America's and has determined to mobilize a larger percentage of them for the instruments of force. All around the world, communism has a policy and an appeal—based on its own rapid industrialization—that can catch the imagination of peoples struggling to modernize their States. Such an appeal was utterly closed to Hitler with his racial nonsense of Aryan superiority.

China, too, by the vastness of its population and the prestige of its traditional Asian predominance, must act as an influence of incalculable power, provided it can demonstrate communism as a quick path to growth in overpopulated territories. The Communist powers are thus much more truly formidable than the Nazi explosion, just as, to give but one analogy, the imperial Confucian state of China—for all its bureaucratic despotism— had a lasting power denied to the marauding Mongol conquerors of the Asian steppes.

Yet it can be argued that the very formidableness and rootedness of communism put its threat and pressure in a very different category from the plunging aggressions of 1914 and 1939. As the revolutions become consolidated, their leaders are in some measure acquiring a mood of conservatism or at least of conservation. There can be no doubt, for instance, that Mr. Khrushchev is serious in his determination to catch up with American living standards—although, after his American visit, he may find the road longer than he thought—and the Chinese Communists no less serious in their aim of surpassing Western European production within a decade.

Russia certainly and China possibly have the resources and the elbow room for such a heroic transformation, provided they also have peace. Whatever their theoretical Marxist beliefs about the ultimate victory of world communism, there is no doubt about the immediate goal and that is internal development and consolidation. No wild talk of conquest, no open boasts of taking over the Ruhr—as Hitler once boasted of appropriating the Ukraine—spur the Russians on to believe in easy wealth at others' expense. The great theme is the work, ingenuity and sustained effort needed at home to show the superiority of communism to an admiring world.

For the same reason, there seems no immediate likelihood of direct Communist aggression in the world at large. Communist agents may be active, local leaders wooed, arms, aid, and trade dispatched, Communist technicians ordered to remote capitals. But Soviet troops do not march into Kirkuk when General Kassim shows signs of checking local Communist activity. There is no Soviet airdrop on Ghana if Dr. Nkrumah excludes Communists from all positions of trust. Most paradoxical of all, Soviet aid to the Aswan Dam continues while President Nasser keeps his local Communists in jail.

In other words, the Russans and the Chinese will exploit all the possible openings for Communist influence—but exploit them short of open conflict. This is tiresome, difficult, and dangerous for the West. But it is not fatal.

Today there is only one tactic from which the world cannot recover—the tactic of direct aggression. The Communists tried this once—in Korea. The instant answer of force with force has discouraged them from repeating the hideous experiment. In fact, one can argue that the most profound reason for believing that 1959 is not 1939—or 1914—is that today the democracies have avoided the appeasement of the 1930's which led Hitler on from violence to violence; and the Communists on their side have enough rational grasp to see what the Nazis never saw, that violence leads to only one conclusion—in the words of Marx, "to the common ruin of the contending parties."

But if these are reasons for hope, they are none for complacency. Every reason for believing that the fatality of 1914 and 1939 can be avoided depends upon vigorous and sustained Western policies—upon a united Atlantic front, upon expansive international economic policies in the free world which permit Soviet aid and trade to be absorbed without creating any dangerous absorption into the Communist economic web, upon an undeviating determination to maintain equality of strength and to let the Communists understand that determination.

Yet can one maintain today that these conditions of safety and survival are all realized in practice or that they are even fully understood? We have to recognize that our policies are still marked by improvisation, impermanence, and inadequacy. We may no longer be involved in cutthroat national competition in the West. But neither are we engaged on a systematic attempt to work out what are the appropriate forms of permanent, supranational association in the atomic age.

The initiative that has brought France and Germany closer together has so far driven France and Britain further apart. Western Europe is in danger of new economic divisions and the common purposes of a possible Atlantic community are hardly spelled out. There is little sign that the Western nations regard themselves as the nucleus of a lasting and cooperative international order coherent and purposeful enough to challenge the Soviet aim of a Communist world.

Because of this central uncertainty, the economic policies of an expanding world society are neither widely understood nor even partially practiced. The extreme severities of the prewar business cycle may have been overcome, but the kind of steady upward thrust in the mature economies—which alone can secure world growth under other than Communist auspices—has not been secured or even formally sought. Twice in the last 7 years sharp falls in Western activity have canceled—by way of lower export incomes—all the benefit derived from Western aid to the less developed areas. Aid itself has been viewed as a stopgap measure for containing the Communists rather than as a long-term strategy for insuring stability in the troubled post-colonial world where bounding populations, pressing on unmobilized resources, threaten economic decline.

And the periods of stagnation, which greatly increased pressure to reduce budgets and cut public expenditure, have helped to whittle away the effectiveness of Western defense. We may not be the flabby, irresolute weaklings of the 1930's. But there is no secret about Russia's growing preponderance in both missiles and conventional arms and equally there is no genuine urgency in the West to redress the balance.

In short, every policy which hopefully distinguishes the present from the despairs of the past has about it some note of weakness—inadequacy of scale, uncertainty of purpose, a quality of impermanence and indecision, a sense of reacting to others' pressure, not of boldly seeking the initiative ourselves. We may have done very much better. But are we doing well enough?

There should be no discouragement in this question for we have it in our power to give the proper answer. The postwar world has already shown—with the Marshall plan, with colonial independence, with foreign aid, with the Korean struggle, with the movement toward European unity, with the American involvement in world affairs—that the Western Powers have recovered a capacity to think and act freshly which seemed totally absent between the wars.

Anyone who grew up in the thirties could be conscious only of doors closing, of lights failing, of the forces of violence and unreason steadily gaining the upper hand. Today there need be no such sense of fatality. The field of action open to the Western Powers over most of the world is limited only by their vision, their resolution, and their generosity. No nagging economic limitations stand in their way provided they maintain their growth. New nations, no longer hampered by political dependence, are ready to cooperate with them in new ways to satisfy their hopes and needs. It is a world of change and movement and aspiration from which the rigidity and the claustrophobia of the prewar system have been blasted away.

For all the terrors and horrors of the last 20 years, their outcome is not a repetition of disaster but a new world of opportunity. We may still lose it. We may shirk its risks, we may miss its possibilities. But this is not a matter of fatality or iron destiny. It is at last a matter of free choice.

Good Lobbying Should Be Encouraged

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am putting in the RECORD a copy of the letter that Sidney Zagri sent to Life magazine in answer to the charge that he had used improper lobbying techniques in presenting the Teamsters Union position on labor reform legislation.

I observed Mr. Zagri's lobbying techniques and discussed them with many of my colleagues. Mr. Zagri is a constituent of mine and I was interested for that and other reasons. To date I have heard only vague charges such as the one in Life's editorial and a recent article in Time magazine that his techniques were other than proper. These rumors have been unsubstantiated.

I am quite disturbed at this constant attack on lobbying by all sides. The attack on lobbying and lobbyists is an improper technique in itself to pass or defeat legislation. These attacks have

contributed greatly to the disinclination of the public to participate in their government, in politics, if you please. After all if we are to have representative government the people must participate in it through their representatives and in choosing and electing their representatives. Lobbying in essence is nothing more than the people participating in their government. It should be encouraged not discouraged.

There are improper lobbying techniques. Falsely accusing another of improper lobbying techniques is itself an improper technique. These improper techniques should be attacked but when they are attacked one should be careful to make it clear that it is the improper technique not lobbying itself that is the basis of the adverse criticism. Good lobbying should be encouraged.

Frankly, I have been shocked by both Time and Life magazines. Nor is it just Time and Life. They merely reflect an approach to public debate that is all too common today in our country. But Time and Life seek the image of promoters of the best in public morals and to a great degree they deserve this image.

I want to say something else. I think a great deal of the criticism of the letter of James Carey is just as off base as some of the things Carey said in his letter. The fact that his letter said his group was going to try to beat those who had voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill I thought was perfectly proper. If we want our people active in Government they certainly should try to beat representatives they think are not good and elect those they think are good. My quarrel with Carey is that he does not think people can disagree with him unless they are tools, bigots, or uninterested in the welfare of the common man. I answered his letter by accepting his challenge at the polls, but appealing to him to keep the public debate on the facts and logic of the issue and off the attacks on the integrity of those with whom he disagreed.

Lest there be any misunderstanding I should mention that I basically disagree with Mr. Zagri on the Landrum-Griffin bill. I voted for it after thorough study and with conviction that this was in the best interests of the general public and of the unions themselves. Furthermore, the powerful Teamsters union headed by Harold Gibbons, another one of my constituents, has provided the basis of my opposition each time I run for election in a district which has powerful labor organization. There is little question in my mind that they will continue to provide this opposition.

Here is Mr. Zagri's letter. I think it is up to his accusers to prove their case. I will be happy to place in the RECORD the reply the editors of Life make to Mr. Zagri:

AUGUST 4, 1959.

EDITOR, LIFE MAGAZINE,
New York City, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: The editorial in Life's issue of July 27, titled "Danger: Hoffa Man at Work," is so grossly inaccurate and so brazenly unfair to the Teamsters and to myself that I cannot let it pass without a protest.

First of all, I most emphatically deny that I have ever threatened any Member of Congress with political reprisals of any kind, no matter how they choose to vote. I have far too much respect for our Nation's lawmakers to approach any of them with anything but the most complete courtesy. I hereby challenge any of the three Representatives you mention, Mr. UDALL, Mr. THOMPSON, or Mrs. GREEN to cite one example of unethical conduct on my part.

I might add that you are completely wrong regarding the lady from Oregon's unladylike departure from character. She most certainly never used the phrase you quote to me and I'm sure she never would.

Never at any time have I used the name of Speaker RAYBURN and again I challenge you to cite a single occasion on which I have.

We of labor are well aware that the right kind of labor reform legislation would benefit the Nation, just as business reform legislation would also, but we are convinced that none of the bills now under consideration could possibly do anything but great harm to all organized labor.

In this connection, informed labor relations experts are well aware of the ironic fact that the Teamsters Union, admittedly the prime target of all the proposed new measures, would survive under even the toughest bill, whereas most other unions could not.

Nevertheless, we of the Temasters Union, as members of organized labor, undertook a drive to defeat pending laws which we feel to be punitive rather than corrective, and which we fear would eventually eradicate all the great gains made by labor since the Wagner Act emancipated the working man. In every case when we have opposed a measure which we considered harmful to labor we have suggested an alternative which we felt would be of actual benefit.

Since our campaign began we have followed the classic patterns adhered to by groups seeking to enlighten and influence their congressional representatives:

1. We met with Congressmen, most of whom were unaware of the key punitive sections of the proposed bills, and explained to them just why we objected to these sections.

2. We urged our members to contact their Congressmen and voice their feelings on such antilabor measures.

3. We sought wherever possible to bring about personal metings between Congressmen and their constituents for discussions of the merits and demerits of the pending bills.

Our methods resemble nothing so much as your own when you urge, as you have repeatedly, that your readers contact their Congressmen and demand severe new labor reform laws, and they are no more sinister and no more "dirty" to quote from your editorial.

We are using the most fundamental of the democratic processes: Let your Congressman know how you feel about something he is going to vote on. If informing our own members of the activities and voting records of their Congressmen is unfair pressure then there is not an important segment of American business that is not equally unfair, because this is standard procedure. If, as Life magazine wrote, Speaker RAYBURN himself offered to campaign personally on behalf of any one in Congress who feels that his chances of reelection have been endangered by my activities, then we are certainly justified in campaigning for what we believe to be right.

In closing, to attribute to me so much power—as our editorial does— is absurd and unrealistic. The opposition arrayed against the other labor spokesmen and myself consists of an almost limitless army of lobbyists, lawyers, and public relations experts, backed by inexhaustible money and resources of every kind, all of them under direct orders from the enemies of labor to stop at nothing until organized labor as we know it today is destroyed forever.

Yours truly,

SIDNEY ZAGRI,
Legislative Representative.

Hon. Richard L. Neuberger, of Oregon, Reports Ovrwhelming Passage by House of Representatives of Federal Employees Health Bill and States Views for a Strong Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure for me to report that the House of Representatives this afternoon passed S. 2162, to provide a health benefits program for Government employees, by an overwhelming margin of 381 to 4. Our bill earlier had passed the Senate on July 16 by a similar overwhelming vote of 81 to 4.

As chairman of the Insurance and Health Subcommittee of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I must confess that there are important differences between our Senate passed bill and the bill that passed the House of Representatives this afternoon.

One of the important differences between the two versions of the bill is with respect to the Advisory Council which has the duty of advising the Civil Service Commission regarding the administration of the Federal employees health benefits program. In this connection, it is worth emphasizing that Government employees are paying at least 50 percent of the cost of the program.

Mr. President, so that the Senate may be fully aware of the importance of the Advisory Council and the issue involved, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, correspondence I have received from the American Hospital Association.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1959.

The Honorable RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The attached copy of our letter to Senator JOHNSTON expresses our particular concern with respect to the House version of the bill providing health insurance to Federal employees.

We urge that the Senate insist upon the inclusion of the Advisory Council to insure that the program is administered in a fully effective manner.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director,
American Hospital Association.

[Enclosure.]

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1959.
The Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: We have followed with great interest the development of legislation to provide health insurance for Federal employees and their families. In our testimony before the House committee, we endorsed and urged the committee to adopt S. 2162 substantially as passed by the Senate because we felt it was a very desirable bill and in the best interest of the people for whom you were striving to provide protection.

We are greatly concerned with certain aspects of the bill which has now been reported out by the House committee. One of these, we believe, is of such significance to the effectiveness of the legislation in actually meeting health needs that we feel impelled to call it to your attention in the hope that action may be taken to remedy the situation.

The House version of the bill provides for an Advisory Committee which does not fulfill the purpose of the Advisory Council as it was provided for in the Senate bill. The proposal in the House is for a committee limited to employees and their representatives, with no participation by individuals experienced and knowledgeable in health matters. This omission, we believe, is the more serious because the agency responsible for the administration of the program is itself not a health agency and is not experienced in the development of health programs and services.

It is our belief that a major point to be kept in mind is that the legislation deals with the health of Federal workers and their families. The proposal has serious health implications quite apart from the financial and administrative aspects, as important as these are. These health implications, of course, will be seriously affected by the manner in which the bill is administered. Because of the number of people involved and the prestige of the Federal Government, moreover, the manner in which this program is administered is likely to have an important effect on the provision of health services and the development of the health prepayment movement throughout the country.

There are within the Federal Government several agencies and individuals widely experienced and highly skilled in health matters. We believe the best interest of Federal employees would be served by providing assurance in the legislation that the advice of such persons will be considered by the administrators of the program. Further, inasmuch as the health services to be provided will be rendered in civilian facilities and by civilian health personnel, it would be well to utilize also the advice and consultation of knowledgeable individuals from the civilian health field. We believe the purposes can best be served by requiring in the legislation that an Advisory Council be established with representatives selected from among the agencies of the Federal Government operating health programs, such as the Army, Navy, Air Force, Public Health Service, and the Veterans' Administration; and further, that at least one physician active in the private practice of medicine and at least one civilian hospital administrator be included on the Council. In addition to these above representatives, it is, of course, essential that there be adequate representation of Federal employees themselves as the consumers of the services.

We would recommend further that a provision be made for at least quarterly meetings of the Advisory Council and for publication of all recommendations.

It will be noted that we do not recommend that the carrier organizations be represented on the Council. It is assumed that the administrators will have day-to-day contact with the carrier representatives. Such persons, however, will not be in a position to function in the same manner as would the members of an Advisory Council.

We cannot state too strongly the need for the administrators of this program to be required to meet with and to consider the advice and recommendations of individuals active in the provision of health services as provided for in the Advisory Council outlined above.

We urge, Mr. Chairman, that the Senate insist upon the inclusion of an Advisory Council which will make an effective contribution to the administration of the program.

Sincerely yours,
KENNETH WILLIAMSON,
Associate Director,
American Hospital Association.

Benson-Eisenhower Corn Program Produces New Headaches

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the August issue of the Iowa Farm and Home Register published by the Des Moines Sunday Register. This article shows clearly that Iowa farmers do understand agricultural economics a lot better than the Department of Agriculture officials who have claimed that lower supports and no controls would adjust supplies in line with demand, and it shows what is happening under the Benson-Eisenhower corn program. You will also notice the great contrast between the interviews in this article and those widely publicized interviews recently conducted by Sam Lubbell. While I am sure Mr. Lubbell's intentions were good, he obviously did not know enough about farming to conduct an intelligent interview of farmers. The reporter, Mr. GLENN CUNNINGHAM, knows how to interview farmers, and this article shows that Iowa farmers do know what kind of a program will work better. It contributes to an understanding of what Iowans are doing and saying about the corn situation, and it is timely in view of our increasingly serious farm problem:

WHAT IOWANS ARE DOING AND SAYING ABOUT THE BIG CORN CROP

(By GLENN CUNNINGHAM)

The prospect of a bumper corn crop in Iowa from the largest acreage in history poses an acute storage problem for farmers. Bins and cribs on many farms are already filled with corn from previous years.

Linked closely to the storage situation are several other serious and perplexing problems, among them the probable price of corn at harvesttime, the question of future livestock programs, and what to do with the corn once it is in storage.

The price of corn at harvesttime is anybody's guess now, but with an alltime record crop in prospect, some of the folks in the big producing areas expect to see new crop corn sell for as little as 65 cents a bushel.

However, with Government controls abolished and all corn grown this year eligible for price support, many farmers are already moving to buy or build additional storage to avail themselves of Government price protection.

With hog and beef cattle numbers at record levels and the prospect of lower prices for meat animals in the months ahead, farmers are in a quandary as to future feeding programs.

Although a few of the in-and-outers are now getting back into hog production, most farmers seem to feel that this is no time to expand any feeding operations.

The tendency seems to be toward a general policy of "holding the line"—continuing feeding programs at about the same level as in the past, with some shifting to cheaper, plainer feeder cattle to lessen the risk.

Those who have been out of hog producton and who are now getting back in are finding it advantageous from the standpoint of low-priced brood sows. And they're guessing that low hog prices won't last too long.

The demand for storage facilities of all types—and for driers and drying equipment from farmers who harvest their corn early to prevent field losses—is at an all-time high for this early in the season.

The government is encouraging farmers to build additional storage, the county agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) offices making 5-year loans to help farmers purchase or put up the facilities they need.

Walter Bradley, implement dealer at Algona, says many farmers are just now starting to take care of their corn and other grain on their own farms, that in the past they have relied too much on elevators in town.

"Many farmers just now are realizing that government-financed storage of their grain has built tremendous elevators," he says. "They've decided to capitalize on the situation and put up their own storage and get the government storage fees themselves on grain they reseal."

A landowner in the Cylinder area bought 14 steel storage structures from Bradley's firm. Each structure will store 1,700 bushels—a total of 23,800 bushels of corn.

Managers of ASC offices in northwestern Iowa say they are getting many inquiries about Government loans for acquiring additional storage. There has been a big increase in corn acreage in this area.

The trend seems to be to permanent-type storage, and a big boom in construction of silos on farms where they are feeding cattle. More and more farmers are picking corn early and storing high-moisture shelled corn.

George Damman of Sanborn and his unmarried sons, Bob, 27, and Glenn, 25, who have 700 acres of corn this year, are buying 40,000 to 50,000 bushels of new storage and a second drier this year. They use a picker-sheller, pick early and dry the corn.

W. H. Holiday, ASC manager in Clay County (Spencer) said in late July that his office already had made several storage facility loans and that he expected a lot of temporary storage—such as snow fence cribs—to be built to help handle this year's crop.

"I haven't yet seen a poor field of corn," Holiday said. "A lot of the corn was shooting tassels by July 10, which is quite early. The crop looks as good as in 1948 but, of course, it isn't in the crib yet."

Art Rohwer, ASC manager in O'Brien County (Primghar) estimates that there is a 30-percent increase in corn acreage in O'Brien County this year and that yield prospects are the best since 1948.

"When you throw the gates open (abolishment of corn acreage controls) and offer a

support price of $1.04 a bushel and say to the farmers, 'Raise all you want to,' that's what they did," says Rohwer.

Jake Peelen, ASC chairman in O'Brien County, says he doesn't know what is going to be done with all of the corn, but that the best thing would be to feed it to livestock and convert it into meat.

"It takes about 7 pounds of corn to make 1 pound of meat," he points out, "but to raise meat a farmer needs a profit. And hogs right now are losing money for farmers who raise them."

Olaf Twedt, Estherville, has purchased 200 brood sows and is buying 1,000 feeder pigs—his first venture in swine in the last 10 years. He and a son-in-law farm 900 acres.

Twedt, who owns additional land which is rented out, says the Government made a mistake in dropping corn acreage controls and making price supports available on all corn grown, regardless of the acreage planted.

"You had less corn raised under acreage controls when supports were restricted to those who complied with planting allotments," he says, and advises:

"Restore controls and increase the support price for those complying."

Some farmers blame Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson for the avalanche of corn which is coming.

"What will we do with corn?" comments George Bentley, 53, a farmer near Onawa in the Missouri river bottom. "That's Benson's problem. And it looks like he will have plenty of it to look after."

Joe Dewaele, 46, a neighbor, agrees with Bentley that there is little likelihood of greatly increased livestock feeding because of the price situation and uncertainties of feeding profits.

Near Goldfield, another farmer, Stanley Sampson, 36, says, "Hog prices are getting down to where there's no profit in raising them." Sampson's father, Steve, 70 and retired, says hogs should bring $18 to provide a fair profit.

Earl Gollhefer, of the Charter Oak Grain Co. at Charter Oak, says a lot of corn is fed in his area, where the trend is to earlier harvesting and storing of chopped or ground high-moisture corn in silos for feed.

He says most of the crop looks good now but that some late-planted corn may need extra time—2 more weeks—before frost to mature.

Everett Halstead, Ida County extension director, says farmers are buying steel bins—for shelled corn—and other types of permanent storage for ear corn, all equipped with air ducts and fans for artificial drying or for keeping corn in good condition.

Halstead says it is difficult to understand why some farmers are going into the hog business with prices moving slowly downward and the prospect of heavy hog marketing for many months ahead.

Virgil Rohlf, ASC manager at Algona (Kossuth County), says the big increase in corn acreage there this year is on the 38 percent of the county's farms which complied with allotments when they were in effect.

"The 1959 crop looks wonderful," he says. "It looks like 100 bushels per acre." He predicts that new corn will sell for as low as 75 cents a bushel during harvest.

Rholf and members of the county ASC committee—Richard Anderson of Ledyard, George Wolf of Algona, and Andrew Fangman of Bancroft—agree that the trend in that county is toward raising more beef cattle and fewer hogs.

Concern over the big volume of old corn reserves and the big crop in prospect is expressed by Kenneth Reed, a young farmer who lives in Kossuth county near the Minnesota border.

"It's quite a worry," he said, "and it isn't right the way it's being done now. The price is down on hogs and there are an awful lot of cattle and hogs being fed. Nobody knows what's likely to happen."

George Eden, Reed's brother-in-law living southeast of Swea City, says, "We're set for a tremendous amount of corn, and I'm afraid it simply means more surplus for the Government. I'd like to see a lot of it made into alcohol to be mixed with gasoline.

"I hope the fellows feeding cattle don't get discouraged."

The Kossuth County ASC already has arranged 20 Government loans for financing more grain storage for farmers. And in late July there were three or four farmers a day in the office inquiring about storage facility loans.

Alvin Rasmussen, near Burt, and Johnie Tobin, near Swea City, express concern over the uncertainty of livestock prices. Rasmussen quit cattle feeding when feeders got high, is fearful of starting feeding again.

Tobin, a swine producer, says he sold brood sows recently for $36 a head, compared with $80 a head last year. He abandoned plans for raising fall pigs because of lower prices.

"I was planning on four farrowings a year," Tobin says, "but after prices kept slipping, I sold my sows. As it is, I'm not going to quit raising hogs, but I'm not going to hit it too heavy."

Another Kossuth County farmer, who asks that his name not be used, has this to say:

"Ninety percent of the farmers feel like I do. It's not the time to jump in or expand. And there'll be some cutback on hogs."

This farmer, who feeds cattle and raises around 150 pigs a year, predicts that the Government will eventually get a lot of the corn being produced this year, but that more and more corn will be stored a long time on the farm.

Max Soeth, former State ASC chairman and now vice president of the Emmet County State Bank at Estherville, says the present Government plan of price support for all corn raised won't work.

He proposes a back-to-grass plan similar to one used during the early years of Government crop-control programs. Under this plan, there would be a higher support price on corn and a farmer would be required to reduce corn acreage a certain percentage. He would receive a Government payment for seeding such land to grass.

AFL–CIO Interview with Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, on Khrushchev Visit to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the upcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev is creating a wide variety of reactions among our citizens throughout the country.

These include strong views both for and against the visit. The predominant feeling, however, appears to be that—now that the invitation has been extended and accepted—the American people should back up the President and create the climate that will enable the best results to be obtained from the exchange visit between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss various aspects of the Khrushchev visit on the AFL–CIO broadcast "Washington Reports to the People." I ask unanimous consent to have the interview printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN OF WISCONSIN, RADIO AND NEWSPAPER NETWORKS OF THE AFL–CIO

Question. Senator WILEY, do you feel the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit this country is a good idea?

Senator WILEY. Overall, I feel the upcoming visit has possibilities for positive accomplishments; at the same time, there are dangers. On the positive side, the visit can (1) correct a few of Mr. Khrushchev's misconceptions about this country; (2) confirm our peaceful intentions; (3) emphasize the unity of the country behind its leadership; (4) give the Soviet leader a real knowledge of the high standard of living of Mr. and Mrs. Average America; and (5) again emphasize that, although our policies are peaceful, we will not be pushed around.

Globally, I would hope that the Khrushchev visit would not be interpreted as a sign that we are "going soft" on communism.

President Eisenhower—the standard bearer of our policy—has made a decision that, in his judgment, will best serve the interests of our security and world peace. The American people—in a united, bipartisan manner—I believe should now give full support to that decision.

Question. Do you have any real fears of Mr. Khrushchev's personal safety while he is in this country?

Senator WILEY. Naturally, I believe that all necessary security precautions should be taken. There are a great many people—particularly from Poland, Hungary, and other captive nations—who deeply resent, and understandably so, the Premier's being invited to this country.

For the public—and our allies—it should be made abundantly clear that the invitation does not demonstrate approval of communism, or of Communist tactics, that have resulted in international tensions and dangers to peace.

As a whole, however, I am confident that the Nation will act in a mature and responsible manner.

Question. Senator WILEY, do you feel that the American people might expect too much from such a visit?

Senator WILEY. No. The years of the cold war, I believe, have conditioned our people to the Soviets' hard policies. As a result, we don't expect any magical, overnight change in Soviet programs.

Question. Do you think the exchange of visits might lead to a summit meeting later on?

Senator WILEY. The decision for a summit meeting—as I have stressed before— rests squarely on President Eisenhower. As the President has stated, such a decision would—and should—be based upon whether it would make a constructive contribution toward easing tensions and resolving East-West differences.

The Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits may or may not make a contribution toward justifying a summit conference.

Question. Do you think that the Khrushchev trip might succeed in altering some of his misconceptions of conditions in the United States?

Senator WILEY. Yes. As a matter of fact, I believe it would be worthwhile—to the degree possible—to plan his trips and contacts to achieve this objective.

As I understand it, however, the planning of the trip is a matter to be agreed upon between the State Department and the Russian Embassy—which, of course, gets its directions from Moscow.

Question. Senator, even if his mistaken ideas are corrected, do you think there is any real likelihood of altering his ultimate aims of world domination by communism?

Senator WILEY. Frankly, I doubt that we can expect to see any far-reaching changes in Communist policy in the near future. To the contrary, the Soviet leaders continue to reiterate their prediction—erroneous, I am confident—that socialism—in the Soviet Union, a false front for totalitarian communism—will eventually rule the world.

Policywise, the communist strategy is changing from "aims of military conquest" to efforts at economic, political and ideological penetration of the Western World. However, there has not as yet—nor can we expect it in the near future—any swaying from the ultimate goal of world domination. Consequently, we must gear our policies and programs to a long-range struggle against communism.

Overall, however, I believe the Khrushchev visit may further "break the ice" for top level—and possibly more fruitful lower level—exchanges to attempt to iron out East-West differences.

In the light of these factors, real "proof" of willingness to effectively promote peace still demands of Khrushchev not words of peace, but deeds.

Veterans of Foreign Wars 60th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in saluting the diamond jubilee anniversary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. This makes 60 years of patriotic service by one of the finest veterans' organizations of our time. They are a proud organization, proud of their beginning and proud of their continued zeal in the welfare of the Nation, the State, and the community. Their type of achievements and leadership makes me truly proud and honored that I have been a member of this great organization for over 40 years.

Since 1899, the national membership has grown to 1,200,000. In the Empire State of New York alone the membership now totals 67,842.

The members of the VFW, who cherish wearing the Cross of Malta, the emblem of the VFW, are veterans of an organization unique in its eligibility requirements. To join its ranks, a man must be able to produce an honorable discharge from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, or Coast Guard, showing "service honest and faithful" in time of war in a theater of operation.

It matters not whether that service was on the frozen plains of the Arctic, in the battles of Chateau-Thierry, or St. Lo, in the steaming jungles of the Philippines, Guadalcanal, or Burma; at Iwo Jima or the Chosin Reservoir, Bunker Hill, the Inchon landing, the liberation of Seoul; or in the mountains of Korea—the members of the VFW walk with their heads high.

From the beginning, under the leadership of Gen. Irving Hale, to the present commander in chief, John W. Mahan, the VFW has pledged to defend the principles of human rights in times of peace and war.

The greatest legislative assembly in the world, the Congress of the United States, granted the VFW a charter. In this charter the purpose of the organization is clearly defined. To preserve and strengthen comradeship among its members; to assist worthy comrades; to perpetuate the memory of our dead and to assist their widows and orphans; to maintain true allegiance to the Government of the United States of America and fidelity to its Constitution and laws; to foster true patriotism; to maintain and extend the institutions of American freedom; and to preserve and defend the United States from all her enemies whomsoever.

The VFW, with its rich heritage, has always been in the forefront to provide aid and assistance to its members and families. The record of legislation with its analysis, submitted monthly by our able director of national legislative service, Omar B. Ketchum and his staff, keep the VFW members well infrmed as to action on bills in Congress.

Throughout the Nation, in large and small communities, the VFW has sponsored and successfully carried out various projects beneficial to civic welfare, schools and churches, and to our youth. One outstanding project, and one which is very successful, is the national home at Eaton Rapids, Mich. This is the refuge for children whose fathers were totally disabled or are deceased. It is a splendid example of what any group of determined and public-spirited citizens can do.

As members of the VFW, we assume without reservation our responsibilities to maintain, strengthen, and defend the institutions of American liberty.

As the name implies, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is an organization of men who have fought behind Old Glory in many foreign lands. These are the men who crushed foreign tyrants; these are the men who have proved their patriotism by offering their bodies and souls so that liberty should not perish from the earth, and American ideals and institutions might be preserved for posterity.

Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial written by one of Florida's up-and-coming young newspapermen, Ted Enns, Jr., entitled "Congress Should Stop Ducking—It's Time for Labor Reform Bill," which appeared in the News Tribune of Fort Pierce on August 9.

It is a powerful and fair editorial, which I believe merits the attention of the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS SHOULD STOP DUCKING—IT'S TIME FOR LABOR REFORM BILL

President Eisenhower, last Thursday night, went direct to the American people with an appeal for support in his demand for an effective labor reform bill. He did a good job. He was not partisan—he was not tough. He advanced no new labor-management formulas nor philosophies. He simply laid the facts on the line—and minced no words in doing so.

Actually, the President added little to what has been known for months. He simply pointed out the leading areas of graft, racketeering and corruption in labor-management relations, as disclosed by the Senate Rackets Committee headed by Senator MCCLELLAN. These conditions he described, in a definite understatement, as a national disgrace. He pinpointed the basic issue as this: Shall the people, through sound labor reform legislation, govern; or shall crooks and racketeers prevail? It is as simple as that.

With all these facts public property, why was it necessary for the President to go directly to the people? After all, isn't it the responsibility of Congress to pass necessary and adequate laws for the public protection? The answer, unfortunately, is entirely too obvious—the Congress has, up to now, completely shirked its responsibility in this field. It has chickened out and run for cover every time the issue of labor reform has come up.

The Congress is, of course, willing to stand up and be counted as "for" love and motherhood and "against" sin. But it has no liking for such issues as labor reform, where the principles involved might conflict with personal interests and support. It would like to pass labor legislation which pleases everybody, but there is no such thing. Failing that, many Members would like to sweep the issue under the rug again, as has been done in the past.

But the time for ducking labor reform legislation is past. The welfare of the Nation demands sound and positive action in this session of Congress. The Kennedy labor bill which passed the Senate is woefully inadequate. This no surprise. As a presidential candidate, Senator KENNEDY would hardly author a bill which would alienate powerful labor leaders.

But the Kennedy bill is a powerhouse compared to the monstrosity which the House Labor Committee reported out. A baby chick wouldn't trade it, tooth for tooth. Supposedly Jimmy Hoffa dictated its provisions—they sound like it. On the basis of either of these bills, the American people would have every right to feel that the McClellan committee had completely whitewashed all current labor-management practices instead of showing, as it did, innumerable instances of crookedness, racketeering, corruption, and a long assortment of associated evils.

There is one bright ray of hope. If Congress has the guts to take it. That is the bipartisan Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill introduced in the House by a Georgia Democrat and a Michigan Republican. This bill gets to the meat of needed labor reforms and deals concretely with such issues as blackmail picketing, secondary boycotts, "no man's land" labor problems, adequate reporting of union affairs, bill of rights for

rank-and-file union members—factors the other bills gloss over or neglect entirely.

George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, is against the Landrum-Griffith bill. So are practically all other labor leaders. For that matter, they will be against any measure which provides adequate provisions for dealing with the corrupt and disgraceful labor-management practices disclosed by the McClellan committee. The American people might as well face facts—labor leaders have vast powers. They are not subject to the laws which govern the rest of us—they are, in fact, pretty much a law unto themselves; the untouchables. They want to keep, and add to, those powers. They will fight in every way, and to the bitter end, any legislation which puts any curb on those powers.

Mr. Meany says it would be virtually impossible for a decent union to operate effectively under the Landrum-Griffith bill. That is utter nonsense. A decent union not only could operate under it, but we imagine the rank and file members of all such unions would welcome the opportunity to do just that. It would be a welcome change to see members, instead of so-called labor leaders, running their unions.

Mr. Meany contends that most unions and union members are good. We agree. But Mr. Meany also should know that, in our society, laws are passed to control the bad, not the good. Mr. Meany might as well argue against laws passed to punish murderers and other criminals. The way he argues, since most people are good, we don't need such laws. What Mr. Meany is really saying is that unions are different, and should not be subject to the same laws as the rest of us. That, Mr. Meany, is just the point: neither labor leaders nor unions are different—nor do they deserve or warrant special considerations. The fact that our current laws make them a privileged class is just why we need an adequate labor reform bill.

We think Members of Congress from the Southern States generally want to, and will, support the Landrum-Griffith bill. But it always helps, in a controversial issue like this, for them to know they have the wholehearted support of the people they represent. Tell them so—write and let them know that you are a part of the overwhelming national demand to put an end to lax laws which permit labor-management graft and corruption, and which threaten our basic concepts of justice and equal rights.

Vice President Richard M. Nixon Addresses the 60th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at Los Angeles, Calif., August 31, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of the 60th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States now in session at Los Angeles was an address delivered by RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States.

Introduced by Commander in Chief John Mahan, Vice President NIXON spoke to a capacity audience that included a cross section of America's overseas fighting men and their wives, together with leaders in the business and military life of the Nation.

The address follows:

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE 60TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., AUGUST 31, 1959

This is the fourth time in 6 years that I have had the honor of addressing the national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

In looking over the speeches I have made in previous years, I find that I have in each one spoken of the threat of international communism to peace and the security of the United States. I chose that subject on previous occasions because I believed that was the greatest issue before the United States and the world.

Today I shall speak to you on the same subject because, despite the developments in recent weeks which have resulted in the announcement of an exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, the magnitude and seriousness of the challenge presented to the free world by the leaders of the Communist world is just as great as it was before these visits were announced.

I particularly want to direct my remarks today to those who have expressed concern over the wisdom of inviting Mr. Khrushchev to the United States. The motives which cause this concern are laudable ones. They are motives that all of us in this room share—patriotism, love of country, opposition to Communism and a well-justified suspicion of Communist tactics. I understand and respect the right of distinguished Americans like your speaker at tonight's dinner, Mr. George Meany, to express doubts as to the President's decision on this invitation.

And, while I disagree with Mr. Meany on some issues, may I say to you what I have said on previous occasions, that there is no more vigorous, articulate and effective opponent of communism in the United States than he is. The American trade union movement which he heads deserves the thanks of all the American people for the effective work it has done throughout the world in helping free trade unions to resist Communist infiltration and domination. I can testify from firsthand experience that in many of the countries that I have visited in Asia, Africa and South America I found that one of the strongest bulwarks against communism was a strong, free trade union movement.

Recognizing that there are plus and minus factors involved, I would like to state for you today the case for Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States. First, let's look at some hard facts.

The United States and the U.S.S.R. are the two strongest nations on the face of the earth, each possessing almost unbelievable destructive power. The fact that one intercontinental ballistic missile can travel the 5,000 miles between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in less than thirty minutes, carrying a warhead which has more destructive power than all the bombs dropped by both sides in World War II, is just one small indication of that strength.

There are differences between the United States and the U.S.S.R.—basic, deep differences of which the Berlin crisis is only one of many. If we fail to settle those differences at the conference table, the only other way to settle them is by a war which would destroy civilization as we know it. If our differences are to be settled at the conference table, we must talk with our opponents.

In the case of the Communist dictatorship of the U.S.S.R., only one man—Mr. Khrushchev—is the man to talk to. He has absolutely unlimited power to make decisions on these great issues. We can continue to talk to him by firing messages across the 5,000 miles which separate us and we may end up firing missiles at each other. I believe that if we are to talk it is better to do so across the table face to face so that the chance for misunderstanding will be reduced to a minimum.

But why bring him here, some may ask? Why not go someplace else to talk to him? Because this man who has greater uncontrolled power in his hands than any man in the history of the world, the power by his decision alone to set off a chain reaction which could start a world war, has some very dangerous delusions and misconceptions about the United States and its people.

He knows that we are militarily strong and that we are economically rich. But because he believes so fanatically in the Communist philosophy, despite everything he has heard to the contrary, he has convinced himself that the United States is a country seething with discontent, that millions of Americans live in poverty oppressed by the wealthy few, that a substantial number of our people do not support the President in his firm stand against Communist aggression. In a nutshell, consequently, these misconceptions lead him to conclude America has the strength but may lack the will to defend her vital interests.

I have seen and talked to Mr. Khrushchev. I am convinced that if he continues to believe what he presently believes about us we can only expect him to continue on his present course of reckless unilateral action like his precipitation of the Berlin crisis. And the risk we would be taking would be a war no one wants which would destroy civilization itself.

I am not suggesting that we should be so naive as to think that his visit to the United States will change his ideas about the relative merits of communism and our system of government.

But he will find that the overwhelming majority of the American people believe in their system just as deeply as he believes in his. That regardless of party we are united behind the President in our determination to defend our independence and that of other free nations with whom we are allied in the event of aggression. And that while the American people want peace, he should never mistake our dedication to peace for weakness, fear, or lack of determination to defend ourselves where our vital interests are attacked.

The peace we want is not the peace of surrender or appeasement but peace with justice. If Mr. Khrushchev has this lesson brought home to him by what he sees and hears in the United States, this visit will have been justified apart from the results of any conversations he may have with the President, because it will have reduced the possibility that he may miscalculate by underestimating our will to resist and thereby precipitate a crisis which could only result in war.

Now put yourself in the place of the President of the United States. It would be tempting for him to view this evil philosophy with scorn and detachment, to refuse to talk to and to meet its representatives except through the usual formal diplomatic channels. But I say that it would be the height of irresponsibility on the part of the President of the United States to take this posture, popular as it might be at the moment, and allow the world to continue to drift into two hostile camps and an inevitable, suicidal war.

In judging the merits of this visit, let me list some of the things that will not result from it.

There will be no acquiescence or approval by us of the status of the captive nations of eastern Europe. There will not be any change in the opposition of the government and people of the United States to communism at home or abroad. There will not be any reduction of U.S. military strength in the absence of self-enforcing disarmament agreements which we know will be kept by them as well as by us. There will be no negotiating on issues affecting our allies without their being present. And there will be no abandonment of our position that the 2,500,000 people of West Berlin must continue to be guaranteed the right to retain the free government which they have chosen by overwhelming vote.

In addition to providing Mr. Khrushchev a chance to see the United States and to know the truth about not only our military and economic strength but also the will and determination of the American people, it will provide an opportunity for him to discuss issues directly with President Eisenhower which affect the peace of the world.

Now I realize that there are those who object to such talks on the ground that they fear they may result in appeasement, surrender of some of our basic interests; some even suggest that Mr. Khrushchev may outwit, outsmart or trap the President and his associates.

To answer these charges bluntly, I think it is time for us to recognize that the Communists are not so smart and we are not so dumb as this kind of talk would imply.

The difficulty in the past has not been so much with what was agreed at the conference table but the fact that the Communists broke the agreements. This has occurred in the case of 50 out of 52 major treaties and agreements since 1933. But we can be sure this time that the President will have in mind the last Geneva Conference where Mr. Khrushchev failed to carry out the agreements on unification of Germany and other issues which they reached at that time.

The President is well aware of the fact that Communist subversion in the United States is still being financed and supported by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

And if there were ever any doubts that the President would not enter these talks with his guard up, the news from Laos has certainly laid them to rest. The support and the encouragement which the governments of the U.S.S.R. and Communist China have been giving to the rebels in that country have served to alert the whole free world to the fact that communism's drive for world domination continues without letup.

In other words, those who believe that this conference is going to result in appeasement, surrender, defensiveness and softness toward communism simply do not know the President of the United States.

We have learned a lot in our dealings with the Communists over the past few years. While we will always treat a guest in our country with courtesy, we know that charm, flattery, and gracious toasts have no effect whatever in changing the rigid positions of the Communists leaders. We have learned that in our meetings with them we have to be just as hard-headed, tough-minded and realistic as they are. This is an approach Mr. Khrushchev respects and understands and this is the kind of a man he will face in President Eisenhower.

There are some who say it was undignified for me to reply to Mr. Khrushchev in public when he attacked the United States and our policies when I was escorting him through the U.S. exhibition in Moscow.

My answer is that I, too, would prefer that important issues be discussed in a dignified private conference. But what we have to recognize is that we are engaged in a great battle of ideas with the Communist world. Mr. Khrushchev knows this well. He never misses an opportunity to make propaganda for the Communist way of life. And I say that it is time for us in the free world to quit being defensive, apologetic, and mealy-mouthed when our system comes under attack, publicly or privately.

We in the free world must stand up and fight for our ideas just as the Communists do for theirs. We have allowed too much to go unchallenged, the kind of talk that: the free nations are decadent, divided and weak. The only and best way to progress in the newly-developing countries is through communism. Communism rather than freedom is the wave of the future. The Communist leaders are too crafty and shrewd for us at the conference table. Their education system is superior to ours.

We have been on the defensive long enough. It is time for us to take the offensive and help make the whole world realize that the Communist idea is not a super idea; that the Communist leaders are not supermen; and that the Soviet Union is not a supernation.

We should not underestimate the deadly seriousness of the challenge which is presented to us because of the disciplined dedication of the Communist leaders. But let us not make the mistake of meeting that challenge with a negative, defeatist, static posture.

As the international spotlight shifts from long-distance threats to man-to-man conferences, we should be cautious. But caution is not the same as a paralyzing suspicion that prevents any move toward peace. Let us give the President our united and wholehearted support as he takes the leadership in the cause of peace with justice.

When Mr. Khrushchev challenges us to peaceful competition, let us go him one better and urge expansion of that competition to include the spiritual as well as the material aspects of our society. Let there be competition between ideas not only in the free world but in the Communist world as well.

We should welcome and encourage a greater exchange of persons and ideas between the free world and the Communist world. A free society thrives on free discussion, criticism, and interplay of ideas. On the other hand, dictators use fear, suspicion, and secrecy to maintain their power and control over the people.

When Mr. Khrushchev says that our grandchildren will live under communism, our answer should be—we do not fear the outcome provided they have the freedom to choose the system they want. We do not say in reply that his grandchildren will live under capitalism. The very essence of our belief is that we will not impose it on anyone else, and that every people should have a right to choose the kind of economic and political system which best fits its particular problems.

But this we do believe—that all the people on this earth, including those of the Soviet Union—will inevitably demand and obtain more and more freedom. Because history teaches us that man was made to be free and that freedom, not communism or any other form of dictatorship, is the wave of the future.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars can render invaluable service to the cause of peace and freedom to which we are all dedicated.

Let our answer to the aggressive tactics of world communism not be simply defensive, negative, and fearful. The best answer to the Communist revolution is the kind of life produced by the American Revolution. The most effective antidote to communism is a program of intelligent, articulate, positive Americanism.

Should Business Go in for Politics?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid article which appeared in the New York Times magazine of August 30, 1959, entitled "Should Business Go in for Politics?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD BUSINESS GO IN FOR POLITICS?

(By Charles P. Taft)

CINCINNATI.—Americans read almost daily now that businessmen should go into politics. This has been said before, but not so often or so broadly. A few years ago, business leaders were being urged to work at the local political level. Now, every salaried employee in some companies is being called upon to select the party that best represents his point of view and work for that party in his neighborhood.

This sounds good, especially to one who has watched local groups seek businessman candidates for, say, the city council in such a well-governed and progressive city as Cincinnati. The task of finding candidates is harder every year, it seems. Perhaps, one thinks, this movement can help. But how civic is it?

Business has been in politics a long time. I have been told that at the end of the 17th century the sons of Robert Taft, a wheelwright, of Mendon, Mass., became selectmen of the town and worked hard to get a bridge built to the west over the Blackstone River—where, coincidentally no doubt, they owned some land.

Certainly the "robber barons" were in politics up to their ears, from Jim Fisk and Commodore Vanderbilt to the copper kings of Montana. Railroaders, liquor dealers, insurance men, shipping magnates, fair traders, and price discounters are only a few of the businessmen who have found it necessary to go to State legislatures and Congress. Makers of fire-department equipment, concrete and blacktop purveyors, clay-pipe manufacturers, road and building contractors all are concerned with who is mayor, city manager, councilman, or Governor.

Companies of any size have a troubleshooter, part or full time, who knows his way around in politics. He may also be the one who decides what campaign contribution is made to what politician by what officer—from his personal salary, of course.

Government regulation in the State or National Capital makes a common front essential to an industry. Government contracts may be the lifeblood of the business, as with most airframe companies. So trade associations grow and prosper, and larger companies have branch offices in Washington.

Then what is new about the business-into-politics movement? One thing is its scale. One nationally known corporation has trained a battalion of 500 executives to spread the gospel of company views on public issues. Another new element is that the present movement, upon examination, begins to assume some of the aspects of a public relations operation. There is even a New York advertising firm organized last year specifically to advise companies in this limited field.

Is all this good or bad? How far will it get?

There is a lot of sound thinking behind a program for a better business climate. A big local plant is usually a sitting duck for a rabble rouser on a city council. It shouldn't be; its intelligent leaders—and its employees on lower levels—ought to fight back.

But there is something wrong with the broad drive to get employees into politics. Even the political P.R. firm warns businessmen to look out. Democratic National Chairman Paul Butler, in a joint interview last May with THRUSTON B. MORTON, his Republican counterpart, said: "With * * * narrow purposes in mind they are going to end up alienating the general public, creating suspicion of the business community and doing a clumsy job of obtaining even their narrow objectives." And Mr. MORTON warned: "If businessmen are to achieve a maximum effectiveness in politics, they must work toward this goal as citizens rather than as spokesmen for, or representatives of, just one segment of our total economy."

Henry Kaiser and George Romney, both pretty good judges of sound business public relations, have stood against the whole idea of business telling its employees to go into politics—apparently for just the reasons Butler and MORTON gave.

That warning is sound. What is really self-interest, however justifiable, ought not to be blown up into civic spirit, and it ought to be advanced with some degree of attractive modesty and humility. What is good for General Motors is not necessarily good for the country, or the city.

A second thing wrong with the campaign is that it is, in fact, aimed at labor. This central motivation—to rival big labor and beat down labor organizations—is openly stated in many cases. An executive of a large corporation, in a speech to the Business Advisory Council last October, urged more vigorous political action by businessmen because of his personal appraisal of the AFL–CIO as the "most aggressive and successful force in politics." This power, he said, is "principally in the hands of other [than racketeer] union officials, who nevertheless put forth ideologies and proposals which result in inflation, concentration of power in central government, damage to progress, and withering of freedom." I cannot remember any endorsement of political participation by business not closely related to emotion about the labor problem.

You may ask why this campaign should not be aimed at labor. There are two good reasons.

One is that labor is not as effective at the polls or in Congress or the State legislatures as is assumed in this emotional reaction. The Taft-Hartley Act was passed by more than a two-thirds margin over President Truman's veto and the labor reform bill that recently passed the House was certainly not the one labor wanted. At the local level labor seldom really works for a candidate—only once since 1925 in Cincinnati, for example.

Labor can vote against when the issue is something like the right to work, and when people in general feel it is simply punitive, not constructive. And if labor comes out to vote on such an issue, it may knock off a candidate incidentally, as it did Senator John Bricker in Ohio last November. But although workers may get herded out to register, they do not vote as "labor." In fact, they do not vote much at all. Their local leaders have their hands too full with union politics to spend much time on local, State or national party politics.

The other reason against just opposing labor is that a wholly negative campaign, for all that it may be temporarily effective, does not work in the long pull. As Arthur Motley, the publisher of Parade magazine and a leader in the successful fight to elect Representative John V. Lindsay against the opposition of the Republican organization in New York's 17th district last November, has put it: "I can see no future for business and our kind of economy if we're merely going to have big business opposing big labor in the political arena."

This leads us to my third general objection to the business into politics campaign—the fact that it looks, and sometimes acts, as if it were against all progress. For example, an official of one of our largest corporations, active in the movement, has talked about "successful Republican candidates who were pulled far to the left in their campaign obligations and promises." The head of another company, located in New Jersey, which conducts one of these programs, has been reported organizing to prevent the renomination of CLIFFORD CASE as Senator from that State because his record is "indistinguishable from the Americans for Democratic Action." Yet CASE in 4 years is recorded as supporting President Eisenhower 85 percent of the time, compared with 83 percent for former Senator H. Alexander Smith.

There is an interesting schizophrenia here. The National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are officially opposed to any program like public housing, and want urban renewal stopped or reduced rapidly. Yet many of their distinguished members belong to organizations in Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Boston, or San Francisco which are the civic spark plugs for urban renewal as the only cure for the blight at the heart of practically every large city in America. In that connection they support public housing. They go to State capitals and to Washington and say so, while the NAM and chamber of commerce present resolutions to the contrary in the same places.

It may be argued that if businessmen want to go into politics to oppose labor, urban renewal, or Senator Case, that is their privilege. To this I answer that we are talking about politics, and that politics, as the art of the possible, is no place for anti-intellectual absolutism about economics and social sciences, or about individuals, either. I do not advocate compromise with principles, but I do mean that in these areas nobody knows all, that humility learns more than arrogance, and that an intelligent and honest opponent may have a little—just a little—in which he may be right.

My final objection to the "go into politics" movement is that it generally neglects local government where public servants provide us with streets, sewers, hospitals, police protection, water, and garbage disposal. Rather, the movement's sponsors back the local organization for supposedly doing the job for the Republican candidates for President, Senator, Congressman, or Governor. (Let us face it: These sponsors work with Democrats because they have to in most large cities, but they are all Republicans.)

The truth is that a local Republican organization does very little for the four named officials on the Republican ticket, especially if there is a real fight on. It is much more interested in the probate judge (surrogate in New York), the auditor (tax assessor), the sheriff, and the county commissioners.

My late brother, Senator Robert A. Taft, now highly revered by the organization in Cincinnati, always ran well behind those local officials, and it was not the Cincinnati or any other local organization that pulled him through for reelection in 1944 by just 17,000 out of well over 2 million votes in the State of Ohio.

Local government—good, efficient local government—is where any political movement ought to begin, especially when, as today, most national domestic issues, including labor corruption, have their roots there. And from local government, too, come those good candidates for national office whom this movement is looking for.

But few spokesmen for the movement even think of local government when they make their speeches. I heard a top corporation man describe the whole program to a president's round table of the American Management Association. When he had finished I asked if what he said applied (1) to local government, and (2) to a city with an independent local movement like our Cincinnati Charter Committee and (3) to places like Detroit or Dayton where the national parties take no part in local elections. (A poll taken last April showed that 60 percent of American cities with more than 50,000 population have no Republican or Democratic activities.) The answer was that, of course, the program applied there, too. I can only say there is very, very little in his company's literature to show it.

Yet there is much that business men could do in politics. They are urgently needed. Clearly, since I have been so critical, it is up to me to lay out some guide lines.

(1) One thing that business men are doing, and that they should do more of, is exemplified by the Cleveland Foundation, the Citizens Development Committee in Cincinnati and the Allegheny County group in Pittsburgh. These organizations back master plans for their areas, and help and encourage local officials of either party to carry these plans through. Their businessman members go to state capitals and Washington to help cut through red tape or get new legislation.

(2) Businessmen should take adult courses in economics, as members of the Committee for Economic Development do. Too many of the vocal ones rely on self-constituted research organizations that tell them what they want to hear instead of on professionally recognized groups like the National Bureau for Economic Research, the Brookings Institution or the National Industrial Conference Board.

(3) Businessmen ought to write their own speeches and do a lot of their own homework. They should practice persuasive speaking, seek critical comments on their technical proficiency. Few businessmen can stand up to comparable labor leaders, mostly for want of practice and training in both sound economics and public speaking.

(4) Businessmen who go into politics should learn first that the "pros" have no interest in their participation except as moneybags or fat cats, and perhaps as rubber stamps for the ticket.

To put it affirmatively, the place to begin is usually with a fight—against the organization—to get good candidates nominated and elected in both the party primary and the election. Talking about starting in the precincts of your own party organization is eyewash, because intelligent young businessmen are the last thing the local machine wants. It wants order takers who will produce votes for the slate at the primary. After that, of course, the voters probably have little choice.

This is not a sorehead's gripe. I can get myself elected in my home town against the organization. I have done it in 11 primary or general elections, and I have lost in only 3.

But my point is shown by the White Plains Republican primary fight of a couple of years ago, in which a group of insurgent beginners lost by only 1,000 votes in 20,000, and by last fall's victory for an antiorganization Republican congressional candidate in New York's 17th District. A group of young Republican businessmen has even analyzed the marginal districts around the country and set out to show, with some success, what a good plan can do, with good local leadership.

Every good American ought to be in politics, because through politics his Government

is run in a way that provides justice for his rights, and the services that make it possible to live as pleasantly as few in history have lived before. Businessmen can help make the word "politician" an honorable tag, even an intellectual tag, and have all kinds of fascinating fun doing it. But no one should fall for the canned slogan: "Join the party of your choice and start working in it at the precinct level (and, boy, let's sock these damned unions)."

Dedication of Stamps Commemorating the 100th Anniversary of the Petroleum Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following talk made by Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield at the dedication ceremonies of the 4-cent petroleum industry centennial commemorative stamp at Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1959:

In my service as Postmaster General, no official act could give me greater pleasure than to dedicate this stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the petroleum industry.

The American people have great reason to be indebted to this industry. It has supplied most of the power that has made the American standard of living possible.

Certainly we in the Post Office Department can see most vividly the contribution this great industry has made to the progress of America.

The improvement of the postal service has depended upon the constant advance of this industry. The development of diesel oil for the railroads greatly speeded our transcontinental service. The development of better gasolines for trucks and airplanes was vital to the Post Office's ability to keep pace with the needs of our people.

Recently the fuel this industry has made possible for jet aircraft has enabled us to give the better and faster service we should render in these times.

But the industry does not stop with this, nor do we. The industry has developed fuels to power mighty missiles—and we have carried out our first experiment in missile mail. We shall look to the petroleum industry in the future to provide power that will enable mail-carrying missiles to speed communications from this continent to all parts of the earth.

In the light of today's progress, it is difficult to believe that it was only 100 years ago that Col. Edwin L. Drake completed the first oil well here in this historic city of Titusville.

It is not difficult, however, to understand the dedication, the sacrifice, the courage, and the tenacity with which Colonel Drake met his challenge. It was a fitting beginning for a great enterprise that has been marked throughout this century by courage, dedication, and success.

The American people, I am sure, applaud the words of a testimonial to Colonel Drake by his contemporaries:

"Edwin L. Drake was the man who first bored for oil, and by his genius and indomitable perseverance, produced the cheapest illuminator of the age, multiplying the wealth of the world, adding to the list of human industries and contributing to the comfort and happiness of mankind."

How very apt, as well, are the words of the centennial slogan of the petroleum industry—"Born in Freedom, Working for Progress."

The oil industry not only was born in freedom, but has been a vital guardian of American freedom through all the years that have ensued. It has been a basic strength in war, a propellant of economic progress—a builder of higher standards of living—in peace.

We look to this stamp as more than a commemorative symbol. With more than 120 million stamps to be issued, it will go throughout the world as a reminder of what can be achieved by the combination of free enterprise and the vision and courage and effort of dedicated men.

It will serve as a worldwide tribute to all who have brought the oil industry to its present greatness—and to its leaders who are moving with confidence to meet the challenge of the future.

It is a great privilege to inaugurate this commemorative stamp, here on the site of the oil industry's birth. This stamp, above all, bears the best wishes of the American people for the second century of oil and the contribution it will make to better life for all the peoples of the earth.

Civil Air Patrol Members Perform Valuable Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. Prsident, the members of the Civil Air Patrol furnish good examples of good citizenship in action.

These people spend a great deal of their personal time and funds to prepare themselves to help others. They keep themselves ready for emergency work. Many people owe their lives to fast rescue work by the CAP. During the war, in unarmed light aircraft, they helped maintain a vigil around our country's coasts.

In addition, the CAP cadet program is one which helps our young people become more self-reliant, more responsible and better citizens.

A group of Texas CAP members recently conducted a simulated air search to keep in practice for the real thing. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as a salute to these public-spirited citizens, an article from the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal for Saturday, August 29, 1959, entitled "All-Day Problem—Simulated Air Search in Area Slated by CAP."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL-DAY PROBLEM—SIMULATED AIR SEARCH IN AREA SLATED BY CAP

Simulated search and rescue activities are planned in an annual SARCAP gathering here today of several squadrons of group 5 of the Civil Air Patrol.

Under direction of Air Force officers and making full use of both VHF and UHF radio communication with mobile units on the ground, fliers and their observers will accept a problem at 8 a.m. from an Air Force officer and will fly designated courses in various sectors of the area in an all-day exhibition.

DINNER PLANNED

A dinner program will be presented for group members at 8 p.m. today in Caprock Hotel. Col. Ben F. Lowell, commanding officer of the Texas wing, which has headquarters in Grand Prairie, will be here with perhaps five members of his staff.

Area embraced by the group is bounded by Lamesa to the south, the Oklahoma line on the north, the New Mexico line on the west, and the Wichita Falls area to the east.

Plainview is group 5 headquarters. Maj. Clayton Campbell is commanding officer. The group consists of Plainview, Amarillo, Borger, Dalhart, Muleshoe, Childress, and Lubbock squadrons.

Planes from each of those cities are expected to land before 8 a.m. on the landing strip at Abernathy. Air Force officers who present the problem to fliers and observers will grade them on flight, location of target, radio communication, landings and takeoffs, and the like.

MOBILE RADIO UNITS

The program, it is expected, will use 10 mobile radio units in the air and on the ground. Those in charge hope some planes will be here from other groups.

Out-of-Lubbock cadets and some senior members will be housed Saturday night at the RAFB bachelor officers' quarters, and Reese will provide transportation to and from Reese.

Expected to participate are about 50 cadets.

Lubbock squadron commander is 2d Lt. Noel Bryant. Operations officer is "Red" Branscum; executive officer, "Chuck" Hamilton; flight safety officer, Herb Pijan; communications officer, Ed Nettleton; flight plan officer, Clyde Myres; cadet commander, Lee Dex Vessels; and J. O. Woods is chairman of a committee planning the banquet.

Tenth Inter-American Conference: Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative appraisal of the 10th Inter-American Conference recently held at Santiago, Chile, by Thayer Waldo, of Mexico, D. F., was recently published in various papers of the United States.

Mr. Waldo is a well-known correspondent and magazine writer on Latin America where he has spent all but 4 of the past 20 years.

The indicated appraisal, known as Continental Closeup No. 45, follows:

CONTINENTAL CLOSEUPS No. 45

(By Thayer Waldo)

(NOTE TO EDITORS.—Part of the following story is based on official and confidential reports shown to me.)

MEXICO CITY.—Put bluntly, what happened during the 6-day Conference of Foreign Ministers at Santiago, Chile, was that the

United States lost the initiative in dealing with pan-American affairs.

For the first time in the 70-year history of the inter-American system, our Government's representatives were outmaneuvered and outvoted on matters relating strictly to the Western Hemisphere.

As a symptom and byproduct of the new attitude, another significant precedent was set in Santiago. Never before has any U.S. Secretary of State heard from his Latin American colleagues such sharp criticism of this country's practices as Christian Herter sat through there.

Realistic appraisal of all action taken at the meeting shows, beyond question, a net victory for Cuba's Fidel Castro—the man who publicly branded conference deliberations "a farce."

That triumph—which included blocking any direct reference to Communist influence in the Caribbean turmoil, or to Cuba's part in recent invasions of other nearby countries—was personally engineered by Raul Roa, Castro's astute, demagogic Foreign Minister.

Roa operated from the start on the classic theory that a good offense is the best defense. The first man with whom he talked privately, after reaching Santiago, was Foreign Minister Miguel Moreno of Panama. The second was Victor Andrade, who holds the same post in Bolivia.

To Moreno, Roa offered an official but off-the-record apology for the fact that some Cubans participated in an attempt to overthrow Panamanian President Ernesto de la Guardia, last May.

Then he adroitly brought up the subject of Panama's longstanding complaint that U.S. authorities and contractors in the Canal Zone pay lower wages to native labor than to Americans performing the same type of work.

Roa said that Cuba fully supported Panama's position on this issue and pointed out that it should be taken up by the conference, which had a broad question of respect for human rights on its agenda.

No preambles or excuses were needed in conversing with Andrade. The Bolivian foreign minister is strongly anticapitalist and suspicious of many U.S. policies. The mere suggestion by Roa that Herter must be prevented from taking over the meeting was enough in that case.

As a result of these moves by the Cuban, Moreno and Andrade devoted a good part of their opening addresses to attacking Washington's broken promises and Wall Street imperialism, respectively.

Coupled with Roa's own flamboyant denunciations of Dominican Dictator Trujillo, these aggressive speeches set the mood of the conference. Even such relatively sober types as Brazil's Horacio Lafer and Diogenes Taboada of Argentina were caught up in the urge to let Uncle Sam have it.

The total effect can be seen clearly by comparing final resolutions approved at the assemblage with the main points made in Secretary Herter's major speech there.

Herter stressed the need for the Organization of American States to adopt more effective measures against intervention and to keep a closer eye on Red infiltration throughout the hemisphere.

In passing, he gave a warm verbal salute to representative democracy and cautiously acknowledged the relationship of economic problems to political instability.

But when the working committees got down to hammering out formal declarations on these issues, the emphasis was dramatically reversed. They gave solemn lipservice to the nonintervention principle by authorizing the Inter-American Peace Commission to look into all charges of aggression. They also went through the motions of rejecting communism and all other totalitarianisms.

Most of the serious labor, though, was devoted to drafting the Declaration of Santiago, which condemns dictatorships for their suppression of civic and human rights; and to calling for a study of economic underdevelopment as a threat to peace in the Americas.

Commissions set up to investigate these matters will report back to the big 11th Inter-American Conference scheduled for next February in Quito, Ecuador.

A few weeks before that gathering, the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Pan American Affairs, chairmaned by WAYNE MORSE of Oregon, is due to release its preliminary report.

Advance information indicates that this analysis is likely to provide new ammunition for critics of U.S. policy in Latin America since World War II, especially as regards our expenditures on military aid versus those for economic and technical assistance to the area.

And if the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange visits between now and then bring a real lessening of cold war tensions, we are apt to find ourselves facing something very like a full-scale revolt by our southern neighbors against what nearly all of them consider U.S. domination.

Only time will tell what, if anything, the Santiago conference accomplished toward restoring peace in the Caribbean. The one sure thing about it at this time is that a brand new era in the Americas was inaugurated there.

Program Sponsored by the Institute of Advanced Studies in the Theater Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD articles from the New York Times of May 17 and July 12, regarding a program sponsored by the Institute of Advanced Studies in the Theater Arts. I think this is a splendid undertaking of the institute, and I congratulate the sponsors upon their foresight. I am sure the institute will make an important contribution for better relations with these respective countries.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1959]

ADVANCED STUDIES—WORLD-FAMOUS THEATER EXPERTS WILL TEACH HERE AT NEW INSTITUTE

(By Donald Lazere)

Next fall when plans are due to be completed, acting, staging, and designing techniques of such companies as the Old Vic, the Comédie Française, the Moscow Art Theater, and the Kabuki Theater will be directly accessible for study to theater professionals and students in New York.

Practicing experts from these and other famous world theaters will be brought to the United States especially to conduct workshops, seminars, and lectures at the newly chartered Institute for Advanced Studies in the Theater Arts.

Recently approved by the New York board of regents as a nonprofit, privately endowed school, the institute will be devoted to specialized studies in international theater and will be open to top American professionals and highly qualified students.

Those in charge of the project picture it as a theatrical equivalent to the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton—"a highly specialized institution where the finest minds in the world can be brought together with what we hope will be catalytic effects on our theater and those abroad."

THE TRUSTEES

Dr. John D. Mitchell and Miriam Pitcairn Mitchell are the founders of IASTA, as the school will be known. Dr. Mitchell, a former professor of theater arts at Manhattan College and Northwestern University was U.S. delegate to the 1953 and 1956 United Nations Economic, Scientific, and Cultural Organization's Congresses of the International Theater Institute. Mrs. Mitchell was one of the founders of the American Shakespeare Festival Theater at Stratford, Conn. Trustees of IASTA, in addition to Dr. and Mrs. Mitchell, are playwright Willian Ingre, John Wharton, a director and counsel for the Playwrights Co., and Rosamond Gilder, vice president of the International Theater Institute and board member of the American National Theater and Academy. Gala Ebin, previously affiliated with ANTA and the Theater Guild, has been appointed executive secretary.

Dr. and Mrs. Mitchell developed the idea of a school for high-level study of international theater during several years of travel throughout Europe and Asia.

"After talking theater with people in 50 countries," Dr. Mitchell says, "my wife and I have found that there is a great deal Americans can learn from the foreign stage. And theater people in other countries always want to find out more about contemporary American drama."

By providing foreign experts as teachers, he explains, IASTA will enable Americans to study worldwide theater theories, techniques and tools firsthand without having to go abroad. At the same time, foreign theater people who want to visit the United States but have been discouraged by currency blocks and other obstacles will have an opportunity to come here as guests of IASTA.

PUBLIC LECTURES

During IASTA's first year, an expert from each foreign theater represented will conduct a 6-week series of workshops and seminars for a small group of American professionals and advanced students, and in addition will deliver 4 to 6 lectures open to the public.

"In the workshops," Dr. Mitchell says, "each man gives the cream of his specialty. For example, a director from the Comédie Française might plunge right in directing a selected group of American actors in a Molière play exactly as it is done at the Comédie Française, except in the best American translations. Meanwhile, directors, playwrights, and designers sit in on rehearsals and, afterward, join the actors in presenting their questions and comments to the director in a seminar. His 6 weeks' course will be climaxed by a public presentation of the play.

"This will be the pattern for the first year's program, with variations of course, depending on each man's specialty. After the first year we hope to fan out and offer a choice of courses and approaches.

Dr. and Mrs. Mitchell currently are on the last leg of a 4½-month trip around the world and are due back early next month. The trip was devoted to completing arrangements to bring over at least four representatives from foreign theaters and acadamies for IASTA's first-year program.

[From the New York Times, July 12, 1959]

PROGRESS

Either November or January should see the start of the recently chartered Institute

for Advanced Studies in the Theater Arts. That is the word from founders Dr. John D. Mitchell and his wife, Miriam Pitcairn Mitchell, just returned from their 4½-month round-the-world tour in behalf of their project. The institute is designed to help American professionals enjoy the benefits of study with outstanding representatives of the world's leading theater cultures.

In addition to the Mitchells, William Inge, John F. Wharton and Roesamond Gilder are trustees. Foreign directors who have been invited to participate in the institute's initial year are Willie Schmidt (Germany), Yuri Zavadski (Soviet Union) and Jean Meyer (France). Representatives from Japan, Italy and Greece also are expected. In the case of Mr. Zavadski, a disciple of Stanislavsky and Meyerhold and for 16 years an actor with the Moscow Art Theater, the State Department would like to make an exchange. It would like to work out arrangements for one of our leading directors to go to Moscow.

Position of Congress on Public Works Appropriations Should Be Sustained

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, once again an effort of the Congress to meet the executive branch halfway on an important issue has been nullified by a Presidential veto—this time, the public works appropriations bill of 1960. In considering a vote on this veto we are faced once again with the question of how far the Congress should go in knuckling under to the Budget Bureau and the executive branch in the matter of determing the policies of this government.

The question at issue here between the Congress and the President is purely on a matter of policy. As we know, the bill as it was sent to the President's desk called for only a very slightly larger expenditure than the recommendations in the budget—an increase of approximately 3 percent. The President's objections to this bill appear to be based largely on the fact that the Congress has refused to accept the Budget Bureau's policy against new starts or even any new planning studies. The basic issue therefore is largely whether the Congress or the President shall determine the policy underlying the development of our water resources of the Nation.

The President, as we know, has guarded the prerogative of the Presidency. He has stated that he would not leave the White House with the powers of the President diminished. But, Mr. Speaker, Congress must guard its prerogatives also and no Congress would be living up to its constitutional responsibilities if it permitted its own powers to be diminished.

There are other good reasons why this veto should be overridden:

First. In rejecting the administration's "no new start" policy, the Congress did not act capriciously or hastily. Let me recall that the Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee spent many months taking testimony on this matter. It heard from some 1,200 witnesses, including the representatives of the Federal agencies and 243 Members of the Congress. The testimony filled four volumes and 4,222 pages of printed hearings. In the other body, the comparable committee also held extensive hearings and heard many witnesses.

The Appropriations Committees and the Congress has considered carefully and well this whole matter.

Second. The "no new starts" policy with which your appropriations Committee was faced when the budget was submitted to the Congress by the President is both unwise and unrealistic. If it were continued it would lead to a drying up of the water resources program of the Nation.

Third. Even more unrealistic is the policy restricting surveys and planning of new projects. It takes many years to make and complete intelligent and prudent surveys, and additional years for making plans for efficient projects. Stopping surveys and planning might very well lead us into a position where in a sudden emergency we would be forced into hurried surveys and planning where the possibilities for costly mistakes and errors would be greatly multiplied. Both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation feel that this Nation should have new starts and an orderly, progressive, and efficient program of water resource development. The amounts budgeted for new surveys and planning in this bill this year are modest indeed and insure a continuation of construction on an orderly basis.

Fourth. We must look at our water resources program as a positive program to develop the resources of our country and to lay a foundation for the continued growth of every region of our country.

Fifth. This Nation cannot run a water resource development program on a "stop and go" basis. We must have an orderly and well-planned continuing program of surveys, of planning and construction. On this basis our country can go forward on a more economical and sound basis.

Sixth. With respect to the questioned construction projects added to this bill by the Congress there are five which resume construction of already started but not yet completed projects; there are four which are actually reimbursements to local interests for expenditures made by these local communities; and there are six which are small loan projects. So that there are actually only 50 completely new projects involving construction by the Federal Government. This is just one for each State. Surely, in view of the billions we are expending for projects abroad, these investments in the development of our own country cannot be considered extravagant.

Seventh. The bill is a good bill, a realistic bill, and a measure that faces up, not only to the present needs of our Nation for the development of our water resources, but also looks to and prepares for the future.

Eighth. It is a bill that insures that this great program of water-resources development which we have had under way for the past 25 years will continue in an orderly and uninterrupted program.

Ninth. It is a bill with a truly national point of view which recognizes the needs of every area of our country and the different types of programs needed in the different regions, and continues a well-balanced program that is truly in the interest of the entire Nation.

Tenth. In short, Mr. Speaker, the Congress in writing and passing this bill did a good job and responsible service. It should stand behind this bill now and see that the months of work which went into the writing of this bill will not have been in vain.

A vote to override the veto will sustain the prerogative of the Congress to establish the policy of our Nation.

Air Force Capt. Allan J. Lavelle, of Bonham, Tex., a Good Ambassador for America Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we have recently heard a lot of talk concerning the bad impression which some Americans give to people overseas.

It is, therefore, refreshing to learn of Americans like Air Force Capt. Allan J. Lavelle, of Bonham, Tex., Speaker SAM RAYBURN's hometown, who are doing a great deal to correct these unfortunate ideas of the United States and our people, created by some uninformed Americans abroad.

Captain Lavelle, assigned to the 6921st Radio Group in Japan has originated and put into operation a number of programs which have helped both the Air Force and the citizens of the area around his base. Men such as Captain Lavelle are a credit to their country and to the uniform they wear. And they help overcome the Communist propaganda tirade against us.

Mr. President, I would like to join with the 180,000 people of the Japanese prefecture, Saitama, and with the citizens of this country, near the airbase, in saluting Captain Lavelle. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Bonham (Tex.) Daily Favorite for Friday, August 28, 1959, entitled "Good Will Ambassador—Bonhamite Winning Japs as U.S. Friends."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOOD WILL AMBASSADOR—BONHAMITE WINNING JAPS AS U.S. FRIENDS

MISAWA AIRBASE, JAPAN.—The 6921st Radio Group Mobile at Misawa Airbase, Japan, can boast of a fabulous personality—Capt. Allan J. Lavelle from Bonham, Tex.

Violin maker, woodworker, artist, farmer, animal carver, tractor and airplane builder, information services officer, pilot, skywriter, interpreter, salvage diver, enlisted man and officer in both the Navy and Air Force and people-to-people ambassador of good will to thousands of Japanese citizens highlight his varied career.

He is best known in Saitama Prefecture when in 1953, upon end of his tour, a telegram in the names of 180,000 people of that prefecture asked President Eisenhower to please keep Captain Lavelle in Japan, for he is the strongest link in the United States-Japan cooperation in this section of Japan. Everyone is praying he stays.

Captain Lavelle personally received 20,000 letters from Japanese people asking him to stay in Japan.

What did he do to warrant this? He simply embarked upon his own program of helping and making friends with all Japanese he came into contact with.

His ability to speak fluent Japanese enabled him to get close to the people. He listened to the little man's problems, established the American-Japanese Cooperative Councils and acted as interpreter.

A nearby farmer's tea crop was being ruined by dust from American military vehicles so Captain Levelle made arrangements to have waste oil poured frequently on the road to eliminate that problem.

He got permission for local farmers to pick up the Air Base's garbage to use for hog feed and thereby created jobs. He helped the Japanese Red Cross and other charitable drives by allowing them to solicit on base which gained thousands of dollars for them to mention a few of his unselfish acts.

As he later said, "The Japanese people can really determine the way the Far East eventually will go in this struggle with communism. I want them to be on our side."

Why Khrushchev Wants To Come to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Americans are baffled and irritated by the strange spectacle of our "split personality" foreign policy.

With one voice it warns: "Don't expect the Communists to let up in their campaign to conquer the world." With the other voice it tranquilizes: "Be nice to 'killer' Khrushchev. Treat him as our honored guest."

This deliberate blurring of the distinction between right and wrong, brought about by the strange melange of failure, fear, and aggressive good will, emphasizes the need for a constant restatement of those truths that must be above expediency. They constitute our only sure guide through the present confusions.

Lest we forget, under unanimous consent, I include for reprint in the RECORD, the clear, courageous, and determined opposition to the invitation to Khrushchev expressed by His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston, in the August 30 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe.

CARDINAL CUSHING EXPLAINS WHY KHRUSHCHEV WANTS SO BADLY TO COME TO THE UNITED STATES—"THROWS MANTLE OF RESPECTABILITY AROUND SHOULDERS"

(By Richard Cardinal Cushing, of Boston)

If there were any doubt of the need for the average American to engage in the intelligent and vigorous battle against Soviet, atheistic communism, that doubt is permanently removed by the coming visit of Dictator Khrushchev to this country.

Already we have witnessed the evil fruits of that coming, before this bloody dictator has set foot on our shores.

Once more history records that the United States has been outwitted by the Kremlin—or rather, outrageously deceived.

This is recorded in the continued cutting down of the free world, the new betrayal of free peoples into Soviet hands, and the continued expansion of Soviet power—all centered around the Khrushchev visit.

While the American Nation is warmly welcoming the Butcher of Budapest, although his hands are red with the blood of the Hungarian and Tibetan peoples, the Kremlin is attacking the United States and the free world through southeast Asia.

While we will be hailing this enemy of freedom in our cities and streets, he has engineered the invasion of the little country of Laos as the prelude to taking over all that part of the world.

The Khrushchev visit is a device which is bringing about the contraction of the free world and with it the cutting down of the number of men and women who dare openly to express their belief in God. It is speeding up the enslavement of the little man throughout the world.

If we are to permit this process to go forward, as we have done for the past 25 years, it will lead to complete defeat.

Why does Khrushchev want so badly to come to the United States?

There are a number of reasons for this desire.

We can immediately single out three:

First, by this invitation, the U.S. Government officially throws the mantle of political respectability around the shoulders of the man who so outrageously double-crossed the Hungarian people in the streets of Budapest.

The natural deduction from our embrace of Khrushchev among the peoples of the world, especially among the captive people who hear only the Soviet side of the story, will be that we have finally turned our backs on all the enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. This conception will be intensified by the flood of Red propaganda going to the comrades of the world, including those of the captive nations, designed to make it appear that Hungary and these other enslaved countries are permanent parts of the Soviet empire.

We must remember that this form of poisonous propaganda—intended to make the inhabitants of the captive nations despair, goes on in regard to Poland, China, and all the other countries behind the Iron Curtain. It is driven home by the Kremlin in every one of the 83 countries in which it operates today.

A considerable section of the population of those countries will be under the impression that the United States has indorsed all the savage acts of the Kremlin by its cordial reception of Khrushchev.

Second, along with the political respectability which Khrushchev thus attains, he is at the same time able by his visit to give new life to the already virulent forces of appeasement and sedition within the free world, and specifically within the United States.

Already the Worker of August 9, in hailing the coming of its master as a great Red victory over the United States, pointed out that it was necessary to go on to the overthrow of our "present system" here if real peace were to be attained.

We can see even now that among some distinguished men who are noted for their appeasement tendencies that they have tried to rush to Khrushchev's defense on the Laos crisis. They have lamely sought to make out that the attack on Laos is the act of Red China and North Vietnam only. But this cannot obscure the strong and official endorsement of this attack by the Soviet Government, accompanied by the usual charge that the U.S. Government (so hospitable to Khrushchev) is behind the whole difficulty there.

This strengthening of the appeasement forces within this country and all the free world is supplemented by the inevitable new attempt to split the nations of the Western world. By permitting bilateral contacts between our Government and Khrushchev, we have opened the Pandora box to Soviet bids to every free nation, large and small, to deal with Moscow on a separate basis from the rest of the West.

This is well illustrated by the present overture made to France, where Khrushchev would receive a wild and tumultuous greeting from the millions of Communists who follow the Kremlin's directions.

And thus it is that inviting Khrushchev to come to this country we are digging our own graves and honoring our prospective gravedigger. For we are enacting the amazing historical scene of acclaiming the man who frankly says that he intends to bury us.

And that fate will eventually be ours out of this visit unless we take immediate steps, each and every American, to halt this process of disintegration in our policies which is leading to our doom.

Third, a chief result from the visit hoped for by the Soviet dictator is the trapping of our big business circles into the expansion of trade with all Soviet-controlled countries which are more and more acting as one big economic unit.

This was one of the main objectives stressed by the 21st Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union held this last January, and is therefore an outstanding feature of the current Communist line.

By this act, if we agree to this procedure, we will once again commit ourselves to the building up of Soviet power so that it may destroy us.

We will also open the doors fully to the free functioning of Soviet espionage agents in this country. With the Soviet dictatorship, trade and good relations are always accompanied by political, military, and industrial espionage.

It is astounding that the Kremlin and its agents think that they can put over this proposal on American business and the American Nation when it entails an endorsement of trade in slave labor products. We have laws in all our States, built up after terrific effort, to prevent the sale of convict labor products on the open market. These acts were passed for the protection of our own highly paid and able, free workers. By one blow, in consenting to widespread trade with nations that engage in extensive

slave labor, we would in effect destroy all of this legislation.

It is encouraging to learn that the national organization of the AFL–CIO has shown itself alert to the danger which would follow from any relationship (including trade) with Soviet Russia and Khrushchev.

We can all be pleased to note that the executive council of that great labor federation on August 20 declared by overwhelming vote that it is "out of the question for the AFL–CIO to give recognition to the head of a government which does not permit its own workers to have any free trade unions."

We hope that American big business circles, which were wooed so openly by Khrushchev's agents, A. Mikoyan and F. Kozlov, will demonstrate the same fortitude and foresight by rejecting all trade with the Soviet slave empire.

Such alleged trade will prove largely to be synthetic so far as America is concerned. This was shown clearly in the 1930's, when such trade was attempted on a considerable scale; then it proved, as it will again, to be illusory in the sense that it merely consisted in Soviet purchase of samples of our machines and precision tools, for duplication in Soviet Russia.

Confronted with all the difficulties and dangers that Dictator Khrushchev's visit to our country raises up for us, the average American can here and now rededicate himself to zealous work for the salvation of his country.

There is no one, absolutely no one, who cannot take part in this crusade in one way or another.

Above all, of course, all our efforts on behalf of the United States and our own freedom should be sanctified and strengthened by prayer.

That is why I have recommended novenas to begin on September 15, including prayers for the silent church behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, and to Our Lady of Fatima. That is the beginning of wisdom in the battle against atheistic communism. If we are to live in freedom and walk without fear of the coming catacombs, we must begin to practice that great right which still remains ours: The right to express publicly and in group worship our faith and belief in God.

Everyone, every man and woman, can within the environment in which he lives and labors let all his neighbors know that appeasement in any form leads step by step to the shrinking of the free world and the constant closing in of Soviet power upon the United States.

That was Stalin's pledge in 1939, now renewed in effect by Khrushchev: To encircle the United States and at the proper hour thus to destroy it.

Look at the map of the world just before World War II and look at it today, and we will be made aware that country after country has fallen under Soviet power. All of this has been done in the name of "peace" and all of it has been attained by Soviet Russia in bringing about acquiescence by the United States in these Soviet conquests.

Each step along this way was achieved by Soviet power under the plea that we should live in a friendly way together, by bringing forward the fake Stalin constitution of 1936, as an instance. We fell for that completely, for Stalin's pretension that he was guaranteeing "freedom of speech," "freedom of press," "freedom of worship," "freedom of demonstration."

But by 1956, to serve his own purposes, Khrushchev let the world know that none of these promises had been kept, that under cover of these pledges one of the most horrible reigns of terror in the history of the world had been carried on.

Then Khrushchev himself proceeded to deceive us with his glib talk of collective leadership and the new turn of affairs in Soviet control, to the point where we were induced to look on helplessly while the Hungarian and Tibetan people were massacred in cold blood, and while the right to worship was restricted and in fact obliterated in China and many other lands.

The much-heralded collective leadership that Khrushchev spoke so loudly about proved to be his own rule as the new Stalin.

It was by similar deceit that we were led to Geneva in 1955, and while we were debating there Soviet Russia made its breakthrough in the Middle East.

But apparently we had learned very little or we who had learned did not express ourselves strongly enough, for we fell victims to the same game by going to Geneva in 1959.

Then, while our representatives were again engaged in endless and fruitless discussions, Soviet power made its great thrust through southeast Asia by way of Laos.

Having this experience in mind, the average American can oppose at once—among his neighbors, in organizations to which he belongs, in any other way that he can express himself—any concession whatsoever to Soviet Russia.

It will not be possible for him, even in exercising his rights as a citizen, to become a thorough student of the Marxist-Leninist classics—the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev.

He can know, however, that these teachings—as the expression of a world view—hold that there can be no peace with the United States until we are completely destroyed.

He can know that this philosophy holds that there must be set up a world Soviet dictatorship, and that every act of the Kremlin and every act of its followers, every hour of every day, is for the purpose of advancing that objective.

He can know that this goal must be advanced by guile as well as force.

Knowing that, he can in his own way stand out against any further friendship with Soviet Russia or any Soviet power until the invasion of southeast Asia is halted permanently.

He can also continue to hammer home the necessity of expelling Red Hungary from the United Nations. With this can go a reiteration of the necessity for refusing to recognize Red China or to admit it to the U.N.

Within America, he can also stress that we must end our namby-pamby, careless policy toward the Communist conspirators in our midst and urge Congress to enact legislation which will protect us and our freedom.

If one reads the press through the country, it is most encouraging to note how many Americans have written letters to their local newspapers expressing opposition to the Khrushchev visit. It is more encouraging to observe how intelligent many of these letters have been.

That development gives us an indication of what the average American can do if he is spurred to understand one fundamental thing: That Soviet Russia, from its very foundation-philosophy, is determined to destroy him, his family, his liberty, and his right to worship God.

Depletion Rate Is Major Factor in Oil's Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Oil Daily of Thursday, August 27, 1959:

DEPLETION RATE IS MAJOR FACTOR IN OIL'S SUCCESS

This simple explanation of oil depletion, by a leading authority, Russell B. Brown, general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America for 30 years, will be understandable to readers in the year 2000 A.D.—(EDITOR.)

Among the many complexities presented to Congress by the adoption of the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which gave Congress authority to tax incomes, there was probably none more difficult of solution than providing a fair basis of taxation for the extractive industries and oil in particular.

Obviously, the total take or total value of sales from products or services was not a fair basis for determining taxable income.

Somewhere between total income and zero was a figure that should represent taxable income, else taxes could destroy all business.

A series of deductions was provided. The difference between total income and allowed deductions should provide a real approach to profit and profit was the nearest approach to taxable income under the amendment.

Since Congress was not given authority to tax capital by this amendment, capital must be preserved free of income tax.

Whatever part of total income represented capital return should be provided for in the deductions. The cost of material used in the process of manufacturing or of goods sold should provide another deduction. The cost of doing business or operations is another.

In the case of a manufacturing industry, the cost of the plant and equipment and the probable life of the plant and equipment were capable of mathematical determination and were provided for through depreciation whereby the capital was returned annually distributed so as to return the capital by the time of the exhaustion of the plant. While never quite exact, this system provided a reasonably accurate base for deduction.

The cost of raw material used in the factory and the cost of operating the plant varied from time to time. Therefore, a deduction was allowed based on the actual cost.

In the case of merchandising or service, the cost of goods sold usually constituted the largest deduction, to which was added depreciation for property used and the cost of services rendered.

These deductions subtracted from total income provided net income to be used as the basis of determining taxable income.

In the case of an oil well, the well itself provided little base for capital values. The cost of the well rarely provided an accurate basis of value as capital to which the depreciation principle might apply.

An oil well is not a factory or plant. It is in effect a highway through which oil may be moved from its source to the surface where the processing for use begins.

Two wells of equal cost normally provided varied amounts of income. An expensive well might pentrate a rich deposit of oil or a poor one. The formation penetrated might release the oil rapidly or slowly, depending on the character of the producing formation. All of the recoverable oil might be produced in a few years, such as 1 or 2 years, or it might be a long period such as 40 or 50 years. But once produced and used this oil was gone forever.

The courts have recognized the "ferae naturae" of oil in place, which meant that oil belonged to no one until reduced to possession.

The fugacious character of oil meant that owning land under which an oil-producing horizon existed did not always mean that you could reduce all of that oil to possession. Operating conditions and practices

often gave to an adjoining landowner a larger portion of the oil than originally was in place under the adjoining land. By this method, properties were drained disproportionately.

The nature of land titles in the United States gives to the owner of the surface the right to explore for and reduce to possession the minerals beneath his soil. This has probably contributed more to the successful search and finding of oil than any single condition. At the same time, it required constant alertness and action to preserve these inherent rights. The "law of capture" made necessary conservation laws to protect these rights.

These and many other differences in the character of the business of producing oil required a treatment in our tax laws that was different from the factory or the merchandising establishment. It required much study and experimentation by Congress and by the tax authorities and administrators to develop an understanding of these characteristics in oil production which required "differential" treatment of this activity in our tax laws.

After much study and experimentation, Congress in 1926 adopted the principle of allowing as a deduction from gross receipts a percentage of such receipts as a method of determining that part of income that should not be subject to the application of income tax.

This new method simplified tax administration and provided equitable treatment to all producers and was welcomed by government and taxpayer alike.

At the same time, Congress provided, in the case of oil production, that the rate of deduction should be 27.5 percent of the income from the property not to exceed 50 percent of the net income.

This method and the amount were not the result of an exact mathematical experience.

They were arrived at by Congress after long study. It was intended to provide a reasonable basis for taxation that would encourage entry into this business, which was recognized to be a risky and hazardous business, of enough capital and operators to insure activities that would find enough oil to meet the expanding industry of our Nation as well as to provide oil necessary to our national security.

To insure the continuous competition of the many individuals and companies, large and small, that would avoid monopoly of this essential resource by a few aggregations of wealth, the Treasury Department provided, by regulation, for allowing deduction from other income for loss through dry holes of the cost of such dry holes and for the intangible expenses in the year in which such expense occurred. This later provision, after about 30 years experimentation, was adopted into law by Congress in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

These provisions have now been in our tax laws for more than 30 years. They are no longer an experiment.

Wise mineral tax policies have been a major factor in the success of finding and development of this Nation's oil resources. Finding and producing of adequate supplies of petroleum have brought forth a new and dynamic era that has made possible yet unknown heights in the productivity and standard of living of the United States.

Petroleum has opened up new sources of national wealth that have contributed greatly to both the areas where oil has been found and also to the width and breath of the entire national enocomy. Petroleum can be credited with providing at low cost the energy supplies and raw materials which have made and are continuing to make more and better things for more people.

The industry has accomplished this feat while paying its fair share of the cost of government and has not inordinately profited.

Why Not Tell Me Face to Face?—That Is the True American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the RECORD, I will include a letter I have written to a number of people in the Seventh Congressional District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent. This letter relates to certain unwarranted criticism by the Governor of Iowa of the position I have taken through the years on Federal appropriations for public works projects, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1959.

DEAR FRIEND: On last May 7 Herschel Loveless, Governor of the great State of Iowa, had a prepared statement read by another at a hearing of the House Public Works Appropriations Committee, of which I am the top Republican member. In that statement he listed six other States which had received more funds for public works than had the State of Iowa—for which he blamed Iowa Congressmen—but he failed to state that Iowa had received over the past years more public funds for flood control, river bank stabilization, soil conservation and valley watershed projects than had other States of the Union.

Congressman CARTER, of Iowa, a Democrat, was present at that hearing to testify in favor of several Iowa projects, and he heard the Governor's statement read—after which, he had this to say in part:

"Mr. CARTER. I want to make a record here expressing my personal gratitude as the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District to my friend, BEN JENSEN, whose district joins mine, for his efforts in behalf of the great Commonwealth of Iowa in this respect. He knows what he is talking about, and knows what he is doing." See page 1618 of the hearings.

Then on June 19 last, Mr. Loveless had another prepared statement submitted by another person to the Senate Public Works Committee of Appropriations. He saw fit to severely criticize me without naming me—but it is crystal clear he meant none other than BEN F. JENSEN. He criticized my speech of May 4, in which I exposed a well organized group of Communists and Socialists in the U.S.A., who planned and schemed for years to get control of our entire Government by establishing River Valley Authorities patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority. In Mr. Loveless' prepared statement to that committee, and I quote in part from the hearings, page 257: "Recently a Member of Congress from Iowa has attacked the power programs of the Federal Government, which have been made possible by money appropriated by Congress. While he included all the Federal programs in his attack, he was especially vitriolic in his attack on TVA. As Governor of his State, I wish expressly to disassociate myself from his remarks. I am positive that he does not speak for the people of Iowa." Please find herewith enclosed my speech of May 4, which Mr. Loveless referred. I trust you will read every word, then decide for yourself which of us speaks best for the people of Iowa.

A number of Members of Congress, all senior to me in service, have told me that they had never known of a Governor of any State submitting a statement, or making a statement in person, to any committee of Congress critical of a Member of Congress from his own State. Such a performance was new to them. Hence, the Governor of the great State of Iowa has established some kind of a new record.

Facts are, that I have supported such federally financed projects as could be justified, and I have opposed such federally financed projects which it was plain to see could not be justified by facts and figures.

In Mr. Loveless' prepared statement to the Senate committee, he inferred that Iowa Congressmen should support the Public Works projects for all other States in order that Congressmen from other States would support Iowa projects. Had the House Public Works Appropriations Committee approved funds for all projects requested by 243 Members of Congress who appeared before our committee this session, along with 1150 interested people from every State in the Union, our Public Works Appropriations bill would have called for an expenditure of over $2½ billion instead of a little $1⅛ billion, which was the exact amount requested by President Eisenhower.

In closing may I say to you, it has afforded me no pleasure to write this letter, but I am sure the people of the Seventh Iowa District, whom I have the honor to represent in Congress, would expect me to state these facts in order to set the record straight.

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I also wish to make reference to the action of our colleague from the State of Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] in inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for August 17, 1959, a statement that was highly critical of me and which included a reference to Governor Loveless' attack on me. Congressional courtesy requires that a Member be informed in advance if a personal attack or criticism is to be made by another Member, either on the floor of the House or through an insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD. Why not tell me face to face?

"What is in the heart, let the mouth speak." Thus was I taught by my parents. Because I have spoken out against the things which in my heart I believe to be contrary to the welfare of our beloved country, I have been attacked as an extremist and accused of being intemperate with respect to my contention that TVA is a socialistic autocratic empire within our free Republic.

On August 10, 1959, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I included excerpts from a newsletter of August 9, 1959, written by Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, of Nashville, Tenn. This Tennessean, Mr. Sensing, is fully aware of the socialistic nature of the TVA, notwithstanding the statements to the contrary by Mr. EVINS or any other apologist for the TVA.

It is to be noted that Mr. EVINS made no reference whatsoever to the statements of Mr. Sensing, of Nashville, Tenn., located right in the heart of the TVA area, even though Mr. Sensing's statements were the basis for my remarks. It was this Tennesseean who, with firsthand knowledge of the operations of TVA, said that—

A Senator has written the President a letter urging him by all means to have Mr. Khrushchev include a survey of the TVA in his tour of the United States. Well, if the thought is to make him feel at home, we should say that is a pretty good idea—

because he will certainly find no free enterprise there. But what is Mr. Khrushchev himself to think, when we parade the TVA before him with pride, than that we are already aping his philosophy of state ownership and state control—and that we are already on our way toward making his prophecy about our grandchildren come true? We all want peace, yes; but must we obtain it at the expense of consorting with Communists and by the loss of our self-respect?

The prophecy referred to by Mr. Sensing was the Khrushchev statement that our grandchildren would be living under socialism.

Now I have no apologies whatsoever for my contentions that TVA is a socialistic autocratic empire within our free Republic; but I do think that Mr. EVINS might have let his readers know that the thought that Khrushchev would feel at home in making a survey of the TVA was not mine but originated in the TVA area itself.

The realization that TVA is socialistic is not a recent one. Speakers on the floor of the House at the time the original TVA bill was passed in 1933 referred to it in terms such as these:

Representative RICH. It is socialism and Russianism on a gigantic scale.

Representative EATON. This bill, and every bill like it is, is simply an attempt to graft on our American system the Russian idea and make the Government everything and the citizen nothing.

And upon its passage, Norman Thomas, the perennial socialistic candidate for President, so aptly described TVA as "the only genuinely socialistic act in the New Deal—a flower in the midst of weeds."

Nor am I alone in the thought that TVA has not been the blessing TVA and its proponents would have us believe. An outspoken editor of a newspaper published at Tupelo, Miss., in the TVA area itself had this to say after 20 years of TVA:

The time has come for TVA to back up and admit that the fastest growth in the South actually has taken place outside the TVA area and we who live within its borders are still as a whole just about the poorest people in America.

This of course would be quite true. For with the exception of giant projects like the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant that Uncle Sam has plunked down in Tennessee, the TVA area has shown less rapid industrial growth than several other portions of the South.

And in income, the TVA area is still dollar for dollar further behind the national average than it was in 1933 when the Tennessee Valley Authority was first established.

Mr. EVINS says if Mr. Khrushchev is invited to visit Tennessee, that his people will proudly show TVA to him—the world's greatest example of water resource development—where floods have been harnessed, navigation and commerce promoted, and where great hydroelectric power dams produce low-cost electricity for sale to the people and for the defense of our country."

Will Mr. EVINS and his fellow Tennesseans tell Mr. Khrushchev that the harnessing of the floods was done by permanently flooding hundreds of thousands of acres of the finest land in Tennessee, an action which a president of the University of Tennessee protested long and loud? Will Mr. Khrushchev be told that the so-called low-cost electricity was made possible only through a subsidy by the taxpayers of the Nation, who have furnished in round figures $2 billion—interest free and Federal tax free—for the construction of the TVA dams and powerplants? Will Mr. Khrushchev be told that the TVA, while claiming credit for pioneering farm electrification, for nearly 20 years consistently lagged behind the country as a whole in the percentage of farms electrified? Will it be pointed out to Mr. Khrushchev that only a few years ago a TVA spokesman admitted only one out of four farms in the TVA area had running water? This compares with a national average of more than double the TVA area, with a number of States in which more than 9 out of 10 of the farms have running water.

Mr. EVINS denounces what he refers to as the implications in my remarks of August 11, 1959 to the effect that the people of Tennessee are accepting and living with a communistic institution in their midst; that those who voted for, and the President who signed the recent revisions of the TVA Act, indicated acceptance of communistic ideas by such action. Of course, Mr. EVINS is free to read whatever implications he wants to into my statement or anyone else's statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; but that does not make his interpretation a valid one. The record over the years of the TVA—from its inception in 1933 as a navigation and flood-control project with incidental development of electric power, to its present day growth into a gigantic autocratic electric power empire—is one of progressive usurpation of powers which TVA itself contended earlier it did not have nor contemplate. That the Congress later condoned such progressive usurpation of powers, over the years, does not make it right nor change the socialistic nature of TVA.

I did not say TVA was communistic, but if Mr. EVINS or anyone else believes there is so little difference between socialism and communism that they are inclined to treat the two as synonymous, that is their privilege. I would have to agree that there is not a great difference between the two. Socialism destroys freedom by degrees, communism kills freedom by one death blow.

Mr. EVINS in a reference to visits of Russian Communists to farms in the State of Iowa appears to classify the individualistic free enterprise of farming in Iowa with that of the socialistic power program of the TVA. Nothing could be farther apart. I am sure the people in my district realize that a farmer in Iowa who pays Federal taxes and who buys his own farm and provides for his own farm machinery, stock and other operating costs, with his own funds or funds borrowed from a bank, could not compete in the marketplace with a farmer who pays no Federal tax and who is furnished interest free Federal funds to buy his farm and to provide the capital to operate it. To say that this same comparable sort of program under which TVA has been operating is not socialistic is to deny Webster's or any other universal definition of socialism.

Mr. EVINS charges that I do a disservice to the people of Iowa when I point out the dangers of letting socialism—as exemplified in TVA—spread to the other river basins in the Nation. May I assure my colleague that an overwhelming majority of the people of Iowa back my stand against the expansion of socialism, which poses a constant threat to our great Nation and to individual freedom—the statements of Mr. EVINS and the Governor of Iowa notwithstanding.

Thousands of patriotic Americans from every section of the United States of America have requested a copy of my speech of May 4 last entitled "The Power Not To Tax Is Also the Power To Destroy—Socialism or Freedom for America." Because of this great demand, I now have a supply on hand and will be pleased to send a copy to anyone requesting same. I can assure you the reading of this speech will open the eyes of any patriotic American.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time an attempt has been made to ridicule me for being a conservative. I am proud to admit that I believe in being conservative with the inherent constitutional liberties of the American people and with the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars. I also believe each section of our great Nation should pay its fair share of the cost of government in keeping with the constitutional requirement. And that the Federal Government should not be called upon to provide for those services for which the people can provide for themselves.

If believing in and fighting for the Constitution of the United States and the individual freedoms which it provides is being an extremist, then I plead guilty to the charge. If belief in the American principle of free enterprise which has made this Nation great makes an extremist of me, as Mr. EVINS charges, then I plead guilty to the charge before man and God.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is better to be an extremist in the defense of the Constitution and the freedoms and principles for which it stands than to be a modern liberal. The American people have long ago correctly defined a modern liberal as one who is liberal with the people's inherent liberties and liberal with the taxpayers' hard-earned dollars and who desires the creation of an all-powerful autocratic central government which will look out for us from the cradle to the grave. Whether you call it socialism or some other name matters not. In my estimation it is contrary to the constitutional rights and principles upon which this great Nation was founded.

In regard to the recent passage of the so-called TVA bond bill which Mr. EVINS referred to, it is of interest to note that the entire Republican membership of the House Public Works Committee voted against reporting the bill out of

the committee. And in the vote on final passage of this bill, 138 Republican Congressmen were joined by 32 Democrats in voting against passage. Only seven Republicans voted for passage. It can be seen that I am not alone by a long shot in my opposition to giving TVA practically unlimited power to operate without proper executive and congressional control. For those who think TVA is under proper control, I should like to end my statement with a quote from a recent issue of the Congressional Quarterly:

A TVA spokesman said TVA would not be bound to follow any recommendations that the President made about its expansion plans.

Dangerous Situation Developing in the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a forthright editorial in the August 25, 1959, issue of the Hopewell News, of Hopewell, Va., emphasizes the dangerous situation now developing to the south of the United States in the Caribbean. Its statements attributed to me were made in an address by me on "Storm Clouds Over the Caribbean" on August 24, 1959, at Reading, Pa., before the Patriotic Order of Sons of America of Pennsylvania, which was quoted by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER in his address to the House of Representatives on August 26, 1959.

The indicated editorial and an accompanying newsstory by Sam Fogg, of United Press International, follow:

[From the Hopewell (Va.) News, Aug. 25, 1959]

DANGEROUS SITUATION IS DEVELOPING IN CARIBBEAN

The International Communist conspiracy has been stirring up trouble in South and Central America and the Caribbean area for a long time. But right now they seem to be having more success than usual.

Apparently something new has been added. We call your attention to the article on this page today by Sam Fogg of United Press International. According to this the Chinese Communist are now active in the Caribbean area, as well as Central and South America.

The foothold that the Communists have secured in Cuba under Fidel Castro has given them a beachhead where they can stir up trouble over a wide area. The more trouble they can start the better it is for the Communists.

One of their favorite tricks is to stir up hatred of the United States. The way that Fidel Castro has lambasted the United States sounds like his speeches were written by Communist agents. In spite of all that we have done for the nations south of us, the United States is still the whipping boy for Reds, Pinks, liberals, politicians and so-called intellectuals.

SET UP ALLIANCE

Just what the Chinese Communists hope to gain in the lands south of us is not very clear. But a delegation of Chinese Communist journalists were welcomed to Cuba by prominent Cuban officials and have been touring Central and South America. They have established the New Chinese Democratic Alliance in Cuba and announced they would publish a newspaper there.

Of course such shenanigans within 50 miles of the United States can prove most troublesome and disruptive.

It must not be forgotten that one of the objects of all this Communist plotting is to take over or neutralize the Panama Canal. In a recent speech Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, long a student of Pan-American affairs, had this to say about the attempted invasion of Panama last spring:

"The situation at Panama did not remain quiet for long. Victorious revolutionists in Cuba, trained in revolutionary jungle warfare in Oriente Province of that important island country and seeking new worlds to conquer focused on the isthmus.

"In collaboration with radical elements of Panama, a few of them exiled in Cuba, some Cuban mercenaries, on April 26, 1959, landed at historic Nombre de Dios on the Caribbean coast of Panama, a short distance east of the Atlantic entrance of the Panama Canal. One of the objectives of this armed invasion of Panama was a token occupation of the Canal Zone. Its main objective was to bring about the overthrow of the duly elected and constitutional Government of Panama. What a crisis might thus have been created."

PEOPLE EXCITED

"Despite the strength of the 3,000-man National Guard of Panama, the people there became gravely excited by the invasion, with evident hysteria among certain political leaders. Had Panamanians known that some of their high officials had sent their families into the Canal Zone as a haven of refuge, the people of that country would have been far more apprehensive.

"Fortunately for all, the invasion collapsed, with the Cubans surrendering to the Panamanian forces. After brief detention and virtually no punishment, the invaders were shipped home where they were disavowed by those who sent them, thus closing the immediate crisis. But the end is not yet.

"Who was responsible for that assault? The best answer to that questions is by President de la Guardia, who stated: 'This was not a group of adventurers from our own country, or even from Cuba. These people were mostly Cubans, but directed and led by militant Communists. Their ambition is the long-stated one of taking over the Panama Canal.'

"This description by President de la Guardia is conservatively expressed and conforms generally to the pattern of current Caribbean turmoil. Similarly motivated by Communist influence this turmoil has already included invasions of two other countries, Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic, which repelled them."

This is a highly dangerous situation and one that calls for constant vigilance on our part, with action wherever it can be taken. Unfortunately under our good-neighbor policy we have pledged nonintervention in the affairs of our neighbors to the South. But we cannot allow any of them to become Communist satellites. We are glad to see that Secretary Herter is working with the other responsible statesmen of the organization of American States on this grave problem.

REDS EXPLOIT CARIBBEAN?

(By Sam Fogg)

Communist desire to establish a beachhead on this country's Latin-American doorstep has been underscored by Secretary of State Christian A. Herter's warning that bristling tensions in the Caribbean are playing into Red hands.

Mr. Herter told the conference of western hemisphere foreign ministers at Santiago, Chile, that the ferment of disorder, dispute, hostility, and threat in the Caribbean countries provides "just the opportunity international Communists are always seeking" to undermine democracy in the Americas.

Ominous evidence that Communist leaders in the Kremlin and Red China are seeking to exploit Latin-American unrest has been accumulating steadily this year.

Latin Americans are being given the "red carpet" treatment in Moscow and Peiping. Soviet premier Nikita Khrushchev and Red China strong man Mao Tse-tung have lent their personal prestige to the drive.

Here are some of the significant signposts that have marked the Red campaign in the trouble-torn Caribbean as well as other Latin-American countries beset by political hostilities and economic distress:

During the 21st congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in Moscow this year, delegates of 18 Communist Parties in Latin America were present and accorded an emphatic Red spotlight. Eleven of these delegates delivered addresses to the congress. Reports from various sources indicate that their problems were accorded "preferential consideration." Khrushchev himself hailed what he called Latin America's struggle against U.S. "imperialism."

Twelve of the Latin-American delegates went from Moscow to Communist China where Mao Tse-tung received them with assurances of "continued fraternal support."

Since the visit by the delegates in March, Spanish-language broadcasts from Peiping have approximately doubled. There has been a substantial increase of visitors from Latin America to China. Non-Communists as well as known Communists have been given the red-carpet treatment.

In one 5-day period in July, Communist China entertained student delegation from Bolivia, and a former Vice President of Chile. The welcome mat is out particularly for women's groups, youth organizations, trade unionists, and former government officials.

A delegation of Communist Chinese journalists has toured Latin America. Their visit developed into a subtle campaign to hire local reporters in those countries to assist in preparing propaganda broadcasts to Latin America. The delegation arrived in Cuba July 8 and was welcomed by a number of prominent Cuban officials.

There is some evidence of a close alliance between Chinese Communists and their party colleagues in Fidel Castro's Cuba. On July 10 a broadcast from Lima, Peru, said that the New Chinese Democratic Alliance would shortly publish a newspaper in Havana known as Kuan Wa Po. The New Chinese Democratic Alliance was described as the only Chinese Communist organization officially established in Cuba.

The Senate Internal Security Committee is focusing its attention on the Communist maneuvers.

Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it has been announced that Maj. Gen. William P. Fisher, director of Air Force legislative liaison, will be leaving in a few weeks to assume command of the Eastern Air Force Military Air Transport Service.

General Fisher has brought great ability and outstanding results to this complex assignment. He has been a persuasive advocate of our defense program and he has done much to keep alive the cordial relationship which exists between the Congress and the Department of the Air Force.

I wish General Fisher his greatest success in his new assignment and I know that my colleagues will join me in welcoming General Fisher's successor as Air Force director of legislative liaison, Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr.

The Landrum-Griffin Bill Spells Out the Basic Rights of the Worker, the Union, the Business Community, and the American Public in General

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, few issues before the Congress of the United States have been as punctuated with emotion, heated controversy, misinformation, and contradiction as the labor reform measure of 1959.

Actually, one must sensibly analyze and appraise the structure of our present day economy and its basic goals to properly appraise the issue in its proper perspective.

We must not forget for 1 minute that everyone living in a democracy such as ours has certain rights. These rights are both legal and moral and must remain so if we are to preserve a proper balance in our society.

Can anyone deny that every man seeking to earn a living has the right to pursue his trade or occupation in the best interest of his own standard of living as well as for his family? Under his constitutional rights and freedoms he must not be forced to pay tribute nor be subjected to forced labor.

Labor unions and their leaders must be provided with the same right to peaceably organize and represent employees in collective bargaining to secure a good standard of wages and better working conditions for their members.

The business community, on the other hand, must be provided the right under the law to do business by the same standards and to show a profit for their investment of time, money, and effort.

The American public has the right to expect that these forces within our gigantic economy maintain a relationship which is not detrimental to the general welfare of the public.

Because in years gone by, management engaged in a selfish drive for power and profits with little regard for the welfare of the individual worker, labor unions organized for the collective protection of the workingman. How necessary this was when one considers the old days of the sweatshop, poor working conditions in the shop, child labor, and inadequate wages. It became necessary for Federal law to provide protection of the individual to be represented by a union and to permit the union to speak for him.

In 1935 Congress passed the Wagner Act at a time when organized labor was still struggling for survival. It was during this era that Congress gave union leaders an almost absolute right to picket, strike, or treat employers in any way they desired just as long as the objective was to bring employees into the union.

Laws have different effects upon our way of life under different economic conditions, and it is the job of Congress to constantly consider the rights of all segments of our economy, to protect the rights of all people and to maintain a degree of balance necessary to the best interests of the American public in general.

In 1947 Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law because this picture became so totally out of balance that establishing ground rules became necessary to the very survival of the business community. At any time the power of any group or individual is curtailed by law, one must expect the emotional shouting of that particular group. So it was at the time of Taft-Hartley. Union leaders charged that passage of this law would ruin organized labor and would create slave labor throughout industry if it were ever enacted. Many of the same folks who made these allegations were those who charged the House-passed Landrum-Griffin bill, which I supported, was a union buster and antilabor legislation.

Yet, 12 years after passage of what union bosses called the slave labor Taft-Hartley law, we find American labor with the highest wages and best working conditions in the history of this Nation. We find, too, union membership across the country has increased by nearly 3 million members since the Taft-Hartley law was passed. In all fairness, does it not seem understandable that the same wild charges against Landrum-Griffin failed to modify the judgment of nearly two-thirds of the membership of the House of Representatives?

It is ridiculous to say that the House-passed bill is in any manner of means a union buster. If it is ultimately enacted into law in a form resembling that which was approved by the House, it will do nothing more than cure some of the abuses which unfortunately put a stigma upon the many honest and sincere labor organizations.

The Landrum-Griffin bill does not interfere in any way with the collective bargaining rights of organized labor in a dispute between union and management.

It does not prohibit picketing in such disputes.

It does not attempt to tell any labor organization how it may spend its dues and funds.

It does not prevent proper recourse against management where legitimate contracts exist.

It does not curb the legitimate objectives of organized labor.

The Landrum-Griffin bill does provide equal rights to union members in the conduct of their union affairs.

It does provide freedom of speech and assembly for union members to meet and assemble with each other, to freely express their views and to speak up at union meetings without reprisal by union bosses. Makes the use of force or violence to deny such rights a crime.

It does prohibit increases in dues, initiation fees and assessments, or imposition of general or special assessments by labor bosses except by vote of the membership.

It does grant a union member the right to take court or administrative action against his union or its officers, after his right to a union hearing within a 4-month period is exercised.

It does guarantee workers the right to a hearing to prevent improper fine or penalty imposed by labor bosses.

It does provide for free and fair union elections by secret ballot, with opportunity for the nomination of candidates, elections at reasonable intervals, no reprisals for supporting any particular candidate, no use of union or employee money to influence elections, membership lists made available to candidates to insure membership of election information.

It does provide machinery for members to remove crooked officials by making possible court-ordered elections by members to remove such crooked union officials.

It does provide for the protection of union funds by making union officials give members a full accounting of union funds, with penalties for misuse of funds.

It does provide for the regulation of trusteeships and prevents power-hungry labor bosses from using dummy locals to force themselves on unwilling union members.

It does provide for the protection of economic strikers against the use of strikebreakers' votes in NLRB elections.

It does provide for allowance of union security agreements by building-trades unions, before hiring, with employees in the construction industry.

It does end no man's land, giving union member and employer a court or board remedy to enforce his rights under the law where NLRB refuses to hear such cases.

These are 12 things that the Landrum-Griffin reform bill does to benefit union members. These are 12 reasons why I joined with the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives in supporting it.

Farewell to Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it was with mixed feelings that I recently learned of the impending retirement at

the conclusion of the current session of Walter Lee, the very able legislative assistant of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Claims. I am happy for him that he has the opportunity to retire and to take it easy after his many years of service on Capitol Hill. I am sad that he will no longer be around to assist us in his very courteous and efficient manner.

It was my pleasure to know Walter since I first came to Congress in 1951. He has been most cooperative whenever I would call on him. His advice in connection with legislation has always been straightforward, sincere, and wise. I shall miss his good counsel in these matters. Somehow Capitol Hill will just not be the same without Walter Lee.

In his well-earned and well-deserved retirement, I wish him and his family many years of good health and happiness. May his years be long and his memory of his many friends on Capitol Hill always pleasant.

Under Self-Help Provision of Wool Act Woolgrowers Are Helping Solve Their Own Probems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, during the month of September the woolgrowers of America are voting in a national referendum on the question of allowing deductions of 1 cent per pound from incentive payments in order to finance continued promotion, advertisement, and merchandizing of wool and lamb.

Under the Wool Act certain incentive payments are made annually to growers to encourage more sheep production in this country. These payments are derived solely from import duties from wool that is brought in from foreign countries to compete on our own domestic markets. And the 1 cent deducted for promotion is taken from the money provided by the import fees. The incentive level for wool is established each year by the Secretary of Agriculture at a figure calculated to allow for the deduction and at the same time provide encouragement and incentive for our American growers, in the national interest, to increase the sheep population of this country.

This promotion program is handled by the American Sheep Producers Council, headed by Mr. Don Clyde, of Utah, an able grower who is dedicated to the best interest of our woolgrowers. And even though during the 4 years the program has been in effect—there has hardly been enough time to observe its capabilities—definite improvement has been noted.

Despite the great drought and the world depression in the textile field, our sheep population has increased by 1,227,000, according to the Department of Agriculture. During the first third of 1959 there has been a 40 percent increase in wool consumption over the same period during the preceding year; and prices have jumped more than 27 percent in the first half of 1959.

NEED FOR PROMOTION EVIDENT FROM INROADS IN TEXTILES BY SYNTHETICS

The necessity for an effective promotion program is self-evident when we look at the competition record in recent years with the manmade fibers. The Department of Agriculture informs me that in 1921 apparel wool accounted for 10 percent of all fabrics consumed in this country, in 1937 it was 6.3 percent, and in 1958 it had dropped to only 3.7 percent. This despite some improvement already noted as a result of promotion and advertisement by the American Sheep Producers Council.

During that same period the synthetics or manmade fibers accounted for 0.6 percent in 1921 of all fabrics consumed in this country; in 1937 it was 6.9 percent, and in 1958 it had reached 28.6 percent.

It is significant, too, that in 1 year the manufacturers of synthetics spend nearly $25 million in promoting and advertising their manmade fibers. This is more than woolgrowers have spent in this country during the life of their industry.

WOOL ACT RENEWAL LAST YEAR INCLUDED SELF-HELP PROVISION

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that after a 4-year trial run, the Wool Act was last year extended by the Congress for an additional 3 years. The act included section 708, which authorizes the deductions for promotion.

Many will recall that one of the selling points in obtaining an extension of the law was section 708. It was pointed out then that here was a provision which enables the growers, by their own voluntary agreement if they should by a two-thirds vote choose to do so, to help themselves to regain their rightful place in our national economy.

Some 94 organizations directly connected with the sheep owners and all general farm organizations, with but one possible exception, gave unqualified support for the renewal of the Wool Act with section 708, the self-help provision, included.

Only the American Farm Bureau entertained any misgivings about the need for section 708. The Congress, being anxious to have the growers do more for themselves toward the solution of their own problems, gave little heed to objections raised against section 708, and these objections were promptly discounted and overruled.

Thus, it was quite evident that the Congress felt that if the Government was to continue to help support the woolgrowers, the growers would be expected to continue to help support themselves through the continued use of section 708.

NEUTRAL POSITION PROMISED BY FARM BUREAU LAST YEAR ON ISSUE POSED BY REFERENDUM

Last year when the Wool Act was before the Congress for renewal the Farm Bureau representative who was testifying before the House Committee on Agriculture on the question of extension, Mr. Frank Wooley, the Farm Bureau spokesman, testified:

Well, we take the position in the American Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Hill, that it is our responsibility to present as many facts as we can through all of our various media to the farmers as to what the pros and cons are with respect to any referendum that is put to them for a vote. We do not take the point of view that it is our responsibility, we think it is improper on our part, to tell them how they are to vote. We just merely do everything we can to see that they understand that a vote is being taken, and that it is in the interest of everyone to know the issues on both sides, and we do everything we can to urge that they vote with respect to the subject.

Unfortunately, however, in some recent releases on the issue being decided by the referendum, the Farm Bureau has publicized some information that has not told the entire story. Indeed some of the published figures I have seen have been very misleading in regard to the success of the promotion program under section 708. Perhaps this has been an inadvertence, but nevertheless it is not in keeping with the policy position outlined by Mr. Wooley in his testimony.

Let me give one or two examples of what I mean. As one example, the Farm Bureau has in effect pulled two figures out of the air to show that from 1954 to 1958 the U.S. farm price of wool dropped 31.6 percent, but failed to state further that wool prices in 1958 dropped to an extremely low point because of prices of wool all over the world were extremely depressed due, as I previously pointed out, to a worldwide textile recession. Except for the promotion program, the prices might very well have dropped even more.

Moreover, in order to get the full picture before our growers the Farm Bureau should have gone further and explained that in the last 6 months the farm price of wool has increased 27.4 percent and that in the first third of this year, wool consumption increased 39.5 percent over the same period of 1958. Without a recital of these facts, the information put out by the Farm Bureau was obviously very deceptive and misleading to our wool growers.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau, the great farm organization that it is, does not want to see manmade fibers, with their huge advertising budgets, make even further inroads into the fiber field enjoyed by wool, cotton, and other superior natural fibers.

We have our backs to the wall in this fiber battle, and we need to marshall all the support obtainable from all organizations interested in our sheep industry.

Mills Scores

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. EVERETT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege and honor to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on our colleague, Congressman WILBUR D.

MILLS, from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., one of the Nation's leading newspapers.

This editorial was so outstanding that I thought the membership would like to read it:

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Aug. 26, 1959]

MILLS SCORES

WILBUR D. MILLS of Kensett, Ark., has zeroed in on the main target for this year's session of Congress, and for the people who elect Congressmen.

That target is governmental spending program that quits when the money runs out—a balanced budget—an end to the part of shrinking purchasing power due to deficit spending.

As senior Democrat on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. MILLS is one of the most powerful men in Congress. This committee has turned away from proposals for getting money to keep up the pace of interstate highway construction by bookkeeping devices that amount to reaching into the Treasury.

It has voted 16 to 9 for 22 months of 1 more cent of Federal gasoline taxes to support the special pay-as-you-go fund for interstate highways.

The idea is, Mr. MILLS said, that getting highway fund money from the General Treasury would jeopardize any chances of balancing the Federal budget.

Well said, Mr. MILLS.

Berkeley County, W. Va., War Memorial Park Dedicated; Popular Recreational Area Is Debt Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege to have participated in the dedication for the Berkeley County War Memorial Park near Martinsburg, W. Va., Saturday, August 29, 1959.

The program for this significant event contained a history of the park, including these cogent sentences:

The Berkeley County War Memorial Park stands today as both a memorial to our community's honored war dead and as a tribute to the cooperation of thousands of our citizens who have made the park possible. * * * The memorialization has been chiefly in the planting of maple trees and installation of individual markers, one to each of the war dead. The park, a suitable recreational area that also is a living memorial to the nearly 200 youths who gave their lives in World Wars I and II, contains about 20 acres of land and was purchased for $15,000. More than $100,000 in cash has been contributed toward development of the park during the past 13 years, plus thousands of dollars' worth of volunteer labor and free material. * * * All money for the park development has been obtained through voluntary contributions without a cent coming from any governmental agency. * * * Dedication has been long delayed but it comes at a time when the park is reaching new peaks of popularity and when it stands debt free.

Appropriately, the present officers and the original members of the board of the Berkeley County War Memorial Association, Inc., and others who contributed much to the successful development of the park and to its dedication program, were recognized in the historical review, including Paul B. Martin, president of the park board and the mayor of Martinsburg when the original park committee was appointed on August 17, 1946; Garland L. Dunn, chairman of the board; Ernest H. McKee, vice president; Donald G. Rentch, secretary; Thom R. Keller, treasurer; Douglas Shipley and Mrs. Harry L. Reeves, members of the original mayor's committee and the original board; Russell J. Scrivener, Lovell Alderton, Rev. Frederick F. Bush, Jr., and Charles V. Sullivan of the original mayor's committee; Lacy I. Rice, Judge D. H. Rodgers, Frank C. Thomas, Philip T. Seibert, Lou Cohen, Rev. Father George Huber, Mrs. Paul Hammann, M. L. Depenbrock, Mrs. Jacob Schleuss, Harry C. Hammann, Mrs. C. A. Kitchell, and John Skelly of the original board.

Preceding the dedication program there were band concerts by Musselman and Martinsburg High School bands, and the Martinsburg Municipal Band.

In response to the association's invitation, I delivered the dedicatory address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that extracts from my speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE BERKELEY COUNTY WAR MEMORIAL PARK, MARTINSBURG, W. VA., AUGUST 29, 1959

I am strengthened as I look about me and see the fruits of 13 years of community endeavor in your memorial park. We are gathered to dedicate this effort to the memory of your loved ones who gave their lives in freedom's cause. Their names and the remembrance of their deeds will be perpetuated in the life of this area. They died that our Nation's future might be more secure. It is fitting, therefore, that this memorial to your sons and brothers also looks to the future. Though monuments in stone and bronze may have their place, you could offer no finer tribute to the valiant dead than this shrine which so enriches the lives of those they left behind.

In setting aside these 20 acres—in thus dedicating this ground, you have consecrated it to the living as well as the dead. In this way we help to keep alive and fresh the values and ideals of those who fought and died. This is our charge and our responsibility.

Yet, our obligation to those young men does not end with the dedication of this ground today. The Berkeley County Memorial Park is but a beginning of the fulfillment of our trust. Our responsibilities will be discharged only when we have also consecrated our lives to tasks worthy of the human sacrifices that have already been made.

MEANING OF SACRIFICE

Our words can but revive the memories of our departed loved ones; but it is our actions and our lives which will continue to keep alive the meaning of their sacrifice. The courageous young men to whom we give our homage offered their blood and their lives in the cause of humanity—in the right of the individual to achieve for himself a way of freedom and dignity. This is the idea which in the past has given the thrust to American life. More than any other idea, it continues to give meaning and vitality to our present life, and it has been the ultimate goal toward which man's constant progress through the centuries has been directed. Thus, the journey toward the American dream has been man's journey toward the full humanity of man. Yet the struggle has not ended.

It has been a dispiriting and tragic disillusionment for Americans, and for citizens of other free nations as well, to see in the years since the end of World War II, the extinguishment of the ideals of freedom and individual dignity among the millions of people under the domination of the Soviet Union and Communist China. In the face of such terrifying repression and assaults upon the integrity of man, we might, in moments of weakness, wonder if it has been worth the cost in blood and treasure.

For those who gave their lives in the cause of human freedom, we find assurance in the words of the Gospel (John IV, 14) that "* * * whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." While this offers consolation to those who have lost friends and members of our families, it does not relieve us of the responsibility of carrying on their struggle and thus, in some measure, giving meaning to their sacrifice. Only in this way can we truly memorialize those who gave the full measure of devotion to their country.

When the great American poet, Walt Whitman, was confronted by the tragic death of President Lincoln he sought in some manner—as did the people of the Nation as a whole—to find a meaning in such an irrational and devastating event. Whitman solved his problem in the beautiful and moving poem, "When Lilacs Last in the Dooryard Bloomed." Here he indicated that, since Lincoln had given his life for the Union, the only meaningful manner in which one could acknowledge his death was to contribute to the growth of the Union and the ideals for which the President had worked and died. These the poet symbolized in the sprig of green lilacs which he brought to the deceased President as a token of his commitment to the future and to the promise of growth and creativity that the future holds.

LIVING COMMUNITY TRIBUTE

This useful memorial park is your sprig of lilac. In the creation of this center you have also created a richer and better community. For families and for single folk, for young and for old, this park offers opportunities for a healthier and more wholesome life. And for the individual who may simply want to leave the indoors for a few minutes' contemplation of the wonder of sky and clouds, of the miracle of youth and the sound of laughter, it offers balm to the heart and a lift to the spirit. And for other fortunate ones it may offer what Nature offered to the poet, William Cullen Bryant, when he wrote:

"To him who in the love of Nature holds
Communion with her visible forms, she speaks
A various language; for his gayer hours
She has a voice of gladness, and a smile
And eloquence of beauty, and she glides
Into his darker musings, with a mild
And healing sympathy, that steals away
Their sharpness, ere he is aware."

This park thus exists as a living community tribute to the sacrifices of the sons of Berkeley County. Yet we may not rest with this. Each of us, individually, has the responsibility to consecrate his life to the fulfillment of the American dream if those sacrifices are not to have been in vain.

And what is this dream? It is what brought generations of men and women from Europe across 3,000 miles of ocean to settle on unknown shores. It is what brought later generations of men and women to cross our own Alleghenies into the great valley of the Midwest, and from there up across the high plains to the Sierras and finally to the Pacific Ocean itself. It is the dream embodied in our own State motto: "Mountaineers Always Free."

Men and women did not leave Europe because of what they feared and hated; they came to America because of what they loved and hoped. Later, when they left the eastern seaboard and started the long trek westward, they departed, not because they despised the East, but because they were drawn to the West by challenge and by belief—by the belief that they could create a future of greater worth and human dignity. This belief in the possibilities of man has shaped the destiny of America.

It is true that there were intolerances and repressions. But the love and the faith outlived them. The belief in freedom of conscience outlived the theocracy of colonial Massachusetts. And the assurance in the dignity of the individual blotted out the misunderstanding of 200 years.

LOVE AND HOPE—NOT FEAR

Until recently we Americans have lived in the light of what we have loved and hoped, not what we have feared. For 300 years we followed the American dream of the future. And that dream became real. It became real in the land that Tom Jefferson and Sam Adams found—in the land that Emerson and Whitman explored—in the land of the free human spirit with eyes aimed at the future. For 300 years this was the dream that we lived and loved.

But in recent years we have become guided less by our loves and hopes than by our fears. Less by our love of America than by our fear of Russia. Less by the hope and possibilities of the future, than by the fear and dangers of the future.

It is a sick man who lives, not by his loves, but by his fears. Thus so, it is true of a nation.

At the height of our power, the most common talk is about our fears—our fear of the Soviet Union, our fear of inflation, our fear of an unbalanced budget, our fear of the power of organized labor.

Where is the talk, and where is the faith in the vision and the fulfillment of the dream? I said a moment ago that the dream had become real. While that is true, it does not mean that the task is completed. Men are not truly free when they and their families live in squalor and poverty. Children are not educated for freedom when our schools are inadequate. Future generations will not be free if we squander the natural resources on which freedom is maintained. In brief, the challenge of the future and the hope of the future are still before us. "The American journey," as the poet, Archibald MacLeish stated, "has not ended. America is never accomplished, America is always still to build; for men, as long as they are truly men, will dream of man's fulfillment."

This, then, is the memorial we must dedicate as individuals: to rekindle the faith in the American future, and to live with a renewed vision of the possibilities of man. We Americans have reason thus to live; whether we have the will depends upon the individual heart.

End of Cold War Will Cause Reduction in Defense Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is deeply concerned about the high cost of living and the tremendous Government expenditures. Relief from big defense spending is not in view. The forthcoming exchange visits between the President of the United States and Nikita S. Khrushchev stir high hopes in the breasts of many Americans. Practical prognosticators predict no material results. The cold war and huge Government expenditures are likely prospects. We all hope that the President succeeds in bringing sanity to the viewpoint of the Soviet representative. We foresee that if the cold war ends, the public will obtain some sort of relief in taxes or in defense expenditures.

A critical analysis by a brilliant writer of the New York Herald Tribune sets forth clearly the possibilities of savings if the cold war ends. I believe that a reading of an article by Allen M. Smythe, feature writer of the New York Herald Tribune, found in the August 23, 1959, issue, will prove interesting reading and describes the hopes and aspirations of an economy-minded public. The article follows:

BIG DEFENSE CUTS SEEN LIKELY IF COLD WAR ENDS

(By Allen M. Smythe)

Top Pentagon officials deride the possibility, but at the same time admit that the $41 billion defense budget could be cut a fourth almost immediately if President Eisenhower ordered it as a result of Premier Khrushchev's visit, Big Four disarmament negotiations or a reappraisal of Soviet military strength.

They disagree as to where cuts should be made, but most contend that if world conditions would justify halting the expanding race for arms supremacy a downward trend in military spending would naturally follow.

Any easing of international tensions exposes the vulnerability of many defense expenditures. More than $4,300 million is scheduled to be spent during fiscal year 1960 on air defense against Russian bombers. Congressional criticism this session has been continuous against the billions already spent in Canada in this effort.

The knowledge of or agreement on the size of Soviet naval strength could influence naval spending. The estimate of Soviet strength is based largely on the assumption that it is top priority. This assumption, in turn, is based on a calculated intelligence report of Russian industrial capacity.

Congress recently appropriated $35 million for a start on a $380 million nuclear aircraft carrier. This is primarily an offensive weapon and needs many supporting warships that will multiply this amount.

During World War II submarines cost $5 million each. The Navy wants a dozen submarines carrying ballistic nuclear missiles, to cost more than $100 million each. When shore establishment and supplies are included the total is doubled. Only recently Secretary Neil H. McElroy has questioned the size and capability of the Russian fleet.

Pentagon fiscal officials are thoroughly cognizant of the economic effect that a sudden reduction in military spending might cause if it were not cushioned by properly prepared plans. The recession of 1953–54—although a mild one—was triggered by an abrupt reduction in military hardware.

Key officials now point out that in the unlikely event of a disarmament agreement with Premier Khrushchev a gradual reduction in the $14 billion annual spending on military hardware could be made that would not wreck the aviation, shipbuilding, and electronic industries. The possibility is that no reduction might be made in missile, reresearch, and electronic efforts.

Savings could be made in other areas. Nearly $2 billion annually could be cut from military construction. A large part of this program is for oversea bases and dispersal of heavy bomber air bases.

OTHER SAVINGS

The elimination of the draft and a 20-percent manpower reduction in the armed services could result in a continuing saving of several billions in pay, housekeeping and housing expenses. The closing of many obsolete bases would save utility and maintaining expenses.

Congressional investigations of improper influences, excessive military profits and duplication of weapons have caused the Pentagon to review its plans for expensive new projects.

Already under review for possible abandonment are North American's contracts for the all steel mach 3 B–70 bomber and F–108 fighter. Under continuous scrutiny for costs and performance are three ICBM missile programs—the Atlas (Convair), the Titan (Martin), and the Minuteman (Boeing). Eight to ten of the missile projects have been quietly dropped. A little top-level displeasure would disqualify that many more.

One Senator equally concerned over inflation and the Nation's security expressed it this way: "We learned from the recession in 1953 that defense reductions should not be made suddenly and exclusively with military contractors. Also, any defense savings should be accompanied by tax cuts for both individuals and business. They should also coincide with stepped-up Federal plans to improve schools and hospitals. Our highway program should be speeded. More Federal aid for slum clearance, especially for the smaller cities, new jet airports and nuclear cargo and passenger ships would also help cushion any economic shock resulting from reduction in our war efforts."

Talk Before Annual Meeting, Southside Electric Cooperative, August 29, 1959, by E. H. Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 29, 1959, Mr. E. H. Will, president of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce and vice chairman of the board of directors of the Virginia Electrict & Power Co., delivered a most informative and interesting address be-

fore the annual meeting of the Southside Cooperative at Crewe, Va.

The Southside Electric Cooperative is one of the outstanding rural electrification co-ops in the country. Mr. Will is an outstanding businessman and a great Virginian.

In the hopes that the Members of Congress will profit from his speech, I include it as a part of my remarks:

Congressman ABBITT, Mr. Chairman, members of the Southside Electric Cooperative, and friends, realizing my limitations as a public speaker, I was reluctant to accept the honor of speaking before you but acquiesced at the insistence of my good friend, Charlie Hooper. I am sure that I will disappoint many of you, particularly if you are expecting any controversial fireworks.

Under the able guidance and leadership of your board of directors, your general manager and staff, your cooperative has made significant strides in promoting electricity in your rural areas. The splendid record written as to substantial increase in customers, and to an even greater degree, increase in usage, has come about by efforts of your management and the economic prosperity of the area that you serve. I congratulate you on a job well done.

Unfortunately, when I accept as a speaker, I find myself in a position comparable to most ladies who have a number of hats to wear. It has been my good fortune to be associated with several organizations in various capacities, most of them of a statewide civic nature. Therefore, it is necessary that my comments be made not as a representative of these various groups with which I am associated, but as a citizen of this fine State.

With your permission and kind indulgence, I should like to touch on three subjects of vital interest to the economy of the State and, I believe, to the area in which your cooperative operates. I refer to the subjects of population, education, and industrialization. While not speaking as an expert or an authority on these subjects, I will try to bring to you some of the information that I have accumulated in my travels around the State.

I mention first population, because this will be one of the key factors in the future economic progress of the various areas throughout the State of Virginia. Our exploding population, already in evidence and projected with scientific accuracy for 1970—about 10 short years hence—will increase 20 percent nationally from 175 million to 210 million. Virginia should do as well as the average and, as we would normally expect, slightly better. While in the next several years births will level off—and this might surprise you, mainly because there aren't enough new mothers to go around—a new baby boom will start around 1965 when the early postwar baby group will reach marrying age.

Somewhat startlingly, we will find that the population upsurge by 1970 will produce a nationwide economy nearly 60 percent larger than it is today. One way of expressing this tremendous potential is the use of a national index known as the gross national product, which is likely to expand to, roughly, $750 billion compared with the present $475 billion.

While we may expect this population increase, we must also be constructively thinking in terms of how to be sure that these new citizens remain in Virginia and, particularly, remain within the rural areas in order that our economy will be maintained and improved.

Population and area growth go hand in hand, which emphasizes the importance of holding our young people and attracting others.

It may or may not be consoling to you to know that the fastest growing age group will be the teenagers. The population between the ages 15 and 19 will increase more than 60 percent in the interval before 1970. Doesn't this challenge the educational needs and facilities of our high schools and colleges? And, the cultural environment in which they will live?

My other two topics are education and industrialization which will have a strong bearing on the effectiveness in maintaining our rural growth.

I do not propose to solve our education problems or to comment on the major question that has been posed in recent months, but I think a review of the progress of education in our elementary, high school, and higher institutions of learning is of utmost importance and should be receiving the careful attention and consideration of community leaders throughout the State. My remarks are in no way a criticism, but I trust that they may be constructive and productive of some new thoughts in the general improvement of education throughout the State. At the outset I must say that I am of the opinion that great strides have been made in our educational system within the past few years. This, however, should not result in relaxing our efforts to further improvement and to bringing us more in line with our proper place in comparison with other States. Recently, surveys have been made pertaining to the educational level in the State and, in general, the findings are not ones that we can read with too much pride.

Comparisons of our educational level with all States rank Virginia in the bottom one-third group as to the educational level of its people.

It has been definitely proved by comprehensive surveys and studies that there is a distinct correlation between the educational level and the economic status in any general area such as the State as a whole and, almost without exception, in smaller segments such as counties. Since we find that Virginia is in the tail end group as to educational level, it is not surprising that it is also in the tail end group of the States of the Nation as to the economic status of its people. Taking the latest available figures on per capita income, which cover the year 1958, Virginia ranks 35th among 49 States with $1,674 as compared with an average of $2,057.

You might ask whether we are getting our money's worth from our educational system and I believe that the answer would be that we are getting our money's worth but that, since our expenditures for education related to our ability to spend places us in the lower group among the various States, we have some basis for an approach to step up our expenditures for education and, thus, pull ourselves up somewhat by our bootstraps.

Here again, we can see a definite relationship between population and expenditures for education since, with the present and expected expanded population, we will necessarily have to provide increased facilities and an increased number of teachers and professors. Thus, volume alone will require additional expenditures even though our scale of salaries remains the same. I do not think that Virginia wants to be ranked in the lower group as to proper compensation for the men and women with whom we are entrusting the education of our children and grandchildren. May I touch with particular reference on our colleges and universities as to their needs in the foreseeable future. Our schools of higher learning deserve and need the moral and material support of all of our citizens and, particularly, our business and professional people who have to look to higher education for their present and future executives much in the same way that people in rural communities have to look to college-trained men and women who will be so important in supplying the needs of the various rural areas, which include not only farming and allied interests but rural industrialization.

You may ask, where are we going to get the money to take care of our expanding additional needs? At this point, I shall get out on the end of the limb. I am now referring to the touchy subject of a sales tax, and I am sure that there will be groups on both sides of this question. In my opinion, it is the case of "eventually—why not now?" The subject has been put forth during the last several sessions of the general assembly and, in all probability, will raise its head again next January.

May I hasten to add that if a sales tax is the answer, it should come only by adjustment of other taxes so our entire tax structure is on a fair and equitable basis. I realize that this is expecting the impossible, but certainly it should be the overall objective.

We are an island State surrounded on all sides by sales tax States and are one of the few remaining States in the Nation without a sales tax. Virginia is necessarily going to have additional revenues. Shouldn't the additional tax burden have a broader base of taxpayers in order that they may contribute their fair share to the cost of necessary State functions, including schools and colleges? With the built-in inflation of our national economy having its direct effect on Virginia's cost of government, some other source of revenue must be explored. Virginia has had for a long time a sound fiscal policy and its credit rating is among the highest of any State in the country. I believe it attained this enviable position because of its pay-as-you-go plan. The sales tax possibility fits in so logically and well in continuing our pay-as-you-go plan, but at the same time would not mortgage our grandchildren's future in order to take care of our present-day needs. I do not have to remind those of you here that our State highway system is built on a sales tax principle.

Every gallon of gasoline that you buy is taxed by a specialized type of sales tax. We, of course, pay many hidden types of Federal sales tax when we buy various commodities. I will mention two that are not so hidden: that on each package of cigarettes, and that on the purchase you may make at the ABC store for medicinal purposes. Many communities levy a consumer tax on utilities, but this is again only a specialized sales tax. We are confronted with the degree to which we apply the principle of a sales tax, which we already have to a limited extent. It has been suggested that a sales tax may be the best answer for the various counties in meeting their responsibilities to the citizens in supporting the necessary functions of governmental service. I believe that a great deal can be accomplished by the presentation to our citizens of the pros and cons of the sales tax issue in order that the fundamental facts may be brought out and understood.

My third topic—one that has received considerable attention in recent months and one that is of the utmost importance to the economy of Virginia and, in my opinion, of particular importance to the counties which are seeking proper ways to balance their basic agricultural economy with a diversified income—is industrialization. Many signs point to an awakening on the part of leaders everywhere throughout the State. The present and future potential of this necessary segment of Virginia's economy cannot be overlooked and must be aggressively pushed to keep ourselves abreast of the stiff competition that we face from other States around us and in the southeastern area.

You will recall that Governor Almond pledged in his platform and in his inaug-

ural address his active support in this direction and we are beginning to see some real rays of hope and realization.

Constructive criticism by some individuals has needled all of us to direct our attention and efforts to this facet of our business life. We needed some real prodding and I think it has made us sit up and take notice and begin to do something about it. I believe that it has so far produced a change in the complexion and objectives of our board of conservation and economic development as well as stepped on the toes of the State chamber of commerce, and also pointed to the lack of leadership on the part of business and community interests. It was a good healthy dose of medicine that was prescribed, and I certainly think it has helped the patient to eventually get well.

To carry out the Governor's determination to improve our economic climate, an additional appropriation was made by the last general assembly to set up increased industrial activity under the State board of conservation and economic development. This included added professional personnel as well as additional money for promotional effort, including national advertising. Recently, a large page ad appeared in the Wall Street Journal commenting on the Governor's industrial conference which he called several months ago, attended by 750 interested people, many of whom are here today. The conference was a real start on a stepped-up industrial program and was, as many expressed, a success. Regional conferences are already in the making to further this interest throughout the State and I hope that this progressive area will take an active part in one of these conferences. Today many interested groups are working closer together than ever before to further our industrial progress.

While some may differ, I believe the various groups, including the State board of conservation and economic development, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, the railroads, utilities, port authority, local industrial groups, local chambers of commerce, city and county commissioners and many others are cooperating—maybe not to the extent that they will be in the near future but far better than in past years. We are beginning to see some results and should experience tangible gains in the not too far future. The recent announcement of a plywood firm's locating in South Boston was a direct result of a State board of conservation and economic development ad appearing in a national magazine.

Certainly, we are going to realize more by pulling together than by pulling apart. It goes without saying that we have our faults—who doesn't have some—and we should try to correct them.

You might be interested to know that in the recent survey of the State chamber of commerce, the industrial development question led the list in the interest among its members. An almost unanimous recommendation was made to the effect that the State chamber of commerce should materially step up its industrial development activity.

Many communities within the State have formed and are forming industrial district organizations in a concerted effort to make available facilities for those industries seeking expansion and decentralization, which seems to be almost universal among the national business concerns throughout the country. It has been demonstrated in many instances that the availability of property or buildings or local capital to construct such buildings makes the difference between a choice where many other industrial asset factors are approximately equal. These local industrial groups are motivated by a progressive interest in the future well-being of their community areas, which is really an investment in maintaining and expanding their local economy.

Within recent years the industrialization picture has changed in its fundamental concept and, fortunately for the counties, has changed in their directions.

Of necessity in bygone days, industries had to be built in heavily populated areas in order that employees would be readily available for its operations. Today the operating personnel comes to the manufacturing plant without difficulty by automobile and our splendid system of State roads and highways. According to surveys recently made, this working traveling public can be expected from a radius of 30 miles and, in many cases, employees travel even greater distances. Also, in this day of automation, which the electric industry makes possible, fewer employees are required, but these employees are better paid and work under better conditions than ever before and bring a higher degree of economy than some of our manufacturing concerns did in bygone years.

As a matter of fact, many companies are seeking the rural areas for their future plants in order to have available a source of competent and established employees such as Virginia offers. Many of these employees come from families whose primary interest may be agriculture and, thus, a balanced family economy results.

I think we shall witness more and more opportunities for locating manufacturing concerns which will not only help the communities but will be mutually beneficial to the well-being of the organizations. Bear in mind that these incoming plants, in addition to their payrolls, contribute materially to the local interest in the payment of taxes.

Of course, the local development of industrial interest necessarily takes leadership, time, effort and money on the part of a dedicated group of citizens, but our American way of life places this responsibility on us in return for the many blessings that we have received and our responsibility to the coming generations. While in many cases efforts may be discouraging at first, the eventual success will reward those who are farsighted enough to see that we owe something to our communities.

May I conclude by reemphasizing the importance that I think population, education and industrialization will play in the present and future economy of the various communities and our State. Since I have made several observations which I am sure are controversial, may I again say that I make these observations as an individual and not as an official representative of the organizations it has been my privilege and honor to be associated with.

I again congratulate the Southside Electric Cooperative on its achievements and say that I appreciate the honor of appearing before you today.

If I have left one little thought of a constructive nature that can be used as a seed to germinate into a community effort, I will be greatly rewarded by your gracious attention to my remarks.

We should remember the words of Benjamin Franklin—who taught us so much wisdom—

"If time be of all things the most precious,
Wasting must be the greatest prodigality,
Since lost time is never found again.
Let us then be up and doing,
And doing to the purpose."

Contempt of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an editorial from the Allendale County Citizen, Allendale, S.C., concerning James B. Carey's threat against me and the other 229 Members of the House who supported the Landrum bill. I also enclose therewith a copy of my letter to Carey along with his record in the archives of the Un-American Activities Committee.

[From the Allendale County Citizen, Allendale, S.C., Aug. 28, 1959]

CONTEMPT OF THE PEOPLE

The arrogant, well-nigh stupid, attitude of union labor leaders is well exemplified in letters which James B. Carey, AFL–CIO vice president, sent to 229 Representatives who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor bill, which Carey opposed. The letters over Mr. Carey's signature threaten the legislators with retaliation at the polls.

The same type of letter could have been written by the head of a criminal syndicate to law enforcement officers trying to protect the lives and property of their neighbors. The labor movement is not a government and has no more right to interfere with due process of law than any other group in this Nation.

Thousands of people, who hitherto have desired to give labor its due, will be disgusted by the Carey tactics and will vote for those Congressmen who, faced with the mounting power, almost the power of life and death, accumulated by union leaders, saw fit to set the Nation's welfare above that of a group seeking only its own benefit at whatever cost to the public.

Too often in the past several years we have seen how a powerful minority, using pressure, blackmail and other unethical if not criminal methods, can force its will upon a reluctant people in spite of all those safeguards assured us in the Bill of Rights and the U.S. Constitution.

We know that the power exercised unscrupulously by these minorities enters into the highest and most sacrosanct areas of Government, in direct contempt of the people of this Nation.

The people of this district and every other congressional district in the land should at once let Congressmen know that no influence within or without the district can be used against men who have honorably made decisions within their best ability and understanding.

Few of us object to the right of labor to better itself, or to seek its full value; but when the power of labor unions is used to serve the ends of racketeers and gangsters, the people have a right to call a halt. They called such a halt in the Congress, where 229 Congressmen, moved by the wishes of the people, conveyed to them by every form of communication, voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The men and women who form the rank and file of the organized labor movement probably realize that the Landrum-Griffin

bill provides them a voice in their own affairs. They know that to date they have not had a voice. They, too, will be with and of the people when Mr. Carey's showdown comes at the polls.

Meanwhile, the severest condemnation should be Mr. Carey's lot. His threatened blackmail of Congressmen speaks poorly, indeed, of his concept of justice, democracy, and American principles of honest dealing and fair play.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1959.

JAMES B. CAREY,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your insolent letter of August 18 wherein you, among other things, attempt to threaten me for my support of the Landrum antiracketeering and antiextortion bill, has been received. This bill will harm nobody in organized labor who is honest. It has nothing to do with the rights, privileges and immunities of labor. These are taken care of in the Taft-Hartley Act. The Landrum bill is to protect the American public and the American workingman from those who are wrecking the labor movement in America.

As you and I go through life we make a record. My record in public life, for the most part, is in the archives of the Congress of the United States. Yours is in the archives of organized labor as well as the Committee on Un-American Activities. Of all the labor leaders in America, you should be the last one to try to intimidate anybody from my section of the world. South Carolinians in the ranks of organized labor will not heed your advice.

If I had to hold public office at your pleasure and under your sufferance, I would rather go down to the "tongueless silence of the dreamless dust" then ever again be entrusted with the high responsibility of serving my fellow man. My people know my record and they know yours and will know it better when I place the Un-American Activities' report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They will be quite interested to learn how many years it took you to get religion. I will see you at the ballot box.

Sincerely,

L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

AUGUST 21, 1959.

FOR: Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS, Member of Congress.

SUBJECT: James D. Carey.

This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee. The fact that the committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated.

Symbols in parentheses after the name of any organization or publication mentioned herein indicate that the organization or publication has been cited as being subversive by one or more Federal authorities. The name of each agency is denoted by a capital letter, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and S—Subversive Activities Control Board. The numerals after each letter represent the year in which that agency first cited the organization or publication. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.")

Mr. Carey was a featured speaker at the national convention of the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers Union, CIO, which was held in Cleveland, Ohio, as was shown in the Daily Worker of September 3, 1940, page 1: he was reelected president of the union at that convention, as was revealed in the Daily Worker of September 4, 1940, page 1, September 5, 1940, page 4, and New Masses of September 17, 1940, page 18. He testified at hearings before a special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor during an investigation of Communist infiltration of the UREMWA (hearings held during September and October 1948); Mr. Carey identified himself before that committee as secretary-treasurer, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D.C.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944, pages 18 and 19, listed the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers of America among the 21 CIO unions in which the committee had found Communist leadership strongly entrenched. The 1949 convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations expelled the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers from the CIO on grounds of Communist domination (press release, 12th CIO constitutional convention, November 20–24, 1950).

After the expulsion of the United Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers, the Congress of Industrial Organizations set up a new anti-Communist electrical union and at an organizational convention held in Philadelphia formally approved the name, International Union of Electrical Radio, & Machine Workers, and the identifying initials, IUE–CIO. The convention inserted in the constitution of the new union clauses barring Communists or adherents of other totalitarian organizations from holding national or local office. (See article in the New York Times of December 1, 1949, p. 3, datelined Philadelphia, November 30.)

It is noted that James B. Carey was listed as chairman of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, & Machine Workers (IUE–CIO) on a letterhead of the union dated January 12, 1950.

An article in the Daily People's World, west coast Communist Party organ (issue of October 18, 1952, p. 3) reported that "Under impetus from Red-baiting union buster James B. Carey, a new anti-Communist organization was being projected today by the Los Angeles CIO Council." The organization was described as "a chapter of Carey's latest brainchild, the so-called Negro Labor Committee, U.S.A." which, "he said frankly, is being designed to counteract the influence nationally of the Negro Labor Council."

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its annual report for 1952, released December 28, 1952, stated: "The National Negro Labor Council is a Communist-front organization, designed to infiltrate communism into Negro life" and "by accusing established labor organizations of overlooking the needs of the Negroes, it hopes to capture more Negroes for communism" (p. 11).

The National Negro Labor Council has been redesignated as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in a list of organizations previously designated pursuant to Executive Order 10450, released April 1, 1954.

Reference to Mr. Carey is found in the committee's report, "100 Things You Should Know About Communism," released May 14, 1951, as follows:

"96. What's a good program for an American union man against communism? Here is one given by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO: Full exposure of the Communists, plus a strong, progressive policy far in advance of the bogus progressivism of the Communists. Swift, flexible infighting that defeats the Communists at their own game within the union" (p. 86).

Masses and Mainstream of November 1950 (pp. 53–54) reported that Mr. Carey had headed a delegation to the Soviet Union in October 1945; the article revealed that "Mr. Carey, speaking for the delegation, said they had 'been deeply moved by the personal warmth and friendship' shown to them by the Soviet workers. He emphasized that no American could himself see the Soviet Union and its peoples without being 'moved by the same feeling of deep human sympathy which we have felt and by the same desire to assist and cooperate in the great tasks in which the Soviet people are now engaged.' The delegation, said Mr. Carey, was especially impressed by the manner in which 'the Soviet trade unions * * * promoted the interests of the workers' and by the 'many activities of a social, welfare, and cultural character and the comprehensive nature of the social security system which they operate.'"

A pamphlet, "Report of the CIO Delegation to the Soviet Union" (p. 1), reveals James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, was the chairman of the CIO delegation which visited the Soviet Union as guests of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions in return for a visit paid to the United States by a Soviet trade union delegation invited by the CIO.

The Daily Worker of September 3, 1940 (p. 4), identified Mr. Carey as a member of the National Council of the Emergency Peace Mobilization (C—1944; A—1942) at which the American Peace Mobilization (C—1942; A—1942; I—1956) was formed. Mr. Carey was a delegate to the American Congress for Peace and Democracy (C—1944), according to the Daily Worker of January 6, 1939 (p. 2). He was nominated for membership on the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy (C—1939; A—1942), which was formed by the Congress held in Washington, D.C., January 6–8, 1939 (pamphlet "7½ Million * * *," p. 32); he spoke on the subject "Labor and Democratic Rights" at a meeting held during the congress (ibid., p. 46); in this source he was identified as president, UERMWA, and secretary, CIO. A letterhead of the American League, dated February 8, 1939, named him as a member of the national labor committee of the league.

The "Call to a Conference on Civil Rights, April 20–21, 1950," page 3, issued by the Washington Committee for Democratic Action C—1942; A—1942), named James B. Carey as one of the speakers at the conference. He was one of the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (C—1944), as was revealed by the prorgam of the conference dated February 12, 1940.

Mr. Carey contributed to the publication, Champion (C—1942), as shown by the November 1937 issue, page 9, and by the Daily Worker of February 17, 1938, page 7.

According to the Daily Worker of March 29, 1938, page 4, James Carey endorsed the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation (C—1944). He spoke before the committee (Daily Worker of Apr. 2, 1938, p. 1; New Masses, April 5, 1938, p. 27) and before the Jewish People's Committee (C—1944; A—1948) (Daily Worker of Jan. 21, 1939, p. 4).

Equal Justice for October 1938, page 4, named James Carey as having been arrested in Chicago for distributing leaflets and as having been defended by the International Labor Defense (C—1939; A—1942). He spoke at the fourth annual convention of the American Student Union (C—1939) on December 26–30, 1938, as shown in "The Student Almanac" for 1939, page 32; he was identified as National Secretary, Congress of Industrial Organizations in this source.

In the call to the New York Legislature of Youth, issued by the American Youth Congress (C—1939; A—1942) for January 28–30, 1938, James Carey is shown as one of those who signed the call; he was identified as president, UERMWA. In the proceedings of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5,

1939, page 48, he was named as vice chairman; "Youth Defends America," a report of the Sixth American Youth Congress, July 3–7, 1940, reveals (on p. 44) that he was elected vice chairman of the group; he was identified as president, UERMWA.

Mr. Carey was a member of the organizing committee of the World Youth Congress (C—1939) (Daily Worker, April 4, 1938, p. 3) and a delegate from the United States to the Second World Youth Congress, August 16–23, 1938 (report of the congress entitled "Youth Demands a Peaceful World").

A leaflet announcing a public meeting to revise the neutrality act to be held in Carnegie Hall, February 13, 1939, named James B. Carey as a speaker at the meeting held under the auspices of the Union for Concerted Peace Efforts (C—1944). He spoke before the Negro People's Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy (C—1944) (Daily Worker, February 8, 1939, p. 2). Mr. Carey was one of those who signed a petition of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom (C—1942), as shown on a mimeographed sheet attached to a letterhead of that committee dated January 17, 1940.

Mr. Carey signed a telegram of the Joint Committee for Trade Union Rights (C—1944) addressed to President Roosevelt on behalf of the International Fur and Leather Workers Union (C—1944) defendants (Daily Worker, Nov. 11, 1940, pp. 1 and 5).

Mr. Carey's activities in the World Federation of Trade Unions were described in Free Trade Union News for July 1948, pages 3, 4, and 7. The Daily Worker of September 19, 1947, page 5, reported that he had praised the Soviet trade unions, and the Daily People's World of October 11, 1948, page 6, quoted him in a statement of cooperation with Soviet trade unions.

However, after the CIO withdrew from the WFTU, an article, "Why the CIO Bowed Out," by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer, CIO, as told to Sidney Shallett, appeared in the Saturday Evening Post of June 11, 1949, pages 28, 128–132. In brief, Mr. Carey commented as follows:

"The CIO was under no illusions when, in February, 1945, we took the momentous step of participating in organization of the World Federation of Trade Unions. We knew that Soviet Russia and her satellites were in the WFTU. From the pitched battles we had fought against Communist attempts to dominate our own organization, we had a precise blueprint of what could be expected from the Reds. Still, the CIO, together with the British and other democratic trade unions, took on the job of attempting to work with the Communists in building a solid, lasting structure of security for the workingmen of all nations.

* * * * *

"Three years and eleven months later, the CIO and the British Trades Union Congress, disillusioned and doublecrossed, had to walk off the job. * * * Thanks to the Reds, the foundation of our structure for the international workingman was built of sand, its timbers were wormy and its roof was full of leaks. Once again we had learned the old lesson that when the Communist brethren give you the kiss of friendship, they also take a bite out of your cheek."

Steel's Pyramid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter to the editor which appeared in the August 27 issue of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, written by Mr. Edgar S. Byers, of Cleveland, entitled "Steel's Pyramid":

STEEL'S PYRAMID

EDITOR, PLAIN DEALER.

SIR: In your issue of August 14 you published a letter to the editor over the signature of Lewis E. Zender, district director of public relations, United States Steel Corp. Time and space will not permit detailed analysis of this letter but, as I read it, it was the kind of thing which has come to be known as Madison Avenue propaganda to mislead the public.

It discussed dividends and profits of the United States Steel Corp. and was undoubtedly calculated to convince that both have been very reasonable indeed. As a matter of fact, the profits of the steel industry, as they have grown under the system of administered prices which made its open appearance under the Eisenhower administration, have been fantastically exorbitant.

The following facts and figures, the latter all from the steel corporation's annual reports, may be of some interest:

In 1949, just 10 years ago, United States Steel Corp. had 8,703,000 shares of issued common stock. In that year a so-called split of this stock was effected by corporate action, with result that certificates for three new shares were issued to the holders for each old share they had held.

When this legerdemain was completed the corporation had 26,110,000 issued shares of common stock, representing precisely the same equity in the assets and business of the corporation which had previously been represented by the 8,703,000 share original issue.

The highest price for which any of these new shares were sold in the market in 1949 was $26.75. So we find that the highest value placed by the market upon the total number of the issued common shares of United States Steel just 10 years ago was under $700 million ($698,442,000).

In 1955 there was another split of the common shares, and this time the shareholders received two new shares for each of the 26,110,000 shares outstanding after the first split in 1949. The corporation then had 52,220,000 shares representing the common stock equity in place of 8,703,000 shares as issued before the first split in 1949, and the holders of the original shares had 6 shares for 1. Again, all of this had not added $1 to the assets of the corporation nor had anything whatever been added to the several interests of the holders of the original shares in the corporation's assets and business.

United States Steel presently has 53,909,000 shares of issued common stock. It has issued a considerable number of shares at favorable prices to executives and favored employees, this practice enabling them to avoid a considerable part of the income tax on their actual earnings.

Recently United States Steel common stock sold on the New York Stock Exchange for a fraction above $105 per share. At this price, $105, the total evaluation which this market price has placed upon the common shareholder's equity or interest in the business and assets of United States Steel Corp. is $5,660,445,000 or more than eight times the value placed upon this equity by the highest market price of the shares in 1949.

To have added nearly $5 billion to the value of this equity in 10 years the corporation would have had to have earned an average of about $57 per share per year, net after taxes, and have paid nothing out of such earnings in dividends.

Of course, it didn't have such earnings. But the corporation did earn in 1957 about $44 net after taxes for each of the original shares, and for the first 6 months of 1959 it reports earnings which, if applied to the number of shares before either of these splits, would mean earnings at an annual rate of $54 on the common shares outstanding originally in 1949 and for many years prior to 1949.

All of this should convince the reader, as Mr. Zender attempts to do, that our steel industry is just a patriotic, unselfish, public-spirited business, concerned only with the welfare of the country in its time of peril and that union labor, which knows all about all this and has participated in and profited by acquiescence in it, is unreasonable to ask for a bigger share of the take.

But be sure of this: No matter what the division is to be, for so long as Mr. Eisenhower is in office the consumer is going to pay administered prices, this being a polite term for illegal restraint of trade.

EDGAR S. BYERS.

CLEVELAND.

Need for Action on Another Application for Foreign Service From Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in Monday morning's Baltimore Sun newspaper. This article carries the headline "City May Get Orient Flight."

The author Albert Sehlstedt, Jr., announcing that Pan American World Airways has today submitted its written arguments and exhibits to the Civil Aeronautics Board in support of its proposal to establish direct air routes from Baltimore and other eastern cities to the Orient, points up a general problem facing United States airlines.

The demand for services from this area to foreign ports grows continuously. The SAB has failed to grant permission to even one U.S. airline to fly out of Friendship destined for Europe. Generally petitions filed by foreign-flag airlines seem to receive speedier action than those filed by U.S. airlines, although not necessarily from Friendship. This problem, of being granted routes from Friendship to foreign ports, is equally applicable to all American-flag airlines and is pointed up by the newspaper article.

The Friendship International Airport in nearby Maryland is the only port on the east coast capable of handling jetplanes and one of the few in the entire country serving these modern aircraft. I have long supported and advocated more complete use of these facilities. The institution of transcontinental flights from Friendship to the west coast has proven successful. In the short period of time that this service has been available, the number of passengers making use thereof has increased over 100 percent. Statistics show that a large number of these passengers are from the Baltimore area itself. Direct flights from Baltimore to Puerto Rico were originally established on a one-a-week basis. Today there are five flights each week and reservation requests indicate the need for daily flights.

The people of this area have proven, when given the opportunity, that if the service is available use will be made of it. This goes far to prove the need for expanding the points of destination from Friendship. The same will hold true for service from Friendship to the Orient.

The CAB now has before it the opportunity to implement the President's expressed objective "that the American-flag service we ultimately envision for the Pacific must be developed as rapidly as it can be justified by the growth of United States-Orient traffic." The demand for such service is present or Pan-Am would not make this request. All that is needed now for further development of American-flag service to the Orient is the approval of the CAB. The same is true for service from Friendship to other foreign ports.

It is hoped that the CAB will act expediently and expeditiously on this request, as well as on the other requests for air routes from Friendship to foreign ports.

Mr. Sehlstedt's article from the Baltimore Sun follows:

CITY MAY GET ORIENT FLIGHT—PAN AM TODAY ASKS CAB TO FLY FROM EAST COAST

(By Albert Sehlstedt, Jr.)

Pan American World Airways today will ask the Civil Aeronautics Board to establish direct air routes from Baltimore and other eastern cities to the Orient.

A favorable decision from the CAB would make it possible for a Baltimorean to board a jet plane at Friendship International Airport and fly to Tokyo in about 16 hours.

The flight would follow a great-circle course over the globe with a refueling stop at Fairbanks, Alaska. A great-circle course is the shortest route between any two points on the surface of the earth.

Today, Pan American will submit written arguments and exhibits to the CAB in support of its proposal.

On October 21, hearings will begin before a CAB examiner who will weigh the statements of litigants favoring and opposing this and other plans for air travel across the Pacific.

The examiner will present his recommendations to the five-member Board. A decision from the Board, subject to the approval of President Eisenhower, is expected about the first of next year.

WEST COAST TO EUROPE NOW

One of the principal arguments of Pan American is that east coast cities should have the same type of direct routes to the Far East that west coast cities now have to Europe.

Last February, President Eisenhower and James R. Durfee, chairman of the CAB, exchanged several letters discussing the overall airline-route situation in the Pacific area.

The President emphasized the need for competitive American-flag service on all international air routes serving major U.S. points.

PRESIDENT'S INTEREST

"Over the North Atlantic," Mr. Eisenhower wrote, "our objective has been substantially achieved, but in the Pacific, because so far it has not been deemed feasible, very little progress in the desired direction has been made.

"This history only emphasizes that the American-flag service we ultimately envision for the Pacific must be developed as rapidly as it can be justified by the growth of United States-Orient traffic."

This case now before the CAB is called the Trans-Pacific Route case and is considered one of the most important ever to come before the Board.

TOKYO, MANILA, HONG KONG

Pan American is proposing that Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Detroit and Chicago be linked with Tokyo, Manila and Hong Kong.

The carrier also wants to establish direct service between east coast cities and Hawaii and operate between certain military bases in the United States and other bases in the Pacific.

A Pan American spokesman in Washington said his airline wants to develop air-cargo business in the Pacific.

ORDERS 10 CARGO PLANES

He said the carrier is ordering 10 specially-designed turboprop planes from Lockheed Aircraft Corp. for hauling freight.

The planes, to cost a total of $60 million, would be similar to the C-130 Hercules now in service with the Air Force.

Pan American also is converting 10 of its DC-7C Douglas transports to cargo use.

Public Works Veto Unjustified

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent Presidential veto of the public works appropriation bill cannot be justified by any reason of economy insofar as the Nebraska projects are concerned.

If the veto is sustained, the Gering Valley flood control project will again go begging. After years of justification of the project and proof of its validity, it again is threatened by unwarranted delay.

Following a disastrous flood in 1947, the Corps of Engineers made a study of the needs of the valley. Its planning and designs progressed until the project was victim of the veto in omnibus bills twice before becoming an approved project in the second omnibus bill in 1958.

The effect of these delays has been the utter waste of money. In 1958, after emergency funds in the amount of $125,000 had been spent on repair work, all of the structures were carried away by floodwaters. Because of the imprudence of attempting to do anything short of complete control of the area, the raw, unprotected drainage area lays open to the ravages of further heavy rains.

With each delay, extensive flood damage has resulted which constantly increases the end cost of an effective control system. The flooding has done serious damage to rich farmland in the North Platte Valley, as well as to roads, railroads and farmsteads.

Expenses on the part of Scotts Bluff County and local irrigation districts have been exceedingly heavy in the valiant attempt of the local people to fight the overwhelming odds of the situation.

And yet this critical problem which had its formal recognition nearly a dozen years ago is stifled because of a label called new start. This label ignores reason or practicality. It ignores the duty of Government. It flaunts the will of the people as expressed by the majority of Congress.

If this project had been fortunate enough to have been in Korea, India, or some other remote area, there would have been funds and a program to take care of the situation—without specific consent or review of Congress.

The public's reaction to the President's action and the wise recommendation that Congress override the veto is, I think, expressed in a recent editorial in the Lincoln Evening Journal of Lincoln, Nebr., which I include at this point:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, Aug. 29, 1959]

President Eisenhower has flung his strongest challenge yet at the Democratic-controlled Congress by vetoing the $1.2 billion public works appropriations bill.

This is an almost unprecedented step with far-ranging consequences. Unless Congress takes further action, it means that construction work on vital irrigation and flood control projects all over the Nation will have to be stopped. This would surely lead to vastly increased costs when these works are resumed and a serious blow to the conomy during the interim.

Obviously, Congress cannot leave the situation as it stands. The most likely and, in this case, the most warranted action will be to override the President's veto. Despite the overwhelming Democratic majority in both Houses, Mr. Eisenhower this year has been able to keep intact his record of never having had a veto overridden. But he has never before put Congress in such a position as this.

True, the public works measure attempts to include "something for everybody" and is, to some degree, politically inspired. But it also is true that with very few, if any, exceptions, the projects called for in the bill will add immeasurably to the productivity of the United States and to the safety and welfare of its people. It is, in every sense of the word, an investment in the future of the Nation.

The President has objected to the bill because it calls for starts on 67 new projects. He contends there should be no new projects started at this time.

Why the United States, during one of its most prosperous periods in history, cannot expand development of its resources by new projects such as these is difficult to comprehend. Whether there should be 67 new projects or some lesser number seems to be a proper function for Congress to determine.

Nebraska is vitally affected by the vetoed measure. It contains funds for continued work on the Bostwick and Frenchman-Cambridge irrigation projects in the Republican Valley, on the Farwell irrigation project on the Middle Loup River, on Missouri River channel improvement from Sioux City to Kansas City. It has money for new construction starts on the Red Willow and Gering Valley flood control projects and for a start of planning on the Salt-Wahoo project around Lincoln.

This should be a matter of deep concern for Nebraska's Senators and Congressmen. It will be in the best interests of the State for each of them, regardless of party, to give the utmost support to overriding the President's veto of this bill.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 29, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

AUGUST 29, 1959.

Before flying to Europe, President Eisenhower appealed to Congress to pass necessary legislation in the closing days prior to adjournment. In two messages to Congress he stressed three programs. He asked: (1) Remove interest rate ceilings on long-term Government borrowing; he explained this is necessary because (a) bondholders deserve a fair rate of return; (b) $85 billion refinancing of Government debt is necessary in the next 12 months; (c) it costs Government more to refinance time and again, on a short-term basis, as we're forced to do now; (d) present law stimulates inflation, weakens our currency, and worries investors both here and abroad; the urgency of this item he made clear when he warned that those unwilling to pass the needed legislation "must assume full responsibility for the possibly serious consequences," for the administration cannot and will not; (2) FHA loan insurance authorization—the President said, "An increase in FHA's loan insurance authority should not be made contingent upon the possibility of approval by the President, after the Congress has adjourned, of legislation which contains features that the administration finds seriously objectionable and that are entirely unrelated to FHA's home loan insurance program." (3) Increased tax reserves to pay for highway program—he stressed the need, in his opinion, for maintaining the pay-as-we-go play by providing the money needed for the increased costs. (See Newsletters of August 1 and July 25.)

The Housing Act of 1959 (second version) passed 283 to 105, containing many features objected to by the President in his veto of the original bill. The House leadership completely disregarded the earlier message from the President (see above) and tied many undesirable items to the necessary extension of FHA home insurance authority. Efforts to eliminate (a) public housing, and (b) direct loans for college classroom construction, failed. Efforts to reduce urban renewal by stretching the $650 million to 2 years failed. The bill contains other administration-opposed provisions as well. I voted to improve the bill, and the amendments failing, voted against the bill. This bill may well be vetoed again.

The vehicular safety standards bill offers a prime example of a bill whose noble sounding title and obviously desirable objective makes it difficult for Congressmen to vote against, however impracticable its language. Who wants to appear to vote against safety? This bill directs the Commerce Department to establish minimum safety standards for all Government autos. It would put the Government into the auto design and engineering field and was condemned by every Government agency which considered it. Result? It passed, pointing up again that many feel that any need can be met by simply passing a law. Incorrect solutions, though they bear fine and imposing titles, can do more harm than good, and that has been pointed up, in my opinion, by congressional action on housing, highways, and interest rates, no less than on vehicular safety standards.

Political issues, and how to find, define and exploit them, seem to be dominant in these closing days of Congress. A special session now appears quite possible since the President may have to force Congress to face up to its responsibility, primarily in the fields of housing and interest rate flexibility.

A lot of dust is being thrown in the voters' eyes these days in the debate over who is really economy minded. Under pressure from home, economy, you know, has suddenly turned fashionable again among political candidates. Hence, it's not surprising that the back page of each day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now features a chart, crammed full of figures and purporting to show that Congress, far from exceeding the President's budget, has actually slashed administration requests by a present total of some $650 million. Oh? Take just one item, out of several which might be mentioned, housing. According to this chart, the President wanted $1,650 million for housing, while Congress "reduced" that figure to $1,300 million, a cut again according to the chart of $350 million. What the chart doesn't say is that the figures cover entirely different periods of time. Hence, the President's proposal called for spending $1.5 billion on urban renewal over the next 6 years. Congress instead voted to spend almost one billion in only 2 years. Some cut. If you "economized" around your house this way, you could "save" yourself broke in a hurry.

The President's veto of the public works appropriation (money for rivers, harbors, dams, reclamation, etc.) will spark a fight next week on the floor. It seems to me that if we're to live within our means, these public works programs provide an obvious opportunity to cut down spending. The only responsible alternatives is to raise taxes, and I believe they are too high now. Hence, though only 20 of us voted that way when this bill passed the House, I believe the President should be commended for his determination to hold the line on public works spending.

Diablo Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the proposed Diablo Dam on the Rio Grande River was further spotlighted this past week by a visit to the site of the project by the U.S. Ambassador to Mexico, the Honorable Robert C. Hill. The Ambassador went there at the request of President Eisenhower to make an inspection and obtain certain information to be relayed to the President.

It will be recalled that the urgency of the proposed dam was a subject of top priority in conversations between President Eisenhower and Mexico's President Mateos at their historic meeting in Acapulco last February.

This project would be authorized by H.R. 8400 which I recently introduced, following an economic feasibility report made by the U.S. Boundary and Water Commissioner, Col. L. H. Hewitt. That report finds the annual primary benefits from the project to the United States compared with annual costs would be 1.96:1 for a 50-year life and 2.48:1 for a 100-year life of the project.

By way of comparison with others, it is of interest to note that in the case of the Colorado River storage project—Glenn Canyon and Echo Park Dams, the ratio of benefits to costs are recorded as 1.64:1; the Whitney Dam and Reservoir, 1.1:1. And similar comparisons are numerous.

The early authorization and construction of the highly justified Diablo Dam is of highest importance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include a newspaper article from Del Rio which reports on the Ambassador's recent visit:

AMBASSADOR VIEWS SITE OF DEL RIO DAM

DEL RIO.—U.S. Ambassador to Mexico Robert C. Hill, made a flying inspection of the Diablo Dam site Friday at the suggestion of Preisdent Eisenhower.

"I am well impressed with what I saw," Ambassador Hill told Del Rio and Ciudad Acuna, Mexico, officials following a helicopter trip over the damsite.

Hill and his staff stopped for a visit in Del Rio following the International Bridge dedication at El Paso and Juarez, Mexico, Thursday. A helicopter from Laughlin Air Force Base, piloted by Col. A. J. Bratton, wing commander at LAFB, took the Ambassador and County Judge Jim Lindsey over the damsite shortly after 8 a.m. Friday. Other members of the party flew in private light planes.

"At the Acapulco (Mexico) Conference President Eisenhower suggested that I inspect Diablo Dam site and get the answer to certain questions on the damsite at the earliest opportunity," said Hill at LAFB shortly after landing.

Following the inspection of the damsite the Ambassador and his staff left for Mexico City at 11 a.m. Friday.

The Acapulco Conference was held in February of 1959 between President Eisenhower and Mexico's President Adolfo Mateos. They discussed plans for joint construction of the new $100 million dam on the Rio Grande.

Location of the damsite is 11 miles upstream from Del Rio. The dam will be 253 feet above the riverbed below the confluence of the Rio Grande and Devil's River.

An estimated 5 years will be required to build Diablo after it is approved by the Bureau of the Budget and passes Congress. The U.S. share of the cost, estimated at $100 million, will be 56.2 percent, or $45,400,000. The center section of concrete will be 1,950 feet in the river with the earth sections extending 2 miles in the United States and 4 miles in Mexico. The concrete section in the channel includes the spillway with a capacity of 1,550,000 second-feet.

Flood control capacity is 1,775,000 acre-feet with additional flood superstorage set at 335,000 acre-feet. Mexican conservation storage capacity is 1,314,000 acre-feet and U.S. conservation storage is 1,686,000 acre-feet for a total of 5,660,000 acre-feet.

At peak construction, between 500 and 1,000 persons are expected to be employed on the dam, which will have a shoreline of more than 200 miles, and will extend beyond Langtry.

Leadership and Progress: The Test of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield on the occasion of the oil industry centennial, Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1959:

LEADERSHIP AND PROGRESS: THE TEST OF OUR TIME

(Address by the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, on occasion of the oil industry centennial, Titusville, Pa., August 27, 1959)

Any man in these United States would be honored to be asked to speak here today.

I think, however, he would realize quickly that this is more than an honor. It is also a very formidable challenge.

Here, within this room, is as great gathering of distinguished minds as you could find anyplace, at any time, for any occasion.

Here is the leadership that has built the modern American petroleum industry. And the accomplishments of this industry are so fabulous as to be almost incredible.

From this industry comes the very life-power behind the growth and progress and security of not only America, but the free world.

We thrive as a free and dynamic people because this industry, in the face of immense problems, is able to provide abundant, low-cost energy for our tremendous needs.

We are gratefully mindful that our country, with 7 percent of the world's population, produces some 40 percent of the energy used by the entire human race.

It is generally forecast that, in our country alone, energy requirements by 1975 will increase by 94 percent. And we have complete confidence that this industry will supply most of this increase—because you who lead it have shown that no challenge is too great for you to accept and meet.

In such presence, the wise speaker will adhere to a subject with which he is most familiar.

I feel I can do this best by reporting to you on some specific problems we face in Washington today. Since any problems in Washington are in fact the direct concern of every citizen—and especially those of you in capacities of leadership—I believe my purpose is appropriate to this occasion.

Further, I should like to do more than report. I should like to tell you what I believe to be the most crucial problem confronting us. And I would then dare to ask you to assess what you can do to help in its solution.

Let me approach the definition of this problem by making two observations that are well known to you:

The first is that government policy vitally affects the economy of any nation. In a dictator state, of course, the effect is absolute. But even in a republic with a free enterprise system, the government literally determines the broad conditions under which the economy shall operate.

The second point is that, in a republic, the elected representatives of the people presumably are to provide the kind of government the majority of the people want.

It is therefore to be assumed that the people have the right—if not the obligation—to insist upon getting the policies they want.

One natural consequence of this process is the formation of pressure groups—groups that may represent only a small fraction of the electorate, but that organize their efforts, vocally and actively, to advance their own self-interest.

When their interest represents the needs and desires of the great majority of the people, they deserve support.

When their interest is detrimental to the people, they deserve defeat. But the fact is, they may still succeed—and all too often, do. They succeed because the interests of the people have too few champions—too few men and women with the talents and the willingness to speak up, to lead the fight in the people's behalf.

To the public officeholder, the self-interest groups appear to have the initiative; the public appears to be apathetic.

If I may be allowed a personal reference, I would mention that I first became aware of these simple facts back in 1940, when I was a businessman very much absorbed in my own business.

There occurred in my home town a shocking demonstration of the worst kind of pressure-group tactics. No one in public office seemed to be willing to cope with it. I began to envision what would happen if such pressure groups, across the land, should come to dominate our local and State, and even our Federal, Governments.

And it became clear to me that I had a responsibility beyond the voting booth—that I should try, in any event, to contribute as I could to the kind of sound government that would make pressure-group government impossible.

My interest, it seems, proved to be more than a passing fancy. I am exceedingly happy that it did. I have cherished my participation in politics and public service. Nothing in my life has been quite so spiritually rewarding, so satisfying.

The basic issue which moved me in 1940 has expanded many times over, today. It is the main force to be reckoned with, as we make our decisions on national economic policy. This year, and in the years directly ahead, these decisions will be crucial.

Upon them will rest the future of our whole security, and freedom and progress as a Nation.

For these are times of supreme challenge. We are engaged in a mammoth cold war in which no quarter is given. It is a war involving economic, as well as physical and moral, strength.

In all the writings of Karl Marx, there is not a line which advocates the overthrow of capitalism by force. Instead, the entire creed is that capitalistic nations will fall because their currencies will weaken and their economies fail.

Certain it is that economic folly, on our part, would be an invitation to disaster. A sound and growing economy is utterly essential to victory.

So our fundamental decision comes down to this: Whether we are to have economic folly through Government by pressure group, with inflation, higher taxation, and deadly monopoly power; or, whether we are to have sound Government, with sound economic policies that rid us of inflation, confiscatory taxation, and abuses of monopoly power.

At present, our Nation has reached the highest level of prosperity in our history. We have the healthiest, strongest economy America has yet known.

Our people are enjoying higher wages and better living standards than ever before.

Overall output is at record levels, and rising steadily.

Employment is rising steeply. Unemployment is falling sharply.

For more than a year, the cost of living has remained generally stable.

The battle for a sound dollar is at least temporarily won.

And the outlook for a balanced budget is the brightest it has been in a great many months.

These are achievements made possible by sound policies of Government—policies maintained by a determined Federal administration.

They are the result of a resolute battle to bring a rampant inflationary momentum under control.

They are the product of clear-thinking, far-sighted leadership—the kind provided by the President in the 1958 recession, when he guided with a steady hand and refused to rush into panic spending.

All these are hard-won gains. And, my friends, it will be harder still to hold them and to continue advancing along these sound ways.

The battle against economic folly is only begun. It must be waged persistently and firmly, as long as there are forces seeking to resume the inflationary process.

The pressures for extravagant Government spending remain very much in being. The groups behind them never rest. Washington is swarming with their representatives, wielding every political weapon that can be applied.

Many in the Congress are inherently bent on limitless spending and taxation. They will ignore the consequences of cheap dollars and deficit financing.

Almost all of these particular Members are saying—for public consumption—that they are opposed to inflation. But what happens every time they have the opportunity to act?

They fight and vote for budget-busting bills that would give inflation another boost.

We have seen examples in just the past few weeks. We are seeing examples now.

I hope you have read the first reports from our Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. I hope, in fact, that all thinking Americans have read them.

I can tell you they represent a tremendous amount of careful study and work. They look at the problems squarely, and they call a spade a spade.

Few men of responsible position, in either political party, in Washington or elsewhere, have sought to quarrel with the findings or conclusions. I believe that even those who would like to discredit them recognize that their strength lies in their truth.

The reports face up to the fact that new inflation can also come from sharp new spirals in wages and prices.

The challenge to the American people is to demand real statesmanship from all concerned—all who influence the factors that bear on prices, and thus the cost of living.

Union members, with most other Americans, want their leaders, as well as the leaders in management, to exercise basic economic commonsense. They have said so in many surveys of their views.

They do not want an ever-rising cost of living forced upon the country by wage increases that outrun increases in productivity.

They do not want inflation. They want fairness with a future.

They—and all our citizens—must realize, too, the important place that taxation holds in that future.

Our population is growing rapidly. Business can create new jobs to meet this growth only as billions of dollars are invested in new tools and capacity.

From where is this money to come, if Federal, State, and local taxes eat up business income?

There are over 100,000 taxing authorities in our country. Their weight can literally crush the ability of business to meet its job-creating capital needs.

As you so well know, our present tax structure is seriously outdated. It is a set of laws reflecting largely the conditions of the past, especially World War II, when the

goal was the confiscation of war profits, not the building of a sound peacetime economy.

A dynamic program of tax reform and reduction is needed in its place. Such a program can ease the burden our taxes are placing on the accumulation of capital for investment.

It can relieve the stifling taxload being carried by the individual citizen, and by our business system.

The Revenue Act of 1954 was a major step in this direction, bringing the greatest dollar reduction in Federal taxes in our history.

Today, the President's insistence on a balanced budget is essential to this goal.

And, needless to say, the broad support of the people will be necessary if this program eventually is to be accomplished.

Let me repeat: The forces devoted to irresponsible spending and taxation are strongly organized. They are highly vocal. They are grimly persistent. They remain confident.

As opposed to them, the number leading the fight for sound government has been relatively small. In Washington, this fight has been led, in large part, by the President and the Vice President, sustained by key members of the administration and some stalwart Members of the Congress.

These are the men who have battled for fiscal sanity, for a balanced budget, for steps leading to tax reform and reduction. More—many more—are needed in every state in the Union.

And here I submit, gentlemen, is the most crucial problem facing this country. It is the need for all who believe in sound government to stand forth and support the efforts that must be made to maintain it.

It is the need for men who have talents of leadership to apply these talents to the political life of the nation.

I would suggest that too much is being expected of too few. The majority of our people want sound and responsible progress by all segments of our society. There has been a vast increase in public consciousness of the fact that only the people, in the end, can see to it that this kind of progress is maintained.

No more dramatic example could be given than the way in which the people have made it clear that they want the abuses of labor monopoly power stopped. Their mandate has been so strong that the adoption of a vitally needed labor reform law—which the labor monopoly leaders appeared to have blocked as little as 3 months ago—is nearly a reality.

We have seen, too, how the forward march of inflation has been slowed by an aroused public opinion. In no other way could the inflationary forces that ran rampant for so many years have been brought to a halt.

But we must not be misled. Let public vigilance fall away only a little, and the pressure groups will be in the ascendence again. The spenders and taxers will not yield easily, nor will those determined to exploit labor monopoly power.

To keep the public interest uppermost, the people will need articulate help and leadership in every community; not advice from the sidelines; nor cautious detachment from the arena where the decisions are being made.

I know of no men in America life whose leadership could be more important than the men in this room at this moment.

No one could speak with greater authority, for you have shown how successfully you can deal with the very problems that confront us.

This great industry has been outstanding in fighting inflation by holding down prices. In the 10 years from 1949 to 1958, gasoline prices, exclusive of taxes, increased less than 6 percent on a national average, while the cost of living rose more than 20 percent. And these were prices for gasoline constantly improved in quality through huge expenditures in research and development.

Your experience in this industry, too, equips you to emphasize the necessity of vast expenditures by private industry for technology and facilities to meet public needs.

The oil industry knows only too well that, if its capital is taxed away, it cannot continue to make the enormous investments, and take the risks, that have enabled it to serve the public so well to this time.

You know, at first hand, such inflationary pressures as that behind the highway construction program. You know that we must be extremely careful that our Federal highway program is carried forward on the most efficient basis possible.

Already, we find, the estimated costs of this program are running 45 percent higher than in 1956, when it was first approved in Congress.

Our people must be urged to see that this program does not become immersed in a pork barrel. Its potential as an element of inflation is great and serious.

I know very well, indeed, how easy it is to become engrossed in the problems and duties of daily business. I know how difficult it is to find the time for other activity.

But it can be done. In time of war, all of us are ready to change our lives, to go where we are needed, to serve in the best way we can. We are willing to make any sacrifice to preserve the life and future of our Nation.

We are enaged in no shooting war, but my friends, we are engaged in a battle to preserve the life and the bright future of our country.

It is a time for service, for sacrifice, for leadership.

There is in this room, a tremendous reservoir of vital political thinking, and of great ability to communicate this thinking.

This, too, is demonstrated on the record. I have been told that at least 10 major oil companies have launched public affairs programs to make their employees better informed citizens—and to encourage employees to participate, as citizens, in political activity.

I know personally that many of you are giving increasingly of your time and ability, as citizens, to public affairs and political participation. This, of course, is of first importance. If a public affairs program for employees is to succeed, it must certainly have the demonstrated leadership of the management of the enterprise.

I would appeal to you, in all events, to speak, work and fight for sound policies and a stronger America.

I would ask you to assess anew the importance of your political participation.

The political party of our choice is, and will be, what we make of it—either by participation, or lack of participation, in its affairs and its choice of candidates.

Unless more responsible citizens devote real time and effort to unselfish politics, Government by pressure groups will triumph.

Only by genuine participation can we be sure that the Government will serve all the people—not some special interest—and assure the greatest opportunities for all our citizens.

This is a day of great meaning in our Nation's history. All America is proud and grateful on this anniversary of these first magnificent 100 years.

It is a day of even greater meaning to our Nation's future. We know that untold wonders will come in the years ahead, in the second century of oil progress.

We salute you—we look to your leadership in industry, and in our national life.

In the spirit of your accomplishment, we shall move forward into the golden era of opportunity that lies before us.

We shall prove anew there is no conceivable limit to the advance of a free people—no goal they cannot, with wisdom and courage, attain.

The Pentagon Book Ban

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, we live in a time of world crisis when the life and death issues of peace or war are debated in the halls of Congress, the press, and public forums throughout the country. The new personal diplomacy of the Eisenhower administration and the forthcoming exchange of visits between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Eisenhower signify the intensity of the search for peace.

In these critical times there is need for basic data and the informed judgment of experts to help the American people find the right road to peace. I have tried, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, to bring to the Congress and the American people the basic facts of nuclear radiation—the effects of radiation from bomb testing as well as the nuclear damage from hypothetical mass attack. As chairman of the Military Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I have tried to do the same in the missile field—bring together in one authoritative document the basic facts of the missile programs which support our strategy of deterrence and defense.

We need more information, Mr. Speaker, not less, to put into the crucible of national debate which will mold the American policy for survival and peace. Therefore, it is with great concern that I note the Department of Defense decision to ban a book by Gen. Thomas S. Power, who heads our Strategic Air Command.

This Pentagon book banning is a shortsighted policy. Granted that there may be some technical problems about books and articles written by Government officials, military and otherwise—technical problems concerning royalties, copyright, and the like—it is vastly more important for the Congress and the public to have the benefit of the seasoned judgment and experience of men like General Power.

General Power's book was written to help the American people understand better the issues of war and peace in the nuclear-missile age. The book analyzes the revolutionary impact of nuclear bombs and missiles on military strategy, the nature of the enemy threat, problems of deterrence, the implications of all-out and limited war, the vital role of civil defense in deterrence, and other important matters.

The Air Force has approved this book for publication. A publisher is waiting

the word to put the book into print. General Power has given up any financial returns that may be derived from the sale of this book.

Mr. Murray Snyder, Assistant Secretary of Defense—Public Affairs—has decided that this book should be withheld from publication. His office issued a press release to this effect, although neither General Power nor the Secretary of the Air Force were informed directly beforehand that a decision to withhold the book had been made.

I presume that Secretary of Defense McElroy has approved Mr. Snyder's action. If so, I believe that the Secretary had better reconsider this action and permit General Power's book to be published.

Secretary McElroy should recognize that book banning, like book burning, is a vicious and futile policy which does no credit to a free nation. The right of the people to learn and to understand should not yield to bureaucratic policy which conflicts with that right.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, August 31, 1959, at pages 15927–15928, there is a list of 15 books by high-ranking military officers written while on active duty. I notice among them "Crusade in Europe," by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, written while he was Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army during the period 1945–48; the book was published in 1948. This book has been highly rated by scholars and commentators on World War II. It was an important work by the general in command of the allied invasion forces. The American people are the better off for its publication.

I believe the same could be said about General Power's book. I have not had access to the book, although I am familiar generally with the subject matter of which it treats. I may not even agree with certain things General Power says and, doubtless, he would not subscribe altogether to points recently made by my subcommittee in its report on organization and management of missile programs. But General Power has an important message for the American people. He should be allowed to convey that message. I hope that the Secretary of Defense will reconsider the ill-advised and unwarranted book-banning decision.

Osceola Mills, Pa., Celebrates Its 100th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, highlighted by congratulatory messages from President Eisenhower and Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania together with introduction of a concurrent resolution by the Congress of the United States extending felicitations and expressing appreciation for the century of splendid services rendered to the Nation by its citizens, the Borough of Osceola Mills in Clearfield County, Pa., observed the 100th anniversary of its founding the week of August 23–29. During that period many former residents responded to the welcome home invitation and returned to join in the centennial festivities.

First named Osceola and then changed to Osceola Mills to avoid a conflict in names and because of numerous sawmills in the area, the town was established in 1859 and incorporated as a borough in 1864. Located on the banks of Moshannon Creek—now the dividing line between Centre and Clearfield Counties—like many other communities in central Pennsylvania the town was named for an Indian.

The community was named for Osceola, the famous war chief of the Seminoles, a Florida tribe, after he, his family and tribe had been persecuted by the whites. Chief Osceola was born in Florida about 1813 during the War of 1812. In 1835 his wife was carried off as a slave after which Osceola and his tribe waged a relentless war against the whites for 2 years with varying success. He was finally taken prisoner by treachery and confined at Fort Moultrie where he died 2 years later. Twenty-two years later the present town of Osceola Mills was named Osceola in honor of the Seminole war chief whose daring and ability won him nationwide sympathy.

Other Indian names in the area including Bald Eagle, Moshannon, Warriors Mark, and Snow Shoe were taken from Delaware, Shawnee, and Corn Planter Indians that lived in the area prior to and after the coming of the white settlers.

History records that the first settlement in Osceola Mills was made by a family named Winter followed by Daniel Hoffman who cleared a piece of land near the junction of Pruner and Coal streets.

Among the oldest settlers in the Osceola Mills area was Valentine Flegal who bought extensive tracts of land in 1800. He was a local minister and held services at Stumptown in 1815. The Stumptown church was later used as a school for more than 80 years and in 1951 after having been abandoned as a school, it was again made into a church where Free Methodist services are held each Sunday. Located across the road from the old Goss Cemetery, another famous landmark, the church was among many points of interest during the centennial celebration.

Osceola Mills was visited by a devastating fire on May 20, 1875, that almost wholly destroyed the town, inflicting property losses of over $1½ million. Despite the fact that all inhabitants were made homeless the residents of the stricken community with the aid of neighboring towns soon recovered from such a staggering blow and from the ruins there arose a new and more beautiful community.

Clearfield County, which was among the principal lumbering areas in central Pennsylvania, is noted for its production of bituminous coal. However, because of the lack of railroad transportation, development of the coal industry was retarded.

It is recorded that about 1830 a mine was opened on what was known as the Goss Farm in Decatur Township, and coal was hauled on wagons to Spruce Creek. The transportation of coal by such crude methods naturally amounted to very small tonnage. It was not until 1846 with the opening of the Tyrone and Clearfield Railroad to Osceola Mills and Philipsburg that the real development of the coal industry in Clearfield County commenced. Prior to that time not one pound of coal was shipped by rail from Clearfield County. In fact, the first shipment of coal from Clearfield County was made during lumbering days when coal was loaded in what were called "Arks" and floated down the Susquehanna River to Lock Haven and Williamsport as early as 1822.

Today, Clearfield County bituminous coal is known throughout the Nation and abroad and it is of interest on the occasion of the Osceola Mills centennial celebration to recall the important part that Moshannon Valley community has played in the coal production records of Clearfield County.

As the residents of Osceola Mills reminisced on this eventful occasion, they were reminded that the community, in addition to lumbering, farming, railroading and coal mining, for a number of years harbored a tannery built in 1873. Other sources of employment include a modern brick plant, and some smaller industries. Railroading has been prominent in the industrial life of the town as evidenced by a large railroad yard which was located in Osceola Mills because it was situated at the junction of the Moshannon branch with the mainline of the Tyrone & Clearfield Railroad, which years ago was absorbed by the Pennsylvania Railroad system.

To commemorate the community's 100th birthday, the Osceola Mills Centennial Committee was formed headed by Chief Burgess John Redding as president and general chairman, with Andrew Tocimak, secretary; Herman Hirsh, treasurer; and William B. McFeeters, publicity chairman. The finance committee was comprised of Neal Baney, Gordon Kephart, Lee Kennedy, George Stranko, and Justin O'Brien. With president John Redding serving as a member of the steering committee, the other members were: Robert Heath, George Mandell, Russell Olenick, Herman Hirsh, John McDonald, Charles Mostyn, Fred Brown, Eugene Danko, Earl Thomas, Norman Stevens, Arthur Bush, and John Timchak.

Following is the week-long centennial program featuring a parade each evening at 7:30 p.m.:

Sunday, August 23: Religious day with special services in all churches and a centennial evening vesper service in the park at 7 p.m. at which time Rev. Ira Duvall, of Curwensville, Pa., former pastor of the Methodist Church was the speaker.

Monday, August 24: Veterans and Defense Day softball game, 6 p.m., merchants versus Little League officials; military parade, 7 p.m., featuring 2d Army Headquarters Band from Fort George G. Meade, Md.; 3d Reconnaissance Squadron, 104th Armored Cavalry; representative units of the U.S. Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; fly-over by Navy and Air Force jetplanes; program at memorial stadium 8 p.m.; concert by 2d Army Headquarters Band; address by Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, captain, U.S. Navy Reserve; Marine Corps attack on fortified bunker position by 34th Infantry Company, U.S. Marine Corps.

Tuesday, August 25: Education Day.
Wednesday, August 26: Founders Day.
Thursday, August 27: Industrial Day.
Friday, August 28: Firemen's Day.
Saturday, August 29: Carnival Day.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to introducing a concurrent resolution in Congress to extend felicitations to the residents of Osceola Mills, it was a great privilege to be accorded the honor of acting as grand marshal of the splendid Veterans and Defense Day parade on August 24 and later to deliver the principal address at Memorial Stadium.

Prior to the parade, it was my privilege to be guest of the Rotary Club and to speak during its centennial dinner program.

In cooperation with General Chairman John Redding, Publicity Chairman William B. McFeeters, American Legion Comdr. Stephen Sidorik, and Eugene Danko, commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I was instrumental in arranging with the Department of Defense for the necessary authorization for participation by military units in the program for Veterans and Defense Day. In addition, it was my pleasure to arrange with the Atomic Energy Commission for an eight-panel library unit exhibit titled "The Useful Atom." The display which was made available by the American Museum of Atomic Energy operated by the Institute of Nuclear Studies, Oak Ridge, Tenn., illustrates the story of the atom and some of the peaceful applications in the fields of agriculture, industry, and medicine.

Osceola Mills, despite its population of 2,000, has a fine record for patriotism, a large number of young men from that area having served in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict. A total of 37 young men from Osceola Mills offered their lives on the altar of freedom in World War I and World War II.

In one section of the borough park there is a large stone monument, with the inscription "A tribute in commemoration of those who made the Supreme Sacrifice in the Great World War." The two names on the stone are Lt. Harry B. Peters, who was killed in action October 15, 1918, near Romagne, France, and Pvt. James L. Gorman who was killed August 28, 1918, near Fismes, France.

In the other section of the park is another monument in memory of World War II servicemen who died in action. The monument was dedicated jointly by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars posts and is inscribed as follows:

This memorial dedicated to perpetuate the memory of our valiant defenders of freedom who made the supreme sacrifice in World War II.

These are the names on the bronze plaque: Jack Arnold, Porter Albright, Chester Beres, Peter Busko, John Domack, Michael Fronslick, William Heath, Vincent Hughes, William Jarrett, Harry Keith, Robert Keller, Leslie Kephart, Jesse Kephart, Clair Kizer, Clark Kizer, Albert McKinney, Cecil McNeish, Francis McNeish, Darrell Merritt, Fred Miller, John Parana, Joseph Petulla, Michael Philiposki, Lewis Price, Robert Redding, Clare Riley, Adam Slabon, Raymond Sokol, Philip Sokolofsky, George Spittler, Harry Stewart, Paul Stevens, William Stevens, Jack Vroman, John Young.

It was fitting that in view of the gallant war history of Osceola Mills that the Department of Defense cooperated to a splendid degree by making a worthwhile contribution to the success of the centennial program.

Opening the celebration on a deep spiritual note with special services in all churches, the centennial program was varied, with each day's program interesting and enjoyable and ending in a carnival-like spirit on August 29 climaxed by a horse show and rodeo at Memorial Field.

The residents of Osceola Mills are to be warmly commended for their enthusiasm and community spirit that always plays an indispensable part in a centennial observance.

The success achieved reflected due credit on the leadership of Chief Burgess John Redding, who acted as president and general chairman of the Osceola Mills Centennial Committee. He was ably assisted by William B. McFeeters, publicity chairman, and by the other officers and members of the various committees who worked as a team of unsung heroes in making certain the success of the centennial program.

In saluting the residents of Osceola Mills on the community's 100th birthday, I am not unmindful of the spendid cooperation extended by members of the clergy, borough council, school officials and teachers, business and industry, veterans' groups, civic, fraternal and service clubs, who with the average citizen pooled their efforts and thus succeeded in making the Osceola Mills centennial an event long to be remembered in the history of central Pennsylvania.

Demands on the Federal Treasury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, one of the rough detours on the road to the adjournment of Congress is the controversial problem of financing the highway program. Pressure has been built up from the States, the construction people, and the material suppliers for a bond issue to finance the bulk of the cost and then a diversion of the excise tax on new cars and parts.

The people demand a program of "pay as you spend or do not spend." The President has recommended an increase in the gas tax of 1½ cents per gallon to "pay as you spend." The committees of Congress have been wrestling with the problem for months. Each time they add two and two, they come up with the disgusting figure of four and then they must go back and start all over. Surely if they wait long enough, Members will become so anxious to get home that they will buy a set of figures that do not add up.

The problem presented is as old as the philosophy of planned spending. The pattern has been followed many, many times, and each time it has produced the desired results. Is there any reason to expect it will not this time? Yes, the garment is new, but the pattern is old.

THE PATTERN

A few years ago the States were suffering financial difficulty with mounting highway traffic. There was increasing demand from the people for more and better roads. The States had levied close to their limits. Although under the Federal highway program the Federal Government matched 60 percent, the States could not meet their 40 percent without tax increases. This they were reluctant to do.

It was becoming serious when someone came up with a plan—an interstate "defense" highway program where the Federal Government would match 90 percent and the State only 10 percent. The State groups reasoned that if they could just get the Federal Government to build one good superhighway across every State, this would relieve the pressure on State governments.

In order to insure that each State would be given at least one good cross State superhighway, the plan provided for the connecting of principal industrial cities. It was labelled a "defense measure," and to sugar-coat the pill, a separate fund was established so the program could be sold as a "pay as you build" program. Certainly Congress would buy that one.

It was neatly wrapped and tied with a lovely "defense" ribbon. Congress bought it. The thing Congress failed to do, however, was to put any brakes on the law. Almost before it was unwrapped, the spenders had their plan in action and construction was accelerated on an antirecession basis. What happened? The same thing that happens to every program which is shifted to the Federal Government—they ran out of gas.

Anyone who could add two and two and come up with a total figure of four would know that with such an outlay of money, the program would go in the hole—$241 million by June 30 next year and $2.1 billion by June 30, 1962. It did, and the program is bankrupt.

However, anyone who understands Congress also knows that it is only nec-

essary to get the ball started rolling downhill—then when the crisis comes, if they can pour enough telegrams into Washington, Congress will surrender and mortgage the future of the Nation to secure the continuance of the program.

The oil companies are stirring up the people against a gas-tax increase to pay for the increased cost, the contractors and suppliers who are caught in the middle are pleading for help—so Congress goes into the Treasury, either directly or indirectly, and the whole ball of wax is added onto the national debt.

As I have indicated, the garment is new, but the pattern is as old as the New Deal philosophy. Add it to the national debt. Paper and green ink are cheap—so we print more bonds and more money. The farmer and miner whose prices do not fluctuate, the retired people on pensions, and those on fixed incomes must pay the bill as these cheaper, inflated dollars—the most vicious of all forms of taxation—pile up.

Yes—the garment is new, but the pattern is old. Local and State governments shift the burden of their obligations to the Federal Government because they do not have the courage to levy additional taxes on themselves. Another thing, legal or constitutional debt limits prevent them from going further into debt, whereas the Federal Government has no effective debt limitation. The national debt limit can be moved up each time Congress spends in excess of national income.

ANOTHER GARMENT, SAME PATTERN

Three years ago the cities were having difficulty doing all the things they wanted to do without increasing the tax burden on the local taxpayer, so they decided to shift more of their burden to Washington.

The Leagues of Municipalities worked out a plan and sold it to the sportmen's groups. The sportsmen carried the ball and the leagues simply ran the interference.

On the basis that clean fish need clean water, they attached an amendment to a simple bill extending the Anti-Stream-Pollution Act, to provide that the Federal Government would make grants to cities for the building of sewage systems.

Sponsors pledged that it would be for only 2 years and cost only $100 million. This year we hit the crisis—too many cities needed help—they needed twice as much for five times as long—and, of course, will get it.

What business does Congress have heaping the city sewers on top of the national debt when all that is needed is a little exercise of the police powers of the State. The answer is "None." It had no business going into this purely local governmental function in the first place, but if it did wish to take this function over, then certainly a tax should have been levied which would raise the money to pay this additional cost.

The purpose was to shift the burden of paying for the sewer system at Podunk from the people of Podunk to the people of the Nation. There it could be added to the national debt.

ANOTHER GARMENT

School districts across the Nation have been having great difficulty meeting the increased cost of school operation without placing the burden too heavily upon the neighbors who pay the taxes. The educators have been looking to the Federal Government for financing on the theory that with Federal money the Federal wage scale could be adopted in the schools. The boards of education have been looking to the Federal Government as money from Washington would relieve the pressure on them, pressure from teaching staffs on one side and pressure from the taxpayer on the other. Another thing, the districts must live within legal debt limits, the Federal Government does not.

The National Education Association with a strong lobby in Washington has sold the "free money" plan to the State associations and the parent-teachers groups across the Nation. Their bill, known as the Murray-Metcalf bill, has been reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and is now before the House Rules Committee.

The bill would cost over a billion dollars annually in the beginning, but will cost many, many billions in a few years. It makes no provision for financing, no provision for increased tax levies. It anticipates adding the cost of educating the children of the Nation onto the national debt. Federal control of education would be serious, but increasing the national debt in this manner and further "watering down" the already deflated dollar would be much more serious.

THE PROBLEM

Senator BYRD of Virginia recently reported that by 1957 Congress has provided 57 different grant-in-aid laws, all of them assisting local groups and local governments in financing projects and programs that are fundamentally the obligation of such local governmental units.

The problem has grown up primarily because individuals, communities, local governing boards and legislatures desire these many improvements, but lack the courage to levy the taxes necessary to provide payment for them. In addition, many States have a constitutional debt limit and local governments have either a constitutional or legal debt limit which prevents them from further increasing their bonded indebtedness. The Federal Government has no effective debt limit. The result is that they look to the Federal Government to finance all of these program. Congress, having no greater stamina than the local governing boards, passes these grant-in-aid laws with the result that each year Federal expenditures increase, the national debt goes up, the value of the dollar goes down, interest rates on cheap money go up, and the whole ball of wax gets bigger and more explosive.

OTHER DEMANDS

It is not only the States and local governmental units that are coming to the Federal Treasury for help. In recent years, friendly foreign nations have learned that when they are short of funds for improvements, for unbalanced budgets, for relief purposes, for defense, and for their many other needs, they, too, can come to Uncle Sam with a package tied in a defense ribbon and have their needs added to the national debt through the foreign aid appropriations.

NEEDED ACTION

How can these raids on the Treasury with resultant additions to the national debt be stopped? The voters can elect Members to Congress who have the courage to say "No." This, of course, is only temporary as the pendulum swings forth and back each two years. They can, however, effectively and permanently halt any additions to the national debt by adopting a simple constitutional amendment.

If Congress were prohibited from enacting any bill which provides for spending any money in excess of the national income for that year without incorporating in such bill a tax levy to raise sufficient revenue to pay for such spending, it would effectively prohibit further Federal indebtedness.

I have introduced a resolution providing for a constitutional amendment which would require that every appropriation bill contain either a certificate that this expenditure, when considered with the whole, will not exceed the anticipted revenues, or that such bill contain within its provisions a tax measure sufficient to meet such expenditure.

I am convinced this is the only method by which increased demands for federally financed programs can be reduced. I am convinced this is the only way deficit spending can be stopped. I am convinced this is the only way a balanced budget can be effected and the national debt can be limited.

While this amendment is an absolute must, if the financial integrity of the Nation is to be preserved, it does not do the whole job. There is another hole in the dike that must be plugged.

FOREIGN AID

At the present time Uncle Sam is being called upon not only to defend but to finance the nations of the entire free world. This would not be so serious if such financing was being paid as we spend. The fact is, however, it, too, is being added to the national debt.

This picture requires a different frame. Uncle Sam cannot levy a direct tax upon our free world friends requiring them to contribute toward the cost of their own and our defense, or to repay our Treasury for the contributions we are making toward bolstering their budgets, contributing to their relief load, their internal development, and so forth, but he can and must require some assistance from them to the American taxpayer.

We cannot levy a tax on the manufacture and shipment of their products being used in trade with other nations, but we can require them to assist our taxpayer and we can require them to help us keep our budget in balance in spite of our great defense outlay, by levying an import tax upon the goods they import into this country. Trade with us is vital to them. The import tax could be based not so much upon the commodity as upon the cost to us of defending and financing that particular country.

THE ALTERNATIVE

The present trend must be halted if national bankruptcy is to be averted. The present national debt is equivalent to a first mortgage on the property of every family in the Nation of $6,400. The deficit of the last 2 years of $16 billion means $360 for each family.

The present program and present policy is rapidly moving this Nation toward the fearful situation of where a housewife must take a market basketful of money to the grocery store to buy a purse full of groceries.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a discharge petition on one of the basic issues of democracy lies in the well of this House. I intend to sign this petition, as I signed a predecessor, so that this House may have an opportunity to entrust to some of its people the right to vote and to have a say in their own affairs.

I should also like to offer for the RECORD a resolution of the Common Council of Hartford, in a State which is proud of its own long tradition of self-government, supporting the people of Washington, D.C., in their bid for home rule.

RESOLUTION OF THE COMMON COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF HARTFORD, AUGUST 25, 1959

This is to certify that at a meeting of the Court of Common Council held August 24, 1959, the following resolution was passed by rollcall vote.

"Whereas local self-government is the bedrock of free government; and

"Whereas the rights and benefits of local self-government should be available to all American citizens; and

"Whereas the residents of the District of Columbia are denied the rights and benefits of local self-government; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has the authority to assure local self-government by granting Home Rule to the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas the principle of home rule has been endorsed by a substantial majority of the residents of the District of Columbia; and

"Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia have unanimously endorsed proposals for granting home rule to their city; and

"Whereas the Senate has passed a home rule bill for the District of Columbia five times during the last 10 years, while in the same period such measures have been bottled up in the District Committee of the House of Representatives, and no hearings held: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That (1) The Congress be, and it is hereby urged to approve home rule legislation to assure local government to the residents of the District of Columbia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That (2) Members of the House of Representatives be urged to sign a discharge petition so that the Commissioners' bill, otherwise known as the territorial bill, be brought on to the floor of the House so that the full membership can have the opportunity at last to vote on the measure; and be it further

Resolved, That (3) a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the majority and minority floor leaders of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the State delegation to Congress."

Attest:

WILLIAM A. LINNANE,
City Clerk.

Military Air Transport Service Comes Under Congressional Attack Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsstory which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, August 30, 1959, written by Mr. Edward Hudson, on the subject of the Air Force's Military Air Transport Service:

MATS ATTACKED IN CONGRESS AGAIN—TWO SENATORS SEE CONFLICT BETWEEN AIRLINE OPERATION AND MILITARY MISSION

(By Edward Hudson)

The Air Force's Military Air Transport Service came under renewed attack last week in Congress in the wake of Air Force opposition to plans for a privately run national aircargo fleet.

Proposals aimed at establishing the cargo fleet have been submitted to President Eisenhower by Elwood R. Quesada, Federal Aviation Administrator. They call for turning over to private carriers the bulk of MATS routine pipeline traffic.

In addition, the Government would assist airlines in buying efficient new cargo aircraft by guaranteeing up to 75 percent of private loans made to carriers for the purchases.

The purpose is to build up at private expense a sizable fleet of cheaper to operate cargo planes that would stimulate the growth of the aircargo industry and provide a ready reserve for use in a military emergency.

Secretary of the Air Force James Douglas reportedly blocked the loan-guarantee proposal at a White House interdepartmental meeting on August 17. The Secretary was said by trade sources to have demanded new cargo planes for MATS as his price for agreement. Congress refused the Air Force funds for 10 jets earlier this year.

TWO SENATORS CRITICAL

Renewed congressional criticism of MATS came from two Democratic Senators, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri. Both are considered authorities on the subject.

Senator MONRONEY has studied MATS over the last 2 years as chairman of a special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Senator SYMINGTON is a former Secretary of the Air Force.

Both men, in Senate speeches, indicated they believed that MATS was carrying on its extensive airline type of operation to the detriment of its mission of airlifting military forces in time of national emergency.

"The simple fact is," Mr. SYMINGTON said, "that MATS cannot be both a commercial-type airline, with 460 stewardesses, and a combat airlift force constantly on the alert, comparable to the Strategic Air Command.

"It is important to note," he went on, "that the Army and the Marine Corps can only obtain adequate airlift through the Air Force; and while the Air Force continues to build up its airline operations, it also continues to refuse to give the Army that lift impartial experts believe is essential if we are to handle a possible limited war."

CONFLICT IS CITED

Senator MONRONEY said there was a growing conviction in Congress and the Defense Department "that the peacetime airline operation of MATS is in direct conflict with its primary responsibility in an emergency."

He argued that the MATS strategic transport fleet was, at any given time, scattered all over the world delivering routine military supplies, and was kept busy at a high utilization rate.

"Not only must its planes be recalled and necessary maintenance be performed before MATS could conduct any large-scale movement of troops, but some arrangements must be made on a crash basis for commercial aircraft to take over routine air logistics on which oversea units depend," Senator MONRONEY added.

If, instead, MATS relied on commercial carriers for routine oversea supplies it could keep its fleet always ready for emergencies abroad, he declared.

The Oklahoma Senator ridiculed a MATS contention that he called the "anyhow theory." This referred to statements by MATS officials that it was economical to utilize MATS planes for military traffic since "the planes are going anyhow" for training purposes.

PROFICIENCY HOURS NOTED

Senator MONRONEY said Brig. Gen. Albert T. Wilson, MATS Deputy Chief of Staff, had acknowledged to his Subcommittee on Military Air Transportation that only 15 percent of MATS flying hours were actually required for the agency's qualification and proficiency-training program.

"The number of hours flown by other units, with missions no less demanding," Senator MONRONEY told the Senate, "confirms the accuracy of this estimate."

He said MATS needed to be reequipped with "substantial numbers" of a specialized workhorse aircraft capable of carrying at least 50,000 pounds of troops and equipment over an intercontinental range.

They should also be able to operate in and out of primitive fields and short runways without the need for elaborate ground-handling equipment, he said. He indicated he thought the same type of plane should be produced for civil use.

"No plan to reequip MATS in these terms has been submitted to the Congress," he said.

He declared that the usefulness for hard-core missions of converted jet transports recently requested by the Air Force was "dubious," while "their usefulness for deluxe passenger service is unquestioned."

He invited the Defense Department to present a comprehensive plan for a modern military transport program and give evidence of its intention to get MATS out of the airline business. He said he was confident of strong congressional support for such moves.

MODERNIZATION IS URGED

Meanwhile, MATS has been making its own case for fleet modernization. Maj. Gen. Raymond J. Reeves, deputy MATS commander, told an American Legion meeting in Minneapolis that "the weakest link in our national security system may well be our strategic military airlift unless we take the trouble now to remedy its deficiencies."

General Reeves said three types of planes were needed—a high-speed turbine aircraft to support jet bombers wherever they go;

a general workhorse plane to replace the piston-engine Douglas C-24 Globemaster, and additional Douglas C-133 Cargomaster turbo-props, a plane that is now in inventory in limited numbers.

"Cutting MATS flying hours to less than the present five a day would hinder its ability to respond in a war emergency," General Reeves said.

"Our maintenance and supply, our own logistic support, once geared below 5 hours, simply cannot accelerate in time, any more than an idle factory can come to peak production overnight," he asserted.

Senator MONRONEY had contended that missions that MATS had to perform because of the size, nature, or destination of the cargo would provide MATS with enough flying hours to maintain proficiency.

Growing Menace of Unrestricted Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein two foreign trade briefs recently issued by the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policies.

These briefs contain truly alarming factual material on the decline of U.S. export trade and the increase of the flood of foreign imports into this country.

The plain facts indicate current economic trends in foreign trade both in and out of this country which, if continued, could well be disastrous to many great American industries. The fact of the matter is that these trends have already produced virtual disaster for some American industries which we believed were basic and virtually indestructible.

According to the cited figures, foreign automobile imports have greatly increased and are causing widespread unemployment. Foreign electrical equipment and turbines are undercutting the American market and even getting Government business which should be going to domestic producers.

Sewing machines coming in from Japan alone amounted to about 1 million machines in 1958.

The great watch industry has been forced to cut its employment by two-thirds as a result of foreign imports which now take 70 percent of the annual domestic market.

Japanese-produced tunafish has cut some of our fleets more than in half.

Shirt imports from Hong Kong and Japan strikingly increased the past year bringing unemployment to an estimated 6,000 American workers.

Our great steel industry has been most adversely affected by a variety of steel products and wares coming into this country, and we are facing the loss of our entire export business in steel according to authoritative reports.

U.S. maritime and shippers business has been cut from about 70 percent of American foreign commerce in 1946 to 8.7 percent in 1959.

The United States is now taking two-thirds of the total Japanese output of binoculars and for the first time in history we are importing more typewriters than we are exporting.

Japanese caps costing 20 cents are undercutting U.S. caps which cost $1, and every branch of the male apparel industry is complaining of cutthroat competition endangering thousands of jobs

In the knit glove industry, imports presently amount to 250 percent of total American production.

The copper and brass industry has been gravely hit by foreign imports and in 1958 operated at less than 45 percent of its 1946 capacity.

The United States has been converted from an exporter to an importer of brass mill products.

The cut in exports and the great increase in imports is gravely imperiling employment in the steel industry and authoritative leaders in the steel industry state that the American steel industry is no longer competitive with the rest of the world.

Special wire products are arriving in the American market in alarming quantities, and for the first time in many years we are importing more steel than we are exporting.

These figures speak for themselves. I have repeatedly presented similar facts indicating these trends and predicting these results, if we did not speedily alter our foreign trade policies. But this was not done.

However, the protests which many of us made regarding these dangerous trends fell on deaf ears and the situation is steadily growing worse.

The escape clause has provided no remedy because in only a relatively negligible percentage of cases has the executive department taken any action which would stem the growing flow of competitive, cutthroat, foreign products which are undermining American industry and labor.

If the Congress does not act soon to stem this flow it is very obvious that this nation will be facing an economic disaster more widespread than any that has ever faced us.

The drastic revision of our present reciprocal trade treaty program has become the most critical and burning economic issue of our times. This Congress must tackle it at once—fearlessly and vigorously—and across a broad front—or this Nation and our industries and working people will suffer the loss of prosperity and the impact of depressed conditions that will make the depression of the 1930's fade by comparison. Let us act now.

The above-mentioned follows:

FOREIGN TRADE BRIEFS, JULY 23, 1959

U.S. auto exports-imports: Since 1955, U.S. auto exports dropped 50 percent, from over 200,000 annually to expected 100,000 in 1959. Three hundred and seventy thousand foreign car imports sold in United States in 1958; present rate indicates 600,000 this year.

UAW aroused: A. J. Mattes, president of local 239, UAW, wrote Baltimore Mayor Grady that over 300 General Motors workers in that city were laid off and remaining 1,500 are working less than 40 hours a week because of increasing number of foreign car imports. Thirty-five thousand autos imported via Baltimore the first 5 months of 1959 could have given employment to 2,500 workers at Chevrolet plant there, working two 8-hour shifts for 13 weeks.

Auto production abroad: Daily output at Fiat's Mirafiore Works over 2,500; Volkswagen heading for 3,000 at Wolfsburg. Plymouth's mammoth Detroit line turns out 1,100 daily; Rambler at modern Kenosha plant about 1,600 units.

Electrical equipment: Florida Power & Light Co. ask foreign producers of heavy electrical generating equipment to bid on two 200,000 kilowatts steam turbogenerators—probably first effort by foreign manufacturers to penetrate private utility market, following successful efforts on Federal-State projects. Domestic firm salvaged contract on basis of delivery date.

Turbines: English Electric bids 30 percent under nearest American competitor to win Army engineers' contract for eight hydraulic turbines for Big Bend Dam, S. Dak.

Sewing machines: Brief filed with Tariff Commission reveals foreign sewing machine manufacturers now control about 75 percent U.S. market, e.g., U.S.-imported Japanese machines, up from 64,000 in 1950 to about 1 million in 1958.

Watches: Ranks of American watch workers steadily reduced from 16,000 to 6,000 employees as foreign imports take 70 percent of annual domestic market or 14 out of 20 million units.

The gold facts: United States now has $19.6 billions in gold, smallest reserve in over a decade, but foreign organizations and individuals have dollar claims of $15.1 against reserve.

Tuna fleet: Imports of Jap tuna reduced ranks of San Diego's tuna clippers to 125 ships from 1952 high of 214. Sales sliced from about $40 million in 1954 to expected $19 million this year.

U.S. manufacturer literally losing his shirts: National Association of Shirt, Pajama and Sportswear Manufacturers went on record opposing State and Commerce Departments' representations on behalf American business and declared in favor of congressional regulation of foreign trade. Shirt imports from Hong Kong-Japan alone totaled 1.75 million dozen in 1958, equivalent to $15 million in U.S. wages for 6,000 American employees.

Tourism: Dollar source: Frequently overlooked as dollar source to foreign nations is tourist industry; Americans spent $2.1 billion on foreign travel last year—10 percent jump from 1957.

Steel: "What's Behind the Rise in Foreign Competition?" [1]

"Let me cite the predicament of one American industry. * * * The industry is that which makes table flatware * * * and recently stainless steelware. * * * This is a new industry in Japan; flatware such as we use is not used generally in Japan.

"By 1955, imports had reached 3,134,000 dozen against U.S. production of 14,654,000 dozen; * * * in 1958, Japanese imports amounted to 8,444,000 dozen, with U.S. production of 14,740,000 dozen. * * *

"While this rise in imports was going on, the gentlemen of GATT progressively reduced tariffs.

"The big reduction was made in 1950 but further reductions were made in 1956, 1957

[1] Excerpts, address by W. H. Wiewel, senior vice president, Crucible Steel, to the American management Association, New York, May 20, 1959.

and 1958, after this industry had really been hurt.

"Japan, fearing action by the United States, voluntarily announced a quota limit to the United States of 5,500,000 dozen for 1958. * * * Up to this time, this industry has been given no relief and employment is off 25 percent. In spite of the announced quota of 5,500,000 dozen, 1958 imports were 8,444,000.

"The time will soon be here when we have completely lost our entire export business in steel, except for a few specialty items which are not made elsewhere."

FOREIGN TRADE BRIEFS, AUGUST 10, 1959

Special note: Representative CLEVELAND BAILEY and colleagues launch House attack on press bias in tariffs and trade field. Cite O. R. Strackbein's request for hearing before American Society of Newspaper Editors. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 30, p. 13522.)

Escape clause box score: "Oh, but industry does have an official remedy," exclaims the liberal-trade enthusiast to import-wounded industries. But "let us ask the man" who sought one. Here's the January 1954 to May 1959 record:

Industries seeking remedy from Tariff Commission	45
Remedy denied by Commission	19
Remedy recommended by Commission to President	[1] 26
But denied by him	17
Remedy granted by President	8
But drastically diluted by him	6
Full recommendation granted (out of 45)	2

[1] One in process.

Foreign cars: Japan's Batsun, plastic-body sports car, speed of 86 m.p.h., now in order-taking stage and slated soon for U.S. market. Also targeted for United States is their tiny Subaru-360 at $1,100.

European-English cars captured 17 percent of Canadian market first 5 months of 1958; now up to 23 percent for same period in 1959. Imports here running about 10 percent of market.

Shipping bottoms take beating: U.S. shippers' share of American foreign commerce had rough sailing since World War II (military excluded):

U.S. share:	Percent
1946	68.0
1951	43.0
1952	35.0
1953	30.0
1954	28.0
1955	22.0
1956	20.0
1957	18.0
1958	13.0
January 1959 [1]	8.7

[1] Latest.

Binoculars: Jap binocular industry, principally geared to U.S. market, produced over 1.5 million units in 1958; United States purchased two-thirds of total output.

Typewriters: $19.9 million of imported typewriters and parts in 1958 outstrip U.S. exports of $14.7 million first time in history.

Cap imports: National Cap and Cloth Hat Institute, joint labor-management group, seeks escape clause action to increase duty on Jap caps. Self-imposed Jap annual export quota of 15 million caps too large for U.S. market to absorb without serious damage, reports institute. Comparative prices: Jap cap, 30 cents; U.S. caps, $1.

Clothing workers concerned: Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, formerly strong trade agreements supporters, adopt resolution attacking destructive imports. Cite cutthroat competition in every branch of male apparel threatening thousands of jobs. Knit glove industry well on the road to destruction, as imports now 250 percent of U.S. production.

Copper and brass: Copper and Brass Research Association's study of causes in decline of domestic brass mill industry reveal: first year after sharp tariff cuts, imports multiplied 42 times preceding year level; imports almost 100 percent of U.S. tubular plumbing goods market; U.S. industry in 1958 operated less than 45 percent of 1943 capacity; United States converted from exporter to importer of brass mill products.

West Europe's gold mounts: Gold and dollar reserve holdings in West Europe increased from $7 billion in 1950 (December) to $18 billion in 1959 (March).

Luxury liner lambs: Indicative of price differential in foreign-U.S. competition was arrival at San Diego of 30,000 Australian lambs on converted luxury liner *Wesoralia*. Estimated delivery price: $10 a head or half of U.S. price. Importer's yearly goal: 100,000 head.

Steel: "The Big Squeeze on Little Steel." [1]

"In 1957, the United States exported 5.2 million tons of steel mill products, and imported 1.1 million tons. But this ratio of almost 5 to 1—in favor of steel mill exports—dropped to less than 2 to 1 in 1958, when exports fell to 2.7 million tons, and imports reached a high of 1.7 million tons. * * * (1959 steel imports running double U.S. exports, NWC.)

"Because of these developments, we appear to have lost much of our foreign market, and a portion of our domestic market is in jeopardy. For example, the United States exported 721,000 tons of semi-finished steel in 1957. This dropped to 124,000 tons in 1958—a decrease of 83 percent. Exports of structural shapes decreased from 453,000 tons in 1957 to 292,000 tons in 1958, while exports of plates declined from 604,000 tons to 249,000 over the same period—a drop of 59 percent. Exports of tinplate, an item in which the United States has long had a preeminent position, fell from 538,000 tons to 244,000 tons—a decrease of 54 percent. * * *

"In the domestic market we are at a competitive price disadvantage in such products as rods, barbed wire, nails, reinforcing bars, and other items. * * *

"Within the past year or so, a number of specialty wire products have arrived on the American market in alarming quantities. * * *

"These are facts. * * * The American steel industry in certain areas is no longer competitive with the rest of the world."

---

[1] Excerpts, address by A. F. Franz, president, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., to American Iron and Steel Institute, New York, May 28, 1959.

Poland Stands Today as a Symbol of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as we pause to look back two decades to the day that Hitler released his panzers to plunge across the borders of Poland to kill and to plunder, we should be mindful that the United States has a close and intimate relation with the brave people of that freedom loving nation which dates back nearly 200 years to the time when the founders of this Nation were fighting for their own freedom against a powerful empire. A number of Poland's great soldiers volunteered their services and fought with the colonial army to victory, sharing all the bitter hardships of America's war for freedom.

It saddens our heart to look back on the brutal and inhuman treatment suffered by the people of Poland, first at the hands of the Nazis and later the Russians. Since the end of World War II, Poland has lived under the yoke of the Communist, but the spirit of her people, their longing for freedom is as evident today as it was two centuries ago. The Communist masters in Moscow have found that their most brutal methods have been unable to suppress this desire for freedom and today of all the nations behind the Iron Curtain, Poland remains the most independent and there the fire of freedom burns brightest, 20 years since her people have known freedom.

Poland stands today as a symbol of courage, a nation that refuses to let freedom die.

Washington Inches Toward Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hartford Courant of Hartford, Conn., under date of August 14, 1959, entitled "Washington Inches Toward Home Rule":

WASHINGTON INCHES TOWARD HOME RULE

Certainly one of the great paradoxes in this land of the free is the fact that taxpayers and resident of its Capital City, Washington, D.C., have no vote in their local affairs. In the old phrase, it would be comical if it wasn't so sad. Since 1802, when the city was chartered, it has had virtually a half dozen forms of rule. But except for the period from 1820 to 1871, when the people biennially elected a mayor, the rule has been imposed from without and above, chiefly by the Federal Government itself or its appointees.

Thus, Washington has gone along something like a second-class colony of some ancient monarchy. But not willingly. For some time there has been an organized demand for home rule. During the last 10 years, five home-rule bills for Washington were passed by the Senate. Now, for the first time in that decade, the House District Subcommittee is holding hearings on legislation that would give Washington residents voting rights in their municipal or local government. Four previous home-rule measures, passed by the Senate, were bottled up by the District Committee and Subcommittee and never reached the floor of the House. The reason is the Neanderthal-type southern racists who dominate the subcommittee.

Even as it is, the current hearings were begun only after a group of home-rule proponents in the House had introduced a resolution to discharge the District Committee

and Subcommittee from further consideration of home rule bills and bring the issue to the House floor during the current session of Congress. Representative BYRON L. JOHNSON, Colorado Democrat, declares that he thinks it safe to say that if the House committee does not report a bill within a reasonable time, we can expect that many House Members, including himself, will sign the discharge petition to force the bill onto the floor. All other citizens of the United States who have a voice in their local affairs will think that from 1878, when Washington's present system of appointed Commissioners was established, to now is already more than a reasonable time. It's about time the House allowed Washington to join the democratic process right at headquarters.

Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan Will Tour Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an illuminating article by Thayer Waldo, published in the United States as "Continental Closeup No. 46," supplies additional information on the mounting crisis to the South.

The indicated article follows:

CONTINENTAL CLOSEUP No. 46

(By Thayer Waldo)

MEXICO CITY.—While President Eisenhower is in Russia on the return half of top-level exchange visits designed to thaw out the cold war, the Kremlin's No. 1 trader will be touring Latin America, busily seeking to undermine U.S. influence throughout that vital area.

Soviet Deputy Premier Anastas Mikoyan is scheduled to stop off in at least five of our neighboring Republics—Mexico, Cuba, Argentina, Uruguay, and Bolivia—during this significant junket, now set tentatively for late October and early November.

Russian diplomats in Mexico City and Buenos Aires are making every effort to get Mikoyan official invitations also from Brazil, Chile, and Venezuela, none of which has relations with Moscow. (Neither does Cuba or Bolivia.)

Behind his unprecedented trip—the first time such a highranking Kremlin functionary has ever gone to Latin America—lies a new and drastically revised Soviet campaign to infiltrate that region.

Russia's "fresh look" at the countries to the south of us was authoritatively outlined in a Moscow lecture, delivered last May 17 by B. Ermolaeff, a professor of political science and recognized specialist on Latin-American affairs.

The lecture was supposed to be private, with attendance by official invitation only. However, a Russian-speaking attaché of a South American Embassy secured admission and took extensive notes on the address.

A full transcript of those notes has been obtained by this correspondent.

Prefacing a detailed analysis of present economic conditions in Latin America, Ermolaeff bluntly criticized Soviet commentators and textbook writers for their "outmoded" descriptions of the area.

Though they usually refer to it as industrially backward, with one-crop economies in most countries, Latin America has actually made enormous advances in recent years, the lecturer said. He pointed out that overall production there has increased by more than 200 percent since World War II.

This rapid development, including much heavy industry and a wide variety of consumer-goods manufacture, has favored "monopolistic" U.S. interests, Ermolaeff continued—but has also built up nationalist and anti-American sentiment.

He quoted Comintern figures showing that Communist Party membership all over Latin America has climbed steadily again since the early 1950's, after falling off sharply from its 1947 high of 480,000, "due to U.S. pressures."

Today's estimate of total native, active Reds in the 20 republics is 350,000, Ermolaeff said. He described Cuba as the present revolutionary center of the Americas, but warned that Fidel Castro and many of those around him are "unreliable," from the Communist point of view.

There are also "good" men in the Cuban regime, he added. The only one he named was Raul Castro, Fidel's younger brother and heir-apparent to the premiership.

"Speaking among ourselves," Ermolaeff said, "Raul Castro is a Communist."

The "middle-class" political parties now dominant in a number of Latin-American countries, he went on, are hostile to U.S. "monopoly" practices. Only a real union of farmers and workers, though, can bring "freedom" to those countries—and that is what all Communist parties in the region are striving to bring about, Ermolaeff concluded.

With this refocused outlook on Latin America to guide him, shrewd Anastas Mikoyan can be expected to propose deals and agreements which will further the long-range Soviet aim of driving U.S. interests out of that entire area.

Thousands of Americans Reach for Guns in TV Western Craze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the State of Connecticut has made many contributions to the defense of this Nation. One of these is through its famous and ever-vigilant firearms industry. The names Colt and Winchester are bywords the world over.

Today, television has encouraged a renewed interest in firearms which made history in the past. Connecticut companies again figure in this revival of interest.

This is a well known story in the Northeast. But it has been set down for national attention by Kenneth Scheibel, who writes for the Hartford Timess and other Gannett Newspapers, in a specially syndicated article.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as it appeared in the Watertown, N.Y. Times:

THOUSANDS OF AMERICANS REACH FOR GUNS IN TV WESTERN CRAZE

(By Kenneth Scheibel)

On a winter night in 1953 President Eisenhower picked up a Colt revolver from his collection and showed the first lady of our land how to "fan" a six shooter.

He cut himself on the hammer but gave a competent demonstration. Wearing a bandage on his hand, he flew off to the first Bermuda conference the next day to ponder global matters with Winston Churchill.

General Eisenhower didn't know at the time. But he was ahead of a trend. Today the old-time six gun which intrigues the president of the United States has thousands of new devotees.

Sam Colt's rugged .45 caliber "Peacemaker" revolver blazed a page in early American history. The fragile television tube set off a western craze and caused its 20th-century revival. It gave birth, too, to a new generation of gunslingers."

The gun finding new favor is the "single action, army" revolver once adopted by the U.S. cavalry. Legend is that Indians dubbed it "The Peacemaker" when they could not withstand its rapid fire. It is the same gun worn low on the hip by Wyatt Earp, "Bat" Masterson, "Wild Bill" Hickok, "Doc" Holliday and other frontier gun toters.

The revival of the six gun has been a bonanza for the gun companies—Colt's Patent Fire Arms Manufacturing Co., Inc., Hi-Standard, Ruger, and Great Western Arms.

At their plant in Hartford, Conn., Colt's President Fred A. Roff, jr., looks up from his desk where figures tell the story of the six gun's amazing comeback in the space age.

"Production of western-type guns at our plant, and by other companies, is about 10,000 a month," Roff says. That is a hefty production rate considering that the only war going on is between cowboys and Indians on television.

The irony of it all is that the gun which is helping gun companies was discarded as obsolete by Colt's in 1941. It was put back in production in 1955 after national surveys indicated a lively interest in it because of television.

"We had to work nights for a while to fill orders," grins production chief Joe Vante. Sales are still high. Colt's business is 35 percent ahead of a year ago.

The "gun that won the West" is a heavy caliber revolver—most popular in .38 and .45. But Colt's, Ruger, and others, angling for the teenage set, brought out a less expensive .22 version. It is a spit-and-image of the "Peacemaker," and, according to Colt's veteran Arnold Goodwin, "sells like hotcakes."

On the western frontier a six gun sold for $15. Before it was dropped in 1941 by Colt's it was priced at $35. Today it fetches $125.

The "Peacemaker" revolver became popular with civilians in the unsettled days after the Civil War. It was part of the dress when a man was his own law and Judge Sam Colt's "justice" reigned supreme.

Sam Colt is credited with invention of the first repeating arm. He went to sea briefly as a youth, and observed there a ship's wheel which could be controlled by a clutch. The idea of a revolving cylinder for a hand gun was born. After early failures, Colt achieved fame and fortune. He died a young man—only 48—in 1862.

"General Custer died with a smoking Colt revolver in each hand," says company literature. And Teddy Roosevelt's "Rough Riders" stormed San Juan hill packing Colt guns. In modern times, General George Patton carried a six-shooter into battle. President Eisenhower has several—one, inlaid with gold, is valued at $2,400.

The six-gun fad has taken many forms. The clips, cigaret lighters and table lamps are patterned in the form of a revolver. Small fry blaze away at each other in "fast draw" duels, with electric lights rigged to holsters to show who is fastest.

The leather goods industry also is cashing in, producing new and fancier holsters and probably better "rigs" than old-time gunslingers ever dreamed of.

Arvo Ojala, who teaches Hollywood stars the art of fast draw, invented and patented

a holster with a metal lining inside the leather. This keeps the holster open so a six gun can be cocked while still inside. Ojala says this is essential to a fast draw.

Another intriguing aspect of the craze is the fast draw club movement. The clubs have sprung up in the West and Midwest and may engulf the Nation with perhaps an annual match yearly to decide who is the fastest gun alive. At local levels, claims of who is top gun are flying as thick as .45 slugs. When you read in the newspaper occasionally that someone shoots a friend while practicing, you can be pretty sure a couple of fast draw artists are at work—and who still have a lot to learn about gun handling.

Jim Devine, a member of the Foothills Shooting Club, Glendora, Calif., travels in the West on business. A quick draw enthusiast, Devine finds clubs range in size from 10 to 110 members, mostly young men in their twenties.

"The challenge is to outdo your fellow man," Devine says. "But recreation is also an element in this movement. Most clubs use wax slugs instead of real lead * * * you can practice drawing and shooting in your living room that way," he declares.

Fast draw clubs meet once a week, sponsored by a local gun dealer usually. "Some of our boys can draw in a tenth of a second," Devine reports. The quick draw fever has caught up the kids, too.

Devine tells of a local Sunday school teacher, quizzing a member of her class.

"Johnny," she asked, "what would you do if you met the devil?"

Johnny, crouched in the stance of a gunslinger, replied:

"I'd say, 'Draw you ———.'"

"That broke up the meeting," Devine says.

McClure says, "Not many people buy these guns for shooting." Significantly, Colt's advertises six guns as a "den decoration," or "conversation piece." Whether it's sex appeal, or shooting appeal, thousands of Americans today are going for guns.

Nazi Invasion of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today the black shadow of war hung ominously over a frightened world. By nightfall of September 1, 1939, war was no longer a shadow, but was a stark and brutal reality. Germans entered Poland from the west, north, and south, and dropped the first bombs on the country. Sixteen German armored divisions faced one Polish division; 4,320 German planes pitted themselves against 404 Polish aircraft. Out of Poland's 34 divisions of infantry, only 24 were ready for battle, since Poland, under Allied pressure, had suspended the mobilization demanded by the Polish authorities. German population outnumbered Poland's by almost 3 to 1.

To put it quite bluntly, Poland had been sold out. The people of Britain and the United States who had quietly watched the remilitarization of the Rhineland and the Anschluss, who had held their breath and their tongues at the partitioning of Czechoslovakia, had not let themselves believe that this could happen. "Europe is too far away," they said. "It does not matter what happens there." They had appeased a maniac, and the result of their appeasement was a devastated Poland.

September 1 was the dividing line. No longer could the isolationists delude themselves about the aims of Nazi Germany, for Hitler had invaded Poland. Furthermore, the manner in which this invasion was conducted clearly indicated that Hitler had no intention of conquering the Polish peoples. Instead, he meant to obliterate them from the face of the earth, and Russia meant to help him. Russia had taken her position at the signing of the Molotov-Ribbentrop Agreement.

"Go ahead," Russia had said; "take what you want of Poland. We won't bother you; we want only some of the spoils."

It is a brutal, devastating thing which we commemorate today, and I think it good that we have this commemoration. It is a reminder of blindness, of delusion, of fear, and of a totally unrealistic foreign policy on the part of the allies. The President of the United States had said again and again that appeasement had to stop, but the people would not listen to him. He had stated that in order to defend the United States we had to insure more than our own continental frontiers. We had to insure the frontiers of the countries bordering Germany. No one had listened. No one believed. No one wanted to—Europe was too far away, remember?

So a nation had been sacrificed to the cowardice of an unthinking world. A peace-loving country, desiring no more than to be left alone, had become the scapegoat of a man who had converted the German State into nothing more than a war machine. It must be remembered, however, that Poland's blood is on the hands of many people besides the hands of the Germans. It is on the hands of ignorance and it is on the hands of all peoples who refuse to grow in a growing world.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a press statement released by the Polish Societies and Clubs of Delaware. It puts very well those things which must never be forgotten as we live in this world of cold war and threats, of power and land hungry people. There can be no more isolationism, there can be no more appeasement. The world owes Poland that chance for freedom which it had denied her throughout history:

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
August 27, 1959.

To the EDITORS OF JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING AND WILMINGTON MORNING NEWS.

DEAR SIRS: September 1, 1959, marks the 20th anniversary of Germany's brutal and completely unjustified attack on Poland with the aid of Soviet Russia, and the beginning of World War II.

It will be a day of mourning for the people in Poland as they can never forget that the German-Nazi barbarians have wantonly, in cold blood, murdered over 6 million people in Poland.

They will never forget the Nazi gas chambers, the human incinerators and the dastardly, inhuman plot to completely extinguish the Polish Nation. They will also remember the Soviet massacres of 20,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, the occupation of part of eastern Poland by Soviet Russia, the mass deportations of millions of Poles to Siberia, and the labor prison camps.

On this tragic anniversary, we wish to issue this statement, reminding the world of these facts and plannings by Poland's centuries-old enemies and neighbors.

Yours truly,

ADAM J. ROSIAK.
LUDWIK KOPEC.

Minshall Traveling Office Set for Week of December 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 11, 1959

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, during the 5 years in which I have been privileged to serve the 23d District of Ohio, every effort has been made to maintain the needs and desires of the people. In an effort to make the title "Representative" truly meaningful I have made it one of my first duties to be continuously well-informed of the views of the residents of this outstanding district. This is possible only through frequent personal meetings, regular newsletters, television and radio reports, and opinion polls.

Like the family doctor, a Representative should always be "on call." Accordingly, a year-round congressional office is maintained in room 525 of the Federal Building in downtown Cleveland. This gives me the opportunity of meeting with people during frequent trips back home as my official duties in Washington permit. While I am at work in the Nation's Capitol, a competent staff in in charge of the Cleveland office. The dual office system means that at all times I am prepared to help constituents with the least possible delay in their dealings with the Federal Government.

A further service to the people of the 23d District is my "Washington Report," which in newsletter form periodically presents a concise accounting of events and views on Capitol Hill. In return, the opinions of the voters of my district are solicited through my annual questionnaire on major legislative issues. This constant interchange of ideas between voter and representative has helped me keep my finger on the pulse of the district.

Because of my heavy workload as a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, it has not been possible for me to return to Cleveland as often as I should have liked. Therefore, as has been done for the last 4 years, a traveling office has been scheduled once again in the various suburban communities which comprise the 23d District.

This method of meeting with the public has proven tremendously popular, and gives me a wonderful opportunity to dis-

cuss and learn firsthand the views and the individual needs of the people.

In that this 1959 session has run late into the year, I accordingly have planned this year's traveling office for the week of December 7–11. Meetings are scheduled so that every resident of the district may conveniently meet with me. The following schedule is a guide only—choose the time and date most convenient for you.

I wish to emphasize that these are not group meetings—they will be individual office conferences open to every person who has a problem involving the Federal Government, who wishes to express his views on national issues, or who just wants to chat and get better acquainted. No appointments are necessary. Individuals are urged to meet with me on the date and at the place most convenient.

The knowledge obtained through my traveling office has gone far in helping me give effective representation of the 23d District in the Congress of the United States.

I am most appreciative of the splendid cooperation given by the many officials who are making meeting places available for the traveling office.

Following is a schedule for the forthcoming office conferences:

Community	Location	Date	Time
Bedford, Bedford Heights, Valley View, Cuyahoga Heights, Walton Hills, Oakwood, Maple Heights, Glenwillow.	Bedford Police Station, 683 Broadway	Monday, Dec. 7	2 to 4:30 p.m.
Shaker Heights, University Heights, Beachwood	Shaker Heights City Hall, 3400 Lee Rd	do	6:30 to 9 p.m.
Chagrin Falls, Pepper Pike, Hunting Valley, Moreland Hills, Solon, Bentleyville, Chagrin Falls Township.	Chagrin Falls Library, 100 East Orange St	Tuesday, Dec. 8	2 to 4:30 p.m.
Warrensville Heights, Warrensville Township, North Randall, Woodmere, Orange.	Warrensville Heights Town Hall, Mayor's Office, 4700 Warrensville Center Rd.	do	6:30 to 9 p.m.
Berea, Olmsted Falls, Brookpark, Parma Heights, Westview, Strongsville, Middleburg Heights.	Berea City Hall, 47 East Bridge St	Wednesday, Dec. 9	2 to 4:30 p.m.
Fairview Park, Parkview, Linndale, North Olmsted	Fairview Park City Hall, 20785 Lorain Rd	do	6:30 to 9 p.m.
Rocky River	Rocky River City Hall, 21012 Hilliard Blvd	Thursday, Dec. 10	2 to 4:30 p.m.
Brecksville, North Royalton, Seven Hills, Broadview Heights, Brooklyn Heights, Independence.	Brecksville Town Hall, 49 Public Sq	do	6:30 to 9 p.m.
Bay Village, Westlake	Bay Village Town Hall, 350 Dover Center Rd	Friday, Dec. 11	2 to 4:30 p.m.
Lakewood	Lakewood City Hall, 12650 Detroit Ave	do	6:30 to 9 p.m.

The New Gasoline Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues, the thought-provoking editorial from the Bayonne Times of August 31, 1959, entitled "The New Gasoline Tax":

THE NEW GASOLINE TAX

In the long, long struggle in Congress over taxes to support the Federal-State highway program too little attention has been given to the Federal version of New Jersey's tax muddle. At the bottom of the controversy is not the reasonableness to adding a cent or so to the price of each gallon of gasoline in order to provide new and better roads; of course it's reasonable. The trouble is that the Federal Government (like New Jersey's) has found gasoline taxes easy to impose and collect, and consequently has been diverting the proceeds to nonhighway uses. Now we have the wryly comic situation of having some legislators argue soberly that we should not tax gasoline more, but should simply take funds from the Treasury for the highways. Thus we would be diverting gasoline taxes to general purposes because they're needed there, and then taking them back again because we find we need them for roads after all.

What is needed, of course, is someone in Washington (as in Trenton) to take a fresh, hard look at the whole tax structure, and then make some intelligent proposals. It makes no sense at all to levy enormous sales taxes on gasoline, and then use the proceeds for general purposes. General purpose taxes should be levied on some better basis than slugging those of us who happen to drink or smoke, and they certainly should not be levied on a necessity like gasoline, which people in very modest circumstances must have these days to make a living.

In the absence of long overdue reform, no doubt the added cent of Federal gasoline tax is about as well as we can do. Surely we should pay for the roads as we get them (posterity is going to have highway problems enough), and no doubt the gasoline tax is as reasonable a way of raising such money as we can find. But let's not forget that if the 3½-cent-a-gallon tax had been devoted to roads, we would never have found ourselves in this jam. There is a point of diminishing returns as well as diminishing justice in selective sales taxes.

Has United States "Sovietized" Federal Workers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are greatly concerned these days about labor-management reform legislation. It is past time that we also show concern over the need for reform of labor-management relations affecting the Federal Government and its employees.

My bill, H.R. 6 and companion bills introduced in the House are still gathering dust in the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. This legislation would establish a modern, workable system of settling grievances and promote sound employee-management relations in the Federal service.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the August 1959 issue of the Federal Machinist News, published by District 44, International Association of Machinists, and commend it to my colleagues:

HAS UNITED STATES "SOVIETIZED" FEDERAL WORKERS?

In the July 16, 1959, issue of our International newspaper, the Machinist, appeared a straightforward story called "Making Russians Wish for IAM Representation." The story reported that America Illustrated (a publication of the U.S. Information Agency, for distribution in Russia and Poland) featured the activities of an IAM business agent as an example of real, free collective bargaining.

Naturally, this is quite strange to Russian union members. The story probably would make them wish for IAM representation. Trade unions in Russia are actually organs for the Communist Party, and tools of the government.

If the U.S. Information Agency, however, would feature a story about unions of employees of the U.S. Government, the typical Russian union member would feel right at home.

Under law and regulations in the United States, Federal employee unions are deprived of the right to take meaningful political action through political advocacy; the right to bargain collectively for labor contracts, mutually arrived at and mutually binding, with impartial arbitration where there are disagreements.

Regulations are first of all formulated by Government agencies. Then the unions are consulted; meaning they are allowed to make comments. Whether or not the comments are accepted is arbitrarily in the power of the agency. The resulting regulations, often minus any union-recommended changes, are then sent to the field activities as an accomplished fact.

The idea of the identity of interest between the union and the Government is a basic concept in U.S. Government labor relations. Appeal channels on grievances are Government agencies themselves, and are confined thereto. Finally, the U.S. Government considers itself a "sovereign employer." This means, in practice, that labor duty to the Government is the basis of Federal Government labor relations.

The U.S. Department of Labor's Bulletin No. 1026, "Elements of Soviet Labor Law," outlines the factors in the Soviet labor system. Here are some of the significant highlights:

"Soviet Russia does not know of any free contract of employment, nor of any legal relations usually connected with the concept of the employment contract. In Soviet Russia, labor duty is the basis of labor relations."

"Under the Soviet system, labor is deprived of the main effective devices by which it may protect itself in a labor dispute in the capitalist world."

"In general, all the channels through which labor can pursue its objectives in the capitalist world—legislation, courts, administrative agencies * * * are in Soviet Russia

agencies of the principal employer of industrial labor—the state."

"The notion of the identity of interests of the workers and the Soviet State was put forward, and the primary function of Soviet labor unions is to serve the interests of the state."

"In plain English * * * the Soviet leaders chose to abandon the last vestige of contract relations between labor * * * and state management * * * for the sake of outright government regimentation. Capitalist free collective bargaining was frankly declared unfit in the Socialist surroundings of the Soviet Union."

"The (labor) regulations are based on the assumption that the 'interests of the workers are the same as the interests of the state.' Accordingly, a model agreement is drafted by each ministry upon consultation with the central offices of the appropriate trade unions. Then the model agreement is sent as an accomplished fact to the establishments concerned."

All of this plainly parallels the U.S. Government relations with its own employees. The Russian worker would find himself right at home in U.S. Government labor concepts.

Union members in private enterprise in the United States of America, building U.S. ships, subs, planes, missiles, and atomic projects, being paid out of the U.S. Treasury, can freely bargain with their immediate employer—an employment agent, by contract, for the U.S. Government.

But what a pity. Their brother union members working in U.S. Government shops, building and maintaining the same ships, subs, planes, missiles, and atomic projects that are being built by their counterparts in private industry, being paid out of the same U.S. Treasury, are, in effect, "sovietized" in their labor relations.

Senators, Congressmen, before the Russians pick this up and exploit it as a propaganda windfall, you can change this into a propaganda advantage to the United States.

H.R. 6 and S. 95 are waiting in the legislative hopper. Passage of these bills would take a long forward step toward giving Federal workers the kind of democracy in the work place for which American is justifiably famous in all industries other than Government. You owe at least that much to your own employees.

Levering Will Hold Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to Congress last fall, I resolved that I would strive in every way possible to maintain a close contact with the people of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, who elected me to represent them.

Since then, I have made regular radio speeches to my people, filling them in on the problems of Government which I think are important. I have circulated a weekly newsletter to the newspapers of my district, so that the editors and the people would be able to understand the issues and the many views relating to them. I have had personal contact with thousands of members of the public from my district. I have corresponded with other thousands.

This year, as did my predecessor in the past, I am arranging a series of meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties in my district, and I am urging members of the public to come to these meetings and to talk over any and all subjects they choose. It is my thought that only by personally contacting the people I serve, can I do the best possible job for them in the Congress of the United States. I will be in the courtrooms of the seven county courthouses from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. each weekday.

Here is the schedule:

Friday, September 25, Ashland, Ashland County.

Monday, September 28, Mansfield, Richland County.

Tuesday, September 29, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Wednesday, September 30, Delaware, Delaware County.

Thursday, October 1, Newark, Licking County.

Friday, October 2, Coshocton, Coshocton County.

Monday, October 5, Millersburg, Holmes County.

I not only welcome visitors at these conferences, I urge individuals, regardless of political party or how they may have voted in the past, to come to see me. I am striving to represent all the people of the 17th District, regardless of their beliefs about any political or legislative issue, and I know that it is of great help for a Congressman to talk over personal, national, and international problems with the people at home.

No appointments are necessary. I hope to see a large number of persons. The discussions can help me to serve them better, and it can help them to understand my problems in striving to do the best possible job for all of the people of my district.

Oregon Leads the Census Away From the Spoils System, Maybe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 20, 1959, I asked on this floor that the spoils system be taken out of the census. I called upon Mark Hatfield, the Governor of Oregon, to use his influence against the use of political tests in the selection of the 2,130 temporary employees needed in Oregon.

Five days later Governor Hatfield wrote to me that he is "completely opposed to the spoils system." He enclosed a letter from the Republican State chairman, Peter Gunnar, which states there are no "political tests" for applicants for census positions.

Oregon leads the way? Are we in Oregon, as we have done so many times before, going to show the Nation a shining example of integrity, efficiency, and economy? I would like to think so but I must mention my growing doubts.

The hiring of these employees is still done through the Republican Party organization instead of allowing the census officials to do their own recruiting. Can the foxes guard the chickens?

Does not this place a tremendous strain on the objectivity of these party officials? They do not ask anyone's political affiliation, it is alleged. Presumably they know the political affiliations of many good Republicans.

All those Republican county chairmen are going to be like hungry seals in the circus balancing fish on their noses. They can balance the fish but they cannot gulp them down.

In any event many of us will be watching to see just who goes to work and who does not go to work for the census in Oregon.

Apparently Don Quesinberry, Republican chairman for Clackamas County, has not accepted any position with the census. Apparently he just takes applications like the other chairmen—with no political test or thought flitting through his head as he hires people.

He sent me a telegram August 27:

Your statement that I have accepted a supervisory position for the U.S. Agricultural Census is completely inaccurate and untrue. I consider your news release an unfavorable reflection on my integrity and I demand an immediate public retraction.

He may not be a paid employee but, according to Gunnar, he and the other chairmen are helping the census recruit people. In that sense he does have a position with the census. My statement was based on a news item in the Milwaukie Review for August 23. I never mentioned his name in any news release of mine but I did mention him in my speech.

I sent him the following telegram:

I regret any embarrassment caused to you by my use of news item alleging you would organize Clackamas County Agricultural Census. I am glad you have not accepted any such position. I hope other Republican Party officials agree with us as to the impropriety of mixing the discredited spoils system with the complexities of a modern census. It is my further hope that you Republican officials will see fit to remove yourselves completely from census employee recruitment and leave it entirely to nonpolitical census officials.

Governor Hatfield, as quoted in the Oregon Journal August 28, says:

I don't think teachers want to be singled out for special favors.

Of course, the main point of my speech was that the political test be removed. I mentioned teachers as a deserving, well-qualified group who might well be called upon on a merit basis.

And I don't think the teachers appreciate the attempt to make them political pawns—

He goes on—

Charlie is simply trying to create publicity.

Again he is not very responsive. He did better in his letter dated 3 days earlier to me where he says in a postscript that he is opposed to the spoils system.

The spoils system in the census is what the shooting is all about. Hatfield stated,

according to the news story, that no party test is given and no one can be active in party affairs while serving as a census employee. This is evasive and unresponsive. The question is, are the faithful being rewarded with jobs or is merit the only test?

Hatfield said I was "ignorant of the regulations governing selection of census takers." I sit on the Census Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. In my recent speech I included a memorandum on the requirements for crew leaders and enumerators.

Hatfield asserted it was "inappropriate" for a State official to ask for changes in the Federal regulations for a particular State. I never asked him to do anything like that, only to speak to Republican officials about not using the spoils system for these census employees. Now he tells me they are handling the recruitment but that no political tests are being used. Well, it may be so. We shall see.

Under consent previously granted I include below a news story from the Portland Oregonian, a letter from Governor Hatfield to me, and a letter from State Republican Chairman Gunnar to Governor Hatfield:

[From the Portland Oregonian, Aug. 27, 1959]

PORTER ACCUSES HATFIELD OF EVASIONS AFTER MAKING PLEA ABOUT CENSUS BUREAU JOBS

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, claims that Gov. Mark Hatfield has been evasive in saying whether or not he is willing to take the spoils system out of the upcoming U.S. census in Oregon.

PORTER urged Hatfield to have more than 2,000 census jobs in Oregon go to schoolteachers on a nonpartisan basis rather than be passed out as rewards for party service to Republican workers. Under the prevailing practice, the employees taken on by the U.S. Census Bureau are cleared by local party leaders, but must pass standard tests to qualify for the work.

The only reply PORTER has received, after several months of letter writing to Hatfield and Representative WALTER NORBLAD, Republican, of Oregon, has been one in which Hatfield said hiring teachers exclusively would not be any more fair than hiring GOP party workers exclusively.

NORBLAD PASSES QUERY

Hatfield said "what applies to Oregon should be the same policy applied across the board to other States." He suggested PORTER settle the question with NORBLAD at the Federal level. "NORBLAD," PORTER said, "replied that he had passed the question on to Peter Gunnar, Republican State chairman, and Bob Mautz, GOP national committeeman."

The Census Bureau recently informed PORTER it will require the following personnel in Oregon during the coming year:

1. For the agricultural census—2 agricultural field assistants to work 4 months at about $500 per month; 30 crew leaders at $16 per day; and about 390 enumerators paid on a piece-rate basis designed to yield $12 to $13 per day for 3 weeks.

ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIX ENUMERATORS PLANNED

2. For the population and housing census—four supervisors, one each in field offices at Salem, Portland, Eugene, and Bend, lasting about 4 months at $500 per month. Each office will employ about four clerks. About 104 crew leaders, paid $16 per day, will be employed 10 to 12 weeks. And 1,646 enumerators, working at the same piece rate for up to 3 weeks.

In his letters to the GOP leaders, PORTER said he had protested this use of the spoils system to the chief of the Census Bureau. He urged the Republicans in Oregon "to stand above this shoddy practice."

"It may be that you would wish to use schoolteachers exclusively. Not only would they be very well qualified for the information gathering which is required, but they certainly could use the extra earnings this would mean."

PORTER said if the Republicans started this approach, he would do all he could to get the Democrats to follow suit in the future.

HATFIELD DOUBTS EQUITY

"Your suggestion," replied Hatfield, "of the use of schoolteachers exclusively is an interesting contrast to your insistence that the applicants be considered on a basis of qualifications alone. I would not think exclusion on the basis of vocation would be any more fair than would the alleged preference to which you refer at length in your letter."

In rebuttal, PORTER wrote Hatfield: "It was my hope that you would be willing to make a positive statement against using the spoils system in Oregon and that you would be willing to tell Mr. Gunnar and Mr. Mautz that you wanted these selections made without their interference and without the use of any political tests."

Taking the issue to the House floor, PORTER referred to Hatfield as "a former teacher of political science and a man whose well-cultivated 'image' includes a rigid belief in the merit system and, of course, an antispoils system attitude." In supporting his allegation that Hatfield has been "evasive" about the issue, PORTER said his last letter to the governor, written a month ago, has gone unanswered.

The fourth District Congressman noted that a supervisory position for the agricultural census has recently been granted to Don Quesinberry, Republican chairman of Clackamas County.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
STATE CAPITOL,
Salem, August 25, 1959.

The Honorable CHARLES O. PORTER,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHARLIE: Please accept my apologies for the delay in answering your letter relating to the selection of individuals to serve as temporary employees of the Bureau of the Census. This delay was occasioned by my desire to have a full understanding with Peter Gunnar and Robert Mautz prior to answering your letter.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter which I have received from Mr. Gunnar which outlines the policies which we plan to follow. You will be pleased to note in the last paragraph of page 2 of the letter that at no time is any question asked, verbally or in writing, of the individual's political registration. Rather, selections are to be based on the basic fitness of the individual for the job to be done.

Your interest in this matter is most sincerely appreciated and you may be sure of my own personal insistence that these individuals be selected upon the basis of fitness rather than political affiliation.

Sincerely yours,

MARK,
Governor.

P.S.—Charlie, I know you are fully aware that I am as completely opposed to the spoils system as you personally evidenced in your own letter. This is borne out by the fact that I have appointed a number of Democrats to key policy positions in my own administration.

JULY 29, 1959.

The Honorable MARK HATFIELD,
Governor of Oregon,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR GOVERNOR HATFIELD: In answer to your letter of July 29, regarding the coming agricultural census, please rest assured that neither Republican National Committeeman Robert T. Mautz nor I as Republican State chairman have any intentions or plans to turn the hiring of Census workers into a shoddy system of political spoils as has been the case under previous national administrations.

Our objective is to cooperate as fully as possible with the Director of the Census and give all possible aid to the Bureau of the Census as it conducts a speedy, efficient, and economical census.

I welcome the opportunity to elaborate on our activities as they relate to the census.

I want to make it very clear that there are no "political tests" for those who wish to become census crew chiefs or enumerators. As you will note in the two U.S. Department of Commerce pamphlets (A32 and A13) which I am enclosing, crew leaders and enumerators are specifically prohibited from "holding office in any political organization or engaging in any political activity during the period he is employed."

The only tests which an applicant must pass before becoming a census worker are described in these pamphlets as (a) "Pass a written test proving he can follow instructions, do simple arithmetic, and read maps; and (b) satisfactorily complete a week's training course."

Because the Bureau of the Census does not have enough permanent employees to do the job, local residents must be recruited. To aid in this recruitment, we have supplied all our county chairmen with complete information on the coming census and have asked them to assist the western Oregon field assistant and the eastern Oregon field assistant in recruiting workers.

We have asked that all applications for these jobs be routed through the county central committees in order that the two field assistants not be swamped with letters and personal applications from persons who may not be qualified.

Our county central committee officers can screen applications and eliminate those who are unqualified and, therefore, aid the field assistants in doing their job efficiently.

Let me also say a word about the two field assistants. I do not have full information on Mr. Homer Rainey, the eastern Oregon field assistant. Therefore, I cannot elaborate on his qualifications. I will obtain these qualifications and forward them to you at the first opportunty.

However, Mr. Edward Bates, the western Oregon field assistant, is eminently qualified for the position. I am enclosing a fact sheet on him, but would like to point out that he has previously been assistant Oregon agricultural census supervisor, was assistant Oregon economic census supervisor, worked on the property evaluation census, worked on the real estate sales census, served on the Portland Chamber of Commerce Agricultural Commission, and is a former State legislator. Those are just a few of his qualifications.

He was recommended by this office on the basis of those qualifications and was appointed by the Bureau of Census for the same reason. We believe that his wide experience and broad qualifications will make it possible for him to operate with positive efficiency.

As you may know, originally National Committeeman Robert Mautz was designated as referral authority for the census for the Second Congressional District, while Representative WALTER NORBLAD was charged with similar responsibilities in the first, third, and fourth districts.

Representative NORBLAD contacted census officials and requested that this responsibility be transferred to me because he felt that this office "could better refer to you names of people for the census than I could * * * here in Washington."

I want to point out that all applications for jobs on the census have been quickly referred to Mr. Bates and we have never asked any applicant verbally or in writing his political registration. Mr. Rainey was just recently appointed and we have not had the opportunity to refer any applications to him. Should such applications be received, we will treat them in the same manner.

In summation I want to point out that our activities have been directed toward helping create an efficient, economical census organization.

It is my understanding that there have been past instances in which the census activity has been seized upon as a means of paying off political debts. This is certainly not the case now.

I will welcome further inquiries.

Sincerely,

PETER M. GUNNAR,
State Chairman.

Poison in Your Water—No. 162

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News of July 16, 1958, entitled "Washington Area Told Columbia River Contaminated, but Snake River Worse":

WASHINGTON AREA TOLD COLUMBIA RIVER CONTAMINATED, BUT SNAKE RIVER WORSE

PASCO, WASH., July 16.—The water wonderland of the Tri-City area is "buggy."

Benton-Franklin district health officers don't want to cause people to shun the rivers but they can't declare them safe for swimming.

The Columbia is contaminated; the Snake is worse; and the Yakima is worse still. The degree of contamination fluctuates daily and according to seasons, the condition of the sewage treatment plants, and other factors.

A 6-week survey to check bacteria count in the Columbia is under way by the health department. The check will show the population of potential disease causing organisms in the water.

Dr. Vernon Michael, district health officer, stated a great deal of sewage flows into the river despite sewage disposal plants, plus industrial pollution and bacteria from other sources.

For instance, the sewage disposal plants of Richland, Kennewick and Pasco all meet requirements but they have different degrees of proficiency. Kennewick and Pasco plants give primary treatment and Richland a more complete treatment of the effluence. But in all plants a certain amount of bacteria is carried into the river despite chlorination. The amount varies.

Columbia River water always contains this bacteria. The extent of diffusion depends on the amount of it, river flow and certain other factors such as lagoons, etc.

Dudley Beall, sanitarian, said today the Yakima River is polluted with animal refuse, sewage and perhaps conditions outside the health district jurisdiction.

The Snake River contains more bacteria than the Columbia. This is believed due to animal refuse.

Dr. Michael said the 6-week test will determine bacteria count and try to find its sources. He added that many known germs come from runoff and sewage. Sometimes raw sewage flows into the river when a treatment plant breaks down he stated.

"Because of these facts it is difficult to judge the pollution of the river from day to day," Dr. Michael said.

More and more people are using the rivers. Beaches and parks are being formed. The health department doesn't want to be a killjoy but the fact is that the river just isn't safe for swimming.

Some may swim for years, and not be affected because of immunity, health, amount of water ingested. Others may get sick right away. Principal diseases would be intestinal such as dysentery.

The health department says: "They're swimming at their own risk. We feel the river is more contaminated today than ever."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Stuart Symington Cited by AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, at its recent national convention in Grand Rapids, AMVETS presented our distinguished colleague from Missouri, Senator SYMINGTON, with its first defense award in "recognition of exceptional contributions to the defense of the United States and the free world." I can think of no one more deserving of this recognition than Senator SYMINGTON. In its citation, AMVETS points out that Senator SYMINGTON "has brought to the Senate unique understanding of the times in which we live." I concur wholeheartedly with this statement and with the other commendations in the citation.

I ask unanimous consent that the citation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with an excellent address which Senator SYMINGTON delivered before the AMVETS convention.

There being no objection, the citation and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMVETS NATIONAL CITATION

The 14th Annual National Convention of AMVETS, assembled in St. Louis, Mo., on August 22, 1958, unanimously resolved that its first defense award be presented to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, U.S. Senator, in recognition of exceptional contributions to the defense of the United States and the free world.

Throughout his outstanding career, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON has contributed exceptionally to the national strength of the United States. He has consistently emphasized to the Government and the public the necessity for impenetrable national defense, as a threat against aggression and to successfully counteract aggression should it occur. Senator SYMINGTON continues to protect the United States and the free world through his active participation on the important Senate Armed Services Committee and Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee.

Senator SYMINGTON, who in 1958 was elected to the U.S. Senate by the highest percentage of votes cast in the history of Missouri, has brought to the Senate unique understanding of the times in which we live. His is the voice of a dedicated American with exceptional knowledge of current military needs. His is the voice of authority on national defense. His is the voice of authority on airpower. His is the voice of authority on defense reorganization.

Senator SYMINGTON'S brilliant service as the Nation's first Secretary of the Air Force was responsible for many of the initial and subsequent contributions which the Air Force has made to the defensive strength of the United States and the free world. Earlier, the devoted public servant enhanced national welfare as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, Chairman of the Surplus Property Board, and Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

AMVETS and the United States—and the free world which looks to America to help preserve its freedom—are deeply indebted to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON. It is with the greatest pride and appreciation that AMVETS present to him their first national defense award.

Presented August 27, 1959, AMVETS 15th Annual National Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich.

W. E. BURDINE, M.D.,
National Commander.
P. E. HOWARD,
National Executive Director.

THE PROTRACTED PSYCHOLOGICAL CONFLICT

(Address by Senator STUART SYMINGTON before the AMVETS National Convention, Grand Rapids, Mich., August 27, 1949)

It is a great privilege to be with you here in Grand Rapids at this national convention of the AMVETS.

Your organization is unsurpassed in its efforts towards adequate national defense.

Those in Government charged with responsibility in this field depend upon groups such as yours to keep our citizens both informed and alert about whether or not the strength of this Nation is adequate enough to insure our remaining a free people.

National defense is not just physical defense. It involves far more. It is the whole of our effort to keep the peace. It includes economic growth, scientific progress, the state of our morale and the quality of our education.

AMVETS does a magnificient job for its veteran members. But when it branches out—exploring the meaning of Americanism; granting scholarships; helping make better communities; speaking out for the legislation in which it believes—then your great organization makes its complete contribution to our overall security.

In the 15 years since its founding, AMVETS has grown steadily in stature.

And now you stand a vigorous, far-reaching, forward-looking organization, dedicated always to the welfare of our country.

In these 15 years this Nation has matured and expanded under the continuing challenge of world communism. We have disarmed, and armed again; forged great alliances; begun to build up underdeveloped areas; and learned some of the patience which must go with leadership of the free world.

Now we enter a new phase. In less than 3 weeks, Premier Khrushchev will come to this country.

It is hoped that he will leave these shores without incident—and with a better understanding of our basic strengths.

But it would be a tragic error to believe that his visit connotes any shift in Communist goals or strategy.

The Sino-Soviet Empire is committeed to a single objective. They seek it at times by talk of peace, at times by war; in one place through professed efforts towards peace; in another by subversion.

But the basic goal is always the same: namely, the overthrow of parliamentary government, all over the world—resulting in their rule of all people.

We seem now to be headed for a phase which will be marked by increasing contact between communism and free peoples.

This means an increasing competition of words, ideas, and performance; and it is about this—what I would call the psychological side of the conflict—that I would speak briefly today.

The Russians are ready.

In his speech to the Second Congress of the Communist International, back in 1920, Lenin said: "Great are the military victories of the Soviet Republic, but still more significant is the victory over the minds and hearts of the masses, the victory of Communist ideas all over the world."

Following Lenin's advice, the Communists have developed the most effective machinery and the most refined strategy of propaganda the world has ever known.

Their assault on the mind takes many forms. It may be a peace congress in Sweden, a youth festival in Vienna, a strike in Paris, or a fair in New York.

Wherever it is, and whatever it is, you can be sure it is a well planned monolithic effort, with the inspiration coming primarily from two places—Moscow and Peiping.

In this area of protracted psychological conflict the Communists are believed to be spending between $2 and $3 billion a year. It is an effort which has but one purpose—to drum home the Communist line, so as to soften up any opposition, as they move on with their plans for conquest.

But deeds are stronger than words; and the most ingenious propaganda is weakened if belied by actions.

This is what happened recently in Hungary, and even more recently in Tibet.

And that is why, despite the scope of the Communist effort, it is they, not us, who are vulnerable in this propaganda field at this time—if only we will shed the current complacency and go to work.

Greater effort in the psychological field could draw rich dividends for the cause of freedom.

Behind the Iron Curtain—in the so-called zone of peace in which we now let Communist rule go unchallenged—the people are nevertheless stirring.

Ideas of freedom have seeped through the blockade of indoctrination and thought control.

Why else would 250,000 Poles turn out to cheer the Vice President of the chief capitalist nation of the world?

Why else would 1 out of every 10 East Germans have left their country since 1950, drawn by the symbol of freedom which is West Berlin?

Yes; dissent and doubt are on the rise in many places behind the curtain.

Let me tell you a story, the authenticity of which is vouched for by the distinguished free Austrian magazine, Forum.

At the time of the Hungarian revolution 140 students were expelled from a Moscow university.

Their crime? In the middle of a class on Marxism they began to ask why, in Hungary, workers and peasants had risen against the Communist state.

The Russian students were not satisfied with the answer of their teachers, so they went to the rooms of Hungarian students

and literally dragged them out of bed to ask some searching questions.

They wanted to know whether the Communist Party has not in fact become the exploiting class Marx warned against; and, if this were true, whether Marxist theory would not demand that the people revolt against the party.

These discussions spread to other Russian universities, where the question was even asked whether "the Russian workers, under Lenin's banner, will not rise against their bureaucratized exploiters."

Only extreme subsequent disciplinary measures quieted this outbreak of criticism. But the incident shows that, after 40 years of control, the Communists would seem to have failed in the indoctrination of some of their youth.

With wise and careful effort, we can carry on this battle of ideas behind the lines to great advantage.

We should utilize holes that have been opened up in the Iron Curtain to intensify our efforts to win converts to freedom's cause.

The crucial weapons of such an effort, I am glad to say, cost nothing.

They need no lead time, because we have them.

They are not subject to mechanical failures.

And they have not grown obsolete in 183 years.

They are parts of our life which many of us take for granted. But translated into the lives led by the people behind the Iron Curtain, they become concepts of great motive power.

First of course is the idea of freedom. The Iron Curtain people should know that if they lived under our system, they would be able to walk the streets without identity cards. They could move to a new city without registering with the police. They would be able to apply for the kind of job they wished, instead of being assigned by the state. They could read, think and speak what they pleased.

And then there is self-determnation—people being free to choose their own form of government, without pressure from foreign troops on their soil; living in a land where men can choose their own government representatives in free elections.

Also there is the concept of material well-being. Better pay, better working conditions, a better standard of living.

How interested these men and women would be to study the way we in America have narrowed the historic gap between rich and poor without revolution or bloodshed.

Why should we fear increasing contact between the Communists and ourselves? Their way of life has no attraction for us. But our way of life has much attraction for them.

The more they learn about how we live, the more they will realize that the free world has actually delivered the better life which the Communists promise.

Why is it that the truth about the West is so largely unknown behind the Iron Curtain?

A few comparisons can answer much of that story.

In the last year, while the Russians were spending billions in psychological warfare, our total effort in this field amounted to less than $150 million.

That is about 3 hours' output of 1 day of our annual income.

We have the weapons to lead the world to peace. But we neglect the means of delivery.

Therefore, I recommend a four-point program to help our country mount a new major offensive in this battle for men's minds.

First, there should be intensification of our radio broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain, our presentation of the truth about America.

We should be able to broadcast long enough, loud enough, and on enough channels to break through Communist jamming efforts.

We should not raise false hopes in the hearts of people—but we should keep constantly before them the difference between their life now, and the life they could have under freedom.

Second, we should increase personal contacts between Communist and free world peoples—through travel, letters, and exchange programs.

The young Americans serving as guides at the Moscow Fair have reported that their own personal views and experiences about life in the United States are a most effective counter to Communist propaganda.

Third, there should be better preparation of our Foreign Service people for jobs abroad. We cannot get over our message to another land or person if our representatives do not know the language. They cannot be effective unless they understand the culture and customs of the country in question.

Far too many of our representatives abroad are not properly equipped for their job. It was for this reason that I proposed the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy, to train the free world advocates of a lasting peace so they could present their message with maximum effect.

Finally, there should be a much more effective use of religion as an antidote to communism.

Eighty percent of the people held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain are Christians.

A large percentage of them are devout; and therefore, when their beliefs rub against the atheistic policies of their Communist rulers friction is automatic.

We have not yet made full use of our creeds and religious convictions as a weapon in this cold war. Through broadcasts, we could do much more in emphasizing the strength of our faith.

These broadcasts should stress the dignity of man under God, along with other religious ideals incompatible with Communist doctrine.

Why not, for example, translate and dramatize some of the outstanding religious broadcasts we hear on our own networks every Sunday.

I present these opportunities and suggest how we might use them. At this point, however, let me make it clear that I do not suggest stirring up any revolution.

But we do want to spread the truth, for there is a good chance that this truth will spread dissatisfaction, and thereby force some relaxation of Russian rule, in terms of more understanding and therefore more good will.

The head of the Central Intelligence Agency, Mr. Allen Dulles, asserted in a recent speech that while the Soviet Government is still a closely regulated autocracy, it is not today quite as free as under Stalin to disregard wholly the desire of the people.

This applies at least as much to the Soviet satellites. They would be grateful for the slimmest ration of the fruit of freedom.

If we can help them to that end, all our effort will have been worthwhile—and the goal of peace will be much nearer to mankind.

First Hungary, and then Tibet, have shown the Communists that if control of their satellites is based on force alone, they damage their cause in the uncommitted nations.

And by spreading our ideas, and ideals, we can stimulate apprehension in the countries they still do not control; plus unrest in the countries they do.

Such possible progress through truth can only reduce the Communist threat to our own security.

As our country heads into the uncertain future, testing new methods of diplomacy, facing new techniques, I have faith that this great organization of AMVETS will support these efforts, efforts essential for our security, our prosperity, and the greatest of all blessings, a just and lasting peace.

High Interest Rates Inflationary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the following letter to the editor of the Aberdeen American-News written by one of my constituents, Mr. Herman Pickus, of Aberdeen, S. Dak., will be of interest to the Members of Congress:

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, Aug. 30, 1959]

OUR MONEY MARKET

AUGUST 30, 1959.

To the EDITOR:

The Eisenhower administration maintains that it is greatly worried about inflation, and rightly so. It maintains that a raise in wages for labor, unless accompanied by corresponding increases in production on the part of labor, too, is inflationary, and rightly so. That is about as far as its position is consistent.

Wages is the money that one pays for the use of another man's labor. Interest is the money that one pays for the use of another man's money. The President maintains it is dangerous to our economy and our national well-being to raise wages, but at the same time, and since 1953 when he became President, he and his advisers have advocated and put into effect a tight-money policy which has continually raised interest rates. Now he demands a law which will raise the limit on bonds running for more than 5 years from 4¼ percent to heaven-knows-what.

The last annual budget of the Truman administration carried $4.7 billion for interest alone. The present budget of the Eisenhower administration carried $8.1 billion for interest. On August 3, the U.S. Treasury offered for exchange $13 billion of 4¾-percent bonds for maturing and 1⅝-percent bonds. You can readily see where our interest costs are heading.

The extra interest that the Eisenhower policy has forced on the Treasury, and therefore on all borrowers as well, has added fuel to the fires of inflation until the interest alone paid by the U.S. Government is the second largest item, next only to national defense, in the Federal budget.

Today a 2½-percent bond for which the U.S. Treasury receives $1,000 can be bought for $816, a new alltime low.

The Republican administration thinks it is wrong for labor to strike for higher wages at this time, but can see nothing wrong when capital strikes for higher interest (wages) for the use of its money. What name can you give it except a strike on the part of capital when it refuses to buy the

best security in the world today (U.S. Government bonds) at 4¼ percent but over subscribes $13 billion worth of 4¼-percent bonds. Is it anything but a strike, almost bordering on lack of patriotism, when there is no money to buy bonds at the lower rate, but plenty at the higher rate of interest or "wages."

I wish that some economist, Federal Reserve official, or Eisenhower administration official, would explain how a higher rate of interest is accompanied by a corresponding increase in production as is asked of labor when it asks for higher wages.

HERMAN PICKUS.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK.

Alaska's Air Transport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, of Alaska, recently participated in a most important meeting of short-haul airline operators in a twin city Alaskan appearance in Anchorage and Fairbanks, July 28 to July 31.

This meeting of the Association of Local Transport Airlines featured an address delivered by our distinguished committee member, Senator BARTLETT, on Wednesday, July 29, 1959, in Anchorage, Alaska, saluting civil aviation in Alaska, past and present, and should be of the greatest interest to all the distinguished Members of this body.

Recognizing the active and most constructive aviation role my distinguished colleague has played in this, his first session as a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I ask unanimous consent to have Senator BARTLETT'S address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, OF ALASKA, TO THE ASSOCIATION OF LOCAL TRANSPORT AIRLINES AT ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, JULY 29, 1959

I am exceedingly pleased to be here addressing you this evening, and want to thank you for honoring me with the invitation to take part in your winged visit to Alaska and to speak to you.

My friends from the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce will join me, I'm sure, in expressing our State's warmest welcome to you of the Association of Local Transport Airlines.

I was all the more ready to accept this invitation to be with you of the association because it was extended to me by Col. Joseph P. Adams, general counsel and executive director of this splendid aviation group. I count it a privilege to name Joe Adams as a friend. Joe has a way of getting around on Capitol Hill and in the executive departments of Government which is just as effective as it is proper. Come to think of it, I wonder if all these local airlines would be in existence if it were not for Joe Adams. As a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who served the public interests faithfully and well, Joe insisted that the little fellow get a break. He prevailed. There were many times, I know, when it would have been easier for him to give up, and jettison his cargo, to lower his landing gear and set down in the face of the very formidable opposition which confronted him. But Joe is not that kind of a man. He persevered, and won out. The public won at the same time.

We Alaskans feel we have an important stake in your association. After all, 5 of the local service airlines that are lifelines in our farflung State form a rather substantial part of your membership of 16 companies. We remember, too, that you had the courtesy, when you first organized in 1957, to reflect Alaska in your original name—the Association of Local and Territorial Airlines. And I can well imagine that you were almost as pleased as we when the march of American history caused you to change that name by dropping the territorial reference.

For many long years "statehood" was a word that had a bitter flavor for us. Now it tastes deliciously sweet as it rolls off our tongues. I understand that statehood has been sweetening the balance sheets of the local service airlines in Alaska and Hawaii, too, by booming the business and tourist traffic. For the benefit of any Civil Aeronautics Board auditors who may be within earshot, let it be stated that this comes to me strictly as rumor. I haven't examined a single account sheet. And I hope this effect extends to your members in what we've taken to calling "the other 48 States" by picking up the pace of their traffic.

It is my fond belief that we have had only the first taste of the benefits of Alaska and Hawaii statehood, and that your palates and ours will be more and more delighted as we grow in the coming years.

Now, having welcomed you on Alaska's behalf, I want to do a turnabout and join those of you from outside in saluting our hosts—Alaska Airlines, Northern Consolidated Airlines, Reeve Aleutian Airways, and Wien Alaska Airlines.

The labors of our intrepid bush pilots gave birth to these airlines. And their history, for high drama, is unexcelled anywhere.

Some of you may recall that one of these airline founders, Bob Reeve, was my rival in a delegate election a few years ago. If things had turned out a bit differently, your speaker tonight might well be one far better qualified on the subject of Alaska aviation.

But I can speak with a good deal of experience as a passenger. Having been a patron of your four host companies during the travels involved in eight campaigns plus a lifetime of residence in Alaska, I can truly say that I know them well, and I hold them in the highest respect.

Even so, a speaker is bound to gulp a few times when he gets upon his feet to talk about aviation to a group of aviation experts. But a politician is never noted for his lack of temerity and so I prepare to take the plunge. Not earthward, however. We are on a higher level tonight. Even as a layman, I can and will make a brag. In about 35 years of flying, most of it within Alaska and starting in the very early days of aviation, I have never had a forced landing. And I attribute this remarkable record less to my own luck than to the splendid skill of the Alaska aviators who have manned the Alaska skies from then until now.

Happily, one does not have to be a flyer himself to make reference to Alaska's air-mindedness, air traffic, airports, aircraft and aviators.

Will anyone rise to challenge the statement that Alaskans are the most airminded people in the world? I don't think so—at least not successfully.

Tonight we are dealing almost solely with facts, and very little if at all with fiction. You have no choice in the matter. I am on my feet in firm, if temporary, control and you may escape a barrage of facts only by departing the room. First, I hand to you one which defies analysis, which is simply incredible, which nonetheless has its veracity attested to by the Civil Aeronautics Board. It is that certified Alaska air carriers last year carried 409 passengers per thousand population. This was more than 22 times the U.S. average of 18 passengers per thousand. Let this be a goal for the 11 non-Alaska members of the Association of Local Transport Airlines.

Alaska is the smallest State in population, making up only twelve one-hundredeths of 1 percent of the U.S. total. But in proportion to this population, her air commerce traffic pattern is fantastic.

In 1958, Alaska aircraft departures totaled almost 88,000, equal to 2.8 percent of the U.S. domestic total—or 23 times what the population proportion would lead you to expect. The number of passengers boarded was about 320,600, equal to seventy-four-one-hundredths of 1 percent of the domestic total—or six times what you would expect. Tons of cargo totaled more than 10,000, equal to 2.3 percent of the domestic total—or 19 times what you would expect. Tons of airmail was the greatest of all: 7,192 tons, equal to 4.8 percent of the domestic total—or 40 times the population proportion. When we say "send it airmail," as so many of our firms do on their business letterheads, we really mean it.

Of course there are sound reasons for our air-mindedness. We are short of highway and railroad mileage. The operation of ocean and river vessels is seasonal in many areas, while on the other hand our flying weather in many regions is best in winter. In vast parts of Alaska the local service airline or the bush aircraft is the only practical means of transportation. Then, too, our people have always been eager to be linked as closely as possible with the rest of the United States, which helps explain why we're the flyingest, airmailingest people anywhere.

How about airports? The State Division of Airports estimates that Alaska has about 600 landing areas of all categories. Gene Roguszka, director of aviation, recently sent me a very handy Alaska airport directory. It lists more than 300 airstrips and seaplane landing areas, and provides maps of most of them.

The 1959 National Airport Plan issued by the Federal Aviation Agency includes 270 Alaska air commerce airports—4 of them intercontinental, 9 continental, 68 trunk, 111 local, and 78 seaplane facilities. Also included in the plan are 64 general aviation airports.

Aircraft? Alaska's owned total of active registered aircraft was 1,179 as of last January 1. In this measurement we were not, as you might expect, close to such sparsely settled Western States as New Mexico, Wyoming, and the like—but rather to more populous States like Oregon and Louisiana. To put it another way, Alaska has 1 aircraft for every 180 residents, which is unquestionably the highest ratio in the United States.

Of these 1,179 aircraft, 56 were, under the new FAA classification, listed as scheduled and irregular air carriers. However, some of our carriers are in the next two categories—among the 64 multiengine planes and 420 postwar 4- and 5-place single engine plans listed under general aviation. Finally, in the all other category, we have 639 more aircraft.

At the same time, we had 2,677 active pilots, or about 1 Alaskan out of every 75. A number of others who once were licensed no longer are on the active list. There has been a lot of talk lately about retiring pilots at the age of 60, or thereabouts. This reminds me that I am now engaged

in a research operation aimed at discovering whether A. A. Bennett is still in the land of the living. If he is, you may be sure that he is still flying at an age not exactly known to me but surely such that he would consider a pilot of 60 a mere youngster. From Fairbanks, where he was one of the organizers of the Bennett-Rodebaugh Airplane Co., A. A. Bennett went down to Idaho. He had his commercial license renewed there in 1957 but as yet my research organization has not advanced beyond that point. Bennett was one of the fabulous characters of early-day Alaska aviation. He steadfastly refused to go in for such a modern contrivance as a cabin airplane. Forced finally to give in by the stress of economic competition, Bennett persuaded the Zenith people to build him a special plane with a cabin for the passengers up forward and open cockpit for the flyer way back aft. Bennett was not adverse to telling anyone, most particularly his passengers, the reason for this. He admitted that airplanes fell down once in a while out of the sky and hit the hard, hard earth and he did not propose to be right on top of the engine when and if this occurred. Let the passengers bear the brunt of this while he took charge from the rear, Bennett said.

And he had the clearest blue eyes ever possessed by man. It was this oldtimer's persistent insistence that his eyesight was perfect because when flying he took off his goggles and stuck his head out of the cockpit. He said the gale into which he then faced toned up his optic muscles, and did everything except erase original sin. But I must guard myself for it is easy to start reminiscing about an extraordinary breed of men—the early-day Alaska pilots.

A significant illustration occurred right here in Anchorage last week, revealing that today's men of wings are in tune in every way with those who started Alaska's aviation. This came about when Don Sheldon of Talkeetna was presented with the Special Service Award by General Necresop. This is the highest award given a civilian by the Air Force.

No doubt you have heard Anchorage referred to as the air crossroads of the world. Lest you think our chamber of commerce friends are overstating their case, let me note that in calendar 1958 the FAA towers at International Airport, Merrill Field, and Lake Hood controlled a total of 406,701 aircraft movements. This was only a few thousand less than at the busiest single airport in the Nation—Midway at Chicago.

Our international airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks are in superb locations astride the aerial routes from the Eastern United States to the Far East, and from the Western United States to Europe, over the Pole. I think the day is approaching when—if with God's help the peace is kept—other Asia air centers, in China and the Soviet Union, will be reached by flights from Alaska. But even if Peiping, Moscow, and Irkutsk do not go up on our destination boards, we can nevertheless look ahead to great growth in our international traffic.

While our intercontinental air traffic is significant today and has great future potential, intra-Alaska traffic is even more striking in relation to national figures. FAA records show that some 66,500 landings were made last year at the 28 intermediate airfields in Alaska. That figure is higher than the total of landings made at the 74 intermediate fields elsewhere in the United States. Air carriers accounted for more than one-third of these landings, which testifies to the vigor of our local service airlines.

These airlines offer plane-window vistas of scenery as awe-inspiring as any on the face of the globe. They offer, too, unique recreational tours—to the Arctic, to the Pribilof Islands in the fur seal mating season, to Katmai National Monument for unmatched trout fishing, and to the national park at America's highest peak, Mount McKinley.

Congress and the Federal Government have for years recognized the importance of aviation to Alaska. But our Territorial status and our lack of voting representation have tended to hold back full development of our airports and related facilities.

In 1948 Congress authorized Federal construction and operation of completely new international airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks. The initial appropriation of $13 million was raised to $17 million 2 years later.

Anchorage International Airport received the lion's share of the money and was somewhat more adequately planned and built than Fairbanks International. Today both these airports urgently need runway extensions to meet the demands of the jet age.

The coming of statehood altered our airport situation and presented problems to which the Alaska delegation in Congress and the State government have devoted major attention.

In recommending provisions for the Alaska omnibus bill this year, the Eisenhower administration proposed to get Uncle Sam out of the international airport business in Alaska by giving the Anchorage and Fairbanks Airports to the State without charge.

The omnibus bill—now enacted into law—also provided transitional grants of $28½ million during the 5 fiscal years, beginning with the current one. Of these transitional grants, it was understood $4½ million should be applied to capital improvements at the international airports.

However, the extensions at Anchorage and Fairbanks were estimated at a cost of some $9,800,000. So it became obvious that Alaska would have to get more than the flat sum of $1,350,000 a year it received in recent years under the Federal airports prograra if the improvements were to be made.

Under the old Airport Act, Alaska was of course treated as a territory. It did not share funds on the basis of a land area and population formula, as the other States did. Nor was Alaska eligible to receive any of the $15-million-a-year discretionary fund which could be allocated by the program administrator to the most important projects, wherever they might be. But the territory did have one advantage in the old law. It was required to match funds on a 3 Federal dollars to 1 territorial dollar basis, instead of the split of about 2 Federal dollars to 1 State dollar for public lands States.

Early in this session, the Senate passed a new airport bill. It would have boosted the available funds considerably, but would have continued to treat Alaska—and Hawaii—on a basis similar to that in the old law as far as matching and eligibility were concerned.

The House of Representatives, however, took a quite different approach to the airport bill. The House cut back the proposed expenditures in relation to the Senate version, but on the other hand it proposed to treat Alaska on the same basis as other States.

The House, while it was more modest than the Senate, still favored a higher level program than the old one. But the administration wanted to phase out the entire airport program gradually. So the battle of the budget soon was raging around the airport issue.

Senate and House conferees could not agree on either one of the bills passed, nor on a compromise somewhere in between. As their discussions wore on, tempers grew more and more brittle. The upshot was that, under the pressure of a June 30 deadline, the conferees finally recommended a simple 2-year extension of the old $63-million-dollar-a-year program. Both Houses reluctantly accepted this recommendation.

This meant Alaska would get only $1,350,000 and still would be treated as a territory. When this decision was reached in conference it was simply impossible thereafter to make any changes referring to Alaska especially, or to make any changes at all in any part of the program.

The inadequate treatment of Alaska was so flagrant that the President called for its correction when he signed the Airport Act extension.

Next, the Alaska delegation introduced an amending bill. It would have boosted our State's share of the airport funds by adding money to be distributed under the overall formula and by making Alaska eligible to share on the same basis as other States. However, as more pencils were brought into use to do the necessary calculations, it became apparent that around $11 million in additional funds would have to be authorized by amendatory legislation if Alaska were to receive that which it would be entitled to as a State without any of the other States suffering cutbacks, which they were not at all willing to accept. We were told very frankly that an effort to add any such sum would, if successful, confront a Presidential veto.

Obviously, there was no point then in engaging in legislative exercises in the Congress for the fun of it. And, very factually, I must add that I think that neither the House nor the Senate would have accepted a bill adding to the total airport sum by about $11 million. When the conferees decided, and the two Houses accepted the proposal for a simple extension of the existing act there was no likelihood that any substantial amendment would thereafter be accepted.

What to do, then? The members of the Alaska congressional delegation considered this as a proposition of the greatest urgency and importance. We held meetings with the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget and a group of his people. It was then that the hopelessness of expecting a worthwhile amendment to the Airport Act became apparent. If I may give myself a measure of credit it was about that time that I came to the conclusion that the most we could hope for—and the very vital most it could turn out to be—would be to amend the law so as to permit Alaska to share in the discretionary funds allotted to the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. Following the meeting with the Bureau of the Budget the members of the Alaska congressional delegation had another meeting with Deputy FAA Administrator James T. Pyle, and members of his staff. Whether it was by coincidence or whether in the circumstances it was the only decision that could be made, they and I about simultaneously at this meeting put the stamp of endorsement on a sharing in the discretionary fund.

The Administrator's views were not long after communicated to the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee when Jim Pyle said in part:

"If the amendment which I recommended is adopted, Alaska will receive money to meet its urgent needs out of the discretionary fund. The Administrator will be in a position to insure that such money is used to meet these needs, and he will also require that Alaska be treated like other States in matching the Federal funds advanced. Alaska will also retain the advantage of having its share of project costs financed out of the $1,350,000 already authorized remain at 25 percent."

Mr. Pyle's statement about matching any discretionary funds granted means Alaska must put up 37½ percent to Uncle Sam's 67½ percent. But on the basic allocation Alaska will continue to match one-quarter to the Federal Government's three-quarters.

The amendment recommended by the FAA was accepted by the Senate committee which unanimously reported the bill. The bill was then passed by the Senate last week. I have talked with Chairman HARRIS of the corresponding House committee and urged prompt action on the bill there. I am hopeful that it will be granted, and that affirmative action will be taken.

Does this mean that substantial grants will be made from the discretionary fund to Alaska in the next 2 years? Not at all. It means that Alaska will have a chance, together with every other State, to request such funds. But I am confident that the high urgency of the need for runway extensions here at Anchorage and at Fairbanks, plus other airport needs in Alaska, are recognized by the FAA and will receive appropriate consideration from that agency of the Federal Government. In this connection, I cannot speak too highly of the splendid cooperation which has and is being given to us in the Federal Aviation Agency from General Quesada and Jim Pyle on down. Uniformly, they have been understanding, helpful and possessed of a vigor and will to advance the cause of Alaska aviation.

Taking a look back, you may be interested to know that from the 1947 fiscal year through fiscal year 1959, $7,284,904 had been made available as Federal allocations to Alaska. With this money 38 projects have been physically and financially completed, 12 are physically completed but awaiting financial payment from the Federal Government, 19 are now under construction and should be completed before October this year and 13 are programed for construction.

But even if the discretionary fund amendment becomes law, we shall be operating under a jerry-built stopgap arrangement. The airport program which was extended to mid-1961 is by no means a wholly adequate program to meet the Nation's jet age needs. It is a program that was veto proofed to meet most of the President's objections and to assure the country that the airport program would not expire completely. I think that you will all recall that the President vetoed a new airport program in 1958.

I look forward to passage of a much better and more comprehensive program under the new administration that will take office in 1961. One point of that program must be treatment of Alaska and Hawaii on an equal footing with the other 48 States.

Senator GRUENING, Representative RIVERS, and I were pleased to have been able to help our State government work out arrangements for the change of hands of the two international airports. This change should be completed in the next year. In the meantime, the FAA will operate the airports as the agent of the State.

In addition, the smaller intermediate airports held by the FAA are to be transferred to the State gradually.

When these transitions are completed, the State of Alaska will be operating one of the most extensive and busiest airport systems in the country. It will still need plenty of improvement in the future. We in Congress will do our best to see that it is as adequately supported by Federal grants as any other State's.

When two-motored aircraft first came into use in Alaska, Alaska pilots first went into uniform. I can remember ever so vividly those great big, marvelous Lockheed Electras, which must have carried 12 or 14 passengers and which opened up an entirely new era in Alaska aviation. The pilots denounced the uniforms they were required to wear with an understanding and ability to use the language comparable to that of a cowpuncher trying to lasso a balky steer. But I always thought that secretly they were proud and pleased as could be. Those were the days when on landing the passengers were told to remain in their seats until the pilot and co-pilot had made leisurely and grand exit from the plane.

Today it is otherwise. But the aura of romance, of accomplishment, of derring-do, of pioneering, of adventuring in the far places, still surrounds the Alaska aviator. They are successors to those elder giants of the Yukon of the gold stampede days. Romance. Mystery. Physical daring and hardihood. All of these are elements that go into the makeup of the true pioneer, wherever he is found at whatever time in history. For example, I cannot think of Ray Peterson as the president of a successful airline which is a constituent member of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, so much as a helmet and goggle flyer in the perfect days of long ago.

So I would conclude here by saluting a brave race of men who have carved their place in Alaska history and whose exploits and vision have opened up for us—for all Americans—the vastness of the Alaska skies and the treasures of land and ocean that lie beneath.

Presidential Veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, 1959, the President vetoed the public works appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1960 which contained funds to carry on the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the Committee on Public Works, I, of course, am vitally interested in the flood control, navigation, and beach erosion projects, funds for which are in the appropriation bill because of the fact that these projects were originally authorized by the Committee on Public Works.

I believe that the veto of the entire program is a grave error on the part of the President and is a shining example of his indifference to water resource development.

It will be recalled that in 1956 and again in 1958 he vetoed the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill, title I of which was the work of the subcommittee of which I am chairman, and title II of which is the work of the Subcommittee on Flood Control of which the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable CLIFFORD DAVIS, is chairman. I have had long and sad experience therefore with the President's attitude toward water resource development. This attitude even extends to problems of water pollution, and on this subject the President, in his budget message, reduced the amount contemplated by Congress for appropriation and expressed his desire to eliminate the Federal grant system entirely at a future date.

Returning to the most recent veto, I would like to invite attention to the fact that the total appropriation of $1,206 million is only $50 million in excess of the President's budget. This addition is the amount agreed to in conference after the other body had added a total of approximately $80 million. I feel that the House is to be commended for having reached a compromise which is only 4 percent in excess of the budgeted figure. This is an amount which is well within the margin of error in the cost estimates themselves.

The President gives as his principal reason for the veto the fact that the ultimate cost of these projects will be more than $800 million. He fails to point out, however, that by the time these unbudgeted projects reach their peak of construction, many of those now underway will be completed. The impression is left that some future budget will be increased by $800 million which is, of course, ridiculous since this amount would be spread over many years.

I would also like to point out that the President does not criticize the merits of the 67 projects. In fact he states that the unbudgeted projects in the bill will, at the proper time, make an important contribution to the economic development of the areas in which they are to be built and to the Nation as a whole. The Appropriations Committees gave long and careful consideration to the testimony presented and selected only those economically justified, worthwhile projects which, in its opinion, should go ahead at this time. These projects are only a small fraction of the backlog of projects in the field of flood control, navigation, and reclamation.

I urge every Member of this body, whether he has a project in the bill or not, to vote to override the veto for the good of the country as a whole.

Journey for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the heartwarming way in which President Eisenhower is being greeted abroad, I believe, is something in which we can take great pride as a nation.

In addition, it bodes well for further strengthening and cementing good relations with the Federal Republic of Germany, Great Britain, and, I am confident, with France.

Engaging in one of the great experiments of history—that is, a willingness to meet with Khrushchev, the No. 1 leader of the opposing camp in the world—President Eisenhower is laying solid groundwork upon which to carry on his discussion with the Soviet Premier.

At home, there are, of course, still differing viewpoints on the exchange of visits idea. Naturally, we must—and shall—continue to respect all opinions.

In Wisconsin, and across the country, our newspapers are showing a commendable responsible attitude in evaluating for their readers the significance of the visit—attempting to create the kind of climate in which best results may be obtained from the meetings.

Now, I ask unanimous consent to have two editorials, first, "Journey for Peace," from the Janesville Daily Gazette; and second, "Chinks in the Armor," from the Superior Evening Telegram, of Superior, Wis.—reflecting this responsible attitude—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette, Aug. 28, 1959]

JOURNEY FOR PEACE

President Eisenhower believes deeply and fervently that the cause of peace can best be promoted through personal diplomacy. He has the confidence of most Americans, who pray that his current visit to West Germany, Britain, and France will pave the way toward Western unity in the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks.

By the usual signs of character and spirit, the President reveals a new strength and sureness and health that breathes hope. There is no cocksureness, but rather firm determination and assurance that our cause is right.

Bonn's lusty welcome was quite balanced by Chancellor Adenauer's sober realism and recognition of the critical Berlin issue raised by the Kremlin. After agreeing to respect West Berlin's freedom, at the end of World War II, the Reds have fomented the issue out of thin air. But the firm refusal of the West to capitulate has at least brought the Reds to extend their deadline.

Mr. Eisenhower has a unique talent for creating confidence in negotiations by his show of sincerity and firmness and honesty. He, of course, fully recognizes the problem left by the failure of the foreign ministers' conference to agree on anything regarding West Berlin.

Perhaps he can achieve, first, more unity of purpose and action among our closest allies, Britain and France, before he talks to Khrushchev. Certainly, the three must approach agreement on aim. Prime Minister MacMillan wants a softer approach to Moscow. But he is surely more susceptible to a unified front than Premier de Gaulle, who is always difficult.

The President is assured of an almost explosive welcome from the people in each country, for this is something of a triumphant return—his prestige is at its peak. That welcome should tend to strengthen his hand, but he faces a most difficult and vital task in working with Macmillan and De Gaulle toward an agreed approach to the Soviet Premier.

There will be no departure from Western ideals and principles in the coming exchange of visits with Khrushchev and no abandonment of the captive nations, he has declared.

In every speech he has stated clearly and sincerely that the United States will work toward peace, individual freedom, and human dignity, and that it is ready, if necessary, to fight to prevent aggression, and he included assurance to West Germany of U.S. protection in the Berlin crisis.

There are many who are skeptical that any possible achievement or agreement can come out of talks between the American and Soviet chiefs, but as Vice President NIXON points out, there is no alternative to talk or fight.

This newspaper is inclined to be skeptical, also, but the alternative to talk is so compelling that the anticipated risk seems hardly a choice.

What concerns us is that Khrushchev has achieved this exchange by blackmail, that he raised the Berlin crisis by threat of war after the Soviets signed the Berlin truce agreement.

One can only pray that President Eisenhower is at the peak of his abilities as a negotiator, peacemaker, and statesman, and that his firmness of purpose shall persuade the British and French, first, and shall convince Khrushchev, secondly, that there are grounds for melting the cold war.

[From the Superior (Wis.) Evening Telegram, Aug. 22, 1959]

CHINKS IN THE ARMOR

Calm voices in America have been saying for years that, in the marketplace of ideas, this country's free system has nothing to fear from the competition of communism.

Despite these thoughtful assurances, many men have been troubled by the competitive menace. And some have felt that the way to meet it was to freeze out all mention of communism, and to bar the study of it in our schools.

The calm ones have argued against this course, saying for one thing that the fundamental necessity to "know your enemy" compels us to have the fullest understanding of what communism is and how it works.

Beyond that they have, as noted, contended that the totalitarian concepts of communism could not possibly stand the gaff when set beside our ideals of freedom and democracy.

The highly agitated performance of the Russians in recent days lends strong support to this view.

The visit of Vice President NIXON to the Soviet Union, and the daily showing of American life at the U.S. exhibition in Moscow, seem to have driven the Reds nearly frantic.

They began to attack basic features of the U.S. fair even before it opened. They have taken particular alarm at the showing of a typical American home, and have tried hard to argue that it is untypical. Again and again they have sought to depreciate the things we show, and to insist that they don't prove anything.

By the same token, they have shown fear that NIXON would be judged too favorably by ordinary Russians. The Kremlin complained that translation problems put Khrushchev at a comparative disadvantage in their now famed TV "debate." Soviet leaders have felt it necessary to have him heckled.

If communism is so strong a force, what are they so worried about?

The truth, naturally, is that in their hearts the Russians know communism isn't a worthy competitor of freedom. They're far more afraid of our ideas than we need be of theirs.

For a long time they've jammed our propaganda broadcasts for that very reason. But they obviously can't jam NIXON, and they can't jam our exhibition in Moscow. That's what has them so pitifully upset.

Communism is the weak one in this competition, and Soviet behavior this summer is striking proof of it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in relation to this matter, it was my privilege last night, as I know it was the privilege of millions of Americans, to see the exchange of ideas between Mr. Macmillan and our President. It brought tears to my eyes. These are two great men and humble men—I call them great statesmen—who are seeking to find answers to the troubles of this troubled world. They were giving to the peoples of the world their ideas in relation to the panacea. It was indeed a heart-warming experience, at least for me.

Chemical Warfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the use of gas and germ weapons has received the attention of only a handful of the American people. A major Chemical Corps installation which stores nerve gas lies in my district. I believe the Members and the public will be interested in the report on gas and germ weapons which appeared in the Denver Post editorial section on August 30. I welcome public attention to the issue:

GAS-GERM WEAPONS POSE U.S. ISSUE

(By Robert M. Byers)

At Pugwash, Nova Scotia, last week, 25 scientists from the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. discussed the horrible consequences of gas and germ warfare.

The occasion was the Pugwash Conference of International Scientists on Biological and Chemical Warfare, sponsored by Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland industrialist, and held at Eaton's Pugwash estate, Thinkers' Lodge.

Attitudes expressed by the scientists at this latest conference reflect how most Americans view gas and germ weapons. They are too horrible to contemplate. Only a beast would use them.

It is this attitude, however, which has some of our top military leaders worried.

We seem to have a national reluctance even to discuss or inform ourselves about chemical warfare (CW) and biological warfare (BW).

Some military leaders fear that because of this national blindspot this country is a prime target for an aggressor using gas and germs.

Our present national policy—and there is no indication it will be changed—was set by President Roosevelt in 1943 when he announced to the world we will never use gas or germ warfare unless it is first used against us. That seemed to put CW and BW into a closet, to be opened only in the event of an emergency.

But in the years since 1943, CW and BW research and development has been going on behind a veil of secrecy, not only in this country, but also in Russia.

It was a Russian scientist at the Pugwash meeting who said CW and BW agents could be as devastating as nuclear weapons.

Several key military leaders want to see the American public better informed about BW and CW warfare.

They believe support for continued research and development of these weapons to keep us abreast of the Russians, and more importantly support for research and development of defense against these weapons

can come only from an alert and informed public.

Recent hearings before the House Committee on Space and Astronautics brought out the far-reaching potentialities of BW–CW warfare. The committee has recommended that this country step up research and development in this area from $40 million a year to $125 million a year.

Actually, not all BW and CW agents are as lethal and devastating as is generally believed.

Statistics, published first in 1939, showed that from the standpoint of killing and maiming, gas as it was used in World War I was less devastating than conventional high explosive weapons.

There were 272,000 casualities among American forces in World War I. About a quarter of them were gas casualties. Two percent of the gas casualties died. Twenty-five percent of the nongas casualties died.

Seven percent of the gas casualties were permanently disabled. Conventional high explosives, however, permanently disabled 25 percent of those wounded by them.

America was the only participant in World War I not to use gas.

War gases come in as many different varieties as high explosive shells and each has a specific tactical and strategic purpose.

There are blister gases (mustard) which destroy internal and external tissues and against which personnel must wear special clothing as well as gas masks for protection.

There are choking gases (chlorine) which irritate and inflame the lungs, but against which gas masks are effective.

There are gases which when breathed in find their way via the lungs into the blood and poison it.

There are tear gases and vomiting gases which make it impossible for victims to perform their duties properly.

Blister, choking, and blood gases are considered casualty producing agents.

Gases were not used in World War II. But the Germans carried out research on new agents and before the war was over their scientists had come up with a new kind of agent—the nerve gases.

Nerve gases are deadly. There's no other way of looking at it.

They are based on a chemical modification of the phosphoric acid molecule and are called organo-phosphorus agents. This is the same chemical principle underlying modern insecticides.

Insecticide poisoning works the same way in the body as nerve gas poisoning. Nerve gases, of course, are more potent.

The modified phosphoric acid molecules, when introduced to the body through the lungs or through the pores of the skin, combine with and inactivate a body enzyme called cholinesterase.

This enzyme plays an important role in transmission of nerve impulses to muscles and when cholinesterase is interfered with nerve impulses cannot be transmitted into muscle action. Paralysis results.

A particularly sensitive nerve-muscle system is the one which controls breathing. Nerve gas victims die of suffocation. Their breathing mechanism is interrupted.

A major producer of this country's nerve gases has been the Rocky Mountain Arsenal northeast of Denver. Production there was terminated several years ago when it was felt sufficient supplies had been accumulated.

But nerve gas is not the last word. The newest series of war gases are not deadly. These are the "psycho gases," some of which can destroy the will to fight and others which induce bizarre behavior bordering on insanity. Both effects are temporary.

Maj. Gen. William M. Creasy, former chief Army chemical officer, told a House committee hearing recently there are psycho gases which could be sprayed by a hand aerosol bomb in the Capitol Building and cause half the Members of Congress to start dancing on the tops of their desks while the other half applauded.

These, then, are the potentialities we face in gas warfare. What about germs?

Using bacterial agents in war is considerably more difficult. Our development here is not as far advanced as it is with gas. But we know it is feasible to seed large areas with, say, anthrax germs causing widespread pulmonary disease.

Those not stricken would be needed to care for those who were. The Nation would be paralyzed. An enemy could take over without blowing up a single building, his own troops protected by immunization.

Germs need not kill. But by the time the attacked nation recovers, it would be too late.

Beyond germs that attack humans, there are other organisms which can destroy crops and animals and leave a nation without food.

What about defense? Most military leaders believe an effective defense for the general population against both BW and CW will come only when the public understands these agents and willingly undertakes to meet them.

The Army Chemical Corps has developed an efficient protective mask good against gases and germs and simple enough to be made and sold to the public for $2.50 or $3.

The mask has been turned over to the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization for possible manufacture and marketing. If large numbers of these masks were in the hands of the public, they would lessen the value an enemy might hope to obtain from a BW or CW attack.

Also, the Army has developed filters which detect CW agents in the air and set off a warning alarm.

BW detection filters are more crude. They only indicate the presence of unusual particles in the air without identifying them. This must be done by standard culturing techniques which take precious time. An effective method of detecting a biological attack quickly and accurately has a high development priority.

But do we really need BW and CW defensive and offensive capabilities? Would not an arsenal full of the latest and best nuclear weapons deter any would-be aggressor from attacking us?

General Trudeau, Army R. & D. chief, answers this way:

"We cannot ignore the tremendous potential of chemical and biological defense. Any weakness here is an invitation to an enemy to use these weapons, and against an unprepared nation they could be decisive."

It is my own observation, however, that America should be even more concerned with the development and operation of a foreign policy that will help assure that we will never be called upon to use the weapons which we have created. Surely the same human mind which has the genius to develop these deadly weapons can also come to understand that the best way to destroy an enemy is to make him your friend.

Because this has frequently been stated best by religious leaders we tend somehow to want to keep it out of politics. But truth is indivisible, and we must learn to apply the highest and best truth that we know to our political decisions, even as we would apply them to our personal and business decisions.

Progressive Enid, Okla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a magazine called Lykes Fleet Flashes, published in New Orleans, La., has paid tribute to Oklahoma in its August issue.

In its continuing series on the cities of the United States, the magazine features Enid, Okla., one of our fast growing cities. The article gives a lively account of Enid's progress and its economy, with accent on its grain storage facilities, its oil refining industry, its business generally, and the wide variety of agriculture in its immediate area and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I retain, however, the editorial privilege of failure to endorse every line. As as representative of the entire State, I must state that the view of the writer that the old Cherokee Strip is Oklahoma's most progressive section is not necessarily the view of this Senator, but I assure the Senate that it is one of the most. I am proud of the development of our northern strip, but I also can speak with enthusiasm for many parts of my great State, as the Senate well knows.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENID, OKLA.

Sixty years ago, a spot on the prairie—today, an ideal family city in the heart of a land that offers agriculture, industry, and oil—that's Enid, Okla. Since Oklahoma's statehood, Enid has enjoyed steady growth and development primarily due to these three factors. A young city with an eye on the future, an aggressive city reaching to gain more industries for the betterment of her people, and to develop the potentialities at her grasp.

Here in the center of the State's most prolific wheat farms, excellent storage facilities, operated by six different firms are available. In regard to national storage facilities, the city stands fourth with a total wheat storage capacity of 64,431,500 bushels. The Continental Grain Co. exports 40 percent of all grain; exportation made easy because of the intricate and elaborate railway system to U.S. gulf coast ports.

The strategic location of Enid and the fine railway system make the importation of grain from Nebraska and Colorado for storage purposes convenient.

Enid's largest industry is oil refining. Oil has been a great factor in the growth and development of Enid with major oilfields located on all four sides of the city. Other sizable payrolls are provided by the milling, steel, and butter, and drilling rig manufacturing industries.

Of the two manufacturers of the portable drilling rigs, the George E. Failing Co., of Enid, has been exporting materials since 1934. At the present time, 38 percent of these are exported to worldwide areas such as the Middle East, the Far East, the Philippine Islands, South America, and Europe.

The principal crop raised by farmers in the Enid area is wheat. Close behind is alfalfa, vetch, and other feed crops. Livestock rais-

ing also is important in the area with emphasis on beef cattle. However, many farmers raise dairy cattle, swine, sheep, and poultry. The turkey industry provides important income to many farmers. Additional farm income is provided by marketing whole milk, cream, and eggs.

Consistently, year after year, the city of Enid ranks third in retail sales in the State, being exceeded only by Tulsa and Oklahoma City, both of which have much greater population. The population of Enid increased to an estimated 44,800 in 1958. There are in Enid 475 retail establishments doing an annual business of over $52 million with an annual payroll of $5½ million.

The area served primarily by retail outlets and service industries in Enid covers more than 2,500 square miles and extends in a circle of approximately 75 miles in diameter from the center of the city. Enid's primary trade area covers all of Garfield County and most parts of Blaine, Logan, Kingfisher, Major, Alfalfa, Woods, and Grant Counties.

Enid has 100 wholesale establishments and 59 manufacturing firms with a combined annual business in excess of $108 million. The annual payroll for these wholesale establishments is more than $11 million.

The city owns and operates a fine, modern airport. Air taxi service, rental planes, and pilot instructions are available. Operating from the municipal airport is Central Airlines with six scheduled flights daily, providing passenger, airmail, airfreight, air express, and air parcel post, and connecting with most all other scheduled carriers.

Vance Air Force Base, located 3 miles south of Enid, is one of the vital installations of the Air Training Command. Present training is being given in T–33 jet engine planes. The base was opened originally in 1941. It was closed after World War II but was reactivated in 1948. Vance Air Force Base occupies an area 1 mile wide by one-half mile long. The military and civilian payrolls at the base put about $10 million annually into Enid trade channels. Local purchases by the base add another $800,000 to yearly trade in the city.

There is close coordination between the officers and men at the base and the Enid Chamber of Commerce and other civic groups. Men from the base participate in many downtown events during each year.

The city of Enid has one of the finest school systems in the Southwest. Educational facilities consist of 15 public elementary schools, 4 junior high schools, 2 public senior high schools, 2 parochial schools, 1 parochial high school, 1 school of nursing, a business college, and Phillips University. The pupil-teacher ratio in the city is 22 pupils to each teacher.

Phillips University, with a student body of over 1,000 is a fully accredited university, offering bachelor's and master's degrees in several liberal arts and professional fields. In addition to the normal educational services offered by Phillips University, it also contributes to the cultural facilities of Enid through its national famous fine arts and bible colleges.

Located in the city of Enid are 60 churches, representing 17 different denominations. A recent survey disclosed that 3 of every 4 families in Enid maintain church membership and 7 of every 10 residents of the city attend church regularly. Ministers of the city cooperate among themselves through an active ministerial alliance and many of the city's ministers take part in civic activities.

Enid and immediate area offers much in the way of recreations and outdoor sports. In the city there are three golf courses, a fine country club, 11 parks, 3 municipal tennis courts, 4 swimming pools, 7 softball diamonds, a skating rink, 2 bowling alleys, and 7 motion picture theatres. Enid is located in one of the major hunting areas of the Great Salt Plains. Lake Canton, Lake Carl Blackwell, and Roman Nose Park are within a short drive.

Enid, the county seat of Garfield County, lies in an area which was originally called the Cherokee Strip in the Indian Territory days. The famous Chisholm Trail, which served as a route for the driving of cattle from Texas to the railroad at Abilene, Kans., passed through this area. And from that opening has grown the finest section of the State—the old Cherokee Strip has become Oklahoma's most progressive section, abounding in agriculture and industry.

Tough Workout for Tall IQ's

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID M. HALL
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the August 31, 1959, edition of Life magazine a very interesting article on a special program administered by Western Carolina College at Cullowhee, N.C., in my congressional district. Western Carolina College is one of the first colleges in the country to conduct a program for children with unusually high IQ's, and this article explains the benefits derived by both children and teachers from this program. This college is nestled in the mountains of western North Carolina within approximately 4 miles of my home, and I have watched it grow from a 2-year college for the training of teachers to a 4-year college of the arts. Western Carolina College is demonstrating that it is a progressive institution of higher learning with imagination, the desire to develop the utmost of intellect potential, and the determination to experiment and expand the educational processes. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article, "Tough Workout for Tall IQ's," in its entirety:

TOUGH WORKOUT FOR TALL IQ'S—GIFTED GRADERS DO HIGH SCHOOL WORK IN EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOL

Secure from the distraction of carefree but less bright contemporaries, a group of small geniuses at tiny Western Carolina College in Cullowhee, N.C., have been enjoying the toughest intellectual workout of their lives. Fifty-nine fifth- and sixth-graders, hand picked for the 6-week stint from schools all over the State, are up to their IQ's (average: 166, well over the genius level) in advanced English, math, and science taught at senior high school level. An additional 21 fourth-graders, who are merely brilliant, commute daily from surrounding communities to study French.

The experimental summer school, now in its second year, was devised by the college and Douglas Carter, head of the Winston-Salem School District's gifted child program, one of the finest in the country. It started when a foundation gave the college $10,000 for 20 schoolteachers to study gifted children in action. As things have turned out, the children are profiting at least as much from the study as the watching teachers.

At their regular schools, the bright children complained, they had to listen impatiently to the teacher explaining the same thing four or five times to those of lesser intellectual attainment. At Cullowhee learning is pitched at them as fast as they can handle it. Up at 7, the pupils clean their own rooms and spend three strenuous morning hours in class. Afternoons they engage in research in the library, or in sports, which they pursue as fiercely as their studies. Each evening they have more than a solid hour's study, without talking or leaving their rooms.

The class program is tight and disciplined, but in their library hours the youngsters can strike out on their own. One pupil studied Greek tragedy, another—fittingly enough—the influence of environment and heredity on IQ. Each child, to give focus to his reading, must deliver a lecture in his chosen field, ruthlessly graded by his classmates. The novelty of intellectual competition has delighted them. "These kids really stimulate one another," says Douglas Carter. "The vocabulary flows, the eyes sparkle." Last month, as the summer school ended, the youngsters took their newly acquired knowledge and enthusiasm home with them and unanimously petitioned their teachers for another session next year.

Golden Dollars—Poets and Poetry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, proof is readily available, and I shall supply it here, that Capitol Hill is inhabited not only by statesmen but also by poets, or, at least, versifiers.

Only recently the Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress, Representative RALPH J. RIVERS, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, and I sent to each Member of Congress "a golden dollar" supplied by the Fairbanks, Alaska, Chamber of Commerce and good for $1 in trade—in Fairbanks. These were "minted," or so our covering letter stated, in commemoration of Alaska's admission to the Union. Accompanying the letter sent to each Member of Congress was a rhymed presentation, a wonderful work of art, no less, from the mind and pen of Charlie Hughes, administrative assistant to Representative RIVERS. So that the whole wide world, or, at least, that part of it which turns to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for education and enjoyment, may have the benefit of reading Charlie Hughes' verses, I present them now:

Today we all holler for a good sound dollar,
A low-priced car and a no-wit collar;
But, despite the advance of this thing "automation,"
We can't even return nickel beers to the Nation.

But up in the city of Fairbanks, Alaska
(A wonderful place, if people should ask ya),
The chamber of commerce has done some-about
A fair return for what you put out.

In honor of Alaska's becoming a State,
And joining you all in the "south 48,"
They've minted a dollar that's worth a whole buck
In all sorts of merchandise, including "muktuk."

They've sent us a "golden dollar" for you,
In honor of statehood—a dream come true;
It comes to you with the chamber's good cheer;
But spend it in Fairbanks—it's no good here.

Mr. President, another "CHARLIE" has retaliated in rhyme. He is none other than my friend CHARLIE BOYLE, that is to say the Honorable CHARLES A. BOYLE, Member of the House of Representatives for the 12th District of Illinois. CHARLIE BOYLE responded to the gift of the "golden dollar" in these words:

Your "golden dollar" has been received
What will be done with it can't be perceived
Spending in Fairbanks will have to wait
For it looks like we're stuck in the "south 48."

With adjournment appearing not coming forth
We won't get a chance to journey north
But thanks anyway for your little token
Perhaps we can use it for the highway program.

Mr. President, the situation is getting out of hand. Poetry begets poetry. Before we are done with this we shall doubtless have a sufficient supply of the muse on hand for the publication of a book, or books. Even as I set about to leave my office to go to the floor to make sure that these enduring words were preserved in print for posterity, another stanza reached me, responsive to the "golden dollar" theme. This is from Congressman HOWARD W. ROBINSON of the 37th District of New York:

Thanks for the dollar—it's welcome you bet;
But my only problem is how to get,
From here to Alaska—so please send the fare,
And I'll spring for the beers, when I get there!

Our Tribute to Walter Lee

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to Members to extend their remarks about Walter Lee, I am most pleased to have this opportunity to record my appreciation of his services during the 21 years that he occupied the responsible position of executive secretary of the Committee on the Judiciary. Mr. Lee became associated with the Congress only a few years before I was elected but immediately it was evident by his interest in the problems of my office that he was dedicated to his job. He fulfilled his responsibilities to the very highest degree and it is no wonder that he made so many friends among the Members of Congress. Always courteous, always efficient, and always available to discuss any problem that came within his jurisdiction with any Member of the House, I join my office staff in expressing our appreciation and thanks to him for his never-ending courtesy.

It must be a great satisfaction to him at this time of his retirement from public office to leave knowing that he has done his job well and has merited the praise and thanks of the Members of the House. I hope that the days to come may be filled with many rich blessings and I know that he will look back with contentment and satisfaction over the years which he spent in the service of his Government.

Asserting U.S. Claims in Antarctica: Resolution of District of Columbia Society of Sons of American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the growing interest in Antarctica—particularly as a result of the fine work carried on during the International Geophysical Year—has again emphasized the need to assure that the U.S. interests are protected.

As we know, the continent itself is yet, to a large degree, unexplored, and, in fact, is now the target for a wide variety of explorative efforts by many countries.

As a matter of fact, I am delighted that the University of Wisconsin, one of the finest educational institutions in the country, is sharing substantially in the overall U.S. program to learn more of the "great white continent."

In these days—during which scientific and technological efforts are unveiling new mysteries of the workings of nature—the scientific work being carried on in Antarctica becomes increasingly significant. With the advent of satellites designed for a variety of purposes, strategic contact points at the bottom of the world, too, become increasingly important; not only in terms of scientific advancement, but also for purposes of defense.

Consequently, I have stressed again and again the need for clarifying the U.S. policy for Antarctica, as well as constructive efforts to assure that our interests in this South Pole region are protected.

Recently I was pleased to receive from Mr. Jesse Byron Manbeck, president of the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, a resolution adopted by that organization of descendants of American patriots. The resolution emphasizes the need for assuring the protection of U.S. rights in Antarctica.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution has on several previous occasions urged the Government of the United States of America to assert claims to the lands discovered and explored by U.S. citizens and by official U.S. Government expeditions in the antarctic; and

Whereas the U.S. Government has to date made no official claims; and

Whereas the President of the United States under date of May 3, 1958, proposed to 12 nations that had taken part in collection of scientific data in the International Geophysical Year that for the sake of harmony and peaceful continuance of such scientific work in the antarctic a treaty be concluded among these nations to the effect that, among other things during the treaty no new claims to territory in the antarctic be made; that the status quo be maintained in Antarctica; and that this treaty be signed by all 12 nations and deposited in the United Nations:

Now, therefore, we the District of Columbia Society of the Sons of the American Revolution, do urge the Congress of the United States of America and the Department of State to study thoroughly the effects of the proposals in this proposed treaty to see if they do not deter future explorations by U.S. citizens and official U.S. Government expeditions in the antarctic since they bar any new claims being made; and that the Congress and the Department of State study most carefully the proposal which in effect will place political matters in Antarctica under the United Nations, as this disposition of our rights in Antarctica may lead to the loss of rights since we have as yet made no claims to territory there.

We call to the attention of the Congress of the United States the resolutions of Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON, Representative to Congress from the State of Washington, calling for the assertion of our claims in Antarctica, and particularly we call attention to the proposed treaty of May 3, 1958, which prohibits assertions of claims while the treaty is in effect.

Dr. William M. Coppridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial in the Durham Morning Herald on the occasion of the death of Dr. William M. Coppridge of Durham, N.C., which occurred on Friday, August 28, in Boston.

I knew Bill Coppridge for many years, since he was a medical student at the University of North Carolina and at a time when I was engaged in the practice of pharmacy in Chapel Hill, the location of the university. Through the years our friendship deepened both professionally and personally. The editorial expresses better than I can the wonderful influence of this man's life and his dedication to excellence in all phases of life and action. He was the good physician of tradition and story and his kind are all too infrequently encountered today. There was a dedicated spirit in his practice of medicine which set him apart from the rank and file of physicians. That he who healed so many others could not heal himself is one of the tragedies of our times. A life such as

Bill Coppridge lived should be an inspiration to all of us.

The editorial follows:

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Sept. 1, 1959]

DEATH CLAIMS AN OUTSTANDING PHYSICIAN

Dr. William M. Coppridge, whose death took place Friday in Boston, was one of that company of exceptionally able medical men who have done so much to make Durham one of the Nation's great medical centers.

At the funeral services for Dr. Coppridge Monday, the Reverend Kelsey Regen said of him:

"Were I asked to set in a single phrase the dominant and lasting impact of Dr. Coppridge's life upon my own—over and beyond his personal friendship and his churchmanship—I would say it was his devotion to and zeal for excellence in all things. First—excellence of character. Second—excellence of mind. Next excellence of workmanship. He pursued excellence with a passion. He demanded it in and of himself. He cherished it for his family, his home, his church, his community, the hospital, the university, his profession, and his colleagues in their respective professional organizations. Excellence in all things might be said to have been the guide, mentor, and judgment of his life and labors.

"And yet this pursuit of excellence did not make him, as it does some men, hard or cold or rigid. In him it was mixed and matched by the capacity for warm and enriching friendship, a gracious kindness, an innate compassion and patience, and a virile and practical faith in and commitment to his Lord. Many honors came to him as the fruit of his own excellence; yet he wore them all with genuine humility. And his whole life was seasoned with a delightful and subtle humor."

All those who knew Dr. Coppridge can agree with this estimate.

For almost 40 years Dr. Coppridge had practiced here. His professional standing, earned by successful practice and by notable contributions to the progress of his field of specialization, attained its highest recognition last spring in his election to the presidency of the American Urological Association.

Durham people are always gratified when one of their number receives such high honor. In the case of Dr. Coppridge's election to head the urological body, the unanimous opinion was that it was richly deserved. But it will not be such honors which will keep his memory fresh; a host will remember him for the skill which brought to them healing and relief from pain. To them he will be more than a able surgeon, an outstanding member of the Watts Hospital staff, a respected president of the American Urological Association; to them he will ever be a trusted friend, a beloved physician whose skill and understanding meant the difference between illness and health, between death and life.

The Weyerhaeuser Timber Co.—10 Years at Springfield, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, 10 years ago the Weyerhaeuser Co. came to Springfield, Oreg., and constructed a large integrated pulp and lumber plant. For many years it had owned substantial land holdings in this part of Oregon which had not been operated. At the close of World War II, the Eugene-Springfield area had expanded to become one of the major forest product centers of the Nation, and today, if I am not mistaken, more timber is produced in Lane County than in any other county in our country. The Weyerhaeuser Co. has announced that its policy on the lands that supply this mill, which incidentally are located primarily in Linn and Douglas Counties, are managed to provide a continuous growth of forest trees.

With the huge investment in plant and facilities required for a modern large forest products operation, continuous production in perpetuity cannot be obtained unless such a policy is actually in practice. The welfare of our State and, in fact, our Nation depends upon the universal adoption of true conservation programs.

I am pleased to note the 10th anniversary of this Weyerhaeuser plant at Springfield. It is my hope that the conservation practices followed will permit anniversaries in perpetuity and that the initial dedication to a sustained yield policy, which this company announced when it started operations, will continue to be the guiding principle of its management.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief article from the Weyerhaeuser magazine of August 1959 be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HAPPY 10TH BIRTHDAY

The echo of the carpenters' hammers had barely stopped when the first sheets of paperboard rolled through the presses at Weyerhaeuser's spanking new millsite in Springfield, Oreg. That was 10 years ago this month. Just a few weeks earlier the first load of lumber was shipped from the new sawmill.

Today our Springfield plant is a bigger, busier place, quietly celebrating a decade of growth and progress. When the sawmill at Springfield went into operation in 1949, it was Weyerhaeuser's first new lumber producing unit since 1930. The modern forest products factory was hailed as the most up-to-date forest products plant in Oregon's history. The integrated sawmill and pulp mill operations had been tailored to fit the timber of that region.

Integration was, and still is, the key to operations at Springfield. The sawmill, power plant, and pulp mill were linked by a conveyer system to obtain the greatest recovery of every bit of wood, sawdust, bark, and shavings.

A visitor to the Springfield plant then and now would notice few visible changes around the plantsite. But 10 years of progress have forced the "tailors" to make a great many alterations inside the plant. Ten years ago Springfield produced lumber and pulp. Today, almost every scrap of timber that enters the 460-acre plantsite becomes lumber, plywood, Pres-to-logs, Ply-Veneer, paperboard, or power.

In the words of Harry Cullens, "They use everything but the noise." Harry is a clean-up man in the planer mill. He is also 1 of the almost 300 employees who have watched the Springfield plant grow from the ground up. "When I started," Harry said, "all they had on the grounds was the field office. It was really interesting to watch the plant go up. I'd never seen anything like this before. The immensity of the operation impressed me. In looking back now, it's a marvel to me how everyone worked together to produce all these products."

Land Supervisor Les Calder gets the credit for being the first man on the scene. Les came to the Eugene-Springfield area as a Weyerhaeuser land agent in 1940 and has watched both plant and community grow. "Our people have worked hard in both Eugene and Springfield. We've built a fine relationship between plant and community. It's one of our best achievements in the past 10 years," Les said. "You have to expect progress, but the thing that was most startling to me was the rapidity with which it came. Ten years ago we had no idea we would be producing some of the items we make today."

Tucked away in the bottom drawer of a battered filing cabinet in the millwright office is a unique record of many of the men who helped the plant grow. The information is all there in Millwright Foreman Bill Grout's time books. Bill has the name of almost every man who helped build and maintain the plant since March 1948. Bill came to Springfield after 20 years at Weyerhaeuser's Everett plant. "We've seen lots of gradual improvements," he said: "They come along with anything. You never stand still."

"I've learned a lot in the past 10 years," said Millwright Jim Sneddon. "I believe that anybody who was here during construction, then left, and came back now wouldn't know the place. I hope to be around for the next 10 years. There will probably be as many changes as there have been in the past. This was a busy, hectic place during construction. Things have settled down to a more routine pace now. But the people are nice. I like the area. I think I'll stay."

Gang Sawyer Leon Mingo was on hand when the first log entered Weyerhaeuser's new sawmill at Klamath Falls, Oreg., in 1929. In 1949 he ran the first timber through the gangsaws as Springfield. "I don't know how much lumber I've sawed," he said. "I'll bet if it were laid end to end, it would go around the world several times. I've seen lots of improvements in the mill, too. It's been a good 10 years here. I like the valley, the rich soil, the climate, and the people."

Accounting Clark Dortha Benton came to Springfield on sort of a vacation. "We liked it so much we decided to stay," she said. Dortha started in the accounting office in January 1949. "The company has made considerable progress in many things," she said. "We've gone through a lot of growing pains, too. Some times have been trying. But it has been a thrill to know the people here, and to watch the plant grow. We'll probably be surprised at what will come up in the next 10 years. Things will be better, though. We know the company will be here a good many more years. It's a good secure feeling."

Henry Hull, a pipefitter for the Springfield pulp mill, started the same month the pulp mill began operations. "The plant has gotten bigger," he said. "We've had our ups and downs. But it's as good a place to work as a person could find."

"We have gone through two major expansions," said pulpmill Carpenter Clarence Jeffers. "And I don't doubt that we'll see a lot more changes. There are good opportunities here if a man wants to take them. We've had some awful good people here, and probably will have 10 years from now."

Warren Stillwell has been with the millwright crew since the pulpmill started. "I've enjoyed the whole 10 years," he said. "Working on and in a new mill, watching

it grow from the ground up, makes it lots more interesting. I've seen a lot of improvements and expansion. What's more, I really like it here. You couldn't ask for better country. We've got a nice mill and good men. What more could you ask?"

It has been a decade of continuous progress and improvement at Springfield. When the mill opened, it was devoted to lumber manufacture and pulp production exclusively. In 1950 a Presto-Log plant was added. A plywood plant went into operation in 1952. In 1953 two new products, ply-veneer and edge-glued lumber, went into production. In 1956 an end-gluing operation started producing high quality panels from short length boards. The pulpmill has more than doubled its capacity and has improved the quality of paperboard produced. It is an endless program, aimed at achieving complete utilization of the raw material from the 270,000-acre Calapooya Tree Farm.

"We're using more of the log," said Springfield Lumber Manager R. A. Kronenberg. "A more intensive utilization of what our lands produce has meant more jobs at Springfield. This plant was expected to employ about 650 people in the lumber division. Increased utilization has created jobs for about 1,400 in lumber division operations at Springfield. There will probably be changes in the next 10 years, just as there were during the first decade of operation. We will undoubtedly be using still more of the log. Our goal is complete utilization."

Pulpmill Manager J. O. Julson said, "It has been a decade of gradual improvement for the pulpmill. We have had two plant expansions that have more than doubled our productive capacity and have improved the quality of our pulp. Our employees have all taken part in helping to make this a better community."

The cities of Springfield and Eugene have grown in the past 10 years. Both communities are busy industrial centers. All in all, it has been a big, busy decade for the employees at our Springfield plantsite. But no one is spending too much time looking backward. They are too busy keeping in step with progress.

The Misunderstood Bloodhound

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, there are a few of my colleagues here who know of my interest in and love of dogs, particularly of the hunting variety. My esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the esteemed gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] have had some of the dogs which I formerly raised of the Red Bones strain.

While I have never had any experience in raising a certain type of hunting dog, and while I am glad to say I have never been pursued by one of this particular kind of dog, I was interested in reading an editorial in the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, published in my district, on "The Misunderstood Bloodhound." Since I always believe in clearing a good name, especially in the world of dogdom, I think other dog lovers in this House will appreciate the editorial describing the true nature of this misunderstood animal, and I would further draw the analogy of pointing out that all of us here, who try to keep our noses to the ground in legislative fashion, should take care that in the pursuit of our obligations and assignments and commitments here, we do not miss, as did Mr. Thurber's bloodhound, all of the beauty of the outside world.

The editorial follows:

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Aug. 31, 1959]

THE MISUNDERSTOOD BLOODHOUND

Contrary to popular impression, the bloodhound is the friendliest of dogs. He is docile and likes people.

We have this on the authority of the American Bloodhound Association. Out to do right by its client, the association in its publicity releases heaps blame on Harriet Beecher Stowe for the bloodhound's unsavory reputation.

Mrs. Stowe, "the little lady," as Lincoln said, "who started the war," not only gave a distorted picture of slavery in the Southern States, as all southerners know; she also slandered the bloodhound.

Recall the chilling scene of Eliza crossing the ice in the dramatic version in Mrs. Stowe's classic, "Uncle Tom's Cabin": Ice floes bobbed, a heavy snow fell, thunder and lightning resounded and flashed backstage. But these were nothing compared with the baying of Simon Legree's bloodhounds in the background.

Even today TV and movie shows reach the ultimate when the sheriff says, "Call out the bloodhounds." Harriet Beecher Stowe set a pattern of viciousness which has hounded bloodhounds way into the middle of the 20th century.

"If the bloodhounds had caught Eliza, fleeing across the ice," says the American Bloodhounds Association, "they merely would have licked her face." Mistakenly identified for years as a beast that "trails his quarry and ruthlessly attacks," the bloodhound is in fact "one of the friendliest of dogs."

Instead of chewing his quarry to pieces, the bloodhound identifies the object of his search by placing his paws on the individual's shoulders and licking his face.

Of course, we too might have fallen for the stage, screen, and video version of the bloodhound had we not read some years ago James Thurber's story of "The Patient Bloodhound" in his "Fables for Our Times."

In it he told of a bloodhound which lived in Wapokoneta Falls, Ohio, and was put on the trail of a man suspected of a certain crime. The bloodhound followed the man to Akron, Cleveland, Buffalo, Syracuse, Rochester, Albany, and New York. The dog missed the Westminster dog show going on at the time because the man got on the first ship for Europe.

Naturally, the faithful bloodhound followed and when the two got off at Cherbourg the dog trailed him to Paris, Beauvais, Calais, Dover, London, Chester, Llandudno, Bettws-y-Coed, and Edinburgh, where he wasn't able to take in the international sheep trials. From Edinburgh the trail led to Liverpool, but since the man immediately got on a ship for New York, the dog didn't have a chance to explore the wonderful Liverpool smells.

Back in America the bloodhound traced the man to Teaneck, Tenafly, Nyack, and Peapack—where the dog didn't have time to run with the Peapack beagles. From thence the manhunt led to Cincinnati, St. Louis, Kansas City, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Columbus, Akron, and finally back to Wapokoneta Falls. There the man was acquitted of the crime he had been followed for.

What was the animal's reward for all this fidelity to the main purpose? He developed fallen paw-pads and was so worn out that he could never again trail anything faster than a turtle. Furthermore, as Mr. Thurber pointed out, since the dog had gone through the world with his eyes and nose to the ground, he had missed all its beauty and excitement.

In other words, not only has the bloodhound been misunderstood, but in keeping his nose, if not to the grindstone, then certainly to the trail, he has become a drudge in the process. The bloodhound's lot, like the policeman's is not a happy one.

Activities of the New York State Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York State Society of Washington recently completed its golden jubilee year. The society, which seeks to retain the strong ties of its members with the Empire State, has held a number of functions and participated in a number of events during the year.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a compilation of the year's activities of the New York State Society.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF THE NEW YORK STATE SOCIETY'S ACTIVITIES FOR 1958–59

Your society has just completed its golden jubilee year. There has been substantial progress both in the number and type of functions held, and in membership, which increased by 30 percent.

We started off the year with a picnic at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Pascal D. Fallon. Four formal parties were held at the Shoreham Hotel and four at the Roosevelt Hotel.

Your society participated in the Cherry Blossom Festival. We were honored by the presence of three foreign Ambassadors, two U.S. Senators, and many distinguished guests at the coronation dance on March 6, when Miss Diana Anfuso, daughter of Congressman ANFUSO, was crowned by Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas. During Cherry Blossom Week, on April 8, we were again honored by a foreign Ambassador, when the Ambassador of Spain held a reception for our members, our congressional delegation and our princess. At the Cherry Blossom Festival Parade we were awarded first prize. The trophy was presented by Mr. Clarence Arata, executive director, Washington Convention and Visitors Bureau, at our member party in April. Several of the maids of honor from Marjorie Webster Junior College rode on the float along with the princess. The float was sponsored by F. & M. Schaffer Brewing Co., of Brooklyn. The trophy will be sent to them for their trophy room after we have displayed it in several local establishments in Washington.

We were supported in our efforts by donations from New York corporations, including Remington Rand, Hickok Co., Yale &

Towne, Taylor Wine Co., and American Safety Razor Corp. In addition we received several donations from local stores; Woodward & Lothrop, Barricini, Hot Shoppes, Gude and Bromwell & Co., also one of our members.

Congratulatory letters were received from both Governor Harriman and Governor Rockefeller.

Through public appearances, newspaper stories and television and radio shows the activities of your society were kept before the public throughout the year. Your president appeared on WRC–TV, as well as on local radio stations. Your society was represented by its president at the Empire State Chamber of Commerce dinner, which was attended by Members of Congress, distinguished New York citizens, and delegates from many local chambers in the State of New York.

Our golden jubilee year not only marked the successful completion of the first 50 years of your society's existence, but provided a cantage-point from which we were able to evaluate past accomplishmets and plan worthwhile activities in the years that lie ahead.

Respectfully submitted.

DOROTHEA J. MACKAY,
ETHEL MAY NODEN,
Historians, New York State Society.

Walter Lee

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues and I were saddened to hear of Walter Lee's decision to retire at the end of this session of Congress. For more than 21 years, he has served faithfully and efficiently as legislative assistant to the House Subcommittee on Claims. We were further distressed to learn of his brain hemorrhage and cerebral upset last week which confined him to a hospital for emergency treatment. We note that improvement has been made and that he is now resting quietly at home with his loved ones.

Walter Lee will be sorely missed by many of us in the halls of Congress. Fifty-one Members are still in the House of Representatives who were here when Walter first came to serve more than two decades ago. All of us who have had anything to do with this House subcommittee will remember him for his cheerfulness and cooperation in preparing and handling the difficult and complex claims bills presented to Congress. In his work, Walter Lee was one of those quiet, capable, conscientious souls who are never fully appreciated until they have left. Only then is the full measure of their contribution, of their helpfulness, of their devotion, realized. We wonder, certainly in the case of Walter Lee, how we are going to get along without him.

At this time let us, first of all, pray that our colleague will soon regain his health. Then may we all wish him and his wife many happy, rich, and full years of retirement that they so richly deserve.

Observant Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the animated public discussion over the visit of Russian Premier Khrushchev has almost driven news of the steel strike off the front pages and out of the minds of many Americans. A timely reminder of the importance of the steel strike and its impact on inflation and rising prices has come to readers of the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, from Mr. Maurice J. Grant, of Manchester. I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Grants letter to the editor printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader, Aug. 28, 1959]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

OBSERVANT CITIZEN

Enemy No. 1

Addressed to William Loeb: While many of our citizens are eyeing with distaste the approaching visit of the Russian Premier Khrushchev, they are giving apparently scant consideration to the present steel strike. Certainly we must be concerned with the enemy from without our Nation; but we should be equally worried about the enemy from within.

I refer, of course, to the disastrous effect of inflation upon our economy.

The statements of disfavor regarding the Soviet official's visit here are, at least subconsciously hinged upon a fear of war. But how many of our citizens realize that the constant attack of inflation upon our economy could make us the losers in a war with Russia even before the shooting started? All too few of our average citizens, among whom I include myself, are taking the time to be concerned with the ever mounting cost of operating our Government and our private businesses, an increasing cost which does not give us a compensating increase in the value of our money.

As an example the cost of a jet fighter plane today, according to published reports, is almost five times the cost of a similar plane purchased by our Government at the end of World War II.

Now comes the statement from steel management that a wage increase is inevitable. Just as inevitable is an increase in the price of this basic commodity which will just as inevitably produce price increases throughout our economic structure. Does not this wave a red—not a Soviet Red—flag warning us that the maggots of inflation are tearing away at the internal value of our dollar?

When are we going to learn that a price increase—and this is exactly what a wage increase means—in steel is going to reflect itself throughout our entire business world? When are we going to learn that the worker who is forcing this price increase upon all of us Americans is not going to be a real gainer but actually will be the loser in the long run because everything he sets out to buy with his heavier pay envelope will be at a price that will far outstrip any wage increase he can hope to gain from steel management?

None of us who have been in business long want any more Federal interference in our business; in fact, we can do with substantially less than we have today.

But it seems to be that if our Government can dictate how few cows should be milked and how short a crop should be planted under the guise of helping the farmer, then the same Government could find some way of helping the wage earners through a simple explanation of the dangers of inflation and the dread effect of an everlasting, never-ending spiral of price increases. Somewhere at some time those who are in a starting position in the wage-price raise for the top must come to grips with the fact that they are committing suicide by consantly pressuring for more and more. They must understand that eventually they will get less and less.

These people, whether they be with union leaders or the workers themselves, who demand the wage increase or the millowners who grant that demand, must understand that by feeding the flames of inflation they are becoming internal enemies of our economic system, and they must be stopped.

Our President has asked us to hold the line. He should receive all of our support regardless of political affiliation.

MAURICE J. GRANT.

MANCHESTER.

Juvenile Gangsterism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. HALEY
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, for the past few years we have been talking about juvenile delinquency. While numerous groups have been diligently seeking some sound solution, for the most part, we have simply been talking without taking enough positive action to curb juvenile crime. We have been shocked by recent news reports of juvenile crimes, and it is readily apparent that we must begin to take more affirmative action in this matter.

In this connection, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Lakeland Ledger, of August 31, 1959, entitled "Juvenile Gangsterism." Mr. Harris G. Sims, the distinguished editor of this fine newspaper, has been a devoted leader in this field. His opinions are certainly worthy of every consideration. In this editorial, Mr. Sims raises a point that I feel should be emphasized, that being, we must put stronger emphasis upon law enforcement. The editorial follows:

JUVENILE GANGSTERISM

The spotlight is upon New York City at the moment because two more teenagers were killed in a gang fight there during the weekend. Those two fatalities raised to eight the total of teenagers killed in New York gang warfare this year.

It is not surprising that the violence there has taken on the pattern of adult gangsterism. Juvenile toughs are being "imported" from other sections of the city to do the killing.

New York police and other adults there who are concentrating their attention on

the problem frankly admit they are baffled. As soon as they get juvenile gangsterism in one area quieted down, violence among teenagers breaks out in another area.

It is a sickness that has the juveniles acting in such a manner, a sickness brought on by a combination of circumstances. They are restless, unstable, insecure youngsters caught in a web as baffling to them as it is to the law-abiding members of society.

Much of it is traceable to lack of proper guidance at home. Many of the youths perpetrating the violence live in homes of squalor, poverty, and strife. Most have time on their hands and have not been taught how to use it constructively.

They have become animals on the prowl, attacking adults as well as other teenagers. They are making a blind effort to prove themselves. Many go along with the gang pattern because in the gang they find security.

Unfortunately, the sickness is not confined to New York City teenagers. In other large cities, juvenile gangsterism is a problem of alarming proportions. Some of the most vicious of the juvenile gangs are in Washington. Night after night for many months, they have been roaming the streets and attacking people within sight of the Capitol itself.

It is not a sickness that can be cured by strict law enforcement. Law enforcement as applied to the present situation is much more punitive than preventive.

Until a long-range preventive program can be made to work much more extensively, however, there is no choice but to put strong emphasis upon law enforcement. The gangs will continue to operate but not with such ruthless abandon when they know they will be dealt with roughly by the police.

The whole problem presents a phase of American life our diplomats, missionaries, and others cannot easily explain away as they tell the people of other lands about American culture.

Address of Dr. Robert L. Sumwalt, President of University of South Carolina

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the able and knowledgeable president of the University of South Carolina, Dr. Robert L. Sumwalt, on Friday, August 28, 1959, addressed the Wade Hampton Camp of the Sons of Confederate Veterans in Columbia, S.C. Dr. Sumwalt's subject was the University of South Carolina and the Confederacy, and his remarks illustrate clearly that the University of South Carolina has probably an unequaled record in its contributions to the cause of southern independence during the conflict of 1861 to 1865. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Sumwalt's remarks, as printed in the State on August 30, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Aug. 30, 1959]

SUMWALT SPEAKS ON CAROLINA AND THE CONFEDERACY

(The following address, on "Our University and the Confederacy," was delivered Friday by Dr. Robert L. Sumwalt, president of the University of South Carolina, before Wade Hampton Camp of the Sons of Confederate Veterans.)

Commander Wright, members of Wade Hampton Camp, Sons of Confederate Veterans, and guests, the opportunity to address this group is an occasion for both pride and humility. Of course I am proud that you have invited me to talk about our beloved university and its part in the tragedy of 1861 to 1865. At the same time I am humble because even if I were an authority on the Confederacy—and no words of mine could enhance the record of patriotism, honor, and valor established by the illustrious South Carolinians of whom I shall speak.

We are on the eve of a centennial celebration which will give appropriate recognition to the awesome events of the Nation's great tragedy.

I shall use the term "university," although the institution was known on various occasions as the South Carolina College and the South Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanics.

PREWAR LEADERS

In the crucial years leading up to the actual war, many distinguished alumni were leaders in the events which shaped the course of history. Among them were Wade Hampton, George McDuffie, William C. Preston, James H. Hammond, Francis W. Pickens, Milledge L. Bonham, Maxcy Gregg, and James H. Rion.

One of the most prominent opponents of the secession movement was James L. Petrigru, valedictorian of the class of 1809.

One of these leaders, Francis W. Pickens, was Governor of South Carolina when Fort Sumter was fired upon and another, Milledge L. Bonham, succeeded Pickens as wartime governor early in 1863. Meanwhile, Bonham had served as a brigadier general on the battlefields of Virginia.

UNSELFISH DEVOTION

The unselfish determination of South Carolina's soldiers is typified by James H. Rion, fiery Winnsboro attorney. Rion, a member of the class of 1850, was colonel of his regiment until he lost an officers' election, whereupon he enlisted as a private and served just as enthusiastically. Later he received an appointment as colonel and served gallantly in this capacity until Appomattox.

Maxcy Gregg, a grandson of the first president of the university, was an ardent secessionist. On one occasion he was chairman of a meeting on the campus at which a number of politicians had been invited to speak on seccession. When the audience assembled but the speakers failed to appear, Maxcy Gregg apologized to the crowd, then embarked on a 3-hour speech which was enthusiastically received.

FIRST REGIMENT

Maxcy Gregg, a member of the class of 1835, had other distinctions. He was one of the most colorful figures the university has produced. He worked for secession, his State was the first to secede, and he is credited with having organized and commanded the first troops raised to defend South Carolina—the First South Carolina Volunteer Infantry Regiment. Of all the initial forces in all the seceding States, his was the first regiment to join the Virginians, and Gregg was also the only native Columbian to attain general rank in the Confederate Army.

On December 13, 1862, General Gregg was mortally wounded while leading his brigade on the Fredericksburg battlefield. As he lay dying, he dictated this telegram addressed to Governor Pickens to his adjutant, Col. A. C. Haskell of the class of 1860:

LAST WISH

"I am severely wounded, but the troops under my command have acted as they always have done, and I hope we have gained a glorious victory. If I am to die now, I give my life cheerfully for the independence of South Carolina, and I trust you will live to see our cause triumph completely."

Apprised of Gregg's death, Gen. Robert E. Lee said, "From my first acquaintance * * * I have admired his patriotism and his unselfish devotion. He was always at the post of danger, and his services in this army have been of inestimable value. The death of such a man is a costly sacrifice, for it is to men of his high integrity and commanding intellect that the country must look to give character to her councils, that she may be respected and honored by all nations. Among those of his State who will proudly read the history of his deeds, may many be found to imitate his noble example."

GREATEST GENERAL

Wade Hampton, of the class of 1836, was South Carolina's greatest general of the Confederacy and its first citizen in the postwar years. My friend, the late Dr. J. Rion McKissick, former president of the university, often stated that Wade Hampton was "the George Washington of South Carolina."

At the beginning of the war, Wade Hampton was recognized as the wealthiest planter in all of the South, and he used this wealth to equip Hampton's Legion which he led brilliantly on many battlefields in Virginia. A man with no previous military training, he became a lieutenant general, and with the death of Jeb Stuart succeeded him as chief of cavalry of Lee's Army of Northern Virginia.

TWENTY GENERALS

Many other former students at the university became distinguished officers, and the institution furnished the Confederacy with no fewer than 20 generals of whom one was a lieutenant general, 3 were major generals, and 16 were brigadiers.

Maj. Gen. M. C. Butler of Edgefield, who left the university in 1855 while a junior as a result of the "Guard House Riot," reached two-star rank before his 30th birthday.

Martin Witherspoon Gary of Cokesbury, left the campus in 1852 because of his part in the "Great Biscuit Rebellion," but he completed his education at Harvard and subsequently became a major general.

The third was John A. Wharton of the class of 1850. Much of his service was performed west of the Mississippi.

SERVED WITH LEE

Most of the 16 brigadiers were infantry or artillery officers serving with General Lee in Virginia, having entered the army as company grade officers early in the war, then advancing from rank to rank until attaining bridgade commands in 1864 or 1865.

A. C. and J. C. Haskell and Dixon Barnes were among the many able Confederate colonels representing the university.

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis, the talented historian of the university, writes: "There were scores of majors, captains, and lieutenants and, serving with perhaps less distinction but with no less devotion were the privates and noncommissioned officers. * * * All these brave men, whether corporals or brigadier generals, served to the utmost of their ability, and there is no reason for disagreement with the statement of Iredell Jones, lieutenant in the cadet company and later

captain in the Confederate Army, that all Carolina men who were physically able to bear arms did service in the Army of the Confederacy."

ONE HUNDRED AND SIXTY DIED

How unfortunate it is that there is no complete record of the alumni who served the Confederate Army. It is estimated, however, that approximately 160 of these brave men gave their lives for the Confederacy as a direct result of the conflict.

Although the university had been established for 60 years and had been in operation for 56 when war came, only two alumni served in the Union Army. This may be unparalleled by any other institution of comparable age in the Secession States.

TWO UNION SOLDIERS

The two Union soldiers were sons of Prof. Francis Lieber, for whom our Lieber College is named. An able scholar and educator, Professor Lieber opposed slavery and secession so vigorously, and dispensed his views so openly and freely, that he left the campus under pressure in 1856. He relocated in New York, along with two sons, Norman and Hamilton, who later became Union soldiers.

A third son, Oscar, remained in South Carolina. Oscar Lieber was the State geologist and had grown up in South Carolina except for a few years spent in Germany to complete his education. He kept one of his father's slaves when the family moved north, and continued to live on the campus with another faculty member.

CONFEDERATE BROTHER

Oscar Lieber lost his life in 1862 while fighting in Virginia as a soldier in Hampton's Legion, and subsequently Professor Lieber wrote, "My son Oscar fell on the Southern side, and his two brothers went to Richmond to place the tombstone on his grave. They fought and bled on the national side. You see the Civil War has knocked rudely at my door."

The records show that all but two members of the 1861 faculty served the Confederacy—as soldiers or as civilians active in the war effort.

TRUSTED LEE AIDE

Charles S. Venable, professor of mathematics and a native Virginian, was a man of mature years and judgment at the outbreak of the war. The students comprising the cadet company which volunteered for service in Virginia elected him their captain, and later he served as a major on General Lee's staff, perhaps the closest and most trusted of the great commander's aides.

Robert W. Barnwell, professor of history and political economy, joined the first cadet company as chaplain at Sullivan's Island in the spring of 1861. Later, after this company was disbanded, he organized the Hospital Aide Association in Virginia, and remained in this work until his death of typhoid fever in Richmond in June 1863.

Beverly W. Means, treasurer and librarian of the university at the outbreak of the war, was fatally wounded in the Battle of Seven Pines in the summer of 1862.

SOLDIERS' RELIEF

Prof. Maxmillian LaBorde was chairman of the faculty during the war years, and was the founder and chairman of the Bureau of the Central Association for the Relief of South Carolina Soldiers, an organization which dispatched supply cars weekly to the Army of Northern Virginia, to Charleston and the coast, and to the Army of the West.

John LeConte, professor of natural and mechanical philosophy, held the rank of major and was in charge of the Confederate Nitre works in Columbia, located at the Old Fair Grounds on Elmwood Avenue, where Logan School now stands.

His brother, chemistry Prof. Joseph LeConte, was made chemist for the Nitre and Mining Bureau with the rank and pay of major. He had previously manufactured medicines for the Confederacy.

CAMPUS SAVED

Our physical plant was saved during the burning of Columbia the night of February 17, 1865, because buildings on the campus were being used as hospital facilities for the wounded of both sides. These same buildings formed the nucleus of the present institution and continue to provide educational resources for the thousands of descendants of the Men of Carolina who served so nobly in the cause of the Confederacy.

It has been a very special pleasure to share this evening with you and to recall some of the great South Carolinians and momentous events of the Confederate War, especially because these concern an institution which I hope means as much to you as it does to me, your University of South Carolina.

President's Veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it was most regrettable that the President saw fit to veto the public works appropriation bill. It will be noted that he did not question the merit of the 67 projects which had been added to the ones which he had originally recommended. On the contrary, he based his veto essentially on the grounds that the timing was bad.

Some opponents of reclamation, in their news releases, have suggested that there were phony or pork-barrel projects mixed into the public works bill, and that it was therefore necessary to first weed them out. I, personally, challenge the truth of this proposition. I have placed myself in touch with the officials of the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and with the Army Corps of Engineers. I have been assured by those who did the planning on these projects that all 67 of them have a favorable cost-benefit ratio, and that from an engineering and economic point of view, they are meritorious.

Why, then, was the bill vetoed? The reason given is that it was for budgetary considerations. In other words, this is the year for no new starts. Regardless of the need, there shall be no new starts. We cannot afford them.

This shortsighted policy was first conceived at a time when it was thought that the 86th Congress might embark on a wild and uncontrolled orgy of extravagance. The actual record, however, shows how wrong this hypothesis turned out to be. Yet the misconceived policy of no new starts still lingers on. The evidence is strong that we shall end this session with an impressive surplus. No person interested in balancing the budget can honestly say that the $30 million which the public works appropriation bill adds to our budget for fiscal 1960 will throw it out of balance.

The administration has therefore shown an inflexibility and unwillingness to adapt its program to ever-changing realities.

When a private utility company launches a plan to spend many hundreds of millions of dollars of equity funds and borrowed funds for capital expansion to meet the needs of a growing community, we give it the accolade of praise and public approval. We call it a bold and imaginative step forward. We call it good business, and a sound investment in the future, because every dollar spent will bring back rich and ample returns.

But when the United States of America makes a capital investment in its future in the form of dams and reservoirs, flood-control projects, and irrigation works, those who philosophically oppose such measures cry out: We cannot afford them.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot afford an investment in the sound and economical utilization of our natural resources to create more business and more wealth and more productive capacity, to take care of our exploding population which, within the lifetime of many of you in this room will reach 250 million and more, then what under heaven can we afford?

This money is not in the nature of a gift. It is a loan. It will be repaid, with interest. It is secured, and that security consists in our mountains, our rivers, our fertile prairies, and our almost-unlimited productive capacity. This security is as good as America is good.

In 1915 the U.S. Government undertook to construct in the State of Utah what is known as the Strawberry Reservoir project. As was to be expected, it was resisted by those to whom its immediate cost seemed more important than its ultimate benefits.

Let us look at the record of this humble little project, which cost $3⅓ million.

Forty-four years later we find that it has paid back 80 percent of its initial cost, with interest. In addition, it has made possible the growing of $78½ million worth of crops, which represents 22 times the value of the original investment. Power, municipal water, and recreation associated with the project bring in one-half million dollars per year. Personal incomes directly attributable to this project amount to $18 million per year. Twelve thousand people live on land made livable by this little project, and Federal taxes paid into the Federal Government from income made possible by this project amount to some $4½ million a year, which is more than a million dollars a year in excess of its entire cost. All of this, as a result of a mere $3⅓ million investment—and this is just the beginning.

Mr. Speaker, the Strawberry Reservoir, in 1915, was a new start. I am thankful that that did not deter wise

men from seeing its value to the future of this Nation.

In closing, I cannot resist the temptation, half in whimsey, but half in seriousness, to inquire whether President Eisenhower is prepared to ask Premier Khrushchev wheher he, too, is willing to adopt a no-new-starts policy in Russia, so that our country will not be too embarrassed by the difference in the speed at which the two nations are increasing their productivity. Obviously Russia will not slacken its pace, regardless of how well Khrushchev is treated by the State Department, and every year's delay in our own reclamation program will give us that much more cause for regret.

I support the public works appropriation bill of 1959 because it is an investment in the future and the prosperity of America.

New Interest Grows for Economic Class I Pricing Formula

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it will be recalled that recently I brought to the attention of the Senate the need for overhauling the Federal milk order system.

Today, over two-thirds of the milk sold wholesale by the Nation's farmers is priced under this system. Unfortunately, the present formulas for determining prices result in what appears to be too wide a differential between milk markets. For example, milk prices range from $6.63 per hundredweight on some of the eastern and southern markets; down to $3.34 per hundredweight in Milwaukee.

While there are, naturally, a number of factors which need to be considered in establishing price levels, I frankly feel that there is no justification for such a wide variation in pricing levels.

As a matter of fact, I brought this matter to the attention of the Secretary of Agriculture and urged that a new look be taken at the milk pricing formula under the Federal milk order system.

Recently, the Pure Milk Products Press, published by the Pure Milk Products Cooperative and the official organ of that organization, contained an article entitled "Interest Grows for Economic Class I Pricing Formula." Since I feel that this article is representative of thoughtful views for revision of the overall milk pricing program, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEREST GROWS FOR ECONOMIC CLASS I PRICING FORMULA

Interest seems to be growing among midwestern milk producers and their cooperatives in the use of an economic formula for pricing class I milk in Federal order markets, President Paul Affeldt told the State board in Fond du Lac August 20.

In general two types of class I pricing are used in Federal orders in the United States. About half a dozen eastern markets, including Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, have been using economic factors indicative of farm production costs and consumer purchasing power in the area. The remaining orders throughout the Nation use the price of manufacturing milk as a basis for establishing class I prices. Chicago and other midwestern markets have used the latter method with the result that fluid milk prices have followed manufactured milk prices downward in response to price support levels regardless of the ability of consumers to pay for milk.

Some 2 years ago Pure Milk Products began work on a formula to incorporate the general economic level of the area into a basis for pricing milk in midwestern markets. The idea developed by Pure Milk Products Co. would be based one-third on consideration of farm production costs as reported by the Wisconsin Crop Reporting Service and two-thirds on consideration of the general purchasing power level in the midwestern markets in which our milk is sold. About a year and a half ago the Pure Milk Products Co. proposal was discussed with several other groups in the market, including both managers and directors. However, at that time little interest was expressed in the idea by the other groups.

Some months later, in July 1958, Pure Milk Products Co. filed a proposal with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to amend order No. 41 to provide for economic formula pricing. To date, the USDA has refused to take any action to consider incorporating such provisions into Midwestern orders. Recently Pure Milk Association of Chicago announced support of economic formula pricing for class I sales. It is hoped that this additional support will encourage the USDA to give new consideration to such ideas.

Pure Milk Products Co. stands ready to cooperate with any other group which may wish to consider or support this method of pricing and will cooperate in developing a formula acceptable to all regardless of claims to credit or past opposition. It is hoped that united support by cooperatives in the area may help to break midwestern fluid milk prices away from the ever-depressing effect of manufactured milk prices as they have occurred under the present price support program, and permit fluid sales to bring return in line with the nonfarm economy.

How Long Can the Benevolent Philosophy of Foreign Aid Continue To Blind Us to the Reality of Its Failures?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, reality is the only means of discriminating between the virtues of benevolence and the sin of misdirected charity.

The foreign aid program most certainly was conceived in a sincere sense of virtuous benevolence. Its history in recent years reflects a sense of indiscriminate charity. Millions of Americans who have been burdened with the expense of this program regard the realities of its colossal waste and failures as reason to bring it to an end either immediately or in the near future. Countless others seem to be willing to accept it as a permanent program for reasons varying from benevolence to the calculated desire to maintain allies. Hence foreign aid has become an issue of deep controversy and one which will more than likely culminate in its slow death if the increasing number of votes in opposition to the program continues in the Congress in the years ahead. By its very nature, foreign aid is doomed—perhaps within 5 years and possibly 10.

There are those who justifiably fear that this program must be continued as long as the world is engaged in a titanic struggle between the forces of capitalism and communism. Be that as it may, no conscientious legislator can view the colossal waste and failures, so vividly revealed in committee investigations, without deep reservations. Neither can any conscientious legislator simply look the other way and blindly assume that we cannot turn back to some path of good judgment in this area of international life.

The U.S. Comptroller General, Joseph Campbell, told a House committee investigating foreign aid earlier this year that military and other oversea spending agencies of the U.S. Government have had more money to hand out than they can judiciously plan and use. Certainly a man in this high position, whose competence has never been questioned, would make no such statement without fact and knowledge.

Just what are some of the things which prevent some Members of Congress from voting "Yes" on foreign aid appropriations? In a number of countries, for example, the major item of expenditure is for training and supplying of a native army. One of these places happens to be Laos, in southeast Asia, now the center of a Communist-inspired rebellion. Representative PASSMAN testified that we supplied funds for maintaining an army of 25,000, but that U.S. military inspectors have never been permitted to find out just what kind of an army does exist there, if any.

But even if no army exists, there is plenty of evidence that there are uniforms, warehouses full of them. Among the thousands of uniforms waiting to be worn there were sizes 44 to 46. Each one of these, it appears, could accommodate two Lao soldiers since the average Lao weighs about 115 pounds and is 5 feet 3 inches tall.

In one depot oversea investigators discovered a 20-year supply of WAC clothing. At another place 70,000 sets of new tire chains were left out of doors to rust. Enough of one ammunition item to last for 185 years was found at a supply base. A 45-year supply of 30-carbine ammunition was uncovered at a military school in another foreign country. Then there was a motor pool which revealed the hoarding of 44 tires for each truck there. U.S.-equipped factories to build airplanes for the personal use of officials, it was found, were getting part of the foreign aid money.

Aid to foreign countries includes the stationing of U.S. missions to supervise

the distribution of the funds and materials. While these supervisors are powerless to control the stealing, they are not without power to live sumptuously themselves. The Comptroller General told of some goings-on in Pakistan. There, for 271 Americans, the United States sent 529 refrigerators costing about $105,800. Since the 271 included wives and children, it is obvious that for each American more than two refrigerators had been supplied. There were also 669 air conditioners valued at $135,600; 650 stoves at $47,100, and household furniture at $128,500.

To bolster an apparently unpopular Pakistanian Government and win its support from the people, the United States decided to build in that country an installation which would supply a billion gallons of water a day for irrigation. A Japanese firm was engaged to do the job and over a million dollars was appropriated. When the pump house was completed it was discovered that there had been insufficient study of the problems to be solved, that the pumps would not be able to withstand the silt and mud and that the whole project was therefore useless as it stood.

Of Burma, Representative PASSMAN said:

> When you go into a country and you cannot find any trace of any benefit from that program, you wonder what we did teach them while we were there.

After hearing how much has been poured into Okinawa and other Ryukyu Islands, Representative CONTE asked of a testifying general whether these moneys had gained us the support of the people of these U.S.-occupied Japanese islands. The general asked that his answer be kept off the record. It was:

Perhaps one of the most authentic and striking appraisals of foreign aid recently came through Max A. Thurn-Valsassins, a member of the Austrian finance ministry and a former consultant to the World Bank.

Our foreign aid, he says, is based on three idealistic assumptions that are peculiar to the United States: that it will help underdeveloped countries raise their standard of living, that this will make them more stable, and that this, in turn, will contribute to American security.

Europe—

He says—

> may be just as conscious of the Russian threat. It may have just as much to lose if the underdeveloped countries fall under Russian domination. Yet, in Europe, economic development has not aroused the big popular concern that exists in America.

The reason is not lack of money, he says. Some European countries could now afford foreign aid programs of their own. Instead, they let the United States struggle along under its self-imposed burden.

It is inconsistent, he says, for Americans to think that they can foster free enterprise, which they regard as essential to rising production, by giving money to rulers who regard our aid only as an instrument for subjecting the productive forces of their countries to their political and ideological objectives. These rulers resent any conditions or supervision accompanying our aid, and without these reins the money will go to build up public ownership and State control—the same things Russia deliberately fosters with her aid.

Such a system—

He says—

> is incompatible with western type political and legal institutions. Unless present policies are altered, these institutions will become progressively weaker. Their final collapse may mean the end of western influence.

What underdeveloped countries need first, he says, is not money; indeed many Latin Americans have been investing large amounts in the United States while their governments are crying for investment capital. What they do need, he says, is a legal and institutional framework which will repatriate local capital and attract new investment from abroad. Lack of capital, he says, is not the cause of underdevelopment; rather, it is the consequence.

Developing this framework, he says, will require time, tact, and patience. But without it, foreign aid will remain futile, and, once it is accomplished, foreign aid will probably be unnecessary. This logic will probably not appeal to foreign aid lobbyists who think that with a generous dose of dollar bills, they can mold Asians and Africans into the image of Americans.

In the final analysis, it might be said that the answer to an effective foreign aid program lies in its proper administration. Perhaps this is true. But, how can a nation administer a foreign aid program when it has little or no control over the distribution of such aid it renders once the gift has been made to another nation? One does not give gifts with the positive direction of their use by their recipients. If the United States has no control over the distribution of economic assistance, nor the right to investigate military assistance given to foreign nations, how can we possibly direct a successful foreign aid program? As a matter of fact, even if we were able to clean up the waste and corruption in the controlled phase of its administration, we would have no means of channelling the gifts of foreign aid to the areas of need. We cannot blindly place a label of benevolence on indiscriminate charity.

Financing of Federal Indebtedness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have always felt that high interest rates were unconscionable, and as a result I have been loathe to support any legislation which had the effect of raising interest rates, whether such interest was to be paid by members of the public directly or by members of the public through taxes and, thereby, the Federal Government.

It is quite obvious, however, that some action must be taken to facilitate the financing of our enormous Federal indebtedness.

A most distinguished citizen of South Carolina, Mr. A. L. M. Wiggins, chairman of the board of the Atlantic Coastline Railroad, has served as a member of an advisory group to the last four Secretaries of the Treasury. He recently wrote a most enlightening and informative letter to me concerning the problem involved. In order that the entire Senate may have the benefit of his statement with reference to this problem, I ask unanimous consent that his letter to me be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTSVILLE, S.C., *August 28, 1959.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: I am terribly disturbed over the failure of the Ways and Means Committee of the House in refusing to authorize an increase in the rate of interest paid by the Government on savings bonds and on the failure to remove the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

I cannot believe otherwise than that some Members of Congress are not aware of the dangers of the present situation with respect to financing the public debt.

Sales of savings bonds have declined and cash-ins have increased as a result of the present unrealistic rate of 3¼ percent. The public is converting their savings bond money into other investments that yield a higher rate of return than savings bonds. As savings bond investments decline, the Government is forced to replace these funds by borrowing on marketable issues thereby adding to the inflationary pressures of the present credit situation.

The faiulre to remove the 4¼ percent ceiling on the interest rate on Government bonds means that the Government cannot sell in the present market Government bonds maturing in more than 5 years for the reason that other long-term investments yield a higher rate of interest. The result is that the Government in its refunding operations and in borrowing new funds must limit the maturities of its marketable obligations to less than 5 years. With a large amount of Government securities outstanding with maturities of less than 5 years, the market for such additional securities is considerably restricted and is largely dependent upon purchases by banks. Due to the present credit stringency, many banks are not in a position to buy additional short-term Government securities but will do so in order to help the Government meet its critical financing problems. The serious result of the purchase of additional Government securities by commercial banks is to inflate bank deposits and thereby add fuel to the inflationary pressures. From an inflation standpoint it is highly desirable that new issues of Government securities be sold to nonbank investors, but in order to do this the Government must pay a rate of interest that will secure the funds in a competitive

market. It is obvious that the Government cannot sell long-term bonds to nonbank investors at an interest rate of 4¼ percent.

I might add that personally I am concerned over the present credit situation, particularly with reference to the Government's obligations. I might add that personally I would like to see interest rates lower because in the financing of our railroads we are frequent borrowers of capital funds for modernizing equipment and would like to be able to borrow money at a much lower rate than at present market. However, we are forced to pay competitive rates. The Government is in the same position.

It is obvious that under our freedoms of choice, the Government cannot force investors to lend money to the Government nor will investors buy Government securities at a substantially lower rate of return than they can secure on other investments.

In my opinion, we are approaching a critical situation in Government financing in which the Government will be forced to add to the fires of inflation through borrowing from commercial banks unless it can get competitive interest rates in the sale of long-term bonds to non-bank investors.

I have served as a member of an advisory group to the last four Secretaries of Treasury (continuously for 17 years), and during all of this time I have never seen a situation as to Government financing more difficult or more critical than it is today.

I am sending a similar letter to other members of our congressional delegation from South Carolina in the belief that all of you will be interested in my observations and conclusions with respect to the problems of financing the Government, because they are based on long and intimate study and observation of this problem. I trust they make good sense to you.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. L. M. WIGGINS.

Harold S. Vance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished American businessman, Harold S. Vance, whose death this week is a serious loss to our country.

Mr. Vance since 1955 had served with dedication and great ability as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission and before that time had been president of the Studebaker Corp. in South Bend, Ind.

In Harold Vance we have a splendid example of an outstanding American businessman who, by serving in high public office, contributes mightily to the security and wellbeing of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a fine editorial in tribute to Mr. Vance in the Washington Post of September 2, 1959. The editorial follows:

HAROLD S. VANCE

Harold S. Vance was one of those eminent business executives who contributed to public service in the final years of his life the rich accumulation of administrative experience gained through a long and successful career in private industry. From 1955 until his untimely death on Monday he was a member of the Atomic Enery Commission—a member who brought to that exacting assignment exceptional courage and balance and judgment. Earlier, as president of the Studebaker Corp., he had done other important jobs for the Government—summoned to service alike by President Truman and by President Eisenhower.

In times like the present when the Federal Government is inescapably involved in tremendous industrial undertakings as a part of its defense program, the capabilities and knowledge of men like Harold Vance are indispensable. Perhaps, indeed, it is not too much to say that the margin of American strength in relation to the Russians rests in no negligible part in just the sort of experience which such men have acquired in the private enterprise which is the foundation of the American economy.

Report on Missile Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Congress a report just issued by the Military Operations Subcommittee of which I am chairman. This report is a factual study and systematic account of our major missile programs. It describes in some detail the resources, procedures, and special agencies that have been acquired or established for prosecuting this all-important missile effort. This report was unanimously approved by the full Committee on Government Operations under the distinguished leadership of Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON.

The missile programs play an increasingly vital role in the defensive strength of our country. The tremendous costs and expenditures involved in acquiring a missile capability alone demand that careful scrutiny be exercised in this field. The Military Operations Subcommittee has attempted to analyze the missile program from several points of view with objectivity and thoroughness.

We have carefully reviewed the agencies and committees and individual offices at the Department of Defense level over the past 10 years for directing and coordinating the missile effort. We have demonstrated the problems involved in attempting to achieve effective top-level control and the bewildering array of mechanisms that have been set up in the process. While this review may be critical, it is not carping. We have set forth the facts as we have found them. We have set them forth fairly and without partisanship or prejudice to any service.

The Military Operations Subcommittee has analyzed the procurement and management methods used by the military services in the missile programs. We have shown that the priorities assigned to these programs have often resulted in the creation of ad hoc agencies and the necessary circumvention of ordinary procurement procedures. While we have pointed out the tremendous waste involved, we have tried to show that the imminence of the Soviet threat and the urgent need for operational missiles were partly responsible.

The report sets forth a detailed account of the Air Force ballistic missile program starting with the Von Neumann committees' recommendations in 1953 that an ICBM program was feasible and should be undertaken.

After public hearings and visits to the Ballistic Missile Division on the west coast we have analyzed the circumstances under which Ramo-Wooldridge Corp. and its successor Space Technology Laboratories became enmeshed in the Air Force program. We have analyzed this company's relationship to the Air Force and the role it plays as a private concern sitting behind Government desks and helping to make governmental decisions. There has been a great deal of concern in the Congress and elsewhere over the tremendous power and responsibility exercised by Space Technology Laboratories. We have proposed that if this same relationship is to continue in the future the company must be converted into a nonprofit institution similar to the Rand Corp., the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, the Allied Physics Laboratory of Johns Hopkins University, and others.

We have spelled out in some detail the controversy over the Thor and Jupiter missiles. We have reviewed the recurring problem of duplication and overlapping roles and missions in the field of air defense. We have discussed the role of the military in space and the problems that have been created by the establishment of an Advanced Research Projects Agency in the Department of Defense and a new independent civilian space agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The subcommittee has directed its attention primarily to land-based strategic missiles. We have found that the basic clash in the ballistic missile field is between the Army and the Air Force. After careful study we have concluded that duplication, waste and interservice rivalries will continue unless the Air Force and the Army "join hands in a single service effort." Our report has called upon the President to initiate studies looking to an Army-Air Force merger.

These strategic missiles are the decisive weapons of the coming decade—decisive for the strategy of deterrence and retaliation. These weapons, however, have no unique service orientation. Land-based missiles can be built and fired by the Air Force or the Army equally well. This creates a dilemma for both services. The Air Force now has operation control over all land-based strategic missiles, but this fact had nothing to do with the basic reasons for creating a separate Air Force. The Army faces a bleak future under prevailing roles and missions assignments

which bar it from any part in deployment of the weapons that are to dominate global military strategy.

As the report states, "no amount of effort spent in clarifying roles and missions can overcome the ruthless logic of weapon technology."

While we believe that an Army-Air Force merger would by no means solve all of the problems of military organization and command relationships, it would solve many and lay the groundwork for the solution of others.

With the full cooperation of all the subcommittee members and the military services we have submitted a report which carefully and objectively tells a story which is of great concern to all of us. I believe that this report will cast light on little-known factors involved in the complex missile effort and contribute to everyone's understanding of the successes achieved and the problems that lie ahead. It will show that the nature and rapidity of missile and space technology demand a reappraisal of organizational arrangements in the Department of Defense.

Eisenhower Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the writer of the editorial that appeared in the Newark, N.J., Evening News on August 31, has, in a few sentences, expressed some of the reasons why the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev may have some good results for the lessening of the cold war, and the return to normalcy of the economy of the free peoples of the world. No one expects miracles, but it is important to know that our spokesman has the confidence and admiration of allies of differing opinions.

The editorial follows:

EISENHOWER ABROAD

President Eisenhower's rare ability to inspire the confidence of divergent allies is being displayed anew on his tour of the Western capitals.

The crowds of Bonn and London greeted him with equal enthusiasm, as the symbol and spokesman for the hopes of the free world. But their impulses were as different as the attitudes of the West Germans and the British toward the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks.

To the West Germans, the President symbolized their hopes for German reunification and unremitting firmness on Berlin. London seemed to reflect the desire of the British for some sort of accommodation with the Soviets.

Despite differing national aspirations, the West Germans and the British place their common trust in the good faith and the integrity with which Mr. Eisenhower is identified the world over.

These qualities, in combination with the warmth and humanity of the Eisenhower personality, arm the President with potent weapons for his momentous encounter with Premier Khrushchev.

Need for the Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLARD S. CURTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I desire to include a fine editorial which appeared in the Evening Chronicle of Allentown, Pa., on August 31, 1959, and which expresses with great clarity the need for the item veto:

A WEAKNESS IN OUR SYSTEM

Just because Congress reached too deeply into the "pork barrel" flood control projects on the Lehigh River have been placed in jeopardy by a Presidential veto.

For the first time since President Eisenhower took office in 1953, Congress may override a veto. If it does, the Lehigh River work will go on. If it doesn't, work will stop and the project will remain unfinished.

The situation developed when Congress added 67 new projects not recommended by the President to the bill providing funds for flood control, reclamation and other water projects all over the United States. Although the amount earmarked for these projects is a relatively small $50 million in a total appropriation of $1,206,000,000, the President vetoed the bill. He had no other choice, if he was to be consistent. He had to accept or veto the whole thing. Unlike the Governor of Pennsylvania, he does not have a selective veto on appropriations.

Actually, he was looking ahead. Although the initial cost would be only $50 million, eventually the new projects would cost more than $800 million. In his veto message he said:

"By any sound test of urgency, these projects should not be started this year if we are to have a responsible Federal fiscal policy."

Because the President committed himself to the other projects in his budget, Congress hoped it could force him to take what he did not want, especially since it represented only about 4 percent of the total appropriation.

Congress should know by this time the President does not hesitate to kill a whole bill when even one small part does not suit him.

But bills like this are dear to the hearts of Congressmen. In them are found the funds for public works. These can be cited to the folks back home as tangible evidence that their elected representatives are looking out for their interests and grabbing their share of meat out of the "pork barrel." That is why an Eisenhower veto may be overridden for the first time. This, incidentally, was his 144th veto since he took office and the 7th of this session.

If the President were given selective veto authority, situations like this would not develop. No longer would there be an incentive to add to an appropriation bill something the Chief Executive does not want in the hope that it will be accepted as part of the whole package.

The lack of that provision is a weakness in our system. The all-or-nothing rule gives no choice but acceptance of the bad with the good or rejection of the good with the bad.

The selective veto would give the President an opportunity to weigh each appropriation on its own merits and relieve him of the responsibility of vetoing a whole bill because he dislikes only a small portion of it.

"Heard and Seen"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal-News, of Nyack, N.Y., August 22, 1959:

HEARD AND SEEN
(By Frank Ernest)
FARLEY ON RACING BOARD

"Farley Named to Trot Board" was the front-page headline in the Daily News last Thursday. The appointment was made by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, a Republican, and the appointee, one of three who will comprise the new commission to govern harness racing in the State of New York, is a former Rockland County, State and national Democratic chairman, the man who, more than anyone else, made Franklin Delano Roosevelt President of the United States, a former Postmaster General and one of the great citizens of the world today.

I make no secret of the fact that I like Jim Farley nor of the fact that in my early days in the newspaper business I did all I could to see that he was defeated in his efforts to seek reelection as Rockland County's member of assembly. Along with the others who sought that end, I felt a sense of accomplishment when Mr. Farley lost. What we actually did was a favor to him. For, had he won that election, he might have been condemned to a long term in Albany and might not have had the opportunity to demonstrate his exceptional abilities as a politician.

Governor Rockefeller's appointment indicates his belief that Mr. Farley, along with the other members of the commission, is incorruptible. That is a long-recognized fact. When Mr. Farley, during the first two terms of the late F.D.R. was, to a large extent, responsible for the distribution of patronage, he was on the spot plenty. Cartoons, stories; headlines put the stamp of an ogre on him. "Farleyism" was a nasty word.

It must be assumed that there were people who were very busy, digging into records, turning over the stones in all fields of politics and looking under them for some sign of a misstep somewhere along the line in order to put him on the spot. Throughout his years in office, from the time he was a committeeman in Stony Point and then town clerk and supervisor and on up, it appeared that there must be a slip somewhere. But none of the probers ever came up with the slightest scintilla of evidence that such a thing had occurred.

I rather imagine that these are some of the things Mr. Rockefeller considered when he made the nomination. I don't believe he took into consideration a point I mentioned a few days ago that, had the Democrats not missed the boat at their Buffalo convention and turned down Mr. Farley's bid for nomination as United States Senator, Mr. Rockefeller might not have been elected. And then again, maybe he could have. But of one thing I am convinced. If then Governor Harriman and State Chairman Michael H. Prendergast hadn't been scared out by Tammany Boss Carmine DeSapio and if the State committee had the opportunity to vote for the nomination of James A. Farley without dictation from the party bosses, New York State would be represented in the U.S. Senate today by one Republican and one Democrat instead of two Republicans.

That's all water over the dam now, of course. But it's nice to see that the talent

and the honesty and the ability of Jim Farley have resulted in his appointment to a post into which he will fit like a glove. When he was chairman of the New York State Athletic Commission, on which his son now serves, he and the other members took a pushing around, too. Sports writers called them "The Three Dumb Dukes." But under his guidance the phony business of winning fights by claiming fouls was eliminated. There may have been some questions about rules and regulations but nobody ever questioned the honesty of the commission while Mr. Farley headed it.

Jim knows horses, too. When he was a youngster there was a harness track near his home in Grassy Point. He saw trotting races too at Sliney's Grove in West Haverstraw, at the New City and Orangeburg Fair Grounds tracks, and at other places. In boxing, in horse racing, in politics and in human relations, Jim Farley can spot a phony from away off. The Governor has made one of the finest appointments possible. It's a little late now but Rockland County Democrats might well have taken a lesson from the man they strove so hard to beat but couldn't.

Philip Henry Handmaker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker—

We know when moons shall wane
When summer birds from far shall cross the sea
When Autumn's hue shall tinge the golden grain
But "Death, Oh" who shall teach us when to look for thee?

Leaves have their time to fall
And flowers to wither at the North wind's breath
And stars to set—but all
Thou hast all seasons for thine own, O Death!

Holy Scripture tells us when Abner, son of Ner, was killed and the word was brought back to King David, he said:

And the King said unto his servants, Know ye not that there is a prince and a great man fallen this day in Israel?

In a similar vein of thought, residents of Altoona, Pa., and those associated with the late Philip H. Handmaker in his farflung business enterprises realized through shock and sorrow that his sudden death on August 9, 1959, was indeed an irreparable loss.

Phil, as he was known to his legion of friends and business acquaintances, was born August 7, 1903, in Russia. At an early age he came with his parents to America where the family settled in Pittsburgh, Pa. He began his business career in Altoona, Pa., in 1925 and despite a humble beginning in true Horatio Alger fashion he reaped phenomenal success in the business world, thus becoming a symbol of the benefits to be derived from the American system of free enterprise.

At the conclusion of this tribute to my departed friend, I wish to include as part of my remarks the obituary of the late Philip Henry Handmaker which appeared in the August 10, 1959, issue of the Altoona Mirror, together with tributes of love and respect from his associates, and by Rabbi J. H. Henderson, which appeared in later issues of the Altoona Mirror. The authors enjoyed the rewarding privilege of association and friendship with Phil Handmaker, and their expressions reflect their love and admiration for his many fine qualities.

Phil Handmaker by his short, yet fruitful life fully deserved the glowing tributes accorded him for he left a proud heritage to his family and his friends—the only heritage that is really worthwhile—an honored name. Trully, as one of the prophets of old said:

He lived humbly, did justly, and walked reverently with God.

As a member of Agudath Achim Synagogue and Temple Beth Israel in Altoona, Pa., his deep faith in God was manifested by his devout manner in caring for his own spiritual welfare aided by his firm adherence to the tenets of his ancient faith.

By his exemplary life which portrayed his deep-rooted convictions that it is mandatory to accept the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God as eternal truths, he brought honor to his age and his people.

Divine providence blessed him with God-fearing parents who bent upon giving their children every possible advantage toiled and sacrificed like countless other immigrant families who have come to America's shores seeking liberty, freedom, and equal opportunity for all God's children.

Fortified by their divine faith which was supplemented by toil, sacrifice, and perseverance, their love and solicitude for their children made an indelible impression on their son, Phil, and provided him with added inspiration to serve as an additional incentive in his successful effort in scaling the heights of the business world. It is of such loving and self-sacrificing parents that the poet has said:

Those distant seas I have not crossed
Bright jewels I never wore
The prizes now forever lost
And comforts languished for—
The rich rewards for which men sigh
That I have never won
The years, the hopes, the dreams go by
Are found in you, my son.

One of the many fine qualities that Phil Handmaker possessed was the confidence he instilled in those fortunate to have crossed his path in life. He had the happy faculty of being able through his kindness to others to encourage his friends and associates to feel free to discuss their problems with him. This admirable trait of character is expressed by the poet when he said:

Oh, the comfort, the inexpressible comfort,
of feeling safe with a person,
Having neither to weigh thoughts nor words
But pouring them all out, chaff and grain together
Confident that a faithful hand will take them
And sift them, keep what is worth keeping,
And with the breath of love and kindness
blow the rest away.

Those of us in central Pennsylvania, who knew Phil Handmaker intimately, recognized and appreciated his great civic consciousness and the insatiable desire he had for advancing the best interests of the city of Altoona and Blair County. That area of Pennsylvania owed him an undying debt of gratitude for his great contribution toward its progress and welfare.

It is common knowledge and a striking illustration of his depth of character that even though Phil was privileged to walk and sit with the mighty, he enjoyed the reputation of never losing the common touch despite his spectacular success in the realm of business. Shunning ostentation and declining to bask in the glare and glamour of publicity, his innumerable acts of charity unheralded and unsung and dispensed without regard to race, color or creed, brought rays of sunshine into the bleak and barren lives of the poor, the underprivileged and the downtrodden.

Such golden nuggets of kindly deeds are treasured and will live forever in the hearts of the lowly and needy of society whose lives he touched. They are an inperishable monument to the memory of such a great American who by his altruistic deeds gives credence to the thoughts expressed in two lines of a poem by the celebrated English poet, William Wordsworth:

The best portions of a man's life—
His little nameless acts of kindness and love.

It can be truly said that Phil's death at the zenith of his career was a tragic loss to his loved ones and to the community, State, and Nation. His noble character may be summed up in the words of Lord Byron:

He had kept the whiteness of his soul, and thus men over him wept.

From a personal standpoint, the death of Phil Handmaker has meant the loss of a cherished friend of many years. His passing recalls to mind the words of the poet—

A friend has passed across the bay,
So wide and vast and put away,
The mortal form that held his breath;
But through the storm that men call death
Erect and straight, unstained by years
At heaven's gate a man appears.

Sharing the sorrow voiced by countless friends and acquaintances, I joined them in tendering sincere expressions of deepest sympathy to his devoted wife, Mollie, their four daughters, and other members of the immediate family.

In conclusion, Phil Handmaker's life was a virtual mirror in which were reflected the many fine qualities of his richly gifted soul. These outstanding personal characteristics enshrine him in the minds and hearts of those privileged to have crossed paths with him in the daily stream of life. His manner of daily living portrayed his adherence to the deathless tradition of the ancient faith of a people who were "keepers of the word" and "the bearers of the commandments."

Thus, it is fitting to say that in the best traditions of the Judaic-Christian precept of living by the word of God, the late Phil Handmaker by his short, yet

fruitful life fulfilled the beautiful prayer of St. Francis of Assisi:

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace;
Where there is hatred, let me sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is despair, hope;
Where there is darkness, light;
Where there is sadness, joy.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Aug. 10, 1959]

CITY AUTO PARTS SUPPLY COMPANY PRESIDENT DIES

Philip H. Handmaker, 57, of 3004 Second Avenue, president of the Automotive Supply Co., and chairman of the Altoona Bus Authority, died in the Altoona Hospital at 9:45 a.m. yesterday after a heart attack.

Mr. Handmaker, whose Automotive Supply firm had many branches throughout Pennsylvania, had large holdings throughout the United States, including a traction firm in Minneapolis, Minn.

Relatives reported he awakened Saturday morning complaining of indigestion. He was admitted to the hospital during the morning.

Born August 7, 1903, in Russia, he was the son of Harry and Sophie (Romick) Handmaker. His career began in Altoona as manager of the Firestone Service Store at 12th Avenue and 15th Street.

He left Firestone to form the Automotive Supply Co. The firm moved in 1937 to its present building at 1917 Margaret Avenue.

Surviving are his wife, Mollie and following daughters: Mrs. Harriet Bregman of Altoona, Mrs. Reitz Kaplan of Pittsburgh, Mrs. Audrey Goldstein of Johnstown and Mrs. Barbara Kaminsky of Ann Arbor, Mich., and nine grandchildren.

Also surviving are two brothers and four sisters: Isaac H. of Tucson, Ariz.: Meyer of Pittsburgh, Mrs. Jean Sparks of Altoona, Mrs. Mary Supowitz of Tucson, Mrs. Saua Auxwerwitz of Harrisburg and Mrs. Josephine Feldman of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Handmaker was a member of Agudath Achim Synagogue and Temple Beth Israel, the Elks and the Altoona Kiwanis Club.

Interment was made in Pittsburgh today.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Aug. 24, 1959]

MAN OF WIDE INTERESTS

EDITOR OF THE ALTOONA MIRROR:

Few men attain the success in the business world as that achieved by Philip Henry Handmaker whose sudden death on August 9, 1959, came as a distinct blow to his countless friends and business associates.

As a small boy, Phil came to this country with his parents from his native Russia, the family locating in Pittsburgh. With meager book learning, he became a giant of business, a true example of a self-made man.

Mr. Handmaker's business career in Altoona began in 1925 at Beale Avenue and 24th Street. At that time, there were three employees—himself and two others. Today, his vast network of holdings in his Automotive Supply Co. and its divisions employs more than 350 persons.

Those who were close to this successful business leader realize that he shunned publicity for himself. Nevertheless, we feel that any individual who made such wonderful strides in his own endeavors and who had done so much good (with no fanfare), merits a written tribute at his passing.

Just as Phil Handmaker never hesitated to make a decision while he lived, it seemed that he died that way.

We would recount his many fine traits of character:

Devoted to family, extremely proud of grandchildren.

Keen insight, always knew what to do and the right time to do it.

Never forgot humble beginning, always anxious to help the less fortunate or anyone who needed a boost.

Strict attention to business—not one for a lot of frivolity.

Office door always open—constantly being approached by those who needed advice or those who wanted his opinion on business and other matters.

In spite of his growth, he never changed. Those who knew him in 1925 (the oldtimers) marveled that he was the same Phil Handmaker they knew way back when.

Accepted appointment to the bus authority even though he was in an entirely unassociated business. He realized that transportation was a must for the community—nothing selfish in his accepting the appointment as his business was not dependent upon public transportation.

Never blessed with a son—seemed to express his interest in young men by offering summertime employment to a great number of college age young men. One such young man, now a law student, when told of Mr. Handmaker's passing, remarked that he learned more from his association with Phil Handmaker and working for Automotive Supply Co. than he did in his 4 years at college.

The Automotive Supply Co., of which he was president, comprises 16 branch firms in Pennsylvania. The main corporation also includes these divisions: University Supply Co., with branch locations at Morgantown and Kingwood, W. Va.; Complete Auto & Home Supply Co., 11 locations in Arizona; Complete Industrial Supply Co., 2 branch locations in Arizona. He was a director of the Twin City Rapid Transit Co., Minneapolis, Minn. He also served as chairman of the Transportation and Motor Buses for Public Use Authority in Altoona.

The life and work of Philip H. Handmaker will ever stand as a monument to his success. His passing is mourned by all who knew him.

HIS ASSOCIATES.

[From the Altoona (Pa.) Mirror, Aug. 19, 1959]

FLAG OF DEATH FOR EVERYONE

EDITOR OF THE ALTOONA MIRROR:

When the morning of August 9, 1959, began, the news was circulated in Altoona that Phil H. Handmaker was no longer among the living. It is very hard to express sympathy when the wound is new, but every one of us must go through it.

The flag of death is for everyone. The life of a person going through this world is like a person arriving in a city, staying overnight at a hotel and leaving in the morning. Life is divided into three parts.

First, a child is born, and as soon as he opens his eyes to look at the world, he closes his eyes and falls back into eternal sleep. Second, when a person is young, in middle age, he strives for happy ending and golden dreams. Suddenly death enters and ends his dreams. Third, when a person reaches old age, his strength leaves.

Naturally your sorrow is very great, but you must remember that death, the funeral, the grave, the cemetery is not the final end of a person. Because the other world brings a new life. I hope his soul is at rest and peace.

Rabbi J. H. HENDERSON.

Resurgence of Krupp Empire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, certain correspondence regarding the reconcentration of German heavy industry—with special reference to the resurgence of the Krupp empire—has come to my attention. I am sure my colleagues will find the subject matter of extreme interest as well as cause for concern.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of a Department of State letter of February 3, 1959, directed to the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., and the latter's response to it. Also included is an Associated Press dispatch from London, dated June 9, 1957, which is referred to in the society's letter of February 13 of this year.

The correspondence follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 3, 1959.

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

SIRS: The Department has received your letter of January 14, 1959, in which you have raised certain questions concerning the implementation of the deconcentration program affecting heavy industry in the Federal Republic of Germany and have referred in particular to the recent approval; given by the high authority of the European Coal and Steel Community, for the purchase of the Bochumer Verein by the Krupp controlled Rheinhausen A.G.

As the New York Times article of January 7, 1959, to which you have referred, indicated, the high authority of the European Coal and Steel Community announced that it has approved an application made by the Krupp controlled Rheinhausen A.G. for permission to purchase the majority interest in the Bochumer Verein. The high authority decision was based on article 66 of the ECSC treaty under which approval of new concentrations is authorized when the high authority finds the transaction will not give the interested parties the power to determine prices, control production, prevent effective competition, or result in establishing an artificially privileged position. The high authority found that the two enterprises involved would, after merger, account for the following percentages of production within the six-nation community: coal 3 percent; coke 4.4 percent; pig iron 5.7 percent; crude steel 5.5 percent; and rolled products 3.7 percent. The high authority also announced that future investment in the steel sector of these enterprises will be subject to special control to insure compliance with the abovementioned requirements of article 66 of the treaty. The high authority emphasized its decision does not affect any obligations of persons, enterprises, or governments pursuant to law 27 regarding reorganization of the German iron and steel industry.

The responsibility for completing certain obligations under Allied Control Council Law 27 was assumed by the Federal Republic of Germany under the terms of the Conven-

tion on the Settlement of Matters Arising Out of the War and the Occupation. Chapter I, article 9, paragraph 3 thereof states that insofar as the convention relates to deconcentration it "shall be without prejudice to such expansion or affiliation of enterprises of the German coal mining and iron and steel industries as shall be permitted under the Treaty on the Establishment of the European Community for Coal and Steel." This provision of the Settlement Convention clearly eliminates any obstacle to a purchase such as the one in question upon approval by the high authority and there is thus no basis in the Settlement Convention for our entering an objection to this transaction.

With regard to certain outstanding obligations which the Federal Republic has under the deconcentration program, the Federal Republic has indicated that the completion of certain aspects of the program presents very considerable difficulty. These difficulties are presently the subject of discussions which are being held with the Federal Republic by the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France. The deconcentration program was an allied undertaking, and whatever action is taken on the German request for release from the remaining obligations must be arrived at on a tripartite basis. While this may result in further delays before a decision is reached, it would be incorrect to say the views of any party have been overruled. It is impossible at this time to predict just what will be the outcome of these discussions, but the Department wishes to assure you that all the aspects of the problem are receiving our careful attention.

Very truly yours,

JOHN DEVINE,
German Economic Affairs,
Bureau of European Affairs,
(For the Secretary of State).

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 13, 1959.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Department of State, Washington, D.C.
(Attention: Mr. John Devine, German Economic Affairs, Bureau of European Affairs.)

DEAR MR. DEVINE: This will acknowledge your letter of February 3, in reply to our letter of January 14, 1959, wherein the society protested against the reconcentration of German heavy industry with special reference to the resurgence of the Krupp empire.

In defending the State Department's refusal to object to Krupp's purchase of the Bochumer Verein, you cite chapter I, article 9, paragraph 3 of the Settlement Convention with Germany which recognizes that reconcentration in the German coal and steel industries may be permitted under the Treaty on the Establishment of the European Community for Coal and Steel (Schuman plan) upon the approval of the high authority. Yet, in the paragraphs 1 and 2 of the very same article (9) it was stipulated that the German Government would carry out the Allied program for the deconcentration and decartelization of the coal and steel industries "through to completion." This pledge was also reaffirmed by Chancellor Adenauer in a letter to Dr. James B. Conant, then U.S. High Commissioner for Germany (October 23, 1954). In that letter which attached to the "Protocol on the Termination of the Occupation Regime in the Federal Republic of Germany," Chancellor Adenauer assured the U.S. High Commissioner that the West German Government "was determined to maintain the anticartel policy hitherto pursued by it and to work toward effective and comprehensive protection of freedom of competition by a German law. In this effort, the Federal Government will also oppose all efforts to repeal or modify the Allied legislation which now prohibits restraints of competition and monopolies."

In our opinion, the pledge of Chancellor Adenauer on behalf of the West German Government and the relevant provisions in the Settlement Convention are in contradiction to paragraph 3 of article 9. It is clear that paragraph 3 enables the Germans to renege on their obligations by resorting to the powers of the Schuman plan high authority as a figleaf for these evasions.

It is astounding to us that U.S. and Allied negotiators should have permitted this obvious contradiction that was embodied in the Settlement Convention when, at the same time, the public received the impression that the Allied deconcentration and decartelization programs would be carried out both in letter and in spirit. In retrospect we now wonder whether the Senate which was called upon to approve the Settlement Convention, was specifically apprised of this contradiction. If U.S. and Allied negotiators were determined to carry out the deconcentration of German heavy industry, then how does the State Department explain the fact that it agreed to chapter I, article 9, paragraph 3, which, in effect, has the potentiality of nullifying much of the allied program for the deconcentration of German heavy industry?

Your letter would appear to imply that the reconcentrations in German heavy industry now taking place, stem from the fact that under article 66 of the ECSC Treaty, the high authority has the power to approve such concentrations. Persons conversant with the history of the U.S. program for the deconcentration and decartelization of German heavy industry know that reconcentration had been taking place well before the Schuman plan high authority was established. This is noted in the Bulletin for the European Community for Coal and Steel, April 1955, which reveals that the Allies had already permitted certain reconcentrations in German heavy industry and were therefore regarded by the high authority as a fait accompli.

In our letter of May 22, 1958, we submitted evidence supporting the contention that reconcentration had taken place for some time. In our magazine Prevent World War III, the society published articles disclosing that key American officials who were supposed to carry out the program of deconcentration, were unsympathetic toward it and by their attitude and actions helped to render it meaningless. We are enclosing herewith the Nos. 36, 37, and 38 issues of Prevent World War III which carry a serial study of the problem under the title "Was the Decartelization Program Sabotaged?" (See No. 36, pp. 31–35; No. 37, pp. 23–29; No. 38, pp. 25–31.) The above-mentioned study referred to the fact that the Ferguson committee, appointed by the U.S. Government to investigate the status of the deconcentration program, reported that "the U.S. occupation officials have failed to smash a single one of Germany's giant monopolies under a crackdown now 2 years old" (New York Times, Apr. 30, 1949).

In this connection, former U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, Gen. Lucius D. Clay, expressed his views on the deconcentration of the German steel industry to U.S. members of the Decartelization Branch: "A great many people believe in small business but it doesn't happen to be that that is a policy of our Government. * * * I would never go along with the idea of breaking up the steel companies into lots of companies." The former Chief of the U.S. Decartelization Branch in Germany, Mr. James Stewart Martin, wrote in his book "All Honorable Men," published in 1950, that General Clay had declared that the steel industries in Germany must be big enough to "live" in competition with the steel industries of other countries.

Also indicative of the fact that the power of the Schuman Plan High Authority cannot explain the reason why reconcentration is growing, is the reemergence of the "big three" banks of Germany (the Deutsche, Dresdner, and Commerz Banks). These banks were never under the jurisdiction of the Schuman Plan High Authority. They were supposed to be broken up because of their predatory record and monopolistic powers. Today they have regained their former status.

Insofar as the Krupp case is concerned, we should like to make the following observations:

1. The Krupp agreement specifically stated that Krupp would dispose of his ill-gotten iron and steel properties within a fixed period of time. If he is now permitted to purchase the Bochumer Verein, how can it be said that he has not violated the spirit of this agreement despite the technicality of article 66 of the Schuman Plan? It seems to us that it was the general public impression when Krupp agreed to dispose of his iron and steel properties that he would be prohibited from ever owning such properties again—otherwise, what was the purpose of the Krupp agreement in the first place?

2. As regards the purchase of the Bochumer Verein, we have provided the pertinent details in our previous letter showing how Krupp cloaked his activities so as to remain within the letter of the agreement. The facts show that the purchase of the Bochumer Verein was part and parcel of Krupp's plan to build up his iron and steel empire to even greater proportions than before the war.

We are aware of the legalism behind which German heavy industry, led by the Krupp interests, is evading its obligations. However, German heavy industry, with the sanction of the West German Government, has brazenly violated the spirit of the Allied deconcentration program. In the last analysis it is this aspect which should carry the most weight for it plainly reveals the simple fact that the Germans cannot be trusted.

This is not the only instance in the postwar period where the Germans have gone back on their word. We can cite a number of important examples including their original pledge not to enter into diplomatic relations with the Russians, and their pledge contained in the settlement convention to abide by the Allied program for the disposal of former enemy assets. This tendency to violate obligations and commitments has progressively sharpened. However, candor compels us to state that United States and Allied officials must share in the responsibility of this grave development. As noted in our previous letter, "If Krupp is permitted to regain his former power, then what becomes of the principles for which so much blood, sweat, and tears were shed during World War II?" As you know, these principles embraced the concept that Germany must become law-abiding both in spirit as well as in letter; that they must learn to carry out obligations assumed and that the sinews of her warmaking power including the huge concentrations of heavy industry must be curbed and whittled down. We believe that it is this concept that concerns all security minded Americans and that should not be sacrificed by resort to ambiguous legalisms.

Therefore, we must reaffirm our protest "against the continued reconcentration of

Germany's industrial war potential which will inevitably bring great harm to the American peoples and their Allies."

Very sincerely yours,

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.,
ALBERT SIMARD, *Secretary.*
ISIDORE LIPSCHUTZ, *Treasurer.*

P.S.—Attached herewith is an Associated Press dispatch from London (June 9, 1957) which sheds some light on the dubious maneuverings of the West German Government in support of the Krupp interests.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, June 10, 1957]

KRUPP HOLDS EDGE IN FIGHT OVER EMPIRE

LONDON, June 9.—A new international storm is blowing up around a coal and steel king who walked out of a German jail 6 years ago still one of Europe's richest men.

He is Alfried Krupp von Bohlen-Halbach, whose family name for generations has symbolized guns and war.

American troops arrested him in World War II. The Nuernberg war crimes court convicted him on charges of exploiting slave labor and plundering. He got a 12-year sentence, but left Laandsberg Prison in 1951 under a sweeping revision of war crimes sentences.

Today Alfried Krupp, 49, soft-spoken and courteous, is sole owner of Krupps. The company has book assets of $238 million, a yearly turnover of $700 million, a payroll for 90,000 workers and publicly unmeasured investments outside Germany.

TALKS COMING UP

The United States, Britain, and France are trying to force Krupp to sell his coal, steel, and iron empire.

All the tangled issues soon are going to be discussed—first among the Americans, British, and French and then between the three Allies and West Germany.

In the immediate postwar years, the Western Big Three set out to smash the power of Krupp and other big industrial combines which had helped to feed the German armed forces in two World Wars. They made Krupp promise never to return to the coal, steel, and iron industries in Germany.

As occupying powers, the Allies passed a law in 1953 providing for the breakup of all such groups. They set a 1958 deadline.

ADENAUER SMARTEST

Western officials say there is little doubt the Allies—left to themselves—would insist on keeping Krupp to his word. But the Western Powers had reckoned without Konrad Adenauer.

West Germany's shrewd old chancellor 4 months ago proposed that the law be scrapped. He argued that Krupp and other steel barons were finding it hard to get buyers in Germany.

Adenauer played his cards well. He refused to acknowledge the Allied law, leaving the Americans, British, and French to deal directly with Krupp.

As a result, some international lawyers doubt whether the agreement given by Krupp (an individual) to the Allies (three foreign powers) could be enforced in German courts.

The Aptuxcet Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, a unique observance is taking place on September 5 and 6 in the town of Bourne, Mass., where I have my summer home and which is represented in the House by our colleague, Hon. HASTINGS KEITH.

The townspeople on these days will commemorate the establishment, in the year 1627, of the Aptuxcet Trading Post in the town of Bourne, on the banks of the Manamet River. It was here that the colonists of the Plimoth Plantation wrote and signed the first business contract in America, thus becoming the birthplace of American capitalism and free enterprise.

A replica of the trading post stands on the original foundations of the post. In 1627, an agreement was written setting up the trading post, by the colonists of the Plimoth Plantation. The written instrument gave certain of their number control of the trade, the purpose of which was to pay off the huge debt still owed to the London promoters of the *Mayflower* expedition, to transport more of their countrymen to Plimoth.

The observance on September 5 and 6 will be marked by a pageant at the post, depicting the historical events connected with it.

The significance of the event is that it was here that the system of free enterprise contracts had their beginning. The colonists built on a firm foundation. From this humble start the way of life established by these rugged settlers became the vehicle for the development of the economic strength which has made our country the greatest power in world history.

Cordell Hull Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a release by the Committee for National Trade Policy announcing their sponsorship of the Cordell Hull Award. This award was inaugurated in 1955 in honor of outstanding contributions to U.S. foreign economic policy and in recognition of Cordell Hull's national leadership which was established in a career of more than half a century as Secretary of State and as a Member of both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives and his historic sponsorship of the recriprocal trade agreements program. The decision to transfer the responsibility for this award from its original sponsor, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., was made because of the vigor which the committee for a national trade policy had exhibited in presenting the facts on trade policy.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SPONSORS FOR CORDELL HULL AWARD

The Cordell Hull Award, established in 1955 in honor of outstanding contributions to U.S. foreign economic policy, is now to be sponsored by the Committee for a National Trade Policy, it was disclosed here today. The transfer of the award is being made, it was indicated, because the originating organization, the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., is discontinuing its activities.

The Hull Award was inaugurated with the permission of the Secretary's family shortly before his death in 1955. In presenting the award the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., sought to recognize the Secretary's "national leadership * * * great tradition of public service * * * established in a career of more than half a century as Secretary of State and as a Member of both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, and * * * his historic sponsorship of the reciprocal trade agreements program."

The first award honoring Secretary Hull was made in 1955 to the late Secretary of State's political protege, Senator ALBERT GORE, Democrat, of Tennessee. The next award winner was Paul G. Hoffman, former Marshall plan Administrator, and the 1957-58 award recipient, Clare Boothe Luce.

In accepting sponsoring of the award a spokesman for the Committee for a National Trade Policy expressed the committee's satisfaction that the continuity of the award will now be preserved and added the hope that the Committee for a National Trade Policy would be strengthened by the support of all the members of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education.

B. A. Rittersporn, Jr., long-time chairman of the Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., said the officers of the organization had decided to transfer the award to the Committee for a National Trade Policy because of its "vigor in presenting the facts on trade policy to the public. The Committee for a National Trade Policy," he said, "has spoken out forcibly for a liberal trade policy in order to stimulate national prosperity and strengthen U.S. foreign policy." Mr. Rittersporn added: "The Committee on Foreign Trade Education has always been pleased to work with the Committee for a National Trade Policy; we are delighted now, as we conclude our work, that they are assuming the responsibility for the Cordell Hull Award and for continuing the tribute to Secretary Hull's great tradition of public service."

Sidney A. Swensrud, former chairman of the Gulf Oil Corp., is now the chairman of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Charles P. Taft, general counsel, John W. Hight, executive director, and Mrs. Rachel S. Bell, legislative director.

Mr. Rittersporn headed the Committee on Foreign Trade Education from its inception late in 1953 to early in 1958, when he resigned to join the Washington, D.C., office of the European Community for Coal and Steel, and, later, to become a member of Governor Rockefeller's campaign organization. He is now a public relations counsel in New York and Washington.

In his statement Mr. Rittersporn hailed the 1958 officers of the trade education organization, Warren W. Dwyer, chairman, Norman W. Davis, secretary and treasurer, and Robert Baldwin and Gerard Palmer, vice chairmen. The extension last year of the reciprocal trade agreements legislation until June 1962, Mr. Rittersporn said, has been a major factor in the decision of the officers to conclude the committee's operation.

He charged, however, that "the 1958 extension contains so many loopholes and under-the-counter giveaways to the high tariff interests that it would be dead wrong to believe that the world's leading Nation is yet equipped to lead in developing world trade." For that reason, he said "the commitee's officer anticipated that members throughout the Nation will pitch in to help the Committee for a National Trade Policy win a trade policy that builds up—instead of tears down—our international security and our domestic prosperity."

The Committee on Foreign Trade Education, Inc., was formed in late 1953 by leaders of both the New York Young Republican and Young Democratic Clubs. It aimed to stir public interest in trade policy and to win popular support for a liberal trade program. In addition to Mr. Rittersporn, cofounders included Maureen Black, Ford Foundation staff member, Thomas L. Hughes, attorney, Maurice Rashbaum, Jr., advertising executive, Daniel F. Ruge, newly appointed director of the New York State Department of Commerce in Washington, D.C. and Robert W. Sweet, onetime assistant U.S. attorney in New York.

Mr. Rittersporn thanked all those who had joined the committee's bipartisan, volunteer drive and gave special praise to the directors of three of the committee's national chapters and affiliates, Mrs. Naomi D. Marshall, of New Orleans; Mr. Jerome Jacobson, of Washington, D.C.; and Mr. Edward S. Flynn, of Los Angeles, Calif. He also singled out some of the organization's New York leaders, Cora Lou Buffum, Peggy Fischer, Edward S. Early, Stephanie Edgel, David C. Hamilton, John Howatt, W. Byron Kantack, Marie Ryan Kearney, David C. Lane, Gwelda McPhee, Winthrop R. Munyan, and John F. Petty.

Public figures identified with the trade education committee as advisors and honorary members included: Senator Jacob K. Javits, Republican, of New York, Senator Harrison A. Williams, Jr., Democrat, of New Jersey, former Gov. Theodore R. McKeldin, Republican, of Maryland, Representative Frank E. Smith, Democrat, of Mississippi, the late Herman P. Eberharter, Democratic Congressman from Pennsylvania, and former Republican Congressmen, Robert W. Kean, of New Jersey, and Albert P. Morano, of Connecticut.

Others included Mr. Whitelaw Reid, former editor and publisher of the New York Herald Tribune; Col. Redington Fiske, editor of Export Trade; Dr. Isador Lubin, former industrial commissioner in New York State; Harry S. Radcliffe, executive vice president of the National Council of American Importers; Louis Harris, public opinion analyst; and Dr. Raymond Vernon, former director of the New York Metropolitan Region Study.

Now Who'll Buy Savings Bonds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks the press has given prominent attention to the President's request to remove interest rates on E and H bonds as well as long-term issues. Most of the comment has criticized Congress severely for its failure to act. One of the most telling arguments in favor of the President's proposal was a letter from Prof. Cyril A. Zebot of Georgetown University printed in the New York Times of August 25, 1959. The last paragraph of Professor Zebot's letter reads as follows:

Congress must find a way to correct the dangerous monetary situation before it adjourns. The political leadership that permitted the hasty House committee decision must be made aware of the fact that general economic literacy is not so low that people will fail to detect the source of the grave consequences that will follow if the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds is not removed now.

Another sound appraisal of the situation appeared in an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of August 20, 1959, as follows:

NOW WHO'LL BUY SAVINGS BONDS?

The bonds of a country's government ought to form one of the most attractive media for the savings of its citizens. For 12 months Americans have been cashing in more than they have been buying of the series E and series H savings bonds which trace their lineage back through two World Wars. In July the excess of cash-ins over purchases surpassed a quarter of a billion dollars.

If a commercial corporation found its securities losing popularity at that rate it wold consider what it could do to make them more attractive, either by increasing the rate of return or improving its credit or both. It is time Congress should consider these possibilities with reference to securities of the United States.

Yet, what has happened? The House Ways and Means Committee by vote of 14 of its 15 Democratic members has tabled the bill carrying the authority requested by President Eisenhower and the Treasury to pay higher interest rates on Government bonds of 5-year or longer terms, including savings bonds. This action is fiscal irresponsibility of a blatant sort. One of its worst features is that, unless reversed, it postpones for a year or more the possibility of making Government savings bonds attractive to citizens who should be taking a financial as well as a civic interest in the affairs of their Nation.

Even with an increase from 3¼ to 3¾ percent in interest rates such as the administration proposes, it would take some time to curb the recent movement away from Government bonds on the part of individual savers and of institutions such as banks and insurance companies.

For that movement has been engendered not only by concern over rate of yield on an investment but still more by concern for safety of the principal—not in terms of dollars but in terms of buying power. Myriad investors, large and small, have been looking for a hedge against inflation, and many of them turning to the stock market.

One irony of the situation is that this enlightenment as to the inroads of inflation may have come at the end of the inflationary spiral and at a point where for once in a generation bonds might hold their value besides paying a reasonable yield. A large number of economists now believe that consumer prices for the next year or two may remain stable—in other words, that inflation may be checked. If the boon of a decade of peace can be added to rising world productivity, this could be a very good period for citizens to own bonds—and for governments to encourage their ownership.

Hosting Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the Dothan Eagle, of Dothan, Ala., published a very interesting editorial entitled "Hosting Mr. Khrushchev." Some very good ideas are expressed in the editorial, which I commend to the reading of all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOSTING MR. KHRUSHCHEV

If Americans heed the requests of President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON they can put on their best bib and tucker for the forthcoming visit of Nikita Khrushchev. Both have spoken forthrightly in a plea that courtesy be shown the Soviet leader and if the forthcoming exchange of visits between him and Mr. Eisenhower is to have any weight as a warming influence in the cold war, it would be well that he be politely received.

Without fawning or kow-towing, due courtesy can be shown Mr. Khrushchev, particularly in view of the Russian receptions given Mr. NIXON. He can be given a polite listening and he can speak his piece, as did Mr. NIXON on several occasions, while having a look-see at America that may do him good.

Memory is not too short to recall the anger expressed widely in the United States by individuals and press when Mr. NIXON was spat upon and pushed around by South American hoodlums on his tour of good will.

Neither is the recollection gone of some slightly shabby treatment accorded Mr. Khrushchev's deputy, Mikoyan, who visited here last January and was the target for some perhaps understandable jeering from some Hungarian refugees. But Mikoyan also was the recipient of some eggs in Chicago and San Francisco and this is hardly understandable conduct from democratic and sporting Americans who are supposed to be the epitome of tolerance.

Even more recently the mayor of Detroit snubbed Soviet Deputy Premier Kozlov and refused to welcome him there.

These events were sharply in contrast to the conduct of the Russians during the tour of eight American Governors as they called on the heads of Soviet Republic States and at much variance with Mr. NIXON'S reception. It might be pointed out here that while Detroit's mayor ignored Kozlov, Khrushchev unexpectedly invited our Vice President to his home for an unscheduled overnight visit.

Concerning the Khrushchev visit here, there already is a policy change by high Government officials over harsh statements about the Russian boss. This was evidenced last week in the notable change in text of a speech by no less a distinguished official than Army Secretary Brucker, and later by the change in text of a speech of Gen. Arthur Trudeau, Chief of Army's Research and Development.

Secretary Brucker's prepared speech had belabored Khrushchev for "blatant Soviet threats of nuclear devastation" and for recent "tough talk" to American visitors (the Governors) to Moscow. Instead, the Secretary substituted remarks about the friendly reception for Mr. NIXON which he said "promises a better era of understanding."

General Trudeau's address was changed to eliminate some harsh quotations from Khrushchev himself.

All of this, of course, including the Eisenhower-Nixon courtesy pleas, is no attempt to be buddy-buddy with the Soviet's biggest figure or to play footsie-footsie to the extent of overdoing politeness.

It is, more to the point, to show the Russians that all of our talk of peace and an end to the cold war is not empty nothingness or sweetness wasted on the desert air.

Let Mr. Khrushchev come, see and talk, as all do under our vaunted freedom of speech.

We can be as polite as a little dog in a meat house, yet be as frank and free as Voltaire when he said:

"I disapprove of what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it."

Clara Barton: Beloved Daughter of the Third Massachusetts District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks I include therein an outstanding and most interesting article entitled "Clara Barton: Angel of the Battlefield" which outlines the remarkable career and contributions of the illustrious founder of the Red Cross who was born in Oxford, Mass., in my district on Christmas Day, 1821.

This article was very ably and appropriately written for the centennial edition of the Webster Times, a celebrated and splendid newspaper in my district. It is the almost incredible story of a gifted woman inspired to help the poor, the lowly, and the afflicted.

The great, humane organization she founded is an imperishable monument to Clara Barton. In the hearts of the people, and in the history of the Nation and the world, the name of this saintly lady will be remembered forever.

CLARA BARTON: "ANGEL OF THE BATTLEFIELD"—AMERICAN RED CROSS FOUNDER BORN IN OXFORD DECEMBER 25, 1821

(America's foremost woman—the "Angel of the Battlefield"—was born in Oxford, Worcester County, Mass., on Christmas Day, 1821. For half a century she was the world's leading figure in relieving the suffering of the thousands who fought on the fields of battle. She became the friend and counselor of Abraham Lincoln, of Ulysses S. Grant, of James A. Garfield, of Hayes, Harrison, Cleveland, and McKinley.)

From the crowned heads of Europe she received homage that royalty might envy. When, according to the custom, she bent to kiss the hand of the CZAR of Russia, he quickly raised his hand and said, "Nay, Miss Barton, not that from you."

Clara Barton was perhaps the most perfect incarnation of mercy that the modern world has known, and the founder of the greatest humanitarian movement in the history of nations. Preceded by the scarlet cross, Clara Barton went to Washington during the Civil War and there—the first woman to render aid to the Union soldiers—visited the hospitals and brought relief to the wounded. Day after day she went down to the wharves, where, with the mud and gore of Chickahominy still clinging to them, were brought the boys in blue and in gray.

Then came the eventful Sunday in September 1862, when she loaded an army wagon with supplies and started out alone in the wake of General McClellan's army. She caught up with McClellan at Antietam and took her place in the swift train of artillery. At a large barn near a cornfield close to the battleline she made her headquarters, where the Confederate shells fell thick and fast, and the cornfield was filled with wounded. The army surgeons ran out of dressings, and endeavored to make cornhusks do. It was then that Miss Barton opened her supply case and brought out what was needed. "I have everything," was her quiet remark.

She rounded up 25 men who had come to the rear with the wounded and set them to work administering restoratives. When her bread and broth were spent, she used a liquor supply that she carried. Darkness fell over the bloody field of battle, and still men remained who had not been relieved. "Five hundred men," cried the surgeon general, "will die before daybreak unless they have attention, and I have no lights."

"Get up, Doctor," said Miss Barton, "I have brought plenty of lanterns this time. The men will be here in a few minutes to light the house. You will have abundance of light and all the help you want." And she led him to the door and showed him how she had arranged lanterns for the work that lay before them. So the candles of her love and pity lighted the blood-stained fields of Antietam and Fredericksburg. It has been said that she bore a charmed life, for though her clothing was often grazed, she was never wounded. At the close of the Civil War she organized the bureau to locate missing men or find their burial place.

At the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War, Miss Barton went abroad where she aided in caring for the wounded, and where afterwards she received many decorations and recognition for her service. The Grand Duke and Duchess of Baden, the Queens of Serbia, Italy and England, the Empress of Germany, and the Prince of Jerusalem all joined in their thanks for her devotion.

During the summer of 1877, Miss Barton endeavored to get the Red Cross convention signed by the Government, but it was not until 1881 that she succeeded. In May of that year the American Association of the Red Cross was formed, and President Garfield made her president for life. She continued in this office until 1904, when President Roosevelt conceived the idea of making the Red Cross a military branch of the Government. It was then that Miss Barton resigned.

In 1892 she sent representatives to Russia, where, following her experiences in alleviating suffering during the Johnstown flood, she helped to relieve the famine. In 1896 she aided Armenia after Turkish ravages. After the battle of Santiago was fought in 1898 the entire American Navy made way for her relief ship. In command of the first ship to enter the harbor after the capture of Santiago, Miss Barton entered the town with food and other necessities. Her last work of national importance was in connection with the Galveston flood of 1900.

Miss Barton lived to be 90 years old. From her home overlooking the fair Potomac she passed her last years a shadowy figure that moved through the gardens of Glen Echo, a pitying sweetness in her eyes, and a frequent word of forgiveness to the Nation that had taken from her the staff that had borne aloft, for more than a half century, the banner of the Red Cross.

A slight stoop was evident in the shoulders that had bent over so many sickbeds, but the fine dark hair, save for silver lights above the ears, remained dark to the end.

Miss Barton died at Glen Echo, April 12, 1912. There was in that year considerable dissatisfaction that her remains were not interred in the National Cemetery, but the town in which she was born, received the body.

Today, in the cemetery at Oxford, stands a monument of "red" in the form of a cross that marks the grave of the town's most distinguished citizen. A diabetic camp, named for her deeds of mercy, is a tribute to this great humanitarian.

Her birthplace is a national shrine, visited by many thousands.

The town's greatest citizen, Oxford may well be proud of being the birthplace of Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross.

Response to Cosponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 127

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a short time ago it was my pleasure to join with some of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation which is intended to help relieve the serious shortage, now existing in this country, of specially trained teachers of the deaf and speech pathologists and audiologists.

From correspondence received from educational institutions and individuals in my State, as well as from all over the Nation, it had become increasingly evident that there is a vital need for legislation which will help to subsidize teachers in training for this noteworthy profession. For example, the chairman of the Department of Exceptional Education of the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, Miss Alice Streng, informed me that that institution has been training teachers of the deaf since 1913, with an average class size of eight students, but—although an active recruiting campaign had been conducted among the student body and high schools in the area—the prospects for the senior class this next year consist of only two students. Miss Streng had attributed this alarming state of affairs to several factors—the primary one being that teachers of deaf children are not usually compensated beyond what an ordinary teacher earns, even though working with deaf children is an extremely difficult and exacting job. In addition, the shortage of teachers in general has drawn students away from the specialties; and, because of limited contacts with deaf children in the population, most students are not aware of this professional field.

Statistics prove that Wisconsin is not alone in its shortage of teachers of the deaf and speech pathologists and audiologists. It has been reliably estimated that there are some 8 million Americans of all ages who suffer from speech or hearing impairments of such a nature so as to seriously handicap them in their efforts to become self-supporting, self-sufficient taxpaying members of their communities. Included in this figure are some 30,000 deaf children of school age in the United States—an increase in 1959 of more than 1,200—who require the training of some 500 teachers of the deaf annually. Despite this requirement, there were fewer than 150 such teachers

in training over the past academic year. In addition, although it is estimated that some 20,000 speech pathologists and audiologists are needed to properly diagnose, train, and rehabilitate these 8 million handicapped people, there are at present only some 2,000 certified specialists in this field.

It is expected, therefore, that—if enacted—Senate Joint Resolution 127 will assist in alleviating this need by establishing and conducting a program of grants-in-aid to public and nonprofit institutions which are engaged in this type of training.

Recently, I have been pleased to receive many letters from all over the country expressing appreciation for my cosponsorship of Senate Joint Resolution 127; among them the American Speech and Hearing Association, the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc., and the Clarke School for the Deaf. I ask unanimous consent to have some of these letters printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SPEECH & HEARING ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., August 31, 1959.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The American Speech & Hearing Association wishes to take this opportunity to express its appreciation to you for cosponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 127 with Senator HILL.

Your understanding of the tremendous need for speech pathologists, audiologists, and classroom teachers of the deaf is most encouraging to all of us actively engaged in work with children and adults severely handicapped by speech or hearing disabilities. If you feel we may provide you with information about the speech and hearing field and the needs in this area, please let me know. The American Speech & Hearing Association, the national professional association for speech, pathologists and audiologists, would like to be as helpful as possible in the effort to secure passage of this extremely desirable legislation.

Yours very truly,
KENNETH O. JOHNSON, Ph. D.,
Executive Secretary.

ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEAF, INC.,
Washington, D.C., August 24, 1959.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On behalf of the 1,200 members of the parents' section of the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, I would like to thank you for the work you have done on the preparation and introduction of Senate Joint Resolution 127.

As parents of deaf children we are grateful for the effort you have made to insure their education and help them grow up to be productive citizens.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT H. COLE,
President, Parents' Section.

THE CLARKE SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF,
Northampton, Mass., August 14, 1959.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: All of us associated with Clarke School wish to add our expression of appreciation to those of the national organizations concerned with the education of deaf children, as well as the schools for the deaf and the parents of deaf children, to you for your active interest in our work. Senate Joint Resolution 127, which you cosponsored, is a significant step in the history of the education of deaf children in this country.

We appreciate the time and effort which you have devoted to this cause, and all of the courtesies which you have extended to Mr. Evan V. Johnston, our director of development.

Undoubtedly you will hear from a good many others who are interested in deaf children across the country. The need for trained classroom teachers of deaf children is urgent, and we in the profession will bend every effort to assist you in urging the passage of the resolution.

Sincerely yours,
GEORGE T. PRATT, *Principal.*

THE CLARKE SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF,
Northampton, Mass., August 14, 1959.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Thank you very much for your thoughtful letter and a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 127, along with the introductory statement taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD relative to Senator HILL's comments on this legislation.

Please accept the sincere thanks of the many people in the profession of education for the deaf, and especially those groups that helped promote this proposal. The main organizations that have been working together to obtain this legislation are the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf; and for title II, the American Speech and Hearing Association.

Passage of this resolution will give a tremendous boost to education for the deaf throughout the world. Your interest has been deeply appreciated, and you may rest assured that we will lend our full facilities to the Congress in order to obtain a clear picture of the critical needs, and in order to aid in passage of Senate Joint Resolution 127.

Sincerely yours,
EVAN V. JOHNSTON,
Director of Development.

We Are Being Sheared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker in recent days on the floor of the House, reference has been made to the plight of several industries that are being adversely affected by this Nation's trade policies. The victims of this program are increasing daily. Those of us who have proclaimed effects of calculated destruction to the pottery, ceramic tile, handmade glass, and similar industries during the past 5 years, have been greeted with courtesy, but also with indifference, shrugged shoulders and knowing looks, by members who felt their industries were secure, or even being benefitted by our suicidal trade program. One of these days, more of my colleagues will be awakened to the realization that they have been feasting on a poisonous fare, a delight to the palate, but death to the diner.

The trade balance has tipped. Dollars and gold are pouring out for foreign goods while the products of the American workman are staying home, unwanted by other nations of the world, whose only interest is in selling to Uncle Sam.

The Zanesville (Ohio) Times Recorder in an editorial of August 28, 1959, quoted the apt description of Senator SCHOEPPEL who said:

> We are making the United States the worst place in the world to buy and the best place in the world to sell in. If we continue we will have full employment in Milan and Manila and increasing unemployment in Topeka and Detroit.

It seems impossible that a deliberative, representative legislative body could have embarked upon such a program to weaken our Nation, but the record speaks for itself. Markets for our goods are dwindling, while we destroy our domestic market by opening the flood gates of trade to foreign nations where a workman receives a pittance to compete with the wage earners of southeastern Ohio.

It is time for us to wake up to the facts of economic life and national survival. We are deliberately trading our dollars for cheap junk and trash that breaks, fades, ravels, cracks, and crumbles.

The Times Recorder editorial which contained the quotation of the distinguished Senator is in its entirety a well-reasoned, frank appraisal of our situation. I include it at the conclusion of my remarks:

WE ARE BEING SHEARED

In the face of the rising tide of imports that, encouraged by our do-gooding reciprocal trade programs, have already brought U.S. imports dangerously above exports, some public figures in Washington are beginning to realize that the survival of one American industry after another is at stake.

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, Kansas Republican, now fears for our much bragged about standard of living and says: "We are making the United States the worst place in the world to buy and the best place in the world to sell in. If we continue we will have full employment in Milan and Manila and increasing unemployment in Topeka and Detroit."

With similar rumbles from solons in north, south, east, and west, Congress may be sufficiently alarmed by next January to consider the bleak prospect we have created through the export of our industrial know-how, our giveaway programs and GATT. But American wool people, notably the American Sheep Producers Council, backed by the processors and weavers, decided some time ago to pull the industry up by its own boot-straps rather than waiting on our lawmakers. Organized as Woolens and Worsteds of America, Inc., wool people—from the grass country to the mills—are awakening the public not only to the unique and inherent virtues of American-made woolen fabrics but to the importance of this far-reaching industry to our national economy and national defense.

In September, which is American Woolen Month, we shall be increasingly reminded that these natural fibers are still unequaled in withstanding both summer's heat and winter's blast, in providing warmth without weight, elasticity that insures long wear and

good appearance; qualities that are enhanced by its resistance to wrinkles and its nonflammability—and the recent developments of mothproofing, crease-retention, and washability. And we will realize, too, that American-made woolens are today the finest in the world.

In considering the wool robes of the Bedouins which protect these rovers from the desert's blazing sun and its shivering nights, we should also consider the plight of an army in the field, in fair weather and foul, without woolen uniforms. And without woolgrowers and woolen mills of our own, we would be at the mercy of nations that might, or might not, share with us—even if we were able to bring these essential fabrics to our shores.

When we see the sheep-shearing displays that are to be a feature of American Woolen Month, let us consider well that, in the international senses, we are the sheep. Foreign mills with wage scales of one-third to one-tenth of our own are doing their very best to denude us. Those of us who care about employment, prosperity, and safety for this country will ask questions before we buy wool products. Where does the wool come from? Where was it loomed? Until Congress gets around to protecting this essential industry, Americans must protect it—by buying American woolens.

Let Khrushchev Call Off the Soviet Union's Propaganda Campaign Against Iran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, all of us have noted, in connection with the prospective visit of the Soviet Premier, that Mr. Khrushchev states that he desires a lessening of world tensions. In addition, he and other Soviet leaders have often asserted that the U.S.S.R. does not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. If Mr. Khrushchev really means what he says, he might call off the Soviet Union's abusive and unwarranted propaganda campaign against Iran, its small neighbor. Apparently, Iran's only sin in Soviet eyes is her friendship with the United States.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond of the New York Herald Tribune has pointed up this situation in his articles of August 24 and August 19.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 19, 1959]

REPORTS ARE ENCOURAGING FROM COLD WAR'S FRONTS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is a good idea to take a clear-eyed look occasionally at the big question: How fares the cold war?

To answer this question you have to ask others. Are the Communists continuing to make friends and influence people? Are they even continuing to make enemies and influence people? Is their power and is their prestige growing—or lessening? Is resistance to communism strengthening itself? Is U.S. policy beginning to show some significant dividends?

We need to avoid being wishful, and sometimes today's gain turns out to be tomorrow's loss. But the other extreme also needs to be avoided—a kind of whipped-up pessimism that everything is falling apart under Communist pressure and that nothing the United States does ever works.

The fact is that on the broad fronts of the cold war the evidence justifies two encouraging reports:

1. In Europe the Soviet Union has suffered several stebacks in recent weeks.

2. In non-Communist Asia the tide is visibly turning against communism and the capacity and will to resist Communist subversion is increasing.

What has Moscow most been trying to accomplish in Europe this year? Primarily to keep any NATO country from accepting American nuclear weapons. It blandly argued that Western Europe can better protect itself if only Russia has nuclear weapons. Then the Kremlin rattled its rockets at Italy, Greece, and Turkey and fired off notes and threats that they must not receive nuclear weapons from the United States. These countries refused to be intimidated and their answer was that "we'll decide what's best for our defense."

For months now the Kremlin has been directing a massive and abusive propaganda campaign against Iran, seeking to force its Government to break its ties with the West—or else. The sturdy Iranians refuse to yield.

Premier Khrushchev found the Scandinavians so unresponsive to his bill of goods that he had to call off his scheduled month-long trip to Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. And the 100,000 Poles who cheered and beflowered the Nixons weren't cheering their own unwanted Communist leaders nor the Kremlin's.

In Asia from Indonesia to India the neutralist nations are becoming less neutral to communism all the time. President Sukarno has ejected the Communists in his Cabinet, as has the new government in Ceylon. Nearly all the free regimes in Asia are achieving new levels of stability and economic growth.

Washington officials are much encouraged by these developments, and the validity of their appraisal has new confirmation in the reports which Ernest K. Lindley of Newsweek has brought back from his 3-month survey from Lebanon to Korea. He is not one given to overstatement or lightheaded optimism. He writes:

"In Asia the tide has turned in our favor. The appeal, influence, and prestige of communism are waning."

There are, of course, some very considerable reasons; such as Red China's bald aggression against Tibet, the brutal regimentation of the communes which has alienated many of the overseas Chinese, the firm and successful stand against the Communist effort to take the offshore islands near Formosa last year, the gross violation of democratic institutions by the Communists in Kerala.

But there are other reasons which have contributed to turning the tide. American economic aid has helped. More Asians are coming to see that the SEATO military alliance is a deterrent and shield against aggression. Our refusal to withdraw from the offshore islands in the face of Communist fire heartened all the free Asian governments.

Obviously this is no time to weaken or alter U.S. policies, including economic aid and nonadmission of Red China to the U.N., who helped to bring about these results.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 24, 1959]

ADVICE FOR MR. K.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

HE COULD IMPROVE THE CLIMATE HERE

There is no doubt that Premier Khrushchev wants his visit to the United States to be harmonious. To that end, from the very day the exchange of visits was announced, the Kremlin called off its more abusive propaganda attacks directed against America and Americans.

There is criticism on Radio Moscow, but the rough language of the past is now muted and sometimes the Soviet press actually speaks a good word about the American exhibition.

This is all very nice, but it doesn't mean much. A temporary interruption in the flow of anti-American propaganda is not going to improve the climate for Mr. Khushchev's trip a very great deal—if at all. I wonder if Mr. Khrushchev would like to know how really to improve the climate? What counts is what is done, not what is said or left unsaid, and I can think of three things the Soviet Premier could do to guarantee a courteous, responsive, and hopeful reception in the United States.

They are these:

The matter of Iran—Here is an innocent, harmless, brave country bordering on the Soviet Union which is certainly no military threat to anybody. In 1946 and 1947 Moscow sought to take part of Iran by setting up a separate Communist state in the province of Azerbaijan supported by Soviet troops which then refused to leave after World War II.

Because of the continuing Soviet threat, Iran joined the defensive Baghdad Pact and strengthened its ties with the United States and the West.

Since the war Soviet policy toward Iran has alternated between honeyed words and bristling threats. For a year now it has been using the bristling-threat tactic. Moscow wants to force Iran out of the Baghdad Pact and to make it sever its ties with the United States. It wants Iran neutral, isolated, and under its protective arm.

Since January of 1959 Radio Moscow in its Persian language broadcasts has been sharply critical of Iran, vilifying personally the Shah and inviting the violent overthrow of the Iranian Government. It has done more. It has set up a clandestine radio in Soviet territory claiming to be the national voice of Iran and attempting openly to incite to revolt. On May 23, it pleaded: "Patriotic Iranians, crusade against the plunderers of Iran." On July 2, it urged: "Dear compatriots, crusade against the detested regime of the Shah."

If Mr. Khrushchev wants to improve the climate for his American visit, he could call off Moscow's abusive campaign against Iran.

The matter of the American fliers—on June 27, 1958, Soviet pilots shot down an unarmed American transport which had lost its way a few miles off its course over the Soviet-Armenian frontier. We have in our possession and we have given to the Soviet Government the complete earwitness of what happened. It is a continuous tape recording of the conversation of the Soviet pilots which literally reveals their words and Russian voices telling each other that they had spotted the lost U.S. plane, that they recognized it as an unarmed transport, that they agreed which should attack first and which should finish it off. There were 17 Americans in the plane. The Soviets have turned over six of the bodies. They claimed the plane crashed by accident, that they know nothing of the other 11.

If Mr. Khrushchev wants to improve the climate for his U.S. visit, he could provide an informative and frank report on the missing 11 U.S. fliers.

The matter of Laos—We believe that the Soviet Union is aiding and abetting the Chinese and Vietnamese Communist aggression against the independent and non-Communist state of Laos.

If Mr. Khrushchev wants to improve the climate for his American visit, he could use his influence with his Communist colleagues to call off the attack and if he is unable to succeed and wants to prove that he tried, he can announce that he will not veto U.N. Security Council action to restore peace.

Aptuxcet: Birthplace of American Capitalism and Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1627 the Aptuxcet Trading Post was established in what is now the town of Bourne, Mass., on the banks of the Manamet River, later to become part of the Cape Cod Canal. The post, a replica of which stands on the original foundations, was the birthplace of American capitalism and free enterprise.

On September 5 and 6 the town of Bourne will celebrate its 75th anniversary. I regard as timely the inclusion in that celebration of a pageant depicting historical events connected with the Aptuxcet Trading Post, and welcome it as an opportunity of acquainting my colleagues in the Congress with the significant role played by the post in the establishment of the American capitalistic system and free enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pertinent information, provided by sponsors of the Aptuxcet Pageant, 1959: Bourne Historical Society, Old Colony Union Women's Club of Bourne, and Buzzards Bay Chamber of Commerce, as written by Mrs. Elinor D. Kemp, chairman of the Aptuxcet Pageant Committee:

The agreement setting up the Aptuxcet Trading Post and giving certain of their number control of the trade there, was written and signed by the colonists of Plimoth Plantation at the plantation, 20 miles distant. Its purpose was to pay off the huge debt still owed to the London backers of the Mayflower expedition, to transport more of their brethren to Plimoth, and to bring profit to the colony.

This agreement was the first business contract drawn up and signed in America and establishes Aptuxcet's claim as the birthplace of American capitalism.

In Aptuxcet's organization and in the reasons that brought it into being lie the basic concepts of that which is typical of our present-day American capitalistic system. The venture was undertaken, through free and democratic process, by people with faith in God and an unswerving devotion to obligations at home and abroad.

Thus, the Aptuxcet Trading Post, as a symbol of American capitalism, can be a powerful anti-Communist weapon. The methods and motives of its founders are the antithesis of everything inherent in Soviet communism. Where American capitalism was founded on faith, freedom, and honor, Soviet communism is dedicated to atheism, enslavement, international deceit, and Communist world domination by whatever means will serve.

Communism seeks the destruction of our capitalistic system by use of the "big lie." In the Aptuxcet story we have the "big truth." American capitalism, which has brought abundance and enrichment to our society, and which we have shared freely with the world, was from its earliest beginnings firmly rooted in moral principles.

Mr. Speaker, I would like also to include in the RECORD a special message from Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, sent to the town of Bourne in honor of this event:

I am very pleased to hear that the town of Bourne is this year celebrating the diamond jubilee of its foundation. The little towns of Massachusetts have always been model communities of family living where the finest qualities of religion and patriotism have blended to give us the ablest of men and most loyal of citizens.

Bourne has a special distinction in having within its borders the old Pilgrim Trading Post in Aptuxcet where we can say that the world of business began in America. When Governor Bradford had drawn up an agreement with a group of colonists to regulate the trading in furs, lumber, and the rest, he could not have foreseen the great economic empire which would one day be America. At the same time, in those modest beginnings, he underscored the lasting principles which should mark every business enterprise—honesty, fair dealing with labor and mutual confidence.

Many years have passed since 1627 and there have been many changes in human life and living but what was begun at Aptuxcet was well founded, and as long as America continues to honor the old virtues, we will have a Nation, not just economically strong, but what is more important, morally strong as well.

My blessings and good wishes to the citizens of Bourne on their happy anniversary. May God watch over them always.

Mr. Speaker, from the correspondence of Governor Bradford, and from his history "Of Plimouth Plantation," it has been found that this trading post not only played a most vital part in the financial struggles of the early settlers, but appears to have been what truthfully may be called the cradle of American commerce.

The Bourne Historical Society, which owns the ancient site, believing that every opportunity should be embraced to preserve landmarks of our earliest history as an aid to inspiring future Americans with gratitude to the founders of the Nation, has, with the support of the General Society of Mayflower Descendants and many friendly citizens, erected on the original foundations a permanent replica of the old buildings as a memorial to the early traders who, by their tenacity of high purpose, here blazed a definite and successful beginning of the trail of the Nation's commerce.

I feel privileged, Mr. Speaker, to be the Representative in Congress of this most important town, with its rich heritage, and of the people there perpetuating the characteristics of the early 17th century pioneers to whom at this time we pay honor.

Rabbi Robert I. Kahn, of Houston, Tex., Chosen as National Chaplain of American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on August 27, I had the pleasure and privilege of addressing the 41st National Convention of the American Legion, at Minneapolis, Minn. On the previous day, the Legion chose as its new national chaplain, Rabbi Robert I. Kahn, of Houston, Tex.

Mr. President, the Lone Star State is proud of this honor that has been bestowed upon Rabbi Kahn, for he is indeed a distinguished man of faith. Rabbi Kahn is known in Texas for his intelligence, his character and capacity for leadership, and his warm sensitivity. I am delighted that the American Legion has made this choice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Legion Chooses Texas Rabbi To Be Chaplain," written by Willmar Thorkelson, and published in the Minneapolis Star of August 27, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGION CHOOSES TEXAS RABBI TO BE CHAPLAIN

(By Willmar Thorkelson)

A tall Texas rabbi whose parents and brother live in Minneapolis was elected today as new national chaplain of the American Legion.

Dr. Robert I. Kahn, 48, for 15 years rabbi of Congregation Emanu-El in Houston, Tex., is the third Jewish clergyman in the 40-year history of the Legion to serve as its chaplain.

He succeeds Msgr. John J. Twiss, pastor of St. Peter's Catholic Church in Lowell, Mass., who has served during the past year.

Rabbi Kahn is son of Mr. and Mrs. Morris L. Kahn, 3908 South Sheridan Avenue, and a brother of Howard S. Kahn, 5133 South Oliver Avenue, former Minneapolis Housing and Redevelopment Commissioner and unsuccessful candidate for the Minneapolis School Board in the June election.

On the basis of his Army experience, Rabbi Kahn said that he didn't expect his being a non-Christian would be a handicap in serving as Legion chaplain.

"When I was in the Army," he explained, "I was rabbi to the Jewish soldiers but chaplain to all men of the outfit. That's what I think I'll be in the Legion."

He noted that in many of its public functions, the Legion has developed a trio approach and has clergy representing the three major faiths—Protestant, Roman Catholic, and Jewish.

Asked if he had seen any results of the Legion's "Back to God" movement, Rabbi Kahn observed that they had been more in quality than in quantity.

He said he referred to the quality of the services at Legion conventions, the response to Legion telecasts and the feeling among legionnaires that the "Back to God" effort was not empty piety, but honest recognition that religion plays an important role in all of life.

The rabbi was endorsed for national chaplain by the Legion's Texas department which said he had brought it "the very best in spiritual guidance" during his term as department chaplain.

A rabbi of the reformed or liberal wing of American Judaism, Dr. Kahn was born in Des Moines, Iowa, in 1910.

He received his A.B. degree from the University of Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1932, and his rabbinical degree from Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, in 1935.

He earned a doctor of Hebrew letters degree from the latter college in 1950. His thesis was on "Anglo-Jewish Preaching in the 19th Century."

Rabbi Kahn began his career as a clergyman at Congregation Beth Israel, Houston, in 1935.

He served in the Army chaplains' corps from 1940 to 1945, spending 2 years overseas with combat troops of the Sixth Army.

During this time, he conducted services in New Guinea and the Philippines at more than a dozen different island installations. He was a captain when separated from service. He joined the Legion a month after leaving the Army.

He was elected rabbi of Congregation Emanu-El, then a new congregation, while still overseas. During his rabbinate, the congregation has grown from 200 to more than 1,100 families and has built a new temple.

Dr. Kahn is married to the former Rozelle Rosenthal of Dallas, Tex. They have three children.

The Visiting Fireman Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal on the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev:

THE UNSPOKEN RISK

In his speech to the American Legion convention, Vice President NIXON gave the clearest official explanation so far of a matter that puzzles and disturbs many Americans—why the administration decided to invite Soviet Premier Khrushchev to this country.

What Mr. NIXON said, it seems to us, adds up to a responsible and dignified answer to that question. And if the U.S. can only stick to the approach defined by Mr. NIXON once the Big Two talks get going, then there need be little fear of the outcome.

Here is how Mr. NIXON summed up the present administration attitude:

"It would be naive and wishful thinking to assume that the visit * * * will result in any basic change in the Communist objective of world domination or their adherence to policies designed to achieve that goal. * * * Everything (Khrushchev) sees in the United States will be seen through Communist eyes and the picture will be distorted or magnified. * * *

"What useful purpose, then, will this visit serve? Putting it in its simplest terms, while understanding alone will not bring peace, misunderstanding could provoke war." Mr. NIXON then discussed some of Khrushchev's dangerous misconceptions about the United States, misconceptions which just might be tempered by his visit despite his Communist bias. On such, containing obvious dangers of a miscalculation on the Kremlin's part: Khrushchev is convinced that millions of Americans do not support the President in his firm stand against communism.

"In a nutshell," the Vice President went on, "if we are to have a Soviet leader with such power in his hands, it is better to have one who knows the world than who is isolated in the Kremlin."

In addition, Mr. NIXON discounted the fear that the American people and their leaders will be lulled by Khrushchev into a false sense of security and trust. We agree with the Vice President there, too; not many Americans ever were taken in by communism, despite the wartime attitude of their Government, and certainly President Eisenhower isn't going to be fooled at this late date.

Still, it will take all Mr. Eisenhower's skill and firmness to avoid a somewhat subtler risk, unspoken by Mr. NIXON in his admirable presentation. In large part this risk stems from the very nature of this kind of get-together. Here are by all odds the two most powerful men in the world, conferring together for several days during Khrushchev's stay. The President will need all his present determination to keep this from being in fact a summit meeting—the summit of summits, to pursue that abused metaphor.

For in these circumstances, with such unprecedented power in the hands of two men, the temptation is inherent, and will doubtless grow as the days go on, to use that power; in our case, for what we deem to be the good of the world. If the stalemate of the oppressive cold war, with its constant risk of nuclear war, could seemingly be broken with a word, even a tacit understanding, many men would find the temptation irresistible.

This would not be the same as being "lulled" by a false-faced enemy. The risk, if any, is of being lulled into a slip by one's own longing for real peace after all these years of bitter frustrations, heavy burdens, and incessant dangers. Lulled by the feeling Mr. Eisenhower himself eloquently expressed the other day in defense of the forthcoming meetings: "What we are talking about is the human race and what's going to happen to it." Lulled in short, not by the vice of megalomania but by the virtue of compassion for humanity.

That is why we think Mr. NIXON's speech is more important than an explanation, useful though that is. It should also be a policy guide. So long as the Government adheres, throughout the trying talks ahead, to the coldly courteous, cautiously exploratory attitude he has outlined, the subtle risk need never become threatening.

Remarks on Diversion of Water Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks on the diversion of water issue.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY BEFORE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES ON DIVERSION OF WATER ISSUE

Let us first get a little of the history involved in this water diversion. Since 1922, bills have been introduced in Congress to authorize the diversion. They were introduced mostly by Congressmen from the city of Chicago. The bills based their right for the diversion of water from Lake Michigan on the following grounds:

(1) Sanitation—for sewage disposal purposes.

(2) Public health—caused by contamination of waters of the Chicago River, the Chicago Sanitary District Canal, and the Illinois Waterway.

(3) Diversion would permit the generation of additional waterpower at the Chicago District Lockport plant.

(4) Fish life would be restored.

(5) It would eliminate damage by extremely high waters of Lake Michigan.

(6) Navigation requirements of the Illinois Waterway demanded additional diversion.

(7) Then there was the position that diversion should be authorized to take care of a variety of demands in the Mississippi River watershed.

Harry Truman once quoted Justice Holmes as follows: "A page of history is worth a volume of logic," so let us get at some of the historical facts.

The controversy originated between the years 1892 and 1900 when the Chicago metropolitan area cut a canal across the Continental Divide. Previously the Illinois-Michigan Canal was completed in 1848. This canal soon became polluted with sewage; and, finally, in 1887, the Commission studied three methods of sewage disposal and recommended as the most economical the discharge of the sewage into the Des Plaines River through a canal across the Continental Divide. The legislature took action and the sanitary district was created with power to handle the situation. At that time, the sanitary district embraced an area of 185 square miles—it now embraces 600 square miles.

Since the opening of the canal, the Chicago River has been reversed. Then, it flowed into Lake Michigan—now it flows away from Lake Michigan. The purpose of the canal was the disposal of sewage and the production of electricity, so the Court found.

In 1907, an application was made to do certain work on the Calumet-Sag Channel to increase the flow from Lake Michigan through said channel. But this was refused by the Secretary of War. In spite of this, the sanitary district went right ahead; so the United States brought suit in 1908. Then, another application of the district in 1913 was denied by the Secretary of War.

In 1908, pursuant to the amendment of the constitution of Illinois, development was begun of a project that would contruct powerplants, locks, bridges, and dams, starting at the water powerplant near Lockport to a point on the Illinois River near Utica; the justification therefore was that it would provide about $3 million a year from the use of water diverted from Lake Michigan for waterpower purposes.

Well, the diversion was made without the consent of the States bordering on the Great Lakes, and in defiance of the Federal Government. Temporary permits were granted from time to time by reluctant Secretaries of War on the plea that the district and Illinois had neglected or refused to install modern sewage disposal plants and that the health of the people would be impaired.

The sewage pollution continued to be offensive up through the years. In 1925, the U.S. position for injunctive relief was affirmed by the Supreme Court, although the Secretary granted a permit for diversion of 8,500 cubic feet—looking to a progressive reduction. Meanwhile, in 1920, the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors of the United States, made a report stating, in substance, that Chicago was debarred from any claim for indulgence; that it had defiantly opposed the Government and was in open disregard of the law; and that they had expended money of their constituents in prosecution of unwise and illegal plans.

In 1927, the Court, having referred the action of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan to Special Master Charles Evans Hughes, who said that the district, in relying on the arguments with reference to the health of its people, had long delayed the subject of suitable sewage plants as a means of avoiding future diversion. Therefore, the district could not complain if an immediately heavy burden was placed upon the district because of its attitude and its course of action. The Court further required that the rights of the complainants be restored gradually; giving the district time to provide adequate means

for disposing of the sewage. In other words, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the Chicago Sanitary District, and the State of Illinois, must stop the illegal diversion (281 U.S. 179) and the Court observed that "the diversion of water for sewage disposal was held illegal."

In 1932, on the application of the States, including Ohio, the Court appointed a Special Master, Edward F. McClellan. He found that the causes of delay in obtaining approval of the contruction of controlling works in the Chicago River "are total and inexcusable failures of the defendants to make an application to the Secretary of War for such approval." The Court entered its decree and provided for "gradual reduction of the diversion of waters of the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence system through the Chicago drainage canal; the reduction should be down to 1,500 cubic feet per second by December 31, 1938."

Again, the district delayed and, in 1932, application was made by the complainants again for a special officer to see that the decree of April 21, 1930 (281 U.S. 696) was carried out.

In 1933, the Court enlarged its decree to provide that "the State of Illinois is required to take the necessary steps to complete adequate sewage disposal plants and sewers to the end that the reduction of diversion may be made at the times fixed in the decree." The sanitary district then demanded that the Federal Government purchase the canals, paying $90 million therefor. The engineer department reported against it and this started the flood of bills; beginning in 1937, in the 75th Congress, seeking authorization for increased diversion of water.

In the Supreme Court Decree of April 21, 1930, there was a requirement in paragraph 5 that the defendant's sanitary district file with the clerk of the court semiannually, on July 1 and January 1 of each year—beginning July 1, 1930—a report to the Court adequately setting forth the progress made in the construction of the sewage treatment plants and appurtenances outlined in the program. Also, it was to set forth the extent and effect of the operation thereof and the average diversion of water from Lake Michigan.

Again, the sanitary district failed to comply with this order. The last semiannual report was filed on January 2, 1939, which said that "the complete treatment of all sewage will not be possible until July 1939,"—although the district was required to complete construction of the facilities on or before December 31, 1938. In January 1940, an application was made again for more diversion. The Court said, in relation to the same, "Illinois has failed to show that it has provided all possible means at its command for the completion of the sewage treatment system as required by the decree and no adequate excuse has been presented for the delay." The Court appointed a special master again and he recommended that the petition of Illinois be dismissed. The Supreme Court upheld the master's report.

Again, in 1956, Illinois petitioned the Court for a temporary modification of the decree and the Solicitor General filed a memorandum on behalf of the Government, as amicus curiae; pointing out the interests of the United States with regard to the paramount power of Congress in relation to navigation and treaties between the United States and Canada which affect the total problem of diversion. The Court, on the application of the district, granted a petition for temporary increase of diversion to, and including, January 31, 1957, and extended it again to February 28, 1957 (352 U.S. 983).

HISTORY OF THE FIGHT IN CONGRESS

Since 1920, bills have been entered to increase the diversion. Twice President Eisenhower has vetoed bills; stating, in substance, that he was unable to approve the bill because:

(1) Existing diversions are adequate for navigation on the Illinois Waterway and Mississippi River.

(2) All methods of control of lake levels, and protection of property on the Great Lakes, should be considered before arbitrarily proceeding with the proposed increased diversion.

(3) Diversions should be authorized with reference to negotiations with Canada.

(4) The legitimate interests of other States affected by the diversions may be adversely affected.

In the 85th Congress, a bill providing for an additional diversion for 3 years was passed in the House, but failed in the Senate.

The Chicago district pressure has not been limited to bills in Congress. Applications were made to Presidents Roosevelt and Truman, with Secretaries of War and with various boards and commissions.

Now, it is evident that Chicago has no health problem. Back in 1940 it was claimed that diversion was necessary because the pollution in the Chicago drainage canal constituted a menace to health. The special master, after extensive hearings, held that there was no menace to health. We know very well that an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet will not clean up the objectionable conditions in the Illinois Waterway as long as untreated, and partially treated, sewage and sludge is permitted to enter the waterway. The permanent solution is to keep pollution out of the Chicago area's waterways by enforcing State and district laws prohibiting the dumping of raw, or partially treated, sewage, chemicals, and other materials in the streams and waterways of the State of Illinois. Eminent sanitary engineers are agreed that the effluent (liquid residual which remains after complete treatment of the well of an operated sewage disposal plant of an activated-sludge of modern type) is a clear, odorless liquid—nonputrescible which requires no chlorination and in which fish can live. The sanitary district affirms that the effluent of its northside treating plant "is almost as clear as drinking water, and quite as harmless as it finally leaves the plant through an outlet and into and through an artificial channel which discharges into the Chicago River" (278 U.S. 367).

There is no claim that additional diversion is needed for navigation on the Illinois Waterway, or for navigation on the Mississippi River. In a recent report by the division engineer, he states that "commerce on the Illinois Waterway has increased from 1,600,000 tons, in 1935, to 21 million tons in 1955." Recent studies of present and prospective water requirement for navigation on the Illinois Waterway show that the authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan is adequate to meet those requirements.

The Alton lock, which was provided by Public Law 500, will take care of any trouble during low water.

Now, the Supreme Court has made it pretty clear that it will not permit any additional diversion at Chicago until the district utilizes all practical means, other than diversion, to alleviate conditions complained of. The U.S. Public Health Service has indicated that there are measures which the sanitary district can take which would handle the situation: Sewage treatment through aeration or chlorination, or the combination of the two. (See Senate Subcommittee on Public Works hearings, 1958, p. 92.) Based on aeration, the first cost would be $2 million; annual cost $250,000. Based on chlorination, the first cost is not given; annual cost $550,000.

It is very evident that the reason the sanitary district urges additional diversion is to avoid the normal and usual sanitation costs which would be required in expanding its facilities. Away back in 1913, when application was made to Henry Stimson, Secretary of War, he stated:

"The demands for diversion at Chicago are based solely upon the needs for sanitation of that city. Every drop of water taken out of the lake necessarily tends to nullify costly improvements made under direct authority of Congress throughout the Great Lakes; and, it is manifestly said that, as long as the city is permitted to increase the amount of water which it may take from the lakes, there will be very strong temptation placed upon it not to take a more scientific—and possibly a more expensive—method to dispose of the sewage."

The Supreme Court on April 21, 1930, limited the amount of water that could be diverted from the Great-Lakes-St. Lawrence system to 1,500 cubic feet in addition to domestic pumpage (281 U.S. 696).

There are the House bill, the Senate bill, and the amended bill, all considered by the committee. A study of the bills indicates quite clearly that some fertile minds which drew the two amendments were trying to meet some of the arguments that were made. The Power Authority of the State of New York, when it accepted the licenses granted to it by the Federal Power Commission for the construction of the Niagara power projects, did so, relying on the decree mentioned above.

The Canadian Government and the State of New York will in the course of the next 3 or 4 years have completed the power projects at an expense of over half a billion dollars. By that time, the power projects will be in full operation and a diversion of 1 year will be felt, causing a loss yearly of over a million dollars in income. So there is no question that the power authority would be deprived of substantial legal rights.

As we have already stated, such a diversion in violation of the Court's decree and the legal treaties would justify the claims of Canada to divert all the water from the Columbia River.

Now the next question arises, Is there any need for a diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second for such a study? Senate Document No. 128 of the 85th Congress, 1st session, states: "Recent studies of present and prospective water requirements for navigation on the Illinois Waterway show that the authorized diversion of 1,500 cubic feet per second from Lake Michigan is adequate to meet those requirements" (p. 48) and shows that losses would result from increased diversion to navigation, power development, and shore property interest. Further, that if the water were diverted, such study could not possibly demonstrate that the levels of the Great Lakes and the flow at Niagara and the St. Lawrence River would not be affected detrimentally—with adverse effects on navigation and power development. It would also show, if such diversion were made, increased power production at the sanitary district's plant at Lockport, Ill., saving the district money.

The U.S. Department of Health in its report of April 29, 1957, suggests the answer by means of chlorination and aeration.

Added diversion will not benefit navigation on the Illinois Waterway; it will affect adversely navigation on the Great Lakes. It will not solve the problem of sewage in the sanitary district. It will affect adversely the power authority and benefit the district power generation.

All these facts raise a Constitution issue of the power of Congress to authorize additional diversion. But if it should be constitutional—and only the Court can decide that—it certainly is unfair to injure the property rights of people in Michigan and Wisconsin and deprive navigation and downstream power interests of their rights

solely for the economic benefit of the sanitary district.

Now that the Court has appointed a master, he should handle the matter. Perhaps it should be referred to the Commission under the authority of article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909.

Certainly diversion is unnecessary. It involves the rights, obligations and interests of the United States and Canada, as well as the litigating States and the inhabitants thereof.

REASONS FOR DENYING DIVERSION

1. The legislation will jeopardize our friendly relations with Canada. Canada is the best friend we have got in the world. Besides that she's our best neighbor, our best customer.

The two notes which follow, which I ask to be printed at the end of my remarks, clearly demonstrate how inappropriate it would be for Congress to take action.

2. The Great Lakes watershed: Canada and the United States are trustees thereof. If the door is opened now a flood of requests will come to the Congress from other communities along the St. Lawrence and in other States. Already the Ohio communities have discussed taking from Lake Erie water to the Ohio River watershed, and recently a group of Texans has suggested that a pipeline be built to the Great Lakes to tap the water thereof.

3. The increase in diversion comes at a time when the Great Lakes are headed for a record low lake level. At a time when every inch of diversion accentuates great losses in shipping, hydroelectric power plants on the Niagara and St. Lawrence River and also the harbors of port cities.

4. We and Canada have put into the St. Lawrence development between us a billion dollars. The utilization of the Seaway requires high water levels. Chicago diversion will nullify, to some extent, the benefits derived from the St. Lawrence Seaway.

U.S. ARMY ENGINEERS REPORT

1. The engineers have stated that a temporary 3-year diverison of 1,000 cubic feet per second would lower Lakes Michigan-Huron by five-eighths of an inch and Lakes Erie and Ontario would be lowered by three-eighths of an inch.

They also stated that an increased diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago would affect the flow and production of power in the Niagara River, the St. Lawrence River and in the Illinois hydroelectric plants—having an adverse effect on hydroelectric energy evaluated at $408,000 to $918,000.

2. The permanent diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second would have the effect of lowering the levels in Lake Michigan-Huron, and the estimated annual average economic loss to the U.S. Great Lakes fleet would be $240,000.

3. The evidence of the chairman of the Power Authority of New York estimated by 1 year additional diversion at Chicago of 1,000 cubic feet per second the total loss to Canada and the power authority would be $1,142,000, and as was suggested, it is plain that H.R. 1 is designed to open the door to a permanent additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second.

4. There has been plenty of evidence to show that the port cities of the Great Lakes would sustain very substantial damages to their harbors and port cities if H.R. 1 were to become law. Every fraction of an inch of loss in lake levels to artificially lower the Great Lakes due to a diversion at Chicago, would cost the lake port cities thousands of dollars annually.

5. The lake carriers testified that an additional diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second at Chicago with the resultant lowering of the lake would result in a loss of approximately $2,500,000.

CONCLUSION

1. The waters of Lake Michigan are interstate in character.

2. Five States: Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Indiana, and Wisconsin in 1955 approved the so-called Great Lakes Basin Compact, but Illinois Congressmen, following in the steps of their predecessors, kept on pressing Congress, even though the Supreme Court has returned and recently taken action and again appointed a master.

3. There are some real nice questions of law involved:

(a) Does Congress have the power to authorize the transfer of huge quantities of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence watershed to the Mississippi watershed with substantial damage to the Great Lakes States, the municipalities located on the Great Lakes and their people?

(b) We believe—

(1) The Court in *Wisconsin* v. *Illinois*, 278 U.S. 367, has answered that question definitely. That it is beyond the power of Congress and the Federal Government, particularly when made to create an artificial waterway to divert water from one watershed to another.

(2) That the power in Congress goes to the constitutional provision to regulate commerce or navigation, and that sewage disposal or sanitation is not a legitimate object of legislation.

(3) Neither is the development of power at Lockport, Ill., a valid object under the Court's decision.

(4) Now that the Supreme Court has again appointed a master, it is the proper machinery to dispose of this matter.

(5) That the notes from Canada, with whom we have been at peace for 140 years, indicate a really substantial reason for Congress not to take action on this bill.

(6) That it is unconstitutional for Congress by additional diversion to prefer Chicago over the ports of the other States.

(7) That an additional diversion would work injury to the other States by depriving them and their citizens and property owners and property without the due process of law (278 U.S. 367).

(8) That, in accordance with the testimony of Colonel Nauman, of the Corps of Engineers, additional diversion is not needed on the 9-foot channel of the Illinois Waterway.

(9) That taking water from Lake Michigan and transferring it to another watershed to the detriment of the first watershed is neither just, legal, nor equitable.

(10) That the only permanent and effective way of cleaning up the drainage canal and the Illinois River is by keeping out of them any untreated, or partially treated, and other material that pollutes the water.

4. The International Joint Commission has definitely stated that if any increased diversion will have the effect of partially lowering the levels of the boundary waters, that it is not within the Congress to attempt to change the amount of the present authorized diversion. Under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, our two nations divested themselves of all authority over the boundary waters as far as raising, lowering, or diverting them were concerned.

Let me recapitulate. Aside from the question of jurisdiction and power of Congress in the premises, no necessity or justifiable excuse exists for increasing the diversion of water from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system through the Chicago drainage canal.

1. The Great Lakes are international waters and no additional diversion should be permitted without the agreement of Canada and the States bordering on the Great Lakes;

2. The Illinois Waterway has more than enough water to handle all of the traffic and freight available and last year handled about 22 million tons of cargo;

3. Additional water diverted from Lake Michigan would not stop any erosion to riparian property on the Great Lakes due to high waters and winds; other means to minimize such damages are effective;

4. The Great Lakes are now in the downward movement of the cycle, with Lake Michigan 5 feet lower today than in August of 1952, and the Great Lakes will have now levels for the next years;

5. Additional diversion will not clean up any objectionable conditions in the Illinois Waterway as long as the Sanitary District of Chicago and industries, municipalities, and individuals continue to dump raw or partially treated sewage, chemicals and other materials in the waterway;

6. Any additional diversion will result in large and continuing damages to the Great Lakes and municipalities on the Great Lakes and their peoples, as witnesses and the United States Supreme Court pointed out;

7. Chicago today has no health problem related to the diversion issue;

8. President Eisenhower in his veto message of September 3, 1954, and in his veto in 1956, set forth succinctly the reasons why additional water from Lake Michigan through the Chicago drainage canal should not be authorized by Congress. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27, 1956, vol. 102, No. 1030, p. 13768.)

9. The State of Illinois has, as a matter of official State policy as evidenced in its adoption of the Great Lakes Basin compact, recognized the justice and desirability of settling the Chicago water diversion controversy by agreement among all of the affected States and Canadian provinces, and not by Federal legislation. President Eisenhower, in his September 1954 veto of the diversion bill, indicated that he approved of an agreement between the interested Great Lakes States before authorizing additional diversion.

The Significance of Laos—Two Articles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, two different articles by Columnists Marquis Childs and Joseph Alsop—both appearing in the Washington Post—point up the significance of recent outbreaks in Laos. Columnist Childs suggests some differences between United States and British policy on Laos which can, as he says, "in a different atmosphere loom large indeed" although they are now being avoided. On the other hand, Mr. Alsop relates the problem of Laos to the question of coexistence. While these two observers appear to have some conflicting ideas about what is happening in Laos, their thoughts are helpful to those who seek to understand the significance of this development and, for that reason, I include both articles in the RECORD under permission to extend my remarks:

LONDON DIVISION MASKED BY SMILES
(By Marquis Childs)

LONDON.—This exercise in good will has ben so carefully stage managed that it has all but obscured the sharp differences dividing American and British policy in important areas of the earth. They have been swept under the royal red carpet of welcome ex-

tended for every step of President Eisenhower's visit.

In the glow of harmony that has been generated here they seem trivial enough. But if it comes to the testing point these differences may be serious.

The trouble in Laos is a case in point. Because Britain accepted responsibility for the Indochina truce when the United States in 1954 simply walked away and would have none of the compromise that carved out separate Communist and non-Communist countries, the British today have a special role in the area. As cochairman with the Russians in presiding over the terms of the truce, they are distinctly uncomfortable in the present situation.

They would like to have the United Nations intervene, through Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, to prevent a nasty little war from becoming a nasty big war. But the Russians will have none of this. Instead, they are insisting that the Neutral Truce Commission be reactivated to play policeman.

But, as seen from the American view, this would be an affront to Laos. It would imply that Laos is not a sovereign power capable, with the help of its allies, of managing its own affairs.

While no British official would admit it publicly, and certainly not at this moment when the theme is hands across the sea, there is a feeling that American zeal for a military buildup in southeast Asia has made Laos vulnerable. In supplying arms and military advisers to Laos, the United States has stayed within the terms of the truce which permits armed forces to be raised to a certain level of capability with outside assistance.

But the effect, as the British see it, has been to draw Laos into the orbit of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and, therefore, to violate the spirit at least of the truce. The British have always taken a rather dim view of SEATO.

Separating truth from fiction in the snatches of information reported from the conflict in what is a new and highly unstable country is all but impossible. This reporter has talked with high officials of both the British and French governments during the past week. They agree that there is no evidence at this time of Communist intervention from outside Laos.

Communication between the capital, Vietiane, and the remote jungle areas where the conflict is going on is virtually nonexistent. Rebel bands with a strong Communist orientation have long operated in the border regions that are for the most part trackless wilderness.

Undoubtedly the Communist objective is to subvert the Government of Laos and bring it down. But whether this subversion can be stopped with the new American arms being flown in to be put in the hands of an additional force of 5,000 Laotians is a very large question. And it is here that British policy and American policy tend to diverge.

Mr. Macmillan's smile is that of a shrewd and confident politician who scents victory in the air in the election that is just ahead. The polls show something like a landslide for the Conservatives, who lead Labor by five to seven points.

Who would want to spoil this by raising unpleasant and controversial issues? Important sectors of British public opinion, and not just alone in the Labor Party, were offended by the President's acting in inviting the Spanish Foreign Minister, Fernando Maria de Castiella, to come to London to see him. Despite the official denials, this was done without prior consultation with the government here. De Castiella's record as a close ally of the Nazis and the Fascists and an enemy of the democracies was so well known that the British refused after the war to accept him as an ambassdar.

But if the Americans want to bring Spain into the NATO alliance the Prime Minister will not make an issue of it at this moment. As with Laos, it is being swept under the rug.

In the solemn splendor of St. Paul's Cathedral and the emotion evoked by the American Memorial Chapel symbolizing the war fought in a common cause the differences are petty and inconsequential. But differences that now seem small can in a different atmosphere loom large indeed.

WHAT IS COEXISTENCE?

(By Joseph Alsop)

TOKYO.—What is coexistence? This will be the true, central theme of the talks between President Eisenhower and Nikita S. Khrushchev. Berlin and Laos are only episodes, though very important episodes, which raise questions about the meaning and possibility of coexistence.

If President Truman were in President Eisenhower's place, it is hard to believe that there would be any opportunity to discuss this vital topic. For if Truman had asked Khrushchev to the White House, and the acceptance of his invitation had then been followed by a naked Communist attack on a position of American interest, even in remote Laos, Truman would have disinvited Khrushchev at once.

But Eisenhower is not Truman, and the power position of the United States in 1959 is altogether unlike the power position that Eisenhower inherited in 1953. So there is little likelihood of disinvitation, although the Communist aggression in Laos amounts to a public expression of Khrushchev's contempt for the President and the country he leads. The vital topic will still be discussed, in a little more than a fortnight, by the two chieftains of the East and West.

The meaning of "peaceful coexistence" to Khrushchev and his subordinates and satellites can be easily summarized. They mean by "peaceful coexistence" playing the game of the world power struggle according to the strange prevailing rules, and thus avoiding any serious risk of major war. The rules they play by, although we have largely accepted them, are rules made in the Kremlin.

These rules permit Khrushchev to tear up the most solemn Soviet commitments, given only a few years ago, because these commitments do not any longer correspond to the facts—meaning the facts of the greatly changed world power balance. They further permit Khrushchev to indulge in the crudest military threats to Berlin, after repudiating the agreement of Berlin reached by the Soviets and the Western Powers in 1949. The result of these actions, moreover, is not American mobilization, but an invitation to Khrushchev to drop in at the White House.

Again, these Kremlin rules also permit Khrushchev, even when newly invited to the White House, to sponsor a naked Communist military aggression. The aggression is duly fuzzed up and disguised a little, of course, as a popular guerrilla movement. But under the rules, any position can be attacked in this manner, where the attack seems safe and the aggression seems likely to pay off. This is what is happening in Laos.

In other words, Khrushchev looks at the current state of the power balance, and especially at the deterioration of the American deterrent. He looks at the mood of the President and the rise of peace-at-any-price feeling in London and elsewhere. After calculating these factors, he then looks for a vital position which he can grab for, without undue risk of a general conflagration. And he promptly grabs for that position, in full accord with the rules of the game as he understands them.

It is bitterly ironical to recall that an attempt to change those rules was once made by President Eisenhower, who came to power with a pledge to liberate the free peoples enchained by Soviet imperialism. In his confirmation hearings, former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles even suggested that it was downright immoral not to believe in the liberation policy.

In the last 7 years, one must remember, the opportunities for a serious liberation policy have been very great indeed. The situation in Eastern Europe reached the potential explosion point in this period, because of the death of Stalin and the post-Stalin disillusionment. Twice, in fact, great explosions have actually occurred in Eastern Europe, in East Germany in 1953, and in Hungary in 1956. If we had such an explosive situation on our side of the line that divides the world, it is easy to imagine what the Kremlin would do about it.

What we did about it was to eat the phoney words about liberation as soon as they were taken seriously. All the resources of the CIA were used to help the Soviets damp down the East German rising of 1953. Our reaction to the Hungarian tragedy, by the same token, was too unpleasantly impotent to bear thinking about.

In this manner, the West has tacitly accepted the Kremlin's rules for coexistence. These are: (a) That we cannot even support a legitimate government struggling to be free, as in Hungary, on their side of the line that divides the world; and (b) that the Kremlin can freely attack any conveniently vulnerable position on our side of the line.

If these rules for coexistence are now approved by President Eisenhower in his talks with Khrushchev, and if they are then confirmed by the President's successor, the predictable outcome is the West's final and total defeat in the cold war. That is the fact now glaring us in the face.

Booming South Texas Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the story of Texas is the story of a land of progress and expansion, of the growth and development of ideas as well as the utilization of ideas.

Recently, a magazine called the South Texan published an article entitled "Booming Population Growth Spurs South Texas Economy."

Because of the interest which other Members of Congress from areas of expansion would have in what is happening now in south Texas, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Texan, August 1959]

BOOMING POPULATION GROWTH SPURS SOUTH TEXAS ECONOMY—ESTIMATES INDICATE 1 MILLION INCREASE IN PAST 9 YEARS

(By R. L. Skrabanek, Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology, Texas A. & M. College)

All sorts of data can be collected and displayed to show that the south Texas area is booming. High on any such list is its very rapid population growth. Population estimates for the last 9-year period (1950–59) indicate that the area has added approxi-

mately 1 million people in this short span of years (see table). This is a tremendous rate of growth considering that there were under 2 million people in the region in 1950.

Current estimates place the total number of people in south Texas at a figure fast approaching 3 million, with the area increasing its population at a considerably faster rate than the remainder of the State.

Where is all of this population increase coming from? One place is through a natural increase brought about by an excess of births over deaths. The area has regularly had a birth rate substantially above that of the Nation as a whole. In more recent years rapid strides have also been made in a falling death rate.

In addition to its increase from births over deaths, south Texas has likewise continued to attract a sizeable migration, a condition testifying to the opportunities offered to migrants into the region.

All of the necessary ingredients for a healthy growth lie in the region—chemurgy, industry, oil transportation, agriculture and manufacturing. Not to be overlooked in this list, however, are the people who, in the final analysis, organize these resources into productive use. Vast areas of the world today have the same resources as those found in south Texas but they remain relatively untapped because of the lack of initiative and know-how on the part of the people who occupy these lands.

Still another factor in the rapid population growth of south Texas is what some might refer to as a fringe benefit—a favorable climate. The climatic factor has been an influencial one in the migration of people from the Northern States to the Rio Grande Valley region particularly, as well as in south Texas in general.

Of course, not all of the areas in south Texas are sharing equally in the rapid population growth characteristic of the region as a whole (see maps) [Not printed in RECORD.] The two maps indicate that some areas have been gaining population at a much faster rate than others.

Regardless of possible explanations for this phenomenon, it all boils down simply to the fact that areas which are largely dependent upon farming and ranching for the most part are barely maintaining their populations or are losing people.

Modern farming and ranching technology has developed rapidly and makes it virtually impossible to operate a small farm or ranch for a profit if one is dependent solely upon it for his livelihood. Consequently, many either must give it up altogether or take on other jobs to supplement their incomes in nonfarm occupations.

The shift of population from rural areas to the larger cities has had the effect of worsening the relative position of many small town merchants who tend to lose business not only through population losses but to also increasingly lose business to retail trade centers. On the other hand, where oil and gas developments are taking place, irrigation is expanding and new industries are moving in, these areas are growing at fairly rapid rates.

The presence of already large population centers and the job opportunities in them has an attraction for many people. A closer look at what has happened in three city-dominated counties in the south Texas area serves to illustrate the drawing power of larger cities. Bexar County is estimated to have added some 370,000 people during the last 9-year period; Travis County increased by well over 100,000 and Nueces County another 130,000. Thus, these three counties alone account for about one-half of the total population increase of the entire area. This is not an unusual situation, however, for the same thing is happening in other sections of Texas. At the present time States' people are concentrated in 15 standard metropolitan areas.

Although their population increases are not as spectacular in total numbers, some of the lesser populated counties have had sizable population increases, too. For example, Victoria County has increased from around 24,000 in 1940 to 65,000 in 1959. Likewise, Comal County increased from 12,000 in 1940 to 23,000 in 1959.

These constitute some of the basic facts about south Texas' population increases. But how will this tremendous population growth affect the area in general? Obviously, they create new problems which require foresight, planning, organization, and cooperation far beyond our imagined possibilities of a few decades ago. Such growth places pressure on school expansion programs, water resources as well as other resources. At the other extreme, however, are the many benefits to be derived—for a growing population means a growing volume of trade and other business activity for the purpose of serving large numbers of customers.

In addition to an increased total volume of business, population increases mean more volume per business enterprise, because population and income tend to rise faster than the number of business units. Thus, in the long run, population increases mean expanding markets which in turn attract new industries and new business establishments.

All of these factors put together add up to a bright outlook for the south Texas area in the future.

1940–50 populations and 1959 estimated populations of south Texas, including lower Rio Grande Valley

STCC district	1940	1950	1959	Percent change	
				1940–50	1950–59
1	105,830	120,861	158,367	+14.2	+31.0
2	428,392	589,522	976,339	+37.6	+65.6
3	210,822	259,541	390,234	+23.1	+50.4
4	89,927	78,574	81,588	−12.6	+3.8
5	116,256	135,241	206,007	+16.3	+52.3
6	111,563	113,848	173,098	+2.1	+52.0
7	215,845	310,569	502,089	+43.9	+61.7
Lower Rio Grande Valley	215,803	320,484	459,580	+48.5	+43.4
Total	1,499,392	1,928,640	2,947,295	+28.6	+52.8

Pomierski on Freedom for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, upon the request of some of my friends and constituents, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein an outstanding letter recently released to the press, commemorating the anniversary of Hitler's attack upon Poland, written by that most distinguished Polish-American leader and great American, Hon. Stefan Pomierski.

This ably written, eloquent communication touches very profoundly upon the great sacrifice of the Polish nation when it was bestially assailed, first by Hitler, and then by Russian hordes during World War II.

There is little anyone could add to Mr. Pomierski's brief but complete statement of these outrages against human decency and against human liberty.

Let us ever be true to the cause of Poland and other heroic peoples behind the Iron Curtain who have suffered unspeakable torture and persecution in the name of freedom.

Let us never betray this great cause.

Let us make every effort that we humanly can to speed the day when these loyal, fearless, courageous sons and daughters of liberty shall be restored to their full rights as citizens of free governments.

Mr. Pomierski, with great clarity of vision, apt powers of expression and unflinching courage has admirably summed up the case for the free world.

Let it be known to Mr. Khrushchev and his colleagues in the Kremlin that the American Nation stands for freedom and justice for all peoples and that we will never abandon our struggle to seek freedom and peace for all peoples who yearn to be free.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 22, 1959.

DEAR EDITOR: September 1st will mark the 20th anniversary of Hitler's unprovoked attack upon Poland and of the beginning of World War II.

On that day the Polish nation stood up to the last man, woman, and child against the mightiest power of that time, and after 19 days of brave resistance against the Nazi hordes—without receiving any outside help as promised by England and France—Poland was cowardly stabbed in the back by Soviet Russia, an ally of Germany.

It took a total of 36 days of fierce fighting, before Hitler and Stalin were able to divide their spoils. A few months after Poland fell, a Polish Army, Navy and Air Force fought side by side with her Western Allies, while those remaining in Poland organized a most effective underground army. Eight million Poles—one fourth of Poland's prewar population—gave their lives for and in the defense of Freedom. Poland lost hers.

The heart-warming and spontaneous welcome given to Vice President RICHARD NIXON on his recent visit to Poland was touching evidence that the people of Poland have a very deep affection for the people of the United States and our ways of life.

The warm applause with which our Vice President was greeted in Poland, is further proof that the Polish nation never has and never will change her devotion and loyalty to God, her love of Freedom, and her long lasting friendship for the United States of America.

Let the betrayal of Poland and let the horrors inflicted upon her by Nazi Germany and Red Russia—both having signed a solemn nonaggression pact with Poland—serve as a stern warning to us and other free nations that neither the spoken nor written word of the evil forces of the Red

Kremlin or any other dictator can be trusted.

Therefore, we must be continuously and diligently alert, fully armed and prepared against any possible sneak attack upon this great country of ours.

We must be grateful that God has blessed us with men in our Government such as the distinguished Congressman from Massachusetts, the Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN, is. He is an experienced, a just, a learned and illustrious statesman, who stands for the finer and nobler things of life.

Congressman PHILBIN, whose patriotism, sense of justice and wisdom is well known all over this country as well as abroad, has won the affection and esteem of all freedom-loving people.

Mackinac: Arsenal of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a most timely radio broadcast was given in Los Angeles over NBC by Mr. Sid Fuller on July 23. He reported on his visit to Mackinac Island where a summit strategy conference by moral rearmament people is in progress. Men and women from 48 nations have been in attendance. The work they have been doing to remake the world is most encouraging. I am certain that Members of Congress will want to read the text of the broadcast:

MACKINAC: ARSENAL OF FREEDOM

As I have reported to you since my return from a Michigan weekend, Mackinac Island is a pleasant quiet place, a green and lovely oasis of refreshing calm in a desert of world-wide turmoil. And it is a historic spot, a point at which the currents of national destinies have met and crossed and swirled in desperate conflict. But today because of an idea, Mackinac Island may well be the arsenal of freedom. Because of Mackinac all men may yet be brothers, may look ahead to a world in which their children will walks the earth in dignity and peace.

Like many of you, I, too, have sensed the disturbing feeling that world war III has already begun. Not that bombs are falling, that great cities are being demolished, that civilization is being destroyed by fire and blast and radiation. No. That apocalyptic doomsday has not come. Rather the enemy has outsmarted us, outwitted us, by not using the weapons we had expected him to use. He is using an even deadlier tool of war. He is waging an ideological war against us. His objective is not the material wealth we have accumulated. He does not want that destroyed. He wants that for himself and in good time he means to have it.

Instead of the material, his immediate objective is spiritual. It is the spirit of god-fearing men that he would first weaken, and then destroy. Men without the will, the moral fiber, the deep spiritual fortitude to stand firmly in defense of what is right are doomed to see their freedom lost, their God-given rights denied, their hope of love and life and laughter unfulfilled. The enemy knows this. He knows that without the spirit there is no will. The man corrupted is the man defenseless.

And mark you this. The enemy knows how to corrupt, how to poison, how to defile. He has done it by force and violence to the 900 million helpless humans already his captives. In attacking the Western World, however, he is reluctant to resort to force and violence. He is counting on our determination to avoid atomic war to blind us to the fact that he is already undermining our ramparts of the spirit. With his evil ideology he is achieving results he could not produce with a nuclear warhead on a guided missile. He knows that free men will resist violence with violence, but he also knows that free men who are spiritually sick need not be attacked with violence. They have already surrendered. So he declares ideological war.

And what is his ideology? It is communism, a stream of social and political and moral and spiritual subversion and corruption that is poisoning the societies of every nation. Including our own. The only weapon that can be used against an ideology is an ideology. An ideology is not a thing of material substance. It is a conviction, a code of faith which no material force can resist. The ideology of communism stems from a conviction that wrong is right, that hate is stronger than love. It is a code that condones treachery and terror and immorality and cruelty and untruth as legitimate means to an illegitimate end. It is a faith that holds evil paramount to good, might paramount to right.

How deal with such a corrosive thing?

There is only one way. With an ideology diametrically opposed. One rooted in a conviction that absolute honesty, morality, unselfishness, and love are the eternal verities, the wellspring of peace, honor, and justice. One with a code which rejects all compromise with evil. One with a faith that God's pattern for the perfect life cannot be distorted or destroyed if man will be guided by God's will.

This is the ideology of Moral Re-Armament.

It is being stockpiled on Mackinac Island right now—at the summit strategy conference. Last weekend I saw it being implanted in the hearts of men and women from 48 nations, people of many races, religions and cultures, but all of them kin because all were learning how to use this weapon against a common enemy. I talked to men already changed, men with fresh hope, new spirit, new courage. Here in MRA is a catalyst that first unites and then releases the enormous moral potential of all men of good will, whatever their racial or spiritual background.

It is impossible to visit Mackinac and come away without a firm, fresh faith that free men with God's guidance and only with God's guidance will yet remake the world and achieve lasting justice and an honorable peace for all men.

Negroes Oppose Mixed Schooling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there appeared in the Baltimore Sun this morning, September 2, 1959, an article entitled "Negroes Oppose Mixed Schooling."

In this article a Negro leader of Birmingham, Ala., wired President Eisenhower a 350-word telegram stating that Negroes of the South do not want forced integration.

Part of his telegram urged the President "not to use force to integrate the schools and deny our race a major symbol of our progress—all-Negro schools."

He further told the President, "I assure you that both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in public schools," and suggested to the President that he have the Federal Government conduct a poll of the majority of the southern Negroes to determine what they want in the way of segregation. He further suggested that the results of this poll would be overwhelmingly in favor of preserving segregation.

Mr. President, I feel this article should be read by every Member of the Senate, especially those who wish to attempt to ram civil-rights legislation through this body in an attempt to help foster forced integration upon people who do not want it.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun of Sept. 2, 1959]

NEGROES OPPOSE MIXED SCHOOLING

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., September 1.—A Negro group today wired President Eisenhower that most southern Negroes do not want forced integration. And the group asked for a Government-sponsored poll of southern Negroes to prove the point.

The statement and the request were included in a 350-word telegram sent to President Eisenhower by the Southern Negro Improvement Association of Alabama.

Samuel H. Moore, of Birmingham, president of the group, said it has more than 5,000 members in Alabama.

Moore told the President:

"I assure you that both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in public schools.

"Racial hate and racial prejudice that was dead is now reconstructed. Threat of forceful integration has created fear and hate in many of our former white friends."

Moore said he put these questions to the President:

"Since this is free America, why not put your racial policy upon voluntary action of the citizens, not forceful compulsion? Why not have the Government take a poll of the majority of the southern Negroes?"

Moore said that such a poll should be confined to southern Negroes because "our northern Negro brothers * * * do not live in the South and therefore do not understand our southern bicultural society."

He urged the President "not to use force to integrate the schools and deny our race a major symbol of our progress—all-Negro schools."

Moore said, "For lasting and enduring advancement of our race our progress must be achieved with good will from the white people among which we must live."

The Right to Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following statement which I made before Senator ERNEST GRUENING'S Subcommittee on Passport Legislation on September 1:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES O. PORTER, DEMOCRAT, OF OREGON, BEFORE THE U.S. SENATE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON PASSPORT LEGISLATION, SEPTEMBER 1, 1959

It is my opinion that the Secretary of State does not have and should not be given powers to prevent an American citizen, Member of Congress or not, from visiting any country in the world. Unless we are actually at war, American citizens should be freely allowed U.S. permission to visit all countries. A passport should be only an identification. Its issuance should be an almost entirely clerical act, not a question of executive discretion to be decided in terms of foreign policy considerations.

Some of the legislation under consideration by this committee was requested of the Congress by the President of the United States July 7, 1958, to authorize the Secretary of State to refuse passports for travel in designated countries or areas. From the Executive's point of view there may seem to be advantages to this but, in my opinion and as in the case of many other restrictions on freedom, the disadvantages are far greater.

Four alleged advantages are set forth in a letter dated July 2, 1959, which I received from Assistant Secretary of State William B. Macomber, Jr.

The first advantage listed had to do with the emergency declared in 1950 and which is still in effect. This means there is a state of unresolved conflict between Communist China and the United States. I fail to see how restricting travel by U.S. citizens assists us in resolving this cold-war type of conflict in our favor. On the other hand I can conceive of improved relations resulting from such visits. However, the Department of State itself has granted permission to 41 U.S. journalists to travel in China. This seems to recognize the fact that the cold war is best fought through an increase of information and understanding. Our motives are good. We plan no aggressions. We truly want peace, freedom, and improved living conditions for the people of the world. To ban travel is to cut off effective personal communication. This lessens the opportunities for the understanding which must be the basis for any real peace.

Second, it is alleged that the United States can't provide the customary protection in these areas, the governments of which we don't recognize. There are many risks a U.S. citizen still takes without the aid of the protective arm of his Government. A citizen going to the Dominican Republic takes the usual risks in a police state of becoming a casualty, something which our diplomatic representatives there can neither prevent nor mend nor readily punish. All that the State Department should do in such circumstances is make certain that the citizen contemplating a trip to a police state understands the risks he faces.

Third, in the case of China, such restrictions are supposed to punish, or at least indicate our disapproval of, the Chinese Communist Government for maltreating and holding as hostages our citizens. This is on the erroneous assumption that our refusing permission to our citizens to visit China hurts or at least demeans them more than it handicaps us in seeking both peace and facts. I feel that we would secure the release of the five remaining U.S. prisoners far sooner if we permitted wider interpersonal communications between our country and Communist China.

Fourth, the State Department refers to what it terms an "important factor," the effort of the Communist Chinese to utilize trade and cultural contacts to promote political objectives hostile to our interests. We can hardly hope to win the cold war if we refuse to join battle on the trade, cultural and other fronts. Indeed, with respect to the Soviet Union, by far our major opponent, we carry on, amid almost universal applause, an extensive program of visitor exchanges. The President's recent decision to trade visits with Khrushchev is a dramatic affirmation of the President's belief that such contacts can aid the cause of peace.

We cannot rely on increased communication alone to guarantee peace. It is even more clear that the willful ignorance or any variety of iron curtains makes war more probable.

Every American citizen who travels abroad is an ambassador. Most are good ones. Some are not. All learn things which they bring back to be evaluated. Enemy stereotypes are blurred by facts and obliterated by understanding.

The peoples of the world don't want war. If informed, they can be powerful drags on imperialistic ambitions of their rulers. Ordinary person-to-person contacts are the best way for human beings to form tolerant and friendly opinions of each other. Curtains between countries, whether of iron, bamboo, visas or passports, become black shrouds for the cause of world peace.

These are some of the reasons why American citizens should be permitted by their Government to travel anywhere. I also believe that this is part of the freedoms guaranteed to every American citizen. This question is for the judiciary to settle.

On August 27, 1959, I filed suit against the Secretary of State because he had refused to give me permission to travel in China. With the chairman's permission I shall file the text of this complaint at the conclusion of these remarks. A Member of Congress is in a somewhat different position from one who is not a Member. Secretary Macomber, in the letter cited above, wrote to me, "as a Member of Congress your visit would be interpreted throughout Asia as well as by the Communist Chinese as a basic change in policy at the very time when the Communists are engaged in liquidating the Tibetan revolt, threatening war in the Taiwan Straits, and showing increasing arrogance and contempt for international law and decency."

I see no necessity for an interpretation that the suggested change of policy would mean any softening of our attitude. Certainly no softening is justifiable. Red Chinese aggression in Tibet, Laos, and India should be dealt with firmly. No one is suggesting that we forgive or forget Korea.

My visit to China, or the visits of other Members, should be characterized to the world as fact-finding missions with no such overtones, just as the Eisenhower visit to the Soviet Union cannot be accurately interpreted as meaning that we have forgotten or forgiven the slaughter in Hungary.

It seems to me there is a more pertinent difference in the case of the Member of Congress who seeks permission to go to China or any other country. This has to do with our keystone governmental doctrine, the separation of powers. The executive cannot, it seems to me, forbid a member of the legislative branch to visit any country with which we are not actually engaged in war. My lawsuit against the Secretary of State seeks a judicial decision on this question.

Moreover, since the State Department has seen fit to give permission to travel in Communist China to 41 journalists, its refusal to permit a Member of Congress seems arbitrary and discriminatory.

Let me make it clear that I do not believe that my going to China is in itself of much importance. This is a test case and I am seeking to help open the way for a policy change which will permit others, far better qualified than I, to go. The harm done by the present policy is more apparent when we consider that the State Department's position also blocks travel by Senator MAGNUSON, the chairman of the Senate's Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Senator COOPER, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator ENGLE, and other Members in both branches. Every Member of Congress has a duty to inform himself on legislative matters and to work for national security, but of course the special constitutional role of the Senate with respect to foreign policy makes the State Department's obstructionism with respect to Senators all the more intolerable and unconstitutional.

My plans for a trip to China and the Far East always have included being accompanied by other Members of Congress, experts in the area and in trade matters, businessmen, and journalists. That I am the sole plaintiff against the Secretary of State does not mean I intended to go to China as a lone, self-appointed investigating committee. Specifically I want to learn what I can, firsthand, about the conditions and potentialities of trade, especially with Oregon.

Workers' Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, one of the more intelligent editorials on the controversial measures now pending was found in the Washington Daily News of several weeks ago. I was surprised that no one put it in the RECORD. It was good then, it is good today, and it will, I hope, be clairvoyant for the future.

WORKERS' PROGRESS

James B. Carey's letter to Congressmen who voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor bill is intemperate and insulting.

Mr. Carey, president of the electrical workers, has a constructive record in organized labor, particularly in his successful fight against the Communists. He's entitled to his opinion as to the effects of this bill but when he impugns the motives of those who voted for it he seems to deny that they, also, are entitled to their opinions.

We think that Mr. Carey, once he cools off, may be sorry he ever wrote his letter.

The organized labor movement isn't much more than half a century old in America. Within the memory of men and women still living, mine and factory wages have been $15 a week and less. Women and children have worked 60 to 70 hours a week for a dime an hour. The 12-hour day was standard in the steel industry.

Conditions like these caused the workers to organize. Union pressure has sped the transformation of a city, slum-dwelling proletariat into a home-owning, auto-driving middle class.

But sometimes labor leaders, forgetting how far they've come, relapse into the idiom of the old days when a man could lose his job for mentioning a union or asking for a living wage. Mr. Carey's charge of a "vindictive assault on the labor movement" is a good example. George Meany's talk of the unions trying to "survive" is another.

Rapid progress of organized labor came because of national persuasion that the union cause is righteous. That conviction hasn't changed but in the present case the union

chiefs simply have lost touch with public opinion. While condemning the racketeers they have seemed to oppose any effective steps to get rid of them.

Passage of a tough labor bill doesn't mean that the country or the Congress has turned against them or the working people they represent. It merely signifies widespread opinion that, in this case, labor leadership is wrong—that this bill is no more a union "killer" than Taft-Hartley was "slave labor."

Gangsters have fattened on the labor movement from the start, defying the best efforts of sincere men to dislodge them and using everything including murder to maintain their power.

If Congress can provide the means for law enforcement officials to root out these criminals, the unions will be the gainers—even if they must, for the common good, put up with some mild inconveniences in the process.

Off the Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 31, 1959:

OFF THE RECORD

STATISTICS

According to the 1958 Year Book of the South Carolina Department of Agriculture, Lancaster County averages 44.8 inches of rain a year, of which 31 percent, or 13.6 inches, falls in the three summer months. We have no doubt that August 1959 will go down in the statistical averages as a normal month.

What statistics will not show, however, is that all our rain for August fell this weekend in one big bucketful. Wow.

FIVE MINUTES MORE

"All South Carolinians," says the State, should go on 'life-saving time,' beginning this week."

"By setting their alarm clocks 5 minutes earlier," the newspaper continues, "the thousands of men and women who head out for work in their high-powered autos at the same time thousands of children start to school, would not have to race to get to the office.

"A 5-minute head start, which would encourage careful driving, might save 80 years of some child's life.

"Give the school-bound youngster a chance. Someone gave you yours."

We don't know what we can add to that simple appeal unless it is to remind our readers that there are at least 10 schools in this area having no sidewalks children can use in reaching them. The kinds must walk in the streets. Drivers must be extra careful.

Also, from 7 to 8:20 a.m. and again for nearly 2 hours in the afternoon Lancaster County has 90 school buses on the highways making frequent, unexpected stops to let children on and off. These buses haul about 5,000 children a day. That's 10,000 feet and legs all running in different directions when the bus doors open.

Mr. Driver, you can't outfigure a youngster every time. When the bus stops, you stop, too. That's the law but it is also the only way you can play it safe.

LYNCHING IN THE NORTH

There is not much profit in arraigning a large city, such as New York, for the prevalence of sensational crimes occurring within its borders. Where population is concentrated violence is also concentrated. That we have learned to accept as one of the more unpleasant facts of life.

What we have never learned to accept is the holier-than-thou attitude of big city newspapers and editorial writers in distinguishing between violence in the cities and violence in the hinterlands. In New York City, for instance, eight young people in their teens or early twenties, have been murdered by racially organized gangs since the beginning of the year.

Any one of those killings in the South would have been called a race riot or a lynching, depending on who got killed. In the North these things are called outbreaks of juvenile delinquency, as if victims were less dead or more righteously dead because of the tender years of the members of these wide-ranging gangs.

A lynch mob in the South is a terrible thing. It brings shame to all of us. The record over the past 50 years shows conclusively that the Southern States have worked hard to eradicate lynching. It has become so rare that it is no longer a real problem. What large city in the North can point to a similar achievement?

Lynch mobs in the South have generally had some poor excuse for their violence. These senseless killings by mobs in the North have nothing behind them but racial or class hatred. By any definition, however, they are lynchings and if they were called lynchings we feel the newspapers and law enforcement agencies of the North would have a clearer idea of what to do about them.

They have always been so positive about them when these acts of violence took place just over the horizon.

Appointment of Moton H. Crockett, Jr., of Austin, Tex., to Junior Chamber of Commerce International Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the first time, a Texan has been honored by receiving an appointment to the Junior Chamber of Commerce International Commission. He is Moton H. Crockett, Jr., of Austin, Tex.

Mr. Crockett's position will be one of far-reaching responsibilities, both on a national and on an international scale. I know that he will do well in his new job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Crockett Given World Junior Chamber of Commerce Job," published in the Austin, Tex., American of August 27, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROCKETT GIVEN WORLD JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE JOB

A young Austin businessman, Moton H. Crockett, Jr., was named Wednesday to the worldwide Junior Chamber of Commerce International Commission—the first Texan ever to be so honored.

Crockett's appointment was made by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce president, Bob Clark of Iowa.

Crockett, a former president of the Austin Jaycees, will be one of 10 U.S. representatives on the international commission. His field of work, the appointment announcement said, will be international relations.

Austin Jaycee President Joe Hannan hailed the choice of Crockett as an event putting Austin in the spotlight of international relations between young men the world over.

Speaking of Crockett's international relations portfolio, Hannan said, "This is one of the more important commission in the Jaycee international movement because of the pressing need for understanding and cooperation between young men of all nations."

Crockett will begin his new job by attending the annual convention of Mexico Jaycees in the resort city of Acalpulco in October.

The following month he will attend the Jaycee International World Congress at Rio de Janeiro.

Jaycee clubs exist in 89 countries, in 59 of which there are national organizations.

Economic Assistance to Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, the Polish American Congress, Inc., with headquarters in Chicago, Ill., and State chapters throughout the United States, represents over 7 million Americans of Polish descent.

The president of this organization is Mr. Charles Rozmarek, who also is the president of the Polish National Alliance, largest Polish-American fraternal organization.

The board of directors of the Polish American Congress held a 2-day meeting at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Washington, D.C., on March 16 and 17, 1959. At that time they adopted a memorandum and a motion on the subject of further economic assistance to Poland.

I would like, at this time, to present the memorandum and motion as adopted. They are as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON FURTHER ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO POLAND, PRESENTED BY THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 16, 1959

Notwithstanding the anti-American pronouncements made by Wladyslaw Gomulka and other members of the Communist regime in Warsaw, we strongly believe that further economic assistance to Poland in the form of new credits for the purchase of agricultural surpluses and industrial machinery is still in the best interests of the United States.

American economic aid to Poland in her present industrial and commercial difficulties will undoubtedly strengthen psychological resistance of the Polish people to communism and against Soviet domination. It will be a step toward Poland's liberation from economic pressures and dependence on the Soviet Union. It will alleviate the distress caused by the shortages of foodstuffs, animal feeds, and consumer goods. As Poland grows economically stronger through American help, she will be in better position to resist Russian pressures and thus gradually create a widening market for American goods in her expanding economy.

The Polish people are not Communists. They did not elect—they were forced under

a system that denies them the freedom that they have championed and fought for throughout history at home and abroad, even to aiding us in our struggle for independence. It will help her to keep alive the hope of returning to the family of Western nations, a place which she earned as a bulwark of Christendom for the past thousand years.

The fact that the Warsaw regime occasionally denounces American policy is of no paramount importance. These pronouncements actually echo the dictates of the Kremlin rather than the real sentiments of the Polish people.

The will of the Polish Nation remains undaunted. It has ever been the will to defend the rich heritage of Western civilization, culture, and tradition. As then, so now more strongly than ever it is to return to the free world as a nation, whose devotion to the ideals of freedom and democracy has been for centuries.

In conclusion, we respectfully submit that Poland's current request for credits be granted within the framework of the mutual security program.

MOTION PASSED AT MEETING OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, MARCH 17, 1959, ON FURTHER ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO POLAND

We firmly support continued economic assistance by the United States to the people of Poland, even though regrettably, Poland's present government continues to be controlled by sources subservient to Soviet rule. We support this continued economic assistance to the people of Poland because we firmly believe that the present government of that nation is transitory while the firm dedication of the Polish people to the principles of freedom and democracy are unending and time enduring.

It is our firm conviction that the two previous extensions of credits by the United States to the people of Poland, namely, the first loan of $95 million and the second for $98 million, have bolstered the Polish people's spirit to continue their resistance toward suppression of liberty in their native land.

Continued economic assistance to the Polish people would help this gallant ally of the West maintain this spirit of resistance.

It should be made clear that while we support the concept of continued economic assistance to Poland, we strongly urge our State Department to take whatever steps are necessary to make sure that this assistance will go exclusively for the aid of the Polish people and will in no way be used directly or indirectly to help the Soviet Union.

We further authorize the executive board of the Polish American Congress to take whatever steps it deems necessary to help obtain continued economic assistance to the people of Poland.

Diamond Jubilee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, this is a significant year for a veterans' organization which has achieved much since it was organized 60 years ago today. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, which dedicated its War Memorial Building in the Nation's Capital this year, is an organization of importance not only to its members but to the Nation as a whole.

An editorial in the August 20 edition of the National Tribune, the Stars and Stripes, gives a good account of the VFW in its diamond jubilee year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DIAMOND JUBILEE

A proud veterans organization will be celebrating its 60th anniversary this month at Los Angeles. We speak of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which may well be proud of its service in time of war, as in time of peace—proud of its beginnings and proud of its continued zeal in the welfare of the Nation, the State, and the community.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is just what its name implies—an organization of men who, like the crusaders of old, have followed the Stars and Stripes into foreign climes, and brought the faith of Washington and Lincoln to foreign tyrants and despots—men who have proven their patriotism by the offering of their bodies and souls in sacrifice that liberty should not perish from the earth, and that American ideals and institutions might be preserved for posterity.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is a permanent organization. It will continue as long as it is necessary for American citizens to defend the faith of their fathers against foreign aggression, and uphold these principles and ideals for which the heroes of 1776 risked their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor in establishing the Nation.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States resulted from the amalgamation of several societies formed immediately following the Spanish-American War in 1899, little groups of veterans returned from campaigning in Cuba and the Philippine Islands, founded local societies upon that spirit of comradeship, known only to those who have faced the dangers of war side by side. Similar experiences and a common language drew them together. The American Veterans of Foreign Service was chartered by the State of Ohio on October 10, 1899.

The Colorado Society, Army of the Philippines, was organized in Denver, Colo., December 12, 1899. Shortly thereafter, a society known as Foreign Service Veterans was born in Pennsylvania.

These organizations grew up side by side, increasing in scope and membership until 1913, when at a convention held at Denver, they merged their interests and identities in a national organization known as the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

The VFW is an organization unique in its eligibility requirements. To join its ranks, a man must be able to produce an honorable discharge from the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force, showing "service honest and faithful" in time of war in the theater of operation.

So much for the history of the organization. The record of its accomplishments may be found in the record of its activities throughout the land—on the local, State, and National level.

Its legislative group is ever alert to legislation which may arise in Congress affecting veterans and their dependents and presents the views of its membership to Congress. Its rehabilitation service devotes itself to the presentation of claims through the regional offices and through the appeals machinery of the Veterans' Administration—ever seeking to secure more adequate medical care for that veteran group.

One of the highlights of the past year in the history of the VFW was the erection of the War Memorial Building in Washington, D.C., a beautiful structure, worthy to take its place among the outstanding landmarks of the Capitol area. The auxiliary contributed substantially to this project and may well be proud of their efforts in this direction.

Perhaps the most outstanding project of the organization is the national home at Eaton Rapids, Mich., which has been maintained as a refuge for children whose fathers were totally disabled or deceased. One visit to the national home will convince the most skeptical critics of organized veterandom that any group which provides such a home for its members' children is more than worthy of the respect of our citizens.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has grown in membership and achievement under the able leadership of its young commander in chief, John W. Mahan, of Helena, Mont., and its auxiliary with Mrs. Myers as president has progressed equally well in its field of endeavor and membership gains.

We hope that all who attend the diamond jubilee meeting of the VFW in Los Angeles this year will have the good time they deserve but also that out of the serious work of the convention will come useful and beneficial resolutions and the type of leadership which the veterans and the auxiliary have enjoyed in the past.

Walter Lee's Retirement Means Loss of Fine Public Servant

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, time has been set aside by the House to honor one of its finest servants and a man who has done long and excellent service for the people of the United States over many years. I refer to Walter Lee, who is retiring from active duty with the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Almost every Member of the House has, at one time or another, had a problem to deal with that came to the attention of this fine committee. And, unless one is an attorney or has had long experience with these problems in the House, one is at a loss as to where to turn and what course of action to follow.

That is, one would be if it were not for the fact that the committee has had on its staff Walter Lee. I know from personal experience that on many occasions I have had to prepare legislation or to follow up legislation and have not known from past experience exactly where and how to proceed. On these occasions I have always been able to turn to Walter Lee for advice and help. He has always been there to give that kind of advice and has always been eager to help.

Walter Lee is leaving the Judiciary Committee staff. He will be sorely missed, particularly by the new Members of the House, who will not—as I have had—have the opportunity to turn to Walter Lee for his sound advice and counsel.

In closing, might I add that Mr. Lee's help was never a matter of partisanship.

Whether a member of the Republican or Democratic Party, Mr. Lee was equally helpful when asked by a Member of Congress for assistance.

In his retirement, the public is losing a good and faithful servant. My one wish is that Mr. Lee will, in the remaining years, enjoy the life of retirement he has so well earned. I know that if to look back on a life of service brings happiness, Mr. Lee will be one of the happiest men on earth.

Atlanta, Ga., Citizens Protest Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, there are many good citizens throughout the length and breadth of America who are convinced that the impending visit of Communist Premier Khrushchev bodes no good for freedom-loving people in this country and elsewhere in the world.

The inclination of the average person is to accept it and to make the best of it, inasmuch as the invitation has been extended and accepted. Yet, those who have throughout the years fought the aims and purposes of communism are aware that this visit is going to result in considerable advantage to Communist leaders from a propaganda standpoint, and considerable disadvantage to us and particularly to the unfortunate and miserable people behind the Iron Curtain whose governments and lands have been taken over by the Communists.

In Atlanta, Ga., in my own district, there is a strong spirit of protest against the exchange of visits between Khrushchev and President Eisenhower. There has been forwarded to me a protest signed by a number of outstanding Atlanta citizens on behalf of an organization known as Atlanta Citizens Protesting the Khrushchev Visit. They have, in a few words, graphically expressed their feelings of protest.

I have asked unanimous consent to insert this protest in the RECORD, and pursuant to this unanimous consent I insert it herewith:

We hereby protest the invitation to Mr. N. S. Khrushchev, head of the Communist Russian dictatorship, to visit our country and our city. We are convinced that only harm can come from such a visit, for it reflects a spirit of gradual compromise, which can lead to the eventual downfall of America.

The association with this man, with his known character, representing the government which is sworn to defeat our country and destroy our way of life, can only give the impression of friendship and indicate appeasement, amounting to support of his aims.

We do not agree with the aims of communism, and we feel that such a visit can bring only misunderstanding and despair to those people who are fighting this godless tyranny, both here and in all the countries of the world.

Joseph G. Maddox; Charles A. Wofford; Joe Maloof; Joseph M. Salome; Alfred Hardman; Paul E. Beard, Sr.; Frank H. Benning; Lester Maddox; J. L. de Give; T. J. Wesley, Jr.; James C. Meaders, for Atlanta Citizens Protesting the Khrushchev Visit.

Withholding, for Purposes of Income Tax Imposed by Certain Cities, on the Compensation of Federal Employees

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MILLIKEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3151. This tax is a very unfair tax. It is imposed by the city of Philadelphia on the nonresidents who work in Philadelphia, who work in the Philadelphia Navy Yard and in other installations in the city of Philadelphia. This tax has been fought many times through the Pennsylvania legislature, and now the city of Philadelphia is down here asking the Federal Government to be their tax collector. If the Federal Government is going to be a tax collector for the city of Philadelphia and other large municipalities, they should also collect the taxes for every municipality in this country. There are 197 local municipalities in Pennsylvania that have wage taxes, and I am sure that every one of these municipalities has Federal employees. I was very disappointed when this bill came out under suspension of the rules. I talked this matter over with former Congressman Wolverton from New Jersey last fall, and he told me the place to object to this bill was before the Committee on Rules. Now, I woke up one morning and found out that this bill was on the floor of the House under suspension.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I kept the gentleman informed completely at all times of when we would bring it up, did I not?

Mr. MILLIKEN. You informed me you were going to bring it up, but you did not inform me that it was coming up, because I had an amendment that I wanted to offer to include all municipalities who have a wage tax.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I understand the gentleman says that this will make the Federal Government a tax collector for the city of Philadelphia.

Mr. MILLIKEN. And other cities.

Mr. GARY. Is not the city of Philadelphia now a tax collector for the Federal Government on income tax?

Mr. MILLIKEN. Yes.

Mr. GARY. Then, what injustice is it to require the Federal Government to do the same thing for the city that the city is now doing for the Federal Government? I have no interest in this matter, but I just cannot see any injustice in it.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Is the Federal Government eventually going to go into and collect local taxes for every municipality in this country?

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. The city of Philadelphia merely collects for the Federal Government from its own employees as any employer would do.

Mr. MILLIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. But every city in the United States, whether it has a wage tax or not, does that for the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Every municipality in the United States does that for the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Free Elections?—Where?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a timely editorial appearing in the Tacoma News Tribune on August 8, 1959.

FREE ELECTIONS?—WHERE?

When we Americans say it is shameful that people cannot have free elections, we usually are thinking of Hungary or some other state ruled with an iron hand by a despotic regime.

We certainly do not refer to the United States of America, the land of freedom and free elections.

And yet the capital city of these United States, a metropolis of some million persons who are entitled to every human right and right of citizenship we in Tacoma enjoy, have no elections at all, free or otherwise.

It is not only that the residents of Washington, D.C., have no right to vote for the man who will be their neighbor in the White House. They cannot even elect a local city or district government. They are run by a commission appointed by the man in the White House, subject to the rules laid down by a congressional committee.

For 80 years the residents of Washington, D.C., have been trying to get voting rights restored, rights that were taken from them at an unfortunate time when the Federal Government thought Washington city government was trying to pressure it. Such a charge would be laughable today, but there is another stumbling block. The majority of persons in the District of Columbia are Negroes and you can't get southern Democrats who run the District of Columbia to

agree to home rule, so much do they want to deprive the Negro of a vote. This also is an untenable position and, thankfully, the Senate has passed a home rule bill now languishing in the House District of Columbia body. There is a move on in the House to get the 219 signatures needed to take the bill away from this hidebound committee and get it on the floor for passage.

The people of our National Capital say, "We believe in democracy; we want to vote." Let's show them we also believe in democracy and ask our Congressmen to sign on this motion to take up the bill.

The Late Kenneth Mills Regan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 18, 1959

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there are many Members of this House who will remember with feelings of friendship and respect the late former Congressman from my State, Kenneth Mills Regan, who died Saturday, August 15, in Santa Fe, N. Mex. He served here in the House during the 80th Congress as the Representative from the 16th Congressional District, demonstrating great loyalty for the people whose battles he fought in committee and on the floor, and great devotion to Texas and to his country. He was reelected to the 81st Congress. I rise to speak in behalf of his memory not only because I have been for years his friend as he was mine and regarded him with affection but because he was during his incumbency as a national legislator one with whom I took frequent counsel and one who had the good grace to acknowledge and respect the value of my advice, experience, and cooperation. He regarded me not merely as a fellow Texan and a friend, but as a fellow American. It was a source of no little pride for me to note that Ken Regan was quite as capable of seeing the Nation as a whole when he was confronted by a decision, as he was eminently astute in recognizing the needs of the area he represented and its people.

Regan's career—broadly speaking—was not unlike that of many of us here in this Chamber. He attended public school and studied at Vincennes University in Vincennes, Ind. He engaged in the real-estate business and since 1920 was an oil operator. He began his political career as an alderman for the city of Pecos and was that city's mayor from 1929 through 1932. Then from 1933 through 1937 he was a member of the State senate. He participated in both World Wars—I and II—serving with the rank of captain. Many of us knew him here in the House when he was elected to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of the Honorable Robert Ewing Thomason. Among his legislative interests here were a deep concern for the ending of the Korean war, proposals for improving the water situation in our State, problems on reclamation and mining, the protection of trademarks, immigration problems, questions involving oil and gas leases—a field in which he was expert—and other issues that confronted our State, his district, and our Nation. He did much for El Paso and for rehabilitation projects along the Rio Grande.

Ken Regan was in his 66th year and while his passing is a source of regret to his family, his friends, the thousands whom he befriended, and the country, it is satisfying to know he had a full and highly satisfying life. He made good, many times over, his obligations as a leader, and accomplished much for the public interest. I want from the Chamber of the House of Representatives to offer my condolences to his widow, Mrs. Regan, the former Roberta Katherine McGary of El Paso, and to express as formally and respectfully as possible, the regrets of the House of Representatives on the death of this distinguished and able former associate.

Interstate Commerce in Ignorance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the August 25 edition of the Paterson (N.J.) Morning Call carried an editorial which comments on recent remarks made by the president of the National Education Association. At a time when there is much discussion of Federal aid to education, the comments and the editorial have great significance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial of August 25, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN IGNORANCE

A most intriguing phrase occurred in a remark made the other day by Dr. W. W. Eshelman, president of the National Education Association. The newly elected head of this organization of educators was commenting on the NEA's support of Federal aid for school construction and teacher salary boosts. "There is as much interstate commerce in ignorance," he said, "as in anything else."

Dr. Eshelman made the point that, because there is such a great interchange of Americans from one section of the country to another, the Nation can no longer afford regional inequalities in education. It is a point of great importance to the long-range national welfare.

Most Americans uphold the principle of local autonomy in education, and dislike the idea of a nationalized system. Within the framework of that principle, however, much can be done to improve educational standards. Endless debate on this subject is a luxury the Nation can ill afford. It is clearly in the public interest that American children everywhere should be well educated. Steps should be taken to make that a reality instead of a dream.

Professor Goddard Father of the Rocket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very ably written and particularly pertinent article by Mr. Evan Kenkins, staff reporter for the Worcester Telegram and Gazette which recently appeared in that celebrated publication which serves my district, relating to the illustrious career and historic work of the late Prof. Robert H. Goddard.

This article is a very interesting and timely résumé of Professor Goddard's historic achievements. It comes at a time when, thanks to the interest and good judgment of the outstanding chairman of our House Banking and Currency Committee and its very able membership, my bill to strike off a medal in his honor has been reported from the committee and passed by the House.

The bill has also been reported from the very able Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and is presently awaiting action by the Senate and I am very hopeful of early favorable action in the other body.

Too much cannot be said about Professor Goddard's experiments, inventions and accomplishments which have revolutionized science and ushered in the space age. Much is being written and said now about the epochal achievements of Dr Goddard but little has been noted of his long, difficult struggles and bitter sacrifices to reach his goal of initiating workable practicable space vehicles.

This great man was not only handicapped by lack of funds, but he most unselfishly gave of himself and his own modest income to carry forward his momentous experimentation. Few and meager indeed were the contributions made to the conduct of his early work, and perhaps more regrettable even than lack of funds was the barrage of scorn and ridicule to which he was subjected. Through all these obstacles, disappointments and discouragements, Professor Goddard with greatest courage, ability and genius was not deterred from his objectives and he stubbornly persisted with his experimentation until he had, not only made great contributions to the national defense with regard to the bazooka and jet propulsion, but also had laid a firm, sound basis for the modern rocket which is now propelling payload, scientific missiles through the reaches of outer space.

Where Professor Goddard's dedicated work will lead not even the most fantastic imagination could predict. Indeed, not even Jules Verne could conceive of man's future conquest of outer space.

With the continued projection of Professor Goddard's original ideas, man is, in truth, released from his previous captivity on this terrestrial sphere called

earth and is destined in the future to soar almost effortlessly through the distant heavens and perhaps into the planetary world. A trip to the moon which when mentioned during the days of Professor Goddard's experiments would be scoffed at and ridiculed is now regarded by scientists as being probable, indeed in the not too distant future.

In any event, this Nation and the world owes an incalculable and everlasting debt to the great Robert H. Goddard who achieved so mightily, and it is most appropriate that Congress and the American people should honor and express the most profound appreciation to this great immortal son of central Massachusetts.

The article follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram, Aug. 30, 1959]

LATE PROFESSOR GODDARD'S DREAM IS SEEN FAST APPROACHING REALITY

(By Evan Jenkins)

America's foremost rocket authority, in a newspaper interview, predicted that trips to the moon may occur long before the lay person dreams that anything of the kind may be possible."

According to the laws of physics, he said, there is not a single reason why such voyages may not become a reality in the near future. And in time, round trips to Mars and Venus may be made.

A visionary? To be sure. Especially so—in 1934.

It was just 25 years ago this week that the late Robert Hutchins Goddard, then head of the physics department at Clark University, spoke with such confidence about trips into space. His remarks were recorded in the Sunday Telegram for September 2, 1934.

FATHER OF ROCKETRY

Today, 14 years after his death, Goddard is revered as the "father of American rocketry."

In 1934, the reporter noted, the Worcester-born physicist was widely known as the "Moon Man."

The writer took care to include in his story the distances Goddard was so sure could be conquered:

To the Moon, 236,000 miles.

To Mars "at its minimum apposition," 35 million miles.

To Venus, 65 million miles.

Skepticism was natural enough. The highest that man had gone at that time was 67,000 feet, or about 12½ miles. (The record was claimed by the Russians, but the aviators were killed when their balloon crashed.)

A FAR CRY

It was a far cry from 67,000 feet to 236,000 miles. But Goddard, for at least 14 years, had predicted that the lunar flight would eventually be made.

By 1934, he had succeeded in propelling a rocket at 500 miles an hour—an unheard-of-speed—in tests at Roswell, N. Mex.

He had developed the all-important liquid-fuel rocket motor, 15 years before the Germans had one.

He had worked out—in 1918—complete plans for the bazooka, an adaption of his rocket work unused until World War II.

He had proved, by actual tests, that a rocket does not need a "cushion of air to push against," as many scientists still believed. In fact, he had shown that a rocket is 22 percent more effective in a vacuum.

GIVEN SUPPORT

Goddard's work in the early years was not without support. The Smithsonian Institution helped finance it, starting just after World War I. Clark, which paid him to teach physics, also provided a laboratory and some funds for the pet project.

Major assistance came from millionaire Daniel Guggenheim. His backing was originally obtained largely through the efforts of another pioneer, Charles A. Lindbergh.

But others, perhaps a majority of the Americans acquainted with the "Moon Man's" investigations, were not so kind.

His work in the 1920's and 1930's was being carefully watched elsewhere, however—notably in Germany.

UNWITTING AID

The V-2 rocket almost changed the course of World War II. Scientists who worked on the 20-year project in Germany said the effort might never have succeeded without the unwitting assistance furnished by Goddard.

An ominous accompaniment to the 1934 Telegram article is a picture of a German rocket launching—an unsuccessful one, that time.

At home, things might have been better financially. Billions are spent today on rocket and missile work stemming from Goddard's trail-blazing studies.

NO DATE SET—THEN

"Ask him when we take off for Mars," wrote the reporter in 1934, "and he is reluctant to set a date."

But not because he lacked faith in the ultimate realization of his dreams.

"He will tell you," the article continues, "that scarcity of financial support is today the deterrent to a human development that would outrival those conceived by the wildest dreams of a Jules Verne or an H. G. Wells."

Warsaw in Chains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to many recent favorable reviews, here and in England, of a book recently published by Stefan Korbonski, entitled "Warsaw in Chains."

There has been of late much interest in recent political developments in Poland. Many Americans are having considerable difficulty in fairly assessing that situation. Vice President NIXON's recent visit to Poland and the unusually warm welcome given to him by the people of that Communist-controlled nation, serve to stress again the warm feeling of friendship to the United States by the Polish people.

The author, Stefan Korbonski, a lawyer by profession, was the political head of the huge Polish underground that fought gallantly under the exiled Polish leadership in London throughout the Nazi occupation. His experiences of personal arrests and escapes make fantastic reading.

I most warmly recommend "Warsaw in Chains" to those of my colleagues who would like to understand better the present situation in Poland and the developments of the last 20 years. It makes excellent and most educational reading.

Amending the Bankruptcy Act With Respect to Discrimination Against Salesmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 872, to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to the priority of debts owed by a bankrupt to workmen, servants, clerks, and salesmen.

On February 18, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4729 on the same subject.

On August 20, 1959, it was my privilege to appear before Sucommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary Committee in support of these measures.

My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK, AUGUST 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. It is the identical subject, but slightly different language.

I am ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Representative of the 13th District of New York.

I have a prepared statement, Mr. Chairman, which I can leave with you.

Mr. FORRESTER. On both bills?

Mr. MULTER. It covers both bills.

Mr. FORRESTER. Let it be made a part of the record.

Mr. MULTER. I have been introducing a bill covering this subject for many years, having in mind that the limitation now in the statute, in the bankruptcy statute, of $600 for each claimant, in the nature of a wage earner or salaried employee, has long since been outmoded.

Originally I put in a bill some years ago with a change, increasing the amount of $600 to a much larger sum. I followed that same procedure when I introduced H.R. 872, on January 7, 1959. And in that bill, I changed the $600 limitation to $1,500.

On February 18, 1959, I introduced H.R. 4729, which has no limitation of amount, but sets up a criterion for determining the maximum that can be paid, averaging it as against the last year's earnings.

Now, the original limitation—may I say first that I do not change the period of time of 3 months prior to the bankruptcy. In other words, any earnings that have not been collected prior to 3 months before the bankruptcy are treated the same as claims of general creditors. That is the law today, and I don't seek to change that. I continue the 3-month limitation, so that the priority granted to earnings applies only if earned within 3 months prior to the filing of the bankruptcy petition.

Now, it was in 1898 that Congress first put the $300 limitation into the statute. Then that was changed.

In 1926 the Congress doubled it and made it $600. Even when they increased it at that time to $600 they hardly went far enough, because even on that basis, taking the comparative figures, if they considered the increase in cost of living, and the increase in wages, percentagewise, as against the figure that had been on the statute books from 1898 to 1926, if they had increased it realistically at that time they would have increased it instead of to $600 to $2,200.

Now, I am suggesting now that in the wisdom of the committee either you change

that amount to $1,500, which is much more realistic than the $600, but still not as far as it should go, or so as to avoid the necessity of coming in each year, or every 2 or 3 years, asking for another change in the statute, set up a formula something like the one that I have set forth in H.R. 4729. Then you don't have to change the limitation from year to year, but as the standard of living goes up, as wages and salaries and commissions go up, you can then take a base period of 1 year prior to bankruptcy, average that out, and whatever the average earnings have been in that prior year limit the priority claim accordingly to 3 months' earnings, but not to exceed what he actually earned during that 3 months prior to bankruptcy. Thus you have a limitation by formula instead of by dollars and cents.

I think that would be the more realistic way of doing it.

At the same time, I can understand how there may be some reaction, "Why should we allow a priority wage earner so much money, $1,500, it is a lot of money." Or possibly if the formula is adopted it may run to $2,000 or $3,000. Well, the fact of the matter is that we ought to determine the amount a man can receive on the basis of his earning capacity.

If I can only earn $100 a week, and the company that is employing me goes into bankruptcy, then I will file a claim, priority claim, for that $100 a week, multiplied by the 12 or 13 weeks in the 3-month period prior to bankruptcy. But, on the other hand, if I happen to be a better employee, or a commissioned salesman, who is doing an awfully good job for my employer, and I am earning $150 or $200 a week, I don't think I ought to be penalized and put on the same plateau of the fellow not doing as good a job as me and not earning as much. The 3-month period is a fair period. If you let each man get what he has earned during that 3-month period we are being just and fair. I can understand if you don't have some kind of a formula, or some kind of a limitation, it would lend itself to fraud. The bankrupt could make a fraudulent arrangement with some friends, whom he put on his payroll, but actually are not earning anything. He could put them on the payroll for $300 or $400 a week, just prior to the bankruptcy, so that they get priority claims that might eat up all of the assets.

My bill does not permit that, because if it is going to be based on my particular formula, then the man must actually have been earning during that year. We take his average of what he has earned and use that as the basis of the limittion of the priority. I think that is a much fairer standard than now in the law.

But, again. I realize the opposition that might develop to having a statute of this kind which does not fix a maximum dollar limitation.

That is, in the main, my presentation, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee. I appreciate very much the opportunity you have given me to come in and present the case for this bill. I do hope you will favorably consider one or the other of these two bills.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOWDY], any questions?

Mr. DOWDY. Not at this moment.

Mr. FORRESTER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]?

Mr. WHITENER. Well, you preserve the 3 months' period for priority?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITENER. What about this independent contractor provision? Would that include corporate independent contractors?

Mr. MULTER. No; it was not intended to include the corporate contractor. This was intended to include that salesman who is working for four or five companes, because, as you know, the salesman, many times, will take on three or four different lines. Some companies cannot afford to employ a salesman full time. Therefore, the salesman will carry three or four lines. He may carry items that sell that may be divided pricewise, or they may be divided qualitywise. He may carry three or four different lines for small houses.

Mr. WHITENER. Manufacturers' agents?

Mr. MULTER. Yes; when they get into the higher brackets, they call themselves manufacturers' agents. In the lower brackets——

Mr. WHITENER. Or sales engineers?

Mr. MULTER. Yes—and independent contractors. But where the man is not working for a single company, unless we have some language like this, he is not covered by the statute. You just suggest by asking will this include corporations, that it may be necessary to amplify that language so as to apply to individuals.

Mr. DOWDY. I understand these words are in the present law, is that right?

Mr. DRABKIN. "Salesmen, whether or not they are independent contractors", I think is in the act now. As I read these bills, it doesn't change the scope of the persons covered. It just changes the measure.

Mr. MULTER. That was the intent, to change the measure of the priority claim.

Mr. DRABKIN. I think in 1956 the amendment was made which broadened the scope of the people included. But this bill, as I understand it, would not do that.

Mr. MULTER. Yes, you are quite right on that. I had been introducing bills along this line since back in 1948 or 1949, and I overlooked, until this moment, that in 1956 you broadened the language of the statute as to the definition of wage earner.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. MULTER, did you furnish counsel with a list of your witnesses?

Mr. MULTER. No, I did not do that. But I think that he has some requests from interested persons.

(Statement referred to is as follows:)

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, DEMOCRAT OF NEW YORK, BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4729, AUGUST 20, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity afforded to me to submit to you my views in support of my bill, H.R. 4729, which I introduced on February 18, 1959.

This bill would remove an archaic discrimination against employees and salesmen when settling the debts of a bankrupt. At the present time, several types of debts have priority and must be paid in full out of bankrupt estates before dividends can be paid to the creditors of the bankrupt. A dollar limitation is placed on only one of these debts, the claims for wages of workmen, servants, clerks, and salesmen. The dollar limitation now effective is the result of a 1926 amendment of a limitation derived from the 1898 act.

The present dollar limit on wages having priority as debts of a bankrupt estate is $600 for each claimant; the amount must have been earned within 3 months before the date of the commencement of bankruptcy proceedings. Prior to 1926, the limit was $300. When the increase was discussed on the floor of the House, on April 17, 1926, Congressman Michener said:

"Under the present bankruptcy law there is an amount of $300 for wages earned within 3 months immediately preceding the bankruptcy proceedings allowed as a priority claim. In the amendment suggested the amount is raised to $600. I might say * * * the American Federation of Labor appeared before the committee and asked that the limit on the amount be removed entirely and that the time limit be removed * * * if $300 in 1898 was the proper amount of wages earned within 3 months then in 1926, with changed conditions, that $600 was a fair and equitable amount." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Apr. 17, 1926, p. 7675.)

The bill which I have introduced and which now is before you does not disturb the time limit of 3 months on earnings which are given priority. It removes the $600 limitation; and provides safeguards to employees and salesmen, and as well to the other claimants against the estate, in determining the amount of wages and earnings. The safeguards are provided in the method of determining the amount earned or receivable in 3 months prior to bankruptcy. The amount is determined on the basis of the average rate of pay during a period of not more than a year before the bankruptcy occurred. Reasonable rates of compensation should be ascertainable from the experience of a year.

When the $600 limitation was inserted in place of the $300 limit in 1926, it was a respectable sum. It was equal, for example, to more than 5½ months average pay of a manufacturing employee. If the limitation were to bear the same relation to manufacturing wages today, it should be at least $2,200.

It seems to me more appropriate to remove the dollar limitation on wages than to try to find one reasonable figure to fit conditions of today, when we know that the course of wages is upward, and any limitation that is appropriate today will be out of date within a year or two.

Removal of the dollar limitation as proposed in my bill probably would increase the wage claims given priority in settling bankrupt estates. In 1958, in 8,449 asset cases concluded in the courts, wages paid to priority creditors were only 2.3 percent of the proceeds realized from the estate. They were only one-sixth as much as taxes, and less than one-tenth as much as administrative fees and expenses. Removal of the $600 limitation would eliminate the distinction made in treating wages and other priority creditors, and make subsequent amendment unnecessary.

If the Congress will not go along with my bill to the extent of eliminating the dollar limitation then the least it should do is increase the amount to a sum that is fair by today's standards.

Thank you.

FURTHER STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. May I respond very briefly, Mr. Chairman,—I don't want to hold you too long. But I was intrigued by the opposition presented by Mr. Krause on behalf of the boys practicing in the bankruptcy courts. And I think you would be interested to know that originally, one of these bills I introduced some sessions ago, called for $3,500 as the maximum. Then I found that the bankruptcy lawyers were complaining about it. I discussed it with many of them—members of but none of them talking for the association that my friend Mr. Krause said he represented here today. But I discussed it with them, and they said, "Your $3,500 is just too high. Why don't you work out a formula—instead of having an amount?" And so you got H.R. 4729.

First, before I put in H.R. 4729, which is the formula bill, without an amount, they said, "Why don't you put in a bill for a more realistic amount? So I discussed it with them, back and forth.

Mr. FORRESTER. Who are you talking about?

Mr. MULTER. Lawyers practicing in the bankruptcy courts, most of them from New York, some from Washington, some from Baltimore, some from Philadelphia—friends of mine I met at various bar association meetings and during the course of my activities.

So I then put in what I thought was a more realistic amount which is the $1,500. Then came the suggestion, "Why don't you instead of an amount come up with a formula." So H.R. 4729 came up with a formula.

That is why I said to you, Mr. Chairman, that one is not a substitute for the other—because of the divergence of opinion, I want the committee now to decide which is the better way of doing it, because I think—I hope you will agree with me that the amount of $600 needs some change.

Now, instead of taking this man who is earning $2,500 a week, or $2,500 a month, as a salesman, let's take the average. And the last witness gave you the average in his club of $8,000. I think if you take the statistics from the Department of Commerce, you will find that that is approximately the same average throughout the country of salemen's commissions. They earn about $8,000 a year.

Eight thousand dollars a year is approximately $154 a week; $154 a week for a 12-week, 3-month period is $1,848. Look how close I came to that.

Mr. DOWDY. If it is $8,000 a year, 3 months is a quarter of that, which would be $2,000.

Mr. MULTER. You can figure it that way, too. If you take 13 weeks, it would be approximately $2,000. And the one bill only calls for $1,500.

Now, if you do it the other way, on the formula basis, you will, of course, take in some of the fellows in the higher brackets. But let's have this in mind. I thought possible our friend who is himself a salesman would have made the point, and it would not have been necessary for me to make it. But this is the situation. If you look at what actually happens in these industries, and how the salesman works—many of these salesmen will take this representation, whether they are representing one company or several companies—they go out on the road. They will stay on the road for as much as a month. They will be sending in their orders all the time, the factory or employer is accepting the orders, filling them, shipping them, getting the money. He doesn't get back to his home office anywhere from 4 to 6 weeks after he has left. Sometimes they go out and stay out for as many as 3 months, covering the entire country.

They leave New York City or Baltimore and cover the whole country, before they finally return. And he doesn't know what is going on at home. And when his checks stop coming in to him, he is not getting his weekly or monthly remittance, he will start writing back. If he is covering the country for three or four people instead of one, he can't come rushing back home, "Why haven't you give me my check?" He will be writing and telegraphing for money. When he gets back, he finds his company is in bankruptcy.

Isn't it most unjust to that fellow not to give him fair priority on the wages that he has earned?

Now, originally the statute, I think, said only wages, having in mind just wage earners. A long time ago they broadened the language to cover salaries and commissions.

I think it is fair to say that many of these places cannot stay in business, they cannot earn the money to pay the salaries or the wages to those who are producing the goods, if they didn't have salesmen out on the road, sending in the orders and bringing in the orders. And those fellows are as much entitled to protection of priority claims as the man who is working with his hands, because if the man simply produces, and the goods stay in the warehouse, and are not sold, then there is no money with which to pay his wages.

Mr. FORRESTER. He does get the same thing as a man working with his hands, doesn't he?

Mr. MULTER. Today he does, yes, sir.

Mr. WHITENER. Well, may I interject this thought? In the whole presentation here today, haven't you gentlemen overlooked the fact that if this is liberalized as to salesmen, it would also be liberalized as to the man who does work with his hands?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, of course. We are not trying to put them in a better position. We are trying to equalize the position for all of them.

Mr. FORRESTER. You are just trying to get it raised?

Mr. MULTER. Yes—but raise it for all of them.

Now, one other thing as to the technical language that Mr. Krause referred to, and the possibility of a need for an amendment.

I excuse my friend the salesman, who is not a lawyer, for saying probably it needs amendment. But you lawyers, like myself, I think, should say to Mr. Krause, "Now, Mr. Krause, don't take words out of context. You must read the entire section, and the entire clause." It is true you don't get down to the word "bankrupt" until line 6 on page 2. But if you read the whole thing, it is obvious.

We are not going to let the man working for four people average his earnings and come in and file his claim against the bankrupt for $1,000, because that is his average earning, when he only earned $200 for the bankrupt. It is obviously intended to apply only to his average earnings from the particular bankrupt against whom he is filing a priority claim.

If there is any doubt about it at all, just insert on line 6, after the words "payment" "by the bankrupt". And there can be no doubt about it. I don't think it is necessary to put it in.

I think on the question of independent contractors, while it is not tendered by the bill, now that the matter has come to your attention, if you think that needs some further definition, nobody would object to your clarifying it.

Mr. WHITENER. As I understand, this is the present law insofar as it refers to independent contractors, and as the language appears in the present law, and in your proposed amendment, it would relieve the court of even being concerned as to whether the individual is an independent contractor or an employee. And so you get away from this never never land of legal problems.

Mr. FORRESTER. Thank you, Congressman. We are glad to have you.

The President's Veto of the Public Works Appropriation Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, relative to the vote on the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill today, I could not find it in my heart to vote to sustain this veto, and I frankly admit that it afforded me no pleasure.

The bill which the President vetoed provides for less than one-sixtieth of the total budget request for fiscal year 1960, all for urgent flood control projects in almost every State of the Union, irrigation, reclamation, hydroelectric projects and related facilities, deepening of harbors, and so forth.

It is noteworthy that the bill which the President vetoed provided for funds less than 1½ percent above the amount which the President requested, and that when the conference bill was before the House on August 14, only one voice was heard against the bill.

Furthermore, every penny in the bill will be spent right here within the shores of the United States of America.

I Vote To Sustain the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Eisenhower vetoed the $1.2 billion public works appropriation bill. He gave, as his chief reason for the veto, the fact that funds were included in the bill for 67 new starts which would ultimately cost $800 million.

Thus, it seems clear that the President's objections are centered on the long-range effect the bill would have, financially speaking, rather than on its immediate unbudgeted impact which has been estimated at only $50 million.

I think it important for all of us to be aware of the nature of the problems we will face, as a Nation, as our population explodes from 171 million today to 195 million in 1965, 248 million in 1980, and a projected 370 million by the year 2010. Foremost among those problems is certain to be that of providing an adequate supply of water for both domestic and industrial purposes.

Interrelated to the certain expanding demand for water, will also be the need for flood control, power, navigation, outdoor recreational facilities, and other such projects as are included in the vetoed bill. Any failure in meeting those demands and needs on schedule would surely result in serious disruptions in our economic growth.

We must not, however, in responding to the urgency of this problem at the Federal level, ignore the necessity for what the President, in his veto message, has called the "orderly development of America's water resources within the Nation's fiscal ability." The key phrase is: "within the Nation's fiscal ability."

Now, of course, as our population grows so will the receipts by the Federal Treasury, and so will such other generally accepted yardsticks of national capabilities as, for instance, the gross national product. Obviously, we can hope to do more in another decade than we could in the next several years.

Who, then, is going to judge the size of the effort America can make now in this field—the President, or the Congress? Some news sources are referring

to the vetoed bill as a "pork barrel" bill. This is inaccurate. Traditionally, perhaps, public works bills—authorizations and appropriations—have been "pork barrel" measures, in the sense that there would be included therein projects which were either economically unjustified or engineeringly unsound. I do not understand that to be the case here.

Nevertheless, it can be assumed that, as in any congressional measure of this sort, political considerations, personal influence, geographical "logrolling" and the like, all played a part in the fashioning of the vetoed omnibus bill. Particularly, this assumption would seem to apply to the so-called new starts. I do not say this critically, and I hope it can be regarded as an objective statement of what we should all be willing to recognize as a legislative failing.

We in Congress are normally apt to look at this sort of subject through glasses that are tinted and somewhat distorted, without our even realizing it, by our awareness of the needs of our particular districts. On the other hand, the President who, with the Vice President, is the only Federal official elected by all the people, can and must make his determinations here on the basis of what he sees through the national glasses. President Eisenhower above all others, since he is not eligible for reelection, can safely be considered free of all political bias in deciding, as he has done, that the budget-approved projects included in the vetoed bill—which total an all-time high of $1.1 billion, which is three-quarters again as much as the Federal expenditure level along these lines in 1955—is all that America can work on now without going beyond her fiscal ability. He warns, in addition, that just to carry on the projects now underway will ultimately cost $6 billion, and that to attempt now to commence work on other projects may weaken our financial structure and add to the tremendous debt burden our children already carry.

I recognize that the President may be wrong. This is an economic decision. Not even all economists are in agreement as to our national future and capabilities, but, rather than to add to the $1,564 share of the national debt which each of my two small sons now bear, in this instance I cast my lot on the side of the President.

I do so with full awareness of the fact that, if the veto is sustained, I may be helping to cause a delay in the funding of the $1.7 million needed to complete the Endicott-Vestal, N.Y., floodwall project now going on in my district, and the funding of the $40,000 floodwall planning work for Nichols, N.Y., also in my district. But I believe the people of my district will approve the acceptance of such a risk in the national interest.

Finally, if the veto is sustained, as I hope it will be, I am confident that the Congress can and will immediately pass another appropriation bill so that work in progress on the budgeted items around the country can proceed without jeopardy. The Congress should not adjourn until it has so acted.

It should also be pointed out that this situation dramatizes to the fullest extent the need for a constitutional amendment giving the President the power of "item veto" as has been recommended by Presidents of both political parties since Ulysses S. Grant. Early this year I introduced House Joint Resolution 282 which would have that effect, and I deplore the fact that the majority party has not seen fit to permit consideration of this measure.

Justice for the Songwriters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very remarkable article by Walter Winchell entitled "For All Songwriters, With Love," which appeared in the New York Mirror sometime ago.

Many people will heartily applaud Mr. Winchell for his eloquent, heartfelt tribute to the Nation's songwriters and I desire to express to him my warm gratitude for taking so much of his valuable time to laud and ask justice for this deserving group, who have made such great contributions to the Nation and the world.

Congress has the great responsibility of promptly correcting the unfair, inequitable laws which are depriving songwriters of the just rewards of their work. To further deny to them just compensation under our copyright laws for the gifted offerings which mean so much to people everywhere is a bitter irony and a fantastic miscarriage of justice in this great democracy.

The article follows:

[From the New York Mirror, June 18, 1959]

FOR ALL SONGWRITERS, WITH LOVE

(By Walter Winchell)

"Start Dust" inspires lovers from the Thames to Tanganyika. The Bolshoi dancers go wild over George Gershwin. Every second of every day somebody somewhere is being delighted by the musical witchcraft of Irving Berlin, Richard Rodgers, or Cole Porter. Yes, in these trying days, when the United States of America is meeting stiff opposition, even hostility abroad, one of the most potent ambassadors of goodwill we have is American music. Our songs have probably won us more admirers and prestige around the globe than all the striped pants and attaché cases in the State Department. Yet we treat our American songwriters shabbily. Europeans respect their musicmakers. We don't. And what's worse, American composers, authors, and their heirs have their songs, plays and novels taken away from them after a certain period—under the provisions of a horse-and-buggy, half-century-old law.

Today's words and musicmakers are still hard at work producing Broadway shows, the better popular songs, cool jazz. Yet they are inadequately protected on the legal front. Their valuable copyrights are taken away after 56 years. And there is no appeal. The law that sanctions this devastating giveaway was passed in the pre-radio, pre-TV, pre-recording Gibson Girl days of 1909. Yet it is still all powerful in the color TV, stereophonic sound era. If you own a peanut stand or an oil well, you own it forever until you or your heirs sell it. But if you create such song classics as Hammerstein-Kern's "Ol' Man River" or Gershwin's "Summertime," you lose these valuable creative gems when the copyright runs out. The creators and their heirs lose property rights, even though the melodies linger on and on and on.

As time passes, more and more musical gems, literary favorites, and dramatic classics go into the land of lost literary properties known as public domain. Once a work goes into public domain, it means that the creation can be used for profit by anybody. Broadcasters, record companies, TV producers. And the composer or author is left out in the cold. For instance: Sousa's brass band blockbuster, "Stars and Stripes Forever," is "PD." So are "In the Good Old Summertime" and "There'll Be a Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight." Also, the "National Anthem," for weddings Roger de Koven's "Oh, Promise Me," which he dug out of a trunk to please a soprano who claimed she didn't have enough to sing. Having a work go into PD neither helps the listening public, the composer, or the dramatist. Says ace lyricist Mitchell ("Star Dust") Parish: "If a work is copyright protected, it is watched over, good editions are made available, and the work is kept from being vulgarized."

In years to come, more and more popular songs will sink into PD. This will hurt hundreds of veteran songwriters in modest circumstances who have a few musical properties at most. When that unhappy day comes, they won't receive a penny in sheet music sales, record royalties or performance fees from radio-TV through ASCAP. Here's a sample of this legal cruelty. Songwriter Ernie Burnett, who has been at Saranac for many years, has been practically living off his one big song, "My Melancholy Baby." His meat-and-potatoes melody will be taken away from him in a few years.

PD recognizes no names, no reputations, no previous contributions to musical Americana. It cuts down the rich, the mighty and the average guys and dolls who have labored a lifetime in the 32-bar factories. Even Irving Berlin isn't exempt. His jubilant "Alexander's Ragtime Band" will be PD soon. So will the late W. C. Handy classic, "St. Louis Blues." And to bring the story closer to home, this year (1959) "Ida, Sweet as Apple Cider" hits the dust. So does Victor Herbert's beautiful kiddie cantata, "Toyland."

Yesterday's songs often become tomorrow's hits. This is another reason why the tunemakers of Tin Pan Alley need longer copyright protection. For a good song is a living memory congealed, and can be sung and played for the public's pleasure for decades to come. Recently, for example, many best-sellers (a welcome relief from rot'n'roll) were old-time ditties wrapped up in new arrangements. They leaped to the top of the toreador-and-jeans set. For instance: Connie Francis' disk click, "Who's Sorry Now," and Pat Boone's million-seller, "Love Letters in the Sand". In the very near future, unless the Government changes its tune, many best-selling "singles" and lp's will feature old-time "standards" that have gone into PD. And the poor creators (or their heirs) won't be able to realize a penny from all that vinylite riches.

Incidentally, an "oldie" often has saved a family from want and fire-eating creditors. A recent chart-buster, "My Happiness," proved to be a literal lifesaver for widow Betty Blasco, writer of the lyrics. At the time of the song's popularity two of her children had serious illnesses and Mrs. Blasco herself was hospitalized many weeks. And as Variety noted: "Just as hospital and medical bills were about to overwhelm her royalties began sifting in."

Of course, there have been some improvements in the copyright situation. You may

not know it, for example, but you can copyright photographs, blueprints, even Sunday sermons. Yet, when with these improvements, if you're a songwriter you can't collect royalties from the multimillion dollar jukebox industry. That's because the robot diskjockeys were exempted by the 1909 copyright law. This joker means that 600,000 jukeboxes (many owned by tone-deaf racketeers) take in money made from music but give none to the "pop" songwriters in terms of performance fees. There's a law coming up in Congress that would make jukeboxes pay for the right to use copyrighted material.

Today's copyrighted material is the bread and butter of America's writing fraternity. Without copyrights and economic protection, there would be no incentive to create toetapping tunes and plays that give millions enjoyment. They are the basis of our mammoth entertainment industries. Broadway, Hollywood, TV, phonograph records. So it is high time that America's melody makers, literary merchants of mood, who have given so much pleasure (by their creative efforts), get more recognition. Their brain children have prodded American show business into what it is today. They have brought us friends the world over. Yet, in the legislative corridors of Congress their pleas for copyright protection (at least equal to European musicmakers) fall on deaf ears.

And here's the final irony: On July 3 a statue will be dedicated on Broadway to the memory of George M. Cohan, playwright-actor-songwriter, who brought golden gleams of entertainment to this land for many decades. Ironically, most of the money was raised by songwriters themselves—not any government or city. The whipped cream on the irony is this: Next year two of George M. Cohan's greatest songs, "Give My Regards to Broadway" and "Yankee Doodle Dandy," go into PD—and his family and heirs won't be able to collect a penny from their use on radio, TV or records.

Poison in Your Water—No. 163

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Cleveland (Ohio) Press of July 2, 1958, entitled "A Terrible Price To Pay."

A TERRIBLE PRICE TO PAY

A health menace almost beyond description exists on the county's east side, along the lake.

It stems from the city of Euclid's sewage outlets, which are pouring thousands of gallons of completely untreated sewage into the already polluted lake hour after hour, day after day, week after week.

A sickening stench pervades the entire area, constant reminder of the terrible price in health risk the suburb is paying for all the years of delay in meeting the need for a new sewage plant.

A need that was recognized almost 20 years ago.

This is not to blame Euclid officials entirely. Many factors, including the prolonged Hilltop sewer line controversy, played a part.

But the point is that the years slipped by, each year the problem growing worse and worse.

Now, to Euclid's credit, it is doing something to eliminate the problem. A $5 million plant is underway. But at what a terrible price beyond dollars.

While the work is going on, while pipes are being installed, the old sewage plant has to be shut down 60 percent of the time, at a very lenient estimate.

The result is that raw waste from Euclid, Wickliffe, and Willowick homes—thousands upon thousands of homes—is pouring directly into the lake, is carried up and down the easterly lake front.

And this situation will go on until late next year. Almost 18 months.

Swimming? Out of the question. Boating? Who can stand to sail or dock boats in a mess like that?

The Euclid lakefront is so polluted, some residents say, that if a man took a bucket of that polluted water and set it down in Public Square he'd be arrested for creating a health menace.

Euclid's Mayor Sims knows of the menace and pledges to see what can be done to minimize this health hazard.

If there is any single thing that can be done to alleviate this mess, to safeguard the health of many people—it is worth every effort.

Oregon: Beauty of the Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, "Beauty of the Land," which appeared in the August 28, 1959, edition of the Medford Mail Tribune. Editor Eric Allen knows and loves his home State. His knowledge and love are found in the following paragraphs:

BEAUTY OF THE LAND

We are ever and always amazed and gratified at the beauty of this land.

The other day, standing at the summit of Mount Ashland, we found ourselves, once again, bemused and enthralled by the ranges, the valleys, the hills and crags of southern Oregon and northern California.

While the temperature was in the high eighties on the valley floor, the wind which whipped across the summit on which we stood was brisk—perhaps in the low sixties or high fifties. And the altitude, more than 7,000 feet, caused us to breathe rapidly from the slightest exertion.

Far to the northeast, almost obscured by drifting smoke from the Medford area's mills, was the sharp point of Mount Thielsen. Slightly to the right were the irregularities of the rim of Crater Lake. Still further south, Mount McLoughlin loomed, smooth, black, and snowless. And to its right were the tumbled hills of the Mountain Lakes wild area, just this side of Klamath Lake.

To the east were the peaks of the Green Springs area, and further south the dry, brown and green valleys near the Klamath River.

Just to the east of south was the monumental Mount Shasta, still bearing some of its everlasting snow, but far, far less than during a usual August. Just to its right, Black Butte could be discerned.

South and slightly to the west were the Trinity Alps, and, closer, the long Haystack Ridge, barren and stark in its blackness caused by the disastrous fire of 1955.

Further to the west were the rolling peaks and ridges of the coastal ranges. (Legend has it that, on a clear day, one can see the ocean from Mount Ashland. This we have always doubted, and we have also heard it refuted by competent authority. Haze and clouds on the horizon prevented eyewitness proof the day we were there.)

Directly west loomed the ridges of the Wagner Butte and the Dutchman. And in the distance more hills and valleys.

To the north, spreading out in its beauty, lay the Rogue Valley—a brown expanse of hills dotted with green trees (almost blue at a distance), stretching down to green and brown fields, intermingled with the colors of buildings and cities and roads and highways.

Roxy Ann is the most familiar landmark in the area, standing guard just to the east of Medford.

Medford itself could only dimly be seen through the haze. But directly below part of Ashland, and the brown scars of the recent fire, showed up clearly.

It is a vista of peace and loveliness, and we could have spent hours just staring at it.

Summerfield Parades Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues have taken advantage of the opportunity within recent days to see the parade of progress at the Post Office Department. I am sure they, like myself, were deeply impressed with this exhibit of the ingenious equipment which has been developed for faster handling of the mail, and which soon will be in actual operation

I only wish mail patrons the country over could be privileged to see for themselves this preview of the gigantic and dramatic strides which are being made in delivering their mail. Fortunately, however, our informative press has given the exhibit good coverage, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Bill Pyper's account which appeared in Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield's hometown newspaper, the Flint Journal, on August 30, 1959. The article follows:

WOLVERINES IN WASHINGTON—SUMMERFIELD PARADES PROGRESS

(By William F. Pyper)

WASHINGTON.—It was a proud postmaster general who paraded his mechanized equipment for Members of Congress and news reporters.

Michigan's Arthur E. Summerfield called it the Parade of Postal Progress, as he literally lifted the veil off the model of a planned new fully-automated post office in Oakland, Calif., and took the occasion to demonstrate some of the newest equipment which his department will put into service all over the country.

Even to the cynics, who wanted to needle him about better mail service, some of the gadgets designed to speed up and make more efficient the handling of the mails were unbelieveable. They represent 6½ years of research and development—years which have gone a long way toward ironing out the rut

of procedural lassitude in which the gigantic agency has been running.

Perhaps Summerfield's brightest moment of the day came when Paul L. Davies, chief executive of the Food Machinery and Chemical Co. which is equipping the Oakland facility, told of surveys his people had made in European countries seeking ideas which might be incorporated into his project.

"In nearly every case, however, we found that the United States was substantially ahead," he remarked.

Such a comment was music to the ears of Postmaster General Summerfield and his staff—his deputy and assistants, all of whom share with him the title of "general."

For there can be no doubt that in 1953, when they took over the biggest civilian department of the Government, numerous states in Europe had modernized, leaving the United States at the post. Since the U.S. Post Office is also the biggest in the world, it was more than a little embarrassing to be asking the Scandinavian and Western European countries how things might be done better.

Today representatives of foreign postal agencies are a common sight around the U.S. Department. Through their international organization they learn that America is ahead in numerous developments which they need. They come here to look it over and return prepared to follow suit wherever it may be practical.

Even the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has entered into a technical exchange program with the U.S. Post Office Department. A year ago, Summerfield's deputy, Edson O. Sessions, studied the Russian system in detail. His survey was followed by a 12-day visit from the Vice Minister of U.S.S.R. communications and three other postal officials to the United States. Just this weekend, four American postal executives, led by Chief Inspector David H. Stephens, are en route to Moscow for a return visit.

Anyone who has been dependent upon Russian mails will agree that the Soviets have more to gain from this exchange than have the Americans. However, Summerfield and Sessions firmly believe that such relationships help to melt the ice of the cold war, just as other exchanges. Thus, the Post Office Department has been doing quietly for some time what other parts of the administration only now are taking up in a more spectacular manner.

Nearly all Americans today are aware of the vast changes which have been made in the postal system since Summerfield took over. Everywhere one sees the red-white-and-blue vehicles and corner drop boxes. A good many persons have seen films or models of the mechanical equipment which was installed to speed up service rather than to meet the demand for restoration of two daily deliveries. The day is near when electronics devices will read addresses on letters and dispatch them virtually without a human thought or action being involved.

Somewhat closer to the public are the completely self-service post office and the automatic substation, where citizens can buy stationery, stamps, and envelopes around the clock.

Also nearly ready for operation is a parcel post acceptance machine which weighs a package, calculates postage and insurance in response to dialed information, stamps the amounts on the wrapper, receives the coins, and sends the parcel on its way.

There had been no new post office buildings in the United States from 1938 until Summerfield began his administration. In the years since then, under the lease program, 3,000 communities have received new facilities. Today, they're being dedicated at the rate of three a day, and the department hopes soon to double the rate. Private contractors construct the buildings and rent them to the Government.

"This is free enterprise at its best," the Postmaster General told newsmen.

Even with all his economies and improvements, plus the increase in rates of last year, Summerfield's department will run up a $600 million deficit this year. The reason lies in the fact that the increase in the volume of mail exceeds the increase in population—a worldwide trend.

"If we hadn't made the economies and improvements, and if we hadn't increased the rates, our costs would be running $1 billion above our revenues by now," he said.

More than that, without the modernization and mechanization, it would have been physically impossible to keep up with the increased volume.

Trade Adjustment Legislation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the reciprocal trade agreements legislation has always had my enthusiastic support. For at least a generation it has been evident to most Americans that the lowering of tariff barriers must be systematically pursued if the United States is to measure up to the demands of world leadership economically as well as politically.

At the same time it has long seemed unfair to me to expect a certain few industries in this country to bear the major burden of our national trade policy. It cannot be denied that the economic reversals suffered by many communities have resulted from tariff reductions.

I believe it is the responsibility of this Congress to ease the adverse effects of our national trade policy on previously healthy sectors of our economy. I am deeply convinced that we should provide temporary assistance to those stricken industries, communities, and individuals that find aid necessary as they attempt to diversify or expand their economic base.

Today I have introduced a trade adjustment bill which I hope may help serve as a focus for discussion in advance of the reconvening of Congress in January.

The objective of the bill is not to subsidize the adversely affected communities and firms or to compensate them for injury. Instead its aim is to help them adjust to new conditions within the framework of our trade policy—either by assisting them to make more effective use of their present facilities or by aiding the development of new lines of production.

The area redevelopment bill passed by the Senate earlier in this session contained an amendment which would have been a first step toward such a program of trade adjustment. This amendment would have authorized governmental assistance for industries and communities as they adjust their productive activities to the new economic conditions created by the lowering of trade barriers. The amendment would have encouraged the President to use every governmental procedure presently available to facilitate the adjustment process.

Unfortunately this amendment is not contained in the area redevelopment bill reported out by the House Committee on Banking and Currency. As a result there is little constructive legislation before this house designed to alleviate the conditions of depressed areas suffering specifically because of our overall national trade policy.

Mr. Speaker, the bill which I have introduced today is a comprehensive measure to provide governmental assistance to those communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals adversely affected by our reciprocal trade program.

Briefly, this bill would provide help from the Federal Government to retrain individuals for news jobs, to render technical and financial assistance for conversion of plants to new items of production, and to assist communities in their efforts to attract new types of industry.

In the past when imports have reached the so-called peril-point threatening a domestic industry, great pressure has been brought to bear upon the Tariff Commission for restoration of tariffs or imposition of quotas. It is my belief that the executive branch should be provided with another alternative in such situations. It should be able to assist these businesses, industries, and communities as they attempt to adjust to newly created economic conditions.

What I propose in this bill is the establishment of an interdepartmental committee, the Trade Adjustment Board. As an alternative to the acceptance of peril-point and escape-clause recommendations, the President could turn the matter over to this Trade Adjustment Board.

Upon application by a community, an industrial development corporation, a business enterprise, an employee, or a union, the Board could determine whether the applicant had been adversely affected by the lowering of trade barriers. If the Board decided that the applicant had been so injured, many different forms of assistance could be made available.

By shifting the point of adjustment from the tariff itself to the particular community, firm, or individual claiming injury, an equitable trade policy would both encourage the expansion of foreign trade and at the same time minimize the extent of possible injury to the domestic economy.

My bill would provide an orderly and direct means of supplying technical advice and information to seriously afflicted communities.

Another type of aid would be granted in the form of loans. These loans could be made available through the regular procedures of the Small Business Administration.

Firms and communities would also be allowed accelerated amortization in order that they might readily develop new or different lines of production.

Finally, this bill would also provide several types of aid to individual workers who lose their jobs because of our trade policy.

The first assistance granted to these individuals would take the form of additional unemployment compensation. The bill would authorize the supplementing of State benefits from Federal funds. A worker, under this bill, could receive two-thirds of his weekly pay for 52 weeks. This unemployment compensation would, of course, be a stopgap measure, providing benefits only until other employment was available.

If a worker is over 60 years of age when he loses his job through the operation of international trade, and if he cannot get another job because of his age, this bill would allow him to retire under the Social Security Act.

Other workers, however, with many productive years ahead would be provided with an opportunity to receive retraining in skills that are in demand by the national economy.

This trade adjustment program is not a subsidy. It is not permanent assistance enabling industries or communities to hobble along. It is temporary assistance designed to help them over a period of adjustment.

If we believe that world trade is crucial to the future economic health of our Nation, as everyone by now should be convinced it is, then anyone seriously injured in the pursuit of this policy should be eligible to receive aid in order that he might change operations and again become productive.

In the field of veterans' legislation, we refer to a "service-connected disability." That is the way I regard the sacrifices which some of our industries have had to make as we pursue the legitimate objectives of our national trade policy.

It is the responsibility of Congress, I believe, to provide temporary assistance to those trade-affected communities, industries and individuals that need and can use aid as they attempt to diversify or expand their economic base. This bill would not subsidize obsolete plants. It would assist them to make more effective use of their present facilities or aid them in switching to new lines of production.

Mr. Speaker, trade adjustment is not an untried idea. It has been tried and found workable.

I refer to the experience of the European coal and steel community. It was recognized by the farsighted men who set up this first major venture in international administration of economic resources that hardship would fall to certain areas because of greater productivity through technical development and shifts in the centers of production.

So the conception of readaption was evolved and put into operation in 1952. Readaption in the European coal and steel community offers aid to disadvantaged firms and workers similar to those proposed in my trade adjustment bill. This European program by and large has met with success. The recent treaty establishing the European economic community has continued the concept of adjustment assistance in areas affected by the reduction of trade barriers.

This concept of readjustment assistance recognizes that our American economy is able to adapt its productive capacities in order to meet changing conditions. We see this adaptability in action every day as American industry modifies itself so that it may assimilate new products or technological improvements.

Here is a partial but constructive solution for an ancient dilemma which has often plagued Members of Congress. Those who wish to lower tariffs should support trade adjustment for they do not want any domestic interest to be injured. At the same time those who are legitimately concerned about some particular industry or community should find in this trade-adjustment bill a way to assist these individual enterprises while at the same time furthering the overall national interest by increasing world trade.

Everyone should now be aware of our true national interest. The easy argument against foreign imports has prevailed too long. If it results in a further weakening of our trade policy we may all suffer gravely in the future. Totalitarian nations will continue to make inroads into the free world as their trade offensive succeeds beyond their greatest hopes. Our alliances will falter over trade antagonisms. Our domestic economy will decline and American laborers will be out of work as other nations are no longer able to buy our products.

None of these things need happen, of course. A policy of trade adjustment provides the means whereby the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act can be strengthened, not weakened. Under it our trade with the world can continue to increase. Only a vigorous trade program of this sort will keep together a strong free world and promote a continually rising living standard for us all.

Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I share with my colleagues a sense of loss at the reassignment of Maj. Gen. W. P. Fisher, Air Force Director of Legislative Liaison. I congratulate him, however, upon his forthcoming assignment, that of commander of the Eastern Air Force of the renowned Military Air Transport Service.

General Fisher is a man of unusual experience and capacity as a commander, beginning with his leadership of the 28th Bomb Squadron, 19th Bomb Group which experienced the Japanese attack on the Philippines in December 1941 and survived.

His great capacity as a leader was notable during his service in the extremely challenging duties which he has had here in Washington. General Fisher is a man respected and admired for his calm, straightforward manner of doing business. His integrity is unquestioned. He has promoted with distinction the cooperative relationship which exists between the Congress and the U.S. Air Force.

I take this opportunity to welcome his successor as Director of Legislative Liaison, Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Musgrave, Jr., who is also an officer of the highest ability.

Just One Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, it seems incredible that just one vote put a roadblock in front of water resource development today.

The public works bill embraced programs to improve and increase domestic and municipal water supply, provide for pollution abatement, insure water for industrial uses and provide for irrigation and reclamation.

As a result of sustaining the veto of that bill, new starts in areas where development has been long overdue will not be undertaken and some existing projects may be endangered.

The citizens of North Dakota are vitally interested in water development. All segments of the State are united solidly behind a plan to divert water from the Missouri River, insure the water supply for many of the towns and cities in the area, and provide for irrigation in areas where rainfall is not dependable. This plan is known as the Garrison diversion unit—a brochure of this proposed project has been mailed to every Member of Congress.

While the people of my State support the Garrison diversion unit, they also are interested in water development throughout the country. Many groups in North Dakota have been formed to advance and encourage water resource development. These people cooperate with groups in other States to discuss their problems and share ideas in this important field.

The North Dakota American Legion, the North Dakota Bankers Association, the North Dakota Farmers Union, the North Dakota Farm Bureau, the North Dakota Water Users Association, the Garrison Diversion Conservancy District, and many others have taken a genuine interest in water resource development.

Prior to the vote on the public works veto today, I received requests that I vote to override the veto from public-spirited citizens in all walks of life. Telegrams were received from the following: L. C. Mueller, Oakes, N. Dak., president of the North Dakota Water Users Association; Oscar N. Berg, Minot, N. Dak., executive secretary of the North Dakota Water Users Association; H. W. Lyons, Jamestown, N. Dak., businessman; W. M. Harrington, Minot,

N. Dak., mayor; A. R. Weinhandl, Minot, N. Dak., banker; Henry J. Steinberger, Donnybrook, N. Dak., farmer; and A. J. Christopher, Pembina, N. Dak., director of North Dakota Water Users Association.

I was also advised by Mr. Herschel Lashkowitz, mayor of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., that the Fargo city commission had adopted a resolution requesting the Congress to override the veto.

Additional requests to override came from the following Rural Electric Cooperative Associations: Nodak Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Burke-Divide Electric Cooperative; Williams Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Mor Gran Sou Electric Cooperative, Inc.; Sheyenne Valley Electric Cooperative; Mountrail Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Mr. Speaker, despite the stunning defeat administered today to water development throughout the Nation, I believe the people of North Dakota stand squarely behind these programs both in their State and in other States.

Let's Make Sure Boxcar Shortages Halt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, year in and year out the Western States are plagued with the threat of boxcar shortages along the rail lines. It seems that some carriers fail to see the wisdom in planning ahead. One common complaint is that eastern carriers have a penchant for keeping boxcars until they are needed—a real handicap to western lines who may need them to haul lumber. The practice has severely injured the economy in the Fourth Congressional District, for example, on many occasions. Now I understand that rail cars are again becoming scarce in Oregon. Public Utility Commissioner Jonel C. Hill has publicly announced the probability of a future insufficient boxcar supply.

Both the House and the other body have examined bills introduced to correct this sort of problem. They would fine carriers who keep boxcars by charging a higher rental per diem per car, for example.

The Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has reported S. 1789 which deals with the problems of keeping the boxcars rolling. This bill incorporates several features, among them giving to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission authority to determine rental rates and old car replacements.

Hearings on this important legislation have been held in the House and the bills are now pending before the committee. I hope the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce will report to the House for action this legislation which means so much to the economy of the West and my district in particular. It is best to lock the door while the horse is still inside.

The newspaper article in which the Oregon PUC Commissioner Hill discusses the problem follows:

[From the Coos Bay World, Aug. 28, 1959]

RAIL CARS TO BE SHORT IN OREGON

SALEM.—Shippers in Oregon may expect a tight rail car situation for the next 2 months, Public Utility Commissioner Jonel C. Hill said today.

Some shortages are now being encountered along Southern Pacific Co. lines in Oregon.

"At this time, various crops are being moved to market throughout the United States," Hill stated. "This means the probability of a future insufficient boxcar supply."

He said Paul Miller, manager of the closed car section of the Association of American Railroads, has assured Gov. Mark Hatfield's emergency transportation committee that cars are on the way to the Southern Pacific to serve Oregon shippers.

"If we get enough of a backlog of boxcars," Hill said, "the shortage may be only temporary."

R. J. Hogue, Medford lumberman, is chairman of the Governor's committee.

Housing Bill—Or Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of September 1, 1959, on the so-called compromise housing bill. The editorial, which needs no illuminating remarks whatsoever, follows, and I urge my colleagues to read it carefully:

HOUSING BILL—OR ISSUE?

One of the most frequently repeated criticisms directed at this 1st session of the 86th Congress is that it has sometimes seemed more preoccupied with creating political issues than with enacting legislation. Rightly or wrongly, the charge has been repeated, and most recently by an influential spokesman of the majority party—Chairman Smith of the House Rules Committee—with reference to the housing bill now before President Eisenhower for approval or veto.

In this case, the background for such criticism is substantially as follows: In early July the President vetoed an omnibus $1,375 million housing bill on the grounds it was extravagant and inflationary. He urged the Congress to try again and to hold more closely to recommendations which he had made in January. The result was a second version, a so-called compromise $1,050 million measure on which congressional action was completed last week. While the dollar figure has been reduced, the bill still contains several provisions to which the President has expressed specific objection, which raise the distinct possibility of a second veto, and which prompt the bill-or-issue query.

These are the major points of difference: (1) A 1-year $650-million extension of the urban renewal-slum clearance program instead of $300 million for each of the next 2 years; (2) new loan programs of $50 million each for construction of college classrooms and of housing for the elderly, both opposed at this time by the administration; (3) authorization for 37,000 new units of federally subsidized low-rental public housing, although the administration recommended none at this time because there is outstanding authorization for 100,000 units not yet built; (4) an increase of $8 billion in the loan insurance authority of the Federal Housing Administration, which the President has explicity asked be provided in separate legislation.

Along with this array of differences, congressional spokesmen have said that this will be the final effort at housing legislation in this session. Party lines were crossed in passing the bill in each branch, but it is difficult to tell how the votes might go on a Presidential veto—if there is one. At the moment, therefore, the question is still unanswered as to whether there will be legislation or a political issue on housing. But if the President vetoes the bill, and there is no legislation, we think he will have the best of the political issue, or what there is of it.

United States-Israel Ties Stronger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press on Monday, August 10, 1959, by Mr. Philip Slomovitz, the distinguished editor and publisher of the Detroit Jewish News, entitled "United States-Israel Ties Stronger."

This article well chronicles the fine, friendly relationship traditional between Israel and the United States and now growing stronger. The article follows:

UNITED STATES-ISRAEL TIES STRONGER

(By Philip Slomovitz)

TEL AVIV.—A new era of American-Israel friendship is in evidence in this country. Ambassadors from the United States have been instrumental, in the 11 years of Israel's existence, in furthering good will, in encouraging trade between the two countries and especially in advancing cultural interchanges.

The new U.S. ambassador in Israel, Ogden R. Reid, former editor of the New York Herald Tribune, is finding particular favor here.

For several months before his departure for Israel, he and Mrs. Reid studied Hebrew. When Reid presented his credentials to President Itzhak Ben-Zvi, they exchanged greetings in Hebrew.

Only the French ambassador is believed to have a better mastery of Hebrew among the foreign envoys in Israel.

Reid's position here is believed to be assuming an especially noteworthy significance by virtue of the latest developments in Arab-Israeli relations. The tension between the two peoples seems to have lessened considerably.

This is believed to be due to Israel's triumphs in the Sinai fighting of 1956 and the quickening of negotiations for the solution of the Arab refugee problems.

The United States is believed here to be playing an important role, behind the scenes of United Nations negotiations, in encouraging efforts for the solution of the refugee problem.

The acceptance in U.N. quarters of the view that it would be impractical for the Arab refugees who left Palestine when Israel was established, May 14, 1948, to return to Israel, is becoming the basis for solution of the problem.

The U.S. State Department has indicated on several occasions—first under the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles 4 years ago—a readiness to provide large sums of money for resettlement of the Arab refugees.

Now there are reports here that the extension of such U.S. aid will be predicated upon acceptance by the Arabs of the viewpoint that the refugees cannot be expected to return to Israel.

The reasons given for such insistence are (1) that a return of Arabs in large numbers would constitute a fifth column in Israel; (2) that only a handful of Arab refugees desire to enter a new environment which would be totally strange to them; (3) that there are no opportunities for economic security for large numbers of untrained Arabs.

A counterproposal calls for the integration of the Arabs into the various Arab lands where there is a shortage of labor; the establishment of large-scale industrial enterprises into which the refugees would fit, and provisions for training the refugees in their new environment and their integration in a society that is akin to them.

Reid favors the friendliest relations between the United States and the Arab States as well as Israel, and he is expected to play a historic role in effecting a solution to the Arab refugee problem.

Congressman Dollinger's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, this is my 11th annual report to my constituents; I have sent them an annual report every year since coming to Congress. This report will be a résumé of my aims and efforts in behalf of the people I represent, as well as a summing up of the work of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. I have enjoyed representing the fine people of my district, and have considered it a privilege to strive for legislation beneficial to them as well as for the best interests of our country.

This Congress has accomplished a great amount of work, when we consider the overwhelming volume of business before it, the defense of our Nation being of primary concern. Vital domestic issues had to be considered as well as the Mutual Security Act, which fortifies our position with friendly nations and enables them to gain economic strength and protect themselves against aggressors.

In addition, we have had to grapple with the many crises engendered by the Soviet menace and the continuing cold war, as well as the explosive situations prevalent in many corners of the earth. Israel's position remains untenable and insecure regardless of the tremendous sacrifices of her people, their ability and industry, for her enemies still threaten to destroy her. I have lost no opportunity to urge that she be given all possible aid, for Israel is our bastion of democracy in the Middle East; she is our friend and ally; she deserves all that we can do to help her.

LABOR

This country's millions of workers await with great anxiety the final provisions of the highly controversial labor bill. At this writing, we do not know what the law will provide, as the Senate and House bills are in conference. We do know that as usual, Republicans favored management, and they, together with the southren bloc, succeeded in passing the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House. This has been labeled a bill which would "kill" the union movement; it has been charged that it was "probably authored by representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers." It has also been charged that a deal was made between Republicans and certain southern Democrats—that the Republicans would stymie action on civil-rights legislation in return for southern votes in favor of the Republican-sponsored Landrum-Griffin bill. I voted against this bill, the effect of which would throw the weight of the Federal Government on the side of management and would inflict punishment on the millions of honest, law-abiding men and women who belong to unions.

I favored a strong and constructive labor reform bill, which would protect union members and end abuses; I shall continue to fight against any labor bill which is punitive, which penalizes innocent workers, and which would deprive labor of any of its hard-won battles and advances. I hope that we shall have the opportunity to consider a final bill which will provide union members with all necessary safeguards and which will not tip the Taft-Hartley scales still more in favor of employers and against workers.

For many years, I have introduced bills to increase the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25. I urged action on my bill, pointing out that millions of our people are merely existing; they live in substandard conditions because they are underpaid and because high living costs and high taxes make it impossible to provide their families and themselves with barest necessities.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Hope for passage of an effective civil rights bill at the present session of Congress grows dimmer; this is a severe blow to all who recognize the great need for such legislation. The 1957 civil rights right-to-vote bill is virtually ineffective; it needs teeth. Unless the Civil Rights Commission is given some real power, Negroes will go into the 1960 elections as voteless as ever. The President wants the Commission extended for 2 more years. This amounts to only a token gesture on his part, when we consider that he has yet to make an earnest plea for strong civil rights legislation. The Republicans are responsible for failure to vote a civil rights bill out of committee; if the Republicans were sincere in their campaign promises regarding civil rights, Members of Congress would have had the opportunity to vote on a good bill long before this, but so far, the Republican members of the committee in charge have withheld their support. The Attorney General must have authority to seek Federal court injunctions to enforce school desegregation and civil rights generally, and legislation to give him such authority should be given priority.

I have introduced strong civil rights bills to end the unconscionable discrimination, harassment, intimidation, and other human indecencies which are being inflicted upon a vast segment of our population. We cannot claim to have true democracy in our country, equality of men, equality of opportunity, freedom as guaranteed by our Constitution, until every vestige of discrimination because of race, color, or religion is abolished.

HOUSING

The President's veto of the first housing bill passed during the present session of Congress came as a great shock to me. In my opinion, his action was not only ill-advised but was unconscionable, when we consider that countless Americans now merely exist in substandard dwellings, and that they must rely on the help of the Federal Government for public housing.

We have now passed a second housing bill and it is to be hoped that it will become law. The bill provides for urban renewal grants; 37,000 additional public housing units, loan programs for construction of college classrooms and dormitories, and housing for elderly persons. This represents a constructive and vitally needed program, but it only begins to meet the minimum standards we should set for American living.

IMMIGRATION

I, with other members of the New York Democratic delegation, introduced an Immigration and Citizenship Act to supersede the present Immigration and Nationality Act, known as the McCarran-Walter Act. It has long been recognized that the present law is discriminatory, unfair, and undemocratic. Under our proposal there will be no discrimination based on national origin or race, no classification of U.S. citizens into two categories, native-born and naturalized. There will be no additional grounds for loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens except those that apply to native-born citizens. Many other necessary provisions are also included.

I hoped that, in view of the fact that the United States joined with other free countries in the United Nations in sponsoring a proposal for a World Refugee Year, and inasmuch as our attention was directed toward those unfortunates so desperately in need of a homeland, Congress would pass legislation liberalizing our immigration laws. However, that hope has been dashed also, and we continue to shirk our duty toward mankind while other nations, less able to sacrifice than ours, are opening their hearts and doors to the unfortunate, the homeless, the innocent victims of wars and oppression.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Democrats are rightfully proud of their sincere efforts and great accomplishments. Their aim has always been to afford the help which the people need. By contrast, we find the Republicans still indulging in their deceitful promises and then sabotaging or ignoring the legislation which would provide for the very benefits they advocate by word only. As witness the deplorable plight of our public school system. The administration has, as usual, called attention to the desperate conditions, but has made no effectual moves to correct those conditions. There is a shortage now of about 140,000 classrooms throughout the United States. There is a great shortage of teachers. The administration is primarily to blame that this grave problem has once again been swept under the rug and that about 10 million American children are doomed to overcrowded and obsolescent classrooms in the richest Nation on earth.

SOCIAL SECURITY, PROBLEMS OF THE AGED, AND OTHER IMPORTANT LEGISLATION

I have been happy to support legislation liberalizing benefits under the Social Security Act, and have introduced bills to provide further benefits. Among the latter are bills to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under the act; to provide that full benefits thereunder, when based upon the attainment of retirement age, will be payable to men at age 60 and to women at age 55; and to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits.

I also introduced a bill to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. The protection offered by this bill is vitally needed by those many thousands of our older people who now cannot afford necessary medical, nursing, or hospital care; they cannot obtain or afford private insurance and they cannot meet the expense of illness. Costs of such care continue to rise, and the Federal Government must act to protect all those who are in dire need of such assistance.

Older workers and their problems have continued to receive my attention, and I reintroduced my resolution which would end existing bias against the hiring of older workers, and which would assist them in maintaining their rightful and dignified place as useful members of society.

I have introduced bills to lighten the taxload; to repeal excise taxes; to grant additional income tax exemptions to those supporting a dependent who is permanently handicapped; to those receiving retirement annuities or pensions; to those who are physically handicapped; to increase the personal income tax exemption of taxpayers.

Veterans deserve all possible assistance, and I have been happy to support legislation in their behalf at every opportunity, as well as to introduce bills beneficial to them. I am gratified that the liberalized veterans' pension bill recently passed, has been signed into law.

I voted for the Federal employee health program bill, and am pleased that it passed. I trust it will be signed into law. This will enable Federal employees to purchase protection at a cost which is within their means, from the unanticipated and oppressive costs of medical care, as well as the often crushing expense of so-called catastrophic illness or serious injury. The bill is designed to close the gap which now exists and bring the Government abreast of most private employers who have for many years been establishing and operating contributory health benefit programs for their employees.

I was happy to procure passage of my bill in the House to provide for the honorary designation of Saint Ann's churchyard in the city of New York as a national historic site. This culminated 11 years of unrelenting work on my part regarding the designation of Saint Ann's churchyard. Last year, I thought my work was finished when the House passed the bill, but it was defeated in the Senate committee. I renewed my efforts again this year; it again passed the House, and at this moment the bill is once more bottled up in the Senate committee. I can only hope that the Senate will take favorable action.

CONCLUSION

Space limitation prevents my discussing all the subjects important to my constituents. I hope the foregoing will show, to some extent, what I have endeavored to accomplish and what the 86th Congress has done so far.

My congressional office at 938 Simpson Street is open daily, and my constituents are welcome to call there and discuss matters of interest to them. I am always pleased to see them, to receive their letters, and to do all I can to be helpful.

Exercises Commemorating and Honoring the Memory of Father Junipero Serra, O.F.M., 175th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, there stands in Statuary Hall here in the Nation's Capitol a statue of Father Junipero Serra as one of California's distinguished sons. On Friday, August 28, at 10 a.m., ceremonies commemorating the 175th anniversary of Father Serra's death were held in front of the statue. Present were all of the California Members of the House, California's two distinguished Senators, the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, Va., members of the clergy, and others.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present herewith the remarks made by the several speakers:

EXERCISES COMMEMORATING AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA, O.F.M., 175TH ANNIVERSARY, STATUARY HALL, AUGUST 28, 1959

The commemoration and the laying of wreaths at the statue of Padre Junipero Serra was held at Statuary Hall, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C., on Friday, August 28, 1959, at 10 o'clock a.m.

Dr. William T. Doran, Jr., president of the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, Va., presided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ladies and gentlemen, the ceremonies commemorating and honoring the memory of Father Junipero Serra, O.F.M., on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of his death will begin with the invocation. This will be given by Father Noel F. Moholy, O.F.M., of Santa Barbara, Calif., the vice postulator for the cause of Father Serra. Father Moholy.

INVOCATION

O God in heaven above, Supreme Master and Sovereign Lord, we praise Thee, we bless Thee, we adore Thee for Thy great glory. We beg Thee, Provident Father of us all, to turn Thy benign countenance upon this assemblage honoring one of America's pioneers. We beg of Thee the signs and prodigies which will show indisputably, to the glory of Thy name, that he is a saint in heaven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Your Excellency, distinguished participants in the ceremony, Members of Congress from the Senate and House of Representatives, it is with great pride that I, as chairman, welcome you here this morning on behalf of the cosponsors of this ceremony: the Members of Congress from California and the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, Va. It is fitting to the memory of Father Serra that we acknowledge the presence here of our distinguished guests. Would that time permitted to mention everyone here because all present represent prominent and cultural groups and include: Knights of Saint Gregory, Knights of Malta, Knights of the Holy Sepulchre. It is with sincere pride and grateful acknowledgment that I mention those whose presence emphasizes the national and international recognition of California's first citizen and man of God's choosing. Representing the executive branch of our Government is Serran James O'Connell, Montclair, N.J., the Under Secretary of Labor. Among the Congressmen is Serran DONALD IRWIN, U.S. Representative from Connecticut. Representing Spain we are honored to have (Spain being the place of Father Serra's birth), the Honorable Enrique Suarez de Puga, Secretary for Cultural Affairs of the Embassy. Representing Mexico, our sister country to the south, and the place of Father Serra's early missionary work, is the Honorable Juan Gallardo, Chargé d'Affaires, and Mr. Luis G. Aveleyra, also of the Embassy. Representing the Pan American Union, is Dr. Juan Marin, Director of the Department of Cultural Affairs, Dr. Javier Malagon, and others. Dr. Manuel Martinez of the Department of Latin-American History of Georgetown University is representing the Spanish-American Historical Societies. Monsignor Magner is representing Catholic University. Father Durkin is representing Georgetown University. Mr. Homer Hammond represents the National Council of Catholic Men; former Congressman John Costello, the Holy Name Society; Mr. Gerald Mooney, Ancient Order of Hibernians; Mr. Justin McCarthy and Mr. Valentine Matellis, the Knights of Columbus. Father Frank Hurley represents the National Catholic Welfare Council. There are representatives of the various Catholic religious orders. Serra clubs of Serra International, are represented here this morning, from California to New Jersey, Massachusetts to Texas. Past President Thomas Reilly of Serra International, is here with us. Father (brigadier general) Walsh, U.S. Army (retired), represents the diocese of Richmond, Va., recogniz-

ing California's saintly pioneer. There are greetings; two of these I will read.

AUGUST 26, 1959.

Hon. JOHN SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I am with you in spirit on the occasion of of the commemoration in the National Capitol of the 175th anniversary of the death of Padre Junipero Serra. May God grant our Nation may soon be honored by the inscription of the name of California's founder and apostle in the Cannon of the Saints.

A. J. WILLINGER,
Bishop of Monterey.

FRESNO, CALIF.

AUGUST 26, 1959.

Hon. JOHN SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Franciscan Fathers of California express sincere appreciation for commemorative observance for Padre Junipero Serra on this 175th year and rejoice at the honor accorded their founder who also laid first stones of culture and initiated progress which has come to such a peak of achievement in the Golden State.

Father DAVID TEMPLE,
Franciscan Province of Santa Barbara.
OAKLAND, CALIF.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ladies and gentlemen, at this time I would like to introduce our first speaker, the Honorable JOHN SHELLEY, Congressman from San Francisco.

Congressman SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, Your Excellency Most Reverend Bishop Hannan, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, representatives of the Governments of Spain and Mexico, my colleagues in the Congress of the United States and ladies and gentleman. It is first my privilege to read a couple of messages that were addressed to my office which arrived this morning:

AUGUST 26, 1959.

Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Old House Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It is a privilege to join with the Serra Society on the occasion of the observance of the 175th anniversary of the passing of Father Junipero Serra. The people of San Francisco are continually aware of the tremendous contribution made to this area by Father Serra. Were it not for his saintly efforts, San Francisco and California would be lacking in many of our greatest spiritual assets. However, our indebtedness to Father Serra exceeds even the sphere of the church as evidenced by the many temporal accomplishments justly accredited to his untiring efforts. San Francisco's debt to Father Serra and his coworkers of nearly two centuries ago can never be fully repaid.

GEORGE CHRISTOPHER,
Mayor, San Francisco, Calif.

AUGUST 26, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington D.C.:

It is distinct pleasure to extend my warmest felicitations to the California legislators and the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir as you gather to commemorate the 175th anniversary of the death of Father Junipero Serra. In keeping his cherished memory alive you do a great service to the church and to the country. May the high ideals of this zealous apostle continue to inspire you and may God abundantly bless your devoted work.

Archbishop VAGNOZZI,
Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

AUGUST 27, 1959.

Hon. JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Understand you will be present at ceremonies before statue of Junipero Serra. Would appreciate your acting as my representative and reading the following message:

It is fitting that in this year marking the 175th anniversary of Serra's death there be a program in his honor in the Statuary Hall of the Nation's Capitol. Father Junipero Serra is truly the first of the pioneers who inaugurated the history of civilized California. He personally established 9 of the 21 missions and made a host of other great contributions to the future of this State. The people of California owe him great and lasting honor and we appreciate the effort made by those of you present today.

Sincerely,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Governor of California.

AUGUST 28, 1959.

Hon. JOHN SHELLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The Native Daughters of the Golden West extend congratulations to Fort Belvoir Serra Club for this observance honoring Junipero Serra whom we revere and honor as the founder of our missions and father of California. Our order recognizes the great contribution Father Serra made to our State and we are happy to participate in this commemoration. I am proud to announce that we are beginning a project for the placement of a statue of Father Serra on the capitol grounds at Sacramento. The Native Sons of the Golden West will cosponsor this project with us. We will be happy to have assistance from other organizations or friends. I wish it were possible to be present for your program, but as it is not, I am delighted to have my daughter represent me and the Native Daughters of the Golden West.

MAXINE PORTER,
Grand President, NDGW.

A MESSAGE FROM JOHN B. SCHMOLLE, GRAND PRESIDENT, NATIVE SONS OF THE GOLDEN WEST, TO THE CALIFORNIA DELEGATION HONORING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF FATHER JUNIPERO SERRA AT STATUE OF FATHER SERRA IN STATUARY HALL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Father Junipero Serra—apostle of California—left an impact on the culture of the State which will live eternal. The simple kindliness which emanated from this man of God still permeates the atmosphere of California. His development and plan of the chain of missions was done in a time and an era devoid of the materials and mechanical knowledge ordinarily attendant and available to structurers even at that period.

Using the elements of nature and the products of the earth, coupled with the resourcefulness of a master builder, this man of God and his aids, drew on their storehouse of knowledge to erect in the primitive wilderness of California the buildings recognized by the civilized world as suitable habitations for the purpose they were to serve. All of the buildings still stand in one form or another—some in semirepair—some still in use. All are shrines, not only to the lover of history and the romantic period known as the Splendid Idle Forties, but also to the devout. Over 1 million tourists annually visit the missions of California.

The results of these buildings have been reflected over the entire history of California. In the architectural field the copyists refer to the buildings as mission style and replicas are still being built today, both for commercial and residential use, by people who have been enamored of this gracious form of building.

This diminutive man in body had the heart, mind, and spirit of a giant and symbolically represents the heart of California. As grand president of the Native Sons of the Golden West, it is my great privilege to write these few words honoring him, for he was a beacon and established a light that has never failed; the forerunner and possibly the reason for the greatest mass migration the world has ever known.

JOHN B. SCHMOLLE,
Grand President, Native Sons of the Golden West.

AUGUST 28, 1959.

Congressman JOHN F. SHELLEY,
Capitol, Washington, D.C.:

San Francisco Serra Club joins with you on the commemorative 175th anniversary of the death of our beloved patron Father Junipero Serra.

ALBERT E. MAGGIO,
President.

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN SHELLEY

Ladies and gentlemen, there is a television series called "I Led Three Lives." This same title is particularly applicable to the State's founder, Padre Junipero Serra, and is especially significant this year. The year 1959 marks the 175th anniversary of Father Serra's death, the 190th anniversary of his arrival in upper California, and the 210th anniversary of his departure from his homeland in Spain. The first 36 years of his life Padre Junipero Serra spent on his native island of Mallorca. There he entered the Franciscan Order in 1730. After obtaining the doctorate in sacred theology, he devoted some 10 years to a distinguished career of teaching, even occupying a chair in the Lullian University of St. Raymond. His ability as a professor was rivaled only by his popularity as a preacher. In 1749 Father Serra sailed to the New World to become a missionary. His first assignment was in the mountains, Sierra Gorda, where in some 9 years he could report that not a single unconverted Indian remained in the region. Eight more years he passed crisscrossing central Mexico preaching missions to the faithful. In 1768 he was appointed padre presidente of the chain of missions in lower California. The following year brought the fulfillment of his heart's desire when he was designated the pioneer priest to handle the Christianizing of upper California. Father Serra helped blaze the trail that is still known as El Camino Real and founded the first 9 of the missions that eventually became a chain of 21. In 1784 he concluded his threefold career which had been lived in three countries and in three realms of activity. Today the servant of God is known and revered throughout the world for his zeal and for his holiness, and tomorrow we hope that the church in her wisdom and her prudence will reward this reputation with her highest honor—the canonization of Father Serra as a saint.

It is now my privilege to present my colleague from California, the senior Senator from California, the Honorable THOMAS KUCHEL.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Representative SHELLEY. Your Excellency, reverend clergy, members of the diplomatic corps, my colleagues in the Congress, ladies and gentleman, these services commemorate the life and labors of a Franciscan friar whose intrepid Christian ministrations

were spread through a great primitive area before the United States came into being. Junipero Serra, Franciscan missionary from Mallorca, journeyed to the North American Continent in the 1750's, came to the city of Mexico and in the late 1760's went northward to upper California. In that northward trek, both he and his courageous, faithful and devoted companions, sowed in the hearts and in the minds of men, the seeds of a new civilization under the Divine Spirit. Father Serra brought with him the mission which meant the spread of religion in these unknown lands, the presidio which meant the expansion of the political and military control of Spain, and the pueblo (a town) which meant the establishment of orderly civil government. Here was a tripartite development both secular and spiritual. The hard trails which his weary feet traversed, from mission to mission, along the El Camino Real today continues to be the wayroad along which our strong great municipalities, great universities, great industry, great agriculture, and the great missions of his day—human progress in its every latest attainment. One hundred and seventy-five years ago, Father Serra departed this life. From a primitive unsettled land on the Pacific shore to which he came, has developed now a majestic center of cultural and economic life rich in all the bounty of God's nature, our magnificent State of California. While we honor Junipero Serra for the blessings of civilization which he left in California, we shall not forget that his was a spiritual labor. The missions he built, the agriculture he founded supported by irrigation systems which, incidentally, still excite the admiration of modern hydraulic engineers, were all means to an end. The sword was there to support the cross, and so was the civil authority—but it was the cross which came first. Imbued with Divine Spirit, charged with an exalted mission and sustained by an unfaltering faith—Father Serra brought to the Indians the civilizing message of Christian teachings. Here was the solid, sound foundation upon which all other building rested. It is well to recall this simple fact in our day, for we too have an exalted mission—to hold high the banner of man's freedom to protect it from all assaults from the ungodly and to advance it with God's grace by an unfaltering faith in the righteousness of our purposes.

Congressman SHELLEY. Senator ENGLE, the junior Senator from California, was to have been here but was detained by a debate on the floor—that's his job—he has to be there. He has very graciously sent a very charming young lady from his office who will deliver the message of Senator ENGLE, of California.

SENATOR ENGLE'S ADDRESS

Your Excellency, reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, Mr. SHELLEY, Senator KUCHEL, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I bring the greetings and regrets of Senator ENGLE, who is now engaged in a major speech on the Senate floor which he was obliged to make at this hour, and he was especially sorry to miss this beautiful ceremony this morning. In his name, I would like to read a few remarks in tribute to Father Serra.

The highest honor any State can confer on a native son is to place his statue here in Statuary Hall in the Nation's Capitol. Each State has been most careful in the selection of the individuals it has placed here. If you visit the respective States, you will find the statute of their favorite son in numerous places there. The statue of Padre Junipero Serra, accordingly, is found throughout California, in public plazas and in private patios, before courthouses and in lush parks. Streets are named in his honor and buildings are dedicated in his memory. Schools, theaters, and a retreat house bear the name of Serra. Such honor you would more or less expect to find in the Golden State but you find a statue of the venerated Franciscan in the vestibule of St. Peter's Church in Chicago's Loop. You see his image on the facade of Holy Name College here in Washington as well as in mosaic at the new Shrine of the Immaculate Conception. You cannot miss his identity in the ceramic of the new church of St. Francis Xavier in Phoenix, Ariz., and he holds aloft the cross from the roof of Casa de Paz Ybien in the same Valley of the Sun. His statute stands on the tables as he presides at every meeting of Serra clubs throughout these United States, and as Serra International grows, his statute moves into foreign lands. If you travel to Mexico you will find him in the vestibule of the church of San Fernando College, the cradle from which California was born. His name and reputation are held in veneration throughout the land to our south. In Mallorca you will find his statute in the principal plaza of his native town. Throughout Spain his name is revered. And now in the eternal city of Rome itself, the new American Franciscan college currently under construction is to be known as Collegeo Franchiscano de Americano de Junipero Serra. Here is a true American success story. The annals of our history feature those who have risen from poverty to riches, from obscurity to influential positions in public life. Not a few immigrants to this country have landed on our shore penniless, uneducated, and uncultured. Lifting themselves by their own bootstraps in this land of equal opportunity to all, they have attained prominence and importance to truly amaze historian and biographer alike. Padre Junipero Serra born in the small village of Petra Mallorca, in the poorest section of that little town, his humble origin might have suggested that he follow in the family simple tradition of farming. His illiterate background portended no brilliant future, yet under Franciscan tutelage first at San Bernadino in Petra, and later at San Francisco in Palma, he manifested such superior native talent and such proficiency in scientific work that he was awarded the doctorate in sacred theology and held the chair of theology in the renowned Lullian University of St. Raymond. All that he sacrificed when he sailed for the New World. While I would not here repeat the story of his life, I would underline his sharing of the American tradition. Although of poor and humble background, he rose to international preeminence. Today three countries claim him either as native son or adopted father. We Californians are justifiably proud to join with our Mallorcan friends in acclaiming him El Foundador de California—the founder of California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ladies and gentlemen, it is my honor now to present Father Noel F. Moholoy, O.F.M., S.T.D., vice postulator for the cause of Padre Serra, from Santa Barbara, Calif.

ADDRESS BY REVEREND MOHOLOY, O.F.M., S.T.D.

Your Excellency Bishop Hannon, right reverend Monsignori, reverend fathers, Members of Congress, honored guests of the diplomatic corps, ladies and gentlemen, unable to stand or even to sit, the father now 55 years old lay restless on his bed of pain. Word spread throughout the camp quickly that Father Junipero Serra was ill. Don Gasparde Portala, the military commander of the expedition, immediately went to the friar's tent, appraised the situation realistically, and told the little padre that he would make arrangements immeditaely to have him transferred to San Fernando de Bellacepa, the mission Serra had founded 4 days previously. The pain disappeared instantaneously as the little Mallorcan reacted aghast: "No. If I die on the road, I'm still going to go." And he called the muleteer and asked him to apply the same tallow and herbs that he used on the pack animals. The next morning Junipero Serra celebrated mass and continued on to San Diego in the land of heart's desire. Frequently in the years that followed Serra was to manifest the same type of determination. When the entire colony in the spring of 1770 was preparing to leave, to abandon California, he was on Presidio Hill, in characteristic prayer begging that the relief ship *San Antonio* would arrive on time. But already a month previously he had served his ultimatum—"Though they all go back, I will remain here with Father Fray Juan (Crespi) to the bitter end." In answer to his prayer, the ship arrived, and he was revealing the watchword he had manifested in the farewell letter to his parents years before: "Always to go forward and never to turn back." He was an enthusiast and a zealot. To him the magnificent bay named in honor of St. Francis was a watery barrier hindering his progress for he envisioned missions as far north as Alaska in his own lifetime and commissioned expeditions to go there. For 15 years he labored in the area in the modern State of California working zealously planting nine of the crosses along El Camino Real, where weary Spaniard and wary Indian alike would find hospitality, nourished for the body and heavenly food for the soul. And it was only when the Angel of Death hovered over his simple pallet that to his beloved son Carlos de Bormelo de Carmello he finally said: "I must take some rest." The West has always boasted that it is a land where men are men. Father Serra can well be said to have set the precedent. He rolled up his sleeves and went to work. California has accorded him her highest honor by placing his statue here in Statuary Hall of the Nation's Capitol. The Franciscan Fathers of California have been laboring for 18 years and longer to place around that head the halo of a saint.

Congressman SHELLEY. It is my privilege at this time, ladies and gentlemen, to present for remarks the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, U.S. Senator from Minnesota, Senator MCCARTHY.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR M'CARTHY

Mr. SHELLEY, Your Excellency, Right Reverend and Very Reverend Monsignori, Reverend Fathers, representatives of the diplomatic corps, of the administration, my colleagues of the Senate, Senator KUCHEL and Members of the House, ladies and gentlemen, friends of the cause of Father Junipero Serra. It is truly a privilege for me, from Minnesota, and the U.S. Senate outside of the Californians to be here to participate in this program. I think that you of California and of the Serra Club and the Franciscans who have had Father Serra to themselves for so many years, must now come to accept that throughout this country and throughout the world, his great work has been known and his cause has many supporters as he has many followers. It may be significant that now that California is no longer the western frontier of the United States, that it is now in effect the geographical center of the country, that Father Serra will be accepted too, as standing in the center of this United States, and the things for which he stood become more widely known and more widely accepted. It is significant I think that he labored in California in the same years during which men of politics labored on this eastern coast to establish the institutions and the traditions which have been the strength of democratic society here in the United States. His approach, as has been said by others here before me, was somewhat different. His emphasis was on the cross and on the things of the spirit but his labors were not restricted to that field, because he knew, as well or better than any man, along with the things of the spirit, it was needed to have political order and economic and social order. So, dedicated to the cross and things of the spirit, he built these other institutions as men of politics establishing this United States sought to build political

institutions and economic and social institutions which would establish the means and conditions out of which spiritual perfection might be achieved. So let me congratulate you, the friends of Father Serra, Californians, members of the Serra Club, and particularly the Franciscan Order and to express my hope that his particular cause, the cause of his canonization, may prosper, but along with that, and more important, the cause which he so well advanced in his own time will prosper even more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We of Serra and California, thank you Mr. MCCARTHY for your remarks. Mr. Hubert Kelly, chairman of the special events committee, Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, will present the wreath laying ceremonies.

Mr. HUBERT KELLY. Thank you Dr. Doran. I shall first call upon Father Clebus Wheeler, Minister-Provincial of the Franciscan Order of Friars Minor to bless the floral offerings that we are about to present. Father Wheeler.

BLESSING

We ask of our Heavenly Father that He speed the cause of Father Serra, that He bless these wreaths we are about to put on the foot of his statue and that He bless us in the name of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Mr. HUBERT KELLY. The first wreath will be presented for Serra International by Mr. Peter A. Mills, Knight of St. Gregory, Pittsburgh, Pa., the permanent chairman of the Father Serra Spiritual Observance Day, and past trustee of Serra International, and by Mr. Ralph Hauenstein of Grand Rapids, Mich., first vice president of Serra International.

Mr. Mills and Mr. Hauenstein thereupon placed a wreath at the foot of the Serra statue.

The second wreath will be presented for the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir by Mr. Joseph S. Hoffmann, Alexandria, Va., past president of the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir, and deputy district governor of district 19 of the Serra International, and Mr. Fiori J. Tamanini, also a past president of Serra Club at Fort Belvoir.

The second wreath was placed before the Serra statue by Mr. Hoffmann and Mr. Tamanini.

We will now call upon Father (Lieutenant Colonel) Pawlowicz, post chaplain of Fort Belvoir and acting chaplain of the Serra Club of Fort Belvoir to make one final introduction before closing the ceremony with the Serran prayer. Father Pawlowicz.

Father PAWLOWICZ. I would like at this time to ask all the distinguished guests to remain seated until after the ceremoney is over and also to call upon His Excellency, the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, auxiliary bishop of Washington, D.C., to present benediction after the prayer of the Serrans.

PRAYER FOR VOCATIONS

O God who wills not the death of a sinner, but rather that he be converted and live, grant, we beseech Thee, through the intercession of the Blessed Mary, ever virgin, and all the saints, an increase of laborers for Thy church, fellow laborers with Christ, to spend and consume themselves for souls, through the same Jesus Christ, Thy Son, who liveth and reigneth with Thee, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, world without end. Amen.

Bishop HANNAN. I think it is fitting on an occasion like this to recite the prayer of St. Francis, a prayer which certainly epitomizes the life of Father Serra. In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

PRAYER

Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the distinguished and honored guests please remain for the press and the photographers. The ceremony is ended.

Tribute by Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker Upon the Life of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted by the House, I am including herewith an address by Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker, of Washington, D.C., delivered at the funeral service of Miss Elizabeth A. Smart on August 15, 1959. Bishop Hammaker is known throughout the length and breadth of America. Miss Smart was his personal friend, as she was a friend to thousands of people in America.

The address follows:

MISS ELIZABETH A. SMART

(An address by Bishop Wilbur E. Hammaker of Washington, D.C., at the largely attended funeral service in Washington on August 19, 1959.)

Our friend, Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, is now numbered among those for whom the bell has tolled. She has moved out of that physical house that was no longer a fitting habitation for her tireless and ambitious spirit. It had served her well across the indefatigable years. But despite her will to live and continue to serve, it became so uninhabitable that she had to give up the processes of repair. She is gone, we have lost her. That is, we have lost her out of the midst of our reforming endeavors. We have not lost her beyond finding. We shall find her some day, in God's good time, and we shall tie together the broken threads.

She has entered on that great and glorious other-life adventure in store for all who fight a good fight and keep the faith. She has been transferred by the Captain of our Salvation from the ranks of the church militant to those of the Church triumphant. She won the promotion. She was a gallant soldier of the cross. She has set out for that bourne whence no traveller ever returns.

CONTINUING PERSONALITY

Over and over, we repeat those four short words: "We have lost her." It is always thus when one loved and respected hears the summons—sharp and sudden, or slow and stumbling—and moves out into the vast unknown. She is gone. We have lost her. In such moments and in some such mood of finality, we now and then temporarily forget that life is ever Lord of death and love can never lose its own. For the nonce, vironed round by shadows of the valley, we fall short of our faith.

Betimes, we almost lose sight of Him, who conquered death on a lonely hill outside a city wall and made immortality man's surest possession. "Yet, ever near us, tho unseen the dear immortal spirits tread." Those whom we cherished, and lost awhile, are not sunk in a sea of oblivion; they are not even asleep; they are alive forevermore. You recall that Jesus said to the repentant man hanging on a cross alongside His own: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." All that I have been saying and more, belonged to Miss Smart. In the last days she was marvelously steadied by her sure confidence in such eternal realities.

A VALIANT SOLDIER

She belonged to the undaunted, the undismayed, the undefeated. She lived far from the group whom little things could discourage, or could satisfy. She took defeats in her stride. She expected to lose battles, but to win the war. Her eyes were strong enough to see the far horizons. She looked beyond the trivial and the transient to the ultimate. She could see no final answer except the destruction of the organized and legalized traffic in alcoholic beverages. She had responded in the soul of her to the mightly appeal with which the author of the letter to the Hebrews sums up his tremendous treatise on the Christian hope, emerging in the midst of a forlorn world.

He says: "Let us therefore go forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. By Him therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name." What the writer of the Hebrew letter is saying is: "Let us live as in God's care and presence and say to ourselves and to others and to Him, that it is blessed to live and move and have our being in the Eternal One." That's sharing in the riches of grace. But our guide and mentor on the Hebrews highway added: "That may become only an individualistic ecstacy." To quote him exactly he says: "But to do good and to communicate forget not; for with such sacrifices God is well pleased."

Add to your experiences on the spiritual mountain tops, testimony and the proclamation of healing truth as you walk up and down the pathways of the plains. Be not tempted as were the chosen three on the transfiguring mount to say: "It is good for us to be here, Master. Let us build three tabernacles one for thee and one for Moses and one for Elias and stay here." To revel in high moments of spiritual ecstasy is tonic for the soul. It is what we need for doing the hard, rough work of the world. Without such refreshment we would weary in well-doing and faint by the wayside. How well Elizabeth Smart knew that.

HER TESTIMONY

She also knew that a correlative reality is to do good and communicate. To tell God's truth is a divine compulsion from which alterted and sensitive souls cannot escape. "Woe is me," moans the aroused soul, "if I speak not the words that lead to the true facts of life." Miss Smart found all that out. She discovered that sometimes such a course is far from popular. She was willing to pay the price. She took the gaff involved in sticking to an unfavored presentation of reality. She shunned not the shame. She knowingly and willingly went forth unto Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. She was not deterred by the fear of being called fanatic. Nor was she downhearted, because of the skepticism of friends or the sarcasm of foes.

She had what our preeimnent psychologist-philosopher William James used to call "the will to believe." She believed that the resources on which she could draw were adequate to the demands life imposed on her. James used to amplify his great statement by adding: "By the grace of God, 'I can' is one of character's priceless ingredients." It reveals the possibilities in us and dares us to try our strength and reach beyond our grasp. She was constantly doing just that. She knew that God is not dead and that His arm is not shortened. In His strength and for His sake, and for the sake

of His children of earth she kept on, going on. She was never alone in the conflict. He was with her. The Lord God—the Almighty one had concern like unto her concern. In fact because of His concern, she had her concern. My soul, how she yearned to warn and to win those tempted by Old King Alcohol. Great was her concern.

HER LEADERSHIP

We shall miss her infectious and inspiring leadership. Her courage in the midst of defeats was heartening and contagious. We, her comrades, found it so. A moment since, I said: "She was never alone in the conflict, He was with her. The Lord God—the Almighty One had concern like unto her concern." Let me now add that she was never alone because the cohorts of her division of the army of the Lord, were always backing her. She had their support to an amazing degree. They believed in her. They had confidence in her counsels. Her words carried weight with the women of the WCTU. Throughout the length and the breadth of the land they had respect for her wisdom.

And how richly she deserved it! She was their voice. She spoke not for herself. Her strength was not in rampant individualism. She was not on her own, she was on their own, she was a representative. She was the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union's agent and ambassador in the Nation's Capital. She was evermore identifying herself with her organization. I have never known a more complete submerging of self in a noble organization, than hers in the Woman's Christian Temperance Union.

NOT HER OWN

Her total attitude of selfless service to a cause and to an organization greater than herself, reminds me somehow of the repeated identifications of Jesus with His Father in numerous assertions of this type: "Believest thou not that I am in the Father, and the Father in Me? The words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in Me, He doeth the works." "Believe Me that I am in the Father and He in Me; or else believe Me for the very works sake". I am mindful of this attitude of the Master when I review Miss Smart's reiterated and consistent declarations of the source of her plans and purposes. She was not her own. She belonged to a group greater—far greater than herself. She and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union were one. They were indivisible.

She had no other will than that of the organization she served. She had no other purpose than the purpose of those godly women. Their mind supplied the norms for her conduct at the battle's front. She was fond of saying to legislators and others in authority: "My organization wants this done". Or "my women believe that the only right course to follow is the one I have just outlined. I plead with you" she would add, "not on my own, but on their behalf. I am only their representative. I bring you their judgment and their desire." How modestly, how persuasively, how eloquently, she pled the case in the name of, and for the sake of the womanhood of the land!

HER SUMMONS TO OUR SOULS

But that moving voice is stilled, she shall, henceforth, no more be heard here in the nerve center of our national life. But we shall follow in her train. To us she has flung the torch; as a tribute and memorial to her heroic contribution to the cause of temperance reform we shall carry on. She would not yield to defeatism nor shall we. Failures did not wear her down, rather she thrived on them. Without coming within a mile af pollyannaism she clung to optimism. She would not give up the dream of a brave new world despite all the slowness of its coming.

Nor shall we. Neither suffering nor shame, neither defeat nor disaster could dampen the ardor of her soul as she held aloft the banner of helpful righteousness. She was sustained by her unbreakable belief in the ultimate decency of things in a world which, after all, is her Father's. She had discounted all the contingencies when she went forth unto Him without the camp, to bear with Him His reproach. This day we salute her; and pledge here in the sight of God to go and do likewise.

Eisenhower Administration's High Interest Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following press release issued by the Democratic National Committee on August 29, 1959:

The Eisenhower administration was criticized today by Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, for trying to press its high interest policy on a reluctant Congress. Mr. Butler's statement:

"The Republican administration is irrevocably committed to a policy of high interest rates and tight money. Democrats quite properly oppose this policy, under which all of the people are increasingly exposed to what is really a new tax, a tax not voted by the Congress, and a tax which is payable not to the Government but to the moneylenders.

"The citizen who borrows to finance a new home, a new car, a new household appliance, is directly affected by the general rise in interest rates fostered by the Government's high-interest policy. Every taxpayer is affected by the forced increase in the interest payable on the debt of Federal, State, and local governments. Every businessman who routinely borrows money from a bank must pay a higher rate of interest—and pass it on to his customers.

"It might have been supposed that the Republicans would acquire, from brutal experience, some insight into the economic facts of life. We have had two Republican recessions in the past 7 years. We have seen in the last year the greatest peacetime deficit in history. We have had the spectacle of the President of the United States coming hat in hand to Congress only last June with the admission that he would need $500 million more to pay for a dead horse—to pay the interest on the public debt—than he had thought 5 months earlier would be needed for this purpose.

"This is fiscal irresponsibility with a vengeance.

"The Democratic platform of 1956 attacked the Republican high-interest policy as a boon to only a few bankers and a hardship for the general public. This policy has been vastly intensified since then. The subsidies provided by this administration for the money lenders in additional interest now exceed $25 billion.

"The administration is so confused about its fiscal objectives that the Secretary of the Treasury put his foot in his mouth this week by acknowledging that 'nothing shoots up interest rates as fast as the fear of inflation.' The fact is that nothing adds speed to the inflationary spiral like increased interest rates.

"The Republicans still resist high wages for labor and insist upon excessively high wages or interest for money. We are proud of the way the Democratic 86th Congress has stood its ground against the arrogance of the administration in this field."

A Tribute to His Country by a New Citizen, Erik Brings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago I had the pleasure of welcoming as new citizens, Mr. and Mrs. Erik Brings. Mr. Brings, in desiring to express his feelings and belief in America, has written a poem in tribute to his country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Mr. Brings' first literary product in the English language, "The Mission of America."

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MISSION OF AMERICA
(By Mr. Erik Brings)

When God divided land and sea
Among His many Nations,
He set aside one country, free,
A land of joy and liberty
For future generations.

As nations grew their skills progressed
And lifted them to splendor,
Till some, with greed and hate possessed,
Compelled the peaceful, happy rest
Of mankind to surrender.

A few ruled many merciless,
The earth was tears and sorrow,
Till some with courage and with stress
Shook off the chains of their distress
And cried for a tomorrow.

Their cries were heard by God, and He
Showed man and woman fighter
His land of joy and liberty,
America, the strong and free,
To make their burden lighter.

God made them promise, thus defined,
To carry on the fighting
Within themselves and for mankind
For freedom of their work and mind,
Until the earth was brightening.

United now for evermore,
Courageous and with vision,
America, keep fighting for
The things you promised once before
The things which are your mission.

Walter Lee

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it was with a real sense of shock that I learned of the illness of Walter Lee, for many years the efficient "chief of staff" of Subcommittee No. 2 of the Judiciary Committee on which I am honored to serve. Mr. Lee has shepherded the work of the Claims Subcommittee through many difficult and crowded legislative sessions, and I am sure we all hope to see him soon restored to full health.

Appendix

Labor Corruption, Business Corruption, and Class Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of proper coverage of the many facets in this labor reform and labor control legislative fight in which we are still engaged, I am taking this opportunity to present to the House a statement sent me by the International Association of Machinists' president, A. J. Hayes.

I do this because he may well have touched on a subject that must be probed by this Congress in the near future, namely, business corruption and the drives behind class legislation.

Insofar as the situation we find ourselves in concurring the ill-fated, politically spawned original Kennedy reform bill, we can thank the President of the United States and his coterie of richly endowed funds such as Humphreys, Black, Payson, Ryerson, Jones & Laughlin, Bethlehem Steel, Armco Steel, who together, handed over $245,000 to Ike's campaign in 1956.

Wonder how they felt and what they wanted in labor reform.

Those of us in Congress know what they wanted and incidentally, got.

It is therefore proper and just to put before Congress the official position of this segment of labor as represented by the following statement.

The history of restrictive covenants disguised as so-called reforms is that instead of reform, they usher in injustice and personal restrictions and in the end, open up Pandora's box from which come the misunderstandings, misrepresentations, and eventually chaos, deceit, and unrestrained evils.

The statement follows:

LABOR CORRUPTION, BUSINESS CORRUPTION, AND CLASS LEGISLATION

The Landrum-Griffin bill is a fraud on the American people. It is a particularly vicious fraud on the workers and wage earners of this Nation—both the organized and the unorganized—for it gives them no new rights—and, in fact, strips them of many old and honorable trade union rights, including the right to picket nonunion employers, the right to boycott unfair employers and the right to govern their own unions by the democratic principle of majority determination.

That this is a drive to hurt the American wage earner and not to help him is evidenced by the indisputable fact that the individuals and groups who have sponsored and supported so-called labor reform legislation are the same individuals and groups who have invariably opposed any measure which would even remotely improve the wages, hours, job safety, housing, health, education and social security programs of the American people.

During the past year these forces have coalesced in a massive effort to cripple the labor movement. They have been actively assisted by politicians from both major political parties. They have had the support of the Nation's business-owned newspapers, magazines, radio and television outlets.

This onslaught has been brought on by 5 years of repetitious congressional exposures of certain shameful—though actually quite isolated—incidents of wrongdoing in a very small segment of the American labor movement.

These incidents, though shocking, are in no way typical of the overwhelming majority of honest and conscientious trade union officials and members. In fact, the integrity of the labor movement is proven by the prompt action which the AFL–CIO took in adopting far-reaching codes of ethical practices, along with an effective enforcement procedure which materially reduces the possibility of corruption and wrongdoing in the future.

It should be noted, moreover, that though some corruption has certainly been shown to exist in the American labor movement, this corruption did not—and could not—exist in a vacuum. It is, in fact, a part of a pattern of corruption that is deeply rooted in the ethical deterioration of business and industry in America today. This deeper corruption of our business society is, of course, well known to the lawmakers—and to the administration now in power. It is, therefore, fitting that since they have used corruption as an excuse to legislate away the rights of trade union members and officers, that they should now undertake to investigate and correct the greater corruption that exists in so many other areas of our society.

As a start, we would invite their attention—and the attention of the American people—to the following evidences of business and professional corruption in this Nation:

1. The reported $5 billion which, according to Life magazine, normally changes hands among businessmen and industrialists in the form of kickbacks, payoffs, and bribes every year.

2. The documented disclosures of the many and widespread business uses of prostitutes by some of the largest and supposedly most respectable corporations in America.

3. The $250 million which, as a matter of public record, has been deducted by employers as withholding taxes from wages of employees, but which has never been turned over to the U.S. Treasury.

4. The reported $750 million which is fraudulently extracted from the American people every year by heartless racketeers operating in the field of charity collections.

5. The many proven reports of ghost surgery, fee splitting, bill padding, and other unethical practices by which the medical profession is cynically undermining union-negotiated health plans.

6. The well-known examples of tax evasion by corporate boards of directors who vote themselves stock options worth millions at the expense of rank-and-file stockholders and, ultimately, at the expense of all other taxpayers.

7. The many reported instances of denials of civil rights in many States particularly in the South, where a well-entrenched coalition of employers and local governments prevents workers from exercising their constitutional rights in both political and economic fields.

These are only a few of the kind of public reports and information that illustrate how deeply the sickness of corruption permeates the fabric of American life. It seems, in view of the billions of dollars that business, industry, and the professions extract unfairly from the American people every year, that the indignation of the McClellan committee over the fact that $10 million in union funds has been stolen, embezzled, or otherwise misused over a period of 15 years, is somewhat exaggerated and misplaced.

If the embezzlement of $10 million over 15 years in the labor movement warranted a 5-year investigation of organized labor—and the enactment of "killer" legislation, there would appear to be justification for a similar investigation in depth of the reports of this much greater corruption in these other segments of our society.

The American people should know that with the exception of a few requirements in the body of the Landrum-Griffin bill, this bill does not do what it purports to do—nor does it do what its sponsors say it will do. It will not prevent corruption and wrongdoing. Instead, it penalizes the very people it is alleged to protect—the rank and file members of labor unions.

Despite assertions to the contrary, the so-called McClellan bill of rights provisions of this bill grant no new rights to American trade unionists. For, in addition to encouraging dissident minorities to obstruct and disrupt unions at every level, and permitting them to thwart the will of the majority, it paves the way for the infiltration of unions by employer spies, racketeers, gangsters, and even Communists. It does this by protecting these disruptive and divisive minorities against any internal discipline on the part of the majority. In fact, the antilabor forces who so often accuse organized labor of "a lack of responsibility" have now taken away the tools by which it can be responsible. The forces who have accused organized labor of being undemocratic have now taken away the prime prerequisite of democracy, the principle of majority rule.

The American people should also know that this so-called labor reform legislation seeks to reform the labor movement by denying workers their constitutional rights, including the right of free speech, the right of free assembly, and the historic trade union right to picket and advertise unfair sweatshop exploitation.

Upon due consideration of these facts, we, the executive council of the International Association of Machinists, firmly believe that it is our duty and our responsibility to inform and warn our members that the Landrum-Griffin—or any similar bill—can have but one result: The substantial and material weakening of the economic effectiveness of our union and the American labor movement as a whole. We feel it incumbent upon us to warn them that this type of legislation will strip them of rights enjoyed by other citizens of our country, that it will divert a substantial part of our finances, time, and effort from our proper bargaining ob-

jectives, that it will open our union to legal harassment, and that it will create a climate of even greater opposition from employers, arbitrators, courts, and administrative tribunals.

We warn our members, and every other worker in America, that the real effect of this legislation will be to hurt every man, woman, and child who is dependent upon wages for their daily bread.

The legislators who are responsible for this damage to honest working men and women under the guise of so-called reform, must be prepared, of course, to be held accountable for this action.

The true tragedy of this legislation is that it is class legislation, a concept that is alien to our free American traditions. And since it is class legislation, it will establish a dangerous precedent in our society. Those who now seek to weaken the economic effectiveness of the American labor movement will do well to remember that while this Congress can legislate against labor along class lines, another Congress, in another time, can just as easily legislate against business and industry along class lines. That is the true and tragic import of this antilabor class legislation.

A Visit to Taylor Tells Our Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an inspiring story of international cooperation and friendship appeared on August 23, 1959, in the Austin American-Statesman. An article entiled "A Visit to Taylor Tells Our Story" reveals a brand of good neighbor policy in the truest sense of the word—citizens of one country stretching out the hand of friendship to those of another—being practiced by the University of Texas in their orientation program for foreign students.

Mr. President, I think this article will be of great interest to all Members of Congress, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VISIT TO TAYLOR TELLS OUR STORY

(By Marj Wightman)

There was a time when the young men and women of those lands a thousand air miles to the south learned about Yanquis from books, newspapers and the products of Hollywood imagination.

They missed the taste of chicken barbecued Texas style.

A couple of days ago the citizens of Taylor plugged a few of those holes left by English language courses and the few American tourists who've braved the highlands of Chile or Peru. They took a busload of South Americans to their hearts and told them just a little about Texas.

It's all part of a University of Texas orientation program for foreign students, the kind of practical handshake that introduces people to people.

Forty-one young graduate students and professional people from Central and South America are spending 6 weeks at the university before scattering across country from Seattle to Boston. They are learning about America from the folks of central Texas.

Five years ago the Texas International Center introduced its first group of South American students to Los Estados Unidos. It tossed out most of the books and turned to people.

You can't roll the taste of catfish on your tongue by reading about it, or shoot color pictures of a rodeo parade you see in the movies or finger a cotton boll in a picture book. But, this is American life in central Texas.

And it will go home to Chile with Jorge Guzman as surely as his brand new Spanish literature degree from the University of Iowa.

Jorge is one of those 41 young men and women who saw the door to Taylor open wide on Thursday. They watched the tall green motorized cornpicker strip the stalks on the Julius Wittliff farm near Coupland, held their ears against the clank and whirr of a cotton gin, and took a hundred color shots of the little kids on big horses in the rodeo parade.

Then they ate barbecued chicken on the Dr. I. A. Shepherd lawn until they knew all American Rotarians were chosen for their ability to cook.

Next week they will scatter to 20 Texas towns from Grandview to Kingsville for a 4-day look at the people who make the wheels turn up in this part of the world. A medical student will live with a doctor, an education student with a teacher, and an electronic student with an engineer.

"We hope, in this way, to give these students a true picture of American life," Dr. Joe W. Neal, international center director, points out. "After 1 year or more of study up here, they will take home more than a degree; they will carry a true picture of America."

Between visits to Texas towns and chats with Texas people, the students go to class. Experts in language and research help them sharpen their English verbs and run the maze of the university library system. When they leave Austin for Dartmouth or Duke, Cornell or Kansas, these young men and women will already know much about Americans.

The Needs of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that is certain besides death and taxes. It is that, if we live long enough, we are going to get old and have to retire. The number of retired persons in our society now runs into the millions, and it is estimated that in just a few years, there will be some 20 million persons 65 years old and older.

Therefore, as can be expected, many of our very largest publications are taking a vital interest in the problems of the aged. The medical profession—which is responsible, in a certain sense, for the tremendous strides we have made in increasing life expectation in the United States—also is devoting more time and attention to the medical needs of the aged.

In Mount Vernon, Ohio, one of the most progressive little cities in the Nation, in my own 17th Congressional District, the Knox County Medical Auxiliary and YMCA Arts and Crafts, both sponsor the Golden Age Club for senior citizens to which my good friend, Mrs. Gordon Pumphrey, has devoted so much time and effort. This is only a part of the town's program for the people who are nearing retirement age, or past it, but it indicates what can be done in every town and city throughout the Nation.

Because of the great interest so many of my colleagues have in the problem of the aged, under leave granted to me, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD two small articles from the AMA News, issue of August 24, 1959. These tell of two developments of primary interest to elderly people. The articles are as follows:

AGING HEARINGS TO BEGIN IN FALL

The Special Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aging charted more than a month of hearings at cities across the Nation to get an on-the-spot picture of how communities are tackling the financial, psychological, medical, and other difficulties that elderly persons may face.

The sessions will begin in the second week of October and carry through December. The tentative schedule calls for visits to Detroit and either Lansing or Grand Rapids, Mich., Miami, Fla., San Francisco, probably Boston, and major cities in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. More cities may be added later.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, subcommittee chairman, has said he planned to hear testimony from, among others, physicians on the progress of local medical societies toward solving problems of health care of the aged. He has declared that unless the problems can be solved locally and through private initiative, the Federal Government might have to take a hand.

Other members of the subcommittee are Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat, of West Virginia; Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona; and Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois.

LIFE STRESSES NEEDS OF AGED

Action by the Federal Government in caring for the aged should be undertaken if individual families, communities, and States cannot meet the challenge.

This was suggested in a series of four articles on problems of the aged which appeared in Life magazine. The series began in the July 13 issue and concluded in the August 3 issue.

In the third article (July 27), Dr. Michael M. Dacso, director of physical medicine and rehabilitation at Goldwater Memorial Hospital, New York City, wrote:

"I believe there is one thing that both State and Federal Governments can do now. They can see to it that a sound concept of aging—taking the element of fear out of it and stressing the potential rewards—is presented throughout our educational system."

Christian Treatment of Unwelcome Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, while there is a wide difference of opin-

ion concerning the wisdom of the President's invitation to the head of the Soviet Union to be his official guest in Washington and elsewhere in this country, there should be no difference of opinion concerning our traditional courtesy of treatment of foreign visitors. With that thought in view, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a thoughtful letter to me dated September 2, 1959, from Mrs. John A. Wood in which she asks that those in the Nation who still believe in prayer will pray that the visit to this country of the Khrushchev party will not be marred by any untoward incident that might imperil the peace of the world.

Mrs. Wood is the wife of a distinguished retired Presbyterian minister and the mother-in-law of the late Dr. Peter Marshall who was one of the Senate's most distinguished and best beloved Chaplains.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERGREEN FARM,
Lincoln, Va., September 2, 1959.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: Ten years ago, shortly after the death of our son-in-law, Dr. Peter Marshall, you were wonderfully kind, and through your influence did much to aid us in placing Bibles in the public schools of Northampton County, on the eastern shore of Virginia. Following our correspondence, and the publishing of my letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe you talked with my daughter, Catherine Marshall. I remember her saying that she shared the opinion that Peter had frequently expressed, that you were deeply interested in spiritual welfare, and were one of the most outstanding Christians among the fine group of leaders, who met together in the morning prayer meetings.

Peter's association with the men in the Senate during the years that he served as chaplain, changed his entire attitude toward your work, and the burden of responsibility that you carry.

This, no doubt, accounts largely for the persistent challenge back of this letter. Last week, after reading President Eisenhower's statement at his news conference (Washington Post, Wednesday, Aug. 26): "We are talking about the human race and what's going to happen to it." And as I have followed him closely through Germany, Great Britain, and France, and think of the forthcoming visit of Khrushchev to the United States, it seems to me that this is truly a dedicated effort toward world peace.

We all know that the Khrushchev visit is crucial. Since many of our difficulties with Russia seem to stem from a serious national inferiority complex on their part, any untoward incidents toward the Khrushchev party, either violence or merely psychological unfriendliness, might have frightening repercussions. I think, for instance, of all the minority groups in the nations whose relatives have suffered greatly in Europe.

The Christians know what it is to disagree with someone, yet grant him the courtesy of gracious hospitality. If we could achieve this Christian ideal during the Khrushchev visit, it just might be the turning point in the cold war.

I am convinced that this is the sort of situation where prayer might make all the difference. But those in the Nation who still believe in prayer, need leadership and need to have the prayer-effort pointed and directed by just such a leader as you are.

If this suggestion has any merit, your own inner convictions will tell you so, as also you will know what steps might be taken.

We are retired from the active pastorate now, and are greatly enjoying Evergreen Farm, 9 miles from Leesburg. It is a lovely old place which Catherine bought and had prepared for our retirement. If you or any small group wished to have a secluded spot in which to discuss such a matter, it would be our joy to have you. The farm is 1 hour, 15 minutes from Washington. In any case, I send my warmest good wishes to you.

Most cordially,

LEONORA W. WOOD.

The Fourth Seacoast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, a forward-looking era in maritime transportation in North America has resulted from the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, carrying a potential of far-reaching benefits to all segments of our population. This revolutionary development has been described as the "Fourth Seacoast," and spokesmen for private enterprise and Governments of both the United States and Canada have emphasized the worthiness of the undertaking in question.

The current issue of the Grace Log contains a vivid description written by J. Peter Grace, one of the Nation's foremost authorities in this field of endeavor. It is commendable that Mr. Grace has focused his interests on this broad expansion, as he is possessed of a rich experience in dealing with questions relative to our internal activities as well as international relationships. W. R. Grace & Co. has long since gained prominence in its varied operations and continues to afford leadership in pursuits so vital to our national economy. The comment of Mr. Grace deserves widespread reading and is as follows:

The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway is one of the most important landmarks in the history of world commerce. The trade routes that it creates will make a significant contribution to strengthening our economic ties with the nations of the free world and particularly with Latin America with which the Grace operation has been associated for over a century. We are, therefore, particularly proud that the Grace Line was selected by the Federal Maritime Board to establish the first U.S.-flag service between the Great Lakes and the Caribbean and north coast of South America. We look with considerable optimism to the development of trade over the new route between the industrial and agricultural heartland of the United States and Canada and the fast developing nations to the south.

In addition to an intensely interesting article by the Honorable George Hees, Minister of Transport of Canada, a statement by Chairman Clarence G. Morse of the Federal Maritime Board presents all of the salient features of this novel undertaking, and is worthy of the attention of citizens of the two countries, so particularly interested in this venture.

In order that widespread reading of Mr. Morse's statement can be afforded, I include for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article appearing in the Grace Log:

THE FOURTH SEACOAST

(By Clarence G. Morse, Chairman, Federal Maritime Board, Maritime Administrator, U.S. Department of Commerce)

The American merchant marine is doing a pioneering job in putting U.S.-flag service on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway routes and, as is to be expected, trailblazing is rugged.

The completion of the seaway will open new opportunities for the privately owned American merchant marine along with the ships of our allied nations to serve the trade and commerce of the United States. With the opening of our fourth seacoast will come an increasing awareness by Americans of the fundamental necessity to support in larger measure the American-flag ships at their disposal.

Up to April of this year all of our overseas trade moving via the Great Lakes has been carried exclusively in foreign-flag ships. Foreign operators have been quick to recognize the potentialities and profitableness of this trade. In 1946, for example, there were only three lines, operating 12 ships, which carried a total of 27,000 long tons of imports and exports. Contrast these figures with the 17 lines that operated 95 ships and carried almost 500,000 long tons of cargo in 1957.

Despite the growth of this commerce, American-flag operators did not find it feasible to engage in this trade. The need for small specialized ships and higher American operating costs were militating factors.

As a result of the economic studies covering Great Lakes-oversea trade, which the Maritime Administration began some years ago, three trade routes were declared essential to the foreign commerce of the United States: Trade Route 32, between the Great Lakes and Western Europe; Trade Route 33, between the Great Lakes-Caribbean area; and Trade Route 34, embracing Great Lakes-Mediterranean commerce. Two other studies are in process that are concerned with the essentiality of trade between the Great Lakes and Africa on the one hand and South America on the other. Press reports indicate that some of the Japanese lines are taking a look at possible service between the Great Lakes and the Far East, despite the great distances involved, which suggests that no part of the world can be overlooked as a possible trading area by ships transiting the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The Federal Maritime Board approved and awarded contracts to Grace Lines, Inc., and American Export Lines to make up to 50 sailings from the lakes to the Caribbean and Mediterranean areas, commencing with the opening of the seaway. The lines will use 10 C-2 type freighters in this service pending their replacement with superior vessels.

Four other U.S. companies have applied to the Board for operating subsidy contracts covering 84 to 126 additional U.S.-flag ship sailings on the essential routes. These applications are being processed as quickly as possible.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, like any new facility, presents many complex and unique problems, the solution of which can be found only in time and through experience.

We are now aware that it is going to take outstanding seamanship and business man-

agement to get this fourth seacoast venture on its sea legs.

To the credit of the American lines that are opening up this new fourth seacoast is the fact that they are doing a lot more than just complaining about conditions and inadequacies. They are carefully noting the difficulties they are encountering and they are constructively advising the governmental authorities involved of what must be done to make it possible for our essential Great Lakes routes to be properly, safely, and adequately serviced.

For instance, we have been put on notice that the Canadian approach walls and locks are unprotected in both the St. Lawrence area and the Welland Canal and as vessels are continually touching, scraping or landing against the solid concrete during transit, hull damage has resulted.

It is felt that this situation could be improved considerably by installing fenders on the approach walls, rubbing pieces in the locks and pile clusters off the end of the shorter walls opposite the regular mooring walls to provide structures to land on when wind is unfavorable for approaching the locks from the regular moored position. American locks already are fitted with fenders and rubbing pieces and it is reported to us that, to date, there has been no incidence of ship damage in either the Snell or the Eisenhower locks.

As we have said, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway, like every other attempted improvement to transportation, brings with it new problems. Our ability to properly exploit any progressive advance lies in our adequacy to meet, overcome and perhaps even turn to our advantage its by-products of inconvenience and dislocation.

Great Lakes port facilities and stevedoring, from the reports which have been coming to us, are a study in paradoxes. Some facilities are excellent; others leave much to be desired. In general, we feel that it is a pity that more and better facilities are not on hand at all the ports to take the fullest possible advantage of this advent of ocean shipping. A great deal has been done. The early experiences point up the necessity for doing a great deal more until all Great Lakes ports have adequate berthing facilities, capable marine superintendents, necessary gear and equipment, trained and adequate stevedores and winch men.

We feel sure the experiences of American shipping lines to date indicate that adequate facilities, when provided, will be adequately used.

We are certain that private shipping and the governments involved will cooperate fully to bring the potential of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway to full fruition.

Profile of a Distinguished Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, recently the Houston (Tex.) Post published an article in profile of a distinguished soldier, Brig. Gen. Stephen D. McElroy of the Civil Air Patrol, based at Ellington Field in Texas. General McElroy has served his country with honor and ability, and he is a credit to his service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Houston Post of August 25, 1959, entitled "General McElroy in City To Command Civil Air Patrol," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL MCELROY IN CITY TO COMMAND CIVIL AIR PATROL

(By Nathan Broch)

A man who commands an "air force" that cannot be knocked out and one which gets by on an annual budget of only $1 million arrived Monday in Houston, the new nerve center for his organization.

Brig. Gen. Stephen D. McElroy, commander of the the Civil Air Patrol, which is now based at Ellington Air Force Base, heads 75,000 civilian volunteers who are in an organization that is one of the world's largest educational ventures.

Until recently the Civil Air Patrol headquarters was in Washington, D.C.

McElroy has flown more than 800 combat hours in World War II and Korea. He flew heavy bombers.

But this heavyweight experience has only sharpened his appreciation of "those little civilian planes" and their part in America's security and everyday life.

McElroy addressed the American Legion convention at Minneapolis over the weekend.

"I told them about the Civil Air Patrol," he said. "I told them about its accomplishments and shortcomings."

He clarified that the shortcomings of the organization are those "found in all volunteer groups—where shortcomings are also part of their strength."

The annual budget of the Civil Air Patrol runs to about $1 million. Of this, some $750,000 will be spent on salaries in Houston.

The "armada" under command of General McElroy is actually the Nation's "grassroots air force." It numbers around 6,000 planes of the smaller variety. All of these are privately owned. The pilots are citizens who are known as the "civilian arm of the Regular Air Force."

"It's the kind of an organization you simply can't knock out," McElroy said. "It's spread all over the country and also operates in Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico."

McElroy had his first contact with the Civil Air Patrol in World War II while on antisubmarine patrol along the eastern seaboard. Private flyers participated in these patrols and won the general's respect.

The general likes to emphasize that the Civil Air Patrol in its present form came into existence December 1, 1941—6 days before Pearl Harbor.

"The Civil Air Patrol is organized along military lines," McElroy said. "The Secretary of the Air Force has authorized Civil Air Patrol members to wear Air Force uniforms."

There are some 39,000 youths in the Civil Air Patrol. These are boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 19. The CAP also sponsors an international exchange program covering about 20 allied countries.

The McElroy family is currently making its home in an apartment on Cambridge Street. The Civil Air Patrol is making quarters for the family available on the base at Ellington.

Last month, two Air Force captains protested they were being evicted from their Ellington living quarters to make room for the general and his family.

McElroy, said Monday, "he was an innocent bystander in the matter of housing." He said, he had no knowledge of the captain's protest until I heard about it through the newspapers.

The two officers were Capts. Joe Saldinger and Paul F. Gilliland. They based their protest on the fact that they were vacating their Ellington quarters anyway by this week—Gilliland to be transferred to Washington, D.C., and Saldinger to civilian status.

One of the major functions of the Civil Air Patrol is educational, McElroy pointed out. Its message is aimed strongly at schoolteachers who are expected to pass it on to their pupils. This is designed to promote airmindedness among youngsters.

As chief of staff of the Air Force Academy at Denver, McElroy found the impact of this educational program. (He held that position until April of this year, when he assumed his present command.)

"The youngsters who had become interested in the Civil Air Patrol program during their years in high school were well prepared for the elements of military discipline they encountered at the Air Force Academy," General McElroy said. "Many of them had actually been Civil Air Patrol cadets before coming to the academy."

The general's only child, Stephen D., Jr., 15, is a Civil Air Patrol cadet.

The educational emphasis of the Civil Air Patrol is also expressed in the presence of 10 educators, all holding Ph. D. degrees, on the staff of the organization. Their job to acquaint the Nation's educators and the public in general with the objectives of the Civil Air Patrol. This is done through the publication of books and pamphlets and the making of films.

The Farmer Is Still an Important Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, because it pertains to the present-day farmer and his importance to the American way of life, I feel the following editorial, which appeared in the August 30 edition of the Kansas City Star, worthy of serious consideration and trust every Member of Congress will take a few minutes to read it:

THE FARMER IS STILL AN IMPORTANT CITIZEN

As we near the end of summer, this growing season is producing crops that approach last year's alltime record. Let's take our hats off to the farmer and take a good look at what he is doing for this country. For the moment let's deemphasize agriculture's price troubles.

The farm problem has dominated the agricultural scene for so long that it has become almost a legend. The public has become accustomed to day-by-day argument over farm programs, surpluses, subsidies, and parity. No wonder many people who are not fully familiar with the situation look upon the farmer as a man who can't run his own business and one who is always looking for a handout from the Government.

He does have his troubles, let's not deny it. But does America have any greater asset than its farmers?

Food is more important to the human race than any other product. In America, we haven't the slightest worry about where it is coming from. A great highway building program, industrial expansion, the production of luxury items, all can be undertaken with confidence in adequate manpower. Each year more and more people can be

spared from the farm. This isn't true in many countries.

If our major worry were producing enough food we couldn't spare the manpower to turn out the many things that are a part of the modern American way of everyday living. Even in war, this country has not gone hungry. It has been the breadbasket for its allies.

Our farmers are producing this abundance with fewer and fewer workers. In the earliest years of the Nation, nearly all people were farmers. A man, who had the help of his family, produced enough for that family. Today's farmer produces enough for himself and 23 other persons. This point can't be overemphasized. If we are to be an industrial nation, these other 23 people must have plenty of food and fiber. Economic progress halts whenever a nation fails to produce the necessities of life with less and less labor.

The farm surpluses, troublesome to farmers and the Government, are in effect insurance. We are virtually guaranteed an abundance for months and years ahead. These surpluses bear down upon farm prices. It is ironic that the farm efficiency which produces the surpluses is so often costly to the farmer. In effect the farmer pays for the insurance against hunger in this country instead of collecting on it at the marketplace. We don't want continued surpluses that are too big to handle.

While the housewife may regard food prices high at the store, farm organization authorities point to the fact that an hour's work will buy more food today than ever before in history. Also, more and more of the cost of food is represented in the expenses of delivery, processing, retailing and built-in maid service.

No longer do you buy a live chicken and take it home to be killed and cleaned. In fact, more and more foods are fully prepared for cooking or even serving on the table. These services all add to the food bill.

Farmers resent charges that their prices account for the high cost of living. The reverse is true. In the cost of living index food prices have either held stable or dropped. If food had been going up, like everything else, obviously the cost of living today would be much higher than it is.

Last year Americans spent $57.7 billion for food. The farmers who grew it received about 36 percent of that amount.

So much has been said about farm subsidies the the average person may well believe that farmers alone have benefited from Government largess. Here again farm organizations, some of which are clearly unsatisfied with current farm programs, point out that farm subsidies are only a part of the benefits handed out through Government channels to American business. The tariff, they suggest, is the greatest subsidy ever granted business and labor. Its costs are hidden as the public pays through prices at the market rather than in taxes as in the case with farm subsidies.

Subsidies helped build the railroads, ships and airlines. Government payment of postal deficits subsidizes mail costs of magazines and other publications. Government contracts assure profits to manufacturers of war materials. In fact, an extremely impressive list of subsidies can be developed by those who wish to make the point that farmers are not alone in getting financial assistance from Uncle Sam.

Of course, the fact that someone else has or is receiving a subsidy does not automatically indicate that farmers, also, should be put into a Government program. Neither does the amazing job of producing food necessarily suggest that they should have Government aid. The Nation faces a practical problem of finding a workable plan. The farmers are dissatisfied with their present lot, despite 30 years of Government programs. This fact indicates that subsidies do not automatically solve their problems.

Too many people are ready to suggest adoption of any kind of a Government price support program on the theory that "others are getting theirs, too." Conceivably, if farmers were better off without any programs, it would be logical to eliminate the programs. We don't think this is going to be done, but the theory holds just the same.

Agriculture is tremendously important to the economy of the Nation. Kansas City always has realized this fact. It was given a forceful demonstration in the spring of 1958 when improving conditions on the farm sparked a strong pickup in business.

Agriculture is a dynamic industry despite its price troubles. Since 1940 total farm output has increased 40 percent. During the same period the number of farmers or farm workers has dropped faster than at any time in history. Today's farmer produces as much in an hour as he did in 2 hours in 1940. Nonfarm labor and manufacturing productivity, on the other hand, have increased slightly less than 50 percent in the same period.

Recently C. Pearls Wilson, director of the School of Agriculture at Kansas State University, compiled data to show the status of agriculture in the American economy. He found among other things:

Agriculture is the biggest buyer, seller, and borrower in the United States.

The inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the assets of the American steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry.

Agriculture uses 6½ million tons of finished steel a year—more than is used in a year's output of passenger cars. It consumes 17½ billion gallons of crude petroleum—more than is used by any other industry—and 285 million pounds of raw rubber—enough to make tires for 6 million motor cars. Agriculture takes 22 billion kilowatt-hours of electrical power—more than enough to serve Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston for a year.

Each year farmers purchase farm supplies worth about $16 billion.

The agricultural plant each year increases its use of capital, of science and technology, of management and research.

There are twice as many jobs in industries that serve farmers as in farming.

The U.S. population is increasing rapidly. Right now it is about 177 million. A conservative estimate used by Government authorities is that the population will grow from the present 177 million to 230 million by 1975. This means total farm production must be increased another 35 to 45 percent by that time. No one doubts that it will be done. Presumably there will come a day in the distant future when this country, along with all others, may face food shortages. But this generation in America has no fears.

What does this summation of the farm situation suggest?

First, we should not discount the importance of farming to the Nation just because we have no worries about food or because farmers presumably are always caught in price troubles. Per capita income on farms is about half the income of nonfarm employment. This is disparity. A way to change it must be found.

In its dilemma agriculture requires the understanding of the urban population. In fact, it also demands greater understanding from farmers themselves. Agriculture is involved in vast changes—declining farm population, the increase in the size of farms and mechanization. The changes bring problems of adaption of technology, of staggering surpluses, and increased costs. The complex situation perplexes the experts.

Because of their strength, industry and labor unions have been able to a large degree to take care of themselves. Farmers, as individuals, have turned to the Government in the hope of getting a better share of national income. Years of dissatisfaction suggest that the Government programs to date have not been successful. More changes are in order.

Let's not count the farmer out. He's a mighty important fellow to have around.

History of Postal Service in Texas—Where National League of Postmasters Was Founded—Postmasters Serve Well

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the postmasters of our country are constantly working to improve their system and service. These men and women perform their many and varied duties quietly and without limit on the number of hours they work per day. They have established a reputation for themselves, and it is a tribute to them and the entire postal service that, in legal terms, when a letter is mailed it is automatically presumed delivered.

The history of the postal service shows a long list of improvements. The Postmasters Advocate, official publication of the National League of Postmasters, recently published an article on the history of the postal service in Texas. It was a Texas postmaster, Oscar Pogue, who founded the national league. This story of growth reflects the entire story of progress in the postal service.

Mr. President, as a salute to the National League of Postmasters, which will hold its 56th annual national convention later this month in Memphis, and to all postal employees, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Postmasters Advocate for August 1959 entitled "Texas—Largest State in Union, as Far as League Membership Is Concerned; League Was Founded in Texas."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS—LARGEST STATE IN UNION AS FAR AS LEAGUE MEMBERSHIP IS CONCERNED; LEAGUE WAS FOUNDED IN TEXAS

Texas is still the largest State in the Union, as far as membership in the National League of Postmasters is concerned. No other State can boast of such an aggressive membership activity as has the Lone Star State, under teh stimulation of the State officers and a group of coworkers.

President Cloy "Junior" Allen and Secretary-Treasurer J. Maxwell Holder have built a fire under postmasters in Texas, and everybody is happy, including those who have recently joined. A few Texas postmasters have not yet joined, but are expected in the corral soon. Then they, too, will be happy.

Texas, as the historians relate, was a political department of Mexico from 1825 to 1835. Texas maintained communication with the United States during this time. When it be-

came an independent republic a special committee of the permanent council was appointed, in October 1835, to establish mail routes. John Rice Jones was named Postmaster General. A post office department was established by an ordinance and decree of the provisional government. This was approved on December 12, 1835, and the Post Office Department of the Republic of Texas was formally created by an act of Congress, approved on December 20, 1836.

Jones headed the postal service until he was succeeded by Robert Barr during Sam Houston's first term as president. When Barr died in October 1839, Jones was again named postmaster general, remaining in that office until January 1841, when the Fifth Congress created the General Post Office as a division of the State Department. A clerk was appointed to take over and perform the duties of a postmaster general. Jones, who organized the Texas postal system, followed the U.S. plan of organization, acquiring its blanks for his guidance.

Sam Houston had "courier" service between military and defensive points as early as May, 1835. The first route, established in 1835, was from San Felipe de Austin to headquarters of the Army, to Bexar, to Velasco and to Cantonment Jessup in the United States. The latter was in Natchitoches Parish, 379 miles from New Orleans.

The first post office in Texas was established in Galveston May 22, 1838, by President Sam Houston of the Republic. Houston decreed that a mail route be established between Galveston and Matagorda, and that the mail be transported every 2 weeks. Peter J. Menard, one of the founders of Galveston, was the first postmaster. Others who succeeded him, prior to the turn of the century after Texas had become one of the United States, were J. H. Branham, R. D. Johnson, J. B. Root, Henry B. Andrews, James A. McKee, W. F. Clarke, C. B. Sabin, S. Gareisen, W. H. Griffin, Thomas A. Gary, W. H. Sinclair, Harry Griffin, and O. S. York.

After Houston's decree, mail for the entire State was to arrive in Galveston on ships of the Morgan line. As soon as this mail hit the docks, clerks would go to work sorting it, working late into the night by the light of tallow candles. The letters were marked by hand on the letters themselves, as envelopes were not introduced until much later.

After the letters were marked, they were stuffed into saddlebags. The horses would be led through the deep sanded streets toward west beach, down 30 miles of deeper sand to the end of the island, San Luis Pass, where a ferry would be waiting to take the carrier to the mainland, free of charge.

The first Texas postage rates established were 6¼ cents for one letter sheet for a distance up to 20 miles; 12½ cents for the second zone up to 50 miles; 18¾ cents for the third zone, up to 100 miles; 25 cents up to 200 miles, and 37½ cents for further distances. Ship mail paid an additional fee of 6 cents. Additional sheets brought the same fees for each additional sheet. Magazines and pamphlets were sent for 1 cent a sheet for any distance up to 100 miles; 1½ cents and 2 cents for greater distances.

A later schedule for letters charged 6½ cents for a distance not exceeding 50 miles; 12½ cents for distance not exceeding 100 miles; and 25 cents for distances between 100 and 300 miles.

The postmaster marked the amount due on the letter in ink, the fees being paid by the sender in coin of the realm.

Texas became one of the United States on December 29, 1845, and effective in February 16, 1846, the postal system of the United States was extended thereto. Under the act of May 29, 1846, the Postmaster General was authorized to pay mail contractors in Texas for service duly performed by them since February 16; and also officers employed in superintending the mail service. This act limited the compensation to that set up by Texas, and provided that the several postmasters in Texas, appointed by the late government of the Republic of Texas, shall duly account to and pay over to the Postmaster General of the United States, all balances accruing to their offices from and after February 16, 1846. Provisions of law for collection of these sums were set up in the same manner as applied to postmasters of the other United States. The same rates of postage also were to be used in Texas, and all laws concerning the Post Office Department, and regulations thereof, were to have full effect and operation in Texas from and after February 16.

Galveston, established as a U.S. post office on April 8, 1846, appears to be the first such in Texas. Galveston was the first Texas post office to receive stamps when the United States began printing them, in the denominations of 5 and 10 cents, on July 1, 1847.

Delivery of mail in Galveston was quite a problem. The carriers had to wade ankle-deep in the street sands. The rains turned the sand into rivers of mud.

Headquarters for the Galveston post office had a roving existence in those early years. There were more than five changes of address before the ornate permanent structure was built by the Federal Government on a site at 25th and Church Streets, where a more modern Federal building now stands.

The Civil War was deeply reflected on the postal system of Galveston and the new State. Vessels carrying letters had to run the blockade set up by Federal ships. During the last years of the struggle, there was no ink, so letter writers made a passable substitute from the juice of berries.

A special agent of the Treasury Department was dispatched to Galveston in 1867 to keep the mail going. In 1868, James A. McKee was appointed postmaster while serving as mayor. He received his appointment from the reconstruction governor in Austin.

McKee was succeeded by Gen. W. T. Clarke, who had been an officer on Grant's staff during the Vicksburg campaign. He came to Galveston in 1865 as a cashier of the First National Bank, the first in Texas.

One of Galveston's more distinguished postmasters was E. R. Cheeseborough, who served under Woodrow Wilson. He was the leading figure in the costly undertaking of raising the grade of the city which was nearly wiped out of existence in the storm of 1900. He instituted a number of reforms in the local administration. As of this writing, he still goes to his real estate office nearly every day, at the age of 92, and shows little sign of his advanced years.

A number of other post offices in Texas had interesting histories.

During the republic days, when San Felipe de Austin was the capitol site, and where the Post Office Department had its headquarters, and Postmaster General, the Alamo fell. San Felipe was burned to the ground to avoid capture by Santa Anna's troops, with a well being the only remaining landmark. The post office, which was built shortly afterwards, was in use for about 75 years, and is now all of 100 years old.

The Fort Worth post office was established on February 28, 1856, and Julian Feild was appointed the first postmaster by President Franklin Pierce. But a postal service had been established before that, in 1849, by Henry Daggett and Archebald Leonard, who operated a general merchandise store. Mail was received by pony express from Dallas, and was distributed from the store. The first post office was a one-story wooden building on the west side of Main Street, between present-day Second and Third Streets. Mail was distributed at irregular hours, depending upon the arrival of the stage, whose schedule was determined by the weather and the condition of the roadless prairie between Dallas and Fort Worth. The postal receipts the first year amounted to $91.99.

Julian Feild resigned after 1 year, and was succeeded by M. J. Brinson in February 1857. Other prewar postmasters were Hiram C. Jewell, September 1857; Leigh Oldham, March 1859; and John M. Murchison, July 1859. George Boon was appointed in June 1860, and served through the Civil War until May 1866. During this period, mail was received from Waxahachie by pony express rider by way of Johnson Station and Birdville. One of the riders was George H. Mulkey, about 1862.

The El Paso post office was established July 26, 1852. It was known as Franklin until 1859, when it was officially changed to El Paso. The first mayor, Ben S. Dowell, was not elected until 1873, so the post office antedates the city government. The first post office was located at the stage station, and supervised by Postmaster Jarvis Hubbell, appointed by President Millard Fillmore.

El Paso was included in the first transcontinental postal service, the San Antonio and San Diego Mail Line. It was known colloquially as the "Birch" or "Jackass" Mail. Butterfield started operating September 16, 1858. Birch's contract was effective July 1, 1857, for a 4-year period, and his first mail for the Pacific coast left San Antonio 8 days later. He pioneered for later operators, over the great desert mail route of the Southwest, leading from San Antonio to El Paso, via Forts Clark, Lancaster and Davis; from El Paso via Mesilla, Tucson, the Pima village of the Gila Valley, and Fort Yuma on the Colorado, to San Diego.

Early travelers described the stage route between San Antonio and the oasis of El Paso as one long battlefield. Marauding Indians kept the riders on the alert.

El Paso del Norte was a way station for north and south traffic, with mail being carried, as early as 1824, trimonthly trips being made between Chihuahua (Mexico) and Sante Fe, N. Mev., mule pack trains, wagon trains, and Mexican stages or "diligencias" traveled this early route.

The U.S. stagecoach era in the West owes its big stimulus to the discovery of gold in California in 1848. As the Mexican War ended, and the great rush got underway, the Government began surveying emigrant roads across country. Three of these emigrant roads came through El Paso.

On the day of the establishment of the post office in El Paso, Postmaster Hubbell awaited the arrival of the rider nervously. This rider would make the inauguration of the post office a success, or a dismal failure by his delay from Santa Fe. El Paso was a dusty adobe village. The rider finally appeared through the dust, with only two letters in the pouch, but the mail service was established.

David Wasson got the first contract to carry mail between San Antonio and Santa Fe once a month, in 1854. This was transferred to George H. Giddings in 1855. The Army provided an escort for this route, the trip requiring 25 days. The contract was let to James E. Birch, for a stage line, which became a weekly mail, and later a passenger service, escorted by troops through Indian territory.

By 1858 letters increased from 4 to 10 letters twice a week, all handled by the postmaster. In 1959 the daily average is 431,000 letters, with a post office staff of 620. At the time of the increased business (to 10 letters twice a week) the guard of Army men from Fort Bliss and Fort Fillmore was authorized by President James Buchanan. The post office was promised removal from the adobe

hut near the stage station to more commodious quarters and the salary of the postmaster increased from $150 to $200 per annum, if the future increase in mails justified it.

El Paso now has its 27th postmaster, Charles T. Boyce, who took office September 1, 1953.

Similar to many other post offices, that of Amarillo was first conducted in a dry goods box. This fourth-class establishment was established on November 23, 1887, with Robert McKenzie "Mack" Moore, as postmaster. He was required to furnish his own quarters and equipment.

Moore secured a dry goods box, fitted a few pigeon holes into it for mail separation, hinged a lid to another box for stamps, and he was ready for business. When he tired of the strenuous work, he resigned, and George S. Berry became postmaster, moving the business to his real estate office May 24, 1888. Berry augmented his income from cancellations, by installing and renting boxes.

Evidence in the changes of post office structures is shown in the accompanying photo of the Waco, Tex., edifice, which was erected about 1890. A part of this building still stands and is occupied by other tenants, but at the time of this photo, it was on the principal corner of the city, Eighth and Franklin Avenue. The post office was moved in 1930.

The post office at Abilene is comparatively new, being established February 14, 1881, with Henry Montgomery as postmaster. Succeeding him were William Reinhard (1882); Thomas Davies (1884); Henry H. Harden (1884); H. W. Morrow (1889); Mary W. Morrow (1897); Turner S. Rollins (1910); Robert E. Rankin (1914); Lindsey C. Payton (1923); Oliver A. Hale (1936); and the present postmaster, Clyde E. Grant, January 31, 1951.

Rural delivery service was started at 7 post offices in Texas in 1900. These include Alvin, Fate, Grandview, Hallettsville, Hillsboro, LaGrange, and Weston.

The present league president in Texas, a former secretary-treasurer, and the present secretary-treasurer, a former president, have enlisted a large group of workers for their membership progress. The officers were elected on a pledge to work or get out. Printing is done for a number of events at a time, such as a series of district meetings. The programs are prepared on one side, and a mimeograph job on the inside provides an impressive mailing piece at a nominal cost. These district meetings are attracting three times as many postmasters as they did a short time ago.

The Texas Leaguer, and the La-Tex Leaguette newspapers are expected to compete strongly for the league publications trophy at the Memphis convention. The several letters bring out something new for postmasters each issue, and bring in new members, because they offer service. For example, the questionnaire to all fourth class postmasters asking them to give figures pertaining to their office receipts, and their projected changes in pay with the new rate schedules. The Texas branch went to bat for those who might suffer a loss in salary through this adjustment.

Texas tried a time-payment membership plan, with considerable success. The year's dues were divided into two payments, now and 6 months later. This brought many new members, although most of them paid for the year in full.

The Texas branch is carrying the ball for a new division of dues between State and national organizations. There are a lot of new ideas in Texas. Some of them will stand out as greatly progressive. Others may be rejected. But they are thinking and working. Certainly any postmaster in Texas who joins the league, knows that he is on the bandwagon and going places.

The league was born in Texas, under the leadership of Oscar Pogue, now living at Cleburne. Pogue, as is generally known, lost his postmaster's job for his activity in organizing postmasters, but his work lives on.

Not only has Texas made sizable contributions to the development of the postal service in the South and Southwest, but it was also the birthplace of the National League of Postmasters.

In May 1904 Oscar Pogue, then postmaster at Blum, sent postcards to 12 or 14 postmasters in Hill County asking them to meet for the purpose of organizing a league. The fledgling organization then extended a call to all Texas postmasters to meet in Hillsboro on July 4 for the purpose of setting up a State league. Mr. Pogue was elected president of both organizations.

In Mr. Pogue's words, "We immediately set in motion a plan, or the idea, of organizing the national league, and since there were reduced railroad fares from all over the country to St. Louis on account of the World's Fair, that city was chosen as the place to organize. We all went there." As a result of that meeting, the National League of Postmasters came into being—with Mr. Pogue as the first national president—and it has flourished ever since. Its first project on a national scale was that of obtaining civil service status for postmasters, a goal ultimately achieved.

Mr. Pogue says, "When I look at the league now, and the fine fellowship that exists between it and the Post Office Department, it just puts joy in my heart to know that I had a part in bringing it about." Postmasters throughout the Nation have benefited through the years because of the foresight and energy of this outstanding Texan.

Love of Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting and thought-provoking editorial which appeared in the Stars and Stripes, the National Tribune, issue of September 3, 1959:

LOVE OF COUNTRY

When it truly exists love of country is one of the most admirable traits to be found in humanity. It is difficult to develop a sincere love of country when the citizen of the country has little or no knowledge of its history.

It is extremely unfortunate that here, in our own land, the average teenager or the group composing the college men and women, have little or no knowledge—scarcely an acquaintanceship—with the history of the United States of America.

This, of course, may be due to the fact that some 30 or 35 years ago, in the hectic twenties it became fashionable to belittle historical facts by what was known as the process of "debunking."

Patriotism as it had been understood up until the time of World War I was frowned upon as something plebeian, something to be stifled as showing a lack of the sophistication which was the standard of the times.

This scorn of our country's history later developed to a gradual lessening of the teaching of this history in our grade and high schools to the extent where it has been almost altogether omitted in the curriculum of our modern educational system.

And what a great pity this is when we think back and recall the splendid history of the founding of our country and the manner in which it developed until, with the successful conclusion of the Spanish-American War, it had come to take its place among the great nations of the world.

Fifty to sixty years ago we recall how the history of our land fascinated us as a wonderful story—its study was never a chore—and how as youngsters we thrilled at the exploits of those men, and women, too, who made our independence possible. True, it may be that time has made some of the stories somewhat legendary but the general facts of those important days in our country's making remained and, once learned, have never been forgotten.

With this background of knowledge of our struggles and growth it is small wonder that the generations who preceded the so-called intellectual era of stark realism were ever ready to answer their country's call to arms when the need arose.

This spirit may be readily identified by the songs that were sung in our earlier wars by the men who fought those wars and the folks who remained behind to await their defenders' return.

Both the North and South had their share of such melodies—some sad, some gay and some of a rollicking nature which permitted the fighting men to face hardships with a smile.

The same was true for the men who fought the war with Spain, the China Relief Expedition and the Philippine Insurrection and it was likewise true for those who left home for service in World War I. All these conflicts brought out words and music to stir the hearts of our fighting men.

The same cannot be said to any great extent for the songs America produced during World War II and the Korean war. As a matter of fact we recall but one song of the time that had a real fervor to it and that was the famous "Praise the Lord and Pass the Ammunition," a product of World War II.

This may seem a far cry from the subject of the teaching of a nation's history to the young but is brought up to show the trend of thought which developed here during the past 30 years.

How could we expect a young man to be fired with patriotism by the spirit and words of such a popular melody as "Don't Sit under the Apple Tree With Anyone Else but Me?"

The very nature of the lyrics brought up at once a thought of abandonment by the loved one in the minds of those who were leaving to serve their country. In the older days the soldier and sailor going off to war knew that the girl he left behind would be waiting for him and there was no spirit of dejection in the goodbys—tender though they might have been.

As we think of the present lack of knowledge of the history of the United States which was born of the frivolity and smartness of the twenties and nutured by the new trend in educators, it is easy to understand why true love of country has diminished until now it is considered "simple" to express any emotion at the thought of our past or the sound of martial music or the passing in review of our glorious flag.

There has been a certain desire shown on the part of some of our present day teachers to want to revert to the old system where the young students were taught to read and write in their childhood and we feel that this is wholly desirable.

Teach the children how to read and then give them the study of our Nation's history and we feel certain that once again there will surge in the hearts of the generation which will have had that advantage an appreciation of just what the history of our land means.

The history of the United States should be made a must in our grade and high schools and we are hopeful enough to believe that this future generation of which we write, once having been taught to read will, as their forefathers, thrill to the brave doings of those who made their country possible.

As we look at it a country without a history will as a sequence, develop no tradition, and a country without history or tradition cannot develop patriotism which, after all, is simply love of country.

Jantzen Knitting Mills, of Portland, Oreg., Marks 50th Anniversary of Firm Which Has Become International in Scope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, imaginative men and women built the West and helped it develop into a prosperous and growing realm of America. New industrial firms have been a vital factor in this progress.

One of the firms of which we are most proud in my native State of Oregon is the Jantzen Knitting Mills, which grosses nearly $50 million in annual sales and has spread into 17 other nations.

Jantzen Knitting Mills has recently celebrated the 50th anniversary of its founding, a most appropriate occasion because this is the 100th year of Oregon statehood.

Jantzen Knitting Mills are a monument to the original founder of this great firm, John A. Zehntbauer, who still functions actively as chairman of the board.

Although I realize it is a redundancy to add this fact, Jantzen Knitting Mills have become world famous as manufacturers of women's bathing suits and other sports garments.

In the Portland Oregonian of August 30, 1959, appeared a comprehensive article by Mrs. Phyllis Lauritz about the 50th anniversary of Jantzen Knitting Mills entitled "Pooling of Ambition, Ingenuity Builds Worldwide Jantzen Firm."

I ask unanimous consent that this article from the Oregonian may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POOLING OF AMBITION, INGENUITY BUILDS WORLDWIDE JANTZEN FIRM

(By Phyllis Lauritz)

Fifty years ago two young men—with little to work on except their own ambition and ingenuity—pooled their abilities to develop a business in Portland which since has spread into 17 countries and does nearly $50 million in sales a year.

The firm was Jantzen Knitting Mills, now and for several years officially named Jantzen, Inc.

The golden anniversary of the Portland firm that became a giant in the swim and sportswear field will be celebrated this week with a 6-day convention at the Multnomah Hotel. More than 150 sales representatives from all parts of the United States will attend.

An attractive young lady in a red swim suit—the Jantzen diving girl—had a lot to do with the success. It has been recognized as the best-known apparel trademark in the business.

The story of Jantzen is far from a typical one in the history of American business. The classic ingredients are there—two poor boys with ambition, almost overwhelming difficulties to be encountered over many years, and finally the happy hit on a successful item which changed the entire future course of the business to a $46,676,284 per year industry.

One of the interesting aspects of Jantzen to others in the fashion field is that it maintains its headquarters in Portland, far from other fashion centers.

Ask John A. Zehntbauer, founder and chairman of the board, "why," and he'll probably answer, despite his well-known antipathy to the State tax structure, "because it's home."

QUALITY CONTROL CONSTANT

Here they spin, they dye, they knit their own yarns, up to completion of the garment and sewing on of the label. Quality is thus under constant control. Through the Portland spinning plant reel approximately 42,000 miles of yarn each day. It's enough to circle the world more than one and a half times.

As Dorothy L. Wallis, feature columnist for Women's Wear Daily, said: "Jantzen has made Portland a sportswear center of the world. Other sportswear manufacturers have gathered around Jantzen Center, until Portland, Oreg., has come to be a real force in the merchandising world of men's and women's fashions."

The founders were the late Carl Jantzen, whose name the company bears, and John A. Zehntbauer, whose original idea the whole thing was.

The company's first products were hosiery, heavy sweaters, knitted jackets for Chinese workmen in the lumbering industry and knitted gloves. Knitting of heavy rowing trunks, for use in a popular Portland sport (Zehntbauer and Jantzen were members of the Portland Rowing Club and wore the first knit swimsuits in 1913), led to invention of the rib stitch swimsuit for men, a product which eventually diverted the company almost exclusively into the swimsuit field. It coined the term swimsuit, now unanimously adopted.

FIRM EXPANDS LINE

From swimsuits the firm gradually added more and more types of sports apparel, until today executives like to think of Jantzen as the one-stop sportswear resource. Jantzen produces swimsuits for the entire family and does the same with sun and play clothes. It even makes girdles.

Jantzen merchandise is produced in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Cuba, New Zealand, Peru, South Africa, Venezuela, England, Australia, Canada, Germany, France, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, and Chile.

There are plants at Hollywood, Dover, N.J., Philadelphia, Seneca, S.C., Eddington, Pa., and Westminster, S.C.

Biggest is the Portland plant, employing 1,200 persons, and the Vancouver, Wash., plant, with an approximate 600 employees for a combined payroll in excess of $6 million per year.

The year 1916 was the first year the firm made money—and the year the name Jantzen first became official.

The Jantzen Diving Girl, now 37 years old and revamped in major alterations four or five times, carries her age lightly, and has stamped the firm's identity on the mind of the world.

She was originally the creation of Frank Clark, a newspaper artist, and made her appearance on a Jantzen catalog cover.

By 1923 the graceful cutout figure was popular in sticker form on automobile windshields—notably on roadsters piloted by rakish young men.

She still appears on Jantzen suits where it is appropriate—notably on solid color suits—but no longer on the patterned models.

VA Disability Rating Schedules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following communication:

BEMIDJI, MINN.,
August 30, 1959.

Hon. ODIN LANGEN,
Member of Congress, Representative Ninth District Minnesota, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANGEN: This is an appeal to Congress at large, and I request it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The following tables are the products of two committees using two different measuring sticks, but the same VA disability rating schedule, applied to the disability problem from wartime and peacetime, in the armed services.

The practical effect desired by Congress of adequately caring for disabled young officers is ridiculously made fiction by the services, as uneducated 90-day recruit VA compensation is much more or out of proportion to retired disability retired pay. A lot of longevity takes care of the vast majority; it is only the beginners, where most casualties occur, who get crucified unduly.

Services pay tables (authority, Department of Defense) 80 to 100 percent disability retirement

Length of service		Those retired before June 1, 1958		Those retired after June 1, 1958		*VA pay table: 90 days recruit, married, 100 percent disability compensation, no educational or attainment status required*
Under 2 years	O-3 Capt.	$274.75		$259.20		$248 per month plus statutory awards to $450; also additional dependents allowances, all no part of services disability retirement.
	O-2 1st lt.	218.56		206.10		
	O-1 2d lt.	187.33		176.72		
Over 2 years	O-3 Capt.	159.20		259.50		
	O-2 1st lt.	217.97		218.25		
	O-1 2d lt.	188.51		188.25		
Over 3 years	O-3 Capt.	279.05		279.00		
	O-2 1st lt.	266.64	*Overage for 1 year 1 day* $4.30	270.00	*Overage for 1 year 1 day* $19.80	
	O-1 2d lt.	235.53		235.00		
Over 4 years	O-3 Capt.	297.65	48.08	311.25	63.81	
	O-2 1st lt.	266.64	46.31	277.50	56.28	
	O-1 2d lt.	235.63		235.50		

Because these unlucky, college graduate, beginner officers got disability in a short war or early in a long war, and because the services in 1955 and 1958 rigged their active duty

pay rates with no raises, their retired disability pay becomes ridiculous compared to the uneducated 90-day recruit compensation allowance.

The victims look at it as the U.S. Government doing it to them regardless of what committee recommends it to Congress.

It all stems from the adoption of a policy of underpayment, like prisoners, slaves, or the indentured, because the beginner officer for 3 years is "hooked" by military obligation requirements. He could be still "hooked," but paid free market wages that existed prior to the 1955 pay legislation. Current wages for active duty beginner officers are now 10 years behind the times, 1 percent under what the much lauded Hook Commission established as fair wages in 1949.

Mostly it is geared to large Academy education expense as cadets' pay is one-half that of a beginner second lieutenant. The graduates of 250 universities and colleges with ROTC who become officers, largely pay for their own college expenses, yet have to tag along at cut rates and thus pay for something they never got, by a sort of payroll deduction.

Also the cutrate (not raised since 1952) pay rates reflect the stigma of the draft as a discount excuse, for officers who volunteer, as well as for forced into service draftees. It degrades a commission on a presumption of disloyalty basis. It takes undue advantage of green, unorganized, capable young men in an unchivalrous manner, not becoming the reputation of forthrightness expected of services' planners. The application of disability laws to active duty pay rates doubles the insult to human dignity, as no one expects disparagement of the disabled to be any small part of democratic U.S. policy.

I have discussed all this to no avail with committees, so I ask that Congress at large know these facts in the hope some champion will come forward with a reasonable solution.

Respectfully,

HOWARD L. MCLEOD,
First Lieutenant E.O.R.L., (Volunteer Before Draft Laws, 1917).

Ship Cargoes in Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the August 9 issue of the New York Herald Tribune carried an interesting account of an antimonopoly action currently being undertaken by the Justice Department.

The occasion arises from the rejection of the Federal Maritime Board of the Pacific Far East Line's application to compete with the Matson Line in the Pacific coast-Hawaii cargo trade.

Involved in this case is the question of whether this rejection permits the Matson Line to enjoy a complete monopoly in cargo trade between the Pacific coast and Hawaii.

Now that Hawaii is a State of our Union, it is all the more reason to prevent the establishment or maintenance of any monopolies on trade of any kind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD this article from the New York Herald Tribune of August 9, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES JOINS LINES' FIGHT FOR CARGOES IN HAWAII

(By Robert S. Burns)

The Department of Justice has taken over the Pacific Far East Line's fight for the chance to compete with the Matson Line in the Pacific coast-Hawaii cargo trade.

The next round is scheduled for later this month in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in Washington. There Justice Department attorneys will seek to have the court rule that the Federal Maritime Board erred in barring Pacific Far East Line from the route.

The Justice Department has entered the controversy in an attempt to get a clear-cut definition of what constitutes "unfair competition" between subsidized steamship lines engaged in foreign commerce and unsubsidized lines in the Nation's domestic service.

The controversy has stirred wide interest in the maritime industry because the Federal Maritime Board overruled its own examiner and counsel in rejecting Pacific Far East's application to enter the Pacific coast-Hawaii trade.

TURNED DOWN IN 1957

In December, 1954, Pacific Far East Lines (P.F.E.L.), which operates a subsidized transpacific service, requested Maritime Board permission to begin an unsubsidized cargo service between Hawaii and ports in California, Oregon, and Washington.

On May 10, 1957, the Board turned down the request. It ruled two-to-one that P.F.E.L.'s proposed service would "result in unfair competition to an operator (Matson) engaged exclusively in the coastwise or intercoastal service, and would be prejudicial to the objects and policy of the 1936 Merchant Marine Act."

In taking the case to the court of appeals, P.F.E.L. charged, among other things, that it was being discriminated against. It asserted that the Board has already granted permission to two lines to carry cargo between the west coast and Hawaii with subsidized vessels.

One line is Matson's wholly owned Oceanic Steamship Co. Oceanic vessels stop at Honolulu on their way to New Zealand and Australia. The other line is Pacific Transport Lines whose ships call at Hawaii on the way to the Far East.

SECTION 805 QUOTED

Section 805(a) of the 1936 act requires a subsidized line to get permission from the Federal Maritime Board (FMB) to enter the coastwise or intercoastal trade. Routes between the United States and Hawaii, Alaska and Puerto Rico are considered part of the Nation's domestic trade. For the most part they are served by unsubsidized lines who are protected by law from foreign-flag competition.

Section 805(a) protects the unsubsidized lines from "unfair competition" from subsidized American lines. Briefly, the section makes it unlawful for the FMB to pay subsidy to vessels in domestic service, and to allow subsidized vessels in the trade if their presence will result in "unfair competition" to lines "operating exclusively" in domestic service, or if their presence would be "prejudicial" to the objects and policy of the 1936 act. It also makes it unlawful to divert "directly or indirectly" subsidy payments into domestic operations.

Justice Department attorneys contend that in writing the 1936 act, Congress "sanctioned subsidized carriers to compete with domestic operators as long as such competition is not 'unfair'." They contend the FMB has misconstrued "unfair competition."

They said the Board decision gave no facts to explain how P.F.E.L. "would gain any competitive advantage over Matson by virtue of its subsidy. They pointed out that a Matson witness admitted that P.F.E.L.'s subsidy would not give it any advantage in competition with Matson for cargoes.

In rejecting P.F.E.L.'s application, the Maritime Board found that:

1. Matson's Pacific coast-Hawaii service is exclusively domestic.

2. Oceanic's participation in the service is irrelevant to Matson's status as an exclusively domestic operator.

3. There is nothing in the record indicating Matson's service has been supported by Oceanic subsidy.

VICE-CHAIRMAN DISSENTS

Clarence G. Morse, Board chairman, and Thomas E. Stakum Stakem, Jr., overruled the findings of F. J. Horan, the Board's examiner, and three of its attorneys in turning down P.F.E.L.'s application. Ben H. Guill, Vice Chairman of the Board, dissented.

Mr. Guill did not agree that Matson was solely a domestic operator. He said Matson had developed a "virtual monopoly" in the trade and he did not see how P.F.E.L's competition could be called unfair. He also noted that he found no arguments to "warrant our reversal of the examiner's findings."

Mr. Horan's findings were directly opposed to those of Messrs. Morse and Stakem in virtually every important question in the case. He made them after hearing over 70 witnesses in 45 days of testimony. The record, one of the longest in Board history, consists of over 9,400 pages.

Very Low Serious Crime Rate in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include in the RECORD today an article which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of September 3, quoting the latest crime statistics released by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 1958, which show that Chicago ranked 85th among 156 metropolitan areas in the United States in serious crime last year.

I am particularly anxious to call these statistics to the attention of those who so frequently, without justificaion, denounce Chicago as a crime-ridden city.

It is lamentable that those who need subjects for motion pictures and sensational television productions have to reach back more than a quarter century to Chicago's past and use this as their basis for judging Chicago as a city.

It is my firm belief that these statistics compiled by the FBI will put to rest once and for all these scandalous attacks on the city which today is destined to become the No. 1 metropolis of the world.

The fact that the entire Chicago area, with a population of almost 6½ million people, had less than 1 percent of its people involved in crimes during 1958—is a tribute to the diligence of public officials and the police department of

that entire community. I think the splendid record in fighting crime being written in Chicago today is a tribute to Chicago's great mayor, Richard J. Daley; his outstanding police commissioner, Timothy J. O'Connor, and to every man and woman on Chicago's great police force.

As a Chicagoan, I am proud of the record that Mayor Daley is writing in our city. Through his dedication and diligence, he has purged the city of its horrible reputation of the past, and in its place has built a metropolis whose chief assets today are culture, harmonious community living, and unprecedented industrial, medical, and scientific progress.

This is the Chicago of today, and let those who would continue to cite the morbid history of the Chicago of yesterday, ponder the FBI figures before they continue their slander against the fine people of a great city.

Mr. Speaker, the Tribune article follows:

CHICAGO 85TH IN 1958 SERIOUS CRIME RATINGS—WELL BELOW AVERAGE FOR 176 AREAS

WASHINGTON, September 2.—Chicago ranked 85th among 176 metropolitan areas in the United States in serious crime in 1958.

With a rate of 943.5 serious crimes per 100,000 population, Chicago was well below the average of 1,154.9 for the 176 standard metropolitan areas.

Chicago was only slightly above the rural and urban rate of 896.9 for the entire country.

LOS ANGELES HEADS LIST

The serious crimes categories include murder and nonnegligence homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and auto theft.

The crime figures were released Wednesday in a joint report by Director J. Edgar Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the 1958 edition of Uniform Crime Reports.

The report fixed Los Angeles as the No. 1 crime area with 155,259 serious crimes, an average of 2,507.6 per 100,000 of population for an area population of more than 6 millions. The area included Los Angeles and Orange Counties.

The total number of crimes in the Chicago area of almost 6½ million population was 61,056. The Chicago area includes Cook, DuPage, Kane, Lake, and Will Counties in Illinois, and Lake County in Indiana.

NEW YORK RANKS 61ST

Los Angeles was topped in the number of crimes by New York with 164,973 but New York ranked 61st among the 176 metropolitan areas in crimes per 100,000 population with a rate of 1,145.3, well ahead of Chicago. The New York metropolitan area, with a total population of almost 14½ millions, included New York City, Bronx, Kings, New York, Queens, Richmond, Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk, and Westchester Counties, N.Y.; and Bergen, Essex, Hudson, Middlesex, Morris, Passaic, Somerset, and Union Counties, N.J.

Chicago was second in murders and nonnegligent manslaughter with 384 to 468 for New York.

Chicago's serious crime rate was below that of Decatur, Ill., which had a rate of 1,034.9, but exceeded that of Peoria with 902.1. Chicago's rate was lower than that of most metropolitan areas in the area except for Milwaukee with 652.6 crimes per 100,000.

CITIES THAT TOP CHICAGO

The following table lists cities with a greater crime rate than Chicago by rank, the number of serious crimes, and the rate of serious crimes per 100,000 population:

Rank and city	Number of crimes	Number of crimes per 100,000
1. Los Angeles	155,259	2,507.6
2. Miami	19,382	2,303 3
3. Phoenix	11,738	2,139.2
4. Jacksonville	8,508	2,004.4
5. Lexington	2,316	1,971.0
6. Tucson	4,640	1,885.8
7. Stockton	4,348	1,861.1
8. Oklahoma City	8,082	1,821.6
9. Pensacola	2,949	1,784.7
10. New Orleans	14,108	1,720.7
11. Savannah	3,321	1,675.3
12. Nashville	5,986	1,669.2
13. Denver	13,751	1,653.2
14. Albuquerque	3,553	1,645.6
15. St. Louis	33,146	1,634.5
16. Norfolk-Portsmouth	9,459	1,609.1
17. San Antonio	9,810	1,582.5
18. Lubbock	2,625	1,573.6
19. Little Rock	3,974	1,570.3
20. Orlando	3,647	1,544.6
21. Houston	18,216	1,541.1
22. Hampton, Newport News, Warwick	2,927	1,540.8
23. Seattle	13,224	1,519.2
24. Muskegon	2,247	1,510.4
25. Bakersfield	4,050	1,495.0
26. Atlantic City	2,194	1,485.1
27. San Bernardino	10,483	1,484.4
28. Charlotte, N.C.	3,602	1,462.2
29. Louisville	10,476	1,456.9
30. El Paso	4,198	1,421.0
31. Greenville, S.C.	2,991	1,419.9
32. Sacramento	6,206	1,419.2
33. Galveston	2,045	1,402.4
34. Raleigh, N.C.	2,215	1,400.8
35. San Francisco-Oakland	37,047	1,389.6
36. Charleston	2,849	1,382.8
37. Tulsa	4,636	1,371.1
38. Indianapolis	9,204	1,368.4
39. Columbia, S.C.	3,175	1,365.2
40. Detroit	51,897	1,343.0
41. Atlanta	12,386	1,336.1
42. Corpus Christi	3,165	1,328.6
43. Waco	2,030	1,326.1
44. Richmond	5,353	1,325.9
45. Tampa-St. Petersburg	8,599	1,320.3
46. Fort Worth	7,846	1,302.8
47. Baltimore	20,797	1,295.8
48. Columbus, Ohio	8,253	1,264.1
49. Salt Lake City	4,642	1,255.9
50. Toledo	5,598	1,219.4
51. Birmingham	7,481	1,212.2
52. Chattanooga	3,222	1,210.1
53. Pueblo	1,432	1,188.6
54. Santa Barbara	1,409	1,177.2
55. Providence	8,626	1,174.5
56. Amarillo	1,663	1,173.7
57. Mobile	3,433	1,162.9
58. Knoxville	4,182	1,157.2
59. Akron	5,584	1,152.3
60. Fresno	3,834	1,148.7
61. New York	164,973	1,145.3
62. Evansville	2,356	1,135.6
63. Dallas	9,656	1,120.9
64. Flint	4,088	1,117.8
65. San Diego	10,215	1,117.2
66. Wichita Falls	1,519	1,113.8
67. Des Moines	2,935	1,091.9
68. Palm Beach	2,300	1,080.0
69. Terre Haute	1,174	1,079.7
70. Montgomery	1,806	1,078.6
71. Beaumont-Port Arthur	3,188	1,067.0
72. Memphis	6,451	1,064.1
73. Topeka	1,360	1,059.3
74. Portland	8,956	1,052.2
75. Macon	1,789	1,049.5
76. Decatur	1,129	1,034.9
77. San Jose	5,703	1,023.8
78. Asheville	1,399	1,006.5
79. Baton Rouge	2,114	1,006.3
80. Roanoke	1,555	984.4
81. San Angelo	747	983.0
82. Washington	18,937	981.5
83. Minneapolis-St. Paul	13,356	977.8
84. Austin	1,957	965.0
85. Chicago	61,056	943.5

The standard metropolitan areas have a total population of 105,735,561 and reported 1,221,208 crimes or 1,154.9 for every 100,000 population. Other cities, with a population of 25,489,735, reported 161,238 serious crimes. Rural areas, with a population of 42,035,033, reported 171,476 crimes.

OVERALL RISE OF 9.3 PERCENT

The total number of serious crimes in the United States in 1958 was given as 1,553,922, or 896.9 per 100,000 for a total population of 173,260,329.

The report revealed crime increased 9.3 percent in 1958 over 1957, as a crime was committed every 20.3 seconds during 1958.

There were increases in all of the individual classifications as follows:

Murder, 8,182 in 1958 and 8,027 in 1957, an increase of 1.9 percent; forcible rape, 14,561 and 12,866, 13 percent; robbery, 75,247 and 66,843, 12.7 percent; aggravated assault, 113,530 and 110,672, 2.6 percent; burglary, 679,787 and 603,707, 12.6 percent; larceny over $50, 391,550 and 354,972, 10.3 percent; auto theft, 270,965 and 265,178, 2.2 percent.

RECORD FOR YOUTHS

Youths under 18 represented only 12.1 percent of all persons arrested. They accounted, however, for 64.1 percent of all arrests for auto theft, 49.9 percent of those for burglary, 48.5 percent of those for larceny, 30.9 percent of those for receiving or possessing stolen property, and 22.8 percent of those for robbery.

Crime increased more than five times as fast as the population.

The New York Times Analyzes the Educational Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the basic principles of our Founding Fathers—as expressed by farsighted Thomas Jefferson—was the ideal of an enlightened electorate.

In this science-attuned world of today this has been expanded to mean education of people through high school and partially through college. We have come to recognize that it is our duty to prepare our young people for the many and varied activities and pursuits of our present day and to teach them to adapt to the changes of a world in which ideas as well as ways of living change with dizzying speed. This is one of the greatest tasks, duties, and objectives of our democracy.

The New York Times discusses this in a recent editorial. It points to the opportunity for improving the world by education if we but desire it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times for Monday, August 31, 1959, entitled "The Educational Revolution."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDUCATIONAL REVOLUTION

Within a few days the "back to school" movement will be getting started again. As we look forward to another school year the National Commissioner of Education, Dr. Lawrence G. Derthick, has given out some interesting and significant figures. It is a good thing to see our whole educational structure in some sort of focus.

In this year one person out of every four in the United States will be in school. In the so-called critical age group, 14 to 17, which covers most of the high school body, 9 out of every 10 persons will be enrolled. At the top level, college enrollment will get close to 4 million, with 3,780,000 expected.

Naturally this continuing increase in enrollment poses the expected problems. There will be a shortage of qualified teachers. There will, in many communities, be inadequate classroom space. In some institutions there will be conspicuous limitations on admissions. There will be, at every turn, one ground or another for viewing with alarm.

To look only at these problems is shortsighted. They are not insoluble, although they may often be complex and difficult. What must be remembered is that we are in the very midst of a gigantic social revolution in which the changing and expanding place of the whole educational pattern is one phase. Within less than two generations we have come, quite unconsciously, to accept the thesis that formal education, even at the higher levels, is a natural and expectable part of our society. When 9 out of every 10 children of high school age, for example, are actually in high school we have adopted a norm of behavior. When nearly 4 million students are expected in institutions of higher learning we are making a different sort of use of those institutions.

Education, in short, is no longer merely a specialized and restricted learning process. It is a function of a democratic society. This may not be working out in precisely the way that Thomas Jefferson had in mind when he insisted that an enlightened electorate was the only real assurance of good governance. On the other hand, it is working out in such a way that we take it for granted, now, that every child and young adult must have an opportunity to enjoy as much of that enlightenment as he can absorb.

Having made that assumption, we are constantly faced with problems of adjustment and adaptation, as well as those involved in gigantic expansion. We are being obliged to set a variety of standards for various aspects of this huge educational structure. Obviously no one thing is likely to be right in all cases, nor is anything likely to be wrong in all, so long as so many dedicated persons are giving their attention, imagination, and devotion to meeting these problems as they arise. What all of us need to do is to recognize that we are living in the midst of a greatly changing world and that we have an opportunity to make changes for the better, if we so desire.

Defense Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, in their book, "U.S.A., Second-Class Power?" Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson set forth a series of incidents in which they spell out influences in the obtaining of defense contracts, giving rise to excessive cost in our defense program. The Hébert committee, headed by Congressman F. EDWARD HÉBERT, of Louisiana, which is investigating the subject of influence by retired military officers and defense officials in the obtaining of Government contracts, heard testimony of Mr. Pearson.

I believe an article by Drew Pearson contained in the Washington Merry-Go-Round, August 18, 1959, will explain the viewpoint of representatives of defense contractors in their relations with the Pentagon. Defense lobbying may be considered as the giving of information or the attempt to influence according to the tendency to be gullible or critical.

Mr. Pearson's remarks will prove interesting and informative reading:

DREW PEARSON SAYS: "ADROIT DEFENSE LOBBYING COSTS TAXPAYERS MILLIONS; WESTERN ELECTRIC LOBBYIST WON'T ADMIT HE'S LOBBYING; HE MERELY GIVES INFORMATION"

(By Drew Pearson on the Washington Merry-Go-Round)

WASHINGTON.—A lobbyist may repent, but he seldom learns. This is what Congressman EDDIE HÉBERT of Louisiana discovered while grilling Vice President C. R. Smith of Western Electric regarding his lobbying efforts to continue an Army missile contract even though contrary to Eisenhower policy.

Western Electric has long demonstrated its ability to get what it wants out of the Eisenhower administration even when it opposes Eisenhower policy. It, together with its parents company, American Telephone & Telegraph, was sued for antitrust violation during the Truman administration. But when Ike took over, the two companies virtually thumbed their noses at the Justice Department and got Charlie Wilson, then Secretary of Defense, to write a letter demanding that the suit be dropped. Eventually it was.

Later, the Defense Department also tangled with Western Electric—and came out second best. It planned to curtail the Nike-Hercules missile which partially duplicates the Bomarc missile. But Western Electric, together with Douglas Aircraft, both manufacturing the Nike, launched a lobbying campaign to continue their profitable contract. In the end they won. Both the Bomarc and the duplicating Nike-Hercules are being continued—at double expense to the taxpayer.

LOBBYIST SQUIRMS

Congressman HÉBERT, who's probing the munitions lobby, tried to get Vice President Smith to admit Western Electric was lobbying.

"I can't believe for a minute anything we would do would have any effect on Congress," insisted Smith. "We certainly wouldn't want to do anything like that."

"Then what purpose was served in going to the Senate Appropriations Committee?"

"We just wanted to give the Senators information."

"You really went to put your position as to why this cutback should not be made," suggested the Congressman from Louisiana.

"No, sir," replied Smith. "Merely to let the public know how we felt about it."

"Then why go to the Senate Appropriations Committee?" repeated HÉBERT.

"To let them know how we felt."

"Regarding the cutback?"

"No, sir."

"I'm still trying to find out why you went to the Appropriations Committee," queried HÉBERT wearily.

But he got no satisfactory answer. Trying another tack, he asked: "Why did you go to Governor Hodges of North Carolina and to the Congressman (CHARLES JONAS) in whose district your plant is located?"

"We work very closely with those gentlemen and try to keep them posted on the employment situation in our North Carolina plant," replied Smith. "We have about 17,000 employees down there."

"Yes, but you would expect them to do what?" asked the committee chairman.

LOBBYING IS NOT LOBBYING

"I don't know what action they would take," answered Smith. "I would expect that they might raise some questions as to the cutback."

"And to whom would they raise these questions?" queried HÉBERT.

Mr. SMITH. "I would suspect that the questions probably would be raised here in Washington."

Mr. HÉBERT. "To the Defense Department?"

Mr. SMITH. "Yes, sir."

Mr. HÉBERT. "They would then come forward in an effort not to allow your employment to be cut—is that correct?"

Mr. SMITH. "I would think they would raise some questions; yes, sir."

Mr. HÉBERT. "Of course, they would raise questions. Whatever word you want to use, Mr. Smith, is all right with me."

Mr. SMITH. "Maybe we were ill advised, sir, in doing that. But at the time it seemed to make sense."

Mr. HÉBERT. "Are you going to continue to do it, if you were ill advised in the past?"

Mr. SMITH. "No, sir."

Mr. HÉBERT. "In other words, from now on you are not going to inform the Congressman from the district that is affected or the Governor of the State?"

Mr. SMITH. "If it is not the proper thing to do, of course we are not going to. I would need a little instruction, I think, in that regard."

Mr. HÉBERT. "You said you were ill advised. So I asked you if you were going to do it again. If you are ill advised in the first place, what are you going to do in the second place?"

But the vice president of Western Electric was incorrigible. "Well, sir, I think we have an obligation to keep these gentlemen informed," he said.

Mr. HÉBERT. "Therefore you will keep them informed though it is ill advised?"

Mr. SMITH. "I beg your pardon?"

At this point Republican Congressman LEON GAVIN rushed to Smith's defense.

All this is one reason why the taxpayers have to spend so much money for national defense.

GTA Daily Radio Roundup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA Daily Radio Roundup, prepared by the GTA public relations department, St. Paul, Minn., on Wednesday, August 26, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP OF AUGUST 26, 1959

Here's a good question: With what group do you associate the word "subsidies"? The answer: Farmers. So says Editor Dick Hanson, of Successful Farming magazine, in a full-page editorial in his most recent issue. He says he'd be surprised if 9 out of 10 city people didn't answer the question that way.

But he explains that there are two sides to every story. And on the question of subsidies the other side hasn't been mentioned very often. So the magazine publishes a list, made up by the U.S. Budget Bureau, of "aids and special services" for the year ended last June 30.

Now here's the Budget Bureau's list of subsidies paid by Uncle Sam:

To business: One and a half billion dollars in airline and shipping subsidies, navigation aids, postal subsidies, patent service, rivers and harbors work, and so on. Also, oil-depletion allowances are a tax break for the oil industries amounting to more billions of dollars.

To labor: $744 million for unemployment compensation and mine safety work.

To veterans: $5 billion for compensation and pension benefits, hospitals, medical, and readjustment programs.

To other nations: $1.4 billion for economic aid plus $2.3 billion for military aid.

To agriculture: $1.9 billion for price supports, soil bank, sugar, and wool subsidies.

In addition, other subsidies benefit so many people at home and abroad that it is hard to pin them down to any certain group. They include $1.5 billion for Public Law 480 which fights communism and aids less privileged nations and at the same time uses up some American farm surpluses. Government officials disagree as to what this should be charged to so they are tossing it into the farm budget now. Then some $2.3 billion are being spent for public assistance to those in need here at home, the aged, blind, disabled, needy children. Also, for school lunches, hospital operation, the public health service, and so forth.

All told, says Successful Farming, subsidies paid by Uncle Sam come to an amazing and largely unpublicized total of $6.5 billion about one-fifth of total Government spending. The farm subsidy is only about 10 percent of the total subsidy bill.

In the light of the above list, concludes Editor Hanson, it would seem that those who associate subsidies solely with agriculture have their heads buried deeply in the sands of ignorance.

That's the subsidy story, as told by Successful Farming magazine. These radio reports are a service to the upper Midwest by the farmers who own and operate GTA, the co-op way.

Summing Up and Looking Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include an editorial appearing in the Boston Traveler of August 22, 1959, entitled, "Summing Up and Looking Ahead." Of particular interest in this editorial is the quotation from a speech made in Leningrad in 1931 by Dimitri Manuilsky, a high Soviet official, when he addressed the Lenin School of Political Welfare of the U.S.S.R., and who years later presided at the United Nations. The statement made by him at that time is one of the fundamental plan, intents, and purposes of international communism, and of the Soviet Union, and the quotation from his speech follows:

War between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years.

To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. Capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction.

As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist.

In my remarks I also call attention to a quotation from a speech made by a truly great American, the late President Theodore Roosevelt, which speech was made at Asheville, N.C., many years ago. At that time President Roosevelt said:

The things that will destroy America are prosperity at any price, peace at any price, safety first instead of duty first, the love of soft living, and the get-rich-quick theory of life.

In a speech made many years ago in San Francisco, the late President also said:

Americanism is a question of spirit, conviction and purpose, not of creed or birthplace.

It is well for Americans of this time and generation to remember those statements.

The editorial follows:

SUMMING UP AND LOOKING AHEAD

Ever since it was announced that President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Khrushchev would get together in Washington, a loose-thinking segment of the American public has been making plans for everlasting peace.

Millions of otherwise intelligent people have been daydreaming about big disarmament cuts, tax reductions, a lowered cost of living and all the other advantages that normally approach as the threat of war recedes.

"Khrushchev is coming," they reason. "He'll learn to like us and he'll put away his missiles."

But that attitude is not only infantile, it's dangerous.

To keep it at bay, we'd do well to remember a speech made by Dimitri Manuilsky, a high Soviet official, when he addressed the Lenin School of Political Welfare of the U.S.S.R. in Leningrad in 1931. Manuilsky, who years later presided at the United Nations, had this to say:

"War between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years.

"To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep, so we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. Capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction.

"As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Those words are still on the Soviet books. They echo the earlier threats of Lenin. They fit neatly with the announced objective of Soviet communism, to dominate the entire world. They have never been refuted, nor has the objective ever been renounced.

And no matter what quips or smiles or good fellowship talks Khrushchev may produce as he goes bumbling around the United States, he is not going to change basic Soviet Communist philosophy. We'll still be on communism's critical target list when Nikita goes home, just as we were when Manuilsky made his speech 28 years ago.

We can expect, however, to see some necessary cutbacks in defense budgeting in the weeks immediately ahead. And several administration officials, frankly, are grateful for the timing of the Khrushchev visit, since it apparently will ease cold war tensions and make military cutbacks more palatable.

As the Wall Street Journal puts it, quoting a Pentagon policymaker:

"After all, we're no longer waiting for a war to break out in Berlin any day. It'll be easier now to convince the public and Congress that cancelling marginal weapons programs will be a wise move."

In other words, we were going to have to trim part of our weapons program this year anyhow. And the air of false optimism created by Nikita's decision to come over and take a look at us will dilute some of the criticism of the cutbacks.

The surgery that's about to be performed on military hardware probably will not shake our defense spending this year from its $41 billion level. But it will mean less spending on certain items in the years just ahead.

Secretary of Defense McElroy has decided, for example, that the Air Force can get along with 32 new B–58 medium bombers instead of 40 as planned, which means a saving of $200 million. Plans for the new souped-up version of the B–58 have been dropped, on the ground that it would be obsolete when ready.

The Air Force B–70 supersonic bomber and the F–108 fighter, each designed to fly at 2,000 miles an hour, are being threatened with cancellation moves. The chief objection in the Budget Bureau is that both planes might be outstripped by missile age developments before becoming effective.

The Army faces the possible loss of its Nike-Zeus antimissile missile. Critics of this missile have not been convinced of its capabilities, and they point out that to keep the program in operation another 3 or 4 years would cost $10 billion. The Army also wants an additional $4 billion at once for modern ground weapons and a boost in manpower. But the Pentagon doesn't appear to be impressed by the need.

The Navy warns that 81 percent of its ships will be worn out or obsolete in the next 3 to 5 years. But nevertheless, it's going to have to trim its shipbuilding plans in general if it wants to go ahead with its Polaris submarine and atomic carrier projects.

Meanwhile, several military missiles now in the experimental stage may be dropped, including the powerful ocean-spanning Titan. The Pentagon trend is to concentrate more effort on fewer missiles rather than to spread thin effort over too many.

All of this does not mean necessarily that we're weakening our defenses or our national security. What it means instead is that the Defense Department wants to take a closer look at where its billions are being spent, and to trim waste and duplication wherever possible, even at the sacrifice of somebody's pet project.

As one Pentagon official explains it:

"Our weapons plan is like a cornfield. We plant lots of seeds and later thin out those that aren't growing too well."

There will be opposition to these cutbacks, but the false glow of harmony that Khrushchev's visit will create is bound to soften that opposition in many political quarters. Once he starts bouncing and babbling on his good will tour, it will be more difficult than usual to stir up resentment back home against military cutbacks.

But we should be careful not to let the public lower its guard too far.

Manuilsky meant what he said, when he threatened to use the clenched fist.

And what has Khrushchev ever said or done to alter the threat?

Nixon Committee Takes a New Tone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nixon Committee Takes a New Tone," published in the Denver Post on August 19, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIXON COMMITTEE TAKES A NEW TONE

When President Eisenhower asked Vice President NIXON last January to head a Special Cabinet Committee on Price Stability and Economic Growth, the main idea was to emphasize the administration's battle against inflation.

The committee dutifully issued an interim report in June, warning that inflation imperiled U.S. prosperity and taking issue with economists who argued otherwise.

Last weekend, in a second report, the Nixon committee registered a significant change in tone.

While it reiterated the need for stable prices, its major emphasis was on economic growth. The word inflation wasn't mentioned at all.

The new emphasis appears to represent an important step forward in the administrations' economic thinking. NIXON and his Cabinet colleagues seem to be recognizing two important points.

The first is that the danger of inflation is not as great now as it was thought to be earlier in the year.

Congress is likely to balance the Federal budget. A wage increase in steel, if one is granted, will probably be moderate.

Consumer prices, which have remained relatively stable for more than a year, are not expected to show any marked upward spurt.

The second is that fighting inflation is not an end in itself but only a means of promoting the overall well-being of the American economy.

In its preoccupation with the inflation problem, the administration has appeared at times to be losing sight of the broader aims of economic policy.

The battle against inflation has to be reconciled with the need of the economy for more plant and equipment, more production, and more jobs.

It must also be reconciled with the need of the American people—for more schools, more roads, more urban renewal, more reclamation, and more effective defense against Communist aggression.

One of the difficulties in fighting inflation is that the conventional method calls for an attack on spending.

If the attack succeeds, consumers will spend less money on installment purchases, small businessmen will spend less on new plant and equipment, the Government will spend less on the schools and roads the Nation needs.

The drop in spending can be expected to reduce the pressure on prices, bringing some of them down and keeping others stable.

The trouble is that a good deal of spending is necessary to sustain prosperity and the necessary expansion of the American economy.

If the anti-inflation measures work too well, the economy could stop in its tracks and the Nation would have to struggle through another recession.

Meanwhile, educational and other needs of the people would be unmet.

So the Government must proceed against inflation with an alert eye to see that the growth and well-being of the Nation are not impaired in the process.

In the latest report of the Nixon committee, there is new evidence that the administration understands the danger. The committee's new emphasis on economic growth is a step in the right direction.

Remarks of Hon. John F. Kennedy, Democrat, of Massachusetts, Before AFL–CIO Convention, Seaside, Oreg., August 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, recently the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, addressed the Oregon State AFL–CIO Convention, at Seaside, Oreg. His remarks were very appropriately directed to the subject of the pending labor reform legislation. Senator KENNEDY, in characteristic fashion, refused to duck the issue, refused to equivocate, refused to waver before the controversial nature of his work and his bill. The Seaside speech by this great American was a superb discussion of labor legislation, and of other vital issues before the American people. It is with a good deal of pride that I include this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF SENATOR JOHN F. KENNEDY, DEMOCRAT, OF MASSACHUSETTS, AFL–CIO CONVENTION, SEASIDE, OREG., MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 1959

It is a high honor to have this opportunity to participate in the discussions of this illustrious convention. In many ways I may be considered a fugitive from the most restrictive closed shop in the country—the U.S. Senate. We have a guaranteed annual wage for 6 years—but we have no job security, no pay for overtime, no unemployment compensation, and no assurance that our contract will be renewed. The strange part about our closed shop is that there are plenty of workers who want to take our place—but none of our current union members ever want to go out on strike.

In any event, I hope that I can—in the words of the oldtime orators—claim kinship here and have it allowed. I have been closely associated with the leaders and members of the AFL–CIO for 13 years, while serving on the Labor Committees of the House and Senate. And my credentials are written in the record of those 13 years. I come to you today as a friend of labor—I have never concealed or apologized for my friendship with labor, and I do not intend to start now.

Neither do I apologize, I should make clear, to my friends in organized labor for the record of recent years. Jimmy Hoffa may not approve of me—but I do not apologize for having earned his hostility. John L. Lewis may not approve of even the original Kennedy bill, as endorsed by the AFL–CIO—but I make no apologies for that legislation.

THE LABOR BILL AND INVESTIGATIONS

I do not say that the bill as it finally passed the Senate was perfect in every respect. Certainly I do not blame the AFL–CIO for trying to change some of the amendments added on the Senate floor. Certainly I share their regret that the reasonable, fair and responsible bill reported by the Senate Labor Committee—worked out carefully with President Meany and his lawyers, and supported by the executive council—was altered, undesirably and unfortunately altered, on the floor of a supposedly friendly Senate. But that debate—and the vote on the so-called McClellan bill of rights amendment—showed you and me the political facts of life which confronted us. And when that amendment carried by a one vote margin, we were forced to go on the defensive to prevent the antilabor forces from completely taking over.

It is easy to say that none of this would have happened had there been no Kennedy labor bill at all, going back to 1958—or to accuse George Meany and the executive council of making a tactical error in supporting responsible reform legislation in 1958 and 1959. But remember, if you will, that our only other alternative last year was to accept the Knowland bill of rights. Let us not forget that we succeeded in defeating those repressive amendments on the Senate floor only because Senator MORSE and I gave our assurance that a reform bill would be forthcoming from our committee; and the AFL–CIO executive council agreed there had to be a bill.

In short, there was a vacuum there, which the Knowlands and the Goldwaters and the Mundts were determined to fill—and it was my responsibility, as chairman of the Labor Subcommittee, to see that we reported a bill aimed at hoodlums and racketeers, not at collective bargaining. So I could only be gratified by the fact that in both years my bill has been endorsed by the AFL–CIO, attacked by Mr. Hoffa on the one hand, attacked by the NAM and the chamber of commerce on the other—and cosponsored both years by the man who is probably the most distinguished labor law expert in the Senate, Oregon's senior Senator WAYNE MORSE.

So I repeat: I have no apologies. I do not say these have been easy assignments, working on the bill and serving on the McClellan committee. There have been unpleasant occasions—there have been mistakes on both sides—and there have been some disagreements among friends. There has been a tendency among some people to lump in one confusing indictment both the Kennedy brothers, all the labor bills and all the McClellan committee investigations. I could have avoided service on the McClellan committee—as others did. I could have left the Labor Committee—as others did—for a less sensitive assignment. But bear in mind the fact that, along with Senator MCNAMARA—later succeeded by Senator CHURCH—we constituted a small minority on the McClellan committee. To leave the committee—or to abandon efforts in my own committee for a bill—would have simply turned the field over to the GOLDWATERS, the MUNDTS and the coalition of Republicans, aided by a small group of Democrats, who still control the Senate on these critical issues (as they did just 10 days ago in recommitting my bill to repeal the loyalty oath).

The danger now is that this same kind of Republican-southern Democratic coalition in the House of Representatives will substitute for a responsible committee bill, an antilabor, unworkable, punitive measure—and I hope you are lending your efforts to prevent that.

I did not intend to take this much of your time in presenting my own credentials—and I hope you will excuse these personal refer-

ences. I only wanted to make clear what I said at the outset: that I come to you today as a friend of labor.

Certainly there has been nothing in the findings of the McClellan committee to change my attitude about the labor movement as a whole. There are roughly half a million local union officials in this country, another half a million business agents, lawyers, and other paid officials, and another 750,000 shop stewards and others employed in serving the labor movement. Of these nearly 2 million labor leaders, the select committee has neither investigated nor received complaints about more than the tiniest fraction—considerably less than one-hundredth of 1 percent.

The union movement, like any other part of American life, has its share of wrongdoers and corruption. But when we hear about bankers who embezzle funds, or financiers who misuse trusts, or politicians who betray the public, we don't condemn all bankers or all financiers or—I hope—all politicians. Why, then, should we penalize the labor movement as a whole? There is no reason whatsoever why anyone should blacken labor's name and restrict its legitimate activities simply because a few bad apples have been found in the barrel—and I hope we can make the press and public realize that fact.

THE ROLE OF MANAGEMENT

It is easier, I know, for the press and public to play up the misdeeds of the few hoodlums who have infiltrated the labor movement. But if that is true, then it is high time they also played up the findings of the McClellan committee concerning the misdeeds of management and the business community. It is time that the public recognized the employers' responsibility for labor-management racketeering. Our committee found numerous employers, large and small, collaborating in these racketeering practices—preventing legitimate unions from entering their plants—using mobsters to force their competitors out of business—financing the racketeers and their illicit operations in order to obtain their help in breaking strikes. I think it is clear that we are not going to get rid of the Dave Becks and the Jimmy Hoffas in this country until we get rid of the Nathan Sheffermans.

The NAM and the chamber of commerce do not like the Kennedy bill as it was reported by the Senate Labor Committee—they do not like the bill which Congresswoman GREEN has helped report in the House Labor Committee—they do not even like the bill in the form in which it passed the Senate. I think it ought to be obvious by now that they do not really want any bill at all unless it completely paralyzes labor at the bargaining table. They are not interested in penalizing irresponsible racketeers—they are interested only in penalizing responsible labor leaders. They want either repressive legislation or no legislation at all. They are more interested in breaking the power of unions at the bargaining table than they are in breaking the power of hoodlums.

They don't want racketeering to be eliminated. They would rather have a political issue—an old reliable whipping boy. They want a legislative vacuum, which they can then fill at the Federal and State level with the worst repressive measures you have ever seen. Despite the results of last fall, they are still talking about so-called right-to-work legislation. And I want to make it unalterably clear once again that I am now, always have been, and always will be completely opposed to right-to-work legislation in any form at any level.

NEW ISSUES

We face these same hostile forces on a number of other issues of importance to labor, as you know. I realize that there are some cynics, to be sure, who say that there is no longer any need for such action. They say that there are no longer any major issues—that the battles of the past have all been won—and that the American public in general, and our workers in particular, can now sit back and enjoy what they have achieved during the past 30 years.

But I am certain that no one in this hall agrees with that analysis. For the problems are not all solved and the battles are not all won and the issues are not all gone.

On the contrary, our agenda today is, if anything, even longer than it was in the 1930's. We have not yet eliminated the malignant effects of poverty, injustice and illness from the land. We can be encouraged by the recent trend toward reduction in unemployment but we can feel no elation while nearly 4 million people are still searching for work—and those that are still able to receive unemployment compensation checks must get by on an average benefit check of less than $31 a week. We have not yet met the needs of nearly 7 million families, in this, the richest land on earth, still trying to get by on less than $2,000 a year. We have not yet met the needs of some 15 million families housed under what the Bureau of the Census classifies as substandard conditions—of nearly 17 million persons who are unable to purchase enough food to achieve a bare subsistence diet. We have not yet ended the waste of our natural resources—reversed the decay that is blighting so many of our major cities—or, most tragic of all, found the means of stopping man's destruction of man.

Far from being a period of resting on past achievements, the period which lies ahead confronts the American economy with an unprecedented challenge. We can no longer invoke the solutions of the past—the programs and the policies which served us so well during the last generation. For now, once again, the age of consolidation is over—and, once again, the age of change and challenge has come upon us. We are faced with a whole new set of problems—a whole new set of dimensions. We are approaching the day of a 200 million population, a $600 billion gross national product, a trillion dollar economy. We are at the edge of this Nation's greatest age of expansion, growth, and abundance—at the edge of a new era for our Nation, our world, and all mankind.

This Congress—the Democratic 86th Congress—must lay the groundwork for the next 25 years—just as the 73d Congress in 1933, during the first 90 days of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal, laid the groundwork for the generation that followed.

And there are three items in particular requiring action by the Congress to make certain that this great new abundance which lies ahead—this unparalleled prosperity—is shared by all Americans. There are three gaps, serious gaps, in income protection; and those who fall into those gaps must look to the Congress for assistance. I am talking about the unemployed, the aged, and retired, and the unorganized workers who are unable to receive even a decent minimum wage.

INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

There are those who say we cannot afford to increase minimum wages to $1.25 an hour and that we cannot afford to extend the law any further, and, with the cosponsorship of Senator MORSE, I have introduced the bill to carry out these obligations, and hope to report it to the floor next week. But I am convinced that we cannot afford to do less. Department of Labor statistics show that the average single worker, much less a family man, cannot survive on a wage of $1 an hour. Department of Labor statistics show that, since the dollar level was set 4 years ago, prices have risen substantially, productivity has risen substantially, and wage rates have risen substantially. But the head of that Department, the Republican Secretary of Labor, nevertheless came before our subcommittee this summer and opposed paying all American workers a decent wage. Substandard wages, inevitably, mean poor health, low efficiency, and great personal tragedies. This is what America cannot afford. Our greatest asset in the race for industrial supremacy is a strong, healthy, vital labor force. Our greatest handicap would be an ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed labor force.

Unions such as yours cannot assume the full burden. The unprotected, unorganized workers at the bottom of the economic scale can only look to the Congress for protection—and Congress must provide that protection this year in the Kennedy-Morse bill.

STRENGTHENING UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

If we are to meet the challenge of the future we must also modernize our unemployment insurance system. When enacted, it provided benefits to workers large enough and long enough to enable them to pay their rent, their grocery bills and their doctor bills until work could be found. It was intended to put back into the community at least 50 percent of the loss in wage payments.

But a schedule of unemployment compensation payments that was adequate 21 years ago is grossly inadequate today. Less than 20 percent of lost wages is replaced today. Whatever data you may hear about prosperity, there has been a disturbing increase in the number of persons without a job for 4 months or longer. In many States that means the complete exhaustion of meager benefits and reliance upon either the bounty of relatives or public assistance. That is not the choice we should offer in a country with the highest industrial capacity in the world. Along with Senator MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, I have introduced a bill to give all unemployed workers at least one-half their pay for at least 39 weeks. I believe in our programs of foreign aid and mutual security—but we should also take care of our own. And the place to begin is by enacting decent nationwide standards for unemployment compensation.

IMPROVING CARE OF THE AGED

Third and finally is the challenge offered by the increasing number of older persons in our population. The death rate in this country has been cut in half during the 20th century. In 1900, a baby girl born into a nation where influenza, pneumonia, tuberculosis, and typhoid still took a high toll—where public sanitation was rare, nutrition was inadequate, and medical science was barely underway—could expect to live some 48 years. Today she could expect to live to the age of 73—and soon 10 percent of our population will be over the age of 65.

But their social security checks have been eaten away by inflation—their chronic illnesses are not covered by group insurance. Their housing needs are unmet. Those still able to work are the first to be fired and the last to be rehired. They are, in the words of the song, "too old to work and too young to die." The treatment of its older citizens is said by anthropologists to be one of the most basic tests of how civilized a society or nation has become. Surely the rich, powerful, democratic United States of America is not going to fail that test. These three items are, of course, only the beginning of our agenda. But the important thing now is to get started. This is no time for mere oratory instead of action. This is no time for halfway measures—for inaction or inertia. It is a time to move ahead—to meet the challenge of the future—to remember the words of Justice Holmes, that "whether we sail with the wind or against the wind, we must above all set sail—and not drift or lie at anchor."

Statement of Need for Revision of Code on Interstate Extradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to revise the Federal statute on interstate extradition—18 United States Code, No. 3182—to do away with the requirement of Governors' warrants in the demanding and rendering States and confine the hearing in the rendering State to a review by habeas corpus.

Let us look at a common example of present extradition procedure. A police department in Indiana has a bench warrant for the arrest of John Smith, who has recently moved to California. The Indiana police send the warrant or a telegraph message to the law enforcement agencies in California, and Smith is arrested, thrown in jail, and bond is set—arrest prior to requisition is authorized by Nos. 13 and 14 of the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act. California officers then wire the Indiana officers that a hearing on the extradition will be held 30 days later—often without telling Smith he can waive extradition or often giving him the erroneous impression that signing the waiver constitutes an admission of guilt. The Indiana officer then takes a copy of the indictment or affidavit to the Indiana Governor for certification that Smith has been substantially charged with a crime in Indiana. When he reaches California, he must get a California Governor's warrant and present all these papers at the extradition hearing in the court of the jurisdiction where Smith is held—see No. 10 of the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act. Meanwhile, Smith has been sitting in jail for 30 days.

The present redtape procedure has become routine and is merely a cumbersome hangover from the internation concept of asylum for political prisoners which is unworkable on the interstate level and contrary to the modern American concept of full cooperation among sister States embodied in the full faith and credit clause of article IV. Section 2, clause 2, of that article makes extradition of criminals between the States a part of the supreme law of the land, and is not governed entirely by comity and agreements between the States. It has been so handled in recent years by the passage in the States of the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act because of the failure of Congress to provide detailed legislation on the subject.

The statute—now 18 United States Code, No. 3182—which was passed in 1793 to implement article IV, section 2, clause 2, has remained substantially unchanged since that date. It was drafted from the provision in the Articles of Confederation and was intended to provide an efficient method to secure the return of fugitives by using the swift and influential means of communication and transportation available only to the Governors in those pioneer times. Its design was, in effect, to eliminate for this purpose the boundaries of States so that each State could reach out and bring to speedy trial offenders against its laws—see *Biddinger* v. *Police Commissioner* (245 U.S. 128 (1917)). But, in our modern era of rapid communication and transportation and of close cooperation between the local law-enforcement officers of the sister States, a procedure that at an earlier time expedited the return of fugitives has now become an obstruction to the swift administration of the law.

I feel this proposal is sound because the issue in extradition is not the guilt or innocence of the accused, and no substantive right is being destroyed. The constitutional framework and relevant statutory and case law do not recognize a right of asylum for fugitives from justice of the States. The use of Governors partially led to the result—among other factors, such as the fact fugitive was a Negro from the South escaped to the North just before the Civil War—in *Kentucky* v. *Dennison* (24 How. 66 (1860)) where the Supreme Court held that, even though the Constitution and the statute used the word "shall" and the duty to extradite was ministerial and not discretionary, it would not compel a Governor by mandamus to perform this duty. I feel that the Court here was not only influenced by the political circumstances of the time but also was recognizing an immunity from suit of the Governor of the State, and if given the occasion to decide a similar case where Governors are not involved, it could reach a different decision. It has been held that both Federal and State courts can control lesser State officials by mandamus—see discussion of the distinction in *Huidekoper* v. *Hadley* (177 Fed. 1, 11 (1910)); *General Oil Company* v. *Crain* (209 U.S. 211 (1908)); see also note 85 in 66 Yale L.J. 97, 113).

For these reasons I believe that the use of Governors in interstate extradition proceedings is now outdated and unwise. But there remains the consideration of whether the use of Governors is essential to maintaining extradition procedures consistent with our constitutional scheme of a division of powers between State and Federal Government. The Constitution states:

> A person charged in any State * * * shall, on demand of the executive authority of the State from which he fled, be delivered up.

I think that executive authority is here broad enough to include law-enforcement officers and not necessarily Governors, and it would seem that Congress in legislation to implement this provision could so define the term. The 1793 statute used both of the terms—"executive authority" and "Governor"—implying that the two were not necessarily coextensive. Several cases have said "executive authority" is a general term and merely designates the branch of government, not a single individual—see "Words and Phrases"; *Comm.* v. *Hall* (75 Mass. 262, 267); *State* v. *Collett* (138 O. St. 425, 35 N.E. 2d 568, 570 (1941)).

The present scheme actually works a hardship on those accused of crime, who frequently refuse to waive extradition because of the erroneous impression that they are making some damaging admission of guilt by signing such papers, or because they are uninformed of their right to waive. Furthermore, the usual inability to post bond or failure of arresting authorities to inform him of his right to waive extradition or have bond, often results in the lengthy confinement of innocent persons who languish in jail awaiting the documents and hearings in the courts and before the Governors. Yet, the proposed revision will not in any way limit the present scope of review of extradition in the rendering State. The fugitive's right to habeas corpus remains unimpaired and guarantees the fullest extent of review to which he is presently entitled. This includes: First, correctness of the requisition papers; second, the relator's identity; third, whether relator is a "fugitive"; fourth, whether a crime is substantially charged. In fact, several cases indicate that review by habeas corpus is broader than on routine extradition hearing and includes the potential abuses of extradition process to aid in the service of civil process or where there is a threatened deprivation of constitutional rights—see discussion at 47 Col. L.R. 470; 23 S. Cal. L.R. 441.

Therefore, the proposed bill merely removes the cumbersome routine procedure which at present obstructs the speedy and efficient extradition of fugitive criminals without depriving the individual of any substantial right to challenge the validity of the extradition.

Ten Thousand Return to School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of this body a most excellent editorial which appeared in the Milford (Conn.) Citizen, on Sunday, August 30, 1959.

The editorial speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, and I wish to present it now for your consideration:

> HOW ABOUT THE TEN THOUSAND?
>
> Only 10 days from now nearly 10,000 boys and girls will swarm to Milford schools. They will meet new teachers, start a new year of adventures in education. There will be complaints from some parents whose children will have to walk where there are hazards.
>
> Thanks to the conscientious work of a faithful board of education and a competent school administration, the 10,000 will emerge from the classrooms next June with a solid year of educational advancement behind them.
>
> But it will be a difficult year because our swelling school population has once again

outgrown our school facilities, and our school budget has been shrunk so far that our children will be denied educational advantages most of their contemporaries in other towns will enjoy.

Through the long, hot summer days the schools have not been in the forefront of the news. This has been a summer in which Milford news has been dominated by politics.

But when the 10,000 hit the schools, their families will once again become painfully aware of our limited facilities.

We shall hear again the arguments about finance, and there will be many who will insist that Federal aid to education is dangerous. It will be argued short-sightedly and selfishly that Connecticut would not get its full share of such aid, as though ignorance elsewhere could not injure us.

And it will be argued that Federal aid to education would put Milford's schools under the control of the Federal Government. To be sure, local authority over education must be preserved. But to assume that Federal control would be a subversive influence displays a dangerous distrust of the officials we ourselves elect. Possibly we cannot find out enough about what our elected officials are doing, because of the thickening curtain of secrecy around them.

But if there is a sinister plot to put the school systems of America under a commissar and pump brainwashing fluid into young heads, it must be masterminded by patience unusual even in the smart politician.

Milford has been receiving Federal aid to education for some 5 years already, and there has not yet been a hand lifted to take control over the schools.

It is better to get the help needed to make our educational program adequate for today's needs, than to sacrifice it for a groundless fear of control that an informed public could throw off if it materialized.

The Agricultural Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the national shrine to agriculture is now becoming a reality. My home county of Wyandotte near Kansas City, Kans., was finally selected as the site for the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

When completed, the Agricultural Hall of Fame will be a national shrine to tell the story of agriculture and of the men and women who have contributed so much to it. This shrine will be composed of:

First. A museum portraying vividly the history of agriculture;

Second. A statutory hall where the immortals of agriculture will be honored;

Third. An agricultural library;

Fourth. An educational unit designed to familiarize children with agriculture;

Fifth. A farm village complete with a sod house, log cabins, and school buildings;

Sixth. An Indian village which portrays the practices and crops of the native Americans;

Seventh. An outdoor amphitheater for pageants, field events and special farm meetings;

Eighth. A special room to honor farmers who have distinguished themselves as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate; and

Ninth. An international shrine to honor farmers throughout the world.

Resolutions were approved commending, encouraging and sanctioning the development of the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

More than 50 cities throughout the Nation bid for this project. After thorough investigation, it was awarded to Kansas City, Kans. A site consisting of 409 acres surrounded by 300 acres of park land was offered by the city as part of its bid. It is located in my county of Wyandotte approximately 10 miles west of Kansas City on the Kansas Turnpike.

Dr. A. Webster Tenney, for a number of years beginning 1943, a specialist in agricultural education with the U.S. Office of Education and national executive secretary of the Future Farmers of America for 14 years, has been given a 5-year contract to actively administer the Agricultural Hall of Fame.

A financial drive headed by Raymond Firestone of Akron, Ohio, to obtain $5 million to complete this national shrine to agriculture is now in progress. The campaign is being financed in its early stages with $100,000 offered by the banks in the Kansas City area as a loan to provide operating funds.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Agricultural Committee, introduced a bill similar to mine, but urged that H.R. 5789 be considered since this hall of fame is to be located in my congressional district, for which I am very grateful.

The Future Farmers of America, Mr. Speaker, hold their annual conventions in Kansas City and the American Royal is located there. When the Agriculture Hall of Fame is completed, it will be a psychological boost for farmers everywhere.

The Kansas City Star recently published an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch which emphasizes the psychological value of this shrine to America, and which I include as part of my remarks:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch]

A PSYCHOLOGICAL BOOST FOR THE FARMER

Over the postwar years the farmer has become the economy's whipping boy. Geared to intensive war time production, but deprived of much of the world market; bedeviled by rising costs of labor and equipment, hagridden by overproduction and falling free market prices, he finds himself in a seemingly hopeless dilemma.

Taxpayers and consumers look at him with a jaundiced eye, as his electoral power wanes with his decline to 12 percent of the population.

He fears to continue precarious dependence on Government subsidies, but he's afraid to cast away the Federal crutches, lest he stumble, break a leg and lose his farm to the mortgagee.

In this doleful situation, the farmer is much in need of something to restore lost pride and the respect of fellow citizens.

What he needs is a psychological "pick-me-up." The Agricultural Hall of Fame being planned for some 400 acres in Wyandotte County, Kans., could be just what the doctor ordered.

The Hall of Fame is to be a national shrine to honor past and present farmers who, on their steady march westward, pioneered American civilization, and from crude beginnings developed the most efficient, most productive agriculture in world history.

City folk who think of cereal and milk as having come from the grocery store need to be reminded that the farm is the birthplace of our food and fiber, and that, in a very real sense, we are all dependent on the brain and brawn of the people who produce them, often in a desperate gamble against whims of the weather.

The proposed, centrally located shrine and museum to commemorate leading farmers, inventors, scientists and statesmen who did much to make this boon of plenty possible, will really be more than the words "Hall of Fame" suggest.

It will be to the history of American agriculture what Colonial Williamsburg signifies to the history of Virginia.

It could be a permanent source of inspiration to millions of farmers, and a mecca for visiting foreigners who come to study the evolution of American methods.

Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a poem entitled "Freedom," written by Thurza Gould of Hartford, Conn.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM

At dusk you lift the latch of the gate,
And later sit on your porch,
Smoking your pipe through the evening late,
Discussing subjects of all sorts,
Or you may just listen to the sea,
Breaking on wide sands somewhere,
And a mountain see in your fancy,
Supporting the sky on its shoulder.

This, then, by right you call your freedom;
Approaching footsteps outside
Your closed door bring no apprehension
That some danger may betide
Those within your house you hold most dear;
Freedom is all this—more, too;
It is filling your lungs with clean air,
And meeting each day anew.

It is all the things you do worthwhile—
It is the tilt of your chin
And bringing to some sad face a smile;
It's helping to rid the world of sin
That all may live by the Golden Rule,
All may worship as they please
And send their children to any school;
Freedom—it is you and these.

—*Thurza Gould.*

Sharp Decline in Aircraft Manufacturing Employment Stresses Further Need for Federal Legislation To Aid Distressed Economic Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release of September 2, 1959, issued by the Area Employment Expansion Committee, New York City, and a fact sheet released by the same organization on labor supply classifications and aircraft employment for 40 selected industry centers:

PRESS RELEASE BY AREA EMPLOYMENT EXPANSION COMMITTEE

NEW YORK, September 1.—Aircraft manufacturing has declined so sharply in the last 2 years that 14 of its principal centers show a substantial labor surplus and 9 are among the Nation's chronically distressed areas, with 6 percent or more unemployment for 18 months or longer.

These figures were revealed today by Solomon Barkin, secretary-treasurer of the Area Employment Expansion Committee, a citizens' group which is pressing for passage of the area redevelopment bill (S. 722) by Congress.

Aircraft employment has fallen 146,500, or 16.4 percent, from its peak of 892,000 in April 1957, Barkin said, with much of the loss concentrated in a relatively few communities. The drop has been 38,500 in the Los Angeles-Long Beach area; 11,200 in Buffalo; 9,600 in Dallas; 5,000 in New York City; 2,900 in Detroit; and only slightly below the latter figure in Chicago and Paterson, he reported.

"Thus aircraft has joined coal mining, textiles, automobile parts, pottery, and other shrinking industries that have inflicted severe and permanent distress upon many communities," Barkin said.

In 40 selected centers where there were 1,500 or more aircraft workers, this industry accounted for 30 percent of the job loss from May 1957 to May 1959, he went on.

"The fact that an industry so closely identified with modern progress has so quickly been affected is dramatic evidence of the need for Federal redevelopment legislation," Barkin added.

The creation of distressed areas is a natural byproduct of our highly dynamic economy, Barkin said, in which older industries and older plants give way to new.

"We can expect this process to accelerate along with the rate of technological change," he continued. "In itself, of course, such technological progress is more than welcome—it is essential.

"However, to achieve and maintain a stable and fully productive economy we must minimize the waste of manpower and capital that results from the collapse of an industry that has traditionally supported an established community. Federal aid must be available for such communities, where it is needed and where it is economically feasible, so they can get their full share of the new industries that arise to replace the old."

The alternative is the concentration of unemployment in those centers that have been hit hardest by the cyclical development of industry, Barkin said. This has been the case during the recent economic recovery, he noted, with the chronically distressed areas remaining static while the rest of the Nation moved toward prosperity.

[Release by Area Employment Expansion Committee, New York, N.Y.]

Fact sheet No. 39—Labor supply classifications and aircraft employment for 40 selected industry centers

[May 1957 and May 1959 classifications; May 1959 employment totals and changes since May 1957]

Area	Classification group		Aircraft employment	
	May 1959	May 1957	May 1959	Net change since May 1957
MAJOR LABOR MARKET AREAS				
Alabama: Birmingham	D	C	(1)	Decrease
Arizona: Phoenix	C	C	(1)	Decrease
California:				
Los Angeles-Long Beach	C	B	174,400	−38,500
Sacramento	B	C	(1)	Increase
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario	C	C	(1)	Increase
San Diego	C	B	55,700	−900
San Francisco-Oakland	C	C	2,700	−1,100
Colorado: Denver	C	B	10,112	+4,970
Connecticut:				
Bridgeport	E	B	(1)	Decrease
Hartford	C	A	(1)	Decrease
Georgia: Atlanta	C	B	(1)	Decrease
Illinois:				
Chicago	C	B	(1)	Decrease
Rockford	C	B	(1)	Decrease
Indiana:				
Indianapolis	C	B	(1)	Decrease
South Bend	D	C	(1)	Decrease
Iowa: Des Moines	B	B	(1)	Decrease
Kansas: Wichita	C	B	35,400	−9,250
Maryland: Baltimore	D	B	(1)	Decrease
Massachusetts: Boston	C	B	(1)	Decrease
Michigan: Detroit	F	C	[2] 4,600	[2] −2,900
Missouri: St. Louis	C	C	(1)	Decrease
New Jersey:				
Newark	D	C	4,000	−1,400
Paterson	D	C	(1)	Decrease
MAJOR LABOR MARKET AREAS—continued				
New York:				
Buffalo	E	C	7,813	−11,200
New York	D	C	31,600	−5,100
Ohio:				
Akron	C	B	(1)	Increase
Cincinnati	C	C	(1)	Decrease
Cleveland	C	B	12,750	−3,350
Columbus	C	B	(1)	Decrease
Dayton	B	C	3,300	−2,200
Hamilton-Middletown	C	C	(1)	Increase
Oklahoma: Tulsa	C	B	(1)	Decrease
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia	D	C	4,400	−1,800
Texas:				
Dallas	C	B	16,750	−9,562
Fort Worth	C	C	(1)	Decrease
Washington: Seattle	C	B	(1)	Increase
SMALLER AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS				
Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons	Surplus	Surplus	(1)	Decrease
Maryland: Hagerstown	do	Not classified	[3] [5]	[3] Decrease
Pennsylvania: Williamsport	do	do	(1)	[4] Decrease
Vermont: Burlington	do	do	(1)	[4] Increase
Total, 40 areas			602,026	−137,966

[1] Data not shown to avoid disclosure of information on individual establishments.
[2] Data for aircraft include some employment in motorcycles, bicycles, and miscellaneous transportation equipment.
[3] Data refer to April 1957 and April 1959.
[4] Data refer to March 1957.
[5] Data refer to June 1957.

Source: State employment security agencies.

Support of Proposed CCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Letters to the Star—Favors CCC," published in the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C., on Sunday, August 30, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERS TO THE STAR—FAVORS CCC

In your editorial of August 21, "No Need for a New CCC" you were, I judged, careful not to argue that there is no need for the sort of conservation work the enrollees might be expected to do. I am sure you realize that even before President Eisenhower introduced his policy of inaction or reduced action, with reference to conservation there was already plenty of need for that sort of work. Evidences of such a need exist within less than a hundred miles of this city. The same or similar need exists in most all parts of our country.

As for the cost, about $3 for each U.S. resident per year, I think we can manage that as well as many other, possibly less essential Government services.

It is true that a new plan will encounter some difficulties not encountered by the old. The fine corps of reserve officers, many of them engineers, which was available in the depression years will not be available now. Good leadership is essential to such a plan. I do have faith that Senator HUMPHREY and others interested in the reinstituted CCC will have an answer to that problem. There may be no great rush of enrollees. Not because of the lack of a depression, some areas are still depressed, but because many boys may not welcome the challenge of the outdoors life, regular hours and a certain flexing of muscle which any CCC program would promise. The boys might just prove me wrong there, too. The plan certainly deserves a thorough trial. Admittedly, the backers of such a plan did not present it as a reform school but if boys with criminal records or with such tendencies did happen to enroll the very nature of the life would do much to "straighten them out." Petty thievery in a barracks may not be difficult but it is often very unhealthful.

The life of a CCC boy would not be a bowl of jelly. The program would not solve all of our problems but it would do much for a rather large segment of our population which needs a helping hand. I say give the plan another try.

CHARLES L. STOUT.

America's Religious Freedom Omitted From U.S. Exhibit in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to an article which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, August 21, 1959, describing the American Exhibition in Moscow.

I think all of you will agree that the Christian Science Monitor is one of the most highly respected newspapers in America, and it is safe to presume that the reports of this newspaper's correspondents are factual and trustworthy.

It is because I have such profound confidence in the integrity of this newspaper that I was particularly disturbed about the following paragraph which was part of the story about the American Exhibit in Moscow in the August 21 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

The paragraph stated:

> There are also reports that many Soviet visitors have been both perplexed and disappointed that there was not more on religion and religious life in the United States at the exhibition.

It is indeed ironic that the following paragraph in this story is as follows:

> But in certain areas visitors' opinions appear to be highly favorable. One of these is the hi-fi area, which attracts a large number of young people who know a great deal about American music, particularly jazz.

While I have no reason to question the accuracy of the Christian Science Monitor report, in order to assure myself that this report was indeed correct, I sent an inquiry to Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, who only last week returned from an inspection of the American Exhibit in Moscow. I should like to point out here that Mr. Canham is also president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

In answer to my inquiry, Mr. Canham was kind enough to forward me the following reply:

> Yes, I agree that religious life in America could have been more effectively and explicitly presented. However, there were many pitfalls, including denominational pressures and probably difficulties with the Soviets. It is a subtle problem, since we need to persuade Russians of the real meaning of religion and religious freedom to Americans, not just formal worship as they have known it. It is gratifying that American guides and specialists have often been able to give meaningful and impressive answers to religious questions asked by Soviet visitors.

It is of particular interest to me that in his reply, Mr. Canham does confirm the fact that the Russian people are obviously asking questions about religion in America.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of these two reports, the Office of the American National Exhibition in Moscow has broken faith with me and the other Members of this Congress.

I should like to recall here that on May 1, 1959, the general manager of the American exhibition, Mr. Harold C. McClellan, assured me in a rather lengthy letter that the "pervasive influence of religion throughout the American society" would be adequately included in the exhibit.

For some time prior to receipt of Mr. McClellan's assurance, I had carried on considerable negotiations with both Mr. McClellan and the U.S. Information Agency to impress on these people that it is my firm belief that the American exhibit should show the Russian people the real dynamics of religious freedom as we know them in this country.

I had pointed out to Mr. McClellan and his associates that the very cornerstone of our freedom in the United States is our deep belief in the Almighty, and I had urged Mr. McClellan to provide perhaps a special exhibit dealing with the subject. Throughout my discussions with Mr. McClellan and his associates, I tried to impress the fact that millions of Russian people who will visit this American exhibit should be made aware that the very basis of our Republic is the spiritual foundation which gives us understanding and compassion in dealing with each other as Americans.

It was on the basis of my firm position on this subject that I received an assurance from Mr. McClellan by letter on May 1 that "we shall do our best to reflect properly the religious side of American life."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on the basis of this article in the Christian Science Monitor, Mr. McClellan has not kept his word, and I strongly urge that that the appropriate committee of this Congress undertake a full investigation to ascertain what factors came into play in omitting this very important aspect of our American life in the exhibit at Moscow.

Ever since the exhibit opened, we have seen press reports of severe censorship of the entire exhibition by Soviet officials. We have seen that our American authorities were not given a free hand in preparing the exhibit so that it would reflect the full meaning of freedom in this country. Only the other day the press carried stories that American officials were compelled to remove a photograph of a hungry child in China holding a bowl of rice.

It was my understanding that some 13 million American dollars have been spent on this exhibit, and I think it is the duty of this Congress to find out what factors were influential when the original agreement for this exhibition was reached with the Soviet authorities. It is my firm conviction that some study should be given to just how much backbone and stamina our American representatives have in dealing with the Soviet Union. There is no question in my mind that if they yield to the Soviet Union on the subject of an exhibit such as the one we are now financing in Moscow, then I hardly think they are capable of dealing with the Soviets on the more profound problems facing the survival of civilization.

I am deeply concerned that those who have set up this exhibit have put their greatest emphasis on the material wealth of American when actually our greatest strength as a nation lies in our spiritual foundation—our freedom of speech, our freedom of the press, our freedom of elections, our freedom of religion, our freedom of assembly.

I need not tell you how chagrined I am that while the organizers of this exhibit could not find sufficient space to tell the Soviet people about our great religious freedom, they did find sufficient resources to emphasize hi-fi and jazz.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing the entire text of Mr. McClellan's letter to me of May 1, 1959:

> OFFICE OF AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION IN MOSCOW,
> *May 1, 1959.*
>
> Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI,
> *House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR MR. PUCINSKI: I acknowledge receipt of your thoughtful letter of April 24 in reference to our conversation concerning the presentation of religion in the American National Exhibition in Moscow this summer.
>
> I have reviewed your letter and its enclosures very carefully and have discussed them with the policy experts on my staff and elsewhere in the executive branch of the Government. It remains my best judgment that we should not present a separate religious exhibit at Moscow, but rather that we should portray the pervasive influence of religion throughout the American society.
>
> I recently returned from Moscow where I have reviewed our plans with Ambassador Thompson, his top officials, and our own exhibit staff. I believe in all sincerity that we are following the proper approach.
>
> I should like to give you an idea of some of the ways we intend to present religion in the exhibit.
>
> 1. One of the most striking features of the architectural exhibit will be a set of panels devoted to churches and the creativity of American architecture in the religious tradition.

2. The two motion pictures to be shown at the exhibit will contain photographs of churches and people entering these churches. These two motion pictures are Circarama and the special seven-screen documentary on American life presently under production by Charles Eames.

3. There will be religious literature at the exhibition in the book, magazine, and newspaper section.

4. There will be an exhibit of university catalogs in which courses in religion will appear. There will also be a certain number of catalogs of theological schools.

5. There will be a considerable number of questions in the Ramac electronic calculating machine concerning statistics and information on religion in American life. I cannot yet tell you how many questions because they are still being prepared in the U.S. Information Agency.

6. The exhibit on the American worker in community life will contain phoographs and textual material on religious life in the community.

7. There will be some paintings with religious themes in the painting exhibit.

8. The large photographic exhibit, entitled "The Family of Man," has a considerable number of photographs depicting human belief in God.

9. The Gallery of Americans, which is a special exhibit composed of photographs of famous Americans, will include several of the national figures mentioned in your attachment and will include quotations which refer to the subject of religion.

10. Religious music will be included as part of the musical programs presented in both the high-fidelity area and the outside rest area.

Please accept again my appreciation of the time and thought you have given this problem and my assurance that we shall do our best to reflect properly the religious side of American life.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD C. MCCLELLAN,
General Manager.

Khrushchev: The Real Story of the Man and His Deeds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those who favor, as well as those who oppose, the invitation to Premier Khrushchev to visit the United States, are fully aware of the potential dangers involved. U.S. News & World Report, in its September 7, 1959, issue, gives an unvarnished account of the Mr. Khrushchev behind the sometimes smiling face.

In the belief that we all should be fully informed as to the type of person we are dealing with, I include under leave to extend my remarks the article, which follows:

KHRUSHCHEV: THE REAL STORY OF THE MAN AND HIS DEEDS

A few days from now Nikita S. Khrushchev is to step off a plane in the United States and the American people are to get their first close look at a Soviet dictator.

For 2 weeks Khrushchev is scheduled to tour this country as a guest of the U.S. Government. He is expected to dine at the White House, talk with President Eisenhower, speak over U.S. television and radio networks, visit several cities, and be seen by millions of Americans.

What kind of a man will Americans see?

If Khrushchev runs true to his usual form, they will see a smiling man. The smile is on the face he uses to charm strangers. Americans may get glimpses of the shrewd and capable Khrushchev who has helped build Soviet Russia into a world power. Khrushchev may bluster a bit for his American audience, or scowl, or even shout angry threats. For Khrushchev is a man of many faces.

But what kind of man is he in fact? And what is behind this outcry of protest that is welling up in the United States about his visit to this country?

For the answers, it is necessary to study the Russian's record—to go behind the official Soviet accounts and get the truth about Nikita Khrushchev. You must go back to Khrushchev's youth as a roistering worker with his hands, follow his rise in the Communist Party, see the part he played in Joseph Stalin's bloody purges. Then you must watch him, after becoming the boss himself, carry on in Stalin's tradition—sending the Soviet Army to crush Hungary's bid for freedom, shooting down unarmed American fliers, stirring up trouble around the globe, and threatening civilization with a nuclear world war III.

The man that emerges is the real Khrushchev—the man that Americans will not be shown in his brief visit to this country.

You get glimpses of the hidden Khrushchev in incidents.

BLOODY HANDS

While quarreling with Kremlin confederates in 1957, Khrushchev is reported to have shouted:

"Your hands are stained with the blood of our party leaders and of innumerable innocent Bolsheviks."

"So are yours," they shouted back.

"Yes," Khrushchev answered. "So are mine. I admit this. But during the purges I was merely carrying out your orders. I was not then a member of the Politburo and I bear no responsibility for its decisions. You were."

TEN THOUSAND CORPSES

The following incident was uncovered by the U.S. House of Representatives' Select Committee on Communist Aggression, in a 1954 investigation:

In 1943, German troops who had invaded the Ukraine dug into an area which had been used by Soviet secret police. They found 95 mass graves containing nearly 10,000 corpses whose hands were bound and who had bullet holes in the backs of their necks. From objects found on the bodies, they were identified as victims of the bloody purge that had been carried out in the Ukraine in the years 1937 to 1939.

Nikita S. Khrushchev had been sent to the Ukraine by Stalin to direct that purge.

APPROVED MURDERS

In his famous denunciation of Stalin in 1956, Khrushchev accused the former Soviet dictator of forcing old Bolshevik leaders into false confessions and then having them executed.

Yet the files of the official Soviet newspaper, Pravda, show that in January 1937, Khrushchev made a speech defending those executions. According to Pravda, he told a Moscow crowd of 200,000 people:

"We are gathered here in Red Square to make our proletarian words resound, words full of approval of the sentence passed by the military collegium of the supreme court on the enemies of the people, the traitors to the motherland, the betrayers of the cause of the toilers, the spies, the diversionists, the agents of fascism."

TRICKERY AND TANKS

When the Hungarian people revolted against Kremlin tyranny in 1956, it was Khrushchev who ordered the Russian Army to invade Hungary and massacre the civilians who demanded freedom. It was Khrushchev who invited a Hungarian leader, Gen. Pal Maleter, to negotiate under a flag of truce and then had him arrested by secret police. It was also Khrushchev who offered safe conduct to the late Hungarian Premier, Imre Nagy, to lure him out of sanctuary in the Yugoslav Embassy, and then had him kidnaped and executed.

While the fighting in Hungary was going on, U.S. Ambassador Charles Bohlen in Moscow asked Khrushchev what he was going to do about stopping the slaughter of Hungarian patriots. Khrushchev's answer:

"We will put in more troops, and more troops, and more troops, and more troops—until we have finished them."

BEHIND THE PROTEST

It is from such incidents as these that you get an understanding of the protests against Khrushchev's visit.

To thousands of Ukrainian refugees in the United States, Khrushchev is known as the "hangman of the Ukraine." To Hungarians, he is the "butcher of Budapest." To Americans of Polish descent, he was a participant, with Stalin, in the 1939 dismemberment of Poland. And, to millions of Americans whose ancestors came from the countries of central or eastern Europe that are now Soviet satellites, Khrushchev is the man who holds their ancestral lands under Red subjugation.

Today, as Khrushchev's visit nears, Americans of all extractions are remembering other incidents involving this man of many faces.

GENEVA DOUBLE CROSS

It was a smiling Khrushchev that President Eisenhower and other Western leaders met at a summit conference in Geneva in the summer of 1955. At that conference Khrushchev and his then-Premier, Nikolai Bulganin, agreed to work toward reunification of Germany—where Khrushchev today is threatening another Communist takeover in Berlin. It was at Geneva, too, that Khrushchev campaigned for peaceful coexistence, and increasing friendly contacts between East and West across the Iron Curtain.

It turned out later that Khrushchev was using the Geneva Conference to screen one of the biggest political moves of his career—a Soviet advance into the Middle East. While they smiled and talked at Geneva, the Communists were arranging to supply arms to President Nasser in Egypt. This deal gave the Kremlin its first foothold in the Middle East—a foothold that was later enlarged to include deals with Syria and a near takeover in Iraq.

The Soviet arms deal with Nasser served also to embolden Nasser for his seizure of the Suez Canal. That seizure, in turn, brought the short and sudden war in which France, Britain and Israel sent forces into Egypt in the autumn of 1956.

It was at the time of the Suez invasion that Khrushchev made one of his first nuclear threats against the West in blunt language, he told the British and French to call off the war or face the threat of missile-borne weapons from Russia.

DEATH OF U.S. AIRMEN

On Sept. 2, 1958, Soviet military planes shot down an unarmed U.S. transport plane with 17 Americans aboard. Khrushchev's Government denied the shooting. Khrushchev's Ambassador to Washington, Mikhail Menshikov, refused even to listen to a tape recording which presented proof that the plane was attacked deliberately by Soviet fliers acting under direct orders. The tape

recorded the radio conversation of the Soviet fliers as they gunned the American plane to earth.

The Khrushchev with this background is now the head of one of the most powerful nations in the world. He controls a Communist empire of 900 million people that stretches over most of Asia and a large part of Europe. Vice President RICHARD NIXON describes Khrushchev as "a man who holds in his hands the greatest power any one man has ever held in the history of civilization—who by his decision alone could press the button which could start a chain reaction which would destroy civilization as we know it."

UP FROM OBSCURITY

How did Khrushchev grow so high and mighty?

There was nothing in the first 40 years of his life to indicate such a future.

Khrushchev was born in poverty in the small Ukrainian village of Kalmovka. The date was April 17, 1894. His father is variously described as having been a coal miner and a blacksmith.

Events of Khrushchev's boyhood are shrouded in an obscurity which has been deepened by the rewriting of history that is customary in Soviet Russia. Official Soviet accounts say that Nikita as a boy hired out as a shepherd and then went to work as a coal miner, following in the footsteps of his father.

Other, unofficial, biographers say that the only sheepherding that Nikita did was to look out after his father's few pigs, cows, and goats, and that he then learned his father's trade of blacksmithing.

Khrushchev often refers to himself as a Ukrainian. But Ukrainian refugees claim that his family was Russian in origin and point out that Khrushchev, even after living for years in the Ukraine, speaks the Ukrainian tongue very badly.

In his boyhood years, when most youngsters are in school, young Nikita got very little formal schooling and showed little interest in education.

At an early age—17, by one detailed account of his early life—Khrushchev left home to become a wandering worker in the factories and coal mines of the industrial Donets Basin, or Donbas, as it is commonly called. This is an area in the southeastern Ukraine, near the Sea of Azov. Unofficial accounts say that Khrushchev's trade was that of turner and pipefitter, that he also was a locksmith. Official Soviet accounts speak of him as working in the mine pits and learning to operate the lift cage.

TALENT FOR DRINKING

One of the few signs of the future Khrushchev that appeared in his youth was this: He was noted, even then, for his ability to drink enormous amounts of alcohol.

A biography, "Khrushchev of the Ukraine," written by Victor Alexandrov, contains an episode about Khrushchev's youthful drinking, as related by Vladimir S. Andriyevsky, a Ukrainian who grew up in Khrushchev's hometown. According to this account, Andriyevsky encountered Khrushchev, accompanied by two young ladies, in a Kharkov beer hall in 1914. Khrushchev was described as drinking yorsh, a mixture of beer and vodka.

When Khrushchev was asked if he weren't afraid of getting tight on such a mixture, Andriyevsky relates, he burst out laughing and said "Yorsh has no effect on me."

"And he was right," Andriyevsky is quoted as saying. "I saw him swill five bottles of beer and a bottle of vodka, Smirnov 56, without batting an eyelid."

When Russia entered World War I, Khrushchev, although of military age, did not go into the army. But he did begin to show a belated interest in education, attended evening classes, borrowed numerous books from libraries.

CAREER IN THE PARTY

When the Bolshevik revolution toppled the Czar in 1917, Khrushchev was not a participant. But he soon joined the movement. He fought with Red troops against the whites and Cossacks in the civil war that followed the revolution. Then, in 1918, he joined the Communist Party and began his long climb to its leadership.

After the civil war subsided, Khrushchev returned to the mines, where he helped organize Communist units. Then, in 1922, he was sent to a workers' school, the Donets Industrial Institute, where he studied agriculture, among other things.

It was about this time that Khrushchev married. Mr. Alexandrov's biography says the marriage took place in 1922 and that his bride was a fellow student of agriculture. Some other accounts give the marriage year as 1920.

The Kremlin is always secretive about the private lives of Soviet officials, and Khrushchev has done little to clear up the mystery about his own. He once said he had two sons and several daughters.

TWO MARRIAGES

Recently, when entertaining Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, at the Khrushchev vacation home, the Soviet Premier became more specific. He said he had two daughters and two sons, and that one of the two sons had been killed while serving as a pilot in World War II. He also told Mr. Johnston that his present wife is not the mother of his children, but is his second wife. The second Khrushchev marriage is reported to have occurred in 1938, after the first wife died.

Upon completing his workers' school course, Khrushchev became a full-time party worker. He was an organizer and propagandist in various cities of the Ukraine. In this effort he acquired a reputation as a hard and effective worker and as a rough-and-tumble orator who could more than hold his own in arguments at party meetings.

Here came Khrushchev's first big break. He won the notice of Lazar M. Kaganovich, then first party secretary in the Ukraine. With the help of Kaganovich, Khrushchev won assignment to Moscow's Industrial Academy for further studies. This was 1929. Khrushchev, the Ukrainian shepherd boy, had arrived in Moscow, the center of the Communist world. His star was rising.

STALIN'S UNDERSTUDY

At the Moscow institute, Khrushchev added industrial training to the agricultural background that he had acquired in the Ukraine. He also won a powerful new friend—Joseph Stalin.

As the story is told, here is how he caught Stalin's eye: At the institute, Stalin's wife was a fellow student. At a students' political meeting, Mrs. Stalin made a critical report which aroused concern in party circles. But Khrushchev, as secretary of the meeting, suppressed her report, thus saving the Stalins considerable embarrassment.

From that time on, Khrushchev's advance was rapid.

In 1931 he won his first party office, as head of the party committee for a district of Moscow. The next year he was elected a secretary of the Communist organization for the entire city of Moscow. In this post he was active in the rebuilding of Moscow and the construction of its famous subway system.

Then in 1934, at the age of 40, Khrushchev entered the chosen circle: He became a member of the central committee of the entire Communist Party.

TRAINING IN MURDER

In his Ukrainian posts, Khrushchev had helped to "finger" minor party functionaries for removal. But in Moscow he got some real training in the Communist technique of purge.

A purge of the party organization in Moscow was underway in the early 1930's. Khrushchev's participation is shown by a report published in 1932 in Pravda, which quoted him as telling a district party meeting:

"The aim of this purge is to track down and expel those party members who secretly persist in their dastardly oppositional activity against the party and against the Soviet State. They are traitors, and will be treated as such."

According to published reports of this purge, about one-fourth of the Communists in Moscow were expelled from the party and more than 500 were handed over to the secret police for execution, imprisonment, or exile in slave-labor camps. In February 1934 Khrushchev reported: "We have conducted a purge in the Moscow organization which further strengthened the militancy of our ranks."

Then, in the middle thirties, began Stalin's great purge which reaches into all parts of the Soviet Union and high into the ranks of party leaders. The reign of terror lasted for several years. By conservative official estimates, thousands were executed and tens of thousands were imprisoned.

By less conservative estimates, the victims of the great purge numbered in the millions.

In a series of show trials, some of the top officials of the Communist Party were paraded in the dock, forced to make public confessions, and then were shot.

Throughout all this purge, Khrushchev was a member of the central committee, the ruling clique of the Communist Party. From 1935 on, he was also a member of the Presidium of the U.S.S.R. Central Executive Committee.

You get Khrushchev's own version of his role in the blood bath from that statement he made to his Kremlin confederates in 1957: "During the purges I was merely carrying out your orders."

A PURGE OF HIS OWN

In 1938, Khrushchev got the opportunity to carry out a purge of his own. Joseph Stalin sent him to the Ukraine to clean up the party organization there and to whip the rebellious Ukraine into line. The Ukraine had been an independent republic before it was conquered by the Russians, and the Ukrainian people were still intensely nationalistic and resentful of Moscow's rule.

Ukrainian refugees have given graphic accounts of the bloody purge which Khrushchev carried out. He started by calling all the leaders of the Ukrainian Government to a meeting in Kiev, then surrounding the meeting with secret police and arresting most of the officials on the spot.

This trick worked so well that he later used a similar method in the arrest of Stalin's secret police chief, Lavrenti P. Beria.

Khrushchev's efficiency in the Ukraine won him a quick reward. In 1939, he was made a member of the Politburo—one of the nine men who ruled the Soviet Union. But he remained in the Ukraine and carried on his purge.

With Hitlerite Germany expanding, war was threatening Eastern Europe. The Kremlin was anxious to remove all rebellious elements from the Ukraine, which bordered on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania.

By some Ukrainian estimates, 400,000 people were killed in a single year of Khrushchev's prewar purge of the Ukraine. Those

mass graves found by German soldiers in 1943 contained, by actual count, 9,439 bodies. Those victims included peasants, workers, and priests as well as party officials. Masses of Ukrainians were deported to Siberia.

KHRUSHCHEV'S WAR RECORD

When war came, the Kremlin found that the Ukraine was still anti-Russian. As the Nazi troops drove into the Ukraine in 1941, its people surrendered by the thousands, greeting the Germans as liberators from Moscow's rule.

Khrushchev, during most of the war, assumed a military role. He was given a high officer's rank and helped plan Soviet military strategy in the Ukraine. He is credited with active participation in the defense of Leningrad.

DICTATOR OF THE UKRAINE

After the Nazis had been driven out, Khrushchev turned back, in 1944, to a civilian role in directing the restoration of the Ukraine. For this task, Stalin made Khrushchev a virtual dictator of the region, subject only to Stalin's personal orders.

Ukrainians describe the postwar purge in the Ukraine as worse than that which preceded the war. They claim that 3 million Ukrainians were killed, imprisoned, or deported to slave-labor camps for collaborating with the Germans.

Yet Ukrainian resistance to Moscow grew until it resembled a civil war, with an underground army, known as the UPA, engaging large units of the Red army in battle.

Khrushchev's failure to pacify the Ukraine was followed by his only political setback. In 1947 he was removed from his Ukrainian dictatorship. But not for long. A few months later he was back in command of the Ukrainian Communist Party.

In 1949, Khrushchev returned to Moscow—this time to stay. He was given the leadership of the Moscow party committee and made a member of the secretariat of the central committee. For the next 4 years, Khrushchev worked busily at building up his power and prestige and getting ready for the opportunity that came with Stalin's death. One of his projects was to set in motion a reorganization of the agricultural system, forcing the already collectivized farmers into huge "state farms."

THE POWER STRUGGLE

When Stalin died, in 1953, Khrushchev was only No. 5 in the party hierarchy. Georgi M. Malenkov became Premier in a sort of "collective leadership" which included the diplomat, Vyacheslav M. Molotov, the police chief, Beria, and Marshal Nikolai A. Bulganin.

But Khrushchev moved up fast. Within 9 days after Stalin died, he displaced Malenkov as First Secretary of the central committee. This is the post which carries with it leadership of the Communist Party.

It was the party leadership that Stalin had used as his ladder to the Soviet throne, and Khrushchev showed he had learned his master's methods well. He spotted Beria as his most dangerous rival. So he teamed with Malenkov to get Beria.

In June 1953, just 3 months after Stalin died, Beria was lured to a Kremlin meeting. Here Khrushchev used the same tactics that had worked so well for him in the Ukraine in 1938. He deployed troops to cut off Beria from his own men, then arrested him. The following December, Beria's execution was announced, along with that of 29 of his confederates. here was no public trial. It was another Stalin-type purge.

Malenkov was the next of Khrushchev's rivals to go. In February 1955 Malenkov made a public "confession of errors" and resigned from the post of Premier. Khrushchev's candidate, Bulganin, succeeded Malenkov. But, here, Khrushchev introduced a new purge technique. Instead of having Malenkov shot, he merely demoted him to an obscure post.

For the next 3 years, Khrushchev ruled the Soviet Union by proxy, using Bulganin, the Premier, as his front man, but leaving no doubt as to who was really boss.

At home, it was Khrushchev who made all the important policy announcements. On their trips abroad, it was Khrushchev who did most of the talking while Bulganin stayed in the background. At the summit meeting in Geneva in 1955, it was clear that Khrushchev, not Bulganin, ran the Soviet delegation.

THE SHIFT ON STALIN

While Stalin lived, Khrushchev served and praised him. Three years after Stalin died, Khrushchev denounced him. This was another turning point in the career of today's boss in the Kremlin. It occured in February 1956 at a secret session of the Communist Party's 20th Congress.

In that session, Khrushchev delivered a historic speech accusing Stalin of brutal murders of his fellow Communists and of acts damaging to the Soviet Union.

A TEAR FOR COMRADES

Accounts of the meeting show Khrushchev weeping as he named comrades whom Stalin had killed. Among those named was Stanislav V. Kossior, who disappeared in the Ukrainian purge of 1938. The record shows that Khrushchev, as Stalin's investigator of the Ukrainian organization, "put the finger" on Kossior to be purged, and then succeeded to his post in the Ukraine.

While denouncing many of Stalin's crimes, Khrushchev defended the liquidation of millions of peasant farmers in the Communist campaign to collectivize them. The record shows that Khrushchev was active in that campaign in the Ukraine.

Khrushchev told the secret party session that Stalin was able to commit his crimes because he had been permitted to grow too powerful. He called for an end to the "cult of the individual," and for a return to "collective leadership."

A year later, in 1957, Khrushchev resumed the building of his own power. He did it by purging some of his oldest and closest friends. The victims: Molotov, Malenkov, Dimitri Shepilov, and Lazar M. Kaganovich, the man who had "discovered" Khrushchev in the Ukraine, brought him to Moscow and sponsored his rapid rise to high Communist office. All were accused of intrigue against the party leadership and were expelled from the Central Committee.

Again, Khrushchev's purge victims lived. But they were effectively removed from his path to power.

In ousting these rivals, Khrushchev used the help of a World War II hero, Marshal Georgi Zhukov. A few months later, Khrushchev turned on Zhukov and ousted him from his post as Defense Minister and from his high party offices.

ALONE AT THE TOP

In 1958, Khrushchev made his final grab for power. He removed Bulganin as Premier and took over the Premiership himself. Then he had everything that Stalin had—control of the government and control over the Communist Party. Khrushchev stood alone at the top.

Now this man who fought his way from shepherd boy to boss of the world's biggest empire is coming to visit the United States—the only country that can challenge his empire's domination of the world.

Latin Red Chiefs Confer in Chile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the New York Times of Sunday, August 23, 1959, written by Mr. Tad Szulc, staff correspondent for the New York Times:

LATIN RED CHIEFS CONFER IN CHILE—DISCUSS HEMISPHERE ISSUES—PROPAGANDA CAMPAIGN AGAINST UNITED STATES MOUNTING

(By Tad Szulc)

SANTIAGO, CHILE, August 22.—Several important Latin-American Communist leaders met here this week to exchange ideas. They discussed the situation in the Western Hemisphere after the recently concluded conference here of the foreign ministers of the American republics.

While Communist quarters insisted that no full-fledged conference had been held, the meeting did coincide with the unleashing of a major anti-U.S. campaign. The Communists charge that the foreign ministers' meeting had been engineered by Washington to overthrow the regime of Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba.

What is perhaps most disturbing to Washington in that the Cuban revolutionary leadership, or part of it, for their own reasons appears to be willing to go along with the campaign.

REDS SQUIRE RAUL CASTRO

How adept the Communists are at courting the Cuban revolutionaries was demonstrated here this week during the brief visit of Maj. Raul Castro, the Cuban Premier's brother and commander in chief of the country's armed forces.

After the Chilean Government and military had ignored the major's presence—largely because they were angry over the appearance here Monday of a Cuban Air Force plane with armed soldiers—the Communists and their allies took him under their wing.

Senator Salvadore Allende, an extreme leftwing politician who was allied with the Communists through Chile's popular front and who recently visited Cuba, was a full-time guide for Major Castro.

At Señor Allende's home Major Castro met at a cocktail party the entire popular front leadership, including Luis Corvalan, secretary general of the Communist Party. Senor Corvalan is regarded as one of the most important Communist leaders in Latin America.

Escorted by Senator Allende, Major Castro visited Pablo Neruda, the poet, a Communist senator and the holder of a Stalin peace prize. At his departure Thursday, Major Castro was seen off by Communist members of Congress and other representatives of the popular front, as well as a group of Christian Democrats.

CUBAN PICTURE REVIEWED

While there are no indications that Major Castro engaged in any serious political discussions with the Chilean Communists, the Cuban situation and its significance for Communist propaganda purposes were reviewed here by Communist representatives from four Latin American countries in addition to Chile. On hand were the secretary general of the Argentine Communist Party, Rodolfo

Ghioldi, the Paraguayan Communist leader, Miguel Angel Soler, the editor of the Cuban Communist daily Hoy, Carlos Rodriques, and the influential Venezuelan Communist newspaper man, Hector Mujica.

Senor Ghioldi and Senor Mujica delivered lectures at party headquarters here on the situation in their countries. Senor Soler had to cancel his appearance because he had to leave Santiago suddenly.

Communist propaganda against the United States, the Organization of American States and the foreign ministers' conference has been going on since the meeting began. This is in line with the standing party policy of opposition to the inter-American system. But it soon took a form in which Cuba was presented as the victim, the United States as the villian and the Communists as something of a rescuing hero.

CONTRADICTORY CHARGES

On one hand charges were made that the United States forced Latin Americans to vote for nonintervention policies to protect the dictatorship in the Dominican Republic, while at the same time Washington was accused of trying to force a policy of intervention so that it could oust Premier Castro.

A pro-Communist magazine photographed a group of U.S. correspondents at the door of the U.S. delegation suite at a hotel here and published it over a caption: "North-American newsmen awaiting instructions. • • • They met every afternoon to make their dispatches uniform."

Increase in Interest Rates on Government Bonds Unnecessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent days about the President's request to raise the interest rates on long-term Government bonds. The administration is urging this Congress to remove the present 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term bonds with threats that if this is not done, the Treasury Department will not be able to continue financing the Federal Government.

I am today inserting two recent articles which appeared in the press on the subject of Government bonds and interest rates.

The first is an article by Miss Sylvia Porter, one of the Nation's outstanding financial observers, who points out that the little investors are joining the big rush for U.S. bonds.

It is significant to me that the moment there was a slump in the stock market, with stock quotations taking a serious dip in the last 2 weeks, the rush for Government bonds started; and I submit that the demand for higher interest rates is nothing more than a ruse now being perpetrated on the American people by a syndicate of Wall Street financiers so that they can build into their investments a guarantee of a higher interest yield for many years to come on long-term Government bonds even though the rest of the Nation's economy may suffer a setback.

Simply stated, what these financiers are doing is this: There is a possibility of a setback if defense spending is curtailed because of a possible thaw in the cold war. I submit these financiers now want to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds so they can "lock" themselves in for a higher yield on their investment in these long-term Government bonds, regardless of what happens to the rest of the Nation's economy.

The other article which I am including today is by Drew Pearson, who clearly demonstrates what a closed corporation has existed in the purchase of Government bonds.

Mr. Speaker, the two articles follow:

LITTLE INVESTORS JOIN BIG RUSH FOR U.S. BONDS—MARKET LIVELIEST SINCE WAR II—4¾ PERCENT RETURN DOES TRICK

(By Sylvia Porter)

For the first time in many years, the little investor is nibbling at the market for U.S. Government securities, is putting new savings or cash obtained from sales of stock into small blocks of U.S. Treasury obligations to get the income they will pay until maturity.

"They showed up out of nowhere," remarks a leading Washington economist. "One day there appeared to be just about no buyers for U.S. Government securities. The next day, there they were, buying steadily."

"We got telephone calls last month from customers who've never even inquired about Government bonds asking us to buy them some of the 'new 4¾s'," marvels a partner of a large Wall Street stockhouse. "When we did and sent them confirmation slips, they were astonished to find out they had bought a note due a year from now. They thought they were buying long-term bonds due in 20 or 30 years."

What is happening is a first hint of a revival of interest among individuals in U.S. Government securities at today's comparatively high annual rates of return. (These securities have nothing to do with U.S. savings bonds which can be bought for a fixed amount, are nonmarketable and can be cashed in at any time at the purchase price plus interest due.)

INTEREST RATES SOAR

During World War II, the great war loan drives attracted individual investors to U.S. Government bonds, but since then the Government market has been practically the private preserve of the big financial institutions.

But also since World War II, interest rates have been rising, and since mid-1958 they have soared.

As rates have climbed, prices of the older outstanding Government securities with their picayune coupons have slumped to record lows. And on new U.S. issues the Treasury has been offering higher and higher coupons to attract investors.

FOUR AND THREE-FOURTHS PERCENT IS POWERFUL LURE

Then last month an unexpected switch occurred when, to encourage holders of $14 billion of maturing IOU's to extend their loans, Treasury Secretary Anderson offered them one note due in a year carrying a 4¾-percent coupon and another due in 1964 paying a 4¾ percent too.

Suddenly, both sophisticated and unsophisticated individual investors apparently decided a 4¾ percent yearly return on a U.S. obligation—the highest offered since the 1920's—was mightly juicy.

It may well be that the highest coupons on new U.S. Government securities have not been seen. The Treasury may be paying even more than 4¾ percent for money if business booms in the months ahead.

BANK TRUST SUSPECTED IN WALL STREET

(By Drew Pearson)

A tightly organized group of 17 Wall Street money manipulators who can and do tell the U.S. Treasury how it can float its bonds has just been unearthed by congressional investigators.

The Senate-House Economic Committee, wanting to avoid hiking interest rates on Government bonds, stumbled into this solidly entrenched money trust.

They suspect the financial tycoons were the chief conspirators behind the drive to remove the 4¼-percent ceiling on interest rates and let the sky be the limit. This will automatically boost the cost of consumer borrowing on automobiles, homes, and appliances.

The congressional fiscal sleuths discovered that virtually all trading in Government securities is handled by 17 dealers, who have direct telephone lines to each other. They use these lines not to transact business but to coordinate prices. This results in uniform quotations and might be of interest to antitrust officials as a violation of the Sherman Act.

The largest dealer, Discount Corp., is owned by five big banks which deal in Government securities. They are Bankers Trust, Chemical Corn Exchange, First National City, Morgan-Guaranty Trust, and New York Trust. Two other banks, Chase Manhattan and Manufacturers Trust, have directors on Discount's board.

These seven banks monopolize the Government securities market, which amounts to a fantastic $200 billion business each year. Without counting the fabulous interest, the annual profit on buying and selling Government bonds exceeds $680 million.

The interest rates are not set by competitive bidding but by Government decree based upon the advice of the same tycoons who profit from the money market.

The Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department no doubt would deny that Wall Streeters fix the interest rates. Yet their recommendations are always adopted.

"The only trouble with this investigation," commented Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the Economic Committee chairman, "is that the stakes are too big. The public doesn't seem to understand scandals involving more than $2 million."

Public Power Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, the very effective testimony of William Jackman, president of the Investors League, before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation hearing on S. 281, to establish another public power project, that on the Snake River Valley, Idaho, is so eloquent and convincing that I am sure all Members should have an opportunity to read it. It is submitted herewith:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, on behalf of our thousands of in-

vestor members I wish to thank you for the privilege of presenting the viewpoint of American investors on S. 281, a bill by Senators HENRY DWORSHAK and FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, and H.R. 1235, a bill by Congressman HAMER H. BUDGE, of Idaho, "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain a reregulating reservoir and other works at the Burns Creek site in the upper Snake River Valley, Idaho, and for other purposes."

We strongly urge the committee not to recommend this proposed legislation.

The description of the purpose of the bills as stated above is deceptive in character by failing to state frankly that the project is designed primarily as a Government-owned hydroelectric power project.

Inadequate hearings were held in the Senate on S. 281 and inadequate hearing (1 day only) are scheduled before this Subcommittee in the House of Representatives. A vast majority of the taxpayers of the United States are totally unfamiliar with the purposes and probable effects of this legislation.

Testimony before the Senate brings into sharp focus the following points which should be brought to the attention of all of our voting citizens for their information and approval before any final action is taken by their elected representatives in Congress—

(1) The project would cost about $50 million of which 98 percent would be charged to power and less than 2 percent to irrigation. There is no actual or foreseeable power shortage in this area. It is well served by two large taxpaying investor-owned power companies operating under State supervision.

(2) There is no proven need of the project for irrigation purposes. The Bureau of Reclamation estimates the 100,000 acre-feet of storage in Burns Creek would be used only two of three times in 50 years. No water would be used on present land; the project would not enable 1 acre of new land to be brought under cultivation.

(3) This project would cost the Federal Government $40 million of lost taxes that would otherwise be paid by private utility companies. Total annual revenue of the project estimated at $1,125,000 would be $311,000 short of meeting annual interest payments of $1,436,000.

(4) The alleged need of this project for "reregulation" has never been proven. Even if it were, a true "reregulation" project could be provided for around $9 million, or over $40 million less than the project contemplated.

The substantiation of the above comments have been made fully available to Congress in documented form by qualified experts in and outside of Government.

Why, then, at a time when the Nation needs new sources of tax money; at a time when our able and conscientious Ways and Means Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS and his committee members are approaching a monumental task of tax reform; at a time when our very solvency is being strained by the vast and necessary costs of national defense; why, at such a time, gentlemen, should Congress vote to unnecessarily squander $100 million or more of the taxpayers' money?

The valid charge has been made over and over again that there are powerful forces within this Nation, encouraged by our enemies from abroad who, wittingly or unwittingly, would weaken or destroy our entire economic and social order in favor of a bureaucratic socialist welfare state. To accomplish this purpose most effectively, they would first socialize our basic energy resource industries. If we do not want this to happen, we must be constantly on the alert.

The $50 million Burns Creek project, small as it may seem in a world in which we talk of billions of dollars, can set a precedent that will spread socialized Federal ownership of American industry like a poisonous weed. The end result? Nothing other than gradual loss of our human freedoms.

INVESTORS LEAGUE, INC.,
WILLIAM JACKMAN, *President.*

Personal Income Tax Exemption

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I introduced in the House of Representatives today a bill which proposes to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by increasing from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness.

Out of regard for our national debt, and for the obvious necessity of revenue raising measures in our tax structure, I could not have introduced a bill such as this in good faith without having introduced three previous bills in this session of Congress which I feel would correct many of the present inequities and loopholes in our tax laws and which, if carried through, would make a tax reduction such as I propose in this bill feasible. The bills that I introduced were as follows: H.R. 6919, which would repeal the special deduction for the depletion of national resources. This bill would close a loophole which I consider to be the most flagrant giveaway in our entire tax structure and would save the American taxpayers literally hundreds of millions of dollars annually. The second tax bill previously introduced by me was H.R. 8753, which would change existing tax law by eliminating provisions which presently allow an individual to exclude from gross income for tax purposes the first $50 of dividends received in a taxable year. This bill would also effect a substantial increase in revenues accruing to the U.S. Government each year. The third bill which I introduced was a measure to increase the holding period for long-term capital gains from 6 months to 1 year. It is my feeling that this would serve to eliminate much of the speculation and fast shuffle being given the present tax law by persons who deal in tremendous sums of money on short-term "sure things." If the holding period were increased to a year, economic trends could not be so readily foreseen, and there would be a much greater hesitancy on the part of speculators to invest large sums of money in business ventures to take advantage of long-term capital gains provisions, as is now being done.

I believe that this bill to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $800 will afford tax relief where it is most needed, namely in the low- and lower-middle income categories. These are the people who most acutely feel the pressure of our present income tax laws—the people who live on more or less fixed low-scale incomes who are subjected to withholding and who are unable to take advantage of any special exemptions or deductions.

I know that many Members of the House of Representatives have introduced from time to time similar legislation, and I am confident that we are of a single purpose in trying to afford tax relief to many of our constituents who we feel deserve such relief. I hold high hopes that the Committee on Ways and Means, when it undertakes a searching reexamination of our tax laws this fall, will work to close the present loopholes and inequities which are so obvious to all of us and try to bring much needed and long-sought relief to Americans living on small incomes.

A Bill To Establish a National Seashore Park on Cape Cod

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HASTINGS KEITH
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill for the establishment of a national seashore park on Cape Cod.

Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator KENNEDY, and I have been working on this bill for several months now, and have come up with, in my opinion, an excellent piece of legislation. The Senators are introducing the identical bill in the Senate today.

There have been several measures introduced previously which would establish a national seashore on Cape Cod. It is certainly understandable that there is tremendous national interest in reserving for future generations the scenic, historic, and scientific treasures of Cape Cod.

However, as I have studied the prior legislation on this matter, I, as the Representative from this area, have become increasingly concerned with the problem of providing adequate protection for the property owners, along with sufficient space for the normal economic growth and development of the towns involved.

When we are dealing with Cape Cod, we are not dealing with the usual, relatively undeveloped national park area. As you know, several well-developed and prosperous communities are involved in this proposition. Therefore, any legislation creating a national seashore park on Cape Cod must recognize the unique character of the area and its problems.

Our bill is more than a statement of the principle that preserving shoreline recreational areas deserves our support.

It embodies a knowledge of the distinct nature of the area, the people, and the character of the cape. A national seashore park and the individuality of the cape can exist together and serve each other with mutual benefit.

The bill specifically suspends the power of condemnation insofar as adequately zoned summer and year-round residential property is concerned. This provision safeguards the individual rights of property owners. It preserves, too, the tax revenue from these homes which the communities so badly need.

The bill contains a clause which would, in effect, allow the towns to control and develop a substantial amount of land within the proposed park area. This will provide adequate room for expansion and growth of these towns. It will keep them self-sufficient and enable them to adequately service the many demands that the national seashore will impose upon them.

Further, the bill sets up an Advisory Commission composed of representatives of each of the six towns involved, the Governor of Massachusetts, and the Secretary of Interior. This Commission will speak for the towns and the park residents in their many negotiations with the Department of Interior.

The bill retains generally, the same boundaries originally recommended by the National Park Service. When we drafted the bill, we felt that we should not arbitrarily include or exclude particular properties. I recognize that the boundaries proposed in my bill will not be satisfactory to all concerned. But neither do I think that I should change the Park Service's boundaries until reasonable and competent testimony is made available to me by the towns and individuals concerned.

Both the Senators from Massachusetts and I have stressed that this legislation is by no means inflexible. We have chosen to introduce it at this time in order to allow all interested parties, both governmental and individual, to study the proposal carefully and recommend such changes as are deemed necessary.

We have in this legislation an excellent framework for establishing a national seashore park. I know that the towns affected by this proposal and the individals who are interested in it will help us to preserve for the present and for posterity the particular charm, character and historical significance of Cape Cod and its communities.

Regarding Statement by Governor Ribicoff on Gas Tax Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I was asked whether I was aware that Governor Ribicoff, chairman of the Governors' road committee, had stated that the Governors had withdrawn their objection to the gas tax increase. I answered that I was aware that Governor Ribicoff had issued this statement. However, a subsequent check this afternoon showed that the Governor of Indiana, the Honorable Harold Handley, as late as Sunday stated that he was not in favor of a gas tax increase. I have also checked with the Members from five other States and find that the position of their Governors has not changed with respect to the opposition to this increase in the gas tax.

In the light of the above I cannot understand the authority for Governor Ribicoff's statement. All these Governors were under the impression that the original position opposing a gas tax increase had not changed.

Who's Irresponsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted to override the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill for 1960—H.R. 7509—because I was truly appalled at the flippancy with which the President disposed of this major appropriation bill. Because the Congress in its judgment dared to differ by about 2½ percent from the Bureau of the Budget's dictate on projects which help the development of the Nation's water resources, the President was persuaded for the 144th time to disapprove a bill passed by both Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed and saddened that this House did not reaffirm its passage of H.R. 7509 by overriding the President's ill-advised veto and asserting the power and the prestige of the National Legislature as an equal and coordinate branch of our Federal Government. I am alarmed that Congress by its failure to stand up to the Executive is more and more relegating itself into a subordinate position.

The President has flouted the judgment of sound, conservative members of the Public Works Appropriation Subcommittees in the House and the Senate who, after mature consideration decided that 67 additional projects totaling about $51.5 million are needed in the Nation's overall water resources program.

To provide for these new works the President's budget requests were trimmed over $20 million and an extra $30 million was added. I agree with the judgment of my able and distinguished colleagues, our venerable CLARENCE CANNON, of LOUIS C. RABAUT, MICHAEL KIRWAN, and BEN JENSEN, just to name a few members of the House Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations that as a dynamic, growing country we cannot afford to stand dead still while our water resources deteriorate or are dissipated.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am worried what the future of St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn., holds in view of the successful but ruthless and shortsighted administration policy of no new construction starts. This year money is budgeted for the advance planning of a badly needed flood control project of the Mississippi River which runs through St. Paul and South St. Paul. If flood control improvements had been in existence 10 years ago, the affected area would have been spared flood damage of $2,788,000 in 1951 and $4,650,000 in 1952—the sum of which exceeds even the present estimated cost of the project. Some of the important commercial developments involved in this 5,400-acre area include steel fabrication, paint, fertilizer, meat processing, and box manufacturing plants; petroleum, coal, and grain storage facilities; river terminals, steam generating plants; railroad repair shops; stockyards; and an airfield. In addition there are sewage treatment plants for the Twin City area, main lines of nine major railway systems and a complex of Federal and State highways.

But important as this area has been to the commercial and industrial life of the Gateway to the Northwest, its greatest development awaits the flood control improvements which will make it possible to begin a vast and exciting urban renewal program to stimulate the economic growth of our district. I, for one, therefore resent any implication that such a project is useless, or "pork barrel."

Before the planning stage is completed, the people affected by the St. Paul-South St. Paul flood control project will expect the administration to abandon altogether the policy of economic mummification that has too long dangerously hampered the development of the Nation's resources, human and natural, when we alone stand as a bulwark for the free world.

Founder of Labor Day in May 1882 Explains the Meaning and Significance of Labor Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of an article which appeared on August 29, 1959, in the AFL–CIO News, Washington, D.C., at page 7 thereof.

In view of the fact that next Monday, September 7, 1959, is a nationally observed holiday, it would appear that the contents of this article by Peter J. McGuire is not only interesting but is important information and is timely:

FOUNDER EXPLAINS LABOR DAY MEANING

(By Peter J. McGuire)

(Peter J. McGuire first proposed a labor holiday before the New York Central Labor Council in May 1882. Twelve years later it became a legal holiday by act of Congress. Several years later McGuire wrote the following article on the meaning of Labor Day:)

On this day the hosts of labor shout their Hosannahs. From a thousand groves and hillsides, by rippling brooks and gurgling streams, comes the glad acclaim.

No festival of martial glory or warrior's renown is this; no pageant pomp of warlike conquest, no glory of fratricidal strife attend this day.

It is dedicated to peace, civilization, and the triumphs of industry. It is a demonstration of fraternity and the harbinger of a better age—a more chivalrous time, when labor shall be best honored and well rewarded.

Pagan feasts and Christian observances have come down to us through the long ages. But it was reserved for this century, and for the American people, to give birth to Labor Day. In this they honor the toilers of the earth, and pay homage to those who from rude nature have delved and carved all the comfort and grandeur we behold.

More than all, the thought, the conception, yea the very inspiration of this holiday came from men in the ranks of the working people—men active in uplifting their fellows, and leading them to better conditions. It came from a little group in New York City, the Central Labor Union, which had just been formed, and which in later years attained widespread influence.

On May 8, 1882, the writer made the proposition. He urged the propriety of setting aside 1 day in the year to be designated as "Labor Day," and to be established as a general holiday for the laboring classes. He advised the day should first be celebrated by a street parade, which would publicly show the strength and esprit de corps of the trade and labor organizations. Next the parade should be followed by a picnic or festival in some grove, and the proceeds of the same be divided on this semicooperative plan, viz:

Each union or organization should get as many tickets as it desired to sell; the more sold the greater would be the benefits to the society selling them. Each society should be allowed to keep all the money realized by sale of tickets through its members. In the end, each of the bodies participating should contribute to the expenses in proportion to its membership.

It was further argued Labor Day should be observed as 1 festal day in the year for public tribute to the genius of American industry. There were other worthy holidays representative of the religious, civil and military spirit. But none representative of the industrial spirit—the great vital force of every nation. He suggested the first Monday in September of every year for such a holiday, as it would come at the most pleasant season of the year, nearly midway between the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving, and would fill a wide gap in the chronology of legal holidays.

The first Labor Day parade and festival of the Central Labor Union of New York City on September 5, 1882, was simply an imposing success. From that day on, it became a fixed institution in the United States, observed today in every city of the land. The plan was next endorsed by the annual convention of the American Federation of Labor and the general assembly of the Knights of Labor. It spread rapidly from city to city, and from town to town. City councils and State legislatures took it up, and made it a legal holiday, until finally on June 28, 1894, it became a national holiday by act of Congress.

There was a time, and it is not many years ago, when the trade union and the labor movement of America were too insignificant for Presidents, Governors, mayors, city councilmen or public men to consider, much less honor. Trade unions were of no consequence; trade unionists were harmless fanatics. Now they are of more weight, more influential, more powerful. No longer can they be sneered down or cajoled; they must be met, they must be recognized.

Hon. J. Bayard Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALTON LENNON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include editorials from the Fayetteville Observer, the Wilmington Morning Star, and the Robesonian, North Carolina, daily newspapers, regarding the life and accomplishments of a former Member of this House, the late Honorable J. Bayard Clark.

The editorials follow:

[From the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer, Aug. 28, 1959]

J. BAYARD CLARK: WE LOSE A WISE FRIEND

Former Congressman J. Bayard Clark, who died in Fayetteville Wednesday, was a gentleman of discriminating intelligence, who for 20 consecutive years had used a profound capacity for constructive work in the interest of his district, his State, and his Nation.

If we were called on to characterize him by a single word, that word would have to be "intelligence."

That intelligence was applied to a versatile life which included farming, teaching, practicing law and serving as the president of a bank, but in its most important application it was to serving the Seventh North Carolina District in the U.S. House of Representatives for 10 consecutive terms from 1928 to 1948.

To this intelligence he added the two virtues of diligence and integrity, both personal and public.

As a freshman Congressman in his first term under a Republican administration Bayard Clark saw a bubble burst. He saw the economy of the United States plunged from a frenzied financial inflation to the deadening desperate depths of the great depression.

The great depression ruined many Americans and unhorsed the Republican Party, so in his third term Bayard Clark was a member of the Democratic majority, coping with Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, cocky, bouncy, experimentative, and along its leading edges, polluted with dangerous radicalism.

One of the greatest achievements of Bayard Clark's career was to serve with a handful of other conservatives as a legislative balance wheel for the great experiment in keeping the wheels of government from running wild. They read the fine print in the bills, they considered the end result of new departures, they sounded the voice of caution, they kept the Roosevelt revolution on the tracks of reason, saved the States from being totally engulfed in the new federalism.

But when the militant authorization dictatorship of Adolph Hitler found the United States fighting a war for survival, Bayard Clark was among those who sensed that some of the luxuries of liberty had to be sacrificed temporarily in the interest of victory. He backed the hand of the President's efforts to create a war machine which would be efficient in depth because its leadership had authority to act without undue debate.

As a member of the important Rules Committee of the House, Bayard Clark played an important role in the design of legislation aimed at victory.

Three years after that victory, Bayard Clark laid aside his congressional toga and retired, an undefeated champion, to resume private life among his friends and neighbors.

As a Congressman, Bayard Clark was more of a worker than a speaker. He was the antithesis of such figures as Bilbo, Huey Long, and Joe McCarthy. He was not a headline seeker. His weapon was reason rather than words. He continually demonstrated that he would rather be right than popular.

Though a polished speaker, he studiously avoided hyperbole and bombast. His aim was to inform his audience, to make them think rather than to applaud.

But his fellow North Carolinians in 10 successive elections gave him the pleasant applause of the soft rustling of votes falling into the ballot boxes.

His campaign speeches were not vindictive, nor concerned especially with personalities, as much as with the explanation of issues. With him on the hustings, courtesy was a long suit.

And he was proud of his agricultural heritage, never let the voters forget that his hands knew the feel of plowshares and that his eyes were familiar with the contours of the southern end of a northbound mule.

The voters loved him for that and for his straightforward, unspectacular service to them and to America. They loved him because he did something about the price of tobacco, about the development of a river, about the improvement of a great harbor. And they loved him in droves.

Bayard Clark will live long in the affections of his friends in Fayetteville and his constituents of the Seventh District as a gentleman, a scholar, and as a working representative of the people.

[From the Wilmington (N.C.) Morning Star, Aug. 28, 1959]

J. BAYARD CLARK, A MAN OF SERVICE

The 22 years J. Bayard Clark represented the Seventh North Carolina District in Congress were marked by able and honorable service to his district, State, and Nation.

The admiration he enjoyed from his constituents in the seven counties and his contemporaries on Capitol Hill was based on respect for his integrity and his conscientious devotion to duty. His political philosophy might well be termed conservative-progressive. He was not a liberal spender. Yet, when a sound proposition merited Federal assistance, he invariably cast his vote for it.

Many Wilmingtonians will remember when Mr. Clark came here, at their request, and publicly proposed the establishment of Wilmington College. At that time there was a veterans' education program. Farsighted citizens felt it could be made the basis for a college. So, Mr. CLARK gave sparkle and new appeal to the idea with the result that it was soon adopted. The community always should be grateful for his assistance on this project.

Always a friend of the farmer, Mr. Clark was a supporter of all measures for the protection of the tobacco producer. Leaf control and price stabilization received his constant advocacy. He will always be counted among those leaders who brought security and economic betterment to the tobacco farmer.

After his well-earned retirement from the House in 1948, Mr. Clark continued to be an influence for the good of the party he

served so long and well. His counsel was sought by all interested in various and numerous civic activities in the Seventh District.

Mr. Clark's numerous constructive achievements will be remembered in the Seventh District. And, in his death in Fayetteville, his many friends and acquaintances will mourn a Christian gentleman who gave so many years of his life in behalf of his fellow men.

[From the Robesonian, Aug. 31, 1959]

DURABLE CONGRESSMAN

For more than 20 years, J. Bayard Clark represented the Seventh North Carolina District in Congress. Those years included some of the most hectic of modern times, in the economic depression of the early 1930's. It was a period of so many changes, in and out of Government, that a show of stability was reassuring.

Mr. Clark was a man who pursued the even tenor of his ways in good times and bad. He spoke so seldom on the floor of the House that his colleagues paid attention whenever he did speak. He worked quietly and effectively. He kept out of political trouble most of the time, by anticipating it and dealing with it in advance, before it became fully developed.

When a conflict of interest arose among his constituents, Representative Clark helped to work out the differences. During his long tenure of office, there was little division in the district. His ties were closest with his home county, Bladen, and his adopted county, Cumberland. Yet he was regarded as Robeson's Congressman in the fullest sense, except for birth of residence, and apparently the attitude in the rest of the district was much the same.

Representative Clark could show the gravest concern over problems that another man might have treated lightly. For example, when it was proposed that a low-head dam be constructed across Lumber River here for the benefit of Carolina Power & Light Co., fishermen raised the question how it would affect their sport. It was not much of a dam—under water part of the time—and the powerplant was a big asset to the county. But Mr. Clark called a hearing in Lumberton, and fishermen, along with power company representatives and other interested parties, had their say. The fishermen found out that similar dams elsewhere, along with discharge of warm water into rivers, had improved fishing. The Congressman could have passed judgment in the matter on the basis of information he already had. Instead, he let the fishermen argue the subject with experts at the hearing, and they went away looking forward to the action they had opposed.

After more than 20 years' service in Washington, Representative Clark anounced he would not be a candidate for office again. He retired according to plan. Most of his career had seemed to go the same way—as he planned it. If he had setbacks and surprises at times, there was little outward evidence of them. Sometimes a heckler in an audience would become annoying. Mr. Clark would go on speaking. Before he got through, he would tell some joke that answered the heckler effectively, working it into his speech as though it had been there all the time.

Mr. Clark was less spectacular than some of his colleagues in Congress. He seldom made national headlines. His voting record was largely the same as that of the Democratic administration. In a period of drastic economic and governmental upheaval, the people of his district looked for someone to see them through. He filled that need. In Congress, as in the district, he was relied upon in the virtual certainty that he would be there next time.

In its own way, Mr. Clark's record as a Congressman was highly successful. To a large extent, he did what he set out to do. If it was unspectacular, it was because he planned it that way, ascertaining what the people of his district wanted and serving them dependably.

The Military Function

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on July 9 of this year Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, U.S. Army, retired, had a letter printed in the Wall Street Journal. This letter addresses itself to the question of the proper role of the military in our civilian society. Coming as it does, from a man who has had a distinguished career in the military service, I think it deserves special attention. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the letter, as follows:

THE MILITARY FUNCTION

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

In commenting upon your most interesting editorial, "The Obsolescent General" (June 30), I would like to add that few indeed, if any, who are familiar with the abilities of Generals Taylor and Gavin would question their competence in the special field of military tactics and trategy. But is obsolescence the question (a term General Taylor placed upon himself), or is it a question of misinterpretation or misconception of the function or role of the military class in a democratic society?

Is it a proper function of any active military leader to presume to determine that "America must be prepared to fight 'limited' wars as well as allout thermo-nuclear conflicts" (William Henry Chamberlin's column, same date)? Presumably it is or was the function of the President and Congress to determine the kind, the time and place of war, if any, the United States was to fight. Likewise until recently it was the function of the President with the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, and through the agency of the State Department, to develop and determine foreign policy for the United States.

Throughout most of my 34 years of regular Army service (1917–51) it was the function of the Secretary of War with the aid of his top military advisers to inform the President and Congress of the capabilities of the Army Establishment at a given time and to inform each what additional forces, if any, would be necessary to support a proposed or given policy of the Federal Government. It most certainly was not the function of anyone in the Army to tell the policy-making bodies of the Government that it was necessary to set up forces to fight any particular kind of war.

The assumption of this policy-making power by the U.S. military is something very recent and, I believe, most dangerous to our democratic society unless promptly brought under effective control. A free society and the garrison state are as opposite as the poles. The military must be limited to carrying out orders, not entrusted with the responsibility of making policies for the security of the Nation. They are utterly unprepared to do this.

Within the past few years the military leaders of this Nation—and I must add with the encouragement and support of powerful civilian forces—have accumulated powers quite similar to the great German General Staff before both World Wars. If we really and truly want to become what we allegedly fight, let's do so, but let's not compound the mistake by claiming we are doing so in order to preserve the free society. I know of no better or quicker way of destroying our freedom and probably the human species.

HUGH B. HESTER,
Brigadier General, U.S. Army, Retired.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

It Can't Happen Where?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, many of us have discussed devaluation of the currency and its resulting tragedy to 170 million people. We have cited instance after instance where disaster ensued.

Now we have another in that far away but very large new nation of Indonesia.

The Washington Star, August 29, had a thought-provoking editorial which I herewith insert:

Djakarta, the capital of Indonesia, is a city of approximately 3 million residents. A mixture of modern and primitive, it is in normal times a busy and bustling metropolis—the major center of commerce and banking for the republic of 85 million persons. As a government city, it may have some resemblance to Washington. As a business and banking capital, it may have even closer resemblance to New York.

On a recent day, however, the normal bustle of Djakarta was stilled. All of its banks and most of its shops were closed. So-called security forces were patroling the streets and guarding the locked entrances to the stock exchange, the banking houses and the larger business establishments. Military police were checking automobiles leaving the city.

Why? It was because Indonesia for months past has been drifting steadily and inexorably into what its own editorialists refer to as a "financial mess." It had become a victim, in the traditional sense that has prevailed in other countries before it, of inflation. And without advance warning, at the close of an earlier and normal business day, the government had announced drastic steps which it hoped—and probably no more than hoped—would arrest this progress toward complete fiscal disaster. It was the government that ordered the banks closed and foreign-exchange transactions suspended. It "froze" 90 percent of each bank account above a certain deposit figure—not only those held in individual names but those of business establishments with payrolls and costs to meet. It set an arbitrary new rate at which the rupiah would be exchangeable into foreign currency—when it would be exchangeable again at all. And in one appalling stroke it decreed that all bank notes of 500 and 1,000 rupiah face value henceforth would be worth only 10 percent of these specified face values.

It was implied, at least, that these steps would strike hardest at "profiteers" or in any case at those who had so much money that they would not suffer unduly by losing 90 percent of some of it or getting along

indefinitely without most of it. It was interesting, though, that nongovernmental commentators estimated that 80 percent of the adult population would be "immediately and personally affected." Even the leading Communist newspaper expressed concern that many more working people than estimated by the government would be hurt by this severe treatment for a severe ailment.

This may, perhaps, be the only way left to combat inflation in Indonesia—and it may work, though at deep cost to many. It does not, however, encourage support for the head-in-the-sand prattle that inflation is only a scare word employed by political "reactionaries" who advocate prudence and responsibility in a government's policies of fiscal mamagement.

The Public Works Veto: A Hollow Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENVER D. HARGIS
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. HARGIS. Mr. Speaker, the only proposed new start on a water resources project in southeast Kansas—a $400,000 allocation for Elk City Dam on the Elk River—got the ax when the public works appropriations bill went to conference. So it cannot be said that I had any ax of my own to grind when I cast what turned out to be a futile vote yesterday in favor of overriding the President's shortsighted, dictatorial, and totally unjustified veto of this bill.

I am unable to muster much sorrow for the few backsliding Democrats who failed to rally to this noblest of causes. But my heart goes out, in deep and sincere sympathy, to the poor Republican Members who fought long and hard to get badly needed water projects in their own districts into this year's bill—and then were compelled, by party pressure and the implacable Eisenhower will, to smash their own handiwork and betray the people they represent.

If this can be construed as another victory for the administration, it is a hollow victory indeed—and a victory won at the expense of legitimate progress in a vital area of the national welfare.

I have always believed that Congressmen who came from areas of water shortage or flooding were the best judges of the needs of that area, and when any such Congressman proved his case to the Public Works Committee, and who had the Engineers' survey accepting his request and showing its need, and the Public Works Committee then refers the project as essential to the Appropriations Committee, and the Appropriations Committee then approves such appropriations; this I had always thought was good evidence that our country's needs were proven. But it seems that one who has probably never seen the area, and knows nothing of the hardship and needs of the people, must be the final judge. The President stopped this progress merely because he says eventual total cost of 67 projects would have been $800 million over an indeterminate period of years, and yet in the next breath he will ask many times this sum for other countries, each year.

It was also my personal conviction that assuring a continuing program of improved domestic water resources was far more important than pouring unlimited funds into our lavish, wasteful, hopelessly mismanaged foreign aid program. This idea of mine remains unchanged, and is shared by a good many of my constituents. I eagerly await the day when it takes hold on so widespread a scale that something will have to be done about it—and I do not believe that day is far off.

Meanwhile, we are faced, presumably, with the necessity of accepting a veto-proof, progress-proof, and extensively watered-down water resources program for fiscal 1960.

There are a great many people in this country who have endured, as have my fellow citizens in southeast Kansas, water shortages that can only be met by Federal reservoir construction, and sudden water surpluses in the form of devestating floods that can only be stopped by federally constructed reservoirs—either too much or too little, but never any equitable balance.

These people are fed to the teeth with delays. The Republican-controlled press is finding it increasingly difficult to sell them on the idea that Ike and the Budget Bureau can do no wrong—and that an idle, undeveloped damsite—authorized for construction that may even get started within their lifetime, if they live to ripe old ages—is a damsite better than no damsite at all. But the papers keep plugging away, and I am sure their tone and attitude will undergo no radical change. Fortunately, their readers are bright enough to see through the thick fog of propaganda—and fed up enough to do something about it, comes next November.

Anyway, the chambers of commerce who flood congressional offices with pleas that the administration's big economy drive be supported at all costs, are now getting their wish. These are the same organizations, of course, who annually send delegations to Washington to plead for an immediate start on water projects affecting the future of their area. I am anxious to see how they reconcile one plea with the other, on the basis of this latest veto..

I can only hope that in the event the other Kansas new starts, on Council Grove and Wilson Reservoirs, get bypassed this year—which seems highly likely at the moment—I will not receive the usual batch of indignant letters, telegrams, and telephone calls asking, "Where were you when all this was going on?"

My answer will be that I was right there on the House floor, doing my best to see that this country gets the water projects it so desperately needs—budgeted or not.

Truckers Urged To Curtail Travel Over Labor Day Weekend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of August 31, 1959, which includes a statement by Gov. David L. Lawrence of Pennsylvania regarding safety on the highways during the upcoming Labor Day weekend:

TRUCKERS ARE URGED TO CURTAIL TRAVEL OVER LABOR DAY WEEKEND

The Pennsylvania Motor Truck Association today urged truck operators to curtail all truck movements during the forthcoming Labor Day weekend.

The request suggested that only emergency shipments or the transportation of perishable commodities be scheduled.

Truckdrivers who must be on the road during the 72-hour holiday were reminded to extend every courtesy to other highway users. They were additionally cautioned that many passenger car drivers will be traveling on strange roads and the professional driver should be alert for opportunities to help when needed.

It was noted that traffic will be unusually heavy because of returning summer vacationists. Families returning from tours and outings in time for September 8 school openings was also cited as a reason for increased traffic congestion.

The PMTA regularly asks truck operators to reduce operations during periods of peak travel as one phase of its continuing award-winning program to promote courtesy and safety on Pennsylvania highways.

Meanwhile, Gov. David L. Lawrence today urged Pennsylvanians to drive with particular care during the Labor Day holiday weekend.

"If Pennsylvania's motorists are to enjoy a safe holiday—and I hope they do—everyone must drive lawfully and carefully, since traffic accidents are basically the result of human error," he said.

"There are volumes of statistics to prove that accidents don't happen—they are caused.

"People are killed or injured because of drunken driving, excessive speed, fatigue.

"These are some of the more serious causes but it does not matter whether the driving error was large or small, since either could result in equal disaster.

"Twenty-nine persons died on Pennsylvania's streets and highways during last year's Labor Day holiday. Many more were hurt.

"The attitude of most drivers, unfortunately, is that it is the fellow in the other car who becomes involved in accidents.

"The truth is that every one of us has at one time or another been guilty of committing a driving error which very well could have ended in misfortune.

"Whenever you are behind the wheel, remember the fifth commandment: Thou shalt not kill.

"Nearly all of us would shudder at the thought of destroying a fellow human being with a revolver, knife, or poison; too often

we forget an automobile improperly handled is a lethal weapon.

"Life is too valuable to sacrifice it as cheaply as we did last Labor Day weekend when 29 died.

"If you are taking a trip during the holiday, please remember your destination is only halfway home. You still have to return home safely before your holiday trip is complete. Be a safe driver in a safe car. Be sure your holiday trip is a round trip."

Voteless Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the House is once more going through the familiar procedure of attempting to get a District home rule bill to the floor for a vote. The people of the Nation clearly favor home rule for their Capital City. The people of the Capital City obviously favor representation to go along with the taxation they already enjoy. The traditions of the Nation make the desirability of home rule self-evident. The arguments for home rule and the reasons for the opposition to it have been neatly summed up in a fine editorial appearing in the Portland Oregonian on August 3. Under unanimous consent I include this editorial in the RECORD:

VOTELESS AMERICANS

The long, frustrating struggle for home rule for the District of Columbia, which has common boundaries with the city of Washington, again has reached a critical stage in the House of Representatives. Home rule leaders are circulating a discharge petition to get a bill out of the grasp of the District Committee, in which a subcommittee controlled by southern Democrats is adamantly opposed to Washington self-government.

The Senate adopted a home rule bill July 15, for the fifth time in the past decade. This year it was a bill by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon. It would give the District the right to elect a mayor, a legislative council of nine members and a nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives.

But the House has not even been permitted to vote on a home rule bill in the past decade. Since 1950, the white population of the District has dropped from 64 percent to 47 percent, and the Negro population has increased from 36 percent to 53 percent. The southerners who dominate the House District Committee and the Rules Committee have bottled up each Senate bill and all House bills on the subject. They are not about to risk election of Negroes to city government, thus to establish a precedent unpopular in the South.

There are other causes of opposition to home rule for the Nation's Capital, however. Of the 69 square miles of the District, 53 percent is tax exempt (43 percent federally owned, much of the rest owned by foreign governments for embassies, etc.). Of the total personal income of the District, 32 percent is paid by the U.S. Government. Some opponents fear higher taxes, since the Congress contributes a recent average of 12 percent to municipal costs.

For 70 years, Washington had a good measure of self-rule. Then, after exposure of scandalous inefficiency and fiscal mismanagement in municipal affairs, Congress took over. For the past 81 years, Washington has been administered by four committees of Congress and three commissioners appointed by the President, one of whom is by tradition an Army engineer.

Besides burdening Congress with the minutiae of city government and depriving the people of a voice in their own affairs, this system has proved to be awkward. The House and Senate District Committees do not always see eye to eye. And the House and Senate Appropriations Committees may not agree with either, or each other. Despite this, Washington has had good government in recent years.

The most stubborn opposition to self-government is aroused by the racial issue. And this conflict between what Americans say and how they live hurts the Nation's prestige abroad. Washington integrated its schools with a minimum of friction after the Supreme Court's ruling. But Congress refuses white and colored alike a vote if they live in Washington, except in the single instance of electing delegates to national conventions.

Since Congress has adopted only one bill withdrawn from a stubborn committee since 1910, the move to thaw the self-government bill may get nowhere. The petition, however, has spurred the House District Committee to hold hearings. If a bill could be moved to the floor, it would have an excellent chance of passage. Congress should find a way to get around the southern roadblock and restore these minimum civil rights of Americans living in the Nation's Capital.

Tolls on Waterborne Commerce or Vessels

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of the City of San Diego in the 30th Congressional District of California, has consistently followed the policy of opposing the establishment of any policies by the Federal Government leading to the levying or collection of tolls on waterborne commerce or vessels for the use of harbors, channels, or waterways within the territorial boundaries of any State, except tolls imposed pursuant to a treaty or agreement with another country.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully call your attention to the following resolution adopted by the city council of San Diego, Calif.:

RESOLUTION 156572

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of San Diego, as follows:

"That the enactment of legislation or the establishment of any policies by the Federal Government leading to the levying or collection of tolls on waterborne commerce or vessels for the use of harbors, channels, or waterways within the territorial boundaries of any State, except tolls imposed pursuant to a treaty or agreement with another country, is hereby opposed.

PHILLIP ACKER,
City Clerk.
ELFA F. HAMEL,
Deputy.

Old Glory Raised Over Fairless Hills, Pa., by Pennsylvania Supreme Court Justice Michael A. Musmanno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker of August 31, 1959, reporting the role played by Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court in raising the American Flag over Fairless Hills, Pa., for the first time in that community's history. Justice Musmanno is to be highly commended for his patriotic activities in this and in many other matters:

RAISE FLAG AT FAIRLESS HILLS

FAIRLESS HILLS, PA.—Justice Michael A. Musmanno and the Veterans of Foreign Wars raised Old Glory over the Fairless Hills Post Office today and the justice said Francis Scott Key could have been no happier.

Key wrote the "The Star-Spangled Banner."

For Justice Musmanno, a member of the State supreme court, it was the culmination of a weeks-long fight to have the flag flown from the postoffice all the time.

Both the justice and VFW, of which he is a State officer, asserted along about midsummer that they were appalled at so little flagflying in this 6-year-old community.

They were told that deed restrictions and other physical difficulties forbade the erection of permanent flagpoles in the huge housing development. Television aerials and radio antennae also are banned, all this, the developers explained, in an effort to keep the landscape attractive.

Justice Musmanno and fellow-members of the VFW brought a flag to Fairless Hills. The justice climbed a ladder and for a few moments held the Stars and Stripes over the post office.

This gesture and the justice's comments brought sharp rejoinders from the postmaster, Mrs. Catharine Wright.

She said the building used as a post office is rented and therefore subject to the same deed restrictions as any private citizen's property. Then, tartly, she suggested that Justice Musmanno devote himself to the supreme court, and let her run the post office.

She termed the flagraising theatrical and an unwarranted reflection upon herself as a Government representative and upon the patriotism of the people generally. She added that there could be no question about that patriotism.

Mrs. Wright was not on hand for today's ceremonies. In her stead was her assistant, Harry Shelley.

Said the justice:

"Although Mrs. Wright is not here I want to express my congratulations and thanks to her, even though she threw a few verbal rollingpins at me, and I perhaps dropped a few chiding feathers on her. I know her heart was right.

"I am particularly happy that the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been successful in our campaign to have the flag properly honored in Fairless Hill."

Trim in his VFW uniform, the Justice was flanked by four other officers of the organ-

ization: Willis Bosch, commander of the Bucks County council; Gilbert Herman, eighth district commander; Walter Holzer, commander of the Levittown Post; and Edward Boehmer, commander of the Falls Township Post.

About 100 people gathered to watch what the Justice called a sweet and memorable ritual.

Origin and Functioning of the U.S. Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech presented by Mr. Slator M. Miller, vice president of the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, entitled "The Origin and Functioning of the U.S. Sugar Act."

The maintenance of a good and healthy sugar industry is important, not only to the people of the State of Hawaii, but to all the people of the United States.

I feel certain that the information contained in this speech will be of great interest to the Members of this Congress. It follows:

THE ORIGIN AND FUNCTIONING OF THE U.S. SUGAR ACT

Ladies and gentlemen, it is my pleasure to talk with you this morning about a successful Government agricultural program, covered by the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. This is a good law. It confers as many benefits upon the buyers of the commodity as it does on the producers. In fact there are many who feel the consumers have had the best of it, but we shall not argue the point here. This is a law of our country which guarantees a major market within its boundaries for producers in foreign areas. Not only that, but one which guarantees these foreign producers a share in the continued growth of the U.S. market as well. I know of no other country in which such a guarantee prevails.

I am sure we are all aware of the serious difficulties usually encountered in trying to legislate farm programs, no matter where. The problem is not limited to the United States where huge surplus supplies of basic crops overshadow and dominate the market. Many other countries have had their farm problems and continue to wrestle with them today.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

So it may be of interest to you gentlemen whose combined efforts provide the technology, the know-how, to raise the sugarcane of the world, to inquire into the roots of this program, to see how there developed a practical formula of control which has remained but little changed in basic concept since the Jones-Costigan Act, the predecessor of today's law, was enacted by the Congress a quarter of a century ago.

In order to understand this we must go back, briefly, over the years to the time of the founding of the United States of America, for it was in 1789, shortly after this country gained its independence, that the Government imposed the first tariff on raw sugar in order to raise revenue. I might say that in speaking of tariffs I shall refer to raw sugar unless I specify otherwise. At that time, and through most of the next century, import duties and domestic excise taxes were the major sources of Government receipts. The sugar tariff for revenue yielded close to 20 percent of all import duties. This duty remained on sugar continuously until 1890, holding at about 2½ cents a pound during most of the period but ranging from 1 to 3½ cents a pound.

In 1890, the U.S. Treasury had a surplus and the need to maintain a sugar tariff to produce revenue was no longer pressing. The duty on sugar, then 2¼ cents per pound, was repealed, and since this removed tariff protection from the domestic producers a compensating bounty of 2 cents per pound to these producers was established. These actions had a particular effect in two of the then substantial producing areas—Hawaii and Cuba. In the case of Cuba production was markedly stimulated when the removal of the tariff further opened the American market. On the other hand, Hawaii was hurt badly by the discontinuance of the sugar duty since, by treaty, the Hawaiian producers had enjoyed tariff protection along with domestic producers but were not now eligible for the domestic bounty.

Four years later, in 1894, the tariff was again levied on sugar, the bounty system discontinued. At this time a different economic reasoning prevailed. The new tariff was imposed not to produce revenue but to protect the burgeoning domestic industry and, incidentally, to restore Hawaii to a preferred position in the American market. The protective tariff system remained in effect until the year 1934 when the present quota system came into being with the passage of the Jones-Costigan Act.

Let us pause now to take a backward look at the then state of the sugar industry. In doing so it is well to remember that with the Cuban Reciprocity Treaty becoming effective December 27, 1903, the fortunes of the sugar industries of Cuba and the United States became closely entwined. You will recall that under reciprocity the tariff on all imports from Cuba became and still is 20 percent less than the regular tariff rates applied on imports from other countries. Under this impetus the Cuban sugar industry expanded rapidly, largely with American capital. The preferential tariff favoring imports from Cuba also influenced a marked change in our sources of foreign sugar. In 1900 slightly less than half of our sugar from foreign lands came from Cuba but by 1913 virtually all our imported sugar was from that country.

The tariff preference afforded Cuba and the tariff protection afforded the domestic industry during these years was small in comparison to the assistance given by many countries to their sugar industries. High tariffs, import controls, exchange controls, internal taxes, and State monopolies kept sugar prices in many foreign countries at such a high level that per capita consumption was only a small fraction of that in the United States. In general this condition prevails today.

Both the domestic and Cuban sugar industries had difficulties through most of the 1920's. Also, toward the close of that decade a world depression in sugar became serious. Rapid increase in production in certain countries and disruption of normal distribution in most countries was the rule, due in part to tremendous advances in sugar technology. It is interesting to note that it was during this period that the International Society of Sugar Cane Technologists was founded. When the world depression in sugar became serious in the late 1920's, domestic producers again turned to the Congress asking for help in the traditional manner, i.e., to raise tariffs still higher to offset world price reductions. As a result, under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act the duty on Cuban sugar was raised to 2 cents a pound and the duty on other foreign sugar was raised to 2½ cents. But the world price kept falling until by May 1932 the world price of raw sugar dropped to less than 1 cent a pound. The U.S. price had followed the world price downward until it reached the depression low of less than 3 cents a pound, which was the 2-cent duty on Cuban sugar plus the world price an the freight to Cuba. It became obvious that the tariff had ceased to be an effective remedy for domestic sugar ills. In addition, there was ample evidence that our 2-cent tariff on Cuban sugar was causing severe suffering to the Cuban people and its increase, or even continuance, would bring further hardship. Already, economic ruin and revolution was the order of the day. Something new and radical had to be done.

The U.S. Tariff Commission made a careful appraisal of the situation and reported on the failure of the tariff to solve the sugar problem. The Commission went further. The Chairman, in a letter to the President of the United States, dated April 11, 1933, pointed out that the price had declined to disaster levels for both United States and Cuban producers; that both the domestic industry and that of Cuba required price relief; that prices should be raised by limiting, through a quota system, the supply of sugar offered for sale in this country; and, that if some type of quota system were instituted by this country, the duty on Cuban sugar might be reduced. It is important to bear in mind the importance to Cuba of this recommendation since it would provide a means through increased returns from sugar to rehabilitate its economy and stabilize its government.

A year passed before the basic suggestions of the Tariff Commission could be put into effect. It was a year marked by numerous conferences by representatives of the sugar industry and government officials to develop a marketing agreement for sugar. After several vain attempts a Stabilization Agreement was reached, but the Secretary of Agriculture concluded the plan was unworkable. Even though the Stabilization Agreement did not go into effect, its formulation paved the way to the later enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act, which became law on May 9, 1934, embodying the same principles included in the Sugar Act that is in effect today.

The development of the abortive Stabilization Agreement had on the plus side a most constructive and important result—one that has had added significance as sugar legislation has come before the Congress from time to time in subsequent years. That is, for the first time it demonstrated that the entire domestic sugar industry could work together to compromise varying interests and points of view and reach agreement on basic principles. At the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture, of the U.S. House of Representatives, when it was giving consideration to sugar legislation in 1947, the official spokesman for the entire domestic sugar producing and refining industry said:

"You will appreciate, I know, that the joint endorsement and the common approval of all five competitive groups, taken together with the support and endorsement of this bill recorded here this morning * * * is not less than a legislative miracle."

THE U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM

Several acts have succeeded the original Jones-Costigan Act with a number of changes of major or minor degree but without substantial basic change.

The national sugar policy is clearly spelled out in the preamble of the act. In plain language, the act's chief purposes are:

1. To maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry;

2. To assure consumers in the United States an adequate supply of sugar at reasonable prices;

3. To promote the export trade of the United States.

The attainment of these objectives involves: (1) the determination of U.S. total sugar requirements; (2) the establishment of quotas to the various domestic and foreign sugar supplying areas representing their share of the U.S. market; and (3) payments, known as "conditional payments," to domestic producers of sugar beets and sugarcane grown for the production of sugar, provided such producers comply with certain labor, wage, price, and marketing requirements prescribed by law. Furthermore, the law imposes a manufacturers' tax on sugar so the program is not a burden on the general taxpayer.

To those of you from foreign areas I should, perhaps, explain that domestic sugar is that produced in the continental United States, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Domestic sugar output provides about 55 percent of the Nation's total requirements. Hence, in order to assure adequate supplies to consumers at fair and reasonable prices, sugar must be imported from foreign areas. How these imports are controlled through quotas will be developed later.

ESTIMATE OF SUGAR REQUIREMENTS

The fundamental requirement to the proper administration of the Sugar Act is the determination each year of the Nation's total sugar requirements. From this determination of estimated sugar requirements stems a system of marketing quotas and the sum of all these quotas equals the "estimate of consumption" as officially announced by the Secretary of Agriculture. The act requires that in establishing the estimate of consumption the Secretary have as his objective making available on the American sugar market sufficient sugar to meet the Nation's needs at prices which are reasonable to the consumer and that will provide a fair return to producers. The law requires the initial determination for any calendar year to be announced in December of the preceding year. The Secretary may, and frequently does, change the estimate from time to time within the year when, in his opinion, conditions warrant such change. The increase in U.S. population, of itself, brings about an annual growth in sugar consumption of about 150,000 tons.

To recapitulate: The size of the consumption estimate (1) determines the total of all sugar quotas, domestic and foreign (thereby influencing foreign trade); (2) governs the amount of sugar that may be made available to consumers; (3) by governing the size of the domestic area quotas it directly influences domestic production; (4) influences the price of sugar because of its effect on supply.

Since I have noted an influence on sugar price, I hasten to say that the Sugar Act is not a price-fixing law. The Secretary has no authority under the law to fix sugar prices. But, because he does have the power and the duty to regulate the Nation's total sugar supply and because it is axiomatic that supply in relation to demand is a price determinate, the Secretary can exert a substantial influence on the price in the marketplace. This is because a phenomenon of American life is the near-static yearly per capita consumption of sugar, about 100 pounds, which does not vary as between depression or prosperity. Due to this steady demand the market is sensitive to changes in supply.

We can see, then, that should the estimate of sugar requirements be set unduly low the supply would be limited, the price might move to an excessively high figure, and the interests of consumers could be prejudiced; on the other hand, should the estimate be unduly high the result would most likely be a depressed market, and the interests of the producer would be jeopardized. It is thus obvious that the Secretary cannot casually make his estimates of sugar requirements as a magician pulls a rabbit out of a hat. As a matter of fact, the Congress recognized the need for great care in determining the estimate and provided a guide to the Secretary by setting forth in the act certain factors which the Secretary must consider in arriving at his initial determination. Briefly, these factors are:

1. He must use as a basis the quantity of direct-consumption sugar distributed for consumption during the year ending the preceding October 31.

2. He is required to make allowances for deficiencies or surpluses of inventories, and for changes in consumption because of changes in population and demand conditions, and the level and trend of consumer purchasing power.

3. He must consider the relationship between the price which he expects will result from his determination and the general cost of living in the United States in comparison with the relationship between the price of sugar and the general cost of living during 1947–49.

(The law spcifies sources for certain statistics used in these requirements.)

Although the law does not require it, the Secretary holds a public hearing each year, usually in November, to obtain the views of interested parties as to the proper application and weight of the statutory factors I have enumerated.

From this you can see that serious and extensive study and evaluation of many complex factors precedes the determination of an estimate of consumption. This is proper because the size of this figure has an influence on all other actions involved in the administration of the Sugar Act.

QUOTAS

After the Secretary has made his determination of sugar requirements, each domestic producing area and each foreign country supplying this country with sugar is assigned a quota representing its share of the market. Separate quotas are established for each of the following domestic producing areas—domestic beet, Mainland cane, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Since the estimate of consumption is expressed in short tons, raw value, quotas are likewise expressed in these terms. Quotas are calculated strictly in compliance with a formula spelled out in the law. This formula is rather complicated and is couched in legal phraseology so I shall not attempt to give it to you in full detail, but we can outline the general pattern.

Historically, in the years just preceding the first Sugar Act, about 55 percent of our total sugar supplies came from domestic sources and the remaining 45 percent from foreign countries, but principally from Cuba. The Sugar Acts in effect from 1934 through 1947 provided for quotas at about this same proportion. During, and immediately following, World War II all restrictions on production of sugar were lifted. In 1947 controls were again imposed. Congress that year passed the Sugar Act of 1948 and in doing so took note of the great expansion of sugar production in Cuba during the war period and, to help her make an orderly and gradual adjustment downward from these high wartime production levels, provided for fixed quotas for the domestic producing areas and gave all the annual market increase to foreign countries—with over 98 percent of this yearly increase going to Cuba. This was done as a temporary measure originally planned for 5 years but in fact it was not until 1956 that future market growth was again divided between domestic and foreign suppliers at the historic ratio of 55 percent domestic and 45 percent foreign. This is the situation today.

The Philippines is an exception. By law and by the terms of the U.S.-Philippine Trade Agreement the Philippine quota is fixed; it amounts to 952,000 tons of sugar, commercial weight; this, by regulation, has been converted to 980,000 tons, raw value.

Should it appear that any supplying area will not be able to market its full quota during the calendar year, the expected deficit is allocated among other areas in a manner prescribed by the law.

I think I should here mention that the Sugar Acts have always provided that only a very limited quantity of refined sugar may be brought to the continental United States under the quotas, not only of foreign countries, but of the offshore domestic areas as well. The limitation was the result of one of the many compromises which went into the formulation of the first Sugar Act and its successors. There have been some slight adjustments in the permissive imports but the current act freezes the percentage relationship between refined and raw quotas in Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines to that which prevailed in 1955.

MARKETING ALLOTMENTS

One important function of the sugar program is to promote orderly marketing. This, in turn, requires effective control over area quotas to be sure they are not exceeded. It is a fairly simple matter to police sugar importation from foreign lands. The Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture, working through the U.S. Custom Service, has set up adequate procedures for this. It is a more complex matter in domestic producing areas, particularly when supplies in any area are more than adequate to fill that area's quota.

If the Secretary believes that the pressure of supplies in a certain domestic area or areas is likely to cause disorderly marketing, he must allot the quota fairly among the marketers. For the purpose of making allotments, a domestic marketer is the first seller of sugar. In the beet area this is the beet processor; in the cane areas it is the sugarcane processor making raw sugar only, or the processor of sugarcane who advances his processing to the point of producing direct consumption sugar. It should be noted that a marketing allotment does not guarantee that a company can sell a given amount of sugar. On the contrary, it merely places a ceiling on the amount the company is permitted to sell in a year. Each company must compete with others in the marketplace, and, believe me, this competition can be, and usualy is, severe.

In establishing marketing allotments, the Secretary is required by law to take into consideration each company's (1) production of sugar from proportionate-share acreage, (2) past marketings, and (3) ability to market. The Secretary can exercise wide administrative latitude in measuring and weighing these factors. The law cautions that "allotments shall be made in such manner and in such amounts as to provide a fair, efficient, and equitable distribution of such quota. * * *" The law also provides for public hearings to permit the affected companies to present their individual points of view with respect to the statutory factors before the allotments are established.

To ensure compliance with marketing quotas a severe penalty may be imposed for marketing of more sugar than permitted under the official allocation. This is a fine equal to three times the market value of the excess sugar marketed.

PROPORTIONATE SHARES

The next step under the program as it applies to domestic areas, is the setting up of practical controls over production, just as the establishment of marketing allotments

controls the marketing of sugar. In order to accomplish this there must be an orderly division of the market among individual farms. In dividing the market among farms, however, the Secretary is dealing with a different total quantity of sugar than when determining quotas and marketing allotments. He must allow for enough sugar to provide a normal carryover as well as the amount of sugar represented by the quota. Each farm's allotment, known as its proportionate share, may be expressed in acres, tons of sugarcane or beets, or in tons of sugar which can be normally produced from cane or beets. In areas where proportionate shares are expressed in acres proportionate shares are known as acreage allotments.

The purpose of assigning specific shares to farms in a particular area is to adjust crop output to the area's quota, and a reasonable carryover, and to assure that farm will share in this adjustment equitably. In determining the proportionate share for a farm the Secretary takes into account the past production on a farm—usually referred to in sugar circles as "past history"—and ability to produce. The act requires the Secretary to protect, to the extent practicable, the interests of new, and small, producers and producers who are tenants and sharecroppers.

It is obvious that the establishment and administration of proportionate shares is complicated, tedious, and expensive. Hence in actual practice, proportionate shares are not made restrictive unless production in an area has exceeded the total of quota and reasonable carryover and where marketing allotments have failed to bring about a balance between production and allowable area marketings. For example, in the domestic areas today there are restrictive proportionate shares effective in the beet area only.

Even when restrictive proportionate shares are in effect producers are not required to stay within their assigned share. But the law provides a powerful incentive to do so in the form of conditional payments, without which the producer suffers a substantial loss of income.

CONDITIONAL PAYMENTS AND EXCISE TAX

Since these payments are an important part of the sugar program we shall take a moment to explain them.

The principal way in which the domestic industry derives benefits from the sugar program is through the stabilization of raw and refined sugar prices at reasonably profitable levels. However, the Congress provided for a system of grower payments as a mechanism to assure compliance with quota and carryover needs and to effect a certain redistribution of income within the domestic sugar industry. Although conditional payments are made out of the general funds of the U.S. Treasury, the law provides for the imposition of an excise tax on sugar which provides funds for the Treasury which more than offset the total of all conditional payments plus the costs incurred by the Department of Agriculture in administering the act. In fact, the Treasury receives each year from the sugar tax revenues some $15 million more than it pays out.

The excise tax is collected on domestically produced sugar as well as on imported sugar. It is in effect a manufacturer's tax and is colected from the processor, or refiner, of direct consumption sugar at the rate of one-half cent a pound, raw value. A compensating tax at the same rate is imposed on all direct consumption sugar imported into the continental limits of the United States.

As the name implies, a grower, or a processor who is also a grower, must meet certain conditions, or requirements, before becoming eligible for payments. The grower must (1) deliver beets or sugarcane grown only on his allotted number of acres; (2) he must pay his fieldworkers at least the minimum wages prescribed for his farm, or farming area, by the Secretary of Agriculture; (3) he must meet certain standards pertaining to working conditions he provides for his employees; and, (4) he must not employ any child labor. If the producer (grower) is also a processor of sugarcane, or sugar beets, and he fails to pay for sugarcane or beets purchased from another grower in accordance with rates established by the Secretary as being a fair price, the producer will lose his conditional payment.

Conditional payments are based on a calculation of the amount of sugar produced from the crop of sugarcane, or sugar beets, of a producer, be he an individual grower or a processor-grower. The payments range downward from 80 cents per hundred pounds of sugar produced to 30 cents per hundred pounds. The payment varies inversely according to the size of the individual's sugar crop. This gives a decided advantage to the small producer. The 80-cent rate applies to production up to 350 tons at which point the reduction in rate of payment becomes effective in varying steps until a production of 30,000 tons is reached. From that point the 30-cent rate applies. Because of the large size of Hawaiian plantations (only about 10 percent of the total sugar being produced by small growers), the average payment to Hawaiian producers is the lowest of all domestic areas. In 1958, the average rate was but 46 cents per 100 pounds. At the opposite extreme is the beet area where, because of a preponderance of small farms, the average rate of payment approaches the maximum rate of 80 cents.

Contrary to the belief of many persons that the tax on sugar is added to the price of sugar to the consumer, the true situation is explained in a statement made by the Secretary of Agriculture on March 15, 1937, as follows:

"One is likely to assume that the excise taxes increase prices under all conditions; but an excise tax on sugar, within certain limits, under a quota system is one of the exceptions."

To recapitulate, we see that the tax-quota-payment system is a self-financing arrangement under which the tax is taken out of the normal gross proceeds of the sale of sugar, and principally reduces the income of the grower, or raw producer, who then, upon compliance with certain conditions, receives the remainder of his normal proceeds in the form of the conditional compliance payment.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE SUGAR ACT

In order to properly fulfill the many responsibilities incumbent upon him in administering the provisions of the Sugar Act, the Secretary of Agriculture has established a Sugar Division within his Department.

The Sugar Division has a director and a deputy director, and it is divided into a number of branches, as follows:

1. Quota and Allotment Branch.
2. Conditional Payments Branch.
3. Wage, Price, and Commodity Programs Branch: (a) Wage and price section; (b) commodity programs staff.
4. Program Analysis Branch: (a) Operational analysis staff; (b) cost studies section.

In addition, the director has an international sugar agreement staff and an administrative management group responsible directly to him. Then, for purposes of direct liaison with producers in the various areas, and for the administration of acreage control and conditional payment phases of the sugar program there are field offices in the principal producing areas. These are State or county agricultural and conservation offices and are concerned with many farm programs of which sugar is but one.

The success of the sugar program largely stands or falls on the character of its administration. Happily, there has been a high proficiency of administration under directors of integrity, understanding, and dedication to the public welfare.

SUMMATION

In closing I shall briefly review the principal factors of the U.S. sugar program. We have seen that this program stems from an act of Congress; that it is designed to shield the consumer from unreasonably high prices and to assure an adequate supply at all times; that the producers' interests are to be fairly protected; and that foreign trade be fostered by allotting foreign producers a share in the American market.

We have noted the major steps in making the act effective, i.e., the determination of an annual estimate of consumption; the assignment of area quotas; the allotment of marketing quotas and proportionate shares, and the making of conditional payments. We have noted the collection of an excise tax on direct consumption sugar which, in total, amounts to a sum more than adequate to finance the program.

I can think of no better words to end my talk than those the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. HAROLD COOLEY, used on the floor of the House on July 30, 1955, in the course of debate on an extension of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended. He said:

"The program has operated so well, so successfully, and so smoothly, that the average housewife is not even aware of the fact that we have a sugar program. But we have it. It has operated well, and under the program prices have been stabilized through the years. We have avoided great fluctuation in prices even in war."

Gentlemen, it has been a great pleasure to have the privilege of talking to you this morning on a subject so important to the continuation of a healthy sugar industry.

Deliberately Expanding Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column written by Mr. David Lawrence which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, August 20, 1959.

DELIBERATELY EXPANDING COLD WAR—SOVIET DOUBLECROSS OF EISENHOWER SEEN IN RED INVASION OF LAOS AND LADAK

(By David Lawrence)

Evidence is accumulating that Nikita Khrushchev was doublecrossing President Eisenhower all the time that the Chief Executive was discussing with him, through diplomatic channels, the possibility of inviting the Soviet Premier to visit the United States as a means of relieving international tensions.

For the critical situation that has arisen in Laos is the direct result of the Soviet government's decision during the last few weeks to intensify the cold war in the southeast Asian peninsula.

Also the Chinese Communists, who act only after colaboration between Peiping and Moscow, have begun an invasion of Ladak—one of the states which is an integral part

of the territory of India. It is on the border of Tibet.

This is an odd way to try to relieve tensions. In fact, there is every indication that, so far as the Moscow government is concerned, there has been a stepping up of the tempo of the cold war in Asia. Thus, the Red Chinese are making hostile moves in the direction of Nepal—an independent republic—which lies on the border between India and Tibet. Latest maps from Peiping not only show Nepal as a part of Red China but they include within Communist jurisdiction the northern State of Ladak in India itself.

This brazen aggression has attracted the attention of free governments throughout the world but not that of the free peoples, so many of whom are busily engaged now in discussions of how Nikita Khrushchev should be entertained on his visit to the United States.

The Soviet government, of course, has been sending out propaganda denying its maneuvers in Laos and other areas. Indeed, the Moscow foreign office makes the amazing claim now that the United States has violated the neutrality of Laos by setting up military bases there. Yet officials of the Soviet Union are well aware that the United States has no bases or any organized military missions in that country.

The fighting in the little Buddhist Kingdom of Laos has been carried on by an estimated 2,000 Red guerrillas who are attacking Government troops at outpost points. The invading forces come across the border from Communist North Vietnam and are regularly supplied from there and from Red China. Significantly, the Moscow official organ, Izvestia, has served notice that hostilities "are apt to grow into protracted bloodletting and they may spread beyond Laos, engulfing a whole line of Southeast Asia countries."

All this began happening just after Nikita Khrushchev conducted personal conversations recently with Ho Chi Minh, the Communist Premier of North Vietnam.

Both the Lao Provinces which now have been invaded from North Vietnam were held by the Communist forces before the 1954 truce conference at Geneva, which this writer covered at the time. It was not until 3 years later that the Communists actually turned over control of the disputed Provinces. Now it looks as if the Reds want to take them back.

Many people may have forgotten the 1954 conference that ended the bloody war in Indochina, in which the French made such big sacrifices to defend their protectorate. They finally agreed to release their former colonies from any jurisdiction by the French Government. But solemn agreements were entered into then by the Communists, which now have been broken. The resumption of the war in Indochina is on a par with the repeated violations of the Korean armistice by the Communists.

Laos is striving to get the United Nations to take some action, or at least to make a thorough investigation of the fighting.

State Department officials are embarrassed. They hesitate to come out in the open and accuse Khrushchev of bad faith, because everything is supposed to be sweetness and light these days in relation to the Soviet Union since the Soviet Premier is coming here as an official guest. But no such compunction seems to affect the Soviet Premier, who, as the man in governmental authority, has issued the instructions to stir up war in the Provinces of Laos and northern India.

The tiny Government of Laos has been making excellent progress toward setting up a democracy. Free elections are scheduled to be held. A new Premier had forced Communists out of the Cabinet. The economy had begun to improve as American advice and financial aid were given. Consequently, the Government was gaining new followers as trained army teams provided health and sanitation facilities, rural schools, and new roads.

These measures were bringing about a stable situation in Laos. The policy was to be one of official neutrality as between the East and the West, but it has been obvious that the people of Laos have been leaning toward the West. This, of course, is what irks Khrushchev, who now has given orders to aggravate the situation so it will involve the spending of more money by the Lao Government to protect itself. The new war is designed, of course, to bring the Communists back into the Cabinet preparatory to a takeover of the country from within by the Reds.

All this is happening at a time when many Americans aren't reading much about Laos but are worrying about how to show Khrushchev a good time in the United States. Sooner or later, the free governments of the world must express themselves against such aggression, either through the United Nations or individually. For this is a deliberate enlargement of the cold war.

Two Eugene Girls on a Pilgrimage to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Marna Baldinger and Mary Jo Delyea, high school students from my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., recently made a pilgrimage to the United Nations. Their trip was part of the annual "U.N. Pilgrimage for Youth" sponsored by the Odd Fellows Lodge and Rebekahs.

The girls had a strenuous and interesting tour. I wish more people, young and old, could have this opportunity to look at the United Nations so closely.

If the U.N. does solve the problems of the world, it will be because people like Marna and Mary Jo give it the support it must have.

Under unanimous consent I am including the text of a feature story by Pepper Allen about the pilgrimage, which appeared in the Eugene Register-Guard, August 26, 1959:

TWO EUGENE GIRLS ON A PILGRIMAGE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

(By Pepper Allen)

Walking through the doors of the United Nations headquarters in New York City is "like walking through the door of the future," according to one Eugene teenager, Marna Baldinger. Above the door is inscribed "Peace, Brotherhood, Justice, and Truth," she said.

Marna and Mary Jo Delyea, also a Eugene High School student, recently returned from participating in the annual "U.N. Pilgrimage for Youth," sponsored by the Odd Fellows Lodge and Rebekahs. Mary Jo was an official delegate, and Marna, who placed second in local competition, was able to go when a vacancy occurred.

Their parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. S. Baldinger and Mr. and Mrs. Frank Delyea, now are hearing accounts of the bus trip to the eastern city, which took the girls through Canada to many historical and scenic points in New England, and to the U.N.

WORK FOR PEACE

The girls were especially impressed with the work done by the U.N.'s specialized agencies—"not actually a part of the U.N., but working with them," Mary Jo said.

"They seemed to me to be doing the most work for world peace," she continued, and emphasized the importance of feeding hungry peoples and increasing material welfare of underdeveloped nations.

Most of the world's poor, according to Marna, "are more interested in four sandwiches than four freedoms." She feels that people must be comfortable in order to be interested in peace."

During the girls' 6-day stay in New York City they heard talks by the heads of the 12 specialized agencies and made tours of U.N. facilities. At the U.N., they attended meetings of the Trusteeship Council.

"It was 'dog-eat-dog' at the council," commented Marna.

VISIT EMBASSIES

Both girls were able to visit various foreign embassies during their New York stay. Marna and her group went to the Russian Embassy, and were met by the first secretary, B. Buron.

"We asked pointed questions," she laughed, but the secretary was friendly and commented on the Communist philosophy and on religion.

He said they felt that socialism was the next step higher than capitalism, she reported, and also explained that religion and communism are not compatible.

Mary Jo, a little wistfully, said that she visited only delegations from "peaceful nations," Brazil and Norway.

A trip to the Russian exhibition in New York City was an additional thrill for both girls—

"It was really fantastic," one of them commented, somewhat sarcastically. "It made Russia look good—by showing fur coats, expensive clothes—" The people at the exhibition were friendly, they said.

FUTURE CAREERS

A performance, "The Music Man" was another highlight of their New York visit, as was a speaking contest for members of the group in which Marna won second place in her division.

To qualify for the trip, the girls wrote essays on "Why I Would Like to See the U.N. in Action" and gave speeches on "Can the U.N. Solve the Problems of the World."

Elimination contests on the city and county levels narrowed Oregon's delegation to 18. "We had more participants than any other State," Marna said with pride.

This fall, Mary Jo, a senior at North Eugene High School, will be student body secretary. She is in Latin Club, and plans to continue her interest in world affairs, with plans for a future career in the Foreign Service or on the United Nations staff.

Marna, who with her traveling parents, has lived in Japan and Mexico and will be going to India with them, also has hopes of becoming part of the U.N. staff. She will be a senior at South Eugene High School, where she is active in French Club and International Relations League.

First of all, however, the girls are catching up on their sleep—one slept 17 hours straight when she finally reached home.

The Gasoline Tax Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, as the record shows, I voted against the 1 cent per gallon increase in gasoline. I voted in this manner after the most careful study of all the facts and factors surrounding the highway program, its financing, and the manner in which we must finance additional construction in the future. I wholeheartedly agree that Congress must act to continue the highway program and, I favor the proposed legislation by Senator ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, to take 1 percent from all other appropriations for Federal agencies and to allocate to the highway construction program the money thus saved.

Senator GORE, who was one of the leaders in the fight for the Federal highway program in 1955, has made two excellent speeches in recent days relating to the reasons why he opposes an additional hike in the gasoline tax for motorists. I wish to associate myself with his views, for I believe that he has used logical reasoning in his statement of the facts about the highway construction program and its financing.

Under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting the two speeches Senator GORE made—one on August 24, and one on August 31. The speeches are as follows:

THE HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(Speech of Hon. ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee, in the Senate of the United States, Monday, August 24, 1959)

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in February 1955, the President of the United States submitted to the Congress a report which dramatically called to the attention of the country the inadequacy and dangerous condition of our highways. This report, prepared by a Commission headed by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, pointed out that one-seventh of all Americans owned their livelihood either directly or indirectly to the highway and highway transportation industries. Particular emphasis was given to the tremendous loss, both economic and in terms of human life and suffering, which was being experienced daily because our highway construction program had not kept pace with expanding needs.

Highway building had been necessarily slowed by the priority demands of a wartime economy. The President recommended that in order to alleviate a critical problem the Federal Government should assume major responsibility for the construction of a new system of interstate and national defense highways, interconnecting our major metropolitan areas. The President gave particular emphasis to the importance of the new system of highways to national defense.

The proposal received intense consideration by the committees of the Congress for almost 2 complete sessions. There evolved the Federal Highway Act of 1956, of which it was my privilege to be coauthor. This act provided that the Federal Government should pay 90 percent of the cost of constructing this new System of Defense and Interstate Highways with a construction schedule calling for completion of the system by 1972 to design standards adequate to meet estimated traffic needs of 1975. It provided, also, for corresponding improvement of primary, secondary, and urban highways to a corresponding state of adequacy.

Construction progress is now well underway. The State highway departments and the highway construction industry have responded to the challenge. We are now, however, in a critical situation in which, unless appropriate action is taken by the Congress, construction will stop altogether on the vital Interstate and Defense System or, at best, be so slowed down and stretched out as to make impossible completion of the system on schedule as specified by the act of 1956.

A halt in construction of the Interstate System will be disastrous. State highway departments have geared their operations to the authorized level. Engineering staffs recruited with great difficulty and expense, would have to be disbanded only to be recruited again at great loss in money and time, if and when the program is resumed. The highway construction industry, having increased its capacity at the request of Congress, will be severely injured. The entire economy will receive a jolt from which it will not be easy to recover. Substantial increases in unemployment will be inevitable.

Meanwhile, if the program is halted, the gap between highways in being and those required will rapidly increase. Our highways will continue to get worse instead of better, and more people, instead of fewer, will be killed on our inadequate highways. Carnage on the highways and economic loss will go unchecked. Unless we take action to provide better highways, the situation will become much worse. Every year that passes sees the need for better highways become more acute. We cannot afford further delay. Even at the rate of progress authorized in the 1956 act we will barely hold our own between the need for highway improvement and the deterioration of the present system of highways.

The act of 1956 created the highway trust fund, earmarking the revenues from certain highway user taxes for transfer to that fund to be used to defray the Federal Government's portion of the cost. From the beginning, it was recognized that in the early years of the program revenues in the fund would be insufficient to meet annual expenditures. To meet this anticipated problem it was provided that when deficits occurred the trust fund would borrow from the general fund, with the borrowed sums to be repaid in later years when revenues were expected to exceed expenditures for highway improvements. Prior to final congressional action, however, restrictive language was written into the bill which was designed to limit annual apportionments to the States to such amounts as would be available in the trust fund with which to pay the bills when they came due. As a result of this restrictive language, the crisis which we now face was, from the effective date of the act, inevitable. This restrictive language has come to be known as the Byrd amendment; though in fact, I am informed it was advanced by the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. George Humphrey.

All responsible people agree that the Congress must act to prevent a collapse of the highway program. If we are to act properly, however, we must do so on the basis of a clear understanding of the problem.

To begin with, the highway trust fund will be out of money by October 1, 1959—unless this Congress acts the highway trust fund will be bankrupt by the time Representatives and Senators reach their home States.

The States will present during this fiscal year vouchers for reimbursement totaling an estimated $493 million for which funds will not be available for payment. Normally this deficit would be made up by borrowing from the general fund as provided in the Highway Revenue Act. However, the Department of Commerce Appropriation Act recently passed by the Congress limits appropriations to such amounts as "may be available in and derived from the highway trust fund." This amount is expected to be $493 million less than required. Unless we take action, the Federal Government will be forced to default in its obligations to the States. This default will occur in October, next October, October 1959, prior to the reconvening of Congress in January.

Moreover, no apportionments of interstate funds whatever can be made for fiscal year 1961. These apportionments should have been made last month. Unless the States receive this obligational authority they will be compelled to terminate even the planning of additional projects. If the Federal Government defaults on its obligations to the States, the States then will be forced to default in payment of their obligations pursuant to contracts performed and completed, unless they can raise the funds from their own resources.

Already many States have announced that no additional contracts can be awarded. Invitations to bid on contracts which have already been advertised are being withdrawn. In short, we face a complete stoppage of the construction of the new System of National Defense and Interstate Highways which the President declared necessary for national security and which the Congress proclaimed as necessary for national security and to promote a growing economy and safety on the highways.

The problem has two parts which, though related, are separate:

First, we must provide funds to the States in 1960 to meet the obligations that the States have incurred by contract pursuant to Federal commitments in the Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958. Without congressional action, then, the States will be forced into default, or budgetary stringencies, on obligations falling due this fiscal year, and this situation, let me repeat, will occur very soon, unless the Congress acts. Solution of this phase of the problem will have a bearing upon the 1960 budget.

Secondly, we must take action to permit continued apportionments to the States to avert complete stoppage of the interstate program. Authorization of apportionments for fiscal 1961 must be made this year to allow time for proper planning, advertising of contracts, and award of contracts. Such authorization, however, can have no impact whatever on the 1960 budget because under the law the funds could not actually be disbursed until fiscal 1961. Actually, for the most part, fiscal 1961 apportionments would not be disbursed until 1962.

So, Mr. President, solution of this problem which, as I have said, has two parts, will have an effect on the 1960 budget with respect to obligations falling due within 1960, which arise from apportionments already made; but action to permit apportionments for 1961 will not have an effect upon the 1960 budget. Actually for the most part fiscal 1961 apportionments would not be disbursed until fiscal 1962.

Before proceeding to discuss possible solutions, I should like to dispel certain myths about the program and the cause of our present dilemma.

In the first place, the present crisis has not been caused by an increase of construction costs over estimates. On the contrary, contracts are being awarded generally well within or below estimates.

Only today the Bureau of Roads made an announcement that highway construction

costs during the April-June quarter dropped by more than 2½ percent.

In the second place, this crisis was not caused by the Highway Act of 1958. As a matter of fact, the Congress was confronted with this same problem last year. The act of 1958 met this problem and averted a slowdown of the program at that time. While that act may properly be said to have postponed the crisis, it cannot be said to have caused it. The delay in resolving the problem and the acceleration provided in the 1958 act have combined to make the problem more acute today.

I think Congress must enact legislation to meet Federal obligations to the States and to permit continued interstate and defense highway apportionments on schedule.

There is no magic way to build highways without money. The only real source of funds for the Federal Government is by way of taxation. This is not to say, however, that there is only one type of tax or only one class of citizens and taxpayers upon whom to levy it.

The administration insists that the only solution to the problem is to impose a further increase in the gasoline tax. This proposal is labeled a pay-as-you-go plan. The implication is plain that users of our highways have not been paying their fair share of taxes and that they should be compelled to do so or else accept responsibility for stoppage of the highway program. Any such implication is highly inaccurate and downright misleading.

In the first place, the theory that highway users should pay the entire cost of the program by direct taxes levied upon them cannot be supported. Good highways benefit everyone and every segment of our economy. We do not levy a special tax on teachers and the parents of students to pay for schools because we realize that education not only benefits everyone but is a responsibility of the general public. The same rule applies, or should apply, I insist, to highways.

But even if we accept the thesis that highway users should pay the entire cost of highways, the administration position, as well as its implications, is unjustified. Highway users are already paying direct excise taxes far in excess of the amount needed for the highway programs. In addition, of course, the users of our highways pay income taxes and all other taxes, as do all of the people.

What are the facts, Mr. President, about highway user taxes?

In fiscal 1958 highway users paid in direct Federal excise taxes $3.493 billion. Of this amount, only $2.026 billion was transferred to the highway trust fund. In other words, of each highway user dollar collected, 58 cents went for highways while 42 cents went for other purposes, to be diverted from use on highways. On the basis of information now available, approximately the same ratio will be applicable, under the budget, to 1959 collections. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing actual collections of highway user taxes in fiscal 1958 and indicating the amount of each transferred to the trust fund or kept in the general fund.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Highway user excise taxes, disposition—Actual collections, 1958

[Millions of dollars]

	Gasoline	Diesel	Lubricating oil	Auto	Truck and bus	Parts and accessories	Tires	Tread rubber, tubes, truck use	Total
Trust fund	1,558	50	.....	.....	111	.....	244	63	2,026
General fund	.....	.....	35	1,170	95	167	.....	.....	1,467

Mr. GORE. Throughout the years highway users have paid larger sums in taxes than were spent for highways. In 1934 the Congress passed the so-called Hayden-Cartwright Act. This act, which is still in effect, provides that any State which diverts to nonhighway uses a larger percentage of highway-user taxes than was diverted at the time the act was passed shall forfeit its right to Federal-aid highway funds. Thus, we encourage the States, by threat of withholding Federal funds, to use all their revenue from highway taxes for highway purposes. Yet the Federal Government does not follow that example. Indeed, it is now proposed that we levy still additional taxes upon the users of our highways, even though they are now paying more than $1.5 billion a year in excess of the amount actually used for highways. I am advised that for the current fiscal year the sum diverted to uses other than construction of highways will be approximately $1,600 million.

Some appear to have forgotten that highway-user taxes were substantially increased by the act of 1956. For the information of the Senate, I list here the taxes that were increased and the amount of the increase in each case:

Gasoline, from 2 to 3 cents per gallon.

Diesel fuel, from 2 to 3 cents per gallon.

Automobile tires, from 5 to 8 cents per pound.

Tread rubber, 3 cents per pound—a new tax.

Trucks, buses, and trailers, from 8 to 10 percent for 1957 and from 5 to 10 percent from 1958 to 1972.

Truck-use tax, $1.50 per thousand pounds—a new tax.

Also in 1956, although not in the same act, Congress extended an additional 3-percent excise tax on automobiles which otherwise would have expired. This tax has been extended annually since then. This 3-percent extension, which is also an increase in highway-user taxes, has brought in an additional $1,006 billion in the last 3 fiscal years.

All told, Mr. President, highway-user-tax increases since 1956 have brought into the Treasury $3.177 billion. Total expenditures from the highway trust fund for the interstate program through fiscal 1959 amount to $2.358 billion. Thus, the revenues from tax increases alone amount to more than total interstate highway expenditures since the act of 1956 was enacted.

It seems to me that we should keep these figures in mind when considering the possibility of imposing yet an additional increase in the gasoline tax. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table showing revenues received from highway-user-tax increases in the last 3 fiscal years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Revenues collected from increases in highway user taxes imposed by Highway Act of 1956

[In millions of dollars]

	1957	1958	1959
Gasoline, 1 cent	432	519	535
Diesel, 1 cent	10	17	17
Tires, 3 cents	81	92	93
Tread rubber, 3 cents	11	13	14
Trucks, buses, and trailers, 2 percent (1957) and 5 percent (1958–72)	34	103	107
Truck use	26	33	34
Total	594	777	800
Auto excise, 3 percent	343	351	312
Total (including auto excise)	937	1,128	1,112
Total additional revenues for fiscal years 1957–59 (not including auto excise)	.....	.....	2,171
Auto excise	.....	.....	1,006
Grand total	.....	.....	3,177

Mr. GORE. Highway users accepted these new levies without undue protest. They did, however, seek some assurance that the question of equitable distribution of the burden of the cost of highways be subjected to study. Accordingly, section 209(b)(2) of the 1956 act declares it to be the policy of the Congress that "if it hereafter appears that the distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways, or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways, is not equitable," the Congress shall enact legislation in order to bring about such equitable distribution.

The distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate at the moment was a member of the Public Works Committee when that provision of the law was enacted, thus giving to highway users assurance that if, after careful study, it was determined that they were paying more than an equitable and fair share of the burden of highway costs, the Congress would rectify the mistake.

Section 210 of the same act directed the Secretary of Commerce to make a study and to provide the Congress with information to enable it to determine what taxes should be levied and in what amounts "in order to assure, insofar as practicable, an equitable distribution of the tax burden among the various classes of persons using the Federal-aid highways or otherwise deriving benefits from such highways."

The Secretary of Commerce was directed to submit his final report no later than March 1, 1959. Subsequently, at the administration's request, the date of submission of the report was extended to March 1, 1961.

The new taxes levied by the act of 1956 have brought into the Treasury substantial revenues. During fiscal years 1957, 1958, and 1959, receipts from these increases alone have, as I have said, totaled $3.177 billion, more, I repeat, than has been used for interstate highway improvements since 1956.

Mr. President, we assured the highway users that the question of equitable distribution of the burden of the cost of highway construction would be restudied. The administration requested that submission of the study called for by the law be delayed from 1959 until 1961. If I had known at the time the request was submitted that there was a plan to ask that taxes be further increased on every gallon of gasoline, I would have opposed the extension. I think we should have such a study before we levy more Federal sales taxes on every gallon of gasoline every person puts in his car or his truck.

Yet without even establishing that the additional levies imposed in 1956 are equitable and fair, it is now proposed to increase the gasoline tax once again, while we wait another 2 years for the study to be completed.

Mr. President, a further increase in the gas tax at this time, at the very least, is not in accord with assurances given by the Congress to the highway users in 1956. The facts speak for themselves. A gasoline tax increase is grossly inequitable and completely unfair.

I should like to read at this time two paragraphs from an article appearing in the New York Times of yesterday:

"Today the tax on gasoline is at a higher rate than that on any other essential product; even that on many luxury items. If the Federal tax of an additional cent a gallon goes into effect on September 1, as provided in a bill approved recently by the House Ways and Means Committee, the gasoline levy will exceed 10 cents a gallon and will just about equal the refinery price of the product."

On what other commodity essential to our economic life do we have a 50-percent tax? At retail levels, every time a man drives up to a filling station in my State and has his tank filled or partially filled, one-third of what he pays is taxes. I repeat that a further increase in this tax is unjustifiable. I continue to read from the article:

"Some economists are wondering how much tax an essential product can stand before there is an adverse effect on the Nation's economy. With business expanding and wage rates moving upward, it is held that the general economy can sustain the present or a higher level without much difficulty. But if a recession should develop, it is feared the high gasoline tax would aggravate it."

The Ways and Means Committee of the other body, after long study and labor, has apparently approved an increase of 1 cent per gallon in the gasoline tax for fiscal 1960 and 1961. For the reasons I have already given, such an increase is without justification. Moreover, the plan proposed by the Ways and Means Committee is inadequate to meet existing needs. It falls short in the following respects:

First. For the remainder of fiscal year 1960 a 1-cent increase in the gas tax would bring in approximately $380 million. This would fall short by more than $100 million of providing enough funds to reimburse the States the amounts which will be owed. Figures released by the Ways and Means Committee indicate that as of January 1, 1960, under its proposal, the trust fuhd will still have a deficit of $309 million, and will still be in arrears by $107 million at the end of the fiscal year. On January 1, 1961, the deficit will be $351 million, and the deficit will not be eliminated until July 1, 1961. I cannot believe, Mr. President, that our preoccupation with a balanced budget will let us go so far as to undertake to balance it by simply not paying to the several States the amounts owed to them by the Federal Government. I cannot believe that the Federal Government will default on its commitments to the States. Yet this is what will happen unless additional funds are made available to the trust fund and appropriated for expenditure by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Second. The Ways and Means Committee proposal would permit the apportionment of $1.8 billion this year for fiscal 1961 and only $2 billion next year for fiscal year 1962. The 1956 act prescribes an annual level of apportionment of $2.2 billion. These apportionments were based upon the cost estimates submitted in the Clay report. Under more realistic estimates later submitted by the Secretary of Commerce, an annual level of apportionment of $2.5 billion will be required to complete the system by 1975. Even at this rate, there will be a 3-year stretchout of the program. With annual apportionments no higher than those which would be permitted by the Ways and Means Committee proposal, this brandnew system of National Defense and Interstate Highways would not be completed until long after 1975. The highways would be obsolete before they were even built.

This proposal destroys the integrity of the Interstate Highway and Defense System as a unified, integrated system of national highways, interconnecting all the principal metropolitan centers, to be completed on schedule and adequate to the needs of 1975.

In any event, a further appropriation act will be required this year if the States are to receive full payment, because the maximum amount appropriated in the bill already passed is insufficient to meet the estimated requirement for funds. Unless such an appropriation bill is passed, we shall have broken faith with the States.

Mr. President, the Congress must come to grips with this problem. In 1955 the President recommended that the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways be built within 10 years. At best this will now be almost doubled. eW cannot allow a further stretchout. We cannot accept the proposal of the Committee on Ways and Means of the other body.

I am willing to meet head-on the question of raising additional revenue if the facts require it. This is admittedly difficult to accomplish in the Senate which cannot initiate revenue raising proposals except by way of amendment. There are many areas in our tax structure, however, from which additional revenue might be obtained far more equitably than by extracting yet another pound of flesh from highway users who are already paying sums substantially in excess of the cost of highways.

Earlier this year the Senate adopted an amendment to a tax bill which would have repealed the tax favoritism granted to dividend income by the Revenue Act of 1954. Had we been able to retain this amendment in conference, it would have increased revenue by $335 million in fiscal 1960—almost as much as would be obtained from a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax. The administration, despite its pleas for additional revenue, was opposed to this amendment, and so were the conferees from the other body.

Mr. President, we have an obligation to implement the interstate highway program which both the President and the Congress have called essential to the national welfare. Pending submission of the study now being undertaken by the administration, and as long as highway user taxes are diverted to other purposes, a further increase in the gasoline tax is unjustified. We can and we should make available an additional portion of these revenues so that the program can go forward.

Why should discrimination be practiced on highway improvement? Why should all other programs, all other expenditures throughout our country and around the world, continue—be the budget balanced or unbalanced—yet stop dead still our vital interstate and defense highway improvements unless an additional Federal sales tax is levied on each gallon of gasoline? I reject this injustice, this total lack of reason.

Funds can be provided for continuation of the highway program in any one of three ways, or a combination of the three.

First. A direct appropriation from the general fund to the highway trust fund or dedication of a sufficient amount of revenue from existing highway user taxes to the trust fund, together with the repeal of the so-called Byrd amendment. To the extent that the amounts thus appropriated exceeded the amounts by which Congress has reduced the Presidential budget estimates, a budget deficit would result, assuming the accuracy of the budget estimates of revenue. The administration opposes this method.

Second. The levying of additional taxes with the revenue dedicated to the trust fund. The administration favors this course and has proposed that an additional Federal sales tax of 1½ cents be levied on each gallon of gasoline. Congress has declined to approve this recommendation. I think it will continue to decline such approval. I am vigorously opposed to this proposal, as are many others, for reasons already stated.

Third. Congress can make a further reduction in other expenditures by enacting a rescission of appropriations heretofore made by an amount sufficient to permit highway improvement within the total budget estimates. I propose this course as a solution. I introduce a bill to rescind 1 percent of all fiscal 1960 appropriation bills with discretion vested in the President to except fixed statutory requirements such as veteran pensions and other obligations made mandatory by statute, which are spelled out in the bill. My bill would dedicate to the highway trust fund such portion of the revenue from excise taxes on automobiles as may equal the total amount of such recision. It provides for a continuation of our highway improvement programs within the 1960 budget estimates.

This will afford the Senate a clear choice of reducing other expenditures or increasing gasoline taxes. When the highway bill reaches the Committee on Finance I shall offer this bill as an amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2588) to amend the Highway Revenue Act of 1956 so as to transfer to the highway trust fund a portion of the receipts from the excise tax on passenger automobiles collected during the 1960 fiscal years; to rescind 1 percent of certain appropriations made for the 1960 fiscal year; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GORE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

REMARKS OF SENATOR ALBERT GORE ON THE FLOOR OF THE U.S. SENATE, AUGUST 31, 1959

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with the passage of each day, the need for congressional action to avert a collapse of our program to build a National System of Interstate and Defense Highways becomes more acute. There is general agreement that action to insure continued construction must, and will, be taken. The question is whether we shall make continuation of this vital program conditional upon a further increase in the Federal sales tax on gasoline.

Mr. President, the power of Congress to levy taxes is one which must be used wisely. In determining what kind of a tax shall be imposed, consideration must be given, not only to the need for revenue, but also to the question of whether the proposal is fair and would result in an equitable sharing of the overall tax burden.

I have already pointed out to the Senate that highway users, in addition to paying all types of taxes levied upon taxpayers generally, are paying direct excise taxes in an amount substantially in excess of the cost of highway construction, a program of which they are one, but by no means the sole, beneficiary. Yet it is now proposed to impose upon them a still greater burden.

Gasoline is an essential commodity. Almost everyone must use it in one way or another to earn his livelihood. The burden of this tax falls equally upon all with no regard whatever to ability to pay. It is a regressive tax in every sense of the word. The wage earner pays at the same rate as does the top corporation executive.

With all the loopholes and areas of tax favoritism which remain uncorrected, I cannot believe that this Congress, after due

deliberation, will determine that the highway user is the one class of taxpayer upon whom an additional levy may equitably and fairly be imposed.

Already gasoline is the most heavily taxed essential commodity. In many States the Federal and State sales taxes combined are approximately equal to the cost of the fuel at the refinery. Indeed, there are few luxuries which bear a tax proportionately as heavy as this essential commodity.

It is said that this additional levy is to be imposed only for a temporary period of 1 or 2 years, to meet an emergency. I would remind my colleagues that the history of taxation is replete with examples of temporary taxes which have become permanent fixtures. Just this year the Congress once again extended the corporate and excise tax rates. The excise taxes imposed on transportation and communications as wartime measures during World War II are still partially with us.

Should this Congress increase the gasoline tax for a definitely prescribed period, the same arguments will be made in the future for its extension that are now made in support of its adoption.

Some appear to contend, Mr. President, that we must increase the gasoline tax because there is no other fiscally responsible way to continue the highway program. The fact is, however, that there is another course of action which will permit the program to go forward without increasing overall appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury.

I have proposed that appropriations for fiscal 1960 be reduced by 1 percent, with the amounts derived from this recission transferred to the Highway Trust Fund to provide funds to pay the States the money the Federal Government is obligated to pay them. I emphasize, Mr. President, that the maximum amount by which any program would be reduced is 1 percent of the amount appropriated. In those instances in which the full amounts appropriated are required by law to be paid, the reduction would not apply, and the President is given the discretion to make this determination in instances other than those enumerated in my bill. I do not believe it can reasonably be asserted that a reduction of 1 percent would be disastrous to any of the many programs for which we annually appropriate funds.

To those who believe that the Congress should act to reduce expenditures, my proposal should appear indeed modest. Yet the amount of the reduction would be adequate to eliminate the 1960 deficit in the highway trust fund.

In addition to the sums already earmarked for the highway trust fund, highway users will pay into the general fund this year $1.6 billion derived from direct taxes imposed upon them. In addition, Mr. President, as I have said, they contribute otherwise to the general fund in the same proportion as do taxpayers generally. I see no valid reason why the highway program, which benefits the entire economy, should be made a stepchild with further progress contingent upon the levy of a penalty tax upon the highway user.

Mr. Coad on the Spot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the Christian Century of September 2, 1959, appears a splendid editorial relating to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD], written by Dr. Harold E. Fey, editor of the Christian Century. It is very evident that Dr. Fey applied very skill that he has acquired in the 20 years in the newspaper business to bring to his readers this story about our distinguished colleague [Mr. COAD]. Dr. Fey received a D.D. degree from Chicago Theological Seminary, an A.B. degree from Cotner College, and a B.D. degree from Yale Divinity School.

Dr. Fey joined the Christian Century staff in 1940, and has been field editor, managing editor, and now editor. This background, as evidenced by this editorial, has given Dr. Fey a deep insight for probing into the realities of the important issues of the day.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] has made an outstanding record for himself in Congress. The people of his district are justified in feeling proud of the public service that he renders, of his great ability, his vision, his fine and noble outlook on life and his strong moral convictions. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] is highly respected by all of his colleagues. He particularly enjoys the confidence, respect and friendship of Speaker Rayburn and myself. The speaker and I frequently call upon him for advice and also to handle important matters for us.

In my remarks I am pleased to include the article relating to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. COAD] and written by Dr. Fey:

MR. COAD ON THE SPOT

(By Harold E. Fey)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—What does a conscious Member of Congress go through when he becomes the focus of mighty forces pressing toward a decision on an issue of great social importance? In particular, what do Christian faith and fellowship mean to a Representative when he has to vote on labor reform? For answers to these questions I went to Washington, saw the House of Representatives take its fateful vote on labor reform August 13, and talked with MERWIN COAD, the young Democrat who is one of three clergymen in Congress. At 34 he is now serving his second term as Representative of Iowa's Sixth District.

Mr. COAD said that no domestic issue in years has created as much excitement, pressure from lobbyists, and searching of heart on the part of Congressmen as has labor reform. Contributing to stir the issue to white heat, he observed, were the McClellan rackets committee hearings; the television appeals of Robert Kennedy, McClellan committee counsel, and of President Eisenhower, in behalf of the Landrum-Griffin "strong" bill; the actions of James Hoffa in resisting corrective legislation; and the lobbying of the National Association of Manufacturers and of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. When the House approached a decision, one Member arose, was recognized by the Chair and charged that Postmaster General Summerfield was in the Capitol using the powerful sanction of patronage in support of the administration position.

I

In his crowded office in the Old House Office Building, I asked MERWIN COAD what all this meant to a Representative from a 15-county, largely rural district in northern Iowa. He answered that it presented him with the most difficult decision he had had to make since he came to Washington in 1957. Congressmen were calling the Landrum-Griffin bill a congressional retirement bill, and it might be that for him. COAD had won by 198 votes in 1956 when he was the first Democratic Representative to be elected from Iowa since 1940. In 1958 he had been returned by 15,000—a larger majority than any other Iowa candidate received—and three other Democrats had been elected. But this young graduate of Texas Christian University, who is regarded by Speaker SAM RAYBURN as having the qualities by which he will rise to a high point of leadership in the House if he continues there, laid his political future on the line in the action he took on the labor bill.

Sitting in the periodical press gallery when the House recorded the highest vote its membership had ever given on any issue (430 out of a possible 436), I saw MERWIN COAD demonstrate his courage. He arose and appealed to the crowded House to defeat the Landrum-Griffin bill and then in the first test voted with the minority of 201 against a majority of 229. To see what that might do to his career, I went to his office and examined the file of around 1,000 letters he had received. "People are really stirred up when they write that many letters," Mr. COAD said. Most of the leters reflected the Kennedy and Eisenhower appeals for "strong" legislation. Some specified Landrum-Griffin. One group of 60 letters from a single town were identical or nearly identical in their demand for a strong bill. Many of them had apparently been typed on the same machine, but they were written on the letterheads of different small businesses and were personally signed. Other letters showed more individuality. Not much mail came from farmers. I saw only one letter from a clergyman.

It did not surprise Mr. COAD that evidences of church influence or interest were scarce. "Ministers and laymen of local churches are generally not in touch with public issues," he said. "They seem to fear politics. Ministers follow; they do not lead. If the church were doing its job, civil rights would not be the serious national issue it is. When the civil rights question was up, I did not hear a word from one church or church organization in defense of civil rights. In the pastorate a man can duck a hot public issue; in Congress he has to face it and commit his future to what he thinks is right."

Labor reform was not a factor in Mr. COAD's first election campaign, but it became an issue in 1957 and he started studying and talking about it. He noted that the big labor organizations did not try to refute the McClellan committee revelations and did not deny the need for corrective legislation. But he also noted that certain interests were intent on attaching to necessary reform proposals some measures which promised to punish all labor. He voted for the Elliott bill because its basic purpose was reform; he opposed Landrum-Griffin because it added punitive measures to reform. The bill passed, said Mr. COAD, "because an unholy alliance of southern Democrats and northern Republicans made a bargain. The southerners supported a punitive labor bill in return for the northerners' letting up on their pressure for stronger civil rights. A political debt has been created which trades off one human right to avoid granting another."

II

"The Landrum-Griffin bill burns down the barn to get rid of the rats," said Mr. COAD. "It is a 'get Hoffa' bill which will probably fail of its purpose but will harm honest labor in some of its provisions. In 6 months or a year, if Hoffa is still on a rampage, nobody will defend this bill. Its provisions making State law prevail ignore the fact that 8 States have no such laws and the other 42 differ from each other. It adds to the burden of the National Labor Relations

Board when that body is already so overloaded that it is years behind in its decisions."

After Landrum-Griffin had passed, Mr. COAD joined briefly in a maneuver designed to substitute the Elliott bill. When this failed he voted for Landrum-Griffin, to make sure that some legislation went to the conference committee with the Senate. His purpose was not, as some newspapers charged, to make a last-minute jump on the bandwagon.

"I voted for this labor reform bill (in its final form) on August 14 in spite of the fact that I felt it was not fair to the union member who works for a living," he says. "The reason it was not a fair bill was that two different bills were thrown into one. One part of the bill which was passed did in fact set up labor reform law. This portion of the bill will give to the union member a more democratic process in his union affairs and will help to protect the welfare and other moneys that he has invested in his union. This was the legislation that all of America wanted desperately and this was the legislation that I wanted to give my people. But the second part of this bill penalizes the laboring man who works for a living, for while the first part gives him democratic rights within his union, the second part takes away his union's rights at the bargaining table. However, in the final analysis, I thought it better that this bill be passed, so that the conferees between the Senate and House could work out a bill which I hope will be truly a labor reform bill but will not penalize the American worker."

Mr. COAD plans to report his vote in his regular newsletter, which he sends to 86 papers (including 5 dailies) in his district and to several radio stations in Fort Dodge and surrounding towns. Labor is organized in his district only on the daily papers and among packinghouse workers and automobile workers. No local of the Teamsters Union is found in his district.

III

Fortune smiled on Mr. COAD the day following the labor bill vote. He had worked hard to secure an $800,000 appropriation to bring a public power transmission line into his district. On that day his proposal was enacted, to the great satisfaction of the farmers, small businessmen, cooperative association leaders and others who will benefit from it. COAD has actively worked to get bills enacted into law which help small businessmen to get credit, which remove limitations on the amount of outside income an individual may earn while receiving social security, which increase income-tax exemptions, and which help maintain farm prices. With the help of the famous Dr. James Van Allen of the University of Iowa, he worked up and introduced a bill establishing a House Committee on Outer Space. Shortly afterward a similar bill was introduced which passed, and its introducer was made chairman of the committee; COAD is not even a member. Instead, he sought and got a place on the powerful committee on agriculture. He is the first Iowa Democrat to hold that post since the 1890's, when it was held by a Greenbacker.

Recently Mr. COAD got an appropriation for the World Refugee Year included in the Mutual Security Act of 1959; for this he received a letter of commendation from the National Council of Churches. He was one of nine U.S. delegates to the June 1959 NATO conference in London and agreed with its action to recommend more economic and less military aid to underdeveloped countries. This was his first trip to Europe. He thinks the public is too critical of congressional travel abroad and insists that travel in other lands should be useful to legislators in checking on expenditures abroad and on implementation of foreign policy decisions.

IV

At lunch in the House restaurant I asked MERWIN COAD whether his status as a minister was a help or a hindrance to his work as a Congressman. On balance, he said, it is an asset. He thinks his clerical status helped him carry the appropriation for the World Refugee Year, and probably helps him get votes from Catholics, perhaps even more than from Protestants. He said his dual role brings him many invitations to speak to church groups in and around Washington, but it is not much help in Iowa, especially in his own denomination, the Disciples of Christ. Now that he does not have to depend on a church for support, he added, he enjoys giving volunteer service in small churches and in other situations where he can be of help. One of his associates told me that Mr. COAD sometimes goes long distances at his own expense to meet a small and poor group where his services can be of use.

Labor reform has put Mr. COAD "on the spot," as it has many others in Washington—with what results the 1960 election will show. But this legislator went to Washington precisely because he believes that a Christian should seek out responsibility. Instead of shrinking from laying his future on the line, he works very hard to prepare himself to meet head-on the difficult decisions Americans must make. When the showdown comes, he votes his convictions. While he is often disappointed by ecclesiastics and ecclesiasticism, he is a firm believer in the church and identifies himself with its mission. He speaks with deep appreciation of the Friends Committee on National Legislation and of the legislative seminars which bring churchmen to Washington in increasing numbers.

Mr. COAD's main reliance for survival and service in politics is not on the church (nor should it be); it is rather on his ability to render worthy service to the people of his district and to the country and the world. Through a complicated system of reporting and through personal visits, he gives an honest and complete account to his entire constituency of what he has done. He has been told that he is too frank, but he believes the people have a right to know and an obligation to use their information. He is betting his career on the faith that intelligence, conscientiousness and truthfulness belong in politics. And that faith puts the people of Iowa's Sixth District on the spot.

Journey Toward Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, my district in Queens is privileged to have as a resident, an outstanding educator, lawyer, and world leader in the fight for human dignity and rights. I refer to Henry Edward Schultz, of Flushing, N.Y., a member of the New York City Board of Higher Education, and national chairman of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Recently Mr. Schultz delivered a stimulating and stirring address, entitled "Journey Toward Mankind." The occasion was the B'nai B'rith Triennial Convention in Jerusalem on May 26.

Taking his text from Archibald MacLeish, Mr. Schultz eloquently supported his assertion that America constitutes a journey toward mankind. It is a pilgrimage which we have undertaken since our earliest days as a nation, to infuse life and meaning into the belief that all men are created equal. Step by step he spelled out the great strides forward which America has fashioned on behalf of human dignity in all aspects of its society.

Law and the governmental authority are changing customs and practices that are a denial of democratic living.

He stated:

The law is succeeding, because the vast majority of the people are ready, willing and often eager to accept these changes.

True—

He admitted—

there are also marked resistances. It is not easy to change the prejudiced or to convince them to give up special privilege.

But, he pointed out, the magnificent reality about America is that we are working at the problem of removing the prejudices of the people, fully aware that it is a lengthy and toilsome process, but one that promises incalculable ultimate reward.

Mr. Schultz's address is so rich in understanding and so meaningful for the times that I believe that it should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. I include excerpts from it in the Appendix at the conclusion of my remarks:

THE IDEA

One of America's great poets, Archibald MacLeish, spoke at the Anti-Defamation League's 40th anniversary observance. The time was 1953, a moment in history when America stood in danger of sacrificing individual liberty to our common fear and distrust of Soviet Russia.

In the tense atmosphere of that highly charged time, he saw the American dream undiminished, but imperiled. He saw America as a journey toward mankind—a journey towards a realization of the hopes of men, a journey wherein men may find fulfillment for their lives.

In America, he said, the end of the journey was man and the belief was a belief not only in the dignity of man, not only in the worth of man, but the human possibility of man.

And, in turn, the dream was the dream of manhood, of brotherhood in freedom, of freedom for each man.

He spoke of America as an idea, even as his Puritan forebears had looked upon the America which they first settled as the New Israel. For to them the name Israel was an idea—the self-same idea of freedom wherein a life—a man—may be fulfilled.

The idea of America is a universal idea, even as the ideas of Judaism are universal ideas. There is therefore a certain logic to history that in our time Jews—both as Jews and as men—are finding their greatest fulfillment in the New Israel that is America and the old-new Israel that is this ancient soil on which we stand today.

If we narrow this discussion for the moment to the problem of anti-Semitism, which is a major concern of the Anti-Defamation League, I think it will become instantly clear that for Jews today, the United States and Israel represent two radically different, but happily successful, solutions to that problem.

Yet, the two solutions have one thing in common—and it is the reason for their suc-

cess: they were both made possible by a clean breakaway from the European sources, institutions and layers upon layers of anti-Semitism which, through the centuries, have brought our people so much misery, tragedy and bloodshed.

• • • • •

STEPS IN THE JOURNEY

To understand why these two solutions were successful and why certain others failed, it would be helpful to take a brief glance backward into the nineteenth century when Jewry lived through a psychic experience as shattering as any in all Jewish history.

Indeed, all of Europe was shaken by the movements which we collectively call the liberal revolution. The French Revolution, the upsurges of 1848, the whole burgeoning of democratic ideas and processes which stirred nation after nation, indeed, the American Revolution itself, were part of this historic development.

Europe at this point climbed out of the feudal and medieval society in which Jews were pariahs and Jewish communities islands of isolation cut off from the mainstream of the life around them. • • •. The results were spectacular. And the physical walls of the ghetto came tumbling down.

But the liberal revolution was largely governmental. Such institutions as the aristocracy, the church, and the military; even the universities, resisted its influence. Europe's stratified society barred Jews as it always had.

Thus, Jews found a little political freedom, but precious little else. Equality of opportunity in most areas of human endeavor remained closed to them.

• • • • •

Even today in Europe, anti-Semitism continues to be used for political purposes. Thus, in Germany, anti-Semitism is wielded as a weapon by every Nazi or neo-Nazi remnant seeking to shake the new order. In France, the political scene has its anti-Semitic overtones, and in Russia and Eastern Europe, anti-Semitism is used blatantly whenever it serves the political purposes of the Communist masters.

One of the earliest observers of the developing liberal revolution was a wise and distinguished American statesman and philosopher. Having viewed the European scene as our Ambassador in Paris, Benjamin Franklin in 1787 told his own countrymen:

"To get the bad customs of a country changed • • • it is first necessary to remove the prejudices of the people • • • and this is not the work of a day."

DIFFERENT SOLUTIONS

The solutions which Jews embraced and which failed, either partially or completely, are those which did not give full weight to this dictum. Those who embraced the emancipation from ghetto status to national citizenship without reservation—and believed it represented the millennium—soon discovered that the liberal revolution's changing of the bad customs did not have its concomitant program of removing the prejudices of the people. That Jews flourished under the new dispensation is a matter of historic record. But it is equally true that the opportunities offered the emancipated were circumscribed by the persistent prejudices of the people, and accompanied by the threat of annihilation by modern, political anti-Semitism.

• • • • •

In the final analysis Europe did only half its job; it offered political rights with one hand and took away human rights with the other; it offered its house to Jews of the ghetto, but could not cleanse its people of anti-Semitic prejudice. As a result, the ultimate solutions had to be found in a clean breakaway from the ingrained European sources of anti-Semitism.

Yet, the solution of Israel and the solution of America wold not have been possible without that smaller degree of success which was achieved in Europe by the emancipation. Despite the frustrations, there were the fulfillments and the release of tremendous energies that enabled Jews, as individuals, to take their place in Western democratic civilization.

This made possible the stream of emigration to the United States and a full realization of the ideals of the emancipation on the one hand. On the other, it made possible the success of the Zionist movement in the establishment of the State of Israel—the ultimate goal of the nationalist expression of Jewish life.

• • • • •

THE AMERICAN EXPERIENCE

The breakaway from the European pattern is quite as clean for American Jews as for Israelis and of somewhat longer duration, though of a different character. In the United States, the people begin with acceptance of the fact that Jews are endowed with all the rights, privileges, opportunities, and obligations that are the common heritage of all American citizens. Thus, we can and do proceed on the assumption that the acts or attitudes of bigotry and anti-Semitism we encounter violate the basic philosophy of our American society. We are at no time ready to make peace with these manifestations or to concede bitterly that they are ineradicable as European Jewry did.

There never was a revolutionary effort needed to obtain equal rights for American Jews, neither has there been any counter-revolutionary movement with anti-Semitism as a basic political tenet. Nor have we historic institutions so encrusted with anti-Semitism that they, by their very nature, exclude Jews and repudiate equal rights for Jews.

• • • • •

While English political ideas were the chief influence in the Revolution, historians have pointed out that Hebraic thought was an important leaven in the rise and growth of American civilization. Hebraic influence was most clearly evident in New England where the Bible-steeped Puritans provided the psychological and intellectual climate for the Revolution. James Truslow Adams goes so far as to say that the Puritans "in spirit • • • may be considered as Jews and not Christians." He found that their idea of God, their interpretation of law, their social attitudes were governed by their absorption in the Old Testament. The constitutions of the Plymouth Colony of Massachusetts Bay, Connecticut, and New Haven leaned heavily on the Hebrew Scriptures.

Rufus Learsi, in his history of "The Jews in America," has a dramatic passage showing the strength of this influence:

"In the Hebrew Scriptures, the apostles of rebellion found precedent and inspiration, and the pulpits of the land, where public opinion was molded, resounded with their revolutionary summonses. The exodus from Egypt was the classic example of liberation from tyranny: The colonies of America should also make their exodus. The 10 tribes of Israel defied the arrogant son of Solomon and established their own government; the Thirteen Colonies should do likewise. The Hebrew prophets denounced kings and potentates, and God-fearing Americans may do the same. Even the call engraved on the Liberty Bell: 'Proclaim liberty throughout the land unto all the inhabitants thereof' was found in • • • Leviticus. Revolutionary doctrine became crystallized in the slogan 'Rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God.' Indeed, those were the words which Franklin, Jefferson, and John Adams proposed for the seal of the United States: They were to be inscribed around a picture of the children of Israel crossing the Red Sea. • • •

"Not less potent was the influence of the Hebrew Scriptures in determining the basic political system of the new society that emerged from the war of independence. To discredit the monarchy, preachers like the bold and brilliant Jonathan Mayhew of Boston held up the warning of the prophet Samuel against royalty. Samuel Langdon, the president of Harvard, considered the Jewish Government a perfect republic, and Ezra Stiles, the president of Yale, found in the American Government the fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. In his classic work, 'History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe,' the eminent 19th century historian, William Edward Lecky, declares that 'the Hebraic mortar cemented the foundations of American democracy,' and the statesman, diplomat, and scholar, Oscar S. Straus, in his 'Origin of the Republican Form of Government in the United States,' concludes that 'in the spirit and essence of our Constitution, the influence of the Hebrew Commonwealth was paramount.'"

In the fact of these facts, one can begin to understand why anti-Semitism in the United States has no historical roots in depth as in European lands; why, instead, it is erratic, emotional, and opportunistic. True, anti-Semitism does affect some of our social organisms, and some prejudicial attitudes have been carried over from European backgrounds, or from bigoted religious training, or developed by ingroups seeking to maintain social or economic advantage. But these are irritants in the body politic, which we and all right thinking Americans seek to treat and to heal. For what makes America different—and it is different—is the fact that we work at the problem of removing the prejudices of the people and we know that it is not the work of a day.

THE OTHER SIDE

It is in this light that one must consider developments and reports of prejudice in the United States today.

Know that when a bomb was tossed at an Atlanta synagogue by a frustrated bigot, millions of Americans were as outraged as you and that the State of Georgia tried five men for the crime. To millions of Americans—and to the President of the United States—it was not the fact that a Jewish temple was bombed, it was a house of worship, a building dedicated to God, that was mourned. Jewish or Christian, it was a House of God.

Know that when we report on a hotel resort that discriminates against Jews, that this is the exception and that the reaction of the American public is such as to hold it up to shame.

Know that when we report on discrimination in employment that State after State is passing laws to make this impossible, and that there is a constant cleanup job being done in industry after industry.

Know, too, that a constant and broad program of education is being carried out by the Anti-Defamation League in conjunction with many other organizations, schools, and institutions—with millions of Americans of all creeds and political persuasions—designed to eradicate prejudice, to improve human relations, and to foster democratic ideas and processes.

It is this which prompts me to echo the word of Archibald MacLeish that for Jews, as for all men, America is a journey toward mankind.

It is a pilgrimage undertaken by the entire Nation, and we are much further ahead than our detractors and our political opponents would have the world believe. Indeed, our capacity for self-criticism, our unabashed wrangling over our failures and our shortcomings, play into the hands of those who, in international affairs, want to hurt us, or

want to misunderstand us, or want to make political capital of our problems.

There is no answer we can give the world to the question raised about Little Rock, except to say that there would have been no Little Rock, if there had not been a Supreme Court decision to correct the remaining inequities in educational opportunities for Negroes. There would have been no Supreme Court decision, if most of the Nation—including millions in the South—did not believe that equal justice and equal rights for Negroes and other minorities were not a just and proper fulfillment of the American commitment to democracy.

Before any nation can solve its problems of human rights and of relationships between varying ethnic, racial, or religious groups within its borders, there must be two prior solutions—a political solution and an economic one. In the United States these two solutions have been achieved as in no other land.

The political solution came with the very founding of the Republic. The commitment was then made to all people that equality of rights and of opportunities was theirs without exception. It was a brave commitment, considering the practices of the other nations of the world at the time. It was a brave commitment to make in the face of the fact that the economic structure of a very sizable region of our land was built upon a slave society.

The problem of slavery which hung over the Nation for 90 years was dissolved by a Civil War—a bloody, fratricidal war fought at an unbelievable cost in lives and suffering—because we could not let that commitment of the Founding Fathers go unredeemed. In the 90-odd years since, we have been struggling to heal the hurts of that war and to clear away the debris of that slave society. What the world is witnessing today is the last of that cleanup operation.

The United States has gone further in its economic solution than perhaps any other nation through its high standard of living and its high economic productivity. Among nations which have not enough food or shelter to sustain their people, such human rights as voting privileges, educational opportunities, or the right to ride in front of the bus are of little interest. But these are issues for Negroes in America, and rightly so, because America has long passed the point for all its people where mere survival is a daily problem.

THE MEANING OF HUMAN RIGHTS

When speaking of human rights in the United States, therefore, we speak on a different level than when we talk of human rights in Soviet Russia or Red China where the most fundamental civil rights are unknown, where the peoples' most elementary privileges are suppressed, where not even a beginning has been made toward a political solution that would give some meaning to the phrase "human rights."

When speaking of human rights in the United States, we talk on a different level than when we speak of them in those underdeveloped parts of the world where nations struggle for economic survival for enough food for the people, for the most elementary medical needs—where there has been no approach as yet to an economic solution.

The most disadvantaged Negro in the United States starts out in this matter of human rights on a higher plane than is ever dreamed of by those who live under conditions of communism or suffer the deprivations of the economically underdeveloped areas of Asia and Africa.

Having said these things, I do not hesitate to talk of the grave problems that face us in the United States in the matter of race relations. We are in the midst of a profound legal and judicial revolution that is nailing down once and for all, the practices as well as the promises of equality in human rights for all of our citizens, regardless of color and creed. This revolution has been proceeding on all levels of government—rulings of the Supreme Court, executive orders of the Federal Government, legislation by the Congress, legislation by State governments, ordinances by municipalities.

Step by step, law and the governmental authority are changing customs and practices that are a denial of democratic living. The law is succeeding, because the vast majority of the people are ready, willing and often eager to accept these changes.

True, there are also marked resistances. It is not easy to change the prejudiced or to convince them to give up special privileges. And so the world hears of the outrageous resistances—the acts af violence, the shouts of discord, the last-ditch stands against change.

THE GOOD NEWS

Bad news always travels fast and far, helped along in this instance by the suspicion and hatred that is being fanned by those seeking to make political capital of our troubles. The good news is oft interred by the same unfriendly propaganda. And we Americans have done poorly indeed in countering these efforts.

What is our record? Look at the advances in this revolution by law. The U.S. Supreme Court during the past decade has struck down the "separate but equal" doctrine in a series of cases of which the most important and the most widely known is the school decision of 1954, implemented by a second decision in 1955, and since then by a series of lower courts decisions which have served to clear the road to school desegregation. In addition, there have been decisions outlawing desegregation in higher education, in the use of public recreational facilities, in interstate and intrastate travel facilities, and in the enforcement of restrictive covenants in housing. Most recently, the Supreme Court struck down an effort by the State of Alabama to interfere with the right of Negroes to maintain voluntary organizations for the protection of their interests.

* * * * *

In 1957, however, the logjam in the Congress was broken and for the first time in 82 years—the first time since the Reconstruction Period that follow the Civil War—the Congress of the United States passed a major civil rights law. This law was the culmination of at least 15 years of unremitting efforts by liberal groups in the country. * * *

The 1957 law will not bring the millenium in America, but it is an important step forward, and even today in Congress, there are new efforts for further legislation that will build on the foundation laid down by the act of 1957.

Then there is the progress which has been made through State and local legislation. Much of the everyday life of the American is ruled not by Federal law, but by State regulation. Thus, there are now 16 States which have effective laws on their books against discrimination in employment. * * * These 16 have nearly half the entire population of the country within their borders.

Twenty-two States have enacted laws against discrimination in public accommodations and within this past legislative period, the State of Colorado took the pioneer step of outlawing all forms of discrimination in housing, whether public or private. There are at least seven other States which forbid housing discrimination in structures built with some form of government subsidy.

These various forms of legislation, while primarily designed to improve race relations—that is, the relationship of non-white to white in the American society—are also of importance to the Jewish community. Laws against discrimination in employment, housing and public accommodation help to destroy the island of bias that still exist against Jews. Their enactment adds to the capacity for Jewish growth in the American community.

Such is the nature of the good news for human rights which comes out of the American scene. It is dramatic news when one can watch the effect of these events upon the lives of individual human beings within our Nation, and the gradual but very real change in the social structure of our communities. Increasingly, even the most depressed among our population are finding their paths made easier in their journey toward mankind.

Perhaps the most dramatic incident that has illuminated the progress in human relations in the United States is the admission of the territory of Hawaii as the 50th State in our Union. If ever there was evidence that with diligence, race prejudice can be converted into racial understanding, it is the relationship of the people of the United States to the former territory of Hawaii. If ever there was evidence that many races could learn to live together in amity in a democratic community, it lies in the people of our new State.

Fifty years ago, many in the United States talked of the "yellow peril." Up until recently, we had an Oriental Exclusion Act in our immigration law. (Unhappily our present immigration laws are still based on the principle of national origin.) Only 14 years ago, we fought in a war with Japan. Yet in the year 1959, we have admitted into the Union a State with an oriental majority—the only State whose people are not drawn primarily from European stock. Of the total population of about 600,000, 38 percent are Japanese and only 20 percent are white. Among the white are not only Americans, but Norwegians, Germans, Russians, Poles, Portuguese, and among all these, 250 Jewish families. There are Hawaiians, Filipinos, Chinese, Puerto Ricans, Koreans. They live in amity and they live happily and prosperously. And now they live, not as wards but as full-fledged citizens of the United States.

In the American journey toward mankind of which the poet spoke, this is a major step on the road.

NEVER SO CLOSE

That road, the pathway to the future, carries the dreams, hopes and aspirations of many generations of men. Never before, in spite of the human agonies of the 20th century, have we seemed closer to the fulfillment of this age-old dream.

In the realization of this dream, these two great congregations of Jews, American and Israeli, play significant roles—in the contribution they have already made and will continue to make in the advancement of mankind's freedom.

When the ultimate goal is reached—when justice and equality of opportunity, when freedom and brotherhood, when the love of man for his brother is the rule of the day—all of us in B'nai B'rith will have reason to be proud of the part we and our Anti-Defamation League have played in this long and noble struggle.

The Largest Group

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress have been feeling pres-

sures from many large groups. Sometimes I feel that the largest group of all, the common rank-and-file taxpaying citizen, has too little said in his behalf.

The Los Angeles Times of August 25 printed a letter to the editor, "Independence," which in my judgment expresses very well the feeling of the greatest group of them all. The letter follows:

In all this whoop-te-do of contrived issues in newspapers and on radio and television about minority groups, there is one minority group upon which the politican looks with scorn and the agitator cannot reach.

I refer, of course, to the citizen who wants no handout, no favoring legislation at the expense of others, who would refuse the ministrations of welfare agencies, who has no ax to grind in city councils, who even believes that some Members of Congress are willing to put the Nation's good above reelection.

God bless and keep him; he is one of a dwindling group, but he will die trying in his quiet way to bring sanity to a world of weird giveaways.

THOMAS H. ROBINSON.

Two Residents of 17th Congressional District of New York Confirmed as Alternate Representatives of the United States to the United Nations General Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I note with great pleasure and, as representative of the 17th Congressional District of New York, with great pride, the nomination and confirmation of two distinguished residents of that district as alternate representatives of the United States to the United Nations General Assembly. The first of these, Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, has a most impressive record of good works, much of which concerns international organizations and affairs. Mrs. Lord has been an alternate U.S. representative to the 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th sesesions of the General Assembly. She is the U.S. representative on the United Nations Commission of Human Rights. She has been particularly effective in her work on behalf of the United Nations Children's Fund—UNICEF—for whom she has made extensive tours and studies. Her nomination as alternate representative to the 14th session of the General Assembly is well-deserved, and another in her collection of high honors.

The second, Harold Riegelman, has distinguished himself as a practicing attorney since he was admitted to the bar in New York in 1916. He, too, has achieved much in public service: he has served as special attorney general of New York State, and as special counsel to the U.S. Treasury; in 1953 he was acting postmaster of New York City; and in the same year represented the Republican Party as candidate for mayor of the city of New York. He has, as well, served with great valor in the U.S. Armed Forces, and holds the rank of colonel in the U.S. Army Reserves. For all these reasons, he, too, is highly qualified and deserving of this new distinction.

I am proud to count both of these fine citizens among my constituents and personal friends.

What Makes Good Pilots?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. L. PILCHER
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PILCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article reprinted from the August 1959, issue of Armed Forces Management:

WHAT MAKES GOOD PILOTS?

The following questions were sent to both BuAer and the Aeronautical Training Society. We believe the answers here give both sides of an old argument fully and fairly:

1. The late-1955 Heller report, result of a $40,000 Navy-sponsored study by a private firm, said Navy could save nearly $7 million a year by contracting for primary flight training rather than doing the teaching itself at Pensacola. Was this accurate then, and does it still hold true?

2. Although Navy did not adopt the major recommendation of the report, it said the expense was justified through improved management practices and resulting economies. Can you cite some of these?

3. Air Force contends the contractor system, which Army also uses, produces better pilots. Navy says their system does. Is there anyway of settling this argument, particularly in peacetime?

4. ATS claims the low turnover rate of instructors at contract schools means better teachers than military men frequently replaced at the end of 1 year. Can the Navy disprove this?

5. ATS says absence of extra-curricular military duties plus greater job specialization mean manpower needs are cut. Can't the Navy change the jobs of military instructors to accomplish the same ends?

6. ATS says contract school system broadens the base of the Nation's military strength. Is this true? If not, why not?

7. Why can't a satisfactory military atmosphere be maintained at contract schools?

8. Heller says it would probably take 5 years to develop a reasonably satisfactory Navy contract school system. Even assuming it would want to adopt the idea, can Navy afford that step backwards?

9. Adopting the idea would involve, says Heller, moving Navy training out of Pensacola. Is this justifiable? Or advisable? Is it advisable, contract school or not, as the Heller report implies?

10. In this hassle, the Navy has been accused of letting tradition dictate to intelligence. What would be your answer?

THE NAVY VIEWPOINT

1. No. The figure was not accurate then, nor it is so today.

2. The Heller report has served a useful purpose in the area of management practices and has more than paid for itself in resulting economies. Significant economies have cut the original cost differential between military and contract flight training about 50 percent by:

(a) Moving primary flight training from NAAS Whiting to NAAS Saufley.

(b) Changing personnel rotation policies.

(c) Elimination excessive flight time permitted students to complete the primary phase.

(d) Improved methods of scheduling and maintaining aircraft.

(e) Improved use of military and civilian personnel.

Continuing effort and cost analysis are being made throughout flight training to effect economies without reducing quality.

3. No.

4. The tour of duty for military personnel assigned as flight instructors for primary flight training has been increased to 33 months.

5. No. The organizational complexities of the military system preclude the simplified management approach available to the civilian contractor.

6. No. A large majority of the civilian instructors are ex-military officers, fliers who are subject to recall in the event of mobilization, with the result that the ability of the contract system to expand during a national emergency would be curtailed significantly.

7. Civilian contract flight instructors are not dedicated to the military way of life. The Navy feels that its student aviators should be instilled in a proper naval atmosphere as early as possible, in keeping with Navy philosophy that a naval aviator is first a naval officer and secondly a pilot.

8. It is questionable that it would take the Navy five years to establish a reasonably satisfactory primary contract school operation, particularly if advantage were taken of the Air Force experience and know-how gained over the past eight years. Therefore, the Navy would not be taking so much of a step backwards from the standpoint of time required for implementation as it would in terms of flexibility. The Navy considers that its training activities must be responsive to its needs, and that the rigidity inherent in a contract type of operation would be costly and detrimental to Navy training objectives.

Drastic adjustment to the present Navy basic (the phase after primary) syllabus would be needed due to the difference between the lengths of the Navy primary flight syllabus (38 hours) and the contract primary flight syllabus (130–140 hours). The military aspects of basic flight training such as formation flying, gunnery, field carrier landings, carrier landings and so on would have to be removed and inserted later in the course. This is not simply a matter of switching the syllabus, because the earlier in the course such items are introduced, the less expensive they are.

9. The Heller report indicated that none of the existent Navy training bases in the Pensacola complex would be suitable for contract operations. Therefore, adoption of the contract concept would in effect move Navy training out of Pensacola, and that well-established complex would be reduced primarily to an administrative role with the flying activity dispersed. Present construction in the Pensacola complex will provide adequate facilities for anticipated requirements, including basic jet training, and as the new facilities become available, obsolete bases will be phased out.

Adoption of contract flight training would negate the planned usage of these facilities, with the result that most of them would have to be closed at considerable expense. Contract school or not, the Navy has a considerable investment in the Pensacola area, and it would be most uneconomical to move Navy training elsewhere.

10. There is no question that tradition plays an important role and guiding influence in creating esprit de corps, loyalty,

courage, and leadership in the Navy. Our Navy has a tradition of which it can justly be proud. However, the Navy is not so tradition-blind that it can't adjust to changing conditions.

The primary objective of our flight training course is to train young men to be naval officers who can fly. It is relatively easy to teach a lad to fly. But to make an officer out of him, particularly a naval officer, is something else again. We believe our system does these things better than a contract flight training system could possibly do.

THE ATS POSITION

1. The figure quoted in the Navy-sponsored study by Robert Heller & Associates, of possible savings of $6,924,000 yearly was as accurate as possible. Since the Heller study, the Navy has changed its program considerably, so it is doubtful the exact figure would apply today.

2. We agree that the Heller report served a useful purpose—but not in the way Navy says. The study brought widespread attention to specific advantages of contract training. The Navy's failure to adopt major recommendations of the report it sponsored—that is, to undertake contract training in the primary stage—would indicate that Navy did not attain the fullest benefit possible. On the other hand, the Navy did make changes, many of which appeared to cover up the more obvious deficiencies of their system as against contract training.

3. Heller & Associates were retained by the Navy to compare the Navy system of primary training with the Air Force system. The Heller report concluded that students at contract schools are more enthusiastic than Navy students over the advantages of the service as a career. Also, it stated: "On balance, it seems clear that contract instructors generally are more proficient technically and better qualified than their Navy counterparts."

4. The contract schools' great advantage is the fact that instructors are on permanent jobs with minimum turnover. This is reflected in the Heller report, which notes: "Generally, instructors at the contract schools visited are older, more mature, better satisfied with their assignments, and more proficient in the art of communicating their knowledge to students than are the instructors at Whiting Field." In the service, many feel that the training duty tour is dull and routine as against other flying assignments.

5. The manpower saving of contract training affords the Air Force and Army great economy in primary training. USAF once compared operation of a military-operated primary training school with a contract school. The military staff comprised some 2,100 officers and airmen, while the contract school could accomplish the same mission with about 700 personnel. This emphasizes how manpower needs and costs are cut by contract training.

6. Contract schools do broaden the base of our overall military strength, according to the Heller report, by providing "a way to use effectively men who could not instruct if they were in uniform and thus to release combat-qualified pilots to billets where there mobilization readiness could be maintained and improved." Most contract school flight instructors are disqualified either by age or ability for combat flying. Yet they are a reserve of trained flight instructors accomplishing a vital mission for the military services.

7. There is a satisfactory military atmosphere at all contract schools. Military indoctrination, as in the Navy, is the responsibility of the service. USAF contract schools are each commanded by a small military staff which provides just the right amount of military way of life.

8. The Navy could establish contract training in a matter of months, accomplishing such instruction more efficiently and economically than it ever has before. It would be just a matter of deciding to do it. The Navy primary flight syllabus of 38 hours does not include the more advanced-type flight training given in the Air Force primary course of 130–140 hours. In other words, the Navy, in reducing what it calls primary training to 38 hours, has tried to make it appear that teaching a Navy man to fly an airplane is in no way similar to teaching an Air Force man to fly.

9. The Heller report recommended that "primary pilot training in the Pensacola complex should be discontinued," adding that the facilities either be closed down or made available for other duty. We feel that there is a need to reevaluate the existing Navy training bases in the Pensacola complex. If none is suitable for a contract operation, consideration should be given to establishing separate contract schools or integrating Navy primary training with that of the Air Force.

10. We've always felt the Navy has used "tradition," if that's the right word, as a poor excuse in its criticism of contract training. The Navy emphasizes a need for "a proper naval atmosphere"; that "it takes a Navy pilot to train a Navy pilot"; and the Navy philosophy that "a naval aviator is first a naval officer and second a pilot." The Navy tradition is great and respected. Yet the Navy in using such statements regarding contract flight training seems to belittle the need for superior flight training at this initial stage. It tends to look upon the primary flight training phase as a course for officer training, leadership, and so on. We know these are necessities, but the actual flight instruction (and cost) should be kept in mind.

Walter R. Lee

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, for a third of a century my life long friend and neighbor, Walter Lee, has rendered devoted public service to his fellow man. As an elected official of Hinds County, he served the people of Mississippi, and as an aid to the House of Representatives, he served the people of all the States.

Walter Lee has contributed much to the important work of the House of Representatives. Although overburdened with multiple duties, he nevertheless always found time to give courteous attention to the problems of Members and their staffs. I can personally attest to his efficiency, devotion to duty, and integrity. He has been of invaluable assistance to the district I represent.

Walter Lee will be missed here. His friendliness, wit, and human qualities will leave a void that will not be easily or quickly filled.

There is consolation for me in the fact that the Congress' loss will result in a net gain for my congressional district and the State of Mississippi. He is returning to his home in Jackson. There he will have time for old friends and civic activities. With his charming wife, Helen, and his grand-daughter, Walter can continue his service to man in a less complex atmosphere. Surrounded by mementos of a life given to public service, he will enjoy a less frenzied existence. Such will be richly deserved.

Fortunately, I will be able to visit with Walter Lee in the future—more often than other Members—because his home is only a few miles from mine. Therefore, I will continue to have the benefit of his wise counsel.

My sincere good wishes go with him in his future undertakings.

The $11 Billion Increase in the Cost of the Highway Program in 3 Years Is Due in Part to the Inordinate Emphasis on Speed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, part of the increasing cost of the federally assisted highway program, which has increased by $11 billion in 3 years, from $25 billion to $36 billion, is due to the inordinate emphasis on speed, according to officials of the congressionally chartered National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Mrs. Helen Duprey Bullock, historian of this great organization, has declared that—

Part of the fabulous and increasing cost of this program is owing to the inordinate emphasis on speed. Routes are not infrequently selected and plotted from the air with an appalling lack of consideration of the human values involved.

I include here the text of Mrs. Bullock's letter, and an article by Grady Clay, staff writer, the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal:

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington, D.C., July 27, 1959.

Hon. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN McDOWELL: In the absence of Mr. Howland, I wish to write to thank you on his behalf for inserting his article from the New York Times in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We are grateful for bill H.R. 7215 which you have introduced, as the destruction ensuing upon the Federal-aid highway program, and to some extent the urban renewal program, is being forcibly brought to our attention every day. There is an excellent article in Landscape Architecture which I enclose for your information. I hope that it, too, can be placed in the RECORD as it states so forcibly the way routes are chosen, and the helplessness of those who find themselves in the way.

I have been dealing with a retired minister and his wife who invested their life savings in buying and restoring a 1724 Dutch stone house in Athens, N.Y.; who have been shunted from one agency to another with a dozen excuses for not shifting the highway location to avoid ruining this property.

Part of the fabulous and increasing cost of this program is owing to the inordinate

emphasis on speed. Routes are not infrequently selected and plotted from the air with an appalling lack of consideration of human values involved. A number of short-sighted officials have given up parklands as "free" that can never be replaced. I do hope that the Congress that made possible this program will be able to apply the brakes as the situation is critical.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. HELEN DUPREY BULLOCK,
Historian.

NEW HIGHWAYS: NO. 1 ENEMY?—THE TIGER IS THROUGH THE GATE

(By Grady Clay)

More than a year ago, I was prompted to observe that the new Federal highway program was "today's tiger at the gate—a tremendous concentration of energy busting loose in all direction"—capable of wrecking our cities and countryside unless held in check.

Today, some 16 months later, we see hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of new highways, bridges, interchanges, and other geometric whirligigs under construction. And there is no doubt: the tiger is through the gate.

Back in 1955, the President's Advisory Committee on a national highway program observed that the expansion of highways had already begun a revolution in our living habits. Since that day, we have watched this revolution get underway. We who must live with its fruits, the bitter with the sweet; we who had pinned our hopes on this, the greatest construction program in American history, are filled with both admiration and dismay—admiration for the great skill at organization of materials, money, men, and machinery which makes this job possible, and dismay at the single-mindedness which seems so prevalent, at the inordinate speed, and at many of the results.

We hope it won't be as bad as it looks, but we fear it will. We have no monopoly on wisdom, and yet a great deal of skepticism about the omniscience of those in charge of the program.

BEST OF ALL POSSIBLE WORLDS?

The optimists among us believe this new revolution is producing the best of all possible worlds. The pessimists among us look around, and are afraid the optimists are right.

My purpose is to emphasize that highway planning and community planning are not necessarily the same thing; that paving an interstate highway does not produce a transportation system; that we must live with the monsters we create; and that the purpose of a highway system is to help create a better civilization. This is a tool—and not an end in itself.

We cannot achieve a better civilization by such simple expedients as learning to speak the other fellow's language. For one thing, this would mean that all the rest of us would have to learn to talk like engineers. At the moment, they seem to have been elevated into positions of power where they can tell us what they want, rather than how to get what we want.

Although a great many millions of non-engineers have a vital stake in highways, the reaction of some of this group to the rest of us and our suggestions reminds me of the old Kentucky mountaineer who hadn't kissed his wife in 7 years. But he shot the first man who tried it.

OVER WHATEVER STANDS IN ITS WAY

My impression is that the men in control of the highway program are interested in the program, rather than in people; in concrete, and not in communities; in traffic movement—over whatever stands in its way. They have got more public money to spend than any nonatomic profession ever had in peacetime. They're convinced that they act in the national interest, in the public interest, and in behalf of the national defense. Occasionally, this conviction is coupled with a self-righteousness which has to be encountered to be believed.

Not long ago I saw a 7-mile interstate expressway placed on a city map at the request of an anonymous official at a nearby Army post—a man never identified in public debate, never quoted except indirectly. But he was alleged to have said this was "necessary for defense." And his word was enough.

Any time an anonymous Army official can designate a $10 to $20 million expressway through a crowded city, he's doing just fine by himself. He needs no help from us.

Even more recently I have watched the town trustees of a small suburban city wake up in dismay to find that a new loop highway had—without their knowledge or consent—been scheduled to cut their community in two. When they finally raised Cain about it, they were reassured by the State that "this is just preliminary; nothing has happened yet."

"YOU AIN'T BEEN HURT YET"

Which reminds me of the fellow who hollered "Don't shoot!" at the man pointing a gun at him. Whereupon the other man demanded: "What you hollering about? You ain't been hurt—yet."

As a reporter, I have writen a number of stories about urban redevelopment, and about highway planning. Nowhere in public life today have I encountered such failure to recognize the need for comprehensive local planning as in this Federal Highway Act. It does not require that interstate or federally aided highways be located as part of a comprehensive community plan. Nor does it require communities to develop a workable program for an overall transportation system.

Many local towns are too poor to plan. Many others claim they can't afford it. Others simply neglect it. Whatever the reasons, I believe the State and Federal Governments have an obligation to this Nation's urban communities to help them work out their own comprehensive plans into which the new highways will fit.

CULT OF OFFICIAL SECRECY

Meanwhile, the cult of secrecy which blights the official life of Washington has been extended out over the highways. Secrecy, combined with the smoke screen of official gobbledygook, makes it mighty difficult for the average citizen to find out what's happening to him.

Not long ago I sat in a conference at which the noted public relations consultant, Edward L. Bernays, recounted his troubles. His firm had been hired by a city which did not want a new expressway laid across its middle like a Chinese wall. Mr. Bernays said:

"It was most difficult to get at the facts about procedure * * * to pin down the responsibilities. It took us 3 weeks to isolate the interrelationships between the national and State people. * * * The national and State engineers were working closely together, which formed an 'entente,' making it difficult to get the public interest. It was difficult to get a decision whether it was worth going underground, versus the elevated highway. As a result, the city has had to develop its own pressure-group techniques."

While such cities are forced to develop pressure-group tactics to keep from being split up, what can smaller citizens' groups do?

I have recently watched a strenuous local controversy in which the opponents of a proposed interstate highway through three city parks have been assured that "the route is not pinned down yet" and that "any protests at this time are premature." Yet when they tried to suggest rerouting another portion, on which public hearings already had been held, they were told that no changes could be made "because of the State's investment in engineering studies and efforts."

In other words, if the public hearing hasn't yet been held, you're premature. And after the public hearing, you're too late.

Meanwhile, those of us who believe that open space is necessary for tomorrow's city, who wish to preserve America's green and lovely city parks and playgrounds, are disturbed over the reckless pursuit of free open space by the highway planners.

PARKS: SITTING DUCKS FOR HIGHWAY MEN

Every big city park is a sitting duck for the highway men, and for the local officials anxious to cut down their right-of-way costs.

Any attack on city park lands has the sanction of the American Association of State Highway Officials in its official bible—the "Policy on Arterial Highways in Urban Areas," published in 1957. On page 91 of this book is a map. It's entitled: "Location opportunities for arterial highways."

And what do they consider a location opportunity? The one and only park in the entire city. Their recommended route cuts through not just a little corner of the park, not just across one end of the park, but right smack down the entire length of the park.

If this hasn't happened in your town yet, I can only suggest it's because the highway men haven't been reading their bible lately.

But all too often, I suspect, the highway locators and park grabbers are aided and abetted by stingy, penny-pinching local officials who are anxious to cut down their right-of-way costs by either giving away or selling park land at ridiculous prices.

What about public hearings? I cannot speak of the thousands of hearings I have not seen, but from some personal observation I am forced to conclude that the public hearing is a carefully staged performance designed to show the audience why the route officially agreed upon in private cannot be changed. As one of the British motor magazines recently described it, these are affairs where "at worst, aggrieved persons may hear very sound reasons why things cannot be altered."

The burden of proof is placed on the private citizen who often is poorly informed and easily buffaloed by technical mumbo jumbo. At one public hearing I recently covered, a representative of the State highway department opened the tape-recorded portion of the hearing by making this statement:

"The question is whether you believe a good road will help this country. That's the question in an economic-impact hearing. Is a good road needed in your county? I'd like to get a statement from anyone present concerning the need for good roads in this county."

BE THANKFUL OR BE QUIET

In other words, don't make any fuss about the route we've already picked. Just be thankful. And if not, be quiet.

At this point, somebody always asks: "But what about the land speculators? We can't release plans for that highway. Those speculators will rush out ahead of us and grab up the land."

Let me quote the answer given by the editor of Right of Way magazine, the voice of the American Right-Of-Way Association:

"A State which has a sound right-of-way acquisition program, predicated upon complete, accurate appraisals, and sound skilled negotiations, and which releases to the public all available data, has nothing to fear from the so-called speculators. For speculators flourish only where there is concealment of information, and where right-of-way departments are unskilled, uncertain, and subject to the whims of politics."

CHECKLIST FOR HIGHWAY PLANNERS

In closing, may I submit that—

1. A greater share of highway planning should be entrusted to local officials and local citizen groups—to the people who will have to live alongside these highways, to the school officials whose districts may be chopped up, to the lovers of city parks who know that quiet, peace, and beauty are possible only at the price of constant vigilance.

The Federal Highway Act, it seems to me, needs amendment to require much more preliminary consultation with local interest groups as well as local officials. And where there are no local plans—a condition prevalent in thousands of communities—the act should provide money to help create such plans.

2. Highway planning is no place for secrecy, and no place for secret preparation of a single, inviolable, unchangeable approved solution.

3. There is room, and there should be time, for alternate routes to be studied in much detail. Too much of this route-picking is being done by map reconnaissance, and not by human beings who get out on their own hindlegs and walk the routes. I suggest that, by the time of the public hearings, the State and Federal highway people should have made adequate comparisons of acreages, dwellings to be demolished, mileages, and rough cost estimates for more than one route, especially where controversial areas are involved. Then we shall begin to have intelligent, well-informed public debate, with plenty of information available to all parties. Also, I hope to see the development of dependable cost-benefit studies, with consideration given for damage done by taking park land, splitting school districts, spilling noise into quiet residential districts, and the damage done to property values outside the right-of-way by noise and vibration.

4. I hope somebody is developing a better method of locating interchanges than sticking one's finger on the map where the new centerline crosses a big right-angle road and saying "We'll take this one."

It is around these interchanges that the competition for choice shopping-center sites is the hottest. Here is where the speculators congregate. Here is where the zoning lawsuits flourish; here is where the experts testify. Here is where ancient farms and deep woodlands suddenly become worth millions; here is where the unearned increment in land value accumulates, much of it sucked away from old commercial strips and neighborhood stores, or siphoned away from land elsewhere. I hope we can develop some way to recapture, for the general welfare, more of this unearned increment which will inevitably pile up around these interchanges.

There are few geographic areas outside the central business district in which an entire metropolitan area has a bigger stake than in the one or two square miles around the big new interchanges.

What happens in the thousand or so acres near the interchange is a real test of our ability to solve metropolitan problems. Here begin the opportunities for designing satellite towns, for encouraging development of specified suburban communities.

5. We should be developing the idea of highway service areas which has come from Prof. J. Marshall Miller at Columbia University. Such areas, preplanned and part of an interchange regional plan, would include motels, restaurants, service stations, stores, and all the services that the weekend and cross-country traveler could need.

6. It is high time to stop looking at highways as merely permanent devices for moving traffic, and begin designing them as multipurpose projects for achieving the widest range of social, economic, and cultural goals. We should be thinking of rights of way a thousand or so feet wide in appropriate places—rights of way which include borrow pits designed from the beginning to become recreation lakes or retention basins for storm waters; rights of way which may follow the edges of property lines rather than the absolutely straight, traditional beeline, providing space for tree nurseries, wildlife refuges, recreation areas, viewpoints. I suggest that we broaden our sights to look on the rights of way as a means of carrying the full range of utilities, including monorail and mass transit wherever appropriate.

The designers of America's new highways must realize what's happened to their public. This public is more visual-minded than any in our history. Its members are conscious of the passing scene, whether it be a barren desert decorated with all the excrescences which the billboard industry can build before local zoning goes into effect; or a lovely bluegrass countryside with its gleaming white fences and long sweeping hedgerows that delineate the open countryside about to be sliced by a dead-ahead, ramroad-straight new highway.

Today's public, whether behind the wheel of a car, or subjected to the second-class citizenship to which we relegate all pedestrians, want a nation that is beautiful as well as efficient; it wants to see the landscape enhanced and not destroyed, beautified and not subjected to the straight-line thinking which will produce a new kind of railroad trackage through the townscape.

The peopel have already put sufficient pressure on their Congress to pass the stiffest law in history regulating billboards; they already have begun to support aesthetic zoning in many jurisdictions; they will, I trust, be quick to protest any new highway which does not contribute its share of beauty and urbanity to the modern townscape. It it to this public that the new highway system should be dedicated.

In Honor of Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not on the floor of the House when the distinguished chairman of the House Subcommittee on Claims of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. LANE, addressed this House in a very factual yet heart-warming tribute of Walter Lee.

I join my distinguished friend from Massachusetts and the other distinguished members of the subcommittee in praising Mr. Lee upon his completion of 21 years of loyal and efficient service to the House Judiciary Committee.

Since I am a freshman in the House, Mr. Lee's aid to me was of immeasurable help in guiding me through the early procedures of the committee work. I found him at all times considerate, patient, genial, and friendly. I know from my experience on the committee of the great contributions he has made to the success of this committee. I know from having talked to him that he shall miss his association with the House committee and the members, but I know, too, the memories he takes with him will be pleasant ones and will grow more pleasant as the years go by.

I wish for Walter Lee many years of happiness with his friends back in Mississippi and trust that he will enjoy to the fullest the retirement he has so richly earned and deserves.

Cross Country With the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade—XiV; End of the Trail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the On-to-Oregon Cavalcade left Independence, Mo., April 19. Ahead were some 2,000 miles before the 20th century pioneers reached the Independence at the end of the trail in Oregon.

I am happy to report that the trip was not only successful but educational and at least one of its members will be ready to go again in A.D. 2059.

He is Rudy Roudebaugh of Drain, Oreg., driver of that city's wagon in the caravan. Rudy kept a diary each day of his trip. It has been my privilege to insert the diary in the Appendix of the RECORD from time to time. This is the final chapter from Rudy's diary. It covers the last days from August 10 to August 15 when the cavalcade received a tremendous ovation in Independence, Oreg.

In these last few days, Rudy describes the thrill of floating down the Columbia River to Portland and then those last few days. His final diary words are:

This is the biggest parade we've been in [in Independence, Oreg.] and the largest crowd of people. We're about to melt from the heat. I hope everyone has enjoyed these articles. At times I didn't know if I'd ever be able to get them out, but always seemed to manage.

See you at the next Covered Wagon Trek—in 2059.

The final chapter of the diary follows:

[From the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, Aug. 20, 1959]

TOURS THE DALLES DAM, DRIVES MULES LAST TIME AT INDEPENDENCE PARADE

(By Rudy Roudebaugh, ex-driver of Drain covered wagon)

August 10 (Monday), 8 a.m.: We're all loaded on the barge. The water truck and kitchen unit came first, then they loaded the wagons with a tractor and last of all the horses and mules. 8:30: Here we go on the barge *Aberdeen* and tug *Francis*. 9:50: We're facing a 40-mile-an-hour gale coming up the Columbia Gorge; Washington on the port side and Oregon on the starboard. We passed a place on the Washington side and a big welcome sign is out for us.

1:40: Bridge of the Gods. Sure is beautiful scenery around here, nice and green. 12:58: Entering Bonneville locks. Seems like the water will never go down the 60 feet. 1:30: We are now leaving the locks. This will be an all-day trip. We'll sleep here and have our breakfast. Ki is on cook shift today and tomorrow. When we left the locks there were two small boats ready to enter. 3:13: We have small boats following us just like the cars did on the highway.

We sure have a beautiful view of Mount Hood, it's behind us now. 3:32: We have docked at Fort Camas and Washougal, Wash. This is the first time the wagon train has ever hit Washington. We are invited to Camas by the chamber of commerce for a chicken dinner. While we were there we met W. B. McAllester from Washougal. He is an old timer from Drain. We were each given a pendettos scarf and a big package of paper goods.

4:32: We are underway. 5:15: Passing Government Island. 5:52: Going under the Vancouver bridge. 6:17: Entered the Willamette river. It sure has a beautiful view of Mount Rainier. We are being escorted by the Coast Guard. 6:50: Went under St. John's bridge; it didn't have to be raised. 7:22: Went under the Broadway bridge. It seemed we were going under a bridge every 5 minutes after this. Steel, Burnside, Morrison, Hawthorne, all had to be opened for us. 7:48: Docked at Zidell for tonight.

August 11, 4:40: Underway going under Ross Island bridge. Janell slept on the lounge of the tug and Ki and I slept on the barge in our wagon last night. 5:21: Docked at Willamette Park, unloaded our wagons and stock and harnessed and was ready to go at 6:16. 6:21: Rolling out on the road again. In Multnomah County. 6:31: Hit highway 43. To give you some idea how we left Portland: We went on Terry Ferry road, which is hilly. They are sanding it right ahead of us. Doc and Jan are sure full of pep today (river travel must agree with them). Now we are on Southwest Third Avenue, turning on Southwest Hume Street, now on Fourth Avenue and on Southwest Terwilliger Boulevard. We are going up Highway 99, now southwest on Bertha Boulevard, now on Southwest Beaverton. 7:30: Going into Glencullen, a small suburb. 7:48: Entered Washington County, also going into Raleigh Hills where the Washington County sheriff's posse joined us. 8:24: Arrived at Beaverton, population 4,200, where we were presented a basket of gifts.

Ki is on cook shift today. 9:06: Going through Huber and Olaha. 9:25: Entering Tobias, and 6 minutes later Reedsville. 10:52: Arrived at Washington County fairgrounds at Hillsboro. David Cooper and family Nelson Sawyers of Roseburg were wagon-train visitors.

August 12, 6:20: All hooked up. We went uptown for breakfast at Times Cafe by the chamber of commerce. We are waiting for Tex and Roy. Last night we had a surprise. Ray Bogan stopped to see us on his way home from Portland. We were each given a gift from the Cub Scouts. They played Indians and raided us last night. We were given a barbecue chicken dinner by the people of Hillsboro. There were 18,000 people visiting the wagons last night. I don't believe I mentioned this before: A buddy of mine when we were in the Coast Guard looked me up at the Dalles, and entertained us. Walter Lowblad is a repairman at the gates of the Dalles Dam. He took me 185 feet down to the bottom of the dam. This was one of my most important sightseeing tours of the 4-month wagon trip.

We are being escorted again by the Washington County Sheriffs Posse. 6:34: We're on our way. Hillsboro has been a wonderful place to camp for the night. We all received a beautiful rose plant from the Hillsboro nursery. Janell, Ki and I received a piece of jewel making us members of the Oregon Wagon Train of 1859. 7:30: Crossing Jacksonbottom slough. 7:36: Crossing the Tualatin River. 8:42: Christensen Creek. 9:48: Going over the McFee Creek. 9:37: Going through Scholls.

Diane Archibal of Drain visited Janell Sunday. 10:16: We are now going by Mt. Side farm (quite a place). It seems around here they are in the nut business. It's rolling country. 10:20: Stopped to water. 10:46: We are rolling again. 10:50: I stopped and made sandwiches on the tailgate of our wagon. Also entered Yamhill County. 12:48: Just came down a long slick hill. Our poor mules have done nothing but slide all day. 1:08: Newberg, population 4,000. 1:28: Crossing Chehalem Creek. (That hill we went down was the Chehalem hill.) 1:50 Entering Dundee, population 310. We will camp at Dundee public school.

While we docked in Portland some people told us John Ward was there and would meet us. Camp and lunch is ready.

August 13, 5:55: All ready to roll. 6:05: Here we go. The State police weighed our mules this morning (2,360 pounds). Mules and wagons together weighed 4,875 pounds. Last night we had a ham dinner given us by the Ladies Club of Dundee. This morning the firemen served us breakfast. 7:26: Crossed the Yamhill River. 9:14: Passed the Eola Village. 10:04: Hit highway 99. 10:14: Entering Amity, population 650. Through here it looks like they grow mostly small grain. Back at Dundee it's a nut country. In fact, it's the nut capital of the world. We have just been met my some horsemen to lead us to camp. 10:27: Entering Amity City Park to make camp. The last three camping places we have been furnished grain and hay. The valley women club made dinner and served us. Then all day we had a hostess to look after us, Mr. and Mrs. Herald Lehonan.

August 14, 5:58: Our last morning on the road we are leaving two minutes early (wonders will never cease). We have one of the biggest crowds ever to see us off. They said there was about 15,000 people here last night. Dick and Edna Erickson came this afternoon to stay with us and also bring us home. Ova Patchen and Mr. and Mrs. Koenig and family, Jerry Whipple and children, Bruce Williams and family all came to see us today.

6:05: Crossing Ash swale. 6:44: Entering Polk County, our last county to go through in the wagons. 8:59: Going over Baskett Slough. It is cloudy, cool morning. 9:16: Coming into Rickreall. 9:23: Rickerall Creek. 9:26: Stopped at Polk County fairgrounds for the 5th Cavalry just came in to spend the weekend with us and escort us to Independence. 10:20: We are on our way again. 11:16: Monmouth Riding Club just met us. 11:21: The people of Monmouth have brought us out some lunch. 11:44: Entering Monmouth, population 2,344. 12:10: We have finally got to the end of the Trail—Independence, population 2,050.

It sure seems hot today. Guess what. We got to the city limits and they led us out on a side road and we have gone 3 miles trying to get to our campsite which is only 1 mile from Independence. This is a real deal right out through field. Up ahead I see our camp. This evening we had a lot of relatives visiting us. We had shower privileges at the Henry Hill school.

August 15, 5: Up and had breakfast. I sure wish we could have slept in. This is going to be a long day. Ki and I have to finish moving out of our wagon. Her brother, Bill Weaver, took a load home for us last night. Ki's brother, Ralph, is here so he will haul the last of our belongings home for us. 8: All hooked up and leaving our campsite to take the wagons over to the parade assembly area. 9:32: Arrived at the grounds. It looks like a long, hot wait. Many of our friends were out at the assembly area to visit us. 11:10: The parade has finally started. 12:15: We are now pulling out of the assembly area and the first of the parade has already been broken up and on its way back to the assembly area.

This is the biggest parade we've been in and the largest crowd of people. We're about to melt from the heat. 1:22: Well, we finally made it. We are at Henry Hill school. One more meeting to attend and we can start for home.

I hope everyone has enjoyed these articles. At times I didn't know if I'd ever be able to get them out, but always seemed to manage.

See you at the next Covered Wagon Trek—in 2059.

The Cost of Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a foregone conclusion that Congress will next year wrestle with a bill to provide medical benefits under the social security program. Bringing a bill of this nature before the House of Representatives during a national election year has rather positive political implications, which only the most naive candidate for public office can deny.

At any rate, I submit herewith an editorial from the Chicago Tribune entitled "The Cost of Free Medicine" which affords considerable food for thought, particularly for Members of Congress who might be inclined to view the issue in the light of the elections of November 1960, rather than the cold reality of the experience Great Britain has faced since the inception of its Government-sponsored medical program:

THE COST OF FREE MEDICINE

The latest tab for socialized medicine in Britain shows that taxes intended specifically to cover the national health service bill defrayed only 24 percent of the cost. The remaining 76 percent must be met by general taxes collected by the Government.

In the 10 years since socialized medicine was inaugurated, costs have risen by one-third, and in the last year hit a record of $1¾ billion.

We hope that these facts will not be lost upon Congress, where a Democratic group led by Representative FORAND, of Rhode Island, is pushing for an extension of social security so that medical care and hospitalization would be provided by the Government to elderly people drawing benefit checks. That this would be another step toward socializing medicine is obvious enough. That it would also embody a cost which eventually would be staggering should be equally plain, although the conclusion is disputed by FORAND and those of like mind.

The British experience demonstrates that the initial estimate of cost was far too low, and that the taxes to cover the supposedly free service were correspondingly inadequate. But, once the taxes were fixed, the prospective beneficiaries had a vested interest in keeping the price cheap on what they expected to get. Inevitably deficits accumulated and were passed on to the treasury.

Representative FORAND contends that the additional charge for his socialized medicine would be "only" an additional one-quarter of 1 percent added to present social security taxes falling both on employer and employee. Those who oppose this departure say that it would either break the social security fund or lead to increases in the tax which would soon be insupportable.

The steadily rising membership in voluntary medical insurance plans suggests that the Forand bill is primarily another scheme to corral the votes of a growing segment of the population. We trust that both Congress and the public will consider it in that light and will have the honesty to recognize that only fools expect something for nothing.

Appendix

Law Enforcement Officers Deserve Better Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the Tennessee Law Enforcement Officers Association at Knoxville on August 28, 1959.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a pleasure to back here in Knoxville this evening and to discuss a subject of utmost concern to you as law enforcement officers, to me as a legislator, and to all Americans as responsible citizens.

Crime is a cancer that destroys the minds and the souls of its practitioners and extorts severe penalties from all of us.

Approximately 3 million crimes will be committed in the United States this year. In order to meet this menace about $22 billion will be spent by local and Federal law enforcement agents. That's more than half the amount that this Nation will spend this year for our national defense. It is 140 times the amount that has been asked by the administration to implement the National Education Defense Act. For every dollar that is contributed to our churches 10 will be spent to combat crime. From a tax standpoint $22 billion cost every citizen $128.

These startling financial figures do not represent the greatest expense that crime inflicts. Most serious of all is the loss in human resources, the corruption of our youth, the weakening of our moral fiber.

When we are locked in a global struggle that threatens our ideals and ideas we cannot afford to see our future strength sapped by the corruption of our youth. I am sure you are well aware of our juvenile delinquency problem and the central part it plays in the whole crime movement. During 1959 more than 1 million young people will get in trouble with the police. More than 50 percent of all those arrested for crime against property will be youths under 21 years of age. The rate of juvenile arrests is growing 2½ times faster than the rate of population growth in this age classification.

Crime does not pay—although a few hoodlums make temporary financial profits. But crime certainly does cost.

Organizations such as yours lead the counterattack against this national menace. The first line of defense against the criminal is the man with the badge who walks the beat or cruises in a patrol car; the sheriffs and officers and policemen who face the gunman, the burglar, and the mugger and at times give their lives in defense of law and order.

ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS DESERVE SUPPORT

You are doing a determinal and courageous job, and your ranks are filled with able, dedicated men. But you can't do it all by yourselves. Your efforts are the central ones, but they must derive added strength from other sources. An effective anticrime campaign is one in which America's law-enforcement officers represent the link between local civic activity and national coordination. You must have the support and interest of the individual citizens which you are protecting. And your efforts would be greatly enhanced by an exchange of ideas and information between various law enforcement agencies through a national crime commission.

Let's briefly consider these two anticrime elements.

During the hearings before the Senate Crime Investigating Committee in 1950–51, of which I was chairman, we found that the American public was dangerously uninformed and apathetic about the pervasive presence of crime. We met many policemen during our investigations—men who told us of the difficulties they have in enforcing the law because of a lack of support from the law-abiding citizens of their community; men who told us how pressure to obtain special consideration or favors breaks down the whole system of law enforcement.

The ugly facts that splashed across the television set of the Nation served to arouse the American people and rid them of their apathy about the crime problem. The hearings stirred a good deal of anticrime activity in the form of volunteer citizens groups, new crime commissions, tightening of State laws, and congressional legislation.

NEED OF CONSTANT PUBLIC INTEREST

But unfortunately much of this activity, particularly the concern of local citizens, has been sporadic and needs dramatic stimulants. An honest and courageous police officer is priceless even as the children and adults he protects. There may be an occasional bad apple, but the vast majority of our law enforcement population represents America's most dedicated men and women. It is the responsibility of all our citizens to see that our anticrime leaders receive adequate salaries and work in conditions unimpaired by dissension or patronage.

Our law enforcement officers need to be better paid, and they need to have more adequate security when they retire or when they are disabled. Unless we can provide these incentives it is going to be hard to maintain the high caliber of people entrusted with the enforcement of our laws. I think there is a duty on the part of the Federal, State, and local governments in this connecttion. A great many State and local violations are also violations of Federal statutes. Local law enforcement officers very frequently assist in the enforcement of Federal statutes as well as State laws. Many times they may be killed or disabled while doing so. So I think it is proper that the Federal Government join State and local communities in a program of seeing that our law enforcement officers have better protection.

With this in mind I have filed a bill that will extend the provision of the Federal Employees Compensattion Act to cover State and local law enforcement officers when they are killed or injured while enforcing any Federal law. The bill provides for payment to the extent of one-third of the amount set forth in the Federal Employees Compensation Act. It is contemplated that the State and local governments would make similar provisions if they have not already done so. I believe that a joint undertaking would help us retain good men and women in the law enforcement service. I believe it is equitable from the viewpoint of the Federal Government. The bill that I have introduced is as follows:

A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to State and local law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while, or as a direct result of, enforcing any Federal law

"Whereas it is in the public interest to coordinate the efforts of the Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in order to improve the enforcement of laws; and

"Whereas many activities which constitute violations of State laws also constitute violations of Federal laws; and

"Whereas State and local law enforcement officers frequently assist in the enforcement of Federal criminal statutes; and

"Whereas State and local law enforcement officers and their families frequently are not adequately protected in the event any such officer is killed or injured and disabled while engaged in the enforcement of laws; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the Congress that the Federal Government contribute toward the provision of a more adequate measure of protection for State and local law enforcement officers and their families in cases where any such officer is killed or injured and disabled while engaged in enforcing any Federal law: Therefore

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a), except as otherwise provided by section 2, the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, shall apply in the case of any State law enforcement officer (as defined in subsection (b)) who is killed or injured while engaged in, or as a direct result of having engaged in, the enforcement of any Federal law in like manner as if such law enforcement officer were an "employee" as defined in section 40(b) of such Act.

"(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term 'State law enforcement officer' means any sheriff, deputy sheriff, policeman, constable, town marshal, or other officer or employee of any State or political subdivision thereof who is authorized to apprehend and arrest criminals and who is charged with the duty of suppressing criminal activity, apprehending criminals and persons suspected of crimes, preserving the peace, and protecting life and property.

"SEC. 2. The amount of any compensation payable under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by reason of the provisions of this Act shall be equal to one-third of the amount which would be payable if the individual to whom or on whose account such compensation is payable were an 'employee' as defined in section 40(b) of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended."

While crime is largely a local problem there is much that can be done nationally to assist our law-enforcement agents. Since our investigations in 1950–51 Congress has passed many bills dealing with various types of criminal activity. This legislation, while beneficial, generally can deal only with specific types and certain manifestations of crime. It cannot strike mortal blows at the

broad evil that only occasionally hits the headlines, but usually is carried on quietly down the street.

NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION

Toward this end, I am planning to introduce again in the Senate a bill to establish a National Crime Commission. This Commission, similar to the once I've proposed in past sessions of Congress, would act as a clearinghouse for the various Federal agencies and anticrime organizations spread throughout the country. It would not interfere with the fine work of the FBI but would supplement it.

It would study the manner and extent to which organized crime uses the facilities of interstate commerce, and evaluate the adequacy of Federal laws dealing with this problem. The Commission would submit recommendations based on its findings, coordinate the activities of various law-enforcement agencies, and expedite exchange of information between such groups.

I believe such an organization would provide elements that are often missing from our anticrime movements: unity and permanence. The unity would be supplied by the organizations' coordination of anticrime efforts and cross-ventilation of ideas and techniques. The permanence would come from its continuing presence as a source of information and a sponsor of new programs.

Local encouragement and national cooperation—these are the elements that have been largely absent in past campaigns against crime. In the past 8 years there have been significant improvements along these lines. Present crime rates show clearly that there is much more to be done.

Washington-Baltimore Adequacy of Service Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, in the past I have had occasion to comment on the delayed justice of the CAB and to criticize the Board's dilatory handling of the Washington-Baltimore Adequacy of Service Investigation, docket No. 8148.

In this connection Mr. Louis J. Hector, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, gave a speech on August 25, 1959, before the American Bar Association convention in Miami. The subject of this speech was the Civil Aeronautics Board's slowness and inefficiency in processing administrative cases. His conclusion was:

Gentlemen, I think most of us agree that this kind of thing can't go on much longer. If a private business tried to conduct its affairs this way it would go broke. If we tried to make our foreign policy or plan our national defense this way, we would still be a third-rate power. And if we keep on trying to plan our national transportation system this way, we will wake up in a national emergency one day and find that it won't do the job. Clearly these procedures must be overhauled.

Mr. Hector's remedy for this delay is both complicated and drastic. He admits his solution requires radical surgery and it is clearly a long-range program.

But what about the intervening time before some major institutional reform can be worked out? Are the people of this country to be subjected to the delays that the people of Baltimore have been experiencing?

What we need is improvement now, not years hence. I believe that the CAB can improve its efficiency almost immediately.

For example, it is well known that the main missions of the CAB are, first, to handle route matters to provide air service to the public; second, to handle rate cases to insure the financial stability of the airlines while preventing overcharging of the public; third, to enforce the law and punish violators of the Federal Aviation Act; and fourth, to discharge their safety functions.

The 1960 budget estimate of the CAB which was submitted to the House Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations is an astonishing document. The CAB estimate asks for $7,500,000 for all activities for 1960 and proposes the following allocation:

Activity and percent of total budget

Route activities	15.0
Rate activities	10.0
Enforcement	4.4
Safety activities	17.0
Total	46.4

Even with the addition of executive direction—5.5 percent—it is plain that the CAB is allocating only half of its budget to support the main activities Congress has empowered them to perform.

To make matters worse the CAB workload in route cases is forecast by them to increase from 190 in 1958 to 260 in 1960, or by 37 percent. The CAB backlog has been getting worse, for example in 1952 there was a backlog of 604 cases while by the end of 1957 it had risen to 1,031.

Why does not the CAB allocate more of its appropriation into its primary activities? The Senate appropriations report on the independent offices bill states—

The Board's budget presentation indicates a desire to delve into many peripheral activities not closely related to the main purpose of the Board's work which would, if Congress were to permit, lead to the further dilution of Board energies from its more important duties.

I heartily concur with this statement and no better example of a peripheral activity is the carrier relations division of the Board.

The CAB has allocated more of its budget to carrier relations than it has allocated to its Compliance Section which is responsible for the enforcement of the law. This would not be so bad if the law were being adequately enforced but the chief of enforcement admitted during the committee hearings:

We have over 50 formal cases pending before the Board, many of them yet to be heard by hearing examiners. (Senate hearings, Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices, p. 78.)

For example, on May 8, 1957 the CAB Office of Compliance filed a complaint against a large air freight forwarder for violating five Federal laws including falsification of documents and unfair competition and requested revocation of the forwarder's certificate. Two years and 4 months later, on September 9 of this year, the Board will hold a hearing and in the meantime the unlawful conduct continues and will continue until the final processing of the case a year or more from now. This situation cannot be allowed to continue.

What does this carrier relations section do which entitles it to more of the budget than is devoted to enforcing the law? Its biggest volume of business is agreements filed pursuant to section 412 of the Federal Aviation Act. It handled 1,500 matters in 1958 and is forecast to handle 1,865 in 1960. I have personally studied the lists of agreements and while occasionally there is an important or complicated problem the overwhelming majority are routine agreements between airlines concerning ticket space, baggage handling, sanitation facilities and the like.

The interlocking relations work is forecast to decrease and the other work—forwarders, 6(b) permits, and charter exemptions—simply cannot be compared in importance to law enforcement, route and rate cases and safety.

Mr. Hector should be commended for his interest in reform and improvement but he should focus on the immediate possibilities for reform such as a wiser expenditure of appropriated money.

American Legion, Louisiana Department, Supports the Cold War GI Bill on Education and Training

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the current tense situation in world affairs requires this Nation to maintain itself as a power for peace, and the tenseness emphasizes the fact that American service personnel have been and may be at any time shipped to any part of the world where they are needed.

We all know of the times when this cold war has turned hot.

It was to help Americans who take years from their lives to serve their country—often encountering the dangers of wartime—to recoup some lost opportunities that the cold war GI bill was written.

The Department of Louisiana of the American Legion, meeting in their 41st annual convention at Baton Rogue on July 23–26, 1959, passed a resolution urging continuation of education and training programs for veterans. I commend the Legion for its farsightedness. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1: URGING CONTINUATION OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Whereas the Congress of the United States, expressing the will of the citizenry by the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), recognized the justice, equity and the general value of a sound education and training program for the veterans of our country; and

Whereas the legislation enacted to provide such education and training benefits was for the purpose of restoring lost educational opportunities to those men and women who served in the Armed Forces of our country and has accomplished this purpose and has been an immeasurable factor in contributing to the economic security of our veterans and their families, as well as to the security of the Nation as a result of the increase in the general educational level and professional and technical skills of the veterans; and

Whereas the increased earning power of veterans directly attributable to the program is resulting in payment of increased income taxes which will more than repay the total cost of the program; and

Whereas notwithstanding the continuing involuntary military service program, Public Law 7, 84th Congress, denies entitlement to education and training benefits to all veterans who first entered service after January 31, 1955, which is grossly inequitable: now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Louisiana, in annual convention in Baton Rouge, La., July 23–26, 1959, strongly urges a continuation of an education and training program similar to that provided by Public Law 550, 82d Congress, to all veterans of our country who serve in any period in which involuntary military service is authorized, and urges the Congress to enact appropriate legislation to accomplish; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, all Members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, and to the American Vocational Association.

Nehru Is Proud of India's Progress in Last 12 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article written by Paul Simon, State representative from Troy, Ill., after an interview with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in India. The article appeared in the Chicago Daily News on August 13, 1959:

NEHRU IS PROUD OF INDIA'S PROGRESS IN LAST 12 YEARS—LOW INCOME, RELIGIOUS SPLITS AMONG TOUGHEST PROBLEMS

(By Paul Simon)

On the eve of India's 12th anniversary of independence, which is Saturday, I spent an hour and a half with Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in his official residence.

Our coversation covered a wide variety of subjects including the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks and I came away much impressed by the man who is the leader of the world's largest democracy—population 360 million.

In many respects India is like the shoes Nehru was wearing. They were a pair of new, black shoes which squeaked a little but looked as if they would serve him a long time. India's democracy is new and has its squeaks but it looks as if it is capable of serving them well for some time.

The man who has served as the leader of India's Government for all of these 12 years was vigorous in his conversation, particularly when he warmed to a subject like U.S. arms aid to Pakistan, which he strongly opposes.

In his frank reaction to questions and in his obvious pleasure in a give-and-take situation, he reminded me of Israel's Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion. The difference is that Ben-Gurion's language marches; Nehru's dances.

He is 69, but does not look it. He clutched a small, pink pillow at his side as he spoke except when he smoked a cigarette ("I've cut down to six a day," he said with considerable pride.)

He faces many problems but he faces them with the confidence of a man who has licked many problems.

Among the problems confronting him are a per capita Indian average income of $54 per year, 14 official languages which make communication difficult, a religiously divided people, and territory bordering Communist China and the Soviet Union as well as hostile Pakistan.

On the positive side, democracy has survived a bloody few months following independence, the low standard of living has been raised by about 10 percent, India is starting industrial growth in a solid way (including five big steel mills), and an increased agricultural potential is beginning to be tapped.

I asked him what his country's greatest accomplishment has been during the last 12 years.

"Emotional integration," he replied.

India was a land of many kingdoms of a feudal nature and now the people have an awareness of belonging to the nation. Land reform has virtually eliminated the former large land operations.

As to the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks, he is not optimistic that there will be any specific accomplishments but feels that the idea of having talks is good. "It may reduce the steel wall of suspicion which exists between your two countries," he stated.

He is also pleased at the prospect of President Eisenhower visiting India, as the President indicated he might do after he retires.

But Nehru would not be unhappy if Mr. Eisenhower would do this while he is still President.

Among other things Nehru said:

Sooner or later the United States should at least vote for the admission of Red China into the United Nations. Official recognition is a separate issue.

The Government in China is going to stay and the United States might as well face the fact. If Red China had been a member of the United Nations prior to the Korean war it is possible that war could have been avoided.

He hinted that he might favor an independent Formosa. (This is a slight change in position for him.)

He is doing his best to maintain friendly relations with Red China but is having his difficulties. He is determined not to leave future generations with a strong feeling of animosity between India and China. But this is not easy. A Chinese map has been published showing part of India within China's border.

In the State of Kerala, where the Communist government was recently removed, he is cautiously hopeful that the non-Communist forces will combine to defeat the Communists in election there.

U.S. assistance has been most helpful, particularly in meeting the emergency hunger situation.

Relations between India and the United States have improved during the last 2 years. The United States has shown a greater understanding of some of the problems India faces.

Relations with Pakistan are little improved. The greatest irritant between India and the United States is arms aid to Pakistan. India understands American motives, but still cannot look favorably on the United States arming an unfriendly neighbor.

Convention of the International Parliamentary Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 1, 1959, an editorial entitled "Less Ice, More Light," was published in the Christian Science Monitor.

The editorial contains information about the meeting which was held in Warsaw, which I was supposed to attend, but which I could not attend due to some things it was necessary to attend to on the floor of the Senate.

The editorial states, in part:

An American Congressman, speaking in Polish, recalled the Nazi invasion of Poland just 20 years ago and said Stalin's deal with Hitler made it possible, with the Soviets seizing eastern Poland shortly after. A member of the Netherlands Parliament objected to calling countries behind the Iron Curtain the "Socialist community," and minced no words about the suppression of Hungary. Other speakers, from Austria and Australia, spoke out about "bloody oppression" in Tibet.

As I said, this occurred in Warsaw.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LESS ICE, MORE LIGHT

Something happened in Warsaw last week which deserves more attention in connection with the current cold war thaw. In the Polish Parliament building 400 officials from 50 nations heard Communist regimes and acts bluntly denounced.

An American Congressman speaking in Polish, recalled the Nazi invasion of Poland just 20 years ago and said Stalin's deal with Hitler made it possible, with the Soviet seizing eastern Poland shortly after. A member of the Netherlands Parliament objected to calling countries behind the Iron Curtain the "Socialist community" and minced no words about the suppression of Hungary. Other speakers, from Austria and Australia, spoke out about bloody oppression in Tibet.

The occasion was a convention of the International Parliamentary Union and the speakers were talking unofficially. Yet they are elected members of their own nations'

legislatures and the union meeting provided a sounding board of world reputation—and behind the curtain—for their anti-Communist remarks.

It is quite possible that this incident brought as much light to non-Communist as to Communist peoples. For many Western folk have oversimplified concepts of life behind the curtain. Many will be surprised that any such freedom of speech can be exercised there. Recognition that their knowledge is incomplete can be the prelude to better-informed, more reliable thinking.

Here is one of the great potential benefits of a cold war thaw—better understanding on both sides. We are not using better understanding necessarily in the sense of closer agreement, but of more accurate knowledge. Such knowledge may strengthen an agreement to disagree insofar as national policies are concerned. But if so the relationship will not again be on such a doctrainaire, dehumanized basis as the cold war "freeze."

For Americans particularly the new melting period holds some danger of swinging from extreme animosity to unthoughtful softness. The better understanding afforded by greater freedom of contacts and information could well lead to a fuller appreciation of people in Communist countries. But it shouldn't lead to hasty assumptions that the Red regimes controlling them are genuinely benevolent or devoted to freedom—a degree of freedom that would unseat them. And their interest in peace is visibly one sided.

If aware of those dangers the free peoples should welcome any thawing. For in general the less ice the more light, and liberty has nothing to fear from light. Free peoples will be stronger where testing their systems pragmatically against competitors. Any movement away from stark military confrontation toward contests in the realm of ideas and information should be all in their favor.

It is no accident that an interparliamentary union meeting should display free speech—even behind the curtain. For Red regimes are under pressure to pretend that they have real parliaments and other free institutions. We should never underestimate the subversive power of freedom.

The Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include an editorial from the Spokane Spokesman-Review in its August 30 issue.

This publication is considered one of the truly sound and conservative newspapers of the Nation. Their viewpoint therefore is of particular interest.

PUBLIC WORKS VETO WAS NOT JUSTIFIED

It would not be surprising to see Congress challenge successfully this week the Presidential veto of the public works appropriations bill for the current fiscal year.

President Eisenhower and his budget advisers had their reasons for this veto. But in the timing of this message and in the explanations given, he has seriously discounted some political and economic realities that now jeopardize his position on the domestic front—at the very time he needs sustained congressional support on the more overpowering international issues that may soon be coming to a critical climax.

Briefly, the risks which Mr. Eisenhower has taken on this public works bill veto are not worth the cost that may now be extracted by a Congress in control of the opposition party.

Unlike many if not most of the bills which have been given an Eisenhower veto, this measure has a wide basis of popular support. Its final terms were determined only after extensive give-and-take in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and finally in the joint conference committee.

The significant votes on this bill—82 to 9 in the Senate and 380 to 20 in the House—are indicative of wide congressional support and of the fact that the leaders of both Houses may have little difficulty in securing the two-thirds majorities required in order to override the President's veto.

To be sure, there are numerous Congressmen alert to the inflationary and budgetary dangers inherent in the granting of initial planning or construction funds for projects which had not secured a preliminary clearance by the reviewing officers in the Bureau of the Budget. The President rightfully points out the implied long-term commitments that Congress would be making in providing money for these new starts now.

Yet the President's position in this case is vulnerable, both economically and politically.

He has just approved a multibillion dollar bill which includes pensions for the widows of veterans who have had no service-connected disabilities. This bill imposes new and costly obligations upon the Nation's taxpayers for the next generation—and it might well jeopardize the ability of the Government to provide properly for deserving veterans injured in the line of duty.

The President's position is also economically and politically vulnerable on the public works bill veto because of White House requests for more and seemingly indeterminate foreign aid. Many of these foreign aid projects never come under the same careful scrutiny required by budgetary and appropriation processes of our own domestic river development projects.

The truly unfortunate aspect of this veto will be the incentive it may give many Congressmen to override other vetoes which could be more easily justified and sustained.

Should the veto be sustained, Congress will have to get going on another public works appropriation bill—a rather irksome task at this stage of the drive toward adjournment. Yet the possibility of the President getting a more satisfactory bill is remote.

The major going projects will, of course, be provided for, in any event. But the liabilities of the present veto are likely to hurt the Eisenhower administration and the Republican Party for some time to come.

This was neither the platform nor the occasion for the President—now so earnestly occupied abroad—to stand up and be counted on this domestic public works issue. The price yet to be paid in congressional rancor will be excessive for the risks now incurred.

Great Lakes Foreign Trade Is Booming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the completion of the St. Lawrence Seaway this year marked—as we all appreciate—one of the greatest achievements of its kind in our history.

Following the opening of the seaway, I have been delighted to note a great many reports illustrating that the increased volume of trade through the waterway will live up to the expectations which we—as sponsors of the seaway legislation—envisioned in the approval of Public Law 83-358.

Recently, the Green Bay Press-Gazette carried an article entitled "Great Lakes Foreign Trade Is Booming." Overall, the article delineates the sharp increase in the number of ships traversing the seaway and moving to and from the ports of the Great Lakes. The ports revealing stepped-up traffic include Milwaukee, Duluth-Superior, Green Bay, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Chicago, Toledo, and others.

We recognize, of course, that encouragement of the maximum traffic through the seaway is significant; not only in terms of its economic impact on our own economy, but also in enabling the seaway—through tolls—to pay off its cost of construction.

That is why I believe the amendments to S. 1748, pending before the Senate—that would divert traffic away from the seaway—would seriously threaten the flow of traffic, adversely affecting the economy, as well as the American taxpayers' investment in the St. Lawrence Waterway.

In view of the new opportunities created by the completion of the St. Lawrence project, I believe it is therefore particularly important that we encourage—rather than discourage—traffic through the route. The adoption of the amendment to S. 1748, I believe, is unjustified, unwarranted, and most certainly would be uneconomical for the American taxpayer.

Illustrative of the way in which trade is booming on the Great Lakes as a result of the seaway, I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Green Bay Press-Gazette printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Sept. 1, 1959]

GREAT LAKES FOREIGN TRADE IS BOOMING—MOST PORTS RECORD SHARP INCREASES IN SHIPS, CARGOES

Foreign trade is booming on the Great Lakes in the first season of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Most ports on America's new fourth seacoast have recorded sharp increases in the number of ship arrivals, a United Press survey showed today.

The vessels are much larger, too, than before the long, tortuous passageway between mid-American and the Atlantic Ocean was reamed out in a joint construction project by the United States and Canada.

They're disgorging greater tonnages of imports and taking on larger cargoes of exports.

GRAIN EXPORTS UP

Grain exports are up sharply.

In the first 3 months of the shipping season, Duluth international seaport loaded 42,754,000 bushels of grain into ships destined for overseas ports.

That is 1 million bushels more than the total anticipated by the Agricultural Depart-

ment for all ports on the St. Lawrence Seaway for the entire 1959 season.

Chicago shipped out more than 27 million bushels of grain from the opening day of the season to August 13, compared with 13 million bushels in the same period last year.

Port authorities in Chicago estimate that gross tonnage of all foreign cargo—exports and imports—is running about 40 percent higher than 1958, the previous record year.

At Toledo, Ohio, both imports and general cargo exports are running three times greater than last year. Grain exports from Toledo have far outstripped those of a year ago.

U.S. customs figures showed 257 foreign ship arrivals at Cleveland through July 31, compared with 182 by the same date in 1958.

DETROIT SEES BOOM

At Detroit, Carlos Toro, secretary of the board of commerce's port and seaway committee, predicted that overseas tonnage for 1959 would total 300,000, compared with 88,000 tons last year.

One note of pessimism was sounded. It came from Joseph Chartrand, traffic manager of the Chicago Board of Trade, who complained of discriminatory action by eastern railroads in cutting rates on grain shipped to North Atlantic ports.

Chartrand said that under a rate cut put into effect June 18 by the New York Central and Pennsylvania Railroads, the roads charge one-half cent less per hundredweight to carry grain 952 miles from Columbus, Ind., to Boston than they charge to haul it 222 miles from Columbus to Chicago.

"If we don't get relief against this discriminatory treatment next year, we'll be crucified," Chartrand said.

Here is the shipping business picture around the Lakes:

Milwaukee: Imports through June 30 totaled 7,086 net tons, compared with 1,210 tons during the same period in the peak year of 1956; exports 2,479 net tons, compared with 2,094 tons for same period of 1956. Individual vessel sailings for the first 6 months of year up from 71 in 1956 to 106 this year.

Duluth-Superior: Ship arrivals up to July 1 totaled 1,210, compared with 610 during same period of 1958. Port officials said tonnage data was available only on grain exports.

Cleveland: Oversea tonnage handled in May and June was 36,406 tons, nearly half as much as the total of 79,121 tons handled during all of 1958. Principal imports included steel, autos, liquors, wines, cheese, olives and talc. Exports included farm and road equipment, auto parts, lubricants, resin, latex and electrical equipment.

Buffalo: A spokesman for the Niagara Frontier Port Authority said 1959 foreign trade is running about five times higher than the average for the last 4 years. Imports up to August 1 total 52,875 tons. Export tonnages were not available. Imports were topped by 25,261 tons of steel, 17,626 tons of molasses and 8,492 tons of fluorspar. The port also unloaded foreign cars, scotch whisky, glass, wines, beer, and hardwoods.

Chicago: Maxim Cohen, head of the Chicago regional port authority, and collector of customs Frank Poeska, estimated that import and export tonnage was running about 40 percent above 1958, the best previous year. William J. Barry, assistant port director, said 1959 trade might amount to 500,000 tons, compared to 250,000 tons last year. The port counted 247 arrivals up to August 1, compared with 175 in a like period last year, and marine authorities said the ships are running two to three times larger than those that visited the city in before-seaway years.

Toledo: Grain exports via the seaway through July 31 totaled 980,290 bushels of wheat, 3,388,360 bushels of corn and 2,416,649 bushels of soybeans. In all of 1958 the port shipped 1,219,164 bushels of wheat, 447,610 bushels of corn, and 1,487 bushels of beans. Sixty-four grain boats have departed; by the same time last year only 21 had left the port. Toledo expects well over 200 oversea vessels by the end of the season. Last year it welcomed 156.

Detroit: Imports are up sharply this year, but there has been little increase in exports. The number of ocean ships arriving in the Motor City is running about the same as in previous years. Officials predict further increases in shipping tonnage when connecting channels are dredged deep enough to permit all deep-draft vessels now transiting the seaway to proceed as far as Detroit.

Green Bay: A report last month of Howard Kalupske, deputy collector of customs, said that, as of June 30, 9,294 more tons of cargo which moved through the seaway had been handled in Green Bay than during the same period in 1958.

A total of 22,934 tons was handled in Green Bay compared with a total of 13,640 tons for the same period last year. Twenty-two ships loaded 15,311 tons in Green Bay for movement through the seaway compared with 15 ships carrying exports of 11,892 tons last year. Imports totaling 7,623 tons arrived on 22 ships compared with 1,748 tons during the same period of 1958.

Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following is a radio broadcast by Mr. Allston Calhoun who is waging a great fight against communism:

AMERICANISM PREFERRED—KHRUSHCHEV'S COMMUNISM CEMENTS POWER, MOLESTING CHILDREN BY DISEASED CRIMINALS

Script of radio show Americanism Preferred, delivered by Allston Calhoun over radio stations in the Southeast, August 29, 30, and 31, and September 1, 1959

Hello, folks, this is your workingman's friend speaking with you on Americanism Preferred.

In a telegram to National Review, America-first fact and opinion magazine, Senator William F. Knowland said, and I quote, "The invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States will have a devastating adverse effect upon the captive people behind the Communist Iron Curtain. It is a victory for Soviet diplomacy which has angled for such an invitation for the past several years. Khrushchev is still the butcher of Budapest. Three years does not outlaw murder of an individual or of a nation."

Thus, Senator Knowland expresses the shock and the disgust of every right-thinking American at this invitation coming from our White House in Washington, wherein the present occupant of the White House, Mr. Eisenhower, will throw open the welcoming doors of that hallowed institution and receive therein as an honored guest one of the most murderous criminals of all time and of whom Senator Knowland tells only an infinitesimal part of the story describing him as the "butcher of Budapest."

But before we tell you more of the butcher, whom Mr. Eisenhower is welcoming to our White House, let us go into the nature of the invitation which brings Killer Khrushchev to our Capital City in Washington, where, it is said, he will follow the parade of American presidents up Pennsylvania Avenue, but this time a Pennsylvania Avenue shockingly decorated with the hammer and sickle of the Communist flag.

Boiling all the evidence down, your "Working Man's Friend" has found that this invitation to Killer Khrushchev, so shocking to all right-thinking Americans is almost exclusively the work of Mr. Eisenhower, himself, and without the prior sanction, or even the knowledge, of the representatives of the people in the upper and lower Houses of our Congress, now assembled in session in Washington.

We find, also, that this shocking invitation was not issued even with the general knowledge of Mr. Eisenhower's Cabinet and executive department of our Government. Even Vice President NIXON, who recently did such a wonderful job in appealing direct to the downtrodden Russian people, with the way he stood up against Khrushchev while opening the American Fair in Moscow, is said not to have known of the coming invitation to Khrushchev before he visited Moscow and crossed up Killer Khrushchev in a verbal exchange at the opening ceremonies.

Certainly Vice President NIXON could not have stood up against Khrushchev so heartily had he known that his boss man back in Washington was, even then, extending to Killer Khrushchev the invitation which would open the gates of America's Capital City and the doors of her White House to this head of the world criminal Communist movement, who is known to have achieved his own position of power in world communism literally, and I quote, "over piles of dead bodies," and these bodies being those of his own people, at that.

Also, one might say that the body of the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, who certainly would have opposed such a shocking and untoward act on the part of the White House, is hardly cold in his grave before Mr. Eisenhower takes upon himself to bring joy and great satisfaction to the hearts of all American Communists and subversives with his invitation to their world leader to be a guest in the house long hallowed by such men as Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt and others of our truly America-first Presidents who thought first of America and who had the gumption to act in accordance therewith.

Certainly, there is more truth than poetry, even though the poetry may be of a dubious nature at that, in the Killer Khrushchev's threat to America, "We will bury you." In this, the Killer is only speaking along the line he knows best, from long experience. He gained this experience in subjugating his own people more firmly under the Communist yoke in Russia, where he was long the chief killer under the murderous Communist tyrant before him, Josef Stalin. According to Eugene Lyons, writing in the Reader's Digest, "Khrushchev achieved his present status by the unlimited use of brute force. This has been his speciality for years. He reached the Kremlin pinnacle in the only way the Soviet pyramid of power can be scaled, over piles of corpses. He was Stalin's genius for intrigue, blackmail, and murder, and under his exterior is a man utterly ruthless and unscrupulous, a tyrant cut from Stalinist cloth to the Stalinist pattern."

Quoting further, direct from Mr. Lyons' report in Reader's Digest pertaining to Khrushchev's rise to power under Stalin:

"Khrushchev remained Moscow boss for about 5 years, and there is no indication that he ever was squeamish. These were the incalculably tragic years of full-blown terror. As the dictator's (Stalin's) chief henchman in the very center of the regime, Khrushchev was necessarily neck-deep in blood. Ten million people were crammed into hideous

slave-labor camps, tens of thousands were shot by the secret police—crimes which Khrushchev himself was destined to acknowledge in 1956.

"His murderous zeal and energetic sycophancy paid off in increased power. In August 1937, Khrushchev, accompanied by Molotov and Yezhov, swooped down on Kiev with orders to clean up the Ukraine. Before they were through, all members of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet had died in the cellars of the Kiev and Moscow secret police. Only two of the 102 members of the 'republic's' central committee of the party escaped arrest.

"A bloodcurdling example of the Khrushchev-Serov terror came to light accidentally during World War II, in the Ukrainian town of Vinnitsa. There, in the purge years, near the local NKVD headquarters, a high board fence had been built to enclose an orchard and part of the Park of Culture and Rest. Armed sentries guarded it day and night. People were too terrified to ask questions; many thought that some kind of secret experiment was being conducted there.

"Later it was brought to light why the Reds had been guarding this orchard near the NKVD headquarters. Ninety-five mass graves were discovered inside the fence containing nearly 10,000 corpses. The victims were fully dressed, their hands bound behind their backs, bullet holes in the nape of their necks. From the fact that their mouths were full of earth, experts in such matters were able to confirm that many of the men and women were still alive gasping for breath when they were hurled into the graves.

"From documents, letters, snapshots and other things on the bodies, it was possible to identify many of the victims who had been rounded up in the 1937–39 terror. Photographs of mounds of the half-decayed bodies and the burial pits are available. Ukrainian emigres have suggested that the next time the smiling Khrushchev is invited via television into free peoples' homes, these photographs be shown by way of silent commentary."

In this, Mr. Lyons was speaking about Khrushchev's invitation to speak over certain American television networks on the part of the same liberals who are now overjoyed at Mr. Eisenhower's invitation to Khrushchev to be the honored guest in our White House.

But if these true accounts on Mr. Eisenhower's White House invitee shock you, just hold on to your seats a minute, for we have more to tell you about Mr. Khrushchev and his regime which is far more shocking than this. Quoting an item entitled, "Coexistence With the Hangman, Russia's Noose Awaits the Naive," and giving data from no less an authority than the House Un-American Activities Committee (American Mercury, August 1959):

"All of Khrushchev's smiles and Mikoyan's camaraderie cannot blot out the crimes of their regime against free peoples who have stood in the way of Russian imperialism. The record is damning.

"Documented instances of these political crimes were recorded in the startling report on 'Communist Aggression' issued by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in 1954."

Here are some horrifying excerpts from the testimony which was presented to the committee by important witnesses. On the subjugation of Rumania by the Communists and as a result of the fateful decisions at Yalta, the deposed King Michael of Rumania testified:

"They arrested as many people as they could: Old people, grownups, and children. The children were placed in various prison cells where they were molested or assaulted all night by special gangs of ill and infected people. The next morning these children were sent back to their parents with a piece of paper around their necks explaining that they had been assaulted by a syphilitic some time during the night, and that would happen in the future if these demonstrations (against communism) continued."

So long, folks. Criminal communism under Khrushchev subjugates a people and forces them to remain under the yoke of the worst criminal menace that has yet beset this world. Thus, Mr. Khrushchev comes to Washington.

The Lake Michigan Water Diversion Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was published in last night's Washington Evening Star an editorial in respect to the action the Senate took regarding the diversion of water from Lake Michigan, entitled, "A 'Must' Requirement." It is a very good editorial, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. President, there was also published a very short editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald of this morning, in which it said, in part:

The Senate showed a good deal of statesmanship by sending the Great Lakes water diversion bill to its Foreign Relations Committee for study of its impact on United States-Canadian relations.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 3, 1959]

A "MUST" REQUIREMENT

The Senate apparently has shelved, at least for this session, a House-approved bill which would permit the city of Chicago to divert an increased flow of water from Lake Michigan into the city's sewage disposal system. And the Senate debate produced one overriding reason why the measure should not be enacted at all without most careful consideration at the foreign relations level.

The reason is expressed briefly, but in diplomatically forceful language, in the note signed by Canadian Ambassador Heeney and submitted to our State Department on August 21. The text has been made part of the record of debate in the Senate, and contains these two sentences: "In the view of my Government, any additional diversion of water out of the Great Lakes watershed would be inconsistent with existing agreements and arrangements which together constitute an agreed regime with respect to these waters. The proposed unilateral derogation from the existing regime therefore occasions serious concern in Canada."

The bill was reported to the Senate floor by the Committee on Public Works, without reference to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was handled in the same way in the House. There was much testimony in both House and Senate committee hearings on the aspects of sanitation, navigation, waterpower development and other technical questions pertaining to the proposal. Even this testimony was divided and floor debate has been similarly split over these technical issues. It would be difficult, if not impossible, for a layman to reach an authoritative conclusion on the rights and wrongs of these arguments alone.

It is not difficult, however, to understand the grave implications of the Canadian objection. Although Lake Michigan is entirely within U.S. boundaries, it is part of the great water complex shared by the two nations. Any operation affecting these waters is of proper interest, and perhaps great importance, to both nations. On this basis, the problem is clearly one of international relations—and, in this case, one in which this country should not set a precedent which may come back to plague us.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 4, 1959]

SALUTARY SETBACK

The Senate showed a good deal of statesmanship by sending the Great Lakes water diversion bill to its Foreign Relations Committee for study of its impact on United States-Canadian relations. The extended debate conclusively showed that objections to the bill went beyond the protests of States bordering the Great Lakes against any lowering of the water level for the benefit of Chicago. More serious were the emphatic protests from Canada to the effect that passage of the bill would amount to a breach of the treaty arrangements between the two countries. The United States simply cannot afford to flout the interests and treaty rights of its good neighbors in this fashion. We hope the bill will not emerge from Foreign Relations until the Great Lakes cases in the Supreme Court have been decided and agreement has been reached with Canada on whatever diversion may then seem to be justified.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer, my junior colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I will say to the Presiding Officer, I received a very nice telegram today from the attorney general of our State complimenting him.

Not Balancing the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, all partisanship aside, it is my sincere belief that many of us who voted yesterday to sustain the Presidential veto of the Public Works Appropriation bill did so with full awareness of the long-range budgetary problems faced by America as so cogently spelled out in the following editorial from today's New York Times which I hereby include under leave to extend my remarks:

NOT BALANCING THE BUDGET

The concept of the flexible, or compensated Federal budget—as contrasted with that of a budget balanced annually, regardless of the state of the national economy—is undoubtedly with us to stay. The fact remains, however, that the warnings of those political skeptics who opposed its adoption or accepted it with very grave reservations have already been justified by events.

It would be easy to get general agreement on the program to be adopted in rainy days, but what about those sunshiny days in which Congress and the public would, in theory, be expected to restore the damage done to the Government's financial position, and take the necessary steps in the area of debt management and monetary policy to resist the potential inflation engendered by the artificial stimulants so freely employed in the immediately preceding period to combat the recession in economic activity? Would we be prepared to accept with necessary courage the policies of comparative austerity indicated in such a period that alone could justify the basic concept of the compensatory budget?

The answer to this question is, on the basis of the record, clearly in the negative. News developments of this week bearing on the state of the Government's finances bear striking evidence to the fact. In the year ended June 30, reflecting the impact of the 1957–58 recession, the Treasury was called upon to finance a deficit of $12 billion, the largest in the Nation's peacetime history.

With the recession ended and recovery well underway, the President has urged a balancing of the Federal budget as a first and basic step to putting the Nation's finances in order and protecting the dollar against the inflation implicit in a return to boom conditions in the economy. Reports from Washington are in agreement that, despite the establishment of new high levels of production and employment since that time, it is doubtful that a balance of expenditure and receipt can be achieved in fiscal 1960, and the substantial budget surplus the administration had envisioned for 1961 is even more questionable.

The contraction of 1957–58 is now not expected to produce anything better by 1961 than a balanced budget at best. This reflects not only the reluctance of Congress to withdraw the stimulants to the economy it was prepared to administer with such alacrity when business activity was contracting; it also reflects a new and frightening development in budgetary practice. This is the recent rapid rise of the program type of project that continues and even increases automatically in future years.

This built-in spending was pointed up by the President in his recent veto (sustained yesterday) of the public works bill. The unbudgeted proposals included in prospective measures would amount to only about $50 million in fiscal 1960, but the ultimate cost would be in the neighborhood of $800 million. This brings into sharp focus how Congress, by action one year, builds increase in the budget for future years. It illustrates how effective control of Federal spending can be lost.

A Record School Enrollment This Year Emphasizes the Need for Classrooms and Teachers—Columnists and Papers Carry Facts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, for the 15th consecutive year, school enrollment in this Nation has gone up. Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau, has warned that our Nation's schools—particularly those in cities and suburban areas should plan now for "an astonishing increase" in the number of pupils in the next 20 years.

If the birth rate of 1955–57 continues, by 1980 there will be a 92-percent rise in college age students, 80 percent more pupils of high school age, and a jump of 64 percent in elementary school age children.

These statistics present a challenge to our Nation—an opportunity for this country to show the best it is made of. Instead, the administration, while paying a halfway lipservice to education's needs, slouches stubbornly along the line of "no new starts," looking backward and repeating its pledge of allegiance:

I pledge allegiance to no new starts,
And to the Republicans, for whom it stands.
Our Nation, standing completely still,
With higher interest and fatter takes for all special interests.

In view of the strides being made in education in other countries, principally some Communist-controlled nations which threaten our democratic way of life, the old adage "He who hesitates is lost" is given new and emphasized meaning.

And by vetoing the housing bill, with its provisions for classroom construction; opposing the cold war GI bill, which would help veterans improve their education and training; and fighting to dilute the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act, the administration is doing more than just hesitating.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Helen Thomas of UPI, from the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal for Sunday, August 30, 1959, entitled "Record School Enrollment To Bring Annual Problems," and an article by Bascom N. Timmons, from the Amarillo (Tex.) News-Globe for Sunday, August 30, 1959, entitled "For Texas Schools—Tidal Wave of Students Due."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lubbock (Tex.) Avalanche-Journal, Aug. 30, 1959]

RECORD SCHOOL ENROLLMENT TO BRING ANNUAL PROBLEMS

(By Helen Thomas)

WASHINGTON.—The Nation's schools and colleges will bulge at the seams again this fall with a record enrollment of 46,480,000, the Office of Education reported today.

But the number of teachers and classrooms—the perennial problems—will again fall short of carrying the extra load.

This is the 15th year in a row that enrollment has taken a jump, officials said. It represents an increase of 1,940,000 students over the 44,540,000 enrolled during the 1958–59 school year.

Education Commissioner Lawrence G. Derthrick predicted an enrollment of 33,460,000 in grades running from the kindergarten through the 8th. He said students for high schools from the 9th through the 12th grades will total 9,240,000. These figures compare with an elementary school enrollment of 32,010,000 and high school load of 8,940,000 last year.

Colleges and universities expect as enrollment of 3,780,000 compared to 3,590,000 last year.

Derthrick warned in a statement that the situation and its attendant problems are likely to continue for many years. Four years from now, he said, the school age population—pupils 5 through 17 years of age—will probably go as high as 48,800,000, or 13 percent more than present enrollment.

He estimated that 1,563,000 teachers will be needed in both public and nonpublic schools in the coming year—185,000 more than are presently qualified to teach.

UNDETERMINED NUMBER

Derthrick said that part of the teacher shortage will be met by former instructors coming back to the classroom but the number cannot be determined.

"The deficit of teachers will mean in many communities overlarge classes, or the employment of teachers without adequate training or both," he said. "In many instances, it will also mean curtailing the number of subjects offered."

Last year elementary and high schools were 182,000 teachers short of the total need.

Derthrick said a turnover rate of 10.9 percent—representing the number who leave the profession each year—adds to the problem.

He pointed out that one out of every four persons in the United States is now attending school, from kindergarten through college. Last October the Education Office figured there were 89.2 percent of boys and girls 14 through 17 years of age enrolled in high schools and colleges.

The office estimated the classroom shortage will run from 130,000 to 140,000 in the new school year.

[From the Amarillo News-Globe, Aug. 30, 1959]

FOR TEXAS SCHOOLS—TIDAL WAVE OF STUDENTS DUE

(By Bascom N. Timmons)

WASHINGTON, August 29.—School age population of Texas will jump more than 15 percent in the next 4 years, the U.S. Office of Education predicted today.

Lawrence Derthick, Commissioner of Education, also predicted that the number of school and college pupils in Texas and in the Nation as a whole would reach an alltime high next year.

It is expected the nationwide enrollment in 1959–60 will climb to 46,480,000. This is an increase of 1,940,000 over the 44,540,000 enrollment for 1958–59 school year.

In Texas it is estimated that 2,553,000 will enter primary and secondary schools for the fall term about to begin.

Texas, which has 5.89 percent of U.S. total enrollment, ranks fourth in the Nation. It is outranked by the States of New York, California, and Pennsylvania, with 8.34, 8.10, and 5.99 percents respectively.

By 1963, 2,941,000 pupils are expected to be enrolled in Texas.

Swelling enrollments and attendant problems throughout the Nation are likely to continue for many years, Commissioner Derthick warned. Four years from now, he said, the pupils from ages 5 through 17 may go as high as 48.8 million, or 13 percent more than at present.

For the 1958 fall term, Texas had an enrollment of 1,956,000. During the same period 74,621 teachers employed by the State board of education were teaching in 70,876 classrooms. Texas was surpassed only by New York and California, with 111,234 teachers for 106,400 classrooms in New York and 104,600 teachers for 98,000 classrooms in California.

Colleges and universities in the Nation expect a total enrollment of 3,780,000 as compared with 3,590,000 last year. These figures are for students seeking bachelor's, master's, and doctor's degrees.

Texas had 175,854 enrolled in colleges and universities for the 1958 fall term. An estimated figure for the 1959 term is not available.

Those studying for advanced degrees in Texas during the 1957–58 school year numbered 3,721 for master's and 263 for doctorate degrees.

The greatest need in education continues to be for qualified teachers, according to the Office of Education. The present teacher turnover rate is 10.9 percent of teachers who leave the profession each year.

Congressman Mitchell Designated To Receive AMVETS Congressional Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I advise the House of Representatives that our colleague, the Honorable ERWIN MITCHELL, Seventh District of Georgia, has been designated to receive AMVETS annual congressional award.

ERWIN MITCHELL is a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and has rendered outstanding service to the committee and to the veterans of our country since his assignment to the committee immediately following his election. ERWIN MITCHELL heads the special legal subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and has done an outstanding job on the assignments which he has received as subcommittee chairman.

Speaking for the members of my committee, I wish to express appreciation to AMVETS for the recognition of the outstanding service rendered by our colleague, ERWIN MITCHELL.

The text of the statement issued by AMVETS in announcing the award to Congressman MITCHELL is as follows:

The Honorable ERWIN MITCHELL, Congressman, a member of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and chairman of the special legal subcommittee, has made a major contribution to the success of AMVETS legislative program for 1959.

Congressman MITCHELL authored legislation and headed the subcommittee which secured enactment of legislation to establish better control over the estates and guardianship accounts of incompetent veterans. Congressman MITCHELL's subcommittee developed legislation to revise the forfeiture law. It was the purpose of this legislation to eliminate unfairness and injustice which had developed in the existing program. The guardianship and forfeiture laws fulfill AMVETS resolutions of long standing.

Congressman MITCHELL, as a member of the Hospital Subcommittee of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, has made an outstanding contribution to the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program. Through Congressman MITCHELL's efforts 400 unused beds in the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Dublin, Ga., were reactivated after being vacant for many years. Congressman MITCHELL played a leading role in obtaining for the Veterans' Administration $15 million additional funds to be used in repair of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The Congress has passed H.R. 7650, the non-service-connected pension bill. Congressman MITCHELL was one of the leading forces in securing enactment of this legislation and in doing so rendered invaluable aid to AMVETS in achieving one of the foremost objectives of AMVETS—the equalization of widows pension benefits.

Congressman MITCHELL has sponsored many bills supported by AMVETS. He has sponsored legislation to lengthen the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis and Hansen's disease. These bills are now law. He has sponsored a bill to raise the income limit as it pertains to widow's pension during the year of death of the widow's husband. This provision has passed the Congress and fulfills a long sought after objective of AMVETS. The direct home loan program supported by Congressman MITCHELL has been signed into law making $100 million available for loans to veterans buying homes in small towns and rural areas.

Congressman MITCHELL's strong and sympathetic interest in veterans' legislation and his work as a subcommittee chairman has resulted in much beneficial legislation for veterans and their dependents. AMVETS takes recognition of Congressman MITCHELL's outstanding accomplishments by naming him to receive AMVETS annual congressional award.

What's in Labor Reform Bill and How Will It Work?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dickson Preston has been diligently covering the labor hearings for the past few months. I believe his analysis of the Landrum-Griffin bill which in principle was agreed on by the conferees will be of interest to all, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 3, 1959]

WHAT'S IN LABOR REFORM BILL AND HOW WILL IT WORK?

(By Dickson Preston)

The public—rather than either labor or management—appears to be the real winner in the labor reform bill now assured of being enacted into law.

Neither union leaders nor the National Association of Manufacturers are particularly happy with the measure which House-Senate conferees have wrought out of 13 days of trying to reconcile differences between the Landrum-Griffin and Kennedy-Ervin bills.

But very few Members of Congress are going to vote against it—for the simple reason that they recognize the public demanded some changes this year in labor law.

The compromise bill won't "kill" labor unions, as AFL–CIO President George Meany charges the Landrum-Griffin measure was intended to do. Nor will it make it easy for racketeers to continue to prey on workers and small employers, as Senate Racket Committee hearings have shown has been a common practice.

SPELLED OUT

What it will do is spelled out in the following questions and answers based on discussions with Senators JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts, and BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican of Arizona, and Representatives PHILLIP LANDRUM, Democrat of Georgia, and ROBERT GRIFFIN, Republican of Michigan, principal authors of the original bills.

Question. Who won in the conference between House and Senate?

Answer. Nobody—except the public. Messrs. KENNEDY, GOLDWATER, LANDRUM, and GRIFFIN all agree that the compromise bill is superior in some respects to their original proposals. The final bill has more Landrum-Griffin in it than anything else—but it has been modified in at least 13 respects from the House-passed bill.

Question. In what ways is the public, rather than either union leaders or management, benefited?

Answer. Numerous provisions (on which there was no dispute) make it tough for racketeers to operate in the labor field. Both union leaders and employers are required to make financial reports. Union members have a bill of rights—with criminal penalties for violations. Honest union elections are assured. "Sweetheart" contracts for the benefit of certain employers are outlawed. So are "hot cargo" deals under which some unions and employers have combined to force high-priced goods on the public.

Question. Are any basic union rights destroyed?

Answer. Senator KENNEDY says they are not, and most labor attorneys agree. Assistant General Counsel Tom Harris of the AFL–CIO helped write final wording of the compromise bill. Attorneys for most other major unions, excepting James R. Hoffa's Teamsters Union, participated in final discussions.

Question. Does the bill penalize the building trades, such as carpenters, plumbers, bricklayers, and electricians?

Answer. They still have the right to sign contracts in which employers agree not to deal with any nonunion subcontractors on a construction job. Language was written in to protect an estimated 300,000 of such contracts throughout the country. They also are granted the right to sign agreements before a job is started requiring every worker to join a union within 7 days.

Question. Then why was the building-trades problem considered such a hot issue?

Answer. The building trades unions also want the right to picket a general contractor on any job in which subcontractors with whom they have a dispute are involved. They claim this would merely put them on a parity with an industrial union which under present law can strike a plant when any of its members are involved in a dispute. Both House and Senate have agreed to consider this problem as soon as Congress convenes next January.

Question. Will the new law restore the sweatshop in the garment trades?

Answer. It specifically exempts the garment industry from restrictions on secondary boycotts or picketing by unions. For example, a dressmaker can be picketed if he farms out sewing jobs to fly-by-night operators who pay low wages. His products also can be boycotted as unfair.

Question. Can unions still tell the public about companies with which they have disputes?

Answer. Yes. They can advertise via newspapers, radio, and other media even to the extent of educating the public that a store with which they have no primary dispute is selling unfair goods. They can no longer, however, set up a picket line which gives the impression that they have a dispute with a store merely because it sells nonunion products.

Question. How about union organizing? Can this continue?

Answer. There's no question it will be more difficult under the new law. Unions can set up picket lines at nonunion plants. But if the picket line has the effect of stopping deliveries or barring employees, a bargaining election must be applied for within 30 days.

If the union loses the election, it cannot resume picketing for a year.

Question. What if a union loses an election or otherwise is frozen out because of unfair practice by the employer?

Answer. It's up to the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. If he thinks the unfair charge is justified, he is instructed not to seek a court injunction to halt the picketing. If he thinks otherwise, he goes ahead with injunction proceedings under the Taft-Hartley Act. Final decision on the unfair charge is up to the NLRB and the courts.

Question. How about all the disputes involving small businesses which the Supreme Court has classed in the so-called no man's land?

Answer. They now can be decided in State courts or by State agencies. But the NLRB cannot narrow down the cases it now is willing to hear. And regional NLRB directors are given broader authority to decide such cases.

Administered and Monopoly Egg Pricing Threat to Producer and Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of Farm Journal is an article which I believe will be of interest not only to farm folks but to our big city cousins. It deals with the question of monopoly pricing in the egg business.

I would wholeheartedly recommend to the House Committee on Agriculture a study of this system of egg marketing.

Mr. Speaker, imagine the feeling of the egg producer who sees the market for his product manipulated in this fashion; and how about the consumer's attitude?

As the concluding sentence of the article says: "It's plain that what farmers really need is a new way to price eggs."

The egg pricing story follows:

THE MEN WHO SET YOUR EGG PRICES

(By Claude W. Gifford)

(Most powerful man in an antiquated marketing system is Gordon Urner or nephew Frank. Each morning one roams through the jungle of egg firms near the waterfront, watches a 5-minute flurry of Exchange trading, then picks a price that's used the country over to pay for farmers' eggs.)

This is hard to believe, but a handful of traders—who operate in a few crusty old buildings near the New York waterfront—pretty much set the price that you get for eggs.

And these men get "the word" from one man—either bespectacled, courtly Gordon Urner, or nephew Frank. Each day, one of them prowls the wholesale center and Mercantile Exchange and names the egg price.

Throw in the Chicago egg market—which has even more glaring shortcomings—and the two markets play the tune that egg producers dance to almost everywhere in the country, except in the far West.

It's incredible, but true. I've just been to New York to watch the process. Care to go along on a world tour?

The people we'll meet are mainly wholesale "middlemen," brokers and speculators who deal in eggs on the Exchange and in the wholesale center.

These firms receive eggs trucked in from nearby and from as far away as Mississippi and Minnesota. They usually pay for these eggs on the basis of "New York prices" on the day of arrival. The eggs then go to jobbers who in turn distribute to hotels, restaurants, small stores, and the like.

They provide very few eggs to the biggest outlets of all—the chain stores.

The crumbling wholesale market center—where these people operate—is a jungle of little offices and partly cooled "egg holding floors." These are tunneled into dilapidated buildings that are jammed into a half dozen short blocks. This is what the trade calls the "street." It's the kind of a place where you wouldn't want to be caught at night, for it's only a baseball throw from the tough docks that line the Hudson River.

"Thirty years ago, this was a bustling center handling big trainloads of eggs that arrived from the West," relates David Meierfeld, egg dealer at 11 Jay Street. "Most of the eggs for the huge New York City population came through this center—and it took nearly 200 big wholesalers to handle the job.

"Then the chainstores started to bypass us and buy out in the country. Their trucks roll from the henhouse right to the store. Today there aren't more than 10 big receivers surviving in this entire wholesale center."

Add just two more things, and you've got the picture of this antiquated marketing setup that still wields tremendous power: The Mercantile Exchange in the heart of the "street"; and the private, 102-year-old Urner-Barry price-reporting service that issues the daily word on egg prices.

I called on John Clagett, executive director of the exchange. He pointed out that members have been trading eggs on the board since 1872. The 400 members also trade in butter, potato futures, and, oddly enough, platinum.

"This is a cash, spot market for eggs," Clagett explains. "It brings together all the forces of the Nation's egg market. Eggs sold on the board are graded, delivered, and paid for by 2 p.m of the same day."

Clagett says that a bid on the exchange—even if there are no takers (which often happens)—will set prices, since an unfilled bid shows that somebody is willing to pay that price.

"It's almost 10:30 a.m. now, opening time for the egg board," Clagett said. "It's open for 15 minutes of trading a day. Let's go down and see it."

We walked onto the exchange floor and found a dozen egg traders idly chatting in front of high blackboards that list 12 different grades and types of eggs—ranging from Nearby Fancy Heavy Whites to Pullets and Peewees.

A bell rang at 10:30 to open trading. I expected to see a commotion. Instead, the traders continued to exchange greetings, pleasantries, and trade talk, as if nothing had happened. And, frankly, nothing had.

Ten minutes later, at 10:40, a trader finally shouted a bid to a board boy standing at the blackboard; he rapidly scribbled down a 41-cent bid for two 25-case units of Nearby Extra Fancy Heavy Whites. Nothing happened. The trader upped the bid to 42 cents. Somebody shouted that he'd sell him the 50 cases.

The same bidder came back with a 41½-cent bid for another 50 cases; then a 42-cent bid. He got no takers this time. I noticed that there were only two other bids—and no takers—on the other 11 grades and types of eggs. Then the bell rang again—it was 10:45 and trading was ended.

I was told that it was normal for traders to use only 5 of the 15 minutes allotted daily, as had just happened.

Only 50 cases had been sold on an admittedly slow day. Was this, I wondered bringing together all the forces of the Nation's egg market, as Clagett had claimed?

But wait, something else was happening. The traders were now gathering around the Urner-Barry blackboard at the side of the exchange floor to see what the official prices would be. In a few minutes, Frank Urner posted the prices: one flat price for each grade, including 41 cents for the Nearby Extra Fancy Heavy Whites. This, despite the 42-cent exchange transaction and the unfilled bids of 41½ and 42 cents, which somebody was willing to pay, as Clagett had pointed out.

The price that Urner-Barry picked became the New York price, accepted as gospel by the traders, who hurried back to their places of business to use these prices as the basis for paying for the farmers' eggs they handled that day.

Traders in other cities across the country did the same as the wire service flashed the prices across the Nation.

"Even most of the chainstores use Urner-Barry New York quotations as the basis of their prices to farmers," says Dr. Alfred Van Wagenen of the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council.

Again next day I went back to watch exchange dealings. This time 33 bids were made on 7 of the 12 grades; 5 deals were completed in 2 grades. In each of the seven grades where bids were offered or deals made, Gordon Urner quoted an official price 1 to 2 cents under the exchange.

"How come?" I asked Gorden Urner.

"We've been in this business 102 years," he replied, "and we've learned that the egg trade wants one flat price—not a range of several cents for the same grade (such as the USDA reports). The single price saves time and trouble in making deals. Over the years, we've supplied the price, and the trade has accepted it."

"But how do you arrive at one flat price that's used almost the country over?" I questioned.

"We watch the supply and demand daily; we have instant contact with Chicago and Boston. Each morning we go down the street and size up the egg movement here in New York by talking with several wholesale firms. Finally, we go to the exchange and watch the trading. Then, based on our judgment and years of experience, we settle on a price."

"But," I persisted, "why do you quote prices ½ to 2 cents lower than sales or bids on the exchange, such as I've just seen?"

"We do our best to prevent unnecessary daily price variation—that's part of our function. We don't like to be thought of as price regulators," said Urner, "but you can't get away from some of that."

What's wrong with this system? Ask those who know most about it and they'll point out that:

1. New York conditions are not typical of the national egg market.

The wholesale center handles only a piddling amount of the national egg supply. Firms are influenced almost solely by their own supplies related to their small share of the New York City market.

It's estimated that one large chainstore in New York handles more eggs than the entire wholesale center.

A couple of extra truckloads of eggs on the New York "street" can throw the market in a tizzy. Because of the high market costs, less than 1 percent of the eggs received are shipped out again to other cities to clear local supplies.

"Supply and demand out in producing areas may not change, but New York prices do," charges USDA egg market chief, H. A. Rust.

2. Urner-Barry's quoted prices don't necessarily show what's happening in New York,

even. Almost always there's a premium paid over the "quoted price"; sometimes there's a discount. But this information is not fully and clearly reported—nor understood by buyers and farmers around the country.

The eggs that a farmer sells to a country buyer by grade—or which are packed in cartons or delivered—are different from the bulk eggs that are used to set base prices in New York.

3. Exchange trading is exceedingly thin, artificial, inadequate.

Members don't rely on the exchange to buy or sell their supplies. Partly because of exchange fees and redtape, it's cheaper and easier to buy and sell on the street. They go to the exchange primarily to test the market and to protect their own margins.

A market this thin can easily be pushed up or down on any one day. "It's highly susceptible to manipulation with a few cases of eggs when it's an extreme market going up or down," says L. C. Giffen, USDA market reporter. "Often exchange trading runs opposite to what I find on the street."

Prices in New York change about once every 2 trading days.

4. The system puts too much power in one man's hands.

"Nobody is that good," says Henry Broad, one of the market's biggest receivers. "But still I base my entire operation on Urner-Barry prices, for lack of anything better."

Actually, Urner-Barry picks up little information from the street on prices, since most of the firms are using the price that Urner-Barry selected.

Even worse, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange price is reported by a private service that usually isn't even present. It calls an exchange employee who relates what happened.

"The nub of the trouble is that the central egg markets are dying," says USDA's egg price specialist, Norris T. Pritchard. "Yet the trade clings to central market prices by long habit—actually let's them set prices by default."

What can be done about it? Here are three suggestions that you hear:

Get egg co-ops and private handlers to aggressively price their own eggs and cut down on price gyrations.

In the Los Angeles area, large egg producers and farm groups negotiate for prices. The contracts are tied to retail store prices. Instead of fluctuating once every 2 days, prices change on the average of only once every 2 weeks. And the margins between farm and customer are among the smallest in the country.

The Poultry Producers of Central California—a farm co-op—has brought similar stability to the San Francisco area; as has the Washington Cooperative in the Pacific Northwest.

Other groups could follow this lead—but even nationwide co-ops couldn't hope to alter seasonal or yearly price fluctuations.

Improve the Government market reporting system.

The USDA is working on this now—but needs support. It wants to get more complete information on egg movements from country points, prices that retail stores pay, the volume moving at different prices and a "national picture."

Broaden exchange trading.

Seats now cost $4,000 in New York, and the rules, in effect, restrict trading to eggs that are already on the market.

But the Northeast egg co-ops have taken a bold step: They've formed an association that wholesales in New York and buys and sells on the exchange. "The trade will agree that we've stabilized prices on this market—and this has helped poultrymen everywhere," says Manager Wyn Geghan.

It's plain that what farmers really need is a new way to price eggs.

Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following article is of tremendous interest to the workers of our country and should be of more interest to the Congress:

OUR TRADE GAP DWINDLES—WHY IT MAY SOON BE UNFAVORABLE

(By Leslie Gould)

Exports of U.S. goods are declining while imports from abroad are rising.

This is the second year of declining exports, but the fifth year of rising imports.

The gap between the two—that is the favorable balance the United States has so long enjoyed is narrowing. This year's favorable balance will be less than a billion, compared to nearly $8 billion in 1957—2 years ago.

Actually, if all factors are taken into consideration—such as the foreign giveaway and aid programs, military help and spending by tourists—the favorable balance may turn out to be unfavorable. That is a subject for a later column.

GROWING DISADVANTAGES

The drop in American exports and the increase in imports reflects these developments:

1. Loss of American technical advantages in production.

2. Restoration of foreign industry, much of it with the latest machinery and paid for largely by American taxpayers.

3. The passing of the war and postwar sellers market. The buyer is now the boss.

The United States has had several advantages—up until now.

HAD PRODUCTION AND MONEY

It was the arsenal of the Western world, including the Communists, in World War II.

When the war ended, it was the only industrial country that could supply the products and the billions in financial aid for rebuilding the economies of the war-ravaged nations, including Russia. Also for the two former enemies—Japan and West Germany.

Prior to the war, the United States had had the advantage of more modern and efficient plants, which more than offset the higher wages and shorter working hours the American workers enjoyed.

This last advantage has been lost. Foreign plants are as efficient and in most instances where there have been entire new installations more efficient.

WAGE DIFFERENCE NOT ENOUGH

Productivity of American workers has not increased enough in the years since the war to hold the prewar production advantage. In an increasing number of products, foreign manufacturers can absorb transportation and successfully compete in the American domestic market. Steel is one. Textiles another. In foreign markets American firms are being priced out.

The low foreign wages in contrast to the higher American wages make the difference, for this is no longer offset by the one-time more efficient American plant. The Japanese, the Germans, the Italians—to name three—have equal or more modern plant and machinery.

In the steel industry, the American worker gets 3½ times what his British counterpart is paid, more than four times what the German worker is paid, and more than seven times what his Japanese counterpart gets.

In the highly competitive electrical equipment industry, American pay scales are nearly three times those of the British, more than four times the German, and eight times the Japanese.

TEN TIMES JAPANESE COST

In textiles, American labor gets a little less than 3 times its British counterpart, nearly 4 times the German, and more than 10 times the Japanese.

In the automotive industry, American pay scales are two and a half times those of the British, more than four times the German, and eight times the Japanese.

In shipyards the American pay is more than three times that of the British, and more than four times that of the German. It is also many times that of the Dutch and many, many times that of the Japanese.

In manufacturing in general, American pay is 2½ times that of the British, 4 times the German, and 10 times the Japanese.

BASED ON HIGH WAGE SCALE

The United States is faced with a critical problem, and there is no comfort in the fact that the wage-price spiral is a worldwide trend.

U.S. prosperity is based on a high wage scale and it cannot be reduced to foreign levels for the $15 to $16 billion exports or $15 billion imports—combined these are only about 6 percent of the gross national product. The exports figure—3 percent of gross national product—is, however, an important percentage. It accounts for a lot of jobs, just as the imports account for the loss of a lot of jobs.

The answer is greater productivity—more efficiency—something David MacDonald—head fo the Steelworkers Union—will have to consider as he wines and dines almost nightly in New York's plushiest restaurants.

Visit by Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in light of events occurring in many places throughout the world, it might very well be in order for our Government to consider withdrawing or delaying the invitation extended to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States or at the minimum to make our position known in no uncertain terms about these aggressive events.

Russia's ally, Communist China, is at this very moment carrying on open and bold aggression against India, against Laos, and a reign of terror is said to exist in Tibet where the entire middle class is being liquidated.

All of these aggressive actions by Moscow's partner, Red China, have been stepped up since Mr. Eisenhower invited Mr. Khrushchev to our country.

Why we should now honor the leader of world communism in light of these events is difficult for me to understand. I have recently returned from one of the satellite countries, Poland. There, the hope for freedom still burns brightly and there, I found misgivings of what might happen as a result of this visit.

Mr. Khrushchev has made his intentions perfectly clear. He has said that our grandchildren will live under communism. He is a dedicated leader of world communism. If anyone has any doubts about him, certainly those doubts should have been resolved when he crushed the revolt in Hungary with blood and iron in 1956.

There is no need to recount the long record of deceit of the Soviet Union dating back to our recognition of Russia in 1933. Promises made then were violated. Promises made in World War II were violated. The Yalta Agreement was violated. Agreements made at the meeting at the Summit in Geneva in 1955 were violated. Korea is still fresh in the minds of most Americans. Millions of people live without freedom because of the violation of these pledges. The recent meeting in Geneva ended in complete failure because of the Russian refusal to bargain and Berlin continues to be threatened.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am worried. I am worried about specious arguments being heard for so-called peaceful coexistence and the subsequent clamor which might very well occur for disarmament in our country. Twenty years ago, the bloodiest war in history started when Stalin and Hitler entered into a cynical pact to divide Poland.

The threat of Russian communism is greater today than it has ever been. I am as much concerned, Mr. Speaker, with preserving the peace as is any American. The way to do that is through maintaining the ideals of American democracy, through firm not soft diplomacy.

I am glad that many Americans are visiting Russia. There they see statism in action and certainly none of them can come home without saying, thank God I am an American. I am glad too, that Russians are able to visit the United States. I wish that literally millions of them could come here and see our country. If they did, they would realize that we have a true people's democracy. And I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the Iron Curtain would cease to exist, so would communism.

But we cannot assure liberty or assure world peace by making concessions to a government that has never been trustworthy.

I am glad to see the spontaneous movements which are organizing in our country in connection with the forthcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev. I am happy to associate myself with those who advocate special religious observances on the day of the arrival of Mr. Khrushchev, and I disagree completely with those who would honor him by inviting him to address our Congress.

I don't know whether or not Congress will be in session. Should it be, I would object in every conceivable way to an invitation going to Mr. Khrushchev.

None of the arguments advanced for his visit here, namely, that it will further negotiations for peace; that the visit would add to his knowledge of the United States and show him the strength of our country as well as give him real insight into how our people live and how our Government functions; none of these arguments could possibly apply in favor of an invitation to address Congress.

An invitation to address Congress is an extension of honor. It is a mark of distinction; it is principally ceremonial. To extend it to this man would, in my opinion, be an affront to our free parliamentary traditions extending to the first days of our great Republic.

The impressions throughout the world of the leaders of this great democratic body receiving in ceremonial applause the leader of world communsim would indeed be hard to dispel, particularly among the uncommitted peoples of the world.

So for my own part, Mr. Speaker, I shall object in every way that I possibly can to such an invitation being extended to him.

In my opinion, the greatest tragedy which could happen to our Nation would be for us to be taken in by this man. I hope that we will maintain firm, dedicated diplomacy in our own country. I am glad that President Eisenhower is travelling through Europe, reassuring our allies of our firm support and particularly assuring them that we will not weaken in our dedication to NATO and the alliance of free nations.

Luther Burbank Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, I was privileged to participate in the simple, but impressive, exercises marking the dedication of the Luther Burbank monument at Fort Devens.

The exercises took place in that portion of Fort Devens which was once part of the town of Lancaster, where Luther Burbank was born and where he spent the early years of his life. The site of his home was cleared by Army officials at Fort Devens and planted with sugar maples and flowers. A 4-foot obelisk, which was unveiled Saturday, marks the site of the Burbank homestead. The obelisk is inset with a plaque commemorating the site, which will be open to the public for picnicking with the permission of the provost marshal at Fort Devens.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of my address at the dedication ceremonies.

The material follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN AT DEDICATION OF LUTHER BURBANK MEMORIAL, LANCASTER, AUGUST 29, 1959

It is an honor and a happy privilege for me to join you today in paying appropriate tribute to the great Luther Burbank.

Thanks to the wisdom and patriotism of distinguished officials of the town of Lancaster and the incomparably splendid and outstanding leader of our military forces of the Army, General Wooten, we are proud to come here today to this hallowed spot to dedicate this beautiful, lasting memorial to one of history's great geniuses who first saw the light of day here where we gather.

I cannot give too much credit today to Lancaster town officials and leaders, Mr. Burgoyne and the board of selectmen, Rev. John M. O'Brien, Mr. Griswold, Chief Ryder, and to General Wooten and Colonel Rutledge and others interested in this fine project, because without their devoted interest, work, and cooperation, today's commemoration would not have been possible.

It is all the more creditable, desirable, and praiseworthy that we should establish this memorial because in a nation and a world which more and more tends to frown upon tradition and the virtues and glorious achievements of the past as an inspiration and fitting accompaniment to present and future accomplishments, it is all the more appropriate and helpful that we should add this historic shrine raised in honor of the great Burbank to the many of which Lancaster may boast.

My good and distinguished friends, Mrs. Esther B. MacDonald, town clerk of Lancaster, and Mrs. Marion Safford, gifted historian of the town, in their diligence and kindness have on other occasions furnished me with comprehensive biographical information on the life of Luther Burbank which I was happy and proud to use in speeches on the floor of the House of Representatives, first on his 100th birthday and again at the time of the Lancaster tricentennial celebration.

Luther Burbank was born in Lancaster March 7, 1849, the son of Samuel Walton Burbank and Olive Ross Burbank, the 13th child in the family. His father was a prosperous farmer and a maker of brick and pottery.

From his mother, Luther apparently inherited his love of nature, particularly his love of flowers.

He attended the Pine Grove School, a typical New England school in the north part of Lancaster.

When he was 15 years of age he entered Lancaster Academy where he studied for four winters, all the while making good use of the excellent library which, even at such an early date, the progressive and educational-minded people of Lancaster had provided to inculcate and encourage learning in the community.

From his work on the farm Luther early gained a practical knowledge of the life, characteristics and growth of plants.

Sometime after his father's death he purchased a 17-acre farm in Lunenburg where he took up the business of market gardening. It was here that this great genius first produced in quantity his first new plant creation—the Burbank potato.

According to Mrs. Safford he was a quiet, reticent youth who frequently was seen walking along the streets of the Town with his hands folded behind his back, apparently in deep thought and in a contemplative mood.

He bred this new species of potato from seed which he found in his garden and sold his crop of seed potatoes to a marketing firm in Boston.

In 1875 when he was about 26 years of age, he sold his farm and went to California where his three older brothers resided, taking with him the capital from the sale of the farm and a small quantity of his newly created potatoes.

His subsequent experiments and creations cover a very wide range and produced revolutionary changes in plant life and methods of cultivation in orchard, garden, field and forest.

Burbank discovered new ways of choosing and caring for seeds, preparing the soil, planting, disease and pest prevention.

He created many new species of berries, fruits, vegetables, and flowers, amazing and unbelievable to botanists and horticulturists.

He improved the size and quality of many species. He utilized grafting to promote startling changes in garden, orchard, and forest.

I could not begin to enumerate his remarkable accomplishments here, but they were epochal, monumental and of lasting value to mankind. Luther Burbank will always be remembered as one of our greatest scientists and one of our greatest Americans.

It is interesting to note that the house where Luther Burbank was born, right here on this very site that we are commemorating today, a large New England style brick home with a wooden ell was razed by the Government when it took over this section of the town to extend Fort Devens during World War II.

Another great American benefactor, Mr. Henry Ford, had purchased the ell of the house some years before and removed it to Dearborn, Mich.

Luther Burbank was born on the second floor in a small room of this ell. Some years ago I talked about Luther Burbank with two of his old schoolmates who long resided in our district, the brothers Fred W. and Luther Bateman, both very prominent and highly respected citizens.

Mr. Fred Bateman who knew Burbank intimately and well, was a famed, successful civil engineer, who even when he was over 90 years of age continued to work daily at his profession. These good men were of the opinion that in his early years Burbank showed great genius and was a painstaking, resourceful experimenter.

The American people, indeed the people of the world have received lasting benefits from the brilliant research and miraculous achievements of Luther Burbank and we are indeed honored today to pay this additional heartfelt tribute to his memory, and express our renewed appreciation for his magnificent work in behalf of science and humanity.

Luther Burbank was the product of this proud, rugged, Lancaster environment, of hardworking people and he unquestionably derived much of his skill and genius from the frugal, industrious habits, willingness to perform hard work and tenacious purpose from his rugged New England forbears and from the favorable, encouraging climate of this distinguished and progressive town of Lancaster.

It was here that he had his humble beginning, got his early training and drew deep inspiration.

It was here that the hand of destiny first placed upon his brow the diadem of genius and greatness.

It was here amidst the eternal, green hills, fertile valleys, and beautiful countryside of old New England where American liberty was nurtured and where its spirit still animates the hearts and minds of the people, that Luther Burbank's brilliant work found its source and its stimulus.

It is for us and succeeding generations to keep in mind and to perpetuate the great spiritual values which are represented in and responsible for the illustrious career of Burbank and his service to humanity—his profound belief in the Almighty, his reverence for free institutions and his faith in himself which led him to lasting fame and, more than that, enabled him to contribute so mightily to the welfare and happiness of people of every race, color and creed the world over.

Among Burbank's most beautiful creations was the Shasta daisy which the people and the schoolchildren of Lancaster and of his adopted home in California believe should become the national flower of our country.

It is fitting on this occasion that we should make reference to this beautiful flower because of all his creations it perhaps best exemplifies the hardy, inconquerable spirit of the great Luther Burbank. May we of this troubled time draw courage and inspiration from the homely virtues and patriotism of Luther Burbank. May his fine example and brilliant achievements long continue to inspire and guide us in the perpetuation of freedom, justice, and peace.

This is probably the last occasion upon which our distinguished friend, General Wooten, will be officially with us. He has been promoted to a much higher post of responsibility in our great Army and, in time, because of his great talents, ability and high purpose he will undoubtedly go right to the very top of his proud calling.

We are all greatly indebted to this great American soldier, not only for his peerless service at Fort Devens, but also for his warm friendship, the interest he has taken in our community affairs, the effective cooperation which he has always given us.

Though we all rejoice in his promotion, we are very sorry to have him leave this district where he has made so many friends and where he is so highly esteemed and beloved. We hope he will return often to see us.

In behalf of our district, our people and myself I wish to express to him today our sincere and deep gratitude for his many contributions, congratulations upon his advancement and very best wishes to him and his family for many more happy, constructive years in the service of our great Nation.

May the memory and achievements of Luther Burbank long continue to inspire our people and to nurture and develop more great men from our midst to serve wholeheartedly and unselfishly in the tasks and the cause of peace.

Poison in Your Water—No. 164

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Austin (Minn.) Herald of October 15, 1958, entitled "Stop That Pollution":

STOP THAT POLLUTION

Foes of pollution of the Nation's lakes and streams are fighting doggedly, and tonight's tricounty, which is open to the public at the Cedar Valley Conservation Club, may be the starting point of a great program for Mower, Freeborn, and Steele Counties.

All over the country, additional recruits in the fight are being rallied to the cause, and concrete results are showing at some points.

To show how widespread and how devastating pollution has become, even the vast expanses of the Great Lakes are in need of a cleanup and eight States are joining in an Izaak Walton League move for effective model water laws.

As this country and Canada enjoy a wave of enthusiasm over the increased lake traffic that the St. Lawrence Seaway will bring, the warning comes that adequate restrictions must be enacted to prohibit dumping of oily wastes and other refuse into the lakes.

Pure water is a priceless possession, which can and will be lost in many places unless corrective measures are taken soon.

Cappers Farmer Magazine Prods Congress on Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of the Cappers Farmer makes some potent and prodding observations regarding the action of the Congress to date on the question of coming to grips with the question of getting the farmers "parity of income in a marketplace considerably less than free."

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with Capper's Farmer that only three men have tried to solve this problem. Many Members have tried and are working very hard on this dilemma, including myself.

I do agree with them that we must pass good legislation in this field and "put the responsibility for failure squarely on the President and his Secretary of Agriculture," if the President vetoes the bill.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the folks who elected me to Congres wanted me to help write a farm bill. I sincerely hope the 86th Congress will yet prove it can write a good farm bill.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS FLUNKED IN FARM LEGISLATION

Congress has failed once more to face up to its responsibility to agriculture. The promised drive for a practical, workable farm program never got under way. Fires lit by the mandate of last year's election fizzled.

By its inaction, Congress has left farmers on the public hot seat, subject to an ever-increasing barrage of criticism and ridicule.

Congress has done nothing to set up effective reduction and control of surpluses. It made only a halfhearted attempt to get wheatgrowers off the hook. The price-support program, so widely criticized by the Secretary of Agriculture and the urban press, remains basically unchanged.

By its failure to act, Congress has tossed farmers into the political arena of next year's presidential election. Again the whole farm issue must be dragged through a political campaign.

Inaction means that the farm mess will be permitted to drift for another year—with the tacit blessing of Congress. Possibility is increased that the price-support program may fall of its own weight with nothing built to replace it. Washington lawmakers may in fact have played right into the hands of those who want to end all farm programs.

Capper's Farmer gives credit to the stalwarts who tried. Time and again such earnest men as Senators GEORGE AIKEN of Vermont and FRANK CARLSON of Kansas and Representative FRED MARSHALL of Minnesota pled for unity and action on an improved farm program. But their efforts did not prevail against stubbornness, indifference, and partisan politics.

Admittedly, there are great difficulties in the way of writing new basic farm legislation. Disunity of farm organizations and noncooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture are roadblocks in any real progress toward a modernized farm program. But it is the responsibility of Congress to com-

promise group differences in writing acceptable laws.

Excuse that a good farm bill would have been vetoed falls flat. A veto would have put the responsibility for failure squarely on the President and his Secretary of Agriculture.

Capper's Farmer agrees with Grange Master Herschel Newsom who said at a recent congressional hearing:

"I have about lost patience with the attitude that we must pass only legislation that the President will sign. We should develop a farm program that will be good for the country. After all, we will have a new President one of these days. Even though it takes 2 years or more to put a program into effect, at least we should get on the right track."

The real issue here—which Congress is reluctant to face—is the role Government is to play in agriculture. Is Government to be an active partner or a passive bystander?

Capper's Farmer believes there's little choice. In the interest of a healthy agriculture, the public welfare, and national security, we believe our Government must work in partnership with farmers; must help farmers find a way to get parity of income in a marketplace considerably less than free.

We believe that the present outdated, unworkable program must go. But we believe, too, that as bad as it is, it would be serious business to scrap it without first replacing it with one farmers and the public can live with.

The folks we send to Congress have to come to grips with this issue. Capper's Farmer beseeches them to face up to it now with bipartisan statesmanship. Surely, if we can lay aside partisan politics to unite on foreign policy, we can face up to responsibility on this critical domestic issue.

THE EDITORS.

The Modern Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 26, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, August 3 through 5, 1959, was the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army which was held at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

One of our distinguished military men who attended this meeting was my good friend Maj. Gen. Anthony J. Drexel Biddle, Adjutant General of the Pennsylvania National Guard and president of the Association of the United States Army.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an excellent article by General Biddle about this group and some comments by the distinguished Secretary of the Army, Mr. Wilber M. Brucker, the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, the Vice Chief of Staff, Gen. George Decker, and the Commanding General, U.S. Continental Army Command, Gen. Bruce C. Clarke on the modern army:

THIS IS AUSA

(By Maj. Gen. A. J. Drexel Biddle, Pennsylvania National Guard; president, Association of the United States Army)

Civic leaders, reservists, and Active Army members meeting to discuss current problems of national defense; engineers, industrialists, and Army authorities gathering in a symposium to consider guided missiles; an ROTC company receiving a briefing from an Army General Staff officer visiting their campus; a film service bringing to industry and business groups movies on recent Army research and development advances; sustaining members receiving publications, news memoranda, and organizational charts, to keep them fully informed on Army activities; a defense information service answering questions of business firms; a national professional military magazine going out to thousands of civilian readers—all these and many more comprise the activities of the Association of the United States Army. They come to a climaxing focal point in an annual meeting such as that just concluded in August in Washington, D.C., where thousands of visitors saw industrial exhibits, heard speakers of national repute, took part in panel discussions led by top-level civilian and military authorities.

Theme of the meeting was "What Is a Modern Army?" Speakers included Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff; Gen. George H. Decker, Vice Chief of Staff; Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, Commanding General, U.S. Continental Army Command; Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Army Research and Development; Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, retired, Director of Selective Service; the Honorable John J. Sparkman, U.S. Senator from Alabama; the Honorable Courtney Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Logistics; and the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army, discussing "This Is a Modern Army."

National news media covered the meetings, and thus helped keep millions of readers, listeners and viewers better informed of the magnitude and intricacy, as well as the significance, of the problems confronting the Army in its quest for modernity—problems that affect the American public, its general welfare and its very safety.

The annual meeting is the climax of activities that continue throughout the year—activities which perform for the Army many things that individual members have found it extremely difficult to do for and by themselves. These activities have grown in size, scope and importance as the association has increased its membership and extended its sphere of interest since its founding less than 10 years ago. Actually the association did not reach its present potential until 1956 when the first annual meeting set the pattern for future activities and growth.

The association is an independent, nonpolitical, educational organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. Although its predecessors go back to the 1880's, the association as such came into being in 1950 when the U.S. Infantry Association and the U.S. Field Artillery Association were merged. Not until 1955, however, when the U.S. Antiaircraft Association joined forces, did present activities become possible.

Today the association membership is approaching the 60,000 mark. Its nationwide sustaining membership program brings industry and the Army together for constructive interchange of views. It gets down to the very grassroots of community life through its regional chapter program, to give the average American a clearer understanding of the Army's problems and a better appreciation of its accomplishments. Its ROTC company program is designed to foster a mutual interest between the Army and the academic community. At present, there are 112 regional chapters and 58 ROTC companies.

Throughout the year, the association conducts industrial symposiums. Currently 64 major industrial firms are participating in the sustaining membership program, to improve communication and coordination between the Department of the Army and the Nation's industrial establishments. During recent years the association has sponsored symposiums on guided missiles, Army aviation, communications, electronics, and battlefield mobility at various installations. In panel discussions, Army experts in the fields of research and development, requirements and doctrine, meet with prominent industrial leaders to discuss Army problems.

Further, as part of the sustaining membership program, the association provides members with the latest unclassified doctrine on Army weapons, equipment, organization, and military concepts and techniques. It also provides a film service and various Department of the Army publications, news memoranda, and organizational and functional charts. An information service provides answers to hundreds of specific inquiries annually. Each member also regularly receives Army, the association's magazine.

At the community level, AUSA chapters work closely with civic organizations. They sponsor visits to Army installations, arrange for presentation of films, demonstrations, and speakers, cultivate good working relationships with news media. In addition, the chapters encourage young men to look to the Army as the desirable service in which to serve, as the backbone of the Nation's defenses. Outstanding young men are urged to seek entrance to the U.S. Military Academy.

Through its active ROTC program, the 58 existing companies of AUSA pursue a varied program which augments their military skills, adds to their general Army background, and disseminates information about the Army's role in the Nation's defense. Members are encouraged to associate with fellow cadets from other educational institutions and with active military personnel, thereby increasing their devotion to the Army and its aims.

Every cadet in an AUSA company holds membership in the association and receives Army magazine. Currently AUSA is bringing its regional chapters into the ROTC program by making available speakers, facilities, and other assistance, thus bringing cadets into close fellowship with mature, experienced individuals who believe in the aims and objectives of both the Army and of AUSA.

Under an association-sponsored awards program, AUSA's ROTC medal is awarded to about 375 cadets annually, in colleges and essentially military schools. The medal is given to the Army ROTC cadet who is in the top 10 percent in ROTC grades and the top 25 percent in general academic grades, who has done the most for the military department or the Army. The same medal, with certain modifications, is awarded to a limited number of Army service school students, under criteria established by the school commandants.

Other national awards include two President's medals awarded each year, a chapter scroll, and certificates of appreciation and of achievement. Many chapters have their own awards programs.

Contributing significantly to the association's efforts to make the Army's story better known is Army, the monthly magazine. This highly regarded military journal keeps the military profession alert to innovations and changes in tactics, weapons, doctrines, and policy, and at the same time keeps civilian groups informed on Army problems. Editorially the magazine backs up positions taken by the association in support of the Army, and demonstrates the Army's proud record of achievement throughout the Nation's history. Editors, reporters, commentators, and leading Government officials recognize its effective role in delineating problems of national security in the nuclear age.

The association draws on the experience, talent, and balanced judgment of its outstanding members in many fields of endeavor. All these abilities in turn are available in support of the Army. Governing body of the organization is an 11-man council of trustees, of which Mr. W. F. Rockwell, chairman of the board of the Rockwell Standard Corp., is chairman. Well-versed in Army matters, Mr. Rockwell served as a colonel in the Army during World War II. The association also receives advice and assistance of a 50-man advisory board of directors. The national headquarters staff presently numbers 28, and is increasing as the association undertakes additional activities.

That the scope of AUSA activities is increasing is attested by the fact that some 600 persons attended the first annual meeting—and last year more than 2,700 were registered. More than 200 members of the press and broadcasting industries covered the meetings. At the August meeting this year, more than 3,000 were registered.

AUSA supports the Army on many fronts. Notable instances include: active support of legislation favoring increased pay scales as proposed in the Cordiner report; support of the Department of Defense reorganization plan with reservations; a resolution recommending that the successful missile team assembled in the U.S. Army Ordnance Missile Command be kept intact, a resolution calling for suitable memorialization of the Army's birthplace; and various other proposals.

While these are noteworthy examples of dynamic AUSA action in backing up the Army's concerns, it must be emphasized that the Association at all times retains its independent status, and that the Army makes no attempt to dictate to it. Only in this way can AUSA maintain a well-deserved reputation for integrity and independence.

All of the day-to-day activities of the Association in behalf of the Army and its members come to a climax at the annual meeting. This meeting has grown continually in prestige and influence in many areas until it is considered a "must attend" affair not only by the military profession but by influential leaders in industry, government, education, and the professions.

In organized efforts ranging from local to national levels, AUSA thus helps the Army perform its vital missions in national defense. AUSA will continue to work actively and encourage the support of all those who believe in the Army's historical and present-day role in preserving the Nation's security. The Association of the United States Army stands ready to serve, whenever and wherever the need arises, and welcomes to membership all those who wish to participate in its efforts.

This Is a Modern Army

(By the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army)

The Army today has one attribute which ranks in importance far above any new weapon, item of equipment, or concept—and that is the new, restless, and revolutionary mental outlook among its officers and men—an outlook which is constantly searching for something better and always looking for something more suitable to the requirements of the age.

After all, a modern army is one which is equipped to perform its functions in a modern world, and one which stays modern. In my opinion, the greatest single asset we have today is this new attitude and habit of thinking which is ready to cast away any outmoded ideas while seeking with a high degree of originality and imagination to stay ahead in an age when technological advancements occur with breathtaking speed.

Implicit in this kind of thinking is the realization that we must not lose sight of today's task—that we must be ready at all times to fight with what we have, that we dare not let our present battlefield capabilities decline while dreaming up new ideas for the future.

The relative proportion and makeup of land, sea, and air forces in the U.S. military structure is a dynamic thing and is of course constantly reevaluated with changing technology and a changing threat. To say that U.S. military power is today adequate to meet threats to U.S. security does not mean that this same structure will be adequate 3 years from today. The U.S. monopoly in atomic weapons ended some time ago, and the shift has been toward parity, a condition of mutual equilibrium arising from a roughly equal capability for reciprocal devastation. Even during that period when the United States had a monopoly on atomic weapons, Soviet leaders showed a willingness to accept grave risks. Today we face increasing boldness.

In this era of balance of terror the United States' ability for massive retaliation must be accompanied by the balanced ability to deter limited war—the piecemeal aggression which, if not curtailed, could seriously threaten our national security. When each side can make total nuclear war unprofitable for the other, the decision will tend to be reached on the basis of military capabilities for limited war. Hence, land forces have become increasingly important.

The modern equipment on display at this meeting demonstrates the Army's use of machines to help do the job. But the Army knows that there is no substitute for the heart, the nerve, the muscle, and the brain of men. Similarly, in the tough competition of power politics, while all forms of military power are essential, there can be no substitute for adequate land power, as the United States has learned time and time again. The inexorable logic of our times makes the Army more important today than it was yesterday, and more important 3 years from today than it is today.

Our air defense deployments are our first line of battle, an integral part of our fighting capability. They constitute a shield fashioned to fit the requirements of our world position, the precise threat we face, and our mission to prevent war if possible, or to win it quickly if it should be thrust upon us. Without these defenses the United States would have only a one-strike strategic force.

In the years since World War II, this Nation has been kept rudely alerted by repeated Communist pronouncements and activities which revealed their intentions to reduce all nations of the world to a state of vassalage. This common peril has acted upon us like war, bringing us closer together in the realization that we are in the front lines of a new and perilous episode in our history which may last for years to come. In the midst of these common trials and pressures, many improvements have been made and a new confidence has been born. With confidence comes achievement; with achievement comes renewed pride; and with pride comes the feeling of unity which will give us the one army we seek.

Why We Need a Modern Army

(By Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army)

Present trends indicate clearly the direction which the development of long-range, strategic weapons is taking. In the coming ICBM era, we can anticipate a day, not too many years away, when our missile retaliatory resources can and must be made so numerous and relatively invulnerable that no missile or other attack upon them, even by surprise, could possibly eradicate them all. This means that our response to the attacker would be absolutely devastating to him—so clearly so that it would be senseless for him to attack in the first place.

When that time arrives, it could bring about, in a curious way, what some have characterized as the equivalent of strategic nuclear disarmament. We shall always want, as a vital component of our military power, the invulnerable missile deterrent needed to maintain this situation. With this in being, the situation will then mean, realistically, that the other components of our power will play the vital role in coping with the tactics and strategy of communism short of the threat of general nuclear war.

These considerations are of vital importance today. In any meaningful planning, we have to take into account, from the beginning, the long leadtime from concept to actual fruition. This requirement for leadtime is obvious in the field of hardware. The requirement for leadtime is even greater in developing the capability to carry out a changed doctrine or strategy. It is greater, because many additional factors are involved. Therefore, we must be keenly aware that basic decisions made this year—decisions on national strategy or decisions on the budget—will inexorably establish the parameters of our actual capabilities 5 and more years from now to meet the then existent threat.

Modern military operations are not restricted to any particular element. The Army must fight as a part of a team which includes forces of the other U.S. armed services, and those of our allies. We are all well aware that land warfare is not conducted solely on the surface of the land. It includes the conduct of operations in the air above the land and in the waters contiguous thereto. In order to carry out its responsibilities with the effectiveness to permit its fellow team members to realize their own full potentials, the Army must be as modern in its functional area as the U.S. Navy, Marines, and Air Force are in theirs.

I want to emphasize that a modern Army requires the capability to fight successfully in either nuclear or nonnuclear conflict. This does not mean, in any sense, that the Army conceives of its role in modern war as being an unimaginative repetition of the methods of the past. What it does mean is that a modern army must have a fully adequate nuclear capability to meet and defeat an enemy with nuclear weapons. At the same time, however, a modern Army's nonnuclear capability must be great enough that it need not feel compelled to use nuclear weapons as the only alternative to failure.

Our Army is modern in many vital respects. It is modern in its outlook and its thinking. It is modern in its knowledge, in its tactics, and in its organization. It is looking always to the future, and striving with all its energy to be ready for that future.

This is an effort which requires thought and devotion and persistence. It requires that concepts not only be envisioned but that they be promptly translated into existing reality. The Army does not balk at the requirement, because it knows that no matter how perfect a blueprint may be, no blueprint by itself ever took a hill, won a battle, or fired a single round.

How We Use a Modern Army

(By Gen. George H. Decker, Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army)

In its role as an element of the deterrent force the Army must perform many tasks. It must provide forces overseas in critical strategic areas. It must maintain mobile, combat-ready forces in strategic reserve in the United States capable of rapid reinforcement of threatened areas overseas. It must

provide forces required for the defense of the United States and Canada against air attack. It must maintain a base for rapid mobilization, including strong, ready civilian component forces. The Army also has the very important function of equipping and training the armies of our allies in some 42 countries around the world. This, in turn, enhances the aggregate deterrent strength of the free world to the extent of some 200 divisions or equivalents.

The salient problem of the commander of the future—as I see it—will be to find and destroy enemy forces, while rapidly maneuvering or disposing his own troops so as to offer as little as possible in the way of a profitable target since it seems reasonably certain that once atomic weapons are introduced to the battlefield a target found will be a target destroyed.

If you will accept this premise then it would seem that the profile of a modern Army should be based on these considerations. First, it should be equipped so that it is able to locate and destroy enemy targets promptly with either conventional or atomic firepower as appropriate. Next, it should have tactical ground and air mobility to enable it quickly to concentrate at a decisive point or to disperse equally rapidly. Third, it should have the communications necessary to enable the commander to control widely dispersed and rapidly maneuvering formations. Fourth, its logistical system must be capable of delivering and maintaining all of the many items required on the modern battlefield without offering a lucrative target to the enemy. And finally, it must be capable of moving in to the enemy's homeland, restoring order and controlling the civilian population.

ONE MODERN ARMY

(By Gen. Bruce C. Clarke, commanding general, U.S. Continental Army Command)

In battle there has never been anything but one Army. No victory in American military history has ever been won by a single arm, service or component of the Army. Victory in the field has always been the product of the combined efforts of Regulars, guardsmen, reservists and Army civilians with all arms and services working as a combined arms team.

Modern technology has sliced wafer thin our protective cushion of time and space. No longer do broad oceans and powerful allies grant us years to mobilize and train our forces. No longer do we have months to activate units and perfect teamwork within the Army after war begins. No longer do we have time to erase conflicting attitudes and complete the welding process before commitment to battle.

Selected divisions and supporting units of the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve are earmarked and must be trained and ready for mobilization immediately following M-day. These forces are essential: To replace without delay those Active Army forces moved abroad at the outset of hostilities. To provide additional divisions—beyond those of the Active Army. To fulfill our NATO commitments. To man our air defense forces. To enlarge our training establishments.

Combat knows no distinction whatsoever between combat-ready units or individuals of the Active Army, the National Guard or the Army Reserve. Granted there is a difference in the degree of combat readiness appropriate to a Reserve unit and an Active Army unit. But never has the difference been so small.

From the very outset of a shooting war—general or localized—all components and all arms and services will be involved. The unity of spirit and teamwork in performance so essential to combat readiness must exist throughout the Army before the first shot is fired. Today our Reserve components are an integral part of our deterrent to aggression.

Michigan Talent Boon to Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD a guest editorial appearing in the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press of Saturday, August 1, 1959, by the distinguished editor and publisher of the Detroit Jewish News, Mr. Philip Slomovitz, who has just returned from a visit to Israel. That article shows how richly the people of Detroit and Michigan have contributed to the growth of the new independent Republic of Israel in the Middle East. Citizens of Michigan and of the United States are proud of their contribution toward the growth of this sister republic of ours in the Middle East. The article follows:

IN MEDICINE BUSINESS: MICHIGAN TALENT BOON TO ISRAEL

(By Philip Slomovitz)

JERUSALEM.—Leaders in varied scientific fields in Michigan have begun to play important roles in Israel's development.

Experts in ophthalmology, dentistry, veterinarianism and atomic sciences in Detroit and Ann Arbor have responded to calls to act in advisory capacities in their related fields by Israelis.

Detroiters already have joined major industrial enterprises in the Jewish State. Prominent leaders in the Detroit food industry, including John and Nathan Lurie, Tom and Al Borman and a number of others already have successfully established the first supermarket in the Middle East—in Tel Aviv. They are planning 12 more supermarkets.

A number of Detroit merchants and industrialists, including Israel Davidson, Max Osnos, Joseph Holtzman, Alfred May, Edward Levy, Leon Kay and many others, are the sponsors of a million-dollar Rock Products Corp. project.

A major gift to Israel was the visit in Jerusalem, at the Hebrew University, of the distinguished Detroit ophthalmologist, Dr. Saul Sugar, who lectured on diseases of the eye and on the progress made for the curing of eye diseases.

For many years, one of the chief problems of the Middle East has been the widespread scourage of trachoma. It has nearly been eradicated in the Palestinian area, primarily due to the efforts of the medical staffs of Hadassah, the American Women's Zionist Organization.

Another prominent Detroiter, Dr. Herbert Bloom, who had the distinction of being called in by the late Henry Ford for dental care, made notable contributions toward the advancement of the new dental department at the Hebrew University. Dr. Bloom lectured on dental problems in the newly created College of Dentistry in behalf of which a score of Detroit dentists have gathered funds and have contributed instruments.

This month, three distinguished Michigan scientists will assist Israel in vital fields.

Prof. Henry Gomberg of the University of Michigan, director of the Phoenix project at Ann Arbor, will be the guest of the Technion, the Israel Institute of Technology in Haifa, to assist in the establishment of the atomic science building.

The Technion is recognized as the leading engineering college in the entire Middle East. Dr. Gomberg has taken a deep interest in its activities and has been called in to act as consultant in matters involving atomic science.

Currently in Israel to address the graduates of the College of Dentistry of the Hebrew University-Hadassah Medical Center is Dr. Leon Herschfus. Dr. Herschfus is chief of the department of dental surgery at Mount Carmel Hospital in Detroit.

Dutch born, having come to the United States in 1941 as a refugee from nazism, he was graduated from the University of Michigan dental school in 1945. He has specialized and written extensively on oral surgery.

Especially vital for Israel's animal husbandry is veterinary medicine, and another Michigan resident, Dr. Allan Marks, of 8232 Hendrie, Huntington Woods, has just visited the Jewish state and has given considerable help to the veterinarians there.

He participated in a number of symposia at the Veterinary Institute at Beth Dagon, where, Dr. Marks reported afterward, vaccines and test materials are produced and the most modern methods are pursued to prevent contagious diseases among the country's cattle, whose protection is jealously and zealously watched in this small but rapidly progressing country.

"Red" Blaik, Army's Illustrious Former Coach, Brings a New Freshness to Football Reporting and Recognizes Validity of Brains and Leadership in the Game by Establishing a Worthwhile Foundation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that those of us who had admired the contribution of "Red" Blaik to modern football as coach of Army's "Black Knights of the Hudson" learned of his resignation early this year.

It is now with much pleasure that we learn that "Red" Blaik's talents have not been lost entirely to the world of football.

I am directing the attention of the House to the announcement that Colonel Blaik has consented to write on the subject closest to his heart—football.

With the permission of the House I am including in these remarks the first article written by Colonel Blaik for the Associated Press which tells the full story.

I have no apologies to make for my position that our service academies, Army, Navy, and Air Force, should be represented on the gridiron and in other fields of sports with the strongest talent available. I have done everything I could to assist each Academy in this endeavor and I will continue to lend my cooperation because no American should be satisfied with anything less than the best for our service academies.

I have long advocated participation of the service academies in bowl games and feel some satisfaction in the small

part which I have been privileged to play in bringing about participation in such bowl games. Such participation has stimulated interest of the nation's youth in our military service and the consequent benefits resulting to the Navy and Air Force has been beyond accurate measurement.

It is to be regretted that the Army has failed to take advantage of the chance to participate in any bowl game although the opportunity has been theirs. I sincerely hope that this shortsighted policy will soon be adjusted. Refusal of the Army to participate in a bowl game has even been in defiance of a policy adopted by its own board of visitors in 1954 and also contrary to the desires of its own coaches and players.

I am further concerned over reports coming to me that the Army is going to further limit its football program, placing it on and Ivy League status. This would indeed be a tragedy. "Red" Blaik brought the Army's teams to hitherto unscaled heights and thrilled a grateful American public with brilliant teams befitting the U.S. Military Academy. Now to tear down what Blaik has built after he has departed would be inconceivable. The American people deserve better treatment from the U.S. military authorities. The leadership developed on the football is not only reflected by the Army but by all schools participating in the game.

As Members of Congress we should do everything to preserve the great athletic tradition of the service academies and accept no less on the athletic field than we have come to expect in the field of education. The two go hand in hand. We should alert ourselves against any change in policy which would make West Point second and inferior to other like institutions in the Nation.

When the Navy participated in the Sugar Bowl and later in the Cotton Bowl it brought honor and glory to all hands in the Navy.

When the Air Force Academy defied the prophets and fought its way into the Cotton Bowl last year it captured the hearts and imagination of the American people and added prestige to the youngest of our services.

All this and more was denied the Army because it turned deaf ears to bowl invitations.

Today the Army, of the three services, is fighting for its life and its existence in the field of survival among the services.

Unless the Army's attitude in the athletic arena is changed it will find itself standing on the side of the road looking at the procession, led by the Navy and Air Force, go by.

But back to "Red" Blaik and his future activity in the football world. Read this opening article and statement of policy and intent and I am sure you will find in it the freshness to which I have referred and an excellent contribution to a better understanding and fuller recognition of the fact that football players are intelligent and students as well as athletes:

BLAIK HOPES TO HELP FOOTBALL BY WRITING

(By Col. Earl H. (Red) Blaik, former Army football coach)

When I retired from coaching last January 13, after 25 years—18 at West Point and 7 at Dartmouth—I said it was unthinkable to overstay a career. But it would be just as inconceivable for me to sever completely my connections with the greatest of American games, which has been inseparable from most of my 61 years. That is why I was pleased and challenged when the Associated Press invited me to write two articles a week for the newspapers of the country.

While one is coaching, he is necessarily preoccupied with the football problems of one school. Although he is aware that the college game, like any human operation of which the dollar sign is part, is not without its weaknesses and requires continuing revaluation and modification. The individual coach is in a position to contribute relatively little, much as he would like to do more.

In this invitation, I see an opportunity to try to help college football, not in any one school or area or within one peripherized philosophy, but in a broad, objective manner to help all colleges everywhere. College football today, while not without some abuses, has reached a plateau of excellence in its general conduct, unmatched in any era of the past. This emphatically bespeaks the love of and concern for the game by all its levels of administrators everywhere, and they deserve, therefore, every measure of encouragement and help. I hope to contribute in this way.

WON'T DUCK CONTROVERSY

My articles will very frequently be of a controversial and critical nature. But I assure you the controversy will be real, not fabricated, and that the criticism will always be constructive. It never will be directed at an individual but at something I feel stands correction and improvement. I repeat, I am concerned with what is good for all the colleges, remembering that what is good and practical in one area is not always so in another.

The articles I am preparing to appear between now and Friday, September 18, the eve of the first major Saturday of play, will appraise the strength of teams and players in various sections, but they also will treat of changes of trends, good and bad, affecting the game both on and off the field. Each Friday, beginning September 18, I will analyze where I believe the strength lies in the big game of the next day, yet more often than not I plan to include in the analysis a controversial or behind-the-scenes factor that has a relation to it.

Once the season is underway on Saturday, September 19, the articles appearing in the Tuesday papers will deal with colorful and dramatic highlights, backgrounds and, again, trends and controversies developing on the college scene, either nationally or from a sectional point of view that has some impact nationally.

Whatever financial remuneration I receive for these articles will be used to help college football. I am establishing eight fellowships for postgraduate work. They will be awarded to those eight boys, one from each of the National Collegiate Athletic Association districts, who have been adjudged as best meeting the following four qualifications:

They must be seniors. They must be leaders in academics as well as football. They must exert a fine influence on their campuses. They must be stanch in their devotion to the welfare of amateur sports.

The fellowships will be administered by the National Football Foundations Awards Committee, headed by Vincent Draddy. The foundation committee will be assisted by an awards committee from each of the eight NCAA districts, each nominating a candidate from its district.

These fellowships should help project what I believe to be a fact about college football, yet one seldom emphasized: That championship performance and superior scholarship are entirely compatible.

The American Commitment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the eyes of the Orient and, indeed, of the Middle East and Africa are watching to see whether we support Laos as that nation is justified in expecting. The administration made a tragic blunder in encouraging the Hungarian revolt and then failing utterly to support it. We have encouraged the SEATO countries to resist communism, and certainly implicit in this encouragement is a commitment to render all needed support in such time of need as now prevails in Laos.

A more complete account of this commitment is contained in an article by Joseph Alsop, New York Herald Tribune columnist, now in Laos, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. It follows:

THE AMERICAN COMMITMENT

(By Joseph Alsop)

VIENTIANE, LAOS.—Judging by President Eisenhower's words and action, the President himself has not yet entirely grasped the key fact here. Yet the key fact remains that the Eisenhower administration has morally and politically committed the United States to guard Laos against the kind of Communist aggression that has now been attempted.

This American commitment has now become immensely, perhaps even desperately, important. Hence, its obscure but undisputed story is worth recording.

The story begins with the situation created in this little country by the partition of Indochina in 1954, which the American Government joined in sponsoring. Briefly, the Geneva partition agreement left Laos effectively divided. The King's sovereignty over the whole country was recognized. But the local Communist forces were left in firm control of the two northern provinces, Phong Saly and Samneua.

The International Control Commission set up at Geneva was charged with this problem. The allegedly impartial Indian chairman of the control commission consistently took a pro-Communist line. Thus, the commission finally persuaded King Sisavang Vong to name a mixed government headed by the non-Communist Prince Souvanna Phouma, but including his brother, the Communist leader, Prince Souvanna Vong.

During all this period, the whole weight of American influence was thrown against the plan for a mixed government. As predicted by the Americans, the Souvanna Phouma-Souvanna Vong government came perilously close to giving the Communists full control of Laos. After the elections in the

summer a year ago, the result was a really major political crisis.

The American moral and political commitment was made during this crisis. In brief, the King and the other Lao leaders had to decide at once whether to make an all-out effort to save their country. Yet the installation of a strong anti-Communist government would quite obviously tend to provoke reprisals and even intervention by the much stronger neighboring Communist government of North Vietnam. There the Communists in Laos had their real base.

The Lao leaders emphasized the risk to the Americans. For example, before taking his young Lao party into the new government, the present foreign minister, Khamphan Panya, went to the American Embassy here. He pointed out the enormous danger of a new course for Laos, and he asked for a formal American guarantee of Laos' territorial integrity.

Crown Prince Savang made the same point and asked for the same guarantee when the present Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, J. Graham Parsons, visited the country at this critical moment. The American answer was always the same. We promised Laos full support, and we asserted that the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization would guarantee Laos against aggression.

In other words, just what is now happening was clearly forecast to the American Government before the strongly anti-Communist government of Prime Minister Phoui Sananikone was even formed. In full awareness of the danger, with all sorts of reassurances to the Lao, the American Government did everything possible to bring the Sananikone government into being. This in itself constituted a solid American commitment.

The commitment was then greatly deepened when American influence was also used to encourage the anti-Communist campaign rapidly launched by Prime Minister Sauanikone. The leading Communists were placed under arrest. In the provinces, the more flagrant terrorists were summarily executed. The Communist-controlled units in the army were disarmed (but one of them got away and is now prominent in the fighting). The remaining machinery of Communist control in Phong Saly and Samneua was firmly dismantled.

All these actions, so strongly tending to provoke a forceful Communist reaction, were taken with explicit American approval. Meanwhile, further warnings of the coming Communist reaction were by no means lacking.

In January, the first probe occurred, when the North Vietnamese Communists seized the small frontier district of Khapai. From January onward, the Hanoi radio telegraphed the coming punch by thundering threats of grave consequences of the Sanaulkone policy.

The Embassy here foresaw and indicated trouble ahead. At least one independent observer, the able Australian newspaperman, Dennis Warner, even predicted the present aggression in some detail. Yet the Americans were not deferred from pressing for appointment of an American training mission for the Lao Army.

This step has now been singled out by the Communists as the specific pretext for their attack on Laos.

In sum, Laos has been attacked because Laos took American advice. It was good advice. Yet a great country which insistently presses such advice on a small country must always assume responsibility for the consequences. The President almost seemed to reject that responsibility in his tepid press conference before going abroad. If he finally does so, the blow to the American and free world position in Asia will be completely irreparable.

The Forand Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, support for my bill, H.R. 4700, to provide insurance against the cost of hospital, nursing home, and surgical services is increasing every day.

Under leave to extend my remarks I offer for the RECORD a statement by the Railway Labor Executives' Association endorsing H.R. 4700. It follows:

STATEMENT OF RAILWAY LABOR EXECUTIVES' ASSOCIATION SUBMITTED TO WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN SUPPORT OF THE FORAND BILL, H.R. 4700, 86TH CONGRESS

My name is G. E. Leighty and I submit this statement as chairman of Railway Labor Executives' Association. I am also president of the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, one of the organizations affiliated with Railway Labor Executives' Association.

Railway Labor Executives' Association is an association composed of the chief executives of all the standard railway labor organizations. Together these organizations represent virtually all the railway employees in the country. The organizations affiliated with Railway Labor Executives' Association are the following:

American Railway Supervisors' Association.
American Train Dispatchers' Association.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers.
Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen.
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America.
Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.
Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.
Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union.
International Association of Machinists.
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers.
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers.
International Organization Masters, Mates and Pilots of America.
National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association.
Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
Railroad Yardmasters of America.
Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO.
Sheet Metal Workers' International Association.
Switchmen's Union of North America.
The Order of Railroad Telegraphers.

As the committee well knows, railroad employees are covered with respect to their age and disability retirement and survivor benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act and are not covered by the old age, survivors, and disability insurance system set up under the Social Security Act. Consequently, railroad employees are not directly affected by H.R. 4700 in its present form.

Under these circumstances the question may well be asked as to what interest railroad employees have in the bill and this question should be answered at the outset. Our interest stems from a variety of sources:

1. Although we are primarily concerned with conditions directly affecting the employees we represent, as participants in the American labor movement we have an interest in the welfare of all American workers. Standards of living and of well being do not isolate themselves by industries, and such standards when accepted or established for a substantial segment of the working population tend to become measures of the standards to be applied in other segments.

2. All but two of the organizations affiliated with Railway Labor Executives' Association are also affiliated with the AFL–CIO. The AFL–CIO is vigorously supporting H.R. 4700 and we feel that the committee should know that our association joins in that support.

3. Many of the organizations affiliated with Railway Labor Executives' Association represent to varying degrees employees in other industries who are covered by the OASDI system and who are directly affected by H.R. 4700. In some of our organizations this is true of the great preponderance of the membership.

4. The organizations affiliated with Railway Labor Executives' Association and who represent nonoperating employees (nearly three-fourths of all railroad employees) have for some years been wrestling with the problem of making hospital, surgical, and medical insurance available to retired employees. We believe that our experience in this respect will be helpful to the committee in evaluating the various possible approaches to the problem.

5. As the ensuing discussion will show, the experience referred to in the preceding paragraph shows that we have not yet succeeded in finding an adequate solution to our problem. We are not prepared at this time to state what we would regard as the best ultimate solution attainable, but we would not wish to exclude the possibility of seeking participation of railroad employees in the system proposed by H.R. 4700 if that bill is given favorable consideration by the Congress.

We have examined the testimony presented to the committee on behalf of the AFL–CIO by Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank and we feel that that testimony thoroughly, conscientiously, and objectively explores the issues involved and points most convincingly to the proper resolution of those issues. No purpose would be served in repeating or paraphrasing that discussion. We concur in it and believe that it demonstrates beyond question that H.R. 4700 is a sound bill and should be enacted.

In 1954 the organizations representing nonoperating railroad employees negotiated through collective bargaining a nationwide plan for providing hospital, surgical, and medical protection for active employees. Under this plan, on roads where hospital associations were in existence the existing arrangements were adapted to provide the negotiated protection. With respect to the nonhospital association railroads a single national insurance policy was negotiated to provide specified benefits at specified premiums. Under this policy the Travelers Insurance Co. was the primary insurer and reinsured varying percentages of the risk with other qualifying companies desiring to participate.

Initially this plan was applicable only to the protection of employees on a 50–50 contributory basis and separate arrangements had to be made to make insurance for dependents available on a voluntary basis at the expense of the employee. Subsequently,

however, renegotiations have provided for the employee and dependents benefits to be on a noncontributory basis and the dependents benefits for hospital association roads and nonhospital association roads are now all included in the one insurance policy.

The arrangements above summarized deal exclusively with active employees and their dependents. We have at least so far not been able, through collective bargaining, to negotiate for the continuation of any degree of employee or dependent protection after the retirement of the employee. This presented a most serious problem. Prior to the negotiation of the collective bargaining plan many railroad employees participated in individual or group insurance or benefit plans with varying arrangements for continuation or conversion after retirement. In many instances such protection ceased to be available after the plan covering active employees went into effect. Even if the protection continued to be available an employee who wanted to protect his continuation or conversion privileges upon retirement would generally find it necessary to continue to carry the protection as an active employee, thus incurring the expense of unnecessary duplicate coverage while in active service.

To meet this situation as best we could, the organizations negotiated a separate group policy providing benefits available on a voluntary individual premium payment basis for retired and furloughed employees and their dependents (and initially also for dependents of active employees prior to their coverage in the collectively bargained plan). The opportunity was thus made available to all employees covered by the collectively bargained plan while in active service to continue protection upon retirement, on a reduced benefit basis and at their own expense. Where hospital associations are in operation retired employees are generally permitted under varying arrangements to continue protection for themselves, though their dependents are generally not covered. In instances where retired employees on hospital association roads do not have continued hospital association protection available they are eligible upon retirement to be covered by the Travelers policy for both employee and dependents benefits and all employees on such roads are eligible to be covered for dependents benefits.

In working out and administering this plan we have had excellent cooperation from the insurer; administration costs and retentions have been kept to a minimum, thus making the greatest possible proportion of premiums available for benefit payments; and every effort has been made to strike a reasonable balance between benefits and costs so as to provide as nearly adequate benefits as could be obtained at premium rates that retired employees might be expected to be able to afford. The plan is, so far as I know, the largest group plan for retired employees in the country. With all of these favorable circumstances, this plan may well be regarded as representing the best arrangements now attainable for retired employees who are severed for insurances purposes upon retirement from the group comprising active employees.

Nevertheless, our experience indicates that the best attainable under these circumstances is not enough. There is much to be said for the proposition that retired employees should continue for insurance purposes to be a part of the group in which they participated during active service and that employers should continue to carry responsibility for the protection of the entire group. Perhaps such a solution if sufficiently generally adopted and if group insurance based on employment becomes sufficiently universal might be considered preferable to the assumption of responsibility by the Government. In our own thinking we have not excluded that possibility so far as railroad employees are concerned.

It is clear from our experience that the adverse circumstances inherent in the type of arrangement we now have make it impossible to achieve really satisfactory results by this approach. The administrative costs involved in handling individual applications, checking eligibility for participation and receiving and properly crediting monthly premium payments necessarily absorbs a disproportionate share of the premium. Individual choice as to participation results in coverage of a disproportionately small segment of the group eligible to participate and must involve a considerable degree of adverse selection.

The present premium rates under our policy for retired employees are $4.48 per month for employee benefits only, $4.60 per month for dependents only, and $9.08 per month for employee and dependents benefits. The benefits include hospital room and board charges up to $8 per day but not to exceed $480 for each period of disability. Hospital extras are covered to a maximum of $80 for each period of disability and an ambulance charge up to $25 is allowed. Surgical expenses are covered under a schedule with $150 maximum. We believe that it is readily apparent from an examination of these premium rates and benefit limitations that some better method of providing hospital, surgical and medical benefits for retired employees must be found.

It has been estimated that during the approximately 4½ years that our plans have been in effect probably about 130,000 nonoperating employees have retired and that about 119,000 of these are still living. About 40 percent of our employment is on hospital association roads and employees retiring from service on those roads would, as above indicated, generally continue hospital association protection with respect to employee benefits and would be eligible to participate in the Travelers plan only for dependents benefit insurance. It may thus be calculated 60 percent of the 119,000 surviving retired employees or 70,400 have been eligible for insurance for employee benefits. As of June this year 17,753 were actually participating for employee benefits; 15,520 had dependents benefit insurance but this latter figure would include employees from hospital association roads eligible for dependents benefit insurance only and must therefore be related to the 119,000 figure rather than to the 70,400.

It cannot be assumed, of course, that the difference between the 70,400 who have been eligible and the 17,753 participating for employee benefits are without any hospital, surgical or medical insurance. Some, we have no way of knowing how many, undoubtedly carry other forms of protection by reason of continuation or conversion of other insurance carried while in active service or policies that have been taken out upon or during retirement or various other possible types of protection. The figures do indicate, however, that the degree of participation in relation to the size of the total group is too low to achieve results that can be regarded as a real solution to the problem. Perhaps there is a very high degree of adverse selection. Perhaps the nonparticpating eligibles do not feel that their income is sufficient to afford any insurance payments and that they must therefore run the risk of incurring uninsured expenses and hope that this does not happen. Or perhaps they consider the benefits available relative to the premium rates inadequate to give them their money's worth. Whatever the reason, it is apparent that intensive efforts under favorable circumstances have not succeeded in developing adequate hospital, surgical, and medical insurance for retired employees by this method.

We have given and are continuing to give most serious study to this situation and are determined to find a more satisfactory solution. Whether this should lie in the direction of efforts to continue retired employees in the group comprising active employees or in the direction of seeking participation in the plan contemplated by H.R. 4700 we are unable to state at this time. We bring our experience to the attention of the committee because we think it may be enlightening in the committee's consideration of the general problem and because we want the committee to know what our particular problem is.

Intaxication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Donald E. Wood which appeared recently in an issue of Automatic Machining magazine. Mr. Wood is one of a large group of American citizens who believe that our Federal Government should live within its income and I heartily agree with him in this respect. Spending beyond our means, in my opinion, is definitely not the answer to our problem:

INTAXICATION

(By Donald E. Wood)

The worker who asks for a general pay raise, or the firm which willingly grants it, is taking the lazy way out of a complicated situation. Added pay may temporarily salve the symptoms; it cannot cure the high cost of supporting all forms of government, the real disease which eats at the heart of our standard of living.

The average American spends the first 2 hours of each day earning money withheld as Federal or State income tax, money he never sees. He works an additional hour or so to pay county and city taxes, gas taxes, excise taxes, and the intangible tax involved in the price of every item he buys.

This problem, basically, cannot be solved by pouring more dollars into the top of the paycheck. The real situation is that all of us spend so much time working to pay taxes, we have too few hours left in which to earn our living. In other words, we find ourselves unwittingly "deep in the heart of taxes."

Taxes create inflation. Inflation, in turn, is forcing some of our domestic manufacturers to look longingly at the advantages of establishing foreign branches. Faced with competition from imported products, it is understandable that these firms must fight fire with fire. But while foreign branches may help the profit picture of the firm, it can only do so at the expense of the American worker whose job has gone abroad.

The trouble with blanket pay hikes is that only a tiny trickle of the added money ever becomes buying power for the recipient; the bulk goes to pay higher taxes, or in the form of added cost for purchased items. And while the worker benefits little, the firm is placed in an even tighter position competitively.

It is traditional in America that we will not become aroused until a crisis is at hand. That day may be nearer than we think. It is time our legislators be informed by all of us that nonessential spending, no matter how desirable, is not what we need. It is time we told our elected officials that governments, like each of us, should check the bank balance before signing for any but essential purchases.

We need wage increases based on ability and merit rather than as blanket policies. We need to help our firms in their competitive struggle, and still uphold our high standard of living.

We can do this. We will do this, when we want—or need—to badly enough.

The Jimmy McHugh Night at the Hollywood Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, on September 5, the American entertainment industry will pay a most exciting tribute to one of its most distinguished, prolific and famous contributors on the occasion of his 35th anniversary as an internationally known songwriter. Mr. Jimmy McHugh will be honored by a presentation entitled "The Jimmy McHugh Night at the Hollywood Bowl," which will climax the season of that music mecca. I think that this anniversary is an occasion of international significance which certainly is deserving of the attention of my colleagues and of the entire American people.

Jimmy McHugh is best known, perhaps, as the composer of "Sunny Side of the Street," "I Can't Give You Anything But Love," and several hundred other "standards," as the classical examples of popular music are known.

Were these great songs his sole contribution to American cultural and social life, Mr. McHugh certainly would qualify as one of our most worthy and productive citizens. However, amazingly enough, this is only one phase of the magnificent work Mr. McHugh has performed and is performing for our society. He has also given generously and unstintingly of his time and personal resources to worthy civic, charity, and athletic causes.

Since it is his music, however, for which Mr. McHugh is best known, let me review briefly a few of his contributions which led a noted observer of the musical world to speak of Mr. McHugh as the Stephen Foster of his time. The titles of Mr. McHugh's songs alone immediately imply his position as the foremost creator of present day popular music. In addition to those McHugh songs already mentioned, "Don't Blame It on Me," "A Most Unusual Day," "I Feel a Song Coming On," "When My Sugar Walks Down the Street," "I'm in the Mood for Love," and many others have become a part of our American heritage.

Should any of my colleagues or, for that matter, anyone in the United States think back, I know he will find several Jimmy McHugh songs which are associated vividly with an important phase of his life. One of the greatest functions of the popular songwriter is to capture and express poetically and musically the emotions which we all encounter, and Mr. McHugh has become a master of this craft. His songs seem to underline our most private emotions and treasured experiences as though he had peered into us and written them personally for each of us.

As I am a music lover but not a qualified music critic, I would like to quote Dr. John Frederick Kilpatrick, music critic of the Dallas Times Herald and professor of music at Southern Methodist University:

> It is like talking to the man who invented doorknobs, the chef who created ham and eggs; it's like meeting up with the fellow who first thought of shoe laces, to be introduced to Jimmy McHugh. Like Stephen Collins Foster, Jimmy for so long has been incorporated in the weave of America that it is hard to realize that his songs were made by a living man and are not some sort of standard equipment that just comes with life.

It was Dr. Kilpatrick who referred to Stephen Foster as "the Jimmy McHugh of his time." Most Americans, certainly most members of the musical world, will give Dr. Kilpatrick's sentiments hearty seconds. Like Stephen Foster, Jimmy McHugh and his work have been a part of the fabric of our experience for the best part of our lives and, in the case of many Americans, for all of our lives. It was as early as 35 years ago that he composed such song hits as "When My Sugar Walks Down the Street" and "I Can't Believe That You're in Love With Me."

The Jimmy McHugh story is the American story. Like most of our great citizens, Mr. McHugh worked his way up from inauspicious beginnings. His first job was office boy at the Boston Opera House. His friendship with such operatic luminaries as Caruso, Puccini and Geraldine Farrar accounts for the fact that Jimmy McHugh songs never are written down to his public but rather live up to the qualities Puccini and Caruso might have expected of their young friend.

His career then followed the trail from piano player in a publishing company to composer of small shows in Harlem to his ultimate glory as one of the famous names of music. An idea of the scope of his work comes from the fact that he has written music for 45 motion pictures and 16 Broadway musicals, at one time having 4 hits on Broadway at the same time.

Another aspect of his importance in the entertainment world is his constant vigilance in discovering and promoting promising talent. Duke Ellington, Phil Harris, and the late Carmen Miranda are only a few of the famous personalities Jimmy McHugh helped uncover and develop.

Another phase of Jimmy McHugh's life which merits the attention of Congress and of the people of the United States is that gentleman's great patriotism and his work on behalf of his country. I know we all remember one of his great inspirational musical contributions to American morale during the Second World War—"Comin' In on a Wing and a Prayer."

In 1944 Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau commissioned Mr. McHugh to write the seventh war bond drive song, resulting in "Buy, Buy, Buy a Bond." It was eminently successful. Again in 1945, upon Government request, Mr. McHugh and his partner, Harold Adamson, supplied the theme song of the eighth war bond drive, "We Have Got To Buy Another Bond." The millions of dollars for which these songs accounted are inestimable.

In addition, the patriotic Mr. McHugh singlehandedly produced a bond rally "aquacade" at the Beverly Hills Hotel in 1945, and in one night's performance he sold $28 million worth of bonds. This was, and I believe still is, the largest single sale ever recorded.

Untold thousands of former soldiers can thank Mr. McHugh for their lives, saved by material purchased with the money he raised.

More tangible recognition came in February of 1947, when former President Harry S. Truman presented him with a Presidential citation in Washington for his contribution of war songs and his contribution to war bond sales. The composer's patriotism has remained untiring and unceasing. In February of 1953, Mr. McHugh was commissioned by President Eisenhower, Comdr. Harold B. Miller and Admiral Halsey to write the official "Crusade for Freedom" song for Radio Free Europe and Radio Free Asia. The resulting song, entitled "Crusade for Freedom," has been acknowledged by the members of those organizations as an important instrument in reaching the minds and hearts of the peoples of captive and neutral nations. It is still the official song of these organizations.

In that same year, Mr. McHugh and Mr. Adamson also wrote the official community chest song, "Give Every Child a Chance."

The creative and patriotic works of Jimmy McHugh, extraordinary as they are, do not overshadow his personal efforts on behalf of numerous charities.

One aspect of this extension of Mr. McHugh's activities is his effort to help promote recreational activity halls for teen-age boys and girls throughout the Nation. Mr. McHugh was honored for this several years ago by a testimonial dinner given by Georgetown University.

In 1951, Mr. McHugh organized the Jimmy McHugh Polio Foundation, the express purpose of which was to raise funds to buy and donate the miracle respirator created by Dr. Albert C. Bower. Since that time his group has presented approximately three dozen such expensive respirators.

In 1955 a single charity function sponsored by the Jimmy McHugh Polio Foundation raised $90,000 to purchase 15 such respirators.

The Polio Foundation was changed to Jimmy McHugh Charities, Inc., a few years ago, which move has permitted Mr. McHugh to devote his time and talents to raising funds for an ever wider field of charitable and worthy causes.

That Mr. McHugh would have any reserve time or energy for other activities is amazing, but it is true. His participation in the civic life of his present hometown, Beverly Hills, Calif., is indi-

cated by the fact that he is known as the honorary mayor of that community. For nearly 15 years he has been on the board of directors of the chamber of commerce of that municipality, serving as president of that organization for a time.

The people of Los Angeles are further indebted to him for his many contributions to the Los Angeles County Museum of masterpieces from his famous collection of paintings.

His astounding energy and compulsion toward public service have brought him into the athletic life of the American people as well. He is one of the country's leading sponsors of amateur swimming. In recognition of his tremendous help in this field, the Amateur Athletic Union of America—AAU—has made him a lifetime member and, as well, he was an honorary official of the 1948 Olympiad in London.

One of the outstanding athletic events of the past decade was the 1949 national men's outdoor swimming meet. It was Mr. McHugh's effort which brought the Japanese swimming team to America to compete in that event, and it was at this meet that Japan's Furuhashi shattered 29 world records in one event.

Mr. McHugh's interests and the impact of his personality extend to many other fields but I would like to conclude with one which has great importance to the United States at this time of international unrest, a time of all too frequent cultural misunderstanding between nations, even on the part of leaders. In view of this condition, the fact that Mr. McHugh for over three decades has been one of our most vigorous ambassadors of international good will, has tremendous importance. The extent to which Mr. McHugh's songs have reached into the lives of people in other countries and stimulated consciousness of American culture is indicated by one anecdote from the glamorous and productive life of this great musician. The event occurred several years ago when Mr. McHugh was called upon to participate in a command performance before Queen Elizabeth II of England and the royal family. Following the performance, Mr. McHugh was presented to the Queen. With a gracious smile, the Queen of England acknowledged Mr. McHugh's bow and said:

Mr. McHugh, you seemed to have written all of my favorite songs and, not only that, I sing them also.

Convention of the Ukrainian American Youth Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to greet the Ukrainian American Youth Association which is about to hold a convention marking the 10th year of the existence of this great organization. Some 8,000 delegates will shortly meet simultaneously at Spring Glen, N.Y., and in Detroit, Mich. They deserve our good wishes, our encouragement, and our applause. It is events such as these which lend inspiration to the whole movement and which give them the courage to continue their dedication to freedom and independence.

To descendants of the people of the Ukraine the battle against Russian imperialism is no new event. They have struggled against Russian tyranny for 300 years. Indeed, their forthcoming convention heralds the 300th anniversary of the triumphant victory of the Ukrainian Army against the Russians at Konotop, and the 250th anniversary of their tragic defeat by the Russian Army at Poltava. The Ukrainian-American knows perhaps better than any of us the threat and the danger of Russian aggression, because they have fought it when it bore the flag of the Czar, and continue to fight it when it carries the flag of the hammer and sickle. Their persistent spirit and dedication to the cause of freedom should serve as an inspiration to all of us.

I want to especially congratulate those members of my district who will be among those attending this fine and praiseworthy convention. They make up an important segment of the Ukrainian Youth Association. Their voices will be strong in the forthcoming proceedings.

I deeply regret my inability to attend and participate in this event, as I have on numerous occasions in the past. I will be with them in spirit, as I think all of us will be, and I wish them success and fulfillment in their great endeavors.

Khrushchev's Upcoming Visit to Iowa Has History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, American-Slovak journalist, of Passaic, N.J., which appeared in the Voice of the People column of the Paterson (N.J.) News of Saturday, August 29, 1959:

KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT TO IOWA HAS HISTORY

EDITOR, EVENING NEWS.

DEAR SIR: Many Americans may wonder why Nikita Khrushchev will visit the State of Iowa and omit other larger States. There is a valid reason for that. One dates back to famine in Russia in 1889, which was followed by a drought in 1890 and 1891. Some 30 million people were affected by this drought, which had blighted nearly 1 million square miles of the best agricultural soil.

Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross, read how the Russian peasants were burning their thatched roofs for fuel and exchanged their clothing for bread. Typhus, smallpox and diphtheria raged in different parts of the country.

She contacted James G. Blaine in Washington, D.C., and Alexander Gregor, Russian chargé d'affaires and learned that Russia would welcome aid from America. Farmers of Iowa wholeheartedly supported this campaign and in a short time 225 carloads of Iowa corn, wheat, rye, bacon, corned goods and medical supplies were shipped to Russia. Iowa corn spread good will and supported 700,000 persons for a month.

Dr. Julian B. Hubbell, who aided Clara Barton in her humanitarian work, was originally from Iowa. He spoke Russian and other languages and traveled with her to many distressed areas.

Dr. Hubbell attended the sixth International Conference of Red Cross Associations in Rome, when he was summoned to go to Riga to help distribute food from America among the starving Russians in 82 centers. Count Alexis Dobrinsky, marshal of the nobility of St. Petersburg, now Leningrad, ordered 320 freight cars to convey the free cargo from Riga to any point desired. Some traveled to the foot of the Ural Mountains. Russian and American colors hung at the hotel where Dr. Hubbell stayed and American sheet music was displayed in shop windows of Russian cities. Dr. Hubbell visited Count Dobrinsky's family, who had a large sugar mill in Moscow. He also visited Count Leo N. Tolstoy, the great novelist and humanitarian in Jasnaja Poljana, where he met Dr. Dushan Makovicky, a Slovak, personal physician of the great Tolstoy. They ground Iowa corn near the Volga River, which reminded Dr. Hubbell of our Mississippi.

This is one of the reasons why Russians are always grateful to the people of the State of Iowa, which also has many Czech (Bohemian) prosperous farmers. It was in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, where the famous Czech composer, Antonin Dvorak, composed some of his greatest music while in America.

The Slovaks too have something to be proud of because it was in Grinnell College, Iowa, where Dr. Edward A. Steiner, well-known American educator of Slovak origin, gave a start to Harry Hopkins, son of a harness maker and later adviser to President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who also visited Russia during World War II and contributed immensely to save the Russian people from famine with generous American aid.

Although I am not in sympathy with Nikita Khrushchev's visit to this country, nevertheless I am bringing these historical facts to acquaint the American public that really and truly Russian people received aid from good old America on several occasions in their most trying days.

Khrushchev should also visit the State of North Dakota, which had its ties with Russian wheat. But this is a different story, which belongs to the story of wheat and our pioneers in North Dakota.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA,
American-Slovak Journalist.

Clayton E. Freeman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, another important life has come to a close and I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to his memory.

Clayton E. Freeman of Glen Ridge, N.J., has by his interest in community

affairs and projects for the common good, left an impact that will long be remembered by those of us who survive him.

The editorial that appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Evening News of September 2, 1959, indicates the esteem and affection in which this fine gentleman was held:

CLAYTON E. FREEMAN

Clayton E. Freeman of Glen Ridge, dead at 86, was a successful businessman who regarded active and unselfish participation in political affairs as an obligation of citizenship. An amateur in politics, an important influence in the clean government movement in Essex County, he rose to be Republican State chairman and later served with distinction as the director of the Essex County Board of Freeholders.

The sincerity and dedication which marked his public career was perhaps best demonstrated by his efforts in behalf of his home community, which rated him the first citizen of Essex County. He personified integrity and deserved the respect in which he was held and the many honors that were paid him.

Ill-Considered Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news report that I have sent to my constituents in the 11th Congressional District of Michigan:

Much has been written and said during the last few weeks about labor reform legislation, especially the Landrum-Griffin bill. I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, and post cards on this subject from all parts of the Nation. None of these contained a threatening tenor, except for the form letter I have received from James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers. So that my constituents may be informed in this matter, I am including a copy of his letter and setting out my reply to him. His threatening communication is a reflection on the citizens of the United States and an un-American attempt to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

AUGUST 18, 1959.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Only you know, in the privacy of your own conscience, whether you carefully considered the possible consequences of the Landrum-Griffin bill when you voted for it on August 13, 1959. If you did, and realized that it is a punitive, repressive measure intended to weaken all labor unions and thereby all working men and women, you have much to answer for. If you did not, and merely yielded to the pressures of the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers, your guilt is perhaps even greater.

You should realize now, if you did not during the heat of battle, that this vindictive assault on the labor movement will, in the long run, prove to your constituents that you are less interested in individual rights and democracy than in property rights and the concentration of power in the hands of big business.

You may believe that you are safe in such action because organized labor is relatively weak in your district, and cannot call you to account for the damage you have sought to do to it. You may be right—at the moment.

We wish to assure you, however, that we shall do all in our power to prove to the working men and women in your district that you have cast your lot against them and they should therefore take appropriate action at the ballot box.

Very truly yours,

JAMES B. CAREY, *President.*

AUGUST 21, 1959.

DEAR MR. CAREY: I have received your form letter of August 18 endeavoring to intimidate me because of my favorable vote on August 12, 1959, in support of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which also was supported by President Eisenhower as well as by 303 of my colleagues out of the total membership of 426 in the House of Representatives.

It is interesting to note that you have described this legislation as "a punitive and repressive measure." This phrase characterizes the tenor of your letter. In my judgment your action constitutes a grave and intemperate misuse of the money of the rank and file of labor union members. By your ill-considered threat you are exposing the labor boss practice of the denial of the basic rights and democratic processes of your union members. A threat from you is no more terrifying to me than would be a threat from Mr. Hoffa, although I believe even he would be inclined to use better judgment than you have demonstrated.

By your act you have caused me to realize more than ever that I was correct in voting for the Landrum-Griffin bill. I am sure my voting record has proven to my constituency that I am interested in individual rights and democracy more than in the concentration of power in the hands of big business, regardless of whether that big business be the management boss or the labor boss.

The people of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan will not yield to the unthinking dudgeon of any labor leader when they are exercising the right to mark their ballot in secret for the candidates of their choice. Similarly, I would not, and did not yield to any pressures from the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce, as you allege, when I cast my vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill.

I have always supported legislation that would protect the rights of labor union members and would rid the unions of the practices of corruption, breach of trust, gangsterism, violence, and abuses of power. The political hoodlumism that you imply will be brought to bear against me does not dismay me, and I am sure it will not be persuasive with the thinking people of my congressional district.

In order that my constituency may be aware of your activities I am sending a copy of your letter and my reply to all individuals on my mailing list. I respect the intelligence of the people whom I have the honor to represent, and know that they too will realize more than ever the real need for the enactment of the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Yours truly,

VICTOR A. KNOX,
Member of Congress.

Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an editorial by Mr. Jack W. Gore, editor of the Fort Lauderdale News, one of south Florida's foremost newspapers. I feel that this editorial will be of interest to all the Members concerned with this problem:

IN AIR BUSINESS, LIKE MARITIME INDUSTRY, WHY IS IT WE NEVER LEARN TILL TOO LATE?

(By Jack W. Gore)

Are American airlines flying international routes being given the same sort of deal that has reduced the American merchant marine to second-class status?

This is a question that is of considerable import and concern today as we move into an era when jet aircraft will make it possible for millions of Americans to enjoy travel opportunities never open to them before.

Few people understand the whys and the wherefores of international air travel. When they want to go some place overseas they are more concerned about getting where they want to go quickly, safely, and economically than they are in the competitive situation that is rapidly causing American flag carriers to take a back seat to foreign competitors.

A glance at what is happening in the rich Latin American air travel market provides ample proof of how badly American carriers are being hurt by the refusal of U.S. authorities to give our own airlines an opportunity to compete with foreign carriers on equal terms.

Not too many years ago an American carrier, Pan American World Airways, was the dominant carrier in Latin American skies. It had pioneered the development of Latin American air routes and on most of these routes its planes provided the only quick and dependable air transportation.

But some 10 years ago the situation began to change.

Country after country in Latin America began to develop and subsidize its own airlines primarily for operation in the international field.

These other countries had no difficulty in getting the permission of U.S. authorities to operate flights to and from cities on the U.S. mainland. Since this permission was a diplomatic matter, these foreign airlines took their appeals to the State Department rather than to this Nation's Civil Aeronautics Board which controls all domestic airline matters. And since the State Department has been eager to provide other nations with an opportunity to serve American cities, in recent years there has been a virtual rash of foreign carriers into the American market.

Today, for instance, there are almost 60 airlines competing for business in the Latin American field. The competition is so bitter that during 1958 Pan American's Latin American Division showed a drop of more than $3,300,000 in passenger revenue.

This drastic drop in revenue didn't hurt only the airline. Forced by the loss of business to foreign carriers to cut back some of its operations, Pan American had to lay off some 207 mechanics and other technical and supervisory personnel.

Why can't Pan American meet this foreign competition? There are several basic reasons. First off, the American carrier pays wages to its pilots, copilots, stewardesses and other personnel far in excess of the rates paid by most of the foreign carriers.

Secondly, many of the foreign carriers are subsidized by their governments and thus, they don't have to worry about operating losses.

Thirdly, many of these foreign carriers don't belong to the International Air Transport Association and thus they can disregard the standard business practices, fare schedules and operating regulations which IATA members must conform to. Some 13 of the airlines currently flying Latin American routes are now offering cutrate fares which no American carrier could possibly

match and still stay in business. As an indication of the kind of competition the American carriers are up against, the standard round-trip fare between Miami and Lima, Peru, is $473.40. Yet three non-IATA airlines are selling the same round-trip ticket for $250, $260, and $280 respectively.

Finally, and most importantly, American carriers are restricted by our own governmental regulations to routes which give them little opportunity to compete effectively against all their new competition. Jamaica, for instance, has become a popular vacation spot for people flying out of New York with 82 percent of all traffic flying to Jamaica generated in that city. But all service between New York and Jamaica is provided by British and Colombian carriers with no U.S. flag airline permitted to fly the route.

What's happening to our American airlines today in the international field is much the same thing that has reduced our merchant marine to only a shadow of what it used to be. Back in 1956 a U.S. Senate subcommittee which took a look into the matter of aviation competition sounded this warning:

"It would be no contribution to the welfare of the free world, and certainly not to the welfare of the people of the United States, if America's international air transport system were to follow the deplorable downward path of the U.S. flag maritime industry."

That warning was, as we said, sounded back in 1956. Since then the competitive position of American airlines has grown incomparably worse but Washington officialdom still continues to be unconcerned.

It is regrettable that in a day and age when tremendous new travel opportunities are opening up for the American people, our own airlines are slowly being forced to take a back seat to their foreign competition. One would think we would have learned something from what happened to our maritime industry but sometimes, it seems, we never learn anything until it is too late.

Reciprocal Treatment for Tariff Concessions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I submit that orderly foreign commerce conducted on a basis of reciprocity and mutual trust is a goal worth striving for, and I would suggest to the State Department that one way to achieve this worthy objective would be for the United States to insist on reciprocal treatment for every tariff concession granted by our negotiators.

Perhaps we have a right to hope that the State Department will recognize the merits of this policy in time for the next big tariff bargaining festival to be held under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1961.

The adoption of such a policy, however, would mark a sharp departure from our present practice of tariff giveaways, a procedure to which our diplomats have clung through thick and thin for a quarter of a century. Time after time they have successfully resisted the efforts of embattled American producers and jobholders to encourage real reciprocity in our international commerce.

Another instance of this one-sided give-and-take—we give and they take—came to light this week in the pages of two different newspapers.

The New York Times, long-time advocate of freer trade, reported the tremendous boom in the transitor radio industry in Japan. Exports this year will be more than doubled over 1958, the Times disclosed, and no less than 60 percent of the 4 million transitor sets to be shipped abroad by the Japanese will land in the United States.

Japan's next biggest customer will receive 10 percent of total exports, or about one-sixth as many as are crowded into the U.S. market.

That is half of the story. The other half appears on the pages of the Journal of Commerce, another booster of freer trade. There we learn that the United States plans to talk once again with the Japanese about their discrimination against goods from the dollar area.

The press report goes on to list those products from the dollar area that are denied automatic import license approval. The 10 items on the list include lard, cattle, hides, beef tallow, soy beans, pig iron, and steel, and copper scrap.

Besides that, says the news story, the Japanese discriminate against automobiles made in the United States in favor of small cars manufactured in Europe.

This, of course, illustrates only a single instance of bogus reciprocity in our foreign trade. There are numerous others everywhere we look. The British Prime Minister, in a televised conversation with the President of the United States, appealed for more lenient treatment of British woolen imports, implying to millions of viewers that the United States had quite a way to go to match Britain's liberal trade outlook.

The Prime Minister did not say "ease up on our woolens and we will ease up on your automobiles or electrical equipment." He did not suggest "give our woolen manufacturers a break and we will liberalize our token import plan." In short, he did not say "give us something and we will give you something in return." Not at all. He simply said, politely, "give us something."

Australia offers another case study of bogus reciprocity in action.

In 2 years, 1956 to 1958, the Australians increased their shipments of mutton to the American market by thirtyfold—from a trifle more than 300,000 pounds to more than 14 million pounds. And in the first 6 months of 1959 these imports jumped to 23 million pounds.

Two years ago Australia sent us less than 6 million pounds of beef and veal. Last year these shipments reached 17 million pounds, and in the first half of 1959, they rose to a staggering 83 million pounds.

But what is happening in Australia's domestic market? One development of certain interest to American industry is the appeal of Australian producers of internal combustion engines for a protective tariff.

Engines and engine parts, it seems, are the only parts of motor vehicles which are not now favored by import duties. Australian producers are anxious to remedy this alleged defect. They want a 42½ percent tariff on imported engines and engine parts—but that would apply only to the United States and other countries outside of the Commonwealth preferential tariff system. Nations inside the Commonwealth family would only have to pay a 35 percent tariff to place their engines in the Australian market.

No one knows better than those who recognize its false implications what an effective word "reciprocal" really is. It is rich in meaning; it raises powerful images of faith and trust and mutual responsibility; it is the Golden Rule at work in international relations.

And, sad to say, it represents a picture of foreign trade as illusory, as misleading, as unfair to American industry and labor, as if the entire issue had been distorted and sentimentalized and glamorized in a Hollywood scenario.

Our Government is now making preparations to take part in the next multilateral tariff conference to be sponsored by GATT.

By preparing to take part, I mean specifically that the Government is scanning American industry for products on which to offer new tariff concessions. Experts in the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Agriculture Department, the Tariff Commission, and other agencies are working to put together our country's official bargaining list—some choose to call it, on the basis of painful past experience, the sacrificial offering list.

Nevertheless, this is a highly appropriate time to urge those who are responsible for these negotiations, as well as for the preparatory research that is already underway, to spend some time reexamining this question of reciprocity.

A bargaining list is one thing; what our negotiators do with it when they sit down with representatives of other nations is something else. As long as we have committeed ourselves to the disadvantages of multilateral negotiation, let us try to make the best of it. Let our negotiators insist on payment in kind; for one thing, let us stop extending outright tariff reductions in return for somebody else's promise that they will not raise their tariffs on our products.

In my opinion, this practice of granting tariff concessions in return for the other fellow's agreement to stand pat is tantamount to saying, "We will give you something if you promise not to take something away from us that we already have." It is like giving away your car in order to persuade the other fellow not to raise the price of the house he is going to sell you.

Yet, this is exactly what we have done in previous negotiations. Perhaps we have learned our lesson. For the sake of our American economy, I most certainly hope so.

Miracle on Capitol Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Washington Post and Times Herald has put its stamp of approval on the conference report of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill certainly places a liberal tinge on this piece of legislation, because surely no one who has read the editorials of this newspaper over a period of time could possibly classify the editorial policy as conservative. The following editorial was published in the September 4, 1959, issue:

MIRACLE ON CAPITOL HILL

The acid test of the Labor Reform Act of 1959, now apparently close to enactment, will come in its application. No one can be certain at this time precisely what the effect of its numerous, complicated, and varied provisions will be. But in terms of objectives, Congress has done remarkably well. Indeed, if the conference bill which was approved by the Senate yesterday had been laid before Congress last January most observers would have said that only a miracle could bring about its enactment.

In many instances the conferees took the best of both the Kennedy-Ervin bill passed by the Senate and the Landrum-Griffin bill passed by the House, and in a few cases it borrowed from other bills for improvement of the final product. An example is the compromise on the no man's land in which labor-management relationships have been beyond the reach of any government. In deference to the House, State agencies will be allowed to handle cases that the National Labor Relations Board does not take. In deference to the Senate, the NLRB will continue to exercise all the jurisdiction it now has, and the acceptance of a provision from the House Labor Committee bill will enable the Board to handle many more cases by decentralizing its supervision over elections.

The conferees threw out one of the worst provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill—that forbidding organizational picketing unless the union could prove that it had the support of 30 percent of the employees. But it applied some other severe restraints to organizational picketing, and these may prove the least defensible part of the bill. A union may picket for organizational purposes for a reasonable period of not more than 30 days without calling for a representation election. But the employer, nonunion employees, or a rival union may call for an election at any time after the picketing begins; the Board will have to hold an election forthwith, and if the picketing union should be defeated it could not resume its organizational picketing operations for a year. In practice this may place an overly severe handicap on labor organization efforts. It is important to note, however, that unions are left free to picket for the purpose of informing the public about labor conditions, so long as they do not cut off service deliveries to the picketed plant.

The ban on secondary boycotts was substantially tightened, as it should have been, with a proviso protecting agreements in the garment industry against piecework by nonunion subcontractors and a similar arrangement for unions in the construction industry. Prehire agreements in the building trades were legalized. Another notable achievement was the elimination of the ill-advised provision intended to authorize suits against unions indulging in organizational picketing.

When this generally moderate disposition of the most controversial issues in labor legislation is added to the constructive provisions designed to compel unions to manage their finances honestly, to respect the rights of their members, and to employ democratic procedures, the bill is an achievement of the first order. It would, of course, be a mistake to view the bill as a weapon to get James R. Hoffa; instead, the measure is a broad reform effort aimed at abuses which go far beyond the Teamsters. No doubt some of its voluminous provisions will have to be modified as time goes on, but we surmise that most of it will ultimately meet with approval by union members as well as the public. Labor-management-Government relations at last appear to have reached a state of maturity.

Budgetary Gymnastics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the no-new-start policy on flood-control and water-conservation projects was inaugurated by the old guard Republican administration in order to base a campaign issue on a balanced budget.

The veto of the public works appropriation bill was part of this plan. Since the Republican Party took over the White House, many bills have been vetoed and each one has been sustained by the Congress. It is quite evident that no measure could have become law over the President's objection. It is still more evident that during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, the budget deficit which exceeded $12 billion should be laid directly at the door of the White House, inasmuch as the President could not be compelled by the Congress to accept any law or any program not desired by the Republican administration.

The waste and extravagance, some of which has been uncovered by congressional committees in various branches of the executive department, can by no possible stretch of the imagination be blamed on the Congress.

In order to create a campaign issue, the Republican administration has branded the Democrats in Congress as being "spenders." From the history of the last 6 years, there is no doubt but that had any legislation been disapproved by the President it would not have become law, and only those measures, including supplemental appropriation bills urgently requested by the President, were enacted. Therefore, the deficit of nearly $13 billion can be attributed only to the executive department, which has demonstrated quite clearly to the American people, that it has been wasteful and extravagant. The party in power and the executive officials who belong to that party cannot escape having the term "wasters" applied to them.

Many Members of Congress, because of promises and pressure from the White House, voted to sustain the President's veto against their better judgment. These men were callous in their disregard for the health and economic welfare of the citizens of their districts and States. The sole result of the no-new-start policy is in itself wasteful, because the Army engineers cannot consistently and properly do their job without having new projects on which to begin work before other projects have been completed. In addition, without new starts, the terrific loss suffered by devastating floods may occur and reoccur in many areas throughout the country before the flood-control program is completed.

Further, the economic development of many cities is stifled because of lack of water which cannot be supplied without the erection of huge reservoirs.

One of the leading and probably the strongest of Republican newspapers in the State of Kansas, Mr. Speaker, the Iola Register, recently carried an editorial which recognized the fallacy of the no-new-start program.

Mr. Speaker, I include this editorial as a part of my remarks:

WORKS BILL VETO

Eisenhower's veto of the billion-dollar public works bill upon the score that it includes too many "new starts" on various projects hits right where it hurts.

Every State in the Union has its own pet measures in this catchall bill. Included are everything from huge harbors projects to tiny dams on the Neosho River. Hardly a congressional district in the Nation is lacking some finger in the pie.

Thus many a Congressman and many a newspaper editor now finds himself in an uncomfortable position. He has supported everything else Ike has done to hold down spending and has applauded his other vetoes of spending bills. Can he logically complain now that his own tender toes are stepped on?

Are all of us for economy only so long as it applies to the other fellow?

Well, I can't say that I am surprised at the veto. It is solidly in line with the all-out and thoroughly consistent fight Ike has been making all this term against inflation and overspending in any field.

And he does, of course, have a good point in the fact that while the new starts in this bill involve a relatively few million dollars this first year, they will involve billions before they are completed and will raise the yearly spending rate several hundred millions in just 3 or 4 years.

But there are at least two good questions to be asked in return:

1. Ike asked no new starts last year and this year because the rest of the budget couldn't stand it. Would he ask the same next year and the next? Would there ever be a new start if we waited for the rest of the budget to get in better shape?

2. Couldn't there very well be instances in which it is just as meritorious and just as urgent to start a new project as to complete an old one? Are those of us who have waited 25 years to get the first scratch of work done on the Neosho any less deserving of flood protection than those who got a better break and started their projects 5 years ago?

This could well turn out to be the time when Ike gets a veto overridden for the first time.

Congress is eager to close up shop for a while. House and Senate committees spent weeks and weeks sifting through projects to come out with what they felt was not too much above the President's recommendation—$30 million to be exact.

The idea of starting all over again to whittle the items down to a point that Ike would accept will be utterly repellent. So they will try for an overide first. And it may go over.

If it does, Ike will be happy because he still will have made his point and stuck by his non-inflationary guns. Congress will be happy because their constituents will still each get their little helpings of pork.

And several milion citizens will be happy as they see their pet projects get just a little closer to reality.

Could it be that this is what Ike had in mind all along?

Settlement of Bethlehem Steel Co. Dispute With Shipbuilding Workers Is Vital to Our Country's Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE] has done the Members of the House of Representatives and the public a signal service by forcefully calling to our attention the present stalemate in contract negotiations between the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL–CIO.

It has been pointed out that the Bethlehem Steel Co. operates 8 shipyards along the Atlantic coast employing some 17,000 men who represent the core of shipbuilding know-how in the eastern United States. One of these yards is located in my district at Sparrows Point, Md., and I, personally, know many of the men employed there who have devoted their entire lives to the shipbuilding industry. The Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, AFL–CIO, is one of the country's most highly respected unions. Its members have proved time and again that they are willing to place our country's strength and well-being above their own economic interest.

The union's contract with Bethlehem Steel expired on July 31, 1959. Prior to that time the union's representatives had begun efforts to negotiate a new collective bargaining agreement with the company. The company has presented the union with demands that the union simply could not accept. Principal among these demands is the threatened elimination of the seniority rights of many highly skilled craftsmen.

I believe that the shipyard workers have given strong evidence of their desire to bargain in good faith. They have proposed that the expired agreement be extended for a brief period in order that negotiations could continue. This offer was refused by the company. The union then offered to submit both the company's demands and the union's proposals to arbitration. This offer was also rejected by the company. The union members have further shown their good faith by continuing on the job despite the fact they do not have a contract.

This is particularly significant because in many of its yards Bethlehem shipbuilding is engaged in vitally important work for the U.S. Navy. At this time Bethlehem shipyards are building the nuclear missile carrier *Long Beach* and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*. At the same time one of its yards is converting the missile firing cruiser *Springfield*. We simply cannot afford to lose any more ground in our efforts to match and surpass the growing Soviet military machine.

I call upon both labor and management to join in full and open collective bargaining in keeping with our established tradition of fair play. It has been suggested that the House Armed Services Committee's subcommittee on defense activities conduct an immediate factfinding investigation. There is ample precedent for this step because the same subcommittee investigated a similar situation in 1954. The previous investigation produced favorable results and should the present situation continue, I, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, will support the request for committee action.

I am further concerned by this situation because recently two of our Atlantic coast shipbuilding concerns lost sizable contracts to California shipbuilders. These contracts were lost because of an unfair and artificial 6 percent advantage given California firms by an archaic section of the National Maritime Act. I have introduced H.R. 8176, which will repeal this unfair clause. If the east coast firms are to compete successfully with other areas, with or without this unfair advantage presently enjoyed by some, we must have fair and stable labor-management relations.

We must also consider the absolute necessity of maintaining our pool of highly skilled and experienced shipyard workers. The collective know-how of these men is vital to our national security. The dissipation and eventual loss of these special skills could have a far-reaching effect on our country's ability to produce today's nuclear vessels.

Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that we learned of the upcoming retirement of Walter Lee, of the Judiciary Committee staff, as we feel the Capitol will lose the services of one of its most able and dedicated aides.

By his friendly and sympathetic handling of every request, Walter Lee has established a guide of service for many to follow. He has always been most helpful to everyone who has found the need for information and advice from the Judiciary Committee.

I am sure that Walter will enjoy some time for rest and leisure, well earned by his many years of fine service here at the House of Representatives, but we will all miss his prompt and helpful assistance which has often been taken for granted because of his consistent efforts to give his full attention to every case and request to him.

American Legion Supports White Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, support continues to mount for the proposal to establish a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to carry American surplus foods, medical aid, and supplies to disaster and distress areas throughout the world. This bold new concept for peace, which is the idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson who is now stationed in London, has received overwhelming endorsement from thousands of people and many and varied organizations in the United States. I also have received in my office letters from persons in other countries commenting favorably on this Manson plan.

Another strong and powerful voice in the United States which recently has endorsed this plan is the American Legion, which at its national convention assembled at Minneapolis, Minn., August 24 to 27, 1959, adopted a resolution in support of the Great White Fleet proposal. The Legion not only endorsed the principle of enacting legislation for this Great White Fleet in the Congress of the United States, but it also recommended public support of this proposal by the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD a copy of this resolution:

RESOLUTION 641

Resolution in support of the Great White Fleet proposal

Whereas, a fundamental principle of the American Legion, as set forth in the preamble to the constitution is "to promote peace and good will on earth"; and

Whereas a proposal recently made at the War College by Comdr. Frank Manson, U.S.N. to create and maintain a new Great White Fleet; an unarmed mercy task force under the American flag, manned by Navy personnel, to pursue a definite intinerary around the world; and

Whereas this Great White Fleet during its stops of 2 or 3 weeks each at major ports (particularly in underprivileged countries) would place its hospital, medical and educational facilities at the disposal of the people of that country; demonstrating and training the doctors and nurses of that nation in our most advanced medical techniques; and

Whereas this Great White Fleet would be available at all times for immediate diversion to any major disaster area about the

world where its facilities might be helpful; and

Whereas the estimated cost of $30 million for the operation and maintenance of this Great White Fleet would be far less than has been demonstrably wasted in abortive foreign aid projects; and

Whereas such a Great White Fleet would be a living, daily symbol throughout the world of the sincere desire of the people and the Government of these United States of American for peace, good will and mutual understanding among all men: Therefore be it

Resolved; That the national convention of the American Legion assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, endorses the principle of enabling legislation for this Great White Fleet in the Congress of these United States; and be it further

Resolved; That the American Legion recommends public support of this proposal by the people of this Nation.

Sustaining the Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Evening Star of September 3, 1959, there appeared an editorial and an article by David Lawrence on the Presidential veto of the public works appropriation which are deserving of being preserved in connection with this historic vote wherein the veto was sustained:

WINNING THE BIG ONE

The 1-vote margin by which the House has upheld the President's veto of the public works bill constitutes the closest of close calls. Nonetheless, it was a big win for Mr. Eisenhower in his touch-and-go battle to curb inflation by clamping down on unnecessary Federal spending.

It was a big win because nothing is dearer to a Congressman's heart than a public works bill—sometimes known as a pork barrel bill. There is something in it for the folks back home in almost every Congressman's district, and in this circumstance it is no easy thing to vote to sustain a veto. But the essential votes were there when the showdown came, and the logical inference is that the President, having won this fight, will be able to use his veto power successfully against any other unwise spending bills which may come before him. If this proves to be the case, there will be renewed hope for the future buying power of the dollar.

Mr. Eisenhower's objection to the bill centered on the fact that it carried 67 unbudgeted projects—projects which the administration had not recommended and for which no provision had been made in the budget. It is true that these projects would have cost only $50 million, a relatively small sum, in this fiscal year. But their ultimate cost would have been more than $800 million.

It will be said, we suppose, that the President's attitude is shortsighted, that long-range national development is being sacrificed in the interests of a misguided short-term economy. We do not believe that this is true. Without any of the unbudgeted items, fiscal 1960 expenditures for public works will total $1.1 billion—an all-time high. Furthermore, according to the President, Congress in the past 4 years has written 200 unbudgeted projects into public works bills, and these, in the end, will cost nearly $3.8 billion. Why add 67 more when they are not essential and when they would boost the ultimate unbudgeted costs by another $800 million?

As Mr. Eisenhower indicated in his veto message, these 67 unbudgeted projects represent desirable, as distinguished from necessary, undertakings. At the proper time provision can be made for them in the budget and Congress can begin appropriating the necessary funds. But these things should be planned in a responsible and orderly way. It is time to put a stop to the willy-nilly approach, and we are glad the President has been able to do it.

SUSTAINING THE VETO: REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS ARE SEEN DEVOTED TO PRESIDENT'S LEADERSHIP

(By David Lawrence)

It's a good thing that, in the midst of his fateful trip to European capitals, President Eisenhower has not been confronted with unfavorable news from Congress. For, had the President's veto of the $1 billion public works bill been overridden, the people of Europe, accustomed as they are to a parliamentary system of government, might have construed the rollcall as a formal vote of lack of confidence in Mr. Eisenhower. This could have had a frustrating effect on on the President's mission abroad, where majority vote against the party in power customarily means a change in executive leadership.

Little consideration, on the other hand, was given here to this point by most members of Congress in their voting on the merits of the public works bill that the President had vetoed. Since none of Mr. Eisenhower's previous 143 vetoes have been overridden by the necessary two-thirds vote of both Houses, dramatic attention was centered on the final rollcall.

The margin of one vote by which the veto was sustained may or may not reflect the maneuvers that went on inside both parties. For the issue really turned on what the folks back home would say in those districts where waterpower projects and other Federal construction proposals had been promoted.

Every Member of Congress who had urged Federal appropriations that would bring about the building of public works projects in his own district naturally was on the spot. If he voted against the bill, there was the chance that political capital would be made out of this in the next election by a rival candidate. If the Member happened to be a Republican, he had to consider the effect on his constituency, especially on the Republican voters, if he deserted the leadership of the President.

Some Republicans, but only a handful, did vote to override the veto. Only a small group of Democrats deserted their party leadership in siding with the President. The issue was decided primarily by a straight party vote of Republicans and Democrats, respectively. The small number who crossed party lines really wielded the balance of power. Maybe if there had been any way to determine in advance exactly how the voting would go, the defenders of the bill might have won out. The last-minute changes indicated that nobody was quite sure of the outcome.

As it was, there were all sorts of stories being circulated among the Members to put them in a quandary. Thus, the vetoed bill contained appropriations for 67 new projects which the President said had not been provided for by the Budget Bureau or checked on by the Army engineers, who have for the most part the responsibility for their construction. One rumor was that, if the measure became law, the administration might have to cut down or delay some of the projects begun in previous years in order to hold down the total sum spent. This touched off a wave of apprehension among those Members of Congress who have a deep-seated interest in projects already authorized but not yet completed. It seemed to many Members that it would be better to have new legislation passed that would specifically take care of projects already underway without initiating additional projects. This was the main point in the President's policy in his veto.

Mr. Eisenhower has adhered to basic principles in his relations with Congress, and he is getting the support of the country because of the sound approach he has taken. He is not opposed to necessary construction of public works projects. But he feels that due consideration must be given to overall budget requirements. Usually local projects are enthusiastically recommended by the people in a given district, and a Congressman feels he has to go along with the community's wishes. But the President has to look at things from a national viewpoint.

The fact that nearly two-thirds of the membership of the House of Representatives wanted to override the veto indicates how intense is the pressure for what has often been called the pork barrel legislation. As the projects emerge from committee, a Congressman often feels he has to support the projects in another Member's district in order to get support for his own.

It was surprising, indeed, to find the veto sustained, but it was largely due to the devotion of the Republican Party in Congress to the President's leadership. Had the Republicans given way to selfish local interests, the veto would easily have been overridden.

The final test, sustaining the President's leadership, cannot but have a favorable effect on the Republican Party's position in the country, enhancing its prestige as a responsible party which is anxious to keep the budget in balance and to maintain the Nation's finances on a sound basis, as against extravagant spending and other inflationary policies.

Opposes Display of Russian Flag During Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. John Ayre, secretary, Luzerne County (Pa.) Executive Association of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, which organization goes on record as opposing the displaying, in any form, the Russian communistic flag during the upcoming visit to this country of Nikita Khrushchev:

JUNIOR O.U.A.M. EXECUTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., September 2, 1959.

Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: The Junior Order United American Mechanics being opposed to communism, in any form, in the United States; the Luzerne County Executive Association of the Junior Order United American Mechanics, strenuously oppose the displaying, in any form, the Russian communistic flag

in the United States, before, during, or after the visit of Nikita Khrushchev, to this country, and we therefore ask your support in helping to keep said flag from being displayed.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN AYRE,
Secretary.

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, USN, Addresses the 60th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Los Angeles, Calif., September 3, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, some 20,000 delegates attending the 60th national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States at Los Angeles this week gave their approval to the Navy's nuclear propulsion program as outlined in an address delivered by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy.

Honoring the father of the Navy's nuclear propulsion program, the VFW presented to Vice Admiral Rickover a gold medal award of merit and citation in recognition of his brilliant and determined leadership in the development of a nuclear task force as part of our national defense.

Vice Admiral Rickover's address follows:

OUR NAVAL REVOLUTION

I greatly appreciate the honor which you have bestowed upon me. As I have said many times before, no large project in this scientific and technological age can be the work of one man alone. I am sure you all realize that in honoring me you are really honoring the men and women who work with me in the laboratories, in the factories, in the shipyards, as well as in my own organization. I accept the award in that spirit and thank you in their behalf as well as my own.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars has always taken a keen interest in developments which affect our national strength. It is important in a democracy that you do so. Our country can be no stronger than the people, acting through the Congress, make their desires known. Your organization, by keeping informed on important national issues, plays an essential role in this process. Your past national commander, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, of Pennsylvania, has continued to be active in both the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Naval Reserve. He went directly from the Navy to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy in 1946, when the Atomic Energy Commission was just being set up to take over from the Army's Manhattan project. He has played a leading role on that committee during the entire 13 years since that time, and I can assure you that his firthand knowledge and interest in military and atomic matters has been an important asset to our country. He has unfailingly backed the naval nuclear propulsion program and deserves a great deal of personal credit for it. He also participated actively in a valuable study which the Joint Committee made in 1956 on the education and training of scientists, engineers, and technicians. This study clearly demonstrated the gravity of our educational situation compared with that of Western Europe and of Russia.

I would like to review for you the status and plans of the Navy's nuclear propulsion program on which the Atomic Energy Commission and the Navy Department have been engaged for 12 years. This program has been undertaken during a period when great changes are commonplace. To understand what has happened and what may be expected in the future, it is useful to establish a scale to measure the current rate of technological change.

We often say that the steamship revolutionized naval warfare. But because the conversion of the world's navies from sail to steam took the better part of a century, the changes wrought were more evolutionary in character than they were revolutionary. The impact of the steamship was therefore less drastic than if it had taken place more rapidly.

The change that is taking place in our Navy today, however—the change from oil to nuclear power—is not only revolutionary in concept, it is also revolutionary in impact.

The first serious proposal to build an atomic powered submarine was made in 1949. Four and one-half years later the land-based prototype of the submarine was operating. A year and a half after that the *Nautilus* was at sea, and barely 90 days later she was accepted by the fleet as a combat-ready ship.

Now, less than 5 years after the *Nautilus* first went to sea, we are embarked upon a nuclear shipbuilding program embracing eight different types of propulsion plants for a variety of submarine and surface ship designs. We will have plants to power ships from the small hunter-killer submarine, the *Tullibee*, up to the nuclear aircraft carrier *Enterprise*, propelled by eight powerful reactors which will develop 280,000 shaft horsepower. Our present nuclear shipbuilding program consists of 37 submarines and three surface vessels either completed and operating, under construction, or authorized for construction.

Within a few years we should have at sea the first nuclear powered task force—complete from submarines to carriers. Thus, a technological and military revolution, which in the past would have taken the greater part of a century, will be essentially completed in about a decade.

No conventional submarine has ever run submerged at its top speed for more than 1 hour. By contrast, the nuclear powered *Seawolf* on a single cruise ran fully submerged for 60 days, covering a distance of 13,761 miles. She then surfaced only because she had completed her mission. The *Sargo*, early this year, returned from a single cruise of 19,000 miles, of which 18,880 miles were fully submerged; only 120 miles were on the surface, primarily for entering and leaving port. Further, the *Skipjack* is capable of maintaining indefinitely a speed few ships of any kind can match. And just how well our nuclear submarines are becoming at home in the ocean depths is evidenced by the fact that the *Nautilus*, in her 4½-year life, has spent a total of over 1 full year completely submerged.

Our nuclear submarines have done far more than demonstrate the basic capability of operating submerged at high speeds and for long periods of time.

Even as late as 1950, when the *Nautilus* land prototype was being built, an official publication was being distributed in Washington which contained the following statement: "Development of the transarctic submarine remains in the realm of fantasy."

Now, the *Nautilus* and the *Skate* have thoroughly proved that the transarctic submarine is a matter of reality. They have opened up a fourth large ocean area for the use of our Navy.

The nuclear submarine is particularly adapted to the missile age. Soon there will be in operation the *Halibut*, a nuclear submarine capable of firing Regulus type air-breathing missiles, and the *George Washington*, first of our Polaris-firing submarines.

Armed with the Polaris missile, these underwater satellites could launch their attack from far out in the Atlantic, the Pacific, or the Arctic Ocean. They could be placed anywhere within hundreds of miles of their targets. They could be dispersed over literally millions of square miles of ocean.

The problem of locating and destroying such a underseas fleet will be tremendous. The enemy would be in the position of a man trying to find a black cat on a vast and empty plain on a moonless and starless night. An aggressor would know that if he dared to attack us he, himself, would inevitably be destroyed.

We are beginning to see what nuclear power can do for the submarine. For the surface ship it will provide virtually unlimited cruising radius. Nuclear ships will not have to shuttle back and forth to shore bases for more oil, or require an endless chain of tankers. Nuclear power multiplies about 20 times the distance an aircraft carrier can travel at full speed without refueling, and about 50 times the distance a guided missile destroyer can travel at full speed without refueling. This dividend we can predict. However, as was the case for nuclear submarines, we will be unable to fully appreciate, until we actually operate these surface ships, the meaning of this dividend in terms of increased military capabilities.

Our naval revolution is proceeding quickly. But since returning from the Soviet Union I am more convinced than ever that we cannot afford to relax. The Soviets have the second largest naval fleet in the world. They have 450 submarines compared to our 120. They have done a good job of building an atomic powered icebreaker. In challenging our command of the seas they are proceeding as in all their other endeavors—deadly serious in attitude, unrelenting in aim, and energetic in achievement.

Since World War II the Soviets have built 350 new submarines to our 24. At the outbreak of World War II Germany had but 57 submarines and of these only 22 were oceangoing. Before the German submarine fleet could be destroyed 14 million tons of allied shipping sank to the bottom of the seas. It has been estimated that 20 percent of the entire allied war effort was tied up in antisubmarine warfare. It should be a sobering thought to all of us that the Russian submarine fleet is now 10 times as large as was the German submarine force at the beginning of World War II. The Soviets have more submarines today than the Germans had at any single time during that war.

Too often we think of this huge fleet of submarines merely in terms of ships that might someday lie in wait to sink our merchant and naval shipping. It is common knowledge that the Soviets can now launch missiles with ranges of at least 200 miles from their submarines. It would take but a single such missile accurately placed to cripple any one of our seaboard cities. Before too long missiles from submarines will reach any target in the United States. In my opinion, the best protection of our shores against missile-firing enemy submarines is in setting up submerged barriers of our own nuclear-powered attack submarines which can destroy enemy submarines menacing our coasts.

Fortunately we are, at the moment, ahead of the Soviets in the development of the nuclear-powered submarine. And, it is by far the best antisubmarine weapon we have today. We must make certain that we remain ahead with this antisubmarine wea-

pon system and that we build a sufficient number of these attack submarines to combat the Soviet submarine menace.

The nuclear submarine is a ship that requires no armament for its own defense. The ocean acts as its protecting screen and its armor. As a result, the submarine can be made all weapon, rather than part weapon and part shield. Therefore each of these nuclear submarines constitutes a complete task force in itself.

The work ahead is full of challenge for us. There is much to do to complete the development of an industry to support an expanding nuclear Navy. Our new nuclear shipbuilding capability is just now being tried out. A number of shipyards which have begun construction of nuclear ships have yet to prove that they can rise to the stringent standards of quality and excellence which are a necessity for nuclear power.

We have just scratched the surface in nuclear technology. The *Nautilus* traveled 62,560 miles on her first reactor core of which over half were while fully submerged. To duplicate this performance, a conventionally powered submarine having the size and the power of the *Nautilus* would have required over 2 million gallons of fuel oil. It would take a train of tank cars over a mile and a half long to carry this amount of fuel. On her second reactor core, the *Nautilus* steamed a total of 91,324 miles of which 85 percent was fully submerged. We are now installing in her a third reactor core that may take her three times as far as her first core. We are working on designs which we hope will result in even further improvements in performance and reduction in cost.

One final thought I would leave with you: the rapidity of change in our modern world. There are many examples, but two, one industrial and one military, stand out in the context of what I have said.

The industrial one is Near East oil. In 1901 an Englishman named D'Arcy obtained a concession to drill for oil in Persia. Everyone considered his venture to be highly speculative, and events soon proved this to be true. By 1908, after many unsuccessful drillings his resources were exhausted and it had been decided to discontinue further drilling. Just then oil was struck on the site of an ancient fire temple.

It was this chance discovery which, in the short span of 50 years, had a more profound effect on the industrial life of Europe and on world international affairs than had perhaps the events of any similar period in modern history. The Suez crisis of 3 years ago has amply demonstrated this.

The second example, the military one, is our own Air Force. On August 1, 1907, the War Department created an Aeronautical Division under the chief signal officer. This division consisted of one officer and two enlisted men. Only 40 years later that three-man organization had expanded to become the predominant military arm of the United States. Never before in all history has so tremendous a military change taken place in so short a time.

The lesson from these two examples is plain. We must expect even more rapid changes and displacements in the future. Predominance in any field today is no guarantee of position tomorrow. In light of the ever-spiraling scientific and technological revolution we must be alert; we must anticipate change; we must recognize that no institution is so hallowed that it must not be examined periodically; we must ever bear in mind that the law of life for organizations as well as for nations is: "Adapt or perish."

How Bond Rates Affect You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most informative and effective articles which has come to my attention on the subject of Government bond interest rates is the following editorial from the September 7, 1959, issue of Life magazine:

HOW BOND RATES AFFECT YOU

Nobody in his right mind thinks that Congress would ever imperil the national defense by refusing to pay the Pentagon's bills. And if it did so there would be such an outburst of indignation that Congress would get cracking.

But the reverse of this is happening. The management of the public debt is also of vital concern. Yet Congress is refusing to give the Treasury the powers it needs to manage the public debt in a sound and orderly way. There has been no outburst of public indignation because the issue is difficult for laymen to grasp.

They had better grasp it, for it affects the value of their savings and the security of their future. By its failure to act, Congress is driving up interest rates and adding to inflationary pressures. Here are the simple facts:

The dead hand of the past—a World War I measure passed in 1918—puts a ceiling of 4¼ percent on long-term Government bonds and savings bonds. It is these bonds, bought by insurance companies, trust funds and the savings of individuals, which should carry as much as possible of the public debt because they check inflation by taking savings out of the scramble for goods.

This 41-year-old ceiling on bond interest makes it increasingly harder for the Treasury to sell new bonds. Institutions and individuals, since they can get better rates from other securities, refuse to buy them. Since 1946, for example, life insurance companies have reduced their holdings of Government bonds from 45 percent of their assets to a mere 7 percent. Many individuals cash in their savings bonds.

Instead of putting out long-term bonds with interest rates high enough to make them marketable, the Treasury has been forced to raise the needed money by "short-term paper" (e.g., 91-day notes), which are bought chiefly by commercial banks. Since they are virtually the same thing as cash, these notes can be used by the banks to expand their loans. They can lend $5 of new money for each $1 of Treasury notes they own. This has an immediate inflationary effect.

Furthermore, this "monetizing" of the debt tends to drive up interest rates as the Government competes with other borrowers for scarce money. In the last fortnight, for example, the rate on 91-day notes has just risen to 3.6 percent, the highest level since the bank crisis of 1933. If this trend continues, even short-term interest rates may soon exceed the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term bonds. This freakish result is made more likely by Speaker RAYBURN'S announcement last week that Congress won't act this year on the President's reiterated request for lifting the interest ceiling. Such inaction undermines the dollar by raising doubts abroad as to its soundness and damages the Government's credit, just as it does the economy itself.

Some leaders are urging the President, on his return, to take the issue to the voters as he did on labor reform. If Congress adjourns without action, the President may call it back in special session. But voters themselves can help speed the necessary action by letting their Congressmen know that they back the President. He has stated the issue very clearly:

"The vital interests of all Americans are at stake because excessive reliance on short-term financing can have grave consequences for the purchasing power of the dollar. * * * Let me state as plainly as I can that this is not legislation to increase interest rates. * * * We always seek to borrow as cheaply as we can. * * * To prohibit the Treasury from paying the market price for long-term money is just as impracticable as telling the Defense Department that it cannot pay the fair market price for a piece of equipment. The result would be the same in either case: the Government could not get what it needs."

Tribute to Commodore A. J. Spriggs, Adviser to the Director, Electronics Division, Business and Defense Services Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, during the past 10 months, Commodore A. J. Spriggs, vice president in charge of eastern operations, Packard-Bell Electronics, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif., has served as w.o.c. adviser to the Director of the Electronics Division, providing technical advice on electronics industrial mobilization activities of the Business and Defense Services Administration. A career of service in the U.S. Navy in electronics and communications, and a period of years of experience in responsible positions in the electronics industries formed an ideal background for this assignment. Commodore Spriggs is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy, subsequently, he completed a year of graduate work at the Postgraduate School there, and earned an M.S. degree in radio engineering at the graduate school, Yale University. Commodore Spriggs is a senior member, Institute of Radio Engineers, a member of the American Society of Naval Engineers, the American Ordnance Association, the American Radio Relay League, and other professional groups. He is married and on completion of his tour of duty will reside in Beverly Hills, Calif.

A study by the Electronics Division of available data revealed a serious lack of adequate information on the operations of that segment of the electronics industries group which produces radar, sonar, missile guidance devices, communications equipment and the like. Since the defense of our country is dependent upon adequate capacity to produce these devices, it was determined that a survey of the manufacturing establishments engaged in producing them in 1958 be initiated.

Commodore Spriggs performed with distinction the assignment of developing a program for surveying the commercial, industrial, and military electronics and equipment industry. He secured the concurrence of the Department of Defense and other interested Government agencies as well as a cross-section of industry representatives in his plans for the most comprehensive survey of its kind ever undertaken by the Government. This involved the development of a schedule for reporting, together with comprehensive instructions, to elicit information on shipments, military backlogs, and in some cases factory inventories, for 64 separate product categories of commercial, industrial, and military electronics equipment from some 2,000 plants.

When the survey is completed, a study will be prepared and disseminated to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and others concerned with mobilization readiness to form the basis for policy decisions. The results of the survey will also be published for the benefit of management people in the electronics industries. Because of its great commodity detail it will be an especially valuable tool for management's use in planning expansions of production capacity, for components as well as equipment.

Among his other major achievements are the consultation with officials on OCDM on programs relating to emergency radio communications during a mobilization period and consultation with other Government agencies and members of the electronic industries on needed revisions of order M-17 and and direction 4 to BDSA regulation No. 2. These orders have to do with deliveries of products needed to insure meeting defense requirements and the equitable distribution of the defense load on producers of certain electronic products.

Upon completion of his full-time duty status in the Electronics Division, Commodore Spriggs joined the ranks of the National Defense Executive Reserve. With the concurrence of officials of his company, he has agreed to serve if needed in the adminstration of electronics production programs during mobilization.

Commendation is due the officials of Packard-Bell Electronics for their fine contribution to the defense effort in making it possible for Commodore Spriggs to serve full time in the mobilization readiness work of the Electronic Division for more than 10 months.

On August 25, H. Herbert Hughes, Acting Administrator of the Business and Defense Services Administration, presented to Commodore Spriggs on behalf of Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller a certificate of merit in recognition of his outstanding Government service during the past 10 months. In addition, the Secretary gave Commodore Spriggs a personal letter of congratulations. Mr. Hughes also tendered to Commodore Spriggs a flag which Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON had caused to be flown over the Capitol as a token of recognition of his service to the Nation, the Business and Defense Services Administration, and the Department of Commerce. Mr. Hughes also presented a letter from BDSA Administrator H. B. McCoy expressing appreciation for his services.

Lesson for Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently four boys left the United States for Russia to be returned to their parents' custody. The Illinois court's decision releasing these boys is noteworthy and, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on September 1, 1959.

LESSON FOR MOSCOW

We wish the Moscow newspapers would print the full text of a decision by an Illinois appellate court's chief justice releasing four boys to the custody of their Russian parents who returned to Moscow. But we doubt that they have or will.

Justice Thomas E. Kluczynski overruled a previous decision that the boys could not be restored to their parents until there was proof that they would have a proper home in Russia. Taking note of their desire to be reunited with their parents, the judge spelled out a humane concept of the sacredness of family ties that the Kremlin might well ponder.

"Although we feel our principles and philosophies are better for the civilized, peace-loving world," said the judge, "it is not in keeping with the American principles that we should force or induce by duress belief in them. The court cannot base its opinion * * * upon the proposition that the natural parents, possessed of a sacred and legally recognized right to the care and custody of their children, have embraced a creed not in keeping with our own."

If there were any reporters for Tass or Pravda present in the court, they no doubt skipped the judge's remarks after a Soviet Embassy secretary thanked him for his "human act." The philosophy that guided him in his decision, said Justice Kluczynski, represents a respect for family ties that the Soviet leaders should adopt in their treatment of the thousands of prisoners of war held in slave labor camps despite solemn promises that they would be restored to their homeland. The longer they are separated from their families, said the judge, "the more serious becomes the problem."

Veto Happy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, considerable criticism has been expressed by independent and Republican newspapers as to the President's veto of the public-works appropriation bill.

Many leading economists and conservationists felt that the no-new-start policy in connection with flood-control and water-conservation programs was shortsighted, expensive, and perilous.

An editorial which appeared in the Kansas City Star, a newspaper which is seldom critical of the Republican administration, expressed on Monday, August 31, 1959, the concensus of the great majority of people who reside in the Midwest area. It will be noted that the Star points out the Congress is not expected to surrender its responsibility to the Bureau of the Budget; neither is the Congress expected to surrender its responsibility to the President. But many people throughout the country seem to be under the impression that these responsibilities have already been surrendered to the man in the White House.

Actually, what has happened, government by veto is the order of the day. A veto-happy constitutional lame duck who follows the advice of those least able to counsel is rejecting good sound legislation with reckless abandon.

Progress in flood control and water conservation suffered a terrible setback, Mr. Speaker, by the veto of the President—and when the veto was sustained.

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial as part of my remarks:

ACTIVE RIVER DEVELOPMENT MUST CONTINUE

The President's veto comes as a shock to the supporters of flood control and water conservation. Maybe some of the projects around the country are open to criticism. We don't know. But as it applies to this part of the country it is a very conservative bill. Nationwide, it adds only $30 million to the Budget Bureau recommendations. The argument is over the total obligation in future years.

It is hard to see this bill as substantially more inflationary in this critical period than the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. The question of how much the country should attempt to do at one time is, of course, open to individual judgment. In his veto, the President called on Congress to eliminate all projects that had not been approved by the Budget Bureau. In effect, he implied that the one final authority is the Bureau. On that we can't agree. Congress carries very large responsibilities for the development of the United States.

Today a large part of this country is subject to destruction by floods and withering by drought. Yet the means for protecting itself against floods and for storing the waters of its rivers have been recognized for a generation.

In some areas splendid progress has been made. But until all the major river systems are brought under control the Nation will have to accept prodigious waste. It will have

to bow to destruction by floods. It will watch its most precious resource—water—roll away to the sea. For a great nation to resign itself to such waste would be outrageous.

In the Kaw Valley the river control program is still in an early stage. In the last decade only one reservoir project, Tuttle Creek, has been started. For this basin the river bill proposed only one new start, the Wilson Dam. It is a small one. The Budget Bureau's position would hold back the Kaw River development for years.

Such delays don't save money. They simply delay the time of investment in essential projects. Each year of delay in the Kaw Valley adds a year to the risk of another billion dollar flood. Each year of delay, priceless water flows down the Kaw to be eventually dumped as waste in the Gulf of Mexico.

Opponents of river development like to refer to all appropriation bills as pork barrel. This prejudicial term is a special favorite of some private utilities. Many electric utilities have carried legitimate fear of public power expansion to the extreme of opposing all Federal dams. Not one of the reservoirs planned for the Kaw Valley is intended to produce power but they aroused persistent private power opposition.

We don't doubt that Congress is quite capable of including some unjustified projects. But the overall figures hardly indicate that it is a runaway bill. Certainly the country doesn't expect Congress to surrender its responsibilities to the Bureau of the Budget. By the nature of its work a Budget Bureau, present or future, can't be expected to be a leader in the development of the United States.

The majority leaders of Congress indicate that they will try to override the veto. That seems to be a natural and proper reaction.

Planes for the Marines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Northern Virginia Sun of Friday, August 28, 1959:

THE PROBLEM OF AIR TRANSPORTATION: PLANES FOR THE MARINES

For the past several weeks, a House Armed Services Subcommittee has been investigating the adequacy of air transportation in the event of a mobilization. This is an excellent idea, particularly in view of the controversy over the point among the military services.

It may be, however, that the Congressmen have the cart before the horse.

Everyone talks about limited war as the worst threat we face at the moment. Shouldn't we prepare, then, for air transport in case of limited war?

We haven't, for example, enough air transportation now to get a battalion of combat ready marines out of the Caribbean in 72 hours, let alone to Europe or Asia where the fights are more likely to come.

The service weekly Navy Times said recently that "senior Marine Corps officers" had told them that the corps could not get troops into the Caribbean as fast today as they did into Lebanon a year ago. The reason given was that the Air Force cannot get the planes together and ready to go as fast as the marines can assemble the troops.

Last summer, the marines got a second battalion into Lebanon in 72 hours. It was mostly a happy combination of circumstances which made this possible. Every available bit of corps air transport was poised at the time to haul Marine Corps reservists to summer training. The planes were diverted to the Lebanon airlift and did the job.

The Marine Corps is designed and trained to fight limited actions over a comparatively short period of time and then turn the job over to units prepared to make a long stand. They establish a beachhead and punch a hole through for the Army. This means a lot of men and supplies in a hurry and fast replenishment. You don't get this when you have to work through a second party, which is the Air Force's part, when it is neither organized for your type of fight nor designed to meet your needs.

There may possibly be one best answer. Why not give the marines the planes and men to fly them so they won't be like the man standing in the rain waiting for a taxi when the need arises? If this isn't feasible, the Air Force might assign some transport squadrons to the corps.

Any other solution is liable to result in a lot of unnecessary casualties on some faraway beachhead.

Passage of Des Plaines Wildlife Area Legislation Vital to Illinois Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an item of legislation, H.R. 3894, which may die in committee in these last few days of the session and upon which action should be taken without further delay.

This bill directs the Army and the General Services Administration to transfer to the State of Illinois approximately 2,400 acres attached to the Joliet Arsenal grounds as wildlife hunting, game preserve, and recreational area adjoining the Des Plaines and Kankakee Rivers. This 2,400 acres should provide not only a wildlife and game preserve but also a fine recreation ground.

The Army, however does not wish to give up any rights to the 1,500 acres south of the present preserve and wants to substitute another area of the present preserve. This substitute area has been carefully inspected and pronounced to be totally unsatisfactory. The Army argues that it needs the other area for military maneuvering purposes. Even without the 4,000 acres in question, the Army would have 39,000 acres for maneuvers. It would seem to me that the Army could do some pretty extensive maneuvering in 39,000 acres.

It would be a shame for Congress to adjourn without concurring with the Senate action on this bill which is not only in the interest of the citizens of Illinois but concerns everyone interested in the preservation of our Nation's public recreational areas.

The Student and His Education: The Compelling Intangibles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a timely and excellent address by Dr. Edward K. Graham, dean of Boston University's College of Liberal Arts and Graduate School, entitled "The Student and His Education: The Compelling Intangibles."

Dean Graham delivered the address at the plenary session of the 12th annual Student Congress of the United States National Student Association, in Urbana, Ill., on August 24, 1959.

Dean Graham points out that what is needed most in this day and age is a spiritual rebirth in education, as prerequisite to the plans and programs that we are developing for the next decade. He also emphasizes that our colleges and universities have to provide the stimulus, the order of intellectual excitement and the climate of independence that will attract and hold the best minds we have, and keep them stimulated.

Prior to coming to Boston University in 1956, Dean Graham served as chancellor of the Women's College of the University of North Carolina, 1950–56, dean of faculties, Washington University, 1948–50, and assistant to the president, 1937–40, and secretary of the university, 1940–47, of Cornell University. He is a past president of the Association for Higher Education (NEA). I feel his remarks will prove to be mentally stimulating to Members of Congress.

The address follows:

THE STUDENT AND HIS EDUCATIONS THE COMPELLING INTANGIBLES

(By Edward K. Graham)

The general theme of the 12th annual Student Congress, "The Student and His Education: Views and Previews," is most provocative. It could take you almost anywhere. One look at the brilliantly conceived program suggests that it is doing exactly that.

One place where the theme takes us is the irrepressible question: Is the American university man obsolete?

This is a fair enough question. I do not propose to answer it—not now anyway. That is fair enough too. The answer has to come from the American university man.

At high flood tide of World War II, Carl Becker took an incisive look at what we

called, in those days of our innocence, the postwar world. "We cannot recover the past," he said, "but we can, within the limits set by nature and history and our own intelligence and resolution, make the future." He went on to say that we make the future either by default or on purpose, and "since we help to make the future in any case, it is better to make it not by letting things ride, but by having some idea of where things ought to go and doing whatever is possbile to make them go in that direction."

Mr. Becker called the essay in which this quotation appeared, "How new will the better world be?" Prophet that he was, he was suggesting that the postwar world was not going to be particularly new, and that there was considerable doubt that it would be any better, unless somebody tried to do something about it.

In this year of grace, 1959, those of us whose lives are bound up in higher education stand at about the same point that Mr. Baker stood back in 1943. Of course we are not involved in anything resembling a shooting war (except when somebody tries to revise the curriculum), but there are some interesting parallels. There is that awesome phenomenon that Barbara Ward has called "the deafening patter of little feet." The demographers—not to mention colleges and universities—are suffering a traumatic experience as a result of the explosion in the human population. The ornithologists have been puzzled for years by the decline in the stork population. The answer is very simple. The storks are working themselves to death.

There is something inexorable about this whole business of numbers. Looking at the years ahead, there is a temptation to believe that we shall not have our colleges and universities as we know them, but something else. This involves us in the national pastime of postexplosion planning. How many students can we handle? Will there be 3 million or 6 million in college in 1970? What are we going to do about the utilization of resources? Are community colleges the answer? What about Federal aid to education and a national scholarship program? Where did that loyalty oath come from? Where are we going to get the faculties? As a matter of fact, we get the impression that virtually every question has been asked except, "who put the overalls in Mrs. Murphy's chowder?"

That these questions have occupied so much time and attention is a healthy sign. The disposition is not to let things ride, as Mrs. Becker put it, but rather to have some idea of where things ought to go and to do whatever we can to make them go in that direction. Admittedly we have before us a gigantic task relating to such tangibles as dormitories, dining halls, financial resources, teaching and administrative staffs, organizations, devices for teaching more people in less time, and all the rest. There is, however, a real danger that in our preoccupation with what to do about the sheer quantitative aspects of "the deafening patter of little feet" that we may lose sight of our aims, while as someone has said, we urge each other to redouble our efforts. As the theme of our conference so succinctly suggests, education is an individual matter, and it happens only in a human being. The theme is "The student and his education." It is not "Six million students and where can we put them?"

As we move into the years ahead, these tangible things which are prerequisites for feeding so many warm bodies, getting them bedded down, seeing that they have enough teachers to go around, and so on, will be very important indeed.

But things are only part of the picture. As the late Alan Gregg has reminded us, when we are talking about colleges and universities we ought not to ask, "What is the setup?" We ought to ask "What is the story?" Even more than by things, the story will be told by certain compelling intangibles. These compelling intangibles will have a lot to do with shaping the course of colleges and universities. They may even help provide the answer to that irrepressible question: Is American university man obsolete?

Education, like all living things, is inevitably and drastically affected by the surrounding tissue—by the nature of the campus where it takes place. If we are going to talk about colleges and universities as the surrounding tissue, we ought to have some agreement on what they are. Anyone who has read the assorted brochures, press releases, and various other publications that are put out by well-intended but totally misguided public relations departments, or who has talked with alumni, faculty, and others who are interested, is well aware that our institutions are many things to many people—alumni meetings, a crusade in community service, a gigantic enterprise in human relations, a royal highway to economic success, a royal highway to social success, a disbursing agent, a receiving agent, one long committee meeting, a lot of papers to be written, a parking problem, an assemblage of vice presidents, a building project, IBM systems, and a lot of other things.

Somewhere in all these images, there must be some common denominator of purpose, some basic commitment, to which everyone could subscribe.

Looking at it one way, a university might be conceived as a place where people come to learn something that they have never learned before and a place where, through research, people try to find out something that nobody has ever found out before. But they have an added function. This relates to the intangibles—what colleges and universities stand for. Learning things that you have never learned before, and being part of something where people find out something that nobody has ever found out before, relate to freedom of inquiry and freedom of thought. They relate to independence of the human spirit and the quest for truth. In this, then, colleges and universities are a symbol not only of freedom, but of the responsibility for freedom of thought and freedom of inquiry that is inherent among free peoples.

In this sense, the mission of the university is to focus the attention of our society upon the possible (but not absolutely guaranteed) accomplishment of something good, rather than upon the avoidance of error.

The idea of the university was a lot easier to grasp when the university first appeared on our horizons in the 12th century. The university was simply a guild—that is what the word "universities" meant. It was the guild of masters and scholars. Before there were classrooms buildings and dormitories, before there was a college president, or a board of trustees, when there were no deans, only demons to be exorcised, there was a college or university—the guild of masters and scholars meeting in learned pursuit in a cathedral courtyard. Centuries ago, someone said that the University of Paris was bati en hommes, that is—built of men, a community of men. Nobody has ever improved on that definition.

These universities, then, "built of men," had as their basis a permeating humanistic tradition. They came on our horizon with the renaissance of the 12th century. The first and great compelling intangible which shaped the mission of higher education in the years of its birth was nothing more or less than a dream—an uplifting of the human spirit in the wake of stand-pat conventionalism and intellectual apathy that had characterized Western Europe (with the exception of a few voices crying in the wilderness) from the time of Boethius to the time of Abelard. This dream is a vital thing. It runs like a bright scarlet thread through nine centuries of man's effort to do something about himself.

Modern university man owes a lot to the dream of the devout clerics of Paris and Bologna, but his is the world of here-and-now. His education is affected primarily by what happens at Antioch and California, at Agnes Scott and Ohio State. The American campus is his surrounding tissue. Adequately to carry forward our role as critic and constituent, we need a clear view of the unique character of higher education in this country, as it exists today.

American colleges and universities, as President deKiewiet pointed out in an incisive analysis some 5 years ago, rests on the two pillars of quantity and excellence. In contrast to European institutions where academic tradition looks primarily toward the education of an intellectual elite, colleges and universities in this country are characterized by their infinite variety. Higher education in America is conducted as a mass enterprise, and within this enterprise, all shapes and sizes and conditions of institutions are included. Each attempts to carry forward its particular mission, and at the same time, to be good at it.

The great challenge to American higher education lies in the assignment which it has perhaps unconsciously assumed—education of vast numbers, and the achievement of excellence at the same time. Perhaps the challenge will always be here, but we make a start toward meeting it when we acknowledge the fact that excellence can best be appraised in the light of the specific mission which any institution has chosen for itself, and the success with which that mission is carried out.

Perhaps the most important element in determining the true worth of an institution is the genius or spirit of the place. Here we are dealing with one of the most important of the compelling intangibles. Every college campus worthy of the name, has a personality, and even a character almost as distinct as the character of personality of an individual. Conceivably, this personality or character—this individuality—may be in some danger of getting lost as colleges and universities are caught up in pressures of conformity to the public image of what a college or university ought to be. Nevertheless, of all our national institutions, our colleges and universities stand as the one best hope for individualism, for independence from the insecure togetherness that has produced the junior-executive syndrome—that peculiar combination of symptoms that has kept sociologies and novelists happily writing, and suburban realtors just plain happy.

It has been increasingly popular in recent years to bewail the sad state of the individual in an age of mass civilization. This seems to beg the question. The trouble seems to be not that we have too much civilization but that we have too many individuals. A civilization, after all, is only a conglomeration of individuals. Daniel Boone thought he was a victim of mass civilization when he could hear his neighbor's dog bark, and moved on. My neighbors think they are victims of mass civilization when they hear my dog bark, and wish I would move. The whole thing is relative. What we are up against is as nothing compared to what your children and my grandchildren will see on this earth. In the year 2059 these may well be known as the good old days of 1959. The problem of the individual, and more particularly the individualist, is to develop his powers and bring his influence to bear in such a way that he helps make the kind of society in which he wants

to live. And he works not with the society that he wishes he had, but with the society he has got.

As the education of the individual is conditioned by the surrounding tissues—that is, the colleges and universities in which it takes place—so are colleges and universities affected by the society in which they exist. The surrounding social tissue which we should influence for good may, in turn, exert pressures that shape our existence adversely.

It was suggested earlier that our colleges and universities are our one best hope in this country for maintaining independence of thought and freedom from that type of conformity which compels us more and more in the direction of the lowest common denominator of acceptable mediocrity. Is it possible that one reason for the declining prestige of our institutions may be that they have lost, in many instances, that peculiar individuality, that somewhat cantankerous independence, that set them off and distinguished them from other benevolent corporations such as the more enlightened industrial firms? Is it our job to turn out a phenomenon that might be called "the man in the gray flannel mortarboard"? If colleges and universities reflect in their thinking, and in their profession of faith, the lowest common denominator of acceptable viewpoints on social issues or if they reflect no viewpoints at all, they do not justify their existence as centers of forward-looking and progressive thought.

This is a problem that everyone ought to ponder in a generation when such a high percentage of our adult population is college educated. Going to college in and of itself is no longer a mark of distinction. It has become a prerequisite to status, and as more people go, the prestige factor will decline. Among the advantages most frequently asserted by our palpitating public relations officers is the economic advantage, closely followed by the social advantage. Both advantages are badly overstated, and the product of misguided people who frequently are themselves eloquent evidence of the futility of a college education that didn't take.

We have spoken of climates of opinion and public attitudes as a force which may work adversely in certain respects in the development of colleges and universities in the years ahead, through an overly sensitive response—on the part of colleges—to what they think the public wants them to be. I believe that the public wants the colleges first and foremost to be good. The public relations people have not adequately understood this important fact yet.

But let me give you an example of what happens when an institution takes a realistic look at what it has to offer, and a realistic look at what people want. When Harvard celebrated its 300th anniversary in 1936, John R. Tunis—I think it was—made a rather careful study of his class of 1911 as part of the reunion activities and reported on what his classmates had been up to during the 25 years since they got out of college. I don't remember all of his conclusions, but one of them I shall never forget. "The class of 1911," he said, "illustrates the futility of college men in general and Harvard men in particular."

Now, Harvard in those days was generally regarded as a place for Boston Brahmins, plus a few odd-balls, squares, and assorted misfits from the back country. There was the Business School of course, for normal people, but they kept that across the river, so that it would not contaminate anybody.

Look at the difference today in the public image of Harvard. Starting shortly after the war, Harvard made an accelerated effort to get across the idea that Harvard was for excellence wherever it could find it. The response has been amazing. People want excellence. Rightly or wrongly—and I think it is rightly—the public image of Harvard has changed from that of a relatively isolated phenomenon on the educational scene to that of a great university which has considerable significance for boys from East St. Louis, for example, provided they have enough on the ball to get in. This has been one of the best jobs in the history of public relations in higher education, honestly and eloquently relating what an institution has to offer, to what prospective college students really want.

College students want excellence and they want it in terms not of abstractions and generalizations, but in terms of meaningful experience. They want it in relation to the times in which they will live.

These times of great social change, with times of even greater change in prospect, are another of the compelling intangibles basic to our previews of the student and his education.

A rather remarkable conference was held in Salonika within the past month, under the sponsorship of the World Council of Churches. The conference was addressed to the responsibility of the church in areas of rapid social change. Here are some impressions from an account given me by Dean Mueider, of our school of theology, who came back from Salonika amazingly uplifted in spirit—even for a Methodist minister.

The conference involved all sorts and conditions of men. There were economists, sociologists, political scientists, and a variety ofr other academic people, as well as representatives from the various churches participating in the World Council. And they came from some 38 countries—from Western Europe and the NATO countries, from Japan and the Philippines, from the Middle East, India, the Belgian Congo, from Nigeria, Liberia, Ghana, and so on.

I was profoundly interested in one or two of the observations that Dean Mueider had to offer. In this gathering of the old and the young countries of the world it had become clear that a young country accepts responsibility for leadership, and produces leaders, once there is motivation for leadership. This can take the form of an expressive nationalism, as opposed to an aggressive nationalism or a defensive nationalism.

A second point brought out very strongly was that university people from countries which were consciously aware that they were undergoing rapid social change were convinced that you do not get at social problems in education except by an interdisciplinary approach; that we have long passed the time when isolated subject matter approaches can serve effectively to bring to bear university resources upon the problems of society. The import, I suppose, is not to eliminate specialism, but rather to emphasize the interdependence of fields of knowledge, and the need for integrated education—particularly in the social sciences—for productive citizenship in our time.

Now all of this set up a provocative train of thought. First of all, there are many types of social change in the world today, over and beyond those which we identify in the wake of the dramatic birth of young nations like Ghana. These changes take place in the older countries. They are taking place in America, and at a rate that is virtually fantastic.

This business of social change and higher education is a fascinating thing. The wandering scholars of the middle ages, the devout clerics of Paris and Bologna, Oxford up to the time of John and Charles Wesley—dedicated men worshipping God and the new humanism and the new science all in the same breath—were clearly conditioned to their centuries. There was liberal education as it came to America, designed to provide teachers for the proper instruction of youth, physicians for caring for them while they were in this world, and ministers for seeing that they were headed in the right direction when they passed on to the next one.

Now we are in a century when education would appear as the best hope for pointing the way toward living with other peoples on this contracted planet, and living with each other at home. This business of living with each other at home we usually think of as minority problems.

The first minority to hit these shores were the white protestants, who were outnumbered by the Indians and who came over here protesting against some protestants back home in England. Then there were the Irish. Then there were the Jews. Then there was the Negro, after Reconstruction when we got started on the long and unromantic road toward meaningful citizenship. Finally, there is the fifth minority—women. To these last, only this affectionate and unpatronizing word in passing: you will get what you want, because you deserve it and you have what it takes. Of course you will have to play by men's rules to get it. But this will not be hard. The hard part will be getting men to play by men's rules.

What I am getting at is that there is no such thing as a majority any more. Everybody belongs to a minority of one sort or another. And we all need each other.

During the Korean war, American soldiers added a new word to the vocabulary—"gook." They had heard the Korean use it, and so they used it to designate Koreans. They did not know that the Koreans were talking about them. I think it was my Korean colleague David Kim who told me that "gook" means anybody who is not from wherever you happen to be from—in other words, a foreigner. Everybody is a "gook" to somebody. All of us "gooks," faced with the happy necessity of living with all the other "gooks" in this world, are aware that an education which does not take this happy necessity into account and do something with it, is no education at all.

An educated American must know the language of some of the other peoples of the world, their culture, and their ethics, otherwise he is not a well educated American. There is no substitution for excellence in world understanding. I have seen the data on Americans who have been returned home from foreign service—both for the Government and for business—because they were not intellectually or emotionally equipped to do the job. The numbers run into the thousands; each represents, in a way, a failure in international relations. Each represents a failure in education.

What we need most of all is a spiritual rebirth in education, as prerequisite to the plans and programs that we are developing for the next decade. Our colleges and universities have to provide the stimulus, the order of intellectual excitement, and the climate of independence that will attract and hold the best minds we have—and keep them stimulated.

If there is to be a spiritual rebirth, then we have to look to the source of the excitement that brought the barefoot scholars to Oxford and Paris and Bologna those centuries ago; the excitement that followed in the wake of the great land-grant colleges, the peoples' universities, of the 19th century, the excitement produced by the rarified atmosphere of the graduate schools at the Hopkins and at the University of Chicago at the beginning of this century. We need new ideas from somewhere.

The recent history of the United States National Student Association has produced some of the best—and certainly some of the most stimulating—thinking that we have had. Perhaps the excitement that brings to not-so-barefoot scholars to Urbana for this 12th annual student congress suggests that the spiritual rebirth may be already on its

way. Take if you will, the commitments of the U.S. National Student Association. Compare them with the commitments of Andrew Dixon White who, 80 years before NSA was founded, envisaged "a system of self-government, administered by the students themselves." A university as Mr. White saw it, was for the development of a higher order of man, for "the development of the individual man in all his nature, in all his powers, as a being intellectual, moral, and religious * * * and bringing the powers of the man thus developed to bear usefully upon society."

To bear usefully upon society, this is the ultimate test of whether or not American university man is to become obsolete. I can give now my own judgment on the question that I asked on this point at the outset. He is far from it; a lot farther than my generation in college was. His great opportunity and challenge is to help his institution from becoming obsolescent; to lend it his strength and his support in the job before it.

What will the story be in the years ahead? How new will the bigger university be? Not so new, in all probability. All of us have a profound moral obligation to give, to the limit of our ability, educational opportunity to those who come to us in seriousness of purpose and who really should go to college. We have a moral obligation, furthermore, to give our support to national scholarship and loan programs designed to provide college education for the thousands of superior students who would otherwise be excluded for financial reasons.

Moral obligation does not, however, require that we abandon our original mission and purpose on any individual campus. No well established and successfully operating institution is going to change its dimensions to the extent that it will destroy what it has built, in terms of excellence, over the long years. There is, I think, considerable latitude remaining in our institutions in handling the increased number of applications that are flooding in upon us. This latitude lies in elimination of that considerable segment of the college and university population which probably has no business being there in the first place.

If our colleges and universities should, in their efforts to accommodate numbers, or to collect tuition, destroy what they have built over the long years in terms of excellence, then indeed we should not have our institutions as we know them, but something else. Will Amherst stop being Amherst? Will Cornell stop being Cornell? Will the University of Massachusetts stop being the University of Massachusetts? There is every reason to believe that they will do nothing of the sort.

Amherst will doubtlessly bring every resource to bear, within her mission and its purpose, to meet the demands upon her, but she has no moral obligation to educate everyone who wants to go to Amherst—only as many of them as she can wisely serve.

Cornell will keep on being Cornell, with a few more cyclotrons and the many-headed Hydra of the State University system to help take the heat off.

The University of Massachusetts will continue to be the vital, progressive, and expanding land-grant institution that it is—the people's University of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. But it will build upon its recent and productive history only if the will of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts can recognize its great potential, and can provide the resources so urgently needed and so recently denied.

It seems most unlikely that our institutions will not change their personality and character, and tear down what they have built up over the long years in terms of excellence, simply to accommodate numbers. Like most prophesies, this is true only within certain limitations. State universities and, more particularly, State university systems, are going to expand in response to a demand, or in response to what somebody thinks is a demand, and they will do this both by enlarging existing plants and by building new ones. Privately endowed institutions, perhaps to a lesser extent, will similarly undergo physical modification. Virtually all types of institutions undergo changes from time to time. They simply undergo more changes at some times than they do at others.

But there is a third type of institution. It calls itself privately endowed, but in reality it is tuition supported. More and more institutions fall into this category. It is my conviction that, whatever the type of institution, the money that a student pays for his tuition should go directly into services to the student, and should not go into plant or fringe operations that do not relate directly to his education. The tuition-supported institution may or may not expand, but it should not charge the student for expansion. It should charge him only for services.

Without being aggressive about it, the student has a right to know what happens to his tuition dollar. Many of you have heard the old bromide that it costs somebody twice as much as you put in for your own education. This used to be true at many places. It is still true at some, where endowment and annual giving programs are large and the proceeds are used to subsidize teaching and student services. It is not true at many others. If it were, we should simply cut the student body in half and raise faculty salaries. Large buildings have been built from tuitions that should go into instruction, student health services, and sound activities programs.

To carry to its logical conclusion the thesis that one of the great strengths of the American institution lies in its infinite variety, then the story of our education for the next urgent decade will be told not in the findings of Presidential commissions or in the reports of foundations and professional organizations. It will be told on each individual campus, and it will be determined in large measure on how well we direct the compelling intangibles for good.

This brings us back to the role of the student as critic and constituent, as the functioning part of the guild of masters and scholars. Hopefully, it will keep him intelligently involved, and intelligently participating, in the vital assignment of bringing our resources to bear on the strength and effectiveness of our colleges and universities not only now, but in his years as an alumnus.

The final intangible is a bit on the esoteric side, but it will be a powerful one. You may remember what was said at the outset about the uplifting of the human spirit and the birth of our first universities, and how this uplifting of the human spirit runs like a bright scarlet thread through nine centuries of higher education. This spiritual quality, aesthetic as well as religious, is reflected in interesting ways. We note in passing that the Annual Student Congress has no display of technological equipment, but it does feature an art exhibit.

Mr. Whitehead touched on this matter of spirit in his familiar phrase, "the habitual vision of greatness." In another place, he writes on the nature of beauty, and the appeal of beauty to the spirit. "Show youth where beauty dwells, and there it will abide."

Now this sets up a provocative train of throught, the relationship of beauty to the romance of education, and possibilities for illusion and disillusion.

Show youth where beauty dwells—beauty is an evanescent thing, and youth a fraction of a story not yet told. Abide—that means forever—and forever is a long, long time.

Is beauty in the setting sun? Refracted rays through dust, cold mist up there, a chill—a trace and more of strontium. (They don't make sunsets quite the way they used to do.)

Is beauty in a vapor trail? A sine-curve thrown across the sky, behind a silver dot in space. The moving finger writes on faded denim arch—first clean, white line, then feather edged; then empty space.

Will youth abide in Gothic arch at Chartres or Saint-Chapelle, where rib-and-panel vault, the buttressed walls, the rose that unifies the whole, glory to God reveal in glass and living stone? (Miniver Cheevey would have had it so.)

Or does beauty dwell in clapboard church, weathered, on a country road; in darkest watch of sickroom; or in public ward—wherever spirit sees through mist and dust of life refracted rays of hope, the spectrum of the heart.

Our colleges and universities are an act of faith and hope, and it is in faith, hope, and hard work that those who love them, and who believe in what they stand for, must lend them strength as we move into times when their greatest tests will be upon them.

The U.S. National Student Association has become a mighty force, as well as an eloquent voice, in forwarding the cause. And you have done this objectively, with imagination, and with responsible and mature insight. It may well be that the spiritual rebirth in higher education, so urgently needed, may be given its major impetus by the American student. You have the respect and the envy of those of us who have gone before you, and our confidence in you is exceeded only by our pride in what you are.

On this rising note, may God speed this 12th Annual Student Congress.

Hon. J. Bayard Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALTON LENNON
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege of extending remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of our colleagues a further tribute to the late Honorable J. Bayard Clark. A splendid editorial from the Bladen Journal, Elizabethtown, N.C., follows:

[From the Bladen Journal, Elizabethtown (N.C.) Sept. 3, 1959]

BLADEN LOSES AN ILLUSTRIOUS SON

Bladen County has given a number of illustrious sons to the State and Nation during the 225 years of her history, but none have achieved more, nor reflected greater luster upon the mother county than Hon. Jerome Bayard Clark, who entered his last sleep at the twilight hour on Wednesday, August 26, in a Fayetteville hospital.

Mr. Clark's record in the Congress of the United States for 20 years, during one of the most trying times ever known in this Nation, was a record of achievement, and as a member of the important Rules Committee, he had an important part in framing the legislation which brought about an eventual victory in World War II.

Bladen is proud of her son's many achievements, but perhaps she loved him best for the man he was—a brilliant gentleman of the highest type of integrity, personal and public—a man of justice, but filled with mercy; a loyal friend, regardless of circum-

stances—a man to whom men of all stations in life could take their problems, and know he would do something to improve them—a friend of Bladen people always, and they loved him.

Congressman Clark never lost his interest in Bladen, and found pleasure, as long as he lived in visiting here, walking the dear familiar ways, clasping the hand of old friends, recalling many an incident of the years gone by, with remarkable exactness.

An illustrious son of Bladen has "drawn the mantle of his couch about him and lay down to peaceful dreams." His memory will forever be cherished here.

To Be Safe, Be Prepared To Fight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interview with Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, as reported by Mr. Courtney Sheldon in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, September 2, 1959:

TO BE SAFE, BE PREPARED TO FIGHT—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH ADMIRAL BURKE

(By Courtney Sheldon)

Adm. Arleigh A. Burke ("31-knot Burke"), the brilliant destroyer tactician of World War II Pacific warfare, now Chief of Naval Operations beginning an unprecedented third 2-year tour of duty as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

Is "very much worried" about whether the Nation is spending enough to retain its capability for limited wars.

Says what the country needs for general-war deterrence "is enough missiles, and it is not very many, and then go a little slowly. That is why we (the Navy) put a limit, somewhere between 40 and 50, on Polaris submarines."

"Admiral Burke, what is the probability of limited war in the next decade?"

"Well, the Russians are trying to get control of the world, but they do not want to take any risks of destroying what they have gained. They push up to the point where they think they are going to have serious resistance. Then they stop, and they will actually retreat, as they did in Finland, and in other places. So, in general, the probability of limited aggressions in the world is, I think, quite great."

"How do you see the role of the Navy in such wars?"

"As a matter of fact nearly all the free world is on the sea, and maybe that is not accidental. Although the Navy cannot do the job by itself, the job cannot be done unless we first do our job."

"Do you feel that at the present rate of expenditures we will have the capability for limited war that you would like?"

"Not the capability that we would like. I am very much worried. I am not an economist. I don't know how much this country can pay in taxes. There is probably a limit beyond which we should not go. That is for other people to determine. Now within that limit military hardware is costing a lot more now than it did a few years ago. New aircraft costs a lot more money than 3 or 4 years ago. Any of the service missiles costs tremendously. So it means that there is less money available for other things, for lesser situations."

"What can be done about it?"

"You have got to do one of two things, either increase the total amount of money available, which is difficult, or adjust the balance within the amount of money that you have available. In adjusting the balance you have to take into account what the military forces will be called upon to do. And you go through the range of cold war, limited war, and general war. We have been emphasizing general war a great deal. I personally do not believe that as long as we have the capability of destruction of any prospective enemy that there will be a general war, because nobody can win on that."

"The Navy's Polaris ballistic missile will be another general-war strategic weapon. If you are thinking in terms of balance, this means a cutback somewhere."

"It should, in other strategic types of weapons that can do the same thing. Now all the intercontinental and intermediate range ballistic missiles and Polaris missiles, too, are only good for mass destruction. They are not good for limited situations because their destructive power is too great. If you spend all of your money on building general-war retaliatory forces, then you don't have any left over for those things which are more probable.

"What I am saying is that we need enough of these forces with the ability to destroy Russia, and no more. Now the question of how much is enough is dependent upon what you choose for targets and our knowledge of where the targets are."

"This is the question which arose during congressional hearings last spring from remarks by yourself and General Taylor which implied that we were not coming to grips with exactly what targets should be pinpointed?"

"That is right. We are coming to grips with them, but there is a difference of opinion on how many targets we should strike. We think there is a limit, and a very safe one. Make the best computation you can and then double or triple it, if you wish. Once you get this, let's spend our money for those things that we will need 5 or 10 years from now and which will still be around and still be invulnerable."

"This is not then a criticism of the decision-making process in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but simply a different opinion?"

"On how much and how fast. The system is fine. Now you take an alert force. The Air Force is very much concerned and rightly so about the vulnerability of the Strategic Air Command. A missile surprise attack on this country aimed at SAC bases would create havoc. So SAC is quite rightly striving to get as much early warning as it possibly can get and to reduce the vulnerability by such means as dispersal and hardening, both of which are quite expensive. They have a strip alert and there is consideration being given to an air alert.

"Now should we spend a tremendous amount of money on air alert or should we increase the rate of production of missiles Polaris, Atlas, Titan? These missiles all do the same thing. What we need is enough missiles, and it is not very many, and then go a little slowly. That is why we put a limit, somewhere between 40 and 50, on Polaris submarines. They carry a sizable warhead. Each one of these submarines can destroy tremendous areas."

"We have a big war deterrent in the Strategic Air Command. Now is there a comparable command we should have for readiness for limited war situations?"

"The big war planning is not in SAC. It is done by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. War is fought by many people and many commands. Now in limited war the unified commands have the responsibility, and in cold war also. There is no way that you could have a single outfit, a single-man plan for limited war. You have difficult and different situations all over the world."

"Is it possible to look forward to a time, say in the next 10 years or so, when you would say we would have achieved an indestructible deterrent force?"

"No, and it will never be. There have been such forces in the past and remember what happened to Troy, Carthage, and Rome. The only way the world is going to be safe is for individuals and groups of people, nations, to continue to be prepared to fight for their freedom. When nations get complacent and satisfied and they would like to keep things just as they are, events move around them and they become engulfed in a more virile and less sophisticated civilization. That is what might happen to us."

Dr. A. E. Mercker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, Al Mercker has received recognition for his achievements in agricultural work at both government and private life levels.

I have had the privilege of having personal association with Al over a period of many years, and during this time I have come to respect his high character and admire his profound ability.

It has been said that a man is a reflection of his background, and the following article entitled "Men on the March," appearing in the August–September 1959 issue of the Vegetable Growers Messenger, points up why—as anyone who knows him can attest—Al is a man of many splendid dimensions.

Because many Members of Congress know Al Mercker, I feel certain they will be interested in these background ingredients that have contributed to the Al they know:

MEN ON THE MARCH

Al Mercker is probably the best known white potato man in the United States. Some say in the world, since he has traveled widely in North America and on the European Continent with leading U.S. agricultural representatives looking for ways to help U.S. growers to do a better job of production, packaging, transportation and marketing potatoes and vegetables.

He started out as a country boy and after finishing high school completed his B.S. degree in horticulture at Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J., in 1915. He worked his way through college by selling vegetables for New York commission houses. In 1918 the USDA Market News Division assigned him to Boston but not for long for he went into the Army. Discharged by the end of 1918 he was transferred to Chicago as a vegetable inspector. In 1922 he was acting supervisor in New York City and later trained inspectors for shipping points, formulated grades and standards in cooperation with State boards of agriculture and other agencies.

During 1927 he was chief of the bureau of markets for the New Jersey Department

of Agriculture. The next year he worked with the Federated Fruit and Vegetable Growers Cooperative Association and in March 1929 the late Secretary of Agriculture, Henry M. Jardine, invited him to become secretary of the Interstate Early Potato Committee. This was a joint program of the Agriculture experiment stations, extension services, State departments of agriculture, the BAE of USDA, potato producers and shippers.

Active in the development of the Pacific Northwest Potato Committee until 1935, he then became Administrator of the Warren Potato Act. Following the repeal of the act he worked on the diversion of surplus white and sweet potatoes into industrial byproducts for livestock feeds and new uses. He was active in the development of marketing agreements and potato acreage allotments.

Mr. Mercker is the man who started and fostered the idea of producing a better grade of starch from white potatoes. His plan readily gained the assistance of friendly European starch experts.

When World War II broke he was assigned to the War Food Administration and had an important part in the procurement and distribution of potatoes for the Armed Forces and civilians. The potato dehydration program for the armed services was a part of his work. Under the Steagall Act, when potatoes became a price supported commodity, Mr. Mercker administered the price support program in the F and V branch of the PMA as acting chief of the potato division. In 1948 he was instrumental in getting 300,000 tons of American potatoes exported to Europe.

In 1954 he received a plaque for meritorious work from the National Potato Chip Institute. An honorary life membership in the Potato Association of America was awarded to him 1955. The University of Maine in 1948 gave him an honorary doctor of laws degree for distinguished service to the potato industry.

After 36 years of loyal service this amiable, animated, and friendly man resigned from Government service to become executive secretary of the National Potato Council whose offices are located in the Munsey Building, Washington.

Every man has an avocation, "Al" Mercker's hobby is chrysanthemums and gladioli. For the past 8 years he has been president of the National Gladiolas Society of Washington, and grows about 200 varieties of this beautiful flower.

Always interested in young people he has been a long time active Scouter serving on the Cub committee and as chairman of the local Scout troop committee for many years. He is a member of the Lutheran Church and a congregational member of the Baptist Church, which is attended by all three of his sons, who by the way, might be called "chips off the old block." Albert E., Jr., a graduate from the University of Maryland in agricultural economics is now selling petroleum products in Saigon, South Vietnam, Asia. Son Rodney Clark graduated in forestry, Michigan State University, and is now in the Personnel Division of the National Health Institutes at Bethesda, Md. Donald F., the youngest, graduated from Dickinson College and lives in Detroit, Mich.

Dr. Mercker and his wife, Frances have been married 41 years and have resided in the same home in the Northwest section of Washington for the past 30 years. Her hobby is needlepoint work and her outside activities are devoted to work in connection with children's homes.

Next to potatoes Al's favorite dish is seafood. His ambition is to work as closely with potato growers as long as they will let him.

Potatomen say that hard hitting, industrious "Al" Mercker knows more about the potato industry than any other man in the country and he almost admits that his hobby is living, studying, talking, and eating potatoes.

Here is another "Man on the March" who has made a powerful contribution to the potato and vegetable industry and the Nation.

Gypping Bond Buyers, Taxpayers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on August 29, 1959:

GYPPING BOND BUYERS, TAXPAYERS

Uncle Sam borrowed $2 billion last month by selling 1-year "bills"—I O U's due next July. He had to pay more than 4.7 percent interest on them to attract buyers.

This is the highest interest rate he has had to offer to raise money since the Roaring Twenties.

Washington can't make investors buy Federal notes, bills, or bonds at any price it wants. The investor sets the market price, not the Treasury.

If Washington wants to borrow money, it has to pay interest high enough to lure investors into making the loan.

Somehow this simple fact of life has escaped the House Ways and Means Committee. Last week, it turned down the White House request for permission to lift the interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds.

At present, the law says the Treasury can't pay more than 4¼ percent interest on regular securities that mature in 5 years or more. However, the sky's the limit on Treasury I O U's that must be repaid sooner.

The House committee is trying to give the impression that it is holding down interest rates by refusing to up the ceiling. That, of course, is baloney.

Uncle Sam can't sell his long-term securities when they pay only 4¼ percent. So when he has to borrow he is forced to raise the money on short-term loans that aren't under a ceiling.

It is difficult, expensive, and inflationary for Washington to live from hand to mouth, by raising money on short-term loans.

President Eisenhower has asked Congress to lift this ceiling on long-term Government bonds, and to raise the interest rate on U.S. savings bonds. We hope Congress will say "Yes" to both requests.

Savings bonds now pay a maximum of 3½ percent interest, if held for 8 years, 11 months. More than 40 million Americans have some $42 billion of their savings tied up in these bonds.

But at the price Washington now has to pay to borrow money, the savings-bond buyer is getting gypped. For the past year, many of them have been selling their bonds, because the interest price isn't right.

Last month, the Treasury sold $350 million worth of these savings bonds—many of them on company payroll deductions. But more than $500 million worth were cashed.

What is happening to savings bonds and to short-term Treasury I O U's should be plain as the nose on your face, even to the House Ways and Means Committee; namely, that it cannot make Americans lend Uncle Sam money at low interest rates, when they can get a better return elsewhere.

What the House is doing in this: It is killing the sale of savings bonds and keeping Uncle Sam from floating long-term loans. As a result, the House is forcing up interest rates on short-term I O U's by making the Treasury rely on them more heavily than it should.

This stubborn attitude is making it more expensive for the Treasury to borrow money and depriving 40 million savings-bond holders of a decent rate of return on their funds.

The Ways and Means Committee should get its head up out of the sand and learn what's going on.

Award of Paul Bunyan Award to Senators Capehart and Sparkman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and I were honored by the Lumbermen's Forest in Israel, an organization in Pennsylvania consisting of people directly or indirectly concerned with home building. This organization honored Senator CAPEHART and me by giving to each of us the Paul Bunyan annual award. The award was made to each of us according to the wording of the plaque "in recognition of his foresight and unrelenting effort in sponsoring legislation for a progressive housing policy aiming to provide the finest housing in the world for the American people." I deemed it a great honor and I am sure that the same was true for Senator CAPEHART.

On that occasion I made a brief talk. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Senator CAPEHART, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am overwhelmed by your courtesy in doing me this great honor. I think that even Paul Bunyan himself would have been impressed with the dimensions of your generosity.

It is fitting that there should be events, such as this, celebrated in the name of Paul Bunyan. His name is symbolic of the resilience and audacity of a frontier society. This frontier spirit is well expressed by Carl Sandburg when he says that—

"The people will live on.
The learning and blundering people will live on.
They will be tricked and sold and again sold
And go back to the nourishing earth for rootholds,
The people so peculiar in renewal and comeback,
You can't laugh off their capacity to take it."

Daniel G. Hoffman quotes those few lines from Sandburg and observes that the poet finds in the Bunyan stories, "conquests of terror by laughter, of despair by comic in-

genuity, and the victory of the indomitable human spirit over adversity."

No task was too great for Paul Bunyan, nor for the indomitable people who created his legend, nor for the people who came after him—both here and in freedom-loving lands abroad.

I wish that we had a Paul Bunyan to take over the task of housing the American people. This is a task which will require all our talents and all our determination.

According to the Bureau of the Census, in 1957 13 million homes in this Nation were substandard—this represents 24 percent, or 1 out of 4 of the 55,340,000 dwelling units in the continental United States. In 1950, the Census Bureau reported 16 million substandard dwelling units, so that in those 7 years we made some progress, but very little indeed when one considers the high level of prosperity during the period.

Why is this?

The simple answer is that we are not producing enough housing units to meet the need. We are not adding enough new units to force abandonment of many existing units which are worn out and have long ago ceased to be fit for human occupancy.

The formation of new nonfarm households over the past few years has amounted to about 1 million units per year. Housing starts, according to the Bureau of Labor statistics, have been a little over 1 million units per year. This is just enough to take care of new household formation.

We must increase production of housing in the future. We have a dual job. First, to produce enough new units to accommodate the big family formation expansion expected to take place in the mid-1960's; and second, to replace the old, wornout, and dilapidated units still occupied.

The babies of the midforties will be the new heads of households of the midsixties, so it requires only simple arithmetic to estimate the probable new family formation for that period. In addition to the need to build enough units to meet the requirements of new household formation and to replace existing substandard units, there is an ever-pressing demand for improvement in the quality of housing consistent with our existing standard of living.

The construction of homes priced to meet the growing needs of larger families is another pressure for expansion of housing construction.

With all these demand factors in mind, we have some rough idea of the job ahead of us. With the right product and the right price, housing production of the mid-1960's could easily double that produced today.

The question is—Can it be done? Do we have the tools to produce housing units within the next 10 years at a rate double the present performance?

I know what Paul Bunyan's answer would be—and my answer is the same. We can produce as much housing as we are willing to produce—and we should never rest until every family in this Nation has a decent home in a suitable living environment.

It is also fitting that Paul Bunyan should be a symbol for your efforts to encourage land reclamation and the development of forests in Israel. For Israel is indeed a frontier, even as our own land was—not so many years ago. Perhaps this work you do through your committee is in partial fulfillment of God's word, when He spoke through Isaiah to say:

"I will open rivers in high places, and fountains in the midst of the valleys: I will make the wilderness a pool of water, and the dry land springs of water.

"I will plant in the wilderness the cedar, the shittah tree, and the myrtle, and the oil tree; I will set in the desert the fir tree, and the pine, and the box tree together."

You in this assembly, and others all over the country, are helping Israel survive under difficulties almost beyond imagination. Israel is an area no larger than the State of Massachusetts, bordered on three sides by unfriendly nations, and suffering from a minimum of natural and climatic resources. We are helping this tiny nation to remain a lamp of freedom, in a part of the world besieged by Communist pressures, in spite of the many handicaps her people face.

What has already been accomplished toward making Israel economically independent is almost unbelievable.

Land under cultivation increased from 400,000 acres in 1949 to 950,000 in 1957. To restore these vast areas to fruitfulness was in many instances a matter of digging stones out of rough terrain by hand. Most of it was done, however, by modern agricultural equipment supplied in large part by help from people in the United States.

In a great program of reforestation in which your organization has played such an important part there have been planted 27,585,000 trees.

Even with this tremendous development of her land resources Israel supplies only about 70 percent of her overall agricultural needs.

Industrial production has increased by more than 300 percent since 1949. Productivity per worker has risen about 50 percent.

This greater industrial production gave a needed boost to Israel's exports, which quintupled during the decade. Exports totaled $200 million in 1957, and reached $250 million last year.

All this was achieved despite a crippling security burden, an Arab boycott, and the absorption of 900,000 immigrants.

We Americans, it seems to me, must assume these fundamental facts about Israel:

1. It is a reality. It is idle to argue whether or not there should be a country such as Israel.

2. The United States had a leading part in the establishment and recognition of Israel as a free and independent country. It cannot, and will not, stand idly by and see Israel destroyed.

3. Perhaps most important of all, despite the initial hardships and difficulties which this new little state has encountered and despite the efforts of the Communists to entice Israel into their orbit, Israel has stood firm for freedom in the great struggle of this mid-20th century.

To Israel we say: "We cherish your freedom and we intend to do what we can to keep you free."

It is imperative that we renew this assurance from time to time. We need to do so to make crystal clear to Russia and to others that we will live up to the moral obligation that we incurred when we helped to establish that little country.

By patience, tolerance, perseverance, and vigilance in the protection of individual freedom, Israel can serve to lead others to democracy and its many advantages.

It is encouraging that you are doing your bit in working for continued economic development and prosperity in that area.

Let me thank you again for this occasion and this opportunity to be with you. I wish you every success in your great work.

The Situation in Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me with respect to the situation in Laos. The statement calls for renewed efforts for the establishment of a United Nations police force.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

The morning radio reports that the Government of Laos has asked the help of the United Nations in curbing the invading Communist forces calls for immediate action by the United States and the U.N. This is a legitimate request of a duly constituted government which is being victimized by outside aggression, and the free world cannot ignore it. No matter how much Peiping and Moscow may proclaim their innocence, the machinations of the international Communist conspiracy are clearly evident in the events in Laos.

I hope the United States will see its way clear to send further aid to the people of Laos in this crisis. I hope, in addition, that the wheels will begin to turn within the United Nations for the creation of a permanent international army which can deal with nibbling Communist aggression such as this. I am today writing to the President urging him to instruct the Secretary of State and our Ambassador to the United Nations to press for positive steps by the U.N. for the establishment of an international police force. Perhaps the crisis in Laos can serve as the spur needed for the U.N. to take this essential step to the building of lasting peace.

One of the most tragic aspects of the request of the Laos Government for U.N. help is that the U.N. does not have any kind of police force which can be rushed into the breach. There is no international army primed for instant action when such conflagrations break out around the world.

It is true, of course, that there is a splendid precedent for using a U.N. group as a buffer between warring states. The special U.N. Emergency Force has wrought miracles in patrolling the Israeli-Egyptian border in the wake of the conflict there. It has provided the cushion which was needed to keep the protagonists apart and promote stability in an area of acute tension.

It is my firm conviction there has been sufficient study and experience concerning a United Nations police force. There is plenty of evidence to show how great a factor it could be in preserving peace. No nation of good will can in good conscience oppose the creation of such a group.

Indeed, I believe we would have every right to question the motives of any nation which would oppose this essential step toward establishing a firm and lasting peace. The United States has repeatedly demonstrated its willingness to participate in an international army for peace and its resolve has been bolstered by resolutions adopted by the Congress.

Certainly, outbreaks of aggression such as we have witnessed in recent years in Korea, Hungary, various places in the Middle East and Far East, and now in Laos, make an international army an imperative the world can ill afford to ignore any longer.

It should, of course, be under the control of the United Nations, ready to move instantly in case of an international emergency at the request of a member government which believes itself threatened by outside aggression or subversion directed by another country.

In a world contracted by speedy communications and transportation, in a world in which so many nations possess the terribly destructive weapons of modern warfare, any international conflict—no matter how localized—can spread like wildfire and thus present a real threat to world stability. The only feasible answer to this challenge to the

peace of the world is a U.N. force capable of so spreading an international mantle over an embattled area as to inhibit—if not directly to prevent the spreading of any local conflict.

A U.N. police force need not be a huge, all-powerful army. It might not number more than 50,000 or 60,000. It might perhaps be best to establish a firm nucleus at all times centered under one command, with other forces in the individual countries available upon call.

The smaller nations should form the backbone of this international group. This will prevent the bigger powers running the risk of being dragged into a nuclear conflict which could doom all mankind.

Such an international army could not—and should not—fight wars. But it could serve as an effective deterrent to hostilities, could be a focus for the moral opinion of the world, and could serve numerous practical buffer uses in observation, patrol, and guard duty between hostile states.

Because of the dangers inherent in man's vast technological and material progress, because of the repeatedly demonstrated determination of some powers to stir up trouble at every opportunity, we must search with imagination and foresight for the answers to the enigmas of world peace. Today we have too little of either—at a time when we stand in desperate need of both.

Time is running short. Each new crisis brings us closer to the potential horrors of world war III. The next international brush fire may set off that world conflagration if the nations of the world do not rise to the occasion.

A permanent United Nations Police Force provides a new, decisive means by which the nations of the world which sincerely believe in peace can provide the machinery to quarantine regional conflicts and Communist military probes, and thus better insure their solution. It would be fitting for the United States, with its demonstrated dedication to creating a peace based on justice and morality, and with its repeatedly affirmed belief in the United Nations, to take the lead in this great task.

In the meantime, I am extremely hopeful our Government will do everything possible to give aid and comfort to the embattled Government of Laos. I hope steps can be taken within the U.N. to establish a temporary, emergency police unit to come to the aid of that nation as it attempts to resist the Communist. I hope ways and means will be found to send additional American aid to Laos. Clearly, the United States and the free world cannot stand idly by while Laos is engulfed in the tide of the international Communist conspiracy.

Labor Sunday Message, 1959: "Free Labor Important to Free People in Today's World"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, for many years the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America and its predecessor organization, the Federal Council of Churches, has issued a message which is used throughout the Protestant churches of America on Labor Sunday.

This message is the product of collaborative effort by concerned church people from labor, management, agriculture, and the professions, together with clergymen.

The message for 1959, which is to be read in the churches on Labor Sunday, September 6, stresses the importance to the economy and the Nation of free collective bargaining and of organized labor's role and responsibility.

I am very glad to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Labor Sunday message for 1959, together with "A Prayer for Those Who Labor":

LABOR SUNDAY MESSAGE, 1959: "FREE LABOR IMPORTANT TO FREE PEOPLE IN TODAY'S WORLD"

Always the churches should give thanks to God for the freedom that is both heritage and living fact about our Nation. In spite of many infringements in our practices, we cherish its spirit within our people, its exercise in our common life, and its embodiment deep within our institutions.

On this Labor Sunday it is right and fitting that the churches recognize and stress the vital place of a free labor movement in and its contribution to our society through the institution of collective bargaining. It is a sign and condition of our freedom that there exist voluntary organizations such as those of labor and management. The effort of these groups to solve together their mutual problems should be encouraged and their freedom to do so safeguarded, insofar as it does not encroach upon the rights of other groups and the common welfare.

FREE BARGAINING NECESSARY FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM

We believe that free collective bargaining is a necessity for economic freedom in an orderly society. The alternative is for labor and management to have imposed upon them undue restrictions or even outright dictation by government. We as citizens, however, may justly expect both management and labor to consider and respect the rights of the vast majority of our people who are not participants in collective bargaining. If the common inerest of the people outside the parties to collective bargaining is disregarded, the people by and large must seek through their government to protect their freedom from any encroachment by either powerful corporate management or powerful organized labor or both.

Without organized workers there can be no collective bargaining. Labor's long struggle to gain recognition was motivated in large part by its necessity to match the bargaining power of employers. Responsible unions and management share the credit for the high place which collective bargaining in many fields of industry holds today among our democratic institutions.

That we are "all brothers" is God's doing; hence individuals who are indifferent to the effect upon others of what they do lay destroying hands upon the fabric of society. All the more intolerable is irresponsible action by an economic group: the harm it does falls upon people of all walks of life, ultimately including those in the offending group. Since free collective bargaining is one of the established features of the American economy, the continuance of responsible action by both labor and management is an absolute necessity.

HIGH LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY SHOWN

We commend organized labor for the high level of responsibility which it has shown in collective bargaining and which devoted labor leaders strive to maintain. It is indeed right for church people to be concerned about malpractices and corruption by some leaders of labor, in some instances acquiesced in by union members. This concern also is shared widely among the leaders and members of organized labor. But church people must not forget corruption disclosed on the part of management as well. On this labor Sunday it is important for our churches and their members to see not only the instances of corruption in labor but also to recognize the essential function and permanent contribution of organized labor.

We therefore call upon the churches to reexamine their own contribution toward the needs and functioning of strong and responsible labor unions. We urge our churches to promote among their people an appreciation of the legitimate and necessary role of organized labor in our free society. Free labor unions are important to all free peoples in today's world. We urge the need as well for a balanced rather than a prejudiced or partial view of the problems which responsible union leaders and their members confront both externally and internally and of how they are trying to solve them.

CHURCHES HELP MEMBERS GROW IN UNDERSTANDING AND PARTICIPATION

We are grateful to God that large numbers in organized labor are also in the churches. As a union leader or member each individual is responsible to God for his conduct in his union as in his other activities. We urge our churches, therefore, to help their members who are also union members to grow in their understanding of the purpose and place which unions properly have in today's world; and to encourage them to participate more effectively and responsibly in the life and affairs of their unions. Responsible group action there, as in churches or elsewhere, depends upon members with an informed and alert sense of individual responsibility.

A PRAYER FOR THOSE WHO LABOR

For those who labor without adequate reward, for those who labor for the common welfare, for those who perfect their skills for better performance, for those who direct the labors of others, for those who adapt machines to lift man's heavy burdens, for those who trade and those who transport, for those who mine and those who smelt, for those who cast and those who die, for apprentices and craftsmen, and for all who contribute to the health and welfare of their fellows through their industry and their effort, dear God, we thank Thee. May they receive their reward in the words of the Master Workman, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant." Amen.

Lafayette-Marne Day, September 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Marquis de Lafayette, whose 202d birth anniversary falls on September 6, was the hero of two continents, the pride of two nations struggling for democracy and freedom.

He was born in 1757 in a chateau in Auvergne, France, and at the time of his death, in 1834, his name had become a household name both in France and in America.

This gallant and gifted son of France, who, in the course of our War of Independence, rendered invaluable services

and thereby earned the everlasting gratitude of the American people, was a remarkable man in many ways. In mid-1777, when he asked for and received a commission of major general, the highest rank after the commander in chief, he had not passed his 20th birthday. The youthful and precocious soldier of freedom quickly acquitted himself most honorably on the battlefield. As a resourceful leader and first-rate tactician, his abilities were fully appreciated by Washington.

When his military career in this country came to an end after the battle of Yorktown he returned to France. There he was made a major general in the French Army in 1781. Later he found himself in the very center of the French Revolution. In 1787 he became a member of the Assembly of Notables, and some time before the Revolution he urged the King to convoke the States-General. During the Revolution he constantly pleaded for personal freedom—for the abolition of arbitrary imprisonment, for religious tolerance, for popular representation, and for the establishment of trial by jury. He was rebuffed by many of the violently revolutionary leaders. He was sadly disappointed with the course of the Revolution.

For a while he had to flee France, and lived in retirement. In 1824 he revisited the United States at the invitation of President Monroe. Here he was overwhelmed with popular applause, and the Congress voted him the sum of $200,000. He gratefully accepted the gift, returned to his native land. He died on May 20, 1834.

Today in honoring the memory of this great soldier of freedom on his 202d anniversary, we also observe another event falling on the same date, September 6, that is, Marne Day, marking the first battle of the Marne which began 45 years ago early in the First World War and continued for the next 3 days. That battle has often been described as the turning point in that war. By participating in that world struggle and thus insuring the conclusion of that war in favor of democratic forces, we also repaid some of the debt to France which America had incurred at the time of our War of Independence.

In expressing our gratitude for General Lafayette's signal services to this country, and also in expressing our profound admiration for the gallant French soldiers who almost alone fought successfully in the first battle of the Marne, we pay our respect to their blessed memory.

Report of U.S. Commission on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me with respect to the report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

The report of the Commission on Civil Rights, although not yet officially released, already has stirred violent verbal blasts from some quarters. This reaction is not unexpected since the work of the Commission has been subjected to obstruction by its opponents from its very inception. It is obvious that there are some people who do not want the facts with regard to civil rights to be studied and discussed. These people are determined to leave no stone unturned in their conspiracy to prevent information on these vital issues from reaching the American people.

I have reviewed the report of the Civil Rights Commission with great interest. It is a balanced, well-documented analysis of the legal and moral problems in the way of realizing equality under the law in accordance with our democratic tradition. These problems are not sectional or partisan. They should be of concern to all Americans throughout the country who respect the Constitution.

I can well understand some differences of opinion with regard to the specific recommendations of the Commission. I cannot, however, condone the blanket condemnation and venom which have already been heaped upon its work by its diehard opponents. Nor can I sympathize with any effort to prevent Americans from exercising their sacred right to vote or from enjoying the same privileges under our laws regardless of their race, creed or national origin.

In my opinion, the Commission's recommendations for the most part are very moderate. Its first recommendation, for example, is that the Bureau of the Census be authorized and directed to undertake a nationwide compilation of registration and voting statistics. I thought we in this country had long passed the day when we would consider such statistic-gathering activities by the Bureau of the Census as un-American. The Commission also recommends that voting records shall be preserved and be made public provided that all care is taken to preserve the secrecy of the ballot. This seems to me to be an eminently reasonable proposal. There also are recommendations with respect to appointment of temporary Federal registrars, for prosecution of persons who under color of law deprive individuals of an opportunity to register and vote, and for the enforcement of the Commission's present subpena powers, which would certainly deserve Congress' support. The only dissent from any of these recommendations is by Commissioner Battle, the former Governor of Virginia. The other Commissioners, Chairman Hannah, president of Michigan State University; Robert Storey, the dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School; Doyle Carlton, former Governor of Florida; Father Hesburgh, the president of the University of Notre Dame; and George M. Johnson, former dean of the Howard University School of Law; were unanimous in their support of these proposals.

The Commission's report deals with housing and education as well as with voting rights and, of course, there are some differences among the various Commissioners with respect to specific proposals made in these fields. This in no way serves to undermine the importance of the Commission's report. Rather, it serves to emphasize the necessity for continuing the great work in which these men are engaged so that further light can be shed on the many difficult issues which are faced in the field of civil rights. These men, all of them distinguished Americans, are engaged in a great dialogue on a subject which goes to the core of our American way of life. Discussions and reports can pave the way for an era of ever-increasing freedom and liberty for all Americans. It has always been my creed that no American can feel secure in his freedom unless the freedom of all Americans is safeguarded. This appears also to be the dominant theme of the Commission's report. I applaud the results the Commission has thus far accomplished. Under no circumstances should we even consider adjournment until the authority for continuation of the Commission has been assured.

Labor Day Statement of George Meany, President, AFL–CIO

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this fateful day in the history of the American trade union movement. It is a distinct pleasure for me to include in the RECORD the statement of President George Meany of the AFL–CIO delivered to trade union members in the United States on the occasion of Labor Day, 1959. I personally would also like to take this opportunity to salute the 13.5 million loyal and honest trade unionists in the AFL–CIO and the other millions of organized labor rank and file this day honors. I include the editorial as follows:

[From the AFL–CIO News, Sept. 5, 1959]

MEANY URGES RESURGENCE OF UNION FIGHTING SPIRIT

(By George Meany)

Labor Day was created as a day of dedication rather than one of celebration. The pioneers who founded the trade union movement and precious little to celebrate back in 1882. The unions of those days were weak, impoverished and the targets of constant harassment by employers. It took a brave man, a man with deep loyalty and plenty of fighting spirit, to join a union and stand by his union under the oppressive conditions that prevailed before the turn of the century.

Today the trade union movement needs above all a rebirth of that fortitude and resolution which enabled Sam Gompers and his associates to lead a parade of progress for humanity unparalleled in human history.

They fought and won despite open warfare by employers and handicaps so great as to make their ultimate victory almost miraculous.

Today, labor faces another kind of warfare, a cold war deliberately invoked against the whole trade union movement by the big business interests of the Nation.

The spokesmen for these interests—such as the National Association of Manufacturers and the chamber of commerce—pay lipservice, of course, to the undeniable fact that unions have done a great deal to improve the American way of life and that unions are therefore here to stay.

But at the same time, big business leaders are doing everything in their power to weaken and destroy our trade union movement. Let me cite three major examples:

They have come out for a wage freeze, forming a solid wall of opposition to any further economic gains by the workers of this country. The steel strike, forced upon 500,000 steelworkers and their families, epitomizes this new form of economic pressure.

They have undertaken an all-out campaign of high-powered deception to prevail upon Congress to enact restrictive antilabor laws in the name of accomplishing labor reform.

They have financed at the State level a blistering bombardment to undermine the security of trade unions through adoption of the misnamed right-to-work laws.

These developments are not haphazard or unconnected. They didn't just happen spontaneously. They have been carefully planned and deliberately organized and heavily financed by the big business interests which are determined to cut down the power of organized labor.

That power has been a power for good for the people of our country. It has enabled the workers of America to gain for themselves the highest standard of living prevailing anywhere in the world. It has created the mass markets which have made industry and the farmers prosperous. It has made it possible for the great majority of the people of this country to live in decent homes, to send their children to school and to enjoy some measures of economic and social security.

Are the workers of this country willing to submit tamely to the forfeiture of these gains? Or are they ready to stand up together again, as their forefathers did in the old days, and fight for the preservation of their rights and their trade unions?

The American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations doesn't have to take a Gallup Poll to obtain the answer to those questions.

We know from direct contact with the members of our unions and the leaders of those unions that they are ready to meet the challenge head on.

In that knowledge, the AFL–CIO executive council chartered a program of action.

1. We have officially proclaimed this Labor Day to be "Support the Steelworkers Day," so that the 13.5 million members of our federation and their friends will be able to demonstrate their complete solidarity with the embattled Steelworkers. To make that support concrete, the general board of the AFL–CIO will hold a special meeting in San Francisco on September 18. At that meeting, a definite program will be drawn up to mobilize the maximum organizational, financial, and moral support of the entire AFL–CIO to insure victory for the Steelworkers. Once that victory is won, the whole wall of resistance erected by big business against further wage increases will crumble.

2. We have determined that we will have to organize for political education and political action in the same thorough and painstaking way that we organized in the past for economic purposes.

This program will take time and patience and hard work and money. But it is our only hope for the resumption of progress in the future.

We want the American people to understand that labor is entering upon the political battleground with reluctance. If we had any other recourse, we would be happy to stay out of politics. But our enemies have chosen to weaken the trade union movement through restrictive legislation so that it will be rendered ineffective at the bargaining table.

To remain true to our trust, to fulfill the responsibilities that the workers of this country have delegated to their unions, labor must fight back in the political arena. We intend to use every legal weapon we have, including the right of every citizen to engage in politics, to regain the ground we have lost.

In this effort, education will play a key part. Against the unscrupulous and deceptive propaganda unleashed against us by the opposition, we must rely on the power of truth.

We need not go beyond the facts and the record to prove our case.

The record shows that the AFL–CIO favors and supports the strongest possible law to drive the crooks and racketeers out of the labor-management field. The record shows that State and local authorities have failed to enforce existing laws against the criminal activities of these racketeers.

The record shows that under guise of Federal legislation against corruption, big business has sought to prohibit legitimate union activities such as organizational picketing and secondary boycotts.

The record shows that the AFL–CIO has demonstrated its integrity by expelling member organizations found to be dominated by corrupt influences and by establishing strict codes of ethical practice for all affiliated unions and their officers.

The record shows that no business organization has ever taken such stringent action despite the fact that the frauds and embezzlements perpetrated by business and banking executives make the transgressions committed by a few labor officials look like petty larceny.

The record shows that big business has tried to fool the public by masquerading its legislative attempts to destroy union security under the false front of "right-to-work" laws in the States.

The record shows that there laws, now in force in 19 States, have not granted the right to a job to a single worker; that they have not improved the economic status of a single worker; that their one and only purpose is to outlaw the union shop.

Once the American pepole fully understand these facts, the massive antilabor campaign instigated by big business will founder and collapse.

We have our work cut out for us. The opposition possesses unlimited resources and controls the main channels of communication with the public. They have a host of soft-soap artists at their command, skilled in distorting the truth and inventing artful propaganda slogans designed to mislead the public.

But we have on our side the strength of numbers and the power of truth. If we use them, we will win.

On this Labor Day, the the trade union movement, with the willing support of the decent working men and women who make up its loyal membership, pledges to work and fight until we do win.

Letter From Oregon National Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include herewith an extremely interesting letter from the adjutant general of the Oregon National Guard.

Our guard units did an outstanding and remarkably prompt job in connection with the recent disaster at Roseburg, Oreg.

This letter points this out in detail and I commend its contents to any Members of the Congress who may have doubts as to the mobility and usefulness of our National Guard units:

AUGUST 19, 1959.

Congressman WALTER NORBLAD,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NORBLAD: Regarding our recent tragedy in Roseburg, I thought you would be interested to know briefly the role the Oregon National Guard played in assisting the citizens and city of Roseburg.

On Friday morning, August 7, following the early hour explosion at 0115 hours (1:15 a.m.), the first unit of the Oregon National Guard was called out. The unit was Company D, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, stationed in Roseburg. Approximately 50 percent of the unit was mobilized by 0145 hours (1:45 a.m.), which is less than 1 hour after the time of the explosion. This indicates the degree of organization and readiness that exists in our National Guard units without further enlarging upon the matter. The balance of this unit was present by 0600 hours (6 a.m.). The first elements of the unit stationed in Cottage Grove, Company B, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, arrived in Roseburg about 0700 hours (7 a.m.) August 7, with the balance of the unit present by 1200 hours (noon) on August 7. These were the only two units initially called out by the Adjutant General's office as directed by the Governor's office. At 1130 hours (11:30 a.m.) on August 7, additional help was requested by officials in Roseburg. The Grants Pass unit, Company C, 2d Battle Group, 186th Infantry, was then mobilized. This unit was present in Roseburg by 1730 hours (5:30 p.m.). The total strength of these three units which were present in Roseburg was as follows: 20 officers. 1 warrant officer, 191 enlisted men.

The above units constituted the units of the Oregon National Guard that were utilized in the disaster area. The total strength was gradually reduced throughout the period August 7 through August 15, with the last National Guard personnel released from Roseburg at 2000 hours (8 p.m.) August 15. The total cost to the Military Department, State of Oregon, for the entire period was $10,833.53.

The primary duty of these units was to protect life and property in the Roseburg area in the initial days of the disaster until businesses were secured to protect against looting. After this had been accomplished, the National Guardsmen were used to isolate dangerous areas and buildings from all but authorized persons.

These National Guardsmen gave freely and willingly of their time. In many instances, the pay they received from being on military duty was much less than the wages from their civilian jobs. However, this was of no major concern to the men, as they knew the people of Roseburg had lost a great deal more. It is a glowing spirit and joint effort by our National Guard units in times of need such as this that make us all justly proud of the Oregon National Guard.

The merit and conduct of the National Guardsmen during the Roseburg disaster has been further endorsed by most appreciative and praiseworthy comments from civic and State officials who worked closely with the stricken city. I feel such words of praise are most deserving.

With best personal regards, and I look forward to the pleasure of seeing you again soon.

Sincerely,

ALFRED E. HINTE,
Brigadier General,
The Adjutant General.

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 8678) to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I must point out some facts regarding my protest vote against the 1-cent-a-gallon increase in the gas tax. By closing off debate and not allowing amendments on the question of where we are going to get money to pay for the highway program, the American people lost and the special interests won. I want it clearly understood that I am in favor of the continuation of the interstate highway program. I am opposed to the procedure by which it became impossible to discuss on the floor of Congress the method of financing it.

Many Members of Congress were in support of alternative methods of taxation to the one proposed. The 1-cent-a-gallon tax increase will injure many people in very modest circumstances who consider gasoline a necessity for their livelihood. It is my feeling that Congress should have considered an amendment to the gas tax bill which would have reduced the 27½ percent oil depletion allowance for foreign oil imports. The Members of the Congress were aware that such an amendment was to be introduced by Congressman HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, had amendments been in order. This would have saved the American taxpayers millions of dollars and thus provided us with $2.4 billion necessary to finance our interstate highway program. If the Congress had supported a plan which would have reduced the oil depletion allowance from 27½ to 15 percent, the gasoline tax would not have had to be raised and the little taxpayer would not be hurt.

I am very sorry that one of the true beneficiary groups of the new highway system, the billion-dollar oil companies, are able to escape the tax burden which other people, not in oil, have to pay.

Another interesting paradox is that American foreign aid funds are being used abroad to build highways without an additional gas tax being imposed in those countries, while in America—to finance our own roadbuilding program—we are called irresponsible if we do not immediately impose an additional 1-cent gas tax.

The American people have been sadly misled on the problem of raising the gas tax so that highway construction would continue. The Administration has diverted moneys collected from the Federal highway fund for other purposes. There is at least $1.2 billion a year which belong in the Federal highway fund which is not getting there. Furthermore, there is no reason why, if taxes must be raised in this area, we must exclude taxing the fat oil companies by continuing to give them tax advantage after tax advantage while the average American must carry a heavier tax burden.

Author of Captive Nations' Week Resolution Points Way To Defeat Russian Cold-War Strategy and Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, as most Members of Congress know, the individual who initiated and authored the Captive Nations' Week resolution is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University. In addition to his academic preoccupations, Dr. Dobriansky serves as 1 of the 44 constituting the membership of the Republican committee on program and progress.

In connection with the Captive Nations' resolution, it was my happy experience, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the efforts of Dr. Dobriansky by submitting the resolution in the House. The total effectiveness of the resolution, now Public Law 86-90, was demonstrated by the violent outbursts it produced in Moscow.

There can be no question of the fact that the resolution struck the nerve center of Russian Communist imperialism and colonialism. The paramount reason why Mr. Khrushchev was deeply disturbed by the resolution is due to the fact that for the first time our Government recognizes in this law the existence of the majority of the captive nations which exist in the Soviet Union itself.

If we press this vital point forward, Russia itself will be made to look rather weak. Without the captive resources of the Baltic nations, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and the other captive non-Russian nations listed in the resolution, Russia itself would assume its real form as a third-rate power. It is this penetrating point that struck Mr. Khrushchev between the eyes. For it is this point which can, psychologically and propagandawise, prick the bloated balloon of Moscow's bluffish propaganda concerning the solidity of its military power, economic strength, science, and the like.

Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 30, the New York Times ran an editorial on "Lessons From Laos." The editorial warns that we have no apparatus to deal with the well-known Communist techniques of infiltration, subversion, and guerrilla fighting. These same techniques were used about 40 years ago to destroy the independence of most of the non-Russian nations now in the legalized prison house of nations known as the Soviet Union. Clearly, it would seem that it is high time we developed means to meet this permanent cold-war challenge.

Closely related to the resolution he initiated, an article titled "A Measure of Realism in the Cold War" has been written by Dr. Dobriansky to show the avenues open to us for a successful counteraction and even victory in the cold war. This article, which appeared in the June issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, advances the practicable means toward a solution to the problem raised by the New York Times editorial.

Because of the grave importance of this problem and the keen interest of our Members in the thought given to it, I have requested that the New York Times editorial and the article written by Dr. Dobriansky be appended to my remarks.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

LESSONS FROM LAOS

The situation in Laos is proving, once more, that the free world has given inadequate attention to its means of defense against the Communist conspiracy. Communist raiding parties have now struck within 16 miles of the capital. At least three areas in the northern part of the country are already under Communist control or in a state of chaos. The survival of free government in this newly independent kingdom is at stake.

Laos is a member of the United Nations, but the Secretary General admits that he is powerless. He cannot even send in observers unless they are requested by both sides in the controversy and naturally the last thing in the world that the Communists want is observation. The United Nations cannot take any forceful and immediate action without the authority of the Security Council where the Communist veto is expected, automatically.

The United States, acting independently, has announced its intention to airlift some small arms and ammunition to the tiny Lao Army. It may be possible to bring its effectives up from 25,000 to 29,000 men, to withstand the assault of North Vietnam and Red China, whose manpower and firepower are not under such modest limitations.

Even that little bit of help is joyfully welcomed by the free Laot as a symbol of the fact that at least someone, somewhere in the world, is concerned over their survival. And naturally it has drawn a prompt and bitter denunciation from the Communists in North Vietnam on the ground that "U.S. imperialists are seeking to expand the civil war in Laos into a real shooting war." This is no time for humor, but one may be forgiven a wry smile at the concern of foreign Communist North Vietnam over a civil war in Laos.

What all this demonstrates is that we have not yet developed any effective techniques for meeting the by now well known Communist tactics. We don't want a big war and the Communists know it. So they can keep up this unremitting process of hacking away at human liberties, knowing that the United Nations is powerless and that most members wish to keep the peace.

Some changes in the mechanism of keeping the peace and preserving human liberties are obviously needed. Perhaps the first change that is required is in our own thinking so that we can recognize a grave menace

when it appears, and not shrug it off lightly because it happens to be on the other side of the world.

[From the Ukrainian Quarterly, June 1959]

A MEASURE OF REALISM IN THE COLD WAR

(By Lev E. Dobriansky)

How to cope with the cold war thrusts and maneuvers of Moscow has been a fundamental and vexing problem for some time. By no means has the problem in any real sense been resolved. In fact, our Government has not faced up squarely to all the demands and issues involved in the problem. As a consequence, no clear-cut decision has been made on how to meet it, no apparatus or coordinating body exists at present to adequately deal with it, and our dearth of operation could only accommodate a defensive reaction, based on military might, to the successive challenges posed by Moscow. In each instance, some gain of a psychopolitical nature accrues to the enemy. This could not be otherwise since our defensive posture can only serve to minimize, not prevent entirely, his inroads into the broad field of operation offered by the free world.

The problem is not one that can be competently and satisfactorily handled by any existing executive agency. Moscow's cold war activity embraces military factors, to be sure, but much of the bluster, bluff, and blackmail built about U.S.S.R.'s military prowess plainly indicate that in this context the military is essentially a tool for the furtherance of broader political and psychological objectives. This dimension does not fall as an object of primary study, not to mention operation, in our Military Establishment. As another example, Moscow's unleashing of economic warfare against the free world creates a similar dimension in its cold war activity. Now the economic tool is utilized to achieve the same psychopolitical objectives. Our Departments of Commerce and State are properly concerned with these economic penetrations into the free world. But the most that one can hope for in either Department is a subsidiary study of this phase of the problem. The same may be said for the propaganda and information phase, cultural exchange, education, science, and other fields of enterprise in the cold war. Studies will continue to be piecemeal, interest in one aspect or another will fluctuate in response to the tune played by Moscow, and much of the effort and capital invested in these lines will yield less than maximally productive results for want of central purpose and efficient coordination.

If, somewhat inaccurately, one dates the beginning of the cold war period as 1947, the picture depicted above is not a pretty one. The picture is scarcely exaggerated; if anything, it is incomplete. After over a decade of experience with cold war activity, we find ourselves still stripped of the necessary means to engage intelligently and competently in it. Recently, some legislators on the House Appropriations Committee were amazed to receive a State Department request for funds to establish a section for the purpose of studying Communist tactics and techniques. As one of them pointed out, he was under the natural impression all these years that appropriations made along these lines were being continuously applied to this primary and necessary end. The obvious moral here is that in these matters one should not be guided by natural impressions and, effect, take things for granted. As a matter of fact, if the Department had actually conducted such continuous studies, there is little likelihood that they would have assumed any concrete operational significance and the problems of coordination and forming a composite picture of Russian cold war operation would still remain unsolved.

There are numerous reasons accounting for this present state of affairs. For one, the nature and scope of cold war activity continue to elude the understanding of many Americans. Some, pitiful in their grasp of Russia's historical background, view it as part of a "strange new force"—that has entered our world—"the strangest and most enigmatic in all history."[1] When, for instance, Khrushchev makes a warm actor's plea for the lessening of international tensions, they find it difficult to understand that this gesture is only another purposeful maneuver in Moscow's cold war operation. The zag—after the zig—is nothing new in Russia (not just in the so-called Soviet) history, and the end has both political and psychological import. Americans naturally crave for real peace. When it suits the calculations of their next operational move, the Russians are prepared to soothe this popular craving. The process misleads, confuses, softens, and gains time and advantage for a concurrent or subsequent move. Moscow's controlled cultural exchange program and recourse to economic aid and competition play on additional American instincts, with much the same results. Even the conduct of diplomatic negotiation is for Moscow a traditional cold war instrument. But many of our leaders, steeped in Western traditions, continue to believe that a high level conference with the Russians in an appropriate occasion for settling differences of view on particular issues.

Another reason for our lack of a cold war apparatus is the expressed distaste Americans have for Russian methods and techniques. It is frequently argued that we could not succumb to the use of such methods. The filth of lies, distortions, callous murders, and general immoral behavior is beyond our political upbringing. Thus we must depend upon our standard ways. In reply one could say that in a hot war we don't hesitate to employ any ruse or means of killing where it serves the end of our survival and self-preservation. Why should we be so discriminating under conditions of neither peace nor war, however, that to overwhelm the Russian cold war threat a condescension to such methods is not necessary. We possess powers of truth and knowledge that are not being fully used for want of organization and implemental zeal and imagination. In short, we haven't as yet developed an efficient apparatus for the utilization of these powers in the most effective ways possible.

Differing views as to the administration of a full-fledged cold war undertaking constitute a third reason for the absence of such a vital program. Those having these views are in complete agreement that such a project is a must. To a greater or lesser extent they do disagree with regard to its content. For example, this writer sees nothing really new in the cold war techniques and methods of the Russian Communists. There is nothing peculiarly Communist about them. Except for accidental variations of refinement and intensity, the substantive content of these techniques was provided by Russian totalitarianism politics as far back as the 16th century. These tools are the key to an understanding of Moscow's phenomenal creation of a vast empire long before Lenin and the Bolsheviks appeared on the scene. However, this perspective awaits expression and treatment once our facilities are adequately established. The newness of these techniques rests in the fact that Americans never encountered them before. For East Europeans of the traditionally subjugated nations, these are historically old methods.

[1] E.g., "What We Must Know About Communism," by Harry and Bonaro Overstreet, 1958, p. 9.

Many recent voicings that something creative and different must be done clearly indicate a widespread feeling of dissatisfaction with existing agencies on this score. Senator JACKSON, of Washington, soundly declared at the recent Military Government Association meeting in Washington that "We have been outmaneuvered politically in one vital area after another." He is right when he avers that "we have never been in the same league with the Russians in the psychological war of wits and words." The writer, David Lawrence, began his illuminating column recently with these words: "What a spectacle the Western governments are making of themselves these days as they flounder indecisively, in the midst of Soviet threats and ultimatums, seemingly afraid to meet squarely the challenging issues of the hour." Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON gives further expression to this growing restlessness as concerns our operational inadequacies when he urges the calling of a summit of the heads of state of the free world.

These and many more evidences simply show that the requirements and demands of the current situation are not and cannot be met by our existing agencies. They are functionally fitted for other respective ends. This does not mean, of course, that with a new agency, created for the specific purpose of dealing with the realities of cold war operation, the fringe efforts of the existing departments would not be embraced. On the contrary, for policymaking reasons, a close coordination would be mandatory.

THE FREEDOM COMMISSION MEASURE

The measure of realism in the cold war is the measure now before Congress, known as the Freedom Commission Act. This measure is sponsored in the House by Congressmen HERLONG, of Florida, and JUDD, of Minnesota. In the Senate its sponsors are Senators MUNDT, of South Dakota, and DOUGLAS, of Illinois. The measure calls for the creation of a Freedom Commission, the establishment of a Freedom Academy, and the formation of a Joint Congressional Freedom Committee. Its basic idea was first advanced several years ago by the Select House Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression which was led by the Honorable Charles J. Kersten of Wisconsin. Two years ago Senator DOUGLAS sponsored a bill seeking this very Freedom Commission. The immediate stimulus given to the present measure was provided by a Florida group called the Orlando Committee for the Freedom Academy.

The bill is designed to provide much-needed facilities for the strengthening of our cold war position. As its objectives imply, it would correct the glaring inadequacy that exists in our executive realm. The Freedom Commission it seeks to create would be an independent agency composed of six members and a Chairman. The members and Chairman would be appointed by the President, with the consent of the Senate. One of the prime authorized functions of the Commission would be the establishment and supervision of the Freedom Academy training at the Academy would concentrate on knowledge of Russian Communist techniques and ways and means of counteracting them. Students would be carefully drawn from governmental, private, and even foreign areas. Other functions of the Commission include the establishment of an information center to aid all groups in an understanding of the Russian Communist conspiracy, the conduct of research and surveys, and a host of additional tasks aimed to realize the objectives of the act. The Joint Congressional Freedom Committee, consisting of seven Senators and seven Congressmen, would oversee the work and development of the Commission.

There is no question that this measure realistically fills in some serious gaps in our Government when it comes to this subject of

cold war preparation. The bill should definitely and overwhelmingly be passed. Its passage would be one of the crowning achievements of this Congress. Beyond a question of doubt there is no educational institution in our Government or in the private area that can be compared with the contemplated Freedom Academy. Second, no existing executive agency is equipped by administrative bent or facility to undertake the functions prescribed for the Freedom Commission. And third, since cold war progress is just as important and vital—if in the long run not more so—as atomic progress, the need for a Joint Congressional Freedom Committee is well satisfied by this bill.

THE BROADER SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MEASURE

This measure of realism in the cold war has a broader significance than an actual reading of it would suggest. First, it should be borne in mind that it isn't impossible for this country, and with it the free world, to suffer disastrous defeat at the hands of the present Russian Empire. The possibility of such defeat is not necessarily grounded in any precondition of a hot global war. As a matter of historical fact, the great advances in the expansion of the Russian Empire, both past and present, were achieved primarily through diplomatic duplicity and conspiracy rather than military means. Thus, if the defeat of the United States should come to pass, the increasing chances are that this tragic eventuation would not be the result of lapsed missile production, any technologic lags, deficiency in conventional arms, retarded space exploration, domestic economic difficulties, or a fictitious economic victory by Moscow. As one speculates with balanced weighting of each of these he cannot but conclude that this possible defeat would be the consequence of a stubborn misunderstanding of the traditional nature of the enemy, how he grew to be what he is, and the trained cunning of his diplomatic, political, economic, and conspiratorial ways and techniques. With the well-grounded projection that our deterrent power in military means will be of declining importance over the long run, the soundness of the preceding observation becomes even more striking.

If the estimate arrived at above is correct, then the significance and indispensable value of the Freedom Commission come into full view for the precarious period ahead. To live up to its expectations, the Commission would have to probe into one of the strangest phenomena characterizing America's role in international politics. In this country, strangely enough, with all its rich traditions of freedom, national independence, and principled opposition to colonialism and imperialism, the real chasm that exists between imperialist Russian totalitarianism and freedom-aspiring non-Russian nationalism seems to escape the minds of many, including many on the highest levels of Government. In these cases, which perhaps are far too numerous than the present critical situation can tolerate, it appears that their deficiency of knowledge concerning Russia qua, Russia is exceeded only by their lack of insight into the traditional spirituality and living revolution of our own Nation. Well exemplifying this was the Mikoyan exhibition in this country at the beginning of this year. Fortunately, however, this inexcusable condition is being steadily, though slowly, overcome by various contributions made in this field at our universities and in group action. The basic force of Russian totalitarian imperialism and colonialism would necessarily be a high priority item for the Commission.

UNUSED POWERS OF KNOWLEDGE AND TRUTH

As mentioned earlier, the argument of submission to the filth of Russian totalitarian behavior is grossly untenable. With honorable means and techniques the Commission can begin to utilize some of our unused powers of knowledge and truth to inflict severe damage upon Moscow's cold war campaign. In this respect its first area would be domestic. There is an intricate labyrinth of false preconceptions and disinformation concerning Russia and the U.S.S.R. and their relations to the United States. Doubtlessly, this cannot be dissolved in short order. Time, patience, and persistent effort are required. Not only an educational but a historical process is involved. This field of knowledge seems to excel all others in this country in confusion, misunderstanding, and even unpardonable ignorance. In its pursuit of objective studies the Commission would inevitably have to consider whether communism or imperialist Russian totalitarianism is a reality, whether the U.S.S.R. can be identified as any other state, whether—all sentimentalism aside—Russians can in any decisive manner be attracted to the responsibilities of freedom while the empire of their capital is maintained. These and other basic issues would have to be sufficiently clarified by the Commission if we are to adopt those approaches to techniques, via understanding, that would incisively penetrate and weaken the present Russian empire.

This first step would be the heaviest and at the same time most constructive responsibility of the Commission. In the order of first things first, unless we begin to rectify our own imbred misconceptions, we can't help but perpetuate old errors. For example, in this field of knowledge the failure of many scholars and writers to comprehend the empire character of the Soviet Union has led to all sorts of distorted and slanted observations. In the military sciences, for instance, the armed forces of the Soviet Union are erroneously viewed as nationally integrated units similar to those of Japan, Germany, and other true nations. Nothing could be further from the truth. In science and the arts, because of demographic ignorance contributions emanating from the Soviet Union are flippantly and uncritically characterized as Russian products. In the field of economics marked by ill-adapted symbols of GNP and the like, treatises are developed on the fallacious assumption that the Soviet Union is a national parallel to the United States. In many other fields the same basic errors of concept and interpretation crop up. In short, the actual is scarcely penetrated to grasp the real: the superficial is accepted in preference to the essential. For purposes of meaningful interpretation and action, the Commission, if it is to achieve a balanced coverage of the enemy and his techniques of deception, would necessarily have to consider alternative frameworks of analytic reference than that presently used.

This first step could not be constructively undertaken without the simultaneous development of the whole area of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. This area of study would have to be developed economically, politically, historically, and culturally. The cultivation of such study, which is virtually nil in this country, will undoubtedly produce many interesting results for perspective and policy alike. One important result is that both out of ignorance as to the nature of the non-Russian revolution in the crumbling Russian empire and out of halfhearted determination, the United States failed to support the ideas and principles of our own tradition in concrete application to independent Georgia, Armenia, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, and other non-Russian nations which determined themselves at the end of World War I. These nations were soon again individually subverted and subjugated by the imperialist successors to the White Czar. But the manifest significance of this period rests in the fact that the Russian Communists built upon this failure and our mistakes of 40 years ago and now threaten the very life of our own Nation. What should have been a second- or third-rate power is today, largely on the basis of accumulated captive resources, a contender for the world. More ironical still is the fact that the sole real imperialist power in the world today has actually stolen the American banner of the idea of national self-determination and freedom and successfully parades it in Asia and Africa. Plainly, then, the Freedom Commission in its positive concern for freedom everywhere would be morally obligated to launch systematic studies of this long neglected and yet vitally strategic non-Russian area of the Soviet Union.

THE PROSPECT OF REDRESSING A SAD RECORD

In addition to its broader significance and suggested opportunities, the Freedom Commission, should it come to pass, would have the tremendous prospect of working to redress somewhat the sad record of American relations with Russia. Whether one appreciates it or not, the successes of contemporary totalitarian Russian imperialism have been imposing and sweeping. These successes from 1918 to the present provide a concrete measure of fault and incompetence on our side. In the 1920's, soon after our contribution by indifference to the establishment of the now Russian Empire, we inadvertently saved the Russian Bolshevik regime by our charities through the American Relief Administration. In the thirties we furnished industrial know-how and capital to the empire, and soon thereafter cloaked the new imperial regime with the respectable bonds of diplomatic concourse. In the forties we spent billions to save Stalin and overlooked our own determining power in virtually allowing the Russians to expand their empire to the Danube and the China Sea. Our naive faith in Russian word and intention accommodated the leakage of the most vital atomic and missile secrets, and in this decade we witnessed the evaporation of our monopoly power. Finally, our ill-advised participation in the Geneva summit conference built up the international prestige of Stalin's criminal successors who are today strengthened by the sputnik, lunik, and intercontinental missiles. Regardless of the rationalization offered for each of these developments, the record is a sad and almost incredible one.

A midwestern professional friend of the writer has suggested as a title for the past decade of these relations, as concerns the United States: "From Atomic Monopoly and Supreme Air Power To Surrender Research." The pessimistic overtones of the title are not to be accepted, although the elements are factually valid. Yet it cannot be argued that we as a Nation did not lose much in the shortest period of time for any leading power. The reasons for this have in part been given above. There are others. But had there existed all this while an administrative entity comparable to the planned-for Freedom Commission, the results would have been immeasurably different. The nature of the enemy revealed itself decades ago. Nevertheless, to win the cold war means in some notable measure to redress our said record. And the Freedom Commission is purposed to realize such victory.

Irrigation and Missouri River Development Important to South Dakota's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House Committee on Public Works has approved my resolution instructing the Army engineers to undertake a survey as to the feasibility of slack water navigation on the Missouri River between Yankton, S. Dak., and St. Louis. I believe that such a study will show the desirability of slack water navigation.

It is my conviction that this type of navigation, now in use on the Ohio and Tennessee Rivers and other systems, will provide for the most efficient use of Missouri River water. Instead of wasteful releases of water to maintain the present free-flowing, 9-foot navigation channel, slack water navigation will permit the full development of hydroelectric power and irrigation in the upstream States. Furthermore, it will increase navigation efficiency downstream and add valuable hydroelectric installations to the stretch of the River below Yankton.

Two very fine editorials from outstanding South Dakota newspapers have recently recognized the importance of such a study. I include in the RECORD an editorial from the August 25, 1959, Daily Republic and a second editorial from the September 1, 1959, issue of the Aberdeen American-News:

[From the Mitchell (S. Dak.) Daily Republic, Aug. 25, 1959]

PEOPLE MUST PROVIDE PUSH FOR IRRIGATION

Congressman GEORGE MCGOVERN's efforts to clear the way for a study of slack-water navigation on the Missouri River has jumped its first hurdle with the agreement of the Army Corps of Engineers that such a study will provide authoritative and up-to-date data, something that is not available at this time.

The slack-water study was suggested by the Missouri Basin interagency committee at the prodding of South Dakota's Governor Herseth and the chief executive of the State of Iowa. The proposal is aimed at saving the stored water in mainstem dams for beneficial uses, rather than to dump it downstream for navigation.

This study, if it is approved by Congress, is only one step in seeing that South Dakota retain its rightful amount of the water now flooding thousands of acres that once provided income for individuals, counties and the State. The other steps must be made right here in the State if we do not want to wake up some day and find that it is too late to fill our demands.

The water resources commission this month made the first move in this direction when it organized as a State water conservancy district. This agency was created by the South Dakota Legislature to assist subconservancy districts to start irrigation projects that will use Missouri River water.

However, there is little the State group can do immediately in the formation of subdistricts. The legislature wisely provided that the support and push for the operating units must come from the people within the district, rather than from a State agency. This is as it should be for these are the people who will benefit most and who also must foot the bill.

The Bureau of Reclamation has been dragging its feet in the major survey of the James River area, partly because of money but mostly because of a lack of organized support for the irrigation project. The same is true in the Charles Mix-Douglas pumping plan which probably could be the first major project if local support can be organized to push through legal channels for the study.

The State water resources commission has been authorized to employ individuals capable of assisting subdistricts in their organization. This should be helpful. But even with this assistance the prime movers must be those residing within the district.

If there is real interest in irrigation on a district, rather than an individual, scale this should be the year to uncover it.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, Sept. 1, 1959]

MCGOVERN WEIGHS SOUTH DAKOTA WATER NEEDS

It didn't result in as large headlines as his comments on labor legislation, but Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN's speech Friday on the urgent need for irrigation was even more important to South Dakota.

The first district Congressman cited at Rapid City the benefits South Dakota can enjoy from irrigation.

Proper use of Missouri River water, he said, will make South Dakota prairies bloom.

What he predicts is certainly true.

Persons who have lived in this State any length of time know that when there is plenty of rain in South Dakota the soil produces with great abundance.

Water, not only for irrigation, is a key to future development—especially in areas such as South Dakota.

Representative MCGOVERN's interest in an imaginative water use program should be helpful in completing studies that will hasten expansion of irrigation.

One section in which persons of this part of the State are concerned is the James River Valley. It would be supplied with water from Oahe Dam near Pierre.

Representative MCGOVERN, during the same week, made a contribution toward development of another type of water employment. He testified before the House Public Works Committee, urging more efficient development of Missouri River water resources through a survey of slack water navigation possibilities.

He reviewed disadvantages to South Dakota of the current water use program and explained preliminary investigation indicates that instead of "huge, wasteful releases of water necessary to maintain a free-flowing 9-foot channel, a system of slack water navigation would be more beneficial both for navigation interests downstream and the irrigation and power needs of the upstream States."

"A system of low-head dams and locks will trap the water in small stretches of the river, slow down its flow, increase the electric power utilization, and improve the overall benefits of the entire river program for both upstream and downstream States," MCGOVERN said.

U.S. Foreign Policy Revised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Drew Pearson which appeared in the Friday, September 4, 1959, issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

Mr. Pearson, with his usual perspicacity, has cited several interesting changes which recently have taken place, or are taking place, in our foreign policy:

IKE SCRAPPING POLICIES OF DULLES

(By Drew Pearson)

Watching the eminently successful trip of President Eisenhower through Europe, I can't help but recall a historic day in Washington last May when the flag-draped coffin of John Foster Dulles lay in state in the National Cathedral. Foreign ministers from as far as Japan flew to pay their respect and homage. Even dour Andre Gromyko, Dulles' protagonist at many conferences, and gnarled old Chancellor Adenauer, Dulles' friend at many conferences, took the long trip across the Atlantic.

They came because Dulles' friend, the President of the United States, decreed that the Secretary of State should have a state funeral. Mrs. Dulles had planned a quiet family ceremony, but a deeply grieving President personally took charge of all funeral arrangements, even specifying the type of dress to be worn, and preparing the list of honor guests. He wanted the man who had worked so tirelessly to solve the problems of the world to have, in death, the recognition of the world. As a result, not even Presidents Roosevelt, Harding and McKinley, who died in office, were buried with such ceremony.

It was just 2 months and 5 days later that President Eisenhower began scrapping the policies of John Foster Dulles. He would be the last to admit this. And perhaps he didn't even realize he was scrapping Dulles' policies. But he did it first by inviting Nikita Khrushchev of the Kremlin to pay a personal visit to the White House, an invitation which Mr. Dulles had emphatically and consistently opposed unless our rights in Berlin were first guaranteed. They were not guaranteed, but Khrushchev was invited anyway.

Ike went even further by accepting Khrushchev's invitation to come to Moscow, which brought gasps of dismay from close friends of Dulles.

IKE BECOMES A DULLES

Then one by one, the President proceeded to throw overboard or discredit, without specifically naming them or perhaps even realizing that he was doing so, the watchwords and policies of his late Secretary of State. The only policy he kept was that of personal negotiation. Stepping into the Dulles shoes of the traveling-diplomat-salesman, he proceeded to carry his own ideas direct to the trouble spots and troubled statesmen of Europe.

He has been so successful that many diplomats wish the President had become his own Secretary of State long ago. But in so doing, here is what happened to the policies of Mr. Dulles:

Massive retaliation was a basic policy coined by Dulles in warning that the United States had great capacity to retaliate instantly, by means and at places of our choosing. In contrast, President Eisenhower told the world in his TV chat with Prime Minister Macmillan: "People want peace so much that one of these days governments had better get out of their way and let them have it."

Brink of war: This Dulles policy, outlined in Life magazine in 1956, completely evaporated at the Geneva Foreign Ministers Conference, when the United States ducked any showdown of power over Berlin and sent Vice President NIXON on a peace mission to Moscow instead.

Liberate the satellites: This basic Dulles policy was thrown out when Mr. NIXON conferred officially with the Communist leaders of satellite Poland, thereby switching the old policy of "liberation" to one of "friendship." Mr. Eisenhower further scrapped the liberation policy when, during his Bonn, Germany press conference, he said he would not discuss the liberation of former German territory—referring to that held by Poland.

Failure from within: Dulles had argued, privately and publicly, that the Soviet Communist system would come tumbling down of its own errors. As late as February 26, 1956, testifying before the Senate Foreign Relations Commitee, he said "They (the Russians) have made little progress in the last few years * * * The fact is that they have failed and they have got to devise new policies."

In Moscow, following Dulles' death, Vice President NIXON, broadcasting to the Russian people, paid tribute to the "thriving productivity of the factory complex of the Urals. * * * The efficient modern equipment of your factories. * * * The competitive drive for progress evident on every side * * * and most of all the people."

Direct disarmament: In December 1956 Harold Stassen, then in charge of disarmament, pleaded with Mr. Eisenhower for permission to fly to Moscow to carry on direct disarmament talks with the Kremlin. He was convinced the Russians were ready not only for disarmament, but a 10-year peace pact with the United States. Dulles vetoed the Stassen trip, eased Stassen out as disarmament specialist.

Today, one definite objective of the Khrushchev-Eisenhower exchange is disarmament.

Areas of Chronic Depression—Mass Production of Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in these pleasant last days of summer, when outdoor employment is high and much of our Nation is enjoying prosperity, it might be easy for us to forget that America still has great need of the area redevelopment bill.

But, in some parts of our country, life is not so pleasant, and winter soon will come to multiply the problems of those who have been thrown out of work by technological changes and other economic factors.

Lest we forget their plight, lest we forget that the Congress and the President still have a duty to bring economic relief and industrial stimulation to these so-called depressed areas, I wish to bring to the attention of the Congress a large, two-page article which appeared in the August 24 issue of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Union News.

The article, titled "Areas of Chronic Depression—Mass Production of Poverty," deals entirely with conditions in West Virginia, which have occurred as a result of far-reaching economic changes.

I believe that these are economic facts which should be studied by every Member of this 86th Congress. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AREAS OF CHRONIC DEPRESSION MASS PRODUCTION OF POVERTY

"I see young people leaving school because they are embarrassed at how they look and what happens to them. I see them wanting to get work and not being able to find it. I see them trying to get in the Army, and they can't get in the Army. They can't pass the physical tests. They are so hungry and they have been without proper food so long they just don't meet any of the eligibilities."

These were the words of Mrs. T. R. Fulton, a social worker for the Monongalia County Health Department, Morgantown, W. Va., an area that except for the war years has not known the meaning of prosperity in any degree for an entire generation.

Millions of words have been written about economic hardship in West Virginia. But no matter how many millions more are written they will not adequately tell the story of the stark and helpless poverty of thousands of the State's citizens, the ravaged bodies of its hungry children.

West Virginia's economic plight is blamed generally on the decline of its major industry, coal mining. But when Union News wanted a firsthand look at one of the Nation's so-called depressed areas the Morgantown-Grafton-Fairmont-Clarksburg section in the northeastern part of the State was picked because of its more typical industrial diversity.

In this region coal remains a major factor, but it is balanced by chemical and glass manufacturing, lumber, metalworking, and the natural resources for other industry.

But despite its raw materials and factory facilities, the area's outstanding production by far is that of human degradation.

At the height of the recession early this year the national average of unemployment was about 6 percent. In this area it was approximately 16 percent. For many years it has continued substantially the same percentage above the national average. The cumulative results have been devastating.

Mrs. Fulton continued and her descriptions applied as well in other counties in the area as to Monongalia:

"I see people living in houses without roofs, houses without utilities. I see children going to school without shoes and without warm clothing. I see houses and homes where children have nothing to eat except surplus commodities and the canned goods which their parents put up in the summer that they got from the fields and the bushes.

"I see illness untreated because of persons who are so ashamed of having no money they are not willing to ask a doctor, who has given them more than he should of medical care, for more medical care. They can't get operations, and they can't get medicine. I know this is true.

"I see fathers leaving the home and bad things happening to their families while they hunt for work. If they are lucky enough to work, then there isn't near enough money to move a family of 6 to 7 or 8 to a new town where the rent is 10 times as much. There isn't enough money to pay for room and board and to send something home to take care of the wife and children."

One man, father of 11 children, told his personal story. He is in his early forties, physically strong and mentally alert. Laid off from his job in a coal mine, he had not worked for 2 years until this summer when he succeeded in getting what he hopes will be permanent, but he fears will be seasonal, work in a glass container plant.

He lives in a tenant house on a farm for which he agreed to give the owner 4 days of farm work a month in return for his rent. A small garden supplements surplus foods received from Federal Government sources.

Clothing comes from relief agencies. One older daughter works as a domestic and her meager earnings go mostly for a few pleasures for the younger children.

Such is the wretched existence of one family, but the case is in nowise isolated. It is repeated not scores, not hundreds, but thousands of times in the counties of Monongalia, Marion, Preston, Taylor, Harrison, and Barbour that make up the area.

The Salvation Army at Grafton is performing a herculean job of distributing surplus foods in three of the counties. But in March, when it list of recipients had grown to 10,000 individuals, a spokesman for the Army said it was at the point of having to ask that a new distribution point be found.

They were at that time in the midst of processing between 400 and 500 new applications or reapplications for food and were simply unable to finance the increasing cost of their work.

At the same time, locals 154 and 158 of the Glass Bottle Blowers of America are distributing the surplus food to some 500 families whose breadwinners were idled by the closing of the Hazel-Atlas glass plant.

Clifford Clemmens, OCAW member who is AFL–CIO community services representative at Grafton, spends a major part of his time looking for jobs for displaced workers and distributing food to needy families.

Still there is not enough food, not enough clothing and, at this point, tragically, there is not even enough hope.

Probably the biggest danger to renewed prosperity for this potentially rich area is complacency. Thousands of the people of the region have been beaten down for so many years that they have come to almost believe that nothing can be done about the situation. And futility is not confined to the jobless.

True there are men of vision in the area who are trying with all their might to solve the problem. The State has an outstanding delegation to Congress. Democratic Senators ROBERT BYRD and JENNINGS RANDOLPH have worked strenuously in efforts to get Federal depressed areas legislation enacted.

Congressman JOHN M. SLACK, Democrat, although not from the immediate area, has done a monumental amount of research work on distressed areas generally and probably is as well informed on the problem as any Member of the House of Representatives. The other Congressmen, too, may be considered outstanding leaders in efforts to bring relief to the jobless and correct a pitiful economic situation.

Leaders of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, the Glass Workers, Miners and other unions help wherever they can.

Business groups in most of the communities have set up development funds with which they hope to attract industry, but these are woefully inadequate.

But on the whole the impression is that there is a lack of drive to the whole effort. Talk to almost anyone, jobless or business leader, and there is no spirit of confidence that there will be a solution of the problem in the near future—if ever.

While the State Legislature was in session earlier this year Editor Richard Parrish of the West Virginian at Fairmont did a tremendous job of publishing illustrated stories of hardship cases and prodding the legislators to increase State funds for relief. The hardened legislature, however, was unmoved and refused the funds, and Parrish readily admitted that this would be no long-range solution for the area's ills.

The editor of another daily newspaper was thoroughly familiar with the conditions and needs of the region, but it had simply never occurred to him that his organ, on its own, might campaign or crusade for early solution, might advance any ideas.

John Martin, editor of the Clarksburg Telegram, was only afraid that contract negotiations underway at the time between the Glass Workers and the Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. might result in the closing of the plant there and the loss of jobs for another 1,500 to 2,000 workers.

The area is rich in natural resources, coal, salt, limestone, and other chemicals. There is abundant water and a moderate supply of timber. Electric power is reported to be ample. The climate is generally good and the scenic beauty of the mountains a natural tourist attraction.

Yet the economy of the country has been steadily declining since the 1930's when china and pottery plants began moving away both through mergers in the industry and to more modern, mechanized factories.

Rather than modernize, in 1936, 1,200 were put out of work when Wierton Steel closed an obsolete rolling mill.

A few years ago a cement plant was closed down at the very time a multimillion dollar concrete bridge was being constructed across the Monongahela River only a stone's throw from the factory.

Over a year ago 450 employees were left jobless when Continental Can Co. closed its modern-appearing Hazel-Atlas glass plant at Grafton.

A chemical plant, constructed at a cost of $163 million by the Federal Government, lies idle at Morgantown. Operated by the Olin Mathieson Chemical Co. since 1953, the jobs of some 2,000 were destroyed when it was shut down last year.

Mechanization of other factories has forced the closing of more than 20 hand-blown glass plants in the area.

Problems of placing the region on its economic feet again are no doubt numerous and complicated. But informed people of the area are in almost unanimous agreement that inadequate transportation is one of the most difficult obstacles to efficient operation of industry.

It is pointed out that railroad service has declined markedly, spur and secondary lines have been closed down completely, and service on through lines has been sharply curtailed.

At the same time, while roads have not been allowed to deteriorate the highway system has not been expanded to replace the lost rail service.

Managers who have closed their plants have cited the transportation need as reasons for moving.

Clemmens told a congressional committee, "We have 23 one-room schools in Marion County, and due to the situation or condition of our roads, it would be impracticable to consolidate the schools," because the students could not be transported to adequate facilities at a central point.

It would seem, then, that a practical point to begin the rehabilitation program for this region—perhaps for all of West Virginia—would be a major, a tremendous, project of highway construction. The State could not do it alone; the initial money outlay would be too great. Federal help would be mandatory.

But a great many jobless could find employment immediately. There would be a sharp, quick boost to the economy. And as portions were completed there is little doubt that industries would be attracted.

Equally important, a concrete program with excellent promise of success would renew the courage, vision and confidence of a badly beaten people.

Henry L. Ash, director of the State's Department of Employment Security, recently stated that "the building of a great state or a strong nation requires at least three basic ingredients. One of these is human resources, namely people. The second requisite is natural resources. The third is ready capital."

He went on to point out that "the deposits as of June 30, 1958, in the banks of the State totaled $1,167,696,000, which constituted an alltime high of deposits in West Virginia's banks."

The State has the three requirements for a thriving economy.

What is needed is a program to put them in action.

IN A PROUD AMERICA

"Ashamed of their ragged clothing and hurt by the taunts of playmates, two little daughters and a son of a destitute Cabin Creek, W. Va., coal miner tried to burn their home in the hope of receiving gifts.

"Assistant State Fire Marshall, C. R. Cobb, said the three started at least 18 fires at the house. The parents put the blazes out before much damage was done. The girls are 13 and 10, the boy 11. There are three younger children.

"The father has exhausted his unemployment benefits. He just finished a month-long hospital stay in a bout with pneumonia.

"The 13-year-old girl said she was embarrassed by the jeers brought on by her shabby dress. She reasoned that if the home were lost, neighbors and the public would donate better clothing.

"There is virtually no food in the house." (Associated Press Dispatch.)

Long lines of empty coal cars parked on weed-grown sidings all over the State are symbolic of West Virginia's industrial misery. But not all of the area's woes can be blamed on the decline of King Coal.

Modern glass plant lies idle

This facility of the Hazel Atlas Glass Co., a division of Continental Can Corp., shut down a year ago, leaving 500 jobless. With this plant devoted principally to glass containers, industry has been hit hard by expanded use of paper, plastic, and metal for canning and bottling. Glass plants are being located nearer sources of products for which they will be used.

They were cold and probably hungry

Eight people, parents, and six children, live in this one-room cabin perched on a Marion County, W. Va., mountainside. They subsist on $14 a week relief money. When this picture was taken last winter the temperature was 8 degrees above zero outside but as they huddled about an inadequate gas heater, only heat in the home, all they had was summer clothing.

"Flight blight" signs greet the traveler entering Grafton, W. Va. They dot the town, urging residents to clean up and improve their neighborhoods. But the real blight of the area is on the minds and bodies of men, women, and children, families whose breadwinners have been jobless for many months, sometimes years.

Fabulous wealth lies idle as people go hungry

Some 2,000 people suddenly found themselves without jobs when this chemical plant at Morgantown, W. Va., was closed down over a year ago. Built by the Federal Government in the 1940's at a cost of $163 million, it is estimated that today it would cost $300 million to duplicate, yet the people of the area have been unsuccessful in efforts to find a company willing to operate it.

Glittering Generalities Courtesy of A.T. & T.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last month I read with interest a full-page advertisement which the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. placed in Life magazine August 3. It was entitled "Why in Heaven Don't You Speak Out on Inflation?"

Naturally I was interested. I estimate that millions of readers saw that appeal.

I believe this ad is part of a campaign being waged by big business as a part of the antediluvian thinking of the Republican Party. I have replied to other such ads and I have sent copies to the Bureau of Internal Revenue to see if they are legitimately paid for as a business expense.

Now no one is against a strong, sound, and stable dollar.

No one likes unreasonable demands.

No one approves excessive spending.

Neither do we approve of child beating or the kicking of dogs.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is that this ad, like too many appearing in newspapers and magazines these days, deals with glittering generalities. The vague proposal or statement is a favorite weapon of Madison Avenue.

I have written to the president of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., Mr. Frederick R. Kappel, to offer some comments about his company's participation in what appears to be a big phony anti-inflation campaign.

The advertisement and my letter to Mr. Kappel follow.

AN INTERESTING LETTER SAID, "WHY IN HEAVEN DON'T YOU SPEAK OUT ON INFLATION?"

I have received a number of letters from men and women who are concerned about inflation. One A.T. & T. shareowner asked, "Why in heaven don't you speak out on this subject?"

The letter went on to say, "If you would alert the 1,625,000 shareowners and 700,000 employees to the facts about inflation, they would help spread the news."

I warmly agree that it is essential to alert more people to the dangers of inflation and we in the Bell System are speaking up and speaking out at every opportunity.

In recent articles and bulletins to employees, the Bell System companies have discussed the threat which inflation poses to the purchasing power of the dollar and to savings, insurance, and pensions.

At the annual meeting of A. T. & T. shareowners I pointed out that inflation has been a tough problem in the telephone business. But we have not just talked about the problem—we have developed more efficient equipment and introduced many economies of operation. It is worth noting that the price of telephone service generally has gone up less since World War II than most other things.

But we know that the forces of inflation are far too widespread and powerful for any one individual or business to stem them singlehanded.

This brings me to the question that I believe so many are asking: "How can I help?" In these ways, it seems to me:

By giving spoken and written support to those who are working for a strong, sound, and stable dollar.

By opposing unreasonable demands, excessive spending, and schemes that add fuel to the inflationary fire.

Your friends and associates, and especially your representatives in Congress, are entitled to your constructive views.

For our part, we will continue to fight inflation by pushing research hard and effecting economies in our business. And by speaking out against this threat to the people and the country.

FREDERICK R. KAPPEL,
President, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.
NEW YORK, N.Y.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., Sept. 3, 1959.

Mr. FREDERICK R. KAPPEL,
President, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. KAPPEL: Your full-page advertisement in the August 3 issue of Life magazine, entitled "Why in Heaven Don't You Speak Out on Inflation"? appears to be part of a concerted effort by big business corporations to influence public policy through paid ads in national magazines.

As I read your advertisement I could not help but reflect that you must have a pretty poor opinion of the intelligence of the American people to think that they could be influenced by so vacuous a statement. You are for a strong, sound, and stable dollar. So are we all. What specifically, then, is it that you would have us speak out against?

You urge the public to oppose unreasonable demands. But what the unreasonable demands are that should be opposed you do not tell us. Has it occurred to you that many of the readers of the advertisement might regard putting pressure upon governmental regulatory agencies to establish rates that add considerably to the cost of telephone service as falling into the category of unreasonable demands? And, you know, rate hikes are also inflationary.

The recent order of the Federal Communications Commission, cutting long-distance telephone rates by $50 million a year, would seem to indicate that if you were genuinely concerned about containing the forces of inflation you would make every effort to achieve a downward revision of the toll charges to your customers without putting the Government into position of having to do it for you.

Your urge us to oppose excessive spending. Here again you are deliberately vague. Surely, it is not your intention that the consumer should curtail his expenditures for telephone services. I presume that what you do have in mind is the reduction of governmental expenditures. Shall we curtail outlays for national defense, foreign aid, highways, schools, etc.? Shall the letters which you urge the public to write aim to support those Members in Congress who wish to maintain a lid on interest rates so as to keep down the cost of servicing the Government debt? Unfortunately, you furnish us with no guidance. Certainly you would want us to be discriminating. Otherwise the public might end up by unwittingly urging the adoption of proposals advanced by the Democratic Party rather than those advocated by the Republican administration, in support of which you are using the funds of the A.T. & T. for paid advertisements.

What we need from business leadership is more enlightenment rather than obfuscation, less of an appeal to the emotions and more to the rational consideration of great national issues. Madison Avenue techniques for getting people to purchase commodities are hardly the tools for promoting understanding and for arriving at intelligent decisions in matters of public policy.

As one of the largest business corporations in America, the A.T. & T. has joined the ranks of what is essentially an antidemocratic movement among certain top business leaders who are determined to employ the funds of their corporations for the purpose of influencing public opinion. Have you ascertained how many of your 1,625,000 shareholders would endorse your campaign to frighten Americans about inflation? I am certain that there are a great many stockholders who do not share your views on political and economic issues. They would, of course, not question your right as a private citizen to publicly express your views. But it is another matter when you use the name and funds of your company to foist on the public your personal opinions as to current events. The taxpayer has also a right to be aggrieved when these paid advertisements are charged off as a corporate expense.

You must have noticed, Mr. Kappel, that 2 weeks after you felt compelled through your advertisement to alert the American people on the threat of inflation, the second report of what is popularly known as the Nixon Antiinflation Committee was released. In contrast to the first report, issued only 7 weeks earlier, which stated that "our economy is now at a critical juncture urgently requiring action to forestall inflation," the second one contained no warning about the imminence of inflation. In the words of Business Week (Aug. 22), the former bristled with a sense of crisis with respect to inflation, while the latter was described as playing down inflation talk, with greater attention given to economic growth. This suggests that before you commit yourself to another full-page advertisement you had better check with the Vice President as to what is the latest official line. In that way you might get the maximum benefit out of your advertising expenditures.

May I remind you, Mr. Kappel, that during the past year when the administration was clamoring vociferously that inflation was so pressing and immediate a threat, fellow legislators with whose thinking I agree have pointed out that there was little basis in fact to support the Administration's claims; that the consumer price index had remained more or less at a constant level throughout the year; that most of the increases in the price level had occurred during and shortly after wars, when too many dollars were chasing too few goods; and that in view of our great responsibilities as the leading Nation of the free world and of our neglected needs at home, it was imperative that the Administration concentrate its efforts on promoting the acceleration of the American rate of economic growth.

I can only draw one conlusion from the antiinflation campaign. The term "inflation" has come to be a slogan employed by conservative elements to defeat any legislation which they look upon with disfavor. It is a weapon used to frighten us away from measures designed to improve the lot of the common man through programs for the removal of slum and blighted areas, for strengthening our school systems, and for expenditures on much needed public services and facilities. It also has had the unfortunate result of taking dangerous risks with the future of our national security through inadequate support of much needed defense expenditures.

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Excerpts From Speech by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, at His 37th Annual Orchard Picnic, Berryville, Va., Saturday, August 29, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, August 29, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD, senior Senator from Virginia, gave his 37th annual orchard picnic at Berryville Va. Senator BYRD is so widely known, respected, and beloved by the people that I will not go into his many accomplishments but simply state that he is Virginia's first citizen and one of the outstanding statesmen of America. At the picnic, as has been the custom in the past, Senator BYRD delivered a most enlightening and cogent speech on the events of interest to our people. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith Senator BYRD's speech:

One of the main topics of conversation in Washington is the approaching visit of Khrushchev. The Congress appears to be divided as to the wisdom of his visit. It has its minus side as well as its plus side. Should one of the hundreds of thousands of refugees who have come to America because of the cruelty of Communist Russia take a shot at Khrushchev, it might start a third World War. Such risks as this, in my opinion, outweigh the plus side of his visit.

I am one of those Senators who do not believe he should be invited to address a joint session of the Congress of the United States.

That is the supreme honor accorded only to those we can trust and those who are our friends, such as Winston Churchill. Should a resolution inviting him be presented, and I hope it will not be, I will consider it my duty to vote against it. I am not willing for the Congress officially to pay tribute to the world's greatest Communist and our most dangerous enemy by inviting him to speak formally to the Congress of the United States.

We all know that we must live in the same world with those who ideas differ from ours, and with nations which have different forms of government. But in the case of Russia, let us always remember that Russia is a totalitarian nation, controlled by one man who recognizes only brute strength.

Let us greet Mr. Khrushchev with courtesy, let us protect him in every way possible, but do not let him or any other Russian lead us into a sense of false security. And above all do not let him sell us a bill of goods.

We must keep our military strength equal to if not greater than Russia's. This is our only protection. The Russians equal or excel us in the field of rockets. They definitely excel us in submarines equipped with nuclear weapons, but we excel them in the air and on the sea and in the development of atomic weapons.

It is tragic that after World War II we should find it necessary to prepare ourselves against attack by a formidable nation whose leader appears to be bent on extending his frontiers and control over weaker nations wherever he can find them. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I tell you we must not let our guard down.

As has been my custom, I will give you a BYRD's eye view of the work of the Congress and elsewhere in the Government this year. I shall not go into detail because much has happened since our last meeting.

THE WARREN SUPREME COURT

I call the present Supreme Court the Warren court so as to distinguish it from those courts on which great Justices previously have served our country so honorably and well and with such distinction and dedication to our principles.

The Warren court continues to run true to form, continues to render decision after decision in defiance of constitutional democracy, which, in the brief space of about 180 years, has made America the greatest of all nations.

America has only one-sixth of the population of the world, one-seventh of the earth's surface, but produces one-third of all the world's goods. This is because of our competitive enterprise system and the freedoms of our people.

The Warren court hands down decisions on Mondays. Nearly every Monday when the Court is in session is a black Monday.

I will not go over the ground which I covered here a year ago when I listed the decisions of the Warren court since 1954. Beginning with the integration decision, these Warren court decisions have steadily weakened our democracy.

This school decision is perhaps the most iniquitous and infamous of all. It was not based upon law nor was it based upon the Constitution, as many distinguished lawyers have so often said.

Since I spoke to you last, the Warren court has rendered three more particularly vicious decisions:

One to search a man's house without a warrant.

Even under the despotic rule of the early English kings a man's home was his castle, and no one could enter without due process of law.

Another decision would destroy the right of States to control and protect their citizens from indecency and immorality in books and pictures.

The third was a decision to permit the States to tax interstate commerce, which is in violation of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

It happens that I have two distinctions, although some may think they are not too creditable. One is that I am the only Member of the Senate now who voted against the Wagner Labor Act in 1935 which gave special privileges to the labor unions.

The second distinction is that I am the only Member of the Senate now who opposed the Tennessee Valley Authority.

These votes represent my philosophy of government. I do not believe in special privileges for either labor or business. I believe in the private enterprise system which is the source of our progress and advancement.

The Senate labor bill was a weak bill. I did all I could to strengthen it. The House labor bill is strong. It not only gives protection to the membership of the unions, but also controls secondary boycotts, hot cargoes, and such things which can destroy businesses not directly involved in any strike.

The House bill has strong provisions to prevent the intimidation of workers by means of picketing. Virginia is fortunate in that during the administration of Gov. William M. Tuck workers were guaranteed the right to work and are protected against violence and interference by pickets or otherwise.

The new Federal labor bill is now in conference where the differences between the House and the Senate bills are being worked out. Labor legislation must not be unfair to labor, but the excesses of ruthless labor leaders must be curbed. Only Congress has the power to do this.

James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical Radio and Machine Workers, inadvertently gave an assist to the passage of the stronger House bill when he wrote to each Member of Congress threatening to defeat every Senator and Congressman who voted for the bill.

PRINCE EDWARD

Before I conclude let me mention that ordinarily public schools next week would be reopening all over the State. But this year not a public school in Prince Edward County will open. Never before in the history of public schools in Virginia or any other State has a whole county withdrawn from the public education system.

It is vital, I think, that we in Virginia and people everywhere in America understand the conditions that brought about this closing of all public schools in an entire county.

In 1951 a suit was instituted against Prince Edward County in Virginia and Clarendon County, S.C., to require school integration. In 1954 the Warren court rendered a decision directed at these two counties imposing integration in all public schools with deliberate speed.

The great and able Virginia judge, Sterling Hutcheson, in a memorable decision, found deliberate speed in the case of Prince Edward to be at least 6 to 7 years.

The leaders of the NAACP then took an appeal, although they were urged not to do so my many of those who favored the Warren Supreme Court decision. Then the Federal Court of Appeals overruled Judge Hutcheson and ordered the Prince Edward schools to be integrated in the school year beginning next week. Thus, the county of Prince Edward faced massive integration. Such an enforced integration means the destruction of the public schools in that county.

There are 1780 colored pupils in Prince Edward and 1562 white pupils. The people of Prince Edward were prepared. They had determined when the suit was first instituted against them 8 years ago that they would resist forced integration. They did this in order to preserve a system of education because they knew white students would not attend integrated schools.

It is significant that although Clarendon County, S.C., was the other defendant in the suit, no effort has been made by the NAACP to integrate in that county.

The people of Prince Edward made no threats, they issued no inflammatory statements. There was no violence and no disorder. They have calmly and deliberately established a new system of private education without the use of a single public-school facility, buildings, schoolbuses, or any other public-school equipment.

Every white student in the county will go to school, using completely nonpublic facilities. The parents of the colored students have not attempted to avail themselves of other means of education.

In order to comply with the decision of Chief Justice Taft, rendered in 1928, providing for equal but separate school facilities, Prince Edward expended $1 million on a colored high-school building. Prince Edward still owes $400,000 on this school. It will be closed. The blame for this situation must be placed directly upon the ruthless action of the NAACP.

The colored people of Prince Edward County have been the victims of their leaders. Their lack of education must be laid directly at the door of those NAACP leaders who have become the integration enforcement agents for the Warren court.

Since the NAACP is responsible for closing the Negro schools in Prince Edward it would be appropriate for this association to allocate a part of its large tax exempt income to aid the Negroes in this county to obtain an education. In doing this the NAACP could in part make atonement for the injury they have done to these members of their race.

Knowing the people of Prince Edward as I do, I am confident that they are prepared to do everything wthin their power to give the colored students of Prince Edward the same education they have had in the past in segregated schools.

The NAACP has won its lawsuits and the Negroes have lost their schools, operated 85 percent at the expense of the white people of Prince Edward.

It is a tragedy for everyone—all because the NAACP deliberately and maliciously forced this action upon Prince Edward. Prince Edward has taken the only action it could take. The county had sought by every honorable means to avoid this step. It was faced with the destruction of its school system. White parents had taxed themselves heavily to build new Negro schools, and the Negroes had as many classrooms as the whites—Negro schoolteachers were paid exactly the same as the white.

The action that Prince Edward has taken is courageous, and it was thoughtfully and well considered. The brave citizens of Prince Edward are true to the faith of their fathers.

Those who expressed confidence in the so-called moderation of the NAACP which is enforcing the integration laws, should not only take note of this ruthless action taken against Prince Edward, but they should note the recent statement by the NAACP spokesman, Roy Wilkins, which has great significance.

"With the collapse of massive resistance laws," declares Roy Wilkins, national executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, "the South is trying to adopt a token compliance policy to get around the 1954 Supreme Court decision. Generally," he adds, "we are opposed to any form of token integration on the grounds that it is contrary to the Court's decision, but the NAACP will go along with plans where it appears to be a bona fide start toward desegregation."

Note that Wilkins accepts token integration only as a "bona fide start toward desegregation." Desegregation means massive integration.

I and other Virginians who advocated massive resistance to the illegal school integration decision of the Warren court have been bitterly denounced, chiefly by those outside of Virginia.

I stand now as I stood when I first urged massive resistance.

I believe then as I believe now that it is either massive resistance or in the long run run massive integration, and this would destroy our entire school system.

As one who has been honored so often by the Virginia people I felt my duty was to give the best advice of which I was capable.

At least under the massive resistance program Virginia remained segregated for 5

years after the Warren decision, notwithstanding the fact that massive efforts of the Federal Government and the NAACP were directed at Virginia alone.

Due to the concentration of all power against us today Virginia is the only southern State having enforced integration.

The policy was to break Virginia down first, and now the unholy alliance of the NAACP and the Federal Government will attempt the same strong-arm methods throughout the South.

I am firmly convinced that as long as the NAACP is in the driver's seat, the goal is massive integration all down the line in all walks of life.

Just a few weeks ago the NAACP met in New York City in annual convention and were addressed by so-called political notables.

A resolution was adopted declaring for complete integration of the races in all areas, effective on the 100th anniversary of the signing by Lincoln of the proclamation for the emancipation of the slaves. This program naturally includes declaring unconstitutional all State laws prohibiting mixed marriages.

If Warren lives long enough and remains on the Court this decision will certainly be rendered. It is not necessary for me to forecast the calamitous results of massive integration accompanied by legal encouragement toward mixed marriages.

Poison in Your Water—No. 165

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the El Dorado, Ark., Times of October 1, 1958, entitled "Dr. Hawley Warns of Diseases Caused by Open Sewers in City":

DR. HAWLEY WARNS OF DISEASES CAUSED BY OPEN SEWERS IN CITY

"Over the past 8 years 34 persons in Camden were stricken with paralytic polio and a recent survey showed that all but one lived in areas that do not have sewers," Dr. James Hawley said in a talk here Tuesday.

Dr. Hawley spoke during a panel discussion on the need for an adequate sewer system at the noon luncheon meeting of the Rotary Club.

In his remarks Dr. Hawley warned of the diseases that can be caused by open sewers. "Just because you happen to live in an area that has a sewer system does not mean you are safe, since flies and animals can carry the virus over the entire city," he pointed out.

Concerning the $1,150,000 bond issue for extending and improving the municipal sewer system, Dr. Hawley urged those present to cast their vote in favor of it at the special election on October 14.

This is why 20 local doctors voted unanimously to support the proposed sewer system at the last meeting of the Ouachita County Medical Society, he said.

The panel also included Bill Shelton, chamber of commerce manager, who pointed out that industries regard sewer systems of towns being considered for one of their factories. He said one of the main reasons one industrialist gave for not coming to Camden was the inadequate sewers. "Raw sewage is dumped into the Ouachita River," the industrialist stated on his report in turning down Camden.

"At the present time four large factories are considering Camden as a possible location. They have made preliminary study of the town but as yet don't know about the sewer situation, but they will find out," he said. The sewer bond issue must pass if we expect to bring industry here, he said.

H. K. Thatcher also spoke on the effect the raw sewage has on Ouachita River, which goes in at four different places. People who have boats know the terrible condition this creates, he said. "We must clean up our river or we will lose the economical value of what we are trying to do," he said with regard to getting a 9-foot channel for navigation.

The panel discussion was led by Mayor James Rowan. The floor was thrown open for questions after each panelist spoke.

Panel discussions like this are being held all over the city in an effort to inform the public of the need for sewer improvements. The next meeting will be on Wednesday night at Whitside School, starting at 7:30 p.m. It will be open to the public and individuals may ask any question they wish.

All Rotarians who expressed their opinion spoke in support of the project. Approval was indicated by the enthusiastic reception given the panel in their efforts.

Guests at the meeting were Jimmy Chambers and Frank Anthony, of El Dorado, and H. S. Neal, of Stuttgart, all visiting Rotarians. Steve Preston, of Camden, and Bobby Tutt and Herbert Asberry, of Harmony Grove High School, were Junior Rotarians.

Huron Editor Commends Colonel Hammond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Col. D. G. Hammond, Omaha district engineer of the U.S. Corps of Engineers, has been enthusiastically commended by the editor of the Huron Plainsman, Mr. Robert Lusk, on the splendid manner in which he has helped to direct the development of our great Missouri Basin system.

The people of the Missouri Basin keenly appreciate the irrigation, power, navigation, industrial, and recreational values derived from full-scale development of the Missouri River. Colonel Hammond is one of the men who has played a key role in this development. I know personally of the fine work which he and his colleagues have accomplished.

His commendation from the Huron editor is all the more significant in view of the fact that Mr. Lusk is himself one of the basin's most outstanding authorities on matters pertaining to River development.

I include in the RECORD the Plainsman editorial of September 2:

COLONEL HAMMOND HAS EARNED OUR SUPPORT

Col. D. G. Hammond, Omaha district engineer, is to be congratulated for the manner in which he is handling his many duties for the Corps of Engineers.

With missile bases and other military installations demanding his attention, he nevertheless has kept the various Missouri River Basin projects moving ahead at a brisk pace.

His progress report, given at a joint meeting of Huron service clubs, indicates the overall Missouri Basin program has reached the half-way mark.

At this time, 31,700,000 acre-feet of water are stored behind Federal dams in the basin and 25½ million acre-feet of that water are deposited in the Missouri River Dam reservoirs.

At the same time, approximately 126,000 acres of land are being irrigated under Bureau of Reclamation projects while an additional 90,000 acres are receiving supplemental water for irrigation.

Flood protection below the dams is guaranteed, Colonel Hammond said, and a new record in waterborne freight is being written on the river with 521,000 tons having moved on the Missouri through the middle of last week, which compares to 485,000 tons for the same period last year.

For power generation, Federal projects in the Missouri River Basin now have a capacity of 1,095,000 kilowatts. Revenue from the Federal plants during the fiscal year (July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959) was more than $12 million, most of which was returned to the Federal Treasury.

Then there is Oahe Dam, one of the world's largest earth-moving jobs. There now are 88 million cubic yards in the rolled earth embankment which will contain 90 million cubic yards when it is completed and completion will come before the snow flies this fall.

But that is only incidental to the big construction push on the project, which is the drilling of the seven power tunnels. Two of the tubes are half completed, another is two-thirds along, while a fourth is being started.

Next milestone for Oahe will come in July 1962, when the first of seven 85,000-kilowatt generators will go on the line. The 595,000-kilowatt installation, largest of the six mainstem dams, will be finished late in 1964.

Impressive as this record may be, there are further projects to be completed along the river.

Construction on Big Bend soon will be underway in earnest and, of course, the Oahe irrigation project, although not yet underway, is just around the corner.

How quickly will these and other basin projects proceed?

Colonel Hammond says a great deal depends upon the people. They have to make themselves heard, he says, or nothing will happen, no matter how worthwhile a project may be.

He is, in effect, asking the support of the people of South Dakota for the programs he has been handling so efficiently. He has earned the right to that support. The people should give it to him.

Taxpayers Rebelling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 19, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks there follows an editorial from the Times News, pub-

lished at Twin Falls, Idaho, under date of July 26, 1959. It very clearly shows that even on essentials the people back home are really practicing economy. Such votes as those described in the Times News ought to teach Members of Congress two lessons. First, that the people themselves are willing to forgo a lot of those things which would be nice to have, and that when they do the voting themselves they elect to do without them. The opposite results when the Congressmen do the voting. Second, the Federal Government, in order to support its many extravagances of recent years, has preempted the field of tax revenue to the extent that the local communities are almost derelict for sufficient revenues for the real essentials. It is high time that the Congress stop voting those things which the people will not vote for themselves.

The Times News article follows:

TAXPAYERS REBELLING

While Twin Falls is confronted with a serious need for water and sewer system improvements, and considerable enthusiasm is being generated in support of a new civic auditorium, developments elsewhere cannot help but dampen our hopes.

On the local level at least, where it's easier for them to demonstrate their opposition, it is becoming more and more apparent that taxpayers are getting fed up.

In one respect, that is an encouraging sign. If all this local opposition eventually develops into a groundswell, it could sweep through the state legislatures and on to Washington where the results would really count.

Meantime, of course, the increased burden of taxation made steadily heavier by the state legislatures and congress, is working a particular hardship on local communities where public improvements are seriously needed.

The taxpayers, resentful of the mounting tax load they are being forced to carry, are not inclined to shoulder any additional burdens voluntarily, much as they might recognize the need for public improvements in their own communities.

These are the only public expenditures over which they have direct control. In these local bond elections they can defeat proposed projects, the added cost of which would be reflected on the tax rolls.

During the last session of our own State legislature, we had an excellent example of taxes being raised considerably higher than was actually necessary, despite an already existing tax load which is working to the state's disadvantage.

In Congress, of course, it's even worse with eager-beaver spenders doling out public funds right and left, not only in the United States but throughout the world, at the American taxpayers' expense.

Just this last week, three proposals such as we are discussing went down in defeat in bond elections in southern Idaho.

An unusually heavy turnout of Boise voters overwhelmingly defeated a proposal to build a $2,400,000 coliseum in the State's capital city.

For the second time in 6 months, King Hill residents defeated a $475,000 bond issue to build additional elementary school facilities.

By more than a 3-to-1 margin, Minidoka County voters in Rupert defeated a proposed 3-mill tax levy to construct a new jail and remodel present jail facilities into office space. The proposal needed a two-thirds majority to pass.

The defeat of these three proposals is significant. No doubt the additional school facilities are seriously needed at King Hill and the jail at Rupert is inadequate.

But the resounding defeat of a new coliseum for Boise came somewhat as a surprise because of what seemed to be widespread support. The auditorium had been endorsed wholeheartedly by the Boise Chamber of Commerce, the city administration, organized labor, the Boise Statesman, and an endless list of individuals and business houses.

The bond issue needing a two-thirds favorable vote to carry fell nearly 1,000 votes short of a simple majority when the nearly 10,000 votes were counted.

Foremost among the various reasons given for the defeat of the project was the following explanation by the Boise Statesman:

"It becomes more and more evident that the people are rebelling against more taxes. Congress has found this out. The coliseum bond issue was the first opportunity our taxpayers had to express themselves."

While it is unfortunate that taxpayers generally have reached a frame of mind where they no longer are inclined to underwrite the additional cost of needed public improvements, it's easy to understand why they are starting to rebel.

All this belatedly brings into sharp focus the ugly fact that State legislatures and Congress have gone hog wild in spending the taxpayers' money, with Congress the chief offender.

While the taxpayers are now swinging the ax where it is most immediately effective, they must realize how that works to the disadvantage of their home communities unless they carry their fight all the way to Washington.

It's more difficult to keep spendthrifts from being elected as our representatives in the State legislature and Congress, and it will take far greater determination on the part of everyone to get the job done.

When taxpayers generally load their guns for bigger game; participate in elections with a vengeance, and insist that all their representatives in government keep in line, then and only then will wholesale Federal spending be brought under control. Then and only then will the individual community be able to support its local needs, with money which formerly was going down the drain through Washington.

Meantime, it should be taken for granted that any plans for water or sewer improvements or a new auditorium in Twin Falls, must be well thought out on a businesslike and conservative basis.

Even when such improvements are an absolute necessity it's difficult to get them underwritten with the taxpayers in their present frame of mind.

The suckers are even getting leery of Government participation. They're not so quick to snap at those gifts which for years have been misrepresented as Federal aid. The tax bills they are receiving all too frequently from Uncle Sam are beginning to open their eyes.

Farewell to Walter Lee

SPEECH
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, through my tenure of office it has been my great privilege to have known and associated with Walter Lee, a native of Mississippi and a dedicated servant of Congress in Washington for many years. It is with great reluctance that I accept the fact that Walter is retiring to a well-deserved vacation. However, it is my hope that he will have many years of happiness ahead with his lovely wife, pursuing those things of which he dreamed for many years. His unselfish service in Washington will serve as an inspiration certainly for me and, I am sure, for the many others whom he has "faded on" by association over the years. I hope it will be my good fortune to visit with Walter in the future and maintain the warmth of friendship over the years with this great American.

Continuation of Education and Training Program for Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call attention to the following resolution passed by the American Legion, department of Louisiana, in annual convention in Baton Rouge, La., July 23–26, 1959:

RESOLUTION URGING CONTINUATION OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM FOR VETERANS

Whereas the Congress of the United States, expressing the will of the citizenry by the enactment of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.), recognized the justice, equity, and the general value of a sound education and training program for the veterans of our country; and

Whereas the legislation enacted to provide such education and training benefits was for the purpose of restoring lost educational opportunities to those men and women who served in the Armed Forces of our country and has accomplished this purpose and has been an immeasurable factor in contributing to the economic security of our veterans and their families, as well as to the security of the Nation as a result of the increase in the general educational level and professional and technical skills of the veterans; and

Whereas the increased earning power of veterans directly attributable to the program is resulting in payment of increased income taxes which will more than repay the total cost of the program; and

Whereas notwithstanding the continuing involuntary military service program, Public Law 7, 84th Congress, denies entitlement to education and training benefits to all veterans who first entered service after January 31, 1955, which is grossly inequitable: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, Department of Louisiana, in annual convention in Baton Rouge, La., July 23–26, 1959, strongly urges a continuation of an education and training program similar to that provided by Public Law 550, 82d Congress, to all veterans of our country who serve in any period in which involuntary military service is au-

thorized, and urges the Congress to enact appropriate legislation to accomplish; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, all members of the Louisiana congressional delegation, and to the American Vocational Association.

Our Job To Preserve Our Way of Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Prince Edward County, Va., has been under the guns of the Federal judiciary since 1951. The Federal courts above the district level under the direction and at the bidding of the NAACP have tried to compel the people of this great county to submit to judicial intimidation, dictation, and usurpation of power. The people of Prince Edward County have refused to submit to unconstitutional judicial fiat, nor have they submitted to judicial usurpation of authority and arrogation of power. These great Americans and true Virginians have been fighting the battle for constitutional government and standing between the rest of the Nation and judicial tyranny. Acting through the appropriate officials, they have closed the public schools and are going to educate the white children of the county in private schools financed in large measure by the people of that noble county.

There have been so many outstanding leaders in this fight to preserve our way of life that no one person can be singled out. However, I feel it appropriate to say that J. Barrye Wall, the editor and publisher of the Farmville Herald, by his soul-searching editorials has done more than his share in pointing out the issues at stake and the need to continue to resist the would-be destroyers of our way of life.

On Friday, September 4, 1959, there appeared another one of his splendid editorials in the Farmville Herald. Under leave to extend my remarks I include that editorial:

[From the Farmville (Va.) Herald, Sept. 4, 1959]

OUR JOB

If there is a disagreement between the Richmond News Leader and the Lynchburg News in regard to the findings of two professors of Emory University prepared for the Southern Regional Council in regard to operations of public schools and private schools, it is certainly no concern of ours. We suspect the respective editors can take care of themselves in such a verbal battle, if it comes to that.

We would have hoped that the editor of the Lynchburg News would have left Prince Edward County out of the argument, but since this county has been brought in as a horrible example and the system of private schools here are already condemned to failure, even before they open, we believe it necessary to point to several facts and truths.

If the Perrow-Almond plan, passed by the legislature under considerable duress, is really a freedom of choice plan, as it is advertised, the people of Prince Edward have taken it at face value and exercised their freedom of choice. They made known their position in 1955, barely 7 hours after the Warren Court made known the rules in its implementing order of May 31, 1955. Funds for the operation of public schools were reduced then to a month-to-month basis with the distinct understanding that local support for public schools would cease when integration was ordered. This position was reaffirmed in 1956, and action was taken in 1959, when the Federal court ordered integration of Prince Edward's schools in September and refused a stay of the order.

The position of the present Virginia State laws of the Perrow plan, disagreement among attorneys, and the attorney general of their true meaning, pressures by Federal courts in the Warren County, Norfolk, Arlington cases, and the unprecedented favoritism in the Charlottesville case form a confused picture.

In view of this situation the white people, having established Prince Edward School Foundation, began preparations for educating their children in a system of private schools.

To this end they have pledged $265,871.49 of a budget of $300,000. In hand is $65,000 or more in cash, a sufficient amount to operate the schools for 3 months. Cash payments of pledges are being received daily as promised by the pledgors. That the schools will be financed this year is a certain conclusion. Contributions from neighbors and friends are being received every day. Incidentally, any contributions to the foundation are deductible for income tax purposes.

To house the schools, the people of the county have made determined efforts. Principally, the churches in the various communities will provide satisfactory housing. In two cases additional rooms have been erected by church members to assure comfortable accommodations.

Transportation will be furnished by the people in the various communities and surplus buses have been bought by Patrons, Inc., a corporation formed for that purpose.

Books for the libraries have come from many points in the southside Virginia, 4,000 from Richmond, 1,200 from Danville, 1,500 from South Boston, 3,000 from the libraries of the people of Prince Edward and its environs, and varying numbers from Hopewell, Emporia, Alberta, and other places. The need was for 2,500 books and the good people have contributed over 9,000 and still they come.

The classrooms in the private schools will be comfortable, light, airy, and adequate. The picture of the blacksmith shop shown on the editorial page of the News, we are sure, was mistakenly referred to as a classroom. It is the industrial shop—and where more appropriately would a metal and woodworking class be taught than in a former blacksmith shop?

If we are any judge of the determination of the people of Prince Edward there will always be private schools in Prince Edward as opposed to integrated public schools.

(1) Because the private schools will be operated equally as efficiently as the public schools.

(2) Because the people of Prince Edward will not submit to integrated public schools.

For how long will the courts and the Federal Government permit the county to deny educational opportunities to the Negro children?

The county of Prince Edward does not deny educational opportunities to the Negro children, now or at any time in the past. The Perrow plan provides for all children. A grant of at least $231 is available to every child in Prince Edward County, for use in private nonsectarian schools, or in public schools outside the county.

The colored people can provide education for their children by two or three easy steps.

(1) Form a corporation or an association under the laws of Virginia to operate a private school, either segregated or integrated.

(2) Establish a school accredited by the Virginia Department of Education, which can be done.

(3) Apply for scholarship grants offered by the State of Virginia through the Perrow plan of "freedom of choice."

(4) Acquire buildings for school use. These may be either buildings privately owned or built, or surplus schools owned by the county. They even may be rented in the discretion of the school board.

The county of Prince Edward has not denied the Negro children any rights they possess, any more than it has denied the white children of their rights. If any rights have been denied by anyone, we suggest that the NAACP-pressured Federal courts have denied both the white and Negro children of Prince Edward a public school system by the unconstitutional decision of May 17, 1954. They have forced many localities in Virginia to bend to their will of racial integration, including the city of Lynchburg, but not Prince Edward County. If Lynchburg chooses to compromise, that is its prerogative; if Prince Edward does not wish to compromise its principles, then let them do it without criticism from anyone. If this be folly, we will make the most of it.

Victory in the Dust Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FLOYD BREEDING
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, since the following article portrays the condition as it existed in a part of my district during the drought years of the thirties, and since I know the people mentioned in this article and still live neighbors to them, I would like for every Member of Congress to read this article. If the good people of this area had not had faith in the land as brought forth in this article, in my opinion a great portion of the Southwest would have become a permanent desert. The article follows:

[From Reader's Digest, August 1959]

VICTORY IN THE DUST BOWL

Everybody in Texas County, Okla., knows Ed Tucker. They know his cool, white farmhouse that drowses under the cottonwoods 34 miles west of Guymon, the county seat, and 18 miles east of the Colorado line. Ed's neighbors have known his story a long time. To them, it may not seem the remarkable thing it is.

The Tucker place, with its huge barns, spreading fields, and mammoth combines, looks like many other prosperous wheat farm. In reality, it is not so much a farm as a battlefield. Like Gettysburg and Valley Forge, it was once a deadly arena in which men fought until their hopes, their fortunes, and their lives were beaten into the earth.

The Tucker farm is smack in the center of the country that gave the American language a new name for hell: Dust Bowl. The enemy was dust. The dust defeated thousands of men and drove them and their families off the land and into the inhospitable cities.

But the dust didn't beat Ed Tucker, though it all but drowned him. Nor did it beat Pearl, his wife, though she nearly drowned with him. Ed and Pearl stayed with the land and fought until it didn't seem sensible to fight any longer. Then they fought some more.

How great their victory was became clear last summer. In the bumper year 1958 the onetime Dust Bowl grew more than 8 million bushels of wheat. Ed Tucker, farming 3,000 acres, grew some 40,000 bushels. It was all prime wheat, and it all came from the very fields that in the 1930's had done their best to kill him.

Why had he stayed on, struggling in the blinding dust, when all around him his neighbors were pulling up stakes?

"I guess it's just this prairie country," Ed says. "Once you get used to it, no other kind looks good to you."

Ed's land is part of the High Plains. Ed was 7 years old when he first saw the flat, forbidding landscape of Texas County. His father, Schuyler Tucker, had been a schoolteacher in Greensburg, Ky., before he felt the urge, the quickening in his blood, that has driven so many Americans westward.

It was 1906. In that year 34 families—more than 125 people—left Greensburg to homestead on the Oklahoma Panhandle. Before long most of them were homesick and discouraged.

They had homesickness so bad that they had to pass a rule against singing "My Old Kentucky Home" at their get-togethers—it was just too upsetting to hear. Once a wit came to a Sunday social carrying a porcelain article designed for nocturnal convenience in the bedchamber. The shocked women drew away to titter in private, but when he explained it was "to catch the tears in case anyone breaks the rule," they burst out crying.

The trouble was the land. Bone dry, featureless, timberless, floor flat, it lay waiting, daring man to make a mark on it. There were no trees, no houses, no barns. It had been designed by nature for nomads. The Kentuckians had known so little about what they were getting into they had even brought fruit trees with them. They dug a trench around each tree to conserve moisture, and a few trees had survived long enough to put out blossoms. Then the wind tore the blossoms off before they could fruit.

For the land was savage. It was like the Australian outback, the blank Mongolian plain, the grim reaches of Siberia. Before the Kentuckians undertook to crop farm it, others had tried to tame this wild, intractable country, and had retreated, licking their wounds.

Cattle barons and homesteaders came hopefully, but were driven out. Finally the Kentuckians arrived. But they, too, found it a fearful struggle—requiring more than most men wanted to give. By 1916 the Kentucky colony had gone the way of all others. It was down to two families, the Tuckers and the Prices. C. W. Price's boys hung on until the onset of the Dust Bowl. Then they pulled out, and only the Tuckers were left.

Schuyler Tucker had a deep reverence for the soil. He learned what kind of wheat could stand the searing summer heat of the Plains. He learned how to plow so that the wind wouldn't blow his fields away before the wheat took hold. During the lean years he held on, raising just enough to feed his flock. But he knew in his heart that he wasn't going to be able to stick it out—not alone. He knew that if they were going to stay it would depend on Ed. His son Ed was 18 years old now, and he had a real knack with the land. Everything he put his hand to—whether animal or plant—did a little better than most.

Then something happened that seemed to seal the fate of the Tucker homestead in Texas County. Daddy Tucker came down with influenza. It was a long siege and, when he recovered, it was clear that he wouldn't have the strength to battle this land again. It would be up to Ed. Either Ed would dig in his heels and wrestle with the giant or the giant would shove the Tuckers off the Plains, back to Kentucky.

Suddenly, unexpectedly, the giant got help, and the battle seemed decided. Back in Greensburg, Granddad Perkins, Ed's maternal grandfather, owned what was practically a milliopaire's domain—2,000 acres of level bottom land. He offered Ed a rich farm on a platter. Ed merely had to come and pick it up.

All his life Ed had heard about the wonders of Kentucky. There were mountains there. And streams with fish in them. There were trees, and the grass was green. Any time you wanted it to rain you just had to whistle.

He was off like a shot, catching the same train that carried the letter saying he was coming. His father said nothing to stop him, but his silence concealed despair. As Ed's train pulled out, he saw his hopes for his homestead vanish with it.

Ed himself felt that in going to Greensburg he was, after long exile, returning home. It was an attitude he had learned from his elders. But it did not work out that way. When Granddad Perkins drove him around the Kentucky countryside, he'd stop the car at this or that likely farmstead. "That's a pretty bottom there," the old man would say, and Ed would take a look. "Yes, sir, it certainly is," he'd agree politely.

But he said it without enthusiasm, for a strange thing was happening in him. He did not feel at home in Greensburg. The countryside was pretty, yes, but only as scenery. The trees crowded him; the hills hemmed him in. And this country was settled. All the big jobs had been done by other men. What was there to do that would really stretch your muscles?

Ed kept wanting to tell his grandfather about John Green's well, back in Texas County. This was long before Ed's day. But Ed had heard the story a hundred times, and each time with a spine-tingling shiver of excitement.

John Green didn't have any water on his place, so he began to dig for it. Day after day he attacked the ground with a shovel. He went down 10 feet, then 20, then 30. When he got so far down that he couldn't use a ladder, he rigged a windlass at the top. He tied a sawed-off barrel to one end of the rope and a horse to the other. Every morning Mrs. Green would lower her husband into the well; he'd start shoveling dirt into the barrel and she'd have the horse haul it to the surface when it was full.

It took John Green 5 years of digging before he began to see damp rock under his feet. Finally, when he was 233 feet down, he reached water-bearing rock. It was a thrilling epic of persistence. Moreover—and this was even more thrilling—he did not have to shore up the hole as he dug. The sides had never once threatened to cave in, because it was all pure soil clear down to bedrock, a 233-foot mine of treasure that a farmer and his generations could live off forever.

Back in Kentucky, Ed thought about that treasure. And then he thought about the men who had tried to claim it.

Nature had presented the farmer on the High Plains with a challenge. Here's all the good earth you'll ever want. Just start plowing. But when you start plowing, look out. Keep one eye on the furrow and the other on the weather. Whatever you do, mind the wind. For the dead hopes of men beaten by that ceaselessly surging ocean of wind lay everywhere—sagging fenceposts, drifted fields, warping boards of abandoned houses.

But not all men had been defeated. There was John Green's well. It was still there, and now a grove of willow trees had grown up on the overflow around it. They stood tall and lonely, a beckoning sign to other men. Schuyler Tucker's family often picnicked in their shade. And other settlers came there to draw water before their own wells were driven. Often they stayed to relax and let the children play. But the best playing, Ed remembered, was just to stand under the trees and look out at the land. Here was a prize if a man could find a way to take it. Here was a future waiting, and the horizons stretched as far as a man could see.

In a few days Ed was on the train again, leaving Kentucky, going home to the High Plains. He didn't know then that his home was going to be turned into a dust bowl, and that he was going to be tested, year upon year, as few men since Job have been tested. He didn't know that he was to be cast in the role of David, or that Goliath was waiting.

The plains never looked better to Ed than the morning he jumped off the train at Guymon. He hitched a ride home, went into the house and pulled on his overalls. It was September, and his father was out beside the barn pouring seed into the boxes on the wheat drill. The team was hitched; when the boxes were full of wheat Ed took the reins and stepped into the seat.

The news in Texas County was that some more folks had moved in. They were the Chatwells from Sparta, Tenn. They had just bought land adjoining the Tucker place, and they had a daughter. In no time at all Ed was tastefully sprigged out to introduce himself. Whippy and blade-shaped, moving with a well-bred strut, he looked like a young sporting gentleman and acted as if he were at a race meet or quail hunt.

Ed remembers well what he thought the first time he saw Lillian Pearl Chatwell: there goes Mrs. Ed Tucker. And Pearl remembers well what she thought the first time she saw Ed: how did he get stuck behind a plow anywhere, least of all in Oklahoma?

She was a sunny-faced, graceful deerlike girl. Ed found her rinsing out some clothes in back of the house. No man to do things the easy way, he had to put up some hurdles, just to see if he could jump over them. "Well," he said loftily, "you look as if you'd make a pretty good washerwoman." Then he made sure she'd remember having met him by asking Pearl's older sister for a date, even after he'd been told she was already engaged to a beau back home in Sparta.

Confidence—the mark of the master: Ed had it. Time enough later, after you've caught the girl's attention, to smooth her feathers. The future Mrs. Tucker, all her feathers bristling as she watched Ed strut off with her sister, called it arrogance then. But that was before the long years proved it to be the rock on which her life and the lives of her children were firm-founded.

It was 1919. The Southern Plains were starting to fill up again. It had been that way for almost 50 years now. Ten dry years of nearly desert conditions would empty the land. Then would come the "good" years, when rainfall averaged about half what the rest of the crop-growing country got, and new settlers would arrive hopefully. This time there were a lot of young people, World War I veterans and their brides looking to start life.

A Virginian named Ed Brewer took up land just down the road a few miles and put up a big barn which became the scene of regular Virginia-style dances. A few miles in the other direction was the one-room schoolhouse, where the community often had box suppers and other gay get-togethers. Automobiles were becoming frequent, mak-

ing evenings in Elkhart, just across the Kansas border, and in Guymon possible.

Ed and Pearl didn't lack places in which to enjoy each other's company. But she was too young to consider marriage, she said. She was still saying it 4 years after Ed had started courting her. But by that time he had got her to admit they were going to marry somebody someday, even if not each other, and they might as well start studying up on home furnishings together. She took to slipping a Sears, Roebuck catalogue under the sofa cushion in preparation for Ed's Sunday afternoon calls.

But Daddy Chatwell usually made a third at these meetings. While the catalog moldered lumpily under the cushion, he talked to Ed about strip-tilling, about capillary water, about ways of feeding beef to change its marbling from yellow to white, and countless other topics of Texas County dry-land farming.

Daddy Chatwell got the devil for it regularly from his wife after Ed left. But it was more than parlor conversation to him. Long ago he had discovered that whatever he had learned about farming in the humid lands was of small use on the plains. Talking to Ed was better than reading books. The boy knew what the books were going to be written about. Nor did Pearl complain.

In fact, she was almost relieved that the big question was thus being put off. It wasn't Ed or the idea of marriage or young-girl foolishness that made her uncertain. It was the wide-open spaces. She wasn't used to this vast land with its endless, motionless sweep—and then there was all that wind.

"Does the wind blow like this all the time?" a newcomer to the plains asked, turning his back to the gale so that his words might be heard. "No, mister," he was told. "It'll blow like this for a week or 10 days. Then it'll take a change and blow like hell for a while."

It was an old folk-joke, but Pearl learned that it was exaggerated only somewhat. The winds blow across the high plains at the same average velocity through the years as they do on the seashore. There is nothing on that stupendous floor of land to act as a windbreak. The full impact of the wind blows right along the ground. Any obstruction will make a tricky rapids in the flow. The wind hits, bounces off, then coils up and springs back and hits again. Sometimes this makes trouble. Where a grain elevator is built right alongside a road, for example, they have to put up a sign: "Danger, Drive Slow, Wind Currents." It's a land that takes getting used to.

At the best of times—in the summer of a good year with crops covering the ground—there is danger of a kind of snow blindness. The sky will become a flickerless blaze of white, and the ground is so flat that you can shut out the sky only by walking with your head down. When you gaze at cattle off in the fields, you look as if they're grazing on the brink of a cliff. You can see the sky above and below them, glaring from between their legs. That's how flat the land is, and Pearl never ceased to marvel at it. Even today she isn't completely used to it.

The enormous, yawning monotony of the landscape produces an affliction that plains people recognize at once. A man would walk around with a shaken look, as if he he had just come away from some narrow escape. There would be a glaze of fever over his eyes, but he didn't have a fever and he had had no narrow escape. He had simply come down with "the loneliness."

But to some—and Pearl came to be one of them—the levelness has an exalting quality. Mountain-born though she was, she got so that she didn't miss the hills, for she learned that it was not earth but sky that made the plains landscape. Standing in one place, she could have an unobstructed view over a circle of earth with an area of more than 300 square miles. She could see a storm begin and end and start again. Here the rainbow attained its fullest range, its colors pulsing as if alive.

The nights in that 3,000-foot altitude were always cool and juicysweet. As the sun rose, the sage became warm and fragrant. The wind, perfumed with sage, came into your bed and woke you. What a land. Its alarm clock was a fragrant silence that made you ambitious to be alive.

And then you were out in the open where even a girl stood up so high above everything else from horizon to horizon that she could feel more a part of the air than of the ground. She could have the same sense of freedom that a bird must have. Elsewhere people could learn it only in love, but here the earth itself taught that there was nothing taller than man except God.

But the stillness had a feeling of death in it, too. The fields had the strange, deep quiet of a cemetery. There was the same quality to the silence as of a crowd of sounds that had been taken away, leaving a sense of loss behind.

Pearl used to think these things, and she used to ask Ed if he felt that way.

To Ed, the stillness and the open spaces meant something different. It meant challenge. Out here, where there was nothing but earth and sky, a man felt mighty tall—or mighty small—depending on how he was accustomed to look at things. If the wind and the everlasting stillness got you down, you became smaller and smaller, and sooner or later you were gone without a trace. But if you had a mind to stand up to the land and wrestle with it, before long the land would give in and become part of you. Then you had some of its strength. It was working with you. Only, you always had to look out. The land, Ed told Pearl, was like a fickle woman. It could turn on you and make you feel small again But always you knew the promise of glory was there, if you could manage to find a way to capture it.

"Isn't that something?" Ed wanted to know. "Isn't that reason enough for a man to stay with the land?"

Pearl had to admit it was—for a man. But a girl has to think of life for children. If a man sometimes felt small out here, what would it be like to be a child? In her mind Pearl saw two children, a boy and a girl, walking hand in hand, lost in the wasteland. But she never spoke of this to Ed.

For all his boldness, Ed was gentle with Pearl; yet he was persistent, and eventually she agreed to order furniture by mail. They wouldn't pay for it yet. They would leave it in the railroad station, crated, in case either one of them had a change of heart.

By that time, almost 5 years had passed since their first meeting. Finally, Pearl set a date—November 26, 1924, the day before Thanksgiving. But it was only to drive to Guymon. Ed could stop in front of the preacher's house as long as he wanted to. If she didn't want to go in, she wouldn't. They'd have to wait until they got there to see about that. All right, agreed Ed, he'd wait.

Ed was living alone at that time on the family homestead. His older brother was married and had already moved off the plains. His younger brother was away in college, and his parents were living in Hooker, about 25 miles away.

On November 26 Daddy Tucker drove out to the farm. He saw that, although it was only midmorning, there were tubs of bath water heating on the stove. He looked at them and then at Ed, who remained silent.

"If you're fixing to get married," Daddy Tucker said after a while, "we might get a turkey ready for you tomorrow."

Ed hesitated for a long minute. Then he said, "Go ahead. Catch your turkey."

That was all that was said.

Pearl's parents saw Ed drive up in his new $1,200 Buick. They saw Pearl come running down the stairs in her new dress, carrying a suitcase. "We're just going for a drive," Pearl explained.

"With a suitcase?" her horrified parents cried.

"We might stay over for Thanksgiving with Daddy and Mother Tucker."

So finally Pearl hurried off trembling into the wild dimness of a future on the High Plains.

All the folks said that Ed and Pearl had chosen a good year in which to be married. The weather on the southern plains seemed to behave according to a 10-year cycle: the 1890's had been bad, the 1900's good, the teens bad again. Now the 1920's were good, and the newlyweds had a right, in 1924, to look forward to 6 or more years in which to build up substance for the lean cycle that they knew must follow.

Eventually, Ed and Pearl knew, they would run into a year when there would be too much rain, or not enough. Or they would be hailstones that would fall like rocks, crushing and shattering the wheat.[1] They knew they could expect a summer when grasshoppers would come over the land in great wavy plumes like smoke, darkening the sun, eating the fields to naked stubble with a clicking sound that could rattle the windows in a house. Ed had seen these things happen. But, as he put down his wheat crop that fall, he felt tall and strong. He thought he had the land tamed for a while. And then the sky opened up and cut him down to size.

In his first year of marriage Ed's crop was hailed out. The wheat he sowed never brought back a dollar. They got into the lean cycle sooner than they figured. Ed took $400 of his savings and bought a junked combine. He fixed it up himself and set to work threshing the crops of neighbors who had not been hailed out. It netted him $1,000. The bad year was behind them. Next year would be better.

But in 1925 there was no crop at all for anyone. And this right smack in the middle of the good cycle. It was what on the plains they call a skip year. There was plenty of rain overhead, but the wind dried the danged stuff before it could fall.

"Never mind, dear," Pearl said to Ed. Pearl didn't care what the weather did. She had confidence in Ed. And Ed didn't care either. He had confidence in the land.

In 1925, as soon as he saw he was not going to have a crop again, he got a tractor. It was only a little secondhand Fordson, but it could plow 20 acres in a day, as much as a six-horse team. Ed traded two horses for it and set to work.

There was plenty of land available that year. The nomads, known locally as "suitcase farmers," didn't come in the dry years, and you could rent their fields for a quarter of whatever crop you raised on them. Ed rented 800 additional acres. His brother, Allan, had left college and was now living with Ed and Pearl on the family homestead. The two men spent the blistering weeks and months of the growing season summer-fallowing. Their only money came from the milk cows and Pearl's dowry—a flock of turkeys she had raised from poults.

It was a typical skip year. While the crop planted the year before died on one part of

---

[1] One night this past June (1959) a hailstorm covered 60 square miles in the vicinity of Selden, Kans., with 18 inches of ice. The storm collapsed the roofs of five business establishments, parts of the roofs of many other buildings, and inflicted a total crop loss on the wheat farmers in the area.

the land, the boys toiled on another, with nothing except Ed's confidence to tell them they would get anything for it next year.

But a good rain came early in September, which was just the right time, and seeds, machines, horses, and men were all deployed to race out and get wheat planted before wind and sun snatched the wetness away.

In the spring the wheat sprang up lustily. Pearl had become pregnant during the winter, and the child in her stirred now. Ed would look at his fields, then come back in and look at Pearl. "Things are busting out all over," he cried once with such excitement that Pearl had to laugh. It was a warm, fond time in life.

All that spring the weather smiled on Ed and Pearl and their spreading, burgeoning fields. In July, just before the harvest, Daddy Tucker came out from Hooker to see what the wheat amounted to. He took one look and had the best field chained off. Then he called in witnesses to testify to the accuracy of the count. It added up to an incredible 64 bushels to the acre, 4 times what was then the national average.

"Boys, you've done it," the old man cried. "You've learned the land."

The whole county had done it. "We showed 'em," the men were crowing as they strutted in to market. "We licked 'em, we beat 'em, we taught 'em a lesson." Ed Tucker crowed some, too. But he knew in his heart that the lesson had been taught by the earth. "If you heed the land," Daddy Tucker used to tell his boys, "the land will help you."

Nineteen twenty-six, a year of blessed memory, R.I.P.—it seemed that the machines had supplied all the answers. The Tuckers marketed 38,000 bushels of wheat during the summer at a price that ranged between $1.10 and $1.25 a bushel. A week after the summer ended—on September 28—there was a second harvest: Pearl gave birth to Elizabeth Allene.

Ed's hat went up into the sky. But he was careful to take it down again. He was 28 in 1926, a veteran with 20 years' experience. If the twenties remained fat years, the thirties must be lean ones.

Ed Tucker bought more land, built a nice new house on it for his new family, bought more and bigger machines—but he paid for everything as he went along. "Always keep a dairy herd," his father warned him, and he did. He was too far from the market to sell the milk, but he could slop it to hogs and sell the cream. "Never eat more than your cream check will buy," his father warned him, and he didn't. With his taste for elegance, Ed's machines had to be the newest and finest, his hogs prime, his dairy herd prize-winning blooded Holsteins. Yet as the 1920's ended he could look in his books and find that he didn't owe any man a cent.

Now the 1930's began, and Ed knew what to expect. It was the dance of life on the plains, the Oklahoma three-step—three steps forward, three steps back. There had been 10 fat years. Now look out for 10 lean years. As Ed looked at the horizon in a circle around his fields, he wondered when the trouble would come.

Every spring the winds would sweep the plains like a broom. A strong blow turned the Oklahoma Panhandle misty. On more and more days people began to wonder what had happened to the sun.

Nobody worried too seriously about it. Dust was inevitable where land was being worked and winds could rove for a hundred miles without bumping into anything higher than a jackrabbit. The dust was all good topsoil anyway.

But before long—in 1931, Ed remembers—he began to have to turn his headlights on in daylight. The dust was pretty thick all that spring. By 1932 there were real storms—regular dusters. The wind would slop drifts up against the houses and fences, and men would groan, thinking of all the extra work involved in cleaning the drifts up. But they learned they only had to wait. The wind would turn around and take the dust away.

Still Ed became uneasy. Some of his familiar fields began to develop a strange look, for not all the dust was being taken away. Topsoil on the high plains had been built up at the rate of 1 inch every 500 years. Now they were getting that much in a single blow.

Then strange things began to happen. Macy Coultice, one of Ed's neighbors, got caught out in a wind. Coultice was within sight of his house when the dust came over and swallowed up everything. He became so hopelessly lost that finally he just had to hunker down, smothering, and spitting, and wait for the air to clear. Later, Ed Brewer got lost between his barn and his house, and soon there were days when people had to grope to find the way in their own homes. The early-morning air, once so fresh, was now stifling, like the air of an attic.

Macy Coultice was the first one to come down with what came to be known as "dust pneumonia." He never felt right after the day he spent choking in the dust. Soon he began to have pains in his chest. A few days later he was dead. The dirty thirties had arrived.

They say now that 1926—the fattest year of them all—was the one that did it. But the trouble started long before then. It stemmed from ignorance of the land and from disregard for its ways. The suitcase farmers, the nonresident landowners, came with the rains to make a crop as one might come to a gambling table to lay down a bet. When they drove off after a harvest, they would leave the fields lying bare and uncared for. Hit-and-run farmers, Ed called them.

Credit was another cause of trouble. The plains demanded big-scale farming. The need for speed in working the land demanded machines. And the machines cost big money. To make them pay their way a man needed still more acres. So men bought machines on credit to work the land they would pay for when they hit the jackpot with a big harvest. Although Ed Tucker, Ed Brewer, the Coultices, and many others avoided such wild gambling, easy credit was the rage of the day.

The depression played its part, too. The businessman could counter falling prices by laying off workers, cutting production and expenses; the farmer's only counter was to increase production. When the extra production drove prices down even farther, the farmer had only one answer: raise still more crops. So they began to break open the marginal lands—the fields they knew should be left in grass.

This marginal land, rashly plowed to keep up with falling prices, was the first to become uncovered in the drought. The wind would nudge at and dislodge a naked soil particle. The dislodged particle would roll and slide along briefly, shoot up in the air for a foot or two—in a movement known as saltation—and then, in lafiding, dislodge another particle.

The soil movement would go on until the particles found protection from the wind in some depression. There they would collect in a pile until the pile had become big enough to fill the depression. Then the wind would get at it again and send the loose particles bouncing and rolling onward.

The crops went. The plants on the windward side of the field were the first to feel the force of the wind. When the first plant was shoved out by the roots, it would slide along to tangle with a plant beyond. Its naked roots sticking up in the wind like a sail, it would nudge, butt, and tug until the second plant was worked loose. Then the two plants would sail on in their fatal embrace until caught by the next plant downwind. This they worked loose in half the time.

That, dissected, was the anatomy of the disaster. By the time half the field was bare, the wind was rolling up the rest of it as quick as peeling. The fatal process began to strip Ed's crops before his eyes, and laid his good land as bare as the marginal land had been. All the earth everywhere was turning into a fog that flew up and fell down to fly up again in the unresting winds.

When he saw a field start to go, Ed would run and get his lister plow. A lister cuts a deep furrow, ridging up the dirt on each side, protecting the soil temporarily against the wind.

Ed would work with his face wrapped in wet rags against the pneumonia riding in the storm. He never had much feeling for his own safety, which worried Pearl; and, whenever she felt it had become dangerous for him to work more, she'd take Elizabeth Allene and young Lloyd (wrapping their faces in wet rags, too) and drive out to fetch him. At the gate to the field she'd start honking the horn. He couldn't hear it very far above the roar of the wind, and he couldn't see the car headlights until he was right on top of them. But she'd leave the headlights on and keep honking. Sometimes it would be an hour or more before Ed would show up.

By listing, Ed possibly could have held his own acres from blowing away—if others had looked after their land, too. But nobody was tending the many fields that were being abandoned or the fields owned by the suitcase brigade. The dust from this untended land would blow Ed's furrows shut in a few hours. It was like trying to put out a forest fire with a thimble. But, in the first years, he was able to save at least part of his meager, drought-stunted crops.

As the drought grew longer, the dust grew deeper. The nearly weightless motes rose high in the wind, a dense moiling whose turbulence subsided only when the wind stilled. In a calm the motes floated gently, descending lower and lower, landing at last on any vegetation in their path. Plants turned black and rotted, dried up by the wind or beaten by blowing sand.

There was apparently nothing Ed could do to save any part of his crops. The whole earth, even the irrigated parts of it, joined the fantastic rush into the air. Not even in the winter when it was frozen dormant did the bare ground stop its fatal roving. A blizzard would tear mud off the fields and mix it with snow.

It became like a plague out of the Bible. A cloud of dust might grow as solid and dark as a thunderhead and become as wide as two States. It would reach higher than an airplane could fly. It would move along slowly, carried by the wind. Once the front had passed, the dust-laden wind might blow for as long as a week.

By marshaling every possible ounce of courage and determination, some families still bore up under it. But the Dust Bowl had an average of about 100 days of dust-storms the early part of every year for 8 years in a row; 1932 through 1939. When the storms subsided, those who stayed on could see that their very fortitude was bringing them only greater ruin. For after every spring came the bone-dry summer, in which the hot sun further seared and baked the already Sahara-like fields, and no crops grew. What remained for those who held on could hardly be called life. Once men and women, now they were figures groping in a nightmare.

Texas County's population dwindled to roughly half of what it had been in 1907, at the first census. Farms were being sold for what they would bring, which was pitifully little. Nevertheless, the sellers all

seemed relieved to be rid of them. "I should have done this years ago," they'd say. "It's only sense to go while you've still got something left to make a start elsewhere."

Panhandle A. & M., the college at nearby Goodwell, went down to 92 students. The professors lectured on soil management through throats choked with dust. High schools that had been graduating 400 students a year closed for lack of attendance. "Why, there's nobody left to keep up a bridge game." Pearl realized, and it was true. The nearest neighbor was now miles away.

Soon the letters came back, from California and many other States—letters telling how well those who had been dusted out were doing. There were jobs in shipyards, jobs in factories or green new farms far from the dust areas. And as they read this news from the outside world, those who stayed behind often wondered why they did.

The only way a man could get any money here was to sell something he'd had before the hard times began. Ed decided to sell his hogs. To get a top price, he hauled them by truck all the way to Pueblo, Colo., 250 miles. He got 2 cents a pound.

Old man May Burton lived alone on his farm for a while, after the death of his wife. Then one day somebody saw his automobile parked outside the railroad station with the keys in it and no sign of the old man anywhere. His son, Castle Burton, was summoned from Boise City, 60 miles away. When Castle got to his father's house, he found all the lights on. There was food on the stove, and some had been served out on the table. There was a full plate, a broken-off piece of bread beside it, a full cup of coffee.

But May Burton had gone to California. He had done his day's work in the fields and had sat down to supper. Castle could see where his father had stopped. The fork was on the plate, still full of meat and beans. But he had never lifted it to his mouth. Instead he had driven to the railroad station taking only what he was wearing, leaving everything behind, even his car. It was as if, by leaving everything, he felt he would prove it was all nothing but a bad dream.

Ed and Pearl feel today that the presence of others who held solid in that rocked and riven world helped them to see the long years through. Men like Ed Brewer, the Virginian whose barn had been the scene of the merriest dances. Brewer kept reading the local newspaper for news of the outside: floods on the Ohio, on the Mississippi; earthquakes in California and Japan; frosts in Florida. Ed Tucker read, too. News of a flood in Kentucky made him feel good for a week. Like Brewer, he didn't wish anybody any harm. He just needed help in convincing himself that there would have been natural disasters to cope with wherever he had settled.

Their women held solid, too. Pearl had a terrible fear of the dust. But where men trust what they know, women trust love. Pearl felt that if only her family remained together in love, good must come of it.

But the good was a long time coming, for the wind continued to howl and paw at the house like an animal. At night they would hang wet sheets in front of the windows (which were already sealed with tape) and over Lloyd's crib. But morning after morning Pearl would wake up to find the only clean place left was the white outline on the bottom sheets where they had slept. There was no way to keep the dust out. It permeated bureau drawers and mounded up on the dishes in locked cupboards. Even the brooms had to be swept before they could be used.

Ironically, Pearl's lowest moment came during the first year of the big dust. It happened because of her lawn. It was not just a plain Oklahoma lawn, but pure beautiful bluegrass. She put a white picket fence around it and worked on it endlessly, making it a kind of sign, an unspoken promise about Ed's future with her. It thrived so well that the seedsman from Elkhart planned to put a color picture of it in the seed company's catalogue. Then the dust piled up fence high on it.

Ed took the fence down, but the dust had packed into a dune. He had to get his tractor and bulldoze it away. Pearl went into the bedroom and locked the door. When the job was finished, Ed could still hear her in there sobbing.

Ed had felt the same way about his pedigreed Holsteins. They were more to him that just a cream check. Handsome and costly, they were a sign he was making. When the dust began in 1930, he had 20 of them, worth up to $500 each. By 1934 he could neither raise feed for them nor afford to buy it; so he hauled his precious cows to Hooker, where he found a dairyman willing to rent them.

By 1936 that outlet was closed, too. For, as the farms died, the towns withered. The dairyman lost his customers and Ed had to take his cows back. But now he was close to scraping bottom. He sold his joy, his pride, his hostages to fortune, for beef. The $500 bluebloods brought $32 each.

When he walked across his empty fields, he felt as trapped and helpless as the wild animals he encountered. Blinded by the dust, they blundered on, falling and getting up, until they were exhausted. He would see a blinded jackrabbit standing motionless in the dust. He'd nudge it with his foot and it would fall over. He's nudge a blinded coyote. It would whimper away a step or two, then stand still as death. Ed used to wonder what the difference was between himself and these poor, suffering animals. He was not blind. But he was groping in an endless maze.

Of the more than 125 people who had started out from Greensburg so hopefully long ago, Ed was the only one who had stayed put. Even his younger brother, Allan, went temporarily to California. Many of the people kept title to their farms but locked them up and moved to greener pastures for the duration. If the land came back, they'd come back. If not, they'd be that much ahead on a new life for their families. Was Ed right in trying to finish what he had started? Was this being farsighted, or was it plain mulish blindness?

Ed would talk it over with Pearl after the kids were asleep. "Whatever you decide will be right," she told him. "Suppose you had to decide," Ed asked her, "for yourself, for your own best interests. What would be your decision then?" It was an easy question to answer. Pearl already had made the decision more than 10 years before, when they were married. "I think we should all be together, and you should do whatever you want," she said.

We won't go; we'll wait until they drag us? That was always Ed's decision.

A crisis came one afternoon. Elizabeth Allene was in school and a bad duster started. Children were sometimes kept at school overnight during dust storms, eating cold food and sleeping on the floor. Pearl didn't like that. But her greatest fear was that the storm might separate them for days. She put Lloyd in the car, honked Ed out of the fields and then they all drove off for Elizabeth Allene.

The school was exactly 1.8 miles from the house. They had clocked it several times, as insurance against being lost. On the return trip, when the speedometer showed 1.8 miles, Ed got out to look for his driveway. He discovered they were not on the road at all but in the middle of some field; there was no way to tell whose field it was. The roadside ditches were filled up; the fences were covered over with dust drifts.

"Well," said Pearl, "isn't it good that we're lost together?"

One thing was sure: they couldn't be far from home. But that made it the more shocking to Ed. For nothing was recognizable. You couldn't tell earth from sky, night from day. The car windows were rolled up tight, but you couldn't even see them. There was nothing to do but wait.

The car radio might have helped pass the time—except that you got only static when the dust was blowing. You got only static out of your own head, too, amid all the howling and battering of that choking dust. Ed sat back and closed his eyes to protect his eyeballs. The dust got in anyway. It put a fur on his teeth. It piled up in his shoes. And above all the static it seemed to broadcast one clear message: Move out, move out.

If we do move out, Ed thought, where will we go?

Daddy Tucker wanted Pearl and the children to move into Hooker. The minister there had left, and they could live in the empty parsonage. But Ed had said no. It would be too much like the beginning of the end. He liked being with Pearl and the children too much to be away from them long. Wouldn't his trips back to the land become fewer and fewer until eventually they stopped altogether?

Ed tried to think about it coherently, but suddenly he knew he could not ask his family to endure further hardships for the sake of the land. Pearl hadn't married a man. She had married a disaster.

It was night when the storm began to slacken. They couldn't tell just what time because the dust had stopped all their watches. When he could see to drive, Ed never bothered to figure out where they had been lost. Instead, he drove straight to Hooker.

They looked in on the parsonage to see what furniture Pearl and the children would need there. Then they drove home. Pearl said nothing until Ed asked her whether she wanted to start packing right now, or wait until morning. Then she asked, "Who'll bring you back from the fields when the dust starts?"

"I'll get back all right," Ed said. "I'll take the car with me." How? Pearl wanted to know. Would he leave the car lights on all the time?

"Now, wife," said Ed sternly, "you just worry about getting yourself and the children to Hooker."

"Don't you 'now' me," replied Pearl. "I don't care whether the dust blows or not. We're a family."

"But," protested Ed, "you said you'd take the parsonage."

"I did not," Pearl cried. "You said I'd take it. I didn't say anything. Go ahead, you take it. The children and I are staying here."

It was like Jacob wrestling with the angel. "I will not let thee go except thou bless me," Jacob said to the angel. To Ed, the land was his angel. He could not let it go except it blessed him.

No dramatist arranges life for a farmer. Like his defeats, his victories became apparent only gradually, long after they've actually happened.

In 1938 there was a little rain, enough to settle the dust and make a light crop. Now land was down to $4 and $5 an acre. Ed scraped up every cent he could get together and made the down payment on 480 acres. In 1939 there was less rain than ever. But what little there was fell at exactly the right time for a crop. By 1940 the drought was over. The good years had come back—the time of three steps forward.

Had the battle been won? Only the next drought could tell. In the meantime, work. The dust had stopped blowing.

They were heading into a good cycle—the forties—and the difference between the way they did things now and the way they had done them in the twenties was tremendous.

Science and technology had made big strides toward improving the use of the land. New seeds were developed. New techniques of soil management were learned. A new method of plowing, called stubble-mulching, left crop residues on the surface to protect the soil from blowing. Windbreaks were created on poor land by planting crops in 10-foot-wide strips athwart the prevailing wind. One strip would be a tall stand of milo (the local term for sorghum), the next strip the much shorter growing soybean, and so on, the short and the tall alternating across the field.

There were new kinds of machines, too, doing new kinds of jobs, all of them designed to help the farmer work his land scientifically and wisely.

New bladelike plows were developed to aid in the process of stubble-mulching. They could knife under the soil to cut the roots of weeds, yet they would leave the weeds and the stubble of the harvested crops standing above the soil for protective cover.

They were among the scores of new devices. Another was the dammer. It threw little dams of earth across the furrows as they were made. Now the dashing rains, instead of pounding the furrows into a slick sluiceway and running down them and away, were held and soaked in. All in all, Ed now shivered when he remembered how primitive his farming practices had been in the twenties.

Another thing the farmers of Texas County had to help them in the forties was water. There had always been plenty of water deep in the earth, but no cheap way to pump it out. There had been a deep-well turbine pump that could bring up 3,000 gallons a minute, but at a prohibitive cost for gasoline or electric power. Then, in 1945, the county was proved out as part of one of the largest-known natural-gas fields in the world. This discovery brought the cost of running the deep-well pump down to 25 cents an hour. This made it possible to irrigate and to grow just about anything on the plains. The farmer didn't have to depend on wheat alone. He could diversify—scatter his bets like anyone else.

True to form, the forties were good years on the plains, and as the fifties opened, Ed wondered: Had they learned the land this time? When drought came, and then wind, would the dust come again, or would the land hold?

They say that every drought ends with a rainfall. But nobody can say when a drought begins. Ed noticed that his plants were drooping in the afternoon sun. But they revived as the day drew to a close, and were fresh and crisp the next morning. Yet the earth was advancing toward a stillness. The time came when the plants failed to revive in the night and stood with bowed heads in the morning sun. The drought was on. The days began to march on Ed like an army of enemies in single file. The land turned brown. The grass at the bottom of the ravines and around the tractor-dug ponds was the last to die.

Where there was grass, jack rabbits gathered in milling herds. The farmers would join together in lines spread out over 2 to 3 miles and drive the rabbits into a wire pen set up in the fields. There would be about 5,000 rabbits at a time in a pen. Not daring to use guns for fear of shooting each other, the farmers would enter the pens with clubs and beat the rabbits to death. The women would join in, too. It was brutal work, but farmers have to choose daily what must die that others may live and, in a drought on the plains, the choice is limited even more sternly. The living stand on the dead to reach the last haggard bits of nourishment. Only the buzzards get enough to eat.

The year 1952 was drier than the driest year of the dirty thirties—only 9.16 inches of rain fell. And 1954 was not much better. People stopped looking for rain, but they never stopped looking for dust.

On February 19, 1954, Ed slept late, and so did everybody else. When they realized why, the old fear came back. There has been no light to wake up by. An old abominable, anguishing specter had emerged from its grave to blot out the light.

It was a dust storm as gigantic as those of the thirties, but this time it was the dust rather than the men in it that had to battle for survival. All over the plains, men charged out of barns on powerful, high-speed machines. They all listed the land, and the land held. The dust was bedded down in a single day.

But one battle is not a war.

The dust was now coming every spring. It got its head up every day, and every day, gratifyingly, it was beaten down. The new machines, the new ways of plowing and planting were giving man an edge in this relentless war. But wait for a big wind, Ed told himself nervously. The big wind arrived one day in April of 1956.

The sky kept growing darker and darker. Finally, even though the clock still showed some of the afternoon left, Ed quit the withering fields. It had become hard for a man to see what he was doing.

The black sky lowered a black lip, and Ed knew that a tornado was being born. The sky tried to get the lip back up. The lip of black air could be seen lifting, then dropping. Ed watched somberly. Thoughts scudded through him like birds, so fast it was hard to know what they were. Abruptly, for no reason, he wanted to laugh. The funnel of the tornado was sashaying as in a real old-fashioned flangdang. It was homing in eagerly on Ed Brewer's barn where he and Pearl had so often gone for their dancing.

Ed watched as the funnel gulped up all the air in Brewer's barnyard in a single suck. The barn gurgled, then exploded. So did a double granary. They went off like bombs, the air inside them expanding instantaneously to fill the vacuum left by the tornado.

The roads in that featureless country mark off the sections of land. Since a section is 1 square mile, you have only to go a mile in any direction on almost any road to come to a crossroad. It's like a checkerboard. Now, suddenly, the checkerboard was full of movement.

When he saw the timbers of Brewer's barn hurtling into the air, Ed Tucker jumped into his car. He could see cars racing along with him on either side. They were converging from all directions to bring Brewer help, each spaced a precise mile from another. He could see the little clouds of dust being raised by all the urgent wheels. The cars looked like little bugs scuttling away from the pursuing dust.

Suddenly it occurred to Ed how remarkable it was that he could see to drive so soon after such a violent windstorm had passed. What's more, he could see for miles. He thought back to a storm in 1933 which had kicked up so much dust that it was still dark on Ed's farm the next day.

Storms vary, of course. This 1956 storm hadn't lasted as long, but, even though it came in the fifth year of a great drought, it had raised so little dust that Ed could see that the Brewer house itself had been untouched. And when he found that both Ed Brewer and his wife, Ida, were safe, Ed Tucker felt like dancing. He couldn't say on a Bible which affected him more deeply: the fact that his old friends had escaped injury, or the fact that there was so little dust.

"Boys, you've done it. You've learned the land." At last, 30 years later, Daddy Tucker's cry was coming true in a way that give it real meaning. Not only a Tucker but almost everybody crop farming the high plains was beginning to "learn" the land.

When you talk to Ed Tucker today you have the same feeling you would get if you were to talk to a general who had planned, fought through, and won a series of battles in a long and desperate war. It would be fitting if Ed Tucker, in company with other generals, were to write his memoirs, giving the names, dates, and strategies of his campaigns. But Ed Tucker's memoirs do not need to be written on anything so insubstantial as paper. They are written, for all to see, on the rich and spreading countryside in Texas County, Okla.

Would that countryside be green and rich today if Ed Tucker had left? No one can say. The most Ed would say if you asked him would be, "Well, some of us had to stay."

Looking at Ed and Pearl, looking at their nighbors, the Brewers, and others, you realize that the people who had stayed had, or acquired a special strength that saw them through. It is as though they had poured their strength into the land and the land, having tested that strength and matured it, returned it a hundredfold.

Communist Propaganda in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement:

The Speaker has generously granted permission to me to exhibit in the Speaker's lobby of the House of Representatives several samples of Communist propaganda typical of that now being disseminated in the Middle East and in south and southeast Asia. This exhibit is designed to acquaint Members of Congress with the scope, breadth, variety, skill, and effectiveness of Communist propaganda in this area of the world and with the corresponding challenge it presents for American policy.

Among the aspects of this challenge, highlighted in the exhibit, are the following points:

First. Propaganda from the Soviet Union and Communist China is supplementary in various fields and in different countries. Chinese propaganda, for instance, appears more often in Pakistan, which is at odds with the Soviet Union, while the Soviets are more active in Burma, where the Chinese are regarded as a direct threat. A major role is also given to propaganda from countries of central and eastern Europe, particularly in the sphere of cultural and economic affairs.

Second. Soviet and Chinese publications are attractive, and present life under communism in terms designed to appeal to the workers and peasants of most of non-Communist Asia. China alone sold an estimated $1 million worth of propaganda material at cutrate prices out of Hong Kong last year.

Samples of direct propaganda publications include:

From China: China Pictorial, China Reconstructs, Women of China, People's China.

From U.S.S.R.: The Soviets distribute New Times, Soviet Literature, Soviet Union, Soviet Land, Soviet Weekly, Soviet Woman, Culture, and Life.

From central and east Europe: Romtrans—Romanian Industry—Czechoslovak Life, Bulgarian Foreign Trade, GDR Review (East German), Do You Know the Rumanian Peoples' Republic?

In the middle east Communist French publications such as Democracie Nouvelle are available.

Asian Communist countries, such as North Korea and North Vietnam distribute their own magazines.

Third. The official Communist propaganda pamphlet campaign is accompanied by standard literature. Russian classics are constantly being reprinted in English. Indeed, more publications in English are now being printed behind the Iron Curtain for distribution in non-Communist Asian countries than are being printed for such purposes by the United States and Great Britain combined.

Each year, scores of new titles in Hindi, Bengali, and Urdu and other national languages are also released. "Handbooks on Marx," "People's China, U.S.S.R.," "Chinese Cooking and Chinese Papercuts," are on sale everywhere, as is the Constitution of the Soviet Union in nearly all languages. Important pronouncements and interviews with Soviet leaders are widely distributed.

Books and albums are published in China and Moscow on the visits of Soviet leaders to other Asian countries. Publications on Islam and Buddhism are frequently distributed.

Communist propaganda aims at filling gaps in available literature wherever such gaps exist. Thus there is much concentration on children's books such as "The Silver Hoof," "Frisky Kitten," "Ukrainian Folk Tales," and a series of "Peace Fables"—published in Bucharest.

Indian art publications are published in Moscow and distributed in India. Many art postcards sold in India are printed in Moscow.

This Communist propaganda effort through books and periodicals is, of course, only one arm of a sustained, long-term program. That program also includes the persistent use of radio, press, films, trade fairs and cultural missions. The following brief summary indicates the extent of some of these supplementary activities:

Radio: Communist Chinese broadcasts number 242 hours per week in 10 Asiatic languages and 5 Chinese dialects. Chinese abroad numbering 30 million are considered as an important target and instrument for Communist propaganda. Moscow broadcasts much more extensively—8 hours weekly to southern Vietnam for instance, 35 hours weekly to Persia, and an unspecified number in Hindi, Bengal, Urdu, Tamil, Telegu, Singhalese, and other Asian languages.

Press: The actual Communist press in Asia is not very extensive—6 papers in India, 2 in Pakistan, 4 in Ceylon and 5 in Japan. But Soviet and Chinese propaganda is carried on (a) through local press agencies which distribute news issued by Tass and the New China Agency, and (b) via extensive distribution of Chinese and Soviet publications in French, English and all Asiatic languages.

Films: Great emphasis is placed on presenting Communist films in Asia. Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Hungary make particular efforts in this field. In addition, Polish-Indian, Hungaro-Indian, Soviet-Indian film companies have been created and are discussing joint productions. The Soviet Union produced the national film "In Pakistan" and the so-called Indian monumental "Pardesi."

Trade fairs, cultural, scientific, and sport exchange missions between Asian countries and the Communist bloc have been considerably increased. The Soviet Union and China have their pavilions at all trade fairs such as the Indian Fairs at Hyderabad or Bombay, or in Pakistan's Lahore Fair. So have east European countries. Presently in Cairo and Bombay there are Czechoslovak, Hungarian, Romanian, Bulgarian, Polish and East German industrial shows. Czechoslovak string quartets and Rumanian dance teams, East German sport teams and Chinese wrestlers visit the majority of Middle East and Asian countries. Communist teams are present at all Asian festivals. Chinese Buddhist art exhibitions tour Ceylon, India, and Burma.

The single, overall conclusion of any current survey of Communist propaganda in Asia is its formidable continuity of purpose. It is a long-term effort, being conducted with purpose and skill. It is not calculated to achieve dramatic or immediate success, but rather long-term impact in depth.

The importance of Asia to Communist strategy is obvious. America's stake in the future of free Asia is equally clear. We will need new thinking and new responses if this challenge is to be met effectively in the months and years ahead.

I hope that this exhibit in the speaker's lobby will help broaden understanding of the nature of this challenge. In the preparation of this material for exhibit, the International Federation of Free Journalists was most helpful, and I gratefully acknowledge their cooperation. I hope that as many Members of Congress as possible will see this exhibit during the next few days.

Crab-Oyster Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, canned crabmeat and canned oyster imports from Japan are increasing at an alarming rate and threaten the prosperity and employment in the Pacific coast shellfish industry.

In the first 6 months of 1959 canned crabmeat imports from Japan totaled 4,289,000 pounds compared to 2,739,000 in the same period of the preceding year. This is an increase of 56 percent.

Canned oyster imports from Japan for the first 6 months of 1959 were 2,600,000 pounds compared to 1,853,000 pounds in the same 6 months of 1958 or an increase of 40 percent.

I have written to Representative HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, urging that his committee this fall investigate the impact of these increasing canned shellfish imports upon the prosperity and employment in the American shellfish industry and to make recommendations to Congress as to the most effective way to protect the domestic industry against damage.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2400 Tilden St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3914 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Historic Time for Polish Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New Orleans Times-Picayune of September 3, 1959:

HISTORIC TIME FOR POLISH TRIP—WARSAW VISIT AT IMPORTANT MOMENT—BOGGS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Representative HALE BOGGS, a delegate from the U.S. Congress to the Interparliamentary Union Conference, has just returned from Warsaw where the 47th meeting of the group is now underway. In the following article he gives his impressions of Warsaw and the meeting.)

(By HALE BOGGS)

WASHINGTON.—I was in Poland on the day before the 20th anniversary of Hitler's attack.

No one there has forgotten the 800,000 people who died there and the other 5 million who died in Poland in World War II. Every block marks the event with flowers, with a clean-up program, with special services in the churches which flourish everywhere.

But a city 85 percent destroyed has come back to life. The architecture is beautiful. The old city has been restored. Over a million people live there now, but as George Healy said in his series on his recent trip through the Iron Curtain countries it is a sad country.

I was lucky; I had an English-speaking driver. He had spent 3 years in England in the Polish Army during World War II. He told me that he ran a very small motorcycle repair shop. Only the smallest family-run shops are permitted to be operated privately. All the rest are state owned. He said that the real hope of the people was that they would get rid of the Communists. Without that hope the nation could not survive and sadness would be displaced by utter despair.

STATE ENTERPRISE

Practically all the members of the family, husband, wife, children, work in some state enterprise. Even so they earn just about enough to keep themselves in clothing and food, both of poor quality. None of the luxuries which we know and enjoy are permitted to these people. Practically every automobile is owned by the state. Things that we take for granted—refrigerators, dishwashers, automatic laundry machines, and so on—are unknown in practically every household.

My visit to Poland coincided with several historic events. It was a few weeks after NIXON's visit; Ike was in Europe preparatory to the Khrushchev visit to our country, about which the average Pole is skeptical, as are many other people that I met in attendance at the conference.

The glow of NIXON's visit still remained. The press reports which I read in our country about his reception in Warsaw were certainly not exaggerated. People came from everywhere to see the Vice President of our country and obviously the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe must have been quite effective because I was informed the local Communist press gave practically no attention to the time of his arrival.

IN SHARP CONTRAST

I was told that the people somehow or other had to buy their own flowers which were thrown at the Vice President's party in profusion. His visit was apparently in sharp contrast to that of Khrushchev whose time of arrival and whose route of entry into the city were not only well advertised in the press, but workers were given time off and provided with flowers and other trappings. Despite this, I am told, the welcome was anything but enthusiastic.

Now a word about the Interparliamentary Union Conference, which was the purpose of my visit. This was the 47th meeting, and I talked about investment in the underdeveloped countries. But the main thing was that we stole the march at the conference and gained a tremendous psychological advantage. One of our delegates, Congressman THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, from Detroit, is a native of Poland. He served as an officer in the Polish Army in World War I and has since gained distinction as a judge and as an outstanding Member of our Congress. He represented our group in the opening speech. He spoke in Polish. He told of his own life and he hearkened back to the events of 20 years ago when the Hitler-Stalin pact led to World War II and the dismemberment of a great country. He received a tremendous ovation from the assembled delegates and one of the British—they are not neophytes in diplomacy—came to me and said, "That was one of the smarest things that you have ever done." A real compliment from an Englishman.

LITTLE ATTENTION

Again the Polish press gave little attention to the Machrowicz speech. My recollection of what one paper said was, "He had given a subjective account of the events of 1939." But the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe gave it wide circulation and in a matter of hours he had people calling on him from many places in Poland.

Many things stand out in my mind. Again referring to the Healy series, which mentioned that in Russia only the old men and women attended the few remaining churches. In Warsaw a great many churches have been rebuilt. They are quite beautiful and the people flock to mass, not only on Sundays, but on weekdays as well.

My wife and I attended mass last Sunday at one of the old historic churches, St. Alexandra, which incidentally is one of the symbolic edifices which was razed to the ground by Hitler's forces, but restored magnificently.

The church was packed and attended by young and old, middle-aged, men and women, children and babies. They were extremely devout. As a matter of fact all of the streets of Warsaw on that Sunday were packed with people going to and from church. This strength of religion is a tremendous deterrent to the communization of the nation.

SENSE OF HUMOR

Despite their lack of freedom, the Poles maintain a fine sense of humor and incidentally they are not afraid to speak out against the Communists or the Russians. Stalin built what is called the Palace of Culture, a monstrous looking skyscraper building completely out of keeping with the architecture of the city. The Poles say that the best place to see Warsaw is from the Palace of Culture because then one can't see the Palace of Culture.

We went to a concert of native music and dancing which was most delightful. The leading architect of the city, a Member of their Parliament, said, "On the stage we Poles can be ourselves."

There are other quotes worth repeating. A taxi driver said, "There is no parking problem in Warsaw." Believe me, there isn't. There are few automobiles and these are practically all owned by the state. Most of the cars are Polish or Russian with some imports from Western Europe.

Senator MONRONEY said it was a good place to take his wife. "Nothing to shop for. Nothing to buy."

You see practically no window displays; there is little advertising; gasoline sells for $1 per gallon. The soldiers are unkept. They seem to have no sense of elan, and very little interest in being soldiers. I would hate to depend on them in a fight if I were the Russians.

YEARN FOR FREEDOM

Again I agree with the conclusions of George Healy. The Poles yearn for freedom. If there is a weak link in the Soviet chain certainly this must be it. The West must continue to hold out hope for these people who have valiantly fought for freedom for 1,000 years and who are noting not only the 20th anniversary of the attack on Warsaw by Hitler, but the 1000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity into this country.

On the way home we had a brief stop in Frankfurt. What a contrast. Frankfurt, too, was destroyed, and it too has been beautifully rebuilt, but here there is a hustle and bustle of a city moving ahead in freedom; automobiles everywhere, shops full of impressive looking goods and consumer items of every type. People well dressed, and seemingly quite happy. What a contrast between private enterprise and communism.

The American delegation in Warsaw was not the only one using free speech, and telling the story of world Communist conquest. The Indian delegates talked about the attacks on their borders and Tibet. The representatives of Vietnam talked about what was happening in their country and Laos. What an experience this must have been for the Russians and other satellite countries to see free speech in operation. Meetings of this kind can indeed penetrate the Iron Curtain.

State Taxation of Income From Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted

I would further like to clarify a point with respect to the bill S. 2524, as passed by the House and Senate. It is not the intention of this legislation, in my opinion, that goods shipped into a State and temporarily at rest in a public warehouse should be singled out as a basis for the levying of a State tax against the shipper or manufacturer.

Significance of National Legislation to Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, now that the end of the first session is in sight, there is opportunity to review some of the major legislative work that has been accomplished.

Looking at the calendar—and the schedule ahead—it is apparent that important work remains to be done.

Recently, in a broadcast prepared for delivery over Wisconsin radio stations, I reviewed the significance—and benefits to be derived from—action in these fields—particularly as it affects Wisconsin. These include highway, health benefits for civil servants, expansion of the school milk program, extension of the Federal Airport Act, liberalizing veterans pensions, and others.

I am aware, of course, that—in view of Uncle Sam's difficult budget problems—it is important that we take a look, from time to time, at the role played by the Federal Government in national programs.

That is why I was particularly pleased to join in cosponsoring the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 70, introduced by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], aimed at redefining State-Federal responsibilities in the economic field.

Although this proposal for establishing a joint congressional committee was introduced late in the session—too late for final action on it—I would hope that this would receive early consideration next year.

As a review of some of the major legislative action taken this session, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY OUTLINES BENEFITS OF LEGISLATION FOR WISCONSIN

(Excerpts of address prepared for delivery by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Chippewa Falls, over Wisconsin radio stations)

Friends, the 86th Congress is now winding up its 1st session. There is, of course, still a good deal of work to be accomplished prior to adjournment. These include a number of major pieces of legislation of particular interest to Wisconsin.

In evaluating legislation, questions arise such as: What will it do for us? How will it affect our progress in Racine, Milwaukee, Green Bay, Superior, Chippewa Falls, La Crosse, and other fine communities around the State?

Briefly, I would like to view the outlook for benefits to us.

NEEDED: FUNDS FOR HIGHWAY PROGRAM

First, let's take a look at the highway program. Unfortunately, the Congress has been too slow in acting upon legislation to provide additional funds needed to finance the highway building program. As a result, there has been serious curtailment in this program, which is designed to provide us with an improved and expanded network of highways.

"Question: What is its significance to Wisconsin, Senator?

"Answer: As of June 30, 1959, 180 miles of roadways were either under construction, or advertised for bid, in the Badger State. This amounted to $57.1 million in expenditures of which $49 million in Federal funds were contributed.

"Under the Highway Act of 1956, Wisconsin was scheduled to receive $26 million in 1961 and $23 million in 1962. Unless Congress acts to provide additional money, however, the State may get nothing in 1961 and only $5 million in 1962.

"Currently, Congress is considering ways and means of providing additional financing for this program. The task is to find an equitable way to provide funds for improving and expanding the National System of Interstate Highways—so badly needed to handle the ever-greater volumes of traffic now, and in the years ahead."

AID TO EDUCATION

"Question: What about aid to education, Senator WILEY?

"Answer: Under the Defense Education Act, passed in 1958, Wisconsin's State educational agencies and nonprofit private schools will receive financial assistance from the Federal Government for the purposes of (1) acquiring laboratory and other special equipment suitable for use in providing education in science, mathematics, or modern foreign languages; (2) expansion and improvement of supervisory and related services in public elementary and secondary schools in these fields; and (3) minor remodeling of laboratory or other space used for such materials or equipment.

"Recently, the State legislature took action to make it possible for Wisconsin to participate in this vital program to improve education in the fields of science and technology; with Wisconsin being eligible to receive up to $1,900,000 per year for the next 3 years on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis.

"Question: Is there any new legislation?

"Answer: As of now, there are pending in committees—in both the House and the Senate—bills to provide more Federal aid for constructing classrooms, laboratory facilities, and general aid. There now appears to be serious questions that there will be final action this session on this legislation."

HEALTH BENEFITS FOR CIVIL SERVANTS

"Question: Senator WILEY, as I understand it, Congress has approved a program of health insurance for folks under civil service.

Would this benefit many people in Wisconsin?

"Answer: About 20,000 civil servants would be eligible for participation in this program. The costs would be shared on a 50–50 basis by the employee and the employer—in this case, Uncle Sam.

SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

"Question: Senator, I recall that you supported legislation to expand the school milk program.

"Answer: Yes, the bill, S. 1289—which I cosponsored—has been enacted to provide up to $84 million in fiscal 1960 for supplying milk in the Nation's schools, child-care institutions, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions. Under this program, Wisconsin children consumed over 80 million half-pints of milk in 1959; with over 4,500 schools and institutions participating. Approximately $2,745,000 of Federal funds was expended in financing this fine project. Overall, the program offers a splendid opportunity for improving the health of our youth; in addition, it provides a splendid outlet for surplus milk."

EXPANDING AIRPORTS

"Question: With the increasing volume of air traffic, is there any action to expand airport facilities?

"Answer: The Federal Airport Act has been extended by Congress this session. Under provisions of the new law, $993,906 annually would be provided in Federal funds for the construction and expansion of airports in Wisconsin during the next 2 years.

"The program would provide for airport facilities, taxiways, land acquisition, parking areas, and other purposes."

LIBERALIZING VETERANS' PENSIONS

"Question: Did Congress pass any veterans' legislation this session?

"Answer: Yes. The Congress approved—and the President has signed the bill, H.R. 7650—to liberalize pension benefits for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, and their widows and orphans.

"Overall, more than 1 million pensioners in Wisconsin, and throughout the Country, would benefit from the liberalizing law. Among other things, the bill would provide pensions for widows and children of World War II and Korean veterans.

"The bill, of course, is not a completely comprehensive measure covering all problems in this field. However, it was designed to attempt to put benefits more on the basis of need."

VETO OF HOUSING AND RIVERS AND HARBORS BILLS

"Question: Senator, what about the housing and the rivers and harbors bills?

"Answer: As you know, the President vetoed measures in both these fields, because he felt the expenditures were too high.

"Now, the Congres is faced with the challenge of taking action—as I believe it should—on modified bills to carry forward these essential programs.

"Although there are many features in the housing bill, for example, it is particularly important that congressional action be taken to extend the FHA insurance authorization program. Under FHA, millions of American families have purchased homes. In Wisconsin, over 3,000 home mortgages, amounting to over $37 million, were processed in 1958. During the 1935–58 period, the FHA insured 39,671 mortgages in the Badger State.

"Overall, this program has helped to make it possible for three out of every five American families to own their own homes.

"Under the rivers and harbors bill, too, there are several Wisconsin projects—either for construction or for planning work. Among them were: work on the Mellen Channel; moving the village of Odanah, and raising the school, on the Bad River, construction at Bayfield Harbor; planning on the Eau Galle River; planning at Saxon Harbor; and planinng at Two Rivers Harbor."

SUMMARY

"Question: Senator WILEY, I know our listeners appreciate getting your review of the significance to Wisconsin of some of the major legislation acted upon in this session of Congress, including: Highways, education, health benefits, school milk, airports, vet-

erans' pensions, housing, and rivers and harbors development projects.

"Answer: Naturally, I am delighted that Wisconsin is sharing so significantly in these national programs.

"However, I believe it is important to make clear that—even though we are receiving substantial amounts of aid in several fields—it is well to remind ourselves that this is not a 'free gift' from Uncle Sam. Every Federal dollar that is spent comes out of the American taxpayer's pocket—yours and mine.

"Consequently, I believe it is extremely important that we take a new look—from time to time—at the kind of role Uncle Sam is playing in these programs.

"As President Eisenhower, reflecting the philosophy of Lincoln, has said:

" 'The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere.' "

COMMITTEE TO STUDY FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

To better define State and Federal responsibilities, I have recently joined in cosponsoring a measure to set up a joint congressional committee. The purpose would be to study the entire field of economic relations between the Federal Government and the States. Following its study, the committee would report to Congress the results of its findings, together with recommendations on ways and means of remedying the many problems which recurrently arise in the field of Federal-State economic relations.

Specifically, the committee would aim to (1) insure fair and equitable distribution among the several States of Federal funds disbursed under grants-in-aid programs, (2) clarify and redefine relations between the Federal Government and the States in the field of taxation, and (3) restore to the States functions which are primarily their responsibility and which the States themselves are financially able to carry out.

CONCLUSION

Now, friends, I have greatly appreciated the opportunity to share this program with you.

This is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, saying, "Thanks for listening."

Procedure Followed When a Visiting Head of State Is Invited To Address a Joint Meeting of the Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include for the information of the Members a statement I recently made to the press and to television and radio stations:

There is considerable misunderstanding, even in the minds of Members of Congress, about the procedure that is followed in connection with the head of a state visiting our country and addressing a joint meeting of the Congress. In such case, the request always comes from the State Department to the leaders of the Congress, asking us to cooperate with the State Department in making such arrangements. In a press conference recently, President Eisenhower unintentionally made a statement to the contrary, to the effect that the executive department has nothing to do with the extending of an invitation. All such invitations start in the State Department, and they have been confined to those persons who are heads of state. In the case of Mr. Khrushchev, he is not the head of state of the Soviet Union. He is the dictator, and he is the boss, in every respect. Of that there is no question, and the world knows it, but he is not technically the head of state.

When a head of a state is visiting our country, the request for a joint meeting of the Congress comes to the leaders of the Congress from the State Department.

Drama of Hypocrisy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, although H.R. 1 the O'Brien lake diversion bill is dead for this session because of the action of the Senate in referring it to the Foreign Relations Committee after passage by the House, it still remains an issue of vital concern to the health and welfare of the people of my district, to Chicago, and a great section of the entire country. Mr. Leo Lerner, editor and publisher of Lerner Home Newspapers, has used his adept pen to aptly survey the problem. Under permission to extend my remarks I commend this article to my colleagues.

DRAMA OF HYPOCRISY
(By Leo A. Lerner)

There are facts. There are emotions. And there is fear. All three are motives.

In the current storm over more lake water for Chicago, the opposition has no facts, emotions are rampant, and fear is the factor that preevnts us from getting enough water to clean out the sluggish Illinois Waterway.

What are Canada, Wisconsin, Michigan, and the other States holding up our water diversion really afraid of?

Even they don't know. The recent note of the Canadian Government didn't say. It's just wild, blind fear. And there's a little politics mixed up in the fear, fear of political reprisal from farmers and fishermen along the water who think that diversion at Chicago will somehow lower their water level and do them unknown economic harm.

Funny how an unreasonable emotion makes decent people seem so suddenly indecent. Let's take Wisconsin. Of all the States I know this one has always been best governed, most reasonable, most logical. A newspaper like the Milwaukee Journal, a sensible man like Gov. Gaylord Nelson, an on-the-side-of-the-angels Senator like BILL PROXMIRE—all have made themselves appear ugly and unreasonable by their highly emotional reaction to Chicago's increasing its water draught from Lake Michigan. (PROXMIRE even conducted a Faubus-like filibuster last year.)

In more than 20 years I never read any editorialized news in the Milwaukee Journal. Suddenly the headlines began calling the diversion plan a water grab.

A hate twist in an otherwise fair newspaper is shocking, considering how little that reasonable men have to cling to in the world of modern journalism.

Never have I seen or read one fact to justify this unreasoning fear of Chicago's getting a little more water out of the Great Lakes watershed for sanitation and navigation. Canada and Wisconsin cannot expect a growing Chicago to choke to death for lack of water, no more than rural Wisconsin can expect Milwaukee to choke to death politically for lack of representation in the legislature. The Journal has been fighting against provincialism for decades, and suddenly it becomes itself narrow and provincial.

I think that what Congressman SIDNEY YATES and Senator PAUL DOUGLAS proposed to the Canadian Prime Minister makes a lot of sense. Let's have an impartial mixed commission of scientists from Canada and the United States study the effects of water diversion for Chicago.

Then if the harm is found to be nonexistent or minimal, let Chicago have its water and let the matter rest there, settled by logic and not by the shaking and shivering of people who don't really know what they're making such a fuss about.

I have my own theories. I think the problem is one of a strong feeling of guilt. Most of the cities in the Great Lakes Basin pour their waste and garbage into the lakes. They do not have adequate sanitation facilities and they are polluting the water supply, all the way from eastern Canada to southern Wisconsin. Even the ducks and geese are dying on the fresh water around Milwaukee.

The fact that Chicago, at the bottom of this queasy flow, has figured out a way to avoid polluting the lake and is making its waste flow harmlessly away to the Southwest, makes the big industries and big cities of the lakes feel guilty.

The only way they can maintain a false selfrespect is to pretend that Chicago is trying to "steal" their water. Guilty as they are of the disgraceful act of polluting the clear, fresh water, they cleanse themselves of the fault by trying to blame Chicago for attempting a small diversion, which Senator DOUGLAS estimates at one-quarter of an inch in Lakes Michigan and Huron.

If Canada and the Lake States would shake off their political dominance by the industries, power companies, and the towns defiling our water, and take action to force them to find ways to divert the pollution, the whole problem would solve itself.

The situation is a drama of hypocrisy that could have been written by Henrik Ibsen, whose "Enemy of the People" had the same general theme.

First Dividend of Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Houston Chronicle:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 26, 1959]

FIRST DIVIDEND OF KHRUSHCHEV VISIT—REDS' ATTEMPT TO TAKE OVER LAOS

A lot of people expected considerable lessening in international tensions when it was

announced that President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev would exchange visits.

The first dividend of this new era of "peaceful coexistence" has come in. It takes the form of renewed Communist activity in the little Indochinese state of Laos, along with Red Chinese threats in the direction of India.

No doubt when Khrushchev arrives and President Eisenhower calls the Lao situation to the Soviet leader's attention, he will order an end to these aggressive moves.

Or will he?

"Come and Get" Is the Formula for Political Advancement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of the Senate an excellent editorial from the September 2, 1959, issue of my hometown newspaper, the Edgefield Advertiser of Edgefield, S.C. It is entitled "'Come and Get' Is the Formula for Political Advancement." This editorial is based around a recent article which appeared in Human Events, and it merits the attention of everyone in this country because of its vital point that we should all work hard for what we get rather than sit back and depend on the security that too many feel "Uncle Sam" can afford and provide for us. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"COME AND GET" IS THE FORMULA FOR POLITICAL ADVANCEMENT

A copy of Human Events of August 10 has been handed to the Advertiser, which it appreciates. A splendid article by the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill is well worth reprinting, and if it is true that experience is the best teacher, Mr. Pettengill makes a good case of hardship being the best medicine, which pretty well summarizes his thoughts.

"In recent years," he says, "society has gone nuts on the pusillanimous cult of security guaranteed by Government; in short, a nation of parasites. The illusion of the age is that people can vote themselves rich. It is a superstition that social security depends on the promises of politicians; not on the character, competence, and courage of men. It is a fable and a fraud that the output of society can be greater than the input of individuals.

"It is a universal complaint that nobody wants to work any more, or only enough to get by. Employers are frantic for dependable employees.

"Theodore Roosevelt" (note: not Franklin Roosevelt—Editor) "attracted national attention when he said: 'I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of strenuous life.' He said of himself, 'let me wear out, not rust out.'

"Theodore Roosevelt" (note: again not Franklin Roosevelt.—Editor) "dreamed nobly of his country, and, by the fire of his example, lit other fires in millions of homes. It was said that Washington founded the Nation, Lincoln saved it, and T. R. revitalized it.

"A century ago Giuseppe Garibaldi appealed to the strong side of men with these words: 'Young men of Italy, I offer you nothing but the water of the streams as your drink. I offer you nothing but black bread as your food, and nothing but the blue canopy of heaven and the lights of the eternal stars as your covering at night. But if you follow me, young men of Italy, you and I will be free.' They followed him and Italy became a united country.

"But today, the general appeal is to the soft side of men—envy, self-pity, covetousness, class hatred. Our elections have become auctions in which rival politicians of both old parties open the door of the Treasury in exchange for votes. 'Come and get it,' is the slogan as people become vandals of their own country and 'bread and circuses' the formula for political advancement.

"So we have cities with few citizens; many who wish to share the blessings of liberty, but shirk its burdens. This is not the spirit of 1776.

"It was said of those who crossed the Appalachians down into the valleys of the Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Missouri and pushed the frontiers of freedom to the Pacific shore that 'the cowards never started and the weak never arrived. With no capital save courage and no resource except resourcefulness, they built the American empire.'

"Avoid struggle and life becomes sterile, vapid, and meaningless. Our mental hospitals are being filled with thousands of neurotics, many of whom feel inadequate to meet life because they were protected from taking the bumps in childhood.

"Young people today face a time of struggle with an enemy of our country more dangerous than King George III in 1776—the godless Caesars of atheistic communism. Let's lick it. Put it and all its teachings out of our schools, churches, public affairs, and private life. What our fathers bequeathed us is still 'the last best hope of earth.' Save it for our boys and girls.

"Remember the poem of the frontier:

"I remember no dream of nursemaid state
That spoons me out my food.
No, the stout heart sings on its strife with fate,
For the toil and sweat are good."

Cappers Farmer Magazine Prods Congress on Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of the Cappers Farmer makes some potent and prodding observations regarding the action of the Congress to date on the question of coming to grips with the question of getting the farmers "parity of income in a marketplace considerably less than free."

Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with Capper's Farmer that only three men have tried to solve this problem. Many Members have tried and are working very hard on this dilemma, including myself.

I do agree with them that we must pass good legislation in this field and "put the responsibility for failure squarely on the President and his Secretary of Agriculture," if the President vetoes the bill.

I firmly believe, Mr. Speaker, that the folks who elected me to Congres wanted me to help write a farm bill. I sincerely hope the 86th Congress will yet prove it can write a good farm bill.

The editorial follows:

CONGRESS FLUNKED IN FARM LEGISLATION

Congress has failed once more to face up to its responsibility to agriculture. The promised drive for a practical, workable farm program never got under way. Fires lit by the mandate of last year's election fizzled.

By its inaction, Congress has left farmers on the public hot seat, subject to an ever-increasing barrage of criticism and ridicule.

Congress has done nothing to set up effective reduction and control of surpluses. It made only a halfhearted attempt to get wheatgrowers off the hook. The price-support program, so widely criticized by the Secretary of Agriculture and the urban press, remains basically unchanged.

By its failure to act, Congress has tossed farmers into the political arena of next year's presidential election. Again the whole farm issue must be dragged through a political campaign.

Inaction means that the farm mess will be permitted to drift for another year—with the tacit blessing of Congress. Possibility is increased that the price-support program may fall of its own weight with nothing built to replace it. Washington lawmakers may in fact have played right into the hands of those who want to end all farm programs.

Capper's Farmer gives credit to the stalwarts who tried. Time and again such earnest men as Senators GEORGE AIKEN of Vermont and FRANK CARLSON of Kansas and Representative FRED MARSHALL of Minnesota pled for unity and action on an improved farm program. But their efforts did not prevail against stubbornness, indifference, and partisan politics.

Admittedly, there are great difficulties in the way of writing new basic farm legislation. Disunity of farm organizations and noncooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture are roadblocks in any real progress toward a modernized farm program. But it is the responsibility of Congress to compromise group differences in writing acceptable laws.

Excuse that a good farm bill would have been vetoed falls flat. A veto would have put the responsibility for failure squarely on the President and his Secretary of Agriculture.

Capper's Farmer agrees with Grange Master Herschel Newsom who said at a recent congressional hearing:

"I have about lost patience with the attitude that we must pass only legislation that the President will sign. We should develop a farm program that will be good for the country. After all, we will have a new President one of these days. Even though it takes 2 years or more to put a program into effect, at least we should get on the right track."

The real issue here—which Congress is reluctant to face—is the role Government is to play in agriculture. Is Government to be an active partner or a passive bystander?

Capper's Farmer believes there's little choice. In the interest of a healthy agriculture, the public welfare, and national security, we believe our Government must work in partnership with farmers; must help farmers find a way to get parity of income

in a marketplace considerably less than free.

We believe that the present outdated, unworkable program must go. But we believe, too, that as bad as it is, it would be serious business to scrap it without first replacing it with one farmers and the public can live with.

The folks we send to Congress have to come to grips with this issue. Capper's Farmer beseeches them to face up to it now with bipartisan statesmanship. Surely, if we can lay aside partisan politics to unite on foreign policy, we can face up to responsibility on this critical domestic issue.

THE EDITORS.

Americans Save $1.7 Trillion as Assets Climb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. MANSFIELD] for their masterful analysis yesterday of the import of the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill. Few measures have come before the Congress this session which are so unquestionably a sound investment in the future of America.

In his veto message the President indicated that the principal basis of his objections to the Public Works bill was the 67 unauthorized new starts in the bill, and to a lesser degree the extra funds appropriated for surveys and new water resources project planning. Actually the cost of the bill was hiked only about 3 percent by these additions, or a net total of $30 million.

Mr. President, this is indeed a modest sum when stacked up alongside the wealth and resources of America. No one believes more intensely than I that all Federal spending should be carefully scrutinized as to its need and urgency, but we must also consider whether we are using our assets properly, whether we are needlessly shortchanging ourselves.

This was brought forcibly to my mind when I read an article this morning in the August 31 issue of the Deseret News, which is published in Salt Lake City. This same issue of the News, incidentally, carried a vigorous editorial supporting the President's veto of the public works bill.

The article to which I am referring points out that the American people are the "savingest people ever," which, of course, is most commendable, and that the Federal Reserve Board estimates the sum total of their savings to be over a trillion and a half dollars.

This means, Mr. President, that the extra funds for investment in the future of America provided for in the public works appropriation bill by the Democratic Congress are less than .002 of 1 percent of the total personal savings of the American people.

With this kind of "money in the bank," with a rapidly expanding population, particularly in the West, can we afford not to keep our water resource development programs going?

I ask unanimous consent that article from the Deseret News be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Deseret News and Telegram, Aug. 31, 1959]

AMERICANS SAVE $1.7 TRILLION AS ASSETS CLIMB

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON.—Americans are the savingest people ever.

The Federal Reserve Board has come up with a staggering figure to prove the point. A number trailing a long string of zeros rarely is impressive these days but this one is: 1,721,700,000,000 (trillion).

That is the sum total of the financial assets held by the American people at the end of last year.

The Board isn't talking in millions or in billions. Our financial assets have shot past a trillion dollars and are well on their way to the two-trillion-dollar mark.

There are more consumers than anything and it's consumers who have been doing most of the saving. Their financial assets total $867.9 billion.

COMMERCIAL BANKS

Commercial banks are in second place with $238.6 billion. Corporations are third with $164.7 billion and insurance companies are fourth with $150.6 billion.

No other important group has as much as $100 billion, although the savings institutions come close with $95.4 billion. The Federal Government is well down the list with $40.9 billion of financial assets.

The favorite investment of the savers is corporate stock. There's $245 billion of it outstanding and consumers hold $386.8 billion.

LIKES STOCKS BETTER

The average American likes stocks much better than he likes corporate bonds. Consumers own only $9.6 billion of bonds while insurance companies own the lion's share of $59.3 billion.

What else do consumers own? Well, they have $92.1 billion in time deposits; $83.4 billion in life insurance savings; $64.8 billion in pension funds; $60.9 billion in currency and demand deposits; $51.2 billion in savings shares; $47.7 billion in U.S. savings bonds; $27.9 billion in mortgages; $25.4 billion in municipal bonds; $16.4 billion in marketable Government securities; and $1.4 billion in security credit.

One thing consumers do not have is gold—at least not that they're talking about, for it's against the law. The commercial banks hold the gold and they had $20.6 billion at the end of last year.

District Juvenile Judges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ERNEST WHARTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, my remarks are no doubt prompted by the fact of my many years experience and connection with juvenile courts but I recall that my first impression of the Federal City was utter amazement when I learned that we have but one children's court judge. Even assuming the highest type of citizen, this would seem entirely inadequate and after due observation I would not characterize the juvenile court situation as bordering on the ridiculous. In neglecting this court we have invited an increase in the crime rate and it is a serious one.

A good juvenile judge should be about 30 percent judge, one-third probation officer and social worker and the remainder a sounding board for beatniks and teen-agers in their relations with society and the general public. In juvenile court the calendar should be clear from day to day. Here is a court where cases cannot be put off for 6 months, or even 6 days. These misguided and ill-advised young people are running up the criminal statistics by leaps and bounds. Many psychopathic cases find their way into the court.

If you want ot know what accounts for the rapidly rising crime rate, just call in a juvenile judge. However, with a single juvenile judge in the entire District of Columbia, I can assure you he has little time to appear before congressional committees, and there is ample work for several judges here.

In this connection let us take note of the statement of a Democratic Senator from Oregon on last Sunday's television program and not be "a Congress of mistaken judgment."

Dr. William Campbell Browne, Prominent Physician of Curwensville, Clearfield County, Pa., Is Nearing the Completion of 60 Years Spent in the Practice of Medicine

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, at the turn of the century the community of Burnside, Clearfield County, Pa., beckoned to the youthful Philadelphia physician Dr. William C. Browne a year after his graduation in 1899 from Hahnemann Medical College. This year marks the 60th year of Dr. Browne's practice of medicine in Clearfield County, 34 years of which were spent in Burnside, and the remaining 26 years in Curwensville where he is still active at the age of 82 in the daily practice of his noble profession.

Dr. Browne's medical career is unique since it embraces both the horse and buggy era of the family doctor in rural America and the present highly specialized age of medical advancement. True to the high precepts of the medical profession Dr. Browne has kept pace with scientific progress in the field of medicine and surgery.

As a result he can indulge in fond recollections of the so-called "horse and buggy" days and enjoy comparing them with the modern methods of healing which he has acquired from constant study and daily practice of his profession. Thus in the discharge of his role of a country doctor who has acquired knowledge of all the modern techniques in the fields of surgery and internal medicine he speaks with outhority borne of 60 years of surging forward in medicine's and humanity's struggle against disease and death.

Dorothy Bladin Hill in a touching tribute to the family doctor had in mind such a physician as Dr. William C. Browne when she penned the following lines:

FAMILY DOCTOR

Out of a world of black ignorance and jagged fear
Standing sturdy like a beacon of guiding light
Dispelling the horror of a pain-filled night,
You come to us, with your brusque, good cheer.

How quick your hands to probe, your eyes to peer;
What God-given strength lies in your quiet might,
What sinewy muscles you use to win your fight.
It's over, and instantly your face is clear

As you smile over a task well done.
Quitely you repack your medical kit
And stop a moment long enough to say,
"How bright the room is with the morning sun!"
And then you go again, doing your needed bit
To help the world face yet another day.

During World War I Dr. Browne served in France as a captain in the Army Medical Corps. After his discharge from the Army Medical Corps he became a member of the Medical Corps Reserve and later retired with the rank of full colonel.

Dr. Browne during 55 of the 60 years of medical practice has had a valiant ally in his devoted wife Fannie. Together they celebrated their 55th wedding anniversary and Mrs. Browne's 82d birthday on August 4 at a dinner given them by their family at the Clearfield-Curwensville Country Club.

There are many families in the Burnside and Curwensville areas who can look back over the years and recall that they and their children and grandchildren have regarded Dr. Browne as "our family doctor." A great number of them were delivered at birth by Dr. Browne and today many of them as individuals take pride in saying, "I'm one of his babies."

The older residents recall Dr. Browne in his role as a general practitioner who drove his horse and buggy over the hills of Clearfield County with a little black bag that served as his drugstore. In those days there were few if any prescriptions to write because "Doc" Browne as he is affectionately called carried his remedies with him. His grateful patients found however, that he carried more than pills and cough syrup. He also dispensed confidence, advice, and cheer coupled with good commonsense, all of which proved powerful stimulants to troubled hearts.

Today "Doc" Browne still retains the same philosophy of life as he now prescribes the modern miracle drugs that are a monument to the progress of medicine.

It would be difficult to even try to enumerate the many kind deeds of amiable "Doc" Browne and the great good he accomplished for suffering humanity who sought and obtained his medical care. Suffice to say that many grateful hearts continue to sing his praises for his dedicated zeal in alleviating human ills. Those who were unable to pay for medical care were never denied "Doc" Browne's healing touch. The result is that such unpaid medical fees over a period of 60 years represents a sizable investment in humanity by the genial "Doc" Browne.

Truly he is a member of the large group of pioneering physicians who have added luster to their names and their profession and thus have merited lasting appreciation.

Ida Marian Breed emphasized the role the medical profession plays in the crowded ways of life when she wrote the following tribute which in a sense can be made applicable to physicians both living and dead:

MEMORIAL TO A DOCTOR

A straight young man goes swiftly by,
Once twisted child with halting crutch;
My heart sees a memorial
To my dead father's healing touch.

It has been my good fortune to value Dr. William C. Browne as a close personal friend for many years. Therefore, it is a pleasure to join in a dual salute to one of Clearfield County's best-loved physicians on the 60th year of the practice of his profession, and to extend to him and his devoted wife heartiest congratulations on their 55th wedding anniversary.

In concluding this tribute of love and respect to Dr. and Mrs. William C. Browne, I wish to include at this point in my remarks the following interesting article written by Mary Ellen McEwan, staff writer of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, which appeared in the July 11, 1959, issue following a personal interview with Dr. Browne at his office in Curwensville, Pa.:

DR. BROWNE IN 60TH YEAR OF PRACTICE

(By Mary Ellen McEwan)

A short, neat, elderly man walked into the waiting room. "I'll be with you in a minute," he smiled, as he returned to his office and one of the thousands of patients he has treated in the last six decades.

Dr. William C. Browne, of Curwensville, this year marks his 60th anniversary as a physician, having devoted his life to the service of mankind through the medical profession.

Still spry at 82, Dr. Browne was born March 30, 1877, in Philadelphia. He attended Girard College and graduated from Hahnemann Medical College in 1899.

A year after graduation, he took up residence in Clearfield County and began his practice in Burnside. Thirty-four years later he moved to Curwensville, where he has lived ever since.

In regard to his early years of practice, Dr. Browne recalled that at one time there was very little respect for members of the medical profession.

"People felt that doctors should be on call 24 hours a day, 365 days a year," he began. "Fees were meager. Why, even today's doctors' calls are just a little more than taxi fares.

"Transportation developments have helped the medical profession greatly in the last 60 years," he continued. "In 1900, Clearfield County had perhaps 1 doctor for every 1,200 to 1,500 people. Today, we have only about one-third or one-half that many physicians, but automobiles and good roads make it possible for a doctor to do 5 or 10 times the amount of work as he did in 'horse and buggy days.' "

Dr. Browne recalled that he often traveled in a buggy, and when the roads were too muddy for that, he would ride on horseback. "There were many times when the only way I could get to a patient was by pulling on my hip boots and wading through the mud," he added.

When asked if all of these experiences had ever affected his own health, he recalled that on many occasions he was sicker than the patients he visited, but that in 60 years' practice he has only missed 6 days' work.

Problems confronting medical science have changed during Dr. Browne's career.

"In 1902 I treated 190 cases of smallpox," he related. "Nowadays, this and other diseases such as diphtheria, scarlet fever, and typhoid, all great threats at one time, are not heard of very often."

Asked what he thought was the greatest discovery in medicine during his lifetime, Dr. Browne replied that antibiotics were probably the greatest advance, but that their use had been greatly abused at times by physicians who did not realize the potential dangers of the drugs.

Other great contributions to medicine cited by the doctor included the X-ray machine and the use of radium.

"From 1900 until today, the X-ray has developed into a wonderful tool of medicine," he explained. "Also, the use of radium has been introduced in the pathological laboratory, greatly advancing the diagnosis and cure of many diseases."

Looking toward the future, Dr. Browne said that he thinks the greatest need in scientific advancement is a definite means of making a diagnosis of cancer in its earlier stages when the disease is curable.

Sharing Dr. Browne's life with him for the past 54 years, Mrs. Browne is the former Fannie Browell. The Brownes, who will celebrate their 55th anniversary August 4, have three children and six grandchildren.

During World War I he served as a medical officer in France, where he studied for a short time at the University of Bordeaux after his discharge. Returning home, he remained active in the Reserves and retired as a full colonel in 1941.

Dr. Browne gave up confinement work 3 years ago, but he still keeps a full schedule of office, home, and hospital calls. Does he ever plan to retire? "Not as long as I'm able to work," he answered, hurrying to type a prescription.

In Honor of Walter Lee

SPEECH

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I learned of the recent retirement of Walter Lee from his important post of

counsel to the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Claims. Through the years I have grown accustomed to relying on his wellspring of knowledge and his dependable judgment, and it is, therefore, with something near regret that I see him go. On the other hand, I realize that the faithful and competent fulfillment of the heavy demands for his personal service merits a well-deserved rest, and it is my prayer that he may enjoy peace and good health within the circle of his friends and loved ones throughout many years to come.

It is a source of pleasure for me to recall the warm personal friendship that I have shared with Walter Lee over the years, and it is my hope that I have not imposed on our friendship in a professional capacity. He has always taken a keen interest in the problems of my office, as he has those of every Member during more than 20 years, and for his innumerable services, I shall be eternally grateful. It would be especially remiss for me to have passed up this opportunity to pay tribute to Walter Lee, a grand gentleman, an excellent lawyer, and a great fellow Mississippian.

Although Walter Lee has vacated his office, the memory of his cheerful and cooperative spirit, his quiet dedication, and his personal ability will linger on as an inspiration to those of us who remain. It is to be regretted that he was the victim of a brain hemorrhage last week, but it is comforting to note the rapidity with which he is recovering. My prayer is for the swift and complete restoration of his health so that he may fully enjoy with his gracious and charming wife and family the years of retirement which he so rightfully deserves.

Laos in Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the crisis in Laos, emphasized by the appeal of its government for United Nations help should, I believe, be an "alert" for the free world.

For some time, now, the Communists reportedly have been staging attacks against the integrity of Laos.

The aggression, symbolic of the Communist-type subversion and infiltration, now apparently has been supplemented by stronger, more direct military attack.

In view of this violation to its integrity as a nation, the appeal of the Government of Laos, I believe, should receive a sympathetic ear in the United Nations. In addition, the free world—particularly the member nations of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization—as well as the United States should see what can be done to lend assistance.

Today, the Washington Post contained a thoughtful editorial on the crisis entitled "Laos in Trouble." I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 5, 1959]

LAOS IN TROUBLE

The sudden appeal by Laos for United Nations troops indicate the near-panic of the Government in Vientiane about its ability to withstand the new Communist aggression. Joseph Alsop, in some splendid examples of alert, on-the-spot reporting, has told how the hit-and-run guerrilla attacks have now been augmented with a full-scale, artillery-backed invasion from Communist North Vietnam. The free world, and most particularly the United States, must supply adequate help quickly if it is not to be too late.

Clearly this is a sophisticated kind of Communist assault. Part of the dirty work is being done by raiding teams of the Communist Pathet Lao, and the effect of the terrorism is compounded by disaffection in the villages which the Pathet Lao has held in the past. But behind the Pathet Lao, guiding it and backing it up with troops and equipment, has been North Vietnam and, more indirectly, Communist China. The jungle country and the withdrawals of loyal Lao Army units have made positive identification of Vietnamese forces difficult; and the incredibly primitive communications complicate the situation further. But the invading troops and equipment do not come from Mars. To doubt the circumstantial evidence is merely to abet the Communist disguise.

Of course it would be preferable to have some independent verification through United Nations observers before other action is contemplated. But there has been too much dalliance already. The immediacy of the problem warrants a special session of the General Assembly if, as expected, the Soviet Union vetoes any action in the Security Council. Meanwhile it may be desirable to consider the dispatch of troop support from, say, Thailand, under the SEATO guarantee pending U.N. measures.

It is plain from the simultaneous trouble on the Indian border that Communist China and North Vietnam have decided upon a campaign of deliberate aggression and challenge. This can be met better now than later; if the locale is more difficult, the principle in resisting these Communist encroachments upon independent countries is exactly the same as in Berlin. It will be easier to hold Mr. Khrushchev accountable and demand his intercession if he understands in advance that the United States and its free world friends will take whatever military steps may be necessary to halt the aggression.

House Holds Ike's Veto Line

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on September 3, 1959:

HOUSE HOLDS IKE'S VETO LINE

By a margin of only one vote, the House of Congress yesterday sustained the President's veto of the $1,216 million public works appropriation measure.

This was a bitter decision for the Representatives to make. The bill contained hundreds of projects, in almost every congressional district of the country. A Congressman loves nothing better than to get a new post office, Government office building, or more flood-control funds for his constituency.

Why then did the predominantly Democratic House vote to uphold the Republican President's veto? It grows steadily more apparent that the politically attuned ears of House Members have heard a great deal of grassroots approval for Mr. Eisenhower's decision to get a balanced budget and dump red ink.

Ike vetoed the works program, as carpentered by the House, because it contained 67 projects in 32 States for which his budget made no provision.

The total for the bill was some $30 million in excess of budget allowances—not a great deal for so large a bill. But it would have knocked a hole in the budget—for what is commonly called a pork barrel catchall.

Undoubtedly many necessary, deserving works are embraced in the defeated bill. Among them are moneys for continuation of flood control projects in Missouri. Now Congress must tackle another works measure, and it will quickly.

Obviously essential commitments need to be met. It would be folly to abandon half-finished projects into which many millions of tax dollars have already been sunk.

But the next public works appropriations schedule that comes to the White House will have to stay within budget bounds and avoid unnecessary projects—for which we now haven't tax funds to pay.

Administered and Monopoly Egg Pricing Threat to Producer and Consumer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in the September issue of Farm Journal is an article which I believe will be of interest not only to farm folks but to our big city cousins. It deals with the question of monopoly pricing in the egg business.

I would wholeheartedly recommend to the House Committee on Agriculture a study of this system of egg marketing.

Mr. Speaker, imagine the feeling of the egg producer who sees the market for his product manipulated in this fashion; and how about the consumer's attitude?

As the concluding sentence of the article says: "It's plain that what farmers really need is a new way to price eggs."

The egg pricing story follows:

THE MEN WHO SET YOUR EGG PRICES

(By Claude W. Gifford)

(Most powerful man in an antiquated marketing system is Gordon Urner or nephew Frank. Each morning one roams through the jungle of egg firms near the waterfront, watches a 5-minute flurry of Exchange trading, then picks a price that's used the country over to pay for farmers' eggs.)

This is hard to believe, but a handful of traders—who operate in a few crusty old buildings near the New York waterfront—pretty much set the price that you get for eggs.

And these men get "the word" from one man—either bespectacled, courtly Gordon Urner, or nephew Frank. Each day, one of them prowls the wholesale center and Mercantile Exchange and names the egg price.

Throw in the Chicago egg market—which has even more glaring shortcomings—and the two markets play the tune that egg producers dance to almost everywhere in the country, except in the far West.

It's incredible, but true. I've just been to New York to watch the process. Care to go along on a world tour?

The people we'll meet are mainly wholesale "middlemen," brokers and speculators who deal in eggs on the Exchange and in the wholesale center.

These firms receive eggs trucked in from nearby and from as far away as Mississippi and Minnesota. They usually pay for these eggs on the basis of "New York prices" on the day of arrival. The eggs then go to jobbers who in turn distribute to hotels, restaurants, small stores, and the like.

They provide very few eggs to the biggest outlets of all—the chain stores.

The crumbling wholesale market center—where these people operate—is a jungle of little offices and partly cooled "egg holding floors." These are tunneled into dilapidated buildings that are jammed into a half dozen short blocks. This is what the trade calls the "street." It's the kind of a place where you wouldn't want to be caught at night, for it's only a baseball throw from the tough docks that line the Hudson River.

"Thirty years ago, this was a bustling center handling big trainloads of eggs that arrived from the West," relates David Meierfeld, egg dealer at 11 Jay Street. "Most of the eggs for the huge New York City population came through this center—and it took nearly 200 big wholesalers to handle the job.

"Then the chainstores started to bypass us and buy out in the country. Their trucks roll from the henhouse right to the store. Today there aren't more than 10 big receivers surviving in this entire wholesale center."

Add just two more things, and you've got the picture of this antiquated marketing setup that still wields tremendous power: The Mercantile Exchange in the heart of the "street"; and the private, 102-year-old Urner-Barry price-reporting service that issues the daily word on egg prices.

I called on John Clagett, executive director of the exchange. He pointed out that members have been trading eggs on the board since 1872. The 400 members also trade in butter, potato futures, and, oddly enough, platinum.

"This is a cash, spot market for eggs," Clagett explains. "It brings together all the forces of the Nation's egg market. Eggs sold on the board are graded, delivered, and paid for by 2 p.m of the same day."

Clagett says that a bid on the exchange—even if there are no takers (which often happens)—will set prices, since an unfilled bid shows that somebody is willing to pay that price.

"It's almost 10:30 a.m. now, opening time for the egg board," Clagett said. "It's open for 15 minutes of trading a day. Let's go down and see it."

We walked onto the exchange floor and found a dozen egg traders idly chatting in front of high blackboards that list 12 different grades and types of eggs—ranging from Nearby Fancy Heavy Whites to Pullets and Peewees.

A bell rang at 10:30 to open trading. I expected to see a commotion. Instead, the traders continued to exchange greetings, pleasantries, and trade talk, as if nothing had happened. And, frankly, nothing had.

Ten minutes later, at 10:40, a trader finally shouted a bid to a board boy standing at the blackboard; he rapidly scribbled down a 41-cent bid for two 25-case units of Nearby Extra Fancy Heavy Whites. Nothing happened. The trader upped the bid to 42 cents. Somebody shouted that he'd sell him the 50 cases.

The same bidder came back with a 41½-cent bid for another 50 cases; then a 42-cent bid. He got no takers this time. I noticed that there were only two other bids—and no takers—on the other 11 grades and types of eggs. Then the bell rang again—it was 10:45 and trading was ended.

I was told that it was normal for traders to use only 5 of the 15 minutes allotted daily, as had just happened.

Only 50 cases had been sold on an admittedly slow day. Was this, I wondered bringing together all the forces of the Nation's egg market, as Clagett had claimed?

But wait, something else was happening. The traders were now gathering around the Urner-Barry blackboard at the side of the exchange floor to see what the official prices would be. In a few minutes, Frank Urner posted the prices: one flat price for each grade, including 41 cents for the Nearby Extra Fancy Heavy Whites. This, despite the 42-cent exchange transaction and the unfilled bids of 41½ and 42 cents, which somebody was willing to pay, as Clagett had pointed out.

The price that Urner-Barry picked became the New York price, accepted as gospel by the traders, who hurried back to their places of business to use these prices as the basis for paying for the farmers' eggs they handled that day.

Traders in other cities across the country did the same as the wire service flashed the prices across the Nation.

"Even most of the chainstores use Urner-Barry New York quotations as the basis of their prices to farmers," says Dr. Alfred Van Wagenen of the Northeastern Poultry Producers Council.

Again next day I went back to watch exchange dealings. This time 33 bids were made on 7 of the 12 grades; 5 deals were completed in 2 grades. In each of the seven grades where bids were offered or deals made, Gordon Urner quoted an official price 1 to 2 cents under the exchange.

"How come?" I asked Gorden Urner.

"We've been in this business 102 years," he replied, "and we've learned that the egg trade wants one flat price—not a range of several cents for the same grade (such as the USDA reports). The single price saves time and trouble in making deals. Over the years, we've supplied the price, and the trade has accepted it."

"But how do you arrive at one flat price that's used almost the country over?" I questioned.

"We watch the supply and demand daily; we have instant contact with Chicago and Boston. Each morning we go down the street and size up the egg movement here in New York by talking with several wholesale firms. Finally, we go to the exchange and watch the trading. Then, based on our judgment and years of experience, we settle on a price."

"But," I persisted, "why do you quote prices ½ to 2 cents lower than sales or bids on the exchange, such as I've just seen?"

"We do our best to prevent unnecessary daily price variation—that's part of our function. We don't like to be thought of as price regulators," said Urner, "but you can't get away from some of that."

What's wrong with this system? Ask those who know most about it and they'll point out that:

1. New York conditions are not typical of the national egg market.

The wholesale center handles only a piddling amount of the national egg supply. Firms are influenced almost solely by their own supplies related to their small share of the New York City market.

It's estimated that one large chainstore in New York handles more eggs than the entire wholesale center.

A couple of extra truckloads of eggs on the New York "street" can throw the market in a tizzy. Because of the high market costs, less than 1 percent of the eggs received are shipped out again to other cities to clear local supplies.

"Supply and demand out in producing areas may not change, but New York prices do," charges USDA egg market chief, H. A. Rust.

2. Urner-Barry's quoted prices don't necessarily show what's happening in New York, even. Almost always there's a premium paid over the "quoted price"; sometimes there's a discount. But this information is not fully and clearly reported—nor understood by buyers and farmers around the country.

The eggs that a farmer sells to a country buyer by grade—or which are packed in cartons or delivered—are different from the bulk eggs that are used to set base prices in New York.

3. Exchange trading is exceedingly thin, artificial, inadequate.

Members don't rely on the exchange to buy or sell their supplies. Partly because of exchange fees and redtape, it's cheaper and easier to buy and sell on the street. They go to the exchange primarily to test the market and to protect their own margins.

A market this thin can easily be pushed up or down on any one day. "It's highly susceptible to manipulation with a few cases of eggs when it's an extreme market going up or down," says L. C. Giffen, USDA market reporter. "Often exchange trading runs opposite to what I find on the street."

Prices in New York change about once every 2 trading days.

4. The system puts too much power in one man's hands.

"Nobody is that good," says Henry Broad, one of the market's biggest receivers. "But still I base my entire operation on Urner-Barry prices, for lack of anything better."

Actually, Urner-Barry picks up little information from the street on prices, since most of the firms are using the price that Urner-Barry selected.

Even worse, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange price is reported by a private service that usually isn't even present. It calls an exchange employee who relates what happened.

"The nub of the trouble is that the central egg markets are dying," says USDA's egg price specialist, Norris T. Pritchard. "Yet the trade clings to central market prices by long habit—actually let's them set prices by default."

What can be done about it? Here are three suggestions that you hear:

Get egg co-ops and private handlers to aggressively price their own eggs and cut down on price gyrations.

In the Los Angeles area, large egg producers and farm groups negotiate for prices. The contracts are tied to retail store prices. Instead of fluctuating once every 2 days, prices change on the average of only once every 2 weeks. And the margins between farm and customer are among the smallest in the country.

The Poultry Producers of Central California—a farm co-op—has brought similar stability to the San Francisco area; as has the Washington Cooperative in the Pacific Northwest.

Other groups could follow this lead—but even nationwide co-ops couldn't hope to alter seasonal or yearly price fluctuations.

Improve the Government market reporting system.

The USDA is working on this now—but needs support. It wants to get more complete information on egg movements from country points, prices that retail stores pay, the volume moving at different prices and a "national picture."

Broaden exchange trading.

Seats now cost $4,000 in New York, and the rules, in effect, restrict trading to eggs that are already on the market.

But the Northeast egg co-ops have taken a bold step: They've formed an association that wholesales in New York and buys and sells on the exchange. "The trade will agree that we've stabilized prices on this market—and this has helped poultrymen everywhere," says Manager Wyn Geghan.

It's plain that what farmers really need is a new way to price eggs.

Centennial Celebration of the Establishment of Land-Grant Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me, written by Mr. Fred S. Hultz, president, North Dakota Agricultural College, Fargo, N. Dak., favoring the enactment of House bill 4012, relating to the centennial celebration of the establishment of land-grant colleges, and so forth.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA AGRICULTURE COLLEGE,
Fargo, N. Dak., August 18, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Those of use who are more or less concerned with legislation supporting the centennial of the land-grant colleges and State universities are greatly disturbed over the present situation concerning this proposed legislation. House Resolution 4012 passed the House some time ago but has been delayed for several weeks in the Senate. Apparently the bill was reported out promptly by the Senate Judiciary Committee and went to the Senate floor where approval was expected. * * * Since this legislation is distinctly not a party project we assume that the delay in action is caused by some misunderstanding or other.

There is certainly no need on my part to point out the invaluable services which have been performed for a century by many of these land-grant institutions. Here in our own State we are just entering the 70th year of such service, which is believed to have been of incalculable value to all North Dakotans.

Needless to say also, that it is not recognition with which we are concerned but, rather the opportunity for continuing and effective services which will arise from the centennial program.

We are somewhat hesitant to call on you for support of this legislation because of the many other projects so vital to our ongoing which demand your time and energy. Nevertheless, we deem this to be a worthy program and one which may prove important to the future of our State. Any help you can give in this matter will be deeply appreciated by all concerned.

Sincerely,

FRED S. HULTZ,
President.

Three Stars for Surgeons General—Eisenhower Establishes the Precedent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to see that the Surgeon General of the Army is about to receive the rank of lieutenant general. I highly commend this action which is long overdue recognition of the vital importance of the Medical Department with its Medical Corps, Dental Corps, Medical Service Corps, and Nurse Corps, to the maintenance of the health and welfare of our servicemen and their families and to the combat readiness and efficiency of our Armed Forces.

The devotion and skill of our medical personnel in preventing disease and in reducing the fatalities and disabilities resulting from combat and during peacetime, has been a tremendous factor in increasing the manpower available for active service. This also has reduced our overall manpower requirements and as a result has saved millions of dollars in the cost of pay and support for these additional personnel, in medical care, retirement, and pension costs.

This achievement has been possible because of the strong, dynamic, and competent leadership and professional guidance of the Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

As I indicated, I think it is most fitting that the Surgeon General of the Army has been recognized by this increase in rank. This recognition should also be extended to the Surgeons General of the Navy and Air Force. Their responsibilities are of no less importance than that of the Surgeon General of the Army.

The Surgeons General of the Army, Navy, and Air Force represent the Armed Forces and military medicine in many civilian professional and medical research groups. Unequal rank between the three has the connotation of secondary status to the medical department of the service or services not so recognized. The greater majority of the physicians of the country have served in one of the armed services.

The appointment of all of the Surgeons General to the grade of lieutenant general or vice admiral would be a significant recognition of the essential contributions of the physicians of the country in providing medical care for our servicemen, and conversely the lack of such recognition of one of the Surgeons General would be a reflection on the contributions and services of the physicians who are serving or have served in that service.

I have on several occasions recommended and proposed legislation to provide such three-star grade recognition of the importance of the medical departments of the armed services. During World War II the Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy served in the grade of vice admiral. Today the Surgeon General of the U.S. Navy—the world's largest navy—is a rear admiral while his counterpart in the British and French Navies are vice admirals. This reflects adversely on our Navy as a whole and on our country.

Of great advantage to the Armed Forces have been the advances in clinical medicine, medical research, and military medicine in this space and atomic age. Many of the aspects of military medicine are unique and have no direct counterpart in civilian medicine. These activities are vital in the adaptation of military medicine to our revolutionary changes in weapons systems with the challenge and problems of space flight, jet and rocket aircraft, and nuclear propulsion in aircraft, submarines, and ships. Air crew and submarine personnel selection, operational fatigue, vehicle habitability and personal equipment problems, atomic and nuclear hazard controls, and mass casualty treatment have necessitated major contributions by medical department personnel.

The Surgeons General are each responsible for the medical care of nearly a million men and a somewhat greater number of dependents and retired personnel. Each is responsible for a large industrial medicine program. For example, the Surgeon General of the Navy is responsible for the health of a far-flung military and civilian enterprise which has many ramifications due to the complex mission of the Navy, including the Marine Corps, with its aviation, submarine, surface ship, and amphibious operations. To support this mission, the Navy is one of the largest employers of civilian skills in the United States—over 300,000 people—and the Surgeon General of the Navy thus has direct responsibility for the occupational health and safety of this great group of people.

The mission of the medical department of the Navy involves plant facilities whose value is roughly one-half billion dollars and includes research and preventive medicine units, medical department schools, dispensaries, station hospitals, and 26 Navy hospitals whose average daily load is 10,000 patients with military and civilian staff of some 16,000 persons. Some 40,000 medical, dental, medical service and nurse corps officers, warrant officers, and enlisted hospital corps and civilian personnel come under the professional training and administrative responsibilities of the Surgeon General of the Navy. Similar responsibilities in industrial, operational, and clinical and military medicine and medical readiness and training evolve upon the other Surgeons General.

In closing I emphasize again that the importance of three-star rank for the

Surgeons General of the Armed Forces—Army, Navy, including the Marine Corps, and Air Force—evolves about both military and nonmilitary aspects of their role and responsibilities due to the scope of the former and the close interrelationship with civilian medicine, medical education and training, medical research, and hospital administration. The Surgeons General serve on major committees of civilian medicine. While they are primarily doctors they represent the Armed Forces in civilian medical gatherings and thus their rank is a factor in the recognition of the importance and contributions of military medicine to the country's defense.

Although considerable training and adaptation of civilian medical techniques is required to meet particular military medical applications, the Armed Forces must depend on civilian medicine for its basic source of medical manpower. The higher rank thus would be a tangible acknowledgment to the doctors of this country that the contributions of their profession to the defense of the country and the welfare of the servicemen is recognized and it would also be a recognition of the scope and essentiality of military medicine to our operational readiness and our ability to preserve the peace.

More Young People Should Learn That They Owe Something to Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, one of the major social challenges in the country is that of channeling the vast reservoirs of energy, talent, imagination, and ideas of our youth into constructive activities. In this fastmoving age, the rapid changes in our social and economic system—as well as the scientific and technological revolution—unfortunately, has not provided adequately for the exercise of the talents and abilities of youth.

Consequently, several undesirable circumstances have arisen.

First. We are letting go to waste too much of the capabilities of our youth.

Second. Energies being dissipated in just killing time could better be channeled into constructive activities. In circumstances of this kind, someone has suggested that "the best way to kill time is to 'work it to death'."

Third. Because of their boundless energies not channeled into constructive outlets, too many teenagers are getting into trouble.

Regrettably, the Nation has experienced waves of bad behavior, ranging from truancy to murder. As a result, the rate of court cases is rising at an alarming rate. For example, it has been increasing 136 percent in 1948 through 1957.

What is the answer?

A great many studies and constructive efforts are underway at the National, State, and local levels. Insofar as these can contribute to solution of the problem, these should, of course, be carried forward with all possible speed.

However, I continue to believe that the major responsibility for channeling the talents, abilities, and energies of our young folks likes, first, with the parents, and, second, with the local commnuity.

Although national programs aimed at curbing juvenile delinquency can service a purpose, certainly, we cannot expect the long arm of Uncle Sam to reach into the homes across America, to train individual youths to be useful, productive citizens.

Because of the minimum opportunities for jobs and other activities to employ their energies, however, parents, I believe, require the assistance of the local communities in carrying out projects that will absorb the talents of our young folks.

In view of the wave of crime and misdemeanors, I would hope that, as a nation, we would soon wake up and learn how to deal effectively with this social problem. This should be accomplished before juvenile delinquency becomes an even greater legal and, ultimately, an economic burden as well as a social blight and a personal tragedy to millions of individuals and families.

Unfortunately, there has developed in recent years a kind of "the world owes me a living" philosophy.

For those of us who have experienced a "bit of life," we know this is not true. To the contrary, the person who seeks to live a fruitful, constructive, productive—and, yes, happy life, learns that this is achieved for the most part by dedication to worthwhile causes in a constructive field of endeavor, not by waiting for the world to "give us a handout" for a life—which, incidentally, I firmly believe is not warranted without a commensurate effort made by ourselves.

Recently the La Crosse Tribune published a thoughtful editorial entitled "It's Time for Young People To Learn That They Owe Something to Society."

Reflective of a good commonsense that bears significantly upon the juvenile delinquency problem, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Tribune, Sept. 1, 1959]

IT'S TIME FOR YOUNG PEOPLE TO LEARN THAT THEY OWE SOMETHING TO SOCIETY

A good house painter is a busy fellow these days most anywhere. Often he needs a helper.

We know a skilled, conscientious painter who took on a boy of around 18. The boy seemed willing enough to learn, and he soon was drawing $1.50 an hour, pretty fair country wages for a beginner.

Not too long afterward, however, the painter noticed that his boy was doing a pretty careless job. He was forgetting to paint whole sides of radiators, to finish off trim, and so on. The man found he was spending hours tracking after his apprentice, redoing the unfinished work.

Listening to the painter's complaints, the boy was unmoved. He didn't say he would try to do better. He said: "I won't be able to work for you any more unless I get $2 an hour."

That, needless to say, was the end of the boy's job.

But the point here is that he is just one of countless youngsters, entering the labor market either temporarily or permanently, who think the world owes them a good wage whether they work well or not.

Employers the Nation over can tell you stories of young applicants and workers who make astonishing demands in the way of salary and benefits, without offering convincing evidence of either ability or the willingness to work hard and learn.

If the demands are not met, they look elsewhere, with a presumptive arrogance that would ill befit them even if they were loaded wtih talent.

In this age we get an awful lot of this business of the young demanding things, from their parents, their friends, their schools, their employers, without feeling it necessary to offer much in return.

This is not the place to argue how the blame for this circumstance should be distributed. It is the place to say a society is in trouble when any fair proportion of its young people imagines the world owes them a living and a good time.

From parents on down the scale, it's time to tell them that they owe something to society, too. On this tough old crust, you earn your way, one way or another, or in the end you flounder and go under.

"But God said to Jonah, Do you do well to be angry for the plant? And he said, I do well to be angry, angry enough to die."—Jonah 4: 9.

American Veterans Committee Backs Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, on July 21, 1959, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] and I introduced in the House, and Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and GEORGE AIKEN introduced in the Senate, concurrent resolutions calling for the establishment of a Great White Fleet of mercy ships to aid in disaster and distress areas throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, the response in favor of this proposal, which is an idea of an Oklahoma naval officer, Comdr. Frank A. Manson, has been tremendous. It is a heartwarming experience to read the thousands of communications received by congressional sponsors endorsing the Great White Fleet proposal.

My office this morning received a copy of the American Veterans Committee's publication, the AVC Bulletin for September 1959, which contains a news story about the White Fleet proposal, and I should like to insert this story in the RECORD at this point.

AVC BACKS WHITE FLEET TO AID NEEDY—BOATS WILL SUCCOR HIT COASTAL SPOTS

WASHINGTON.—A resolution calling for the establishment of a White Fleet which will

give emergency aid to disaster struck coastal regions of the world was submitted to the Senate last month by Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and GEORGE AIKEN, and was immediately endorsed by AVC's International Affairs Commission under the chairmanship of Bernard Cogan.

The bill, Senate Concurrent Resolution 66, proposes that U.S. Navy vessels now mothballed be restored to service and be operated by private philanthropic organizations. The fleet would include a hospital ship, a ship equipped to generate electricity, and one or more cargo vessels to transport supplies, clothing, and other equipment. U.S. surplus food would be made available for distribution, and the facilities of the U.S. Navy would be offered the fleet to maintain its operation.

Cogan, in his letter of support to Senator HUMPHREY, said: "This concept is a novel approach to the American effort abroad and deserves the support of all individuals and organizations in this country who recognize that the aspirations of the people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America will not be denied.

"Understanding and aid from America presented in this form significantly underline governmental assistance programs in underdeveloped areas of the world in ways that cannot be distorted by totalitarian propaganda."

Integration of the Races

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two well-written editorials which point up the mounting evidence that even most of the Negroes in this country—both North and South—do not favor forcible integration of the races. One of the editorials, entitled "Northern Negroes Seek Education," was printed in the September 3, 1959, issue of the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., which is ably edited by Mr. Wayne Freeman. The other, entitled "Negroes Oppose Mixing," was printed in the September 3, 1959, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., which is ably edited by Mr. Louis Harris.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Sept. 3, 1959]

NORTHERN NEGROES SEEK EDUCATION

The New York Times has done its city and the Nation a distinct service, although a surprising one, by pointing out that Negro parents in many northern big cities are sending their children to the segregated South to go to school.

The Times' writer, no doubt, had full documentation for his story. Leaders of integrationist organizations in New York denied it, naturally, for they have long held out the hope that the solution to all of the Negro's problems lay in integration, either in the North or in the South.

This vain hope has attracted many Negroes from the South. It was not the only factor, of course, for many of them migrated because machinery had displaced a lot of hand labor on the farms, and they hoped to get factory jobs in the North.

But they have found the northern cities to be far short of the land of milk and honey. The story is being told every day in the headlines reporting strife, poverty, racial riots and gang killings in the "asphalt jungle" of New York, Chicago, Detroit, and Philadelphia.

It is not a new story. It has been trickling South by various lines of communication for years. It's just that the situation has become so serious that northerners can no longer ignore it.

Southern educators and, especially, those making a close study of the South's own racial and educational problems, long have been aware that children of Negro parents living in northern big cities were being sent to this region to go to school.

In most instances, perhaps, they are the children of migrant southern Negroes who are either unwilling or unable to move back home and find jobs. In others, we are sure, they are children of Negro parents who may have been born in the North but who have relatives in the South willing to provide homes for their children while they go to school.

There is no way of determining how many such children may be attending South Carolina schools. School officials trying to pin down family relationships among Negroes often run into a lot of vague answers. But there are enough instances on record of children, especially some of high school age, registering to attend Negro schools in this State to indicate that the number is large.

And who can blame either the parents or the children? Despite the difference in the amount spent per pupil, it is obvious that South Carolina is doing better by both Negroes and whites in segregated schools than New York is doing by either in integrated schools.

Other factors may be involved, but these parents are seeking a decent education for their children, first, and letting social change follow its normal course.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Sept. 3, 1959]

NEGROES OPPOSE MIXING

Do-gooders bent upon forcing school integration in what they fancifully believe is the best interests of the Negro race must have suffered rude awakenings from two developments of the past few days.

The first was the acknowledgement by the New York Times through a front-page news story Sunday that many of New York's Negro families, protesting the spread of racial tension and juvenile delinquency, are sending their children to segregated schools in the South so that they may be educated properly.

The second came Tuesday when a Negro group in Birmingham wired President Eisenhower that most southern Negroes do not want forced integration and requested a Government-sponsored survey of southern Negroes to prove their point.

The New York revelation, which must have caused great consternation in the ranks of the NAACP and among those who have fostered its program for selfish ends, was to the effect that many Negro parents are thoroughly disenchanted with conditions in the schools of that city, some dispatching their children to reside with relatives in the South, others sending their youngsters to parochial and private institutions.

One Negro minister, the Reverend George E. Calvert, of the Church of the Son of Man, said that concerned parents found "it simpler to educate the children in the old culture than to make new, confusing city culture relevant to the lives of their children."

While Negro leaders in New York have estimated the number of Negro pupils leaving the city to attend southern schools as high as 2,000, chagrined NAACP officials refuse to admit the migration is on such a large scale. Nonetheless, another clergyman, the Reverend J. Archie Seagraves, of the Congregational Church of the Nazarene in Brooklyn, said that 10 of the 475 families in his congregation alone are sending children out of New York this fall. He said he knows of 20 other families taking similar action.

The inevitability that Negroes themselves would sooner or later see the utter ridiculousness of forced race-mixing is evident in the action being taken by these responsible Negro parents.

It is further demonstrated by the statement and request made in Birmingham. There, Samuel H. Moore, president of the Southern Negro Improvement Association of Alabama, wired the President that "I assure you that both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in public schools. Racial hate and racial prejudice that was dead is now reconstructed." And then he asked:

"Since this is free America, why not put your racial policy upon voluntary action of the citizens, not forceful compulsion? Why not have the Government take a poll of the majority of the southern Negroes?"

Moore spelled out the underlying factor involved when he said the poll should be confined to southern Negroes because "our northern Negro brothers do not live in the South and therefore do not understand our southern bicultural society."

It is tragic that the white do-gooders do not understand, either.

Hapless Fledgling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 13, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from Barrons national business and financial weekly of August 17, 1959, entitled "Hapless Fledgling—The Feeder Airlines Point Up the Folly of Subsidy":

HAPLESS FLEDGLING—THE FEEDER AIRLINES POINT UP THE FOLLY OF SUBSIDY

For anyone who likes to call a spade a spade, the devious reasoning of Federal officials sometimes defies explanation. According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator JOHN WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, upon scrutinizing certain peculiar dealings of the Small Business Administration, not long ago reached precisely that point of bafflement. A sturdy champion of good government, Senator WILLIAMS had criticized SBA for granting credit to poultry farmers, despite a highly publicized glut in the market. In response, he received a letter from Wendell B. Barnes, head of SBA, which he proceeded to describe in the following scathing terms: "Mr. Barnes' letter is a typical bureaucratic letter. It says one thing in one paragraph, then wobbles around for three or four more in an effort to explain the first, and then winds up with an entirely different version. * * * His plain duty, as he calls it, is to continue to make loans which, in the first part of the letter, he says he has not been making."

As a fitting companion piece of muddy official thinking, Barron's herewith nominates a recent statement by Louis J. Hector, member of the Civil Aeronautics Board. In a speech on the future of aircargo, Mr. Hector urged a crash program upon the industry. The Government, he said, should spur its

growth through what he called the "time-tested method of subsidy." In advancing his proposal, the CAB official skimmed lightly over several possible objections, including the circumstance that the air freight business, quite unaided, is thriving handsomely at the moment. More to the point, he chose to overlook the fact that right in his own backyard, with regard to the local or feeder air carriers, such an approach has proved to be anything but time-tested. Far from encouraging the fledgling industry to spread its economic wings, Government subsidy, so to speak, has kept it hapless in the nest. In Washington, as in Wonderland, words evidently mean what people want them to mean. Concerning the CAB and the feeder airlines, however, it is surely time to set the record straight.

What the record reveals is, to be sure, not wholly negative. The first short-haul carriers were chartered in 1946, under a Federal mandate to "cultivate the potential air traffic at small cities, at a reasonable cost to the Government and the traveling public." Since then, by some yardsticks at least, the group has come a long way. In the postwar years its numbers have grown to 13, of which 2—Allegheny Airlines and Mohawk Airlines—are listed on the American Stock Exchange. Serving more than 500 small communities (including such out-of-the-way spots as Glens Falls, N.Y., and Oil City, Pa.), the industry in 1958 flew more than 800 million revenue-passenger miles, a gain of 10 percent over 1957. Total revenues, including Federal subsidy, came to roughly $95 million, up from virtually nothing a dozen years before.

To those who cherish growth for its own sake, such a showing might seem impressive. More jaundiced observers, who have some regard for profit and loss statements and balance sheets (not to mention the taxpayer's pocketbook) tend to take a different view. To begin with, the industry's rapid expansion has been accompanied and, in large measure, caused—by a sharp rise in Federal subsidies. From roughly $12 million in 1949, such payments soared in 1958 to $32 million. In the current fiscal year, they are scheduled to exceed $50 million, a figure which approaches the annual sums which the CAB used to contribute to the support of the Nation's domestic trunklines.

What's more, unless somebody changes course, the cost will keep climbing. Last year alone, to illustrate, the CAB approved scheduled flights to nearly 50 additional localities, thereby at one fell swoop expanding the total served by nearly 10 percent. Several of the more aggressive short-haul carriers have pressed successfully for the right to compete on some routes with the trunklines. Finally, a CAB examiner, after an appraisal of the industry's finances, not long ago recommended a big increase in its authorized rate of return. To some interested parties, apparently, the sky's the limit.

For its mounting investment, the Nation has little to show. True, as noted, the short-haul carriers have burgeoned all over the map. However, sheer size is a poor substitute for competitive or financial strength, which the industry by and large sadly lacks. Among other things, it suffers from a badly lopsided capital structure. According to Selig Altschul, noted aviation authority, total captalization of the industry at the end of 1958 comprised 59 percent debt and only 41 percent equity, contrasted with 46 percent and 54 percent, respectively, for the trunk carriers. As of the same date, it boasted only $1 of net worth for every $5 of assets. In Mr. Altschul's view, the imbalance "is a source of extreme vulnerability in any period of adverse operations." Earningswise, the picture is no brighter. Last year several of the feeder lines operated at a loss; others, by virtue of counting in airmail payments not yet authorized, ran nominally in the black. In the fine understatement of the CAB, the industry has not been profitable enough to maintain financial integrity, attract capital on reasonable terms, and return reasonable compensation to investors. By way of ironic contrast, Flying Tiger Lines, Inc., largest domestic air freight carrier, has been thriving on its own. This year it is likely to report the best results in its history.

On close scrutiny, then, the time-tested method apparently doesn't always work. Indeed, its glaring defects belatedly have impressed themselves upon some members of the CAB, who now are seeking a new and better approach. In a speech before the Association of Local Airlines a fortnight ago, James R. Durfee, CAB chairman, remarked: "It does not serve the public interest in meeting its needs for an economical, efficient air transportation system simply to add more and more cities to the network, to carry more and more passengers at greater and greater annual costs." What Mr. Durfee's official rhetoric lacks in symmetry or grace, it more than makes up for in commonsense and candor. The time-tested way to build an industry—or a nation—is not government subsidy. It is the unremitting effort of competitive enterprise.

Laos Crisis Creates More Evidence for Need of U.N. Police Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a news report, prepared by me, relating to the crisis in Laos.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SAYS LAOS CRISIS CREATES MORE EVIDENCE FOR NEED OF U.N. POLICE FORCE

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, today cited the Lao crisis as one more bit of evidence on the need for a United Nations police force.

"Around the world, the Communists—in Laos, on the India-China border, and elsewhere—continue to engage in infiltration, attempts at subversion, and outright aggression, to attempt to accomplish their goal of world conquest.

"The establishment of an effective U.N. police force, I believe, could do much to control and/or prevent such situations," Senator WILEY said.

"Overall, the nations of the world must increase their efforts to encourage respect for territorial integrity, international law, adherence to high standards of conduct, and, more particularly, to discourage such infiltration and aggression as is now occurring in Laos.

"Until enforcement machinery is provided, however, we can—in view of the Communists pursual of their goal of world domination—expect this kind of outlawry to continue to create threats to the security of countries.

"We recall that, in 1958, the U.S. Congress, by resolution, expressed its support for establishment of such an international force. Unfortunately, opposition by the Soviet Union has, until now, prevented the creation of such a force within the United Nations.

"The Lao crisis—as well as the India-China border dispute and other such Communist-inspired crises—furnish additional evidence of the need for establishment of an effective U.N. police force to curb such violations and provide for a more secure peace," Senator WILEY concluded.

Walter Lee

SPEECH

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the Congress in January of 1943, a new, green and inexperienced freshman Congressman, Walter Lee was among the first to visit my office to extend a cordial welcome to the Hill, and to make his guiding counsel available. Although I did not know Walter personally before that time, I had known him by reputation—a reputation which was good, indeed. He comes from a prominent and refined rural family most of whom I know personally.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in the fact that Walter is a native of my congressional district. While the citizens of the city of Jackson and of Hinds County in Mississippi claim him as their own, in reality he belongs to the people and the soil of Calhoun County, Miss., where he first saw the light of day and lived until his maturity. Even after all of these many years since he has lived and worked in Jackson and in Washington, Walter himself looks upon his native county as home. He frequently returns to the scene of his youth so as to renew and enjoy the associations of his early life and the worship in the little country church where he first came to know and dedicate himself to the service of the Supreme Ruler of the Universe.

Observing and appreciating his high quality and ability, Walter was persuaded by the beloved Congressman Dan McGehee, of Mississippi, to assume the clerkship of the old Claims Committee. He served with such proficiency that upon the party switch in chairmanships which was effected in the 80th Congress, Walter was urged to stay on as clerk of the Claims Committee. In fact, the late, lamented and lovable Judge Jennings, of Knoxville, who was slated to assume the chairmanship of the committee in the 80th Congress, conditioned his accepting this high responsibility upon the committee reelecting Walter as the committee clerk. There was no issue about it. He was retained and has there remained throughout these many years.

This, Mr. Speaker, is proof of the fact that Walter was then and is now one

of the most efficient committee clerks ever to serve on Capitol Hill. It is further proof that Walter has endeared himself to all Members of the House of Representatives, both Democrat and Republican. With his wonderful smile, penetrating personality and accommodating spirit he has established for himself the reputation of being everyone's friend, which indeed he really is.

Walter has earned the retirement which he is now about to enjoy. As he leaves our midst he does so with our profound thanks for his valuable services and with our good wishes to both him and his charming and attractive wife, Helen, that they will enjoy many restful, pleasant and happy years in their dream house down in the good Magnolia State of Mississippi. We wish them well and we particularly wish for Walter a speedy recovery from his current illness.

Migratory Farm Laborers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to be named chairman of the subcommittee investigating the obvious injustice perpetrated on half a million American migratory farm laborers in this country, the so-called forgotten citizens. Members of the subcommittee will soon see for themselves the distressing conditions under which these migrants battle for survival. Secretary Mitchell has well described them "as lonely wanderers on the face of our land, living testimonial to the neglect that is possible in a wealthy society."

Although much work lies ahead for all of us before we can provide the bare fundamentals of social justice to which every human being is entitled, the stirring of interest in this subject from many levels has been indeed heartening to see.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the newspaper Labor and an article from the St. Louis Dispatch of August 29 which relates some factual information on a little known subject.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Labor, Aug. 29, 1959]

FARM WORKERS' PLIGHT SHOWS WHAT LIFE IS WITHOUT UNIONS

Ironically, while reactionary employers and lawmakers have been successfully fanning up antilabor hysteria to put over harsh new curbs on unions, some parts of the Nation have been getting a good look at what these employers want to turn back to.

The utlimate in life without unions exists among the great army of 800,000 unorganized migratory farm workers who toil each year on the Nation's factory farms.

Secretary of Labor Mitchell has described these workers as "lonely wanderers on the face of our land * * * living testimonial to the neglect that is possible in a wealthy society."

Recently, the Washington Post and Times Herald and the Denver Post spotlighted conditions that prevail among the thousands of migratory workers brought into Maryland and Colorado each year.

The Post and Times Herald reporter visited migrant camps in Maryland, next door to the Nation's Capital, and wrote a series of articles on what he found. He described crowded "shacks" and otherwise miserable living conditions for the workers' families, and workers crammed into trucks without seats or benches.

He wrote, "When harvest is good, a migrant picks until his knees are sore and his back aches. In a bad session, there is the specter of empty stomachs for himself and his family."

In a full page Sunday editorial, the Denver Post pointed out that the U.S. migrant farmworker "has been consistently written out of much of the social legislation of the past 20 years." He had no minimum wage protection, no jobless insurance, no union, and no vote. When he becomes sick he's a "charity case."

The newspaper concluded that "the braceros (Mexican workers brought into the United States) generally enjoy better working conditions and have more job security than the U.S. citizen." These Mexicans, unlike domestic workers, are protected by a law.

Meanwhile, Senators WILLIAMS of New Jersey, JAVITS and KEATING of New York, MCCARTHY and HUMPHREY of Minnesota, MCNAMARA and HART of Michigan, NEUBERGER and MORSE of Oregon, PROXMIRE of Wisconsin, MURRAY of Montana, and YOUNG of Ohio, are sponsoring bills that would require farm labor employers to register. This would facilitate a check on their hiring practices.

Also, in California, the AFL–CIO has launched a drive to organize American farm laborers. However, it is being bitterly fought by employers. The battle undoubtedly is going to be a long and tough one.

Several days ago, California's industrial relations director, John Henning, entered into the discussion as to what Russian Premier Khrushchev should see when he visits the United States.

Henning suggested that Vice President NIXON, a native Californian, bring Khrushchev to California to visit a farm labor camp. To show such shameful aspects of America, "would take real courage," Henning said.

Yet, in this way Khrushchev would be getting a true picture of exploited farm labor in the State—"a picture of people living in houses which NIXON would not permit his dog to live in," the State official added.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 29, 1959]

The half-million American migratory farm laborers are not the forgotten citizens they so often seem to be. Secretary of Labor Mitchell has scheduled hearings next month on proposed changes in the Federal law designed to regulate the interstate recruitment of these workers in a manner which will not undercut wages, working conditions, and transportation practices in the areas in which they are employed. The amendments do not embrace a minimum wage or bargaining rights and they do not affect Mexican migratory workers now covered by Federal law, so they may be regarded as the bare fundamentals of social justice.

The Senate already has held hearings on legislation which would set a minimum age and a minimum wage for migrants. The chairman of the subcommittee, Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., Democrat, of New Jersey, also has announced a tour of migratory labor camps after Congress adjourns. Meanwhile, California, Maryland, Delaware, and Virginia are moving on the State level. But there remains a great deal of opposition, spearheaded by American Farm Bureau Federation.

American migratory workers constitute almost one-fourth of the 2,200,000 person who work more than 25 days a year on farms. Department of Labor figures show the number is increasing. The Department estimates these workers earn an average of $892 a year, from farm labor and from additional employment. This is an income so small that it certainly should not be reduced.

In a typical year, 17,000 of these workers register at the migrants' information center in Sikeston, Mo. About 7,000 help harvest Missouri's cotton, with the aid of several thousand more privately recruited in nearby States. About 4,000 Missourians go each year to Michigan to harvest fruit crops. As a general rule, most of the migrants work on factory farms, which depend seasonally on migratory labor.

Yet these laborers are denied the protection of the minimum wage law, unemployment insurance, laws covering labor-management relations, and most State workmen's compensation laws. Often they are not covered by State and local health and welfare laws, usually because they cannot meet residence requirements. The social security old-age and survivors insurance setup now covers them, however.

Secretary Mitchell's proposals would require the States to certify that there is no farm labor available within their boundaries before any of their farmers could avail themselves of the services of the U.S. Employment Service in recruiting migrants. The States also would have to examine crop yield estimates to show that migratory labor is essential. They would have to ascertain that the migrants are not offered wages lower than those prevailing locally. They would have to make sure that reasonably decent housing facilities are available, and they also would have to make sure of transportation facilities equal to those in the areas in which the workers are recruited.

Broadly, these provisions would require employers to maintain local standards which, in themselves, may be distressingly low for the migrants. That is the least that can be asked for the protection of migrants and local workers, too. At least, the regulations would prevent a contest in misery in which local and migrant workers underbid each other in an area in which compensation already is far from good. The ultimate answer probably is year-around employment. Short of that, the migrants deserve better protection than they get in their seasonal labors.

Address by Congressman Thaddeus Machrowicz in Warsaw, Poland, on the 20th Anniversary of Hitler's Attack on the Polish People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 20th anniversary of Hitler's infamous attack on the brave and

noble people of Poland. The brutal invasion of Poland in 1939 in turn touched off World War II, the war which brought so much suffering to millions of human beings throughout the world.

It is fitting indeed that two decades after Hitler's attack on Warsaw the ringing voice of freedom should be heard in that great city. The voice was that of our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, who last week in the chamber of the Parliament of Poland on the opening day of the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. Our able colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], also a delegate to this conference, has told the House of the tremendous ovation received by Mr. MACHROWICZ at the conclusion of his address, which was delivered in Polish.

Congressman MACHROWICZ is a native of Poland and served during World War I in the Polish Army.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the continuing desire of the people of Poland to enjoy the full blessings of liberty, I am sure that Members of Congress will be moved as they read the address delivered on August 27, 1959, by Congressman MACHROWICZ in Warsaw. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

Mr. Chairman, honorable delegates, my request that as an American delegate I be permitted to speak in the Polish language is, I realize, somewhat unusual, but I would like to justify it by citing certain facts. I am personally of Polish birth and served in the Polish Army in World War I. I became an American citizen and the American Nation has entrusted me for the last 10 years with membership in its highest parliamentary body, and lately with membership in the delegation to the Interparliamentary Union.

I am very proud of my ancestry in the great Polish nation. I am equally proud of my citizenship in the great American Nation. This somewhat dual character of my individual membership impels me to make a few remarks which are probably more appropriate from me.

In his excellent report, the General Secretary called our attention several times to the great advances made in the last few years by the Polish nation in the economic and political fields under conditions which we all recognize as most difficult. I agree wholeheartedly with his findings in this respect.

It was unquestionably proper that in his address of welcome to this Interparliamentary Conference, the Honorable Aleksander Zawadzki, chairman of the state council of our host, the Republic of Poland, called to the attention of the delegates that this historic session is being held in Warsaw on the 20th anniversary of the commencement of World War II.

It was right here in Warsaw 20 years ago, on September 1, 1939, that a shower of bombs thrown without warning, without declaration of war, put into motion World War II with all its years of terror, loss of lives, and of untold damage.

There is no city in the world which withstood so gallantly so much suffering, loss of human lives, so much wanton destruction. A brief visit around the town still shows the scars left by those days of horror, despite the remarkable efforts of reconstruction by the Government and nation.

On this 20th anniversary of the commencement of the greatest military tragedy suffered by humanity—one which cast mourning over the entire world—a tragedy which took the lives of 20 million persons—in Poland alone 6 million or over 15 percent of the population—I would like to offer my respect to those to whom it is due. Above all, it belongs to the courageous population of Warsaw and all of Poland, which by its sacrifice of human lives, blood, suffering, and general destruction, demonstrated actively its dedication to those ideals which we in the Interparliamentary Union acknowledge, opposing aggression, that terrible threat to international security.

In discussing problems of international security and disarmament, we cannot, however, rest in paying our respect to this nation. The reconstruction of Warsaw from ruins and shambles, through the great effort of the Polish nation and Government, inescapably casts upon us the query: What was the reason for this catastrophe which literally destroyed an entire generation? How was this gigantic historic process, the results of which are felt bitterly by the entire world in both hemispheres, put into motion? And what lesson should the world derive from this experience?

I would like to recall to the honorable delegates some historical facts which throw significant and important light on the general problem of international security.

When 20 years ago, on September 1, 1939, the forces of Hitler made the unprovoked attack on Poland, they completely disregarded their international commitments, particularly the freely entered into Polish-German pact of nonaggression of January 26, 1934.

Only 16 days later, on September 17, 1939, Poland's powerful neighbors from the East commenced occupation of the eastern territories of Poland.

This joint action was by no means coincidental. On the contrary, it has been fully documented in the secret Stalin-Hitler pact of August 23, 1939.

This secret pact, concluded 8 days before the German aggression on Poland, cynically decided on the future division of Poland, an independent nation. These secret negotiations became public only after the war, after publication of the secret Hitler documents which fell into American hands after Hitler's defeat in 1945.

My limited time does not permit me to cite more completely from these documents, copies of which are in my hands, but they do disclose how the plan was actually put into action.

In reminding the delegates of these undeniable historical facts in connection with the attack on Poland, I sincerely hope that in consideration of that historical moment, we keep in mind all the facts and keep them in proper perspective.

A full and serious contemplation of these historical facts led me to the introduction of a resolution dealing directly with international security, which would serve to help prevent the recurrence of another world war.

Unfortunately, for purely procedural reasons, since it was not listed on the Secretary's desk within the prescribed time, it cannot be considered without unanimous consent, which I realize I could not obtain. The resolution merely states that the Interparliamentary Union solemnly declares that conspiracy between governments directed toward the destruction of the independence, freedom, territorial integrity and internal safety of any other state shall be deemed an international crime and, further, it is urged upon all parliaments to take effective measures on their respective national levels precluding the commission of such crimes.

I regret that we probably will not have the opportunity at this session to discuss that resolution, so proper and necessary to assure peace and security to the entire world. I do believe, however, that we shall never have fully accomplished our obligation in that respect until we adopt that or some similar resolution.

The Federal Government Can Save Tax Dollars—Move Its Operations to Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week the proposal to reduce appropriations for schools in federally impacted areas was rejected by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee. The decision was disappointing to supporters of the administration's program to cut down on unnecessary spending. It was another blatant refusal to take a stand against inflationary practices.

The recommendations of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were modest enough, with the principal item providing for a 50-percent decrease in aid to school districts where parents of students work for the Government in another jurisdiction. A district in point is Montgomery County, Md., the residence of many men and women who are employed by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia. Montgomery County, which prides itself as one of the wealthiest—if not the wealthiest—counties in the United States, comes in for a handout of about $3 million this year under Public Law 874, which one of the laws the administration sought to modify in the interest of economy.

The total cost of the prevailing program amounts to $225 million annually, with beneficiaries including numerous school districts serving permanent military bases. Under the administration plan, appropriations would have been reduced by almost 30 percent the first year, with additional savings scheduled for succeeding years. At a time when the general public is alarmed at the high cost of Government that is constantly reducing purchasing power of the wage earner's dollar, it is extremely unfortunate that an opportunity to save more than $60 million annually was dismissed by the subcommittee. Yet it is encouraging that Members considering the amendments submitted this observation in their report:

> It is the feeling of the subcommittee that certain modifications of these programs may be desirable.
>
> For that reason, the subcommittee plans to take up the question again early in the next session with the intention of making specific recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm hope that the subcommittee will in its wisdom make a complete reevaluation of the impacted area gratuities in order that the taxpaying public may at long last obtain relief from the current imposition on the Federal Treasury. Meanwhile, Congress can make a distinct contribution to the cause of economy if demands of local citizens are determined before sites for

further Government installations are selected.

As Representative of the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I should like to invite my colleagues to inspect the advantages of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana Counties as locales for military bases and Federal offices. Although our per capita income cannot be compared with that of Montgomery County, we should be happy to provide the necessary school facilities for children of Government workers if they are located in our district. We resent having to contribute to the education of students in communities that have pleaded for Government construction and then insist on subsidies to provide for normal services and facilities.

If Montgomery County cannot afford to pay for its own schools, give us some of the new Government offices that are contemplated for the future. We would appreciate the employment opportunities and steady paychecks that come with them. In our part of the country we have thousands of men and women wholly competent of serving in whatever capacities are needed. They will welcome the economic stimulation which Government payrolls provide, and in turn they will meet whatever tax assessments are necessary to maintain our schools.

The 22d Congressional District has ample space, excellent transportation facilities, and a climate far superior to that of Montgomery County. I suggest that Congress consider these advantages before deciding upon further new construction. We would be happy to be classified as a federally impacted area without permitting our school system to become a public charge.

Support of S. 2540: Automatic Promotion of Certain Officers Upon Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me in support of S. 2540.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

For 34 years, the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard have enjoyed a tradition established by law allowing members of these services who were commended in combat to receive an automatic promotion upon retirement. This promotion did not carry with it extra pay or pension, but merely the prestige accorded to persons who had served their country above and beyond the call of duty.

On July 27 the Senate passed H.R. 4413, which had appended to the body of the bill a repeal of this tradition, effective November 1. Since this provision was never available to members of the Army and Air Force, it was, as it stood, discriminatory against members of these services. Accordingly, I introduced a bill which would extend this privilege to members of these services. My bill has been opposed by the Department of Defense, and in the absence of passage, perhaps termination of the privilege for naval officers will be the only way to end the discrimination.

With this, I am not taking issue. It is the abruptness of the termination which I oppose. When Naval, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard officers have charted their careers over a period of years expecting in good faith to have this tombstone promotion, as it is called, awarded to them in the twilight of their service, 2½ months is not enough time to change course. For those who may want to retire early in order to get in under the wire, adequate opportunity to revise their retirement plans is not afforded.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has introduced on behalf of himself and others, S. 2540, which will continue until July 2, 1960, authority to promote these officers who have been commended for combat action. I want to express my support for this bill. I believe it will effectively accomplish the original purpose, without working any undue hardship on the officers which would be affected.

Death of Rev. Thomas Cunningham, S.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a noble and gallant figure has passed from the Alaska scene. He is the Reverend Thomas Cunningham, S.J., known far and wide throughout Arctic Alaska as "Father Tom."

I ask unanimous consent that his obituary notice as it appeared in the New York Times of September 5, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It was my privilege to get to know "Father Tom" well in the early days of World War II when I was organizing the Alaska Territorial Guard units among the Eskimos in northern and northwestern Alaska. I appointed him commander of the guard unit on little Diomede Island, where he was serving at that time, the portion of U.S. territory closest to Siberia—for Big Diomede Island, only 2½ miles away, is Russian. "Father Tom" had a firsthand experience with the ruthlessness of our nearest neighbors, when he was captured by them, and being a priest, and therefore particularly a target for the animosity of Communist totalitarianism, was in imminent danger. Fortunately he was rescued by our Eskimos who were devoted to him.

Now this devoted servant of God and of his fellow men has gone to his reward, but the memory of his courage—physical and moral—and his great friendliness, will linger to the end of the days of all who knew him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REV. TOM CUNNINGHAM IS DEAD; PRIEST IN THE ARCTIC OF ALASKA

POINT BARROW, ALASKA, September 4.—The Reverend Tom Cunningham, "the parish priest of the Arctic," died of a heart attack yesterday in his cabin at this northernmost tip of the United States. His age was 53.

Father Cunningham's death ended 25 years of missionary work in the largest Roman Catholic parish in the United States—150,000 square miles of ice and tundra above the Arctic Circle.

Last November Father Cunningham and 20 others were rescued from a wind-swept Artic ice island that had broken up in a polar storm. The Jesuit priest, an authority on ice conditions, had chosen the ice floe at the request of the Alaskan Air Command for use by scientists carrying out International Geophysical Year studies.

Father Cunningham, a native of New Zealand, came to Alaska in 1934. He first served on Little Diomede Island, then established missions at Teller and Nome before coming here.

In visiting his farflung parishioners, Father Cunningham often traveled as much as 2,500 miles by dog sled.

Father Cunningham was born of Irish parents. He entered the Jesuit order in Australia, studied in Europe, Montreal and California, and volunteered for Arctic missionary duty. He enlisted for chaplain's duty in World War II and the Army Air Force set him to teaching Arctic survival to pilots.

He became one of the world's few experts on the behavior of pack ice, by joining in hazardous scientific expeditions on ice floes 20 miles offshore in the Arctic Ocean. The knowledge he obtained came by camping with Eskimos on icepacks as they went on hunting expeditions. By living the Eskimos' life and mastering their language he won their respect.

Journeying with the Eskimos in their umiaks, or walrus-skin boats, he traveled throughout the barren areas. In the spring of 1938, he was on a hunting trip with Diomede Eskimos in a skin boat that was caught in ice and forced to land on Big Diomede Island, a Russian possession.

The Russian customs officials promptly arrested him for trespassing on Russian soil. Father Cunningham won his release by filling out a questionnaire that was in Russian. He gave his answers in Gaelic.

How Could the Supposed Experts Be So Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Not only Lord Boyd Orr, but an eminent Canadian banker have assured us, after visiting Red China, that the Communists' gains there are miraculous and their startling claims justified. In the end, facts always impose themselves. The Communists are far weaker than they have succeeded in making many people believe. If we will continue to stand firm at this crucial juncture, as we will, and if certain allies will also, the

noble people of Poland. The brutal invasion of Poland in 1939 in turn touched off World War II, the war which brought so much suffering to millions of human beings throughout the world.

It is fitting indeed that two decades after Hitler's attack on Warsaw the ringing voice of freedom should be heard in that great city. The voice was that of our distinguished colleague from Michigan, Congressman THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, who last week in the chamber of the Parliament of Poland on the opening day of the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. Our able colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], also a delegate to this conference, has told the House of the tremendous ovation received by Mr. MACHROWICZ at the conclusion of his address, which was delivered in Polish.

Congressman MACHROWICZ is a native of Poland and served during World War I in the Polish Army.

Mr. Speaker, as we reflect on the continuing desire of the people of Poland to enjoy the full blessings of liberty, I am sure that Members of Congress will be moved as they read the address delivered on August 27, 1959, by Congressman MACHROWICZ in Warsaw. The address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

Mr. Chairman, honorable delegates, my request that as an American delegate I be permitted to speak in the Polish language is, I realize, somewhat unusual, but I would like to justify it by citing certain facts. I am personally of Polish birth and served in the Polish Army in World War I. I became an American citizen and the American Nation has entrusted me for the last 10 years with membership in its highest parliamentary body, and lately with membership in the delegation to the Interparliamentary Union.

I am very proud of my ancestry in the great Polish nation. I am equally proud of my citizenship in the great American Nation. This somewhat dual character of my individual membership impels me to make a few remarks which are probably more appropriate from me.

In his excellent report, the General Secretary called our attention several times to the great advances made in the last few years by the Polish nation in the economic and political fields under conditions which we all recognize as most difficult. I agree wholeheartedly with his findings in this respect.

It was unquestionably proper that in his address of welcome to this Interparliamentary Conference, the Honorable Aleksander Zawadzki, chairman of the state council of our host, the Republic of Poland, called to the attention of the delegates that this historic session is being held in Warsaw on the 20th anniversary of the commencement of World War II.

It was right here in Warsaw 20 years ago, on September 1, 1939, that a shower of bombs thrown without warning, without declaration of war, put into motion World War II with all its years of terror, loss of lives, and of untold damage.

There is no city in the world which withstood so gallantly so much suffering, loss of human lives, so much wanton destruction. A brief visit around the town still shows the scars left by those days of horror, despite the remarkable efforts of reconstruction by the Government and nation.

On this 20th anniversary of the commencement of the greatest military tragedy suffered by humanity—one which cast mourning over the entire world—a tragedy which took the lives of 20 million persons—in Poland alone 6 million or over 15 percent of the population—I would like to offer my respect to those to whom it is due. Above all, it belongs to the courageous population of Warsaw and all of Poland, which by its sacrifice of human lives, blood, suffering, and general destruction, demonstrated actively its dedication to those ideals which we in the Interparliamentary Union acknowledge, opposing aggression, that terrible threat to international security.

In discussing problems of international security and disarmament, we cannot, however, rest in paying our respect to this nation. The reconstruction of Warsaw from ruins and shambles, through the great effort of the Polish nation and Government, inescapably casts upon us the query: What was the reason for this catastrophe which literally destroyed an entire generation? How was this gigantic historic process, the results of which are felt bitterly by the entire world in both hemispheres, put into motion? And what lesson should the world derive from this experience?

I would like to recall to the honorable delegates some historical facts which throw significant and important light on the general problem of international security.

When 20 years ago, on September 1, 1939, the forces of Hitler made the unprovoked attack on Poland, they completely disregarded their international commitments, particularly the freely entered into Polish-German pact of nonaggression of January 26, 1934.

Only 16 days later, on September 17, 1939, Poland's powerful neighbors from the East commenced occupation of the eastern territories of Poland.

This joint action was by no means coincidental. On the contrary, it has been fully documented in the secret Stalin-Hitler pact of August 23, 1939.

This secret pact, concluded 8 days before the German aggression on Poland, cynically decided on the future division of Poland, an independent nation. These secret negotiations became public only after the war, after publication of the secret Hitler documents which fell into American hands after Hitler's defeat in 1945.

My limited time does not permit me to cite more completely from these documents, copies of which are in my hands, but they do disclose how the plan was actually put into action.

In reminding the delegates of these undeniable historical facts in connection with the attack on Poland, I sincerely hope that in consideration of that historical moment, we keep in mind all the facts and keep them in proper perspective.

A full and serious contemplation of these historical facts led me to the introduction of a resolution dealing directly with international security, which would serve to help prevent the recurrence of another world war.

Unfortunately, for purely procedural reasons, since it was not listed on the Secretary's desk within the prescribed time, it cannot be considered without unanimous consent, which I realize I could not obtain. The resolution merely states that the Interparliamentary Union solemnly declares that conspiracy between governments directed toward the destruction of the independence, freedom, territorial integrity and internal safety of any other state shall be deemed an international crime and, further, it is urged upon all parliaments to take effective measures on their respective national levels precluding the commission of such crimes.

I regret that we probably will not have the opportunity at this session to discuss that resolution, so proper and necessary to assure peace and security to the entire world. I do believe, however, that we shall never have fully accomplished our obligation in that respect until we adopt that or some similar resolution.

The Federal Government Can Save Tax Dollars—Move Its Operations to Depressed Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week the proposal to reduce appropriations for schools in federally impacted areas was rejected by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee. The decision was disappointing to supporters of the administration's program to cut down on unnecessary spending. It was another blatant refusal to take a stand against inflationary practices.

The recommendations of Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were modest enough, with the principal item providing for a 50-percent decrease in aid to school districts where parents of students work for the Government in another jurisdiction. A district in point is Montgomery County, Md., the residence of many men and women who are employed by the Federal Government in the District of Columbia. Montgomery County, which prides itself as one of the wealthiest—if not the wealthiest—counties in the United States, comes in for a handout of about $3 million this year under Public Law 874, which one of the laws the administration sought to modify in the interest of economy.

The total cost of the prevailing program amounts to $225 million annually, with beneficiaries including numerous school districts serving permanent military bases. Under the administration plan, appropriations would have been reduced by almost 30 percent the first year, with additional savings scheduled for succeeding years. At a time when the general public is alarmed at the high cost of Government that is constantly reducing purchasing power of the wage earner's dollar, it is extremely unfortunate that an opportunity to save more than $60 million annually was dismissed by the subcommittee. Yet it is encouraging that Members considering the amendments submitted this observation in their report:

> It is the feeling of the subcommittee that certain modifications of these programs may be desirable.
>
> For that reason, the subcommittee plans to take up the question again early in the next session with the intention of making specific recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm hope that the subcommittee will in its wisdom make a complete reevaluation of the impacted area gratuities in order that the taxpaying public may at long last obtain relief from the current imposition on the Federal Treasury. Meanwhile, Congress can make a distinct contribution to the cause of economy if demands of local citizens are determined before sites for

further Government installations are selected.

As Representative of the 22d Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I should like to invite my colleagues to inspect the advantages of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana Counties as locales for military bases and Federal offices. Although our per capita income cannot be compared with that of Montgomery County, we should be happy to provide the necessary school facilities for children of Government workers if they are located in our district. We resent having to contribute to the education of students in communities that have pleaded for Government construction and then insist on subsidies to provide for normal services and facilities.

If Montgomery County cannot afford to pay for its own schools, give us some of the new Government offices that are contemplated for the future. We would appreciate the employment opportunities and steady paychecks that come with them. In our part of the country we have thousands of men and women wholly competent of serving in whatever capacities are needed. They will welcome the economic stimulation which Government payrolls provide, and in turn they will meet whatever tax assessments are necessary to maintain our schools.

The 22d Congressional District has ample space, excellent transportation facilities, and a climate far superior to that of Montgomery County. I suggest that Congress consider these advantages before deciding upon further new construction. We would be happy to be classified as a federally impacted area without permitting our school system to become a public charge.

Support of S. 2540: Automatic Promotion of Certain Officers Upon Retirement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me in support of S. 2540.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ESTES KEFAUVER

For 34 years, the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard have enjoyed a tradition established by law allowing members of these services who were commended in combat to receive an automatic promotion upon retirement. This promotion did not carry with it extra pay or pension, but merely the prestige accorded to persons who had served their country above and beyond the call of duty.

On July 27 the Senate passed H.R. 4413, which had appended to the body of the bill a repeal of this tradition, effective November 1. Since this provision was never available to members of the Army and Air Force, it was, as it stood, discriminatory against members of these services. Accordingly, I introduced a bill which would extend this privilege to members of these services. My bill has been opposed by the Department of Defense, and in the absence of passage, perhaps termination of the privilege for naval officers will be the only way to end the discrimination.

With this, I am not taking issue. It is the abruptness of the termination which I oppose. When Naval, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard officers have charted their careers over a period of years expecting in good faith to have this tombstone promotion, as it is called, awarded to them in the twilight of their service, 2½ months is not enough time to change course. For those who may want to retire early in order to get in under the wire, adequate opportunity to revise their retirement plans is not afforded.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has introduced on behalf of himself and others, S. 2540, which will continue until July 2, 1960, authority to promote these officers who have been commended for combat action. I want to express my support for this bill. I believe it will effectively accomplish the original purpose, without working any undue hardship on the officers which would be affected.

Death of Rev. Thomas Cunningham, S.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ERNEST GRUENING
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, a noble and gallant figure has passed from the Alaska scene. He is the Reverend Thomas Cunningham, S.J., known far and wide throughout Arctic Alaska as "Father Tom."

I ask unanimous consent that his obituary notice as it appeared in the New York Times of September 5, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It was my privilege to get to know "Father Tom" well in the early days of World War II when I was organizing the Alaska Territorial Guard units among the Eskimos in northern and northwestern Alaska. I appointed him commander of the guard unit on little Diomede Island, where he was serving at that time, the portion of U.S. territory closest to Siberia—for Big Diomede Island, only 2½ miles away, is Russian. "Father Tom" had a firsthand experience with the ruthlessness of our nearest neighbors, when he was captured by them, and being a priest, and therefore particularly a target for the animosity of Communist totalitarianism, was in imminent danger. Fortunately he was rescued by our Eskimos who were devoted to him.

Now this devoted servant of God and of his fellow men has gone to his reward, but the memory of his courage—physical and moral—and his great friendliness, will linger to the end of the days of all who knew him.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REV. TOM CUNNINGHAM IS DEAD; PRIEST IN THE ARCTIC OF ALASKA

POINT BARROW, ALASKA, September 4.—The Reverend Tom Cunningham, "the parish priest of the Arctic," died of a heart attack yesterday in his cabin at this northernmost tip of the United States. His age was 53.

Father Cunningham's death ended 25 years of missionary work in the largest Roman Catholic parish in the United States—150,000 square miles of ice and tundra above the Arctic Circle.

Last November Father Cunningham and 20 others were rescued from a wind-swept Artic ice island that had broken up in a polar storm. The Jesuit priest, an authority on ice conditions, had chosen the ice floe at the request of the Alaskan Air Command for use by scientists carrying out International Geophysical Year studies.

Father Cunningham, a native of New Zealand, came to Alaska in 1934. He first served on Little Diomede Island, then established missions at Teller and Nome before coming here.

In visiting his farflung parishioners, Father Cunningham often traveled as much as 2,500 miles by dog sled.

Father Cunningham was born of Irish parents. He entered the Jesuit order in Australia, studied in Europe, Montreal and California, and volunteered for Arctic missionary duty. He enlisted for chaplain's duty in World War II and the Army Air Force set him to teaching Arctic survival to pilots.

He became one of the world's few experts on the behavior of pack ice, by joining in hazardous scientific expeditions on ice floes 20 miles offshore in the Arctic Ocean. The knowledge he obtained came by camping with Eskimos on icepacks as they went on hunting expeditions. By living the Eskimos' life and mastering their language he won their respect.

Journeying with the Eskimos in their umiaks, or walrus-skin boats, he traveled throughout the barren areas. In the spring of 1938, he was on a hunting trip with Diomede Eskimos in a skin boat that was caught in ice and forced to land on Big Diomede Island, a Russian possession.

The Russian customs officials promptly arrested him for trespassing on Russian soil. Father Cunningham won his release by filling out a questionnaire that was in Russian. He gave his answers in Gaelic.

How Could the Supposed Experts Be So Wrong?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Not only Lord Boyd Orr, but an eminent Canadian banker have assured us, after visiting Red China, that the Communists' gains there are miraculous and their startling claims justified. In the end, facts always impose themselves. The Communists are far weaker than they have succeeded in making many people believe. If we will continue to stand firm at this crucial juncture, as we will, and if certain allies will also, the

turning of the tide may be closer than most people think.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Aug. 27, 1959]

INFLATED CHINESE CLAIMS

Communist China's humiliating confession that its vaunted production claims were grossly inflated recalls to us the report of Lord John Boyd Orr only 4 months ago that the Chinese Reds were doing all they claimed.

Mr. Boyd Orr, a former head of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization, and a board member of England's largest farming enterprise, went to China and inspected production personally on an extensive tour. Though the Chinese themselves now admit they raised only about two-thirds as much of the grain and only a little more than half the cotton they had claimed (with some similar reductions in steel and coal) Mr. Boyd Orr apparently was completely taken in. He said in May his inspection convinced him the Red Chinese estimates of a huge increase in food production were not exaggerated. He described the results as astonishing.

How can a qualified observer, in fact one of the world's foremost authorities, be so badly fooled? Presumably Mr. Boyd Orr was given a better than usual opportunity to see things for himself, but still he did not see them as they were. At any rate, a distinguished Scottish face deserves to be red, as well as a number of less-distinguished Chinese faces.

An Open Letter to Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of the Word, monthly publication of American Legion Post 51, Whittier, Calif., contains an editorial that presents a very mature approach in the form of an open letter greeting Mr. Khrushchev. Mr. Stanley C. Bumm is the able managing editor of the Word. The editorial reads as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO SOVIET PREMIER NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

Greetings, Mr. Premier. On the eve of your visit to the United States this letter is prepared in order that you may have tangible evidence of America's solidarity in the understanding and appreciation of our Government.

We welcome you as a guest but we do not offer you the key to our house. We seek, as we hope you are seeking, a means to better understand the difference in governments and ideologies and not an exchange of agreements backed up by military might and threats of armed aggression.

Proudly and still with simplicity and conciseness we remind you what the United States of America represents.

The United States of America is a Nation characterized by a unique way of life. Building upon the foundation laid down by history's greatest exponents of human freedom and buttressed by convictions of individual dignity and integrity, the founders of our American way of life were well aware that they were creating a new conception of liberty and responsibility for mankind.

Our Nation has prospered, providing for the world the best example of what men can do for themselves, under God's will, when their energies are freed and their best judgment made the law of the land.

With our fundamental values being challenged by the Communists we in America are at work to clarify as well as to defend these values, to strengthen our understanding of them, and to assure ourselves that the convictions we have lived by will be made clear and fully glorious to our children and youth.

Man has worth and dignity as a human being in America, endowed by God with certain rights which can be violated but which cannot be taken from him. Among these natural rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The individual under the American form of government has responsibilities as well as rights. Accepting the worth and dignity of all men, he respects their rights as he expects others to respect his. In the Christian tradition, he lives in the belief that man has great possibilities for intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth; and he acts to make the best use of his opportunities to promote such growth to himself and others.

The citizens of the United States understand that the personal freedom and the standard of living enjoyed by him rests on the labors of generations of men and women who have believed that in order to have a good, man must first create a good; who have devoted heart, mind, and muscle to building an America whose material wealth, while resting on rich natural resources, is chiefly a result of fully developed human resources brought to fulfillment by a way of life that frees energies and purpose as none other in the world.

America's greatness rests not upon her wealth, although that is great, nor upon her opportunities for self-improvement, although these are legion. The greatness of America grows out of the personal worthiness of the men and women of America. Under our from of government, we have found that freedom and the necessity for making great moral and spiritual values of our own. These values become our guide to live by, as we assume responsibilities for ourselves and the common good.

We believe in uniting to mobilize our present strengths and build our future defenses in this greatest of all struggles, the battle for the future of mankind.

Communist Action in Laos an Object Lesson for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times:

A WARNING ON LAOS

There are times when Communist impudence and effrontery reach depths that free and civilized men find hard to plumb. How is one supposed to react and retort to statements of policy and purpose that are obviously conceived in iniquity and born in falsehood? Presumably we wish above all for two things: to find out the truth and to keep the peace. The Communists in Asia are manifestly determined to obscure the former and prevent the latter.

The immediate case in point is the latest broadside from Peiping in which the United Nations is warned that the gravest consequences will follow if the United Nations dares to send observers to Laos to find out what is happening in that threatened kingdom. We are entitled to ask a few questions, even if we are somewhat bewildered in the devious labyrinth of Communist lies.

Gravest consequences to whom? To the United Nations? Red China is still at war with the world organization. To Laos? It is already in the obvious path of Communist conquest and there could be no graver consequence than the consummation of the plot which is apparently still being hatched in the top-level meetings of Moscow's agents, such as North Vietnam's Ho Chi Minh who, having just returned from Moscow, is now conferring with the agents of his transmission belt in Peiping, the top operators in the Red Chinese oligarchy.

Of course, the virtually defenseless Lao are not the prime target. The United States has drawn far more fire from Peiping. The United Nations is now the ostensible target and the Communists are testing out the weapon of intimidation, with the threat of gravest consequences if the United Nations so much as dares to ask for the facts.

The real danger to the Reds, obviously, is the truth in the case. Has the United States actually set up vast military bases in Laos, as Peiping continues to charge? It hasn't as U.N. observers could quickly find out. Is the border fighting inspired by the imperialists, as Ho Chi Minh charges? United Nations observers could make a prompt report. Is there actually a Communist conspiracy against Laos? United Nations observers would probably have to guess, since they would hardly have any more access to Communist territory than they had in Korea.

But even within limits the Communist obviously cannot endure a search for the truth. And if the United Nations shows any desire to look for it there will be gravest consequenses. There may be a little object lesson here for those who are still crying for Red China's admission to the U.N.

Report on Roseburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Olive Starcher, a staff member of the Medford, Oreg., Mail Tribune, and her husband visited the city of Roseburg and their friends, the Paul Helwegs, shortly after the terrible explosion of August 7 which has taken at least 13 lives and caused an estimated $12 million in damage.

It is hard to realize the extent of the damages. I think Mrs. Starcher's column of August 11 helps put it in perspective, as it relates to the world in which we all live. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mrs. Starcher's well-written and informative column:

POTPOURRI

(By Mrs. Olive Starcher)

PORTLAND.—It's Monday morning and 9 o'clock and Potpourri is on vacation. And so what do we do? We take typewriter (an old Underwood loaned by the Multnomah

Hotel) in hand and write. So many of our days begin in this fashion that somehow the week wouldn't start off well otherwise.

The two of us visited Roseburg yesterday. We had planned to do so on that Sunday before the disaster which struck the city last week, so did not change our plans. It seemed that a goodly share of southern Oregon had the same idea. Traffic was very heavy, and since all entrances to the city are patrolled by police or men in Army uniform—we took them to be National Guardsmen, it takes a long time to get anywhere.

In spite of the bustling traffic and many people at work replacing glass and otherwise repairing damage, there is a note of gloom in the city. The enormity of the task of rebuilding and renovation made necessary by the explosion and fire which demolished such a large part of the business district last week, is beginning to bear down. We were told that meetings of city and State officials, attorneys and insurance representatives were to be held this week to begin the colossal task of planning the rebuilding. There is much talk of damage suits.

Pappy and Potpourri called on the Paul Helwegs, whom we have known for many years, and who own a fine home on Riverside Avenue across the river from the city—about a quarter of a mile from the center of the town as the crow flies. Their story of the disastrous night must be much the same as that of hundreds of other householders.

Mrs. Helweg heard the fire siren blow and got out of bed to look toward the city. Seeing nothing, she returned to bed. In a few minutes the siren sounded again and about the time she stirred and wondered if she should get up again, the night was shattered with the huge explosion and a big window a few feet from their bed broke into bits and fell in on the Helwegs. The Helwegs thought, as it seems 9 out of 10 Roseburg residents did, that the city had been hit by an atom bomb. Remembering what they had read, the couple, with Mrs. Helweg's sister who had come from the Midwest to visit, hurried to the basement, picking up a small radio as they went. Plugged in, the radio was silent. After a time Mr. Helweg went to the phone and finding it working, asked the operator "What happened?" The frightened woman said "I don't know—I just don't know."

Eventually the Helwegs and their guest began to walk around the house and in the yard and street, as others were doing. Everyone was quite dazed—no one knew quite what to do next. It was some time before Mrs. Helweg discovered that her hands were covered with blood and it was realized that she had a large cut on her back—one which required several stitches to close when she at length could be treated by a physician.

The Helweg's neighborhood is quite near the hospital—which lost dozens of windows and received patients into rooms littered with glass and with contents knocked askew by the terrific blast. When a fire started in back of the hospital building, neighborhood men gathered to put it out.

When the Helwegs returned to their home and began to check the damage they found the heavy front door, which had been locked, had been blown inward, and the casings ripped loose. The knob and other hardware lay on the floor. A back door was in a similar state. Cupboard doors were wrenched open and the contents dumped on the floor. Mrs. H. particularly remembered the spice closet—"everything was scattered around—I had to sweep up stuff like parsley flakes."

Plastered ceilings are somewhat cracked, and blinds damaged. It seems that in some homes where draperies were drawn across the window, glass ripped great holes as the sharp sections blasted inward. Thousands upon thousands of pieces of plywood and sheets of plastic were used to cover the damaged windows.

Householders are worrying about how to be sure all the glass is cleaned up. Sunday the Helweg's son-in-law and daughter, the Terry Herchers and their two small sons were up from Medford. Since the broken windows fell both in and outside, the older folk kept a sharp lookout and warned the older Hercher boy not to play in the grass near the windows.

People about the city show evidence of injuries—many have cuts on legs and arms, bandaged limbs, facial cuts, and scalp wounds.

We were told that practically no one is being allowed into the area where the blast occurred and where damage is the heaviest with the exception of property owners, certain officers and others whose business is of the utmost importance. Sunday the ruins were still hot and smoking and the task of hunting for bodies and carrying on other needed work will not get underway until the rubble has cooled. Banks, hotels, stores, shops—all business right down town is stopped. The main post office is closed and business Saturday was conducted from substations.

The task of cleaning up the wreckage presents a different problem to every businessman or merchant. It is said, for instance, that a jeweler whose store was almost demolished is endeavoring to sweep up and save the rubbish in front of his building. Much of his stock of diamonds and other small jeweled pieces was blown into the street. By sifting through and examining each bit of this rubble, he may be able to recover some of the stock.

The bus depot, where we boarded the Greyhound Sunday evening, has windows boarded up or covered with plastic. The gas supply was still off. The ticket clerk asked us to look upward. The large light fixtures were all hanging loose from the ceiling, with a gap of 3 or 4 inches between the plaster and the fixtures.

Where to eat was a problem in Roseburg Sunday. Those cafes and restaurants still open were literally swamped not only with local residents whose homelife has been disrupted by the disaster, but by the hundreds of curious people who flocked into the area to take a look at the disaster.

When the earth-shaking explosion struck Roseburg, with the resulting mushroom of smoke, dust, and gas, followed soon by heavy fire, almost everyone thought the city had been struck by an atom bomb. There was no bomb—only one truckload of dynamite and other explosive material with an infinitesimal power as compared to an atomic or hydrogen bomb. Roseburg folk, other Oregonians and citizens throughout the United States are rightly shocked by this local disaster; they demand investigations, and action to make sure that such a horror will not happen again.

Yet Roseburg's disaster was as nothing when compared to that which befell the city of Hiroshima in Japan. On that August day a U.S. plane flown and manned by citizens of the United States dropped a bomb on Japan which brought the same type of disaster as struck Roseburg, only magnified thousands of times.

Thursday night this writer sat in beautiful, peaceful Lithia Park and heard Suzanne Hanson read from John Hershey's soul-stirring account of Hiroshima. For the first time the full significance of what had happened in Hiroshima dawned on this writer. True, we read the newspaper accounts, heard the radio reports and since that time have been a part of many discussions on the horrors and futilities of atomic warfare—its downright inhumaneness.

Friday morning, with Mrs. Hanson's voice still ringing in our ears, and with the word pictures which Mr. Hershey painted still fresh in our mind, we heard about Roseburg. Yesterday we saw and heard more. Yesterday we heard the cabdriver, the housewife, the businessman all saying "something must be done. This must never happen again." Voices filled with compassion and "how dreadful for the driver of the truck. His life is ruined. Better that he had died." Or, "I hope this teaches the men of that firm a lesson. How can they be so careless when human life is involved?'

Driving home from the United Nations meeting Thursday night in the park, there was more talk of Hiroshima, and bombs, and wars. We were reminded that the Japanese, while sinned against, have not been without sin when it comes to slaughtering their fellow men, and that after all, Hiroshima happened because we were at war, and after all, war is war.

Of the Roseburg disaster we say "it must not happen again." Of Hiroshima we say "but we were at war."

Recent Legislative Actions by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of this session of Congress action has been taken on several measures which have been of importance to the people of the nation. A great many of my constituents have written to me concerning them.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The Federal highway program faced a serious crisis when it appeared that there would not be sufficient funds to keep it on schedule. Several projects in my State were confronted with the possibility of a slowdown or a shutdown. Not only did this involve a loss of work and jobs in the State, but it meant that the traffic requirements of the State would fall further short of the necessary goals.

The President had requested a cent-and-a-half increase in the Federal gasoline tax. The House of Representatives after a delay of many months finally approved a compromise measure which calls for a 1-cent increase in gas taxes until July 1, 1961. At that date 50 percent of the 10-percent tax on automobiles and 62½ percent of the receipts from the 8-percent tax on parts and accessories—presently going into the general fund—would be transferred to the highway fund. This measure will permit the highway program to continue with only a minor slowdown.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Following lengthy hearings, and after intense debate and consideration, Congress finally approved a bill calling for reforms in management-labor relations. Several bills were considered. Foremost was the Kennedy proposal, S. 1555, which was approved by the Senate last April. The House Education and Labor Committee reported the Elliott labor bill, H.R. 8342, which was supported by Speaker SAM RAYBURN in his nationwide broadcast. Another bill, the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill, H.R. 8400, bore the names of its authors and was supported

by the President over a nationwide TV broadcast. A fourth bill was known as the Shelley bill, H.R. 8490.

Eighty-five percent of the provisions of all bills were similar. They differed chiefly with respect to the extent to which they amended the Taft-Hartley Act. The Landrum-Griffin bill went furthest in this regard and was spoken of as the strongest bill. However, with respect to democracy in unions, elections of officers, reporting of union finances and the protection of union funds, all four bills contained approximately the same provisions. There was little or no controversy over these. The main controversies arose over the proposed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. The House approved the Landrum-Griffin bill. Because it differed from the Senate-passed Kennedy bill, it was necessary to send the matter to conference. The House and Senate conferees worked diligently for about 2½ weeks, and finally reached an agreement on a compromise measure. In effect, the Landrum-Griffin bill was softened somewhat. Both Houses of Congress then approved the compromise measure and it was sent to the President for his signature.

INCREASED INTEREST ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Congress gave the President authority to give 40 million Americans who hold $42 billion of series E and H savings bonds bigger returns on their investment. The President in his message to Congress had requested that the ceiling on interest rates on long-term Government bonds be eliminated. People were not purchasing them in the amounts required to meet the Government's financial needs. Since 1956 bond redemptions have generally exceeded bond sales. In other words, more bonds previously acquired were being turned back than were being purchased.

The President in his message said that people in a free society could not be compelled to buy Government bonds when they could get better returns on their money from other investments. The Government needs to borrow money, and the Treasury Department has been confronted with the necessity of placing the entire national debt in short-term bonds on which the law does not impose maximum interest rates. It would be difficult to estimate what the cost of such a procedure would be to the Government.

After considerable delay by the House Committee on Ways and Means, a bill was presented to the House of Representatives which would eliminate the ceiling on the interest on series E and H savings bonds. The limit on the interest rate since 1957 as been 3.26 percent. The bill would also authorize an increase in interest rates on outstanding series E and H bonds. The President is given authority to increase rates in both instances where he finds the national welfare so requires. The bill contained certain other provisions to make Government bonds more attractive and saleable. After some debate, the House of Representatives approved the measure.

TVA CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Congress in recent years has not appropriated all the funds which the Tennessee Valley Authority has requested for plant development and new facilities—particularly steam plants for the generation of electrical energy. Congress passed a measure which authorized TVA to sell $750 million in bonds to obtaain the capital it needed. There would then be no need for annual appropriations by Congress.

The President vetoed the first TVA bill because it attempts to divorce the TVA's construction program of new power-producing projects from executive review and would not afford an opportunity for the President to exercise his constitutional role in the legislative process.

When it was agreed by the House and the Senate to delete the objectionable features from the bill by separate action, the President signed the TVA proposal.

It Is Red China's Own Behavior Which Makes Peaceful Settlements Impossible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following concise and conclusive statement by the Honorable Henry Cabot Lodge, our Ambassador to the United Nations, on the reasons why Red China completely disqualifies herself for membership in the United Nations, a union of peace-loving nations to maintain peace:

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR LODGE

Sometimes we hear it said that the exclusion of Red China from the U.N. is an obstacle to peaceful settlements. But the real obstacle is Red China's refusal to settle any important question except by causing its opponents to surrender.

The U.N. is not the only place where conflicts can be settled. The United States has been in diplomatic contact with the Chinese Communists at Geneva and Warsaw since 1954. Thus they have a perfectly good channel for peaceful settlements if they want to use it, but they show no desire to do so.

Now, of course, we all agree that it would be a good thing if Red China's behavior were completely to change—and change so drastically that the word "honorable" can be applied to those who govern the Chinese people. But to make statements expressing this hope at a time when there is not a scintilla of evidence on which to base such hope is regrettable and misleading.

Remember that for a decade the people of China have been cut off from the community of law-abiding nations. It was not the community that cut them off but the barbaric behavior of their Communist rulers. The Chinese people deserve a great place in the community. The day they are permitted to resume their place will be a great day for mankind.

But there is no sign that such a day will come soon. There is not even a sign of modest improvement. When we study Red China's recent behavior we find such sins as these: the violent subjugation of Tibet; the attempts to conquer Formaso by force; the setting up of agricultural communes described by a leading scholar from India as more terrifying than all hells put together.

Also the vicious persecution of Christian missionaries, both Protestant and Catholic; the spiteful and inhuman refusal to release American citizens, five of whom are still held prisoner in Red China; the ceaseless stream of "hate America" propaganda, and refusal to account for 452 American soldiers missing since the Korean war.

Thus the score against Red China at U.N. speaks for itself.

Will The Church Bells Be Ringing?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, it is evident from my mail and from calls and other communications I have received, that a great number of earnest, hard-working Americans are perturbed about the approaching visit of Premier Nikita Khrushchev, of Russia.

For example, Mrs. Lois Bartels Moore has sent me a copy of a letter written to President Eisenhower suggesting that church bells should be tolled throughout the country each day during the period Mr. Khrushchev is visiting here. This is only one of a number of communications I have received from individuals who say some outward manifestation should be made on the part of the American people to show that they reject his godlessness and his belief in atheistic communism.

As we know, Mr. Speaker, some groups have suggested that the American citizens in the vicinity of Mr. Khrushchev, wherever he may be, when he visits our country, should attend prayer meetings wear black arm-bands, or otherwise show that they are mourning for the captive people behind the Iron Curtain.

It is not perhaps for us to say that the forthcoming visit of Premier Khrushchev cannot help to bring about lasting peace. Let us be praying that this move on the part of our President turns out to be fruitful and helpful in the field of international diplomacy. But I am sure many of my colleagues cannot help but join with me in wondering if it will prove to divide our people and weaken the resistance of the captive peoples of the world at a crucial moment in world history. Under leave granted me, I am inserting Mrs. Moore's letter in the record. It follows:

CHARDON, OHIO,
August 17, 1959.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Because of my deep religious heritage my day begins and ends with a prayer. Often one is included for you, sometimes for Mr. Khrushchev.

I have been disturbed by what seems to be the lack of an organized plan to show Mr. K. the one great strength America has which Russia has not, our belief in God.

A thought struck me with force yesterday as I prepared breakfast before leaving for church. "Why couldn't church bells ring continually all over America during Mr. K's visit?" I glanced at the Women's Day calendar above my sink. The admonition was "Do all that is in thine heart; for God is with thee." (1 Chronicles 17: 2.)

When I arrived at services I found the first hymn was:

"Built on the rock the church doth stand,
Even when steeples are falling;
Crumbled spires in every land,
Bells still are chiming and calling,
Calling the young and old to rest,
But above all the soul distrest,
Longing for rest everlasting."

After the service I spoke with my pastor, the Reverend Kenneth Hoffmann, of Grace Lutheran Church, Cleveland Heights, Ohio, relating my experience.

He was most enthusiastic and offered to phone his brother, Dr. Oswald Hoffmann who is public relations director of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, and also the speaker for the "International Lutheran Hour."

This morning I began calling my friends asking them to join in praying that this idea would be favorably received and that contact might be made with churches of all denominations to let our church bells speak for us.

The phones in this community are busy today. My latest call was from a friend who suggested I write to the President of the United States.

Very respectfully,

LOIS BARTELS MOORE.
Mrs. H. H. Moore.

Siegrist Exposes UNICEF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have always been opposed to the United Nations Organization—particularly to that branch known as UNICEF.

When the United Nations Organization was initiated at San Francisco, it was done by men who left God out of the negotiations and refused to start its meetings with prayer. Alger Hiss, a well-known Communist and an agnostic, was the architect of the Charter of the United Nations, so the organization had two strikes against it before it went into operation.

The following broadcast of October 27, 1958, by the well-known news commentator, Bob Siegrist, entitled "Siegrist Exposes UNICEF," has been brought to my attention by members of the DAR. It is worthy of wide publicity. Therefore, I offer it for the RECORD as a part of my remarks for the edification of my colleagues:

SIEGRIST EXPOSES UNICEF

It has come to this reporter's attention that, again this year, American children are being asked to forego the Halloween practice of "trick or treat," and, instead, that they participate in a door-to-door canvass for contributions for the United Nations Childrens Fund, better known as UNICEF.

Under the directions of the New York-based UNICEF office, with its bureaucracy, publicists and internationally minded propagandists, this appeal for the begging services of our American children filters down at the local level through Girl Scout troops and various other church and/or school organizations.

If our children are told at all, that their efforts are sought for the United Nations Childrens Fund, or UNICEF, it is perfectly obvious to this reporter that those children and their parents—and even the majority of the adult leaders of children's groups through whom the U.N.-originated appeal is based—have little or no knowledge or information as to the real meaning of UNICEF.

Generally, it seems that our children are merely told that their help is needed in soliciting funds for the poor children of the world, much less fortunate than they, who thereby need their help.

Obviously, it takes little if any sales pressure from teachers or other trusted leaders of American youth to convince idealistic child minds that here, indeed, is a splendid moral, Christian way for our children to turn what used to be an annual period of at least mild, juvenile violence and general youthful troublemaking into a happy, useful act of Christian charity in behalf of those less fortunate than our own American children.

Unfortunately, however, this effort to convert America's traditional and nonpolitical Halloween into something entirely different is well in keeping with the massive effort for the perversion and absorption of all religious holy days and national holidays into instruments completely contrary to the ideologies and traditions upon which those days are based.

Just as the Kremlin has throughout its satellite ghost world committed this slaughter of religious holy days and national holidays, so too would the Kremlin do here in the United States.

Ever since the tragic founding of that grossly misnamed organization known as the United Nations more than a decade ago, the Kremlin has enjoyed great assistance in this direction from many persons in, about, and subscribing to the United Nations and its so-called principles.

Tragically enough, much of that assistance in the Kremlin-directed desire of breaking down American traditions and principles has been granted, unwittingly, by good and well-meaning people who, unfortunately, have chosen to accept at face value the U.N.'s propaganda rather than to examine what lies behind that propaganda along with the record itself which, all to frequently, is in great conflict with the propaganda.

As it has been with the U.N. proper and with most of its organizations and agencies, so, too, has it been with UNICEF.

Some of the sharpest and clearest punctuation of this truism is found in a compilation called "Facts About UNICEF," which has come to this reporter's attention through the Church League of America.

The general chairman of the Church League of America is Maj. Edgar C. Bundy, of Wheaton, Ill. Major Bundy distinguished himself as an Air Force Intelligence officer in World War II. Since that time, a great pro-American, a great patriot, he has dedicated his life to an outstanding one-man crusade for America.

One of Major Bundy's best-known contributions has been through his authorship of the authoritative and widely read book, "Collectivism in the Churches," which, for some time, this reporter has made available as a public service, to his listeners at the regular publisher's price of $5.

UNICEF, therefore, is well in line with Major Bundy's specialty, as it is with the distinguished American who compiled these "Facts About UNICEF," Lawrence Timbers, vice chairman of the antisubversive committee of the American Legion.

What follows is directly from Mr. Timbers' great report:

"One of the best examples of subversion," he says, "is that of the churches of this country being injected into the UNICEF program. UNICEF is United Nations Childrens Fund," as Mr. Timbers says, and he adds:

"Some ministers and others take issue with this statement, for the reason that they and their churches have been active in UNICEF Hallowe'en drives, and they do not want to believe the truth. They approach this problem," he says, "with closed minds and do not want UNICEF exposed."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, it's a pretty good thing to expose UNICEF. We're going to try and do it right now, thanks to Mr. Timbers and Major Bundy.

"In UNICEF," according to this report, "we have an organization, governmental in character, and underwritten by contributions from 81 governments. The United States Government contributes more than 80 percent to its support, and the other 80 nations contribute less than 20 percent. * * * 19 of the nations—and this includes all the of the nations—and this includes all the Communist and Iron Curtain countries—contribute in nonconvertible money * * * and this money can be used only to hire their citizens to work for UNICEF, or to purchase goods from that country, or to return it in aid to that country.

"Any fifth-grade student," says Mr. Timbers in his report, "should be able to see through the fraud that is perpetrated when UNICEF gives $1 in aid to a country, that country in turn provides on the average [of] $2. * * * Anyone would be willing to pay $2 to get $3 back and if the truth were known," he says, "those governments are spending that money to suit themselves * * * and UNICEF (and the organization WHO—World Health Organization) are accepting their reports as bona fide. It is just a case of one nation bidding against the others and the ones who offer the most, get the most UNICEF aid," he notes.

Then he goes on, "UNICEF has a U.S. National Committee to promote its program, and at least 19 of its 65 members, are or have been affiliated with one or more Communist front organizations.

"The first chairman of UNICEF was Ludwig Rajchmann, representing the Communist Government of Poland. He used his influence to get aid for the Communist countries. Just last year the Senate Committee on the Judiciary subpenaed him to ask him about his connections with Alger Hiss. He fled to Paris to get away from U.S. jurisdiction, but he is still the representative to UNICEF for Communist Poland. * * *

"Miss Joyce Campbell was an employee of UNICEF. She admitted that she had been president of United Federal Workers Local 12 and that it had been expelled by the CIO for being communistic. She admitted that she had been employed by the American Committee for Yugoslav Relief, which is on the Attorney General's list as a communistic subversive organization and that her position here was the reference that obtained her job on the United Nations appeal for children * * * I suspect," says Mr. Timbers, "that she is still working for a United Nations agency.

"Ruth Crawford was an employee of UNICEF and admitted that she was a member of the Communist Party, and that her sympathies are still with its programs and aims * * *. An inquiry to the U.S. Com-

mittee for UNICEF, asking if she still worked for them, has never been answered.

"Mr. William Berges, the UNICEF representative in Shanghai turned large stock of UNICEF supplies over to the Communists. In a speech to the Chinese Communists he said '* * * the ruling clique of America are responsible for the Korean war.' * * *

"The World Health Organization which cooperates with UNICEF by furnishing technicians, had as its head in 1955, Mr. Brock Chisholm, a Canadian. He advocates that Canadian and United States families should practice birth control and limit their families to two children. They should adopt children from the backward countries and the darker the skins the better, because he says the sooner we are all mixed into one race the better. * * *

"The two official UNICEF greeting cards, sold at Christmas time, are titled 'Brothers,' showing two figures embracing; and 'Community of Man,' showing four faces, one black, one red, one yellow, and one purple all joined together by the bonds of love, apparently," says Mr. Timbers, "meaning that when the black, white, yellow, and red races are mixed together according to Brock Chisholm, we will have a purple race.

"The artist who drew these two monstrosities was Hans Erni, a Swiss national and well-known fellow traveler and an active member of the Swiss-Soviet Friendship Association. In October 1949, the Communists, added a new maneuver to their fraudulent peace campaign. They formed delegations of world renown individuals under Communist control, to visit and influence the parliaments of the world powers. Hans Erni was in the delegation assigned to the United States. Our State Department, under pressure from the Senate, denied visas to these people, including Hans Erni."

And, by the way:

Major Bundy advises us that one of the articles for this year's UNICEF Christmas card is one Ben Shahn. We have on our desk from our files "Information from the files of the House Committee on Un-American Activities," dated December 5, 1955, which contains three letter-sized, single-spaced typewritten pages concerning Mr. Ben Shahn's associations and activities in connection with such publications as New Masses which the U.S. Attorney General has officially cited as a Communist periodical, and such organizations as the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (officially branded as subversive by the Attorney General) for which Shahn designed, by the way, a pamphlet—according to this official report.

This report from Mr. Timbers goes on to say that: "UNTAA (the United Nation Technical Administration Agency) gives technical assistance to UNICEF. UNBSA plans programs for UNICEF," another U.N. outfit. "The Executive Chairman of UNTAA Board is David A. D. K. Owen, British Socialist. Head of (the other outfit) UNBSA, is Dr. Hans W. Singer, British Socialist. He advised Pakistan that Russia's brutal and disastrous collectivization of agriculture in the 1920's was an outstanding example of successful development planning.

"Messrs. Owen and Singer gave employment to many of the U.S. citizens who were fired from the United Nations as a result of loyalty hearings back in 1952."

"From [the] United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) financial report and accounts for the year ended December 31, 1956, and report of the Board of Auditors [note this]:

"UNICEF allocations to December 31, 1956 [and] contributions to UNICEF (by various countries)."

The allocation from UNICEF went to the tune of $325,000 in 1956 to Red Albania, which gave nothing; $5,500,000 to Red Bulgaria, which gave nothing; $3,500,000 to Communist China which, of course, gave nothing; $5,600,000 went to Czechoslovakia, Communist Czechoslovakia, which contributed, by the way, $34,722.22. Communist Hungary got $2 million, and gave nothing. Communist Poland got $19 million of UNICEF funds in 1956, according to UNICEF's own report and audit, and gave $80,000. Communist Romania got $7 million, gave nothing. By the way, in Romania, just tonight, ladies and gentlemen, the Red regime there is fearing the Hungarian-type freedom revolt, and the resultant persecutions and the incarcerations tonight in Romania are massive.

Yugoslavia, Tito's Yugoslavia, got in 1956 from UNICEF funds (80 percent of them from the United States of America) $18,200,000. Tito's outfit gave to UNICEF a token $200,000.

Now, there's more ladies and gentlemen, more, only time will prohibit us from giving it tonight. This report is available, we'll be glad to see that you get it.

We cite this report on UNICEF, what we have of it so far, in the public interest—with special emphasis on all of those persons who have found themselves employed through churches, schools, Girl Scouts, etc., as unknowing instruments for the advancement of this effort to enlist innocent American children in a campaign for funds—most of which go to Communist regimes which persecute the clergy, enslave the laity, and struggles to pervert to Satanic monsters, and in war machine against us, the very young.

We particularly commend this report to the attention of every parent of a school age child—whom we hope will query their children as to whether they have been solicited to help with this Hallowe'en drive, and in so doing, we certainly recommend serious consideration to the suggestion that if our children and their organizations wish to solicit contributions for the poor children of the world—that they do so in the name of and under the auspices of—their own churches and their own missionary societies and organizations of whatever denomination.

If we're going to help the poor children of the world—let's make sure that the poor children of the world benefit from our effort—that our efforts are not, instead, going to benefit Communist gangsters and their slavemaster regimes who multilate children, who destroy children, if not physically, mentally and morally, for the war machine used against the very children in the future who are being asked to contribute to the UNICEF fund.

What's the Big Rush To Adjourn?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me in regard to the prospective sine die adjournment of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEATING

WHAT'S THE BIG RUSH?

That annual malady commonly called adjournment fever has made itself felt in recent days, and I am very troubled by what this development might portend. We have been witnessing today, as earlier in the week, some of the manifestations of this illness which appears to be peculiar to the banks of the Potomac.

I certainly want to join with my colleagues in commiserating with the leadership as these events have unfolded. And, of course, while the problems of a minority leader are great, those of a majority leader are prodigious. We should all have great sympathy for the vicissitudes of the majority leader as he labors with his many complex assignments and coworkers in these closing days.

However, we cannot abdicate our responsibilities as Senators in these last days of the session and close up shop without completing important tasks. No one seems to want to say it, but there is a strong aura of suspicion that some people want us to fold up our tent and leave before the impending visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

I must challenge any decision to adjourn before the end of next week if it will mean that must items will be lost in the shuffle. Khrushchev may be the Typhoid Mary of international statesmanship, but is that any sign that free Americans lack immunity to the virus he peddles? It really won't hurt us to be in the same city with him; nothing says we have to invite him into our parlor.

Now, there are a number of very vital legislative matters which must command the attention of the Senate before we can adjourn in good conscience. I refer particularly to the matter of civil rights.

We have received repeated assurances from the majority leadership that bills in this vital field will be brought up before the end of the session. But now there is talk of running out of town in advance of Khrushchev's visit without acting on civil rights. That, in my view, would be unthinkable, and I shall oppose any movement in that direction with all the weapons at my command. Surely, this Congress cannot in good faith adjourn without at least extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission. And there are other important proposals in this field which I think we should act upon.

It would be ironic, indeed, if we were to slight the civil rights of Americans just to avoid the presence of a man who has done more to undermine civil rights than any man in the world.

It is clearly beneath the dignity and prestige of the Congress of the United States for us to end our work and turn our back on the pressing needs of the Nation just because a foreign dictator comes to our shores. I trust this view will prevail as we enter the closing days of this session.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

A New Horizon for Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Horizon for Labor," which was published in the Philadelphia Inquiror for today, September 7, 1959.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW HORIZON FOR LABOR

On Labor Day, 1959, the working people of America look forward to brighter opportunities than they have seen on this holiday in any recent year.

They also face challenges that will give a stern test to labor's mettle.

The last few days have brought to a spectacular climax the great national debate on legislation to drive racketeers and hoodlums out of labor unions. It was a bitter battle that shook the foundations of organized labor and aroused the American people as they had rarely been aroused before.

We believe that the rank-and-file working men and women of the United States of America—and honest, dedicated labor union leaders—have emerged from this struggle stronger than ever and that the entire country will benefit.

Enactment of a new labor bill by Congress last week was a victory for the workers—an appropriate Labor Day gift.

The bill is not antilabor, as some critics charge. It is prolabor.

It is anticorruption, antiracketeering, antihoodlum.

It is legislation to give American workers more effective control over union affairs, to rid the unions of thugs and thieves who pose as friends of labor for personal profit, to eliminate unfair practices by the minority of union officials who use force and violence as bargaining weapons.

But the battle is not yet won.

The underworld won't release its grip on the American labor movement without a fight. Enforcement of provisions in the anticorruption bill will be a difficult task requiring the cooperation of labor's rank and file and its responsible leadership. Additional legislation may be needed to finish the job.

This is a day for labor to reflect earnestly on the victories of the past and the tasks of the future.

Nearly 3 years of hearings by the McClellan committee and 2 years of congressional debate on labor bills have put the union movement in clearer perspective. They have shown that the vast majority of union leaders and members are law-abiding citizens who strive for reasonable goals by honorable means.

The hard core of gangsters and rogues who have infiltrated the ranks of labor union leadership is small in number but immensely powerful.

Workers who once were underdogs in their struggle to right the wrongs of unscrupulous employers now are engaged in a fight for freedom from persecution and abuse by irresponsible union leaders.

The Government of the United States and popular opinion of the American people are alined on the side of the workers. They stand at the dawn of a new day. Unprecedented progress is plainly visible on the horizon, rising above dark clouds cast by the Hoffas and the Becks and others who have sullied the good name of American labor unionism.

There is heartening evidence on every hand that the hoodlums in labor unions are receding from their high water mark under the pressure of a rising tide of public indignation.

One hundred and eighty years ago this month, when John Paul Jones was in command of an American warship under attack by a British frigate, he answered a demand to surrender with the immortal words "I have not yet begun to fight" and went on to victory.

We hope these words will be echoed with spirit and determination by the working men and women of America as they gird for decisive battle against criminal elements who are guilty of subversion against labor unions.

State Taxation of Interstate Commerce

SPEECH
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I am extremely pleased that the conference report on S. 2524 is being called up for consideration today, and I think the members of the Judiciary Committee are to be especially commended for the dispatch with which they have moved in seeking a solution to this vexatious problem of State taxation of interstate commerce.

In the past, interstate commerce has been at least relatively free from the burdens of multiple State taxation. As a result of the court decisions in the Stockham Valve case and in the Northwestern States Cement case, however, the door may now be open for any State to step in and impose crushing taxes on firms located outside, but doing business within, the boundaries of that State.

The burden of such taxation would be especially severe for the small businessman, whose volume of business in any one State would probably not even warrant continuing to do business in States imposing such taxes.

In fact, several firms in my own 38th District of New York have indicated to me that their volume of business in some States would be such that they probably could not even afford the administrative costs connected with keeping the voluminous records necessary to pay the taxes, let alone the taxes themselves.

Just this week, I have received word that 70 percent of the gross sales, both wholesale and retail, of the companies in Newark, N.Y., are made in interstate commerce throughout the entire country. Newark is the largest city in Wayne County, N.Y., which I am privileged to represent in the Congress, and it would be a fearful blow to the community's economy if crushing income taxes were suddenly imposed by a number of States in which Newark's business firms are operating.

S. 2524 deals with a portion of the problem by prohibiting States from taxing income derived solely from the solicitation of orders within a given State by out-of-State companies. The language of the bill itself makes it clear that this is not the final answer to the entire problem by providing for continued study by two separate committees of the Congress. But it definitely represents a step in the right direction, a step which is of vital importance to every businessman operating in interstate commerce.

Mr. Speaker, the absence of artificial trade barriers between the States has been responsible for much of the dynamic growth of this Nation, and the Congress has a grave responsibility to see that these channels of trade remain free and open. S. 2524 will serve the best interests of thousands of small businessmen throughout the country, and I urge adoption of this conference report.

Food for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a fine editorial, entitled "Food for Peace," appeared in one of our fine Minnesota newspapers, the Mankato Free Press of August 11, relating to the pending legislation. This particular editorial supports the proposals which the senior Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have advanced in this body for a broadened program for the use of our food and fiber.

A paragraph of the editorial which I think is particularly helpful reads as follows:

It is difficult to find criticism of this plan. One of the areas where the United States has

been weakest is in assisting the economic development of the countries that we want to be our friends. We have stressed, rather, military assistance and have insisted that the countries to which we send arms must be ready to fight for our way of life.

Finally the editorial states:

It appears that food for peace is a step in this direction.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD FOR PEACE

The food-for-peace plan that has been proposed by Minnesota's Senator HUMPHREY is drawing considerable support as a vehicle with a twofold purpose. One aim is to dispose of surplus products that are filling warehouses and bins throughout the country and the other is to go a step further and give economic assistance to the nations that receive the products.

In this respect it seems a sound and worthwhile expansion of Public Law 480, under which Congress made it possible to sell surpluses abroad. The Senator has pointed out that it isn't meant to replace Public Law 480, but to strengthen it in the interests of needy people everywhere in the world.

The Senator's proposal calls for selling the products to nations that would pay the United States in local currency. The United States then would take the money that is received, pay bills with part of it in the nations that made the purchases and use the rest for loans that would help build the local economies.

The goal is an uplifting of the standard of living throughout the have-not countries, with the thought that it would both improve their economies and help build friends of the United States.

It is difficult to find criticism of this plan. One of the areas where the United States has been weakest is in assisting the economic development of the countries that we want to be our friends. We have stressed, rather, military assistance and have insisted that the countries to which we send arms must be ready to fight for our way of life. We have failed to give them a reason for waging this battle, because we haven't, by example, convinced them that our way is best. We talk of our generosity and our insistence on preserving the dignity of the individual, but we haven't put American democracy truly into action.

It appears that food for peace is a step in this direction.

Labor Day Statement by David J. McDonald, President, United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a Labor Day statement by the president of the United Steelworkers of America, of which I am a member.

This Labor Day is not a happy one for the workers of America. They have just experienced the passage of a bill by a coalition of northern Republicans and southern Democrats to break down the economic life of those who toil. However, organized labor has taken setbacks before from the same type of labor haters that we have today. We will rise again, as the American labor movement will close ranks and become stronger than ever. We now know who our friends are in the Congress of the United States.

The statement follows:

LABOR DAY STATEMENT, BY DAVID J. MCDONALD, PRESIDENT, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA

This is the day when working families pause from their labors recalling past victories that improved their living standards and set new goals for the future.

This is a different kind of Labor Day for millions of workers. It is a day of decision. And for the sake of all the people in our Nation, we must make certain we are choosing the right course.

We must not allow Labor Day, 1959, and all the Labor Days to follow, to be converted into another "Memorial Day" set aside to mourn lost opportunities and destroyed freedoms.

That workers everywhere are aware of the perils that face them is evidenced in the fact that today is also designated by the organized labor movement of America as "Support the Steelworkers Day." It is a day when workers everywhere are rallying to the support of a valiant group of steelworkers who are in the frontline trenches, standing up to an onslaught that could well be turned against all working families in our Nation.

In this enlightened age there are powerful industrial leaders who would turn us around and head us downhill back into the dark abyss of industrial serfdom.

They speak for a steel industry which has forced a half million steelworkers out of the mills in a fight for their rights and hard-won freedoms.

The steel industry deliberately fomented this shutdown, and turned its back on every union effort to settle it. Industry is testing the steelworkers now. If its campaign against the workers in steel is successful, it will turn the guns in open warfare against workers in other industries, while it also seeks to destroy their effectiveness on the legislative front.

The leaders of this rich industry are warring against steelworkers from treasuries swollen with undreamed profits. And they deny the just needs of their employees while their own pockets bulge with money reaped from fabulous salaries, stock option deals, and fat bonuses. Labor Day, 1959, is a day of crisis, not only for the steelworkers but all Americans. These are times when huge question marks grow on the horizon—questions which trouble those in the union movement, and questions which demand immediate answers from America.

Where would these powerful industrialists lead us? What will they substitute for a free democratic union movement? Will they drive us into a servile state at home while we fight the tide of dictatorship that looms larger and larger around our shores?

This must not happen. The United Steelworkers of America and the free labor movement is America's solidest insurance policy against those who would supplant the democracy we cherish with hated tyranny.

Because the men of steel have been thrust into the forefront in the battle for basic industrial democracy, Support the Steelworkers Day should be of special significance for every wage and salary earner who has hopes and goals for a brighter, happier future.

The Precarious Right To Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald there was published an editorial entitled "Precarious Right," the first sentence of which reads as follows:

A survey of Negro voting in the South conducted by the Southern Regional Council underscores with stark, incontrovertible figures the urgent need for civil rights legislation in the present session of Congress.

In the course of the editorial it is said:

It is, of course, the fundamental right of American citizenship—a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. And this is why the Government of the United States must not fail or falter in protecting it.

The last sentence in the editorial is:

It ought to be operative before the next election despite the foot dragging so apparent on Capitol Hill.

Mr. President, I consider the protecting of the right of all citizens to vote, irrespective of race, creed, or color, to be the most fundamental and most important of all civil rights issues. Because I think it is so important and because we have proposed legislation pending in regard to the matter, Mr. President, are other reasons why I am taking the position that every possible effort should be made under the rules, particularly by liberals in the Senate, to hold this body in session until next week, and later, if necessary, to pass very much needed civil rights legislation, along with other legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Precarious Right" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRECARIOUS RIGHT

The survey of Negro voting in the South conducted by the Southern Regional Council underscores with stark, incontrovertible figures the urgent need for civil rights legislation in the present session of Congress. The council study shows that in 8 States of the Deep South—Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia—the number of Negroes registered to vote dropped by 45,845 from 1956 to 1958. An estimated 25 percent of the eligible Negroes are registered in the South as compared with 60 percent of the white citizens of voting age.

When one considers the obstacles that have been put in the way of Negro voting in the South, the fact that more than a million Negroes have registered is a tribute to their courage and their sense of citizenship. They have registered in spite of poll taxes, in spite of literacy tests administered with gross discrimination, in spite of the hostility of registrars, and in spite of threats of violence and other forms of intimidation. The right to vote must be looked upon as precious in-

deed by those who face such perils to exercise it.

It is, of course, the fundamental right of American citizenship—a right guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. And this is why the Government of the United States must not fail or falter in protecting it. There can be no doubt of the need to require States to keep registration and voting records—and to afford the Attorney General ready access to those records so that Federal protection of the right to vote can be made effective. This is a minimum requirement of civil rights legislation. It ought to be operative before the next election despite the foot dragging so apparent on Capitol Hill.

A Gift to Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the enclosed article, "A Gift to Labor," from the Peoria Journal Star:

A GIFT TO LABOR

If the labor reform bill approved in its final form by Senate and House last week had been planned as a Labor Day gift to American workers, it couldn't have been more timely.

Regardless of the complaints of labor leaders, the measure is a great step forward in protecting rank-and-file union membership and the public from gross abuses revealed in the hearings of the Senate Rackets Committee.

Testimony concerning these abuses has been sensational news for many months. It has often been shocking news, alomst unbelievable. The fact that most labor unions have not been invaded by the hoodlum element makes it no less shocking. If even one union could be taken over by racketeers and the members deprived of their rights, our labor laws needed correcting. This was emphasized by the fact that labor chiefs found they were unable to discipline corrupt unions.

Nobody could contradict the good sense of President Eisenhower's appeal when he said, in his television speech of August 6 that "any reform bill worthy of the name must also protect the individual rights of union members within their unions. It must assure them of fair elections * * * honest handling of their money * * * It must also give the Government authority to investigate and enforce these provisions."

Many members of labor unions will appreciate the protection of their rights given them by the new law. Those who have been the victims of treasury raiding by crooked officials will appreciate the Federal protection of their finances. And the new controls over union elections may revive the interest of membership in union activities.

For the protection of employers and the public, the new bill contains provisions against secondary boycotts and extortion picketing and limits on organizational picketing. (The Illinois General Assembly twice demonstrated its lack of courage in failing to outlaw racketing picketing.)

Those who manage the labor lobby in Washington were bitterly opposed to the Landrum-Griffin bill, but it was obvious that they did not speak for the rank and file.

Members of Congress, we believe, have no reason to fear retaliation by labor union voters, as threatened by the lobby.

A vote of gratitude from workers at the next congressional elections would be more appropriate.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the August 12 Willmar Daily Tribune, of Willmar, Minn., there appeared an excellent editorial relating to the current agricultural situation and the failure of the administration to present any comprehensive agricultural program.

My colleagues may recall that from time to time certain members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and myself in particular, urged upon the administration the presentation of an overall, comprehensive farm program, rather than the patchwork, piecemeal attempt that has been made to prepare a program which today is working very poorly and at great cost to the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Willmar Daily Tribune, entitled "Answers Benson," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANSWERS BENSON

Some time ago Secretary of Agriculture Benson stated publicly that Congress has never given him the kind of a farm program which he could properly administrate. In the complexity and confusion of programs for agriculture and all the hullabaloo about them—one could almost swallow Benson's statement as close to fact. At least those not conversant with Benson and his aims, could be mislead and deluded to think he was right. He has not fooled the farmers generally but he has deliberately had a part in misrepresenting the farm parity programs to the city folks.

If his complaint to Congress has fooled or impressed some of the representatives down there, Secretary Benson has not pulled the wool over the eyes of Senator HUMPHREY. For the Minnesota Senator really took Benson to the cleaners in a speech he delivered to the Senate on August 6. It was a dilly. Wish we would have the time and the space to reprint the whole speech.

We can give you the gist of it. HUMPHREY reminded Benson of proposal after proposal coming out of Congress which would do something about the farm problem. In practically every case the administration either turned thumbs down on them or they were killed by the veto or prospect of a veto. Plans to curb surpluses have been offered, programs to assure a stable agriculture, acreage controls, corrections of abuses found in previous programs. All these have gone for naught.

So the conclusion is evident. The administration really wants no program at all—Benson wants no program. They want them abolished and the farmers thrown upon the open market, in a survival of the fittest unabridged free enterprise where the strong will gobble up the weak, where the smaller farmers will be liquidated and we will be on the road of corporate farming and the big farming estates, which were once found in old Europe. Then the small farmer became a serf. Can history repeat?

That is what is going on in the business and industrial fields. They want the same in agriculture. The worship of bigness, out with the little fellow—he is only in the road of the corporate steamroller.

And is that what we want out here in rural Minnesota? Does America really want that? A Minnesota which when its small farms disappear will also see the rural town vanish A Nation which in losing its rural countryside will find that the Republic has inherited a mess of pottage in feeding its teeming metropolises!

If America is to remain the great democracy it is—a part of the anawer will not be "on to the big cities" but rather "back to the land." That is a major question in this whole farm problem, plus the right of farming to get a decent price for what it produces, commensurate with the income which is being received in urban fields. Out of the consumers dollar, the farmer seems to get the least for all his work.

Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, even if there were no other reasons for me to vote against the pending conference report on the so-called labor-reform bill, I would vote against it solely because of the economic discriminations and disadvantages which are certain to develop against the economy of Maine and New England as a result of the "no-man's land" area of labor-management disputes jurisdiction.

The economic advantages which are guaranteed to the Southern States by the provisions of the conference report have been covered in detail by several of my colleagues. The "pirating" of the New England textile industry by the Southern States, over the past several years, has been accomplished by reason of the low-wage levels and lack of statutory and collective-bargaining requirements for decent working conditions in these States. Naturally, there has been almost unanimous support by Southern Congressmen for the punitive and restrictive labor-organizational provisions of the Landrum-Griffin proposal and its 90-percent acceptance by the House and Senate conferees. Wage levels and working conditions cannot be improved without strong, aggressive union organization in the South. This conference report nails down, by congressional fiat, the economic advantages of the South over the northern industrial States. In short, this Landrum-Griffin conference report

is a legislative license to procure northern industry and jobs. Does any industrial manager in Maine think for 1 minute that Arkansas, the home of that great "protector" of the rights of organized labor, Senator McCLELLAN, where there is a State minimum wage law of 16 cents per hour, is ever going to increase that minimum to Maine's $1 per hour requirement, as long as NLRB denied jurisdiction over labor disputes and proceedings is taken over by the State courts of Arkansas? Do any of the industrial managers of Maine or the members of the chambers of commerce of our communities, who have pressured me to vote for the Landrum-Griffin shackles for labor organizations, think for 1 minute that Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, where there are no compulsory laws for workmen's compensation, are going to be forced to adopt such 20th century protection for labor unless and until strong and aggressive labor organizations force the issue?

I would expect, Mr. Speaker, that every businessman in Maine, who applied the pressure on me to vote to curtail the organizing activities of unions, has on many occasions, expressed his opposition to the low wage levels and substandard working conditions of the South and yet these same leaders of industry in my State condemn me for voting against legislation which will perpetuate these unfair and substandard advantages which have so effectively undermined the Maine economy. Certainly, I was not elected to Congress to liquidate further our already diluted Maine industry and the sadly decreased number of jobs which it provides.

It is my sincere conviction that a vote for the Landrum-Griffin conference report was a vote to speed the flight of industry from the North to the largely unorganized South. Maine and New England industry will really get the "sales pitch" now to move into not only the unorganized, but also, the never-to-be-organized South.

Another strongly motivating factor in my vote against the Landrum-Griffin conference report was the open invitation for the powerful unions of the Nation to take over the small, struggling unions. Under the terms of this conference agreement, only the well-entrenched international unions with great assets and legal talent will be able to meet the legal delays, the legalistic entanglements and the slanted antilabor decisions of State courts, operating under State statutes and decisions. This, in turn, means that small unions who cannot afford to fight against these handicaps will be absorbed by the big unions which have caused the people of America, who have been getting this antilabor brainwashing over the past several years, to demand so-called reform legislation. The Landrum-Griffin conference report is not corrective—it is punitive and destructive of legitimate union activities.

Another inevitable result, in my opinion, of the adoption of this Landrum-Griffin conference report, will be encouragement and opportunity for racketeers and crooks to take over official leadership of small unions. Dedicated, honest union leaders, confronted with almost impossible duties of mandatory detailed financial reports and faced with criminal penalties, if found in violation of the so-called bill of rights of union membership, will refuse to expose themselves to the abuse of stooges, agitators, Communists, drunks and hired wreckers of their union organizations. They will resign and the type of leadership which the exposures of the McClellan committee publicized to the Nation will take over in increasing numbers. This probability is not good for anybody in America, for it is not good for the working men and women of America.

As I see the picture, Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this Landrum-Griffin conference report leads in only one direction. It is just one more step toward more restrictive labor legislation. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers Association, speaking and acting for big business with their appetites for further labor control whetted by this victory, will press for the ultimate victory; namely, a national so-called right-to-work law and then, the antitrust stranglehold for which they are really aiming. Many of them have already so stated. The program of big business in America is not only to control financially and economically, but also politically. Strong labor unions now stand in the way of their objective just as America and the free world stands in the way of Khrushchev and his totalitarian power.

The Taft-Hartley law, and its maladministration for these past 6½ years, by the National Labor Relations Board, through its big business-administration appointees, has served as a brake to slow down the growth of labor organizations, which otherwise, today, would have numbered far more than the now organized 18 million of the total 67 million working men and women of America. If Taft-Hartley had not replaced the real magna carta of labor, the Wagner Labor Relations Act of the depression days, organized labor would have been far more effective in gaining equalization with the power of big business and accordingly would have been far more effective in the Congress. The Landrum-Griffin conference report will not only slow down further the growth and strength of the trade-union movement, but it will eventually lead to the more repressive developments to which I have referred; namely, the so-called right-to-work laws on a national scale and then, the crowning blow, the antitrust knockout punch. This will mean the breakdown of American democracy.

As long as I am a Member of this House, Mr. Speaker, my vote will never be recorded for legislation which makes illegal the economic weapons which the working men and women need, to fight for and get their fair share of the production of this great productive plant which is known as industrial America.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to and shall vote against this Landrum-Griffin conference report.

The Sanctity of Marriage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in his column in yesterday's Washington Star, a weekly inspiring column discussing great spiritual truths, the noble Chaplain of the Senate wrote about the sanctity of marriage and the symbolism of the home as the foundation of our society. I think it is a beautiful column. It is well that we reflect upon it, particularly in view of the fact that so much of our writings these days, both in the field of the novel, and outside the novel and fiction, seems to cast a reflection upon the great moral values of the marriage institution.

I think it is a rather sad reflection on the state of American life that writers find such ready readers for such rot.

Because I thought the Chaplain yesterday rose to such great heights of spiritual leadership in setting forth the great moral truths, I ask unanimous consent that his column entitled "A Bride's Rosary," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

A BRIDE'S ROSARY

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The old saying that all the world loves a lover points to one of those facets of humanity which changing fashions of living do not alter. The love of a man for a maid, if it is unsoiled and free from base alloys, is as perennially fragrant as the scented breath of pink arbutus when spring trips north.

Across the centuries what a social system does with marriage has been a prophecy of what time will do with that civilization. Alas, that in these glittering gadget-mad days the holy estate of matrimony is being cheapened, desecrated and fouled—especially by those in the public eye who are both famous and infamous. Men and women highly paid, whose profession it is to depict life on the stage or silver screen, audaciously flout all the decencies by chasing from one mate to another with a license which savors of free love. The epitaph for many in this fast set is suggested by Kipling's insight, "A man may be festooned with the whole haberdashery of success and go to his grave a castaway."

Enslaved mainland China, whose life for many centuries has been rooted in the family ancestors, is now having its homes torn apart by its ruthless masters in the diabolical commune system in which the relationship of man and wife is reduced to the status of a breeding stable.

Missing the beauty of the ancient marriage rites in which religion played so great a part, even Russia has been lately forced to recognize the sanctity of marriage which was blasphemed by the new regime at the beginning of the revolution. Under the hammer and sickle they are now endeavoring to garnish godless wedding ceremonies with a few Marxist sprouts to offset to some degree the loveliness of the church's sacrament, with its solemn warning, "What God

hath joined together let no man put asunder." The Reds are finding that no pontifical dictum of Lenin has revoked the declaration of John Bright, "The nation rests on the cottage."

What a refreshing respite, to which the weary world has been treated, in the midst of salacious scandals and of frightening threats of pushbutton devastation when, by the miracle of today's communication and visualization, millions were able to fix their gaze on a church spire against the Norwegian sky and, on a sacred altar in that tiny church, as, with the whole world watching, an American groom and a Norwegian bride, coming down a church aisle strewn with roses and carnations, took each other for better or worse, till death do them part.

With paganism's blighting hands over more than a third of the planet's population and endeavoring to strangle the church of the Living God wherever its materialistic creed is enforced, here, before the listening world, was lifted up a Christian church, a Christian minister, a Christian altar, and Christian lovers anxious to have their love consecrated with the benediction of the Master, who, in the days of His earthly ministry, blessed the happiness of a wedding feast.

That lovely shrine in a valiant land is an emblem of the church of every name, now being subjected to terrific pressures and cruel persecution with arrogant demands that the church lose its soul by becoming subservient to a police state. Did we say the world was watching a "little" church, tucked away among the hills of Norway?

"A little thing this church? Remove its roots,
Ossa and Pelion would not fill the pit."

In the reality and the faith symbolized by that church in the hills of Norway is the hope, and the only hope, of this world's salvation.

It was a lofty conception of marriage which was lifted up before the world when, in that village church, Vicar Olav Gaute-stad stood at the ancient altar to hear their vows and to pronounce Steven and Anne Marie man and wife. His pastoral remarks, so simple yet so profound, seemed like a lovely rosary whose beads could be counted by untold millions with profitful remembrance. The pastor that day displayed a string of Christian virtues gleaming like lustrous pearls. It was a rosary that the Christ of God would gladly bless. Shall we count its beads as this faithful shepherd of souls so reverently unfolded them? We quote exactly his admonitions.

The first has to do with that mightiest monosyllable, God: "I pray to God that this day may be the beginning of many days of happiness and the blessing of the Most High."

The next bead is love: "The real love which is from God breaks down all the conventional barriers. In His eyes we are all equal."

The next is heritage: "In our time, when the majority of youth seems to take as their ideals those of doubtful moral qualities, the press of the world is paying tribute to an ordinary girl who has taken pride in being industrious, reliable, and faithful to her Christian heritage."

The next bead is home: "To build a good home is perhaps the greatest of all arts. You who stand before the altar today have the best possibilities to build a good home—for both of you have taken good building materials from the homes of your childhood—homes of prayer and Bible reading and God-fearing parents."

Then comes practice: "A home is not only a question of foundation, it is also perseverance of spirit—the spirit of love and goodness. Without that spirit even a home beautiful and rich may be barren because of the evil spirit of egotism, self-assertion and caviling."

The next pearl is example: "Set an example, let folks see a Christian home in which love and a willingness to serve are something that naturally belongs to everyday life."

And last comes belief—the creed by which true believers live: "Never forget that the greatest happiness is to have personal belief and trust in Jesus Christ. In that faith you are to help one another to come to everlasting life."

What a string of heavenly pearls to handle as the days go swiftly by—God, love, heritage, home, practice, example, belief. All that the preacher said that wedding day as he held up this devotional rosary is summed up in one of the great hymns of the church:

"Happy the home where God is there
And love fills every breast,
When one their wish and one their prayer
And one their heavenly rest.

"Happy the home where prayer is heard
And praise is wont to rise,
Where parents love the sacred word
And all its wisdom prize."

Public Works Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in our consideration of the latest bill to appropriate funds for Federal public works projects, we have a graphic example of why our Presidents should be given "item veto" powers in appropriation bills.

The President has objected to some 67 new public works starts which will cost us for than $800 million over the years. These projects have not been eliminated from the bill proposed by the House Appropriations Committee and which is due for a vote on Tuesday.

It is in the interest of our Nation that the President have a means of eliminating objectionable projects from bills such as this one without killing funds for worthwhile projects at the same time. There is no way that these objectionable projects can be extracted without vetoing the whole bill.

Therefore, the President and Congress are faced with the prospect of killing a bill which contains many worthwhile projects or approving a bill which will cost our taxpayers a great deal of extra money.

All of us know that appropriations for new public works projects are deceptive. First-year engineering and construction costs for these projects are relatively small. It is in later years that Congress finds itself in the position of appropriating billions of dollars for projects which quite often should not have been attempted by the Federal Government in the first place.

Tax dollars are hard to come by. Let us save them and balance the budget now and in the future.

In the past 4 years, Congress has tacked on some 200 new projects over and above those projects provided for in the budget. These new starts are going to cost our people some $3,800 million before they are completed.

It would be wonderful if a Taj Mahal or a Great Wall of China could be constructed in every congressional district in our Nation so that each Member of Congress would have something tangible to which he could point with pride.

But this is one of those times in which Members of Congress should view with alarm.

It is my hope that those Members of Congress who find themselves in the very least embarrassed by this present predicament will keep in mind the necessity and the service to the American people which would result from item-veto powers for our Presidents, the vast majority of whom have sought such powers during the past half century.

These neatly wrapped, expensive packages which are presented to us by the Appropriations Committee unfortunately contain a great number of bad apples along with the good ones.

In rather a unique method, the House Appropriations Committee has come up with its newest solution to this problem.

Instead of eliminating the bad apples, we are asked to slice a 2½-percent chunk off all the apples in the package whether they are good or bad.

This novel approach to the public works program certainly would not meet with the approval of any housewife shopping at the grocery store. If such an alternative were presented to her and she were given no opportunity to eliminate the good from the bad, I believe that her decision would be to eliminate apples from her diet until such time as they were of better uniform quality and content.

Interest Rate Ceilings on Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bloated Bondholder a Durable Ghost," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier Journal of August 25, 1959. The article deals with the interest rate ceilings on Government securities. I think it is appropriate in view of the discussion we have had today. The editorial punctures the conception of the "bloated bondholder" and is a strong argument supporting the administration's position with respect to increasing the interest rates on Government obligations.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOATED BONDHOLDER A DURABLE GHOST

On August 12 President Eisenhower listed some of the things he hopes Congress will do before its present rapidly waning session ends. First of all he put an upward adjustment of the interest rate ceilings on Government securities. The House Ways and

Means Committee had that same day approved a bill granting that authority to the Treasury.

However, last week the committee—or, for practical purposes, the Democratic majority in the committee—reversed itself, and put the President's request on the shelf, or in effect denied it for the present session. The committee's action demonstrated that not only the President but also Congress possesses a power of veto. Mr. Eisenhower, who has brandished his own veto club rather provocatively, may need a civics lesson. Even so, this was expensive and reckless pedagogy.

However, what probably influenced the Democrats more than a desire to educate Mr. Eisenhower was the psychology indicated by the old-fashioned term "bloated bondholder"—a favorite in the political oratory of earlier and simpler times. The term has become obsolete, so far as we know, but evidently the bondholder is still bloated in many minds.

But suppose that he still were vastly bloated—and he, in the case of Government securities, is usually not an individual but a bank, insurance company or other institution holding funds in trust—he will not be unbloated by refusing to let the Government pay higher interest rates. He will simply be inclined to find other and more profitable places in which to invest the funds which he has or which are entrusted to him. In short, Uncle Sam is at a disadvantage when he goes to the money market, and is compelled to resort to devices costly to the taxpayer.

The Democrats may not be moved by the serious difficulty in which the present interest rate ceilings put Treasury Secretary Anderson. But have they given up hope that the next Treasury Secretary may be one of their own?

Congress of the Lithuanian Community Resolutions Concerning Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, last night I was the guest of the Congress of the Lithuanian Community meeting at Detroit, Mich. This organization had members from 20 of our States present, as well as guests from Canada and Italy and other foreign nations. These people, who understand well the meaning of American freedom and Communist tyranny, resent the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to this country.

Their feelings are well expressed in the following resolution:

The Congress of the Lithuanian Community, meeting at Detroit, Mich., September 5–6, 1959, and representing over 20 States and many communities in the United States composing the Americans of Lithuanian descent resolved:

Whereas news eminating from the press and official pronouncements from Washington indicate that the Communist dictator and enemy of all democracies is preparing to visit the United States of America;

Whereas such a visit would be an acceptance of a person non grata, who negates all human freedoms, justice, and principles enunciated in our Constitution upon which our way of free life is based;

Whereas such a visit would diminish all hopes of enslaved nations to regain their independence and freedom and their belief in American democracy;

Whereas acceptance of Khrushchev as an honorable guest would augment his prestige in the Communist world by strengthening the Communist position in such countries as Italy, France, South America, Asia, and Africa, where, up to the present time communism was on the defense.

Whereas his trip to the United States of America would disorient American allies in the West by sowing discord, suspicion, and lack of confidence in the American foreign policy and weaken the unity of the NATO nations;

Whereas our acceptance of oppression of free nations would divide the Americans into opposing camps in their foreign policy and thus, diminish our unity and effectiveness;

Whereas Khrushchev's trip to America would injure prestige of America, whose citizens sincerely believe in American independence and human freedoms expressed in our Constitution to all of which Khrushchev and his regime are diametrically opposed and bent upon destroying;

Whereas Khrushchev's visits to our cities would encourage a more aggressive policy of the Soviets to enslave more free nations and intensify demoralizing propaganda in a free world: Be it then

Resolved, That all efforts by any means available be used to prevent Khrushchev's visit to the United States of America unless he complies with some of the basic conditions which follow:

1. Restore independence and freedom to all occupied and enslaved nations by the Soviet Union.

2. Liquidate all concentration and slaved labor camps and repatriate all enslaved peoples to their respective and freed countries.

3. Abandon East Germany and allow free elections.

4. Give up the Soviet Imperialistic arms and cease all internag and external activities designed to create trouble spots in the world.

Adopted on this, the 6th day of September, 1959 at Hotel Sheraton Cadillac, Detroit, Mich.

SUPREME COUNCIL OF THE CONGRESS
OF THE LITHUANIAN COMMUNITY.

Possible Candidacy of Senator Scott for the Presidency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "SCOTT Could Help GOP Ticket," published in the Washington Evening Star of September 3, 1959, dealing with the possible candidacy for the presidency of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCOTT COULD HELP GOP TICKET
(By Gould Lincoln)

The Republicans have two potential and probable candidate for their 1960 Presidential nomination—and perhaps a dozen for second place on their ticket. Their presidential possibilities are by general consent Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, of California, and Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York. Many Republicans would be delighted to have both on their national ticket, one for President and the other for Vice President. But both the Vice President and the Governor have announced they are not interested in and will not have a vice presidential nomination. Mr. NIXON, quite naturally, does not wish to make a career of being Vice President. He will have held that office 8 years at the close of his present term. Governor Rockefeller apparently prefers to remain New York's chief executive if he fails to win a presidential nomination.

MANY VICE PRESIDENTIAL POSSIBILITIES

The list of possible Republican nominees for Vice President extends across the country, from Gov. Mark O. Hatfield, of Oregon, to Senator Hugh Scott, of Pennsylvania, and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, of Massachusetts. From the wide expanse in between come Minority Leader of the House Charles Halleck, of Indiana; Gov. William A. Stratton, of Illinois; Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton, of Nebraska; Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, of Michigan; Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, of Texas and Connecticut; Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona; and then again in the East, Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, of New Jersey; Senator Clifford P. Case, of New Jersey; and Attorney General W. P. Rogers, of New York.

Vice President NIXON and Governor Rockefeller could head a ticket with any one of these potential nominees for second place, except that the Attorney General also being from New York could not be the choice on a ticket with Mr. Rockefeller. However, should Mr. NIXON be the choice for President, the nomination for Vice President would likely go to an easterner or a man from the Middle West, and if Mr. Rockefeller should have first place on the ticket, the choice for Vice President would probably be from the West or Midwest.

Many of these possible Republican choices for Vice President have had wide experience in politics and government. Two of them in the past have been chairman of the Republican National Committee, Senator SCOTT and Postmaster General Summerfield. Mr. HALLECK is making an outstanding record as Republican leader of the House, a strong Eisenhower supporter. Ambassador Lodge, representing the United States at the United Nations, has been highly praised by the President for his work. Governor Hatfield, by his election last year, turned aside the Democratic tide running in Oregon. Of them all, however, Senator SCOTT demonstrated his vote-getting strength in a most surprising upset election in Pennsylvania, the old Keystone State, still second only to New York in number of presidential electoral votes, though now equal to California.

Senator SCOTT, although a freshman Senator, is no newcomer to Congress. For 16 years he represented a Philadelphia congressional district in the House of Representatives. His campaign abilities are attested by the fact he first won the nomination for Senator in 1958, without backing of the organization, and then went on to defeat the Democratic Governor, George Leader, by the margin of 112,765 votes, while Governor Dave Lawrence, Democrat, was being elected by 75,000 votes over his Republican opponent. Mr. SCOTT's victory gave the Pennsylvania GOP a shot in the arm which was much needed and was acclaimed as a Republican

gain virtually as remarkable as Governor Rockefeller's victory in New York.

SCOTT'S POPULARITY GROWS

During his service in the Senate, which began last January, Senator SCOTT has shown himself an indefatigable worker and a strong supporter of President Eisenhower. The results of a statewide poll, recently taken in Pennsylvania, indicate that he is even more popular with the voters than he was when elected. The questionnaire distributed to some 10,000 voters, Republican, Democratic and independent, asked among other questions, how well the voters thought President Eisenhower, Governor Lawrence and Senator SCOTT were doing their jobs. On the basis of approval and disapproval, the score stood—on Mr. Eisenhower, approval, Republicans 99.4 percent, Democrats 69.4 percent, independents 69.5 percent; disapproval, Republicans 5.7 percent, Democrats 30.6 percent, independents 30.5 percent. On Lawrence, approval, Republicans 61.4 percent, Democrats 81.9 percent, independents 56.4 percent; disapproval, Republicans 38.6 percent, Democrats 18.1 percent, independents 43.6 percent. On SCOTT, approval, Republicans 93.6 percent, Democrats 88.9 percent, independents 89.9 percent; disapproval, Republicans 6.4 percent, Democrats 11.1 percent, independents 10.1 percent.

This poll indicates that SCOTT would bring strength to the Republican national ticket both from Democrats and independents, especially the latter. To win, the GOP needs both.

Labor Day Honors Rank and File Laboring People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON L. SHORT
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion on the general subject of labor here on the floor of the House during the past several weeks. Some of us who voted for legislation that would protect the rights of rank and file union members and the small businessmen have been unjustly criticized for supporting antiunion legislation. I certainly do not in any sense consider the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill, as revised by the House-Senate conference committee and overwhelmingly approved by the House on Friday, September 4, a labor-busting bill or a killer bill, as some labor leaders would have the public believe.

So much has been said on this subject that I will not take up any more time with my own remarks. I want to bring to the attention of the Members of the House, however, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning. I think it very fitting and proper that this great newspaper has seen fit to print such an editorial on this national holiday which this Nation has declared in observance of the welfare, rights, and dignity of the laboring people of our Nation:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 7, 1959]

NO DOGHOUSE FOR LABOR

Labor Day 1959, finds some of the leaders of organized labor in sackcloth and ashes and others deeply confused by the events of last week. Congress not only enacted a stiff labor reform bill; it did so by overwhelming votes in both Houses. It was not merely the coalition of Republicans and southerners that ignored the protests of organized labor, but almost the entire Congress. Does this mean that the country has suddenly swung into an antilabor mood?

Despite the gloom in some labor circles, we think the question must be answered with an emphatic "No." The people have conveyed to Congress an unmistakable demand for legislation to protect the rights of individual workers, to oust racketeers from the labor movement and to curb various practices that some unions have indulged in to the detriment of the public interest. But in our opinion the support for good working conditions, high wages, the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively remains unshaken. Not for a moment did the public call for a killer bill against labor. Rather, the bill won landslide support because of the belief that its provisions are fair to organized labor as well as to employers and individual workers.

Some persons who have abused the great power now in the hands of labor unions are certainly in the doghouse, but not labor as a whole. Taken as a group, the U.S. 71 million working men and women have the highest living standard ever known. Most of them have also attained a large measure of economic and social security along with the right of voluntary association to improve their working conditions. They enjoy the rights of free expression, free movement, and general participation in the political life of the country. Congress has closed some doors to corruption and arbitrary use of power, but the national interest in a strong, vigorous, and clean labor movement is as great as it ever was.

State Co-Op Directory Shows Number of Co-Ops Down

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, unfortunately, the Congress this session will not, apparently, succeed in passing any broad-scale legislation that will substantially improve the Nation's farm program and brighten the outlook for the American farmer.

We recognize, of course, that this situation is the result of a number of factors, including the inability of farmers and farm organizations, as well as national agricultural planners, to get together on what a majority feel should be done in agriculture.

In the light of this situation, it is especially important, I believe, that: First, we reexamine the existing programs in operation to assure that, functioning as efficiently as possible, they are providing the maximum assistance to the American farmer; second, that we continue efforts to see what modifications can and should be made in the overall farm program to brighten the economic outlook; and third, to encourage and, as desirable, expand those activities which, of themselves, are making a contribution in this significant field.

Today, I would like particularly to comment briefly on the role of cooperatives in the farm economy. In Wisconsin, as throughout the Nation, cooperative organizations are making a tremendous contribution to help the farmer survive the economic tide that regrettably, in recent times, has been running against him. In our Badger State, there are 1,184 organizations. While this is a substantial number—making Wisconsin second in number of cooperatives, and fourth in volume of business in the country—it represents a decrease in organizations from 1,222, in 1956.

I am aware, of course, that, that from time to time, questions arise as to the proper role of cooperatives in the economy, the tax treatment for such co-ops, and other questions. While these must be resolved on an equitable basis, I firmly believe that the co-op, in its proper role, can and will continue to make an important contribution to better life on the American farm.

Recently, the Farmers Union News published an article on the scope of the co-op movement in Wisconsin. The article, entitled "State Co-Op Directory Shows Number of Co-Ops Down," illustrates that, despite a reduction in the number of organizations, our Wisconsin cooperatives—with an estimated 404,500 members—is making a significant contribution to many facets of our economy. I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CO-OP DIRECTORY SHOWS NUMBER OF CO-OPS DOWN

Operating throughout Wisconsin this year are 1,184 cooperative organizations incorporated under chapter 185 of Wisconsin Corporation Laws according to a directory of cooperatives just prepared by the farm cooperative assistance section of the markets division, State department of agriculture.

Over the past 2 years, 32 new organizations filed articles of incorporation but complete dissolutions were filed for 18 associations and mergers and consolidations reduced the total number from 1,222 in 1956 to the present 1,184.

The number of all types of dairy cooperatives decreased from 354 to 300, poultry and egg associations from 22 to 10 and vegetable marketing organizations from 15 to 10.

Greatest consolidations have taken place in the farm supply associations which handle feed. The number of such groups dropped from 226 to 176. In the service cooperative area, the number of artificial breeding associations is 22 as compared to 52 in the 1956 directory, as consolidations toward larger centralized organizations took place.

There were increases in general farm supply and livestock marketing cooperatives. The former jumped from 60 to 125 while the

latter increased from 40 to 116. Farm management associations grew in number to 55.

The directory classifies the cooperatives into six groups. There are 461 agricultural marketing associations, 335 purchasing associations for supplies, and 251 service cooperatives for dairy herd improvement, artificial breeding, spraying, trucking, telephone, and electric associations.

A total of 115 co-ops sponsor fairs, farm management associations and general farm interest groups. There are 13 housing and real estate cooperatives, 5 printing and publishing firms, 2 funeral homes, a monument company, a storage cooperative, a body shop, and an industrial development organization.

Wisconsin was second in number and fourth in volume of business with $570 million and 404,500 members. Minnesota exceeded Wisconsin in number of members and California, Minnesota, and Illinois did more dollar volume, according to figures supplied by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

During the past fiscal year ending July 1, 133 cooperative associations were audited by accountants of the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture. Twenty-six co-ops received assistance in incorporating and 15 were dissolved. Two consolidations were completed and at least five others are now planning mergers.

Besides the cooperatives chartered under chapter 185 of State statutes, the Federal Government charters 21 national farm loan associations and 17 production credit groups. The commissioner of insurance charters 183 township mutual insurance companies and the State banking commission 728 credit unions. These increase the number of all co-ops in the State to 2,133.

Some of the more unusual types of cooperatives include 2 community hospitals, a dry cleaning plant, 7 fur marketing associations, and 21 groups which provide their own water supply for home use or irrigation.

An Unbeatable Presidential Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, 1959, I made a 1-minute speech in this House proposing a Nixon-Rockefeller team to represent the Republican Party in the campaign of 1960—DICK NIXON for President and Nelson Rockefeller for Vice President.

I said at that time, by joining the East and West, by joining the two most populous States, by tying the conservative Republicans and the modern Republicans together, by teaming up two very popular and effective votegetters, we would have an unbeatable political team.

Mr. Speaker, evidently that proposal of mine has germinated, has caught on, and is spreading. A letter printed in the Christian Science Monitor on Friday, September 4, 1959, expresses the same thought that I expressed in my speech of June 18, 1959. However, it was expressed in different words. As a part of these remarks, therefore, and to reemphasize the proposal, I offer the following letter from the Christian Science Monitor:

A NIXON-ROCKEFELLER TICKET

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

While our Republican leaders are jockeying for strong nominees they know they will need to win the 1960 election, let us Republicans not lose sight of the fact that we have a young, experienced, and capable man in our Vice President, RICHARD NIXON. Some seem ready to throw him aside for the popularity gained recently by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller. We have two good men here, each with his own capabilities.

Mr. Rockefeller, with less than a year as Governor, has undoubtedly demonstrated his abilities to forthrightly tackle any problem in debate, gain the people's confidence and win votes. He has shown a conservative approach to budget balancing. From a previous administration he gained invaluable experience in the South American trouble spots which would make him a valuable addition to the new administration as South America is presenting increasingly complex problems.

Mr. NIXON also has shown his ability to meet opposition in debate or discussion and frankly win the confidence of the people. He has exhibited this ability in his many travels and has well represented us abroad. He has been able to grasp the problems he saw and return with valuable information as well as suggestions to the President. This has been of considerable worth to him in preparing him for the office he may hold. His trip to Russia has strikingly shown this.

Vice President NIXON's experiences in his present office have been larger in scope than any previous holder of that position. In carrying out the duties, so largely expanded for him by this administration, he has become sharpened to meet the requirements of the office of President. During the President's illness he carried on admirably even in the eyes of some of the opposition. He has shown that he has the capabilities to attract not only a national but an international following.

The administration has wisely built up the job of Vice President of the United States from what it previously was. In this changing age the President's job is too big for one man. A young, vibrant Vice President and the advice of older men with their valuable experience are a necessity for a modern administration.

Here we, as Republicans, have two men with all the qualities needed to win this election. The two combined could well gain the 18 to 22 percent of the Democratic votes needed. If warm personalities and graciousness mean anything in an election, they both are excellent votegetters on this score. Their sound health is also going to be a factor in the coming campaign. Their large electoral vote combination is most favorable.

Therefore why don't we, in view of the fact that this is going to be a hard and bitter fight, run Mr. NIXON for President on the same ticket with Mr. Rockefeller? In 4 to 8 years Mr. Rockefeller should be in a fine position to run for President and win. This is just commonsense.

HAL KORMAN.

OCEANSIDE, LONG ISLAND, N.Y.

Success of Oregon Centennial Exposition and Trade Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the notable success of the Oregon Centennial Exposition and Trade Fair has been heralded in an editorial published in the Oregonian of September 3, 1959. In my opinion, major credit for this outstanding achievement, accomplished with relatively limited financial resources, should go to Anthony Brandenthaler, chairman of the Oregon Centennial Commission, and to his able associates. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Encore," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENCORE

Whatever the final box office statistics at the centennial exposition, the centennial year in Oregon will have been a success. For the observance of the passing of 100 years of statehood has been the occasion for a number of events that should and could be repeated.

The International Trade Fair held in conjunction with the exposition has been an unqualified success, both during the phase of catering to buyers and that in which it has been open to the public generally. A similar fair annually would be supported by the Portland metropolitan area.

The city has had and is having a taste of opera, such as has been available here all too seldom. A committee has been formed to organize permanent sponsorship for the New Savoy Opera Co. of Reed College, which last month delighted full houses at the Oriental Theater through a 4-week run. The company's performances of Gilbert and Sullivan operas, if scheduled annually, could become as celebrated as Ashland's justly famous Shakespearean festival.

And this week Portland is host to the San Francisco Opera Co., considered by many persons to be the best in America. The company's appearance here precedes the opening of the opera season in San Francisco, which annually attracts many Northwest residents. Let it be hoped that the response at the box office here will be sufficient to convince the San Francisco Opera Co. that an annual preseason visit to Portland will be mutually worthwhile.

Meanwhile, there are but two more weeks to see the exposition, along with its big, new attraction, "The Oregon Story." Those who have viewed the rehearsals for the elaborate arena event tell us that it, too, is worthy of occasional repetition. The home folks who haven't yet visited the exposition should mark their calendar right now. For although certain features may be revived, Portland will not soon again have such a big show for so little.

Pennsylvania Secretary of Commerce William R. Davlin Honored by Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story which appeared in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker on Friday, September 4, 1959, reporting the honor bestowed upon Secretary Davlin by the VFW at its nation convention recently concluded in Los Angeles:

DAVLIN CITED BY VFW FOR CREATING NEW JOBS

LOS ANGELES.—The creation of new jobs for veterans and others—a project dear to the

heart of the distressed areas in Pennsylvania—was the basis for an award to a Cabinet officer of that commonwealth by the Veterans of Foreign Wars in a ceremony held here today.

The VFW's Gold Medal of Merit and a citation were presented to Pennsylvania Commerce Secretary William R. Davlin by newly elected Commander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann, of Hazleton.

It was Feldman's first official presentation after his election to the top post of the 1,300,000-strong organizations of overseas veterans holding its 60th national convention here.

Davlin was cited for "his pioneer program in establishing an industrial development partnership between State government, local committees of community leaders, and private enterprise to create more jobs for veterans."

TWENTY THOUSAND NEW JOBS

Pennsylvania's program of providing loans for community-sponsored industrial development groups which Davlin pioneered has been a major factor in creating nearly 20,000 new jobs in the State's critical employment areas in the past 3 years. The program is being copied closely by many other States.

The new VFW commander in chief also is a prominent figure in industrial development at the community level.

He is one of the organizers and is an official of Can-do which has brought almost 1,000 new jobs for men to the Hazelton area in a do-it-yourself project.

Can-do has raised over a million and a half dollars by selling bonds. Funds are combined with loans from the State and local bank financing to erect new factory buildings at Valmont Industrial Park.

This program has won Hazleton a Freedom's Foundation award and has pumped new lifeblood into a community which was on the verge of becoming a ghost town when World War II had ended and the veterans returned to find few, if any, jobs available.

In making the presentation to Davlin, Feldmann said "your efforts represent the ultimate in cooperation and demonstrate how Government can work hand-in-hand with veteran and community groups to their mutual benefit."

Special Labor Day Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it seems to me that this Labor Day, 1959, has particular meaning. It follows closely a time of wrangling and emotionalism which has brought about legislation designed to curb misuse of power in the union movement. It comes, too, at a time when we find over 500,000 of our Nation's labor force idle by a strike against 12 major steel firms.

Does this imply a "suppression of the masses" or an example of the "downtrodden American workers" as Mr. Khrushchev likes to refer to the great mass of America's laboring force? I think not. I think it is once again a striking example of freemen in a free society, free to bargain for their individual rights and free to undertake reforms where needed.

It will be rather difficult I feel for Mr. Khrushchev to comprehend these things when he visits our country. I wonder if he will understand that Americans have fought for the right to disagree, to voice their opinion at the bargaining table, to engage in violent controversy. Americans have been ever thus. But—eventually—in the typical American fashion, differences will be resolved. Not perfectly, nor permanently, of course. But in the true spirt of a democracy in action.

So as Mr. Khrushchev's visit approaches, we would like to tell him on this Labor Day, of the great strides that have been made for the workingman in terms of economic prosperity and social justice since 1882. We would like to tell him that it is these 17 million workers in our country's trade unions who have contributed so much to the Nation's industrial progress. And while they may fiercely argue their point of view, they treasure above all their right to argue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Sunday Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., of September 6, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL LABOR DAY MESSAGE

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: Inasmuch as you are soon to be the guest of this country, and inasmuch as the "downtrodden American worker" seems to be one of your pet concerns, it might be fitting on this holiday we call Labor Day to speak directly and frankly to you about certain misconceptions you hold.

Let's warn you right off that during your visit here you may see some factories closed—not because of any holiday—and some picket lines, and maybe even some violence. But be aware that strikes are authorized by the workers themselves, who have the freedom to use this weapon if bargaining talks break down.

(We know there are no strikes in Russia, but is it because everything is just hunky-dory over there, or is it possibly because workers are unable to strike?)

And be aware that, even should U.S. labor disputes reach the strike stage, bargaining is still going on behind the scenes and differences will eventually be settled by discussion and compromise. Not perfectly, not permanently, not without hardship.

But when have freemen been perfect? Freemen, we repeat.

Each settlement, we hope, means one little step forward. We humbly claim to have taken quite a few steps in the direction of economic prosperity and social justice since our country's first strike of Philadelphia printers in 1786, since the first union of cobblers was organized in 1792, since our first Labor Day in 1882.

Yes, Mr. Khrushchev, there's been a lot of wrangling going on in Washington over labor reform legislation, following exposure of corruption in both labor and management. But it's a question of weeding out the rotten apples without ruining a barrel of pretty good fruit.

It is not, as your crude propagandists proclaim, another instance of the suppression of the working masses.

We have the same kind of hassles when it comes to changing the ground rules of college football. We may argue like blazes and call each other names, but we're all interested in improving the game.

Many other countries also celebrate a Labor Day, on May 1. Workers take the day off—without pay—to march in protest against their conditions. And police are out in force to see that they do not protest too much.

We know that May 1 is a holiday for workers in your country, too. They gather in huge throngs to watch the parade of Soviet military might and to give thanks to Big Brother for being so good to them.

Here, you'll probably find most of us Americans off fishing or enjoying the quiet—or noise—of our backyards. If you think that shows a lack of unity or patriotism, just try telling us that.

Above all, Mr. Khrushchev, remember when you get here that the Labor Day we just celebrated was instituted by workingmen to honor the workingman, not a regime or an ideology. Workers won this country and its privileges by the sweat of their brows. And workers of all kinds—blue-collar, white-collar, laborers, thinkers—work to keep this democracy going.

If you think you've got a better system to offer, you're welcome to believe it. But please, Mr. Khrushchev, do not take it as a sign of disrespect if we yawn in your face.

Sincerely,

AN AMERICAN WORKER.

Making Better Use of Missouri River Water for Irrigation, Power, Navigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, a most able South Dakota editor, Mr. John Sittner of the Lake Preston Times, has written a thoughtful editorial calling for a more efficient use of the great water resources of the Missouri Basin. I am pleased that Mr. Sittner has strongly endorsed my resolution which was recently approved by the House Public Works Committee authorizing the Army Engineers to survey slack-water navigation feasibility on the Missouri. Mr. Sittner's editorial in the September 3, 1959, issue of the Lake Preston Times, follows:

LET'S GET THE MOST FROM IT

Expanding industry, expanding population and an ever-higher standard of living are putting an ever-increasing strain on one of the Nation's basic natural resources—water.

And the drought in South Dakota this year is making us realize as never before the necessity for using to the ultimate the water resource offered by the Missouri River, for irrigation as well as for power, flood control, and recreational opportunities the development in bringing.

So it is with a great deal of interest that we should view efforts of our congressional delegation to secure for our State the fullest development of the Missouri River basin.

Fullest development means more than appropriations for dams and irrigation projects, and quite significant is the current interest in developing slack-water navigation, a project in behalf of which Representative GEORGE MCGOVERN appeared before a House subcommittee last week.

This basic problem, in short, is this: South Dakota's needs require a large reserve of water for release for power generation during the winter months, and our future irrigation needs will also require a large reserve of water.

But what's happening now? Much of the water is being released during summer months for maintaining free-flow navigation on the Missouri, lowering the reservoir levels and reducing the amount available for present power generation and future irrigation.

McGOVERN has asked the committee to authorize a Corps of Engineers' study of feasibility of slack-water navigation—the establishment of a series of low-head dams downstream that would maintain navigable levels without expenditure of so much water.

Such a program would seem to make good sense, for it would use the same water many more times than we're using it now. Right now the Nation is using South Dakota rainfall just a few times—where it falls, to generate power at Randall and Oahe, and to provide navigation. Install a slack-water navigation system, and you can use it to better advantage—where it falls, to generate much more power and at a better time of the year at Randall and Oahe. In addition, we would have a ready reserve for irrigation purposes in the future; also, navigation would be improved because you wouldn't have current to contend with in a slack-water system, and, also, the low-head dam would provide additional power downstream.

Actually, there's nothing new about slack-water navigation. We have it on the Tennessee and Ohio Rivers, as McGOVERN pointed out to the subcommittee. And the entire Nation has benefited from the intensive development of those river systems, particularly the Tennessee, where TVA has helped a backward part of the Nation increase tremendously its share of the national productivity.

In Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world they've learned how to use the same water over and over for multiple uses, for they haven't had an unlimited supply of natural resources to waste.

And in this country we should realize we no longer have those unlimited resources we bragged about so much in the past. So far as water is concerned, we're limited, we're actually hurting, right now.

It's high time we began getting the maximum benefit from our water, to realize the full potential of the great Missouri River development.

Girl, 10, Revives 2-Year-Old Sister

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the heroism of the young is well known to readers of history and also of the daily newspapers, but rarely have I encountered a more compelling example of youthful courage and intelligence than in the case of 10-year-old Linda Kay Gibson, of Maplewood, in suburban St. Paul, Minn.

Last Thursday, Linda Kay saved the life of her 2-year-old sister, who had stopped breathing after a convulsion, by applying oral respiration until the smaller child began to breathe again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Evening Star's account of Linda Kay's heroism be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no opposition, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 5, 1959]

GIRL, 10, REVIVES 2-YEAR-OLD SISTER WITH MOUTH-TO-MOUTH RESPIRATION

ST. PAUL, MINN., September 5.—"After all, Joyce is the only baby sister I've got; I simply had to do something."

Linda Kay Gibson, 10, had only this simple explanation for the mouth-to-mouth respiration that police and family doctor credited with breathing life back into the tiny body of her 2-year-old sister.

Joyce, ill with a high fever, suddenly went limp and stopped breathing after a convulsion in the family's suburban Maplewood home Thursday night.

"Right away, mother was frantic, on the telephone trying to get the doctor and the police—and, well, I just had to do something," Linda Kay said matter of factly yesterday.

What she did was to start forcing her own breath into the baby's mouth. She continued for about 5 or 10 minutes.

"Once in a while Joyce would sort of gasp a little and stop breathing again—I was half crying, but I kept at it," said Linda Kay.

When police and the doctor did arrive, Joyce was breathing regularly again.

"They said I did good," Linda Kay happily reported.

"I remembered reading in the newspaper how one kid saved another kid's life by breathing in his mouth," she continued. "So I thought it might work with Joyce.

"To get more air I ran outside with her in my arms and then stood and breathed in her mouth. I shook her a little and called to her—and it worked."

Her mother, Mrs. Eugene Gibson, 33, said that even after the baby's breath was normal, Linda Kay insisted on staying up most of the night watching Joyce.

The doctor said the lung congestion and high fever resulted from an infection. He decided that Joyce did not require hospitalization. He prescribed medication and hot baths.

Linda Kay's father, absent at the time, added his praise for her efforts when he got home. Linda Kay goes into the fifth grade when school opens here next week. The Gibsons have a third child, James, 8.

Attorney Louis G. Feldmann of Hazleton, Pa., Elected Commander in Chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two news articles which appeared in the Hazleton Plain Speaker, Friday, September 4, 1959, on the election of Attorney Louis G. Feldmann as the new commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

HAZLETON ATTORNEY IS COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF FOREIGN WARS VETS—THUNDEROUS OVATION PUTS FELDMANN IN OFFICE AT CALIFORNIA CONVENTION

(By Dom Antonelli)

LOS ANGELES.—Attorney Louis G. Feldmann of Hazleton today was elected by acclamation as commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and installed in that office amidst colorful pomp and pageantry of military color guards and veterans' ritual.

When Feldmann's name was posted with the nominations and a vote was asked for by outgoing Comdr. John Mahan, Montana, the more than 1,500 delegates who jammed the beautiful Pacific ballroom of the Hotel Statler-Hilton in Los Angeles, shouted their unanimous vote for Feldmann.

Then Julian Dickinson, adjutant of the VFW, declared the Hazleton attorney was duly elected commander in chief.

STANDING OVATION

Immediately as the delegates accorded him a standing ovation, Feldmann and his wife, Ann, were escorted down the aisle to the rostrum by the VFW master sergeant at arms staff, including Assistant Sergeant at Arms Frank Pataki, of the Hazleton detail of State police.

Honorary escorts for Feldmann during the procession to the rostrum were Gen. Graves B. Erskine, U.S. Marine Corps, retired; and Brig. Gen. Don Hittle, U.S. Marine Corps. They were led by the Marine Corps color guard in dress blue uniforms. Following was a Marine Corps Drum and Bugle Corps from Camp Pendleton, Calif., which played the Marine Corps hymn as the ex-marine sergeant from Hazleton was installed.

Others in the procession were led by cheering members of the Pennsylvania delegation carrying their State banner and followed by delegates from the other States including Alaska and Hawaii.

Assistant Sergeant at Arms Pataki was accorded the honor of escorting Feldmann and his wife, their nephew, Peter Fagan, and niece, Judy McKernan to the place of honor on the ballroom stage while television cameras whirred and flashbulbs popped.

OUTLINE PLATFORM

In his acceptance speech, Feldmann said that the theme of his administration for the VFW would be progress, responsibility, peace, and work for victory.

He explained that veterans must realize that they have to work in peacetime just as hard as they fought in wartime for those things which they cherish.

He continued that the approach to the various problems must be realistic and positive. Among those projects he plans are establishment of a committee to examine the ever-growing problem of facilities in veteran's hospitals, also to establish programs and to continue those now in effect for youth activities such as baseball and other sports, Boy Scout work and Americanism programs.

HITS DELINQUENCY

Speaking of the veteran's responsibility on community problems, he emphasized that juvenile delinquency needs immediate attention, "It is a responsibility of everyone in this room to fight this community blight. Men who know the horrors of war must do their utmost to stamp out this cancerous menace."

Feldmann added the VFW will continue the people-to-people program which he originated and hoped to build a new village for Korean war victims under the very guns of the Communists.

He said this year the VFW will take a leading role in the fight against international communism, adding that "we must be ever vigilant against those Communists who masquerade as Americans."

SILENT, CIVIL

Speaking of the controversial visit to this country planned for Soviet boss Nikita Khrushchev, the new commander-in-chief said to the delegates "let us be silent, but civil. Let us demonstrate that the VFW backs the President of the United States and at the same time let us show the Soviet leader that we Americans have a freedom to worship as we please by attending service in our own place of worship during his visit to this country."

He concluded with the assertion that he will work for victory, total victory in peace as we fought for it in war.

As commander in chief of the VFW, Feldmann will lead an organization of over 1,300,000 members with 10,000 post and representing four major conflicts. He is the third marine veteran to assume the top national office in the 60 years of the organization.

Other officers elected were: Senior Vice Commander Ted C. Connell, Killeen, Tex., and Junior Vice Commander Robert E. Hansen, St. Paul Minn.

NOMINATES FELDMANN

Making the nomination of Feldmann for commander in chief at the 60th annual VFW convention Thursday afternoon was former Gov. Ed Arn of Kansas. Arn is a justice of the Kansas Supreme Court.

Seconding the nomination was Gen. Graves B. Erskine, USMC-retired, who is now an assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

Judge Arn was introduced by John Piparato, Easton, Pa., commander of the VFW's Pennsylvania department.

PRAISES HAZLETONIAN

General Erskine, who was Feldmann's commanding general during World War II, said of the ex-Marine sergeant that "Lou Feldmann's long and illustrious record is indicative of what can be expected of him as commander in chief. I am confident he will fulfill the many responsibilities in a commendable manner and with great dignity."

HIGH SIGNIFICANCE

The stature of the post to which Feldmann has been elected has grown to a point where it is becoming increasingly significant at two levels—international and community.

As head of the 1,200,000-strong organization which has over 10,000 posts in the United States and territories, Feldmann will be a spokesman for an organization which uses its cumulative strength—based firmly in the grassroots of hometown America to establish, support and guide projects in the field of veterans' welfare, charity, community service, and participation in governmental affairs. The VFW represents the new look, typical of our veterans' groups which today exercise a responsible mandate from their members to speak out on matters of importance in the fields of national defense, foreign policy, education, welfare, etc.

And on the community of the man whom the VFW members select as their commander in chief a spotlight of publicity is focused during his tenure, since it is obvious that a man who can reach that pinnacle must have a background of service to his own community. The eyes of those who recognize the immensities of the VFW also will focus on his commander's hometown to see just what kind of a place produced such a leader.

BREAK FOR HAZLETON

For Greater Hazleton, this can prove to be one of its bigger breaks in this decade which saw the community fight up out of its economic doldrums and win renown with CAN-DO and other projects.

Such national and international publicity already manifested at the 60th national convention in Los Angeles will be a great boon for the continued industrial development progress of Hazleton.

Indicative of the kind of attention the VFW commandership attracts is a partial list of the prominent people who have been guests of and callers on the Feldmanns at their suite here in the Statler Hilton Hotel.

The guest list ranged from industrialists like Walter O. "Spike" Briggs, owner of Detroit Lions, to four-star generals such as G. B. Erskine, assistant to the Secretary of Defense and a former commanding general of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Others were C. D. Jackson, executive vice president of Time and Life, Robert Christenberry, postmaster of New York City and former state boxing commissioner, Jess Gorkin, editor, and Fred Blumenthal, Washington editor, of Parade magazine, William R. Davlin, Pennsylvania Commerce Secretary, Hugh O'Brien, the Wyatt Erp on TV, retired Gen. Pat Carney, former Congressman from New York, Maj. Gen. Robert Quinn, Chief of Army Information Services, Timothy Murphy, Boston financier, Sumner Whittier, director of Veterans' Administration.

Prominent jurists such as Edward Arn, ex-Governor of Kansas, justice of Kansas Supreme Court, and Judge John Dougherty, chief justice of Cook County, Chicago, also were guests with many other high ranking public and military officials.

Assisting Feldmann and his wife Ann, as hosts for the reception were Dr. and Mrs. Leo Corazza, Freeland; Dr. Michael Matsko, McAdoo; Mary Capparell, Betty McKernan, George Chisnell, Dom Antonelli, Victor C. Diehm, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Sacco, Trooper Frank Pataki, Judy McKernan, and Peter Fagan.

NEW VFW COMMANDER ATTENDED NIGHT SCHOOL, WORKED FOR LAW DEGREE

A Hazleton attorney who once worked as a waiter, cook, chauffeur and hosiery salesman is the new national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Attorney Louis G. Feldmann was elevated to the post today at the national VFW convention in Los Angeles just 5 days before his 50th birthday. His election to the top VFW post in the United States culminates an active career which has won him accolades from veterans and civic groups.

WAS DISTRICT ATTORNEY

His career has covered civic, industrial development, veteran and political fields and he served as Luzerne County district attorney from 1952 to 1956.

He is presently one of the key figures in the affairs of CAN-DO, the organization which is bringing new industry to this region.

NATIVE OF WILKES-BARRE

He was born in Wilkes-Barre, son of John T. and Jessica (Cole) Feldmann. The family resided in Wilkes-Barre, Forty Fort, and Kingston. He lived in Kingston until his graduation from high school.

After graduation, he went to work in the Allentown area selling construction equipment. He then secured a job in Chester. During his high school days he held many jobs, including newsboy and office boy.

In 1929 he entered night school at the University of Pennsylvania and worked days in a variety of jobs. In 1931 he secured a Coxe Scholarship and entered the university's day school. Following his graduation he did graduate work at the university on a graduate scholarship.

Feldmann taught for several months at the Penn Treaty High School in the first adult educational program in the United States.

HELD OPA POSTS

From 1933 to 1942 he was employed as stores inspector, accountant and special investigator for the Pennsylvania Liquor Control Board. In 1942 he became associated with the Office of Price Administration at Pittsburgh where he was chief investigator.

In 1943 he graduated from the Duquesne University Law School, where he attended night school.

He is married to the former Anne R. McKernan, of Hazleton, and is a member of St. Gabriel's Church.

SERVED IN MARINE CORPS

Feldmann's military career began on June 9, 1943, as he enlisted as a private in the Marine Corps. In 1945 he went overseas where he served on the Mariana Islands and Guam. He was discharged in November 1945 as a sergeant, having continuously refused a commission.

A month after returning to civilian life he joined Drake-Wear Post 589 in Hazleton. The following year he was elected post commander. The same year he was elected judge advocate of the Anthracite Counties Council, VFW, and in 1947 became the council's commander.

He also served as judge advocate for the 11th Pennsylvania District, VFW, judge advocate for the Department of Pennsylvania, VFW, Department of Pennsylvania junior vice commander, senior vice commander, and as department commander in 1950. He served as president of the Joint Veterans' Council of Pennsylvania, which includes all the major veterans organizations, chairman of the Loyalty Day Committee of the Pennsylvania Department, and chairman of the VFW National Loyalty Day Committee.

RECEIVED CITATIONS

In 1948 he received the Greater Hazleton Veterans Association award "in recognition of his service and devotion to the veterans of the region."

Other awards:

Wilkes-Barre Lions Club, Red Cross citation, Unico National, Hazleton Chapter No. 1, Veterans of Foreign Wars national citation for Americanism work and Loyalty Day, and an honorary life membership in the Hazleton Junior Chamber of Commerce.

CIVIC ACTIVITIES

His civic activities have included chairman of the Red Cross Fund campaign, cochairman of General Solicitation of Industrial Development Drive (Electric Auto-Lite), chairman of Civic Improvement Committee of Hazleton Chamber of Commerce, member of the President's Mid-Century White House Conference on Children and Youth, member of the advisory board of the Salvation Army, member of the Catholic Charities, member of the Heart Association, member of the Hazleton Educational Council, member of State Veterans Reemployment Rights Commission, president of Joint State Veterans Council, past judge advocate of Marine Corps League, Department of Pennsylvania, member of the American Legion, member of the Catholic War Veterans, and national Americanism chairman of the VFW.

He is also a member of the Lower Luzerne County Bar Association, Wilkes-Barre Law and Library Association, Pennsylvania Bar Association, American Bar Association, American Judicature Society, and Commercial Law League.

An Open Letter to Khrushchev by Jess Gorkin, Editor of Parade Magazine

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I was very much impressed with an article entitled "An Open Letter to Nikita

Khrushchev," which was contributed to the September 6, 1959, issue of Parade magazine by the editor of Parade, Mr. Jess Gorkin.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gorkin's article from Parade, which was published in the September 6 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herld, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of my colleagues, especially in view of the debate in the Senate during recent days over Mr. Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to the United States as the invited guest of President Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV

(By Jess Gorkin)

All Americans, even those who did not welcome the invitation, are interested in your coming visit. We all want you to see us as we really are, to test for yourself the sinews of freedom.

Communism has created a subterranean world of half-light, which apparently has distorted your image of us. Your speeches are burdened with misconceptions that we hope this trip will dispel.

You have repeatedly declared that "the impoverishment of the proletariat is the law of capitalism." We hope you will look around as you traverse our land. Notice the automobiles that choke our highways, the television antennas sprouting from our housetops, the stores swarming with shoppers. Are these the fruits of poverty?

If you doubt that all classes partake of our prosperity, you should break away from protocol and mingle with our common people. Visit our neighborhoods, inspect our homes, judge for yourself our living standard. Since most Americans keep telephones, you can open any telephone directory, select a name at random and visit his home. You will find he lives better than his counterpart anywhere else in the world.

You will be unable to avoid the newspapers, billboards, and radio-TV commercials that move the goods produced under capitalism. Such saturation advertising obviously is directed at a mass market. From this you can see how capitalism depends upon widespread distribution of our national wealth.

You will meet millionaires here. Ask them about their beginnings. You will be surprised how many started as humble workers. Any American can dream of becoming President or a millionaire for there is no limit to individual progress.

You may conclude that the dollar decides our fate, but it is merely the reward for work and skill. You may accuse us of being a nation of comfort seekers. True, overindulgence is a national failing. We are constantly searching for ways to produce better goods in less time at cheaper cost, to make life more enjoyable.

"The days of capitalism are numbered," you have said. "Just as cells are constantly renewed in a living organism, so in society do old forms die and new, more progressive and advanced ones are born. Such a new form is the Communist society." The American system was born from the bloody triumph of our forefathers over despotism. Out of the wilderness they wrested a mighty civilization. Since those stirring days, we have met changing conditions with new ideas. Our economic growth has been matched by political and social progress. Now we face the future with boldness and imagination.

You have been obliged to introduce economic incentives into your own society. These are capitalistic roots, Mr. Khrushchev, but don't be afraid. You can find out what it's like to be a capitalist yourself by purchasing a few shares in one of our great corporations. Learn how your investment can earn dividends; attend a stockholders' meeting; read the company reports mailed to you in Moscow.

Our officials may try to steer you from labor strife. Don't let them. Find out where a labor strike is taking place; insist upon going to the scene. Then meet with management; talk with the workers; sit down at the bargaining table. You will discover that labor strikes are not expressions of Marxism or class warfare. The twin pedestals upon which our labor-management structure rests are the right of workers to earn good pay and the right of management to make a fair profit.

Our success depends upon peace, not war, as you have so often charged. It is not true that "war is wanted by the big monopolists who make profits from the armaments race." Any straight-talking industrialist will tell you that, in an age of intercontinental missiles and H-bombs, factories can be devastated. And without factories, there are no profits.

Although our economy is geared for peace, we have not ignored the necessity for military preparedness. You will find little justification for your boast that you "could crush the United States" with your bombs and missiles. We hope you see enough of our military strength to inject sober realism into future Kremlin assessments.

You have been scornful of our two-party system of government, asserting that both political parties represent the same vested interests. We suggest you visit the Democratic and Republican National Headquarters, and hear what the rival leaders say about each other. For an insight how our Government carries out the will of the people, stop by any Senator's office and ask to read the mail from his constituents.

Contrary to your charge that our papers print only "untruths and misinformation," you will find that the press is totally free of any capitalistic censorship or Government interference. Read for yourself the criticism of government, conflicting views, and factual reporting found in our newspapers.

We don't expect to convert you to capitalism. But we hope you will see enough to judge the mood, temper, and ability of our people more accurately in the future. Our stake in peace is far too great for us to desire war or to capitulate if war is forced upon us.

We do not ignore the hand of friendship. At various times in our history, the British, Spanish, Mexicans, Germans, Italians, and Japanese have been our mortal enemies. Now they are our friends. Our relations with the Soviet Union could also improve if both sides worked to make it possible.

My True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in Congress, we often discuss the necessity for preserving our national security from external threats; however, the basic factor which has made our country great, that of personal security, is frequently ignored. I refer to personal security developed through initiative, self-reliance, and courage, the qualities that have enabled the United States to progress so effectively. The future of our country will depend upon our national ability to complement the results achieved individually with effective action exercised by our Federal Government.

Miss Cynthia Peters, Maine's representative in the junior chamber of commerce's "My True Security" contest, has effectively captured the concept of personal security and its importance in our American way of life. In these days when Americans too often look for security above all else, Miss Peters points out that initiative and self-reliance are prerequisites for individual progress. It follows that these same qualities are prerequisites for national success as well.

Maine people, generally, are genuinely proud of Cynthia's contribution and I, particularly, representing her congressional district, deem it a great privilege to recognize her contribution by making her essay a part of the permanent RECORD of Congress:

MY TRUE SECURITY

(By Cynthia Peters)

"His brow is wet with honest sweat,
He earns whate'er he can,
And looks the whole world in the face,
For he owes not any man." [1]

From the pen of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow flowed these well-known but powerful words. Have they any value or significance today?

When these lines were written, they undoubtedly expressed his feelings about life and the single man. His village blacksmith was an individual relying upon himself alone. He was dependent upon his own efforts and powers; he had complete confidence in his own efficiency and initiative and self-reliance.

He achieved much, great and admirable, from his self-reliance—self-satisfaction, gratification, self-respect; yet not in an instant, not in an hour, not even in a year. He labored diligently; he built fortitude and character; he established standards and foundations; he applied his energy and displayed it in the initiation of his actions.

Although he "owed not any man," somewhere along the path of his youth, the village blacksmith must have been dependent upon someone other than himself. Perhaps, his mother or his father or his nearby friend taught him about life and its enormity; about people, friends, or enemies; about his duty to himself and to mankind. There, somewhere, he was taught and he learned and he applied his knowledge and skill, building for himself, a sound security.

We, too, you and I, must find personal security. Yet without the accompaniment of initiative and self-reliance, it can never be attained. To be personally secure, one must believe in his own thoughts and principles and trust that what is true for him is true for all people. Security is inevitable when one relies upon the integrity of his own mind and upon the safety of his own methods. One must stand firmly implanted in his self-trust and escape from all imitation and mockery. Be the man without the crutch, support yourself.

Self-reliance builds the leader, not the follower; initiative leads to success, not to failure. Nothing can bring you or me peace and security but the possession of self-reliance and the spontaneous drive of initiative.

---

[1] "Village Blacksmith," Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.

"It is easy in the world to live after the world's opinion; it is easy in solitude to live after our own; but the great man is he who, in the midst of the crowd, keeps with perfect sweetness the independence of solitude."[2] With these immortal words of Emerson ringing in our ears, let us lay our firm foundations for a safe, but powerful, true security.

[2] From "Self-Reliance," Ralph Waldo Emerson.

The Democrats and the President's Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Arkansas Gazette, entitled "The Democrats and the President's Veto."

I endorse the editorial's view that the issue of party identity and responsibility is the gravest threat facing our democratic institutions.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Sept. 4, 1959]

THE DEMOCRATS AND THE PRESIDENT'S VETO

It has been remarked, by us, and now by others, that the 86th Congress "belongs," properly speaking, to House Republican Leader CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana. Although like thinkers in his party were mowed down in windrows in the 1958 congressional elections, and although Mr. HALLECK himself barely survived, it is the minority spokesman from Indiana who has most effectively given his impress to this Congress, and who may well be remembered longest for it.

However, if it is not too late to switch nominations we'd like to put forward the name of Representative A. S. HERLONG, the Florida Democrat, as a symbol of the 86th Congress. It was A. S. HERLONG who first voted to override President Eisenhower's veto of the rivers and harbors bill—and then switched his vote to "present," thereby insuring that the veto would be sustained. This, in our view, has become painfully representative of the present-day American political scene and of the Congress, in particular.

The touted Democratic 86th Congress has been present, but that is about all.

Looking at the last-minute changes of signals which upheld the Presidential veto of the water projects bill by a vote of 138 to 274 (with 1 more vote needed to override), it is difficult to escape the conclusion that a number of Democratic Members of the House were as interested as President Eisenhower himself in preserving his record of never having had a veto overturned. Why this should be so is a question that we will leave to the Democratic Members concerned and to the party's leadership in the House

Representative HERLONG's nonvote on a critical party issue was, then, a symptom rather than a cause.

Our objections to the Landrum-Griffin bill, for example, have not been so much over its contents as against the manner of its passage.

There was a time, and not so long ago, when if a President wanted a bill such as Landrum-Griffin, he would have campaigned for it, proposed it formally in an early state of the Union message, and fought for its passage, getting the votes where he could, but concentrating his fight along party lines. He would not have waited until the final months of his final term and then jumped abroad a hybrid concoction brought forth by a hydra-headed but essentially formless bipartisan coalition.

The temptation now is great to support Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, and Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, in their move to attach a rivers and harbors rider to the foreign aid bill as a retaliatory gesture. But this is what the antiforeign aid Republican leaders in Congress (as distinct from the President) have wanted all along, and there is the fact that the national security might be hurt by such a maneuver. In a similar fashion, Senator KEATING, of New York, charging southern foot dragging on civil rights legislation, has sought to attach a civil rights rider to a peanut acreage bill.

Such circumnavigations of what ought to be separate, straightforward issues might appear to work for a time, but not for the long haul. Even so, the American people, according to a recent Gallup poll, appear rather to like the idea of a Government permanently divided between the two major parties—with the inevitable blurring of major public issues and the consequent difficulty in fixing political responsibility.

It may well be that this issue of party identity and party responsibility is the single gravest threat facing our democratic institutions, larger in the gravity of its implications than civil rights, labor racketeering, national defense, or what-have-you.

Improved Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the soil bank law passed by Congress has been a distinct advantage to the farm economy and, more important than that, to the economy of our country. Unless our farmers have good soil in which to raise food for our people, they cannot and will not be properly fed. Therefore, it is important for us in the Congress to give attention to the important area and especially as it relates to the conservation. Recently editorials appeared in the Wallaces Farmer and the Des Moines Register which dwell on this subject and I think it would be very worthwhile for my colleagues to read and study. I, therefore, insert them in the RECORD:

[From Wallaces Farmer]

IMPROVED SOIL BANK

The revised conservation reserve program promises to be one of the most efficient farm adjustment plans yet devised.

By efficient, we mean that the tax money being spent will achieve its purpose. It goes to farmers, not to grain warehousemen and processors. And it goes to farmers who definitely help other farmers by reducing or completely ending their farm operation.

USDA figures show that the price support cost of products that would have been grown on retired land would have been at least twice as much as actual conservation reserve costs. Thus the soil bank provided a net Government saving of $317 million this year.

The changes in the reserve for next year eliminate most of the objections that have been raised—without seriously hurting the overall program. City investors can no longer buy run down farms and rent them to the Government.

No longer can people rent State, city, or other publicly owned land and put it in the soil bank. Even the clamor of businessmen that small towns in fringe farming areas would dry up has been met. No more than 25 percent of any one county may now be retired.

The bidding scheme for accepting applications will stretch the available money as far as possible. Only those in best position to retire land are likely to bid low enough to get their application accepted this year.

Only one problem remains—not enough money has been appropriated to retire the land needed to balance production with current demand. A halfway measure won't do the job—it will only draw more criticism from the nonfarm front.

[From the Des Moines Register, Aug. 29, 1959]

SOIL-BANK ADVANTAGES

The Federal soil-bank program has been pretty small-scale so far. It hasn't affected total farm output very much. Only the poor land is placed under contract to keep it out of production. Moreover, farmers often can increase production on the remaining land in crops by use of fertilizer and more intensive methods.

But removing land from crops by renting it to the Government in the soil bank does have some effect in holding production down, in the short run, at least. It thus works in the direction of easing the surplus problem.

Unlike the acreage-allotment program, the soil-bank program removes the land completely from production for 3 to 10 years. Under allotments, farmers often have been able to substitute other crops on the allotted acreage. For example, farmers have been permitted to grow feed crops on land taken out of cotton, corn, and wheat. Often this meant no reduction in total output and may have even increased it by inducing better rotations and better-balanced livestock-feed supplies.

Another advantage of the soil bank is that it tends to save the Government money on price-support operations. The Department of Agriculture has calculated that the conservation reserve program saved the Government about $700 million in price-support costs in the 3 years 1957, 1958, and 1959.

This calculation is based on an estimate of the quantities of price-supported commodities that would have been grown on the land if it had not been in the soil bank. In 1959, the Department estimated, farmers would have grown 143 million bushels of corn on land which is in the soil bank. The price-support costs to the Government for this much corn, including storage, transportation, etc., would have been $249 million.

This cost is based on the cost of acquisition of the corn minus the estimated returns to the Government from domestic and export sales of surpluses. Obviously, this method of figuring costs leaves something to be desired. Not all the supply of a commodity is sold to the Government, even in the case of corn, where all producers are eligible.

Nevertheless, the Department of Agriculture has a point. A given expenditure on the soil bank would not be wholly an addition to total farm-subsidy costs, since it would tend to reduce price-support costs.

Price-support spending often tends to worsen the problem it is intended to alleviate by encouraging farmers to produce more of the price-guaranteed crop. Soil-bank payments tend to encourage farm adjustment—by making it possible for some farm-

ers to reduce farming operations and take off-farm jobs and for others to retire from farming altogether.

Would it not be sensible, therefore, to greatly increase the soil-bank program in the next few years and make it the primary instrument of farm-income support and resource adjustment?

Address by Hon. Ben Arnold, Member, Arizona State Senate, Before 38th Annual Conference, Western Association of State Highway Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the Honorable Ben Arnold, a member of the Arizona State Senate from Pinal County, addressed the 38th annual conference of the Western Association of State Highway Officials at Billings, Mont. on June 24, 1959. I think his speech is most provocative. It is one which all Senators should read, particularly those who come from the Western States, for which the interstate highway bill is creating many problems.

I call attention, for instance, to one statement which Senator Arnold made:

Certainly the superhighways are wonderful devices to serve mankind. But man has other needs—he must find access to and from his neighbor's home, from his farm to market, from his community to the neighboring town.

Throughout his speech, Senator Arnold speaks of the problems with which we in the West are confronted. We in the West have not sought interstate highways, but only better highways to serve our own people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator Arnold's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY HON. BEN ARNOLD, MEMBER, ARIZONA STATE SENATE, FROM PINAL COUNTY, BEFORE THE 38TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION STATE HIGHWAY OFFICIALS, BILLINGS, MONT., JUNE 24, 1959

Mr. Chairman, delegates to this 38th annual conference of the Western Association of State Highway Officials, guests, and friends. I am most grateful for this opportunity of discussing with you one of our mutual problems.

It is certainly a privilege and pleasure to be here in Billings, Mont., today, and to experience firsthand the association with you men who are performing one of the most notable tasks of the 20th century. I can think of no assignment more important for the public welfare of these United States than that of building and planning the roadways of tomorrow.

I feel humble indeed to have been invited to this conference and to speak for a few minutes on a subject which I know is of interest to you all.

At the risk of being facetious, I would like to say first off that I wish right now I had the powers of a Houdini and could transfix, for a moment, the picture I make here on this platform. For, with that power, I would hastily put together for myself a montage, if you please, in which I would include Solomon, of course, for his vast wisdom; Cordell Hull, for his great diplomacy, and Lady Justice with her picturesque scales and then, and only then, perhaps I could speak adequately on the subject assigned me: "How can we maintain the confidence of our legislatures?"

A wise man once said that "only the builders are truly in communion with creation." Certainly, you and I can find little satisfaction in our lives beyond that which can be measured by what we have contributed to the total good of our society and the service of our fellow men, and you who have built and maintained our highway system can take pride in your accomplishment.

The very fact that this subject has aroused sufficient concern to be included on the agenda of this meeting would, I suggest, indicate the existence of a serious problem.

This assignment is both a challenge and a responsibility for me but I would be less than honest with you, or with myself, if I refused to squarely face the implications in the subject title assigned to me.

Let me assure you I'm not an expert of any kind. I'm not a professional politician. I operate a business in a small town—a town small enough that my neighbor's needs and problems are communicated to me on a daily basis. And I serve in a State where the population is still relatively small, and all that I have to say to you today is no more than the voice of one man, the thoughts and opinions of Ben Arnold.

No man can rightly claim that his opinions adequately and completely express the opinions or beliefs of any group or any organization. Ben Arnold, a State senator, cannot separate his thinking and his beliefs from those of Ben Arnold, the businessman in a small community. For we are each of us individuals, reflecting in our personalities, and our opinions no more than our own experience.

I would suggest the very title of this talk is ambiguous. How can we, the officials involved in the building of roads and the awarding of road contracts, maintain the confidence of the legislature?

I would submit to you that a member of a legislature in any of your States is not, and must not be, regarded as an individual who, when he sits in the legislative halls, becomes one personality, and when he operates his business or follows his profession in his home community, becomes another personality.

And I would suggest that if there be a problem of maintaining the confidence of the legislature, then that problem is more truly represented in a statement which would not attempt to narrow or confine the field.

Members of the legislature are elected, and if they be good members of the legislature, they will reflect and mirror the opinions and the thinking of their constituents. And this problem, truly defined, is not one of merely maintaining the confidence of the legislature; rather it is a problem of maintaining adequate communication with all of the residents of a State.

Gentlemen, in these days of tremendous progress, these days of tremendous demands on those who govern, confidence is a big and weighty word. It is premised on results and lasts only so long as the results are pleasing to those who seek to use it.

And if such a problem exists, then I would suggest it has its genesis in the prevailing pressure of our times which has, of necessity, in some instances, built a barrier which has prevented adequate communication, which has served to isolate professional thinking in every field.

You highway builders deal with substantial sums of money. You are preoccupied by the technical requirements of your assignment. You are, I suspect, frequently absorbed in your jobs to the exclusion of all other interests. Now the highway construction problems enjoy, in many States, a special type of revenue, and the Federal-aid projects and the Interstate Highway Systems receive considerable financial assistance from the Federal Government. But if there is a State highway engineer in this audience who at this moment doesn't honestly need more money than is currently available, then I would say that gentleman is enjoying a uniquely favorable situation.

Now the interests of the people are not antagonistic to the interests of the highway builders. This statement may cause some of you to raise your eyebrows in disbelief. You may remember a particularly painful session; you may have experienced the bitter community rivalries which enter into highway locations. I sometimes suspect that the members of the Arizona State Legislature spend some of their time feeling like the shuttlecock in a badminton game—batted back and forth by the intense partisanship of residents of rival communities, and the highway commission.

You and I are not so naive as to believe that everyone in our growing areas will ever be completely satisfied with any governmental decision.

But the problem, as I view it, is one of mutual understanding and this will never be achieved unless, and until, there is a mutual trust.

If you and I are arrayed on the opposite sides of a question, and I view you with suspicion, and you regard me with distrust, we have created a situation which can never be resolved.

You people who are engaged in planning and building our highways in your respective states are seeking the kind of confidence which is measured by public acceptance of your official decisions.

You want to be assured that these decisions will, for the most part, be accepted and supported by the people who are elected to represent their fellow citizens in your State legislatures.

All of us, no matter what our station, no matter how humble our occupation, as individuals, are eager for the approbation of our fellow citizens. We are disturbed and concerned when our actions, which we believe to be well motivated, are met with sneering criticism. And let me assure you—you gentlemen have no monopoly on this type of destructive condemnation.

I can tell you for a fact that most men and women elected to public office are constantly subjected to criticism.

In the last 35 years in this land of ours it has become fashionable to be cynical, to suspect and to believe that those who hold public office, either by election or by appointment, are motivated primarily by a desire to feather their own nests.

The professional debunkers have been so successful in their attempts to downgrade American traditions that you and I must realize patriotism is regarded by some people as a corny emotion. The great leaders of this nation, past and present, are constantly subjected to snide criticism—to the well-planned jabs of the know-it-alls who profess to read into very public act an evil motivation.

You and I have inherited this situation, and it will never improve so long as we

merely hold meetings and lament the sadness of our situation.

We can counter with bitter, intemperate criticism in reply. We can dismiss these things as the outbursts of selfish men. We can say the public is dumb or uninformed or apathetic, and let it go at that.

We can enlist with those cynics who profess to recognize a hidden, selfish motive in every act of a governmental agency.

We can promote and develop an open warfare between the Members of the legislature and the administrators of our highways. But this is the course of destruction and ruin.

What, then, is the alternative?

I would suggest that first of all you and I must grant to the other individuals with whom we must deal the same charity of honest motivation which we like to maintain for ourselves.

There will be differences of opinion. But let us not dismiss an honest difference of opinion with the charge that the proponent of the opposite course is guilty of selfish motivation. When questions are asked which seem to imply by their phrasing a suspicion of our actions and our motives, we can resist the natural human reaction to respond in kind, and instead, make a full and frank disclosure of all the factors involved.

Now I know that these decisions which affect the future of your State, the welfare of your people, are never arrived at easily or simply. They don't come down from some Mount Olympus in a neatly packaged form. They should be arrived at after an agony of indecision, after a careful inspection of all the facts, after a weighing of alternative possibilities.

And I would suggest that if we are to maintain the confidence of our fellow men, we must be willing to share with them every fact, every possibility, every alternative, and we must regard their suggestions as an honest attempt to help us solve our problems.

With the development of the Federal Interstate Highway System, many communities in our Western States are threatened with what they believe may be economic ruin as a result of the rerouting of a present highway.

In my State this problem of small city bypass has assumed enormous proportions, and the people involved believe they are fighting for their economic existence. The gas station operator who puts his pumps by the side of the road when there was only a trickle of traffic. The motel operator who built his units in advance of the needs of the traveling public. The small towns whose merchants believe much of their prosperity is dependent upon the highway traffic—I would suggest these people are entitled to share with you all the problems of highway relocation.

These individuals can only look to their legislators, themselves, and to their civic organizations for support. They can't pass the buck as some highway commissions have done, and blame the relocation on the Federal agency. And the members of your legislature who represent these areas would be guilty of extreme bad faith if they allowed the expressions of concern of their communities to go unanswered.

Too often for the design engineer, the area of concern becomes a matter of distance and topography. To the engineer planning a better tomorrow, it is entirely logical to him to select the most direct possible route and it is probably inevitable that in this forward progress some communities will suffer. But when their pleas are ignored, when their requests for a hearing are denied, when their viewpoint is dismissed as merely an expression of selfish interest, then I would suggest there has been opened a breach between the highway builders and the people which will never heal unless and until there is a recognition of mutual interest and a reconciliation of divergent viewpoints which perhaps must inevitably become a compromise.

Perhaps a simple answer to the question you and I are discussing today would be to say that highway commissions and highway departments need better public relations—I have refrained from using this phrase so far because too frequently the term "public relations" merely means the employment of slick techniques to confuse or persuade the other fellow that the decision you have already made is really the right one.

High priced publicity men in an organized campaign of newspaper stories, surrounded by all the trappings of the pageantry of press-agentry, is a paltry substitute for public understanding; and I would submit that what is required to solve this situation is not public relations, but public understanding.

As an elected member of the legislature of my State, I am constantly at the command of my constituents. My first responsibilities are to a certain number of people in a certain geographical area. I must account for my stewardship every day of my life, for as long as I serve in this capacity I belong to these people.

Am I wrong as a representative of these people to repeat the questions they have asked of me when impending decisions regarding highways concern them?

Is it wrong for a State senator or a member of the house of representatives to use his talents and his ability to defend and protect the interests and the welfare of the people who elected him?

Every constituent in my county feels, and justifiably so, that I represent him and his particular interest. Should I fail to do so, I should be remiss in my oath of office.

Does this then postulate a situation which is impossible of solution? I think not. But it is a situation impossible of solution unless there can be mutual trust, mutual understanding, and a mutual willingness to consider the other fellow's point of view and to effect a compromise which will provide the greatest good for the greatest number, and do the least injury to the citizens who are adversely affected.

In the past several years, the interest and the publicity in the Interstate Highway System has, in a large measure, removed primary and secondary road projects from the front pages of the local newspapers.

Certainly the superhighways are wonderful devices to serve mankind. But man has other needs—he must find access to and from his neighbor's home, from his farm to market, from his community to the neighboring town.

Does it then seem so strange that men and women whose first concern may involve these primary and secondary roads should feel their interest is being neglected?

Let me make it clear—I am not accusing you gentlemen of neglecting this primary and secondary road interest, but I am saying that the public emphasis on the superhighway has operated in such a way as to create the impression in many areas of a great lack of concern for the primary and secondary road users.

Everywhere in our world today individual liberty is diminishing. Freedom is under constant assault. The concentration of power constantly operates against the dignity of man.

The very bigness of some of our projects defies comprehension. Certainly no highway engineer has time to visit with every citizen.

Certainly no highway commission could find the hours to discuss and debate every decision with all of the individual citizens who express an interest in highway building.

As our highway departments increase in size, as your task becomes greater, and your staffs become larger, there is that inevitable removal and separation from the people who, in the final analysis, will use the roads you build and will pay for them.

Bigness has many penalties. I suspect its greatest liability is to be found in this inevitable separation and, in such a climate of remote authority, arbitrary decisions are possible.

In moments of impatience, we who are convinced of the logic and justice of our position are tempted to regard questions as criticism, to avoid or evade responsibility by attributing a decision to some other agency or some other operational group.

Our world today stands divided. On the one hand, the advocates of the totalitarian philosophy proclaim that dictatorial decisions are more efficient. They support the theory that most individuals are either incapable or indifferent and, therefore, the voice of the individual must be discounted.

This is the philosophy expressed today by the Marxian materialists—but here in this great land of ours we still proclaim the importance of the individual, and despite the errors and mistakes of the past 35 years, we still operate a representative form of government.

This may not be the most efficient governmental system. This may not be the most economical governmental system. But for free men there can never be any other acceptable course.

And you and I who believe in the freedom of the individual, in the right of public expression, in the principles of representative government, are confronted with the responsibility of meeting each new problem with a firm declaration of that basic faith.

And I would say to you who are members of highway commissions, or members of the staffs of highway commissions, that you will maintain or regain the confidence of your legislatures when you grant to them the same trust that you would like to receive from them, when you speak to them of your problems with the same frankness you would elicit from them.

When you recognize the divergent pressures, and the sincere conflicts of interest which at times may compel them to adopt a position which opposes the official position of your commission.

Let us then, each of us, meet good faith with good faith. Let us devote some of our time and talents to the consideration of the other fellow's position, and, above all, let us resist the temptation to dismiss questions as criticisms and creatures of evil motive.

The highway into the future must be built, and we in America will build this highway, not alone with concrete and asphalt and steel, but the highway we build must serve more than the vehicular traffic. It must be more than a magnificent engineering achievement, for it will be built with the blood and the labor and the savings and the ingenuity and the genius of all America; and it will provide a pathway to freedom or a turnpike to slavery. Our children and their children and generations unborn will judge what we build, not by the alinement of a curve or the placement for a bridge or the total mileage, but by its usefulness as an instrument for the progress of the people of this land.

Gentlemen, more than almost any other professional group, you will shape the future. Let us build together for the progress of free men, based upon a mutuality of understand-

ing and respect, recognizing the rights of individuals to voice and maintain differences of opinion. Let us bring to every problem an openminded willingness to share with each other the problem of a decision.

When you are tempted to strike out blindly at those unreasonable fellows in the State legislature, please keep this in mind.

For all our failures, and for all our ineffectiveness, for all of our preoccupation with our own small worlds, we are together enlisted in a project to build a better America; to preserve that great legacy of freedom and independence and individuality which we have received.

To provide greater opportunity so that we maye make progress in transportation and science and the arts and the professions, to the end that all who live in this land may enjoy a greater realization of that purpose for which man was created.

Clif Stratton Writes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much has been written about the Khrushchev visit—and much has been said over the airwaves. We get many letters pro and con on this visit. Many of those who write commending this visit seem to do so on deep religious beliefs—that we should forgive and love our enemy.

To those persons I commend the following article written by a longtime resident of Washington, D.C., and as a noted political writer for the late Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas—who served 30 years in the Senate.

Clif Stratton writes:

CLIF STRATTON WRITES

Welcome, Nikita?

Second Book of Kings, 20:

"12. At that time Berodachbaladan, the son of Baladam, king of Babylon, sent letters and a present to Hezekiah: for he had heard that Hezekiah had been sick.

"13. And Hezekiah hearkened unto them, and shewed them all the house of his precious stones, the silver and the gold, and the spices, and the precious ointment, and all the house of his armour, and all that was found in his treasures: there was nothing in his house, nor in his dominion, that Hezekiah shewed them not.

"14. Then came Isaiah the prophet unto King Hezekiah, and said unto him, 'What said these men? and from whence came they unto thee?' And Hezekiah said, 'They are come from a far country, even from Babylon.'

"15. And he said, 'What have they seen in thy house?' And Hezekiah answered, 'All the things that are in mine house have they seen: there is nothing among my treasures that I have not shewed them:'

"16. And Isaiah said unto Hezekiah, 'Hear the word of the Lord.

" 'Behold the days come, that all that is in thine house, and that which thy fathers have laid up in store unto this day, shall be caarried into Babylon: nothing shall be left," saith the Lord.' "

The more it changes, the more it is the same.

Memorial to Judge William Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, even in the rush of these closing days of our 1959 session of the 86th Congress, I would like to take this opportunity to memorialize one of our former Members who served briefly in 1948, Judge William Lewis of London, Ky., and who represented my district in the U.S. Congress during that year and who has now passed out of this mortal life at the age of 90 years at his home in Kentucky, on August 8, 1959, after a lingering illness of several years' duration.

I knew Judge Lewis during the days of his maturity as a lawyer and a judge and as a public figure in southeastern Kentucky. He was always kind, affable, congenial, and courteous. Never did I see him in anger or exhibiting a spirit of vindictiveness toward his fellow man. He was a scholarly man and one of the ablest lawyers down in my part of Kentucky. He understood the mountain people and their homespun philosophy and their humble origin. He himself had the same philosophy and origin, for he came from the humblest of the humble. Although his fill-in term of service was very brief, yet he must have impressed quite a few Members of this body with his native ability and his pleasing personality because several who served with him have inquired about him since I became a Member of Congress.

Judge Lewis' career in public service covered half a century. For 18 years he had been judge of the same circuit—made up of Clay, Laurel, and Jackson Counties.

His son, Ray C. Lewis, London, served later the same district as circuit judge.

On April 24, 1948, he was elected to Congress to serve out the remainder of the term of the late John M. Robsion, Sr. This was in the strongly Republican Ninth District, which is now the Eighth.

The Democratic Party leaders made one attempt to nominate a candidate, but were prevented by a flood from holding a scheduled convention. So only write-in votes opposed Judge Lewis in the special election. He won easily.

But he had had a much harder time in the deadlocked nominating convention on April 2, 1948, at London. County chairmen and chairwomen from the 17 counties in the district voted to select a nominee. Thirty-two people voted and 17 votes were needed for the nomination.

Five men were placed in the race, but after several ballots there were 15 votes for Lewis, 15 for John M. Robsion, Jr., son of the late Congressman, and 2 for Charles L. Seale, Booneville.

The tally remained unchanged for three ballots. Judge Lewis was backed by former Gov. Simion Willis' faction of the party.

After the seventh ballot the younger Robsion withdrew. He said,

It is harmful to the party to continue this deadlock. While we all have our personal ambitions, there comes a time when somebody has to give.

On the eighth ballot, Judge Lewis won with 27 votes to 4 for Seale.

Mr. Robsion later moved to Louisville and was elected to Congress from the Third District and is the GOP nominee for Governor this year.

Judge Lewis did not seek reelection in the fall of 1948.

He was born in Perry County, Ky., on September 22, 1868. He was educated in public schools in Perry and Leslie Counties and in Hyden High School and Laurel County Seminary. A private tutor taught him law.

In 1890 he became Leslie County sheriff. He was named Leslie County school superintendent in 1894. In 1899 he was elected to the Kentucky General Assembly.

From 1903 to 1909 he was Commonwealth's attorney in the 27th judicial district. He served as circuit judge of that district from 1909 to 1921, and from 1927 to 1933.

Survivors include his wife; the son, Judge Ray Lewis; and a daughter.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to the family and many friends and relatives of Judge Lewis my deepest sympathy in the loss of this well-loved man and able leader from my part of Kentucky.

Congressman Moore To Tour District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress draws to a close, we all are looking forward to an opportunity to return to our respective States and visit and talk with the people whom we have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

Inasmuch as the First Congressional District of West Virginia is only an hour's time from Washington by modern air travel, I have made every effort to spend as much time in my district even while the Congress was in session. This has permitted me to better help and assist the people in my district and has given me a better than average knowledge of conditions in West Virginia and how the folks back home feel on particular legislative issues. Also, throughout the session, I have maintained an office in the district to better serve my constituents, and I have made a great many personal appearances and speeches in the seven counties which I represent. However, the limited time which I have been able to spend in my district has not permitted me to travel about as much as I would like, and to talk with persons who have problems on

which I, as their Congressman, might be of assistance. Consequently, I am looking forward to adjournment as a time when I might visit each community and hold regular office hours during which time persons might drop in to say hello or to sit down and discuss specific problems.

In preparation for these annual visits in each community, I have made arrangements for office space in various courthouses, post offices, and other civic buildings where it will be convenient to meet and privately discuss problems with individuals, who might want to see me. The following schedule has been arranged and in each instance the time shown is local time in the particular community:

Tuesday, September 29, Hancock County: 10 a.m. to noon, courthouse, New Cumberland; p.m. to 5p.m., post office building, Weirton.

Wednesday, September 30, Brooke County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., courthouse, Wellsburg.

Thursday, October 1, Ohio County: 9:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., fourth floor, post office building, Wheeling.

Tuesday, October 6, Taylor County: 930 a:.m. to 4:30 p.m., post office building, Grafton.

Wednesday, October 7, Marion County: 9:30 a.m. to 5 p.m., courthouse, Fairmont.

Thursday, October 8, Wetzel County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, courthouse, New Martinsville; 1 p.m. to 4 p.m., city hall, Hundred.

Wednesday, October 14, Marion County: 9:30 a.m. to 12 noon, post office, Farmington; 1:30 to 4:30 p.m., city hall, Rivesville.

Inasmuch as my district office is situated in Moundsville and is open to the general public 6 days a week, I have scheduled no courthouse visit for Moundsville but my constituents from that area are invited to present any problems they may have at any time to me personally in my district office.

These visits in the various cities and towns are as informal as we can possibly make them, and workers, businessmen, and housewives are urged to drop by for a chat. No appointments are necessary and all persons are welcome to come as "they are" to see and visit with their Congressman. I hope the tour this year will be as successful as it was last year when we had several hundred people each day stop by our "mobile" office to let me know their feelings on various matters.

As I have stated, my district office, located in the Mercantile Bank Building in Moundsville, is open 6 days a week to serve the residents of the First Congressional District. When I am out of the office on official business, there is always a competent member of my staff available to answer questions or assist persons with their problems. I always welcome having my friends call upon me whenever my services might be of particular assistance.

The Farm Problem Must Be Attacked on Many Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under dates of July 7, 8, 9, 20, and August 3 and 12, I included in the RECORD articles in a series on the farm problem prepared by Alvin F. Bull, managing editor of Wallaces' Farmer. I wish to include today the final article in this series which appeared in Wallaces' Farmer on September 5, 1959. I sincerely hope that all Members of Congress will take the time to read these timely articles on our agricultural problems:

HERE'S WHERE TO START—THE FARM PROBLEM MUST BE ATTACKED ON MANY FRONTS

(By Al Bull)

Rising farm production has swamped the domestic food market and overflowed into a huge Government storage program.

At the same time, declining farm prices plus rising operating costs have put a squeeze on net farm income.

There's no single, easy cure for an ailment so complex. The only real answer is to attack the problem on several fronts at the same time.

The attack has two major areas: (1) building bigger markets, and (2) reducing supply.

We all prefer the first. But a previous article (New Markets) in this series pointed out that efforts in this direction alone will not be enough. However, they can whittle down the size of the surplus.

BIGGER MARKETS

Here are steps we can take to move more farm products:

1. Use a food stamp plan, or other means, to distribute surplus food to needy people.

2. Continue research on nonfood uses for farm products.

3. Turn consumers to foods requiring more agricultural production resources. From a breakfast of corn flakes to one of bacon and eggs, for example.

4. Boost exports. This offers the greatest hope—if food is tied to economic planning (including education) in underdeveloped nations. Such a move requires long-term, rather than year-to-year food commitments.

Even if these posibilities were all pushed to their practical limits, they will not handle our average annual surplus. So supply control of some sort is the likely companion to the above measures.

In recent years, most of our supply control has been the storage of grain to keep it off the market. Storage costs zoomed as the grain piled up. Most folks now realize that storage without strict production controls gives only temporary relief.

The best way to reduce output is to transfer some land, labor, and capital from agriculture to other uses. Or let some of these inputs lie idle.

Low prices can force the transfer or idling of these inputs. But this method soon bankrupts even good farmers, and depresses the whole economy. So it is better to encourage, rather than force, such changes.

LONGRUN SUPPLY CONTROL

The surplus problem threatens to be with us for many years to come. So at least some of the adjustment should be long range.

Here are some long-range steps we can take:

1. Increase vocational guidance and counseling. This could help steer capable farm boys with an opportunity to operate an adequate unit into farming. It could guide those without this opportunity into occupations where they will be better paid.

Earl O. Heady, director of the Center for Agricultural and Economic Adjustment, put it this way in a recent talk:

"We predict for a sow what she will be worth in the future; or we can tell what she is worth at a half dozen different markets. But we don't predict for a farmer's son his worth at different locations and in different occupations.

"Which is more important, the sow or the boy?"

2. Improve the reporting of job opportunities throughout the Nation by State employment services. The best jobs may be outside the local community, even outside the State.

Suppose a young fellow on an unprofitable farm wants to take a job as a mechanic. It would help if his local employment office could tell him of openings in Des Moines, Cedar Rapids, Los Angeles, and Detroit, as well as in his local community.

T.H. Schultz, economist at the University of Chicago, has even urged a direct subsidy plus vocational training for farmers who want to get nonfarm jobs. He calls it homesteads in reverse.

3. Encourage industry in small communities. Some folks on small farm units have trouble making ends meet. Part-time work provided by industry is the happiest solution for those tied closely to their farm and community.

4. Educate rural people on alternative investments. Stocks, bonds, and nonfarm real estate may bring higher returns than new equipment or more hogs.

5. Emphasize business analysis, long term outlook, and agricultural adjustment in extension service activities. The better folks understand what is happening, the better they are able to adjust to the changes.

Nearly all the farm outlook information is for next week, next month, or at most, next year. Yet many farm decisions, including the decision to farm, cover a much longer term. We seriously need 5-, 10-, and 20-year outlook information.

6. Develop more land for recreation. Shorter work weeks and higher incomes have increased the desire for outdoor fun. People, as a group, seem willing to pay for it, too.

Unfortunately, these long term steps bring results slowly. They will do little to solve the problem next year—or even in the next 5 or 10 years.

So direct, shortrun measures for supply control are called for. These measures must, as far as possible, work in harmony with the long term efforts outlined above.

Of the inputs going into agriculture, land is probably easiest to remove. In the past, we've made some move in this direction but with programs that didn't get the job done.

SHORTRUN SUPPLY CONTROL

Marketing quotas, acreage allotments, and soil bank are aimed at supply control by reducng the acreage in production.

Both marketing quotas and acreage allotments have been unpopular with most farmers. Yet stiff cross compliance rules are necessary to make these programs work. They also tend to keep production from concentrating in areas with lowest costs per unit.

Production payments are mostly a means of transferring income to farmers. This method may have merit in short run situations, but it does not attack the heart of the problem.

A soil bank program seems most acceptable to individual farmers and to groups which must get behind any program that is to succeed.

Coupled with soil bank could be programs for additional recreation areas and other programs to shift land to less intensive use. From pasture to forest or from wheat to pasture are two examples to use.

A whole-farm soil bank is most effective in reducing output. If only part of the farm is taken out of production, labor and capital formerly used on the retired part goes to increase output of the remaining acres.

The whole-farm soil bank also encourages some older farmers to retire early. This reduces the size of the agricultural labor force.

Another step we can take soon is to trim Government programs which increase agricultural output.

Reclamation projects bringing new land under irrigation are out of step with the times. Such work should be delayed until the extra production is needed.

Parts of ACP could be dropped. Liming, tiling, fertilizing, and similar practices are output-increasing rather than soil-conserving.

The soil-conserving practices of ACP could be retained and justified on a general welfare basis. The same goes for our extensive research and extension service setup.

COMBINED ATTACK

A deliberate, overall program calculated to strike the farm problem at its core has been delayed too long.

Let's take all practical steps to expand our markets.

Let's get started on long range measures to make farming as profitable as other occupations.

Let's use short-term measures that are consistent with long-range goals to bring about the adjustment needed as quickly as possible.

A Hellenic Contribution to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, mankind is indebted in many ways to Greece and her people. For example, the glories of ancient Greece in her intellectual and legal contributions to mankind has left their imprint throughout the centuries, and despite the passage of time, are a living dynamic influence today.

As immigrants have come to our shores from many other countries, there have been immigrants come to our shores from Greece. All immigrants and their descendants have made their contributions to the progress of our country. And among them, none have made more contributions than Americans of Greek origin. Wherever they have settled, or wherever they are located in our country, they are industrious, hard-working persons, interested in civic and charitable activities—a good neighbor and fine Americans. Their patriotism and their love of America is above reproach. Their activities as Americans, and as a part of American life, national and local, are too numerous to mention.

Their latest effort—one of significant importance—of the American-Greek community in America, is the establishment in Boston, Mass., of our Nation's first Hellenic University.

This is a project of major importance to Americans of Greek blood and to America itself.

When this university is completed, it will be a direct link between intellectual and legal Greece of centuries ago, and of America of today and tomorrow. It will be a living memorial principally established by donations of Americans of Greek blood to the ever-living principles of truth that the great philosophers and learned men of ancient Greece gave to mankind.

For truth, once established, lives forever and cannot be destroyed. The exercise of truth may be temporarily suppressed by dictatorial governments, but can never be destroyed. And none knew this better than the philosophers and learned men of anicent Greece. And history supports this fact.

There are many fine Americans of Greek origin who are deeply interested in the success of this new Hellenic University. One of them is a close and valued friend of mine for many years, Judge John C. Pappas, of Boston, Mass.

At the Supreme Convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association—AHEPA—held in Los Angeles, Calif., on August 16–22, 1959, Judge Pappas delivered an address entitled "An Hellenic Contribution to America" relating to the dreams and ambitions of Americans of Greek blood to establish this proposed university.

Knowing Americans of Greek origin as I do, I confidently predict that they will establish this new proposed university and make its operation a great success and a real contribution to American life.

In my remarks, I include the splendid address made by Hon. John C. Pappas at the recent convention held in Los Angeles, Calif., on August 16–22, 1959.

I also include an editorial, "Athens in America," appearing in the Boston Traveler of September 2, 1959, and an article written by Richard Jacobson, appearing in the Boston Traveler of August 31, 1959:

A HELLENIC CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA

(An address by Judge John C. Pappas, supreme convention, American Hellenic Educational Progress Association, August 16–22, 1959, the Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif.)

Last year at this time, in my hometown of Boston, I enjoyed the rare privilege of speaking to the supreme convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association at its 1958 convention.

Last year I did not have the honor of being a delegate, but was simply a guest speaker. Today I feel distinguished to be among you as a delegate from the Boston Chapter of AHEPA.

I hope that some of you who are here today may recall that when I spoke to the convention last year I tried to remind the assembly that "our endowment is culture."

In my talk I tried to reactivate our interest and rekindle our pride in the Greek spirit that created the greatest culture ever known to man. I tried to remind our audience that the Greeks were the first intellectualists—that they had a passion for using their minds—that the Greeks were the first scientists, and that all science goes back to them.

That the modern Greek has not forgotten this is brilliantly demonstrated by Greek-born Dr. George M. Papanicolaou of Cornell University Medical College, who was described in a recent issue of Time magazine as the man "who has done more to save lives threatened by cancer than any other man."

The Greeks were the first people in the world to play—all sorts of games and athletic contests of every description, including, I might add with a blush, horse racing.

As that world renowned classicist, Edith Hamilton, who on her 90th birthday was made an honorary citizen of Athens, said, "to rejoice in life, to find the world beautiful and delightful to live in, was a mark of the Greek spirit."

This fierce possession of that spirit of life also included the concept of the liberty of the individual which brought about the world's first democracy.

But, most important of all, was the Greek character, which was to the Greeks a man's share in qualities all men partake of. The Greeks always saw things as parts of the whole.

These, then, were some of the cultural aspects—aside from the sculpture, the literature, and the relics of the incomparably beautiful buildings—which caused me to say last year, and causes me again this year to remind this audience that our endowment is culture, and that we have reached a point in our life in America where we must dispense this endowment through our own institution of higher learning.

I am speaking, of course, of the eventual establishment of the Hellenic University of America—using the existing facilities of the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School in Brookline, Mass., as the nucleus.

The provocative plan for the eventual establishment of our own university has been approved by the board of trustees of our theological school, and I am delighted to tell you that work started some time ago on the very first of the new buildings at the seminary, and that I am hopeful by the time I return to Boston the new building will be completed. Thus, the actual physical work on our own Hellenic-sponsored university has begun, and step No. 1 practically completed.

The board of trustees of our seminary has also unanimously voted to accept the creation of the charitable vehicle through which funds will be accepted for the eventual establishment of our university.

The charitable corporation through which the archdiocese will accept funds will be known as the Friends of the Proposed Hellenic University of America.

Without going into details let me read to you the corporate purposes and powers from the bylaws:

"To foster the charitable, educational, and eleemosynary purposes of the Greek archdiocese of North and South America, and more particularly for the purpose of expanding the physical facilities and educational program of the theological school of the archdiocese in Brookline, Mass., enlarging the religious instruction program of the said archdiocese, providing for the eventual establishment of a nonsectarian university with the theological school as a nucleus in said Brookline, Mass., to be known as the Hellenic University of America, provide financial aid to the patriarchate, and for such other educational and religious objectives as the said archdiocese may determine."

Thus, step No. 2—the medium through which we can accept funds—has been accomplished by the board.

Step No. 3—the acquisition of more real property contiguous with our present property—has also been accomplished. I am delighted to tell you that the theological school has just purchased 25 acres of land adjoining

its property, thus providing the land requirements for the eventual establishment of our university. You will be happy to know that the theological school now owns approximately 60 acres of desirable land which is more than sufficient space for the university we envison.

With the unanimous approval and finalization of these three steps—the adoption of the plan to establish the Hellenic University of America, the approval of the establishment of the Friends of the Proposed Hellenic University of America, as a means of raising funds, the acquiring of more real property—the board of trustees has been alert, astute, and farsighted. They should be commended for their wisdom.

The concept of the eventual establishment of the Hellenic University of America is a provocative plan, and goes hand in hand with the ascending dignity of our people in this country.

His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos and America's leading Greek-American industrialist, Spyros Skouras, are cochairmen of the fund-raising activities for the proposed university.

I need not tell you how fortunate the Greek community in America is to have two such distinguished men of vision and endless energy to provide us with their leadership.

His Eminence had planned to be with us on this convention, as you know. And he had planned to tell you of his enthusiasm for the eventual establishment of our university.

My dear friends, an hour before I boarded the plane in Boston for this marvelous convention I visited His Eminence at the hospital in Boston where he is convalescing from his recent operation. I am pleased to be able to report to you that he is now resting comfortably after suffering considerable pain. How fortunate we are to have this inspirational leader. His devotion to us is infinite.

In the short hour I was with him he told me of the deep regret he feels because he cannot be here with us. Of course, he sends his blessings.

He told me of the high regard in which he holds the AHEPA as an organization and of the affection he feels for its officers and members.

His Eminence reminded me of the many accomplishments of the AHEPA during its 37-year history—the many building programs and scholarship funds undertaken by the AHEPA to aid the cause of Hellenism in America; the leadership of the AHEPA in the fight for equality in immigration laws; the selling of over $400 million in war bonds during World War II; the contributions of the AHEPA to the Greek war relief program; the successful AHEPA hospital campaigns during World War II; AHEPA's support in justice for Cyprus; and, most recent of all, the completion of the AHEPA Hall for Boys at St. Basil's Academy, and the present construction of the AHEPA school at St. Basil's.

His Eminence agreed with me that the AHEPA firmly believes in the theory that education is everybody's business and that the AHEPA, with its laudable and generous activities at St. Basil's, has made this belief abundantly evident.

Because of AHEPA's firm conviction in education—its middle initial is "E" for education—His Eminence, as national cochairman of our fund-raising campaign, believes it is not only proper but natural that we should make our first major appeal to the Grand Order of the AHEPA.

I only regret that His Eminence is not here to convey these thoughts to you himself.

Unfortunately, also, Mr. Spyros Skouras is in Europe on business and cannot tell you personally of his enthusiastic interest in this exciting venture. But, only last month in New York at a meeting with His Eminence and with Greek-American lay leaders, Mr. Skouras had this to say relative to the university:

"There is still a considerable number of us who emigrated here. But the Greek immigrant is no more. We have now the American of Greek extraction. He is an integral part of the American community. He is now a citizen of substance and moral stature. Up to now, he has been consolidating his position, contributing to American life as a whole by his industry, by his eagerness to work and to learn, by his example as a law-abiding citizen, by serving his adopted country faithfully in peace and war.

"But now he wants to give more—he is in a position to give more. And he looks around. He wants to be identified with America, to leave a lasting monument to this great country of ours, to give something of greater, more lasting value.

"One of the great needs of America today is schools. With our rapidly expanding population, this is of paramount importance.

"Everywhere the cry is for more and more schools. Young people have difficulty in entering college. There are not enough to fill the demand. Other minorities have contributed toward that need. So will the American of Greek extraction.

"Let us give America another great institution of learning, equal to our existing great and world famous universities. A university where any American of any ethnic background will be proud to send his sons, a university toward the establishment of which any American will be willing to contribute.

"Such a university then will be the contribution of the American of Greek extraction to American life and culture. And such a university must have also a school of theological studies. This will fill the need for the higher, more rounded preparation of any theological student, but especially those of the Greek Orthodox faith."

If a man of Mr. Skouras' stature can find the time to analyze the situation as just described, surely we lesser lights can find the time to dedicate ourselves to this concept of a university sponsored by Greek-Americans.

Although I spoke about the Greek spirit, the university itself will be nonsectarian: And, to its halls of learning will be welcomed boys of all faiths.

As Mr. Skouras indicated, the Greek community in America will be rendering a great service to its adopted land by providing a much needed institution of higher learning.

According to all available statistics, the need for additional reputable colleges is fast becoming critical. Five years from now the need will be acute. All colleges with good standards are crowded, and admission to colleges of high standing is extremely difficult.

The establishment of a Greek-sponsored university in New England seems to me to be particularly appropriate because it was to New England shores that first came those seeking freedom. And, it was in New England that the first colleges were established.

I have talked with many persons associated with colleges and universities and they are thrilled with the decision of the seminary board to establish our university. They think it is a wonderful idea.

When His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos came to Boston last spring to break ground for the first of our university buildings we together visited His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, popular Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston. Cardinal Cushing was delighted to learn of our decision and said it was about time we did sponsor our own university. He said he would personally endorse it and would make a financial contribution toward its success as soon as the drive is commenced.

What better time than right now on the occasion of the 37th Supreme Convention of the Order of the AHEPA—to announce the opening of our campaign for $5 million for the establishment of our university.

What better way can we announce the opening of this campaign than by an outright pledge or contribution by the Order of AHEPA of a sum of $250,000, thus making this the first large gift to the campaign.

The AHEPA has done more than any other organization in the United States to unify Greek-Americans, and I am sure that you, as delegates, and the AHEPA as a whole, will respond to this appeal. And when we return to our homes we will be able to tell the members of the AHEPA who honored us by electing us delegates of the wonderful role that we played in the establishment of a university in their name.

[From the Boston Traveler, Sept. 2, 1959]

ATHENS IN AMERICA

For a long time Boston has taken pride in the artistic and intellectual assets that have made it known as the Athens of America.

And now there's reason for more satisfaction, as that description takes on the shape of literal truth in plans for establishing the Nation's first Hellenic University in Jamaica Plain.

The $100 million nonsectarian college, already under construction by the Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary, will add substantially to Boston's standing as a cultural and educational center.

It comes at a fortunate time—in the midst of America's pressing need for more colleges to accommodate a fast-growing student population.

And in emphasizing the Greek heritage, as it will, it will underscore the origins of democracy, to the benefit of all of us.

As important as anything else, the new university will serve as a focus for the fine relationships that exist throughout the Greek community in America.

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 31, 1959]

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR UNIVERSITY PLANNED BY GREEK GROUP

(By Richard Jacobson)

The Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary has bought the adjacent 25-acre former Bacon estate in Jamaica Plain and will build on it America's first Hellenic University.

The seminary, which now occupies a 35-acre site in Brookline and Jamaica Plain will be the nucleus of the proposed $100 million educational institution.

The university will be nonsectarian and dedicated to inspire and continue the heritage of Greek culture in America.

Although its support will come from Hellenes throughout the United States, Judge John C. Pappas, a moving force behind the development, emphasized that this "will be an educational institution which every American should and will support."

The Bacon estate was purchased at auction in 1941 by the late Vincenzo Barletta of Roslindale, a contractor. The latter's widow sold the million-foot estate, located off Jamaica Pond, to Judge Pappas, acting for the seminary.

The purchase price was not disclosed, but it was believed to be $200,000.

Judge Pappas said the Greek community in America felt that now was the time to establish a university—a time when higher education of the American youth was so vitally needed.

SAYS GREEK CULTURE HAS MADE UNITED STATES STRONG

"Greek culture has contributed so much in the past to make America strong" he said, "that the Greek community felt this heritage

should be encouraged and continued in full bloom in America and with American vigor.

"Hellenes are aware that only in education can we stop the advance of communism and dictatorship in the world. The future of Greek heritage lies in the inspiration we can give to our American youth and to those generations yet unborn.

"Only a university we can call our own—yet which will also belong to all Americans—can nurture that inspiration.

"This university—the first Hellenic University of America—will be our endowment in culture."

WILL SET UP CHAPTERS THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES

Pappas said chapters to support the proposed university would be established throughout the United States as foster alumni groups.

"Spyous Skouras, of New York and California, prominent business industrialist, will lead the campaign for the $100 million," Pappas said.

The first $250,000 building of the university is under construction and will be dedicated shortly.

It lies alongside the seminary, which is the Holy Cross Theological School.

The first structure will contain a library, classrooms, and a gymnasium.

The cost was underwritten by Judge Pappas, his brother, former U.S. Amdassador Thomas A. Pappas, Angelos Cotsidas, and Theodore Tonna, all of New England.

Pappas said Massachusetts was chosen as the site for the university because of the presence here of other great religious and educational institutions, such as Boston College, Tufts, Boston University, and Harvard.

He also cited, as an example of what an ethnic group could do, the amazing growth of Brandeis University under the auspices of the Jewish people.

"I am a member of the board of trustees of Brandeis," he said, "I have seen this educational institution rise in 10 years into one of America's mightiest schools of higher learning for all Americans."

Why a Labor Day?—It's an Old Tale

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress, as well as the Nation, an editorial by J. Spencer Gray, editor of the Herald, of Westchester. This, the 1st session of the 86th Congress, will go down in history for its active participation in the enactment of legislation to protect and safeguard the rights of the laboring man. I, therefore, deem it only appropriate to salute the workers of our great country on this, their national holiday, with the following summary of events by Mr. Gray in observance of Labor Day:

Labor Day can be variously defined as: the end of summer; the beginning of the school year; a Westchester traffic jam; or simply an excuse for a long weekend away from the office.

But the founder of the holiday, Peter J. McGuire, conceived it as a tribute to "the industrial spirit, the great vital force of every nation."

In 1882, McGuire, a leader in the Knights of Labor, proposed that a day be set aside to honor the workingman. He suggested the first Monday in September, since it came almost midway between Independence Day and Thanksgiving Day.

The Central Labor Union of New York adopted his proposal and held the first Labor Day celebration on September 5. As McGuire had suggested, the union paraded through the streets of Manhattan, to show the strength and spirit of trade and labor organizations.

Shortly after, the Knights of Labor voted for an annual celebration. In 1884, the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada—predecessor of the American Federation of Labor—voted to make the celebration national.

The first State to make Labor Day a legal holiday was Oregon, in 1887. The Legislatures of Colorado, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York quickly followed suit and, in 1894, Congress made Labor Day a national holiday.

Labor Day now ranks with Independence Day, Washington's Birthday, and Thanksgiving Day as the most generally celebrated holidays in the United States.

Is Space the Way to Peace and Abundance?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] is not only one of the ablest but one of the most devoted and serious-minded Members of the Congress, enjoying the respect of his colleagues and the confidence of Speaker RAYBURN and myself. He is one of the most active members of the newly established, important Committee on Science and Astronautics and is chairman of one of its subcommittees.

Congressman ANFUSO attended the 10th Annual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation that was held in London, England, on September 4, 1959, and delivered a splendid and imformative address to the members attending this particular congress. The address being entitled "Is Space the Way to Peace and Abundance?"

In my remarks I am pleased to include the excellent address made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO]:

IS SPACE THE WAY TO PEACE AND ABUNDANCE?

(Address by the Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO at the 10th Annual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation, London, England, September 4, 1959)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of this congress, and guests, at the outset, I wish to congratulate the members of the International Astronautical Federation and particularly its illustrious president, Mr. Andrew G. Haley, for bringing us together. Mr. Haley, as an organizer and as a pioneer in the field of international cooperation and space law, has no peer.

As a member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, I feel that on this occasion we can share a few thoughts of common interest.

Let us first face the fact that never in its history has the world been so near to destroying itself; that never before has so much deception in diplomacy been practiced and that never has there been so much talk of peace, while all the planning is for war. The situation is like inviting someone to your home for dinner, while making arrangements for his demise.

It is in this kind of world that we must seek the ingredients for peace.

We know that man has already discovered a new world—many times larger than the world Columbus found—but it is one of unexplored horizons. We have opened the door to the heavens' pathless way. The questions now being asked are these: Will, what we find there, be good or evil? Will it prove to be a boon to humanity, or are we getting nearer to the day of destruction?

As we look back over the recent past, it is hard to believe that man's efforts to penetrate outer space came to fruition less than 2 years ago. Prior to that time, most people regarded satellite orbits and interplanetary travel as nothing more than the fantasies of children or visionaries, of comic-strip cartoonists or science-fiction writers. During these past 2 years everyone has come to recognize that the practicality of space flight has been demonstrated. The impact of all this on people's minds has been unprecedented. Of all the wonders wrought by the progress of science and technology, it seems to me that none before—not even nuclear energy—has opened such vistas for mankind. Certainly none has ever promised to free us, while still alive, from the earth itself.

At this great international gathering, it is fitting to review the material benefits, in new knowledge and the practical applications thereof, which we may reasonably expect from man's future explorations in outer space. No less important is it for us to consider the prospects that may be offered for permanent world peace. But we must not let ourselves be so dazzled by these glittering possibilities that we forget the deeper meaning of our emergence into outer space. I refer, of course, to man's moral sense, his curiosity and capacity for wonder, his faith and reverence in God, and his spirit of adventure.

I shall not waste the time of this learned audience with details of the possibilities which the exploration of space has to offer. As a layman, I am interested in the practical aspects of these discoveries and particularly how this will affect our daily lives. I am interested, for example, in the observation made by Dr. James Van Allen who said that the progress of space science and technology will bring (and I quote):

"A rich and continuing harvest of important practical applications. Many of these applications will be of military value; but their greater value will be to the civilian community at large."

Dr. Fred Whipple, Director of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory, said:

"Weather forecasting, in my opinion, will become a science instead of an art. I predict that its value to the country will greatly outweigh the cost of the entire (space) program."

Dr. Wernher von Braun said that communication satellites will not only pay for themselves, "but pay for trips to the moon and other ventures in this business."

The few examples I have cited could be multiplied many times. They are the serious predictions of responsible and eminent men.

I am convinced that the expansion of knowledge and its applications can be speeded up by providing greater incentive for scientific and engineering efforts. Accordingly, I introduced a bill in Congress in April of this year, known as H.R. 6288. It

calls for the creation of a Presidential Medal of Science, which is to be awarded to persons who make outstanding contributions in the physical, biological, mathematical or engineering sciences. Needless to say, achievements in the space sciences and technology are included. My bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives on August 19, 1959, and 2 days later by the Senate of the United States. I trust that this law will serve as an incentive for further scientific progress.

I am further convinced that the progress of space science and technology and the peaceful uses of outer space will be greatly facilitated by a full partnership of cooperating nations. Many projects in outer space, which could benefit all mankind, would be literally impossible without international cooperation, for example, if they required the use of worldwide tracking or telemetering equipment or of launching sites in certain geographical locations. Costs alone will prevent some nations, or even any one nation, from undertaking certain ambitious space operations. Some of these space projects can be done better and more cheaply if they are carried out as joint enterprises of two or more nations.

There is reason to hope that a good deal of international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space will be forthcoming in the foreseeable future. A good beginning has already been made. The cooperation of many nations in the International Geophysical Year (IGY) and the Committee on Space Research (Cospar) established by the International Council of Scientific Unions, has been most encouraging. Even the United Nations ad hoc committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has produced some valuable results, although several nations have refused to participate in its work on the ground that its membership is unrepresentative. This situation should be corrected as soon as possible.

I propose that all governments interested in the peaceful uses of outer space should create a Committee on Space Cooperation, with fair representation from the Communist and non-Communist worlds. In my opinion, the Committee should be established within the framework of the United Nations. In any event, its functions would be the exploration and development of outer space in the common interest of all mankind. If subcommittees were subsequently formed in the various member nations, I would hope that in my own country, at least, suitable representation would be provided for science, industry, and the Government, and that both the legislative and executive branches of Government would be represented in its membership.

The challenge of outer space demands a full and true partnership, first among nations, then among science, industry, and government. To deny such participation in the peaceful exploits into outer space would widen the no man's land barrier presently existing between the Western and Communist worlds and would invite further full-scale competition. The discoveries then, on both sides, could easily be diverted, not to create a peaceful and closer knit world of abundance where no one need be in want, but to create even more menacing ways of destroying the world than we have today. Thus we would all be the losers in such competition.

Prior to attending this meeting, I addressed letters to both President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Khrushchev urging that they discuss this one area of possible agreement as a step toward world unity. I have further suggested that this proposal be given consideration by the United Nations and the NATO powers prior to the meeting of the heads of state.

An example of what can be done by joint peaceful cooperation is the agreement reached in April of this year between the United States and Canada in ionospheric research.

Another example is the agreement announced only July 29 of this year between the United States and Great Britain under which agreement British scientists will prepare the instrumentation for satellites to be put into orbit by the United States.

Still another forward step in the joint use of outer space is being taken by the International Telecommunications Union, which is meeing at this moment in Geneva.

I believe that agreement on space frequencies could set a pattern for multilateral cooperation in other space activities. Through their partnership in outer space, nations can learn the ways of meaningful cooperation on earth. Certainly cooperation is a more fruitful and more effective method than coercion—or even mere coexistence—if our goals are peace and abundance.

Whether mankind's emergence into outer space will serve the cause of peace is still a matter of hope, rather than conviction. It is true that space technology can be used for either peace or war. For that very reason, however, war has become all the more obnoxious and impractical. General Lemnitzer, the U.S. Army Chief of Staff, predicted recently that missiles will soon create "strategic nuclear disarmament," becoming so numerous and relatively invulnerable that no attack can prevent retaliation.

Regardless of such military considerations, I feel strongly that an arms race to dominate outer space must be avoided. National rivalries should be confined to the earth—and, if possible, buried there for all times.

Some observers have suggested that enterprises in outer space will provide mankind with a moral equivalent of war. Early in this century, the American philosopher and psychologist, William James, made the following comment:

"What we now need to discover in the social realm is the moral equivalent of war; something heroic that will speak to men as universally as war does and yet will be as compatible with their spiritual selves as war has proved itself to be incompatible."

We may reasonably conjecture that in the vastness of outer space man may at last find a moral equivalent of war, to evoke and satisfy his longing for adventure, his fascination with the unknown, his need to be challenged and tested to the final limit of his strength.

In addition, it is fortunate that space technology may provide the means, at long last, to maintain world peace. The risk of surprise attack, for example, could be minimized by a system of international satellite surveillance.

Perhaps the immensity of the cosmos and the new knowledge of its mysteries resulting from space exporation will bring the peoples of the world closer together in new patterns of cooperation. Is it too much to hope that man's mind and spirit will expand with the scope of his activities?

Let me conclude by saying that space can be, if we will, a way to world peace as well as abundance. If earthmen can get together on this one thing—the peaceful exploration of outer space—then that very space can be the way to the creation of a world of abundance, making war outmoded and unnecessary.

For America's Coal Miners and Workers: Take Vittles Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE SILER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, on this Labor Day, which is a great holiday for all of our ordinary folks, including both the organized and unorganized workers of America, it is a good time to pause and reflect upon the treatment one creature of congressional action is currently according to a great many of those God created in His image among the ranks of persons who toil here in our country.

I am now referring to that governmental corporation, Tennessee Valley Authority or TVA, which seems to signify only "take vittles away" as far as the coal miners of my congressional district are concerned. TVA buys plenty of coal somewhere and at certain prices but only at such prices as to mean "take vittles away" for the average coal miner or at such prices as to invite bankruptcy and a nonprofit operation for the average operator.

Not only does TVA seem to starve coal miners and operators in my own district but it also seems to follow a policy of "buy foreign" instead of "buy American" when it goes out into the open market to buy its turbines, generators, and similar equipment for its overall operations. Mr. Speaker, I would feel much ashamed to face my fellow Americans if I bought a car, or a suit, or a box of matches, of foreign manufacture. I would not want to save a few paltry pennies in order to "take vittles away" from those who go to bat for America in time of war and pay tax bills for America in time of peace.

I would like to insert the following article taken from the United Mine Workers Journal under date of September 1, 1959. This article emphasizes the problem and is very timely and its contents certainly should be pondered by the Congress that created TVA for the benefit of our people. The article follows:

NEWS FOR UNEMPLOYED AMERICANS

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which has just been handed a carte blanche by the Congress to do as it pleases, spent three times as much money on foreign-made equipment last year as during all the years since TVA's inception in 1933.

TVA reported domestic and foreign purchases totaling $125,936,788 during the Government fiscal year ending June 30 for materials, equipment, supplies and nonpersonal services.

Of this, $66,924,517 was for manufactured goods, such as turbines, generators and transmission lines; $51,931,238 for raw materials, such as coal to generate electricity, and $7,081,033 for miscellaneous services. The latter category included barging of coal, labor costs in installation contracts and the like.

Twenty-seven percent of the total money was for manufactured equipment purchased from foreign firms. This amounted to $17,900,000, compared with $5,600,000 on such purchases for all previous years since 1933. All but a small fraction of the foreign purchases went for generators and transformers.

About 41 percent of the total, or $51 million, went for coal purchases for TVA steamplants. This was $33.5 million less than the previous year, probably reflecting TVA's continued purchase of dog-hole, nonunion coal.

American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs Convention at Wilkes-Barre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. Joseph F. Lester, of Kingston, Pa., in which he encloses a résumé of the 1959 convention held in Wilkes-Barre by the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs, Inc.:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF POLISH CULTURAL CLUBS, INC.,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., September 4, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DAN: Thank you very much for your letter and your suggestion to have the story of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs convention held in Wilkes-Barre inserted by you in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanking you for your kind contributions in helping make the Wilkes-Barre ACPCC convention an outstanding one, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH F. LESTER.

RÉSUMÉ OF THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF POLISH CULTURAL CLUBS CONVENTION, 1959

The American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs, Inc. (ACPCC), held its 12th annual national convention at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., from August 4 through August 9, 1959. Theme of this year's conclave was thé millennium of Poland (A.D. 960 to A.D. 1966).

Approximately 150 delegates from 23 arts and cultural clubs, representing almost every State of the Union, participated in the convention activities on the Wilkes' campus. Plans for Poland's millennium program were initiated at the convention and committee members to work on the project were elected by members present. Heading the millennium committee will be Attorney Roman V. Ceglowski, from Detroit, Mich.

The American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs annual conventions provide not only a fertile ground for the exchange of ideas and experiences, but they also give opportunities to compare and to learn from each other. They wake up initiative and stir ambitions while teaching techniques to produce and promote an even higher quality in cultural presentations and performances.

The ACPCC functions as a national representation of local Polish-American cultural groups, which often use the name of "Arts Clubs," and of which the oldest is the Polish Arts Club of Chicago. The Polish clubs were formed and continue to form with the idea of giving their respective communities a better understanding and appreciation of cultural values, based on Polish inspiration or creativeness, both past and contemporary.

The preamble of the ACPCC constitution proudly states the existence of the organization as one that aims "To perpetuate and develop the culture created by our forefathers; to encourage higher education and scholarship among people of Polish descent; to foster in Americans of Polish descent a consciousness and pride in their own heritage; to spread the knowledge of Poland's thousand-year-old culture; to enrich the forming pattern of America's great culture by weaving into it the best from Polish source of inspiration and of accomplishment, we associate ourselves together."

And being the official representative instrument on the national level of all its duly constituted and affiliated organizations, the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs serves them by:

1. Maintaining a clearing house for the interchange of information and ideas which pertain to the promotion of Polish culture in America, and should be translated into initiative and action on a national scale.

2. Proposing program material and suggesting plans for cultural activities which would stimulate interest and provide member clubs with worthwhile guidance for the fulfillment of their objectives.

3. Encourage the formation of new cultural clubs, particularly in such communities where they do not exist.

4. Cooperating with other Polish or Polish-American organizations, or activities of a similar purpose in order to maintain close contacts with the creative forces of contemporary free Polish cultural life.

National president of the council, Dr. W. J. Wagner, associate professor at the Notre Dame Law School, was unable to attend the 12th annual ACPCC convention in that he had recently been awarded a Fulbright grant from the U.S. Government to teach at the universities of France for 1 year. His departure for Europe coincided with the start of the convention. First Vice President Thaddeus Siesinski, Polish Arts Club, Chicago, was acting president at the convention.

The following resolution was unanimously passed by the ACPCC delegates at the opening session of the conclave. This resolution was sent by telegraph message, August 4, to the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON:

"Whereas the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs is meeting in annual national convention, August 4 through 9, at Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; and

"Whereas this convention having received a message with wishes for a successful convention from Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; and

"Whereas we are convening here to evolve plans and means of enriching the American culture and heritage by acquainting ourselves and our fellow Americans with the achievements of the Polish People in the fields of arts, music, literature, and history, a people who have a cultural background which in 1963 will be 1,000 years old; and

"Whereas we Americans of Polish descent having been thrilled by the spontaneous, enthusiastic, and genuine reception given to RICHARD M. NIXON, Vice President of the United States, at his recent visit to Warsaw, Poland, this reception exemplifying the fact that the people of Poland have love and respect for the United States, its people, and form of government: It is hereby

"Resolved, That this convention send this resolution to Vice President NIXON; and that it be further

"Resolved, That, we the delegates, convening here respectfully request that Vice President NIXON give a message to this convention concerning his impressions of his visit to the people of Poland."

In answer to this resolution, Vice President RICHARD NIXON sent the following letter to the ACPCC convention chairman, Joseph F. Lester, Kingston:

"DEAR FRIENDS: This is just a note to thank you for wiring as you did on August 6. Your thoughtful good wishes expressed through the resolution of the National Convention of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs is most gratifying. I can assure you, and I want you to know how deeply I appreciate your most generous comments regarding my recent visit to Poland.

"I can recall no more heartwarming experience than that which occurred when we arrived in Poland, and we shall always remember the great warmth, affection, and friendship expressed to America by the Polish people.

"Again, I should like to thank you for your kind thoughts, and I welcome this opportunity to send to all of you my very best wishes for the future.

"Sincerely,

"RICHARD NIXON."

A. J. Drexel Biddle, major general, the adjutant general, was unable to attend the convention but the following excerpt is part of the letter he sent to the convention chairman:

"The President's proclamation of Captive Nations Week is, for me, a source of real satisfaction, and I feel confident that you share my reaction.

"My thoughts and prayers are always with the gallant people in Poland. They may have been stripped of their rights, but the tyrannical forces of oppression will never succeed in stripping them of their spirit and faith in God.

"I send you my warmest good wishes for a highly successful gathering."

The following editorial about the ACPCC 12th annual convention appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader on August 5, 1959:

"With Poland in the limelight because of the official visit of Vice President NIXON, the convention of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs, opening in Wilkes College this afternoon, takes on national and even international significance. It is a most happy coincidence for Wilkes-Barre because of the added interest in the sessions which will continue until Sunday.

"Poland has a rich cultural background and has produced scores of internationally known figures in the arts through the centuries. It is the purpose of affiliated clubs, of which the Women's Committee for the Polish Room of Wilkes College is one, to preserve this heritage. The council itself coordinates these efforts.

"In the preamble to the council's constitution, there is this brief outline of its role in American life:

" 'To perpetuate and develop the culture, created by our forefathers; to encourage higher education and scholarship among people of Polish descent; to foster in Americans of Polish descent a consciousness and pride of their own heritage; to enrich the forming pattern of America's great culture by weaving into it the best from Polish sources of inspiration, and of accomplishment, we associate ourselves together.'

"The council maintains a clearing house for the interchange of information and ideas, pertaining to the promotion of Polish culture in America. It suggests cultural activities and provides guidance to clubs for the fulfillment of their objectives. It cooperates with other organizations and maintains close contacts with the creative forces of contemporary Polish cultural life. The council's principal task is one of initiative and inspiration.

"Its projects have covered a wide range. They include the Norwid literary contest, the Marcella Sembrich Kochanska voice contest, and the Mickiewicz centennial. The convention theme this year is the Millennium of Poland, the national observance of which

will be ushered in here, no small distinction for the community as well as the organization. The public will become increasingly aware of this in the years immediately ahead, with the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs spearheading the movement.

"It is fitting that the 1959 gathering of this distinguished body should be held at Wilkes-Barre which has made so considerable a contribution of leadership to organizations of Americans of Polish extraction. Currently, Charles Rozmarek is president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, and Dr. Joseph Kocyan is chairman of the board of the Kosciuszko Foundation, to cite two of many examples. Joseph Lester is an officer of the American Council of Polish Cultural Clubs and convention chairman. Nowhere could the council meet where it would be more at home.

"It is a privilege to join with President Eisenhower and other notables in extending greetings to the city's guests for the next 5 days and wish them well in their efforts to enrich our national heritage.

"Guest speaker at the ACPCC convention was Prof. Zbigniew Folejewski, internationally recognized authority on Russian and Polish literature and linguistics, who spoke about "Polish Literature and World Literature, A.D. 960 to A.D. 1966."

"In his address, Professor Folejewski traced the continuity of the Slavic traditions, customs, views poetic forms, and brought together the specific development of the Polish state and the outside influence, and the importance to world culture.

"Several problems he highlighted were the following: Kochanowski as the first Slavic poet of international reputation, Polish classicism as a reflection of close contact with the West, Polish romanticism as a national and literary victory in political defeat, Polish realism and symbolism as a continuation of the tradition and as an overcoming of one-sided national attitudes.

"Alexander Janta, executive director of the educational Paderewski Foundation, New York, presented color transparencies of the Polish royal treasures at the keynote session of the ACPCC convention.

"The Polish Royal Treasures Chest was established in 1957 under the auspices of the Paderewski Foundation with the aim of financing the preparation and publication of an illustrated monograph on the Polish national treasures temporarily stored in Canada.

"The unique national collection, evacuated from Wawel Castle in Cracow at the beginning of the Second World War, has been stored in Canada since 1940. In addition to the royal insignia, among them the Coronation Sword, the collection contains tapestries from the 15th and 16th centuries, rare suits of armor and arms and other objects of historic importance and artistic value. These are known to but a few art experts and historians as they have never been fully displayed in the West.

"Ancient Polish chronicles and documents of historical, literary, or religious importance have been added to the rescued collection along with the world's largest treasure of autograph musical manuscripts of Chopin.

"Color transparencies shown by Janta represented choice items of the collection from the photographs of Yousuf Karsh, master photographer of Canada. One of the tapestries included in the collection was evacuated from Poland at the outbreak of World War II. This tapestry is part of the Biblical set made in Brussels for Wawel Castle in Cracow on the occasion of the wedding of the Polish King Sigismunc Augustus to Catherine of Austria in 1553.

"The tapestry, entitled 'The Flood', is considered one of the most cherished possessions of the Polish nation, a prized object in the collection willed in 1571 by the King, a great patron of the arts, to his people.

"Among the honored guests at the concluding dinner-dance at Hotel Sterling, Wilkes-Barre, Pa., were: Dr. and Mrs. Stephen Mizwa; Representative and Mrs. Daniel J. Flood, Wilkes-Barre; Judge and Mrs. Bernard C. Brominski, Swoyersville; Judge Paul Selecky; Mr. and Mrs. John J. McSweeney; Dr. and Mrs. Kocyan; Mr. and Mrs. Fryderyk Janda, Minneapolis, Minn.; Dr. Eugene S. Farley, Wilkes-Barre; Miss Wojnarski, Wilkes-Barre; Mr. and Mrs. Pisczek; Mr. and Mrs. Joseph F. Lester, Kingston; Thaddeus Siesinski, Chicago; Dr. Anthony S. Mallek, Pittsburgh; Mr. aud Mrs. Vincent Znaniecki, Nanticoke; Mrs. Marie Sokolowski, Minneapolis, ACPCC president; Dr. Charles Allan Baretski, Newark, N.J.; Mrs. Mary Jane Gustafson, Minneapolis.

"Visiting delegates to the ACPCC convention attended mass Sunday, August 9, at St. Hedwig's Roman Catholic Church, Kingston, Rev. Joseph Losienieck, pastor, prior to returning home.

"Mrs. Marie Sokolowski of the Polanie Club, Minneapolis, was elected the first woman president of the American Council of Polish Cutural Clubs, Inc., at the convention.

"Her daughter, Mrs. Mary Jane Gustafson, of Minneapolis was elected secretary.

"Other officers named were: Dr. Charles Allan Baretski, Polish Arts Club, Newark, N.J., first vice president; Judge Joseph F. Swaicki, Polonaise Art Club, Cleveland, Ohio, second vice president; and Mrs. Henry Travis, Plish Arts League, Syracuse, N.Y., treasurer.

"Elected to the board of directors were: Dr. Lewis E. Yager, Detroit; Joseph Lester, Kingston, Pa.; Andrew J. Juskiewicz, Norwood, Mass.; Edward V. Stronski, Buffalo, N.Y.; Dr. Anthony S. Mallek, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Henry Szczyrba, Alliance College, Cambridge Springs, Pa.; Helena Przybysz, South Bend, Ind.; Mrs. Irena Jedrzejczak, Milwaukee, Wis.; Thaddeus Siesinski, Chicago, and Dr. Wienczyslaw J. Wagner, South Bend, past president.

"Elected to the millennium committee were: Dr. Anthony S. Mallek, Pittsburgh; Attorney Roman V. Ceglowski, Detroit, Mich., chairman; Miss Angela V. Zybal, East Orange, N.J., assistant secretary; John Wegerzyn, Chicago, Ill.; Joseph F. Lester, Kingston, Pa.; Aleksander Janta, New York City; Joseph A. Kalenkiewicz, Detroit, Mich., general secretary; Judge Joseph F. Sawicki, Cleveland, Ohio; and Dr. Wienszyslaw J. Wagner, South Bend, Ind.

"Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, though not of Polish descent, has shown and demonstrated a vitally keen interest in the propagation of Polish cultures which radiates from Wyoming Valley and to the whole United States.

Two Views on Iowa's Water Really One

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN V. CARTER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two items today which I think reflect the sentiments and attitudes of all thinking Americans with regard to flood control and the conservation of water, our most valuable resource.

The first of these items is an open letter to the Members of this Congress from Iowa. It appeared in the Ottumwa Daily Courier, the leading newspaper of a city which I have the honor to represent. It was prompted by the President's veto of the public works appropriations measure, which contained the first construction money for Red Rock Dam, a proposed project which would protect the city of Ottumwa from the ravages of the Des Moines River floods which it has known for so many years. I think that the column speaks for itself and clearly conveys the heartbreaking memories of loss of life and property, disease, and the other forms of tragedy that go with this type of disaster.

On the brighter side of a discussion of the water situation, I am including an article by Mr. Cecil Smith, a distinguished citizen and farmer of Fremont, Iowa. He has done a singularly thorough job of telling just what water resources mean to the farmer, whether in Iowa or elsewhere. I heartily commend his remarks to the attention of all my colleagues who are concerned with the future of America's water resources.

Mr. Speaker, although each of these articles is directed at a separate phase of our water problems, I think it is significant to note, and I cannot emphasize this too much, that flood control and water conservation both result from construction of a dam like the Red Rock. I am confident that this House will act in the interest of both city dweller and farmer alike through approval of the second public works bill this week.

[From the Ottumwa (Iowa) Daily Courier]

This is sort of an open letter to Iowa Senators and Representatives. Probably some of our readers will want to send clippings on to Senators TOM MARTIN and BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, and to Congressmen STEVEN CARTER, FRED SCHWENGEL, LEONARD WOLF, H. R. GROSS, NEAL SMITH, MERWIN COAD, BEN JENSEN, and CHARLES HOEVEN along with their own comments.

It's really not an open letter so much as it is a reminder of what happened in Ottumwa 12 years ago, and what can happen again. Needless to say, most of us in Ottumwa and in the Des Moines Valley hope these Congressmen pass over the President's veto the bill that provides a start for Red Rock.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Yesterday we had word here in Ottumwa that Ike had vetoed the public works appropriations bill. That's the measure that includes $1 million for starting the Red Rock dam. This is the same dam that we in the lower Des Moines Valley have been working for and hoping for during the past 40 years. We hope you can do something about it before Congress adjourns.

"It's pretty difficult to explain just how important this legislation is to the people of this valley. It's difficult, also, to report the extent of disappointment when word of the veto came. We appreciate the President's concern about spending and inflation. But we doubt that his budget officers fully appreciate our concern about our lives and our property and our future.

"Just a dozen years ago the river came down our valley in such volume that $20 million in damage was done in 2 weeks. Since then Ottumwa people have mortgaged their future to build flood protection works in the future. But one hand will still be tied behind our backs in the fight against floods unless Red Rock is built.

"Below are a few paragraphs from bulletins the Courier published during that 1947 flood. They do not tell the full story, of course. But they dramatically remind us

of our danger, and of our need for that dam:

"'June 7, 1 p.m.: At noon, for the sixth straight hour there was little change in the stage of the river at Vine Street. The reading was 20.2 feet.

"'Everybody in Ottumwa and the surrounding flood area should have typhoid inoculation at once, warns city physician Ed Hoeven. Vaccine has been flown in by the Red Cross.

"'Officials at the police station said another drowning has been reported. With local boats smashed in the fast water, officials halted small boat operation and were waiting for large Navy crashboats and Coast Guard inboard motorboats. The Navy is also sending helicopters for rescue work.

"'The following neighboring cities either have sent or are sending drinking water: Oskaloosa, Grinnell, Sigourney, Hedrick, Lancaster, Mo., Bloomfield, Albia, Chariton. Distribution centers are being set up.

"'One hundred twenty-five Dain Manufacturing employees, marooned throughout most of the night and today, were rescued by a big inboard Coast Guard motorboat that had just been brought from Burlington.

"'Flood Relief Director Herschel Loveless said at 8 a.m. that the public must cooperate in staying out of the flooded and downtown areas.

"'For inoculation against disease identified with the flood, medical centers have been established. On the north side, go to the American Legion, and on the south side, to the Stuart school.

"'A police official said the department is being besieged for passes to go to the south side. He explained they are doing everything possible to get people out of the south side, and will not issue passes for anyone to go into that area.

"'South side residents are advised that they may get water from the swimming pool. North side residents will continue use of the Lister bags being filled on many corners.

"'A temporary morgue was established in the Red Crown bowling alleys, Fourth and Market Streets, this morning. Bodies of flood victims recovered will be taken there.'"

STATEMENT OF CECIL SMITH, FARMER, FREMONT, IOWA

Everyone should know what water is. It has been, and always will be a problem and a limiting factor in agriculture. Fewer people know that it is a problem and limiting factor in the expansion of industry, business, and just about every facet of modern living.

The supply of easily available usable water in Iowa and most other States concerns all of us. If industry is to expand in Iowa, which it must, and unless you live along the two rivers that border the State, the supply of water is bound to be a question of ever-increasing importance.

Rainfall, whether it shows up as surface water, streamflow, ponds, lakes, or wells, is the major source of usable water in Iowa. There is water deep down in Iowa, but this supply, though abundant, is nearly always mineralized and is expensive to develop and refine. So, for the foreseeable future, Iowa must depend on rainfall for our water supply. Fortunately, if we can make more of the rainfall stay in Iowa, we shall have enough for some time to come.

The water resources in Iowa have not changed much in 50 years, and unless some method of changing the climate, or practical means to induce artificial rainfall is taken, they are not likely to change in the next 50 years.

In the last half century, the average annual rainfall in Iowa has varied from a high of 44 inches to a low of 18 inches.

The average for 50 years is 31 inches plus, and this average varies from a high of 34 inches in the southeast counties to a low of 18 inches in the extreme northwest. Presently, 6 inches of this 31 inches runs off (sometimes in disastrous floods) and accounts for the streamflow in Iowa and so is carried away from Iowa. Twenty to twenty-two inches of the annual rainfall is used in the growing of crops, and seven-tenths of an inch is used for all other purposes. But this use is increasing very fast and probably will double in the next 10 years. All this often adds up to more than we have got and shows up in a water shortage somewhere in Iowa nearly every year.

It takes 6,000 gallons of water to produce 1 kilowatt-hour of electricity (there are powerplants all over Iowa). It takes 6 million gallons of water to produce a ton of synthetic rubber (there is a Firestone plant in Des Moines). It takes 10,000 gallons of water to produce a bushel of corn, and 200,000 gallons to produce a ton of alfalfa hay.

There are lots of other figures that could be quoted. There will be in Iowa, in 1959, about 12 million acres of corn; the average yield of corn has increased a conservative 20 bushels per acre in the last 25 years or so. Multiply this 20-bushel increase by 11 million acres, times 10,000 gallons per bushel, and you get a figure that ought to scare all of us.

In 1956, 250 farmers on 25,000 acres along the major streams in Iowa used water for irrigation purposes, as much water as was used by all of the nonagricultural users. It would not take much irrigation in Iowa to put some of our cities out of the water business.

The danger is plain to be seen, and if the State of Iowa is going to exploit its resources to the fullest, the conservation of the State's water resources must receive more and more attention.

Clearly any gain to be made must be made in the control of runoff, and runoff begins where the rain falls, which is out on the land. We have learned much and have accomplished much in the control of runoff. Much more needs to be known, and much more needs to be done.

What is and can be done is reassuring. Just a good rotation with a grass or legume included will reduce the runoff by one-half, as compared to continuous corn; add to a rotation mechanical practices, contours, strip cropping, terraces, and grassed waterways, and you can cut the remaining half in two. Multiply these savings by the 25 million acres of crops in Iowa, and you are going to fill up a lot of reservoirs, wells, and lakes, and even our streams, with much clearer water, and go a long way toward solving an important and near critical problem in Iowa. As impressive as the progress in soil and water conservation now is, only a fraction of the job is done, and at the present rate, it will take 50 to 100 years to accomplish the job. Will anyone say that Iowa can wait that long? Is there not a possibility that before too long, if present efforts are not accelerated, this problem may become so acute that land might be declared a public utility and, as such, be subject to regulation in the interest of public welfare? And who wants that?

Soil and water conservation, especially soil conservation, is not new in America. George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and others were concerned about it. Except for the last quarter of a century or so, it has been largely ignored, and as a result, millions of acres in America are eroded and depleted past the point of redemption.

A more serious and determined effort has been made in the last 30 years or so, and a number of governmental agencies are involved. All of them have been and are making very important contributions to this problem. To be brief, shall we mention three—the major ones, namely, the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization Committee, and the Extension Service. All three work together and supplement each other—the Extension Service for education, the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance, and the ASC for financial help.

Since 1940, 100 county soil conservation districts have been organized in Iowa. These groups, with the cooperation of a whole host of other agencies of all kinds, and, of course, with thousands of farmers, have made a very impressive record, but when you compare this record with what remains and must be done, it looks like only a beginning has been made. Progress has been sound but slow, and because of the impact this problem of water supply is having, and shall be in the near future, much too slow.

The President said in his state of the Union address to Congress, that this country needs a totally new farm program. Nothing could be more right. The present program is only a conservation program in part. True, it has encouraged, by conservation payments, the use of many conservation practices of great benefit not only to the participants, but to the country as a whole. But large portions of these payments, especially lime and fertilizer, have the most to do with fertility and crop production and if not accompanied by other conservation practices, contribute but little to water runoff or the conservation of the soil. However, the acreage reserve and conservation reserve were and are true conservation measures and can be of much importance. But the acreage reserve is being dropped. The conservation reserve, to be effective, should be greatly enlarged and augmented.

In the 26 years of the existence of farm programs in America, the original intent and purpose of the programs have been diverted by political expediency, the stimulation of production, and the relaxation of controls caused by two wars.

Crop controls (cross-compliance) have not been enforced. Production payments were made with no compliance and corn acreage allotments made in an unrealistic manner. This served to penalize thousands of honest cooperators. Supports have been lowered and the program made as unattractive as possible.

As a result of these and other mistakes, farmers have increased production (witness the intent of Iowa farmers to increase corn acreage in 1959 by 2 million acres) to maintain their income. Surpluses have increased. The cost of storage has multiplied, the principles of soil and water conservation have been ignored.

The cost to the American taxpayer has increased to a point past endurance. The whole program has been so mangled by these and other forces that little of the original remains. A new program, with a new approach is needed, and it must be bold enough, broad enough, attractive enough (by high supports or some other subsidy) to insure wide and uniform participation.

I think, as a lot of others do, that a soil and water conservation plan which has been developed over the years by the Soil Conservation Service and others, offers this kind of an approach.

The application would be much more uniform than that of the conservation reserve, because the conservation reserve tends to be concentrated on whole farms or parts of farms and will lack the general use that shall be necessary for the complete job.

A conservation plan carries within itself a great deal of crop control and would go a long way toward reducing surpluses, especially during the few years while it is being established. This will not be enough

to bring supply in balance with demand, but if further adjustments are needed, it makes a fair basis from which to start.

The machinery for the administration of this kind of plan is already in existence and can be easily carried out by the governmental agencies now in being.

The cost ought to be very much less than the present program. I believe that if a plan of this kind is offered to the American farmer and made attractive, enough of us will cooperate to bring supply nearer demand, and thus reduce surpluses, the cost of storage, and other ills associated with overproduction, and at the same time, a lot of soil and water is going to stay home where it is needed—not only for the benefit of the man on the land, but for the taxpayer and everyone else as well.

Let's have a new farm program, in the administration of which no farm operater shall be eligible for a subsidy of any kind unless the operator shows that he uses good and effective conservation practices on all the land operated or controlled by him. Let's begin with this and let any other objective be subordinate.

(Figures quoted here come from "Iowa's Water Resources," published by Iowa State College Press, 1956.)

Big Trade Deficit Is Sparking Move To Cut Aid Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I was greatly impressed with a story appearing in the New York Times for Sunday, September 6, 1959, concerning the big deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments and the effect that our foreign aid spending is having on the matter.

I believe the story will be of interest to every Member of the Congress, and I, therefore, insert the article in question in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BIG TRADE DEFICIT IS SPARKING MOVE TO CUT AID FUNDS—UNITED STATES WORRIED BY DECREASE IN GOLD STOCKPILE AND RISE IN FOREIGN ASSETS HERE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 5—The big deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments, with its resulting outflow of gold and buildup of foreign assets in New York, has begun to have a major impact on administration thinking about foreign aid.

Powerful voices, centering in financial agencies, have begun to argue that the flow of Government capital abroad in the form of aid is too large for the continued strength of the dollar.

The underlying belief in top administration financial circles is that there is an entirely new situation in the world economy, with European currencies gaining strength while the dollar is showing the first faint signs of vulnerability.

EMOTIONS IN CONFLICT

The immediate results of this view came in President's Eisenhower's trip to Europe, during which he urged that European nations undertake a far greater share of the burden of helping underdeveloped countries.

In a sense, the administration is torn between two powerful emotions. One stems from acceptance of the basic idea that the underdeveloped countries must be helped in the interest of the United States as well as for the good of those nations that get aid.

The other is a growing fear for the future stability of the dollar unless two related things happen: domestic finances are controlled and the balance of international transactions is righted. The U.S. deficit in international transactions was $3,400 million last year and will probably be even larger this year.

FUTURE SEEMS GLOOMY

As financial officials see the situation, it will do no good to anyone if there is a larger outflow of aid dollars but the dollar becomes of dubious value. This could happen, it is believed, if U.S. payments deficits continue on a large scale for many more years.

Such a deficit means that foreign countries as a whole obtain more dollars than they spend to buy American goods. They can take the difference in gold or can keep it in dollars and invest them in the financial markets in New York. These invested dollars are potential claims against gold. Already they total $15,651 million, not far below the gold reserve, which has dwindled to $19,524 million.

As the claims grow and the gold stock declines, U.S. short-term liabilities might eventually exceed assets. Even that would not necessarily mean a run on gold or some other crisis. But U.S. officials do not like to contemplate even the remotest possibility of such an event.

Besides, some of them, looking ahead, are unhappy at the thought of potential pressure on the United States from what, in effect, would be its foreign creditors. The United States, which has been exerting the pressure for years, does not want to be on the receiving end.

Foreign countries are already substantial creditors of the U.S. Government. They have invested about $6,200 million in New York in short-term Government securities. Thus, as one high official puts it, "we're borrowing short from foreigners at home and lending abroad long."

The recent deterioration in the U.S. balance of payments has come about mainly because of a drop in exports and a rise in imports, not because of an increase in foreign aid. But as financial officials view the situation, foreign aid is the one element in the total balance over which the Government has considerable control.

It is regarded as certain that the new line of thought in the administration will be a major theme in conversations with foreign finance ministers at the annual meeting here later this month of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

European countries have been running strong surpluses in their balance of payments while the United States has been in deficit. To U.S. officials this means only one thing: Europe should become a much bigger exporter of capital and the United States a smaller one.

NEW VIEW ON INVESTMENTS

Officials worried about international-payments deficit are even beginning to take a less enthusiatic view of investment abroad by American business. Up until very recently, this was welcomed on every count, by conservatives and liberals alike.

Now, with the payments deficit uppermost in many minds, an investment abroad is frequently seen as a double blow—first an immediate outflow of dollars, and, second, a probable setback to American exports. The export loss occurs when an American manufacturer, for example, builds a plant in Europe to share in the common market rather than try to sell goods made in the United States.

This feeling accounts for the Treasury's opposition to a bill to provide new tax incentives for foreign investment unless its benefits are limited to investments in underdeveloped countries.

A reflection of the growing concern about the international payments position of the United States came in the administration position on the Development Loan Fund in the foreign-aid bill. The President refused to support a Senate move to put the fund's financing on a long-term basis, increase its lending authority and get around the appropriations committees, even though the President's original position backed all three ideas.

Another reflection of the new line of thought, paradoxically, is U.S. support for the new International Development Association, even though this will cost the United States $330 million. Such a new institution has several merits in the eyes of an official worried about the U.S. payments deficit and the problem of the underdeveloped countries.

It puts Europe in the lending picture for the first time on a formal, multilateral scale.

Because it will be equipped to make "soft" loans—loans with easy terms and repayable in the currency of the borrower—it should eventually ease the pressure for a larger and larger Development Loan Fund in the United States. The Loan Fund also makes this type of loan.

Sovereign Rights of United States in Panama Canal Zone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Earl Harding of New York City in which he comments upon an address I made at Reading, Pa., on August 24, 1959:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *September 3, 1959.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
331 Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FLOOD: Your address on "Storm Clouds Over the Caribbean" to members of the Patriotic Order Sons of America at Reading, Pa., on August 24 as introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 26, 1959 by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER should be read in every high school and college history class and be made available in pamphlet form in every school and public library. It is invaluable as a brief and graphic summary of crucial dangers that now threaten our national security at the lifeline of our defense, the Panama Canal.

It is indeed heartening to those who have followed your campaign for recognition and protection of North American rights and interests in the Panama Canal Zone to see deserved commendation come to you through a certificate of merit from the oldest patriotic organization in our country. Equally gratifying is Representative WALTER's statement on the House floor that he is pleased to associate himself with you in the fight against communistic forces that will destroy, if they can, our sovereign rights in the isthmian area.

You condensed into 159 words at the conclusion of your address a five-point policy program for action. I believe all informed citizens of the United States will approve, as I do. But they must first be informed.

Public opinion must become acquainted with the background facts set out so readable in your address. And, furthermore, public opinion must penetrate the North American press blackout of news of Panama's attack on U.S. policy before the recent Conference of Foreign Ministers at Santiago, Chile. Panamanian newspapers have been filled with details and editorial approval of charges of treaty violations by the United States made publicly in that Conference by Panama's Minister of Foreign Relations, Miguel Moreno. Have you seen anything of this in our newspapers?

Are Panamanian politicians' claims to sovereignty over our Panama Canal Zone, their threats of peaceful occupation of the zone on November 3, their threats to take the United States before The Hague or the U.N. to enforce Panama's unilateral interpretations of our rights and obligations under binding treaties, and their reiterated demands for more and still more annuity pending ultimate expropriation of our canal by Panama, are these false ideas in Panama to grow into realities because they are allowed to go unchallenged and unanswered? Does the conspiracy of silence encompass both the North American press and the U.S. Government?

Sincerely,

EARL HARDING.

Franco Tricks the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, General Franco pulled a fast one on President Eisenhower recently when he arranged for his Foreign Minister to see him in London. Richard Scott Mowrer tells the story in the Providence Journal-Bulletin of August 28, 1959, and I include it here under unanimous consent:

A COUP FOR FRANCO: HIS FOREIGN MINISTER'S SCHEDULED VISIT WITH EISENHOWER IS SEEN AS A TRIUMPH

(By Richard Scott Mowrer)

MADRID.—A raising of diplomatic eyebrows, and not a little admiration, has been caused here by the ability of Gen. Francisco Franco's Foreign Minister to get himself invited to London to see President Eisenhower.

Despite the fact that the President's schedule is tight and that some of the NATO countries' representatives who would have liked to meet the President privately will be unable to do so, Spanish Foreign Minister Fernando Maria Castiella will be among the favored few August 31.

Why this should be perplexes foreign diplomats here. There is no problem affecting Spanish-American relations so serious or urgent that it requires discussion at such high level. It is presumed that the State Department's acquiescence to the idea stems from established American policy to encourage the Franco regime's endeavors to attain international respectability and ungrudging acceptance as a member of the free world.

For Spain the scheduled Castiella-Eisenhower meeting adds up to one of the neatest diplomatic coups ever pulled off by the Franco regime. The fact that the meeting is taking place in London makes it even better, for this reason:

In 1951 Castiella was persona non grata in Britain. He had been designated by Franco as his Ambassador to the Court of St. James, but the British wouldn't have him.

The rebuff stemmed from Castiella's record as an out-and-out supporter of the Axis during World War II. With the current Spanish Ambassador in Washington, Jose Maria de Areilza, he coauthored a book hailing the new order under Hitler and referring to Britain and France as "decadent democracies."

The book, "Reivindicaciones de Espana" (Spain's Claims), listed Spanish claims to various territories, including Gibraltar, in anticipation of the day when the Axis would win the war and divide the spoils. The book, published in 1941, was awarded the National Prize for Literature.

Possibly another reason why the British Government refused to have Castiella as Spanish Ambassador was that he had been a soldier in the ranks of the Blue Division, a Spanish unit which fought alongside Hitler's Wehrmacht on the eastern front. Castiella is a recipient of the German Iron Cross.

Since those days, Spain's Foreign Minister has changed his outlook quite a lot. He has worked hard, and successfully, to improve his country's relations with Britain, France, and other democracies. But there is a risk that a good many Britishers, particularly Laborites, will not forgive easily and that they may cause a rumpus when Castiella shows up in London to see President Eisenhower.

Meanwhile the fact that the British Government was not consulted before the United States invited Spain to join the party is omitted in the papers here. What is printed is a statement of a Foreign Office spokesman in London to the effect that "obviously we have no objection and are looking forward to welcoming the Spanish Foreign Minister to this country." What is omitted is the spokesman's opening statement: "it is true we were not consulted."

If the Spanish foreign minister has changed quite a lot since the war years, the regime's ideology basically has not. In fact it is a matter of pride with Franco supporters that it is the rest of the Western World that has come around, without the Franco regime having had to deviate from its authoritarian ideology. This theme was played up in 1953 when the United States signed the bases-for-aid agreements with Spain. Last month it was played up again when Senators STYLE BRIDGES and MIKE MANSFIELD and a number of Representatives said nice things in Congress about Spain's role in World War II.

The Franco regime never has formally repudiated its past association with Nazi Germany, nor has it felt the need to do so. It is true that there is little lamenting, at least in public, of the Axis defeat. But the press, which is controlled by the state and dutifully reflects its views, regularly omits news that would tend to divulge to Spaniards some of the worst aspects of nazism.

Poison in Your Water—No. 166

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the Woborn (Mass.) Times of October 2, 1958 entitled "Federal Action Urged on Oil Spills Along Northeast Coast":

FEDERAL ACTION URGED ON OIL SPILLS ALONG NORTHEAST COAST

A Federal action to control oil spills from merchant and naval vessels causing extensive damage to New England coastal areas annually was urged today by Chairman Edward T. Dickinson of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission.

At a meeting of the commission here, Mr. Dickinson pointed out that the oil spills "are responsible for a huge economic damage, which in many instances negates over a decade of effort by this commission to provide clean waters for the people and industry of the Northeast.

"The commission has made repeated representations to the Federal Government through the U.S. Public Health Service for assistance in the abatement of this nuisance, but there has been no action."

Oil spills from sea-going vessels, Mr. Dickinson said, cause extensive damage to the shell-fish industry, destroy the value of recreation facilities at beaches, create fire hazards at many places along the coast and cause upstream pollution through tidal action.

"For more than a decade, the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission and its seven member States have been working to bring the problem of water pollution in this area under control. A great deal of progress has been made through interstate cooperation," he said.

"However, pollution of tidal waters through wanton acts of carelessness now threatens to undo much of what has been accomplished here. It threatens one of the greatest economic resources of the Northeast. Unfortunately the individual States concerned have no control over the vessels which are committing this nuisance. Our only recourse is through the Federal Government, which so far has failed to indicated that it will act."

Mr. Dickinson noted that the Navy has been cooperative in controlling pollution of tidal waters through the installation of treatment plants at its New England bases.

"However, neither the Navy, nor the Coast Guard, nor any other Federal agency appears willing to accept responsibility for controlling oil spills from their own or merchant vessels," he said. "Instead, they have passed the buck from hand to hand, with the result that damage from oil spills is greater than ever before. If even greater pollution of the tidal waters of this area is to be avoided, the Federal Government must take the corrective action soon."

Mr. Dickinson is also commissioner of the New York State Department of Commerce. Mr. Dickinson served with the Federal Government as executive director of the War Production Board, as codirector of the foreign military assistance program, assistant to the Joint Secretaries of Defense and as Vice Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. Prior to World War II, he was research assistant to the chairman of the board of United States Steel.

Us or Laos?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE SILER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, I note in the U.S. News & World Report of September

7, 1959, the statement that U.S. aid to Laos has cost the taxpayers of our country $225 million since 1955. Laos is the little country in southeast Asia where the Chinese Reds are now coming across the border and trying to conquer this small, rugged bit of sovereignty and convert it to their own use and dominion. The headlines of our daily papers are right now full of Laos and the problem of Laos. Apparently the $225 million of U.S. aid has done nothing to secure Laos or to keep it out of the vest pocket of communism. The U.S. aid mentioned has paid for the following, according to the U.S. News & World Report:

1. A local army of 25,000 men.
2. Jungle highways, a power station, irrigation dams.
3. Health services, sanitation, development of farming, communications, mining.
4. Planning for future flood control, power, irrigation projects.
5. Training for teachers and technicians.

Although this $225 million donation may have done nothing whatever toward its intended purpose over in Laos, just think what it would have done for us—not Laos—in some of the underprivileged sections of America if we had sent the aid up the creeks and into the hollows of our own country. With this kind of help we could have built in all the school districts of Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia some adequate and badly needed school buildings; or we could have constructed badly needed flood control projects in every water damaged section in Kentucky and perhaps in one or two additional States besides.

I am willing that no one should ever treat Laos as a louse but I am wondering if it is not time for us to quit treating the good American in our own house as a louse.

Spanish Political Inquisition, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe this is the 20th century and not the 16th or 17th when we read of the recent tortures in Spain. Apparently the chief difference is that the persecution today is for political deviations rather than religious.

It is an unpalatable fact to accept that we must deal with such barbarous governments as Spain in the 20th century, but at least we can deal with them with our eyes open and remembering the old adage: "He must have a long spoon that shall eat with the Devil."

Under a unanimous consent previously granted, I am including hereafter an editorial from the New York Times of September 3, entitled "Meditations on Spain":

MEDITATIONS ON SPAIN

The favorable notices that Franco Spain has been receiving in and from the United States in recent weeks should not go without a corrective. Power politics have generally transcended what George Kennan once called legalistic-moralistic principles. Nevertheless, when the United States embraces a dictator it should be done with open eyes as well as open arms.

There was a reminder of this elementary principle in a new item published on Wednesday taken from the Times of London. That newspaper's correspondent had gone to Burgos, Spain, and written a moving and shocking story about the treatment of more than 400 political prisoners who have been in Burgos jail from 12 to 20 years under inhumane conditions.

About 2 weeks ago the Guardian of Manchester printed an editorial headed: "Spanish Torture." It called attention to protests made by the Madrid bar council and also by lawyers of the Barcelona bar. The former group condemned the Spanish Government "for permitting the use of torture." The latter sent documents to the Archbishop of Barcelona "describing in appalling detail how the strikers they defended last December were maltreated by the police so as to get them to confess."

This refers to 1959. On could go back to 1958 and each earlier year for similar stories. The Franco government, nevertheless, blandly insists that there are no political prisoners in Spain. If that is the case, why does it not allow foreign correspondents to visit a prison like that of Burgos so that they can see for themselves?

There have been recent protests in Europe about arrests and lack of freedom in Franco Spain—by the British Labor Party, the British Committee on Science and Freedom, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and university students in Belgium, for instance.

The practical reasons for our own toleration of the Franco regime are presumably being accepted by many Americans, but even those who accept ought to remember an old adage: "He must have a long spoon that shall eat with the Devil."

UAR Interference With Suez Canal Free Passage Not To Be Tolerated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, once again, Israel has been forced to lodge a complaint with the Secretariat of the United Nations on Egypt's interference with freedom of passage through the Suez Canal.

This is not a matter which concerns Israel alone. We are faced with an infringement of maritime rights and a fluoting of an international decision on the part of the United Arab Republic, which has gone a long way in establishing a dangerous precedent in the significant area of the freedom of the seas. Basic principles of maritime rights are being violated. It must be kept in mind that it is not only a matter of seizing Israeli ships but of seizing any ships which carry Israeli cargo, such as was done with the barring of the *Ingetoft* from transit through the canal because it carried Israeli cargo. This is only one incident in a long line of incidents.

Yet, the World Bank is seriously considering lending to the United Arab Republic a large sum of money for the enlargement of the Suez Canal. Thus, by indirection, we are placing ourselves in a dangerous position of incurring the continued violation of maritime rights. The World Bank should make no such loan just so long as the Arab Republic is using the Suel Canal as a weapon against a free State in its effort to strangle the economy of Israel. At issue here is not the enlargement of the Suez Canal. The need to do so might very well exist. At issue, is whether international commitments of the right of passage can be arbitrarily violated, and whether such violation shall be encouraged by the granting of the pending loan. Neither the Constantinople Convention nor the United Nations Security Council decision are sufficient, it would appear, to prevent the United Arab Republic from using the Suez Canal for its own political purpose. That the United Arab Republic could impound unlawfully and with impunity, mail bags and scientific equipment taken off Norwegian ships bound for Israel, is hardly an act that can be passably viewed by any of the adherents to international law.

I emphasize again that any active encouragement, among which I would include the granting of a loan by the World Bank for the enlargement of the Suez Canal, aids and abets the establishment of a precedent, which will some day reach forward to shackle us.

Time To Curb Excessive Jet Noise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the price of material progress is sometimes too high in terms of its effects on the health, safety, and comfort of human beings. Such an instance appears to be the increasing concern felt by many at the impact of jet noise on the people who live in the vicinity of airports which service commercial jet aircraft.

This problem is especially important at the major airports in the New York metropolitan area, including the Newark Airport which is adjacent to the district I represent.

I was pleased, therefore, to note that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held a hearing today at New York's Idlewild International Airport for the purpose of inquiring into the situation. I am hopeful the subcommittee will be able to offer constructive ideas, for it is apparent that the Federal Government has at least a measure of responsibility for controlling the excesses of jet noise.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, I include a brief item from the Sunday New York Times of September 6, which cites the particularly bad noise record of certain

domestic airlines using jet aircraft in contrast to flag carriers of other nations. I also include a longer story from United Press International which appeared in the same issue of the New York Times, and which describes the growing concern throughout the country.

Finally, I include the text of a statement I prepared for the Interstate and Foreign Commerce subcommittee hearing in New York today.

The material follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 6, 1959]

AIRLINE CRITICIZED FOR JET NOISE HERE

Of five airlines operating jet planes out of New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens, American Airlines is the only one in "willful disregard of the public welfare" by making noisy takeoffs, the port authority charged yesterday.

John R. Wiley, aviation director of the port authority, which operates the airport, said that American Airlines conformed to noise standards in only 64.3 percent of its takeoffs from Idlewild during August.

Trans World Airlines conformed on 68.3 percent of its takeoffs, he added, an improvement over its 59.6 percent conformance dur- July, but still "far below the acceptable level."

Pan American conformed 91.8 percent, while Aerolineas Argentinas and British Overseas Airways Corp. conformed on all their takeoffs.

There are 25 takeoffs of jet planes daily at Idlewild. Residents of the Jamaica Bay area have complained of noisy takeoffs and landings.

A public hearing into these complaints will be opened at 10 a.m. tomorrow on the fifth floor of the control tower at Idlewild by a House of Representatives subcommittee.

A spokesman for American Airlines said yesterday that his company was "following closely" the voluntary procedures for noise reduction set up by the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee. This organization consists of delegates from all domestic airlines, the pilots' union, and the Federal Aviation Agency.

[From the New York Times, Sept 6, 1959]

PROTESTS OVER JET NOISE MOUNT TO A NEW PITCH AROUND AIRPORTS—SLEEPLESS RESIDENTS SEEK FLIGHT CURBS—PROBLEM IS MOST ACUTE IN NEW YORK, SAN FRANCISCO, AND LOS ANGELES

WASHINGTON, September 5.—America's new jet airliners, conquerors of distance and time, are not doing so well with people on the ground.

Specifically, those irate citizens live near airports and complain vociferously that jet noises is interfering with life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The airliners are frankly worried. The organized protests have reached such proportions that some citizens' groups are demanding a curfew on all jet landings and takeoffs between 11 p.m. and 7 a.m. They have taken their fight to Congress and to the Federal Aviation Agency.

The chief trouble spots appear to be in New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. This is the situation in those three cities.

New York: John T. Clancy, Queens Borough president, is spearheading the opposition, directed mainly against jet operations at New York International Airport, Idlewild, Queens.

It was Mr. Clancy who proposed that no jet landings are takeoffs be permitted at Idlewild during sleeping hours—and he would extend that curfew even to LaGuardia Airport, which has no jet service. He also has threatened to start sewer construction projects in Queens that would block traffic into both airports.

San Francisco: San Francisco's International Airport is surrounded on three sides by the bay, and annoyance is limited to one residential area—the city of South San Francisco with a population of 40,000.

For more than a year this community has had an antinoise committee that holds frequent meetings. It even hired a noise expert.

SCHOOLS PROTEST

The complaints center around more than loss of sleep. The South San Francisco school district has at least twelve schools directly under the takeoff pattern, and school officials are considering legal action to keep jet noise from interrupting classes. So loud and frequent have been the complaints that a special telephone had to be installed at the airport to handle them.

Los Angeles: Several local groups from areas near Los Angeles International Airport have formed antinoise committees without getting much more than sympathy.

One school has filed complaints that classes have been stopped by noise. A single rally drew more than 1,000 persons, but the protesting committees have backed away from a proposal to move the airport itself; too many people, including some of the complainants, make their living at the airport.

COMMITTEE FORMED

A group called the Los Angeles Sound Abatement Coordinating Committee has been formed, with the aid of the airlines, Government, and airport officials.

What can be done about the noise problem? The question was put to pilots, the Federal Aviation Agency and the airlines themselves. Their unhappy but unanimous answer: Not an awful lot, for these reasons:

The jets are equipped with sound suppressors (at a cost of $25,000 per plane), but, while they reduce noise to a certain extent, a lot more work must be done in this field.

The FAA, the airlines, and the pilots put safety ahead of noise nuisance. Whenever possible, they try to use preferential runways that avoid settled areas.

RUNWAYS LIMITED

But the preferential runway solution is limited by the low number of such runways. Most airports have only one, and it is not always possible to use it. Under most conditions, particularly hot weather, jets must use the longest runway and this is not always the preferential one.

Some complaining city officials have insisted that pilots climb faster to reduce the noise problem. Pilots already are instructed to attain at least 1,200 feet of altitude as quickly as possible and also hold that altitude as long as possible before landing. Any faster climb than that is impossible under the existing air traffic control situation.

Such drastic solutions as a night curfew would wreck the airlines. For example, suspending all flight operations in New York from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m. would mean that no New York-bound flight could leave Los Angeles after 2:30 p.m. Pacific coast time.

The Federal Aviation Agency is sturdily resisting demands that it take action to reduce noise annoyances. It is convinced not much could be done at present unless the protesting groups wanted to ruin commercial aviation and it believes the noise problem must be settled largely on a community level, not by the Federal Government.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE FLORENCE P. DWYER, SIXTH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY, BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE CONCERNING THE OPERATION OF COMMERCIAL JET AIRCRAFT AT AIRPORTS IN THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN AREA, SEPTEMBER 7, 1959, AT THE NEW YORK INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity of presenting this statement for your consideration. The problems related to the operation of commercial jet aircraft from the three major airports in the metropolitan New York area—that is, Idlewild, LaGuardia, and Newark Airports—are of intense and increasing concern to the people who live in the areas surrounding these airports.

As the Representative of the Sixth Congressional District of New Jersey, a portion of which lies adjacent to the Newark Airport, I am concerned for the health and safety and comfort of a great many of my constituents, all of which are jeopardized by the frequent use by jet aircraft of Newark Airport.

I hope that the subcommittee, in considering these problems, will give equal attention to all three airports. The problems are the same in each; all three airports serve the same area; all three are operated by the same Port of New York Authority; and, as the subcommittee is aware, Newark Airport has been utilized, more and more often, as a supplemental airport for traffic originally scheduled for Idlewild and LaGuardia when these airports are unable to handle them adequately.

Before any of the substantive problems can be solved, it seems to me, there is a fundamental need to fix responsibility among the several agencies involved with commercial aviation in this area, to determine the specific jurisdiction and the extent of authority which each is assigned. I refer, of course, to the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Port of New York Authority, and the voluntary National Air Transport Coordinating Committee. In my own experience and in that of other Members of Congress, there has been in recent years a great deal of ambiguity and confusion and avoidance of responsibility whenever efforts are made to control the operation of aircraft in the area in the interests of the general public.

Specifically, I believe that Congress must determine what agencies have effective authority to impose necessary conditions upon the operation of aircraft, both in the air and on the ground, in order to restrict noise and otherwise provide for the safety and health and reasonable comfort of those who reside in the vicinity of the airports. If sufficient authority has not been granted to date, then I believe further that Congress should undertake the responsibility of assigning it—in clear and specific terms.

For these reasons, I have supported House Resolution 162, introduced by our colleague, Mr. BOSCH, of New York, which would establish a select committee to study these problems. However, in the event this subcommittee, with its extensive background of experience in the field, would be willing to undertake such a study, then I should be among the first to encourage you to do so.

Certainly, the seriousness of the noise problem justifies your attention. As part of its noise reduction procedure for jet aircraft, the Port of New York Authority set a maximum level of 112 perceived noise decibels. While this level is extremely liberal when compared with the 60 decibels level which medical and acoustical authorities have recommended for the hours from 11 p.m. to 7 a.m., even this high level has been frequently exceeded by aircraft operating out of New York area airports.

Levels, for instance, of 124 decibels and 129 decibels have been verified by the Port of New York Authority as having been reached by jet aircraft operating in the area within the past 2 months. In understanding these figures, please remember that 140 decibels represents the very top of the sound scale, that physical pain will be experienced at sound levels above 130 decibels, and that a level of 108 decibels (substantially below the maximum set by the Port of New York Authority) is the equivalent of the noise

produced by 30 Niagara Falls roaring simultaneously.

It is obvious that exposure to constant noise disturbances of these magnitudes will seriously affect the health and comfort of people living in the area over which jet aircraft must operate flying in and flying out of New York airports.

A section of Elizabeth, N.J., called Elizabethport, is situated within 1 mile of the most heavily utilized runway at Newark Airport. This is the runway, you will recall, which was specially built following three successive crashes of aircraft operating out of the Newark Airport in a very small section of Elizabeth. Planes which land or take off from this runway in a southerly direction fly over the Elizabethport section at levels below 400 feet—considerably lower than even the most liberal permissible minimum altitude.

Despite the past assurances of Port of New York Authority officials, these aircraft increasingly are jet aircraft, since jets have recently been permitted to use Newark Airport as an alternative to Idlewild and La-Guardia. On recent evenings, as many as five huge jet transports have thundered over this residential section of Elizabeth at incredibly low altitudes. The effect on the population has been upsetting and disturbing in the extreme. One of my constituents, for example, has been forced to replace no less than nine ceilings during the past few years as a result of the physical shock of the sound of constant lowflying aircraft. The cost of this situation in terms of lost sleep, impaired health, and shaken nerves is, of course, incalculable.

Yet, the justified complaints of our people go unheard and increasingly, in fact, unacknowledged. If the public agencies involved, or the airlines themselves, displayed any determined effort to correct this menace or to develop noise controls of one kind or another, then there might be cause for hope. But as far as we can determine there is little or no serious effort being made to live up to the obligations toward the general public inherent in the public franchise enjoyed by airlines and in the responsibilities of public regulatory agencies.

As a last resort, we are seeking the assistance of the Congress: first, to define the areas of authority and responsibility, and then to see to it that the rights of the people to protection of their health and safety are respected.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Distinguished Service to Agriculture Award to Senator Stuart Symington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I take pleasure in including a report of the ceremonies attending the award to Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, made by the Missouri Farmers Association to Senator SYMINGTON, and notes from his address before the annual convention of the Association in acceptance of the award.

The Missouri association is the largest cooperative State association in the Nation and transacts a larger volume of business annually than any other State agricultural organization. The president of the Missouri Farmers Association, Mr. Fred V. Heinkel, is one of the outstanding agricultural executives of the Nation today.

Senator SYMINGTON before his election to the United States Senate had taken a deep interest in the development of the farm cooperatives of the State and during his service in the Senate has been recognized as an authority on agricultural legislation.

In conferring this distinguished honor upon Senator SYMINGTON at the annual State meeting of the Missouri Farmers Association in session at Columbia, Mo., on August 24, President Heinkel said:

Because of your distinguished record as U.S. Senator from Missouri, and as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and because of your firm insistence on truth, honesty, and positive action as a member of that committee, because of your perfect 100-percent voting record on farm legislation while a Member of the U.S. Senate; and, further, because of your loyal support of REA, farmer cooperatives, soil and water conservation programs, forestry, and flood control; and because of your sincere interest in the health and well-being of the people of this Nation as a whole, and American farmers in particular, we feel that you have earned and are eminently deserving of the highest honor and award the Missouri Farmers Association has to offer.

Therefore, the board of directors of the Missouri Farmers Association has voted unanimously to bestow upon you the MFA's Award for Distinguished Service to Agriculture.

In response, Senator SYMINGTON said in accepting the distinguished award:

Mr. President, there must be unity in agriculture if we are to have prosperity in agriculture.

Nobody can deny that the American farmer is the forgotten man of our present economic recovery. The record proves that while other groups in our economy have moved forward from last year's recession, the American farmer has moved backward.

Part of that unfortunate record follows:

For the first 6 months of 1959, total national income is up 10 percent over 1958; but farm income is down 8 percent; in fact, parity today is the lowest in 19 years.

For the first time in our history, the farmer's share of the consumer's food dollar has sunk below 40 percent.

And as we all know, farmers' expenses are now at record levels.

The record is also clear in showing that the farm policies of this administration are pushing the farmer further toward the bottom of the economic heap. The farmer's share of the Nation's income has declined from 5.2 percent in 1952, to 3.2 percent so far in 1959, a reduction of about 40 percent in less than 7 years.

Unless our great Nation is satisfied with partial economic health, something must be done to bring farm income back to a fair return for work expended.

In addition to the income squeeze, the farmers of America now find themselves in the midst of one of the biggest administrative messes in the history of our Government.

The Government investment in farm commodities has increased from $2.5 billion in 1952, to $9 billion in 1959—and at the present rate of increase this investment will be over $12 billion by this time next year.

The resulting drain on taxpayers is tremendous, as witnessed by the fact the present Secretary of Agriculture has spent more money in his 6½ years in office than all the previous Secretaries of Agriculture in the history of our country.

Nevertheless Secretary Benson continues to reject congressional attempts to deal with this growing problem.

Of 124 agriculture bills introduced in the Senate, during his term of office, he has opposed all but 14.

Yet despite his promise to the Senate last February 16, Mr. Benson has yet to come up with any overall farm plan of his own.

As an interesting aside, note that processors of agriculture products are now making, in effect, comparable complaints against retailers that farmers have been making over recent years about processors.

If we don't stop this trend toward the vertical, soon a very few people will control it all—and this goes beyond agriculture.

FOOD-FOR-PEACE PLAN

Our agricultural abundance, instead of being an economic curse, can be used as a potent tool in our efforts to build world peace.

We should declare to the people of the world now plagued with hunger and starvation and disease and poverty that the people of the United States are willing to share our abundance—our blessings—of food and fiber.

REA

One of the greatest examples of the value of cooperation and unity in agriculture is in REA.

In 1935, less than 6 percent of our American farms had central station electric power.

Then the wheels of cooperation began to turn. Individual farmers, working hand in hand with their neighbors and with their Government, forged an organization and a network of powerlines which now provide more than 96 percent of our farms with the benefits of electric power.

But even with these outstanding achievements, we must continue to cooperate and unite against those who do not have the best interest of the farmer and REA at heart.

Some of these attacks come from the very people who are supposed to represent the American farmer.

I am glad to announce that, only last Friday, the Senate passed the Aiken resolution, which reaffirmed and restated the sense of Congress that REA shall continue to serve the American farmer.

Here again is the evidence of farmer cooperation through their representatives in Congress, to unite and cooperate to preserve this great institution.

UNITY IN AGRICULTURE

Perhaps this very meeting this week, here in Columbia, Mo., can stimulate wholehearted efforts on the part of farmers, farm leaders, and all of us interested in the future of agriculture, to unit—to speak as one voice.

I pledged my full support toward that goal.

Politics Carried to an Extreme

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Idaho Daily Statesmen of September 4, published at Boise, Idaho.

It is to be earnestly prayed for that the resolution referred to in the edi-

torial—calling for diplomatic relations with Red China—will die where it was born. Such recognition of a bandit government would heap ignominy on the heads of the countless thousands of persons who have suffered, and are suffering, at the hands of the Red Chinese.

The editorial follows:

POLITICS CARRIED TO AN EXTREME

With a single dissenting vote, it is reported, some 100 delegates at a meeting in San Francisco of the Western States Conference of the Young Democratic Clubs of America have adopted a resolution calling for early establishment of diplomtaic relations with Red China.

Evidently the Young Democrats must have been under some pretty serious compulsion to take this action at this particular time when Red China, at war with the United States and the United Nations ever since the Korean police action, has lately resumed bombardment of Quemoy and is currently terrorizing Laos with guerrilla warfare and challenging an incomprehensibly friendly India with aggressive advances upon Indian protectorates and across the border into India itself.

It would be utterly unreasonable to expect any responsible administration in the United States to make a play for Red China's favor at this time.

Such action on our part could be not only more humiliating than the British experience when they eagerly stretched out a diplomatic hand to the Communist regime when it first came to power in China's mainland, and then watched the British Ambassador cool his heels on the threshold of Peiping. But it most assuredly would be devastating to whatever standing or prestige we may have among the non-Communist nations that hitherto have stood aloof and only now are beginning to recognize the threat that Red China lowers against them.

Reasons advanced for the Young Democrats' importunity are shoddy and suspect.

One suggests a settlement of the status of Formosa. On that we would have to start to deal with Red China's thesis which is like unto that of the anaconda, and it's not at all likely to be changed by any moral suasion.

It's suggested that we should engage with Red China in an exploration of the possibility of a widespread system of disarmament and the control of nuclear testing. The answer to that might be that a trustworthy agreement with the Russians might leave nothing at all in that area to be taken up with the Red Chinese.

Then it's suggested that an establishment of diplomatic relations might lead to a mutually profitable trade and cultural exchange. It's a proposal that ignores the fact that 25 years after we recognized the government at Moscow, we bought from Soviet Russia last year some $16 million worth of stuff and we sold the Red Russians goods valued at something less than $4 million, which is less than the value of the total value of a year's output of one of Idaho's larger industrial establishments.

The motivation for the Young Democrats' resolution is not at all obscure. It's an attack upon the policies of the present administration.

It carries partisan political considerations to a perilous extreme.

It's pronouncement is definitely ill considered, and it's dangerous insofar as it may influence others as unthinking and recklessly oblivious of consequences as its authors have shown themselves to be.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of September 5, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The importance of every vote was demonstrated when the House sustained the President's veto of a public works bill by just one vote. With a two-thirds majority needed to override, each vote to sustain equals, in effect, two votes. The President, bent on balancing our budget, asked for no new starts on projects this year. In this I wholeheartedly concur. Each Member, of course, defines fiscal responsibility his own way, and I was the only Texan to support the President's position on the final vote. Two hundred and seventy-four Members (263 Democrats and 11 Republicans) voted to override, and 138 (132 Republicans and 6 Democrats) to sustain. Starkly dramatic was the demand for a recapitulation, with the Speaker refusing Minority Leader HALLECK's request for an announcement of the vote count before any recapitulation. Several vote switches could have been decisive. The one-vote margin means that each man among the 138 sustainers cast the deciding vote. The possibility of majority reprisals against the 138 became a topic of speculation. The Trinity survey funds were not deleted from the proposed substitute bill, though threatened. In all the political jockeying to take credit, or place blame, any real concern for sensible economizing is often lost.

The 1-cent gas tax increase debate was controversial, but generally not partisan. Argument centered around whether to (1) keep the program pay-as-we-go, by raising tax; (2) keep program at present high level of construction, or stretch it out; (3) dedicate more of highway user taxes to road fund. Everybody was for maintaining the highway program, one way or another. The President's proposal to boost the gas tax temporarily by 1½ cents per gallon was defeated, and a 1-cent increase agreed upon, plus earmarking other present user taxes for the highway fund. I opposed any tax increase (see July 25 and August 1 newsletters) believing that what we need is not more money, but more for our money. I feel we should check carefully into the still unexplained but soaring increases in cost estimates before increasing any taxes.

Another housing bill was vetoed and for practically the same reasons as before. The President has urged extension of FHA's insuring authority, and a slowdown or cutback in most other areas. The bill sent to him went far beyond budgeted figures in programs for college classroom construction loans, direct loans for additional housing for elderly persons, public housing, and urban renewal.

The Government interest rate ceiling brought on a heated debate, and probably this session's least understood one. The technical nature of the Treasury's debt-management problems, and the political appeal of being against "money lenders and their profits" helped muddy the water of fact and truth. Refinancing the national debt, and paying new bills run up by Congress, forces the Treasury Secretary to go into the open market and borrow under the best terms he can get. Yet he must do this under out-of-date Government-set interest rates for loans over 5 years. Unable to do so, he is forced to borrow for shorter terms, on which no such ceilings apply. Result? The Secretary is handicapped in trying to refinance on the best terms possible, and the Government is forced to compete with individuals, families, and small businesses for the short-term money available. The administration proposal to remove arbitrary interest restrictions on all Government borrowing was defeated, and only the interest ceilings on E- and H- (savings) bonds were removed. How the Treasury will refinance $85 billion of Government indebtedness during the next year was not faced up to, nor was the fact that the credit of the United States and the value of your currency is at stake. The present "political" interest ceilings will wind up costing John Doe Taxpayer much more. And the President has clearly warned that, if they refuse to act, the Democrat leadership in Congress will be responsible for the consequences.

The labor bill conference agreement, generally conforming to the stronger House bill, passed handily, 352–52. Only one Republican was among the 52 stanch labor supporters who opposed. While on labor affairs, two other items, appearing in the RECORD this week are worthy of note: (1) a quotation of Senator KENNEDY's apt and honest description of his labor bill as "worked out carefully with President Meany and his lawyers" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 3, A7683) and (2) a résumé of Congress-threatening James B. Carey's past affiliations with Communist front organizations as well as his opposition to them upon occasion (RECORD, Sept. 3, A7600).

Another National Guard armory in Dallas was included in the military construction conference report adopted this week.

Khrushchev's visit opposition may at least prove to him that the American people are not taken in by his duplicity. It is my fervent hope and prayer that (1) he will sense the tremendous "sleeping giant" strength of the American people, so he will not miscalculate our ability and determination, (2) that more good than harm comes from his visit here. Khrushchev's visit is of grave concern to most here and ever present in the thoughts of many, despite preoccupation.

The Invitation to Khrushchev Could Be Withdrawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of August 22:

THE INVITATION TO KHRUSHCHEV COULD BE WITHDRAWN

The Communist aggression against Laos is still going on, as reported in the news dispatches and as discussed in the column on

this page by Joseph Alsop. An invasion from Communist North Vietnam has been predicted and may already have begun; Peiping has been threatening to take action against nonexistent American bases in Laos; and the presumption is that this new aggression has the support of Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, since Ho Chi Minh, the Communist Vietnamese boss, was recently Khrushchev's guest in Moscow.

This situation somewhat resembles the maneuvers which preceded the North Korean invasion of South Korea. It could lead to serious trouble in southeast Asia, trouble in which we might become involved.

According to Alsop, some officials of the State Department already have taken the position that it would be difficult, if not impossible, for President Eisenhower to receive Khrushchev as his guest while the attack on Laos continues. Khrushchev must know this; either he is incredibly stupid to let the attack go on, and to lend his support to it while arrangements are being made to entertain him in this country, or he has lost control over his Asiatic allies.

At any rate, we should insist that the attack on Laos be halted, and be halted permanently. And we should make it clear that unless this is done promptly, Khrushchev will not be welcome in this country. He is not very welcome as it is, but the invitation for him to visit the United States could be withdrawn just as easily as it was extended.

Stockpile Alcohol Instead of Corn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I will include a recent letter to the editor of Wallace's Farmer from Charles Henderson, of Guthrie Center, Iowa, who supports the Jensen-Mundt bill which provides that 5-percent alcohol made from our surplus grain shall be used in all motor fuel and which would consume almost 800 million bushels of our costly price-depressing surplus of grain annually.

It is noteworthy that a number of years ago Brazil had a great surplus of sugar which was by degrees destroying their farm economy as well as their economy as a whole. Yet their problem was quickly solved by a law that required a 10-percent sugar alcohol blend in all motor fuel.

Mr. Henderson's letter and the editor's note follows:

STOCKPILE ALCOHOL INSTEAD OF CORN

To the EDITOR:

Today we have a burdensome surplus of corn. Why not convert it into alcohol? Some could be used for motor fuels and other purposes, and the rest could be stored.

Why build more steel bins? Of the two nearest alcohol processing plants, one is standing idle and the other is used at far less than capacity. Put the unemployed to work converting grain to alcohol.

Many people contend that smog in our cities is due to petroleum products and that a little alcohol will reduce it.

In case of war, foreign sources of fuel are not dependable. We would need an immense amount of alcohol. Our enemies fought the last war with the aid of "ersatz" fuel.

Alcohol has many uses as a fuel to produce heat, light or power; as an antifreeze, solvent, and in the manufacture of countless drugs.

Grain in the form of alcohol is less bulky for storage and transportation. There's less chance of spoiling, and practically no lose due to deterioration by age. Our climate is not suitable for storing grain.

CHARLES HENDERSON.

GUTHRIE COUNTY, IOWA.

(Representative BEN F. JENSEN has introduced a bill (H.R. 4186) which would require the use of alcohol in gasoline. The amount required would be 2 percent for the first year, then 5 percent. The alcohol would have to be made from farm products.—EDITOR.)

Indifference, Ignorance of the Facts, Inertia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News of September 4, 1959:

On Picasso, three eyes look good, but will U.S. airlines and pilots be doomed in the jet age by our own Government's three I's?

The three dangerous I's of Government are indifference, ignorance of the facts, and inertia.

Any one of these three I's can spell disaster to the international airlines of the American aviation industry, and to thousands of workers who have built it into the world's greatest achievement of this modern age—not the least of whom are the pilots. And, even worse, they can mean disaster to the Nation itself, for the whole is made up only of its component parts—each interdependent upon the other.

Free enterprise doesn't mean management against labor. Free enterprise is made up of both management and labor. Pilots are just as much a part of the free enterprise system as any executive, shareholder or banker. Like the Nation, each is interdependent on the other.

Therefore, we—the pilots—rightfully ask our own Government why?

Why is it that foreign-flag lines, generally chosen instruments of their governments, operating without regard to profit-or-loss statements, strangely receive preference so frequently over our own international airlines?

Why is it that we (who proclaim to the world that the private enterprise system is the only one for men everywhere) must see our Government, via the State Department and the CAB, favor foreign governmentally controlled airlines over our very own?

Why is it that monopoly on the great circle route over the Pacific to Tokyo is tolerated in this Nation, a nation built on the thesis that only through healthy competition can men be free?

Why is it that the pressing problems of new fast cargo planes receive lowest priority in a day when delay is tantamount to self-destruction?

Why is it that, in this country which has always deplored militarism in others, the world's biggest airline is MATS—with hundreds of hostesses, flying competitive routes against our free enterprise American-flag lines?

Why is it that no one remembers it to be the commercial, not the military airplanes, on which the Nation must rely when there is a war or a sudden emergency—yet MATS is our chosen instrument competitor from within?

Why is it that no one remembers what happened to our American merchant marine of the sea—and takes lessons learned to prevent the same tragic occurrence destroying our merchant marine of the air?

The jet age has changed many things. We—the pilots—do not oppose technological advance. We fight for it—even though one Boeing jet 707 or Douglas DC-8 can do the work of 3 DC-7's (and thus means the loss of jobs).

Because—we—the pilots—know that American technology, American know-how, American ingenuity, if only given a chance, will cut fares, find new ways-and-means, find more jobs for our pilots—and everyone will be better off, including the traveler and the air cargo shipper.

Why? Can it be those three I's.

Can it be either indifference or ignorance of the facts or inertia?

Or can it be all three I's?

William Penn was a gifted administrator who lived long before our present jet age. Yet, so long ago, he said:

"Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them, and as Governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined also. Therefore, governments depend upon men rather than men upon governments."

Don't tell us that William Penn knew more about the jet age and its problems than the CAB and our own State Department.

We the pilots ask the answer—Airline Pilots in the service of Pan American World Airways, members of the Air Line Pilots Association International (affiliated with AFL-CIO).

Andrew Jackson May

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, we are all deeply saddened by the passing of our former colleague from Kentucky, Andrew Jackson May. "Uncle Jack," as he was affectionately known, served the good moutain people of Kentucky of the Seventh District, for seven terms. He was the chairman of the old Military Affairs Committee that had to do with the U.S. World War II effort.

I shall never forget that as a new and young Member of the House—back in January 1945—"Uncle Jack" had up before the House the Mobilization of Civilian Manpower—the commonly known work-or-fight bill. Having been retired from the Air Corps a short time before I was elected to Congress in 1944, "Uncle Jack" asked me if I would speak on his committee's bill. He said that it was in trouble. He told me that he thought if I would urge the membership to support the measure—that they would be inclined to do so—since I had just left the armed services. I did speak out on

the bill. I took the position that if the Congress could draft a young boy to leave home, train, fight, and even die in the defense of his country—surely then the Congress had the power and the moral obligation to draft a man to work and to fashion the tools, the guns, and the munitions for him to use in his fighting. The bill passed the House and later "Uncle Jack" was kind enough to tell the newspapers that my speech in behalf of the legislation was the difference between victory and defeat of the bill.

Andrew J. May lived to be 84 years of age. He passed away quietly at the hospital in his hometown of Prestonburg in his beloved Kentucky mountains.

Andrew J. May led nearly every fight for every major piece of legislation that gave our great country her strength, manpower, and her vast striking power during the war. He carried this terrible load of work and great responsibility all during the entire World War II period. Specifically, he piloted the draft bill and the GI bill of rights through the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Andrew May should be remembered for the many, many good things that he did. As one of two members of the Kentucky delegation who served in the House of Representatives with "Uncle Jack"—I want to say that he was, in my opinion, kind, considerate, sympathetic, understanding, sober, and capable. He loved his home, his family, his people, and his State. May God rest his soul in peace.

To his family, I extend my deepest sympathy on this sad occasion, and may the good Lord bless them and keep them always.

Mr. Speaker, there follows excerpts from a story appearing in the New York Times of September 7, 1959:

ANDREW MAY DIES—EX-LEGISLATOR, 84

PRESTONSBURG, KY., September 6.—Andrew Jackson May, a power in Congress until war-bribe charges destroyed his career, died today in a hospital here. He was 84 years old.

Mr. May's wife, the former Julia Grace Mayo, died in the 1940's. They had three children, two of whom survive—Robert and Mrs. Olga May Latta, both of Prestonsburg.

ATTAINED PROMINENCE IN WAR

An obscure Representative from Kentucky until World War II, Mr. May gained national prominence as head of the powerful House Military Affairs Committee.

* * * * *

He had assumed that post in 1938, after having served in Congress since 1930.

* * * * *

In 1946, the Mead committee, headed by Senator James M. Mead, New York Democrat, began investigation of war contracts. * * * In a speech on the floor of the House, he branded the committee a court of inquisition, described Dr. Garsson as his "very good friend," and said that he had acted out of patriotism in aiding the syndicate.

* * * * *

Mr. May had once said that with a name like his (Andrew Jackson) he had to be a fighter. Ill and worn at 72, he fought hard at his trial to prove that he had never accepted money from the Garsson brothers and that he had not done favors for them that he would not have done for others.

* * * * *

On June 26, 1952, the Kentucky Court of Appeals restored Mr. May to his standing as a lawyer because it was "not in keeping with Christian principles" to deny him another chance. On December 25, 1952, former President Harry S. Truman granted a full Presidential pardon that restored his citizenship rights.

Since then Mr. May had lived in Prestonsburg, less than 15 miles from Langley, where he was born on June 24, 1875.

He began his career as a schoolteacher and later was admitted to the bar and entered politics. From 1901 to 1909, Mr. May was Floyd County attorney. He later was a special judge of the circuit court of Johnson and Martin Counties.

Entering business, Mr. May served as president of the Beaver Valley Coal Co. In 1930, he was elected to the 71st Congress. He was reelected successively until 1947.

The President's Veto of the Housing Bill Brings Protest From the People at Home Who Realize What the Effect Will Be

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. McFALL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who worked and voted for good housing legislation only to have the wishes of the majority thwarted by Presidential opposition three times in the past 2 years are understandably disturbed and disappointed.

But even more concerned are the people on the home front who are faced with the prospects of no housing legislation because of the veto.

I am hopeful that before we adjourn we will enact a new housing bill, as good or even better than the defeated bill of 1958, the trimmed down vetoed bill No. 1 of 1959 or the even further curtailed but still vetoed bill No. 2 of 1959.

Every person in the country is hurt if our housing program is stopped, not only the real estate salesmen, builders, carpenters, and suppliers who are direct effected by shutdown of the FHA program, but all the others who are indirectly hurt.

Following are telegraphic comments from some of those in the 11th District of California who know firsthand the harm that is being done by these vetoes:

From Dean C. DeCarli, mayor of Stockton:

The city of Stockton is extremely disappointed over the veto of the housing bill by the President. As this bill is needed to assist us in financing our West End redevelopment project to provide for a needed 200 units of public housing and to provide for Federal assistance for displaced people, we urgently request that you override the President's veto.

From John E. Hirten, executive director, Redevelopment Agency, city of Stockton:

Veto of housing bill will have serious effect on entire urban renewal and housing program for the city. Completely stops possibility of renewal and redevelopment of 200 acres West End skidrow area. Also kills 200 public housing units needed to replace obsolete city owned Lanham Act war housing. We appreciate your efforts in the past and once again implore your assistance to override the President's veto. Two years without appropriate housing legislation will certainly restrict our programs and hurt interest and initiative shown by citizens of this community. It can truthfully be said that the lack of housing legislation will have detrimental affects on our community and its economy. Of all legislation the housing bill comes closest to paying for itself in increased tax base of communities and their economy.

From C. P. Kenyon, administrator, San Joaquin County Board of Supervisors:

The President's veto of the housing bill affects several vital projects in San Joaquin County. We feel that the public housing bill should be passed and we urge your vote to override the President's veto.

From Henry Hansen, secretary of the Central Labor Council of Stockton:

Housing bill is vital to Stockton. Appreciate your support to override the veto.

From executive director of the San Joaquin County Housing Authority, Allen R. Reed:

Thank you for your letter of August 28 and your attached newsletter No. 34 on the subject of difficulty of enacting good housing legislation. We were both somewhat surprised and shocked when we learned of the President's veto of the second housing bill. All we can do at this time is to express our appreciation for your good work and await the outcome of the override action. In a telephone conversation with the Commissioners today they asked me to express their most heartfelt appreciation for your work and support of the housing bills.

Educating the Layman in the Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the process of our Government to be appreciated must be understood. We often feel that the legislative process is not sufficiently understood by many of our constituents and we try to help them understand them. We know that we ourselves have trouble understanding the executive process from time to time.

As for the judicial process, those of us who are lawyers, know that many of our nonlawyer friends have a very poor opinion of courts and lawyers, often with good reason.

The American Broadcasting Co. on ABC–TV has been running a series of courtroom programs called Day in Court. They have been contributing significantly to a better understanding of the judicial process.

This particular series is of special interest to me because a long time friend of mine, Prof. Edgar Allen Jones, Jr., professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles, sits as the judge.

Under unanimous consent previously granted, I am including here an article about this TV series, entitled "Phi Delta Phi Plays Leading Role in New TV Courtroom Dramas," from the spring 1959 issue of the Brief, quarterly publication of the international legal fraternity of Phi Delta Phi:

PHI DELTA PHI PLAYS LEADING ROLE IN NEW TV COURTROOM DRAMAS—"JUDGE" JONES (MINOR 1950) LEADS DOUBLE LIFE

Quiz shows, comedy shows, and musical variety shows have faltered by the wayside, but if the hard riding TV westerns should ever pause for a backward look down the narrow and tortuous rating trail, they may be disturbed by the relatively new phenomena of courtroom drama shows coming on like the U.S. Cavalry after a batch of Indians. The bemused trial lawyers who have been wont to speak of courtroom "drama" with self conscious hyperbole, now suddenly find the element of truth in the day by day commercialized reproduction of their performances. The thought of 700,000 viewers (a network guess of the number who watch "Traffic Court") is a startling one for the practitioner conditioned to work before a scattering of unhappy defendants awaiting their turn and a few habitues with nothing else to do.

Actually the entertainment industry has long recognized the dramatic potential of courtroom localities for the playing out of human problems. But it has afflicted attorneys and judges with representations of the administration of justice which have considerably deviated from reality. All too often a distorted picture is given to the public of the processes of justice. Judges have been portrayed as pompous ignoramuses, lawyers as unscrupulous connivers. "Justice" has seemed more a search by venal men for self-preferment than the dedicated goal of a profession. Rarely has "show business" shown a genuine concern for authenticity in picturing court business.

The new development in television, however, is premised on nothing more elaborate than reasonable facsimile presentations of daily courtroom fare. The afternoon matinee at the courthouse has turned out to be a smash hit when trimmed down and taken on the road.

Backbone of the nationwide network courtroom dramas is provided by the American Broadcasting Co. television network and its three different court programs: "Day in Court," "Accused," and "Traffic Court." Each has received favorable ratings in network appearances.

Actual (though unnamed—per Canon 27) attorneys present the cases to a "judge" who, without makeup, is professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles, Edgar Allan Jones, Jr. (Minor Inn, University of Virginia, 1950). "Judge" Jones sits at five different sessions, one-half hour each on three different programs each week.

ABC–TV presents a total of seven half-hour courtroom programs. On two of the "Day in Court" sessions (the series runs Monday through Friday in the afternoon for the soap opera clientele) an ex-professor of speech and drama, William Gwinn, presides in adoption and domestic relations proceedings. On the balance, Professor Jones sits as "judge."

The most recent of the three ABC–TV courtroom programs "Accused," appears weekly on Wednesday evening across the country. "Traffic Court," a highly rated local program in Los Angeles, now in its second year, may well soon be back on a network since it achieved a high rating in the large metropolitan areas of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia.

In excess of 50 persons are involved in bringing each half hour to the video screen. Originator of the court shows for ABC–TV is network Vice President J. Seligman, himself a Harvard law graduate and former Government attorney.

Law students at a nearby university do the basic case research, submitting briefs of cases involving aspects of tort, contract, probate, criminal law, adoption and domestic relations. The requirements for prospective cases as submitted to the programs' writers are legal accuracy and dramatic potential. The briefs go to the three writers assigned to the court programs. They take the skeleton of law and cloak it with a credible dramatic half-hour show which must both be entertaining and retain the aura of authenticity.

The scripts thus produced are then given to professional actors and actresses to "read" so they may be cast for the parts. Although the scripts present lines and cues, the actors and actresses are instructed by the director not to feel bound to match cue and cue, but to convert the thought into their own words. The script indicates the sequence of development of situation and character. The ad libs of the performers tend to enhance the spontaneity of the drama.

Not infrequently, of course, the transition from law student brief to dramatic script to portrayal by an actor or actress actually changes the previously indicated legal solution as set forth in the original brief. The responsibility for catching that kind of change, for converting any errors along the way into dramatic profit and legal accuracy, and for getting the show off the air exactly on time (within 15 seconds) falls upon "Judge" Jones. His facility for quick reaction and repartee prompted Newsweek recently (Jan. 12, 1959) to describe him as "the leader of the new breed of ad libbers," and John Lardner to comment in the New Yorker (Aug. 2, 1958) that this "facsimile judge with a turn for the theatrical" made "the work of law enforcement in 'Traffic Court' to be sharp and skillful, as well as picturesque."

To avoid preconceived notions concerning the decision which will actually be rendered upon the basis of the evidence presented while the "court" is on the air, and to preserve the spontaneous effect, "Judge" Jones never reads the scripts or briefs before appearing at the studio for the initial rehearsal. The total time involved in producing a half-hour show, from the point of first rehearsal to the end of the show as seen by the audience across the country, is about 3 hours.

During those 3 hours, a dry rehearsal is held, during which the "Judge" first meets the attorneys involved and hears the case for the first time. The case is presented at that time to see what problems of admissibility and procedure are written into the script. Attorneys are encouraged to object to anything objectionable. Even the director, Larry Robertson, has become so sensitive to the usual courtroom faux pas after repeated exposure to the dry rehearsals that he plays a key role in moving the show around legal shoals. Questions are rephrased, foundations are laid, and so forth, so that no basis for objection will remain, except those which are retained for dramatic effect. If necessary, the case is basically reoriented to make it legally believable while still preserving its dramatic impact.

The cast for that particular show then go before the TV cameras on the actual courtroom set, the klieg lights are turned on, and the show proceeds through a dress rehearsal on closed circuit TV cameras. Seconds and minutes are pared by cuts of the script and careful meshing of action so as to compress the case within the required time limits. Finally, in the last half-hour of the 3 hours, the program is gone through a third time, this time being recorded on magnetic tape, complete with whatever ad libs or errors may take place. It is then flown all over the country for simultaneous release on the Nation's video screens.

At least 150 attorneys have thus far appeared on the ABC–TV courtroom programs. The three bailiffs, three clerks, and two court reporters are either active or former court attachés. The services of eight disability retired police officers are utilized to portray policemen when necessary. Similarly, California highway patrol officers are used. Two practicing attorneys are retained by ABC–TV for direct consultation with the writers on problems as they arise. The Los Angeles County probation department cooperates actively with the production of the program, its 20 male and 20 female probation officers appearing on the air as needed. Doctors, laboratory technicians, fingerprint experts, insurance adjusters, fire department officials, all are utilized to put their real-life talents and experience to work as expert witnesses as the cases may demand. An average of more than 50 actors and actresses are employed each week, including nonprofessional "specialists" like professional boxers or wrestlers, circus performers, organ grinders, burlesque grinders, and such.

The "fan" mail reflects a conviction on the part of the audience that the viewers are watching a real judge operate in a real courtroom. This is so although the announcer regularly makes clear at the outset and conclusion of the program that recreations rather than actual cases are being seen. It also reflects a surprising number of persons who first realized that they had legal problems or neglected rights when viewing one of the courtroom programs. The judge constantly cautions criminal defendants on arraignments to secure counsel and also emphasizes at every opportunity that no litigant need lose his rights for lack of counsel and no person need ever go unrepresented by counsel for lack of financial means.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed agricultural trade development extension and took up bill on savings bond interest rates.

House passed miscellaneous bills and sent to conference bill extending Public Law 480.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 16796–16818

Bills Introduced: 2 bills and 1 resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 2651–2652; and S. Con. Res. 76.

Pages 16800, 16801

FNMA Mortgages: By unanimous consent, it was ordered that vote on August 20, 1959, on S. Res. 130, expressing the sense of the Senate with regard to the exchange of FNMA mortgages for Government bonds, include the name of Senator Neuberger as voting in the negative as he did and that the Journal be corrected accordingly. **Page 16894**

Agricultural Trade Development: By 68 yeas to 14 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Senate passed with amendment H.R. 8609, to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (after discharging Committee on Agriculture and Forestry from its further consideration), the amendment being the substitution for its language the amended text of S. 1748, companion bill, which had already been further amended as follows:

Adopted: First branch of Humphrey amendment (on behalf of committee) inserting provision for assistance to meet emergency relief requirements other than for surplus food not exceeding $2 million for any fiscal year; Aiken amendment authorizing $300 million annually for title II (enrichment and packaging of certain donated commodities) from January 1, 1960, to December 31, 1962, plus any unexpired authority coming over from preceding year; Johnston (South Carolina) amendment to add new section on enrichment of cornmeal, grits, and white flour; by 44 yeas to 38 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Humphrey amendment to insert provision on food stamp and food allotment plan in six communities; Cooper amendment giving priority to distribution to U.S. needy before sale for foreign currencies of surplus agricultural commodities; Mundt amendment to add new section on annual rates on conservation payments; Anderson amendment to insert new section on national marketing quota of 1960 cotton crop; Humphrey amendment to authorize CCC to make available stocks of animal fats and inedible oils for donation to charitable organizations; and modified Humphrey amendment respecting use of certain foreign currencies by any jointly controlled nonprofit foundation established in a foreign country pursuant to agreement between U.S. and such country for promoting research, education, health, and public welfare; and

Rejected: Balance of Humphrey amendment (on behalf of committee) on emergency relief requirements other than surplus food; by 37 yeas to 44 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Butler amendment requiring delivery directly to export vessel at U.S. port of shipments of exported surplus U.S. commodities; by 18 yeas to 64 nays, Hart amendment to add title IV on direct food distribution program authority of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Senate insisted on its amendment, asked for conference with House, and appointed as conferees Senators Ellender, Johnston (South Carolina), Humphrey, Young (North Dakota), Aiken, and Hickenlooper.

S. 1748, companion bill, was indefinitely postponed.

Pages 16791, 16818–16820, 16824–16868

Tribute to Labor: Senate adopted H. Con. Res. 435, expressing realization and appreciation of Congress of the basic role that labor plays in U.S. economy and the contribution made by laboring men and women to America's well-being.

S. Con. Res. 76, companion measure, was indefinitely postponed. **Pages 16801–16802, 16868–16869**

Savings Bond Interest: Senate made its unfinished business H.R. 9035, to permit issuance of series E and H savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum and to permit Secretary of Treasury to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss. **Page 16868**

Record Votes and Quorum Calls: During Senate proceedings today, four record votes and two quorum calls

Appendix

Labor, the Strong, Vital Force of Our Nation, Is the Thrust Born in the Hearts, the Minds, and the Hands of the Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Labor Day in West Virginia, as is true throughout most of the United States, is a holiday truly dedicated in numerous appropriately located communities to the honoring of the men and women who toil that America be strong and remain free.

It was my privilege to have participated in one Labor Day eve observance at Morgantown, September 6, when I was dinner host to the executive committee for Labor Day celebration events in Morgantown, Monongalia County, and a public reception which followed.

My brief remarks on that occasion were a prelude to and extracts from two addresses I had the honor of delivering in areas of southern West Virginia on Labor Day. The first was the annual celebration at Harris Memorial Park, Smithers, Fayette County at noon, under the auspices of the upper Kanawha Valley local unions. The other event was the United Mine Workers' annual Labor Day celebration at Comfort, Boone County.

Several thousand persons were in attendance for each of these traditional programs in the largest bituminous coal producing State. The workers, whether members of organized unions or toilers in unorganized activities, were all accorded honors of the day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the speech which I delivered at these celebrations be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, LABOR DAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1959, AT UPPER KANAWHA VALLEY LOCAL UNIONS' ANNUAL LABOR DAY CELEBRATION, HARRIS MEMORIAL PARK, SMITHERS, FAYETTE COUNTY, W. VA., AND UNITED MINE WORKERS' ANNUAL LABOR DAY CELEBRATION COMFORT, BOONE COUNTY, W. VA.

Ladies and gentlemen, members of the United Mine Workers, and friends, I am grateful for this opportunity to join with you in celebration of the one day of the year set aside for commemoration of the men and women of American Labor.

"Labor Day differs," said Samuel Gompers, "in every essential from the other holidays of any country." Fifty years ago, the father of the American trade union movement stated that "All other holidays are in a more or less degree connected with conflicts and battles of man's prowess over man, of strife and discord for greed and power, of glories achieved by one nation over another. Labor Day * * * is devoted to no man, living or dead; to no sect, race, or nation."

This is the occasion on which we pause in the course of our own labors to acknowledge the sweat and toil of the men and women who created much that we see about us. It is fitting, too, that Labor Day should have come to be acknowledged in the manner that it has. The product of no Executive fiat, no Act of Congress—except for the District of Columbia—the acceptance of Labor Day itself is an expression of the free and voluntary character of the American trade union movement.

First propounded in 1882 by Peter J. McGuire, a carpenter in New York, every State has independently adopted the day which, in the words of Mr. McGuire, "shall be Labor's—an occasion devoted to the industrial spirit, the great vital force of every nation."

This vital force is the thrust born in the hearts, the minds, and the hands of the worker. It is this force which has built railroads to span the continent and raised buildings to scrape the sky; it has built and manned our factories and gone into the bowels of the earth for fuel to fire them. All of these are the product of the efforts and dreams of the American worker.

In thus pausing to survey the achievements and reckon the gains of American labor, it is therefore appropiate for us to recall some of the milestones in the union movement. Some of you here have your own milestones—the struggles to achieve recognition, the victories and defeats of organization. You also recall the grim days of the depression. And for many of you, I am sure, the road has seemed long and arduous, a road along which you have been guided by hope, but on which you have met also with the face of despair.

But in the history of man and in the history of labor, 75 or 100 years is not a very long time in which to create a new institution. And let us not ignore the fact that the trade union movement is indeed just that—a new and compelling social institution in mankind's history. Only 50 years ago Prof. William Graham Sumner was still preaching to the bright young men at Yale University the doctrine that "every experiment only makes it more clear that for men to band together * * * instead of being a remedy for disappointment * * * is only a way of courting new calamity."

This was the typical and mistaken response of the conventional wisdom of the period when Samuel Gompers and a handful of other union leaders met in Pittsburgh in 1881 to form the Federation of Organized Trade and Labor Unions. Five years later this organization was succeeded by the American Federation of Labor—the same year as the Haymarket riot in Chicago. Since that time the history of American labor has been a chronicle of the march toward an ever broadening realization of the dictum of Mr. Justice Holmes that "liberty of contract begins where equality of bargaining power begins."

It is a record marked in its early stages by bitter and last-ditch struggles of management to resist the recognition of unions. The uses of injunctions, "yellow-dog" contracts, and private labor spies live still in the memories of many union leaders and rank and file workers.

It was only 89 years ago that the first written contract was signed between coal operators and coal miners. Less than 70 years ago—in 1890, to be precise—and within the lifetime of the dynamic and dedicated leader, John L. Lewis—the United Mine Workers of America organized formally. While it was not until some 30 years later, in 1922, that the UMWA won its famous case against the Coronado Coal Co., in which the Supreme Court declared that a strike was not a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Though organized labor made slow but steady gains from the 1880's to the 1930's, its security was not assured until the arrival of the New Deal under the leadership of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And I am happy to have had a part in those exciting times as one of the original members of the F.D.R. team in the Congress. For, it was our passage of the National Industrial Recovery Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, and the National Labor Relations Act, which, for the first time, established national policy protecting the right of workers to organize and to elect their representatives for collective bargaining.

These are only some of the high points of labor's progress. The record has not been unmarked by violence on the part of both labor and management—we have had the Haymarket riots, the Pullman strikes, and Little Steel strikes. But in spite of the occasional eruptions of violence—in spite of the sometimes ruthless actions of reprisal—the chief mark of the American labor movement has been its use of legal and democratic methods to forge social and economic advancement.

The free American labor movement has confounded the Marxist dogma of class antagonism and has refuted the Marxist prophecies of blood and iron. Here, working within the framework of a cooperative capitalism, American labor most clearly distinguishes itself from many of its counterpart movements in Europe.

The goal of the trade union movement in the United States has not been to inflame the jealous passions of the dispossessed and the "have nots" against the "haves," but to seek a more abundant life for all. Karl Marx—blinded by his own sense of being an outcast—failed to see this; and present-day Marxist leaders—blinded by their own dogma of Marx and Lenin also fail to see this.

The wisdom of American labor's use of peaceful, legal, and democratic methods is apparent to us today. For organized labor has finally—in many areas—achieved full partnership with capital in the American productive system. With this increase in power, working men and women have won new rights. But these rights carry new responsibilities as well.

And the first responsibility is that which goes with all power—the obligation to use one's strength wisely for the benefit of the general good. This position—you know and I know—has not been universally and consistently upheld by all of our present-day labor leaders. This can be said also for the use and the abuse of power by some management leaders.

Our Founding Fathers wisely recognized that power is inherently dangerous. There-

fore, they sought to disperse political authority as widely as possible within the Federal structure of government and between the Federal and State Governments. As our civilization has become more complex and our society more centralized the same problems of the distribution of political and economic power have developed within nongovernmental institutions. Parallel to this development there has grown the need to erect and maintain democratic safeguards against the misuse and abuse of power throughout the range of American life—in the great communications media, in industry, and to a lesser extent, in labor.

I speak quite candidly on the subject of the labor-management reform bill recently reported by the Senate-House conference committee, accepted by the Senate, and awaiting House action, probably today or tomorrow. I was a member of this committee and participated for 12 days in the exacting business of its deliberations. At the outset I had determined that I would vote for those reform measures which had been revealed to be necessary by the Senate Rackets Investigating Committee, but that I would not associate myself with any punitive or repressive provisions which would restrict the legitimate rights of organized labor. I held as firmly as possible to that position, as did my Senate Democratic colleagues.

The bill as reported admittedly will not please every one. It does not fully satisfy me. But it is doubtful that any law passed by the representative legislative process will ever be acceptable to all because, in such issues as these, there are as many points of view as there are parties to the discussion. But democracy is the art of the possible—and in this instance we have done all that could be accomplished within the latitude afforded by the differing versions passed by the two Houses of the Congress.

There has been much exaggerated talk at both extremes regarding Senate and House actions on labor-management legislation. And though it may take time to assess its impact, this I can state from knowledge based upon intimate study and contact with its preparation: It is a measure aimed at eliminating the racketeer element from honest labor and restoring democratic safeguards to those unions where they have been lost. These accomplishments can be brought about under the terms of the legislation without destroying the hard-won and legitimate rights of organization and collective bargaining.

In discussing the conference report in the Senate on Wednesday of last week, I said: I toiled to prepare a report which would be restrictive where necessary but would not be repressive to the legions of loyal labor so vital to the strength of our country.

At this point I state emphatically that, in my opinion, the conference chairman, Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, spoke with complete accuracy when he informed the Senate, also on Wednesday, when he said:

"There were serious shortcomings in the reform bill which passed the House, and the conferees on the Democratic side, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] shared my view that we could not under any circumstances have voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill. While many Members of the Senate hold an opposite view, if the Landrum-Griffin bill had come to the floor of the Senate in the form in which it passed the House * * * all the Senators would have regretted it finally. * * * And when we view the significant provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill, one after another, we must admit they go far beyond reform. They go into an area which would limit what we all would consider legitimate activities of men and women who bargain collectively."

But I do not choose to inflate out of its proper proportions the importance of the issue of so-called labor reform. Whatever the merits of the issue, the problem has not been one in the great body of the institution of trade unionism. This has always been, and remains so today, a movement necessary to the welfare and strength of a democratic system.

My concern for the welfare of organized labor in America goes deeper than the issue of reform. In these closing minutes I would like to address what seems to me a more fundamental issue—more fundamental for the labor unions and for the welfare of American democracy. I refer now to the loss of what might be called a "sense of mission." And I do not use the term lightly.

For the trade unions have always acted their best—as has the United States itself—when imbued with a sense of mission—a mission to perform not for themselves alone but for all Americans. This was the lesson of the life of Samuel Gompers. It was from this sense of mission that the unions fought for gains for all Americans—for free public schools, child labor laws, minimum wages, workmen's compensation, social security, and a host of other advances which have been to the benefit of all American citizens.

Thus have the trade unions always best served themselves when they have served the American heritage, when their actions have been charged by the belief that they could create a future of greater worth and human dignity. This belief—this belief in the possibilities of man and the dignity of labor—has shaped the destiny of America.

American labor, led by the trade unions, is today a full participant in that destiny. But if we are to live up to the fulfillment of America we must live beyond the preoccupations of our particular job or craft. This is a responsibility which one cannot defer to his political or union leaders. It is an obligation which rests upon the individual heart and will of each of us.

"The American journey has not ended," stated Archibald MacLeish. "America is never accomplished, America is always still to build; for men, as long as they are truly men, will dream of man's fulfillment." This is the mission to which we must again rededicate ourselves; this is the mission which Samuel Gompers saw with such clarity.

Thus, as citizens and as workers, it is up to each of us to rekindle the faith in the American future, and to live with a renewed vision of the possibilities of man. We Americans have reason thus to live; whether we have the will depends upon the individual heart. And if we do so live, our work, whatever its nature, will be ennobled in its service to the greater benefit of man.

Oil Industry Facing Future With Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, we have considerable oil activity in my congressional district and in looking over the magazine Highway Highlights of July–August 1959 on pages 12 and 13, I read an article written by Mr. Frank Porter, president of the American Petroleum Institute which I found most interesting in view of the fact that I know something about the petroleum industry. On these pages appear two pictures of Mr. Porter and under one it reads:

The reason the oil industry has made such remarkable progress in just 100 years: "It has been able to operate in a free economy—one that has been free up to now of burdensome governmental controls."

Under the other it reads:

Concerning highway transportation: "The petroleum industry, of course, is certainly in favor of good roads, properly engineered and properly financed."

I was impressed with this article as I know many others will be and, therefore, take this opportunity of placing it in the RECORD:

"The long-range picture is bright."

Doing the talking was Frank Porter, affable president of the American Petroleum Institute. Seated at his desk in the API offices in Rockefeller Center in New York City, he was giving Highway Highlights his views on the past, present, and future of the petroleum industry, currently marking its 100th anniversary.

In viewing the future optimistically, Mr. Porter said he was doing so "assuming that there will be no burdensome or unnecessary Government controls and that the system and the philosophy that has prevailed in this country and which has enabled the industry to grow, will still continue."

The system and philosophy: "Free enterprise and free markets. Any time you stifle a marketplace, you stifle free enterprise."

Mr. Porter feels strongly about this. He points out that the biggest stimulant the industry has had during its first 100 years is that "it has been able to operate in a free economy—one that has been free up to now of burdensome governmental controls."

President of American Petroleum Institute—composed of about 11,000 members—since 1950, Mr. Porter originally was from Oklahoma. He has been engaged in one form or another in the petroleum field all his life.

It shows. When he talks about any facet of the industry, he does so with conviction, with authority. He answers questions promptly, directly, and without equivocation.

About the petroleum industry as a whole, he declares:

"I think that the industry is of paramount importance to the economy of this country. It certainly is the third largest industry, excepting only agriculture and the combined utilities. It furnishes over 70 percent of our energy."

Tracing the tremendous growth of the industry during the century it has existed, Mr. Porter observed that "It's come from nothing to where it is today."

While oil was discovered at Titusville, Pa., in 1859, one of the events that gave the industry its biggest boosts, he feels, when, in 1901, "Spindletop" came in on the gulf coast "and gave every indication that there would be a supply of oil in abundant quantities." Another milestone, he said, was the development of the gasoline buggies and the growth of roadbuilding.

"The petroleum industry, of course, is certainly in favor of good roads, properly engineered and properly financed," the API head emphasized. "The industry and highway transportation go hand in hand. And highway transportation, like oil, will continue to grow, too."

What has been the industry's greatest achievement in its relatively short history? Mr. Porter was asked.

Pausing a moment, he replied:

"I think one of the greatest achievements of the industry—and one that has worked in the public interest—is in the field of conservation. Working with the regulatory authorities of the various oil-producing States, conservation laws have been enacted which really have a twofold purpose: the protection of the relative rights of the operators, and also, of course, the conservation and proper producing methods of this valuable resource."

About the present condition of the industry, Mr. Porter had these observations:

"The oil industry, just like any other industry, has its good, its fair, and its bad times. In some respects, 1958 was a trying year. I think the consensus is that 1959 will be a better year, that there will be some increase in demand.

"It must be borne in mind, though, that the above ground stocks of products are too high for this time of year. That is always a matter of concern. But this is something that the industry itself can take care of by exercising some restraint in production.

"I don't know what you would call our biggest problem at the moment. But there was put into effect recently a mandatory import order which restricts the amount of crude oil that can be brought into this country. It hasn't been in operation long enough to have all the 'bugs' out of it. I wouldn't say that everyone is happy with it."

How about taxes?

"Taxes are everybody's problem these days," he said. "And anything that would conceivably change the tax regulations adversely to the production of oil and gas would seriously hamper our operations and would undoubtedly lead to higher prices for the particular product affected—all of which would not be in the interest of the public."

He added that the API remains opposed to any increase in the Federal gasoline tax, as proposed by the administration.

The dawn of the atomic power age doesn't disconcert him. In commenting on this, he remarked:

"All predictions, of course, are that the energy requirements of this country will grow tremendously in the next two decades—and oil and gas will be called upon to furnish a great share of this increase.

"Atomic energy will come into the picture, of course, but the best thinking is that it will merely complement the present liquid and other forms of energy.

"The oil industry has always carried on vast research programs. There has been a great deal of work in the field of petrochemicals—which is a growing field. Did you know that out of gas and oil, some 2,500 articles are now manufactured?"

The listener hadn't known * * * and he left with the feeling that Frank Porter had not merely been employing words when he said:

"The long range picture is bright."

The Future of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, an old acquaintance and friend of mine, Mr. Robert Harriss, is among the businessmen who have a deep concern for the future of agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement that he has prepared for presentation to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTROY AGRICULTURE AND DESTROY AMERICA

(Statement by Robert M. Harriss sent to the U.S. Senate Agricultural Committee and the House of Representatives Agricultural Committee)

Gentlemen, I am a native Texan, but now a resident of Florida. I have been interested in agriculture for the past 40 years and have farms and ranches in Texas, Florida, and old Mexico. I have also had experience in foreign exchange, currencies, and exporting and banking.

Agriculture being our greatest and basic industry upon which the existence of our Nation depends, I believe we agree that this problem should be given first consideration. It is all vital to our national security. I believe if we destroy agriculture we destroy America.

I also believe we will agree that paying our farmers not to produce for the past 25 years has proved uneconomic and destructive. It is against nature's or divine law. While we have been paying our farmers not to produce, Communist Russia and Communist China have been doing everything possible to increase their agricultural production. Our present surpluses are not a liability but could prove one of our greatest assets in combating communism, provided a constructive program is adopted for the disposal of same among the starving, hungry, and needy of the world.

I believe you will agree the American farmer, the man who is feeding and clothing the Nation is entitled to a fair or parity price on that portion of his major nonperishable commodities domestically consumed and leave him a freeman to compete in the world markets at world prices on any surpluses produced above his allotment for domestic consumption. Such a program would be rather simple in administering and would save the Government and taxpayers billions of dollars. If the farmer produced in excess of his domestic allotment he would have the option of either selling it in the world market at world prices or holding his surplus against his allotment for the following year. If the domestic consumption should prove less than anticipated then the excess production could be held by the Government for a reduction in the allotment for the following year. If the domestic consumption should prove more than the allotment, then the farmer or the Government could be permitted to sell the shortage out of their surplus.

Regarding the existing surpluses in major nonperishable commodities, the selling of them should not be left to the discretion of any one man. A portion of them should be stockpiled for national emergency and the selling of the remainder should be definitely fixed equally over a 5- or 10-year period but only for disposal in the world markets.

To facilitate the disposal of existing surpluses three things should be done without delay:

1. Government credit insurance to American exporters on liberal terms guaranteed by reputable foreign buyers.

2. Long term loans with acceptance of foreign currency of friendly free nations as collateral.

3. Outright gifts to the people of certain nations who are in dire need of food and clothing and under the control of our Government.

Regarding the perishable crops: It would be impracticable to have a domestic allotment on these. However, I think you will agree that our farmers are entitled to the domestic market on these crops and should be fairly protected against the importation of perishable crops from foreign countries that they can produce with their cheap labor and low taxes at much less than our American farmers with high labor and standard of living and taxes. Many of our American manufacturers are now beginning to find that they cannot compete with foreign nations for this same reason. In a recent article Mr. Leslie Gould, one of the outstanding financial authorities in the country, stated, "Today, foreign steel producers can and are underselling American companies in the domestic market and in neighboring Canada. The same for many other goods."

There may be opposition from certain foreign sources regarding adoption of the domestic allotment plan and the orderly disposal of existing surplus commodities. However, why should we permit foreign sources to dictate our economic and agricultural program. Why should the domestic market not be protected for our own farmers at fair or parity prices and why should they not be left free men to compete in the world market at world prices on any surpluses.

In connection with the foregoing it would be well for us to take into consideration the following farm and agricultural statistics:

According to Government figures the national income has increased 100 percent during the past 12 years and at the same time agricultural income has declined 20 percent, and to make the situation worse the purchasing power of the paper dollar they receive has declined 33 percent. In other words, in terms of dollar purchasing power agriculture is receiving only about half of what they received 12 years ago. The farmers' situation is even worse. According to Government figures, the net farm income, compared to national income, was 104 percent more 12 years ago and, considering the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, he is only receiving a net income of about one-third what he received 12 years ago. Is it any wonder that during these 12 years the farm population has declined more than 6,500,000 despite the increase in the national population from 144 million to 174 million? Has not the influx of farm population to the cities and factories had a direct influence on unemployment and relief?

I do not believe the domestic allotment program would be the fundamental solution of our economic troubles, but it would be helpful and constructive for agriculture and our economy and save the Government and the taxpayers billions of dollars.

I believe the most helpful step that could be taken for a sound national recovery would be a free gold market. Since the value of gold was arbitrarily fixed 25 years ago, the general price level and labor costs have risen about 300 percent, while the only recognized medium of exchange—gold, has been arbitrarily pegged at $35 per ounce. How can we have a sound recovery in our country or world recovery until we have a free medium of exchange on which exports and imports and world trade is based—gold. This would naturally result in a higher price for gold in terms of the unredeemable paper dollar, which would be essentially helpful not only to agriculture, industry, business, and labor, but a sound national and world recovery. This because such a free gold market would permit foreign nations to buy more of our agricultural and manufactured products for less gold. During the past 24 months we have been losing gold at an alarming rate; about $3 billion of gold has been lost during this period. In Associated Press, June 24,

1959, article by Mr. Sam Dawson, he stated, "Uncle Sam's stock of gold is dropping below $20 billion for the first time since 1940, when it was nearly $25 billion. At the same time total payments by the United States to other nations continue to exceed receipts from them. Latest figures show exports slipping while imports hold high." New York Times article on financial page, June 25, 1959, also stated U.S. gold stock was below $20 billion for the first time since 1940. About one-half the gold in the United States is earmarked or belongs to foreigners or foreign governments. Why wait for the inevitable to happen and, in the meantime, permit confusion and inflation and economic conditions to grow worse? Until we establish a free gold market and find out what the paper dollar is worth in terms of gold, economists whose opinion I value and agree with, believe the inflation and debasement of the paper dollar will continue.

Some argue that because England, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Russia, and other countries urge higher price gold we should not cooperate in same. They also argue it would be helpful to Communist Russia. May it not be the case that because Communist Russia advocated higher price gold they do not want it because they know their advocacy would be a handicap in bringing it about? Also higher price gold is not important to Communist Russia as the free world, because Communist Russia produces gold with slave labor. The record shows the present price of gold is destroying the gold mining industry in the United States and adversely affecting allied mining. Eighteen years ago we produced 270 percent more gold than now. In any event we own a large part of the gold. Therefore, higher price gold would be helpful to our exports of agriculture, manufactured goods and our economy; also a free gold market is essential to free trade. In the long run this would be most detrimental to Communist Russia.

Not long ago Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Economic Minister of West Germany, who is credited with engineering Germany's prosperity to its present world position, when asked if he saw any end to the gradual decline in the purchasing power of money, replied: "There is no way of knowing whether the dangerous trend toward inflation will come to an end, so long as there is no real progress toward making currencies freely convertible into gold." Recently I attended an all-day seminar on the gold, dollar and inflation question given by Dr. Franz Pick, who is considered one of the outstanding world authorities on gold and the money question. Dr. Pick was of the opinion that inflation, debasement of the dollar and confusion would continue and grow worse until we had higher price gold. With your permission I would like to leave a few articles that have a direct bearing on Dr. Erhard's and Dr. Pick's statements, if you desire them for the record.

As some of us may remember, in March 1933, when our country was in the depths of the worst depression in history, we were forced to place an embargo against the exportation of our gold. This was promptly followed by unbelievable economic recovery in agriculture, industry, business, and employment.

Economists, whose opinions I value, do not advocate the arbitrary raising and pegging the price of gold at a fixed price. We advocate a constructive monetary policy on gold, medium of exchange for 6,000 years; first, an embargo on the exportation of our gold followed by a free gold market, to determine what the value of the unredeemable paper dollar is worth in the terms of gold. When this has been determined we can return to redeemable currency and with economy in Government and a balanced budget. We can go forward with a sound prosperity for agriculture, industry, and world trade and recovery.

Attached are some statistics, reports, and data, substantiating the foregoing, which I believe conclusively prove:

1. That inflation will continue as long as we are on a paper unredeemable dollar and end in disaster.

2. That in order to return to redeemable currency we must have higher priced gold.

3. We should stop the export of gold until it can be determined what the dollar is actually worth in terms of gold.

4. That higher priced gold would be of great benefit to agriculture, industry, and labor because it would make it possible for foreign countries to buy more of our surplus commodities and goods and make it more difficult to dump cheap foreign products on the American market.

5. On pages 9 and 10 of the gold report it shows the falsity of the Communist propaganda that higher priced gold would help Communist Russia and that the reverse is true—that higher priced gold would be of great benefit to the economy of our country, the free nations, and damaging to Communist Russia and other Communist countries.

Khrushchev Before Congress?—That's Going Too Far

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Oelwein Register on the question of Khrushchev speaking before the Congress.

It should be noted that it is not necessary that Khrushchev be invited to speak before the Congress. Heads of state are not extended this courtesy as a matter of course, nor do these meetings accomplish very much. As a general rule these remarks made on such occasions are of a polite and innocuous nature. Very little is learned from these polite speeches.

It seems to me that a far more important and fruitful way to proceed with Premier Khrushchev would be if particular committees such as the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations invited Khrushchev to discuss with these two committees in a joint meeting problems of world peace.

The article follows:

[From the Oelwein (Iowa) Register, Sept. 2, 1959]

KHRUSCHEV BEFORE CONGRESS?—THAT'S GOING TOO FAR

It is one thing to show the Khrushchev family typical American courtesy and to consider their visit something that could improve Russian-American relations if only to prove to the Soviet premier that what he has been told about the American standard of living is true. But it's something quite different to ask him to speak to the House and Senate.

His visit to Iowa is bound to open his eyes. It is interesting that he will appear on television for an hour long speech.

But an invitation to him to address both Houses of Congrese or either House is going a little too far.

Eisenhower has gone a long way toward making it clear to our Western allies that the Khrushchev visit here and the President's visit to Russia will have a bearing on our relationship with our friends, and that no secret agreements will be made. It certainly is important, while taking all reasonable steps to thaw out the cold war, to make sure that the enslaved Hungarians, Czechs, Poles, and other satellite peoples do not become disillusioned by the Khrushchev visit.

He does not deserve the recognition of addressing the Congress. If he is invited to do this, then the leaders of every other nation who visit the United States, including the very smallest, should be extended the same courtesy.

We are not sure where the idea of Khrushchev's appearance before Congress originated. Apparently there were a number of legislators who wanted it. The idea of adjourning Congress temporarily until the end of the Khrushchev visit, we believe, also was misguided. As many legislators have said the past few days, let's get on with normal business, there's much to be done, and not permit the Khrushchev visit to have any bearing on our plans.

An Illogical Cotton Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a very important and timely editorial which appeared in the September 7, 1959, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga. It is entitled "An Illogical Cotton Program," and it urges approval by the administration of the petition which has been filed by the National Cotton Council under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ILLOGICAL COTTON PROGRAM

The bewildering impracticability of Federal bureaucracy is no better typified than by the most recent irrationality of the Department of Agriculture.

Ostensibly designed, we charitably presume, to foster the sale of American cotton on the world market, this latest bit of strategy calls for the Government to place a subsidy of 8 cents a pound upon exports of raw cotton, setting a price of 8 cents a pound less to foreign buyers than that paid by domestic users of the staple. In essence, a textile manufacturer in India or Hong Kong or Pakistan or Japan may purchase American cotton approximately $55 a bale cheaper than his counterpart in the United States must pay for the identical commodity.

This new policy—obviously stemming from the one-world-mindedness of some of our so-called leaders in Washington—is effecting even greater constrictions for the American textile industry which, in just the past year or two, has been able to alleviate a depress-

ing situation resulting from the resurgence of Japan as a textile producer.

Although it required extreme nimbleness and persuasion on the part of American textile manufacturers, the Government, 3 years ago, worked out a quota plan with Japan which permitted that nation's exports to the United States to be kept on a scale acceptable to American manufacturers and workable to the extent that it enabled both the Japanese and the domestic industry to function at a profit.

Now, however, new parties have been heard from. India, Hong Kong, Pakistan, Formosa, and Korea are flooding the American market with piece goods and made-up garments. Not only have those countries a formidable differential in wage rates, but now they are given a tremendous advantage in the cost of their raw materials.

Even the American textile manufacturers will argue that this, in addition to being unsound and unfair so far as domestic industry is concerned, is patently unfair to Japan in that that nation has voluntarily agreed to control its exports to the United States, while no such restriction is placed on the other Asian countries. It could lead Japan—and possibly rightfully so—to abrogate its quota plan in order to meet the rising competition from its neighbors.

In that eventuality, the more than 286,000 bales of cotton—some of which finds its way into Hong Kong from Red China—that are currently coming into this country could become many times that number almost overnight.

Should that occur, the American textile manufacturer would be in the position of having to curtail operations and, as a result, reduce his consumption of American cotton.

Even the Department of Agriculture should be able to see that such an eventuality would redound against the American farmer, the man the Agriculture Department theoretically is striving to assist.

Thus, it should be logical to presume that the Department will be willing to act favorably upon a petition by the National Cotton Council for invocation of section 22 of the Agriculture Adjustment Act which imposes upon the President the obligation to take remedial action in this type of situation.

First Major U.S. Mine Tragedy Occurred 90 Years Ago Near Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article written by Mr. James J. Corrigan, of Wilkes-Barre, anthracite industry historical researcher, which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Sunday Independent of September 6, 1959, in which Mr. Corrigan graphically narrates the mine disaster that took 110 lives at the Avondale Colliery, in Plymouth Township, near Wilkes-Barre, on September 6, 1869:

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Sunday Independent, Sept. 6, 1959]

ONE HUNDRED AND TEN PERISHED IN AVONDALE FIRE; FIRST MAJOR U.S. MINE TRAGEDY OCCURRED 90 YEARS AGO TODAY

(By James J. Corrigan)

Ninety years ago today, on September 6, 1869, there occurred at the famous Avondale Colliery, Plymouth Township, America's first major coal mining tragedy and also the worst disaster in the long history of northeastern Pennsylvania's anthracite mining industry.

One hundred and eight tragically-trapped men and boys inside the mine perished through asphyxiation when an uncontrollable fire, originating in a furnace at the bottom of the Avondale shaft, over which the breaker and works stood, flashed upward and destroyed the surface structures. It was the only means of entrance and exit. Two other men succumbed in a heroic rescue descent into the mine and numerous other men nearly met the same fate in rescue attempts. Avondale mine fire fatalities totaled 110.

The Avondale works were completed in September 1867, being considered the finest in the valley. But the tragic neglect or abysmal lack of foresight was responsible for the construction of what proved a disastrous one-way ticket into the mine.

In the 1860's Avondale and the general Plymouth area were settlements largely of persons of Welsh ancestry. Men of this nationality proved their heroic stature in dangerous rescue attempts in descending the Avondale shaft, stifling with obnoxious gases, immediately following the fire. There also was a lesser number of Irish families and European Continent immigrants scattered throughout the anthracite settlement in the vicinity of Avondale.

On the morning of September 6, 1896 (a blue Monday of tragedy), a hoisting engineer at Avondale, Alexander Weir, was the first workman to discover the flames, midway between 11 a.m. and noon shooting up the shaft to the breaker atop.

FLAMES AND FURY

Weir, he told a newspaperman a short time later, was "startled by flames rushing up the shaft with great fury. So rapidly did the fire progress that I merely was able to blow the colliery whistle and arrange matters to prevent a boiler explosion. In an almost incredible short time everything combustible about the entire works was in flames—a line of fire extending from the Bloomsburg railroad track below, along the bank of the Susquehanna, to the mine shaft high above, a distance of not less than 300 feet."

Whitewashed hill homes of workmen at the Avondale were in proximity to the engulfing surface conflagration. For several hours, household goods hurriedly were removed to places of safety by residents of the company houses and friends. By then, thousands were attracted to the Avondale mine coming by wagon, horseback and on foot.

It was late in the day before the fire was extinguished. Then, it was deemed prudent to determine the noxious nature of the gases from and in the mine. A dog, enclosed in a box with a lighted lantern was lowered into the shaft. At 6 p.m., the box was raised to the surface. The dog was yet alive, but the lantern light was out. This test, unfortunately aroused strong hopes that the 108 men and boys inside the mine were alive.

At 6:30 p.m., Charles Varture, 35, was lowered into the shaft in a bucket. Fourteen minutes later, at his signal, he was raised to the surface. Varture reported obstructions in the burned out shaft prevented his further descent.

GASPING FOR AIR

Other rescue volunteers were called upon from the thousands at the Avondale scene. About 7 p.m., two volunteers, Charles Jones and Stephen Evans, supplied with a hatchet, a hook and other rescue appliances, were lowered into the shaft. After about 9 minutes they were raised, gasping for air. The pair reported the ominous news that they had discovered two dead mules near the foot of the shaft.

Hopes for recovery of the entrapped men and boys immediately were dimmed. But, to add to the tragedy, two other heroic men, Thomas W. Williams and Davis Jones, were lowered into the shaft. Receiving no sign or signal after some time had elapsed, two other men were let down the shaft. They found Williams and Jones—dead.

Despite these sober warnings, hope yet was held for the entrapped. On Tuesday morning, September 7, 7 a.m., work was commenced pumping air into the smoke-filled mine. Several subsequent search and rescue parties were compelled to resurface on encountering obnoxious gases which almost cost them their lives.

On Wednesday, shortly before 3 a.m., still another search party was lowered into the burned-out Avondale shaft. On this occasion, two dead bodies were discovered near the underground stable.

About 6:30 a.m., Wednesday, four Welshmen descended into the mine and made the most exploration of the interior yet attempted. The air was clearing. They reached a closed brattice which a majority of the entombed men had constructed in a despairing effort to exclude the life-stifling gases. Breaking through the brattice, the quartet reported on surfacing that their gaze met a view which appalled the stoutest heart among them.

Grouped together, this crew reported, in every possible position, laid the dead bodies of 67 men and boys, some appearing as if they had quietly dropped asleep, while others seemed to have struggled with their impending fate; their faces buried in coal dust. One father was stretched out, a son closely clasped by each arm, with a third son lying between his father's legs, his head resting upon his father's breast. Another father lovingly embraced a young son, and all appeared sweetly sleeping.

A FATAL PROMISE

In another heart-touching incident of the tragedy, a boy, Willie Hatton, aged about 10, was found in an attitude of repose; his father also dead near him. It was said that Willie did not work at the Avondale, but that his father took him that fatal morning, according to a promise he made the boy sometime previously to take him to see the mines.

John Burch and his 12-year-old son, John, Jr., were discovered also by the crew, who saw them exactly as found in the chamber of death. The father's left arm was clasped around his boy, and both looked as if they had slept their lives away.

Then began the work of removing the Avondale dead. By 2 o'clock Thursday afternoon all the 108 bodies originally in the mine at the time of the fire had been brought to the surface. A number of the victims were from Hyde Park section of Scranton.

A 2-day coroner's inquest at Plymouth decided that "the fire originated from the furnace in the mine, taking effect on the wood brattice to the up-cast course leading from the bottom of the shaft to the headhouse." The coroner's jury consisted of E. C. Wadhams and Josiah W. Eno, acting as coroner; William J. Harvey, Charles Hutchinson, Samuel VanLoon, James George, Martin McDonald, and Thomas Patton.

The coroner's jury noted that it regarded the current system of mining as insecure and unsafe to the miners, and strongly recommended "where practicable, two places for ingress and egress, and more perfect ventilation, thereby rendering greater security to the lives of the miners under any similar accident."

The Avondale jury's recommendation was fulfilled when, the following year, 1870, the Pennsylvania State Legislature enacted a law demanding that each coal mine must provide for two openings to the surface, "for the ingress and egress of the men employed therein."

Under the direction of Rev. T. P. Hunt of Wilkes-Barre, a relief fund committee was organized at Avondale on Tuesday, September 7, even before the bodies had been re-

covered. Members included E. C. Wadhams, James McAlarney, J. Fuller Reynolds, George Evans, Dr. Richards, Jacob Roberts, J. W. Eno, H. J. Yaple, Harry Hakes, Samuel Shafer, B. J. Woodward, Robert Boston, John F. Wren, Nathan Van Horn, Frank Turner, H. H. Harvey, Richard Stilwell, John B. Smith, Joseph H. Scranton, Henderson Gaylord, and Hendrick B. Wright.

By October 2, a total of $155,825 had been raised, contributions from all parts of the North Atlantic States, including one from the British delegation at Washington.

The Avondale fund's board of trustees, on September 28, determined, among other measures, of the distribution of the moneys that "each widow shall be paid the sum of $200 in equal monthly payments for the ensuing year. Each male orphan child under 14 and each female orphan under 16, of a deceased miner, shall be paid for the same period monthly, in equal sums, $100."

The Avondale disaster destituted 72 widows and 153 orphans, not counting foreign dependents, it was estimated when relief regulations were formulated.

The Avondale mine, yet producing coal, was leased in June 1863, later became the Steuben Coal Co., merged subsequently with the Nanticoke Coal & Iron Co., lessee from the D.L. & W. Railroad Co.

No Taxes, No Water Tolls in Modesto District—Public Power Pays the Whole Water Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, it is almost a cliche around Capitol Hill, as well as in the West, that power is the paying partner of irrigation. We know it is true, but from time to time I think it is helpful to reinforce the point with proof positive. We do that easily every year with the data that comes out of each annual report on the Central Valley project. However, Federal power under reclamation law is not the only public power that helps pay the cost of irrigation development. Local public power does, too, as proven by the news item I have here from the August issue of Western Water News, published by the California Irrigation Districts Association.

Back in 1923 the Modesto Irrigation District in the San Joaquin Valley built Don Pedro Dam on the Tuolumne River in conjunction with the Turlock Irrigation District. They also built a powerplant at the dam. And they held on to their hydroelectric power, not only in production and transmission, but also in distribution of the power throughout the city and the district. It was true public power all the way from producer to consumer.

What is the result? Well, besides low-cost power for 35 years, Modesto now has really low-cost water—in fact, free water in 1959. Mr. President, that is quite an object lesson in these days of mounting water costs all over the country.

As the article says, the Modesto Irrigation District tax rate this year is zero. Furthermore, there is no water charge. Cheap public power pays the whole bill. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Western Water News, August 1959]

WHAT? NO TAXES? YEP, THAT'S IT IN MODESTO

Water users in the Modesto Irrigation District will not pay any district taxes this coming year as a result of dramatic and far-reaching action of the board of directors. They won't pay a water toll, either.

The district is very much in business. In fact, the budget will exceed $4 million. Electrical revenues will approximate this amount, so—the water users will enjoy a full supply of water in the 81,000-acre district without any tax on their land. The levy totaled approximately $117,000 last year.

In past years the tax on the land has been assessed at the rate of $1.50 per $100 of assessed valuation. The average assessed valuation is about $80 per acre, which made the usual tax for the water users $1.20 per acre—pretty cheap as water goes these days, but quite a bit more than nothing.

The Modesto Irrigation District, with the motto, "Where the land owns the water and the power," is out of debt, too. All the bonds have been paid off. It would appear that Modesto has made a record in achievement.

This Senseless Highway Killing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, with the delivery of our paper this morning we were confronted with the fact that over 400 of our citizens were killed on our highways over the Labor Day weekend. This senseless slaughter was due in great part to selfish disregard of the rights of others and points up the fact that the human element is the prime factor in highway accidents.

On the other hand, many people who died on the highways in the last few days would be alive if the manufacturers of automobiles had undertaken to build into their product a few simple safety devices that would protect front seat occupants from the inevitable impact with dash and windshield which causes so many fatal injuries.

Over the weekend I had the privilege of a demonstration of a patented device which operates on the front seat in the event of a collision with another car. The seat is so constructed that upon impact it tilts the passenger backward at an angle of some 30 degrees and thereby protects him from those head and chest injuries which in almost every collision are the lot of the unprotected front seat passenger.

The demonstration was arranged by an old friend of mine and at its conclusion I asked him to write me a letter briefly summarizing the advantages of such an appliance which he did as follows:

COATESVILLE, PA., *September 5, 1959.*
The Honorable PAUL DAGUE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am writing this letter to inform you, and Members of Congress, of the greatest invention to prevent automobile injury since the four-wheel brake.

This is the first major breakthrough in the field of packaging the passenger.

This device operates on impact in a head-on collision. At thirty-one one-thousandths of a second the leading edge of the front seat rises 20 degrees. When inertia takes place the seat rises another 10 degrees and moves forward approximately 6 inches. By this motion the seat absorbs all the whiplash and inertia that is trying to throw the passenger through the windshield or against the dashboard and the steering column.

There are three great advantages to this device. The first is that it eliminates all personalities. The passenger does not have to hook up or turn on anything. The device is completely automatic. The second is it eliminates whiplash, which is the common cause of death in automobile accidents. The third is, it also protects the passengers in the front seat in a rear-end collision. The device snaps the locks and lets the seat scoop the passengers forward, so the shoulders are not rigid and there is no snap permeated to the spinal column.

I would like very much to see this device receive its rightful recognition in saving lives.

Sincerely yours,
HERMAN M. BREUNINGER.

In this connection I think it important to emphasize that I have no interest whatsoever in this device or its promotion other than that which stems from an abiding concern in the development of any mechanism that will reduce the number of deaths resulting from collision on our highways.

Incidentally, it occurs to me that our House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might properly investigate the appliance in question and I am sure that a demonstration could be arranged which should prove convincing and might lead to its utilization, in the first instance, on public vehicles at all levels of government. The ultimate goal will not be reached, however, until this device, or a similar accessory, is installed on all automobiles at the factory.

Veto of Public Works Appropriation Bill Particularly Inimical to States in Pacific Northwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Oregon Daily Journal of September 1, 1959, entitled "Northwest Hard Hit by Veto."

I endorse the two major themes of this editorial. One is that the veto by President Eisenhower of the public works appropriations bill affects more adversely our Pacific Northwest region than any other area of the United States. I also subscribe to the contention in the editorial that the President of the United States should have authority to veto single items in appropriation bills, so that he does not have to burn down the house to roast the pig, as has been the case with respect to such vetoes as that of the entire public works appropriations bill.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Oregon Journal of September 1 be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, Sept. 1, 1959]

NORTHWEST HARD HIT BY VETO

The President's last-minute veto of the omnibus public works bill appears to hit the Pacific Northwest a harder blow than any other area.

That's because it involves more than $50 million worth of Oregon construction projects, including the indispensable John Day Dam, for which $20 million was sought; $9 million for Cougar Reservoir, $8,300,000 for Hills Creek Reservoir and $7 million for the Dalles dam and locks and other projects already underway.

To make matters worse, the $32 million Bonneville power administration budget is caught in the veto mill, including $22 million for lines and substations that will become imperative in the next three fiscal years as some 2 million kilowatts of new Federal and non-Federal power come into the BPA grid.

Also involved are such continuing projects as the deepening of the Columbia River Channel from Vancouver to The Dalles, which Army Engineers hoped to finish next year, and half a dozen bureau of reclamation projects (Columbia Basin, Talent and Crooked River, for example) about which there has been no argument.

Irony of this situation is that virtually all of these projects do not involve new starts against which the President expressed his ire. They are continuing projects, already fully approved, which will add to the wealth and productive capabilities of the area. With only a couple of minor exceptions they do not fit the "pork barrel" label in any way.

Finally, projects such as John Day, Ice Harbor and The Dalles, where large crews now are busy, will be thrown completely off schedule by costly delays—unless the Congress either overrides President Eisenhower's veto or knuckles under and cuts out every item to which he takes exception.

For these reasons, the scheduled attempt of the Congress to override the veto on Wednesday will be watched with intense interest by residents of the Northwest. The President's 11th-hour veto (the $1,200 million bill for power, navigation, reclamation and flood control would have become effective last Saturday otherwise) has aroused so much angry reaction and genuine concern that he may be overriden on a bipartisan basis. This would upset his otherwise perfect record of making his vetoes stand up.

The problem posed by this latest veto is another clear indication of the need for Presidential authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills. Otherwise the all-or-nothing veto procedure really can hurt.

A New Pension Bill for Veterans of World War I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to make a statement in support of a new pension bill for the benefit of veterans of World War I that I introduced today in the House.

As you know, these veterans are arriving at an advanced age in life and are being forced into retirement because of age, disability, and various other reasons. If it is not already the case, they are upon the threshold, as a group, of facing their waning years of retirement and old age without earning capacity to offset the steadily increasing costs of living. As is the case with all our veterans, we owe this group of men our national gratitude. It appears possible, through such proposals as I have included in my bill, to assist our World War I veterans in their old age on the mutual basis of need and reward.

It would be difficult to determine just how many veterans of World War I are already receiving some form of public assistance through State and local agencies. There are also undoubtedly certain sums of tax money being deducted on a personal exemption basis by the persons on whom many of these veterans have become dependent. These are considerations which should be, and I am confident will be, taken into account in any hearings held on a bill such as I am proposing.

My bill does away with requirements which presently exist to the effect that a veteran must be totally and permanently disabled in order to receive a nonservice-connected pension, even the liberal construction of such requirements. A World War I veteran would automatically qualify for a pension under my bill upon reaching the age of 62 years, regardless of the degree of any disability he might have or the status of his employability, provided his income fell within the maximum limitations prescribed in the bill. This would correct one of the greatest and most glaring deficiencies in our present veteran's pension regulations. To demonstrate, let me quote from Report No. 537 of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I have the privilege to be a member. This was the committee report accompanying H.R. 7650, which has since become Public Law 86–211.

In addition, the committee has been studying the adjudication of non-service-connected disability pension cases and has reached the conclusion that VA regulations and their current applications are inadequate as they apply to the cases of certain veterans who have high disability and advanced age. In some of the cases examined by the committee, the VA has denied pensions to veterans on the basis that the veteran is employable, notwithstanding the fact that these veterans were above age 60, had high disability, in some instances, from 40 to 80 percent, and were earning far less than the amounts specified by the income limits.

It was noted that VA commonly denies employability in the case of certain farmers, despite the fact that the farmers are old and severely disabled. The denial is on the basis that the farmer is employable even though the farmer's income is very low and the farm which he controls is very small and occupies only a small part of his time.

It is recommended and expected that the Veterans' Administration will review its regulations as they relate to employability of veterans with advanced age and high disability to assure that these elderly veterans with high disability, who are meeting the income limits, will not be denied pensions on the basis of employability when they are not working a substantial part of the time at a gainful occupation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my bill will serve to eliminate that area of administrative discretion which the Committee on Veterans' Affairs feels has resulted in many unfair and inequitable decisions made by the VA in pension matters.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9134

A bill to provide a new pension program for veterans of World War I

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress finds that a substantial number of veterans of World War I are in need of assistance today. It is therefore the purpose of this Act, as an indication of the appreciation of the United States for the service rendered by such veterans, to provide benefits, based upon the need therefor, to this meritorious group, as a reward for such service.

SEC. 2. (a) Subchapter II of chapter 15 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 513. World War I veterans

"(a) The Administrator shall pay to each veteran of World War I who meets the service requirements of section 521 of this title, and who has attained the age of 62 years, a pension at rate prescribed by this section.

"(b) If the veteran is unmarried (or married but not living with and not reasonably contributing to the support of his spouse) and has no child, pension shall be paid at the monthly rate set forth in column II of the following table opposite the veteran's annual income as shown in column I:

Column I		Column II
Annual income		
More than—	but Equal to or less than—	
$600	$600	$140
1,200	1,200	100
	1,800	50

"(c) If the veteran is married and living with or reasonably contributing to the support of his spouse, or has a child or children, pension shall be paid at the monthly rate set forth in column II, III, or IV of the following table opposite the veteran's annual income as shown in column I:

Column I		Column II	III	IV
Annual income				
More than—	Equal to but or less than—			
$1,000	$1,000	$140	$145	$150
2,000	2,000	110	110	110
	3,000	75	75	75

"(d) If the veteran is in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly rate payable to him under subsection (b) or (c) shall be increased by $70.

"(e) The Administrator shall deny or discontinue payment of pension under this section when the corpus of the veteran's estate is such that under all the circumstances, including consideration of the veteran's income, it is reasonable that some part of the corpus be consumed for the veteran's maintenance."

(b) The analysis of such chapter 15 is amended by inserting immediately below

"512. Spanish-American War veterans."

the following:

"513. World War I veterans."

SEC. 3. Section 521 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Where a World War I veteran has been granted pension under section 513 of this title, pension may not thereafter be paid to him under this section."

Most Teenagers Aren't Delinquents: Dallas Council of Social Agencies Sets Example

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, teenage crime and violence and stories of juvenile delinquency appear in our newspapers almost every day.

However, most of our young people do not fit into this category. The vast majority of this Nation's teenagers are preparing themselves for adulthood and are exhibiting good citizenship right now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mildred Young which tells of some services performed by public-spirited teenagers in Dallas, Tex., under the guidance of the Council of Social Agencies of Dallas. The article was published in the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald for Sunday, August 23, 1959, under the title "Teenagers Cure Boredom With Service to Others."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEENAGERS CURE BOREDOM WITH SERVICE TO OTHERS

(By Mildred Young)

Teenagers seek diversion every fleeting moment. When they do not find it in sufficient quantity, they complain of being bored with it all and begin to seek additional outlets for their endless energy and enthusiasm.

Adults often agree that this desire can be a bad trait which leads to delinquency. But to some 1,500 Dallas young people and 18 service agencies, this excessive energy has meant a summer of helpful and interesting activity.

Three years ago the Council of Social Agencies of Dallas, which provided cooperative planning for effective welfare services, put out a plea for teenage volunteers to serve, without pay, in institutions throughout the city in a wide variety of activities.

RESPONSE GROWS

The first year about 150 responded. The following spring, the promotional meeting was moved from the YWCA to the Statler Hilton Hotel and 400 responded. This year's public presentation was given at the A. Harris & Co. graduation show. In addition to the annual promotional meetings, volunteers are sought through Y-teen clubs in the schools.

Mrs. Raymond Potts, chairman of the youth volunteer committee, says that the volunteer program has not only proved increasingly popular with the young people in Dallas, but increasingly valuable to the whole community.

Agencies now cooperating in the program include: Baylor University Hospital, Bethlehem Community Center, Children's Medical Center, City Park Department, Community Chest, Dallas Day Nurseries, Jewish Community Center, Junior Red Cross, Juvenile Traffic Court, Marillac Social Center, Museum of Fine Arts, Parkland Memorial Hospital, St. Paul, Veterans' Administration Hospital, Well Baby Clinics, Health Department, West Dallas Social Center, Wesley Community Center, and the YWCA.

CAREER LAUNCHED

Though the ideal age for volunteers is 15 to 16, Miss Delores Sands, a 16-year-old, worked for the Camp Fire Girls when she was 12. Miss Sands said that she got tired of not having anything to do. She wrote a letter which led to the Camp Fire job, and the following year she started her present task with the Community Chest public relations office. Miss Sands has wanted to be a journalist for a long time and now thinks that she would like to serve the Community Chest or a similar organization in her chosen field. Asked why she didn't find a job with pay, Miss Sands stated, "Well, when I first started to work no one would hire me because I was too young."

Others are planning to enter a service organization on a full-time professional basis as a result of their volunteer work. Nursing and teaching helpers' positions are especially attractive to the girls. Three volunteers working at St. Paul Hospital are going into nurse's training and a fourth into medical arts study. Most young people took the jobs for lack of enough to do. In putting their spare time to use, some have found a life's vocation.

There are a wide variety of positions open. Volunteers can assist in nursing offices; escort outpatients; serve at the lobby information desks; as library and recreation assistants, office workers, radio disk jockeys; participate in traffic court as officials; assist mothers with babies; weigh and measure babies; serve as a Spanish interpreter, as registrars; assist in bedside patient care and feeding, making surgical dressings and tray favors, folding bandages, work in dental and medical labs, and a hundred other tasks.

What has the volunteer to gain in personal satisfaction? One Baylor volunteer said, "I have always wanted to see the world. Now my ambition has been realized. I am meeting the world at Baylor, all her various phases, and all her people—the French professor, the Irishman with his charming brogue, the age-worn artist, the woman from India, the husband and wife from England. The world has a story to tell and she's telling it to me."

Union Money Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the September 4 issue of the Washington Evening Star:

UNION MONEY TALKS

Some union spokesmen have said that the labor reform bill, as approved by the House-Senate conferees, is bad legislation. They have said that it is a punitive, oppressive, union-busting measure. It is worse, they have claimed, than Taft-Hartley, which, when adopted 12 years ago, was supposed to have enslaved labor.

All such talk is the sheerest nonsense. But after all it is only talk, and in this instance union action, or union money, speaks louder than words. What we have in mind is the announcement by Walter Reuther that his industrial union department of the AFL–CIO has given $1 million to the steel workers to support their strike. And this is only a "first down payment" on $25 million which the AFL–CIO is planning to donate if it is needed for the strikers.

If money talks, and we think it does, this gift gives the lie to all the chatter about the prospective destruction of the union movement. What this $1 million gift says is that the union movement is strong, probably the strongest organized force in the country, and that its leaders have plenty of confidence in its future.

The reform bill does impose some restraints on some abuses of union power. It restrains secondary boycotts of businessmen not directly involved in a strike. It imposes some restraints on so-called organizational picketing—picketing designed to force workers to join unions even though they may not wish to join. It outlaws the hot cargo clause—a favorite coercive weapon of the Teamsters Union. And it permits State agencies to take jurisdiction of some labor disputes which the National Labor Relations Board cannot or will not handle. There is nothing in these provisions which stifles any proper union activity. What they will do, if they prove to be effective, is to prevent intolerable abuses of union power, and that will be a good thing for all concerned.

In its more important provisions, the bill cracks down hard on the thieves, racketeers, criminals, and Communists who have infested labor unions. This crackdown has been a long time in coming, but public pressure resulting from the exposures by Senator MCCLELLAN'S committee has proved irresistable. Even the most prolabor legislators have felt the heat, and are eager to vote for these reforms. If the bill becomes law, as undoubtedly it will, and if it accomplishes what it is suposed to accomplish, honest workers, honest union leaders, and honest businessmen will enjoy something approaching a new birth of freedom. And this is true, no matter what the professional handwringers may continue to say.

How Constituents Can Discourage a Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on October 31 the Louisville Courier-Journal published an editorial which calls attention to a distressing aspect of public life which we have all faced at some time. It refers to the experience of Congressman BRADEMAS, who was unfairly charged by some of his constituents with voting against the confirmation of an Ambassador and the Secretary of Commerce.

Congressman BRADEMAS can properly be credited with taking an active part in the constructive legislation passed by the other body, particularly for his conscientious efforts in behalf of sound labor reform legislation, but it must have come as a shock to him to learn that he was also expected to exercise the prerogatives of a member of the Senate and vote upon the confirmation of appointments to the Cabinet or to an embassy.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Aug. 31, 1959]

HOW CONSTITUENTS CAN DISCOURAGE A CONGRESSMAN

"Only a small minority commented on my stand on the issues, either from information received from TV talks, or indirectly by word of mouth from others." That was the observation of Stimson Bullitt, a cousin of the Kentucky Bullitt family, when running for Congress in his home State of Washington. He recorded that and many other thoughts in a useful book called "To Be a Politician."

This certainly parallels the experience of many other office-seekers. In an era when voters seem more interested in a candidate's appearance than in his ideas or his past performance, it is easy for politicians to turn cynical and use all their resources on building a glamorous personality.

Yet some vision of a politician's record does linger about his head in the mind of the voter, either as a dim halo or as a dark ugly cloud. The distressing part is that this view is often distorted and even wildly inaccurate. JOHN BRADEMAS, a new and conscientious Congressman from South Bend, Ind., takes rueful note of this peculiarity of politics. He was recently assailed by some of his constituents for his vote on a labor reform bill. Two letter writers added bitter criticism of other votes they believed he had cast, one against Clare Booth Luce as Ambassador to Brazil and the other against Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

WHAT HE MUST PRAY FOR

BRADEMAS no doubt explained to these stern critics that he did not and could not have voted on these two confirmations. He is a Member of the House of Representatives. Only the Senate votes to confirm appointments to the Cabinet or to our embassies. Perhaps the young Congressman can convince these two individuals that he is innocent of their specific charges. It will be a miracle, however, if he can root from their minds a prejudice based on misinformation, even if they themselves admit they were misinformed in this instance.

This is all very discouraging for the honest public official. If he holds office in a democratic country, however, he simply has to accept certain limitations of our political system, in return for its great advantages. He must give constant attention to his voting record, praying all the while for three things: that the record will be accurately and fairly reported; that his constituents will grasp and remember its details; and that they will think well enough of him to respect his motives even when they disagree with his actions.

Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in one of the outstanding newspapers in my district. It expresses rather forcefully and persuasively the opinion that the District of Columbia should be granted home rule.

Having lived in the District during my 2-year tenure in the Department of Justice in 1954–55, I believe that I know personally a number of reasons justifying the granting of home rule in some form to the District of Columbia.

I submit herewith an editorial of Thursday, August 20, 1959, appearing in the Olean (N.Y.) Times Herald:

[From the Olean (N.Y.) Times Herald, Aug. 20, 1959]

HOME RULE FOR WASHINGTON, D.C

Once again, the prospects for home rule for the city of Washington, our Nation's Capital, seem within a hairbreadth of success. The Senate has passed a bill that would allow the people of the District to vote for a mayor and legislature, and the House District Committee is considering it.

However, this committee is packed with men who have long been opposed to home rule for the citizens of the capital. A petition is being circulated by Representative ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, New York, to bypass the committee and bring a home rule measure to the floor of the House where vigorous support is expected.

When originally established by the founding fathers, Washington was given a mayor appointed by the President, and an elective council. From 1812 to 1820, the council chose the mayor, and from 1820, he was elected by the people.

In 1871, Congress repealed the charter of the city, and later established a system of government by appointed commissioners. Ever since then Congress has been burdened with the legislative and administrative details of the Capital city.

It seems strange that the Capital of our great democracy should deny the basic rights of self-government to its citizens. It has been charged that southern Democrats oppose home rule because of the majority of Negroes in the city. While this might be expected from many southerners, certainly the majority of our Congressmen should be ashamed of such a stand.

An administration back resolution in the House asks for a District governor appointed by the President, and elected city council, and an elected nonvoting delegate to the House of Representatives. In other words, the people of Washington are seeking the privileges given them in 1802. It's high time they get them back.

Resolution of St. Regis Tribe of Indians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Council of Chiefs of the St. Regis Tribe of Indians in New York State concerning their lands.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the American St. Regis Indian Reservation in New York State is located adjacent to the St. Lawrence River; and

"Whereas, the said Indian Reservation lands are the only lands still available in the United States and east of the first locks in the St. Lawrence Seaway for industrial and commercial purposes; and

"Whereas the St. Lawrence Seaway has made the availability of such lands of tremendous importance toward industrial and commercial progress in the United States; and

"Whereas we, the Council of Chiefs of the St. Regis Indian Tribe of American Indians, recognize that possible leases of some of the lands of our reservation in this area would inure to the benefit of the tribal membership: Now, Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, the Council of Chiefs of the St. Regis Tribe of Indians in New York State, residing upon our reservation at Hogansburg, N.Y., recommend that legislation be adopted by Congress declaring that lands owned by the St. Regis Tribe of Indians may be leased for such purposes and for such periods as may be permitted by the laws of the State of New York.

"The clerk of our tribe is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to those representatives in our U.S. Government and other officials for the purpose that such legislation may be adopted at the present session of Congress or any future session.

"Dated: the 31st day of August, 1959."

CERTIFICATION

I, Margaret C. Lazore, certify that I am the duly elected and acting clerk of the St. Regis Tribe of Indians, with post office address, Box 121, Hogansburg, N.Y.; that the resolution attached hereto was duly adopted by the duly elected Council of the St. Regis Tribe of Indians on the 31st day of August 1959.

MARGARET C. LAZORE, *Clerk*.

Howard E. Simpson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the phenomenal success of any citizen is a matter deserving of the attention of us all. When such a success story applies to a self-made man who now is in a pivotal position affecting the economy of the Nation, it is of especial significance.

Such a favorable life achievement is to be found in the career of Howard E. Simpson, president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. Not only has his notable attainment been an inspiration to thousands of his fellow Marylanders and to others throughout the country, but the further fact that he has ascended to his high post through seemingly insurmountable difficulties makes his story one to be made available in the widest possible way.

The New York Times of Sunday, September 6, gives a graphic description of Mr. Simpson's success story. At first glance, it seems almost fictional, but the factual information it contains is proof positive of the sterling worth of the man and is an example, particularly for the oncoming generation, to attempt to emulate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article written by Robert E. Bedingfield in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PERSONALITY: SURE HAND AT B. & O. CONTROLS—SIMPSON CLIMBED TO ROAD'S PRESIDENCY THE HARD WAY—AS AID, HE PROVED BOSS WAS ON THE WRONG TRACK

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

Howard Edward Simpson became president of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad by the method most unlikely to succeed in most instances. He kept telling his superiors they didn't know what they were talking about.

Fortunately for Mr. Simpson, and for the B. & O., which is doing remarkably well under his guidance, Mr. Simpson was always able not only to prove his point, but to offer better routes to what the boss had been trying to attain.

The boss that Mr. Simpson tangled with was Roy B. White, chairman of the B. & O. When the two men first met in 1926, Mr. Simpson was an assistant general passenger agent of the B. & O. affiliate, the Central Railroad of New Jersey. Mr. White had just been elected president of the Jersey Central.

Mr. White, on first meeting with Mr. Simpson, told him what he believed was wrong with the railroad's passenger service. After listening to Mr. White's criticism, Mr. Simpson declared:

"We'll do it your way if you insist—you're president of the railroad. But I disagree with everything you've said."

CRITICAL RETORT

That retort started an argument that lasted for an hour or so as Mr. Simpson detailed why he, an assistant general passenger agent thought the president was wrong. Finally, the president said:

"You're right, and I'm wrong. Keep on doing what you're doing."

Having come up through the passenger side of the business, Mr. Simpson has a lingering fondness for those worrisome creatures, a railroad's paying riders. Although he is the first to second the motion made by so many other railroad executives of late—that something should be done to reduce passenger service deficits—Mr. Simpson takes the line about convenience and necessity seriously.

Even if a service is losing money for the railroad, he is willing to continue it "as long as the public patronizes it and it is justified," Mr. Simpson said in a recent interview. "Management has the responsibility under its charter to provide service until it is no longer patronized."

"Take the Royal Blue," Mr. Simpson said. He explained that that crack Washington-Baltimore-New York train service, which the B. & O. finally discontinued in 1958, was a losing proposition after World War II ended. Not until late in 1957, however, when patronage between New York and Washington had dropped ot about 100 paying riders a day for 6 deluxe trains, an average of about 17 riders on each train, did Mr. Simpson petition regulatory authorities for permission to drop the service.

There was no disputing the fact that the passenger was no longer riding the Royal Blue, Mr. Simpson said, and the B. & O. had no difficulty proving its argument to the States involved.

"If we had tried to end the service 10 years ago, however, we would have been rebuffed at every turn," he added.

REALISTIC VIEW

In discussing the unprofitable nature of railroad passenger service, Mr. Simpson is one of the few in his industry who doesn't overdramatize his road's losses. Not because they aren't staggering. They are. Although passenger service traffic accounts for but 6.5 percent of the road's total operating revenues on a full-cost accounting basis the B. & O. lost more than $25 million on the business last year. The out-of-pocket deficit was $14,500,000.

"I don't like to hear people talk about the loss on a full-cost basis," Mr. Simpson said, "not that it isn't correct, but use of that figure merely confuses the issue." Mr. Simpson sticks to the out-of-pocket figure—the actual cost, above that of the rails, of running a train and the amount that he knows the railroad ultimately could hope to save if it stopped running the train.

Obviously, a successful railroad executive—and the B. & O. record since September 1953, with Mr. Simpson in the president's office has been one of the most outstanding among the eastern lines—can't spend all his time on the part of the business that loses money. While he is the first to acknowledge that he is not fully trained in all phases of railroad operation, he has become a keen student of freight traffic since 1946, when he was promoted from general passenger traffic manager to assistant vice president in charge of all traffic.

The most important single commodity in the B. & O.'s freight traffic is soft coal. It accounts for about 44 percent of the road's tonnage and 30 percent of revenues. Steel and steel products are the second most important traffic sources. With about 20 percent of the road's revenues linked to the steel industry, the B. & O. has been hard hit by the steel strike.

While the B. & O.'s carloadings for the first 34 weeks of the year show a 7 percent gain over last year's, loadings in recent weeks have been down more than 14 percent. The toll is reflected in the income statements. The August report will not be issued until next week, but earnings in July fell to $806,000, from $2,900,000 in the 1958 period, when traffic was being reduced seriously by the recession.

Prior to the steel strike, Mr. Simpson had been estimating that the B. & O. this year would achieve a 10 percent increase in carloadings and finish 1959 with earnings at least as "good as last year" when net income was $16 million. Mr. Simpson was hoping that sustained traffic improvement would permit the B. & O. to accelerate its plans for making major improvements to its yards and to extend its several centralized traffic control (automatic remote switching) projects now under way as well as to upgrade its rolling stock. But these hopes were voiced before the steel strike.

LONG AN APPRENTICE

Mr. Simpson, a native of Jersey City, one of the country's busiest railroad centers, has been a railroad man since 1912, when he was only 15 years old. His first job was as a $20-a-month office boy in the passenger department of the Central Railroad of New Jersey.

His first 14 years of service were largely, as he looks back on them now, an apprenticeship, in which he learned his business in the thorough fashion that so impressed Mr. White. After 1926, his rise was steady and, for a railroad executive, swift. He went to work for the B. & O. in 1931 as general eastern passenger agent in New York and 5 years later was transferred to the carrier's executive office in Baltimore.

Mr. Simpson is married to the former Mildred Apgar of Elizabeth, N.J. The Simpsons are simple folks. Their home is the same apartment in Baltimore into which they moved in 1936, when Mr. Simpson was transferred to the head office. Most week nights at home are quiet ones, with Mr. Simpson looking forward to relaxing with his newspapers and listening to his wife play the piano.

Understanding for Victims of Heart Diseases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a New York City constituent of mine, Mr. Arthur Murray Aibinder, recently sent me a copy of a letter he wrote which was printed in the New York Journal-American on the subject of victims of heart disease. He points out that heart disease must be constructively understood, not merely sympathized, and emphasizes that these victims can often perform useful and important work after their illness.

The employment situation of people in this category and their concomitant psychological problems, should be considered by all of us who have contact with cardiac cases or who consider legislation dealing with heart attack victims. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Aibinder's interesting letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOPE FOR AFFLICTED

About 10 years ago, the patient with diagnosed heart disease was either confined to

bed, or was ambulatory in a wheelchair. Today, modern medicine enables the average cardiac patient to lead a normal life. Depending on the degree of the illness, certain restrictions will be advised by the physician. Unfortunately, not all share the concepts of modern medicine. Prospective insurance policyholders, and applicants for employment, are required to take physical examinations prior to be being accepted. The stethoscope diagnosis of heart disease has caused an unwarranted number of rejections. The psychological results will, in many cases, create an insecure feeling of invalidism. Cardiac patients can be very capable workers, and long-surviving policyholders. It should be understood that the patient with chronic heartbeat has a ray of possibilities.

ARTHUR MURRAY AIBINDER.

MANHATTAN.

Muffle Drums—Last of the Boys in Gray Was Never in War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, on August 11, 1959, Congress passed a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation calling for a day of national mourning, with the flag to be flown at half staff, on the occasion of the death of the last surviving veteran of the Civil War.

This resolution was passed to honor one Walter G. Williams, of Texas, who would supposedly reach his 117th birthday on November 14 of this year and who is generally accepted as the only and last surviving veteran of the Civil War.

The Cincinnati Post and Times-Star was contacted by a resident of the Cincinnati area who contended that Walter Williams was not a Civil War veteran. The newspaper assigned one of its ace Washington correspondents, Lowell K. Bridwell, to determine the facts. Mr. Bridwell, after a painstaking, thorough, and exhaustive investigation, found that the newspaper's informant was correct in her assertion.

In view of the resolution passed by the Congress, I am calling Mr. Bridwell's finding to the attention of all Members and the President who under the resolution must issue the proclamation, by inserting here in the RECORD his column as it appeared in the Scripps-Howard papers on September 3, 1959.

It seems to me that under the circumstances the Congress should act to nullify its action since it is now apparent that Congress acted on the basis of misinformation.

MUFFLE DRUMS—LAST OF BOYS IN GRAY WAS NEVER IN WAR—RECORDS SHOW HE WAS BOY OF EIGHT WHEN HOOD MADE FINAL STAND

(By Lowell K. Bridwell)

WASHINGTON.—Walter G. Williams, of Houston, Tex., accepted by the Nation as the "last living link with the Civil War," is a Confederate veteran only in his memory-clouded mind.

The Texan, ill and under the constant care of a daughter, is looking forward to November 14, happily anticipating the attention bestowed upon a man on what he figures must be his 117th birthday. It probably matters little to him that old census records indicate he's really only 103.

Just when and where the aged Texan became universally and sentimentally accepted as a member of the famed Confederate Hood's Texas Brigade isn't known. Maybe it resulted from the tales of elderly men passing the time on county courthouse steps.

Apparently no one bothered to check, or no one really cared. Nevertheless, the meticulously kept Confederate records in the National Archives fail to disclose Williams' association with that most lionized of all Texan fighting outfits.

Perhaps, after years of clouding memories, Williams has forgotten that he was a mere lad of eight on his father's Mississippi farm when the unit he now believes he fought with was making its final stand in Virginia and that Gen. John B. Hood, his self-proclaimed leader, was conducting the battle of Atlanta.

The unfeeling facts contained in musty old ledgers and documents also tell their stories. But they were not presented to the veterans' organizations, the State of Texas, the Congress and the President of the United States when they chose on several occasions to honor this supposed last of the 3½ million men who fought this Nation's only Civil War.

Just last month, Congress approved and President Eisenhower signed a resolution declaring the day of Williams' death to be a day of national mourning with the flags to be flown at half staff. In 1958, Congress provided and the President approved a special Federal pension for Williams and a Virginia Confederate veteran who since has died. Two years earlier, Williams was presented a gold medal by an act of Congress.

Just how long Williams' legend has existed, no one knows. It started officially when he applied for a Texas Confederate pension Aug. 5, 1932, the first year of the great depression.

Williams was merely reflecting the pride of his adopted State when he filed a sworn affidavit that he was a member of Company C, 5th Regiment, Hood's Brigade, 11 months before the war closed. The men of Hood even today are looked upon with respect and awe because of their bravery and key parts in Confederate victories over Union forces in 1861 and 1862.

Williams and thousands of others undoubtedly have forgotten that Hood's famed unit was broken up and lost its historic designation long before Williams believes he enlisted.

These cold records preserved in the National Archives, much more complete than is generally accepted, fail to turn up any evidence of Williams' proclaimed service.

"Other than the sworn statement of Mr. Williams, no evidence was required to begin payment of Confederate pension benefits," wrote Gerald Turner, Texas Veterans' Affairs Commission assistant director, when asked about Williams' service record.

"No official records from many source are available which would verify the statements made by Mr. Williams."

Old census records, however, are able to sweep away the eventful years and shed light on the Williams' legend.

They show, for example, that Williams' father, George W. Williams, and his mother, Nancy, lived on an Itawamba County, Miss., farm in 1850 with their two children, Mary L., 8, and Stephen B., 2. Williams' grandparents, Stephen and Mary Williams, lived there, too.

The family's progress and the toll of the years can be seen in the census records taken every 10 years. By 1860, the grandparents and Mary L. no longer were listed. But as some members were taken away, others came, for the Williams family now had two new members, Laura A., 9, and Walter G., 5. Stephen B. had grown to be a lad of 12.

The move westward apparently swept along the Williams family because they moved to Brazos County, Tex., by the time the 1870 census was taken. George W. and Nancy still headed their family. Stephen B. apparently had gone out to make his own way in the world. Laura A., now a lady of 17, was still living at home. Walter G. was a young man of 15.

By 1880, George W. and Nancy were getting along in years. He was 65. She was 62. Laura was gone, but young Walter G. had married and brought his wife, Florence, home to live.

The young Williams couple, in those eventful 10 years, ont only had married, but produced the first three of their family. They were Marth, 6, Thomas M., 3, and Ida B., 1.

At various times over the years, and confirmed by daughter, Willie M. Bowles, who now cares for him, Williams has listed all these persons as members of his family.

Actually, perhaps, the Williams legend can best be seen in light of his own words, uttered at widely separate times. On his pension application, he said his family moved to Texas in 1870. Years later, he told a newspaper interviewer he was 14 years old when he came to his adopted State.

State of Texas Joins Opposition to Radioactive Waste Disposal in Gulf of Mexico: The Chronicle and the Observer on the Same Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission's attitude of "hear, see, and speak no evil" concerning the dumping of radioactive wastes into the Gulf of Mexico almost succeeded.

However, a number of citizens, joined by me and other Members of the Congress, by newspapers, by community and county governments, by civic and conservation organizations, and by others, protested the proposed move. Now the State of Texas has asked that it be allowed to intervene in the case.

The matter is still under consideration by the AEC, with a hearing scheduled in October. I sincerely hope the Commission will study the application to dump radioactive wastes into the Nation's sea areas careful scrutiny—a closer study than it gave the pollution of some rivers in the Northwestern part of our Nation, which are now reported contaminated because of radioactive wastes dumping.

The Houston Chronicle, one of the largest newspapers in Texas, has led in protesting this move along with some other publications. A militant weekly newspaper which has entered the fight is the Texas Observer. This paper pub-

lished an article which sums up the situation as it is right now. The Chronicle editorial points up the value of citizens doing their own thinking and then having the courage to speak up. An informed, courageous, vigilant citizenry is the best public safeguard in the world. In this day of TV documentaries and mass media of communication brainwashings, individual thinking is more important than at any other period in our history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Houston Chronicle for Monday, August 24, 1959, entitled "State Enters Fight Against Atomic Dumping Along Coast"; an excellent and factual article from the Texas Observer for August 28, 1959, entitled "Alarms on the Radioactive Drums"; and an editorial from the same issue of the Observer, entitled "Flip That Crazy Junk."

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle, Monday, Aug. 24, 1959]

STATE ENTERS FIGHT AGAINST ATOMIC DUMPING ALONG COAST

When a locally organized company months ago applied for a permit to build an atomic waste disposal plant here, with plans to dump the wastes in the Gulf of Mexico, only a handful of citizens here, some county officials and the Chronicle questioned the safety of the plan. This opposition was enough to delay the operation.

Then many other groups joined the fight. Coastal members of Congress took up the campaign against the dumping of atomic wastes in the gulf near Texas. Sportsmen voiced their opposition.

Now the State of Texas has entered the fight, through the attorney general. The attorney general has filed a petition with the Atomic Energy Commission, asking permission to intervene in the case now pending before the Commission on the company's application for a license to dispose of the wastes. The attorney general's brief said the State takes the position that disposal plans to date do not include adequate guarantees of safety.

The situation has changed considerably in the last 2 or 3 months. At first some local sources were aghast that anyone would question the scientists who said that there is no danger in dumping atomic wastes in the Gulf of Mexico. One paper called the opposition "witch burning." But later it was discovered that some equally prominent scientists believe it would be dangerous. The more the case is argued the more apparent it becomes that nobody really knows what effect dumping atomic wastes in the gulf, even in concrete containers, would have on marine life. Some of the self-appointed interpreters of the facts of science now seem to be rather juvenile in their viewpoint.

What if a few determined people hadn't started the fight when the matter first came up? By now, marine life along the coast might be contaminated by radioactive wastes.

There is a moral in this for the public. Citizens should do their own thinking and not be afraid to speak out on their convictions.

[From the Texas Observer, Monday, Aug. 28, 1959]

ALARMS ON THE RADIOACTIVE DRUMS

HOUSTON.—When and if the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission gives the four or five people who call themselves the Industrial Waste Disposal Corp. permission to dump radioactive wastes in the Gulf of Mexico, there chosen spokesman here admits, some of the drums are expected to burst, the cement encasements will split, and the wastes will diffuse into the gulf.

But here, says their lawyer, young John S. Kiibler, Jr., is the problem: "What are you going to do with these wastes? There are only two things you can do: Take the really dangerous atomic refuse and lock it behind walls and put it under guard, where it will stay, as at Oak Ridge, for thousands and thousands of years; or take the less dangerous wastes, dump them in the ocean, and let them spread out.

Thus has come home to Texas and to Texans a personal meaning for the atomic age, an intimately personal issue: the purity of the coastal waters, the safeness of shrimp and fish we eat, and perhaps most all the way we feel in our environment.

If the wastes are not taken somewhere they will stay where they accumulate. In the city of Houston alone 80 licenses have been granted for the use of radioactive materials in commercial and medical pursuits. "Why, trucks are traveling the streets of Houston day and night with two or three curies—which is far greater than we can have in any one package," Kiibler said. So the question is not, Shall we dispose of radioactive wastes, but how?

The 3-year-old Industrial Waste Disposal Corp., attorney Kiibler said, proposes to receive the wastes in Houston on hired trucks, convey them in other hired trucks to the company's steel haul vessel, take them to an area roughly 150 miles east of Port Isabel and 180 miles south of Galveston, and dump the stuff overboard into at least 1,000 fathoms of water.

IT'LL SPLIT, IT DIFFUSES

Admitting the cement encasements and the drums can split, and ofter will, when they are dropped into a thousand fathoms of water, Kiibler told the Observer in an interview:

"The fact is that it doesn't make any difference. My Lord, it'll split. That's confusing the issue. It's expected to split. It diffuses."

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH has speculated that the currents in the gulf could carry radioactivity to the coast.

"The current itself is very helpful," Kiibler responded. "If there were no current it would still diffuse. * * * Believe me, if some got to shore, it would have been washed free of radioactivity. It's safe without a current—it's so much safer with a current—that much safer, that is."

Conveying, by that verbal tangle, a desire to leave no implication that there could be any danger from the waste dumping from which Industrial Waste Disposal Corp. proposes to make a profit over the years, Kiibler, asked if there would be any danger at all, replied:

"This is a matter of proven fact: It is not dangerous if it is handled in the manner specified in the license. This company is fully equipped to handle it."

How many permanent employees does the company have? he was asked. "Probably from four to six," he said, including the president, Dr. Donald Hood, an oceanographer; Miss Edna Wood, a biochemist; the ship captain, and the two of three people the captain hires for his crew.

The company, Kiibler said, is "a small concern engaged in handling industrial wastes," such as oil and chemical wastes from industries along the Houston ship channel. "Our business is finding some way to deactivate the waste so it can be disposed of without contaminating the streams," he said.

Radioactive materials are used for such things as medical work and determining interior strength of metals, he said. Industrial Waste Disposal Corp. would receive them from "anyone that we could economically." He said he has heard that there are seven other U.S. companies doing the same kind of work.

What area would the firm service? "It depends on the shipping rates," he said. "We would expect to get most of it from Texas. * * * It seems a good source of income."

In outcry about the dumping have been heard the voices of YARBOROUGH, Texas Congressmen, the Texas Legislature, the shrimp industry, and sports fishermen. The AEC was required by the politics of the situation to hold up the issuance of the license to Industrial Waste Disposal Corp., as for a brief from the company by September 15, and schedule arguments October 13 in Washington. Attorney General Will Wilson has asked the AEC to be allowed to intervene against the dumping at the October 13 hearing. Kiibler will be there, too.

Representative CLARK THOMPSON, Galveston, has introduced a bill to prohibit radioactive waste-dumping closer to shore than 200 miles and shallower than 1,000 fathoms. Containers would have to be leakproof.

In a recent statement on the subject, YARBOROUGH said THOMPSON'S bill "is a long step in the right direction—namely, deeper and farther away. A mistake here could be fatal. * * * An overdose of radiation is most hazardous to children and can affect generations 100 and 200 years in the future."

WILL COME OUT OF DRUM

The young, alert La Porte lawyer said the waste would consist of such things as test tubes, beakers, contaminated paper, carcasses of dead animals used in experiments, and some materials exposed to radioactivity from radium, such as the containers in which it was stored.

The wastes would be trucked to Industrial Waste Disposal Corp. in drums which would have to comply with AEC standards, so that if the basic container broke, liquids would be absorbed by an inner container.

"Either you or I can carry one of these containers around all day," he said. "The radioactivity is of such a low intensity, it does no harm. It could sit there indefinitely and you could live with it indefinitely."

Could you leave it in your bedroom? "You could have it in your bedroom, yes," he replied. Each concentration of radioactivity "is well below the maximum permissible concentration."

Not opening the drums, Industrial Waste Disposal Corp. would encase some of them in concrete strengthened with wire mesh; drums not filled up with wastes would be filled with concrete instead of encased in it. (Presumably they would have to be opened if they had to be filled with concrete.)

"The main function of the concrete is weight," he said. "They don't need it for protection."

After the drums were dumped, concrete encased or concrete-filled, into the gulf within 2, 3, or 4 miles of latitude 26°20' north, longitude 94°32' west, what chance would there be, the Observer asked Kiibler, of the ocean pressure breaking them open?

"Some of the drums will break," he said. "The concrete will probably break—a shearing break, a sort of crack, that doesn't shift the concrete. It does break. It's expected to break. The wire mesh holds it together—it doesn't come off."

The probability of the drums opening under the pressure, he said, is not great. "The inner metal drum may crack. Then the water rushes in and equalizes the pressure.

"Of course," he said, "radioactive material will come out of the drum."

At this point he reverted to the nature of the problem, What is to be done with radioactive waste?

"You can either contain it and keep it away from man, which is very expensive, very impractical," he answered. "You can put it in steel containers at Oak Ridge under armed guard and leave it there for hundreds of thousands of years—that's just hearsay. Or you can reduce its intensity and scatter it so that it can do no harm. It is exposed to the diffusion process in the ocean—it diffuses very quickly so that it can do no harm."

He said there is "much less chance" of the drum splitting than there is that the cement will crack. "If there is no airspace in the drum, it won't split," he said. "The fact is that it doesn't make any difference. My Lord, it'll split. That's confusing the issue. It's expected to split. It diffuses."

WORST POSSIBLE THING

The Atomic Energy Commission itself, he continued, "envisioned taking the material, transporting it to the bottom, and instantly removing the container—so that you would have raw radioactive material in the ocean. This was the worst possible thing that could happen—why, all the material would be in the water at once."

He said a current helps the diffusion. "It would naturally diffuse with or without a current," he added.

He quoted Dr. Dayton E. Carritt, associate professor of oceanography at Johns Hopkins University, on how much danger there might be:

"Take strontium 90 material, the deadliest kind, 10 curies of it, and sink it to the bottom, dissolve the container, so it's in the water. Also assume no current to aid in the diffusion process. Go out (1¼ miles), sit on the bottom of the ocean—assuming you could drink sea water, you could sit there and drink sea water for the rest of your life, and no harmful effects," Kiibler reviewed.

If there was a 5-knot current you could drink the water at eight-tenths of a kilometer, or half a mile, he said.

YARBOROUGH has also made the point, Kiibler was reminded, that fish concentrate radioactivity in their bodies, since they live off ocean life which has itself in turn attracted the radioactivity.

WHAT ABOUT THE FISH?

"Fish will pick it up," Kiibler agreed. "Fish have the same maximum permissible concentration as humans—it's quite a coincidence."

But they might not die before they are caught and eaten, the Observer observed.

"It's not going to kill the fish," Kiibler said. "They could drink it too."

What about fish within the area where the drinking water would not be safe? "I don't know if you could catch fish at 1,000 fathoms," he said. "All commercial fishing—sports fishing—is above the themocline. Below that there is very little plant life, very little fish life—perhaps a few monsters, that sort of thing."

Could the radioactive materials rise above the thermocline?

"Radioactive oil and very hard plastics are the only two items that could come up from 1,000 fathons," he said. "The rest would be pressed flat by the pressure—clothing, wood, for example. By the time it came to the surface, the oil and plastics, too, would have been rendered harmless."

Then he thinks there is no danger of contaminating gulf fish life? "None whatever." And no danger to boats passing over the dumping grounds? "None."

He said that after 6,000 curies of radioactive waste had been dumped into one spot off the Atlantic coast, scientists went out there to run tests, "and with all their delicate meters, they couldn't even find it." He recalled a figure that the background radioactivity in the Gulf of Mexico is 3,400 million curies. "Since we'll not be dumping more than 10 at a time, you begin to see the ridiculousness of the objection."

The gulf is quite a large area, however. Kiibler responded that the scientists hadn't been able to detect where the 6,000 curies had been dumped off the Atlantic coast.

Had not a drum been found floating off the coast off the Pacific Northwest marked for radioactivity? Yes, he said; but it had had no radioactivity and was thought to be the work of pranksters, according to a story he had seen.

Kiibler thought the public's alarm about the radioactive dumping a healthy thing, but the concern is simply through a lack of knowledge. It's very similar to the first filling station. People were very alarmed about the dangerous properties of gasoline. No one now thinks of gasoline stations as dangerous.

[From the Texas Observer, Aug. 28, 1959]

FLIP THAT CRAZY JUNK

It's easy to be uneasy about dumping drums that will burst encased in cement that will crack full of radioactive refuse that will then diffuse in the Gulf of Mexico 150 miles off the Texas coast. But for YARBOROUGH's alarm, who knows what the smug sanitarians of the AEC might have done? But what is to be done with the lethal, sterilizing, deforming, invisible death being concentrated at points all over the world like a suicide collects knives? Long run there's only one humane solution: put the stuff on rockets and fire it into space. However, there will be consequences. We may have to footnote our poems to the universe with the admission it's also used as a garbage dump. And how will we know where the stuff fires off to? Just as a few heretics defended the Indians of the American continents from exploitation by the invading Europeans, humanitarianism will be challenged by the Martianists, or the Orionists, or the Milkywayans, or perhaps simply the universarians. And they may retaliate. Or maybe they'll dump their stuff on us first, and we'll retaliate. But to return to earth, we are grateful for Senator YARBOROUGH.

The Khrushchev Visit: Dangers and Hopes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of Sunday, September 6, 1959, written by Mr. Henry A. Kissinger, associate director of the center for international studies at Harvard University, and the author of the book, "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy":

THE KHRUSHCHEV VISIT: DANGERS AND HOPES

(By Henry A. Kissinger)

In 9 days Premier Khrushchev is to arrive in the United States. His every gesture will be watched for significance; his every smile will be reported as a harbinger of a happier world; his every affirmation of the desirability of peace will be taken as a sign that Soviet policy has entered a new phase.

In these circumstances it seems almost ungracious to express a word of caution. But it is dangerous for democracies to act as if all issues could be reduced to personalities. The cold war is not the result of a misunderstanding between our leaders and those of the Soviet Union. It is the product of a conscious Soviet policy which includes the suppression of freedom in Eastern Europe (it is less than 15 months since the execution of Imre Nagy, of Hungary); the Soviet refusal to accept schemes for the control of arms; Communist pressure on all peripheral areas, of which Laos is only the most recent example; the unprovoked threat on Berlin. A solution of the cold war can be found only in relation to these issues.

The exchange of visits will assist the cause of peace only if it provides a basis for dealing with these problems. It will be beneficial to the extent that it gives the Soviet leader an incentive to reverse a course which has repeatedly brought the world to the brink of war. Yet the circumstances in which the visits will take place do not inspirt optimism in this respect. If Mr. Khrushchev compares his position now with what it was last November, when he first threatened Berlin, he may well conclude that bellicosity has its rewards. As a result of his pressure on Berlin, accompanied by threats of missile and nuclear attacks, Mr. Khrushchev has already gained the following points:

1. A meeting at the top without withdrawing the threat to Berlin. Whatever the desirability of a visit by Mr. Khrushchev to the United States in the abstract, under present conditions it is a Soviet tactical victory. From the start of the Berlin crisis, we insisted that we would not go to a summit conference under duress, that there had to be some "progress" at a lower level before the heads of state convened. Throughout, Mr. Khrushchev has maintained that the Foreign Ministers could settle nothing and that the "heavyweights" should talk. The threat to Berlin has not been withdrawn; the Geneva Foreign Ministers' meeting was a complete failure. Yet Mr. Khrushchev has done better than achieve a four-power conference. He has been invited to meetings with the President from which our allies are excluded.

2. A demonstration of the lack of purpose in the West. The immediate reaction to the Soviet threat to Berlin was a public debate on what concessions might be made and public accusations of bad faith and irresolution among the allies. Three weeks before the Foreign Ministers' Conference there was still no agreed Western position, and the tentativeness with which the Western plan was presented revealed that the West lacks a clear conception of the purposes for which it might strive.

Rather than concentrating on restoring its unity or developing its own program, the West has been obsessed with determining Soviet intentions. Delegations of political leaders from most countries of the Atlantic community and from almost every political party have descended on the Communist capital. Moscow has become the focus of diplomatic activity. The West has hung on Mr. Khrushchev's erratic pronouncements as if it could do nothing save in reaction to Soviet moves. The Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings are the culmination of a trend which has seen the Western alliance dangerously close to being split, with each ally essaying his own diplomatic approach.

3. A hardening of the dividing lines in Germany. The attempt by Germany to pursue an isolated policy in the center of the Continent has produced disaster for Europe twice within a generation. One of the important goals of our policy must therefore be to retain Germany as a willing member of the Western community. If Germany should feel forsaken by its allies, it may seek to realize its aims by separate dealings with the East. And among these aims, unification will always occupy a key role. Thus for us a great deal depends on demonstrating that only Soviet intransigency keeps Germany divided. Any other course will in time produce what we should fear most: a dissatisfied, militant power in central Europe.

When an East German delegation was seated at Geneva, a major step was taken not only toward the perpetuation of the division of Germany but toward our acceptance of the East German puppet regime. This was underscored by the lack of conviction with which the Western plan for German unification was presented and the haste with which it was pigeonholed at the first sign of opposition. After the first week in Geneva, the foreign ministers dealt with only one problem: the transformation of our position in Berlin, for which the quid pro quo was to be the withdrawal of a Soviet threat. We were asked to give up our rights while the Soviets would give up a menace. By accepting what amounted to a proposal that we "solve" problems the Soviet Union had created, we were placed in the demoralizing position of letting our well-established rights be called in question with no better argument than that they had become "abnormal."

4. The demonstration of a basic weakness in Western military policy. In our belief that deterrence is best achieved through the threat of maximum destructiveness, we have placed our principal reliance on nuclear weapons and strategic bombing. We were thus caught in the dilemma of deciding whether Berlin is "worth" the tens of millions of casualties of an all-out nuclear war. And it does not matter how determined we "really" are; if the Soviet leaders doubt our resolution they may provoke the crisis we are striving to avoid.

President Eisenhower is reported to have expressed puzzlement that our repeated warnings that we would fight for Berlin have apparently failed to impress Mr. Khrushchev greatly. The reason is not hard to find: Our threat to resort to our only strategy has lost its credibility, not because our leaders are irresolute but because the threat of all-out war has become inherently implausible.

Moreover, once Soviet pressure had begun, few of our actions were calculated to reinforce our words. We did nothing to remedy the weakness of NATO's ground forces; on the contrary, we reduced both our Army and the Marines. We kept stressing the priority of long-range balance over readiness as if we did not face an immediate crisis. These actions may have encouraged a Soviet belief that our show of determination was bluff, that in our quest for relief from the burdens of military expenditures we might be induced to give up our other interest.

When we assess the exchange of visits between the President and Premier Khrushchev in this context, the potential dangers of the meetings emerge clearly. In my opinion, they are:

1. The risk of euphoria. Some of our allies seem to feel that anyone who warns against overoptimism seeks to avoid a settlement. This is not true; no one can be opposed to a genuine end of the cold war. But we must guard against succumbing to the illusion of relaxation while the causes of the cold war remain unsolved and new crises build up in an atmosphere of blandness and "normalcy." And there is a grave danger that the American people will be lulled into complacency by abstract protestations of good will; that we will confuse personal affability with a change of attitude. We may be deflected from the long-overdue reexamination of our policies, both diplomatic and military, if the impression is created that the fact of a conference is more important than the substance of what it achieves.

2. Weakening allied ties. One of the characteristics of the postwar period has been the decline in power and influence of Europe. But one of the paradoxical results of Europe's new status has been a tendency to exaggerate its weakness. As a result, Europe has not fulfilled all her potentialities for political initiative.

It is important that the conference between the President and Mr. Khrushchev do nothing to increase this sense of impotence. Our European allies must not be given the impression that matters affecting their most vital interests can be negotiated without their participation. No one who has read the President's remarks in the course of his European trip could suspect that Mr. Eisenhower would betray our allies. But separate conversations could underscore the junior position of our partners and be a blow to their self-respect.

We must take care that we do not reduce any future summit meeting to ratifying decisions taken by the United States and the U.S.S.R. Mr. Khrushchev has already sought to exploit this possibility. He has stated that after his meeting with the President there might be a conference including our European allies plus Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary. We must guard against having our allies reduced to the status of the East European satellites.

President de Gaulle's reported plan to visit Moscow, following the Macmillan trip to Russia and the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange, indicates that a situation could come about in which allied unity—in the diplomatic field, at least—would be little more than a formal pose. If the principle of separate dealings becomes established, we may well be the victims of the next phase of Soviet policy, when an attempt may be made to appeal to our allies against us.

3. The demoralization of the free world. It is a Soviet goal to reduce contemporary issues to a clash of personalities in an effort to make us forget that the cold war has been caused by specific Soviet aggressive actions and that it can be ended only in relation to these issues. The more the Soviets can give the impression that crises stem from individuals (Adenauer's "rigidity," Truman's "failure to follow Roosevelt's policies," etc.), the more uncertain the free world will become, for in any Soviet-provoked crisis the West will be tempted to blame its own leaders or to search desperately for a new approach that will somehow end all tensions. Mr. Khrushchev may indeed make the ultimate decisions in the Soviet Union—as many advocates of conversations at the top maintain. It is nonetheless dangerous for democracies to permit a dictatorship to impose its manner of conducting affairs on them too completely.

Now that the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev has been issued, we must consider how the exchange of visits can be made to bring the best results.

It is likely that Mr. Khrushchev suffers from severe misconceptions about the nature of American society. Although it is not easy to imagine what the Soviet leader is likely to see in a cross-country trip of 6 days to change the attitudes of a lifetime, he should learn of the unity of the American people. Unless Soviet doctrine blinds him completely, he may come to understand, if he ever doubted it, that America has no aggressive designs, that it is unthinkable for the United States ever to initiate hostilities. At the same time, he may realize that the American people will be as one in resisting any attempt to achieve world domination. He could gain an appreciation of our strength and our productive capacity.

Mr. Khrushchev cannot fail to notice the sincerity of the President when Mr. Eisenhower says, as he has repeatedly, that in a nuclear war both sides must lose, but that, if the Soviet Union is prepared to seek security through negotiations and to forgo the quest for empire, it will find us conciliatory and imaginative. And the conversations between Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev will demonstrate our desire for peace to the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, we face a delicate task in the forthcoming meetings. If we negotiate about specific settlements we may disrupt the Western alliance by giving our allies the impression that major decisions are being taken in their absence. On the other hand, if we confine ourselves to generalities we may confuse our people. In that case it will never be clear what was decided upon. Misinterpretation or misunderstanding will be encouraged. We shall not be able to convey even to the Soviet leaders our understanding of the causes of current tensions and the means to overcome them.

We have never had too much difficulty obtaining Soviet agreement "in principle." The frustration has arisen because principle has proved impossible to translate into action.

Court's Irresponsible Race Views Were Drawn From Swedish Socialist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the widely read news columnist, Mr. Westbrook Pegler, is currently on a tour of Europe, and at a stopover in Stockholm, Sweden, he has prepared a very interesting and important column which merits the attention of the Congress. It is entitled "Court's Irresponsible Race Views Were Drawn From Swedish Socialist," and was published in the September 7, 1959, issue of the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COURT'S IRRESPONSIBLE RACE VIEWS WERE DRAWN FROM SWEDISH SOCIALIST

(By Westbrook Pegler)

STOCKHOLM.—The Earl Warren dispensation of the American Supreme Court by its resort to an irresponsible discussion of the Negro's relations with his white neighbors in the United States touched off the Little Rock trouble, in turn has wrought some damage to our national reputation in other countries. The injury may be momentary. Be that as it may, we are now urged to submit to moral blackmail to win the approval of people who have no authority in our domestic affairs, who plainly do not know certain essential facts, and in all cases have a few moles and warts on their own noses.

The irresponsible discussion which Earl Warren invoked was written by a left wing politician of the Swedish equivalent of the American union racket. Warren and his wife, being of Swedish background, are sentimentally regarded here as ex officio Swedes. The Swede who wrote the opus which Warren seized upon is an inveterate officeholder of the Socialist Labor movement which in most countries has stretches of common front with the Communists. His name is Gunnar Myrdal.

He appears never to have joined the Communist Party but his disposition was expressed when, as Minister of Commerce in

1946, he actively prompted a trade credit of 1 billion kroner, about $20 million in American money, to help Moscow obtain industrial equipment for the modern development by which Khrushchev now threatens to surpass the United States and destroy capitalism. The Russians have cashed this credit to the extent of 550 million kroner. They have undertaken to pay this debt in a stretch from 1961 to 1967 but, obviously at considerable loss to Sweden through shrinkage of the value of the kroner. The deal did not stipulate repayment in kroner of the same value as the kroner which Russia borrowed.

At the dissolution of the wartime coalition government of Sweden in 1945, Myrdal's party, called the Social Demoorats, swept in with firm control. The election was legitimate and the Swedish unions, which are a reckless, wasteful force with their own lavish bureaucracy including their own newspapers subsidized by the wages of the faceless man, exulted in its new power and its great opportunity.

Myrdal was jubilant. He was quoted as having said, "Now is the time to bring in the Socialist harvest."

Myrdal left the government in 1947. Parting was a mitigated sorrow to the party although Myrdal, being severed from the payroll, reasonably may have felt shooting pains. He is a bureaucrat and professional doctrinaire as unfamiliar with actual toil in a personal sense as Rex Tugwell and most theoretical teachers of the social science courses in American colleges. His wife is a doublesome of similar bent now Ambassador to India at somewhere between $8,000 and $9,250 a year. Myrdal himself enjoyed some years in a soft job with the U.N. at about $25,000 a year, tax free.

Some of the conservative Swedish press fought this credit to Moscow. One phase of the program called for enormous orders of manufactured electrical equipment. The biggest Swedish firm in this line resisted involvement in the task on the ground that the reparation of war damage in all directions, plus demands for apparatus newly developed, would provide capacity business for its facilities. Thus there would be no need for made-work production under an ill-disguised subsidy from the Swedish Government. One paper intimated that the party in power then threatened native Swedish industry with an invasion of Sweden by General Electric of the United States to manufacture the stuff. Ultimately, Swedish firms filled a variety of orders for Russia.

Myrdal enjoyed a sojourn in the United States on a grant from a typical tax-free foundation. This grant became, in practical effect, a subsidy which ultimately paid for the court decision based on Myrdal's brief observations of relations between white and colored Americans. And this alien Socialist's findings in this field are now, in similar practical effect, the law of the land, supplanting a time-honored interpretation of the Constitution by the pre-Warren court.

The Good Senor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of September 8, 1959:

THE GOOD SENOR
(By Red Smith)

In the autumn of 1955, there spread through the American League an uneasy suspicion that Marty Marion, Chuck Comisky, Johnny Rigney, and affiliated intellectuals in Chicago had all slipped their trolleys. As usual, the White Sox had finished third and as usual Manager Marion and his assistant thinkers longed to beef up the team's girlish attack. In October they took a step in this direction by wangling the muscular Larry Doby off the Cleveland roster, but at a cost which suggested they had taken leave of their senses.

In exchange for Doby they gave the Indians Jim Busby and Chico Carrasquel, one of the best shortstops in baseball, who had served the Sox with distinction for six seasons. It was a desperate gamble, for no team can play first-rate ball without a first-rate shortstop, and a club can search for years and spend a fortune without discovering one of Carrasquel's quality.

All Chicago's eggs were thus dumped into one frail basket carried by a 20-year-old shrimp out of Venezuela, advertised as a live one but a total stranger to the big leagues, with only two seasons in the bushes on his record.

One year later when the 1956 averages were published, Luis Ernesto Aparicio had led the league's shortstops in total chances accepted, led the league in stolen bases, batted .266 and was designated Rookie-of-the-Year by the Sporting News. In 1957 he led the shortstops in assists, in 1958 he was tops again in total chances, and in both seasons he was the league's most proficient thief on the bases.

THE SMART SENOR

Recently there was an item about a poll of American League managers who were asked to name the one player they would select first if given their choice of all the talent in the leagues. There are eight American League managers. There were eight votes for Luis Ernesto Aparicio. Obviously Senor Alphonso Damon Lopez, current manager of the White Sox, must have gone with the crowd. Senor Lopez knows when he is well off.

"I would hafta say," Mr. C. Stengel is wont to remark, "that they got a smart fella for manager because he has never finished worse than second and he used to work for me."

Except for the fact that the White Sox lost twice by one run margins, the weekend series with Cleveland was vividly characteristic of the champions-presumptive and the lop-jawed, tobacco-eating desperado who plays shortstop for them.

In Saturday's game Chicago was trailing, 3 to 2, in the fifth inning when Aparicio beat out a bunt. He stole second. Then he stole third. Then he dashed for the plate on a short fly by Jim Landis, and was thrown out. The Indians squeaked through, 6 to 5.

On Sunday, Chicago's only extra-base hit was a double by Aparicio. Neither team scored until the fifth inning when Aparicio singled, stole second, reached third on a single by Nellie Fox and rushed home when Landis—the big third man in Chicago's terrifying batting order—scratched a hit off the pitcher's glove. That was the only run for the Sox; Cleveland got two.

LARCENOUS LATIN

Aparicio is batting .262 and his Sabbath steal of second was his 49th theft of the season. By way of comparison, the most larcenous operative in the National League is that colorful character, Willie Mays. He has stolen 26. Little Luis ought to bring on another half-dozen thefts before the season ends. Nobody has done anything like that since George Stirnweiss knocked off 55 a decade and a half ago.

As a base runner, Aparicio isn't exactly a throwback to Ty Cobb, who considered it one of his lesser years when he didn't steal more than 90, but he is the most exciting guy on the bases since Jackie Robinson was a newcomer.

In those days, Robinson was the one player around who could stop a game cold by getting on first base. If he walked or singled, all other action froze. The television director in Ebbets Field threw an electronic fit, employing the split-screen technique to show both pitcher and runner. Fans held their breath as Robinson jigged and feinted.

Yet Robinson never had more than 37 steals in his best season and when he led the league one year with 29, Bugs Baer wrote than John McGraw used to demand more than that by the writers traveling with the Giants.

DEAD-END KIDS

Chicago's only .300 batter, Nellie FOX, has two home runs, which is about normal for him. Al Smith has made 14 and Sherman Lollar 20. After Fox's .308, the team's top hitter is Jim McAnany at .279, and this rookie has been around less than half the season.

It is unlikely that even a world series would bring out the best in batters of this stripe, but the Sox are a team that worries the enemy into panic. They're a pack of dead-end kids who sneak up on a victim from the rear, whereupon Fox trips the sucker and Little Luis swipes his watch and chain.

No Editing by the President, So Why Should Senators?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should be a verbatim record of what Senators and Representatives say in floor debate. However, it is not. The revising of remarks made on the floor has become part of senatorial custom. Every Senator does it. I have done so myself, although I hope that I did so in a manner of circumspection.

The only way to end the practice of revising substantive matters recorded by the very able reporters who take down the daily proceedings in the Senate, as they happen, is by a rule which cuts off the privilege for all Senators simultaneously.

Mr. President, on August 20 the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I submitted to the Senate, Senate Resolution 168, which would amend the Standing Rules of the Senate so as to add a new rule prohibiting substantive changes in the recording of remarks made on the Senate floor. The resolution provided that changes would be permissible only to correct grammar and syntax and to eliminate errors made in the transcribing of such remarks.

This proposal has created considerable favorable editorial comment. I ask unanimous consent that comment of sev-

eral newspapers which has come to my attention be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Aug. 26, 1959]

NO EDITING BY THE PRESIDENT—WHY SHOULD SENATORS?

A great many Democrats have made fun of the frequent roundabout and unparsable sentences uttered by President Eisenhower at his news conferences. But one Democratic Senator, RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon, has taken a sympathetic attitude toward Mr. Eisenhower in this regard—or, more particularly, toward the President's practice of letting the verbatim transcript remain untouched, no matter how the written words may make the Chief Executive look.

Mr. NEUBERGER has invoked this Presidential practice in defense of his resolution to deprive Senators and Congressmen of the privilege, now liberally exercised, of editing their oral remarks in the House and Senate before they are reduced to cold print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Senator NEUBERGER is joined in this move by Republican Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado.

"Some persons may scoff and speak of lack of clarity exhibited by (the President's press conference) answers," says Senator NEUBERGER. "Yet I doubt if any Senator has the right to engage in such ridicule.

"Members of the Senate may rigorously revise their remarks. It is my understanding that the President takes advantage of no such privilege," he says.

We cherish little hope that the House and Senate will give up their precious privilege of patching up the errors, faux pas, and inanities uttered, however innocently, during the course of debate, even though this practice smacks uncomfortably of the rewriting of history described in George Orwell's novel, "1984." But perhaps Senator NEUBERGER's gentle chiding will make them a bit more hesitant about deriding the Presidential press conference answers.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 26, 1959]

AN UPROAR OVER DELETIONS FROM CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is supposed to be just that—a verbatim record of what Senators and Representatives say in floor debate. But it isn't. For years legislators have claimed a right of revision.

Supposedly this allows them to correct grammatical errors, eliminate personal abuse and off-the-cuff remarks. Actually, it is frequently used to revamp arguments, change stories, let the speaker appear as an orator of wit and logic.

Last week the situation reached a ridiculous point. Four pages of remarks were deleted from a debate on a banking bill. Senate leaders were involved. There was a tremendous uproar.

Investigation revealed that a staff member of the Senate Banking Committee made the deletions without getting permission of anyone.

Senators NEUBERGER, Democrat, Oregon, and ALLOTT, Republican, Colorado, are trying to stop this practice. They have introduced a resolution to deprive Senators of the revision privilege.

NEUBERGER said, as is now, a man wishes he had said something and is then permitted to go back and say it for the RECORD. He might have added that it also permits the man to wipe the slate, or the RECORD, of something he said and wishes he hadn't.

The Oregonian pointed out that there had been some criticism of President Eisenhower's press conference remarks—the lack of clarity sometimes exhibited. He said Senators had no right to join in such ridicule—"Mr. Eisenhower takes advantage of no revision privilege before his press conferences are released for publication."

Senators, of all people, should be willing to stand on what they say. In honesty, the bipartisan Neuberger-Allott resolution should be adopted.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 29, 1959]

"CAB WIT" IN THE SENATE

The British have long had a term for it: "Cab wit." That is, the happy phrasing one might have given a passage in the speech, the devastating irony with which one might have crushed an adversary's argument, the sparkling quip with which one might have rocked the dinner party—all thought of in the cab going home.

There is no speaker or writer who must phrase his thoughts under the exigencies of the moment into words beyond recall but who indulges occasionally in this form of futile penance. Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER recently told the Senate:

"Many men would like to rewrite history. Few get the chance. Among the elite are U.S. Senators. Their vehicle is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

And he has proposed in company with Senator GORDON ALLOTT a new rule prohibiting substantive changes in the recording of remarks made on the Senate floor, permitting only changes to correct grammar, syntax, and errors in transcribing.

He must have made some of his colleagues squirm a bit when he reminded them that the President's responses in press conference are published verbatim in American newspapers. Officially what is said on the Senate floor is what is recorded in the RECORD. Citizens of today and tomorrow are entitled to know how it was actually phrased, unaltered and unembellished with "cab wit."

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Aug. 29, 1959]

A MOTION SECONDED

The Nation should rise in unison and give 15 cheers for Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado. These two propose to put an end to the costly privilege of "correcting the RECORD."

This would be the greatest boon to democratic government since the invention of the veto. Anyone who has had occasion to browse around in a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD may be dumfounded to learn that Congressmen don't always speak in faultless prose sparkling with wit and weighty with wisdom. Their secretaries get a chance to revise their remarks and in the process practice a form of censorship which prevents constituents from getting a true picture of their lawmakers.

If President Eisenhower can submit to having his remarks quoted verbatim so should Congressmen. The RECORD might even become a contender with best selling novels if "printed raw." Senator NEUBERGER thinks his resolution would discourage personal abuse on the Senate floor and would reduce the number of "horseback" opinions on important matters.

Congress is double-dared to adopt the resolution.

West Virginia Is Getting Short-Changed: XI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, over the past weeks I have stood repeatedly before this House and cited statistic after depressing statistic to bear out my contention that my State of West Virginia has been woefully neglected in the distribution of Defense Department sites, employment, and contracts.

My State, despite its many advantages, ranks a dead last among the 50 States in Defense Department spending and payroll, civilian and military. This, I submit, is an unfair situation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have compiled other figures which indicate that the Defense Department is not alone in its discrimination against my State—where unemployment remains shockingly high and where jobs are desperately needed.

Apparently the Commerce Department has a similar disregard for the needs and rights of West Virginia. I have here a list of Commerce Department employment in each of the 50 States, and the proportion of the total population which this employment represents.

Can you imagine where West Virginia stands? Again, at the very bottom of the heap.

West Virginia, with only 37 Commerce Department employees, has only .00184 of 1 percent of its total population on the Department's payroll.

I do not think one single Member of this House can fail to agree that this shocking story of abuse and discrimination deserves to be given fullest distribution.

When I was pointing out how the Defense Department has discriminated against West Virginia, I admitted that certain States were better suited than others for defense purposes. But I felt that, despite this fact, the evidence was clear that West Virginia had, indeed, been shortchanged.

By the same token, I am not suggesting that the Commerce Department install the headquarters of its Maritime Administration or its Coast and Geodetic Survey in a landlocked State such as West Virginia.

However, I am at a loss to explain how equally landlocked Idaho, with barely a fourth West Virginia's population, rates exactly five times as many Commerce employees, or how an inland State like Colorado, with less than two-thirds as many people, merits exactly 10 times as many.

I can say that some regional offices would seem ideally suited for the Mountain State. But apparently the Commerce Department has not even consid-

ered locating these facilities in West Virginia.

For example, my State is highly air-conscious, since the mountainous terrain makes other forms of transportation difficult. Yet there is not one single Civil Aeronautics Administration employee in the entire State.

In the field of business and defense services, which could be a godsend to assist industries and communities in overcoming the effects of a lingering recession, there is not one Commerce Department employee in the entire State. This division, which offers facilities and assistance so sorely needed, is not represented in the State where it possibly could do the most good.

Mr. Speaker, I do not ask needless favors for West Virginia. I do ask for equal treatment and fairplay.

I believe that it is becoming more and more evident that many departments of our Government, which ought to be concerned with helping stricken areas, have instead callously turned their backs on West Virginia, and until something is done to rectify this situation, I intend to keep bringing these disturbing statistics into the open.

Department of Commerce employees by States

	Number of employees	Total (1950) population	Employees as percent of population
Alaska	1,077	128,643	0.8372
Maryland	2,884	2,343,001	.123
Nevada	80	160,083	.0499
Oregon	686	1,521,341	.045
Louisiana	1,055	2,683,516	.0393
Idaho	185	588,637	.0314
Colorado	370	1,325,089	.0279
Virginia	882	3,318,680	.0265
Washington	474	2,378,963	.0199
Wyoming	51	290,529	.0175
Montana	103	591,024	.0174
North Carolina	604	4,061,929	.0149
Utah	102	688,862	.0148
Indiana	504	3,934,224	.0128
Kansas	219	1,905,299	.0114
California	1,179	10,586,223	.0111
Arizona	80	749,587	.0106
Alabama	271	3,061,743	.0088
Florida	240	2,771,305	.0086
Missouri	338	3,954,653	.0085
New Mexico	53	681,187	.0077
Tennessee	250	3,291,718	.0075
North Dakota	45	619,636	.0073
South Dakota	47	652,740	.0072
Texas	531	7,711,194	.0068
New York	947	14,830,192	.0063
Nebraska	76	1,325,510	.0057
Delaware	18	318,085	.0056
New Jersey	268	4,835,329	.0055
Vermont	20	377,747	.0052
Georgia	175	3,444,578	.0051
Maine	45	913,774	.0049
Minnesota	128	2,982,483	.0042
New Hampshire	20	533,242	.0037
Massachusetts	172	4,690,514	.0036
Oklahoma	72	2,233,351	.0032
Illinois	273	8,712,176	.00319
Rhode Island	25	791,896	.00316
South Carolina	64	2,117,027	.0030
Mississippi	65	2,178,914	.0029
Arkansas	54	1,909,511	.0028
Connecticut	55	2,007,280	.0027
Ohio	211	7,946,627	.0026
Pennsylvania	269	10,498,012	.0025
Michigan	108	6,371,766	.0024
Iowa	62	2,621,073	.0023
Wisconsin	70	3,434,575	.00204
Hawaii	19	499,794	.002
Kentucky	67	2,944,806	.00191
West Virginia	37	2,005,552	.00184

Address by Senator Long at Graduation Exercises, Loyola University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, one of the finest honors which has ever been conferred upon me was the action by Loyola University of the South recently when the faculty of that institution presented me with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my address on that occasion may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—will the Senator from Louisiana permit me to extend him my hearty congratulations for this deserved honor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator very much. I doubt whether I deserve the honor, but I am flattered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to extend my congratulations to the Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana?

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF SENATOR RUSSELL B. LONG BEFORE GRADUATION EXERCISES OF LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, MAY 27, 1959

It is indeed an honor to share the platform with your Congressman HALE BOGGS, and speak to you tonight.

Inasmuch as Congressman BOGGS will not have the opportunity to speak tonight, permit me to say that he is undoubtedly one of the great leaders of the national Congress. If we are ever successful in making order out of the chaos that exists in the field of foreign trade, for example, it will be in large measure due to his enlightened leadership. The contribution of HALE BOGGS to the improvement of our National Government has been great indeed, but with each additional year he becomes more effective, more competent, more productive. All Louisiana is proud of your Congressman.

And now speaking for myself, it seems but a short time ago that I was receiving a bachelor of arts degree from my old alma mater. Time flies and things happen in a hurry after you graduate from college. May I be excused for failing to remember what the principal speaker said on the night that I graduated. I cannot recall a word of it.

The night was hot, I had plans for the evening. I wanted to get it over with. Let us hope that my experience was not in that respect a forerunner of yours tonight.

Yet on that June night of 1940, almost every man and woman in the class could have told you then and could tell you now some of the things that our President Franklin D. Roosevelt was saying over radio that year.

He told us that our generation had a rendezvous with destiny. It was true.

We were not of the maturity or experience to become the heads of government and immediately provide the top leadership, but we had the good judgment to help the Nation choose good leaders and we played a part in deciding which direction American policy would take.

Few of us were privileged to make command decisions, but we supported those decisions. We provided the workers, soldiers, officers to make those command decisions successful.

Our generation saw America emerge as the greatest Nation on the face of the earth, and the leader for all free peoples.

We learned how to attain full employment for our millions of workers who had suffered a cruel depression. We discovered many of the secrets of the Diety and made them available for the service of mankind.

We struggled successfully against totalitarian dictators, we were able to preserve the freedom of mankind in many parts of this planet.

Yet in spite of the best we could do, the dangers and the challenges will be even greater for you. Unless your generation measures up to those challenges, then the next 20 years will see world leadership pass from this Nation just as the last 20 years saw it come to us.

Such a result could spell disaster for this planet.

You will be in all respects equal to the task, and your achievements will be greater than those of my day if you can do two things, simple to say, difficult to achieve.

First by working in the right direction.

Second, by trying very hard to get there.

It has been my impression that most of our difficulties in this world and in this Nation exist because there are a lot of people working in the wrong direction.

You will be surprised to discover how many of them there are, and how powerful some of those people are.

Most of them do not think of themselves as doing anything wrong. Most of them are the victims of misunderstanding, on the one hand, or shortsightedness on the other.

Yet such people make it twice as hard for us to get good results. Some of them actually succeed in doing things that hurt their Nation notwithstanding their honorable intentions.

A few years ago, one of our best known Washington cartoonists, Herbert Block, better known as Herblock, published a volume of cartoons demonstrating his philosophy of life. He illustrated vividly one point that some of us never forgot.

Most U.S. Senators work hard, but many of them are working in the wrong direction. Herblock gives this illustration:

"Suppose I am a working man who is in need of a home for his family, and suppose my Senator is fighting against legislation which would help me to get a better deal. Then I am no better off because he is working hard. I would be better off if he had stayed in bed."

More than 30 years ago, a boy by the name of Roy Riegels played center for California's Golden Bears. He made what was perhaps the most famous run in the history of the Rose Bowl. It was a long run—just 6 inches short of 70 yards—but that was not what made it famous. The world remembers that

run and remembers Roy Riegels because he ran in the wrong direction.

There is no reason to discuss here how Roy Riegels happened to make this mistake. The fact is that he did do it and that it typifies in this one memorable act out of a lifetime of acts, the many public officials, businessmen, and leaders in all walks of life, who all too frequently head out in the wrong direction—and who often refuse, as Riegels did, to listen to the shouts of their teammates who know they have gone wrong.

Roy Riegels may have lost his direction temporarily, but he did not lose his courage. He played a lot more good football the next year. He was elected captain of the team.

When statesmen are going in the wrong direction it is even harder to persuade them to turn around and reverse their field. It is hard for a man to be certain that he is wrong; frequently it might actually be popular. It might actually appear to offer personsal profits although the result might be bad for the Nation or for the world. A man might stick to his direction even when he realizes that what he is doing is resulting in more harm than good.

It is for these reasons that we should be fulsome in our praise of a man with the humility to admit his mistake and change his direction. The moral being: If you can't be right, at least be humble.

This misdirection applies to people on all sides. It applies to the businessman who selfishly demands things which are bad law from a legislator. It applies equally to the legislator who is more interested in serving again than he is in serving well.

So let me say this to the men of Loyola who officially take their place in the great arena of the world tonight.

When the great Scorekeeper marks your record down, be certain that all of your yardage was in the right direction. Or, at least, be certain that you tried to reverse your field before you scored for the wrong side.

Now a word about this thing of trying hard enough—time and again statesmanship is failing this Nation and this world because men who know what is right are not doing enough about it.

A great number of us feel that we are not maintaining sufficient armed strength to save this Nation in the event that we are forced to fight. Some of us were successful recently in offering an amendment to a bill appropriating money for the various departments of Government, stating specifically that no further reduction should be made in the strength of the Army or in the strength of the Marine Corps.

Those who represented the U.S. Senate, in conferring with the House of Representatives, threw in the towel on this issue in short order. When Members of the House of Representatives refused to discuss the matter, the Senators on the conference committee were quick to take no for an answer.

Some of us tried to force those who represented the Senate on the conference committee to go back and fight again for the position taken by the U.S. Senate. We lost, but we tried and we tried hard. If Senators who offered excuses for failure had voted with us rather than offer those excuses, we would have won. We will try again this year, and again next year. If we try long enough and hard enough we will prevail.

In dealing with other branches of our Government, we have frequently found that a Federal administrator can make a law work out the way it should work if he determines to reach that result. If he does not want it to work out he can find a thousand reasons why the law cannot succeed. The same thing is equally true of your Representatives in Congress, your Governor, your State legislature, your mayor, and your city council.

As a Member of the Senate of the United States, I have at times kidded other Senators about the excuses that some of them offer for their failure to vote for a matter which they admit to be in the national interest. It is either "too hot" or "too cold"; or perhaps a line from the recently popular song could better describe it: "It's the right time, it's the right place, but it's the wrong face."

At the moment, our Nation is failing to make itself understood among the 1 billion people of the world living in countries which are opposed to communistic slavery. The prevailing view of the ordinary people of the United States and the prevailing view of the people throughout the world toward our foreign aid program is that the program is of benefit to the unscrupulous politicians. Many persons in Government as well as the vast majority of the little people around the world feel that the program should be reformed. The trouble is that there are too many people who take a defeatist attitude about the matter. They are not trying hard enough.

Then, let us consider for a moment the actual problem of mankind's hope for survival due to the threat of all-out thermonuclear war over Berlin, Germany, Korea, or other trouble spots.

How much has actually been achieved in working out some sort of an arrangement to assure that literally billions of innocent people are not exterminated in an atomic war?

How much is being achieved in making sure that the possible causes of war are reduced?

What has been done to assure that there will be some limitation of the battle area and that the combat forces will be confined to those limits should war occur?

What has been done to limit the size of nuclear weapons and to control the testing which is polluting the atmosphere of this earth?

Very little. Yet the Russians have as much interest to survival as we do.

We cannot forever excuse our failures by blaming it all on the other fellow. Sometime we should approach these international conferences with the understanding mutually that both sides will be condemned for failure to come back with some sort of agreement.

Certainly one of two things must be wrong: Either the approach has not been right or the effort has not been sufficiently determined.

We must try again, reconsider our approach, and try harder.

When statesmanship fails the people perish. Statesmanship cannot succeed without steadfastness to a worthy purpose. It cannot succeed without tireless effort.

The flags of this Nation have been at half mast for the past 3 days out of respect to the late John Foster Dulles, former Secretary of State. In a number of ways, I differed with Mr. Dulles. I never disagreed with his purpose.

One thing everyone will forever admire about John Foster Dulles. He gave us everything he had. He drove himself to his grave fighting for a foreign policy which he had helped to shape. Any failure of his policy could not exist because the man failed to fight for it.

This may sound like simple words of advice, but I believe you will find that this advice will bring you a successful and satisfying future if you follow it.

First, be sure you are heading in the right direction and then give it all you've got.

Hope of Big Sandy Valley Fades With President's Veto of Waterways Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article from the Paintsville Herald, Paintsville, Ky., entitled "Hope of Big Sandy Valley Fades With President's Veto of Waterways Bill":

HOPE OF BIG SANDY VALLEY FADES WITH PRESIDENT'S VETO OF WATERWAYS BILL

For the Big Sandy Valley, the President's veto of the waterways bill that carried $200,000 for planning Fishtrap Reservoir in Pike County and $2,500,000 for Pound Reservoir in Virginia, extinguished the hope for the valley's future.

It was only 30 months ago that our people saw the wild, rushing waters of the Big Sandy River spread across their lowlands from hill to hill, sweeping all in its path, and leaving thousands without home, food, clothing, and business. Never in the history of the valley had there been such suffering and devastation. As the days passed, despair deepened as losses were realized, and the ugly dream became a reality.

Then, the citizens of the Big Sandy towns joined hands to present our local flood problem to our Government in Washington. Had not President Eisenhower said that "It is up to the party in power to carry out a sensible program of progress that the American public will approve."

After all, we do have a Government noted for its benevolence, a Government that donated last year $30 million worth of food to the Italian people alone, and $6 million worth of food to the children of Italy this year.

Finally, after the trips of citizens to appear before Senate and House committees in Washington, after thousands of letters and telegrams, it seemed that the goal had been reached. Both the Senate and the House approved funds for Fishtrap Reservoir and Pound. But this hope was like a mirage that deceives so cruelly in the desert wastes. The waterways bill was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Shocked and amazed, we stand alone. We know that security and homes and jobs and all that is worth while in life depend on our safety from recurring floods. We ask, "Is it sensible to bring a halt to the development of a region, its security, and future? And who is able to foresee the value of these reservoirs to our Nation in future years?

Our national strength is a multitude of localities of which our valley is a single unit. A good businessman spends today for what is essential tomorrow, and money spent for national strength and human welfare is not extravagence.

Our Nation owes its greatness to what it has spent in the past. If other Presidents had acted with the same view to economy, there would have been no Panama Canal; no Louisiana Purchase; no buying of Alaska; no development our our rivers and harbors.

Prior to 1954, the foreign aid program brought the total over an 11-year period to about $100 billion, and billions have been sent to foreign nations since that year 1954.

With incredible amounts sent abroad for defense and rehabilitation for the 10 years from 1945 to 1954, there is evidence of waste and extravagence with our tax money.

We believe the waters of the Big Sandy River could be a blessing and a great economic asset if controlled with dams. The construction work would provide jobs for the unemployed, would stimulate needed business, and provide another link in the vast Ohio River system for flood control. When completed they would be permanent assets, safeguarding the lives and homes and property of the valley's inhabitants, and adding to the national strength and economy.

It is now known that the 1957 flood crest could be exceeded by 10 or more feet. In the face of these facts, surely our people are in a position as critical as any that are now approved for foreign aid from our Government.

During President Eisenhower's campaign, he said:

"The basic long-term issue of this campaign is between two totally different concepts of America and two totally different estimates of the American people.

"On the one hand there is that school of thought whose spokesmen regard America as finished; a 'mature economy'; a land of closed frontiers. There is another and opposite school of thought and of action. It regards America not as a dead end but still at its begininng, in its youth."

Our valley, without flood control, is a closed frontier, awaiting the onslaught of destruction. Our whole existence is linked to flood control. Without the building of these projects, all programs for rural development and community betterment, the studies, and conferences, and surveys, are sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal, a waste of time, money, and effort.

The hope of the Big Sandy Valley, it seems, now lies in the overriding of the President's veto by Congress.

Excerpts From Address of Senator Symington, Delivered at French Lick, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
FOR
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. HARTKE). Mr. President, on Saturday, August 29, most of the leaders of the Democratic Party in my home State, and members of the Indiana Democratic Editorial Association gathered at French Link, Ind. to hear an inspiring address by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. I would like to share his outstanding remarks with my colleagues and therefore ask unanimous consent to have a report of his address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRENCH LICK, IND., August 29.—"The American people should demand from this administration a fair return on their tax dollar through the more efficient organization and management of the three Federal agencies which use most of the taxpayers' money," Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said here tonight.

The Missouri Senator stated, "The record of many hearings before the Congress this year shows that billions of dollars annually could be saved in the Defense Department alone if that Department were organized in recognition of the nuclear-space age, instead of drifting along on the basis of tradition.

"Introduction of businesslike administration in the Department of Agriculture, plus sound fiscal management throughout the executive branch, would also cut out a great deal of misused tax money."

To support his conclusions about waste in Government, Senator SYMINGTON cited facts and figures. "Including estimates for this fiscal year," he said, "the total spending for the Department of Agriculture amounts to $34.9 billion just since 1952. This is more money than was spent by all the previous Secretaries of Agriculture put together, in the history of that Department."

The Senator added that "in 1958 the administrative costs alone of the price support program were 10 times as much as they were in 1952."

Senator SYMINGTON referred to the unsoundness of continuing to accumulate such large inventories. "Government investment in farm commodities," he said, "has increased from $2.5 billion in 1952, to $9 billion this year, and at the present rate of increase will amount to over $12 billion by this time next year."

Turning to the question of financial management, SYMINGTON said he was "seriously concerned with the mounting national debt, particularly with the increasing cost to the taxpayer of servicing that debt.

"The Treasury Department has failed to follow the well-established principle of debt management, namely, borrow at the lowest possible interest rates, and spread the maturity dates as evenly as possible over the following years."

The Senator cited a number of examples drawn from the official records of the Treasury Department during the past 3 years. He said, "Last March the Treasury Department offered a 4-percent 12-year bond, of which the public offered to buy $1.5 billion worth. Strange as it may seem, the Treasury accepted only $619 million of this subscription.

"Just a year prior to that, investors offered to buy at least $6 billion worth of a 3-percent 8½-year bond, and the Treasury decided to sell only $1½ billion.

"Based on these and similar illustrations," the Senator said, "I have come to the conclusion that the taxpayer would be paying at least a billion dollars a year less for interest alone, if the Treasury Department had acted as a good banker for the people's money."

Senator SYMINGTON said, "By far the largest source of saving of the taxpayers' money could come from a reorganization of the Defense Department. Service rivalries, duplication of weapons systems, and the multiplicity of separate forces without centralized commands result in the waste of billions of dollars every year."

Zablocki's Well Earned Honor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower's nomination of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] to represent the United States at the U.N. General Assembly meeting this fall has been confirmed by the U.S. Senate. This recognition of our colleague is well deserved. He will do an outstanding job for our country.

The Milwaukee Journal of last week carried a fine editorial on this appointment. I would like to read it to the House:

ZABLOCKI'S WELL EARNED HONOR

It is a long path from St. Vincent's grade school to the glass and steel palace of the United Nations on the East River in New York City. It is a long way from playing the organ at St. Vincent de Paul's church and teaching languages and music at Kosciuszko junior trade school to representing the United States in U.N. debate.

But CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI will conclude such a trip this fall. President Eisenhower and the Senate have honored Milwaukee's fourth district Representative by naming him one of the six-member American delegation to the 14th General Assembly of the U.N., which convenes September 17.

ZABLOCKI has earned the honor. Since 1949 he has been a hard-working and conscientious Member of Congress. As member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he has been studious, responsible, and highly respected by his fellow members. He is considered a congressional authority on American foreign policy in Asia and eastern Europe.

Milwaukeeans will join in congratulating Representative ZABLOCKI, not only on his new honor, but on the opportunity further to serve his Nation in the important U.N. sessions just ahead.

Ten Million More Jobs Forecast by 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the economic outlook fortunately continues to show progress — demonstrating the strength of our free enterprise system.

We recognize, of course, that maintaining high employment is tremendously important to the economy.

What is the outlook?

According to a forecast by the Labor Department's Chief of Manpower and Employment, Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein, we can expect 10 million more jobs by 1965. These will be available in factories, trades, services, professions, and other fields.

Who will fill these jobs?

According to predictions, the majority of the jobs will go to: First, the over 45 group of men and women; second, just-out-of-school boys and girls; and third, according to predictions, only a minor portion of the total number of jobs will go to persons in their prime working and career years.

Recently, the Green Bay Press Gazette published the syndicated column by Sylvia Porter entitled "10 Million More Jobs Are Forecast by 1965"—taking a long-range look at the employment situation for the future. Reflecting a

variety of thoughtful ideas on the national challenge—that is, maintaining high employment—particularly as it relates to employment prospects for women—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press Gazette, Sept. 2, 1959]

TEN MILLION MORE JOBS ARE FORECAST BY 1965—THEY WILL BE FILLED BY WOMEN, PEOPLE OVER 45, AND SCHOOL GRADS, SURVEY SAYS

(By Sylvia Porter)

By 1965, there will be 10,400,000 more jobs available in our factories, trades, services, professions, etc., than there have been in the closing years of this decade. Who will be filling them?

Women.

More than half the new jobs to open up these next 5 years will be taken by women.

The over-45, men and women.

About 5 million of the new jobholders in 1965 will be socalled older workers.

The just-out-of-school boys and girls.

Another 4,500,000 of the new jobs will be going to young persons in the 14–24 year age bracket—babies of the war and postwar eras, now mostly in elementary schools and on the way to our high schools.

Only a picayune half-million out of the vast total of new jobs will go to persons in the prime working and career years of 25 to 44.

This is no crystal-ball gazing. What I've just summarized are official forecasts of the U.S. Labor Department's Chief of Manpower and Employment, Dr. Seymour L. Wolfbein. And as Wolfbein remarked in a little-noticed address at the University of Michigan a few weeks ago, "To look ahead to 1965 in this field of employment is a well manageable problem because all persons who will be of labor force age in 1965 (14 years or older) already have been born." And in our country, there is no great influx of people from other lands to complicate the statistics.

Just as it's relatively simple to project who will occupy the jobs, so it's comparatively easy to project why the jobs will develop.

If our population just continues to expand as it has been expanding, for instance, there will be 25 million more of us here in the mid-1960's than there was in the mid-1950's—meaning that every 18 months, we are adding the equivalent of a city the size of Chicago to the United States. This upswing in our population must generate rising demands for housing, highways, factories, all sorts of goods and services.

If our production efficiency just continues to climb at the pace it has been climbing up to now, our Nation will be turning out 50 percent more goods and services in the midsixties than in the midfifties.

TEN MILLION MORE JOBS

So if we are just to take care of our growth in population and in production, we'll develop about 10 million more jobs by 1965.

Where will the workers come from? Not from the 25–34 year age group. In the face of an upsurge in our total population, the number in this working group actually will decline by millions—for the starkly simple reason that this is the age group born in the depression years between 1930 and 1940, an era when the birth rate was at a historic low.

It means that the sex barriers in employment must topple. What all our pleas haven't been able to achieve in crushing sex discrimination in jobs, necessity will achieve.

It means that the age barriers in employment must topple too. What all the studies proving the value of the over-45 worker haven't been able to accomplish in wiping out age discrimination in jobs, necessity will accomplish.

It means that our schools must provide the amount and quality of education to produce workers with the talents and gifts the economy of 1965 will demand. And what we'll need in 1965 will be fewer farmers and unskilled workers but vastly more professionals, white collar employees, skilled and semiskilled craftsmen. What all the warnings about Russia's superior educational techniques haven't done, necessity will do.

Age and sex barriers in employment and second-rate schooling never have been excusable in America. Wolfbein's projections are telling us that in the next few years, they'll become intolerable. The gains that should be coming from reasoning will be brought to us by necessity.

These planners are to be congratulated upon their wisdom and foresight in finding such a unique and interesting way to perpetuate the knowledge, understanding, and love of Abraham Lincoln.

As their Congressman representing the Fourth Congressional Kentucky District, I take pride in giving recognition to all of those wonderful citizens of Larue County, Ky., who have had a part, large or small, during this Lincoln Sesquicentennial year, in paying homage and tribute to the Great Emancipator. Truly it is an honor to be able to serve such "salt of the earth" people here in the House of Representatives.

Participation of Hodgenville, Ky., in the Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHELF
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Speaker, I want to comment upon the participation of Hodgenville, Ky., in the Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial this year.

The birthplace of Lincoln is located near this enterprising town whose fine officials and citizens have taken a great part in the celebration of this outstanding event. The progressive, cooperative spirit which pervades this community and with which its splendid citizens are imbued has prompted them to be significant participants in this event of national importance and magnitude. Their unselfish dedication to this cause elicits the admiration of all who love our country and its great leaders.

The Abraham Lincoln Birthplace Land Corp. devised a brilliant and imaginative plan by which the section of the Lincoln birthplace farm not owned by the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park is being released to schools, historical societies, prominent citizens, and individuals for their private ownership as historical heirlooms. In the words of the corporation:

This property has been divided into square foot sections to allow as many as possible to share in this wealth of American heritage * * * a treasure with national significance which can be passed from generation to generation with a pride of ownership second to none.

The truth of this is borne out by the fact that the deed which was issued to me, giving me actual ownership in 1 square foot, section No. A–202, parcel A, of the original Lincoln birthplace land, is framed and hanging in a prominent place in my office here in Washington.

Queens County Bar Association's Committee on American Principles Sponsors Second Tour of Washington, D.C., for 26 Queens County High School Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, this year, as they did in the past year, the Queens County Bar Association's Committee on American Principles sponsored a tour of Washington, D.C., for 26 Queens County high school students, who had been chosen for their scholastic abilities and all-around activities. The students came to Washington on May 20 and remained until the afternoon of May 22.

Mr. A. Joseph Geist, chairman of the committee on American principles, has written me in detail of the trip and the reasons behind it, and I am taking the liberty of including his letter in the RECORD at this point; together with a report by Mr. Joseph E. Lucas, a vice president of the bar association, on the students' visit; a list of the students who participated in the trip; and a copy of the winning essay by David Norris of John Adams High School, Queens County, entitled "Lincoln's Eternal Precepts."

I would like to emphasize the fact that although the letter from Mr. Geist is addressed to me, it is meant for each and every one of the Queens Members of Congress—Hon. James J. Delaney, Hon. Albert H. Bosch, and Hon. Seymour Halpern, and for Andrew J. Viglietta of the Long Island Daily Press and Star-Journal, who all contributed to the success of the tour.

This is a remarkable example of what can be done to engender a further interest in our American history and way of life in our young people, and in this instance is a resounding success:

QUEENS COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION,
Jamaica, N.Y., August 29, 1959.

Hon. LESTER HOLTZMAN,
House of Representatives Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR LESTER: Words alone are not adequate to express the profound sense of gratitude which I, as chairman of my

committee and which each of the members of the committee and of the Queens County Bar Association warmly extend to you because of the extensive efforts you made to make the Washington trek of some 26 students of high schools functioning in Queens County, New York City, both inspiring, educational, and enjoyable.

The members of our commitete who accompanied the group, namely, Joseph E. Lucas, vice president of the Queens County Bar Association, and his wife; Charles K. Finch, a former president of the Queens County Bar Association, and his wife, a distinguished member of the bar; and Mr. John Piselli, a member of the faculty of Martin Van Buren High School, and his wife, are deeply grateful to you for assisting them in making this trek an outstandingly successful one, in which each of them participated with equal enthusiasm to that of the students and which each of them likewise thoroughly enjoyed.

This was our second annual program of this nature, and as you remember, it was originally initiated at the suggestion of Dr. C. Frederick Pertsch, associate superintendent in charge of high schools, and Dr. Bernard E. Donovan, assistant superintendent assigned to special functions, of the Board of Education of the City of New York, and it was enthusiastically approved by Dr. John J. Theobald, superintendent of schools. You will also remember that one of the important phases of the plan that was evolved was that the students were requested to submit essays on any incident in American history which symbolizes our American traditions, the American way of life, and American political principles. We were desirous that the trip should not only be an enjoyable and cultural journey to the Capital of the Nation, but also one that would constitute a source of inspiration to the students and a rich opportunity that would be theirs to learn some part of the background of America and to be so inspired and stimulated as a result of it, that each would be gladly willing to write an essay on a subject which would necessitate some research work into and reading of the history of the United States. This would be carrying out the main purpose of the committe on American principles of this association, namely, to help spread the knowledge of American institutions and political traditions so that in no place in our area would there be found fertile ground in which to implant the seeds of the communistic philosophy of life, and so that in every nook and corner and on every block and in every square and in every private and public institution in our community, our democratic way of life, based upon American political principles, may ever endure.

Another matter that I would like to call to your attention and this is almost a case of bringing coals to Newcastle in stating this fact to you that the Queens County Bar Association, of which you are and have been for many years a distinguished member, has now been in existence for a period of 83 years and that it firmly believes that it is the duty and the obligation of its members, as members of the bar, to reach our citizens and teach them what this Nation stands for and what it vitally believes in and of its most advanced form of government on the face of the earth—that our government is one that rules by persuasion of law, rather than by the arbitrary and capricious or unrestricted will of tyrants.

I am appending at the end of this letter a copy of the essay which was submitted by David Norris, of John Adams High School, one of the students who took this last trip on the 20th, 21st, and 22d of May 1959. I am sure that on reading this, you will agree with us that the efforts of the Queens County Bar Association and of its committee on American principles are not without avail and that similar action taken by local bar associations throughout the State of New York and throughout each State of the Union would contribute very largely to a better and richer understanding and appreciation by every citizen of the rights and privileges and obligations of very citizen of our great and progressive Nation.

I am privileged to send you herewith a list of the students who attended this tour and the names of the high schools which they respectively attend. I also attach herewith a copy of the report of Joseph E. Lucas, Esq., who was in charge of this tour.

In 1958, when we planned to defray the expense of a tour to Washington by Queens high school students, we conferred with Hon. William B. Groat, county judge of the County of Queens and also acting justice of the supreme court of our county. Judge Groat has conducted annually for a number of years tours to Washington of Queens County lawyers whose admission to the U.S. Supreme Court he would move en masse or as one group. Accordingly, he has had varied experience in connection with such tours and having been closely and officially associated with Senator Ives in Washington for a number of years, was qualified to advise and counsel and guide us. The many lawyers whom Judge Groat moved for admission to the Bar of the U.S. Supreme Court established a fund which was to be used by Judge Groat as he would determine from time to time. He decided to use such funds to assist the Queens County Bar Association to finance the expense of the Washington trek. Thus last year we received a substantial contribution from Judge Groat out of this fund and again this year. Without his financial help, it might have been impossible for the bar association to defray the entire expense on its own account.

This year, instead of conducting a tour for only a small number of students, we invited two students from all the remaining high schools operating in Queens County which had not furnished any students in the previous year; included in these schools were two parochial high schools. The students were selected as they were last year. The principals and the faculty members of each high school were invited to select two students of their school to take this journey, who the principals and facilities respectively judged to be representative junior citizens, good scholars and the most valuable contributors to the welfare and well-being of their respective high schools. As a result, the students selected constituted a very fair cross-section of the quality and character of students who attend our high schools and truly represent the junior citizenry of our community. In this connection, I desire to state what I said to you last year when I reported to you concerning the tour:

"It may be said that the money of the taxpayers devoted to our educational system has been well spent, and that our student body today which will take over in the next generation or two will be well qualified to do so, and that they will keep and maintain our democratic principles in their pristine condition. We can look for many improvements from them to the well-being of the society of tomorrow. We can entrust our future in the hands of our young Americans. It is worth every effort that we can make as a association of lawyers to sponsor any community enterprise that would tend to develop the character, understanding, education and idealism of our youth.

"We leave to the social workers the solution of the juvenile-delinquency problem, which, I believe all of us will agree, affects such a tiny percentage of our youth that it has not in any way vitally or materially affected the sinew and fabric of the youth of this generation. Our schools, our parents, and our citizens should be proud of the superior quality of the youth that we have raised in this present generation, and so I believe that the activities of our association, through this committee, are fully justified and will be compensated by incalculably strengthening the body of our citizenry of tomorrow."

This year the same travel agency, namely, the Bob Pugh Travel Agency, which organized the tour last year, took charge of the tour. We made some changes by arranging that the Red Line Bus Co. would convey the group from the steps of the General Courthouse in Jamaica direct to Washington and there convey them to and from the various places which they visited and the same bus conveyed them back again to the point of departure. This was a very convenient method of transportation and solved many problems that we faced last year. This year, too, instead of arranging for the group to feed at the hotel where they were stopping, it was arranged that the chaperons on the trip would pay for all the meals wherever taken, out of a fund which was supplied by Judge Groat's contribution. In this manner we avoided the difficulties that arose by requiring young adults to partake of foods specified in table d'hote menus; instead, we offered them the opportunity to make such selection of meals as they desired, particularly on Fridays.

Prior to the bus leaving from Jamaica, all of the students met at the courthouse, together with the chaperones. There Judge Groat was introduced to them, who informed them concerning the rich opportunities that they could realize on the trip, and how valuable it would be to them and how much they would and could enjoy it. Joseph J. Perrini, Esq., president of the Queens County Bar Association, was himself present and delivered a short talk to the assembled students, and indicated to them that the Queens County Bar Association which was a long time in existence and was constituted of distinguished members of the bar of Queens County, were interested deeply in promoting the best interests of the community and creating better and well-informed citizenship on the part of the younger adult groups, and that he was very proud to be at the head of the organization, the host of this Washington trek.

The chairman introduced Mr. Joseph E. Lucas and Mr. Charles K. Finch, as representatives of the Queens County Bar Association, and Mr. Piselli, the official chaperones. Mr. Lucas and Mr. Finch addressed the group.

The chairman also addressed the group and made clear to each of the students present that the very purpose of the Queens County Bar Association in arranging and financing the Washington trek to be taken by them was to give them an opportunity to learn more about the seat of our Government and its operations and to be inspired therefrom in measure sufficient to induce them to study American history and do some research work in order to prepare an essay on any incident in American history which symbolizes the American traditions and the American way of life. For the best three essays chosen, prizes would be selected and given by the Queens County Bar Association and in addition, the next four best essays would receive honorable mention. Thus, it behooved each one of the students to devote themselves assiduously and ambitiously to this task. Here at this opint I interrupt to inform you of the fact that all the 18 students who were selected for the 1958 trip submitted essays in the contest. This year, all the 26 students who were selected for the trip submitted essays in the contest.

It would not be at all proper if I were not to call your attention to the fact that

we were informed that Congressmen DELANEY, BOSCH, and HALPERN were extremely cooperative and participated with you in helping make this journey such a great success, and we feel extremely grateful to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS and Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, both of New York for taking an active part in the program at Washington and giving of their valuable time to assist in making it the unforgettable success it was. The chaperones, as well as the students were all deeply inspired by the attention showered upon them by the Senators and Congressmen whom I have mentioned. They were not only gracious hosts but demonstrated to everyone in the party that we are blessed with representatives both in the Senate and the House of Representatives that are men of profound understanding and wisdom, each actively typifying true Americans in every sense of the word, and may I say, in conclusion, "God bless you all."

With warm regards.

Sincerely yours,

A. JOSEPH GEIST,
Chairman, Committee on American Principles.

REPORT OF JOSEPH E. LUCAS

The second tour of Washington, D.C., sponsored by the Committee on American Principles of the Queens County Bar Association started on Wednesday, May 20, 1959, at the Queens General Courthouse in Jamaica. Prior to boarding the bus for the trip, the 26 high school students, chosen from 13 Queens high schools for their scholastic and all around activities, met their chaperons, Mr. John Piselli, an English teacher at Martin Van Buren High School and his wife, chosen as faculty chaperons; and Mr. Joseph E. Lucas, second vice president of the Queens County Bar Association and his wife, chosen as the representatives of the committee on American principles. Mr. Charles K. Finch, a past president of the Queens County Bar Association and his wife, who were last year's chaperons, joined the expedition at their own expense.

A program was arranged at the steps of the courthouse. The students were addressed by Mr. A. Joseph Geist, chairman of the committee on American principles, who then introduced them to their chaperons and to Miss Hilda Rashba, his secretary, who worked with him on plans for the project. Mr. Joseph J. Perrini, president of the Queens County Bar Association; Mr. Samuel S. Tripp, past president, who in his term, created the committee on American principles, and Judge William B. Groat, who raised some of the finances for the venture, each spoke a few words to the group.

The bus left the courthouse at 1:10 p.m. Our tour director, William Rother, introduced himself to the group and presented our driver, Karl Jacobsen. After some conferences with the chaperons, a flexible plan for the tour was arranged. In a short while the expedition stopped at a restaurant on the New Jersey Turnpike, for a rest and refreshment period. After a pleasant and uneventful trip, we arrived in Washington about 6:15 p.m.

After Bill Rother obtained our room assignments in the Hotel Roosevelt, we freshened up and were taken downtown to a good cafeteria for dinner. We had received buttons from Parker Tours, on which our names were inscribed. They were used for identification in the cafeterias, so that one bill could be obtained from the cashier for our group.

After dinner, we were driven around Washington by our bus. We visited the National Archives and examined the original documents on display. We then visited the Jefferson Memorial and the Lincoln Memorial. The comments of the students, most of whom had never been to Washington before and some of whom were away from home and family for the first time, showed that they were impressed by the exhibits and the city of Washington after dark.

The spirit of the students is exemplified in the statement which one of the girls made to Mrs. Lucas. The student said that it was fabulous that they who had been strangers to each other at noon, had become friends before retiring the first night.

Thursday morning, we were called at 7, left the Hotel at 8 and after breakfast at another good downtown cafeteria, we were driven to the Capitol, where a group picture was taken. We then went to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and were taken on a guided tour. While the group took a tour of the White House, Mr. Lucas visited Senator JACOB JAVITS' office and Congressman LESTER HOLTZMAN'S office, where final arrangements were made for the luncheon and afternoon program.

Congressman HOLTZMAN met the group outside the House Office Building and escorted us to the Congressional Cafeteria where we had a good luncheon. Congressmen JAMES J. DELANEY, ALBERT H. BOSCH, and SEYMOUR HALPERN joined the group and all of the Queens Congressmen were with us at luncheon. A table had been reserved for us on a raised section of the dining room and while luncheon proceeded, the students each met the Congressman from his or her district. Andy Viglietta had two pictures taken for the Star-Journal and the Long Island Press of the Congressmen and a student from each Congressman's district.

The four Congressmen then escorted the group through the subway and then up to the House of Representatives gallery, where the group stayed for almost an hour, listening to debates on the housing bill. Before we left, Congressmen HOLTZMAN and DELANEY came up to the gallery and answered questions for the students. They then took us to the Senate Reception Room and presented us to Senator JACOB JAVITS, who welcomed the group. We were then welcomed by Senator KENNETH B. KEATING and our picture was taken on the steps of the Senate with both of the U.S. Senators from New York and Congressmen HOLTZMAN and DELANEY.

From there we went to the Supreme Court of the United States. A deputy marshal had a pass to the courtroom for our group. A full Court was in session and we heard one argument and part of another. The students showed a keen interest in the argument on the election of remedies in a condemnation matter, which they had heard.

We then went over to the Senate gallery. A committee meeting was being held in the Chamber. After this we visited the Smithsonian Institution and viewed the exhibitions.

After dinner, we went to Glen Echo Amusement Park, where a little relaxation was afforded the students.

Friday morning, we were up at 7, our bags were packed and we were ready for a hearty breakfast at 8. The morning newspapers carried an account of the passage of the housing bill by the House of Representatives. The students were thrilled to realize that they had witnessed the proceedings in the House the day before.

After breakfast, we went to Arlington, Va., where we visited Christ Church. George Washington and Robert E. Lee had been vestrymen in the church. We continued to George Washington's home at Mount Vernon on the Potomac. On our return we visited Washington Monument. Since there was a very long line waiting for the elevator, 20 students and Mr. Lucas climbed the 898 steps to the top of the monument.

After luncheon, we reluctantly left Washington. On our way north, a stop was made for ice cream at a restaurant on the New Jersey Turnpike.

The bus arrived at the front of the Queens General Courthouse at 8 p.m., where the parents of the students were waiting for their sons and daughters. All were tired but happy.

At this time I want to thank Mr. and Mrs. John Piselli and Mr. and Mrs. Charles K. Finch for their assistance to me in the decisions that were required to be made on the tour.

I desire to express my appreciation to Mr. A. Joseph Geist, chairman of the committee on American principles, and to his secretary, Miss Holda Rashba, for their early and excellent planning of our tour, which operated so smoothly.

My appreciation is expressed to Congressman Lester Holtzman, to Miss Davis and Miss Graham of his staff; to Congressman James J. Delaney, to Congressman Albert H. Bosch, to Congressman Seymour Halpern, to Senator Jacob Javits and to Senator Kenneth B. Keating for their hospitality to us, which made a lasting impression upon each and every member of the group.

Finally, I want to express appreciation for my appointment as the representative of the committee on American principles. My 3 days with the students brought to me an awareness that our historic American principles will be safe in the hands of the next generation. It has also pointed up the disservice done to the youngsters of today as entirely too much is publicized about the delinquents and too little is said about the majority who are good law-abiding citizens, upon whom will rest the future.

Respectfully submitted.

JOSEPH E. LUCAS.

LIST OF STUDENTS AND HIGH SCHOOLS ATTENDED

Holy Cross High School: William C. Donnino, 61–36 223 Place, Bayside, N.Y.; Frank P. LeVeness, 80–78 209 Street, Hollis, N.Y.

William Cullen Bryant High School: Marcelle Arak, 3121 54th Street, Woodside, N.Y.; Robert Friedman, 22–20 77th Street, Elmhurst, N.Y.

Grover Cleveland High School: Robert Whelan, 62–53 60th Place, Ridgewood, Queens, N.Y.; Erika Bieber, 62–69 60th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Aviation Trades High School: Dennis McGuinness, 104–18 Metropolitan Avenue, Forest Hills, N.Y.; Efrain Munoz, 321 East 26th Street, New York, N.Y.

Martin Van Buren High School: Burton Brody, 247–16 83d Avenue, Bellerose, N.Y.; Loretta Tremblay, 94–07 262d Street, Floral Park, Long Island, N.Y.

Bayside High School: Carl Crosley, 9–15 166th Street, Whitestone, N. Y.; Dorothy Meyer, 47–09 188th Street, Flushing, N. Y.

Richmond Hill High School: Richard Suttmeier, 87–83 118th Street, Richmond Hill, N.Y.; Christine Zolotas, 132–01 Metropolitan Avenue, Richmond Hill, N.Y.

Newtown High School: Louis Barnett, 67–38 79th Street, Middle Village, N.Y.; Thalia Comninos, 32–28 88th Street, Jackson Heights, N.Y.

Andrew Jackson High School: Barry Austern, 234–16 129th Avenue, Laurelton, N.Y.; Rita Padnick, 121–19 234th Street, Laurelton, Long Island, N.Y.

Woodrow Wilson Vocational High School: Joseph Wheeler, 144–09 156th Street, Jamaica, N.Y.; Eda Piantieri, 163–39 Phroane Avenue, Jamaica, N.Y.

Jamaica Vocational High School: Miss Bonnie Wheaton, 95–27 Woodhaven Court, Woodhaven, N.Y.; Mary Lou Linsalata, 77–16 95th Avenue, Ozone Park, N.Y.

John Adams High School: Janet Clementi, 107-18 110th Street, Richmond Hill, N.Y.; David Norris, 132-10 Crossbay Boulevard, Ozone Park, N.Y.

Stella Maris Commercial High School: Patricia Power, 425 Beach 131st Street, Belle Harbor, N.Y.; Clara Rodriguez, 1811 East 34th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y.

LINCOLN'S ETERNAL PRECEPTS

(By David Norris, John Adams High School)

As I walk up the glistening marble steps, I am caught in the magnificent yet simple beauty of the Lincoln Memorial. Upon reaching the outer colonnade, I am dwarfed by the immense Doric columns towering 40 feet above me. I enter the memorial. My eyes are raised and held almost magnetically to what confronts them. There enveloped in a soft glow of surrounding lights and the most profound silence, is the statue of Abraham Lincoln. I say statue, for I know not what else to call it. It is made of stone, yet as I stare steadfastly upon it, my gazes seem to be returned. I find myself captivated by a look that seems all joyfulness and all melancholy at the same time, a blending of both, yet a sharp distinction between the two. To add to the confusion of this seeming paradox, I notice the hands of the statue. One hand is clenched in a mighty fist, while the other is open in a tender expression of comfort. As I stand there quietly wondering, my eyes fall upon an inscription just above the statue; it reads, "In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union, the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever." The words "saved the Union" stick in my mind and I begin to recall the greatest threat to American internal unity. From the very outset, Lincoln was plagued by the imminent question of secession. On the very first day after his inauguration, he was confronted with the first sign of the momentous task ahead of him. Major Robert Anderson, Commander of Fort Sumter, the last remaining fort in Federal hands in the harbor of Charleston, sent word that his provisions were running low and that if he could not be supplied within 6 weeks, he would have to abandon the fort. In his inaugural address, Lincoln had promised to "hold, occupy, and possess" places and property belonging to the Federal Government. But if he were to supply Fort Sumter, the seven seceded States might resist with open forces. However, not to supply the garrison would prove that the new administration had not the courage of its convictions. Fort Sumter had grown to be a symbol. For the North, the holding of the fort meant the preservation of Federal authority; for the South the maintenance of a Federal fort within the territory of a seceded State meant humiliation and insult. Lincoln played for time realizing that aggressive action at Fort Sumter would draw the lower South into the war against the North, and might bring about the alienation of the loyal slave States. Soon, however, the situation was such that Lincoln saw the absolute necessity of supplying Fort Sumter. The Confederate government in Alabama replied to this by declaring that the Confederacy would no longer suffer the presence of Federal troops within the territory of a seceded State, and demanding the immediate surrender of Fort Sumter. James Chestnut, Jr., and Capt. Stephen D. Lee, both aides-de-camp to Brigadier General Beauregard, delivered these demands to Major Anderson in the midafternoon of April 11, 1861. Within an hour he replied with a refusal to evacuate the fort. The words were spoken, the deeds were done and war was certain. At 4:30 a.m. the first shot of the War Between the States was fired by Capt. George S. James, Confederate commander of Fort Johnson on James Island. Thus, in the hazy, foggy dawn of an April morning, the "house" was irreparably divided. The Civil War had begun.

The first crash of Lincoln's mighty fist came with his issuance of a proclamation declaring that as the laws of the country were opposed in the seceded States "by combinations too powerful to be repressed by the course of judicial proceeding," he was compelled to call on the States of the Union for 75,000 troops of their militia "to suppress the said combinations." Force was to be met by force; the challenge of the South against Federal authority would not be tolerated.

As battle after bloody battle passed into history, names such as Bull Run, Antietam, Fredericksburg, Vicksburg, and Gettysburg became infamous. The personal tragedy of war struck directly at Lincoln when a young and dear friend, Col. Elmer E. Ellsworth, was killed by rebel sympathizers at Alexandria, Va., on May 24, 1861. Lincoln turned to the sad task of writing to the colonel's parents. With beautiful tenderness the President sought to comfort the stricken couple. "In the untimely loss of your noble son, our affliction here, is scarcely less than your own. * * * The honors he labored for so laudably, and, in the sad end, so gallantly gave his life, he meant for them (his parents), no less than for himself. In the hope that it may be no intrusion upon the sacredness of your sorrow, I have ventured to address you this tribute to the memory of my young friend, and your brave and early fallen child." This was Lincoln, the tender comforter. However, the forceful influence of Lincoln was continuously evident. At one time just prior to open hostilities, he spoke to delegates of a peace conference, hurriedly convened to prevent what was to be inevitable, of his views on the conflicting issues of the moment. With emphasis and fearless conviction, Lincoln stated, "The Constitution will not be preserved and defended until it is enforced and obeyed in every part of every one of the United States. It must be so respected, obeyed, enforced, and defended." It was this opinion which guided him through the war and which prevented any compromise that didn't insure the preservation of the Union.

At last, after 4 long years of devastation and turmoil the Confederacy collapsed and the Union was victorious. On Sunday, April 9, 1865, Ulysses S. Grant solemnly accepted Robert E. Lee's surrender at Appomattox Courthouse. Yes, it was over. The power and the might of Lincoln during the long struggle were indisputable. But an ordeal even more difficult than winning the war now faced the reelected President. And that was to rebuild the "house"; to heal deep wounds and to make national pride overcome sectional hatred. In his second inaugural address, Lincoln summed up his hopes for a united future. In words of tender forgiveness he said hopefully, "With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow, and his orphans—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations." Mighty in his battle yet infinite in his forgiveness was Abraham Lincoln.

As I stand there in that marble temple I begin to understand these inconsistencies. Abraham Lincoln was truly representative of America. In his thoughts as in his acts he displayed all that has come to be synonymous with our heritage and our principles. For every conflict and every display of armed might of which it has been a part, the United States has shown mercy and understanding. Just as was Lincoln, so too is all America—mighty and victorious on the field of battle yet humble and merciful after the struggle is past and destruction is replaced by construction. But more important than tradition and history is the future. And I know that with such influences as the thoughts and deeds of Abraham Lincoln, America has, and forever will accept this pattern of glorious might coupled with compassionate forgiveness as a permanent and lasting way of life.

As I turn and descend the marble steps I begin to comprehend this huge paradox; this tremendous thing of 170 million parts, with each part insuring for us a country now and forever majestically humble and victoriously merciful.

GOP May Recoup Losses in Farm Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAMER H. BUDGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Columnist Ray Tucker, appearing in the August 10 edition of the Hudson Dispatch, published at Union City, N.J.

The article follows:

[From the Union City (N.J.) Hudson Dispatch, Aug. 10, 1959]

GOP MAY RECOUP LOSSES IN FARM AREA

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON, August 9.—The Republicans may recoup recent political losses in farm areas from the bipartisan congressional attack on a lobbyist who has virtually converted the popular Rural Electrification Administration's 4 million customers into a Democratic organization of great ballot-box influence.

He is Clyde T. Ellis, former Democratic Representative from Arkansas and for years the Washington manager of National Rural Electrification Cooperative Agency. When he lost out in politics after an unsuccessful try for the senatorial nomination he organized the lobby under a name that is sometimes mistaken for the Government agency itself.

He has fought for larger and larger REA appropriations, for vast extension of electric service, and for low interest rates on money advanced to his co-ops by the Government. Although Uncle Sam must pay more than 4 percent for its borrowings, the co-ops pay only 2 percent.

SERVED AS SPOKESMAN FOR CO-OPS

Ellis has served as their spokesman here, and until recently he wielded tremendous influence with legislators and farmers. Coops' dues have rewarded him with a handsome salary, a million-dollar structure at Washington, a magazine filled with agricultural advertising, and they have formed the basis for organization of a profitable insurance company.

With gross income of $900,000 for 1959, he now plans to form sort of investment company with the surplus funds. Since 96 percent of the Nation's farms have been electrified, he must seek new and more permanent interests.

But he has "led the co-ops astray" recently, according to a floor denunciation by rugged Representative BEN F. JENSEN of Iowa, and numerous Members from the Democratic South. He has alienated conservative rural consumers by denouncing a pending bill to upset a Supreme Court decision favorable to Communists. He is charged with following the CIO-PAC line by Capitol Hill critics.

STATES RIGHTS BILL

The legislation opposed by Ellis in secret letters to Members was introduced by Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, of Virginia, after the Supreme Court overturned the conviction of Steve Nelson as a Communist in Pennsylvania. It is known as the States rights bill, and seeks to protect the States' enforcement powers against Federal invasion.

Numerous members, all supporters of REA, took the floor to assail Ellis for his intervention, in view of the fact that the Smith proposal does not involve rural electrification. Upon receipt of the Ellis letter, Representative JOHN J. PILCHER, of Georgia, telephoned Walter Harrison, president of the NRECA, and reported to the House that Harrison is 100 percent for this bill.

"In opposing this States rights bill," said Representative WILLIAMS JENNINGS BRYAN DORN of South Carolina, "Ellis is not working in the best interests of REA. By joining with the CIO and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People in opposing this great legislation, he is hurting REA."

ELLIS FACES ATTACK BY BOTH PARTIES

Ellis is also under attack by Republicans and Democrats for associating with the Electric Consumers' Information Committee, advocates of government ownership of power facilities.

Its members include Leland Olds, whose nomination to the Federal Power Commission by Truman was blocked by Senate Majority Leader JOHNSON; Jerry Voorhis, a radical representative who was defeated by Vice President NIXON; Walter P. Reuther, automobile union president; and Clay Cochran, a CIO-PAC economist.

DEMOCRATS IRE AROUSED

In reciting the dangers of such associations before a branch of the Ellis organization in El Paso some years ago, Senator JOHNSON told how Ellis had visited him on behalf of the Olds nomination:

"Because of one man's endorsement," said the Texan, "REA coops were associated permanently with a discredited and disreputable propaganda campaign in which REA should not have been involved. Shortly afterward, the Senate turned down the nomination by a vote of 53 to 15."

Democrats today are as bitter toward Ellis' opposition to the States rights program as Senator JOHNSON was on the question of public versus private power years ago. It could mean the end of Ellis' political influence, and a 1960 boon for the GOP.

One Hundredth Anniversary of Our Oil Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, certainly the oil industry's growth in this country has been a close parallel to and indicative of the great progress which we as a nation have made during the last century.

The tremendous importance of this industry to our security and economy has been demonstrated time and again over the past years since the discovery of oil in our country in 1859. This year the oil industry is celebrating its 100th anniversary; and in my own State of Florida, the last week in August was proclaimed as Oil Centennial Week in Florida. At the end of last year, there were 11 oil-producing wells in our State. Many celebrations and special events were planned to demonstrate the importance of the industry to local communities and the State and to express the feelings of good will which exists in Florida toward representatives of the industry.

Automobile Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 17, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a paper prepared by Mr. Henry H. Wakeland, a New Yorker who I am honored to have as a constituent, on the subject of automobile safety. This follows on the heels of the passage of H.R. 1341 by the House of Representatives, a bill providing certain minimum safety standards for automobiles owned and operated by the Federal Government.

Mr. Henry Wakeland is a former automobile engineer of talent and demonstrated skill. He has made a careful study over many years of this important problem. He has also identified himself in New York City with other engineering matters of great importance to every citizen. One such is the control and elimination of air pollution caused by exhaust fumes. Mr. Wakeland is a community-minded citizen who is attempting to save New York City for that much-forgotten man—the resident. These are the people who spend much of their life in the city dodging automobiles. Automobile design, he insists, should be directed not only toward the safety of the driver and passenger but for the pedestrian.

POLITICAL GAINS IN THE BILL ON SAFETY STANDARDS FOR FEDERAL AUTOS

The Roberts bill, H.R. 1341, passed by the House and awaiting Senate action, is one of those minor bills which may prove to have major constructive effect.

Everyone knows the appalling statistics of motor vehicle death and injury. The first aim of this bill is to prevent Federal employees from needlessly joining these casualty lists. Federal employees have a right to be protected by the best wits of their employer, and much of the new knowledge of safety which needs to be applied has been found by the Air Force and Public Health Service. It also costs money when employees are out of action. Taxpayers have a right to demand use of the best cost-saving safety knowledge.

The House debate also discussed important effects in encouraging auto design improvements for the general public—in fact, this is the larger benefit sought. For the public, this gentle bill would exert much good effect through a leverage that is genuinely political as well as technical. The best laws are good precisely because they provide solutions to political problems.

Why is Mr. Roberts' little bill political? Not because the problem yet involves public politics, but because the bill opens a way for a new outlook in the policymaking patterns of the auto world. It does this without breaking the general network of present industry theories and it even promises to place these theories in a better light. The bill is nationally important because the policies of the auto world affect everyone.

H.R. 1341 may also have a good effect on the specific processes by which these policy decisions of the auto culture are made. Weaknesses in the political theory and political process of the auto culture are the real reason why the safety problem has come before the National Legislature. If H.R. 1341 strengthens these weaknesses it could stave off a need for legislation on a whole range of serious auto policy problems now rising within the Nation.

Why has the auto world bypassed much of the new safety? Is it only because people won't buy safety? Plainly that is only part of the difficulty. Let us look at the network formed by the more important production and marketing theories.

Almost everyone agrees that machine efficiency of mass production allows the ordinary man to afford an auto. Production is also of such efficiency that money for a new model is available every year. If slowness in improvement is present it results only from the careful approach to design called evolution, not revolution. The great research centers made possible by funds from mass sales are pushing as hard as they can to find basic new improvements, especially in safety. Although evolution is certain to apply these improvements quickly, it is a new evolution not known to Darwin. This evolution needs no profusion of different functional methods from which the best will survive. All can advance more or less together, since safety knowledge is shared freely, and thus wasteful diversity will be avoided. Impetus for improvement is not lacking either, since the unquestioned goal is to give the public what it wants.

This deeply held theory moves on to the primacy of fashion and psychology, prediction of public demand for auto fashions through polls, use of motivational psychology in advertising, and final sales victory through styling. Then the theory turns back to acclaim the least common denominator as necessary arbiter of design. Finally, it is seen that this necessity coincides with the original efficiency of mass production.

The circle is closed. Each questionable part is soothed by the next element. The circle is sealed and armored by the belief that if the automotive giant should stub his toe over some obstacle he may fall out of his castle, slide clear to the bottom of the national beanstalk, and strip off all the prospering beans on the way.

As a whole this theory seems unassailable—until the need to add more safety to the system. For no section of this accepted theory offers a healthy place for the "safety first" request to grow.

"Evolution" of the proven safety belt, for example, apparently took a small step forward at the hearings on H.R. 1341. One manufacturer announced that his 1960 cars would have a dimple in the floor to help mechanics locate the proper place for attaching the safety belt bracket. This was 4-year models after the safety belt was offered as an eccessory. And this floor dimple was ahead of the field.

"Evolution" in pedestrian injury prevention, so necessary here in New York City, is at a standstill. The "spear points" of 1956 were dropped in 1957 in favor of the headlight "sharp mouth." These survived through 1958. The year 1959 offers sharpened cheese cutters," "ax blades," even "scythes."

What about safety research funds from mass sales? In 11 months of 1958 consumers paid $10.1 billion for new autos, according to Automotive Industries. In September of the same year, Dr. Andrew Kucher of

Ford estimated that the auto industry was spending $5 million yearly in safety research of all varieties. Safety research is apparently aided by style-encouraged sales volume to the extent of 0.5 percent.

Ford Motor Co., incidentally, has some creative safety thinkers who are well versed in the field.

H.R. 1341 neither questions this circular theory nor approves it. The bill would simply cause a portion of the demand for autos felt by industry to reflect greater safety. In that portion, evolution would be helped to catch up and research would be encouraged to claim its proper stature.

At the Bureau of Standards conferences which will examine standards for Federal autos there will be no confident claim. "This is what everybody else wants," which has closed the question in the past. When ethical engineers of industry and government meet, it can be freely asked what degree of auto front end sharpness or hardness is least damaging to traffic-directing policemen or daydreaming pedestrians. A rational specification can be discussed far from the veto now held by the styling vice president back at the plant.

There are certain to be disagreements in such discussions, but all concerned will be thinking and arguing in the framework of functional design. The performance of seats in crashes can be discussed in terms of numerical descriptions which actually exist but are not now seen in salesroom specifications. The "rollover strength" of Federal autos may be defined in real numbers rather than by impressionistic demonstrations carried out on soft earth. Experience accumulated around the early specifications can be statistically evaluated for better standards ahead.

In time, design for safety may well emerge as a science in its own right. At the very least, free consideration is a first step to learning on both sides of any conference table. Thus a new constructive element will have been injected into industry's pattern of political theory, and injected painlessly.

The bill would also help to close a gap in another part of the automotive political system. Auto design and engineering in this age is not purely a matter of custom or economic necessity. Designs result from a series all interest at the same time. Policies are defound and specific powers exist. As with any policy, auto design policies cannot favor all interest at the same time. Policies are decided at visible times and places and under describable (if informal) rules. The pedestrian and the auto buyer are interested groups in this system. And the industrial area of the auto world does not always win by any means.

There are natural checks and balances in the constitution of the auto policymaking picture. But some of the most effective checks, such as slowed the horsepower race and produced the compact car, are still mostly outside the system.

Shortages of safety design seem best explained by failure of the auto world's communication system to carry meaningful information to the voters of its own auto-buying public. (The pedestrian public, of course, has no sales vote.)

Anyone can estimate the relative importance of messages about new safety possibilities in advertising of the mass media. Dozens of the new methods have never been mentioned in the mass media. Certainly the standardized safety exhortations of institutions do not include any about auto design. At the end of a holiday one's car radio is plainly convinced that all drivers need retraining, but the radio never seeks to compensate for driver errors by reminders to "fosten seat belts."

H.R. 1341 would place the safer autos of the Government where they could be seen by a number of people and recognized as a present possibility. If the Federal Government can buy such improvements, why can't the city do the same? If the city, why not the citizen?

One need not agree with this political interpretation of the bill to appreciate how it might have a good effect far out of proportion to its legal force. The leadership of the Health and Safety Subcommittee, Messrs. ROBERTS and SCHENCK, are to be congratulated on the bill's good sense and workability. Men of both parties have studied an involved problem and won through to an agreeable action which, whatever its legal theory, hits one of the safety nails squarely.

Now there is hope that the workings of the auto world will face the remainder of the desirable safety policy: creative engineering and production of a coordinated safety auto. To do this industry may need to review its theories and to reeducate its powerful recalcitrant. The whole auto world needs to develop better political mechanisms for the satisfaction of reasoned consumer interests and expression of ethical engineering. Congress has withheld the forecefulness found in the Railroad Safety Appliance Act of 1893. There is time for nongovernmental resolution of the problem.

But other national auto problems are ahead. Automotive air pollution is rising. Public traffic arteries are being clogged by hot weather failures due to marginal engineering. Automotive fuel waste seems to threaten several resource and logistic areas of national defense. Slowness of evolution raises the costs of military vehicles. And auto design is moving toward the center of the national culture. We may not have time for continued public ignorance and belief in the economy of revolving fashions.

So it is comforting to know that our National Legislature has been able to understand and act to this point for fuller safety. Apparently Congress can find leaderly ways in problems of technology. One may hope that the informal legislatures in the world of the auto may be encouraged to continue this leadership.

Poor Little Guy Who Doesn't Belong

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to present for my colleagues' reading, an editorial from a well-known local weekly newspaper in my district, owned and published by Mr. and Mrs. Jay Morton—the Home News, of Hialeah and Miami Springs, Fla.

This particularly well-written article brings out very clearly the plight of a very large segment of our population which we all know exists, but:

POOR LITTLE GUY WHO DOESN'T BELONG

Poor little guy—his case is a pathetic one. He's a patriotic citizen and he believes in the American way of life. But he's taking a kick in the teeth because he doesn't belong.

He doesn't belong, we mean, to any of the groups dedicated to organized selfishness and therein lies his trouble.

NOT A DOCTOR

He's not a doctor, with all the might of the American Medical Association to shield him should he wish to make money faster and easier. Yet certain practices of physicians—like unnecessary surgery and unnecessary hospitalization of patients—have raised the cost of his medical and hospital insurance.

NOT A LAWYER

He's not a lawyer with the power of the various bar associations back of him to protect him should he, too, wish to make money almost as easily as counterfeiting—yet the frequent $100,000 and $200,000 suits that clever damage attorneys are winning for comparatively minor injuries—have jacked up his auto insurance rate to a new hardship-creating high.

NOT A LABOR UNIONIST

He's not a member of a labor union with the strength of this vast force to win him new rounds of wage increases—yet the effect of the wage increases is constantly raising the prices of the things he can't do without.

NOT A NAM MEMBER

And, of course, this little man—small business owner, white collar worker, artist, college professor, retired individual or person on a fixed income—is not a member of the National Association of Manufacturers with its powerful economic might and ability to form cartels and fix and raise prices.

Our little man—and his name is legion—is caught in a colossal economic squeeze and he is powerless to help himself.

For today, no matter how high-sounding the purported objectives of these various unions—their real aim is to extract more and more from the public for their various members—for doing less and less.

UNORGANIZED ANONYMOUS

What then is the answer to the plight of this little man—member of nothing but "unorganized anonymous?"

Does it mean that he and his kind—as in a game of musical chairs—must rush to grab a place for himself in some organization devoted to specialized selfishness?

INDIVIDUALS NOBODIES

And suppose that he and everyone else does just that—what happens to a democracy in which individuals no longer matter—and only a handful of mighty organizations grapple with each other to see which gains the most—and with it dictatorial control?

Can the poor little guy who doesn't "belong" be helped? Or for that matter—is anyone interested in helping him?

LOST CAUSE?

He may be a lost cause—a symbol of the American tragedy—the extinction of the individual under the steam roller of the big organization—a symbol of the United States that once was but is no more.

Home Rule for the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following unsolicited letter was received by me under date of September 1, 1959, and was written by Robert B. Lane, of Colfax, Wash. I am pleased to commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

COLFAX, WASH., *September 1, 1959.*

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MULTER: Have just read the account of testimony you gave on

August 26, 1959, before the House District Committee as it concerned home rule for the District of Columbia. I wash to congratulate you for an excellent presentation of your views. By virtue of your cogent statements and your desire for compromise, you conveyed—even to the dull brown pages of the RECORD—a vivid impression of legislative democracy on a high level.

Especial congratulations for saying what you did in your closing statement—that parcel about the political facts of life. We on the outside realize they exist, and so long as the good men, like yourself, do your best in spite of them (and, I hope, because of them) we're for you.

With my best wishes, and please, do not bother to acknowledge this, I am,

Yours truly,

ROBERT B. LANE.

Khrushchev's Opening Barrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, now that the invitation to Nikita Khrushchev is an accomplished fact, it is necessary that we know and continue to expose his true nature so that in the event he seeks to derive propaganda value from his visit, the American people will not be deluded. I have stated previously and I still adhere to the view that it would be best that he not come here until such time as we would say, in equity, he can come with clean hands.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the September 14, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 14, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S OPENING BARRAGE

(By David Lawrence)

Nikita Khrushchev has let loose a barrage of propaganda designed to deceive the people of the United States as to the true intentions of the Soviet Government and the real purpose of his visit to the United States.

The Soviet Premier has written a lengthy article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs, a quarterly magazine published by the Council on Foreign Relations, Inc.—a private organization of citizens in New York City devoted to the study of international problems. He made an argument ostensibly for peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, but in reality he outlines his concept of world conquest by Soviet imperialism.

The whole discourse boldly disregards the facts as they actually exist throughout the world today. Mr. Khrushchev says:

"What, then, is the policy of peaceful coexistence? In its simplest expression it signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. However, this does not cover the entire concept of peaceful coexistence. Apart from the commitment to nonaggression, it also presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever.

"The principle of peaceful coexistence signifies a renunciation of intereference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government or mode of life or for any other motives."

Yet the Soviet Government has violated every single precept contained in the above pronouncement.

Soviet imperialism has violated the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Soviet imperialism has established a firm hold on the governments of the so-called satellite states in Eastern Europe and today maintains troops in those countries to uphold the Communist stooges who are stationed inside each government to see that the Communist point of view is the law of the land.

Soviet imperialism sent its troops and munitions into the mainland of China to help overthrow the Nationalist Government there.

Soviet imperialism has undermined the governments of independent nations in the Middle East.

Soviet imperialism shipped arms into North Africa to help stir up revolt.

Soviet imperialism sent munitions into North Korea in 1950, and direct assistance was given to North Korean armies despite the fact that the United Nations had called on the Soviet Union, as well as on all other U.N. members to repel the aggression in that area.

Soviet imperialism has given support to its ally—Red China—which has violated the territorial integrity of neighboring countries, first, by overthrowing the government of Tibet and now by marching troops into India as well as Laos.

The record of the Soviet Union since 1945 has been one of continuous aggression in different parts of the world.

No continent has been immune from Soviet infiltration. The latest examples include the operations of Communist agents in Cuba and in other Central American countries as well as in Latin America generally.

Nobody questions the right of a people to support theories of State socialism. There is really no important international issue at stake in so-called "ideological differences." The United States does not object to the social system that any other country in the world may choose to adopt for itself. It objects only when such a social system conspires to invade an independent country, violates its territorial integrity, or seeks to undermine its independence.

Mr. Khrushchev is disturbed about the resolution recently passed by the Congress of the United States expressing sympathy with the "captive nations." He says:

"It would be interesting to see, incidentally, how the authors of this resolution would have reacted if the parliament of Mexico, for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona and California be 'liberated from American slavery.'"

The answer to this is simple. Let Mr. Khrushchev agree to permit the people of the several states of the Soviet Union and of the satellite states in Eastern Europe to have the same right to vote in free elections as the people of Texas, Arizona, and California have enjoyed in the century that has elapsed since the territory of these States was legally acquired by formal treaty. The United Nations would be glad indeed to furnish impartial supervision. Mr. Khrushchev goes on to say:

"The Soviet Union has liquidated its bases on the territories of other states."

Does not the head of the Soviet Government know that the American people have a free press, that the American newspapers have reported repeatedly the presence of Soviet troops in Eastern European countries which are supposedly independent? Does he think we have forgotten what happened only 3 years ago in Hungary, when Soviet troops deprived the people of that country of the right to determine their own form of government?

As Mr. Khrushchev goes back to 1939, he unwittingly reminds us of the Soviet treachery that enabled Hitler to start World War II. The Soviet Premier declares:

"In the Second World War the Hitlerites occupied Western Europe before advancing against the Soviet Union."

But Mr. Khrushchev omits to say that it was the Soviet Union which made World War II possible when Stalin and Molotov in August 1939 entered into an alliance that protected the Nazis on their Eastern front, and thus gave Hitler free rein to attack France and Britain. That's how Western Europe came to be occupied.

The Soviet Premier prates a good deal about the importance of letting people decide their own fate, but he is unwilling to let the German people form a united republic today. He writes:

"It now seems that no sober-minded leader in the West is inclined any longer to advance the unrealistic demand for the so-called reunion of Germany before the conclusion of a peace treaty, inasmuch as more and more political leaders are becoming aware of the fact that reunion in the conditions now obtaining is a process which depends upon the Germans themselves and not upon any outside interference."

But does not the Soviet Premier realize that the whole world knows East Germany is occupied by Soviet troops today? How can there be any free elections in East Germany as long as Soviet military forces there keep the people under duress? He adds:

"We should start from the obvious fact that two German states exist, and that the Germans themselves must decide how they want to live."

But who is interfering with the right of the German people as a whole to decide "how they want to live"?

Only the Soviet armies are interfering. The free world is ready to see elections held in East Germany as well as in West Germany to establish a single government over both.

Again and again proposals to that effect made by the West were rebuffed by the Soviets at the Geneva Conference last spring. Yet Mr. Khrushchev says:

"As for Germany's unity, I am convinced that Germany will be united sooner or later. However, before this moment comes—and no one can foretell when it will come—no attempts should be made to interfere from outside in this internal process, to sustain the state of war which is fraught with many grave dangers and surprises for peace in Europe and throughout the world."

But at this very moment the Soviet government is interfering "from outside" and is unwilling to let the peoples of the two Germanys determine their own form of government.

Not a single sentence in the article mentions the ultimatum issued last autumn by the Soviet Premier demanding that the West pull its forces out of West Berlin. Yet it was this demand which started the present crisis in the world. The ultimatum has never been withdrawn. Mr. Khrushchev says:

"We resolutely reject any attempts to ascribe to the Soviet Union the intention of seizing West Berlin and infringing upon the right of the population in this part of the city to preserve its present way of life."

But the record of what has happened since last November, when the Soviet Government issued its first note demanding the departure from West Berlin of all Western troops, contains ample evidence that the Soviet Government did threaten to "seize" West Berlin. The words of the threat have been widely printed for all to read.

The Soviet Premier is demanding that the "status quo" be maintained throughout

Eastern Europe. He wishes the past to be forgotten, the injustices of recent history to remain uncorrected, and the conquests by Soviet imperialism to be accepted now by the free world as an accomplished fact. He adds:

"It is necessary that everybody should understand the irrevocable fact that the historic process is irreversible. It is impossible to bring back yesterday. It is high time to understand that the world of the 20th century is not the world of the 19th century, that two diamerically opposed social and economic systems exist in the world today, side by side, and that the Socialist system, in spite of all the attacks upon it, has grown so strong, has developed into such a force, as to make any return to the past impossible."

But the free world is not demanding the return to any social systems of the 19th century. It is protesting against the return to the despotism of the Middle Ages. It is demanding, indeed, a return to freedom and independence. There has never been any time in world history when freedom was considered outdated or liberty was regarded as outmoded.

The lessons of history teach us that peoples do not indefinitely acquiesce in enslavement. Sooner or later they do demand that dictators be removed and that the right of self-determination of peoples be recognized.

Mr. Khrushchev objects to discussion of the idea of "rolling back" communism. But nobody is advocating the "rolling gack" of communism as an ideology or as a theory. What is being advocated by free men everywhere is the "rolling back" of Communist imperialism, which imposes its will by brute force and deprives people in Eastern Europe and Asia of the right to determine their own destiny.

The Soviet Premier evades the real issue and misrepresents it. He is trying to tell the American people that all that is wrong with the world is the existence of "two different social systems."

The American people, however, as well as the peoples of other countries, know the difference between tyranny and freedom. They will never acquiesce in the maintenance of a system of oppression, and they will always reserve the right to express their sympathy for other peoples who are unfortunately the victims of distatorship and autocracy.

Mr. Khrushchev's plea for the "status quo" will not be accepted. The American people will never agree that "peaceful coexistence," as Soviet imperialism interprets it, shall be tolerated along with its far-flung process of infiltration, subversion and aggression in different parts of the world.

How ironical it is to read calls for more trade—the right to import strategic materials for the Soviet war machine—and hypocritical pleas that "no ideological differences should be an obstacle to the development and extension of mutually advantageous economic contacts." Mr. Khrushchev's emphasis is entirely on materialism. He says nothing about the cause of human freedom.

To fill this omission, Francis B. Stevens—who before retirement was in charge of the division of Russian affairs in the Department of State and now is on the board of editors of this magazine—offers an interesting plan. He suggests that the United States reply to the Soviet challenge of "peaceful competition" in industrial and agricultural productivity by proposing in return a "freedom competition." The purpose would be to see which nation could do most to assure liberty for its citizens and self-determination for other peoples.

Such a challenge to the Soviet Union would call upon the Moscow Government and its allies to join with the United States in a crusade to promote and advance in all countries of the world the following freedoms:

Freedom of worship.
Freedom of assembly.
Freedom of information.
Freedom from fear of arbitrary arrest.
Freedom from want.
Freedom of political activity by all opposition parties.
Freedom from external aggression.
Freedom from internal subversion by foreign agents.
Freedom of choice by every nation to determine its own political and economic system.

With reference to the last-mentioned freedom of choice, it is astounding to find Mr. Khrushchev now insisting that this principle has always been accepted by the Soviet Government. The Soviet Premier, in his article, gives vent to the following outburst of piety:

"As for the social system in some state or other, that is the domestic affair of the people of each country. We always have stood and we stand today for noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries. We have always abided, and we shall abide, by these positions."

What is disturbing is not only the effrontery of the Soviet Premier in making such an untrue statement, but his deliberate disregard of what the Soviet Government is doing today with troops and money and agents throughout the world. It is in itself significant that the Soviet Premier assumes an article containing such untruths will actually be accepted as truth by the people of the United States. What an insult, particularly to the intelligence of such a well-informed group of Americans as the members of the Council on Foreign Relations.

What possible motive could have induced Nikita Khrushchev to have such an article prepared for this audience? Does he really believe the American people will not perceive his hypocrisy?

The words in the article may be those of Nikita Khrushchev, but the concepts are those of Adolph Hitler and of all the other dictators in past history who have disturbed the peace of the world.

The forces of freedom sooner or later must arise to defend themselves against such dictators and to help all peoples to liberate themselves from the yoke of tyranny and autocratic government. Meanwhile, the organized deception and injustices perpetrated by despotic governments must be exposed to full view. For they offend truth and violate the right of all men to be free.

The Voice of the Near Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the Western States Conference of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, with only one dissenting vote, passed a resolution recently in favor of negotiation through regularized diplomatic channels with the Chinese Communist government. I submit that this may very well be the voice of the very near future and one which will be heard in Washington more and more until it is heeded.

Under a unanimous consent I include the article from the Washington Star of August 31, 1959:

RECOGNIZE RED CHINA, YOUNG DEMOCRATS ASK

SAN FRANCISCO, August 31.—Young Democratic leaders yesterday called for early establishment of diplomatic relations with Red China as a necessary step toward world disarmament and nuclear control.

The Western States Conference of the Young Democratic Clubs of America, attended by 100 delegates from 13 Western States, wound up a 2-day conference by recommending a resolution for the National YDCA convention in Toledo, Ohio, in November which calls for negotiation through regularized diplomatic channels with the Peiping government.

The resolution, adopted with one dissenting vote, argued that such channels are not now available because of the policies of the present administration.

ASK ATOM INSPECTION

"We therefore call for the early opening of diplomatic relations with China for the purpose of seeking solutions to the outstanding differences existing between our two nations (including settlement of the status of Formosa), for exploring the possibility of a world-wide inspection system of disarmament and the control of nuclear testing, and for the beginning of mutually profitable trade and cultural interchange," the resolution concluded.

As far as is known, this represents the first formal expression by a segment of either of the two major political parties of the idea that effective disarmament and nuclear control eventually will depend on agreement by the government which controls 650 million people on the Chinese mainland.

The resolution declared that present American China policy "is predicated on the assumption that the Chiang Kai-shek government on Formosa speaks for all the Chinese people. This assumption is not in accord with political reality."

CALIFORNIAN IS SPONSOR

The resolution was offered by Mary Louise Allen, California State YDCA president.

Another resolution praised President Eisenhower for his decision to exchange visits with Soviet Premier Khrushchev and called on Americans to greet the Soviet leader in a manner befitting a mature, democratic, and peace-loving people.

Other resolutions called for strengthening the Federal Civil Rights Commission, Federal and State fair employment laws, and stronger antidiscrimination measures in housing and schools.

Exchange of Visits of Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was sent to the President of the United States by the president of the Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania.

It expresses the fear that they and the other captive nations under the forced domination of the U.S.S.R. have been forsaken by the West, due to the agreed exchange of visits by President Eisenhower with Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

I hope all Members of Congress will express in their own manner to these peoples that the American peoples will never give up our efforts to help gain their independence from Soviet Communist control.

When Congress reconvenes in January, it is my intention to hold hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives to explore the impact of the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev.

AUGUST 14, 1959.

The PRESIDENT OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania, representing the silenced Lithuanian people now suffering under Soviet oppression, has always had highest regard for the firm and positive stand of the Government of the United States of America as regards the inalienable rights of peoples to self-determination. The captive Lithuanian nation as well as this committee appreciate especially the refusal of the United States to recognize the Soviet occupation of Lithuania, perpetrated in violation of the law of nations and of all Soviet international obligations and commitments.

This well-established and universally known American position has kindled during all the tragic years of Soviet occupation of Lithuania the hope of the enslaved people to regain their freedom. The Kremlin has done everything to destroy this hope. Each and every, even the slightest, American gesture of cooperation with the Soviet Union was exploited by Moscow to persuade the subjugated people that the United States has abandoned them and that no country would support their efforts to break off from the Soviet control.

The intensification of the cultural exchanges between the United States and Soviet Russia and, particularly, the present official visits have, in accordance with the Soviet propaganda maneuvers, strengthened the Communist pressure upon the subjugated Lithuanian people aimed at convincing them to give up any hope for American support of their struggle for freedom and independence.

The recent visit of the Vice President of the United States in the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, backed by the invitation extended to the Soviet Premier to come to the United States, have resulted in new Soviet propaganda measures surpassing any previous Moscow efforts to distort the real reason and meaning of these visits. All Soviet media of information—radio, press, television, films, and certainly the speeches of leading personalities—are interpreting to the captive Lithuanian people the American invitation to Mr. Khrushchev as a Soviet victory and as Washington's final recognition of the incorporation of Lithuania in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This misleading Soviet propaganda, based on the exchange of the Soviet-American official visits, is creating distrust and disappointment, as well as forcing the Lithuanian people into despair and distress. Only a strong American political and diplomatic action coupled with a firm determination to oppose the godless Communist philosophy and their inhuman system could reduce, at least partially, the devastating effects resulting from the Soviet propagandistic interpretation of the exchange of official visits between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The Supreme Committee for Liberation of Lithuania wishes therefore respectfully to request you, Mr. President, to state clearly and resolutely to the Soviet Premier the unswerving United States stand with respect to the right of the Lithuanian people to choose its own government in free and unfettered elections supervised by the United Nations and to the urgent need for withdrawal of the Soviet armed forces from Lithuania.

A public reiteration of this stand would contribute very much to relieving the enslaved Lithuanian nation of its anxieties and to securing relaxation of international tension and stability in that part of Europe. Moreover, an official restatement to the effect that the United States will not acquiesce in the Communist capture of Lithuania may dissipate the growing suspicion in Lithuania that the Captive Nations Week, which unfortunately coincided with the invitation of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States, had been proclaimed with the purpose of eliminating the regrettable effects of the forthcoming visits; it would restore the conviction that the week was a manifestation of American support for the right and the efforts of all captive European nations to regain their freedom and independence.

I avail myself of this opportunity to extend to you in advance, Mr. President, my profound gratitude for whatever you will deem as proper of doing in support of the great cause of just peace and freedom to men and nations.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. A. TRIMAKAS,
President.

Everybody Isn't for Pork, or Mrs. Stafford's Warning to Liberals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, from some of the speeches we listened to during the recurrent discussions of the public works appropriation bills I kind of got the feeling that anyone, like myself, who wanted to keep them within reason would be No. 1 on the tar and feathers parade in any 1 of the 50 States. We more or less got pictured as some kind of modern day dragons breathing economy fires that withered and charred the fond aspirations of the entire citizenry for a new America, bright and shiny with bold construction projects proliferating the national landscape. At least I sensed an accusation of being part of a latter-day horde of Genghes Khans smashing the national hope chest out of sheer ecstasy for destruction.

Then along comes a citizen, a lady from Long Beach, Calif., who writes a letter to the editor of her newspaper, the Long Beach Press-Telegram. Now this lady puts a whole new slant on the business. She is the fearless kind. She calls a pork-barrel bill a pork-barrel bill. She even says she is more for less taxes than for more pork. Obviously, she must be smitten with a fantastic notion that the Government really does not get its money out of a pump. Probably she even believes that in some unexplained manner the people always wind up paying for whatever Congress appropriates the money for the Government to buy or build. Proceeding from this misleading premise I can just see her craftily concluding that when people who are living on a bare susbsistence level for their own needs are made to bear extra and nonessential expenses of government, they find themselves below the bare subsistence level. Probably she would even say that those in Congress opposing a lot of nonessential spending are really not against improving our landscape, but really fighting a humane battle to keep those sometimes generally termed the common man—the millions of so-called little men's and little women's heads above the fiscal waters.

This woman is a clear and present danger to all liberals. What if her ideas should contaminate the Congress? What then, I ask, would happen to the jobs of thousands of tax collectors? Could we trust the American people with all that extra money in their hands to spend as they wanted? What would happen to all the people in social welfare agencies taking care of people who do not have enough left to take care of themselves after taxes and inflation have emptied their pocketbooks? Believe me, things could really get tilted. I have asked that her letter be reprinted here for the sole purpose of warning the liberals to put their guard up against people like her, with full confidence that her radical message will never subvert the minds of the truly dedicated.

[From the Long Beach (Calif.) Press-Telegram]

PUBLIC FORUM—ROLLING OUT THE OLD PORK BARREL

EDITOR.—Once again the pork barrel is being rolled out in Washington, D.C.—and who will pay the bill for the costly goodies each vote-conscious politician stuffs into it in spite of the President's warning that we can't afford boondoggling right now? Why the groaning taxpayer, of course—who else?

The Government can't give us a cent which it hasn't first taken from us, deducted half for clerical expenses, etc., and sent a fourth to some other state. So why not take the quarter cent; at least we'd get something back? I'll tell you why:

1. Our taxes have already been increased just to meet current costs—so our governor said. Where then are we going to get our share of the costs of pork barrel projects? Our share will have to come from another increase in taxes. Do our citizens want that?

Well, if they don't they had better grab a pen and tell their Congressman to vote no on the public works bill right now.

2. There's another reason why it's not very smart for California to enter the pork barrel grab bag head first. By the time we come up for air witif our tiny tidbit clutched in our greedy little fist we will discover the project, alas, has grown to enormous proportions, which requires a second, then a third, maybe a fourth tax increase to complete. Thus, on and on we are led into ever bigger and better inflation by the pork barrel addicts in Washington. Unless, of course, we wake up and tell them to dump all the pork barrel goodies in the Potomac and turn the barrel upside down, permanently! Let our legislators earn votes by reducing taxes, not tripling them!

GRACE L. STAFFORD.

A Sectional Analysis of the Civil Rights Bill, H.R. 8601

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have prepared a sectional analysis of my civil rights bill, H.R. 8601, which has been reported to the House. The analysis follows:

A SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL, H.R. 8601

TITLE I (OBSTRUCTION OF COURT ORDERS)

Section 101 of the bill proposes to amend chapter 73 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to obstruction of court orders in school desegregation cases. Accordingly, it amends that title by adding at the end of the chapter a new section. The measure would make it a Federal offense to willfully use force or threats of force to obstruct or impede court orders for school desegregation purposes; upon conviction, the offender could be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 60 days or both.

It further provides that other injunctive or civil relief against the type of conduct made criminal by this proposal is not to be denied on the grounds that such conduct is a crime. In this regard, provision is made that any fine or imprisonment imposed for the violation of such an injunction shall not be in addition to that imposed for a violation of this section.

It further provides for the exemption of the acts of the student, officer, or employee of a school when the act is done at the direction of or is subject to discipline by an officer of the school.

TITLE II (FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR DAMAGING OR DESTROYING ANY BUILDING OR OTHER REAL OR PERSONAL PROPERTY)

The proposal would make it a felony, punishable by a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment of not more than 5 years or both, to move in interstate or foreign commerce, to avoid local prosecution, custody, or confinement after conviction for willfully damaging or destroying or attempting to damage or destroy by fire or explosive any building, structure, facility, vehicle, dwelling house, synagogue, church, religious center, or educational institution, public or private. Flight to avoid testifying in criminal proceedings relating to such offenses would likewise be punishable.

TITLE III (FEDERAL ELECTION RECORDS)

Section 301 would require the retention and preservation for a period of 2 years of any general, special, or primary election records involving candidates for Federal office. The Federal offices are the Office of the President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Resident Commissioner of Puetro Rico. It would include all records and papers in the possession of election officers relating to application, registration, payment of poll tax, or any other act requisite to voting in such elections. Provision is made, however, that where such records are required by State law to be deposited with a custodian, such election records may be so deposited and the duty of retention and preservation then devolves upon that custodian. A willful failure to retain and preserve the records is made an offense punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.

Section 302 provides that any person, whether or not an officer of election or custodian, willfully steals, destroys, conceals, mutilates, or alters any of the records required to be retained and preserved shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year or both.

Section 303 provides that such records as required to be preserved by this title shall, upon the written demand of the Attorney General or his representative to the party having custody, possession, or control of them shall be made available for inspection, reproduction and copying by the Attorney General or his representative. Demand, however, must contain a statement of the basis and the purpose therefor.

Section 304 provides that when a demand is made by the Attorney General, the record shall be produced either at the principal office of the person upon whom the demand is made or at the office of the U.S. attorney in the district in which the records and papers are located.

Section 305 provides that unless ordered by a court of the United States, neither the Attorney General nor his representative nor any employee of the Department of Justice should disclose any record or paper produced pursuant to this title except to the Congress and any of its committees, governmental agencies, or in the presentation of a case or proceeding before a court or grand jury.

Section 306 provides that in the event of nonproduction, jurisdiction would be conferred upon the Federal district courts to resolve any dispute which might arise in connection with the exercise of the authority conferred upon the Attorney General by this title including appropriate process to compel the production of the record or paper.

Section 307 defines the term "officer of election" to include any person who under color of the law performs or is authorized to perform any function, duty, or task with any application, registration, payment of poll tax or other act requisite to voting at any one of the enumerated elections at which votes are cast for candidates for the specified Federal offices.

TITLE IV (CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION EXTENDED FOR 2 YEARS)

Section 401 would extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 2 years. Under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the Commission is required to submit its final report not later than September 9, 1959. Provision is made in this section also for an interim report to be submitted to the President and the Congress not later than September 1, 1959.

Section 402 of title III would remove any doubt as to the authority of the members of the Commission to administer oaths.

Section 403 would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, section 105(a), by deleting the words "in accordance with Civil Service and Classification Laws" and inserting "without regard to the provisions of the Civil Service Laws and the Classification Act of 1945, as amended,"

TITLE V (EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES)

Title V would amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, as amended, which authorize Federal payments to school districts which provide free public education to children whose parent resides or works on Federal property which is not subject to State or local taxation.

Section 6(a), Public Law 874, now requires the Commissioner of Education to make arrangements to provide free public education for children residing on Federal property if the State and its subdivisions may not spend tax revenues for their education or if no local public educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for them.

Section 501 of the bill would amend section 6(a) to permit the Commissioner to make arrangements also for children of members of the Armed Forces on active duty, whether or not residing on Federal property, where the schools usually provide free public education for them are made unavailable to them by official action of State or local governmental authority and no local public educational agency is able to provide them with suitable free public education.

Subsection (b) of 501 provides complementary amendments to section 6(d) of Public Law 874. The existing provision permits the Commissioner, when he makes the arrangements for provision of education for the federally connected children, to make such arrangements only with a local educational agency or with the Federal agency having jurisdiction over the property on which they reside. Where this new category of children of Armed Forces personnel are involved, arrangements could also be made with the head of the Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over the parents of some or all of the children.

Section 6(d) of Public Law 874 limits the arrangements to those which provide for the use of either facilities situated on Federal property or facilities belonging to a local educational agency. The amendment provided in subsection (b) of section 501 would make this limitation inapplicable where the Commissioner is required to make these arrangements for the new category of children.

Section 502 of title IV of the bill amends Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended. The proposal of the bill would authorize the Commissioner of Education to acquire possession of any school building constructed with the aid of Federal funds after the enactment of the proposed amendments contained in this section, when the local educational agency which owns the building is no longer using it for free public education and the Commissioner needs the building to provide education for children of military personnel or for other children who reside on Federal property. While the school remains in Federal posession, the Commissioner would pay the local district a rental fee proportionate to its share of the cost of constructing the building.

Section 6(b), Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended, now requires applications of local educational agencies for the approval of construction projects, which must be filed before the agencies may receive payments to help finance such projects, to contain or be supported by various assurances relating to the authority of the local agency, and other relevant matters. The amendment proposed in section 502 of the bill would add to this provision the requirement of an assurance that any facilities constructed with aid under this law, the application for which is approved after the enactment of the bill, will be made available to the Commissioner in case they are not being used to provide free public education and that the Commissioner needs them to provide facilities for the education of children who reside on Federal property or whose parent is on active duty with the Armed Forces. Subsection (b) of section 502 would amend section 10 of Public Law 874.

Subsection (b) of section 502 would amend section 10 of Public Law 815. Existing law now requires the Commissioner to make arrangements for the constructing or otherwise providing the minimum facilities necessary for the education of children who will be residing on Federal property at the end of the next fiscal year if the State and its subdivisions may not spend tax revenues for their education or if no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for them.

Section 502(b) of the bill would amend this section to permit the Commissioner to make such arrangements to provide, on a temporary basis, such facilities for children of the members of the Armed Forces on active duty, whether or not residing on Federal property, where the schools usually providing free public education for them are made unavailable to them by official action of State or local governmental authority and no local educational agency is able to provide them with suitable free public education.

Section 502(c) of the bill further amends section 10 of Public Law 815 by adding a new subsection which authorizes the Commissioner of Education to take possession of facilities constructed with the aid of funds provided for by Public Law 815, under an application approved after the enactment of the bill, if they are not being used for free public education and are needed by the Commissioner, as minimum facilities necessary for the children residing on Federal property or children of the Armed Forces personnel on active duty. Possession would be taken under the terms and conditions prescribed in regulations of the Commissioner of Education. Payment by the Commissioner of a reasonable rental on the portion of the facilities financed with non-Federal funds would be required. Provision is also made for the return of those facilities to the school district when the district reopens those schools and makes them available to the federally connected children or when the Commissioner no longer needs the facilities for direct Federal operation purposes. However, the best interests of the federally connected children, the objectives of this proposal, and the commitments to the personnel employed in the direct Federal operation would be factors to be considered in determining the appropriate time for the return of the facilities.

TITLE VI (SEPARABILITY)

Section 601 merely provides that if any provision of this act is held invalid, the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

Are Steelworkers Wages Too High?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the baseless lies repeated over and over again in steel industry propaganda and by uninformed persons is that steelworkers already get paid too much. Any homemaker in a steelworker's family could tell you how ridiculous this accusation is as she struggles to make ends meet on the meager and very uncertain wage of a steel employee. And anyone familiar with the hard, gruelling conditions under which steelworkers turn out more and more steel per hour would concede that steel wages are hardly adequate.

Much is made of a Bureau of Labor Statistics report that shows average earnings in the steel industry during June 1959, came to approximately $3.10 an hour. The implication is that this is a normal wage rate collected by the steelworker 8 hours a day, 5 days a week, 52 weeks a year, bringing his annual pay to a figure exceeding $6,000. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The $3.10 hourly figure was compiled at a time when the steel industry was feverishly stockpiling its product in anticipation of the mill shutdown it planned to force upon its employees. In estimating average hourly earnings, the BLS lumps together with the base rate of employees all compensation including overtime pay, extra pay for holiday work, incentive earnings paid for extra exertion on the part of employees, shift premiums and all other wage payments which the steelworker deservedly may have coming. There is no assurance he can continue this rate of earnings and there is enough proof to show that he seldom can even approach this earning rate under normal plant operations.

Only once in the last 13 years have steelworkers averaged as much as 40 hours a week. In 1958, for instance, the average steelworker wages for the entire year totaled only $4,700. This is a far cry from the $6,000 a year which industry would like the public to believe that steelworkers earn.

Workers in many other industries earn more hourly and annually than the steelworkers. Seven other industries have base rates which top those in steel.

And while industry profits are customarily quoted after taxes, no industry spokesman ever explains that the steelworkers wage figures used publicly are before taxes and before the many deductions which put quite a hole in the average paycheck. Steelworkers can spend only their take-home pay—not the exaggerated, blown-up and mythical wage earnings which the industry talks about.

It is interesting to note that the city worker's family budget, prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, calls for a minimum income of about $4,700 yearly for a family of four. But in 1958, one-half of all steelworkers did not earn even enough to "afford" the low standards provided by this BLS budget. This budget, mind you, was last calculated by the Government in October 1951, and is based largely on studies of family spending in the 1930's. The standard of living attainable today under this criteria is, of course, hopelessly inadequate. Still, even under these extremely low standards of existence, this budget shows one-half of the union members in steel did not qualify.

The more adequate Heller Wage Earner's Budget in September 1958 required annual earnings of $6,087 for a homerenter and $6,435 for a homeowner. Three-fourths of all steelworkers in 1958 failed to earn $6,000 annually. This factual study by one of our leading universities thus demonstrates how pitifully meager steelworkers wages are in comparison to what they actually need to enjoy a fairly decent standard of living.

Those who have some knowledge of steel mill operations will readily concede that a steelworker earns every penny of his wage. He puts up with intense heat and prolonged periods of concentrated effort calling for the fullest skills and demanding the heaviest type of responsibility. He endures smoke and fumes, dangerous dust and suffocating blasts of gas-laden air billowing and blowing about him. He is exposed to ear-shattering noise and torrid, grimy, and hazardous conditions equaled in few other industries.

In spite of the challenging conditions under which he works and despite the inadequate compensation he gets, the steelworker of today is the most productive and efficient the industry has ever employed.

Year after year, industry records show that less and less man-hours are needed to produce a ton of finished steel. In 1949, it required 16.3 man-hours. By 1954, this figure was reduced to 15 man-hours, and to 13 man-hours by 1956. The latest figures, as of April 1959, show that it takes but 10.7 man-hours to make the same ton of steel.

In the face of these startling employee productivity figures, the American public must be completely baffled by the unfair and purely ridiculous charges of "featherbedding" and "loafing" which the steel companies have injected in current negotiations with the union. This hardly squares with the factual report by Secretary of Labor Mitchell which shows the steel companies are making more and more money with fewer and fewer steelworkers on the job.

Steel profits so far this year are rolling in at the unprecedented and breathtaking rate of $3 billion a year. Yet today there are 44,000 fewer steelworkers on the payrolls than there were in 1953 and this reduced work force has actually turned out 30 percent more steel.

The rich, prosperous steel industry, which accumulated its record profits with the hard work and sweat of its highly productive employees chooses to ignore these plain facts. Instead of helping the union find ways to reward him through wage and contract improvements, the companies are unbelievably trying to punish and set the steelworker backward.

There has never been a more brazen, cruel, and heartless attempt by any industry to not only deprive employees of economic justice but to confiscate what already belongs to them.

Mr. Summerfield Wins a Round Against Peddlers of Smut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose an article by Edward Reardon, Washington representative of the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, concerning an important action recently taken by the House in an

effort to assist Postmaster General Summerfield in his fight to rid the mails of obscene literature. I agree most heartedly with the Postmaster General that the youth of our country must be protected from this smut literature which FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover recently testifying before a congressional committee called one of the chief factors in the problem of juvenile delinquency:

MR. SUMMERFIELD WINS A ROUND AGAINST PEDDLERS OF SMUT

(By Edward J. Reardon)

WASHINGTON.—Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield, an earnest, likable man, this week won the first round of his fight against the half-billion dollar obscene literature industry when the House passed a bill which will supply his Post Office Department with the needed legal tools to start the filth peddlers on the run.

Now he must repeat his victory on the Senate side before the Department can really get down to the business of cleaning up the mails.

In Mr. Summerfield's campaign to protect the youth of America against the unsavory merchants of smut, he had the capable assistance of one of New Jersey's freshmen House Members, Representative GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, 12th District Republican. WALLHAUSER is a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee which hammered out the bill Secretary Summerfield said he needed for his battle against immorality.

Another of the leaders in this crusade for decency was Representative KATHRYN GRANAHAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee which fashioned the bill. Parents of youngsters who will be less exposed to the very great evil of pornography if this bill becomes law, should gratefully remember those two names.

In Passaic, the House action will undoubtedly be noted with satisfaction by members of Perez Council, Knights of Columbus, who for years have waged a crusade against the dissemination of obscene literature.

Those unimpressed with the need for firm action in dealing with the merchants of immorality should be given the opportunity of visiting the Postmaster General's office quarters in the Post Office Department Building here in the Capital.

One room of his office suite has been set aside by Mr. Summerfield for an exhibit of obscene pictures, magazines, and other materials which have been taken from the mails.

It is so disgustingly nauseating, so offensive to decency as to bring a conviction to all right-minded persons that the devil himself must be the operating head of this nefarious business.

"I have no desire to be a censor," said the Postmaster General as he conducted us on a tour of this chamber of horrors, "but I want to enforce the law as passed by Congress and as interpreted by this Department's General Counsel."

Mr. Summerfield estimated that between 700,000 and 1 million youngsters will receive through the mail this year some of the lewd, lascivious, vile material which is on exhibit.

The smut dealers have devised a simple system for gathering youthful victims into their net. A small advertisement inserted in a comic cartoon book or similar publication is the bait which sets the trap. It offers to send a set of interesting pictures or some other article of merchandise upon receipt of some small cash amount up to a quarter. Kids from age 8 into the teens respond. Thus a mailing list is obtained which is the foundation for this infamous multi-million-dollar-a-year business.

The youngster gets by mail the article advertised and contact is established. In due time he gets another solicitation. This one may contain a sample of what he can obtain by sending another quarter or 50 cents.

Generally, the youngster is so shocked by the nature of the material he is fearful of showing it to his parents. So he hides it in a schoolbook perhaps, then passes it around among his classmates.

And the work of undermining the morals of the Nation's children goes on undetected except for an isolated case here and there.

How much does this trafficking in obscenity contribute to the country's teenage crime?

J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, testified before a congressional committee that it is one of the chief factors in the problem of juvenile delinquency. Its members heard a playback of a confession, tape recorded, of a teenager picked up for the revolting murder of a little girl. He admitted his passions had been aroused by lascivious pictures he had received through the mail.

"Remember," the Postmaster General warned us, "the kids who get this kind of filthy stuff could be members of your own family."

He did not attempt to conceal his dislike for some of the Supreme Court decisions which have hobbled his efforts to rid the mails of lewd and indecent literature.

One panel of his office exhibit is made up of magazines which the Court has ruled cannot be prohibited. One group is the so-called art magazines. Another is nudist publications. Despite the opinion of the Court, neither group is of the caliber decent parents would want to fall into the hands of their own youngsters.

Mr. Summerfield stopped before one nudist publication and snorted.

"I have no quarrel with people who want to run around in the nude," he said. "That's their own business. Maybe it is healthful and stimulating as they claim. But I see no reason why they should have their nudity photographed for magazine purposes."

As of today, Secretary Summerfield has one more river to cross in his fight to rid the mails of obscene materials. He must get the Senate to follow the action of the House.

But it is hardly likely this could occur during the present session. Meanwhile the smut merchants—concentrated in Los Angeles, Chicago, and New York—will be fighting tooth and nail to save their lucrative business.

Labor-Management Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, during the closing days of this session of Congress action was taken on a labor-management reform bill. It is my hope that the President will sign this labor reform bill into law at the earliest possible moment.

When the subject of labor-management reform legislation came before the House last month for consideration I supported the bill that was favorably reported out of the House Education and Labor Committee, the so-called Elliott bill. This bill was designed to do away with abuses of union power that were exposed by the McClellan committee. These abuses included unwarranted secondary boycotting, blackmail, extortion, and picketing. It was also designed to protect the union members from being victimized by unscrupulous leaders and the general public from labor racketeers.

During the last few days of this controversy. I was pressured by both extremes to vote against the committee bill. Some pressure came from those antilabor elements who wanted a punitive law against all unions, other pressure came from those who wanted no bill at all. I felt that it was my responsibility as a Representative of all the people in my district, to resist pressure from both extremes and to support an effective and fair bill which would drive the hoodlums out of power without hurting honest, law-abiding unions.

I stated at that time that if the Landrum-Griffin bill were to pass in its entirety, Massachusetts and the whole New England area would suffer economically. It was my judgment that many of the measures included in the Landrum-Griffin bill were designed solely to prevent the unionization of plants in the South. While this bill paid lipservice to driving racketeers out of the labor movement, it seemed to me that their real intent was to prevent any organizational drives by legitimate unions in the presently nonunionized South.

As you probably know, many of the Southern States now run ads in our papers asking industry to come south, where there is cheaper electric power furnished by public utilities, such as TVA, local tax rebates, and subunion pay scales. The committee bill, which I favored, was stringent, and would have driven out the hoodlums and racketeers while still giving opportunity for legitimate unions to operate all over the country as they do in New England.

I could not understand why plant operators in New England should pay high union wages and have to compete with low wage scales in nonunion Southern States.

I, therefore, voted on three separate rollcalls against the Landrum-Griffin bill. However, I also stated at the time that if the House and Senate conferees would agree on a fair and effective labor reform bill, I would be happy to vote for it. It seemed to me that was the only way we could have labor reform legislation that would serve the best interests of our entire country, labor and management alike.

I was, therefore, pleased that the conference report substantially adopted the Kennedy-Elliott bill and supported the position of such a bill against both extremes. In other words, the conference report as passed by the House and Senate was closer to the Kennedy-Elliott bill than any other bill, and, of course, that bill was patterned after the original Kennedy-Ives bill.

Without going into all the major changes made in the Landrum-Griffin bill by the conference committee, I would like to point out that the following

changes safeguarding the rights of the trade union movement and the workingmen which comprise these unions were made upon the insistenee of the Kennedy-led Senate conferees:

First. Subcontracting: The legality of restricting subcontracting in the garment industry in order to keep out sweatshops was established.

Second. Consumer appeals: The right to publicize nonunion goods to consumers, without causing a secondary work stoppage, is recognized in the conference agreement. Employees will also be entitled to publicize, without picketing, the fact that a wholesaler or retailer sells goods of a company involved in a labor dispute. All appeals for a consumer boycott would have been barred by the House bill.

Third. Organizational picketing: The conference report preserves the right to engage in organizational picketing provided that a petition for an election is filed within a reasonable time not to exceed 30 days. Unless the union won the election, the picketing would have to cease. The House bill would have virtually banned organizational picketing.

Fourth. Organizational picketing: The right to engage in purely informational picketing without filing a petition for an election is secured provided that the picketing does not halt the pickup or delivery of goods or the rendition of services by the employees of other employers.

Fifth. Primary strikes: The conference report recognizes the right to engage in primary strikes and primary picketing, thereby eliminating the danger that the House bill would sometimes invalidate such picketing.

Sixth. Defense to picketing: Although the conference agreement contains a prohibition upon picketing an employer who has a contract with another union, language was added to the House bill which wolud make it a defense to show that the General Counsel had issued a complaint charging the employer with unlawfully dominating, maintaining, or assisting the other union.

Seventh. Union liability for damage suits: The section imposing liability on labor unions for damages in the case of unlawful organizational picketing was elimiated.

Eighth. Federal-States jurisdiction—No man's land: The conference report permits the States to take jurisdiction over labor cases over which the Board currently refuses to assume jurisdiction. Under the House bill the NLRB could have refused jurisdiction over additional cases. The Board's present jurisdictional standards are broader than they have ever been, thus insuring more unions and employers protection of the act.

Ninth. Economic strikers: The House bill contained no provision permitting economic strikers to vote in representation elections. The conference provision permits strikers to vote in representation elections within 1 year after the commencement of a strike.

Tenth. Struck work: The conference report preserves existing law on the question of the right of labor to refuse to work on struck goods. The House bill would have limited this right.

Eleventh. Bonding: The conference report places a $500,000 limitation on amount of bond required to be taken by a union officer; the House bill had no such limitation.

Twelfth. Elections: The conference report makes the Secretary of Labor responsible for bringing suits in a Federal court to remedy improper elections. The House bill would have provided that individual members could bring suits in U.S. district courts to overturn improper elections.

Thirteenth. Membership lists: The House bill gave candidates for union office the right to inspect and copy from membership lists in union shops. Conference report restricts this to one inspection 30 days prior to an election without right to copy.

Fourteenth. Employer reporting: Conference strengthened immeasurably employer reporting section 203 which was meaningless in the House bill.

With these 14 measures incorporated in the conference report that were not contained in the original Landrum-Griffin bill, I voted for passage of the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that this conference report on the labor-management reform bill that has passed the Congress will protect union members and legitimate union activity in the overwhelming percentage of cases. At the same time it will eliminate the overpublicized so-called racketeering which has come from a very small percentage of the labor movement which led to a public demand for this action. I am, therefore, pleased that I could support this sound and effective labor reform measure.

Veteran Kicked Out as Temporary Rural Mail Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, a few months ago the people living on Rural Route 2, Brighton, Ill., in my home county of Macoupin, were saddened by the death of Mr. Rolland Ingham, who had served as their rural mail carrier for 32 years.

Before his death Mr. Ingham had appointed Mr. Eugene Arban as substitute carrier. Judging from numerous letters that I have received in the last week, Mr. Arban was a popular choice. For example, Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Krueger wrote, "We feel that Mr. Arban will be just as good in the next 32 years as Mr. Ingham was in the 32 years past."

It appears, however, that Mr. Arban will not get the opportunity to continue his good service to the people of Rural Route 2, not even as temporary carrier. Although Mr. Arban was named temporary carrier after Mr. Ingham's death, he suddenly was shifted back to the substitute position, effective September 5, and a man with no previous postal experience was appointed temporary carrier.

Mr. Speaker, while this procedure may have been legal, I believe most of my colleagues will agree that it is very unusual for political pressure to be brought to bear in the appointment of a temporary carrier. Normally, the substitute carrier continues as temporary carrier until the permanent carrier is appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question the Republican administration's power to direct the appointment of a temporary carrier. I do wonder, however, that political intrigue should penetrate so far down into our postal system as to take away a few months' work from a man who has faithfully performed the task to the satisfaction of everyone on his route. It is especially remarkable when it is considered that the man so unceremoniously deprived of this temporary position is a combat veteran of World War II. Eugene Arban was a member of a bomber crew in the Pacific and suffered during 5 months' imprisonment by the Japanese. He returned to become a useful citizen of the Brighton community. He has served as commander of his American Legion post and as a member of his church's governing board. He also is active in Chamber of Commerce and Masonic activities.

Don't Underestimate the Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my State of Massachusetts is not generally thought of as a farm State. Admittedly, the scale of agriculture in our part of the country cannot compare in scope with that in central and western America.

Nevertheless, we have a thriving agricultural community which plays a vital role in our economy. Recently a close friend of mine and one of Massachusetts' most distinguished citizens, Mr. Carleton I. Pickett, who is executive secretary of the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, issued an important statement on this subject. I commend it to the attention of all my colleagues. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include it in the RECORD at this time:

DON'T UNDERESTIMATE THE FARMERS

(By Carleton I. Pickett, executive secretary, Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, Inc.)

Farming in Massachusetts is still big business. Farmers pay hired laborers $24,454,463 a year and another $1½ million to men and machines where farmers have to hire machine work. It's a sizable payroll.

About 55,000 workers are obtained from employment service agencies and another 11,258 workers are hired direct. The helping hands of the farm family are not counted in this payroll. Neither is lumbering, selling of trees, or hard wood.

The last census shows between 68,000 to 70,000 members of rural families living on Massachusetts farms, some part-time, some full-time, some large indeed.

We have a varied agriculture—cranberries to tobacco. We have big and little dairymen, poultrymen, market gardeners, fruits, berries, swine, etc. The point is that for an urban State, in spite of population moves, new housing, new highways, loss of farm, we still have a thriving agricultural business that is important in our economy.

This industry has more ownership and less debt than most. It has millions of dollars in an expanding nursery stock and flower plant business to beautify the places of business, the industrial plant grounds and the constantly growing number of homes.

The capital investment in our farms is about $50 million.

So what?

So don't ever sell it short—as an economic farce, or as a social factor, or as a political influence.

These farmers are not wards of the Government, they are not subsidized, they are not even properly chargeable with some of the items that are legislated in the name of agriculture.

The Farm Bureau does its best to speak for the organized farmers. This is a voluntary dues paying organization that has no connection with Government except as it tries to make Government understand the viewpoint of the organized farmers.

It is necessary every once in a while to point out these simple truths. It is also necessary to remember as you speed through the new Massachusetts superhighways, almost never seeing a farm, that back from the roads there are enough left to send $150 million this year into the shops and stores along Main Street after paying the towns and the State and Uncle Sam a whacking big hunk of taxes and meeting a payroll of $25 million. * *

Governors express concern over the loss of a factory. Our Senators in Washington move heaven and earth to get military establishments keep going here. Legislatures show grave concern for unemployment. This is proper. This is admirable. But all of them and all of us should take time out to try to protect, promote, and expand our valuable agriculture.

Louis G. Feldmann, Hazleton, Pa., Attorney, New Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of September 5, 1959, which comments upon the election of Attorney Louis G. Feldmann as the new national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

VFW COMMANDER

The name of Louis G. Feldmann has been added to the growing list of Luzerne County residents who have furnished leadership for the country and its organizations in peace and war. The Hazleton attorney, a former local resident, was elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars without opposition at the convention in Los Angeles yesterday.

During national emergencies, including the Second World War, the county furnished generals, admirals and other officers by the score. Time and again, both Pennsylvania and America have turned to this area for leaders, not just in public office, but in professional and fraternal bodies.

A former State, council, and post commander of the VFW, Attorney Feldmann has been active in the national organization for years, serving in many capacities and acquiring the experience necessary for the office to which he now has been advanced.

The signal honor that has come to him is shared by Hazleton, Luzerne County, and Pennsylvania.

Labor Fights for Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on September 1, my colleague [Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina] had inserted in the RECORD a broad attack on James B. Carey, president of the International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, which had been published by the Allendale County Citizen, Allendale, S.C., under dateline of August 28, 1959. There was also included correspondence which indicated a personal attack against Mr. Carey, impugning his Americanism.

On the basis of the statement which Mr. RIVERS inserted in the RECORD, it is apparent that my esteemed colleague is unaware of the great contribution Mr. Carey has made in this country. Through Mr. Carey's efforts, thousands, even millions of Americans, have achieved a better life, better pay, better ability to buy the necessities and other good things produced by our country, better working conditions, and the right to hold their heads high in dealings with their employers.

I am sure that Mr. Carey could have chosen to be on the management side with his extraordinary ability, but he elected rather to fight for the rights of the American man and woman who works for a living. It is this dedication to the cause of the workingmen that obviously motivated Mr. Carey's letters to various Congressmen who supported the Landrum-Griffin bill.

There is no question in the minds of many workingmen that the support for the Landrum-Griffin bill was motivated by economic reasons to maintain the competitive edge which cheap labor obtains for several sections of our country. Of course, many supported this bill to clean up the rottenness in labor unions, but no such support developed to clean up the rottenness in management. The Landrum-Griffin bill went far beyond the requirements of protecting the union member and cleaning out the racketeers. That bill disregards the economic effect of the industrial North, East, and West by destroying labor's traditional practices to organize and to obtain a decent wage for the workingman. Many Southern States have no protection for workers in their desire to obtain a decent wage. They do not provide any minimum-wage protection and labor legislation. The Southern States which have no minimum wages are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. My colleague [Mr. RIVERS] comes from South Carolina, where there is no minimum wage in industries not affected by interstate commerce. Arkansas, whose representative is one of the great fighters for labor reforms, Senator MCCLELLAN, has a minimum wage law, but the minimum is pathetically low and amounts to a minimum of 16 cents per hour; hardly sufficient to keep body and soul together.

Several States have no compulsory compensation laws, and these are Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas.

The existence of cheap wages and its component competitive edge has caused industry to flee from the North to various sections of the country where the climate is right for wages which are cheap and the benefits to management are many.

I have taken the trouble to inquire into a number of industries which have fled from my own city of New York to go to Southern States where management can obtain a competitive advantage over States which have high standards of wages and strong unions. These are as follows:

Company name	From	To
Cohler & Campbell	Bronx, N.Y.	Granite Falls, N.C.
American Safety Razor Corp.	Kings, N.Y.	Staunton, Va.
Arkel Safety Bag Co.	do	Newport News, Va.
Bonner Spring Hinge Co.	do	Londuram, S.C.
Julius Kayser, Inc.	do	Greenville, S.C.
Reynolds Metals Co.	Queens, N.Y.	Alabama.

These firms which employed 100 or more employees left the city of New York thereby creating unemployment in my city and brought material benefits to States which attracted their operation. Is it any wonder that Mr. Carey who has been struggling to obtain decent wages for the working man and who has contributed so much to the labor forces would resent legislators who by their vote tend to destroy the ability of labor to defend itself?

I do not condone threats nor do I appreciate personal attacks upon people for their opposition. America has been great because we can disagree without being disagreeable. We have freedom of

speech and we have the inalienable right to criticize representatives. In fairness to Mr. Carey, who represents a large segment of decent and honest labor forces, I set forth Mr. Carey's record for all to see so that the distorted impression obtained by a reading of Mr. RIVER'S statement would not be accepted by all fair thinking people.

The Wonderful Lady With the Yuletide Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Racine, Wis., is privileged to have among its citizens a most kind, thoughtful and wonderful lady with the Yuletide name of Mary Christmas. Many Members of Congress may have read or heard in years past of the great work which Mary Christmas does throughout the entire country with her Shut-In Club; and answering the thousands of requests each year for Christmas greetings. For the past 5 weeks Mary Christmas has been seriously ill in St. Mary's Hospital, Racine, Wis.; and I would like to pay tribute to her and let her know that we are thinking of her as she has, through the years, unselfishly remembered thousands of other shut-ins.

Mary Christmas was born in humble circumstances and her first husband, William M. Kiley, died leaving her with two small children and another child on the way. Mary worked hard to keep her family together and in 1919 married Samuel Christmas, who was born in England and who had served in the British Army prior to coming to America. Other children were born of this marriage and today Mary Christmas has 5 children, 26 grandchildren, and 1 great-grandson.

Over the years Mary had been sending greetings at Christmas time to children in the Racine area; but in the early 1930's, after a newspaper reporter wrote an account of her activities and after a radio appearance in Chicago and New York, her mail increased tremendously. Mary managed to answer all these letters personally. In 1936, an invalid by the name of Bernice Cameron wrote and asked Mary if she could correspond with her and also with other invalids with whom Miss Cameron was acquainted. Within a short time, Mary had hundreds of regular correspondents and it was decided to organize this activity as the Mary Christmas Shut-In Club. The club's activities shortly became nationwide and volunteers helped Mary handle the mail when its volume became too great for her to take care of personally. Contributions were received from interested Racine citizens to cover the postage expenses, but the club's activities were strictly a voluntary project and Mary gave all of her time freely to it. When World War II broke out, thousands of servicemen were added to the list of Mary's correspondents and each was remembered by her.

Mr. Speaker, this brief account will give the House some idea of what one person has managed to do in her lifetime to bring greetings, kind words of encouragement, cheer, joy, and happiness to invalids and others who are too seldom remembered by this busy, selfish world. Only those folks who have received her greetings or have been invalids can really appreciate the wonderful and unselfish work done over the years by Mary Christmas. Now that Mary herself is bedridden, we certainly should take time to remember her and to wish her a speedy and complete recovery. For folks such as Mary Christmas, having done God's work during her life, will be remembered by Him here on earth and in the life hereafter.

Ninety-six Years of Community Service for Newspaper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including an article that appeared in a country newspaper in my district, the Enterprise-Chronicle of Burlingame, Kans. This paper has been published for 96 years. The article covers a considerable share of our State's history. The Chronicle has been influential in the development of our State.

The Enterprise-Chronicle this week begins its 97th volume—or 96 years of public service for the Osage County Chronicle which was later merged with the Burlingame Enterprise. The original newspaper was founded by Marshall M. Murdock who sold out in Burlingame to move other printing equipment by teams and wagons overland to the budding community of Wichita, not yet served by a railroad.

Marshall Murdock was one of the colorful men of the old West who was destined to shape the future of Kansas by way of the printed word while others brought law and order to the prairies punctuated by gunfire. Burlingame's first publisher had two sons, Marcellus and Victor, who followed in their father's Wichita newspaper, the Wichita Eagle. Marcellus is present publisher; Victor died a few years ago.

Burlingame, too, had a newpaper before it had a railroad. Printing equipment 96 years ago would not suffice in these modern times as the type was set by hand, presses powered with a foot treadle and drinking water was no doubt carried by the bucketful from a community well.

The slavery question put Kansas in line with the North. The Osage County Chronicle, established in 1863, was accomplished during the War Between the States and there were many other blazing issues at that time. Kansas had achieved statehood in 1861 only 3 years after Burlingame was reorganized on the grounds once known as Council City. Settlement was moving westward in Kansas as cattlemen struggled with homesteaders and sheepmen who were fencing off free range for the purpose of cultivation.

Like the newspapers which were springing up in promising communities with a job press and a shirttail full of type, homesteaders cut farms in the sod with walking plows and a team of horses or oxen. Seed and a few provisions were brought in covered wagons from farther east and the wagons usually had a crate or two of chickens plus a few milk cows following.

Settlements were formed in colonies by Mennonites, Bohemians, Russians, Swedes, Germans, and the Negro settlement of Nicodemus in Graham County which later became famous for its Emancipation Day celebrations in a grove of trees. National differences of the old country were left there. They were left behind in the new land plagued by Indian raids, prairie fires, rattlesnakes, and windstorms. There was little communication between colonies but they met man to man in communities and learned to read the same local newspapers wherever they were provided by long-suffering, outspoken editors of that day.

Cyrus became a popular name for babies as the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway began to reach across the Flint Hills into buffalo grass under the able direction of Cyrus Holladay. Perhaps farm folk named a baby Cyrus because of the new reaper invented by Cyrus McCormick because the back-breaking task of cutting wheat was made possible by a new machine which cut and bound the crop in a single operation.

Burlingame's Osage County Chronicle also witnessed the change in transportation as wagons passed through this community toward the silver mines of Colorado when Pikes Peak was a "hole in the ground" or the promise of gold wealth in California. The Old Santa Fe Trail was gouged deep by the wagons of homesteaders, fortune hunters, and buffalo hunters when three forts—Fort Dodge, Fort Hays, and Fort Wallace—were being established to protect settlers from the lawless element as well as Indians who stubbornly refused to give up their hunting grounds.

Time marches on and feeling ran high in selecting communities as official county seats. Osage County was no exception. Open warfare almost broke out when the community possessing the courthouse was approached for removal of records to a preferable location near the center of the county. Another county in Kansas give 36 sections of land to the county north of it to hold to a strategic center. A northwest Kansas county moved the records under cover of darkness to accomplish the task without force of guns. Echoing public sentiment were the newspapers, quite frequently two in a town and both enjoying such freedom in print that rascals were called rascals and thieves were thieves. The editors paid little attention to advertising as a nominal subscription fee—in cash or produce—was sufficient to buy a cow, a few pigs and garden seed to put food on the table and clothes on the family.

The turn of the century found homesteaders well entrenched on the land, black smoke boiling from the "iron horse" on the plains and a few factories in operation. Taxes were hardly felt as rural schoolhouse doors were opened to the overgrown teenage boys who had missed educational advantages in their younger years, and to the little tykes who were able to walk.

Wheat harvest progressed from binding and shocking to header crews and the newspapers carried detailed accounts of big crops which developed a migration of men from across the country to make up crews for any farmer who needed the help on a basis of barter with regard to the crop and the price of grain.

This was perhaps Kansas' early labor troubles as some of the hands were inclined to pad the price of their services when they couldn't tell the difference between the breeching and a bridle. There were those referred to as IWW's—officially, International Workers of the World—but it became evident that these workers were not only lacking in effort, they were trouble makers not too different from the labor hoodlums of modern times. The term IWW was made to mean other things such as "I won't work" and "I want whisky."

Transportation was changing on the Kansas scene as travel on the Old Santa Fe Trail gave way to chugging locomotives. The Santa Fe Railway followed the general direction of the Santa Fe Trail but the only crossing of the two were at historic Switzler Creek in Burlingame. Diagonal roads were abandoned as section lines were marked in criss-cross pattern and the State provided legal procedure to open roads to give access to all farms without trespassing on private property.

The horseless carriage appeared on the prairie perhaps equally as quick as they did on the street of Eastern cities. The industrial age was being felt in the newspapers as the Linotype was proving to be a practical invention for the larger newspapers. These were not the first typesetting machines but they were the most practical approach to relief of hand compositors perched on high stools day in and day out. Linotypes increased the cost of production and newspaper advertising was becoming an important field to retail services which could and did provide income for even the smaller shops to join the march of industry.

Not many could afford the first automobiles—and those who could afford them were prone to lack mechanical skill to keep them operating. Even the short drives were accompanied by such discouraging things as flat tires, running out of gas, sandy roads, and high centers—not to mention all degrees of engine trouble.

Fixing a flat was relatively simple; a tubular box of patching materials would repair the usual puncture and a blowout resulted in pulling of the tire and riding on the rim back to town. Lack of gas at first was quite serious as it was a rare item among farmers. Kerosene was used in lamps of that time but the cheaper fuel would not function in an automobile unless it was first warmed up on gasoline. Sandy spots on country roads were traps comparable to Tanglefoot of that area to catch and hold flies. Once the car bogged down in sand, the high-pressure ties threw sand like a frantic gopher until there was no traction at all. The best way out was to lay brush, weeds (sometimes a fence post) or a blanket under the rear wheels. High centers were not actually high but wagon wheels cut ruts deeper into the ground than the underpart of the car, high as it was in early models. The car would ride the middle ridge until the tires were suspended in the air.

The early makes of cars in Kansas were: Brush, Maxwell, Popehartford, Overland, Buick, and Ford. If there was any copied design, it resembled horse-drawn vehicles rather than that of another automobile. Speed was governed by the condition of the ungraded roads and a smooth stretch might allow 25 miles per hour estimated. It was a timeworn phrase of the times when a team and buggy passed a stalled auto for a person in the buggy to say, "Get a hoss."

Besides creating a great industry for the Nation as a whole, the automobile added new businesses in every community the size of Burlingame and smaller. There were car agencies, repair shops, filling stations, accessory stores and, more recently, motels. Highways were improved as the cars were made faster, providing employment that would not have been possible without the horseless carriage.

The newspapers, like all other industries today are geared to the automobile although, from the reader's standpoint, the printed word remains pretty much the same. It moves the people to focus their attention on the basic welfare of mankind—looking backward momentarily now and then to make comparisons in anticipation of the future. Ninety-six years, the period spanned by the Osage County Chronicle, has witnessed some important changes in the ups and downs of Burlingame.

In some respects our democratic system has failed to make the most of the heritage handed down by the pioneers who first turned the sod. The people, as voters, have allowed Government officials to become soft toward ruthless connivers for power among labor leaders. The IWW's were panty-waist dreamers compared with those who hide behind the fifth amendment but strike fear into the hearts of honest laborers under the cover of darkness.

An overgenerous Government has made weaklings out of laborers by allowing them to feed well at the welfare trough when they might have had the pride of providing for themselves through their own efforts. We have permitted our military services to give recognition to goldbrickers and one branch of the service to resent the efforts of another.

Child labor laws have gone too far when it is next to impossible to teach a teenager good work habits allowing a child to use his mind and hands in coordination to prepare himself for adulthood. The juvenile delinquency problem would quickly disappear if the juveniles had job opportunities in keeping with their physical development. Far more dangerous than a piece of industrial machinery is the high-powered automobile placed in the hands of an inexperienced teenager.

High taxes cannot be blamed entirely on our public officials. Perhaps those public officials have been taught by the voters to seek the popular side of every issue and the middle of the fence on debatable issues. There was a time within the past 96 years when a politician would seek a direct course in government to remain free from campaign, industrial or labor obligations. He was a statesman as stalwart as the pioneer following a walking plow—with a steady eye and a firm grip. All was not success with those statesmen but, failing, they backed away for a better look and returned with a renewed vigor that put wrong things right and the populace got the benefit.

There are times when security is important and it may be needed only as a temporary measure but, for the Government to provide security from the cradle to the grave, robs the individual of rights that should be his—the right to meet his obligations as a man and a member of a free society.

In spite of errors of the past, it is not too late to correct events in the future. Voters need to take a long, awesome look at the present and, understanding what they see, start the wheels of justice and fairplay for all. We, as voters, need to back our politicians against their circular fences and let them know that we will reclaim the right to govern by secret ballot and have our political desires put into practice by representative government on all levels.

Looking at the governments of the globe, none are more practical than ours—none offer as much for the dignity of man. It has stood the tests of time—pressures from within and without; whether it was a Teapot Dome scandal or the greedy fangs of aggressor nations, this Nation has emerged stronger in the concepts of right. The past 96 years should provide strength to overcome individual and collective shortcomings. This can be the heritage of this generation for the next 96 years.

An Oregon Mother Looks at Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, for her many worthy civic activities and for her meritorious performance as a mother and a wife, Mrs. H. P. Bosworth, Jr., of Medford, Oreg., was named Oregon Mother of the Year not long ago.

Under unanimous consent I am including a copy of a letter to the Secretary of State, mailed to him on August 28. This letter is an example of her honest and intelligent concern about peace in the world:

MEDFORD, OREG., *August 28, 1959.*
The Honorable CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
State Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HERTER: I truly believe that the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to our country is a step toward peace. It is hoped that he and President Eisenhower can make great progress for nuclear and general disarmament. But, if these two do arrive at agreements, will the people of the United States stand behind our President? In a democracy, universal support comes through arduous effort and often slowly. Let us not be overconfident as the way to peace is a narrower path than the newspaper headlines would lead us to believe.

It occurs to me Congress could make a great contribution if it were not to adjourn before his visit. A full dress performance of the U.S. Congress at work could show Mr. Khrushchev how elected representatives of a free people can debate and make foreign policy. The demonstration would be complete if the great number of lay organizations interested in politics and peace, particularly, were on hand to testify. The issue for debate would have to be properly chosen and presented to enhance the prestige of Congress and democracy in general. The indirect method could bring about greater change in Mr. Khrushchev's ideas and perception about democracy than all the coercion and threats of our atom bomb rattling and it would be hoped that he, in turn, would not even for propaganda, threaten us. If the climate is peaceful there can be some change of heart and modern psychology theorizes that a sense of threat actually hinders perception and change.

The issues to be presented at such a full dress performance could be a debate on how Congress will set up an adequate study of fall-out from bomb testing and from the "peaceful atom"; or a debate on how to strengthen the United Nations and the United Nations Police Force in order to permit general massive disarmament; or a second performance of the debate on the issues concerning the Mutual Security Authorization of last July. This last issue is of such scope that it could show how interdependence between nations has grown from political and military interdependence to the present acceptance of economic interdependence. In this manner, Mr. Khrushchev would see that U.S. foreign economic aid is the beginning of a progress that could lead to a Summit Conference urging joint international efforts to abolish proverty.

What I really want to say is that the tremendous amount of work for peace by Con-

gress, citizens and organizations like the Council of Churches, American Friends Service Committee, International League for Peace and Freedom, and the League of Women Voters, must be presented to counter-balance the pentagon, munitions, and military budget. This visit is an opportunity to use the United States' position of strength and reputation for morality, to acquire support for peace proposals and strengthening the United Nations as a means of carrying out these proposals. The hour is late for such a suggestion but from this, some development may occur that will bring greater hope for peace.

Very truly yours,

MARIE M. BOSWORTH,
Mrs. H. P. BOSWORTH, Jr.

MEDFORD, OREG.

Twentieth Anniversary of Nazi-Communist Attack Upon Poland and Upcoming Khrushchev Visit to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter addressed to Members of the House of Representatives by Mr. Jozef Mlot-Mroz, president, Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A., dated September 1, 1959, as well as two open letters by Mr. Mlot-Mroz to the President of the United States, one dated August 2, 1959, and the second dated August 13, 1959:

Z.P.W.P., INC.,
ANTI-COMMUNIST CONFEDERATION
OF POLISH FREEDOM FIGHTERS,
Salem, Mass., September 1, 1959.

To the Members of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the name of the Committee to Commemmorate 20th Anniversary of Poland's Invasion and also in the name of the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A., I am forwarding to the members of the Senate committee and members of the House of Representatives a resolution which was passed on occasion of the 20th anniversary of the treacherous Nazi-Communist attack upon Poland.

I take the liberty of enclosing two copies of open letters, which I am sending to President Eisenhower in connection with the unfortunate invitation to the United States of Khrushchev, executioner and tyrant of captive subjugated nations. As I affirmed in them, for 7 days before the coming arrival of Khrushchev to the United States of America—I am starting a hunger strike of dry starvation and I will continue it if need be to total sacrifice of my life.

This hunger strike of dry starvation I intend to carry out in Washington in front of the White House.

I firmly believe, sir, that after becoming acquainted with the content of the resolution, as well as that of the open letters, you will take a proper stand and you will do everything in your power to bring about the desired effect.

With deepest respect,

JOZEF MLOT-MROZ,
President, Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A.

RESOLUTION OF COMMITTEE TO COMMEMORATE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLAND'S INVASION, SEPTEMBER 1, 1959

September 1 will mark the 20th anniversary of Hitler's most hideous and tragic attack on Poland. That day was the beginning of the worst war in the history of all mankind. At dawn on September 1, 1939, Nazi planes and the falling bombs awakened Poland and enveloped her in an artillery fire. Civilized world was aghast.

Yet, at dawn for the beginning of this tragedy one must look back a few days prior to this day, viz, August 27, 1939, when Hitler extended his blood-drenched hand to Russia and signed a ignominious Ribbentrop-Molotov pact.

However, much greater crime was committed on September 17, 1939, when the Soviet Army crossed the Polish border and dealt a treacherous blow by stabbing Poland in her back.

The bloody echo of that September 1939, lives on in the world with its fruit: Yalta, and final enslavement of Poland and the other subjugated nations, which are still held in captivity.

Step by step communism is conquering nations. It is horrible to realize that on this 20th anniversary of September 1939 when the fettered Polish nation looks up with hope to America—at this very moment—Khrushchev, the international murderer, the blood-thirsty executioner of Poland and other conquered nations is invited to the United States by President Eisenhower.

Filled with indignation the Poles of America demonstrate their opposition to diabolical communism and we condemn this new perfidious Khrushchev-Eisenhower pact.

Therefore, in the name of the Americans of Polish heritage the committee commemorating the 20th anniversary of invasion of Poland appeal to the U.S. Government to repair the wrongs inflicted upon the Polish nation and the other captive nations who look toward America, champion of liberty, as their only hope.

We commend and congratulate the Honorable U.S. Congress for adjourning at this time. We appeal to you, statesmen of the United States of America to ignore completely the visit of the Murderer Khrushchev.

We Americans should remember Khrushchev's threat to us when he said: "We will bury you." And we should remember that as long as the spirit of opposition lives in the captive nations, so long can America count on a final victory and triumph of justice.

May this 20th anniversary of that tragic September awaken the conscience and heart of the Americans. Americans, your actions ought to be directed toward the liberation of these captive nations.

War with communism is a must of the present moment. Hand clasping with the tyrant and executioner Khrushchev is nothing but a nail for the cross of the subjugated nations, Poland among them, and grave for the powerful American Nation.

Wake up America, today. For tomorrow may be too late.

For the committee:

Rt. Rev. L. A. SIKORA, P.A.
JOZEF MLOT-MROZ,
JOHN J. TWAROG.

OPEN LETTER

Z.P.W.P., INC.,
ANTI-COMMUNIST CONFEDERATION
OF POLISH FREEDOM
FIGHTERS IN U.S.A.,
Salem, Mass., August 2, 1959.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The bondage of the enslaved nations of central Europe is one of the reasons causing the international conflict and the real reason for failure of bringing about world peace. As long as the enslaved people will be forbidden to decide about their own fate, so long will last the great war tension in the world. Such was the opinion of the world and that of you, Mr. President, just a few months ago.

Your statements on behalf of the enslaved nations at different times, especially your proclamation of the Week of the Captive Nations was an assurance that the miracle of obtaining freedom for these nations, among which is found Poland, must and should come from the West.

Unfortunately, the news, radio, and television announcers for the past few days remark about the cordial invitation extended to Khrushchev to visit the United States. This invitation breaks up the hope of the Polish as well as other nations enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

Just at the moment when the Polish people are preparing to celebrate the 20th anniversary of losing their freedom, when Khrushchev wishes to succeed in breaking up this feeling of hope, the eyes of Poland are turned to the United States of America with the hope that it will become their defender. To confirm this we see no better picture than the hearty welcome of Vice President NIXON in Poland.

That is why the visit of Mr. Khrushchev in the United States of America will be a vivid expression of breaking up the hopes of the people as well as the nail added to the coffin of Poland. The hearty handshake with the murderer Khrushchev, the smiles of both leaders will naturally break up the spirit and morale of the people of central Europe and certainly will rule out any American doing in obtaining their peace and freedom.

Therefore, as the president of the Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A., I permit myself, on behalf of the organization, to ask you, Mr. President, not to invite Mr. Khrushchev to the United States of America.

We, the people of Poland, found in all parts of the world, betrayed at Yalta, begrudged a native land—loyal to God and country, beg of you:

It is not proper and permissible to invite Mr. Khrushchev to the United States of America to break up the spirit and hope of the enslaved nations, to go into partnership with communism, the menace of the 20th century, it is not permissible to join in any work for the coexistence of communism:

It is therefore our duty to safeguard the enslaved nations and bring forth their day of freedom, we must bar the way of communism in their plans of possessing the entire world, embedding within them the communistic ideas, ideas which crippled and destroy the health of the nations.

Only on sound principles will grow up an idea of freedom among the enslaved nations and upon such principles will there evolve a stable world peace and once again will return the peace and happiness for which American people yearn.

These are our pleas which we send to the leaders of the American people.

We, the Polish people of America do not wish that Mr. Khrushchev be invited to the United States of America. If necessary I will give my life on the altar for the love and freedom of Poland.

Seven days before the arrival of Khrushchev to the United States of America and in defense of freedom I will go on strike of dry starvation and continue it until I offer my life for my country and freedom.

With respect,

JOZEF MLOT-MROZ,
Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A.

SECOND OPEN LETTER

Z. P. W. P., INC.,
ANTI-COMMUNIST CONFEDERATION
OF POLISH FREEDOM FIGHTERS,
Salem, Mass., August 13, 1959.

To PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The sun of freedom shines the same to all countries, and we must understand the meaning of this motto. Their will be no peace at home where harm and misfortune is brought about to our neighbor and friend. Therefore your friendly clasp with Khrushchev, the Poles may well compare to the Ribbentrop-Molotow pact of 1939, when symbols of communism, nazism, and fascism embedded itself in the hearts of Poland.

The President of the United States of America should consider that those who now are the enemies of God are also our enemies and therefore there should be no talk or even thought of cooperation and unity.

The invitation of Khrushchev to the United States of America brought about an unfavorable reaction in Congress. The bill of Congressman LANE, who demands public opinion on inviting Khrushchev here, is the voice of a wise and intelligent politic as well as a defender of enslaved peoples.

President Eisenhower should be convinced and aware that communistic Khrushchev through his visit is trying to ease the tension and probably the carefulness of the American people and in this way built up a cradle of peace and bring about an initiative of communistic politics.

Through his visit Khrushchev is trying to lower the morale of the people as well as their desire of courage and firmness in opposition to communistic designs.

The psychological approach for many years taken step by step was a success for Khrushchev, and the last resort an invitation to the communistic leader to visit the United States of America is the most unfortunate step in the career of the great fighter, leader, and politic, our President—Mr. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

President Eisenhower must remember that Khrushchev is a murderer who with cold blood sacrificed the lives of millions of innocent people just to build up communism. To Khrushchev a human being is nothing more than an animal, a machine, less valuable than modern invented apparatus. Therefore this human being, machine, must be sacrificed for the victory of communistic ideas.

Khrushchev admits that there is no God, he laughs at our feelings and beliefs, he laughs at the American slogan "We trust in God." Just as Governor Harriman admitted, Khrushchev is more dangerous than Stalin.

Khrushchev attempts to possess the world by epitaphs. The first being to force the West to admit the up-to-date communistic ideas of capture, thus to liquidate cold war. Second to bring about communistic revolts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Third the gradual overcome of Western Europe and complete preparation to rule the whole world. The fourth to break down the carefulness and the morale of the American politics during his penetrations into the various countries, that is why Khrushchev so willingly accepts the American invitation.

The invitation is also a sign of our agreement to the continuation of the sufferings of the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain.

It is wrong to believe that Kremlin has changed its tactics in reference to politics and that in the future it promises to live in accordance with the different pacts made. The Soviets only wish to have peace as mentioned by His Eminence Cardinal Cushing, a peace that will give them entire possession of the entire world, and each word of Khrushchev is only an empty phrase. Therefore there can be no talk of real peace without freedom granted to the enslaved nations.

O, misery, to this fire of enslavement behind the Iron Curtain President Eisenhower inviting Khrushchev added fuel, therefore further comments are fruitless.

Therefore I call to the conscience of all Americans: America awake, the Red curtain enfolds you, and the fire of enslavement awaits thee, and you with your Ike dream only of your happiness and success and peace, dream only of clear skies and eternal fairness. Awake America, before it is too late. Khrushchev told you: "We will bury you." This threat can hold only one moral for us: Wake up America—facing Communist danger.

That is why President Eisenhower has no authority to invite and entertain Khrushchev and he cannot confer with him for as history teaches us every such conference is a victory for communism and defeat for freedom. This was affirmed by no one else but Khrushchev who stated that he places the victory of communism above freedom and peace. Khrushchev has the ability and slyness of a fox.

That is why in the name of the Polish people in this country and in all other countries I am not begging for grace or alms but for that what is just and ours. Poland is an Alpha and Omega of happenings in the world. Help Poland America, it was betrayed by you, it is your duty. Helping the suffering nations you defend the future and success of your own country.

The kingdom of this world suffers now, and you wish entertain the greatest enemy of peace. Be ashamed, America.

As protest I feel that I must use the only alternative left. As I have stated in my first letter to the President, 7 days before the arrival of Khrushchev I will go on a hungry strike and I will not break it even if I have to give my life on the altar as a sacrifice for the love of my country.

Even though some will consider this a foolish idea, that will not hinder any of my intentions. Only this way and in the face of opposition and foolishness my demonstration is a protest of the feelings of the enslaved nations and the sacrifice of my life is nothing compared to the sufferings of the millions of murdered and being murdered in the communistic regime.

I place forth the call of all those who are still suffering in defense of their own country, for they cannot do so themselves. I speak on behalf of those murdered by the Communists, the Americans who gave their lives in Korea, and those still alive in communistic prisons. I believe in the justice of truth for which I will sacrifice everything, even that what is the dearest worldly happiness, health, and life.

My protest in the form of a hunger strike, let it be a verdict for Khrushchev and warning to America. My death on the altar of sacrifice for the love of country may it be an awakening of the Americans who in luxury and success forget the suffering of others especially the enslaved nations among which is Poland.

With respect,

JOZEF MLOT-MROZ,
President, Anti-Communist Confederation of Polish Freedom Fighters in U.S.A.

Is Lao Attack a Magnificent Deception by Moscow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I believe the following analysis by Miss Marguerite Higgins, one of America's most distinguished journalists, is self-explanatory, and I am delighted to call it to the attention of my colleagues.

The article follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Sept. 7, 1959]

IS LAO ATTACK A MAGNIFICENT DECEPTION BY MOSCOW?

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—It is not just India that is running out of other cheeks to turn to the Communist bloc.

The United States is having troubles, too, along this line. In its anxiety not to "mar the atmosphere" of the September visit to the United States of Soviet Prime Minister Nikita S. Khrushchev, many U.S. officials have been busily looking the other way and generally minimizing the Kremlin's possible connection with the current unpleasantness created by Communist aggressions in Laos and elsewhere in the Far East.

Right after the Khrushchev visit was announced, for instance, a remarkable new theory grew up to account for the Communist activities in the Far East. The attacks in Laos, it was rationalized, were Peiping's way of showing its displeasure over Khrushchev's forthcoming meeting with President Eisenhower and its impatience over any efforts of this kind to really reduce international tension.

In other words the Peiping-Hanoi axis was, in this case, openly acting against the policies being followed by Moscow.

There are a number of very large holes in that theory.

First of all, although the world little noticed, at the time the Peiping-directed attacks against Laos were clearly showing the marks of a planned military campaign considerably before the date when the exchange of visits between Mr. Eisenhower and Khrushchev were finally announced.

Even for the Communists, who keep their expeditionary forces in excellent trim, the primitive mountainous terrain of Laos presents great problems. You do not decide 1 day to send in troops backed by artillery and dispatch them the next. It is more in the nature of a month or 2, or even 3.

Also, because of the Communist tactics of camouflaging all aggression as so-called civil war, the planning has to be particularly careful so that the pretense can be believed.

TRAINING PROCEDURE

To illustrate: The Pathet Lao forces allegedly "rebelling" against the Royal Lao Government have almost totally received their training in Red China or Communist Vietnam. That is standard Communist op-

erational procedure. In Korea the army that led the first attacks in 1950 was largely trained in the Soviet Union.

Thus the first Communist tank drivers we captured at the front could speak only Russian although they were oriental in appearance and could claim remote Korean ancestry. Indeed the first such prisoner interviewed by this correspondent during the war in Korea said he had received combat experience in Stalingrad.

But in a small war, as in Laos, much finer attention to detail is required. Thus to maintain the pretense it is necessary to make sure that some of the "rebel" troops attacking the Lao border provinces of Sam Neua and Phong Saly possess some notion of the local dialect. And that takes careful planning in the disposition of forces.

So it is vital to note that the first phase of the present crisis was underway in Sam Neua and Phong Saly by July 15, long before Peiping could have become piqued about Khrushchev's visit to Washington because at the time Khrushchev could not be sure of the matter himself.

HO CHI MINH'S VISIT TO MOSCOW

Another crucial and little noted fact was the visit to Moscow in July and August of Communist Vietnam's leader Ho Chi Minh.

Isn't it a bit hard to believe that Communist leader Ho, whose victory at Dienbienphu would have been utterly impossible without Molotov trucks, Soviet artillery and automatic weapons, failed to explain and clear the Communist military excursions into Laos being wafted at that precise time from his own military sanctuary?

Moscow may not have instigated the aggressions. But is it logical to suppose that Khrushchev is so devoid of influence over Peiping and Hanoi that Moscow could not bring the crisis to an end if it really wanted to?

Or is the real truth that Moscow is prepetrating a most magnificent deception?

It isn't an old Russian proverb, but it's a frequent human tactic to engage the homeowner in pleasant conversation in the parlor while an accomplice enters through the back door to steal the silver.

A BACK-DOOR STEAL?

Is it possible that Moscow and Peiping hoped that the United States would be so intent on making a "success" of the Khrushchev visit as to let the Communists steal the Lao silver while the Soviet leader was being entertained in the Washington parlor?

The Lao appeal to the United Nations made it impossible of course for the United States either to stand silently by or hope that the crisis would go away of itself.

But Khrushchev's forthcoming trip does offer the chance to make it plain that the United States cannot long be fooled by protestations of peaceful coexistence in the West so long as they are accompanied by war drums in the East.

It may be true that Khrushchev is toying with the theory that after the death of John Foster Dulles the United States began turning into a soft touch. All the more reason to disabuse him quickly for this could be the most dangerous "misconception" of all.

Instead of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therein an address by Willis E. Stone, entitled "Instead of Taxes." This is in support of my House Joint Resolution 23:

INSTEAD OF TAXES

(Speech by Willis E. Stone, chairman, National Committee for Economic Freedom, delivered in the Scottish Rite Temple, Sept. 8, 1959, in Portland, Oreg., before members of Scottish Rite and their friends)

Friends, your illustrious order has given America some of its greatest leaders who faced in their time much the same problem which confronts us today. George Washington, Paul Revere, Benjamin Franklin, and many other Masons of colonial times achieved everlasting fame by solving the tax problem which confronted them. They were required to use more drastic means than is necessary naw.

Basically, the same tax problem to confront the colonists is now tearing our constitutional forms apart. The details are different, but the fundamentals remain the same. If we have the wit and the wisdom to apply the same principles the Founding Fathers applied we will find that we can solve the present day problem with equal effectiveness.

First, let us appraise the dimensions of our problem. In the foreign field it appears that the American taxpayers, who have never known military defeat, have been compelled to pay more treasure into the coffers of foreign powers than all the vanquished people in history have paid to their conquerors.

On the domestic scene the bureaucratic conquest of the American taxpayer is fantastic. More than 700 Federal corporate activities, existing without the slightest pretense of constitutional authority, ride the backs of the American people as interest free, dividend free, rent free, cost free, tax free competitors of taxpaying producers and consumers.

Most people recall that our Constitution was designed to prevent this conquest, but the tax collectors keep us much too busy earning enough to satisfy their demands to know much about the details of what has happened, how or why. Assuming that the function of government is the protection of life and property, we have paid little heed to the enormous conquest of our land by Federal agencies.

To get a comprehensive view of this phase of the problem, let us turn to the U.S. Government Organizational Manual and see what some of the Federal agencies have to say about themselves.

On page 221 of the 1958–59 issue of this manual the Interior Department describes its vast empire by asserting that it has custody of 750 million acres of land. Thus this single agency claims to have jurisdiction over 32.3 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all of its territories and possessions.

On page 254 of the same manual the Forest Service claims that it administers about 188 million acres. This acreage equals 8.1 percent of the total land and water area of the United States and all its territories and possessions.

This cities the landholdings of but 2 of the more than 700 Federal agencies which have in some way invaded private enterprise. This by no means is all the landholdings in the hands of such agencies, as most of those listed have undertaken to build landed estates for themselves. However, these two are the largest landholders. They have jointly taken over an area greater in extent than the combined land area of 25 European countries. These are:

England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, Portugal, Spain, France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, Switzerland, Germany, Iceland, Denmark, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Hungary, Italy, Monaco, Albania, Greece, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

This constitutes quite a conquest in itself. Added to the other areas taken over by other Federal agencies, the non-tax-paying but tax-supported political empires come close to representing the majority interest in the United States. Practically all of this land should properly be privately owned and under State jurisdiction. The problem is further complicated when we realize that fully 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the Nation is located on this land, under the control of and operated by the Federal agencies on an interest free, dividend free, rent free, cost free, and tax free basis. This makes one wonder what happened to the American institution of "equal justice for all" to which we pledge our allegiance during each flag ceremony.

This summary of problems has no value unless we are willing to utilize the information as the basis for the development of a solution. It should be readily apparent to everyone that the fabulous costs of these political empires is the primary reason for our high taxes. It is simple logic, then, to presume that by eliminating the problem of Federal invasion of private enterprise we would at the same time eliminate much of our tax problem.

While the problems appear to be massive, and any solution necessarily complex, the facts indicate that all the elements which constitute the problems are soluble by giving new force and effect to the original purposes of the Constitution. The answer to a few basic questions might help to clarify the problem, its solution, and the manner of its application.

Question No. 1. What is it the Federal corporate activities do?

Answer. These Federal agencies have invaded as active competitors almost every field of human vocation.

Question No. 2. Where did these Federal agencies get the capital to go into business as competitors to private citizens?

Answer. The American people were required to provide the capital—an estimated $250 billion gathered through taxes or included in the national debt, for the acquisition of the land, plants, and facilities involved.

Question No. 3. Do these Federal corporate activities operate with constitutional authority?

Answer. No. Actually the intent and purpose of the Constitution was to guard against such activities being undertaken by government. The Federal corporate activities exercise powers without constitutional authority, and have survived through a process of selective law enforcement with fosters political violation of the spirit, intent, and purpose of the Constitution.

Question No. 4. Do the Federal corporate acivities pay their own way?

Answer. No. They have made claims of paying their own way on occasion, but such claims are based upon extraordinary and unrealistic accounting practices which would not be permitted to private enterprise, and do not include such normal items as cost of space consumed, many operational costs, interest, dividends, and taxes. Each year these agencies seek additional tax dollars to pay their losses, underwrite their payroll, and administration or to finance hidden costs.

Question No. 5. Do the Federal corporate activities assume the responsibilities undertaken by private enterprise?

Answer. No. Instead of assuming normal operating responsibilities and supporting the civic interest, they demand services of all kinds from every level of government. Despite this political preference and privilege, which is contrary to our American concept of equality and justice, the Federal corporate activities have consistently lost more than $10 billion per year since 1948,

and in 1959 the losses are estimated to exceed $19 billion.

Question. No. 6. Isn't it true that these Federal corporate activities have only been developed to provide us with the goods and services which private enterprise has failed or refused to provide?

Answer. No. The contention that private enterprise either failed or refused to perform in any economic area has no basis in fact. Political force has frequently prevented private enterprise from functioning, but I find no instance in which private enterprise has failed to meet the challenge when it has been free to do so. In every case, without exception, private enterprise has demonstrated the capacity to produce more and better goods and services at an infinitely lower actual cost than any governmental agency has recorded.

Unfortunately, the political empire builders are not deterred by such facts. They rely on political privilege rather than productive excellence, and seek to use the force of government to subdue competition that they may dominate their fields.

From their vantage point of political preference and prestige, with easy access to fabulous quantities of our tax dollars, and with immunity from the laws which govern the rest of us, the Federal corporate activities devote themselves to expansion. They fight to maintain and expand their lush positions of power, using the wealth and means of the people they attack to sustain their conquest.

Question No. 7. What can we do to control such practices and reestablish constitutional protection for our individual properties and enterprise?

Answer. We can follow the pattern established by the Founding Fathers. They fashioned our Constitution, in which they delegated to Government a few, limited, and carefully designated powers. Not satisfied with particularizing the powers delegated, the first 10 amendments to the Constitution were added to prohibit governmental exercise of any other powers.

The ninth amendment reads: "The enumeration of the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people."

The 10th amendment reads: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

These stipulations are clear and concise, but they are not self-enforcing. They require continuous support of informed public opinion to be kept in full force and effect. They have not had this support. Little by little, through a long series of legislative acts, powers which the Government does not possess have been delegated to governmental agencies, authorizing various enterprises. These statutes are invariably accompanied by declarations of high purpose, and thus public resistance is lulled and public apathy is nourished.

Now we become aware of the enormous political power which has been syphoned from us through this process. We are confronted with the accumulative host of political empires which hold 40 percent of the land area and 20 percent of the industrial capacity of the Nation, and absorb more than half the total revenue of the Federal Government, directly and indirectly, to pay their losses and hidden costs.

With this realization we should also understand that we have the power to correct the problem. We can do this by going back to first principles and again spelling out the terms of our economic freedom in the Constitution. Only in this way can we abolish those practices which we know to be antagonistic to our history, tradition, and well-being. By regaining our economic liberty in this manner, we can eliminate the taxes which sustain this bureaucratic competition against us.

Question No. 8. What device can be used to obtain these objectives?

Answer. A proposed 23d amendment to the Constitution has been prepared. Fifteen years of research and documentation has gone into the task of making certain that it is just and equitable in every detail. These studies have brought to light more than 700 Federal corporate activities, which have been listed in the first issue of Fact Sheet, which is a series of documents analyzing the activities of various Federal agencies. In the first 30 of the agencies studied, direct losses of more than 31 billion tax dollars have been identified. This research has indicated the enormous savings in governmental costs which can result from selling the Federal corporate activities back to the American people from whom they were taken. The savings indicated are greater than the total volume of individual income taxes paid by all the American people combined. Thus it follows that, by getting government out of competition with its own citizens, the individual income tax collections would no longer be necessary and can be repealed.

The proposed 23d amendment designed to solve both the taxing and the spending problems, has been introduced into the 86th Congress by Representative JAMES B. UTT of California, as House Joint Resolution 23. It has been formally approved by the States of Wyoming and Texas. It provides that:

"SECTION 1. The Government of the United States shall not engage in any business, professional, commercial, financial, or industrial enterprise except as specified in the Constitution.

"SEC. 2. The Constitution or laws of any State, or the laws of the United States, shall not be subject to the terms of any foreign or domestic agreement which would abrogate this amendment.

"SEC. 3. The activities of the U.S. Government which violate the intent and purposes of this amendment shall, within a period of three years from the date of the ratification of this amendment, be liquidated and the properties and facilities affected shall be sold.

"SEC. 4. Three years after the ratification of this amendment the sixteenth article of amendments to the Constitution of the United States shall stand repealed and thereafter Congress shall not levy taxes on personal incomes, estates, and/or gifts."

Question No. 9. What is the process for adding this amendment to the Constitution?

Answer. According to the fifth article of the Constitution, two-thirds of both Houses of Congress concurring can initiate the amendment, or, when the legislatures of two-thirds of the States adopt a resolution identical to that adopted by Wyoming and Texas, Congress will be required to call a Constitutional Convention to submit the amendment to the States for ratification. Initiated by either method, the amendment must be ratified by three-quarters of the States to become a part of the Constitution.

Question No. 10. How would the properties and facilities of the Federal corporations be sold back to the American people, and how would this alter the costs of Government?

Answer. Congress would make the rules governing the sale of the properties to the people, and would supervise the process. It is estimated that the land, buildings and facilities, even under the worst conditions, would bring better than $65 billion, all of which would be applied to the national debt. The House Government Operations Committee estimates the Government's investment in these properties to be $262 billion. We estimate a minimum return of 25 percent of this figure although recent sales of Government property, such as the synthetic rubber plants and property at Oak Ridge, Tenn., returned about three times the book value. However, by retiring only $65 billion of the national debt the interest charges on this would save the taxpayers about $1,950 million in such a year as 1959.

This would also save the amortization cost of paying off this portion of the national debt which, on a 40-year amortization basis, would mean the saving of another $1,625 million per year.

The average annual losses of the Federal corporate activities has been more than $10 billion per year and reached a gigantic $19 billion in 1959. This would not have to be provided by the taxpayers after the properties are sold.

It has been estimated that more than 1 million Federal employees are required to provide service to the Federal corporate activities, and at no cost to them, putting this burden on the taxpayers. With the corporate activities sold back to the American people, these employees will be more gainfully employed by private enterprise, and thus 1 million pay envelopes, each now containing an average $4,300 per year, would not have to be filled with our tax dollars, saving the taxpayers about $4,300 million per year.

One more item. It is estimated that at least $3 worth of goods, services, and facilities are required to maintain every dollar of payroll. On this basis, the saving of $4,300 million in payrolls would mean a related saving of $12,900 million in goods, services, and facilities.

Now let us add up the savings possible by enacting the proposed 23d amendment.

	In millions of dollars
The interest which can be saved	1,950
Amortization cost saved ($65 billion paid in 40 years) average annual cost	1,625
Losses saved by removing the source (1959 level)	19,000
Payroll saved (by removing free services now provided the agencies)	4,300
Costs of goods, services, and facilities saved (estimated at 3 times payroll)	12,900
Total domestic savings from H.J. Res. 23 (1959 estimate)	39,775

As the proposed 23d amendment would also prevent the taxing of the American people to pay tribute for foregin powers, this would terminate the so-called foreign aid programs which have produced such hatred of Americans around the world. The foreign grants and credits which would no longer be financed by our tax dollars amounts to about $5 billion per year, bringing the total potential savings under the proposed 23d amendment to $44,775 million.

We can repeal individual income taxes. They produced, in 1959, $36,900 million leaving a surplus of $7,875 million, permitting repeal of estate and gift taxes which, in 1959, yielded $1,393 million leaving an estimated surplus of $6,482 million.

Question No. 11. These billions of dollars are difficult to understand. Just how does all this affect my tax bill and my take-home pay, and how will it affect the Nation as a whole?

Answer. The proposed 23d amendment would cut the cost of Government more than half—more than enough to offset the revenue lost through repeal of individual income taxes. This means we would not be required to fill out tax form No. 1040 ever again. None of your earnings would be withheld from you. Our take-home pay would be increased an amount equal to the amount we now report on tax form No. 1040. This enormous increase in spendable income would not involve a change in the rate of pay. It would simply restore to us that which we have already earned.

This increase in our take-home pay would permit us to buy the things we have been

wanting. Whether we spend it or save it, it still goes into trade, and would automatically increase the volume of business being done by the present business community by more than 15 percent. The corporation, excise and other taxes on this increased volume of business would amount to an estimated $5,100 million of new revenue for the Federal Government.

Twenty percent of the Nation's industrial capacity now pays no taxes. This would be sold back to the American people and start paying taxes just like other similar business establishments, and it is estimated these new sources would provide the Federal Government with $3,825 million per year in taxes.

Thus, the surplus identified before of $6,482 million added to the increased revenue anticipated from the present business community of $5,100 million plus the revenue anticipated from the enterprises sold back to the people of $3,825 million would produce a total surplus (1959 estimate) of $15,407 million which would absorb the 1959 deficit of $12,900 million leaving a net surplus of (1959 estimate) of $2,507 million.

There are other items of potential savings which do not appear in this tabulation, such as the $200 million spent by the Treasury Department each year to collect the individual income tax, the $40 million in postage costs to handle the flood of mail relating to these taxes, and the $100 million in printing costs to print forms, booklets, and other items regarding income taxes. These three items alone total $340 million which might better be spent to pay off the national debt.

All this and more can be achieved by the enactment of the proposed 23d amendment introduced into Congress by Representative JAMES B. UTT as House Joint Resolution 23, and already approved by both Wyoming and Texas.

Then, instead of the agony of paying individual income taxes we will enjoy the benefactions and incentives of economic freedom.

Instead of the Federal Government operating at an average annual deficit of $12 billion per year, as it has these past 20 years, it will operate with a balanced budget and be able to pay off the national debt in an estimated 50 years.

Instead of our Government being the greatest pauper in history it will be returned to a solvent position and regain the affection of its citizens, and the affection of the citizen is the greatest asset any government can possibly enjoy.

Solution of these problems at the national level will contribute enormously to the solution of many related problems closer to us. Think of the advantage to every businessman when the threat of Federal cost-free, rent-free, tax-free, cutthroat competition is removed. Consider the endless benefits to come from a people whose genius is no longer restrained by political straitjackets or the blight of impossible taxation.

Local tax problems will be enormously simplified as the Federal corporate enterprises go back on local and State tax rolls to share the burden with the rest of us. In some areas this item can be enormous. For example, the Federal Government agencies now own 48 percent of the State of California and 87 percent of the State of Nevada.

In each State, in each city, and to each person, the situation differs, but in every instance, without exception, the economic freedom restored to us through the terms of the proposed 23d amendment means an infinite variety of benefactions beyond our capacity to imagine, just as the Constitution itself held advantages for us far beyond the dreams of those who gave it life.

Even the conflict between labor and management will be largely resolved by the amendment because it will restore to labor the reward for its toil which is now being taken away through the withholding tax. This will put a greater net increase into the pay envelope of every American than any politician or any labor leader ever dared to promise.

With such tremendous rewards available as a result of this single amendment to restore economic freedom, it would seem that we would all support this fight for the right without hesitation or limit. And I would urge that we get at it immediately. Winston Churchill once put it this way:

"If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed; if you will not fight when your victory will be sure and not too costly; you may come to the moment when you will have to fight with all the odds against you and only a precarious chance of survival."

Lawrence Wizard Invents Graph To Aid Investors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article from the Boston Daily Globe for September 7, 1959, which tells about a constituent from my home city of Lawrence, Mass., Mr. Sumner Gill, who invented the graph for stock market investors.

[From the Boston Daily Globe, Sept. 7, 1959]

LAWRENCE WIZARD INVENTS GRAPH TO AID INVESTORS

(By John J. McKone)

LAWRENCE.—As to the stock market, Sumner Gill's friends think he really has it made.

He works with a mass of financial facts and seasons it with a mathematical process he calls the "positive-negative" theory.

People seek his advice. They stop his dad on the street. They come to Sumner with bundles of cash for investment.

But he turns them down.

"I'm not in the brokerage business for one thing," he tells them, "and further, I don't want the responsibility of anyone's money."

Politely, he pushed away about $150,000 for investment purposes within a few days. Frankly, he has nothing to offer except a graph he has just perfected to aid everyday investors.

It all started when word got around that he was a whiz at stocks because of a formula all his own. He is a gifted mathematician. His hobby is a continuing study of the relationship of numbers. His formula is a profound secret. No crystal ball, no mumbo-jumbo; plain figures, that's all.

Sumner is 34, single, and a maker of maps for a large Boston engineering firm. He says he is "most happy" and you may infer it is from his discovery.

He is a friendly man, but cagey. No close-ups with the camera when he displays his graph. He follows the advice of his counsel attorney Harold Meizler of Boston, who works with him on the possible marketing of his creation.

The Lawrence man remembers two occasions when the product of his labors went to the profit of others because of the human tendency to imitate and appropriate.

He drew on his mathematical genius to create a computation chart for the taxi business. It was copied and is now widely used.

Not a penny came his way

Stock-market graphs, of course, are not new. But they can be vastly different. Sumner's conception embraces more factual points of interest, yet is less complicated, he believes; more for use by the nonprofessional investor.

This positive-negative theory involves comparative quarterly dividends and the relationship of figures. That's about as far as the math man cares to go in discussing it. It has to be admitted that stocks do behave shamefully out of line with facts and figures sometimes, in transitory swings, tempered by news of the day.

"My graph will be a help to the average investor," Sumner said. "It was designed for him. There are some 13 million people who own stocks. Many of them use hit-or-miss methods and they depend more upon what they hear. I find that being my own adviser works out better."

Math factoring tells him far better than a soothsayer about the probable best future course of a stock, most of all maybe the time to sell.

A discovery of this sort could place one in an awkward position, either to keep mum and get rich, or give it to the world.

As to giving things to the world, Sumner has done that already.

Some years ago he invented the Gill Computer and never got a dime out of it, yet his device is being used by the Government today.

While he was at work in Washington he saw experienced mathematicians put in angles of oblique aerial photographs. He invented a computing chart that cut the figuring time to 5 seconds.

At age 8 he amazed friends by multiplying several-digit numbers in a quick mental process. He has toyed with the magic of numbers and their relativity for years.

He is a son of Mr. and Mrs. Maurice Gill, 160 Warwick Street, attended Lincoln Prep, Lincoln Tech and Northeastern University.

Gill has set in with some brokers to talk about his chart of stocks and methods of plotting.

"People are never satisfied with a gain in stocks," he says. "They always want more. A gain of two or three points is never enough. The process can go on indefinitely. Humans are greedy."

Weapons of Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with the deepest regret that I was forced to inform the commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. John W. Mahan, that I could not be with him in Los Angeles to speak before the Veterans of Foreign Wars' annual convention on September 2 because of pressing business in the Senate.

I had hoped to pay tribute to the splendid work of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary and to pay particular tribute to the leadership of Commander in Chief Mahan, Senior Vice Commander Louis G. Feldmann—who has now been unanimously elected as the new commander in chief—Ted

Connell, the new senior vice commander, and Robert E. Hansen of South St. Paul, Minn., newly elected junior vice commander in chief.

The leadership of these men has been extraordinary, and they deserve the congratulations of every American for their work in behalf of American veterans and their families, a strong national defense, and a vigorous community welfare program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address entitled "The Weapons of Freemen," which I had prepared for delivery on September 2, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WEAPONS OF FREEMEN

Commander Mahan, officers of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, delegates and distinguished guests, it is an honor to be asked to address this splendid group of men who have given so much for the country we all love, who have served our country overseas, and who continue to serve at the community, the State, and the national level.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and their auxiliary are a great power for good in this Nation of ours. I have had the privilege of seeing your effective efforts in my own State of Minnesota. I have seen the good work you have done for young people, for better, cleaner, more healthful communities. I have watched the enthusiasm and vigor with which you roll up your sleeves and go to work on a project. In fact, in just a few days, one such project will be completed, with the dedication of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Cancer Research Institute at the University of Minnesota, to stand as a symbol of all that is unselfish, public spirited, and generous among the men and women who make up your great and vital organization.

I have always admired the way in which the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been able to work tirelessly and effectively in behalf of veterans and their dependents, and at the same time give leadership and impetus to constructive proposal to help all our people.

So during this session, we saw your leadership working ceaselessly to secure a new Senate Committee on Veterans Affairs—which we should have—and at the same time working for a desperately needed balance in our Armed Forces, for urgently needed modernization of our conventional forces, for more airlift and close air support.

I have seen your splended commander in chief and my admired and respected friend John Mahan, giving personal leadership not only to the cause of improved veterans and widows pensions, but also to the cause of preventing that tragic and senseless waste of young lives which we know as juvenile delinquency.

I count it my great good fortune to have as my friend and valued consultants not only Jack Mahan, but also your dedicated and respected director of legislative affairs, Omar Ketchum, the officers of the Minnesota department such as Department Commander Don Otte and Minnesota's brilliant national councilman, Bob Hansen. The advice of men like these is not only welcome, but sought after.

And it is because of the great respect and admiration I hold for you men and your great organization that I wish to speak to you of a very serious matter this morning.

There is an old British saying: "Beware the hug of the bear." I hope that every American will remember those words when the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union begins what could become a spectacular Soviet success in his visit to the United States this month.

For Premier Nikita Khrushchev is a new kind of bear, so far as the history of Russian leadership is concerned. He is clever, able, forceful and vigorous—and dangerous. He kisses babies, he shakes hands, he is disarming in his manner.

But his mighty Soviet war machine is not disarming.

The Russian Premier is above all else a political man. He seems to prefer to outsmart his opponents, to trick them, to undercut them, to outmaneuver them. He can and has used force—as in Hungary—to work his will. He is shrewd, tenacious, and tough. He has survived forty years of purges, secret police, and all the other terrifying trappings of the Communist police state. He has either buried all his principal opponents, or set them to watching the machinery in obscure corners of the Soviet Union.

He would rather talk us into something than go to war about it. He would rather outsmart us, out maneuver us, out-produce us, and out-last us than to take the awful risks of a nuclear exchange.

The President of the United States has invited the Soviet Premier to visit this country. I support that invitation. And I support the President's visit to the Soviet Union.

The President has said that he hopes this exchange of visits with Mr. Khrushchev will "help create better understanding between the United States and (Russia) * * * and will promote the cause of peace."

I hope so. I truly hope so.

Khrushchev's visit to the United States may help to free him from some of the misconceptions about this Nation that he now has. It may help to convince him that the United States is stronger, wealthier and more unified than his own propaganda artists have painted us. Most of all I hope that he is able to see a Nation and a people who have worked hard, and who are working hard, to overcome great and serious problems, who are capable of enormous bursts of energy and of sustaining a high pitch of effort for years on end.

I hope he will have time to discover that ours is not a Nation of lotus eaters, not a people of soft touches. I think it is imperative that he understand that here in America there is an ever sharper and stronger competitive spirit than that which drives the men in the Kremlin.

And when he comes, let us meet him with the courtesy that is bred of strength and confidence in ourselves. We are his hosts. Let us listen to him, let us hear what he has to say.

But being courteous, we can also be candid.

Being pleasant, we can also be persuasive.

Mr. Khrushchev should feel the spirit of this people as well as see the face of our land. It will be both instructive and enlightening, I think, that the Soviet leader should hear and see precisely what the American people think and believe.

He should hear—without any shouting, discourtesy or demonstration—that Americans are ready to cooperate with the Soviet Union in every constructive way—but that we are opposed to the brutality, the oppression, the cruelty of Soviet imperialism. He should discover that the American people—not just what his propagandists call U.S. ruling circles—are passionately united in their belief that man must be free to choose his own way of government, that no nation has a right to rule another, and that freedom of speech, of movement, of assembly, of religion are not just words in a book but rather are articles of a living faith and component parts of our social order. He must see that our people actually believe these are the God-given rights of men and women everywhere. He must know that free men are prepared to struggle harder, more stubbornly, more tenaciously, and more effectively than the forces of communism. He must learn that we are prepared to live and die for these rights. We have before and are prepared to do it again.

It will be a tragic mistake if our people are led to expect too much from the forthcoming exchange of visits, if they are permitted to believe that with perhaps a new era of diplomatic courtesy, the underlying struggle with the forces of world communism has come to an end.

Yes, let us be prepared to talk, to negotiate, to confer. And let us have unfailing patience. Under the shadow of a nuclear holocaust, let us earnestly and sincerely search for a way to reduce tensions, to minimize the chances of a terrible explosion into outright war, to persuade our opponents that it is in their own best interests to resist the temptation to turn to force.

But even as our President and the Soviet Premier are talking in the White House or the Kremlin, the two worlds they represent will be colliding at a thousand points. Today the forces lock together in the great city of West Berlin and in the wild back-country of Laos. Yesterday they were joined in Tibet, Budapest, and Korea. Tomorrow?? Who knows about tomorrow?

We are engaged in a total struggle—far and away more than a question of mere military force. In this kind of struggle—economic, political, diplomatic, intellectual, scientific, cultural—everything counts. Tanks are important. So are teachers. Missiles are vital—so is money. Atom bombs are weapons—so are airways, oil pipelines, and sea lanes. Trained divisions are required—but no less do we require doctors, dentists, and diplomats—the best we have, the best we can train, are needed to strengthen our own society, and to go out to represent us in Asia and Africa and Latin America.

Underlying it all is the yawning gulf between two societies—one which gives no importance to freedom and the dignity of the human person and the other whose very roots strike down to the bedrock of the Judaeo-Christian heritage. With all its internal contradictions, the free world yet stands for the worth of the individual and a moral law.

I, for one, shall not be content to write off half the world as irretrievably lost to the dark forces that deny men and women the light of truth and the warmth of dignity and freedom.

If, then, we are soberly determined to carry on the struggle, then we should beware of falling into two grievous errors:

First, there is the danger that we may see only one narrow area of the struggle and overlook others equally important. If we become preoccupied with the military threat, we may forget the Soviet diplomatic, political, and economic onslaught. Equally dangerous is the tendency to see the struggle solely in terms of economics and politics, and to ignore the powerful military forces that confront us.

A second danger is the temptation to adopt the tactics and values of the adversary. It is said that we must fight fire with fire. In a sense this is true. We need missiles, jetplanes, and ships to defend ourselves against missiles, bombers, and submarines. We need men to fight men. We must develop an international economic strategy to counter the Communist economic offensive. We need the Voice of America to correct the distortions of Radios Moscow and Peking. In this sense we must fight fire with fire.

But we can never permit ourselves to forget that we are freemen and that we can use these weapons only as freemen use them. Communists have no such inhibitions. They can use their weapons with no holds barred, no qualms of conscience. If Radio Moscow lies about us and our objectives, it is not the part of freemen to retaliate by lying

about the Soviet Union. Russia can exploit her allies and send her tanks to crush a popular uprising in Hungary. But freemen must respect the integrity of their allies and accept their criticism of our policies.

Yes, freemen and tyrants may possess the same weapons, but they use them in a different way and for different purposes. Herein lies the fundamental moral distinction between the free world and the Communist world.

To meet the many-sided Communist challenge the arsenal of freemen must furnish many weapons, not the least of which is the weapon of an effective diplomacy. Diplomacy is the art of bargaining, of fighting for what you believe by peaceful means at the conference table.

To be effective, a diplomat must speak from a position of strength. As Carl Sandburg once said, "The cockroach is always wrong when it argues with the chicken."

To go to the negotiating table weak or divided is to invite disaster.

The United States will not be able to negotiate an honorable settlement of the Berlin issue unless we are strong and determined, and unless our strength is reinforced by the strength of our NATO allies.

Negotiation is not a substitute for a strong defense. But negotiation is the indispensable handmaiden of military strength. Our willingness to negotiate is not a sign of weakness, but an indication that we want to explore every honorable path to prevent war on the one hand or capitulation to tyranny on the other.

I support the forthcoming two-power talks. I have supported all our efforts to negotiate with the Russians since the end of World War II. To be sure, we have not yet been successful in settling the German problem or in achieving an effective arms control agreement, but on the other hand have avoided a nuclear war, and not one square inch of Western Europe has been taken by the Soviet Union.

Just as diplomacy is no substitute for military strength, the instruments of modern war are no substitute for negotiation.

I am deeply concerned about our present military posture—as is the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We are a powerful nation. We have many strong and reliable allies. We have the capacity for massive retaliation, although this capacity would be severely limited by a massive surprise attack.

Unfortunately, however, our capacity for retaliation, which serves as a deterrent to any hostile power, is not yet matched by our capacity to deal with limited aggression. We do not near have the balance forces capable of dealing with all likely military contingencies. We are weak on mobility. We are weak on the tactical weapons and manpower required to rebuff a local assault. Our weakness in these areas tends to invite adventurous nibbling from the rim of the Communist world.

In the passion and determination to balance the budget, our military posture has been thrown off balance. In a desire to get a "bigger bang for a buck," the budget-cutters have tempted Russia to run a bigger risk with their ruble.

Civil defense, for example, has been almost criminally neglected. Yet a realistic survival program is critical in a balanced defensive posture. A solid civilian defense effort would add substantially to our deterrent strength.

Let me illustrate what I mean. According to competent experts a medium-sized nuclear attack on the United States today would kill at least 50 million persons, most of them as radiation casualties.

A comprehensive shelter program to protect against radioactive fallout could save as many as half of these victims. In other words, such a civilian survival program could strengthen our country by 25 million survivors in the event of a surprise nuclear attack. This is no small factor in the military calculations of a potential aggressor, to say nothing of the humanitarian values involved.

If a fallout shelter program could save 25 million American lives, and if it would serve as an additional deterrent to nuclear attack, why has our Government not embarked upon it?

The answer we are given is: "It costs too much." Well, how much would it cost? According to Rand Corp. studies and the Gaither committee report, a shelter program of thie magnitude could be accomplished in 5 years with an annual expenditure of less than 10 percent of our present defense budget.

At present the administration is content with a voluntary, do-it-yourself, shelter building program. How can we expect State governments, local authorities, and individual citizens to take civilian defense seriously when their own national government does not even require that shelters be included in new Federal buildings or in federally assisted construction?

Our military and diplomatic weapons would be as weak reeds without a strong economic underpinning. And here, though we are strong, we can be caught napping. Soviet production today is about 40 percent as great as U.S. production. But she is gaining—and fast. Her economy is growing at a rate of 7 to 9 percent. That is approximately three times as fast as our rate of growth.

In the realm of economics, world war III has already started. Premier Khrushchev has repeatedly boasted that the Soviet Union would overtake the United States and eventually win the world to communism by economic, rather than military, means.

"We declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade," said Khrushchev on November 22, 1957. This boast cannot be lightly dismissed. Soviet sputniks and lunik should have shattered any remaining illusions we once entertained about Russia's technological backwardness.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union has launched a worldwide economic offensive. The two main weapons in her ruble war are trade and aid, which she frankly regards as instruments of her large political purposes. She has succeeded in penetrating strategic countries in the Middle East and in Southeast Asia. By her "no holds barred" economic tactics, she was able to precipitate a serious Cabinet crisis in Finland. I was in Helsinki when it happened, and I know what I'm talking about.

We must meet this competition by increasing our aid and investment program abroad substantially, and by moving hard to make better use of our tremendous reserves of real wealth in the form of American-produced food and fiber.

You can't talk democracy and freedom effectively to a family lacking food, health, shelter, and economic opportunity. The battle for men's minds cannot even begin until at least partial victory is won over poverty, disease, and illiteracy.

In the efforts to help the newly emerging nations of Asia and Africa and Latin America to help themselves, American capital is vital—an important weapon of free men. Through the World Bank, our Development Loan Fund, and the promising International Development Association, our capital can merge with West Europe's increasing capital reserves to support economic growth in the uncommitted areas of the world.

One of the greatest of all our weapons in this vast struggle is that agricultural abundance which some consider a burden and a curse. Yet, if Mr. Khrushchev had our surplus of farm production, what would he not be able to achieve in the world.

Food and fiber in the hands of freemen can accomplish enormous good. I have seen the way American food speaks for us. It is eloquent in pleading the American way of life—from Barcelona to Athens, to Calcutta and Seoul, Korea.

The food for peace program which I have urged for years, and which is now before the Senate, would permit us to use in greater measure our supplies of grain, milk, and cotton in construotive works of peace overseas. With food and fiber we could build hospitals, schools, and laboratories. We would take our food and fiber surplus production out of the storage bins and put it to work in the great world struggle.

The idea for a White Fleet first suggested to me almost 2 years ago by Cmdr. Frank Manson of the Navy—and on which we have worked together ever since—struck me as a most useful and dramatic way of carrying out one part of an expanded American foreign policy based on the works of peace. Yes, we could very well afford to provide a fleet of ships to help carry out technical assistance programs, particularly in the field of public health, along the coasts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. And we could in so doing provide for disaster relief on a much greater scale, and much greater scale, and much more quickly and effectively than we have provided in the past.

The deeds of a White Fleet would also speak eloquently of the American mind and the American heart.

It is significant that 34 of my fellow Senators joined me in introducing the White Fleet resolution, and that Congressman Ed Edmonson, of the House side, was joined by many of his colleagues.

The White Fleet could take its place among the peaceful weapons of freeman. To heal the sick, to feed the hungry, to cloth the naked, to rescue the distressed, to teach the illiterate * * * here are noble goals firmly rooted in the long American tradition. Pain, hunger, want, and illiteracy—these are worthy enemies—against which we should pit ourselves even if no Communist leader threatened to dominate the world. How much more vital it is, then, that we should throw our resources into the work of overcoming these evils.

Can we afford these great efforts?

How can we afford not to make them?

This magnificently endowed country of ours, this vast productive capacity, this free society which permits the energies of so many men and women to flow into the national effort can and will produce what is necessary to win the world struggle.

It will require planning, it will require decision making, but I am convinced that by voluntary planning, and if necessary sacrifice, our people and our free world allies can outproduce, outwork, and outmatch, and outfight anything that the Communists can put up against us.

And America can do this without becoming a garrison state—a modern Sparta. Indeed, we have the resources to become a modern Athens—rich in the arts of peace, strong in our arms and in our purpose.

A free people cannot expect to survive automatically. It is not written in the stars that because a society is free it will continue forever. Just because we are friendly and openhearted, the leader of the Soviet bloc cannot be expected to let us alone.

Th truth is that we cannot live without leadership, without purpose, without courage.

Edmund Burke, the great 18th century English statesman, warned us long ago when he said, "Evil triumphs when good men fail to act." We must act—but action requires purpose and leadership.

It is clear that we have nothing to fear if we boldly into the future, if we produce leadership wise enough to understand our dangers, bold enough to face them and plan their defeat, imaginative enough to rally our people to the task and the battle.

Gasoline Tax Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have most vigorously supported and propose to continue to support the Federal highway construction program, which in my judgment is urgently needed to improve our national vehicular transportation travel and for the public safety.

When this program was first adopted by the Congress, adequate long-range financing measures were also adopted. While it is true that since that time, original costs of estimates on various parts of the program have increased, the original formula for raising and disbursing the funds required to advance and ultimately complete this great national project is just as sound today as when it was first proposed and adopted.

The diversion of earmarked funds has most unfortunately reduced receipts from the wide range of excise taxes which together with appropriated funds if undiverted would produce more than enough to meet all the Federal obligations under the road program and defray all necessary costs. There are several strong reasons why I do not believe that it is either necessary, or in the interest of sound principles of taxation, to impose additional taxes on gasoline.

In the first place, current gasoline taxes fall with especially heavy impact upon the American people. Heretofore, the gasoline tax had been considered to be a proper area for State taxation. In some States this taxation, imposed on gasoline at present constitutes more than 40 percent of the total purchase price of a gallon of gas.

To my mind, this is not taxation; it is a form of confiscation most oppressive in its effects. Secondly, the gasoline tax strikes at the more than 65 million automobile owners in the Nation who are required to use gas, and it thus imposes onerous taxation on ordinary consumers who are already very heavily taxed.

Moreover, as I pointed out above, it is entirely possible, feasible, equitable, and proper that Congress should and can finance this great roadbuilding program without further taxation on gasoline.

In addition, extensive roadbuilding construction overseas has been financed under the foreign aid program without the adoption of special taxes to pay the cost thereof.

I can see no logic and certainly no need or sound reason for placing additional special taxation of this kind upon American consumers. The Congress can and should provide all the funds needed to finance the program without the imposition of additional heavy special taxes.

I cannot possibly accept the argument that has been advanced here that failure to adopt this tax would bring the road program to a halt because Congress has readily at hand the means of financing the program on a solid, fundamental basis and should not hesitate to do so. This tax is discriminatory against the use of automobiles, other vehicles, and consumers, and against several great American industries and their employees and I cannot find any justification whatsoever in supporting it.

I think that the present taxes on the people and on business are already truly extortionate in many instances and are causing inestimable damage to our high American standards of living as well as to the fundamental operation of our great free enterprise system, and I express regret that Congress even proposes to add to these heavy burdens which are afflicting our people as a whole and seriously impairing the spirit and the incentives of private initiative. I greatly deplore this excessive taxation and I believe Congress should bring it down to fair, reasonable, unrepressive levels, if we have to stay here until Christmas to do it.

At this time, we need lower taxes, not higher taxes. If we could secure lower taxes, it would bring untold benefits to the Nation, to the American public, and to American businessmen, especially the small businessmen who are struggling so hard these days to make both ends meet. In addition, lower taxes would, in my humble judgment, produce higher revenues in the long run and thus assist in balancing the budget and reducing the national debt—two goals which I believe are of greatest import to the future prosperity and well-being of this Nation.

Poison in Your Water—No. 167

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Boston, Mass., Herald of December 11, 1958, entitled "Sewage Called Damaging to New England Fishing":

SEWAGE CALLED DAMAGING TO NEW ENGLAND FISHING—NAVAL DISTRICT HEAD DENIES HIS VESSELS ADD TO POLLUTION

The chairman of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission charged yesterday that "irreparable damage" may be caused New England fishing and beaches by the dumping of sewage offshore by naval and merchant vessels.

The commandant of the First Naval District issued a quick denial that the Navy contributed to pollution.

CHARGE MADE IN NEW YORK

Edward T. Dicksonson, chairman of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Commission and a commissioner of the New York Commerce Department, made the charge in a New York speech at a commission meeting.

New England communities spend millions annually, he said, to control water pollution, "yet these efforts are constantly frustrated by the dumping of sewage into offshore waters" by vessels with no regard for the efforts and expense of these communities.

"It is highly discouraging," Dickinson added, "for a community to construct with hard-earned tax dollars a facility which will prevent its own sewage from polluting rivers and offshore waters and then to have a vessel—with no apparent concern for pollution—discharge the sewage of hundreds of men.

"There is no excuse for this, when the proper precautions would prevent the pollution of these waters upon which so much of the economy of New England depends."

SAYS PROTESTS IN VAIN

He said the organization has protested to Federal public health authorities oil spills from vessels but that the Commission's attempt to improve the situation "have so far been largely in vain.

"It is imperative," he said, "that some action be taken before irreparable damage is done to the beaches of New England and its shell-fishing industry."

Rear Adm. Carl F. Espe, First Naval District Commandant, denied that naval vessels have polluted offshore waters and pointed out that "nobody has made any complaints to us."

ONLY FEW SHIPS

"The only possible place that might be affected," he said, "is Newport, and that's deep tidal water which would carry refuse out to sea.

"We have only a few ships at the Navy Yard, and we have strict regulations that ships must be a certain number of miles offshore when they refuel or clear their bilges.

"By the way," Admiral Espe added, "don't most of these cities dump their own sewage into the ocean?"

Little Folks' Stake in Bank Row

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7950, if enacted, would impose double taxation of earnings on those who are now free from it. I hope that most of our colleagues will agree with me that you do not attain equality or equity by perpetuating inequity.

I believe that the way to attack the inequity created by double taxation of earnings is to fight for the removal of the double taxation, not to imbed that bad principle in our law by urging double taxation of earnings on those who are now free from it.

What the American Bankers Association refers to as tax exemption of mutuals and cooperatives is not tax exemption but merely single taxation on earnings. That sound principle is what the association should stand and fight for. Our democratic way of life should not countenance taxing earnings before distribution and taxing them again upon distribution.

In this connection, I commend to our colleagues the following article by Donald I. Rogers, business and financial edi-

tor of the New York Herald Tribune, which appeared in that newspaper on August 28, 1959:

LITTLE FOLKS' STAKE IN BANK ROW

(By Donald I. Rogers)

During the last week six New York State mutual savings banks announced that they were resigning their memberships in the American Bankers Association. In July the New York State Savings Association resigned from the ABA. Seven individual savings banks immediately followed suit. In addition, 33 savings banks have reported they will allow their ABA membership to lapse when it expires August 31.

The reason for this rift among bankers is a relatively unpublicised piece of legislation pending in Washington called the Mason bill. It would provide for a tax on mutual savings banks on much the same basis that privately owned commerical banks are taxed. Because the august ABA threw its support behind the Mason bill, savings banks are withdrawing from their leading trade association.

It is causing violent behind-the-scenes eruptions in the entire banking industry, though every effort is being made to present a calm face to the public, for the banking fraternity has always felt that the public should see only a natty, if smug, visage whenever it looks upon a banker.

The fact is, though, the public—a large segment of the public—has a major stake in this internecine war as well as in the disputatious Mason bill itself.

The ordinary people of America, the nonbankers and non-politicians, we little people, in other words, have pinched and saved and exercised prudence to a point where we have deposited more than $34 billion in mutual savings banks. This is money squirreled away for the rainy day. It earns, currently, 3¼ percent in most savings banks and will begin to earn 3½ percent in most of them during the last quarter.

AFFECTS 17 MILLION

There are very few accounts of more than $10,000, for that's the limit of insurance for a single account allowed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. It is estimated that there are 17,377,000 individuals who have deposits in mutual savings banks.

Savings banks grew by fulfilling a need in the communities not met by the commercial banks—the taking of small deposits and making mortgage loans on individual homes. It was this very need which also gave rise to the Federally chartered savings and loan associations.

It is possible that a few small commercial banks might be hurt in some areas by the competition from savings banks, but, if that's what the public wants, then that's what it should get. Another larger and perhaps stronger commercial bank can always step in and take care of commercial needs. Many do it now, anyway.

The Mason bill is heralded as an instrument which will "equalize" the taxes of both the savings banks and the commercial banks. In our opinion, it would not do this. Rather it would take from the savings banks, the thrift institutions, their only advantage.

This is the ability of the savings banks to pay higher dividends on savings deposits. That is something which affects each one of us.

With the Mason bill as law, the commercial banks would be able to offer about the same interest rates as thrift institutions (savings banks). In addition, they, the commercial banks, would continue to offer their full range of banking services, on most of which they make a profit. Savings banks, under present thinking, would acquire no new services to balance things out, to make them competitive in the whole banking field, with the commercial banks.

Even if savings banks decided to compete with commercial banks in the whole spectrum of banking, most of them do not possess the personnel, the background or, in many cases, the locations and contacts to become commercial banks.

There is also this: Mutual savings banks do not operate at a profit, all earnings, after reserves and necessary expenses, being paid back to depositors in the form of dividends. Commercial banks are supposed to be profit-making corporations. They are taxed on their profits.

There is, of course, the other side of the argument. Taxpaying institutions deserve protection from nontaxpaying enterprises. However, the commercial banks haven't made out a case on this point.

Judge Schramm, of Pittsburgh's Outstanding Juvenile Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, my good and respected friend, Judge Gustav L. Schramm, 61, nationally known juvenile court judge, died of a heart attack Saturday, September 5, at his home, 37 Mount Lebanon Boulevard.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph of September 7, 1959:

JUDGE SCHRAMM, OF PITTSBURGH'S OUTSTANDING JUVENILE COURT

Before his death, Judge Schramm realized a dream of conducing an international juvenile court institute. He was the founder and director of the Pennsylvania Mason Juvenile Court Institute that ended its sessions here Friday.

For the 10th session of the institute, the State Department sent five Koreans and a representative from Ghana, Africa.

The jurist, who never wore a judicial robe, had personally listened to the problems of more than 350,000 youngsters in nearly 26 years on the bench.

He headed the juvenile court here since it was founded by the State general assembly in 1933. Judge Schramm was appointed the judge. He was serving his third term which would have ended in 1963.

Judge Schramm built the institution into a model juvenile court. His operation has been responsible for many other juvenile courts throughout the country.

In 1958 he received the Pennsylvania Bar Association's Distinguished Service Award.

Last year he was given the highest Masonic honor—the 33° of the Supreme Council of the Scottish Rite. He received the honor in Pittsburgh during the supreme council session.

He was district deputy grand master of the 51st Masonic District of the Grand Lodge of Free and Accepted Masons. In this position, he directed the work of 15 Masonic lodges.

He was a member of the Scottish Rite and Syria Temple. His Masonic lodge was Bellefield Lodge, F. & A.M.

Judge Schramm served as president of the Pennsylvania Council of Juvenile Court Judges from 1951 to 1953 and was president of the national council from 1949 to 1951.

He was born on the south side. His father and grandfather were pastors of the historic "Rooster" Church—the German Evangelical Church of Birmingham. It was in this church that Judge Schramm met his wife—Louise Hammell, his sole immediate survivor.

Judge Schramm held bachelor of science, master of arts and law degrees from the University of Pittsburgh and one in philosophy from Columbia University.

He taught at Pitt Law School since 1916. He served on many boards of child guidance groups.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Gen. William Tunner Warns America To Keep an Adequate Airlift Prepared at All Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an address made by Lt. Gen. William H. Tunner to the Air Force Association in Miami on September 5, 1959. General Tunner has selected this forum to again remind the Nation that the Military Air Transport Service is obsolescent and every day approaches its inevitable doom if Congress does not provide adequate new inventories enabling it to fulfill its minimum wartime mission.

Mr. Speaker, the cheapest insurance on earth is a military air transport service capable of moving. Mr. Speaker, should disaster strike, this Nation will never forgive Congress if we do not provide MATS with the tools to do its job. MATS must be modernized; MATS present fleet is obsolescent; MATS primary mission is support of SAC; MATS only mission is to serve the Nation. MATS must be modern.

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. WILLIAM H. TUNNER, COMMANDER, MILITARY AIR TRANSPORT SERVICE, TO AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., SEPTEMBER 5, 1959

Whenever the doctrine of airpower needs support, the Air Force Association can be counted on to do the job.

This distinguished gathering today, in which I am honored to take part, is fresh evidence of that. But there is also an extremely personal reason why I am happy to be here with you.

I want to thank you, and your fine magazine, Air Force and Space Digest, for the splendid manner in which you have supported the Military Air Transport Service at what may well be a turning point in its history.

Like all elements of military power in this country, military airlift must develop its full potential. The operators and users of military airlift need a common goal. They cannot go on being divided much longer.

For there is, I am very frank to say, a developing weakness in our military airlift system which is one of the penalties of disunity. It has not yet reached the point at which we may find ourselves unable to carry out the directives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as laid down in emergency war plans.

Our successful missions in Lebanon and Formosa last year are the best proof of that.

But unless we act quickly and decisively we may find ourselves seriously lacking in modern military airlift at some particularly dangerous time when we will have the greatest need of it.

Let me proceed to outline the target for you as plainly as I can.

The Military Air Transport Service, by its very nature, must be an integrated system working in harmony with all the military services—with the Army and Navy and Marines, as well as the Strategic and Tactical Air Commands, and the rest of the Air Force. As an Air Force major command, we exist because we have a wartime job to do.

Under the direction of the Secretary of the Air Force as single manager, MATS provides airlift for the Department of Defense. And because we are a two-service organization with 4,000 Navy people helping us serve all elements of the Armed Forces, it is only reasonable that we should look forward to a broader development.

But before there can be unification in that broad sense, four basic requirements must be met to insure an adequate state of readiness in our strategic military airlift. These are:

1. A modern, turbine-powered fleet of strategic military transports sufficient in speed, range, and capacity to deliver our military personnel and their cargoes in sufficient quantity, at the right spot, and at the right time.

2. Effective, day-by-day training at the minimum rate to provide all-important experience for our entire system in handling personnel and cargo flights on routes tying in with wartime requirements.

3. Use of this productive capability by all the military services to permit the most efficient and economical operation.

4. Commercial augmentation at a necessary rate, consistent with the needs of the military establishment, to insure prompt delivery in peacetime, and a powerful reserve force that can be called upon, after the first surge to wartime strength, to help meet any emergency.

Let us see where we stand now on each of these four matters so that we can tell what remains to be done and how it can best be accomplished.

I wish I could tell you that we have a military airlift capability second to none, but it would not accord with the facts. The truth is that, out of our force of 1,100 aircraft, less than half are used in the strategic air transport category and all but about two dozen of these are rapidly becoming obsolete. The rest of our aircraft are assigned to such independent services as rescue, weather, communication, charting and aeromedical evacuation.

What MATS needs is a balanced strategic air transport fleet. This would include at least three specific types of aircraft—those that travel at high speeds, those that can be used for "workhorse" operations and those that can carry all types of outsize cargo which no commercial carrier can possibly handle.

We do not have in our inventory today, immediately ready for use, a single high speed, modern aircraft that we can put on alert status to fly in emergency support. We are trying to supply jet age bombers and supersonic ballistic missiles, and associated requirements, with 190-knot airlift. We are propelling ourselves into space at speeds never before traveled by man, and trying to run our supply system at a World War II pace.

Here may be the weakest link in our chain of military defense. Whether we contemplate small wars or the holocaust of all-out atomic war we cannot fly at a rate even one-half as fast as our bombers.

At the rate at which modern wars are likely to be fought, it could all be over by the time our reinforcements and supplies get there at some future D-day. We are, it is true, making a small beginning on the modernization program. But we face a threat that cannot be met by good intentions, or a symbolic development.

To replace our C–118's and C–121's, and their piston engines which are slow by today's standards, there is urgent need for a number of high-speed modern aircraft. These are intended for the alert force, the aircraft that are always kept in reserve, ready to go wherever they are needed at any time and at maximum speed.

For our C–124's, the backbone of our strategic transport and troop carrier fleets, a larger and speedier "workhorse" aircraft is necessary. We cannot get along on what we have for any appreciable time without impairing our capability. Our C–97's are about to follow our C–54's out of the inventory very soon.

It is only in the category flying outsize cargoes that we are beginning to make some progress. Here, we have the C–133's, which are fulfilling a great need. To show you what modernization really means, for every C–133 we have placed in service, we have been able to retire five C–54's, and we have been able to increase our total cargo capacity and our effective deliveries in spite of it.

That, in itself, establishes the principle that an obsolete air transport fleet can be a dangerous source of weakness, both militarily and economically. Give us the planes, and we will do the job, provided the airlift system can function at an adequate level.

It is this problem of functioning on a day-by-day basis for training that leads to so much misunderstanding of the role of military airlift, and that brings me to my second point.

The Secretary of the Air Force and the Chief of Staff have decided that our strategic airlift system in MATS must be exercised at the rate of 5 hours per aircraft per day.

It means that the entire airlift system—planning, loading, maintaining, operating and all the thousand and one factors in military air transport—must be exercised. You would not expect a championship athlete, who is out of training, to run a 4-minute mile. You could not expect an idle factory, maintained by a skeleton force, suddenly to produce at capacity.

So it is with airlift. What we have on D-Day must be in Existence at that moment; we will not have time, as we did in the Korean war, to surge from a low utilization rate of less than 3 hours to an adequate level. It took us many months to make the change over then, and we should never forget that lesson.

We will never again have that much time.

Now we could fly at a rate higher than 5 hours per aircraft per day for training purposes, but we recognize that this would not be consistent with economical management of our resources. But this does not mean, as some of our critics imply that a high utilization rate is not necessary.

Two requirements are laid upon MATS.

First, we must deploy specific forces to specific locations in support of the nuclear offensive, using aircraft that are on runway

alert or on alert in the continental United States. For this, we have our alert force which is geared to single sortie operations at a low utilization rate.

Second, we have to count on using each assigned aircraft again and again to resupply the nuclear forces, or to provide for continuing support of the Army, Navy, and Air Force elements already deployed overseas, or to deploy additional combat elements. Here, we need high utilization—constant use of every airframe in our strategic airlift inventory.

This is our one-two punch. And we had better have it ready for use when the time comes.

The question arises, of course, whether these aircraft should carry adequate loads in their daily training missions. I do not ask, "Why?" I ask, "Why not?" If all this capacity for military personnel and military cargo were not used as our planes fly on their scheduled routes, it would be bad training, bad economy and bad judgment.

All of us, as taxpayers, would have the right to ask why a transport force should not act as a transport force. The Army's trucks do not roll empty, nor do the Navy's ships sail with vacant holds. If the Air Force's strategic transport fleet were flown empty, it could cost the nation many, many millions of dollars to buy the airlift which we now supply at no additional cost.

I am frequently asked, "Does it really pay to carry these air cargoes? Can't it be done cheaper if it is sent by the more traditional methods of shipments?" That misconception, I am sorry to say, still is held by some in our armed forces.

Let me tell you what the Air Force has discovered. Since we changed our logistic concept and increased our use of air transport several years ago, we have saved nearly $7 billion by being able to cut our very large inventories, reduce pipeline time and save on initial procurement of high value items. As an additional factor, the adoption of a policy of moving all personnel overseas by air has resulted in the more productive use of sufficient personnel to staff three heavy bombardment wings.

With a modernized strategic air transport fleet, we will have the capacity at our established training rate of utilization to handle maximum air shipment requirements of the Army and Navy, as well as the Air Force. Right now, these two services still require airlift for only about half as much personnel and cargo as the Air Force. Together, they could save even more than the Air Force has been able to do thus far, if they adopted a modern—and may I add, a unified—air transport policy.

On the basis of my long experience with military airlift, not only in the Berlin blockade but flying the hump in Burma during World War II, I advise them and urge them to move their personnel and more of their cargo by air. It will have to be done during an emergency, when we may be hard put to get up to required capacity overnight. Why not begin now? In that way, we will always be prepared.

I come now to the role of commercial airlift, certainly a controversial subject during the past few years, and one which has been the source of concern for all of us in MATS. On the part of some of the more enthusiastic proponents of commercial airlift for the military, there has been a tendency to believe that commercial augmentation means commercial substitution for military airlift.

I don't believe that is possible. In an atomic war, the first shock waves will have to be borne by the military in the defense of the Nation. It is their job by training and preparation, by the heritage of service which sends them into battle to follow orders whatever the cost. Nobody questions the ability of patriotism of the commercial crews, and certainly they will be needed in great volume after that first shock is over.

But the D-Day mission belongs to the military and it will be carried out by the military, God willing, with gallantry and devotion. That being so, the training function must be preserved and amplified. There is need for the commercial augmentation program, in alliance with the military, during peacetime, and it stands to reason that it will grow. From 1955, when we spent only $4.5 million for commercial airlift, until 1959, when we spent $71 million, the increase has been enormous and it is likely to continue to go up.

We need commercial augmentation and we should buy as much as is necessary. But nobody has asked for, and nobody really wants, to have the Army, Navy, and the Air Force subsidize the commercial airlines by making unnecesary payments to them through MATS for unnecessary services. I want to add this additional precaution for what it is worth. Nobody is going to gain, and everybody is going to lose, through a prolonged annual dispute over how much commercial airlift the military ought to buy.

It is sound and proper for our military and commercial airlift to work together. It is also sound and proper for the military to buy as much commercial airlift as it needs.

But the military, merely because it is the military, cannot escape the necessity of showing good management and sound economic practice in conducting its wartime training practices. And, because training for military airlift consists of hauling milipassengers and cargo, a military organization should not be unfairly criticized or penalized for making a decent showing. In fact, that is what our critics seem to have against us principally—that we are doing a good job.

And so, in summation, I think it is clear that military airlift has made some progress toward a unified program but a great deal more remains to be done.

We need help. We need our sister services in the Air Force. We need the Army and the Navy. We need our commercial carriers. But most of all, we need public understanding and public support if we are to increase our service to the Nation. And for this, we count on the stalwart assistance of the Air Force Association now as in the past. I want to thank you again for all you have done to support us.

Montana's Favorite News Columnist John Tatsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate has put in some long hours and we have been considering some very serious matters of great importance to the Nation and the world. I think it is about time that we injected some humor and human interest into the proceedings that are known as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Montana's best known newspaper columnist, John Tatsey, has been introduced to the Senate on previous occasions and several months ago he received recognition in one of our large weekly news magazines. Despite his new-found fame John Tatsey continues to write the Heart Butte News, devoted to the everyday incidents that affect his friends and neighbors who live on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation at Browning, Mont.

Mr. President, it has been several months since Tatsey's column has appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have a series of John Tatsey's columns, which appeared in the Glacier Reporter and the Hungry Horse News, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the series of columns was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, Apr. 9, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The weather has turned out real nice and the people all moving around, don't seem to know what to do. The weather is so good they overlook what's to be done. Just walk around.

Last Friday was visitors day at the Heart Butte school gym where about 250 people gathered and the visitors made there talk about Mr. and Mrs. K. W. Bergan from Helena. Mr. Bergan made a talk on how Heart Butte School growed in the last few years when only 65 children attended, and this year there are 188 students. He said he was interested in the showing of the school and would do all the can to help keep the school growing.

Miss Harriet Miller, of Helena, State superintendent of schools, was also here for the day at Heart Butte. There she was inducted in the tribe, and given the name Morning Star Woman. The name was given to her by Sam New Breast, Sr.

Elsie Campell, of Conrad, was also a visitor, and also was taken into the tribal membership and was given the name Spear Woman by Pete Stab By Mistake. The Browning people are adopting every summer so Heart Butte will adopt from the south side of the reservation.

Mr. Wayne Pratt, from Washington, D.C., was here Friday for the open house which was held at the school gym, and he got the name Takes Gun Himself Brave Man. To take a gun by himself from the Indian ways. Name was given by Pete Stabs by Mistake.

Mr. George Wagganer of the Bank of Glacier County of Cut Bank was around Heart Butte Tuesday on business. Saw good country. he'll come a second time.

Mrs. Cowan county superintendent of schools in Pondera was here Friday and several others.

There is a shock among the People at Heart Butte when Principal and Mrs. Ducan announced there leaving Heart Butte to teach at Brady next year. They did so well here and improved the school and the children. They did a good job while they were here.

James the reporter for the Great Falls tribune was here to interview the indian Police Tatsey. He must have wasted a dozen films on him taking pictures that he is going to send to New York to some magazine outfit.

Mose the trapper is up along the foot hills trapping and musta went to sleep that one real warm day. He came down Sunday and told the Police that he saw two cowboys rope the devil and dehorn him, hard to believe.

Maggie Jiggs has been bothered by drunks all winter and one night last week she turned things around and chased everybody out of her house.

Stoles Head Carrier has been staying home good. He won't even come for his commodities.

Tatsey visited the school room and talk to the children on what they should do and not to do. The first grade children all small want to see what the jail was like so Mrs

Kennerly the teacher took them over there. When they all got in side Tatsey shut the bar door and all started screaming.

Johnnie Calf Face told his wife he was going to the store and get some things but never returned. The store keeper said he got some gas and said he had to get to the hospital as he had an infection in his arm. Maybe it was in his stomach.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, Apr. 23, 1959]

A MINUTE WITH MI

All of the recent publicity our reporter, John Tatsey, has been getting has evidently scared him just a little. At least we haven't seen him for a couple of weeks. We did hear a rumor that he was out looking for the devil, now that Mose swears he saw a couple of cowpokes dehorn him, and was going to challenge him to a stick game, or something, but that, of course, is pure rumor.

We have welcomed a good number of new subscribers as a direct result of John's recognition, coming from California to New York, and from Louisiana to Michigan. One even wanted to know if Tatsey is a real person, or if someone just made him up.

Please believe us, Tatsey is real, and as grandpa used to say, "And there ain't another 'un like him cus while they was makin' him he broke the mold."

[From the Hungry Horse (Mont.) News, May 1, 1959]

HEART BUTTE PLANS JULY 4 CELEBRATION

(John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman, writes Heart Butte community news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper. Tatsey's columns have been frequently placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, and recently he was the subject of an article in Time magazine.)

The people had a meeting held Tuesday evening and selecting their committee for the coming fourth of July celebration which will be at Heart Butte. The following members, Joe Running Crane, George Comes At Night, Sam New Breast, William Running Crane, are the collectors and John Tatsey as treasure and Joe New Robe, Paul Running Crane as camp chiefs.

James T. Ingram of Birch Creek has been around moving homes for people, moving them close to the agency where they will live in Dizzyland, a new community.

Miss Cook of the Blackfeet Hospital was at Heart Butte and Swims Under School.

Police Tatsey was down to Lower Black Tail Wednesday and up Birch Creek.

Mr. Joe Mountain Chief of Heart Butte got in on the land sale which was held in Browning last week. One piece of land he sold got in the thousands. Lucky Joe.

Frank Vielle will be living near the agency and Jenson Boy Four Horns is moving from Swims Under School to Old Agency and Dave Margan will have someone near him.

Stoles Head Carrier has left Heart Butte and now staying with John Eagle Ribs to be of some good to the old folks but John Tatsey sure misses him.

Since the weather turned warm everyone on the east end were able to walk early in the morning after a light wind. They are seen walking among the pines with sacks picking up pine knots for fire wood.

Joe Running Crane came to the reporter and told the following story. The prairie gophers and red nose gophers are holding meetings. Red noses want to have Indian days and the others want Sun Dance but the prairie gophers will win out and have the best time.

Louie and Bernard Red Head went down to Shelby where they have some work picking rocks.

Sam Calf Robe and Henry Evans are down east of Conrad working on farms.

Green grass is sure showing up since the last snow storm and people have already cleaned up their yards.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Tatsey are just about done lambing. They had fair crop of lambs and calf crop is also good and June had a yard fence put in and had her flower bed all worked up.

Mrs. Maggie Spotted Eagle is wondering whether her party name, Maggie Jiggs, was given away with her Indian name Spear Women which was given away by Pete Stab By Mistake.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, May 21, 1959].

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

There was no news from Heart Butte last week because the reporter was called to Great Falls on a grand jury hearing.

Gene Head Carrer and Franklin Comes at Night were sent to Billings last week and had a hearing there and were released till June the 8th when they will be called to Federal court.

Some of the People at Heart Butte went to Conrad to put on an Indian show which turned out real good. they enjoyed the buffalo barbecue every one was filled up so they really put a dance on in the evening.

Stoles was there and Tatsey got hold of him and got him on top of a Pickup truck and introduce him to the Conrad People. he was not winking to bad but had enough stuff in him to ask to talk over the Mike and has not come home yet. he is still whooping it up the dusty trail.

One of our dancers never got to Conrad Pete Day Rider. his wife ran him off and left his dancing costume and she locked them in a trunk and lock the house and she left hard luck.

The parade was very colorful and very nice. one of the biggest ever Put on in Conrad. they are doing better each year when they celebrate the whoop up trail days and the rodeo was no bunk. Corrals and stock were first class and the natural grandstand on the side hill was not tire some buck brush and sage. only the rattle snakes and woke up but it was good sitting.

Henry Evans was one of the whoop up dancers and when he came home Sam Calf Robe saw him dancing in front of his house by himself.

Boys around Browning were taken down on the hi line to work on the rail road there were over 50 that went so it looks kinda bad for James Walters migh close up or throw the doors wide open for air. brick motel.

Pughslys has shipped in their cattle on the summer range along the foot hills of Heart Butte. they run around a thousand head.

There were two semi truck unloaded cattle cattle at twin lakes last week for Dick Stone.

There will be lunch and ice cream served at Heart Butte School May 27 for children and Parents. There will be an Indian dance in afternoon all teachers will be there and some may not come back next year so every one that dances bring your costumes. Everyone welcomes farewell Party for teachers and children dancing will be in the square.

There is a committee meeting Wensday program. They will start camping on the 26th June so we are going to put on the best we can. keep posted on the next week news column for more on the celebration.

Miss Cook from the hospital staff was down around Mad Plume district when it rained so hard and slide in the ditch and spent a lot of time looking for help. Her Patient was the one who helped her out. good luck next time.

John Peanuts and his followers from Cree Corner that north of Browning were at Heart Butte Sunday where they locked horns with the boys in stick game but took no money home. come again.

Dizzy land at Heart Butte has been slowed down by the Police but the Party goers have backed up away the Police quarters. they have a new place on Big Badger but the Police have been tipped off on this. so be careful.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, May 28, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The boys have all come home from where they worked it rain so much could not work steady.

Pete Stabs by mistake was taken to the hospital last Monday by Dr. King.

Raymond Aims Back has come home from Deer Lodge where he spent few years.

Last Sunday was a fine day and there a lot of People at church and evening the stick game was crowded.

Geo Wippert has got his lights fixed and in use and stick games players had good lights.

Old man Fish Wolf Robe was at Heart Butte Sunday his wife set him in a corner while she looked at the games when she came to where he sat he was gone. she look around for him two old ladys had him out side in a car. the two ladys were from Heart Butte. Mrs. Fish don't take him to H. B. any more.

Boys from Browning that went to work some have come back home and two or three have moved from the railroad tracks to the city home at Chester for disorderly conduct.

Stoles Came home from Conrad and went on through to Browning and has not been seen around since.

Some men had the excuse of their wives being sick so they could not go to work but they left any how and the women got well and ramble the town.

The Police at Heart Butte was driving down along White Tail Creek one evening when he saw a fellow run in the brush. when John went to see who this guy was he saw him on the other side of the creek. it was Bill Old Rock he jumped into a beaver dam. he got away.

John Powers from Black foot was at Caroline Old Rock Home Monday evening disturbing when Police came he was gone. He got away with Carolines daughter and some blankets.

Dizzy land folks are having a well drilled so they will have good water to drink each Monday morning.

Sam Choate was taken to town to Dr King. he was down with the flu.

Henry Duck Head came to Heart Butte Sunday and went to dizzy land and pretty soon one women came after Police. Every one was hiding in a coulee. Henry took over.

Some people are doing some remodeling on the statue of the Virgin Mary at the grave yard.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, June 4, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Decoration Day at Heart Butte was sure nice to see the people fixing the graves of their loved ones. There were eight large flags out for soldiers; the graveyard was really beautiful.

The doings at Starr School were good and there were lots of people there to look on different races pulled off. The outstanding runner was Alex Doore, son of James Doore, and the Black Lodge dance was crowded. Visitors from other tribes all received gifts, evening to talk and fix up the 4th of July blankets and money; all had plenty to eat.

Mr. and Mrs. Roy Doore were at Heart Butte Sunday. Decorated Mrs. Doore's brother's grave, a hero of World War II.

Henry Williamson and Bob Ploots, of Rexford, were at Heart Butte last Sunday, where Bob was looking, and said it was beautiful country, and also spotted some beautiful girls. He may come back because he is single.

All teachers have left for different parts to spend the summer. Mr. and Mrs. Ducan left for Missouri to visit their folks. Mr. and Mrs. Hobbick are going to Missoula, where he will attend summer school. And Richard Gregory and wife also left for across the mountains. Only Mr. and Mrs. Hiram Crawford are still at Heart Butte; they will be leaving for Havre soon.

John Powers, of Blackfoot, was around last week disturbing at Heart Butte. When he left there was a young woman missing, so everyone knew that he got away with her and some army blankets. He went to Idaho. The young woman was Cathrine Old Rock Mad Plume. Lucky man.

Bob England is left to be a caretaker of the Heart Butte school buildings. Tatsey will be there.

Rev. Father Cassidy from Spokane is here visiting Father Mallman; he came Sunday and was taken out by Police Tatsey. He was safe on his trip to Heart Butte.

Stoles Head Carrier got in the big money last week; the first thing he did was to buy a Nash car. The last he was seen was on Two Medicine on the shortcut to Heart Butte sitting with two flat tires and no gas and had his car brought in for repairs and hitchhiked out.

Mrs. Margaret R. Crane came to town and she met Wesley Ackerman; she told him she hired Henry Morning Gun for a baby sitter and Henry was taking care of Joe R. Crane in the car.

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Faught lived long enough in Browning to be grandparents. They are lucky to have a granddaughter.

There is a piece of writing in the Cut Bank paper where Frank P. Sherburne mentioned where the name Blackfeet came from. Next week from Heart Butte News will come the real story.

There will be a meeting at the George Wippert place Friday evening to discuss the program for the celebration at Heart Butte on 4th of July.

Peter Tatsey has all his ground plowed and disked and ready to seed into oats and barley; he has about 40 acres.

The holiday weekend last weekend caused some people to lose one another—one lost her husband and another lost his wife.

[From the Hungry Horse (Mont.) News, June 5, 1959]

WOLF ROBE STRAYS AT HEART BUTTE

(John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman writes Heart Butte news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper.)

Old man Fish Wolf Robe was at Heart Butte Sunday his wife set him in a corner while she looked at the games when she came to where he sat he was gone. She look around for him two old ladies had seen him outside in a car. The two ladies were from Heart Butte. Mrs. Fish don't take him to Heart Butte any more.

Boys from Browning that went to work have come back home and two or three have moved from the railroad tracks to the city home at Chester for disorderly conduct.

Stoles came home from Conrad and went on through to Browning and has not been seen around since.

Some men had the excuse of their wives being sick so they could not go to work but they left any how and the women got well and ramble the town.

The police at Heart Butte was driving down along White Tail Creek one evening when he saw a fellow run in the brush. When John went to see who this guy was he saw him on the other side of the creek. It was Bill Old Rock he jumped into a beaver dam. he got away.

The boys have all come home from where they worked it rain so much could not work steady.

Pete Stabs by Mistake was taken to the hospital last Monday by Dr. King.

Raymond Aims Back has come home from Deer Lodge where he spent a few years.

Last Sunday was a fine day and there a lot of people at church and evening the stick game was crowded.

George Wippert has got his lights fixed and in use and stick games players had good lights.

John Powers from Black foot was at Caroline Old Rock Home Monday evening disturbing when Police came he was gone. He got away with Carolines daughter and some blankets.

Dizzy land folks are having a well drilled so they will have good water to drink each Monday morning.

Sam Choate was taken to town to Dr. King. he was down with the flu.

Henry Duck Head came to Heart Butte Sunday and went to dizzy land and pretty soon one women came after police. Every one was hiding in a coulee. Henry took over.

Some people are doing some remodeling on the statue of the Virgin Mary at the grave yard.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, June 18, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

The well in Joy Land has been completed. The first one was not any good so they drilled at another place and struck good water.

Leo Overfelt state stock inspector from Great Falls was around Heart Butte checking on some stock.

U.S. marshall from Great Falls was at Heart Butte serving sobpoenas on the Head Carrier and Comes at Night cases.

George Comes At Night and family and Mr. and Mrs. William Running Crane drove to Pablo to play stick game with the Flathead Indians last Sunday.

Gene Head Carrier and Franklin Comes At Night were called to Great Falls last Monday. Stoles Head Carrier was along and said that he had a fine trip but never knew when he left the Falls till he got home on Tuesday morning.

The sheriff from Conrad and deputy from Dupuyer were here Sunday and also Mr. Leo Overfelt stock inspector from Great Falls.

Week before last when the rivers were bank full Miss Cook the field nurse made her rounds at Heart Butte. She went down to Stoles when she drove into an old crossing which was dammed up by beaver. The water was so deep she could not open the doors of the car but managed to get out into the water waist deep. Stoles only had a hangover.

Last Sunday the people had a gathering at the Bull Shoe ranch where they had horse races. Joe Carlson from Two Medicine brought four of his running horses.

Lloyd Spotted Eagle was picked up by James H. Walters last week and was taken to the nut house at Warm Springs. There are more around that are heading there.

The reporter from Heart Butte was going to tell in this news how the Indians got the name Blackfeet. Will write a good story on it when the writer has a little more time. Its Blackfeet and not Blackfoot and did not come from burned grass. It will be a short story.

There was a lady from the east during the track meet at Starr School who wanted to know when was the Blackfeet Indians happiest day they enjoyed. A man by the name of Flood Water told her that the happiest time was when they are jerking meat. White man calls it drying meat.

The committee at Heart Butte had a meeting last Friday and had their plans. They are going to have horse races on the first day of July with purses given and dancing from the 2 to the 7. They will also be other Indian doings and they also mentioned about drinking and disturbance in camp. They are going to have a good bunch of young Police officers and anyone comes in a drunk condition will be picked up and pay a fine large enough. If he can not pay it he will be sent to J. H. Walters till the celebration is over so come sober and have a good time. Veterans day is on the 4th. Everyone that has horses to run bring them and make some expense money. Everyone welcome and it wont cost anything. Also bring your cameras.

Tatsey and Stoles Head Carrier and others have gone to Great Falls Wednesday to attend Federal court.

The 4th of July races will be from 100 yards to a half a mile. Four horse races and foot racing.

There was a car wreck at Little Badger Tuesday morning with four person in it. All shakin up not bad.

There was an old man who is blind. One morning his son was fighting his wife. The old fellow went to stop them. He got hold of his son's wife around the waist and was sure hanging on.

Negro Group Takes Sensible Stand Against Forced School Integration

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. FORRESTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I recently read an editorial which appeared in the Herald, a Negro newspaper published at Anderson, S.C. It was written by Davis Lee, a man who had labored many years for the welfare of his race and who stated in his editorial that integration is not a cure-all for the Negro's problems.

Forced integration is opposed by most southern Negroes, whose views, along with the views of the white people of the South, have not been taken into consideration by those who, for political or financial gain, are bringing about trouble between the two races.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Columbus Enquirer, Columbus, Ga., which is based upon a wire sent to President Eisenhower by Samuel H. Moore, president of the Southern Negro Development Association of Alabama, who says emphatically that "both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in the public schools."

The editorial follows:

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Sept. 3, 1959]

NEGRO GROUP TAKES SENSIBLE STAND AGAINST FORCED SCHOOL INTEGRATION

A highly interesting development occurred in the school integration fight when a Negro group in Birmingham wired President Eisenhower that most southern Negroes do not want forced integration.

Samuel H. Moore of Birmingham, president of the Southern Negro Development Association of Alabama, said the message was sent to the President on behalf of that organization. He stated that his group has more than 5,000 members in Alabama.

The president of the body told the President that:

"I assure you both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in the public schools.

"Racial hate and racial prejudice that was dead is now reconstructed. Threat of forceful integration has created fear and hate in many of our white friends."

"Since this is free America, why not put your racial policy upon voluntary action of the citizens, not forceful compulsion? Why not have the Government take a poll of the majority of the southern Negroes?"

The president of the Negro group asserted that such a poll should be confined to southern Negroes because "our northern Negro brothers * * * do not live in the South and therefore do not understand our southern bicultural society."

Moore urged Mr. Eisenhower "not to use force to integrate the schools and deny our race a major symbol of our progress—all-Negro schools." He added that "for lasting and enduring advancement of our race our progress must be achieved with good will from the white people among which we live."

There is much good sense in what this Negro has to say against forced integration.

There is much in his point in behalf of the all-Negro schools.

The agitators do not care what the southern Negroes as a whole think about the desegregation issue. They argue long and loud for the constitutional rights of those who do not want to go to school with the white children. These agitators give little consideration for the rights of the whole mass of the Negro population in the South. Though they accept token integration as a means of making progress in the fight, the aim of the agitators is far beyond the mixing of the races on a small scale. They want the door of white schools opened wide to Negroes—to all Negroes.

The race baiters are yelling loud for the rights of those who are perfectly satisfied with matters as they are.

There are some few Negroes who allow themselves to be used by the professional racial disturbers, but we are sure the the great majority of the Negroes of the South do not look with favor upon this upsetting influence that is sweeping the South in a move to effectuate the 1954 ruling of the Supreme Court for desegregation.

The Birmingham organization made a good point in stating that "racial hate and racial prejudice" are being "reconstructed." This is to be deplored. The members of both races are put to a great disadvantage as a result.

Negroes want to go to their own schools. This movement for integration has spread an unwholesome atmosphere over the country. Especially is this true in the South, where the Negroes and their white friends are greatly disturbed by the agitation.

Florida Leads Nation in Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some of my distinguished colleagues in their comments in recent years have indicated that they are inclined to feel the South is a little backward in the field of education. Therefore, I hope they will listen to this brief statement of mine and then read the article from the Tampa Tribune of September 7, 1959, entitled "Florida Leads Nation in Educational Television" which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Florida now has educational television stations in operation at Miami, Jacksonville, the Tampa-St. Petersburg area, and the University of Florida in Gainesville. A fifth station is expected to go on the air early next year at Florida State University in Tallahassee.

The people of Florida are rightfully proud of such progress in this new field of education.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune, Sept. 7, 1959]

FLORIDA LEADS NATION IN EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

TALLAHASSEE, September 6.—Private organizations and individuals are playing a big role in placing educational television before thousands of students in Florida.

Money, equipment, and services totaling more than $1,500,000 have been put into the program by foundation grants, the Federal Government, and local groups.

James Etheridge, Jr., executive secretary of the Florida Educational Television Commission, said the State's leadership in the E–TV field was one of the reasons for the contributions from non-State sources.

Commercial television stations and other businesses and civic, education, and labor interests have helped put the State's four educational TV stations into operation. This is more stations than any other State has on the air, Etheridge said.

The four stations are in Miami, Jacksonville, Tampa-St. Petersburg, and at the University of Florida.

The fifth station, at Florida State University, is expected to go on the air early next year.

Etheridge said the State probably is paying the biggest part of the E–TV costs, but grants from two funds established by the Ford Foundation have been substantial.

Grants totaling $563,000 have been made by the fund for adult education and the fund for the advancement of education. The Ford Foundation itself has put in $52,000 and the Federal Government has provided about $100,000 to pay programing costs.

But the stations at Jacksonville, Tampa-St. Petersburg, and Miami have drawn even greater support at the local level.

The Politically Popular Policy of Bloated Spending Programs No Excuse for Creating Economic Calamity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 12, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives of the United States is charged with the constitutional responsibility of spending the tax dollars of this Nation. As a Member of the House, I am aware of how easy it is for some to say "yes" to every vast spending program that dips into the barrel at the Federal Treasury—and obviously some seem to think it is a bottomless barrel.

In this session of Congress my voting record for economy and a balanced budget is undeniably among the top 10 percent of the House and the Senate. I feel an obligation to the citizens of this country to use some prudence in the allocating of their tax dollars and in so doing, control inflation which attacks those who are least able to protect themsleves.

The expanded spending programs espoused by the do-gooders which create inflation do more harm than good to the very people who can least bear the burden of higher living costs—the widow attempting to raise a family on the proceeds of an insurance policy, the old folks dependent on pensions and the millions of people in this country with relatively fixed incomes.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an authoritative study of the effects of our living and spending far beyond our income and the hard inevitabilities we face as a consequence. This report is by Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Maurice B. Stans and appeared in the July issue of Reader's Digest:

MUST WE DELUDE OURSELVES INTO DISASTER?

As the Federal Budget Director—and as an American and a certified public accountant—I must pass on to you a solemn warning. Unless we as a government insist right now upon living within our income, we face certain hard inevitabilities. Either there will be more tax increases, piled on top of our already heavy tax load, or there will be a mounting national debt and growing inflation with disastrous rises in the cost of living and a dangerous weakening of our national strength.

Either way the prospect is menacing. Few of us want to pay more taxes. And all of us have been victimized by past cycles of inflation, the economic fever that jacks up the prices of everything we buy, that mercilessly drains our earnings and savings. Yet inflation is a manmade sickness, one we can combat—if every citizen recognized the causes and does something about them.

Inflation feeds on the delusion that the Federal Treasury is a free-flowing well, that money from Washington doesn't cost anyone a cent. It is this something-for-nothing delusion that allows special-interest groups to smooth talk the public into believing that all their Federal spending proposals are possible. This is why gigantic spending bills are passed without tax measures to pay for them. This is why astronomic national spending goes on regardless of the revenue that comes in and despite the efforts of economy-minded members of both parties in Congress. And this is why these pressure groups are trying to push us headlong into ever greater debt, heedless of the nightmare of inflation that would result.

The President, his Cabinet, all the rest of us in the executive branch feel it is essential that America wake up and face these grim facts. Behind this conviction is a significant series of events you should think about.

Despite our warnings a year ago against too much panicky recession spending, and in the face of dwindling tax receipts, Federal spending surpassed all expectations. Last September, when staff experts at the Bureau of the Budget came to me with sheaves of figures for the 1959 fiscal year, our worst fears were confirmed. The Government was

piling up the biggest 1-year budget deficit in peacetime history—a staggering $13 billion. And, with a nearly $3 billion deficit from the year before, the Treasury for the 2 years was in the hole by almost $16 billion, or an additional new debt of $360 for every family across the land. The total national debt had risen to an alltime high of $285 billion, or some $6,400 for every family.

To add to our worries high Government officials returning from trips abroad met us with disturbing news. They told us that other nations were beginning to question America's financial stability, and its will to face up to dangerous fiscal practices that in the past had almost destroyed them.

If you are just a citizen who doesn't want economic calamity for yourself and your children, then insist on prudent government. To block the self-serving special interests that are ceaselessly driving us toward bankruptcy, I urge you to mobilize yourselves. Make yourself heard. Now. It is your own future that is at stake.

Found: The Ideal Community for Locating New Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that industrial growth and expansion play an extremely significant role in our economic progress. Throughout the country, communities are taking action to find ways and means to encourage the growth and development of new industry. The objective is to benefit the community economically, and also provide more consumer goods to meet the needs of our people.

In providing the climate in which new industries can grow and prosper, there are a wide variety of factors involved, including: equitable taxes, adequate water, electrical and other utilities, a network of transportation, availability of an adequate labor force and other features that augur well for industrial progress.

Naturally, there is no utopia in this, or in other fields. In Wisconsin, and across the Nation, however, communities are making constructive efforts to provide the kind of climate that will induce the development of new industries. The task is a complex one. Communities can often benefit from guide lines laid down through large-scale surveys.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal's business news carried a useful article outlining an arrangement of factors which are most conducive to industrial growth, entitled "Found: The Ideal Community for Locating New Industry." Reflective of the kind of accommodation which communities are striving to provide, in part or wholly for industrial purposes, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Sept. 6, 1959]

FOUND: THE IDEAL COMMUNITY FOR LOCATING NEW INDUSTRIES—LOW COSTS, EQUITABLE TAX DISTRIBUTION ARE FEATURES OF "INDUSTRIAL UTOPIA"

At last an ideal community has been found for industrial development—a community in which almost any company would be happy to locate a new plant.

The community was found by compiling the factors most sought by industry in selecting sites for new plants.

The ideal community, created from a study of more than 800 different factors listed by national firms in comparing communities and selecting locations for new facilities, was described in a recent address by H. McKinley Conway, Jr., president of Conway Publications, Inc., North Atlanta, Ga., who is regarded as an authority on industrial development.

Conway's "Industrial Utopia," he said, "reflects the composite thinking of the top planning experts in the Nation's 'blue chip' firm—the kind of firms almost every community would like to have."

What is the makeup of Industrial Utopia?

LOW-COST LEVEL CITED

One is a production cost level that is below the national average. Another is a fair and reasonable distribution of taxes.

Conway pointed out that the cost of producing goods in Industrial Utopia is below the national average not because of low wage rates but because of high efficiency and productivity inherent in the character of the labor force.

There is an adequate labor supply available, and good relations between local labor and the industries already located in the area, he added.

"Moreover," Conway said, his Industrial Utopia "has a right to work law and intends to keep it."

In addition to an equitable distribution of taxes, he said, the ideal community also has a low per capita debt.

"There are no giveaways or tax exemptions for new industry," he added, "but Government officials are noted for the fine cooperation they give in extending utilities and providing other assistance for new plants."

Conway noted that Industrial Utopia is a small city, one of less than 100,000 population but whose population is steadily increasing. It is a satellite community that offers easy access to a major city nearby. About two-thirds of "the significant new plants" in the United States are being located in such cities, Conway said.

GOOD TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

Industrial Utopia is located on a major rail line, has feeder airline service connecting conveniently with larger systems, has a hard surface airstrip with lights and radio facilities, and also is on a navigable waterway for inexpensive transportation of bulk materials.

The community also is just off a branch of the new Federal Interstate Highway System.

Industrial Utopia, Conway continued, "has a comprehensive planning and zoning program with adequate facilities and long-range expansion plans for traffic control, parking, schools and hospitals, sewage handling and water supply.

Also, Conway added, "the city fathers have seen to it that there are plenty of good plant sites available at reasonable cost. Good tracts along rail lines and major highways have been reserved by zoning or by direct acquisition."

PRIVATE FINANCING AVAILABLE

Industrial utopia also has alert private groups ready to assist in financing a new plant.

Industrial utopia has a well balanced economy and "is geared to handle industries of the space age. There's a vocational training program for developing new skills. More important," he added, "there's a top flight engineering college nearby."

The ideal community, he continued, has an honest government, an effecitve law enforcement program with a crime rate well below the national average and an efficient fire department.

The community also has a strong chamber of commerce, well financed and well staffed.

IS THERE SUCH A CITY?

An outstanding feature of the ideal community, Conway said, is its wealth of recreational activities—swimming, fishing, hunting, and other sports. In addition several major sports events are held each year.

The community also has good visitor accommodations—a new motel on the outskirts or a new wing on the hotel downtown. The sale of alcoholic beverages is legal but carefully controlled.

The community also shows interests in cultural pursuits, and there are churches for the major faiths. There is an alert newspaper and radio station. Television reception in the area is good.

Is there such a community as Industrial Utopia?

No, Conway admitted. But the important thing, he added, is that "most of the factors which affect a community's desirability for industrial development are controllable—the citizens of an area can do a great deal to make their area more attractive if they set their minds to it."

Invasion of Canal Zone Planned for November 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following two news articles from the Panama American of Wednesday, August 26, 1959, which reports that certain radical elements in the Republic of Panama plan an invasion of the Canal Zone on November 3, 1959:

AQUILINO: "WE'LL MARCH"—SHRUGS OFF FLOOD'S WARNING AGAINST INVASION OF CANAL ZONE

Panama Assemblyman and former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd indicated today he would go ahead with plans to march into the Canal Zone on Panama's Independence Day, November 3, despite U.S. Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD's speech Monday against such a proposal.

Boyd emphasized that there is no desire to provoke hostile or violent demonstrations, "but FLOOD and all America can be sure that on that day Panamanians, with a greater motive than ever, will march peacefully into the Canal Zone as an act of reaffirmation of Panama's sovereignty over isthmian territory."

In his speech before the Patriotic Order of Sons of America at Harrisburg, Pa., FLOOD said Boyd's plans for the proposed "peaceful occupation" of the Canal Zone included a "mass invasion by Panamanian demonstrators" and suggested that the Panama Government take steps to prevent any such revolutionary forays into the Canal Zone.

FLOOD said the demonstrators plan to take up seats on the doorsteps of the Panama

Canal administration building, at the portals of the police stations, at the churches, in the clubhouses, and other places of prominence and described it as conforming to the long-range Communist program of indirect warfare.

Boyd, a leader of the Third Nationalist Party, declared that FLOOD's eccentric pronouncements serve the cause of Panamanian nationalists more appropriately than the reactionary principle which induced him to deliver such an address.

He indicated that FLOOD has again made it evident that the time has come for Panama to take action and stop begging for a better deal from the Government of the United States.

In his address, FLOOD said the proposed march, "if permitted to occur, would be as gross an indignity to our Government and flag as if made against the continental United States; and should be so regarded and treated, for it would greatly impair U.S. prestige throughout the world."

The Congressman claimed that advance world publicity "with agitations in Panama (is) aimed at forcing the Canal Zone sovereignty question into an international court for arbitration, or to the United Nations.

Boyd first suggested a peaceful November 3 march into the Canal Zone to mark the 56th anniversary of Panama's independence from Colombia, some weeks ago during a Spanish-language "Meet the Press" program.

PLANS FOR CANAL ZONE INVASION REAFFIRMED—BOYD SAYS MARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT ON NOVEMBER 3

Former Foreign Minister Aquilino Boyd said yesterday that the proposed peaceful invasion of the Canal Zone as an assertion of Panama's sovereignty over that territory will be carried out November 3.

Boyd issued a press statement in answer to a speech by Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD, who urged the United States to warn against any demonstrations in the Canal Zone.

Boyd, who is one of the leaders of the Nationalist Party, has proposed that Panamanians en masse enter the Canal Zone on November 3, the national independence day, to signify Panama's sovereign rights. Boyd is also one of the proponents of the 50–50 split of the gross earnings of the canal between Panama and the United States.

One of Boyd's close followers, Ernesto Castillero P., has said that on November 3 Panamanians will sit at public places in the Canal Zone.

In his press statement yesterday, Boyd said: "There is no desire to display hostility nor to provoke violent demonstrations in the Canal Zone on November 3, but Representative FLOOD and all America can be sure that we Panamanians on that day, with all the more reason than ever, will go to the Canal Zone, peacefully as a gesture of reaffirmation of Panamanian sovereignty over Isthmian territory."

Boyd referred to FLOOD as "Panama's No. 1 enemy" and said FLOOD's pronouncements help more the cause of Panamanian nationalists than the reactionary purposes which moved him to deliver that speech.

The Poll Tax at Long Last To Get the Ax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, in its issue of September 6, entitled "The Poll Tax at Long Last To Get the Ax." It deals with the substance of the issue, and calls attention to the leadership of our colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], in offering the proposed constitutional amendment.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-Journal, Sept. 6, 1959]

THE POLL TAX AT LONG LAST TO GET THE AX

There are more ways than one to skin a cat, or to accomplish a social reform. The point has been proved again by the long fight to abolish the poll tax as a requirement for voting.

For at least two decades, it has been apparent that a large majority of Americans find this restriction on a basic right distasteful and undemocratic. A product of the late years of the 19th century in the South, the poll tax was designed not only to curb Negro voting, but to deny the ballot to poor whites who had shown a liking for the Populist movement. It has been a handy tool of corruption for political machines in some southern cities. They have made a practice of buying up blocks of poll tax receipts, using them for controlled voters they could herd to the ballot box.

Despite all the sentiment against the poll tax, it has been impossible up to now to uproot it from its last sanctuary in the Deep South. Several Southern States have dropped it voluntarily—Tennessee, North and South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana. It lingers in only five others, Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas, and Virginia. Action by Congress to outlaw the poll tax altogether as a voting restriction in Federal elections has been tried repeatedly. The House of Representatives passed repealers in 1942, 1944, 1946, and 1948. Each time the reform was dashed to pieces on the rocks of a Senate filibuster.

Now at last the issue seems on its way to solution, by means of a constitutional amendment. Moderates proposed this method years ago. It was considered too slow by eager proponents of repeal, and they kept butting their heads against the stone wall of the Deep South resistance.

MUCH SOUTHERN SPONSORSHIP

Even now, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is opposing the amendment method. We believe they are ill advised. The cardinal point is to get rid of a restriction that denies so many people the franchise, and the way now lies open to get a two-thirds majority in the Senate for an amendment to the Constitution. It should be no real problem to follow with ratification by three-fourthes of the State legislatures.

The bill for a constitutional amendment is offered by a respected Southerner, Senator HOLLAND, of Florida. A dozen other southerners are among its 66 cosponsors. Three of them are even from States that still retain the poll tax, JOHNSON and YARBOROUGH of Texas, MCCLELLAN of Arkansas. Lined up with them are many northerns liberals. The new votes from Hawaii and Alaska can be counted on.

The amendment only concerns election to Federal offices. It leaves to the States their right to make such rules as they see fit for election to local and State offices. An amendment to the Constitution is the long way around to reform, but it is the safe and sure way.

Baltimorean Now Heads Catholic War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, commendable it is for a loyal citizen of our country to be singled out for distinction as the head of a nationwide patriotic organization. One of my constituents has just been accorded such a deserved tribute by the Catholic War Veterans of the United States at their organization's 24th annual convention in Pittsburgh. He is Robert T. O'Leary, an attorney of Baltimore City, residing at 3564 Elmora Avenue in the Third Congressional District.

The fact that the purposes and principles of this organization are directed toward the preservation and advancement of our Nation's institutions is worthy of note, and our congratulations go to the guiding head of such an association of proven patriots.

The account of deliberations at the recent convention is set forth in the current issue of the Catholic Review of Baltimore and, under unanimous consent, I include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

BALTIMOREAN NOW HEADS CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS

Robert T. O'Leary, Baltimore attorney, last week was elected national commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States at the organization's 24th annual convention in Pittsburgh.

Mr. O'Leary, who is a veteran of World War II, lives at 3564 Elmora Avenue.

He has been serving as national first vice commander, and is a past national trustee, and past department of Maryland commander. He succeeds Peter J. Hopkins of New York.

Two other Baltimore veterans also won national office. Joseph J. Stumpf was elected national officer of the day, while Henry C. Einolf, past department commander, was appointed adjutant general.

Mrs. Irene Hennigan, Middle River national treasurer and past department auxiliary president, was elected national second vice president. She also received the national president's award.

A resolution deploring the recognition and honor afforded Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev by an official White House invitation to visit the United States was adopted by the 3,000 delegates.

The same resolution urged a campaign of prayer calling upon almighty God to direct and guide the officials of our Government in any relations they may have with the Soviet Premier.

In other actions, the group urged Spain's admission into the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; deplored the exclusion of Nationalist China from the 1960 Olympics; restated its opposition to admission of Red China into the United Nations; recommended ouster of the Hungarian delegation from the United Nations.

It also commended President Eisenhower for his policy on West Berlin; supported the strengthening of internal security laws along lines recommended by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association, and commended Postmaster General Summerfield for his campaign against indecent literature in the mails.

John Albert Johnson, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the death, on September 21, 1909, of John Albert Johnson, newspaper editor, lecturer, and Governor of Minnesota.

Johnson, the son of Swedish immigrants, was born on July 28, 1861, near the frontier village of St. Peter, Minn. The struggles incident to his early life of poverty probably influenced his character and temperament in later life. At the age of 13 he left school to work in a grocery at a wage of $10 a month. During this period of his life he read extensively and practiced oratory and debating in that favorite school of politics, the country store. His early environment gave him a lasting sympathy with the common man, and despite hardships he preserved a sense of humor and buoyancy of spirit which enabled him to struggle on in the face of discouragement.

Subsequently he was a clerk in a drug store and then in a general store in St. Peter. He took an active part in the life of the community as a member of a debating club, fraternal organizations, and the National Guard. He sang in a church choir and was for some years secretary of the Nicollet County fair. In the early eighties he became a registered pharmacist, but his health suffered under the confinement of indoor work, and he became a supply clerk, working for a firm of railway contractors in Iowa and Minnesota.

In February 1887 Johnson became editor and half owner of the St. Peter Herald, and through the newspaper he began to be known beyond the limits of the town. His contact with other newspapermen in the Minnesota Editors' & Publishers' Association, of which he was elected secretary in 1891 and president in 1893, created for him a body of influential friends throughout the State.

Although his district was normally Republican, Johnson was elected to the State senate as a Democrat in 1898. He failed of reelection in 1902 by a narrow margin. In 1904 he was nominated and elected Governor in an extremely bitter campaign. He was given a plurality of 6,000 votes at the same time that Roosevelt carried the State for the Republican national ticket by 146,000, and was reelected by greater margins in 1906 and 1908.

As Governor, he worked harmoniously with Republican legislatures, and through his influence legislation was enacted providing for employers' liability, the abolition of railroad passes, schools for delinquent girls, and a reform of the civil service. In addition, he was instrumental in effecting local and national reforms in insurance laws. His prestige as Governor was not diminished by the quiet, though determined, method employed by him in dealing with the miners' strike of 1908. One of his most notable acts in office was his veto, in 1909, of a tonnage act on iron ore, on the ground that such an act would establish double taxation of a certain class of property, and would work great hardship on one section of the State.

Johnson was a popular Governor. His romantic rise endeared him to the public mind while his simple friendliness completed the conquest. He was dignified without being pompous. During his years as Governor the recognition of his talent as a public speaker was not confined to the people of Minnesota. It was after his speech at the Gridiron Club banquet in Washington, in December 1907, that he was first mentioned as a presidential possibility. In 1908 his name was presented to the Democratic convention by the Minnesota delegation and he received 46 votes. His untimely death, due to appendicitis, in 1909, plunged the State into sorrow and has occasioned much speculation as to whether, had he lived, he might not have won the Democratic nomination which was awarded Woodrow Wilson in 1912.

John Albert Johnson was a giant cut down long before his time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Governor Johnson Honors Set," published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR JOHNSON HONORS SET

(By Fred Neumeier)

Fifty years ago on September 21, 1909, Gov. John A. Johnson, whose national reputation indicated he might some day be called to the presidency of the United States, died.

On Sunday, September 20, St. Peter, his birthplace, will observe that anniversary with a program in front of the court house there where stands a monument in his memory.

He was a Democrat and three successive times he was elevated to the governorship in a State strongly opposed to his political party.

Cyrus Northrop, president of the University of Minnesota, wrote at the time of his death "mourning over his untimely death has hardly been equaled by the mourning of any other citizen except Abraham Lincoln."

Men and women wept in public when his death at Rochester following an operation became known. Fifty thousand persons were said to have been in the sad procession of farewell at the State capitol and their footsteps wore a path in the stone.

On the day of his funeral in St. Peter all business was stayed. In some degree the whole Nation mourned. Warships in New York harbor dropped their flags to half mast. Telegraph wires were crowded and mails congested with expressions of grief. Hundreds of memorial meetings were held.

Newspapers reported that "everywhere it was sadly realized that the Nation had lost a leader of hope and strength."

After the funeral his staff in the Governor's office raised a trust fund for the perpetual care of his grave and, twice a year, on Memorial Day and the anniversary of his death, to place a floral wreath at his monument in St. Peter.

When the memorial services are held Sunday, September 20, civic and political leaders from throughout the State are expected to be present. Governor Freeman will speak. Arrangements are being made by Henry M. Benson, former State senator and attorney general, and Robert Wettergren, both of St. Peter.

Her Four Rockers Prove a Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, during the 8 years I have had the privilege of representing the Third Congressional District of Maine, I have had the distinct pleasure of working with May Craig, a truly distinguished newswoman.

As the very capable correspondent for the Press Herald Publishing Co., of Portland, Maine, May Craig reports the news of interest to Maine citizens. In addition, she writes an excellent column entitled "Inside Washington," which informs Maine readers about interesting individuals and places and also presents her observations relative to domestic and international issues. These observations are drawn from a wealth of personal experiences at home and abroad, including her firsthand observations of the world leaders.

The Evening Star of September 8, 1959, carried a very interesting feature article about this high caliber newswoman, one written by Rose McKee and entitled "Her Four Rockers Prove a Point."

Mrs. McIntire and I have, on more than one occasion, been present in May's home for dinner. May is a most gracious host.

I wish to take this opportunity of inserting the article previously referred to into the RECORD, thereby paying tribute to one I consider to be among the most distinguished newswomen of America:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 8, 1959]

HER FOUR ROCKERS PROVE A POINT

(By Rose McKee)

Washington Newswoman May Craig, whose questions on a television press panel have made her something of a national figure, has a home which her friends say "looks just like May."

Its walls and most of its furnishings are in blue or rose. These are the costume colors for which Mrs. Craig was noted on Capitol Hill long before she became a TV personality. Her home is trim and pretty, with crisp white organdy curtains at the windows and, coupled with all the modern amenities, the suggestion of a Victorian air. Each room has a radio for handy tuning in on the latest news.

Mrs. Craig, a grandmother and mighty proud of it, does not admit to having a living room. "I call this a parlor," she explained as she sat back on a blue sofa in her blue-papered front room. She has four rocking chairs in the parlor.

"My friends laugh at me for having rocking chairs," Mrs. Craig said, "but I notice they all like to sit in the rocking chairs."

Her red brick house, 100 years old, has gone through various modernizations, including some to provide an abundance of storage space. The house is filled with pretty things she has picked up on news-hunting travels around the world.

HER DINNERS

Mrs. Craig is noted for her small, intimate dinner parties at which there is usually a guest of honor who is in the news and some of her news-gathering friends. She never has more than 12 at her dining room table and she prefers 10 but thinks 8 "is best of all."

Conversation at her table is apt to turn into a frank and spirited political discussion, as when she has entertained for presidential aspirants before the party conventions. Everything said is "off the record" but reporters are free to check the next day with the guest of honor for permission to use what they consider news.

Possibly one reason May Craig's dinners are such a success is that she has no worry over menus. She has a basic dinner which she serves at every party. She said, "A dinner, like your house, should be typically yours. People remember it if you have a speciality and look forward to it. If you have a good menu, why change? You can't improve it."

She likes her table to be "white and pretty." She always uses white linen, white flowers in a crystal vase on a mirror, white candles in glass candlesticks and gold-edged white china.

The cooking is done by her prized housekeeper, Louise Jacobs, who has been with her since her children were little and has never had another employer.

Mrs. Craig has her personality stamped even on her manner of serving. Everything is always on plates direct from the kitchen to avoid passing, which she dislikes, and the order never varies.

The first course is a big salad, arranged to make the "plate look pretty." Then comes a plate with half a chicken, two halves of spiced peaches that have been soaked in brandy for 24 hours, and maybe a sprig of parsley or green vegetable for color contrast. There is one definite variation to the course—she serves either cornbread, spoonbread, or biscuits.

DESSERT

Fruit with cordial to pour over it is Mrs. Craig's favorite summer dessert. In winter she serves vanilla ice cream with a topping, usually of chopped preserved fruit, the kind used in making fruitcake. Coffee is served at the table in pretty individual cups gathered from around the world.

Her home is so near Capitol Hill that when her children were young they used the big tree-shaded Capitol ground as their playground.

The house has one room that records May's life and times. This is her office, upstairs off her bedroom. Its walls are papered with pictures of the great and neargreat about whom she has written for her Portland (Maine) papers. Included are presidential press conferences in which she is shown and which go back to one held by then President Herbert Hoover. Among autographed photographs is a full-length of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, taken at the time of F.D.R.'s inaugural. Mrs. Roosevelt has been the honor guest at several May Craig parties.

Harpers Ferry Prepares To Mark Centennial of John Brown's Raid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to point out during prior service in the House and recently in this forum the historical significance and picturesqueness of Harpers Ferry, W. Va., at the junction of the Potomac and Shenandoah Rivers—and only a brief driving time distance from the Nation's Capital.

Reenactment of some of the most eventful of Harpers Ferry's history will take place during a 4-day centennial program there, October 15 through 18, 1959.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two well-written and interesting articles, one by Carl Irving published September 7, 1959, in the Washington Star and the other by Jean White published September 8, 1959, in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 7, 1959]

HARPERS FERRY PREPARES TO MARK CENTENNIAL OF JOHN BROWN'S RAID

(By Carl Irving)

HARPERS FERRY, W. VA., September 7.—On the dark and rainy night of October 16, 1859, a bearded Ohio farmer and 18 men slipped down from the Maryland heights, crossed the Potomac over a covered bridge and captured a national armory.

Before the night was out, John Brown and the town of Harpers Ferry were bound inseparably in a drama which proved a prelude to the Civil War. His plan to arouse and arm the slaves and form a nation was shattered in less than two days.

Now the residents of the old town and the nearby communities are getting together a centennial observance (not a celebration, they make clear) about the raid, trial and hanging, which were to stir debates that still go on.

The 4-day centennial program, October 15 to 18, will include tours of the restored sections of the town, exhibits of a century ago and a drama, "The Prophet," relating the Brown story.

VIVID LEGEND

The raid is a vivid legend to the old timers who live among the stone houses that perch almost precariously on the slopes of the steeply rising town at the junction of the Shenandoah and Potomac Rivers.

William V. Marmion recalls that his father was a youth at the time of the raid. His grandfather, a physician, tended to some of the wounded who were struck by bullets from Brown's raiders.

"My father (later Assist. Surg. William V. Marmion of the U.S. Navy) often told how he and his brothers went hunting with Brown's men over by their farm in Maryland. Brown called my father Willy and took quite a fancy to him."

Willy and his brothers noticed lots of weapons being stored at the farm, but Brown had told them "he just made a hobby of it," Mr. Marmion, a retired Washington attorney, recalled.

TOWN RESTORED

John Brown would probably recognize Harpers Ferry today. The Park Service is trying to restore parts of the town to the way it looked during its great moment in history.

A careful collection and study of maps and photographs, diaries, letters and newspapers have helped historians get a clear view of Harpers Ferry in 1859.

Several buildings constructed later have been torn down. Others that were there when Brown arrived have been repaired and cleaned up. The block where most of the fighting took place is lined now with empty white stone buildings, their patched windows displaying some of the relics of the period.

Archeologists have dug through layers of flood silt, shattered stone, rusted metal, fragments of wood and brick to expose the foundations of the old arsenal which Brown's men occupied. They are now digging for the remains of the once-famous rifle works now covered by swampy silt, trees and damp shrubbery.

BROWN'S CAPTURE

Brown and the surviving raiders were eventually surrounded and captured in a firehouse at the armory, then across the street from the arsenal. It now stands on the highest point of the town, the abandoned Storer College campus.

Marines, dressed in the uniforms the corps wore then and 2 years later at the first battle of Bull Run, will reenact the storming of the firehouse on October 17.

The old paymaster's office where the wounded Brown was held overnight has been restored and is the headquarters for the Park Service, which designated Harpers Ferry a national monument in 1955.

The jail in neighboring Charles Town, where Brown was taken, has disappeared. But the courtroom in the 123-year-old courthouse is still in use, with the same long, oak benches that were jammed during the week-long trial. The records in the clerk's office next door list the conviction of Brown for treason against Virginia, conspiracy to incite the slaves, and murder. One faded paper carefully notes that Brown was hanged between 11 and 12 o'clock, December 2, 1859.

GALLOWS MARKER

A small stone marker at the corner of a house a mile from the courthouse shows where Brown was hanged.

The centennial play was written by a Texan, Edwin W. Dace, who teaches drama at Sweet Briar College, Virginia. The only nonresident in the cast is Timothy Rice, a drama student at American University in Washington.

"We needed a tall man with a tremendous speaking voice, for without a strong John Brown the play would have fallen to pieces," explained the centennial chairman, Mrs. Cyrus Cavalier.

Mr. Rice, 21, is president of the University Players and won the best actor award 2 years ago at American University. Mrs. Cavalier will direct the cast of 50 and Dr. J. H. Yokum, theater director at American University, will handle the lighting and design the set.

ANTIQUE SHOWS

The residents, who will be attired in costumes of the 1850's, will conduct antique shows and sales and motorcades through neighboring towns.

Mrs. Cavalier pointed out that many residents were only lukewarm about any kind of a program. Brown's raiders killed several Harpers Ferry residents, including the popular mayor, Fontaine Beckham.

The residents decided, for that reason, to tone down the ending of the play, she said. Omitted was Brown's last message, which he had scrawled on a scrap of paper and handed to a bystander as he was led to the scaffold. It said:

"I, John Brown, am now quite certain that the crimes of this guilty land will never be purged away but with blood. I had, as I now think, vainly flattered myself that without very much bloodshed it might be done."

COMMANDER'S PROCLAMATION

Instead, the play will close with the proclamation of a Virginia militia commander:

"So perish all such enemies of Virginia. All such enemies of the Union. All such foes of the human race."

"Then," said Mrs. Cavalier, "there will be the song 'John Brown's Body' and everyone in the audience can decide what to think for

himself. We didn't want the play to end with a sermon by John Brown."

Some of the lighter moments of the centennial will include the judging of costumes and best beards, grown by residents during the summer. There will be concerts by the Charles Town and Harpers Ferry High School Bands.

The Sharpsburg Rifles, a group of men dressed in Union uniforms of the Civil War period from Sharpsburg, Md., will conduct a drill. Similar units in Confederate uniforms are expected to appear during the centennial.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Sept. 8, 1959]

JOHN BROWN'S RAIDERS TO RIDE AGAIN IN HARPERS FERRY CENTENNIAL PAGEANT

(By Jean White)

If John Brown's body lies a moldering in the grave, his legend still goes marching on at Harpers Ferry, W. Va.

Pageantry, drama, ceremony, and sham battles will be featured when Harpers Ferry stages the centennial of John Brown's famous raid October 15–18. The citizens will toss a big affair for the strange, fiery-eyed outsider who came out of the hills to put the little town on the historical map and make it celebrated in song and poetry.

The centennial of John Brown's raid will be the opening curtain on a growing series of reenactments and celebrations coming up in the century after the Civil War.

On a rainy Sunday night, the 16th of October 1859, Brown led 18 raiders down from a farm hideout to seize the government arsenal and armory at Harpers Ferry. The sheer madness of the raid has made it a fascinating fillip to history ever since. For 2 days, Brown and his little band of fellow fanatics held the arsenal, expecting slaves to rise up to support their abolitionist cause.

RAIDERS BOTTLED UP

Townsmen and militia bottled up the raiders until Col. Robert E. Lee and Lt. J. E. B. Stuart—to be heard from again later—arrived from Washington to take command of the forces, including a detachment of marines. Brown and six other survivors were captured in an old enginehouse and later hanged.

The big centennial show this fall will include the world premier of "The Prophet," a three-act historical drama. Timothy Rice, an American University drama student, will resurrect John Brown and take him to the gallows. There will also be a sham battle between Union and Confederate units and a reenactment of the storming of the enginehouse—with the marines called in again to supply officers.

When Brown swooped down on Harpers Ferry in 1859, the attention of the Nation centered on the quiet, thriving town of 3,000. This fall the centennial planners hope again to focus attention—and tourists—on the town, now down to fewer than 700 residents.

ARSENAL NEVER REBUILT

After the war, the arsenal later burned to the ground, was never rebuilt. Floods periodically ravaged the town, and after the great one of 1936 the lower downtown section of Harpers Ferry was abandoned and became a ghost town of tattered posters and dark windows.

But the trains of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, which carried the word of John Brown's raid to the outside world, still rumble pass the town, linking the past and present. And the National Park Service now has taken over some 515 acres for the Harpers Ferry National Monument.

Just last month, an archeologist working for the National Park Service dug up the used and twisted remains of 15,000 guns stored in the arsenal—dramatic evidence of the violent events that followed less than 2 years after John Brown's raid. By then, the Nation was at civil war, and Union troops soon were to march to the words:

"John Brown's body lies a-moldering in the grave,
His soul goes marching on."

On April 18, 1861, a small band of Federal troops at Harpers Ferry sprinkled gunpowder over the cache of guns in the arsenal and burned them to keep them out of Confederate hands. Later the Confederates destroyed the gunmaking armories as the little town changed hands some half dozen times during the war.

These days will come back to life during the big centennial.

Helen Mozelle Cavalier has arranged a 4-day schedule to cover the events from the day of final preparation for the raid to the time Brown was captured and removed to the county jail at Charles Town to await trial.

There will be four performances of "The Prophet," a style show with some authentic costumes still in possession of Harpers Ferry residents, a beard-growing contest, a sham battle between the Sharpsburg Rifles and the Big Pool Confederate Unit, and a restaging of the Marine attack on John Brown's fort.

The fort—a white-cupolaed enginehouse—now rests on the campus of Storer College. It was dismantled in 1892 for the Columbian World Exposition in Chicago and then reassembled on the college campus. The National Park Service hopes some day to put it back on the original site—now marked only by a rectangle of stones.

National Park Service has set up self-guided walking tours about Harpers Ferry for visitors, and a museum.

The centennial committee has arranged special excursion trips from Washington and Silver Spring to Harpers Ferry on the centennial days. If all goes well, the citizens hope to make an annual affair of John Brown's raid.

Election Day Holiday Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that our colleague from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS] has introduced legislation calling for a new legal public holiday every 2 years to be known as Election Day.

The purpose, of course, would be to overcome the comparatively low turnout of voters in national elections.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article on this subject which appeared recently in the Sylacauga (Ala.) Advance; and also an editorial which appeared recently in the Anniston (Ala.) Star.

The article and editorial referred to follow:

[From the Sylacauga (Ala.) Advance]

FOR GENERAL ELECTIONS, ROBERTS' BILL WOULD MAKE VOTING DAY U.S. HOLIDAY

WASHINGTON.—Would more Americans vote if election day was a national holiday?

Representative KENNETH ROBERTS, Democrat, of Alabama, thinks so. He is sponsoring a bill that would create a new legal public holiday on the present general election day in all the States except Maine: The first Tuesday after the first Monday of November in each even-numbered year.

"In this country," he said in an interview, "we make it difficult for many of our people to get to the polls, and yet we deplore the fact that more of them don't turn out. In the 1958 general elections, for instance, only 60 percent of the registered voters in the United States cast their ballots.

"We note with envey that 90 percent of the registered voters in Finland go to the polls, a record of 97.9 percent have turned out in Austria, 83 to 85 percent in France and in Germany, over 82 percent in Sweden, 77 percent in the United Kingdom and so on.

"But it is seldom explained that these other countries generally hold national elections on a holiday or on a nonworking day."

A few foreign countries, he said, hold elections on Sunday, and on occasion this has been proposed in the United States.

How does ROBERTS feel about that?

"I do not believe the God-fearing American people want Sunday elections," said ROBERTS, who comes from what the late Henry L. Mencken called the Bible Belt.

"Many religious people might think Sunday voting was in conflict with the words of the Book of Exodus: 'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.'"

The other day ROBERTS told a House Judiciary Subcommittee that a lot of potential voters are discouraged by the fact that our general elections come on a regular working day.

"That means for most," he said, "that they must ask special permission from a supervisor to get off and vote. Or that they must wait until after working hours—when the polls are crowded and they are tired."

"It's all very well to spout high-flung phrases about the citizen's duty to vote, and to say that all of us ought to be willing to go to a bit of extra trouble to cast our ballots. But the fact remains that we ought to make it easier for those who like to vote to do so."

ROBERTS thinks that, if Independence Day is important enough to justify a July 4 holiday every year, then surely the day on which millions of voters have a chance to demonstrate their personal independence through the ballot is worth a holiday every other year.

It is doubtful that the subcommittee can act on ROBERT'S proposal this year, since all major departments of Government will be asked for comment on a plan that would mean an additional day off for Federal employees. But the Alabamian is serious about this, and he hopes all concerned will take it seriously, too.

[From the Anniston (Ala.) Star]

ROBERTS SCORES ONCE MORE

The proposal in the House of Representatives by KENNETH ROBERTS, our excellent Representative from this district, has received national attention again by his proposal that general elections in this country be declared national holidays.

The objective in this instance is to get a much larger number of American citizens to go to the polls and to exercise their franchise in behalf of men and measures of their choice.

Old World countries vote on Sunday, but that would not be tolerated in this country.

Nevertheless, it is next to a national disgrace that so many of our citizens fail to vote, as we are far below other civilized nations of the world in that respect. A national holiday for better elections may be the answer to better citizenship, as Mr. ROBERTS believes.

In Praise of Maine and Its Lady Senator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which appeared in the Portland Press Herald on August 13, 1959, entitled "In Praise of Maine and Its Lady Senator."

While the letter pays tribute to Maine, its emphasis is upon the work and achievements of our distinguished colleague, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, the senior Senator from Maine. As the letter points out so well, Senator SMITH is a great Member of the body, and faithful and effective in her work in the Senate, and to the interests of Maine. The letter also calls to mind the human qualities of interest in the problems of the people she represents, both in Maine and the Nation.

All of us who serve with her recognize her effective and distinguished service, which has been confirmed time and time again by the support of the people of Maine.

I would like to note also that Mrs. Bessie S. Cheatham, the author of the letter, visits the Senate almost every day, and with intelligence and good judgment, is a very discerning observer of the work of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, Aug. 13, 1959]

IN PRAISE OF MAINE AND ITS LADY SENATOR

(Editor of the Press Herald)

Here's to Maine—the only State from Maine to Hawaii that has a lady Senator. How the hearts of the women must swell with pride whenever they name her—MARGARET CHASE SMITH. She is always there, at the Senate's beck and call. She takes no trips while the Senate is in session. She travels in the fall, when the Senate has adjourned and the Senators go to their homes to learn first hand what their constituents want and desire.

I have seen her on the floor, I have heard her speak, I've watched her vote, I've seen her in committee meetings, I've listened to her questions, when she was securing information. She is helpful to constituents when they come to Washington. She delights the groups of high school boys and girls when they come from Wiscasset, Caribou, Lisbon Falls, etc. They think they have seen the best of the Senate when they have seen and talked with her. They speak of her as "Our Representative from Maine." And they are happy when they have met her.

She is most careful in how she votes, so she will be sure to vote right, and as her good judgment tells her. She holds the record as to the number of her votes. She has not missed a recorded vote in 637 times.

If you don't have enough Republicans to reelect her, or enough Democrats to reelect her, then pool your forces and your resources, and reelect Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, either to the Senate, or to the vice-presidency.

Mrs. BESSIE S. CHEATHAM.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Sad Plight of the Migratory Worker Demands Immediate Congressional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the fall harvest is at hand, and nearly a half million migratory farm workers will begin their trek across the Nation. In the orchards and fields these workers will gather up nature's yield of a bountiful year.

It is truly a shame that these nomadic toilers are not provided with decent housing, wages, and transportation. In some sections of the country they work under considerably better conditions than in others and the wages are more adequate depending upon the location and type of harvest but certainly it cannot be denied that legislation is sorely needed to establish better minimum standards for these people who are frequently overcrowded in totally inadequate housing facilities with lack of beds and bedding and substandard sanitation facilities.

According to the report of the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, some of these workers are required to sleep in the open, completely exposed to the elements. It is an undeniable fact that these workers are often packed into trucks by the hundreds like sardines for long trips from one area to another.

Tomorrow the Labor Department will conduct hearings which offers some ray of hope for improvement of these conditions and minimum standards for migratory workers.

While these folks choose this type of work and even the way of life it has traditionally required, the fact remains that without them, millions of dollars' worth of fruits and other crops would literally rot on the vine if they did not take to the open country each year.

Among the proposed regulations which will undoubtedly stem from the hearings along with the revelations of the President's Commission report will be: A regulation to provide through State public employment offices, adequate and sanitary housing before such agency will fill any request for workers. This, of course, would mean guarantees conforming to applicable housing and sanitary codes.

The State agencies will probably be required to make sure that pay offered will equal the prevailing rate in the area for similar jobs.

The prospective employer will probably be required to guarantee better transportation than is now provided.

Charging an invasion of States rights some farm State legislators challenge the authority of the Labor Department to implement such regulations. There may be a legal basis for their position. On the other hand, the Justice Department upholds the legality of the Federal Government to legislate standards of this nature. This might or might not be challenged where migratory workers would operate within a State and would not cross State lines in the course of their employment.

Regardless, this is a problem which the legislators can no longer ignore, and legislation at some level should and must be enacted to meet it squarely during the 86th Congress.

In the Law's Finest Tradition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, a few days ago the St. Louis Post-Dispatch published an editorial, "In the Law's Finest Tradition." The editorial concerns the award of the American Bar Association's highest honor to Grenville Clark, who has been a member of the bar more than 50 years. The editorial also makes mention of the fine work of Joseph Harrison, of Newark, N.J., who in 1958–59 was chairman of the American Bar Association Committee on Constitutional Rights, originally proposed by Mr. Clark. Under Mr. Harrison, the committee has carried on its work, in the words of the editorial, "in the spirit and tradition of Grenville Clark."

I ask unanimous consent to insert the full text of the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE LAW'S FINEST TRADITION

It is not easy to convey the deep significance of the award of the American Bar Association's highest honor—its gold medal "for outstanding service to the legal profession"—to Grenville Clark, of Dublin, N.H., who became a member of the New York bar more than 50 years ago. For while Mr. Clark's long and distinguished career is an exemplification of the finest traditions of the law, his conviction that a lawyer must be devoted to the practical application of the Bill of Rights has involved him in controversial issues over which his colleagues have split far apart.

On Grenville Clark's Army services in World Wars I and II, in which he was the far-seeing initiator of vital troop training programs, there can be only complete agreement. He helped notably in the winning of both wars and the Distinguished Service Medal which he received was a patriotic recognition fully earned. But when he reminded the American Bar Association in the 1930's that it is "the duty of true conservatives to support the Bill of Rights regardless of the unpopularity of the citizens whose rights might be in jeopardy," he opened up a debate that was still being heard last week on the floor of the American Bar Association's house of delegates at the 1959 convention in Miami Beach.

Grenville Clark's original proposal to the American Bar Association on constitutional rights led to the establishment of the bar's standing committee on the Bill of Rights of which Mr. Clark himself was the pioneering first chairman, 1938–40. Under his leadership the Bill of Rights committee entered aggressively into ugly situations which

needed its attention. For example, it went so far as to file a memorable brief in support of the rights of the Jehovah's Witnesses family in the first compulsory flag salute case, *Minersville (Pa.) School District* v. *Gobitis*, which, after a first defeat, triumphed in the Supreme Court.

Since those early days this important committee has had an uneven record depending on its membership, but the 1958–59 chairman, Joseph Harrison of Newark, N.J., saw to it that its work was in the spirit and tradition of Grenville Clark. When Mr. Harrison presented the committee's detailed 6-to-1 report with the conclusions that the recent Supreme Court decisions had not harmed national security, this set off one of the sharpest debates in the American Bar Association's house of delegates in many years. Past Presidents Loyd Wright of Los Angeles and Frank E. Holman of Seattle attempted to table the findings. Past President David F. Maxwell of Philadelphia and Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, supported by President Ross L. Malone of Roswell, N. Mex., led the fight, not as supporters of the report, but in the belief that it should be received for attention and study, without formal approval or disapproval.

In the end the open-minded, forward-looking leadership won out and the report was not tabled or suppressed but accepted in accordance with practice. It was just such a battle as Grenville Clark carried through to success more than 20 years ago, for the fight for liberty is continuous and never ending. Many important subjects were taken up at the American Bar Association's 1959 convention, some of them in the presence of leaders of the British and Canadian bench and bar, as well as before Justices Brennan, Clark and Stewart of the U.S. Supreme Court and other legal and judicial leaders. But none is more urgent than the responsibility of the individual lawyer, whoever he is and wherever he may be, to stand up in his own life and work for civil liberties at home and for peace in the world through reliance on the rule of law between nations.

The Time To Act Is Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in today's RECORD, I included an article from the Indianapolis Star. Herewith is an editorial relating to the same matter—that is, the Communist menace in Latin America:

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, has called for a congressional investigation of the dangerous attempts by the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America to obtain secret industrial information from Latin American power companies—information that could lead to massive industrial sabotage. This attempt is especially dangerous when it is known that the head of the ECLA energy development and hydraulic resources program is hardly a reliable character. The U.S. Attorney General once demanded that the State Department have his U.N. credentials taken from him because of his constant association with Communists and fellow travelers.

Certainly Congress should investigate as much as it can. It should also demand that the State Department do everything possible to prevent this secret defense information from falling into the hands of the U.N. Commission. Possession of such information by any enemy would be a direct danger to the security of the United States. With it in his possession the enemy could paralyze the whole of Latin America in a single coordinated act of sabotage. Without electric power Latin America would be as fully knocked out as if it were hit by 100 atomic bombs.

Investigation into the whole direction of these U.N. economic agencies, staffed as they are with Socialist and Communist experts, is certainly in order. If the activities of these U.N. agencies are threatening the economic and military security of the United States it is time to stop them in their tracks.

The United States pays one-third of the entire U.N. budget. We are the host nation. That surely gives us the right to demand that our interests be protected from sabotage and economic infiltration. It is the duty of the State Department, as it would be the duty of the armed services, to act swiftly to prevent this developing economic and military danger to the United States of America.

The Texas Commission for the Blind Enables Sightless Citizens To Help Themselves and Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although he can no longer see, a blind person has a great many other talents which can be utilized. The Texas Commission for the Blind is helping many sightless people. By learning to utilize his other talents, the blind person receives the invaluable ingredient of self-respect so necessary to a complete life. And society receives another contributing citizen.

A great deal more needs to be done in helping blind persons to complete rehabilitation, but steps are being taken in the right direction.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Vernon Fewell from the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle for Sunday, September 6, 1959, entitled "Offers Security—Plan Uses Talents of State's Sightless."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFERS SECURITY—PLAN USES TALENTS OF STATE'S SIGHTLESS

(By Vernon Fewell)

In the black frustration of blindness there is no greater gift than certainty—a strong, sure sense of security in a world of sound and touch.

It was to offer the sightless a secure grip on life that 17 years ago Texas entered into a program to make businessmen of blind men. The investment was well rewarded.

Last year the operators of 120 blind stands in Texas did a gross business of $1,650,000 and collected a net profit of $305,061. This is an average of $250 per month profit per stand.

All of it was done under the business enterprise program of the Texas Commission for the Blind, a program dedicated to putting to use the ample but undirected talents of the sightless.

Fifteen such blind-operated notions and snack bars dot the Houston-Pasadena-Rosenberg area, a dozen of them in Houston.

They are found in public buildings, such as the downtown postoffice or the Veterans' Administration Building and in many private industries where they compete on equal terms with caterers and other concessionaires.

Houston's 12 stands recorded a healthy profit in the fiscal year which ended June 30, averaging a net of $470 a month each. Their gross was $265,000 with a total net profit of $57,000.

One operator, using three full-time employees, chalked up a net of nearly $950 a month on a volume of $9,000.

Such statistics convinced the legislature this year to authorize the opening of 10 more stands in Texas—3 of them in Houston. They are now in the process of location.

Under the law, the legislature appropriates a reserve of funds on which the commission may draw to establish new stands. Initial cost of stock and equipment runs about $3,000.

When a blind person is assigned to a stand under the vocational rehabilitation program he retains all the profits of the operation. The State holds title to all the equipment and charges a small fee for maintenance, depending on the volume of business.

Operators are selected in a careful process of counseling and examination to determine eligibility and aptitudes. A person must be 80 percent sightless to qualify for the State aid, and then must go through a 3-month training period if selected.

Supervising the blind stand program in Houston and southeast Texas is the job of George Broyles of the Commission's District Six office in the M. & M. building.

Keeping an eye on some 20 of the independent agents means maintaining a constant liaison service between them and Austin.

It also means lending a hand with their problems—the purchase of new equipment reordering stock, bookkeeping, or what have you. But the business is a different story. It's all in their hands.

Biggest problem, says Broyles, is opening up new stands.

Once it was thought that public buildings were the best locations. Now locations in private industry have been found to be more desirable and more profitable as well.

Free World Is Facing Danger Grave and Urgent in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there is a small section of earth where today forces of evil are violently simmering under the cunning stirring

of the Communists. These evil forces are being directed against Laos, a tiny country which is a vital part of the free world in southeast Asia.

Some writers have been decrying "waste and corruption" in this country, basing their "facts" on hasty visits with a few malcontents, or else "warming over" old scandals at this critical period in Laos' life.

I think Americans deserve better information about Laos and the terrific part it may play in shaping the military lives of American citizens. We have gained prestige and confidence of southeast Asians. Everything we have gained, however, can be quickly lost if we pay heed to misinformation and slanted articles. On the other hand, there are at least two outstanding writers who know at firsthand whereof they speak, and who have the rare capability of fully and fairly evaluating the facts. One of these gentlemen is Ernest K. Lindley of Newsweek. Another is Joseph Alsop, New York Herald Tribune columnist. Mr. Alsop, in his syndicated column Matter of Fact declares "Danger Grave and Urgent" exists. His article follows:

VIENTIANE, LAOS.—The danger created by the renewed Communist aggression against Laos is certainly grave and may be very urgent too.

This renewed aggression took the form of an invasion of Laos by not more than 2,500 troops from Communist North Vietnam. In a normal country it would be outrageous but hardly dangerous. Laos, however, is far from being a normal country.

Laos' small army of 25,000 men, almost devoid of heavy weapons of any sort, with no reliable or rapid communications system, is not a normal national army, even although it is generally a tough and courageous army. Laos' terrain, mountainous, jungle-clad, and almost wholly without roads, is not a normal national landscape. Laos' population, almost 50 percent composed of tribal peoples doubtfully attached to Laos, is not a normal national population.

All of these abnormalities are very heavy initial handicaps in a war like this strange war in Laos—a war against local Communist dissidents fighting in the jungle as guerrilla units, with the strong support of invading Communist units from North Vietnam. The first important thing to note about this war is that the invasion from North Vietnam is the key fact. Until the first border crossings occurred on July 15, the Laos Government and Army were making good progress in unifying the country and liquidating all Communist influence.

The first border crossings in July had immediate effects. They created an acute military problem in the two northern provinces, Phong Saly and Sam Neua. The first effect, therefore, was to drive the Lao Army to strip all the other provinces, in order to reinforce the two invaded provinces.

Meanwhile, of course, the remaining Communist undergrounds in the rest of the country went over into open rebellion as guerillas. The second effect of the invasion in the North was to leave the Lao Army with insufficient resources in the rest of the country to stamp out the suddenly created centers of guerilla activity. Thus something like six important areas of Communist guerrilla power came into being, including an important area in Luang Prabang province, on the approaches to the royal capital.

The first invasion might have done the job, in fact, if the Lao Government had not intercepted a general order from the Communist executive committee for Laos, signed by the military member, Col. Sing Papo. This order, intercepted in May, gave the detailed program of the present aggression. As a result the government moved preventatively.

One of the two Communist battalions in the Lao Army, left over from Lao neutralist period, was quickly disarmed. (The other, unfortunately, escaped to play a big role in the present fighting.) The provincial undergrounds were also greatly weakened by preventive arrests and executions of the better known terrorists.

Quite largely for this reason, the initial aggression on July 15 did not produce the expected results. The northern provinces did not immediately fall to the invaders. Phong Saly, in fact, had been just about cleaned up again when the renewed invasion occurred. The guerillas in the other provinces, although they could not be stamped out, also failed to spread their influence and cause general panic. Just before getting the news of the second invasion of Laos, the commander of the Lao Army, the tough and brave Gen. Ouane Rathikoune, told me:

"The army is stretched to the utmost, but I am sure we can win this war if no more units come in from North Vietnam. Everything depends on that."

When the general said this, the second invasion of Laos had already occurred, although his lack of communications had kept the grim news from him. With the Lao Army already "stretched to the utmost," the design of the second invasion is obviously to stretch the limited military resources of Laos beyond the snapping point. It is easy to see, moreover, how this design can succeed.

Twenty-five hundred men with heavy weapons may not seem like a great many men. But this small number is a serious threat to the government's limited local forces with few heavy weapons and sharply restricted possibilities of reinforcement. Thus the invaders may perhaps take Sam Neua Province at least, for example. If Sam Neua falls, the effect all over the country will be terrible and instantaneous. Fence sitters will flock to the guerilla centers. As another example, the guerilla forces in neighboring Luang Prabang Province, strengthened by new recruits, now having Sam Neua as a rear base area, may perhaps gain enough power to threaten the King's city of Luang Prabang.

In short, this can be a very bad business indeed. Although the new invasion of Laos has taken place in remote mountains and all but impenetrable jungles, it is still aggression, as naked, as flagrant as a Soviet-East German attack on Western Germany.

Bushel and a Peck and Our System's a Wreck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently I introduced legislation to direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a study to determine the practicability and desirability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

My proposal is contained in S. 2420. The bill authorizes a 3-year study to determine the benefits and practical difficulties involved in switching to the metric system.

Since my submission of this measure, there have come to my attention several items bearing on the question with which S. 2420 is concerned. I would like to bring them to the attention of the Senate.

First. Dael Wolfle, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, has forwarded to me a carbon copy of his letter of September 2, 1959, to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce discussing the association's activities with regard to the metric system and urging serious consideration of S. 2420.

Second. In the August 30, 1959, issue of the Oregon Journal, of Portland, Oreg., there appeared an excellent editorial, entiled "Foreign Markets and the Metric System," pointing out the implications of our system of weights and measures in international trade and noting possible business losses this country may suffer in competition with other nations due to our peculiar measuring methods.

Third. In the August 2, 1959, edition of the Journal there was published an amusing and informative article regarding the metric system entitled "Bushel and a Peck and Our System's a Wreck."

I ask unanimous consent that these three items be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE,
Washington, D.C., September 2, 1959.

Mr. EDWARD JARRETT,
Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JARRETT: I am writing to furnish in a little more detail the information I gave you last week by telephone concerning the interest of the American and British scientific community in studies of the feasibility and possible desirability of the adoption of the metric system.

The question has long been of interest to scientists, for metric units are in most cases easier to use than English units, and are much more frequently used in scientific work. Two years ago the British Association for the Advancement of Science, stimulated by European Common Market thinking, appointed a committee to carry out a rather extensive study of the problems, the costs, and the possible advantages of the conversion of British industry to metric units and of the simultaneous decimalization of British currency. The committee has had the cooperation of British industry, and is now in the process of preparing a report that, I anticipate, will give considerable detail concerning the problems and costs of conversion in various segments of British industry. The British committee has been under the chairmanship of Sir Hugh Beaver of the Guinness Co. and has had as its vice chairman and active leader, Mr. A. H. Hughes of the same company.

The report of the British association committee will probably be a joint publication of the British Association for the Advancement of Science and the British Chamber of Commerce. I hope that it will become available sometime during the winter.

To work in parallel with the British committee, this association appointed a similar committee at the end of 1957. Its chairman is Mr. Wilmer Souder, formerly head of the Metrology Branch of the National Bureau of Standards. Other members are: John

T. Johnson, president of the Metric Association in Claremont, Calif.; Robert J. Painter of the American Society for Testing Materials in Philadelphia; William G. Pollard of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies; Henry D. Sharpe, Jr., president of Brown & Sharpe Manufacturing Co. in Providence; and C. A. Whitten of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

At our annual meeting in Washington, D.C., last December, one major part of the program consisted of a symposium on national and international aspects of systems of units in science and technology. The papers for that symposium were prepared by men representing a number of different points of view, different countries, and different types of use of various systems of measurement. At our annual meeting this year (in Chicago, December 26 to 31) we are scheduling a further symposium on problems of measurement.

When the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce comes to consider Senator NEUBERGER's bill, S. 2420, if it appears that any of the work or thinking of the committee or the papers of the symposia would be of assistance, we would be glad to supply you with any help we can.

The basic problem is one that cannot be easily solved, for, on the one hand, there are some aspects in which the metric system simply without question is superior to the system of units we now use; it is easier to use and easier to learn. On the other hand, as a nation we have built up a huge investment (from milk bottles to machine tools) in English units. How much short-term cost is justified to achieve the long-term benefits of conversion from English to metric units is a nice problem for study. I am glad that S. 2420 has been introduced, and hope that the committee will give it serious consideration.

Sincerely,

DAEL WOLFLE,
Executive Officer.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., Aug. 30, 1959]

FOREIGN MARKETS AND THE METRIC SYSTEM

We are still chuckling over a well-written feature story in a recent issue of the Journal reciting the handicap under which United States industry operates with our present standards of weights and measures. A clever headwriter headlined the article: "Bushel and a Peck and Our System's a Wreck."

Dr. Edward Teller, father of the hydrogen bomb and University of California physicist, insists that failure of the United States to adopt the metric system can cost us dearly in foreign markets where we must compete with nations selling machinery and goods under that intelligent use of weights and measures.

Teller said: "If a foreign custom has a chance of buying a piece of machinery which he knows, and for which he understands how to replace a screw and how to measure that screw without the introduction of a whole new branch of learning, he will buy that simpler machinery."

Of course, one country does not give us any competition in the bushel-and-peck, inch-and-yard race. That is Great Britain, where we learned the awkward standards under which we jointly operate. Russia, Germany, France, Scandinavia, Japan, and India have adopted the metric system through the years. Russia made this step only in 1927, joining most of the rest of the world except the United States and Britain. Britain has the additional handicap of the pound, shilling, and penny money system, likely the clumsiest numerical system since the Romans employed the hard-to-do "letter" method. Most Britons in private conversation will admit their system is virtually incomprehensible to a foreigner and calls for intensive local schooling in multiplication and division, particularly.

When our Founding Fathers set up the decimal system for our money, it is most regrettable that they did not adopt the metric system introduced by France early in the 18th century.

So we cripple along with the inch and 12 of them to the foot, 16½ feet to the rod, and 5,280 feet to the mile, mostly divisible by nothing; 16 ounces to the pound, 4 pecks to the bushel; 16 ounces of liquid to the normal pound, while the nations with the metric system are working with meters and kilometers for distance, grams as the unit of mass or weight, and the liter as the unit of volume. Fractions are simple and multiplications easy to do.

Proof is given of Teller's assertions when one realizes that many scientific processes in the United States have had to adopt the metric system because of its value and convenience.

The United States has been so long a practitioner of the bushel-and-peck, inch-and-yard, ounce-and-pound school of standards it would take a convulsion of nature to turn us to the commonsense metric system. But we ought to do it for our own convenience, if not to keep from being shut out of world markets.

[From the Oregon Journal, Portland, Oreg., Aug. 2, 1959]

BUSHEL AND A PECK AND OUR SYSTEM'S A WRECK

The U.S.'s standards of weights and measures threatens this Nation's position in world economy, believes Dr. Edward Teller, University of California physicist and father of the hydrogen bomb.

In advocating U.S.'s adoption of the metric system used by much of the world, Teller told a Marquette University audience in Milwaukee recently:

"If we do not change, we shall lose in the economic competition with Russia. If a country has a chance of buying a piece of machinery, which he knows, and which he understands how to replace a screw and how to measure that screw without the introduction of a whole new branch of learning, he will buy that simpler machinery."

"In 1927," Teller said, "the Russians did away with whatever rudimentary words and other absurd units they had and they, like most of the rest of the world, are now on the metric system. Also relatively recently, the Hindus and the Japanese have adopted the metric system.

"But there are still some wild Anglo-Saxon tribes which cherish their traditions above everything else. Let me mention to you a few of these * * *."

"The yard: It is said that King Henry I established the yard by measuring the distance between the tip of his finger and the tip of his nose. It is indubitably true because it is found in the 17th pronouncement of King Edward II that an inch is three, dry, round barley corns laid end to end.

"The mile: You all know that the mile comes from the Latin 'mille' or thousand, for the thousand double steps of the Roman soldier. The French, who since that time have improved their ways, have a more civilian and more civil measure of great lengths; and that was the 'pip'—the distance you can walk while smoking your pipe.

"Temperature scale: (This) comes from a very erudite German by the name of Fahrenheit, who lived in Danzig. * * * Mr. Fahrenheit waited in Danzig until it had got as cold as it would get. Then on the day that was absolutely the coldest possible, he stuck his thermometer out the window, and that was zero. Then he put it under his arm and he seemed to have slightly elevated temperature, and that became 100."

The metric system of measurement uses the meter as its unit of length, the gram as the unit of mass or weight and the liter as the unit of volume.

The Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in voting against the Landrum-Griffin so-called labor reform bill and the 90 percent Landrum-Griffin conference agreement, I voted to prevent retrogressive developments in the trade union movement which are certain to cause more far-reaching adverse results to the American economy and democracy, itself, than have been disclosed by the McClellan committee, in its many months of antiracketeering investigations.

It seems to me almost inevitable under the provisions of this law, that the clean, legitimate small unions of this Nation will have no future because of the roadblocks against their growth and expansion, written into this law. Expensive legal and accounting requirements will force these unions to merge or to become absorbed by the powerful and big international organizations.

It also seems inevitable that the dedicated, honest leaders of small unions will be forced out of office by the persecution and prosecution with criminal sanctions which are certain to stem from planned incidents in union meetings by stooges of management, drunks, and agitators, including Communists; such a vacuum in leadership will be filled by racketeers and hoodlums, the very same type of leadership which this law is supposed to destroy. A few examples of such probable incidents are as follows:

First. One member, among hundreds, is not given the floor at a union meeting because the chair understood the debate to be closed; the speaker had exhausted his time; or the speaker acted in a disorderly fashion; or for a dozen other reasons which are well-founded, but possibly illegal under the statute.

Second. One member, among hundreds, did not receive adequate notice of a union election, due to a misaddressed envelope.

Third. Union dues are increased, pursuant to arrangements for a secret ballot election, but the ballot of one member among hundreds, was marked in an open area where it was observed by others.

Fourth. A hand was raised to nominate a local union officer at a local union meeting, but the chair overlooked it.

Fifth. A charge, upon which a member is disciplined, after due notice and a fair hearing, is held not to be as specific as some judge may subsequently determine.

Sixth. The involved, intricate and confusing internal government and financial reports which the officers—most of whom are unschooled as well as unpaid—are required to file, prove to be inaccurate, due perhaps to an error in arithmetic.

It, furthermore, seems inevitable to me that any such developments, involving the destruction of clean leadership and

the absorption of small unions by large powerful unions will naturally result in the next attack, by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and National Manufacturers Association on the trade union movement, being directed against the bigness of unions. This attack, after sufficient public demand has been generated, will have antitrust controls over labor as its goal. Another objective already being discussed by President Canham of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is a so-called national right-to-work law.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the pattern is clearly indicated. The great industrial and financial giants of America are determined to be the political giants, as well. They will, then, have the package, all wrapped up. Complete control of America by the forces of conservatism and even reactionaryism will be the inevitable result of the weakening of trade unionism.

To document my viewpoint with regard to this detrimental trend for small unions, Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks the following newspaper story by Wilfrid C. Rodgers in the Boston Daily Globe of September 7, 1959:

[From the Boston Daily Globe, Sept. 7, 1959]

LABOR REFORM BILL HIKES COSTS OF RUNNING UNIONS—MEMBERS GET MORE SAY BUT MUST PAY

(By Wilfrid C. Rodgers)

Passage of the labor reform bill by Congress will have two almost immediate effects on individual union members:

1. Gives them a bigger voice in union affairs.

2. Makes bigger dues almost automatic in many unions.

The bigger voice in union affairs was given members by legislative law in an effort to get rid of crooks in the labor movement.

The bigger dues will be assessed on members because of an economic law—the labor bill pushes up the cost of doing business for unions and the members have to pay these costs through dues.

Why the increased costs for unions?

Every time the Federal Government passes labor relations laws it costs unions more to operate.

It started for most unions with passage of the Wagner Act. There were no complaints from union officials on this score, however, because to them the Wagner Act was the "magna carta of labor."

It opened a whole new field of organizing and brought in new union members by the thousands.

It also opened a new legal field for lawyers—labor relations.

Until the Wagner Act, the Nation's labor laws depended upon what State you were in. The State courts were supreme.

A strike declared legal by a court in New York could well be—and often was—declared illegal in Massachusetts.

In effect, with the passage of the Wagner Act, the Federal Government said to the States:

"When it comes to interstate commerce we'll make the laws on labor relations and enforce them. You keep your hands off."

This was the way things operated during the New Deal and through much of the Truman administration.

The National Labor Relations Board administered the Wagner Act with appeals from its decisions going to the Supreme Court.

Then came the Taft-Hartley Act.

One Boston labor leader sums it up this way:

"The Wagner Act meant a union had to have a lawyer. The Taft-Hartley meant you had to have two. And the labor reform bill means we'll have to have three lawyers and a corps of certified public accountants."

The labor reform bill now has placed a large segment of labor relations cases back in the hands of State courts or State administrative boards.

The reason for this was the so-called "no man's land."

At first the NLRB took jurisdiction over any firm that was even closely connected to interstate commerce.

If the firm, its products or its raw materials crossed State lines, the NLRB took charge.

Then business became heavy. The NLRB complained it couldn't carry the entire load. It set up standards, usually stating that only firms doing a certain amount of gross business interstate, were eligible to use the NLRB.

This reduced the amount of work for the NLRB but meant chaos for some small businesses and small unions.

STATES COULDN'T ACT

Because the Wagner Act said the Federal Government would handle the interstate commerce disputes, the Supreme Court held that even if the NLRB declined jurisdiction, State courts or State administrative bodies couldn't touch the disputes.

The labor reform bill now says that if the NLRB declines to handle the case, the firms or unions involved can go into the State courts.

The rub comes—so far as labor is concerned—when the labor reform bill says that State law will govern the State court in acting on the cases.

State courts have been mostly out of the labor relations business since New Deal days. Except for a small handful of States, no attempt has been made by legislatures to keep State laws up to date on labor relations.

Why should they, when labor relations mostly was in the hands of the Federal Government?

BABY WAGNER ACT

In Massachusetts there exists a Baby Wagner Act. This created a State labor board which did for intrastate business what the NLRB did for interstate business.

Now the State labor board will have jurisdiction over those cases turned down by the NLRB. (This board was almost eliminated during the budget-cutting sessions of the legislature on the grounds it didn't have enough business to do.)

In Maine, however, there is no State labor board, so cases declined by the NLRB in that State will be thrown into the State courts.

Already unions and management are preparing for legislative tugs of war over this issue.

The unions will press for State labor boards where they don't exist and State statutes governing labor relations.

To comply with the financial reporting provisions of the labor reform bill, unions will have to spend money for certified public accountants. (Many already do.)

The touchy part of this provision of the bill, to labor leaders, is that if the financial reports aren't correct the union officers can be thrown into jail.

SMALL UNIONS AFFECTED

Since small unions—with less than 300 members—aren't exempt from these reporting provisions, union leaders anticipate trouble getting members to run for office.

Most of these officers receive little if any pay; most aren't experienced in making financial reports.

To induce members to run for office, some locals may have to make the position salaried.

Other locals may well be forced into merging with other small locals in their area who belong to the same international.

In this manner, two, three, or even four small locals could merge into one and pay but one bill for lawyers and accountants rather than three or four such bills.

Trouble is that some of the very men the labor reform bill aims at getting out of the labor movement, such as James R. Hoffa, have been trying to merge these small locals for years without too much success.

Dumping three small locals—that the international doesn't control—into one big local that it does, resulted in many abuses the labor reform bill hoped to eliminate.

Proponents of the bill, however, hope that giving individual members a bigger voice in union affairs they will use it and rid labor of some of the corruption exposed by the McClellan committee.

Sane Way to Smut Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, because we are all interested in controlling the smutty and obscene material which is sometimes made available to our people, particularly young people, I think the following editorial is very timely.

The Postmaster General of the United States has given a great deal of effort and thought to this, and the editorial from the Indianapolis Times indicates that Indiana's Governor Handley has also launched his own crusade against smut:

SANE WAY TO SMUT CONTROL

Governor Handley has launched a crusade against smut that seems to us to have the best, if not the only, chance to succeed of any of the several so far undertaken.

His plan strikes at the roots of the problem.

Instead of blunderbuss-type raids of dubious legality that in the past have helped to defeat their own excellent purposes, the Governor proposes to mobilize the public opinion that obviously already exists in overwhelming majority against the distribution of obscene literature, and which in our opinion is the only force that can cope with it.

To that end he has assigned the Governor's Youth Council, a statewide group already active in various areas, to the job. It will invite the cooperation of all organizations concerned with the problem, and enlist more, in every county of Indiana, including wholesale and retail distributors of magazines and books, city and county officials, Parent-Teacher Associations, the Indiana Council of Churches, and the Citizens for Decent Literature, and various others. With such forces working together on a sane and reasonable program there appears to us very little doubt that objectionable printed material can quickly be driven off the magazine racks, and permanently.

Not everyone, perhaps, will agree completely on just what specific publications are objectionable, which are acceptable, for sale. They never have so far. That need be no bar to establishment of reasonable standards, though, which will be generally satisfactory to most of the people of any community.

Such standards can neither be established nor maintained, however, by arbitrary force.

This program the Governor proposes takes into account realistically the obvious fact that nearly all those in the business of selling printed matter of whatever kind and at whatever level, are just ordinary decent citizens themselves, with no conscious intent to peddle pornography and certainly no desire to destroy the good will on which their business is built by flaunting offensive material on their display racks.

If the Governor's program does succeed, as we have every reason to believe it can, there should be no great difficulty in defining of such reasonable standards, and gaining the fullest cooperation to maintain them.

The Late Honorable Edmund P. Radwan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday it was my sad duty to announce the death of a former Member of the House of Representatives, the Honorable Edmund P. Radwan. The passing of Mr. Radwan removes from our community one of the most dedicated public servants. He showed great love for his work and his devotion to public service is best reflected by the wonderful record he has left. As one who was privileged to call him a friend, I extend my heartfelt sympathy to the members of his family.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Buffalo, N.Y., on Septemebr 8, 1959:

EDMUND P. RADWAN

Ill health last year compelled the retirement of Edmund P. Radwan after four terms in Congress. His death now at the age of 47 writes a sad epilogue to a brilliant career cut short just as it was reaching its prime.

Mr. Radwan had served in public posts at all three levels of government. Starting as village attorney in Sloan, he was elected to the State senate in 1945 while serving in the Army. After 5 years at Albany, he entered Congress in 1950. His ability as a votegetter increased apace with his years of service; though hospitalized throughout his final campaign in 1956, he was reelected to the House by a plurality of more than 44,000.

Voter confidence in the young Congressman was not misplaced. For several years he served with distinction as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Later, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he proved one of the mainstays of support for the Eisenhower foreign policy. With the two other Buffalo Representatives in the House—Representatives PILLION and MILLER—he was a member of one of best teams ever to speak for this area in Congress. Working in close harmony, they compiled a legislative record of unusual productivity and effectiveness.

Mr. Radwan's voting record showed a flair for independence throughout his legislative and congressional career. He was thoroughly devoted to well-being of his constituents and did not lose sight of their needs even while striving to serve the interests of the Nation as a whole.

It is a loss to both the community and the Nation that a kinder fate did not spare him for the even more important years of congressional service that surely would have been ahead.

U.N. Maps Latin America Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, the Indianapolis Star recently carried two disturbing stories relating to Latin America. Because it is so important to our people and free people everywhere, I think they deserve a wide reading. Accordingly, with unanimous consent, I enclose the first of the articles herewith:

[From the Indianapolis Star]

U.N. MAPS LATIN AMERICA SOCIALISM—RUSS WOULD GAIN IF FIRMS MUST GIVE SECRET DATA

(By Jameson G. Campaigne)

A complete blueprint for Socialist integration of all Latin American industry and agriculture is planned under the supervision of the United Nations.

The plan has been prepared by the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, the same agency which would make massive industrial sabotage possible in South American countries through a plan to require all power companies to reveal secret information for the files of the United Nations.

Neither plan has been revealed publicly, but I have seen a copy of each in the office of U.S.A. Magazine in New York. The magazine obtained the information from a confidential source inside the United Nations.

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, ranking Republican member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has announced that he will demand a congressional investigation. He declared that he was shocked by the revelations.

The ECLA development and hydraulic resources program, which seeks secret information from all Latin American power companies, is headed by Adolfo Dorfman, described as an undesirable alien in the United States by the U.S. Attorney General.

The plan to socialize Latin American industry and agriculture is contained in supplement No. 4 of the official records of the 28th session of the U.N. Economic and Social Council.

Generally the ECLA report plans to achieve the progressive socialization of Latin American economics into a single integrated unit by first aiming at the establishment of a common market. This common market would be brought about through the efforts of U.N. economic experts who already are advising and counseling many Latin American governments. It would, of course, follow a Socialist pattern, since every top economic executive in the United Nations is either a Socialist or a Communist.

There is not one top economic expert in the U.N. agencies or commissions who is known to be devoted to free economics, the market economy or capitalism. The U.N. chief regional commissions, of which ECLA is one, is a Communist from Poland, W. R. Malinowski. The reason Adolfo Dorfman was considered an undesirable alien in the United States when he worked for the U.N. here is his contacts with Communists and fellow travelers.

The ECLA report proposes that the U.N. seek to impose economic development programing under U.N. experts on all Latin American governments. "The Secretariat," it says on page 55, "in cooperation with other United Nations departments and specialized agencies, had been assisting governments (in Latin America) in various fields. It was important for such assistance to be systematically extended to economic development programing." What this means in Socialist language is the establishment of a government-controlled economic plan for all Latin America under the supervision of the U.N. commission.

In addition, ECLA proposes that the U.N. provide "training for government officials concerned with budgetary matters." Since all top U.N. economic officials who would choose these experts are Socialists or Communists, it is clear that the training would be in Socialist and Communist techniques.

Already OPEX, "Operational and Executive Personnel" in the U.N., is sending U.N. experts directly to national governments in Latin America to take over key positions "until such a time as national personnel can be trained to take over."

This Socialist-Communist influence in the United Nations extends right up to the top and down to the bottom. Speaking to the opening meeting of ECLA last May 14, U.N. Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold, who is a well-known Swedish Socialist, praised ECLA's plans to "integrate" Latin American industry and agriculture.

"Bold proposals stand before you," he said, aiming at the establishment of a regional market. "* * * *Such an idea has not sprung from a sudden and visionary inspiration * * *. Rather, it derives from the systematic investigation and analysis made in ECLA * * *. It is in the course of analyzing the economy of individual countries * * * that the limitations inherent in political fragmentation have shown themselves in such a clear light.

"As you are embarking on a new phase of this long and difficult journey toward ambitious goals for which social scientists use the word 'integration,' it is my sincere hope that the United Nations, where this idea received its first concrete formulation, will continue to be closely associated with it."

In other words, the Secretary General proposes that the U.N. become a permanent adviser and director of an economic revolution in Latin America aimed at Socialist integration of all industry and agriculture.

How does this affect the United States? If it were ever put fully into effect it could destroy our markets in Latin America and create on our southern borders a huge Socialist regime with all the state trading, centralized and government-controlled economic practices that go with it. It would put large segments of American business at the mercy of people like Adolfo Dorfman and W. R. Malinowski who would be the advisers of the new order in Latin America.

One-fourth of all U.S. exports go to Latin America. One-half of all Latin American exports come to the United States. One-fifth of all American private investment abroad is in Latin America. Obviously the Socialist-Communist aim of ECLA could inflict mortal damage on American business and American investments in that area.

How can the United States put a stop to this Socialist-Communist meddling in Western Hemisphere economic affairs by the United Nations? We have surrendered without protest from our Government the control of all personnel appointments to the Secretary General and members of the Secretariat. At one time in 1952 when it was discovered that many American Communists had gone to work for the United Nations, the then Secretary General Trygve Lie asked the advice of a special commission of jurists on whether he could fire American Communist or pro-Communist employees. The ju-

rists recommended that he could and should do so. But not long after that Lie rejected this advice and Dag Hammarskjold also had.

But the United States does have and should have some rights when its interests in the Western Hemisphere are endangered by threats of industrial sabotage and the "integration" of Latin American economies. We supply one-third of the U.N. budget. We are the host nation. We can demand that our interests be protected, that Socialist-Communist activities in Latin America by the U.N. be stopped, and that people whom we consider dangerous to American security and liberty be fired.

Dag Hammarskjold fired Paul Bang Jensen when the Soviet Union and other Communists demanded it. He can just as well fire Adolfo Dorfman if the U.S. Government demands it. The United States has the power to protect itself in the United Nations. It is the power of the purse. At present the United States is being forced to finance steps designed in the U.N. to destroy our hemisphere defenses and our hemisphere economic freedom.

American industrialists and specialists in the electric power field assert that two great dangers exist if secret information concerning powerplants is made available to a U.N. commission.

They are: 1. Should the information fall into possession of the Russians, all Central and South America could be paralyzed in a single stroke by saboteurs in event of war.

2. Economic, because the Soviets would know exactly who was selling power equipment to Latin American companies, thus enabling Russia to penetrate those countries by undercutting American and Allied suppliers. At the same time Russia could flood those countries with technicians.

Adolfo Dorfman, who heads this project for ECLA, is a leftwing, Russian-born Argentinean. In 1953 the Attorney General demanded that the State Department rescind his accreditation to the United Nations because of his association with Communists.

Schedule of Meetings, Eighth Ohio District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the best way for a Congressman to secure the views of his constituents is by personal interview. For this reason, I plan to visit the county seats in the Eighth Ohio District this year, as I have each year in the past. If anyone has any problems or views in connection with the Federal Government, I will be pleased to have him come in and discuss them with me.

I shall be at the commissioner's office in the courthouses at the following places on the following dates from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.:

Monday, October 5, Bucyrus; Tuesday, October 6, Tiffin; Wednesday, October 7, Tiffin; Friday, October 9, Upper Sandusky; Tuesday, October 13, Marion; Wednesday, October 14, Marion; Thursday, October 15, Mount Gilead; Friday, October 16, Kenton.

If I Were a Member of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the interest of my colleagues these thoughts of a former Member of Congress on the various votes on labor-management reform legislation:

IF

If I were a Member of the 86th Congress I would continue to be true to consistency. I would not have performed a flip-flop as did some 150 Congressmen on August 14 when they voted for final passage of the Landrum-Griffin labor bill after voting twice on the previous day to defeat the measure.

I would have alined myself with the side that I felt was right and best for the public as well as for the members of the labor unions. Once that stand was taken I would not switch on a third vote after declaring my position on two previous votes.

If I had voted against the substitution of the Landrum-Griffin bill; if I had voted for recommittal of this same Landrum-Griffin bill in a further attempt to defeat it; then I most definitely would have voted nay on the final passage of the bill. That is the essence of consistency and a proof of sincerity to self and to others.

If I had supported the Landrum-Griffin bill on two previous votes, then I would have voted for its final passage. It's just that simple.

If I had received a letter from James Carey or from any other person threatening me at the polls in the next election, I would have returned the letter to him with three short words added. We dare not have government by intimidation. We need more men like DEROUNIAN, AYRES, BUDGE, BOSCH, and many others who were unafraid to send a sharp reply to Mr. Carey and also to have this reply printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The men who should be respected in the House of Representatives are the 229 who had the fortitude to vote for the substitute, or the 125 who consistently voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill on the three votes that were made possible.

If I had been there—but I was not there and so I applaud the sincere souls who honestly represent their districts without fear of any recrimination at the next election. I know what I am talking about, too, because this past winter for the first time in my life I have found time to reflect and to contemplate. I have a great satisfaction in reviewing my 10 years of service to my State and my Nation in the knowledge that I voted at all times for those measures that I sincerely felt were for the greatest good for the greatest number of people. I have been able to live with my conscience.

Incidentally, if I had been there I would have voted for the Landrum-Griffin substitution for the committee bill; against the recommittal motion; and for final passage. Why?—because so many members of labor unions are quietly asking for this kind of help and because the public also needs protection from the unfortunate evils that have crept into the labor movement.

Political Expediency Versus Educational Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who are part and parcel of the political scene in this Nation can easily put our finger on the culprit that causes our public criticism and the loss of public regard—the culprit is expediency.

In the name of all that is fair and good and just, we use expediency to cover up our failure to be fair and good and just.

One need not go deeper into history than this present session of Congress to come up with some rather disturbing facts and conclusions.

Let us look at education. For the past decade we have heard about the school crisis and yet, with the school bells tolling the new school year this September, we hear the same talk of crisis and shortages in both schoolrooms and teachers. If anything, the bells are louder because the crisis is worse.

For the past 6 years there have been repeated warnings that Federal aid for education has become a desperate necessity. Schoolroom shortages have plagued us. Miserably low teachers' salaries have caused a dangerous shortage of well-equipped instructors for the Nation's youth. The Eisenhower administration has shown no enthusiasm whatever for a sweeping Federal program. It is the job of the States and the local communities, is the answer—even though the States and local communities have been unable or perhaps unwilling to measure up to the task.

American parents will awaken from their vacation time lethargy with the complaints of their youngsters of overcrowded rooms and harassed school authorities.

Let us see what some of our better known experts have to say on this subject. An article by Robert B. Cooney pointed up some of the thinking on this subject and also showed the weakness of substituting expediency for effort:

The classroom and teacher shortage has grown over the years even as the Nation debated first whether it existed and then what to do about it.

One turning point was reached when a 1955 White House Conference on Education, stacked in its selection of delegates against Federal aid to education, unexpectedly decided there was a need for Federal aid.

Since then, school bills have come closer than ever to passage but have still foundered on such issues as civil rights, Federal control or plain politics.

Probably the chief obstacle has been business opposition. Federal aid to build schools has been fought by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the American Farm Bureau Federation.

EISENHOWER SHIFTS POSITION

President Eisenhower has constantly shifted his position on the school problem. He once expressed himself as flatly against Federal grants for school aid.

However, Democratic proposals of sizable Federal grants inspired him to counter with proposals which emphasized bonds and loans. In 1957, Eisenhower could have helped pass a school bill if he had moved to change the votes of just three House Republicans. He remained silent.

In Congress, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats has sabotaged Federal aid to schools, the latter in part because more schools would mean easier desegregation and a quicker transformation of the South.

At present, such a coalition has had bottled up since June 8 in the southern-controlled House Rules Committee a 4-year $4.4 billion Murray-Metcalf bill. It would raise teacher salaries as well as help build schools.

In the Senate, a labor subcommittee recently OK'd a 2-year $1.1 billion program, a sharply reduced compromise move which provides for construction only.

However, even as the Democratic bill in the Senate was cut down as a compromise to improve chances of passage and came to resemble closely the Eisenhower proposal of 1957, it ironically came under the threat of veto.

Flemming informed his August 26 press conference the classroom shortage is a problem of considerable magnitude. But he told the same conference that the Democratic Senate bill is contrary to the President's fiscal policy.

The U.S. Office of Education reported a few days ago that an estimated 42.7 million youngsters will enter classes from kindergarten through the 12th grade this school year.

This is an increase of 1.75 million over last year.

Because of the shortage of classrooms, one out of every four in the total school population will be shortchanged in education.

The number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees by the classroom shortage is about 10 million according to Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Arthur S. Flemming.

Flemming said recent reports on public school enrollment show there were 1,843,000 pupils in excess of normal school capacity last year.

These excess students were added to an estimated 6 million in crowded urban elementary schools alone and another 2 million or so in obsolete or inadequate buildings to arrive at the total of 10 million.

And these figures are understated, since the statistics leave out urban high schools and all rural schools.

The way in which overcrowding impairs education is reasoned this way: The desirable maximum class size is considered to be 30 pupils; if a class has 40 or 50 pupils, then everyone's education is hampered, not just that of the 10 or 20 "excess" pupils.

INDIVIDUAL ATTENTION EFFECTIVE

The effect of individual attention through smaller classes can be startling. Carl J. Megel, president of the American Federation of Teachers, was visiting a school in New York City earlier this year. A heavy snowstorm that particular day cut attendance from the usual 45 pupils to 16. The teacher told of this incident:

"Mr. Megel, a very interesting thing happened today. A young lad, who has been a serious disciplinary problem, in this small class on this particular day, conducted himself in exemplary fashion and at the end of the day came to me and said: 'This is the first day that I have thoroughly enjoyed school.'"

If the problem of surplus students is handled simply by cramming more pupils into each classroom, the problem of the teacher shortage has multiple effects.

U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick had this to say a few days ago:

"The deficit of teachers will mean, in many communities, overlarge classes or the employment of teachers without adequate training, or both. In many instances, it will also mean curtailing the number of subjects offered."

Last year the Nation's elementary and secondary schools were short 182,000 teachers. This year, Derthick reported, the shortage will amount to 195,000.

TEACHER TURNOVER RATE HIGH

Derthick said the teacher shortage is intensified by a teacher-turnover rate of 10.9 percent. He said current studies show this rate to be more accurate than the 7.5 percent formerly used in calculating shortages.

Why are teachers increasingly leaving their profession?

Low salaries is the chief reason, according to Megel.

The head of the teachers, whose job requires him to keep in touch with trends around the country, discussed the problem in these terms:

"A school district which I visited in May offers a case in point. Out of 160 teachers, 34 well-qualified certificated teachers resigned their positions and indicated their decision of finding employment elsewhere.

"Low salaries, of course, still constitute the major reason for this exodus of teachers from their chosen profession.

"But, in addition to low salaries, the overcrowding occasioned by shortage of classrooms makes it impossible for the conscientious teacher to do a competent job in the classroom.

"Overcrowding increases disciplinary problems because teachers are unable to provide individual attention to so many boys and girls in such a few minutes of a class period."

Segregated schools, where they exist, add to the problem because they prevent the most efficient use of school facilities and teacher resources.

SCHOOL AGERS INCREASE STEADILY

The Nation's school-age population was 37.3 million in 1955. It rose 6 million to an estimated 43.3 million in 1959. This was a rise of over 16 percent.

By 1963 the school-age population is expected to increase nearly 13 percent, or by another 5.5 million, to a total 48.8 million.

Meanwhile, 10 million American schoolchildren are handcuffed in their educational opportunities.

Is it any wonder that some of us, both in and out of Congress, wonder if we are seeing and hearing straight when we hear and see the inexcusable doubletalk and lack of sincerity in our whole approach to the crisis in education?

The real threat of this inaction and political expediency is the threat to unity in this country. How can a nation so confused and in a sense, so inconsiderate of its own needs, hold out that hope to the world leadership that will lead us all to the promised land of peace, tranquillity and prosperity.

How can an American explain the President's veto of two housing bills, each of which contained sums of money to be loaned to our institutions of higher learning for the purpose of building needed dormitory space to relieve conditions described by some observers as being close to a national disgrace, while at the same time approving a foreign development fund expenditure of some $30 million, to build dormitory housing for the University of Burma.

Whom do we fool with this silly and almost idiotic procedure? Do we fool the American workmen, businessmen, or farmers when the President talks about refusing to sign a $1 billion a year aid to education bill, while at the same time, he demands a higher appropriation for so-called foreign mutual aid which he has had amended to give the receiving foreign countries the right to spend the whole aid program for education. This is no fairy tale, it actually happened. The President threatened to veto the Murray-Metcalf bill for $1,100 million yearly aid to American education while at the same time threatened to call Congress back into special session, if it failed to up the multibillion-dollar foreign aid bill.

The question was, who was fooled? The answer is simple—All of us are fooled and especially the harassed taxpayer who too often condemns the teachers and the school system for taking too much out of his tax dollar.

The best dollar's worth we buy is education. Recently, we had an example of how easily the American public can be fooled by the clever and sometimes sinister activities of the hired specialists whose job it is to mold public opinion.

In the face of the highest military budget and the lowest people's needs budget in history, we were led to believe that if we passed a killer labor bill and got rid of Jimmy Hoffa, everything would be all right.

The sun would shine again, cats would purr, dogs would whine, clouds would disappear, and American enterprise could prosper and grow rich.

The only trouble with that is that the so-called tough bill has passed, and yet the schoolrooms are still crowded, our teachers are still underpaid and although Jack Parr still has his show, the salaries of southern teachers are only 50 to 60 percent of our northern teachers while the southern coalition of Congress smiles broadly at the maneuvering that has gained them the greatest victory in all of the years of their political control of congressional committees.

The southern Democrats and northern Republicans have combined to put this program on this year's list of congressional achievements:

First. Bottled up the aid to education bill.

Second. Killed the civil rights—desegregation—bill.

Third. Passed the Landrum-Griffin bill—described by GOP leaders as labor "killer" bill.

Fourth. Veto of two public and education housing bills.

Fifth. Veto of Army Engineer approved and planned flood and water control.

Sixth. Increased gasoline tax 1 cent to meet higher banker interests on loans for the highway program.

Seventh. Increased interest rates for the benefit of bankers and moneylenders increasing short-term interest from a low of three-fourths of 1 percent under Truman to over 5 percent under Eisenhower—the increased interest payments alone would pay for two Murray-Metcalf aid to education bills.

Eighth. Passed amendments to foreign aid allowing foreign countries to keep money loaned for aid purposes if they put it into education, while at the same time killing American aid to education here at home.

Ninth. Vetoing any bills dealing with area redevelopment.

Tenth. Refusing to allow deduction in personal income tax to help pay for educational and ordinary living requirements.

Eleventh. Refusal of coalition to pass bill extending and revising social security, unemployment compensation, and so forth.

Twelfth. Continuing a disastrous farm program that has allowed certain persons and groups to receive millions of dollars in the name of farm subsidy.

Last, but not least, the covering up of all of these failures by shouting "crook" at labor and bringing Khrushchev over to the United States in a drive to create a trade bargain that will further load our domestic shelves with cheaper made goods and in the end, further depress our American way of life.

All throughout this year's sessions there appeared to be a feeling of no reality. One keeps asking himself, is it really true—no education bill, no housing, no public works, no cut in military, no disclosure of known military purchase frauds and waste, no civil rights—all this, and work in Congress on Labor Day and next weekend, Khrushchev for lunch.

Of course, we will have a better record next year—why every politician from Ike's doors will be out lamenting the status of our educational system, the plight of the unemployment, the heartaches of the aged, the need for housing, the waste in Government—oh, yes, and above all the great rights of labor and the underpaid schoolteacher.

This will be the off-season talk, but come January and a new session, what will we get, I will tell you, the coalition.

News for Unemployed Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial that appeared in the current issue of the United Mine Workers Journal, under the caption, "News for Unemployed Americans."

The editorial deals with the present practices of the TVA of purchasing equipment and supplies in foreign countries, rather than awarding these contracts to American firms.

The editorial follows:

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, Sept. 6, 1959]

NEWS FOR UNEMPLOYED AMERICANS

The Tennessee Valley Authority, which has just been handed a carte blanche by the Congress to do as it pleases, spent three times as much money on foreign-made equipment last year as during all the years since TVA's inception in 1933.

TVA reported domestic and foreign purchases totaling $125,936,788 during the Government fiscal year ending June 30 for materials, equipment, supplies and nonpersonal services.

Of this, $66,924,517 was for manufactured goods, such as turbines, generators, and transmission lines; $51,931,238 for raw materials, such as coal to generate electricity, and $7,081,033 for miscellaneous services. The latter category included barging of coal, labor costs in installation contracts and the like.

Twenty-seven percent of the total money was for manufactured equipment purchased from foreign firms. This amounted to $17,900,000, compared with $5,600,000 on such purchases for all previous years since 1933. All but a small fraction of the foreign purchases went for generators and transformers.

About 41 percent of the total, or $51 million, went for coal purchases for TVA steam plants. This was $33.5 million less than the previous year, probably reflecting TVA's continued purchase of dog-hole, nonunion coal.

Harrigan Scores Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Anthony Harrigan from the August 31, 1959, issue of the New Leader:

DEFENSE BY SEAPOWER—A FAST-MOVING, WELL-BALANCED U.S. MISSILE FLEET COULD PROVE THE FREE WORLD'S MOST EFFECTIVE FORCE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

(By Anthony Harrigan)

It is a matter of historical record that the United States met the challenge of Soviet aggression in Lebanon in 1958 with the resources of seapower, not with airfleets based on the doctrine of massive retaliation. Naval vessels and ship-based aircraft, plus units of the Fleet Marine Force, were utilized to secure U.S. diplomatic objectives. They were able to exert a stabilizing force in that troubled region without precipitating serious incidents with the Soviet Union. The lesson for the future should be clear to Americans.

A compelling reason for the increased reliance upon seapower is the emphasis the Soviet Union has placed on missile warfare. Now, guided and ballistic missiles can and undoubtedly will be located at ground installations here and abroad. But the difficulties that will result from ground installations can be clearly discerned. Fixed missile positions in the United States pose many of the problems that preatomic age coast artillery posed. Locations of firing stations can be determined by spies. And it is conceivable that saboteurs could damage or destroy these ground stations. Furthermore, ground missile stations can be zeroed in by the enemy and rendered useless.

Perhaps the greatest drawback of ground missile stations, however, is their utter lack of flexibility. They cannot be shifted from one area to another in order to cope with a changing threat from overseas. Fixed concentrations quite obviously cannot take into account the shifts in concentration of nuclear firepower. One of the greatest advantages of the missile systems currently being developed for shipboard use is mobility. This mobility makes possible concentration of missile firepower in any quarter of the globe, in any defensive or offensive combination against an enemy's weapons or land.

There is yet another advantage to seaborne missile forces. Although North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies of the United States have agreed to permit the location of missile-launching sites on their territories, the political complications involved increase almost from month to month. Indeed, the United States is finding it very difficult to retain existing Strategic Air Command bases in North Africa and the Mideast. Neutralism is on the increase in these regions, and the day when overseas bases on foreign soil are no longer possible does not seem distant. Even in Great Britain, the stanch ally of the American Republic, powerful political forces oppose the location of nuclear-armed bombers on the home islands. There is a fear in some friendly countries that the location of ballistic missile bases will cause their lands to be prime targets in the event of a Soviet attack. The atomic blackmail practiced by the Soviet Union increases this fear of sudden attack.

A missile fleet is predicated on the role of the United States as the great insular power of the modern world. This country's geographical position should be utilized to the greatest degree in defense planning, for this position is extremely favorable. Our greatest protection remains the oceans shielding us. It also is well to remember that our traditional good friends are island countries and/or nations whose principal defenses are ships—Great Britain, Australia, the Philippines, the Netherlands and Canada. The maritime resources of the combined NATO nations are truly immense. These nations have not the manpower to meet the Soviet Union division for division on land. But in warships of all types, the NATO countries have total assets of tremendous value in the event of war. These seapower resources can be expanded without great difficulty.

Clearly, then, a major missile fleet, including Polaris-equipped submarines on station under the polar ice cap so as to guard Arctic Ocean approaches to the North American continent, would provide a war deterrent of massive proportions. Indeed, the Polaris missile, with a range of 1,200 miles, is the key to the missile fleets of the future.

From the positions off the west coast of Norway, a ballistic missile fleet would be able to command the whole of European Russia, including the cities of Leningrad, Moscow, Kiev, and Kharkov. Stationed in the eastern Mediterranean, a fleet equipped with the Polaris missile would be in a position to retaliate against the oil-producing region of southern Russia and submarine bases in Abania and the Black Sea. A missile fleet in the Indian Ocean, the Bay of Bengal, the Arabian Sea would be able to reach targets in Samarkand and western China—an area presently being developed for heavy

industrial purposes. And a missile fleet in the western Pacific would have the capability of retaliating against China, Manchuria, and the Pacific region of Siberia. Only the innermost zone of the Soviet-Red China heartland would be beyond the reach of a Polaris-equipped missile fleet.

The far-ranging operations of naval task force in World War II demonstrated what havoc seapower can bring to the homeland of an enemy. Since that time, the striking power of naval task forces has been vastly augmented and even greater power is soon to be given fleet units. Nuclear propulsion, the guided and the ballistic missile, and the nuclear warhead have created a new era in seapower, in which the only limit on naval operations is the endurance of the men who man the ships.

Of course, in order to provide a more perfect deterrent to war and become a superbly effective strategic striking force under the new conditions of sea warfare, the U.S. Navy must complete the naval revolution that is underway. Replacement of oil-burning powerplants with nuclear engines is the most fundamental change in store for the Navy.

But there is also a need for wholly new types of warships. New ships and new missiles are in the process of development. A great deal has been done along this line in the area of antisubmarine warfare. The plant to carry helicopters aboard destroyers, the development of frigates, and the use of sonic buoys and atomic depth charges—all are part of the mighty change taking place in the fleet.

The Polaris-equipped submarines planned for the fleet are ideally suited as the prime instrument of defense along the Arctic frontier. But undetermined as yet is the capital ship of the Navy in the years ahead. Certainly, neither the Polaris submarine operating alone nor "wolf packs" of Polaris submarines is the answer to the need for a fleet-action capital ship. While a submarine can be built sufficiently large to fire a ballistic missile, the size of ballistic missiles today and those sure to be developed in the years ahead make necessary a capital ship with ample storage facilities for the big weapons.

Vice Adm. Charles R. Brown, U.S. Navy, commander of NATO's Southern Europe naval forces, recently outlined his ideas on the capital ship of the future. Speaking in Washington, Brown reviewed the advantages of the missile monitor and the heavy missile assault ship. Such vessels, he said, would be battleship hulls revamped to carry ballistic missiles instead of conventional armament. He stressed that the Polaris missile could be fired with great accuracy from the big surface ships.

The missile monitor is the logical extension of the concept of the aircraft carrier. That is not to say that missile monitors or assault ships should replace flattops at any time in the near future. Manned aircraft are weapons of unique reliability that are able to carry out complex missions which missiles cannot undertake.

The heavy missile attack ship is needed, however, because a ship of great size is required if a sustained attack with Polaris missiles is to be carried out. Smaller vessels, both surface and subsurface, would have to replenish their supply of missiles after a single mission. The heavy attack ship also must be of sufficient size to provide for a vast complex of surface-to-air defensive missiles that would enable the ship to operate in safety during close-in attacks—operations several hundred miles off an enemy coast.

Thus, one may conclude that the task force of the missile era will require a variety of different types of warships—nuclear, missile-equipped submarines for high-speed lightning raids, nuclear radar picket submarines of *Triton* size for long-range warning of conventional air and missile attack, high-speed antisubmarine destroyers and frigates, aircraft carriers for repelling aerial attacks and for special missions, and heavy missile attack ships for sustained attacks against the enemy's homeland.

Such a task force offers the maximum in offensive and defensive power that can be foreseen in the present era. Able to move at great speed across the sea and prepared to strike with nuclear weapons at any point from the Mediterranean to the Sea of Japan, such a task force would be able to survive any attack. Were the United States rocked by nuclear attack, the fleet still would be on the move, prepared to retaliate against the enemy. As Admiral Brown has noted, "Wars are won by remnant forces."

The missile fleets of the years ahead undoubtedly will pose new requirements. If they are to be prepared to play the role of remnant forces after a destructive enemy attack on the continental United States, they must be free of dependence on fixed bases. This country learned in World War II and Korea that great quantities of fuel and other supplies must be in the ocean pipeline at all times. This lesson is especially applicable in the age of missile fleets.

Until the conversion to nuclear power is completed in the fleet some years hence, there will be a very great need for high-speed supertankers. For the missile fleets to be ready for extensive war operations at all times, vast quantities of fuel must be kept at sea in all parts of the globe. Even as SAC keeps its retaliatory forces airborne and refueled in the air, the Navy in the years ahead must keep its missile fleets moving at sea and refueled at sea.

As is the case with aerial refueling, the process of gradually dispensing with shore stations and shore refueling in distant parts of the world is expensive and cumbersome. But the worth of such battle readiness would be manifested if war came. In a world that has suffered crippling nuclear attacks, it would be essential for a fleet, if it is to be effective, to be independent of shore stations. The need, then, is for dispersal rather than concentration.

Admiral Brown, in discussing the role of missile monitors, correctly pointed out that vessels of this type would be a visual symbol of power and would help in controlling sensitive areas in a time of limited hostility. These vessels, he noted, would represent an excellent cold war and small war weapon. To bring graduated force to bear in troubled international situations is a job for the modern navy. Thus the missile fleet of the future requires yet another type of ship than the missile monitor.

The high degree of combat readiness required of all U.S. defense forces makes necessary the availability of a large contingent of Marines aboard special assault ships. This, of course, is standard procedure in the 6th Fleet. The 7th Fleet also moved into the Singapore area last year with Marine units on shipboard. This procedure paid off in the Lebanon intervention, when battle-ready Marines could be dispatched to the trouble zone at the same time that ships were ordered to steam to the eastern Mediterranean. The interests of the United States in an era of brush-fire wars and superheated political situations call for maintaining seaborne assault forces at all times.

The British are keenly aware of the need for such assault forces. Speaking in Norfolk last fall, Adm. Lord Louis Mountbatten, First Lord of the Admiralty, stressed that a battalion of commandos on the spot shortly after an incident occurs may be worth a division of regulars several weeks later. Realizing that truth, the British are augmenting their commando forces and converting an aircraft carrier into a special commando assault ship. Though the U.S. Marine Corps has pioneered in the development of the helicopter assault carrier, even greater stress should be placed upon this innovation in warfare. Had the Nation pushed the development and conversion of helicopter carriers as much as our changed strategy requires, the United States would have been better prepared to speed a landing in Lebanon.

The assault carrier and the missile monitor would complement each other. Fully seaborne battle forces, with their own short-distance airlift, plus the nuclear bombardment capability of the missile monitor, would provide the United States with the best possible answer to indirect or all-out aggression, a brush-fire war, or a major enemy attack.

The Lebanon intervention also made clear that far more adequate airlift facilities will be needed in the years ahead. The Navy has the answer to this need in the P6M seaplane known as the Seamaster, which has a speed of 600 miles an hour and which can refuel from a submarine. Replacement of conventional land-based MATS transports with a troop-carrier version of the Seamaster would enable the United States to use the water areas of the world as bases. The problem of circuitous routes, involving flights through the airspace of several countries (a matter that vexed Lebanon airlift planners), would be eliminated by having all refueling carried out at sea.

The new weapons, vessels and supply and repair organizations necessitated by this plan involve revolutionary changes in the fleet. More exactly, perhaps, the changes represent further development of existing equipment or trends. The Navy has missile cruisers; it has only to build or adapt battleship hulls in order to have heavy missile assault ships. The Navy has helicopter carriers; it has only to augment its force of these vessels and to make refinements.

In general, the Navy will have the basic task of promulgating doctrines of seapower that will take into account the capabilities of the weapons when used in combination. There also is the task of explaining to the country what is taking place in the Navy and in American defense planning in regard to the new role of seapower. For more than a decade, indeed since the attack on Japan in 1945, the American public has been persuaded that the destruction of an enemy's bases, industrial complexes, and other strategic targets is strictly a function of the Nation's long-range Air Force, and now of missiles fired from land.

The creation of a vastly enlarged strategic mission for seapower, involving limited war capability and shows of force, will require an adjustment in interservice thinking and in the understanding of the American public. It would be a grave mistake for naval planners to be lacking in missionary fervor or to fail to push the strategic role of seapower, for U.S. defense requires that seapower's mobility and concentration of firepower be fully utilized. It is simply necessary for naval planners to make the country understand the truth of what Adm. A. T. Mahan said decades ago: "Every danger of a military character to which the United States is exposed can best be met outside her own territory—at sea."

View From the Farm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following

editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 17, 1959:

VIEW FROM THE FARM

"Today's burdensome surpluses with their fantastic storage costs are symptoms of a sick farm program which has infected the business of agriculture with the disease of Federal aid and control."

Now, people reading those words might conclude they came from some city slicker so ignorant of the farm he things prize-winning calves always come in pairs a couple of inches above some shapely ankles.

Not so. Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, was the speaker. The Farm Bureau Federation represents 1.6 million farm. families throughout the country, but does not, of course, claim to speak for all of them. It can speak for a considerable majority of its members, however, for frequent polls the Federation holds invariably show opposition to the support programs.

"The farmers would be vastly better off," Mr. Shuman told an audience recently in New York, "if the Government would permit them to use the free marketplace to supply consumer needs. Government subsidy programs based on parity serve neither the interests of the consumer nor the farmer," he added.

Nor of anybody else, for that matter. Consumers and farmers pay taxes (somebody once figured out that there are 51 taxes hidden in one loaf of bread) and the taxes they've paid for the monstrous farm program might be enlightening to some who don't realize the figures. Since 1954, and including 11 months of fiscal 1959, the farm program has realized losses of $5.8 billion.

In addition to paying farmers for things they grew and for things they didn't grow, the Government also spent some pretty impressive sums of money the farmers didn't get a dollar of.

For example, the Commodity Credit Corporation reports for the 11 months ending last May 31 that carrying charges alone on crops amounted to $495 million, interest amount to $145 million and "general overhead"—that euphemism for a bureacracy that has moved in on the farmer faster than a corn borer through the lower 40—has cost the taxpayer $39.3 million in the same period.

Well, if a wasteful program such as this isn't even liked by farmers it's supposed to benefit, what in the world keeps it going?

Mr. Shuman had an answer for that one, too. "Though farmers often have asked that these programs be changed, the Congress has not yet taken effective action."

And that, so far as letting the public know who is really to blame for the follies of the farm program, ought to help separate the sheep from the goats.

How To Win in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, there are many approaches possible in dealing with our problems in the Far East, particularly in southeast Asia. Last year I had the opportunity to visit Laos and Vietnam. I inspected their military defenses, their parachute schools, repair depots, and other facilities, and discussed matters with their leaders. I flew over the dense jungles and, believe me, it is hard to visualize military operations in such a place. Only those who experienced jungle warfare at its worst in World War II could have full appreciation of the tremendous problems involved.

Consequently, I am much concerned at the present situation in Laos, and, indeed, in all of southeast Asia.

One of the finest series of firsthand current reports on this region has been written by Ernest K. Lindley of Newsweek. In the current issue of Newsweek he presents some authoritative conclusions on "How To Win in Asia." The article follows:

HOW TO WIN IN ASIA

(By Ernest K. Lindley)

This final report on my firsthand survey of free Asia deals with the great question for us: What must we do now and in the visible future to keep the favorable tide running? Earlier I set forth the evidence that Communist influence has waned and confidence in the United States has grown. I cited the reasons why: The disenchanting Communist deeds and the successful elements in American policy. I also pointed to some current errors and to three special problems.

I have emphasized also that the struggle between Communist imperialism and freedom in Asia is far from finished, that it is apt to be long and hard. Now, with the aggression against Laos and armed incursions into India, it is rising to a new climax. All that has been gained can easily be lost if we don't do the right things.

INDISPENSABLES

What are the right things? They are what free Asia must have but cannot wholly provide for itself: Security and economic development. Without protection against aggression, the free regimes would fall quickly. Without economic development, rapid enough to satisfy their people, they will fall eventually. Only we have the strength, military and economic, to guarantee to free Asia these indispensables. Beyond these, the right things are whatever increases understanding and friendship between the free Asian peoples and ourselves. More specifically, we should:

1. Never yield an inch to force or threats. Never permit the slightest doubt to arise about our readiness to do whatever may be necessary to repel aggression. We now face a decisive test in Laos. We are committed to its protection, not only generally through the U.N. Charter but specifically through SEATO and morally because we encouraged a new Laotian regime to take brave measures against internal communism. Our defensive alliances are the backbone of Asian security. Even neutralists have come to see that there is no security in Communist promises of peaceful coexistence. If the aggression against Laos is allowed to succeed, all southeast Asia will again be seized with fear and its confidence in our word—and our courage—gravely impaired.

2. Maintain and, in some cases, strengthen the military forces of our frontline allies.

3. Never automatically limit ourselves to purely local defense against aggression. Various countermeasures might be used now against North Vietnam and Red China.

4. Keep Red China what it has made itself: A pariah. Keep it out of the U.N., don't recognize it, do nothing that would restore its deflated prestige. The Indian thesis that Peiping would behave better as a U.N. member is unsupported by experience with the U.S.S.R.—Hungary, for example. Besides, no regime should be permitted to shoot its way into the U.N. A new approach should not be considered until Peiping begins to act civilized, at least externally.

5. Meet at least halfway Asian leaders who, learning from experience, are moving toward us.

6. Gird ourselves to compete with the Communist economic offensive. Slash red-tape. Dismiss the notion that technical aid, and perhaps a few small projects, are all that free Asia needs. Capital—in growing amounts—is indispensable. Use the World Bank and its affiliates to the utmost. Encourage private enterprise and Western Europe to do more. But don't duck the fact that for a long time much of the capital, as well as of the technical aid, must come from the U.S. Government.

7. Put economic aid on a long-term basis. Encourage each nation to draft a sound plan. See that all are underwritten (not just India's—the others are not waiting to see how India fares). Spur inter-Asian cooperation within feasible limits. But recognize that Asia is too diverse for a continentwide Marshall-plan approach.

8. Provide more scholarships for Asian students, more educational and cultural exchanges.

These guideposts confirm and extend policies that have proven successful so far. They are planted in visible realities, not in complacency, wishful thinking, or sheer conjecture about more distant possibilities, such as hostility between the Soviet Union and Red China. They are things we must do to win a struggle that we cannot afford to lose.

A Reexamination of the Fifth Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to comment to our colleagues the following very erudite article written by Harris B. Steinberg, chairman of the Committee on Penal Law and Criminal Procedure of the New York State Bar Association. It appeared in the association's bulletin of July 1959.

It is most timely because at this moment we are not under the stress, tension and hysteria of more recent days. I hope our colleagues will give it the attention it deserves.

The article follows:

[From the New York State Bar Bulletin]

A REEXAMINATION OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT [1]

(By Harris B. Steinberg, Chairman, NYSBA Committee on Penal Law and Criminal Procedure)

Many years ago, I read a story which left a lasting impression upon me. It was by Katherine Mansfield, I believe, and it dealt with a man whose son had died in battle. The genuine love which the man felt for his son filled his heart, and he was beset by

[1] This article is an extension of a speech made at the Summer Meeting of the Association at Saranac Inn, June 26, 1959. Dangling participles, nonstop sentences and similar lapses have been excised, and some other changes have been made by the author with a view to giving the appearance of scholarship, commonsense and other desirable attributes.

tender memories of his son's childhood. His son's face was constantly and clearly before him. Then he was invited to speak about his son's heroism and sacrifice at a patriotic dinner. It was so successful that he was asked again and again to give similar talks. Eventually a strange thing happened—he could no longer evoke the picture of his son in his mind, and he realized that he no longer felt any sincere emotion or grief. The story ends with the man sitting at his desk, playing dully with a fly, which buzzes near the open mouth of an inkwell. He pushes the fly into the well, and it emerges briskly, shaking the ink off its wings. He pushes it in again and again, and each time it grows weaker and more lethargic, until finally it succumbs.

I have a feeling that in dealing with the fifth amendment, we have been coming dangerously close to that sort of conduct. I have a feeling that the fifth amendment—particularly that portion of it which deals with the right not to be compelled to give incriminating evidence against oneself—is being poked at in a dangerous way, and unless we are careful it could be lost to us.

The provision of the fifth amendment with which we are here concerned today, is, of course, one of the provisions embodied in the Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Federal Constitution. It has its counterparts also in almost all of the State constitutions, including our own. It stems from common law, and is recognized in England. It finds itself in good company—the same fifth amendment prohibits the taking of property without due process, requires indictment by a grand jury for serious crimes, and prohibits placing a defendant twice in jeopardy. These provisions commend themselves to us very readily—no one is attacking or questioning them at the present time, so we accept them as part of our traditional heritage, and think them worth preserving.

TODAY'S CHALLENGE TO THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

The challenge we face today, however, arises from the fact that the portion of the fifth amendment which protects us from self-incrimination is being questioned by a troubled public. Is it wise? Is it necessary? Doesn't it amount to protecting the guilty? Shouldn't we amend it, or do away with it?

I submit that unless we, as lawyers, can give good and satisfying reasons for the preservation of that right, it may well be lost to us. If there are good and sufficient answers to those questions, we should first formulate for ourselves the reasons for the validity of the provision, and then we should do our utmost to educate the public, who look to us for advice and guidance in legal matters, that their best interests lie in the preservation, unchanged, of the basic right we are now considering.

Let no one think that a right which is good and basic automatically commends itself to the great majority of mankind. It takes reasoning, and if necessary, fighting, to defend it; and it takes tender, loving care to nurture it, when it is abused and sickly. Today, the greatest portion of the population of the globe subscribes to philosophies alien to ours. Vast hordes behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains live and die without freedom to worship God according to their consciences; free speech is denied to them; trial by jury; presumption of innocence; freedom to educate their children in the way they think best—these rights, among others, which we take for granted, are also repudiated by the iron-fisted rulers of millions and millions of human souls, who submit meekly to such rule.

Nor can we relax and feel that these alien concepts are so far from our shores that we need not concern ourselves with them. Only a matter of months ago, we read of the events in Cuba, where men were placed on trial for their lives before a howling, bloodthirsty mob of 18,000 spectators in an open-air arena. And recently, we read that in Cuba an acquitted man was retried on a capital charge, because Castro was displeased with the original verdict. Ideas, like viruses and jet planes, travel fast and far.

Finally, even in our own country, men trained in the law have from time to time disagreed with the wisdom, not only of the fifth amendment, but with the desirability of other provisions of the Bill of Rights, and sought their repeal. As the hydraulic pressure of great events is exerted from time to time, there are recurrent attacks on all of our basic liberties.

Emotion and fuzzy talk are not enough to resist these attacks. A person sensitive to art may look at an abstract painting, and be stirred by it; he finds beauty in it. Another well-intentioned person who sees nothing beautiful in it may ask the first one to explain why he finds it beautiful and meaningful. This may be a hard or impossible task if there is no common meeting-ground of receptiveness and sensitivity. So, too, if one is sincerely convinced of the desirability of a basic right, it may not be enough to take a lofty, superior tone to the troubled person who asks for reason why the right is a good one. In the case of the picture, the insensitive person may turn away, but he is not going to stop the artist from painting similar pictures to delight the sensitive enthusiast. In the case of our basic right, however, if a well-meaning but uninformed body of opinion gains strength, the clamor and votes will become available to change the law, and then the right will be taken from all of us, convinced protagonists or not.

A PERTINENT ANALOGY—CONSIDERATION OF THE FOURTH AMENDMENT

Lawyers often find that attacking a problem by analogy is a useful device; in the present case, I beg leave to adopt this crabwise approach.

The fourth amendment, which immediately precedes the fifth, and which is often linked with it in consideration of constitutional problems, is, of course, the provision protecting against unreasonable searches and seizure. In practical effect, this provision prohibits a government official from breaking into one's home without a search warrant.

You may recall that in recent months the Apalachin meeting occupied a great deal of the attention of the press, and it developed that for a long time investigators and process servers sought to gain entrance to Joseph Barbara's home, to serve him with process, or perhaps to search or examine the premises. For weeks they parked on his doorstep, but did not gain entrance. It never occurred to them to break in. Why not? Surely they had the physical means to do so; they were officers of the law; public opinion was on their side; the occupants of the house were the object of widespread unpopularity and notoriety. Why didn't they summarily break in? Because today the fourth amendment is strong, and recognized by everyone as something worth honoring. There are no attacks on the fourth amendment by any organized groups; one doesn't hear of "Fourth Amendment Communists," or "taking the fourth," as terms of opprobium. There has been no holding up to the public displeasure of the oft-repeated spectacle of suspected criminals, poised inside their doors, refusing to honor requests that they open their houses to let the law have a look around. Yet, when one keeps his door locked in the face of authority, he is merely asserting his constitutional privilege. When he is not asked to waive his rights, he is not required affirmatively to assert them.

"I refuse to admit you to my home, on the ground of my constitutional privilege under the fourth amendment," would be often heard in the land, if the Government instituted a policy of sending its agents to the doors of persons suspected of crime with a request that searches be permitted. And the reading of such a formula, from a typed slip supplied by a lawyer would be a commonplace. It might even cow respectable people into hastily opening their doors to the world, so that no one would suspect them of hiding narcotics in the fireplace.

Somehow, I doubt it. Everyone has a home; everyone has a strongly developed feeling for privacy (that is, their own); and everyone would resist the idea that a failure to allow searches of one's home founds a necessary or reasonable inference of criminality.

But it was not always thus. In 1925, so thoughtful and able a judge as Judge John Knox, of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York, spoke at the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, and launched a strong attack upon the fourth amendment. He said, "The fourth amendment is a terrible stumbling block in the way of justice." If this sounds surprising from such a source, we ought, in fairness, to examine the surrounding circumstances. Judge Knox had then had almost a decade of service on the district court. Prohibition was in force. Gangsterism, bootlegging, corruption and racketeering were rife. Everywhere, agents were breaking into homes and places of business, without proper warrants, finding illegal liquor, yet cases were thrown out, because of violation of the fourth amendment. In despair at what he felt were frequently unjustified verdicts, and results which protected guilty people, the judge spoke. The fact that a trained, intelligent person felt that way (no doubt mirroring the feelings of many respectable people) at that time, shows that there is a certain virtue in the long-range view when we deal with basic constitutional safeguards. It was far wiser to repeal the 18th amendment than the fourth.

But, most important, it shows us that governmental abuses of a basic right may stir up a great deal of resentment, not against the abuse, but against the unpopular person who stands in the way of that abuse, and claims his rights.

APPLICABILITY OF THE FOREGOING TO THE FIFTH AMENDMENT

Why has the fifth amendment come under a cloud in recent times? I submit that in our day we have been witnessing widespread governmental abuses of the privilege against self-incrimination, with the consequence that the public has been led, like a frightened and blindfolded beast, to attack the other tormented victim readily at hand—the person whose rights are violated—rather than the real tormentor.

People are being exposed to questioning in public, when it is known in advance that they will claim their privilege—more, when it is known that they will properly claim it. No one will argue that a crook should be protected. If his derelictions are discovered, and proof is properly presented in a court, he should be convicted and punished. Similarly, when a congressional committee seeks information as a background for legislation, and some individual's misdeeds are uncovered to the public indignation, in the course of hearings, no one has a right to complain.

The McClellan committee is an able group of highminded Senators who have done a fine job of exposing conditions which should be remedied. They have produced evidence which demonstrates that certain laws should be changed. They have shown that certain

individuals have violated the law. They have passed this information along to law-enforcement authorities, and prosecutions and convictions have eventuated. But what do they add to the efficacy of their job when they learn, at private preliminary hearings, that a prospective witness, whose misdeeds will be the subject of a public hearing, intends validly to claim his privilege, but nevertheless insist on his appearance, and the public claim of privilege? Again, what purpose is served by asking that witness a score, twoscore, or a hundred questions, knowing in advance that every one will be answered by a claim of privilege? Certainly, the committee learns nothing from the witness. If the witness' misdeeds are relevant, they are usually documented from other sources.

On the other hand, what do we lose from such a procedure? Widespread publicity, motion pictures, television broadcasting, bring home to the lay public that A has claimed his privilege 197 times, or 215 times, that he read his statement monotonously from a paper prepared by a lawyer, and thus he has thwarted the Government. The more times the privilege was claimed, the greater the criminality; the more times he asserted his undoubted rights, the more vicious the man. Ergo, let us do away with the privilege, so we will have no more such unedifying scenes. This is a dangerous logic. Much more valid, it seems to me, is the conclusion that if a man has a right, and we know that he intends properly to assert it, we should not force him to assert it, and thereby impugn not only his own integrity, but the rights of all of us. I would hope that now, 5 years after the turmoil of the McCarthy hearings, in quieter retrospect, we have learned the lesson that self-restraint, in matters like this, better serves the public interest in the long run than heated, sensational dramatics.

THE FALLACY OF EQUATING A CLAIM OF PRIVILEGE WITH GUILT

What makes our present problem peculiarly difficult is the easy assumption that a claim of privilege amounts, in reality, to an admission of guilt. In actual fact, in most cases, this is probably so.

What about a bank clerk who is accused by his employer of stealing from the till—doesn't a claim of privilege in such case warrant his discharge? I would readily agree. What about the admission committee of a golf club, which in answer to a question about a man's background, are met by a claim of privilege—aren't they warranted in turning down his application? Of course. Well, then, wherein lies the difference, when a witness at a Senate committee hearing, asked about whether he stole money, claims the privilege?

When it comes to social relationships, everyone has a right to pick and reject his friends. Logic, prejudice, whim, caprice, may all serve as basis for decisions of this nature, and no one can complain. Arbitrary decisions, for the most part, can be made in most human relationships, with certain exceptions. Some employers may be prevented by union contracts from hiring and firing at will; pension rights may have accrued; a club member cannot be fired out without cause, in many instances. But for the most part I would think that the more valuable the thing we seek to take from someone, the more careful we have to be in adhering to principles of fairness which have stood the test of time.

In considering whether a lawyer can be deprived of the right to pratice because of a claim of the privilege against self-incrimination, the court of appeals, in *Matter of Kafenburgh*, 188 N.Y. 49 (1907) wrote that the privilege had long been regarded as a safeguard of civil liberty, "quite as sacred and important as the privilege of the writ of habeas corpus or any of the other fundamental gauranties for the protection of personal rights. When a proper case arises, they should be applied in a broad and liberal spirit, in order to secure to the citizen the immunity from every species of self-accusation implied in the brief but comprehensive language in which they are expressed." The court held that there was no necessary inference of guilt, from a claim of privilege, and wrote that "To now hold that by availing himself of such privilege it amounted to a confession of his guilt upon which a forfeiture could be adjudged would, in effect, nullify both the provisions of the Constitution and the statute."

It is refreshing to consider this language of a half-century ago, and compare it with the frightened attitude of some lawyers who would proclaim their own respectability, and freedom from Communist taint, by proposing to make it grounds for disbarment to claim the privilege. Such is the osmosis of contact with laymen—we find ourselves drawing weakness from them, instead of infusing them with the fervor and strength of enlightened understanding of the Constitution.

The most fundamental deprivation which one human can visit upon another, of course, is taking away his life or liberty. Cruel and criminal when one individual wreaks it on another, it is often necessitated and proper when organized individuals—society—practices it against an erring member, or violator of society's laws. But here, in the most awesome duty of man—that most closely approaching the power of a god—particular self-restraint is necessary. Blood lust, revenge, public clamor should all ideally be kept to a minimum. Who can ever forget that chilling story by Shirley Jackson, "The Lottery," when the unbearable suspense is released by the community stoning of the woman chosen for death by the lottery.

The long struggle for civilization finds one of its noblest accomplishments in our modern rules for determining guilt or innocence of crime. We take no one's life or liberty except in accordance with rules tested over many centuries. Would anyone quarrel with the requirement that guilt must be proved beyond a reasonable doubt? Proved by whom? By the prosecution—not by the defendant. When a defendant is placed on trial, he need not take the stand, and he may properly put the prosecution's case to the test. Nor may comment be made on a defendant's failure to take the stand. We all accept this as a valid premise. But the inescapable logic of these rules is that a failure to take the stand raises no inference of guilt, and indeed the law expressly requires the court so to charge a jury. How can such a rule exist, and remain at the foundation of our criminal law system, if it has no validity? Yet, whenever one says that a claim of privilege is tantamount to a confession of guilt, one is attacking that rule, since a defendant's decision to remain off the stand is nothing more nor less than a claim of privilege.

Experience has taught us that there are many reasons, other than guilt, which may prompt a claim of privilege—or its equivalent, a defendant's decision not to take the stand. Every criminal lawyer knows that it is not fear of denying criminality in the case on trial which keeps a defendant from giving evidence. Indeed, the eagerness to deny guilt is often in direct proportion to that guilt. But the real reason why most defendants choose not to testify is the fear of being questioned on collateral matters affecting credibility. A criminal record of past convictions, illicit romances, income tax evasions—in short, a myriad of things other than the issue raised by the indictment and plea of not guilty, are often the deciding factor in such decisions.

Dean Erwin Griswold, in his book, "The Fifth Amendment Today" gives other instances of the fallacy that a claim of privilege is tantamount to a confession of guilt. I have no hesitation in borrowing copiously from that work, since a book so excellent and so widely discussed must have escaped actual reading by most.

Perhaps the best example one can envision of the invalidity of such an inference of guilt from the assertion of the privilege lies in the Salem witch trials. Consider the charge—being a witch. It would be safe to assume that none of my readers believes in witches. Yet in the Massachusetts colony people were tried for their lives on the charge of being witches, and they were tortured to make them confess. Would a claim of the privilege there be an admission of guilt? Could it be? It could, to the people of Massachusetts in the 17th century. Yet the unfortunate defendants of those days could only maintain their innocence, and be tortured; confess to something of which they were not guilty; or claim their privilege.

ORIGIN OF THE PRIVILEGE AS A PROTEST AGAINST TORTURE

Dean Griswold speaks of the privilege as a landmark in man's struggle to civilize himself. We shudder now to think that torture—the physical breaking of bodies on the rack, hot irons, all the devilish devices testifying to the inhumanity of man to man—was once a recognized instrument of Government policy to get at the truth. Lilburne's case marked the end of the infamous Court of Star Chamber in England. The colonists were determined to eradicate it when the Constitution was adopted. Can anyone say that the urge to break men's bodies and minds, in order to extract evidence from them, is dead? We need only to look across the oceans, east and west, to remind ourselves that right now, and in the last two decades, millions of people have been tortured to death by governmental action, and forced to say anything which suited their tormentors. Can we say with assurance that no such specter can ever arise here? Only by strengthening our belief in the constitutional safeguards can we add to that assurance.

If we were to do away with the fifth amendment, and its State counterparts, as some people advocate, we would face a situation where people would be called to testify against themselves as a matter of course. In my opinion, we would be taking a long step toward opening the door to torture if we did so.

THE PRIVILEGE HAS BEEN A POTENT DEFENSE AGAINST OPPRESSION

As our life becomes more complex, government becomes more complex. If a citizen were to read all the ways one can violate the law and become a criminal, he would be inclined to stay in bed, for fear that a step beyond his threshold held innumerable terrors. The endless, serried ranks of the red volumes of the U.S.C.A., the fat volumes of the New York Penal Law, the cleverly hidden municipal traffic and sanitary regulations and unconsolidated laws carrying criminal sanctions, create a maze wherein we must all tread carefully, lest we expose ourselves to prosecution. No longer is adherence to the Decalogue a trusty compass through life. I say this half in jest, but only half so.

It becomes important to keep something of the pioneering independent spirit of our forebears. They know that constituted authority, being administered by men who sometimes suffered from the human failings of avarice, jealousy, pride, and stupidity, sometimes had to be kept in place. In doing so, the privilege has been a potent weapon. Two interesting examples come to mind.

In the Pennsylvania Colony, the printer, Bradford, was so fired by the spirit of liberty

that he undertook to print the Pennsylvania Charter of Liberties, so that the people might know their rights, vis-a-vis their rulers. He was also realistic enough to realize that it would be well to leave his name off the publication. He was haled before the Governor, and we are indebted to Dean Griswold for the following excerpt from the record.

"GOVERNOR. Why, sir, I would know by what power of authority you thus print. Here is the charter printed.

"BRADFORD. It was by Governor Penn's encouragement I came to this province and by his leave I print.

"GOVERNOR. What, sir, have you license to print the charter? I desire to know from you whether you did print the charter or not and who set you to work?

"BRADFORD. Governor, it is an impracticable thing for any man to accuse himself. Thou knows it very well.

"GOVERNOR. Well, I shall not much press you to it, but if you were so ingenuous as to confess, it should go the better with you.

"BRADFORD. I desire to know my accusers. I think it very hard to be put upon accusing myself.

"GOVERNOR. Can you deny you printed it? I do know you did print it and by whose direction and will prove it and make you smart with it, too, since you are so stubborn."

In England, in the 17th century, in the reign of William IV, the highly respected Lord Chief Justice of England once found it expedient to claim his privilege. Chief Justice John Holt was summoned before the House of Lords to explain a decision of his, which seemed to that body to trench on their jurisdiction. He refused to answer, in these words:

"I look upon this as an arraignment; I insist upon it if I am arraigned; I ought not to answer."

He maintained this position, the Lords retreated, and we learn from Campbell's "Lives of the Chief Justices" that the "public has strongly taken the side of the Chief Justice and his health was given with enthusiasm at all public meetings throughout the kingdom."

It is heartening to think that a judge could be a popular hero—not for bowing to authority, or to the legislative branch—but for standing up to them, by asserting his privilege. It was only possible, I submit, because the people of England knew their rights, valued them, and were quick to respond to a challenge to those rights.

One can only ask oneself morosely what would happen today if a Chief Justice were impelled to claim his privilege. Would the public, aware of the meaning of that step, judge him properly, or would they pick up their papers, read the headlines, "Chief Judge Takes Fifth," and promptly assume he must be guilty?

CONCLUSION

1. The privilege is historically part of a package of rights evolved over the centuries by an Anglo-Saxon common law determined to protect the citizens from governmental excesses and repressions.

2. It is an expression of our dissatisfaction with torture as a governmental instrument to determine truth.

3. It is a recognition of human dignity; it is more fitting that society, when it judges and punishes people for transgressions, should not humiliate and degrade a defendant.

4. It is an essential part of the process, which requires proof beyond a reasonable doubt, and is inextricably interwoven with it.

5. It is not necessarily true that a claim of privilege is an admission of guilt; there are sufficient instances of the inference not being valid, to make use reject that proposition when we seek the certainty which justifies our depriving others of life and liberty. To put it another way, the cliche, "It is better to acquit 99 guilty men than to convict 1 innocent one," is still true.

6. Experience tells us that from time to time things which seem immediately important must collide with basic rights, which frustrate these temporary things. In the long run, it is better and wiser to give up temporary, high-keyed satisfactions and adhere to permanent ones, on a quieter scale. A diet of vegetables is better for us than candy.

Tribute to Representative Burleson, of Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I was gratified to see that one of Texas' most respected newspapers, the Houston Chronicle, recently paid tribute to one of Texas' ablest, most distinguished young Congressmen, OMAR BURLESON, of Texas.

Representative BURLESON has served in the House for 13 years and has risen to become chairman of the House Adminstration Committee. He is widely respected and admired for his forthrightness, his honesty and his impressive grasp of the important problems confronting us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Burleson Has Risen Rapidly in Influence," written by Edward Jamieson, and published in the Houston Chronicle, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURLESON HAS RISEN RAPIDLY IN INFLUENCE

WASHINGTON.—Seniority is all-important in determining the leaders of the U.S. House of Representatives. As a result, many Members serve in the House for a score or more years before reaching the chairmanship of a committe or a similarly influential post.

A notable exception to the usually long period of a Member slowly rising to a top place is Representative OMAR BURLESON, of the 17th Texas District.

BURLESON did not enter the House until 1947, but already he is chairman of a standing committee of that body, and ranks fourth on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

ALMOST FULL-TIME JOB

He has been chairman of the House Administration Committee since the 83d Congress and in that capacity has directed legislation and other activities dealing with the actual operation of the House itself.

This is virtually a full-time job in itself, but the Texan also devotes a great deal of attention and effort to the work of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

While has has been critical of some phases of the international policies of the administration of President Eisenhower, he feels that the appointment of former Representative Christian Herter, of Massachusetts, to succeed John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State was an excellent decision by the President.

"I served with Secretary Herter in the House and have great confidence in his ability," BURLESON declared. "I think the President made a very wise decision in naming him at this critical period when a decision must be reached over the future of Berlin."

The 51-year-old Member whose home is in Anson, west of Fort Worth, is a quiet-spoken Member of the House who works long and hard at his job, but does not normally try for newspaper headlines.

ONE EXCEPTION

An exception has been his attempt to force his colleagues to report to the House the amounts of money they spend on their visits to foreign countries each year.

"Most of the Congressmen who make these inspection trips while Congress is not in session really try to do a conscientious job and I am sure that in the end, they save the taxpayers money," BURLESON says. "Nevertheless, I do not see why each Member should not be required to report to the public how much he spent, whether it was given him by his own committee, or through the State Department with its counterpart funds."

BURLESON, through his campaign, has forced the various committees to report their total expenditures for trips by Members out of the country, but he still feels that individual Members also should be required to make similar reports.

ONE OF TWO CHAIRMEN

Though Texas has the Speaker of the House, Representative SAM RAYBURN, and many Members high up on important committees, BURLESON is only one of two Texans who are chairmen of standing committees. The other is Representative OLIN TEAGUE, of College Station, who is chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

After serving as county attorney and county judge of Jones County prior to 1940, BURLESON was a roving agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 2 years. He entered the Navy in 1942 and shortly after he returned to active law practice in Anson, he ran and was elected to the House.

He is married to the former Ruth DeWeese. They have no children.

Is Red China Embarrassing Khrushchev in Laos?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I wish to insert into the Appendix of the RECORD two articles on the problem of Sino-Soviet affairs. The articles, written by Walter Lippmann and George Sokolsky, deal with the problems of southeast Asia and the apparent interest in the Chinese in establishing a partial Mongolian hegemony.

The United States should be aware of the problems which the southeast area now faces and should revamp our policies in this area of the world.

Both Mr. Lippmann and Mr. Sokolsky surmise that the present tactics of the Chinese Communist government are aimed, to a great extent, at showing Khrushchev Chinese independence from Soviet leadership. This policy of independence of the Communist Chinese is dangerous for the United States at this time since there are few controls which

can be exercised over Chinese policies. The usual strictures and considerations which nations that are members of the United Nations are inapplicable in the case of Communist China.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1959]

ASIA AND MR. K

(By Walter Lippmann)

The eruption on the Indian frontier and in Laos is an ominous development, not least of all because it lies outside of an beyond the control of the existing international order. Western relations with the Soviet Union are conflicting and unfriendly. But they are conducted within an existing order. There are ambassadors, there is the United Nations, there are conferences of foreign ministers and of experts, there are the exchanges of visits by the heads of governments, and there is the prospect of summit meetings.

But the Chinese revolution, unlike the Russian revolution, is outside the international order, and it is not subject to its rules and obligations. For all practical purposes it is isolated and incommunicado. This means that there is no way to talk with the Red Chinese Government except through the Soviet Union, and this poses some very complicated questions.

The complications arise out of the indubitable fact that the relations between Moscow and Peiping are themselves complicated. Their relations are unclear and ambiguous. We do not know, and probably Russia and China themselves do not know, to what degree they are independent of each other and how far they are entangled. It is certain that Red China is not a Soviet colony, or dependency, or satellite. Yet it is certain, too, that under any conditions now possible they are bound together on the issue of war and peace.

The relations between Red China and the Soviet Union are not healthy. It is a peril to the peace of Asia and of the world that the Chinese revolution, which is in a highly expansionist phase, should be represented in the international order only by the Soviet Union. It is evident that the enormous revolutionary convulsion will not be and probably cannot be restrained by the Soviet Union. Yet the Soviet Union will not and cannot stand aside and allow the United States and its allies to attempt to contain that revolution.

In the coming talks with Mr. Khrushchev it is possible to imagine how coexistence might be stabilized in Europe. But it is not possible to imagine, so it seems to me, how coexistence can be stabilized on the periphery of the Chinese revolution.

In Europe for the time being coexistence would mean the status quo—two Germanys, two Berlins, two Europes, with arrangement for increasing cultural, economic and political intercourse between them. This would leave to the future the problem of German reunification, the problem of the military status of a reunited Germany, and the problem of the redeployment of forces within the NATO and the Warsaw Pacts. This is possible because such a de facto understanding does no immediate violence to the vital interests of any of the great powers.

But nothing comparable with this is in sight or even conceivable in South Asia. The fires of the Chinese revolution are burning fiercely and the Russians could not extinguish them even if they wished to do so. Although the Russians are indubitably apprehensive from the point of view of their own national interests because they are the neighbors of this portentous revolution, they are also Communists who as true believers must also believe in the Chinese revolution. They cannot oppose it, they can restrain it, if at all, only secretly, and they must defend it if it becomes involved in war.

There have been a few voices raised in this country suggesting that as a protest against and punishment for what is happening in Asia, we should break off the coming talks with Mr. Khrushchev. That would be very unwise. If a modus vivendi for Berlin and Germany can be worked out, we should do so, not only because that would be a good thing in itself, but also because it would put us—and it may be the Soviet Union, too—in a better position to work on the containment of the Chinese revolution.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 8, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV AND MAO

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Two views can be taken of the Sino-Indian situation and it is not likely that the truthful explanation will be available for many years. Mao Tze-tung is a complex personality, the product of a mixture of Confucian and orthodox Marxist thinking. He is a pragmatist whose measure of the rightness, the fitness, the propriety of a course of action is its effective implementation.

Obviously, Nikita Khrushchev would not take the trip to the United States and make all the preparations he is making for it, if he anticipated a total failure. It is equally obvious that the support that the United States is giving Laos and the support that Great Britain and the United States must give to India could lead to real trouble. In fact, Nehru fears a war between India and Red China because he would have to call in British and American (or United Nations) protection. India is a member of the Commonwealth of Nations and of the United Nations.

It begins to look as though the troubles in Asia, coming a fortnight before Khrushchev comes to the United States, could spoil the effectiveness of his visit here. The two views on this subject are:

1. That Khrushchev intends to ride into our land with a fanfare of explosions to show his power and his fearlessness. I do not hold to this view because it is self-defeating. It would so stiffen the backs of our people that it would not be long before Khrushchev would discover that we cannot be bullied and Eisenhower would find that his peace program had been defeated not in Moscow or Washington but in the southeast of Asia. Why come at all under such circumstances?

2. The other view is that Mao Tze-tung is making it very tough for Khrushchev. There can be several reasons for this.

First of all, Mao is an orthodox Marxist. He has clearly indicated that he does not approve the middle course (that is, within Marxism) that Khrushchev pursues. Mao was closer to the Kaganovich-Malenkov-Molotov group, which Khrushchev denounced as antiparty and exiled, than he ever was to Khrushchev.

Secondly, in the past Khrushchev's orientation has been eastward and he has supported Mao's empire-building throughout Asia. It will be recalled that Chou En-lai, Mao's Premier, sought to play the leading role at the Bandung Conference (1955). As far back as that Nehru must have suspected that Mao hoped to establish a hegemony over the whole east and south Asia.

What Mao must fear is that Khrushchev will go European on him. He must fear that a prolonged series of summit meetings, constant personal contacts with heads of Western States, such fraternization as was evident during the Nixon visit, could reorient Khrushchev's position into a westward direction. Without Russian support, Mao could not last in China. He has depended upon Russia since he forsook philosophy for politics sometime about 1925.

Third, it has been a sore point with Mao that despite Russian support, Red China has not been admitted to the United Nations and has not been recognized by the United States. Year after year, the Russians plead with the United Nations to admit Red China, which, as things stand, is an outlaw nation. Just as Khrushchev has recently been advocating two Germanys, so he has been advocating two Chinas, an idea which evoked considerable sympathy among the pro-Russians in the State Department.

Mao understands his own people and he knows that two generations will have to die before the hatred for Russia, long existent in China, dies off. Meanwhile, he is forced to show his dependence upon Russia because he has no voice in international councils. He can only talk through Russian mouths.

And now Khrushchev is coming to Washington and Eisenhower is going to Moscow and one thing can lead to another. Mao is an envious man. I can recall his hatred for Chen Tu-shiu who organized the Chinese Communist Party. Mao disliked in the Peiping University such philosophers as Hu Shih and Chiang Monling, his contemporaries: An envious man can only view what Khrushchev is doing with bitterness. He, too, would like to be at a summit—but how? Only through Khrushchev. It is not good enough.

This is not based on facts. It is a surmise that comes from long residence in China and some experience with Chinese habits of thought.

Difference in Charges to Federal Government as Against Other Contractors

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting this letter, a copy of which was given me by a constituent, to call the attention of my colleagues to the difference in charges to the Federal Government as against other contractors. I am informed this is a common practice:

THE COMMERCIAL SHEARING & STAMPING CO.,
Youngstown, Ohio, August 27, 1959.

Reference: P.O. No. 131/1–70965/60XY.

Mr. S. YEVELSON,
Code 530 B1, New York Naval Shipyard, Brooklyn, N.Y.

DEAR MR. YEVELSON: As discussed in our recent phone conversation, this is to confirm that the price of $446.82 was quoted in error. Correct unit price should be $893.50 for cylinder model D32 JE–3–45'' stroke.

The reason for this is, Mr. Yevelson, that we have two pricing policies, one for users, such as the Federal Government, and original equipment manufacturers. Since the Government falls in the former category, and the original price given to you was an O.E.M. price, we have been instructed to inform you that the user price is to apply, namely, $893.50.

We regret this error and any inconvenience it may cause. It would be greatly appreciated, however, if you would issue an amendment to this order correcting the price to read $893.50 net each.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

F. B. COOPER,
East Orange Regional District Sales.

Another Korea?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the folly of surrendering our independence to any international organization is becoming increasingly obvious.

Possibly no one could conceive of a finer thought or program than that of bringing permanent peace to the world, improving the living conditions of all people wherever found, bringing prosperity and security to everyone. That might be the thought which took us into United States, NATO, and other international organizations.

The idea back of our entanglement in foreign affairs, and you will recall that Washington warned against it, may be somewhat similar to that entertained by those who attempted to build the tower of Babel. That failed, we are told, because of the confusion of tongues.

Since then human nature has remained much the same.

A "ONE WORLD ORGANIZATION"

We now find that, by joining United Nations and NATO, we are committed to a policy, wherever in the world what we are pleased to call a free nation is invaded or imposed upon by the Communists, of sending not only money and supplies, but our young men to fight in a war in which we are not directly interested.

Because of our previous commitments to our so-called allies, we became involved in Korea, and the cost in lives and suffering was enormous.

An extremely unfortunate result of our joining these foreign organizations is that so far, and evidently in the future, we—our people—will be forced to bear an undue part of the cost, both in treasure and in lives.

It is extremely difficult for the young women and the young men of America of today to see why they should be forced into the armed services, into a program of intensive training and ultimately to fight and die at the call of some foreign group which has no real interest in the future of our country.

Today, whether our young men and, perhaps, our young women, because of our membership in U.N. are taken from their homes and sent to fight in Laos depends upon what the Security Council of the United Nations decides. For years, we have poured millions into Laos.

We have sent billions upon billions taken from our taxpayers to bolster not only the independence and integrity of other countries, but to make them active and efficient competitors of our industry.

Certainly, we believe in charity, in being helpful, and that has been our record since the beginning of our Nation, but, in my judgment, of far more importance is a policy which will enable us to remain independent, in control of our own destiny, to make secure the future of our own people.

Why not do a little serious thinking on the issue of how far can we weaken ourselves, and are we justified in imposing burdens upon our own folks to aid others?

The present demand is that, if we are better acquainted with the people of other nations, there will be less contention. Perhaps so. But history shows that the nations of the Old World—neighbors, it might be said—have always been on the verge of war with each other.

Helpful to others? Yes. But not at the cost of our own independence.

Civil Rights Report: Unhappy Reading

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, too long have we been content to assume an immature attitude toward the problems which our Negro citizens face. The new report of the Federal Civil Rights Commission spells out the areas of difficulty, corroborates conditions already known to those who have taken the trouble to inquire and makes recommendations in line with proposed legislation.

It is my hope that this report will create the sense of urgency on the part of legislators warranted by these critical problems. We can no longer equivocate or ignore our responsibilities.

The case is stated effectively in the following editorial from the pages of the New York Times which I place in the RECORD under permission to extend remarks:

CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT

The report of the Federal Civil Rights Commission to the President makes important, though unhappy, reading. It describes in detail what every informed American should be aware of—that large numbers of Negroes in the South are prevented from voting by methods which range from physical violence to legal trickery, that the Supreme Court decision outlawing school segregation has been far from implemented and that racial discrimination in housing forces Negroes, Puerto Ricans and similar groups to provide disproportionate percentages of the Nation's slum dwellers. No American who takes seriously the ideas of freedom and equality in this Nation's heritage can feel anything but shame about the basic situation described in this report, even though progress has been and is being made in the area of extending civil rights to all.

What can be done to eliminate these evils in our democratic society? The recommendations of the Commission have already come under attack, particularly from those who benefit from the disqualification of many Negro voters in the South. But on the whole the proposals and recommendations of the Commission are moderate in nature and worthy of serious consideration by all men of good will.

The proposal that temporary Federal registrars be appointed to take over in southern areas where State and local officials prevent Negroes from voting has drawn immediate opposition from the diehards. Yet those who have begun shouting States rights must answer the grim story the Commission's report tells of how many State officials in the South have labored to prevent Negro Americans from voting. It is no answer to say merely, as does Commissioner Battle in his dissent, that "present laws are sufficient to protect" the right to vote. Too many Negro Americans are being denied the right to vote to take that claim seriously.

On housing, the Commission is constructive in its emphasis upon the need for more housing and for equal opportunity to secure decent housing. On education the three northern members of the Commission should find a sympathetic reaction to their proposal that Federal aid be withheld from institutions of higher education which exclude students on racial grounds. We still have far to go to reach the ideal in the civil rights field, but the Commission's report promises to help us make progress. And it is certainly to be hoped that the move begun in the Senate yesterday to continue the life of the Civil Rights Commission beyond next November will be successful.

Padre Island, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, in recent years there has been increasing concern at the rapid rate at which our Nation's natural shoreline areas have been vanishing.

One of the greatest of these areas, embracing the longest undeveloped shorelines area in the United States, is Padre Island which stretches for 117 miles along Texas' gulf coast.

In an effort to assure timely action by the Federal Government in preserving this priceless heritage for the public good, I recently joined with my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and two able Members of the Texas delegation in the House [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. YOUNG] in addressing letters to the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as well as the Honorable Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior.

In the interest of apprising others in the great potential of Padre Island, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that both these letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 2, 1959.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you are well aware there has been increasing concern in recent years over the rapid rate at which the natural shoreline areas of the United States have been vanishing. It is generally recognized that unless the Federal Government acts soon to preserve for the American people some of the few remaining areas of shoreline wilderness, this aspect of our heritage will have disappeared forever.

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs currently has under consideration a number of bills which would authorize the

establishment of shoreline park areas, including S. 4 introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH, which would specifically authorize the establishment of a national park at Padre Island, Tex. Other bills would authorize the acquisition of shoreline areas, and though they are broad enough in scope to permit development at Padre Island, its selection would not be assured under the terms of these bills.

The purpose of this letter is to urge your committee to conduct hearings on the question of establishing a national shoreline area on Padre Island and to report to the Senate legislation which would insure the preservation of this natural wonder. Padre Island, stretching 117 miles along the Texas gulf coast, is the longest remaining undeveloped beach area in the Nation. Here at Padre Island the United States has its last opportunity to preserve a substantial length of beach area in its natural state.

The National Park Service has conducted a full investigation of the potentialities of Padre Island, and both the Park Service and the Interior Department's Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments have recognized the opportunity at Padre Island and have strongly recommended the establishment of a national shoreline area here. If Padre Island is to be preserved for future public use and enjoyment, action must be taken soon. Otherwise, the island will follow other shoreline areas into conventional commercial beach development.

We believe that the Congress must enact authorizing legislation soon if this beautiful wilderness is to be preserved. If at all possible, Congress should act on the matter next year. Therefore, we respectfully request that your committee hold hearings on this question between the adjournment of the present session of Congress and the commencement of the next session. If the committee does hold these hearings we recommend that the committee visit the area for on-the-spot hearings in order that its members will personally appreciate the wonders of nature found at Padre Island.

We are most anxious that the Congress act on this matter soon, and we know that if the members of your committee would visit Padre Island and report their impressions to the Senate, the early establishment of a national shoreline area at Padre Island would be assured.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
U.S. Senator.
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator.
JOE M. KILGORE,
Member of Congress.
JOHN YOUNG,
Member of Congress.

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, D.C., September 2, 1959.

Hon. FRED A. SEATON,
Secretary of the Interior, Interior Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On April 27, 1959, you transmitted to each of us a copy of a field report by the National Park Service on the proposal to establish a national shoreline area on Padre Island, Tex.

We were and are extremely impressed with this report. It is apparent that the National Park Service's investigation of the potentialities of Padre Island as a shoreline area was extremely thorough, and the need for immediate action to preserve this beautiful area for the people of America is fully demonstrated by this report.

Both the National Park Service and the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments have recommended the establishment of a national shoreline area on Padre Island. But to our knowledge the Interior Department has not approved this proposal nor has the Department recommended that the Congress enact legislation which would insure that a national shoreline area be established on Padre Island.

This is one of the Nation's last opportunities to preserve a substantial segment of our shoreline in its wilderness state. Padre Island, stretching 117 miles along the Texas gulf coast, embraces the longest undeveloped beach remaining in America. Thousands of acres of Padre Island are still in a natural state providing many miles of spacious beaches and lovely dunes. If these can be preserved, American families in the future will be assured of the opportunity to enjoy the natural beauty of the island as well as the recreational benefits the wonderful Padre Island beaches can bring. But if this is to come about, action must be taken now. Otherwise, the opportunity will have been lost, and the natural beauty of Padre Island will have given way to conventional commercial beach uses.

We strongly urge you to take immediate action to implement the recommendations of the National Park Service and the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments that a national shoreline area be established on Padre Island. We ask that Padre Island be officially designated by the Department of the Interior as a suitable location for such a national shoreline area, and that the Department immediately recommend to the Congress that it enact legislation which will specifically authorize the establishment of a national shoreline area on Padre Island.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
U.S. Senator.
JOE M. KILGORE,
Member of Congress.
RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator.
JOHN YOUNG,
Member of Congress.

Poison in Your Water—No. 168

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune of October 9, 1958, entitled "Reveal Pollution Survey Results":

[From the Gary (Ind.) Post-Tribune, Oct. 9, 1958]

REVEAL POLLUTION SURVEY RESULTS

HOBART.—Delegates to the Inter-Chapter Council of the Izaak Walton League, at a meeting in the Hobart chapter's clubhouse, were jolted to an awareness of the existing conditions of Hobart's water pollution when they were told that "Lake George and Deep River are nothing more than an open sewer."

Speaking for the committee which made a survey of the lake and river as well as spot checks in the area was George Maywald.

In presenting the report of statistics compiled in the survey, he also listed the specific locations from which the water samples had been taken and a description of the samplings. They are:

At Deep River, at the Ridge Road Bridge above the confluence of Duck Creek and above the sewage treatment plant outfall; Deep River at the Rand Street Bridge approximately one-third mile below the sewage treatment plant outfall; Duck Creek at the Michigan Avenue Bridge at the south edge of the sewage treatment plant grounds, 150 yards above its confluence with Deep River.

Contaminated water was found at several septic tank installations and raw sewage entering the sewage treatment plant final effluent from the sewage plant ditch flowing north under Eighth Street to Lake George just west of Fleming Street; the ditch at the intersection of Wisconsin and 10th Streets; sewer outfall to the south side of Lake George 10 yards east of Wisconsin Street.

And, ditch running south from Third Street just west of Colorado Street; ditch on the north side of Ridge Road, just east of Ash Street; and the 16-inch outfall to the south side of Lake George at the west end of Pennsylvania Street.

VIOLATIONS

Conditions observed during this survey violated the regulations required by the stream pollution control board, that generally, "the oxygen content of the receiving water shall be no less than 50 percent of saturation and, in no case, shall it fall below 25 percent saturation." Other sections of the regulation were also violated.

The high bacteria concentrations noted during this survey indicate a serious health hazard to the community, the committee pointed out.

Deposits of organic materials in a stream or ditch cause putrid sludge banks which inhibit and destroy aquatic life. Odors arising from the decomposing material cause nuisances and lower property value adjacent to the stream or ditch.

Maywald also read from a copy of a letter to Mayor Fred Rose and the board of public works, from Oral H. Hart, sanitary engineer at the State board of health, in which a copy of the survey was included.

The letter also stated that consideration was given in 1950–51 to the construction of additional sewers and a complete sewage treatment plant. The program was reduced because of financial difficulties. Approval of the stream pollution control board for the construction of an interceptor sewer and a primary treatment plant was with the understanding that it was the first step toward the construction of a complete sewage plant.

NO DELAY

The continued population growth in the Hobart area and the increased discharge of raw or inadequately treated sewage to miscellaneous streams and ditches and to Lake George makes it imperative that further construction be undertaken with the least possible delay, the letter concluded.

Field and office work in connection with the survey was accomplished by personnel of the Water Pollution Section, Division of Sanitary Engineering, State Board of Health.

With the exception of field determination for dissolved oxygen, the analyses were made in the laboratories of the State Board of Health.

"This survey," according to the committee "is only the beginning of the fight to clean up our lake and the streams leading to it."

The committee conducting the survey here, is comprised of members from a number of organizations in this area, who are interested in furthering the project. Of these, the Izaak Walton League and the American Legion are two.

THE COMMITTEE

Maywald, T. N. Bale, William Chadwick, and Mrs. Howard Enslen represent the Hobart chapters of the league and Clarence Schultz of Hammond is the representative from the American Legion.

The business session concluded with the election of officers for the coming year.

Arthur Minninger of Griffith chapter will be the new president, with Harvey Mosher Glen Park chapter as vice president, Mrs. Mosher, of Timberlost chapter, secretary and Mrs. George Bodin of Lake-Wood, Hobart, is the treasurer.

Formal installation rites will be November 6. At this time trophy awards will be presented to winners in the casting and rifle tournaments.

The remainder of the evening was spent with members voicing their concern and interest in the report heard during the session.

The Cause of All Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the remarks of Mr. Norman Knight, president of the Yankee Network Division, RKO General, Inc., at the annual awards luncheon of the American Heritage Committee, in New Bedford, Mass., on June 5, 1959:

THE CAUSE OF ALL MANKIND

(By Norman Knight)

Were we pessimists, we might say it is unfortunate that so few people in this land of ours are aware of the dangers of communism.

Were we optimists, we might be inclined to feel that we are making great progress in fighting the Communist threat.

I like to believe, though, that we are neither optimists nor pessimists but that we are realists; and that we are constantly aware of the traits of our Communist enemies and, conversely, that we are appreciative of the fine, decent qualities of those Americans who support true American traditions and are not apathetic to the Communist menace.

My remarks will be brief, and it is my wish to spend most of these few minutes discussing the words of wisdom of a man whose writings and whose actions as an American have always given me great personal pleasure and pride. He was first called the Father of his Country. As much as I admire George Washington, this is not the great American to whom I refer since some years before this title was passed on to Washington, a man was called the Father of his Country, because of his work at the very beginning in establishing the independence of our country.

Of all the patriots, this man was the only one to sign all five of the great state papers that achieved our independence—the Declaration of Independence, the Treaty of Amity and Commerce With France, the Treaty of Alliance With France, the Treaty of Peace With England and, of course, the Constitution of the United States.

When I think of the work of your good committee, the American Heritage Committee, and of our own modest efforts in the field of promulgating American traditions, I always like to think first in memory of Benjamin Franklin.

It is particularly fitting as we attend this function in New Bedford, itself the scene of great American historical traditions, that we reiterate thoughts expressed by Benjamin Franklin because, not only was he first called the father of his country but I believe it was Carlyle who later called him father of all the Yankees.

Were Benjamin Franklin alive today, he would not have need to philosophize any differently nor with greater depth or perception than he did during the 18th century were he able to guide us in our current struggle with communism.

Boston-born Franklin believed that an essential service of man to his fellow man was the free communication of ideas, and without this communication he felt there could be no real freedom and no universal peace. His first public act at the age of 16 was to start fighting for freedom of speech and the press. His last public act just before he died at 84 was an appeal for the emancipation of slaves, employment for freed Negroes, and education of slave children.

Franklin was, above all else, a practical man, and his beliefs were backed with action.

His brother, James, was publisher of the New England Courant and was thrown into jail for criticizing British authorities in Boston. To save the paper, young Benjamin, then an apprentice, was named publisher and with rare courage under the pen name of "Silence Dogood" he wrote these words in the London Journal:

"Without freedom of thought, there can be no such thing as wisdom; and no such thing as public liberty without freedom of speech; which is the right of every man. * * * Whoever would overthrow the liberty of a nation must begin by subduing the freedom of speech."

Were Franklin here today, I am sure that he would say there are many ways to subdue the freedom of speech, and one of these would be apathy, doing nothing about something.

When I think of the Communist menace sometimes it occurs to me that next to creating frictions among religious, ethnic, and racial groups (which I still consider to be the foremost objective of the Communists in America) the most important target for communism is plain and simple apathy. From the day that our Founding Fathers signed the Declaration of Independence until this very moment, America has remained great because of what her people have done. Our problems have been caused by the things that we did not do.

Americans must think and act to meet Communist aggression here and abroad. This is why I have insisted that our organization reprint and distribute materials that will better educate New Englanders to the menace of communism, this is why we have produced films and other visual materials that would show Communist leaders to be untrustworthy and that is why we have produced the only continuing network program in today's radio which pictures in depth the fanaticism of hard-core Communists and the need for grassroot opposition to communism by Americans everywhere.

It is fitting that we call this last described program the "Dangers of Apathy." It was made possible only by the resources that we have available to us, the determination of people like Jack Maloy and my other associates who have contributed so much to this task and most importantly by the dozens of men and organizations whose backbreaking work over the years has developed the storehouse of information which our communications media can distribute. The undercover agents who have worked voluntarily, the FBI and other law enforcement groups, the American Legion and the American Heritage Committee and other patriotic committees, the citizens who have moved forward to help us—all of these have made it possible for us to further our objectives in this work.

Now we must urge others to join us. There are many things we can do. Let us take courage from the words and deeds of Benjamin Franklin and other Revolutionary patriots and find ways to do things to express our patriotism with action. Here are some of the things that all of us can do:

1. When we see communications media courageously fighting communism, be they magazines, newspapers, TV stations, radio stations, or any other type of media, write to them and encourage them to continue their work.

2. When articles concerned with American traditions are printed, order reprints and distribute them to more people.

3. When special TV and radio programs are scheduled, such as our "Dangers of Apathy," call friends and urge them to call more friends to listen to the program.

4. Order reprints of such statements as J. Edgar Hoover's recent one-page statement, "What You Can Do To Fight Communism," and mail them to your friends and neighbors.

5. Write to your Congressman, your Senator, and to members of the executive branch of our Government and praise them and encourage them when they stand up and fight communism at home or abroad.

6. Speak out against any act of bigotry or prejudice, because words that create friction among Americans aid the Communists' cause. Denounce as un-American any man or woman who spreads hate in any form, because as Franklin once said, "Fools multiply folly."

7. Seek to find ways at the grade school and high school levels to encourage reading of American history and to stimulate forum discussion, contests, and other activities concerned with acts of American liberty and justice. A great fear of the Communists is that American children will gain a greater appreciation of American heritage and the great struggles that have won and maintained our freedom.

8. Demand honesty from public servants, union officials, and management men, all of whom have trusts, since it is proven that in many countries graft precedes confusion and confusion precedes communism.

9. Certainly be constructively critical where circumstances deserve criticism, but be alert to Communist-inspired criticism of government services and government functions. Do not support demands for further expansion of governmental expenditures except where they are deemed necessary for national security, for it is an oft-repeated Communist statement that capitalistic countries are doomed by inevitable economic collapse. Our answer must be one of concerted economy, balanced budgets, and immediate planning to institute reduction in the national debt. Individual support by Americans everywhere is essential to the attainment of these objectives.

10. Be informed and urge others to be informed through a sincere desire to know all possible about communism's devious plans and maneuvers which change in execution (but never in long-term objectives) almost on a daily basis.

For all of us it is important to remember that our fight is not just the fight for New Englanders nor is it the fight only for Americans. Our opposition to communism serves an even greater cause best expressed in a statement made by Benjamin Franklin whose foresight must have destined his remarks to be as appropriate today as they were the very hour that he expressed them. I have studied these remarks many times, and our finest statesman of the 20th century could not weld words in such a way as to do greater justice to our situation in the world today than did Franklin's almost two centuries ago.

"All Europe is on our side of the question, as far as applause and good wishes can carry them. Those who live under arbitrary power do nevertheless approve of liberty, and wish for it; they almost despair of recovering it in Europe; * * * it is a common observation here, that our cause is the

cause of all mankind, and that we are fighting for their liberty in defending our own. God grant that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere and say: 'This is my country.'"

Save Our Shorelines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a letter signed by Mr. J. W. Penfold, conservation director, Izaak Walton League of America, Glenview (Ill.) on the introduction of H.R. 8445, a bill to "save our shorelines."

THE IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., August 13, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: The Izaak Walton League of America wishes to congratulate you on the introduction of H.R. 8445, a bill to save our shorelines.

Studies made in recent years by the National Park Service and comparable State agencies reveal the appalling fact that the public is fast losing the opportunity to use beneficially our great shorelines of the Atlantic, gulf, and Pacific coasts, the Great Lakes and major inland waterways. More and more shoreline areas heretofore available to the public for recreation have been lost to private development for industry, commerce and community expansion. At the same time the population burgeons, leisure and real wages increase with a more than corresponding increase in public demand and need for shoreline recreation.

It is clear that a comprehensive and coordinated Federal-State program will be required, if we hope to preserve even some of these opportunities for present and future generations. Moreover, it is clear that except as we do implement very quickly such a program as H.R. 8445 proposes, the chance to do so may be lost entirely or rendered infeasible due to constantly rising costs of shoreline real estate. To put it crudely—such lands, however costly, can never again be acquired as cheaply as today. Senator MURRAY has cited the instance of an area the Park Service could have acquired 20 years ago at $9,000 a mile which would now cost $110,000 per mile, illustrating what has already occurred. In this connection, I noted recently an advertisement offering a Florida property, stated to be the last 5-mile stretch of undeveloped shoreline between Miami and Daytona Beach, for "$1 million down—terms for the balance."

The bill approaches the problem on three important fronts: (1) It lists several areas which have already been studied and proposes their consideration for authorization; (2) proposes a cooperative program by which the States can be assisted in expediting their State park and shoreline programs, and (3) lists additional areas for study to determine whether they are suitable for national or State shoreline designation. We are pleased that the bill recognizes that regulations established for national shoreline areas should permit continuation of present recreational uses such as hunting, fishing, water-fowling and the like where appropriate. In effect, then, the legislation would establish in the park system under congressional policy a new category of public area, so successfully pioneered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

We are pleased that the legislation sets fairly broad acreage limitations on the areas to be considered for authorization within which, if authorized, the Secretary of Interior may acquire lands. This is a sound method as has been demonstrated at Big Bend, Cape Hatteras, Everglades, Virgin Islands, Fort Clatsop, Shenandoah, and other national parks and monuments established under similar or identical procedures. During the course of hearings, of course, the committee will be able to study specific boundaries in more detail and may, if it appears desirable, describe them with more preciseness. We note also that the Secretary, before designating any authorized area, would be required to consult with the Governor of the State concerned, and to hold local hearings. Beyond this, and before the Secretary could spend any Federal funds for land acquisition, he would be required to come before Congress, in the usual appropriation process, for funds. This provides Congress with still another opportunity to assure itself that the program is being carried out soundly and within the congressional intent. These appear to be adequate safeguards against any possibility of abuse of administrative authority. At the same time it provides means at the daministrative level whereby the most sensible areas can be worked out in terms of national, State, and local interests.

It is an unfortunate fact that the Nation's national park system protects and preserves in the broad public interest little of our shoreline. This great gap has been filled to only a slight degree by State park programs, splendid as they are. The save-our-shorelines bill is designed to expedite Federal and State programs cooperatively before it is too late. It is a most worthwhile objective in which all thinking Americans should and will, I am sure, join forces to support.

Sincerely,

J. W. PENFOLD,
Conservation Director, Izaak Walton League of America.

The Late Ken Reagan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in the House in paying deserved tribute to the late Ken Reagan, a former Member of this body. He was a dedicated public servant. He was a true patriot of the old school, and always will to fight for the cause of good government whenever the occasion arose. Few men have ever served in this body who were more devoted, more courageous, and more deserving of commendation.

Ken Reagan was my personal friend. I visited with him frequently. I was always inspired by his pleasant mannerisms and by his philosophy. He was a friend of friends, a big-hearted and generous person, who always had a good word and a pleasant thought.

This Nation needs more men of the statute of Ken Reagan. He was a man who always put the welfare of the country ahead of petty politics. He voted the way he thought, the way he believed, never looked back. The one test that he applied to every issue was: Is it right or is it wrong? Ken always associated himself actively with the economy-minded bloc in the House. He warned of the dangers of inflation and the importance of balanced budgets. He was a man of great foresight who thought more of the future than he did of the political benefits that might accrue at a given moment.

I extend to his wife, Roberta, my deepest sympathy in her bereavement.

Council Seeks To Change Laws That Hamper Federal Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of September 4, entitled "Council Seeks To Change Laws That Hamper Federal Employees":

COUNCIL SEEKS TO CHANGE LAWS THAT HAMPER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

(By Thomas G. Walters, operations director, Government Employees Council)

Although America's first labor law was enacted in 1813, by far the greater part of effective labor legislation is the fruit of the period since 1910, and especially during the 1930's.

HOLIDAY VOTED

In 1894, 65 years ago, the U.S. Congress voted Labor Day a legal holiday. Labor Day now is celebrated by parades and meetings at which addresses are made by prominent labor leaders and political figures.

Notwithstanding the law of 1894, declaring the first Monday in September a legal holiday, postal and Federal employees continued to be denied and harassed by Executive orders forbidding them the right of free speech and the right to petition Members of Congress or to appear before congressional committees in the interest of better financial and working conditions.

On January 31, 1902, President Theodore Roosevelt issued an Executive order as follows:

EXECUTIVE ORDER

"All officers and employees of the United States, of every description, serving in or under any of the executive departments or independent Government establishments, and whether so serving in or out of Washington, are hereby forbidden, either directly or indirectly, individually or through associations, to solicit an increase in their pay or influence or attempt to influence in their own interests any other legislation whatever, either before Congress or its committees, or in any way save through the department or independent Government establishments in or under which they serve, on penalty of dismissal from the Government service."

In 1909, President William Howard Taft added the following paragraph to the Executive order of 1902:

"Nor shall any such person respond to any request for information from either House of Congress, or any committee from either House of Congress, or any Member of Congress, except through or as authorized by the head of his department."

Several postal employees were removed from the service because they did not buckle under and go into a shell after these Executive orders were issued. But the courageous and freedom-loving employees of the Federal and postal service rededicated their lives to the passage of laws to eliminate these Executive orders.

MAGNA CARTA

On August 24, 1912, they were rewarded by the passage of Public Law 336, 62d Congress. This became known as the Lloyd-La Follette antigag law. This has become known as the Magna Carta of Federal and postal employees.

In 1912 the States began to enact laws regulating the hours of work for women.

With these and other laws on the statute books, Federal and postal employees continued to be embarrassed and humiliated, and denied free and collective bargaining with their superiors.

Even some Members of Congress continue to think that we, the Federal and postal employees, are denied the right to petition Congress.

What we need, and need badly, is a law setting forth the ground rules of personnel management in Federal and postal service. We will not rest until such a law is approved by Congress and signed into law by the President.

World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to be able to offer the successful motion to restore to the Executive authority to spend up to $10 million for U.S. participation in the activities of the World Refugee Year, at the time that the mutual security appropriation bill was before us. I sincerely hope that this provision will be included in the final measure which we vote.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an excellent editorial from the Washington Post showing the tremendous importance of American participation in World Refugee Year.

THE UPROOTED

The United Nations General Assembly designated the period July 1, 1959-June 30, 1960 as World Refugee Year with the hope of focusing interest on the refugee problem and encouraging some concerted effort to meet the problem by governmental and nongovernmental agencies. The problem is unlikely to be solved in a single year—there are still some 2½ million homeless and uprooted human beings in the refugee centers of Europe and the Middle East and north Africa and Hong Kong—and, of course, there are now the Tibetans who have fled to India.

But by resolution and energy and generosity something can be done. And perhaps the most important spur to doing something is to remember that the refugees are not mere numerals in a table of statistics but flesh and blood persons capable of feeling cold and hunger—and even hope.

Although the United States has contributed a great deal to the aid of refugees in the years since the war, it has not yet committed itself to any special action in support of the World Refugee Year program. There are two minimum steps which, in our judgment, Congress ought to take before adjournment. One is to pass a bill authorizing a modest American financial contribution of $10 million to be spent at the President's discretion for refugee relief of various sorts. The other is to adopt a joint resolution proposed last May by Representative FRANCIS WALTER permitting a limited number of refugees to enter the United States under parole and in excess of the regular quotas. The attempt which has been made in committee to restrict such admissions to "Europeans" is, of course, entirely out of keeping with the spirit of a World Refugee Year.

There are pragmatic as well as humanitarian reasons for helping the refugees. Homeless and uprooted people present real perils to the political and economic stability of the countries where they are stranded. Migration is only one of the solutions to their plight; and it is a mistake to assume that all or even most of them want to come to the United States. They need housing and education and food and self-help projects and rehabilitation assistance; and some of them, of course, need transportation to lands such as Australia and Brazil which have ample room for them. It is unthinkable that the United States, a sponsor of World Refugee Year, should fail now to take some measure of effective action toward solution of one of the world's most tragic problems.

Khrushchev's Peace and Friendship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD the text of an advertisement which is currently appearing in many newspapers throughout the country, entitled "Peace and Friendship."

This advertisement was sponsored by the Allen-Bradley Co., located in the district which I represent in Congress. It contains a timely message to the American people on the subject of Khrushchev's impending visit to our country. It warns our people that there is a vast difference between what Khrushchev says and what Khrushchev does. By listing the nations which have fallen under Communist domination, the message proves its point very clearly.

I have repeatedly expressed my deep concern about the possible effect of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, and warned that we should not be deceived by his smiles and his talk of peace. Let us keep our eyes and ears open, and, as the Allen-Bradley message suggests, remember that there is a big, big difference between Communist pledges and Communist performance.

A few days ago, I introduced a resolution in the House, calling on the American people to observe a minute of silence on the day of Khrushchev's arrival in the United States—a minute of silence devoted to silent prayer and meditation about the spiritual heritage of our great Nation. I sincerely hope that my resolution, suggested by the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order, receives wide attention and support. The dramatic demonstration of our respect and reliance on divine guidance should have a salutary effect on Mr. Khrushchev.

The text of the Allen-Bradley message follows:

PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

Under this banner, Kremlin Boss Khrushchev is coming to the United States.

To Khrushchev, peace and friendship means the total enslavement of all nations, of all peoples, of all things, under the God-denying Communist conspiracy of which he is the current czar.

In exploiting his hypocritical theme, he promises profitable trade to the businessman, and heaven on earth to the workingman.

No one, however, has better translated his real meaning and purpose than has Khrushchev, himself, in his ugly boast: "We will bury you."

This invitation to visit the United States will give Khrushchev the additional standing he needs among the Russian people and among the peoples of those countries teetering on the Communist edge. It will also create despair among the peoples of his Communist-enslaved nations.

If our statesmen or business leaders overlook that Khrushchev is reputed to be one of history's most brutal murderers, and most vicious liars they will tend to rob the Khrushchev-captive peoples of their belief that their best hope for liberation is through the United States.

It is imperative for our national survival that our people realize the vast difference between what Khrushchev says and what Khrushchev does.

The terrible brutality of burial into Communist enslavement is known to the people of the 22 captive nations listed below.

Let there be no concessions, no appeasement, no deals with Khrushchev. Let us not be negotiated into that position which Khrushchev plans for us—the position of becoming his greatest captive nation.

Meanwhile, let us remember those thousands who died trying to defend their freedom in these Khrushchev-controlled captive nations: Poland, Hungary, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Tibet, North Korea, North Vietnam, mainland China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Albania, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Turkestan, Azerbaijan, White Ruthenia, Georgia, Ukraine, Armenia, Bulgaria, Rumania.

The Allen-Bradley Co., Milwaukee, Wis., urges you to hold fast to your American freedoms. These include your freedom to live, your freedom to worship God, and your freedom to work and to vote as you choose. These freedoms are still with us in the United States of America. But these freedoms have been destroyed by the Communists in those large portions of the world where the Communists have seized control. Don't let it happen here.

The Allen-Bradley Co. manufactures quality motor controls and quality electronic components. With this public service advertisement, the Allen-Bradley Co. is trying to sell you nothing except the importance of recognizing and understanding the horrible threat posed by Kremlin-directed international communism against our country, our people, and our incomparable American free enterprise way of life.

Citizens of San Leandro, Calif., Can Be Justly Proud of Their City Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Leandro, in Alameda County, Calif., is a progressive and rapidly growing community whose population in the last 12 years has just about trebled.

In spite of this explosive growth San Leandro has met all of her commitments to her citizens. She is not deficient in the services she furnishes.

Under the guidance of Mayor Jack D. Maltester, and a forward looking city council composed of the Honorables Valance Gill, William Swift, Kenneth Cheatham, James Frazier, Alvin Kant, and Robert J. Taylor, San Leandro has prospered well. Wise and able Wesley McClure, the efficient city manager, has done a fine job as chief administrative officer.

On September 1, 1959, the following release was issued by the office of the city manager:

Last night the San Leandro City Council once again reduced the city tax rate.

In these days of inflation, rising costs, and rising taxes, the city of San Leandro, Calif., is, it believes, justifiably proud. This year the citizens of San Leandro will, for the 12th consecutive year, benefit from a tax rate decrease.

In 1947 the city tax rate per $100 assessed valuation was $1.98; it has been reduced annually to its present low level of $1.22.

How has this been accomplished? There are many contributing factors. A most important factor is the philosophy of city councilmen to provide for prudent spending and administration. The council believes strongly in the pay-as-you-go philosophy of financing. Thus, there is not a multitude of expensive bond issues to be repaid out of tax moneys.

As a first step however, in 1947 a bond issue was passed which permitted construction of separate industrial sewage lines, and further sewage plant expansion. These lines were laid through many acres of orchards and farmlands; on the site of these orchards and farmlands now stand some of the most valuable industrial properties on the west coast.

Indicative of the city's economic growth is the fact that the city's assessed valuation in the last 12 years has increased sixfold to its present level of $120,849,700.

Simultaneously, the population of the city has increased from 26,442 in 1947 to its present 66,700. The growth of both population and industry demonstrates the desirable balance between the two which is present in San Leandro. The city is a good place to live and a good place to work.

This constant decrease in the tax rate has not been accomplished at the expense of services. The size of the full-time staff has more than tripled. There is presently under construction a $1,700,000 Community Library Center. The city is in the fourth year of a $140,000 per year capital improvement program for expanding recreation facilities. There is under construction at present the first stage of a major marina development on the city's shoreline. It is anticipated that this extensive development will be self-supporting and cause no tax increases.

The city's 6-year capital improvement program has been made possible by the city council allocating annually one-half of the city's sales tax revenue for major capital outlays, rather than using it for normal day by day city operations.

In addition to the above, the city has embarked upon a self-administered downtown revitalization program. A citizen's committee, in cooperation with the downtown property owners, has received pledges of full support from the San Leandro City Council.

While these major projects are uppermost in the minds of the citizens, it must be remembered that the city has also increased its level of service in such areas as street repairs, street lighting, police, and fire protection, etc.

For all of these reasons, the citizens of San Leandro can be justly proud of their city officials for combining a high level of municipal service with a consistently lowered city tax rate.

The 100th Anniversary of Theodor Herzl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, Theodor Herzl, the man whose dreams of a western democracy in the Middle East became a reality in the State of Israel, was born in Budapest almost a century ago. The Jewish world is engaged this year in marking the 100th anniversary of his birth.

The great leader, Louis Lipsky, in his portrait of the founder of modern Zionism, likens Herzl, whose life story has become a source of continuous fascination and attraction, to Abraham Lincoln, whose life became a source of inspiration a decade after his death.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the article by Lipsky, as it appeared in the September 1959 issue of the American Zionist:

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEODOR HERZL—A PORTRAIT OF THE FOUNDER OF MODERN ZIONISM

(By Louis Lipsky)

The Jewish world is engaged this year in marking, with due solemnity and emphasis, the 100th birthday anniversary of Theodor Herzl whose personality illuminates the modern Jewish movement, and today occupies a living memory in the State of Israel, and among the Jews of the world. The anniversary will give emphasis to the dream of which Herzl was the first to give utterance to in our day, and who, with his imaginativeness and creativeness, gave form to Zionist action, and set in motion the revolution that brought to life the Jewish state.

As the years pass, it seems that the man, Theodor Herzl, evokes deeper memories, and more significance to Jewish destiny today than he did 57 years ago when he died. Like Abraham Lincoln, whose life became a source of inspiration a decade after his death, so Herzl, through his diaries, has become a source of continuous fascination and attraction. His archive grows larger and more colorful, and with more of the elements of his unique personality. This is due to a large extent to the remarkable revelation of his personality—in thought and in action—as seen through his diaries which are the fascinating record of his great adventure, and seems gradually to increase in volume, and to reveal over the years more and more of what was first hidden and is yet to achieve is final completion.

The international anniversary celebration is being organized under the auspices of the organization to which Herzl gave life and form and purpose. The appended article is a substantial abstract of the profile of Theodor Herzl as published in my book "Gallery of Zionist Profiles" in 1956. (Farrar, Strauss & Cudahy.)

The story of his life has been told in a substantial volume written by Alexander Bein; it has been revealed in his amazing "Diaries." When you have read all that has been written about him, you begin to understand why the new symbol of the old legend would not be the weird and futile story of another false Messiah, but the engrossing first chapter of the modern exodus which led in 1917 to the Balfour Declaration and in 1948 to the rebirth of the Jewish state in the land of Israel.

There were no indications of his later transformation in the beginnings of his life. Born in Budapest in 1860, he was matured in an alien environment. He was not part of the mainstream of Jewish life. His Jewish education came to an end when he was 13. What he knew of Jewish tradition was packed away in his memory and rarely disturbed him. He knew of Jewish disabilities only as an affront to an ancient people and as a personal humiliation. He was made conscious of being a Jew by the society in which he lived. He was educated in the University of Vienna. He studied law and was admitted to the bar. He practiced his profession for a while, and then turned to journalism and literature.

He was drawn to the press, to the theater, and to the society of the elite. Like most young men of the time, he was first a Viennese, then a cosmopolitan. He looked through a small window into the larger world of culture and longed to be included in it. He was not troubled by the deeper problems of life; he was not "a soul in torment." He became a good reporter and commentator, and a writer of light and easy entertainment in the theater. His security was assured by the generosity of his father. When he was 29 he married. When 32, re was well known as a journalist and dramatist, and reached the highpoint of his ambition when he was sent to Paris by the Vienna Neue Freie Presse as its correspondent.

Herzl was unaware that for several decades the Jews of Eastern Europe were engrossed in a national revival. They were emerging, in spite of Russian oppression, from life in the ghetto, and were opening their windows to modern thought and aspirations. They were greeting the alien air. They welcomed enlightenment. In the course of their spiritual and intellectual escape, they ran toward the liberating ideals of the Russian Revolution, but at the same time the Hebrew language was reborn and the old ideal of the "return" experienced a revival. Hebrew became the medium of a modern literature.

To all of this Herzl was alien. Paris was, in a sense, the birthplace of his conversion. There, slowly, with uncertain steps, he found his way back to his people through the provocations of anti-Semitism. He read anti-Semitic periodicals and books with avid curiosity and rising indignation. He was present as a correspondent at the trial of Alfred Dreyfus in 1894, and saw the ceremony of degradation. He heard the cries of "Down with the Jews" in the streets of Paris. He followed the intrigues and sensations of the Dreyfus affair as it moved to its revision under the angry challenges of Emile Zola. He was obsessed by an inner unrest. He fell into a mood of feverish agitation which he could not explain to himself. He wrote a

play with a Jewish theme in which there was sharp debate about the Jewish problem.

His mental state was reflected in the restless inquiries he made of friends and acquaintances as to the validity of his ideas. He was not sure of himself. He even doubted his sanity. He composed "The Jewish State" in various forms. He sent the first version to Baron de Hirsch; the second was a revision addressed to Baron Edmond de Rothschild. In desperation, he wrote and rewrote the text to get the matter out of his system. He then decided upon the publication of his manuscript in order to validate the creation of his mind and to win, if possible, public support.

Herzl's distinction was that he gave the Jewish problem form, dramatic content, and political reality. He provoked a general international discussion. The pamphlet he wrote—"The Jewish State"—was the first public expression of a dynamic concept of how the Jewish people could achieve their freedom, a land of their own, how their redemption could be organized and financed.

With startling self-assurance, on his own responsibility, he proposed the creation of a Jewish state and became its sponsor and advocate. He used all his friends to help him find a way to distinguished supporters. He won the loyalty of Max Nordau, then at the height of his international fame. He met Baron de Hirsch who rejected his plans. He submitted a memorandum to Baron de Rothschild who thought his enterprise would be dangerous to Jews in general. He established contacts with Jews in England, in the United States, in Russia.

At first, Herzl hesitated to identify the territory of the Jewish State. The charter he aimed for made necessary, however, approaches to the Turkish Sultan, who held sovereignty over Palestine. The pressures of the Russian Zionists forced him to come down to terra firma. When he wrote the novel "Altneuland" in 1902 he had beyond doubt landed definitely and forever in Zion. But here he revealed, even 5 years after the First Congress, that he still had not penetrated the deeper meaning of redemption and rebirth. The Zion he saw 20 years hence in "Altneuland" in 1902 was a synthetic composition. It was made of shreds and patches, picked up from alien gardens. The home the Jews returned to was provided with modern furniture not of their own design. It had acquired no distinctive way of life based upon Jewish tradition or Jewish ethics or Jewish aspirations. The garments of the ghetto were removed, social living was cleaner and roomier, but nothing distinctive had been developed. There was only a faint reflection of a new Jewish spirit. There was no evidence of the renaissance of Hebrew. Only in the last year of his life did Herzl realize what creative power was hidden in the promise.

The publication of "The Jewish State" was the first public step in his great enterprise. It was not submitted as a dogmatic finality. It was not not a plan or blueprint. There were many improvisations subsequently discarded. But the objective was clear. It was to secure for the Jewish people the grant of sovereignty over a territory large enough for the requirements of a nation.

The magic title of the brochure evoked widespread interest and comment, rejection, and acceptance. It raised the sights of many Jews and made them conscious of their origins, their depressed position, their servitude, and the urgency for organized action. It was their first exposure to world scrutiny as a people. It made them feel that the world might be won for the cause of their liberation. It gave them courage and hope and liberated their spirit. It gave wings to their imagination and work for their hands.

When Herzl set out on his mission he had no sponsors or backers, no committee or organization. He was the sole promoter and advocate of an international project, and its leader. It was not his aim to create a mass movement. He was not concerned with democratic forms. His first thought was to seek the cooperation of Jewish philanthropy. When these efforts failed and he realized that political negotiation must be backed either by masses of people or by funds, he called the first Zionist Congress to be held in Basle in August 1897.

Through the congress the leader of a people emerged. When he stood on the platform at Basle it was said that "he was like a scion of the House of David risen from the dead, clothed in legend and fantasy and beauty." In the congress he was the moderator in clashes with persons and parties. He curbed his natural impatience. He was gracious and considerate, sharp in retort, but quick to recover balance. He was aware of the dramatic. His interventions in debate were well-timed, arresting, but controlled. He became a skilled parliamentarian in a democratic assembly in which procedures and languages fought for dominance. He was seldom an orator. He spoke as if he were the first minister of state. He gave the impression of a man convinced of the validity of his mandate which stood higher than the vote of congress. Beneath his public calm and reserve a fierce restlessness beat against his strained heart.

All his unrevealed talents converged to provide the audacity to become the first Jewish diplomat, the first to negotiate the cause of reestablishing the Jewish State on practical, political levels. The man of letters became a political strategist and diplomat. He seemed to carry the credentials of an ancient people who had regained old political manners and came straight to the throne of public opinion, seeking not special favors or mercy, but the righting of an ancient wrong; on the record, not in secret treaty.

He was not an economist. He was not a financier. But he had the gift of an extraordinary imagination and an amazing resourcefulness. He was able to find harmony in discord, unity in diversity. It required great resoluteness at that time to face an arrogant Kaiser and to plead the Jewish cause with restraint and dignity. The effort to see and influence the Sultan of Turkey was an elaborate conspiracy of great ingenuity. The influence of the Kaiser died early, but Herzl played the gambit with the Sultan to the bitter end. The crafty ruler finally offered him Mesopotamia, Syria and Anatolia, but specifically excluded Palestine.

Herzl had proposed the refunding of the Turkish debt by a group of Jewish financiers. The consideration was to be a Charter for Jewish Colonization in Palestine. His efforts to establish contact with the Sultan is a fantastic story of Oriental intrigue. He had to push his way through the meshes of a corrupt court. His own agents were not to be relied upon. Every step had to be paid for. Bribery was the order of the day. He was never sure that his messages were being received or that alleged replies by the Sultan were authentic. He seemed to be playing with an invisible adversary. Finally, in 1901 he succeeded in having an interview with the Sultan and spent 2 hours face to face with the ailing ruler.

Herzl left the audience with the Sultan and touched many hands stretched out to him in the vestibule. He distributed gold pieces. The next day he received a diamond stick pin. That was all he ever received from the Sultan. The Turkish debt was taken over by the French. When the time came for him to return to England, it was in fact the last available station on the zigzag march begun in 1895. The English offer of Uganda was the only definite proposal Herzl was ever able to bring to his people.

Herzl did not know that he had fired a revolution in Jewish life and thought. He did not know that he had created the instrument of redemption which would live on long after his departure, and would ultimately reach the goal he had missed. In the first flush of revelation he had thought freedom would come through the contributions of Jewish philanthropists, through foreign influence bought and paid for. He organized the Jewish Colonial Trust. He set in motion the Jewish National Fund. He made the Zionist Congress the international voice of the Jewish people. In the final hours of his life he knew that redemption would come from the struggle of his people, their sacrifices, their belligerency, their obstinacy. It was his historic privilege to set the Jewish people on the road that would bring them to the Promised Land—not any land, not Argentina, not Uganda, but the land which finally found a living place in his bruised heart.

He said that the foundation of the Jewish State was laid at the first Basel Congress. He foretold that 50 years later the Jewish State would be a growing reality. The first congress was held in 1897. The Balfour declaration was issued in 1917. The Jewish people proclaimed the State of Israel in May 1948.

In his last will he asked that his remains be buried in the Jewish cemetery in Vienna near the grave of his father "to remain there until the Jewish people take my body to Palestine." When the Russians entered Vienna in 1945, it was found that the Nazis had overlooked the desecration of Herzl's grave. The new State of Israel—the reality of all Herzl had striven for—resolved to fulfill his wish. On August 17, 1949, the dust of Herzl was gathered together and brought from Vienna and interred in one of the hills of the Holy City of Jerusalem where the memorial to his historic struggle will be an everlasting shrine and beacon.

Tribute to Clarendon College, Clarendon, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, some of this country's best colleges are also its least known, and some of the small colleges which have been answering the needs of the frontier country are often forgotten as larger, more spectacular institutions fill the newspapers with tales of tournaments and regattas.

Mr. President, Clarendon College, in Clarendon, Tex., has served the people of the Texas Panhandle and surrounding counties for more than 60 years. It is one of our distinguished smaller colleges.

Because of the interesting story that it relates of people working together for noble ends, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Clarendon College Survived, Thrived Because of Community's Determination," published in the Amarillo Daily News of August 28, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARENDON COLLEGE SURVIVED, THRIVED, BECAUSE OF COMMUNITY'S DETERMINATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A short history of Clarendon College appeared recently in the Shamrock, magazine of the Shamrock Oil & Gas

Corp. As it will be of interest to many of our readers, we are reprinting it here.)

Back in the days of late 1800's, institutions of higher learning were relatively few and far between in the still-young West. A number of colleges had sprung up in Texas, but most of them were in the southern and central parts of the State.

The Panhandle—a vast and rich expanse comprising more area than the entire State of Mississippi—was attracting settlers by the thousands. As the population increased at a rapid pace, the need for a college in the area increased just as steadily.

The citizens of Clarendon saw the need for such an institution. They decided something should be done. Thus it was that 2 years before the turn of the century, the Methodist Church, South, founded the first college in the Panhandle.

Known as Clarendon College, the institution served its community for more than a quarter century as a junior college before a transition to senior college standing proved unsuccessful. Its successor—Clarendon Junior College—took up where the original 2-year school left off and has fulfilled the educational needs of the area for more than 30 years.

Today, Clarendon Junior College, an A-grade institution, is considered one of the better 2-year colleges in the State, keeping pace with the times by offering a complete and up-to-date curriculum. The college is also keeping pace with the space age, boasting one of the few rocket clubs in the country. Students build and fire their own rockets, all under the strict supervision of college instructors.

It has been a long and uphill climb for the college which was founded in a virgin territory for higher education. But based on the premise that education can best be offered in the familiar and homelike atmosphere of a small institution where "the individual is a name, not a number," the college has continued to grow and prosper.

Clarendon College was founded as the result of the perseverance and determination of the early-day citizens of the city. A committee of townfolks started a subscription campaign in the summer of 1897 to build the college. This list was presented by a special committee to the District Conference of the Methodist Church, South, which met in Memphis, Tex., in November of that year. The group offered to erect a two-story brick building on a 4-acre campus which would in turn be deeded to the church.

The conference received a similar offer for a college at Goodnight, a small town located 20 miles to the west of Clarendon. Rev. W. B. McKeown, a member of the conference board of education, was assigned to investigate the proposals.

Reverend McKeown recommended the Clarendon project be placed on the list of Methodist schools. Rev. J. W. Adkisson was elected its first president and classes were scheduled for the fall of 1898.

The promised building was not completed when fall arrived, but classes opened as scheduled on September 5 in the Methodist church. Harwood Beville was credited with being the first student at Clarendon College when he allegedly won a footrace for the honor.

All 75 pupils who enrolled the first year were grade school pupils. Each was eligible to enter public school, but their parents preferred to send them to Clarendon College because "there can't be a college without students." They had contributed to the construction of the college and were making sure it would be a success.

It was the same Reverend McKeown who recommended the college be built in Clarendon that succeeded Reverend Adkisson as president. It was also the same Reverend McKeown who inspired the following editorial in the Clarendon Press.

"His bishop assigned him to the Panhandle territory where rattlesnakes and sinners outnumbered Christians 15 to 1. But the story of his ministry was one of the sagas of the Old West. McKeown supplemented his Bible with a pair of six-shooters and tackled the West on its own terms and won the respect of its citizens. He preached in barrooms, railroad stations or in the open—wherever there was an audience to listen."

It was the indomitable spirit which prompted the continued growth of the college. The enrollment increased steadily, and today the Panhandle boasts many who proudly proclaim Clarendon College as their alma mater.

Clarendon College was 27 years old when its first real trouble began to brew. It had become a 4-year senior college in 1925, but after 2 years in this status it soon became apparent that something must change.

The school's indebtedness had been paid, but the material improvements requested by the Methodist conference had not been completed. Only part of the endowment for the college had been promised and not enough funds were available to complete the gymnasium for which the cornerstone had been laid.

There had been rumors from the beginning of the school term that the college might be moved from Clarendon.

It was at this juncture that Dr. R. E. L. Morgan, president, requested the Northwest Texas Conference of the Methodist Church to settle the question once and for all. Despite the pledges of the citizens of Clarendon to endow the college with the needed funds if it would remain in Clarendon, the committee announced on March 1, 1927, its decision to move the institution to Amarillo.

The proposal hit a snag, however, when suitable finances could not be arranged in Amarillo, and the conference voted to give the original endowment for Clarendon College to McMurry College in Abilene.

Thus came the end of one era and the beginning of another.

The citizens of Clarendon, sticking by their determination for a college of their own, proposed and carried by a margin of 343 to 2 a bond issue for $42,000 to purchase the physical assets of defunct Clarendon College. The Clarendon Independent School District now owned a college of its own, and Clarendon Municipal Junior College opened its doors in September 1928.

The college has moved along at a steady pace since. Today it boasts 128 full-time students and 48 in night classes, including many townspeople. Attendance has been far above the college average, with only 12 absences reported in the final 9-week period of the last semester.

Athletics have played a large part in the life of Clarendon College and its junior college successor. The original college was credited with bringing the first intercollegiate football game to the Panhandle in 1903. The grid sport has long since made its demise, but other activities such as basketball, tennis, track, and volleyball have gained eminence among the college's athletes.

The Clarendon Junior College Bulldogs are rated one of the best small school teams in the district and are perennial contenders for the district championship in basketball.

One of the most popular departments of the college today is the science department, thanks chiefly to the intense interest of the Clarendon Rocket Club, an organization made up of college and high school students.

The club was organized in the spring of 1958 to prove that rockets could be fired safely. The group makes its own missiles in the college laboratory and has met with phenomenal success in firing them from their launching site on the W. J. Lewis ranch northeast of the city.

W. W. Cooper, science instructor, is one of the sponsors of the club which now boasts nearly 30 members, including several girls.

"The students have developed a deep interest in rockets and are not only learning that rockets can be fired safely, but are also gaining a wealth of basic knowledge of science," Cooper says.

Clarendon is proud of her college and thousands of alumni scattered throughout the land are quick to proclaim the merits of the small school.

The complete story cannot be told in a small space. But Ethel Harvey, a former resident of Clarendon, has ably recorded many of the glorious memories of the oldest college in the Panhandle in a recent book, "The Athens of the Panhandle."

Those memories, as is Miss Harvey's book, could well be dedicated to those doughty pioneers of education "whose lives were devoted to guiding youth in the search for knowledge."

A Plan To Relieve Traffic Congestion in Downtown Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. I am sure that many of our colleagues have shared my frustrating experience of trying to get downtown to a Government agency to keep an appointment, or trying to get to National Airport, during the rush hour traffic.

A plan to relieve this congestion has been proposed by the D.C. Transit System, Inc., and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues. Unfortunately, we have no means of reproducing maps and charts of the type included in the company's pamphlet. Those interested may get a complete copy of all thereof from the company.

The booklet is as follows:

THE FIRST OF A SERIES OF PLANS TO RELIEVE TRAFFIC CONGESTION

(Prepared by D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

PREFACE

The purpose of this booklet is to present a new look at a problem which we all face. Indeed, not a day goes by but what every one of us is affected, regardless of our individual activities, even down to the youngest children.

While the automobile has proven a blessing, it also has developed many staggering headaches, not to mention heartache inherent with accidents, regardless of blame. The big problem, however, is the volume of vehicles on our streets and highways, today and tomorrow. More specifically, let's concern ourselves with just one phase of this constantly increasing menace, namely, rush hour traffic.

The next few pages are designed to point out some basic ideas concerning a sensible solution which, if applied, will show widespread success immediately.

There would appear to be only two solutions to the gigantic problem of relieving our overcrowded roads and bridges. One, build even more roads and bridges, or two, reduce the number of automobiles on these overcrowded facilities by imposing legal restrictions. Such restrictions would certainly have bad effects on all concerned; and as the problem grows in size, the restrictions will

necessarily increase to the point where even the suburban streets will feel the pain.

We are all familiar with the first solution; that is, the mammoth construction programs which are presently in progress and the plans for years ahead to relieve the superroad systems now being built. Necessarily, this type of solution is slow in producing results, due to the nature of construction coupled with the fact that property acquisition is, in itself, a time consuming process. From the daily traffic jams, through the long drawn-out planning stages and the seasonal influence on the actual building program, this type of remedy is, at best, only temporary relief. An all important factor involved in this type of solution is the millions of dollars that must be raised in order to pay the staggering costs necessary to this program.

For many years, new construction has been the only sought after answer to our rush hour traffic congestion. It is clear that this type of remedy is running a losing race. When all the superroads have been built, at the expense of vast demolition involving business, landowner and taxpayer, have we at last reached the final answer? No. It will be impossible for existing city streets to accommodate the flow of traffic from the network of wide superroadways. We then must begin more roads and more roads and still more roads. Yes, all this, just to enable us to proceed to and from work each day in a method which becomes more time consuming and expensive each year.

Such has been the history of our area for many years. The systems to be built 10 years from now are needed today; we cannot catch up at the rate we are proceeding. We should all be aware by now that we are constantly falling further and further behind in the race to prevent traffic strangulation of the Nation's Capital. Would it not be a refreshing idea to think that the financial planning and manpower involved in this losing struggle could be diverted to the building of facilities to accommodate other needs? Let's build parks, not think of pouring tons of concrete over the few we have left. Such things as more adequate schools, playgrounds and recreational facilities are sadly needed. Surely there are a countless number of projects worthy of undertaking which have seen defeat in order to establish the budget necessary to attempt the roadbuilding program which cannot catch up.

In view of the tremendous expense and long delays of construction projects would it be sensible to try some other plan of attack which will show immediate success, a plan which could be put into effect today, with results today. A plan relatively free of expense to anyone.

Let's look again at the problem and break it down to its simplest form. What causes the rush-hour congestion, too many cars in a concentrated area at one time—simple. This is the reason for congestion. A street will accommodate only a certain number of vehicles, and to exceed this number means we must stop and wait. For what do we wait, the overflow to be eliminated, easy. The heart of the problem must then be the overflow above the designed capacity of the streets and traffic signal systems. Inasmuch as congestion causes a lot of waiting and delay, it would be ideal if we did not have to leave our homes to do this waiting. We could spend a very substantial part of the time required for our journey to and from work doing things more important than wasting gasoline, blowing horns and tangling fenders. This clearly shows that everyone shouldn't want to be in the same place at the same time.

Were it not for a plan initiated during World War II, our traffic problems today would be in far more critical condition than they are. For it was during the war years that the staggered hours system was put into effect. This, as we all know, relieved downtown streets of having everyone all in one place at one time. Unfortunately, this plan still operates on the basis of gasoline rationing. It was designed for the purpose of more economical use of transit vehicles during the times when most private automobiles were not in use due to fuel shortage. Staggered hours can easily help solve our traffic problems again today.

Since most of us already work under the principle of staggered hours, let's make the most of it. It's time we used the staggered hours idea to the advantage it would best serve. By incorporating the wasted travel time with our hours of work, we can eliminate the long delays, horn blowing and maybe even some of the tangled fenders.

Conditions have changed since World War II, no more rationing, plenty of automobiles, plenty of gasoline. So let's bring staggered hours up to date.

Do something now.

A PLAN OF ACTION

It must be realized that the restaggering of staggered hours is not a small, insignificant, overnight change. It must be handled on an orderly, systematic method so as to avoid confusion. The final result will be a major reduction of traffic congestion during the rush-hour periods.

A logical beginning point in the program is with the largest employer—the U.S. Government. By incorporating a change of only 15 minutes in the reporting and leaving hours of 90,000 Government employees, a 20-percent reduction of their congestion can be accomplished.

This means that 4,125 employees of the Department of Interior who now work from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. will then work from 7:30 a.m. to 4 p.m.; 51,725 employees of the Department of Defense who now work from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. or 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. or 8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m. will then work from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., 8:15 a.m. to 5 p.m., respectively; 2,575 employees of Department of Labor who now work from 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. will then work from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; 11,225 employees of the Department of Commerce who now work from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. will then work from 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.; 1,400 employees of the Post Office Department who now work from 8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m. will then work from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.; and 4,000 employees of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who now work from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. will then work from 8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m.

The present peak of 47,600 employees reporting to work at 8 a.m. will be reduced to 39,800 employees reporting at 7:45 a.m. The secondary peak of 38,500 employees now reporting at 8:30 a.m. will be reduced to a secondary peak of 34,000 employees reporting at 8:15 a.m.

In the evening the maximum peak of 47,600 employees leaving work at 4:30 p.m. will be reduced to a peak of 39,800 employees leaving at 4:15 p.m. The secondary peak of 42,000 leaving at 5 p.m. will be reduced to a secondary peak of 29,800 leaving work at 4:45 p.m.

This is proposed as only the first step in the overall program. The chart [not printed in RECORD] on the following page shows the benefits to be derived from just this 15-minute change.

Another proposal would change the hours of work of some departments by 30 minutes. This means that 7,900 employees of the Department of Agriculture who now work from 9 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. will then work from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m.; 11,225 employees of the Department of Commerce who now work from 8:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. will then work from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.; and 51,725 employees of the Department of Defense who now work from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. or 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m. or 8:30 a.m. to 5 pm. or 8:45 a.m. to 5:15 p.m will then work from 7:30 am. to 4 pm., 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m., 8 a.m to 4:30 p.m., or 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m., respectively.

The present peak of 47,600 employees reporting to work at 8 a.m. will be reduced to 41,000 employees reporting at 7:30 a.m. The secondary peak of 38,500 employees now reporting at 8:30 a.m. will be reduced to a secondary peak of 36,000 reporting at 8 a.m.

In the evening the maximum peak of 47,600 employees leaving work at 4:30 p.m. will be reduced to a peak of 39,000 employees leaving at 4 p.m. The secondary peak of 42,000 leaving at 5 p.m. will be reduced to a secondary peak of 36,000 leaving work at 4:30 p.m.

This is proposed as an alternate method of taking the first step and is illustrated by the chart [not printed in RECORD] on the following page which shows graphically the good to be achieved from this 30-minute move.

The maximum plan, or plan to achieve the greatest benefits, can only be devised through the cooperation of the departments of Government. This, of course, is necessary to produce the most effective and attractive working hours and at the same time have an equalizing effect on the number of employees starting and ending work at peak times.

The desired maximum leveling of the flow of employees to work can be comfortably accomplished within the framework of customary working hours, with a minimum adjustment by individuals.

This is a fast and economical way of attacking traffic congestion; it does not involve the lengthy planning and construction of new highways. Highway construction priorities will be reallocated to projects designed to serve other purposes than local home-to-work travel in the urban area.

The staggered hours program can be implemented overnight without cost once it is decided upon. It offers a simple solution to a big problem.

Let's do something. Support the proposed first step. Demand staggered hours.

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged: XII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A7840, I furnished State-by-State figures on employees of the Department of Commerce, relating them to the population of each of the 50 States in the Union. This record, compiled from official figures supplied by the Department of Commerce itself, reveals that my State of West Virginia ranks absolutely last in the relationship of Commerce Department employees to State population.

We have only 37 employees of the great Department of Commerce within our State, Mr. Speaker—a mere 37 out of a department with some 25,000 employees of whom almost two-thirds are located outside of the District of Columbia and within the 50 States.

Today, one out of every eight able-bodied workers in West Virginia is unemployed. There is no blinking at this

stark fact. There are those who have accused me of advertising West Virginia in an adverse light for bringing out this fact, but neither the State of West Virginia nor the Nation can afford to stick its head into the sand and wish the problem would go away. Of course, the solution is to attract more and diversified industries, and believe me we have been making some fine progress along these lines in recent years: the construction and expansion of the Kaiser Aluminum plant at Ravenswood, the Goodyear plant at Apple Grove, and the projected Montocatini Chemical plant in Wayne County, to mention only a few.

But industry does not automatically settle and build plants on those tracts best suited for their products, labor supply, transportation, and resources. Frequently the assistance of Federal officials, working in conjunction with State and local leaders, cause an industry to decide on one spot rather than another. Now I submit that the Department of Commerce, by its prejudice against West Virginia in the number of its employees in the State, is loading the dice against West Virginia in industrial development.

The Department of Commerce maintains a Business and Defense Services Administration with field offices in 33 States. Not one of these 33 offices is located in the State of West Virginia, which sorely needs an office of this nature. Huntington, W. Va.—with a population of 86,353 according to the 1950 census—would be the ideal location for such a field office. Let us examine some of the cities in which these 33 field offices have been located. Perhaps these cities have been selected on account of the size of the city. If this be the case, then why is one of the 33 field offices located in Greensboro, N.C., with a population of 74,389 according to the last census? Or Cheyenne, Wyo., with a population of 31,935? Or Charleston, S.C., with a population of 70,174? Or Reno, Nev., with a population of 32,497? Each of these cities mentioned is exceeded by Huntington, W. Va., in population; yet Huntington and the entire State of West Virginia are deprived of a single field office. This further weights the scales of disadvantage against West Virginia when it comes for assistance in business development.

It is all very well for people to say: "All business development depends ultimately on community initiative." Of course community initiative is the most important single factor, and no community can attract and foster industrial development if its schools, roads, resources, and leadership are inferior. But when you do have a high-spirited community, with lots of able people, and which after years of work has made the community and its resources highly attractive, why handicap them because they are in a State to which the Department of Commerce gives an absolute minimum of assistance?

It seems to me that from the standpoint of improving the national economy, the Department of Commerce should not concentrate on making wealthy States wealthier, but should try to be of greater assistance to those States like West Virginia where the potentialities for future industrial development are greatest, and where the labor supply is high and readily available. Yet what do these 37 employees of the Department of Commerce in West Virginia do? They are employed by the Bureau of Public Roads in Charleston, and the Weather Bureau in Charleston, Huntington, and Parkersburg. This is small comfort for a State working hard against odds to develop and expand its industry.

Not long ago, my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., was selected by an expert jury as an All America City. Huntington worked for this award. Its citizens sacrificed a great deal to build up the city to meet higher standards—economic, political, and cultural. The city voted special levies to improve its services to all the people. It built a fine new airport with the aid of individual and community contributions. Yet the specter of unemployment still stalked the city, and it worked hard to attract new industry and provide job opportunities for its younger people. Of what earthly justification is all of this blood, sweat, and tears if the Federal Government turns around and uses the money of the taxpayers of West Virginia to help other and richer States expand their industries? I say, Mr. Speaker, that is not only downright unfair but it is high time we blow the whistle on that kind of misapplication of the people's money.

Let us look at this whole problem in perspective and in a constructive spirit, Mr. Speaker. To develop the Nation's economy to make a stronger America, do not throw the weight of the Federal Government against certain States and areas like West Virginia where there is a good labor supply, natural resources, transportation, and markets.

Give West Virginia an even break—that is all we ask. Stop making us cover 25 yards instead of 10 when we make a first down.

Professor Goddard, Space Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, it was most gratifying to me to have word early this afternoon that the Senate had passed my bill, House Joint Resolution 19, honoring the late Professor Robert H. Goddard for his pioneering accomplishments on space rockets, missiles, and jet propulsion.

I would like to reiterate my deep appreciation to Chairman BRENT SPENCE of the House Banking and Currency Committee and our former colleague, the Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, for their effective help and cooperation. Members of both committees and the professional staff members went out of their way to consider, report, and act favorably on this bill in these closing hours of the first session at a time when such vital legislation as the housing bill was under discussion and I am indeed grateful to all for their interest and concrete assistance.

Congressman DONOHUE, cosponsor of the Goddard resolution, and I are tremendously pleased that the Congress should take this action to honor a distinguished native son of Worcester County, Prof. Robert Hutchings Goddard, whose name and pioneering works will go down in history as one of the great scientists of the ages.

Father of modern rockets and missiles, pioneer experimenter in radioactive materials and jet propulsion, and innovator of the modern bazooka, the control of rocket flights by gyroscope and instrumentation to record conditions of rockets in flight, Professor Goddard made great sacrifices to carry out his epochal work. Congressional recognition, in the name of the people of the United States, is a fitting action to memorialize his outstanding contribution to science and national security.

In his lifetime, Professor Goddard never received the credit and recognition that was his due for the genius of his conceptions and the brilliant painstaking work he accomplished in advancing his pioneering ideas to practical use.

The world is now entered upon an entirely new era, the space age, which is already replete with phenomenal, almost incredible developments in science. These advancements have already had—and will continue to have—revolutionary impact upon our military organization and our way of life. It is impossible, of course, for any of us to envision or predict at this hour the miraculous developments yet to come, but already we have taken giant strides from the early experiments of Professor Goddard.

For all of this great progress, Professor Goddard must certainly be given a major share of the credit because it was his painstaking researches, sacrifices, talents, and work that started missiles and rackets on their way toward playing such a vital role in all human life.

I think that we can all be resolved, even at this late date, that Professor Goddard, together with his wife and family, should receive that recognition which has long been their due for his fabulous exploits and contributions.

It is just about 1 year ago that I made known in a speech in the House my intention to sponsor the Goddard bill in the House when the 86th Congress was convened. Since that time, many expressions of interest in the bill have come to me from outstanding American scientists. Some of these statements I furnished to the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees as an evaluation of the work and accomplishments of Professor Goddard. At the conclusion of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of these statements.

These scientists have known for many years what has escaped the general public until recently—the great strides in the development of long range rockets, missiles, earth satellites and space flight are due in great measure to this comparatively unknown American scientist, Prof. Robert H. Goddard, who opened up

an entirely new field of science and engineering through his pioneering efforts.

Professor Goddard began his experiments in rockets long before other scientists saw any value or promise in this new field. His interest began at an early age in 1899 when he was only 17. As early as 1908, Professor Goddard while a senior at Worcester Polytechnic Institute carried out static tests with small solid-fuel rockets. In 1912 he worked out the detailed mathematical theory of rocket propulsion and showed that the rocket, because it needs no air to push against, could be sent to the moon or into space, provided an efficient motor could be developed.

With the entry of the United States into World War I, Professor Goddard explored the military possibilities of rockets for the U.S. Signal Corps.

An account of his work from February 1917 to June 1918, as compiled by Mrs. Robert H. Goddard from her husband's diaries, is described in the following memorandum made available to me by Worcester Polytechnic Institute:

On January 8, 1917, Dr. Robert H. Goddard (Worcester Polytechnic Institute 1908), at that time assistant professor of physics at Clark College, received word from the Smithsonian Institution that it would grant him $5,000 from the Hodgkins Fund to continue his development of more efficient rockets. After a conference with Prof. Wilmer Duff of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute and Carleton D. Haigis (Worcester Polytechnic Institute 1915) on February 9, he learned that Mr. Haigis was willing to start on preliminary work under his direction. Apparently the Magnetic Laboratory on the Tech grounds was used very soon thereafter, for after several further conferences, we find a record of new wiring to the building being arranged for, on March 7.

The work undertaken by Mr. Haigis under Dr. Goddard's direction concerned a powder "gun" or rocket, using a reloading mechanism for cartridges. Several Goddard patents, beginning in 1914, cover breechblocks and feeding mechanisms for dry-fuel rockets. In the course of the work many kinds of powders were tried. On July 9, 1917, he records that the gun "blew up" and the detonation was apparently heard by neighbors.

Clark University also had a fine machine shop and one or two instrument-makers at this time. Dr. Goddard employed at least one of the men to make some devices at Clark, which were brought to the Worcester Polytechnic Institute Magnetic Laboratory to be tested. As the work progressed, Mr. Haigis needed an assistant, for he himself was teaching at the institute. Dr. Goddard approached Professor Bird for help in getting more men, for the pressure was apparently great. He was at this time in correspondence with a General Dunwoody regarding possible military applications of his rocket. By January 1918 he was planning work for the military, with funds supplied by the U.S. Signal Corps.

Some annoyance was experienced at the Magnetic Laboratory building from intruders, who might, in that spy-conscious period, be suspected of sabotage. In February Dr. Goddard saw Chief of Police Hill, and next day, presumably with the consent of the police, he brought a shotgun to Mr. Haigis, and on February 12 a watchman was hired. A draftsman was also at work there, together with several machinists, for the names of Parker, Jernberg, Carlson, Ljungquist, Fagerquist, and Sloan appear in the notes. Mr. Milo Riffolt, an instrument-maker at Clark, was also on the Goddard payroll.

Mr. Haigis was subject to the draft, and both he and Dr. Goddard made several trips in order to obtain deferment for him. By April, however, Mr. Haigis spoke of leaving, but was given another assistant and a vacation in an effort to keep him. Some rocket testing was transferred to Clark University late in April.

Meanwhile, perhaps because of undue public curiosity regarding the activities, the Signal Corps (or the Smithsonian) decided to move the project to the Mount Wilson observatory shops at Pasadena, Calif. Mr. Haigis is not mentioned in the diaries after May 11, 1918. Messrs. Sloan and Fagerquist accompanied Dr. Goddard to California on June 6, helped unpack and returned east June 17. Messrs. Parker and Hickman joined Dr. Goddard shortly after his arrival, and stayed with him throughout his California stay, accompanying him in November to the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Maryland, for demonstrations to the military of the capabilities of the new weapon, which proved to be the prototype of the "bazooka" of World War II. The demonstrations went off very successfully, but the armistice prevented further allotment of funds. Just before and during World War II, Dr. Clarence N. Hickman, with Dr. Goddard's permission, worked most effectively to put the bazooka into the hands of infantrymen in time to be of help in the war.

Thus the magnetic laboratory at the Worcester Polytechnic Institute served Dr. Goddard and his assistants from about February 1917 to June 1918, in the preliminary development of a useful World War II weapon, and played a part in bringing about the present "jet age".

Mr. Speaker, these glimpses of the early work of Professor Goddard show how closely Worcester County is identified with the early beginnings of what has grown to be a multi-billion-dollar missile and space industry and with the development of the bazooka of World War II. Here in the faded pages of Professor Goddard's scientific diaries is recorded his successful development of several types of solid-propellant rockets to be fired at tanks or other military objectives. Successful demonstration of these rockets—from a hand-held firing tube or one steadied by two legs—were shown at Aberdeen Proving Ground as World War I came to a close. From these experiments came the great American developments in solid-propellant rockets during World War II.

Professor Goddard continued his experiments until his death in 1945, at which time he was developing jet-assisted takeoff and variable-thrust liquid-fuel rocket motors for the U.S. Navy. In an article which appeared in the Worcester Evening Gazette of May 9, 1958, Albert B. Southwick, an editorial writer, describes some of the pioneering accomplishments of Professor Goddard. I ask unanimous consent that the news article be printed at this point in the RECORD:

THE MEMORIAL WHICH DR. GODDARD WOULD HAVE LIKED BEST OF ALL

(By Albert B. Southwick)

I met Dr. Robert H. Goddard only once. It was in the late thirties when I was a student at Clark University. He had come up from Washington to attend to some business at Clark, from which he was on a leave of absence at the time. I do not recall what he said, but I still have the vivid impression of a tall, quiet man with dark, penetrating eyes. But even though Dr. Goddard was already famous, few of us students realized how far into the future those penetrating eyes had peered.

TOWARD THE MOON

The whole world knows now. Far overhead, in empyrean vault of space, three manmade satellites are weaving their huge, elliptical paths about the earth. The Explorers and the Vanguard, hurtling along at 18,000 miles an hour, sending down their mysterious messages to scientific checkpoints on earth, are the tangible fruits of Dr. Goddard's vision, the incredible dream come true. It was in 1920 that he had written: "Incidentally, it is worth mentioning that the rocket method is the only method of raising apparatus of any delicacy to great heights that is consistent with the known laws of mechanics and of commonsense."

At a time when his claims seemed like the imaginings of a Jules Verne, Dr. Goddard coolly and flatly stated that he eventually could build:

(1) A rocket that would enter the stratosphere and send down important meteorological observations; (2) a rocket that could reach the moon and set off a flash charge which could be seen from the earth; (3) a rocket capable of carrying a man to the moon and back.

In making these seemingly absurd claims 30 and 40 years ago, he showed the assurance of genius.

ACHIEVEMENTS

A few years ago, the Guggenheim Foundation, which supplied Dr. Goddard with money to finance many of his rocket experiments, listed some of his major achievements as follows:

In the course of his pioneering work, Dr. Goddard:

Developed the basic idea of the bazooka during World War I (1918), though his plans lay unused in the U.S. Army files until they were put to use in World War II.

Was first to develop a liquid rocket. (Mar. 16, 1926, at Auburn, Mass.)

Was first to develop a rocket motor using liquid fuels (liquid oxygen and gasoline), thus anticipating the German V-2's about 15 years.

Was first to shoot a liquid-fuel rocket faster than the speed of sound (1935, near Roswell, N. Mex.)

First developed gyro steering apparatus for rockets, about 10 years before the Germans did it.

First patented the idea of the rocket motor for steering rockets.

First patented the idea of "step rockets."

First explored mathematically the practicality of using rocket power to reach high altitudes and to shoot to the moon.

Was first to develop in detail the mathematical theory of rocket propulsion and rocket flight.

First proved, by actual test, that a rocket will work in a vacuum; that it needs no air to push against.

First developed pumps suitable for rocket fuels, self-cooling rocket motors, practical rocket landing devices, and forecast scientifically buzzbombs, jet-driven airplanes, rocket-borne mail and express, and travel in space.

This brief list alone shows why rocket and space experts all over the world look upon Dr. Robert H. Goddard as perhaps the greatest pioneer of the space age which we are now entering. Worcester has produced no more illustrious son. It is fitting and proper that this, his native city, where he was born and where he attended high school and college (Tech), should do him the honor of establishing some sort of memorial to his achievements.

But what sort of memorial? A plaque? A statue? A scholarship?

Of the three, I think that Dr. Goddard would far prefer the latter. A man of imagination and capacious intellect, he would like the idea of some bright student receiving a substantial scholarship every year, especially for advanced study in the sciences.

But I believe that, fine as a scholarship fund would be, there is an even more fitting memorial which Worcester can raise to Dr. Goddard.

It is this: A Robert H. Goddard Memorial Hall in the new library which Worcester will soon be building. This, I think would give the community an unequalled opportunity to serve both the memory of Dr. Goddard and the future of its young people.

The Goddard Memorial Hall would be a library of science. It would have reading tables and reference works, and a first-class collection of the latest books and periodicals dealing with the branches of science to which Dr. Goddard devoted his life. An initial contribution by the city of Worcester of $5,000 or $10,000 would establish the nucleus of a first-rate science library.

VALUE

A fantastic figure? Not at all. In the first place, Worcester would be honoring one of its most brilliant figures, one who deserves far more than a casual tribute. In the second place, a science library, carefully selected so as not to overlap with the libraries at Clark and Tech, would be a permanent and priceless addition to the intellectual life of Worcester. It would serve Worcester's young people indefinitely.

I cannot claim that I knew Dr. Robert H. Goddard personally. But I will stake a great deal on the assertion that this is the sort of memorial he would like best of all.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Goddard was born in Worcester, Mass., on October 5, 1882. He was graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1908 where he obtained a position as instructor of physics after graduation while doing graduate work at Clark University. He received his M.A. from Clark in 1910, his Ph. D. in 1911.

In 1912 and 1913, he was a research fellow in physics at Princeton. In 1914, he joined the Clark University faculty at Worcester and became a full professor in 1919.

It was in 1919 that he published the classical paper, "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," wherein he outlines his mathematical explorations and gives some of his space flight ideas. This paper, published by the Smithsonian Institution, has become one of the basic documents in technical rocket and jet propulsion literature and the source of numerous developments since its publication.

During the 1930's Professor Goddard developed near Roswell, N. Mex., at his rocket proving range, large and successful rockets which anticipated many features of the German V-2 rockets. These experiments were made possible through grants from the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation and financial assistance from Daniel Guggenheim. In 1936, the Smithsonian published his report of progress in liquid propellant work, "Liquid Propellant Rocket Development."

With the start of World War II, Professor Goddard received an assignment from the U.S. Navy to the development of practical jet-assisted takeoff and liquid propellant rocket motors capable of variable thrust. He was successful in both fields and continued his Navy work until his death in 1945.

Since his death, the world has seen Professor Goddard's dream of rocket power become a reality. We are now on the threshold of another great Goddard dream—flight into space, a dramatic turning point in the history of mankind.

It is, therefore, fitting that Congress, through its enactment of House Joint Resolution 19, expresses its commendation of the monumental work of Professor Goddard by memorializing his unselfishness, his high ideals, his originality, his great skill and genius, tenacity of purpose and painstaking labors in conceiving and carrying out ideas which are leading mankind to the stars.

The text of House Joint Resolution 19 and some of the statements from my files on Professor Goddard's contributions to science follow:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in recognition of the great, creative achievements of the late Doctor Robert H. Goddard, and his historic pioneering research on space rockets, missiles, and jet propulsion, the chairmen of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on behalf of the Congress, are authorized to present to the family of the late Doctor Robert H. Goddard an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the chairmen of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause duplicates in bronze of such medal to be coined and sold, under such regulations as he may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof (including labor), and the appropriations used in carrying out the provisions of this section shall be reimbursed out of the proceeds of such sale.

ARMY BALLISTIC MISSILE AGENCY,
U.S. ARMY ORDNANCE MISSILE COMMAND,
Redstone Arsenal, Ala., February 10, 1959.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: I have your letter of January 29 requesting from me a brief statement concerning the work of the late Robert H. Goddard.

I have always held Dr. Goddard and his work in the highest esteem. I believe my sentiments can be summed up in the statement made by the board of directors of the American Rocket Society after he died in 1945. The eulogy read as follows: "The lifework of Goddard, both as a scientist and a man, will always remain a brilliant inspiration to those who are privileged to carry on his endeavors, and to every other bold explorer on the frontiers of science. In time to come, his name will be set among the foremost of American technical pioneers."

To this statement, I would add that speculation on whether our generation will live to see the predictions of Robert Hutchings Goddard become realized facts is not of paramount concern. But whether there is to be an aggressive continuation of fundamental research in a climate of tolerance is the concern of every living American. It is imperative that such a climate include aid, encouragement, and proper recognition for men like Goddard who in spite of technical difficulties, disbelief, and ridicule persist with dogged resolution until they realize their aims. The true fulfillment of our hopes for a peaceful and better world lies in the fruit of their labors.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WERNHER VON BRAUN,
Director, Development Operations Division.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., February 11, 1959.

Robert Hutchings Goddard will long be remembered for his fundamental contributions of great and enduring value to the art and science of rocketry and space flight. Throughout most of his adult life, his very considerable talents were devoted to the furtherance of his soundly based concepts about "a method of reaching extreme altitudes." These pioneering efforts of Dr. Goddard, both in the development of theory and in the proving of his theories by experiment, pointed out the path along which scientists and engineers around the world have since moved toward the far reaches of space.

T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION,
Washington, D.C., October 7, 1958.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: I have read with great pleasure your remarks published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix of September 12, 1958 (p. A8292), announcing your proposal to introduce a bill at the next session of the Congress to honor the late Prof. Robert H. Goddard.

I am grateful to you, both for your very excellent tribute to this great man of science and for your thoughtfulness in proposing that a medal be struck in his honor.

We at the Smithsonian Institution revere the memory of Dr. Goddard and take pride in the early relationship between him and the Institution. As you probably know, it was through a grant of funds to him from the Smithsonian Institution that his early experiments in rocketry were made possible.

It will be a matter of great satisfaction to me if the Congress acts favorably upon your proposal.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD CARMICHAEL,
Secretary.

During the 28 years of the Smithsonian Institution's association with Dr. Goddard, many reasons developed to justify the financial and advisory assistance we gave to him. The most important one was that which derived from the will of our founder, James Smithson, of England, who in 1829 directed that we engage in "the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." Certainly the fundamental and advanced discoveries in rocketry achieved by Dr. Goddard and reflected in today's accomplishments have broadened man's knowledge of the universe.

Another reason was our specific interest in meteorology, stimulated by Dr. Goddard's letter of September 27, 1916, to this Institution, describing his theories and experiments for developing "a method of raising recording apparatus to altitudes exceeding the limit for sounding balloons" (then about 25 miles) "* * * capable of propelling masses for very great distances * * * would very likely be useful in warfare * * * and I therefore feel that an investigation of my method should be conducted by such a body as the Smithsonian Institution * * * with

the understanding that if in subsequent work, results should arise which appeared to be of importance for national defense the Government should be given exclusive data concerning these results."

The opportunity of assisting with the development of a new kind of vehicle and a new type of force which would be capable of reaching extreme altitudes was particularly interesting to the Institution. When Dr. Goddard's letter was received, the Institution had for a third of a century been conducting research in solar radiation and the physical properties of planets. Also, a fund for investigation of the upper air had been given to this Institution by Thomas G. Hodgkins. We were therefore able, from that fund, to make the first advance to Dr. Goddard.

Another reason for our support was a patriotic one which developed soon after the declaration of war with Germany in 1917 and the military potentials of Dr. Goddard's experiments became apparent. Those potentials were realized in part, during that war, in the development of a recoilless projectile having greater range and impact than the trench mortars then in use. The modern counterpart is the bazooka.

As the Institution contained its relations with Dr. Goddard, there were temporary disappointments, and some failures, but nevertheless through the center of those swirls and eddies of pioneer experiments there flowed the stream of progress. Looking back now upon the Institution's association with Dr. Goddard, it is felt that it was a supreme privilege to have the opportunity to support him and to aid a true genius in attaining the goal which he set out to accomplish.

INSTITUTE OF THE AERONAUTICAL SCIENCES, INC.,
New York, N.Y., February 9, 1959.

The Honorable PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I would have no hesitation whatever in recommending any recognition that might be given by the Congress of the United States in acknowledgment of the work of Dr. Goddard.

As a matter of fact, we have just participated in honoring him ourselves through the presentation of the first Louis W. Hill Space Transportation Award. It was presented to his widow, Mrs. Esther Goddard, at our honors night dinner in New York on Tuesday, January 27. For your information I am attaching several copies of the booklet which was prepared for that occasion. This booklet will indicate to you the importance which we have attached to Dr. Goddard's scientific contribution. I trust that this will be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

S. PAUL JOHNSTON,
Director.

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE,
RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: It is a pleasure to have the opportunity of adding a few words of praise of Dr. Goddard, posthumously, in support of joint resolution (H.J. Res. 19) to authorize the issuance of a gold medal in honor of the late Prof. Robert H. Goddard.

Dr. Goddard's achievements are an inspiration to all men in science and engineering.

As early as 1912, at 30 years of age, Dr. Goddard made the initial computations that led him to the conclusion that lifting a load to great heights by rocket fuel would require relatively little fuel.

In 1916, when Dr. Goddard found that he could not continue his research on his own resources, the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, impressed with Dr. Goddard's ideas, earnestness, and enthusiasm, was instrumental in making money available.

Three years later, in 1919, when Dr. Goddard had completed a manuscript entitled "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," he had laid claim to the title now generally acceded to him—Father of Modern Rocketry. The $11,000 made available by the Smithsonian Institution is frequently described as the investment that launched modern rocketry and jet propulsion.

Some of the experiments performed by Dr. Goddard during the fruitful years 1929–41 were sponsored by Daniel Guggenheim and subsequently by the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation.

Harry F. Guggenheim eulogized Dr. Goddard in the foreword of the book, "Rocket Development," which presented for the first time the Goddard data on experiments during 1929–41. Mr. Guggenheim stated that there is evidence that the German rocket engineers followed Dr. Goddard's work very closely from the time of publication of his first Smithsonian report until his death and that Dr. Goddard was the undisputed father of modern rocketry.

The American Rocket Society considered Dr. Goddard's 1919 report of sufficient significance to warrant their printing a facsimile in 1946. Remarks preliminary to the facsimile state: "Only 1,750 copies of this paper were printed, but they were sufficient to launch a new era, creating almost worldwide interest, and setting off trains of research and speculation which are undoubtedly to have profound effects on the future history of the world."

House Joint Resolution 19 reflects the statements quoted here as well as many others that have been made by persons capable of evaluating Dr. Goddard's contribution, and I strongly endorse this joint resolution.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT F. YORK.

THE DANIEL AND FLORENCE GUGGENHEIM FOUNDATION,
New York, N.Y., February 5, 1959.

Col. JOHN P. STAPP,
President, and the Board of Directors, American Rocket Society, Wright Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio.

Mr. WILLIAM LITTLEWOOD,
President, and Members of the Council, Institute of the Aeronautical Sciences, Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Will you permit me to suggest that you recommend to the President and the Congress of the United States that the highest appropriate posthumous award be granted to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard.

Dr. Goddard's pioneering and original contributions to the theory, science and art of rockets and space flight are just as important as the contributions of the Wright Brothers that made posisble the airplane and aviation. I believe that knowledgeable scientists throughout the world would acknowledge these contributions of Dr. Goddard's, an American whose genius and contributions to the space age have not as yet been suitably recognized by his Government.

Attached is a résumé of some of Dr. Goddard's contributions and accomplishments.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman of the House Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.

Yours faithfully,

HARRY F. GUGGENHEIM,
President.

AIR FORCE BALLISTIC MISSILE DIVISION,
AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 25, 1959.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PHILBIN: I read your letter of February 4 with a great deal of personal interest for I have long felt that Dr. Goddard has never received the proper recognition due him.

Without doubt, Dr. Goddard's work is one of the cornerstones upon which today's space programs are built. Both Nation and the field of science are greatly indebted to this brilliant and imaginative scientist.

I most heartily concur in your proposal to strike a gold medal in honor of Dr. Goddard.

Sincerely,

B. A. SCHRIEVER,[1]
Major General, USAF Commander.

---

[1] General Schriever is now Lieutenant General Schriever. He is the first commander of the Air Force Ballistic Missile Division.

Ex-Congressman, 38, Proves a Business Whiz in Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 10, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in glancing through the Daily Review, published in Hayward, Calif., the other day, I came across a story originating in Houston, Tex. The title of the story was "Ex-Congressman, 38, Proves a Business Whiz in Texas." Naturally, the headline caught my eye and I was indeed tickled when I saw the story was about our former colleague, Lloyd Bentsen.

Lloyd Bentsen's office was next to mine and over the years we became great friends.

We all hated to see Lloyd leave Congress, though he was succeeded by the personable JOE KILGORE.

I am sure that all of my colleagues who served with Lloyd will be interested in the story which appears below:

[From the Hayward (Calif.) Daily Review, Sept. 2, 1959]

EX-CONGRESSMAN, 38, PROVES A BUSINESS WHIZ IN TEXAS

HOUSTON, TEX.—A Texan who retired undefeated from Congress at the age of 34 has made such a mark on Houston's fast-moving business circles in just 4 years that he is already being linked with those legendary Texans who "built things big."

He is Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., and he is the head of not one but two multimillion-dollar firms.

As a politician from the Rio Grande River, Bentsen was a sensational success, having first been elected to Congress when he was only 27. But that success may have been surpassed already by his swift rise in the ranks of high finance in the South's fastest growing city.

His financial growth started in 1955 when he retired from Congress after serving in the House of Representatives for 7 years to devote his time to private business.

After leaving Congress, Bentsen, with the backing of his father and an uncle, founded the Consolidated American Life Insurance Co., with initial capital and surplus of $5,337,000 which was then a record for an insurance firm in the United States at the time it was formed.

In its first 28 months, his insurance company recorded sales in Texas of $30 million.

Still "wanting to build," Bentsen merged his company last year with Lincoln Liberty

Life, which had its home office in Lincoln, Nebr. He paid $7 million for the company in one of the largest cash transactions in American business in 1958.

Bentsen's most recent business venture was the announcement that construction will begin soon on a $15 million center in downtown Houston which will house an 800-room luxury hotel and will serve as southern headquarters for his Lincoln Liberty Life Insurance Co.

The Sheraton Corp. of America signed a long-term lease to operate the hotel, which will be completed in 1961.

Bentsen, a tall wiry Texan, has always enjoyed fierce competition. When he was the youngest Member of the 80th Congress, at 27, he had five times as many bills passed as any other freshman Congressman.

Before that, he had defeated a strong political machine to become a county judge in the Rio Grande Valley when he was 25. He piloted his own private plane in hectic political campaigns along the Rio Grande.

Bentsen said there was a marked similarity between being a Congressman and heading a multimillion-dollar insurance firm.

"In Congress, I came up for reelection every 2 years to see if the voters liked my management," Bentsen said. "Now, I come up for reelection every year."

Bentsen said stockholders seem to appreciate a full disclosure of what's been accomplished just as voters do.

"Stockholders, like voters, want to know what you have done for them recently," he said. "In one case, you have the company's operating statement to show. In the other, you stand on your voting record."

Labor Leaders Finally Becoming Disturbed by Cheap Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to Victor Riesel, newspaper columnist, labor leaders are at long last showing signs of becoming disturbed by the flood of cheap imports that is hitting this country.

The time for them to have demonstrated their concern was last year when a majority in Congress was whipped into line to support a 4-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act, with a 5-percent reduction in tariffs in each of the 4 years. Instead of supporting labor, industry, and agriculture in providing protection against the increasing flood of cheap labor products from foreign countries, most of the leaders of labor or their representatives joined hands with Eric Johnston, former president of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and other of his international cohorts, in staging the drive on Congress for a further lowering of tariffs and opening the doors of this country to virtually free trade.

A year ago, in opposing extension of the Trade Agreements Act with a 20-percent lowering of tariffs, I warned, as did others, that this legislation would haunt those who supported it. A few days ago the Department of Agriculture announced that for the 12-month period preceding July 31, 1959, imports of agricultural products into the United States exceeded exports. The so-called Reciprocal Trade Act made a substantial contribution to that unfavorable trade balance, and to the fact that American farmers suffered a net income loss of $1 billion in the first 6 months of 1959.

Now comes Mr. Riesel to set forth a few of the facts and figures concerning the dumping of millions of dollars worth of cheap labor products on the American market. American labor and industry cannot possibly meet this onslaught. This is not competition, for there is no possible way that American industry can meet these costs. Neither can American workers provide their services on a competitive basis and do anything but starve.

If Eric Johnston and others of his international stripe are bent on putting labor, industry, and agriculture in this country on a world price level, they are on the way to achieving their diabolical end. But I again warn that this will not be accomplished without first putting a host of workers, employers, and farmers through the wringer of bankruptcy.

There will be another meeting this fall of GATT—General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Is it too much to hope that American delegates and representatives to that conference will have the ability and courage to speak out in behalf of the welfare of the United States? Or will there be among these representatives the same number of politicians and junketeers as attended last year's meeting?

Mr. Riesel's article follows:

RIESEL SAYS LABOR LEADERS DISTURBED BY CHEAP IMPORTS

(By Victor Riesel)

Very clever people those Japanese. Soon they expect to unload on this country thousands of $50 television sets, $19 combination short-wave and regular transitor radio receivers and read-to-wear men's suits at $15 to $20 apiece f.o.b.

Already they're pouring in scores of millions of dollars worth of children's and women's garments at prices so low you won't believe it, so we won't even list them. This year Japanese and Hong Kong Chinese exports of women's wear, mostly dresses, blouses, and brassieres, and youngster's clothing, will total about $150 million.

All this can be dumped on the United States—wiping out firms and jobs across the land—because the ayerage garment wage in the Orient ranges from 9¾ pennies in Hong Kong to 14 cents an hour in Japan's clothing and electrical shops.

This is the story behind the visit of U.S. Ambassador Douglas MacArthur II to the honorable gentleman, Hayato Ikeda, Tokyo's Minister of International Trade and Industry. I don't know if there was a majority of one in that two-man parley—but our Ambassador was under specific instructions to tell the Minister to stop dumping stuff in the United States.

And behind this message is the fact that key industries employing some 2 million Americans may be crippled by our low-wage friends abroad.

There is the men's clothing field, for example. In Washington the other day, Leo Ullman, vice president of the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States and Jacob Potofsky, gentle-voiced but determined president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, told Congressmen about Japanese firms like one named Tara.

Tara gets out a $36.75 f.o.b. New York suit. It is delivered to distributors here at that wholesale price almost completey hand-tailored. There is only one machine seam. Fabrics are woven in Japan by dime-an-hour weavers from the finest wools, silks, and mohairs. Ask your tailor what he would charge you for such a suit completely hand-felled, made with inside bellows coat pockets and even the bar tacking—done by hand.

Such a suit would cost you at least $150 manufactured here. Furthermore, one observer described new Japanese fabrics as "mohair blends and silk worsted blends along with some very exotic blends of cashmere, the samples of which had the 'hand' of whipped cream."

These textiles, produced at less than 10 cents an hour labor costs can crush our already hard-hit textile industry.

Also being dumped are overcoats, raincoats, shirts, knit gloves, pajamas, robes, underwear, pants and sporting apparel.

The other day the high command of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, lead by David Dubinsky, was startled by statistics from its research director Lazar Tepper. He revealed that before 1950 total imports from Japan and Hong Kong for all female garments were less than $10 million annually. Last year this figure hit $120 million. This year it will probably top that by some $20 million, according to other estimates.

Dubinsky and his colleagues lashed out at a small band of American manufacturers who are working with the Japanese starvation-wage operators.

Now the union leaders want the United States to take an average year's average production, say 20 million pairs of pants of a certain type. This amount should be protected each year—that is, only after such a total is sold would the Japs be permitted to dump their stuff. This high-tariff protectionist policy is a switch for such militant leaders as Dubinsky and Potofsky, now fighting to save their industries and jobs. They expected full support of the AFL–CIO high command. But they didn't get it.

Opposed to such high tariffs are Walter Reuther and James Carey. This surprised many, especially since the auto industry and the electronic field also have been hard hit by foreign imports. This is just one of the many battles which will be fought out at the San Francisco national convention.

Weaknesses in the Benson Farm Policies

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took the House floor to tell as best I could some of the difficulties and anxieties that beset the American farmer. Today I want to discuss what I believe to be the weaknesses in Secretary Benson's approach to the farm problem. On tomorrow, I plan to take the floor for the third time this week to make some positive suggestions for improving our agricultural economy.

Let us get one central fact clear in our minds. The farm problem is not a matter of concern only to rural people. Our agricultural economy is so intertwined with the national economy, that any weakening of agriculture's position

is a loss to every American. Let me say to my colleagues in the Congress who represent metropolitan areas that the welfare of your people is closely tied to the American farmer. Not only do our farm families provide you with the finest supply of food in the world but farm customers buy the products that keep your factories running.

Farmers, for example, use more steel each year than is consumed by the American automobile industry. When farm income drops, so do the sales of steel companies, farm machinery manufacturers, and auto companies. The Detroit auto worker and the Peoria farm machinery worker have as much at stake in a good farm program as does the farmer.

Of course, the wise farmer knows that his welfare is likewise tied to the buying power of the worker and the merchant in the city who consume the products of the farm. Those who divide and confuse the farmer, the worker, and the merchant do a grave injustice to all three of them. Together they comprise a three-legged stool that tumbles if any one of the legs is broken.

It is especially clear that the farm problem is closely tied to the economic well-being of the small businessman. Farm families purchase large quantities of groceries, shoes, clothing, washing machines, medicine, machinery, furniture, haircuts, gasoline, et cetera.

It has often been pointed out that the farmer creates new wealth from the soil. The rest of us depend so directly or indirectly upon that new wealth that we all suffer every time the farmer's income takes a dip. In fact, it is estimated that the farm dollar turns over six or seven times in its impact on the economy.

The Conference on Economic Progress report, prepared in December 1958, reached the conclusion that from one-fourth to one-half of our entire national production lag since the end of the Korean war in 1953 stems from depressed farm purchasing power. With farm income for the first 5 Benson years $12 billion less than the previous 5 years, the cash registers in towns and cities across the Nation have been slowed down.

Who can deny that the farm problem is America's problem—the problem of each one of us? It will take the best efforts of a great many of us to meet that problem successfully.

I am convinced that no proper answer to the difficulties of agriculture is to be found in the approaches recommended by Secretary Benson. He is doubtless a man of good character and sincere purpose, but he seems to be totally lacking in understanding of farmers and their problems. Since he took command of our agricultural programs in 1953, he has repeatedly made administrative rulings and exerted pressures that have aggravated rather than helped our farm economy. Nearly all of the major farm bills passed by the Congress in recent years have been vetoed by the President on the advice of Mr. Benson.

Many of us in the Congress were dismayed when the administration vetoed our wheat bill earlier this year. That bill would have reduced surplus wheat production by 480 million bushels, cut Government costs by $528 million, and protected the farmer's income. The bill was further improved on the floor when Congress accepted my amendment to place a $35,000 ceiling on the amount of price support loan that any one farmer could receive. Yet, the President vetoed this bill at Mr. Benson's insistence.

In a nutshell, Secretary Benson's program has consisted of lowering the farm price-support level to accomplish three objectives: First, reduction in farm surpluses; second, reduced Government costs; and third, reduced food prices to the consumer.

The policy has been an enormous failure on all three counts. The Secretary has cut farm prices to be sure, but in doing so he has sharply reduced farm income, driven many farm families from the land and most frustrating of all, instead of reducing surpluses, tax costs and food prices, the reverse has happened.

While farm income was falling, farm surpluses and farm program costs to the taxpayer have skyrocketed and food prices are up instead of down.

Here is the record based on Government statistics for the Benson administration from 1953 until the present:

Farm income down by one-fifth.

Farm purchasing power down by one-third.

Farm surpluses have quadrupled from $2.4 billion in 1953 to $9.1 billion in 1959.

Department of Agriculture budget now seven times greater than in 1952.

Food prices up 5 percent.

Four million Americans have left the farm. Instead of eliminating surplus production, the Benson policies have eliminated farmers whose farms have been incorporated in larger units. Many of these family size farms have been swallowed by vertical integration or corporation farming.

A year ago, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture [Mr. COOLEY] summarized the results of Secretary Benson's policies as follows:

> Since Mr. Benson began to bring down farm prices 5 years ago, farm income has dropped about $1 billion a year, the cost of farm programs has increased by about $1 billion a year, farm debt has climbed about $1 billion a year—and farm people have been leaving the farms at the rate of about 1 million a year.

No fair-minded person would argue that Secretary Benson is solely responsible for the current agricultural problem. The evidence is clear, however, that he is promoting a discredited theory which may sound convincing to those who preach it but which has disastrous consequences when applied.

The Benson theory is "the free market theory." According to this view, farmers are overproducing because of Government price supports; overproduction depresses farm income; take away firm price supports and farmers will balance supply with demand so that all will be well.

The only trouble with this "free market" or "supply and demand" theory when applied to agriculture is that every time it is applied it leads to economic disaster. Farmers have wryly observed that the law of supply and demand means that when there is a supply there is no demand.

When the farmer brings his produce into a free market, he is more often than not like a lamb going to slaughter. He has nothing to say about either the price he shall be paid for what he sells nor the price he himself will pay for the things that he must buy.

Before the advent of the Federal farm program which Mr. Benson has been gradually taking apart, farmers were taken for an economic ride each year by the speculators. During the marketing period following harvest, speculators enjoyed a hey-day as they watched the temporarily-flooded market sink. They would then move into the glutted market and buy low knowing that the farmer had to sell to pay his bills and his expenses. They could then sit back and wait for the market to rise before they unloaded at a neat profit.

We need not rely on theory to know how the "free market" would work in the absence of a Government farm program. We had such a market in the 1920's and early 1930's. During that period the stock market boomed to an all-time high in 1929. Industry was prospering. The farmer, however, saw his markets collapse in late 1920 and 1921 and from then on for the next decade he was in serious trouble.

All across rural America while prosperity reigned in the cities, farm families were forced to the walls, mortgages were foreclosed, mainstreet businesses and banks closed and everyone suffered.

That is why farm State Republicans and Democrats joined in demanding a program that would bring order out of chaos in our agricultural economy. Great champions of the farmer in Congress such as Norbeck, of South Dakota; Norris, of Nebraska; and LaFollette, of Wisconsin; tried unsuccessfully to convince Presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover that the Federal Government had a responsibility to meet the crisis in agriculture. Their efforts fell on deaf ears, however, with Coolidge typifying administration attitudes when he said:

> Farmers have always been poor and there isn't much that can be done about it.

It was this lack of administration understanding of agricultural people and their problems that led Norbeck, Norris and other farm State Republicans in the Congress to shift their support to the Democratic President, Franklin Roosevelt. Norris campaigned for the Democratic presidential candidate as early as 1928.

These men knew that in the absence of a national farm program, millions of individual farmers have no way of keeping supply and demand factors in balance. They can never know whether Mother Nature will bring drought, hailstorms, or bumper harvests.

Nor can the farmer know what the impact will be of shifts in production by other farmers, or a change in the pattern of international trade and foreign production. The farmer, for example, who might decide that a 10 per-

cent cut in corn production would help stabilize prices, is powerless to do anything about his hunch if other millions of farmers should fail to act on the same impulse. Even then, in a free market, during the period when the crop is brought to market, the price would sink, giving the speculators their opportunity to profiteer on the farmer's toil.

It is only through a carefully planned farm program that supply and demand factors can be made effective.

The Federal farm program established in the 1930's and 1940's gave farmers an opportunity for the first time in American history to market certain basic commodities in an orderly and profitable manner. Under this program, farmers were assured price support loans up to 90 percent of the parity value of their crop, provided they complied with production limitations. The farmer paid interest on his loan, and had the option of either redeeming his stored commodities by paying off his loan or letting the Government keep the commodities. For 20 years, 1933–53, this program operated for six basic farm commodities. Not only did it stabilize farm production, marketing, and income, but at the end of two decades the Government, instead of subsidizing farmers, had actually made a $13 million profit.

Furthermore, there were no burdensome surpluses. The Government farm storages were a great blessing during World War II and the Korean war. Even in peacetime years, the surpluses were never larger than that needed for a national reserve.

There were, of course, weaknesses in the farm program. One basic weakness was that it was never geared sufficiently to the needs of the smaller farmers. There was no graduated scale of acreage allotments and parity guarantees similar to the Federal income tax principle. As a result, acreage restrictions worked a hardship on the small producer. Likewise, big producers parlayed price support profits into investments in bigger and bigger farms that made it increasingly difficult for the little man to enlarge his holdings.

Another fundamental failure has been our slowness to convert our farm abundance into an effective foreign policy instrument in a world overrun with hungry inhabitants. There is something immoral about the constant deploring of farm surpluses while other human beings in Asia, Africa, and the Middle East are yearning for food. Indeed, there are hungry Americans here in the United States who ought to be benefiting from our surplus food.

But the lack of family farm considerations and an imaginative food for peace concept have not been the weaknesses that Secretary Benson has sought to correct.

Because of a deepseated prejudice against Government intervention in economic life, Secretary Benson set out in 1953 to dismantle the Federal farm program. Mr. Benson was not motivated by any desire to remedy the weakness of the program for the benefit of the small farmer. He was determined to do away with the entire program by a series of reductions in the farm price support level.

Mr. Benson's biggest error is the basic assumption that he could reduce farm production by reducing farm price supports. Each time that he has lowered farm price supports, production has gone up—not down.

The reason is clear. Farmers have high, fixed operating costs which can only be met by multiplying the volume of production times the price. If their prices are lowered, they have no recourse other than to increase their volume. This they have done in the case of every commodity following reductions in the price support level. Cuts in farm prices, combined with acreage cuts and rising costs, comprise a three-way pressure on farmers to increase the yield per acre as much as humanly possible. Scores of farmers have told me that Secretary Benson's policy of lower prices, combined with reduced acreage allotments, has forced the very surplus production it was supposed to prevent. Thus, the $2.4 billion in Government-held farm surplus of 1952 has mushroomed to $9.1 since Mr. Benson has been handling the program.

We have already seen that Benson has failed equally in his two other objectives—that of lowering food prices and reducing Government costs. During the years that Benson has been administering our farm program, each time he has lowered farm price supports, middlemen have simply widened their profit margins. Neither farmers nor consumers have benefited from lower farm prices.

Consider, for example, the case of bread. During the past 10 years the price of a bushel of wheat has declined 13 percent, but the cost of bread has increased 39 percent.

The record of failure is equally clear in the case of Mr. Benson's claim that his approach would lower costs of the farm program to the taxpayers. His policies, including his highly advertised soil bank, have been vastly more expensive than any previous farm program in our history.

The annual budget of the Department of Agriculture, prior to Secretary Benson, was approximately $1 billion. This year's fiscal budget has reached the astounding total of $7 billion.

A news item in the Washington Post of June 1, 1959 tells the story as follows:

> A Library of Congress study shows that Agriculture Department appropriations from 1862 to 1931 totaled $2.4 billion. From 1932 to 1953, expenditures were $35.2 billion. Since Benson took over in 1953, net budget expenditures have reached $31 billion. In other words, the present Secretary has spent more than all his predecessors combined.

Let us see briefly how this has happened. First of all, although there are 4 million less Americans engaged in farming today than in 1952, Mr. Benson has increased the number of employees in his Department from 67,406 in 1952 to 98,487 as of June 30, 1959—an increase of more than 31,000.

Second, price support losses by the Commodity Credit Corporation which formerly were either very small or actually net profits to the Treasury, have increased enormously in recent years.

The Department of Agriculture supported the prices of major storable crops for 20 years prior to 1953 and ended that 20-year period with a net profit of $13 million. During this same period, even with the price support losses on the perishable commodities included, the Government cost was only slightly above $1 billion. By contrast, Mr. Benson lost more than $4 billion during the first 5 years that he handled the price support program.

Because Mr. Benson has been protected by the big metropolitan press and friendly commentators, the shocking cost to the taxpayers of his policies is not generally known. Yet, the record is clear. He has lost more than four times as much in price support operations in 5 years as was lost in the 20 previous years by Secretaries who believed in the program they were administering and did their best to make it work rather than trying to prove it would not work.

Here are some of the other factors in the Benson financial record:

First. Interest charges in the Department of Agriculture have increased from $16 million in 1952 to $323 million in 1958.

Second. Storage and handling charges have gone from $73 million to $409 million.

Third. Transportation costs for moving Government commodities have risen from $45 million to $178 million.

Fourth. Administrative expenses for Mr. Benson's office have jumped from $15 million to $34 million.

Fifth. County office expenses have zoomed from $13 million to $50 million.

The biggest expense of all in the Benson years was his highly administered soil bank. That program has cost the taxpayers $2½ billion and has benefited only a small minority of our farm families. When Mr. Benson and his supporters in the Congress told us in 1956 that the soil bank was the answer to the farm problem, I publicly protested this false claim. "The soil bank may have certain conservation values, but it is a poor substitute for a strong price support program," I warned repeatedly during the months this new program was being advanced.

The soil bank was actually promoted by Secretary Benson in 1956 as an election-year scheme to get some quick cash into the pockets of farmers who had been hurt by his policies. The Secretary recommended that $1,200 million be paid out to farmers just before the 1956 election on the farmer's promise that he would take acreage out of production the following year. "I wonder what would have been the reaction of the press and the Nation if a Democrat had offered any such thing just before an election," observed Congressman WHITTEN, of Mississippi, chairman of the House Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

Although the Government has spent nearly $2½ billion on the soil bank, it has had little effect on reducing production. The acreage reserve costing $1¾ billion was junked by Congress this year after Mr. Benson publicly admitted his plan had not worked.

The conservation reserve of the soil bank, which remains, has some good features, but involves only a small fraction of the Nation's 4 million farmers—125,000 in 1957–58. It has cost three-quarters billion dollars to date, and we are committed under this program to some contracts running 10 or 15 years.

Here, too, the effect on production has been slight. Congressman WHITTEN reports that his committee investigations revealed that "all sorts of nefarious schemes were used, in some instances, to bilk the Treasury in connection with the program. Most of the lands rented had little real production history anyway." Chairman WHITTEN concluded, after an intense committee study of the soil bank, that its chief purpose was "to place in the hands of some farmers cash which they have lost under the policies of Secretary Benson."

Strangely enough, while pouring $2½ billion into the soil bank, Secretary Benson has tried to undercut such programs as the agricultural conservation program in which 1¼ million farmers participate. He has recommended cuts in the already small school lunch and milk program, has resisted efforts by the Congress to expand the use of our farm surpluses overseas, and for needy American families, and has strongly urged higher interest rates for our rural electric users.

The more I study Mr. Benson's record, the more convinced I become that he is a representative not of the farmers, but of the powerful and influential middlemen who process, store, transport, and handle the farmer's products.

I fully recognize that it is not enough simply to criticize Secretary Benson's policies. My purpose in doing so is my conviction that any improved program must begin with a recognition of the mistakes that have been made in the recent past. I have given a great deal of time and thought to the farm problem in recent years and have discussed it with hundreds of farmers in my home State of South Dakota. The suggestions which I shall make tomorrow for improving our farm economy are offered in humble recognition of the fact that no one of us has any quick and easy solution to this tough national problem.

Philosophy in American Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include the following article by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director of the the American Federation of Teachers, and Mrs. Reuter:

PHILOSOPHY IS THE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR IN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Dr. and Mrs. George S. Reuter, Jr.)

I. INTRODUCTION

American education is in need of many things, but an adequate consideration of a school philosophy for each school district in our Nation should have priority over all other things. This, in turn, should spell out a national philosophy of education that each citizen will make a part of himself, because he had a part in developing it.

The Bible was first to give status to the area of philosophy in dealing with individuals. More recently the United Nations noted the important phase of philosophy by calling attention to the fact that "wars begin in the minds of the people."

American education has always had a difficult struggle. Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1786: "Preach, my dear sir, a crusade against ignorance, establish and improve the law for educating the common people," but few people had his zeal and understanding of a sound educational philosophy. Too often the philosophy has been much like that described by Jonathan Swift that "the best doctors in the world are Doctor Diet, Doctor Quiet, and Doctor Merryman."

During the age of Jefferson, people permitted their philosophies to include royalty. While royalty should have a part in any age, because many regal people have made great contributions to all ages, yet it is doubtful whether royalty should be a basis of our Nation's philosophy even though Louisville, Ky., was named as a tribute to Louis XVI of France for his services to the colonies during the War of the Revolution, or the fact that the common law, that is so important in our legal history, gives great importance to the King.

Some Americans desired to make George Washington a king. Others referred to various members of royal households and their influence over rulers. One such remark, in the latter category, was that DuBarry was the last of the left-handed queens of France, which gives the historian two considerations in the area of philosophy.

First, the expression "left-handed," gives the idea that "right-handed" is superior. In reference to the fact that these women were mistresses and not legal wives of rulers, the point is correct. Also, a married couple should always be true to each other, as this is a basic part of the Christian philosophy expressed in the Bible, yet a second consideration must be noted. The mistresses normally did not possess royal blood and seldom became recognized queens. Ann Boleyn, of England, was an exception to both counts. The fact remains that these women did influence the development of the philosophy of the nation.

Second, "left-handed," or "to the left" has developed the idea that these things are inferior to "right-handed," or "to the right." This is false, because one extreme is as bad as the other. This philosophy is traced to the Bible where many believe it is more desirable "to sit on the right" than to "sit on the left." Jesus was critical of honored places to sit, but the idea has continued.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Horace Mann and others saw the necessity of public education. In one way, public education was the answer to the condition expressed by Josiah Holland: "Every man who can be a first-rate something—as every man can be who is a man at all—has no right to be a fifth-rate something; for a fifth-rate something is no better than a first-rate nothing."

Those people who favored a philosophy that provided for free public education created much controversy. Mann was somewhat in the same status in his day as Mrs. Roosevelt is in our day. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., recently described this condition as: "It was once said of Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt that no woman has ever so comforted the distressed or so distressed the comfortable. Our country has need of people who can do both these things."

The public schools have developed under the philosophy that each system should reflect its community. Of course, there are times when the result will be poor because the community is poor. This basic concept of reflecting the majority ideas and ideals goes through all areas of government, so the comment by Dr. Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., is basic here. He recently referred to our age as the "homogenizing atmosphere of the age of Eisenhower," and if this description is correct, the philosophy of the schools will reflect this.

The current weakness of the reflection theory in general is the fact that our population is so mobile. This is noted in a recent study where it was found there are more Negroes in New York City than in New Orleans; more in Detroit than in Birmingham, Ala.; more in Pittsburgh than in Little Rock; more in Chicago than in Atlanta. This question thus develops whether the future philosophy should include the reflection theory.

Even if the reflection theory is retained conflicts often become bitter and the schools may take years in adequately reflecting these changes. For example, George Meany, recently made a statement that reflects a school of thought, when he said: "We support legislation that will get at the crooks. We oppose legislation which will do harm to the trade union movement." Another reflection comes from the statement of the Senior Citizen Prayer: "Heavenly Father, give us serenity to accept what cannot be changed; courage to change what should be changed; and wisdom to know one from the other."

The public schools will be affected in the area of philosophy whether it is Panos D. Bardis' "Eternal Tests," or William Watson's "The Woman With the Serpent's Tongue." The "Eternal Tests" is an expression of retaining the status quo philosophy beyond a reasonable time, and is expressed:

"There was a most clever
Professor who never
Prepared a new test,
Although Dean Don Daly
Would lecture him daily
And plead and protest.

"So three generations
His examinations
(Identical all)
For decades had taken
Frustrated and shaken,
At old Froebel Hall.

"At first the grandparents
And later the parents
Were able to pass
The children, however,
Despite their endeavor,
Flunked all tests en masse.

"Such doom enigmatic
Resulted from static
Test questions like this:
'Is Leipzig's Herr Schlendent
School Superintendent?
Yes? No?—Do not miss!'

" 'No!' answered the classes,
'You're wrong, lads and lasses!'
The old test key said.
Yet every class member
Could this well remember:
Herr Schlendent was dead."

"The Woman with the Serpent's Tongue," is at the other extreme in philosophy. This could be the type of "frustrated old maid in the classroom" that may be found in many school systems. This concept is completely discussed in the humorous chapter, "Let's Spank Old Maid Teachers," which appears in the new book "For Conscience' Sake." Watson's poem:

"She is not old, she is not young,
The woman with the serpent's tongue,
The haggard cheek, the hungering eye,
The poisoned words that wildly fly,
The famished face, the fevered hand—
Who slights the worthiest in the land,
Sneers at the just, condemns the brave,
And blackens goodness in its grave.
In truthful numbers be she sung,
The woman with the serpent's tongue;
Ambitious from her natal hour.
And scheming all her life for power;
With little left of seemly pride;
With venomed fangs she cannot hide;
Burnt up within by that strange soul
She cannot shake or yet control:
Malignant-lipped, unkind, unsweet;
Past all example indiscreet;
Hectic, and always overstrung—
The woman with the serpent's tongue.
To think that such as she can mar
Names that among the noblest are.
That hands like her can touch the strings
That move who knows what men and things?
That on her will their fates have hung.
The woman with the serpent's tongue."

III. SOME SUGGESTIONS FROM AUTHORITIES

Facts are still important and should have a place in American education and life. For example, it is well to know that Baron Robert Silvercruys recently retired as Ambassador from Belgium to our Nation after 16 years and that his wife is the former Mrs. Brien McMahon of Connecticut. It is also proper to cite famous people, as did U.S. Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON recently, when he said: "One of our most distinguished American statesmen once said to me that in a long life he had met only three great men. They were Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States and Gen. George Catlett Marshall—and he said also that General Marshall was not the least of the three."

We are, however, more concerned about statements by authorities that relate to a more complete educational philosophy. First, we should note three expressions concerning the status of our Nation in 1970.

1. Dr. Allan Nevins: "The United States will have failed to keep up with urban and suburban growth in planning, housing, roads, parks, schools. * * * The line between countryman and cityman will be blurred. * * * The intellectual level will be higher but we will lack a superculture."

2. Dr. Henry S. Commager: "Atomic power will grow vastly for both war and peace. * * * The passing of the dominant position of the United States and Russia and the emergence of other regions, will mean a new balance of global power. * * * The welfare state is here to stay."

3. Dr. Crane Brinton: "The rivalry between Russia and the United States will remain as before. * * * Intellectuals will still take an unrealistic view of nonintellectuals. * * * We shall return to small families, to repression of much now considered irrepressible, to Victorian decencies."

Second, the further interdependency is noted by Mr. Hanson, Dr. Malott, and Dr. Gould.

1. Earl H. Hanson: "The defense value was admirably expressed by Admiral Rickover when he urged a congressional committee that, if it were necessary to take money from the Armed Forces to support the schools so that they might function adequately, it should go ahead and take that money."

2. Dr. Deane W. Malott: (It is) "Fascinating because there is significant progress being made in the Soviet economy; frustrating because * * * a dictatorship is a most inefficient operation; frightening because of 40 years and because of their united determination for further accomplishments, as compared with much less apparent purposefulness of the American people."

3. Dr. Samuel B. Gould: "We are entering a new age of education * * * of which the paramount characteristic is a new seriousness of purpose. Each day there is increased realization that the role of education on the stage of modern society is more and more the central one. The American people, as never before, are moving steadily toward the full recognition that the quality of today's and tomorrow's educational process represents the basis for hope and for progress. Emerging from all the critical comments made in recent times and intensified by our sense of competition internationally is a deep concern for the proper encouragement and nurture of our youth."

IV. A SCHOOL PHILOSOPHY

Of the more than 200 school philosophies studied in the United States, one of the best came from Pinellas County, Clearwater, Fla. While it is essential to adapt each school philosophy to local conditions, many of the principles found in the one from Clearwater, Fla., are important throughout the Nation. The 1957 edition is as follows:

"Pinellas County schools have a twofold responsibility: to contribute to the growth and development of individuals and to improve and strengthen our democratic society. Our statement of philosophy for our school system expresses the hopes and aspirations of all those who are concerned about or who are responsible for our educational program. We feel strongly about the statements presented here as we believe they are based on fundamental truths which must be sustained if our country is to survive. Though our system of education does not completely achieve all these goals, yet they serve as a common basis by which to evaluate procedures and practices used in any part of the system.

"We believe moral and spiritual values should be emphasized at all levels. We feel strongly about this because we realize that by observance of moral and democratic principles this Nation was built, and only by preserving and following them can this Nation survive.

"We believe that the school is a social institution and as such is an integral part of the community.

"We believe that we should recognize the individual as a growing organism and that we should recognize both the differences and likenesses of each individual and of the group.

"We believe that all persons who are physically and mentally able should continue in school until their maximum potentialities have been reached or until they have graduated from the 14th grade.

"We believe that public schools should offer our children and youth desirable experiences through which each one will have the opportunity to achieve physical, intellectual, social, emotional and spiritual stability.

"We believe the public schools should offer children and youth opportunities to master the basic skills through the various areas of subject matter.

"We believe that the schools should help each individual to develop respect for the dignity and worth of people regardless of race, religion, nationality, and socio-economic status, and an interest in and a desire for the welfare of all mankind.

"We believe that the schools shold be organized, administered, and conducted in a democratic manner so that those who are trained in the schools will learn to live together democratically and practice good citizenship.

"We believe that the schools should acquaint individuals with vocational opportunities, and should develop in them an appreciation for all kinds of work.

"We believe that public instruction should include vocational education and opportunities in vocational and recreational instruction to meet the needs and abilities of youth and the older members of the community.

"We believe that the schools should provide instruction not only in normal growth and development but also in social relations and marriage when such instruction is appropriate to the emotional and intellectual maturity of the individuals.

"We believe that the schools should build common backgrounds of tradition and loyalties.

"We believe that the schools should help boys, girls, and their parents develop an interest in maintaining good family relations.

"We believe that the schools should give instruction in the desirable use of and continuous preparation for leisure activities.

"We believe the range and the use of experiences and materials should be sufficient to help every individual progressively appreciate his community, State, country and the world.

"We believe that the curriculum is a coordinated series of experiences, continually changing according to the needs of the maturing individual and of society.

"We believe an effective and flexible curriculum utilizes all community resources, both those within the schools and those outside the schools.

"We believe that understanding the growth and development of the individual is basic in the preparation for teaching and is necessary to the continuous growth of teachers.

"We believe that our Pinellas County school system is a functioning part of the State, regional and national educational program.

"We believe that members of our system should participate in developing and maintaining the standards of the program of these groups.

"We believe that responsibility for our public school system is a joint one shared by the community, the county, the State, and the Nation."

V. CONCLUSION

If we are to have an adequate public school system in America that will serve the needs of all our youth, philosophy must become the major factor in American education. Once this is established other factors, like adequate salaries, well-trained teachers in adequate supply, fringe benefits, etc., will follow. This is a serious problem for all the Nation to face, but success is possible.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

Appendix

John Tatsey, Well-Known Columnist of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD several of the news columns, written by John Tatsey, the widely known and well liked columnist, which were published in the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter and the Hungry Horse (Mont.) News, on various dates. I know that my colleagues will enjoy reading the neighborly accounts of the happenings in the vicinity of Heart Butte, Mont.

There being no objection, the news columns were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, Aug. 16, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Heart Butte celebration was a good gathering what few days they had there were races of all kinds horses men women and children.

There were 2 days of dancing and there were visitors from Wolf Point and Cardston. they got many gifts and plenty to eat. the only bad thing was the weather windy and cold. There were some tents that blew down.

There were five boys that were a little off balance and were soon taken care of at Heart Butte. Next day were taken to town.

Stoles Head Carrier went to Browning for the Indian Days but no one saw him till the last day. he was O..

There was some happening on White Tail Creek during the celebration when two Joes were drinking together and they had to cross a foot bridge. The older Joe took the lead and the other behind. When in the middle of the bridge the one in the back struck the other in back of the head and knock him in the creek. When old Joe got out of the water he was on a fight but the lady on the other side had a gallon of gallo and cool him off.

Peter Tatsey has got himself a 1959 Chev and is well satisfied with it.

Patrichia Tatsey has gone to Havre with her aunt Doris Eagle Feathers who is attending summer school there.

A planning will be taken up by the people at Heart Butte for a race meet for labor day.

Sunday was a big day for horse racing. horses came from different parts of the reservation. there was a large crowd.

Police Tatsey was gone on a trip to Themopolis, Wyo., last week end and got back Tuesday. Had a good trip and saw lots of country but no place like the Blackfeet Reservation.

Mrs. Shirley Truckman from Kent Washington was over for the Indians celebration and visited friends and relatives. Her brother Robert took her along the mountains and saw a band of sheep and one black one in the band. She told her brother look there is a car driving among them but it was only a black sheep.

Some of the Heart Butte Indians went to Arlee to celebrate and play stick game. All lost. Fred Marceau did not feel bad over his money because when he came home he brought a young Flathead girl so he got his moneys worth. Lucky boy.

George G. Kipp took Pete Stabs By Mistake to Great Falls where he got check up and feels a lot better. Pete has been down for 6 weeks.

George Tatsey from lower Blacktail was in Browning. got some boys from James Walters Place. he has them bucking bales of alfalfa. They will sweat the gallo out.

Stoles Headcarrier found Tatsey was gone Sunday. guess he really opened up and there were others so will start picking up. Boys better get out and work for wages or you will be at the brick house.

[From the Hungry Horse (Mont.) News, Aug. 14, 1959]

LOUIS RED HEAD, JR., LOSES SOCKS, SHOES

(John Tatsey, Indian Service policeman, writes Heart Butte news for the Glacier Reporter, Browning newspaper.)

Louis Red Head, Jr., was picked up at East Glacier Monday night and brought to Jas H. Walters stop over motel. When he appeared before Judge Brown he did not have any socks or shoes.

Last Wednesday the Heart Butte people celebrated Father Mallman's 25th anniversary. He received donations and gifts. Hope he stays another 25 years.

Stoles was in town Tuesday so there be some things about him next week. It takes 2 or 3 days to hear about him.

Bernard Red Head and John Head Carrier are working for Jas H. Walters. They say Jas is a good pay.

George Comes at Night went to the Flathead Reservation last Sunday to play stick game. He likes to play with some of those Flathead women don't mind what he looses.

There was a big crowd at the races and a lot of folks came from Browning.

This Sunday, August 9, there is match between Carlson and St Goddard horses. These ran once before so this is a return race.

Johnnie and Kaye Stopped at Hi-Line Lumber got some presto wood that Jas Calf Robe bought, they loaded and took off but never delivered the wood. Had a good time on it.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, Aug. 20, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

It was a sad day Monday when Mr. Joseph Iron Pipe was buried at Heart Butte cemetery. After the funeral the survivors and Family of Iron Pipe were relieved of their sorrow by the crowd that attended. County Sheriff Jesse Harlan and the Governor Aronson from Helena were pallbearer. It was a fine funeral.

Rufus Good Strike of Cardston was over for the funeral of Iron Pipe at Heart Butte.

Racing on two medicine was not very well attended. Not many horses. There was one horse from Starr School that took all races and money. There will be racing at Starr School next Sunday.

George Wippert of Heart Butte has found a cook job with a Pack outfit back in the mountains for a couple of weeks. Maybe that's why Heart Butte shook Monday night.

James Eagle Head has moved to Heart Butte after living in Browning. Jim is about 74 years old. Was born around Old Agency. When he growed up a young man he took up riding bronchos and race horses. In his riding days there were not many spurs or boots. All he wore was moccasins. He told of a time when he rode a bucking horse in mid summer and was headed to Heart Butte for races when a blizzard storm came up but he had on a fur overcoat and the next thing came up was a thunder and rain but he put his slicker on and the horse was broke gentle. He was shook up by the bucker that winter and summer was all mixed up in his mind.

Tatsey drove to Pete Stabs By Mistake home to see how he was getting along. He feels better and able to walk around and get up on his own power.

Stoles has disappeared. Tatsey has not seen or hard anything of him but when he shows up there will be Plenty news of him.

Two Short bear stories as told to the reporter at Heart Butte.

One evening last week Phillip Dog Gun came to Mike Swims Under House on upper Big Badger. He left after dark and meet three boys on the hill his hands were all scratched up and face. He told that a bear attacked him at the house and also said he fell down and layed still and the bear would turn him over. When Mike come home he noticed his windows were broke. The window was the bear. Little gallo was mixed up with the story.

Pete Stabs told the reporter some one came to his house to visit and was telling stories when this man told him that Wm. R. Crane came home to his hay camp only to find his tent taken down and everything scattered. Even his cook stove thrown over a bank. After that Willie would sit in his car and watch while his family would sleep in the tent.

There was a meeting held at the Wippert Place Tuesday evening where they decided on the Labor day racing. There will be the following distances one-fourth, three-eighths, one-half miles. There will be relay races, shirt races and others. The committee has money to put out for the Purses. This money was left over from the 4th of July fund so bring your horses. You will get feed and have People selling bottle and can pop. Please bring a garbage can.

Found two black male pups by Joe Running Crane. The two pups showed up at Joe's house for breakfast. Joe feed them he said they were good blooded dogs and bob tail so any sheep man lost any dogs look up Joe R. Crane at Heart Butte. Joe ain't lucky enough to find money only dogs. Not like the one found money instead of grasshoppers.

More wind next week.

[From the Glacier (Mont.) Reporter, Aug. 27, 1959]

HEART BUTTE NEWS

(By John Tatsey)

Sunday was a nice day and there were a lot of People at the church.

Louie Jackson has come back from Cardston, Canada, after spending a few days at the Indian celebration and said the People the blood indians were doing very good.

Last Saturday evening Joseph Jackson drove to Dupuyer with a Party and he had the good luck of getting Picked up for being disorderly and spent a week in Conrad.

The south side race horse men went to Starr School and they lost two races and won the last two all broke even.

Races will be at Heart Butte this Sunday the 29 of August and also labor day the program will be out in next weeks paper.

Chas Reevis of two medicine was at Heart Butte Tuesday with Louie and James Reevis to attend a meeting.

Walter (Blackie) Wetzel, Geo. G. Kipp from the counsel were invited to Heart Butte to a meeting by the People.

Mr. Wetzel made talks on the Payment for the School children and on other tribal matters. they brought sandwiches and coffee everyone enjoyed there visit. Some one was new. There will be another meeting some time soon and hope more counsel men come.

One speaker at the Tuesday meeting said the tribal counsel should adopt the Heart Butte People into the tribe, this has been a lost tribe for long time.

Wm Running Crane made a talk where he said that the big shots that comes in from different offices of the government first the north side of the reservation adopt and give a name. Running Crane said they should wait till these men do something good for the tribe because we will need help this winter. Heart Butte has a surplus of chief names.

Last Monday evening Leo Bull Shoe left Browning on his way home when on Duck Head Hill he stopped to look at a wheel which had already caught fire when Tatsey got there the whole car was ablaze.

Bill James reporter for the Great Falls tribune has been promoted to City Editor of the Tribune. he did a good write up of the Heart Butte news gatherer.

Young Kickingwoman of Starr School got drunk one night started kicking windows he did not have a woman to kick. his wife took off.

An old lady came out of the counsel meeting last week. she said she wanted to get out of the room. everyone that came of there were really ugly for some reason.

Mrs. George Wippert of Heart Butte was telling of the earth quake what happened at her house when it shook the children said maybe a horse was rubbing against the house. She felt a second one when her big Boxer dog was asleep under the bed when the dog started scratching under her bed.

The Bluebonnet Bowl

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, in a few short days, the great American collegiate football season will open throughout our Nation .

Millions of football fans will support their favorite teams as they begin the long, grueling contest which is climaxed by the annual classics, the postseason bowl games.

I am extremely proud and happy that Houston, Tex., has added another to the great list of such postseason bowl games, one that will rank high with the sports-minded in our Nation.

Scores of civic and business leaders in Houston have formed the Greater Houston Bowl Association, which will sponsor these annual classics.

The official flower of our fair State was chosen as the name for this great contest: the Bluebonnet Bowl. And on December 19, and on each succeeding year, two of the Nation's outstanding college football teams will gather on the gridiron of the 70,000-seat Rice Institute stadium to play in this great bowlgame. I know that through the years, you will hear much of the Bluebonnet Bowl, and that it will stand in your mind with such favorities as the Cotton Bowl, the Sugar Bowl, the Orange and the Rose Bowls.

I want to invite all of you not only to see this great football game, but to take the opportuity to share in the warm hospitality and view the industrial assets of this great Queen City of the South.

While I urge you not to miss this initial game, I am also happy to tell you that CBS television network has completed arrangements to telecast the game over a nationwide hookup.

To the great sports-minded and public-spirited citizens who formed the Greater Houston Bowl Association goes the credit for this wonderful achievement. It is fitting that the net proceeds of this game—and I assure you it will be a sell-out—will go to charitable and educational purposes within the Greater Houston area.

The formation of the Greater Houston Bowl Association, and sponsorship of the Bluebonnet Bowl, exemplifies the type of public spirit which has made Houston the largest, greatest, and most progressive city in the South. Residents of our area—and I am sure that football fans throughout our country—are especially grateful to the 99 directors and the officers of the association, Elvin M. Smith, president; J. K. Butler, executive vice president; Charles Fleetwood, Dan M. Moody, and Corbin J. Robertson, vice presidents; John B. Holmes, treasurer; and A. Frank Smith, Jr., secretary.

Statement of Walter P. Reuther, President of UAW

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on August 20, 1959, UAW President Walter P. Reuther issued a statement with regard to the visit of Prime Minister Khrushchev. Mr. President, I think it is all to the good if Mr. Khrushchev has an opportunity to meet with representatives of American labor. It may be helpful if Mr. Khrushchev is able to observe at firsthand the strength of this Nation, and certainly a great deal of that strength is represented by American labor.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement issued by Mr. Reuther be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY UAW PRESIDENT WALTER P. REUTHER AT THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING AT UNITY HOUSE, PA., AUGUST 20, 1959

There is room for honest disagreement between people of good will over the forthcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev. There is no disagreement whatsoever about the basic immoral character of communism and the brutal suppression and denial by the Soviet dictatorship of human freedom and the democratic rights and values that we as free people cherish.

Mr. Khrushchev's visit cannot wipe out the tragic chapter of the brutal Soviet suppression of the Hungarian people's thrust for freedom, of the heroic efforts of the workers of Posnam and the people of Poland to assert their independence and the many other incidents of Soviet aggression and inhumanity, for these are indelibly etched upon the conscience of the world.

The purpose of contact with Mr. Khrushchev during his visit to the United States upon invitation of President Eisenhower is not to honor him, is not to befriend him nor to consort socially with him. The purpose is to enable Mr. Khrushchev to see America at firsthand, to meet its leadership and its people, to witness our industrial progress, our productive power and, most important, the sense of spiritual dedication to basic human and democratic values which give our tremendous resources and technology a deeper meaning and a higher purpose than mere materialism.

No one with a realistic view about the Soviet dictatorship and the drive of communism for world domination remotely believes that Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States and Mr. Eisenhower's visit to the Soviet Union will contribute to relaxing world tension and minimize the possibility that current pressure points may trigger rash action which could lead to a full-scale nuclear war and the total destruction of the human family.

Whether or not any tangible results flow from the exchange visits of Mr. Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, the United States is morally obligated to do everything humanly possible, without compromising our basic principles of human freedom, to relax world tension and improve the prospects of world peace. To do less would be to play into the hands of Soviet Communist propaganda which has by hypocrisy tried to camouflage the Soviet Union's aggression with slogans of peace while calling America the warmonger.

Mr. Khrushchev will undoubtedly be impressed by the industrial might of America and the phenomenal productivity of both our farms and our factories. This he expects, and we should show him what he expects to find. What is more important, however, is that we demonstrate that America as a free society respects and encourages differences between labor and management and between other groups, unlike a totalitarian society which achieves unity by absolute and rigid conformity. We must show him that we achieve a stronger, more indestructible unity in diversity. While American labor might disagree with American industry, Mr. Khrushchev must have the opportunity to see and hear that all Americans, regardless of economics or politics, are united in common dedication to the defense of our system of freedom and are unalterably opposed to and will resist with all our energy the efforts of the Soviet Union at world domination.

During his visit Mr. Khrushchev ought to have contact with every segment of American life. Since Soviet dogma and propaganda are essentially built around the myth that communism is the liberator of the working class, it is essential that American trade union leaders, who represent millions of the working people of America, ought to have the opportunity of telling Mr. Khrushchev straight from the shoulder that the workers of America through their trade union movement, are irrevocably committed to the cause of human freedom and no amount of Communist propaganda will succeed in deluding or diverting us from our total dedication to our system of human freedom and our firm opposition to communism. No one in America has better credentials to do this essential job than do American trade union leaders, and if they fail because of an attitude of isolation, they do America and the cause of human freedom a great disservice.

Conference Report on Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss in detail the provisions of the conference report, a few brief comments on several sections of the bill might be helpful in clarifying legislative intent.

Section 101(a)(4) of the bill of rights is designed to protect the right of a union member to resort to courts and administrative agencies. The proviso which limits exhaustion of internal remedies is not intended to impose restrictions on a union member which do not otherwise exist, but rather to place a maximum on the length of time which may be required to exhaust such remedies. In other words, existing decisions which require, or do not require, exhaustion of such remedies are not to be affected except as a time limit of 4 months is superimposed. Also, by use of the phrase "reasonable hearing procedures" in the proviso, it should be clear that no obligation is imposed to exhaust procedures where it would obviously be futile or would place an undue burden on the union member.

Furthermore, the proviso was not intended to limit in any way the right of a union member under the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as amended, to file unfair labor practice charges against a union, or the right of the NLRB to entertain such charges, even though a 4-month period may not have elapsed.

The last proviso in section 101(a)(4) was added to make sure that interested employers do not take advantage of rights accorded union members by encouraging or financing harassing suits or proceedings brought by union members against their unions. The purpose of the proviso should be kept in mind and it should not be so narrowly construed as to impose unnecessary or unintended restrictions upon employers in their relationship with their employees. For example, the language does not prevent, and there is no intent to preclude, an employer from encouraging his employees to write or otherwise communicate with their Congressman or legislators concerning legislation.

Section 201(d) repeals the reporting and non-Communist affidavit filing obligations of section 9 (f), (g), and (h) of the Taft-Hartley Act. This provision will become effective upon enactment of the bill. However, the repeal of these sections does not have a retroactive effect and is not intended to excuse any previous failure to comply therewith.

Section 701(b) authorizes the National Labor Relations Board to delegate to its regional directors certain powers under section 9 pertaining to representation elections. Two safeguards are included to make certain that regional directors precisely follow Board rules and policy regarding representation cases. These are, first, the explicitly stated right of the Board to review any action of a director delegated to him under the section; and second, the permissive nature of the delegation. The latter would allow the Board to withdraw the delegation from a director who refused or failed to follow Board policy in such matters. It should be emphasized that the section relates only to representation matters and is not intended in any way to alter the present supervisory authority of the General Counsel over regional directors and their staffs.

Section 702 relaxes the present ban on voting by economic strikers in representation elections. Two limitations are imposed: First, economic strikers are not to be eligible to vote after 12 months from the commencement of the strike; and second, they shall be eligible prior to that time only in accordance with regulations established by the Board consistent with the purposes of the act. In other words, a maximum length of time is established but the Board may limit the right by regulations consistent with the purposes of the act.

Section 704(c) is an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act dealing with organizational and recognition picketing. It bans such picketing in three instances:

First, where the employer has lawfully recognized another labor organization and an election under section 9(c) is barred.

Second, where a valid representation election under section 9(c) has been conducted within the preceding 12 months. Any valid election is sufficient; the picketing union need not have been on the ballot. Otherwise, this subsection could easily be avoided through picketing by different locals of the same international union.

Third, where picketing has been conducted beyond a reasonable time (not more than 30 days) from the commencement of the picketing without a representation petition having been filed. Of course, the picketing may be enjoined in less than 30 days if the Board finds the circumstances are such as to make it unreasonable to permit it to continue and it must be stopped at the end of 30 days.

The second proviso to the subsection makes an exception of picketing or other publicity directed to consumers which is for limited purposes and which does not have the effect of inducing employees of others to refuse to cross the picket line to make pickups and deliveries and to perform services. Any type of publicity, including picketing, which has this effect is not protected by the proviso. The proviso pertains to subsection (c) only and therefore consumer appeals for organizational or recognition purposes are banned after an election.

Moore County News, of Dumas, Tex., Remembers Labor's Services in a Prosperous Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Labor Day is an annual holiday set aside to honor the working men and women who make up the vast majority of our population. Last Monday, September 7, was the 1959 official Labor Day holiday.

Those honored are the people who make machine wheels turn, provide food and needed services, and perform thousands of other necessary tasks each day. These people are honored on Labor Day, but I feel they and the vital services thye render to our Nation should be remembered the year round.

The meaning of labor to one community is discussed in an editorial in the Moore County News, published at Dumas, Tex. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The unique thing about the editorial is that it appeared in a newspaper which is published in a primarily rural county; and the day before this editorial was published, the newspaper praised labor for what it has done to raise our standard of living—a rather unique action insofar as that part of the country is concerned.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Moore County News (Dumas, Tex.), Sept. 6, 1959]

LABOR: WHAT'S IN IT FOR US

Probably the most unobserved holiday in Moore County's lineup of annual special days will be checked off the calendar tomorrow with little or no recognition of its purpose.

To most of us, Labor Day means that extra long weekend, closing of swimming pools, racetracks, picnics, and a mad scramble on danger-infested highways to get in that last outing before settling down to the serious business of routine fall chores.

True, this national holiday was designed for a day of relaxation, recreation and family fun, in recognition of the millions of working people of our land.

But, like many holidays, few of us see past the hot dogs and watermelons and we fail to reflect over the occasion as it was intended.

If any county, anywhere, can be grateful for its labor and working status it is Moore County, for beneath our very noses is found the very essence of individual and community prosperity, the product of industry and labor.

Last official estimates show that more than 4,800 families make their homes here. They are good homes, provided by an average per family income of $6,488 yearly, about twice the national average, and one of the highest in the State of Texas. This figure has been nearly doubled since 1949, when our average per family income was $3,877 annually.

Certainly we cannot ignore the impact of industry, and its vast role in Moore County's economy. Nor can we merely toss aside the fact that the major bulk of our income comes from industry and its hundreds upon hundreds of laboring residents.

Important as they are to our area, agricultural assets have to take a second seat, for our official farm population is estimated at slightly more than 5 percent. It takes little imagination to realize that the remainder of our population is either directly dependent upon industry, or that they depend on the wage earners' income for their own living.

Industry has brought jobs to Moore County. Jobs have meant a high standard of living for the worker here, and, in turn, have meant a business community through which wages are circulated over and over.

The end result reveals little poverty indeed, but instead, we enjoy an excellent balance of income among our people.

We can praise the fact that Moore County is the largest producer of natural gas, with more than 1,000 active wells, or that we have become the Nation's greatest origin of interstate gas transmission through a huge network of pipelines, or that Moore County produces more than two-thirds of the free world's helium.

But the true praise for economic conquest in Moore County must be handled to the only source for these developments we have, our people.

It is to those who earn their living by applying their energies in labor that we salute on this Labor Day, 1959.

Congress Should Keep Control Over Foreign Aid Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

CONGRESS SHOULD KEEP CONTROL OVER FOREIGN-AID SPENDING

Foreign aid started in 1946 as an emergency measure to enable the devastated nations to repair their war damage, put their economies together again and resume normal peacetime operations. Most of the countries which received our aid have got back on their feet. Some of them are our toughest competitors in international trade.

So far, so good. But the advocates of and bureaucratic dependents on foreign aid have developed a new switch. Foreign aid has forgotten about war damage; we are now supposed to develop the "undeveloped." We are now in the midst of a propaganda drive to embalm this new type of foreign aid as a permanent policy, with Uncle Sam putting the required amount into the kitty and leaving its distribution to United Nations agencies. Whether the idea is touted as an International Development Authority, or the Special United Nations Fund for Eeconomic Development—SUNFED—the nut of the proposal is always the same—take foreign aid away from Congress, which knows nothing about it, and hand the money over to the U.N., which knows all about the problem.

Curiously enough, this plan is often advanced as an anti-Soviet program, despite the fact that the Soviet Union is a member of the United Nations and despite the even more important fact that the newly appointed Secretary of the Economic and Social Council of the U.N., which will have general supervision over the distribution of aid through United Nations agencies, is Dr. Wladyslaw R. Malinowski, representing the Polish Communist Government.

To support this extraordinary proposal, some bizarre arguments have been advanced. One of these is given an airing in a little book by Cmdr. Sir Robert G. A. Jackson called "The Case for an International Development Authority" (Syracuse University Press). In an introduction to this book, Harlan Cleveland, who is dean of the Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse, writes, "The same American who would get nowhere operating out of an embassy is able to become a trusted adviser in a newly developing country if he represents an agency of the United Nations." In short, they won't take our money unless routed through the U.N.

Commander Jackson, who thinks the career of UNRRA (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration) could be a model for the agency given the job of passling out development aid, estimates that $25 billion would do for a starter. This sounds like a lot of money, but it always amazes the commander that "our governments are so ready to face the vast financial requirements of a fantastic defensive effort and yet fail to realize that positive economic policies which could secure peace in great areas cannot be purchased at bargain rates." He's telling us.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently approved a proposal to put $1 billion a year out of our total foreign aid contribution into a Development Loan Fund which would be distributed without fear of congressional scrutiny. Thus, according to Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, "expenditure control through the appropriation process is bypassed." This fund would not be administered by U.N. agencies, and it is doubtful if Congress even under present auspices, would sanction such an arrangement. However, the loan fund idea is a step toward the exclusion of Congress from consideration of foreign aid.

Despite the disposition of many Senators to delegate this problem to the bureaucrats, it is the bureaucrats, not Congress, who have made these foreign aid messes—in Iran, in Laos, and in a dozen other areas. The efforts of congressional committees to weed out incompetence and extravagance have had little influence. Pressure for more foreign aid continues as if nothing had happened.

So far Congress has managed to evade proposals like SUNFED and other devices for permitting United Nations agencies to take charge of our money. However, the Monroney resolution, passed last year, calls for the thorough exploration of the establishment of an International Development Association, as an affiliate of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. From this distance the scheme sounds like something that does need some cold, skeptical exploration.

Facts Prove Farm Myths Are False

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we recognize that the Nation still faces a serious, unresolved economic problem in agriculture.

Today, the costs of operating the American farm are still disproportionately high in relation to the prices received for farm commodities. Despite substantial costs of the national farm program, the economic plight of the farmer has not been resolved; nor have we succeeded in substantially reducing surpluses.

Consequently, it is important that a realistic effort be made to overhaul the admixture of Democratic-Republican planks in the farm program to see what can, and should, be done to effectively improve the situation.

Over the years, there have, unfortunately, developed some distorted viewpoints about the economic status, standards of living, amount of Federal assistance, and other factors in the farm picture.

Recently, the agricultural committee of the National Planning Association issued a report exploding a number of the false myths about life on the American farm.

Recognizing the need for providing the public with a true picture of the agriculture situation—as well as to promote farm-city understanding—I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the report by National Planning Association, published recently in the Wisconsin Agriculturist, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Sept. 5, 1959]

FACTS PROVE FARM MYTHS ARE FALSE—SOME PEOPLE HAVE DISTORTED VIEW OF FARM SCENE TODAY, SAYS NATIONAL PLANNING ASSOCIATION

(By Donald R. Murphy)

Did you ever have a city friend tell you, "Farm price supports are raising food prices for me?"

Or did a visiting relative from the city ever say, "Don't worry about your surpluses. Lots more babies. They'll eat up the surplus."

The agriculture committee of the National Planning Association bumped up against the same problem and decided to get out a report on myths about farming. This report says:

"It is hard for a city resident to pay much attention to the farm situation. Even though he is fed, clothed, and sheltered by resources from areas he never sees, he seldom wonders how this happens.

"Yet he is called upon to help other citizens discuss farm and settle national farm policies. He is handicapped by lack of interest and lack of information. He is also handicapped by myths about farming."

Here are some of the myths and a summary of NPA's comment:

1. "If farmers were as efficient as city workers, they wouldn't be in trouble."

Official figures show output per man-hour in agriculture in 1957 was 83.4 percent more than in 1947. Output per man-hour in manufacturing was 41.9 percent more than in 1947.

2. "Farm price supports are causing the increase in the cost of living."

Prices received by farmers actually dropped from 1955 to 1958 while the cost of food went up. So farm prices couldn't have caused the rise.

3. "Farm surpluses will be gobbled up by increasing population."

Actually farm output is keeping a step ahead of population growth. In 1958, farm output was 97 percent higher than in 1910–14. U.S. population was 87 percent higher than in 1910–14. Many estimates indicate that this tendency is likely to continue through 1975 at least.

4. "The ordinary Iowa farmer * * * has a minimum of two cars and they are usually brandnew Buicks or Oldsmobiles or Cadillacs."

This statement, in various forms, shows up constantly from people who overestimate farm income. Latest estimate shows the following ownership among Iowa farmers of the three makes of cars listed above:

	Percent
Buick	6.2
Oldsmobile	6.2
Cadillac	.4

5. "Federal taxpayer now hands out to farmers an annual gift equal to half the farmers' income."

This myth refers to the total appropriation for agriculture. This total covers loans, which will be repaid; it covers consumer services, like meat inspection, U.S. Forest Service; it covers expenditures for school lunch food.

Payments to farmers from Government are much smaller than the total appropriations.

6. "Farmers don't need much cash. They raise most of their own food."

Farmers pay 31 percent of their family living budget for food. Production expenses—machinery, fertilizer, seed, feed, etc.—amount to around 65 percent of a farmer's gross income.

7. "Farmers are getting along fine. There is no sense in giving them any help from Government."

Most people forget that farm operating expenses are rising steadily, while farm receipts jump up and down. Per capita income from farming is about one-third of per capita income to nonfarmers.

8. "Farm subsidy programs are keeping people on farms who ought to be getting out of farming and into city jobs."

National Planning Association quotes census figures to show that the big drop in farm population actually came during the period of big farm programs. People have been leaving agriculture lately at an unprecedented rate.

9. "The way to solve the farm problem is to reduce or remove support prices. Then farmers will reduce production and the surpluses will vanish."

Actually farm output has kept rising steadily, both in years when farm prices are falling and in years when farm prices were rising. National Planning Association might have called attention to the 1959 corn crop as an example.

10. "Put high supports—90 percent of parity or better—on farm products and we farmers will be all right."

This is a farm myth, rather than a city myth. National Planning Association notes that 90-percent supports, without control of production, are likely to result in production of surpluses and more farm trouble.

11. "Farmers have an advantage over nonfarm people, because of Government aid to agriculture."

Per capita income from farming is about one-third of nonfarm income. And one authority says, "Farm operator families on the 2,213,000 commercial (high production) farms received an average income of $5,415 in 1956, while all nonfarm families, including those living on skid row and public relief, received an average income of $6,900."

These are brief summaries of what the agriculture committee of the National Planning Association says in much more detail in its report.

Wisconsin members of the agriculture committee of National Planning Association are: Orval L. Erikson, Dane County, and Ralph S. Yohe, Wisconsin agriculturist.

Any reader who wants the full text of this report can send 30 cents to National Planning Association, 1606 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Import-Export Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the August 17 issue of the Washington Post and Times-Herald contained a news story on imports and exports that merits the diligent attention of every Member of Congress. I therefore ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Aug. 17, 1959]

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-NINE IMPORTS OF EUROPE GOODS SOAR

(By Harry W. Frantz)

U.S. imports from Europe in the first half of 1959 were sharply higher than in the same period of 1958, while exports declined. As a result, the international merchandise trade balance turned favorable to Europe.

The United Kingdom ranked first and West Germany second in both the imports and exports of the United States.

According to unpublished Commerce Department statistics obtained by United Press International, U.S. imports from Europe in January–June 1959 were valued at $2,192,813,000 compared with $1,544,119,000 in the same period of 1958.

U.S. exports to Europe in January–June 1959 were valued at $2,075,214,000 compared with $2,293,258,000 in the same period of 1958.

The Department classifies "Europe" as comprising continental countries including the Communist bloc, and also the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Iceland.

Mr. Speaker, here is another chapter in the accounting on an international trade program that subordinates the welfare of American industry and labor to the market desires of nations specializing in low wage scales. For years supporters of this program have defended their position with charts and tables aimed at convincing Congress that a favorable dollar balance was proof enough of the advisability of their scheme. They chose to ignore the fact that U.S. foreign handouts and other gratuities provided buying power for much of the business enjoyed by the Nation's exporting industries. They contended that the thousands of workers shoved out of jobs by products entering our shores from abroad had to accept this fate as a contribution to the overall benefits of free exchange of goods.

Now even this argument has been dissipated. Despite all the billions of dollars that continue to pour out of the U.S. Treasury to foreign indigents, we are buying more than we are selling in European trade. Last year America's gold deficit amounted to $2.3 billion, and the unfavorable trend is continuing. Meanwhile the invasion of our markets threatens an ever-increasing number of jobs in this country.

One of the most vicious consequences of the current foreign trade program is that more and more American capital is being shipped abroad to build plants that will provide further competition in domestic markets. Unable to compete with products of cheap foreign labor, American manufacturers are investing overseas for the purpose of, first, capturing foreign markets that would normally be supplied, at least in part, by U.S. exports, and second, taking advantage of America's easy entry to crowd out the production of this country's labor force.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the economic difficulties that are responsible for so many surplus labor areas in this country are never going to be solved by taking mills and factories out of the United States and setting them up in Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America. The distressed areas of Pennsylvania could quickly become prosperous regions if only a small percentage of the capital going overseas were invested in our State. Under present conditions, many of our communities are unable to meet obligations because families without incomes cannot pay taxes or make normal voluntary contributions to civic activities. The loss is also felt at the State and national levels.

For a decade the State of Pennsylvania has been plagued with considerable unemployment occasioned by foreign competition. One coal mine after another has closed because foreign residual oil was allowed to flow into east coast fuel markets without respect to its impact on the domestic economy. The President wisely placed a limit on residual oil imports when it became evident that the national defense structure was being eroded. But Congress is going to have to meet the issue of economic damage caused by imports, and I hope that the shocking data on the developing unfavorable picture on imports and exports will stimulate action in this regard.

While I am not unmindful of the other States whose working men have been deprived of jobs because of the surging volumes of imports deluging our markets, Pennsylvania has without doubt been a principal victim. We have lost heavily to foreign glassware, pottery and ceramics, clothing, machine tools, turbines and generators, and many other products. Now steel—another of our major industries—is threatened. Steel Facts for August reports that foreign competition has been more intense this year than ever

before. For the first 5 months of 1959, the United States imported 1,501,792 net tons of steel as compared to an export total of only 850,747 net tons. Steel mill product exports are also pointing downward, and of course we lose in our domestic markets every time a foreign car or other steel product enters the country. Our disadvantage extends to barbed wire, nails, reinforcing bars, and other items.

Recently the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers' Institute filed a petition with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for relief from imports of surplus military firearms. The premise for this petition is that the American firearms industry is vital to national defense, a position which can hardly be contested. The fact remains, however, that defense considerations alone should not dictate the Nation's foreign trade policies. Congress has a responsibility to all citizens regardless of whether they belong to so-called defense industries. To permit unnecessary deterioration of domestic industry constitutes grave dereliction of duty on the part of Congress, which is going to have to face up to its responsibility on the foreign trade fiasco if economic catastrophe is to be averted.

There is an important lesson in the latest import-export data. It should be studied conscientiously in the coming months with a view to taking corrective action when the next session convenes in January. I personally would prefer to withhold adjournment until legislation is enacted to protect domestic industry and labor, and to discourage further exodus of industry to foreign fields, yet I am practical enough to realize that—for the time being—our only hope of relief is through the national defense amendment to the Trade Agreements Act. If import-export statistics continue to follow the pattern established through the first 6 months of this year, then surely the opposition to a sane foreign trade program will admit to the folly and futility of its position. In any case, Congress has a moral and constitutional obligation to stop this cruel and needless exportation of American jobs.

Marymount-on-the-Potomac Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the dean of women, Mother M. Eymard, R.S.H.M., of Marymount College, Arlington, Va., has written an article entitled "Marymount-on-the-Potomac Expansion." The article, which outlines the basic philosophy and noble vision of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, was brought to my attention by my friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, D.D., Ph. D, professor of Latin American history and culture at Marymount.

It is noteworthy that Marymount-on-the-Hudson, Tarrytown, N.Y., was the mother institution for Marymount-on-the-Potomac. Moreover, Marymount-on-the-Hudson, a world-renowned educational center, continues to serve as provincial house for the Institute of the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary, not only for Marymount-on-the-Potomac, but also for the International schools in London, Paris, Rome, and Barcelona. The Very Reverend Mother M. Gerard, R.S.H.M., superior general, resides in Tarrytown, N.Y.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter I have referred to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARYMOUNT-ON-THE-POTOMAC EXPANSION

(By Mother M. Eymard, R.S.H.M., dean of women)

In an age which has been alerted to the importance and far-reaching influence of education, it is encouraging to note the growth and development of America's educational system, the awareness of her young people of the advantages of education, and the willingness of her citizens to promote educational enterprise on all levels.

For the past few years educators have noted with both satisfaction and apprehension the ever-increasing enrollment figures in their institutions. Long-established colleges and universities have undertaken expansion programs to meet the need, and new institutions have sprung up in amazing numbers. And the picture for the future shows that such growth and development will have to continue for the next few years with even more vigor if it is to meet the needs of those who will be ready for higher education in the immediate future.

In line with the expansion of educational facilities operating on a nationwide level, the District of Columbia and environs can boast of its educational accomplishments. Its schools and colleges and universities have played a magnificent role in the past and are making every effort to provide for the future. The history of one of its colleges illustrates the foresight and planning characteristic of our American educational system.

Marymount Junior College, or Marymount-on-the-Potomac, as it is popularly known, is a 2-year liberal arts college for women founded in 1950. It has enjoyed a phenomenal growth for a small private school and has contributed to the community through the scholarship and social services of its faculty, student body, and alumnae.

Marymount Junior College began in 1950 with a pioneer class of 13. Its enrollment this fall totals 245, and this is capacity. The number of applications to the college so far exceeds the number who may be accommodated, that Marymount is this year beginning extended construction. Ground will be broken early in the fall for a recreation center which will serve the needs of present students and enable the college to provide for more students in the future. New dormitory and dining hall facilities are being planned and work should begin on these within 2 years. The pioneer class of 1950 would not recognize many of the beautiful buildings erected on the campus since they attended classes in the graceful colonial administration building, but they would find at Marymount the same spirit of dedicated service, the same ideals and traditions, the same adherence to lofty aims and objectives which characterized their alma mater from the beginning.

Marymount is one of a number of schools and colleges conducted by the Religious of the Sacred Heart of Mary in this country and abroad. This religious institute was founded in southern France a little over 100 years ago for the purpose of educating young women to take their rightful places in society by a training which would embrace the spiritual, intellectual, moral, and social aspects of the individual. The education offered at Marymount schools has always been based on this harmonious development of the whole personality, and this has been effected through an integrated program of religious, intellectual, physical, and social activity.

The first Marymount in America was opened in 1908 at Tarrytown-on-Hudson, N.Y. Marymount, Tarrytown, is now the provincial house for the institute in this country and coordinates branch houses from the east to the west coast, as well as foundations which have been made by the American province in mission territories such as Africa.

A special feature of Marymount's educational offerings is the junior year abroad. Recognizing the tremendous advantages of a year of foreign study, Marymount operates international schools abroad where American students may study for the junior year in college, returning to the United States for their final year at Marymount College, Tarrytown. International schools are conducted in Rome, Paris, London, and Barcelona. Many of the students who attend 2 years at the junior college in Arlington take advantage of this foreign-study plan and continue their education.

The location of Marymount Junior College, just 20 minutes from the Nation's Capitol, offers its students all the unique benefits of the cultural, historical and social highlights of Washington, D.C. The students visit the Capitol, the White House, the Supreme Court, the National Gallery, and various Embassies, Government agencies and other places of interest. In addition, prominent persons come for lectures and receptions at the college, and help the students to interpret world events and the implications of the contemporary scene. As a more intelligent participation in government is a desired result of education, Marymount Junior College has a distinct advantage in being able to acquaint her students personally with the persons and places involved in America's executive, legislative and judicial branches of Government.

Marymount's curriculum has been expanded and strengthened to meet the demands placed on women by contemporary society. Besides the purely liberal arts training which forms the core of its curriculum and gives the individual an appreciation of the cultural achievements and insights of previous ages, it offers specific training to equip its graduates to enter a number of careers and professions or to continue their college work towards a degree. Recognizing that women have a responsible part to play in family, social, and civic life, Marymount trains young women to utilize their opportunities and advantages to help restore and maintain peace and security in their own family circle, in their communities, and, by means of their influence, in the world at large. An awareness of world issues and the forces which shape them is necessary, and classroom instruction is supplemented by informal discussion, contact with the personalities who help to shape our history, and firsthand experience whenever possible. Courses such as world politics, American government, current social problems, Latin American history, community organization, juvenile delinquency, equip the stu-

dent to face the society in which she moves competently and constructively. Courses in marriage and the family, child psychology, integrated principles, practices and methods of education, enable her to prepare for her future role as wife and mother, with a vital interest in the schools, playgrounds, and civic regulations of her community. Courses in theology and philosophy enable her to base her life and conduct on sound, eternal principles, and give her a guide for action. Finally, courses in merchandising, in business training, in medical-secretarial and pre-professional work equip her to attain economic security in a highly technical and specialized age.

And now, Marymount in planning to offer this program to an even greater number of students. As enrollment figures rise, the administration of the junior college is undertaking an expansion program to accomodate more students and serve them more effectively. The new student center will include an olympic-size pool, bowling alleys, auditorium and modern, fully equipped stage, two full sized basketball courts, lounges, snack-bar, student offices and meeting rooms. This will contribute much to the recreational facilities of the college which now include an auditorium-gym, tennis courts, hockey field, outdoor stage, student lounge and patio. The number of resident students who can be accommodated will be augmented by the construction of a new dormitory and dining hall early in 1960. It is expected that the number of students from the area who attend the college will increase in the years ahead, as the number has increased steadily each year. These students will enjoy all the advantages of the existing college facilities for study and recreation as well as the new ones but they will live at home with their families. They will receive the same personalized guidance service through an assigned faculty adviser, the college chaplain, resident nurse, consultant doctor and psychologist according to their individual needs and specific problems. A thorough testing program is designed to help the student discover her interests and aptitudes so that she may plan her college career in the light of her ultimate vocational choices. A placement bureau operates to help the student find a position after graduation, and the alumnae association serves to keep graduates in touch with each other and with their college. For Marymount operates as more than a school. It is a home, and each student becomes a part of the Marymount family. The family has been growing for over 100 years now, and Marymount-on-the-Potomac, one of the latest branches, holds great promise for the future. It gives evidence of being a strong and permanent branch, one which will continue to provide the very best in education to the Washington-Arlington area and to the representatives of each State in the Union who make up its student body.

The Future of National Sovereignty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I am pleased to include a significant, informative, and constructive address delivered by Spencer M. Beresford, special counsel, Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, at the 10th annual meeting of the International Astronautical Federation held in London, England on September 4, 1959.

Discussions of space law have traditionally dealt with national sovereignty and the altitude to which it should extend. Last year, however, in the "Survey of Space Law," the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration proposed that the question of national sovereignty in outer space might be bypassed, in the interest of an early and suitable international agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space. The present address explores some of the legal and practical considerations involved, and suggests alternatives to national sovereignty as a basis for the international legal control of outer space.

The address follows:

THE FUTURE OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

(Remarks of Spencer M. Beresford, special counsel, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, U.S. Congress, at the 10th anual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation, London, England, September 4, 1959)

Until recently, most discussions of space law have dealt with the upper limit of national sovereignty. At other times and places, I have stated my view that the definition of aircraft in the annexes to the Chicago convention,[1] which is today the only generally accepted international flight agreement, does not apply to satellites or other spacecraft.[2] I have also suggested that the legal distinction between airspace and outer space need not coincide with any physical boundaries, and in any event should be determined by scientific, economic, military, and political considerations.[3] In the present paper, I propose to explore whether and to what extent the concept of national sovereignty is likely to remain useful from this point of view, especially in terms of national security.

My observations on this subject are personal and not official.

The law of the sea often provides a starting point for discussing the law of outer space. In simpler times, a distance of 3 miles was taken as the limit of national sovereignty at sea. According to many historians, this distance was chosen because it was then regarded as the greatest possible range of shore batteries.[4] In any event, the apparent purpose of offshore jurisdiction was defense, and its extent was limited by effective control.

The 3-mile offshore limit, however, has been riddled with exceptions and stretched by claims and practices. International law recognizes a qualified right of innocent passage through territorial waters.[5] There are special rights for such matters as fishing and the exploitation of minerals in the Continental Shelf. A 4-mile limit has been recognized by the International Court of Justice.[6] Since 1790 the United States has claimed jurisdiction for customs purposes in a contiguous zone extending up to 12 nautical miles from the coast.[7] In addition, it has established defense identification zones for ships and aircraft in contiguous waters beyond the limits of the territorial sea.[8] Last year, at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, many nations contended for a 12-mile limit, some for a limit as high as 200 miles.[9] The 3-mile limit still survives, but only for lack of agreement on an alternative.

Vertical sovereignty is even more unsettled. In the air, no upper limit of sovereignty was ever recognized. Although early air lawyers advocated "freedom of the air,"[10] the principle of air sovereignty was proclaimed in both the Paris and the Chicago conventions.[11]

The apparent purpose of air sovereignty, like that of jurisdiction in the marginal sea, is chiefly national defense. Both the Paris convention (1919) and the Chicago convention (1944) were strongly influenced by the wartime experience of danger from the air.

On the other hand, air sovereignty differs from offshore jurisdiction in having no fixed limit. Article 1 of the Paris and Chicago conventions states simply that every nation "has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the airspace above its territory." The reasons for this difference are not hard to imagine. If 3 miles was the greatest possible range of shore batteries, it was also the greatest possible range of naval guns. No one could set an upper limit, however, for the dropping of bombs from aircraft. Furthermore, aircraft as distinguished from ships are capable of reconnaissance at every point of national territory.

With the advent of space flight, many proposals have been heard for the indefinite extension of national sovereignty into outer space. Is such an extension necessary or expedient, or would it be a reductio ad absurdum?

Let us first consider the view that national sovereignty extends into outer space without any limit whatever. A cone of sovereignty conceived as stretching into space from the center of the earth through the territorial boundaries of each nation would clash with the facts of astronomy. With the movement of the earth and other astronomical bodies, the content of each nation's cone of sovereignty would change continually. Any given point in space would constantly pass from one cone of sovereignty to another. A rocket could not go from the earth to the moon, for example, without crossing through the sovereign space of many nations.

Furthermore, if different legal rules are applied to airspace and outer space, the absence of any dividing line will lead to an airspace dilemma. Unless the same rules are applied to both, jurisdictional conflict seems inevitable. Air sovereignty and freedom of space, for example, can be reconciled in practice only by a general distinction between airspace and outer space, or between aircraft and spacecraft, or by the classification of flight instrumentalities according to their functions and capabilities.

A boundary set at a fixed height between airspace and outer space would indeed reconcile the jurisdictions of air law and space law. At the same time, it would encounter the test of consistency with existing international flight agreements and the objection that it was premature in view of our present limited knowledge of outer space. Furthermore, what is the critical difference between aviation and space flight—is it altitude alone, or speed as well, or the functions and capabilities of aircraft and spacecraft, respectively?

One alternative to a boundary between airspace and outer space is a general distinction between aircraft and spacecraft. Such a distinction would conform to the language of the Chicago Convention,[12] which defines "aircraft" (in its annexes) but not "airspace" or any equivalent term. Spacecraft could be defined in such a way as to complement the present definition of aircraft, and so that spacecraft and aircraft together would exhaust the class of flight instrumentalities. In annexes to the Chicago Convention, aircraft are defined as flight instrumentalities "which can derive support in the atmosphere from the reactions of the air."[13] All others could be classified as spacecraft. Dual flight instrumentalities, capable both of space flight and or flight by means of atmospheric support, would presumably be subject (like aircraft) to national air sover-

Footnotes at end of speech.

eignty (the more restrictive of the two legal regimes).

There is a third alternative: to classify flight instrumentalities according to their functions and capabilities. Thus, a satellite capable of launching missiles, for example, would be treated differently from one equipped with nothing but instruments for measuring cosmic rays. The classification could be carried as far as policy interests required.

The view is widely held that there must be an upper limit to national sovereignty. While it would serve no purpose in this discussion to review the various limits that have been proposed, the pertinent considerations are the purposes for which the limits are set and the consequences of setting one limit rather than another.

I submit that the purpose of national sovereignty in outer space, like that of air sovereignty or jurisdiction in the marginal sea, is largely national defense and safety, limited by the principle of effective control and the reciprocity of nations.

It is hardly necessary to document the importance of national defense as a factor in fixing the limit of national sovereignty in outer space. Both American and Soviet writers have emphasized that sovereignty must extend as far as national security requires.[14]

The principle of effective control as the limit of three-dimensional sovereignty is stated as follows in Kelsen's "General Theory of Law and State":

"The territory of a state * * * is not a plane, but a space of three dimensions * * * an inverted cone. The vertex of this cone is in the center of the earth. * * * What traditional theory defines as 'territory of the state,' that portion of the earth's surface delimited by the boundaries of the state is only a vicible plane formed by a transverse section of the state's conic space. The space above and below this plane belongs legally to the state as far as its coercive power * * * extends." [15]

As Kelsen says elsewhere, effective control is "a conditio sine qua non, but not a conditio per quam" of sovereignty.[16] The principle is thus that sovereignty cannot go further than effective control (in the sense of power to exclude). It need not, however, go so far.

In extending national sovereignty away from the center of the earth, therefore, the minimum distance is set by the requirements of safety and defense, and the maximum distance is the limit of effective control. Now, what if the former exceeds the latter? This is the quandary in which nations may find themselves.

The concept of sovereign, self-contained national states no longer fits all the facts. It has become a commonplace that nations are not self-sufficient in any significant respect—political, cultural or psychological, military, scientific, or economic.

For some 3 centuries, it has been traditional to regard international politics as a system of relationships among sovereign, independent States living together in an unstable but persistent balance of power. As applied to European states, at least, this view once stood the test of events. It long formed the basis, for example, of successful equilibrium policies in foreign affairs. In our own time, however, this view seems too static. Not only the system of relationships among States but the structure of statehood itself has changed and goes on changing.[17]

Perhaps the principal cause of this change is the cumulative force if science and technology, especially in transportation, communications, atomic energy and astronautics. Science and technology have accordingly transformed the physical meaning of national security and sovereignty.

While it seems impossible to assess all the aspects of declining national sovereignty, some stare us in the face. We are giving up the old mental image of a nation—like a nut, within the shell of its natural and artificial barriers and its armed forces. Those of us who have forgotten the fall of the Maginot Line and the penetration of bombers to their targets, regardless of opposition, may yet learn the lesson from long-range missiles. For purposes of defense, at least, territorial integrity has almost ceased to exist.

More than 5 years ago, J. Robert Oppenheimer compared the United States and the Soviet Union to two scorpions in a bottle, each capable of killing the other, but only at the risk of his own life.[18]

Since that comparison was made, Oppenheimer's bottle has grown—and may continue to grow until it contains the whole world.

It does not necessarily follow, however, that a balance of terror will keep the peace. Nor can the state be safely rejected as an outmoded form of political organization, until a stable and feasible substitute can be found.

Nevertheless, atomic weapons are by no means the only factor involved in the changing significance of national security. There are other space-defying means of warware: Chemical, biological, economic, and psychopolitical, in addition to air power and space power.

It would be a digression to consider what changes in international comity and law may be required by the new means of warfare. Perhaps the nations must learn to live together, as individual human beings have done in a rather similar situation. When each can kill, all must cooperate.

More positive factors are also at work—notably, the growth of economic, scientific, and cultural interdependence. Few nations today could prosper, or perhaps even survive, without materials, products, and services from areas outside their territory. Even comparatively self-sufficient nations are obliged to act beyond their borders.

All the foregoing factors defy space, and shrink it to relative insignificance. As a result, effective control over any portion of space—in the immediate vicinity of the earth, at any rate—may soon no longer be possible except in old-fashioned or traditional circumstances.

Sovereignty is neither necessary nor sufficient for solving the problems created by the space age.

States cannot rely on sovereignty in outer space. Their security or their scientific, economic, or political interests may be materially affected by objects moving in space outside their projected territorial boundaries.

It may be doubted whether the indefinite upward extension of national sovereignty would provide as much protection as some writers seem to believe. Given the speed of missiles, the difficulty of detection, and the time required to determine their position and movement, defensive action taken after they enter a nation's sovereign space may well be too late.

The inadequacy of sovereignty for purposes of national defense is shown by the hovering of foreign ships or aircraft outside territorial limits.[19] For example, submarines may lurk beyond the marginal sea but close enough to launch their missiles against cities and other targets on land. Intercontinental bombers may remain airborne, perhaps over international waters. Satellites already in orbit may be equipped to bomb strategic targets on radio command. Traditional national sovereignty could provide no protection against such threats unless extended to fantastic extremes. In addition, intercontinental missiles in their own homeland may be preset for delivery against foreign targets.

At the same time, sovereignty in outer space is fortunately not necessary to protect the interests of national states. No claim of sovereignty is made in the Air Defense Identification Zones [20] of the United States, or under the Antismuggling [21] or Hovering [22] Acts. In all these instances, the Nation merely asserts certain limited powers and privileges in areas beyond its territory. Similar techniques can be developed by which nations, acting alone or more probably in concert, can provide for their safety without claims of sovereignty in outer space.

The foregoing considerations tend to simplify the legal problems created by space flight. It has been stated that international agreement on the peaceful uses of outer space can be achieved most rapidly by concentrating upon urgent matters which show some promise of settlement and deferring the question of national sovereignty.[23] A similar position has recently been taken by both the United Nations ad hoc committee [24] and the committee on the law of outer space established by the American Bar Association.[25] In all probability, the practical problems defined by each committee will lend themselves to speedier solution apart from larger questions of policy and jurisprudence.

The most promising alternative to the extension of sovereignty into outer space is the classification by international agreement of proscribed activities in space according to their purpose and effect, leading in time, through limited particular agreements, to a self-enforcing system of international control. It would be premature to anticipate the manner in which control wil be accomplished. Timing and the method of negotiation are essential elements of an agreement. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suppose that solutions will be facilitated if particular space activities are considered one by one. What activities and capabilities of artificial earth satellites, for example, are permissible or not? By a series of such steps it will be possible to build a legal order in outer space.

---

[1] Convention on International Civil Aviation, 15 United Nations Treaty Series 102.

[2] In a speech at the 1958 annual meeting of the American Bar Association. See proceedings of the International and Comparative Law Section, American Bar Association (1958), pp. 35, 36–37.

[3] Idem, p. 37.

[4] Galiani may have been the first to set the limit of effective control by shore batteries at 3 miles, then considered the maximum range of cannon. See Jessup, "The Law of Territorial Waters and Maritime Jurisdiction" (1927), p. 6. Bynkerschock held that "territorial dominion ends where the power of weapons terminates." See Bynkerschock, "Questionum Juris Publici," II, 54 (No. 14, vol. II, "Classics of International Laws," 1930). See also Kent, Commentaries, 29: "According to the current of modern authority, the general territorial jurisdiction extends into the sea as far as cannon shot will reach, and no farther, and this is generally calculated to be a marine league." Compare the view of Grotius in Mare Liberum that the high seas must be free because they are not susceptible of dominion.

[5] For a recent reaffirmation of this right, see the Corfu Channel case, reports of the International Court of Justice (1949).

[6] See the Fisheries case (*United Kingdom v. Norway*), Reports of the International Court of Justice (1951).

[7] See 1 Stat. 700; 49 Stat. 517, 19 U.S.C. 701 (Antismuggling Act of 1935).

[8] Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 973, 49 U.S.C. 401), sec. 1201, as amended Sept. 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 825, 49 U.S.C. 701, 703). Cf. the Hovering Acts (note 17, infra).

[9] See United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, official records, doc. A/Conf. 13/37–43.

[10] See, especially, P. Fauchille, "Le Domain Aerien et le Regime Juridique des Aerostats," Revue Generale de Droit International Public, (1901). Fauchille also proposed, however,

that nations could exercise sovereignty as high as necessary to their rights of self-preservation.

[11] Paris Convention (International Convention for the Regulation of Air Navigation, 11 League of Nations Treaty Series 173), art. 1; Chicago convention (note 1, supra), art. 1. Art. 2 of the Paris convention granted a right of innocent passage. A modified right of innocent passage was provided by the so-called two freedoms agreement (International Air Services Transit Agreement), which was adopted at the same time as the Chicago convention.

[12] Note 1, supra.

[13] See the Chicago convention (note 1, supra), annexes 6, 7, and 8.

[14] See, for example, Ward, "National Sovereignty in Space," Proceedings of the International and Comparative Law Section, American Bar Association (1958), p. 42; Galina, "On the Question of Interplanetary Law," Soviet State and Law (1958), No. 7, p. 52; Korovin, "International Status of Cosmic Space," International Affairs (January 1959).

[15] Kelsen, "General Theory of Law and State" (Harvard, 1945), p. 217. Cf. Cooper, "High Altitude Flight and National Sovereignty," 4 Int. L.Q. 411 (1951), "Missiles and Satellites: The Law and Our National Policy," 44 ABA Journal 317 (1958); Hanover, Welf Heinrich, Prince of, "Air Law and Space" (Goettingen, 1953), published in English in 5 St. Louis U.L.J. 11 (1958); Jacobini, "Effective Control as Related to the Extension of Sovereignty in Space," 7 J. Pub. L. 97 (1958); Meyer "Rechtliche Probleme des Weltraumflugs," 2 Zeitschrift fur Luftrecht 31, 32–33 (1953). See also Meyer "Legal Problems in Space Flight," Annual Report of the British Interplanetary Society (1952), p. 353.

[16] Idem, p. 119.

[17] See Herz, "International Politics in the Atomic Age" (1959), p. 5 ff.; also "Rise and Demise of the Territorial State," World Politics (July 1957).

[18] See Oppenheimer, "Atomic Weapons and American Policy," 31 Foreign Affairs 529 (1952–53).

[19] Cf. the various Hovering Acts which forbid foreign ships to hover within certain limits outside territorial waters: 1 Stat. 668; Rev. Stat. 3067; 42 Stat. 974, 46 Stat. 747, 19 U.S.C. 1581.

[20] See note 8, supra.

[21] See note 7, supra.

[22] See note 17, supra.

[23] See "Survey of Space Law," staff report of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, 85th Cong., 2d sess. (1958), reprinted as H. Doc. No. 89, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (1959), p. 36.

[24] See report of the ad hoc committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, United Nations General Assembly, doc. A/4141 (14 July 1959), pp. 63–67.

[25] See Draft report of the Committee on the Law of Outer Space, American Bar Association (July 1959), pts. 1 B, D, F.

Hon. John A. Burns Selected as the Outstanding Catholic Layman in Hawaii for 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure in bringing to the attention of the Members of this House the award which was recently bestowed upon our former and beloved colleague, the Honorable John A. Burns, former Delegate from Hawaii, in being selected as the outstanding Catholic layman in Hawaii for 1959.

It is not necessary for me to express once again the regard and high esteem which the membership of this body has for John Burns. However, I do wish to make reference to the fact that John Burns is a true Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. I am extremely pleased, as I know my colleagues are, in the honor which has come his way and which he so richly deserves and merits.

The text of Reverend Churchill's announcement in this regard follows:

INTRODUCTION TO AWARDING THE "OUTSTANDING LAYMAN OF THE YEAR"

(By Rev. Raymond B. Churchill, moderator, Saturday evening at annual installation banquet of Chinese Catholic Club held at Honolulu Junior Chamber of Commerce meeting room, Queen Street, August 15, 1959)

Your Excellency, Reverend Fathers, distinguished guests, officers, members and friends of the Chinese Catholic Club, this is a day of joy. It is the Feast of Our Lady's Assumption into Heaven, and thus an ideal day for feasting. It is a delight for me to be feasting with you tonight, having inherited the fruit of the fine work done by Father Kakumano, at the 34th annual banquet.

I congratulate the new officers and board members, and the outgoing ones. I commend the outstanding members honored here tonight. It is the excellent work of these fine officers and members which continues the tradition of excellence which the Chinese Catholic Club has established and maintained for these past many years.

Tonight there is an added pleasure for me. I am privileged to announce to you the name of the winner of the Outstanding Catholic Layman of the Year award.

The outstanding Catholic layman in Hawaii of 1959 is a man who has served God and country well in these islands. It will be for history to judge the eminence of this man. In reviewing the life and character of this gentleman, we are free to proclaim to all that here we have a man of extraordinary talent, obvious courage, and to an unusual degree the virtues of honesty, industry, manly piety, fraternal charity, genuine humility—truly, a man of integrity. He was raised on Oahu by a gifted mother whose life was a model of Catholicity. He attended St. Louis, and shortly after his marriage, his wife, obviously impressed by the wonderful man she married, became a Catholic. The couple had five children, three of whom are now living, who were taught to love and serve God and their fellow man. The public service of this distinguished honoree is well known. Not so well known are his years of exemplary Catholic living, his exceptional devotion to that sacrifice by which Christ redeemed the world—his daily reception of the Holy Eucharist.

He has never been rich, but I understand he has often been poor. In his public life he has not hesitated to mention his Catholic faith and principles, nor has he been timed about saying that his political philosophy has its roots in his religion. He is certainly not a lukewarm person, nor does he inspire lukewarmness in either political friend or foe. His enthusiastic, dynamic approach to the duties of his state in life make him an enviable man—a man of conviction.

A person whose mind is set on doing the will of God is a person who has great resiliency, a person who is full of surprises, a person who can take the good times and the bad without changing his gait—often the person whose mind is set on doing God's will is the person whose victory is guaranteed by defeat. Christ set the stage, and some of his followers have Christ-like roles to play.

Our honored gentleman is not with us tonight. He is in Washington, D.C., where as Hawaii's last Delegate to the Congress, he is assisting our first Senators and Representative in their work of adjusting to life and duties in the Nation's Capital.

It is with great pride that I announce the outstanding Catholic layman of the year, the Honorable John A. Burns.

Charges by Former Representative Sam Coon, of Oregon, of Waste and Extravagance in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as the Senate approaches discussion of the foreign aid appropriations bill, I have been much disturbed about reports in the press of mishandling, bungling and even outright corruption in the administration of this program. I have consistently supported President Eisenhower in his foreign aid requests because I have regarded the President and his Secretary of State as far more informed on questions of foreign policy than I could possibly be. I also credit them with a sincere desire for lasting world peace.

Yet, Mr. President, we cannot shut our eyes to imperfections in operation of a program which is so costly and expensive to the taxpayers of the United States. After he was defeated for reelection to Congress from the second Oregon District, Mr. Sam Coon received an appointment as Deputy Director in Peru for the International Cooperation Administration, which is the Federal agency conducting the foreign aid program. It is significant, I believe, to add that Mr. Coon is a Republican and thus a member of the same political party which has been responsible for operation of the foreign aid program ever since January of 1953, over some 6½ years ago. Mr. Coon has now returned to this country with a shocking tale of bungling, extravagance, waste and personal profiteering in South America by certain ICA officials. Obviously, I cannot vouch for either the truth or falsehood of ex-Congressman Coon's account. Yet I believe it should be called to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. Coon was interviewed by A. Robert Smith, correspondent for the Pendleton East Oregonian, the newspaper of largest circulation in the district which Mr. Coon once represented in the House of Representatives. This interview appeared on the editorial page of the Pendleton East Oregonian for September 5, 1959. I ask unanimous consent that this article by A. Robert Smith, entitled "Sam,

Coon Reveals ICA Misconduct in Peru," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAM COON REVEALS ICA MISCONDUCT IN PERU

(By Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Sam Coon, former Congressman from eastern Oregon, has disclosed details of a case of "ugly Americanism" in Peru where a U.S. foreign aid director has been fired for a conflict of interest.

Coon last March resigned from the post of Deputy Director in Peru for the International Cooperation Administration, the Federal agency which handles the foreign-aid program. In June he went before the House Appropriations Committee, of which he was once a member, to reveal behind closed doors shennanigans connected with the Peru operation. The testimony has now been made public.

The story Coon told contained these elements:

IN LIVESTOCK BUSINESS

1. John R. Neale, ICA Director in Peru, was fired for being in the livestock business in that country. He was in partnership with the Peruvian husband of another ICA employe, his administrative assistant.

2. Neale used an ICA veterinarian six or seven times to treat his stock. The vet told Coon the ranch was 17,500 acres devoted to 2,000 sheep and a string of cattle.

3. Neale's daughter then bought a ranch near an isolated town, Oxapampa. Shortly thereafter, Coon found that three main ICA programs—agriculture, health, and education—were started in that area without any apparent foreplanning. Coon sought the reason. The head of one of these three programs said he went in because he learned the other two were going in. The second said the same thing. Coon added:

"I asked the director of the third one and he told me—he kind of smiled—and said, "Do not ask any embarrassing questions."

SHORT CUT TO JUNGLE

4. A road project, whose location was settled with local authorities, was suddenly relocated into an area that hadn't been checked by ICA technicians and was only a "short cut to the jungle."

Coon, stating that local Communists took advantage of Peruvian discontent over these things, told how he personally tried to call to the attention of top ICA officials in Washington but only got the run-around. Often he was advised not to relate these developments to anyone. He wrote a long letter to the head of ICA, but his only reply was a request that Coon thereafter go through proper channels with his letters.

Coon then flew to Washington at his own expense to try to see the top brass at ICA. He was unable to get an appointment with James H. Smith, then ICA head, and lower officials suggested he return to Peru and not mention this to any Member of Congress.

When asked by his old colleagues why he didn't make these matters known then—back in 1958—to the press or to Congress, Coon said he know that a new director would be coming in soon and he thought this would bring needed changes.

When Vice President NIXON visited Peru on his rocky South American trip, Coon was told by aide to the U.S. Ambassador in Peru not to say anything critical of ICA Director Neale "or you will pay the consequences." A possible later consequence was that Coon's work in Lima was given a low rating by his superior, Neale.

Coon told how the main office of ICA in Lima showed an elaborate map that was not accurate in showing the extent of ICA work in the country, but he was told it was only to impress visitors from Washington. The budget for Peru was from $2.5 to $2.75 million a year, Coon said.

UNDER INVESTIGATION

Neale was finally relieved and replaced by another man whom Coon had little praise for. Neale then went to work for the Minister of Agriculture of Peru, and then the Minister of Agriculture was hired by ICA, Coon declared.

Coon wasn't solely responsible for bringing Neale's conflict of interest to light. That had been under investigation for several months before Coon arrived, ICA officials claim. Queried now, they are "still investigating."

The Republican from Baker, who won high praise from his congressional colleagues, said he wasn't against the foreign aid program and thought it had in many cases helped combat communism. But he criticized its top management.

Coon resigned after his initial 2-year term was up, as he was free to do. He was offered another post in Pakistan at slightly higher salary but turned it down. When asked why, he said he thought he would find "more peace of mind if I went back out in the West and did not have the responsibility of being connected with this program any longer."

Labor Bill Lobby

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of September 10, 1959:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 10, 1959]

MOOD MANIPULATION IS GIVEN CREDIT

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Sophisticated business lobbying, combined with conscious manipulation of a public mood, is being credited with a major role in the passage of the strong labor bill.

Details of the skilled operation began coming out this week.

The core of the technique, as spelled out by its practitioners, was to focus on uncommitted House Members, particularly those in marginal districts. There a deliberate effort was made to translate public anger at the disclosures of union corruption by the McClellan committee into a barrage of letters urging the Congressmen to vote for a tough bill.

The major organizations involved were the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, aided by many of their State groups; the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Retail Federation; and the little-known National Small Business Men's Association.

These groups did not march in perfect lockstep any more than their opposite numbers in labor. But one participant has said that the degree of coordination exceeded that ever undertaken by business in the past.

The small business group supplied many of the ideas and much of the intelligence; all of them generally avoided the hamhanded union tactics of descending on Congressmen in platoons and warning directly of retaliation at the polls.

The business group's first task was listing House Members in marginal districts—those won by 55 percent or less of the popular vote—who had never voted on a labor bill. About 120 were in this group.

The next step was to refine this list to those who favored a bill, but were not clearly committed to either a strict or a softer measure.

Left to their own devices, the Democrats in this group would have likely followed their leadership and backed a "moderate" bill; the Republicans, generally from industrial districts, also would have been in this camp. A few more Congressmen with similar viewpoints but from "safe" districts were added. A final list of 54 was selected for the major effort, which began in June.

The problem then became one of arousing constituents in these districts to flood their Congressmen with mail. One important tool was a television drama, "Sound of Violence."

This hour-long show portraying union hoodlums in the jukebox field had run in April on Armstrong Cork Co.'s Circle Theater to an audience estimated at 25 million. It ends with an appeal from Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, urging the American people to do something about the evils shown.

When Armstrong decided to run the drama on July 8 as a summer repeat, the business lobbyists latched on. Local NAM affiliates and other trade associations told their members when and where the show could be seen; they advised employer members to urge their workers to watch it; above all, they encouraged their members to get viewers to write their Congressmen on the labor bill.

The Texas Manufacturers Association, for example, advertised the viewing time and stations for Amarillo, Austin, Dallas, Houston, Galveston, Lubbock, Odessa and El Paso. The Lumbermen's Industrial Relations Committee did the same for Spokane and Seattle, Wash. and Portland, Medford and Klamath Falls, Oreg.

The strategists discovered that stations in 27 key congressional districts would not carry the show. Arrangements were made to get eight of these stations to run it as a public service or under local sponsorship. Newspaper ads were taken in 20 of the important districts, urging people to watch and write.

An estimated 4.5 million to 5 million mailings plugging both the show and letters to Congress were sent out. Between 15 million and 20 million persons were said to have seen the rerun.

After the Griffin-Landrum bill, strongest of the measures proposed, was introduced in late July, the strategists continued to pour on the heat.

Brief tape recordings were made for radio and television, featuring Representatives PHIL M. LANDRUM, Democrat, of Georgia, and ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Republican, of Michigan. Beginning in August, these were run frequently, again as public-service features or under local sponsorship in 35 of the crucial districts.

In one swing area an experiment was tried. A good-sized corporation sent its foremen out to ring neighbors' doorbells. This tactic, it is claimed, produced 3,000 letters in 1 week urging a stiff bill.

The crucial House vote came on August 13, when the Griffin-Landrum bill was approved, 229 to 201. Of the 54 target Congressmen, 23 voted for the bill, or more than the 14 whose votes decided the issue.

Since the entire group of 54 had originally been selected on the premise that they leaned toward a softer bill, the lobbyists claim their missionary work helped produce the margin of victory.

Business lobbyists, pleased with their efforts, expect to use these techniques with more success in the future.

Wisconsin's Rural Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, faced with the national challenge in the field of education, we recognize that there needs to be a stepped-up, coordinated effort at the local, State, and—yes, possibly at the Federal level—to meet this challenge.

Throughout the country, there are still many areas in which there is a shortage of teachers, classrooms, facilities, laboratory equipment, and other educational aids.

Improving our educational programs entails not only developing the specialties required by individuals to earn a living, but also in providing them with a well-rounded education to make them useful citizens in the human community.

We recognize, of course, that the spotlight of the educational process is on the teacher. Without high caliber—yes—inspirational teaching, the students may not succeed in attaining all that his inherent capabilities promise. For almost all of us there are definite remembrances of times when, with the guidance or words of advice or inspiration—our teachers made indelible impressions on us that improved our lives.

Unfortunately, the economic status of the teacher has been one of the last considerations. For too long, there has been a failure to recognize the significance of the contribution which the teacher makes to the education and the development of the child and thus, to the community.

Despite these unfortunate factors, however, the vast majority of teachers throughout the country continue to loyally and ably serve in their chosen profession.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist published an article entitled "Wisconsin's Rural Teacher of the Year." The article briefly reviews the splendid way in which Mrs. Hazel Clark, of Marathon County, Wis., recipient of the rural teacher of the year award—has demonstrated her loyalty to the teaching profession and her unlimited service to the community. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Sept. 5, 1959]

WISCONSIN'S RURAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Under the cover of a mischievous grin, the small boy closed the drawer of the teacher's desk. Inside, the small snake wiggled uncomfortably in the new surroundings.

Students stiffened and grabbed for books as the teacher returned to the rural classroom in Marathon County. There was muffled laughter as she reached for a pencil. Finally, the desk was opened and the students in Boulevard School got their first nature lesson of the year.

"That doesn't happen very often any more," chuckles Mrs. Hazel Clark, who has taught at the school for 22 years. "Not since the word has got around that I'm not afraid of snakes or frogs.

"In fact, it's a good opportunity to really get the students interested in nature study. One time when one of my students brought snake eggs to school, we kept them until they hatched."

TEACHING HAS CHANGED

Teaching methods have changed through the years too. "Now the emphasis is on the needs of the child, rather than plain subject matter," she explains. "This doesn't mean that the three R's aren't stressed, but we give greater emphasis to subjects like science than we used to."

"Today's teacher has to be more alert than she did several years ago," she says. "Television, radio, and newspapers have increased the interest which students have in world events."

Although fast disappearing from Wisconsin's countryside, rural schools are first choice with Mrs. Clark, who's been teaching in rural or village graded schools for 30 years.

A native of Oconto County, she came to Marathon County as principal of the Boulevard School in 1937, a job she still holds in addition to teaching grades 6, 7, and 8.

Previous teaching experience was in graded schools in Oconto and Shawano Counties. She is a graduate of Oconto High School and holds a bachelor of science degree from Oshkosh State College. She has also continued her education through summer school and University of Wisconsin extension courses.

Mrs. Clark has been active in local, State, and national education associations. She has served as president of the North-Central Wisconsin Education Association, the Marathon Country Education Association, and the Gamma chapter of Delta Kappa Gamma.

Her loyalty to teaching has won the respect of her associates in the profession. Here's what the county superintendent of schools says about her: "She has real understanding of children and knows how to meet their interests, their needs, and their individual capacities for learning. On top of that, she has a keen imagination, and an enthusiasm for her teaching.

A teacher's work doesn't always end when the last student goes home. And Mrs. Clark is no exception.

"I live near the school," says a parent of one of her students, "and I know that she spends many hours each day there, arriving as early as 7 o'clock in the morning and never going home until at least 5 o'clock in the afternoon."

"Even while seriously ill last year, she continued to give her time and energy, coming to school for visits and assisting the teacher in charge during her sick leave. As soon as she was physically able, she assumed her previous duties, and there were never any happier students."

Her individual interest in students is praised by one of her former students. "She was very careful to explain the subject that she was teaching. If there were any questions, she always gave enough time to each student to understand the problem."

The reputation of the school is well established. And students are welcomed in nearby high schools.

"We are always glad to have a student from Boulevard School," says a high school official, "because we know they have an excellent background."

When you talk to the people of the community you begin to realize that Mrs. Clark is not only a dedicated worker in her profession, but an outstanding community leader as well.

Her leadership qualities have not gone unrecognized. Many of the area's service and church groups have chosen her as leader of their organizations.

In addition, she has a strong interest in community affairs including 4–H clubs and conservation programs.

WORKS WITH CONSERVATION

Her interest in conservation, which includes attendance at Eagle River Conservation Camp, is reflected in a nearby school forest and a living snow fence which protects the school from the north winds of winter.

Mrs. Clark was largely responsible for obtaining the tax-delinquent land from the county for use as a school forest.

Although not active at the present time, she was a local 4–H leader in the Boulevard community for 15 years. She has served as a camp supervisor for a district 4–H camp since its beginning during World War II. For the past several years she has had charge of Marathon County's 4–H dormitory at the county fair.

In recognition of her dedication to rural youth, her loyalty to the teaching profession and her unlimited service to the community, the Wisconsin Agriculturist—in cooperation with the National Education Association—is honored to present Wisconsin's Rural Teacher of the Year Award to Mrs. Hazel Clark.

The Sad Fruits of Government Meddling in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include a release on a speech being made today in Kansas City, Mo., by Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, at the 44th annual meeting of the National Association of County Agricultural Agents.

Mr. Shuman's words should give food for thought to those who believe that the only salvation for the American farmer is increased, continued and fantastically expensive subsidy and control programs.

More than a quarter of a century of Government meddling as a substitute for the exercise of managerial judgment by farm operators has proved an expensive and wasteful use of resources.

Legislative efforts to control production and to guarantee prices for individual farm commodities have proved costly to farmers, the farm leader asserted.

Here are some of the problems Government price fixing and production controls have created:

Production costs of farmers producing controlled crops have been increased as operations have been reduced in size and resources and have been forced into poorer alternatives.

Farm income has declined during periods when prosperity prevailed in other segments of the economy.

The value of allotments representing the right to grow the controlled crops for guaranteed prices has been capitalized into higher land prices.

Acreage taken out of controlled crops has been shifted to the production of other commodities, thereby creating problems for other farmers.

The use of synthetics and other substitute products has been expanded resulting in loss of markets.

The right of the producer to plan his own farming operations has been restricted.

Surpluses have grown larger and more burdensome year after year. Rising program costs have become a threat to the future of all price support programs.

Unsound, unworkable Government price support programs are also threatening to put the Nation's farmers in the public opinion doghouse.

There are those who feel that mentioning the facts about the Federal farm program creates bad public relations for farmers. If farmers have a bad public relations problem, it is the result of a bad farm program. And trying to defend an indefensible Government farm program will not help farmers over the long pull.

These and other problems which farmers face today are dramatic results of the wrong kind of Government participation in agriculture.

What then is Government's proper role? It is a role of partnership with farmers in providing with with proper research findings and the proper interpretation of these findings in all of the fields of production, marketing, and utilization, so that the operator can make the best use of his land and capital resources.

One of the best examples of the profitable partnership of Government and farmers is to be found in the exemplary work of the county agent down through the years as the local representative of the cooperative extension service.

The county agent's main objective has been to help the farmer make full use of his managerial ability and take advantage of the latest findings to improve and increase efficiency and thus lower unit production costs.

In this period of rapid and dramatic changes in agriculture, the county agent is faced with even greater responsibility and challenge. One of his new demands is for advising with farmers on how to improve his bargaining position with buyers and processors of farm products.

It is more important than ever that there be constant and objective appraisal of the cooperative extension service program and its results by State and local administrative authorities. In addition State and county farm bureaus have a responsibility to make certain that the extension service program meets the constantly changing needs of farm families.

Likewise, Farm Bureau's objective is to create conditions under which farmers can earn and get a high per family real income in a manner which will preserve freedom and eliminate Government regulation of individual farming operations.

Our efficient agriculture knows it can do even a better job only if it is allowed to use the marketplace to reflect consumer needs, and to meet them.

Labor Reform: A Tribute to a Pioneer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, sometimes in the realization of hopes long deferred, memory is shortened—and, in the flush of the hour of accomplishment, we often forget those who have borne the burden and heat of the day.

One such toiler in the vineyard whose contribution merits special recognition in connection with the passage of constructive labor legislation is the Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN, who so ably represents the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan in the other body of Congress.

This indefatigable fighter, who remains young and vigorous in mind and body, in spite of the passing years, has long been a pioneer in the labor reform movement.

The Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, of which I am a member, forged ahead in certain areas along trails blazed by CLARE HOFFMAN.

The labor reform bill recently passed by the Congress, follows some 135 labor bills and resolutions introduced in the past 22 years by CLARE HOFFMAN, in his efforts to obtain needed labor reforms.

On August 13, Mr. HOFFMAN introduced two amendments to the labor bill: One, to outlaw strikes in public utilities; and the other, to subject unions to the restraints of antitrust legislation. While not adopted at this session of Congress, legislation to that effect may ultimately attest again to CLARE HOFFMAN'S foresight as he continues in the van of crusading legislators.

Something of the spirit of this trail blazer has been captured by Hale Montgomery, of United Press International, in an article which recently was published in newspapers throughout the country. It gives a measure of credit where credit is due. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the South Bend (Ind.) Tribune, Aug. 11, 1959]

HOFFMAN PIONEERS IN LABOR REFORMS

(By Hale Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—Tough and peppery CLARE HOFFMAN first proposed in 1937 that Congress enact reform legislation to clean up corrupt labor unions and drive out racketeers.

The veteran Michigan Congressman followed this up in 1939 and 1941 by introducing almost identical House bills. Each time his colleagues gave these radical proposals quick burial.

Last Wednesday in the supercharged atmosphere of current events the 83-year-old HOFFMAN reintroduced a similiar bill with hardly a comma change.

FOR TOUGH BILL

The outspoken Republican veteran, who in the intervening years has introduced 136 different pieces of labor legislation, remarks:

"Something that I advocated 22 years ago now is suddenly popular. What bothers me is that now I'm getting letters and telephone calls urging me to vote for a tough labor bill. Of course I will. I've been for that all along. I didn't think anyone would be surprised to learn it now."

When House Members begin assembling around noon for meetings of the House, the wiry HOFFMAN generally is already there, waiting.

For the past 3 weeks, he has taken the floor at every opportunity to speak on the need for labor reform legislation, hammering away on this subject regardless of the topic up to debate.

FEARLESS SPEAKER

When the House debated foreign aid, HOFFMAN rose to speak on labor; when it considered a home rule proposal for the District of Columbia, HOFFMAN slipped in a blast against UAW President Walter Reuther was a man "trained in organized violence"; when the Inter-American Bank bill was before the House, he charged Teamsters Boss James Riddle Hoffa was a "greedy" leader with "unbridled ambition" who misused union welfare funds.

"I'll talk on something when no one else does," HOFFMAN said. "Some members think it is unpopular to oppose labor leaders; afraid they'll lose votes. But basically they're wrong."

HOFFMAN, who hails from the relatively well unionized Fourth District of Michigan is quick to explain he is not opposed to the labor union movement.

OPPOSED TO CROOKS

"I'm for organized labor, of course, always have been," he said. "I'm just against those few who are crooked. I never asked for anything that would hurt a union working man—never."

HOFFMAN was chairman of congressional investigating groups in 1947–48 and again in 1953–54 exposed instances of racketeering and strong-arm organizing tactics. The inquiries led to more than 12 criminal convictions of corrupt labor leaders.

As far back as 1936 when sitdown strikes were fashionable, and in 1941 when Ford Motor Co. experienced a bloody, death-marred strike, HOFFMAN went to Detroit and other cities to observe these and other labor-management violences first hand.

FEARS LABOR POLITICS

HOFFMAN'S 1937 reform bill has many of the features of the modern legislation now pending in the House. It includes a provision for a secret ballot and a requirement that unions file complete financial reports of every dollar taken in and spent.

He fears chances of passing "sound, equitable legislation" could be damaged if the boys start playing politics.

He said President Eisenhower's recent nationwide TV–radio appearance backing a strong reform measure "might tend to raise the political issue. Maybe not, we'll see."

Asked if Congress will pass a reform bill this year, HOFFMAN paused and replied:

"We'll get something. The House will pass a bill which the labor boys will call stringent. But for me, I'd call it mild. But I'm not predicting what the Senate will do."

The Problems of Small Life Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, the city of Indianapolis in my congressional district is fast becoming an insurance center for many small life insurance companies. I am submitting for insertion in the RECORD a statement of Mr. John Wilkins, who has served as president of the National Association of Life Companies. I believe that this statement is a clear and factual exposition of the problems of many of the small life insurance companies of this Nation.

REPORT OF JOHN WILKINS, PRESIDENT, TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LIFE COMPANIES FOR 1959

As we open our 1959 convention, the fifth annual convention of the National Association of Life Companies, let me tell you how much I have enjoyed serving as president of NALC during the past year and how deeply I have appreciated the honor of being president of our association and how grateful I am to the members for their loyal, constant, and effective support and help during the year. This has all been most gratifying and a year I shall never forget. I thing what has impressed me most about our association is the loyalty of its membership and the willingness of the members to cooperate in every effort that we have made. Whenever we have called, they have answered promptly. Time and distance have seemed to mean nothing to them. Willingly, cheerfully, and at very considerable sacrifice, executives of nearly every company in our ranks have thrown themselves into every undertaking of the association. It has been a rewarding experience to work with you and to get the opportunity to know more of our members closely and personally. For that, let me just say "Thank you, and God bless you."

The National Association of Life Companies began 4½ years ago out of recognition of a handful of small company executives that the smaller, younger, growing, progressive companies needed some forum where they could exchange ideas, where they could talk over common problems, where they could enlist each other's support for mutual defense and protection.

Although there were some 400 energetic small companies in the Nation, they had no one to speak for them. Each of us stood alone and isolated; each of us stood bare and unarmed before stronger, more powerful competitors, who were not always too meticulous in their dealing with "stinking little companies," that dared to offer competition to the great.

I think that every member of this association, I think that every small company executive everywhere in America—except perhaps a small score of pious blue-bloods, who were content not to compete and say, "Yes, sir, Massa," to the dominant elements in the industry—had, at the end of 1954, a feeling of being utterly alone.

If NALC has done nothing else for us, if the accomplishments of past 4½ years that we think have been so substantial in so many ways, actually mean nothing at all—the association has been worth every effort, individually and collectively, that we have made, simply because we have been able to say to ourselves, "I am not alone."

It has been this splendid feeling of comradeship that has enabled an organization that began with an actual net membership of 43, representing a few States in the South and Middle West, to expand in 4 years to a membership of 134 in 29 States—ranging from the Bering Strait to the shores of the Hudson—from the Great Lakes to the Florida keys.

During the past year, our membership has increased by 26—this is an average increase of more than 2 per month.

These new members have been brought in through the efforts of our membership. They have joined with us because they realize that the objectives of National Association of Life Companies are objectives that are wholesome and good for the small companies, the growing companies, the progressive companies; that they are objectives that are good for the industry as a whole; that they are objectives that are good for America.

NALC has one major objective: we stand for the American principle of free competitive enterprise.

In a day when this ideal is assailed in many directions, when it is under attack from both the left and the right, when it is under fire both by the regimentationists and the strangulationists of would-be giant monopolists—it may be that the small, growing, progressive life insurance companies of America have established, with NALC, a rallying point for all those who believe that free competition, regardless of the type of business, is the most essential element to the nourishment of a free society. NALC has endeavored to make its practical stand, on practical issues, conform to this basic ideal.

During the past year there were three significant issues with which this association was deeply concerned.

I must report to you that on one of them we won a complete victory; on one of them we did pretty well, but not as well as we wished; and on the third we took a pretty bad beating.

The first of these was the completion of the work that is now known as the commissioners 1958 mortality table.

When NALC asked the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, and the industry, to take a breathing spell and actually examine X–17 before precipitantly adopting it and forcing it upon the entire industry, there were some elements in the industry, and a few among regulatory authorities, that were critical. Before the examination of X–17 was complete, there was 100 percent approval and very widespread gratitude to NALC for having had the responsible conservatism, sound judgment, and broad vision requisite to assume the entire leadership of the industry in this question and prevent a possible crisis and near tragedy for every company in America. The improvement in the commissioners' 1958 tables over X–17 speaks for itself, and NALC's accomplishment speaks for its value to the younger and smaller companies and to the entire life insurance industry of America.

Our next major activity was over the Federal Income Tax Act. I think every member here is aware of the vigorous efforts we made to represent our segment of the industry effectively before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee considering this bill. The bill that was passed is not a good bill. The only thing that we can say for it is that it is not as bad in its final version, as it was when it first passed the House. On an industry-wide basis, we did not get what we wanted or what the industry needs. We are convinced, that after 4 or 5 years at the longest, the Treasury and Congress will return to the basic thesis that NALC laid down, or turn to separate measures for stock and mutual companies and junk the measure that was adopted this year.

However, we obtained reasonable treatment for the smaller companies—and, where the very young companies are concerned, we won a complete victory and obtained for them concessions that are sufficient to enable them to get into effective competition without being strangled at birth. So many members of the association worked so hard and so long and so diligently on this problem that I am not going to single out anyone, but I am going to say that all of you worked hard, and it was a good fight, a brave fight, a competent fight, and a worthwhile one.

On the third front we simply have been taking a series of beatings. It is evident to me, it is evident to our legal staff and our executive secretary, and it is evident to the members of the committee that is studying the question, that we must make a completely fresh start, possibly in Congress, if we are to obtain equality of the younger and smaller companies in the sale of life insurance of domestic companies on military establishments. The regulations provided by the Pentagon were extraordinarily stringent; the interpretations of those regulations has gone far beyond anything that reasonable men can expect, and the younger and smaller companies have simply been banished from the sale of life insurance almost everywhere that this could be effected.

We are defeated on this front, for the present. We are not surrendering; we are not quitting. To borrow a phrase from that patriarch of our association, Bill White of Denver: "We have just begun to fight."

In the coming year we are going to have to concern ourselves with three pressing problems and I pass them on to my successor, with a certain amount of unrestrained relief.

First. Modification of the Federal income tax act, to try to make the present bill workable in some way can, I believe, be expected before next year is out, and we must be as vigilant and energetic, as we have been in the past.

Second. We must watch for new monopolistic trends and elements of unfair competition. We must be vigilant in watching for tricks in State regulations, especially in the rash of new State insurance codes. There is sometimes a tendency to think that what is good, virtuous, and benign when practiced by the immensely large and immeasurably powerful giants on the shores of the Hudson—becomes wicked and dangerous when practiced by small companies on the shores of the PeDee, or the Chattahochee, or the Wabash.

Third. Nowhere is the danger more potentially menacing than in the problems connected with variable contracts—and the impact of variables creates our third major problem.

I do not want my comments to infringe either upon the careful report that will be made by our general counsel or the splendid seminar that we have planned later during the convention. I do, however, want to point out the contrast of the receptiveness, in some quarters, of the questionable idea of permitting certain large companies to, perhaps, create encumbering liabilities upon the surplus derived from the small policyholder for the protection of widows and orphans in the erection of mammoth pension structures upon pension investments with the hostility toward investment-type variable endowment contracts favored by the progressive, smaller companies. We must be vigilant. We must be very careful. We must be sure of our ground, and we must be very energetic in our fight on this issue.

In spite of a Federal tax bill that favors other savings institutions over life insurance, in spite of menacing inflation. I am quite confident that next year, and every year thereafter—will see for the life insurance industry, growth in premium income, in assets, in insurance in force, and in realized opportunity for greater service in America to Americans. I am equally confident that next year, and every succeeding year, will see National Association of Life Companies growing, surging ahead, serving better its membership in the industry—and renewing always—its dedication to that great American principle—the ideal of free competitive enterprise.

The Story That the Correspondent Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the September 6, 1959, issue of the New York Times Book Review, entitled "The Story That the Correspondent Told."

The article is based on a speech made by Mr. Allen Drury, member of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times, before the National Press Club of Washington.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STORY THAT THE CORRESPONDENT TOLD

(Allen Drury, a member of the Times Washington bureau and author of the current best seller, "Advise and Consent," recently discussed the writing of his novel and his aims as a novelist in a speech before the National Press Club in Washington. The following article is based on that speech.)

The genesis of a novel, any novel, I suspect, lies in some one insistent theme that rises out of the writer's general observation, living, and experience. In the case of "Advise and Consent," that one theme was, of course, the American democracy and how it operates.

One gradually arrives, after covering the Government of the United States at its heart for 16 years, at some sort of philosophy about Congress, about America, and about the American people, in relation to themselves, to their times, and to each other. There are some, I think in the minority, who have arrived at a philosophy of angry and ironic contempt. There are others, I think in the majority, who have arrived at about what I have arrived at—a realization of America's weaknesses, an appreciation of her strengths, and a balance that comes down, even as it looks some quite hard facts in the eye, on the side of hope.

I do not contend in this book, nor I think can any honest man contend, that this Government or this people are perfect. The American people are rather more idealistic and goodhearted than most on this globe. And while they are sometimes weak, shortsighted and corrupt, they also posseas a fundamental duality which permits them to be on other occasions, and sometimes at the very same time, noble and generous and decent. Their strengths, as their weaknesses, it seems to me, are attributable entirely and exclusively to what they are, a free people of many backgrounds, doing what they please as they deem best.

This American duality, which I think the facts will support, is too much for some of our more vocal citizens, and they spend their time and their energies nagging at the country's shortcomings without ever once conceding or, indeed, even understanding her strengths. You will find in "Advise and Consent" many somber things about America, for she is seen, I hope, through an honest glass; yet the end result is faith in the American way.

I came to the Senate for United Press in November 1943 and within 5 or 6 years there began to stir the vague outlines of a book. The framework for saying the things I was gradually concluding about the American way of life and government, appeared to be the Senate, which I knew best; and within the Senate some one of the major battles that occupy that endlessly intriguing body.

Gradually by a process of elimination, partly conscious, but perhaps even more subconscious, I found myself thinking increasingly in terms of a controversial nomination upon whose twists and turns and developments all else could hang. There have been a number of these in the past 16 years, the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, the nomination of Edward Stettinius to be Secretary of State, the nomination of David Lilienthal to be head of the AEC, the nomination of Charles E. Bohlen to be Ambassador to Russia; and more recently, though of course coming long after I completed the novel last November, the nominations of Lewis Strauss and Clare Boothe Luce.

At first the aim was rather narrow: to show to her own citizens and to the world, if I could, how America's system operates; to say, "This is how it is." The nomination was to be made to an independent agency, say, or perhaps to an assistant secretaryship. The interest was to lie in the mechanics of government alone; the controversial nature of the man was to provide all the drama necessary. "This is how it is" was to be enough both to state the problem and carry the reader.

This is not, however, an easy age in which to concentrate, particularly when you live at the heart of it: its terrors are too many and its fearful possibilities too great. Aside from a few fugitive scraps of dialogue and a few notes on climactic scenes, and a gnawing feeling inside that this was something I must eventually do or suffer from the lack of it in ways that would sound a little precious except to other writers, time passed and very little got accomplished.

Abruptly, however, in 1950, there came a sudden spasm of work for reasons I cannot now put my finger on exactly. Out of it came the first two chapters and, in the first four sentences, almost without conscious volition on my part, the final decision as to what this book was going to be. Those sentences, which begin "Advise and Consent," are as follows:

"When Bob Munson awoke in his apartment at the Sheraton Park Hotel at 7:31 in the morning he had the feeling it would be a bad day. The impression was confirmed as soon as he got out of bed and brought in the Washington Post and Times Herald.

"President Names Leffingwell Secretary of State," the headline said. What Bob Munson said in a tired tone of voice, was, 'Oh, God damn.'"

After that, the pattern became clearer. Of course, it should be a Secretary of State: there was the office upon which to hang not only the "This is how it is" of the American Government, but the "This is how it is" of the cold war, and of all the other problems that beset a well-meaning land in an ill-meaning century. About these too I had acquired a good many opinions, and, understandably enough, I aimed to express them. The plan, the purpose, the general project began to take on a scope far beyond what I had originally intended; yet again there was a lapse, aside from a few more notes and casual jottings, for seven more years.

Consciously, that is, subconsciously, many things were apparently going on, because by September 1957, when a mutual friend set up an appointment for me with Ken McCormick, editor-in-chief of Doubleday, the book was evidently ready to roll, though I was not entirely aware of it for several more weeks after that. By January 1, 1958, I had completed 257 manuscript pages of Bob Munson's book and sent them off to Doubleday.

From that point forward the novel progressed virtually without a hitch—certainly no major ones, at any time. There were no blocks and few worries; it wanted out, and it got out.

There are a great many things in the book that I never knew were going to be there until they actually came out of the typewriter; midway the ending changed completely. The characters, in a very real sense, took over. Incident by incident and link by link the structure built up, and from each new vantage point the ultimate conclusion became more clear.

There are two pompous and pretentious queries that almost any author has to deal with: "What kind of writer do you want to be?" and, "What do you want to accomplish with your writing?" The kind of writer I would like to be is the kind of writer any reporter or radio man or TV commentator with an ounce of integrity would like to be, and that is the kind of writer who says a little something valid about the human experience, and who illuminates also something of his times so that his contemporaries and those who come after may find their understanding a little better for what he has done.

As for the allied pomposity of "What do you want to accomplish with your writing?" there, too, I think, most of us are in essential agreement as to what we should like to do. And that is to say a little something honest, in a phony time, about a country which needs our understanding and our help and our love. America seems to have gotten lost from herself, somehow, hidden away and submerged and obscured by the more clamorous of her clever, clever citizens. It is an era in which slogans are substituted for reality, in which false values have behind them all the force of organized advertising and promotion, in which an unfounded optimism is offered as a counterfeit for sober bravery, in which everything is slightly out of focus, so that nothing shows clear and it is hard to remember and recapture and hold fast to the things that have made our Republic, and us as a people, a beacon for mankind.

Somewhere under all this phoniness there still live a great Nation and a great people; and it is to them that I, and I think most of us, should like to be true in whatever I write. For I suspect that when the last television program is snapped off, the last urgent advertisement is laid aside and the last hearty admonition from the hidden and not-so-hidden persuaders dies out upon the quivering air, the great majority of us in this country are still creative, skeptical, down-to-earth and, for the most part, level-headed; quite confused by what we face and sometimes quite scared by it, but on the whole valiant and sound, possessed of a goodly land and a heritage that warrants hope.

Beneath the mush and the organized hogwash, beneath the pretensions and the phony attitudes with which too many in influential position try to hide from the problems of our world, there is still a great vigor and a great vitality and a great decency and a great courage, both of purpose and, quite often, of achievement.

It is this essentially that I, and I think most of us in this reporting and writing business, would like to record, in whatever ways we may have the ability, when all else is said and done—that there is a Republic, not perfect, yet with great decencies; not infallible, yet with great strengths; not all-knowing, yet with a kind intention and a brave heart.

Most of us, I believe, would like to so write about America that our contemporaries can say, "Yes, we see ourselves." And in a later day if men happen to come across the record we have left, they may say to one another, "This is how it was—in that country—in that time."

The Late Honorable Edmund P. Radwan

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to pay respect to the memory of our esteemed

departed colleague from the State of New York, the late Honorable Edmund P. Radwan. It was my privilege and good fortune to have served with Congressman Radwan both in the New York State Legislature and in this Congress.

Congressman Radwan was a man of great political and personal courage. He had a keen and high sense of honor. Although it was conceded by everyone that he could have been reelected in this last campaign, Congressman Radwan chose not to seek reelection. This decision was based upon his belief that, due to his illness, he could not give his undivided service to his constituency.

In the State of New York, I can recall his courage and determination in fighting against a proposal to increase taxes in the year 1949. In Congress, Representative Radwan earned the respect of his colleagues for his sincerity and his adherence to principle.

Congressman Radwan was a dedicated public official with a deep sense of responsibility to his constituency and to the people of this Nation.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his family.

Editorial Comment on Civil Rights Commission Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, two outstanding South Carolina newspapers, the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., and the Florence Morning News of Florence, S.C., have published very strong editorial comments against the biased and irrational report which the Civil Rights Commission has made to the President and the Congress. I call these two editorials to the attention of the Senate and ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The News and Courier editorial which appeared in the September 9, 1959, issue is entitled "Civil Rights Report Weakens States and Threatens Liberty in Republic." The Florence Morning News editorial which appeared in the September 9, 1959, issue is entitled "Commission Report Affront to Dixie."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Sept. 9, 1959]

CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT WEAKENS STATES AND THREATENS LIBERTY IN REPUBLIC

The Commission on Civil Rights, in its first report, has recommended changes in the law that would create a vastly different America. The Commission would have social as well as political and economic relations regulated by the Federal Government. Freedom of association in school, college, and neighborhood would end by force of law.

Though the language of the report makes plain that the Southern States are the principal targets of the report, the ill-conceived recommendations, if enacted into law, also would reduce individual liberty in all States of the Union and create strife and bitterness between racial groups.

The Commission recommends: (1) Appointment of Federal voting registrars; (2) a constitutional amendment giving the right to vote to every citizen who meets his State's age and residence requirements and who is not in jail at the time of registration or election; (3) withholding of all Federal aid funds from private and publicly supported colleges which refuse to integrate; (4) insistence on prointegration policies in public housing, urban renewal projects, and FHA- and VA-financed private housing developments.

The first recommendation—calling for temporary voting registrars—represents the most immediate threat to States' rights.

The Commission proposes that a Federal registrar be installed in any county where nine or more individuals swear they cannot register to vote.

Agents of the Commission would be assigned to the locality to investigate and to rule on applications for registration. A Federal officer such as a postmaster or clerk of Federal court, would be required to grant registration certificates.

In a forthright dissent, Commissioner John S. Battle, former Governor of Virginia, said that appointment of Federal registrars "would place in the hands of the Federal Government a vital part of the election process so jealously guarded and carefully reserved to the States by the Founding Fathers."

It also would infest scores of southern counties with Federal political agents, armed with the subpena power, who would stir up racial bitterness and virtually abolish local government. Supervision of registration, which the Commission recommends, is what South Carolina experienced during Reconstruction.

Though the proposed constitutional amendment is not a present danger, it represents a long-range threat to good government in every area of the country. It would be a godsend to the political bosses of northern cities. The Commission would admit former criminals to the polls.

In New York City, for instance, the masses of migrants from Puerto Rico could be made the motive power of a giant political steamroller to crush the educated, responsible element in the city. In many Southern States the result would be complete control of large areas by numerically superior but propertyless Negro masses that could be herded to the polls by political agents of the NAACP, each one with a marked voting ticket in his hand. The outcome would be ruinous government for able and enterprising people of both races.

Withholding Federal aid from southern colleges and universities would only further antagonize the South. Actually, this is not likely to be approved. The congressional representatives of the big northern cities, who are eager for Federal aid, need southern votes in the House and Senate to obtain even a minimum of their wants. But the Commission recommendation indicates the vengeful spirit of nonsouthern members.

In calling for integration in federally aided housing, the Commission proposes that a hornet's nest be disturbed.' This recommendation, if made law, might provoke rioting in northern cities where school integration is more or less accepted but where segregated neighborhoods are fiercely defended.

Vice Commissioner Robert Storey, former dean of Southern Methodist University Law School, and former Gov. Doyle Carleton of Florida, joined Governor Battle in a powerful dissent to this recommendation. They criticized the notion of "a fixed program of mixing the races anywhere and everywhere regardless of the wishes of either race * * * the result (of which) would be dissension, strife, and even violence in sections where you would least expect it."

The Commissioners who recommended this coercive program, which violates the traditions of the United States, are Chairman John A. Hannah, former manpower Director of the Defense Department; the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame; and George M. Johnson, former dean of Howard University, the only Negro on the Commission. The staff director of the Commission is Gordon Tiffany, a protege of former "Assistant President" Sherman Adams.

Each and every one of these recommendations would deprive individuals and States of rights to which Americans are accustomed. In our view, the recommendations should be rejected because they are repugnant to the principles of a free republic.

[From the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, Sept. 9, 1959]

COMMISSION REPORT AFFRONT TO DIXIE

The report of the Civil Rights Commission is certain to stir up a storm of protest from southern congressional leaders. Protest had already begun, in fact, before the report was released to the public.

There is ground for this protest. Recommendations of the Commission represent unwarranted Federal interference in the rights of the States. The most conspicuous case in point is the proposal that State registrars be supplanted by Federal appointees "until local officials are prepared to register voters without discrimination."

In the first place, this is flagrant violation of all the traditions of local self-government that are so much a part of our American system.

In the second place, there is nothing to indicate, at least so far as South Carolina is concerned, that there is discrimination in voter registration. The right of the Negro to vote is accepted without question and he is subject only to the restrictions that apply to both white and Negro. We believe that this condition prevails generally throughout the South.

To replace local with Federal registrars would be a further affront to the South and worsen the already strained relations growing out of the segregation controversy.

We have seen only that part of the Commission's report which has appeared in the public press. If this is typical of the entire report, it warrants the opinion that here is another commission which, faced with the necessity for justifying its existence, was motivated more by self-interest than the public good.

Vanishing Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL HOGAN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting article from the Evening Star for September 8, 1959, which tells about the Ringgenbergs family and their story of the American farmer, entitled, "Try Telling the Ringgenbergs That They Are 'Vanishing Americans.'"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 8, 1959]

TRY TELLING THE RINGGENBERGS THAT THEY ARE "VANISHING AMERICANS"

Lately, a lot has been written and said about the farmer—much of it proclaiming, "The family farm is doomed * * * all farmers nowadays are either subsidized profiteers or subsidized failures."

Like many thousands of others, the Ringgenbergs would beg to differ. They are a farm family—making a go of it on their own 200-acre dairy farm near Pierceton, Ind. They are proving that an independent family unit can thrive on the farm * * * by applying creative methods to extend the range of their own labors.

They started in 1946—late in the fall when the land was asleep. They started with 60 good-for-nothing acres; with a thousand-dollar debt; with a kind of simple, idealistic confidence that was supposed to have gone out of style with Horatio Alger.

That's how it was when 22-year-old Gene and Sally Ringgenberg moved onto this land of their own—60 wornout acres near Pierceton, Ind. Their son, Kerry, was just a baby, only 6 months old.

"And some people thought Gene was just a baby, too," Sally recalls. "Sure to be burned on a farm nobody'd ever been able to succeed with before. Corn crops so bad—they weren't worth picking."

Today, those 60 barren acres of 1946 represent a neat, alfalfa-covered corner of the 200-acre family business which the Ringgenbergs call "Green Top Farm."

The boy, Kerry, an eighth-grader now, has a sister, Karen, born in 1948—the same year Gene and Sally completed the land-buying portion of their drive to make a go of it on the farm.

And on this farm today, the Ringgenbergs are feeding a herd of 90 Holsteins, 60 of them milk cows, the rest young stock. Production last year—10,000 to 11,000 pounds of milk per cow—a total of over 1½ million pounds.

"You know, the doubters of 1946," says Gene, "would've been convinced we were crazy, if we'd told them these 200 acres could feed more than 30 or 40 cows. No telling what they'd have thought if they knew the plans we have today. I believe we can build this farm without buying more acreage—build it so, when Kerry and Karen grow up, there'll be a living here for three families, not just one."

Certainly these aren't words you'd expect to hear from the head of an economic unit—the family farm—which is supposed to be on the way out. Certainly the Ringgenberg record to date lives up to the promise of Gene's words.

CONFIDENCE VERIFIED BY RECORD

And there's even more bite to his words when you think of this—there are no hired hands at Green Top Farm. All the work is the Ringgenbergs' own. Last year, for example, the investment in outside labor was just $12 (far less than a city family might spend on baby sitters).

What's their secret?

"No secret to it," says Gene. "Lots of farmers are doing as we are. It's a matter of managing the farm as a business—using the new tools and ideas and methods that'll help you produce more efficiently.

"When a farm fails, I figure it's like any business failing. Maybe they didn't plan sensibly—or maybe they let themselves get old-fashioned and inefficient."

DO-FOR-YOURSELF PLANNING PREFERRED

"Some people say we couldn't exist without being propped up by the government," Gene continues. "I think they're wrong. I think we can lick our problems by working to a businesslike plan—by using the latest, most efficient methods for producing at the lowest, possible cost. You've got to do for yourself—not with props and hand-outs. That kind of help carries direction right with it. I'd rather do my own thinking—plan my own future." Such are the attitudes of Gene Ringgenberg at age 35. Attitudes shaped by a drive that started when he was a boy—raising his own cows on his father's farm—fabricating his own tractor from an old pickup truck.

Sally recollects, "He's always worked toward goals—in everything. Back in high school, he was the shortest man on the basketball team, just five-seven. Well, the scientific way he developed his game, by senior year, he'd won All-Sectional honors, and that's not easy here in Indiana. One of his records still stands—70 games played without once fouling out—and that's not easy anywhere."

The quickest way to appreciate the Ringgenbergs' progress is to join Gene on the job—any day of the year, about 4:45 in the morning. With the night as yet untouched by any fringe of pink in the east, you'll find Gene driving the milk cows into the dimly lighted holding pen outside the milking parlor. He's built on the order of a broad-shouldered fireplug—short but exceedingly solid. Surrounded by the mooing, pushing "ladies of Holstein," he has the look of a man fording a river, up to his chest in waves of black and white.

PUSHBUTTON MILKHOUSE

The cows enter the milking parlor five at a time. The milking is performed by electric units—with the milk being piped automatically, direct from cow to stainless steel cooler in the Grade "A" milkhouse.

How's this for mechanization? Altogether the milking of 60 cows takes just about an hour and a half (about 7 minutes per cow).

Sally generally arrives on the scene in time to supervise the cleanup of the milking apparatus. And supervise it she does—by pushing a button on an electric control box to start an automatic cycle of washing, rinsing, and sterilizing.

By this time, Gene is likely to be doing two jobs at once—feeding the herd and scrubbing down the milking parlor. "It's easy to do both," says Gene, "because the feeding is automatic."

JUST 15 MINUTES TO FEED THE HERD

He simply pulls a switch on one of his three mechanized Harvestore feed processing units—the tall, blue towers that are more than symbols of success for the Ringgenbergs. And as the switch turns, a bottom unloader begins to hum—unloading the sweet-smelling feed called Haylage onto an auger-conveyor that feeds the cows automatically. It takes just 15 minutes to serve the Ringgenbergs' entire herd their first big meal of the day. "And this is the way they get every meal," says Gene. "There are no pastures on my farm. Too much waste that way—too much feed value lost."

PROCESS THEIR OWN HIGH-VALUE FEED

"Everything my cows eat is processed through the Harvestores. To a stranger, these units may look like nothing more than big, blue silos—but they sure mean a whole lot more than that to me. They're the key to my feeding program. And next to land and livestock, that's the most important part of an efficient dairy farm."

As Gene explains it, the Haylage from his Harvestores compares favorably with any complete cow ration he might buy. And the raw material for Haylage is alfalfa grown right on his own land.

The alfalfa is mowed as it might be for hay, but that's where the similarity ends. Instead of the old way of balling and drying—a wasteful method that often cost him as much as half his crop—he now runs it through a mechanical chopper at 40 to 50 percent moisture, then blows it up and into the top hatch of one of the Harvestores.

Gene says, "We haven't had to worry about rain spoiling hay ever since the first of the three units went up. But that's just part of the saving. The real difference is in what happens inside the Harvestores. You see, they're sealed to keep out oxygen. There's no spoilage. And the feed values are preserved. No matter how many months it's stored, the Haylage we get is moist and sweet-smelling. The cows love it."

CREATIVE PRODUCTION KEY TO FUTURE

As you go through a day on the farm of Gene and Sally Ringgenberg, you appreciate the truth and validity of Gene's statement—"We can lick our problems by working to a businesslike plan—by using the latest, most efficient methods for producing at the lowest cost."

Everything you see is the result of intelligent, creative planning—the kind of planning designed to get the most value from every ounce of work. You see it is the pushbutton milking operation, in the storage and mechanized feeding system, in the modern tractors and wagons, the chopper and blower. You're seeing a healthy, productive business—a business being built to insure a family's future on the farm.

A Commission Divided

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an excellent article appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of September 9, 1959, by David Lawrence entitled "A Commission Divided."

Mr. Lawrence has made a penetrating study of the so-called report by the controversial Civil Rights Commission, and I think this article by Mr. Lawrence strikes at the heart of the situation with which we are confronted when we are asked to review the life of the Civil Rights Commission. Mr. Lawrence states:

> Anyone who had the idea that a national commission to investigate "civil rights" could come up with a coherent report after months of study is bound to be puzzled by the confusing and to some extent contradictory recommendations just issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. President, I think the very controversial and divided nature of the Civil Rights Commission's report should be ample evidence to everyone that there could be no possible service to the country rendered in extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

As Mr. Lawrence points out in his article, the Commission has wandered far afield from constitutional principles. Indeed, it has given us no answer to any problem; to the contrary, the verbal garbage the Commission's report contains is highly inflammatory and will only tend to worsen conditions and cause a wider breach between proponents and opponents of forced integration.

It is an unquestioned matter of fact that the Commission has simply re-

flected, in a magnified way, the same old bitter issues that have beset us for so many years. The Commission's report simply makes the job more difficult for everyone concerned. Any extension of the life of the Commission will stir up more agitation, cause more confusion, and deepen hatreds.

Mr. President, when the administration was seeking the creation of the Civil Rights Commission, the Attorney General of the United States testified to the Congress that such a Commission would foster better understanding and relations between peoples of different races.

Mr. President, it appears to me that the Civil Rights Commission has accomplished nothing in the field of creating harmony in racial matters. Quite to the contrary, since its inception, violence, disorder, prejudice, hatred, and downright disrespect for law and order have increased. This is particularly true in the very areas of the Nation where integration has been forced upon people in recent years.

I hope the Members of the Senate will heed the lesson taught in the long list of racial violences that have occurred across the Nation recently, and not add fuel to the inflammatory problems of civil rights by passing civil-rights legislation or even extending the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. President, I ask that the article appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of September 9, 1959, by David Lawrence, entitled "A Commission Divided" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COMMISSION DIVIDED—CONTROVERSIAL CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT SEEN AS REFLECTING SECTIONAL CLEAVAGE

(By David Lawrence)

Anyone who had the idea that a national commission to investigate civil rights could come up with a coherent report after months of study is bound to be puzzled by the confusing and to some extent contradictory recommendations just issued by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Six members—three from the North and three from the South—made a conscientious effort to come to grips with the civil rights question as it affects registration and voting, housing and education. But the net result is a sharp division between the six.

As for voting rights, the report presents an anomaly. The three northern members—John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, and Prof. George M. Johnson, former dean of Howard University, who is the only Negro member of the Commission—joined together to recommend a new constitutional amendment. They feel it is necessary if the people wish to take away from the States their present right to determine for themselves all the different qualifications of voters apart from race or color or sex. This is sound reasoning. For, as noted in these dispatches several weeks ago, the Constitution today specifically gives the States the right to define such voter qualifications and to provide, for instance, tests to prove that a citizen can read and write.

Oddly enough, however, two of the southern members—former Gov. Doyle E. Carlton of Florida and Robert G. Storey, dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School at Dallas, Tex.—joined with the three northern members to recommend the passage of a Federal law to prevent individual discrimination in the application of existing State laws on the subject of voter qualifications. But these same two members, together with a third from the South—former Gov. John S. Battle of Virginia—then insisted that an amendment to the Federal Constitution is unnecessary to secure proper enforcement of voting rights because existing powers of Congress are adequate.

Perhaps the most controversial section of the report is that which deals with alleged discrimination on the part of educational institutions which receive Federal funds. It is signed by the three northern members and says in part:

"More than $2 billion a year of Federal funds go for educational purposes and to educational institutions. The principal recipients of these funds are the Nation's colleges, universities, and other institutions of higher education. Whether tax-supported or privately financed, they receive Federal grants and loans both for their general support and capital improvements as well as for research projects, special programs, and institutes."

The same three members of the Commission recommend that Federal agencies "be authorized and directed to withhold funds in any form to institutions of higher learning, both publicly supported and privately supported, which refuse, on racial grounds, to admit students otherwise qualified for admission."

But, unfortunately, the three members who signed that particular statement disregard the fact that, when the Federal Government attempts to enforce one section of the Constitution with respect to Federal aid to education, it opens up to similar scrutiny the application of other parts of the Constitution, especially the first amendment, which decrees a complete separation of church and state. If this concept of existing constitutional provisions were followed literally, then the GI bill of rights and any other Federal grants might be held to be improper where any church-controlled schools or colleges are involved. It is interesting to note that the three southern members—Commissioners Storey, Battle, and Carlton—do not think the Federal Government should attempt through its money power to police the schools. Their dissent is as follows:

"We cannot indorse a program of economic coercion as either a substitute for or a supplement to the direct enforcement of the law through the orderly processes of justice, as administered by the courts.

"Such a proposal by this Commission—as a branch of the Federal Government—would drastically affect the administration of privately owned institutions of higher education. Such action goes beyond the scope of the Commission's duties."

Strictly speaking, all private schools could be compelled under such a plan to admit anyone, irrespective of race or creed or color, or else forfeit tax exemptions and other Federal Government privileges.

It is in the field of housing, however, that the Commission finds itself wandering far afield from constitutional principle. It says:

"The need is not for a pattern of integrated housing. It is for equal opportunity to secure decent housing. * * * The Negro's need for an alternative to blockbusting as a way of securing housing must be met just as the legitimate interests of white neighborhoods on the edge of Negro expansion areas must be protected."

This sounds a bit reminiscent of the "separate but equal" doctrines that used to be applied by the courts before the 1954 Supreme Court "desegregation" decisions. Interesting enough, while this very section on housing apparently won the concurrence of all six members of the Commission, again even this appearance of unanimity is offset somewhat by a supplementary comment by the three southern members concerning future methods of tackling the problem of housing. They warn that "no one pattern will serve the country as a whole."

Miss Mildred C. Thelen, Lynn, Mass., Schoolteacher, Appointed To Attend Foreign Language Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a newspaper item which appeared in the Lynn (Mass.) Telegram-News and was reprinted in the Bay State Bulletin of the University of Massachusetts, about Miss Mildred C. Thelen, teacher of French and English at the Lynn English High School, Lynn, Mass., in my congressional district.

I am also including a written article by Miss Thelen, entitled "Central America, Land of Mayas," which was one of a series of seven articles which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News for seven consecutive Sundays:

[From the Bay State Bulletin, April 1959]

LYNN TEACHER ATTENDS FOREIGN LANGUAGE SCHOOL

Miss Mildred C. Thelen, teacher of French and Spanish at the Lynn English High School, is 1 of 100 foreign language teachers appointed to attend the Foreign Language Institute being held this summer at the University of Maine under the auspices of the U.S. Government. Title VI of the National Defense Education Act provides that each participant in the institute will be paid $75 per week, plus $15 per dependent during the 7-week period of intensive study.

WORKING SCHEDULE

Members of the institute attend nine classes, clinics, and workshops per day from 7:45 a.m. to 5:20 p.m., learning and experimenting with new aural methods, language laboratory techniques, educational electronics, as well as basic conversational Russian. At meal times they are assigned to language tables where they must speak their major language (French, Spanish, and German), which they are requested to use continuously throughout the day. Miss Thelen is taking part in the French program.

The four language institutes for 100 teachers each, originally set up by the U.S. Department of Education, at the University of Maine, University of Michigan, Louisiana University, and University of Colorado received 4,000 applications from language teachers. The response was so great that several more institutes have been added throughout the country and the program under Federal auspices will continue for the next 4 years.

TOPS IN LANGUAGE FIELD

Miss Thelen, who was also appointed as an alternate in the Spanish program of the Foreign Institute at the University of Colorado, is a past president of the New England

Chapter of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese, is a member of the Advisory Board of Foreign Language Consultants for the Massachusetts Department of Education, and State coordinator of Spanish for both State and National committees of the Foreign Language Coordination Committee of the Modern Language Association, and is a nominee for the office of member of the national executive committee of the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese.

She holds a master's degree in romance languages from Boston University and has attended summer sessions at the Sorbonne in Paris, the Middlebury French and Spanish Schools, the University of Mexico, and the University of Madrid.

CENTRAL AMERICA, LAND OF MAYANS

(By Mildred C. Thelen, Lynn English High School)

Several years ago, I attended the summer session at the University of Mexico, and took a course in the history of the Aztec civilization. While there I also visited the ancient Aztec ruins and pyramids of San Juan Teotihuacán outside of Mexico City. In the summer of 1957 I spent some time high up in the Andean Mountains of Peru visiting Cuzco, the ancient capital of the Empire of the Incas, as well as Machu Picchu, that awe-inspiring lost city of the Incas, which I described in one of my series of articles entitled "Around Latin America in 30 Days." As a result of my interest and study of these ancient peoples of Mexico and Peru, who attained a high level of culture and civilization many centuries before the Spanish conquistadores set foot on this hemisphere, I decided to visit Central America where the sites and ruins of the ancient Mayans are to be found.

Of these three distinct aboriginal races the Mayans had the most elaborate civilization and the most interesting customs and practices. In this article, I shall describe to you my trips through the jungles of Guatemala and Yucatán to see the temples and palaces of the ancient Mayans.

LAND OF ETERNAL SPRING

Guatemala is called the land of eternal spring and rightly so. The average mean temperature year around is 68 degrees. There are no rapid changes in climate or temperature, although there is a dry and rainy season. To escape hot summers and cold winters, this country is an ideal land for the tourist. Artists and photographers love it for its emerald green lakes and mountains, its picturesque Indian villages and markets, as well as its historic ruins. The 33 cloud-ringed volcanoes throughout the country seem to serve as a majestic backdrop for scenes of spectacular beauty and color. Most important of all, the people are friendly, polite, and kind. It is a wonderful country to visit.

TIKAL-MAYAN METROPOLIS

One of the highlights of my tour of Guatemala was my visit to Tikal, the largest city of the old Mayan Empire. Very few tourists have as yet seen this breath-taking spectacle in the dense jungle of Petén in northern Guatemala.

For the past 3 years, the Guatemalan Government and the University of Pennsylvania have been making excavations and restoring the temples, palaces, monuments, and other structures. The work has been under the direction of the American archeologist Edwin Shook of the University of Pennsylvania and Senor Antonio Tejeda Fonseca, of the National Archeological Museum of Guatemala.

ANCIENT MAYAN CITIES

Mayan cities were religious and civic centers with handsome abodes for the rulers and priests, beautiful temples and huge courts for games and ceremonies. To erect those tremendous stone temples, the Mayans must have had a mathematical and engineering knowledge of a high order. They moved the heavy stones on logs because they did not know the principle of the wheel. With only crude tods and maguey ropes, they erected buildings, carved and decorated with figures and hieroglyphics, that were truly marvels of art and beauty. The lower classes lived in grass thatched huts just as they do today.

INTERESTING PLACE

Chichicastenango (the place of the nettle leaves) at an altitude of 7,000 feet in the mountains of Guatemala, is one of the strangest places I have ever visited. About 1,000 Ladinos (mixed Spanish and Indian people) live in the little town of white houses, roofed with bright, red tile. However, 20,000 Indians live in the hills nearby and flood the town (almost empty on other days) for the Sunday and Thursday open-air markets. On these days, the large area in front of the 400-year-old Church of Santo Tomás is filled with several thousand Indians squatting about or selling their wares in awning-covered stalls.

The whole scene is one moving mass of color, as the Indians wear brilliant native costumes of all hues in the rainbow. One can immediately tell the village from whence they come by the type of costume.

THE MASKMAKER

A must on the agenda of every traveler to Chichicastenango is a climb to the top of a nearby mountain and a trip to the house of the maskmaker, who carves and paints wooden masks for the Indian dances and ceremonials.

In his workship and display room were hundreds of masks of devils and animals. The main work, however, is creating the masks for the Dance of the Conquistadores, when light-colored masks representing Pedro de Alvarado, the Spanish conquistador of Guatemala, and dark-colored masks representing Tecum Uman, the Maya chief whom he killed in combat, are used. The light masks have pink faces, gold hair, gold beards, and blue eyes. The dark-colored masks have brown skin, dark eyes, and black hair with quetzal birds decorating the temples. Very frequently whenever there is a fiesta, the Indians in elaborate costumes and painted masks, strut and dance for hours in the village plaza, as they reenact the story of the Mayas and the Spanish conquistadores.

MAYAN INN

The Mayan Inn in Chichicastenango, is perhaps the best known hotel in the country. It was built 25 years ago by Alfred Clark of Clark Tours, pioneer in the Guatemalan tourist business. The Mayan Inn opened up this whole section of Guatemala for visitors. It is a unique experience to stay there.

The Inn is a very unusual place. The walls of the flower-filled patio are decorated with Mayan hieroglyphics and figures, while here and there are old statues and chests of the colonial period. My room was very large and decorated with many valuable Spanish antiques. Most of the furniture was carved and massive. The draperies, rugs, and upholstery were all hand-woven native textiles. Tall, white calla lilies in a large vase added a hospitable touch of beauty to the room. Logs in the mammoth fireplace were read for the "fireboy" to come and make the room cozy and warm. In that cold mountain air, a crackling fire in the evenings and mornings was very inviting indeed.

RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES

Still retaining much of their ancient pre-Hispanic culture, the natives of Guatemala combine the worship of both the Christian God and their pagan deities in a most unique fashion.

For four centuries they have absorbed, within their limits to understand, the forms and teachings of the Catholic Church brought to them by the Spanish padres, and have blended them with their own ancient ceremonies. Religion answers a deep and emotional need in the nature of the Indian, and praying to the Supreme Being is the most important part of his life. The Catholic priests there, with great understanding and wisdom, are more concerned with what the Indian means, than with the details of his manner of prayer, so sincere and fervent that the onlooker is deeply touched.

MARIMBA MUSIC

The national music of Guatemala is played by marimba bands. No one knows exactly how the first marimbas came to Central America. One theory is that the conquistadores found the Indians playing on small sets of wooden bars made from rosewood trees of a special quality which, when struck, produced a mellow and resonant tone unlike that of any other wood. To amplify the tone, gourds were placed below the wooden bars. The instrument, about 8 feet in length, resembles a gigantic xylophone. Tones are sounded by striking the keys with small rubber hammers.

HUEHUETENANGO

An airplane flight brought me to remote Huehuetenango (pronounced waywaytenango), meaning "the place of the old people." It nestles on a plain in the shadow of the gigantic Cuchumantanes mountains, which range to 13,000 feet in height. It is a lead, copper, and silver mining center, but the chief attractions for the tourists are the Zaculeu ruins of the Mam Tribe and the Silver Virgin of Chiantla.

RUINS OF ZACULEU

A cab ride took me to the ruins of Zaculeu, ancient capital of the Mam Tribe of Mayan Indians, who lived there centuries before the Spanish conquest. The United Fruit Co., as a gesture of goodwill and friendliness to the Government of Guatemala, has reconstructed the ruins. Eight buildings have been completely restored as they were in the pre-Spanish conquest period. They are small and artistic. They do not compare at all with the majestic and towering structures located in Tikal and Yucatán.

MARYKNOLL MISSION

The highlight of my trip to Huehuetenango was my visit to the Maryknoll Mission. I was told by the Maryknoll Fathers in Guatemala City that the most important mission of the order was located in Huehuetenango.

There are about 28 Maryknolls at the present time in Guatemala. They are doing a wonderful work in helping the Indians to improve their way of life.

A MAN OF GOD

I met Father Leo Conners, who heads the mission, in the garden of the church in Huehuetenango. When I told him that I was interested in the work of the Maryknoll Fathers and would like to write about the work that this American order of missionaries is doing, he suggested that I accompany him in his jeep in his morning round to one or two of the mountain villages. He actually has charge of the mission work in 11 villages, some so remote that he can only get to them in his jeep about once a month to say masses, and perform marriages, baptisms, and otherwise help them with their spiritual needs.

I accepted his invitation and so Father Conners, two Indian girls and I sped around hairpin curves and barrancas at an elevation of 11,000 feet. It was certainly thrilling and exciting.

From time to time, Father Conners would stop at an isolated, thatched hut or tiny village. The Indian women would come out to greet him and hold up their babies, which he patted and fondled very affectionately. It was easy to see that they all loved him very

much, as he spoke to them in his rapid, fluent Spanish.

Father Conners has been doing missionary work in the mountains of Huehuetenango for 11 years. He is a jolly, energetic person, with twinkling blue eyes, and a great sense of humor. He is a completely happy person, selfless, and dedicated to the work of helping these impoverished Indians.

SPANISH COLONIAL RUINS

Antigua, the ancient capital of Guatemala, is a must for tourists who come from all over the world to see the most impressive Spanish colonial ruins in the Western Hemisphere. Founded in 1543, it was the third largest city in the Americas and the greatest cultural center in Central America.

In 1773, however, a shattering series of earthquakes in 10 minutes destroyed its magnificent churches, public buildings, and palaces. It was decided to abandon it as the capital. Today, the buildings, built over a period of three centuries, still stand in ruins. Antigua now has become a national monument, with all its historic shrines left in mute testimony of that fateful earthquake, a unique example of a Spanish colonial city untouched by modern times.

POSADA BELEM

I stayed at the Posada Belem in Antigua (the Bethlehem Inn) which in the 17th century was a monastery and housed the Hospitable Order of Belemiticos. Today, the old monastery, with its lovely gardens, arcades, patios, flowering terraces, and swimming pool, offers all the modern conveniences in an atmosphere of days long past.

PEDRO DE ALVARADO

The conqueror and first Governor of Guatemala was Don Pedro de Alvarado, who, in 1523, was sent by his commanding officer, Hernando Cortés, still occupied in the subjugation of the Mexicans, to invade Guatemala. He headed an army of 500 Spanish soldiers and Indian warriors.

There are a number of pictures of Alvarado in Antigua and Guatemala City. Without doubt, he is the handsomest historical figure I have ever seen, judging from his paintings. He was tall and well proportioned, with hair and beard that were reddish blond. The Indians called him "The Sun." An obscure, young adventurer of 25 when he left Spain, his ambition and daring brought him to the position of governor over the land he had conquered.

Today the Indians don dazzling mask replicas of his smiling countenance, when thye do their "Dance of the Conquistadores." Avaricious and cruel, he was brave to a fault and invincible.

LAKE ATITLÁN

No words can adequately describe the trip to the Mayan Highlands and the lake region of Guatemala, a veritable labyrinth of mountain ranges, deep gorges, and scenic volcanos. After a 3-hour drive from Guatemala City, you reach a high plateau where the turquoise waters of Lake Atitlán can be seen 2,000 feet below.

Lake Atitlán, reputed to be the most beautiful mountain lake in the world, is 70 miles in circumference and 17 miles across. The color of the lake changes constantly from soft pink and gray at sunrise to aqua blue at noon, and emerald flecked with golden tints at sunset. Twelve picturesque Indian villages, all named after the Apostles, dot its shores.

Although my primary reason for going to Central America was to see the temples and palaces of the ancient Mayans, nevertheless, while I was in that part of the world, I did want to visit some of the neighboring countries of Central America. My itinerary brought me into El Salvador to see the fires of the volcano Izalco and a trip up the El Boquerón, the crater of the Volcano of San Salvador.

I could not pass up a flight to Costa Rica, famed as a country that has more schoolteachers than soldiers. Volcano Irazú, 33 miles from San José, capital of Costa Rica, was rewarding as was a visit to the shrine of the Virgen de los Angeles at the beautiful cathedral in Cartago. The legend of the Virgen de los Angeles is very reminiscent of the miracle of Bernadette at Lourdes. Not to be forgotten were the beautiful hand-painted oxcarts of intricate designs and myriad colors.

Prior to my going to Yucatán, I stopped over in Nicaragua and spent some pleasant days sightseeing in Managua and its environs. But my heart was set upon completing my tour by seeing and visiting the most famous of all the Mayan ruins in Central America, Chichen-Itza and Uxmal.

MÉRIDA

Mérida is the capital of the State of Yucatán, Mexico. It is from Mérida that the Barbachano Travel Service specializes in tours to the ancient Mayan ruins and has an office opposite the Hotel Mérida. This company has been in business for over 30 years. Without a doubt, it is one of the most efficient and well-organized travel companies ever encountered on my tours. They own the beautiful hotels "Mayaland" and "Hacienda Uxmal" located in the heart of the jungle and archeological areas of Chichen-Itza and Uxmal.

They had fleets of cars taking tourists back and forth continuously to the ruins. The drive to Chichen-Itza was 83 miles over a well-paved road cut right through the jungle. It was hot and humid, even riding at a fast pace in the car. I was glad to reach the Hotel Mayaland. It is amazing that such a beautiful and luxurious place could be maintained in the heart of dense jungle.

HOTEL MAYALAND

Because it is unique, I would like to tell you a little about this hotel. Guests have their choice of a room with a private balcony in the hotel or a native hut in the tropical gardens surrounding the hotel. I chose the hut, but what a hut. It had a thatched roof, beautiful tile floors, tile bath, and hand-carved furniture of authentic Mayan motifs. At night the palm trees, bougainvillaea, and hibiscus trees were electrically lighted here and there in the tropical garden. An illuminated statue of Chac-Mool, the rain god, in the center of the garden, created a scene of enchanting splendor, as you strolled along the walk to the hotel for dinner.

GALA MEXICAN DINNER

Dinner was served by native girls dressed in the huipil, a vestment of primitive origin adorned with fine needle design at the square collar, sleeve openings, and lower part of the dress. The hair was worn in coiled braids piled on the head and tied with colored ribbons. In the balcony of the mural-walled dining room, three Yucatecans, dressed in the typical white shirts and trousers of the region, played guitars and sang Mexican songs during dinner.

There were large silver plates at each place, on which the regular china dishes were set. (We were all impressed with the silver plates, but then, we remembered that Mexico has a great abundance of silver.) Wild duck, venison, turtle steak, pompano, Morro crab and pollo pibil, as well as many exotic tropical fruits were featured on the menu. I chose pollo pibil, which turned out to be tiny chickens cooked with a delicious sauce, barbecued in a banana leaf, and served with friend bananas.

After dinner we all gathered in the large, handsomely-tiled lobby for the native dances. The dancers in Yucatecan costumes came down the stairs and did intricate regional dances, including the Jarana, to the accompaniment of guitars and maracas. One dance was done while the young native girls maintained wine-filled glasses on their heads.

CHICHEN-ITZA, YUCATÁN

The next day following the gala Mexican dinner at the Hotel Mayaland, our party started out at 8:30 a.m. for the tour of the spectacular Mayan ruins of Chichen-Itza. The tours begin early in the morning, led by the Hotel Mayaland guides. An early departure is necessary because it becomes terrifically hot later in the day. There is a great deal of climbing and walking to be done. Generally, tourists can take just about 2 hours of this activity in the hot sun of Yucatán. A later tour leaves every day at 4:30 a.m. to explore the remaining partially restored temples and altars in the archeological area.

Chichen-Itza, the most sacred city of the ancient Mayans, once covered 6 square miles, and at times housed as many as 500,000 people. It was excavated by a 20-year archeological expedition of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, headed by Dr. Sylvanus Morley in 1924. During this period, considerable scientific research work was done on the temples and pyramids, through the study of Mayan hieroglyphics.

MAYAN TEMPLES

On our morning and afternoon tours, we explored the Temple of the Warriors, the Temple of a Thousand Columns, the Ceremonial Ball Court, the Temples of the Jaguar and the Serpents, as well as many altars and monuments. It would be impossible to describe all the impressive ruins in this space, but I shall concentrate on a few of the most interesting.

The Temple of Kukulcan or El Castillo, as the Spaniards called it when they used it for a fortress, is an imposing pyramid over 100 feet high. It seemed to be the mecca for most of the tourists, who wanted to climb the 91 narrow steps, ascending perpendicular in the air, to reach the loft platform above. The temple was built to glorify Kukulcan, meaning, in the ancient Mayan language Plumed Serpent. It signified "Lord of Heaven and Earth," for the bird symbolized heaven and the serpent, earth.

I followed the guide along with the rest of tourists up the steep steps and into the dark, spooky chambers at the top to see the Chac-Mool (Rain God) and the fierce-looking Jaguar God. The Chac-Mool has eyes, teeth, and nails of pearl-like shell. The Jaguar, painted red, has eyes of jade, fangs of flint and teeth painted white. They are in a state of excellent preservation because they have not been exposed to the elements.

The Sacred Well of Sacrifice was a most interesting place. Steep and rough, with jutting ledge of rock, it was the scene of a strange ceremonial to propitiate the Rain God. The Temple of the Virgins of El Palacio de las Monjas (Palace of Nuns, as the Spaniards called it) is also one of the most important structures at Chichen-Itza. The ancient Ball Court is another point of interest in the tour of the ruins. There are two long high walls. In the center of one is a huge stone ring with a hole in the center. It is carved with twisted serpents and is placed about 20 feet from the ground. Present-day basketball may have had its origin from this ancient Mayan game. It also resembles the Basque game of jai-alai.

HACIENDA UXMAL

After 2 days at Chichen-Itza, our party left for Mérida in order to get to Uxmal, considered the most beautiful of all the ancient cities. There is no road between Chichen-Itza and Uxmal, so the Barbachanco tourist cars had to return to Mérida in order to make the trip to these ruins, which are distinctly different from those of Chichen-Itza.

We arrived late in the afternoon at the Hacienda Uxmal, a very pretty hotel built in

colonial style, enclosing a patio of tropical trees and flowers. All the furniture and decorated, handmade ironwork were especially designed for the hotel. The swimming pool was always filled with bathers in the late morning and afternoons, after the suenuous tours through the ruins. The polished tile floors throughout the hotel were designed in bright colors and seemed to glisten, as you looked down through the arcades and corridors.

RUINS OF UXMAL

Early the next morning, our party went out with the guide to see what the archeologists consider to be the finest examples of stone mosaics, as well as the most elaborately decorated structures of the ancient Mayan world. We followed him through the House of the Turtles, the House of Pigeons, the Temple of the Magician, with its steep stairway of 118 steps, the Place of the Governors, and many more superb structures. The buildings of Uxmal were constructed during the classic Maya period, when these ancient people had reached the peak of their culture. These temples seem almost Grecian in their beauty and proportion.

ADIÓS

"All good things must come to an end," so the adage runs, and finally came the time for me to leave for Mérida. There I finished my souvenir shopping for "recuerdos" and soon was on my way to the airport and the Pan-American plane for New Orleans. At the gangplank, I turned around and took one last look at the land of Mayas where I had had so many thrilling and interesting experiences.

I shall end this article with the very beautiful word which I said at that moment, a word that is to the Spaniards a benediction and a farewell, "Adiós."

Too Many Snakes in the Civil Rights Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on September 9, a most interesting editorial was published in the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, which is one of the Nation's truly liberal newspapers in the grand old sense of that term. The editorial is entitled "Civil Rights Report: Too Many Snakes."

The editorial is a very wise one; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greensboro Daily News, Sept. 9, 1959]

CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT: TOO MANY SNAKES

No wonder the Civil Rights Commission is badly split on its sweeping new recommendations designed to combat racial discrimination.

Even moderate southerners on the Commission opposed certain proposed constitutional amendments and Federal laws which would upset the traditional balance between State and Federal Government.

Key recommendation of the six-man Commission—but opposed by one member, former Gov. John S. Battle of Virginia—calls for Federal intervention if nine or more persons complain of having been denied the right to vote on a discriminatory basis.

The complainants would submit affidavits to the President who would relay them to the Civil Rights Commission for investigation. If the Commission found the complaints to be valid, the President then would appoint any local Federal official in the affected county or district to step in as registrar.

The Federal official—he could be a postmaster—would handle these duties until the President saw fit to return registration to local control. Persons certified to vote would then be able to vote only for Federal officers.

This recommendation stems from the Commission's investigation of voting discrimination in the Southern States, particularly Alabama and Louisiana, where large groups of Negro citizens are denied the ballot. The Commission found little or no cooperation on the part of some white officials in recognizing voting rights.

This is an issue basic to representative government. If a Negro is a citizen, he should be treated as any other citizen in his right of franchise. What can be done when the race which controls the political machinery at the local level will not recognize basic rights?

Every intelligent American citizen recognizes the need for remedial action here, but all will not agree that control of election processes should be removed from local hands and enforced by Washington.

The answer, in the Daily News' opinion, is not more Federal regimentation, which already has produced a continuing furor in the public schools.

The answer lies in education, appeal to the good conscience of the white South and assistance for southerners anxious to correct abuses but unwilling to upset built-in balances to accomplish even worthy ends.

Obstinate, prejudiced men and women—both North and South—will vanish or mellow in their passions as time passes. But destructive changes in the division of powers between local and Federal Government cannot be easily corrected once they are made.

The Daily News has been a longtime champion of basic rights of citizenship in a democracy. Every qualified citizen ought to be allowed to vote.

But the Civil Rights Commission is simply stirring up more snakes than it can kill by suggesting that the answer to a passing phase of racial discrimination is destruction of necessary balances between State and Federal Government.

Khrushchev Visit—Dedicated to Our Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues today to an excellent analysis of the pending visit of Soviet Premier Khrushchev to this country, which has been prepared by Mr. Charles Rozmarek, national president of the Polish American Congress. This analysis appeared in the Chicago Tribune on September 10, 1959.

Mr. Rozmarek has been one of the most courageous fighters against Communist internationalism that this country has ever had. Mr. Rozmarek has a distinguished record, not only as president of the Polish American Congress, which represents 7 million Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, but also as president of the Polish National Alliance, which is the largest Polish-American fraternal organization in this country.

Mr. Rozmarek's analysis follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Sept. 10, 1959]

"DEDICATED TO OUR DESTRUCTION"

CHICAGO, September 8.—Twenty years ago on September 17, Russia, as Hitler's accomplice, stabbed Poland in the back. It is ironic that Khrushchev's visit to this country should be timed to coincide with this sad anniversary.

As president of the Polish American Congress, representing 7 million Americans of Polish descent, I have conferred with President Eisenhower on several occasions, as I have with his predecessors, President Roosevelt and President Truman. While I have the greatest admiration for our President's dedication to peace, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not voice disapproval of Khrushchev's visit to the United States.

This is the same Khrushchev, who as a member of the Kremlin regime, shares responsibility for the mutilation of Poland, the seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the Communist control of Czechoslovakia and other countries in Europe and Asia, the Katyn massacre of 15,000 Polish war prisoners, the betrayal of the Warsaw uprising, the planned starvation of millions of Ukrainians, the deportation of 40 million innocent people to Siberian slave camps, the slaughter of Hungarians, the murder of American soldiers in Korea, and the shooting down of unarmed American planes.

This is also the same Khrushchev who, despite the fact that America rescued Russia from Nazi enslavement when Hitler was at her throat, has threatened to bury us.

Although a glance at the map will show that communism is the only aggressive force, Khrushchev recently announced that he is reinforcing his army and navy "to keep them in a state of high battle preparedness."

Let Americans beware. Unless we have a strong, firm, and courageous America, ready to meet every threat, Russia will attack us without warning, just as she did Poland 20 years ago.

There is no use pretending. The master of the Kremlin is not coming here to promote peace. He is coming here with his entourage of master spies to survey the land he wants to conquer, to capture the front pages of the press of America, and to relax our guard by telling us that communism is never an aggressor and, therefore, America has no need to protect itself with H-bombs or overseas bases.

Although our Government will extend Khrushchev the courtesies demanded by protocol, we are told that we also owe him a courteous reception. We owe him nothing. We are under no obligation to greet anyone dedicated to our destruction.

This is one time when Americans of all persuasions should present a united front on the side of freedom and decency. In addition to religious services in all Protestant and Catholic churches and synagogs for the victims of communism, there should be in all cities to be visited by Khrushchev peaceable demonstrations of people carrying signs advocating "Freedom for Captive Nations." Is there anything wrong in asking the Russians to back up their words of peace with deeds?

Moreover, such an orderly demonstration would show Khrushchev and the world how fortunate we are to live in a free country where we have a right to disagree with our leaders, without fear of reprisal, and they in turn approve of our right to disagree with them.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress.

Don't Rob Your Children of Struggle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Human Events, Inc., enlists many of the Nation's outstanding citizens to write on topics of vital interest to the Nation. In the August 19, 1959, edition of Human Events, former Congressman Samuel Pettengill brilliantly discusses the need for some degree of struggle in the lives of man. He deplores the trend toward the welfare state. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Don't Rob Your Children of Struggle," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T ROB YOUR CHILDREN OF STRUGGLE—OUR YOUTH MUST BE TRAINED TO FACE TOMORROW'S CHALLENGE

(By the Honorable Samuel B. Pettengill)

"The chessboard is a symbol of life—of all life. The essence of life is struggle. Take struggle out of chess, or out of life, and what is left? In chess I have found happiness." Those words were spoken 35 years ago by Emmanuel Lasker of Berlin, who had reigned as world chess champion for 24 years.

Lasker was not a mental freak. He had a Ph.D. in mathematics and wrote a profound book on philosophy. He had come to my hometown of South Bend to put on an exhibition match with some 30 local chess players. At supper that night we asked him why he had given so much of his life to chess. He gave the response quoted above.

That was a long time ago, but I have never forgotten his words. I have often said to young parents, "Don't take struggle out of your children's lives." The instinct of fathers and mothers is to do just that—to make "life easier for my boy than it was for me." It is interesting to note that youth is sounder in this matter than age. Youth revels in competitive sport, whether to do something better than its fellows or to beat some previous record. Even small children, when they invent games of their own, always put struggle into them. Struggle is a blessing to be sought for, not an evil to be avoided.

In recent years, society has gone "nuts" on the pusillanimous cult of "security" guaranteed by Government; in short, a nation of parasites. The illusion of the age is that people can vote themselves rich. It is a superstition that "social security" depends on the promises of politicians, not on the character, competence, and courage of men. It is a fable and a fraud that the output of society can be greater than the input of individuals.

It is a universal complain that nobody wants to work any more, or only enough to "get by." Employers are frantic for dependable employees. Labor unions have the laudable desire to improve the position of their members, but they overplay their hand when they say, "Stretch it out. Take it easy. Do no more than enough to stay on the payroll."

When young people apply for their first jobs they ask, "When will I begin to draw a pension? How many coffee breaks in a day? How many paid holidays? How long and frequent are the paid vacations? And if I work more than 40 hours in a week do I get time and one-half?"

The young men who ask none of these questions are sure to get and hold jobs. These young men have a golden age ahead of them. They will have less competition than their kind of men ever had—and greater rewards.

Theodore Roosevelt attracted national attention when he said: "I wish to preach, not the doctrine of ignoble ease, but the doctrine of the strenuous life." He said of himself, "Let me wear out, not rust out." He told young men to hit the line hard. At a time when any woman who had more than two children was considered subhuman, if not a little indecent, he told women not to shirk their prime function to bear children.

Theodore Roosevelt dreamed nobly of his country, and, by the fire of his example, lit other fires in millions of homes. It was said that Washington founded the Nation, Lincoln saved it, and T. R. revitalized it. He appealed to the strong side of men as is now chiefly done by Marine sergeants and the coaches of athletics like my old friend, Knute Rockne.

"Rock" had no use for "lounge lizards" or "tea hounds" on a college campus. Youth liked that. They flocked to Notre Dame to play under him, and when his players were behind at the half they proceeded to pull the game out of the fire because "we can't let 'Rock' down."

A century ago Giuseppe Garibaldi appealed to the strong side of men with these words: "Young men of Italy, I offer you nothing but the water of the streams as your drink. I offer you nothing but black bread as your food, and nothing but the blue canopy of heaven and the lights of the eternal stars as your covering at night. But if you follow me, young men of Italy, you and I will be free." They followed him and Italy became a united country.

But today the general appeal is to the soft side of men—envy, self-pity, covetousness, class hatred. Our elections have become auctions in which rival politicians of both old parties open the door of the Treasury in exchange for votes. "Come and get it" is the slogan as people become the vandals of their own country, and "bread and circuses" the formula for political advancement.

Men like John Dewey have tried to eliminate struggle from the classroom. No required subjects. No examinations. They develop inferiority complexes, rather than the challenge to do better. Never punish a child. Children should be wholly free. And so forth. The result is that employers despair because "Johnny can't read and Mabel can't spell."

So we have cities with few citizens; many who wish to share the blessings of liberty, but shirk its burdens. This is not the spirit of 1776, nor of the great chess master, nor of Theodore Roosevelt. America needs a rebirth of the strenuous life and I know I am talking to young men who will take their part in it.

It was said of those who crossed the Appalachians down into the valleys of the Ohio, the Mississippi, and the Missouri and pushed the frontiers of freedom to the Pacific shore that "the cowards never started and the weak never arrived. With no capital save courage and no resource except resourcefulness they built the American empire."

In Vermont there are hundreds of miles of stone walls—every stone dug from the ground and moved to where it now lies by oxpower and human muscle alone. We think of the Pyramids of Egypt, and the tens of thousands of slaves who dragged the huge stones across the desert under the whips of their masters. It is my guess that the stone walls of Vermont represent more toil than the pyramids. But the walls were laid by the free choice of freemen. They scorned delights and lived laborious days.

Avoid struggle and life becomes sterile, vapid, and meaningless. Our mental hospitals are being filled with thousands of neurotics, many of whom feel inadequate to meet life because they were protected from taking the bumps in childhood.

No man was ever greater than the difficulties he overcame. Great difficulties, great men. Small difficulties, small men. From struggle comes strength—and physical and mental health.

It is only struggle that calls forth hidden powers we do not know we have. The great psychologist, William James, said the average person does not put forth more than 10 percent of his potential.

My great grandfather, Peter Pettengill, came to Vermont in 1787. One time his hired man was chopping down trees in the virgin forest and did not come to the house at noon for lunch. My great-grandfather went to see what was wrong. He found that a tree had fallen on the hired man and killed him. With nothing but the strength of his own powerful body, Peter lifted the tree off the dead man and carried him to the house.

Whence came his strength to do that? From the challenge before him. That tree was never cut into timber or firewood. It lay where it fell. Other strong men in the neighborhood came and tried to lift it. They could not. Why? Because they did not have the incentive that Peter had. Nor could Peter himself ever lift the tree again. The incentive was gone.

You have all seen athletes at times "play over their heads." Why? Because of the challenge and its acceptance.

It is men who have counted struggle as a blessing who get the big rewards of life. As Emerson said, "God keeps an honest account with men."

The hard surgical case, where life hangs by a heart beat, does not go to the dilettante surgeon. The tough engineering problem, like building a bridge across a mighty river, does not go to the engineer who has always looked for the easy jobs. And the same for lawyers and top executives in business.

If at times you feel that you "did not have the same chance" that others have, ask yourself what chance did Abraham Lincoln have? Remember that "it is not so much the size of the dog in the fight that counts, but the size of the fight in the dog."

Young people today face a time of struggle with an enemy of our country more dangerous than King George III in 1776—the godless Caesars of atheistic communism. Let's lick it. Put it and all its teaching out of our schools, churches, public affairs and private life. What our fathers bequeathed us is still "the last best hope of earth." Save it for our boys and girls.

Remember robust Robert Browning: "I count life just a stuff to try the soul's strength on, educe the man."

Remember Tennyson's Ulysses and the old Greeks "who ever with a frolic welcome took the thunder and the sunshine"—hard hours with the same zest as the pleasant ones.

Remember the poem of the frontier:

"I dream no dream of a nursemaid state
That spoons me out my food.
No, the stout heart sings in its strife with fate,
For the toil and the sweat are good."

A Congressman's View of Technical Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. VAUGHAN GARY
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include an article published in the May issue of the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, entitled "A Congressman's View of Technical Cooperation."

The title of the article really does not do it justice, because it does not convey the important fact that the author is a Congressman who is uniquely qualified to write on technical cooperation. The author is the Honorable PORTER HARDY JR., the distinguished and exceedingly able Member of this House from the Second Congressional District of Virginia. He is the energetic and capable chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations of the House Committee on Operations. This subcommittee has done outstanding work in investigating our Government's operations abroad, and the disclosures which his subcommittee has developed have been most helpful to the Congress in evaluating our foreign aid program. Representative HARDY'S article points out that the technical cooperation program has been a wonderful success in many places, and he makes clear that it is out of a sincere belief in our technical cooperation programs, and his concern for their success, that he has found himself in the role of a critic. I add, however, that in my view he is a most constructive critic.

The article follows:

A CONGRESSMAN'S VIEW OF TECHNICAL COOPERATION

(By PORTER HARDY, JR.)

Advocates of particular points of view commonly characterize as opponents those who are not enthusiastic supporters. For example, if a Congressman makes a speech or writes an article criticizing the conduct of a particular Government program, he is forthwith considered as against it. When, as is often the case, he couples with his criticisms a pledge of support for the program he is apt to be accused, as politicians sometimes are, of talking out of both sides of his mouth at once, doubtless with an eye on the next election.

More careful observers recognize constructive criticism. They know that the adverse comments which Congressmen make about given activities of Government do not always have ulterior motives. Instead, critical observations by Congressmen may often arise out of a sincere belief in and a profound concern for the very things being criticized. It is out of a concern for the success of our technical cooperation programs that I find myself in the role of critic.

We in the Congress have listened carefully year after year to the reports of performance and claims of accomplishment for these programs which are sent up by the International Cooperation Administration and the Department of State. Along with most of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle I have consistently voted funds for their continuance. But, as chairman of a House subcommittee charged with the duty of studying U.S. international operations, I have also had some special opportunities to observe their day-to-day conduct, and I have not always been gratified by what I saw. It is out of the experience of the past 4 years, in which I have studied at close hand technical cooperation programs from Iran to Uruguay, and from Cambodia to Mexico, that my judgments have been formed.

AIMS AND PHILOSOPHY OF PROGRAM

The objectives of this program are most inspiring and unselfish, particularly for an actively undertaken by one government on behalf of another. The technical cooperation program is founded in hope and optimism. It envisions a future in which, through the sharing of technical knowledge and skills, a better life can be created for millions of people in other lands—people for whom over the centuries tomorrow has always been bleak.

It is by no means accidental that the United States has led the way in this bold and imaginative undertaking. The stoic acceptance of life as it is has never been an American characteristic. We have always considered ourselves masters of our fate. Coupled with this confidence is a deep humanitarian urge which impels Americans into action whenever they see human misery caused by poverty, starvation, disease, and ignorance.

Moreover, when such conditions exist in lands with untapped resources, to an American it appears that what is needed is the application of American know-how to make the stubborn earth yield its stored abundance, to push back the ancient enemy of disease, to feed and clothe and house the people and give them the hope for tomorrow which seems so tragically lacking.

This is the central objective of the technical cooperation program. This is the valid element which finds a response in the heart of every American. This is why Congress so consistently supports this effort.

A praiseworthy objective, however, does not by itself assure success. Good intentions must be matched by wise actions. It is from this standpoint that it becomes the duty of even the most ardent supporters of technical cooperation programs carefully and coolly to examine the nature of these activities and the way they are carried out.

Section 418(a) of the Act for International Development of 1950 defines technical cooperation programs as "programs for the international interchange of technical knowledge and skills designed to contribute to the balanced and integrated development of the economic resources and productive capacities of economically underdeveloped areas."

The United States contributes to this effort in three ways; by sending U.S. technicians to work in the host countries, by bringing host country personnel to the United States for training, and by contributing to the support of special joint bureaus set up within the host governments to carry out technical assistance programs. The emphasis throughout is intended to be upon the transfer of skills and know-how. Any expenditure for capital equipment is supposed to be limited to that needed for demonstration purposes only. It is, in other words, intended to be a program of education, not of economic aid.

The implications of this form of foreign aid are worth noting. One of the presuppositions of technical cooperation programs is that there are human and physical resources in the host country which will be employed as soon as the necessary know-how is made available. Another presupposition is that the host country can and will initiate, or take over and continue on its own, a given activity once the method of doing it has been adequately demonstrated. Finally, the concept presupposes that technical cooperation funds will not be employed to continue a given activity after know-how has been acquired by the host country. If additional U.S. dollars are necessary, they should either be provided through private sources or through other categories of the mutual security program.

Out of a total of nearly $4 billion of the President's budget request for the fiscal year 1959 mutual security program, $164 million—about 4 percent—was for technical cooperation. Thus the technical cooperation programs do not involve large sums of money when compared to the billions which we spend each year on other foreign aid activities. A portion of this amount represented U.S. contributions to technical cooperation programs carried out through international organizations like the United Nations and the Organization of American States. Of the total, however, $142 million was for bilateral programs set up by agreement between the United States and individual host countries. The following comments relate principally to the bilateral programs.

I have already expressed myself as being impressed with the inspirational aspects of technical cooperation. It provides people-to-people contact—an element which should be supplied but is generally lacking in other aspects of our foreign aid program. Military assistance programs all over the world serve to protect the freedom of countries and their citizens—but the impact of such programs is not felt directly by the people. Military hardware does not fill empty stomachs. Economic assistance dollars too often are used for monumental projects such as dams and roads—projects which are primarily dedications to national pride. Although over a long period of time they contribute to an improved economy, they have little or no significance in the here and now for the ordinary man. The only programs that immediately encourage and directly help the individual are those embraced under the point 4 concept—that is, technical cooperation. Through these programs, individuals are helped to better health, to useful and enlightening education, to a more adequate diet, and to improved sanitation and housing.

In the current year over 3,000 American technicians are working abroad in some 50 countries. Most of these technicians are working with their counterparts overseas in the fields of food production, public health, and education. These are basic areas for the improvement of living standards. Some programs have been broadened, in response to changing needs, to help solve problems of transportation, housing, industrial management, public administration, and community development.

AGRICULTURE

In many countries technical cooperation programs have shown the way to better methods of cultivation, improved plant varieties and breeds of farm animals. Through these and the application of fertilizer to crops, improved tools and implements, control of plant diseases and insect pests, the production of food for hungry and growing populations has been vastly increased.

Even slightly improved tools or better methods of cultivation often make immediate and striking improvement. In Iran, a demonstration of the advantages of using a moldboard plow instead of a pointed stick in sugar beet cultivation resulted in three times the yield. In Ethiopia, a simple change to row planting of corn instead of broadcast planting increased production from 18 bushels an acre to 30 bushels.

Agricultural vocational schools and colleges have been opened in a dozen countries as a result of technical cooperation.

Through agricultural extension activities, additional channels have been opened through which a continuous supply of scientific information flows to the farmers themselves in a form which they can understand and apply.

HEALTH AND EDUCATION

The original activity of technical cooperation in Venezuela was in malaria control. In 3 years, malaria dropped from third place to sixth among causes of death. In the Philippines, malaria incidence fell 68 percent as a result of DDT spraying. The malaria control program, in addition to its striking accomplishments toward better health, had the important side effect of tremendous expansion in food production—particularly in Indonesia and Iran. Mosquito control restored to cultivation much highly productive land which previously had been abandoned because of malaria.

The surge of interest in education in all newly developing countries is a phenomenon of the present era. In 1946–47 in Cambodia there were 38,000 children in primary schools; in 1955–56 attendance was 241,000. In Iran, since the U.S. technical cooperation program began in that country, school enrollment has increased from 20,000 in 1948 to 45,000 in 1955. The great need everywhere is for trained teachers, and technical cooperation projects in education have concentrated on filling this need, helping to give preservice training to more than 17,000 teachers and in-service training to more than 46,000.

I have given only a few examples to illustrate the operation of this program and the benefits it has produced.

Let us consider in more detail another example of accomplishment, in order to discuss the criteria applicable to a technical cooperation activity. In Chile, the Government had sought over many years to establish a satisfactory program of preventive medicine. As part of the U.S. technical cooperation program in the field of health, during the period from 1943 to 1953, five health centers were established and operated in strategic locations. These centers have since been turned over to the Chilean Government, which continues to operate them today. More important, using these original centers as a pattern, the Chilean Government has constructed ten additional health centers in Santiago Province alone and has made such centers the basic field unit in a reorganization of the Chilean National Health Service.

All the elements of a successful technical cooperation project were present in this case: (1) The project dealt with a problem which had been of concern to the host government; (2) it involved a demonstration of a method of solving the problem; (3) it resulted not only in an activity which could be and was turned over to the host government, but it stimulated expanded and continuing action by the host government in this particular field.

We have, as a matter of U.S. policy, sought to insure the presence of these elements by stipulating three conditions to be met in carrying out a technical cooperation activity. First, the host country must request it. Second, the host country must pay a fair share of its cost. Third, it must be related to efforts being made by the host country itself.

HOST COUNTRY REQUEST

These are wise provisions which, if adhered to with reasonable consistency, would guarantee that every program and project was a truly cooperative undertaking. If we conduct only those programs which the host country requests we can be sure that we are responding to a genuinely felt need; by the contribution of host country funds, local interest in a program's success can be both measured and sustained; and by establishing a relationships with other activities and plans of the host country not only can we contribute to balanced progress and development but the encouraging effect of our help can spread beyond the individual programs.

Unfortunately, in altogether too many instances, these sensible rules have been broken. Investigations by our subcommittee disclosed that some projects were being implemented where host country approval had been obtained through insistence by U.S. representatives rather than as a result of a bona fide interest in the part of the host government. To be sure, a formal request by the host government was on file, but it was little more than a piece of paper drawn up to meet technical requirements. Sometimes these projects originated simply because particular U.S. specialists were available and wanted to undertake them. In other instances, pressure from Washington was put upon U.S. field personnel to get certain types of projects underway. Almost invariably, as might be expected, such projects ultimately were financed almost entirely with U.S. funds. The interest of the host countries was as small as their contributions.

HOST COUNTRY CONTRIBUTION

The second requirement, that the host country contribute a fair share to the support of projects, has also been applied very unevenly. In one country we found that the United States has been paying over $1 million a year to support an agricultural program on the basis, not that the host country could not support it, but that it would not. In another, our technical cooperation funds were being used not to supply know-how but to underwrite a routine Government activity, which is not in the spirit of the technical cooperation legislation. In a third country; a major agricultural project was of such little interest to the host country that when the time came to put in its contribution it refused to do so, even though we had allocated more than three-quarters of a million U.S. dollars to it.

The proportion of local support for individual programs and projects varies widely even within a single country. What appears to emerge is that host country contributions have been made to some projects and not to others, depending on the extent of host country interest in them. This, of course, is why the fair share requirement was instituted in the first place, but it has not been fully or adequately adhered to by U.S. administrators.

The importance of the level of host country contributions cannot be overemphasized. It is not a matter of specific amounts of money, for these might vary considerably from country to country and even from time to time within a given country, depending on the local financial situation. What is crucial is that the most reliable index of a host country's interest in a program or project is not how much it is willing to have the United States invest in it, but how much the country itself is willing to contribute.

The heart of technical cooperation is the idea of self-help. There is little to be gained by imposing on others plans and ideas in which they have no interest. These programs are intended to be cooperative efforts. Unless the recipient country wants and believes in a project or program, enough to put its own funds into it at whatever level it can afford, the cooperation aspect is lost.

In this connection, reports given to the Congress on the extent of host country contributions have been more than a little misleading. These are usually expressed for comparative purposes in terms of equivalent dollars. Yet, by the use of par-value exchange rates which have no current significance, the contributions of some countries have been greatly exaggerated. We found, for example, one country where local contributions as presented to Congress had been magnified in this way by a factor of 20. In other instances, under a category called contributions in kind, a dollar value had been placed on a number of intangibles and everything conceivable has been counted as a host country contribution, including duties they had waived collecting on imports for the program. Most ridiculous of all was reporting, as a host country cash contribution, the local currency obtained by the sale of U.S. commodities we had given them.

As I have pointed out earlier, local contributions, when account is taken of the general financial situation of the host country, can be most revealing about local acceptance of programs and projects. I therefore believe that more effort must be made to adhere to the "fair share" rule than is now the case. I make this observation out of a conviction that the planning of programs, their day-to-day conduct, and their chance of achieving their ultimate goals will be improved thereby.

PROJECT PLANNING

The third requirement, that programs be related to efforts being made by the host country itself, brings up the question of planning. What seems to be absent in most cases is a realistic estimate of the situation. Projects are often initiated with only the most hazy idea of how extensive a problem is involved, without determining in advance the availability of the technical personnel who will be needed, and without fixing a goal by which progress toward completion can be measured. Few projects are based on the kind of preliminary survey and analysis which would determine how much of what kind of technical knowledge or skill needs to be and can be supplied over what period of time. In place of careful planning, the tendency is simply to initiate and to expand programs, in the words of one overseas U.S. program officer, "to provide facilities which haven't been provided heretofore."

It is this approach which leads to pressures from Washington and even from officials in the field to get projects underway, not so much because they are relevant to local needs, but because a similar activity is underway in some adjacent country. This is hardly a sound basis for relating programs to activities of the host country, and it has accounted for a number of notable failures. Fits and starts in other cases have occurred because the problem of recruiting technical personnel to carry out the work was not adequately considered. In Uruguay, for example, a program in health was delayed for more than a year after the chief of the program arrived because four or five technicians could not be supplied.

CONCLUSION

Reviewing these observations, it is clear that most of the faults in technical cooperation programs are matters of administration. Yet, paradoxically, some of them are at the same time tributes to the good intentions and zeal of the administrators who have been activated by a strong desire to obtain tangible results and impatient in their haste to reach ultimate goals. One can applaud enthusiasm—but not when it initiates action with inadequate planning and results in wasteful errors caused by hasty judgments.

A basic trouble, I am coming to believe, lies in a failure to appreciate the fact that there are significant limits to the rate at which technical knowledge and skill can be absorbed by an underdeveloped economy. As Americans we are attuned to a dynamic and open society in which technological change is rapidly assimilated. We must keep in mind the fact that the differing societies of many underdeveloped lands cannot now make use of all the skills we can offer them. First, some far-reaching changes must take place in the nature of the societies them-

selves. What I am referring to, of course, is the problem generally called cultural lag. For example, it may be possible in a given country to suggest improved methods of agriculture and yet have few of them adopted because to do so may require a revision of age-old traditions of land tenure and ownership and perhaps even of family relationships. Similarly, technical improvements in tax administration may require a totally different view of the role of government within a given culture. Such changes do not come about quickly nor do they result from the availability of technical knowledge. The need for improved skills may be apparent now, but the demand for them may require cultural changes which time alone can bring.

No one is better fitted to take such considerations into account than host country officials who, of necessity, are representative of their own culture. This is why the participation of the host government in planning and carrying out technical cooperation programs is of such paramount importance. This is why unilateral judgments by U.S. officials of what projects are to be undertaken should be discouraged.

It can, of course, be argued that adhering strictly to the rules might result in a reduction in the number and scope of activities now underway. This, indeed, might prove to be the case and in some instances it might be wise. It is also possible that sounder programs might result. In addition, there is a real possibility that when full account is taken of the limits imposed by cultural lag, to say nothing of administrative matters like the recruitment of adequate numbers and kinds of U.S. technical personnel, the seemingly modest level at which these activities are operating may turn out to be very nearly the maximum which is currently feasible.

I have not commented on the relationship of these programs to our more costly undertakings in the fields of outright economic assistance and military aid. Obviously they are related, since improved economies and greater military strength require added technical knowledge and skills. Conversely, the full use of such knowledge and skills may depend upon the addition of considerable amounts of physical capital.

Technical cooperation is basically education, and it is as an educational activity that it must be assessed. In my view, its fundamental concept is sound. The broad policy guides which have been set up for its conduct are inherently wise. If to the good intentions of the U.S. officials administering these programs there can be added sounder judgment, and a greater degree of commonsense, I believe we will more fully accomplish our purpose.

For its part, Congress, I am sure, will continue to give this activity its strong support. It is to be expected, however, that a careful congressional eye will be kept on technical cooperation operations, and that the sharpest criticisms will still come from those Members of Congress who most devoutly want these programs to succeed.

Teenage Boys Snatch Girl From G.I., Rape Her

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article appearing in the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times-Herald of September 9, 1959, entitled "Teenage Boys Snatch Girl From G.I., Rape Her."

Mr. President, this article relates how a group of Negro youths snatched a screaming 18-year-old white girl from her soldier companion and raped her in a wooded area near heavily traveled East River Drive in Philadelphia.

This is but another instance in the growing and mounting series of tragedies which are besetting the large cities of America where forced integration has become the so-called law of the land.

Mr. President, until the people of this country realize that integration can only exist peacefully in places where people voluntarily prefer it, we will continue to have incidents such as these and the thousands of others that have occurred and are occurring in New York, Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, and other cities I have mentioned recently on the floor of the U.S. Senate. There will be no end to such violence and disrespect for law and order so long as integration is forced upon unwilling people.

Mr. President, I ask that this article from the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Sept. 9, 1959]

TEENAGE BOYS SNATCH GIRL FROM G.I., RAPE HER

PHILADELPHIA, September 8.—A group of Negro youths snatched a screaming 18-year-old white girl from her soldier companion and raped her in a wooded area about 100 yards off heavily traveled East River Drive.

Police said the attack took place late Monday afternoon in the city's Fairmount Park area. The victim said she was grabbed by a gang of 10 or 15 teenage boys.

She said she and her companion, Arthur Izers, also 18, were walking through the park when approached by the band of Negroes, all about 17 to 19 years old. She told Park Guard Frank Stewart that seven of the youths grabbed Izers, while the others pulled her behind some bushes, ripped off her blouse and shorts and assaulted her repeatedly.

Izers, an Army private, stationed at Fort Dix, N.J., finally broke loose and dashed for the River Drive. He hailed four motorists who followed him back into the woods. When they reached the scene, the youths fled into the woods.

Police and park guards arrested 25 suspects, but all were released for lack of identification.

Oceanographic Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently the American Legion in national convention assembled adopted a resolution endorsing oceanographic research. Since the Committee on Science and Astronautics, of which I am chairman, has had this matter under study, I commend this resolution to my colleagues for their consideration.

RESOLUTION 640 (CONVENTION COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS) OCEANOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

Whereas the knowledge of the scientific phenomena related to the world's oceans at present is extremely meager compared to their paramount importance;

Whereas the world's oceans cover three-fourths of the earth's surface and are daily increasing in importance to the destiny of the free world;

Whereas increased utilization of marine resources provide a promising food potential in the face of the explosive increases of the world's population;

Whereas the world's oceans provide a future source of atomic fuel, mineral resources, and fresh water supply;

Whereas there is an increased mutual interdependence of the nations of the free world for non indigenous strategic materials in view of expanding technological applications;

Whereas the United States and the free world depend for sea lift of 99 percent of all materials exported;

Whereas the United States depends largely upon utilization of the world's oceans by its naval forces for its capability to cope with limited war and international crises all over the world;

Whereas th threat of enemy submarine launched missile attack against the United States is now a reality; and

Whereas there is an urgent need to provide a comprehensive long range program for oceanographic research embodying an accelerated increase in oceanographic research and survey ships, laboratories, schools and scientific personnel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Legion National Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, indorses the overall 10-year plan for ocenanographic research as outlined in the Report of the Committee of Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences and the U.S. Navy.

Judge Orel Busby Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Young Democratic Clubs of Oklahoma staged a dinner on August 29 at Ada, Okla., to honor Judge Orel Busby of that city as the founder of the Young Democratic Club movements in America.

This occasion was made more outstanding by the presence of America's most distinguished Democrat, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House. The remarks made at this occasion by Judge Busby were so impressive by virtue of their sincerity and profoundness that I believe our colleagues in Congress will find them of great and refreshing interest. Judge Busby's remarks follow:

Governor Nigh, and friends, all, in reality my part on this program tonight should be

only to say "Thank you," but I want to say a little more.

First, I appreciate that gracious and flattering introduction. After that introduction, I should probably—in courtroom language—rest my case before this court of public opinion. Surely anything I might say from this point forward will only decrease your estimate of me.

I addressed you as, "Friends, all." I consider that every person present falls in that category. Your printed history has on it—very much in evidence—my name. But you can readily understand that my real part in this program might be expressed in the words of the Roman philosopher who wrote, "A fly sat upon the axle of a chariot wheel and said, 'What a dust do I raise.'" Figuratively speaking, I am only the fly on the chariot wheel. The chariot wheel of this program, so to speak, is this distinguished audience and our distinguished guests.

But I would be less than human if I did not express to you my sincere appreciation of my part in this program tonight—even though I feel that my use of the English language is inadequate to express fully my feelings.

One's work in life is worth only so much as the things about which he busies himself. In the opinion of Oklahoma's young Democrats I must have busied myself in my youth about something worthwhile when I aided in the formation of an organization which might be considered Oklahoma's first political youth movement. From its humble beginning the youth movement of 48 years ago is now credited with making a lasting impression upon the political history of this State and possibly of the United States.

Shakespeare said, "All the world is a stage, and the men and women are merely players. They have their exits and their entrances, and one may, in his time, play many parts." Tonight's meeting pleasantly reminds me that in my early youth I made an entrance and played a small part on the political stage of Oklahoma. Also that the young Democrats of Oklahoma now believe that I am entitled to be awarded an "Oscar," so to speak.

The youth of 48 years ago were no different from the youth of today. They were idealistic—certainly they wanted to be recognized—and they were reformers as youth has always been, in all ages and in all times. But you can see the effect of these youth movements.

We had another youth movement at our last State election, and it resulted in the election of a youthful brilliant Governor, J. Howard Edmondson, who is honoring us with his presence tonight, and also a youthful and brilliant Lieutenant Governor, who is so ably presiding here tonight.

I see in the audience tonight many contemporaries who helped form the organization of young Democrats and who, in the early years of its existence, worked hard for its success and who deserve as much credit as I. Their presence brings me nostalgic memories of my college days and of my youth. These memories bring treasured emotions and sentiments. These Oklahomans here tonight can take pride in their accomplishments. They have been tall men. Refer to the printed history of the league and to the list—which is partial only—of those who worked hard the first few years of the existence of this organization to make it a success. And then look at the successful accomplishments, as Oklahoma citizens, of those listed as living. And I pause to pay tribute, with feeling, to those listed as dead and to their accomplishments.

Also in our audience tonight, I see many prominent Oklahomans who are leaders in business, professional, and judicial circles. I see prominent officeholders and men with whom I served on the supreme court. And I see a large number—youthful and mature—of very important persons in the Democratic Party in Oklahoma. These persons range from earnest party workers to a very able and a very distinguished U.S. Senator, Senator ROBERT S. KERR. BOB was born and reared here in Ada—and we Adans are justly proud of his great accomplishments.

And I see a few prominent Republicans, personal friends, for whose presence and friendship we feel grateful.

And as the capsheaf of this splendid audience, we have honoring us as the principal speaker, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN—not just a politician, but a lovable statesman of international stature, whose influence over world affairs is probably second only to that of President Eisenhower.

As I make my exit from the political stage—actually I made it in 1942—I make this observation to the many officeholders and prominent politicians present. When I was actively engaged in politics I received my share of the brickbats that come to the protagonist in the political arena whose interests clash with others. Now, at my exit from the political arena, it appears that flowers and not brickbats are coming my way. And I assure you, with feeling, that a few bouquets in your lifetime are worth a truckload on your grave.

But my wife warned me not to become too "drippy" in this response and not to give vent verbally to too many mixed emotions. She brought me back to earth with a definition she heard on TV—to the effect that mixed emotions are what a man feels when he sees his mother-in-law tumbling over a cliff in his new Cadillac.

As further appreciation of this occasion tonight, I want to thank again all the young Democrats who have made it possible. Special mention should be made of Jim Hamilton, Bob Ford, Bob Bennett, Henry Roberts, Daryl Cody, and the splendid group of young helpers, in whose minds the idea for this program was born, and who have worked untiringly to make this occasion a worthwhile success.

And I would feel remiss if I did not refer to the honor bestowed on this gathering tonight by the presence of five of our very able and very outstanding Congressmen from Oklahoma, CARL ALBERT, TOM STEED, ED EDMONDSON, TOBY MORRIS, and JOHN JARMAN. We are especially indebted to my lifelong friend, TOM STEED, and to our brilliant neighbor from McAlester, CARL ALBERT, for their part in obtaining Mr. SAM to lend his name, his prestige, and above all, his presence to this gathering.

Finally, special attention should be called to this beautifully presented history furnished us, and to those who made it possible. I shall cherish mine as a valued souvenir.

We are also indebted to the good ladies of the garden clubs of Ada, who have so beautifully decorated this room with flowers.

Again, and from the depths of my heart, I say—

Thank you, friends, all.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Montgomery County, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. LAFORE, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. LAFORE. Mr. Speaker, today, September 10, 1959, Montgomery County, Pa., which is also the 13th Congressional District, celebrates the 175th anniversary of its founding.

On the occasion of this anniversary, it is with great pleasure that I join with my friends and neighbors, in extending birthday greetings.

This milestone in the county's history clearly demonstrates the ability and dynamic purposefulness of our citizens to work together for a cause that is beneficial to all. We are very proud of our county and its development over the 175 years of its existence, and I am sure that with high enthusiasm and will, bent on continued success, we can look forward with confidence to even greater things in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a proclamation for Montgomery County Day, Thursday, September 10, 1959. Congratulatory communications from President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and the Senators from Pennsylvania, Hon. Hugh Scott, and Hon. Joseph S. Clark as follows:

PROCLAMATION FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY DAY, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1959

Whereas Montgomery County has reflected dynamic advancements in industry, government, health, commerce, transportation and communications during the development of our Nation; and

Whereas Montgomery County has ever encouraged self-reliance and fostered freedom of opportunity for its men and women; and

Whereas our citizens can take pride in Montgomery County's vast resources, her versatility and manifold attainments in industry, health, and her amazing diversity of products; and

Whereas it was on Montgomery County soil that the forces of Gen. George Washington withstood their most severe test in the Nation's successful fight for freedom; and

Whereas Montgomery County must look to the future, ever searching for new endeavors which will mean continued growth and prosperity; and

Whereas the occasion arises to appropriately observe our heritage and impress upon the world that it will be preserved in enriched form for generations to come: Now, therefore,

We, J. Walter Hammonds, Warren M. Cornell, Jr., and Forrest J. Henry, the Commissioners of Montgomery County, do hereby designate and proclaim Thursday, September 10, 1959, as Montgomery County Day to commemorate the 175th anniversary of the founding of Montgomery County.

We call upon our citizens to seize upon this opportunity to acquaint themselves more fully with the resources, development, history and potentialities of their county, and ask that the occasion be marked by appropriate exercises in the schools and by business, civic, religious, patriotic and fraternal organizations within Montgomery County.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

Hon. J. WALTER HAMMONDS,
Hon. M. CORNELL, JR.,
Hon. FORREST J. HENRY,
Commissioners of Montgomery County, Courthouse, Norristown, Pa.:

Through Congressman JOHN A. LAFORE, JR., I have learned of the 175th anniversary of the founding of Montgomery County, and it is a pleasure to send greetings to all joined in the observance of this event.

Montgomery County, including the hallowed land of Valley Forge, enjoys a proud

history. Its people, strengthened by a tradition of enterprising and responsible citizenship, can face the future with confidence.

Congratulations and best wishes.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Montgomery County,
Norristown, Pa.:

It is a pleasure to extend greetings to the citizens of Montgomery County, Pa., on the 175th anniversary of the founding of their county. The United States has expanded enormously since 1784 and in these 175 years Montgormery County has contributed much to the cultural, political, and industrial development of the Nation. I also know of the excellent reputation Montgomery County has for providing efficient and progressive government as well as a low tax rate. Your county could well be considered a model for all of us. With best wishes for the next 175 years.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Congratulations to Montgomery County on the 175th anniversary of its founding.

These days when our society devotes so much emphasis to those things which are changing, it is heartening to have people call attention to the things which have not changed—our heritage, and the principles which guided our forebears and continues to guide us today.

People who are interested in their own past, almost always are those who are also planning for the future. They live a fuller life and conduct their civic affairs in a manner which will make their children proud to inherit the community.

This has contributed to making Montgomery County so vigorous an area and one which is a credit to the whole Commonwealth.

U.S. Senator HUGH SCOTT.

Messers J. WALTER HAMMONDS,
WARREN M. CORNELL, Jr.,
FORREST J. HENRY,
Commissioners of Montgomery County,
Norristown, Pa.

GENTLEMEN: It is a pleasure to salute Montgomery County on its 175th birthday. I have many special reasons for particularly warm feelings for Montgomery—one being that my daughter attends Bryn Mawr; another than a key member of my Senate staff is from Conshohocken.

Your continuing prosperity and growth, your rich history, your diversity of resources and industrial development—all these make Montgomery a cornerstone on which the welfare of Pennsylvania is built.

Best wishes for 175 more years of steady progress.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH S. CLARK.

We Are Proud of Mercy Flights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, an idea we would be glad to export from Oregon to other parts of the United States and the world flies under the name of Mercy Flights, Inc. It has been in operation for almost 10 years and its purpose is the transportation of the sick and injured, quickly and safely, to medical treatment. Its financial support comes from the community. The only remuneration paid anyone is in the form of expenses for the volunteer pilots.

Recently Mercy Flights made another outstanding contribution when it helped transport persons injured in the Roseburg explosion disaster.

Eric Allen, managing editor of the Medford Mail-Tribune, explains Mercy Flights, Inc., in the following editorial, included here under unanimous consent. It appeared in the Medford Mail-Tribune on August 20, 1959.

MERCY FLIGHTS' JOB

In the wake of the disastrous earthquake in Montana this week, the cry went up for airplanes—planes to transport the injured, planes to fly in emergency supplies, planes to spot marooned survivors, planes to bring in news reporters to tell the world about the event.

The same was true, to a lesser extent, after the Roseburg disaster, when the airport at the stricken town was humming with activity.

This serves to point out that Medford is lucky to be the "home base" of the only privately operated nonprofit air ambulance organization in the United States, and, so far as is known, in the world.

Mercy Flights, Inc., is now more than 9½ years old. Just 10 years ago this month the idea for such a service was conceived. During the late summer and fall and early winter months of 1949, the plans were developed, money solicited, the first plane and its rudimentary equipment purchased.

In January, 1950, the first "mercy flight"—a phrase we're now used to hereabouts—was made.

Since that time the number of patients carried by the planes has grown to an average of 150 each year—nearly three each week—and the total number of patients has gone over the 1,000-mark.

Mercy Flights, Inc.'s primary job is the transportation of the sick and injured, quickly and safely, to medical treatment—either from elsewhere to Medford, or from this area to the big hospitals of Portland, Seattle, or San Francisco.

But the job is not limited to that function alone. For instance, a Mercy Flights plane was the first emergency vehicle, other than fire engines, to arrive at Roseburg before dawn on the morning of August 7, carrying two doctors, three gas company repairmen, and a supply of blood.

On other occasions, the planes have been pressed into moving supplies for the Forest Service during fire emergencies.

But none of these other activities, worthwhile as they are, have been allowed to hamper the service's readiness to serve emergency patients.

Mercy Flights' support from this community (meaning not only Medford, but all of Jackson and the surrounding counties of northern Oregon and northern California) has been remarkable.

From the very first, when school youngsters gave their dimes and nickels to make the organization a reality, Mercy Flights has received the cooperation and support, not only of officials and organizations, but of people everywhere.

It has responded by standing by, around the clock, ready to perform its errands of mercy.

The organization's chief means of financial support comes from the prepaid subscriptions, which, for $5 per year per family unit, or $3 for individuals, entities one to free transportation in medical emergencies within a 400-mile radius, and low rates for other forms of ambulance service.

(Charges to nonsubscribers are lower than commercial air ambulance service for those living in Mercy Flight's service area, but it is the firm's policy not to compete with such commercial services.)

This service is operated without remuneration (other than expenses for the volunteer pilots) by local people. The best way to insure that it will continue is to take out a subscription to its service, or, if already a subscriber, to renew promptly when the subscription expires.

The address: Post Office Box 522, Medford.

—E. A.

Report to the People of the Second Congressional District of South Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my final report for the 1st session of the 86th Congress to the people of the Second Congressional District, South Dakota.

It is as follows:

Each year as the session draws to a close, I have attempted to supplement my regular monthly reports to you with a final report in which I endeavor to summarize what has been done by Congress, what should have been done, and the overall picture as it hangs in the national frame.

In sizing up the national picture, we should recall first that the Nation and the world are at peace. True—there are troubled spots—always have been and always will be—but international tension is lower today than at any time since I came to Washington over 8 years ago when a Korean war was in full bloom.

Historians marked the date last week as 20 years since Hitler had moved his armies into World War II. It was 21 years before then that the Kaiser moved his troops into World War I. Each war resulted primarily because the Allies had compromised their positions rather than taking a firm stand and backing up that position with strength.

Today at the end of the present 20-year period, the leader of the potential enemy has asked to come to our shores, not with armies, but with his wife and family, to visit a nation and to visit a President who, upon taking over the reigns of state, served an ultimatum from a position of strength and has refused to compromise one word of that ultimatum, one acre of that ground, or one citizen of that area.

A recent visit with that President convinces me this position will in no way be altered and none of the fundamental principles that have kept the peace will be compromised when the two men sit down across the table from each other to visit. President Eisenhower does not bluster and blow as the bulky dictator of the Soviet Union, but neither does he cringe from pressure or politics. Should anyone doubt that, they should read his record of holding the brakes on a spending-pledged, two-thirds Democrat majority in the 86th Congress.

No—the Khrushchev visit can do no harm—it could do good. He will return to his Communist empire with a firsthand knowledge of the strength of this country—

not just the military strength, but the economic and social and spiritual strength of a great, free, Christian Nation.

When I first came to Washington, I heard the then General Eisenhower make the statement that the military is only the cutting edge of the sword, that the strength of the blade back of that cutting edge is the economy of the country. A month ago I had breakfast with the now President Eisenhower and heard him relate the remarks of Ludwig Erhardt of Germany, who told the President the greatest fear of their people was not recessions, but inflation; that they had experienced inflation at its worst; that the worst kind of hard times comes when the housewife must take a market basket full of money to the grocery store to buy a purse full of groceries.

It is my privilege, as your representative, to cast your vote for you, and I have cast that vote not only to strengthen the President's hand in forcing a balanced budget, but to go even further than the President has gone in a determined effort to return fiscal responsibility to the Nation, thereby strengthening the blade back of that cutting edge and preventing the day when a basket full of money is required for a purse full of groceries.

I believe that fiscal responsibility is measured not only by a balanced budget, but likewise in seeing that the taxpayers get their money's worth for the tax dollar that is expended. I have opposed programs that will unbalance the budget, and I have opposed programs where I feel the taxpayer will not get his money's worth.

I hope you will read the enclosed remarks which I made on the House floor during debate on several issues. There I have pointed out some of my fears based upon the trends of the times. Space in this report prohibits more than just a summary, but in this summary I would remind you again that it is Congress which makes the laws, it is Congress which appropriates the money. When those laws are made, when those appropriations are passed, the President and the executive branch have no alternative but to execute the laws which Congress has enacted.

Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, recently pointed out that in each year since 1939 the value of the dollar has decreased with the exceptions of 1949 and 1955. I would point out that these two years followed the only two balanced budgets since 1939—the work of the two Republican Congresses, the 80th and the 83d. This is proof that it can be done, that the devaluation of the dollar can be stopped if Congress has the will to live within the national income.

It was to help strengthen the hand of the President and force a spending-bent Congress to live within the national income that I voted to sustain the President's vetoes in an effort to not only bring those particular bills more in line with national needs, but at the same time quell the overall thirst for drinking at the tempting spring of inflation.

It was to cut spending below the national income that I voted against such frills as a new congressional office building; public parking lots; Federal assistance to communities sponsoring sporting events; the unnecessary grant-in-aid programs for constructing business establishments at airport terminals; public housing; city slum clearance; area redevelopment; construction of city sewage systems; and a dozen other similar programs which could and should be financed by private enterprise or local governmental units.

It was to reduce similar programs abroad that I voted against the $3.1 billion foreign aid bill. I also opposed permitting the International Bank and Monetary Fund, as well as the Federal Aviation Agency and the Development Loan Administration, from drawing directly on the Federal Treasury to fund department expenditures rather than obtaining appropriations from Congress—a procedure known as "back door" spending that has cost the taxpayers almost $8 billion annually.

Our chickens are coming home to roost from another field. After going off the gold standard, a certain confidence was maintained in the dollar through the knowledge that large gold supplies were buried at Fort Knox. Because of inflation at home and the effect of the reciprocal trade policies, our gold supplies are slipping away. As of July 1, our gold stock stood at $20.5 billion. Of that amount, foreign governments and nationals owned $14.9 billion, leaving a domestic gold reserve of $5.6 billion. This is due largely to the fact that we have, for the first time in modern years, lost the balance of trade. We are buying more foreign goods and selling less abroad. I have urged a return to the gold standard to right this wrong.

The 86th Congress made history in adopting the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. Its passage was not a personal victory for the President, the Republicans, nor the conservative Democrats. It was simply an example of the people asserting their rights when sufficiently aroused.

The powerful and well-financed labor bosses could not have been overcome without the people demanding (1) that legislation be passed which would drive racketeering and corruption from the ranks of organized labor, and (2) that the rights of the individual union member be protected.

The new law does these things. It contains the McClellan "Bill of Rights" with criminal enforcement, then it adds protection to the public as well through the curbing of secondary boycotts, organizational and recognition picketing, and in settling the "no man's land" between State and Federal jurisdiction.

The 86th Congress designed "five rows of six and four rows of five" stars in Old Glory with the addition of Hawaii as the 50th State. It continued the interstate highway program through a 22-month increase in the gasoline tax; increased the interest rate on savings bonds; plugged loopholes in the law on obscene mail; exempted out-of-State companies from State taxation in certain cases; corrected "equal time," confusing regulations for radio and TV stations; etc.

General Romulo on Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Philippine Ambassador to the United States, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, is quoted in the McCarthy Sugar Report of September 4, 1959, as having given certain figures on Philippine sugar production of interest to this body.

Because of the fact that the Philippines is a country openly and courageously committed to the side of democracy and freedom and has fought communism successful, and because General Romulo is acknowledged as a true friend of the United States in war and in peace, I wish to bring the report to the attention of the Members of the House. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

REPORT NO. 12: THE MCCARTHY SUGAR REPORT OF SEPTEMBER 4, 1959

Philippine Production Potential Tremendous: In Report No. 10 we surveyed the Puerto Rican sugar outlook and concluded thatthe islands offer scant hope for production increases, when and if the United States decides to look beyond Cuba as the dominant source of supply.

The Philippine outlook, by contrast, is decidedly promising. It would be only a slight exaggeration to say that a telephone call today would get you 300,000 tons of additional raw sugar tomorrow. With an invitation from the U.S. Congress the Philippine growers could move up to 1,600,000 tons almost without effort.

But Congress hasn't issued any invitations to the Philippines, nor has it given the Philippines an even break in years.

In 25 years of Sugar Act legislation, the Philippines have never received an increase in their quota. Yet their people were our stalwart friends and allies in World War II in the struggle against Japan.

The Philippine initial quota this year is 980,000 short tons, raw value, tied as it is to the Independence Act, against 1,015,186 in 1934 when quotas were first adopted.

Compared with their competitors in the sugar business, this is the way the Philippines have fared since 1934, first year of the Sugar Act:

Area	Initial 1934 quotas	Initial 1959 quotas	Net change
Cuba	1,901,752	3,060,475	+1,158,723
Hawaii	916,550	1,115,479	+198,550
Philippines	1,015,186	980,000	−35,186
Puerto Rico	802,842	1,166,375	+363,533
Virgin Islands	5,470	15,905	+10,435
Full duty countries	17,000	248,025	+231,025
Beet processors	1,556,166	1,998,717	+442,551
Mainland cane	261,034	615,024	+353,990
Total	6,476,000	9,200,000	+2,724,000

Note the striking increase to Cuba and only modest increases to all other areas, and the actual decline of 35,186 tons for the Philippines.

In the postwar years, Philippine production has been moving forward at a healthy rate—from almost total disappearance as a result of Japan's occupation. In 1945–46 output reached its low point of 70,000 tons.

We asked Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, whether the Philippines could supply an additional 300,000 tons if it were requested of them suddenly, and this is what he said:

"My answer is yes, without any expansion in area already available for sugar cane production and without any additional equipment for the present operating sugar centrals."

Ambassador Romulo said that before the establishment of the U.S. sugar quota system in 1934, when Philippine sugar production was not restricted, the Philippines produced that year a total of 1,597,949 short tons of centrifugal sugar from an area of 755,861 acres, or a unit yield of approximately 2.19 short tons of sugar per acre. Under the U.S. sugar quota system, he said, Philippine sugar production has been under Government restriction and has been geared to the quantity of sugar allowed entry into the United States of 952,000 short tons, plus the Philippine quota to the world free market of 50,997 short tons, plus domestic consumption of approximately 300,000 short tons, and plus reserves.

In the past crop year of 1957–58, the Ambassador explained, the Philippines produced a total of 1,377,847 short tons of centrifugal sugar from an area of 452,131 acres, or a

unit yield of 3.05 short tons per acre. This production was allocated as follows:

	Short tons
Total 1957–58 production	1,377,847
Less:	
Domestic consumption	300,000
U.S. quota	952,000
World's quota	50,997
Total	1,302,997
Surplus and reserves	74,850

The Philippine Sugar Quota Administrator has recently announced that the Philippines are going to have a record postwar sugar production this season with an estimated centrifugal sugar crop for 1958–59 of 1,512,330 short tons. This will leave a total amount of surplus and reserves of 209,333 short tons, as follows:

	Short tons
Estimated 1958–59 production	1,512,330
Less:	
Domestic consumption	300,000
U.S. quota	952,000
World's quota	50,997
Total	1,302,997
Surplus and reserves	209,333

"It will thus be seen from the foregoing data," said Ambassador Romulo, "that the Philippines can provide additionally 300,000 tons of sugar to the United States without expanding the area now available for sugar cane production nor making any addition to the existing machinery and equipment of the operating sugar centrals."

He continued: "Obviously, a slight increase in the unit yield per acre would bring up production to around the 1,600,000 level. The 25 sugar factories at present milling have combined total production capacity of 1,600,000 short tons of sugar, thereby enabling them to produce the additional 300,000 tons quota to the United States should this be granted to the Philippines."

In his appraisal of the Philippine sugar production picture, Ambassador Romulo was not gilding the lily. Trade sources report that the potential for production there is unlimited. Vast virgin areas are contained within the boundaries of the Philippine Islands, and it is safe to say that given the proper encouragement, the Philippines could easily and quickly run production up to 3 million tons and, in fact—given time—to much greater heights.

Outlets for Philippine sugar other than the U.S. market are small. Under the International Sugar Agreement the Philippine quota is 27,558 short tons plus a special reserve of 24,251 tons.

Consumption in the Philippines is moving up, amounting annually to about 275,000 tons.

In 1956 when the Sugar Act of 1948 was last amended, the Philippines put up a strenuous fight to obtain an increased quota for the United States. This was denied. When the President of the United States signed the new amendments, however, he stated that the next time sugar legislation comes before Congress, the Philippines should be given consideration for an increase.

The Philippine-United States quota is statutory and is not increased when the overall U.S. quota is increased. But if Congress heeds the President a change may come in 1960—long overdue. Certainly, the Philippines should share in deficit reallocations.

What better time will there be than now to give the Phillipines the break they so vastly deserve. We say what better time because Cuba under the Castro regime has treated the United States with utter disdain and has, in fact, been so insulting to us that we can no longer look upon her as a friend. Further, we will find that we cannot depend upon her for one-third of our sugar requirements. The hatred expressed for the United States by Fidel and Raul and their followers clearly indicates that they would be weak sisters in time of need.

Resolutions Adopted by the 41st Annual Convention of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolutions adopted by the 41st annual convention of the American Legion on August 24–27, 1959. I commend them to the Members of the House for consideration.

RESOLUTION No. 411, OPPOSE ANY CUTS IN NATIONAL GUARD OR RESERVE STRENGTH

Whereas the 85th session of Congress set a minimum strength of 900,000 men in our Regular Army, 300,000 Guardsmen and 400,000 Army Reserve; and

Whereas the House Appropriations Committee agreed to delete mandatory language from the defense appropriation bill, similar languages in the measure last year blocked an administration planned cut of 40,000 Guardsmen and 30,000 reservists; and

Whereas the Guards and Reserve are the Nation's second line of defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, That we go on record as being opposed to any cuts in our Guards or Reserve strength.

RESOLUTION No. 594, GA., REAFFIRM STRONG READY RESERVE

Whereas there is no successful way to deal with Russia or its satellites diplomatically, politically, economically, or militarily except from a posture of the greatest possible strength; and

Whereas no trust can be placed in any oral or written agreement made with or promised by these nations; and

Whereas the fairest and most democratic method of sharing the staggering financial cost and heavy sacrifice of personal service is upon a universal basis; and

Whereas, the cold war will apparently last for the foreseeable future; and

Whereas we already have through taxation a method of universally sharing this staggering financial burden; and

Whereas the most economical and democratic method of providing the necessary posture of military strength is through a relatively small hard corps of professional Army, Navy, and Air Corps establishments and a large Ready Reserve of trained civilians, units, and machines prepared for instance action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by The American Legion in National Convention, duly assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, That the traditional position of the American Legion which calls for a relatively small professional military establishment and a universal compulsory system of training and service in the Ready Reserve be and the same is hereby reaffirmed.

RESOLUTION No 352, 6-MONTH TRAINING PROGRAM

Whereas the 6 months' training program established and continued under Public Law 51 of 1951 and the Reserve Forces Act of 1955, has been accepted with very general approval by the trainees, and by the class A Reserve, including the National Guard; and

Whereas it has been of great help in providing basically trained personnel for the National Guard and other units of the class A Reserve; and

Whereas due to monetary restrictions and administrative orders imposed by the Defense Department only 44,000 trainees were included in this program for the last of 1958 and early 1959; and

Whereas when the present strength of the Regular Armed Forces is reduced it should be replaced by a commensurate number of ready trained replacements, whether members of a unit of the National Guard, other class A Reserves or merely retained in a pool of classified trained personnel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion, That the Congress be called upon to provide the necessary money for including in the 6-month training program 110,000 trainees, and that the Defense Department be called upon to issue the necessary administrative orders to provide for the training of this number, and that this size of the 6 months' training program be constantly maintained: Now be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention assembled in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, take the necessary action to see that the above objectives are accomplished.

RESOLUTION No. 101, INCREASING THE STRENGTH OF, AND THE MODERNIZATION OF WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT OF THE U.S. ARMY

Whereas there now appears to be a nuclear parity between the United States and Soviet Russia; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has employed the tactics of limited war successfully during the past decade by the employment of ground forces; and

Whereas the ground forces of Soviet Russia appear to have qualitatively and quantitatively superior weapons and equipment; and

Whereas the U.S. Army has missions, which exceed its capabilities in both strength and equipment, as well as missions which cannot be accomplished by other than ground forces; and

Whereas it is agreed upon that American soldiers should not be equipped with inferior weapons or equipment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn, August 24–27, 1959, That there be a rapid acceleration in the modernization of weapons and equipment of the U.S. Army, and that the U.S. Army, Active and Reserve, be increased to more impressive, effective, and respected strength.

RESOLUTION No. 143—U.S. ARMY BE MAINTAINED AT A MINIMUM STRENGTH OF 900,000

Whereas a strong U.S. Army is indispensable to national security; and

Whereas the U.S. Army has a vital task of creating and preparing forces for sustained combat on land; and

Whereas, the use or threat of use of atomic weapons does not eliminate the need for a powerful Army in all-out war; and

Whereas the national security policy of the United States requires the peacetime stationing of Army garrison forces in European and other friendly nations; and

Whereas Congress has appropriated funds to maintain a 900,000-man Army which

funds have not been expended by the Pentagon; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, support efforts to maintain the minimum strength Army of 900,000.

RESOLUTION No. 243—MAINTAIN STRENGTH OF ARMY AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD AT 470,000

Whereas the American Legion, traditionally, through the mandate of national conventions, has endorsed the Reserve military system as part of the Armed Forces for the security and preservation of our Nation; and

Whereas the Army and Air National Guard with a congressional authorized strength of 470,000 citizen soldiers organized in more than 5,500 units, trained and equipped, constitutes the Nation's largest and most ready military force; and

Whereas this Ready Reserve Force is dispersed in more than 2,500 communities in every State, the Territories, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, and by virtue of this dispersion would prove to be of inestimable value in assisting Civil Defense agencies during the period of initial recovery in the event of a successful massive air attack on this Nation; and

Whereas the National Guard represents the most fundamental American tradition of citizen soldiery at the grassroots level, offering the maximum national defense against attack from within as well as from without, and at the same time offering young men an opportunity to perform their military service in their own home communities; and

Whereas the National Guard has served the Nation, the States and Territories with honor and valor in times of peace and war and, largely by virtue of its own initiative and determination, has achieved a high degree of mobilization readiness, and is prepared to undertake more advanced type training, and to effect necessary reorganization within existing organizational structure to properly complement the active military establishments; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has proposed a reduction of 40,000 men from the Army National Guard and curtailment of funds for the Air National Guard which could bring about the elimination of many units of the Army and Air National Guard; and

Whereas such action is considered to be not in the best interest of national defense as it would reduce the capacity of the National Guard of the States and Territories to render assistance in the event of emergencies or disaster; and

Whereas such reductions of personnel or units of the Army National Guard would constitute a writeoff of many millions of dollars in Federal and State funds already invested in the National Guard and its existing facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, That the National Legislative Commission petition the Members of Congress of the United States to take necessary actions to maintain the strength of the Army and Air National Guard of the United States at the 470,000 level; and be it further

Resolved, That necessary action be taken to assure procurement of the necessary personnel in order to sustain the Army and Air National Guard with young men capable and willing to undergo military training in the defense of their country.

RESOLUTION No. 302—MODERNIZE WEAPONS AND EQUIPMENT OF U.S. ARMED FORCES

Whereas the land forces of the Sino-Soviet bloc greatly outnumber the forces of the United States and its allies; and

Whereas a high percentage of the weapons and equipment currently available to and utilized by the U.S. Armed Forces was produced during World War II and the Korean War; and

Whereas the U.S.S.R., since the close of World War II, has extensively modernized its forces with weapons and equipment of new design, and has emphasized in the modernization process mechanization of its forces, electronics, and firepower of increased range, lethality and mobility; and

Whereas, the U.S.S.R. is producing modern ground equipment at a rate alarmingly greater than that of the United States, thereby permitting the U.S.S.R. to equip not only its own forces but those of its satellites and allies; and

Whereas a continuation of the current rate of modernization of the U.S. Armed Forces seriously impairs the capability of the United States to counter Communist aggression, whether limited or general in nature: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in National Convention assembled in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, That the U.S. Armed Forces shall be modernized at a rate and to an extent which will assure the United States qualitative superiority in all weapons and equipment.

Panama Canal and Caribbean Situation: Views of General Wedemeyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the many letters that I have received concerning my addresses on the Panama Canal and Caribbean situation is one from Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer, one of the Nation's most distinguished soldiers of World War II, in which he fully supports the position that I have presented to the Congress with respect to the Panama Canal and Caribbean situations and the Monrone Doctrine.

General Wedemeyer's letter follows:

THE ESTATE PLANNING CORP.
Washington, D.C., July 20, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: Thank you so much for the opportunity of reading the addresses you made concerning the Panama Canal and the Caribbean question. I am in complete accord with your basic premise and I hope that your colleagues in the Congress will recognize the implications of developments in the Latin American countries. Unfortunately, if an individual is a little in advance of his contemporaries in thinking about a problem, he is not appreciated, in fact he is sometimes ridiculed. Often in the past 25 years many Americans have foreseen the difficulties that would be injected into the international arena by the fanatical, arrogant, and aggressive Communist leaders. However, the American people and many of our own leaders refuse to accept or to appreciate the analyses and judgments of those who would alert them to the dangers.

You are right, in my judgment, in stating that the Monroe Doctrine should continue to have a broad application, for it certainly was so intended by its proposers and supporters.

All good wishes for success in your worthy endeavors.

Faithfully,

A. C. WEDEMEYER,
General, U.S. Army (Retired).

Eisenhower's European Trip

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress gets press releases from many of the various governments of the world whose embassies are located in Washington. In this connection, on yesterday each of us received the Bulletin, which is a weekly survey of German affairs issued by the Press and Information Office of the German Federal Government. An article which each Member of the Congress should read is "Significance and Implications of Eisenhower's Visit," by Felix von Eckardt, State Secretary and Federal Press Chief.

Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Armed Services Committee, and knowing the indispensable need for the existence of NATO and its continuation, and knowing so well that without NATO there would be no free Europe, I was impressed beyond words with the impact of the President's visit to West Germany.

As an American, I am proud of my President; as an American, I am so elated that my President took the lead and improved the stature of our Nation in the eyes of our allies in Europe. It is imperative that we keep West Germany on the side of the free world. The West German Government is a democratic government. It witnessed the man who brought a proud Germany to her knees returning as her friend and her protector. The Germans saw, in Eisenhower, one dedicated to peace and they read in his eyes one wedded to his mission, standing behind the sacred commitments of this Government against the threats of Russia to the free peoples of Europe. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that President Eisenhower's visit to Europe has done more than all other emissaries before him have accomplished. He has helped the American cause in Europe. He has helped the cause of our allies. He represented this Nation with dignity and at great personal sacrifice. I, as an American, am proud of the fine job he did on his recent crusade for peace.

As a member of a military committee, I know the terrific stake America has in Europe. President Eisenhower did a job that needed to be done. The stature of Uncle Sam was diminishing until Eisenhower gave the freedom-loving people of Europe new hope and new respect for the greatest Nation on earth—the United States of America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article hereinabove referred to, and the press comments on the trip of the President:

SIGNIFICANCE AND IMPLICATIONS OF EISENHOWER'S VISIT

(By Felix von Eckardt, State Secretary and Federal Press Chief)

In Dwight D. Eisenhower there came to Germany not only the President of the United States but above all a man of honor, a politician whose real opinions correspond to his moral convictions. Perhaps that ex-

plains the overwhelming welcome afforded him by the population of Bonn and the surrounding districts. The common man is acutely sensitive to evidences of incorruptible political behavior which he grasps much more quickly than he does the endlessly complicated maneuvers of diplomacy. The radiative power of Mr. Eisenhower's personality is so strong that it even strikes deep into the heart of the Eastern bloc.

Mr. Eisenhower's reception in Bonn was absolutely unique. Anyone who kept his eyes open and noticed the places of origin of the many cars lining the streets could picture for himself the trouble taken upon themselves by the thousands wanting to see President Eisenhower, thereby making the close relations between the United States and the Federal Republic outwardly visible. It is almost superfluous to say that the Federal Government had no more to do with this reception the people gave the American President than to make known the program of the visit.

It is in accordance with Mr. Eisenhower's character, not only with his political convictions, that he feels the partition of Germany to be deeply immoral and unjust. It is simply not reconcilable with his ethical outlook. From his point of view one could perhaps say: Even a people which has brought a great deal of misfortune on the world cannot simply be torn apart; this cannot be just.

President Eisenhower will accordingly make every effort in practical politics to obtain a just reunification of Germany in peace and freedom. This we have long known. But his visit to Germany has fortified this belief and made it more concrete.

The politically decisive aspect of President Eisenhower's visit seems to me to be that it was made clear with complete unambiguity that the United States regards the North Atlantic Alliance as the foundation of its European policy. For the peoples of Western Europe this is a vital question, for without the support of the United States, NATO would be politically and militarily worthless.

It is safe to say that the American President—whose freshness and mental agility have surprised all who saw him in recent years—has now taken over John Foster Dulles' conception of foreign policy. After the death of the friend who was politically and personally closer to him than any other, he is continuing with the work.

The people of West Berlin can rest assured—if they ever had any doubts at all—that no "accident" will befall them. In the talks between the American President and the Federal Chancellor it was established without any doubt that the United States does not consider any abandonment of their basic rights in Berlin, unless a guarantee for the freedom of West Berlin is found which absolves the Western Powers of their rights and duties conclusively and without danger for the security of the West Berliners. Granted, such a state of diplomatic affairs does not seem attainable today or tomorrow.

This admission that not everything can be attained today or tomorrow also applies to the disarmament question. The American President and the Federal Chancellor were agreed that disarmament is the central problem of our time. On the other hand they are realistic enough to see that one must be modest, and that one must take the chance on a hopeful beginning such as might result from the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to Washington. In any case, in this respect, both of the statesmen showed the same interest and appraisal of the situation.

But one thing must not be overlooked in the evaluation of all the diplomatic details of President Eisenhower's visit. That is the strength of the evidence that the German people have mentally surmounted the quarrels and feuds of yesteryear. There is much talk nowadays of the "economic miracle." In economics there are no miracles. The miracle of our days is the complete disappearance of resentments. We have experienced this in the radical change in the relationship between France and Germany. It is noticeable in the popularity enjoyed by Sir Winston Churchill in Germany; and, above all, we could feel it in the welcome given to Eisenhower, the American general who led the armies of the Western Allies against Germany in World War II.

To me, this seems to prove that Hitler's aggression has long since been condemned by the German people. In 1914 the German people went to war in the belief that they were defending a good cause. The findings of the historians are of no importance from the psychological point of view. The enthusiasm of August 1, 1914, was a fact. September 1, 1939, however, was one of the gloomiest days in German history. Because the great majority of the German people have recognized that fact, the man who crushed Hitler's aggression is popular in the Federal Republic. Of course, it should not be forgotten that other very real feelings play their part. They center on the concepts of protection and security. The German people, for the first time in a long period, are immensely relieved to have a reliable ally, all the more so, that this ally is the greatest state in the world.

PRESS COMMENTS ON PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S VISIT TO BONN

Hannoversche Allgemeine Zeitung (independent):

"Once again the truth has been confirmed that all the papers and documents exchanged between governments can be no substitute for sincere and open-minded friendship between the peoples themselves. From now on a stronger bond will unite America and Germany, and, in an era when political conditions have become so uncetrain, this fact is immensely important. * * *

"Exact agreements, of the kind that people are forever expecting to materialize at the very next corner, are probably very far off. But if even at this stage the American President is giving assurances that he will do nothing to weaken the German position or jeoardize the freedom of Berlin, this is worth a mountain of gold. On leaving Bonn, Mr. Eisenhower must surely have taken with him the certainty that his own loyalty is being answered with the fullest confidence and a loyalty no less great. * * *

"During these 2 days Mr. Khrushchev must have realized how completely he has failed in the attempt to paint Dr. Adenauer and the Federal Republic as the disturbers of the peace and to separate them from their allies."

Die Welt (independent): "The warmth with which Mr. Eisenhower spoke of the two nations' common dedication to freedom was not the technique of a diplomatist but the sincere expression of a strong and vital conviction full of vitality. That the two countries have this feeling in common is the basis of German-American friendship."

Hamburger Abendblatt (independent): "Dwight D. Eisenhower made it easy for all who wished to see him to give him such visible signs of their confidence in him. He won all hearts along the Rhine not alone through his great personal cordiality and charm. In addition, the fact that this man, who has so great a burden to bear, was so obviously in splendid health, in itself aroused confidence."

Berliner Morgenpost (independent): "With joy and great satisfaction the Berliners heard what Mr. Eisenhower declared concerning the situation of their city. It was the renewed promise to stand by Berlin under all circumstances. We have never had reason to doubt the American guarantees. However, Mr. Eisenhower, previous to the forthcoming East-West talks, apparently considered it important to demonstrate Mr. Khrushchev once more, in no uncertain terms, at which point the patience of the United States and the rest of the free world is at an end."

Christ and Welt (Protestant): "In the course of time many heads of government have come to Bonn for short visits of consultation, but none has ever been given so enthusiastic a reception."

Der Tag (independent), Berlin: "Mr. Eisenhower has given the proper answer to all speculation reckoning with weakness on the part of the Western nations and their proneness to be divided among themselves."

Neue Rhein-Zeitung (SPD): "That the West Germans cried 'We like Ike' during Mr. Eisenhower's visit was not due to any instruction from the top down. It was the expression of the German people's feelings toward a man who is using the weight of his office as well as of his personality to preserve peace. * * * Any political evaluation of the visit must take into account the jubilant public mood. The official outcome mirrors the scene on the streets: no conflicts, no problems, no disagreements—in short, harmony on both sides, confidence in Ike, confidence in Conny. Two countries, with but a single purpose."

Allgemeine Zeitung—Neuer Mainzer Anzeiger (independent): "Mr. Eisenhower clearly understood what was being so spontaneously offered him by his German ally—for at his press conference he said that by this welcome the German people showed the American people that the words 'liberty' and 'freedom' mean exactly the same thing to both."

Munchner Merkur (independent): "Whoever saw the reception that the Germans gave the American President cannot have failed to recognize the simple fact that in this enthusiasm of thousands of people there were demonstrated three basic elements of German foreign policy: the wish for security by means of a German-American alliance; the longing for national unity in freedom and in loyalty to the Western Alliance; and the deep desire to preserve the peace—not by capitulating but by the steadfastness that is inherent in patience."

Die Welt (independent):

"The hearty welcome afforded to President Eisenhower by the Europeans is by no means aimed only at his powerful position, nor even at the integrity of his personality. There are also certain expectations involved. * * *

"But Mr. Eisenhower cannot be assumed to have a magic wand. If we do not have the good will for reconciliation among ourselves, even he cannot help us. We ourselves must do our very best. However, Mr. Eisenhower even in World War II was known as an excellent mediator. We can hope that he will again give proof of this skill."

Rhein-Zeitung (independent):

"The West Germans are no longer inclined to gather in the streets to show enthusiasm—least of all for anyone connected with politics. This is due in part to the experience that has taught them to be sceptical of anything that seems to give the appearance of having political importance, and in part to indolence. Thus, the hearty almost stormy welcome that tens of thousands gave Mr. Eisenhower seems to prove that West Germans have, nevertheless, not lost their instinct for what is a really historic moment. * * *

"It is no mistake to assume that the inhabitants of Bonn and Bad Godesberg, as well as of the towns along the way from the airport, were acting on behalf of the entire people when they greeted the President with such overflowing cordiality and enthusiasm. They demonstrated that they decidedly approve of Adenauer's policy of firmly siding with the free West and that they have great confidence in Mr. Eisen-

hower. Wherever he appeared there was an immediate and uncommon rapport between these crowds and the man who appeared to them so very congenial and worthy of affection."

Suggestions for a More Sensible Farm Program

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I took the floor to discuss some of the problems which beset our farm families. On the following day I pointed out what I believe to be the weaknesses in the farm program which we are now following under the administration of Secretary Benson. Today, I want to discuss what I believe might constitute the rough outline for a more rational Federal farm program.

Anyone who searches for a satisfactory solution to the problems of agriculture is made keenly aware of the fact that there is widespread disagreement among farm organizations as to the proper remedy. This disagreement coupled with the sharp differences of opinion between the present administration and the Congress has delayed any acceptable solution to our agricultural problem.

Any major problem will produce differences of opinion, however, and we have not let such differences stand in the way of progress in the past. Indeed, we cannot afford as a Nation to delay much longer the establishment of an improved farm program. How can a great Nation ignore a condition which depresses the income of our food producers to a level only half that enjoyed by city dwellers? How can we ignore the pile-up of farm surpluses to the tune of $9 billion at an annual cost of $1 billion in storage and handling charges? How can we turn our backs on the outstretched hands of hungry millions overseas and our own undernourished here in the United States when vast quantities of food are deteriorating in Government bins? How can we close our eyes to the cost-price squeeze that is forcing farm families to sell out to corporation farm operators and integrated agriculture? How, for example, can my business constituents in South Dakota regard their future with security knowing that farm families are leaving the farms in South Dakota at the rate of one thousand per year for the past 5 years, many of them looking for work in the large cities where unemployment is already a problem. I feel a special concern for the young farmers who began farming after the Korean War when prices were high and their hopes for the future were even higher. These families were hit the hardest by the price depressing policies of Mr. Benson, tight money, and rising costs of operation. They did not have sufficient reserves to survive the squeeze between falling farm prices and rising costs of operation. What is our suggestion to these farmers?

To raise these questions is to recognize that the crisis in agriculture is more than an economic crisis; it is a moral crisis, as well.

GUIDELINES TO A BETTER AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

More than a year and a half ago, the gentleman from California, Congressman ROOSEVELT, and I sent a letter to the Members of Congress in which we suggested four major factors which we believed any new farm program must recognize. I believe that those four guidelines are even more apparent today as criteria for an improved agricultural program. In setting forth the conditions of an acceptable new program, we said:

First. It must be of maximum benefit to the family-size farmers who makes up the great bulk of our rural population.

Second. It must not raise food costs to city consumers.

Third. It must not be unreasonably costly to the Federal Treasury as is the case with our present disorganized and poorly planned program.

Fourth. In view of our position as a leading world power, a Federal farm policy should be related to our opportunities and responsibilities abroad.

Mr. Speaker, it has seemed to me for years that the No. 1 weakness in our national farm policy has been our slowness in recognizing that agricultural abundance if properly used can be a great asset both at home and abroad. The amazing efficiency of the American farmer which is the envy of the world can be a mighty instrument in strengthening our economy at home and building good will and peace abroad.

I cannot believe that an all wise providence intended America to let her abundant agricultural production become a curse that depresses the income of the hard-working men and women who make that abundance possible. To do so is to ignore the parable of the slothful servant who was condemned by his master because he hid his talent in the ground.

We all know that in a world where most of the people are hungry, our chief adversary, Mr. Khrushchev would love to have control of America's food surpluses to use in his international operations. Why then have we been so slow to recognize the potentiality of our amazing farm production?

Early in this session of the Congress I introduced a resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 60—entitled the "Food for Peace Resolution," calling upon the Congress to make vastly greater use of our food reserves as an instrument of peace and freedom. We have made some progress in that direction under Public Law 480, but much more can be done in the months ahead. The following is the text of my food-for-peace resolution which I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 60

Whereas the abundance of food and fiber produced by the American farmer is the marvel of the world; and

Whereas most of the people of the world are undernourished; and

Whereas the American people historically have been concerned with the well-being of other peoples; and

Whereas in many nations of the free world vital economic development programs are retarded and political stability is threatened by an inadequate supply of food; and

Whereas the remarkable bounty of the free American farmer has resulted in accumulations of farm commodities for which there is insufficient domestic demand; and

Whereas the Congress seeks to reduce unnecessary expenditures, including, where possible, those for commodity storage and for foreign assistance; and

Whereas the Soviet bloc has publicly challenged the United States and her allies to economic competition in demonstrating before the world the viability of their respective economic system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that an agricultural abundance is one of America's greatest assets for raising living standards and promoting peace and stability in the free world; and that Congress favors action to resolve the paradox of American agricultural surpluses and world food needs by more fully utilizing the resources of the American farmer as an integral part of the United States foreign assistance program.

SEC. 2. This concurrent resolution may be cited as the "Food for Peace Resolution".

There is also an urgent need for greater use of our farm surpluses here at home. Two-thirds of our schoolchildren are not included in the school lunch program and there are still 17 million Americans who are undernourished. One reason for the inadequacy of our domestic food use program is the fact that it is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture which is already under fire for its heavy budget. Actually our domestic food distribution program should be under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This Department is not only better suited to carry on a humanitarian food distribution program, but it would eliminate some of the budgetary criticisms of the Department of Agriculture that are now hurting the farmer's chances for a stronger program.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Senator KENNEDY, and I are the cosponsors of legislation—H.R. 7473 and S. 1884—that would transfer the food distribution program to the Welfare Department and expand the use of farm-produced foods among needy American families.

To accomplish the purposes of a comprehensive agricultural program designed to meet the needs of farm families and the Nation as a whole, the gentleman from Minnesota, Senator HUMPHREY, and I have cosponsored a challenging program—H.R. 8597 and S. 2502—which we believe is entitled to the thoughtful consideration of every American. Both Senator HUMPHREY and I were born in small South Dakota towns in the rural heartland of America. We have devoted a large share of our time and energy in public life studying the farm problem and talking with farmers in our home States and across the country. We believe that our legislation should be given full-scale hearings when the Congress returns next January and that it may point the way to a better agricultural economy in the best

interest of farmers and city dwellers alike.

There follows the full text of our bill which I strongly urge every Member of Congress and every citizen to study. I am most anxious to receive suggestions from my colleagues and from my fellow South Dakotans as to possible improvements in this legislation before we begin hearings next year.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the text of the bill at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

H.R. 8597

A bill to provide for the development of a comprehensive family farm program, to bring the production of agricultural commodities into balance with demand therefor, to enable farmers to secure fair prices, to better utilize agricultural abundance in the Nation's interest at home and abroad, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Family Farm Program Development Act".

TITLE I—POLICY OBJECTIVE

SEC. 101. The objective of this Act is to provide for the orderly development of a comprehensive family farm income and supply stabilization program that will (1) assure consumers in the United States an adequate, varied, and nutritious supply of food, fiber, and timber in the immediate future and in years to come, (2) bring the supply of farm products into balance with requirements for domestic use and export, (3) enable farmers who are willing to participate in and cooperate with orderly marketing and production adjustment programs for agricultural commodities to secure fair prices that will enable them to secure returns on their labor and invested capital comparable to earnings in comparable nonfarm occupations, and (4) better utilize the Nation's abundance of food and fiber products in support of United States international policies by assisting people in underdeveloped countries of the world to develop their economies, to modernize and expand their training and educational systems, and to avoid famine and malnutrition.

TITLE II—DOMESTIC FOOD AND NUTRITION PROGRAM

SEC. 201. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) is authorized and directed to formulate annually and submit to the Congress on or before February 1 of each year a domestic food and fiber program for the United States, both immediate and long range, together with budgetary estimates for carrying out such program in the first year and in subsequent years of operation.

(b) Any food and fiber program submitted by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall include provisions for—

(1) expanding and liberalizing the national school lunch program (carried out under the National School Lunch Act) and the special milk program for children (carried out under the Act of July 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 276));

(2) a food allotment program under which the nutritional needs of low income persons, the unemployed, the aged, and the handicapped will be more adequately fulfilled; and

(3) a national security reserve of food and fiber products designed to protect people of the United States against charges of such products in the event of war or other national emergency.

TITLE III—INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND FIBER PROGRAM

SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to cause a study to be made for the purpose of determining the annual fiber, food, and nutritional deficiency in the world and submit a report of such study to the Congress annually on or before February 1 of each year. He shall include in such report—

(1) recommendations as to the fair and feasible share of that deficiency which should be met from food products produced in the United States;

(2) recommendations for making food and fiber products produced in the United States available to aid in meeting such deficiency; and

(3) estimates of the annual cost of carrying out such program.

(b) The program specified in subsection (a) shall be planned as a long-term program in order to facilitate the effective use of food products made available in the recipient countries. Such program shall be planned in such a manner as to be consistent with the international objectives of the United States and so as not to interfere with the commercial trading activities of friendly exporting countries; but planned so as to afford maximum economic benefit to the recipient countries.

TITLE IV—ADJUSTING SUPPLY AND DEMAND

SEC. 401. (a) Whenever the Secretary determines that the supply of any agricultural commodity exceeds effective demand at a fair price, he shall establish for each such farm commodity a farm commodity program development committee to be composed of representative producers of such commodity. Each such committee shall be composed of members elected from their own number by the producers of such commodity and shall be established and operated in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

(b) Whenever any such farm commodity program development committee recommends it, the Secretary is authorized to conduct a referendum of the producers of such commodity to determine whether they favor a national marketing quota for such commodity as outlined by the Secretary after the consultation and guidance of the commodity committee. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in any such referendum vote in favor of such a program, the Secretary shall submit to the Congress a national marketing program for the commodity concerned in conformity with principles hereafter outlined in this title, together with estimates of the annual costs of each such program.

(c) The national marketing quota for any marketing year in the case of any farm commodity for which a marketing program is effectuated pursuant to subsection (b) shall be an amount of such commodity which will move in domestic and foreign markets in such marketing year, as determined by the Secretary, at a fair price for such commodity, taking into account the amount of such commodity to be utilized pursuant to any program effected under title II and III of this Act.

(d) With respect to any national marketing quota program submitted to the Congress under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) establish the necessary production adjustment and orderly marketing control procedures for the commodities concerned, including the necessary incentives or penalties to effect compliance with the program;

(2) establish procedures for transferring sales quotas among producers in the same area, and among different areas; and

(3) utilize, as may be necessary for the effective administration of such program, any alternative income stabilization methods, individually or in combination, including but not limited to crop loans, marketing premium payments, marketing agreements, marketing orders, surplus diversion purchases, purchase agreements, export incentive payments, export equalization payments, stabilization pools, or income deficiency or compensatory payments direct to farmers, in order to achieve the fair price objectives of this legislation at the lowest possible cost to consumers and taxpayers: *Provided, however,* That in no instance shall any individual farm operator receive total Government payments of more than $5,000 for such purposes in any one marketing year, or more than $25,000 in crop loans.

(e) The term "fair price" as used in this section means, with respect to any commodity, the price which will yield returns on capital and labor (on representative family farms) comparable to nonfarm earnings, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of costs and returns collected and published annually by the United States Department of Agriculture for typical family-operated commercial farms.

(f) If the Secretary determines that the fair price for any commodity encourages competition from synthetics or tends to otherwise significantly reduce domestic consumption or export of such commodity, or in the case of oilseeds the products thereof, he may allow the commodity to move through the market at a competitive price and pay the difference between the competitive price and the fair price as a compensatory payment directly to the producer.

(g) Unless any such marketing program submitted to the Congress under provisions of this title is disapproved by joint resolution of the Congress after sixty days after submission by the Secretary, it shall be placed into operation; and all other previously existing price support provisions for such commodity shall be suspended for the period for which such program is in effect.

(h) The Secretary shall use funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purposes of implementing this title.

TITLE V—LONG-TERM AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

SEC. 501. (a) In order to facilitate the adjustment of the supply of agricultural commodities to the demand therefor and to effect a healthy and balanced growth in agriculture, the Secretary is authorized and directed to formulate and submit to the Congress, within six months after the enactment of this Act, a comprehensive program dealing with long-term adjustments in agriculture in the United States, together with a long-term budget setting out the estimated costs of carrying out such program.

(b) Any program submitted by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) shall include, but not be limited to—

(1) plans for an expanded agricultural resources conservation program, including incentives to encourage land-use adjustment and temporary retirement of land not needed for production;

(2) plans for a review and appraisal of the total research effort, public and private, in the field of agriculture with a view to determining the need for increased research in the production patterns, marketing, and uses of agricultural production.

TITLE VI—LOW PRODUCTION FARMS

SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed (1) to review and report to the Congress the progress of the rural development program in solving the production and income problems of low production and low income family farms, and (2) to submit to the Congress, within six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, further recommendations for dealing more effectively and more rapidly with these problems, and

(3) to submit estimates of the costs of carrying out such recommendations.

(b) The Secretary shall, with respect to any recommendation submitted pursuant to subsection (a), consider, but not be limited by—

(1) the use of increased supervised credit to help speed farm reorganization and to help achieve more efficient sized and better organized farm units;

(2) the establishment of special services, including individual farm and home management guidance;

(3) the feasibility of payment of special grants to assist families with poor economic futures in agriculture who may desire to seek more gainful opportunities; and

(4) better protection for the benefit of families or persons who gain their living primarily as hired farm workers; and

(5) stimulation of further industrial development in underdeveloped rural areas; and

(6) the desirability of extending the United States Employment Service to rural areas and providing counseling service to people living in rural areas.

Abuses in the Automotive Industry Require Enactment of H.R. 880

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 880, to require certificates of fitness in the sale of automobiles. I have received many unsolicited letters from citizens throughout the United States stating that they are in favor of the bill and citing their own personal experiences as examples of why the measure is needed.

The latest of these letters is dated September 3, 1959, and comes to me from Anthony J. Cinelli, of Brooklyn, N.Y. It reads as follows:

BROOKLYN, N.Y., *September 3, 1959.*

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Your proposed legislatoin against misleading auto advertising is positively very much needed, especially to curb some deliberate lying, unscrupulous, and crooked dealers, salesmen, and possibly some irresponsible manufacturers.

I purchased a 1959 Ford from Four Star Motors, Inc., 1532 86th Street, Brooklyn, N.Y. On January 7 I received my car with the speedometer reading 2 miles. Five minutes after taking possession of this car I returned to the showroom to advise Mr. Weiner, the salesman, that the car pulled when brakes were applied. He told me to take it to their service department for brake adjustment. On January 8 I went to the service department, only to be told that they would not attempt to correct this "pull" until I had at least 1,000 miles on the car. This is a Ford Motor Co. regulation, so I am told. Therefore, I had no choice other than to risk my neck with defective brakes for 1,000 miles.

On February 22, 1959, after driving 1,047 miles, I returned to Four Star Service for the so-called 1,000-mile check, and to date I have returned 26 different times with the same trouble—pulling when brakes are applied—and still cannot get this corrected.

Mr. Cohen, the service manager, admits he is baffled. He has tried everything he knows to correct this condition and has also had Ford engineers on two different occasions without any success. He tells me it is the Ford Motor Co.'s problem.

The following has been done on my car by Four Star Motor's service department and still this dangerous condition has not been corrected:

1. Aligned front end three times.
2. Exchanged five sets of wheel cylinders.
3. Replaced six sets of wheel brakes.
4. In June, on the advice of engineer De Lisa, I am told that the entire brake system was removed from a new car and installed in my car—still no change—auto pulls.
5. Rounded wheels three times, the last time on August 13 at the request of Ford Engineer Evans—still no luck—still pulling and is about as safe as riding a missile.

To make matters still worse, during one of my many visits to Four Star service department, I learned from Joseph Testaverde, the foreman mechanic, that he personally road-tested my car and he advised Mr. Weiner, the salesman, that the car pulled but this unscrupulous individual's idea was to complete the sale first and worry about the trouble later. Needless to say, this ——— ——— denies that Mr. Testaverde advised him of this brake pull.

I wrote several letters to Ford Motor Co. but found this to be a waste of time. Apparently they are as irresponsible as this dealer. My letters are answered with letters of sympathy but they have never made any effort to eliminate this dangerous condition. I guess if I am involved in a head-on collision, causing several deaths, Ford Motor Co. will again send letters of sympathy. Maybe then I will not be in a position or mood to appreciate them.

You can be assured of my full support on your proposed legislation. If I can be of any assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me. Something must be done to protect a buyer. A poorly manufactured car, sold, and serviced by incompetent mechanics can very easily be the cause of a fatal accident. I know this quite well, I've had one or two close ones.

Very truly yours,

ANTHONY J. CINELLI.

Czechoslovak National Council of America Warns Against Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a memorandum which has been prepared by the Czechoslovak National Council of America concerning the visit of the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union to this country. This memorandum has been sent to President Eisenhower, and it is my sincere and earnest belief that the administration should give serious consideration to the suggestions made in this memorandum.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America represents a substantial number of Americans of Czechoslovakian descent, who are serving the best interests of their adopted country when they display such deep concern about the visit to the United States by the Soviet Prime Minister. Even more important is the fact that the Czechoslovak National Council of America emphasizes with such clarity that the United States cannot wage a successful fight against communism on the one hand, and on the other hand, be inviting the world's No. 1 spokesman for communism to this country.

The Czechoslovak National Council of America quite appropriately points out the demoralizing effect on the people of the satellite nations that Khrushchev's visit to this country will have. There should be no question in anyone's mind about the close ties that have existed over the years between the United States and Czechoslovakia in the never-ending struggle against tyranny and oppression. It is for this reason that I hope not only the President, but also the Members of this Congress, will respond effectively to the eloquent pleas of the Czechoslovak National Council of America.

I am very happy that the Czechoslovak National Council of America has its national headquarters in Chicago.

The memorandum follows:

MEMORANDUM OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA CONCERNING THE VISIT OF PRIME MINISTER OF THE SOVIET UNION, SUBMITTED SEPTEMBER 11, 1959

Mr. President, the Executive Committee of the Czechoslovak National Council of America begs leave to submit the following memorandum.

The present international situation is of paramount importance to the future of the United States of America and to the well-being of the now captive nations of Europe. Under these circumstances we consider it our duty to draw your attention to the anxieties and wishes of our members, tens of thousands of loyal American citizens of Czechoslovak descent, on whose behalf we speak.

We are prompted to take this step primarily by your decision to invite the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union to the United States and by your acceptance of his invitation to visit the Soviet Union.

The fact that the President of the United States extended an invitation to Mr. Khrushchev and accepted his invitation to the Soviet Union is being erroneously interpreted in Czechoslovakia—equally by Communists and non-Communists—as a major shift from a tougher to a softer U.S. policy toward the Soviet bloc.

The Communist authorities in Czechoslovakia seem to rejoice in this change of policy. They expect from it an increase of domestic and international respectability and they hope it will result in a weakening of the NATO cohesion.

The non-Communist majority of the people in Czechoslovakia appear to view this very change of U.S. policy with regret and apprehension.

The non-Communists seem to consider Mr. Khrushchev's invitation to represent a refutation of the previous line of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R., as it was often stated by the President and Secretaries of State and formulated most eloquently by the Policy of Liberation and recently by the Captive Nations Week resolution.

The people of Czechoslovakia seem to be so confused by the latest developments of U.S. foreign policy that they believe the exchange of invitations is to be a prelude to a new Munich agreement.

This wrong impression of a shift in U.S. policy may cause in Czechoslovakia and presumably in other captive nations a major deterioration of the psychological situation with adverse results for the future security of the United States.

Some consequences of this psychological change are feared to be the following:

A. A feeling that the United States is abandoning the people of Czechoslovakia and is giving up its hope and interest in an ultimate liberation of the captive nations;

B. An impression that the United States of America is accepting the status quo in central and eastern Europe as being just, desirable and lasting.

C. A stronger grasp of communism over the minds of the people;

D. A weakening of the spirit of resistance and western sympathies throughout the captive nations with all the regrettable consequences for the NATO forces in case of a future outbreak of hostilities, which we all fervently hope will never come to pass;

E. A loss of confidence in the integrity of American intentions and in the trustworthiness of American moral and legal pledges.

Against the backdrop of these premises we wish to recommend most urgently the following desiderata to your consideration.

Let it be made know to Mr. Khrushchev in a way which shall reach the hearing of the Communist government and the non-Communist people in Czechoslovakia:

A. That Mr. Khrushchev's invitation does not represent a basic change in the line of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R and their puppet governments in the captive nations;

B. That in consequence the United States does not accept now—any more than before Mr. Khrushchev's invitation—the status quo in central and eastern Europe as just, desirable and lasting;

C. That the cause of the captive nations shall be discussed by the President of the United States and his representatives with the Soviet Prime Minister and his representatives not only at the forthcoming visit, but at every future meeting or conference concerning itself with problems of European security, be it in the United Nations or elsewhere;

D. That the U.S. spokesmen shall insist on the restoration of independence and freedom to the formerly sovereign nations of central and eastern Europe, as was solemnly pledged by the United States and the U.S.S.R.;

E. That the United States shall insist on free elections under effective international control;

F. That, if a German peace treaty were to be discussed and if the Soviet government were to insist on the presence of representatives of the Communist governments of Prague and Warsaw, the U.S. Government shall invite such spokesmen as have a right to represent the true interests of free Czechoslovakia and free Poland;

G. That any European security pact will have to be preceded by the complete evacuation of all Soviet armed forces and other control organs from the territories of the captive nations.

In conclusion we wish to assure you, Mr. President, of the wholehearted support of any policy intended to alleviate the present hardship of our oppressed brethren and to accelerate the liberation of Czechoslovakia and all other captive nations.

Very respectfully yours,

CZECHOSLOVAKIA NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA,

JAMES HOVORKA, *President*.

U.N. Plan Would Aid Saboteurs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. ROSS ADAIR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's RECORD, I included the first of two stories from the Indianapolis Star relating to apparent efforts of Communist sympathizers to obtain important information with respect to Latin America. Following is the second of these thought-provoking articles:

[From the Indianapolis Star, Sept. 6, 1959]

U.N. PLAN WOULD AID SABOTEURS—PERIL FOR LATIN AMERICA

(By Jameson G. Campaigne)

"Massive industrial sabotage" imperiling both the economic and military security of the entire Western Hemisphere will be made possible if a plan, not yet publicly revealed, by the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America is carried out.

This will be charged in the September 11 issue of the magazine U.S.A. published by Alice Widener and to be mailed tomorrow. (U.S.A., Post Office Box 134, Lenox Hill Station, New York 21.)

The man directly responsible for this plan to gather secret industrial information from every power company in Latin America is a leftwing, Russian-born Argentine who was, in 1953, the subject of a demand by the U.S. Attorney General to the State Department that his accreditation to the United Nations be rescinded because of his constant contacts with Communists and fellow travelers.

U.S.A. magazine was able to obtain, through confidential U.N. sources, a thermofax copy of a letter from the U.N. Economic Commission for Latin America, sent to all Central and South American power companies, demanding, "without prejudice in writing you again," complete information about these companies' construction equipment, conveying and generating equipment, electric generators, auxiliary and safety equipment, control equipment, telecommunications equipment, structures and pole lines, cables, conductors, and transmission lines.

Information also was demanded on design of power plants, atomic reactors, and the costs of energy. In addition the power companies were told to "send us a list of the principal electric-mechancial materials and equipment you are purchasing or intend to purchase in your own country or Latin American countries, showing the corresponding supplier's name and address." I have a copy of this letter in my files.

American industrialists and specialists in the field of electric power say that there are two enormous dangers in making this sort of secret industrial information available to the U.N. commission.

Should this information fall in Soviet hands, the first danger is economic. The Soviets would know exactly who was selling power equipment to Latin American companies. They could then accelerate their economic penetration into Latin America by undercutting the prices of American and allied suppliers and at the same time send their technicians into Latin America along with the equipment sold.

But the second danger is even more disastrous.

In case of war Communist saboteurs, knowing exactly where the critical equipment was and what it was, could destroy transmission lines, poles, and power stations and, in a single stroke, paralyze all South and Central America.

Communist revolutionaries, carrying out Castro-like invasions of Caribbean or other Latin American countries, could, with this information, swiftly paralyze the entire Nation attacked and throw the economy into complete chaos. We have seen here in the United States the results of a partial power failure in New York just recently that threw half the city into darkness and paralysis.

Reached yesterday by phone, Kenneth Redmond, president of the United Fruit Co. which has vast interests in Latin America, was informed of the details of this U.N. questionnaire.

"No small businessman, much less a big power company executive, would divulge this type of information to any outside agency," he said. "Those industrial secrets are just as vital to the security of Latin America as any military secret no matter how important. Without power you could not move. If these secrets are revealed to the enemy, they would have an opportunity for the most tremendous industrial sabotage in time of war. It would be a great disaster if this information fell into the hands of the Soviet Union."

There is a real danger that South American governments, many of them Socialist oriented, will pressure private power companies into complying with this request from the Socialist-Communist-dominated Economic Commission for Latin America, not knowing the real dangers to their own economic and military security that are involved. Particularly since they are apparently not aware that the man responsible for the plan is considered an undesirable alien in the United States.

The letters sent to the private power companies in Latin America were signed by Adolfo Dorfman. Dorfman was born in Russia and is now a citizen of Argentina.

At one time he worked in the United States in the Office of Inter-American Affairs under Nelson Rockefeller. In 1952 he was chief of the Economic Development Section of the Division of Economic Stability and Development in the United Nations. In 1953, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service in New York informed the Attorney General of the United States that it had derogatory information about Dorfman serious enough to make it necessary that the Attorney General request the State Department to ask that his accreditation to the United Nations be rescinded. Apparently the State Department acted, for Dorfman left the United States November 13, 1953, leaving his family behind.

I am informed that there is a classified file on Adolfo Dorfman at the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service in New York. The latest entry on that file is 1954.

Despite the fact that the U.S. Government declared Dorfman persona non grata, and asked that he be removed from the U.N., Dorfman turns up in Santiago, Chile, as chief of ECLA energy development and hydraulic resources program.

He works directly under the U.N. chief of regional economic commissions who is no other than a Communist-Polish national named Wladyslaw R. Malinowski.

How Dorfman came to be appointed to his present position is a mystery. So far the U.S. State Department has either not tried, or has failed to have this dangerous man

removed from his powerful U.N. position despite the fact that the U.S. taxpayers pay at least one-third of his salary.

When informed of these facts by telephone yesterday, Congressman ARMISTEAD SELDEN, Democrat, of Alabama, and chairman of the Inter-American Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs told me: "If the information that is contained in the Indianapolis Star story is correct, this is a matter that should be looked into carefully by the security authorities of the United States."

Senator STYLES BRIDGES, ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, told the Star: "I am shocked by the information submitted to me by the Star. Certainly I am going to demand a congressional investigation."

How We Should Greet Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. CAHILL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, while some people are questioning the advisability of Khrushchev's visit to the United States, all of us are concerned with the way he should be greeted in the cities and towns he will visit. All Americans want to be courteous, yet do not by their good conduct wish to give approval of Khrushchev's past actions and the philosophies for which he stands. How then should we greet him? By cheers and applause, by boos and jeers? May I suggest that we as Americans should view Khrushchev's visit as an opportunity to show him and the world the unity, strength, and patriotism of the American people regardless of their ancestry, be it Polish, Hungarian, German, Italian, or Czech. Regardless of their religion, be it Protestant, Catholic, or Jew. And how do we do this and still carry the American tradition of fairplay, of courtesy toward visiting heads of States? By the simple method of displaying and waving the American flag. Hands that wave a flag need not applaud. This gesture would indicate welcome without approval; friendship without surrendering our own faith and beliefs—but above all, it would forcefully demonstrate the strength and unity of all Americans. It would also show to the world as a result of the photographs, television, and movies that are taken of Mr. Khrushchev, through the medium of a backdrop of red, white, and blue, that the American people, while holding the hand of friendship, also possess the fists of determination, unity, and strength.

I hope, therefore, that every factory and business, home and office, native and foreign-born citizen will display the Stars and Stripes in the cities and towns in America that are to be visited by Mr. Khrushchev. Let the steel companies and the pickets, the farmers and the factory workers, the corporations and the labor unions demonstrate by the symbolic display of the American flag the lesson that all of us want Khrushchev to learn, namely: that while we want friendship and peace, we are united behind the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States in their firm stand for justice to all people throughout the world.

Ron Clem, a Young Man Going Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the September–October 1959, issue of Goodyear News carries an inspiring story on the accomplishments of Mr. Ron Clem, of Yankton, S. Dak.

Ron is now in his second year as owner of Clem's Tire Service in Yankton, the city that was recently named as an All-America city. Ron is typical of the progressive businessmen who have brought Yankton favorable recognition both in South Dakota and in the Nation.

I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fine tribute paid to Mr. Clem by the editors of the Goodyear publication:

YANKTON DOODLE DANDY—RON CLEM HAS MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS BEHIND HIM; A BRIGHT FUTURE AHEAD

Ron Clem is a young man going places.

A veteran of the tire business at 36, Ron is a remarkably successful businessman—a resourceful, ambitious and energetic person who has earned a terrific reputation in his community.

Ron is now in his second year as owner of Clem's Tire Service in Yankton, S. Dak., a prosperous community of 12,000 located on the upper Missouri River. Yankton is famous historically as the first capital of the Dakota Territory. It also points with pride to the fact band leader Lawrence Welk got his start there 25 years ago.

Back in 1944, Ron moved to Yankton from Sioux City, Iowa, as manager of a competitive tire sales outlet. What he believes was the turning point in his life came in 1948. Bob Lewis (he celebrated his 45th anniversary as a Goodyear dealer in 1957) hired Ron to actively manage the Lewis Tire Co. in Yankton. He did and with great business acumen. So much so that in January, 1958, after the death of Lewis, he purchased the business lock, stock and barrel.

Since his first year as manager of the dealership he's boosted his volume 400 percent. That's the way it has been all the way down the line—more and more profits. In 1958 he did 22 percent better than 1957 and for the first 6 months of 1959 his business was running 20 percent ahead of a corresponding period last year.

How does he account for soaring profits? When a customer enters the store, Ron makes sure he or another member of his sales force is there to greet him.

"You've got to talk to your customers to let them know that you take special interest in their individual needs," says Ron.

Outstanding services is another key to Clem's success. He says, "With good service sales come automatically."

Clem's Tire Service has been forced to expand its facilities several times in recent years to meet growing needs. The expansion includes two new additions and doubling of the service area.

Just recently Ron purchased adjoining property to provide drive-through service for customers. Now they no longer have to back out on the street after their cars have been serviced. There's parking for 20 cars.

Goodyear's identification division has come up with a modern, attractive front for the building. Present plans call for still further identification improvements.

Because of its location in the heart of a great agricultural area, farm tire sales and service are heavily stressed. Clem's Tire Service operates a full-time farm service truck and features a "loaner" service. A farmer who encounters trouble need only phone and within a short time the Clem service truck is on the scene with a replacement tire. This enables the farmer to continue his tractor and equipment operation without delay while his tire is being repaired.

In merchandising, Ron relies heavily on direct mail and this year is getting excellent results from Men magazine, Farm Progress and 4-Aces. Newspaper ads also are used regularly in addition to radio advertising.

Always on the alert to new sales possibilities, Ron has rung up additional sales through "baldie" spotting. An employee regularly checks parked cars in Yankton's business district for smooth tires. A card is left on the windshield of those cars with dangerous tires and invites the motorist to visit Clem's Tire Service to look over the complete stock of Goodyear passenger car tires.

Although recapping is not a major part of the business, Ron has equipment installed to give him a well-rounded operation.

Sales are where you find them. And Ron has found them in the most unlikely places. As a member of the Yankton Country Club (he was president in 1958) he sold several Goodyear batteries to the club for its fleet of new golf carts.

A shrewd businessman, Ron isn't a one-sided citizen. When the people of Yankton want to get something done they're likely to turn to Ron.

In his spare time (if that's what you call it), citizen Clem is up to his ears in the work and fun of the community which in 1958 was named an all-American city in recognition of its civic accomplishments. No small measure of credit belongs to Ron who has been one of the prime movers behind Yankton's civic betterment.

Chamber of commerce: As a member of the city improvement committee, Ron helped raise funds for a new senior high school (it cost over $1 million); a community swimming pool; and promoted the construction of Gavins Point Dam that has improved downstream navigation and bank stabilization, created unlimited recreational opportunities and benefitted fish and wildlife conservation.

United Fund: He is a director of the fund raising organization this year and has been active in its work since he came to Yankton.

Baseball: A rabid baseball town Yankton is proud of its "Terrys," a semipro team. Ron is on the local baseball commission.

Shrine Elks: Ron has been active in the various benefits sponsored by these organization. Through them much good has been accomplished for all the people of Yankton.

These civic activities give Ron an opportunity to get on a first-name basis with many of his customers; they in turn rate him as a solid citizen.

Ron was born in Alda, Nebr., the son of a Methodist minister, and moved frequently in his youth as his father took various pastorates in that part of the country.

He met his wife, Maxine, in Sioux City, Iowa, and they were married there. The couple has two children, Sherry Lee and Jacqueline.

On Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD a letter written by Dr. Clarence Streit, president of the International Movement for Atlantic Union, offering a very interesting and appropriate suggestion regarding Khrushchev's visit to our country.

I would like to commend this letter to the attention of the membership of this body:

INTERNATIONAL MOVEMENT
FOR ATLANTIC UNION,
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1959.

To the EDITOR:

Much as I agree that since the President has invited Mr. K. we should be hospitable, I wonder if the traditional tickertape welcome would be appropriate. After all, Wall Street is the Communist hell. Worse, it makes the bear that symbolizes Russia symbolize a bleak future, while its symbol of a bright outlook is the bull that, at the mere sight of red, attacks.

Would it not be more hospitable to welcome Mr. K. by having Washington instead shower him with the tape for which it is famed? True, since this tape is in his favorite color he may misread this to mean that our Government is swarming with Communists. Yet, would not this danger be offset by the advantages gained from burying Mr. K. in redtape, instead of continuing to use it to choke practical efforts to defeat dictatorship without war—such as the Humphrey-Morgan-Zablocki resolution? This proposal to call a convention to explore how best to give the Atlantic community the strength that proverbially lies in union has been entangled in redtape ever since the recent Atlantic Congress unanimously urged that this convention meet before next spring.

What of New York, where Mr. K. will be on September 17 and 18, proclaiming in the U.N. communism's fervor for peace, its hatred of racism and imperialism, its self-sacrificing dedication to the protection of the weak from the strong? Some may find it tactless to have him appear there then.

On September 17, only 20 years ago, the Red Army began its part of the invasion of Poland—already blitzed by its Nazi partner—to secure its share of the spoils agreed on in the Nazi-Communist deal which set off World War II. And on September 18, 1939, the Red and Nazi armies fraternally met at Brest-Litovsk—where communism had previously stabbed freedom in the back by the first of its deals with German autocracy. To speak in the U.N. on this anniversary does not, however, seem to embarrass Mr. K.

President Eisenhower will no doubt have the good taste not to show his guest the monument our fathers raised just across the street from the White House to an earlier Mr. K. Yet, if we forget him entirely, the present Mr. K., who comes offering us the gift of peace, may think we neglect our noblest benefactors. To solve this dilemma, I suggest that our press take a bit of page 1 from him and devote it to our first Mr. K. on September 17. That day is appropriate, since this hero of our own Revolution later led a no less heroic struggle against a previous Prussian-Russian deal—the one of 1794—to invade, partition, and obliterate Poland.

Having been a reporter, I know why news standards count personalities as more interesting than principles, and live dictators as more newsworthy than dead liberators, and I do not complain, even though the space given Mr. K. serves willy nilly to build up the personal prestige of the most dangerous enemy of freedom of the press. All I suggest the press do is to keep alive the memory of the one who fought for our free principles—by publishing at least the last four lines of Campbell's poem which (as every schoolboy once knew) ends:

"And freedom shriek'd—as Kosciuszko fell."

On that same September 17 might not some of us Americans—including those who, like me, are not of Polish origin—who wish to express with dignity to Mr. K. the principles our Union, as Lincoln said, "lives by and keeps alive," say it with flowers * * * placed round the monument raised, across from the White House, to Liberator K.?

CLARENCE STREIT,
President.

Algeria to Albany, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, people of Oregon, and especially in my district, show a special interest in foreign affairs. Perhaps it is because our western boundary is the Pacific Ocean. Perhaps it is also because they are an intelligent, hard working, conscientious group of men and women who, like many others in the United States and throughout the world, yearn for peace.

As a consequence of this responsible attitude, we have many students and visitors from foreign lands coming to our homes and educational institutions. In the Albany Democrat-Herald for August 22 a story by Betty Mayfield tells of the arrival of a fourth-generation Algerian-born French girl, Nicole Rouxparis. Nicole will spend the year attending Albany Union High School, under the American Field Service exchange program. Her hosts for the year will be Dr. and Mrs. W. H. Alden, 1060 Lawnridge Street, Albany. She comes from an area where the French and the Arabs have been fighting for 5 years. When she leaves, she will no doubt leave with a better understanding of Oregon and America, and many Oregonians will have a better understanding and appreciation of France's problem in Algeria.

Under unanimous consent I am including hereafter the text of the newspaper article about Nicole Rouxparis:

ALBANY HIGH EXCHANGE STUDENT WITNESS TO FRENCH-ARAB STRIFE

(By Betty Mayfield)

A fourth-generation Algerian-born French girl arrived in Albany Friday to spend a year attending Albany Union High school under the American field service exchange program.

Sixteen-year-old Nicole Rouxparis will find the coming school term quieter than last year, when her Christmas holidays were interrupted by rebel Arab tribes sweeping in from the hills to attack her town, only to be repulsed by the 300 French soldiers garrisoned there.

Nicole, who will stay in Albany with Dr. and Mrs. W. H. Alden, 1060 Lawnridge Street, said that fighting between the French and Arabs has been going on in Algeria for 5 years.

"Last year the Arabs attacked very often, but now not so much," she said. "I think they will make peace eventually, but it will be very long before they do."

Nicole's father is mayor of Diderot, a town of about 1,000 population—200 French and 800 Arab. It is located near Tiaret, a city of 30,000, about 190 miles southwest of Algiers.

BORN IN ALGERIA

Her great-grandfather moved to Algiers from France, and her grandparents and parents were born in the African province, as well as Nicole and her older sister.

Nicole took her early schooling in Algiers, and for the last 2 years she studied at a school in Toulouse in southern France.

She would be eligible to enter the university this fall, but decided to spend a year in the United States instead.

After her year in Albany, she will return to France and attend the University of Toulouse, where she plans to train to become an English teacher.

Nicole has studied English for 7 years. She said that all students in her school were required to take two foreign languages—English and one other. She chose Spanish for her second study.

She traveled from Rotterdam to New York on a ship with 700 other foreign students from several European countries and then flew to San Francisco. A bus took the northbound students, dropping Nicole in Salem, where the Aldens picked her up.

VISIT PLANNED

Today she was to leave with the Alden family for a 2-week visit to southern California.

The Aldens applied to American Field Service for a foreign student last fall through the high school. They were the only Albany family applying this year.

The host family is responsible for the student's board and room and such things as school pictures, Mrs. Alden said, but the AFS takes care of medical expenses and provides the student with an allowance.

American students also go abroad under the AFS plan, but Albany was not entitled to send any this year, because no foreign students were quartered here last year.

Nicole will be accompanied to high school in Albany by two members of the Alden family, Georgia, a senior, and John, a freshman. The older daughter, Mary, queen of the year's Timber Carnival, will be a freshman at the University of Oregon, and the youngest son, Bill, is in sixth grade.

Although Nicole has not had time to do much sightseeing yet, she is looking forward to her year in the United States.

"I think I will enjoy it very much," she said, "and it will help me when I start to teach English."

The Late Honorable Edmund P. Radwan

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep sorrow that I learned of the

passing of my beloved and esteemed friend, Edmund P. Radwan. Our Maker called Mr. Radwan at the early age of 48 and we mourn his passing. I met Ed Radwan in 1947 when we served together as senators in the New York State Legislature. He was a senator from the great city of Buffalo where he was born and grew up. He was a dedicated servant and public officer. He was always vibrant, alive, and stimulating. His talents were recognized by his friends and neighbors who promoted him to Congress in 1951 to serve his country further.

Cities and places are just brick and mortar to be admired for their beauty and architecture. People give them meaning and make them come alive. On every occasion that I had a problem in Buffalo, I could always call upon Ed for assistance and he never failed me. Whenever I thought of Buffalo, I would think of Ed Radwan. During the past few years, Ed Radwan did not enjoy good health. He suffered, but made no complaints. When he realized that he could no longer render service to his people, he graciously stepped down to permit another more physically capable to take his place.

He was one of the most courageous men I ever knew. He suffered silently and stoically. He approached his Maker with composure and resignation. He has gone to the great beyond. Because on the way he touched me, I am richer in experience, I am wiser in judgment, and happier in thought. All who knew and met him on his journey through the corridor called "Life," share this feeling and sentiment.

He lives in the hearts of his wife, his three children, his friends, and his brother, Ralph. I extend to his family and those who love him my heartfelt sympathy.

A Constitutional Amendment To Establish Universal Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a joint resolution for a constitutional amendment to establish a free and universal franchise throughout the United States.

That thousands of Americans, citizens of the greatest free Nation in the world, are today denied the right to vote, a right sacred in any democracy, cannot be denied.

The most effective and equitable way to insure to every citizen of the United States, regardless of his race or color, this fundamental right is a simple constitutional amendment.

PRAISES CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION REPORT

Mr. Speaker, I believe that September 10, 1959, is a particularly appropriate day on which to make this proposal because it was only yesterday that the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights transmitted to the President its report. It is an excellent report and its title, "One Nation Under God, With Liberty and Justice for All," expresses the principle on which the constitutional amendment I am proposing is based.

HAILS FATHER HESBURGH AS ADVOCATE OF AMENDMENT

There is another reason I am particularly proud to urge the adoption of an amendment to establish universal suffrage in America. This amendment is advocated in the report of the Commission on Civil Rights by three members of the Commission. One of these members resides in the congressional district I represent. He is the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., the distinguished president of the University of Notre Dame, and one of the most able and dedicated citizens of our country. In addition to his position as president of a great American university, Father Hesburgh is the permanent Vatican delegate to the general conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, a member of the special studies project of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and a member of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

The amendment urged by Father Hesburgh is also advocated by two other distinguished Americans on the Civil Rights Commission, John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, and George M. Johnson, former dean of the Howard University Law School.

NOTES NEGROES DENIED RIGHT TO VOTE IN SOUTH

Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Commission report states that Negro registration in the South represents only about 25 percent of the nearly 5 million Negroes of voting age in the region in 1950. It will not startle anyone to learn that it is in the South of the United States that the denial of the right to vote is most widespread. Literacy tests and poll taxes are among the devices commonly used to keep Negroes from voting.

CITES INDIANA VOTING STUDY

But, Mr. Speaker, I do not for a moment claim that those of us who live in the North should be complacent or self-righteous. The Commission report declares that "there are de facto denials of the right to vote in northern areas that exclude or discourage Negro residnce altogether."

For example—

Says the Commission—

The report of the Committee on the Right To Vote of the Indiana State Advisory Committee stated that in 1946 it was found that there were no Negro residents in 30 of the State's 92 counties. The Indiana report added that—"in a number of the county seats and small communities in the counties signs are visible advising "Niggers don't let the sun go down on you here." Obviously, if one cannot establish residence in one-third of the State, he cannot meet the qualifications for voting."

PRAISES INDIANA EFFORTS TO SOLVE CIVIL RIGHTS PROBLEMS

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to say that in my own State of Indiana and in my own congressional district, serious efforts are being made to study and act on the many problems in the field of civil rights. For example, the Chairman of the Indiana Advisory Committee of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, John A. Scott, of Elkhart, and Mrs. Scott, are providing fine leadership toward public understanding of civil rights issues. This fall, the Young Women's Christian Association of Elkhart is sponsoring a series of civil rights conferences in which community leaders from business, industry, labor, and the professions will hear addresses on various aspects of the civil rights problem and will join in discussions with the visiting speakers.

EXPLAINS HESBURGH UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

Now, Mr. Speaker, just what will the Hesburgh amendment do?

The proposed constitutional amendment would give the right to vote to every citizen who meets his State's age and residence requirements and who is not legally confined at the time of registration or election.

Mr. Speaker, only those who do not believe in America can possibly object to this amendment. Only those who are opposed to the American principles of freedom and democracy can range themselves against this proposal. Only those who deny the Hebrew-Christian tradition of respect for the dignity of the individual human being as a child of God can deny to an American citizen the right to vote.

CALLS HESBURGH-HANNAH-JOHNSON STATEMENT BEST ARGUMENT FOR AMENDMENT

The best and briefest way for me to put the case for the universal suffrage amendment is to include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the joint statement, which is contained in the Commission report, of Father Hesburgh, Dr. Hannah, and Dean Johnson in support of the proposal.

The statement follows:

PROPOSAL FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO ESTABLISH UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE

(By Chairman Hannah and Commissioners Hesburgh and Johnson)

The Commission's recommendation for temporary Federal registration should, if enacted by Congress, secure the right to vote in the forthcoming national elections for many qualified citizens who would otherwise, because of their race or color, be denied this most fundamental of American civil rights. But the proposed measure is clearly a stopgap.

In its investigations, hearings, and studies the Commission has seen that complex voter qualification laws, including tests of literacy, education and interpretation, have been used and may readily be used arbitrarily to deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States.

Most denials of the right to vote are in fact accomplished through the discriminatory application and administration of such State laws. The difficulty of proving discrimination in any particular case is considerable. It appears to be impossible to enforce an impartial administration of the literacy tests now in force in some States, for where there is a will to discriminate, these tests provide the way.

Therefore, as the best ultimate solution of the problem of securing and protecting the right to vote, we propose a constitutional amendment to establish a free and universal franchise throughout the United States.

An important aim of this amendment would be to remove the occasion for further direct Federal intervention in the States' administration and conduct of elections, by prohibiting complex voting requirements and providing clear, simple, and easily enforcible standards.

The proposed constitutional amendment would give the right to vote to every citizen who meets his State's age and residence requirements and who is not legally confined at the time of registration or election.

Age and residence are objective and simple standards. With only such readily ascertainable standards to be met, the present civil remedies of the Civil Rights Act should prove more effective in any future cases of discriminatory application. A court injunction could require the immediate registration of any person who meets these clear-cut State qualifications.

The proposed amendment is in harmony with the American tradition and with the trend in the whole democratic world. As noted in the beginning of this section of the Commission's report, the growth of American democracy has been marked by a steady expansion of the franchise; first by the abandonment of property qualifications and then by conferral of suffrage upon the two great disfranchised groups, negroes and women. Only 19 States now require that voters demonstrate their literacy. Michigan, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Vermont have suffered no apparent harm from absence of the common provisions disqualifying mental incompetents. With minor exceptions, mostly involving election offenses, Colorado, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia have no provisions barring certain ex-convicts from the vote, and of the States which do have such provisions, all but eight also provide for restoration of the former felon's civil rights. In only five States is the payment of a poll tax still a condition upon the suffrage.

The number of Americans disqualified under each of these categories is very small compared with the approximately 90 million now normally qualified to vote. It is also small in relation to the numbers of qualified nonwhite citizens presently being disfranchised by the discriminatory application of these complex laws. The march of education has almost eliminated illiteracy. In a nation dedicated to the full development of every citizen's human potential, there is no excuse for whatever illiteracy that may remain. Ratification of the proposed amendment would, we believe, provide an additional incentive for its total elimination. Meanwhile, abundant information about political candidates and issues is available to all by way of television and radio.

We believe that the time has come for the United States to take the last of its many steps toward free and universal suffrage. The ratification of this amendment would be a reaffirmation of our faith in the principles upon which this Nation was founded. It would reassure lovers of freedom throughout a world in which hundreds of millions of people, most of them colored, are becoming free and are hesitating between alternative paths of national development.

Mr. Speaker, the opening lines of the Declaration of Independence contain the noblest utterance yet written in support of the proposition that free men should have equal rights in a free society:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

The amendment to establish free and universal suffrage in America, Mr. Speaker, will help to make real for all Americans the bright promise of the Declaration of Independence.

Monsignor McGrath Predicts America's Doom Unless People Wake Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most interesting article by Rt. Rev. William C. McGrath, S.F.M., P.A., reprinted from the Tablet, a weekly Catholic newspapers published in Brooklyn, N.Y.

The article follows:

PREDICTS AMERICA'S DOOM UNLESS PEOPLE WAKE UP—MONSIGNOR MCGRATH SEES FULFILLMENT OF LENIN'S PROPHECY THAT UNITED STATES WILL BE SOVIETIZED WITHOUT WAR

(By Rt. Rev. William C. McGrath, S.F.M., P.A.)

Ten years more, that's about all. Fifteen, maybe, at the outside. By then the Reds will have taken over America.

No war. No hydrogen bombs. No mass slaughter—till after the victory has been won.

The coup d'etat, in course of accomplishment even while you are reading these lines, will be engineered to final success by the entrenched and untouchable traitors in high places, aided and abetted by their strategically placed cohorts in the nerve centers of the Nation.

The men who sold 500 million Chinese into Communist slavery will finally betray America. The saboteurs who ordered ignominious defeat in Korea will at last achieve the utter destruction of the Nation that has too long stood between Russia's Communist leaders and a bloody Communist world.

It will be the fulfillment of the prophecy made by Lenin in 1923: "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

CITES FATE OF ANTI-REDS

Who are these traitors? In what key spots are they located right now?

Apparently we are not to know until it is too late. It is worse than useless; it is military or political suicide for any individual to attempt to track them down. For the end is ever the same: character assassination, disgrace or death.

From Patton to Forrestal to Wedemeyer; from MacArthur to Lawton to McCarthy our shores are littered with broken men, among them some of the greatest Americans of our generation.

McCarthy came nearest to success. He was dangerously close to pay dirt in his attempt to unearth the mysterious forces avowed to encompass our destruction.

That was why his disgrace had become an absolute necessity and would serve as a deterrent to the McClellans and Jenners and J. Edgar Hoovers who might be stupid enough to continue this exposé of treason.

That was why a petition against his censure, signed by 10 million Americans was brazenly ignored.

Public opinion must not be permitted to count any more, as witness the treatment accorded General MacArthur who was given the greatest public acclaim ever tendered to anybody in the history of the country and is now the forgotten man.

This grim prospect for America was given to us in strictest confidence by two outstanding experts on Communist tactics of subversion and whose names I may not reveal. They are firmly convinced that the Nation is doomed; that nothing really effective is being done or can be done to arrest the progress of the great betrayal.

Ten to 15 years they say, before the massacres in the streets and convents and churches and seminaries; before the brainwashing and diabolical torture and the boatloads of broken humans heading northward toward Siberia and death.

In China, since its "liberation" by the Communists, 15 million innocent people have been done to death. But in China, a Red officer recently told a departing missionary, they were not cruel enough. "We will be 100 times as cruel when we take over America."

Not only will this verdict of the experts not be generally accepted but it is virtually impossible today to convince people as a whole that America is even in danger.

So long have we been inoculated and anesthetized with subtle, sporofic party line slogans about peace and security and coexistence that the soul within us has died, the mere thought of resistance, even to the menace of Communist enslavement, has come to be regarded as a sort of treason to a peace-loving world.

North America today comprises in its population a truly alarming number of naive defeatists; of innocent lambs ready—"eager," one would be tempted to say at times—to be led to the Communist slaughterhouse.

Let anybody advocate a strong stand against Communist aggression and immediately there is a hue and cry of "warmonger." We must be realistic about the present last stand of freedom in Asia. Pay any price, for another cease fire anywhere on earth, even the price of handing the whole of Asia over to Red domination.

See to it that there never will be any further attempt to liberate the Chinese mainland. Eliminate the troublesome Chiang Kai-shek. Bottle him up forever on Formosa or, for that matter, in exile, and make use of the mighty U.S. 7th Fleet to insure the surrender of some of his vital offshore islands.

Invtie the murderers of priests and sisters and American uniformed men to the conference table and welcome them as respected members of the United Nations.

Condone. Appease. Pretend. But above all forever surrender.

Peace in our time, wherever we've heard that before. Bury your head in the sand while Russia enslaves the rest of the world and hope—oh, just somehow—that it cannot happen here.

SAYS CATHOLICS ARE ASLEEP

Thank Heaven not all people have given up. A few brave souls in America are trying to arouse the country from its sleep of death. Magazines like the American Mercury and the U.S. News and World Report. Columnists like Sokolsky, Lawrence and Budenz. Radio commentators such as Winchell, Fulton Lewis, Jr., and John T. Flynn.

I have before me an interesting letter from one such lecturer not perhaps so well known, a lady who has consistently spoken against the Communist menace, who has been hounded and persecuted and finally forced to sell her home and move out of her home State.

Hear what she has to say on this subject: "I believe the same diabolical plans will be duplicated in America, for the men who are dedicated to the worship of Lucifer are bound to crucify the followers of Christ. They are a bunch of sanctimonious, holier-than-thou hypocrites. Watch them crucify McCarthy.

"Yes, we do need many prayers. But let me ask you this. Do you think the general run of Catholics have any inkling of the dangers all around them? Is it not a fact that people do not pray for help unless they believe they need it?

"Despite all of Bishop Sheen's telecasts, the Fatima Crusade, the Rosary Crusade, etc., I do not find Catholics in general recognizing that there are serious dangers to their souls, their homes, their families, their way of life. When I try to draw their attention to what I know, they look at me with a blank, dubious stare. Human beings do not come to their senses until they suffer themselves. So I suppose we are going to have to suffer before there is an awakening."

I have heard Bishop Cuthbert O'Gara discuss this subject at length. He is distressed and deeply disturbed over the failure of people in this country to recognize the danger of the Communist threat. And Bishop O'Gara knows all about communism from firsthand experience. For he spent 24 months in solitary confinement in China in an old hut located between a pigsty and a latrine.

A recent interview he granted the Catholic press in Pittsburgh should do much to awaken those who still favor appeasement of Red China.

"The people of the United States," he stated, "do not appreciate the magnitude of the defeat the West has suffered since 1945.

"It is incredible that such a small group of pro-Communist pseudointellecutals should have effected in so short a time one of the greatest turnovers in the history of mankind."

QUOTES BISHOP O'GARA

Bishop O'Gara said that this defeat could not be blamed on stupidity but had been deliberately and coldbloodedly engineered.

"No group of Americans," he said, "could be that stupid. The deliberate throwing away of victory after World War II is confirmed by the whole list of stupidities since V–J Day. And these stupidities are still going on. Someone is still directing the sellout."

Apropos of what would happen in America should the Reds take over, I have before me at the moment a document that affords fruit for meditation. It is a list of 192 priests, some of whom I knew personally, who have been murdered in China and the list is admittedly incomplete. Read for yourself the nature of the treatment meted out to those martyred servants of God and then ask yourself if our fight today is not against principalities and the powers of darkness.

Father Charles Osnagui, buried alive, February 1942; Father Humbert Verdini, burned with some 30 Christians, July 1942; Sister Anne Chang, dragged to death, March 1948; Father Joseph Chang, dragged, beaten, shot, October 1947; Archbishop Cyril Jarre, O.F.M., died in jail, March 1952; Father Francis Hsiao, died after tortures, Good Friday, 1950; Father Seraphin Shih (and many of his fellow Trappists), head crushed between stones.

And so the story goes for all of the 192 who were done to death.

All this at the hands of the Red Chinese murderers who still hold some 900 Americans in their filthy dungeons and who, if our nitwit liberals have the final say-so, will be permitted to shoot their bloody way into the United Nations.

Truly—whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad.

Good Samaritans Are Still With Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every once in awhile the newspapers carry a story that renews every man's faith in his fellow man.

Such a story appeared on September 5, 1959, in the Tucson Daily Citizen.

Because it concerned Oklahoma, it was sent on to me by my good friend and colleague, the Honorable STEWART L. UDALL.

I enjoyed reading the story, and I was proud to be reminded that the spirit of the good Samaritan is still alive in the State of Oklahoma.

The town of El Reno can be proud of the unnamed citizens who so cheerfully, extended the hand of friendship to a neighbor in distress.

They were true to the finest traditions of the Sooner State, where every stranger of good will is welcome.

Here is the story, as written by Leslie Ernenwein:

SHORTY THINKS OKLAHOMANS ARE O.K.
(By Leslie Ernenwein)

"You newspaper guys are always writing about oddballs and hoodlums," L. C. (Shorty) Longshore said. "But I could tell you a story that's different."

Such as what?

About the nice people in an Oklahoma town—a Samaritanville of a town named El Reno.

"Shorty," who works at a service station in Tucson, was on his way home from a vacation trip a week ago when his car broke down.

"Way out in the country. My heap suddenly sounded like a harvesting machine—made a terrible racket."

Just about that time another car, going in the opposite direction, passed him. "Shorty" drove off to one side of the road, and the other car turned around and came back.

Its driver said, "Sounds like you threw a rod."

"Shorty" agreed that it did, and was really beat.

The stranger said, "Don't let anything worry you, mister, I've got a chain in my trunk."

The Good Samaritan had "Shorty's" wife and grandson get into his air-conditioned Oldsmobile and towed "Shorty's" car into El Reno—a distance of 18 miles.

The stranger wheeled up to a garage and told the proprietor that "Shorty" needed quick service, that he was on his way home and had a long way to go.

"He took my wife and grandson to a motel and secured accommodations, then came back and told me where they were. I asked him his name, but he said he just wanted to help me, and drove off."

While the mechanic was investigating the damage to his car, "Shorty" went to a restaurant for a cup of coffee. Another stranger came up to him and handed him the keys to a new Buick.

"I hear you and your wife had a little trouble," the man said. "Perhaps you'll need a car while yours is being fixed."

Shorty said he couldn't afford to rent a car.

"I'm lending it to you," the man said. "Leave the keys in it when you get through.

Shorty was nonplussed.

"Thought I must be dreaming. These men were total strangers. I still don't know their names."

He used the new Buick to go to the telegraph office and wire for money, then went back to the garage.

The motor was ruined and would have to be replaced. A new one could be obtained in Oklahoma City, 30 miles away.

"I was shook up," Shorty said. "I figured the bill would come to $350 or $400. But I was stranded, so I said OK."

The garage man went to Oklahoma City, got the new motor and worked late Saturday installing it. Then he advised Shorty to drive it around some that night and bring it in for a final checkup in the morning.

"But tomorrow is Sunday," Shorty said.

"I'll open up. You want to get an early start?"

Shorty nodded. The new motor checked out OK and the man handed him a bill for $234.68.

"All the labor, a new motor, going to Oklahoma City, and opening up for me on Sunday," Shorty said, "I couldn't believe it. I asked him what I owed for all his kindness."

The garage man said, "Just a letter when you get home, telling me if you got there safely."

Shorty thinks Oklahomans are real nice people.

Agribusiness: The Plan of Big Business To Take Over Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just read a very fine address by a constituent of mine, Mr. L. A. Schafer, of Springfield, Ill. Mr. Schafer gave this address at St. Louis University in St. Louis, Mo., June 22, 1959, during a panel discussion with outstanding leaders in agriculture to the students and teacher staff of the workshop in problems of economic education. Because of the widespread interest in this field I wish to include his address as part of my remarks. His address is as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY L. A. SCHAFER, GIVEN AT ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 22, 1959, TO THE STUDENTS (EDUCATORS) AND TEACHER STAFF OF THE WORKSHOP IN PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION DURING A PANEL DISCUSSION WITH OUTSTANDING LEADERS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. Ogle, moderator, panel, ladies, and gentlemen, a short few minutes ago, I asked the moderator if any of the panel would tell us about the new, self-named superorganization who is working in the United States to take over ownership of our American farming land, and all of our American food.

I was surprised that three of our panel said they knew nothing of it. Mr. Ralph Bradley, president of the Illinois Farmers Union, representing the National Farmers Union, said he was not prepared to talk about it, but that he was most anxious to help the American farm family. He knew the contents of the book whose author was John

Davis, former Assistant to Secretary Benson. The title of the book is "Concept of Agribusiness."

I came to St. Louis this morning as a guest and do feel it out of place for me to be speaking to you from this platform, but I felt that it is of utmost importance that you know about the organization that is planning to change farm ownership and obtain control of our food and fiber.

First, I believe that I should, like Mr. Sikes, of Purina Mills, during your noon luncheon, also give you my biography. I was born on a farm in Gardner Township, in Sangamon County in Illinois; moved into Springfield, Ill., in 1904; started part-time work with my father and brothers in a feed and supply store for farmers and city folk in 1910; started full-time work in 1917, and have continued since, in the same business; I have held several terms as president of Illinois Hatchery Associations and have been director for many years; director 2 years in Sangamon County Junior Fair Association; moved on to and operated a small farm of my own purchase in 1952; became active member of Sangamon County Farm Bureau in 1952; held office as vice president 2 years and president 2 years of Springfield Township Farm Bureau unit; I am presently serving my second term as president; I have worked on committee assignments for our county farm bureau.

Most of my personal friends are independent diversified American farmers, and, to me, these are the most important people in the world. I have culled chickens and mated breeding stock on farms in Sangamon, Morgan, Menard, Christian, Macoupin, Cass, and Logan Counties in Illinois, and have visited with the families on these farms and have talked with them about their agricultural problems, and advised them about their management and disease problems in livestock and poultry.

Recently, Mr. Bradley accepted my membership in the Illinois Farmers Union, and, I am proud to be a member of a farmers' organization that realizes the need to help the American farm family against the present agribusiness superorganization.

I told you I came as a guest. I do not have a speech prepared and I am not a public speaker. When visiting Mr. Bradley last Thursday, he told me he was to represent Mr. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, in a panel discussion at a workshop in problems of economic education in St. Louis on Monday. I did not tell him, that immediately that he told me of the school, I had a premonition that the workshop was planned to "train additional research workers and teachers for coping with agribusiness problems." And I believe I know the names of the steering committee who planned and arranged this workshop. I wanted to gain more information about agribusiness policy and progress, and I asked him if I may come with him.

Realizing the enormous changes that have taken place in agriculture, about 2 years ago I started out to find out who started the change, who is helping, and who intends to profit. I have made a very extensive survey and am glad to have the opportunity to tell you my findings.

The book, "Concept of Agribusiness," reminds me that history repeats itself again and again; there are always "little men" whose desire it is or has been to control the universe; others whose dream it is to control one or the other segment.

Before World War I, it was Kaiser Wilhelm's desire for power—something happened that ruined his chances.

Adolph Hitler gained by the mistakes made by his predecessor, and his determination was that no mistakes would be made. Hitler put his plans in book form under the title "Mein Kampf" known as the Nazi bible. The plan was for worldwide totalitarian rule—something happened that ruined his chances.

Most recent: you all know the story about Cuba. Farming land in Cuba has been taken from American capitalist owners and is being given back to Cuban farmers.

Now, in our United States, the present agribusiness plan took concrete form in 1944, when the president and fellows of Harvard College authorized the establishment of the Food Foundation under the administration of the business school. Donald David, while dean of the school, provided the inspiration for starting the program. In 1950, the basic idea gained new impetus when a generous gift of the late George Moffett provided an endowment for a professorship in agriculture and business. A major gift was made by Whitehall Foundation; other gifts from Southern States Co-op., Inc., the Cooperative Grange-League Federation Exchange, Inc., the Farm Bureau Cooperative Association of Ohio, and General Foods Corp.

Soon after he became Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, John H. Davis, another aspirant took over the project. Plans were reconstructed and completed in book form with the assistance of Ray Goldberg, officer and director of a Minnesota Seed & Grain Co., and Goldena Mills in North Dakota. The book, "Concept of Agribusiness," was published in 1957. The authors insist there must not be any mistakes this time, mistakes that were made in the past. The plan, according to the book, is to use the necessary measures to remove farm families from their homes and land.

I believe you are receiving the economic knowledge from the book and are being told how dynamic farming business is. The agribusiness approach is an evolutionary process which is geared to progress. The book is practically filled with facts and figures telling that farming is big business; but, the most important part of the book containing the plan is on pages 74 to 81 inclusive. I shall read one paragraph that is on page 77 so you can realize this barefaced and clear-cut statement of purpose:

"At least in the beginning stages, collaboration between groups probably can best take place informally, without any attempt to create a new superorganization. Coordinating committees, task groups, and ad hoc working parties can play an important role, provided due care is exercised in selecting leadership and provided the participating members actually desire to achieve results."

And another sentence:

"Among the items which need to be reappraised are such questions as * * * the responsibility of supply firms with respect to overproduction; and the responsibility of processor and distributors for market expansion and price behavior."

And a part of a paragraph:

"An important step in the direction of better research is closer teamwork at the university level between colleges and schools of agriculture and business administration. * * * An important duty of such experts would be the training of additional research workers and teachers for coping with agribusiness problems. In turn, agribusiness orientation should be given to the agricultural extension service, vocational agriculture, and similar programs."

It is intended that no stone be left unturned to remove farm families from their homes and land, and place the farming land, food, and fiber, into the ownership and control of capitalists, change the antitrust laws of the United States to "permit freedom from close restrictions for agribusiness," and to shift some or all of the responsibility of the U.S.D.A. to private enterprise.

You can know by the part paragraph that I read, why the American Farm Bureau, some farm advisors and vocational agriculture teachers are helping to remove farm families from their homes and land. Many very innocent career men and women, working under civil service for our State and National Government, principally USDA, also instructors in our public and private educational institutions, have or are helping agribusiness progress.

Apparently, depopulation of farms started with manipulation which caused the price paid to the farmer for cattle to be lower; many farmers lost heavily; many gave up trying to make a profit feeding cattle after 3 years of heavy losses. Hogs followed in line with cattle, also cotton. Then came broilers, milk, and presently eggs. I was feeding cattle and raising hogs and chickens when prices paid to farmers were declining, and I did not get back stock and feed costs. The prices received for grain have been gradually going down. After the farm products leave the farm, they make good profits for all groups, up to the consumer.

Cattle and hog prices paid to producers have increased greatly from the low, and contract-grower financers and the independent growers that kept on, have made a profit, but, according to recent USDA reports and warnings, one can expect another lowering of prices paid to farmers for beef and pork. No doubt, the agribusiness boys know there is another large supply of red meats that can be imported. It is my understanding that South American corn, ground, has been coming into the United States for years, duty free.

The farmer is told he is inefficient—that he must enlarge and raise more—and, he is told that too much is raised and there is a surplus, and, that is the reason the prices paid to him are low; too low, so he cannot make expenses.

Some months ago, Secretary Benson told farmers that "if you are not making money on your farm, then move off." Recently, he told chicken raisers that "if you are not making money in the chicken business, raise something else."

Mr. Sikes told you at noon today of the prosperous, happy contract growers in Georgia, all with fine buildings, modern homes with all the latest conveniences, furniture, appliances, television, and a good automobile. He did not tell you how much they owed on their financed deal—he did not tell how much equity the contract grower had left in his farm, and he did not tell how soon the farmer must leave his home and farm, if he would quit feeding.

Millions of dollars have been sent into different parts of our country through USDA to enlarge contract farming and as research, to smash the independent farm operator.

Independent growers have been receiving 14 to 15 cents per pound for broilers, which will not pay for the cost of chicks and feed when billed at legitimate prices.

We are told we farmers must increase our operations and raise more, so we will go broke or give up in despair sooner, and sell out to a ready buyer of our farm and home.

Six years ago the cattle raisers were storming Washington for relief; 5 years ago the hog raisers were there in large numbers; 3 years ago the broiler growers had their turn; presently, the egg producer. The papers are loaded with reports of meetings; next will be grain growers time—all the while the agribusiness boys keep working more aggressively—they "must not fail to act on opportunities open to them, opportunities which will be profitable to them."

George Washington's Military Birthplace, Cumberland, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 5, 1959, I introduced H.R. 7586, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to erect a monument at Fort Cumberland, Allegany County, Md., in honor of George Washington.

Very recently an article was published by Mr. J. William Hunt in his column, "Across the Desk," in the Sunday Times of Cumberland, Md., explaining in great historical detail the intimate association of George Washington with Cumberland, Md. Because of the unusual but little known historical events connecting our first President with Cumberland, I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as strong proof of the justification for H.R. 7586 and the monument at Fort Cumberland in honor of George Washington.

The article follows:

ACROSS THE DESK—POTENTIAL MILLIONS WOULD COME HERE TO SEE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL ON SITE OF HEADQUARTERS OF BRADDOCK EXPEDITION—AMERICAN SCHOOL CHILDREN INTRIGUED BY "BRADDOCK'S DEFEAT" AS BY "CUSTER'S LAST STAND"

(By J. William Hunt)

Much has been written concerning the events that projected Cumberland into world history in 1755. But to limit our consideration to the local happenings of 204 years ago is to fail to see the complete picture of the French and Indian wars of which the Braddock expedition was only a part.

In the effort to secure national support for a memorial here for George Washington, it is necessary to convince Congress that Cumberland's claim is based on more substantial grounds than a provincial desire to get a monument at Government expense.

A recently published novel based on the English-Colonial capture of Louisburg, far up on the Cape Breton (north of Halifax), makes much of the assumption that the campaign there marked the first united effort of the American Colonies in a military enterprise.

Louisburg, although captured in 1745 by New England militiamen in conjunction with a British fleet, was returned to French control by the Treaty of Aix La Chappelle in 1748, and was not finally brought under English rule until 1758, the same year that Forbes drove the French out of Fort Duquesne. In the 1745 campaign against Louisburg, it was largely Massachusetts militia that engaged in the effort, some Connecticut militia also participating. It must be remembered that New England (then consisting of four Colonies—Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Hampshire) was more or less homogeneous in racial stock, creed, and habits of thought and action. There was not the diversity of background that characterized Maryland, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, the Carolinas and other Colonies. Hence the assertion that Americans first united for military purposes in the 1745 capture of Louisburg from the French is not based on a correct appraisal of what colonial unity meant.

In that early effort against the French there were no colonial fighting men outside the homogeneous, compact militiamen from New England, mainly citizens of Massachusetts.

Four years before the second capture of Louisburg, Washington commanded troops from several Colonies with headquarters here, and a year later (1775) soldiers from seven Colonies were welded into a united force under Braddock and Washington while stationed at Fort Cumberland.

Braddock himself settled the question of the relative importance of the places from which attacks against the French were to be launched. He decided to take command of the main British-Colonial Army which would be based at Fort Cumberland for an attack on the French stronghold on the Ohio—Fort Duquesne.

Governor Shirley of Massachusetts was to lead an attack on Fort Niagara. Sir William Johnson was to strike at the French forts leading from north of Albany to the St. Lawrence, and a diversionary movement was to be launched against Fort Beausejour on the Canadian boundary.

Hence in the massed efforts of 1775 we find Braddock and Washington choosing Cumberland for their base of operations, assembling here the greatest British Army ever seen up to that time on the North American Continent.

This place, therefore, deserves national recognition for these basic reasons:

1. It was field headquarters for the Braddock Expedition. Every schoolchild has heard of Braddock's defeat, and potential millions of tourists would come here to see where that famous expedition had its headquarters.

2. It is the military birthplace and "West Point" of George Washington, according to his own words.

3. Here the Colonies first put into practice military cooperation, and learned (through Braddock's defeat) that British troops were not invincible. Many young Colonial soldiers were emboldened to fight for American independence 20 years later because of their experience at Fort Cumberland.

4. Washington's first public service started here in 1753 when he joined Christopher Gist and began his wilderness trek to the French commander on the Ohio.

5. Washington was first elected to public office while commanding troops at Fort Cumberland.

6. First designation of Washington as "commander in chief" came to him while he was on duty here. It was only commander in chief of Virginia Militia, but it presaged his later similar title as head of the Continental Army.

7. Washington's final appearance as commander of troops in the field was in Cumberland in 1794 when he was President of the United States.

These are but a few of the substantial reasons why a national memorial should be erected here to George Washington. And the ideal site, as Judge Morgan C. Harris has pointed out, is in the vicinity of the Allegany County Courthouse, which is located on a part of the land once occupied by historic Fort Cumberland.

No Business Like Show Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of a tedious session, I think all of us could use a smile. With that in mind I include a recent column by Tom Cawley, popular columnist for the Binghamton, N.Y., Press:

SO WHAT CREDITS YOU GOT, SAM?

(By Tom Cawley)

The ultimate in funnybone politics has been reached. Politics always has been funny, but the Democrats have now retired the trophy.

They've hired a clutch of Hollywood producers to put on their 1960 convention in California, by way of television.

The guy who is going to produce the spectacular is George Seaton, who writes and produces movies.

We can hear the rehearsals now.

The scene is the Coliseum in Los Angeles, 4 days before the convention is brought to order.

DIRECTOR. OK, OK., where's the bird we open on? Hey, you. What's your name?

MAN. RAYBURN. SAM RAYBURN.

DIRECTOR. RAYBURN? What credits you got? "Playhouse 90?" "Beat the Clock?" "Continental Classroom?" What's your best side?

RAYBURN. What?

DIRECTOR. Never mind. Stand there. No, not there. There. Now—lift that gavel. Not that high. You're killing the birdseye spot. Whattaya want, shadows all over? Whattaya think this is "Camera Three?" Look, buster, this is a political convention, and——

RAYBURN. I quit.

DIRECTOR. Sorehead. He's not tall enough, anyway. Are all Democrats that short? Hey, MANNY, get me a tall Democrat.

MANNY. Where do I get 'em? The casting office said you got to take your chances with these guys. There's one with a haircut from Massachusetts that takes full flat lighting, with two spots with barn doors, and there's a guy named JOHNSON from Texas who's never gonna make it 'cause he's as bald as Eisenhower and who can light Eisenhower. I mean, you seen them crumby lighting jobs from Washington, and that Montgomery's supposed to have something on the ball. No wonder they dropped his option, and I understand this Eisenhower's option is up, too, and——

DIRECTOR. Never mind, just get me somebody up here who can understand a cue. What's your name? Stevenson? OK, Stevenson, stand over there, where the chalk marks are. Not there. There. Now, just stand there while MANNY fixes the lights. Stop fidgeting.

STEVENSON. My name, sir, is Adali Stevenson, and, sir, while I appreciate the qualities of risibility in a situation like this, it does seem to me, that, as Kafka noted in one of his earlier pieces, that darkness always appears to be the warmest part of light, if you know what I mean——

DIRECTOR. Another wise guy (sighing). Some day, I'm going back to adult westerns.

Better Utilization of Water Resources in the Belle Fourche Irrigation District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, sent to me by the directors of the Belle Fourche Irrigation District, merits in my opinion the care-

ful consideration of the Congress and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation:

Whereas the water supply for irrigation of Belle Fourche project lands is becoming more limited each year; and

Whereas runoff records show reduced watershed yields; and

Whereas the amount of available water to the project lands during the past several years has been insufficient to produce crops on the project in quantities to justify increasing water assessments to the water users to meet increasing operation, maintenance, and replacement obligations of the district; and

Whereas the United States claims all waters as defined in article 33 of contract No. Ilr-1555, and that this water can possibly be put to further beneficial use on presently irrigated project lands: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors advise the Bureau of Reclamation of their concern over the seriousness of the water shortage that exists on the project, and that they recommend that the Bureau of Reclamation make a study to determine methods of better utilizing the water resources presently available. This study to include possible use of runoff in natural streams running through the project, return flows in drains and natural channels, underground water, improved efficiencies in water deliveries, possible changes in project operations, and a review of possible transdiversions from other watersheds.

Dated at Newell, S. Dak., this 4th day of August 1959.

By order of the board of directors of the Belle Fourche Irrigation District.

WM. A. YUILL,
President.

R. W. MELBERG,
PRESTON L. HILL,
RODNEY J. LARSON,
JOHN M. CAMPBELL,
FLOYDE V. RIGGS,
DAVID LUNGREN,
Directors.

Attest:

FLORENCE T. HEDMAN,
Secretary.

[SEAL]

Deficiencies in the National Defense Program in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, this is to follow up my previous comments in regard to deficiencies in the national defense program in Alaska. We must remind ourselves time and again that Alaska's strategic location as the corridor between Asia and North America must be fully utilized in terms of modern weapons capable of neutralizing the missile potential of the Russians found in their many military bases and missile sites in Eastern Siberia. Leaving Alaska vulnerable could result in its falling into the hands of the enemy, and in turn being used as a platform for easy range nuclear missile attacks against all our principal cities.

The point I make is well expressed in a recent editorial in the Anchorage Daily Times, from which I quote, as follows:

The defense forces in Alaska have always been inadequate for the job assigned to them.

Alaska has only recently acquired its first Nike installations. These ground-to-air interceptors were installed around many of the major cities of the 48 States before any were assigned here.

The use of the first Nike facilities certainly would have been more effective had they been placed in a strategic area such as Alaska.

Today the Nation's first facilities for intermediate range ballistic missiles are being built far from this important part of the world. The one nearest to Alaska is at Spokane, Wash. Because of the distance from Spokane to China and Russia, the short-range missiles will have relatively few important targets within shooting distance.

The same missiles located in the Aleutian Islands and on the Arctic shores of Alaska would have hundreds of important targets within their reach.

The Nation has yet to decide where launching facilities will be placed for the intercontinental missiles which are now approaching operational status. Will they be in Alaska where they can cover every major target in both China and Russia? Or will they be located farther south despite the fact that the number of available targets will be less?

This is alarming to Alaskans who recall the neglect that marked the approach to World War II, before they had full representation in Congress.

While the world was building up strength for the struggle that was imminent, Alaska saw virtually no defense activity. As a territory, the people saw their area neglected to the point where about 200 infantrymen at Chilkoot Barracks were the only strength here.

Alaska's Delegate in Congress made speeches about it, but the Nation ignored them. It was only when the crisis was at hand that action was taken. The Nation then spent a billion dollars under crash conditions, wasting funds and manpower and material in a frantic effort to catch up.

This should not happen again. The strategic importance of Alaska is known. The national leaders have learned to look at maps of the Polar projections instead of the old distorted maps invented by Mercator.

Dirty Money From a Desperate Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, last February I was informed that Trujillo had just arranged to spend $1 million to assist his public relations, then as now at a very low ebb, in the United States. My informant promised to tell me the names of the persons to whom money was to be given but because of fear for her life, which I well understood, she declined and left the United States for a country she regarded as safer.

On September 2 it was revealed that the Dominican Republic did indeed spend $750,000 with the Mutual Broadcasting System, that is, with certain gentlemen who are no longer associated with the Mutual Broadcasting System but who at that time were in charge.

Whatever else may be disputed in the criminal case which the Federal Government has filed against these gentlemen, it is a fact that the money was spent and that the Dominican Government is now suing these gentlemen for the return of the money.

I believe it is only a question of time until Government investigators or an alert journalist will discover where the rest of this $1 million was spent in Trujillo's desperate effort to make Americans think he and his Government are worthy of respect.

Under a previous consent I include an item from Printer's Ink dated February 27, 1959, and an article from the New York Times of September 2, 1959:

[From Printers' Ink, Feb. 27, 1959]

NEW BUSINESS FROM TRUJILLO?

Representative CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat, of Oregon, long a foe of Latin American dictators in general and Gen. Rafael Leonidas Trujillo, of the Dominican Republic, in particular, is now hard at work to link Trujillo money with six American advertising agencies. According to PORTER, Trujillo is financing an advertising campaign in the United States with a $1 million gift presented to him by Fulgencio Batista, the deposed Cuban dictator, now in the Dominican Republic.

Sources close to Dominican matters say that PORTER's theory is highly unlikely. Batista and Trujillo are old enemies, and Trujillo has little need of Batista's money. In addition, Trujillo, who closed down his public relations account with Harry Klemfuss Associates last December, has never renewed this business, which he thinks is a waste of time and money. International agency people here point out, moreover, that a $1 million account split six ways and tied to a dictator would interest few agencies.

Nevertheless, PORTER insists that his information comes from reliable sources and that it is only a matter of time before the whole matter will be out in the open. In the meantime, several Government departments are making their own investigations, according to the Congressman.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 2, 1959]

GUTERMA AND TWO AIDS INDICTED AS TRUJILLO AGENTS IN RADIO DEAL

(By Anthony Lewis)

WASHINGTON, September 1.—Three former officers of the Mutual Broadcasting System were accused today of having accepted $750,000 from the Dominican Republic to broadcast its propaganda.

A Federal grand jury here charged that Alexander L. Guterma, Hal Roach, Jr., and Garland L. Culpepper, Jr., had not registered as foreign agents after making the deal. The indictment was announced by the Attorney General, William P. Rogers.

Mr. Guterma, who bore the reputation of a financial wizard for some years, was indicted just last week by a Federal grand jury in New York in a stock fraud scheme said to have netted him $1 million. Two other fraud indictments have also been returned against him.

Mutual was bought in September 1958 by the Guterma-controlled Hal Roach Studios. Mr. Guterma became president of the network. Later Mr. Roach took the post of board chairman, and Mr. Culpepper, a New York lawyer, became vice president and secretary.

Messrs. Guterma and Culpepper resigned from Mutual on February 12. Controlling

interest in the network was sold to Mr. Roach. He dropped out on March 22, and control went to Malcolm E. Smith, Jr.

Last July the network filed a bankruptcy petition showing assets of $579,607 and liabilities of $3,195,207. Robert F. Hurleigh, a Mutual newscaster, obtained 100 percent of the stock and took over as president under court orders.

Today's indictment sounded at times like a fictional tale of international intrigue.

It brought in the names of Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molinas, dictator of the Dominican Republic, and Porfirio Rubirosa, the playboy-diplomat who was once married to Barbara Hutton. Mr. Rubirosa was Dominican Ambassador to Cuba at the time of the alleged events. He is now Ambassador to Belgium.

The incident charged that on or about last January 30 Mr. Guterma and Mr. Roach met in the Dominican Republic with Otto Vega, a Dominican official.

At that and other meetings, the indictment charged, the Mutual officers agreed to become publicity agents for the Dominican Government and to disseminate within the United States political propaganda on behalf of and favorable to the Dominican Republic.

The indictment said the defendants had agreed to feed propaganda on to the Mutual network under the guise of bona fide and genuine news items concealing the fact that such political propaganda was to be actually provided by the Dominican Government and that $750,000 was to be paid.

According to the indictment, Messrs. Guterma and Roach received the promised $750,000 from Mr. Vega on or about last February 6 in the Dominican Republic.

Whether the Trujillo government got its money's worth was not made clear in the allegations. The indictment said in one place that Mutual made certain broadcasts last February, but these were not identified. Mr. Guterma was out of Mutual 6 days after the alleged payment.

The indictment accused the defendants of conspiring to avoid registration as foreign agents and of actually not registering. The Government will have to prove that the defendants were in fact Dominican agents.

Mr. Roach and Mr. Culpepper asserted their innocence today in public statements. There was no comment from Mr. Guterma, who is reported to be in Florida. The Dominican Embassy here also declined to comment.

Mr. Roach, in Los Angeles, said:

"I am not now, have not been in the past, and would never be an agent for a foreign government. I am absolutely confident that I will be cleared of the charges when the facts are presented in court."

Mr. Culpepper's denial came through an attorney, Jacob L. Rosenblum, in New York. Mr. Rosenblum said "from the facts available to me I am confident that Mr. Culpepper has not violated any law and will be exonerated."

NO CONNECTION WITH MUTUAL

Mutual's current president, Mr. Hurleigh, said neither the present management of the network nor its employees had "any knowledge of or connection with the matters" charged.

There were three counts in the indictment. The first accuse Mr. Guterma and Mr. Roach of failing to register. The second charged that all three defendants with not registering Mutual as an agent. The third alleged a conspiracy by the three to avoid registration.

Each count carries a maximum penalty of $10,000 and five years' imprisonment.

Mutual, which calls itself "the world's largest network," does not own any stations. It contracts with independent radio outlets to handle its programs.

Last winter the network was reported to have 453 stations connected by 24,000 miles of telephone lines.

It was reported here today that the leads to the asserted deal with the Dominican Government came from the Securities and Exchange Commission investigation of Mr. Guterma's affairs.

OTHER INDICTMENTS

Mr. Guterma is under other indictments in Federal courts here. He was indicted last March on charges of having tried to defraud the Government and investors by failing to file necessary reports with the Securities and Exchange Commission about the financial status of the F. L. Jacobs Co. when it was under his control.

He was also indicted last March on charges of fraud against the Bon Ami Company when under his control.

Last month Mr. Guterma and Lowell M. Birrell, another financier, were indicted on charges of fraud in stock schemes when they controlled the United Dye and Chemical Corporation, now known as Chemoil Industries.

Mr. Guterma has denied all the charges. Mr. Birrell is a fugitive from justice in Brazil.

Order of Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius at Danville, Pa., Observe Golden Jubilee Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Tuesday, September 8, 1959, which reports the golden jubilee observed this week by the Order of Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius at Danville, Pa.

[From the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, Sept. 8, 1959]

ORDER MARKS ANNIVERSARY—4,000 ATTEND SERVICES AT DANVILLE

The Order of Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius at Danville climaxed its golden jubilee yesterday with a day of prayer highlighted by two high masses. Some 4,000 persons from throughout the eastern United States visited the St. Cyril Academy.

Both masses, one in the morning and the other in the afternoon, were celebrated outdoors. The morning mass was said in Latin and the afternoon mass in Slavonic. It was reported to be the second time in the history of the hemisphere that a mass was said in Slavonic.

Rev. Michael C. Bernat, pastor of Sacred Heart Slovak Church, North Main Street, city, and Sisters of the Sts. Cyril and Methodius Order who teach in the parish elementary school, were among the thousands in attendance. Reverend Father Bernat was honorary subdeacon for the afternoon mass.

Celebrant of the first mass was Bishop George L. Leech of Harrisburg. Bishop Leech gave the English sermon and Rt. Rev. Michael C. Polcha gave a sermon in Slovak.

Bishop Andrew G. Grutka of Gary, Ind., celebrated the afternoon Roman-Slavonic Pontificial high mass and gave the sermon. Message of greeting from Pope John XXIII was read. Another greeting came from Most Rev. Egidio Vagnozzi, apostolic delegate.

Final event of the year-long celebration will come Friday when the third and final Roman-Slavonic mass will be celebrated by Rev. Michael Lacko, S.J.

Order of Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius was founded 50 years ago and a Wilkes-Barre young woman was among the first three to take its vows. She was Mary Pauly, who became Sister M. Emmanuel, and who served as the second superior general of the order.

First motherhouse, located at Middletown, Pa., was moved to Danville in 1919 with the purchase by the order of a former Danville mansion. Half the newly acquired building was reserved for a high school for the education of girls, and the cornerstone of the present St. Cyril Academy was laid in 1929.

Chapel was added in 1939 and in 1957 the structure which houses St. Methodist Convent for the Sisters, and St. Philomena Residence for students, was dedicated.

There are 397 professed members in charge of 36 schools, including the elementary school on North Main Street. The order also conducts a reading clinic in Sacred Heart School.

Resolutions by Committee on Aeronautics and Space of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the 41st annual convention of the American Legion met at Minneapolis-St. Paul August 24–27, 1959. I was privileged to attend this convention and participate in its deliberations. The following resolutions emanating from the committee on aeronautics and space were adopted, and I commend them to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION NO. 637, CONVENTION AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COMMITTEE—INVESTIGATE NAVAL AND COMMERCIAL USES OF THE AIRSHIP, RIGID AND NONRIGID

Whereas the American Legion, pursuant to mandates of national resolutions adopted unanimously by the 39th national convention of the American Legion, at Atlantic City, N.J., September 18, 1957, and again, unanimously, at the 40th national convention at Chicago, Ill., September 1, 1958, did call upon and strongly urge the Congress of the United States, the Department of Defense, and then by redirection, the Department of the Navy and the Department of Commerce, to thoroughly investigate the potential and uses of the airship, rigid and nonrigid, in the defense and commerce of this Nation, and that they implement their findings with legislation, organization, and funds necessary, which resolution originated with the national security commission at the conventions noted; and

Whereas these mandates have been called to the attention of the directees in said resolutions; and

Whereas we have been unable to obtain any specific information which would indicate that such thorough investigation is being made; and

Whereas the Department of Defense and the Navy Department particularly have been

reemphasizing the dangers to this country from atomic-missile-equipped submarines of a possible attacking power; and

Whereas airships thoroughly demonstrated their ability as antisubmarine apparatus during war one, and again with added effectiveness in war two; and

Whereas this Nation is the only one presently known to have the manufacturing facilities, the nonflammable helium gas necessary to efficiently and safely operate airships and the organization of trained military and commercial personnel capable of operating and maintaining airships; and

Whereas all of these unique lighter-than-air assets are being dissipated and diminished because of the apparent lack of interest of the governmental activities having cognizance thereof; and

Whereas a further widening use of this unique weapon, namely a nuclear-powered airship with a consequent wider application in the defense of this country, and particularly in antisubmarine warfare, has been submitted to the governmental agency having cognizance for consideration.

Now, therefore, in view of the above, and the particular danger to this country from missile-equipped submarines, be it

Resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, That the resolutions passed at the last two conventions be forcefully called to the attention of the Congress of the United States, the Department of Defense, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Commerce, and be it further

Resolved, That because of the inaction, lack of interest, or other unknown reasons, resulting in the lack of the investigation requested by the American Legion over the past 2 years, or any reasonable or specific information thereon, and because of the imminent danger from the submarines noted, and because of the apparent possible widened value from a nuclear-powered airship, and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be directed to the President of the United States for his attention, and our respectful plea for action so that the investigation called for herein will go forward promptly and fully, and that the findings will be implemented with legislation, and such organization as may be necessary and with the funds that may be required.

RESOLUTION NO. 635, CONVENTION COMMITTEE ON AERONAUTICS AND SPACE—PROMOTE USE OF HELICOPTERS

Whereas the helicopter has proved itself a useful and versatile vehicle for both military and peaceful uses; and

Whereas there is need for increased emphasis on the many services the helicopter offers to enhance our way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in national convention, assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, does reaffirm the principles and objectives of Resolution 639 adopted by the 40th national convention to the end that we promote and encourage the development and use of helicopters and the passage of necessary ordinances and regulations as will permit their efficient operation.

RESOLUTION NO. 80—MASSACHUSETTS—ARM ALL MILITARY PLANES FLYING IN OR NEAR A RADIUS OF COMMUNIST-HELD TERRITORY—THIS CONSOLIDATES RESOLUTIONS NO. 371, NEW YORK, AND NO. 609, LOUISIANA

Whereas American aircraft flying on routine assignments near Communist-dominated countries have on occasion been fired upon resulting in injury, loss of life and valuable equipment; and

Whereas our Government has documented the deliberateness of some of these unwarranted attacks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion assembled in national convention in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, That all American aircraft required by their official duties to fly in the vicinity of Communist-dominated countries be adequately armed to properly defend themselves or that they be escorted on such flights by properly armed escorts.

Mr. Speaker, the following resolution from the Naval Affairs Committee:

RESOLUTION NO. 638 (CONVENTION COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS) ANTISUBMARINE WARFARE

Whereas the danger to our national survival posed by the Soviet submarine force increases daily; and

Whereas our control of the world's oceans would isolate the enemy to his own land mass, giving us access to 85 percent of the earth's surface insurance and maintenance of the free world's vital sealanes of communications; and

Whereas an entirely new antisubmarine defense requirement has arisen with the ballistic missile launching capability of many of the Soviet submarines in the foreseeable future; and

Whereas in this event no point in the United States would be outside the range of missiles launched from unpredictable submarine-launching sites; and

Whereas the security of our Nation is increasingly dependent upon the U.S. Navy's ability to successfully combat the enemy submarine threat, of approximately 500 submarines: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the national convention of the American Legion assembled in Minneapolis, Minn., August 24–27, 1959, etc., support whatever legislative and executive action be required to insure that the Navy is provided with competent personnel, capabilities, equipment, ships and weapons to counter successfully this threat to our Nation's survival.

Prohibition's Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at the very outset of these remarks I want to get one thing straight—I am not a prohibitionist.

Perhaps it is not necessary for me to reaffirm my strong antiprohibition sentiments but I wanted to repeat them to make certain that what I am going to say will not be distorted or misinterpreted. It is because I am so strongly opposed to prohibition that I am compelled to bring to the attention of the House the things which I am going to say as a warning not to allow prohibition to sneak up on us on our blind side as it did once before.

There were those before the advent of the "noble experiment" who thought it couldn't happen, but it did happen.

There are those now who think that prohibition cannot happen again, but it can if those of us who are so strong against it do not recognize what is going on about us and do something about it.

When Oklahoma recently went wet it was pointed out that only one State in the Union, Mississippi, remained "legally dry."

A real eye opener would be to tabulate the counties of the several States and find out how many are "legally dry" especially in some recognized wet States and have become so since the repeal of prohibition.

The prohibitionists have never ceased their fight to return this country to the dry calendar. They are still about their business and are taking every advantage of situations and conditions which will lend themselves to an argument in favor of the return of prohibition, first on a local option basis and then on a nationwide scale.

Let us look the facts right straight in the eye.

I, personally, make no secret of the fact that I consider myself a pretty fair "country two-fisted drinker" and have demonstrated it on many an occasion through the years. The fact that I can hold my own is something with which I had nothing to do. I just happened to be born that way. I am not allergic to alcohol but there are many things to which I am allergic and to which other people are not allergic.

Some people are allergic to the effects of one of the greatest miracle drugs of times—penicillin. They had nothing to do with it, they were born that way.

Some people are allergic to dust through no fault of their own; others to weeds or grass or vegetables.

And some people are simply allergic to alcohol.

Let us be sensible about this whole business and face the facts of life and do something realistic about it.

Recent developments here in the District of Columbia cause me to wonder whether the words of an old epigram of unknown authorship which reads "God looks after fools, drunkards, and the United States" are being taken too literally. My particular concern at this moment is with the measures which are being taken in the District to effect the scientific treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. Some of you will recall that I was the author of a bill to establish an alcoholic clinic in the District of Columbia to do something to help and rehabilitate excessive and compulsive drinkers here in Washington. This bill—Public Law 347—was approved by the 80th Congress on August 4, 1947. Now after nearly 12 years have passed, I am dismayed to find that we are still a long way from accomplishing the purposes of this act which had the unanimous approval of the Congress. I beg your indulgence for a few moments to bring you up to date on the problem of alcoholism generally and specifically in the District of Columbia; to tell you something about the shortcomings and weaknesses in the District program for the alleviation of alcoholism, and to outline for you some further steps which must be taken to strengthen the alco-

holic rehabilitation program and increase its effectiveness.

In spite of the fact that there is some lack of agreement as to the exact size and nature of the problem of alcoholism no one disagrees that it is a serious problem here and elsewhere in the United States. Some consider it a sin, others a vice, and there are those who think of it as a disease or a symptom of a disease. In some circles there is no distinction made between so called social drinking on the one hand and outright "alcoholism" on the other. Most people agree that there are "problem drinkers." The more precise definition of such individuals in terms of the psychiatrists and the behavior scientists is a person who has a chronic behavioral disorder manifested by repeated drinking of alcoholic beverages in excess of his dietary needs and the social standards of the community and to an extent that interferes with the drinker's health or his social or economic functioning.

Applying a definition of this kind, it has been estimated that there are nearly 5 million alcoholics in the United States, only a small proportion of which are found on skid row. For instance, it has been estimated that there are 1½ million alcoholics employed in business and industry. It has been estimated that alcoholism results in an annual economic loss to industry of $1 billion through accidents, work spoilage, and absenteeism. In the District of Columbia it is said that there are nearly 50,000 alcoholics, for an average of 7.8 percent of every 100,000 adults. It has been definitely proven that the sale of alcohol in the District of Columbia is over twice the amount per capita as elsewhere in the country. Here it is 4.6 gallons per capita per year. In the country as a whole it is less than 2 gallons. These are some of the facts which have caused medical authorities to recognize alcoholism as a major public health problem.

Happily, experience has shown that alcoholics can be helped and rehabilitated. The integration of scientific knowledge and treatment techniques into community programs offers a means of controlling and preventing this devastating condition. During the past 15 years, 38 States and the District of Columbia have enacted legislation authorizing specific programs on alcoholism and establishing provisions to attack the problem through research, treatment, and education. Thirty-two of these programs have specific services for treatment and rehabilitation, and the District of Columbia is among these. These programs operate a total of 122 alcoholic clinics. In 1956 these agencies expended over $3 million on a total of nearly 23,000 cases. Unfortunately, many programs have been hampered by inadequate funds.

Now, let us take a brief look at the alcoholism picture here in the District. More than 1,600 chronic alcoholics are admitted to the psychiatric service of the District of Columbia General Hospital each year. These patients remained in the hospital for an average period of three days. Each year, about 1,000 alcoholics voluntarily share the limited resources at the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Clinic which is operated by the Department of Public Health. Perhaps the most grievous figure is that of the number of persons who are arrested by the Metropolitan police for intoxication. For instance, in the year 1956 there were 40,000 arrests for intoxication, 16,000 of which resulted in prison commitment. Consider for a moment that the average daily drunk population in the District prisons exceeds 1,200.

I have it on good authority that if one totals up the cost of handling chronic alcoholics by police, courts, prisons, the Clinic and hospitals, in the District, it is found to be nearly $2 million a year. The saddest part of the whole business is the inadequacy of present methods. Obviously, a program which spends so much on arresting and jailing alcoholics offers little to the so called "social alcoholic" who, when arrested, ordinarly forfeits collateral and is released to his family, going unnoticed until he is again arrested. By the same token, a program of this kind has little to offer the "skid row chronic alcoholic" who has no home, family or other social ties in the community and whose rehabilitation requires intensive treatment rather than imprisonment. As presently managed in the District, alcoholism results in overworked police and courts, overcrowded prisons, and only very limited treatment and rehabilitation. There is no better indicator of the ineffectiveness of the program than the high rate of recidivism among those arrested for intoxication. One study showed that 68 percent of those arrested were repeaters, many having a record of 12 prior arrests for the same offense.

Unfortunately, very little has been done to reverse the growing trend of drunk arrests so that the problem of alcoholism in the District continues relatively unabated. All of this is a source of grave personal disappointment to me since I had high hopes that the passage of Public Law 347 would offer some relief from this unsatisfactory situation. You will recall that this act provided that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be authorized and directed to establish clinic and hospital facilities for the treatment and study of chronic alcoholics who become known to the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. As originally conceived, the alcoholic clinic established by this act was to have resources and personnel to enable it to carry on an effective treatment, rehabilitation and education program, and to permit it to effect close liaison with the courts, hospitals and other agencies concerned with the management of alcoholism. The act stipulated that 10 percent of the annual fees for licenses for the manufacture or sale of alcoholic beverages were to be permanently appropriated to carry out the purposes of the act.

Now I must report to you the sad fact that we have fallen far short of realizing the constructive and vitally important aims of the act. For some time now, the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Clinic, which is the keystone of the program, has been severely handicapped by lack of funds and personnel. Although the 1958 annual report of Public Health Service Advisory Council for the District of Columbia indicates death rates from cirrhosis of the liver—which is correlated with alcoholism—was much higher than for several diseases including tuberculosis, the investment of funds for combating alcoholism remains pitifully small compared with money spent on these other ailments. The clinic program, which opened in 1950, with a budget in the neighborhood of $100,000 has subsequently had its funds drastically reduced when the portion of the license fees allotted for its operation was cut to 6 percent.

Although more than $10 million was collected in taxes on liquor in 1958 in the District of Columbia, less than $70,000 was devoted to salvaging the victims of alcoholism through the clinic program. It seems almost inconceivable to me that an alert Board of Commissioners and the public could have permitted this to have happened. I am even more concerned about the apparent apathy which permits this most unsatisfactory arrangement to continue. I ask you, How may a program of this kind be expected to grow and increase in effectiveness when its appropriations are so drastically reduced?

Let me tell you how this has affected the staffing pattern at the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Center. I am advised that its full-time staff now consists of two psychiatrists, three social workers, three clerks, and one psychologist. Physical examinations are conducted by a physician who visits the clinic on a part-time basis. Since there is no provision for an administrative officer, one of the full-time psychiatrists must devote a good portion of his time to the purely administrative responsibilities of the clinic. In addition, the clinic does not have any health educator on its staff nor does it have any nurses or occupational therapists.

It is only through the dedicated spirit of this limited staff that any good results are obtained with the thousand or so patients seen annually by the clinic. To give you an idea of the kind of results obtained at the clinic, I would like to tell you about one of their cases. This man, who voluntarily applied for treatment, was 40 years old at the time of his admission. He was married and had a young son. Employed as a taxi operator, this man was known to be an intelligent and capable person who was strongly critical of himself because of his lack of achievement. His drinking began as a teenager and he observed that it helped him to overcome his timidity when with other people. By the age of 29 he had had an episode of delirium tremens during which he attempted suicide. When he came to the clinic, he had reached the point that he was unable to control his drinking which caused him to be incapable of working nearly a third of the time. In spite of his wife's effort to supplement the family income, they were hard pressed to meet their obligations.

At the clinic, this man participated in group therapy sessions and also under-

went treatment with the drug antabuse. Although he showed some improvement under these treatments, he did not attain continuing sobriety until he was placed under individual psychiatric treatment. This treatment enabled him to gain a better understanding of himself, enhancing his confidence in himself and enabling him to deal with his underlying fears and anxieties without returning to the excessive use of alcohol. The clinic staff points with pride to the fact that this man has now remained completely sober for the past 5½ years. His homelife with his family is greatly improved and he is employing his leisure time in constructive activities. His wife is grateful to the clinic for their help and the patient is finding new happiness in his increased self-esteem and self-confidence.

It should be readily apparent that increasing the number of psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers will permit the treatment activities to be expanded and will also permit more intensive efforts with those who come to the clinic for help. It is doubtful that the clinic will accomplish much in the way of education and the promotion of temperance until at least one health educator is placed on the staff.

But these are only some of the immediate needs of the program. In addition, the inpatient hospital facilities for alcoholics must be expanded. The present practice of hospitalizing alcoholics for a brief 5-day-or-so drying-out period and then sending them out into the streets withoutany followup accomplishes very little in the way of rehabilitation. Expansion of the clinic staff and facilities would make it possible to offer followup treatment to alcoholics after they have been discharged from the hospital. This should greatly improve the results obtained.

Under present conditions, the clinic often must improvise arrangements for the care of alcoholics who are in need of hospital care, which is not available. More hospital beds for alcoholic patients are urgently needed to remedy this unsatisfactory situation.

The establishment of a halfway house facility would also add greatly to the strength of the program. Such a facility would provide a situation for the continued care of patients who are well enough to be out of the hospital, but still require some degree of formal supervision.

Let me emphasize again my belief that we have a grave responsibility to take some action to increase the resources for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics in this city. We must insure adequate clinical facilities for their diagnosis and treatment. When adequate facilities for the medical diagnosis and treatment of alcoholism are available, the stigma of alcoholism will no longer be a problem; public support will have been gained. Adequate facilities must include resources for education and for the dissemination of information and the coordination of all of the various agencies and activities which are, and should be, concerned with this problem. We must enlist the complete cooperation of the medical profession as well as that of the law enforcement people and all social agencies concerned. Also, expansion of treatment facilities should go hand in hand with research. A treatment program incorporating all that we know will be the best place in which to learn what we do not know and what more we need to know. Research should follow such an activity and, in fact, be a part of it.

In urging this action I am not speaking as "teetotaler" or a "blue nose" or "killjoy." I am simply presenting for the attention of Congress and action by the District Commissioners an inescapable health problem demanding attention and constructive action. Here is a case where "one man's meat is another man's poison." Senseless efforts to sweep it under the rug spell only disappointment and disaster. Let us begin to chip away at it straightforwardly and intelligently. We have appropriated this year upward of $221,584,000 for cancer, heart disease, mental illness, and a dozen other of mankind's killers. I am all for that but also I am for making at least a token effort to do something about a public health problem as baffling and widespread as any for which we have appropriated so much.

Future at Stake

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith an excellent editorial on the highway legislation, written by Mr. Verne McKinney of the Hillsboro Argus, of Hillsboro, Oreg.:

FUTURE AT STAKE

Will 3 years of progress come to a halt? The Interstate Defense Highway System, which has pumped so much new lifeblood into the veins of Oregon's economy, will halt unless something is done about it.

Now, the public is faced with superhighways that end in plowed fields, with continued use of present cramped and obsolete roads and with increased auto fatalities and property losses every year.

Contracts totaling $138 million have been awarded to low bidders, most of whom are Oregon contractors. Furthermore, contracts totaling $38 million are ready to be let when money again becomes available. Oregon's economy has grown with the program and the State is prospering, driving is safer. This is the progress of the 3 years. Now, because of the lack of positive legislative action, funds for new roads are not available.

Can this be afforded? Unnecessary loss of life and property will increase. Manufacturers, supplying roadbuilders and using the vital transportation arteries, will lose production. Contractors will be out of jobs, facing large equipment losses. A vast throng of skilled production workers will be idled. The rising economy will be blighted with everyone sharing in the loss.

To help avoid this loss, you can write or wire now to your Congressman and Senators. Urge them to reorganize and reestablish the sources of revenue to keep the Interstate Defense Highway System under construction at the present pace.

The House Ways and Means Committee has approved a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax, but this still must pass the House and Senate. An improved highway system, not only makes for safer driving, it also saves wear and tear on automobiles to make up for the extra gas tax.

The Great White Fleet Proposal Gathers Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of the Great White Fleet proposal, I am most gratified by the continuing support which this imaginative idea has been given by my fellow South Dakotans.

This proposal for utilizing our farm surpluses and medical and technical capacity in conjunction with a world-wide mercy fleet, composed of idle naval vessels, could dramatize with great effectiveness the peaceful intentions of the American people.

It is obvious that such a fleet supported by voluntary contributions could not solve the enormous problems of poverty, disease, and ignorance in the underdeveloped areas of the world. The White Fleet mission, however, would have a mighty impact upon world public opinion. It would go a long way in providing greater foreign policy initiative for the United States.

In an earlier speech on the House floor, I summarized some of the supporting statements which I have received from South Dakotans relative to this humanitarian project. Since that time, many others have written me. There follows brief excerpts from some of the letters my constituents have written on this matter:

"I am sure the people of foreign countries, who are sick and hungry, will remember doctors, food and clothing much longer than the American dollar" (Henry Dertien, Jr., Platte, S. Dak.).

"Very good indeed" (George Malone, Porcupine, S. Dak.).

"We should do less muscle flexing and more heart stretching" (Dave Pearson, Brookings, S. Dak.).

"Put the White Fleet into service" (William Dafnis, Aberdeen, S. Dak.).

"Pleased" (Joe Johnson, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.).

"Hope that you and your fellow Members of Congress may be instrumental in getting it started" (Clifford Grant, Redfield, S. Dak.).

"Deserving of unanimous support" (Ralph Rogers, Sioux Falls, manager of Lakeside Dairy Co.).

"It sounds good" (Marvin Norling, Jr., Mitchell, S. Dak.).

"A wonderful idea" (Ruth Herdliska, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.).

"Wonderful. It makes more sense than most foreign aid" (Clark and Marguerite Newman, Aberdeen, S. Dak.).

"The best idea to come before the public in a long time" (Richard and Grayce Johnsen, Redfield, S. Dak.).

"We pray that it will indeed become an actual reality" (Mr. and Mrs. E. T. Keeler, Lead, S. Dak.).

"A splendid and bold proposal for peace" (Mrs. Clarence Long, Mr. and Mrs. Arne Matteson, Mr. and Mrs. John Taylor, Terraville, S. Dak.).

"Highly in favor of" (Clarence Biggs, Deadwood, S. Dak.).

"We think it would be wonderful; we have been talking to every one about it" (Mr. and Mrs. Harry Carlson, Pollock, S. Dak.).

"I believe the quotation about 'bread cast upon the waters' would apply here and present a strong appeal to all peace-loving nations of the world" (E. N. Tullar, Lennox, S. Dak.).

"A wondeful idea" (J. A. Swan family, Fort Pierre; H. C. Tompers, New Underwood; John Mickel, White River).

"Only way of reaching many of the hungry people" (Carl T. Wright, Rapid City).

"It can capture the imagination of the world's people" (Rev. Richard Moberly, Doland).

"The help would come from all the people of America" (I. T. Kolbu, Red Owl, S. Dak.).

"Highly in favor of" (Carrie and Albert Olsen, St. Lawrence).

"An idea that we Americans should wholeheartedly and enthusiastically support" (Lloyd Hardy, Brookings, S. Dak.).

"Our obligation to the underfed populations of the world" (Mrs. W. G. Frederick, Sioux Falls).

"A good idea" (Milber Keller Chamberlain; Delmar Farming, Sioux Falls).

"I am in thorough agreement with the idea" (T. A. Overby, Aberdeen).

"The worthiest motives prompted the plan" (Cliff Cook, Sturgis).

"It doesn't make sense for us to be burdened with overproduction when part of the world is starving" (E. S. Heglin, Beresford).

"Much more sensible to confront starving peoples with food, clothing, and medicine, than to go parading our outmoded war paraphernalia" (Rev. Reuben Tanquist, Highmore).

"Will do more good than furnishing them arms to fight with" (Henry Briscoe, Gettysburg).

"I agree with you 100 percent" (William Butzow, Aberdeen).

"We favor the proposal" (Mr. and Mrs. Gerrit De Young, Sioux Falls).

"Brotherly love and going the second mile will do more to further peace than hate and atomic war" (Mr. and Mrs. Tom Mani, Milbank).

"A wonderful thing" (J. H. Cotton, Huron, S. Dak.).

"Hope you will use all efforts to put it into effect" (Marjorie Radabaugh, Fulton).

"We should move this food to our starving brethren" (Johnnie Miller, Flandreau).

"A most noble cause to which any thinking citizen would subscribe" (Rudolph Brown, Parkston).

"The finest thing your newsletters have ever contained" (W. E. Bishop, Sioux Falls).

"A great demonstration of Christlike service" (Mrs. Rosa Sell, Springfield).

"The idea has exceptional merit" (Thomas Roby, Watertown).

"A great idea" (Arvid Anderson, Erwin).

"Keep plugging for this" (John W. Smith, Eureka).

"Would give proof of the qualities for which this Nation was founded" (Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Symens, Claremont).

"I hope that the project will find favorable response" (Rev. Harvey Sander, Rapid City District Superintendent).

"I am sure there are enough good men in Government to put it into action" (Mrs. Ann Rutan, Chamberlain).

"Very effective in combating communism" (Maude Linahan, Sioux Falls).

"The most important task of mankind is to build a world where peace can be maintained with honor and dignity" (H. P. Chilson, Webster, president, Elevator Store Co.).

"The real challenge is to 'do unto others as we would like to have done to us' if we were in the same pitiable predicament" (Pastor E. W. Haygeman, Garretson).

"I think this is a wonderful thought, to let people know we are trying to help them instead of destroying them" (Mrs. O. P. Corcoran, Miller).

"An excellent proposal" (Elmer Cwach, Spearfish).

"A wonderful step forward" (Guy Varns, Sioux Falls).

"Could we have the wonderful motto 'In God We Trust' on these ships to show other peoples from whence we get our inspirations and strength?" (Mrs. J. J. Keegan, Aberdeen).

"Terrific idea" (S. R. Polus, Sioux Falls).

"I am very much in accord with feeding the hungry (Elmer Howell, Leola).

"I made an announcement in this regard at our church services last Sunday and I want to express my own support of this bold and imaginative move" (Pastor Johan Thorson, Aberdeen).

"The best idea for peace yet. Boys in the service could get their later training manning the ships and passing out the help. This could give them compassion and world understanding that no army camp could do, besides giving them friends around the world" (Mr. and Mrs. Decil; Cecil and Della Bartholow, Huron, S. Dak.).

House Sustains Veto of Rivers-Harbors Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the need for item veto power by our President was never more clearly demonstarted than it was today in the vote on the public works appropriation bill.

There is no doubt about the feelings of the watchdogs of governmental procedures, our newspapers, which have performed such a worthwhile service throughout the Nation.

May I call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which appeared recently in the Pontiac Press on the dire need for such changes to permit our President to delete objectionable items in appropriation bills. Its editor and publisher, Mr. John Fitzgerald and Mr. Harold Fitzgerald, have shown a great deal of courage and foresight in their news columns and editorial pages in keeping a large number of my constituents informed of happenings which directly affect their readers. There is no doubt of the effect of the House action today. It will either mean more taxes or less purchasing power for those who are footing the bills for us here in Washington.

Following is the editorial:

HOUSE SUSTAINS VETO OF RIVERS-HARBORS BILL

By a matter of one vote the House sustained President Eisenhower's veto of the public works "pork barrel" appropriation bill. The measure now goes to the Senate.

This is the third time in 3 years that the President has refused Congress' first try at slipping through a padded list of river and harbor projects with something for everyone.

The vetoed bill would have appropriated $1.2 billion for Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. No doubt many of the projects are needed but Congress included funds for 67 unbudgeted new ones in 32 States. Last January Mr. Eisenhower pointed out that many civil works already were in progress and that there was no need for more new starts.

The 67 unbudgeted items would have cost $50 million the first year ($30 million more than the budget message had proposed) but would ultimately cost $800 million. This, the President warned, is a built-in future budget boost and an abandonment of fiscal responsibility.

Unfortunately the President hasn't any power of item veto. He cannot delete objectionable parts of an appropriation bill. It's all or nothing. Politicians don't want him to have this power. It would interfere with the narrow interests of their constituents.

Edmund P. Radwan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, we have been saddened by the passing of a former Member of this body who served here with great distinction and credit to himself, his State, and our Nation. I am speaking of Edmund P. Radwan of Buffalo, N.Y., who entered the House of Representatives with the 82d Congress and served until illness caused him to retire last year. He was a sincere, energetic and devoted servant of his constituents and of the Nation. We regret exceedingly his untimely passing and extend our deepest sympathy to his wife and family.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News of Tuesday, September 8, 1959:

EDMUND P. RADWAN

Ill health last year compelled the retirement of Edmund P. Radwan after four terms in Congress. His death now at the age of 47 writes a sad epilogue to a brilliant career cut short just as it was reaching its prime.

Mr. Radwan had served in public posts at all three levels of government. Starting as village attorney in Sloan, he was elected to the State senate in 1945 while serving in the Army. After 5 years at Albany, he entered Congress in 1950. His ability as a votegetter increased apace with his years of service; though hospitalized throughout his final campaign in 1956, he was re-elected to the House by a plurality of more than 44,000.

Voter confidence in the young Congressman was not misplaced. For several years he served with distinction as a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Later as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he proved one of the mainstays of support for the Eisenhower foreign policy. With the two other Buffalo representatives in the House—Representatives PILLION and

MILLER—he was a member of one of the best teams ever to speak for this area in Congress. Working in close harmony, they compiled a legislative record of unusual productivity and effectiveness.

Mr. Radwan's voting record showed a flair for independence throughout his legislative and congressional career. He was thoroughly devoted to the well-being of his constituents and did not lose sight of their needs even while striving to serve the interests of the Nation as a whole.

It is a loss to both the community and the Nation that a kinder fate did not spare him for the even more important years of congressional service that surely would have been ahead.

Resolution by Polish National Relief Fund Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert into the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the delegates to the Eighth Annual Conference of the Polish National Relief Fund Committee, which was held in Detroit, Mich., on September 5, 6, and 7, 1959:

Whereas on September 1, 1939, Poland took upon herself the entire burden of armed opposition to the totalitarian forces in their march to world conquest; and

Whereas the Polish Government established itself in exile after Poland had been overrun by the military might of Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia and dedicated the country's remaining resources and its manpower to the defeat of the enemy; and

Whereas Poland is the only member of the winning team to have lost in the war while Germany and Russia, whose attack upon Poland precipitated the bloodbath for the whole world, are destined to be the greatest beneficiaries; and

Whereas Germany, the perpetrator of the greatest crime in history, ironically is recognized as free and sovereign, except for the part known as East Germany, dominated by the Russians; while Poland, the first ally, is a Soviet satellite, not free, and ruled by a government subservient to the views and wishes of Moscow, backed by Russian troops on Polish soil; and

Whereas the spontaneous outpouring of good will and the greeting which Vice President NIXON received from the people of Warsaw was proof positive that Poland's spirit of freedom still lives on; and

Whereas the invitation to Nikita Khrushchev to visit the United States extended almost simultaneously with the announcement of a week of prayer for all nations oppressed and enslaved by Soviet Russia is incompatible with democratic principles of justice and could result in irreparable moral damage and lower the prestige of the United States; and

Whereas Poland's only free spokesman in the free world, the Polish Government-in-Exile, functioning on English soil, headed by President August Zaleski, the same government recognised by the whole world until July 6, 1945, has withstood the sinister challenge of the Communists for 20 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates to the eighth annual conference of the Polish National Relief Fund Committee of the United States and Canada, being held at the Hilton Statler Hotel in Detroit, Mich., September 5, 6, and 7, 1959, respectfully request His Excellency, the President of the United States, and the Honorable, the Congress of the United States, to revise their attitude toward the Polish government in exile, a true symbol of all that we in this country, in our hearts, hold near and dear; and recognize that the Polish nation is being wronged when its only constitutional governmental body is denied a voice and whose just postulates are not duly considered.

Adopted and attested to by unanimous vote September 7, 1959:

Resolutions committee:

J. Bartosiewicz; K. Bonislawski; A. Buczek; S. Dybek; S. Kozlowski; B. Kwiatkowski; A. Lyczak; S. Lyczak; S. Lesniewicz; Dr. T. Rosol; M. Szymanski; N. Zbyszewski; Z. Nowicki, chairman; Lucian Pruszyneki, convention chairman.

Attested:

MITCHELL S. JACHIMSKI,
President, Michigan Division.

Special Prayers for Peace as Mr. Khrushchev Comes to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 25, 1959

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, heretofore you and all of my other distinguished colleagues in this great legislative body have granted me unanimous consent to extend my remarks and I, therefore consider it a privilege to insert for the information—and I trust inspiration also—the text of what seems to me as a very appropriate editorial which appeared the other day in the Los Angeles Daily Examiner in which the distinguished Father Francis Cardinal McIntyre named in the editorial reminds us all that the President of the United States has designated October 7, 1959, as the National Day of Prayer.

Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief and conviction that the observance of such day in accordance with the language thereof suggested by the distinguished Catholic cardinal will be most appropriate and, no doubt, magnificently strengthening to the attitude and activities of the American people who recognize the need of divine guidance and who pray accordingly.

Following is the text of the editorial:

SPECIAL PRAYERS FOR PEACE

The action of James Francis Cardinal McIntyre in ordering special prayers for peace by 287 Catholic pastors in this area for 10 successive Sundays could prove the spark which will light a great universal prayer crusade.

The prayers will petition for divine guidance for the Nation's leaders in their search for a just peace for the world.

It is timed to span what may become one of the most important periods in the world's history, covering the weeks of President Eisenhower's visit to western European countries and the coming visit to the United States of Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

The Cardinal notes that President Eisenhower has designated October 7 as a national day of prayer, and he also says:

"We all must recognize the need of divine guidance for those who labor in search for a just and permanent peace. * * *"

We know the power of prayer. We can all join in prayer in this time of especial need for world peace.

Oregon's Umpqua Valley as Seen and Described by Gladys Workman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Oregon is proud of its new nationally known author, Gladys Workman. The author of "Only When I Laugh" comes from the beautiful Umpqua Valley in my district. With her husband Norman and her nephew, also a Norman, Gladys has carved a fine niche in the valley.

She is a hard-working Oregonian by adoption. She has put together some of the family experiences and related them in readable fashion in her book. Her descriptions of the valley, its people, its wildlife, and its never-ending glorious scenery will undoubtedly entice many people to Oregon.

The Workmans would make the visitors want to stay forever. They and their neighbors are that kind of people.

My wife and I have the privilege of knowing the Workmans personally. A good deal of their warmth, affection and humor shines from the pages of "Only When I Laugh."

Editor Lowell Anderson, of the Drain (Oreg.) Enterprise, a fine weekly newspaper published near the home of the Workmans, has made this comment:

She has a knack for not taking herself seriously—yet she takes life seriously. Her story, built out of what was not always a happy experience, is told in the warmly hilarious tradition of "The Egg and I." It is the tale of how she got her neighbors to become her friends.

If one is to pick a few samples of the writing to quote I would suggest bits like the following:

Sometimes the rain comes in gusty squalls and the fists of the storm bang against your house and make the flames in the fireplace shudder. At such times, the electric wires are blown down or sag beneath the weight of fallen boughs, and the telephone usually loses its voice for hours or days. But this morning, there were no theatrics. Just the soft, tiny droplets, making the road a ribbon of black sateen, turning the great trunks of firs into porphyry columns, polishing the leaves of the willows and graying the mountains into watery invisibility. After an hour or so of this hypnotic rain, the eaves begin to drip and a thousand rivulets carve their way to the river. From the kitchen I watched the Umpqua, far below, running slowly under a steamy white blanket of mist.

There is humor in "Only When I Laugh" like:

Susie was a city cat, used to central heating, electricity, television, intimate candle-

lit dinners, and the bright chatter of cocktail parties. In a word, Susie was neurotic. The wilds of the Umpqua scared her to death.

Susie soon adjusted, though, as Gladys points out, thanks to the help of an Umpqua swain named "Sammy."

For instance, there was Sammy the cat. Sammy was a rake and a roamer with a wild eye and a devil-may-care tilt to his gray head. He belonged to a neighbor, but he appointed himself general superintendent of construction at our place and watched every move Claude and young Norman made. Sammy was also a great comfort, in his gruff way, to Susie and the other cats we brought from El Monte.

There are fine descriptions of people:

Blacky was the biggest man ever seen in the valley, stacking up near 6 feet 6 and weighing close to 300 pounds. He was fantastically strong. Blacky was a high climber and, with all his strength, was the gentlest fellow in the woods. He always took a dozen sandwiches into the forest for lunch, and sometimes a couple of pies, but he did not eat all that. He'd wander away from the rest of the crew and seek out birds and squirrels and he would eat with them. Gentle Blacky, like an oversize St. Francis, would sit on a log and open his lunchpail to the whole forest. Deer and skunks—and not any of your deordorized skunks, either—squirrels and jays, would settle down for the meal, picking daintily at the morsels Blacky offered. Even the humming birds ate out of Blacky's hands.

Or—

I'd look at Emma Hedden in her store, with her steel-colored hair wrapped around her head in a single braid, dabs of rouge on her cheeks, reading a letter for a man who couldn't read for himself, or helping someone send off a letter to the mail-order house (and probably lending him the money), and it was hard to see her in the role of giant killer. Now I know Emma Hedden is one of the strongest women ever fabricated. I have no doubt that Emma Hedden could run General Motors if she put her mind to it, and it's probably a good thing for the Ford Co. that she prefers to run her little store in Scottsburg."

Or—

If the Grange had no other reason for existing in the Umpqua—and there are thousands of good ones—its Christmas parties would justify it forever. The Christmas parties unify the valley, tying it together in the softest bonds of Christian charity and love. Then the hills and canyons empty, and lonely people, who may not see one another for months at a time, gather around the old grandfather stove (amidst the mob hysteria of the children) to talk of old times and new wonders. The talk at Christmas parties is the gentle, rambling conversation of old friends gathered in warmth to smile and watch the children and think of children of other years.

And Mrs. Workman writes crisply. A particular example of a sharp vignette—not particularly small or dainty, just excellent—follows:

In shared joys and sorrows, in all our moods, the party line tied us together. None of us will ever forget the black day when the line carried the omnious warning against a tragedy which could not be avoided. Pappy and I were standing outside talking to the driver of a logging truck when we heard the phone ringing sharply and incessantly. "Something's wrong," said the driver. "You can always tell when it sounds like that." We ran inside and picked up the phone. At first there was a mixed babble of voices:—"He looks like he's drunker than a lord."—"Can't anybody stop him?"—"Where is he now?" And then the chilling fact: "There's a guy coming up from Reedsport driving one of those big gasoline tanker rigs all over the road. Unless he kills himself first, he's going to kill someone else just as sure as you're born. Get the children away from the highway and stay away yourself." The log truck driver with us hastily ran his truck into our field. Traffic through the valley, never heavy, slowed to a halt. The party line shouted bulletins: "He just barely got through Scottsburg," someone reported. "One of the double wheels got in that ditch in front of Emma's house. He was clear over on the wrong side of the road and it's a wonder he didn't turn over there and burn up the whole town." The tanker roared past the Lewises, past Paul Applegate's place and avalanched through Green Acres, the new trailer and gas station settlement. Now we could hear the approaching rumble. There was nothing to do and nothing to say. We just watched silently as the wavering tanker thundered past our house and disappeared. We listened for a while, listened for a crash we all expected as the tanker slammed up the highway toward Elkton and Drain. "He's just come by here going like a bat out of hell," Sawyer's Rapids reported. Then there was another period of waiting. Silence. Surely, we all thought, there has been time for him to clear the valley. When the phone rang, we jumped to our feet. It was Grandma Butler. "That tanker tangled with a car just before it got into Elkton," she said. "All I know is two people are dead."

These are a few sample from the book. I hope it will be possible for the Members of this House to explore the whole book one of these days.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article about Gladys Workman which appeared in the May 9, 1959 issue of the Coos Bay, Oreg., World:

GLADYS WORKMAN TO LAUNCH NEW BOOK

The city of Scottsburg will be observing the centennial year Sunday, May 17, with an old-fashioned family picnic. Emma Hedden, whose parents pioneered the area and established its general merchandise store, is asking everyone to join in the celebration. Scottsburg was founded in 1850 and was the second post office in the State.

A principal feature of the day will be the launching of a book, "Only When I Laugh," by Gladys Workman, a Scottsburg resident, who writes about her life and her neighbors in the Umpqua Valley. She will be in the Hedden store to autograph copies of the book and to visit with her many friends.

Mrs. Workman's most recent endeavor in the bay area was to spend an evening at Mercy Home instructing the residents in ceramic art for which she is noted throughout the Nation. Many severely handicapped persons in California as well as Oregon have found a joyful hobby and gainful employment through Gladys' teaching "Ceramics for Fun."

She is an honorary member of the bay area Zonta Club.

Her book deals with her roller coaster-paced experiences since leaving a thriving business in Los Angeles to make a new way of life in a shack in Oregon's backwoods.

Gladys made up her mind that the fresh air and peaceful life of the woods was what was needed to restore her husband's health. Ignoring such problems as where to live and how to earn a living, she packed up her husband and nephew and left for Scottsburg, a remote spot in the Umpqua River Valley—a warm, fertile stretch of land tucked in the southwest corner of the State, less than 20 miles from the Pacific Ocean.

Gladys has appeared on Ralph Edward's "This Is Your Life" television program and broke up the show when she couldn't stop laughing at her incredible string of misfortunes.

With gumption on their side, plus an abounding humor that was to bounce them over the direct crises, the Workmans launched their new life in a construction shack Gladys found. Though the new home was minus doors, windows, electricity, water, and facilities, Gladys felt compensated by her surroundings. For a front lawn she had a river stocked with 20-pound leaping salmon; the air came straight from the ocean, the land was a deep rich green and all about them, dwarfing the one-room shack, was a forest of soaring Douglas-fir trees.

At the age of 46, Gladys found herself confronted with such country triflings as floods, snakes in the kitchen, bears on the porch, a broken neck, cops and robbers, sleeping sickness, a runaway tractor, and a raging forest fire.

But perhaps her biggest obstacle to adjusting to the new life was a collection of plain speaking, uninhibited neighbors. She thought them to be full of ornery cussedness; they were certain she was dangerously mad.

Country folks didn't take to a woman falling asleep while fixing meals and nearly burning down the house, who didn't get out of bed until 10, who kissed the men and called them "darling." Gladys' first big gesture at being a good neighbor gave her another black mark when the town learned she had served her guests poisoned clams and a variety of physics.

The local people believed their suspicions confirmed when Gladys' husband revealed he had spent their life savings on 6 tons of daffodil bulbs. (Neither knew which end of the bulb to stick in the ground.) With the arrival of planting season, Gladys contracted sleeping sickness and couldn't stay awake to help plant the 90,000 bulbs; word spread that she was too stuckup to help in the fields.

Still losing every round in her passive war against the ways of the valley, Gladys turned from daffodils to ceramics, which she tried to teach the local ladies and thus win their friendship.

There was a change for the better when her husband helped improve the valley daffodil industry. Neighbors invited them to join the grange, which was also the center of social activities. Encouraged, Gladys increased her winning ways. At this time, doctors started showing up at the Workman house about like milkmen at other homes.

Gladys lost her voice, Gladys broke her neck, Gladys had heart palpitations, Gladys nearly choked to death, but she never lost her laugh or her optimistic view of the future.

She has a knack for not taking herself seriously—yet she takes life seriously. Her story, built out of what was not always a happy experience, is told in the warmly hilarious tradition of "The Egg and I." It is the tale of how she got her neighbors to become her friends, why and how she stayed in the Umpqua, and why now, neither she nor the valley will ever be the same.

West Virginia Is Getting Shortchanged: XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, for the third time in as many days I wish to pro-

test the fact that the State of West Virginia has the scales weighted against it in an unfair way.

I have previously pointed out that West Virginia, on a per capita basis, ranks 50th among the 50 States in employment of Commerce Department personnel. I have further explained how this actually can inhibit industrial expansion, in a State which needs such growth badly, by denying valuable Federal assistance and advice and by making helpful Federal officials inaccessible.

The expression "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer" is best remembered as a phrase characteristic of the cynical atmosphere that pervaded this Nation during the depths of depression. Yet, it would appear that this is the very policy that governs placement of Department of Commerce facilities.

Previously I presented figures to show that West Virginia had but 37 employees of the Commerce Department in the entire State, and these included only employees of the Weather Bureau and Bureau of Public Roads.

Coastal States and other strategic areas have natural advantages for certain Commerce activities, but two inland States, Idaho and Colorado, have geographical characteristics similar to West Virginia's; yet one (Idaho) has 5 times as many Commerce employees, while the other (Colorado) has exactly 10 times as many.

I am puzzled as to why Idaho needs 42 Weather Bureau employees to serve 588,637 population while West Virginia has only 10 to serve 2,005,553. Or why the Weather Bureau has 73 employees in Colorado, with 1,325,089 population.

I also marvel that West Virginia can get along with only 27 employees in the Bureau of Public Roads, while 166 persons are employed at Boise, Idaho, and 297 at Denver, Colo.

I must admit that the figures I have presented on Tuesday are subject to change. In fact, I have a graphic illustration of that—but it only serves to accentuate the Commerce Department's discrimination against West Virginia.

For example, my Monday figures list Indiana as having a total of only 504 Commerce employees. But today, on Thursday, I received statistics from the Commerce Department itself indicating that a Census Bureau installation suddenly has started to employ a whopping total of 1,256 persons at Jeffersonville, Ind.

On further inquiry, I learned that this installation is handling the processing of data gathered in the 1958 Business, Manufacturing, and Mining Census on a national basis, supplanting the Washington office to some extent in that field. I also found that this same office will be a central point for processing information gathered in the big 1960 population census, and will probably employ many times its present personnel figures again on a national basis.

Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does this not appear to be discrimination of the rankest sort to locate such a facility in a State where unemployment is relatively low, below the national average, and overlook a State which has the highest level of unemployment in the entire Nation?

I should like to submit statistics to show that the State which has been most neglected by the Department of Defense—I have dwelt at length on this Department in previous statements—and the Department of Commerce, has the highest unemployment percentage in the country?

Does there not seem to be a correlation here? Is there not some way in which West Virginia can be assured a fair break, so that the rich no longer get richer while the poor get poorer?

The following State-by-State unemployment figures cover the number of insured unemployed. Leading statisticians estimate that the insured unemployed figure represents only about 60 percent of the total unemployed, which would mean that West Virginia's total unemployment remains, as it has for months, more than 13 percent of the total work force, or one out of every eight of our citizens.

State	Total insured unemployed (except railroad), week Aug 22, 1959	Percentage which insured unemployed relates to insured total work force (based on average of 12-month period ending December 1958)
West Virginia	26,959	7.9
Michigan	107,399	6.4
Pennsylvania	165,718	5.7
Maine	9,000	4.9
Alabama	24,599	4.8
Alaska	1,309	4.7
Kentucky	20,059	4.7
New Jersey	58,818	4.0
Louisiana	21,386	3.9
Mississippi	9,812	3.9
Rhode Island	8,919	3.9
Washington	23,081	3.9
Arizona	7,775	3.8
Delaware	4,705	3.8
Maryland	24,707	3.8
Tennessee	23,346	3.8
New York	179,721	3.7
Connecticut	25,667	3.6
Florida	29,081	3.5
Arkansas	8,551	3.4
Georgia	23,345	3.3
Oklahoma	11,175	3.1
Massachusetts	43,427	3.0
North Carolina	24,531	3.0
Utah	4,736	3.0
California	100,760	2.9
Nevada	1,891	2.9
New Hampshire	4,155	2.9
New Mexico	4,046	2.7
Missouri	24,076	2.6
South Carolina	10,247	2.6
Wisconsin	21,572	2.5
Indiana	24,251	2.4
Illinois	58,911	2.3
Texas	39,020	2.3
Kansas	7,456	2.2
Ohio	52,011	2.2
Vermont	1,466	2.2
Idaho	2,218	2.1
Montana	2,281	2.1
Hawaii	2,331	2.0
Oregon	7,372	2.0
Virginia	13,331	2.0
Minnesota	12,865	1.9
Colorado	4,754	1.6
District of Columbia	3,747	1.5
Iowa	4,184	1.0
North Dakota	647	1.0
Wyoming	544	.9
Nebraska	1,649	.8
South Dakota	456	.6
National totals and average	1,294,668	3.4

Mr. Speaker, we see from the foregoing figures that West Virginia ranks far and away the first in the Nation in the percentage of unemployed, yet ranks last in the nation in Department of Commerce employees within West Virginia. And not a single one of the paltry 37 Commerce Department employees in the State is assigned to work on those phases of Commerce Department activities designed to reduce unemployment through industrial development and services to business.

Labor's Contributions to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, many statements were made on Labor Day throughout the Nation, but I believe that few could equal the sentiments of the president of the Huntington (W. Va.) District Labor Council, Mr. Summers I. Dean. What makes Mr. Dean's remarks so timely is the fact that he has taken a constructive position on the great contributions which organized labor has made to American society, culture, and economy.

No truer words were spoken than when Mr. Dean says: "To weaken the labor movement is to weaken America itself." He points out the numerous ways in which American labor has strengthened our whole country, and how the improvements in our standard of living have benefitted millions of people who were never members of a labor union. It is this type of unselfish service for the betterment of every group in the Nation which marks the labor union movement as a great and constructive force.

Under unanimous consent, I include the following statement by Summers I. Dean in the RECORD:

LABOR: PART OF AMERICA, GOOD FOR AMERICA

(Statement by Mr. Summers I. Dean, president, Huntington (W. Va.) District Labor Council)

On this 77th Labor Day we of the AFL–CIO take a serious look at ourselves and the present position of organized labor in the United States.

We find that it has almost become a national pasttime to attack organized Labor or at least demand stringent, punitive legislation against it.

This well organized vicious attack is a deliberate attempt by big business and other vested interests to mislead many well meaning Americans, in order to nullify the gains won after many years of struggle and sacrifice by the American worker.

The McClellan hearings in Washington have shown that while some crooks and racketeers did exist in the ranks of labor, the vast majority of organized labor consists of dedicated hard working people like you and your neighbor.

The AFL–CIO acted promptly. It expelled racket infested unions, and then supported corrective legislation in the U.S. Congress. This is unique in modern history. No other social or economic group has ever supported legislation to regulate itself.

Yet despite these efforts, selfish interests made use of the McClellan disclosurers and started a hysteria that led one Washington Congressman to state during the labor bill debate that this is a field day for demagogs.

We urge our fellow citizens today to reflect for a moment and consider the vast contributions of organized labor. The shorter workweek, more leisure time, health and pension plans and safety programs are some of labors contributions to the American way of life.

The merchant should think of the consumer dollars spent in his store.

If sweatshops and company stores still existed, workers could not afford all the things that make America the best dressed, best housed, and best fed Nation in the world.

The pensioner is secure because organized labor fought for social security program in the thirties. The unemployed benefit from unemployment insurance a law advocated and backed by labor.

The Federal minimum wage of $1 may soon be raised because organized labor recognizes the need for greater spending power of the American worker, and therefore petitioned the Congress for such an increase.

The AFL–CIO participates in Huntington community affairs. Its members and leaders sit on the boards of the United Fund, the YMCA, the hospitals, and other groups. They not only donate money but hundreds of hours of their time for the welfare of the community.

We are not a separate group. We are part of Huntington. We are part of America. To weaken the labor movement is to weaken America itself.

We look proudly at our achievements. On this Labor Day we pledge ourselves again to the great job ahead; the improvement of the standard of life for all workers. We are convinced of the justice of this course.

As Americans we put our trust in God and the great democratic ideals of our country. On this day the Huntington District Labor Council AFL–CIO extends its greetings to all citizens of Huntington.

Congressman Wolf Says United States Has Much To Show Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers have been full of various comments on Mr. Khrushchev's pending visit to the United States. One of the most intelligent comments I have seen on this subject appeared in the Waterloo (Iowa) Courier for September 3. In a guest editorial in that paper, our vigorous, young, and effective colleague, LEONARD WOLF, discusses the prospects for the Khrushchev visit and the opportunity that is facing us.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include his editorial as follows:

WOLF SAYS UNITED STATES HAS MUCH TO SHOW RUSSIA'S KHRUSHCHEV

(By Representative LEONARD G. WOLF, Second Iowa District)

The contemplated exchange of visits between Khrushchev and Eisenhower this fall has raised the hopes of the American people and the peoples of the world. This optimism has not decreased although many people after a second look question the good that can come from such an exchange of visits.

It is, of course, unreasonable to expect too much from such an exchange of visits. For even powerful leaders such as Eisenhower and Khrushchev do not have it within their power to turn back the tide of the cold war which has been raging for at least 12 years. The philosophic differences are great between the two nations. Much misunderstanding and mistrust on both sides have resulted in great ill feeling. Each country is committed to great armaments and military spending. These drawbacks cannot be expected to be overcome by two men who will visit each other's country for, at most, 2 weeks.

This does not mean that such visits are wrong or cannot accomplish any good end. Winston Churchill once pointed out that it is "better to jaw-jaw than to war-war." And he is right. The costs of war today are prohibitive. All rational men know this. The world would possibly be destroyed or at least civilization would be turned back to the darkest cave man days.

Consequently, discussion and negotiation are welcomed so that the chances of fighting an atomic war are lessened.

Many people in the United States will not take kindly to the coming of Khrushchev. This is quite understandable. The record of Khrushchev is, to say the least, not spotless. He has on his hands the blood bath of Hungary and the cruel and unexplainable murder of two heroes of Hungarian freedom, Pal Maleter and Imre Nagy. This is not something that can be forgotten and should not be forgotten. The Russian advance in science by putting sputnik in the air does not wipe out the cruelty of the Soviets in Hungary.

We should not forget the threats of Khrushchev and his saber-rattling, nor his reckless playing with destruction over the question of Berlin.

On the other hand, the President of the United States has invited Khrushchev in an effort to lessen tensions in the world and the Russian leaders at least seem more amenable to reason and negotiation. And the Vice President has shown us that the Soviet people themselves want peace and are very friendly to the United States. Thus, it is the duty of the American people to do all in their power to impress on the Soviet leader two ideas: That the American people want peace, and that the American people love freedom and are willing to fight for it and have the capability of fighting for it.

We must not try to cover up the shortcomings that we have. But we can show great and hitherto unparalleled progress in such areas as human relations in which people of different backgrounds live together in harmony. We can show Khrushchev our great economic wealth in which, because of our free enterprise system governed by societal responsibility, the people have reached economic heights that are unparalleled in the history of man. We can show Khrushchev our great strides in culture in which our artists are free to paint and write what they please without fear of Government interference as was the case, for example, with the great Russian writer, Boris Pasternak.

I do not fear a visit from Khrushchev. We have a great civilization. Certainly the greatest since the Athenian civilization over 2,400 years ago. We have much to be proud of. And we must rid Khrushchev of his appalling conceptions of American life and the great misrepresentations of our policies which the Soviet Government feeds the Russian people. These misunderstandings and misconceptions must be corrected lest Khrushchev make a serious mistake and plunge the entire world into an atomic holocaust which the Russian people and the American people surely do not want.

Our Lady of Czestochowa Parish Celebrates 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday the 30th of August I had the great privilege of being present as a speaker at the Golden Jubilee Banquet of Our Lady of Czestochowa Church in Turners Falls, Mass.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the text of my remarks in the RECORD:

I want you to know how greatly honored I am to have been asked to participate with you in the 50th anniversary of Our Lady of Czestochowa. How proud all of you must be to see how wonderfully this parish has flourished, and the fine group of men and women who today call it their own. For half a century now, your church has served the people of this wonderful community as a house of worship and a spiritual home. In times of trouble and sorrow it has been a source of strength and a beacon of hope; in times of happiness it has been the center of rejoicing for family and friends; and throughout each year, it has added understanding to life and provided a guideline for true Catholic living.

As you know, I come from another heritage than yours. My family came from Italy and your families from Poland. But in many ways, I feel a real brotherhood with each and every one of you. My parents, like yours, came to America and lived in great hardship during their first years in a new country. Both my parents and yours learned what a wonderful blessing it is to enjoy the fruits of American liberty. Both my parents and yours brought with them a fervent religious tradition which enabled them to go through the hardest years and finally vanquish the difficulties in their paths.

Let me say to you today that the 50 years of service and growth of this church are a tribute to the religious devotion of you, its members and clergy, and to the deep faith of the Polish people and Americans of Polish descent. Wherever the Polish people have settled in America they have brought their great faith with them, building new churches with priests of Polish descent and following their time-honored customs. This deep-rooted religious faith and conscientious fulfillment of religious obligations, together with your love of family and willingness to work long and hard, are the chief among the reasons that you have become such a vital and beloved part of America.

It is the same deep faith demonstrated by the 50th anniversary of this church which has sustained the Polish people in the old country through the many wars and partitions to which their land has fallen victim. For many centuries there have been many invasions, occupations and partitions, but no matter how determined the aggressors, they have not been able to suppress the freedom-loving spirit of the people of Poland. Never has this been more vividly illustrated than in the Poland of today, and never has religion played a more important role in the defense of Polish freedom than it does now.

Today Poland suffers under perhaps the cruelest tyranny of the many which have afflicted her over the centuries. But the Communist government imposed upon the Polish

nation by Russia has had a difficult job in stamping out the liberties of the Polish people. In many other parts of the Communist world, all freedom of speech, all freedom of religion have been stamped out. But not in Poland. The Polish love of freedom, strengthened by religious convictions and guided by the clergy, is simply too strong to deal with so quickly and easily.

A few weeks ago we saw a wonderful demonstration of the true will and feeling of the Polish people. Admiral Rickover, who was along on the trip made by Vice President NIXON, told our committee in Congress that the people of Warsaw lined the streets, tears in their eyes, to welcome the American party. The welcome given Khrushchev a few weeks before was meager in comparison. The Nixon visit gave the people of Poland an opportunity to demonstrate once more their great and unquenchable love of freedom.

The people of Poland are in a difficult position today. To the east stands Soviet Russia, with the mightiest land army in the world, ready to crush the Polish nation once more if a dangerous rebellion begins. To the west is the Soviet puppet regime in East Germany, where almost 400,000 Soviet troops are stationed. The people of Poland must steer a careful course, or Russian tanks will once more rumble through their streets and they will suffer the cruel fate of the people of Hungary.

One of the most important factors aiding the Polish people to maintain their spirit and resist communism is the church. In their worship the Polish people continually assert their support of a cause greater and finer than that of the Communist empire.

A key figure in this great struggle is Cardinal Wyszynski. He symbolizes the important role of the church in the fight to keep liberty alive. A priest since 1924, Cardinal Wyszynski's first work was among the labor unions. I am sure that his close association with the working people and economic problems gave him special insight which would later help him to see through the Communist myth and fight it effectively.

In 1946, at the very time that Communists were making intense efforts to remake Poland in the image of the Soviet Union, this man became Archbishop and Primate of Poland, and 4 years later, he received the red hat. No sooner had he become Primate, however, than the Communist government in Poland moved to take all economic and political rights away from the church, seizing much of its property and creating no end of hardships for the church. For years the Cardinal fought against these violations of the rights of the church. The government never lived up to its agreements. Instead, Catholic papers were closed down. Priests were arrested. The church's great charitable organization was taken over. And the Communists even tried to set up an organization known as PAX, a practical competitor to the church, trying to divert the faithful from the fold.

This train of events culminated in September 1953 when the state secret police appeared in the courtyard of the Cardinal's residence, and for the next 3 years held him virtually as a prisoner.

But the Communists miscalculated. They did not understand the real spirit of the Polish people. Unrest began to mount throughout the land. It was clear that the old regime was fighting a losing battle to keep control of the people. In the famous month of October 1956, Gomulka returned to power and Cardinal Wyszynski was released. The Communists realized that in order to prevent a great uprising they must grant liberties, particularly to the church.

No one can say that the people of Poland are enjoying full and real liberties today. But they are enjoying a few more liberties than the people of most of the other satellite nations. The reason is that they have frightened the Communist powers that be into letting them have those liberties and religious freedom.

Cardinal Wyszynski is not deceived about the basic struggle between catholicism and communism. He has said that because communism, like an evil cancer, is dangerous to all parts of man's life, it must be combated by the united efforts of the whole society. He believes, that someday there must be a decision between Christianity and communism, and that the whole Polish nation and the whole world must prepare for that final decision.

Nevertheless, this brave cardinal also wishes to keep Russia from using turmoil in Poland as an excuse for intervention. He wishes to keep the church alive. In this difficult task I know he has the prayers of peoples of all religions throughout the free world, and especially of those, like yourselves, who have Polish ancestry and love the land of Poland so much.

As for the Communist leaders in Poland, they realize that the teachings of the Catholic Church contradict all that they claim, and that Cardinal Wyszynski is their mortal enemy. In the past year they have made repeated efforts to suppress the church, but with limited success. In fact, there is much evidence that the Communists are fighting a losing battle, especially in the town of Czestochova for which this church is named.

For more than 300 years a picture of the blessed virgin, believed to have been painted by St. Luke, has hung in the monastery of Jasna Gora at Czestochowa. As you know, this is the holiest shrine of Polish catholicism. Every year in August there is a great pilgrimage to this monastery to celebrate the assumption of the virgin. These pilgrimages have continued throughout the Communist reign. The city of Chestochowa has become a symbol of the great and lasting influence of the church in Poland and a great spiritual center.

Last year, just before the time of the annual pilgrimage, the sanctuary of Yasna Gora was searches by police for the first time in its history, supposedly to halt the printing of what were called illegal publications in the Pauline Brothers Monastery. Following the Yasna Gora raid the smoldering conflict between church and state flaired into the open. The government barred nuns, monks and priests who belonged to religious orders from teaching religion in the schools.

Nevertheless, the pilgrimage took place as always. On August 15, from every part of Poland, pilgrims journeyed to Chestochowa on foot, on bicycles, by bus and by train. This, my friends, is the deep and lasting type of devotion which the Communists cannot suppress as long as the Polish people have life and strength to express their deep will.

It is the same type of deep and lasting faith which has made this parish here in America so successful during its first half century. I am confident that this same abiding religious faith will be a source of rebirth for the Polish people even in times of deepest despair. It will continue to bind the faithful in Poland with the faithful here in America and other nations, in eternal dedication to common ideals and the great common belief. It will be the inspiration for wisdom and courage until the shackles of Communist tyranny are thrown off—not only in Poland, but wherever they may exist in our world.

Once more, my friends, my warmest congratulations to you on this great anniversary. May the good Lord continue to bless your wonderful undertaking in the years ahead, just as he has during the first glorious half century of our lady of Chestochowa here on American soil.

The Passport Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on September 8 I answered "no" when my name was called on the passport bill. Eighteen Members voted with me in opposition to this measure, and 371 Members voted for it. My "no" was a protest against bureaucratic tyranny, and I am submitting the following editorial from the Indianapolis Star to demonstrate to the Members of this Congress and to the Nation what tough, Midwestern thinking is on this subject:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, July 5, 1959]

DON'T FENCE ME IN

The power of the Government to say to what parts of the world Americans may be permitted to travel has been upheld by the Federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The court found that the right to travel is protected by the Constitution, being a part of the right of liberty. But it concluded that it is legitimate for the Department of State to limit this right, as an extension of the President's power to conduct foreign relations. Travel of an American in a foreign country may, the court decided, so affect foreign relations as to be part of them.

This is a case involving a general ban on travel in the Communist portions of China, Korea, and Vietnam, and in Hungary. It is different from the question whether a passport can be denied to an individual on grounds of personality, which has been decided by the Supreme Court in favor of the individual citizen's right to travel without discrimination. There is no question here of saying which persons may travel. It is a question of saying where any American may travel.

There is little likelihood that this ruling would be upset by the Supreme Court, except on the exceedingly slim chance that it might disagree about an individual's travel being a part of foreign relations. In the controversial treaty cases of past years the Supreme Court has bluntly stated its unwillingness to apply the test of constitutionality to anything which is done in the name of foreign relations. While not so clearly stated, the same reluctance can be found in this ruling on travel.

Great danger of abuse lies in the logic by which a private citizen's travel to a foreign country is made an instrument of the Nation's foreign relations. By applying this rule a State Department which was so minded could decide that travel by Americans anywhere outside the country would disturb foreign relations. Thus Americans could be effectively fenced within the national borders. Of course such a possibility seems inconceivable now, but the power to do exactly that has been confirmed by this court decision.

Americans almost universally proclaim it to be an evil thing that the Communist nations pen their citizens within their own national borders. Would it not be equally evil for the United States to do it? If the act would be evil, then the power to do it is also evil.

This line of logic also offers the point on which legislative remedy could hinge. As one of the reasons for refusing a passport in the case before the court, the State De-

partment said that "the official approval" of the presence of American citizens in the barred areas—that is, their presence there with a passport—would impede the execution of foreign policy.

It is exactly this point—the claim that possession of a passport indicates official approval of the citizen's travel—which should be eliminated. The right to travel is a part of liberty and is protected by the Constitution. Therefore the citizen's travel does not require any official approval. The use of the passport as a device for implying such approval merely opens the door to the withholding of that approval.

A passport should be identification and nothing more. Its issuance should imply nothing except the establishment of the citizenship of the owner and documentation by photograph, fingerprints, and physical description. This passport, denoting nothing but identification, should then be available at any time to any citizen upon satisfaction of the identification requirements, and without question as to where the citizen may plan to travel.

The State Department should, of course, continue to designate areas which, in its judgment, should be avoided by American travelers. But these designations should be advisory, not binding. The designation should merely mean that protection of the American flag is not offered in those areas. The citizen should be free to go to such areas at his own risk, if he chooses. At the same time, the protection of the flag in areas of normal travel should be made more meaningful. It has become rather empty in recent years.

The right to move about is an essential element of individual liberty. It has been seriously curtailed by a government which, as in other matters, has become far too preoccupied with shielding the individual against the possibility of making mistakes and exposing himself to hardship or harm. A new generation of Americans, reared in this spoon-fed atmosphere, is in danger of losing the spunk on which freedom must feed. Let's give every American room to move.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses overrode President's veto of public works appropriation bill.

Senate passed 62 measures on calendar call, and passed numerous other bills, clearing several for White House.

House passed housing bill.

Conferees reached agreement on agricultural trade development extension.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 17341–17365

Bills Introduced: 8 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2673–2680; S.J. Res. 140–141; and S. Res. 190. **Pages 17343–17344**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 2230, to amend the National Cultural Center Act with regard to disposition of certain donated funds (S. Rept. 991);

H.R. 8035, designating Dyberry Dam and Reservoir, Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa., as the Gen. Edgar Jadwin Dam and Reservoir (S. Rept. 992);

H.R. 616, designating the dam across the Lampasas River, Tex., as Stillhouse Hollow Dam (S. Rept. 993);

H.J. Res. 80, providing for the erection of a memorial tablet at Garden Key, Fla., in honor of Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd (S. Rept. 994);

S. 743, to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act in order to remove the exemption with respect to certain mines employing no more than 14 individuals, with amendment (S. Rept. 995);

S.J. Res. 103, authorizing the National Geographic Society to erect in the State of Virginia a memorial to Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd (S. Rept. 996);

S. 2673, to provide for appointment of additional circuit and district judges, with amendments (S. Rept. 997);

H.R. 2982, to fix the official station of retired judges assigned to active duty (S. Rept. 998);

H.J. Res. 310, to authorize designation of period from October 17–24, 1959, as National Olympic Week (S. Rept. 999);

H.J. Res. 317, to change the designation of Child Health Day from May 1 to first Monday in October of each year (S. Rept. 1000);

H.R. 6809, 2068, 7640, 7935, and S. 609, private bills (S. Repts. 1001–1005);

S. Res. 183, authorizing printing of additional copies of part 3 of the Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (no written report);

S. Res. 184, to print additional copies of part 4 of the Second Interim Report of the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field (no written report);

S. Res. 186, to print as a Senate document the study entitled "Tensions in Communist China" (no written report);

H. Con. Res. 405, to print additional copies of hearings entitled "Hospital, Nursing Home, and Surgical Benefits for OASI Beneficiaries" (no written report);

S. Res. 190, authorizing the printing, as a Senate document, of the proceedings of the 39th biennial meeting of the convention of the American Institute of the Deaf (no written report);

S. Res. 173, commending the National Jaycee Community Development Program (no written report); and

H. Con. Res. 404, to print additional copies of "Compendium of Papers Submitted on Revision of Federal Income Tax Laws" (no written report).

Pages 17342–17343

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Page 17387**

President's Communication: Communication from President was received transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations to pay claims for damages and a judgment rendered against the U.S. in amount of $323,629, together with indefinite interest—referred to Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed as S. Doc. 56. **Page 17342**

Call of Calendar: On call of calendar, 62 measures, of which 35 were private, were passed as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

D.C. life insurance: H.R. 7145, relating to the regulation of the business of life insurance in the D.C.;

Appendix

Arms of Friendship, Inc., a Constructive New Force for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, relating to the reduction of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCOTT

The subject uppermost in everyone's mind these days concerns the reduction of tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union. It is with this highly commendable objective in mind that our State Department arranged for our American exhibit in Moscow and for Soviet citizens to visit our country under the cultural exchange agreements. It is the reason for President Eisenhower's visits to Germany, England and France, and for the exchange of visits with Mr. Khrushchev. I approve and applaud these efforts and all of us hopefully look for a more favorable trend of events so we may no longer live under the threat of war.

It is true that a possible nuclear war would bring frightful disaster and losses to both the United States and the U.S.S.R. It is true that international communism is committed to ultimate world domination and that the leaders of this cult are acknowledged atheists, uninhibited by moral codes. Let us also remember that through politics, propaganda, and a Machiavellian version of public relations, 800 million of the world's population and one-fourth of the earth's surface has vanished behind the curtain of Communist domination in the past 40 years. We cannot afford to disregard lightly the threat posed by that aggregation of men, money, and technique. All of our people—on the farms, in the cities, and in industries need to remember that the Soviet dangers have not ended merely because the Iron Curtain has been lifted just a little bit.

We seek new solutions to the existing impasse with the Soviet Union, to find, if possible, a fresh and sound approach which can change the pattern of our diplomatic stalemate and which can be a constructive new force for peace. I have been informed of such a program, based on years of study and already justified by its first fruits. I am especially happy that it is not a Government plan but one supported and carried out by private individuals. Such a plan has many advantages, since it can act directly, rapidly, avoids long delays, can be positive, flexible, and handled in a personal manner by a small group.

I refer to the organization named Arms of Friendship, Inc., of Philadelphia, which was organized by friends of mine after detailed and exacting research at Temple University under that distinguished educator and president of that institution, Dr. Robert L. Johnson. A few of the other outstanding Pennsylvanians who have helped in the creation of this organization are Mr. George D. Widener, Mr. Henning W. Prentis, Jr., Mr. Walter D. Fuller, Mr. John A. Diemand, Mr. William T. Carter, Jr., Mr. C. Mahlon Kline, Mr. Edgar Scott, as well as city officials. The organization grew out of concern over U.S. activities in the cold war. The basic question researched was whether or not private citizens could, through intelligently planned programs, help reduce existing tensions with the Soviet Union. This was before President Eisenhower initiated his people-to-people program which has been so well received, but the conclusions reached are in accord with the President's ideas.

The research explored in great detail the conduct of American-Soviet relations. The seminars and discussions held and the testimony and evidence gathered gave a clear picture of the problems confronting our people. Synoptically stated, the conclusions were that a real need exists for private individuals actively to seek out personal contacts and establish friendship with individual Russians. This was concluded to be a practical down-to-earth method of helping reestablish the trust and understanding that appears to have been lost between Americans and Russians. This type of effort was concluded to follow a positive and constructive path to lasting peace. The frightening alternative to such efforts is, ultimately, war.

The research brought out many facts to which few of our people have given much thought. The Russian people suffered much from the disasters of war. Hence, they desire peace just as we do. They are motivated by the same aspirations as we are. The same fears, hopes, and longings influence their lives. Their family ties are close. Like all people in all lands, the Russian parent wants his children to enjoy a happy and successful life. The Russian people are patriotic. They love Mother Russia and they have legitimate reasons to be proud of their land, their culture, and their science. They would like peace in their time, and they look to the future for continued improvement in their living standards.

The considerations on which Arms of Friendship was founded are obviously true. Some of the existing differences with the U.S.S.R. have undoubtedly resulted from the distances that separate us and lack of information of each other. How could this problem in understanding be solved? Was it possible that, at this date in history, new conditions exist which could change the past pattern of diplomatic debacles? Was it possible that the time is approaching when diplomats who fail to achieve their ends by logic or before a court of world opinion, such as the United Nations, may no longer be able to use as the final act of diplomacy the threat of force? That marching men, roaring cannon, and atomic weapons may one day no longer be available to the whim of despotic and uncontrolled leaders? The research conducted by Arms of Friendship concluded that that day is coming swiftly, and that real peace can be brought closer and ultimately realized by creating better understanding, closer ties, man-to-man contact, respect, trust and friendships between Americans and Russians, particularly ex-servicemen, combat veterans, reserves, retired, and other such military men of the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. It maintains that the similar experiences and knowledge of war of such men and women make possible a mutual understanding and desire for peace which transcends differences in language, nationality and ways of life.

Unless ingredients of conflict are replaced by feelings of understanding, trust, and friendship between Americans and Russians, war is almost certainly the ultimate outcome. And just as the winning of war requires the coordinated effort of most of the people of the Nation, the preservation of peace is concluded to be a responsibility of the people.

Now these conclusions reached by the studies conducted at Temple University are certainly challenging. After all, it is not wealth or wheat, steel, oil, or our vast facilities of transportation and communications that is the most important product of any country. It is the people, and if they get to know each other it seems to me that the problems that lead to war might be resolved.

The basic theme and concepts of Arms of Friendship are in accord with the views of the late Honorable John Foster Dulles. Speaking in behalf of people-to-people efforts of this nature he made the following significant statements: "The individual should be the basic source of the movements, the efforts, the trends that take place in the world. We all know how problems become readily soluble if you are operating in a favorable climate and favorable atmosphere. You (our people) have got the job of making it clear throughout the world that freedom is the preferable form of society. And if you by your works make that clear, then the problems that come up day by day will be soluble by your government. If you can't make that clear, then they will become insoluble and all the things we have stood for since our Nation was founded will go down." And while speaking of the need to liberate the forces of freedom through individual effort, he emphasized that "the process must be made one of evolution and not one of violent revolution."

In evaluating the worth of efforts of this nature we should remember that the people of the Soviet Union are created by the same God that we worship. They have the same capacity for recognizing right and wrong that we do, and possess the same instincts and aspirations. Unfortunately, they have been cut off from the rest of the world for some 40 years. They have been denied free knowledge of other countries, and the resulting ignorance could lead to disaster. There is an obvious need for us to convey to the people of Russia the truth about our country, our people, and our objectives as we seriously seek to eliminate the dangers of war.

Arms of Friendship is facing the problem realistically. Its positive efforts include a travelers' program, letter-writing contacts, a plan for the exchange of meaningful gifts and a program for the dissemination of useful information concerning the rehabilitation of disabled veterans. It has initiated forceful and effective people-to-people contacts between veterans of the United States and veterans of the Soviet Union. The limitation to veterans has been made in order that the activities being undertaken may be most effective and yet be kept within manageable proportions. After all, the veterans of both nations had similar war experiences, readjusted to civil life at the end of the conflict, and are now coming to posi-

tions of increased responsibility in the economic, scientific and civic areas of both countries.

Arms of Friendship recently sent two groups of veterans to Russia to explore the practicality of their efforts. The travelers included a senior retired general and an admiral, two past commanders of the American Legion, the national commander of the Jewish War Veterans, the national commander of the AMVETS, the past commander of the Disabled American Veterans, and a past commander of the Catholic War Veterans. These men represented without portfolio several million of our fellow Americans. The groups were accompanied by four Russian-speaking veterans, which enabled them to move about without dependence on Intourist guides, and in this fashion they were able to sample public opinion. They brought back convincing testimony of the need for concentrated effort to reach the average Russian with the truth. The following extract from Mr. Lewis K. Gough's report concerning his trip—forwarded from Europe—is synoptic of the views of all who made the trip: "I was amazed that the people have retained as much friendliness and receptiveness toward us as they have, in view of the propaganda techniques to which they are subjected. Their strong basic friendly feelings give me higher hopes for peace than before I went to Russia. Russia is not black or white and those who emphasize either the very good or the very bad, do us a disservice. Talking to them may prevent fighting them in a war in which there could be no winner, and they must understand the alternative as we do, and the world at large."

The evidence seems clear that there is a job to do and that the programs of Arms of Friendship are practical. The average Russian has heard only Soviet propaganda that the U.S.S.R. wants peace and that the United States is for war. They need to know how we live and that we would like to see them enjoy the same surplus of consumer goods that is available here. They need to learn the facts about other countries they are denied knowing by restrictions on radio programs and news media from the outside world. The groups of veterans that I mentioned brought back many examples of the insatiable appetite for honest factual information. In one city an intelligent, highly trained, Russian master carpenter asked Mr. William Gill, past national commander of the Catholic War Veterans, if it was true that American carpenters could earn enough money to own their own automobile. Such ignorance is both pathetic and dangerous. The only way to fill this vacuum is through direct people-to-people contacts.

Arms of Friendship has been granted tax exemption in recognition of the objectives being undertaken, and the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II have all passed resolutions supporting the efforts of this organization. To the best of my knowledge, it is the only private nongovernmental organization that is contributing practical help toward solving our differences with the U.S.S.R. Given the proper financial and moral support, it can make a tremendous contribution toward stemming the flood of communism across the world and preserving peace with honor. In these days of back-breaking military budgets, which must inevitably get increasingly heavier with the evolution of weapons, efforts of this nature which are sponsored by men of unquestioned integrity deserve widespread public support.

The primary office of Arms of Friendship, Inc., is located at 4150 Henry Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., and its board of directors is headed by Gen. Jacob L. Devers (retired), who commanded the 6th Army group during World War II; Gen. John E. Dahlquist, Gen. Charles L. Bolte, Adm. Richard L. Conolly, Adm. H. Kent Hewitt, Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, and Lt. Gen. Williard S. Paul are typical of the military representation.

Mr. James A. Farley, Dr. Robert L. Johnson, Mr. George D. Widener; Mr. Colby M. Chester, Mr. Henning W. Prentis, Jr., Mr. William L. Clayton, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, mayor of Philadelphia, three past commanders of the American Legion, and Miss Chloe Gifford, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, indicate the type of civilian leaders lending their support.

In conclusion I want to emphasize my support of people-to-people contacts such as those being carried out by Arms of Friendship. In this changing world it seems to me the benefits of peace may be within our grasp. If people can get to know each other, they will discover they have more of common interest than differences justifying quarrels. They are certain to seek methods short of war in resolving their conflicting interests. As President Eisenhower said a short time ago, "The problem is for pepole to get together and to work out not one method but thousands of methods by which people can gradually learn a little bit more of each other. What we must do is to bring the family of Russia closer into our circle. * * * In this way, I believe, is the truest path to peace. All of the other things that we do are merely holding the line while constructive forces of this kind take effect. There is no more important work."

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 1 of the series:

[From Life magazine, Sept. 7, 1959]

HOW BOND RATES AFFECT YOU

Nobody in his right mind thinks that Congress would ever imperil the national defense by refusing to pay the Pentagon's bills. And if it did so there would be such an outburst of indignation that Congress would get cracking.

But the reverse of this is happening. The management of the public debt is also of vital concern. Yet Congress is refusing to give the Treasury the powers it needs to manage the public debt in a sound and orderly way. There has been no outburst of public indignation because the issue is difficult for laymen to grasp.

They had better grasp it, for it affects the value of their savings and the security of their future. By its failure to act, Congress is driving up interest rates and adding to inflationary pressures. Here are the simple facts:

The dead hand of the past—a World War I measure passed in 1918—puts a ceiling of 4¼ percent on long-term Government bonds and savings bonds. It is these bonds, bought by insurance companies, trust funds, and the savings of individuals, which should carry as much as possible of the public debt because they check inflation by taking savings out of the scramble for goods.

This 41-year-old ceiling on bond interest makes it increasingly harder for the Treasury to sell new bonds. Institutions and individuals, since they can get better rates from other securities, refuse to buy them. Since 1946, for example, life insurance companies have reduced their holdings of Government bonds from 45 percent of their assets to a mere 7 percent. Many individuals cash in their savings bonds.

Instead of putting out long-term bonds with interest rates high enough to make them marketable, the Treasury has been forced to raise the needed money by short-term paper (e.g., 91-day notes), which are bought chiefly by commercial banks. Since they are virtually the same thing as cash, these notes can be used by the banks to expand their loans. They can lend $5 of new money for each $1 of Treasury notes they own. This has an immediate inflationary effect.

Furthermore, this monetizing of the debt tends to drive up interest rates as the Government competes with other borrowers for scarce money. In the last fortnight, for example, the rate on 91-day notes has just risen to 3.8 percent, the highest level since the bank crisis of 1933. If this trend continues, even short-term interest rates may soon exceed the 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term bonds. This freakish result is made more likely by Speaker RAYBURN'S anouncement last week that Congress won't act this year on the President's reiterated request for lifting the interest ceiling. Such inaction undermines the dollar by raising doubts abroad as to its soundness and damages the Government's credit, just as it does the economy itself.

Some leaders are urging the President, on his return, to take the issue to the voters as he did on labor reform. If Congress adjourns without action, the President may call it back in special session. But voters themselves can help speed the necessary action by letting their Congressmen know that they back the President. He has stated the issue very clearly:

"The vital interests of all Americans are at stake because excessive reliance on short-term financing can have grave consequences for the purchasing power of the dollar. * * * Let me state as plainly as I can that this is not legislation to increase interest rates. * * * We always seek to borrow as cheaply as we can. * * * To prohibit the Treasury from paying the market price for long-term money is just as impracticable as telling the Defense Department that it cannot pay the fair market price for a piece of equipment. The result would be the same in either case: the Government could not get what it needs."

Nuclear Disarmament and Testing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Christian Science Monitor for September 9, we find "A Capital Interview With Senator Clinton P. Anderson," on the subject "Nuclear Disarmament and Testing." The article was written by Courtney Sheldon, and describes a very interesting interview which he had with

the distinguished and knowledgeable Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT AND TESTING—A CAPITAL INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON

(By Courtney Sheldon)

WASHINGTON.—Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, outspoken chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy with a crucial watchdog and idea-suggesting role in shaping the country's atomic policy:

Questions whether, if an agreement on nuclear weapons testing is not reached with the Soviets before January, we are likely to reach any significant agreement at all.

Feels that if an agreement is not reached, "the United States should continue its test ban on atmospheric shots which are the sole source of radioactive fallout contamination, but, if the Government believes as I do that some further underground shots may be necessary, it should thereafter resume underground testing. I would reserve for the present a decision on high altitude shots."

Are you in agreement, generally speaking, with the way the administration has handled Geneva negotiations with the Soviets over a nuclear weapons test-ban treaty?

"No one likes to be critical of the way his Government has handled a conference with other nations. However, I would have been happier if the United States had not apparently switched its position during the conference.

"We started out trying to reach an agreement which involved the establishment roughly of 180 inspection stations and the complete ban of all types of nuclear testing. We amended our position when we reevaluated certain underground experiments held last fall.

"I would have been better pleased if at the outset we had taken the position the President took on April 13, which was to put the agreement into effect in phases or stages beginning with a prohibition on nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, but permitting for the present underground testing and high altitude shots.

"I think the President was on sound ground in making that change and I support his recommendation. It was proper for the President to seek some initial agreement eliminating atmospheric tests and thereby eliminating the fallout hazard. If that preliminary agreement succeeded, we might by successive stages have reached other agreements and eventually arrived at whatever goal this country felt was desirable."

Was it a wise move, in your judgment, for the President to extend the U.S. voluntary test ban beyond the October 31 deadline he set earlier?

"Yes, I think it was a wise move. The decision to continue beyond October 31 was essential in order to keep the Geneva conference from folding. We can now try again."

If no significant progress is made between October 31 and January 1, would you favor resumption of testing in a restricted form—underground, above atmosphere, or limiting testing within the atmosphere?

"If we cannot reach an agreement by January 1, 1960, I question if we are likely to reach any significant agreement at all.

"I think the United States should continue its test ban on atmospheric shots which are the sole source of radioactive fallout contamination, but, if the Government believes as I do that some further underground shots may be necessary, it should thereafter resume underground testing. I would reserve for the present a decision on high altitude shots."

Would it be necessary to do an extended amount of testing to develop the type of small, tactical, limited-war nuclear weapons the military feels it needs?

"On some types of small tactical weapons useful for limited war purposes, I do not believe much more testing is necessary. However, for other more advanced weapons of this nature I believe more testing is essential. Furthermore, there may be concepts of weapons essential to our national defense that have not been even conceived that may require testing as our brilliant scientists from Los Alamos and Livermore discover them. We should not want to tie our hands in this field."

How far ahead would you say the United States is in the development of nuclear weapons generally?

"I would not say. We tested our first atomic bomb in 1945 and the Russians were years behind us. We tested our first hydrogen bomb in 1952 and on that the Russians were only a few months behind us. If they can close one gap that rapidly, they may by now have closed other gaps.

"This is not, however, to imply that our own weapons program is not an excellent one. I believe we are still in the lead. I believe we will maintain that lead, but I do not want to close my eyes to the possibilities that the Russians have also made excellent progress."

Have we maintained our readiness to test well enough so that there would be little lost time if the Soviets suddenly made large scale tests?

"I think so. I believe the teams from Livermore and Los Alamos and elsewhere could swing into action very quickly. Our scientists know what technical problems they want to solve. I think they could proceed rapidly with the solution of them."

Do extensions such as the President has ordered in the test ban increase the likelihood that a suspension of tests will be achieved without a formal treaty; in other words, that neither side will risk affronting world opinion by being the first to resume?

"I am not able to predict what Russia will do when it comes to affronting world opinion. They broke the test ban on November 1 and November 3 of last year by conducting two tests beyond that period. In Budapest they displayed conduct which world opinion did not approve. My guess is that they will resume or not resume when and where it suits their convenience, not the opinion of the rest of the world.

"On our part, however, we can win favorable world opinion by running our tests in a manner that does not further contaminate the atmosphere or further increase the danger and damage from fallout."

What other countries besides France do you feel could achieve the capability of exploding nuclear devices in the next decade?

"The easy answer is how many industrial countries want to do it. We could help a few. Russia could help a few. Some other countries could go it alone. After all, Klaus Fuchs in now in East Germany at Deputy Director to the Central Institute for Nuclear Physics. He could design for East Germany a nuclear device that would explode even though it might not be the last word in destructiveness."

Are you reasonably certain that the Soviets are not now conducting sneak atomic explosions? How good is our detection system in the absence of an international one?

"How can we be certain? The best answer to this question might be the exact words used by the President himself when he announced we would extend the moratorium to the end of the calendar year. In his statement he pointed out that to the best of our knowledge the Russians have not conducted any tests since November 3.

"We have thus far learned that no detection system is perfect in the absence of an inspection team which can examine all occurences to determine whether they are earthquakes or atomic blasts. We can detect atmospheric shots rather accurately. If those are banned, there won't be too many sneak explosions. Those in the ground would be permitted and hence not violations."

The Publishing of Federal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the January 1959 issue of the American Bar Association Journal carried an article, by Norman J. Futor, styled "Searching the Federal Regulations: 47 Steps Are Too Many." Mr. Futor outlined a type of looseleaf system for the publishing of Federal regulations, and he proposed that such a system be substituted for the present Code of Federal Regulations and Federal Register.

In order to encourage consideration and discussion of this matter, I include—under leave to extend my remarks—a "Detailed Evaluation" of Mr. Futor's proposal which was written by the Director, Office of the Federal Register. Appended as a footnote thereto is a statement of March 18, 1959, which is a condensation of the "Detailed Evaluation":

DETAILED EVALUATION

(By the Director, Office of the Federal Register)

Mr. Futor suggests that the daily Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations be discontinued and replaced with a centrally published looseleaf system, each portion of which would be under the name of the issuing agency or division.

Such a change would, of course, require legislation amending the Federal Register Act, and the suggestion is therefore beyond the power of the Office of the Federal Register to approve. Apart from this, however, there are a number of considerations which indicate that the present system is better than that proposed by Mr. Futor.

The idea of a looseleaf promulgation system has been examined and discussed many times since 1938 when the Codification Board considered various possible systems, including looseleaf, in developing the structure of the Code of Federal Regulations. During the past 20 years, the advantages and disadvantages of a looseleaf system have been reexamined from time to time as improvements in printing and publication techniques have become available.

However, we have not been able to find a substitute for the general system of bound volumes and bound supplements, principally because the element of absolute reliability always remains as our prime responsibility.

No looseleaf system yet devised has this element. Every user of a looseleaf publication is at the mercy of those who inserted the leaves. No matter how good the filing instructions, no matter how pressing the need for accuracy, and no matter how conscientious the person filing, the user has no abso-

lute assurance of completeness and accuracy. There are simply too many chances for human error involved.

The legal status of the Code of Federal Regulations ultimately depends on its official character. Present legal presumptions, so necessary to the conduct of Government, could not be maintained where the basic integrity of the text rested on the actions of innumerable nonofficial parties engaged in filing pages and removing other pages from a looseleaf service.

A looseleaf system has the further disadvantage of weakening the integrity of individual documents having the force and effect of law. Under Mr. Futor's suggested method, the amended text of a regulation would be separated from the general recitals as to the nature of the agency action. The important statements relating to background and effectiveness thereby would be more difficult to coordinate with the amended text.

Since many regulations are effective 30 days following publication, this separation would also result in the removal from the looseleaf binders of currently effective provisions and the replacement of them with provisions having future effectiveness. The consequent jeopardy to individual rights, privileges, and immunities would be indefensible.

While a looseleaf service may be valuable in some areas as a working tool, we do not believe it would meet the needs of majority of the users as well as the Federal Register-Code of Federal Regulations system. Convenience of reference is indeed important in a publication of this sort, and we are always looking for ways and means to improve this element. But it is more important that the user be able to rely on the accuracy and completeness of the codification as of its cutoff date. We believe that the present format meets this requirement more effectively than would be a looseleaf system.

We also believe that the need for determining the precise language at a given time in the past is at least as great as the need for knowing the current status of a regulation. Under Mr. Futor's system the replaced leaves would soon become too voluminous and cumbersome to be readily used for determining the past status and too uncertain to be depended on.

Although costs could never be the deciding factor in a matter of this importance, the relative expense of various methods of promulgation deserve thorough evaluation.

The present system of Code of Federal Regulations bound volumes and supplements requires the printing of approximately 18,000 pages a year, most of which are printed with type picked up from the Federal Register without resetting. A careful study of the regulations published in the Federal Register during a recent typical week reveals that the 65 pages in the daily issues would have resulted in 441 looseleaf pages under Mr. Futor's suggested system. Projected to a year's total, this would equal over 22,000 pages.

Greater additional costs, however, would result from increased editorial activity. Many documents prescribe miscellaneous amendments which cut across the entire body of basic regulations and would involve complex copy preparing operations which would raise costs greatly and would have the further disadvantage of delaying publication unduly.

Such delays could not be tolerated since many urgent agency actions and programs become effective upon publication of the implementing documents. Under the present format these documents are filed promptly upon submission and are published in the immediately following issue.

Besides proposing a looseleaf publication for the Code of Federal Regulations, Mr. Futor suggests grouping regulations strictly by the name of the issuing organization. There are specific situations in which this is advantageous. In more general situations, however, there is greater advantage in a functional grouping. The Code of Federal Regulations uses a combination. Generally speaking, the titles of the Code of Federal Regulations cover broad functions, while the chapters within each title correspond to the names of the issuing agencies. This combination benefits from both concepts without imposing the rigidity of either.

Thus far we have discussed only the category of rules and regulations. Documents promulgating these comprise approximately 40 percent of the Federal Register. The larger portion of the daily issue consists of notices of proposed rulemaking and other notices, orders, and statements not affecting the Code of Federal Regulations. Mr. Futor suggests discontinuing the daily Federal Register but makes no provision for publishing these very important and necessary documents.

We agree with Mr. Futor that there is much room for improvement in the publication of Federal Regulations. However, we do not agree with some of the methods he would use to attain this improvement. We are in the course of carrying out major improvements in the Federal Register system under plans drawn up last year. Under these plans, any actual difficulties cited by Mr. Futor have been or will be corrected on a progressive basis.

The new program is designed to bring the Federal Register system in line with present-day needs and to keep it flexible enough to anticipate future nedes. We expect to be able to complete substantial improvements during this calendar year.

Under this new program, Mr. Futor's 47 steps have already been cut down to 7 or less. This was done by revising the codification guide system to provide for better and faster cumulation.

Currently planned improvements include more rapid supplementation of the Code of Federal Regulations as required, the progressive substitution of rapid offset printing for the slower letterpress; improved agency procedures for drafting and submitting documents, and the possible introduction of a supplementary loose-leaf service where it is practicable and really needed.

(NOTE.—The following statement of March 18, 1959, by the Director, Office of the Federal Register, is a condensation of the detailed evaluation:)

Mr. Futor suggests (a) discontinuing the daily Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations, replacing them with a centrally published loose-leaf system, and (b) regrouping regulations strictly by name of issuing organization. He finds that 47 steps must be taken to locate current regulations under the Federal Register-CFR system.

Some of Mr. Futor's criticism is valid. The system he offers as an alternative however, would not be an improvement. We believe it is better to improve the present system than to abandon it—which could not be done without a revision of the law, and should not be done in any case except after congressional hearings.

We have reviewed many suggestions for a loose-leaf promulgation system during the past 20 years and have reexamined the advantages and disadvantages from time to time as improvements in printing and publication techniques have become available.

However, we have concluded that, while a looseleaf service may be valuable in some areas as a working tool, it would not meet the minimum requirements for an adequate official publications service for Federal rules and regulations. It would be too unreliable, providing too many chances for human error, and leaving the user with no absolute assurance of completeness and accuracy.

It would have many other disadvantages: Loss of integrity of individual documents through separation of general recitals as to nature of action from amended text in order to provide looseleaf replacement leaves; removal from binders of currently effective provisions and replacement with provisions having future effectiveness; increased difficulty in determining precise language in effect at a given time in the past; greatly increased editorial operations which would delay publication.

In addition, discontinuance of the daily Federal Register leaves no publication system for documents other than rules. These comprise about 60 percent of the daily Federal Register and consist of the very important and necessary notices of proposed rulemaking and other orders, statements, and notices not directly affecting the Code of Federal Regulations.

With respect to regrouping regulations by organization name, there are specific situations in which this is advantageous. In general situations, however, there is greater advantage in a functional grouping. The Code of Federal Regulations uses a combination. Generally speaking, the titles of the Code of Federal Regulations cover broad functions, while the chapters within each title correspond to the names of the issuing agencies. This combination benefits from both concepts without imposing the rigidity of either.

The Office of the Federal Register is in the process of carrying out major improvements under plans drawn up last year. In a memorandum to the Administrator dated October 16, 1958, the Archivist presented plans for an improved program for the Federal Register activity. These recommendations were approved by the Administrator November 25, 1958. Under these plans, any actual difficulties experienced by users have been or will be corrected on a progressive basis.

Under this new program, Mr. Futor's 47 steps have already been cut down to seven or less. This was done by revising the Codification Guide system to provide for better and faster cumulation.

Currently planned improvements include more rapid supplementation of the Code of Federal Regulations as required, the progressive substitution of rapid offset printing for the slower letterpress; improved agency procedures for drafting and submitting documents, and the possible introduction of a supplementary looseleaf service where it is practicable and really needed.

Former Senator Henry Fountain Ashurst

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. George Kennedy, in his very delightful column published in the Washington Evening Star, wrote an article in which he said:

The most wonderful man the Rambler has met in his years in Washington is Henry Fountain Ashurst.

Mr. President, former Senator Ashurst is a man I have never personally known, but a man whom I know many Members of the Senate do know. This is such a delightful article that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I noted the same article and had intended to insert it in the RECORD this morning. I am glad that the Senator from Wisconsin has done so.

I associate myself with his statement and with the article mentioned as to the wonderful qualities of Senator Ashurst. We live under the same roof at the Sheraton Park Hotel. He is one of the most inspiring persons I have ever met. Frequently I seek his advice and counsel. Also, I find him to be the most delightful raconteur of historic events in the political history of the United States it has ever been my chance to know.

I am glad the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin is making this article available to his Senate colleagues and to the general public.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAMBLER NOTES IMPORTANT DATE

(By George Kennedy)

Well, let's get this on the record.

The most wonderful man the Rambler has met in his years in Washington is Henry Fountain Ashurst.

Webster, Haine, Clay, Calhoun, Blaine, Conklin, La Follette, Norris, and Borah are just names to him. But Henry Fountain Ashurst is a reality. This writer has heard him speak.

But not in the Senate Chamber, a matter of regret.

It was at an Alfalfa Club picnic at Dr. Eddie Thomas' farm on Braddock Heights in the saddle of the Catoctins west of Frederick. (He died a few days ago.)

A tall, distinguished man in a white suit arose and gave the address. It was a difficult assignment. The club is named after the legume that sends its roots farther than any other to get a drink.

Everyone was having a good time.

But the orator silenced and fascinated them. This was in the summer of 1952. Henry Fountain Ashurst had been out of the Senate since 1940 after serving there for 28 years, the first Senator to represent his State. He took his seat in 1912 when Arizona was admitted to the Union.

It was a presidential year and what he said (the writer has checked his report from the clips) seems worthy of repetition. Another presidential year is coming up. The clipping reads:

"With a deferential reference to his host, a Frederick physician and surgeon, Mr. Ashurst offered to outline some of the symptoms of the worst disease that can attack the politician, 'presidentialitis.'

"Irritability was the first of the symptoms.

"Thirst was the second.

"The third was loss of sleep and suspicion of all other politicians.

"'The disease,' he said in describing the fourth symptom, 'attacks the vocabulary to a point of reducing it to a single pronoun, the personal pronoun, I.'

"'It is progressive,' he said. 'The terrible thing that happens to the victim is a complete metamorphosis of the backbone into India rubber.'"

All this is occasioned by a telephone call from a mutual acquaintance the other day.

"Henry Fountain Ashurst," the caller said, "will be 85 years old Sunday. You might want to do a piece about him."

Do a piece about him? He's something of a challenge. Quoting him makes much better copy than writing about him.

The Rambler called on him last evening in his Sheraton-Park apartment.

He was fit as a fiddle. He did not seem to be disturbed about the current situation in the Senate—1 man [Senator MORSE] against 99.

He is better at quoting the bard than any Washingtonian in the writer's acquaintance.

But Shakespeare is not his only playwright. He quotes Aeschylus, Sophocles, Aristophanes, Moliere and Shaw.

The remarkable thing about all this—is that his formal education was very limited.

He was born September 13, 1874, in Nevada. His father, a Kentuckian, was looking for gold or silver.

His schooling ended at 13. He was a cowboy for 6 years. And then as he approached his 20th birthday, he got a sedentary political job. He was appointed turnkey at the county jail. That gave him an opportunity to read.

He can quote. And he can roll his own. Samples:

"Those who object to long sentences are usually the criminal classes."

"I prefer a man who is hardboiled to one who is halfbaked."

He has a million of them and 85 candles on his cake.

Happy birthday, Henry Fountain Ashurst.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 2 of the series:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Sept. 3, 1959]

WHO'S BEING HURT?

What is most ironical about the congressional efforts to keep interest rates low by refusing to lift the ceiling on long-term Government bond interest rates is that these fighters for low interest rates are actually hurting the people they are trying to help.

It is not large corporations or other major borrowers that Congress is helping when it fights in this curious way for lower interest rates. Rather it is the small business borrower and the individual installment purchaser.

In effect what the congressional action has been to switch Federal borrowing from the long-term into the short-term market by refusing to raise interest ceilings on long-term borrowing.

No congressional action was taken to reduce spending or to raise taxes. Consequently the Treasury is left with the responsibility to finance its deficit in the open market despite the limit on interest cost payable. And the refusal of Congress to act on the ceiling certainly did nothing to make potential investors and lenders decide to accept a lower interest rate just because the Treasury couldn't meet the market.

All that happened was that the Treasury had to switch from the possibility of long-term borrowing to heavy short-term borrowing, where the ceiling is not in force.

And it is in the short-term sphere that the Treasury's credit needs come into direct clash with those of the small borrower.

It is not long-term investment funds that the small shopkeeper or moderate sized business needs. It wants working capital and short-term loans to cover inventory and operation. Yet the Treasury's inability to borrow on the long-term market turned the Government into a direct competitor with the small businessman. Similarly, the individual looking for installment credit to finance a car or some appliance purchases is also finding that the Treasury's sopping up of short-term funds is making it more expensive for him to get the credit he needs.

At the same time, the large corporation, if willing to borrow for a longer period of time, sees far less of a squeeze on its credit sources than does the small man; for the lack of competition from the Treasury in the long-term market makes it that much easier for the large corporation to obtain funds.

Naturally, it could be questioned whether the ability of the large corporations to obtain funds while the small man must suffer from the credit squeeze is the result of favoritism on the part of the financial institutions. But this is not the case. The favored position of the corporation results simply from the structure of the financial system itself.

Insurance companies, savings institutions, and other institutional investors still have their steady flow of funds coming into their offices for placement, and this is money that must by its very nature be placed into longer maturity securities.

This means that large corporations, willing and able to undertake debt obligations for a long period of time, do not have too much trouble obtaining investment funds. The smaller firm seeking money for only a moderate period of time finds these institutional investors are not interested in this type of offerings. Meanwhile, those investors who would ordinarily take shorter maturity debt securities find the high rates the Treasury must offer to sell its bills, notes, and certificates attracting their funds away from the small borrower's securities.

The inflationary effects of the interest rate ceiling have been explained in this newspaper numerous times and do not require further repetition now. Nor is it necessary to state again how much the stature of the dollar and the strength of the economy would be improved if the Treasury were able to borrow the funds it needs from these institutional investors instead of having to rely on short-term credit creation by the commercial banking system.

But these facts have been pointed up by this and other newspapers, independent economists, and others for quite a while without effect on congressional opinion.

An examination of who is being hurt both by tight money and by the inflationary effects themselves then might change a few minds in Congress where appeals to economic reasoning have not done so.

Meet Wisconsin's FFA Star Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation the Future Farmers of America—

FFA—program is making a most constructive contribution to training our young folks for careers in farming. As we know, the FFA program includes: Developing competent agricultural leadership, assisting individuals in making intelligent choices of farm occupations; providing practical experience in carrying out special projects; developing creative attitudes, knowledges, and training by which individuals can cope with and resolve problems; and in other ways improving the individual's ability to making a contribution to the economy.

In 8,993 chapters across the country, there are 377,000 youths engaged in these constructive activities. In Wisconsin, for example, we have more than 14,000 members participating in a wide variety of constructive programs to improve the ability of our young farm folks to plan and make a success of a career in agriculture.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist published an interesting article entitled "Meet Wisconsin's FFA Star Farmer," by Doug Sorenson. The article outlines how LaVerne Frambs, of Barron County, won the FFA star farmer award for his work in farm management on the 750-acre home farm. Illustrative of the kind of program that is contributing to broadening the opportunities for our young folks to make a success of a career in farming, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, Sept. 5, 1959]

MEET WISCONSIN'S FFA STAR FARMER—LAVERNE FRAMBS, BARRON COUNTY, WON THE FFA STAR FARMER AWARD FOR HIS WORK IN FARM MANAGEMENT ON THE 750-ACRE HOME FARM

(By Doug Sorenson)

One of the biggest honors than can go to a young farm boy is the FFA star farmer award. And it couldn't go to a more deserving fellow than LaVerne Frambs, the young Barron County farmer who won the award this year for Wisconsin.

The handsome, husky lad of 19 is already well along the road toward successful farming. The story of how he earned the coveted award is a story of enthusiasm, hard work, and a dynamic vo-ag program.

Just out of Rice Lake High School last spring, LaVerne Frambs is already doing a big job of farming in partnership with his older brother, Harold, and his father, Otto Frambs. Together they work 2 farms totaling 750 acres in the fertile land of northern Barron County.

STARTED BUILDING HERD AT 7

LaVerne's progress toward the star farmer award began a dozen years ago. When he was only 7 years old his father gave him a calf as a start toward future farmownership. Today LaVerne owns 32 head of holsteins, 14 of them in the milking line. He's working toward a purebred herd and today has two cows, a bull, and a bull calf that are registered.

The Frambs' herd of 52 cows is a good one, averaging 386 pounds of butterfat and 4 percent test.

When LaVerne entered high school 4 years ago he was well on his way toward the star farmer award. Because of their father's heart condition, he and his brother had been doing the heavy farmwork for several years.

LaVerne began his FFA farm project with a cow and a calf. It wasn't long until he was deep into FFA activities.

During two of his high school years he was vice president of his local chapter. And during the 4 years he served on practically every chapter committee.

He was active in the corn-grain-hay show which his chapter puts on every fall. Grain from his own farm made good showings at some of the shows. The best was his 85-bushel yield of corn. "I've been close to being a top winner," he says, "but I never quite made it."

The county fair was always a big event and you'd always see some blue ribbons on LaVerne Frambs' exhibits. He showed hogs, dairy cattle, and handicraft. When he was a sophomore, he carried home 16 blue ribbons.

Registered Hampshire pigs are another of his projects. Today he has 10 purebred sows which started with a bred gilt that he got through an FFA gilt ring several years ago. "I had good luck with her," says LaVerne, "and I've still got her in my purebred herd. She's never had a litter smaller than 10 pigs."

LaVerne also raises some feeder pigs. And this summer he brought home 10 ewes and 10 lambs to start a sheep project.

But livestock projects are not the only ones that LaVerne has been successful in. The farm shows evidence everywhere of good soil management and conservation. The Frambs have grassed their waterways, limed the fields, strip cropped, and plowed down green manure crops. LaVerne tests the soil on the farm every 2 years to determine its fertilizer needs. Ten acres of pasture have also been renovated.

LaVerne likes to keep up on the latest developments in farm chemicals, too. This year his farm has test plots for different types of weed sprays. Also there is a plot showing how different varieties of grain perform.

Each year LaVerne and Harold clear a little more woods to make new cropland. In open areas of the woods they have conducted extensive pine reforestation.

How did LaVerne Frambs accomplish all this while maintaining a high scholastic record at school? It took a lot of hard work and planning. A daily schedule on a weekday looked something like this:

"I got up at 4:30 in the morning," says LaVerne. "After I did the milking and some of the chores I was off to school and in class by 8:30. I was able to make arrangements for transportation so that I could be home by 3:15 in the afternoon for chores. Often I worked in the fields until dark."

Work was so pressing at the time of the FFA convention, where he got the award, that LaVerne had to help plant 120 acres of corn before he was able to get away.

"I had no time for school sports," he says. "But I spent a little time hunting, which is a favorite sport of mine. Last year I got 52 coons."

BUILDING UP MACHINERY TOO

Although LaVerne's part of the Frambs partnership is mostly livestock, he is building up some machinery too. He bought a new tractor this year.

LaVerne knows that his success in farming this far is not all his own doings. "I had a lot of help from my parents," he says, "and my school advisers and the FFA chapter have been a constant inspiration."

LaVerne's advisor is Donald Triebensee, who is making something of a record for himself as an instructor, too. Last year's Star Farmer Award also went to a Rice Lake boy. This year several other boys in the chapter got top FFA awards.

"There is nothing about the modern farm these Frambs boys cannot do well," says teacher Triebensee. "They are Samsons when it comes to work."

To be sure, LaVerne Frambs is off to a good start as a successful farmer. But this is only the beginning. Right now he is talking of working more land and enlarging the family dairy herd.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before International Association of Printing House Craftsmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, without communication there could be no civilization. In our time, we have seen the development of such new media of communication as radio and television. However, these have supplemented, rather than replaced printing, which continues as the chief medium of communication.

I am sure that the following address, delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley at the golden anniversary luncheon of the International Association of Printing House Craftsmen, Inc., will interest all who value the contributions that printers have made to society:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, THE COCA-COLA EXPORT CORP., AT GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY LUNCHEON, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRINTING HOUSE CRAFTSMEN, INC., STATLER-HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 1959

Mr. President, distinguished guests, members of the International Association of Printing House Craftsmen, ladies and gentlemen, I am doubly indebted—to you and my longtime friend, Gus Giegengack—for your kind invitation to be here today. Firstly—because I wish to pay my respects to a great craft which has been for too long taken for granted. Secondly—if I may be permitted a selfish motive, what I say here today is designed for a secondary audience—my grandchildren—in the years to come.

It is a convenient classification of anthropologists that the acquisition of the skills of pottery distinguish a barbarian from a savage, and the acquisition of a language makes the beginning of the elevation of the barbarian peoples to a tribal society.

To this I wih to add my own observation that the acquisition of the skills of the printing press—mark the beginning of the rise of tribal states into civilized society. Not only are the printing arts the cornerstone of civilization, they are its lifeblood. It is impossible to conceive of the evolution of modern society without it—or to imagine it continuing for 24 hours in its absence. I am, therefore, honored to be here today—to pay tribute to that greatest developer of arts, which in its powers of transmission to others, miraculously developed into a great art in its own right.

Its effect is more pervasive, but as an American, I want my children and grandchildren to know—that the very independence of our country was born of the most explosive combination ever known to bigotry, tyranny, and ignorance—the free air—freemen breathe—and the smell of printer's ink.

Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and John Adams would have been novices in the wilderness—except for the presence of the

man who knew the alchemy of a printing press—Benjamin Franklin. He knew that what a printer etches on metal, reason and honor engrave on men's souls. He knew that the massed armies of Europe could neither crush nor outflank an idea in men's souls—nor could any cavalry—or for that matter, any modern jet—outspeed the God-given ability of men to recognize the truth of the printed word.

I feel sure that if the first and greatest Postmaster General under the Continental Congress—Benjamin Franklin—were here today, he would express the thanks of the Republic for your magnificent past service and your present incredible usefulness. Since by reason of matters over which I have no control—Mr. Franklin cannot be here, as one of his successors as Postmaster General of the United States, I am sure he would not count it amiss if I thanked you, on behalf of all of us for your great contribution. Where there are printers, there will be ideas—and in the end—the strength in men's souls can break any chains the ingenuity of tyrants—from Genghis Khan to Josef Stalin—can design for men's wrists. The Liberty Bell may well be the symbol of liberty—but the printing press is the armory of freedom.

It is most appropriate that your convention is being held this year in the city of New York, where the craftsmen movement was started just 50 years ago this month with the founding of the Club of Printing House Craftsmen of New York.

A few days ago I was privileged to see some of the printed chapters of your golden anniversary commemorative book, "Printing Progress: A Mid-Century Report." In my opinion, it is one of the most handsome examples of your handiwork—of the printer's art—that I have seen in a long time. You are to be congratulated upon its production; you are fortunate in having such a valuable and beautiful permanent memento of the great organization to which you belong.

While admiring the book as a book, I was especially interested in one of its chapters—the history of your organization by its first president, the late Perry R. Long, who, I understand, attended every one of your 39 conventions including the one last year in Detroit. Unfortunately, he passed away shortly thereafter and missed what would have been a rare pleasure and honor for him—to have been here today on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the international association which he helped found and the 50th anniversary of the craftsmen movement.

Although I never met Mr. Long, the eloquence with which he told the story of the craftsmen organization—its ideals, its accomplishments, its goals—is evidence that he must have been an unusual personality who loved his industry and was an inspiration to those employed in it.

I am amazed at the growth of your organization—from one local club 50 years ago to a federation of 113 clubs with 16,000 members in the United States, Canada, and overseas. I don't need to be told that your organization with its "share your knowledge" ideal has contributed immeasurably to the advancement of the printing industry and its technology.

In my opening remarks I made a reference to my good friend Gus Giegengack, who is one of your past presidents and who is also president and general manager of the great Graphic Arts Exposition now at the Coliseum. If I mention Gus once or twice again in the course of my remarks, it is because through him I have come to know something about the printing industry in general and about the Printing House Craftsmen in particular. Twice in the past 25 years I was able to be of some assistance to Gus, who, among other things, is an expert compiler and presenter of petitions.

The first time was in 1933, when Gus was a candidate for Public Printer. As you know, an appointive position of this kind requires political assistance and endorsement. Gus came to me with one of the most handsomely bound volumes of petitions I have ever seen. It contained letters of endorsement from important printing industry organizations and individuals prominent in your industry. It's been many years since I have seen the volume, but I do remember how voluminous it was. It was so big that I suspect it contained letters not only from prominent printers, but also from their uncles and their cousins and their aunts.

I was happy to have been in a position to help Gus in a small way that time. I say a small way—because Gus was his own best advocate. I suspect that I don't need to tell this audience that Gus didn't need help from me or anybody on how to be a politician.

The next time Gus and I cooperated on a project connected with the printing industry was in 1939, when the postage stamp commemorating the 300th anniversary of the introduction of printing in colonial America was issued. Since this month marks the 20th anniversary of the issuance of that stamp, and because the craftsmen, among other organizations, were so closely identified with it, I believe the story will bear retelling now.

The story starts in 1938 with a man named August Dietz in Richmond, Va. Mr. Dietz submitted to the Post Office Department, when I was Postmaster General, a design for a stamp commemorating the 300th anniversary of the arrival of the Stephen Daye press in Cambridge, Mass. The design carried a drawing of the press. The stamp was not seriously considered by the Post Office Department at that time.

Then one of your leading trade periodicals, Printing magazine, picked up the idea and ran the Dietz stamp design on the cover of its March 1939 issue. The magazine started a campaign to promote a 300th anniversary commemorative stamp, to be issued September 25, 1939, the day the Fifth Educational Graphic Arts Exposition was to open at Grand Central Palace. Printing magazine invited leading trade associations and printing trades unions to address letters of petition to me as Postmaster General.

The campaign was successful. A total of 63 letters of petition from printing industry groups sent to Printing magazine, which encased them in a handsome green morocco cover for presentation to me. Gus Giegengack, then Public Printer, agreed to make the presentation on behalf of your industry.

A hitch developed. The Post Office Department discovered that 1938 appeared to be the true anniversary—the year the Stephen Daye press arrived in America. Ernest F. Trotter, editor of Printing magazine, made a search, learned that John Clyde Oswald, a noted graphic arts historian, had written a book which claimed that, while the press was set up in late 1638, its first products, the "Freeman's Oath" and the "Bay Psalm Book" were not printed until early 1639. Although some historians still disagreed, the Post Office Department was convinced the preponderance of evidence was in favor of 1639. The stamp was authorized, a design prepared which prominently displayed the Stephen Daye press, and an order placed with the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for 65 million stamps to be ready for the date of issuance, September 25, 1939. As those of you who attended the 1939 Graphic Arts Exposition will remember, the Stephen Daye press itself was brought down from Vermont under armed guard and placed on exhibit at the exposition.

Clark Long, one of your past presidents who, in 1939, was Assistant Director of the Bureau of Printing and Engraving, said that the bound collection of letters of petition for the stamp was "the most elaborate and attractive presentation portfolio that had ever been offered" for such a purpose, so far as he could recall.

Your industry's petition for a commemorative stamp reached sympathetic ears in the person of the then Postmaster General. I like stamps, and needed only to be convinced there was a legitimate reason for issuing one. The printing stamp was the first truly commemorative stamp ever issued to honor an industry, and the second stamp identified with any industry. The first one was issued in 1901, as a salute to the transportation industry, in connection with the American exposition in Buffalo.

My interest in stamps has led me to be accused of starting a philatelist spree which kept the Bureau of Engraving and Printing stamp presses running around the clock. That is a little exaggerated in my opinion, but you must remember that, during that period, I was employed by a stamp collector—who lived in the White House.

I am sure that the printing stamp, and its use on mail during the months that followed its issuance, was of major public relations value to your industry. That leads me to comment on one of the outstanding accomplishments of your organization.

Except for my brief encounters with your industry which I have mentioned, I probably know no more about printing than the average citizen. We are inclined to take printing for granted—like food, clothing and shelter—or anything else so basic to our daily lives. At least that was true until the craftsmen started Printing Week. Originated about 15 years ago by your own Perry Long, and now observed nationally under the sponsorship of craftsmen clubs and employer organizations, it has come to be a major public relations event for your industry.

Every January, appropriately during the week of the birthday of Benjamin Franklin, the patron of American printers, you do an excellent job of telling the public about the contributions of your great industry to the cultural and economic welfare of the Nation. No citizen who reads can any longer be unaware of the importance of printing, thanks to the craftsmen organization and Printing Week.

I am impressed by another facet—the most important facet in my opinion—of your craftsmen organization. It is less tangible than Printing Week, but nonetheless significant and far-reaching in its influence. It is related to the craftsmen slogan "Share Your Knowledge" and the educational nature of your activities. Perhaps I am impressed because you craftsmen have discovered a secret shared by those of us who have spent most of our lives in public service and politics. To paraphrase the late Colonel Stoopnagle, of Stoopnagle and Budd radio fame, "People are more important than anybody." You as printing plant executives—foremen and superintendents, and top management, too—know that your success depends upon your ability to get work done through people.

Up at the Coliseum this week you have on display the newest mechanical and electronic marvels of the age designed to produce printing faster and better. Wonderful as these machines are, they are as naught without people—without you and the men under your supervision to operate them. Through your "Share Your Knowledge" program, you keep yourselves and your fellow craftsmen informed on changing methods and new techniques. More than that, you keep ahead of the parade, and I suspect that much of the technological progress represented by new machines and devices at the exposition was stimulated by your thinking—by your informed awareness of the need for better tools to do your job.

The major emphasis of your convention program this year, I understand, is on an evaluation of the new things you are seeing at the Graphic Arts Exposition. That is fine—your industry no doubt needs improved machinery and methods if for no other reason than to keep pace with the rapid technological strides that are being made in all industries these days. You have to move forward technologically to keep competitive in our free economy.

But along with this emphasis on the industry's new technology, I see that you have found time to schedule "Human Relations" as a subject for discussion at your Golden Anniversary Clinic Number Four tomorrow morning. And I am told that some of your local clubs pioneered in conducting classes on human relations in industry and that several thousands of your members have taken the foreman-management courses sponsored by Printing Industry of America.

Any industry with the foresight and leadership to sponsor programs of that nature is just bound to progress. You are to be congratulated upon your key part in the program.

Not the least important part of your educational program and one of the major accomplishments of the craftsmen is the series of graphic arts expositions—of which the one at the Coliseum this week is the seventh.

Although it is now conducted by a corporation with representatives of several trade organizations on its board of directors, it was you, the craftsmen, who initiated the idea. The exposition corporation has always been headed by a craftsman; all the expositions have been managed by a craftsman.

I am told that your last exposition was held 9 years ago, and that it has been 20 years since one was held in New York. A lot of things have happened since 1939. At that time the country was just coming out of a major depression, and soon thereafter World War II started. Both of these disasters slowed progress in many things. But since the end of World War II the tempo of technological change, in printing as well as other industries, was accelerated tremendously.

Things are being done automatically today, by electronic controls and other devices, that were done tediously by hand and not always accurately, 20 years ago. Human judgment, however, has not been replaced by machines. Rather, it has been freed to be more creative, which is important in an industry like printing whose business is primarily the communication of ideas.

I know practically nothing about the mechanics of your industry, but I can imagine it would be an interesting exercise to make a list of what is being shown at your exposition this week and compare it with a list of what was shown at the 1939 exposition at Grand Central Palace 20 years ago. There must be many things now that were not even imagined, or at least not on the drawing boards, then.

Many wonderful things have happened in this country, and in your industry, in the past 20 years. I have been told there have been more changes in your industry in the past 15 or 20 years than in the whole 500-year history of the printing industry. What about the next 20 years? Speculation is anybody's game, but one can at least predict that, with the accelerated pace of research and development in all industry, a graphic arts exposition 20 years from now will put this one "in the shade" more than your 1959 one does the 1939 exposition.

You've all heard the story of the Washington taxi driver taking a visitor down Pennsylvania Avenue past the Archives Building. The passenger, seeing the inscription on the building, which says "What Is Past Is Prologue," asked the cabdriver if he knew what it meant. "Sure," said the cabbie, "it means 'You ain't seen nothin' yet.' "

Whatever new is to be seen in your industry 20 years from now, I'm sure that the craftsmen with their "Share Your Knowledge" zeal will be "with it." Nay, more than that, they'll be largely responsible for bringing it about.

Thank you.

Forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev Talks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD selected editorials which have appeared in Chinese newspapers in Taipei. These articles express varying degrees of doubt on the forthcoming Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks, and fear of a Yalta-style compromise on the Far East. It is difficult to reassure these people in the face of full-scale Communist aggression in Laos and renewed shelling of the islands in the Formosa Straits. The views expressed are not necessarily my own, but I thought they warranted consideration.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the China Daily News, Taipei, Aug. 8, 1959]

CAN THE EISENHOWER-KHRUSHCHEV TALKS SETTLE PROBLEMS?

Appeasers in the international set are again obsessed in their illusions since Washington and Moscow announced simultaneously the exchange of visits by President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev. They say this is a great change in America's policy toward Russia as well as the beginning of the unfreezing of East-West relations. Two London papers described President Eisenhower as a new man who has become a fully responsible President, and asserted that John Foster would be shocked if he were still alive. These statements of appeasers have betrayed their illusion that all existing problems will be settled once the leaders of the two powerful countries meet.

But can the talks between Eisenhower and Khrushchev settle problems? Khrushchev's replies in his August 5 press conference were a good answer to this question. He reiterated Russia's stand that the Western allies must leave West Berlin, that West Berlin must become a free city, and that the wartime allies must sign separate peace treaties with both West Germany and East Germany. In iterating this stand which his spokesman Gromyko had repeated again and again in the Geneva foreign ministers conference indicated that he would try to attain the goal which he failed to attain in the Geneva conference. In other words, the Communists must annex West Berlin and the West must recognize Germany's division and the enslaving of the satellite regimes in the Eastern European countries.

The West firmly rejected these peace terms during more than two months of the foreign ministers conference. If it is said that the Ike-Khrushchev talks can settle these problems, then President Eisenhower must give grounds by buying peace from Khrushchev with the freedom of the people of West Berlin and of Germany. We very much doubt this possibility.

We believe that the Ike-Khrushchev talks not only will not settle the problems but also will create more troubles. Regarding the Berlin and the German problems, a Yalta-style story may not be repeated. However, available signs show that plotters in the Kremlin appear to be forcing a Yalta conference for the Far East. It is very possible that the present Lao Communist rebellion is a part of this plan. Possibly, Peiping's intensified military activities in the Chinmen-Matsu area are an important move in the International Communists' global strategy. There was a hint in Khrushchev's press conference. The Russian Premier said that the United States should be friendly not only to the Soviet Union but also to Russia's allies. For this reason, the Chinese Communists may create new crises in the Taiwan Strait and the Indochinese Peninsula so that a background for a Yalta-style compromise will emerge when Eisenhower meets Khrushchev. As the atmosphere of appeasement becomes rampant in the United States and abroad, it may force the United States to become friendly to Russia's allies.

Of course, this trap is only the wishful thinking of the Kremlin. Reports from the United States said that both the American Government and the American people are waiting for the Ike-Khrushchev talks with a prudent and vigilant attitude. The New York Times, other papers, and Congressmen are warning against excessive optimism and pointing out that as long as the Communist goal of world conquest remains unchanged, any optimism will be baseless. It is particularly gratifying to learn that the American Congress also is planning a negative boycott on Khrushchev's visit by advancing its date of recess so that Khrushchev will not be invited to address it as other visiting chiefs of government have been. We hope that all these public opinions will serve to raise Eisenhower's vigilance so that he will not fall into the trap laid by the Red dictator.

[From the Hsin Sheng Pao, Taipei, Aug. 8, 1959]

A WAR UNDER THE COVER OF ATMOSPHERE OF PEACE

Although many farsighted people are viewing the exchange of visits by President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev with a reserved, suspicious, and worried attitude, a group of appeasers and neutralist countries already are entertaining great expectations of the Ike-Khrushchev meeting thinking that the cold war will be unfreezed and that the dream of peaceful coexistence will thus become true. Yet, right at this moment, in a tiny corner of the world about which very little is known to the world at large, a war, genuine though small in scale, has broken out.

As a matter of fact, the Communist rebellion in the northeastern part of Laos began quietly in the middle of last month. It became intense when the provinces of Sam Neua and Phong Saly were captured by the Communists. The Communists rebels have announced their plan to capture Vientiane within 3 to 4 months. If Vientiane falls, then a half of Laos will be gone. Even if this Communist dream fails to become true, the rebels will at least set up their border base and thereby turn Laos into a second Vietnam. It is clear enough that it is because of the supply of manpower by the Vietnamese Communists and the supply of arms by the Chinese Communists that the Lao Communists have been able to launch this counter offensive. Besides, they did launch the offensive from North Vietnam. Thus, it is not a civil war but 100 percent aggression.

Some people may feel it strange for the Communists to choose this moment to start

a local war since Khrushchev has launched a full-scale peace offensive to lure the United States. Will his goal be damaged by this war as other people may doubt his sincerity for peace? Practically speaking, choosing this moment to ivade Laos is very delicate. We should know that whatever change may take place in international situation, the Communists will never give up their final goal of world conquest. Since they are at present yet unable to start a full-scale war, they can only conquer the world by gradually encroaching upon it. In invading Laos, they are using the atmosphere of peace prevailing the world to carry out their aggression.

It may be said that the Western governments can protest to Khrushchev or demand that he restrain the Chinese and the Vietnamese Communists. But Khrushchev can brush the protest aside by saying that it is Lao's civil war or by saying that it is not his business but the affairs of Ho Chiminh or Mao Tze-tung.

The Chinese Communists have a further political goal in their invasion of Laos. In view of the unclear attitude of the free world after Laos brought the case before the United Nations, we can hardly expect the free world to give open support to Laos. On the contrary, the Lao crisis will be used as an excuse by the neutralists such as Nehru who will say: "If the Chinese Communists had been admitted to the United Nations, the Lao crisis would not have happened." Thus, by invading Laos, Peiping not only has expanded its influence but also has created a hope of breaking into the United Nations.

Having known the Communist plot of starting local encroachment under the cover of atmosphere of peace, we must raise our vigilance. The Communists will not start a war for Berlin, nor will they invade Taiwan and Penghu because these actions will become too big a stimulation to the free world. But it is highly possible that Peiping may try to seize our offshore islands at this moment. We are not scared however. So long as we do not slacken our vigilance, our own strength is capable of crushing Peiping's plot. We only hope that anti-Communist countries, particularly those in southeast Asia, can apprehend the Communist intrigue and support Laos to succeed in suppresing the Communist rebellion at an early date.

[From the Ta Hua Evening News, Taipei, Aug. 5, 1959]

THE END OF "U.S. CENTURY"

The whole world was more than astonished when the exchange of visits between Khrushchev and Eisenhower was announced simultaneously in Washington and Moscow. Unlike Khrushchev's visit to the United States, which had been brewing for quite a long time, Eisenhower's sudden decision to visit Moscow was rather a surprise that would adversely and vitally affect the world beyond all precedent. British newspapers called it a miracle of 1959, but we would like to consider it an unfortunate miracle to the whole world.

Since World War II, the President of the United States never has made a state visit to any friendly nation outside the Western Hemisphere. But now Eisenhower feels a particular interest in a state visit to Soviet Russia. What this indicates is U.S. tacit recognition of Soviet Russia as her equal in leadership, the beginning of United States-Soviet coexistence, and the affirmation of a long-range tragedy of mankind.

Khrushchev's coming into power has created two outstanding changes in the Soviet Communists' foreign policy; emphasizing peaceful coexistence and constantly visiting other countries, one working in coordination with the other. During the last few years, Khrushchev has been willing to visit any country where his visit was not rejected, even a satellite as small as Albania. It is no wonder that he should have desired to visit the United States. In our eyes, it is strange that the United States should be willing to receive him, but more strange is that Eisenhower should agree to return his visit by calling on him in Moscow.

Some may interpret this as an international courtesy. In fact, however, the U.S. President has never made a state visit to any of the friendly nations in Europe and Asia except his visits to the neighboring Mexico and Canada and several trips to Europe to participate in various international conferences. Now that Eisenhower has decided to visit Moscow, we may conclude that the United States is thinking much of her enemy—the Soviet Union—even if she is not thinking little of her allies.

We still believe, however, that the United States will not sell out any of her friendly nations during the exchange of visits, and that she will stand as firm as ever toward practical questions. Nevertheless, Eisenhower's visit to Moscow obviously implies the shaking of U.S. leadership in the world. The "U.S. Century" and "Eisenhower Era" that have fascinated the Americans since World War II would have to give way to a "United States-Soviet Century" and "Ike-K. Era." The U.S. policy of liberating the Iron Curtain would soon have to be replaced by peaceful coexistnce, and vanish for good following the institution of "Captive Nations Week." The tragedy that mankind is half free and half enslaved would last forever, and irrational disruption and occupation would be legalized. For future historians who might endeavor to find an epoch-making sign, Eisenhower's visit to Moscow would serve to mark the end of the "U.S. Century" and the beginning of a "Coexistence Era."

[From the Central Daily News, Taipei, Aug. 4, 1959]

REPORT ON KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Washington and Moscow announced simultaneously yesterday that President Eisenhower and Khrushchev will exchange visits this fall. Our view on this event is that Khrushchev will exchange visits this fall. Our view on this event is that Khrushchev has long entertained this hope. He repeatedly expressed this desire to American visitors and has received favorable reaction in certain quarters in America. So, although President Eisenhower said that the exchange of visit was his suggestion, it is probably the result of internal pressures.

Secondly, why has Khrushchev been so anxious to visit the United States during the past year? In the first place, this will greatly bolster his personal position at home; in the second place, the visit will cover the failure of the foreign ministers conference, and lastly, the effect of the Captive Nations' Week will be offset if he can pay a visit to the United States as the captive nations will unavoidable doubt the sincerity of the United States in launching the movement.

We shall not discuss the substantial contents of the future Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks, but thew isdom of making such contacts is doubtful. To say that Khrushchev will give up his aggressive ambitions after he has seen America's true might is a wishful thinking because it has underestimated Khrushchev's ability. Beside, if he should do so as expected, he would not be a Communist after all.

If it is imperative for President Eisenhowevr to extend this invitation, we only hope that he will not disappoint America's friends and make the enemy happy by allowing Khrushchev to make use of him.

[From the Hsin Sheng Pao, Aug. 3, 1959]

Reports from Washington and Moscow show that a visit to the United States by Russian Premier Khrushchev has now become an irresistible situation.

The Western European countries have already felt uneasy because of these reports. They feel that they have been excluded and describe this "back door meeting" as a surrender to Khrushchev's aggressive ambitions. At present, voices opposing the Khrushchev visit can already be heard in the United States but they are fragmentary and weak. We also are not in favor of the visit because it will not be in the interest of the United States and her allies.

As we pointed out before Khrushchev probably was more interested in visiting the United States than in holding open meetings. He fully understands that in order to make gains in any field, he must first shake America's stand. Once he succeeds in doing so, he can march on unobstructed to the goal of world conquest because no other country is capable of resisting Russia's pressures.

Should the reports on Khrushchev's visit become true, two effects would be produced. Firstly, the feeling of the Western European powers that they have been "excluded" will be aggravated. Consequently, they will suspect America's policy and stand. Moreover, the same feeling will brew in America's Asian allies. Finally, the unity and mutual trust between the free allies will become shaky. So, when President Eisenhower uses one hand to greet Khrushchev, his other hand will launch the movement splitting allied unity. Gradually, the United States will be isolated.

Secondly, the influence of appeasement in the United States and the free world as a whole will be bolstered. The greater the influence of appeasement is, the more will the difficulties to the American Government be.

We fully share the view that to invite Khrushchev to visit the United States is tantamount to a surrender to Khrushchev's aggressive ambitions. The Western powers must see one point very clearly. All the actions of Khrushchev are themselves a kind of cold war. If he has prevented the foreign ministers conference from solving existing problems, he will not allow the "back door meeting" to solve them either. As far as his strategy against the United States is concerned, basically, he is not interested in the Eisenhower administration which he knows will definitely not satisfy his ambition. His visit to the United States and his demand for a summit meeting are designed to soften the stand of the Eisenhower government for his own expansion. Based on these observations, we are of the opinion that to invite Khrushchev to visit the United States or to hold a summit meeting will at the same time invite trouble for America herself.

[From the United Daily News, Aug. 4, 1959]

Khrushchev's visit to the United States can be reviewed in two respects. The first is that whether or not the free world needs such a visit. In other words, will this visit change the present cold war situation? Will it lead to a true peace? The second is that in accepting the invitation, does Khrushchev consider that he can lightly attain the goal which he has failed to attain by his intimidating and delaying tactics?

In the first aspect, the answer must be sought for in the existing Berlin issue. Moscow wants to swallow this city so that the gap in the Iron Curtain can be closed. So the key to this issue lies in the determination of the Western allies. If they decide to give up West Berlin, then Khrushchev's visit to the United States will provide them an opportunity to save their faces. On the con-

trary, if they decide to retain that city, then, the settlement of the problem cannot be benefited in the least by inviting Khrushchev to pay a visit to the United States because the difference on this issue between the two sides is too great. If the United States knows clearly that this visit can render no help to the settlement of the problem and yet she still has extended the invitation, we can only describe the action as "childish and naive."

It may be said that in inviting Khrushchev to visit the United States the latter hopes that the visitor may reduce his belligerent spirit after he has seen America's true strength. This statement is unreasonable. Khrushchev has his agents all over the new continent and thus he cannot be ignorant of America's might. Moreover, all Communists have a prejudice. They are convinced that the United States is a typical capitalistic country and the No. 1 enemy of communism. To say that Khrushchev will change his mind after his tour of America is no less than daydreaming.

We want to say frankly that America's invitation to Khrushchev to visit the United States and the latter's acceptance of the invitation will bring every damage and no advantage to the free world. The regrettable part is that this judgment has to be confirmed by future facts instead of being foreseen by the wisdom of the present Western statesmen. So, when we learned of the reports on Khrushchev's visit, we could but deplore the dark future of mankind.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 3 of the series:

[From the Hartford (Conn.) Courant, Aug. 23, 1959]

BLOW AGAINST THRIFT

Early last week a duly constituted committee of Congress decided to disdain the repeated pleas of the administration for permission to raise the ceiling on interest rates for Government bonds. Whether or not this was the final word of the 86th Congress on this subject, it was a serious economic mistake. Of greater interest to most Congressmen, probably, is the fact that it eventually may prove a political boner as well.

The decision to cling to an outgrown ceiling affected, in the first place, all new issues of marketable bonds of more than 5 years maturity—those intended for such institutions as banks and insurance companies and for big individual investors. By refusing to lift the top rate beyond 4¼ percent, Congress has greatly handicapped Secretary Robert Anderson in managing the ever-growing public debt with the least possible stimulus to inflation.

But that is not the whole story. More significant to the average citizen is the fact that the resounding congressional no will prevent the Treasury from raising the long-outdated interest rate on E and H savings bonds. And these are securities that one administration after another has been persistently trying to sell to the American public for some 18 years.

In the past the Treasury has succeeded in winning from Congress occasional modest increases in the interest it can pay on savings bonds, to keep the return roughly commensurate with that available from other conservative investments. On E-bonds held to maturity, for example, the yield has inched up over the years from 2.9 percent to 3.26 percent. Meanwhile however, the rate paid by commercial banks has risen as high as 3 percent. Savings banks have gone to 3¼ percent and within a few months some will step up again to 3½ percent. Some savings and loan associations for their part are paying 4 percent.

Yet the U.S. Government, by decree of Congress, is unable to keep pace. The inevitable result has been a steady cashing in of savings bonds by their holders. The Treasury has just disclosed that cash-ins of E and H bonds had outrun sales for 12 successive months through July. For the first 7 months of this year, redemptions outstripped sales by $613 million. Furthermore, Treasury officials said that unless the arbitrary ceiling is lifted, the whole savings bond program is in danger of collapse.

It could be. Most Americans bought these bonds in the first place out of patriotic zeal, and a desire to back the boys on the firing line in every way possible. When the guns fell silent, many persons continued to buy them, as a form of regular savings, for their safety, and perhaps even for their steady if unspectacular yield. But with the continued march of inflation all that has changed. Few savers are going to put money into Government bonds that pay a scant 3¼ (and that only if held to maturity), when other institutions offer higher rates along with a Government guarantee of the principal. Under today's circumstances, moreover, saving in any form has become a dubious procedure. Hence the popularity of the high-flying stock market, as a possible, if risky, hedge against the rising cost of living.

If it is to halt the ravages of inflation, Washington must act forcefully on several fronts. But it surely will not succeed if it persists in penalizing the saver. That is exactly what Congress is doing by clinging to an interest rate that was adequate 10 years ago, but is clearly inadequate now.

Danger Seen for North in Housing Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I note with deep interest an article appearing in yesterday's Washington Post and Times Herald entitled "Danger Seen for North in Housing Segregation."

Joseph D. Lohman, former chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, is reported to have said in a speech Wednesday that segregation in housing in the North may be the forerunner of increased racial violence and political conflict in the North. He is directly quoted in this article as stating, "The violence which confronts us in the South is as dust in the wind compared to the prospects of violence in the segregated metropolitan areas which are now developing."

Mr. President, I do not know where Mr. Lohman has been in the past several months, but I am quite certain he must not have been reading the morning and afternoon papers from around the Nation, and particularly the ones from the North. Mr. Lohman is apparently oblivious of the fact that violence and political hatred and racial conflict are now at an alltime peak in the North where integration has occurred. To the contrary, we do not find any violence in the South where segregation exists, and we do not find violence in the North wherever segregation may exist.

Contrary to Mr. Lohman's comments to the annual conference of the National Urban League, the violence which he anticipates will only come wherever integration is forced upon people.

If Mr. Lohman fears violence because of segregated housing in the North, or anywhere in this country, I wonder if he would but name one place where violence has occurred in these United States on account of segregation.

Mr. President, Mr. Lohman and the other supporters of the National Urban League are shooting in the dark and are making such illogical statements in an attempt to take away from the terrific impact violence in integrated areas of this Nation is having upon our people.

It is ridiculous for anyone to argue that segregated housing is going to cause violence in any part of this Nation. As I have repeated before, it is only where integration is forced upon people that violence occurs. People do not segregate against their will, but they are more often integrated against their will. We would not have segregated suburban areas in the North, or anywhere in the Nation, unless is was desired by the people who buy the homes.

Mr. President, in order that everyone may have the benefit of Mr. Lohman's ridiculous views, to which I take sharp exception, I ask that this article from the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 10, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGER SEEN FOR NORTH IN HOUSING SEGREGATION

(By Luther P. Jackson)

Joseph D. Lohman, former Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, declared yesterday that segregation in housing may be the forerunner of increased racial violence and political conflict in the North.

"The violence which confronts us in the South," he said, "is as dust in the wind compared to the prospects of violence in the segregated metropolitan areas which are now developing."

Lohman, now State Treasurer of Illinois, spoke at the annual conference of the National Urban League which ends today at the Sheraton-Park.

Lohman's comparison of violence in the South and North was criticized at a press conference by League President Theodore W. Kheel, of New York. Kheel said such state-

ments give support to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Democrat of Mississippi, and other foes of integration.

Lester B. Granger, executive secretary of the league, added that there is generally less racial tension in northern cities than there was 40 years ago. He said the press has made the public more alert to racial incidents.

Lohman later commented that "violence is inexcusable," but added that "rigid housing segregation represents a framework for violence."

In his speech, Lohman asserted that the "true pillar of segregation in America is residential segregation." He said there is more of this type of segregation now than ever before and that unless corrective measures are taken, there will be still more by 1975.

Lohman said all-white suburban communities are developing because private builders are allowed to build large subdivisions using the old ethic of segregation.

In contrast, he said, efforts are being made to renew the cities under the "new ethic" of integration as spelled out in laws and court decisions. He said Negroes are forced to accept inferior housing within the cities while whites have a free choice.

Lohman said a political conflict between cities and suburbs could result from Negroes taking over old city political machines. "It would be poetic justice," he added, "if Negroes used their new political power to bring about changes."

Labor Reform Legislation—the Public Desire—the Real Need and True Objective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am submitting herewith an excellent editorial entitled "The New Labor Bill," appearing in the Danville (Ky.) Advocate, of which a good friend of mine is the editor.

For long as Mr. Swain's paper been a keen student of public affairs and Government. Its acuteness respecting the pulse of the folks has long been recognized. Its analysis of the needs in the field of labor reform legislation, as well as his notions concerning just what the general public was seeking, is one of the most accurate and to the point statements I have seen in the mass and welter of editorials, propaganda, and so forth, with which we all have been besieged in recent months. I am sure the article will be most refreshing to the majority of us:

THE NEW LABOR BILL

The long haul is over. After many delays and maneuvers, legislation to bring organized labor under firmer control in the public interest is assured. The bill finally agreed upon by a Senate-House conference committee obviously does not satisfy everyone, and some labor leaders consider it unduly harsh. There is little doubt, however, that in approving a labor reform bill Congress was implementing the wishes of the great majority of Americans.

The measure, as finally approved by the conferees, is much closer to the Landrum-Griffin bill which the House passed than it is to the milder Kennedy-Ervin bill passed by the Senate. It sharply limits organizational picketing, secondary boycotts, and hot-cargo contracts. Under terms of the new bill, the first major labor legislation passed in 12 years, States will be empowered to deal with smaller labor dispute cases which the National Labor Relations Board refuses.

It was such provisions as those which were the source of the greatest controversy. And, ironically, it was those provisions which aroused the least public interest. The public was concerned mainly about reforms to guard against the sort of corruption the McClellan committee had been revealing. In this respect the House and Senate bills were quite similar. There was little dispute about them, and they promise a tight rein on corrupt labor leaders in the future.

That is good. That is what the American people wanted. As to other parts of the new legislation, the test of their fairness and wisdom will come. If some provisions appear to be punitive, as some labor leaders contend, they may be revised in time. The main thing is that the Federal Government now has a powerful weapon to wield against corruption in labor. All of us, including labor, will benefit.

The Late Zygmunt B. Dybowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, and Polish-Americans of the Nation, have been saddened by the passing of a notable Polish-American who served the cause of democracy with great distinction and credit to himself, his State, and Nation. I am speaking of the late Zygmunt B. Dybowski, teacher, author, and editor.

I have known Mr. Dybowski and his family for many years, and his courage, his intellectual integrity, his humanity, and his endless devotion to the cause of democracy and liberty will ever remain as an inspiration and memorial to all those who knew him.

As I extend my condolences and sincere sympathy to his widow and his son, Lt. Col. Eugene Dybowski, U.S. Air Force, I am sure that Polish-Americans throughout America join with me in sorrow and regret at the passing of Zygmunt B. Dybowski. We, however, who count ourselves among his friends, are certain that his life has left an impact that will long be remembered by those who knew him.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a biographical tribute to Mr. Dybowski.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Dybowski was born January 20, 1896, in Tarnow, Poland and received his primary education there. However, in 1913, he came to the United States and studied at the American International College at Springfield, Mass., from 1914 to 1917. When World War I began, he broke off his studies before graduation and served in the 51st Infantry, although at that time, he was still an alien.

Later, he completed a course in journalism at Columbia University and began his journalistic career with the Telegram Codzienny in New York City. Ever interested in the affairs of his homeland and with a dedication to freedom and liberty, he collaborated with A. Debski and B. Kolabowski in preparing a memorandum to President Woodrow Wilson suggesting the proper boundaries of the newly created Republic of Poland after the war.

In 1923, he became managing editor of the Polish Daily News in Cleveland, which position he held until his death. As editor, he spoke out boldly to our Polish-American friends and through the medium of his newspaper interpreted American ways and beliefs so that our newly arrived immigrants would understand more fully our American way of life.

Mr. Dybowski not only preached Americanism through the channels of his paper, but taught the Polish language in South High and Lincoln High Schools in Cleveland from 1929 to 1935, and beginning in 1935 until his death, instructed citizenship classes in Cleveland.

He was the past national adjutant of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, a member of the Selective Service Board No. 9 of Cleveland, a member of the PNA, and other civic and fraternal organizations. He was constantly active in social and civic affairs.

Aside from his own paper, he wrote articles on Polish questions in many foreign language newspapers. Among his published works are "Artolagta Poesji," "Astatnia Pewia," "De Profundis," "Dzwne Opowiesci," and "Imigranci."

His public service was given recognition in 1925 when Marshal Josef Pilsudski presented Mr. Dybowski with the Krzyz Legronowy (Legionaire's Cross), and in 1935 the Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences bestowed the Srekrny Wawrzyn Akademicki (Silver Wreath) upon this noted author.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 4 of the series:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Bulletin, Sept. 3, 1959]

INTEREST-RATE BOOMERANG

The cost of borrowing money went up sharply on Tuesday, with most of the larger banks throughout the country posting an increase of one-half percent in the rate to their best credit risks.

The results are likely to be unpleasant. One immediate effect will be that many companies will take a new look at plans for expansion.

There is real irony here. A major reason for the rise is that some Congressmen, rais-

ing a phony cry of "keep interest rates down," have blocked action on President Eisenhower's appeal for a rise in the 4¼ percent ceiling rate now fixed on marketable U.S. bonds.

The Treasury, contrary to whatever these Congressmen may think or say, does not set the pattern of interest rates. Like any other borrower, it has to meet the market price or it cannot sell bonds.

With interest rates rising, the Treasury can't sell bonds at the fixed rate of 4¼ percent and has been forced into short-term borrowing. This has now helped push up the rates for everyone.

If Congress is awake to its responsibilities it will recognize the warning and take prompt action to give Secretary Anderson the power he needs for efficient handling of the Nation's debt.

Miss South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, this week in Atlantic City, N.J., 54 beautiful women from all over America are vying for the title of Miss America and among them is Miss Nettie Adelaide Dennis, of South Carolina. Miss Dennis is a 19-year-old sophomore at Columbia College, Columbia, S.C., but is a native of Moncks Corner, S.C. Miss Dennis was recently honored by her hometown of Moncks Corner with a Tootsie Dennis Day. State and civic leaders from all over South Carolina came to Moncks Corner on this occasion to honor Miss Dennis, who holds the title of Miss South Carolina.

South Carolina is indeed proud of Miss Dennis and naturally hopes she will win the Miss America contest in Atlantic City. Miss Dennis has held 15 various beauty crowns including the title of Queen of Hearts at Moncks Corner High School, which was the first title she ever won. The latest title she holds is that of Miss South Carolina.

I ask that an article entitled "Miss South Carolina" from the Berkeley Democrat of Moncks Corner, S.C., of September 9, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISS SOUTH CAROLINA: TOOTSIE DENNIS

This is the week that Moncks Corner will be making history in Atlantic City. The reason is the blonde, blue-eyed Tootsie, Miss South Carolina, who left Sunday from the Charleston Municipal Airport for that point to compete with 53 other State choices for the title of Miss America, 1960. Tootsie was accompanied by her official chaperone, Mrs. Dan Read, and was joined at the airport by 30 Moncks Corner citizens who were on hand to wish her bon voyage and success in the forthcoming contest. Mrs. Evelyn Waldrep, of Columbia, hair-stylist, also accompanied Tootsie to Atlantic City, at her own expense.

Tootsie's mother, Mrs. Nettie C. Dennis, left early Monday to join her daughter and Mrs. Read.

On Tuesday, Mr. and Mrs. Ed Guy also left for Atlantic City. Mr. Guy is president of the Jaycees, who were responsible for Miss Dennis' opportunity to represent Moncks Corner in Greenville and win the coveted title of Miss South Carolina.

When Tootsie left the Charleston airport she was wearing a two-piece suit of Navy blue linen, printed with gold flowers, a gold beaver hat, beige shoes, and a mink stole. It was reported that her luggage (six pieces) topped the limit by 80 pounds.

Leaving Friday to attend the rest of the festivities are Tootsie's younger sister, Adah, and her two brothers and sisters-in-law, Mr. and Mrs. David Dennis, and Mr. and Mrs. R. L. Dennis, and an aunt, Mrs. Annabelle Dennis Parker (Miss Moncks Corner, 1939, by the way), of Charleston.

Tootsie's talent will include her song, "I Enjoy Being a Girl," from the "Flower Drum Song," a Broadway musical. She has taken vocal 1 year; dancing, 6 years; and piano, 8 years.

Monday morning, Miss South Carolina registered together with the 53 other State beauties. Tuesday was for swim suit posing (incidentally Tootsie won the swim suit competition in Greenville). Tuesday night there was an illuminated parade, and each day was planned to include a pageant rehearsal. Priminary judging begins tonight (Wednesday) with the finals Saturday night. It is expected that the top 10 will be televised on Saturday night.

A Tribute to an American Composer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, just less than a month ago the New York Philharmonic, directed by Leonard Bernstein, gave Moscow one of the most exciting, tradition-shattering concerts the Soviet capitol has seen in its recent musical history.

The New York Times, in a Moscow-datelined article on August 25, declared:

One of the most unexpected events was a rousing demand by the cheering, stomping, clapping throng for a repeat performance of an unusual little piece by one of the first American composers of modern ideas, Charles Ives:

This composition, "The Unanswered Question," had never been heard in the Soviet Union. Mr. Bernstein broke another tradition by giving a little talk explaining Ives' philosophy and his theory of accidental music in which several themes in different tempos are woven together and cross each other accidentally at unpredictable times.

I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, that Charles Ives is, at long last, beginning to receive the recognition he so richly deserves.

It is to be regretted that such recognition comes after his death.

Five years after his death at the age of 80, 40 years after he virtually stopped composing, 12 years after he received the Pulitzer prize for a symphony he had written 40 years previously, Charles Edward Ives appears to be attaining fully to that recognition so long withheld from him—the recognition that here is an authentic American genius, in all probability one of the greatest composers American has produced.

In my hometown of Norwalk, Conn., further recognition of Mr. Ives will be given by the Norwalk Symphony Society which will present a Charles Ives Birthday Festival concert.

This concert will be given on October 19, the eve of Mr. Ives' 85th birthday, and it will consist entirely of Ives' music in several of the forms in which he worked—orchestral, piano, and songs both for solo voice and chorus.

It is quite proper that this tribute to Mr. Ives should be made by a Connecticut symphony society, for Charles Ives is a native of my State, having been born in Danbury, and having lived for many years in Redding.

He was a highly successful insurance man who composed as an avocation, producing a large body of musical work during the years from 1900 to 1920 which was ahead of its time, and long went virtually unplayed.

American should learn more about its own composers and it is hoped, Mr. Speaker, that the recognition accorded Charles Ives' music in Moscow several weeks ago, and which will be accorded it on October 19 in Norwalk, Conn., becomes contagious.

All American should learn to enjoy and love the music of Charles Ives—a great American composer who had a full measure of the gift of compassion and laughter, and translated them into music.

Interest Rate Ceilings on Government Bonds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an editorial, entitled "The Interest Ceiling Issue," which appeared in its August 27 edition, presents a very careful study on President Eisenhower's request to Congress that the interest rate ceilings on Government bonds be removed or modified.

In its usual thorough manner, the Times offers a clear picture of the need for such a move. I believe this editorial is worthy of the attention of all the Senators and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INTEREST CEILING ISSUE

President Eisenhower at his news conference Tuesday renewed—and in the most emphatic manner—his request first made to Congress on June 8 that the existing ceilings applying to interest rates on Government bonds be removed or liberalized.

The ceiling on marketable securities is 4¼ percent, and applies to issues with maturities of 5 years or longer. This legislation is in the nature of an anachronistic accident. It has no logical relationship to present conditions in the bond market. It was enacted in 1918 in connection with the second Liberty loan financing of World War I, and was based on conditions then contemporary but today purely history.

What makes this legislation imperative is that the Treasury must raise vast sums in the months ahead in order (1) to fund a constant procession of maturing obligations, and (2) to raise new money to pay for the appropriations voted by Congress and not covered by taxes. As much as possible of such financing should take the form of securities designed to appeal to savers since, when money is raised through savings, it has no inflationary effects. In practice this means that, broadly speaking, it should be raised through the sale of long-term securities. But with business in a boom phase at present, the demands of borrowers of all categories in the money market are extremely heavy. These demands, competing for a comparatively limited supply of funds have driven interest rates sharply upward. With the market rate on comparatively long issues above 4¼ percent the Treasury finds itself in a position in which it has no alternative but to raise its funds through the sale of short-term paper, a procedure inflationary in its implications because it involves the creation of bank credit or expansion of the money supply.

The present ceiling on savings bonds, from which the President has also asked relief, is roughly 3¼ percent, a rate that makes it impossible for the Government to compete actively with other available outlets for savings. This is not only a grave injustice to the 40 million patriotic holders of savings bonds in the Nation, but it is a potential threat of the most serious kind to the whole Government savings bond program, itself a major bulwark against monetary inflation.

Savings bonds outstanding total $50.5 billion. That figure exceeds by $2 billion the total of all publicly held marketable issues of the U.S. Treasury with maturities of 5 years or longer. Every dollar that is withdrawn by a savings bond holder is a dollar that the Treasury will have to replace, and that, so long as present interest limitations remain in effect, it will have to replace by raising the money through methods highly inflationary.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 5 of the series.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 9, 1959]

AN EMPTY TRIUMPH

The Members of Congress who are blocking President Eisenhower's request for an end to the 4.25-percent rate ceiling on the Government's longer term bonds have managed to push the rates on such obligations lower than they might otherwise be. But not in the way they think.

A glance at the list of quotations and yields on Federal bonds available each day on the fourth from last page of this newspaper shows the highest returns on the short-term issues and the lowest returns on the long-dated bonds. For instance, on one recent day bonds due in 1961 yielded 4.89 percent, those due in 1966 4.58 percent, those due in 1980 4.25 percent, and those due in 1995 3.9 percent.

In contrast, bonds offered the same day by the State of Connecticut and the County of Allegheny in Pennsylvania showed the opposite trend. The Connecticut yields ranged from 2.6 percent for 1961 obligations, up to 3¾ percent for those beyond 1982. The Allegheny yields ranged from 3 percent for 1961 to 4.3 percent for 1996. Of course, the lower overall ranges of yields on these issues than on the Federal bonds are due to the fact they are tax-free, but this freedom doesn't affect how the yields vary with maturities.

What affects how the yields vary with maturities is the market's demand for various dated bonds. The range of yields on the State and county bonds reflects accurately what investors want. At present they want a bigger return when they lend their money out for many years than when they lend it out for just a few years. We know this to be true because there is no artifical rule or law governing the variation of yields on those non-Federal issues. If investors wanted the ladder of yields to lean the other way, the bonds would be offered to them that other way.

But the Federal yields do slant the other way because the legal ceiling forces them into that pattern. This law succeeds in doing so because the U.S. Treasury cannot sell any bonds that come due in 5 years or more. Investors know, therefore, that the supply of such issues is going to be limited so they pay a premium on any such issues now outstanding, by accepting lower yields on them than on shorter issues.

Some might suggest that since the 1995 Federal bond is at a 3.9 percent yield the Treasury can issue bonds of that maturity below the 4.25 percent rate ceiling. The answer is that, if the Treasury even hinted it might offer such bonds, their potential supply would be increased, their price would fall and their yield would rise up to or past the ceiling.

Thus the congressional preservers of the ceiling have, it is true, richly succeeded in keeping down the rates on the longer term issues of the Government. But it's an empty triumph, because Uncle Sam can't take advantage of the low rates. Indeed, his borrowings, at present confined by the law's prohibition to short-term issues, cost him more than 4.25 percent.

It is still the market, not Congress, that dictates Uncle Sam's borrowing costs.

Special Interest Power Opens Campaign To Destroy Public Power in America: False Advertising Draws Ire of Clyde Ellis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the special interest companies of America have recently launched a massive, vastly expensively, new Madison Avenue type advertising campaign aimed at discrediting and, if possible, destroying public power in America.

In full page advertisements in Time magazine, the Saturday Evening Post and other publications, special interest companies are waging a propaganda campaign based on half-truths to brainwash Americans into opposing public power.

This insidious propaganda campaign, while purporting to be in the public interest, is in truth simply a slick move by special interests to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people. Certainly, all of us would defend private power companies' right to prosper and grow, make a reasonable profit, and to present their case to all Americans, through advertising in all media, and in any other proper way.

But it becomes a matter of great concern to every thinking American, when special power interests base such a campaign on distortions and half-truths. One advertisement alleges that "Federal Government electric power systems have already cost the Nation's taxpayers $5½ billion." Yet private power company officials know that public power systems simply amount to a vital investment in national development by loans which will be repaid, an investment which private power could not or would not make at the time it was needed. What is more, these projects are paying for themselves through the sale of electrical power, much of which is purchased by private power firms.

The advertisements, while citing the $5½ billion investment in public power, fail to mention that private power has received the benefit of $10 billion in taxes by way of accelerated depreciation certificates and easier depreciation practices—in other words, fast tax writeoffs—that the working people do not get.

From these advertisements, it is obvious that the private power companies are producing more than electrical power—they are turning out powerful propaganda slanted to their special objectives. It is clear that the advertisements they are paying so much to print are in the private interest and not in the public interest. Are they adding the costs of these advertisements to the consumers' bills?

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I received from Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, dated September 8, 1959, which discusses this problem, and copies of two advertisements which private power published in the Saturday Evening Post, August 8, 1959, and Time, June 29, 1959.

There being no objection, the letter and advertisements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., September 8, 1959.

Hon. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR RALPH: Adolph Hitler wrote at page 313 of "Mein Kampf": "In the size of the lie there is always contained a certain factor of

credibility since the great masses of the people * * * will more easily fall victims to a great lie than to a small one."

The attached advertisement, entitled "How Much Is 'Public Power' Costing the People of Your State?" is good evidence of how "America's Independent Electric Light and Power Companies" are applying Hitler's philosophy.

But even Hitler discovered that falsehoods do not change facts. Similarly, no amount of nationally circulated falsehood can alter the fact that Federal power projects do not cost the Nation's taxpayers. Their entire cost is repaid by the rural electric co-ops, power districts, municipally owned systems, commercial power companies, and Federal Government agencies which purchase the wholesale power from them. Furthermore, it seems doubly wrong for these investor-owned electric utilities to make such statements when they have been granted over $10 billion in Federal tax subsidy by way of accelerated depreciation certificates and through liberalized depreciation practices available to them since 1954.

As to the ability of these companies to provide all the low-priced electricity the Nation needs—without depending on taxes, the events which transpired in New York City on August 17 may indicate a possibility that America's Independent Electric Light and Power Companies could advantageously spend more time building their own business and less trying to destroy the work of others.

It seems unconscionable to us that the customers of these specially privileged cost-plus corporations should be required to continue financing this malicious, unjustified attack on a national resource policy which has been approved by Congress for half a century and upon which the member consumers of 450 rural electric systems depend in part for a decent living standard.

We hope Congress can find some way to at least make absolutely certain that such untruthful attacks are financed 100 percent from corporate profits and not by a levy on customers.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

[From the Saturday Evening Post, Aug. 8, 1959]

HOW MUCH IS PUBLIC POWER COSTING THE PEOPLE OF YOUR STATE?

Alabama	$51,700,000
Arizona	28,600,000
Arkansas	24,200,000
California	564,850,000
Colorado	52,250,000
Connecticut	123,750,000
Delaware	32,450,000
District of Columbia	36,300,000
Florida	125,950,000
Georgia	68,750,000
Idaho	14,300,000
Illinois	400,400,000
Indiana	132,000,000
Iowa	63,800,000
Kansas	51,150,000
Kentucky	57,200,000
Louisiana	67,100,000
Maine	23,100,000
Maryland	103,400,000
Massachusetts	194,150,000
Michigan	273,900,000
Minnesota	90,750,000
Mississippi	23,100,000
Missouri	127,050,000
Montana	16,500,000
Nebraska	35,750,000
Nevada	11,550,000
New Hampshire	17,600,000
New Jersey	242,100,000
New Mexico	19,250,000
New York	752,400,000
North Carolina	72,050,000
North Dakota	$10,450,000
Ohio	338,800,000
Oklahoma	50,050,000
Oregon	50,050,000
Pennsylvania	396,550,000
Rhode Island	30,800,000
South Carolina	33,000,000
South Dakota	12,100,000
Tennessee	63,250,000
Texas	235,400,000
Utah	19,250,000
Vermont	9,900,000
Virginia	91,300,000
Washington	85,250,000
West Virginia	41,800,000
Wisconsin	114,400,000
Wyoming	9,350,000

(Amounts (to nearest $50,000) figured on the percentage of all Federal taxes collected in each State. Current tax collections used as basis.)

Every American is taxed to pay for Federal public power, and the cost to people in your State has run into millions of dollars.

Federal Government electric power systems have already cost the Nation's taxpayers $5½ billion. The list above shows about how much was collected in each State.

If the public power lobbyists succeed in their plans for getting the government still deeper into the electric business, the cost will soar to $15½ billion. The cost to your State will be almost tripled.

Yet this spending for more and more Federal public power is completely unnecessary. America's hundreds of independent electric light and power companies are ready and able to provide all the low-price electricity the Nation will need—without depending on your taxes.

These are the companies that have doubled the supply of electricity in the past 10 years, and will double the present supply in the next 10.

Federal public power keeps growing because most people don't realize they are paying for it. But informed Americans can put a stop to it.

Will you help spread the word among your friends and neighbors? When enough people understand, something surely will be done to halt this unnecessary spending.

When public power wins—you lose. Every time another Federal public power proposal goes through Congress, you are taxed to pay the bill.

AMERICA'S INDEPENDENT ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANIES.

[From Time, June 29, 1959]

WHEN PUBLIC POWER WINS, YOU LOSE

Every time another Federal public power proposal goes through Congress, you are taxed to pay the bill.

Most people, according to national opinion polls, don't want the Federal Government in the electric business. Yet everybody, including you, is taxed to pay for such Federal public power.

Already $5,500 million of tax money from you and other Americans has gone into this Federal public power. And now the public power promoters are pushing hard for $10 billion more.

Is there a need for all this tax spending for more and more public power? None at all—for America's hundreds of independent electric light and power companies are ready and able to provide all the low-price electricity people will need—without depending on your taxes.

These companies have doubled the supply of electricity in the past 10 years, and will double the present supply in the next 10.

Spending for more public power goes on because most people don't know about it. The best way to stop it is to tell your friends and neighbors what's happening. As soon as enough people understand, you can be sure something will be done to halt this unnecessary spending.

AMERICA'S INDEPENDENT ELECTRIC LIGHT AND POWER COMPANIES

Tribute to Edwin E. Smith, a Truly Great Teacher for 40 Years at Classical High in Springfield, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, when the bell at Classical High School of Springfield, Mass., sounded the start of the school year this week, for the first time in 40 years, Edwin E. Smith was not there to greet some of the old and the new students. He had retired last June of 1959 after giving a lifetime to the teaching profession. During his long service in the Springfield school system he had become a tradition. To accomplish this, he must, of necessity, have been endowed of unsual talent and personality. Ed Smith was so gifted.

Thousands of eager youngsters came under his spell. Beyond his great capacity to impart knowledge of English literature to his students, he advised and counseled them with marked effect. Seldom have I ever met or known of anyone in the teaching field who was so genuinely loved by the boys and girls who sat in his classes. He had a real personal interest in their efforts, their success and their future. Indeed, he epitomized to the fullest the best in the great teaching profession.

English literature was Ed Smith's forte and in this field, he contributed notably to the famed reputation of the Springfield school system and particularly Classical High School. The thousands of his students that went on to higher education in the colleges of the land appreciated how well and thoroughly he taught them. Many of them received top honors in the colleges of their choice. He had a remarkably easy, convincing and persuasive way of impressing young minds of the worth of education and how to use it. He was richly endowed with the wisdom, the temperament and the determination necessary in the educational field. He was not anxious for the bell that tolled the end of the school day and I know that his students lamented the end of his classes. Ed Smith felt and knew that he had a job to do in the very best way he knew to do it. His efforts spoke for themselves as he was heartened by the successes in life that many of his boys and girls attained. He, indeed, was an artist as he worked with the precious clay of unfolding youth.

Edwin E. Smith was born in 1894 in White River Junction, Vt., and graduated from Dartmouth College in 1917. After

a brief teaching spell in Vermont, he came to Classical—Central—High School in Springfield, Mass., in 1919. There he remained for 40 years to retire in June 1959. His educational achievements were many. He carried a master of arts from Harvard in 1929; pioneered in accelerated courses for the gifted child—a program that was started in the high school in 1935; coauthored with Ralph Boaz the texts, "An Introduction to Literature" and "Enjoyment of Literature." The latter textbook has been widely used and accepted by teachers and pupils since it was first published in 1934. In 1954–55, Ed Smith was chosen president of the New England Association of Teachers of English and held membership in the New England Association and the National Association of Teachers of English.

Recognition and honors have come his way from associates, his students, and from his community. The executive board of the New England Association of Teachers of English conferred a plaque for outstanding contributions and service of over 30 years. A memorial in Ed Smith's name was given by the Classical High School Alumni Association to the school library. The memorial consists of an alcove dedicated to him with a gift of money for books to be purchased in his name. His portrait will grace the alcove as a constant reminder of the fruitful years he spent in the truly hallowed halls of Classical.

At this past June graduation exercises, a moving tribute was paid to him by His Honor Mayor Thomas J. O'Connor, of Springfield, in expressing the gratitude of the city for the great teacher service he had given.

Ed Smith no longer will be an active teacher in our school system but his dedication to his profession will never be forgotten. Whenever or wherever any of his former pupils gather, they will retell again and again of their years under his tutelage. They will talk again of him and recount why he measured to the fullest their ideal as a great teacher and a good friend.

One of his former students and presently a teacher at Ed Smith's beloved Classical puts it simply and beautifully:

Ed's deep interest in and understanding of all his pupils, his ability to teach them to think and to appreciate good literature, his brilliant intellect coupled with genuine humility have made him a truly great teacher. No wonder they love him so much.

Mr. Speaker, as one who knows him, I join in this tribute to Ed Smith and express the wish that he will be around for a long time to continue to contribute his talent and his counsel to those who yearn to learn and to his community.

Advice and Consent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the September 17 issue of the Reporter, there appears an article entitled "The Advice and Consent of J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT," written by Sidney Hyman. I believe the article is worthy of the attention of the Senate; it gives the views of the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee vis-a-vis those of the committee and, for that matter, those of the Congress and the executive branch, on questions of foreign policy. It emphasizes, once again, the keen sense of responsibility which has always actuated the thoughts of Senator FULBRIGHT in his relations with the executive branch of the Government and his feelings on the separation of powers. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADVICE AND CONSENT OF J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

(By Sidney Hyman)

Several of the newspapers I read have compared the hero's welcome President Eisenhower received at various stops on his European trip with President Wilson's experience there 40 years ago. In view of what the U.S. Senate did, after Wilson's return, to deflate his personal triumph among the Allies, it seemed worth whole to discuss President Eisenhower's present standing in Congress with a central figure in that relationship, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Given the fact that FULBRIGHT has little in common with Henry Cabot Lodge, a repetition of the 1919 debacle is obviously unthinkable; so I began by asking the Senator if he felt that the President's hand was greatly strengthened in foreign affairs by the support he can count on from Congress, even though it is controlled by the opposition party. With a wry smile, the Senator conceded that it might make some difference. But he went on to say that he has a pretty clear idea of the limits of his own power and doesn't expect any applause for not exploiting the nuisance value of his job. For Senator FULBRIGHT, the principal concern is how to get things started, not how to stop them.

Unlike many other Senators caught for an interview at day's end, FULBRIGHT has the grace to remember that he is not addressing a vast congregation. He actually converses with his interviewer and, above all, he respects the fact that the simple declarative sentence is the greatest invention of the human intellect. This, then, is a report on the uses to which he put that singular invention in an hour of twilight talk.

THE SENATE'S JOB

Senator FULBRIGHT finds some grounds for comfort in the fact that Christian Herter, a trusted friend, now sits at the head of the State Department, ably backed up by another trusted friend, Under Secretary of State C. Douglas Dillon. But he is disturbed by the degree to which these good and generous men are hemmed in by a set of distinctly parsimonious policies—policies that proceed largely from a passion for economizing and a timid interpretation of the Nation's economic potential. The decline of American power since 1953 has not been arrested. The self-inflicted national wounds resulting from a wrong order of national values and priorities have not been healed. The strains within the Grand Alliance have not lessened, while the Soviet Union, with Communist China hot on its heels, daily grows in strength.

But Senator FULBRIGHT's most pressing day-to-day problem is how and where to draw a frontier line between the powers of the Executive and the Senate, so that our national-security policies can be formulated and executed in a way that is both responsible and responsive to the needs of the Nation.

Unlike some of his predecessors, FULBRIGHT is convinced that the Senate is not structurally equipped to play any major role in the day-to-day management of foreign affairs. When it tries to do that, especially under modern conditions of coalition diplomacy, it only multiplies disarray at home and confusion abroad. The management function, he feels, is by its very nature executive in character. The Senate therefore must not only place itself under a self-denying ordinance when it comes to the mechanics of diplomacy, but must help arm the executive with competent means and authority to bargain, to maneuver, and to seize any fugitive opportunity cast up by the shifting tides of world events.

The Senate, by keeping its distance from the executive, can be an effective instrument of public education; it can define and clarify the zones of the feasible, the areas of the negotiable, thereby assuring that the executive, when it decides to act, has the fullest support of public opinion. On its own, moreover, the Senate can bring its social inventiveness into play by formulating the policy objectives to be pursued around the world, while leaving the executive complete freedom as to the timing and tactics. In other words, the function of the Senate, and of the Foreign Relations Committee in particular, is to try to be the conscience of the executive—without in any way indulging in the frivolous delusion of coequality.

Here is how the theory has worked out in practice recently. Senator FULBRIGHT was not informed before the public announcement that President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev had agreed to an exchange of visits. Nor was he informed in advance that President Eisenhower meant to go to Europe. Nevertheless, as Senator FULBRIGHT had himself previously contributed to the climate of opinion which made these events possible, he felt no affront to his personal dignity when events unfolded as they did. Things would surely have been very different if a man like Arthur Vandenberg—or even Tom Connally or Walter George—had not been sent word in advance.

THE VETO PRESIDENT

None of this is to say that Senator FULBRIGHT feels that the President, now billed as "the new Eisenhower," is without fault or flaw. "In domestic matters," FULBRIGHT remarked, "what passes under the adulatory name of the 'new Eisenhower' is really the old one whose essential strength lay in not initiating new things, but in stopping the new things others tried to put in motion. He has been the veto President all along; only now, instead of exercising the veto behind the covering screen of men like Secretary of the Treasury George Humphrey, Sherman Adams, or the successive budget directors, he is compelled by circumstances to do it in his own name."

Senator FULBRIGHT adds that a veto President is not inherently better or worse than a prime mover President. Changing times and cases may call for one and not the other. "What is misleading," he says, "is the polemics of the current case. The administration is trying hard to pin a 'won't do' tag on the present Democratic Congress, as if it were just like the Republican-controlled 80th Congress President Truman successfully anathematized. The two are really as different as day and night. The Republican 80th Congress vetoed or scaled down the proposals for comprehensive domestic legislation involving such matters as inflation control, tax revision, and the liberalization of minimum wages and social security benefits. All these measures had reached Congress on the initiative of President Truman. In the present Congress, the proposals for

comprehensive legislation in domestic matters are coming from the Democratic Members, only to be knocked down or scaled down by a vetoing Republican Presidency. If the 'won't do' label in domestic matters is to be stamped anywhere, it ought to be on the White House."

In this connection, Senator FULBRIGHT believes that the administration is guilty of something more than mislabeling. He feels that by citing the danger of inflation as a ground for vetoing all moves toward a stepped-up rate of economic growth, it is crippling the Nation's power to attain the diplomatic goals that the administration itself has set: "If we assume that the cold war is moving into a new dimension where the grounds of battle will be economic in character, then the domestic economic strength of the parties to the conflict and the priorities they assign to their productive resources may be of decisive importance. To the extent that the administration fails to increase its sources of revenue either through taxes or through an expansion of the economy, to that extent will it prejudice the Nation's chances of victory in the new dimension of the cold war which seems to lie ahead."

Turning from the domestic to the oversea background for the "new Eisenhower," Senator FULBRIGHT paused to recall how the Republicans indicted President Franklin D. Roosevelt for having practiced the same brand of personal diplomacy. "I am not at all sure what the phrase means," he said, "except that I know it was invested with a full quota of sinister significance. Now, of course, we are treated to the spectacle of President Eisenhower being hailed in the act of practicing personal diplomacy. I don't think it is the next worse thing to original sin. Quite the contrary, I have long favored the sort of personal exchanges now underway. My point is merely about the ironies of the situation."

And he continued: "When you stop to think about it, isn't it also an ironical commentary on the disarray within the NATO alliance when responsible leaders of European powers should need a reassurance from a President of the United States that he will not deal behind their back in his meetings with Mr. Khrushchev? But leaving irony aside, I welcome all evidence that in the field of foreign affairs we are seeing not a 'new Eisenhower' but the 'Ike' of pre-1952 Republican convention days. The 'Ike' of those days embodied in his person the whole spirit of what NATO was meant to be. He was the prophet of warning and encouragement, the negotiator of operating agreements where each member nation could see that its own national interest was best served in the context of a security arrangement that served simultaneously the national interest of every other member. His renown was vastly augmented by that fact. And if now he returns to the scene and source of the accomplishments which carried him into the White House, and if he there sets in motion the material programs necessary to restore the integrity of his earlier accomplishments, the actions which will add luster to his name will also add strength to the Grand Alliance."

TAKE HIM TO OUR LEADER

When the fact of Mr. Khrushchev's impending visit came into the conversation, Senator FULBRIGHT observed how often democracies are inclined to invest their dictatorial rivals with omniscient powers. When Adolph Hitler was at the height of his harassing business, for example, the belief took hold among his intended victims that everything he did was thought out to the last chapter, and subject to his personal control at every step along the way. He had played everyone on an automatic chess board, and everyone must inevitably move according to a master plan of his own design. Only afterward, when the Nazi war records were available for study, it became clear that he was often swept along by events that caught him by surprise and carried him in directions he had no intention of going. It also appeared that he was an incredible blunderer.

"It would be well to remember," FULBRIGHT said, "that Mr. Khrushchev too can be swept up and carried along by external forces over which he has no control. He can also fall into gross errors of judgment. It is quite possible that what he thought would happen when he precipitated the Berlin crises was very different from what actually did happen. In any case, it is as much to our own interest as it to his to keep open the avenues on which we may move toward tenable positions that are alternatives to war."

Nevertheless, the Senator felt that the advance buildup given to the impending Khrushchev visit in the press might serve to activate what is always a latent danger in a democracy that has been subjected to a long period of stress. The danger is that the public, impatient for quick relief, will make its impatience a source of embarrassing pressure on its leaders when actual negotiations take place.

"It is important to bear in mind," he said, "that the impending visit has not altered a single item in the quotients of world power. It is the beginning of a procedure for protracted conversations, and nothing more than a procedure. It does not mean that we no longer need a strong and versatile Military Establishment. Much less does it mean that we can do without an aggressive, articulate foreign-aid program.

"What we urgently need, if there is to be any continuity in that kind of program, is long-term planning. What we now have is a system of appropriations on a hand-to-mouth basis that is both wasteful and inefficient. When this comes to the notice of the American public, it is followed by a great outcry against the whole concept of foreign aid. This is rather like putting hobbles on a horse and then beating him because he won't run faster."

In the coming parleys with the Russians, Senator FULBRIGHT, as always, is firmly convinced that only the Executive, and in this case the Chief Executive, can speak for the Nation. To be sure, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee may prod the Executive to move in certain areas, as he did recently with his declaration about the need for new policies in the Middle East. But the Senator already insists—and this is particularly important for foreigners who may have heard just enough about Wilson and Henry Cabot Lodge to develop a profound misunderstanding of our balanced system of Government—that it is up to the Executive to assume the actual burden of conducting foreign affairs, whether they be mere conversations or serious negotiations. The job Congress has to do is big enough, and it has nothing to gain or to contribute when it tries to act like a back-seat driver or a camp follower.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments o nthe subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 6 of the series:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 4, 1959]

A PARTIAL RESPONSE

On Tuesday the leading New York banks raised their prime commercial rate to the highest point since 1925. A jump in the Federal Reserve discount rate follows inevitably.

It was no accident that on Wednesday Speaker RAYBURN announced a belated effort to put through a bill increasing the interest rate on Government "E" and "H" savings bonds, and that it has now begun to move. These savings bonds are the ones now held by some 40 million small investors who bought them on the assurance that they were buying a good investment. Not to keep the yield in line with that from other forms of prudent investment is to break faith with these small investors. And there is a practical as well as a moral consideration (assuming the two don't always coincide). The Government raises substantial amounts of money through these bonds. The holders of them, if they don't get a fair shake, will stop buying them and will not reinvest them when they mature.

When is Congress going to apply the same practical test to the administration's request for raising or removing entirely the statutory limit on the interest rate for regular Government securities? True, the interest of 40 million small investor-voters is not involved. But when the banks raised their own prime interest rate on Tuesday, outstanding Government securities promptly fell to a new low. Under the present statutory limit, it becomes more difficult than ever—all but impossible—to market any new medium- or long-term Government securities. The only way left for the Government to borrow money in the market is by way of short-term bills, which are only one step removed from printing-press money. Without relief from the interest-rate limitation, the Treasury is quite unable to handle the national debt in an orderly and anti-inflationary way.

Congress has been consistently mulish about granting this needed relief. If it doesn't do so during this session, it will almost certainly be called back into special session for the purpose later on, when Members of Congress would much rather be home politicking. The sensible thing to do is to grant this relief during the present session.

Red China's Aggressions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, recent acts of aggression by Red China in Asia have provided further evidence that this Communist regime is not worthy of representation in the United Nations. Red China has presided over the Tibetan slaughter and has aided and abetted the uprising in Laos. And now in a surprising turn on a friend, the Chinese Communists have acted with military violence against the territory of India.

It is particularly surprising that Red China should stir up violence along the northern frontier of India in light of

Prime Minister Nehru's consistent plea that his Red neighbor be admitted to the United Nations. An editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of August 31 comments about this turn of events in Asia, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEHRU AND RED CHINA

There can be little doubt that Prime Minister Nehru is engaged in an agonizing reappraisal of India's policy toward Red China. Throughout the years of the cold war, he has been the chief voice of neutralism and nonalinement in Asia. Walking a kind of mystical tightrope between East and West, he has held his government aloof from the opposing military blocs, and he has seemed at times—even to his own countrymen—to be naively tolerant of the sins of international communism.

More particularly, having in mind the geographical location of India, Mr. Nehru has spared no effort over the years to cultivate friendly relations with the Mao Tze-tung regime in Peiping. To that end, for example, he has consistently taken a leading role in advocating Red China's admission as a member of the United Nations, and he has done numerous other things in behalf of the Chinese Communists. But now his past generous attitude toward them has been gravely shaken. This is so because they have gone out of their way in recent months to push him off his neutralist tightrope. Not content with their slaughter of Tibet (the Asian Hungary), or their pressures against the states of Bhutan and Sikkim, or their support of the rebels in Laos, they have committed acts of military violence against Indian territory along the disputed northern frontier.

Mr. Nehru himself has branded these acts as aggression in a continuing form, and although he has discounted the possibility that they may presage an all-out invasion, he has made clear that India will defend its territory (and Bhutan and Sikkim as well) against any attack. More than that, suiting the action to the word, he has ordered the Indian army to move into appropriate positions for that purpose. He still hopes, of course, that he will be able, through diplomatic representations, to persuade the Chinese Communists to withdraw from the areas they have entered, but he has indicated a vast sense of disillusionment about their good faith and intentions. His position on the tightrope thus has become exceedingly precarious, and some of his country's most influential newspapers have begun to suggest that he ought to abandon "neutralism" and aline his government with the defenses of the free world.

Perhaps the most baffling question involved in all this has to do with why the Chinese Communists have thus repaid Mr. Nehru's many kindnesses with moves that seem deliberately calculated to alienate him. Certainly, if they push him too far, or if their frontier aggression against India becomes a major territorial violation, he will have no choice but to condemn them without his usual equivocations. In that case, the whole of neutralist Asia would be profoundly affected, and hardly to Peiping's advantage.

Football Frankenstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post this morning printed an editorial setting forth some very pertinent remarks concerning the tragic death of two young men following football practice sessions. The Post quite correctly points out that the major share of the blame for these tragedies rests upon the inflation of football from a game to a national obsession.

Like most Americans, I enjoy an occasional football game. It is a fascinating sport and deserves a place in our school extracurricular activities program. But these tragedies certainly underscore the degree to which football has changed from a form of amusement to a big business. This is every bit as true of high school and college football as it is of so-called professional football. This overemphasis on competitive sports is one of the reasons I have opposed legislation to single out high school athletic coaches for salary increases above and beyond the salaries paid their academic colleagues on the high school faculties. Such recognition for the extra work put in by coaches, it seems to me, is simply an extension of the overemphasis on competitive sports which has detracted so seriously from the real job of our educational institutions. Science and foreign language and history and English teachers also put in extra time and extra effort that deserves equal recognition. Let us raise all salaries to the level that is just and fair.

Let us put football back in the place where it belongs in the high school program as the following editorial suggests:

FOOTBALL FRANKENSTEIN

Two young lives have been snuffed out in the past fortnight—needlessly and senselessly—as a result of heat exhaustion induced by football practice in summer weather. A 17-year-old high school boy in North Carolina collapsed after a practice session on August 28 and died in a hospital the next day. And a 19-year-old Maryland University sophomore died in Baltimore 4 days after a prolonged workout on the playing field September 2. The coaches involved in these two tragedies cannot, of course, escape a share of the blame; grown men ought to have had more simple wit than to put boys wearing heavy football equipment through the fatiguing paces of practice on hot and muggy days. But to make scapegoats of the individual coaches would be at once foolish and unjust. And it would be to ignore the underlying responsibility of a society which has inflated football from a game to a national obsession.

Football has its place as a team sport for school and college youths. But it has been lifted entirely out of its place by a mystique which has made the winning of games a matter of transcendent importance and which has made it a tradition to be willing to die for alma mater. College teams which are in all essential respects professional rather than amateur in character draw vast crowds; and in order to keep their stadiums filled colleges feel obliged to extend the professionalization of this sport by starting practice long before the opening of school and by making a grueling business out of what is supposed to be a form of play. The plain truth is that college football, and to a considerable extent high school football, no longer has anything whatever to do with cultivation of the health, character, and sportsmanship of students. It is a ruthless contest for big money in which victory is equated with virtue.

More tragic than the occasional loss of life and less occasional injury from this kind of football is the debasement of values which flows from it. Parents can, if they will join hands and voices, put football back in the place where it belongs.

Ike Inspires Trust Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a most interesting and perceptive article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers, commenting upon the recent visit of President Eisenhower to Europe.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IKE INSPIRES TRUST ABROAD

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers)

SAN SIMEON, CALIF., September 5.—My contact with the goings on in the world has been chiefly through the most reliable and satisfying of all media, daily newspapers. (Advertisement.)

Seriously though, you don't get the news from them at a given hour when editors are ready—but the papers are waiting a quick onceover or thorough perusal when you are ready.

Also, if you didn't quite get the point the first time you can reread the piece or paragraph. You can't get any place saying, "how's that again"? to a radio or TV voice.

Meanwhile back at the ranch I have been following the travels of President Eisenhower in Europe. And as he rests this weekend in the 16-room apartment in Culzean Castle, which the Scottish people gave him for life-time use in affection and gratitude after World War II, there isn't any doubt at all that he has most successfully accomplished his mission.

I don't think any other leader in the world today could have done as well. No one else could have inspired the trust of the peoples of the various and different countries and won the confidence of their statesmen.

Why?

People speak of the Eisenhower charm. He has charm all right, but it is more than that. President Roosevelt had charm, too. He was loaded with it. Yet to take one example of immediate interest, Mr. Roosevelt was never able to charm General De Gaulle into either liking or respecting him. But this remote, self-centered, difficult and dedicated Frenchman has extended President Eisenhower his admiration since their first encounter in the days of the last war.

Charm alone would not have moved the people of West Germany, whose land he had crushed as a conqueror, to give Mr. Eisenhower their overwhelming greeting now as commander in chief of peace, and to sum up their feeling for him in a banner that read: "Germans trust Eisenhower."

There, it seems to me, is the key word: "trust." The Eisenhower charm is a manifestation of an inner sincerity and an innate good will. These are the qualities he displayed in the dramatic setting of the world stage in Bonn, London, and Paris and that have earned him the esteem of his fellow Americans at home.

There has at times been disagreement with his views and doubt of his policies. Our papers have not always concurred in everything he has done. But we have never questioned the sincerity of his beliefs nor the integrity of his character. Nor, as it is now apparent, do our allies.

While Mr. Roosevelt was loaded with charm, our man from Abilene is loaded with character.

An instance comes to mind in my leisurely horseback review of the President's trip. It is not an example of world-shaking significance but more like a bit of byplay in the midst of great events.

It is the party the President gave in London to old friends of World War II, first and foremost among them Sir Winston Churchill, whom I am pleased and proud to count as my friend, too. Among those present on invitation of the President and somewhat to his own astonishment, was Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery, General Eisenhower's Deputy Commander of Allied Forces in Europe during the war.

You may recall that Lord Montgomery published his memoirs last year. In them and in a television interview he criticized General Eisenhower's wartime strategy and his postwar political leadership. The Viscount does not mince words, and it is no secret that his words burned and hurt.

No demands of social protocol compelled the President to invite Lord Montgomery to the party. Nevertheless he did and welcomed Lord Montgomery with the same hearty friendliness with which he greeted the others. I gather a good time was had by all.

A small episode? Yes. But it illustrates my point. It takes a man of character to overlook criticism that disparaged his conduct of the massive exploit climaxing his military career.

To return to the big picture, Mr. Eisenhower's meeting with doughty old Chancellor Adenauer resulted in complete understanding and removed whatever doubts the Chancellor may have had that the President might give way on our obligations to the free people of West Berlin or West Germany. In fact, it appears that the meeting did more.

As a result of it, Chancellor Adenauer moved over to the peace offensive in calling on Premier Khrushchev for hard negotiation on controlled international disarmament.

The talk with the President also seems to have been behind the Chancellor's dramatic gesture of amity toward the Polish people—not their Communist government—in a broadcast admitting the guilt of Hitler's Germany in invading Poland 20 years ago and offering the hope of friendship from the new Germany today. The fact that the offer was cynically rebuffed by the Polish Communist Premier reflects on him, not on Adenauer.

In Britain there were once more tumultuous crowds and the delightful scene of the welcome by Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip at Balmoral Castle, but the big show was the informal TV and radio chat of the President and Prime Minister Macmillan.

Once more the President's sincerity and character showed themselves when he said he will not be a party to a summit meeting "that is going to depress and discourage people—we must have some promise of fruitful results."

His reiteration of his position—which I fully endorse—showed that he could not be moved from it in an atmosphere of adulation any more than he would be in one of threats. The British would like a summit as soon as possible, on the premise that the Foreign Ministers meeting at Geneva narrowed areas of disagreement enough to warrant one.

The President does not go along with this. To continue his figure of speech, the fruitful expectations at Geneva were green and sour. We must have a far more ripened expectation of accomplishment from Premier Khrushchev before we go to a formal summit. The differences between the British and us are not critical and I do not think the President will have much difficulty in persuading them, when the matter comes to decision, to play it our way.

In Paris there was more pomp than in Bonn or London. The Parisian crowds managed to convey their sentiments with shouts of "Vive Ike." And the President, after beaming and waving along the boulevards and the Champs-Elysées, managed to convey his when he stretched out his arms to the people and said, "Je vous aime, tous" (I love you all). (I couldn't help wondering when I read it if he said it in a south of France accent.)

There was no pomp and more substance in his unexpected appearance at NATO headquarters where he gave the alliance a succinct prescription for peace. "If we are firm among ourselves," he said, "if we refuse to retreat one inch from principle, if we remain flexible so far as tactics are concerned, if we give NATO the same patriotic deep devotion we give to each of our own nations, then there will be no war. Then there will be peace."

It is to be hoped President De Gaulle marked the words, for his dedicated desire to restore France to her former grandeur—with which we must sympathize in principle—has been a disruptive influence on NATO—for which he deserves no sympathy at all.

The De Gaulle regime has demanded our support of its policy in Algeria, which is impossible unless, as has been hinted, the General is ready to accept the principle of self-determination as the eventual solution of the problem.

The President was wise in withholding comment on this until General De Gaulle makes his position formally clear, as he is expected to be by the time the UN meets September 15. Mr. Eisenhower could not endorse in advance a policy that has not been firmed up.

Nor can we agree to French control over our nuclear weapons on her soil, nor for a United States-British-French directorate of NATO. There is good reason to expect that the President, by his attitude of cordiality and firmness, has persuaded De Gaulle to recede from these untenable positions. As concerns a NATO triumvirate, the President pointedly remarked that all NATO nations are equals.

While we await clarification of these issues, we do not have to wait to sum up the President's mission to Europe as far more successful than anyone had anticipated.

I hope he enjoys his rest in Scotland, and that the American people will give him a big welcome when he comes home. He has earned both.

The Passport Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. BARR

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, it is my honest opinion that the passport bill, which the Congress passed on Tuesday, the 8th of September, was not as simple and harmless as it seemed. I voted "no" on this bill, and I am inserting two editorials from the Indianapolis Star of June 28, 1958, and December 10, 1958, setting forth some of the arguments against this type of legislation:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, June 28, 1958]

WIDE-OPEN EXIT

The State Department has decided to stop trying to prevent American citizens from leaving America and coming back. Henceforth passport applicants will no longer be required to answer form questions about Communist Party membership. The change represents a State Department decision to go all the way in conforming to a recent Supreme Court opinion.

It is too bad the passport matter had to get fouled up with the Communist issue. It is too bad the State Department had to wait for prodding by the Supreme Court. The principle involved should not be confused with communism or with the Court's past tendency to twist law and logic to favor Communists. By the law of averages, the Court has to be right sometimes, and this is one of the times. The State Department is wise to surrender.

There never was any legislative authority by which the Federal Government could restrict the travel of American citizens for political reasons except under wartime conditions. Neither the State Department nor any other branch of Government has ever had the right to make of the United States a jail which some of its citizens cannot leave. A citizen who advocates violent overthrow of the Government can and should be prosecuted and imprisoned under antisubversive laws. That is the proper punishment for his guilt. The denial of his freedom to travel when he has not been legally detained is pure oppression.

The State Department's misuse of its passport functions has been based on the dangerous theory that the Government has the right to use private individuals as tools of diplomacy. The idea has been that the movement of individuals can be restricted and regulated in line with what officials conceive to be the national interest. There has never been a more subversive idea accepted on high levels. The American Government exists to protect the freedom of the individual, including his freedom to refuse to take an active hand in Government policies. It does not exist to shanghai the individual into becoming an active agent of policies with which he may disagree.

Without hindrance by his own Government, an American who is not under criminal detention should be free to go anywhere in

the world where he will be accepted. If other governments want to keep us out of their countries, that is their privilege, as it is ours to keep their people out of the United States. But it is not the right of our own public servants to tell us as individuals where we can and cannot go. If we want to risk our necks in dangerous places, they can and should disclaim responsibility, but they have no right to keep us from going.

Now that the State Department has admitted it has not the power to withhold passports for reasons of belief or association, it should not wait for a Court decree to take one other vital step. It should immediately abandon the policy of trying to keep Americans who do have passports from visiting blacklisted countries. If an American wants to visit Communist China, or any other place on the face of the earth, and is willing to do so at his own risk, the American Government should not be able to deny him the right.

An Iron Curtain is possible only where a government exercises complete authority over the movement of its citizens. We don't need that kind of government here, and we don't want it.

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Dec. 10, 1958]

LET'S KEEP THIS FREEDOM

It is gratifying to find the State Department alarmed about the activities of American Communists and Communist supporters. But it would be wrong to give the Department the power to deny passports to such persons. It is questionable whether the denial of passports is a very useful tool against the Communists. The exercise of such power in the past has done great violence to the American ideal of freedom, and it would do the same again.

During 6 years previous to last June, when the State Department was operating under a power to deny passports which it had simply assumed for itself by regulation, by its own count passports were "tentatively or finally" denied to "more than 300 persons" because of records indicating that they were supporters of the Communist movement. A few of these cases involved persons of prominence, and in these cases the Department succeeded in causing a considerable uproar. The prominent ones stayed home if they didn't get their passports. But the traffic in forged papers is too widespread and too well known to admit of any supposition that persons whose travel was important to the Communists were kept at home by denial of bona fide passports.

Roderic L. O'Connor, administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs, said in a recent address that "we can very seriously hinder the effective operation of the Communist Party here and abroad by making it difficult for the supporters of that party to depart from the United States." On the basis of the experience of the 6 years during which the Department exercised the power, that statement requires a lot of substantiating.

Unquestionably, however, the Department could very seriously hinder the activities of persons who are essentially law abiding if it held the power to deny people of a particular philosophic viewpoint the right to depart legally from the United States. If the precedent is established now to forbid the departure of supporters of communism, tomorrow the precedent could be used to forbid the departure of the supporters of free trade, or prohibition, or anything else which the makers of the regulations might regard as a dangerous philosophy.

The fact that control of travel can be used to hinder the development or operation of a political or philosophical idea is the very reason that the right of the individual to move about is basic to human freedom. The right of the American citizen to leave the country and go wherever in the world he wants—as far as American Government control is concerned—is just as vital as the right to move about inside the country. When the Government begins to close the travel gates to persons with "dangerous" ideas, the Government takes control of the communication of ideas.

Freedom is not protected against the Communists by adopting the tactics of the Communists. Making it hard for the supporters of other systems to leave the country is one of the basic methods of the Communists. After all the argument Americans individually and the United States officially have made against the policy of the Iron Curtain, it would ill befit the United States to take up that policy.

It is true that Communists and their supporters in America are dangerous. Stronger laws are indeed needed to control their conspiracies against the security of America. The teeth should be put back in the Smith Act and the power of the States to defend themselves against sedition should be restored. If security requires still further restriction of Communists, it should be done directly and not through such devious measures as travel regulations which would set the precedent for hampering the freedom of all Americans.

Acquisition of Real Property by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the letter of transmittal and resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, Renville County, N. Dak., relating to the acquisition of real property by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENVILLE COUNTY, N. DAK.,
September 2, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Upon direction of the Board of County Commissioners of Renville County, N. Dak., I am enclosing herewith a copy of their resolution with regard to S. 910 and H.R. 5731 and H.R. 6073. You are probably aware that Renville County has lost tens of thousands of acres from the tax lists as a result of the Upper Souris Game Refuge, which loss has been a heavy burden upon the remaining taxable territory. It appears that if the legislation above referred to is passed, that considerable benefit could be derived by this county and a number of other counties in the same situation.

We hope that you will see fit to give this proposed legislation your full support.

Very truly yours,

ESTHER HOCHSPRUNG,
County Auditor.

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF RENVILLE COUNTY, N. DAK., ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1959

Commissioner Vendsel introduced the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Whereas Renville County and other municipalities and governmental jurisdictions have been in the past and are at present severely affected by the loss of tax revenue resulting from the acquisition of real property by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas there have been introduced in Congress S. 910 and H.R. 5731 and H.R. 6073 which, if adopted, will assist in alleviating the situation referred to: be it therefore

"*Resolved*, That the Board of County Commissioners of Renville County go on record as supporting the said proposed legislation and of urging the Senators and Representatives from the State of North Dakota to do all in their power to bring about the passage of said legislation; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the county auditor be directed to send to Hon. WILLIAM LANGER, Hon. MILTON R. YOUNG, Hon. DON SHORT, and Hon. QUENTIN R. BURDICK copies of this resolution.

"Upon vote, all commissioners voted "Aye" and none voted "Nay", and the resolution was adopted.

"Dated at Mohall, N. Dak., this 1st day of September 1959."

ESTHER HOCHSPRUNG,
County Auditor.

An Editor's Views of Current Developments in Central America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following series of four articles written by Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor, the News and Courier, Charleston, S.C., during his recent trip to Central America and the Caribbean area. I found Mr. Harrigan's articles extremely interesting and highly informative and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues and others interested in the important developments taking place in that part of the world:

OUTLOOK IS GLOOMY IN CASTRO'S CUBA

(By Anthony Harrigan)

HAVANA, CUBA.—Castro's bearded, long-haired soldiers in olive green uniforms stand guard with loaded submachine guns outside the Presidential Palace. They are stationed along the Avenida de las Misiones, in front of this White House of Cuba. They are in the park at the rear of the building, walking among the baby carriages and the lovers. Every few minutes a truck or jeep, loaded with soldiers, dashes along one of the nearby streets.

Castro's forces are arresting "counter-revolutionaries." The estimates of numbers vary by the hour.

GOVERNMENT JUMPY

The government is jumpy. The city is full of rumors of Batista-Dominican landings on this island.

Fidel Castro is an elusive figure moving rapidly from place to place. He carries the Cuban government in his hat.

"Castro is Cuba," a veteran Havana journalist told me. "He decides everything."

This able American writer, who knows Cuba inside out, stressed the chaotic nature of the Castro regime, its leftist character,

and its unrealistic approach to Cuba's problems.

"Castro," I was told, "is not a Communist. But he is doing everything the Communists want."

My informant told me that a leading Communist editor had made this statement in private conversation. The so-called agrarian reform, which is the principal program of the revolutionary government, has long been an objective of Communists in Cuba.

"They will destroy the sugar industry," my journalist acquaintance said. "They haven't the capital or the ability to operate it.

NO MANAGEMENT

"As for their plan to create cooperatives, no organization in Cuba could manage such an enterprise.

"They actually want to destroy the sugar industry. They have the idea they can sell vegetables and cattle to the United States. They don't understand that Cuban beef is marked fourth class in the United States and that the last thing Americans need is more agricultural commodities."

My informant held out no hope that a moderate element exists within the Castro government.

"Recently," this journalist told me, "Castro appeared before a group of newspapermen. He said: 'I am appointing my brother Raul commander in chief of the armed forces, and if I die, he will become head of the government. If you think I am radical, then you don't know my little brother Raul.' "

This writer said there wasn't any evidence as to whether Raul Castro is or is not a Communist. "But for years," said my source, "he has been soaking up leftist and communist ideas."

What concerns this American journalist is that Communists are filing all the second echelon posts in the Castro government.

Cited as an example was the education ministry. Though Armando Hart, 23-year-old education minister, is not regarded as a Red, the entire staff charged with the preparation of new textbooks for Cuban schools consists of persons with ultra-leftist and Communist backgrounds.

I was told that Castro can't understand that Cuba must stay in the good graces of the United States in order to survive economically. Cuba depends on sugar for its cash, and the world price of sugar is below the cost of producing it in Cuba. The only part of the sugar crop that Cuba profits from is that part which is sold to the United States at the special high price which the United States is willing to pay.

Though Castro professes not to understand why Americans don't like his regime, he continually whips up anti-Americanism. He attempts to promote new trade ties for Cuba. In recent months, the Japanese have been dickering with the revolutionary government. But as my source explained, these exploratory efforts aren't likely to get anywhere. The Japanese want to sell textiles to Cuba, and inasmuch as Cuba has textile mills, protests are made every time the government talks textiles with the Japanese.

As to the future of Cuba under Castro, my informant was pessimistic. The word that I received was that things are likely to go from bad to worse.

"Castro is destroying the upper middle class," I was told.

And for a nation that hopes to prosper, such an action is a virtual guarantee of continuing poverty.

THE HONDURAN ECONOMY

(By Anthony Harrigan)

TEGUCIGALPA, HONDURAS.—Fires blazed on eroded hilltops as our plane neared the capital. Oxen are pulling carts in the city streets. Students in crumpled gray cloth suits lounge outside a rundown university building. These are signs and symbols of Honduras, a poverty-ridden country.

Honduras is so poor that even the police, a privileged class in most Central American countries, wear shabby uniforms.

The national budget of Honduras is $42.5 million a year. Money is tight. When President Villeda Morales took office 2 years ago, there was only about $40,000 in the national treasury. The government finds itself in a jam when it needs an extra $10,000 for specific purpose.

This mushroom-shaped country the size of Tennessee is the second largest of the six Central American Republics. It has a population of 1.8 million.

A few additional facts:

At last report, Honduras had only 24 miles of paved highway.

The only railroad facilities are feeder lines for banana divisions operated by the United Fruit Co. and the Standard Fruit Co. These are on the north coast far from the capital city.

Almost 90 percent of Honduras is mountainous.

Honduras has less electric power than any country except Haiti.

The country lacks the rain needed for good agricultural production. U.S. agriculturists do not believe that food crops will flourish on land that receives less than 20 inches of rain a year. The annual rainfall in much of Honduras is only 17 inches.

Only on the northern coast, where there is rain and bananas can be grown for export, is there a truly productive agricultural enterprise. The United Fruit Co.'s banana division there, with its piers and railroad facilities, represents one of the few solid properties in the country. Taxes paid by the United Fruit Co. are the mainstay of Honduras. Without these taxes, the country would be in a desperate financial condition.

The country's assets, in addition to the United Fruit Co. banana lands—which are the result of heavy investment by U.S. citizens—include a pleasant climate and some of the most superb mountain scenery in the world.

Tourist trade is negligible, however. Though good air service exists, few American travelers enter this country. The tourist trade is one that this poor country should cultivate but most probably cannot afford to promote in expensive U.S. news media.

American travelers who ask only for natural beauty, and not for luxurious accommodations offered in some international hotels, would enjoy this magnificient country. Not only are the mountains and valleys spectacular, but here are buildings of interest to students of history and architecture. The Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel, in downtown Tegucigalpa, is one of the finest Spanish churches I have seen on this journey.

In the 138 years of its existence, Honduras has had 138 revolutions. An unsuccessful revolt took place only recently. But Americans should not make too much of such political upsets. They aren't much more than changes of the guard—affairs involving small forces, and usually resulting in few major changes.

One has to remember that the best business in Honduras is government. For the able people of this country, the Government is the only source of income and influence. Business enterprises are virtually nonexistent.

I am told that the present Chief Executive is a good man but unable to effect any real changes in this country because of a lack of funds.

The United States puts roughly $1.5 million a year into Honduras through a variety of agencies. The money is spent on health, education, and agricultural projects.

Since 1947, the United States has been spending an average of $1 million a year.

Private investment, except for the big operations of the fruit companies, is negligible. Bulk Carriers, Inc., and the Crown Zellerbach Paper Co., have under consideration a $40 million pulpwood plant. Private Honduran investment is modest.

In the city of Tegucigalpa, such prosperity as exists is reported to stem from the expenditures of the sizable North American colony. Hondurans rent homes to North Americans for as much as $250 a month. Many of these private homes are lovely indeed. They are built of white and pink stone quarried in the neighborhood. The majority of streets in front of houses in new sections—Tegucigalpa's suburbia—are unpaved.

The basic problem in Honduras is food. There simply isn't enough of it to go round. Available supplies are sold at exorbitant prices. A head of lettuce can be sold in Tegucigalpa for $1. Corn sells for two and one-half times the price in the United States. A jar of strawberry jam costs 90 cents.

While food is the greatest need of this country, the news here is that the U.S. Government is about to embark on a major new health campaign in Latin America. If this is so, it can only mean greater suffering in a country such as this. Why? Because improved checks on malaria and better water supplies will mean a lowering of the death rate and more mouths to feed. Better health will simply upset the balance of nature in Honduras and similarly situated Caribbean countries.

It is impossible to openly oppose better health and longer life, but the end result of humanitarian measures is increased suffering.

Of pressing importance is the production of more foodstuffs—field crops such as corn, rice, and beans. These are the crops that provide the greatest amount of nourishment for the greatest number of people. Later, when there is enough basic food to go around, the country can concentrate on cattle and vegetables.

But agricultural production is slow to increase. Much of the land is worthless for farming. Skilled farmers are few. An especially serious problem is the credit necessary for a farmer to prepare new lands and carry his operation through the first year.

Money is difficult to borrow in Honduras. Interest rates range from 8 percent a year to 3.5 percent a month. There is a national central bank in Honduras and one private bank, plus money lenders. The London and Montreal Bank will commence operations in October. As private banking facilities become more numerous, interest rates may be competitive.

One should not imagine that this is a city without people of affluence. There is money here. Profits are high in many Honduran enterprises. But people with money are likely to stash it away in banks in the United States and in Switzerland. They fear political turmoil and confiscation.

What are U.S. objectives in Honduras? That's the question Americans must consider carefully.

For one thing, U.S. citizens and companies have a big stake in this country. Thus our Government should do whatever is reasonable to protect U.S. investment.

The United States has a big stake in the status quo in that it has no desire to see a Communist regime installed in any Central American country. Red infection might spread throughout the Americas and the Soviets might seek to establish satellites and military installations in this hemisphere.

Then there is the attitude that the United States should help a neighboring republic which lives on the brink of chaos.

Whether U.S. aid is sufficient to help Honduras solve its tremendous problems, this writer can't say. But if it prevents the economic collapse which might be a prelude to a Communist regime, it is money well spent. After all, the annual bill for aid to Honduras comes to less than half the cost of a single ballistic missile.

LATINS LOOK TO UNITED STATES FOR LEADERSHIP

(By Anthony Harrigan)

GUATEMALA CITY.—Five years ago a U.S. Ambassador, the late John E. Peurifoy of South Carolina, walked the streets of this city with an automatic pistol tucked under his belt. The Colleton County man spoke openly of what sort of leaders the United States did or did not want in Guatemala. Though Ambassador Peurifoy's personal role in the Guatemalan liberation movement of 1954 is still not wholly clear, the fact is that the pro-Communist regime of Jacobo Arbenz was ousted from power.

Today the role of the United States in Guatemala is a quiet one. The administration of President Miguel Ydigoras Fuentes is friendly to the United States. Nevertheless, the U.S. Embassy and information service operation here is one of the biggest in Latin America. Guatemala bears close watching, as indicated by the fact that a leftwinger, Dr. Luis F. Galich Lopez, recently was elected mayor of Guatemala City.

Potential danger stems from the attitude of many university students. The present generation of students received primary education during the period when the Reds controlled this country. Many students had their thinking colored by doctrines they heard during their formative years.

A complicating factor, I have been told, is that many Guatemalans associate the early days of the Arbenz regime with national reform. It was not until the 1940's after the ouster of a rightwing dictatorship, that Guatemala received its first social legislation designed to help the poor.

While the United States is properly alarmed about Communist penetration in Central America, citizens of these countries are not greatly disturbed.

"The Latin attitude," I was told, "is doubt that the Communist menace is serious but that if it is, then the United States will take care of it."

The importance to the Communists of having a Red regime in Latin America cannot be overestimated. When Communists controlled Guatemala in the early 1950's, world communism could say to people in Europe and Asia: "See, the United States is so weak it cannot keep up out of its own backyard."

The principal U.S. diplomatic device in this and other Central American countries is economic aid, both direct and indirect. The United States has spent about $80 million in Guatemala since the Red regime was overthrown in 1954.

In addition, the Government knows that inasmuch as the United States is the principal supplier of funds to the World Bank, it has a big say in how loans are made. The U.S. Ambassador is influential because his views may determine how much aid is available.

As in other Central American countries, poverty is a friend of leftism and an enemy of the United States. For a nation to respond to the policies of a capitalist country there must be sympathy for for capitalism and expectation of sharing in its fruits. So long as Guatemala has great poverty, the danger of Communist political exploitation is present.

While Guatemala has made great strides in recent years, it also has much poverty to overcome.

Guatemala City has many blocks of beautiful homes that represent a blend of international architectural styles and the Indian traditions of this country. Streets, public buildings, hotel and airport facilities are excellent. But Indian women with babies on their backs sleep in the entranceways of stores. Many people seem to have no homes but the sidewalks.

This is a city that is making real progress, but it also is a city of conspicuous misery.

Everywhere one travels in Central America one sees the misery of the present and the promise of the future. Certainly Guatemala, a beautiful land of lakes, mountains and ancient ruins, will draw increasing numbers of American tourists in the years ahead.

In this and other Central American countries the Germans, Japanese, and British are alert to trade opportunities. The British, for example, dominate tractor sales in this part of the world.

These Latin countries abound in opportunities for shrewd investors and smart traders. They need everything that an industrial economy produces. If U.S. citizens are awake to the opportunities, they will arrange credits so that they get the business.

With some notable exceptions, U.S. business seems to be slow to grasp the opportunities of selling to the middle class market in Middle America. This is unfortunate for the United States, inasmuch as history tells us that trade ties lead to political ties. If we fail to develop, we may lose the other. One day soon the Communist world may enter the trade war in this region.

Everywhere one travels in Central America, one realizes the extent to which people look to the United States. They seem not to look so much for dollars as for U.S. leadership.

Americans at home don't begin to appreciate their Nation's farflung power and influence. The people of Central America expect us to deploy our national strength in various ways. They often overestimate the alertness of the United States to its own needs, imagining that we are bolder in foreign policy than we actually are.

Clearly, the United States has a great future in Middle America if it wakes to its opportunities. We should realize, however, that each country is different and requires different handling.

It is important to understand that these countries are not ratholes for foreign aid. U.S. citizens and companies can and should do more business in these countries. One North American corporation, the United Fruit Co., has been doing busines in these lands for more than half a century. Though political conditions have altered radically and may change even more in the years ahead, this company believes it can continue to do business on a profitable basis.

The United Fruit Co. has a flexibility of approach that stands it in good stead. The U.S. public should recognize that the changing world of Central America, which is characterized by intense nationalism, requires this sort of flexibility.

The United States will remain strong and influential in this hemisphere if it learns to be flexible in bringing its power to bear; if it assigns able young businessmen and diplomats, and if it rediscovers the business drive that made fortunes for Yankee traders 100 years ago.

A VIEW OF COSTA RICA

(By Anthony Harrigan)

SAN JOSE, COSTA RICA.—The most overworked description of this country is that Costa Rica is the Switzerland of Central America.

But that's the right description. I shall use it.

This is a country, which as seen from San Jose, the capital city, high in the mountains, is a land of republican simplicity, dignity, and decency. The President, Mario Echandi, drives his own automobile to work. The presidential palace is an unpretentious structure. There are more teachers in Costa Rica than policemen—a remarkable thing in Central America. Equally remarkable to the visitor is the evident unwillingness of Costa Rican administrations to build huge Government palaces at the expense of the people. National ministries are housed in a variety of modest structures, which though freshly painted and kept in good repair, would not be accepted by empire-building bureaucrats in many a U.S. county seat.

Another sign of the Costa Rican way of life are the schoolchildren in simple blue and white uniforms. And most extraordinary of all, the young girls—the teenagers in school attire—don't wear lipstick or cosmetics or in any way attempt to appear as though they were 25 or 30.

Costa Rica is a good Catholic country. A huge throng of worshipers filled the San Jose cathedral during midmorning mass Sunday. It was a cross section of humanity in this city—the young and the old and the well dressed and the shabby. They were in the cathedral again early Monday morning—men in overalls and torn shirts and businessmen in expensive suits—fashionably dressed women and old crones in drab black dresses, moving on their knees down the long aisle toward the high altar.

This is not a spectacular city like Havana, but one well worth raving about, for it offers the kind of life to which all Central American countries should aspire.

To understand Costa Rica, one has to know that since Spanish times it has had many small landowners and few holders of vast estates. It is more of a white nation than any country in Central America, having a large population of pure Spanish origin. The country's original Indian population received the same treatment as the Indians in the United States. Furthermore, Costa Rica welcomed large numbers of European immigrants in the last century.

I talked today with the descendant of one of the immigrants who came from Germany in the 1800's. He is Hubert Federspiel, one of San Jose's leading young businessmen. Though he bears a German name, he is completely a Costa Rican in thought and manner.

Mr. Federspiel permitted me to tour the magnificient department store and printing plant that he owns in downtown San Jose. Carlos Federspiel & Co. which is the name of the establishment opened my eyes to the advanced state of Costa Rican business enterprise.

Elsewhere in this part of the world many dry goods stores seem to be 30 years behind the times, with little understanding of modern packaging and sales techniques. But Federspiel's could teach most small city U.S. enterprises many a lesson.

The accounting department at Federspiel's has the most modern equipment and sales and credit data systems. Management receives a daily inventory report on every item in the store. The lines of radios, TV, tape recorders, typewriters, etc., offered for sale,

are as fine as anything in U.S. communities. The book store which the company operates has everything from the complete works of Descartes to cut-out books for children. The company has a lithographing shop that turns out labels for Costa Rica beer, the jackets for all the cigarettes made in San Jose, Petty-style calendars in full color, plus the national lottery tickets. The print shop is equipped with the latest German presses and paper cutting machines. The company's canteen offers better facilities for a pleasant coffee break than most U.S. business places. The employes have the use of real china, not paper cups. And the entire sales and manufacturing operation is under one roof, with delivery assured anywhere in Costa Rica.

Federspiel's is an example of the best of Latin business.

What about U.S. business? According to Mr. Federspiel who learned merchandising in Chicago, U.S. businessmen are lagging behind the Europeans and the Japanese. Though his company buys quantities of U.S.-made goods, the Germans and other foreign business groups are making the big gains in the expanding Costa Rican market.

These national groups, according to Mr. Federspiel, don't mind spending time to sell their goods. They come into the city, learn the wants, needs and capabilities of a store, and carefully and graciously work with the store management to get a sales order that will be satisfactory. The U.S. salesman reportedly rushes in and offers what he has on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, ignoring some of the little polite usages here which mean a lot to Latins. The abundance here of European and Japanese products (the latter have sold a great many jeep-like vehicles in this country) indicates that U.S. companies need to study their sales operations in Latin America. They will have to become more competitive if they don't want to lose the growing middle class market of middle America.

Though this country is unique in Central America, it is not without problems. The Communists are at work here as elsewhere in the world. Legally banned, they nevertheless issue a newspaper that whoops it up for the Soviet Union and Cuba's Fidel Castro. The country has an unfavorable balance of trade, and must increase its exports.

Socialism is a problem in this country. Certain existing laws hamper economic growth. At the present time, for instance, liberals in the national legislature are pushing a pay plan which would require employers to pay their workers an extra month's salary as a bonus.

But there are conservative Costa Ricans who are fighting this and other schemes which would slow the country's progress.

I talked this afternoon with Guido Fernandez, an able, articulate young businessman, who is the executive secretary of ANFE, the national association for economic development.

This is a private group devoted to the advancement and protection of free enterprise in Costa Rica. It wars with socialist-minded officials who want government to run every sort of business. ANFE conducts a vigorous campaign in the Costa Rica press, buttonholes legislators, issues a magazine devoted to free enterprise, and even sponsors free enterprise committees in the national university.

ANFE also is active in bringing new business to the country. Mr. Fernandez was making plans today to hold a luncheon for a plane-load of Baton Rouge, La. businessmen, who have been invited to fly down here and investigate investment opportunities.

Wherever one looks in San Jose, one sees a bright future. This is a politically healthy stable country which is friendly to the United States and whose friendship the United States should value highly.

Overseas Tour by President Eisenhower and Forthcoming Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in a column which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald of August 30, entitled, "Trip Is Great Adventure," George Minot presents a revealing analysis on the importance of President Eisenhower's overseas tour.

Mr. Minot also touches on the pressing problem of Premier Khrushchev's forthcoming visit to this country and he stresses the need of our displaying to the Soviet Premier our unity of purpose and our dogged determination to protect our way of life. I ask unanimous consent that this penetrating commentary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRIP IS GREAT ADVENTURE

(By George Minot)

President Eisenhower is spending the weekend at the country home of Prime Minister Macmillan outside London. Tomorrow night the two of them will go on British television for what has been characterized as an informal talk. The purpose of it, of course, is to show the world that they stand side by side in combating the common menace.

Apparently the President is having the time of his life on this his greatest adventure. It is the kind of thing he does best. You remember that before the invasion of Europe in wartime our allies and our own generals were split from hither to yon. In those divisions, and in those that followed until the end of the war, it was Eisenhower who soothed the angry, calmed the impatient, prodded the laggards, and—if you pardon a hackneyed term—got the team pulling together.

HOPE, FOREBODING, AND CUROSITY

So it is little wonder the entire world—free and slave—is watching this adventure with a peculiar fixture of hope, foreboding, and curiosity. Its potentialities for good are almost boundless. Possibly it will result in an uneasy peace for years to come. It could have dangerous consequences—even be the forerunner of war. It may lift the world into an ecstasy of hope and confidence. Just as easily it could cast the earth into a slough of despair.

If you have been reading any of the great columnists, you may think that this is a new Eisenhower who is testing his personal diplomacy on our allies and who next month is to receive Premier Khrushchev to these shores. Walter Lippmann, for instance referred to the President as a man who "has for years been throttled down by diffidence, by a lack of confidence in his own political know-how."

That, of course, is nonsense. Lippmann forgets quickly. It was know-how, political as well as military, that produced unity during the war, and, that ended the mess in Korea later. It was Eisenhower's confidence and courage that kept this country on a level keel when all around him cried for crackpot schemes to end the recession.

The New York Times, in a lead editorial, the other day paid tribute to Eisenhower's new leadership and to his determination to do his utmost for peace before leaving office. For heavens sake, what do they think he has been doing the last 6 years?

NEVER A TRIP LIKE THIS ONE

Nobody knows how such myths start, but none is more ridiculous than the one that Secretary Dulles was absolute boss of our foreign policy for years and that the President didn't show much interest or participate fully in great decisions until after Mr. Dulles' death. In private conversations in the last few weeks, Mr. Eisenhower has exhibited considerable surprise and annoyance at this talk of his new leadership.

It is no new Eisenhower who this last week has been conferring with Chancellor Adenauer in Bonn and who will follow up his London meetings with others in Paris. Then, returning to Washington to meet Khrushchev he will prepare to be off again on a return visit to Soviet Russia and then later still for an East-West summit meeting. He may fail in this great mission but if he does the whole world will know that responsibility for the failure rests elsewhere.

In any event, it isn't an exaggeration to say there never has been a trip like the one Eisenhower now is on. Civilized statesmen never have dealt with men like Khrushchev and his predecessors before. It is one thing to meet with power-mad autocrats, and quite another with demons who raise problems not to settle them but to make sure they are not settled, with dedicated zealots who threaten, blackmail, and denounce but who have no idea of honestly negotiating.

DE GAULLE INTERESTED IN FRANCE

It is, of course, too early to say positively that Eisenhower has appeased the uneasy and bitter Adenauer. At least he feels no longer neglected and if he is sure of anything now it is that the President and Secretary Herter are walking the same path as did Mr. Dulles. And he knows, if he didn't know it before, that we never will sell out the people of West Berlin.

DeGaulle also is bitter. He doesn't want to talk about Khrushchev, the Reds, Berlin or much of anything else except France. He wants Eisenhower to persuade the Allies to give France a bigger voice in world councils, help her in Algeria and give her more secrets of the atomic bomb than she has. If Eisenhower resists these demands, DeGaulle is ready to threaten he'll pull out of the NATO alliance.

Eisenhower will have little trouble with DeGaulle, no more than he is having with Macmillan this week end. Our British cousin is willing to go along with us on almost anything as long as he will get some of the credit if it is successful, but none of the blame if it turns out badly. The "German problem" doesn't bother Macmillan very much. Like the French, the British don't care if Germany is divided for years. As long as he gets to a summit meeting Macmillan will be happy.

MUST SEE US AS WE ARE

Home again, the President has another big job. Somehow, he's got to show Khrushchev a people and a country not only happy and free—as he has already said—but a country and a people who are tough and strong, who hate tyrants and tyranny, who loathe what the Communists stand for, who possess a huge arsenal of arms and can turn out implements of war in thousands of plants from the Atlantic to the Pacific—and who will fight—to their last drop if thugs and murderers push them too far.

Khrushchev must not leave these shores without understanding that he and his gang cannot continue to threaten and insult us. He must not get the idea Americans are so wallowing in comforts and so engrossed in

earning good livings, and so satisfied with their schools and hospitals and industrial plants that they stand any amount of pushing around.

He must be made to understand that the rights and liberties of human beings mean more to a free people than their own material possessions, that big business does not dominate us and that we stand firmly behind the President on great issues like Berlin. If he goes home knowing these things his trip will be vastly worthwhile to him and to us. Mr. Eisenhower has no bigger job than to see that he does.

I Didn't Raise My Boy To Be a Babysitter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a letter I have received from a former officer in the Air Force.

He has some interesting observations to make on the misuse of personnel in the Armed Forces, a field which is now under study by the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

Here is the letter:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX.,
September 5, 1959.

The Honorable FRANK KOWALSKI,
U.S. Representative from Connecticut, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: For some time I have been reading with profound interest the proceedings of the investigation into the manpower abuses by the military establishments, and I must say that such an investigation appears to be long overdue. The American people should be apprised of the manpower policies being pursued by the Armed Forces, particularly when we are footing the bill of several million dollars per year to provide lackeys and personal servants for the families of the general and flag officers of the services. This is to say nothing of the servants provided some of the lesser lights in the military profession.

Ever since World War II the corps of lackeys and personal servants for officers' families has been growing until it has reached almost astronomical proportions. At the same time the services have been pleading for more people to accomplish their respective missions—a paradox by any manner of reasoning you wish to employ.

An officer of the Armed Forces, regardless of rank, is paid an adequate salary to provide for his needs and I am sure that it was never intended by Congress or the taxpayers that any officer should be provided with a retinue of lackays in addition to his salary. The use of such euphamistic titles as "administrative assistant," "aide to the commanding general," and "orderly" does not extinguish the fact that a man who washes dishes in the home of an officer, baby sits for his wife or daughter, or chauffeurs his family, is performing personal services not intended to be provided by the Government. A civil servant of like responsibility does not enjoy such a ridiculous windfall. (I am sure that your allowances as a Representative do not include this type of authorization.) I have heard some individuals who are opposed to the draft singing the song "I Didn't Raise My Boy To Be a Babysitter."

During my 25 years' service I was always chagrined when I received those TWX's from higher headquarters directing that we screen the records for an aide-de-camp for a certain general. By the time we read the qualifications we usually wound up looking for a Phi Beta Kappa who would be willing to serve as a lackey for a general's family.

I sincerely hope that you and your colleagues will pursue your investigation with the resolution and vigor you have shown in the past and that you will introduce appropriate remedial legislation in the Congress.

Respectfully,

HOWARD W. JESSEE,
Lieutenant Colonel, USAF (Retired).

Why Shouldn't We Honor Santa Fe With a Commemorative Stamp?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial dated August 17, 1959, which appeared in the New Mexican, published in Santa Fe, N. Mex.:

Santa Fe's request for a special stamp to commemorate its 350th anniversary has been turned down by a Post Office Department screening committee on grounds that the event is of only regional interest.

Evidence to the contrary is beginning to build up. In Sunday's edition, we reprinted an editorial from the Dallas Morning News—one of the biggest and most influential newspapers in Texas—which reflected the interest of our big neighbor to the southeast concerning the committee's ruling.

Below you'll find the opinion of our big neighbor to the north—an editorial entitled "Don't These Guys Read History," from the Denver Post:

"A citizen's committee which makes recommendations to the Postmaster General regarding the issuance of commemorative postage stamps has—believe it or not—turned thumbs down on a request that a special stamp be issued next year in honor of the 350th anniversary of the founding of Santa Fe, N. Mex.

"The reason given for the committee's action was that it is contrary to established policy to issue stamps in celebration of events which are of only local or regional interest.

"Do tell.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe is the oldest seat of any government in the area now comprising the United States?

"We believe it is—except, perhaps, to a few provincial easterners who think of the Alleghanies as the western border of civilization.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe has the oldest public building in the United States—the Palace of Governors, built in 1610, which housed public offices under Spanish, Mexican, Confederate and U.S. jurisdictions?

"We believe it is.

"Isn't it a matter of national interest that Santa Fe was an established capital a decade before the Pilgrims arrived at Plymouth Rock?

"We think so.

"It isn't a matter of national interest that Santa Fe was the terminus of the oldest highway in North America—the Turquoise Trail, the original trade route between Mexico City and New Mexico.

"Of course it is.

"Among special stamps issued by the Post Office Department recently were those commemorating the completion of Mackinac Bridge in Michigan, the 200th anniversary of the establishment of Fort Duquesne and the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Missouri University School of Journalism.

"We have no quarrel with any of these issues but we can't understand why those events should be worthy of special stamps if the founding of Santa Fe is to be brushed off as a 'local event' of no national significance.

"We understand Mayor Leo T. Murphy of Santa Fe is protesting the decision of the citizens' stamp committee to Postmaster General Summerfield, who has authority to overrule the committee. He should do so."

Mr. Speaker, we have been making every effort to convince the Post Office Department of the genuine merit of commemorating the 350th anniversary of Santa Fe, also known as the Royal City of the Holy Faith of St. Francis de Assisi, but we have been unable to gain or to get a sympathetic ear although, as the above editorial points out, the Post Office Department has seen fit to issue commemorative stamps for bridges, schools and I do not know what all, over the past few years.

I think this honorable body knows, Mr. Speaker, of the importance of Santa Fe in the history of this great country, and I do not believe that our request is untoward or unfounded in merit. Certainly, such a stamp would have profound historical significance.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 7

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 7 of the series:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Sept. 5, 1959]

SAVINGS BOND INTEREST

Obvious intention of Congress to raise the interest rate on E and H savings bonds won't give the Treasury the help it needs in management of the public debt. But it is an act of ordinary justice.

These bonds are bought, in large measure, through the payroll deduction plan. Some buy them out of patriotism—in the belief they should help the Government. And they are a convenient method of regular saving for people of relatively small means.

These people are entitled to a rate of interest which at least is comparable to what they can get at the building and loan.

It is a shame Congress will not take the interest ceiling off of long-term bonds and thus permit the Treasury to bargain properly for the money it needs. But, if the savings bond rate is raised, some good, at least, will come of the Treasury's efforts.

Coast Guard Should Be Placed Under the Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER BOWLES
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, H.R. 9214, to transfer the peacetime jurisdiction over the U.S. Coast Guard from the Department of the Treasury to the Department of Commerce.

My colleagues with long memories will recall that this step was originally proposed in 1949 by the Hoover Commission, one of whose members was our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

In making this recommendation in 1949, the Hoover Commission said in part:

The Coast Guard is obviously misplaced in the Treasury Department at the present time. The principal functions of the Coast Guard relate to provision of coastal and interior aids and services to air and water navigation. It regulates and inspects provisions for marine safety. Considering the general nature of the work it performs, its location in the Treasury has no reasonable basis.

From the standpoint of functional efficiency, there can be no argument with the Commission's recommendations. If anything, they are more cogent today than they were 10 years ago.

In the 18th century, placing the Coast Guard under the Treasury seemed like a logical step. At that time, smuggling was a problem to our young country. Every dollar of revenue lost through smuggling operations was a dollar our struggling Nation could ill afford. At that time the Coast Guard was primarily concerned with smuggling, and it therefore seemed reasonable to place it under the Cabinet department chiefly affected by a potential loss of revenue.

This situation no longer holds true, Mr. Speaker. The modern Coast Guard's activities in the fields of aids to navigation and marine safety have no connection whatsoever with the Treasury's principal function of fiscal management. This old and honorable service has, over the years, become a stepchild.

This anachronistic situation has resulted in the continued smothering of the Coast Guard's very real needs for money and manpower. The most striking example is the Coast Guard Academy in New London, Conn. While we hear tales of $90 medicine cabinets and other costly installations elsewhere, the Academy at New London is denied funds to replace rotting docks and causeways which are no longer safe and wartime temporary wooden buildings which the Connecticut State authorities have condemned as unsafe.

I would like to make it plain, Mr. Speaker, that I am in no way criticizing Secretary of the Treasury Anderson for this situation. I have had the greatest personal respect for Mr. Anderson for many years.

The Treasury is preoccupied with its basic functions of fiscal management, however, and rightly so. When this interferes with the legitimate needs of a fine and honorable service like the Coast Guard, I think it is high time that the situation is corrected. Many observers are convinced that the critical financial needs of the Coast Guard would receive more sympathetic consideration in the Department of Commerce. I have introduced H. R. 9214 in order to carry out the recommendations of the Hoover Commission to transfer the Coast Guard with this in mind.

The Best Investment: People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a thought-provoking article by Prof. Theodore W. Schultz, of the University of Chicago:

[From the Humanist]

HUMAN WEALTH AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

(By Theodore W. Schultz)

We Americans have traditionally taken it for granted that expansion, growth—particularly economic growth—is in itself a good thing. But recently we have witnessed the beginnings of a debate; it is being argued that we are putting too much emphasis on economic growth in national policy and in our thinking, and that it should be given a lower priority. This essentially is the thesis of a recent book by Professor Galbraith of Harvard, "The Affluent Society." In effect, Dr. Galbraith closes the United States off and says that we have grown fairly rich now, and why then be concerned about more economic growth?

This amounts to a very sophisticated new brand of isolationism with which I would quarrel seriously; and I was glad to see an article by Leon Keyserling (the New Republic, Oct. 27, 1958) in which he took Mr. Galbraith and others very much to task for this limited view. Mr. Keyserling said very effectively—not speaking as an economist, and more effectively than an economist could have said it—that if we were truly aware of our responsibility in the world today, we would see that we are indeed very poor.

That is not to argue that economic growth will necessarily solve all the problems of the world. It cannot give us all the necessary and sufficient conditions for world peace. Nor is rapid economic growth always a comfortable process for the countries involved. Very heavy stresses and strains are implicit in the changes brought by rapid growth in the economy. We in the West do not usually consider this when we urge poor countries to move ahead more rapidly. But it is easier to see at home, for example in American agriculture, where change has been so rapid that the social cost is very high. During just 1 peacetime year, from April 1956 to April 1957, we had 2 million people leaving American agriculture. That was 10 percent of the American farm population. In leaving a sector of the economy they normally had to change both location and job, giving up not only their occupation but their community life as well. When change occurs at such a fantastic rate, the social cost is proportionately high. And we should bear in mind that when rapid growth occurs in poor countries, the same kind of thing happens. This is not to argue against economic growth, but to say that order too has value for the community; that order and change should each have a place in the thinking and experience of communities where change is going on.

What then, we may ask, do people want economic growth for? Do people, as individuals and as communities, want economic growth? Is it important to them, and why? My answer is that economic growth is important on a worldwide scale because there is so much poverty in the world. And we no longer believe that poverty is ordained by God. Men today will not be kept down in poverty because it is a part of the symbolism of a caste or class or religion. Men can, and men will, do something about it.

The example of early industrial development in the West, of Japan later on and Russia more recently, has become common knowledge all over the world. People in the areas we think of as "backward"—Africa, some of the Asian countries, even the Indians in the mountains of Peru—are rapidly becoming informed and aware of these vital matters. They want first-class citizenship and the right to enjoy some of the fruits of living, and not the bare subsistence that has for centuries been their lot.

Economic growth, therefore, is important both for us here in the United States and for others; and it is important for us to comprehend the way in which it is brought about. I believe that we in America do not really understand our own economic growth and how it was achieved. Much of our debate on the subject is in terms of material as against spiritual values; and we think of economics as materialistic, partly because we have identified capital with goods—reproducible goods—and have not seen it in its human context. And this applies to Marxian theory as well as to our own non-Marxian thinking. At the individual level, the way to achieve economic growth can be stated very simply: work, and thrift. You work hard, you are thrifty and save and you accumulate something called capital. It helps to have chosen your birthplace wisely, to be born where there is plenty of oil, and coal, ores, rich farmlands, harbors and rivers; but I suspect that this is less important than has been supposed. Consider the prosperity of landlocked, mountainous Switzerland; or look at what the Puerto Ricans are doing on an island that has almost no resources, or at Mexico which is far from rich in this sense. And there are other examples. The key to economic development, I believe, is in man himself, and not in material resources.

Another road to economic growth has been revolution—followed by a generation or two of enforced accumulation of capital achieved by forced labor of one kind or another along with drastic limits on consumption. The human cost of that road is, of course, appalling. It is shown in Boris Pasternak's

much-discussed novel "Dr. Zhivago," where we see the lives of a few people who try to save their souls from the crushing excesses of a vast revolution. Similar excesses characterized the French revolution, and in some ways also the Mexican revolution. It would be a mistake to see the novel as a purely political document, rather than as an account of what happens to human values during such a revolution. William Faulkner's account of other human values, in "Intruder in the Dust," with its setting in our society, is if anything sharper and more devastating than anything in "Dr. Zhivago."

WHAT CAUSES ECONOMIC GROWTH?

Let us consider economic growth in the United States, and how it came about. Do the increases in man-hours of labor, the total man-hours worked as our population and labor force have grown, plus the increases in the stock of real capital, account for most or all of our own economic growth throughout our history? Several recent studies have been made that bear on this question, and they all tell very much the same story.

Consider the period from 1929 to 1953, which is fairly recent and avoids some of the measurement problems that would be met if we went back further. During this time, the total national real income—and by real income we mean, not money income, but "real things"—of this country a little more than doubled. If we think of it in terms of compound interest, this is an increase of something more than 3 percent per year.

During this period from 1929 to 1953, while total real income doubled, our resources in terms of total man-hours in the labor force increased by 17 percent. At the same time, the total capital stock—that is, the value of material resources, manufacturing plants, etc.—went up 42 percent. If these figures are weighted properly, the total rise in input (man-hours and capital stock combined) is about one third—or, in compound interest terms, an increase of 1.2 percent per year as compared with the 3-percent increase in real income.

The increase in resources, then, would seem to account for about two-fifths of the rise in real income, leaving three-fifths open and to be explained. We added a third to our resources, and ended up with twice the product. Where did the rest come from? What explains the difference? This is the enigma of our history; we do not understand it ourselves, and I think most of the political debate on this issue is quite beside the point. Both the liberal and the conservative views on economic growth are probably wrong.

Businessmen and others who tend to the conservative view would probably argue that if we want more rapid growth in the American economy, we will have to give larger incentives to people to hustle, to work, save, invest, accumulate capital, build new plants, and so on. Lower taxes on these activities might provide these incentives. And conservatives would also argue, no doubt, that when decisions by Government result in waste of resources, these should be corrected. A fair case might be made here in connection with—for example—some of the transportation decisions made by the Interstate Commerce Commission and some of our agricultural policies. If, however, as we have just seen, growth in capital accounts for such a small proportion of total growth, it would seem impossible that even substantially higher incentives to increase capital in reproducible goods would result in a substantially greater increase in total growth. It might be wise to do some of these things on other grounds, but that they alone bring about appreciably more economic growth, can be denied.

On the liberal side, our friends in labor would say that to get rapid growth we should reduce unemployment; that if, instead of running 5 to 6 percent unemployment on the average, we could get this figure down to 3 or even 2 percent as they are doing in some European countries, the problem would be solved. Certainly this would result in a larger product in the beginning; there would be a rise when the extra resources in human effort were allowed to work. But it does not follow that this would lead to a higher rate of growth from then on, and the picture in European countries at present bears this out. Again, I do not mean to argue that a decrease in unemployment is not a desirable thing to achieve; but it cannot by itself bring about economic growth of the explosive kind shown in the unexplained figures just given.

Another liberal argument is that the public sector of the economy should be enlarged, and more resources given to the government to spend in certain ways, in order to achieve this kind of rapid growth. Of course, the list of things that ought to be done on the public account is a very long one: urban renewal in our large cities; enlargement of social security; conservation of natural resources; improving our parks, rivers and harbors; development of water sources, dams, power; building highways, schools and hospitals; and so on. But I doubt that even if each of these were increased by 20 percent, this would lead to appreciably more economic growth. Certainly we are woefully behind in some public facilities in our society today, and for the welfare of our citizens we should be spending more funds on these things. But I do not believe a case has been made for the achievement of economic growth in this way.

THE FORMATION OF HUMAN CAPITAL

What then is the key to economic growth? The hypothesis which follows has become the center of my own work in studying this subject, and I do not wish to state it dogmatically as proven; but it seems to organize the relevant facts of our history and experience better than any other hypothesis I have worked with.

That hypothesis can be stated this way: looking at our own economic growth from 1929 to 1953, or at the rapid growth of Japan or Germany or other countries, one observes what I shall call an underspecification of resources. We have omitted a part of wealth, and my thesis is that this omission is represented by the additions that have been made in the stock of human wealth. This human wealth consists of improvements in human effectiveness arising from the fact that man has developed capacities that result from investments in man. We may feel a bit touchy at having this concept of "capital" taken over from the realm of reproducible, material things, and applied to ourselves as humans. And yet perhaps the greatest capital formation that has been going on in our society is this investment in ourselves. It may be that these investments in ourselves—in our abilities, our talents and capacities, in our stamina, our health, the way we live and what we eat—are the very kinds of capital that make the greatest returns in terms of reward for our efforts.

One aspect of this human wealth, of course, is the great increase in useful knowlege. I first became aware of the importance of this when I tried to understand the rapid growth that has taken place in some parts of Latin America, Mexico, for example, has been an extraordinarily poor country. If anyone had hold me, when I first studied it in 1930, that Mexico could achieve the increase in output, in its total production, that it has achieved since that time, I should have said it would be impossible. Particularly I should have said this about the economic area I knew best, agriculture. If I had been told that Mexico, with its pitifully poor resources, could actually double its output in agriculture—traditionally one of the hardest kinds of output to increase—I should have denied it. But that is what the Mexicans have done. Their gross national product has been rising by 7 or 8 percent a years, but the agricultural product has been rising even faster. In the past 12 years, they have had increase in gross national product of approximately 80 percent—and they have again doubled their output in agriculture. Although less dramatic, yet similar things have been happening in Brazil and in other places, such as Puerto Rico.

These observations prompted a second look at some earlier work in which I had found that in this country, since 1923, for every 25 percent increase in agricultural output, we had increased our input in man-hours and material resources by no more than 3 to 5 percent. It suddenly occurred to me that some of these countries that are moving forward so rapidly now are doing much the same thing. They have found a way to get a greatly increased output without an input that is proportionately that large. This would appear to be a direct contradiction of the doctrine of the 18th century economists, Ricardo and Malthus, who held that for every increase of, say 10 percent in input, a country would get somewhat less than 10 percent growth in output—the classic image of diminishing returns.

In order to discover just what was going on in these areas, my colleagues and I began a series of studies, particularly of Argentina, Mexico, and Brazil. These studies showed that Brazil and Mexico in particular began to develop, in the late twenties, and achieved an increase in agricultural output that was substantially greater than the additional input. Argentina showed a pattern of growth that looked very much like that of Canada and the United States—until Perón came to power; and then it reversed itself. And unfortunately, Argentina has not begun to move forward again even now, 3 years after Perón's downfall.

In another study, I then undertook to try to discover whether these unexplained, omitted, "inputs" could be represented as the return on the investment that has been going into humans. One of these investments is education, in high schools, colleges, and graduate schools in the United States. Comparing figures for two dates, 1920 and 1956, we can identify what the economists would call gross capital formation, in ourselves, for this one kind of investment during that period. In 1920, counting all the costs as you would if you were developing capital in the physical sense, our investment in education in the United States was $1.6 billion. In 1956, this figure had risen to $22.7 billion. This is a much more rapid increase than the value of our physical capital during the same period. In fact, it was 7 percent of gross physical capital in 1920, and in 1956 it was up to 28 percent. And even this is an understatement. In terms of net capital (that is, the life of capital when its depreciation is subtracted), the comparison is even more striking, because during this period the life of human capital has been increasing very substantially. A person invests in himself, and then has a longer period of useful activity in society than he would have had 30 years ago. At the same time, the life of so-called physical capital is getting shorter and shorter. This is one of the notable phenomena of our time.

RETURNS ON INVESTMENT IN KNOWLEDGE

The individual and social returns on our investment in education are suggested in the

results of a recent study in which Morton Zeman of the University of Chicago tried to explain the very large differences in the average earnings of urban workers, Negro and white. Using census figures, Dr. Zeman was able to classify people, white and Negro, by region, city size, age, and education. He found that in the North, comparing Negro and white workers all of whom had had 5 years of school, the average difference in their earnings was small. The average earnings of northern Negroes were slightly less than those of whites of the same educational level.

Of course there are other factors influencing earning power, such as age, city size, and so on; and in the South the picture is still more complex. But the extraordinary thing was that, at any rate in the North, the most important factor determining earning power of both white and Negro workers was the amount of education they had had. This suggests that one of the tragic errors in American history has been our failure to invest in Negroes as citizens as we have invested in whites as citizens. One of the great costs has been the lower productivity in the economy, as well as the individual differences in earnings as revealed by Dr. Zeman.

Other studies, of white and Negro farm families, have yielded similar results. The implication is that our economy pays high rewards for more investment in people, as shown even by this crude measure. The fifth year in school, the sixth year in school, the seventh and eighth and so on through the high schools—with each added year of education, the rewards increase.

The social returns on investment in new useful knowledge are demonstrated in another set of studies. In a project underwritten by the National Science Foundation, we attempted to identify particular pieces of new knowledge that have moved into the economy, and to see what they cost the society and what return they made to the society. One such piece of new knowledge that we were able to isolate and treat in this way was the development of hybrid corn.

The history of hybrid corn development in this country goes back to 1910, with relatively few people involved at first, but with a pyramiding of effort in the later stages. A colleague of mine has just published the results of some very ingenious research; he has found that if we count all of the private and public costs of hybrid corn, everything that has gone into its development—and the records on this are quite complete—a total of $130 million has been invested since 1910. (This figure also allows for compound interest over the time period, but that is a technicality.) Then if we measure all of the product that can be identified and attributed to this particular new piece of useful knowledge, we find that its contribution to the consumer surplus—and it quickly becomes a consumer surplus, which is what made the analysis so difficult and required so much ingenuity—turns out to be no less than $910 million. That is, the return on the $130 million invested is running at 700 percent per year.

Most of the time we consider it an improvement if we can work out an allocation of resources that increases the return from 5 percent to 6 percent. We criticize private or public business if they are sinking funds in 5 percent areas where they could use such resources in activities that produce 6, 7 or 8 percent. My argument is that we should be looking for ways in which human effort and useful knowledge can move us into the range of 50 percent, 100, 200—even 700 percent return. This is the key to the explosion of our own economic well-being.

If my hypothesis is correct, it carries radical implications for our thinking about the rest of the world. It implies that fewer steel mills and other big plants should be built in the underdeveloped countries, and more invested in the people of those countries, as we have invested in ourselves.

As we look at other countries, let me draw a few comparisons. We can now gain new insights on why Great Britain's growth has been appreciably slower than our own during the past 50 years. The British have neglected the education of the middle group in their society. Their elementary education system is much like ours, perhaps better. But at what we call the high school level, before university education begins, the story is of two different worlds. Our high schools, like the elementary schools in both countries, still deal in mass education. At this level we are still investing in people on a mass basis. In Britain, on the contrary, only some 15 to 18 percent of the people go beyond elementary school.

By way of contrast, let us look at Japan, an Asiatic country, highly populated. Something happened in Japan at a very early date, and it began to produce not only industrial products but also much more food under the most adverse circumstances. The agricultural achievements of Japan between 1875 and 1910—before World War I—stand as a miracle. In 1873, Japan moved to universal education, a 6-year program, compulsory all over the country. As a result, they very soon had a literate population; the rural people became more skilled at farming, and a supply of labor was made available to industry that was more sophisticated than even European countries had at that time, and far more so than that of other Asiatic countries. And we should remember that we did not have universal compulsory education for Negroes, or for some whites, in the United States at that time. (Some of my American colleagues, confronted with these facts, have said, "Why, it couldn't have happened. It hadn't happened in the United States yet."

I think I now understand why Japanese tenant farmers could come to our west coast and do better at farming than many American farmers with whom they were competing. It is often said that they were able to save and buy land because they were willing to accept lower standards of living. But that is not the whole story. I have seen some of these farms; I remember one, of 231 acres, not far from Stanford, which had been acquired by a thrifty Japanese tenant who came over in the late twenties. He and his family farmed the land intensively, with little extra labor—about 10 people in all at peak periods—and today he is an American citizen, owns his farm, and his three sons are all graduates of the University of California. When I visited him, he was selling over half a million dollars' product a year from 231 acres. The intricacy of that farming operation makes our agriculture in most of the United States look simple.

A parallel situation would be the postwar recovery of West Germany. When I saw the destruction of the houses, the factories—whole cities in ruins—like everyone else, even the Germans themselves, I missed completely in anticipating the rate of recovery. We simply could not visualize what would happen in growth, in production, during the next decade, or up to the present. And the reason was that we were putting too much emphasis on steel mills, plants, machinery, railroads, and buildings. We didn't see the human capital—and it was the human capital that went to work.

ALONE ON THE HIGH ROAD?

What does all this mean for the U.S. policy? I believe it means that the time has come when we have to understand ourselves, and recognize the predominant role of human capital, human wealth. Somehow we have hit on a productive formula for our own society; and it seems that the Russians also are making large gains on this score. The importance of the role of new physical capital in the Soviet Union is often overstressed. The Russians, like ourselves, have been creating human capital very rapidly; and they have been turning it sharply and directly to economic account—undoubtedly at the expense of values we hold dear in our own free society.

Therefore, as we take a hand and act responsibly in other countries, we should bear in mind that the increase in real earnings, the rise in product that is needed to help the peoples of the world out of their poverty, requires human capital. Whether it be in point 4 technical assistance programs, in activities like the Rockefeller Foundation work in Mexico with hybrid corn, in the work of church groups operating through some 1,600 mission projects in agriculture, education, and health in Latin America and elsewhere, or through private business—the transfer and development of new knowledge, new abilities and capacities are the most important contributions we can make. This is where the underdeveloped countries tend to neglect themselves. This great neglect in India, for example, is men. There are now three countries in Africa that are investing more per capita in human resources in this generation than India is. The great emphasis on human capital in Puerto Rico makes it stand out in comparison with other Latin American countries.

We in the United States stand here on the high road, which is indeed well paved with large stocks of knowledge and many developed abilities. This is our good fortune, part of our heritage and history. But is this road for us alone? What about most of mankind, trudging on the low road marked "poverty," working so hard and with so little knowledge? Shall we leave them there, like the lonely cultivator described in Faulkner's "Intruder in the Dust"? "The man and the mule and the wooden plow, which coupled them furious and solitary, leaning terrifically against nothing."

A Nobleman in His Own Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable James A. Farley's host of friends will agree wholeheartedly with the sentiments expressed in the following editorial which appeared in the September 5, 1959, issue of the Irish Echo:

A NOBLEMAN IN HIS OWN RIGHT

The appointment of James A. Farley by Governor Rockefeller to the Harness Racing Commission is one that has met with popular approval in New York.

It is felt by all who are familiar with Mr. Farley's public career that no more eligible appointment could have been made by the State's chief executive. For more than a generation now Mr. Farley has demonstrated his capacity to serve the public with the highest qualifications including honesty, integrity and ability. He has measured up to the highest expectations. And it can be taken for granted that he will be an asset to the Harness Racing Commission which will place it among the most respected in public officialdom.

Mr. Farley will be long remembered as Postmaster General of the United States

during F. D. Roosevelt's administration as one who gave to the Federal postal service a most progressive business stride and for his untiring disposition to make that service of full use to the American people. He is, and always has been, an ideal public official.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 8 of the series:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Sept. 7, 1959]

ECONOMIC VIEW

(By Harold B. Dorsey)

LEGISLATORS HURT THOSE THEY PROFESS TO PROTECT

The penalty of financial strigency imposed upon millions of small businesses and individual borrowers was symbolized last week by the increase from 4½ to 5 percent in the interest rates which commercial banks charge their "prime" customers. The interest rate charged for money loaned by the banks to other borrowers will now scale upward from 5 instead of from 4½ percent.

There can be little doubt that the failure of Congress to pass legislation that would permit more flexibility to the Treasury Department in its financial operations is closely associated with the rising interest rates. As prospects for this legislation diminished there seemed to be a corollary increase in interest rates. Then when it was announced that the House Ways and Means Committee had pigeonholed this legislation for the balance of the session, interest rates rose sharply.

On Monday of last week the Treasury Department had to pay the highest interest rate for its 91-day borrowings since the bank holiday in March 1933. And Government bond prices declined again to the lowest levels since the early 1930's. The interest yield for most outstanding Government bonds is now well in excess of the 4¼ percent ceiling which Congress has refused to lift.

Only a few months ago it was considered to be only a fantastic possibility that Congress might force the Treasury Department to borrow all of its money in the short-term and intermediate-term market. Now that the fantasy seems to have become a fact, it is clear that this competition of the Government for short-term credit, in competition with all of the other kinds of borrowers, is causing an extremely tight credit situation.

One might logically ask: Why has there been so much weakness in market prices for longer-term Government bonds? The answer is that the congressional attitude on this subject strongly suggests encouragement for inflation. Few lenders want to lend their money for a long period of time if there is such a clear threat that they are going to be paid back in depreciated dollars.

At any rate, we stand today with some of these financial factors in an unusually critical condition. Furthermore, the arithmetic suggests that this condition is going to get worse between now and the end of the year. The Treasury Department has $8.9 billion of debt maturing in November to refinance and it has to raise several billions of dollars of new cash in the next few months. This substantial demand for credit has been forced into the short-term credit market.

In addition, many businesses have to increase their borrowing between now and the end of the year to carry harvests and to carry their Christmas inventories. More bank credit will be needed after the steel strike has been settled to finance the anticipated snapback in business activity.

When we pile these additional demands for credit on top of the present unusually tight situation, we do not end up with a very pretty picture. Somebody is going to get hurt. In the first place, the implied inability of small-business people to borrow money for their seasonal needs is a painful matter. In addition, millions of people who borrow for their personal needs are being forced to pay higher interest rates—if they can find the credit at any interest rate.

And as if that were not enough damage, all of the rest of us are being penalized by the needlessly higher interest rates which our Government is having to pay for its borrowed money.

It is very difficult to understand why Congress has not been able to recognize these painful effects that are resulting from their amateurish efforts to tamper with the Nation's delicate credit mechanism. Is it possible that those Congressmen who are blocking the legislation to give the Treasury Department more flexibility fail to comprehend the painful effects of their inaction? If they had not been able to anticipate that their inaction would cause the Treasury Department to pay the highest interest rate on its borrowings since the bank holiday 26 years ago, then all they have to do now is look in the newspapers and find that that is the fact. If they had been advised that this kind of thing could not happen, then they should, at leat belatedly, recognize the ignorance of their advisers. The facts that have already been developed prove that ignorance.

The weird part of this whole thing is that the suffering is most serious for the millions of people whom these Congressmen profess to be protecting, while it is helping the profits of the comparatively few for whom numerous Congressmen have frequently expressed criticism—the bankers. Even the latter realize that they will ultimately suffer by the distress that is being imposed on all of the others.

Planning for Equal Opportunity—A Call for Statesmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address entitled "Planning for Equal Opportunity—A Call for Statesmanship," given by Mr. Albert F. Watters, vice president of General Foods Corp., White Plains, N.Y., before the National Urban League in Washington on September 10, and I hope that my colleagues will take the opportunity to read this enlightened, intelligent, and forward-looking statement.

The General Foods Corp. has adopted a policy of employee selection and nondiscrimination which has met with the general endorsement of responsible people and organizations, and in his speech Mr. Watters thoroughly explores the problem of employing Negroes from the point of view of the responsibilities of a corporation to its stockholders, the responsibilities of good citizenship, and the responsibilities of the Negro himself. This is a real contribution to this very live problem.

The address follows:

PLANNING FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY—A CALL FOR STATESMANSHIP

I am especially happy to be here today. First of all, it is an honor to share the platform at this important conference. And I welcome every opportunity that comes my way to reciprocate for the substantial and continuing help given to me by Julius Thomas, and by others whose warm friendships I have come to value during the 15 years I have had the pleasure of working with the Urban League.

As I understand my assignment on this program, I am to try to give you some points of view which might help to make your work more effective in the quest for equal employment opportunity.

To do this I propose to touch briefly on the history and general climate of your work. I will register some views from my personal experience about how employers regard the risks involved in providing equal employment opportunities, and then go on to how employers view their responsibility to establish and maintain equal employment policies. Finally, I expect to offer some observations about the Urban League itself.

The theme of your conference, "Planning for Equal Opportunity," clearly indicates that you are here to provide for future action. In a search for new ideas, an evaluation of present practices and a look into the past gives us a useful frame of reference. So let's look back over the last 20 years, and note the almost revolutionary developments that have come to pass in the status of the Negro here in the United States.

At once, I believe, we have to look beyond this country for a full understanding of what has come to pass. There is no doubt in my mind that the accelerated pace at which these developments have occurred in America—especially since World War II—is part of a larger, worldwide development.

Since 1945, more than 20 nations of predominantly non-Caucasian peoples have achieved a new status of freedom—the freedom of self-determination, the freedom to do for themselves. This new freedom contains political, social, and philosophical overtones, but in every instance—as clear as a bell—the fundamental note is economics. The struggle for freedom is essentially an insurrection against poverty.

In my view, the same fundamental force motivates the American Negro. The struggle for voting rights, education, and personal development are all directed—and rightly directed—toward equality of economic opportunity. If the American Negro wins economic equality, he will also win a balanced social status. It is to this end that he is struggling. It is in this light that reasonable people must view his struggle, if the ex-

tremes and the complications of emotion and racism are to be averted—or at least be kept in proper perspective.

Although the advances made so far are still far distant from the goals set, they should be a source of considerable satisfaction to you of the Urban League and others who have dedicated themselves to the struggle.

Not too many years ago a Negro child was taught at home and came to believe from personal experience that the best he could look forward to was a small, almost unmeasurable, improvement in his status. He was compelled to believe that the enlargement of his opportunity to live and grow in our American society had to be at a snail's pace. He consoled himself—if it was consolation—with the idea that generations yet unborn might some day become the beneficiaries of his acquiescence, and of his patience.

But thanks, no doubt, to those who were not acquiescent, who were patient only to progress and not to stagnation—see what has happened.

Twenty years ago nonfarm employment of Negroes totaled 4 million. Today approximately 6 million Negroes obtain their living from nonfarm employment.

Since 1940 more than 3 million Negroes have migrated from the South to the greater opportunities of the North, often with help from the Urban League. To the everlasting credit of the Urban League, the movement continues with 1,400 arriving monthly in New York, 2,000 in Chicago, and 1,700 in Los Angeles.

Twenty years ago there were 46,000 Negroes enrolled in institutions of higher learning. Last year more than 100,000 Negroes attended colleges and universities.

Since 1940, earnings of the Negro worker have increased four and one-half times, and the spendable income of the Negro community has increased from $3½ billion to $19¾ billion.

This is progress. It has been made possible not only by the faith, zeal, and courage of Negro leaders and organizations in all parts of the country, but also because reasonable white Americans have sensed the valid and humane purposes involved. And it has been speeded by a widened understanding among thoughtful Americans that a full utilization of America's total manpower is essential to the continuing growth of the United States—and to its strength as a world power.

Both the great depression of the thirties and World War II helped to crystallize this understanding. The need for manpower during World War II, particularly, provided a situation in which difficult local, sectional, and regional points of view were in large part moderated to help the common cause—the winning of the war. And some of the war-induced moderation toward equal opportunity persisted—after the war. Moreover, as a result of favorable wartime experience, many employers began to employ Negro workers in significantly increasing numbers.

The resulting improvement of the economic status of this important group of Americans, and the development of an important total Negro buying power, has produced not only a potent economic impact upon employers (who are also sellers) but has also observably strengthened our economy. This, too, has widened understanding.

There is another side to the picture, of course. The existence of bigots, extremists, and racists of one kind or another, will continue to plague and interfere with the orderly process and reasoned development involved in improving the Negro's lot in the United States. But this condition is a known factor—past, present, and future. It can be dealt with in the years ahead as it has been in the past.

It still remains that whether measured in terms of moral right, social development, education, job opportunity, or by any other yardstick, the requirements of the future, as reflected in the hopes and fears of mankind, compel all thoughtful Americans to extend their thinking far beyond the color of a man's skin.

As we plan for the future, then, it seems to me that we can be motivated by the high sense of purpose which comes from the knowledge that job opportunity and economic progress are almost synonymous. If we accept the thesis that economic progress for the Negro is fundamental to all-over progress for America, we will not be sidetracked or caught up in the emotional snares of what is altogether too loosely called social progress.

Today, more than ever, our national needs call for all the intellect and all the skills of all of our people. As we look to the highly technical requirements of the jobs and products of the future—both in terms of national defense and the Nation's economy—the call can be answered, the demand met, only by greater educational opportunity and higher level educational opportunity for Negroes.

Basically, this also asks for an unprecedented program of scholarships and early vocational guidance for Negro young people, directed toward motivating and equipping them to find employment in industrial and scientific occupatons. Such a program should enable them to compete successfully in the higher employment levels which will become more and more a part of the American job scene during the next 20 years.

Motivational and training processes must also be developed to retrain large numbers of Negro workers who have been or will be dislocated by new production techniques in this era of rapidly developing automation. An important goal of this phase of the overall program must be to reawaken the interest of many Negro workers in further personal development—to inspire them to gain the higher skills necessary to perform jobs at higher technical levels. And it should be clear to all thoughtful Americans that any limitation of interest in development by the Negro often stems from indifferent treatment of the Negro.

A program of new motivational and training processes is fundamental to preparation for upgraded jobs which, in the future, will be provided by American industry. Progress in this area is absolutely essential to the expansion of job security and earning power of the Negro. And, most importantly, such a program is undispensable to the economic and political well-being of our Nation in its relatively new role of leadership in the free world.

Of the many considerations involved in the various lines of progress I've traced out today, one consideration always seems to be present. I can put it in the form of a question. "When it comes to expanding opportunities for the Negro, just what is involved for those who are properly concerned and responsible?" It is true, is it not, that the educator, transport official, retailer, landlord, politician, churchman, businessman—and the Negro leader—all think in terms of the risks when attempting to compose the points of view and forces which bear upon any proposed action?

Let us examine the risks from the point of view of a prospective employer—and we will assume that the employer is a reasonable man with a fundamental desire to provide equal job opportunities in his company. What are the risks he must consider? As he tends to see it, that question breaks down into many parts. For example:

What will be the reactions of present employees if we hire a Negro?

If we employ Negroes, will it create complications with the union?

Can Negroes be taught to do the kind of high quality work we need to have?

Will the Negro be reliable—or are we creating a problem of absenteeism for ourselves?

Will turnover among regular employees increase because of the introduction of a Negro into the work force?

Will we run into consumer and customer problems either nationally or regionally?

After employing a Negro, how do we continue providing equal opportunity within the organization?

If the results are unfavorable, will it be a personal reflection on my capabilities?

Those are some of the questions the employer will ask. Of course all of you recognize them as typical of those which the Urban League must help employers answer or resolve. This is a service the employer expects from you. By assisting him to cope with these risks, the Urban League fulfills an important part of its function. Experience has shown that many such risks vanish into thin air once an intelligent program has been undertaken.

However, although the employer expects help from the Urban League, the responsibility for the adoption and implementation of a corporate policy on equal employment rests squarely upon the employers own shoulders. There are, of course, several reasons why this is so. For example:

1. An employer has a responsibility to the Federal Government to conform to a policy of nondiscrimination in connection with work on Government supply contracts.

2. An employer has a responsibility to observe certain State and municipal laws and regulations regarding nondiscrimination in employment.

3. An employer has a responsibility to the American public in general to conduct his employee relations in such a manner as to contribute in the greatest practical degree to the Nation's economic and social progress.

4. An employer has a responsibility to his stockholders to conduct his employee relations in such a manner as to generate and develop acceptance of his products by all segments of the buying public.

5. An employer has a responsibility to his employees to meet its responsibilities involved in policy statements and union agreements, both in letter and in spirit.

The way in which an employer meets these responsibilities is, of course, up to his management organization—an obligation that runs from the very top to the lowest level of management. As a management representative, I am proud of the record of many fine companies, large and small, whose corporate conscience has greatly contributed to progress in this respect. And I would like to quote the direct, six-step procedure my own company finds effective in implementing our policy of equal opportunity:

1. The president reaffirms that its policy and policy implementation agree in letter and spirit with National, State, and local law and regulations relative to nondiscrimination in employment.

2. The president assigns responsibility for implementing corporate policy to each operating division general manager and corporate staff head.

3. The president affirms to each operating and staff head his desire that each such executive utilize the services and advice of personnel administration in developing employment techniques and practices which will be effective and orderly in anticipating and meeting problems arising out of the integration process.

4. The president requests an annual report from the operating and staff heads, to be submitted and coordinated through personnel administration, reflecting status, progress, and plans with respect to employment of Negroes.

5. Each personnel manager and employment manager will be reminded in writing by his divisional general manager, or appropriate staff head, of his responsibility for carrying out the company's policy of nondiscrimination and for keeping the reputation of the company inviolate in this respect.

6. The approach and method will in all matters be based on qualitative considerations.

Here, with your indulgence, I want to register my deep pride in the fact that the General Foods policy and procedure has been adopted by the Pennsylvania Fair Employment Practice Commission as a guide to other employers. I cannot resist quoting what the commission wrote us:

"After reviewing the materials on employee selection and nondiscrimination," the commission wrote, "we believe they may be of value to us in meetings with other employers in this State who have not as yet developed a clearly defined nondiscrimination policy * * *. We would like permission to use this excellent statement of employment policy and procedure in this State's program on fair employment."

The commission's request, of course, was granted. And I feel justified in quoting the commission's commendation because it gives me the opportunity to suggest that you may also find our statement of policy and procedure useful. I should be happy to provide copies.

Now, if I may, I should like to exercise a friend's privilege and talk about the National Urban League directly—as an organization—and with this preface: that there are few, if any, organizations which cannot benefit from a periodic reevaluation of their own operating objectives and principles.

I will venture to suggest that as an organization through which greater equality of employment opportunity is made available to qualified Negroes, the National Urban League might well benefit from such a self-appraisal. The league might well ask, for example, in considering some of its own principles and practices, such questions as these:

1. In the area of employment and business, can or should the league project itself more as a professional business service organization dealing with legitimate business processes and practices?

2. Can the league benefit by greater use of known tools of management within its own national and local units? By setting of objectives and goals? By evaluation of performance in meeting them?

3. How can the league develop a broader base of financial support?

4. Would a clearer community understanding of the total Negro contributions (monetary and otherwise) to community fund and other communitywide efforts be of value to all concerned?

5. How can the league become more effective in its use of facts and fundamental information in planning to meet objectives?

The same kind of appraisal might also be of value to some of your local urban league groups. It seems to me that each group might well ask itself:

1. Are our professional workers in local situations knowledgeable in detail about our communities? Do we know the moral tone of our communities? Do we know the physical makeup of the community, the population ratio between whites and Negroes, the availability of qualified personnel?

2. Do we know the specific needs and objectives of each company we hope to influence? Do we know the types of products or services, the number of employees, and the kinds of jobs available within each company?

3. How cooperatively do we work with the local U.S. Employment Service and State organizations established to fight job discrimination practices?

4. Do we know our school officials? What are we doing about guidance counseling of Negro high school students?

5. Are we armed with the facts about the buying power of the Negro community in our area?

6. How do we work more effectively with our local community or United Fund efforts?

These are but a few of the questions local Urban League people should be asking themselves, as it seems to me, and no doubt many groups are asking such questions—and finding answers, too. Good for them. Self-appraisal is usually difficult, sometimes painful, but always brings constructive results.

In summary, then, I am suggesting that we apply the art of statesmanship to the problems of equal job opportunity, that we judge our effort to solve them in the broadest and most self-critical terms, and that we will find certain guidelines useful. I have suggested seven.

1. The almost revolutionary struggle of the Negro to improve his status in this country, in which he has now been joined by reasonable men of other races, parallels and, in some respects, is a part of the worldwide effort by underprivileged people and nations to achieve freedom, directed toward self-determination and economic growth.

2. The last 20 years, despite all kinds of problems, interference, prejudice and emotion, have produced measurable and observable progress which has added strength and value to America.

3. Future progress in providing equality of employment opportunity (and perhaps in other aspects of equality) will be stimulated and helped by relating the effort to the achievement of opportunity to economic terms.

4. Management of employer organizations has, by and large, crystallized the character of its responsibility to offer equal employment opportunities in terms of law and the public it serves.

5. Procedures by which equal employment opportunity policies can be implemented have been established—their use continues to be influenced by natural questions as to the various risks which are involved at any point in time.

6. By working with employers in resolving the questions of risk, the Urban League provides an essential, professional, business service.

7. As in any business enterprise, the Urban League at national and local levels can benefit by constructive and critical self-appraisal and perhaps redefinition of some of its own concepts of purpose and processes of operation.

As we continue in our efforts, we can find satisfaction and reward in the knowledge that only in a country such as ours could the struggle we have been discussing take place at all. This is the point that some people at home and many people abroad miss completely—the struggle for equal job opportunity, even its defeats as well as its glorious victories, is a true measure of the meaning of freedom within our concept of democracy.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 9

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 9 of the series:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Aug. 27, 1959]

AND EISENHOWER AT HOME

Before he embarked on his historic mission to Europe, President Eisenhower admonished Congress to get about its business.

In the vigorous language he has been using of late, the President called for a gas tax increase to finance the highway system, an acceptable housing bill, and a boost in Federal bond interest rates, three items vital to his program.

It would seem, however, that the President will not get all he asked. The House holds the key on all three issues and compromises are building up on two.

The Ways and Means Committee, for example, approved a gas tax hike of 1 cent for 22 months, a middle course between the President's request for a straight 1½-cent increase and Speaker RAYBURN's proposal to limit the 1-cent increase to 12 months. It was a hard slap for Mr. SAM who laid his influence on the line and was rebuffed. But the President's position was sustained in principle, since the House previously voted no raise at all. Now the highway program can go forward if this becomes the final action.

The Senate passed and the House Banking Committee has approved a $1.05 billion housing bill. It calls for less than the $1.37 billion measure which the President vetoed as inflationary and extravagant. It still includes provisions for public housing, urban renewal and housing for senior citizens which Mr. Eisenhower found particularly objectionable before.

The issue of the interest rates may turn out to be the most controversial of all. The House Ways and Means Committee first approved the President's request for a jump from 3¼ to 4¼ percent, then voted to suspend action on the bill for the remainder of the session.

Thus the President, in his messages to Congress, stepped into three highly controversial situations.

The effect is that the Democratic majority, greatest since the salad days of the New Deal, is faced with the hard choice of knuckling down to the President or taking the consequences. One consequence is the danger of being tagged as the most ineffective congressional leadership in a long time.

Rabbi Samuel A. Bloom, Spiritual Leader of Amsterdam, N.Y., To Be Honored at Testimonial Dinner on September 20

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding religious leaders in my district, Rabbi Samuel A. Bloom, spiritual head of Congregation Sons of Israel in Amsterdam, N.Y., will be honored by his many friends at a testimonial dinner to be held in the city of Amsterdam on September 20.

In the 10 years in which Rabbi Bloom has been in Amsterdam, he has made great contributions to better understanding between peoples and has established

himself as a leader in the community, not only from a religious but also from a civic and cultural point of view.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder of September 3 commenting on this significant occasion in the city of Amsterdam:

DECADE OF SERVICE

The spirit of a community is said to reflect the character of its civic and religious leaders. If this is true, we in Amsterdam have good reason for pride.

We have many leaders dedicated to the betterment of the community. One of these is Rabbi Samuel A. Bloom, spiritual head of Congregation Sons of Israel, who will be honored by a testimonial dinner on September 20.

In the 10 years he has been in Amsterdam, Rabbi Bloom has done much to create better understanding among the races, creeds, and religions which are represented on the Amsterdam scene.

Through his brotherhood programs, many of us have gained a better understanding of the importance of true tolerance and trust in our fellow men. In addition to his religious activities, Rabbi Bloom has found time to participate in many civic enterprises which have meant much to the community as a whole.

We in Amsterdam are fortunate in having men like Rabbi Bloom to guide us in these troubled times. On this, the anniversary of his first decade of service in Amsterdam, may we add our congratulation accompanied by the wish that he will continue with us for many years to come.

The Presidential Inability Riddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 871 to provide a method for determining Presidential inability.

In that connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues an article by Edwin L. Gasperini, a member of the New York bar, as it appeared in the New York State Bar Bulletin of July 1959:

THE PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY RIDDLE [1]

(By Edwin L. Gasperini, member of the New York bar)

Clause 5 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution of the United States reads in part as follows:

"In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President." [2]

QUESTIONS RAISED BY THE CLAUSE

1. Does the Office of the President, or the powers and duties of the said Office devolve upon the Vice President?

A. In the event of removal, death, or resignation?

B. In the event of inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said Office?

2. Who raises the question of inability, and who makes the determination as to the commencement and termination of inability?

THE LOUISIANA CRISIS AGAIN FOCUSES ATTENTION ON THE PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY RIDDLE

The confused state of affairs in the State of Louisiana in its recent political crisis concerning the inability of the Governor to act, once again emphasizes that on the Presidential level, no clear and permanent solution to the riddle of Presidential inability has been found.[3] A brief description of some of the statements and acts of Louisiana officials, as reported up to the time this article went to print, should highlight the picture of a State operating in complete confusion.

The attorney general of Louisiana gave as his opinion:

"The constitution is very clear that if the Governor is unable to serve for any cause, the Lieutenant Governor acts as Governor ad interim until the disability is removed.

"The question of Long's inability to serve was answered by the court yesterday when it ordered him [Governor Long] to Southeast Louisiana Hospital." [4]

The Louisiana secretary of state disputed the ruling of the attorney general, giving as his view "that some official body, or Mr. Long himself, must declare the Governor's inability to act." [5] Meanwhile, press reports had the Lieutenant Governor moving "cautiously to take over the reins some 16 confusing hours after Gov. Earl K. Long had been dragged, battling and bellowing, to a State mental hospital." [6] He finally declared, however, "I'm Lieutenant Governor," and declined to assume the powers of Governor of Louisiana when Mr. Long was in the State of Louisiana.[7] These acts took place some 3 weeks after Mr. Long entered a mental clinic in Texas. The leaders of the house and senate, and various other officials and doctors, had varying comments to make, but while officials were debating and declining to act, Mr. Long was in and out of mental institutions, and the State of Louisiana was in fact without a Governor.[8]

The manner in which Mr. Long finally effected his release from one of the mental institutions, Southeast Louisiana State Hospital, is also worthy of note. Acting as Governor, and joined by the Lieutenant Governor and president pro tempore of the senate, he simply discharged the superintendent of the Southeast Louisiana State Hospital, and replaced him with another appointee. The latter thereupon declared him "sane" and a free man. A habeas corpus proceeding scheduled to inquire into whether he had been legally committed was dismissed by the judge, since no cause for it remained in view of Mr. Long's having been set free. For good measure, the director of the State department of hospitals and the head of the State police were also discharged, and the Governor muttered threats of other reprisals. Governor Long left the Louisiana courthouse and alternating between sheriffs' cars and Cadillac limousines, eventually arrived at his farm in Winnfield, La., described by him as his "Little Pea Patch." In addition to being a free man, he was exercising the powers of Governor of the State of Louisiana with a vengeance.[9] Press descriptions of the events expressly left open the question of his "sanity" [10] however, and painted a portrait of a press conference at which Governor Long appeared in pajama top with a sheet draped over his legs and a psychiatrist sitting beside him.[11]

One shudders to think of what would occur on a national level, given a similar set of facts, in a time of national or international emergency. Yet for reasons of physical health, mental strain under the stress and burdens of the most wearing office in the world, or other eventualities which might occur in this atomic age, inability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President by the incumbent, could occur overnight.[12] Yet, the Constitution of the United States is no clearer on the question of inability of the President than is the constitution of Louisiana. Indeed it is less clear.

Section 6, article 5 of the constitution of the State of Louisiana reads:

"In case of vacancy in the office of Governor, the order of succession shall be: first, Lieutenant Governor; second, president pro tempore of the senate; and if there be no Lieutenant Governor or president pro tempore of the senate to fill the vacancy, the powers of the office of Governor shall devolve upon the secretary of state, who shall act as Governor until a president pro tempore of the senate is elected and qualified.

"In case of the inability of the Governor to act as such by reason of his absence from the State or for other cause, all the powers and duties of his office shall devolve upon the officers in the order named above, and such officer shall act as Governor ad interim until the inability be removed."

Thus, it can be seen that under the Louisiana constitution, in case of inability, only the powers and duties of the office of Governor devolve, and not the office itself. Under the U.S. Constitution, it is ambiguous as to whether the powers and duties devolve, or the office itself devolves.

The New York constitution is also quite clear that only the powers and duties devolve, the second sentence of section 5 of article IV reading:

"In case of the impeachment of the Governor, or his removal from office, death, inability to discharge the powers and duties of the office, resignation, or absence from the State, the powers and duties of the office shall devolve upon the Lieutenant Governor for the residue of the term, or until the disability shall cease."

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PRESIDENTIAL INABILITY RIDDLE

On April 4, 1841, 1 month after his election, William Henry Harrison, the ninth President of the United States, died, worn away and destroyed by the hordes of applicants for public office.[13] Professor Corwin recounts:

"Two days later Tyler took the oath prescribed by the Constitution for the President, but only, as he explained at the time, for 'greater caution,' his own conviction being that he was fully 'qualified to perform the duties and exercise the powers and office of President without any other oath than that which he' had taken as Vice President. In other words, it was clearly Tyler's original belief that he was Vice President acting as President, and not President. But, characteristically, reflection enhanced his self-assurance and stiffened his attitude, and in the 'inaugural address' that he published on April 9 he boldly proclaimed that he had been called to 'the high office of President of this Confederacy,' though by whom called he did not say." [14]

Since President Tyler's time, Messrs. Fillmore, Johnson, Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, Coolidge, and Truman have followed his precedent and assumed upon the death of the President the office of the President and not just the powers and duties of the office. These seven precedents have solved the riddle on the death of a President, but have raised a question as to whether, in the event of inability of the President, an assumption by the Vice President will be of the powers and duties of the office or, as is the precedent in the case of death, a permanent asumption of the office itself. The view has been advanced that such assumption would, in effect, oust

Footnotes at end of speech.

the President for the remainder of the term. This is one phase of the problem, and the reluctance of Vice Presidents Arthur and Marshall to act during the "inability" of Presidents Garfield and Wilson has been attributed by historians to a fear of such ouster.[15]

WHO RAISES THE QUESTION OF INABILITY AND WHO DETERMINES IT?

The other phase of the riddle is the determination as to the commencement and termination of inability. There are varying views as to where the power to determine inability is vested under the Constitution, i.e., the courts, the Congress, the President, or the Vice President. The problem was first raised in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention by John Dickinson who asked "Who raises the question [of inability] and who determines it?" [16] Delegate Dickinson's colleagues did not answer him, and 172 years later no clear answer has yet been given to Mr. Dickinson's query. The majority of the commentators seem to believe that the Vice President has the power.[17] This view is supported by the rule of law that in contingent grants of power, the one to whom the grant of power is given must decide when the emergency has arisen. However, this interpretation has been vigorously disputed by Martin Taylor, Esq., chairman of the subcommittee on Presidential inability of the association's committee on Federal Constitution.[18]

Various suggestions and solutions have been advanced to solve the riddle of the determination of the commencement and termination of inability, including commissions composed of various officials, distinguished citizens, doctors, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives; the courts; the President; the Vice President; the Vice President and the Cabinet; and assorted combinations of the foregoing. Expressions of the views of eminent jurists, political scientists, public officials, students of government and the Constitution, have been sought and presented to subcommittees of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the period 1956–58. There would appear to be as many views, ideas, and solutions as there could possibly be in any particular area. Extensive study, analysis, and proposed solutions have been made in the past, especially—and almost exclusively—at the height of Presidential illnesses. Thus the bibliography on the subject during the years 1881, 1919–20, and 1956–58, is extensive, and reflects the illnesses of Presidents Garfield, Wilson, and Eisenhower. Yet the ambiguity remains in the Constitution, and no proposed constitutional amendment or legislation to deal with the problem has been adopted by either House of the Congress.

As stated by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, Chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, "We believe, therefore, the people of this Nation will not tolerate a repetition of the silence and stagnation of past congressional action on this matter. To date providence has been patient and benevolent to our Government in spite of a blatant disregard of its responsibility on the part of the Congress.

"In view of the precarious condition of present world affairs and the tremendous responsibility which world leadership has placed in our hands, it ill behooves us to tempt providence once more by inaction.

"The time to strike at the heart of the problem is here. Clarification must supplant procrastination." [19]

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO THE RIDDLE

President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON on March 3, 1958, published a memorandum of their understanding of the constitutional role of the Vice President as Acting President during the inability of the President.[20]

The memorandum expressly stated, however, that it was "intended to apply to themselves only." In accordance with the memorandum, the Vice President would serve as Acting President in the event of being informed of inability by the President. In the event of an inability which prevented the President from communicating with the Vice President, the Vice President could make the decision and would serve as Acting President until the inability had ended. Under the memorandum, the President retains sole power and authority to determine when the inability ends, and at that time resumes the full exercise of the powers and duties of the office of President.

The memorandum has received various comments from many sources, mostly favorable. However, it does not provide a permanent solution to the problem,[21] since it is only meant to be binding upon President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON. It also does not provide for a system of final determination of inability by anyone other than the President, in the event that the President is actually unable to discharge the powers and duties of the office, but believes otherwise.

Two permanent solutions which seem to have evolved from the various hearings, studies, and reports are contained in Senate Joint Resolution 40 (introduced in the 86th Congress on January 29, 1959, by Senator KEFAUVER, for himself and Senators DIRKSEN and HENNINGS),[22] and the Report of the Committee on Federal Constitution of this association dated December 31, 1958.

Under both proposals, clause 5 of section 1 of article II would be amended to make absolutely clear that the Vice President succeeds to the office itself upon the removal, death, or resignation of the President. Both proposals also make it clear that upon the "inability" of the President to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President succeeds only to the powers and duties as Acting President, and not to the office of President.

With respect to the determination of the commencement and termination of inability, Senate Joint Resolution 40 and the committee's proposal take divergent courses. Senate Joint Resolution 40 spells out a detailed system whereby if the President declares his inability in writing, his powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President. It authorizes the Vice President, if satisfied that inability exists and the President does not declare inability, with the written approval of the majority of the Cabinet, to assume the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President as Acting President. The President may recover the powers and duties of the office after a declaration by him that his inability has terminated, unless the Vice President, once again with the approval of a majority of the Cabinet, declares that, in his opinion, the inability has not ended. This determination by the Vice President with Cabinet approval, has itself to be approved within 7 days by a concurrent resolution of two-thirds of the Members present in each House of Congress. If the determination is approved, the powers and duties of the office would be restored to the President thereafter only upon a proclamation by the Acting President that the inability is ended, or a concurrent resolution approved by a majority of the Members present in each House of Congress.

The association's committee on Federal Constitution "does not believe that the amendment should prescribe the methods for determination of the facts relating to inability. It is better constitutional practice to leave that matter to Congress, which under our proposed amendment Congress would be authorized to provide for by legislation." [23] The committee's proposal is accordingly "that the commencement and termination of any inability shall be determined by such method as Congress shall by law provide." [24]

The committee on Federal constitution endorsed as second best Senate Joint Resolution 161 (1958, introduced in 1959 as Senate Joint Resolution 40). The report of the committee on Federal Constitution was approved and adopted by the executive committee of the association on January 29, 1959. The executive committee's supporting resolution called for action in the following whereas clause:

"Whereas in the last 2 years extended hearings have been held by the Judiciary Committees of both the Senate and House, and much thought has been expressed by a wide variety of informed persons and much education accomplished by public discussion, and it is important for the committees of the 86th Congress to come to a conclusion and submit to Congress a solution for this most urgent national problem."

A proposal which would combine Senate Joint Resolution 40 and the proposed constitutional amendment of the committee on Federal Constitution is presently under consideration in legal circles. In essence, this proposal also favors a constitutional amendment making it clear that on removal, death, or resignation the Vice President succeeds to the Office of President, whereas on inability he succeeds only to the powers and duties of the Office of President. It would leave the determination of the commencement and termination of inability to "such method as Congress shall by law provide"—i.e., the proposal of the committee on Federal Constitution. However, it would then go further and endorse the rather detailed method of Senate Joint Resolution 40 for the determination of the commencement and termination of inability as implementing legislation which the Congress should enact.

The proposal would appear to cure by constitutional amendment a problem which legal scholars and constitutional lawyers believe must have its permanent solution in a constitutional amendment. It would, at the same time, approve implementing legislation which appears to be satisfactory and to contain sufficient safeguards to deal with the problem. Yet it would not freeze into the Constitution a detailed system for determination of the commencement and termination of inability, which experience might prove should be modified.

In any event, this latter proposal, Senate Joint Resolution 40, and the proposed constitutional amendment of the committee on Federal Constitution of the association, with the resolution of approval of the executive committee of the association, have sufficient merit to warrant consideration by the appropriate committees of the Congress and action by the Congress.

CONCLUSION

The Presidential inability riddle has been thoroughly canvassed, explored, and analyzed. The time for action has come. The present Congress affords an excellent opportunity for such action. It is a sad commentary that only at times of high crisis is attention given to solving the riddle. The next crisis may come at a time when it will be too late and lead to tragic consequences.

The appropriate committees of the Congress and the Congress should be urged to submit a solution for this most urgent national problem and eliminate the enigma in this area. In the words of Chairman CELLER, "Clarification must supplant procrastination." [25]

---

[1] Riddle, "An enigma propounded for solution by guessing, esp. as a form of play; * * * a riddle commonly involves paradoxical or contradictory statements and is definitely proposed to be guessed." Webster's New International Dictionary, 2d ed., 1958.

[2] The remainder of the clause reads, "and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or in-

ability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected." Congress has, pursuant to this provision, dealt with this dual eventuality in the Presidential Succession Act, 3 U.S.C.A. sec. 19 (June 25, 1948, c. 644, sec 1, 625 Stat. 672).

[2] "Disability" is an inclusive term, which would cover all situations, i.e., removal, death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the Office of President. "Inability" accordingly excludes cases of removal, death, or resignation. Since the principal constitutional enigma today relates to inability, this article has been entitled "The Presidential Inability Riddle."

[4] New York Times, June 20, 1959.

[5] New York Times, June 20, 1959.

[6] Ibid.

[7] New York Times, June 23, 1959.

[8] New York World-Telegram, June 25, 1959.

[9] New York Times, June 27, 29, 1959. See also the editorial comment in the June 28, 1959, edition entitled, "Melodrama in Louisiana."

[10] Ibid.

[11] New York Times, June 29, 1959.

[12] The prescience of Prof. Arthur E. Sutherland, of the Harvard Law School, in his statement at the hearing before the Special Subcommittee To Study Presidential Disability of the House Committee on the Judiciary, 84th Cong., 2d sess., ser. 20, at 77 (1956) is borne out by the events in Louisiana. Professor Sutherland noted:

"However, no very unusual imagination is required to think of a situation in which a President of the United States might have the misfortune of mental illness. Few of us who have practiced law have not had occasion to see the embarrassment arising when some person, stricken with mental illness, very naturally resents the suggestion, even when made by kind friends, that he is no longer able to carry out his ordinary duties. There is now no procedure to cope with such a situation in our public life. The possibility of such a misfortune, or such disabilities as those of Presidents Garfield and Wilson, occurring in the present posture of world affairs, makes the present question one of obvious importance to the United States."

[13] "Presidential Disability: The Constitutional Problem," Department of Justice press release, at 4, May 25, 1957.

[14] Edward S. Corwin, "The President, Office and Powers, 1787–1957," at 54 (1957).

[15] Ruth C. Silva, "Presidential Inability," 35 U. Det. L.J. 153, 169 (1957). "Study of the Garfield and Wilson cases indicates, however, that a declaration of disability was viewed as disloyalty on both occasions because it was feared that such a declaration would mean ousting the disabled President from office for the remainder of the term."

[16] 2 Farrand, "The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787," 427 (1937).

[17] Silva, supra 156–157.

[18] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 85th Cong., 2d sess. 93 (1958).

[19] House Committee on the Judiciary, "Presidential Inability" (House committee print), 84th Cong., 2d sess. 1 (1956).

[20] New York Herald Tribune, March 4, 1958.

[21] Attorney General William P. Rogers, with whom President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON consulted with respect to the memorandum, has repeatedly urged a constitutional amendment to solve the problem. He has continued to do so subsequent to the date of the memorandum: Department of Justice Press Releases, "Presidential Inability," address at the Yale University Law School Association dinner, Apr. 25, 1958 at New Haven, Conn.; address at the 52d Annual Meeting of the National Association of Attorney Generals, June 11, 1958, Chicago, Ill.; Apr. 6, 1959 letter to the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate. In the April 6, 1959 letter, urging congressional approval of S.J. Res. 40, Attorney General Rogers stated, "The need for this amendment to close a serious gap in our constitutional fabric is, I believe, clear. This session of Congress affords the most timely opportunity to discuss the amendment. The proposal can be considered solely on its merits in relation to the constitutional need at this time without becoming intermixed with disconcerting digressions of what effect amendment would have on specific individuals and parties. To summarize, this amendment, I believe, is vitally important; and this is the most favorable opportunity the country will have for several years to give the proposed amendment the objective and thorough consideration it merits. Therefore, I urge the immediate favorable action of your subcommittee and that of the full Judiciary Committee on S.J. Res. 40."

See also, "Presidential Disability: The Constitutional Problem" address by George Cochran Doub, Assistant Attorney General, at the dinner of the Federal Bar Association in honor of the judges of the 10th circuit, at 14–15, May 25, 1959. Denver, Colo., noting that—

"Although the problem arises from a permanent inherent defect in our constitutional system, proposals for its resolution now lie dormant in the Congress under the press of far less significant matters. The bipartisan constitutional amendment (S.J. Res. 40, 86th Cong.; S.J. Res. 161, 85th Cong.) was proposed over a year ago yet the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Judiciary Committee have taken no action of any kind.

"An informed and responsible public opinion appears needed to secure the action which the interests of the Nation plainly requires."

[22] S.J. Res. 40 is identical to S.J. Res. 161, a bipartisan amendment introduced in the 85th Congress, and reported on favorably by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Judiciary Committee. S.J. Res. 161 was never reported on by the Judiciary Committee. S.J. Res. 40 has been reported out this year by the subcommittee to the Judiciary Committee, but hearings have not as yet been scheduled on it by the Judiciary Committee.

[23] Report of the Committee on Federal Constitution, Dec. 31, 1958. The committee also believes that any proposal must "meet the issue in a manner that would be understood by or acceptable to the American people, a consideration of highest importance, and that the text should be readily understandable not only to lawyers but to laymen as well."

[24] One further difference should be noted. The committee on Federal Constitution's proposed constitutional amendment would provide for the succession to the office of President upon the removal, death, or resignation of both the President and Vice President, whereas S.J. Res. 40 retains the present constitutional language, which allows the Congress to provide by law "for the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President." There would seem to be no reason to further in this way Tyler's original assumption of the office of President. This point of difference presumably could be worked out if eventual agreement could be reached on other points. The committee on Federal Constitution makes no recommendation with respect to the legislation for the determination of commencement and termination of inability, leaving that matter to Congress.

[25] See note 19, supra.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 10 of the series:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, Aug. 27, 1959]

RISING INTEREST RATES NO BOON TO BANKS

President Eisenhower wants the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds lifted. The reason is that the Treasury can't sell new bonds at this rate when Federal securities can be had in the market which yield about 4½ percent.

This forces the Government to sell short-term securities on which there is no interest ceiling. For reasons we will not go into, this makes it difficult to manage the debt without contributing to inflation.

Members of Congress who refuse to lift the 4¼ percent ceiling dwell on the "high interest burden." Yesterday, we quoted Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson to the effect that interest costs are small compared to the increased cost of goods and services caused by inflation.

Rising interest rates are a result of restrictions on the supply of money and credit imposed to prevent inflation.

Another argument used by those who favor "easy money" for the sake of low interest is that high interest benefits the bankers at the expense of the public.

In his copyrighted interview with U.S. News & World Report, Secretary Anderson also debunks this notion.

"That is a common misconception," he said. "It is true that banks earn higher interest rates on their loans * * * that's to be expected when money is scarce relative to the demand for it. But what is often overlooked is that the values of their investments in Government bonds and other securities go down at the same time. If they want to make new loans at the higher interest rates, they are probably forced to sell some of their Government securities at a loss. * * *

"Also, people often overlook the fact that higher interest rates are costly to banks. As interest rates have risen in the past few years, competition has forced banks to pay higher interest rates on time and savings deposits. It is interesting to note that, since 1946, the amount of interest banks received from Government securities has increased about $200 million, but their total interest paid out on customers' time and savings deposits has risen by almost $1 billion."

Before flying to Europe, the President told Congress that it is inviting inflation by re-

fusing to permit a higher interest rate on Government bonds. A flood of letters to Congress has demonstrated that inflation is a key issue. If the pressure is maintained, there will be action.

New Era for Families in Agricultural Area: Ranch-to-Ranch Milk Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LeROY H. ANDERSON
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. ANDERSON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, when I was a boy growing up on a Montana homestead farm, we and each of our neighbors kept a few milk cows. Morning and evening, 7 days a week, the chores had to be done and the cows milked. One couldn't leave the farm even for a weekend without arranging for one of the neighbors to come in and "do the chores."

Gradually, farmers sold off their cows to concentrate on their main crop production, and bought their milk and dairy products in town.

Now, the ultimate step has been taken and the milk, cream, butter, cheese, and other dairy products are delivered twice a week right to the farmers' doors.

I realize that for anyone who has never traveled through the rugged country of the great Northwestern States of our Nation, it may be impossible to visualize the vast stretches of land separating neighbor from neighbor, and rendering almost inaccessible such a convenience or service as this which the urban-born and -bred expect and take for granted as a part of their daily living. Even more difficult to imagine is the fact that throughout much of the territory in my district, during many months of the year, our roads are impassable and our people are virtually cut off from contact with the outside world except for the mediums of radio and television.

I, therefore, desire to commend those enterprising individuals, Ralph Hales, manager of the Conrad Creamery at my hometown of Conrad, Mont., and the driver of the creamery truck, Robert Aitken, who have undertaken to deliver their Pride of the West dairy products to some 200 families in the region. Some of the ranches served are as much as 30 miles from any town, and it is frequently several miles between ranches. This involves driving approximately 1,000 miles a week. Remarkably, during the past winter season, they missed only one delivery day because of bad weather. Often such luxuries and conveniences make slow progress in a geographic area like ours, and I feel that these men are to be highly complimented for their introduction of this service which in a short time has come to mean a great deal to the families of our agricultural community.

What Mr. Khrushchev Won't See

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this morning's New York Times contains a fine editorial anent Khrushchev's impending visit to this country. There are many tangible things that he will see on his tour but the Times points up that there are many things he won't see—the ideas that this Nation has been built on.

I commend to the attention of Mr. Khrushchev a reading of the following editorial:

WHAT MR. KHRUSHCHEV WON'T SEE

Mr. Khrushchev will not see the most important things in the United States. He will see our biggest city, our rugged iron and steel center, our horizon-filling grain fields, our impressive Government buildings. He will see our officials, wave to roadside throngs, scan the breadth of our country twice. But he won't see the most important things; they can't be seen, since they are ideas. These are the ideas this country was built upon, which are even more important than the people in the country; these are the ideas of freedom and democratic processes that we try to make clearer and clearer to ourselves, that we pass on to descendants for preservation, that we will always refuse to give up.

These ideas are rejected by Communists as hollow slogans. A number of Americans visiting in Russia during the last few years have reported similar experiences illustrating this. A discussion of political differences with a Russian official or citizen will progress fairly well to a point. Then the American will try to illustrate his position by saying that, though he is an executive of his company, he is of a different political party than, say, the president or chairman of the company. The Russian will regard him with total blankness or will shake his head. An American broadcaster with the Nixon party recently had this experience when he was talking of his network's independence from the Government and freedom to criticize it. The Russian official simply threw up his hands and broke off the conversation.

The fact is that the Russians believe, when the conversation reaches this point, that they are speaking to a man duped by propaganda, and that it is useless to go on. It is not that Russians can't understand the democratic idea—they have a sort of vision of it expressed in their own belief in the Communist governing apparatus ultimately withering away. But they can't believe that the democratic idea really is working in this country today. The blinders they are wearing are those of economic dogma. This dogma runs as follows: Under capitalism there can be no real freedom for the nonmoneyed classes. The Government is controlled by the moneyed classes. Newspapers and radio stations are owned by the moneyed classes—so naturally they wouldn't criticize seriously the Government they themselves control. An employee's freedom to differ with his Government or employer is limited to trivial areas. The right to vote is not a real freedom since there is no difference between the two major parties, both of whom are controlled by moneyed groups. Thus runs the Soviet dogma on life under capitalism.

That Mr. Khrushchev himself believes these things implicitly and fully is shown clearly enough in some of his public statements. If he could be relieved of such notions—if he could be made to feel that there is an air of freedom in this country, that would be a greater accomplishment by far than any impression we could score with our material might, or even evidence of our unity. How to do it? Perhaps the sight of our judicial system in operation in a jury trial would impress Mr. Khrushchev—or an explanation of a writ of habeas corpus. Or perhaps Mr. Khrushchev should be shown a few bushels of the latest opposition mail received by Congress or the White House on specific issues—or perhaps he should be allowed to sit in on a union-steel company negotiation session. There is nothing so far on Mr. Khrushchev's itinerary that is likely to remove his blinders—that is doubtless too much to hope for. But some human scene, or some one's chance remark may give Mr. Khrushchev an insight into the fact that the freedom here is real.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 11 of the series:

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Aug. 26, 1959]

THE DOLLAR NEEDS MORE MUSCLES

Democrats in Congress have decided to try to hold interest rates on Government savings bonds and long-term bonds within artificially low ceilings.

They say they fear a hike in the Government interest rate would be reflected in higher interest rates generally, for persons borrowing to buy cars or homes, for merchants borrowing to buy stocks of goods, for persons borrowing to start new businesses.

Cheap or easy money, the Democrats believe, helps creditors while dear money is of advantage only to lenders.

So, the bill requested by President Eisenhower, to permit the Government to offer more than 3¼ percent on savings bonds and 4¼ percent on long-term bonds, has been tabled in the House Ways and Means Committee, thereby killing it for this session.

We doubt if the Democrats will be able to get much political mileage out of their be-kind-to-borrowers gesture. And their refusal to adjust interest rates to meet current bond market conditions may have serious consequences.

The first effect of the Democratic decision will be to force the Government to put more and more of its debt in short-term bonds on which there is no interest ceiling.

The trouble with short-term Government bonds is that they are virtually the same as cash. If billions of dollars are added to the short-term debt, a vast floating supply of cash or near-cash will be created in the country, adding tremendously to inflationary pressures on prices.

It has just been announced that the consumer price index has climbed to its fourth consecutive record level in 4 months. It would be a good idea to syphon some buying power into long-term bonds but the Democrats in Congress are unwilling to help.

The worst effect of killing the bond interest bill may be its reaction on the world money markets.

Our monetary policies have already weakened confidence in the dollar to some extent. Some countries have been cashing in their dollars for gold.

If we deliberately embrace a policy of easy money and rising prices, we will encourage a belief that the United States is not fully responsible as far as Government finances are concerned and that the dollar, long the anchor of free-world strength, is no longer to be trusted.

Cooperation by the Armed Services With a Local Community Humanitarian Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure to bring to the attention of the Members of the Congress a recent outstanding example of close, constructive cooperation by the armed services with a local community humanitarian project. In a letter of September 9, 1959, Mr. Robert T. Bond, chairman and camp director, of the American Legion Boys' Camp, sponsored by post No. 86 of Rockville, Md., informed the Honorable Murray Snyder, Assistant Secretary of Defense, of the practical assistance to the underprivileged boys' camp rendered by the Military District of Washington, the National Naval Medical Center, and Fort Detrick.

It was my privilege this summer to visit this boys' camp at Camp Echo Lake, Frederick County, Md. There I saw firsthand the superlative volunteer work that the members of post No. 86 is doing.

Under the energetic, dedicated and imaginative leadership of my good friend, Frank Bliss, of Rockville, nearly 100 young underprivileged boys tasted the joy of outdoor, close to nature living, supervised by members of post No. 86. Building boys to be better citizens in this way is the best insurance against juvenile delinquency.

The letter set out below is concrete proof of the rich benefits derived from detailed participation by the armed services in worthwhile community activities.

THE AMERICAN LEGION BOY'S CAMP
OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, INC.,
Rockville, Md., September 9, 1959.

Hon. MURRAY SNYDER,
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), Office of the Secretary of Defense, Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: It is with a great deal of pleasure that I write to you concerning the outstanding support that members of the armed services, both active as well as Reserve, have contributed to the American Legion Boy's Camp of Montgomery County. This camp, initiated by the membership of Henderson-Smith-Edmonds Post 86, the American Legion, to provide an opportunity for a few days camping to young boys in our community who might not otherwise be privileged to enjoy such a pleasure due to the limited circumstances of their families, has received commendable assistance each year from individuals and organizations of the military services. Today these individuals and units, some having been with us from the start, consider it a privilege to participate in this fine community program. Currently the camping period is for 15 days.

The first year the commanding general, Military District of Washington, provided tentage, mess gear and cots; the commanding officer, National Naval Medical Center, provided medical personnel for daily sick call; personnel of the antiaircraft gun sites adjacent to Rockville aided in the operation of the camp; and CWO Louis A. Fricke, USN, recruiting office, Rockville, organized the mess and prepared and served all of the meals for the 2-week period, which incidentally was during his leave.

In the secnod year there was increased participation by the armed services. In addition to the continued support of the National Naval Medical Center and the Military District of Washington, Capt. (then 1st Lt.) John G. Jimison, Jr., U.S.A., stationed at the missile site on Muddy Branch Road in Montgomery County, CWO Vaughan B. Coale, USNR, and Herbert Pennington, Sr., CS 1, USNR, joined the program. Herb Pennington performed superbly in supervising the mess which undoubtedly was the crowning feature of the camp. Captain Jimison and selected members of his battery erected tents and participated in the daily functions of the camp during their off duty hours. Captain Jimison offered this assistance as his contribution to promote good public relations in the community in which he resided, and in which his men spent many of their off duty hours. During that year the camp was honored by visits, both informally as well as by invitation, of many of the ranking military commanders in the Washington area. These commanders participated with the community leaders in addressing the youth and created a most favorable impression on the audiences, youth as well as adult. It was during that year that initial interest was developed by personnel of the Naval Reserve Surface Division 5-37 (L), Silver Spring, Md.

In the third year our camp outgrew the facilities available to us at our post home on Congressional Lane, Rockville, and we had to seek another location. Fortunately with the assistance of Captain Jimison and community leaders we were able to obtain the use of ground in Seneca Creek State Park on Cloppers Hill Road, Montgomery County. It was during that year that Comdr. Ray O. Zimmerman, commanding officer, Naval Reserve Surface Division 5-37 (L), swung his wholehearted interest to the camp and provided personnel on a full time basis as part of their active duty for training. Equipment was loaned by the commander of the David Taylor Model Basin, principally through the effort of Lt. Comdr. Charles Hart, USNR, who is employed as a civilian at the basin. Chief Warrant Officer Coale again spent many hours at the camp. Of particular significance was the outstanding contributions of Frank Bliss, Jr., SMC; Samuel L. Saylor, Jr., GMM 1; and Charles T. Abshire, SK 1 all of the Naval Reserve Surface Division 5-37 (L). Also worthy of recognition was the assistance of Mr. A. Franklin, civilian, Warehouse Section, Property Branch, Office of the Post Quartermaster, Fort Myer, Va., who upon instructions of the commanding general, Military District of Washington, made available tentage, cots and mess equipment. M. Sgt. Irving D. Dixon, special service office, Military District of Washington, spent many off duty hours assisting in the operation of the camp. Captain Jimison's missiliers again erected tents and gave assistance in camp sanitation. Maj. Gen. John G. Van Houten, commanding general, Military District of Washington, honored us by his informal tour of the camp facilities.

This year growth continued and we had our most successful camp, which in no small part was due to the support of the armed services. Capt. M. L. McCollough, Jr., USN, commanding officer, Naval Reserve Training Center, Washington, D.C., lent his support to provide Naval Reserve personnel for key spots in the camp operation. He also visited the camp on Naval Reserve night to address the boys. The Office of the Surgeon General, Department of the Army, provided medical support through medical personnel stationed at Fort Detrick, Md. Daily sick call was conducted at the camp, this year held in Frederick County some 14 miles northwest of the city of Frederick, by Capt. Donald A. Pious, MC. Captain Pious gave unstintingly of his time and professional skill to insure that the maximum of health was maintained among the campers. Frank Bliss, Samuel Saylor and Charles Abshire again superbly organized the operation of the camp. Herb Pennington came back, after an absence of a year, to again supervise the mess and, although it is hard to believe, he topped his performance of his first camp. Other Naval reservists were Richard Ogan, ETR 2; Thomas Martin, SA; William Dorsett, SA; and James Dean, SR. Incidentally many of the above named eligible veterans have joined our American Legion Post as the result of working in the camp project. Their continued participation assures us that we are serving the community, State and Nation through a demonstrated need in the community. The training and practice in leadership that is gained in the camp is particularly beneficial to the participating reservists.

I realize that this has become a rather lengthy letter, but the significance of the outstanding support in community service contributed by the Armed Services in this area requires more than a few cursory lines to express our appreciation for their individual and collective, directed and volunteered efforts.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. BARD,
Chairman and Camp Director.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 12 of the series:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 8, 1959]

THE E- AND H-BONDS

The House Ways and Means Committee, it seems clear, will take no action at this time

on the President's request for a general relaxation or removal of the present restrictions on the interest rate the Treasury may attach to its medium or long-term security issues.

Last week, however, the committee moved to grant the Administration's request so far as it applied to Government savings bonds. It would authorize the Treasury to increase the rate on its E-bonds and H-bonds from the present 3¼ percent, which, since 1957, has also been the maximum legal rate, to 3¾ percent. In the case of persons holding bonds purchased prior to June 1 of this year, interest payment would be adjusted so as to make the higher rates applicable from that date through the remaining life of the bond.

If this proposal, designed to enhance the appeal of savings bonds to the small investor, is, as Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON predicted yesterday, approved by Congress, it will mark the third time since 1952 that it has been found necessary to sweeten up these securities in order to keep them on a competitive basis with other saving outlets in a tightening money market. In 1952 the Treasury raised the effective interest rate to maturity from 2.9 percent to 3 percent, then the ceiling rate, by the simple expedient of shortening the maturity from the prevailing 10 years to 9 years and 8 months. With interest rates again on the rise, Congress was persuaded in 1957 to raise the legal limit on these securities from 3 to 3¼ percent.

The urgency of the 1957 change was shown by the decline in popularity of these bonds, beginning midway through 1956 as reflected in the volume of sales and the rate of redemptions. Sales fell off $300 million from the level of 1955, though the year 1956 as a whole still showed an excess of sales over cash-ins of $211 million. By the end of July of this year we had been witnessing a recurrence of that warning symptom for an entire year, and on a more spectacular version. In the first seven months of 1959 alone the excess of cash-ins over sales amounted to $613 million.

Civil Rights Report Vicious Attack Upon Historic Powers of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL BROWN
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House a splendid editorial which appeared in the September 8 issue of the Augusta Herald, Augusta, Ga., on the report of the Civil Rights Commission.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CIVIL RIGHTS REPORT VICIOUS ATTACK UPON HISTORIC POWERS OF THE STATES

One of the most vicious documents ever framed by a commission of the Federal Government has, as of today, at last been removed from behind its tight veil of secrecy and placed within the public province.

We refer to the highly controversial report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, portions of which were made public prematurely by Senators STROM THURMOND and OLIN D. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and which promptly set off a storm within the Halls of Congress.

It would be well for every American, regardless of race or section of origin, to take close note of some of the designs this Commission is making upon the rights of the 50 sovereign States to administer their own affairs.

Throughout the document, released in excerpt form to the Nation's press, radio and TV, run several recurrent themes, designed first to level the powers of the States and second, to renew the life of this unnecessary Commission, exalt it to the level of a fourth branch of Government, and spread its powers over so broad an area that it would closely approximate a dictatorial power in the field of human relations.

The Commission asks for the adoption of a 23d amendment to the Constitution which would extend a blanket franchise to every person, subject only to state age, and residency requirements or legal confinement. As was pointed out by three members of the six-man Commission, the amendment is wholly unnecessary, since sufficient safeguards to the franchise already exist in the Constitution. These members were Vice Chairman Robert G. Storey and Commissioners Doyle Carlton and John S. Battle.

More ominously, the Commission would have created a system of Federal registrars, who would become the ultimate authority on who may and may not qualify as a voter. This is a clear, unveiled, undeniable infringement upon the historic right of the States to apply their own test to each would-be voter.

It would give added weight to the fraudulent ukase of the Supreme Court in integration by forcing racial mixing in Federal housing and by withdrawing Federal funds from any school or university which balked at integration. It would further extend to the field of housing, built under FHA and/or VA mortgage guarantee, thus denying to the home-builder, civilian, or veteran, the right to live in an area of his own choosing, free from the threat of racial strife imposed upon him by an injudicious but self-willed Washington bureaucracy.

Yet the Commission is inconsistent enough to admit on page 127 of its report that "Desegregation by court order has been notably more difficult than desegregation by voluntary action where the method and timing have been locally determined."

In other words, it recognizes the widespread strife that has been created by the Supreme Court's edict, but nevertheless would insist on creating more.

These are but a few of the disturbing portions of the voluminous report. Perhaps the most damning criticism of the document is the statement by Commissioner Battle appended to its final page. Writes he:

"I must strongly disagree with the nature and the tenor of the report. In my judgment it is not an impartial factual statement, * * * but rather, in large part, an argument in advocacy of preconceived ideas in the field of race relations."

We agree with Governor Battle. The Commission's report itself is the strongest argument that could be advanced for letting the Commission die as it is supposed to this coming November.

That, plus the fact that it never should have existed at all.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling for Federal Bonds—No. 13

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor today, I said I was going to put in the RECORD some recent comments on the subject of removing the interest ceiling on long-term Federal bonds. This is No. 13 of the series:

[From the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star, Aug. 29, 1959]

SURE WAY TO SAVE MONEY

The reluctance of Congress to lift the interest rate ceiling for long-term Treasury bonds is interesting. Partly it is just politics, the demagogic appeal to prejudice against "the bankers," meaning in reality anyone who has money for investments which earn interest. But partly also there must be reaction against the high and still rising cost of carrying the national debt. It already costs Federal taxpayers around $8.5 billion a year just to make the interest payments.

The simple refusal of Congress to raise the interest rate ceiling is not going to hold the interest cost down. As a matter of fact it might cause the cost to go up in the end. The Treasury has to borrow so much money this year to cover the budget deficit and to refinance maturing bonds. If it is forbidden to pay an interest rate high enough to borrow this money on long-term bonds, it will simply have to settle for short-term borrowing, on which it has authority to pay whatever interest is required.

In this respect the Government is in the same boat as an individual who needs to borrow money and doesn't want to repay it for 10 years. If the bank will lend him the money for 5 years but not for 10 he'll just have to take the 5-year loan and face the problem again when it is due. In meeting this year's problems by short-term borrowing, the Treasury takes the risk that when it is necessary to refinance these loans the interest rate may be still higher. Because of the influence of the Government's own actions—including heavy short-term borrowing—that is very likely to happen.

There is, however, another way out for Congress if it is unwilling to pay the going interest rate. It can quit borrowing.

This would require giving up the luxury of spending more than is raised by taxes. It would not be so hard to do. For the new fiscal year, which has already begun, it could be done quite readily by cutting back foreign aid spending and farm subsidies. And both actions would result in improvement of the programs. Next year these programs could be further refined and others could be tackled to cut spending down further and enable paying off of some loans as they mature instead of refinancing. Then the interest cost would go down and budget balancing would be that much easier. A persistent downward trend in the total national debt over several years would probably result in lower interest rates on Government obligations, and still more would be saved.

The cycle of budget balance and saving, once set in motion, would tend to be self-energizing, just as the opposite cycle of deficit and constant increase in spending has proved to be self-energizing.

The sooner it is started, the sooner the taxpayers can begin to benefit from it.

American Business Goes Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the exodus of business enterprise to foreign

lands is of great concern to this Nation and its economy.

Many make the move to a foreign country in order to avoid paying reasonable wages to their employees and with the hope that they can avoid paying their just share of taxes to their Government.

An editorial which appeared in an outstanding Kansas newspaper, the Kansas City Kansan, written by Mr. John H. Stauffer would be of interest to other members and I ask, Mr. Speaker, that it be included in my remarks.

[From the Kansas City (Kans.) Kansan, Sept. 1, 1959]

FOREIGN GOODS LOWER PRICED

The expression "we are pricing ourselves out of our own labor market" is illustrated clearly by the decision of the Coleman Co. of Wichita to operate a factory in Holland and distribute its products throughout Europe and Asia.

For many years the company's products have been made in Kansas and distributed throughout the world. The company's lamp is probably the best known Kansas-made product. But the company's expansion plans will not help Kansas labor. The new plant was located in Europe because wages are lower than in the United States. Tariff restrictions also are less of an obstacle beyond the U.S. borders.

The Coleman case is but one of numerous instances of U.S. manufacturers setting up operations in foreign countries where they may sell not only in foreign markets but to Americans as well. Manufactured products from pop guns to powerplants are being produced at less cost in dollars in other lands than in the United States.

The American customer will find a surprising number of foreign labels on what he buys if he looks closely, as we did at the "Made in Japan" label stamped in a simple tool for sale at a local store.

The situation is a matter of greater concern to the United States than we may want to admit, because it is hard to see how men can continue to be employed steadily in this country at high wages if the things they make do not command a steady sale. Americans will not cheerfully pay higher prices for U.S. goods than for acceptable foreign-made goods simply for patriotic reasons.

Attorney Louis G. Feldmann of Hazleton, Pa.; Elected New Commander in Chief of Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some remarks delivered by Attorney Louis G. Feldmann of my district upon his election last week in Los Angeles as the new commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, an extremely high honor indeed.

We of Luzerne County are rightfully proud of Lou Feldmann and I know he will be an excellent national commander for this great organization of veterans.

I have known Lou Feldmann for a great number of years. When I served as deputy attorney general of Pennsylvania back in the midthirties, Lou was a member of my staff serving in the capacity of chief investigator. Following his graduation from Duquesne University Law School in Pittsburgh, he practiced law in Luzerne County and became a well-known and popular figure in the county and in northwestern Pennsylvania.

Lou Feldmann was a member of the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II as an enlisted man, reaching the rank of buck sergeant. Upon his discharge from the corps, he returned to Luzerne County and was subsequently honored by the voters of Luzerne County by his election as district attorney, of the third largest county in the great State of Pennsylvania.

Also during the post-World War II era, Lou became one of the prominent figures in the VFW—first on the county level, then the State level, and finally on the national scene, where, for the past year, he served as national vice commander and, finally, last week became the VFW's new commander in chief.

On behalf of the people of Luzerne County whom I have the distinct pleasure of representing in the Congress, I take this means of extending our warmest congratulations and very best wishes to Lou Feldmann for a highly successful and productive term as the new commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. We salute him.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I submit herewith a letter of transmittal from Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, enclosing some extemporaneous remarks made by Commander in Chief Feldmann on the occasion of his election to that high office on Friday, September 4, 1959, at the VFW National Convention held in Los Angeles:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Kansas City, Mo., September 10, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: I am attaching herewith copy of a statement made by Louis G. Feldmann, newly elected commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars at the VFW national convention in Los Angeles, following his election and installation as commander in chief.

The statement was largely extemporaneous, with only a few notes to guide him, but I know Commander Feldmann would appreciate having you place this in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at your earliest convenience. I understand the Congress will recess in the very near future, and I hope it can be included before the recess.

Thanking you for this courtesy and with best wishes and kind personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

OMAR B. KETCHUM,
Director.

EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS OF LOUIS G. FELDMANN, OF HAZELTON, PA., BEFORE THE OFFICERS AND DELEGATES TO THE 60TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING HIS UNANIMOUS ELECTION AS COMMANDER IN CHIEF ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1959

My comrades of the 60th National VFW Convention, first of all, I should like to introduce to you my wife. Many of you have met her. We have been married for 28 years, and, as I have told some of you for 2 years, I love her very much and I am sure you are going to like her too.

Next, I should like to introduce my young nephew who was in the news with Vice President NIXON and was described as the calmest and most collected man in the receiving line. When the Vice President asked him who he was and that he was glad to meet him, Pete nonchantly said, "Likewise."

And a niece who has been here with me to enjoy these things. I want to present Miss Judy McKernan.

I should like to present two men under whom I served in the 3d Marine Division, first, a man that you have met before, one of the few four-star generals in the history of the Marine Corps, Gen. Graves Erskine, retired, not only my former commanding officer but my very dear close friend and adviser.

The other, Brig. Gen. Don Hittle, who was G–4 in the 3d Division and who has been most helpful to me in my career and is now a liaison officer with the Marine Corps in Washington.

First of all, may I say I want to thank all of you who have so vigorously supported me over the years, and, particularly, I want to thank all of you from Pennsylvania, for without your help it would have been impossible. Of course, I must especially thank those people from northern Pennsylvania, particularly the Anthracite Counties Council, where I really started in 1946; the people from Hazleton, my sister-in-law, Ann Mary Caparell, and all the people that came out here with me, Victor Diehm, who has handled radio contacts for me, Dom Antonelli, and so many people.

May I put everybody at ease. I have no intention of conducting a stormy administration or trying to set the prairies on fire, because, as I see it, our approach to the various problems facing veterans, their widows and their orphans, must be realistic and progressive. We must face these problems with positive action rather than negative words.

But let me get something straight. Despite the fact that I think Commander in Chief John W. Mahan did a great job and that every Member of the Congress who worked for and voted for the present pension bill was honest and sincere, I don't like that bill. I will agree that great progress was made in the bill as to widows and orphans. John Mahan worked hard for it, as he should—and I would have done the same thing that John did—but that does not prevent me from disagreeing with certain fundamentals of the bill.

First, the income limitations are so low that in some States you can get more on public assistance than you can get by taking a pension under the bill, and I don't think that is right.

Second, there is a little provision in this pension bill called corpus of the estate. You people who aren't lawyers may not know what it means. But it means if you die and leave a home or some savings, under the law as it is written the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may decide how much of that estate must be used up before your widow or child can qualify for a pension. I believe Administrator Whittier to be a completely honorable and sensible man and I don't believe that he would do anything unreasonable, but years ago one of the Founding Fathers of this country said, "Don't give power to your friends you wouldn't want your enemies to have." And, therefore, I want that "corpus" out of the pension bill entirely.

Finally, I refuse to destroy thrift. I refuse to destroy frugality. I refuse to destroy all of the American concept of life. If income limitations are to be placed in pension bills—and unquestionably they will as a practical matter—then I state emphatically they should not include anything ex-

cept earned income. The limitations should not make a veteran or a widow either a pauper or a thief before he or she can collect under the bill.

The most crucial problem facing the veteran today is that of trying to find medical and hospital care. John Mahan has made great steps forward in that area and so have our last several VFW administrations. There is still much to be done but there is a limitation on the dollars to do it. I am of the opinion that maybe we could get more hospital beds by increasing VA efficiency. I have no brief for the veteran who uses a veterans hospital bed as a place to loaf and denies beds to those persons who need it because they are sick. I want to get those veterans who do not require serious medical attention out of the hospitals and into some kind of domiciliary care, or something of that sort, which costs less than a hospital; so we can find beds for the sick ones who really need the beds.

However, in order to make sure that I am right, I plan to set up a special hospital committee this year that will have the stamina and courage to face up to the ever-growing problem at veterans' hospitals, the need for beds and facilities, and the need to improve the lot of our aged comrades. This committee will be made up of competent men both in and out of the VFW—men trained in the field of medicine, law and cost accounting—men who can answer any argument of the Government budgeteers.

Let me say another thing. I am getting very tired of hearing how much the VA program costs. I am getting completely tired of hearing about $10 billion additional cost in the next 40 years. One answer would be a complete analysis of the VA budget. I believe a complete analysis of that budget will show that many of the things that are charged to veterans should be charged to the Public Health Administration and to other branches of Government. I have no objection, in fact I urge research in medicine on geriatrics and many other problems, but why should the veterans be charged with research costs when medical research benefits all of this country?

In the past the Veterans of Foreign Wars has worked with the youth of the Nation. We have established programs that have become institutions in the towns and hamlets across America, programs such as teener baseball, marble tournaments, rifle matches, bowling leagues and working with our local Boy Scout troops. Yet today the problem of juvenile delinquency is greater than it ever was before.

This year we must squarely face one of the most important problems—juvenile delinquency. I don't mean breaking windows. I mean thievery, robbery, marijuana, dope, rape, and murder. It is a responsibility of everyone in this room to fight this community blight. It is up to the veterans of this Nation, men who know the horrors of war, to do their utmost in stamping out this cancerous menace that is threatening America today.

For that purpose I am appointing a competent committee of advisers to suggest what we can do in the big cities to help stamp this condition out. If you don't think it is bad read the newspapers about the situation in New York in the last 2 weeks.

Over in Korea right underneath the Communist guns there is a village that has been practically destroyed. People still live in it despite the destruction. It is an example of things that have not been corrected. Because of redtape and things of that sort, and diplomacy being what it is, nothing can be done to reconstruct it.

I would like to suggest the thought that possibly the Veterans of Foreign Wars might like to help reconstruct those buildings. I am going to more fully develop this at a later date, because I think it would be an outstanding example of how free men and how veterans who fought in foreign wars are willing to help those who carried the brunt of the battle for them. I am going to talk to you as I visit you this year about this Korean village and whether or not you would like to help reconstruct it, and to say to the Communists, "We believe in the things we talk about. We put our money where our mouth is."

We must be conscious of the international trouble spots throughout the world: Indochina, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America. We must at all times strive to counter the Communist menace that is seeking to engulf the world. To do that we must sell America as an individual in the people-to-people concept. This year the VFW will lead, as it has for many years, the fight against international communism. Those who fought so hard for victory in war must fight ever harder in stamping out international communism wherever it is found. We must be ever vigilant against those Communists who masquerade as Americans, those Communists who while professing to bear allegiance to the Stars and Stripes, actually hate everything that it stands for. They are just as bad as the people in the Kremlin. In fact, they are worse because we know where the people in the Kremlin stand.

Communism has enslaved Poland, Hungary, and Yugoslavia; communism has enslaved Latvia and Estonia; it has enslaved parts of Indochina and China; Communism would enslave countries all over the world. Today as I am talking to you communism is about to enslave Laos. Laos is a tiny nation that few of us ever heard about until it got in the news, but I say to you we should with every ounce of our moral fiber call upon our Government to make sure that Laos is not enslaved by the Communists. Let our Government take whatever steps are necessary to aid and assist in making sure that Laos does not slip under the enslavement of the Communist rule.

Now Mr. Khrushchev is coming to this country. That is already decided. Mr. Eisenhower is going to Russia. That is already decided. It is going to happen. What are we going to do about it? Well, since Mr. Khrushchev is coming to this country my recommendation is that we should all be silent but civil. We should treat Mr. Khrushchev the same as we expect Mr. Eisenhower to be treated in Russia. But there is a way to do something. You know, there is a great difference of opinion as to where we stand economically in relation to where the Russians stand economically. There is a great difference of opinion as to which nation is going to be ahead in 10 or 15 years. There is a great difference of opinion as to educational programs in both countries. There is a great difference of opinion about many things, but, as you know, we have one thing Russia doesn't have and we can use it to demonstrate, to let Mr. Khrushchev know how we feel. There is one think that Mr. Khrushchev and his Communists must hate, if they believe in the concept of communism. They must hate every reference to God or by whatever name the Supreme Being may be called.

Therefore, I suggest a way for us to demonstrate, a way for all the people of this Nation to demonstrate—let every faith, creed, let every color, let every religion demonstrate; let us all go to our houses of worship throughout this country in the greatest number this Nation has ever known while Khrushchev is here, to inform Khrushchev that we have one thing he doesn't have—we have a belief in God, and having a belief in God we know this Nation cannot perish from the earth.

Let us work for victory. Let us not just talk, let us work, let us work hard for this victory of peace; let us work just as hard for peace as we did in war. Let the letters of the VFW be reversed. Work for victory. If we are willing to work we will be an organization worthy of our congressional charter. Thank you very much.

Public Comment on the Interest Ceiling on Federal Bonds—No. 14

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Baltimore Sun of Friday morning, September 11, 1959:

WHAT LEADERSHIP

In his column today, Mr. Thomas O'Neill recalls the sanguine mood of the congressional leadership at the beginning of the year. They had the votes: they were going to take over the leadership.

They still have the votes. What about the leadership?

A good example of the quality of this leadership is provided by the congressional handling of two matters: the pork-barrel bill and the administration's urgent request for the right to raise the interest rate on Government bonds.

The bond interest rate is now limited by law to 4¼ percent. Owing to the high cost of money, the Government is unable to float any bonds at all at that rate of interest. It is under the harrowing necessity of financing current obligations by means of short-term notes, most of which must be refinanced by new borrowing in a year or less. This kind of financing is only one step from printing-press money. Yet this Congress has flatly refused to pave the way to more orderly deficit financing by raising the interest rate ceiling.

As for the pork-barrel bill, the President has vetoed it twice. He vetoed it both times because it contains 67 unbudgeted projects which, though calling for small expenditure this year, would commit the Government to $800 million worth of spending in the years immediately following. Both the House and the Senate have already overridden the President's second veto.

Put these two together and what do you see? First, Congress commits the Government to raising an extra $800 million that it doesn't want to spend. Second, it adopts a point of view on the interest-rate question that prevents the administration from selling bonds to raise the money.

What leadership.

Keeping the Family Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD a most remarkable article from a small neighborhood newspaper in Detroit, the Southwest (Detroit) Journal, of August 20, 1959.

This article gained for the editor, Hal Miller, the written commendation of the Commission on Children and Youth of the city of Detroit, and I ask additionally that a communication signed by Grovenor N. Grimes, executive secretary, Commission on Children and Youth, city of Detroit, also be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF DETROIT,
COMMISSION ON CHILDREN AND YOUTH,
August 25, 1959.

MR. HAL MILLER,
Editor, the Southwest Journal,
Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MR. MILLER: I was particularly pleased to note your article in the August 20 edition of the Southwest Journal, regarding four suggested steps for holding a family together.

Those of us who are concerned with children and youth realize how important it is that there be a constant re-stating of basic principles of family life. I was especially gratified to note the inclusion of the family ritual idea, because there appears to be considerable evidence that when a family enjoys being together and participating in certain small rituals—as birthdays, anniversaries (which were mentioned) or traditional breakfasts, picnics, Christmas festivities, and the sort (which were not mentioned)—that family has an excellent chance of being a successful and happy family.

We are always interested to see such constructive articles in the neighborhood and language newspapers which we feel are a definite and valuable influence in the community.

Sincerely yours,
GROVENOR N. GRIMES,
Executive Secretary.

[From the Southwest (Detroit) Journal, Aug. 20, 1959]

HOW TO HOLD FAMILY TOGETHER—HERE ARE FOUR SUGGESTED STEPS

The increase in marriage breakups and juvenile delinquency are evidence that family life in America needs strengthening.

Any family can take certain steps, at no cost to itself, which will pay dividends in security in a single generation. Four steps recommended by the American Institute of Family Relations are: Family association, family ritual, family discipline, and family love.

Family association: It is important for couples to associate with persons who have satisfactory ideals and practices concerning marriage and the family. Couples whose close friends and daily associates are people with negative outlooks on marriage, are more apt to have their marriage end in a divorce court.

Family ritual: Celebrating birthdays, anniversaries, and even the keeping of pets help create family solidarity. Every successful family has its own symbolic customs. A family council where problems are discussed is outstanding in this respect.

Family discipline: Consistency in discipline is more important than the kind of discipline maintained. Children need standards to go by. They want to know where the limits of behavior are. The greatest defect is parental inconsistency. The adolescent is allowed to do as he pleases this week and then violently punished next week.

Family love: It has never been doubted that love of parents for their children and for each other is equally necessary. One study shows that children make the best adjustments in their own marriages when they come from homes where father and mother not only love each other, but were demonstrative in showing this love in the presence of the children.

A family can select its associates carefully, maintain its ritual, discipline and atmosphere of harmony. Without these, family disintegration is almost inevitable.

The "Pork Barrel" Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the text of Bill Sprague's comments last evening over WRC radio. Mr. Sprague and his background stories on the day's news events are a regular feature on this station, and I think his remarks on the public works appropriation bill—or "pork barrel" bill—would be of interest to many in the House and Senate.

Rather paradoxically, President Eisenhower has had his first veto overridden at a time when his popularity and prestige are at a crest. Never since his first days in office has Mr. Eisenhower apparently enjoyed such widespread backing.

This comeback, reflected in the opinion polls, dates from about the time Gov. Sherman Adams vacated the White House. Whether the evidence of the President's leadership and this parting of the ways had any real connection is a subject for debate.

At the time of the Goldfine-Adams Roman holiday, the President rejected the suggestion that he fire his chief of staff with the words, "I need him." With no disrespect to Governor Adams intended, it now appears that his indispensability was somewhat exaggerated. Certainly the Eisenhower relations with Congress and with the press have been steadily and dramatically improving and his stature with Allied Nations now can scarcely be improved upon.

It is also written that the changeover in the Republican high command in Congress has made all the difference. Senator DIRKSEN, once looked on as an irritable relic of the McKinley era, has blossomed out into a field general who can work with the White House and with his colleagues in a manner far more effective than his predecessor, Senator KNOWLAND. And Capitol Hill observers are virutally unanimous in their agreement that Minority Leader CHARLES HALLECK in the House has performed feats of strategy which old wheelhorse JOE MARTIN could never have pulled off.

But despite all this, the House and then the Senate today overrode the White House veto of the second public works appropriation bill.

This measure, which comes up every year, has long been referred to as the "pork barrel," because a Congressman's chances of reelection often depend heavily on how many Federal works projects he can wrangle for his district. Some Members are rather sensitive about the epithet and take trouble to explain that each of the flood control, beach erosion, navigation, land reclamation, and power development projects they've proposed is necessary and vital to the welfare of the United States. In many instances the plea is made that public works is a form of sound investment on the Government's part, that when the such-and-such river is made navigable the people and firms in the area will get richer and have to pay more taxes.

But this year the administration chose to put the brakes on the public works program as an economy measure, and the key provision of the bill sent to Congress from the Budget Bureau was no new starts. That is, work should continue on projects already begun, but no new projects should be initiated. Congress added 67 new starts.

This didn't appreciably raise the amount of the appropriations bill for this year, for most of these 67 new starts were merely studies of a few thousand dollars each. Congress upped the Budget Bureau's figure by less than 1 percent. But since the principle had been violated, and more important because this was committing the Treasury to future expenditures running close to an extra billion, Mr. Eisenhower vetoed the bill and demanded that the 67 new starts be dropped.

This didn't set well with the Congress. Fact is that a good many Republicans were in inner turmoil when it was decided to try and override the veto in the House. Should they vote to uphold the President and thereby stay in solid with the White House, or should they go along with the crowd and stay in solid with their constituents? It was a matter of guessing which way the vote to override would come out, and they guessed wrong. For the President won that first test by a one-vote margin, and those of the faithful who sided with him began to look bad at home.

The committee then set up a new bill that the President was bound to veto. Keeping the 67 new starts, it brought the total figure down to less than the one in the budget by reducing each project, new and old, by 2½ percent. Its only merit was political. Those behind it could boast they'd voted less money than the administration wanted, neglecting to mention that they were mortgaging the future.

But though the President suggested that Congress enact a stopgap resolution to keep work underway going forward until next year when a better bill might be worked out, the House and Senate today overrode his second veto with yelps of triumph. In the House only 121 Members stuck with the leadership. When the result was announced there was cheering, and then a crowd of Republicans trooped over to the Senate to supervise the voting of the other body.

There, the critics of foreign aid were getting in their licks, pointing to the new starts the administration had been launching in the mutual security field, despite much talk of money being wasted. Said Senator MANSFIELD: "The administration is asking more than $300 million for foreign aid 'pork barrel' in Cambodia, Formosa, Indonesia, Korea, Laos." "New starts," he observed, "are proposed in Morocco, Somalia,

and Tunisia. This doesn't include the development loan program in which hundreds of millions are earmarked for new starts all over the world."

The Senate quickly followed the lead of the House, which had been fully expected, with eight votes to spare.

Asked for the President's reaction to the news, Jim Hagerty at the White House said, "He thought the lure of the 'pork barrel' was a little bit too much for the Congress to avoid."

How Heavy Will Be the Mortgage on Our Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, a very good friend of mine, Mr. John W. Colt, managing editor of the Kansas City Star, recently returned from a 2-month trip to Europe.

Soon after his return he addressed a convention of Kappa Alpha in Kansas City. An article which appeared in the Kansas City Times on September 4, 1959, tells of Mr. Colt's conclusions after studying the effect of our foreign aid in other countries.

Inasmuch as he takes exactly the same position as did I in my 1958 campaign with respect to limiting our foreign aid to long term loans, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this article which quotes Mr. Colt be included as part of my remarks.

And today, Mr. Speaker, it is regretable to note that powerful interests on behalf of the administration are attempting to deny to the Congress the right to be informed of the corruption, waste, extravagance, fraud, and inefficiency in the administration of our foreign aid program. The millions wasted, the millions given unnecessarily, add to the already heavy mortgage on our future.

CALLS FOR END TO GIVEAWAYS

"Is it necessary for the United States to continue financing the free world?"

That was the question posed by John W. Colt, managing editor of the Star, last night in a speech to representatives at the convention of the Kappa Alpha college fraternity at the Hotel Muehlebach.

"I am convinced," he said, "that we must put a stop to the fantastic giveaway parts of the aid program and set the rest of it on a long-term loan basis."

SEES MUCH PROGRESS

Colt, who recently returned from his third trip to Western Europe in 10 years, said he was amazed at the economic recovery and present day prosperity of that area.

"If someone were to ask me just what was the main difference I have noticed in this last trip and the other two, which were in 1950 and 1954, I would say it was the present air of prosperity," he said. "It puzzles the tourist who has been contributing taxes for foreign aid.

"Aren't we approaching the time when we can cease to be banker at no rate of interest and with little or no prospect of getting it back? I don't know of any bank in the history of the world that has survived on such a program."

SOME AID IS NECESSARY

His conclusion:

"Let's don't presume we can change all this foreign-aid system overnight, a system which amounts to the largest engineering, supplying, and banking operation of all time.

"The foreign aid program is only one instrument we have for influencing the course of the world's struggle, but it is a necessary one. This makes it all the more important that the program be placed on a sound basis if it is going to be necessary to the security of the free world, for many years to come. We cannot continue the present pattern of waste." Colt pointed out that since foreign aid started in 1946 the United States has paid out between $70 and $80 billion. He compared it to crating up 16 or 17 of our largest cities and shipping them to Europe. He added that the Federal budget has been balanced only five times in the last 27 years.

A MORTGAGE ON FUTURE

"We are putting a massive mortgage on our future production and wealth to the extent of more than $280 billion (the approximate national debt). This Federal debt, borne by us, only 6 percent of the world's population, is greater than the combined debt of all the other (86) countries in the world, including the 70 we are giving money to," he said.

Referring to a report to Congress recently, Colt pointed out that in 1957 the United States led the world with a production valued at $440 billion compared to $397 billion for all of Western Europe and $175 billion for Russia and her satellites. The report, he continued, estimated that by 1970, Western Europe would lead with $800 billion, wtih $740 for the United States and $400 billion for the U.S.S.R.

"As the economy of our debtors rises we find growing competition from foreign goods. The economic facts of life are that in many cases we are financing a competition that puts U.S. citizens out of work.

"Hasn't the time arrived when free-world countries must start taking over the project of helping themselves? They must establish strong economies sometime; why not now?"

Colt said that 80 percent of foreign aid under the present program is given away, never to be repaid, that the United States will recover only about one dollar out of every five provided.

He pointed out too, that in some cases our aid programs have made enemies rather than friends out of the recipients, and that the money is often wasted.

Systematic Retirement of the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the National Federation of Independent Business has polled its entire membership on my bill creating a systematic retirement of the national debt. This poll included more than 130,000 independent businessmen all over the Nation, and the result of the poll shows an overwhelming 86 percent in favor of the bill.

Only 10 percent expressed doubt about the efficacy of the proposition and 4 percent expressed no opinion.

This overwhelming endorsement resulting from this actual poll of small businessmen throughout the Nation corresponds with the general enthusiasm I have encountered in the public at large in favor of this proposal to retire the national debt on a systematic basis.

Texas "Aggie" Earns Education and Maturity in 4 Years With Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important factors in our democracy which has made our country great is our splendid colleges and universities. Of these schools none has made a greater contribution to our democratic way of life than Texas A. & M. College at College Station.

Although we have other outstanding colleges in Texas—among them Lamar State College of Technology, which I attended before it became a 4-year college, and the University of Texas, where I received my work in journalism and law—there is no Texan who is not proud of the splendid academic record of Texas A. & M. I know each member of the Texas delegation shares with our colleague, Congressman OLIN TEAGUE, who represents the district which includes College Station, the justifiable pride he feels for his own alma mater.

This pride we all feel for Texas A. & M. reaches beyond its high academic standards to include the remarkable esprit de corps of Texas "Aggies" and the guidance this spirit gives to its graduates throughout their lives. Loyalty is a most commendable attribute of any man and loyalty to the worthwhile traditions of "Aggieland" is particularly commendable.

A devoted alumnus of Texas A. & M. and my good friend, Mr. C. L. Babcock, of Beaumont, this year sponsored a campuswide essay contest with entries to be written on the subject: "What Does Texas A. & M. College Mean to the Average Student?" The winner of this contest was a senior student from my congressional district—Mr. Tommy Keith, of Cleveland.

Mr. Keith has written in a few hundred words the experiences and challenges at Texas A. & M. that have helped him, as he puts it, in the long climb from boyhood to manhood. Few things are more important to either men or boys.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Charlie Babcock should be commended for making it possible for such an essay to be written, and after having read Tommy

Keith's account of his nearly 4 years as a Texas Aggie, I feel sure each of our colleagues in the House will join me in congratulating this fine young man for a job well done.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Keith's essay be included in the RECORD at this point:

TEXAS A. & M.—WHAT IT MEANS TO ME

(By Tommy Keith)

An individual goes to college for various reasons, but primarily for one thing—an education. Certainly Texas A. & M. stands out as one of Texas' outstanding educational institutions, but means much more than that to me.

One of the first things that comes to my mind as I think of what A. & M. means to me is how it has assisted me in growing up and maturing. I came to Aggieland straight off the farm. I attended a small high school where nearly everyone, even I, was a "wheel" of sorts. I had a highly exaggerated opinion of myself which certainly needed to be destroyed.

It took only about 2 days in the corps and approximately an equal number of days in class to knock the props completely out from under me. Everything I did seemed wrong. I decided that the thing to do was get out of the terrible old corps, but changed my mind after a man-to-man talk with an upperclassman to whom I am still grateful. I became convinced that the real thing to do was stay and fight it out instead of running away, even if I did have to sacrifice my curls and see my "steady" only three times a semester.

This was undoubtedly one of the turning points of my life. I could fill the entire space of this essay enumerating duties, pressures, and so forth, that I was subjected to. But the important thing is that I had to cope with these things to remain at A. & M. and I feel that facing them helped me greatly in the long climb from boyhood to manhood.

At A. & M. I learned tolerance that was unheard of, to me at least before I entered. As in any military organization that is to achieve any measure of success, certain disciplinary steps must be taken. Walking the "bull-ring" is not my idea of the perfect way to spend a sunny Saturday, nor is "call to quarters" my concept of an entertaining night. But I had to endure them and I feel that even though their value can't be measured in dollars and cents the training they and similar things provided will be most valuable on jobs I hold.

To me it is impressive that some of the things that are standard procedure and just routine at A. & M., though unheard of at most other colleges, can be of much value. For example, "whipping out" (introducing oneself) provides valuable training in meeting and remembering people.

No discussion of what A. & M. means to me would be complete without mentioning traditions. I may soon forget many of the formulas taught in freshman math, but I will never forget how I feel at Silver Taps. I may forget the skeletal makeup of my body, but I shall never forget the first muster I attended. I have already forgotten many of the laws of physic, but memories of the Aggie bonfire shall stay with me always. Traditions will most assuredly occupy a big portion of my memories of A. & M.

I stated in my opening paragraph that an individual goes to college primarily for an education, and though A. & M. is outstanding in this field, it means much more to me.

I have listed a few of the other things which could be classified as more or less accessory benefits and could enumerate many more if room permitted. However, I don't want to minimize what A. & M. means to me from the standpoint of education, for I feel that this would have to be listed in the position of top importance. I don't mean to completely divorce education from the other things I have discussed because I think they are certainly a vital part of it. But in this particular discussion I am referring to education as the training and knowledge one gains in his particular field of study.

I am strong in the conviction that A. & M. is unsurpassed in this category. Before I came to college I was interested in agriculture and knew several leaders in the field who were A. & M. graduates. This is probably the biggest reason I entered. I might add that it was the logical reason since theoretically a person goes to college mainly for one reason—so he can "live a little higher off the hog." So naturally I wanted to pick the school I thought would do the best job.

But not until after I started to college did I become fully aware of A. & M.'s prestige as an institution of higher learning. Students in almost any field are confronted with a difficult schedule designed to do the best possible job of preparing them for their work after graduation. It is also significant to me that a number of employers seem to be aware of this.

This means a lot to me. It means that while I am in school I have the benefit of top training and preparation, and it means that when I am graduated I carry with me the reputation and prestige of an educational institution which is widely recognized for its success in turning out topmen.

A common Aggie complaint is that we have no girls and not enough parties, as coeducational institutions do. But even this means a lot to me. It means added prestige and helps to set A. & M. apart from the run-of-the-mill schools. Of course, there are other factors involved, but the lack of many so-called good times gives people the true impression that we are here for what we should be—an education.

As I look over this essay, I realize that I have fallen far short of adequately telling what A. & M. means to me. But as I think about it, this is quite natural. I feel that Aggies have a lot to be proud of—and I challenge any man to attend Texas A. & M. almost 4 years as I have and put what it means to him in a meager 1,000 words.

Luzerne County's Civil Defense Program Proven of Value

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Keystone Defender of July–August, 1959, on the civil defense program of Luzerne County, Pa. This publication is released monthly by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania State Council of Civil Defense, Harrisburg, Pa.

LUZERNE'S CIVIL DEFENSE POLICE PROGRAM PROVEN OF VALUE

During last spring's Susquehanna River mine disaster civil defense police from Pittston, Dupont, Exeter, Wyoming, West Wyoming, and Jenkins and Plains Townships, all of Luzerne County, did outstanding work around the clock assisting State and local police in traffic and crowd control.

This disaster, termed an extreme emergency both by Governor Lawrence and President Eisenhower, had attracted the curious from near and far.

Fortunately Luzerne County Civil Defense had long placed emphasis on auxiliary police training (at this writing, 1,300 trained and duly enrolled). Lt. Col. Frank Townend, Luzerne director had agreed with Auxiliary Police Chief Frank Flynn's viewpoint:

"I feel the greatest deterrent to panic are trained men. And the better the traffic control at a disaster scene, the fewer casualties. We're training auxiliary police for one purpose—civil defense disaster."

Chief Flynn has a goal of 3,000 trained auxiliary police in Luzerne County—trained, and organized.

"After the training period none of the classes has drifted away or disbanded," Chief Flynn writes. "This is due largely to real interest shown by local police chiefs and regulars. Our chiefs and his assistants take the course right along with us. At graduation the local police assist the new auxiliaries in forming companies, platoons, and squads, each with a leader but always under supervision of the chief of police.

"Some of our units organized socially, meeting at least once a month and electing officers and paying dues. Wives and families often join in social gatherings."

Chief Flynn stresses the cooperation of heads of local political subdivisions. "They've helped us a lot under the Federal Matching Fund program," he asserts. But men have purchased uniforms without such assistance.

"Keeping the outfit together after training" appears to be the No. one problem facing civil defense police units today. Chief Flynn's comments have a value here. Ideas from other leaders across the State will be welcomed.

Cheaper Men's Wear From the Far East Threatens U.S. Market, Worries Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wall Street Journal, of September 9, 1959.

CHEAPER MEN'S WEAR FROM THE FAR EAST THREATENS U.S. MARKET, WORRIES INDUSTRY

(By Laurence G. O'Donnell)

NEW YORK.—Men's suitmakers are getting nervous about competitive imports from Japan and Hong Kong.

Bringing in suits from the Orient in growing numbers, importers are able to undersell domestic competitors by about $10 a suit at wholesale, even after including shipping and tariff costs, U.S. producers protest. These importers are finding an eager market among the big department store chains, domestic suitmakers contend.

Although the foreign competition isn't seriously hurting America's suit industry yet, the trade worries about continuation of a trend that may eventually affect the business of big volume garment producers, as well as small retail outlets.

Lower labor costs give foreign suitmakers the edge, U.S. suit manufacturers say. Domestic suit producers pay union workers about $2.12 an hour, including fringe benefits, for a 40-hour week. In Japan, workers receive 14 cents an hour, benefits included, for a 50-hour week. In Hong Kong, the current wage rate is 9¾ cents an hour. Labor costs figure out to about one-third of a suit's cost.

So far, suit makers in Japan and Hong Kong are turning out only about 10,000 garments a month, but the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States, a leader of the anti-imports drive, estimates it won't be long before Japanese and Hong Kong production reaches 50,000 suits a month or more.

SHARE OF MARKET APPRAISED

Projecting this rate to an annual production figure of over 700,000 suits, it's estimated the suit trade in Hong Kong and Japan would soon have about 4 percent of the U.S. market, based on last year's domestic output of 17.7 million suits.

Already, clothing makers and union workers have taken their case to Congress. The C.M.A. and Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America recently explained their plight to 19 Senators. Result: This week New York's Senator KEATING will introduce a bill to amend existing tariff laws to aid the suit business.

The industry says it wants a "sliding scale of duty rates," which would take into consideration the comparative hourly wages of foreign and American workers.

Although the suit industry complains about Hong Kong exports, its ire really centers on the Japanese situation. To avoid labor costs in the United States, "several so-called 'American entrepreneurs'" have opened up clothing factories in foreign countries, asserts Harry A. Cobrin, executive secretary of the C.M.A. "Ready-made clothing factories are now beginning to mushroom in Japan," he says. "We're crying wolf before it's too late." Mr. Cobrin stresses that "readymade clothing plants previously had not existed in Japan because the average male there usually wears custom made or special order garments."

The men's suit business, of course, is just one of many sectors of the apparel and textile industries fighting imports. Late last week, the National Cotton Council, speaking for cotton growers as well as the cotton cloth mills, filed a new petition with the Agriculture Department; it seeks import quotas or tariff rate increases to curb the inflow of cheaply produced textile products from abroad.

Some divisions of the textile and apparel trades have already worked out some compromises on imports from Japan. The Commerce Department arranged a system of "voluntary quotas" on shirt imports from Japan, for example. Since it took effect in 1957, Japanese imports have totaled 1 million dozen a year, or 2½ to 3 percent of the U.S. output.

Suit makers, however, favor the "sliding scale of duty rates," rather than quota systems. "We want them (the oriental suit makers) to pay a decent wage," Mr. Cobrin of the C.M.A. says.

It's known, though, that the suit industry fears evasions of "voluntary quotas," which plagued shirtmakers in the past. Shirtmakers found that Japanese exporters got around the "voluntary quotas" by shipping goods to the United States via other countries; currently, however, the shirt business thinks these "deviations" have been curbed.

Current import restrictions on woolen imports are causing problems for suitmakers. Their domestic supply of suit fabrics has diminished with the sharp cutbacks in U.S. woolen and worested mills during the past decade. With the big upswing in demand for suits so far this year, suitmakers have been caught short of piece goods and are unable to satisfy completely their needs in U.S. markets. And they've found "no important relief from fabric imports," either, according to one major suitmaker.

SHIPMENTS FROM ITALY UP

Reason: Woolen fabric imports are governed by quotas. This year, exporters of low-quality woolen from the Prato district of Italy, near Milan, shipped more than 11 million square yards of cloth to the United States before the "cutoff" date in May. That was 198 percent more than in 1958, and more than any other country including Great Britain, a key supplier of woolens. "Prato" cloth isn't usable in men's suits.

Imports from Great Britain slipped 2 percent to just under 11 million square yards, while fabric imports from Japan, another key source, dropped 18 percent to 8.1 million square yards. As a result of the "Prato" imports, foreign supplies of men's suit materials was sharply reduced, complain suitmakers.

They concede they could have bought imported cloth after the "cutoff" date. But the increased cost of this cloth, caused by higher tariff rates, would have made the price "prohibitive for manufacturers of popular-priced clothing," says one executive.

The tariff setup on woolen goods shapes up this way:

The importer pays ad valorem duty (based on the value of the cloth) of 25 percent plus 37½ cents a pound. After the "cutoff" date, the ad valorem rate soars to 45 percent (the higher rate goes into effect when 5 percent of the previous 3 years' average domestic wool fabric output is matched by imports).

Poison in Your Water—No. 169

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Twin City Sentinel of February 18, 1958, entitled "Twelve Towns, Firms Pollute Streams":

TWELVE TOWNS, FIRMS POLLUTE STREAMS

(By Gene Whitman)

The State stream sanitation committee listed a dozen Rockingham County towns and industrial firms today as significant pollution sources in the Roanoke River basin.

It identified Draper, Leaksville, Madison, Mayodan, Reidsville, Spray and Stoneville in Rockingham, and Walnut Cove across the line in Stokes, as communities which have insufficient sewage treatment, or none at all.

It listed Fieldcrest Mills at Draper, Leaksville, and Spray, Leaksville Woolen Mills, Inc. at Spray and Washington Mills Co. at Mayodan as industrial polluters. Other towns and firms farther east were listed.

The cities and industrial firms are expected to advise the division of water pollution control of the State board of health within 60 days whether they contemplate voluntary action to abate the pollution and apply for a temporary permit.

COULD CONTINUE

Under the temporary permit, they would be allowed to continue discharging wastes into the streams under a satisfactory time schedule for building adequate treatment facilities.

The North Carolina policy is not to start enforcement action if satisfactory compliance from the towns and industries is obtained voluntary.

There was no estimate of the money which will be required to treat the sewage and industrial wastes. The committee suggested that towns and their industries get together on treatment plans, if possible.

Committee conclusions on the pollution and the steps needed to abate it included:

Draper: A system expected to serve 3,500 persons discharges sewage without treatment. A treatment plant should be built as soon as possible.

Leakesville: A system collecting sewage from an estimated 5,080 provides no treatment. A plant should be built as soon as possible.

TWO SEPTIC TANKS

Madison: Sewage from approximately 1,200 flows through two septic tanks that are grossly overloaded. A secondary treatment plant should be built as soon as possible.

Mayodan: A municipal sewage system serves an estimated 2,000 and receives domestic sewage from Washington Mills. A small intermediate treatment plant is overloaded and not properly operated and maintained. It should be either enlarged or replaced.

Reidsville: Sewage from a plant serving about 4,000 is discharged into the Roanoke basin, increasing the coliform bacteria. No further physical improvements are indicated at present, but the city should begin planning to enlarge its facilities or pump the wastes into its new plant for treatment.

Spray: The sewage system collecting wastes from an estimated 5,000 provides no treatment. Proper treatment facilities should be built as soon as possible.

Stoneville: A sewage system serves an estimated 530 and gives both primary and secondary treatment, but needed repairs and alterations should be provided.

Walnut Cove: The sewage system serves only about 566 people—a small portion of the town. A primary treatment plant is overloaded and some sewage is discharged without treatment. The town should consider extending its sewer lines into areas not now served and providing treatment in a single plant.

Fieldcrest Mills, Draper: Sewage from each mill is given partial treatment in a septic tank, then discharged into the river. Treatment equal to secondary treatment should be provided.

Fieldcrest Mills, Leaksville: Sanitary sewage, dye house and finishing wastes are discharged without treatment. Facilities should be built, providing the equivalent of secondary treatment.

Fieldcrest Mills, Spray: Sanitary sewage, dye house and finishing wastes are discharged without treatment. Facilities should be built providing the equivalent of secondary treatment.

Leaksville Woolen Mills, Spray: Sanitary sewage and a small amount of industrial waste are discharged without treatment. If the town of Spray will not accept wastes, the company should determine the most practical method of treatment.

Washington Mills Co., Mayodan: Overflow sanitary, bleach and dye wastes are discharged without treatment. They should be treated prior to discharge.

A West Point for Science and Engineering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in three campaigns for Congress, I urged that emphasis be placed on the training of

young people particularly in the field of science and engineering. The following is from a speech made in Overland Park, Kans., on August 9, 1956.

We should offer scholarships for capable students or establish a West Point for Science and Engineering as soon as possible in order to train much needed scientists and engineers.

The Republican administration since taking office in 1953 has failed to grasp the importance of having sufficient trained scientists and engineers in order to maintain a strong and firm economy and national defense.

Today I am introducing a resolution which I trust will result in thorough consideration being given to the establishment of a U.S. Science and Engineering Academy. No better location for such an institution could be found than at Sunflower, Kans., where over 10,000 acres, many buildings and much equipment under control of the Army are now standing idle. An advanced academy of this type could be combined with one for foreign service training which would give special emphasis to foreign languages.

The Science Advisory Committee recently appointed by the President, while attempting to avoid statements which conflict with the policy of the present national administration, certainly took cognizance of the great need for training in the science, engineering and other fields.

Dr. Edward Teller and Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover and many other outstanding Americans have sounded the alarm that Communist Russia will far outdistance us in the education of our youth unless decisive action is taken immediately. Only by proper and adequate education can we maintain, or regain, our leadership in the field of science and foreign relations.

Before the advent of the first Russian sputnik an editorial written by Miss Helen E. Kohlenberg, editor, appeared in the Western Spirit, published at Paola, Miami County, Kans., on Thursday, June 28, 1956, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Miss Kohlenberg's editorial.

THE GEORGE PROPOSAL

In his statement released at the time of filing as Democratic candidate for Congress from the Second District of Kansas, NEWELL A. GEORGE, Kansas City attorney, advocated the establishment of a "West Point" for science and engineering to provide the needed technically trained young people.

This stems from a condition of which few Americans are cognizant. But recent statements by top administration officials to the effect that Russia holds superiority over America in certain lines of national defense are just cause for action along the lines of promoting science and engineering research and training. We train young people in other lines through scholarships and they enter the professions or industry. Hence, scholarships are not the answer.

A West Point for science and engineering, established along the lines of the naval, Army, and air academies would serve to remove the shortage of scientists and engineers by providing an incentive to young people to enter those fields of endeavor, and young people thus trained would serve their country just as heroically as do the military.

Need for immediate action is emphasized in the testimony of Gen. Earle E. Partridge before the Symington committee that Communist Russia is far advanced in the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile. Other testimony was to the effect that one thermonuclear (hydrogen) weapon could completely destroy one of our large cities and that Russia has the planes to deliver such weapons.

GEORGE'S suggestion that no better location for such an academy could be found than in the Second Kansas District fits into the picture of the movement by the Government, the military, and industry to midwestern locations.

Mr. GEORGE'S proposal for such an academy is the first that has come to our attention and we urge that it be given serious consideration.

Good Services Recognized

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON G. ROGERS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Mr. R. James Malloy, an employee of the Bureau of Reclamation in the Denver, Colo., office, has devoted his extra time in the last 4 years to make recreational development for the people of Colorado a reality.

His services in this regard have been without remuneration or hope of reward. However, the Denver Post, on August 29, 1959, placed Mr. Malloy in its hall of fame because of his successful efforts to have Cherry Creek Reservoir developed as a State recreational area. There were many complicated problems in the achievement of his objective because the U.S. Government had constructed a dam on waters controlled by the State of Colorado. Nevertheless, Mr. Malloy was able to bring about a solution to the problems and today the people of Colorado are enjoying a new recreational area because of the leadership of Mr. Malloy.

Most of the people interested in the recreational area joined in a letter setting out the accomplishments of Mr. Malloy. The letter is as follows:

We are writing this letter in appreciation of a Colorado and Denver citizen who we feel should because of his personal accomplishments in the last 4 years in the field of recreational development for the people of Colorado be given public recognition.

We refer to R. James Malloy, a respected member of practically every boating and wildlife organization in the State and who some 4 years ago was the first person to start a crusade to impound water behind Cherry Creek Reservoir. His and our dream was culminated this summer when the State parks and recreation department opened this area for the people of Colorado.

Because of the hundreds of letters he wrote to Federal agencies, State officials, and to the Colorado congressional delegation, and the many personal conferences with all concerned in pursuit of his dream that this area should be fully developed as a recreational area, he can truly be called the father of the Cherry Creek recreational development.

Coincidently with the Cherry Creek project, he had his sights on other recreational areas that he felt should be made available to the people of Colorado. After 2 years of negotiation, on April 24 of this year, he personally negotiated a contract and agreement with the Denver Water Board to open Antero Reservoir for boating and boat fishing only, with Cheesman, Gross, and Eleven Mile Reservoir to follow next year. The operating contract between the Denver Water Board and the State parks and recreation department was signed on July 28, 1959, and Antero Reservoir should be opened for public use no later than August 15, 1959. As a result of his efforts, future years will see thousands of Colorado families enjoying these areas. For years in his talks before boating and wildlife organizations he has stressed and pleaded for more effective planning and use of Colorado's outdoor recreation resources. A recent statement we heard him make is, "Boating, fishing, camping, hiking, skiing, and hundreds of other recreational opportunities can and must be wisely developed so that present and future Coloradans can more fully enjoy their own State—the greatest State in the Union." In collaboration with Harold Lathrop, State director parks and recreation department, and at the request of Senator Dunkley of Denver he wrote Colorado's boating bill which was passed by the last general assembly. He is a hunter, fisherman, boater, and water skier. We feel that he can be called Colorado's No. 1 sportsman and boater.

He is a supervisory official of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and he has accomplished these things on his personal time without financial remuneration from any organization.

We feel that he is a credit to the State of Colorado and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation who employ his services.

Because of his aggressive leadership throughout the years, we recommend him to you for proper public recognition and your newspaper's Hall of Fame as Colorado's No. 1 Sportsman for 1959.

Sincerely,

Patrick W. Chamberlain, representing the Rocky Mountain Boat Racing Club, Inc., Arvada, Colo.; Paul L. St. Onge, representing the Outboard Boating Club of Metropolitan Denver, Denver, Colo.; James B. Jurgens, representing the Inboard Association, Denver, Colo.; Gene Wensinger, representing the Riviera Lake Boating Club, Denver, Colo.; Robert T. Roath, representing the Mile Hi Boat Racing Club, Denver, Colo.; C. N. Centers, commander, U.S. Coast Guard Flotilla No. 2012, Denver, Colo.; Leon S. Brunner, Jr., representing the Metropolitan Wildlife Association, Englewood, Colo.; John L. Shumaker, representing the Sailboat Association, Littleton, Colo.; Wilfred Howard, Jr., representing the Denver Municipal Boating Association, Denver, Colo.; Tris Calomino, representing the Calomino Marine Co., and past president, Marine Dealers Association, Denver, Colo.

The Work of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I would like to insert the following radio editorial which was broadcast over station KOAT-TV in Albuquerque, N. Mex., on September 15, 1959:

In closing tonight, this food for thought: Along about this time of year the people as a group and the press in general begin to get a little impatient with Congress. Senators are accused of dragging their feet, Congressmen are often accused of clamping the lid on important legislation. However, if for just 1 day, every person in the Nation could read the complete CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it would make one thing clear. The boys in Washington may take a while to get things accomplished * * * but a great deal of research and thinking goes into their final decrees. The RECORD is full of very enlightening reasoning by men supporting both sides of any controversy. And the choice of which side to take can sometimes be tough. Generally speaking, though, Congress as a body does an excellent job in keeping the wheels of Government going. The proof of this is that the wheels have never stopped and look good for the next three or four centuries, at least.

The Late Honorable Edmund P. Radwan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply sorry to learn about the passing away of our former colleague from New York, the late Honorable Edmund P. Radwan.

I had the privilege of serving with Congressman Radwan on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Through our close association over the years, I learned to respect him greatly for his integrity, for the soundness of his judgment, and for his devotion to his legislative duties. I know that many of my colleagues have shared my esteem for him. We are deeply moved by the sad news of his death.

It is indeed tragic that someone so young, so able, and having—to all appearances—the whole world in front of him, should have suffered so much and been called by his Maker in the prime of his life. The illness which ultimately led to Congressman Radwan's death had earlier forced him to resign from the Congress and to abandon the life of public service to which he had devoted himself with such vigor and devotion. That grievous misfortune was compounded by the ordeal of repeated surgeries which he had to undergo, and by great physical pain and suffering.

Although we cannot always understand the workings and designs of the divine providence, we must seek consolation today in the thought that the good Lord had called our late colleague to be among His very own.

I want to extend my deepest sympathy to Congressman Radwan's family and his friends. May the good Lord keep them in His special care during this time of their great sorrow and loss.

The New Face of Our Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the developments in our foreign trade in the last 18 months have been so startling and ominous that the Congress should no longer look upon the scene with folded arms.

The trends that have become apparent cast a serious doubt over our foreign trade policy, and especially over the wisdom of entering into negotiations for further tariff reductions, such as are contemplated in 1960. Our exports have been dropping in serious proportions since 1957 and efforts to restore them depend largely upon further subsidization.

Raw cotton is an example. Our exports have declined alarmingly, from some 6 million bales to less than 3 million. Now we have increased the subsidy by allowing exports at prices 8 cents per pound below the domestic price, compared with the previous 6½ cents. This increase in the differential between the domestic and the export price is expected to lift exports to 5 million bales.

We cannot expect to subsidize all exports. Among the heavy volume shipments abroad in the past have been automobiles and steel. Now we import more of each than we export. Are we going to subsidize these exports in order to recoup our export markets? From the trends that have become apparent we would soon be subsidizing one line of exports after another. We have long subsidized merchant shipbuilding and the merchant marine in order to keep it on the high seas. Even so there has been a serious decline in the share of world trade carried by American-flag ships.

It must be obvious that we cannot ask the Treasury to bail out every industry that either finds itself losing its foreign market or crowded more and more in the domestic market by imports or both. Yet, an increasing number of our industries are finding themselves in that situation.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an address made by O. R. Strackbein before the Plumbing Brass Institute on the occasion of their annual meeting in White Sulphur Springs, W. Va. Mr. Strackbein presents an analysis designed to demonstrate that the present import-export situation is not a passing phenomenon but the reflection of a very serious shift in our international competitive position that shows this country in a weak and weakening position.

I commend his address to all Members:

THE NEW FACE OF OUR FOREIGN TRADE

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy before the Plumbing Brass Institute, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., September 2, 1959)

In March of this year our imports reached a record high level above any previous month in our history. In June the March record was surpassed. Also in June our imports exceeded our commercial exports. The first half of 1959 saw our imports run 18 percent ahead of the first half of last year.

Our exports on the other hand have declined. In 1958 they dropped 16 percent from the preceding year and during the present year they have declined roughly another 5 percent.

These trends are being explained by liberal trade proponents as being temporary and abnormal. They say that the high imports this year are swollen by heavy steel imports attributable to the steel strike, the popularity of the small foreign automobile, and several other extraordinary factors. When the steel strike is settled and when the domestic automobile industry brings out its so-called compact car, imports will presumably level off. Last week Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns in a press conference expressed the opinion that our exports would rise; and he doubted that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets.

As for exports, the freer-trade apologists expect cotton exports to spurt and jet plane shipments to zoom, and thus to raise the export level.

If we examine these explanations and hopes we find that even though steel and automobile imports have risen, coffee and petroleum imports, which are among the highest of all, have suffered a decline in dollar value. If coffee prices rise this year imports will again loom larger. Also, it may be questioned whether steel imports will fall substantially after the strike. They began rising over a year before the strike was called and price comparisons with the foreign product would indicate a continuation of imports at a level considerably higher than in the past. If a judgment can be based on the experience with other products, imports that have a distinct price advantage will continue to increase; and steel should be no exception.

The same reservation applies to the small foreign car. It may be found that imported cars have established a market for themselves that will not readily yield to the smaller American car. Of course, even if the automobile industry, with its mass production techniques, should succeed in stemming the import tide without resort to import restrictions, this would offer little comfort to other industries that do not possess the vast resources of this giant among American industrial wonders. The test even with automobiles, however, is still to be met.

It should also be pointed out that the petroleum imports that helped swell the total import volume for the first half of 1959 began to decline after March when mandatory import quotas were established. This again would indicate that total June imports of all products were not abnormally high. Petroleum and coffee imports, both of which were down from previous levels, have been the No. 1 and No. 2 imports in dollar value for several years. Therefore the increased steel and automobile imports that are used as explanations to account for the surge in our total imports do not of themselves succeed in making the high import levels of recent times abnormal. They are offset by declines elsewhere that may be of a temporary nature. Moreover, high steel and automobile imports may continue.

That exports of cotton may increase seems assured with the increase in the export subsidy that went into effect August 1. Such an increase in exports will, however, be an artificial rather than a normal and healthy expansion, since the subsidy amounts to about 30 percent of the price. An increase of this kind should not be counted as a sound commercial development nor should the upward surge be listed as reflecting the capacity of the American economy to com-

pete in the world market—quite the contrary in fact.

The anticipated increase in plane exports may also help to boost exports. This is expected to be in the magnitude of $400 or $500 million per year and will represent commercial exports. However, a sharp decline has been registered in coal exports within the past year, and this does not appear to be headed toward a reversal. An increase in exports in some other field, such as the expected rise in sales of planes abroad will indeed be needed to offset this loss.

Steel exports have recently been exceeded by imports at a ratio of two to one or more. This is a startling development. In 1958 imports of typewriters for the first time also exceeded our exports. In many other fields, such as electronics, sporting goods, fishing tackle, cameras, sewing machines, farm tractors, etc., imports have increased sharply. Machine tools have also had the experience of increasing imports and falling exports; and this is very significant because machine tools are of themselves sources of technological development. Greater self-sufficiency abroad, as indicated by the decline in our exports, combined with the ability of other countries to export machine tools to us, are more than straws in the wind to be blown out of the way by the words of Assistant Secretary Kearns.

In the textile field exports have been declining for several years while imports have risen greatly. The trend to higher imports was halted, temporarily at least, by inducing Japan, the principal source of imports, to impose export restrictions on her shipments to us. That such restriction was necessary in order to save the domestic industry demonstrates once more the weak competitive position in which we find ourselves in the foreign field.

It should be clear enough all around that the increasing imports since 1957 plus the decline in exports since that time reflect, not an abnormal and passing condition, but bespeak yet greater competitive trouble for many of our domestic industries in the future.

There is yet further evidence of the uncomfortable position in which the United States finds herself in the foreign trade field. In 1958 we experienced a defict of $3.4 billion in our total foreign account even though our merchandise exports exceeded our imports by more than $3 billion. Actual gold shipments abroad covered some $2.3 billion of this deficit. This drain on our gold has continued through the first half of 1959 during which period we lost another $955 million in gold. Our gold stock in Fort Knox has fallen below the $20 billion mark, the lowest level since 1940. The National Foreign Trade Council recently estimated a deficit of nearly $5 billion in our total foreign account for 1959.

The foregoing facts will not be vaporized by glib assurances of the freer-trade elements. The latter seemingly have lost their contact with reality.

There is much else beside the statistics of imports and exports and figures on gold drain and falling U.S. gold reserves that should indicate even to the blindest that the United States has come into a highly vulnerable competitive position in the world. Even our great mass production industries, these giants that have been in the technological forefront and in the vanguard of automation are now finding themselves beset by a competition that is beyond their reach.

There should be no element of surprise in this at all. Other countries have imported or otherwise obtained from us through foreign aid approximately $30 billion of modern machinery in the past 11 years, $21 billion of it in the past 6 years. Installation of this machinery abroad has brought with it a great boost in foreign productivity. During these same years in the neighborhood of 10,000 foreign productivity teams have been given access to our factories.

The increase in foreign productivity, while uneven, has obviously been startling in many instances. Modern machinery superimposed on a low level of technology or primitive machinery, as has happened in many foreign production centers, has meant a boost in productivity not experienced in this country. We have saved a number of countries a generation of research and development by making available to them our latest technology.

This is not said by way of complaint; but we should at least have sufficient insight to comprehend the probable consequences of our policies. The echoes are now coming in from many directions.

Not least among our difficulties is the fact that foreign labor unions have yet far to go to equal ours in bargaining capacity. They are hobbled psychologically no less than ideologically. Therefore increasing productivity shows up in lower costs abroads more readily than in this country.

Not only is the trend in our trade in the past 18 months not abnormal; the competitive situation on which it is based is not a superficial one. The cause is deep seated and was long in the making. The higher costs of production in many of our industries compared with foreign costs are the result of developments that will not be undone overnight. In seeking to adjust to them an increasing number of our industries have been arranging for foreign production. Some of them have established branch plants in other countries; others are in the process of doing so and still others are studying the possibilities. In other instances licensing arrangements are made with foreign producers whereby our patents are made available on a royalty basis. Then again some of our companies have bought foreign concerns outright or purchased a substantial interest in them. Others are still shopping for production facilities in a number of countries.

The purpose is to gain the advantage of lower wages and thus to become competitive in foreign markets. In some instances as in the case of automobiles, tractors, and typewriters, the foreign branches or subsidiaries ship the foreign-made product into this country itself. Principally, however, the purpose has been to hold the export position or rather to make up for the loss of exports by supplying foreign markets from foreign sources.

This trend toward partial emigration represents an adjustment by our industries to the competitive facts of life. As imports encroach on the market in this country and deprive our own industries of ever increasing shares of their accustomed market, industry is driven abroad as a matter of self-defense. Since capital has mobility this is not only a possible move but in many instances an unavoidable and sometimes a profitable one.

What is wrong with it?

There is nothing wrong with the self-defensive movement of itself; but there is something disturbingly wrong with the conditions that have brought forward this type of economic defense as a competitive necessity.

It is often said that we have priced ourselves out of foreign markets. This may be admitted without placing the blame on any particular factor of the domestic economy. Many will say that it is our high wages; but it would be just as easy to say that foreign wages are too low. Certainly heavy contributing factors of our high costs are the war expenditures and postwar defense outlays, the heavy national debt, price supports for agriculture, social security, etc. Our wages are admittedly high but we should not overlook the fact that they provide the tremendous purchasing power that has kept our economy at a high level. If foreign wages were higher than they are in relation to foreign productivity our higher wages would not create a competitive disadvantage, such as is now the case.

If foreign wages could be increased our competitive troubles would disappear; but there is no present method that can be employed by us to accomplish this objective immediately or very soon.

The question then arises what can be done.

There are those who, though recognizing the difficulty, say that tariffs are not the answer; and, of course, tariffs are not the complete answer. They say that we must invent and modernize and sell more vigorously; we must mechanize all possible production and in general become more efficient.

All these years we had been told by the liberal trade advocates that we were in the forefront in technology, productivity, know-how, and efficiency. Now, it appears, this is no longer true and we need to buckle down to hard work, take in our belts, and reinvigorate our economy. Very well, but other countries are mechanizing, too, and since they have a lower starting base they can easily outstrip us in raising their productivity. They, too, are buckling down and inventing and selling. Moreover, we are still assisting some of them technologically and financially and putting our techniques at their disposal.

The prospects are not bright for a pull away by this country. Not at all. The other countries now have all that it takes to catch up with us, including the creation of mass markets. The question is how their catching up is to be accomplished. Must we be torn down in the process, or can we hold our own while the other countries come up?

We need a holding defense. This can best be contrived through a combination of tariffs and quotas, by the use of which suitable shares of our market can be opened to imports while reserving the remainder for ourselves. We can thus recognize the need for a high volume of trade without placing our industries on the sacrificial block as pawns in the shifting currents of international politics.

American industry is exposed competitively to imports to a degree not previously experienced. Our defenses are down, with an average tariff protection about 80 percent below the level of 25 years ago; and there is virtually no remedy today against injury from low-cost imports.

For these and other reasons it would be high folly to consider the present foreign trade situation as a passing phase of an abnormal development. Most of the pointers indicate otherwise. Therefore we should prepare for what appears to be ahead.

Reserve Air Fleet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gaffney Ledger, Gaffney, S.C., of September 8, 1959:

RESERVE AIR FLEET

In Washington it has been proposed that a large-scale loan guarantee program, to spur development of a national air cargo fleet, be undertaken.

This would be a highly desirable program, and it is to be hoped that it will soon be

underway. Approval, in brief, would guarantee loans to individual airlines purchasing modern, efficient cargo-carrying aircraft.

For one thing, such a program would build up the air cargo industry by enabling airlines to reduce costs and rates. Those costs and rates are high today because inefficient aircraft are being used.

The aircraft were designed for passenger transportation rather than freight.

For another thing, a modern reserve cargo fleet would be instantly available to the Nation in a military emergency, and this is something which is badly needed today. MATS aircraft are rapidly becoming obsolete, and Congress recently refused to vote any money to allow MATS to purchase jet aircraft, to be used for logistical support purposes. (Private airline companies, and their lobbying, are responsible for this congressional attitude.)

The new program would enable the commercial airlines to build up their cargo fleet, but it should be coupled with appropriations enabling MATS to modernize its logistical support fleet also.

Most MATS planes today are rapidly becoming obsolete, and Congress has not authorized any jet acquisitions. Therefore, it is vitally important to the safety of the country for the Nation to have an available capacity of jet cargo carriers.

Such a fleet should be acquired by every means available.

Successful Cooperation Between the Commander of a Military Establishment and Citizens of the Surrounding Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter forwarded to Maj. Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, commanding general at Fort Campbell, Ky., by Mr. W. Graham Harvey, president of the Hopkinsville and Christian County Chamber of Commerce, Hopkinsville, Ky.

Congressman ROSS BASS and I commend it to our colleagues as an excellent example of successful cooperation between the commander of a great military establishment and the citizens of the surrounding area:

Maj. Gen. W. C. WESTMORELAND,
Commanding General, Fort Campbell, Ky.

DEAR GENERAL WESTMORELAND: The relationship between the personnel of Fort Campbell and the townspeople of Hopkinsville, Ky., is a great credit to both of these communities. This splendid association exists not only in social contacts between members of our two communities, but also extends into the area of business relations.

This relationship is of great concern to us in Hopkinsville because we realize the well-being of the service personnel at Fort Campbell is of primary importance to us due to the important position they fill in the defense of our country.

We are proud of our relationship with Fort Campbell as it now exists because we feel it is the best we have ever had and was developed by mutual understanding and trust. Recently there was some discussion by us as to the operation of the Fort Campbell post exchange and commissaries and as we did not fully understand these operations we invited Brig. Gen. W. G. Rich to meet with our board of directors and chamber of commerce retail merchants committee. General Rich met with us and explained the operation of these facilities and did a brilliant job of answering the many questions of our members.

Later we called General Rich and through his willing cooperation a tour of these facilities was arranged for some of our merchants in order that we might still better understand their operation.

The results of the study made by the chamber of commerce board of directors and retail merchants committee are as follows:

1. While it is normal for every merchant to strive to gain the largest portion of any available market, we do realize the basic importance of the Forst Campbell post exchange and commissaries and feel that the contributions made by them as presently operated, outweigh any loss of trade these facilities might cause to us in our civilian operations. We recognize the fact that the savings the military personnel gain by purchasing on the post in most cases find their way into the local economy. We also realize that a stabilizing factor in our economy is the civilian payroll of the post exchange and commissaries and Fort Campbell.

2. Our chamber of commerce would like to compliment you and your command on the operations of the post exchange and commissaries and wish you to know we look with favor upon these facilities at Fort Campbell, maintained within their present limit, as to the type of items sold.

At a meeting of the board of directors held on July 20, 1959, I was instructed by the board to write you that after the complete study by the board of directors and the retail merchants committee that the board of directors unanimously voted to publicly endorse the operations of both post exchange and commissaries at Fort Campbell for the benefit of our Armed Forces personnel.

Yours very truly,
W. GRAHAM HARVEY,
President, Hopkinsville and Christian County Chamber of Commerce.

The Future of Labor Can Be as Useful as Its Past, Despite Present Trials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, on September 7, 1959, the Nashville Tennessean published a splendid editorial on the growth and accomplishments of labor unions in this country. This editorial is one which should be read by every person who is sincerely interested in organized labor and, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including it for this purpose.

Organized labor has accomplished a great deal for the working people of this country during this century. It has grown to a place of major importance in our economy, and it is believed that it will fully awaken to its new responsibilities to its members and its country.

The editorial follows:

THE FUTURE OF LABOR CAN BE AS USEFUL AS ITS PAST, DESPITE PRESENT TRIALS

Organized labor's time of trial over internal abuses and scandals has resulted in losses of prestige and public support. Now the excesses of the few have brought new legislation with which the whole must live.

In the tumult, perhaps a great deal has been forgotten about a movement that today has more than 18 million members in 190 national or international unions and 77,000 locals. Any assessment of the trade union movement now requires a backward glance, for it is in retrospect that we are best able to measure what organized labor has meant and can continue to mean. Labor Day, 1959, is an appropriate time for a history review.

During the infancy of this Nation, the lot of the workingman was what his employer decided it would be in terms of hours, wages or working conditions. If a few workers protested, or attempted to form a bargaining unit, they were slapped down by the law. The early courts followed English common law doctrine based on concepts that a maximum wage could be fixed by law and that workers could be compelled to work. Any challenge here was held to be a criminal conspiracy.

But with the growth of industry and the factory system, workers found themselves increasingly exploited. Labor was a commodity swelled by immigrants and men, women, and children from farms. They spent long hours in crowded, unventilated places filled with dangerous machinery and subject to the whim of overseers whose only thought was production at a profit.

In the years of the 1800's, the laboring force had almost no voice in determining the course of economic or social destinies. The workers knew theirs had to be a stronger voice. They formed organizations, only to have them struck down by depressions or management efforts. The cycle of rise and fall went on, but finally the labor movement caught on, given life in the protest against what seemed to be an inherent economic tyranny of the factory system and its dictum: submit or starve.

From 1904 to 1917, unionism grew. It brought on more receptive legislation, betterment of working conditions and wages. The 8-hour day was adopted for the first time in many industries, and union membership increased to 4 million. In the 1920's, however, labor was again in retreat, hit by depression, strike loses, Government hostility and reaction against radicalism. Only the stronger unions survived.

It was well into the 1930's and under the New Deal that the labor movement entered a new era, began once more to grow and assert itself in areas of economic and social needs. Already it could look back on such gains as universal male suffrage, free public schools, mechanics lien laws, and the abolishment of imprisonment for debt.

Unions became more and more a force in the development of the Nation, sharing increased portions of the fruits of a system of enterprise that promised and delivered material abundance beyond that of any man-made system. Great economic and social gains were again being brought about with the help of organized labor, gains in which all workers could share. Among these were the 40-hour week, minimum wage rates, establishment of child labor laws, a National Labor Relations Act, a Fair Labor Standards Act, social security for the old-aged, survivors, and dependents. Legislation in the realms of social security and labor standards was designed to aid working people whether they were organized or not.

It is important to remember this role of unions in the development of the country. It is also important that organized labor stay fully conscious of the fact that past laurels are no guarantee of its own permanency.

The labor movement has reached a point of power it has never had. And it has reached a point of corresponding responsibility as a major force in industrial society. In the future, the political power and the faith of the public in the labor movement depend as never before on how wisely and how well unions measure up to that responsibility.

The people and Congress have just given labor unions an object lesson on the issue of abuses and corruption within labor's house. It would be foolhardy for the union movement to fail in demonstrating from here on that further lessons aren't needed.

Labor: in the Public Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, now that the labor-management reform bill is about to become law it is interesting to recall the outstanding work of the McClellan committee and its staff headed by Robert F. Kennedy, it chief counsel.

Established early in 1957 by the U.S. Senate, much unsavory dealing was brought to light on the part of management and labor. Although the blackest chapters of the life of the committee established that some corporations were guilty of contemptible acts, which were selfish and greedy to the extreme, our news media did not succeed in impressing those heinous deeds upon the American people.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, opprobrium was brought down on all of organized labor because of the shameful conduct of a few leaders among the many in the labor movement. Three top labor leaders were proven unworthy of their trust.

Hutchinson, Beck, and Hoffa—all of labor suffered because of them. Seldom did the public press limit its criticism and make clear that these three were the culprits and not the whole of organized labor. Never did the slick magazines clearly set forth that all three were high in the councils of the Republican Party.

No, Mr. Speaker, the average reader thought he knew that those three, stigmatized by the proven facts, were Democrats. He little knew, and had no way of knowing from the public press, that these infamous three were among the largest contributors to Republican campaign funds and to other devices designed to bring victory to the old guard of the GOP in elections that now are history.

Of the thousands of citizens who urged passage of either the Shelley bill or the Landrum-Griffin bill, possibly a dozen individuals had read the bill they endorsed. But again, the press and communications media played their part.

"The Landrum-Griffin bill is a start in the right direction," said the President. So said practically all of the Republican leaders, the National Chamber of Commerce and the National Manufacturers Association. If this bill was but a start, just where would be the end. Or was it their desire to bring an end to organized labor and to compel the laboring man or the working woman to bargain individually for decent wages and working conditions? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is very clear.

The labor reform law can now be tested and in the light of experience it may need to be amended. But, Mr. Speaker, let us all give the law a fair opportunity to prove its value and its faults before another drive is begun to crucify organized labor. Let us remember that the prosperity Americans have enjoyed and the economic progress our country has made is due in large part to organized labor.

To the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts, all Americans should be exceedingly thankful. Because of his patience, his endurance, his knowledge of labor-management relations and his legal ability, unconstitutional provisions were removed and certain sections that would have defeated the legitimate objectives of organized labor were modified in conference. To Senator KENNEDY all of us who believe in fair play, whether of management, of labor, or of the public, should be forever grateful.

Recently an editorial written by Bill Baker appeared in the Kansas City Star which paid tribute to the McClellan committee and its chairman. The writer frankly admits that he frequently disagrees with the Senator from Arkansas, as do I. But, Mr. Speaker, I believe that other Members would enjoy reading this September 5, 1959, editorial and I include it as part of my remarks:

JOHN MCCLELLAN'S LABORS FOR A LABOR LAW

It is one of the ironies of legislative history that the new labor law does not bear the name of JOHN LITTLE MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas. Certainly no man has worked harder, longer and more doggedly for the bill that finally emerged from the crucible of compromise. Indeed, if there were a D-day for the new law, it was February 1, 1957, when the Senate established the McClellan committee.

For students of political science, we recommend the ensuing investigation as the textbook example of the way congressional investigations should be conducted. Seldom if ever has any congressional group conducted such an important study. Seldom, if ever, has a congressional committee been so objective. An excellent staff was gathered, spearheaded by young Bob Kennedy. In the hearing room, MCCLELLAN was the imperturbable chairman who brooked no nonsense from witnesses. Nor did he permit his colleagues to wander away in search of political headlines.

The conduct of the investigation was typical of JOHN MCCLELLAN, and it has paid off in a bill that he regards as a fine reward for the years of work. It is unlikely, however, that the Arkansas Senator would permit himself even a moment of self-satisfaction. That would be out of character for the little man who poses as a plain country lawyer.

In Congress, the country lawyer is a dour, usually quiet man who can explode with sudden fury. A wide range of committee activities gives the impression of a man always on the go yet unhurried in the tradition of the South. And MCCLELLAN is by all means the southerner. Politically, he is a conservative and he makes no bones of the fact. He is, however, fiercely independent of his party, a fact recognized by Democratic leaders.

Only such total independence could have produced an objective study of such a politically-loaded subject. Independence, and a terrific amount of energy that is perhaps an escape from the personal tragedies of his own life. MCCLELLAN'S three sons have all died untimely deaths, the last in an airplane crash in 1958.

We have frequently disagreed with JOHN MCCLELLAN'S position, and there will be times when we will disagree again. But the labor law of 1959 is a milestone of a legislative career in the tradition of a State that has produced some outstanding lawmakers. The country lawyer from Camden is a credit to the Senate, his State, and the Nation.

The John J. Dempsey Memorial Radio Scholarship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, the New Mexico Broadcasters' Association on August 29, 1959, established a new scholarship for radio broadcasting in honor of the late John J. Dempsey, former Representative and former Governor of New Mexico. It will be known as the John J. Dempsey Memorial radio scholarship.

Radio broadcasters and newscasters in Washington and throughout the entire country remember Representative Dempsey with particular affection. After learning from Fulton Lewis, Jr., of the inadequate facilities for radio newsmen covering the Capitol, Representative Dempsey was instrumental in 1939 in establishing the congressional Radio Galleries. His resolution amending the Rules of the House to set up the House Radio Gallery was passed on April 20, 1939. The House Radio Gallery was opened on May 23, 1939, and is 20 years old this year. A companion resolution to the Dempsey resolution amending the Senate Rules to set up the Senate Radio Gallery was passed on April 25, 1939. The Senate Radio Gallery was opened on February 9, 1940.

Now, 20 years later, in recognition of Mr. Dempsey's contribution to facilitate radio news broadcasting, the New Mexico Broadcasters' Association has elected to make its own contribution to the future of radio broadcasting in the form of a scholarship in John J. Dempsey's name.

The new scholarship will be awarded for the first time this year. Potential recipients will be New Mexico college sophomores who plan to major in radio journalism at the University of New Mexico. The $500 annual award will be made on the basis of scholastic aptitude,

high character, financial need, and a sincere interest in the radio news field. The selection of the recipient will be made by a committee made up of two faculty members of the University of New Mexico and three members of the New Mexico Broadcasters' Association. The scholarship will be continued through the recipient's junior and senior years, providing his scholastic record is 2.5 or better, and providing he continues his interest in radio broadcasting.

The scholarship fund will be administered by the University of New Mexico. Each radio station in the State will contribute to the annual scholarship fund. Wayne Phelps, owner and manager of radio station KALG, Alamogordo, N. Mex., is chairman of the John J. Dempsey Memorial scholarship committee for the New Mexico Broadcasters' Association.

Presentation of Flags to Committee on Science and Astronautics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, recently the Committee on Science and Astronautics staged a historic meeting in its committee room. The occasion was the formal presentation of the American flag together with the Army flag with its 145 colorful battle streamers. On this occasion, the committee was honored by the presence of the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, and by the Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. L. L. Lemnitzer. The entire committee was present and drawn up around our distinguished guests and around the Army color guard.

The Secretary opened the program by presenting to the committee these two symbols of our Nation and its Army with a short speech, a copy of which I am presenting for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

Chairman Brooks and members of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, it is a great honor and a genuine pleasure for me to represent the U.S. Army today in presenting the American and Army flags to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives. Although both of these banners are new, they both symbolize institutions as old and older than the Nation itself.

Our American flag is a familiar and beloved symbol to every red-blooded American. Its history and its significance are known to every schoolchild, and the new, 49th star it bears—signifying the entrance of Alaska into the Union—gives every thoughtful citizen new cause for pride. In this troubled and changing world, when most of the colonial areas and peoples of the world are seeking freedom from old ties, it is deeply significant that a large and richly endowed area, such as Alaska, should so enthusiastically enter our family of States. The faith, good will, and patriotism reflected in this act betides more future good for American than all the forcefully acquired and subjugated land areas will ever mean to a ruthless conqueror. What greater tribute could be paid to any government than this irrefutable evidence—given freely and without fear or force—of belief in these governmental principles which make our several sovereign States the United States of America.

Our Army flag has been in existence only since June 13, 1956, at which time it was presented to me on behalf of the President by Vice President NIXON. Although many Army units, from groups and corps down to separate battalions, had long had their distinguishing colors and standards, there was no flag, prior to 1956, which was the emblem of the Army as a whole.

This beautiful silken banner is made up, as you see, in our national colors—red, white, and blue. The blue device in the center is the seal of the War Department authorized by the Continental Congress in 1779, which still serves as the real of the Department of the Army. Above the seal a rattlesnake—reminiscent of the colonial rattlesnake flag—holds in its mouth a streamer bearing the motton "This We'll Defend." The date 1775 shown on the flag refers to the year in which the Continental Congress established the U.S. Army on June 14, 1775, by authorizing 10 companies of Infantry to be raised in Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Maryland to march to Boston, Mass., and there be formed into an Army under Gen. George Washington, its first Commander in Chief.

We are tremendously proud of this flag and of the glorious tradition of courage, devotion, and sacrifice in the service of America which it symbolizes. Each of these 145 colorful battle streamers represents one of the campaigns in which the Army has fought during its 184 years of history—from Ticonderoga right down through Korea. What a splendid record of dedication to the security of our national heritage these battle streamers signify.

The Army feels a close kinship with the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. We share your belief in the principle that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, and we are partners in your efforts to apply our newly acquired knowledge in this area for national defense, if need be.

With the devout hope that this committee and the Army may continue to work together for the defense of the Nation and the progress of science, I shall now ask General Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, to make the official presentation.

Mr. Speaker, this speech was followed by the formal presentation of the Army flag by Chief of Staff, General Lemnitzer, in the presence of four young men in full uniform, color bearers for the Army.

I, as chairman of the committee, replied on behalf of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, accepting these two flags and causing them to be installed at once in their proper place of honor in the committee room. My remarks are as follows:

Mr. Secretary, General Lemnitzer, this occasion is indeed a signal honor to this committee, of which I am proud to be chairman, and I am sure that the distinguished Members here assembled join with me in extending to you our sincere thanks for the magnificent flag of our country and of the Army which now stand proudly on our rostrum.

It is most appropriate that, as Secretary of the Army, you should present this committee with our Nation's flag, since the Army throughout our entire history has been in the forefront of the unending struggle of our people to preserve our freedom and to defend it through many wars against enemies who have opposed the principles of human dignity for which "Old Glory" stands.

And when I look at the flag of the U.S. Army, and see the battle streamers that represent 145 campaigns in which the Army has fought, I think of the millions of American men and women, foreign-born or descendants of people from almost every country on earth, who have carried our flag to the far corners of the world and many of whom gave their lives so that we can stand here as free men on this memorable day.

I am reminded, too, when I proudly wore the uniform of our Army in France during World War I. I can vividly recall my deep feeling of pride in seeing "Old Glory" flying above our cantonments and camps, a symbol of hope, encouragement, and ultimate victory for our country in its struggle against imperial Germany.

And again, I am reminded of the World War II and Korean campaigns which will remain as eternal monuments to the courage and unlimited sacrifices of Americans who fought to preserve their way of life, which since the beginning of history has been founded on the bedrock principle of human rights and self-determination for all men.

And now, we are engaged in a struggle that is no less bitter and crucial than those of the past. We are faced with an enemy that abhors everything this country represents, and who has openly and continuously dedicated himself to the destruction of our Nation and the other free nations. At these critical times, the Army continues to be one of our main bulwarks of strength, and a source of great confidence in the future.

We, the members of this committee, are not unaware of the significant and material contributions being made by the Army in this space and nuclear age. We have heard testimony from many important witnesses who have reminded us of the outstanding accomplishments the Army has made in developing operational guided missiles and in placing our first satellites in orbit. We know that our Army stands continuously prepared for any national emergency that may arise and to undertake any task that may be assigned to it.

And now, Mr. Secretary and General Lemnitzer, it is with great pride and reverence that I accept these flags on behalf of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. May they continue to remain for many years to come a permanent part of the committee, giving our members and our staff an increased sense of responsibility and loyalty and inspiring an even greater devotion to our labors here in the committee room. You may be sure that the committee members will be ever mindful of the great heritage these two flags and their battle streamers represent.

Look Here, Mr. Khrushchev, and Learn How Private Industry Underwrites Medical Research in Free America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, it would be futile to hope that any of the pollen of the flowers of the American private enterprise system would rub off on Mr. Khrushchev during his visit to this country, but as just a single example I wish he could become acquainted with the contribution one of the Nation's big

chemical companies, whose main offices and plants are located in the district I represent, is making as a public service in the field of medicine.

The Dow Corning Corp., of Midland, Mich., a pioneer in silastics, has announced the founding of the Dow Corning Center for Aid to Medical Research for the purpose of furthering medical research in the use of silicones in medicine and surgery. The center is financed by the corporation and all its findings will be available to the medical profession without cost.

During the past several years a number of remarkable advances have been made in medicine and surgery by using Dow silicones in a variety of forms. The interest among physicians and surgeons has grown so great that Dow-Corning Corp. had to assign two of its best scientists to act in a liaison capacity between physicians and surgeons and its research laboratories.

AID TO MEDICAL RESEARCH

Dr. W. R. Collings, president of the Dow Corning Corp., in announcing the founding of the new center said:

Our board of directors has recognized the responsibilities of the corporation by authorizing a nonprofit unit separate from our commercial activities, but allied with our research department.

According to Dr. Collings the purpose of the center will be to aid medical research by supplying technical assistance, by acting as a clearinghouse for information about the use of silicones in medicine and surgery, and by cooperating in research in organosilicon chemistry in relation to the human body.

Offices of the new center will be at Midland. The director will be Dr. Rob Roy McGregor, and the executive secretary, Silas A. Braley, Dr. Collings announced.

Dr. McGregor is one of the first inventors of commercial uses of silicones. Formerly a fellow of the Mellon Institute, Pittsburgh, he has been a member of the research team of Dow Corning since its founding in 1943. Assistant director of research, he has in recent years given his time to relations with the U.S. Food and Drug Administration and with the medical profession.

SILICONES HAVE MANY SURGICAL USES

Dr. McGregor points out that so far the best known medical uses of silicone material have been in brain surgery, heart valves, sutures, ducts, and heart-lung oxygenators. Already silicone valves have been responsible for over 4,000 successful operations on children with hydrocephalus — water-on-the-brain.

In one form or another medical research has found use for silicones in literally every part of the body, even the eye. One main reason is that silicones are chemically inert and nontoxic. They can be made in any physical form from fluids to rubber and thus can be applied as coatings or molded. Tissue fails to adhere to silicone rubber, and thus embedded material can be removed without pain.

Appropriately and in accordance with the rules of medical ethics, the announcement of any new techniques will come from the medical profession itself.

This, Mr. Khrushchev, is just a small sample of the contribution made by the free industries of America under the capitalistic system which you propose to bury.

One Man's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD an editorial entitled "One Man's Record," which appeared in the Arizona Republic, Phoenix, Ariz., of September 4, 1959:

ONE MAN'S RECORD

BARRY GOLDWATER ought to be feeling pretty good today. He was the one Senator who voted against the Kennedy labor reform bill. Ninety of his colleagues voted for it. Senator GOLDWATER said it was a panty-waist bill completely incapable of cleaning up the Augean union stables uncovered by the McClellan committee. The other Senators were satisfied with the bill. Organized labor thought it was too tough, and union leaders almost unanimously lashed out against GOLDWATER as the "bete noire" of the labor movement, a union-hater of the first order, a reactionary so-and-so.

BARRY shrugged off the abuse and stuck by his principles. He said it was high time to make union leaders account for their funds, to require them to stand for regular secret elections, to end personal raids on union treasuries, to protect the average union worker with a bill of rights, to protect the public by outlawing organizational or blackmail picketing and secondary picketing, to end the no man's land bteween Federal and State agencies in handling labor dsputes. The people rallied to his cause. A flood of mail reached every Member of Congress, urging the lawmakers to end the unholy power of racketeering, corrupt, and unscrupulous labor leaders.

The rest is history. The House of Representatives properly sensed the public demand for a strong labor reform bill. It passed the Landrum-Griffin bill despite some of the most arrogant, strong-armed union lobbying in the history of Congress. Union Leader Jimmy Hoffa threatened nationwide teamster strikes. Union Leader Jim Carey wrote Congressmen who had voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill threatening to purge them in the next elections.

For 12 days a joint Senate-House committee worked at the task of reconciling the effective Landrum-Griffin bill with the ineffective Kennedy bill. On Wednesday they reached agreement on a measure that was in essence the Landrum-Griffin bill, with a few minor refinements. Its passage by both Houses and approval by the President was assured.

Thus ends the great labor reform fight of 1959. Union leaders are still sulking in their tents, muttering threats of reprisals, talking about the killer bill that Congress passed. But there is nothing in the new measure that will hurt honest trade unionism. There is a lot in it that will protect rank-and-file union members and the public. The Congress has shown that the people of the United States do not intend to let any segment of the labor union be run by extortionists, scofflaws, and power hungry bosses. This Nation, from time to time, has redressed the balance caused by individuals and groups who thought they were bigger than the people as a whole. It has now taken steps to put the unions in their place, a dignified, respected place to be sure, but not one of complete power.

The whole country owes a debt of gratitude to BARRY GOLWATER for never quiting when the going got rough. He has answered the old question that confronts individuals in a democracy, "What can one man do?" He has shown that one man, with the people behind him, can do anything that is required by the national welfare.

An Appraisal of Herbert Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished former Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Robert F. Bradford, has written an intensely interesting evaluation of the life of former President Herbert Hoover. This article appeared in the Boston Globe of September 9.

I commend to the attention of all my colleagues this article about a great former President—written, I might add, by a great former Governor of my State, whom we in Massachusetts respect and admire in much the same way that the entire American Nation now respects and admires Herbert Hoover:

HERBERT HOOVER

(An appraisal by former Gov. Robert F. Bradford, written for the Boston Sunday Globe, Aug. 9, 1959)

It is seldom that a man reaches full stature in the eyes of his contemporaries. More often perspective is distorted by events with which he is associated or exaggerated because of legends attaching to his personality. Thirty years ago, or even 20 years ago, this could be said to be the case with Herbert Hoover. He had already lived three full lives. He had been a highly successful mining engineer with an international reputation dating back to his work in China even before the Boxer Rebellion. During World War I he became the symbol and administrative genius behind the organization of American relief to refugees, first in Belgium and later throughout Europe. From that it was a short step after the United States entered the war for him to become Food Administrator—a position without much power, but so ably directed that for the time being to "hoover" or to "hooverize" in the saving of food became a part of the national vocabulary.

With the change of administrations following World War I Hoover became Secretary of Commerce and applied his great talents and wide range of knowledge to rally the shaking business structure which was the immediate aftermath of peace. Thirty years ago Mr. Hoover became President of the United States. Up to this point his image in the public mind was that of a benevolent, impersonal, somewhat autocratic man with an awesome reputation for efficiency and getting things done. His very formidable successes in his previous roles set an impossible standard for him as President: it made him seem unapproachable, and it attributed to him the

blame for anything anywhere that went wrong. Then in October 1929 came the stock market crash which cast an inevitable pall over the entire administration of President Hoover.

One of the sorriest chapters in American political history is the story of the deliberate, cold-blooded and carefully performed campaign by the Democratic national high command to smear Hoover. The story is told baldly in detail by the principal executioner, hired for the job, Charles Michaelson, in his book "The Ghost Talks." After the midterm congressional elections of 1930, which returned a Democratic House to Washington, nothing that President Hoover proposed could get through Congress. No program for recovery known to be favored by him stood a chance of adoption. The reaction on the President, with his dedicated sincerity and his tireless capacity for work, was complete frustration and the Nation wallowed in what the opposition was prompt to label the Hoover depression. Mr. Hoover left the White House a man politically destroyed. Yet many a proposal originated by him, only to be blocked in the Congress, was immediately put into effect by his successor. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is one such plan, to name one out of many.

So complete was the destruction of the political image that for almost 20 years Democratic candidates all over the country were, as someone well said, "running against Hoover" with every hope of success. For the average individual who did not know the man it was impossible through this smoking ruin to evaluate the real Herbert Hoover. Even in political circles it was thought unsafe to be identified with the name. In the 1936 Republican Convention in Cleveland Mr. Hoover was permitted to speak, or so the corridor legend goes, only upon the understanding that he would leave the convention immediately after finishing his address. At all events he lived up to the agreement, if it was an agreement, scrupulously and the fears, for they were genuine fears, of a stampede for Hoover among the delegates were allayed. At the 1940 convention, again steps were taken to avoid the possibility of a draft Hoover maneuver. No opportunity was afforded him to address the convention until after the nomination was settled.

If these details seem petty in a life as full and serviceable as that of Mr. Hoover up to the time he left office as President, they are important to emphasize because they underscore the greatest achievement in Mr. Hoover's great career: His ability to rise above personal bitterness, rancor and frustrated hopes of vindication and to achieve a fourth life of selfless and serene statesmanship as a private citizen.

There is a story which is so good one can only hope that it is true that during the early stages of this fourth phase of Mr. Hoover's life he was called upon to give an address in Oakland, Calif. One of his close friends who saw an early draft of the speech was bold enough to suggest that Mr. Hoover inject some of his natural humor into the text. The President strenuously opposed the idea; it was out of character for him and undignified. Nevertheless he went along with the suggestion. Immediately after the address he boarded a train for New York, being joined on the trip by one of his former secretaries, Theodore Joslin, formerly of the Boston Transcript. All the way across the country Mr. Hoover was plunged in gloom. No telegrams had come in, no comment or criticism of the Oakland speech had been received. He felt that he had been right in opposing the friend's suggestion and that through his weakness in finally going along with the idea his reputation was forever ruined. When the train reached New York Mr. Hoover was met by another secretary bulging with telegrams. At the door of his apartment there was a positive avalanche of messages, all highly laudatory. Finally, convinced, Mr. Hoover turned smilingly to his staff and said with a twinkle, "You see, I knew all along this was what I could do if I tried." In any case it was about this time that a new Hoover definitely emerged. That is to say, the real Hoover began to be known for himself.

Another great American, John Quincy Adams, defeated for reelection as President, and with an illustrious record behind him, made his greatest contribution in afterlife as a simple Member of Congress, dubbed "Old Man Eloquent" by his fellow Congressmen for his unflinching fight against the tyrannical gag rule. So Herbert Hoover, ex-President, may be said to have done most for his country through his example as a private citizen and for his leadership and implementation of the recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commissions for the reorganization of our National Government.

So as we salute him on his 85th birthday it is possible to say of Herbert Hoover that he has lived to achieve the satisfaction of complete vindication and a permanent place in the affection and admiration of his fellow countrymen. No one who was present at the Republican Conventions of 1952 and 1956 could have failed to note in his memory book that the highlight of both conventions was the spontaneous and overwhelming welcome extended to Mr. Hoover during his entire visit to the platform and the reception of his remarks, which were those of a wise, witty, warmhearted, and happy man.

The clouds have lifted from the mountain. What emerges in the clear light of the afternoon sun is the peak, calm, serene, and magnificent. That is the Herbert Hoover every American hails today.

The Storm's Gathering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Camden Chronicle, Camden, S.C., September 4, 1959:

THE STORM'S GATHERING

As this is written, President Eisenhower has reassured West Germany's Chancellor Adenauer, if in vague terms, of our determination to pursue the unification of Germany and "protect the freedom and welfare of the people of Berlin," and is now engaged in talks with Britain's Prime Minister Macmillan in London.

At both Bonn and London, the President was received in tumultuous ovations by crowds that obviously exceeded all expectations. On the 16 mile automobile journey from the London Airport to the residence of U.S. Ambassador Jock Whitney, the conquering hero reception reached a level of exuberance that more than once rent the police lines asunder, but apparently without serious incident.

It looks as though the British leaders, generally regarded as advocates of appeasement, have stiffened their attitudes toward the Kremlin since the Khrushchev invitation to the United States. Now, uneasy of the outcome of the Washington talks, Mr. Macmillan is expected to advise the President that he must adopt a get tough policy toward his guest, and to urge a four-power summit conference this fall.

At his next stop, Paris, President Eisenhower will doubtless be received with all the uproar and excitement with which the French invest a public reception. But the real test of his journey will come in the conversations with the stiff-necked President De Gaulle, who not only takes a dim view of the Khrushchev visit, but, with some justification, we think, feels he has been given the back of Uncle Sam's hand. If President Eisenhower soothes De Gaulle by endorsing the French policy in Algeria, it will be all right with Chancellor Adenauer, but Prime Minister Macmillan will be very unhappy and regard this as a blow to Western prestige in Asia.

And then home to prepare for what is, at best, the most dangerous diplomatic experiment in American history. Khrushchev, of course, has been preparing for it by lobbing further threats at West Germany and by hotting up the Lao war, in which we are now participating with military aid to this beleaguered free nation.

In the meanwhile as disapproval of the Khrushchev visit mounts here at home, its repercussions in Moscow add to the growing hope that the visit may still not happen. In anticipation that this unwelcome guest may bow out, just as he canceled his trip to Sweden, the White House might still withdraw the invitation.

A Minimum Security Unit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, overcrowded prisons and correctional institutions are causing much anxiety to law enforcement officials.

The U.S. Prison at Leavenworth, Kans., was erected in 1895 and is now overcrowded by some 800 prisoners.

One of the greatest needs in this country today is a minimum security institution in which young and first offenders could receive proper treatment, care and rehabilitation.

Dr. Karl Menninger, an outstanding psychiatrist, is of the opinion that less confinement and more psychological therapy would improve our penal system. This would certainly be true in the cases of young offenders.

An editorial, Mr. Speaker, appeared on Tuesday, September 1, 1959, in the Kansas City Kansan of which Mr. John H. Stauffer is the editor. Under leave granted I include this editorial in the extension of my remarks:

[From the Kansas City Kansan, Sept. 1, 1959]

OVERCROWDED PRISONS

Dr. Karl Menninger's recent statement that prisons are a poor place to rehabilitate wrongdoers is recalled when one peruses the official reports disclosing the steadily increasing population in our institutions of confinement. The total population of the United States is growing fast but the prison rate is growing even faster, according to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI.

The situation in Kansas is worthy of passing note. The U.S. prison in Leavenworth, built in 1895 to house 1,700 at present houses 2,500 prisoners, which has been an average

total for a number of years. In 1934 when many men were being convicted of making and selling illegal liquors the prison population reached 3,400, according to Associate Warden Kaiser's report to the Leavenworth Times.

There are more Federal prisoners now, he thinks, because more offenders are being caught. But Leavenworth's problems are not unique. All Federal prisons are over crowded, Kaiser says.

At the State penitentiary at nearby Lansing, Warden Tracy Hand sees no population problems as far as State institutions are concerned. Capacity there is 1,945 prisoners; present occupancy, 1,544 prisoners. The housing limit has been exceeded in the past however. During the depression when men were driven by want and hunger to crime there were as many as 2,100 prisoners at Lansing.

Dr. Menninger believes a better penal system should be instituted, with much less confinement and much more psychological therapy and an adequate parole supervisory program.

Which leads one Kansas editor to suggest that the State prison be relocated to Topeka, where psychotherapists are available.

Military Manpower Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the investigation of misuse of military manpower which is being made by the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee has already uncovered many situations in need of correction.

Under the able chairmanship of our colleague, Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, the subcommittee has been doing splendid work to strengthen the armed services and save millions of dollars for our taxpayers.

Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI, of Connecticut, our indefatigable colleague, has won national admiration for his endeavors in the manpower field. And the efforts are beginning to pay off.

It is gratifying that the Military Establishment is taking some small steps to correct the waste of our most precious asset—manpower. But the job of seeing that personnel are utilized for maximum effectiveness must go on. Some rather startling changes were made by William Bradford Huie in the October issue of Cavalier magazine and if the situation is as described by Mr. Huie, then the U.S. Army and the Marine Corps are subsidizing athletes and athletic teams.

If big name athletes are being kept off duty and out of training simply to play at their sport, then the only word that can be used is "subsidizing."

Brig. Gen. William B. McKean, U.S. Marine Corps (retired) has said that the situation in the Marine Corps is deplorable. If what Mr. Huie reports about the treatment of Lt. Ron Kramer is true, then a deplorable situation also exists at Bolling Field.

If the facts in this case are not as presented in the Cavalier story, the Bolling Field people should welcome the opportunity to present the facts.

Let me present some significant extracts from the article in Cavalier magazine:

We can tell Mr. PRICE right now, and we'll give him plenty of proof later in this story, that investigating athletes won't win him any popularity contests—as Mr. KOWALSKI's investigation of servants is doing for him. But if manpower is what his committee is talking about, he sure better look at the jockstrap situation. Not only will he find a horde of men being wasted but he'll find that a lot of money is being spent helping these men carry on a program that is making their presence in uniform a farce.

Mr. PRICE really doesn't have to travel very far to find out if the jockstrap program is worth investigating. Two of the biggest fellas are right under his nose—Bolling Air Force Base and the Quantico Marines.

For a starter he could check the training records of such Bolling stars past and present as John Roach (SMU and Chicago Cardinals), Don Schaeffer and Joe Heap of Notre Dame, Ralph Guglielmi of Notre Dame and the Washington Redskins, now a civilian again.

Now the Bolling people will have an explanation. Bolling's an administrative base, they'll tell Mr. PRICE, and because most of the athletes (who were in Air Force ROTC in college) have a physical defect they are held over at Bolling. Same goes for Eglin AFB, the other big Air Force football power.

Someone else might tell him that the Air Force ROTC is the best thing that ever happened to the Bolling team. That now the coaches know who's coming into the Air Force in the fall and can requisition the men through personnel and thus can plan the teams in advance of the season. The fact that Bolling, the base closest to the Pentagon, has the best record over the years is not a coincidence.

No, the Bolling brass will say, it's all coincidence and luck that they get such teams.

Ron Kramer, the Michigan and Green Bay Packer star end, could tell Mr. PRICE a story too, and Ron is at nearby Fort Myer, Va., quite accessible to Mr. PRICE, if he wants to ask him.

Seems Kramer, an Air Force ROTC man, was called to active duty and taken in on a waiver after failing the physical examination. The next stop for him was Bolling Air Force Base. But Ron was a spoil-sport. He just refused to play football. He had a bad knee and he was going to save it for Green Bay where the pay is better.

You remember the old service saying "we can't make you do it—but we can make you sorry you didn't." Kramer began to get some of that—and once more he turned out to be a spoil-sport. He mentioned what was going on to a couple of newspapermen on the coast and one in New York, and they gave out with a few growls and the Bolling people ran like hell.

When the Kramer situation cooled off, he was transferred to Fort Myer, where they don't have a football team. There was no need for his type of intelligence officer at Bolling, the Public Information Officer explained. Question: What job would he have done at Bolling then if he had played football? Mr. PRICE can get the answer when he finds out what the other stars do when they're not playing. Should be very interesting.

Over at Quantico they'll be more direct—in the best Marine tradition. They've had great teams for as long as anyone can recall and they'll admit they try to hold on to the good football material as long as possible.

The reason given for that will be elevation of morale. For an answer to that I commend to Mr. PRICE a passage from the book Ribbon Creek by the outspoken Brig. Gen. William B. McKean, USMC (retired). In the chapter on leadership Mr. McKean says:

"Now we have a large completely different influx; those fulfilling obligated service. Rather than be drafted into the Army as a private these characters do the minimum work necessary for a commission because they think life as an officer easier than that in the ranks, and also they wish to exercise some control over where they do their required service. A large share of these draft evaders just mark time waiting for a release. This was pointed up by a recruit battalion sergeant major sitting on our enlistment board. "Well, sir. They go to basic school and stay at Quantico until basketball season is over. Then they come down here for a season of football and basketball. After that they come into a recruit battalion for about 3 months to complete their active duty. What can we expect?"

After these "characters" go back to inactive duty they go into the Reserves where eventually they become captains. In a brush-fire affair they could be leading companies of men. Theortically they'd be qualified. Theoretically.

The Marines really work at having the good teams and spreading the good teams around. Athletes at either basic school or boot training are eligible for only one season of a sport at Quantico or Parris Island. (This can mean a whole year for a three-sport man.) To make sure this rule is enforced, Headquarters has a special jockstrap roster punched into its accounting machines and a desk in the personnel department which manages the swapping of players among "clubs."

Good for morale? Or just good for the morale of the hero-worshiping brass? Certainly not fair to the taxpayer who is paying for a man to be trained as a fighting man and not fair to the man who leaves the service labeled "trained and combat ready" when he isn't.

And it doesn't stop here. The jockstrapper is a big man in the Pacific and European theaters, too. Listen to a young ex-Army man and he'll be glad to talk to Mr. Price about it too. "I spent almost 24 months in the Army. For about 5 months I was on real active duty. The rest of the time I did next to nothing except play basketball.

"When I first went into the Army at Fort Dix, I was assigned to a training company and issued a rifle. A few days after my training cycle began, I was tapped to be a basketball player. I had played college ball. When my company commander objected to my absence from training formation, I was transferred to another company. At this other company, I did very limited training in the morning. I was picked up at 1 o'clock in the afternoon and taken to practice. I slept in a special cadre room by myself in a 7-foot bed. It took me almost 8 months to finish basic. I never had a rifle after leaving my first company.

"When my orders were cut for overseas duty, I was told to look up a certain officer at Fort Kilmer, N.J., who would see to it that I was taken off the overseas shipping orders and would be assigned to a post in the States, a good basketball post. When I got to Kilmer the officer in question was gone and instead I ran into a anti-jockstrap officer who gave me a really hard time when I broached him on the subject.

"When I went overseas I was again tapped to play for the team at Orleans, France. Here we played something like 60 games—a big schedule—and did very little, if any, duty. We were very seldom at the base. When we weren't playing, we were usually in Paris on passes. The only time I was ever on duty

was when I was on teletype during alerts. All athletic activity stopped during alerts, but I assure you I could have done very little if the alert had ever been the real thing. We traveled all over Europe playing other teams and almost took a trip to Egypt, but missed out at the last minute. As I said before, the last officer I met at Camp Kilmer had been antijockstrap. The light colonel we had with our Orleans team was almost pathetically projockstrap. He used to stand behind the bench and towel us as we came off the floor and also inject drops into our noses.

"Most jockstrappers had all the leave they wanted. Most of it wasn't charged to them because the brass always had a man in personnel who would juggle records for the athletes.

"When I got out of the service I was almost as green a recruit as I was the day I went in. From what the other guys I knew from basketball tell me, the same setup is still going strong."

Time To Pay for Prodigality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include here an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal for Thursday, September 10, 1959:

TIME TO PAY FOR PRODIGALITY

It cannot be an easy decision for the President to make public acknowledgment that the Government of the United States is in financial straits.

For one thing, such an acknowledgment must partake of the nature of a confession by those who make it; it must also carry implications of blame for many past errors by others. Thus it would be bound to raise a tremendous political furor.

For another, there is the sheer difficulty of explaining the problem, of relating the Government's fiscal difficulties, seemingly so remote, to the work-a-day lives of the people. It would require considerable skill to do this with the right sense of proportion.

And finally there is the very real fear that dramatic gestures might carry such a tone of desperateness as to make matters worse. It is this that pinions the President and those about him upon the horns of a dilemma; they may need dramatic gestures to give a sense of urgency to action, but the same gestures could conceivably turn a sense of urgency into one of panic.

So we can understand the doubts and hesitation over the plan, now being discussed within the administration, to call a special session of Congress to deal with pressing fiscal problems and to have the President personally explain to the country, by television and radio, the dimensions of that problem.

Yet it seems to us that the time has come for something to dramatize the Government's fiscal plight. The risks involved, we think, are far outweighed by what is to be won.

The fiscal problem as viewed by the men who manage the Government's money, and whose views are reported elsewhere in this newspaper, is serious, beyond doubt. But it is not calamitous, much less hopeless—if the right actions are taken promptly. And we have not lost our conviction that the people of the United States will support the right actions, once they are told the truth plainly and honestly.

That truth, in its simplest form, is that time has caught up with a prodigal country. For more than a decade this country has spent money like the proverbial drunken sailor. We have poured out billions to make life more pleasant for farmers, to pay handsome rewards to veterans, to give ourselves a luxury of houses and roads and any sort of welfare that came happily to mind. We have poured many billions of hard-earned money all over the globe.

And we have done all this with a blatant disregard of the deficit the billions accrued in our accounts. Many politicians led us on by dangling before us all the wonderful things we could buy with these billions. Worse, many learned economists reassured us that all those deficits were of no consequence; the supply of money was endless. Still worse, we as a people believed all this, too intoxicated to remember that even the richest purse is not bottomless.

Well, now the men who manage the money see that the bottom is not far away. The technical problem that grabs the headlines—the rising interest rates for borrowed money—is merely a warning sign of what lies beneath. It says that the barrel is running dry not only for the Treasury of the United States but for everybody.

But a warning is also an opportunity. Here the opportunity is time to choose between two paths. One is to choose inflation; not the modest inflation we have heard so much about but inflation in mammoth doses. The other is to choose to put our house in order.

This means, first of all, to pay the price of our past prodigality. Congress must give the Government the legal authority to shoulder long-term debts regardless of the cost, in interest rates, of that debt; the managers must have the tools to manage with. But it means most of all that we must stop our prodigal spending.

Neither the President, the Secretary of the Treasury nor anyone else need suppose that it is any secret to the informed people of the world that the United States has come to this choice. Not to speak of it, not to say frankly what must be done, will only hide it a little longer from the great body of the citizens.

So we think it is far better to speak plainly and act boldly. This country has had more than a decade of dancing to a feverish spending tune. But nobody need despair of it if it shows it is now ready to pay the piper.

Agricultural Imports Do Not Help America's Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, our Nation's trading partners abroad are well on the road to achieving a record year in sales of their products to their favorite customer, the United States. Manufactured goods of practically every description are landing at our shores in unprecedented volume—to the distress of many American producers, investors, and jobholders.

The invasion of our domestic markets is not limited to manufactured products and minerals, about which we have heard much in recent weeks. Our agriculture interests find themselves targets for foreign competition which is rapidly mounting.

The meat industry provides a good example. In 1958, our imports of meat products were valued at nearly $335 million. Animals shipped here for slaughter were valued at $131 million. Together, they accounted for some $460 million in sales for livestock producers, packers, and shippers in other countries.

Moreover, this represented a gain of 86 percent in a single year. In 1957 our imports of edible animals and meat products totaled $250 million. But at the time, that too was a banner year, for only a year earlier, in 1956, total imports of these items were less than $160 million. So 1957 brought a gain of more than 60 percent over 1956.

Thus, in the brief span of 2 years, 1956–58, imports of livestock, poultry and meat products climbed $310 million, or very nearly 200 percent.

This phenomenal increase indicates clearly why so many of this country's livestock producers have joined their voice to the rising chorus of protests against a foreign economic policy that leaves them all but defenseless in the face of unreasonable competition from abroad.

Some segments of the domestic meat industry have been harder hit than others. Mutton producers, for example, are witnessing a virtual flood of imports from Australia and New Zealand. The statistics will speak for themselves.

In 1956, Australia shipped 313,000 pounds of mutton to the United States; in 1957, shipments rose slightly to 441,000 pounds; in 1958, the dam burst and shipments soared to 14,250,000 pounds, or more than 30 times the 1957 volume.

But teh worst was yet to come. Australian mutton shipments to the United States surpassed the record 1958 volume in the first fourth months of 1959. By June 30 they had reached nearly 23 million pounds, up more than 50 percent over last year's total imports.

Mutton imports form New Zealand show a similarly fantastic increase, from a mere 9,000 pounds in 1954, to 250,000 pounds in both 1955 and 1956, to 1,300,000 pounds in 1957, to 2,310,000 pounds in 1958, and in the first 6 months of 1959, over 5 million pounds.

New Zealand also found the United States a prime market for lamb, beef and veal. In 1956 New Zealand shipped us 161,000 pounds of lamb; in 1957, 368,000 pounds; in 1958, 4,700,000 pounds.

Imports of beef and veal increased even more dramatically. Shipments from New Zealand have risen from 1,121,000 pounds to 182 million pounds in the short space of five years.

As recently as 1956, imports of beef and veal from New Zealand totaled 4 million pounds, then multiplied more than 12 times to 50 million pounds in 1957, and then nearly quadrupled to 182 million pounds last year. In the first 6 months of 1959 these imports lagged only a trifle behind the terrific pace achieved a year ago.

Australia, of course, could not be expected to concede the U.S. beef

and veal market to its New Zealand competitors without a struggle. So, not surprisingly, imports of beef and veal from Australia, after a fairly slow start, have caught up with and passed New Zealand's shipments.

In 1954 Australia sent us $1,800,000 pounds of beef and veal; moderate yearly increases sent the total to 5½ million pounds by 1957. Then, in 1958, these imports more than tripled in volume to 17 million pounds, and this volume was exceeded in the first 2 months of 1959. By the end of June 1959 the United States had received more than 83 million pounds of Australian beef and veal, and New Zealand, after far outstripping its neighbor's shipments a year earlier, was running a respectable but fairly distant second.

Other examples of the unreasonable competition confronting the American meat industry are plentiful. For instance, in the single month of January 1959 Australia shipped us more lamb than she sent here in the entire 12 months of 1958. Imports of Australian lamb reached 2 million pounds in the first 6 months of 1959, compared to 326,000 pounds in all of 1958.

A recent issue of the Sheep Industry Journal reports that lamb growers from Australia and New Zealand have journeyed to this country to find ways to increase their shipments here.

With all due respect to the splendid free nations these gentlemen represent, I cannot sincerely wish them success in their overtures. On the contrary, I would advise them to let well enough alone.

For in spite of its haphazard trade policy, the U.S. Government still retains a sense of obligation to its domestic industries, and sooner or later it will take steps to prevent the American meat producers' total destruction. We can only hope that these steps, when finally authorized, will not be too little and too late.

Shall Congress Sell Michigan Down the Mississippi?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the people of Michigan are grateful to Congress because it has once again stuck its thumb in the dike, so to speak, and prevented for the time being the outpouring of the waters of our Great Lakes into the Chicago drainage canal for the benefit of that city's sewage system.

The selfishness of the Chicago authorities is appalling. In the face of the objections of an adjoining nation and the city's neighboring States, these officials continue to insist on getting congressional authorization for additional water with which to flush its sanitary canal.

The editor of the Midland (Mich.) Daily News appropriately asks, editorially, "Is Michigan Being Sold Down the Mississippi?" The editorial is very much to the point. I hope my colleagues who have supported this water diversion proposal in the past will take another look in the light of the Michigan position, as reflected by the editor of the Midland Daily News. The editorial follows:

IS MICHIGAN BEING SOLD DOWN THE MISSISSIPPI?

Washington reports seem to predict that Michigan, as well as other Great Lakes States, is about to be sold down the Mississippi.

Senators from the Lakes States failed Friday to stem the tide on Chicago's request for more water from Lake Michigan. By a 66–21 vote, a motion to delay action lost. A second 72–19 vote made the bill the pending Senate business.

The big question was whether the House-approved measure was near final Senate passage.

The bill would, for a 1-year trial period, increase water diversion into the Illinois Waterway from the present 1,500 cubic feet per second to 2,500 cubic feet per second to increase the flushing effect on the Illinois Waterway and the Chicago sanitary canal. It also authorizes a 3-year study seeking a solution to Chicago's sewage problems.

Other cities, large and small, treat sewage and return water to rivers and lakes. For instance, Midland takes water from Lake Huron. Sewage is treated and water returned to the Tittabawassee which flows back to Lake Huron.

With lake levels already low despite wet seasons, further diversion of water by Chicago is questionable at best. Millions of dollars in lake frontage investments is involved as well as navigation on the lakes.

There is apparently little Michigan can do except to continue fighting. Its Senators are lined up against the bill. If passage comes, the only hope is for a Presidential veto which appears possible.

Meanwhile, Chicago and Illinois could do something about solving their sewage problems in a manner that would not damage other States.

Nigola Dimitrov Petkov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I feel it an honor and privilege to call to the attention of my colleagues the following biographic sketch of the great Bulgarian patroit, Nokola Dimitrov Petkov, who courageously defended the freedom and independence of his country through his lifetime:

NIKOLA PETKOV: BULGARIAN NATIONAL HERO AND GREATEST MARTYR IN THE STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Nikola Dimitrov Petkov was born in Sofia in 1894. He was the son of Dimiter Petkov, a self-educated peasant from Dobruduja, who became Prime Minister of Bulgaria. Dimiter Petkov was assassinated in 1907 for opposing foreign intervention in the internal affairs of Bulgaria, especially on the part of Tsarist Russia.

Petko Petkov, Nikola's brother, was one of the greatest Bulgarian peasant leaders. He fought Alexander Tzankov's Fascist dictatorship of 1923 and as a result was shot down on a Sofia street on June 14, 1924—exactly 1 year after the merciless assassination of Alexander Stamboliiski.

Nikola Petkov received a law degree in Paris, where he spent most of his youth. During the Nazi occupation of Bulgaria he was an underground leader and was imprisoned several times.

When the Nazis were driven out of Bulgaria, Nikola Petkov and three other representatives of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union—the largest political organization in Bulgaria—took part in the first coalition government, together with Communists, Socialists, representatives of the political group Zveno, and the independent intellectuals. Together with Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, Secretary General of the Bulgarian National Agrarian Union, Nikola Petkov fought stubbornly against Communist outrages, terror, and violence, and thus incurred the hatred of both the Communist Party and the Soviet occupation authorities. Despite these difficulties, he continued to defend the freedom and independence of his country.

When the Soviet occupation authorities demanded the removal of the capitalist agent, Dr. G. M. Dimitrov, from his post as Secretary General Nikola Petkov took his place.

In July 1945, Nikola Petkov sent a memorandum to the Inter-Allied Control Commission demanding the postponement of the elections which the Communists had scheduled for the end of August 1945. These elections were to involve only one list of candidates, headed by the Communist party. As a result of the memorandum, the Prime Minister declared that Petkov had resigned, although formally he never did so. In protest, Nikola Petkov and other cabinet ministers broke up the Coalition Government, and thenceforth openly opposed the Communist dictatorship. Upon interevention of the control commission, the elections were postponed until November 18, 1945.

During the winter of 1946, Stalin sent Vishinsky to Sofia for the purpose of getting Petkov to come back into the government. At their dramatic meeting, Petkov declared that it was not his custom to obey the orders of any foreigner, but to listen only to the will of the Bulgarian people.

That meeting decided Petkov's fate.

In October, 1946, Petkov headed the opposition in its election campaign against the Communist-Soviet attempts to seize full control of the country. The enthusiastic people from the countryside and towns voted en masse for Petkov's list, but the election results were falsified and violence and bloodshed were commonplace. Nevertheless, 101 people's representatives, headed by Petkov, were acknowledged to have been elected and triumphantly entered the grand national assembly. It was there that Petkov's most courageous and heroic struggle culminated. Availing himself of his constitutional immunity, he unmasked in Parliament the treacherous intentions of the Communists and their leader, Georgi Dimitrov, former Secretary-General of the Comintern. He accused them of being Stalinist agents, and said that their hands were stained with the blood of innocent Bulargians and that they wanted to make Bulgaria a Soviet province.

As a result of his activity, Petkov was charged with conspiracy against the state and the Soviet Union. Like his predecessor, he was called "an agent of Anglo-American capitalism."

After dramatic and stormy debates in Parliament, Petkov was arrested inside the Parliament Building in complete defiance of the constitution and the law. Petkov declared dauntlessly that he would share with pride the fate of his father and his brother.

On August 16 Petkov was sentenced to die on the gallows.

Early in the morning of September 23, only 15 minutes after midnight, he was executed in secret because the Communists feared the people's mass indignation. (At that time all executions took place about 5 o'clock in the morning.)

Prior to the execution a representative of the Bulgarian Communist Government appeared in Nikola Petkov's prison cell and offered him a pardon if he signed a petition in which he declared his repentance.

"You are even trying to desecrate my sacred memory," Petkov replied. "My sentence was passed by your Moscow masters and no one can revoke it. I do not seek any mercy from you. I want to die so that my people may be freed sooner."

The heroic example set by Nikola Petkov shook the free world and opened its eyes to the treacherous intentions and methods of the Bolshevist international conspiracy and the tragic fate which Soviet imperialism is preparing for all of humanity.

Petkov's career was a brilliant model of self-sacrifices for his people, principles, ideas, freedom, and democracy. Thousands and thousands of Bulgarian patriots followed his great example.

That is the reason why the American Congressmen who, upon the occasion of a visit to Bulgaria, laid a wreath on his freshly dug grave, called him "one of the greatest democrats of all time."

This is why government officials and statesmen from all over the world sent protest notes to his Sofia and Moscow executioners, and honored, and still continue to honor, Nikola Petkov as one of the greatest martyrs of human freedom and the right to independence.

With each elapsing year, the memory of Nikola Petkov is becoming a greater danger for the Communist tyranny, shaking its yoke and leading the freedom fighters to their final victory.

General Romulo on Philippine Island Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, recently, here in Washington a ceremony was held in the Philippine Chancery, which is significant because it shows that our friends and allies, the Filipino people, are grateful and they recognize services rendered in their behalf. It also shows that we have fellow Americans who do honor to their country by taking up unselfishly a cause that they believe just. Philippine-American friendship is fostered by occasions such as that which took place on September 2, 1959, when Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States, who has dedicated the best years of his life to building up and developing friendly relations between our two peoples, decorated Mr. Miles D. Kennedy and Col. Clarence H. Olson with the Philippine Legion of Honor, in the degree of officer, for their service to the veterans of the Philippines.

I would like to state in this connection that it was proper that General Romulo should have been the representative of his government to award the decoration of these two officers of the American Legion because I have personal knowledge of the untiring efforts of the Philippine Ambassador in defending the rights of his fellow veterans in the Philippines and has spared no effort here in the United States to uphold their cause. Recently, because I invited him to open the International Trade Fair in Seattle, he left his work and other engagements here to accept my invitation, and in his speech at a banquet at the Olympic Hotel, he did not fail to mention the heroism of the Filipino veterans who fought for the American flag in the Second World War.

His address when he decorated Messrs. Kennedy and Olson follow:

REMARKS BY GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO, PHILIPPINE AMBASSADOR, AT THE PRESENTATION OF AWARDS TO MR. MILES D. KENNEDY AND COL. CLARENCE H. OLSON OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT THE PHILIPPINE CHANCERY, WASHINGTON, D.C., WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, 1959

I am happy to be the representative of my Government to confer the Legion of Honor, rank of officer, to two Americans who are real friends of the Philippines. I am proud as their fellow veteran to be able to publicly thank them in this manner in behalf of all the veterans of my country. Aside from Congressman OLIN E. TEAGUE, of TEXAS, who has been conferred the highest decoration in the gift of our Government by the late President Magsaysay, and Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, of Massachusetts, I do not know of any two Americans who have so indefatigably and so disinterestedly fought for the recognition of the rights of the Filipino veterans than Mr. Miles D. Kennedy and Col. Clarence H. Olson. We in the Philippines owe them a debt of gratitude which we can never repay, and these medals are but a modest token of our deep appreciation which the Republic of the Philippines officially makes as its own today.

Here are two Americans who owe no favors to us. Without hope for any material reward, of their own free will, merely because they believe in the justice of our veterans' claims, they have taken up the fight. I have personal knowledge of the amount of work that they have done in pleading for a hearing for their fellow veterans in the Philippines, of their persistence, of their personal sacrifice. Against all odds they have tried every means and exerted every effort to show the American Government that the case for the Filipino veteran is a case that involves not only Philippine-American relations but America's honor. In the American Legion, on Capitol Hill, before American official agencies, whenever and wherever they can be heard, they have spoken forthrightly and eloquently for our veterans' cause.

While we have such American friends, while we can count on the support of such champions of our veterans, while we have Americans imbued with that inherent sense of fairness and square deal of the true American, while we have men like Congressman Teague to whom we are indebted for his untiring efforts for our veterans, Congresswoman Rogers, Mr. Kennedy, and Colonel Olson who selflessly take up the fight for us, I say to my people that they can take heart, they need not despair, for as I have always said, the cause of our Filipino veterans is a just cause and I have an abiding faith in the unfailing sense of justice of the American people.

The Filipino veterans who have come from Manila to attend the American Legion convention in Minneapolis last week have seen another convincing demonstration of America's friendship for us and of the Legion's firm conviction that the fight for our veterans in the Philippines is a just fight and must be pursued here in Washington at all levels. The American Legion has approved three resolutions all of which are an endorsement of the plea of the Filipino veteran for a recognition of his just rights. If our people are looking for another evidence of America's continuing friendly interest in us, of the reservoir of American good will for the Philippines, the American Legion has given such evidence and I need not say it is deeply appreciated by my people.

The fight to assert the just rights of our veterans is three-pronged: (1) to enlist the help of American public opinion, and working through influential organizations like the American Legion is a correct approach; (2) to get the favorable support of the administration, that is, get the affirmative report of the executive agencies of the U.S. Government; and (3) finally, the approval of the American Congress. It is not an easy matter to succeed in getting a concerted action by these three. In fact, it is an uphill fight and it takes time, patience, coordination of efforts and restraint. It took us 24 years to get recognition of the justice of our gold devaluation refund claim and 10 years for the approval of additional war damage compensation. With Congressman TEAGUE and Congresswoman ROGERS and other friends on Capitol Hill and with men like Colonel Olson and Mr. Kennedy and others in the American Legion, with our Government firmly backing up our veterans, and with our veterans in the Philippines presenting a united front, I am confident that this question of the claims of our veterans will be solved to the mutual satisfaction of both peoples.

For my part, I wish to give the assurance that I will continue to spare no effort and leave no stone unturned to see to it that my fellow veterans who risked their all for the American flag are given the recognition that is their legitimate right. On the floor of the U.S. Congress when I was Resident Commissioner and in committee hearings—all of which are on record—I have given voice to their just pleas. In three of my published books I have paid them the tribute that they have earned and thus impress the American people with their heroism and sacrifice. My unremitting efforts in their behalf I reiterate will continue with vigor because I firmly believe that their cause is just and the American people, given the facts, will not deny justice where justice is due.

Mr. Kennedy and Colonel Olson: The medals that you now wear symbolize your entry in the Legion of Honor, select men to whom 23 million Filipinos are beholden for outstanding and distinguished service rendered in their behalf. You personify the qualities of true Americanism that have won for your people the friendship and loyalty of men who in America's hour of need stood by you without counting the cost. When your Old Glory was pulled down in the Philippines by enemy hands, in your darkest hour in the Pacific, they were brown hands that picked it up and they were brown breasts that were bared against Japanese bayonets in defense of the United States. In behalf of those Filipino soldiers who did not hesitate to fight for your flag, I thank you for remembering them and for your efforts to see to it that your people may not forget.

AFL–CIO President George Meany's Address to 60th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of an address made by George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, before the distinguished guests banquet at the 60th annual national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

ADDRESS BY AFL–CIO PRESIDENT GEORGE MEANY TO THE DISTINGUISHED GUESTS BANQUET OF THE 60TH NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS AT THE STATLER-HILTON, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Distinguished guests and friends of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I am deeply touched by your recognition of my efforts to serve America. There could be no greater tribute than to be honored for service to Americanism at such a moment in the life of our Nation. What I appreciate most about receiving this award is that, in honoring me, you are paying tribute to the vital and constructive role of American labor at this crucial hour.

Since receiving notice of this award I have asked myself: What is Americanism? What is the most valuable thing in our life as Americans? To American labor, Americanism is a way of life based on human values, on the right to worship God in the way we please, on men not on money, on character and capacity and not on color, on opportunity not on origin, on aspiration rather than on acquisition. We look upon our democracy not only as a heritage—but also in part at least as our own achievement, with a continuing responsibility upon all Americans to constantly work for the improvement of our democratic institutions. Americanism cannot be the monopoly of any organization, movement, or individual.

Much of our national strength is rooted in the diverse backgrounds of our people. If we go back far enough, we are all foreigners. Whether we came via Plymouth Rock, or Ellis Island, or as refugees from Communist-enslaved Hungary, we were impelled by a yearning for freedom, dignity, opportunity for creativeness and growth and not only by a hope for material improvement. This common faith, this common hope, has welded us into one Nation of many peoples.

We dare not take our liberties and our national security for granted. Never, for a moment, can we take our eyes off the reality of our times. The aggressor we face is ruthless and fully armed with the deadliest modern weapons.

The world crisis has made us more aware of the weaknesses and shortcomings of our democracy. The totalitarian despots are counting on these weaknesses to help them triumph. We must not slacken our efforts to overcome such weaknesses as racialism, discrimination, recurring economic recessions, unemployment, and poverty. Failure to overcome these weaknesses would jeopardize our democracy.

We of American labor have the greatest faith in the effectiveness of democratic institutions and processes as instruments for solving economic problems and furthering happiness in the daily lives of our people.

Political democracy cannot grow or even continue for long without our economy prospering and growing. Economic democracy must go hand in hand with political democracy. Theodore Roosevelt once put the problem this way: "If democracy is to mean the happiness and contentment its founders intended for all Americans, we must pass prosperity around."

Our democracy cannot be defended successfully by military force alone. Social and economic security is indisepensable to national security. Denial of industrial freedom and social and economic insecurity are enemies of democracy within our lines. We must overcome these enemies from within in order to take the full moral and political offensive against our enemies from without. Communism, fascism, falangism, and every other type of tyranny thrive on social maladjustment and economic insecurity.

If we look at Americanism in a practical sense, and not as a platitude, then we will see clearly that one of the most vital and indispensable expressions of American democracy is the labor union. I say this with a full realization of the errors and weaknesses of our movement. The right of workers to join one with another for the purpose of collectively securing a fair share of the wealth created under our American system is a basic right without which there would be no protection for workers against economic exploitation.

American business has learned quite well to adapt itself to technological change. But, unfortunately, quite a few businessmen still refuse to adapt themselves to social change and progress. Failure in this respect can only lead to a bankruptcy even more costly that that which would result from refusal to adapt business to technological change.

On a number of recent occasions, the Soviet dictator, Mr. Khrushchev, has said that his totalitarian system is new and young and that the democracy we in America cherish is old. He has bragged that Soviet Communism is the wave of the future and that the future belongs to his slave empire. In the role of a prophet, Khrushchev reminds us of Hitler who often boasted that his Nazi empire would last 1,000 years. Need we remind the Communist dictator about what happened to Hitler and his prophecy?

Khrushchev knows his tyranny, but he certainly does not know his history. Historically speaking, the democracy which our country represents is new and young. Democracy is the most forward-looking, and advanced system of human relationships—being based on human dignity, equality, opportunity and justice. The tyranny that Moscow represents is old. It is totalitarian slavery. The only thing really new about Soviet tyranny is its masquerading a movement for profound social reform and its utilization of modern technology and industry for bolstering its despotism. Khrushchev's communism is but another reactionary and dreadful episode in the long history of man's uphill struggle for dignity, decency, and democracy.

In recent weeks, there has been much talk emphasizing America's desire for peace and friendship with the Russian people. There never was any question about the American people being genuinely friendly toward the Russian and the other Soviet peoples. We want peace and friendship with the Russian and the other enslaved peoples of the Soviet empire. However, the issue in the world today is not peace and friendship but peace and freedom. This is the issue at the heart of the world crisis. It is not an issue merely dividing the Kremlin from the White House or the Moscow regime from the American people. It divides the Moscow regime from its own people. In a world of peace and freedom, there would be no problem of friendship between nations. But in a world where peace can be dictated by blackmail or the ballistic missiles of despotism, there can be no real friendship, there can be no freedom, and there can be no peace—unless it is the peace of the prison or the peace of the graveyard.

But military attack is not the only danger our country faces today. We must also guard against dangerous illusions about our enemy and his hypocritical pretensions.

Wishful thinking has led some to delude themselves into believing that the Communist dictators are hostile to America because they do not know enough about our country and have some misconceptions about our democratic way of life and the loyalty of our people to our free institutions. Therefore, say these self-deluded: let the Communist dictators come to our land as our guests, let them see for themselves the truth about our country and they will lose their misconceptions. Then, they will become friendly to us, world tension will be lessened, and the danger of war will be ended. It is all so simple.

No illusion could be more dangerous. The Soviet rulers have unlimited access to the facts about life in our country. They have the most extensive and effective intelligence espionage service in the world. Very likely, the Moscow dictators are far better informed in a detailed sense about our defense system, our economy, our labor unions and our political parties than the heads of our Government are about what goes on in the Kremlin.

It is not so much ignorance or misconception of our democratic way of life which has prompted Stalin and Khrushchev to wage cold war against us and to threaten humanity with atomic destruction. In fact, the more Khrushchev and his Communist regime know and understand our democracy and the full support it enjoys among our people, the more they fear and hate it as the obstacle in their drive for conquering the world and remolding it on the Soviet pattern.

The Communist rulers are prisoners of their own dogma. Twenty-five years of American recognition of the Soviet Government have meant the presence of many of its diplomats in our country. Leading Soviet figures have been participating actively in the affairs of the Unted Nations. Molotov, Manuilsky, Mikoyan and Kozlov amongst other Moscow bigwigs have visited our country and have had every opportunity to see it firsthand.

Did any of them lose any of their misconceptions about us? Did their regime change its policies and work for peace and friendship as a result of their having been confronted wth the realities of our land?

These Soviet visitors reported faithfully and fully to Stalin and Khrushchev on what they had seen and learned. Yet these educational tours did not stop Khrushchev from telling us: "We will bury you." Apparently visits by officials like the one Mr. Mikoyan and Mr. Kozlov made to the United States did not provide the means of frank and full discussion of some of our problems and the development of solutions for them. Nor did these visits by Mikoyan and Kozlov bring about any change in the Soviet pattern of diplomatic negotiations. As Secretary of State Herter declared after his last return from the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers: "The Soviet Union pursued an objective that made successful negotiations impossible."

The Moscow rulers continue to spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year on jamming our broadcasts.

They do not allow their subjects, the plain people, to leave the U.S.S.R. and come to our country as tourists.

Obviously the Kremlin dictatorship is afraid to trust its own people with ideas different from or critical of communism.

These days, some are getting excited about cultural exchanges with the Soviets. Some are even deluding themselves into hoping that these cultural exchanges will get Moscow to call off the cold war. This is no time for wishful thinking. Let us be realists.

Under Khrushchev, as under Stalin, the Soviet peoples lack the basic democratic rights which they must have in order to have free and genuine contacts among themselves. Until the Soviet peoples get these democratic rights, they certainly will not be able to have free and genuine cultural contacts and exchanges with other peoples.

Until the average Russian worker and peasant, and not only the handpicked Soviet representative or espionage agent, can visit our country, it is self-deluding to talk about people-to-people exchanges between the U.S.S.R. and the United States.

And until those who do visit us can, upon their return, report freely to the people on what they saw and learned in America—without fear of imprisonment or execution for treason—it is an insult to commonsense for anyone to pretend that the Russians are free to exchange ideas with other nations.

Visitors and tourists who have recently returned from the Soviet Union tell us that there is great friendship among the Russian people for the American people. The visit by Vice President NIXON has confirmed this. However, it is also evident that this obvious friendship of the Russian people toward the American people has had no impact on the Soviet Government's foreign policy.

It is in the very nature of the dictatorship that what the people think and feel on foreign as well as domestic affairs is not reflected in the actions of the ruling clique.

The Kremlin has tried to make it appear that the crisis of our times is due to a conflict between American capitalism and communism. This is sheer nonsense. The crisis today is not between American capitalism and Soviet communism. We in the United States never had and do not have today capitalism as it was known to Marx and the Socialists of Europe and Asia. The growth of our free economy has not been hampered by feudal barriers or cartels. Moreover, our economy has shown great resiliency and a capcity to adapt itself to change.

The real struggle in the world today is between democracy and despotism, between human freedom and tyranny.

We must understand that communism is predicated on the basis of a definite objective.

Its fundamental principle is world domination with the aim of remolding the entire world—including the United States—on the pattern of Soviet tyranny.

The Communists have been unrelenting in the fanatical pursuit of this aim. They may vary their strategy and tactics, but they never change or even swerve from their fundamental aim. The Communists are past masters in combining rigidity of purpose with flexibility of tactics.

The overriding aim of every Communist Party, no matter where located, is to subvert and overthrow by force every form of Government—except the so-called proletarian dictatorship.

Communism is a worldwide system of rule. It is, therefore, quite natural that its decisions and deeds should be determined and directed by the strongest state under Communist control. Today, Russia is that state. Since the Soviet rulers are also the rulers of world communism, they always consider its interests, or the interests of any non-Russian Communist regime as subordinate to or identical with the interests of Soviet Russia.

If any Communist Party or individual Communist outside the U.S.S.R. should balk at this absolute Russian monopoly, he gets booted as a revisionist, deviationist, or a traitor. What happens then?

Clearly, under such a system there are no American Communists, but only Communists in America. Communists in democratic countries may, at one time or another, say they are for democracy and peaceful democratic methods, but secretly and actually they continue to be dedicated to the overthrow of all democratic institutions.

Some of our businessmen seem to be in a great hurry to trade with the Soviet Union. The Kremlin needs such trade to build up a huge modern chemical industry and to develop automation in its production. Let these get-rich-quick industrialists ponder the basic dogmas of Russian communism before they rush to do business with Khrushchev. Need we remind them of what happened after some profit-hungry industrialists and financiers "did business" with Hitler?

Khrushchev would have us believe that some bilateral arrangement between the Soviet Union and the United States is the surest way to avert a world war. His arrangement would, of course, have our country recognize the legality of the Kremlin territorial grabs. Moscow wants time in which to consolidate its conquests. It wants America, as the most powerful democracy, to accept as final the status of the captive peoples. American acceptance would shatter the morale and hopes of the oppressed for freedom, and, thereby, serve to stabilize and strengthen the Iron Curtain empire.

Moscow wants bilateral hobnobbing and talkfests in order to sow suspicions of America among our allies and take the ground from under the foundations of NATO.

In his recent "sweetness and light" speech thanking President Eisenhower for inviting him to the United States, Khrushchev reiterated his determination to snuff out the freedom of West Berlin and absorb all Germany into the Communist slave empire.

Nowhere in Europe is the fraud of Soviet communism so painfully glaring as in the Russian Zone of Germany which incidentally is the only area in Europe with a declining population. According to the latest official "Statistical Year Book" of the Soviet Zone administration, the population of this area fell by more than a million between 1950 and 1958—from 18,388,200 to 17,311,707.

Some in our midst are prisoners of the illusion that Stalin pursued warlike foreign policies but Khrushchev is more peaceful. Nothing could be further from the truth. The 20th Soviet Communist Party Congress did not change Stalin's foreign policy. It did not say a word against the Stalin annexations and aggression of the postwar period or his unleashing of the cold war. It made no decision that communism will now try to achieve its international objectives by peaceful means rather than by force.

At the 20th Soviet Communist Party Congress in February 1956, Khrushchev sharply criticized the dead Stalin for his brutal mistreatment of some of his closest and most loyal followers. But, while making this criticism, Khrushchev did not dare to reverse Stalin's basic economic and international course, because such a reversal would have shaken the very foundations of the Soviet slave empire.

And lest we forget, it was Khrushchev who supported Peiping's military attacks on Quemoy and Matsu and the rape of Tibet. It was Khrushchev himself who directed the butchery of the Hungarian people when they sought freedom and genuine peaceful coexistence with the Soviet Union and the rest of the world. Nor is the present Soviet-provoked Berlin crisis exactly a demonstration of "peaceful means." As a matter of fact, in his ultimatum of November 27, 1958, Khrushchev was far more truculent and aggressive toward Berlin and German national reunification than Stalin ever was.

In the days of Molotov, whom the free world found to be very rigid and stubborn, the Soviet rulers, on occasion, even paid lip-service to the idea of unification of Germany through free elections.

These days the columns of Pravda are oozing "sweetness" toward the United States. How reminiscent of the Geneva spirit of 1955. But let no one forget that this spirit was followed by Hungary and Khrushchev's threats to launch a missile attack on London and Paris during the Suez crisis in 1956.

No one should oppose negotiations with the Kremlin on any level in the interest of peace and freedom. But let us have no illusions. A change of phrase, a slick maneuver, pretension to international honor and morality does not mean a change in Communist basic aims. Only a change in deed, a change of Soviet purpose and practice can really be meaningful. Such a change has not taken place in the Kremlin hierarchy.

If we do not delude ourselves, then there is no basis for panic or pessimism about the future of our country.

No doubt, Communist despots, like their predecessors—the Pharaohs of old, the Kaiser in World War I, and like Hitler of yesterday—have been able to organize production and harness effectively the technology of their times to the pursuit of aggression and war. Hitler was even more ahead of us in missiles than Khrushchev is today. We should neither minimize nor exaggerate the Soviet capacities to challenge us in the realm of economy.

We of American labor prefer our democracy—with all its imperfections—a millionfold to the perfect totalitarian despotism behind the Iron Curtain. This is the categoric position of American labor.

Ours is a human country—with all the frailties and all the failings that are human. In our country, there is much to be improved and remedied and many wrongs to be righted on both sides of the Mason and Dixon line. I am confident that these will be righted by those who love America and not by those who hate our democratic way of life and want to replace it with communism or any other despotism.

Let us remove the shortcomings and weaknesses in our own social fabric—racial discrimination, unemployment, un-American living conditions.

In Latin America and Africa, as well as in Europe, let us talk and act as friends of the oppressed and never as friends of dictators and oppressors.

Let our Government exercise a greater initiative in extending democracy and freedom by working to have our allies break with all colonialism.

Let us improve the substance and manner of our helping the newly established and economically underdeveloped nations to grow into healthy and prosperous democracies. Remember, life is still a nightmare for hundreds of millions throughout the world—the underfed, undereducated, underhoused, and underproductive.

Let us rebuild NATO and enlarge its purpose through effective cooperation by its members in promoting economic progress and prosperity, mutual assistance in the realm of technology and science, and the strengthening of the military forces.

Let us strive to turn the United Nations into a more effective instrument of world peace on the basis of its charter. Under no circumstances, can we accept the transformation of the United Nations into a reformatory for international criminals like the Chinese Communist dictators.

Last but foremost, let us build an America that will be strong enough, along with our allies, to deter and if need be defeat those who stand in the way of world peace and the freedom of mankind.

Come to Bergen County, Khrushchev; See Us; Hear Freedom Ring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who live in Bergen County, N.J., have great pride in its growth and development under this wonderful free enterprise system of ours. One of our leading citizens, who happens also to be a lifelong friend, Edwin Emrich of Haworth, has returned recently from an extended tour of Russia. He traveled as an individual, not as part of a group. He says he found "the food inferior, the women brawny, and the people intensely curious, particularly about the United States." Emrich is a resident of Haworth, a great admirer of Bergen County and its people, a successful stockbroker with Hirsch & Co. in New York City, a member of the Bergen County Planning Board, and president of the Northern Valley Planning Association. He is considered to be one of the leading municipal and county planners in the United States.

The Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N.J., asked Mr. Emrich to write a special article that would be of particular interest to Bergen County readers in the light of Premier Khrushchev's impending visit. Mr. Emrich's article was published on September 9 and because it applies to just about every State, county, and town in our great country, under leave granted I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD where all may benefit from the great American philosophy so well expressed by him.

The article follows:

"OUR PEOPLE, LIKE YOURS, WANT PEACE; BUT WE WON'T BE BULLIED"

A population study made by the Bergen County Planning Board has shown some very interesting facts. Here in this county we had in 1950 some 75,000 foreign-born residents—60,000 of them naturalized, 15,000 not naturalized. In 1950 we had 2,446 persons who were born in the U.S.S.R., a gain of 24 percent over 1940, a gain second only to Canadian immigrants, and compared with a gain of 2.3 percent from England, and a loss of 1.5 percent from Italy.

THEY HAVE A CHOICE

Truly, if Mr. Khrushchev should come to Bergen County, he would find as many different national origins as he has in his vast native Russia.

Come to Bergen County, Mr. K.

We'll show you a community just short of 1 million representative Americans of every heritage known to mankind—Americans with the problems of life, its joys and sorrows, with wealth and modest means, average men, below and above, each with a different ambition or desire, an individual way of life.

They conform or they don't. They have free choice, free speech, free assembly. They have justice and injustice.

These things, Mr. K., are ours: The right to make our own mistakes, our own successes, our own homes, our own law, our own trees, our own churches, our own business; most of all, our own families, our own children, not raised by the State, not indoctrinated with a single system. We have the right to doubt or to have faith; a huge, free, competitive press to print every opinion to all, for all. We have free libraries and pay libraries, books for all by anyone who has anything to say, wise or foolish, great or mediocre. We have new thoughts, new ideas, wisdom and stupidity, vision, and talent, creative men and women.

All this awaits you in Bergen County, Mr. K.

You will see every shade of architecture and design, wide roads and narrow, crowded streets and empty, parks, playgrounds, every type of recreation and enterprise. It's all here, Mr. K. In fact so much is here that our own people sometimes don't know really how great it is. They must travel all over the world, including your own Russia, to find out how truly great and massive, how abundant and wonderful and thrilling their own possessions are.

Here in Bergen County, United States of America, Mr. K. we will show you people who are kind and generous and peaceful and determined to improve with each generation. When we slip from our course it is because of human frailty and not because we wish to do harm. We will defend all we have with everything we have but we threaten you not and the people of Russia not at all.

We offer you the chance to see us, study us, copy us or not, as you choose, but we ask the same of you, Mr. K.

Don't push. Don't threaten. Don't holler, and above all, don't start anything!

The moon shines over you and over us. The stars come out at night in Russia and in the United States of America. The winds blow, the snow and rain fall, and the sun shines freely for the the entire world. The same creator watches all children.

So come to us, Mr. K. Read our papers and our books and try to understand our hearts and minds. Please remember that freedom is a noble thing and we think freedom more to prize than all the gold in the world.

Yes, come to Bergen County, Mr. K. Here you will find the descendants of the world's greatest revolution, the longest lasting, and the most successful. It was a revolution led by truly noble men, Washington, Jefferson, Franklin, Adams, and Paine. They were intellectuals, patriots, men of justice, lovers of liberty.

The giants roadway to freedom runs through Bergen County and clear across the world to join together all revolutions based on justice, freedom, and the rights of man against the state.

Thirty Years With the Louisville Courier-Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, Robert L. Riggs and the Courier-Journal of Louisville, Ky., celebrated the 30th anniversary of a highly successful relationship. It is most appropriate that Bob Riggs has served so long and with such distinction as a correspondent for the Courier-Journal for this newspaper consistently is named on all survey lists as one of the 10 great U.S. papers. The ability and integrity of its correspondents, editorial staff, and technical personnel have raised the Courier-Journal to this position of recognition and eminence in the newspaper field. The incisive, comprehensive and intelligent reporting of Bob Riggs has contributed in no small measure to the superiority of the Courier-Journal.

When Robert L. Riggs began his association with the Courier-Journal 30 years ago, the Nation was staggering under the sullen weight of the depression, and breadlines and soup kitchens were common stories for the young reporter. However, the economic stability of our country was to improve, and concomitant with a gradual return to fiscal normalcy was the emergence of America as the industrial giant of the world. The fast-moving events of the next 3 decades were reported by Bob Riggs and his career has covered one of the most exciting periods in history—from the industrial age, to the atomic age and now into the mysteries of outer space. These are thrilling and frequently tense times in which we live, and no one is more familiar with the conquests of science and the flow of history than a man whose job it is to record these events in the daily press. Just within the past year or so we have seen the development of a nuclear submarine which can remain submerged for as long as 60 days, jet planes span the country in less than 4 hours, one of our satellites is in orbit around the sun, IRBM's and ICBM's are becoming more devastatingly accurate, astronauts have been selected for the first manned flight into outer space, the world's first atomic-powered merchant vessel was launched this summer, and the conquering of age-old diseases has prolonged our lifespan by many years.

Bob Riggs has been chief of the Washington Bureau of the Courier-Journal for many years and is presently serving in that capacity. His affable manner and shy smile are well known on Capitol Hill. He is especially familiar to all members of the Kentucky congressional delegation, and, while at times there might be a slight difference in viewpoint, the excellence of his reporting is universally held in high regard. Robert L. Riggs has earned the admiration of his friends and the respect of his colleagues. He is a newspaperman in the finest sense of the word.

Khrushchev's Broken Promise on Slave Labor in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of an article by Mr. Béla Fabian, chairman, Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, which appeared in the September 7, 1959, issue of U.S. News &

World Report. I am bringing this shocking report to the attention of those Members of this body who have not already read it since it clearly reveals that, despite persistent denials by those in the Kremlin, Soviet slave labor camps are still very much in existence in Soviet Russia and hundreds of thousands are still suffering in these camps which Mr. Khrushchev promised to shut down in 1955:

KHRUSHCHEV'S BROKEN PROMISE ON SLAVE LABOR IN RUSSIA

(By Béla Fabian, chairman, Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners)

The Soviets are playing up the question of Nazi concentration camps, mainly to draw away the attention of the world from their own. They pass over with silence the fact that it was the Soviets who first introduced the system of slave-labor camps on the Solovetski Islands in 1919. Neither do they speak of the outrageous fact that they deported the survivors of the Auschwitz camp, which they "liberated" in 1945. They do not boast about the millions of Russians who were deported to Germany by the Nazis, and whom they took back to the Soviet Union against their own will, to confine them to Siberian slave-labor camps for reeducation.

One of the aims of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners, which was founded in 1951, is to collect information about concentration camps in the Soviet orbit. I myself have spent 5 years in Nazi and Soviet camps and prisons, and, therefore, believe that I cannot do a more useful job than to try to free the ones who are still suffering in camps and prisons.

We receive our facts from three competent sources:

1. From prisoners who were released from concentration camps;

2. From prisoners who escaped; and,

3. From Russians serving in the Soviet Army who are stationed in occupied countries. As they themselves bitterly oppose the concentration-camp system, they willingly reveal the truth to persons with whom they are in close contact.

Our organization learned about the tragic fate of the Hungarian girls who were deported to the Soviet Union for having actively taken part in the revolution in 1956, from letters which these girls wrote to their families, and which were forwarded by the Russian soldiers whom they had met in Siberia. The parents of the girls wrote to their friends in America asking them to do something on behalf of the girls.

From Hungary alone, approximately 6 million letters are sent yearly to the United States, as there are 1 million Hungarians living in America. Whenever such letters contain information that would interest our organization, we are immediately contacted. A large number of letters are likewise being sent from other countries behind the Iron Curtain. They have developed a special common language. So if, for example, a father writes that his son was taken to the hospital, this means that he was arrested.

In 1955, Khrushchev declared that all concentration camps would be dissolved and all political prisoners would be released. Not only did this fail to materialize, as so many other Soviet promises, but, since Khrushchev came to power, the number of concentration camps and political prisoners has increased.

In Hungary alone, in the darkest days of the Rákosi regime (Mátyás Rákosi, former first Secretary of the Hungarian Communist Party), there were only three concentration camps and the number of political prisoners amounted to 27,000. Today, I myself have knowledge of the existence of seven camps and the number of political prisoners surpasses 60,000. Two of the largest concentration camps, Kistarcsa and Tököl, are only 12 and 20 kilometers (7 and 12 miles), respectively, distant of Budapest.

In Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Rumania, the concentration-camp system is still prevalent. In Albania, a system of concentration camps built underground has recently been introduced. Since the Hungarian revolution, the regimes of the occupied countries no longer conceal the fact of the existence of concentration camps and the cruel treatment of prisoners. This serves as an instrument of terror to discourage and suppress any move for freedom.

Prisons, concentration camps and secret trials are the three principal implements of terror, without which no dictatorship, especially not that of the Soviets, could maintain itself.

The denial of the existence of concentration camps is only for outside purposes, as no newspaper published in countries under Communists rule would dare print such a brazen lie.

When Mikoyan (Anastas I. Mikoyan, a Soviet First Deputy Premier) visited the United States, I asked some influential persons, who had the opportunity to speak to him, to intervene with him for the release of political prisoners who were deported to the Soviet Union or imprisoned in Hungary. One of them was Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who was invited to the Soviet Embassy in Washington to have lunch with Mikoyan. Mikoyan told Senator HUMPHREY that there were no political prisoners in the Soviet Union. In Soviet terminology, this means that anyone who is in prison or concentration camp is a criminal. When I asked Zorin (Valerian A. Zorin, a Soviet deputy foreign minister) at a press conference in Geneva whether there was any chance that the Hungarian deportees would be returned before the conference was over, he became very angry and told me that I was living in the past, otherwise I wouldn't ask such foolish questions.

Although the concentration camps exist as before in the Soviet orbit, some changes have taken place inside the Soviet Union since Stalin's death.

In the summer of 1953, shortly after the East German revolts, strikes broke out in all East Siberian and Arctic camps. The bloodiest revolts took place in Karaganda, Kolyma, Norilsk, and Vorkuta. In many places the military and the guards went over to the prisoners' side, and some camps even fell into the hands of the prisoners. Security troops from Moscow and Leningrad had to be sent out to reestablish order at the cost of thousands of lives.

Even if the revolts were put down, they nevertheless achieved some reforms and alleviations.

Food became more abundant and of a better quality. Bread rations were increased from 600 grams to 1 kilogram (1.3 to 2.2 pounds) daily. Restaurants and commissaries were set up in the camps where prisoners could eat and purchase certain things, as they now received pay. Furthermore, bars were removed from the windows of the barracks, and the prisoners were permitted to write more frequently to their families.

All these reforms served the purpose of increasing production in the mines and other industrial enterprises—such as the production of timber, which is done by prisoners, as is 98 percent of gold mining and 17 percent of coal mining in the Soviet Union. The industries of the Leningrad district depend entirely on the output of the mines worked by prisoners.

However, despite the easing of some aspects of their life, there is no serious increase in production as, naturally, the prisoners want the total dissolution of the camps. As long as they had to subsist on a starvation diet, food played the foremost role in the prisoners' lives. Now that they have enough to eat, all they think of is to regain freedom.

Whenever a prisoner has completed his sentence, he is released from the camp but, with a few exceptions, permitted to live freely only in the district where his former camp is situated. The reason for this is that work would stop in the mines if the prisoners returned to their former dwelling places. In order to keep them there, especially in the Arctic regions, the regime rather consents to their having their families brought there. So, for instance, in the Komi territory, that includes Vorkuta, there used to live some 80,000 to 100,000 Komis, whose language is related to the Finnish and the Hungarian. Now it has 4 million inhabitants who are living in and outside the slave-labor camps.

The regime has two means of keeping the so-called free laborers in such places. One of them is that they receive a paper on their release specifying that they are not permitted to leave a certain territory without a special permit. Without special permit they cannot buy railway tickets, and there are no other ways of travel. From places such as Karaganda, Kolyma, Norilsk, and Vorkuta it is impossible to escape. Distances are too great to walk, and there is no place to hide because of the Arctic climate.

Instead of stopping deportations, Khrushchev has started a new phase. Khrushchev's pet project was that of opening up the virgin lands of Kazakhstan. However, normally, it would have been impossible to settle free workers there because of the extreme climate and the shortage of housing facilities. He solved the problem by recruiting so-called volunteers, mainly university students and workers who betrayed too much independent thinking. They were promised good wages in case they volunteered, but had no other choice, as they would have been deported anyway. On arrival they found nothing but desert land, and had to build their own living quarters.

The adverse climate and total lack of the most elementary conditions of hygiene took a heavy toll in lives. With the exception of volunteers from the Baltic, who had to sign only a 5-month contract, all others had to sign one for 3 years. Khrushchev himself said in one of his speeches that, out of the 8,000 students of Leningrad University, 4,200 had volunteered.

Because at the beginning mostly young men were called upon to volunteer, unrest broke out later because of a lack of women. The regime is now recruiting young girls and women in large numbers, not only in the Soviet Union but also in the satellite countries. Recently, a short notice was published in the Soviet newspapers praising 25,000 women who had volunteered to help carry out the Khrushchev plan in Kazakhstan. More than 10,000 girls were recruited in Bulgaria, and the Bulgarian newspapers publish notices of marriages and of new houses being built. A Polish Communist reporter, who was in Sofia at that time, took pictures at the railway station of a train full of girls leaving for Kazakhstan. Girls are also being recruited in Hungary and Rumania.

How to put an end to the shameful system of concentration camps? By not going along with Khrushchev and pretending to believe that there are none. The free world must keep talking about this question and not treat is as taboo. A disease that is concealed can never be cured. A maximum of publicity is the only way to close down the concentration camps and to free the political prisoners.

Donald V. Sawhill, Civic Leader, Business Executive, and Outstanding Pennsylvania Citizen of Sharon and Pittsburgh, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Don Sawhill was such a wonderful fellow and such a fine friend of so many of us in western Pennsylvania and eastern Ohio that I want such a personable, gay, and constructive person noted permanently in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Don certainly deserves to be remembered by our generation, and the generations to come, for his many accomplishments in the betterment of his community, his help to young people in education, and his high level leadership of his good business associates and employees to such well-deserved business success.

Don worked hard and enjoyed it. He was loyal to his friends. He was a wonderful guy. We friends vote him "tops."

As a memorial for Don Sawhill, I call to the attention of my colleagues in Congress, and to the American people, the generosity of his good wife, Mrs. Donald V. Sawhill, his son Don, the family, and his associates in the Sawhill Charitable Foundation and in his businesses, set out in the following newspaper quotations:

[From the Sharon (Pa.) Herald, July 21, 1959]

PERKINS PROPERTY IS GIVEN TO UNITED FUND BY DON SAWHILL'S HEIRS—MEMORIAL GIFT TO BE USED AS AGENCY OFFICES

Mrs. Donald V. Sawhill and the trustees of the Sawhill Charitable Foundation jointly announced today the gift of the former Grace Tod Perkins property on West State Street to the United Fund of the Shenango Valley area.

A memorial to the late Donald V. Sawhill, founder and chairman of the board of Sawhill Tubular Products, Inc., and a tireless worker for the civic good of the valley, the property and buildings will be used as a community service center for the United Fund, its agencies and the residents of the valley.

Mrs. Sawhill and the foundation purchased the tract from the Perkins heirs.

The gift is the biggest private grant to the valley since Mr. and Mrs. Frank H. Buhl endowed it with Buhl farm in 1915.

WILL BE MEMORIAL

The executive committee of the United Fund, in accepting the deed to the property yesterday afternoon, indicated it would be called the "Donald V. Sawhill Memorial Building."

In a prior meeting yesterday at the Sawhill suite in the Shenango Inn, the presentation was made by the Sawhill trustees and a representative for Mrs. Sawhill to Dr. A. A. Booth, United Fund president.

United Fund officials said that the historic Sharon landmark, an approximate 8-acre tree-shaded sweep of hillside on the corner of West State Street and North Irvine Avenue, will be kept intact. The United Fund will be responsible for maintenance.

The estate includes a brick three-story, 16-room house, built in 1912, a gate house, a huge carriage house, a tool house, a caretaker's home, a greenhouse and extensive flower and vegetable gardens.

VALUED AT $260,000

Replacement value of the estate is reported to be $260,000.

The gift represents a boost for the West State Street business area where a renovation program is in the planning stage.

Yesterday's transfer of the showplace, known in late years as Perkinsville, also represents the first time since 1832 that the land has been out of the hands of the descendants of Gen. Joel B. Curtis.

At the site, Curtis developed the first coalfields in Mercer County. Later, in 1850, he opened the first iron industry in the valley. Miss Perkins, who died last month, was his great-grandniece. She was the daughter of Simon Perkins, the man who founded Shenango Furnace Co. in Sharpsville. The property was willed to her niece and nephew, Mrs. Laura Woodruff and George Leonard Collord.

Dr. Booth, envisioning activities for youth and golden-agers to be carried on at the spot as well as a variety of community uses, called it "a place for the people."

The grant is the initial act of the Sawhill Charitable Foundation since it was organized last November. Donald B. Sawhill, secretary of Sawhill Tubular Products, Inc., and son of the firm's founder; Ray F. Eisenbies, president of the company, and Louis J. Wiesen, general counsel and a director of the firm, are members of the foundation.

The idea of the presentation was conceived by Donald B. Sawhill, who is also a member of the United Fund board of directors. Eisenbies is cochairman for the United Fund campaign in the valley this fall.

Mrs. Sawhill, the codonor, is the widow of Donald V. Sawhill and is chairman of the board of the company. She lives on Highland Road.

In extending the gift in the memory of Mr. Sawhill, the group noted: "His business associates and his family felt it was fitting because of his many long years of interest in charitable and beneficial works in the Shenango Valley."

United Fund leaders said today that the main fund-raising office and a group of agencies that do not have buildings of their own, do not have to conduct welfare programs in segregated localities and that indicated in a recent survey that they might be interested in new office space will move into the buildings on the property within the next several weeks.

These agencies, unaware of yesterday's events, were invited to meet at 2 p.m. this afternoon. At that time, they were taken to view the building.

The housing committee of the United Fund that had been surveying possible office sites since January is composed of Peter Joyce, chairman; Mrs. William Whitla, Louis Puskar, G. S. Warren, Jr., B. W. Norton, and S. B. Doyle.

Mr. Sawhill was a prime mover in promoting the health and welfare of the community. Before his death in 1955, he was a director and vice president of the Sharon General Hospital, a former campaign chairman, director and active supporter of the Community Chest, one of the planners of the Shenango Inn, and later served as a member of the board of the Valley Hotel Operators Corp. and a chairman and trustee of the Mercer County Branch of the Pennsylvania Economy League.

He fathered the planning commission idea in the valley. He was a trustee of the Economic and Business Foundation of New Wilmington. He also was a trustee of Thiel College and held an honorary doctorate from the school.

During World War II, he served as a member of the War Production Board.

His other affiliations included director of Armstrong Grocery Co. here and Copperweld Steel Co. in Pittsburgh.

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator, July 21, 1959]

SHENANGO UF GETS MANSION AND EIGHT ACRES—HUGE ESTATE IS GIFT OF SAWHILL GROUP TO COMMUNITY

SHARON, Pa., July 21.—Shenango Valley United Fund, celebrating its fifth anniversary, has been donated a 16-room mansion located on 8 acres of land for its offices and headquarters.

The Perkins estate located on the west fringe area of the city's business district, is the gift to the community of Mrs. Donald V. Sawhill and trustees of Sawhill Charitable Foundation.

It will be a memorial to Don Sawhill, founder and president of Sawhill Tubular Products Inc., who died in 1955 after an outstanding industrial and community-service career.

The estate, named "Donald V. Sawhill Memorial Building," by the United Fund directors who Monday afternoon accepted the deed for the property, was purchased by the Sawhill Foundation from the estate of Miss Grace Tod Perkins, who died several days ago. Miss Perkins was the daughter of Simon Perkins, a pioneer industrialist in this area. The value of the gift is given as in excess of $80,000.

PROVIDES AMPLE SPACE

Located on West Hill at State Street and Irvine Avenue, the mansion will provide ample space for housing of officers of the local agencies supported by the United Fund. There also will be room for carrying out activities of some of the agencies.

The deed for the property was turned over to United Fund by representatives of the Sawhill family and foundation at 2 p.m. Monday at Shenango Inn. Three hours later the United Fund directors and executive committee accepted the gift.

Mrs. Claire Sawhill was out of the city and was unable to attend the ceremonies. The family was represented by her son, Donald B. Sawhill.

GIVES GIFT TO THIEL

The Sawhill Foundation was formed at the request of Mr. Sawhill, and in recent months has made several community contributions, including a gift to Thiel College where a new dormitory is to be named Sawhill Hall.

This is one of the largest contributions made to Shenango Valley in recent years and is the first by an individual outside the community gifts from Mr. and Mrs. Frank H. Buhl and the P. L. Kimberly estates.

The mansion was built in 1912 and has been one of the show places in Sharon. The property was purchased in 1832 by Col. Joel B. Curtis who developed coal mining operations on the site. Curtis, who was a great-grandfather of Miss Perkins, a founder of the plant now known as Shenango Furnace. Miss Perkins had willed the estate to her niece and nephew, Mrs. Laura Collard Woodfuff, of Sharon, and George L. Collard, Jr.

[From the Sharon (Pa.) Herald, July 22, 1959]

DEDICATED TO SERVICE—GIFT ESTATE SUITED TO UF USE

Elegant red brick, Georgian "Donald V. Sawhill Memorial Building" and community activties go together like a horse and carriage.

Under United Fund management and that of United Fund agencies, its 8 acres of land and adaptable outside buildings will adjust not only to meeting rooms and offices, but to youth programs and work centers for the aged.

Speaking of horses and carriages, in the old carriage house that also contains a wash rack for buggies, youth groups may hold gettogethers or winter baseball games. They also may conduct Easter egg rolls or go sled-riding on the long sweep of lawns. And there is quilting and workshhop space for goldenagers and greenhouses and gardens where they may work close to the land.

CHALLENGE TO GARDENERS

Gardeners might find a challenge in the century-old asparagus fields on the upper property or mushroom trays in the basement of the manor house. Bookkeepers might set up shop in the brick gatehouse that once served as an office and tally the success of the crops.

Almost hourly activity will be chalked off on the brass sun clock in the gradens.

This and community contributions have been traditional at the site.

The clock dates back more than 100 years when Joel B. Curtis bought the land. That was in 1834 and the purchase was from John Hull who thought Sharon would never come to much so he moved to Pulaski. Curtis, a downtown merchant, found coal on the property. An opportunist, he shipped the coal on the Beaver and Lake Erie Canal and opened Mercer County's coal trade. In 1850, he founded Sharon Iron Co. and opened Mercer County's industry.

About the same time he organized Sharon Iron Co., Curtis put a house on the corner of West State Street and North Irvine Avenue. It was a fantastic, yellow framehouse adorned with columns, carved wood orches, turrents, parapets, eave brackets, all in line with the style of the day and had more additions than there were city blocks in Sharon. In 1864, a second story was added

The old porch columns are still used in the arbor. A toolhouse, that is even older than the big house, stands in the garden.

BUILT IN 1912

The present house was built in 1912 after the old framehouse had burned to the ground one March morning in 1910. At the time, the whole community turned out to help rescue the furniture. The dining room table that the United Fund will use as a conference table, was rolled down the hill and the piano, still in use, was pushed down the hillside where it was caught at the bottom by a cluster of Sharon railroad men who banged on the keys while the house burned.

The hillside landscaping, that has never been changed, was engineered by Curtis and executed with a horse and scoop.

Now tree shrouded, it is composed of the sprawling great house, built by Wallis and Carley, and composed of three usable floors, a through hall, dormer windows, arched porchway, window seats in a 40-foot-long living room, and eight bedrooms and eight baths.

The property is enclosed by an old spiked fence that was made at Sharon Iron Co.

It was inherited from Curtis by his son, Alfred Norton Curtis. He was known for his private charities in the community. This, in turn, is traditional with the purposes of United Fund.

It passed to Alfred Curtis' niece, Mrs. Simon Perkins, who had married the founder of Shenango Furnace Co. in Sharpsville. Miss Grace Tod Perkins was their daughter.

For her, the estate was called Perkinsville. Her heirs, Mrs. Laura Woodruff and George L. Collord transferred it to Mrs. Donald V. Sawhill and the Sawhill Charitable Foundation who gave it to the United Fund as a memorial to Donald V. Sawhill. Mrs. Woodruff and Collord felt that Miss Perkins would have preferred that the property go to an organization that worked for the community.

Donald V. Sawhill was of the same community conscious frame of mind.

United Fund leaders said today that they will retain it as a historic landmark even while they use the property to the highest degree of usefulness.

Invitation To Attend the Admission Day Celebration of the State of Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, I am hereby enclosing a certified copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, which was adopted by the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii in special session, on September 4, 1959:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution inviting the President, Vice President, Members of the 86th Congress of the United States, members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, the Governors of the several States of the United States, and other dignitaries to attend the admission day celebration of the State of Hawaii

Whereas throughout more than the sixty years that Hawaii has been a Territory of the United States, the President, Vice President, and Congress of the United States have shaped its growth and guided its development toward the ultimate destiny of full participation in the National Government of the United States; and

Whereas the 86th Congress of the United States, through its passage of the Act of March 18, 1959, Public Law 86-3 (73 Statutes at Large) to admit Hawaii as a State has fulfilled the aspirations of the people of Hawaii to become an integral part of the United States Government; and

Whereas the 49 several States of the Union of the United States have supported Hawaii in its aspirations to become a sister State; and

Whereas it is the intent of the First State Legislature of the State of Hawaii to make an adequate appropriation in order to make the official observance of Hawaii's Admission Day a glorious and fitting celebration; and

Whereas it is particularly fitting that the President, Vice President, Members of the 86th Congress through whose wise and just actions the desires of the people of Hawaii have been realized and the Governors of the several States of the United States whose support of Hawaii is deeply appreciated, participate in the joyful celebration which will take place upon the office observance of admission of Hawaii as the 50th State of the Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President and Vice President of the United States, all members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, all Members of the 86th Congress of the United States, the Governors of the several States of the United States and such dignitaries as the Governor may deem desirable, are hereby invited by the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii to join with the people of Hawaii in the official observance of Hawaii's Admission Day Celebration; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governor of the State of Hawaii issue formal invitations to the parties hereinabove named; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President and Vice President of the United States, all Members of the 86th Congress of the United States, all members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, the Governors of the several States of the United States and the Governor of the State of Hawaii.

THE SENATE
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII,
September 4, 1959.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii in special session.

W. H. HILL,
President of the Senate.
WALTER G. CHUCK,
Clerk of the Senate.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
OF THE STATE OF HAWAII,
September 4, 1959.

We hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution was this day adopted by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii in special session.

ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.
HERMAN T. F. LUM,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

Higher Price Tags May Mean Better Bargains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Minneapolis Star of September 8, 1959. Mr. Arthur Upgren is a distinguished economist with the rare capacity to describe economic facts and processes in terms understandable by all of us. This article is especially important when it is being contended by some, wrongly, that to let interest rates find their natural level will automatically mean higher living costs:

HIGHER PRICE TAGS MAY MEAN BETTER BARGAINS

(By Arthur Upgren)

Is a straight line always the shortest distance between two points? Not always, as mathematicians and geographers can prove.

Can a higher price give you something for less money? I think I can demonstrate the truth of this equally surprising proposition.

For example, I have recently been criticized for saying that higher interest rates can give us houses for less money. I'd like now to show why this is so.

At the time of the Korean war the Government reimposed larger down payments and shorter periods of payment for the purchase of automobiles. These terms can be thought of as a higher price.

What was the result? A sharply lower price for automobiles both new and used. Three Minneapolis sales manager for automobiles told me at the time that the price of a nice used car came down from about $1,595 to $1,195.

With stiffer down payments, fewer people could buy a car at once. That reduced the total demand for cars. When you reduce

total demand that makes the price less. That is the way the law of supply and demand works.

Actually we had diverted enough steel from the production of automobiles to the making of implements of war so that we had to get along with fewer new automobiles. Somebody had to wait to get a new car.

If we had not imposed stiffer down payments and shorter terms, too many people would have tried to buy cars. The price would have risen. That's inflation.

The American people wouldn't have gotten any more cars, they just would have had to pay more money—a higher price—for the limited number of cars available.

It was that higher price trend that we nipped almost in the bud. So the stiffer terms made the automobiles lower in price.

About the same time, 1951, interest rates moved sharply forward when the Federal Reserve banks dropped the support of all Government bonds. That support had made interest rates low. Dropping the supports made credit tighter and interest rates higher. The prices of houses declined.

An economist for the AFL–CIO bought a house in Washington. He complained, that he had to pay what amounted to about 1 percent more interest. Someone might say that made the house cost him more. But did it?

One percent more interest on a $15,000 mortgage amounts to $150 a year increased cost to pay interest on the mortgage. (Actually the interest rates have not gone up that much in any single year either then or now.)

But my economist friend also told me that he got a wonderful bargain in buying his house. In his own words he said he bought the house "for $4,000 less than it was worth."

Tighter money meant not quite so many people could buy houses. That reduces demand. Lowering demand has the lowering effect on price.

The real point is that when you have inflation you cannot meet all money demands at prices that remain constant. So businesses raise the price. That is inflation. Tightening credit raises the financing cost but it helps hold the price of the thing on which you pay interest down to lower levels.

If you have any doubts about this just ponder for a moment the idea that lowering the interest rate will make things cheaper. How do you lower interest rates? By making money much cheaper. That will make money available at, say, 5 percent instead of 6 percent for houses.

What do you think will happen to the price of houses? We can't build them out of air, and our production of them cannot increase quickly. So the price will have to go up until some buyers are squeezed out of buying. That makes houses more expensive for everybody who can buy.

The only person who gains by a lower interest rate is the one who finances his house at the low rate just before the rate is advanced.

Our New Labor Law: What It Is and How It Came About

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the remedial labor legislation recently enacted was designed to and will first, to a great extent, protect the right of union members to participate in union policy. To know for what purpose the dues and special assessments exacted from them through the checkoff are spent. It will give them a greater opportunity to elect union officials and, thereafter, control their activities.

Second. It will in certain circumstances permit the union shop which compels the applicant for a job to join the union, pay initiation fees, and dues.

Third. It will somewhat limit secondary boycotts, picketing to force employees to join unions.

Fourth. It supplements the Hobbs amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act, which if properly enforced, will prevent extortion and racketeering.

It does not make antitrust and monopoly laws applicable to union activities. This is necessary if nationwide strikes and tieups are to be prevented.

It fails to prevent strikes in public utilities, which in the past have, and in the future may, prevent the supply of necessities such as light, water, food to whole communities.

It fails to prevent forcing employees to make involuntary contributions for the establishment of policies to which they are opposed.

Overall, it is a good bill and will work out for the benefit of practically everyone.

WHO FORCED ITS ENACTMENT?

An amusing situation has come about because of the effort of so many to claim credit for the law's enactment.

In truth and in fact, as everyone familiar with the situation knows, we now have the law on the books because the people, learning through the publicity given the McClellan committee's hearings so much of what has been happening, and many, finally realizing how they were adversely affected, demanded that their representatives provide a remedy.

We have the law today because of aroused public sentiment. The result is very encouraging because it shows that, when the people really take an interest in their Government and insist, their representatives get up into the collar and do what the home folks want.

The Union Oil Co. Responds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 30, 1959, I wrote a letter to Mr. Reese H. Taylor, chairman of the board of the Union Oil Co. of California, commenting on that company's advertisement in the July 13 issue of Life, and taking exception to what I termed "misleading and unfair poppycock" in the advertisement. On August 14, Mr. Taylor wrote a reply to that letter and he has recently asked that I insert it in the Appendix. I am glad to do this and to consider his complaint that my "lengthy comments hit us somewhat harder than we deserve."

Of course, I shall not argue with Mr. Taylor about the necessity for old fashioned hard work. Moreover, I am very glad to see his stress on annual growth rates, but I hope he will also pay attention to annual growth rates with respect to overall productivity and share my concern for our economy in this vitally important respect. I do not like taxes any more than Mr. Taylor but I do not see much hope in his suggestion that we reduce Government spending "through greater efficiency, less Government in business operations, and the elimination of waste." This is like saying, "fight needless spending" or "eliminate corruption."

I am glad to know that Mr. Taylor is not "antiforeign products and against high wages." This was not at all clear from the advertisement in question. I share Mr. Taylor's concern for our competitive position in the world and I, too, am against unearned wage advances whether or not they are accompanied by increased featherbedding or other labor wastage.

Under unanimous consent previously granted, I am including the entire text of Mr. Taylor's letter to me of August 14, 1959:

UNION OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 14, 1959.

Hon. CHARLES O. PORTER,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PORTER: Thank you for your extremely detailed letter commenting on our advertisement in the July 13 issue of Life magazine. One of the aims of this series is to encourage thinking and discussion about important economic problems facing our country. From the many hundreds of letters we have received, we feel confident that we are succeeding in this.

I wish to say at the start, that we are proud of our country, proud of its people, and proud of its accomplishments. However, we are not content—and this was the message we were driving at in the ad—to sit back and reflect on our past accomplishments; we are not content with the knowledge that our standard of living has long been the highest in the world. Rather, we are extremely concerned with the possible consequences of our becoming a high-cost nation in the world trade picture. We believe this is a real possibility, with consequences far more serious than generally realized. This we wished to call to the attention of the American people.

In our effort to keep our message short, simple, and direct we did not completely cover all aspects of the problem in the text of the ad. Although we anticipated some criticism because of this, we believe your lengthy comments hit us somewhat harder than we deserve.

You ask many questions, although most of them, I suspect, are more rhetorical than interrogatory. However, the three principal issues—foreign trade, productivity, and taxes—can be answered as follows:

1. On page 2 you wrote: "Did you forget, if you ever knew, Mr. Taylor, that in no year since 1936 have our imports been as great as our exports and in recent years the excess of exports over imports has been most substantial." Foreign trade statistics are used to measure a great variety of things, and in proving a point such as this one you can no doubt find supporting statistics. However, if we limit ourselves to merchandise exports and imports—the major

components of our "balance of payments"—the facts do not support your complacency. The following table shows, for the last nine quarters, a significant and alarming trend:

U.S. merchandise exports and imports

[Millions of dollars, seasonally adjusted]

Quarter	Exports	Imports	Difference
1957:			
1st	$5,122	$3,229	$1,893
2d	4,899	3,366	1,533
3d	4,918	3,380	1,538
4th	4,451	3,316	1,135
1958:			
1st	4,065	3,076	989
2d	4,019	3,187	832
3d	4,143	3,218	925
4th	4,000	3,432	568
1959: 1st	3,773	3,525	248

Source: Survey of Current Business, June 1959, p. 17.

In the past this merchandise surplus has helped offset our Government's direct payments abroad. However, as the surplus has shrunk, we have seen dollars and gold flow out in order to restore the necessary "balance" to our balance of payments. This outflow cannot, of course, continue for very long without seriously affecting our national economy.

It has been estimated that some 4 to 5 million people in this country are employed in jobs supported by foreign trade. We are not concerned with what these people did in 1936. We are concerned about what might happen to them in 1959, 1960, and beyond.

2. While we agree with your remark that "the available data on productivity for industry as a whole is not very satisfactory," we do not agree with your further assertion that there is no evidence that wage gains are in excess of productivity gains. The data you cite, in our opinion, are not directly related to the productivity problem. Your figures cover only part of the manufacturing labor force and include only direct payroll costs. Further, by considering real wages you are bringing into the picture the effects of all inflation in the economy irrespective of how it was generated.

The issue is this basic one being faced continually by businessmen: Suppose product output per man-hour (commonly called "productivity") rises by, say, 2 percent in a given period and total labor costs also rise by 2 percent, then labor cost per unit of product would be unchanged. In this circumstance, labor, by itself, would contribute no direct pressure for a product price increase. However, if output per man-hour rose by 2 percent and labor cost by 4 percent, then labor cost per unit of product would be higher and there would be pressure for a price increase. This has been happening throughout much of the postwar period and describes what is commonly meant by the expression: "Wage gains are in excess of productivity gains."

Actually, since the definition of productivity as "output per manhour" ignores the enormous role played by capital investments in bringing about our expanded output, it is, in fact, only a partial definition. The broader, correct concept of productivity (called total factor productivity) has been studied at length by Dr. John W. Kendrick, of the National Bureau of Economic Research. In a recent report of this work (reported in Business Record, June 1958), Dr. Kendrick presented the following date for the U.S. private economy for the period 1948–57:

	Average annual rate of change, percent
Total factor productivity	+2.1
Factor prices:	
Labor	+5.2
Capital	—1.0
Product prices	+1.6

These data point out the fact that during the postwar period the rate of return on capital has actually declined, thus offsetting, in part, some of the inflationary effects of labor's gains of more than 5 percent per year. This trend has continued during 1958 and 1959.

In your last sentence on page 2 you ask: "Where else does the average factory worker have the automobiles, the electric appliances, the comfortable homes, the leisure, and the luxuries that are commonplace here?" We may enjoy this favored status today, Mr. PORTER, but unless we start substituting old-fashioned hard work for this continued "pointing with pride," a great many nations may soon overtake us. This possibility is suggested quite clearly by data included in a recent study of international productivity trends by Dr. Marvin Frankel, of the University of Illinois. In this study he estimated annual growth rates in industrial output per employee for 15 nations for the period 1950–57 to be about as follows:

	Annual growth rate, percent
Japan	13.1
Poland	8.2
Italy	7.4
Czechoslovakia	6.2
France	6.1
Soviet Union	6.0
West Germany	5.2
Austria	5.0
Norway	4.5
Denmark	2.9
Sweden	2.9
Belgium	2.8
Canada	2.1
United States	2.0
United Kingdom	1.9

Source: American Statistical Association, proceedings of the business and economic statistics section, Dec. 1958, p. 265.

A 5-percent growth rate (such as in West Germany) means a doubling of output per employee in 15 years; a 2-percent rate (such as in the United States) means a doubling in 35 years.

3. Admittedly, America's tax burden is not the highest in the world, yet its rate of advance certainly is enough to cause alarm. For example, consider the following data published by the Tax Foundation:

Year	Tax receipts—Federal, State, local	Taxes as percent of net national product
1938	$14,180,000,000	18
1948	57,548,000,000	24
1958	110,300,000,000	28

This upward trend has contributed to the Nation's inflationary pressures and, we fear, will probably continue to do so. In a situation such as our country faces today, every dollar added to the price of our products—whether because of higher labor cost or taxes or any of the costs of production—can make us less able to compete in world markets. You imply, Mr. PORTER, as do many politicians when someone complains of high taxes, that I am demanding fewer schools, roads, hospitals, and a sharp curtailment of our national defense effort. This is so absurd as to require little reply. Surely you must be aware that there exist ample opportunities for reducing Government spending through greater efficiency, less Government in business operations, and the elimination of waste.

A final comment, Mr. PORTER, is this: You accuse me of being antiforeign products and against high wages. Neither of these charges has a grain of truth in it. Free trade has long been recognized as a means whereby two or more countries can both gain by concentrating on producing goods for which they have a special advantage. We do not oppose high wages, as such; however, we do oppose today's trend toward unearned wage advances accompanied by increased featherbedding and other labor wastage. We fear that if these things are not halted we could well find ourselves at a substantial disadvantage in the competitive markets of the world. The result could be the loss of many jobs and the lowering of our standard of living.

We believe the time to be concerned about these things is now—while there is still time for corrective steps.

Yours most sincerely,

REESE H. TAYLOR,
Chairman of the Board.

P.S.—You might be interested to know that we have received thousands of letters regarding this ad and other similar ones. Only slightly under 2 percent are critical, the balance being extremely complimentary and expressing appreciation.

Warsaw Letter Depicts Nixon Visit Rejoicing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of a letter which appeared in the Public Letter Box of the Detroit News, on August 21, regarding the reception Vice President NIXON received on his recent visit to Warsaw. It is indeed heartening to read of the enthusiastic and warm reception which was accorded the Vice President in Poland. It clearly demonstrates the strong bonds of friendship which exist between these people and the United States:

WARSAW LETTER DEPICTS NIXON VISIT REJOICING

To the EDITOR:

A Detroiter recently received from his brother in Warsaw, Poland, a letter describing Vice President NIXON's visit to that city. It was so eloquent a letter that I am sending translated parts of it along to you in the belief it would be of interest to your Letter Box readers. The excerpts:

"People came to the gates of the University of Warsaw to show their love, not the kind given the previous visitor (Khrushchev). But the police cordon closed the gates and didn't allow anyone inside, making it difficult for anyone to see the visitor (NIXON). Many in the huge crowd became so angry that they screamed 'Moscow puppets' at the police. They asked why the police gathered up people to see Khrushchev and wouldn't let them see NIXON. Shamefacedly, the police finally opened the gates.

* * * * *

"People bought out all the flowers in Warsaw and suburbs for NIXON, something Khrushchev never dreamed of or saw. I saw this fox (Khrushchev) driving along Holy Cross Street with head bowed, a silent man among silent people. There were no shouts of 'niech zyje' (long life) for him as there were for NIXON. Instead of flowers, the people would have liked to hit him with a strap, but our political and geographical situation makes this impossible.

"In the case of Khrushchev we were told to greet him, but no one wanted to. NIXON was shielded from the crowds who sincerely and universally wanted to greet him. Those who saw NIXON considered it a rare and pleasant privilege, as compared with Khrushchev. Those who didn't were sorry indeed."

JAMES KEITH.

Views on Veterans and Washington Generally, by Dr. Stanley E. Peterson of Brockton, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, I include a letter and newspaper clipping from Dr. Stanley E. Peterson of Brockton, Mass., which is self-explanatory.

The bill to which he refers is H.R. 7650, which passed the House on June 15, 1959, by a division vote of 226 yeas to 34 nays and passed the Senate on August 13, 1959, by a record vote of 86 yeas to 6 nays. The bill has now been approved by the President and is designated as Public Law 86–211.

I am advised that Dr. Peterson is a specialist in surgery, and I hope is not representative of the medical profession.

So far as I know, Dr. Peterson had no service in any branch of the Armed Forces.

The letter and clipping follow:

BROCKTON, MASS., *August 26, 1959.*

DEAR SIR: Enclosed is a clipping from the Boston Herald.

May I congratulate you for your dishonesty and corruption. Kindly convey this message to your committee also.

What we need in Washington is a good housecleaning via the firing squad or rope.

Sincerely,

S. E. PETERSON, M.D.

As I have written previously to Washington, the biggest parasites we have in this country are the war veterans, farmers, and Congressmen.

PENSION AUTHOR ADMITS $10 BILLION COST BOOST

WASHINGTON.—The House passed veterans pension bill conceded it will cost the Government an extra $10 billion in the next 40 years rather than save $12 billion.

Representative OLIN E. TEAGUE, Democrat of Texas, made the concession after Representatives CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Republican of Michigan, and H. R. GROSS, Republican of Iowa, said the cost of the measure had been camouflaged in Monday's debate. It passed the House 226 to 34 and was sent to the Senate after limited debate.

"This is nothing but a deception and a fraud on the Members of the House," HOFFMAN said.

TEAGUE is the chief author of the bill.

Strongly denying any deception, TEAGUE, who is chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, said that all House Members were supplied last weekend with "full information as to the effects and costs of the bill."

He said that the cost of a provision adding many more widows to pension rolls was not mentioned in debate because of lack of time. That provision is expected to cost $22 billion through the year 2000.

The bill, approved unanimously last Thursday by TEAGUE's committee, would result in a sweeping overhaul of the pension system for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities. It would peg pension systems on the basis of need.

In addition, it would liberalize eligibility qualifications for World War II and Korean war widows. Under present law, they can be eligible for pensions only if their husbands had service-connected disabilities. The bill would place them in the same category as World War I widows and make need the only qualifying basis.

Memorandum by Peter Schoemann, General President of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 5, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a memorandum prepared by Mr. Peter Schoemann, general president of the United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

I believe that Mr. Schoemann's effort to correct some erroneous impressions which have found their way into the dissenting views of the House Committee on Education and Labor regarding H.R. 8342 should become a part of the permanent RECORD regarding this year's labor legislation. I am including Mr. Schoemann's statement in the RECORD today because the House Labor Committee's own transcript has already been printed.

Mr. Schoemann's memorandum follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PUCINSKI: In studying the report of the Committee on Education and Labor concerning the Elliott bill, H.R. 8342, I was very much disturbed by some of the statements which appear in the dissenting views printed as a part of the committee report.

I am referring to pages 95 and 96 of the report. Here, the dissenting views allege that some Indiana members of Chicago Steam Fitters Local Union 597 have tried for years to secure a separate charter and have not succeeded in obtaining a proper investigation of their request by their International Union, the United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters. And, as an indication of a weakness in the so-called bill of rights in the Elliott bill, the dissenting views further charge that these members had to bear the costs of their efforts to secure a charter and have been subject to reprisals by the local officials.

Contrary to these allegations, the record in our hearings of the House Committee on Labor and Education clearly shows that the question of issuing a charter to this small group of men was fully considered by the general president of the united association not less than three times. Each time a separate charter was denied only after full consideration of all of the equities of the situation and only after fully consulting the best interests of the 9,000 members of this local union.

The record further shows that the Indiana members seeking a charter represented a very small minority in the local union. They could not even claim to represent a majority of the members of 597 who live in Indiana.

Many years ago local union 597 received broad jurisdiction over the entire Chicago industrial area, including northern Indiana, for the very purpose of promoting the welfare of all members living in the Chicago area, so that all members might freely seek employment at standard wages and working conditions with all contractors performing any work in any part of this sprawling industrial community.

As one who has spent his life in Chicago, you undoubtedly know that no one traveling through this great industrial area from Chicago toward the Indiana line can possibly tell from observation where Illinois ends and Indiana begins. At one place, for example, there is a large powerhouse situated exactly on the line between these two states. One-half of the powerhouse is in Illinois and the other half is in Indiana.

Workers living in Indiana move daily across the invisible boundary to jobs in Illinois and journeymen in Chicago move daily to employment in Indiana. Certain places such as South Chicago and Hammond, Ind., are only about 20 minutes from downtown Chicago by automobile. And to reach the furthest boundaries of Lake and Porter Counties in Indiana takes only about 45 minutes from the city of Chicago. All of these facts appeared in the record before the subcommittee.

In this situation one charter for one local union covering the entire industrial area at a standard wage rate for all workers and all contractors was the wise decision reached by the international union in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the members of the local union itself. I, for one, sincerely believe it would have been a clear discrimination against Illinois members to have created a separate Indiana local union under these circumstances.

Yet, here we find the good name and reputation of local union 597 and the United Association of Plumbers and Pipe Fitters tarnished by this statement of dissenting views. Wise action in the interest of the majority is pictured as a denial of individual rights. Apparently, the dissenting members believe the will of the minority should govern and charters should be issued on request. Is it their desire to divide and weaken unions? Do they want to provide breeding places for the very kind of corruption recently exposed in hearings in the Senate?

Issuing charters, at will, to irresponsible groups has, according to the record made before the McClellan committee, frequently turned local unions over to the control of hoods and racketeers. Paper locals created by corrupt international officers have been one means frequently used for shaking-down employers and milking union members. Yet the dissenting views would, apparently, have Congress foster and promote these very conditions by force of law.

Finally, there are printed on these pages, allegations of threats and reprisals by officers of local union 597. Here again, the record fails to support this statement made in the dissenting views. A careful review of the testimony fails to show concrete evidence of force or threats or reprisals at any time. Charges of job discrimination were repeatedly filed with the National Labor Relations Board and were repeatedly dismissed for lack of evidence. Any implication that the union should bear the costs of seeking a separate charter is totally unjustified by these circumstances.

But, both the Elliott and the Landrum bill would provide the very means for penalizing and harassing every union officer who had the courage and wisdom to deny these dissenting Indiana members a separate charter in this case. And, in citing this case in their dissenting views, the dissenting members of the Committee on Education and Labor have given me a illustration of why they were against both of these bills. Because both would punish unions for wise and forthright action in the best interest of union members.

Sincerely,

PETER T. SCHOEMANN,
General President, United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the United States and Canada.

Will There Be Reciprocity in International Trade With the Introduction of Smaller American-Made Cars?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, a great deal is heard these days about the introduction of American-made small cars on a wide scale this fall. Many commentators interpret this move as signaling the U.S. automotive industry's counterattack on the mass invasion of foreign cars.

In my opinion, there is another side to the story, the export side. For the loss of markets by American automakers has not been confined to these shores. While imports have risen dramatically—and are still climbing—exports of U.S. autos have declined tremendously.

Now, with the domestic industry turning to small car production on a mass scale, perhaps there is hope that the export trend will be reversed.

Perhaps it will be possible, for example, to persuade our friends in West Germany to purchase more than 333 U.S. autos, our total exports there in 1958, a year which also saw 134,610 West German autos imported here.

Or it may be possible to expand our exports to Great Britain from 329, the total we shipped there in 1958, to a number more in keeping with the 156,597 British cars unloaded here last year.

Happily, the Government of the United Kingdom has seen fit to increase the annual dollar quota on passenger cars from North America to $2 million, compared to the $600,000 limit which has been in effect.

Admittedly, $2 million is a far cry from $194,072,216—the value of British-made cars imported by the United States in 1958—but it is a tiny step in the right direction, nonetheless.

Both at home and in overseas markets, U.S. manufacturers have a lot of ground to make up. In the period 1956–58, imports of new passenger cars quadrupled, from 107,675 to 433,921, and if the present import pace continues, 1959 will see 600,000 foreign cars landing here.

The value of these imports in 1958 approached $500 million, and this is perhaps a better measure of the domestic market which has swung to imports and which American producers hope to recapture, at least to some extent, with their new economy-size models.

Not only new passenger cars, but other types of imported motor vehicles are reaching the American market in growing numbers. Here are a few examples.

In 1956 we imported a scant 1,537 used cars; this rose to 4,862 in 1957, and then jumped to 12,861 with a total value exceeding $16 million in 1958.

The United States imported 2,853 foreign-made trucks in 1956, 8,036 trucks in 1957, and 15,032 trucks valued at more than $17 million in 1958. In the first 7 months of 1959, our imports of trucks passed 13,000, indicating a 12-month total of 22,000 or more.

Motorcycles are another fast-rising import. In 1956 we imported 32,148 motorcycles; raised that figure to 53,100 in 1957, and raised it again to 63,700 valued at $13 million in 1958.

United States auto exports, meanwhile, remain in a tailspin. American manufacturers shipped 175,000 new cars to foreign buyers 2 years ago, then saw their overseas market dwindled to less than 122,000 last year. In the first 7 months of 1959 we exported 66,000 new cars, so exports this year should approximate 110,000—to register another downturn.

With the introduction of a series of new small cars, produced in American factories by American labor, the domestic industry has served notice it is ready to give its foreign competitors a run for their money.

My hope is that this step will also mark a turning point in our automotive export trade. Certainly it should pacify those who claim that large American cars are neither safe on narrow foreign roads nor economical for foreign motorists paying 75 cents or $1 for a gallon of gasoline.

I, for one, will be most interested to watch the reaction of our trading partners, particularly in Western Europe, to the new competition of American small cars. Will they offer us the same open-arm welcome that we have given to their products, now that it appears we will be able to compete on equal terms in their own markets?

This will be a true test of reciprocity in international trade.

Visit of Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the pending visit of Nikita Khrushchev, the No. 1 Communist of the Soviet tyranny, I think it is well that the American people keep in mind the years of aggression and oppression which Khrushchev and his predecessor Stalin have inflicted on millions of people behind the Iron Curtain.

The following statement from several Lithuanian societies in the Calumet region of Indiana, sets out facts which the President, State Department, and the American people should constantly keep in mind:

We citizens of the United States of Lithuanian extractions gathered in the annual meeting at our parish hall, 3905 Fir Street of East Chicago, Ind., are shocked by the action of the U.S. Government in inviting Nikita Khrushchev to visit the United States. In view of the foregoing knowledge of Nikita Khrushchev and the principles which he represents and hereby voice our disapproval by registering this our protest:

"Whereas Niikta Khrushchev and his associates have demonstrated to the civilized world to be criminals of international magnitude, guilty of heinous crimes by murdering millions of Hungarians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Poles, Latvians, Estonians, Germans, and Russians; and

"Whereas Nikita Khrushchev and his cohorts have enslaved many nations by brutal force and by devious methods of liquidation, deportations and dispersions of leaders and their people, aiming to effect genocide of small nations; and

"Whereas Communist Russia has over 15 million people in the slave camps; and

"Whereas Communist Russia is fomenting discord among nations and disturbing the peace of the world; and

"Whereas Nikita Khrushchev represents a regime dedicated in principles to brutal suppression and persecution of religions; and

"Whereas the leaders of communism, in order to hide their crimes against humanity, have established an Iron Curtain around Russia and enslaved nations:

Therefore, we resolve that the Committee of the Lithuanian Community of East Chicago, Ind., shall forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States and our Senators and to the press."

Sincerely yours,

BRONIUS NAINYS,
Chairman.
VIKTORAS MAKIELJUS,
Secretary.

As long as the United States keeps a firm anticommunistic policy, maintains its strength and power, leads the cold war strategy, and does not recognize the occupied territories, the spirit of freedom behind the Iron Curtain will continue to burn and at least a passive resistance will be maintained. This passive resistance is one of the major causes preventing the Soviet Union from starting a major war. The truth told by refugees to the free world about Mr. Khrushchev's mass murders, prison tortures, slave labor camps, mass deportations, and all kinds of persecutions, is the main barrier in his way to conquer the world. This is the main problem that Mr. Khrushchev will try to solve in his favor at this coming visit.

What will we ask of him? What answers will he give us? Will you ask him, Mr. President, to give freedom to the enslaved nations, such as Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and others; to release slaves from labor camps; to return deported ones to their homelands; to give freedom of press, speech, meetings, and religion, and free elections? Will you ask him to withdraw the Red armies from occupied nations? It would be too naive to believe that Mr. Khrushchev could be persuaded to do so. Then why invite him? Are we that inexperienced and careless in our foreign policy?

At a recent news conference you asked American people to show Mr. Khrushchev warm hospitality and you were quoted as

saying that there are certain uncontrolled individuals who might disturb the long created friendly atmosphere. It would not be hard to understand that this name applied to the citizens involved in the demonstrations against Khrushchev's predecessors, in which we, unable to take an active part, gave the demonstrators our full moral support. And why do you think we deserve such a name?

If you remember 13,000 brutally murdered Polish Army officers at Katyn, thousands of Ukranians slaughtered at Vinica, mass tortures and murders in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the massacre of Hungary, the shooting down of defenseless American planes, our brothers and sisters dying in the slave labor camps and deportation boxcars, and thousands of other atrocities committed by Mr. Khrushchev and his murder gang, how could you expect us to greet this international criminal with broad smiles and shake his bloody hand?

And you call us certain uncontrolled individuals despite the fact that by peaceful demonstrations we are trying to tell the truth to the world. We feel hurt and depressed. We are not "certain uncontrolled individuals" but we are fighting for the freedom which was denied us at Yalta and other conferences, similar to the one Mr. Khrushchev is now seeking. No human being has a right to stop us.

We do not believe in violence, but reserve us the right to fight by every possible peaceful means for independence of our motherlands, and no matter what the diplomatic courtesy may be, by our demonstrations we are trying to show that at least we are not welcoming the murderers. In our greatest fight for liberty and human rights we expect our President to help us, not to destroy us.

Very respectfully yours,

The Representatives of American Lithuanian Council at Lake County, Ind., Albert J. Vinick; American Lithuanian Community East Chicago Chapter, Antanas Juodvalkis; Lithuanian Democratic League of Lake County, Ind., Angue Justine; Lithuanian Alliance of America, Lodge 185, ——— ———; National Lithuanian Society of America, Inc., East Chicago Chapter, Kasimir Pocius; Lithuanian Pleasure Club, East Chicago, Inc., Theodore Mason; Bronius Nainys, Secretary of the Executive Committee.

Granting of Statehood to Hawaii Struck Home in Asian Hearts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, during the various debates on statehood for Hawaii, some of us have emphasized the tremendously favorable psychological effect which granting statehood would have on Asian peoples. It will bring our deeds into harmony without words—and in a most dramatic way, incapable of being distorted by our enemies into something unworthy.

Vivid confirmation of this view has come from a distinguished Asian of Chinese descent and Thai citizenship. His comments were reported in the Honolulu Advertiser, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Apr. 6, 1959]

THAI CHINESE LEADER PRAISES STATEHOOD AS "ACT OF FAITH"

(By Gordon Morse)

The leader of Thailand's 3½ million Chinese residents said yesterday that the United States had done more for international good will by admitting Hawaii to the Union than any other single act in recent history.

"The granting of Hawaiian statehood has dramatically lifted a veil of misunderstanding from Asian eyes and its repercussions will change history," said Chang Lan-Chen.

Chang is chairman of the Chamber of Commerce of Bangkok. As Thailand's leading Chinese citizen in business and social circles, he is spokesman for the largest block of Chinese residents outside of Red China and Taiwan.

He left Honolulu for the mainland. He and Mrs. Chang are the first couple to be invited by the U.S. State Department to tour the United States for 2 months.

"The granting of Hawaiian statehood was an act of faith in the democratic conception that men of all races could live in peace and harmony," said Chang through his interpreter.

"America had done a lot of preaching about this but had done little that the common resident of the Far East could understand. Statehood for a Pacific island community with its minority population of Asian descent struck home in Asian hearts.

"Now suddenly a veil of misunderstanding dropped from our minds. We witnessed Americans taking Asians into their arms. Most Asian people only believe what they see and this they witnessed and understood."

Chang urged that America follow up the Hawaiian statehood act with a more sincere program of internationalism and cement the new feeling of friendship now created.

He also applauded Hawaii as the perfect place for a foreign visitor to be introduced to the United States.

"I would have been completely bewildered and lost if I had suddenly been set down in a place like Chicago or New York," said Chang. "But Hawaii has my kind of people living as Americans. This I can understand. They gave me the introductory course."

Address by Senator Eugene J. McCarthy on "The Family and Political Action" at the Annual Convention of the Christian Family Movement at the University of Notre Dame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, there are few Americans who can discuss with such wisdom and dedication the role of politics and politicians in a democracy as the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, the Honorable EUGENE J. MCCARTHY.

Senator MCCARTHY has been a high school teacher and a university professor. For 10 years he served with great distinction as a Member of the House of Representatives. He speaks with deep understanding and experience of the responsibility of the Christian in political life.

Last month, on August 29, 1959, Senator MCCARTHY delivered a fine address on "The Family and Political Action" at the 11th Annual Convention of the Christian Family Movement held on the campus of the University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

Other distinguished speakers at this convention, which was attended by more than 2,500 persons, including 750 married couples, included Roman Catholic Archbishop Albert G. Meyer, of Chicago; the Reverend Robert C. Hartnett, S.J., former editor of the weekly magazine America; and Stephen A. Mitchell, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I should like at this point in the RECORD to include excerpts from Senator MCCARTHY's address:

THE FAMILY AND POLITICAL ACTION

(Excerpts from address of Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY at the Christian Family Movement Convention, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind., August 29, 1959)

Nineteen hundred and sixty is a national election year. When the polls close on November 8, the voters of the United States will have chosen thousands of State and local officials. They will also have elected 437 Members of the House of Representatives, one-third of the 100 Members of the U.S. Senate, and a President of the United States.

Next year will be a year of intensive political activity. Candidates, their supporters, party officials, and party organizations will be busy trying to convince the voters of the merits of their causes.

Through the media of mass communication, the newspapers, the radio, and television, political discussion and political personalities will come into the homes of America. The home, rather than the public square, the street corner, or the picnic grounds has become the principal arena of political controversy.

It is no longer possible for the citizen to avoid politics or to set it apart for special times and places. Neither is it possible any longer to isolate children and young people from politics. It remains to be seen whether or not these changes in place and methods of political action will improve our democracy.

Certainly it is desirable that citizens be politically aware. In a democratic state, all citizens have political power. That power can be exercised well only if all citizens, or at least a majority, are wise; that is, are intelligent and informed and are men of good will.

Modern techniques of communication and of influence have proved excellent tools for the demagogue and the tyrant. The challenge is to use them to improve government and thus to promote the common good.

Parents have a very special responsibility to develop right attitudes and to advance the political education of children. This responsibility is of special importance because of the significance of citizen participation in politics in a democracy, and because of the fact that politics can no longer be excluded from the home or the young people protected from it.

For adults enjoying full citizenship, issues and personalities are important as a basis for the practical political decisions which must be made. Issues and personalities will be important to children in an election year also. It is wholly natural for them to be interested in political personalities and in controversial issues. For children and young people, however, who are not yet qualified for direct or full participation in

political action, the development of right attitudes toward democracy, government, and politics is even more important. In an election, parents have an opportunity to lead the young people of the Nation away from the popular disposition to be cynical regarding politics and government.

There is no disputing the fact that the conduct of some public officials in the United States has been disgraceful. Many have shown a shocking lack of any sense of moral responsibility. Others have been found holding to standards which are extremely personal, flexible, and generally inadequate. The facts in these cases should not be withheld or glossed over. It is essential, however, that they be presented accurately, without exaggeration and without unwarranted general applications.

Children should not be brought up believing that the holders of public office are generally venal and corrupt. They should not be conditioned to the careless use of expressions such as "pork barrel" and "feeding at the public trough" in relation to public service, and should be discouraged from using terms of opprobrium without deliberation and distinction. They should not be led to look upon politics as a necessary evil at best, or as a field in which the ordinary standards of truth and decency do not apply and need not be honored. They should be brought to realize that political party activity is not necessarily unbecoming or degrading.

Not every citizen has an obligation at all times to participate intensively in party activities, but every citizen should realize the need for political parties and for party activities. History demonstrates clearly the need for party politics in democratic government. In America party factions preceded the adoption of the Constitution itself.

Parents should be careful to educate children to an understanding of the importance of the political party in our system of government, and to bring them to realize that good government depends on good political parties. By their own example, as well as by word, they should show the young people that a political party is not merely a propaganda instrument, not a private club, nor an organization which protects one's own job or which provides a job in return for the payment of dues and the performance of party services.

Rather, a political party is an organization made up of a disciplined group of citizens seeking to influence government or to gain control of it in order to govern not only for the majority, but for all according to the determination of the majority within the limits set by custom, law, and constitution.

In order to prevent disillusionment, young people should, of course, learn that politics is part of a real world. Political choices must be made in actual historical situation, affected, therefore, by ignorance, prejudice, and bad will. They should know that political officials often cannot make the ideal choice, but must adjust decisions to circumstances.

Truth will prove the best antidote for cynicism, which is an especially dangerous attitude when it prevails among the young. It destroys the base for an attack on real and different problems in politics, as in other fields.

This danger is clearly shown in one of the novels of Charles Williams, the great English writer of novels dealing with the conflict between good and evil. Mr. Williams shows the great advantage which can be given to evil by the loss of public belief in politics. The consequence of this loss of faith in Mr. William's novel was the acceptance of a completely amoral leader who capitalized on the cynicism of the people and come to power because of it.

An election year provides the best of times in which to develop in children and young people a clearer understanding of the real meaning and implications of democracy; of impressing upon them the fact that democracy does not simplify life, but rather that it complicates it by adding the responsibility of government to other responsibilities.

It is further complicated when we consider that democracy seeks to establish an order based not only upon justice, but upon justice and freedom; that is, not only an order of justice prescribed and forced on people, but determined by them and freely accepted.

An election year provides the best of times in which to develop in our children and young people understanding and respect for the purposes, institutions and procedures of democratic government, and to lay the foundations upon which we can erect in the United States a firm tradition of the privilege and responsibility of citizenship and of public service.

It is not sufficient merely to undertake to humanize and sanctify our individual lives. Neither is it sufficient to humanize and sanctify the institution of the family alone. Over and above this, it is essential to humanize and sanctify social institutions such as the neighborhood, the class to which one belongs, the business and professional community, leisure time activities, means of communication, and political institutions.

For as Cardinal Suhard has stated: "Each of them constitutes both an area of living and reality which is independent of the individuals of which it is made up (and one can say also independent of the family units which make it up) or over whom it holds away."

Although it is true that the social order exists for the persons who make it up, and in a secondary sense also exists for the family, it is nonetheless correct to say that society—that is, civilization itself—requires salvation.

Neither the salvation of persons, nor the salvation of the family can be accomplished without a humanization and sanctification; that is, a Christianization of all essential institutions which make up the social order.

Civil Rights Must Be Safeguarded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 2, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, another forceful reaction to the Federal Civil Rights Commission report is recorded in an editorial from the September 9 edition of the San Francisco Chronicle which I submit for the RECORD under permission to extend remarks.

The specific solutions to be developed are proper subjects of debate and discussion. The point is that the problems revealed cannot be denied and should no longer be ignored:

CIVIL RIGHTS MUST BE SAFEGUARDED

We earnestly hope that the report of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission, published yesterday, will rattle the chains of Congress loudly enough to awaken some of its Members to the need for protecting Negro voting rights.

This report is deeply disturbing in its revelations of the capricious, snide bad faith of southern States in denying Negroes the ballot.

"Complex voter qualification laws, including tests of literacy, education and interpretation, have been used and may readily be used arbitrarily to deny the right to vote," the Commission concludes. "It appears to be impossible to enforce an impartial administration of the literacy tests now in force in some States, for where there is a will to discriminate, these tests provide the way."

The story of the obstacles this Commission met in its efforts to find the facts about Negro voter registration in Alabama and Louisiana has been a running scandal in the papers. Alabama officials refused to produce their registration records at the Commission's hearings but let the staff look at them; Louisiana officials declined even to allow that much. And after records in only half the counties being investigated in Alabama had been examined, the legislature passed a law permitting application forms of persons denied registration to be destroyed.

There is just one remedy for oafishness of that sort—Federal intervention to protect the citizens whose rights are denied. Accordingly, the Commission recommended (1) that Congress require all registration and voting records of the States to be preserved for 5 years and be subject to public inspection; (2) that it forbid any person, "under color of State law, arbitrarily * * * to deprive any individual of the opportunity to register, vote, and have that vote counted" for any Federal office; and (3) that where people are arbitrarily disqualified from voting the President be empowered to appoint temporary Federal registrars to "administer the State qualification laws and issue to all individuals found qualified registration certificates which shall entitle them to vote."

These were majority recommendations. A split developed on a proposal for a constitutional amendment that would put the right to vote beyond the power of a State to deny except on the grounds of age or length of residence. This would take away the power of qualifying electors on property ownership or literacy standards that the States now possess. The need for such an amendment is debatable; the Constitution already gives the Federal Government all the power it needs to deal with denials of the right to vote on account of race; what is lacking is a determination in Congress to use the power.

In its strong conclusions about denials of voting rights, the Civil Rights Commission has given the expiring Congress a challenge on an issue of clear and present discrimination, a challenge from which those Members not dedicated to preserving white supremacy and racial inequality cannot hope to escape. The least that Congress should do now is to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission and give an unbreakable commitment to take up its substantive recommendations on voting rights at the next session in January.

Our Surplus Food Abroad Can Build Good Will Only if It Is Handled With Great Sensitiveness to the Real Needs and Aspirations of Receiving Countries and to Other Friendly Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a long-overdue article by Alfred D. Stedman, of the St. Paul Pioneer press staff on the dangers and difficulties as well as possi-

ble benefits which must be evaluated more intelligently in our programs of selling or bartering or contributing our food surpluses abroad:

FOOD GIVEAWAYS

(Alfred D. Stedman)

A bit of a shock to U.S. notions was the raising by foreign farm writers here of a certain question. It arose in a recent panel with Minnesota farm editors. Held on the university's St. Paul campus, the panel touched on international problems of food in the cold war.

The question was: Why do not U.S. farmers deal with their own surpluses? Why do we go on producing such big ones? Why, instead of meeting the surplus problems here at home, does the United States choose to export those problems to other countries and peoples?

The question was taken in stride by the Minnesota farm editors. The United States, they acknowledged, has come faster into world power than into knowledge of or experience with problems of other nations. A lot of us are too busy making money to find out about those problems. Our politicians haven't had the nerve to balance Government price supports with effective crop controls. So the United States has gone on growing bigger and bigger surpluses. And it has gone on depending increasingly on subsidized exports to avoid swamping our own farm markets.

Is there food for thought in those answers? There's still more of it in the implications of the question raised by the gentlemen of the foreign farm press.

Their very idea seems to suggest that revisions are in order to some of the most commonly accepted of the assumptions that underline U.S. farm laws and programs.

Aren't the U.S. farm surpluses an unmixed blessing to a hungry world? Aren't our gifts or bargain sales of surplus foods helping us to win the cold war against communism? Can't we give away all surpluses however big?

Of course there's no way of knowing how each of the foreign farm editors would have replied to these questions. But the discussions did show that among these 12 writers, mainly from Latin American and African countries, the answers would not have been unanimously yes.

The discussions brought out that, besides the help given to the hungry by gifts or bargain sales of U.S. food, there are also disadvantages. They brought out that these subsidized farm exports have tendencies to disrupt world trade and unsettle world prices. They brought out the existence of tremendous unsolved problems of transportation of food to the hungry in remote regions. They brought out that the U.S. motives in subsidizing our farm exports are regarded in receiving countries as open to question. They brought out a reluctance of such countries to become dependent on others for food. As a goodwill builder, they emphasized the effectiveness of U.S. technical assistance in developing the resources and the know-how of receiving countries for self-dependence.

And none of the visiting editors expressly dissented from a view that the United States is losing the cold war.

Everyone is at liberty to draw his own inferences from the ideas that came to light among the representatives of the foreign agricultural press. But these gentlemen have perhaps earned appreciation of farmers and farm legislators for helping to clear up points needing clarification.

Indefinite expansion of U.S. farm production in expectation of disposing of all unwanted surpluses in other countries seems unacceptable abroad as a basis of U.S. farm policy. Throwing too much U.S. farm stuff on world markets can break world prices just as doing the same thing at home can break home prices. U.S. food giveaways won't automatically win the cold war.

U.S. food surpluses can build goodwill abroad if their handling fits the needs and aspirations of receiving countries to develop their own resources and economic independence.

Real trade among nations of things and services each can best produce still seems a good basis for economic health and growth of free nations in a free world.

All this seems to mean that, in the end, the United States will have to face its surplus problems here at home with effective crop controls. It can look for expanding exports only of such food and services as other countries want and need.

Tenth Anniversary of Chancellor Adenauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, September 15, 1959, marks the 10th anniversary of the leadership of Chancellor Adenauer. President Eisenhower has recently visited with him and paid him a tribute of respect and honor.

Out of rubble and ruins, the Chancellor and his Cabinet have built a strong republic, which is orientated westward and has done all and sundry to buckle itself as a stanch ally to the United States and Western democracies.

There is no doubt that West Germany, under the guidance of her leaders like Chancellor Adenauer and President Heuss, Foreign Minister Brentano, Economic Minister Erhard, and others, has realized that the mark of Cain was upon the Germans because of the terrors of Hitler and nazism. They worked feverishly to wipe out that strain and have succeeded in reestablishing West Germany as a liberal nation in the liberal world, dedicated to the principles of individual freedom and democracy.

A look at the map will reveal in realistic fashion that Germany in the heart of Europe must always be a buffer state on the flank of a free and democratic Europe. We do well to strengthen Germany by our insistence that East and West Germany be made one Germany. We do well to assure the world that we will never let Berlin down; that Berlin, now an island in a Communist sea, must be integrated into a unified Germany.

It is worthy of comment also, that Chancellor Adenauer, President Heuss and his successor, Dr. Heinrich Luebke, and the other praiseworthy officials of Germany have made, and are making restitution to the Jews in Israel and other Jews, whose property and valuables were filched from them by Hitler and his cutthroat bandits. That restitution, of course, cannot bring back the 6 million dead, but it can go a great way in the court of public opinion to show that Germany wishes to be rehabilitated, that Germany is repentant and that Germany is expiating her wrongs.

We all, therefore, hail Chancellor Adenauer on his 10th anniversary and present our compliments to President Heuss and his able successor in the Presidency, Heinrich Luebke. We present our compliments also to Foreign Minister Brentano, and Economic Minister Erhard for work well done.

Report by Congressman Perkins Bass to the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire on 1st Session, 86th Congress, September 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PERKINS BASS

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress has adjourned. We are now able to appraise its accomplishments and their effect on the country and the Second Congressional District of New Hampshire, which I represent in Congress. In many respects it was an unusual session, with the opening guns being fired by a newly elected opposition majority and the final battles being won by President Eisenhower, who exerted a vigorous and effective executive leadership on all fronts.

The tone of the session was set early when the President called for a determined effort to fight inflation through a balanced Federal budget of $77 billion, and indicated his desire to correct labor union abuses and waste in the farm subsidy programs. Despite frequent efforts by the majority members to pass bills which carried spending authorizations far above the administration's original requests, the President held the line through a judicious use of the executive veto.

The highlight of the session, of course, was the passage of the Landrum-Griffin labor reform bill. Senator MCCLELLAN'S investigations of racketeering and corrupt practices in certain labor unions had clearly shown the need for some kind of strong corrective legislation to protect the rights of individual workers and to outlaw secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing. Although it seemed doubtful at first whether Congress would be able to agree on a reform bill which dealt adequately with abuses in these areas, public opinion, spurred by the President's last minute appeal, grew strong enough to push through the tough but fair Landrum-Griffin proposal in substantially the form it passed the House. Like a majority of the Members, I voted for this bill, because I felt it was necessary to protect both the public and honest unions from infiltration of corrupt racketeers and power-hungry opportunists. It is equally important to point out there is nothing in this new law which will harm honest labor unions such as we

have in New Hampshire. This measure is not a "punitive" or "killer" bill, any more than the Taft-Hartley Act was a "slave labor" bill.

On the inflation front the President and the Republican minority in Congress fought hard to keep spending authorizations down to the level required for a balanced budget. The tug of war over spending became particularly apparent to me as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Some of the more controversial big spending bills, such as the area redevelopment bill, the Community Facilities Act, and the original omnibus housing bill, were debated extensively in our committee, with the Republicans, including myself, generally opposing excessive spending authorizations.

In all these areas the administration proposed reasonable programs which would do the job without unbalancing the budget. Unfortunately, in almost every instance, the congressional majority insisted on pushing through proposals with price tags which would have hopelessly unbalanced the budget. That is the main reason why the President, for example, vetoed the first two omnibus housing bills. At the end of the session the Congress wisely passed an adequate housing bill in line with the President's recommendations.

As in previous sessions, the farm problem returned this year to haunt the Congress and the public in general. It seems tragic to me that we have been unable to find a commonsense solution to the problem of mounting farm surpluses. Using taxpayers' funds to buy up these surpluses only aggravates the problem, and I have thought it better to eliminate farm price supports altogether. Farm surplus crops owned by the Government and in storage now total the astronomical figure of $9 billion—85 percent of which is in cotton, corn and wheat. In tthe current fiscal year the Federal Government is expected to spend $4.5 billion for direct price support activities, of which nearly $1 billion will be for storage, handling, and interest charges alone.

This is a disgraceful situation and is the chief reason I voted against the opposition-sponsored wheat and tobacco price support bills which the President eventually vetoed. The feed grain price support bill, for example, would have added an additional $140 million to the already staggering farm bill this Nation is footing.

On a more positive side, Congress passed the Hawaiian statehood bill, after many decades of debate and controversy. Those of us who supported statehood for these islands were particularly proud of the recent election results there which showed that some 93 percent of the Hawaiian voters went to the polls. This in itself was a remarkable proof of their political maturity and fully justifies the wisdom of granting statehood to these friendly and energetic people.

Late in the session a compromise highway financing bill was approved, providing a temporary 21-month Federal gas-tax increase of 1 cent. The program which Congress agreed to after months of consideration will temporarily solve the pressing financial crisis in the highway trust fund by placing it on a pay-as-you-go basis, at the same time calling for a moderate stretchout in construction of the 41,000-mile road system.

Congress also earns a "well done" for passing legislation authorizing U.S. participation in an Inter-American Development Bank. Once established, this Bank will make long-term low-interest loans to South American nations, providing them with badly needed development capital. I personally favor this type of development agency, for it shifts foreign aid from a grant to a loan basis, making it a sounder and more business-like proposition.

Congress deserves credit, too, for much solid work on the annual appropriation bills which must be painstakingly dealt with each session.

Adequate funds were provided for the Armed Forces and for missile development.

New Hampshire residents will be particularly pleased that Congress approved a $3,225,000 appropriation for the construction of a consolidated Army Cold Regions Engineering Laboratory at Hanover. The laboratory will be a boon to the Hanover region, as well as to the Second District in general. The entire New Hampshire delegation worked long and diligently to get this project located at Hanover.

On the whole, Congress did its usual competent if unspectacular job in dealing with the incredibly complex task of providing funds and shaping policy for the world's largest Government. Most of its day-to-day work goes unnoticed by the public. But the work is done, nevertheless, and generally done well. On the question of labor reform, Congress showed that it was responsive to the will of an aroused people.

During the recess, I will conduct office hours in the cities and larger towns in every county of the Second District. I hope as many of you as possible will stop by during office hours in your area to get acquainted and discuss problems.

Small Business Real Target of High Interest Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Federal Reserve Board authorized eight Federal Reserve banks to raise interest rates on loans of commercial banks from 3½ to 4 percent. This is a new 27-year high and the highest of any time since the stock-market crash and the great depression of the thirties. I am not predicting that we are entering a similar cycle but I want to add my word of caution since there seems to be a continued policy of this administration to make the small businessman extinct. I am particularly concerned because I feel that the small businessman is a very important part of our economy. If this administration is successful in its attempt to eliminate this segment of our economy it could have far-reaching and perhaps disastrous effects.

Mr. Speaker, this hike was even anticipated by our commercial banks who raised their basic interest rates to 5 percent last week. The effect of these increased rates has been to make it difficult if not impossible for a small businessman to secure necessary loans to conduct his normal business operation. It has increased his cost to the place where all of his normal profits have been diverted into the hands of bankers through increased interest rates. Corporations are able to provide necessary financing regardless of interest rates through the issuance of bonds or stocks in the markets but the small businessman is forced on bended knees to beg the local bankers for even this expensive money.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following article by Sylvia Porter in yesterday's Evening Star, which obviously was written before the Federal Reserve Board took its action to increase the interest rate to the highest level in 27 years. The article is as follows:

THREAT TO SMALL BUSINESSMAN

(By Sylvia Porter)

A potentially great threat to small businessmen has appeared on the financial horizon. The threat lies in the mounting scarcity of credit, the rising cost of borrowing.

We have entered a cycle of the tightest, most expensive money in a generation, and the odds are credit will become even harder to get before it becomes easier. In this era, the big, profitable corporation borrower won't be pinched much, though; the top-notch corporation always will stand at the head of any credit line.

In this era, the borrower who will be squeezed the most will be the small businessman or the so-called marginal concern. Banks are simply not designed to provide risk capital or long-term loans for the small businessman. They never were designed for this purpose.

This type of firm won't be able to get all the funds it needs for long-term growth by issuing bonds or stocks in the capital markets.

This firm won't be able to get anywhere near ample financing from existing Federal or State or semipublic lending organizations. None of these organizations has enough capital to cover more than a fraction of loan demands.

And this firm won't be able to get much aid from the new syestem of small business financing that was supposed to come out of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and was supposed to help fill a dangerous vacuum in the credit structure of the United States.

For, so far, this act has been a flop beyond the expectations of even the most cynical. A year ago Congress passed this law under which the Small Business Administration was to promote the formation of local small business investment companies to help small businesses get risk capital and long-term loans at fair interest rates.

But apparently the investment companies are being strangled by redtape, regulations,

interpretations, and misinterpretations. The number created in all these months has been ridiculously meager. The revolutionary new system of financing small business is still to come.

We enter a cycle in which borrowing will be the most expensive in a generation and even the top-rated corporations of the world will be paying up to 6 percent for short-term bank loans. And what will smaller firms be paying? Perhaps an effective rate of 7 percent.

We enter an era in which the intensity of competition will make it imperative for all businesses to modernize their plants, finance research and new products. And what companies will find it toughest to get the cash to finance modernization, research, etc.? You know the answer.

Yet, to all who worry about the unfair, discriminatory impact of tight money, the Federal Reserve System replies, in effect: "If credit controls are to curb inflation, they must squeeze some borrowers. If tight money is to work, it must work some hardship. This is the price the Nation must pay for a stable dollar."

And no one in power is standing up to convince the Federal Reserve it is not pursuing the best of all possible policies now.

A Clear View of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, neither blind adoration nor despairing cynicism is the proper attitude to take toward the United Nations. Since its establishment in 1945 it has accomplished much, more than most people realize, but of course it has many imperfections.

This is why many of us want to have high level discussions of charter review and to have a charter review conference in the very near future.

Under a previous unanimous consent I am including here an excellent article by Lincoln P. Bloomfield entitled "The U.N. and National Security" which appeared in Foreign Affairs for July 1958. It is well worth reading to get a clear view of the United Nations.

THE U.N. AND NATIONAL SECURITY

(By Lincoln P. Bloomfield)

In 1945, when the United Nations was founded, its raison d'être was to provide greater security for its member nations. As the basic conflict of interests between Soviet communism and the free nations unfolded, the cold war rapidly came to suffuse the entire organization like a sort of nerve gas, paralyzing but not killing. In a relatively short time, it was seen to be incapable of resolving or even seriously affecting the dominant world conflict. The United States and its principal allies were forced to conclude that except as it provided a forum for counterpropaganda the United Nations was irrelevant to the overriding short-term military and security problem posed by aggressive and expansionist Soviet communism.

The Korean war threw a new light on the capabilities of the U.N. as a political mechanism for organizing and demonstrating worldwide resistance to limited Communist aggression. But the disproportionately large contribution which the United States had to make to that fight strengthened the doubt whether the U.N. could play a central role in the shortrun protection of American national security. It continued to exercise a powerful attraction for the American people, since it exemplified their great will for peace. But as the custodian of the peace it seemed to be in a fiduciary relationship not to us but to an unborn generation of men who might have a capacity for managing their affairs rather more harmoniously.

Reasons for the American public to favor continued participation in the U.N. were, besides the moral attraction of the charter ideal, the possibility of using the organization selectively in the settlement of disputes within the free world, and its secondary activities involving dependent areas, technical assistance and the humanitarian achievements of the specialized agencies. Those functions turned out to be important enough to sustain American membership. But no amount of enthusiasm for the potentialities of the organization under different circumstances could overcome the conviction that at best it must be considered to be on ice so far as concerned the profound and immediate security problem that preoccupied us.

Meanwhile great changes have been taking place in power relationships and in the policies designed to protect national security. The capacity of the United States to influence international events decisively has seemed to decline in recent years. We cannot afford the luxury of misusing any available means of making our influence felt. What of the United Nations? Has our estimate of its capabilities taken account of our new insights into the present realities of international political life, specifically as they relate to political and technological developments? What contribution might it make to security in the years immediately ahead?

II. THE CHANGING U.N.

Four things have happened in recent years to put in question our old basic attitudes toward the U.N. as an agency promoting our national security.

The first is the loosening of the alliance structure on both sides. In the early days of the cold war it was not uncommon for the vote in the General Assembly to be 55 to 5 on a whole range of issues. The lines were sharply drawn; the balance of power was so rigid that little flexibility for maneuver was left within the U.N. or for that matter outside. Even so, U.N. action played a part in varying degrees in Iran, Greece, the Berlin blockade, Korea, and, later, Hungary. In the overall it was not much. There clearly was no possibility of "U.N. action" in the cold war apart from whatever the United States and its allies were themselves able or willing to do.

In view of the cold war, the presence of Soviets and Americans under one roof posed a novel problem for Western diplomacy. In a time when we were struggling to organize a worldwide defensive coalition against the Communist threat, we had to meet and negotiate with our allies in the presence of the enemy. Each issue and each vote thus came to represent a separate test of free world unity, and often it was more important in this sense than because of the actual question involved. As time went on, the unity of the non-Communist world was put under increasing strain by the growing split between the poles of what might be called north and south, primarily on issues arising in the colonial field. But the overall alliance held together, albeit with difficulty.

Since 1953, the tone and mode of Soviet diplomacy, in and out of the U.N., have altered. The political effect of this has been acute, coming at a time when the bipolar political world was itself beginning to splinter. With the development of something like a military standoff between the United States and the Soviet Union, forces within the two coalitions began to assert their freedom of maneuver and to move toward positions relatively independent of the two leader states. Britain, India, Yugoslavia, Poland, Egypt, China and Germany suddenly began to emerge as focuses of new independent leadership. "Automatic majorities" and "automatic leadership" in the U.N., if they had ever really existed, became things of the past. The world was changing and the U.N. was changing with it.

A second development was the enhanced role of the uncommitted countries. The success of the West in gathering support from these countries through the U.N. has become increasingly dependent on the stands which Western nations take on issues of primary importance to the peoples of that "third world." These have not been such issues as capitalism vs communism, or German unification, or liberation of the satellites, but colonialism, "self-determination," economic development and racial discrimination. Out of the present membership of 81 countries, approximately 45 members for one reason or another see these as the crucial issues and put the United States to the test in regard to them with increasing frequency. Here again the issue often is purely symbolic; it may reflect an accumulated heritage of resentment or be designed to play off the East against the West. But in the U.N. these issues take concrete shape in resolutions and action programs in which Russian and American performance is constantly made the measure for a host of other attitudes.

The way in which we have restructured the U.N. itself has added to the American delemma. For perfectly good reasons the United States urged a greater role for the General Assembly (where all nations, whatever their size, have equal votes) in order to offset the impotence of the Security Council. In the fall of 1950 it appeared essential to remobilize the capabilities of the U.N. for collective military action. Happily the American display of determined resistance in Korea as well as other subsequent developments have tended to discourgae military risk-taking by the Communists. The Assembly's real role in this field therefore is still not measurable. But as part of the same development the Assembly has become a prime political forum for the nations which remain outside the East-West camps and pursue their own goals of political independence, economic improvement and racial dignity. In this situation what might be called the North-South conflict cuts across the East-West issues and makes its own powerful demands on American diplomacy, while offering magnificent opportunities for the Soviets to seize the political initiative.

The third change is in the military scene. It is by its performance here that many people would have the U.N. stand or fall. Of course, it long since became clear that the Security Council would not be able to carry out its enforcement powers. Yet in the 13 years since the charter was drafted there has been no general war, and one of the chief reasons for this has certainly been that the important operational principles of the charter—collective action for security and avoidance of violence in resolving disputes—have been in general effect. It might be said that the San Francisco principle has failed in detail but has had general validity in the sense that it has been translated into regional and self-defense arrangements which, because the charter existed, were able to borrow from its spirit and purpose.

The U.N. has also invented new military and quasi-military functions connected with the security task. UNEF in Egypt and the earlier military observer teams in Palestine

and Kashmir are cases in point. And despite waning confidence in the validity of its major premise, the U.N. displayed unforeseen capabilities in a "hard" case of Communist aggression — Korea — which could scarcely be envisaged in 1945. Both in and out of the U.N., then, many states have acted as though they had assumed an important general commitment and meant to take it seriously. In a way which the old League of Nations could never achieve, all states are involved in each successive crisis. This has obvious disadvantages in potentially widening an otherwise limited conflict. The offsetting advantage may be in keeping these crises from ending in general war.

The "failure of collective security," then, turns out to be a failure in the procedure which had been established more than in the substantive result achieved. The notion of universal collective security based on an abstract commitment to fight anyone, anywhere, anytime, on a call of a majority, has evaporated; but it had never really been a legitimate expectation, in the absence of a true world community and given the wide variety of meanings ascribed to the concept of justice.

But something more than this must be said about the political role of the U.N. as an agency of military security in the period ahead. The revolution in military weapons has changed both the kind of wars most likely to be fought and the attitudes of the great Powers toward war itself. The political status quo of the West is anathema to the Soviets, and the territorial status quo of world communism is unacceptable to us. Yet as general war becomes an increasingly unattractive proposition for both parties, the de facto line between the two worlds has hardened. When it is crossed in strength, as in Korea, the entire world appears to recognize it as a plain violation of the peace, and counteraction becomes politically feasible. Even India and Egypt voted initially to oppose the Communist aggression in Korea. On the other hand, as we saw in Hungary, a general military counter-action across the line was quite impossible politically even if we had been willing to lead it—which we were not.

Unlike the Communists, the United States through the President and Secretary of State has specifically renounced force to resolve political differences. There is no doubt that we would react vigorously to open Communist aggression, i.e. action across the line. But we explicitly avoid steps that could lead to general war. We have applied this self-denying ordinance to ourselves in the case of Communist China, the Berlin blockade, the crossing of the Yalu, Indochina and, most recently, Hungary. We have also applied this policy to our friends, as in the Suez crisis of 1956. It is argued that the United States could and should have blocked the shipment of Soviet arms into the Middle East, with the aim of heading off the subsequent crises, but the President was being entirely consistent in refusing to countenance a local military action that could lead directly to world war, however great the provocation to our friends. A significant result of the Suez fiasco is the realization that both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are likely to veto military action by third parties that might commit them to expanding potentially uncontrollable situations. Barring a drastic change in Soviet estimates of Western power, it would appear that the paraphernalia for all-out war has more political than military significance today. In turn, lesser instruments for exerting power assume increasing importance. The United Nations is one of them.

The fourth change is in the significance of disputes within the free world. Cases in point are the Indian-Pakistani dispute over Kashmir; Palestine, in all its ramifications, including the status of international waterways; India versus South Africa over Indian minority rights and racial discrimination; Greece, Turkey, and the United Kingdom over Cyprus; and Indonesia versus the Netherlands over West New Guinea. Each might "go critical." As Suez illustrated, a dispute which did not directly involve the two great powers can quickly pose life-and-death decisions for the entire human family. As things stand, the control rods of "the Suez pile" are held by an international brigade of U.N. troops. The chain reaction can start there again. But for the moment the world is buying time with the help of a variety of U.N. instrumentalities and functions, including UNEF, the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, and the activities of the Secretary-General. If Kashmir should be the scene of renewed fighting, and if the Soviet Union backed India and the United States backed Pakistan, the risks that the direct Soviet-American confrontation might develop into general war would be that much greater, given the geography and the stakes.

Whenever possible, the United States has preferred to leave disputes not directly involving Communist nations to the U.N. It is within this range of issues that the U.N. machinery for the pacific settlement of disputes has been brought into play. The Suez case is an indication of how we have become prisoners of outmoded ways of thinking about the organization. Throughout the intense and futile negotiations in the summer of 1956 the United States and its partners rigidly shunned any positive use of U.N. instrumentalities. One American motive in this was to avoid the possibility of a public discussion of the Panama Canal, by association, as it were. Consequently we relied exclusively on the so-called London group. This forum was unacceptable to Egypt. At the same time we failed to avail ourselves of a wide range of possible actions through the U.N., including appointment of a U.N. mediator, or of a U.N. agent-general to operate the Canal in the interim without prejudice, or the establishment of a joint régime, or, at a minimum, recognition through a U.N. resolution that the Canal was international in character. Reasonable proposals that enlisted heavy U.N. support could conceivably have altered Egypt's intransigence. We now see that when the British and French finally went to the U.N. in early October it was to clear the way for unilateral action. Only when fighting broke out did we ourselves turn to the U.N. to stop it. And this was of course the one thing the U.N. was unable to do apart from its exertion of purely moral force and apart from whatever outside pressure individual members such as we and the Russians could apply.

Western statesmen have spoken for years, quite correctly, about the great value of the U.N. in getting the parties to a dispute around the table, substituting talk and mediation and conciliation, however endless and frustrating, for bullets, and offering a variety of institutional means for limiting the conflict and facilitating peaceful change. In the case of Suez we underestimated the preventive capacity of the U.N. before the crisis became acute, overestimated its capabilities when the crisis arrived, and again lost interest when the crisis had passed. Our attention immediately wandered to another dimension of the problem—the possibility of overt Russian military aggression. The resolutions regarding a peace settlement and the refugee problem which we introduced in the hectic early nights of the crisis were never again referred to, and instead we brought forth the Eisenhower Doctrine for the Middle East. It may have been worthwhile to post a U.S. "keep out" sign in the area, even though the possibility of overt aggression was and is comparatively slight. But this was our only real move to remedy a whole set of critical local situations which did not primarily involve the Communist bloc but which were the basic sources of conflict in the area. Because all of these, including specifically the refugee problem, have once again been passed over, it can confidently be predicted that the next local explosion will be that much more potent.

III. SECURITY OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

How should the considerations just mentioned affect American policy toward the United Nations in the years immediately ahead? Let us first identify some of the overriding security goals of this policy today and see how the U.N. might help in achieving them.

Of course, our principal and obvious security objective is to create the kind of world order in which we and every other nation can cultivate our respective societies free from external threats of disruption. Everything else falls within this governing purpose. Fully spelled out, it would comprehend a wide variety of subordinate objectives in the economic, social, humanitarian and cultural fields. Here, however, we shall concentrate on the most acute problems which determine our choice of means and our allocation of resources.

Objective number one, then, is to reduce the generalized threat which Soviet Communist power presents to the United States and all Western society. This broad objective has three components. The first is to reduce the Soviet capability to inflict intolerable physical damage upon us. The second is to moderate hostile Soviet intentions. The third is to limit and if possible reduce present international support for the Soviet Union.

The second objective is to find means of limiting warfare if it does break out.

The third is to ensure, in the event of general war, that we rally maximum political support to our side, in order that we may have the best chance of organizing the post-war world in an acceptable way.

The fourth is to reduce the possibility of a general war developing inadvertently.

Reducing Soviet military capabilities

Since the U.N. does not have any military force of its own it would seem of little use to us in attaining this first objective. It can provide a variety of forums for negotiating the limitation and regulation of armaments and restricting the use of outer space to non-warlike purposes. True, whether or not these questions are to be resolved depends on agreement between the United States and the U.S.S.R., and in this sense the decision will be bilateral rather than multilateral. Nevertheless the wide choice of means of negotiation offered by the U.N. should not be discounted, as was shown when Russia wanted to talk privately with us about liquidating the Berlin blockade. A summary appraisal must be, then, that the U.N. can affect Soviet military capabilities only indirectly, by furnishing a negotiating vehicle.

Affecting Soviet intentions

This objective is more complex. At its least complicated level—military intentions—Soviet policy since Korea seems to have consciously excluded the overt use of military force in favor of more profitable and acceptable techniques of political and economic warfare. Secretary Dulles has said on several occasions that if it were not for the U.N. we would be in world war III. The real significance of the commitment undertaken by 81 nations—including the Soviet Union—to refrain from the threat or use of force is obviously not in its legal quality. Because any warlike act will immediately be brought before 80 other nations, the Soviet Union is faced with the fact that it must persuade an effective majority that it has not breached the existing line which neither side can properly cross, whatever it may be doing behind that line.

This deterrent is not comparable with the deterrent of our Strategic Air Command, but there have been too many examples of Soviet

sensitivity to world public opinion for us to write it off as meaningless. It is not always remembered that the U.N. resolution condemning the U.S.S.R. in Hungary was supported by 15 Afro-Asian states, with none in opposition. The Soviets periodically stumble badly because of the difficulty of sustaining a soft line in the U.N. when their line outside hardens. Soviet troops are still in Hungary, but the Soviet Union's reputation in the uncommitted nations was gravely tarnished just when its efforts to woo them were at a peak. On balance, the fact that the U.N. exists can be set down as a consideration affecting Soviet calculations about the profitability of military operations, but it hardly figures as a prime factor. On the other hand, regional and collective self-defense arrangements largely embody the charter commitment to oppose aggression, and these manifestly shape the Soviet estimate of the non-Communist world's vulnerability.

If, however, we think of Soviet inventions in the context of an evolution of Soviet society into something more tolerant and more tolerable, there are additional dimensions to the possible U.N. role which may not always be fully grasped. Certainly the U.N. cannot transform the nature of Soviet communism significant, but in various ways it might exert a favorable influence.

The fact that it is a continuous point of contact between the Communist bloc and the West may acquire special significance in a changing situation, if only by giving the Soviet Union assurance of being readily accepted into the community of nations as a great power even though it is rejected as a messianic and apocalyptic force. Meanwhile, U.N. membership can have the effect of sustaining and encouraging the independent identity of such satellites as Poland.

Thus we should continue to offer the Soviets alternative courses of action that one day may appear realistic and attractive to them. With or without them, we should continue to work to institutionalize areas of common action and to create an international community that can compete successfully with the barren Soviet variety. We have already led the way in nonpolitical programs such as health and technical assistance, which the Russians, for many reasons, ultimately have come to join. Seen in this light, the cold war should spur us to greater experiments with multilateralism among those disposed to cooperate; it should not serve as an excuse for us to retreat into inaction and defeatism.

One further matter may be mentioned conveniently here even though it is not directly related to Soviet intentions.

The U.N. is a demonstration and testing point for the unity of the free world. When that unity increases, the Soviets have seemed to raise their estimates of Western capabilities; and, conversely, Western disunity has encouraged the Soviets to calculate their opportunities as more promising. Sometimes the U.N. has been an embarrassment to us when used as a place for airing the free world's dirty linen. Sometimes the Russians have been able to use it as a place to disrupt free-world unity. If we are to live successfully in the kind of U.N. that has developed, and retain majority support when it really counts, we must do a number of new things. We must be prepared to go a great deal further than we have with our close friends on issues which are of great political importance to them but of only secondary importance to us. Primarily, these represent differences over essentially procedural matters such as elections or budgets or the composition of committees, which often have been the source of more interallied friction than any substantive policy issues except Chinese representation or Suez. We might do better not to engage the prestige of the United States on such procedural issues but to save it for the big ones. We might also gracefully accept an occasional minority position on some issues instead of insisting on having our own way, or going over the heads of friendly delegates, or threatening retaliation, however subtly.

Limiting international support for the Soviet Union

This support is coming primarily from the underdeveloped, neutralist, anticolonial countries and territories. No actions of ours can be expected wholly to reverse this tide until it has run its course. Nevertheless, it is here that the battle is being fought, and our task is to find ways of diverting local forces of discontent into constructive channels, to furnish incentives for native leadership so that the forces of nationalism may be harnessed to tasks of building rather than destruction and hate.

The prime factor here is economic. We should estimate afresh the political and economic benefits that might stem from greater use of the U.N. in financing the development of underdeveloped countries. But there also are important psychological factors, and here the style and sensitivity of our diplomacy can be crucial. Both in and out of the U.N., our ability to command the support of an effective majority depends heavily on the way we handle the legacy of bruised feelings left by centuries of Western claims to racial superiority, and on the understanding with which we view the ambition of Asians or Latin Americans to "catch up," to become industrialized, to be less dependent on a peasant economy that offers only continued human misery and poverty.

The U.N. is the one place where all of these tensions and claims and expectations come into focus in full view of virtually all the world. There the uncommitted nations have found their place in the sun, there the concept of the legal equality of States offers them the self-respect and dignity they seek.[1] There they acquire a parliamentary strength entirely disproportionate to the amount of real power they command in the world. This power is used primarily to bring before the rest of the world their ambitions and grievances, incorporated in concrete issues and demands: freedom from the only kind of foreign domination they know about; generous economic assistance for development, specifically grants, low-interest loans and fair capital investment; protection of their exports from uncontrollable fluctuations in world prices; racial equality in practice; freedom for the remaining colonial possessions of Western Powers; in short, equality with the rest of the world.

If we are to have the political support of these nations we must find better ways than we have done so far to relate our own interests to their interests, aspirations and goals. Where the U.N. provides the only agency acceptable to them we must utilize it to the utmost.

Limiting warfare if it breaks out

Our general military objective here has three parts. One is to avoid a direct military confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States, as already discussed. Another is to keep such a confrontation within bounds if it happens. A third is to keep outbreaks within the non-Communist world from spreading into a general war.

The scope of hostilities between free-world and Communist nations would undoubtedly be determined by the estimates each side made of the intentions and the capabilities of the other. Given the will of each to keep them limited, the U.N. can then offer the advantages it did when the United States made its decision to resist the Russians in Korea.

These advantages are several. First, the U.N. furnishes one means for us to secure maximum worldwide political support. This support is indispensable if we are not to lose the sense of legitimacy and moral right which we as a people need in order to sustain a military effort. The second advantage is the opportunity given us by the commitment made by all U.N. members to assist the organization in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter. This does not have to mean "action" in the legal sense of Security Council enforcement. Marginal offers of bases, transit rights—even "a sharpshooter on a camel"—cannot merely demonstrate the breadth of international disapproval of a Soviet act of limited aggression but can pay important strategic dividends. The third advantage is that the mere fact that the conflict is before the U.N. tends to discourage participants from expanding the scope of the war recklessly or setting extravagant war aims.

Perhaps the situation most likely to arise is one in which a military outbreak does not directly involve the Armed Forces of the United States or the U.S.S.R. Here the role of the U.N. is essentially political. When there is an effective majority against the continuance of hostilities, and the parties involved are responsive to it as they were in the Suez crisis, the conflict may be halted before it gets completely out of hand. An international military force such as UNEF can then play a most important role in helping restore conditions favorable to peaceful settlement and perhaps peaceful change.

Schemes for a standing U.N. force to counter large-scale aggression call for a relative preponderance of power at the center. Without some form of world government this is unattainable. Yet there is a more limited military role for the U.N. that is realistic and at the same time would serve to meet a vital contemporary need. Only the U.N. can develop and perfect the sort of limited and neutral force needed to prevent or deal with local situations which we know constitute a real and present danger to world peace. Such a force would not be supposed to undertake full-scale military action but only police functions. The response of the smaller nations in 1956 proved that they are ready, able and willing to contribute to such a force. Rather than continuing to present the U.N. as a club of like-minded states all prepared to take identical action, we should be grateful that some of them may form a third party available to be interposed in such situations. We ourselves have been the third party on occasion, as in the Indonesian Good Offices Committee, or in Algeria, and might well play such a role again.

A defect of various valuable suggestions recently made for establishing a permanent force along these lines lies in their failure to reckon fully with the formidable financial costs involved. One way to overcome this problem would be to set up a training command with a small permanent cadre. Selected units from member countries would be rotated there for a specified period, but would then return home to be held as a reserve.

Using the U.N. in a general war situation

We are prone to believe that general war would mean the end of the U.N., and this may be so. Yet as we saw in the case of Korea, the U.N. can serve as an umbrella under which the United States can legitimize its military response to a Communist aggression. Our planning must not ignore this possibility. We must assume there will be a postwar world to organize. The U.N. might accord legitimacy to non-Communist representatives of peoples in the Soviet bloc while hostilities were still in progress and thus arrange a vital political focus for the forces which would cooperate to bring into being the sort of world for which we had fought. Finally, if the political war aims were defined by the U.N. rather than by a single nation this might bring hostilities to a satisfactory end more promptly.

[1] This, incidentally, is why a weighted voting system, for all its logic, does not seem feasible unless and until genuine powers are reposed in the General Assembly.

Reducing the possibility of general war developing inadvertently

Since it is unlikely under present conditions that general war will be launched by the deliberate decision of any nation, the chief concern of responsible statesmen should be to prevent the outbreak of war by inadvertence. If we rule out the use of force to remedy the legitimate grievances of states, we are obliged to find other means for the solution of those problems. It is here that the U.N. has possibly its most vital future task to play in terms of our national security. But to energize the U.N. to undertake this task and to exploit its institutional potentialities fully the United States is going to have to attach a wholly new order of importance to developing better means for peacefully settling disputes and facilitating peaceful change. We must apply political muscle to the "preventive peace" about which we speak so frequently. It may mean a concentrated political and financial effort to resolve the Palestine refugee deadlock. It may mean taking the Peace Observation Commission out of mothballs and urging that it be dispatched to an unquiet frontier like that between Tunisia and Algeria. It may mean leading the way to greater use of the International Court of Justice, instead of setting an opposite kind of example by falling back on the domestic jurisdiction plea, as in the Interhandel case. It may mean pressing for the international regulation of international waterways—including the Panama Canal. In short, it means doing what no one has ever done before in all history—expending an effort to prevent violence comparable to the effort usually made in picking up the pieces afterward.

In working with enlarged purpose and effort on the chronic causes of instability and friction, we should not find our motivation only in the Soviet threat. Persistent international tensions threaten our ability to fulfill the promises of our own society. For our own internal good our role in the world must be more than that of a powerful negative force. Our well-rounded development as a people has come to depend on the development of stability for other peoples. Means must be found to resolve peacefully the clash between the status quo and the dynamic forces that continuously challenge it.

In the period ahead the United Nations may have extremely important uses both in support of the national interest and in support of the common interest in a more stable peace. These uses, as indicated here, may have little to do with the stereotypes and symbols of U.N. action that we still cling to, expressed in terms of universal collective security, "misuse of the veto," overemphasis on purely military estimates of the cold war, excessive U.S. control over multilateral funds and programs, the "popularity contest" theory, and expectations about altruistic international behavior. The crisis is too grave for us to afford to misunderstand the capabilities of any instrumentality offering genuine opportunities to advance our national prospects and the prospects for a tolerable world around us.

Unwanted Guest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr Speaker I haven't spoken out on the coming visit of Premier Khrushchev until this moment. As yet, I find it difficult to find a good reason for cheering.

However, the purpose of this extension is to put into the RECORD an article published by St. Joseph's Parish, Brooklyn, N.Y., edited by the Reverend Edward Lodge Curran, Ph. D.:

UNWANTED GUEST

In 1955, President Eisenhower attended a so-called summit meeting of governmental big shots in Geneva, in order to find ways and means of reducing the military high blood pressure of the world, or, to use the customary journalistic expression, in order to melt something out of the cold war atmosphere created by the antics of the brutal and godless Government of Soviet Russia.

AT GENEVA

That summit meeting was a complete bust. Only the tyrant of Soviet Russia benefited. He had succeeded in having himself placed on the same level with the decent rulers of the other nations assembled there.

Just recently, again in Geneva, another just-short-of-the-summit meeting was held by the Foreign Ministers of the same nations. This time, Free Western Germany and enslaved East Germany were allowed to sit in as observers. Again, the Soviet representative, one Andrei Gromyko, tied up the meeting in recruiting knots. Again, nothing was accomplished to relieve world tension. Again, this almost-summit meeting was a complete bust.

HOME AND ABROAD

From time to time, on this side of the Atlantic, governmental officials in Washington and American business tycoons have been rolling out the red carpet for visiting top officials from the Soviet Government. Once it was for Anastas Mikoyan. Then it was for Frol Kozlov. Honeyed words were intermingled with snide remarks by the Russian representatives who toured the United States and addressed American audiences. One again, however, nothing was accomplished to ease the warlike tension of the world.

Most recently, we have had glimpses of Vice President NIXON's 2 weeks' tour of Russia, with a brief side trip to Communist-enslaved Poland. The Vice President was cheered by the people, heckled by some workers, and argued with by Khrushchev. Mr. NIXON constantly repeated the theme of "Friendship and Peace." Sometimes he indicated that it was wrong of Soviet Russia to exercise military domination over certain nations in Western Europe. He made no mention of the utter slavery to which the Russian people themselves are subjected. Nor did he publicly refer to God or religion or religious rights. As far as we can judge, this next-to-the-summit tour of Vice President NIXON accomplished nothing.

PRESIDENTIAL GUEST

Now, the American Nation is informed that President Eisenhower has invited Nikita Khrushchev, godless dictator of Soviet Russia and imperial master of all Communist-enslaved nations, to visit him and to tour the United States of America. This means that there is to be a summit meeting between the President and the tyrant in Washington. This will be followed later by another summit meeting between the same individuals in Moscow. The President has chosen to do this, despite his public declaration that he would participate in no summit meeting unless the recent Geneva Foreign Ministers' meeting accomplished something definite. The President ignores the fact that the Geneva meeting merely added hot air to a cold war.

What good does President Eisenhower expect to accomplish by his invitation to Khrushchev? It could not have been issued to acquaint the Russian dictator with the current history and activities of the United States. Khrushchev does not have to visit the United States to learn about us. Through his espionage system and through the Russian officials who have preceded him, Khrushchev already possesses adequate knowledge about American politics and economics and military preparedness and education. He can confirm and increase his knowledge by studying the American exhibitions now on display in Moscow.

Does the President expect that Khrushchev's visit will generate good will toward us on the part of the Russian dictaor? If so, the President is laboring under a tremendous act and atmosphere of self-deception. Communistic tyrants have good will for nothing expect world communism. Their entire philosophy and history and political science are against good will to non-Communists. Communistic tyrants are motivated by fear and hatred, not be confidence and love.

President Eisenhower's invitation is one of the biggest diplomatic victories ever attained by Dictator Khrushchev. It will give him, as the Daily News editorial of 6 weeks ago stated, "a means of building his prestige and convincing his slaves and slave-nations that the United States has at last endorsed their slavery."

POPULAR PROTOCOL

The President's invitation and its acceptance have already succeeded in displeasing thousands upon thousands of our fellow citizens. Americans who have relatives in Poland and Lithuania and Latvia and Estonia and Hungary and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, will not take kindly to it. The Communist-enslaved peoples themselves, of Western Europe and Asia, may again be driven to doubt the sincerity of official Washington's oft-stated sympathy and desire for their liberation.

Both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON have asked American citizens to receive Khrushchev kindly when he comes. Until he comes, however, the American people have the right to indicate their individual and corporate displeasure at the President's invitation. By such peaceful means, the people of Sweden were successfull in keeping Khrushchev out of their country.

If such peaceful protests fail and the unwanted guest arrives, American citizens will exercise the kindness of restraint. They cannot be expected to wave flags and strew flowers and utter cheers and play bands and hold parades in honor of the Communist tyrant. They have the right to let him pass in stony silence.

Our fellow citizens will not create any international incident but they will not abandon their religious and political ideals at the sight of one whose hands are still red with the blood of martyred Hungarians. To do so, would be disgustingly hypocritical.

It is too bad that President Eisenhower has overlooked the warning of Pope Pius XI, when he wrote: "Communism is intrinsically wrong and no one who would preserve Christian civilization may collaborate with it in any undertaking whatsoever." By inviting Khrushchev to the United States, we believe that President Eisenhower has made the biggest domestic and international blunder in his presidential career.

Mr. Speaker, while reading this interesting observation, I noted Father Curran's editorial on "Labor Day" and since it is so apropos to the issue of the day, labor reform legislation, I include it with my remarks:

LABOR DAY

Monday, September 7, is Labor Day. The splendid progress made by American workers and American labor unions will be joyfully commemorated by all American citizens.

Much publicity has recently been given to the existence of certain faithless labor leaders in our midst. Fortunately, these constitute only a small and insignificant minority of those who devote themselves to the welfare of American workers. The vast overwhelming majority of labor unions and labor leaders are decent and law abiding and reputable and honest and sincere.

American workers are just as anxious to remove any faithless labor leaders from their midst as are American politicians or journalists. A few faithless law-enforcement officers do not destroy either the integrity or the reputation of a city's police department. Neither should the existence of a few faithless labor leaders be used to question either the integrity or the reputation of American labor.

It was Pope Leo XIII who publicly pronounced the right of workers to organize in labor unions for the protection and promotion of their economic welfare. We pray that the American labor movement will purge itself of any personal or material evils in its ranks. We also pray that the American labor movement will contribute to the spiritual as well as the economic progress of America.

All who work, no matter what their occupation or their status, should always remember the following admonitions of Christ:

"What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his soul?" (Mark, viii: 36.)

"Seek ye therefore first the kingdom of God and his justice, and these things shall be added unto you." (Mark, vi: 33.)

Watch Out for Communist Code Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Saturday Evening Post on the Communist code language. At the time of Khrushchev's so-called "peace mission," we need to be more than ever, alert to this doubletalk. Peace means to them, surrender by us. Edward Hunter, writer of the editorial, is the first Westerner who analyzed and described the diabolically skillful ways which the Red Chinese have developed to change people. He has authored "Brainwashing in China," "The Black Book on Red China," and other books on Communist tactics. The editorial follows:

MARXIST JARGON CAN TRAP UNWARY NEGOTIATORS

(By Edward Hunter)

Communism is a language, as distinct as any other, except that it takes the form of a code. Communism's greatest asset is its use of the same words with the same spelling and the same grammar and pronunciation as in other languages, except that the words have special meanings to Communists.

The key to the code is dialectic materialism. This isn't a matter of mere semantics, but of fundamentally different definitions.

Practically everything the Reds say or do falls into place once we recognize this. Adlai Stevenson learned something about code language when he visited Khrushchev. He was informed by Khrushchev that the word "noninterference" means noninterference with Communist procedure or expansion. Thus Communist fifth columns in non-Communist countries are not guilty of interference. Khrushchev presented this hoax with a straight face.

Nasser blew his top because he said Khrushchev broke his word after pledging noninterference. Khrushchev didn't interfere with Communist activity in Egypt. This was what noninterference meant in Communist language. Nasser should have had the agreement translated into the two languages, Egyptian and Communist. The only way an American negotiator at a summit conference—or anywhere else—can similarly guard himself would be by insisting that agreements be translated into English according to Webster and into English according to dialectic materialism.

Dialectic materialism teaches that everything is in flux, everywhere in the universe, except one thing—the Communist line. Dialectic materialism presents new standards. What is good or bad is judged according to whether it is good or bad for communism. What is a lie or what is truth is judged accordingly. If something conforms to communism's needs, it is true; if not, it's a lie.

If Communist strategy required that Americans be said to have engaged in germ warfare, the extortion of fake confessions was good. They were the "truth"—in Communist language. The same applies to the bestial Red charges that the self-sacrificing American and Canadian nuns cracked the skulls of the babies in the orphanages they tended. That they did nothing of the sort has nothing to do with the case, once one accepts dialectic materialism.

Brainwashing has to be part of communism; otherwise nobody would fall for it. It takes the clinical treatment of a twisted Pavlovian approach to madden a mind in this manner.

When a Red delegate in the U.N. rises, after a resolution has been carefully steered through every conceivable legalism, and calls it illegal, he is talking the Communist language. The seating of the Chinese Nationalist Government, or any other act opposed by the Reds is automatically "illegal" once Communist language is accepted.

We know that our truce agreement with the Reds in Korea was violated simultaneously with its signing. According to the Communist language the truce was binding only on us. We neglected to have it translated. Use of this code language has trapped our diplomats and our intelligence officers consistently, and without such translation it makes our newspaper dispatches misleading.

Of course, the Reds would no more agree to such a translation of agreements than to mutual inspection of armaments. But insistence on it would show up the Red hypocrisy and at least inform our side of what the Reds are saying. This would be preferable to being taken for another ride.

A serious dictionary of the Communist language needs to be compiled. Some definitions that rise to mind are:

Peace: A state of affairs where all sides accept communism.

People: Those individuals accepted as legal entities, excluding all not in Communist favor.

Illegal: Not in accordance with dialectic materialism.

Aggression: Interference with Communist activity or expansion.

Democracy: Communist Party activity in the interests of the masses, who don't know where their interests lie.

Education: Instruction in dialectic materialism, or from its point of view.

Patriotism: Local nationalism focused against the free world until communism takes over, then loyalty to the world Communist camp.

Reform: Change in a wrong direction where opposed to Communist revolution; change in a good direction when focused on some one social or political field, taking its direction from dialectic materialism.

Every diplomat, intelligence officer, and newspaper correspondent should be obliged to translate from the communism accordingly. Every agreement with the Reds should contain a statement that the West is not accepting Communist doubletalk.

The Great Jailer Visits the Land of Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following brilliant allegory on Khrushchev's visit to the United States, written by the eminent clergyman, writer, and television teacher, Bishop Fulton J. Sheen. Read and pondered, his allegory of the jailer will help sincere but puzzled citizens see more clearly the essential facts and factors to be considered, and therefore guide them in determining their attitudes and conduct while the world's greatest jailer is in our midst.

The article from the Los Angeles Examiner follows:

GREAT JAILER'S VISIT TO LAND OF FREEDOM UNIQUE

(By Bishop Fulton J. Sheen)

Once upon a time, there was a great jailer who was invited to visit a people who boasted they were not captive or imprisoned. What made his visit so unique was that this great jailer had millions and millions of people in his prison; some of them he put to death before they even got to jail and others who tried to break out of their jail were driven back with tanks.

The problem that faced the free people when the great jailer came to their free country was: "What should I think?" "How should I act?"

1. Do you think you will make the great jailer anxious to throw away the keys of his prison simply because he sees that you have longer automobiles, better hair-dos, more electric gadgets, more rooms in your apartment, richer food at your table, and the greatest per capita income in the world? Remember that the great jailer is already a rich man—richer than anyone in America; he owns all the lumber, all the steel, all the railroads, all the autos, all the housing in his own land.

The great jailer who became rich through confiscation does not envy your national wealth; he envies your personal wealth. Personal wealth is the economic guarantee of your freedom. He knows that your right to call property your own, is because you already have a soul which you can call your own.

FREEDOM ENVIED

This is a great challenge to the great jailer. If the great jailer believed in the spirit, he would rejoice in your well being, because the spiritual man rejoices in the property of others. But being a materialist, the great jailer envies your freedom; it embarrasses him before other nations of the world.

As Chesterton said: "There is a spirit which drives men incessantly on to destroy what they cannot understand, and to capture what they cannot enjoy."

Think not, therefore, that seeing your comforts will make him work hard to catch up to you in a peaceful world. Rather, he may think it wise to destroy what you already posses. Do all men in the face of saintliness seek to be good? Are there not some men in the face of goodness who seek to crucify? Your freedom is not an object of pious emulation; it is an object to be destroyed.

2. As your economic prosperity and freedom will never change him, so neither will a visit to you change his philosophy of life. Remember that the great jailer is himself a prisoner. He is the prisoner of a collectivity from which he cannot escape. The leopard cannot change his spots, nor the Ethiopian his skin.

ANT HILL LIFE

In brainwashing others, the great jailer has become brainwashed. The touch of Christ's lips did not make Judas less the traitor. The great jailer's life is not his own; it belongs to the ant hill; the moment he changes his mind or heart, he will suffer the liquidation he has ministered unto others for changing their hearts.

There are some who will not believe, though one rise daily from the dead. His basic philosophy is that freedom is not in the person, but in the party; it is the party who decides who shall live and not live. It is therefore, not a person who is visiting you; it is a philosophy; it is a party; it is the great jaildom.

3. Think not that because the great jailer comes, not with the prison keys rattling from his hammer and sickle, that he has nothing to do with bars and cells. In all human relations with the great jailer, remember the prisoners. Prisoners who are so thin they stand like posts in their imprisonment; who are so hungry they even make the name of their country sound like their starvation; remember that in some jails the prisoners wear not stripes but checks.

Look then at the great jailer as if he were transparent; see through him to the millions who weep tears at the sight of a free man from a free country; see through the jailer to the hands lifted saying: "Betray us not. The world is upside down. Those who should be in prison are the jailers. Now is verified the words of innocence behind bars: 'I was in prison and you visited me'."

DON'T INSULT HIM

Finally, do not insult or injure or be unkind in word or deed to the great jailer. Freemen must not lower themselves to the level of those who would destroy freedom. There must be moments of silence before the great jailer as Christ was silent before the Jailer Herod because Herod sent John to his death; but there should be moments of speech, warm and sincere, as the great jailer is shown not just our reactors, but our churches and our synagogues.

Take him to a synagogue, to a Protestant church and to a Catholic church during services, that he may see that we are great, not because we challenge God and seek to destroy Him as is done in his jaildom, but because we love and worship Him Who has endowed us with, as our Constitution says, "unalienable rights" and among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Food Donations Set Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. QUIE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 24, 1959

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the record set by the administration in donating nearly 3 billion pounds of surplus foods during fiscal year 1959 is surely a record of which all Americans can be proud.

It has been announced recently that this food has been provided for use in our own school-lunch programs and charitable institutions as well as to needy persons at home and abroad. The distribution shows an increase of 5 percent over the previous fiscal year, and marks a high point in donations of Government-owned foods.

The increase has been distributed to domestic outlets, as donations to needy persons, schools, and institutions total more than a billion pounds for the year—a considerable rise over the 871,600,000 pounds distributed the previous year and a tremendous increase from the figure of 161,100,000 pounds in 1953.

Foreign distribution amounted to 1,867,200,000 pounds in donations in fiscal 1959, compared to the 24 million pounds donated in 1953. The administration reports that increased donations of wheat flour were offset by decreased amounts of cheese which was removed from the list of foreign donations last year.

I believe the administration deserves unsparing praise for the manner in which it is handling this important feature of our surplus disposal program. Foods acquired through surplus removal and price support programs are distributed to eligible recipients in our country through designated agencies of State and local governments—while distribution in 91 countries has been handled by voluntary church and welfare organizations. It is important to note that surplus foods are donated for relief overseas only after they have been made available to meet needs in our own country.

Because I believe it is important for all of us to see where the food is going in our own country, I am including a table which sets forth the numbers of needy persons in family units who received donated commodities in June 1959:

Alabama	127,127
Arizona	50,423
Arkansas	178,341
California	23,215
Colorado	18,799
Connecticut	587
Delaware	3,062
District of Columbia	29,604
Georgia	30,878
Illinois	79,281
Indiana	75,485
Iowa	65,919
Kansas	11,370
Kentucky	280,968
Louisiana	120,604
Maine	56,543
Maryland	44,532
Massachusetts	4,114
Michigan	380,343
Minnesota	33,314
Mississippi	179,055
Missouri	93,153
Montana	8,877
Nevada	992
New Hampshire	6,703
New Jersey	13,789
New Mexico	35,628
New York	364,056
North Dakota	5,320
Ohio	113,568
Oklahoma	232,186
Pennsylvania	735,368
Puerto Rico	595,430
Rhode Island	11,432
South Dakota	23,994
Tennessee	149,458
Texas	118,138
Utah	11,667
Vermont	11,633
Virginia	37,404
Washington	3,977
West Virginia	295,345
Wisconsin	40,076
Wyoming	7,468
Trust territory	3,218
Samoa (American)	2,905
Total	4,715,349

Mr. Speaker, the total figure of 4,715,349 should be compared to the 100,000 needy persons in family units who received donated food in fiscal 1953. This is truly a great demonstration of the worth and success of this vital program.

Effective Civil-Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, a great number of Members of Congress, including myself, have pressed for practical and effective civil-rights legislation during this the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Having failed so far to enact suitable civil-rights legislation the feeling among the sponsors is that at this late date the Congress could not give the necessary time and work to enact the type of civil-rights bill which is necessary.

It is my hope and I know I will be joined by a great number of other Members to get effective civil-rights legislation enacted early in the next session.

Rev. L. K. Jackson, president of the Interdenominational Ministers Alliance of Gary and the Calumet region of Indiana, submits the following communication on this important legislation for the consideration of the Congress:

THE ST. PAUL BAPTIST CHURCH,
Gary, Ind., September 8, 1959.

Representative RAY J. MADDEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. MADDEN: Your very kind letter of a few days ago is at hand, contents carefully noted. Replying to same, please accept my sincere thanks for the influence you radiated in an effort to get effective legislation passed, in this session of Congress, that will protect decent, honest and upright labor leaders and members of unions from racketeers, gangsters, and the underworld.

There is another piece of legislation pending in Congress which is just as important as labor legislation is, and our representatives in Washington, from the President down to our most recent elected Congressmen, should be just as deeply interested in, and just as concerned about getting effective civil rights legislation passed in this session of Congress as you were about the passing of effective labor legislation.

In view of the awful shame and terrible disgrace that is being brought upon our country by a large segment of men and women under the leadership of the White

Citizen Council and the Ku Klux Klan, who are so stewed in the broth of race prejudice that they do not believe in democracy for all; and are exhausting every diabolical scheme in the book to prevent the democratic process from working in America, I urge, beseech and pray you to use the influence of your great office to keep Congress in session until effective civil rights legislation is passed that will stop the reign of terror, shame and barbarity that is being carried on in Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, and throughout the South against some of the most loyal, patriotic, and law-abiding citizens in America.

Race prejudice is one of the most dangerous, cancerous, contagious and destructive diseases of this age and generation. I cannot see how any loyal American can talk as much as some of them do about communism abroad and do absolutely nothing to destroy the effects of race prejudice at home. For beyond any variation or shadow of doubt, it is the root of more dissension, discord, tension and animosity than can be described; and is doing the United States more harm abroad than all the billions we are spending on foreign aid, mutual aid, and all other aids abroad in an effort to win the uncommitted nations of the world to our philosophy of life—is doing good. With that in mind, I urge, beseech and pray you to use all of the influence of your great office to help pass legislation that will bring an end to this barbarity at home, and take down this reproach abroad.

With every good wish for your continued success and hoping to hear from you at your earliest convenience on this very important matter, I am,

Yours very truly,

L. K. JACKSON,
The Servant of the Lord's Servants.

Truth Will Out: Red China Has To Admit the Fraudulence of Its Claims

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington News of August 27, 1959:

PEIPING PRESTIGE DUE TO DIVE

TOKYO, August 27.—Communist China's admission that it would fall far short this year of its grandiose production targets was certain to send its prestige on a nosedive throughout the Far East today.

Peiping's mainstay in keeping it halfway respectable in the eyes of Asia's millions had been the reported progress in getting more grain and cotton to feed and clothe its millions.

The measures taken on the mainland—such as forcing approximately 500 million into people's communes and all-night work brigades—were harsh, most Asians would admit.

But most of those in Asia's underdeveloped nations, where the threat of famine still too often exists and where few ever have full stomachs, also saw a not pleasant, but at least a possible solution to their woes in the road taken by the Chinese.

ILLUSION DESTROYED

The communique and resolution adopted by the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party at their plenary session in Lushan, Kiangsi Province, did much to destroy this illusion.

The communique and resolution, released yesterday, made it clear that the big increases reported during 1958, China's "year of the great leap forward," were greatly exaggerated.

The Chinese admit that they had inflated 1958 grain production figures, for example, by 125 million tons to 375 million tons. The "verified" figure reported now is only 250 million tons.

Also, the Chinese say now that their much publicized backyard furnaces were not up to par and that the figure for steel output in 1958 was only 8 million tons, with 3.8 million tons produced by the "local method" not good enough to be counted in the nation's overall total. The new 1959 goal for steel has been dropped from 18 million tons to 12 million.

Cotton output was 2.1 million tons instead of the 3.35 million earlier reported.

PUSHED TO LIMIT

What will further disillusion Asians is that the Central Committee has called for still further efforts from its millions whom most feel already were being pushed to the limit.

China's prestige already was suffering in the Far East because of its actions in Tibet. Asians were becoming wary of the Chinese because of events in Laos.

The feeling among many Asians now is that much of the hardships and tribulations of the mainland Chinese have been for naught.

A Strong Domestic Minerals Industry Necessary to Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress too strongly the importance to our national security of a strong domestic minerals industry.

Our Government has, to some extent, recognized this importance. It has taken steps to prevent the undermining of certain segments of the minerals industry. Restrictions have been placed on imports of foreign oil, quotas have been established on imports of lead and zinc, and tariffs have been put into effect on copper and many other materials.

Additional measures are now being seriously considered. Legislation has been introduced to tighten the quotas on lead and zinc. Further legislation is pending to set up a system of quotas and price support for fluorspar. Other proposals are under consideration.

However, no consideration has been given to the plight of the domestic sulfur industry, and industry which for the past five years has been subjected to drastic price cutting by Mexican producers and to flooding of domestic markets by foreign sulfur.

On top of this, the industry is now confronted with large Government sponsored sulfur production in France and with the prospect of even greater production of sulfur from sour natural gas in Canada.

The French production is part of a huge industrial complex which is controlled by the French Government by virtue of its ownership of a majority of the stock and which is largely financed by long-term government loans.

In fact, the development of most of the Mexican production was aided by loans from our Government. The Export-Import Bank put up almost $10 million to help some of the sulfur mining companies in Mexico get started in 1954.

By 1958, the Mexican industry, using the same Frasch hot-water process as that developed by the U.S. industry, had captured 16 percent of the U.S. market and 25 percent of the export market for Frasch sulfur. Last year the Mexican producers flooded this country with 600,000 tons of cheap sulfur and the export market with an additional 460,000 tons, all at the expense of the U.S. producers.

To make these inroads, the Mexican industry carried price cutting to an extreme degree. After U.S. producers had been forced to make substantial reductions in their own prices to try to meet this competition, the Mexican producers cut their prices even lower. I understand that the actual price of sulfur is now little above the level in the depression of the early 1930's and that it is selling at the equivalent of a cent a pound.

The loss of business to the Mexicans has been reflected in earnings of the U.S. sulfur industry. Stockholder reports of one domestic producer show a 52-percent drop in net earnings between 1956 and 1958. Another producer saw net income from sulfur sales decline more than 25 percent in the same period. A third producer's net dropped 145 percent from a profitable year in 1956 to a loss of well over one-half a million dollars last year.

As recently as this past July, the largest U.S. producer announced that it had to lay off 10 percent of its Texas labor force and could see no chance of rehiring the workers in the near future.

Yet, all the while, profits and production in Mexico have been increasing. The largest Mexican producer, moreover, announced recently that it plans a further substantial increase in production.

How have Mexicans been able to slash prices and thereby grab so large a share of the market in so short a time?

The answer is cheap labor, cheap shipping costs and special tax advantages.

The cost of labor is one of the largest expenses a mining company faces, and any saving in this area gives a producer a considerable advantage over his competitors.

A comparison of Mexican and United States wage scales is staggering. Trade surveys show that laborers at the mines on the Tehuantepec Isthmus are paid about $1.88 a day, while the rate for a comparable job in Texas and Louisiana is between $16 and $17—about nine times as much.

The Mexicans also have special shipping advantages. Domestic sulfur shipped to consumers on our Atlantic and Pacific coasts must by law be carried in U.S. vessels, which pay high American wages and charge high freight rates. In contrast, Mexican sulfur comes to U.S. ports in foreign vessels which have low wages and freight rates.

The difference in shipping costs is substantial. For example, in the first half

of this year, it cost $6.50 per ton to ship sulfud from Texas and Louisiana to New England. At the same time sulful was moving from Mexico to New England at rates as low as $2.25 per ton.

Other special advantages enjoyed by the Mexican producers include lower property taxes and production taxes of less than one-fourth those paid by U.S. producers.

While the large sulfur mines in Texas and Louisiana can no doubt withstand this onslaught, the smaller mines cannot survive against this cutthroat competition. And once a mine is closed it is almost always lost forever because of the high cost of reopening it.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that to let such mines wither and die is incompatible with our Government's avowed policies of encouraging the development of domestic mineral production and of conserving our natural resources. Nor is it compatible with national security. In peace and war, sulfur is no less essential than oil or steel. It is, in fact, vital to the processing of both these key commodities, just as it is to the making of fertilizer, chemicals, rubber, rayon, paint, pulp and paper, and a host of other necessities.

Although sulfur is seldom seen in the final product which it helps to produce, it enters at some stage in the production or processing of virtually everything we eat, wear or use. Our industry and agriculture could not exist without it. Thus, the maintenance of a sound domestic sulfur industry is a matter of vital national interest.

My purpose in presenting these facts is to draw the attention of everyone concerned with our natural resources to a situation which needs correction.

I strongly urge that serious consideration be given to the establishment of import quotas on sulfur similar to the restrictions placed on foreign oil and to the quotas in force for lead and zinc. I urge also that consideration be given to the establishment of a tariff on sulfur as we have on so many other mineral products. Incidentally Mexico itself, while flooding our country with sulfur, imposes a tariff amounting to about 25 percent of the value of any sulfur we ship to them.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a quota and a tariff are essential in order to safeguard the domestic sulfur industry from the disastrous effects of substandard wages and preferential shipping rates prevailing elsewhere and to prevent this industry from being permanently weakened from these effects.

U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following three articles by Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, U.S. Army, retired. General Hester has considerable background in international relations, and I am including with his articles a copy of his biography. His articles appeared originally in Peace Action, an independent publication published in Washington, D.C. The following selections discuss: "A more Realistic Policy Is Needed for Germany," "A Plague on Both Blocs," and "Keep Up Massive Resistance to Brinkmanship":

BIOGRAPHY OF BRIG. GEN. HUGH B. HESTER

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, lecturer and writer on U.S. foreign policy, was born in Hester, N.C., in 1895. He is a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and has been a graduate student of law and international relations at the University of North Carolina, George Washington University, and the University of Pennsylvania.

When he retired from active military service in 1951, he had behind him more than 34 years of service, with many and varied military assignments. Among the more important of these assignments were: Executive Officer for Procurement in the Office of the Assistant and Under Secretary of War, 1939–40; Chief of Procurement Control of the Production and Military Planning Divisions in the Office of the Quartermaster General, 1940–42; Director of Procurement of Supplies from Australian sources under reverse lend lease and commanding general of General Depot and Base Section Seven, 1942–45; Director of the German food program for the U.S. Military Government in Germany, serving successively under Generals Eisenhower, McNarney, and Clay, 1945–47; Military Attaché to Australia, 1947–48; commanding general of the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, 1948–51.

General Hester has received the U.S. Distinguished Service Medal, and he has been awarded the Legion of Honor (officer) by the French Government.

Since his retirement he has undertaken graduate work in international relations at the University of Pennsylvania. He has written numerous articles in such leading magazines and newspapers as the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, the Saturday Review, Nation, Progressive, New Republic, and the Churchman. His recent writings include "The Challenge of Our Times," Virginia Quarterly Review, spring issue, 1957, and "The U.S.A., U.S.S.R., and Peace" Meanjin, December 1957 issue (a leading Australian quarterly of arts and literature). General Hester is the coauthor, with Dr. Jerome Davis, of "Making Peace," to be published in the spring of 1959.

A PLAGUE ON BOTH BLOCS

(By Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, USA, retired)

Before commenting on the present propaganda hysteria over the execution of Imre Nagy of Hungary in particular and on the cold war in general, I want to make it especially clear that I yield to no one in my abhorrence of physical violence and man's inhumanity to man so characteristic of the 20th century, especially so of that part called the Christian World. This abhorrence is based upon participation, as a Regular Army officer, in World Wars I and II and the police action in Korea, and extends to the senseless slaughter of all men, women, children, and enlisted personnel with equal force as it does to the execution of former Prime Ministers and other important people. It also extends to the casualties on both sides, whether Communist or anti-Communist, in the Hungarian rebellion and to the British, French, and Israeli casualties as well as the Arab victims in the war against the Egyptians in 1956. As members of the human race all are brothers; and in the eyes of the truly humane, the lowliest is as important as the loftiest.

It is necessary, I believe, to understand this in order to establish some sense of sanity or basis for balance in the 40-year-old struggle between capitalism and communism. This struggle has taken the form of both a hot war, as when the representatives of the former en masse attacked the nascent Soviet Union in 1918–20, and that of a cold war from that time to the present. As for the current furor over the execution of former Premier Nagy of Hungary (and again I repeat my deep feeling of sorrow that another human being has been sacrificed upon the altar of violence) it is also importance to remember that he too drew the sword and participated in its blood bath. In this participation he probably committed no greater crime than many others; but in the end his fate did not differ markedly from that of most other unsuccessful men of violence.

Former Premier Nagy, like the countless thousands of casualties of many races and creeds, over the past 13 years, was a victim of the cold war between the United States and the Soviet Union. But for this senseless struggle, it is extremely doubtful that there would have been any Hungarian rebellion in the first place; and certainly there need not have been any Russian participation in it. And the current shedding of propaganda tears over these latest victims of violence is not likely to hasten the establishment of freedom in Hungary, but is better calculated to promote the blood bath of world war III; and as a result the lives of hundreds of millions of others, both big and little, will be lost.

Every competent student of international relations knew at the time of the Hungarian rebellion that the Soviet Union could not tolerate the formation of a hostile government on its borders any more than the United States could or would on any of its borders. They also knew that Secretary Dulles' policies of East European liberation without a general European settlement, or German unification inside NATO, were and are impossible of realization without a world war.

FREE ELECTIONS

In the propaganda struggle, liberation means release of forces from the side of one's enemy and the attachment of those same forces to one's own side; and "free" elections are desirable when—and only when—one is certain of a firm majority. For this reason U.S. official policy favors free elections in Germany and Korea, but not in Vietnam; and the Soviet Union favors them in the latter but not in the former two. Morality, unfortunately, has nothing to do with the position of either power on these issues, and it is time to stop the hypocritical pretense that it does.

This is the self-evident truth about power politics under the balance-of-power system. The maintenance of this balance is now the principal function of both the Warsaw Pact and NATO. The crushing of the Hungarian rebellion and the quashing of the Sues invasion are illustrations of this. NATO has not prevented the Russians from marching west to the English Channel since V–E Day any more than it has been the Warsaw Pact that prevented our coming to the military assistance of the Hungarian rebels in October 1956. And to claim, as some do, that this is so—that since the Russians have not not marched west, NATO has therefore prevented it—is to employ in a negative sense the "chicken coop" logic used by Chanticleer in his call for the sunrise. The fear of world war III was the deterrent (if any was required) against such a move in both cases. But fear is a slender, if not broken reed upon which to lean for permanent peace.

Does any informed person really believe that the United States would stand idly by

while the Communists were taking control of France or any other one of her 42 "allies" through violence, as was attempted in Hungary? If so, he hasn't comprehended the meaning of the Eisenhower Doctrine and hasn't yet read Mr. Dulles's speech before the Overseas Press on March 29, 1954, where he stated: "Under conditions of today the imposition on Southeast Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally, by whatever means, would be a great threat." And he has, also, forgotten about Guatemala, 1954. But no one can so soon have forgotten what happened in Lebanon and Jordan mid-July 1958.

Is not any moralist entitled then to inquire—since the U.S. foreign policies and those of her allies are allegedly based upon moral considerations—just what distinguishes these policies from those of their opponents? Was not the attack on Egypt by England and France in 1956 and the occupation of Jordan by the English in 1958 in violation of their treaty obligations under the United Nations Charter? Were the interventions by the United States in the Chinese civil war, when the President interfered in the Formosa Straits, June 1950, and again in the Lebanon civil war, 1958, any less violations of the U.N. Charter than the Soviet Union's intervention in the Hugarian uprising, October 1956?

ACT OF FORCE

The fact that China could not at that time challenge the seapower of the United States in no way affects validity of the charge that it was an act of war. In truth many students of international relations believe that this was the principal reason for China's entrance into the Korean war; and on this basis they conclude that her action was no more morally reprehensible than that of the United States earlier. Did not the United States again violate its treaty obligations "not to use the therat of force" when she mobilized the Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean in 1957 during the tensions between Syria and Turkey? And what of the earlier blank check given by the United States and the British to the Lebanese and Jordanian Governments to intervene upon request in this present civil war? A check since honored.

What, the historians of the future have the duty to ask, distinguishes the Truman doctrine of containment in 1947, as modified and accepted by the present administration and its allies from the Holy Alliance of the 19th century, following the defeat of Napolean in 1815? This alliance, under the direction of Prince Metternich of Austria, obligated the reactionary houses of the Hapsburgs, Hohenzollerns, and Romanovs—together with their allies—to oppose all change. This they did, but change proved uncontainable then and must, I believe, prove so again. No nation or group of nations could then, or can now, control the world or prevent change. A world gendarmerie in the days of the rifle and sailing ships proved impossible of achievement; how much more so must it prove impossible now in a deeply divided world with both sides armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs and missiles, and with the ability to use them effectively? The British and American answer to the Metternich policy of the 19th century was the Monroe Doctrine. Unfortunately the answer to the Dulles madness now may be war III.

The failure of political leadership to realize the basic necessity for change—economic, political, and social—is, in the writer's opinion, largely responsible for the world's present chaotic state. Communism is the symptom, not the cause, of man's maladies. The remedy lies in a coordinated global attack on the real enemies of man: poverty, ignorance, and bigotry—not on more propaganda for the containment of the uncontainable. Since neither bloc can win either the cold war or a hot one, why not substitute international cooperation for conflict?

A MORE REALISTIC POLICY IS NEEDED FOR GERMANY

(By Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, U.S. Army (retired))

Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, British foreign secretary, seems to be afflicted with the same myopia as former U.S. Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles. Just what basis has either for supposing that the Soviet Union is preparing for unconditional surrender in Europe? According to the New York Times, December 5, 1958, Mr. Lloyd is willing to keep German troops out of East Germany after unification, while retaining a unified Germany inside NATO, and Mr. Dulles remains certain that the Soviet Union is frightened and ready to retreat because West Berlin is a showplace for what free men can accomplish.

It would be difficult to imagine a more unrealistic or dangerous appraisal of the power situation than either of these points of view. The Soviet bloc is much stronger than ever before. Even the Warsaw treaty members are more harmonious and unified than formerly, and therefore the treaty stronger, thanks to the determined efforts of the United States and Great Britain to remilitarize the German Reich. A high ranking officer in the Polish foreign office told this writer a year ago that nothing could more effectively chain all of Eastern Europe to the Soviet chariot than the West's rearmament of Germany. Will we never learn?

As for West Berlin being a showplace, it would be incredible if this were not true after the hundreds of millions of dollars poured into that city by the West for that purpose since World War II. This writer, as Food Administrator for the U.S. Zone of Germany, 1945–47, shipped many millions of dollars worth of supplies to West Berlin. No informed person can really believe that freedom had anything to do with this completely artificial situation. Even the slums of dear old London and of many large American cities could be completely removed and made showplaces through a comparable largess. Western capitalism would prove much more convincing to the uncommitted if it would demonstrate its capacity to lead a peaceful rehabilitation and redevelopment program, under the auspices of the United Nations, for a war impoverished world rather than by making a showplace of West Berlin and redeveloping and rearming Germany for further possible military adventures.

Germany cannot be united inside NATO with or without free elections as every properly informed political scientist knows. The West would not tolerate for a moment a rearmed and united Germany, by whatever means, inside the Warsaw pact, and rightly so. A rearmed and united Germany allied to either bloc would constitute a grave threat to the other bloc, and this writer believes to both blocs. For this reason, if no other, it is time to talk sense and stop this propaganda nonsense about free elections which have no relevance in a militarily polarized world.

The British Labor Party's New Foreign Policy Manifesto offers the most sensible plan so far presented by any official and representative group of the West. Disengagement of the military forces of the opposing powers, through the establishment of a neutral zone, mutually guaranteed by both the East and West, is the minimum requirement for peace in this dangerous area of Europe. Much more than this is required, of course as the labor manifesto points out, for peace throughout the rest of the world. Fortunately for the West and the world, Great Britain, unlike the United States, does offer through her Labor Party an alternative to the stereotyped, sterile, inflexible and outmoded foreign policies of Acheson, Dulles, and Macmillan.

This writer would like to supplement the excellent program of the British Labor Party with a more general one. First, a normalization of relations throughout the nation-state system to include: (1) Recognition of all governments actually in control of the instruments of national power, (2) maximization of trade without discriminatory restrictions, (3) freedom of travel, and (4) free exchange of information and cultural achievements. Second, adequate support of a comprehensive rehabilitation and redevelopment program, under the direction of the United Nations, for the rapid reduction of poverty everywhere. Third, universalization of membership in the United Nations, including Formosa and the divided states such as Germany, Korea, and Vietnam. Fourth, a time limit of 10 years for the independence of all dependent peoples with power to choose complete independence, dominion or other status within a larger unit. Fifth and finally, the immediate and permanent cessation of all atomic tests for weapon purposes, the cessation of atomic weapon production and destruction of present atomic weapon stockpiles, including bases and all means designed for their use and delivery, and as rapid and complete a reduction of the munitions industry and military forces of every kind as internal security will permit.

KEEP UP MASSIVE RESISTANCE TO BRINKMANSHIP

(By Hugh B. Hester, brigadier general, U.S. Army (retired))

It will be a tragedy of the first magnitude if the press, radio and TV commentators, and the public—now aroused over the dangers of brinkmanship—relapse into the lassitude of complacency as a result of the temporary relaxation of tensions in the Far East or elsewhere. Mr. Dulles, for tactical reasons alone, has bent, but not changed, before the storm of protests over Quemoy and Matsu that amazed Vice President NIXON and alarmed President Eisenhower. This is an old lawyer trick of Mr. Dulles, appearing to yield before force in order to create hope and gain the sympathy of an obviously frightened world, while surrendering nothing of importance.

NO SUBSTANCE IN OFFER

Take a look at his proposal for the Far East. If China would renounce force to liberate two of her principal ports, thin out her forces opposite Quemoy-Matsu and surrender her claim to Formosa—a claim which Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek and Roosevelt agreed to at Cairo, 1943; Atlee and Truman reaffirmed at Potsdam, July 1945; and General MacArthur underwrote by directing Japanese forces on Formosa to surrender to the Republic of China, September of the same year—Mr. Dulles indicated he might attempt to secure Chiang's approval to thin out his forces inside two important Chinese harbors: Amoy and Foochow. Oh, yes, and Chiang might consent not to take China alone. Both he and the Secretary agree now to rely to some extent upon a Chinese revolution for help. And presumably, the Secretary, as usual, obligates the United States to supply the wherewithal with which to finance this subversion. Shocking, is it not? Since only the Communists are supposed to resort to such crude immoralities.

TWENTIETH-CENTURY HOLY ALLIANCE

No; Mr. Dulles has not changed. He is still determined upon the destruction of evil as he sees evil from his Olympian heights, even though it should incinerate the human race. Before the Overseas Press, Washington, D.C., March 29, 1954, he said: "Under the conditions of today, the imposition on south-

east Asia of the political system of Communist Russia and its Chinese Communist ally, by whatever means, would be a great threat."

Referring to this a few days later, this writer in a private memorandum circulated to key policymakers, stated: "The key words, the fateful phrase 'by whatever means' is a new policy, a new departure, and one never taken before by the United States"; and asked the following questions: "Is this the 20th-century edition of the Holy Alliance of the 19th century? Are all changes of a political and social character going to be denied? Is self-determination to be abolished as a legitimate objective of people? Is the status quo to be frozen in the name of freedom?

CAN WIN A HOT WAR?

For years this writer has feared that the present Secretary of State and his immediate predecessor, Dean Acheson, were pursuing national policies which could only lead to world war. But it remained for Mr. Dulles himself to disclose that he considered the dangers of the cold war greater than those of a hot one. It is now reported (New York Times, June 27, 1958) that he told a committee of the Congress, "I think we would win a hot war, but I don't know if we will win this cold war or not," and continued, "but as far as the defense of the principles and ideals for which this country has stood from its beginning * * * they are, I believe, in greater jeopardy from a cold war than from a hot war."

PERTINENT NOTES IN DULLES' BIOGRAPHY

According to John Robinson Beal's authorized biography of Secretary Dulles, assurances were given Chiang Kai-shek of U.S. defense of Quemoy and Matsu in connection with both the treaty with him and the Formosa resolution approved by Congress, 1955 (See I. F. Stone's Weekly, Washington, D.C. Oct. 6, 1958, and the Beal biography, pp. 220–1 and 226–4). Should not this be the subject of a full congressional investigation to determine what secret commitments were given, and by whom, to Chiang Kai-shek, or may have been given to some of the others of our 40-odd allies? Are not the American people (those who will be the casualties) entitled to know what commitments, secret or otherwise, have been made for them?

The two-dimensional approach, the black and white, the true and false, the God and Devil, theory of international relations, was bluntly exposed in a widely syndicated State Department paper, August 10, 1958, under the heading, "U.S. Policy Statemen on Nonrecognition of Communist China." This statement studiously ignored the efforts of the United States and the anti-Communist world to "destroy the Communist baby in its crib" á la Churchill, 1918 and since, by (1) a hot war, 1918–20; (2) food blockade, 1918–19; (3) undertaking the supply and financial support of the counter-revolutionary forces—the White Russians; (4) nonrecognition of Russia by United States, 1917–33; (5) trade restrictions; (6) liberation of East European satellites through subversion; (7) encirclement with a thousand or more military bases; (8) a vast military-alliance system; (9) nonrecognition of China by United States; (10) intervention in the Chinese civil war by the U.S. 7th Fleet, June 1950 and since; (11) denial of China's legitimtae seat in the Security Council and refusal of her admission to the General Assembly of the United Nations; and finally, (12) the maintenance and complete logistics support of Chiang Kai-shek by the United States as a pretender to power over the mainland of China and in his civil war with Red China.

In a persuasive speech before the National Council of Churches conference at Cleveland, Ohio, November 18, 1958, Mr. Dulles again sought to wrap his foreign policies in the cloak of high morality and those of his opponent in base immorality. And again he deliberately ignored the many millions of dollars which the U.S. Government is expending annually through Central Intelligence, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Department of State, to subvert the Soviet system. Here again he attempted to leave the impression that only our opponents indulge in such dirty work. Unfortunately for him, Mr. Walter Lippmann in his widely syndicated column August 5, 1958, stated: "Indirect aggression—that is to say, propaganda, infiltration, bribery, subversion—is an old instrument of power politics. * * * Both sides use it."

In stating in the same speech in Cleveland that international communism "won control of all or major parts of what were 16 independent nations with a total population of 900 million," Mr. Dulles not only failed to name them, but failed to note that Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, were part of Russia long before Arizona, California, New Mexico, and Texas became parts of the United States, and by the same method—war.

The fact of the matter is that most of the other countries of eastern Europe now within the Soviet bloc are the result of a war against the Soviet Union in which their governments participated as aggressors. It is probably true also that the people of these countries have as much freedom now as they had before World War II and as they would have after another war of liberation. Such is the nature of war. And certainly Mr. Dulles knows that Chinese communism is not the product of an international conspiracy any more than democracy, wherever it exists, is the product of an international conspiracy. Both, of course, are products of ideas widely held in a disastrously divided world.

KEEP UP THE PRESSURE

So long as Mr. Dulles remains in his present office, the best hope for peace will continue to lie in massive resistance to his dangerous policies. And even the success of this may in the end depend more upon the rationality and forbearance of our opponents than upon American leadership: a slender thread indeed upon which to rely in a world gone completely mad with military power.

Unless and until the top leaders of the West are willing to sit at the conference table with the top leaders of the Communist bloc to discuss their problems and normalize their relations at all levels, including recognition of China and her admission to the United Nations, God Himself cannot prevent the catastrophe of world war III. Positions of strength through an unlimited arms race and bloc alliance-systems have always led to war. This time it will, also, lead to mutual suicide.

A HIGHER LOYALTY

"Our country * * * may she always be right" is still sound, but our Government right or wrong is quite a different matter in the thermonuclear age. Man owes a higher loyalty to the preservation of his species than to any government group: local, State or national, and massive opposition to unsound and dangerous foreign policies of one's government is not likely to bring war (as Mr. Dulles asserts) but to prevent it; that is, unless he is prepared to provoke one in order to silence dissent. His policies continue to constitute our greatest threat of war. Continuous and vigorous opposition to them, not only is not disloyal, but constitutes the highest possible loyalty both to the Nation and to humanity.

Hamtramck Little Leaguers World Champions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, while all the attention is drawn to the pennant races in the American and National Leagues for baseball supremacy, one title was decided Saturday, August 29, at Williamsport, Pa. On that date the two remaining teams, representing their respective Little Leagues, from among over 5,000 such leagues across the United States, met in their world championship game.

The two contenders were representatives of the Little League of Auburn, Calif., and Hamtramck, Mich., which is located within my congressional district.

The day was a historical event for Michigan. Though Hamtramck teams have frequently and habitually reached the playoffs. Never before has a Michigan Little League team attained such a high position in Little League play.

In winning their regular league games, these boys have made a remarkable record in attaining their victories. The spirit of competition was keen and their team play was unmatched. In the district, sectional and regional finals they swept through all opposition, scoring over 50 runs while holding the opponents scoreless. Only in the last regional game was the opposition able to score.

In gaining the right to play in the championship game, the Hamtramck boys had to win over the team representing Hawaii. This they did by a score of 7 to 1.

The final game was played in the newly dedicated Little League Stadium. Presiding over the dedication ceremonies was Gov. William Lawrence of Pennsylvania, and the stadium honors the memory of Howard J. Lamade, a former director of Little League.

The game was witnessed by approximately 10,000 people, among which were about 150 from Hamtramck, led by Mayor Albert J. Zak, and including many prominent civic leaders as well as the parents of the players. Among the spectators was also another Hamtramck champion, Miss Joyce Pniewski, newly crowned national women's public parks tennis queen, who came to cheer her brother, Greg, Hamtramck's catcher.

One New York television station taped the entire game for later presentation, which was seen the next day in Hamtramck.

The spotlight glitters on Arthur Deras and Sydney Cline. These two have been the backbone of the team in hoisting them to the championship game. Deras has pitched and won all his tournament games by shutouts. He averaged 2.5 strikeouts per inning and allowed only 4

hits in 36 innings as a pitcher. He also was potent with his bat, getting 24 hits in 12 tournament games for a comfortable .686 average. Twelve of his blows were last seen going out of the park for homers. He knocked in 23 runs.

On the other hand, Cline, too, had pitched six victories, four of them shutouts. But while these two were hurling the team to victory, the efforts of the other players should not be overlooked.

The championship game turned out to be a slaughter of the Auburn, Calif., team. The final score was 12 to 0. The Hamtramck team lashed out 13 hits off Bob Sunada, an American-born Japanese youngster who never had lost a game in 4 years of Little League pitching.

The game was pitched for Hamtramck by Deras, who added 13 more strikeouts and slammed a 3-run homer and upped his runs-batted-in total to 26 in championship play.

I am happy to extend my most sincerest congratulations to the boys of the team for their wonderful performance in Little League play, an effort crowned by becoming world champions. I would also like to extend these congratulations to the manager and coaches of the team for their interest in youth guidance and their assistance in promoting such wonderful teamplay. I congratulate the parents of these players for permitting the boys to partake in organized play, where they were able to learn the need for working together to obtain the desired victories. Lastly, I wish to congratulate the Hamtramck Recreation Commission for providing the necessary equipment and facilities to permit these boys to play under supervised leadership, thus taking them off the streets and out of trouble.

Hail to Hamtramck, the city of champions.

Impact of the Space Age on Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent address by an outstanding U.S. scientist of the space age:

IMPACT OF THE SPACE AGE ON SOCIETY

(By Addison M. Rothrock, Office, Program Planning and Evaluation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, presented at the University of Maryland Space Education Institute, March 2-May 18, 1959)

You people have come here tonight to learn more concerning space, what we are doing, and plan to do in space, how we propose to do it, and the effect of these activities on us as individuals and on our society as a whole.

I hope to describe to you, in a general way, the impact of man's present and expanding activities in space on our society. I should also like to discuss with you the manner in which space flight fits into our overall technological development.

I propose that we shall examine this subject as answers to four questions:

1. What do we mean by space?
2. What is the space age?
3. What will be the effects on us as individuals and as a society?
4. What are our immediate responsibilities in answering the challenge of space exploration?

If we can answer these questions with reasonable satisfaction, or if we can determine the questions which must be satisfied to provide the answers we will be in a much better position to intelligently face the problems which we, as a nation, and as a society, are facing.

WHAT DO WE MEAN BY SPACE?

The answer to our first question, "What do we mean by space?" is fairly simple. We mean the universe beyond the atmosphere surrounding our own planet. Using this definition, the scope of space is infinite.

Much was learned of space many years ago. During the third century B.C., Eratosthenes of Alexandria made sufficient measurements to estimate the earth's diameter as about 25,000 miles. In the next century, Ptolemy estimated the distance from moon to earth to be 59 times the radius of the earth. Both figures are close to the truth. Following the decay and destruction of the Roman empire, the Greek learning was assimilated by the Arabs. By the ninth century A.D., Baghdad had become a center of learning, and here the Arab astronomer Al-Battani added to the astronomical tables of Ptolemy.

The study of space was not undertaken to any great degree by our own developing Western civilization until contacts were made with the Arabs through the Moorish invasions and through the Crusades. With the decline of the intellectual movement in the Islam world came the growth of it in our own. We term the first accelerative period of this growth the Renaissance. Although started in the Italian peninsula, the secrecy self imposed by Leonardo da Vinci, and the fear of learning that led to persecutions such as those imposed on Galilleo and Bruno caused the center of scientific thought to move to Northern Europe and to England. In the studies of the heavens we now have the names of Copernicus, Brahe, Kepler, Newton, and a host of others until, by the middle of our century, man had made extensive measurements of space, and had learned much about it. But other than light or radio waves, man had placed nothing in space. Then on October 4, 1957, the Russian sputnik was launched and the space age, was in being.

WHAT IS THE SPACE AGE?

The space age is the name that we have applied to that period of technological development that has let man start his investigation of the universe from beyond the limitations of the earth's atmosphere.

Man's scientific and engineering progress has proceeded, continuously, and accumulatively. The satisfying of our desire to know and our desire to do has passed from one civilization or group to another, and, fortunately, though civilizations have disappeared or stagnated, their accumulated knowledge has not.

A tremendous breakthrough (and it is a term that I don't like to use) occurred in our own civilization. During the period covered by the 16th through the 19th century, man realized the dependence of scientific progress on experimentation and further realized that science and engineering could be used to produce devices that not only supplemented, but far surpassed in output, what man could do with his own hands.

The expansion of the experimental method from its accelerative growth in the 16th century gave us the Newtonian mechanics of the 17th century, the start of modern chemistry in the 18th century, electricity and thermodynamics in the 19th century, and nucleonics in the 20th century.

Through the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, progress was made by individual contributions either in the field of science, man's desire to know, or in the field of engineering, man's desire to do. The scientist or engineer might be rich or poor. Charles II of England had his own laboratory at Whitehall and, according to Macauley, "was far more active and attentive there than at the council board." Macauley states further: "The spirit of Francis Bacon was abroad; a spirit admirably compounded of audacity and sobriety. There was a strong persuasion that the whole world was full of secrets of high moment to the happiness of man, and that man had, by his Maker, been entrusted with the key which, rightly used, would give access to them."

"Progress in science," quoting from Forbes, "was not achieved by the universities which remained in the grip of Aristotelian logic up to the age of Newton, but by practical engineers and by the learned societies." Formal professional education was, for the most part, limited to law, medicine, and the ministry. However, it became necessary to organize technical learning, and this could be done only in the universities. First in Germany in the late 1700's; and then in the United States, starting with the founding of Renssalaer Polytechnic Institute in 1824, colleges for engineering and scientific learning were established. The classical universities admitted the sciences to their curriculums, but for some time were loath to add engineering. Only in Germany and the United States did the idea of extensive engineering and other technical schools firmly take root. And the United States far outstripped Germany and all of Europe in this endeavor. England chose, for the most part, to substitute trade schools connected with her industrial centers. In the development of technical schools, Russia more recently entered the lists.

Early in the 20th century technological progress became increasingly dependent on industrial, government, and university laboratories. And now a new situation confronts us. The costs, and risks in research and exploitation of certain developments require that government, that is the people as a whole, assume responsibility for the development. The outstanding example is application of nuclear energy to man's benefit.

In space exploration we are in that phase of technological development in which the effort required is of such magnitude that it can be handled only by a large national effort. For adequate progress a minimum of about 200,000 persons must be assigned to the job. This figure represents an annual expenditure of three quarters of a billion to a billion dollars. It must include a continually increasing proportion of our scientific and engineering personnel. Again, this represents about one-third of a percent of our total work force. This figure seems small, but as a unified effort on a project whose benefits cannot be too fully described at this time, it looms large in the public mind. There are few nations who can, or feel they can, afford this kind of expenditure—United States, Russia, and possibly before long Red China. The effort requires a very large population or a lesser, but still large, population accompanied by a high degree of industrialization. This combination is currently limiting and will stay limiting as long as most countries require a large proportion of their working population to provide the bare necessities of life. In Asia,

for instance, about three-fourths of the population is occupied in the production of food, in Western Europe, about one-third, in the United States, one-tenth or less. I do not have the figures for Russia.

If the space effort must be so great and if the benefits cannot be clearly cataloged, why should we concern ourselves with it? Now I must go to personal opinion. If we, as a nation, and a people, want to continue to grow in moral and physical stature, I don't think we have a choice. I think history shows clearly that a nation or people will grow in knowledge and accomplishment, or its culture and standards will start downward to be overrun by another people that has the virility to drive forward. The seeds of decay of a civilization are internal. The final military overthrow is a result, not a cause. It happens after the people have ceased to progress. The fact that the growth effort must now be on a great technological scale is a fortune of our time.

WHAT WILL BE THE EFFECTS OF SPACE FLIGHTS ON US AS INDIVIDUALS AND AS A SOCIETY?

The most immediate effect is that of national prestige. It is an intangible, but I think most of us agree an important aspect. There are many nations who are in the process of deciding whether they will follow our path or Russia's. And we must remember that to a people who are ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed, the removal of these deficiencies is their first want, though democracy may be their goal. These uncommitted or partially committed nations are watching the progress of these two powerful nations, one under a Government responsible to the people and the other under a government responsible only to itself. To these people, progress on man's newest frontier is a visible symbol of the rapidity of industrial progress—the only means by which vast poverty can be removed.

Effects of direct benefit to us will, as has been well publicized, be first realized in the field of communication, weather forecasting, and, to a certain extent, in navigation. With the use of earth satellites as receivers and transmitters, worldwide radio and television will be possible, and if, intelligently and wisely used, will be beneficial. As long as we have a world in conflict earth satellites will provide surveillance not otherwise possible.

Mostly during the next several years we will launch highly instrumented vehicles into space to make and record measurements. For the first time, we can make them outside the earth's atmosphere and under varying degrees of the earth's gravitational and electromagnetic fields. For our immediate benefit, we will study the earth's atmosphere and its movements and changes which we term "the weather." But we will also be studying our solar system, our galaxy, and to the extent we can, the universe as a whole. We will get data to prove or disprove existing theories, to suggest new theories. We do this not for the purpose of theorizing, but for the purpose of knowing. We do not know until we check with facts. Quoting from Einstein: "The most important demand to be made of every scientific theory will always remain—that it must fit the facts." And from Pasteur: "In science, one must always doubt until facts confirm." So from these data gathering spacecraft, we will increase our knowledge and remove uncertainties. We will also increase our appreciation of the vastness of the universe.

Beyond these types of benefits lies the unknown. Man's scientific and engineering exploits have always led to his betterment. At the start of a new period of exploration we do not know, except in a vague way, what the benefits will be. That we will travel to and from planets in our solar system I am sure. Exactly how it will benefit us I cannot tell you. In trying to predict far into the future, we are always handicapped by our inability to judge the cumulative effects of progress in the many different fields.

WHAT ARE OUR IMMEDIATE RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE SPACE AGE?

We now come to our last and possibly, most important question, "What are our immediate responsibilities in the space age"? I think the first thing for us to realize, is the impact of scientific and technological progress on our civilization. I use technological, rather than engineering, to include the application of the life sciences as well as the physical sciences. Science and technology is having, and will continue to have, an increasing influence on our culture, largely because of what it permits us to do. We will not stop technological advance and it will, therefore, continue to affect us. Some effects will be good, some will not be good. Unfortunately, the debits generally become effective in considerable degree before we are fully aware of them. But the decisions here are up to us as individuals, or through our elected representatives, up to us as a nation.

I think our immediate responsibility lies mostly in the education we are giving ourselves and that we are giving our children. I do think we should fully realize that trained scientists and engineers are a national asset and that the supply is limited first, by the number of children capable of adequately learning science or engineering, and second, by the number of these children who study and follow science or engineering.

Using a broad definition, an education should give a child spiritual and emotional growth and growth in his knowledge and his ability to reason. Although the emphasis in these separate factors may, in individual cases, be placed on only one, separation of them should not be too great. In teaching those things which appeal to the spirit or to the emotions, it is difficult for us to agree on what should be taught. I don't know the answer other than to try to broaden our own understanding through our own living and through adult study, that is, through reading.

We cannot, in our education system, teach all children sciences, but I think there should be an attempt to teach what science means, the importance of experimentation as a means of increasing our knowledge and understanding. We should appreciate that all our material progress, and I firmly believe that material progress benefits our spiritual progress, is dependent on our ability to experiment and learn from experimentation. Quoting again from Einstein: "Pure logical thinking cannot yield us any knowledge of the empirical world; all knowledge of reality starts from experience and ends in it."

We must appreciate that to advance, we must investigate and further appreciate that our investigations because of the very nature of science and engineering will become successively more expensive. For this reason, the exploration of the new frontier of space will be accomplished by us as a Nation, or we must leave the field to others and these others will not be nations smaller than we are. It is true that we will want and will get assistance from other nations, but, for the free world, the major responsibility is ours.

We must help our children to know, particularly when, as adolescents, they are deciding on careers, that an understanding of the basic principles in science is the soundest training for engineering that can be had. This is particularly true, because of the rapidity with which progress is now made. In my own experience in the field of flight propulsion, this fact has been particularly exemplified. In a period of 20 years our major research effort has successively included the reciprocating engine, the turbojet, the chemical rocket, the nuclear turbine or rocket, and more recently, the ion or plasma jet. This progress required extensive coverage in mechanics, thermodynamics, fluid dynamics, materials, chemistry, nuclear physics, and electronics, all applied separately and jointly.

I think we should try to broaden the overall base of our education with more emphasis on history as well as science. We should make more of an attempt to teach our children and ourselves the growth of man's progress, and the things that resulted in this growth. I know that this is difficult because, again, we find it difficult to agree on what should be taught; and, in spite of our progress in learning, there are still lurking fears to the acquisition of knowledge.

So I think our immediate responsibility is largely one of appreciating the necessity and inevitability of technological progress and the realization of the need to sponsor it, as a nation, and to guide it to our betterment.

Looking back to the end of World War II, I am afraid that, as has happened before, we thought we had arrived in our civilization at a point where we could spend our time enjoying the fruits of our labor. Instead, we find ourselves living in a time when people whose civilizations have tended to remain dormant for many generations, or even centuries, are again on the march. We must help to show them the way, and part of this is to lead in the exploration of man's newest and most extensive frontier—the exploration of space.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF ADDISON M. ROTHROCK

Addison May Rothrock, scientist for Propulsion in the Directorate of Program Planning and Evaluation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was born May 12, 1903, in West Chester, Pa. He graduated from the Pennsylvania State College in 1925 with a bachleor of science degree; he remained there for the succeeding year as graduate assistant in the physics department.

In 1926 Mr. Rothrock joined the staff of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) and was assigned to the Langley Aeronautical Laboratory at Langley Field, Va. His work there was chiefly in the field of fuel combustion in diesel engines and combustion and fuel rating in spark ignition engines. He has been active in the work of the Coordinating Research Council in these fields, and has served on many committees for the Council.

In 1942 he was transferred to the NACA Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, where he became Chief of the Fuels and Lubricants Division. In this capacity he supervised NACA research in the field of high performance aircraft fuels and lubricants. In 1945 he was promoted to chief of research at the Lewis Laboratory, and in 1947 he was appointed Assistant Director for Research and was transferred to the NACA headquarters in Washington. When on October 1, 1958, the NACA became the nucleus of the newly organized National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Mr. Rothrock became Assistant Director of Research for Power Plants in the Aeronautical and Space Research Directorate.

Later he was named scientist for propulsion in the newly termed "Directorate of Program Planning and Evaluation." In this capacity, Mr. Rothrock applies his broad knowledge of propulsion and propulsion systems to the planning of the Nation's program in space technology.

Mr. Rothrock is a member of the American Rocket Society, a fellow of the Institute of Aeronautical Sceinces, and a past member of the Society of Automotive Engineers, of which he was vice president in 1949. In 1938 he was awarded the Horning Memorial Award by the Society of Automotive Engineers. He is a member of the Pennsylvania State College chapter of Sigma Xi and Sigma Pi Sigma.

Final Report, 1st Session, 86th Congress of Hon. John H. Dent, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 27, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit my newsletter for the month of September 1959:

FINAL REPORT, 1ST SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS

This report will try to summarize our efforts, good or bad, as this session comes to an end.

One thing that will stand out of course will be the record of Presidential vetoes.

In every case of a veto the record shows that the item vetoed meant "something for the people."

The ill-advised and unsubstantiated claims of this administration that such vetoes were in the interest of a balanced budget and anti-inflationary period are not borne out by the record.

The items vetoed included housing, public works, area redevelopment, municipal facilities efforts, etc. Some were vetoed directly, others by veto threat.

The increased interest rate and increased foreign aid demanded by the President would pay for all the housing, area development, and public works supported by the Democratic Congress.

Never in our recent history have profits and property been given such a high priority over people as they have during the session of Congress by a President of the United States.

These are the acts passed by your Congress and the record on the major issues:

TAXATION

Corporate income tax: 52 percent rate extended to next July 1.

Excises on alcoholic beverages, autos, auto parts and accessories, and cigarettes: Extended to next July 1.

Tax on local telephone service: Repealed as of next June 30.

Transportation tax: Reduced from 10 to 5 percent as of next June 30.

Life insurance company taxes: Income tax rates adjusted and new levies imposed on underwriting profits and investment income to raise $215 million. Gas tax was increased one-half cent for 22 months.

BUSINESS AND GENERAL

National debt limit: Raised $2 billion to $285 billion, with temporary increase to $295 billion until next June 30.

Hawaii: Admitted as 50th State.

Airport program: $63 million matching Federal aid to States authorized annually for fiscal 1960 and 1961.

Antitrust: FTC cease and desist orders under Clayton Act made finally effective 60 days after issued unless stayed by appeal; FTC permitted to seek penalties for first violation of such orders instead of waiting for second offense.

Bank reserves: Federal Reserve Board permitted, but not required to allow member banks to count all or part of vault cash as reserves; Fed also given discretionary power to ease individual bank reserve requirements in special situations and to eliminate "reserve city class" of members within 3-year period.

Renegotiation Act: Extended to December 31, 1962, with provision for recovery of excess profits on defense contracts. New study of procurement and renegotiation policies authorized.

Veterans' housing: $100 million in direct housing loans authorized; GI mortgage rate raised from 4¾ to 5¼ percent.

TVA: Authorized to issue up to $750 million in revenue bonds on its own for power facilities; territorial expansion forbidden.

Rail workers: Pension and jobless benefits increased under Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

Labor: Passed Landrum-Griffin bill.

Public works: Was vetoed two times—finally passed over veto.

Passed one-half percent increase for family bond interest only.

Finally passed housing bill as President wanted it—leaving out school classrooms.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Foreign aid: $3.5 billion authorized, including $2.1 billion in military assistance.

Loans of Naval vessels to Italy and Turkey: Approval extended to 1964.

Draft Act: Continued to July 1, 1963.

Navy ship construction: $110 million authorized for fiscal 1960 to develop advanced vessels.

Import duties and taxes on scrap metal: Suspension continued to next July 1.

Subscription to International Monetary Fund: Increased $1.4 billion; to World Bank—increased $3.2 billion.

Above and beyond all other legislative actions by this, the 86th Congress, history will record the Landrum-Griffin bill as the most restrictive and confusing Act ever passed by a U.S. Congress against the free American labor movement.

This act passed final the Friday preceding Labor Day with some of the most critical charges ever made on the record, against labor leaders, labor practices, and in general, the unions of this Nation.

On Monday, September 7, 1959, 2 days later, a less vociferous and somewhat calmer Congress passed the following resolution (unanimously):

"A TRIBUTE TO LABOR

"Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House concurrent resolution, as follows:

" 'Whereas American labor has raised its standards of productivity to heights unequaled in world history; and

" 'Whereas the efforts of American labor have brought to this country a standard of living that has no parallel; and

" 'Whereas American labor has served the Nation in peace and war; and

" 'Whereas American labor has been a bulwark of freedom; and

" 'Whereas the first Monday in September is traditionally set aside to commemorate the services of working men and women to our Nation; Threfore be it

" '*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress does hereby express its deep realization and appreciation of the basic role that labor plays in our economy and of the contributions that American working men and women have made to America's well-being.'

"The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

"There was no objection.

"The SPEAKER. The question is on the House concurrent resolution.

"The House concurrent resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table."

Not doubting the sincerity of the sponsors and of Congress as a whole, one could not help but note the sober, serious and subdued atmosphere in the House on Labor Day.

To one who had heard the speeches, the Jack Paar show, the President's speech, the McClellan hearings, the radio, television and newspaper coverage of the preliminaries preceding the final passage, the passage of the above resolution was an example of the conflicting emotions that dictated the final vote on the Landrum-Griffin Act and also it showed the neat dexterity and shifty footwork of the American politician.

I don't think the American workingman will be fobled by this resolution because if the American workers measures up to the praises of this resolution, he could not be what the Landrum-Griffin bill says he is, a second class citizen who needs to be told whom he can elect to office, how he must spend his money, when and where and what he can say to his fellow worker, what kind of a contract he can negotiate with his employer, how much his union can loan him for an emergency, gives him the dubious privilege of being an accuser and informer, with the promise of secrecy and reward, even if his union officers have not violated the law, but are about to violate and he has no proof nor does he need evidence of wrongdoing.

It further denies him the right to make and carry his own signs proclaiming unjust unfair treatment by his or any other employer, but he may pay for advertisement in a newspaper.

It gives him the right to coerce, intimidate and bulldoze his fellow worker any time, any place if he is attacking and belittling his own union officers, but makes it a crime if he does the same thing against an unfair employer.

This new "Magna Carta" as one Congressman hailed it, gives labor a few more rights that might be considered by the fair-minded American when he is analyzing this act of Congress.

It allows all workers on a construction job to refuse to go through a picket line at a construction except a truckdriver who belongs to the union.

It forbids all other unions except the garment workers from signing a hot cargo contract.

It forbids all other unions except certain trade unions in the construction industry from requiring union membership a requisite to work for any given employer.

It raises the dues of every union in America in order to pay lawyers, accountants, etc. if that union doesn't already have such services.

In every section of this so-called labor reform bill, it provides for attorney fees (out of the workers' pockets) and further excludes from the reporting provision all attorney actions in labor relations under the broad term of "attorney-client" relations.

No person wants to disrupt this great institution of attorney-client relationships, but this lets management continue the abuses practiced by the Sheffermans, Teitelbaums, and others whose actions were exposed and condemned by the McClellan committee.

Every union in this country will be compelled to revise or change its constitution and/or bylaws or find itself, its officers, and even its members in contempt of the law.

Last, but not least, it wipes out the one saving grace of the Taft-Hartley Act which gave union members as well as those seeking to join unions the protection of the services of the Federal courts and turns back to tender mercilees and perilous justice so often found in local courts.

This power, long sought by the NAM and chamber of commerce can make a mockery out of any attempt by the underpaid, underprivileged workers in our Southern States.

Uncurbed, unrestricted use of the injunctive weapon has and will again create abuses against free labor that will not only stop any advances in their workers' living standards, but may very well lower them.

With all due respect and my personal high regard for the sponsor, Majority Leader JOHN MCCORMICK, of Massachusetts, I can't help but compare the high sentiments on Labor Day and the low esteem contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill 2 days previous when I

think of the American worker, your father and mine, this week of Labor Day, Year of our Lord, 1959.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

The American Bar Association Resolutions Regarding the Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the text of an address by H. H. Nordlinger, a member of the New York bar, delivered at the New York State Bar Association summer meeting at Saranac Inn, New York, on June 27, 1959, together with the remarks of Robert M. Benjamin, both of which appeared in the New York State Bar bulletin, was as follows:

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE SUPREME COURT

(By H. H. Nordlinger, member of the New York bar)

On the first page of the news section of the New York Times of Sunday, February 22, 1959, there appeared a story reading in part as follows:

"The governors of the American Bar Association gave their support today to broad recommendations for congressional revision of recent Supreme Court decisions relating to communism. * * *

"The report avoids any generalized attack on the motives of the Supreme Court Justices, as some other recent criticism of the Court has done. * * *

"Nevertheless the report is highly critical of a long list of decisions. It urges Congress to reverse them.

" 'Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage increase in communistic activities in the United States,' the report says, 'although those cases might easily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting National and State security efforts.

" 'Our international security has been weakened by technicalities raised in judicial decisions which too frequently in the public mind had the effect of putting on trial the machinery of the judicial process and freeing the subversive to go forth and further undermine our Nation.' "

The report referred to bears date February 1959 and is entitled "Resolutions and Report of the Special Committee on Communist Tactics, Strategy, and Objectives." It was transmitted by the board of governors to the house of delegates with the following statement:

"The board of governors herewith transmits to the house of delegates the report of the special committee without any deletions or alterations excepting a minor correction in recommendation No. 1.

"The board recommends approval by the house of the several recommendations in the report and their transmittal to the Congress of the United States in order to correct legislative defects in the field of internal security revealed by particular decisions cited in the report.

"In making its recommendations for approval, the board does not in any way intend to indicate censure of the Supreme Court nor an attack upon the independence of the judiciary. Indeed, the obligation of the bar to defend the Supreme Court as an institution is emphasized in the first resolution proposed by the committee's report.

"The recommendation for approval, in the case of this report as in the case of all other reports of association sections and committees, does not constitute endorsement of statements in the report itself, such statements being those of the individual members of the committee."

The matter came before the house of delegates on February 23, at 2 p.m. Arthur J. Freund, of St. Louis, moved that consideration of the resolutions be deferred until the following morning, saying that the proposed matter was one of the most momentous which had come before the association for many years and that he doubted whether any considerable number of the members had read the report. The motion was carried; but when the matter came up at 10 o'clock the following morning, a moton by Orison S. Marden, of New York, to postpone the matter further until the next meeting of the house of delegates was defeated and the resolutions, in slightly modified form, were carried.

While there is naturally no way of knowing whether the action of the American Bar Association correctly represented the view of the American bar, it was greeted with disapprobation in various professional quarters, both organized and individual. I speak only of those which have happened to come to my attention. The New York City Bar Association passed a resolution[1] making it clear that it disassociated itself from any express or implied criticism of the Supreme Court, stating that the association "deplores and condemns any attempt to create or give impetus to any public impression that there exists an attack on the Supreme Court of the United States by the organized bar." A number of members of the American Bar Association—most of them without publicly stating any reason for doing so, but presumably because of displeasure at the action of the association—resigned from membership in the association. The Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York City Bar Association issued a reasoned statement analyzing and disapproving of the action of the American Bar Association. Thirty-five law professors at the Columbia, Cornell, Harvard, Pennsylvania, and Yale Law Schools sent a telegram to Senator EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, opposing the legislation which had been introduced in Congress to implement the action of the American Bar Association. The signers of this telegram included the deans of Columbia, Yale, and Pennsylvania Law Schools, and acting dean of Harvard Law School.

Mr. Malone, the respected president of the American Bar Association, has been busy since February explaining that neither the board of governors nor the house of delegates took any responsibility for the report, but limited their formal action to approving the proposed resolutions. Mr. Malone was frank enough, in one of the very speeches in which he did this, to say:

"In all fairness, I must confess that to an outsider the distinction between resolutions adopted by the house, which represent the position of the association, and the report of a committee which accompanies proposed resolutions to the house and which reflects only the views of committee members who sign it, is quite finely drawn and likely to result in confusion." (American Bar Association Journal, May 1, 1959, p. 346.)

There can be no doubt that in the public mind what happened was that the American Bar Association chastised the Supreme Court for allowing the enemies of our country to escape their just desserts by captious and unjustified invocation of technicalities in their defense.

And the implication that the Supreme Court had made a series of incorrect or doubtfully correct decisions which were harmful to the security of the Nation was much too much in the very warp and woof of the resolutions to be eliminated by mere disclaimer of approval of the report and amendment of the resolutions. The resolutions as adopted contained, among other, the following recitals:

Resolution I:

"Whereas this association recognizes that sharp differences have been expressed as to the soundness of some of the recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court affecting the National and State security, with particular reference to the activities of domestic and foreign Communists within our country; and

"Whereas such differences have given rise not only to severe criticisms of the decisions, but unfortunately to condemnation of the Court itself, and to omnibus proposals for limiting its appellate jurisdiction; and

"Whereas while members of this association view some of the decisions to be unsound and incorrect, they deem such broad omnibus proposals at this time unwise and likely to create more problems than they will solve;"

Resolution II:

"Whereas it has been deemed by many Members of the Congress, the bar, and the public that such declarations and interpretations thereof tend to impede the work of the Congress through its committees and thereby create a problem; the solution to which must be found;"

Resolution IV:

"Whereas recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, in cases involving National and State security and with particular reference to Communist activities, have been severely criticized and deemed unsound by many responsible authorities;"

Nor can the American Bar Association dissociate itself from the report. While, as has been carefully pointed out, it never formally approved the report, it has certainly never disapproved it. With nothing but the report before it, it took substantially the action which the report recommended. The only reasonable construction that can be put upon the action taken by the house of delegates is that while they were unwilling to take the responsibility of approving everything said in the report, they in substance approved its reasoning and recommendations. As Congressman CELLER aptly said in his letter to the American Bar Association (Journal of June 1959, pp. 546, 548–549): "I believe that the report is no more separable from the recommendations than are the roots from the tree, and the association must accept the unhappy responsibility for both."

I turn now to the report.

As the title of the report indicates, it covers a wide range, dealing among other things with such diverse subjects as the Red impact on world trade, the weakening of U.S. gold reserves, Soviet advances in the control of space, the Hungarian revolution, recognition of Red China, the proposed summit conference, the alleged weakening effect on the United States of cultural exchanges, etc. Exclusive of the introductory statement and the proposed resolutions, the report is 34 pages in length. Of these 34 pages, only eight (8 to 15) deal with Supreme Court decisions. The discussion of these decisions begins with the following statement:

"The following are the principal cases that have been criticized by the public officials and the bar in varying degrees as illustrative of how our security has been weakened:" (American Bar Association Resolutions and and Report, p. 8).

There follows a numbered list of 24 decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court which are

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

presumably intended to support the statement just quoted.

The only thing these 24 cases have in common is that they were all decided between 1955 and 1958 and that in each of them a ruling was made in favor of a party proved or claimed or suspected to be a Communist or Communist sympathizer.

Not the slightest attempt is made in the report to show that any of these decisions was unjust or wrongly decided.

Justice Douglas began a speech which I heard him deliver this spring, at the annual dinner of the Columbia Law Review, and which was later reprinted in the Columbia Law Review (vol. 59, p. 227), by saying:

"While being interviewed recently by students in Washington, D.C., I was asked by a serious looking young man: 'What is the attitude of the Court these days toward labor?' I was rather surprised by the question since it seemed to assume that judges sit not to dispense justice but to administer their prejudices."

If Justice Douglas was shocked by a group of students taking this position, what are we to think of a supposedly responsible organ of the American Bar Association adopting a similar standard?

Fortunately, we have a Supreme Court which honestly tries, not to administer its (or any one else's) prejudices, but to dispense justice—with due regard, I may add, to the Bill of Rights, to which almost all of us pay at least lip service but the report scarcely even that.

A scholarly study of these 24 decisions undertaken for the Committee on Federal Legislation of the New York City Bar Association by Alfred Berman and Nanette Dembitz[2] shows the following:

1. During the same period covered by the decisions cited by the American Bar Association committee, a number of important cases were decided by the Supreme Court against Communists or alleged Communists. To the cases cited by Mr. Berman and Miss Dembitz may be added the decisions on June 8, 1959, in the Barenblatt and Uphaus cases.

2. All of the decisions criticized in the report were the logical consequence of accepted principles, with the possible exception of the *Jencks* case (353 U.S. 657), which has already[3] been modified by legislation (Criminal Code, sec. 3500). (I do not call this corrective legislation, for I believe the Jencks decision was correct.) Be this as it may, the change had already been made well over a year before the report was submitted. In one of the 24 cases (*Gold* v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 985) the Court reversed a judgment of conviction because of official intrusion into the privacy of the jury. In another (*Communist Party* v. *Control Board*, 351 U.S. 115), it reversed a judgment because it was based on undisputedly perjured testimony. These are practices which I trust no lawyer would publicly and seriously condone, even where the parties under prosecution are Communists.

3. The American Bar Association committee inconsistently criticizes the Supreme Court in some of the cases cited for placing its decision on too broad a ground and in others for placing it on too narrow a ground.

4. Five of the decisions were unanimous. Five were 8 to 1. Only three were decided by a vote of 5 to 4. Of the Justices most frequently in the minority (Clark, Burton, Whittaker, and Harlan), each of them sometimes voted with the majority in nonunanimous cases, and each of them wrote at least one majority opinion.

It may be of incidental interest to note the character of the proceedings involved in these 24 cases.

Nine of them involved refusal to answer questions, almost all before legislative committees. Four involved charges of falsity of noncommunistic affidavits, and one involved failure to file a noncommunistic affidavit. Thus 14 of the 24 cases, it may fairly be said, did not directly involve any question of prosecution or other legal consequences of seditious or subversive conduct, but only the question whether a witness had the right to refuse to give testimony, or the question whether testimony, when given, was true or false. Of the remaining cases, two involved the dismissal of Government employees, two involved admission to the bar, three involved passports or deportation, one involved the classification of the Communist Party as a subversive organization by the Subversive Activity Control Board, and only two (*Yates* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 298, and *Pennsylvania* v. *Nelson*, 350 U.S. 497), actually involved prosecution for alleged subversive conduct or conspiracy.

This breakdown led me to check up on the number of persons convicted of major crimes against the security of the United States in recent years, and the results may again be of incidental interest.

The annual reports of the Director of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts shows that in the years 1955 to 1958 inclusive, there were approximately 115,000 persons convicted of all crimes in the U.S. District Courts throughout the United States.

The major crimes involving subversive activity are treason, espionage, sabotage, and sedition.

The total number of persons convicted of these crimes throughout the United States in the 4 years mentioned (1955 to 1958 inclusive) are: sedition, 63; sabotage, none; espionage, 5, treason, none.

For the previous 5 years (1950–54) the figures are not very different.

The total number of persons convicted for all crimes throughout the United States approximated 177,000. Of these, 114 were for sedition, 1 for sabotage, 8 for espionage, and 2 for treason.

I come now to the actual recommendations in the resolutions, which will be discussed more fully later in connection with the legislation proposal to carry them out.

Resolution I:

The resolving part is as follows:

Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the American Bar Association disapprove proposals to limit any jurisdiction vested in the U.S. Supreme Court; be it further

Resolved, That wherever there are reasonable grounds to believe that as a result of court decisions, weaknesses in internal security have been disclosed, remedial legislation be enacted by the Congress of the United States, including a specific pronouncement of congressional intention that State statutes proscribing sedition against the United States shall have concurrent enforceability."

With the first of these recommendations none of us will quarrel.

The second has two parts, the first of which is so indefinite that it is impossible to attach any specific meaning to it and the second of which proposes to overrule the *Nelson* case (350 U.S. 497), which held that the Smith Act preempted the field of sedition against the U.S. Government. This latter part I shall discuss when we come to the bills which have been introduced.

The second and third resolutions propose to meet the *Watkins* case (354 U.S. 178), by recommending that the authority of congressional committees be better defined and that witnesses appearing before them be specifically advised in writing of the precise terms of the basic authority of the committee. How effective such procedures will be may be a matter as to which opinions differ; but there can be no reasonable objection to the suggestions. In any event, they do not call for legislation.

Resolution IV contains five specific recommendations for legislation.

The first two are inspired by the *Yates* case (354 U.S. 298), which was a prosecution for violation of the Smith Act. The first proposes a broader definition of "organize" than that adopted in the *Yates* case; the second is intended to overrule that part of the *Yates* decision which held in effect that in order to be indictable, advocacy must be more than a persuasion to thought but must amount to an incitement to action.

The third proposal is evidently intended to meet the *Slochower* case (350 U.S. 551), by making it a condition of Federal employment for each employee that he shall not refuse to answer any question before a congressional commitee or before any executive or judicial arm of the Government with respect to Communist front, or other subversive activity or any other matter bearing on his loyalty to the United States.

The fourth suggestion is evidently intended to meet the *Bonetti* (356 U.S. 691) and *Witkovitch* (353 U.S. 194) cases, the former by defining entry as any entry into the United States and the latter by broadening the control of the Attorney General over aliens whose deportation has been ordered but who have not in fact been deported after the expiration of a period of 6 months from the date of the deportation order.

The fifth suggestion relates to a claimed technical defect in the present provision of law and as a result of which the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1948 might be deemed not applicable to propaganda issued without the United States for dissemination within the United States.

The fifth and final resolution generally commends the work of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House on Un-American Activities Committee and recommends the close liaison of these committees with the intelligence and security agencies, as well as with the Attorney General of the United States. This recommendation obviously does not call for any legislation, and does not seem to require any comment here.

A number of bills have been introduced in both the Senate and the House of Representatives which are designed to accomplish the purposes set forth in the resolutions.[4] As there is considerable duplication among them, they can best be taken up by categories.

Hearings were held on these bills before a subcommittee of the Senate of which Senator KEATING was the chairman. Judge Walsh, Deputy Attorney General of the United States, appeared at these hearings and stated the position of the Department of Justice on all the bills except those relating to passports, as to which he said the State Department should speak.

A number of bills, including S. 3, S. 294, S. 1299, H.R. 518, H.R. 798, H.R. 958, H.R. 1139 and H.R. 2000 seek to amend chapter 37 (entitled "Espionage and Censorship") of title 18 (Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure) of the United States Code by striking out section 791, which limits the applicability of the chapter to the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, the high seas, and the territory of the United States. The purpose is to make the chapter also applicable to acts of citizens of the United States performed in foreign countries. While these bills have no direct relation to anything specified in the American Bar Association resolutions, they seem to be in accord with the general principle of these resolutions and are apparently considered a part of the American Bar Association group of bills.

At the subcommittee hearing, a feeling was expressed that if this section were eliminated, the act might be deemed to apply to noncitizens acting outside the jurisdiction of the United States. Subject to this possible objection, the bill seems unobjectionable.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Preemption: A number of bills, including H.R. 3, S. 3, S. 294 and many others, were introduced to overcome the effect of the ruling in the *Nelson* case (350 U.S. 497), to the effect that the Smith Act preempted the field of sedition against the Federal Government and made invalid any State laws on the subject—except, of course, to the extent that they dealt with sedition against the States or were directed against actual violence. So anxious were the proponents of this change to effect it that the original bills H.R. 3 and S. 3 threw out the baby with the bath and in addition to specifically overruling the *Nelson* case, provided in general terms that no State legislation on any subject should be deemed void on the ground of preemption unless the Federal statutes contained a specific preemptive provision or unless the State statutes were in direct, positive and irreconcilable conflict with the Federal legislation.

It soon became apparent that so broad a provision would have unintended and at least in part undesirable consequences in many fields, including labor, railroad regulation and food and marketing, among others. In this broad form, the Department of Justice opposed the legislation and suggested that there might be serious doubt of its constitutionality.[5] The narrower bills, typified by S. 294, which confined the overruling of the Nelson case to the field of espionage, subversive activities and the like, received rather lukewarm approval from the Department of Justice.

At page 403 of the minutes of the hearing, the Deputy Attorney General said:

"As I say, State procedures are more flexible in some regards than Federal procedures. Arguably, in that respect it would be helpful. Actually, I cannot say that since the Nelson case has been decided there has been any gap developed where someone who could have been prosecuted had the case gone the other way was not prosecuted."

In this situation, there are those who believe that it is neither necessary nor desirable to open the field to legislative investigating committees and criminal prosecutions in 50 States, in addition to those now carried on by the Federal Government, nor to the chance of what is in effect if not, under recent decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, in the constitutional sense, double jeopardy. The approval by the Department of Justice of this legislation, even in its restricted form, is evidently far from enthusiastic.

The next two categories of legislation arise out of the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Yates* case (354 U.S. 298) in which the opinion was written by Mr. Justice Harlan and the only dissent by Justice Clark.

The first of the rulings in that case to which proposed legislation is directed is the holding (pp. 303 to 311) that the word "organize" as used in the Smith Act means only the creation of new organizations and does not include acts thereafter performed in carrying on its activities.

The bills designed to change this rule include S. 527, S. 1300 and H.R. 2369. The proposal is to add a provision reading substantially as follows:

"Organize includes the recruiting of new members, forming of new units, and the regrouping or expansion of existing clubs, classes and other units."

This amendment is approved by the Department of Justice in the form which I have quoted. Somewhat broader versions in some of the bills (e.g. S. 1300) which include encouraging recruitment are deemed by the Department of Justice to be too broad and possibly unconstitutional, and are not approved by the Department.

The second point decided in the Yates case to which legislation is directed, is the holding stated by the Court, 354 U.S., page 318, as follows:

"We are thus faced with the question whether the Smith Act prohibits advocacy and teaching of forcible overthrow as an abstract principle, divorced from any effort to instigate action to that end, so long as such advocacy or teaching is engaged in with evil intent. We hold that it does not."

The bill intended to alter this result (S. 1305), provides in effect that advocacy of the forcible overthrow of the Government is punishable "without regard to the immediate probable effect of such action."

This bill is opposed by the Department of Justice both on the ground that they regard it as of doubtful constitutionality and on the merits. As to the latter, the Deputy Attorney General said:

"Now we were content with that meaning of the Smith Act. We asked the trial judge in the Yates case to charge as the trial judge had in the Dennis case along these lines, and he declined to do so, thinking that the Dennis case had charged that rule.

"We are quite content with that part, with the law as so interpreted.

"We think that this change will not really make it easier to get a sinister person who is advocating the overthrow of government by force.

"It may draw into the range of the statute people who engage—and this is a more abstract form of activity, who are on the crackpot fringe, who advocate this thing with no serious ability to do anything about it.

"All that would do would be to divert the prosecutorial forces of the country. It isn't going to help."

The next proposed change is embodied in S. 1301, which would make it a condition of Federal employment that a Government employee not refuse to answer an inquiry with respect to Communist, Communist front or other subversive activities or any other matter bearing upon his loyalty to the United States.

This, again, was disapproved by the Department of Justice. In addition to expressing doubts as to its constitutionality, the Deputy Attorney General testified as follows:

"Our feeling with respect to that bill is that it is not necessary, that the Presidential order which deals with the discharge of employees of questionable security in sensitive positions already incorporated the power to take into account such a refusal to answer.

"The Lloyd-LaFollette Act, and the Veteran's Preference Act * * * permit the Civil Service Commission to take into account a refusal to answer such an inquiry before the Commission.

"Now, from the point of view of screening unsatisfactory employees, we think that the Government has whatever power it needs as far as the refusal to answer is concerned.

"I don't think the Civil Service Commission has asked for his provision, and the Department of Justice does not. We are content with the law as it is."

The next two points are included in a single bill, S. 1302. The first section of this bill would overrule the *Bonetti* case (356 U.S. 691). In this case a petitioner first entered the United States in 1923. He was a member of the Communist Party from 1932 to 1936, when he left the party and never returned to it. In 1937, he went abroad, abandoning all rights of residence in the United States. In 1938, he was readmitted to the United States for permanent residence as a quota immigrant. He has since resided in the United States except for a 1-day visit to Mexico in 1939. In 1951, proceedings were brought to deport him under statute providing for deportation of any alien who at the time of his entry into the United States or any time thereafter, was a member of the Communist Party. The Court held that as he had abandoned his 1923 entry and was relying solely on his 1938 entry, the statute was not applicable to him and he could not be deported. The first section of S. 1302 is intended to overrule this decision by defining "entry" as meaning "any entry." However one may regard the Bonetti case, the situation there presented is obviously a very special one. This section is mildly advocated by the Department of Justice. The best statement they were able to muster up in favor of it is as follows:

"There was a case, a rather unusual case, where a man came into the United States, is said to have engaged in that activity, left the country, then came back and there was no proof that he engaged in that activity after he came back a second time. There was, nevertheless, an effort to deport him.

"The Court held the only conduct under review was the conduct after his last entry into the United States. This bill would overcome that. We have no objection to that. We don't think that this is a situation that is going to occur very often.

"But we have no objection to the change and conceivably it might make it easier to pick up a dangerous subversive.

"Senator KEATING. You have no objection to it. Do you favor it?

"Mr. WALSH. I think on balance we would favor it; yes, sir."

The balance of the bill was intended to overrule the *Witkovitch* case (353 U.S. 194), by tightening the control of the Attorney General over aliens against whom a final order of deportation has been outstanding for more than 6 months but who has not been deported.

The Department of Justice is not in favor of the enactment of this bill without further study. After considerable discussion back and forth, the Deputy Attorney General testified as follows:

"Mr. WALSH. * * * It seems to me that this is a matter which deserves further study. We have not asked for any such measure as this. Although my recollection is that the Witkowich case was decided about 3 years ago, we have not asked for this power.

"We recognize the constitutional power that exists, and my own feeling is that the Department is fully using the power that it has now, keeping track of this man and his availability for deportation. We must first exhaust those powers to the full, and then perhaps, after further study, there could be some statutory improvement of our situation that will not bring this unreasonable hardship on a deportee.

"But we, at this point, don't have the solution, and we would ask, under these circumstances, that, except for the first part of the bill, which deals with the word 'entry,' that there be further study of the matter.

"SENATOR KEATING. In other words, you would oppose S. 1302 except for section 1.

"Mr. WALSH. We would oppose it this time without further study."

There remain for discussion what seem to me the two most clearly objectionable bills stemming from the American Bar Association resolution.

One of them (S. 1304) provides that, notwithstanding any other provision of law.

"The head of any department or agency of the Government may, in his absolute discretion and when deemed necessary in the interest of national security, suspend, without pay, any civilian officer or employee of the department or agency which he heads."

I am informed that the Department of Justice, awaiting the outcome of some pending litigation, takes no position on this bill.

That the result of the removal or suspension from employment for security reasons can be disastrous for the individual concerned is too clear for argument. To vest in

Footnotes at end of speech.

the head of the department the absolute power in all cases to suspend officers or employees, without pay, on security grounds, seems abhorrent to every consideration of a fair play and fair procedure.

The remaining bill (S. 1303) is designed to meet the decisions in *Kent* v. *Dulles* (357 U.S. 116) and *Dayton* v. *Dulles* (357 U.S. 144), which held that under existing laws the Secretary of State does not have the right to withhold a passport because of beliefs, associations or ideological matters.

The bill, in the broadest terms, grants the Secretary the power to do this very thing; expressly authorizes the refusal of a passport because of activities continued consistently over a long period of time indicating that the applicant for the passport has adhered to the doctrine of any group which has been found by Congress, agency or officers of the United States duly authorized for that purpose to be of a subversive character, or of any group affiliated with such a group. It provides—

"Nothing in this subsection shall alter or limit the authority of the Secretary of State to deny any application for the issuance of a passport, or to revoke a previously issued passport, on any ground other than the ground described in this subsection. The Secretary may withhold a passport in the national interest on the basis of confidential information where he shall certify that it is contrary to the interests of this Nation that a passport be issued to the applicant."

It provides that a passport may be withheld because of—

"(5) Any other conduct which tends to support the belief that the applicant is going abroad or traveling abroad for such purpose."

And provides:

"(c) The Secretary of State shall not issue to, or renew or extend the passport of, any person, and he shall limit, restrict, withdraw, cancel, or revoke a passport of any person, if he is not satisfied that such person's trip or such person's activities abroad would not—

"(1) violate the laws of the United States;

"(2) be prejudicial to the orderly conduct of foreign relations;

"(3) be contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security; or

"(4) otherwise be prejudicial to the interests of the United States."

After a proclamation has been made by the President that restrictions on travel are in the interest of the United States, the bill makes it unlawful to depart from the United States without a passport.

The act provides that the sole review of the refusal to issue or extend a passport or of the withdrawal or cancellation thereof, shall be before a special officer designated by and acting subject to the supervision of the Secretary of State and among others contains the following provision

"(h) The files maintained by the Department of State and any other pertinent Government files submitted to the special review officer shall be considered as part of the evidence in each case without testimony or a ruling as to admissibility. Such files may not be examined by the applicant."

It seems difficult to imagine a more shocking violation of the fundamental rights of the citizen.

The State Department has made a formal statement generally approving the principle of the bill, and concluding as follows:

"There are a number of provisions of S. 1303 which the Department feels could be amended so as better to accomplish these objectives. Therefore, the Department expects to comment formally and in detail on the provisions of S. 1303 in the immediate future."

The State Department does not state whether it believes the bill should be more severe or less so. Let us hope it means the latter. It seems difficult to believe that in its present form the constitutionality of the bill would be sustained by any court.

To sum up:

We have one bill (that relating to section 791 of the Criminal Code), which seem unobjectionable.

We have three—the narrower form of the preemption bill, the narrower bill enlarging the definition of "organize" in the Smith Act and the bill (S. 1302 first part) intended to overrule the Bonetti case, the advisability of which may be arguable. These three bills are approved by the Justice Department—two of them in an obviously unenthusiastic way.

Six bills or groups of bills seem clearly objectionable. These are the more general form of the preemption statute; the bills changing the rule that to establish a violation of the Smith Act there must be an incitement to action and not merely to thought; the bill (S. 1301) making it a condition of Federal employment that an employee shall not refuse to answer questions as to his affiliations; the bill (S. 1302 second part) designed to overrule the Witkovitch case; the passport bill (S. 1303) and the bill (S. 1304) giving heads of government departments the unrestricted right to suspend, without pay, for loyalty reasons. Of these, four are opposed by the Department of Justice; as to one, the Department of Justice has reserved its position; and as to one, the State Department, while approving in principle, has not approved the bill in its present form.

One's attitude toward the kind of legislation which we have been discussing depends, I suppose, on one's fundamental philosophy. To those who really value freedom of speech and of thought and the other fundamental freedoms guaranteed by our Federal Constitution, anything that tends to impair or nullify these freedoms seems to contradict the fundamental principles on which our country was founded. I cannot conclude more appropriately than by quoting the eloquent words of Mr. Justice Black, dissenting, in the Barenblatt case:

"Ultimately all the questions in this case really boil down to one—whether we as a people will try fearfully and futilely to preserve democracy by adopting totalitarian methods, or whether in accordance with our traditions and our Constitution we will have the confidence and the courage to be free."

REMARKS OF ROBERT M. BENJAMIN

At the conclusion of Mr. Nordlinger's address, Mr. Robert M. Benjamin asked to be heard.

Mr. Benjamin said that he spoke as a member of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association who had participated in the proceedings of the house; he did not speak for the American Bar Association, since nobody (including the special committee on Communist tactics, strategy and objectives) can speak for the American Bar Association except with the authority of the house of delegates or the board of governors.

Mr. Benjamin said that he wanted to emphasize that the house of delegates had not approved the report of the committee on Communist tactics, but had acted only on those of the committee's recommended resolutions which were submitted to the house by the board of governors, and had adopted those resolutions only with significant changes. It is not the practice of the house of delegates ever to approve or disapprove committee or section reports as such; it acts only on recommended resolutions.

Mr. Benjamin said that he had voted for Orison Marden's motion to postpone consideration of the resolutions until the August meeting of the house of delegates, but he could recognize a valid reason for voting against postponement. Despite the cautionary note that is always prominently printed on the face of committee reports that such reports do not represent the official policy of the American Bar Association, and that only recommendations adopted by the house of delegates represent association policy, it appears that an earlier draft report of the committee on Communist tactics had somehow been publicized, and had even been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as if it spoke officially the views of the American Bar Association. Those who voted against postponement of official action thus had reason for thinking it wise to state official policy promptly.

As an introduction to his own further remarks, Mr. Benjamin read excerpts from an article in the March 9 issue of the New Republic, which began:

"Like the early intelligence of Mark Twain's death, newspaper stories of the American Bar Association's criticism of the Supreme Court are greatly exaggerated. * * *"

After commenting on certain specific resolutions with which it agreed and others with which it disagreed, the New Republic continued:

"But the Court has been supported rather than attacked by this action, and one may regret that a contrary impression has got abroad. We are strongly confirmed in our view by an examination of what the Association declined to do. It declined to say that the Court has invoked 'technicalities * * * against the protection of our Nation,' and it declined to imply (as by use of the phrase 'restore to' in lieu of 'amend' the Smith Act) that there is something fishy about the Court's recent work. A proposed recommendation in favor of Executive authority to deny passports on the basis of confidential information, though approved by a committee, was not put to a vote of the delegates. The same is true of recommendations to extend the loyalty-security program to nonsensitive government jobs."

Mr. Benjamin referred further to the two major changes made in the house of delegates in the resolutions as they had been drafted by the committee. The reference in the first committee resolution to "technicalities * * * invoked against the protection of our Nation" had been the subject of critical comment in the New York Times and elsewhere. In the house of delegates a revision was proposed by Albert E. Jenner, Jr., president of the American Judicature Society, and strongly supported, to eliminate this clause. Peter Campbell Brown, chairman of the committee on Communist tactics, accepted the proposed amendment. He accepted also amendments proposed by Garner Anthony, former attorney general of Hawaii, to amend resolution IV so as to provide for "amending" the Smith Act and other statutes in certain respects instead of "restoring to" those statutes things that were in effect never in them.

What was left in the resolutions, Mr. Benjamin said, was a series of recommendations for legislation to cure what were thought to be defects disclosed by Supreme Court decisions. This is in no sense disparagement of the Supreme Court or its decisions. As to the particular recommendations for legislation reasonable men may differ. Mr. Benjamin said that he himself, for example, agreeing that the Government can properly inquire into Communist or other subversive activities of a prospective employee, might have preferred to limit such inquiry to the employing agency rather than to include inquiries by others, as paragraph (c) of Resolution IV does. But such differences on matters of legislative policy lend no support to the view that has been put forward that the American Bar Association has disparaged the Supreme Court.

Mr. Benjamin said also that two legislative matters which the press and others have

frequently referred to as having been within the resolutions adopted by the house of delegates, namely, procedures relating to the issuance of passports and the Federal loyalty-security program affecting those already in Government employ, had not in fact been submitted to the house of delegates or acted on officially by the American Bar Association.

Mr. Benjamin was not, he said, concerned primarily with defending the American Bar Association against misunderstanding of what it had in fact done, though he thought it ironic that the association should be subject to any such misunderstanding in the face of the preeminent part it had played in defeating the 1958 Jenner-Butler bill, which would have drastically limited the Court's jurisdiction, and in the face of Resolution I adopted in February 1959, strongly reaffirming its disapproval of all such proposals. What primarily concerned Mr. Benjamin was the resulting damage to the Court and to the public; it is a fundamental disservice to both, he said, to have the view presented that the American Bar Association is against the Court.

---

[1] Meeting of March 10, 1959. The resolution was introduced by the executive committee of the association and was unanimously adopted at the meeting of the association.

[2] Published in the Record of the city bar association for June 1959.

[3] Footnote: Sept. 2, 1957.

An interesting sidelight on the generality of the principles involved is the fact that last Monday (June 22, 1959), the Supreme Court decided three cases involving the so-called Jencks Act. None of them involved subversive activities.

[4] When the present address was delivered at Saranac, Robert M. Benjamin, of New York City, stated that some of the bills referred to below are not within the scope of the resolutions adopted by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association; and this is no doubt correct at least as to S. 1303 and S.1304. All of the bills, however, are clearly within the recommendations of the report. In introducing bills S. 1299 to S. 1305, inclusive, Senator EASTLAND said (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Mar. 5, 1959, p. 3006):

"I introduce for appropriate reference a number of bills to carry out the recommendations of the American Bar Association to correct certain decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States."

In view of this, it seems not only proper but necessary to discuss all of these bills here. Senator EASTLAND'S statement, moreover, is an excellent illustration of the impact on the public mind of the action of the American Bar Association.

[5] According to the New York Times of June 25, 1959, the House of Representatives pased H.R. 3 on June 24. The Times story states (p. 12) that the Justice Department has called this bill the most hazardous bill before Congress.

A Spirited, Responsible Defense of Castro's Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Walter Lippmann and Senator FULBRIGHT are two of many outstanding leaders in this country who have urged that we be sympathetic and understanding in our relations with Cuba. We must not forget the misery, the corruption, and death Batista spread through Cuba for so long.

The following, included under unanimous consent granted previously, is a letter to President Eisenhower and the people of the United States. Its signators are distinguished Cubans. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and others who want a clearer picture of Cuba and its revolution:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AND THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: If you have read the book entitled "Fidel Castro," by Mr. Jules Dubois of the Chicago Tribune, chairman of the committee on freedom of the press of the Inter-American Press Association, you will know that on the date, August 26, 1958, while Cuba was still engaged in the tragic civil war in which our people overthrew the powerfully armed despotism of Fulgencio Batista, the civilian revolutionary front directed a letter to you signed by Dr. José Miró Cardona, one of Cuba's most distinguished citizens. We believe you were never apprised of that letter, since it was answered only on October 13, 1958, by an officer of your State Department.

In order that the same fate may not befall this letter, and desiring at the same time to inform the U.S. public as well as its President of the truths given below, we have chosen this public way of addressing you.

Representing as we do the vast majority of the civic, professional, and religious organizations of our country, we wish to thank you for the assurance given to the press on July 15 last that the U.S. Government does not accuse the revolutionary government of Cuba as Communist.

At the same time, we protest as an offense to the sovereignty and dignity of our Nation the recent action by a subcommittee of the U.S. Congress which took testimony from a person who is charged as a traitor and deserter from the armed forces of a neighbor nation.

We believe that it should not be necessary to repeat continuously that the Cuban Revolutionary Government is not Communist, nor is the 26th of July movement nor its leaders. The principles and goals of this revolution have been clearly and repeatedly stated by Fidel Castro and other revolutionary leaders. We consider that, in dignity, we should not have to dwell on what the Cuban Revolution is not.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower recently stated that a great incomprehension exists between the two Americas. We believe that that is true and that, apart from the obvious factors of language, tradition and temperament, one important reason for this incomprehension lies in the understanding of the word "revolution." We believe that this word in the United States signifies nowadays only disorder, perturbation, a negative situation which alarms. For us, "revolution" signifies life, a moving forward at last toward ideals and goals too long detained, too long obstructed, a positive and creative approach to problems.

Our revolution did not start with the resistance against the despot, Batista. That was merely the rebellion which made the revolution possible. The revolution started on January 1, 1959, upon the triumph of the rebellion, in the same way that what is known in the United States as the American Revolution did not consist of the rebellion against England, which was the War of Independence, but began with the world-shaking truths set down for the first time in history in a political document by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence—that document which ignited the French Revolution, sounded the death knell to the system of monarchical despotism and opened the door in the United States and Europe to political democracy.

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

These political doctrines of 1776 were upheld by José Martí, and they are upheld by Fidel Castro and the people of Cuba in the Cuban revolution. Can these great truths even remotely be reconciled with communism?

But that is not the crux of the problem. Political democracy alone, the nations are agreed, is not enough. There must also be economic democracy. Man does not live by bread alone, but neither can man live by votes alone. To what avail are a million votes if there is not bread?

When this problem reached a crisis in the United States, it was solved by a series of measures—bitterly combated in their day—known as the New Deal, which led the United States away from a strictly captalistic economy into what became known as a mixed economy, in which the Government played a far greater role than ever before. Many European nations went farther in the role granted to government until today virtually all, including Great Britain, France, Sweden, Denmark, Norway, etc., have adopted varying degrees of Socialist economies.

The Cuban revolution, not wishing merely to copy any other system but to find solutions most applicable to our particular problems, has adopted its own methods which are not derived from communism, capitalism, or any other of the accepted isms and has given these methods the name of democratic humanism.

These methods, which are entirely in accordance with Christian concepts of social justice, seek to improve the well-being and the happiness of our people through a better distribution of the means of access to the national wealth, through a new orientation of private and public investment to the end that it serve social interests above individual interests, through Government-encouraged industrial and agricultural diversification, based to the greatest possible extent upon our own savings, our own capitalization, our own hard work, our own sacrifice, since a people, as an individual, only finds happiness in what it itself creates.

But Cuba in this decision had to face a serious problem. During the years of U.S. expansion under a capitalist economy, many powerful U.S. landowning corporations had established themselves in Latin America (usually with the consent of governments which had no other solutions to offer) and wielded an influence in the life and politics of those nations, in the same way that they have always wielded an influence in the political life of the United States. This situation has inevitably produced resentment and ill feeling, much as the influence of well-meaning in-laws frequently produces resentment and ill feeling within families.

At the same time, these corporations wield considerable influence in the foreign policies of the United States toward Latin America.

Agrarian reform, which the U.S. Government itself undertook in Puerto Rico and Japan, is obviously (as both Cuban and

international economists have long pointed out), an essential first step toward the solution of our economic problems. This measure necessarily affects a number of large private U.S. corporations, as well as Cuban. The intention, however, is not to offend but to obey national necessities which we believe the people of the Untied States will understand.

As a result of the agrarian reform program, the Cuban revolution has been accused of extreme nationalism when we seek only to be—as all peoples should be—truly free, self-respecting and independent, dependent only to the extent that all nations should be interdependent on a basis of mutual respect and friendship.

We believe that a higher degree of economic development in Cuba coincides with the best interests of both our countries and with the best interests of democracy itself, for communism is an evil weed which does not grow on well-cultivated soil. It thrives on idle, uncared-for soil, held in reserve for the exclusive benefit of the few against the needs of the many—dangerously ignoring every lesson of history since the rights of man were first proclaimed in 1776.

Rejecting the timidity and the half measures which have prevented other nations of our continent from solving their economic problems, Cuba has resolved to go once and for all to the roots of its problems, cost what it may cost. We are prepared to make all of the sacrifices necessary to achieve our goals; 20,000 Cubans died—among them many of our finest sons—that we might build a new future based on freedom and human dignity. We are resolved that they shall not have died in vain.

But the forces against us are powerful and well financed. And we have witnessed the tragedy of the United States, birthplace of Thomas Jefferson, seemingly standing behind the foes of freedom in Latin America.

We have witnessed innumerable unfriendly interventions in the past, immoral ambassadorial intrigues, arms supplied to despots, hospitality toward deposed tyrants and their henchmen who have come to your shores heavy with wealth stolen from their countries, threats of economic sanctions, laws refusing aid to any country which confiscates U.S. private properties and, more recently, the U.S. delegate to the Organization of American States voting side by side with the delegates of the despots of Santo Domingo and Haiti against the delegates from the democratic nations of Latin America. When all of these things occur, it is the United States which betrays democracy, not we.

One by one, the tyrants of Latin America have been overthrown by their peoples: Peron in Argentina, Rojas Pinilla in Colombia, Perez Jimenez in Venezuela, Fulgencio Batista in Cuba, and the list could go back much further. Today there remains only Trujillo in Santo Domingo, Duvalier in Haiti, the Somozas in Nicaragua and, to a lesser degree in tyranny, perhaps, Sr. Stroessner and his friends in Paraguay.

What Cuba has achieved already in its Revolution serves as a beacon of hope to all of our sister nations still living under oppression and as a warning to the remaining handful of tyrants and would-be tyrants of what a determined people seeking freedom can do.

It is for these reasons and these reasons only that powerful forces have been organized against us by the friends of privilege and despotism in an attempt to paint us as aggressors and Communists—forces whose influence reaches even into the U.S. Senate, the Pentagon, and the U.S. Department of State.

The goal is to destroy the Cuban revolution and with it the democratic aspirations of Latin America, in order to preserve the status quo, even if only for a little while longer. But the course of history is against these forces; the needs of our people cannot wait. This revolution, which belongs to all of America, cannot be destroyed, no matter how strong the campaign against us. Our road ahead is clear. We shall not turn back or betray our principles.

Neither shall we, as our government has clearly stated, attempt to export revolutions, firm in the belief that each people must seek its own salvation. Cuba can merely set an example.

We shall, however, defend the ideals and principles of democracy everywhere, encourage their propagation and the downfall of tyrants and oppressors, extend our hands in friendship to all who seek freedom and democracy. That is our sovereign right and our solemn duty to our martyrs. We shall never adopt the principle that democracy is good for us but not for others, nor shall we be detained by an ignoble or hysterical fear of communism, for that is to play into the hands of the supporters of tyranny and totalitarianism.

One of your magazines recently stated: "There is fear in Cuba." We deny this statement and answer: "Our time of terror is past. What there is now in Cuba is a great faith."

There are some, unquestionably, who tremble, as many trembled in the United States in 1776, because powerful interests have been challenged which were never challenged before. Most of the Bastistianos have left the country and are denouncing the revolution from Santo Domingo and the United States, just as 100,000 persons fled from the American Revoltuion in 1776 and denounced that revolution from Europe and Canada. Had communism existed then, the American Revolution would also have been called Communist. The U.S. Government confiscated the properties of those who fled then, as the Cuba revolution has done here. The Cuban revolution is radical, as was the Revolution of 1776, and our theme is also "libertad o muerte," liberty or death.

Anyone without a criminal record who wishes to leave Cuba is free to do so, just as anyone who wishes to come is free and very welcome to come. Why, then, have there been a number of cases of escapes from Cuba? Most of those who have escaped have been required for criminal actions. But others have been persuaded to escape as a part of the campaign of calumny against us. Because if Cuba is to be painted as Communist, it must be made to look like a Communist nation, with dramatic escapes included.

It is also true that some in good faith, particularly of the older generation, have doubts about this revolution. It is not possible that all have the same comprehension and understanding; it is not possible that all are able to acquire a revolutionary spirit and conscience. But a recent survey by Bohemia, one of the outstanding publications of Latin America, showed that more than 90 percent of the Cuban population stands firmly behind the revolution, which represents a clear mandate. And the recent ministerial crisis demonstrated beyond question the unequalled place which Fidel Castro, intellectual and moral author of this revolution, holds in the devotion of his countrymen.

We offer this statement in a desire to dispel some of the incomprehension which undoubtedly and understandably exists in the United States concerning our revolution and we call upon the President and the people of the United States to support our struggle, firm in our belief that the great majority of North Americans still uphold the revolutionary principles of 1776, which are also our principles.

Joint Committee of Cuban Institutions: Eng. Constantino León Expósito, president, National Confederation University Professionals; Arq. Horacio Navarrete Serrano, president, National Association of Architects; Dr. Rosa Sánchez Domínguez, president, National Association University Librarians; Dr. Alfonso Bernal, president, National Association Doctors of Science, Philosophy, and Letters; Dr. Arnaldo Schwerert, dean, National Association Doctors of Social Science and Public Law; CP. Rolando Méndez Insua, president, Association Public Accounts of Cuba; Dr. Pantaleón García Sánchez, president, National Dentists Association; Dr. Ramón Iglesias Vasallo, president, Municipal Dentists Association of Havana; Dr. Laureano Pequeño, president, National Association of Pharmacists; Eng. Rolando Parajón Biart, president, Federation Association of Engineers of Cuba; Eng. Ramón Tejeiro, president, National Association Agronomists and Sugar Engineers of Cuba; Eng. Leandro Ramos Ledon, president, Provincial Association Agronomists and Sugar Engineers of Havana; Eng. Gustavo Sterling, president, National Association Civil Engineers of Cuba.

Eng. Francisco Suárez de Urrutia, president, Provincial Association Civil Engineers of Havana; Eng. Armando Salcedo, president, National Association of Electrical Engineers; Eng. José Pria Groso, president, Provincial Association Electrical Engineers of Havana; Eng. Felipe Ordoño Camps, president, National Association Mechanical Engineers; Eng. Joaquín Martínez Mestre, president, National Association of Chemical, Sugar and Industrial Engineers of Cuba; Dr. Raúl de Velasco, president, National Medical Association; Dr. René García-Mendoza, president, Municipal Medical Association of Havana; Dr. Manuel Morales Lucena, president, National Association of Veterinarians; Dr. Eduardo Hernández Bermudez, president, National Association of Optometrists; Dra. Publia Sardiñas Izquierdo, president, National Association Doctors in Pedagogy; Dr. Liliam Gutiérrez Vizcompti, president, Provincial Association Doctors in Pedagogy of Havana; Dra. Concepción Portela, president, Municipal Association Doctors in Pedagogy of Havana.

Dr. Joaquín Fernández, president, Municipal Association Doctors in Pedagogy of Guanabacoa; Dr. Fernando Soto Hernández, president, National Association Chemical, Agronomy & Sugar Experts; Julio Callejas Dávalos, president, National Association University Professors of Physical Education; Dra. Esperanza Palacios Herrera, president, National Association Social Workers of Cuba; Sr. Augustín Castellanos, president, National Confederation Non-University Professionals; Dr. Fernando González Lines, president, National Federation Cuban Private Schools; Dr. Alberto Abreu Lorié, president, National Association Private School Teachers; Dr. Daniel Camacho Cazón, president, National Association Surveyors & Land Appraisers of Cuba; Dr. Luis A. Caos Espinosa, president, Municipal Association of Surveyors & Land Appraisers of Havana; Sr. Orestes Valera, dean, National Association of Radio Announcers; Sr. Rodrigo Rossie, dean, Municipal Association of Radio Announcers of Havana; Dra. María Josefa Valez, president, National Association of Kindergarten Teachers.

Sr. Orlando Sáenz Rodríguez, dean, National Association of Agricultural Instructors; Dr. José F. Jiménez, president, National Association Normal Teachers of Havana; Sr. Eudaldo Gutiérrez Paula, dean, National Journalists Association; Dr. Jorge Quintana, dean, Provincial Association of Journalists of Havana; Sra. María Arregui, dean, Association of Solicitors of Havana Province; Sr. Jorge A. Bombino, dean, National Association Publicity Professionals; Sr. Paulino Pérez Salas, dean, National Association of English Teachers; Sr. Jorge Franchi Mateu, dean, Municipal Association of English Teachers of Havana; Sr. Antonio Díaz, president, National Association of Radio Telegraph Operators; Sr. Pedro Pablo Guirola,

National Association of Telegraph Operators; Rev. Raúl Fernández Ceballos, president, Cuban Council of Evangelical Churches; Srta. Hilda López Rodríguez, president, Federation of Young Women of Cuban Catholic Action; Dr. Antonio Fernández Nuevo, president, Federation of Young Men of Cuban Catholic Action.

Sr. Julio Jover Vidal, state deputy, Knights of Columbus of Cuba; Sr. Alfredo J. Vidal Pérez, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus; Eng. Jorge L. Echarte, president, Catholic University Group; Dr. Alfonso Cueto, president, District Multiple "C", International Lions Club; Dr. Jorge Esteva Varela, governor, Lions, district "C2", Havana; Sr. José Sabatés Forgas, governor, Rotarian District 400 (Cuba); Dr. Juan José Tarajano, Grand Lodge, Isla de Cuba; Sr. Armando J. Suárez Castell, Eureka Lodge; Sr. Evelio León Valdés, Hermanos del Mundo Lodge; Sr. Sebastián G. Rodríguez, Pureza Lodge; Sr. Jesús Poo Bencomo Sol de Cuba Lodge; Dt. Julio Martínez Cabrera, president, youth association, Esperanza de la Fraternidad; Sra. Anita Arroyo, president, Lyceum Lawn Tennis Club; Sr. Harold Gramatges Leyte-Vidal, president, cultural society, Nuestro Tiempo; Sr. Humberto Pascual Pérez, president, National Association Youth Organization of Cuba.

Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital located at East 49th Street and Rutland Road, Brooklyn, N.Y., is a hospital of outstanding achievement. The good work of this hospital is known throughout New York City, the State, and the Nation. I am happy to insert in the RECORD a statement concerning the hospital's inauguration of a unique medical care program for victims of long-term diseases:

HOSPITAL TO INAUGURATE UNIQUE MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM; OFFERS PREHOSPITAL CARE AND TREATMENT TO VICTIMS OF LONG-TERM DISEASES; $330,000 NIH GRANT TO AID PROGRAM

A unique prehospitalization care and treatment program is being inaugurated by the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital, Brooklyn, for victims of long-term diseases, it was announced by Isaac Albert, hospital president.

This program, supported by a grant of $330,000 from the National Institutes of Health will open a 5-year study to determine the feasibility of offering care and treatment in the home to victims of strokes. This new service will be offered prior to hospitalization as a possible means of avoiding the need for hospital care. This program is designed to offer services which would ordinarily be given in a hospital.

"It is hoped," said Arthur Feigenbaum, executive director of the hospital, "that by starting the treatment shortly after the stroke occurs, it will be possible through this new program not only to prevent further damage to the patient, but also to improve the patient's condition so that he may live as normally as possible."

"We hope to determine the feasibility of such a program," he declared, "so that hospitals throughout the country which have no facilities for long-term patients may be encourged to undertake similar programs and so offer care and treatment to individuals who are languishing in their homes while waiting for months and even years to be admitted to a hospital. The long wait works to the disadvantage of the patient and often creates a very difficult medical situation since the patient's condition generally worsens."

Such a program, Mr. Feigenbaum pointed out, will be far less costly to the patient who requires medical care and treatment over a long period of time, and to the hospital providing such care. It will also make more hospital beds available to those who require constant medical and nursing care.

Present home-care programs offer care at the conclusion of an appropriate period of hospitalization, when the patient has received the maximum benefits.

The advantage of this new program for the active chronically ill patient, according to Dr. Joseph B. Rogoff, the hospital's director of physical medicine and rehabilitation, who is principal investigator of this project, is that he will receive early treatment at home. Even a relatively short period without effective medical and social rehabilitation may result in a lifetime of invalidism, indigency, and uselessness, with the attendant problems to the family and to the community.

To carry out this program a closer working relationship is being developed between the Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital and other hospitals, public health nursing agencies, family agencies and welfare services.

The program, under medical direction, will consist of a broadly based complement of medical, nursing, social caseworker, physical and occupational therapies, and housekeeping services to be made available to the patient to the degree determined by professional standards of rehabilitation. Where necessary, such other specialists or consultants on the hospital staff will be provided. Should the patient develop an acute condition of the primary illness, or should other acute conditions develop, such medical and nursing services as may be required will be provided. This will include hospitalization for any acute ailment that may occur.

Mobile units of physical therapy and occupational therapy will be brought in and adapted for home use.

Among the services to be provided under this program are the preparation of meals and light housekeeping as required, nutritional control, administration of necessary drugs, instruction of family members in methods of assisting the patient to carry out the therapeutic regime, and counseling of the patient and his family. The services to be offered each patient will depend upon the patient's needs.

The Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital, located at East 49th Street and Rutland Road, Brooklyn, is the largest, voluntary, nonsectarian institution of its kind in the country. It has facilities for the care and treatment of 810 patients.

Among its patients are men, women, and children afflicted with such chronic conditions as cancer, cerebral palsy, leukemia, heart disease, arthritis, polio, spina bifida, multiple sclerosis, rheumatic fever, diabetes, Parkinson's disease, muscular dystrophy and Tay-Sachs disease.

The hospital maintains the following clinics: Cardiac, orthopedic, neurology, tumor, rheumatology, multiple sclerosis, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, pediatric, cleft palate, child guidance and orthodontics.

The prehospitalization care program is an extension of the hospital's rehabilitation services which aids patients to develop the use of paralyzed and handicapped limbs, it includes an outpatient cerebral palsy clinic, physiotherapy, occupational therapy and manual arts therapy departments, a speech clinic and vocational and prevocational divisions.

The hospital's emphasis is on the rehabilitation of patients who can be helped and be returned to their families within the shortest possible time.

It serves as a training center for students from New York University, and Columbia University in physical therapy; Brooklyn College in speech therapy; New York City Community College in dental hygiene; Long Island University in psychology; Yeshiva Univeristy in psychology; and New York School of Social Work (Columbia University) training in social work.

September has been designated as Jewish Chronic Disease Hospital Month by Mayor Robert F. Wagner. It launches the hospital's annual campaign for funds for the maintenance of the hospital and for research and rehabilitation. The institution's 1959 campaign marks the beginning of its 35th anniversary.

Gen. Richard K. Mellon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 3, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Richard K. Mellon, of Pittsburgh, Pa., has unanimously been selected as the Sportsman of the Year for 1959 by the Allegheny County Civic Sportsmen's Association. Richard Mellon has had an illustrious career as a civic leader, financier, humanitarian, soldier, and sportsman. He has made an outstanding contribution to the Pittsburgh Renaissance and Allegheny County redevelopment.

Richard Mellon received this award as a sportsmen because of his founding 25 years ago the International Rolling Rock Hunt racing events at Ligonier, Pa. I quote from the letter of my good friend, Judge Samuel Weiss:

ALLEGHENY COUNTY CIVIC SPORTSMEN ASSOCIATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 7, 1959.

Congressman JAMES G. FULTON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR JIM: Gen. R. K. Mellon was unanimously selected as "The Sportsman of the Year for 1959" by the above organization.

Because of his founding of the International Rolling Rock Hunt Racing Events 25 years ago at Ligonier, Pa., as a horse sportsman, and because of his great contribution to the Pittsburgh Renaissance, as a great financier, humanitarian, soldier, statesman, and sportsman, our organization honors him.

The executive committee of our group consists of Judge Samuel Weiss, president; Dr. Hubert Wagner, vice president; Harry Kalson, Esq., secretary; Meyer Gefsky, treasurer.

Harry Keck, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph; Al Abrams, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette; Chet Smith, Pittsburgh Press; William "Red" Friesell, corporate executive and outstanding athlete; Luby Dimiellio, former Pitt western Pennsylvania U.S. marshal; Attorney David Fawcett; Attorney "Ted" Buckley; Carl K. Rebele; Judge John Brosky; and Dr. William Campbell, superintendent of Homestead schools, are members of the executive board.

Sincerely yours,
SAMUEL A. WEISS,
Judge, Common Pleas Court
of Allegheny County.

On the occasion of this award I think it is fitting that we review the career of this outstanding American.

Richard K. Mellon was born June 19, 1899, in Pittsburgh, Pa., the son of Richard Beatty and Jennie Taylor Mellon. He was educated at Shady Side Academy, Culver Military Academy, and Princeton University. In 1918, he enlisted in the Army and served as a private. He was awarded the Victory Medal and the Pennsylvania World War I Victory Medal. He began his banking career as a messenger at the Mellon National Bank in Pittsburgh, rising through the ranks as assistant cashier, and then vice president. He was elected president in 1934.

After the outbreak of World War II, Richard Mellon was commissioned a major in the Army of the United States, and in 1943, with the rank of colonel, he was appointed Director of Selective Service for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. During this period he was assigned to the General Staff Corps and journeyed into the Asiatic-Pacific campaign area for the completion of a special mission. In 1945, Dick Mellon was appointed Assistant Chief of Staff of Reciprocal Aid Section of the International Division of the War Department. During World War II he earned the Asiatic-Pacific campaign, American campaign, European-African-Middle Eastern campaign, and World War II Victory Medals.

Dick Mellon was returned to inactive military status in 1945. The following year he became chairman of the board of the Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., when the Mellon Bank merged with the Union Trust Co. That year he was also awarded the Distinguished Service Medal by the U.S. Army.

In 1948 Richard K. Mellon established the Richard King Mellon Foundation for "public, religious, educational, scientific, and literary grants," giving priority to undertakings in the Pittsburgh area.

Dick Mellon continued his interest in the military and in 1948 he was commissioned a brigadier general in the Army of the United States; in 1950 he was commissioned a major general in the Pennsylvania National Guard and in 1956 was commissioned a major general in the U.S. Army Reserve. In December of 1954 he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Richard Mellon is a director of a number of large corporations: Aluminum Co. of America, General Motors, Gulf Oil, Koppers Co., the Pennsylvania Railroad, and the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. He also serves as a trustee of the Carnegie Institute, Carnegie Institute of Technology, Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, and the University of Pittsburgh. He is chairman of the museum committee of the Carnegie Museum. He is also active in a number of civic and philanthropic organizations.

Richard Mellon is married to the former Constance Prosser. They have four children and make their home in Ligonier, Pa.

Richard K. Mellon has received numerous honorary degrees and awards. They are listed below:

RICHARD K. MELLON

HONORARY DEGREES

June 2, 1946, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL.D.) from Waynesburg College, Waynesburg, Pa.

September 3, 1946, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of political Science (S.P.D.) from St. Vincent College, Latrobe, Pa.

June 9, 1947, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL.D.) from Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa.

June 9, 1948, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL.D.) from the University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

April 11, 1950, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of commercial science (D. Com. S.) from New York University, New York, N.Y.

November 12, 1954, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of engineering (D. Eng.) from Duquesne University Pittsburgh, Pa.

May 1, 1954, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of laws (LL.D.) from Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa.

June 5, 1956, Mr. Mellon received honorary degree of doctor of science (Sc. D.) from Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh, Pa.

AWARDS

January 16, 1947, Mr. Mellon received plaque from the Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh in tribute to his patriotic service, both as a civilian and a military man.

November 3, 1947, Mr. Mellon was awarded a citation by Forbes magazine upon his selection, in a nationwide poll, as one of today's 50 foremost business leaders.

January 19, 1948, Mr. Mellon was acclaimed the Man of the Year for 1947 by the Pittsburgh Junior Chamber of Commerce. He was chosen because his "outstanding leadership especially during 1947 brought about a marked revolution and a revived hope in the industrial and urban redevelopment of Pittsburgh."

November 13, 1949, Mr. Mellon was presented with the Heart Award (first annual award) by Tent No. 1 of Variety Club International (Pittsburgh chapter), "for your humanitarian service to the people of the tristate area."

September 12, 1950, Mr. Mellon received special citation for "outstanding optimism in Pittsburgh's future" from the Optimist Club of Pittsburgh as the No. 1 Optimist for 1950.

October 9, 1950, Mr. Mellon received a commemorative plaque from western Pennsylvania chapter, Society of Industrial Realtors honoring him as the outstanding industrialist in the Pittsburgh area who has made the most significant contribution in the public interest.

November 16, 1953, Mr. Mellon received the Gold Medal of Merit Award from the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, Alumni Society, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, "for the greatest contribution to American business during 1953."

December 11, 1954, Mr. Mellon received the Gold Medal Award, the Pennsylvania Society, for distinguished achievements and his many significant contributions to the welfare and public service of the State and Nation.

February 9, 1956, Mr. Mellon received the Gen. Arthur St. Clair Award from the Ligonier Valley Chamber of Commerce in recognition of his lasting contributions to the cultural, historical, and recreational advancement of the Ligonier Valley.

April 27, 1956, Mr. Mellon received the Veterans of Foreign Wars Citation from the Allegheny County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the committee on Americanism for outstanding community service.

November 6, 1957, Mr. Mellon was awarded a citation by Forbes magazine upon his selection, in a nationwide poll, as one of today's 50 foremost business leaders.

January 22, 1958, Mr. Mellon received a certificate of honorary association in the Pittsburgh chapter of the American Institute of Architects, in recognition of his distinguished service to our community.

April 28, 1958, Mr. Mellon was cited as a great living American by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the award being presented to Mr. Mellon for his personal leadership in the rejuvenation of Pittsburgh.

BANKING AND INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES

Aluminum Co. of America, director; General Motors Corp., director; Gulf Oil Corp., director; Koppers Co., Inc., director; Mellon National Bank & Trust Co., chairman of the board, director, and member of executive committee; T. Mellon & Sons, president and governor; the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., director; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., director.

CULTURAL, EDUCATIONAL, AND SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES

Carnegie Institute, trustee; Carnegie Museum, chairman of the museum committee; Carnegie Institute of Technology, trustee; Mellon Institute of Industrial Research, trustee; the University of Pittsburgh, trustee.

CIVIC AND PHILANTHROPIC ACTIVITIES

Allegheny Conference on Community Development, member of citizens sponsoring committee and point park committee; Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association, chairman of the executive committee; Sarah Mellon Scaife Foundation, trustee; Regional Industrial Development Corp., director; ACTION (American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods), director.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun Telegraph, Aug. 13, 1959]

RICHARD KING MELLON: DAD TOLD HIM, "LIVE WHERE YOU WORK, WORK WHERE YOU LIVE"

Pittsburgh's dramatic rise to new strength and greatness during the past 15 years represents the accomplishments and work of corporate interests, foundations, government and many individuals, in public and private life, uniting their efforts for a single objective—the good of the community.

Richard King Mellon, perhaps more than any other person, has been responsible for the city's amazing rebirth. He would be the first to state and stress this formula of cooperative civic enterprise, this pattern of partnership that has been the basis for the successful community development program in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Mellon's abiding interest and decisive role in the affairs of his native city are as natural as the hills and valleys and rivers that give western Pennsylvania its rugged beauty.

An anecdote about his early life provides an insight into this aspect of the Mellon personality.

As a young boy, he was riding with his father, Richard Beatty Mellon, along New York City's Fifth Avenue, where many Pittsburgh steel barons had built mansions and lived much of the time, when his father turned to him and said:

"Son, live where you work and work where you live." This wise counsel made an indelible impression on the young man, who has followed so closely in the footsteps of his distinguished father.

OBSERVATIONS OF A TEENAGER

Growing up in the home of his parents on Pittsburgh's Fifth Avenue, Dick Mellon observed firsthand the imaginative planning that must precede a period of immense physical construction, like the present here.

Many of the meetings of the Citizen's Committee on City Plan for Pittsburgh, forerunner of the Pittsburgh Regional Planning Association in which Mr. Mellon served as president for 11 years and of which he is still chairman of the executive committee, were held at 6500 Fifth Avenue while he was a teenager.

Today this site, donated by the Mellon family to the city for park purposes, is Mellon Park, where thousands of Pittsburghers in the densely populated East End can enjoy sports and the outdoors—interests that have absorbed Richard Mellon all his life.

The annual races at Rolling Rock, sponsored for the benefit of the Industrial Home for Crippled Children, are an expression of two dominant aspects of the well-rounded Mellon personality—the sportsman and the humanitarian.

In the world of business, where 2 and 2 are 4, Richard King Mellon has reached the pinnacle, and in his quiet, modest manner brings a vast personal knowledge and experience to corporate affairs in which Mellon interests are concerned.

KEY TO CITY'S RENAISSANCE

During the lifetime of Mr. Mellon, the United States had fought two World Wars. At 19 years of age he enlisted as a private in World War I. In World War II he served on active duty in the U.S. Army from 1942 to 1945, when he was honorably discharged with the rank of colonel. He was commissioned in 1956 as a major general, USAR. Mr. Mellon has a profound grasp of American history that is reflected in a patriotism that is refreshing in these times.

Richard King Mellon is a builder. As an active member of the Allegheny Conference on Community Development, he has been in the forefront during these years of spectacular change and reconstruction in Pittsburgh.

Mellon Square, in many ways the crowning achievement in the renaissance and certainly a key to the rebuilding of the midtown Triangle, was conceived in his mind as he strolled around San Francisco's Union Square one evening during World War II.

In 1953 at the University of Pennsylvania, Richard Mellon set forth in an address before the alumni a fresh concept of management, a responsibility to the community, and of a clear, convincing logic the part of business has in shaping the environment in which its employees live and work.

GOOD NEIGHBOR POLICY

In the course of his remarks, he observed:

"It was Abraham Lincoln, I believe, who said, 'A man cannot be truly happy unless he is doing something for somebody else.' Participation by business leadership in community activities provides such a vehicle for basic happiness. After all, we must consider people and their individual happiness. Part of that happiness is supplied by the environment under which they live and work.

"People live in the same communities in which corporations do business, and they and their neighbors work for them. They expect business to be a good neighbor and a good citizen. And good neighbors collectively make a good community in which to live."

No city has benefited more from this forward-looking concept of the role of present-day business in the community than Pittsburgh.

Through the years Pittsburgh has bred great men. As Pittsburgh commemorates its bicentennial, it is especially proud of Richard King Mellon, whose vision, leadership and philanthropy have set such a splendid example of unselfish devotion and service to his native city.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2400 Tilden St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.* Sheraton-Park
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.*
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Appendix

Khrushchev's Kind of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include a powerful analytical article exposing communism, written by the Rev. (F.) Robert H. W. Martin, appearing in the September 11, 1959, issue of the Catholic Standard, an article which should be widely read, entitled "Khrushchev's Kind of Peace."

KHRUSHCHEV'S KIND OF PEACE—A PRIMER OF COMMUNISM AND COEXISTENCE

(By the Reverend Robert H. Wharton)

Soviet truth is stranger, and much more terrifying, than fiction.

A mind would have to be extremely fertile to come up with stories to match the power struggle of the Communist leaders. When Stalin was master of all he surveyed, a rising Red star by the name of Nikita Khrushchev brought forth this paean of praise for his master's birthday: "Our father, sage, Stalin, teacher and brilliant leader of the party, of the Soviet people, and the toilers of all the world."

Yet 3 years after the father, sage, teacher, and brilliant leader had died, he was denounced by the star now secure in his firmament, Nikita Khrushchev. Armed with a fierce determination and a disarming grin, Khrushchev had seized power from the heirs-apparent and was ready to demolish them one by one.

Malenkov followed Stalin as Premier in a "collective leadership," but relinquished his post of party chief to Khrushchev. The Premier and the head of the party then joined forces to bring about the execution of Beria, the powerful police chief.

Shortly thereafter, Malenkov "confessed his errors" and resigned the premiership. The master plan called for grandfatherly and goateed Bulganin to step in as Premier.

STRUGGLE CONTINUES

The battle royal became exciting after that. Khrushchev pooled his craftiness with the prestige of war hero Marshal Zhukov. Result of the pact: Molotov, Malenkov, Shepilov, and even Kaganovich (who had discovered Khrushchev in the Ukraine and had been the young Communist's patron in his rapid rise to power), all were discredited, ousted, and lost in obscurity.

This amazing feat should have added another medal to Zhukov's chest; but the wily puppeteer had other plans. Out went Zhukov.

There was only one name left on the list of important Communists, that of Bulganin. The Premier "decided" to accept a minor post and meekly added his vote for Khrushchev as the new Premier. At last, the New Stalin was in charge of both the Government and the Communist Party.

What is the strange system that could bring a Khrushchev to power and enable him to calmly knife his compatriots one by one?

It is not the pudgy, smiling man's personality that makes him the most hated person in the world. His vitality and color would not cause him to be known as the "hangman of the Ukraine" or the "butcher of Budapest."

There must be a philosophy, a way of thinking, a system to produce a man so skilled in treachery and deceit and murder. That philosophy is communism.

WHAT IS COMMUNISM?

It is not enough for us to know that the enemy is wicked. We should be able to answer the simple question: "What is communism?"

Pope Leo XIII realized what it is. As long ago as 1878, he said it is "the fatal plague which insinuates itself into the very marrow of human society, only to bring about its ruin." The Holy Father spoke these words long before the plague had contaminated all the nations of the earth and long before the brutality of Hungary and Tibet.

Even earlier than Leo's reign, in 1846, Pope Pious IX was one of the first men to recognize insidiousness of communism. He described the system as "absolutely contrary to the natural law" and something which threatened to "utterly destroy the rights, property and possessions of all men, and even of society itself."

Communism as we know it today was derived from the social and economic theories advocated by Marx and Engels, developed by Lenin and the Bolsheviks, and later by Stalin. The "Communist Manifesto" of Marx and Engels (1848) presented the basic doctrines to the world and became the "Old Testament" of communism. Lenin made the theory a living thing by the 1917 revolution in Russia, and his writings together with those of Stalin make up the Communist "New Testament."

The economic theory of communism is important. The theory holds that all wealth is derived from labor and that all capital is therefore theft. All capital tends to concentrate in the hands of fewer and fewer and will finally, by economic necessity, be taken over by the working class.

These ideas, of course, start out with a denial of man's right to possess property and predict the coming conflict between the classes—with victory for the working class.

Behind this is materialism. Communism denies all spiritual realities; everything is just matter. Marx also taught that this matter develops through a conflict of forces, the dialectic. Thus the high-sounding name for Marx's theory: dialectical materialism.

ROOT OF THEORY

Because communism claims that all causes are economic and that matter is the only reality, denial of God and of human rights are essential to the whole system. The Communist's atheism is not the kind that "lives and let live," but a militant atheism calling religion a delusion and waging ceaseless war against it.

The ideal of communism is a classless society where all property is owned in common in an earthly paradise. All forces are supposed to work to hasten the coming of this state of bliss. That is why conversion of the whole world to the theory is an essential part of Communist doctrine.

This all sounds rather quaint in the abstract. But ever since the Czar was dethroned in 1917 and the Bolsheviks seized power in Russia, the frightening results of the deadly theory have been only too apparent.

Communism makes war on all religion. Witness the trials of prelates, execution of priests and nuns and ministers, the exquisite methods of torture that would make the ancient Romans sit up and take notice, the fierce efforts to discredit the church and wipe out all religious sentiment in the countries subjected to communism's iron rule. As long as communism is communism, it will of necessity hate and persecute all faiths.

DENIAL OF MORALITY

Along with this struggle against God there is communism's denial of morality. Man is just another brute animal; there is no God. So what basis is there for right and wrong? Lying, murder, theft, treason, broken pledges—all are approved methods in the Communist catechism. The concept of honor and justice has no place in a system which murders or enslaves millions with wholehearted dedication to the cause.

The doctrines of communism result in state dictatorship as well. The state is supreme; its rulers are absolute; obedience is essential. Our Nation was founded on the principle that God has given us rights that cannot be taken away. To us, the state exists merely for the good of the individual. This will not do for communism.

To the Communists' twisted mind, man exists for the state. Everything an individual does should be subordinated to the interests of the state. It is true that this all-knowing and all-powerful state is supposed to disappear eventually in the future Communist paradise. Until the arrival of that happy time, however, the state is the beginning and the end of a loyal Communist's life.

Communist leaders come and go. They change tactics, they frown and then smile, they threaten and then utter soothing words, they murder millions and then kiss babies. But through all these things the foundation remains: communism's determination to take over the world.

Right now, it would seem that this international conspiracy would rather use its supply of honey to attract the flies. It would rather be at peace to consolidate its gains, to infiltrate another country, to let people forget the Hungarian massacre, to build up its economic strength.

It makes no difference to Communists what methods are used, as long as there is steady progress toward their ends. Sometimes force must be used. The true face of Communism was shown in 1956 when 40,000 Hungarians were killed and 200,000 others were forced to flee their homeland. The crime of the Hungarians was unforgivable; they wanted to run their own country.

THE RED APPEAL

Where do all the Communists come from? Why does anyone embrace such an obviously destructive menace to the human race? In order to gain disciples, the Red leaders preach paradise to hungry and downtrodden people They are adept at the use of beautiful words such as justice, freedom, abundance, equality—even though they never give these things.

Communists are masters at crying against abuses: the selfishness of the rich, injustice in the world, race prejudice, social snobbery.

Communism has a method for every occasion, a solution for every problem, a slogan for every cause.

Every American would benefit from reading a recent speech by Gen. C. P. Cabell, Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. At present, says General Cabell, the Soviets are engaged in a triple-threat attack on the free nations.

The most obvious form of the Soviet Union's attack is its use of military, political, diplomatic and economic weapons for its own ends. The second wing of the assault is a worldwide program of subversion (10,000 spies in the United States alone, our authorities say). The third way of securing their purpose lies in their use of Communist-front organizations in nearly all countries of the world. Our Attorney General's list contains the names of hundreds of these supposedly patriotic groups.

WHAT HE MEANS

Khrushchev, the disciple of Marx and Lenin and Stalin, will now show his smiling face to the people of the United States. We must remember that, more than anyone in the world, Khrushchev is communism. All the things said about the evil theory, its aims and methods, apply especially to this absolute dictator. We can endure the smiling face, if we can be sure that all Americans will look beneath the surface and see the soul blackened by teachery and mass murder.

Lest we think the smile might mean a new and enlightened Khrushchev, we would do well to think about these frequently quoted words of Dimitry Z. Manuilsky of the Lenin School of Political Warfare (1931):

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come. To win we shall need the element of surprise * * *. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record * * *. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist."

Khrushchev stated only recently that there are two alternatives facing us: Peaceful coexistence or the most destructive war in history. Besides his disarming grin, the Soviet ruler offers us a seductive word: coexistence. We will play into his hands if we fail to see the fraud of this tinsel word, coexistence.

Khrushchev believes that communism will be victorious in the end, of course. But he would have us think that the only sensible way, the only "sporting" way to achieve victory is by peaceful competition. The struggle between East and West, we are assured, should be kept in the realm of ideas.

Is it possible that anyone could believe him? Bullets, not ideas, killed millions of Ukrainians and Hungarians. Barbed wire, not ideas, keeps countless thousands in slave-labor camps all over Russia and satellite Europe. Ideas alone did not seize Tibet from its ruler's hands; ideas are not murdering in Laos now. Nor have ideas caused unspeakable suffering for the church in several countries.

Peace and coexistence are empty words as long as an evil and powerful enemy seeks to bring the world under its domination. These words mean nothing as long as millions are forced to bow to the rule of Communist masters.

Our true watchwords have been given by Allen Dulles, Director of Central Intelligence: "Our defense lies not in compromise but in understanding and firmness, in a strong and ready deterrent military power, in the marshaling of our economic assets with those of other free countries of the world to meet Communist methods of economic penetration, and finally in the unmasking of Communist subversion."

It was 40 years ago that Woodrow Wilson, appealing for ratification of the Versailles Treaty, spoke these courageous words against compromise: "So long as wrongs like (enslaving of peoples) exist in the world, you cannot bring permanent peace to the world. I go further than that. So long as wrongs of that sort exist, you ought not to bring permanent peace to the world, because those wrongs ought to be righted, and enslaved peoples ought to be free to right them."

Now, 40 years later, these wrongs exist more than ever in the history of mankind. We would have to turn deaf ears to the cries of millions of suffering human beings, abandon our Christian and American ideals, and be guilty of crass appeasement in order to accept Khrushchev's kind of peace.

What Khrushchev Really Wants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 5, an editorial of the Tablet of Brooklyn, N.Y., pointed out the probability that one of the motives of Khrushchev's visit is to secure credits and other forms of monetary assistance in the United States.

The editorial wisely points out that we must resist any move in this direction which could only serve to strengthen the Soviet Union and increase the strain on our own fiscal stability.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT KHRUSHCHEV REALLY WANTS

There has been a lot of emphasis in the official utterances on the forthcoming visits to be exchanged between Washington and Moscow, on the educational value of such travel, contacts with people in the United States of America and the U.S.S.R., their way of life, and so on. The discussion, favorable or unfavorable, in Congress, in weekly reviews and in the metropolitan and specialized press, has touched upon the possible agenda and the consequences that these exchanges and conferences may have.

It is surprising that no one has suggested that the primary objective of the Soviet regime in this business is to get vast credits from the Government of the United States, directly or indirectly. Anyone who has followed closely the events of the past few years is aware that next to the total and unconditional neutralization of Germany—on the model of the Austrian Peace Treaty—the Soviet Union has most urgently wanted easy and unimpeded contact with the major industrial nations.

Apart from the Czechs, there is no considerable community within the entire range of the Communist world which possess any substantial tradition of skilled artisan labor, that takes generations to develop. Without skilled artisans which central, western, and southern Europe have known for all the centuries when eastern Europe was still seething in tribal warfare, and still importing both skilled labor and the products of artisan skill, the Soviet Union cannot simultaneously organize the extractive and heavy fabricating industries and produce the wide range of consumers' goods that its people (particularly as they become more urbanized in consequence of their industrialization) will more and more incessantly demand.

Why not, therefore, come to terms with the U.S. Treasury, get large credits, establish trade on a reciprocal basis, provide a share in the economic expansion of the great "underdeevloped" areas under Soviet control for the "capitalists" of New York, Cleveland and elsewhere in the United States and in Great Britain (some of whom have been so active in trying to bring this very situation to pass)? After all, when the United States lifted the price of gold from $20.67 per ounce to $35, some 25 years ago, it contributed to transform the practically insolvent Soviet Union, almost overnight, into a prosperous customer with considerable purchasing power because of its gold production. Why should not the United States again step into the situation and help out, now when even the Soviet gold stock is not equal to the vast load it must assume in carrying out its role as distributor of both capital goods and consumer goods for more than a third of the population of the planet?

When the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund were set up at the Bretton Woods meting of 15 years ago, the Soviet Union did not see fit to enter them, despite the priminent part that Harry Dexter White and other friends of the U.S.S.R. had teken in bringing these institutions into being. In later years, there may have been a feeling in Moscow that this aloofness was a mistake. It is even possible that much of the Soviet animus toward Nationalist China arises from vexation that the latter steadfastly retains her very large subscription in these institutions, which the Communist Chinese and Soviet Union would doubtless love to divide betwen themselves. Membership in these institutions is almost as much a shortcut to the U.S. Treasury as a direct loan would be.

Congress has lately greatly increased the U.S. subscription in both institutions; our Federal debt statement discloses that just short of $2 billion in non-interest-bearing notes of no fixed maturity have now been made available to them. Possibly, when the annual meetings of the two institutions occur in Washington shortly after the Soviet First Minister has arrived there, we shall hear a chorus of loud welcome to the U.S.S.R. as a subscriber to their capital on a generous scale, in the interest of expanded trade between "peace loving peoples."

To our way of thinking, the greatest practical danger in the new policy lies precisely in the financial support, direct or indirect, which the United States is evidently on the verge of granting to the U.S.S.R. Even if it creates a new boon in "peace stocks" (in contrast to "war stocks") and stimulates something like full employment over the next year or two, this policy is inherently suicidal because it must end by committing this country to unconditional endorsement of the economy of the U.S.S.R., its way of life, its currency, and the rest, no matter how many reservations are uttered about "our capitalism" and "their communism." It can only end in the dollar moving down to the level of the ruble, and the interpenetration of the two systems of social, economic and political organization.

In addition to "Not Welcome" signs, let's ask Congress to post guards around our Treasury with signs reading "The U.S.S.R. is not coming in here."

Christianity—Private Enterprise—State Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, for the past decade, or longer, I have noticed an increasing interest on the part of the clergy in this country in economics, politics, and sociology.

A considerable segment of our Protestant ministers appear to be ready to replace our freedoms and our form of government with socialistic measures.

My attention was recently called to a publication entitled "Christian Economics." This most worthwhile publication is published by the Christian Freedom Foundation, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

Its basic philosophy is:

We stand for the free market—the economic system, with the least amount of government and the greatest amount of Christianity.

I am pleased and delighted to know that a publication of this character is available for circulation to the Protestant ministers in this country.

The following article by Rev. E. F. Molnar, Ph. D., is typical of this publication. Dr. Molnar's article is most timely in view of Mr. Khrushchev's impending visit to this country:

WHO SHOULD OWN CAPITAL?

(By Rev. E. F. Molnar, Ph. D., St. Luke's Presbyterian Church, Bathurst, New Brunswick)

Who should own the means of production? Private individuals or one single political party? That is the great debate of our generation.

If you believe that the people should own capital than you are for freedom. If you believe that a single political party should appropriate, in the form of a monopoly of production, all forms of property, lands, animals, factories, machines and money, then you have identified yourself with communism or socialism—the rule of a single political party.

Public opinion on this vital question affords an insight into the most carefully guarded secrets of the Communist Party—the growing belief of the Communists that the whole venture of communism is based on a blunder and promoted by bluff. Party members are beginning to sense that the monolithic monopoly of production enjoyed by the Communist Parties in Russia and other states cannot find the way from absolute tyranny—the rule of terror, the secret police, the concentration camps and liquidation of all dissenters—for a better world.

The writer questioned 100 people on each of the following propositions and with the results noted below. In each case the 100 persons represented all walks of life:

Should any single political party appropriate all forms of property, lands, animals, factories, labor, machines, and moneys? Yes, none. No, 94. Indifferent, 4. No opinion, 2.

Should people own capital, all forms of property, lands, animals, factories, labor, machines, and moneys? Yes, 96. No, none. Indifferent, 2. No answer, 2.

The overwhelming answer given to the first question shows that communism can never take over the central power by vote of the majority. People everywhere, even in Russia, are opposed to monopoly. The world has never before witnessed such a complete monopoly and such an absolute control of a nation's human and material resources. The Russian arch conspirators conjured up into real existence that fearful and fallacious type of big capital that devoured its own children and sets even the members of one family against each other.

The positive answer given to the second question shows the will of the people that capital should not be united under the ownership of one single party as in Russia.

The true issue that divides the people of the world in our present world crisis is one party-owned monopoly of production against peoples' free enterprise rooted in privately owned capital i.e., means of production. The Russian type of production can be upheld solely by terror while the production of the free world is anchored to the validity of law enacted by a majority vote.

By contrast, freemen owning property may set up a free government based on law which is quite capable of adaptation not only for maximum production but to safeguard the rights and privileges and promote the well-being of its citizens, leading on to their highest spiritual and material welfare.

The people everywhere should learn the plain truth about the fundamental issue of the present world crisis. Guns cannot decide the issue. It will be resolved when the truth is widely perceived. A government of law over a property-owning people can evolve as needed to promote their well-being, but a government of tyranny and monopoly of the means of production suppress human liberty and human welfare in order to maintain itself in power.

Deception and Misinformation in Private Power Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, one thing I always have admired about the private power lobby is the proficiency of its propaganda. But I could be wrong. Because it seems to me that its national propaganda campaign is getting a little stale, and when that happens it is likely to emit a bit of an odor, especially after it has been exposed as baloney in the first place. I have here an editorial which makes that exposure which I would like to submit for the RECORD. It was published in the Sacramento, Modesto, and Fresno Bees of August 30, 1959.

The Bee papers call this private power campaign willful misrepresentation which I think it is. The editorial challenges a recent advertisement in Time magazine by America's Independent Electric Light & Power Companies. I have another here from the Saturday Evening Post of August 8 which is likewise full of half truths—for example, it speaks only of public power costs, never of public power revenues which return to the people and help pay taxes to boot. This kind of advertising is more pernicious than it is proficient. It is becoming more and more distasteful. I do not think the majority of our people will swallow it.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Foes of Public Power Carry on a Campaign of Misinformation," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOES OF PUBLIC POWER CARRY ON A CAMPAIGN OF MISINFORMATION

A rank deception being perpetrated on the American public these days is the advertising campaign conducted against Federal public power in a national magazines by the privately own electric utilities.

The surprising thing is quite a few otherwise discerning people have fallen for the propaganda, hook, line and sinker, among recent examples being an editorial in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat.

Seldom have so many misstatements been made in so few words but this may be because the editorial simply retailed the misinformation in the advertisements put out by America's independent electric light and power companies.

One page ad in a recent issue of Time magazine depicts John Q. Public writing a check for Federal public power in the sum of $5,500 million, and says:

"Public power spending goes on because most people don't know they, themselves, are paying the cost."

Most people do not know it because they do not pay it.

The $5,500 million is hard to rationalize. The total bureau of reclamation investment in the United States is $3,500 million. This includes irrigation, flood control, navigation, municipal and industrial water, recreation and other benefits as well as power.

About 30 percent of the reclamation bill is allocated to power, or around $1 billion. Add TVA, add all the Army Corps of Engineers powerplants and you still are far under $5,500 million.

Seemingly the utility propagandists have taken the total cost of western water development and put it on the bill for public power, which if true would be willful misrepresentation.

All money invested in Federal public power projects is being repaid to the Treasury, plus 3 percent interest—and much more.

This and more is important. Take the Central Valley project. The total Central Valley project investment is $800 million. Of this, $319 million is allocated to power. But the repayment from power will be $416 million.

In other words, power is subsidizing irrigation and the other public benefits to the extent of $100 million.

The Press Democrat states:

"One thing your tax dollars have done is provide low rate tax free power to Sacramento."

The Sacramento municipal utility district will repay about half of the Central Valley project power investment, with interest. So maybe the Sacramento municipal utility district customers are the ones to complain they are subsidizing irrigation by about $50 million.

The Press Democrat further says the redwood empire has not received a single watt of Federal power. If that is a lament the reason may be found in the fact the redwood empire contented itself for years to electing as its Congressman HUBERT SCUDDER, who not only failed to seek water projects for his district but vigorously fought public power.

Neither the people of the redwood empire nor of Connecticut or any other State pay the cost of public power but profit from it.

A Bill To Promote World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, in our endeavors to promote world peace and assist underdeveloped, friendly countries, many ideas are expressed by many interested citizens.

Mr. D. T. Larson, Sr., of 809 14th Street, Berlin, Conn., has an idea which he has prepared in legislative draft. I believe it will bear study:

A BILL TO PROMOTE WORLD PEACE, TO RAISE STANDARDS OF LIVING AND COMBAT HUMAN HUNGER AMONG THE PEOPLES OF ALL NATIONS, AND TO FACILITATE INTERNATIONAL COMMERCE AND THE DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS COMMODITIES THROUGH A SYSTEM OF REGIONAL BANKS UNDER THE GENERAL COORDINATION OF A CENTRAL BARTER AND SURPLUS POOL

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the intention of the Congress and the purpose of this Act to promote world peace, raise standards of living, and combat human hunger throughout the world by providing an international market and a system of international trade and commerce for the sale or exchange of surplus agricultural commodities and other goods and commodities so that the peoples of the world who are in need of such goods and commodities can more readily obtain them from those possessing adequate or surplus supplies.

(b) The President shall administer the program established by this Act through the personnel and procedures established under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 or in such other manner as he may deem appropriate to insure the complete and efficient functioning of such program.

PART I—REGIONAL BANKS

SEC. 101. (a) In order to carry out the purpose of this Act, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out agreements with nations or organizations of nations to provide for the establishment of five regional banks for economic development whose operations will respectively cover North and South America, Europe, Africa, the Near East, and the Far East; except that the President, pursuant to negotiations with the nations involved and in accordance with such agreements, may take steps to provide such other division of geographical jurisdiction for such banks as he may deem appropriate.

(b) Each of the five regional banks created pursuant to subsection (a) shall have such powers and functions and operate through such procedures consistent with this Act as may be prescribed by the applicable agreement. Each such bank shall be separate and distinct from the other banks and shall be controlled exclusively (except as provided under part II of this Act) by the participating nations of the region involved plus the United States, in proportion to the respective investments of such nations in such bank.

SEC. 102. (a) It shall be the function of each regional bank to assist in promoting world peace, improving standards of living, combating human hunger, and facilitating trade and commerce in the region involved by assisting in the sale or exchange among the countries of that region and between such countries and those of other regions, in the manner provided in part II of this Act or in such other manner as may be appropriate, of surplus agricultural commodities and other goods and products.

(b) In carrying out the function described in subsection (a), each regional bank shall—

(1) assist each country in its region in the sale and exchange of goods and commodities by providing full information concerning the needs and available resources of the other countries of the region;

(2) assist such countries in the sale and exchange of goods and commodities which are in surplus supply in such countries;

(3) assist the countries of its region (in the manner provided in part II of this Act or in any other manner which may be appropriate) in the sale and exchange of goods and commodities in transactions involving countries outside such region;

(4) prepare and disseminate a code of standards for goods and commodities to be sold or exchanged under the program established by this Act;

(5) establish a program of insurance on and guaranties of goods and commodities to be sold, exchanged, transported, or stored under the program established by this Act;

(6) assist the countries of its region in making loans and exchanges of currency involving other countries in its region or (in the manner provided in part II of this Act or in such other manner as may be appropriate) countries of other regions; and

(7) take such other action as may be appropriate to achieve the purpose and objectives of this Act within its region.

Each regional bank shall impose a reasonable charge for its services rendered in connection with such functions, to the end that its operations will be self-sustaining and self-liquidating.

PART II—INTERCONTINENTAL MARKET PLACE

SEC. 201. (a) In order to further carry out the purpose of this Act, the President is authorized to negotiate and carry out an agreement or agreements with all other interested nations for the establishment of a central barter, surplus, and credit pool (hereinafter referred to as the "Intercontinental Market Place").

(b) It shall be the function of the Intercontinental Market Place to assist in achieving the purpose and objectives of this Act by coordinating the activities of the five regional banks established under part I and assisting them in the performance of their functions.

SEC. 202. (a) In carrying out the function described in section 201(b), the Intercontinental Market Place shall—

(1) assist the regional banks in sales and exchanges of goods and commodities between countries in different regions and subject to the jurisdiction of different banks;

(2) provide full information to the five regional banks and to other interested persons with respect to the location, availability, and cost of goods and commodities which may be available for such sale or exchange and with respect to areas where specific types of goods and commodities are needed and those where there is a surplus;

(3) make loans to any of the regional banks, secured by goods and commodities held under the program established by this Act, in amounts not exceeding 50 per centum of the value of the goods and commodities so held, provided that clear title thereto has been assigned to such bank;

(4) promote and assist in the exchange of local currency among the regional banks and the individual nations of the world to the maximum extent practicable;

(5) establish and maintain such accounting and related procedures as may be necessary or appropriate for the coordination and supervision of the regional banks; and

(6) take such other action as may be necessary or appropriate to coordinate the activities of the five regional banks and to insure that the purpose and objectives of this Act will be achieved as rapidly and effectively as possible.

The Intercontinental Market Place shall impose a reasonable charge for its services rendered in connection with the performance of such functions, to the end that its operations will be self-sustaining and self-liquidating.

SEC. 203. There shall be a Policy Board to provide advice and consultation in the administration of this Act and in the exercise by the Intercontinental Market Place of its functions. Each of the five regional banks shall be represented on such Board, and shall have a voice in the determination of the policies of the Intercontinental Market Place equivalent to its proportionate investment therein but in no event to exceed 40 per centum.

SEC. 204. In addition to its other functions under this part, the Intercontinental Market Place shall have authority to make loans and grants of food and other goods and commodities, on such terms and conditions as it deems appropriate, when necessary on account of crop failures or other emergencies in any part of the world; and it shall establish and maintain a reasonable reserve of goods and commodities for use in such emergencies in accordance with this section.

SEC. 205. From and after the execution of the agreement or agreements described in section 201(a), the Intercontinental Market Place shall accept, for sale, exchange, distribution, or other disposition in accordance with this Act and the agreements entered into hereunder, goods and commodities aggregating in value not more than $30,000,000,000.

Roseburg, Oreg., Plans To Build Modern Community on Shattered Rubble of Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, occasionally from the ashes of disaster there arises the phoenix of progress. On August 7, a tragic detonation of high explosives occurred in the city of Roseburg, Oreg., a leading lumber community with a population of 12,000. Some 13 people were killed and at least $10 million in property damage occurred. Many blocks were leveled and buildings destroyed.

Now, the people of Roseburg are determined to rebuild a series of modern, utilitarian structures in the area which was devastated by the blast. An outstanding western architect, Richard Neutra, of Los Angeles, is to assist Roseburg in this enterprise.

Because the Roseburg calamity has come to the attention of the Senate on

several occasions, I believe my colleagues will be interested in two articles appearing the Oregonian of Portland of September 8, 1959, which describe the far-sighted vision of the civic and governmental leaders of Roseburg, who are planning this modern city. The Senate already has taken cognizance of what occurred at Roseburg by passing S. 1606, a bill to tighten up and make more effective Interstate Commerce Commission regulations over the transportation of high explosives and radioactive materials in interstate commerce. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these articles from the Oregonian about a dynamic new city arising from the rubble of Roseburg, Oreg., be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The author of the articles is Ken David, able staff writer of the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Sept. 8, 1959]

PLANNERS HOLD KEY TO "NEW ROSEBURG"

(By Ken David)

A dramatic new city—dynamically modern, artistically exciting—may arise from the ashes and rubble of blast-shattered Roseburg.

Out of this southern Oregon community's disaster could emerge a showplace of the West.

This prospect is envisaged in plans brewing to engage world-renowned Architect Richard Neutra of Los Angeles, a man whose name has been synonymous for more than a quarter of a century with the new and the daring in architecture, as adviser and consultant in drafting a master plan for development of the area destroyed by the tragic August 7 explosion and designing the buildings which will replace those leveled in that disaster.

The idea to engage Neutra (pronounced Noytra) came from Francis W. Brown, Portland, editor of Western Building, a trade magazine.

LUMBER USE ADVISED

Brown, looking over the devastation in the wake of the detonation of 6 tons of explosives in downtown Roseburg, recommended that since Roseburg is one of the centers of the State's lumber industry, reconstruction of the buildings should employ "interesting and dramatic uses of lumber."

He took his idea to the wood promotion committee of the National Lumber Manufacturer's Association, meeting in San Francisco; Roseburg city officials, including City Manager John Warburton and City Planning Director Lyle Glenn, and lumbermen operating in the Roseburg area.

He suggested Neutra be engaged by the lumber industry, primarily local lumbermen, and his services offered to city officials, architects who will be employed to design new buildings, and the consultants hired by the city to draft a master plan for reconstruction.

He won favorable response and then took the idea to Neutra. The world-famous architect responded with enthusiasm and told Brown, Warburton, and Glenn he would be available for such an assignment in about 3 weeks, if the plans crystalized.

Neutra, who has helped cities the world around rebuild from devastation of war, flood, and earthquake, told the Oregonian Monday he contemplates that his role in the reconstruction of Roseburg, if the plans materialize, would be one of a guiding spirit.

He indicated he would enjoy taking part in a project that would demonstrate to the rest of the Nation that the people of Roseburg, stricken by disaster, could "pull themselves up by their own bootstraps without help from the Government" and bring a dramatic new city to life out of the disaster.

He emphasized that realization of this goal would mean that the businessmen of Roseburg must delay plans for rebuilding until an overall development plan is worked out.

Warburton and Rosenburg City Attorney Paul Geddes told the Oregonian that the businessmen of the community are cooperating with city officials in this respect.

PLANNING FIRM HIRED

City officials last Thursday employed the Seattle-Portland firm of Clark, Coleman & Associates to draft a master plan for development of the blast-shattered core business district. A preliminary plan is scheduled to be submitted to the city council in 30 to 60 days, Warburton said.

Within the eight-square-block area of total destruction the ruins still smolder, and an acrid stench clings in the air. But beyond this zone merchants and homeowners are busily removing the scars from the massive explosion which took 13 lives, injured more than 100 persons, and caused an estimated $10 million in property damage.

Brown believes that Neutra could create from the Roseburg disaster a business and industrial area that would win for this small southern Oregon lumber community a nationwide reputation that would benefit not only Roseburg but all of Oregon.

[From the Oregonian, Sept. 8, 1959]

ARCHITECT RICHARD NEUTRA ENTHUSIASTIC OVER CHANCE TO HELP REBUILD BLASTED ROSEBURG

"If you want to build a house for a polar bear, you must be interested in, even like, polar bears. If you want to build a house for humans you must understand and love them."

This is Richard Neutra's philosophy of architecture summed up by him for the Oregonian Monday from his office in Los Angeles.

Neutra, who has become a legend in his world of stone and steel, wood and concrete within his lifetime, may furnish the guiding spirit in the rebuilding of explosion-torn Roseburg if current plans materialize.

And Neutra is enthusiastic.

He indicated as much Monday to the Oregonian just before he left on a 3-week trip to Brazil as guest of the Brazilian President and to Venezuela to check on a couple of housing developments he is building in that country.

Citizens of Roseburg are rapidly recovering from the extensive property damage caused by the August 7 explosion of a truck laden with dynamite and other explosives.

Roseburg City Manager John Warburton said the master plan now being prepared will contemplate possible relocation of streets and utilities to gain the most and best uses of the land and the location of a new bridge across the North Umpqua River so it will blend into the development plan.

The State highway department has come up with a bridge location plan which is not completely satisfactory. The new bridge under this plan would cost about $2.7 million but would siphon traffic directly into the congested downtown area, Warburton said.

The sounds of hammers and saws fill the air all over Roseburg as homeowners and businessmen repair damage from the disaster.

SCHOOL PROJECT LARGEST

Insurance representatives said the number of properties damaged total about 2,500. They said insurance would cover about 60 percent of them. Dollarwise, the picture is less certain. Insurance agents figure 85 percent of the depreciated value of damaged and destroyed property was covered by insurance. How much replacement value was insurance covered seems to be anybody's guess now since no one knows yet what use will be made of the zone of completed destruction or what kinds of buildings will be constructed there.

Wendell Smith, school district business manager, said no final decision has been made on whether to rebuild or repair the Central Junior High School.

The school district was fortunate in its insurance—it was covered for replacement value. This will be the biggest single reconstruction project. A new building will cost an estimated $550,000. Repair of the Umpqua Hotel, second largest project, will cost an estimated $250,000 to $300,000.

LAND USE CONSIDERED

The blast wrecked an estimated $10 million of property in varying degrees. This dollar estimate of the results of the explosion does not include the loss to businesses interrupted nor the value of the 13 lives lost and the scores of persons injured.

Approximately 75 percent of the businesses closed after the blast of an explosives-laden truck shortly after 1 a.m. August 7 have been reopened wtih major repairs completed but with board still substituting for window glass in many cases.

Warburton said a group of businessmen is toying with the idea of buying up residential property in the zone of complete destruction and holding it for future industrial development. In most cases, he said, insurance will not cover the cost of rebuilding these homes and apartments, and purchase of the land by the businessmen would enable owners of these destroyed homes to rebuild outside of this essentially business and industrial area.

City officials have already rezoned this section of the city so a stricter fire code must be observed by builders. This may present some problems if plans materialize to develop an overall, harmonizing scheme for rebuilding the area to emphasize wood in construction.

Neutra said he thought agreement could be worked out for designs stressing dramatic uses of wood.

Brown said indications are now that Neutra will send one or two of his associates to Roseburg to confer with planners and city officials pending Neutra's return from his South American trip.

Neutra, who recently completed the U.S. embassy building in Karachi, Pakistan, has been honored throughout the world for his bold concepts in architecture. He has served on the California State Planning Board, and a secretary told the Oregonian he has been deeply interested during his career in city planning. He has won more than 50 awards in worldwide competition for commercial and residential designs, has won honorary doctorate degrees from several universities and has been made an honorary member of architectural associations of numerous foreign countries.

Conference Report on Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

SPEECH

OF

HON. GRAHAM A. BARDEN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 4, 1959

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the few brief comments which I am about to make on several sections of the bill,

which are in addition to those I have already made, will be helpful in clarifying legislative intent.

With reference to section 701(b), it is clearly intended that the regional directors in making any decisions or rulings pursuant to a delegation permitted by that section would be subject to and bound by the various precedents and rules and regulations established by the Board and, furthermore, an appeal to the Board is provided to prevent and/or remedy any abuse of discretion or departure from Board precedent or Board rules and regulations by the regional directors.

Section 501 imposes fiduciary responsibilities and obligations upon the officers, agents, shop stewards, and other representatives of a labor organization and provides that such persons occupy a position of trust in relation to such organization and its members. The McClellan committee recommendations on regulation and control of union funds specifically stated that:

> Since union dues moneys, as well as health and welfare funds, are in actuality a trust, being held for the members of the union by their officers, the committee feels that attention should be given to placing certain restrictions on the use of these funds, such as are now imposed on banks and other institutions which act as repositories and administrators for trust funds.
>
> This type of legislation, in the committee's opinion, would go a long way toward preventing wholesale misappropriation and misuse of union funds such as that disclosed by committee testimony.

Section 501 is intended to meet the needs, purposes, and objectives set forth in the McClellan committee recommendations which I have just quoted. The language of section 501 clearly and unmistakably carries out that intent.

The general principles stated in section 501 are familiar to the courts, both Federal and State, and therefore incorporate a large body of existing law applicable to trustees and a wide variety of agents. The purposes for which funds of a labor organization may be expended or invested will necessarily therefore, be restricted and limited by such existing law regardless of any provision in the constitution, bylaws or resolutions of a labor organization purporting to limit the application of such law.

Section 702 only restores the law with respect to voting of economic strikers to what it was prior to the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act of 1947, as amended, with the qualification, however, that after the expiration of 12 months after the commencement of the strike, economic strikers not eligible for reinstatement, would lose such right to vote as they may have had prior to the expiration of such 12-month period. Prior to 1947, the Board sometimes permitted either the strikers, the replacements, or both the strikers and replacements to vote depending upon all the circumstances. It is important to note that section 702 does not give employees engaged in an economic strike who are not entitled to reinstatement an unqualified right to vote. Rather this section provides that they shall be eligible to vote only under such regulations as the Board shall find are consistent with the purposes and provisions of this act and then only if the election is conducted within 12 months after the commencement of the strike.

Impressive evidence was presented to the labor committees of both Houses of Congress with respect to the devastating injury to the businesses of employers, the jobs of employees and the welfare of the public, which has often resulted from the blackmail organizational and recognition picketing activities engaged in by certain labor organizations.

The purpose of the proviso to paragraph (C) of section 704(c) which states that when such petition has been filed the Board shall forthwith direct an election, is to enable an employer or the employees to obtain a prompt election instead of having to go through an indefinite and prolonged period of picket line warfare which could have the effect of placing the employer's business and the jobs of his employees in jeopardy.

Such being the problem dealt with, it was not the intent that this proviso, which was added in conference, should be used as a device or subterfuge by a picketing union to bring about a prehearing or so-called quickie election.

Therefore, in all cases, it will be appropriate for the Board to investigate as to whether a labor organization is using the picketing as a device simply to bring about a prehearing election. Where the Board has reason to believe that this is the intent of the petitioning labor organization, the Board will be under a duty to direct the petitioner to follow the provisions of section 9(c)(1), and to afford the opportunity for a hearing. The right to a hearing is a sacred right and it should not be denied where such denial would lend support to a subterfuge.

Tribute to George Evan Roberts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOS. E. MARTIN

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, it is an honor, to have an opportunity to pay tribute to distinguished native sons of one's State. One such distinguished native son of my State of Iowa was George Evan Roberts, who in a lifetime that spanned the years from 1857 to 1948, made a name for himself first in Iowa as a newspaper publisher and later throughout the country as director of the U.S. Mint and one of the Nation's outstanding bankers.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to George Evan Roberts prepared by Mr. Homer C. Platt, vice president of the Delaware County, Iowa, Historical Society.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE EVAN ROBERTS

(By Homer C. Platt, vice president, Delaware County (Iowa) Historical Society)

Out of the past has come the present, and on it we build for the future.

The early adventurers who followed Columbus were largely motivated by personal greed and ambition. Their main objective was gold and silver; the history of the Spanish American colonies bears testimony to this spirit.

When Sir Francis Drake sailed from England in 1577 he was aware of the presence of gold in California, where 3 centuries later those gold fields were to lure the Forty-niners. But few of the Forty-niners became rich. Often they made only $10 for a week of back-breaking labor. Merchants, land speculators, gamblers—they were the ones who profited.

Meanwhile, discoveries of a far less spectacular nature were taking place within the area of northeastern Iowa; such as the discovery of great quantities of blue clay, produced by the weathering of the shale. In the deep valley cut by the rampaging Little Turkey River, the shale and clay were left exposed. Tests proved the excellent quality of this clay in making high-grade pottery wares.

Here it was that a young man named David Roberts arrived in 1857 and founded a pottery at Colesburg, Iowa. Here, also, was born a son who was destined to help shape the course of American political history.

George Evan Roberts, eldest son of David and Mary Harvey Roberts, was born on August 19, 1857, at Colesburg, Delaware County, Iowa. Exactly 1 century ago, in 1859, the family moved to Dubuque County, Iowa. David Roberts subsequently brought his family to Delaware County and resided for a time in Manchester, the county seat, where young George E. was employed as an apprentice in the Manchester Press printing shop, then owned and operated by H. L. Rann, Sr.

During the year 1873, the family took up its residence in Fort Dodge, Iowa, where George E. Roberts grew up. This was where, at the early age of 21, George Roberts became editor and publisher of the Fort Dodge Messenger, then as now a widely respected daily newspaper. He retained control of this paper until 1909, but during that period his ambition and his ability already were carrying him beyond the confines of the Fort Dodge area. From 1883 to 1889, he served as Iowa State Printer.

In 1898, George Roberts moved into the national scene with his appointment as Director of the Mint, an office he held until 1907 when he resigned to become president of the Commercial National Bank of Chicago. In 1910, he left the bank to return to the post of Director of the Mint, where he stayed until 1914 when he again resigned, this time to become assistant to the president of the National City Bank of New York. He moved steadily up the ladder of National City Bank officialdom until he became its top vice president, then retired from active business in 1931.

Throughout the latter part of the 19th century, a continuous debate was waged over various phases of the money question. Although exposed to all the "isms" of that era, George E. Roberts used his own good sense; meantime pursuing his studies along financial lines. Too, he inherited certain views of his father who was orthodox on the money question.

Again and again, George Roberts denounced the fallacy certain groups cling to: viz, that they can keep the price of their products or their services up, while the prices of other things are going down. Mr. Roberts denounced such attempts as unfair and unworkable.

"The whole situation," said he, "affords another demonstration that the basis of

sound economics is the moral law. In truth, the economic law and the moral law are one and the same."

It is the desire of this writer that the memory of George Evan Roberts be perpetuated in a manner benefiting our American tradition.

Report of the Commission on Civil Rights

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday, on September 9, 1959, each Member of Congress received a copy of the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, together with a smaller volume containing an abridgment of the substance of the report and the Commission's findings and recommendations. I hope every Member will read the Commission's findings and recommendations, and will also take the time to read extensively through the text of the whole report. It is a document that should be widely read by the people of this country, just as was the October 1947 report issued by President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights, which greatly helped make the entire country more aware of the gross discriminations perpetrated against millions of Americans solely because of their race, religion, or ancestry.

There has been much progress since 1947 in reducing these discriminations. Almost all of that progress has been through court decisions, actions of administrative agencies, and by voluntary actions of groups and individuals. I am disappointed that Congress has done almost nothing to fulfill its legislative responsibility to bring about a greater realization of our ideals of equality under the law. As the present Commission's report shows, an enormous amount of discrimination still remains.

Since I received the Commission's report, I have been examining it carefully. I am much impressed by its factual and legal analysis. It concentrates particularly upon the fields of voting, public education, and housing. These are very important in the life of our Nation, and as the report shows, they are full of problems of racial discrimination. I am sorry that the Commission did not also include in its report an analysis and findings concerning discrimination in employment. In a capitalistic society such as ours, economic discrimination is often the pit in which most other rights are lost. However, I realize that the Commission had scarcely 16 months in which to do its job, and I think it deserves great credit for making its good factual study in the fields of voting, public education, and housing.

This report should be of great value in bringing into sharper focus the facts of discrimination and inequality that still plague the Nation. It is especially significant that although three of the six members of the Commission are southerners who have in the past been closely identified with the maintenance of segregated patterns of life, many of the recommendations of the Commission were unanimous.

They unanimously affirmed that—

Many Americans, even today, are denied the franchise of race * * * through the creation of legal impediments, administrative obstacles, and positive discouragement engendered by fears of economic reprisal and physical harm.

They stated that—

It has become apparent that legislation presently on the books is inadequate to assure that all our qualified citizens shall enjoy the right to vote.

Their statement that "no one had yet been registered through the civil remedies of the 1957 act" points up how woefully inadequate the watered-down Civil Rights Act which Congress enacted in September 1957 has proven to be.

Their findings and recommendations concerning the widespread denials of the right to vote, a right which the Commission describes as "the cornerstone of the Republic, and the key to all other civil rights," certainly emphasize the urgency for congressional action on the bills now pending in Congress to give greater protection to this basic civil right.

The Commission's report contains much valuable material concerning the problems of desegregation in public education, and thus serves a useful function in presenting the facts to the public. However, I am somewhat disappointed at the meagerness of the Commission's recommendations for dealing with discrimination in public education. The problem of bringing the schools into compliance with the decisions of the Supreme Court deserves more than simply providing for additional collection of information and the mediation of disputes concerning proposed desegregation plans. Three of the Commissioners have frankly recognized that it is inconsistent for the Federal Government to grant financial assistance to institutions of higher education that practice racial discrimination, and recommended that Federal funds be withdrawn from such schools. A more positive program is embodied in the civil rights bills now pending in Congress, such as my bill H.R. 300, which would provide for necessary financial and technical aid and legal sanctions to assist in preventing or eliminating denials of constitutional rights to public education.

Even though some of the Commission's recommendations seem weak or inadequate, the Commission has certainly performed a valuable public service in presenting a comprehensive and factual analysis of the present status of racial discrimination in the dynamic fields of voting, public education, and housing. I therefore urge everyone who is interested in the welfare of our country to study the Commission's report, and I hope that it will lend a sense of urgency for the enactment of at least some of the pending civil rights bills.

We have had ample study of the problems and the proposals. Now we need legislative action. America cannot afford to fiddle and dawdle any longer with the burning issues raised by the continued denials of equality and justice under law.

A Tribute to Goldie Graham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Joseph (Goldie) Graham, who passed away recently, was a much beloved friend of thousands, who remember him not only as the high school coach, but as a sunny, friendly man. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Bill Shefski, entitled "A Tribute to Goldie," which was published in the Daily News, Philadelphia, Pa., on September 5, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A TRIBUTE TO GOLDIE
(By Bill Shefski)

Joseph "Goldie" Graham was more than just a coach to be interviewed to me. My association with him begin 11 years ago when I was a 101-pound quarterback in the Pop Warner conference and it continued as a Roman junior varsity player for 1 year, as a South Catholic opponent for 2 years, and, finally, in my present sportswriting capacity. I hope this humble work will describe the impression he left on me:

IN MEMORIAM: A SMILE PERPETUATED

"There is something about a smile;
It will brighten most any gloom.
And whether Roman won or lost
Goldie's lit the dressing room.

"Some smiles sparkle like diamonds;
others obscure hidden truths.
Goldie's glistened like sunlight
despite fumbles and other goofs.

"Compared to some of his players,
Goldie seemed almost too small.
But to Katcavage, Glasscott, and Kahana
His spirit made him 10-feet tall.

"His 44 years matched his nickname;
For he gave a smile to us all.
Though some coaches have greater records.
Goldie's '47 champs rate top call.

"Chiodetti dashing off tackle.
Bob Evans opening a hole.
That team has never been equaled,
When it comes to crossing a goal.

"Touchdowns meant a lot to Goldie;
After all, he wanted to win.
Though no more titles were due him,
Still his players were treated like him.

"Roman kids did have their hardships;
A trolly ride before each drill.
After class the trip was tiring,
'Till that smile at the field named Cahill.

"Cahill surely will seem lonely now;
Ask John Hoban, if you care.

'Bring me the line, John' is missing
And that smile just isn't there.
His loss hits not only Roman;
Somehow the league's not the same.
'Cause Goldie was quite a tradition,
Like Thanksgiving and the big game.

"Goldie was not a Knute Rockne;
No national fame had he won.
But privileged are we who knew him.
And sad are we that he's gone."

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Death of Great Shelburne Benefactor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to include the following interesting article from the Greenfield (Mass.) Recorder-Gazette concerning the 100th anniversary of the death of one of our region's greatest early benefactors, Ira Arms of Shelburne, Mass.:

SHELBURNE MARKS 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ARMS' DEATH

SHELBURNE FALLS.—Today marks the 100th anniversary of the death of Ira Arms, Shelburne farmer, whose benefactions established Arms Academy, Arms Cemetery and Arms Library.

Arms was born in Greenfield on May 14 or 15, 1783, and died here September 9, 1859. He spent part of his life in Shelburne in the house now owned by John Friend, and also in Buckland on the site of Walter Legate's house on State Street. His last years were passed in the Thaddeus Merrill house south of the Congregational Church here.

A Mason and a Congregationalist, Arms served in the house of representatives in 1830, 1832, 1835, and 1838.

Though personally opposed to mixing politics, schools, and religion, he was induced to include a clause in his will requiring the school he intended to have built to use only orthodox Congregationalists as trustees. This clause prevented the building of the school as a public institution. It was about 20 years after his death before Arms Academy, a private institution, was built. By that time the fund of $20,000 had reached $50,000, largely through the sale of land owned by Arms on Severance Street, which he had given, with the money, as a site for the school. The school graduated its first class in 1882. It was made a high school in 1895, the town renting the building and managing it through the school committee.

Arms also gave $1,000 and a plot of land on the Buckland side of the river for a cemetery. Because the Buckland site seemed a poor location, land for the present Arms Cemetery was purchased and laid out.

His wife, Sophia, died in 1848, and an adopted daughter, Isabelle G. Newton, died in 1853, at the age of 20. Included in his will were bequests of $5,000 for Arms Library, $5,000 for the Shelburne Falls Congregational Society and $500 for the Shelburne Center Congregational Church.

Arms' life was summed up by Zebulon Piske in a speech at the Shelburne centennial exercises as follows:

"His sympathies were always with the common people and for their welfare. No attractions of wealth or fashion or rank could ever withdraw them. With them he associated and as familiarly with the laborer as the capitalist. A pattern of industry, he loved labor. He never sought an unfair advantage, never drove a hard bargain, and as a point of honor, would never receive in any way more than legal interest. He never overvalued his services. Though often called to represent his town in the legislature, he never retained his full pay, but paid into the town treasury for the benefit of the schools a generous portion, as wages not earned, and that too when sessions were short, and pay per diem low compared with those of modern time."

Miss Ruth Hillis, Corpus Christi, Tex., YWCA Worker, Carried American Friendship to Our Good Neighbors in South America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Americans are rightly concerned with the image they present to the other peoples of the world. It is vital that we live in an atmosphere of peaceful cooperation with our neighbors if we are to survive.

People such as Miss Ruth Hillis, new executive director of the Corpus Christi, Tex., Young Women's Christian Association, have helped that image abroad to be a good one. Her work in Brazil, in helping organize the YWCA there, proved we are willing to work with our friends in South America and elsewhere that we may mutually benefit from the exchange of ideas and culture.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Joanne Townsend published in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times for Sunday, August 30, 1959, and entitled "Miss Ruth Hillis, New Director, Organized YWCA in Brazil."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISS RUTH HILLIS, NEW DIRECTOR, ORGANIZED YWCA IN BRAZIL

(By Joanne Townsend)

About the same time Corpus Christians were forming a YWCA here, 13 years ago, Miss Ruth Hillis was busy in Recife, Brazil, organizing one there, the second in that country.

With her many years of experience with the YWCA include more than 20 years in Brazil, Miss Hillis will begin her job here Tuesday as executive director of the YWCA.

"I think I'm going to like it here very much. The YWCA seems so well organized and productive. And too, the weather is not too unlike that of Brazil, where I lived until last year," the tall attractive Oklahoman said.

Born in Oklahoma City, Miss Hillis has followed a variety of means of helping others.

Between her junior and senior year at Asbury College in Wilmore, Ky., she taught in the hill country and after she received her degree in Spanish and education, she taught in the two Indian camps and did substitute teaching.

"I did a lot of things in those 2 years between getting my bachelors and beginning my masters. Those were the depression years."

After she completed her master's degree in religious education at Scarrit College in Nashville, Tenn., she did graduate work at Union Seminary in New York. She accepted a job as a social worker missionary in the Methodist Church in Rio de Janeiro.

"I was registered at Columbia University for a doctorate, but I went to Brazil instead," she said.

Although she had majored in Spanish, she had to learn Portuguese, the language of Brazil. Because of her background in Spanish, however, she passed her 3-year examination in 6 months.

Although there was a large American colony there, Miss Hillis was among native Brazilians most of the time.

After 5½ years as a social worker, she went to a mission and organized a home economics department and then was assistant director of a USO.

During the war years, she worked with this group, from helping to start new USO's to being in charge of the food.

Following the war, she accepted a job with the YWCA in Rio and after several months she moved to Recife to begin the country's second YWCA.

A new building was inaugurated in 1956 and within a year, they had outgrown it. Another was finished in 1958. Nearly all of the funds were raised by the people.

One of the most significant things she organized was a children's club, which are quite common in our country, but completely new to Brazilians.

The children, ranging from 5 to 11 years of age, were taught handcrafts, attended day camps, and worked on fiestas.

In the 20 years she was in Brazil, Miss Hillis came home seven times. Each visit was filled with speaking engagements, visits, and plans to return to the country she felt was like home.

"When I felt my work at the YWCA was finished, I decided to come back to the States. I took a job in Akron, Ohio, as associate director of the YWCA because I wanted to get used to the American ways again," she said.

When she was considering the job here, the Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce sent her loads of information on south Texas.

"They certainly did a good job of helping me decide. And when a friend who works for an insurance company had an opportunity to transfer to Harlingen, I felt like a native telling her all about it," she said with a smile.

"I chose Corpus Christi because I thought it would be like Brazil and because I will have a chance to work with Latin American people. And because it's integrated," she said.

Many of the small mementos from South America are used in her apartment at 711 South Broadway.

"Once I get established at the YWCA, I hope to become active in other activities, but right now I want to concentrate on learning more about the YWCA."

Income Tax Deductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues in the House a bill I introduced today to allow our taxpayers a deduction for income tax purposes for all charges levied by a municipality, county or other local government. The term "charges" refers to any tax, special assessment, fee, or other service charges which is established and imposed by the local government for the performance of a service or the provision of a local improvement, which the taxpayer has no option to reject. These public services include sewage disposal, water, garbage-trash collection, utilities, recreation, roadbuilding, welfare, and

other services deemed necessary or desirable.

The need for consideration of such legislation was called to my attention by a very active civic group in my congressional district. The Opa-locka (Fla.) Civic Improvement League conducted a survey of 114 cities located in 44 States to determine what services they were providing their residents and the methods used in financing the services. Results of the survey showed some cities finance public services through general revenue collections; others by imposition of service charges for the individual items; others by a combination of both methods. In all cases, there is a wide variance in the rate of taxation or assessment; one thing they all have in common: the charge is imposed by the local government, the taxpayer having no option to reject it.

Under existing law, taxes paid which tend to increase the value of the property assessed are not deductible from income tax. On the other hand, taxes paid directly under the classification of "real property taxes"—which in some cities support all or most of the public services—are tax deductible. Therefore, in those communities where the real-property tax is substantial and there is little or no use made of the so-called service charge, fee, or assessment, the taxpayers residing therein enjoy a tax deduction for these payments. In other communities where the tax rate on real property is low and the revenue to finance public services is collected through individual service charges or fees, these residents are not allowed such a tax advantage on the theory that such taxes tend to increase the value of the property assessed. This policy penalizes the citizens of those communities where the local government is forced to levy these service charges and assessments in order to equitably distribute the cost of municipal services and public improvements.

I submit the basic theory for discriminating between these two types of charges is unrealistic and outmoded. We have witnessed in the last 20 years a tremendous mushrooming of our communities with the resultant demand for more and better roads, hospitals, sewage systems, water-supply facilities, and the like. With the wide range of revenue sources already tapped by the Federal Government, local governments are hard-pressed for taxing sources with which to provide and support such services. The service-charge method therefore has been gaining in popularity, as a means to furnish necessary and needed services and improvements.

In the interest of being fair and treating all taxpayers equitably, I feel it should make no difference to the Federal Government whether or not local service and improvements are financed under the general taxation method or the special taxation method.

Congress took a step in this direction when the law was amended in 1954 to allow a deduction for taxes assessed by special districts for debt retirement and capital purposes. To be deductible, the assessment must be levied annually at a uniform rate on the same assessed value of real property in the district, including improvements, as is used for purposes of the real property tax generally. Deduction was also allowed for the amount of local taxes properly allocable to maintenance or interest charges.

With the tremendous variance in the rate of taxation or assessment and with the different methods of collection in common use, I feel the Congress should seriously consider this legislation making all charges imposed by municipalities tax deductible. Then it will be up to each local government to collect for these functions in the manner best suited to its own individual situation.

I introduced this bill today in the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will request the appropriate governmental reports on this question and that all individuals and groups who share an interest in it, will participate in the consideration of it. The bill and this statement in support of it are necessarily broad and I would expect more definitive amendments would be made to it after consideration by the committee. While it is expected that the Treasury Department will once again voice its opposition to the bill because of the anticipated loss of revenue, I feel that justice to all taxpayers and the interest that this Government certainly has in the development of our communities will far outweigh any such objection.

Matt Dillon, U.S. Marshal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I have received from George R. Bainum, of Topeka, Kans., under date of August 25, 1959, with reference to Matt Dillon, U.S. marshal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., *August 25, 1959.*

Re Matt Dillon, U.S. marshal.

The Honorable ANDREW SCHOEPPEL,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHOEPPEL: I have read and heard the uneducated comments of the local press, radio, and television reporters concerning your comments about our next most famous Kansan. These people blindly are saying he is a myth, there never was a real Matt Dillon. How wrong they are.

There are people in Kansas who also say the Jayhawk is a myth, but any real Kansan knows better indeed. We see the works of the great Kansas bird around us every day just the same as we see that which was accomplished by Matt Dillon. Yes, Matt Dillon, the marshal of Dodge City, Wichita, Atchison, Cimarron, Fort Scott, Abilene, LeCompton, or any Kansas town wherever a lawman once drew his trusty gun with which he brought that strange element called law and order to our early Kansas. Matt Dillon is every man who ever paid an installment on our civilization as it is today, with his life. Matt Dillon came to Kansas slowly, but eventually and after much blood, sweat, and tears, he was all over Kansas at once. Matt Dillon was short and he was tall, he was fat and he was skinny, dependent, of course, on how you looked at him. He used every kind of weapon ever made, and was good with them. Under the name of Jimmie Jabara, Matt flew jets, and under the name of Glenn Cunningham and Wes Sante, he was a whiz at track. Under the name of Dwight D. Eisenhower he went to the White House. He was Walter Chrysler, Carrie Nation, Wyatt Erp, and many others rolled into one. Matt Dillon was and is Kansas.

Would any committee of the Congress dare go to Minnesota and say Paul Bunyon was a figment of the imagination, or go to Atlanta, Ga., and say General Sherman after all was a fine gentleman, or to Alaska and laugh at Sourdough Joe? I very much doubt it.

Perhaps Matt Dillon did spring from the pen of a television writer, or maybe he did follow the wagon trains to the West. Really, though, who cares, because he certainly has been here and still is here, and I am glad you corrected a glaring deficiency by at last recognizing Matt in the U.S. Senate. Matt Dillon is Kansas, you, me; all of us as one.

Who cares whether Matt Dillon was cited by error or not? The important thing is he has at last been recognized. Keep up the good work, and don't let anyone back you down.

Very best regards.

Sincerely,

GEORGE R. BAINUM.

Monetary Gimmicks Are No Substitute for Fiscal Integrity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, in the last three decades the United States has spent itself into a position of impending financial crisis. That crisis is inevitable only if we disregard the warning signs, continue the mistakes of the past 30 years, and refuse to deal forthrightly with our Nation's fiscal affairs.

The record of the past 30 years indicates that despite unprecedented tax burdens we have spent more than our income so that the public indebtedness has increased 17-fold from $16.8 billion in 1931 to upwards of $290 billion at the present time. In the last 30 years the Federal Government has had annual budgetary deficits in 25 years, or 83 percent of the time, ranging from the smallest annual deficit of $462 million up to $54 billion. It is not being a Cassandra to say that if we continue in the next 5 years the mistakes we have made in the past 30 years, we will be inviting inflation, retarding economic growth, and possibly bringing about the destruction of our free enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has said that matters

dealing with debt management are the most important legislative issues to come before the Congress in the current session. The President was not crying, "Wolf"; he was not advocating a resort to fiscal gimmicks. He was admonishing the Nation that we must face the fiscal and economic facts with realistic determination to put our house in order. The simple truths are: we cannot spend ourselves rich; we cannot pay today's bills with tomorrow's taxes; we cannot solve anything with fiscal quackery; we cannot repeal basic economic laws even if we were willing to accept totalitarian regimentation; we must govern ourselves with fiscal rhyme and monetary reason.

Mr. Speaker, I recently noticed in the RECORD that one of my distinguished colleagues was advocating what I regard as the gimmick approach to dealing with our Nation's fiscal affairs. It was alleged by this colleague that it was the administration that had raised the interest rates, and that it was the administration that had imposed higher interest rates, not only on the American people, but also on the other nations of the free world. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that my distinguished colleague was wrong in his ascribed reasons for rising interest rates, wrong in his analysis of their effect, and wrong in his proposed solution.

Mr. Speaker, this colleague stated that all that was necessary to enable the Treasury Department to sell Government bonds at 4¼ percent or less was for the administration simply to reduce interest rates. He implied that this could be done by requiring the Federal Reserve to support the Government bond market. This would mean that the Federal Reserve would stand ready, as it did for the 9 inflation-ridden years ending in 1951, to buy all Government bonds offered by holders, presumably at par.

Let us look at the plan proposed by this gimmick advocate so that it can be seen for exactly what it is—an inflation-spawning monster.

The active money supply of this country is now about $140 billion. Moreover, about $140 billion of marketable Government securities are held by private investors. What my colleague is advocating, then, is that the Federal Reserve adopt policies that could almost immediately add this additional $140 billion or so to the existing money supply. Because, if any investor, at any time and regardless of conditions, could convert his marketable Government securities into cash at par, these securities would in fact be the equivalent of money.

It does not take an expert in economic theory to realize the disastrous consequences of a doubling of the money supply in a short time. We would be doubling the flow of money to purchase available goods and services. This would have a major impact on the cost of living and would destroy meaningful economic growth. With the economy already operating at a very high level, the only possible result would be galloping inflation. This would inevitably be followed by a financial crisis involving wholesale redemptions of savings bonds—of which more than $50 billion are outstanding—and determined efforts by people both here and abroad to get rid of dollars so as to purchase property, gold, other currencies—anything that appeared safe.

This is not the whole story—my colleague who advocates that the Federal Reserve should peg the Government bond market understands full well that when the Federal Reserve buys $1 of Government securities, the purchase provides the basis for a $6 expansion in bank deposits and the money supply. So what we have here is the advocacy of a plan that could promote new money creation with a vengeance, along with the crippling inflation that would be sure to follow.

Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for us to call a spade a spade. To promise to all private holders of Government securities that they can always get dollar for dollar for their securities is tantamount to financing the Government's requirements by cranking up the printing press and issuing greenbacks. Why bother to issue securities in the first place. If they are to be freely convertible into cash? Why not save the cost of printing the securities by taking the direct step of printing the money?

The advocates of Federal Reserve Board support of Government bond prices point out that we had Federal Reserve support prior to 1951 and claim that things did not turn out badly then. Wholesale prices doubled during that period. I wouldn't call that an exactly happy development. It is true that during part of that time our Nation was at war but the primary fault for the inflation was the manner in which we financed the war—too much money creation, too much reliance on Federal Reserve support of the Government's securities market, too much of exactly the same type of policies that my colleague is advocating today, in a period of peace and prosperity.

My colleague who was speaking in the well of the House the other day went on to say that the so-called high interest rate policies in this country have brought about high interest rates abroad. Germany was mentioned as an example. I don't believe that any one could convince the German people—especially the older generation—which recalls the disastrous inflation of the 1920's—that sound money, even if it means high interest rates, is to be avoided. The German people know what inflation means and what it can do. They know that it wiped out their savings, paralyzed their industry, and provided the basis for a rise to power of one of the most ruthless dictatorships this world has ever known. And they know too that their phenomenal economic gain since the end of World War II could not have been possible without the discipline of sound money.

These people abroad—the Germans, the French, and many others—have learned from bitter experience that you cannot compromise with inflation. They are now showing that they are willing to accept the disciplines that are essential if integrity of their currencies is to be maintained. And they realize full well that a central bank is not a toy to be used for money creation at the whim of the easy money inflationists. Instead, the central bank must be a responsible institution that is devoted first, last, and always to the true economic well-being of all the people.

Mr. Speaker, if these advocates of printing press money and Federal Reserve Government financing want inflation, if they want a managed economy with governmental regimentation, if they want to destroy the value of the dollar, let them advocate such a position without posing in the posture of one who has an easy solution to a grave and serious national problem. In that way the American people will be able to decide what course our Nation should take—the road to inflationary disaster or the road to fiscal discipline through paying our own way.

Improving Our National Parks: Padre Island Seashore Area Should Be Added

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the population of the United States and the world is increasing rapidly.

Changing Times magazine said in the August issue:

> Every time your watch ticks off a minute, world population increases by 85 people. * * * U.S. families are doing their part. For every 100 families in 1940, there are about 135 today. Some of the reasons: more couples live to celebrate their golden wedding anniversary; there are more remarriages; economic conditions are better; and fewer people stay single.

As the population rises, our Nation must keep apace with the needs of the increasing number of people. These needs include our national park system.

And a needed addition to the system is the creation a national seashore area on Padre Island, Tex. This fine, almost completely undeveloped beach on the shore of the Gulf of Mexico between Corpus Christi and Brownsville has the rich potential of becoming an outstanding winter playground for the Nation. The popularity of the Cape Hatteras facilities speaks loudly for this type of area.

The establishment of a national seashore area would preserve this beach in its primitive form. Yet, just beneath its sands—surrounded by salt water—is a reservoir of fresh water which would prove invaluable.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald for Wednesday, September 9, 1959, entitled "Improving Our National Parks," and an article by Dr. J. A. Hockaday, mayor of Port Isabel, Tex., published in the Port Isabel Press for Friday, September 4, 1959, and entitled

"Now Dig This, Water in Sufficient Amount for Seashore Park Area on Padre Island."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Times Herald, Sept. 9, 1959]

IMPROVING OUR NATIONAL PARKS

Since July of 1956 the Interior Department has been waging a concerted program to improve the national park system. Returning vacationers are, many of them, in position to say whether results of the program are noticeable.

The Interior Department itself says the park system is in the best shape it has ever been in. Through June 30, under the Mission 66 improvement program, as it is called, nearly 2,000 construction projects costing nearly $100 million have been completed. Another 710 projects to cost $59,083,000 were under construction or committed for construction as of June 30.

Aim is to make these recreational meccas capable of handling 80 million visitors annually by 1966. Probably this is no overestimate of the need. Some taxpayers may believe, however, that with essential Government costs at an alltime high, park improvement is one of the things that could be put off until later.

But undoubtedly, our national parks make an important contribution to the health of the citizenry. As the Nation's life becomes more complex such outdoor refuges will increase in value. Likely we are a long way from being too poor to afford to keep up these splendid assets and to make them adequate for our expanding population.

[From the Port Isabel (Tex.) Press, Sept. 4, 1959]

WATER IN SUFFICIENT AMOUNT FOR SEASHORE PARK AREA ON PADRE ISLAND

(By J. A. Hockaday)

Certain physical factors concerning Padre Island and Port Isabel and other adjacent islands along our coast has long remained a mystery to many. The presence of ground water at these points has been known for many years but why it existed has never been satisfactorily explained to the rank and file of our population. In the old days of Point Isabel fresh water was looked upon as manna from heaven by the local population; without it we could not have lived as a community in this area of long periods of limited rainfall. No one then living in Point Isabel or upon Padre Island could satisfactorily explain why one could sink a well to a depth several feet below sea level and draw from it a bountiful supply of sweet water of a potable quality.

Point Isabel was and still is in fact, an island and not a peninsula as its name implies. For almost a century and a half Point Isabel existed as a village of several hundred population. With the exception of a small amount of rainwater, caught and impounded in cisterns, man and beast depended upon ground water for existence long before any form of municipal water supply was available, e.g., before 1928. Point Isabel was a substantial village as early as 1800 and was a thriving community for half a century from 1850 to 1904. A portion of this period from 1870 to 1904, known as the golden age of our early history, there was great activity at this point when merchandise to the value of over $4 million per month passed through our portals and we maintained a population of almost 1,000 persons, and many animals, who depended almost entirely upon ground water.

Wild animal life existed upon Padre Island long before it was first seen by the Spaniards and the cattle industry thrived there for many years, quenching their thirst from the ground waters of the island and at times small lakes during heavy rainfall. Thousands of cattle waxed fat on the rough vegetation upon the island, with no water for their subsistence except the ground water of the island.

The story of the tenderfoot whose car became stalled about midway of the island and who attempted to walk back to the southern tip of Padre on a hot summer day, a distance of approximately 45 miles, is worth relating. He became exhausted, sunburned, and almost famished from thirst. He lay down to die, thinking his end was near, when he was approached by one of Pat Dunn's "bacheros." He told of his thirst and related his impending doom for lack of water. The cowboy dismounted, stepped a few yards back from the beach and with a clamshell dug a hole in the sand about 2 feet in depth which promptly filled to several inches of good, sweet water and handed the distressed stranger the clamshell and told him to drink his fill. To die of thirst on Padre Island while standing or walking over thousands of gallons of sweet water not more than 2 feet before his footsteps implies an example of ignorance to the nth degree, but it could well happen to anyone, unfamiliar with the area and not knowing that beneath the surface of the island is stored a bountiful supply of good, sweet water.

As in all things, "street corner engineers" had an explanation for the presence of ground water in this locality, but like all curbstone philosophers, they seldom come even remotely close to the correct answer. The most accepted theory formulated by them being that a substrata of clay, impervious to water held the rainfall that seeped into the soil, like an earthen vessel, thus separating the fresh rainwater from the sea water that lay beneath the clay. This condition actually exists in some limited areas. However, borings made at Port Isabel and upon Padre Island in those localities where the most abundant water is to be found, show this deduction does not apply.

The recent coming into the limelight nationally of Padre Island, the causeways at each end, its development at the north and south tips of the long narrow island which stretches for 90 miles along the Texas coast and the proposal that the middle section of Padre be made into a national park focuses attention upon its physical characteristics. The availability of a domestic water supply becomes an almost insurmountable factor in the middle reaches of this long, narrow strip of sand dunes, where even the installation and operation of a salt water conversion plant would become an expensive operation. The availability of a supply of good fresh water close at hand becomes of increasing importance, even though such a supply is limited.

It has long been known that fresh water does exist on many small sandy islands completely surrounded by sea water in a surprising amount. The reason for such a condition was explained and published as early as 1887, by a Dutch engineer by the name of Badon Ghyben, and later Bauret Von Herzberg, a German engineer, working independently of Ghyben, published the same proof in 1900. Neither of these studies were accepted by the engineering profession outside of Holland and Germany until recently. Later research into the physical properties of waters of different density developed the law of equilibrium between fresh and sea water which became known as the theory of Herzberg in recognition of the work of this famous engineer and scholar.

In 1925, the U.S. Department of the Interior, published Water Supply Paper No. 537, by John S. Brown, "A Study of Coastal Ground Water." This information is available at a few cents cost from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. This pamphlet of 100 pages explains the physical phenonomen in simple terms, adequately illustrated. The theory of Herzberg applies principally to small islands and narrow land masses made up of freely previous material, especially sand. Small cores of clay, gravel, or shell may exist but do not interfere with this phenomenon.

As rain falls upon sandy islands there is little if any runoff, but the rainwater soaks into the island soil or sand. It does not mix with the sea water in the absence of agitation. Due to its lesser density it lies as a lenz upon the top of the subsurface sea water depressing and displacing the water of greater density, sometimes to a depth of over 200 feet, below the mean sea level, in areas of heavy rainfall. Above sea level the fresh water lays as a convex lenz but to a lesser degree. The higher the land mass the greater the thickness of this lenz of fresh water.

The following illustration shows this condition as it exists on the island of Norderney, Germany. Showing the application of the Herzberg theory, taken from the Department of Interior pamphlet on island ground water. It is common knowledge that this same condition exists on Padre Island and in most of the area of Port Isabel but few realize the physical properties that accounts for this condition. However, it only exists in that portion of Port Isabel where the soil is sandy, chiefly south of the railroad and in the area near the Delhi-Taylor Refinery. It was near the northwest boundary of the refinery property, in an area known by the Spanish word "Palangana" that the city of Port Isabel obtained most of its domestic water in our early years. The water from this area being more desirable due to a minimum of contamination and more palatable. Nearby is now the sewage disposal plant of Port Isabel's recently constructed sanitary sewage project. Progress has again destroyed another of old Port Isabel's early landmarks—the Palangana Wells.

The recent heavy rainfall that raised the water table in south Port Isabel, damaging our paved streets is simply the operation of the theory of Herzberg. In some areas the water table came to within a few inches of the surface where the elevation of the land was from 8 to 10 feet above sea level. By the elimination of the enormous volume of septic tank effluent, with the connection of all buildings to the sanitary sewer system, this elevated water table should be reduced in the event of a similar wet season. At least the soil will not become too heavily contaminated. The only remedy appears to be the installation of an expensive subsurface drainage system which Port Isabel cannot afford at this time. There is a ray of hope that some of the funds that will be available from the urban renewal project, may be diverted for this purpose, in the more critical areas of south Port Isabel.

In the inhabited portions of Padre Island and Port Isabel with no sewer system the increased effluent offsets much of the natural evaporation. This contaminated effluent of fresh water makes it impractical for any domestic use of our ground water. However, in the expansive undeveloped area of Padre Island, free from contamination, this enormous underground storage of water could probably be utilized for any moderate demand. Much of the time this water would conform to the U.S. Public Health standard of less than 1,000 parts per million of solids. The solids or minerals contained therein would be chiefly sodium chloride or table salt and esentially free from boron, alkali, etc., found in the inland ground waters of the valley.

Imports and Our Domestic Mass Production Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, within the past few years the foreign commerce of the United States has undergone revolutionary changes of vast long-range significance to this Nation and every citizen in it. Yet, so far, only a few isolated voices have been raised to point out the tremendous problems created by this transformation in our trade.

For the first time, the emphasis in our import trade has shifted to manufactured goods produced in mass volume by some of the largest domestic industries. Automobiles are a prime example; steel is another; electrical appliances and office equipment are others.

These great mass-production industries, providing employment for hundreds of thousands of workers, are those to which the Nation will look first to provide jobs for our expanding population. In the next 10 years, our economy must create employment for 10 million to 15 million more Americans. This can only be accomplished if our largest industries set the pace for economic expansion.

However, in many instances, it is these very industries which now confront intensified competition from abroad, not only in the U.S. market but in export markets the world over. Under these conditions, can we reasonably expect industrial expansion to keep pace with the job requirements of our growing population?

American taxpayers, under decisions and commitments made by their Government representatives, have pumped tens of billions of dollars in economies abroad. The unprecedented generosity of the American people has restored the world economy, raising standards of living to new heights, opening new vistas of opportunity and prosperity to free peoples everywhere.

No thoughtful American will begrudge the fact that our friends abroad have never had it so good. As citizens of the most prosperous nation in all history, Americans faced up to the obligations of international brotherhood. Willingly, we have diverted great shares of wealth and resources to those less fortunate, so that they too could enjoy the fruits of free men's initiative, imagination, and enterprise.

However, there must be a limit to the sacrifices that a single nation, however great and prosperous, can make in behalf of its friends and allies. There must be a point of diminishing return, a point at which the cost becomes too great to justify the effort. I suggest that we have reached this point insofar as our foreign trade policies have contributed to the dynamic development of competitive economies abroad.

Two recent accounts of thriving conditions in foreign mass-producing industries underscore this fact. Both reports appeared in the magazine Business Week:

FOREIGN STEELMAKERS BOOST OUTPUT, ENLARGE THEIR SHARE OF WORLD MARKET

With the steel strike in its sixth week, executives of the struck U.S. mills are closely watching the speedy progress of steelmakers in Western Europe and Japan. Foreign steel companies are boosting their share of world steel markets—including the United States.

Steelmakers in West Germany and Japan are enjoying the liveliest boom. But steel output is also curving upward in France, Britain, and Italy.

In West Germany, steel producers are headed for a new output record of more than 30 million tons. Renewed capital investment and machinery exports have helped boost demand this year.

In Japan, the industry has been setting records all year, thanks to rising exports and a capital spending boom. With production likely to top 15 million tons this year—about 2 million tons over 1958—Japan threatens to displace France as the world's fifth largest steelmaker. Some of Japan's steel companies are getting ready to ask the World Bank for loans for a $300 million expansion program to raise capacity to 25 million tons in 1965.

In Britain, steel output has reached 80 percent of the industry's 26-million-ton capacity. While investment still remains low, an upsurge in autos and appliances is adding to steel consumption. Auto production, in fact, has been gobbling up steel so fast that a shortage of sheet is feared.

In France, steel production has climbed almost 5 percent above last year's record level. Aided by devaluation, the French industry has managed to improve its share of Europe's growing steel market by being able to offer lower prices.

In Italy, steelmakers also enjoy expanding sales because of the Common Market. One sign of expansion is the Government's proposal to establish a new 1-million-ton steel plant in southern Italy.

TRANSISTOR RADIO MAKERS WILL MARKET JAPANESE MODELS UNDER U.S. LABELS

In the past year, the U.S. electronics industry has watched Japanese manufacturers grab more than half the market here for transistor radios—largely by sales under Japanese labels. Now, some companies have decided to meet the foreign competition by marketing Japanese-made radios under their own U.S. trade names.

Latest transistor radio manufacturer to join the importers is big Emerson Radio & Phonograph Corp. Through its international bargaining subsidiary, Emerson has concluded an agreement with Tokyo's Standard Radio Corp. to import 100,000 radios in coming months. Emerson officials say it is making the move because Japanese companies are making radios and parts too small to be produced competitively in the United States. Emerson, which will sell the imports under its Jefferson Travis label, follows Motorola, Inc., as the second big radio maker to move into the Japanese import field.

Meanwhile, Tokyo's Ministry of International Trade and Industry is spurring Japanese efforts to make electronic computers. MITI plans to sponsor a company—50 percent privately owned—to produce 50 computers next year, and more than that in each succeeding year.

The American steel industry provides perhaps the classic current study of import penetration into a long-established, mass-production domestic industry. Even before the strike, imports were climbing dramatically. In the first 6 months of 1959, nearly 2 million tons of foreign steel landed here, against some 1.7 million tons in all of 1958.

With domestic manufacturers immobilized by the work stoppage, foreign steel producers are devoting every effort to gaining a strong and permanent foothold in the American market, as well as capturing American markets abroad. And regardless of the outcome of the strike, there is considerable doubt that American steelmakers will be able to regain these losses.

For instance, one of this country's largest can manufacturers is now buying tinplate from Great Britain for its factories on the west coast. Even though this tinplate is shipped thousands of miles, and through the Panama Canal, it is still 5 percent cheaper than tinplate manufactured in California.

The chief executive of a major American steel company added a new dimension to the competition facing his industry when he reported that agents of Japanese steel producers insist that American customers agree to continue buying their steel after the strike ends if they expect to receive any now.

Another problem worrying the American steel industry is the rising volume of imports of foreign products in which steel is a primary component. Automobiles are a case in point. Imports of foreign cars will probably exceed 600,000 in 1959, compared to 57,000 in 1955 and 260,000 in 1957.

Exports of American cars, on the other hand, have declined appreciably. If the present export pace continues, our auto exports will not exceed 115,000 in 1959, or less than 25 percent of the import volume. A scant 10 years ago we exported 10 cars for every 1 we imported.

Signs of crisis abound throughout our foreign trade structure. More than 2 million transistor radios will reach here from Japan in 1959; in fact, 6 of every 10 Japanese transistor sets exported find their way into the American market.

Imports of steel pipe and tubing surpassed 200,000 tons last year, upon nearly 300 percent since 1955, and so far this year imports are running some 30 percent ahead of last year's pace.

As my committee colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] informed the House a few days ago, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is stitched with British wire because American producers, meeting American wage standards, cannot match their competitors' prices.

In 1950 the United States imported 2,000 tons of wire rope; in the first 5 months of 1959 imports of this product exceeded 16,000 tons. Records of the Independent Wire Rope Manufacturers Association reveal that the U.S. Navy, a large buyer of wire rope, gives most of its business to foreign mills. In 1958 the Navy's General Stores Supply Office in Philadelphia bought $470,144 worth of wire rope; of this sum, 73 percent, or nearly $350,000, went to oversea manufacturers.

In the last fiscal year, the Tennessee Valley Authority, a large consumer of heavy electrical equipment, paid nearly $18 million to foreign manufacturers of turbines and generators. This was more than three times the total outlay by TVA for foreign-made goods in all previous 25 years of its existence.

It is not really necessary at this time to reexamine the reasons for the amazing upsurge of import competition. It can be summed up simply: We cannot match their prices.

And one of the major factors in our failure to remain competitive in a broad range of industries is clearly illustrated by a few uncomplicated statistics, as follows:

In West Germany the average hourly wage for nonfarm workers is 53 cents; in France, 62 cents—and that makes French workers the highest paid in the European Common Market; in Italy, 34 cents; in the Netherlands, 38 cents; in Benelux, 53 cents. Surprisingly, all of these hourly rates, pitifully low by our standards, reflect increases of 19 to 38 percent since 1955.

The American garment industry, sorely distressed by a flood of imports from the Far East, supply additional data on comparative wages. The American garment worker draws $2.12 per hour, including fringe benefits, for a 40-hour week. The Japanese garment worker receives 14 cents, including fringe benefits, for a 50-hour week; the garment worker in Hong Kong is even worse off, collecting less than 10 cents per hour. Labor costs account for about one-third of the total cost of manufacturing men's suits.

With such a disparity in wage rates at home and abroad, it is not surprising that more than 3,000 American companies, including 99 of our 100 biggest industrial corporations, are now engaged in production at overseas facilities. It is not surprising that direct U.S. private investment abroad has more than doubled since 1950. It is not surprising that American business expects sales from its foreign operations to increase at twice or more the pace of export sales in the next 10 years.

In short, the problems created by current trends in foreign commerce, especially when weighed against the urgency of creating at least 10 million more jobs at home in the next decade, seem so clear cut, so starkly defined, as to preclude all argument over their validity.

Yet that is not the case at all. We are still belabored by demands for more tariff handouts, for more relaxation of our import laws. Truly, there is precious little left to give away. In the past 25 years, in a lonely and largely futile quest for real reciprocity, the United States has pared its tariffs until they are now among the lowest in the world—as even the most ardent free trader will concede.

Moreover, the outlook is that things will get worse before they get better. A year ago the Congress saw fit, for reasons beyond my comprehension, to authorize still further cuts in our frail tariff structure. The administration was granted power to reduce tariffs by another 20 percent over the next 4 years; much of this authority will be called into play when the United States joins its partners in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at the bargaining table in January 1961.

Fortunately, the GATT negotiations are still many months away. There is still time to alert the American people, to bring the facts, however distressing, to the attention of citizens across the land. There is still time to prevent another headlong sprint down the road to economic catastrophe and still time to save countless thousands of American jobs at a time when we cannot afford to lose a single one.

I know that many of my colleagues have pledged themselves to this task. I know, too, that our ranks will grow as more and more American industries become imperiled. As a nation, we are coming to our senses—slowly, to be sure, but we are getting there. We can only wonder how many more plants will close, how many more jobs will disappear, before our eyes are completely opened.

The Hollywood Motion Picture: A Revolutionary Force of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Hollywood: Today's Revolutionary," written by Kenneth H. Campbell, manager of the Foreign Commerce Department, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and published in the Film Daily of September 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Film Daily, Sept. 10, 1959]

TODAY'S REVOLUTIONARY

(By Kenneth H. Campbell)

The Hollywood motion picture is one of the most revolutionary forces of our time.

I am not speaking in a political sense, although it cannot be doubted that our motion pictures reflect the democratic character of our society. Politically—as I have informally gathered—the motion picture does this by the "soft-sell approach," or, to use another phrase, "a low pressure approach"—and no approach could be more valuable when the American motion picture takes out a passport to visit foreign lands.

High pressure salesmanship for democracy would get us nowhere. In the long run I believe that the soft-sell approach will win. In our approach, there are no bayonets glittering in the near distance.

Meanwhile, I would like to mention, briefly, the impact of the American motion picture upon foreign trade, as I see it. The American motion picture has an undeniable effect on the marketing and consumption of the products of our factories, forests, farms, and mines.

Here in America, we have created an unparalleled society of abundance as a result of our dynamic, competitive, private enterprise system.

We have done this through a process of mass production and mass consumption. An affluent society depends upon that process. It is imperative.

The future of our economic system depends upon continual growth and expansion. Stagnation and constriction—or Government controls, to put it another way—are the enemies of growth and expansion. We must export much of our total product—and we must not raise artificial or unnatural barriers to imports. We need two-way trade.

I do not say that we have solved the problem of perpetual economic abundance. We are far from that. Our economic system is like cropland. It demands constant attention, the constant irrigation and fertilization of constructive thinking, a constant reinvigoration. The human factor can promote it or destroy it.

Now we get back to the Hollywood theme—the economic impact of the motion picture.

Let us lay aside the glitter and tinsel of Hollywood. They have nothing to do with the economic impact of the motion picture except to the extent that they sell tickets.

As a world traveler, the American motion picture, as I can plainly see, stimulates economic desires. It suggests actual needs that were not realized before. All this, is a by-product of sheer entertainment. It is not a conscious effort. Once again, it is the soft-sell approach.

As a foreign commerce man, I know nothing about dramatic impact, but as an ordinary citizen, I can appreciate the fact that a farmer in Africa, with nothing but a wooden plow at his disposal, might be deeply stirred by a motion-picture scene of a Kansas farmer plowing with a tractor.

The African farmer's wife does the washing on a flat rock beside a stream. I wonder what she thinks of a motion picture which depicts an American farmhome with an automatic washer and dryer?

Perhaps she thinks that as far as she is concerned it is nothing but a Cinderella dream. On the other hand, she might well wonder why she doesn't have what other people have. At all events, her imagination has been stirred. The revolutionary force of the American motion picture has made an inroad on the thinking of a far-distant people.

I am given to understand that this influence of Hollywood is sometimes accused of portraying America as too materialistic, too callous to human values, too indifferent to native cultures.

That premise fails to hold water, because the scene of Mrs. America with her automatic washer and dryer is not a calculated portrayal. The scene is necessary to the unfolding of the dramatic story.

I can see nothing wrong in creating human desires and wants. There is nothing wrong, as I see it, in creating dissatisfaction with poverty and hopelessness.

In recent years, we have witnessed an upsurge of nationalism and individualism in territories held for centuries within the bonds of feudalism and colonialism. I could not possibly estimate the extent of the motion picture's impact on these revolutionary developments, but I can guess that the impact has been substantial.

As a result of our own experience here in America, we know that no such thing as permanent poverty need exist.

Communism is trying to ensnare the undetermined peoples of the world with the promise of a full rice bowl. We try to win their allegiance to the democratic way with no promises at all except the suggestion that a full life, plus a full rice bowl, is possible.

The motion picture has played a significant role in this suggestion, and I am sure that its influence will continue to be one for good for ourselves and for the well-being of all peoples.

Typewriter Imports, Job Exports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACKSON E. BETTS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the Business and Defense Services Administration, an important adjunct of the Commerce Department, has completed a comprehensive research analysis of international trade in typewriters over the decade 1948–58.

In order to offer my colleagues the benefit of this excellent report, I have compiled a series of pertinent excerpts which highlight the major findings. These excerpts follow:

The United States clearly dominated world typewriter trade before World War II, supplying from one-half to two-thirds of the world demand through exports. Exports from the United States in 1958 supplied less than one-tenth of the world demand. * * *

After the Korean war, U.S. typewriter firms were faced with increased competition in their traditional markets; a thriving European typewriter industry that enjoyed a competitive advantage in lower production costs; a larger and growing world demand for typewriters; and established trade patterns, trade controls, and regulations, and economic organizations. As a result, widespread changes were required in the structure and marketing strategy of the U.S. industry.

To share in the growing world market and to meet the challenge of European competition, U.S. typewriter firms moved overseas. Emphasis was shifted from exporting to overseas production. * * *

The countries that have registered the greatest gains in world typewriter trade during the decade 1948–58 are important members of the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation): Germany (West), Italy, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, Sweden, France, and Belgium.

These eight countries, together with Canada and the United States, account for practically all the world production and exports of typewriters. In 1948, the eight countries, combined, supplied about 33 percent of the estimated world total exports of typewriters. Their combined share of the world market has steadily increased. In 1957, they accounted for about 85 percent of the estimated world export trade in typewriters.

Since 1948, the U.S. share of the world export trade in typewriters has declined steadily. In 1948, U.S.-made typewriters accounted for an estimated 63 percent of the total world trade. In 1957, the U.S. share declined to about 9 percent of the world total. Preliminary estimates for 1958 indicate a further decline in the U.S. share, to perhaps 7 to 8 percent of the world total export trade.

The decline in exports of typewriters has not only been relative—i.e., in terms of percentage of the world total—but also in terms of actual numbers of machines. The United States exported 278,118 typewriters in 1948; 106,169 in 1957; and only 56,063 in 1958. With the exception of the years 1950 and 1951, when exports increased abruptly, the decline has been steady. * * *

The year 1958 was a turning point for the United States in world typewriter trade. It marked the first year in history that the value of imports of typewriters and parts exceeded the value of exports of these commodities. U.S. exports totaled $14.7 million, and imports totaled $19.9 million. * * *

U.S. exports of typewriters and parts to the OEEC countries in 1958 totaled about $5 million, and imports from the OEEC countries were $17.4 million. This volume of imports during 1958 was more than enough to overcome the U.S. net favorable balance of trade of the previous 10 years, and to shift abruptly the balance in favor of the OEEC countries. Including 1958, the 11-year cumulative trade balance shows: OEEC, $60.4 million; United States, $54.5 million. * * *

The establishment of U.S. typewriter plants in the OEEC countries has been a major factor in the decline of U.S. exports of typewriters, and also in the increase in U.S. exports of parts. It has also been a factor in the rise of several European countries to importance in the world typewriter industry. * * *

Market considerations were the chief factors prompting the U.S. firms to shift from exporting to production overseas. The European economic organizations, as organized in 1948 and after, and their concomitant trade regulations and foreign exchange controls made a European location attractive as a base for serving an expanding world market. For example, a location in the United Kingdom permitted preferential access to the British Commonwealth markets as well as the OEEC. A location on the Continent offered access to the growing OEEC markets and also entry into the Common Market.

Thus, the prospect of entering a concentrated, regional market having a combined population of 250 million, and a combined gross national product almost equal to that of the United States, coupled with the possibility of exporting from Europe to dollar shortage areas of the world with European currency credits, could not be ignored by American firms. * * *

Another, though secondary, factor in this development was the growing competition from European producers for the U.S. domestic market in lower priced typewriters. By building plants overseas, the U.S. typewriter firms also strengthened their competitive position for the U.S. domestic market in the lower priced field, particularly in portable typewriters.

Because of generally lower production costs in Europe, low-priced, foreign portables early in the post-World War II years began to account for an increasing share of the growing U.S. market. Some U.S. firms moved to protect their domestic market by locating overseas, or by acquiring foreign production facilities and meeting foreign competition on a more equal production-cost basis.

As a result, some foreign-made American portable models are sold in the United States in competition with imported foreign models. Not all the U.S. firms producing overseas, however, export typewriters to the United States. Some confine overseas production output solely for the European and world markets.

The 10-year trend in imports of typewriters is the reverse of the export trend. While exports have declined, imports have increased phenomenally. In 1948, total U.S. imports of typewriters numbered 13,229, valued at about $1 million. Canada supplied 10,513, and the OEEC countries supplied 2,706. The following year, in 1949, imports of typewriters nearly doubled, totaling 25,558 units and valued at about $2 million. Canada supplied 16,703, and the OEEC supplied 8,809—more than three times the number of the previous year.

By 1958, U.S. imports of typewriters had risen to 390,814 units. Canada supplied 20,902 and the OEEC countries 345,420, valued at $17.2 million.

Research and Development Pools for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, under the amendments to the Small Business Act enacted by the Congress last year, there were provisions for the encouragement of the formation of research and development pools by small business firms to enable such firms to maintain a competitive position with the larger companies which can afford to maintain such activities as a branch of their own operations. We live in a fast-changing world in which businesses—and entire nations—find it hard to survive unless they can through research adapt their methods and their products to this new scientific age. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an announcement published by the Small Business Administration of the formation of the first of these small business research and development pools authorized under the new law.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The first small business research, development and production pool—composed of three Colorado small firms engaged in research and development work and in performing production contracts for the missiles and aircraft industries—was announced today (Saturday) by Wendell B. Barnes, Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

The pool, Spec Products, is located at 6300 East 44th Avenue, Denver, and is composed of the B. K. Sweeney Manufacturing Co., Denver—developers and manufacturers of special tools and equipment; the McPherson Corp., Denver—engaged in the production and heat treatment of nonferrous castings; and the Physics, Engineering, and Chemistry Corp. (P.E.C.) Boulder—engaged in research and development in physics, engineering, chemistry, and mathematics.

The pool has a total of 262 employees and will seek Government research and development contracts, as well as defense production orders. Spec Products was organized for the purpose of obtaining contracts, chiefly in research and development and in defense production, to be performed by its member companies located in the Denver-Boulder area. The pool is interested in research and development and the production of items in the missile and aircraft industries, as well as ground support equipment such as tracking devices, launching apparatus, and testing units.

Mr. Barnes explained that the three firms desired to associate as a group for the pur-

pose of bidding or negotiating for research, developments, and defense contracts from which they, as individual companies, would otherwise be excluded due to their respective limited capacity.

Prior to approving the pool, Administrator Barnes consulted with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and the Attorney General. Since the pool has received approval of the Small Business Administrator and the Attorney General, activities of the pool and its members in carrying out the approved programs are exempt from the prohibitions of the Federal antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Under section 9(d) of the Small Business Act of 1958, the SBA was given authority by Congress to approve research and devedopment pools to be composed of small firms for the purpose of greater participation in the Nation's expanding research and development programs. The agency also has authority under section 11 of the Small Business Act to approve small business defense production pools.

Mr. Barnes said that research and development are major factors in the growth and progress of industry and the national economy, but the expense of carrying on such programs often is beyond the means of many small business concerns. "By forming the pool the member firms have obtained an advantage in research and development work as well as in obtaining and performing defense production contracts," he said.

Not To See but To Be Seen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, patriots everywhere are saddened and alarmed over the Khrushchev invitation. The result is going to be a great political revolt in 1960. The American people are not going to stand for this appeasement with the "Butcher of Budapest."

I commend to the Congress and to freedom loving people everywhere the following broadcast by Dean Clarence E. Manion over the Manion Forum network September 6, 1959:

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT MOST SERIOUS MISTAKE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

DEAN MANION. It is undoubtedly safe to say that President Eisenhower is the most popular man in the world. Press and public, here and everywhere, respond to him with unprecedented enthusiasm.

When the President makes an obvious mistake in the administratian of his high office, important, influential criticism is hard to find, and even more difficult to publicize when it is found.

This being so, we must wait for history to weigh the full gravity of Mr. Eisenhower's great mistake in inviting Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country in exchange for a subsequent visit by our President to the Soviet Union.

From my own researches into congressional feelings on this subject, I am convinced that, without the force of the President's personal persuasion, a proposal for such a visitorial exchange would have been voted down in House and Senate by a margin more than 4 to 1.

Nevertheless, when the President suddenly announced that Khrushchev was coming, all but a few of these congressional opponents shrouded themselves in silence.

Fortunately, there were notable exceptions. As soon as he could get from his sick bed to the Senate floor, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, put the scandalous history of Nikita Khrushchev into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in one of the most learned, powerful and persuasive Senate speeches that has been heard in modern times. If you want the whole sordid story of the President's upcoming Communist guest of honor, read this revealing speech by Senator DODD. The Manion Forum will mail you a copy for the asking.

In Washington last week, I asked Senator DODD for a short statement to be included in this broadcast. Here it is:

"Senator DODD. I hope that during Khrushchev's visit we shall hear church bells in the land tolling their remembrance for the murdered millions behind the Iron Curtain. I hope that there will be public observance of prayer for the deliverance of the captive nations.

"I am not opposed to a meeting between the President and Khrushchev at a proper time, under proper conditions, and in a proper place, but I think it is a national disgrace to give this Red dictator a state visit as the guest of the American people at this time in our country with all the fancy trimmings."

DEAN MANION. The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is the ranking member of the President's own party in the Senate. He has been a Member of that distinguished body continuously since 1937. I asked Senator BRIDGES to give me his opinion of the Khrushchev invitation. Here is what he said:

"Senator BRIDGES. I have strongly opposed Khrushchev's coming to this country. I am still strongly opposed. I can foresee no good from his visit and I fear his presence here will further soften some of our more complacent citizens and discourage and dishearten people in Communist captivity as well as our own free world allies."

DEAN MANION. One of the most able, energetic and influential Members on the Republican side of the U.S. Senate is the Honorable BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona. I had the good fortune to see him in Washington. For the benefit of his friends in the Manion Forum nationwide radio audience, Senator GOLDWATER said this:

"Senator GOLDWATER. I believe that the invitaton to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States is a propaganda and psychological victory for the Russians. They attempted to achieve this through the summit conference and, failing there, they were able to achieve this invitation.

"If Mr. Khrushchev comes to this country and is invited to the U.S. Senate, such as has been suggested, the junior Senator from Arizona will certainly vote against his being there, and if he is invited, the Senator is going to be conspicuous by his absence. I see no reason to be overjoyous in our welcome to this land of this murderous brand of communism that Khrushchev is spreading across the world."

DEAN MANION. One of the American ports of call arranged for Khrushchev by his managers in Washington is Des Moines, Iowa. This puts the Honorable Herschel Loveless, Governor of that great State into the position of official host to Khrushchev, whether the Governor likes it or not.

From the newspapers, I gathered the impression that the Governor of Iowa did not like it, and so, through our affiliated station KWDM, at Des Moines, I went to the Governor for verification. Here is our recorded interview:

"Governor Loveless, I understand that you are something less than enthusiastic about Khrushchev's prospective visit to the United States. Is that true?"

"Governor LOVELESS. Yes, Dean Manion, I have qualms and misgivings about the pending Khrushchev visit. I expect to receive him in Iowa as I would any foreign visitor and will try to be as hospitable as we Iowans are noted to be, but I fear the reaction on our many allies throughout the world on our receiving someone from the Communist area, and I am sure that they might be wondering just what is going on and if we are deserting them."

SOUTHERN GOVERNOR POINTS UP DANGERS

DEAN MANION. In a dispatch from the recent Governors' conference at Puerto Rico, I read that the popular and personable Governor of South Carolina, the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, also had misgivings about the upcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev. With the help of our affiliated station WIS, in Columbia, I obtained the following statement from Governor Hollings in South Carolina:

"Governor HOLLINGS. The foreign policy of the United States is to win over to the free world the neutral nations and promote the resistance of the captive nations. To support this policy; we have pledged that we will resist any further aggression by communism. This firm policy has created hope and courage within the neutral and captive nations.

"However, when we accept Khrushchev as a political and social visitor to the United States, we cannot help to a degree giving stature to what he stands for—tyranny, murder, and communism. The neutral and captive nations immediately lose hope and courage, and our struggle for world peace suffers irreparable harm."

DEAN MANION. One of the most respected and influential men in America is retired Adm. Ben Moreell, of Pittsburgh, former chairman of Republic Steel Corp. Admiral Moreell is now the guiding spirit of Americans for Constitutional Action, a powerful working organization of American patriots. Through our affiliate, station WCAE in Pittsburgh, I obtained the following statement from Admiral Moreell on the subject of Khrushchev's visit:

"Admiral MOREELL. Mr. Khrushchev's visit raises disturbing questions as to its political, economic, defense, and moral implications. Since we are a people whose trust is in God and whose social structure cannot endure without that direction which stems from our religious beliefs, the moral aspects of this visit overshadows all others.

"We should then ask these questions: Do we, by inviting him to our shores, give moral sanction to his past misdeeds and those of the Government he represents? Are we prepared to endorse as conforming with Judeo-Christian moral values their cruelties to the peoples of Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Tibet, and other enslaved countries?

"Do such actions conform to our concept of the nature of things as they should be? The answers are clear. Although he is an invited guest, we must not by any act of public or private acclaim indicate that we condone his inhumanity."

DEAN MANION. My friends, these are samples of responsible patriotic opinion concerning this most ominous event of our lifetime. It would take hours to evaluate all of the similar opinions that I have received and observed since the fateful announcement was on August 3.

For instance, Eugene Lyons, a newsman with long experience in Moscow and now a senior editor of Reader's Digest, said in a public speech (UPI, Madison, Wis., Aug. 26) that the invitation to Khrushchev was a political mistake which could be turned into a political catastrophe. It will add dimen-

sions of prestige to world communism. It could spread defeatist gloom among millions of our friends and secret allies within the Communist world.

Chief Justice M. T. Phelps, of the Arizona State Supreme Court, wrote a public letter of protest in which he told the President that "your invitation involves the moral integrity of the sovereign citizens of whom you are the servant. It involves a flagrant breach of your duty to the people. You have invited and propose to break bread with the arch-murderer of all ages."

At the American Legion convention in Minneapolis, Vice President NIXON made an eloquent plea in defense of Khrushchev's visit to this country and urged the assembled legionnaires to do nothing that might upset President Eisenhower's bold plan to melt some of the ice around the cold war.

The delegates listened politely and then passed a resolution demanding an end to diplomatic relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, unless the Kremlin releases American soldiers and citizens now held behind the Iron Curtain; holds free elections in the satellite countries, and ends espionage against America.

What is wrong with these sensible, moral, and self-respecting prerequisites for continued diplomatic association with any government worthy of the name? Nothing could be better calculated to melt the ice of the cold war than the Kremlin's prompt compliance with these conditions.

Will the President, therefore, please present this resolution from his old comrades-in-arms to his upcoming guest of honor and get an official reply for all of the American people?

The wives and mothers of the 11 missing American airmen deliberately shot down by Russian fighter planes over Soviet Armenia just 1 year ago would like to know where these men are and when, if ever, they are to be returned to this country. Will these wives and mothers be permitted to speak to our distinguished guest of honor? If they are denied access to him, as they undoubtedly will be, then will not the President or the Vice President please speak for them?

NIKITA JOCKEYS IKE TO AIRPORT

The President and the Vice President have defended this unfortunate invitation by their determination to show Khrushchev the might and power of this country, lest he start a war in ignorance of our ability to strike back. Khrushchev has now let it be known that he has other ideas.

He is not looking for a balanced picture of the United States of America. On the contrary, he wants to appear before large crowds in big cities where he can expect top newspaper, radio, and television coverage.

Khrushchev is not coming here to see, but to be seen; not to learn, but to teach; not to be softened, but to further soften our already badly weakened resistance to the satanic evil of communism, of which he is the personification.

The wily conspirator has already seized the propaganda initiative from President Eisenhower. Mr. Eisenhower had explained that, since Premier Khrushchev was not the titular head of the Soviet state, that position being held by one Kliment Voroshilov, the President would not be required to greet him at the airport.

That was all Khrushchev needed to know. He immediately announced that, for the purpose of this trip, Voroshilov is deposed and Nikita himself will be the head of the Soviet state when he gets to Washington.

So, President Eisenhower must meet the big burglar at the airport after all, and ride with him through the streets of Washington. You will see it all on television. So will the enslaved people of the capitive nations—Khrushchev will take care of that.

Mrs. Khrushchev is coming, too, which will bring the official Washington hostesses into the big act—Mrs. Eisenhower, Mrs. Nixon. More pictures, more propaganda, all calculated to cause the hopes of the Communist-held slaves to curl up and die. Says the Indianapolis Star (August 27):

"After (all) this has been done, America can never look quite the same to the victims of barbarism everywhere who have looked to America as the champion of right and justice. They will feel, rightly, that America has turned its back on them and on its own great principles of liberty and justice for all."

In the Khrushchev visit, President Eisenhower is sowing a wicked whirlwind. It will take all of his great popularity to ride him through the resulting storm.

Federal Aid to Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and well-written article, entitled "Federal Aid to Schools," published in the Spirit of Jefferson Advocate, Charles Town, W. Va., on September 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

(By Henry W. Morrow)

I could not help but be wryly amused when I read an editorial in the Martinsburg Journal last week criticising Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH for the position he has taken on Federal aid to education. Had the editorial been written 50 years ago it might have fallen on a more receptive ear; but what amused me was that the arguments advanced against Federal aid were of such a vintage and have been disproved for so long a time that I had not thought anyone would care to dust them off and get by with it in 1959.

The editorial took the position that aid to education is a matter which should be dealt with exclusively by the States, and that Federal aid can only result in Federal control. I was somewhat surprised that creeping socialism was not mustered into action, but I assume that this argument was carefully kept in the closet in the hope that, through its absence, I might not detect the vulnerability of the other arguments used.

To begin with, the voices that shout the loudest about leaving the matter of education exclusively in the hands of the States are the very same voices that protest the loudest when the States do undertake to do something about it. The only difference is that when the States start to do something about it the shout is, "Let the respective counties do something about it." And then when it gets down to the county level the shout becomes, "Raise everybody's taxes but mine." What strikes me about all this clamor is that at no place is there any denial that something should be done. At all stages there is virtual admission of the need for something to be done, with the critics doing absolutely nothing about it except shouting that someone else should do it. This is a traditional type of argument employed by those people who don't dare to oppose the idea, but seek to defeat the goal by shifting the responsibility for action to whatever class is either unable or unwilling to do anything about it.

But it's when you get to this argument about Federal control that I really become annoyed. Those who invoke the argument of Federal control seem to think there is a magic in the phrase that will automatically incite opposition, and that nothing more need be said. And, unfortunately, in many instances they are right. In fact, the antieverything lobby in this country has been so successful and in many instances the public has been so gullible, that the word "Federal" has become a dirty word. It took a long time to get around to thinking that Federal housing isn't a nasty idea, although some Republicans, including the President, haven't gotten out of the woods yet. Of course, you can talk to the President about a Federal highway program or a Federal Army or Navy and if you are talking about the right thing you can even mention Federal Government; but for heaven's sake don't use that phrase "Federal aid to education." It's on the list of "Federal" taboos.

Education poses one of the biggest national problems in our country. It is a real problem in Jefferson County; it is a problem in West Virginia; it is a problem in the United States. To say that it is not a national problem, to say that it is 50 separate State problems, is akin to saying that a fire in the middle of the block is of no concern to the other inhabitants of the block. And since education is a national problem of the first magnitude, it is a problem that demands national action. Every bill that has ever been introduced in Congress dealing with this subject has been carefully worded so as to dispense with the unwarranted fear of Federal control, and yet notwithstanding this, the opponents of the program continue to shout. (My son had a lunch at school today under the Federal lunch program and I must hasten home this evening to decontaminate him.) Federal aid to education may not be the very best solution to the problem; but it is better than no solution at all. And I rather suspect that no solution at all is precisely what most of the opponents of the idea want.

Our Newest Plant Gets Rolling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it is always good to report the establishment of a new industry in our district or our State.

Today, I am proud to announce that the recently completed Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant at Apple Grove, W. Va., has begun large-scale operations. This plant is producing synthetic textile fiber resins at this time, and soon will begin the production of Videne, a remarkable new protective-coating material.

We are all happy to have Goodyear represented in our district. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am placing in the RECORD the following article, from the pages of Goodyear's employee newspaper, the Wingfoot Clan:

VITEL RESIN PRODUCTION UNDERWAY AT WEST VIRGINIA PLANT

Volume production of Vitel resin at Goodyear's new $10 million plant in Apple Grove, W. Va., is now underway.

Production of Videne laminating film is expected later in the fall. This new polyester material is now being produced at plant C in Akron and eventually these production units will be transferred to the West Virginia plant.

Limited Vitel resin production began last April. Known as the Point Pleasant Plant, the new facility consists of two main buildings—a processing and warehouisng unit and a utility center—plus several smaller structures, a tank farm area and parking lot.

Vitel is the resin from which synthetic textile fibers can be spun. It is to be sold to textile converters for processing into fibers for such end uses as shirts, suits, dresses, and related products.

Initial customer for Vitel is Beaunit Mills, Inc., which now is converting the resin at its Elizabethtown, Tenn., plant into a fiber sold under the trade name of Vycron.

Videne is the unique film to be utilized for direct or stretch-laminating applications in the textile, metal, wood, paper, plastic, automotive, and packing industries. Videne also can be converted into a special wrap—Videne TC—for machine packaging of meat and other food products.

For porduction, a labor force of some 200 is expected to run the plant at peak capacity.

Total construction area of the plant facilities is approximately 100,000 square feet. Of this area, 80,000 square feet is utilized in the processing and warehousing building, which is divided into three sections.

The largest section, containing 47,000 square feet and rising 5 stories, handles resin production. Film operations are in a second section of 15,000 square feet. The remaining area of 18,000 square feet provides office, maintenance, locker facilities, and warehousing for finished products.

Approximately 9,000 square feet are contained in the utility building. The steam powerplant, refrigeration and air-conditioning occupy 6,500 square feet. Another 2,500 square feet is allotted to raw material handling and storage. Electrical demand for production is about 3,000 kilowatts. Water requirements run at about 500 gallons per minute.

Alaska Agricultural Expands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, Mr. Sterling R. Newell, Director of the Division of Agricultural Estimates of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, was recently in Alaska in connection with the establishment of a crop reporting service there. Mr. Newell returned to Washington via California and while in Sacramento he was interviewed for an article which appeared in the Sacramento Bee for August 16. There Mr. Newell gave a report on Alaska agriculture which is especially interesting because it comes from an expert. I take pleasure in making the article available for reading by my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Aug. 16, 1959]

ALASKAN FARM DEVELOPMENT IS TOLD HERE

Agriculture in Alaska is expanding steadily and there is room for considerable further development.

This is the reaction of S. R. Newell, chairman of the crop reporting board of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, who conferred with California Department of Agriculture officials here last week en route to Washington, D.C. from Alaska.

Newell had been in Alaska to investigate the possibility of establishing a Federal crop reporting service similar to that operated in other States of the Union.

LAYING PLANS

We are laying plans prior to the 1960 farm census and trying to figure out how an Alaskan crop reporting service could be established. We don't know when such a service could be established because it takes governmental action and appropriation of funds.

Alaskan agriculture is growing and farmers there are interested in learning about and adapting the advances made in other States, especially in grading and packaging. They have some fine quality home grown products which have a flavor distinctive to their area.

BIG CABBAGES

They grow fine cold weather vegetable crops, cabbages running up to 40 pounds in weight; they also grow good quality potatoes and barley and many other crops.

Milk production is on the increase and there are some large, modern farms with milk parlors and all the latest equipment. A Danish Red breed of cattle crossed with Holsteins is proving successful in the dairy herds.

Poultry is coming along too but a large increase hinges on the problem of producing feed.

Sheep are being raised successfully in the southern portion of Alaska and are being tried along the Aleutian chain.

Newell said farm development is slowed by the high cost of labor and land clearing, but it is not a forbidding land and has many fertile valleys and tremendous potential.

The 86th Congress Compiles an Impressive Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, now that legislation has been passed by the Congress to maintain the interstate highway program, it appears certain that this is one bill that will not receive a White House veto.

An editorial in the Kansas City Times—the Morning Kansas City Star—which appeared on Monday, September 7, stated that the compromise legislation is the work of a legislative session that is compiling an impressive record.

This record was made even more impressive by the action of the Congress in overriding the veto of the public works appropriation bill—the all-American measure for the benefit and the welfare of the people of the United States.

It is requested, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial be included as part of my remarks.

THE ROAD PROGRAM IS SAVED FROM FAILURE

It was unthinkable that Congress would sabotage the great road-building program, yet for a while that seemed a possibility. Then the House heard the rising demand for better roads from the States, cities, and civic groups. Now the Senate, in a marathon weekend session, has passed the compromise bill that would continue the great building program. The action is another feather in the cap of the 86th Congress.

The alternative, of course, was a coast-to-coast shutdown of what had been advertised as the greatest construction project in history. Failure to finance it now could have been advertised likewise as the biggest construction flop in the history of man.

We could hardly believe that Congress would take that responsibility. For beyond the highways, a break in construction would have been a blow to all industries and industrial jobs that are involved in road building. If the highway projects had screeched to a halt, a lot of workmen would have been turned loose to hunt for other jobs. And the Nation would have been deprived of the safer, modern roads that the motor age must have.

We assume that the minor differences between the House and Senate versions of the 1-cent gasoline tax increase will be ironed out quickly. Of course the administration can't be too happy about the provision to earmark for the roads a small part of the excise taxes on automobiles and parts. That money would otherwise go to the Treasury. But the change will not be effective until July 1, 1961. Meantime, roads will be built, though at a somewhat slower pace. That is the important thing.

Nor do we think that Congress need worry about a great roar of outrage over the higher gasoline tax. The tax is so small that the average motorist will hardly notice it. If he drives 10,000 miles a year and gets 12 miles to the gallon, he'll pay $8.33 a year more. Anyone who uses the rural superhighways or the city expressways is going to get far more in value received from easier and safer driving.

In the last few weeks Congress has had every opportunity to see the consequences of failure. The word came particularly from the States that originally had made a play for some other form of financing. At the recent Governors' conference in Puerto Rico the State executives called for any compromise between Congress and the administration that would finance construction.

Congress found the formula and the tremendous Interstate System of 41,000 miles has been saved from catastrophe. The compromise is the work of a legislative session that is compiling an impressive record. The motorists of the Nation can be thankful.

A Clear Need for Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star with respect to the veto of the public works appropriation bill, which empha-

sizes the need for the item veto authority. Had the item veto been in existence it would not have been necessary for the President to veto the entire bill. It is important, in my judgment, that the item veto provision be adopted by legislation, if possible, and, if not, by an amendment to the Constitution.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Winchester (Va.) Evening Star]

A CLEAR NEED FOR ITEM VETO

A great shout went up in the House of Representatives yesterday when the vote to override the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill was announced.

What were the Congressmen shouting about? Is it a time for glee when a decision is made to spend millions of the taxpayers' dollars on projects described with more than a little accuracy as "pork barrel" items? The Congressmen were shouting over a victory which will be anything but victorious for the tax-paying public.

This was the second public works bill the President had vetoed, and with good reason. The bill includes 67 new projects not recommended by the President or the Army Engineers. It probably is in understatement to say that these projects, which the President says will ultimately cost about $800 million, are of dubious value.

But even if a good case could be made out for deepening this river channel or widening that canal, the cost should be weighed against the Government's ability to pay for them. Considering the fact that the Federal Government is already $272 billion in the red and the debt is rising, the reading on the scales would be obvious. The Government is already spending billions of dollars it doesn't have.

Virginians will be interested—and should be proud of—the fact that there were four Virginians among the seven Democrats in both Houses of Congress who stood for economy by voting to sustain the President's veto. Senator BYRD, of Virginia, and Senator LAUSCHE, of Ohio, were the only Democrats in the upper Chamber voting to sustain. In the House, five Democrats voted to sustain, and three of them were Virginians: Congressmen ABBITT, SMITH, and TUCK.

The Senate vote overriding the veto came shortly after the House received the veto message and voted.

There is one small consolation. At least the public's attention is being focused on the kind of wasteful spending that has put our Government so deep in the red.

The whole affair is a clear demonstration of the need for an item veto provision. As it stands now the President must accept an appropriations bill in toto or veto the entire bill. In Virginia, as in many States, the Governor may exercise his judgment, vetoing items he deems unwise and accepting others.

An item veto provision in the Federal Government would save the taxpayers millions of dollars almost every year.

Committee for Hungarian Liberation, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Gen. Julius Kovacs, executive vice president of the Committee for Hungarian Liberation, Inc.

The gist of his communication is that no appeasement or compromise of our position with respect to the Soviet and world communism be made by reason of Mr. Khrushchev's visit to the United States.

We should keep in mind that the Soviet is haunted by these facts of life:

First. Recent events in Hungary, Poland, East Germany, and the Baltic countries prove that the Soviet cannot in the event of war rely upon the loyalty and devotion of the peoples in the satellite countries.

Second. There is a growing awareness on the part of the world's nations of the dangers and disadvantages of affiliation with the Soviet and the Communist ideology.

The nations of the free world are united more than ever in their determination to resist Soviet threat or aggression.

Third. China, with a population of 650 million and a radical revolutionary regime, will continue to threaten the integrity of Russian Asia.

The attainment of A- and H-bombs by China will upset the balance of power in Asia so that Soviet policy and military power will no longer dominate this area.

General Kovacs' letter follows:

COMMITTEE FOR HUNGARIAN LIBERATION, INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, August 20, 1959.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: All of us feel that the forthcoming visit of Mr. Khrushchev to the United States of America is the beginning of a series of meetings and conferences concerning matters of worldwide importance. These meetings and conferences will mark the irresistible and rapid changes in the course of history. Two ways of life, one of freedom and justice as envisioned by the free West, one a dictatorship based on force, will be sparring to take the leadership of man's destiny. A third solution in inconceivable.

The captive peoples clearly realize that these meetings and conferences will decide their fate and the fate of their progenies, may be forever. Since the plight and future of the captive peoples was not on the agenda at the just concluded, unsuccessful conference at Geneva, the acute anxiety of the captive peoples is obviously understandable; and this anixety is increased by the knowledge that the Soviet Union will do everything in its power to prevent these captive peoples from having a voice at all at the meetings where their destiny will be determined.

We Americans of Hungarian descent are familiar with the Communist way of life, which we fear and positively reject. In the course of the last four decades, Hungary repeatedly withstood in arms the territorial advances of communism. In 1956, during their sacred freedom fight, they made a supreme and futile effort to become free again. The barbaric assaults of communism upon the Hungarian people gave them a firsthand knowledge of the nature of communism. On the other hand, the free world obtains only superficial and abstract reports of the true nature of communism from the East German and Polish uprisings and the terrible sacrifices and brutal massacre of the Hungarians and the Tibetans.

The captive nations know from experience that the word "peace"—under existing conditions—does not have the same meaning behind the Iron Curtain as it does in the free West. There is no doubt that Communist world imperialism under Soviet leadership is employing every suitable method in its program of world conquest. But communism can only advance where there is decay in strength of will, unity, morality, and economy. Under the label of peaceful coexistence and peaceful competition, communism will be laying its groundwork of confusion and chaos for the West.

Because of direct experience the captive peoples intuitively sense the danger signals long before the free West suspects anything. We know that the Soviet Union does not have any conventional political or territorial boundaries. Through its methods of political warfare, the Soviet Union, not inhibited by law or morals, is physically present within the political boundary of every free nation. Mr. Khrushchev is not only making an official visit to the United States. With his presence he is encouraging his unseen allies and the potential fifth columns. The captive nations recognize the sinister implications of this visit and that is why they are so apprehensive of the future.

Mr. President, in your proclamation of Captive Nations Week, you stated the following: "* * * it is appropriate and proper to manifest to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the Government and the peoples of the United States of America for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence."

Mr. President, the captive peoples cannot wait indefinitely for freedom. It is not because of impatience that they cannot wait. They know from the cruel history of the Soviet Union over the past 40 years that the Soviet Union will eliminate their national existence in a period of time, or disperse them in the Communist empire to liquidate them as a nationality.

If captivity continues for long those who are willing and abel to fight for freedom will be eliminated when they become absorbed in the vast territories of the Soviet Union. If the day of liberation is delayed too long, there will be only ghosts of once great and cultural nations to rejoice at the posthumously arrived hour of freedom.

Mr. President we therefore ask you to:

1. Refuse to recognize the present status quo under any promise or compromise. Such recognition would permit the Soviet Union to consolidate its penetration into the free world and provide the necessary basis for further advance;

2. Discourage the continuation of the present division of the world into two spheres of influence; coexistence in the eastern half of the world means stabilization of the slave status of the captive nations;

3. Hurry the day of liberation of the captive nations; these peoples are doomed to extinction, the delay helps only the captors in their work of genocide;

4. Enforce the international peace treaties. Since the signing of the Austrian Peace Treaty the Soviet Union is in illegal military occupation of Hungary;

5. Prevent the decisions of the United Nations to be forgotten which were voted for by the overwhelming majority of its member nations, among them the most important: the evacuation of Soviet troops from Hungary;

6. In considering a neutral zone between the East and West, the Carpathian Basin must be included in this zone, because such a zone would be of no value and use for the West is so much as a portion of the geographical unit of the Carpathian Basin would be under sovereignty by a strong military power, always ready to attack the West.

7. Use the dignity of your office to release the Hungarians imprisoned in the Soviet Union, the political prisoners, the deported, the prisoners of war, and to stop the persecution of the freedom fighters in Hungary;

8. Consider the future of the Hungarian people, help them, give them every practicable political support so that they may regain their freedom and national independence. The unsuccessful freedom fight, in which Hungarians made the supreme sacrifice in blood and tears, represents the free West's greatest victory over the Soviet Union and world communism.

In spite of the terrible lessons and experiences of our century, the Hungarian people still believes in a just and free future. They unshakenly trust that you Mr. President, the Congress and the people of the United States of America will never negotiate and ratify a treaty which confirms slavery and surrenders the ideals of justice and freedom.

On behalf of the member and supporting organizations and the members in the United States of America, Canada, South America, Europe and Australia of the Committee for Hungarian Liberation, Inc., among them:

National Committee of Hungarians of Czechoslovakia, Dr. Bela Szilassy, president.

Council for Liberation of Southern Hungary, Anthony Lelbach, M.D., president.

Committee of Transylvania, Father Gabor Takacs OFM, president.

Committee of Western Hungary, Victor Falk, president.

Sub-Carpatho-Ruthenian Liberation Movement, Mihaly P. Pancelos, president.

Delegated by the board of directors of the Committee for Hungarian Liberation, Inc.

Respectfully yours,

Gen. JULIUS KOVACS,
Executive Vice President.

Admiral Rickover Says Russian Schools Are Better Than Our Own

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who visited the Soviet Union last month, had an excellent chance to see first hand the Russian educational system.

He says the Communists' schools produce students with an educational level 2 years ahead of their counterparts in our own country.

As we move more completely into the space age, we realize more and more the values of education—not just for the scientists but for all our people. There are all types of positions calling for trained technicians, skilled workers, and people who have studied and prepared themselves for their jobs.

Admiral Rickover's report to the House Appropriations Committee on August 18 is an enlightening statement.

Unless we take steps to improve our educational system, we may find ourselves ahead in the battle of missiles but hopelessly losing the war for increasing our brainpower, the most important battle of all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Saturday, September 12, 1959, the first entitled "Rickover Says Russian Schools Outclass Ours," and the second headed "Parents Challenged To See Soviet Tests."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 12, 1959]

RICKOVER SAYS RUSSIAN SCHOOLS OUTCLASS OUR

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who visited the Soviet Union last month with Vice President NIXON, has told a congressional committee that American education is the Russians' greatest "secret weapon."

The outspoken admiral, developer of the Navy's nuclear submarine, has been a caustic critic of "frills" and "softness" in American schools. He told the House Appropriations Committee:

"If I were the Russian Government, I would do all I could to keep us from changing our present system of education."

Rickover appeared before a secret session of the committee August 18 to testify that the Russians are winning the technological and scientific race with the United States because they have a far better education system. A transcript of his testimony was released yesterday.

He said the Russians are graduating about the same number of high school students as the United States, "but the Russian children are at least 2 years ahead of the American high school graduates in sound, basic education.

"By that I mean mathematics, the sciences, mastery of the mother tongue, knowledge of their own classical literature and that of major foreign nations, foreign languages, and history—though their history study is colored by Marxist doctrine," he added.

The admiral, whose qualifications to criticize the schools have been challenged by professional educators, told the committee he was "forced into the educational problem because I saw the poor products of our educational system."

"I am a customer for the products of our schools," he said. "I tried to get people to help me do a job in nuclear power development, and I found the product of our schools quite unsatisfactory, so I set out to find the reasons."

Among the reasons he found, Rickover indicated, were "contempt for education, a lack of understanding of what education is and can do, a failure in responsibility to our children and a selfish attitude by grownups where they are more interested in acquiring material things than in developing the minds of our youth and taking care of the future of our country.

"There are many schools in this country where the boys and girls drive up in expensive cars but have to go double shift in the school."

Rickover said the Soviet Union will have 2 million scientists and engineers by 1961, compared with 1.6 million here.

He blamed a lack of adequately educated people for the Nation's waste of money on missiles and other technical projects, and told the committee:

"This is what I don't understand: Why Members of Congress are willing to appropriate large sums of money for things which they know may not succeed, but will hesitate to spend money to set up educational standards and otherwise help education, when the return on the investment is certain and great."

When Rickover spoke of inequalities in educational opportunities in the various States, some members of the committee rushed to the defense of their States' schools. Rickover invited them to try Soviet test questions on their high school graduates.

Though the exchange does not appear in the transcript, a member of the committee told a reporter that Representative JAMES L. WHITTEN, Democrat of Mississippi, assured Rickover that his State's schools were better than the District's.

"God help the District of Columbia," Rickover reportedly replied.

The Admiral asked Congress to take the lead in establishing nationwide standards for pupils and teachers, a longer school year, simpler school biuldings, separate schooling for children of markedly different abilities and Federal equalization to permit poor States to offer good education.

Referring to congressional concern about Federal control of education, Rickover asked: "Is anyone worried that it is wrong to regulate airplane travel and train travel, food and drugs, and so on?

"The products of our schools certainly move across State frontiers. * * * Isn't honest labeling of educational diplomas as important as honest labeling of drugs?"

The Admiral charged that the National Education Association and the U.S. Office of Education are part of "a vast bureaucracy of 'life adjustment' people who control our primary and secondary schools."

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 12, 1959]

PARENTS CHALLENGED TO SEE SOVIET TESTS

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, father of the nuclear submarine and stormy critic of American education, challenged the Nation's parents yesterday to see how their children would do on tests required of Russian high school graduates.

Rickover introduced a set of Russian examinations into the record when he testified before the House Appropriations Committee last month. He said the set definitely shows that our schools are not the best in the world.

The admiral told the Washington Post yesterday that he hoped parents would write to the committee for copies of the transcript.

"I hope they become angry enough to force their school boards to improve the curriculum, to improve the teaching and to stop wasting the time of our children with fun subjects and other matters unrelated to educations," he declared.

Rickover said 1,600,000 Russian students passed the oral maturity examination in 1957 to graduate from the Soviet Union's 10-year schools—the equivalent to our high schools. He compared the number with 1,458,000 American high school graduates that year—including many who took nonacademic courses.

The Soviet examination "covers a much broader field of knowledge than our college board achievements tests," Rickover told the committee.

Following is an outline of subjects covered by the examinations together with some sample questions. The first and thirteenth topics in each field have been selected as representative samples:

ALGEBRA

1. The types of combinations and permutations. Number of permutations of n elements taken n at a time. Number of permutations of m elements.

Quadratic equations. Complete and incomplete quadratic equations. Solution of quadratic equations of the form $x^2+px+q=0$.

13. Theorem concerning the equivalence of inequalities with multiplication and division of both sides of the inequality by positive and negative numbers.

Logarithums to the base 10 and their properties.

GEOMETRY

1. Properties of the faces and diagonals of a parallelepiped.

Property of the obtuse angles of a convex polyhedral vertex.

13. Right polyhedrons.

Bihedral angle. Linear angle. Equality and inequality of bihedral angles. Theorem: "To equal bihedral angles correspond equal linear angles." Converse theorem.

PHYSICS

1. The first and second laws of Newton.

Laboratory work: Determining the internal resistance of a source of current.

13. Series connection of conductors. Derivation of the formula for the common resistance of conductors connected in series. Additional resistance in voltmeters. Application of series connections of conductors in technology.

Solving the problems concerned with melting and boiling of the type of problem No. 721 (given below) and giving an explanation of the solution.

Problem No. 721: In a container there were 800 grams of water and an equal amount of ice at 0°. What quantity of steam at 100° would be needed to melt all of the ice and to raise the temperature in the container to 30°? The specific heat of the container is 40 calorie/C°.

CHEMISTRY

1. Oxides: Their classification and chemical properties.

Problem: To compute the release of the product of a reaction in terms of percent of theoretically possible, if the quantity of the initial substances and the quantity of the obtained product are known.

Sample problem: In a laboratory 105 grams of nitrobenzene were obtained from 78 grams of benzene during a nitrating reaction. This amount constituted what percentage of the theoretically possible yield?

13. Characterization of the group of alkaline earth metals.

Problem: To determine with the aid of characteristic reactions each of three furnished inorganic substances.

ENGLISH

1. Reading and translation of an unfamiliar text with a dictionary. Answers to questions relating to the text read.

Find in the text compound and derived (common or abstract) nouns; in the derived nouns indicate the suffix.

13. Reading and translation of an unfamiliar text with a dictionary. Answers to questions relating to the text read.

Find in the text verbs in the past perfect; explain the necessity of using past perfect in the given text.

Plans Set for $3 Million Oceanographic Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe, August 23, 1959, under the heading of Canadian-American News, setting forth the fact that Canada is establishing an Oceanographic Institute at a cost of approximately $3 million.

I am very happy to see the Canadian Government taking this action as we need their cooperation and all of the knowledge possible in this field of science.

Canada's initiative in this should quicken our own conscience with regard to expenditures in this field.

[From the Boston Sunday Globe, Aug. 23, 1959]

PLANS SET FOR $3 MILLION OCEANOGRAPHIC INSTITUTE

(By Leonard Lerner)

Canada, with the longest coastline of any country in the world, is expanding oceanography in the Department of Mines and Technical Surveys to fill the need of data on its coast waters for defense and resource assessment.

It is seting up, in Bedfort Basin near Halifax, N.S., a $3 million oceanographic institute, which will have the facilities to allow studies in any phase of this science.

The new institute will take 5 years to complete. It will have a staff of some 300 oceanographers, hydrographers, submarine geologists, and other scientific personnel, plus an operating fleet of 10 vessels.

The first of the new vessels, the $7 million CGS *Hudson*, is expected to be commissioned in 1961.

The entire project will include liaison with the Fisheries Research Board, the Atlantic Oceanographic Group which will be housed in the new institute, and with Dalhousie University which is setting up an institute to train scientists.

Findings on Salmon Migrations at International Oceanographic Congress, Held Under Auspices of the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the truly great mysteries of nature is how a migrating salmon can find the exact creek or streambed where it was spawned 5 or 6 years earlier. Such migrations often involve more than a thousand miles of travel, among thousands of tributaries. How does it happen? Biologists of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and others have sought the answer for countless decades.

Now a Scottish scientist at the United Nations has suggested that a sense of smell may lure pilgrimaging fish across trackless oceans and through a labyrinth of rivers. This is so significant a dispatch from the U.N. headquarters, at the International Oceanographic Congress, that I believe it should be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I know that it will be a source of profound interest to many hundreds of people associated with the Chinook salmon industry in my native Pacific Northwest. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article from the New York Times of September 11, 1959, describing this phenomenon, be printed in the Appendix. Its title is "Fish May Follow Noses Home, Scot's Tests on Salmon Indicate."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH MAY FOLLOW NOSES HOME, SCOT'S TESTS ON SALMON INDICATE

(By Harold M. Schmeck, Jr.)

UNITED NATIONS, NEW YORK, September 10.—Some of the fish that mysteriously find their way across tracking oceans to ancestral spawning grounds may simply be following their noses home, a scientist said here today.

There is evidence that certain fish can follow trails made by extremely dilute chemical traces drifting downstream on ocean currents from the spawning area, said Dr. C. E. Lucas, director of the Marine Laboratory, Aberdeen, Scotland. The chemicals are present in concentrations of a few parts per million or even less.

Dr. Lucas said experiments showed salmon could be guided along the faint chemical trails by what amounted to a combined sense of taste and smell. Fish that had their nostrils plugged in the interests of experiment had greater than normal difficulty in finding their way, he said.

Dr. Lucas spoke at the International Oceanographic Congress, which closes tomorrow at the United Nations. He cited the experiments on fish homing as an example of the unexpected ways in which traces of organic chemicals, spewed out by living things, affect other forms of life in the seas.

Frequently, he observed, minute sea organisms produce compounds essential to the life and well-being of other plants and creatures.

Research suggests, he said in an interview, that this ability to follow faint chemical trails may apply not only to salmon but also to fish that spend their entire life cycles in the open ocean.

In either case, he said, the system appears to work about this way:

In its early life in the spawning area, the fish somehow becomes conditioned to the presences of certain traces of organic chemicals that are characteristic of the locality.

Later, when the fish is ready for spawning, it senses these traces as they drift down current and follows the trail to the home ground.

Just how far such trails may extend is not known, he said. But salmon were thought to travel certainly for hundreds of miles and perhaps thousands to spawn. Some fish find not only the right river but also the right branch of that river in their quest to return to their birthplace.

Experiments on the homing capabilities of Pacific salmon were done originally by Dr. A. D. Halser of the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Lucas said. Further work has been done at the Aberdeen Laboratory.

The evidence may have practical commercial implications, Dr. Lucas indicated. But for the present, there is no hope that a fisherman can attract a salmon by smearing the right chemicals on his hook. The specific nature of the traces the fish appear to follow is unknown.

Probably, Dr. Lucas said, the traces are a proportion of this, that and the other a representation together of the living things peculiar to the immediate area.

Impact of Federal Spending on the Economy and Welfare of the People of the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Members of the House of Representatives from the State of New York are increasingly concerned with the harmful impact of Federal spending upon the economy and the general welfare of the people of the State of New York.

There is extensive unemployment in the State of New York. Federal defense spending has increased on the west coast, while New York State has suffered substantial cutbacks in this area. Federal aid programs increasingly siphon taxes from the people of the State of New York for redistribution to other States. The channeling of wealth out of the State of New York into other areas of the Nation is unjust per se. This process also tends to increase total taxes for New York business and allows other States to attract new industry and New York State industry with State and local tax reduction inducements.

In May 1959, the members of the Republican delegation from the State of New York unanimously agreed to request the Library of Congress to compile the pertinent facts to be used as a basis for remedial measures. The members of the Republican delegation from the State of New York are: JOHN TABER, CLARENCE E. KILBURN, DEAN P. TAYLOR, R. WALTER RIEHLMAN, KATHARINE ST. GEORGE, WILLIAM E. MILLER, HAROLD C. OSTERTAG, J. ERNEST WHARTON, FRANK J. BECKER, ALBERT H. BOSCH, STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN, FRANCIS C. DORN, PAUL A. FINO, JOHN R. PILLION, JOHN H. RAY, STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT, EDWIN B. DOOLEY, HOWARD W. ROBISON, ROBERT R. BARRY, SEYMOUR HALPERN, JOHN V. LINDSAY, ALEXANDER PIRNIE, JESSICA MCC. WEIS, and CHARLES E. GOODELL.

On July 29, the Library of Congress submitted its report to this group. This study is confined to fiscal year 1958, ending June 30, 1958. The following extracted data glaringly points up the systematic Federal extraction of the wealth and earnings out of New York State's citizens:

New York's percentage of the Nation's population: 9.5 percent.

Percentage of Federal tax collected in New York State: 19.52 percent.

Federal tax revenues, fiscal year 1958: $76.06 billion.

Federal taxes paid by New York State, adjusted on the basis of the origin of tax: $10.1 billion.

Percentage of Federal tax paid by New York State on basis of origin of tax: 13.28 percent.

Total Federal expenditures, 1958: $80.49 billion.

Federal expenditures and grants 1958 for New York State: $7,565 billion.

Percentage of Federal expenditures and grants 1958 for New York State: 9.40 percent.

Net loss in 1958 to New York State—difference between tax revenues paid by origin and Federal expenditures plus grants to New York State: $2.45 billion.

The net loss of $2.45 billion amounts to the payment by each man, woman, and child in New York State of about $155 more in Federal taxes than the average citizen of the United States. This huge sum of $2.45 billion is more than the annual total tax revenues of the State of New York. It amounts to an overpayment to the Federal Government by the citizens of New York State of an amount more than the total New York State tax.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID

New York State is particularly and severely penalized in the field of Federal grants-in-aid. The expansion of this type of Federal activity is a most serious threat to the economy and the political well-being of the State of New York.

Federal grants-in-aid in the year 1925 amounted to $124 million. Federal grants-in-aid in 1958 totaled $7.42 billion, an increase of 6,000 percent over the space of 33 years.

In 1958, Federal aid payments in New York State were $482 million out of the national figure of $7.42 billion. The percentage receipts for New York State is 6.5 percent as compared to its population of 9.5 percent and its taxpayments—by origin—of 13.28 percent.

There are 105 different grants-in-aid. Each of them have different formulas or criteria for the distribution of Federal funds. There is no uniform or central rationale or objective.

In practical effect, Federal aid is socialization on the State level. Wealth and earnings are siphoned off from one group of States and redistributed to other States.

CONCLUDING REPORT

The Republican Members of the House representing the State of New York express their gratitude to the Library of Congress and particularly to the members of the staff who worked so diligently on this thorough and exhaustive report.

A concluding report is expected to be submitted by the Library of Congress in January 1960. This report will gather the statutes, formulas, rules, regulations, and policies relating to the allocation and expenditures of Federal funds to States or other geographic areas.

Summarizing, tables I and II of this report are presented:

TABLE I.—*Estimates of Federal tax revenues by State of origin and expenditures by State of recipient or activity, fiscal year 1958*

State	Aggregate		Amount per capita		Amount per $1,000 of personal incomes [1]	
	Tax revenue by State of origin (see table III)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)
Continental United States (total)	*Millions* $76,063	*Millions* $80,490	$447	$469	$220	$233
Alabama	795	1,244	251	390	191	298
Arizona	431	603	400	543	217	303
Arkansas	410	624	230	352	201	307
California	7,671	9,653	553	684	218	275
Colorado	723	918	435	544	217	275
Connecticut	1,563	1,503	680	656	246	237
Delaware	417	244	961	549	348	203
District of Columbia	534	1,097	632	1,333	256	525
Florida	2,004	1,999	476	462	267	266
Georgia	1,102	1,664	292	438	204	308
Idaho	234	227	363	347	224	217
Illinois	5,289	4,268	545	436	224	181
Indiana	1,775	1,804	394	397	195	198
Iowa	966	887	347	316	191	176
Kansas	761	1,465	362	695	199	384
Kentucky	844	1,091	277	356	202	262
Louisiana	966	1,079	315	349	201	225
Maine	359	455	382	481	229	290
Maryland	1,372	2,094	474	716	220	335
Massachusetts	*Millions* $2,575	*Millions* $2,687	$533	$555	$227	$246
Michigan	3,580	2,800	465	360	214	168
Minnesota	1,305	1,103	393	330	212	180
Mississippi	385	608	178	307	184	319
Missouri	1,840	1,867	434	439	223	226
Montana	255	281	379	414	202	223
Nebraska	522	547	363	378	198	207
Nevada	166	160	634	605	257	248
New Hampshire	250	269	437	465	235	253
New Jersey	3,054	2,869	544	505	217	204
New Mexico	280	512	345	618	200	366
New York	10,101	7,565	625	467	247	185
North Carolina	1,219	1,901	273	355	206	270
North Dakota	190	214	294	330	205	232
Ohio	4,437	3,972	482	428	214	191
Oklahoma	773	1,067	342	470	210	290
Oregon	711	610	408	347	210	180
Pennsylvania	5,325	4,473	484	404	228	192
Rhode Island	466	301	474	579	237	293
South Carolina	529	999	223	377	189	323
South Dakota	194	258	279	371	180	240
Tennessee	981	1,036	285	317	206	225
Texas	3,484	4,402	380	475	213	269

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Estimates of Federal tax revenues by State of origin and expenditures by State of recipient or activity, fiscal year 1958*—Continued

State	Aggregate		Amount per capita		Amount per $1,000 of personal incomes [1]		State	Aggregate		Amount per capita		Amount per $1,000 of personal incomes [1]	
	Tax revenue by State of origin (see table III)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)		Tax revenue by State of origin (see table III)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)	Tax revenue (see table IV)	Expenditures (see table VII)
	Millions	*Millions*						*Millions*	*Millions*				
Utah	$291	$335	$347	$451	$202	$267	Wisconsin	$1,611	$1,326	$417	$340	$217	$179
Vermont	151	130	408	349	241	207	Wyoming	143	174	450	546	221	271
Virginia	1,318	2,539	344	654	209	403	Alaska [2]	66		311		115	
Washington	1,179	2,062	433	751	204	356	Hawaii [2]	223		363		203	
West Virginia	591	534	301	272	193	174							

[1] In the supporting tables, these amounts are expressed as percentages of personal incomes.

[2] Not included in total or average for continental United States. The expenditure estimates apply only to the continental area (48 States and the District of Columbia).

TABLE II.—*Percentages and index numbers for estimates of Federal tax revenues, by State of origin and expenditures by State of recipient or activity, fiscal year 1958*

State	Estimated percent of continental United States		Index numbers (U.S. average=100)				State	Estimated percent of continental United States		Index numbers (U.S. average=100)			
	Tax revenue by State of origin (see table IV)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Per capita amount relative to U.S. average		Amount per $1,000 of personal incomes, relative to U.S. average			Tax revenue by State of origin (see table IV)	Expenditures by State of recipient or activity (see table VII)	Per capita amount relative to U.S. average		Amount per $1,000 of personal incomes, relative to U.S. average	
			Tax revenue	Expenditures	Tax revenue	Expenditures				Tax revenue	Expenditures	Tax revenue	Expenditures
Continental United States:							Missouri	2.42	2.32	97	94	101	97
Total	100.00	100.00					Montana	.34	.35	85	88	92	96
Average			100	100	100	100	Nebraska	.69	.68	81	81	90	89
Alabama	1.04	1.55	56	83	87	128	Nevada	.22	.20	142	129	117	106
Arizona	.57	.75	90	116	98	130	New Hampshire	.33	.33	98	99	107	108
Arkansas	.54	.78	52	75	91	152	New Jersey	4.02	3.56	122	108	98	87
California	10.08	11.99	124	146	99	118	New Mexico	.37	.64	77	132	91	157
Colorado	.95	1.14	97	116	98	118	New York	13.28	9.40	140	100	112	79
Connecticut	2.05	1.88	154	140	112	102	North Carolina	1.60	1.99	61	76	93	116
Delaware	.55	.30	215	117	158	87	North Dakota	.25	.27	66	70	93	99
District of Columbia	.70	1.36	146	285	116	226	Ohio	5.83	4.93	108	91	97	82
Florida	2.64	2.48	107	99	121	114	Oklahoma	1.02	1.33	77	100	95	124
Georgia	1.45	2.07	65	94	93	132	Oregon	.93	.76	91	74	95	77
Idaho	.31	.28	81	74	102	93	Pennsylvania	7.00	5.56	108	86	104	82
Illinois	6.95	5.30	122	93	102	78	Rhode Island	.53	.62	106	124	107	125
Indiana	2.33	2.24	88	85	88	85	South Carolina	.70	1.12	50	80	86	138
Iowa	1.27	1.10	78	68	87	75	South Dakota	.25	.32	63	79	82	103
Kansas	1.00	1.82	81	148	91	165	Tennessee	1.29	1.36	64	68	93	98
Kentucky	1.11	1.36	62	76	92	112	Texas	4.58	5.47	85	101	97	114
Louisiana	1.27	1.94	71	75	91	96	Utah	.38	.48	76	96	92	115
Maine	.47	.57	86	103	104	125	Vermont	.20	.16	91	75	110	89
Maryland	1.80	2.60	106	153	100	144	Virginia	1.73	3.15	77	140	95	173
Massachusetts	3.39	3.34	119	118	103	106	Washington	1.55	2.56	97	160	92	153
Michigan	4.71	3.48	104	77	97	72	West Virginia	.78	.66	67	58	87	75
Minnesota	1.72	1.37	88	70	96	77	Wisconsin	2.12	1.65	93	73	99	77
Mississippi	.51	.83	40	66	83	137	Wyoming	.19	.22	101	117	100	116
							Alaska [1]	.09		70		52	
							Hawaii [1]	.29		81		92	

[1] Not included in total or average for continental United States.

Progressive Public Works Are Not "Pork Barrel" Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a marked tendency on the part of the news reporters covering our Nation's Capitol to refer to projects in the public works bill as "pork barrel" works. This slur is both untrue and unfair.

My own State of Texas, which in the past 7 years has known both drought and flood, and now sees larger ships wanting to enter its ports, and the necessities of many vital water conservation projects, shows that the items in the public works bill are not just made work. It is projects such as these in the past which have helped keep our Nation on the road to progress with a dynamic and growing economy.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Corpus Christi Caller for Wednesday, September 9, 1959 entitled "Progressive Public Works Hurt by 'Pork Barrel' Slur."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi Caller, Sept. 9, 1959]

PROGRESSIVE PUBLIC WORKS HURT BY "PORK BARREL" SLUR

Federal public works appropriations, vetoed successfully by President Eisenhower and now under congressional revision, carry the handicap of a slur label that begs reexamination. Like its annual predecessors for many years, the legislation is cynically referred to as the "pork barrel bill."

Webster's defines the "pork barrel" as Federal funds "regarded as appropriated more for local patronage than to make needed improvements." The term is closely allied with another political slang word, "logrolling," which means you vote for my pet project and I'll vote for yours.

No one should be so naive as to deny that Congressmen seek Federal funds to gain and keep their constituents' favor. Nor is it any secret that individual Congressmen and blocs trade out to accomplish that. What needs to be understood is that, within reasonable bounds, that is an indispensable phase of the democratic process of accumulating and compromising minority views and demands to weld them into a practical expression of the majority will.

While the priorities and fiscal impact of the various items in the public works bill may be endlessly debated, we doubt that few, if any, of them fail to merit classification as "needed improvements." The President's veto was on budget-balancing grounds; no

charge was made that the objectionable items were "boondoggles"—valueless projects.

The "pork barrel" slur has moved some to renew the suggestion that the President should have the item veto, such as Texas' Governor has, so that he could eliminate projects he opposes without having to send back the entire public works appropriation bill to Congress for reconsideration. That, however, would place a vast and dubious new power in the Presidency. By threatening Congressmen's pet projects with the item veto, the President could whip them into line behind his own policies. Congress is not likely to subject itself to such dictation from the White House.

In the future, it would be well to discourage the reckless labeling of public works appropriations as "pork barrel bills," unless they actually deserve such approbrium. The bill now under consideration has not deserved that slur, either before or after revision.

Excerpts From Trade Relations Council Publication, Tradeways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Trade Relations Council of the United States, largest coalition of industry and agriculture dedicated to improving our foreign trade policies in the interests of a stronger domestic economy, has just issued the first edition of its publication, TRC Tradeways.

Among other interesting and newsworthy material presented in the first edition is an editorial which, for its concise and analytical appraisal of trends in international trade, merits careful consideration and study. The editorial follows:

This publication, Tradeways, and its sponsor organization, Trade Relations Council, begin life at an historical moment when the trading world enters a dramatic new phase.

All over the globe trading units are reshaping into new production and marketing alinements and patterns. The motivating force is basically political.

The United States and Soviet Russia are today's political giants. In their shadow other countries—even the former top world power, Great Britain—feel individually feeble and frustrated. Hence their desire to merge into the giant class.

The common market is the bridge. Central Europe already has organized one. An outer ring is forming a free trade area. Similar blocs are emerging in Latin America and the Near East. Africa may be the next scene.

The common market is but a means to an end. That end is unification of the component countries. And the end is good if it means stronger allies in the fight for a free world.

While these political units are forming they will throw around themselves all sorts of protective devices to foster the unification process, the effect of which is to discriminate against the outsider. And the United States is outside all of them.

Some of our Government officials appear to think of the European Common Market as an economic manifestation only. They talk of bargaining it out of its dedicated course by offering U.S. tariff cuts via the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade. Already they are preparing for tariff-negotiating sessions in 1961.

We are only deluding ourselves if we think we can hold back an historic groundswell by offering to cut our already-decimated tariffs once again. The only certainty would be to expose American industries to the increasingly injurious effects of imports from low-wage countries.

Those of us familiar with the forthright policies and programs of the American Tariff League, predecessor organization of the Trade Relations Council, have come to expect from this group such candid and realistic statements on public issues. I commend the council for this frank and open presentation of its views.

Passport Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD an excellent and high level statement on passport legislation:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOHN W. HAYNES, JR., ADMINISTRATOR OF SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE, BEFORE THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE ON PASSPORT LEGISLATION AUGUST 5, 1959

Mr. Chairman and members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, we are grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee to testify about passport legislation, and particularly about the need for prompt legislative action to deal with the problem of passports for dangerous American supporters of the international Communist movement.

Our recommendations are necessary because of a present lack of legislative authority in this field as pointed out last year by the Supreme Court, primarily in two decisions. In June 1958, in the Kent, Briehl, and Dayton cases, the Supreme Court by a majority of 5 to 4 said, in effect, that Congress has never given the Secretary of State the authority to deny passports to members or supporters of the international Communist movement, or even to persons whom he has specifically found, are going abroad willfully and knowingly to engage in activities which would advance that movement. The Court did not hold that it was unconstitutional to deny passports to such persons, but only that the Secretary lacked legislative authority to do so. The Court further said that any legislation giving the Secretary such authority must carefully protect the constitutional rights of citizens.

Since that time, the administration has been consistently seeking the passage of such legislation by the Congress. The President and the Secretary of State have both reiterated the need for such legislation. Just over a year ago, representatives of the Department of State appeared before your committee to testify about the urgent need for legislation empowering the Secretary of State to refuse passports to certain supporters of the international Communist movement. At that time the administration suggested a comprehensive bill on passport matters, but we endeavored to make it clear to the committee that we were not suggesting that particular bill reflected the only possible approach to the outstanding problems.

Last year's hearings, before this committee and before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee indicated there was some congressional preference for a measure dealing separately with the Communist problem rather than for comprehensive passport legislation. Indeed, this committee reported out and the House passed such a bill in the closing days of the last Congress. It was not acted on by the Senate.

We still believe a comprehensive measure is ultimately desirable.

We fully agree, however, that the critical problem today is to remedy the total lack of legislative authority to deny passports to really dangerous participants in the international Communist conspiracy. In messages to the Congress last year both President Eisenhower and the late Secretary Dulles underlined the danger represented by this legislative gap which makes legislation in this field essential. Accordingly, the Department has strongly supported such specific remedial proposals now before the Congress. These represent what we believe is the minimum required in the light of the present and continuing danger to our national security.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has the responsibility constantly to consider and to review all aspects of our foreign policy. There is, therefore, certainly no group which understands more clearly than this committee how pervasive and total is the hostility and the menace of international communism.

The late Secretary of State Dulles, in his characteristic terse manner, said that international communism "seeks to unify and harmonize the world by gaining control of all national governments." That basic objective was sought by the Soviet leadership in the days of Lenin, and it has in no way been altered by any of the changes in Soviet leadership down to the present day.

One of the greatest dangers posed by international communism is the full awareness both of its leaders and its followers that they are engaged in a total war with the rest of the world. They wage this war with an unswerving singlemindedness of purpose. They wage it in every way they dare, politically and diplomatically and economically; and they do not hesitate to wage it secretly and subversively.

International communism maintains in every foreign country, and particularly in the United States, a vast well-trained, well-financed subversive organization solely devoted to winning that war. This organization is truly international; its worldwide activities are controlled and centrally directed with ruthless efficiency. Some members of that organization hold American citizenship, but their allegiance is not American, and their loyalty and service is to international communism.

Communication and personal contact are essential to the effective operation of any such complex organization. When, in addition, it is directed from abroad, this becomes doubly important. It requires travel—travel by the leaders and travel by those who carry their messages and their instructions, and by all the others whose activities are necessary to keep the apparatus operating.

Some travel and personal contact would undoubtedly be required even if this whole organization were operating quite openly and legally. Obviously, however, it becomes even more important because so many of its activities must be both secret and illegal. Those who engage in such activities usually fear and avoid regular communications for obvious reasons, and instead use personal assignments and personal discipline. Such a conspiracy can operate suc-

cessfully only so long as it can maintain secure and rapid communications. It is a basic rule of Communist practice to communicate by word of mouth rather than in writing and to avoid the usual communications methods. If their vast personal communication network is impaired, their operations are rendered less effective and the whole conspiracy is placed under a serious handicap. We believe it is a handicap which we should impose on it to the limit of our ability; and we certainly think that we should not be required to facilitate its communication.

Our weapons against Communist subversion in this country have been a closely interlinked set of techniques. They have included penetration of the conspiracy and constant surveillance. Always, to the extent we could achieve it by passport and visa and immigration regulations, they involved denial to the conspirators of free movement in and out of the country and thereby of easy and satisfactory communications.

The loss of our ability to stop American members of the Communist apparatus from getting passports has blunted the other weapons we have against the Communist conspiracy. For example, our success in preventing the entry of foreign Communist agents and couriers with their financing and instructions from headquarters becomes rather hollow if American members of the apparatus can travel freely out of the country. Similarly, the most successful penetration of the domestic Communist apparatus by agents of the United States is rendered much less useful if the persons can evade observation for extended periods by traveling abroad, probably behind the Iron Curtain where we can hardly expect to know what they are doing.

The Communists have invariably stepped up their activities whenever we have let the bars down. At one time the dangerous members of the conspiracy, if they had to travel abroad, had the alternatives only of doing so illegally without a passport, or of resorting to fraud and falsification to get passports, and thereby exposing themselves to criminal prosecution. Today an American Communist does not have to resort to fraud—there is no incentive for it. He may get a passport, in his own name, on his own birth certificate, with his own picture. He can require his Government to legalize and assist his travels. This is the facilitation he wants and needs.

I would like briefly to try to put the problem of control of Communist travel in proper perspective. For the 2 calendar years preceding the Supreme Court decisions of last summer, over a million passports were issued or renewed. Out of this group, 51 were initially and tentatively turned down because of alleged affiliation with the Communist movement. These individuals were afforded access to an elaborate hearing and appeal machinery. Indeed, in the entire 6 year period since that machinery was established in 1952, the Secretary of State—and it must be the Secretary personally—finally denied passports on Communist grounds to only 15 persons after they had exhausted their administrative remedies. Some others were granted passports after hearings; and some did not contest the Department's ruling.

I think that these figures concerning the number of Americans whose passport privileges were actually curtailed by the Department's Communist regulations are very revealing; but obviously they do not represent the scope of the problem posed by the travel of Communists.

When these regulations were in effect, most of the really active Communists refrained from applying for a passport. The few who did apply were usually stopped at the threshold, because they refused to supply the Department with a sworn statement concerning their current and past affiliation with the Communist Party. There were just over a hundred such cases in each of the calendar years 1956 and 1957. Most dangerous Communists are equally unwilling either to expose their party connections or to run the risk of a perjury indictment.

There can be no doubt about the deterring effect of our regulations and the affidavit requirement. For, since the Supreme Court decisions of last year, a number of old-line, dedicated Communists have applied for and have had to be granted passports.

The objectives of the legislation we need are rather simple. We need legislative authorization for the Secretary of State to deny passports (as appropriate) to persons who are presently engaging in activities knowingly intended to further the purposes of the international Communist movement. This authority should be based on congressional findings as to the danger to our country inherent in those purposes.

You will notice that I spoke of people who are engaging in activities and that I further said presently engaging. We think both these matters are important.

We do not want authority to restrict the movement of people who hold political, social or economic opinions which are not of the orthodox American variety.

We seek only the authority to deny passports because of a person's present knowing engagement in activities for the purpose of advancing the Communist movement. We do not seek authority to deny passports to American citizens who are not today a danger to our security, even though at some time in the past they may have supported the Communist conspiracy. We do believe, however, that present membership in the Communist Party, or present activities under party discipline or under the direction or control of the Communist movement, should be considered as important evidence of furtherance of the international Communist movement. When a person is knowingly engaging in such activities, he should carry the burden of demonstrating clearly that he will not engage in such activities while abroad. On balance this is fair, since the Department first has to show that the person is knowingly engaging in such activities.

A person's past actions alone, of course, should not disqualify him from receiving a passport, although naturally they cannot be entirely ignored in assessing his present and probable future actions.

If a person does come within these carefully defined categories, the Secretary of State should be able to deny him a passport without demonstrating the specific harm he would do on a specific future trip. Indeed, at the time of application, a Communist may have no specific trip or mission in mind, or he may not receive his orders until long after he receives his passport. The passport, however, once issued, remains valid for 2 years, renewable for 2 more.

As a general rule, we cannot show in advance what a dedicated Communist is going to do on a particular trip abroad. We may not find out for many years, if ever. Communists do not tell us on their passport applications that they seek to subvert us. We may have some indication what a particular Communist intends to do abroad, but this is the exception rather than the rule. The fact is, the more nefarious his purpose—the more important his mission—the less likely we are to know about it; and even if we do know we would, in all probability, not be in a position to document it for the open record. We must be able to anticipate harm to our foreign relations and our national security. The action we take is and should be preventive, but never punitive.

This brings up one other essential of passport legislation which is often misunderstood, and that is the necessity for the Government to be able to utilize confidential information, under carefully controlled circumstances, as part of the basis of its decision.

I would like to make very clear that in our opinion any legislation purporting to deny passports to Communist supporters would not achieve that purpose if it entirely prohibited the Government from utilizing confidential information. We certainly do not seek legislative authority to rely absolutely on confidential information, or to utilize it so as to preclude an opportunity for the passport applicant to rebut it. On the other hand, our experience and careful analysis of past cases has shown that almost without exception dangerous cases in the Communist area involve some confidential information. The reason for its being confidential is almost always in order to protect the investigative source. Indeed, the more recent and meaningful the information is, the more likely it is that it has come from current investigative sources within the Communist movement.

The Government has an overriding interest in maintaining the security of these investigative sources and methods. Of all the weapons which we have against the Communist conspiracy, our knowledge of its current operations is certainly the most important. If faced with the unpleasant choice of exposing and thereby destroying a valuable and continuing source of such knowledge, and issuing a passport to an individual member of the conspiracy, the Government would have no alternative but reluctantly to issue the passport as the lesser evil.

I do not mean to imply that confidential information comprises a major, or even a very large part of any total case. It almost never does. But the part it does play is often vital in relating the separate parts of the case.

Legislation designed to prohibit passports to Communist supporters but which would prevent us from utilizing any confidential information whatsoever by requiring full confrontation, would, we fear, generate the dangerous illusion that the travel of Communists was being controlled, when actually it would not be. Such legislation would, in effect, guarantee the most dedicated and dangerous Communist an absolute right to travel.

The situation is similar with regard to highly sensitive information obtained from foreign sources or our own diplomatic and consular representatives abroad. Our foreign intelligence depends to a great extent upon close cooperation with other friendly governments and we cannot afford to prejudice these arrangements.

However, we have not operated, nor do we seek to operate, in an unrestricted manner in this field. Unless the full disclosure of information and the sources thereof would, in the opinion of the Secretary of State, have a substantial adverse effect upon the national security or the conduct of foreign relations, then the Department would either disclose both, or not rely upon the information. Under existing case law, there must be findings of fact by the Secretary of State and these findings must state the extent to which they are based upon confidential information, and must set forth specifically the reasons why such information cannot be fully disclosed. We think this is wise and should be continued. Under such requirements the Secretary could hardly, even if he were so disposed, render a decision based on unsubstantiated rumors or gossip.

Moreover, we are suggesting a further significant step to safeguard the interests of the individual applicant. We feel, after careful consideration of the details of past cases, that the Department can and should provide the passport applicant with a fair

résumé of any confidential evidence which cannot be disclosed fully. In most cases, this would mean giving him everything except the identity of the source. The applicant would then have due notice of the points in issue and would be given an adequate oportunity to rebut this information.

I believe that when the Secretary of State asserts that he cannot spread certain information on an open record; explains with as much particularity as possible the reasons of national security why he cannot do so; furnishes a summary which he certifies to be a fair summary of the information; and makes specific findings of fact, we should be able to rely on the Secretary's integrity and accept his statement.

Lastly, we feel there should be legislative approval of a reasonable oath requirement as to present or near-past Communist Party membership. We think it desirable to have a clear expression of congressional approval on this subject.

The oath requirement under our now defunct regulations was very helpful to us. So long as the requirement is reasonable and pertinent, we do not believe that such an affidavit infringes unduly on the rights of anyone seeking a passport. I am not speaking of any so-called test oath. The affidavit would not have to be answered in any particular way in order for the applicant to receive a passport. Nor would any particular answer cut short the administrative procedure open to him. His answer would be merely another factor in the consideration of his case on its merits.

I would now like, with the committee's permission, to comment briefly on some of the bills which are before you.

H.R. 55 (SELDEN BILL)

H.R. 55 and a number of other identical bills before the committee are in the same form as the bill which passed the House on August 23 last year.

The Department is in full accord with the objectives of H.R. 55. Representatives of the Department apepared before this committee twice last year in connection with the formulation of a narrow bill directed at the problem of Communist travel. The bill which this committee reported out, H.R. 13760, was, in the Department's opinion, adequate to meet the problem. However, the bill was amended on the floor to provide that the judicial review established by the bill should be on the record. The Department had previously advised the committee, when consideration was being given to such a provision, that it would seriously reduce the effectiveness of the bill in accomplishing the purpose intended, and would place the Government "in the hopeless dilemma of revealing confidential information and sources, or, failing to do so, of issuing the passport."

H.R. 55 contains this same provision which is the only aspect of the bill with which the Department disagrees.

The Department, in commenting on H.R. 55 earlier this year proposed certain revisions which we think would strengthen it. We also suggested the addition of rather complete administrative review provisions to spell out adequate safeguards of the citizen's constitutionally protected right to exit the United States.

If the committee decides that only the most minimum provisions should be enacted, and a bill should be kept to its simplest terms, the Department would endorse H.R. 55 if it were amended (by deleting three words) to conform to the bill unanimously reported by this committee last year. We believe that this bill would give the Department the legislative authority found lacking by the Supreme Court in the Kent-Briehl and Dayton cases.

H.R. 7006 (BENTLEY BILL)

H.R. 7006 was introduced after the Department submitted its comments on H.R. 55. This bill contains all of the suggestions the Department made in those comments.

We believe that H.R. 7006 would also give the Department the legislative authority it needs.

We believe this is a good bill. We strongly support it and we hope the committee will report it favorably to the House.

I understand the Department of Justice forwarded its technical comments on H.R. 7006 to the committee in mid-June. However, I am sure the committee would be interested in a current statement of the position of the Attorney General on passport legislation.

The Attorney General has advised me that the Department of Justice shares the view of the Department of State that the enactment of legislation along the more comprehensive lines of the administration's bill in the last Congress would be preferable. However, he agrees with us that our most urgent current problem in the passport field is the lack of congressional authority to deny passports to those persons in situations where information establishes that their travel abroad would constitute a real danger to the United States. Accordingly, if the Congress decides to enact legislation dealing with this narrower problem, the Attorney General informed me that his Department joins with the Department of State in supporting the provisions of H.R. 7006 and believes it would supply statutory authority found lacking by the Supreme Court in the Kent-Briehl and Dayton cases. He continues to feel, as he suggested, that certain minor technical revisions of the bill would be helpful.

H.R. 8329 (HAYS BILL)

H.R. 8329 was only recently introduced and the Department received a request for comment last Friday. Our comments were forwarded to the committee this morning.

Basically the Department feels that this bill would not provide effectively for the denial of passports to Communist supporters, and therefore is inadequate to counter the existing danger. We also feel that, inasmuch as it obviously is a comprehensive passport bill, it would, by the omission of certain important provisions, severely restrict the existing authority of the Secretary of State to act on considerations of foreign policy in the passport field.

Section 103 of H.R. 8329, for example, appears to enumerate certain sole grounds upon which passports could be denied. This enumeration would by omission severely restrict the existing authority of the Secretary of State to act on individual passport cases on the basis of reasonably anticipated harm to the foreign relations of the United States.

Section 103(a)(3) of H.R. 8329 lists three rather extreme grounds on which passports may be denied on national security grounds. Naturally, we agree with these three grounds, although we feel that the Department presently has authority to deny passports in any cases where there is substantial evidence of such serious activities. We believe, however, that the exclusion of all other grounds would make it unlikely that even dedicated and known Communists could be refused passports under the provisions of this section.

An advance showing that a particular person would, when abroad, engage in one of the narrowly defined extreme activities listed in this section would be impossible in almost every case, for reasons I have indicated earlier in this testimony. We rarely have reliable information even as to where a Communist is going, much less as to what he specifically intends to do when he gets there. Our experience teaches us that such people frequently misrepresent the places they intend to go, as well as the true purpose of their travel. Furthermore, under section 201 of this bill the Department would not even be able to inquire of the applicant about the purpose or length of his proposed travel.

Section 201(c)(2) of H.R. 8329 specifically prohibits the Secretary of State from asking an applicant for any information with regard to membership in any organization which is not finally registered under the provisions of the Subversive Activities Act of 1950. Of course, as the committee is aware, no organization (including the Communist Party) is yet included in this category because of protracted litigation. The Department doubts that reliance on this provision of the 1950 act (which has not yet become effective and appears unlikely to do so in the near future) is the best way to meet the Communist passport problem in 1959.

A difficult problem is posed by section 307 of H.R. 8329, especially subsection (d). This provision would require the judicial branch of the Government to substitute its judgment for that of the executive branch in determining whether the disclosure of particular information would have a substantially adverse effect upon national security and foreign relations. The courts have long held that in such areas the executive branch has special competence as well as broad constitutional authority, and the courts should be hesitant to trespass. The Department fears that this section might effectively nullify those desirable provisions of H.R. 8329 which recognize the necessity for the Government to rely on confidential information under some circumstances.

There are many provisions of H.R. 8329 with which the Department is in agreement, and there are a few other technical objections which are set forth in greater detail in our letter of comment. The Department's overall opinion, however, is that the bill would not be effective in meeting the present danger to the national security, and that it would not supply the statutory authority found lacking by the Supreme Court in the Kent-Briehl and Dayton cases.

H.R. 2468 (COLLIER BILL)

H.R. 2468, on which the Department recently submitted views to the committee, appears identical with H.R. 7315.

The Department is in accord with the apparent objectives of this bill. We feel that H.R. 2468 would probably meet the problems we face in the Communist area. The Department believes, however, that its provisions are more restrictive than is required.

Furthermore, the bill proposes to incorporate into statute provisions of our passport regulations which were not invalidated by the Supreme Court. The Department finds no objection to this; however, in the last Congress both this committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee indicated a preference for adopting a narrow approach to the Communist problem. We would not wish to prejudice the likelihood of getting remedial legislation in that area by insisting on legislative recognition of any broader authority at this time, even though it would be ultimately desirable.

We have often pointed out to the Congress that we do not believe there is only one magic formula to our legislative needs in this area. However, we think provisions along the lines of H.R. 7006 are more adequate both from the standpoint of the individual and the Government.

H.R. 5455 (CURTIS BILL)

There are many features of this bill with which the Department is in agreement. Again we believe H.R. 5455 would probably provide adequate authority in the Communist area, but the bill includes provisions that are much broader than this. In fact, certain provisions of the bill seem to go beyond the comprehensive legislative endorsement of authority we requested in the administration's bill submitted to the last Congress. If this type of comprehensive bill is to receive consideration, the Department would prefer provisions along the lines of those formerly proposed.

Additionally, H.R. 5455 (sec. 7) would create a U.S. Passport Service. The Department is firmly opposed to this feature of the bill. The Department feels strongly that the Secretary of State should be permitted to organize his Department as he deems necessary. It has been longstanding executive branch policy, as well as the recommendation of the Hoover Commission, that department heads should not be deprived of authority to determine the organization of their respective departments.

Section 7 of H.R. 5455 is defective in a number of other ways besides being a violation of sound administrative practice, as the Department has pointed out in our detailed comment upon the bill.

I have tried to make clear the Department's earnest desire to establish a fair administrative process by which we can achieve a balance between a danger to the security of the United States and the citizen's right not to have his freedom of movement unreasonably restricted.

We seek only the means to protect the United States by denying passports to those relatively few citizens who are knowingly engaged in the activities of the Communist conspiracy, and whose travel abroad would thus be a danger to the security of the United States.

Algeria and the 14th General Assembly of the U.N.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Homer A. Jack is the newly appointed associate executive director of the American Committee on Africa, which has offices in New York City. Before joining the committee staff he was minister of the Unitarian Church, of Evanston, Ill.

Dr. Jack has written an enlightening article on the Algerian problem, which appeared in the Christian Century for September 9, 1959, which is included here under a previous unanimous consent.

[From the Christian Century, Sept. 9, 1959]

THE FORGOTTEN WAR

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—The 14th General Assembly of the United Nations, due to open September 15, will hardly be less concerned with Africa than the 13th, which discussed at least 20 issues affecting Africa and in February held a special session on the Cameroons. Once again the case of South-West Africa will be reopened, with South Africa continuing to dodge responsibility for her mandate. The International Court of Justice may be asked to accept jurisdiction and compel South Africa to submit reports on that territory to the U.N.

South Africa will also be reminded at the U.N. of apartheid within her borders, including her treatment of residents of Indian origin. And again on the U.N. agenda will be challenges to Portugal's claim that Angola and Mozambique are integral parts of metropolitan Portugal. Efforts will also be made to induce the General Assembly to discuss Britain's Central African Federation, although Charter obstacles might prevent a full-dress debate on deteriorating conditions in the Rhodesias and Nyasaland.

I

But the chronic issue before the U.N. is the continuing war in Algeria. The past decade has witnessed war in Korea, Indochina, Suez—and Algeria. All the other wars have, in one way or another, come to an end, but the Algerian war will enter its sixth year on November 1 with no end in sight.

Recently the French have come under increasing attack for various acts of cruelty and for their treatment of an estimated million Algerians held in regrouping centers. In April 35 French Roman Catholic priests serving with their country's army in Algeria formally condemned the use of torture and the summary execution of civilian and military prisoners by the French. In May two of France's leading Christians, Maurice Cardinal Feltin and Pastor Marc Boegner, jointly issued a statement suggesting that the Christian conscience cannot remain indifferent to the treatment of the Algerians in the French regroupment centers. In June a small book, "La Gangrène," by seven Algerian students was published. It described tortures administered to them by the French police in Paris: "The gangrene of torture has traveled from Algiers to Paris." This book was promptly banned, but its allegations have not been disproved. Indeed the Catholic weekly Christian Testimony commented: "As long as France's answer to the expressed will of a people to live is torture, it is France that will be menaced by death."

About 300,000 Algerians are refugees in Morocco and Tunisia. They receive some help through the Red Crescent, an affiliate of the International Red Cross. Aid is also coming to them from the United States, including Church World Service, and two dozen Algerian students have scholarships in the United States. More aid to Algerian refugees is badly needed in this World Refugee Year.

Although General de Gaulle was put into office partly by French extremists in Algeria, there were hopes that, because of his popular mandate, he would try to negotiate an end to the Algerian war. But though there are rumors of secret talks, his government has refused to enter into serious negotiations, except on terms that Algerians will not accept. France has now begun the "integration" of Algeria into France—as if there were no continuing war. Recently the French army opened a new offensive.

II

For almost a year there has been in existence the Provisional Government of the Algerian Republic, created by the National Liberation Front. With Ferhat Abbas as Prime Minister, this government has headquarters in liberated Algerian territory. Some of its ministerial departments operate from Tunis and Cairo and it has offices in London and New York. Despite threats of reprisals from France, 16 nations have recognized this government, the latest being Ghana. The nine independent African states, at their inaugural meeting in April 1958, voted to aid Algeria to become independent. Their foreign ministers held an unprecedented meeting in Liberia early in August primarily to decide what further steps they could take to help Algeria become free. Several Arab nations also have given the provisional government economic and perhaps military aid.

The so-called Algerian question was first put on the U.N. agenda in 1955. However, no extensive debates took place until the 11th and 12th sessions of the Assembly in 1957. Twenty-four Asian-African nations requested that the issue be considered by the 13th session last autumn. In debates in the political committee, a resolution was passed recognizing the right of the Algerian people to independence and urging negotiations between the two parties concerned with a view of reaching a solution in conformity with the charter of the U.N. The vote was 32 to 18, with 30 nations abstaining and the United States voting in the negative. This resolution contained a reference to the provisional government of Algeria which the sponsors volunteered to omit during the plenary debate. The vote on this modified resolution was 35 to 18, with 28 abstentions. This time the United States, in a partial but significant change of policy, abstained. The result was one vote short of the two-thirds majority necessary for Assembly approval of the resolution, but the moral result was clear to everybody—except France.

Some weeks ago 22 Asian-African nations sent to the U.N. Security Council a memorandum urging it to look into the deteriorating situation in Algeria. At about the same time 25 nations, including Japan and the Philippines (both of which abstained from voting on the Algerian question in the 13th Assembly), requested that Algeria be put on the agenda of the 14th Assembly. It is predicted that there will easily be a two-thirds vote in the plenary session, with several more Latin American states supporting the resolution.

III

Algeria apparently constitutes one of the most difficult decisions for American policymakers. The United States wants to be friendly with France, its longtime ally and NATO partner. Yet it presumably wants to keep in step with its own revolutionary tradition, with modern history, and with the Asian-African world. Present State Department policy (dictated, significantly, by its European rather than its African Section) calls for a peaceful, democratic, and just solution for Algeria. This is the essence of ambiguity. One U.S. official recently said that the American vote on Algeria in the next General Assembly will be decided on the highest level, almost a military decision rather than a political one.

The Algerian war is the forgotten war. Nobody in the United States seems very concerned. The labor movement has passed several resolutions on Algeria, but what has the church done? In England, however, a British Committee on Algeria has lately been formed. In Tunisia and Morocco there are still hopes that together with a free Algeria they can form a North African federation, the Mahgreb. Tunisian Premier Habib Bourguiba in July urged the Pope to mediate the Algerian conflict. In France itself many intellectuals are deeply disturbed by the intransigence and cruelty exhibited by the representatives of their nation in Algeria. As Jean-Paul Sartre said some time ago, "If we want to save France from this disgrace and the Algerians from this hell, there has always been and still is only one way—to open negotiations and to make peace."

The 14th General Assembly of the United Nations will ask France to do just that. We of the United States should get off the political fence, interest ourselves in this vital issue affecting the Mediterranean and the whole African world, and risk the worst with France if necessary.

HOMER A. JACK.

C. D. McNamee, Great Newspaperman and Outstanding Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, a great newspaperman, and one of Michigan's outstanding citizens recently retired as editor of the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle published in the Ninth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent. Mr. C. D. McNamee steps down after he devoted 51 years of his life earning a reputation as one of Michigan's top journalists.

Mr. McNamee's distinguished newspaper career began in 1908 with the Owosso (Mich.) Press-American. He served as a reporter and editor with the Detroit Tribune from 1911 to 1917. When he left the old Detroit Tribune 42 years ago, he joined the staff of the Muskegon Chronicle, serving first as a county and city reporter, then as associate editor beginning in 1925, and managing editor beginning in 1936, and, finally, as editor since 1950.

His many readers and those who have worked for him over the years revere and respect Mr. McNamee as a man who knows his business as a newspaperman, who is firm in his convictions, and who has never hesitated to take a forthright public position on vital issues affecting his community, State and Nation.

Throughout the period of his editorship, Mr. McNamee was eminently successful in his dedicated efforts to publish a newspaper which was interesting to read, complete in its coverage of national and local affairs, forthrightly independent in its leadership in public affairs, and highly influential not only in western Michigan but throughout the State.

In addition to the long hours which he spent at his editor's desk, Mr. McNamee always found time for great personal sacrifices in time and effort in a wide variety of civic activities. To mention only a few of his community interests, Mr. McNamee provided outstanding leadership in the organization of the West Shore Symphony, the Muskegon Civic Theater Association, the Greater Muskegon Community Chest; he has been a tireless leader in the Boy Scouts organization; and he pioneered the establishment of the commission-manager form of city government for Muskegon.

Over the years, he has been the recipient of many honors and awards for distinguished service; for example, he received the distinguished service award of the Michigan Department of the Marine Corps League, he was cited by Temple B'nai Israel in 1952 as the outstanding Christian of the year, and, more recently, a special resolution of appreciation was adopted by the Muskegon City Commission in recognition of his leadership in successful community efforts to attract new industry to Muskegon.

A few months ago, Mr. McNamee received the annual award of the Michigan United Conservation Clubs, honoring the Muskegon Chronicle as the outstanding newspaper in the State of Michigan for its reporting of conservation news.

Mr. McNamee has been active for many years in such professional organizations as the American Society of Newspapermen, the Michigan Press Association, the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, and the University of Michigan Press Association. He served as a lecturer in the University of Michigan School of Journalism.

He has always taken a particular interest and genuine pride in the training of young journalists. His cub reporters usually found him to be a rough taskmaster at the beginning, but they soon learned that his example and demanding standards provided invaluable guidelines for their own careers.

Mr. McNamee's half-century of service as a newspaperman and civic leader stands as a record of outstanding achievement worthy of the attention and recognition of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues in the Congress and my constituents, I warmly extend to Mr. McNamee the wish that he may enjoy many happy years of retirement and good health.

Farm Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, when farm imports exceed farm exports in our country with its overwhelming farm surpluses it is a national calamity and unbelievable; but, Mr. Speaker, here are the figures:

FARM EXPORTS FELL BELOW 1958 IMPORTS

In a reversal of form, the United States imported more agricultural products during the year ending July 31 than it exported.

In the previous 12-month period, the exports exceeded the imports.

Preliminary figures put exports during the year at $3,720,450,000 in value and imports at $4,005,258,000. In the preceding year, the exports were $4,001,820,000 and the imports $3,929,422,000.

Agriculture Department officials said the decline in foreign sales during the past year largely reflected a sharp drop in cotton sales. U.S. cotton prices were above world levels.

An upsurge in exports is expected during the 12-month period ending next July 1, largely on the basis that cotton has been returned to a competitive price basis in world markets.

Petition of the Federated Indians of California for a Redress of Grievances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, there is reproduced below the contents of a petition of the Federated Indians of California for a redress of grievances, which today has been filed in the House of Representatives:

PETITION OF THE FEDERATED INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA FOR A REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES

To the GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES:

We, the Federated Indians of California, one of the organizations among the 36,000 enrolled Indians of the State of California, pursuant to a resolution unanimously adopted at a convention, duly called and peaceably assembled, at the county courthouse, in the city of Sacramento, State of California, on the 16th day of August 1959, do hereby submit to the Government of the United States this, our petition for a redress of grievances under the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States which reads as follows:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Our President, whom the Indians of this country call the Great White Father has just obtained from Congress the passage of legislation to curb and eradicate what he called gangsterism, racketeering, and corrupt practices existing in the field of labor-management relations brought to light by months of investigation by the committees of the Congress.

In presenting this petition we desire to bring to the attention of the Government of the United States the fact that the Indians of California, in the matter of the just settlement of their claims against the United States, authorized to be presented to the Indian Claims Commission, and by appeal, to the courts, are suffering now, and have suffered for many years, from the same evils, namely, racketeering, gangsterism, and corruption largely in connection with the selection of attorneys to present our claims to the legal tribunals established by law and in some instances the attorneys themselves have violated the laws of the State of California and of the United States. These evils have existed for many years and have caused us, not only substantial losses in money, but have delayed and thwarted the just settlement of our claims for many years. Selfish and unprincipled men, some of whom have criminal records, have wormed their way into our affairs and for years have collected large sums of money from our people on false pretenses; in one instance of which we have documentary proof, a group of men organized a gambling corporation in Nevada, transferred their activities to California, the par value of the stock being the sum of 10 cents with provision in its articles of incorporation under Nevada law for the sale of 1 million shares, and the purpose set forth in said articles was dealing in the claims of thousands of Indians against the United States for a profit; and we also have documentary proof that several attorneys now

prominent and vocal in our affairs have, or had a contract with this company. We have found that a number of other violations of law have occurred in connection with the activities of some attorneys in our claims cases.

We have brought these evils to the attention of the officials of the State of California and of the United States but so powerful have been the political and personal influence brought to bear upon public officials that our rights have not been protected; we cannot mention or recall a single instance of anything ever having been done by either Federal or State officials to correct the evils we have mentioned, herein.

We, therefore, as members of the Indian race and duly enrolled descendants of the tribes and bands of Indians who occupied and owned the major part of the lands of the State of California at the time they were acquired by the United States from the Republic of Mexico under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in the year 1848, and vitally interested in the just settlement of our claims against the United States now being litigated before the Indian Claims Commission; and also as citizens of the State of California and of the United States, in the exercise of a right given to us by the first amendment to the Constitution, for the purpose of freeing ourselves from the chains of servitude and oppression placed upon us by gangsters and racketeers to the end that our just claims may be settled according to the principles of right, truth, and justice and the schemes and purposes of these selfish men exposed and thwarted and the men involved in them forever banished and forever expelled from our midst, and prevented hereafter from ever having anything to do with our affairs, do hereby submit this petition for a redress of grievances to the Government of the United States earnestly urging it to see to it that the laws enacted by Congress for our protection be enforced and fully carried out.

By authority of the Federated Indians of California as set forth in the foregoing resolution:

FEDERATED INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA,
By BERTHA STEWART, *Secretary.*

Signed at San Francisco, Calif., September 8, 1959.

I Am an American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include an excellent and sympathetic speech made by Miss Clora Ann Click of Des Moines, N. Mex., when she won the New Mexico 4-H talent and public speaking contest held in Las Cruces, N. Mex. I think all of us can profit by reading the remarks made by this fine young girl:

I AM AN AMERICAN, THIS IS MY COUNTRY

The title of my speech is "I Am an American, This Is My Country." Have you ever made this statement, or even thought about it? I think that it is one of the greatest things a person can say, because, after all, what other statement can you think of that covers so much ground and means so much to you personally?

The main trend of events during the last 2 years has been toward the scientific phase and development of America. People have been concerned with the number of satellites we have in comparison to the number Russia has, whether the next rocket try will reach its goal or will fall back to earth a failure, with the long months of preparation ruined in one fatal moment, and whether the experts in charge will ever perfect the means to actually send a person to the moon. I'm not going to minimize this scientific part of America, because I believe that it is a very important part of our lives—both personally and as a Nation of people. I do believe, however, that while we have not been putting too much emphasis on this part of America, that maybe the rest of America and what it means to be an American, has not had enough emphasis.

Since I live in a ranching part of the country, I am naturally more aware of the bountiful lands of America than a person would be who had always lived in the city. The various industries all have their places in this land and many of them are dependent on natural resources. For instance there are the mining, petroleum, and forestry industries, to mention just a few. May I add a word here on these natural resources? We should all realize that they are part of our heritage on this great land and that we must help to preserve them for future generations.

The educational opportunities are better here than anywhere else in the world. Where else can a person go to school in public schools, use free textbooks, have the advantage of having good teachers who are well trained, and further their education in their own chosen field without fear of interference from the government? We should remember that people everywhere are not as privileged as we are and in many cases are told what field to enter and then put to work where they are needed most rather than where they want to work. I believe that young people too often don't realize that their responsibility in return for this trust in them is great. We are the future leaders of the world and it is up to us to take full advantage of every opportunity coming our way to better prepare us for the work ahead.

There are many of us who are born Americans and have all the rights of Americans as soon as we can use them. There are many others who are immigrants and have fought hard to become Americans. Stop to consider for a minute—what if you had been born somewhere else? Don't you think that you would want to become an American as quickly as possible? I am sure that I would. While some of the immigrant Americans have been content to merely stop at the slums, there are those who are striving earnestly to better themselves and their position whenever possible and many have been successful.

Politics may seem very remote and far away from us right now, but it is really a very strong influence on our lives. Even though the great majority of us will never actually run for a public office, it is still our personal responsibility to try to get the best person into office. We can do this by supporting the campaign of the person who is our choice for the office and above all, by our vote. Voting is one of our most important privileges and duties. To vote wisely, we should inform ourselves and then by our very presence at the polls, we will show that we are willing to take up the fight to keep America on a democratic basis.

President Roosevelt appeared before Congress on January 6, 1941, and outlined a plan to help the Allies in the war against the Axis. First of all he stated the four freedoms. They are as follows: The first is freedom of speech and expression. This is used many, many times, and without it many democratic functions of this country would fail and we would have an almost insurmountable personal obstacle. This second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way. This is very important to us personally. The Bible is the greatest book we have and we must have faith in God and in his supremacy before we can ever fully complete our mission on this earth. I believe that we were all put here to fulfill a purpose and if we don't pay proper respect to our maker and study his word, we will be left with a huge void in our lives. The third is freedom from want, and the fourth is freedom from fear. In world terms these last two insure our happiness and safety here. Freedom from want must be obtained through economic understandings and freedom from fear can be obtained through a world reduction of armaments to such an extent that nations cannot commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor.

These four freedoms were intended to reach all over the world, and apply to every nation. Of course we know that they have not been followed throughout the world, but freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and other freedoms, such as freedom of the press, are in effect in this country. Our forefathers have fought many battles to give us these freedoms, and now it is up to us to keep them going and to do our best to live up to them in their fullest sense.

Modern science and inventions have shaped our lives to a very great extent. Laboratories have turned out countless devices and gadgets and have made discoveries to further our comfort, pleasure, and knowledge. Let me mention a few of the more important ones: Electricity, automobiles, airplanes, missiles, movies, radio, television, radar, medical advances, development of atomic power, plastics, telephones, and many others. I could use all of my allotted time in talking just about these inventions. Take, for instance, the telephone. We all know that it was invented by Alexander Graham Bell in 1876. Two years later the first central switchboard was put into operation, and by the end of the century more than 700,000 telephones were in use in the United States. Now the United States has more telephones than the entire remainder of the world combined. Pehaps another good example would be the automobile industry. We all know something of the tremendous advancements in this industry since the first cars were invented. There really are not too many things in the new cars which are like those of the first cars, and the appearances are, at least, certainly different.

Our scientific advancements are superior to those found anywhere else in the world. Even from behind the Iron Curtain, students are sent to America for more advanced training in this field.

I think that you can see by now that America is by far the most advanced country, with so many advantages over any other country that they can hardly compare. I am proud, and I'm sure that you are too, to be able to make the statement: I am an American, this is my country.

Petroleum Industry Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the 100th anniversary of the birth of the petroleum industry in Titusville, Pa., August 27,

1859, was celebrated the week of August 23 through 29, 1959.

It was indeed a great honor to have the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, the Postmaster General of the United States, as the speaker on the auspicious occasion of the dedication of a new postage stamp, issued in commemoration of the drilling of the first commercial oil well by Col. Edwin Drake.

As a Member of Congress from the 24th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, I consider that it was a high tribute to my district and to the oil industry to have the Postmaster General take time out of his busy schedule to make this contribution to the success of the oil centennial.

Small Businessmen Plagued by Government Forms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from Mr. Al Schock, president of the Terrace Park Dairy, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Mr. Schock is an outstanding business and civic leader. His letter to the Director of the Census, in reply to a request to complete a new Government form is, in my opinion, a graphic statement of the small businessman's legitimate complaint about the morass of Government forms. Many small businessmen have told me that a sizable amount of their time is taken up trying to work their way through blanks and forms now required by the agencies of the Government.

I include Mr. Schock's letter for the attention of my colleagues:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1959.

ROBERT W. BURGESS,
Director, Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BURGESS: In September 4 I received a monthly Industry Survey Form that you have requested us to fill out. Aside from the fact that we are already overburdened filling out meaningless forms, the form you have provided is no more applicable to obtaining a dairy report than is a Cadillac for hauling livestock.

The trouble with America today is that small business is being demoralized by incessant redtape harassment imposed by Bureau dictators of every sort from Washington. When will all this meaningless monkey business cease? When will operators of small business be permitted to use their energies to produce rather than waste time in nonproductive effort. The wealth of a nation is determined by the quantity of goods produced at low cost for the masses. Industry will do this provided our Government does not place too many demoralizing stumbling blocks in its path.

Since I'm in no mood to fill out additional forms I am returning your form to you for your bulging files.

Sincerely,

AL. A. SCHOCK,
President.

P.S.—All the information that you seek can be obtained by your office from the Milk Marketing Division of the Department of Agriculture. We report monthly to that Department. You'll find the latter in the vicinity of your own building in Washington.

P.S.S.—Incidentally this letter is being written on Labor Day. Holidays for small business management are fast becoming a thing of the past. Thanks in part to you.

NALC President William Doherty Presents Compelling Plea for International Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, a major element in efforts to maintain peace in the world is understanding between peoples of different races, nationalities, and cultures. Recently, in a speech prepared for delivery at a trade union congress in Stuttgart, Germany, William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, described, in very cogent terms, the role of the international labor movement in efforts to increase communication among the world's populace.

In his address, Mr. Doherty states with forceful clarity a fundamental fact of vital importance to a world engaged in a war of nerves. He declares that—

> Freedom of communication and dictatorship cannot exist in nature together. For the dictator, to be successful, must make of every man an island. * * * It is because of this truth that a free system of communications has always been freedom's first creation and tyranny's first target.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of that portion of Mr. Doherty's able talk dealing with the necessity for exchange of information and fellowship between citizens of different countries be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. The address was delivered at Stuttgart on September 10, 1959.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, AND VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE DEUTSCHER GEWERKSCHAFTSBUND CONGRESS, STUTTGART, GERMANY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1959

It has always seemed a curious and significant thing to me, that the ordinary everyday people of this world, such as you and I, have no trouble whatsoever in maintaining friendships which ignore international boundaries and which survive military alliances—and which always seem to survive even the activities of the professional diplomats. It is only governments which have trouble in maintenance of friendship.

We of organized labor have forged a true brotherhood which includes men of good will everywhere, regardless of race, creed, or nationality. Ours is the only true and successful brotherhood on earth.

The AFL–CIO has uncompromisingly supported a firm and aggressive position against all kinds of totalitarianism and for the advancement of free trade unions in every corner of the world.

We feel strongly that the programs for organization and workers' education which are required in the lesser-developed areas of the world—in particular, in Africa and Asia—have created new challenges to the free trade union movement, and have made new demands on its resources.

In view of the efforts of the ICFTU to meet this situation adequately, a number of suggestions have been made about how that organization should be reinvigorated in order to accomplish its indispensable world role. We in the American trade union movement are anxious to join with our fellow ICFTU affiliates to support the necessary measures and changes to accomplish this work.

It is good to be able to state that the affiliates of the AFL–CIO are also now playing an increasingly vital role in the work of the International Trade Secretariats. We believe it is becoming clear to anyone with the eyes to see that a good deal of the organization work that is required to be carried out in large parts of the world can best be accomplished by organizations such as the International Trade Secretariats that have a particular interest in a trade or industry where the organizing is to be carried on.

I am glad to be able to inform you that our experience in organizing work along these lines—that is, through the International Trade Secretariats—has become increasingly successful in the Western Hemisphere, and it is our hope that in this type of activity we have found the way in which we can be of real and permanent assistance to our Latin American brothers south of our border.

The new Soviet-Communist line calling for peaceful coexistence and united fronts has greatly increased our task in the so-called neutral or uncommitted areas. It is vital that we remain mindful of the fact that even while the Russians are talking loudest about entering into peaceful economic competition with the West, they are not diminishing at all their ruthless program of forceful international aggression.

This was well illustrated by their provoking the crisis over Berlin. Our friends in India have also experienced a similar sense of urgency created by Communist China's unforgivable aggression in Tibet.

More than ever, it is our feeling in the AFL–CIO that the response of the West must be to safeguard its unity, and that we must not allow false promises and propaganda campaigns to weaken or dissolve in any way our solid opposition to any and all attempts of international communism to encroach upon the free world.

I am happy to be able to state that in our own country the AFL–CIO has taken the lead—both before congressional committees and in representations to the executive branch of our Government—in asserting that the foreign economic policy of the United States must be attuned to the welfare and security, not only of our own Nation, but to the economic requirements and aspirations of all the people in the free world.

Now, why have we in the international labor movement been successful in creating and maintaining international friendship when professional diplomacy has so often failed? Because diplomacy, though necessary, is a bloodless exchange on a government-to-government level.

The international labor movement, on the other hand, is a people-to-people operation; and in the realm of human affairs this is the only kind of operation that has permanent value.

Men of good will are basically the same the world over. And, given half a chance, we always do very well together.

This is not surprising. After all, to paraphrase another great poet, Shakespeare: We

are fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same winter and summer.

I sincerely believe this vast potential for international understanding and friendship should be recognised by the governments of the world and exploited to its fullest extent. We who make up the labor organizations of the free world have the membership, the will, and the machinery to accomplish this objective, and in this we are unique among all other organizations in the world.

You know, my friends, in a way it is very significant that I was selected to represent American labor at this Congress, for I have the honor to lead a union which deals with communications, and the key to peace in the future is the extension and refinement of communication between people.

Freedom of communication and dictatorship cannot exist in nature together. For the dictator, to be successful, must make of every man an island—it is necessary to make him feel that he alone has the will to lift a dream strong hand against oppression or, if need be, to stand barefoot against the hobnails.

It is because of this truth that a free system of communications has always been freedom's first creation and tyranny's first target.

Compare our own free communications with the situation that exists among those bleak meridians of slavery behind the Iron Curtain. In that great commonwealth of fear, the postman, in most instances, does not make his appointed rounds; the radio is the progenitor of propaganda lies, the newspaper is a creature of the State and the telephone an instrument that makes men's tongues thicken with terror.

Soviet Russia has made enormous technological advances; in two generations she has jumped from the oxcart to the cyclotron. But there is less freedom of communications there today than there was in the time of Genghis Khan. And there wil always be a limitation of communications until freedom is once again available in wholesale quantities and when men can once again walk upright and call no man master, and worship the Almighty as they see fit.

But wherever freedom still exists, there is a possibility that we of organised labor hold in our hands and our hearts the key to the future. The perspiration from our brows could well be the force which can turn the wheels that will crush those wanton wills who hold freedom in contempt and account democracy a fraud.

That is why—to me—this tremendous spirit of brotherhood that exists among us—this deep and abiding fellowship, has never had such profound implications as it has today.

For it may well be that we—who have traveled so far through adversity, who have borne the burden of contempt, who have felt the whiplash of calumny—even we shall someday be the chosen instrument through which all men everywhere can learn that the Lord God of trajectory and blast is also the Lord God of fresh bread and April morning, and that peace is not as hopeless of achievement as the warmongers would have us believe.

And so—brothers—if there is a message which I can bring you today from across the water it is this:

Let us face the future with courage, with confidence and with pride; and let us face it together.

Let us lift up our eyes. Above our heads extends the bright and singing land of infinite hope, infinite accomplishment. Let us march forward into that promised land together as brothers and comrades in a mighty endeavor.

The Labor-Management Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I voted for the Kennedy-Ervin bill when it passed the Senate, and I also voted for the conference report when it came to the Senate. I have been criticized for my vote by a district president of the UMWA in West Virginia, and I have received from his office a resolution of condemnation, to which I have today responded by letter. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution and a press article carrying the labor leader's attack upon the two West Virginia Senators, published in the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald, on September 10, 1959. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my letter of reply to the resolution of condemnation.

There being no objection, the resolution, article, and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas during the past several years in the National Congress, a group known as the Senate Labor Rackets Committee has been developing a patter of approach designed to destroy the organized labor movement and reduce the men and women who toil to chattel slaves. It accomplished its work well in providing a forum of discussion and dissemination to the public of a garbled and distorted picture of union labor. Whenever and wherever possible this committee worked in the atmosphere of the savage passions of Washington politics and the irreconcilable conflict of personal conscience and personal ambition; and

Whereas the hour of decision came to the Congress within the past few days when against the pleading of House Speaker RAYBURN, a coalition of southern Democrats and reactionary Republicans were successful in passing the Landrum-Griffin bill—the most stringent of the three before the honorable body—a bill designed by the malefactors of great wealth and the disciples of entrenched greed to take the laboring masses back down that long road when we were nothing more than outcasts deprived of performing any meaningful function in our communities, denied the basic necessities of life including adequate health care and unable to maintain the minimum standards of decency this social stagnation made living a thing to be deplored; and

Whereas in the last political campaign we were confronted with political chameleons—lizards that change color of their skin—who uttered praise and platitudes for the greatest labor organization in all the world—the United Mine Workers of America—and swore allegiance to the cause we collectively espouse. In these allegations they gave only lipservice and we submit that to this date they have not performed one single act that may be considered constructive in performing the task they purported to perform—the slogan on their campaign posters was "Build West Virginia With RANDOLPH and BYRD."

Whereas this stab in the back will, if not taken lightly, perform a great service for our people—it will cause them to come to the realization that a politician cannot be trusted when the chips are down; it will awake in them the graveness of the situation and cause them to realize anew that their only hope is in the power and influence of our great organization and our great leader, John L. Lewis, who has toiled always with unyielding courage and persistence in their best interest. In the discharge of his duties, Mr. Lewis in his high office, has with fairness of appraisal, poise amid confusion, a kindly heart, a nobility of goodness, and the simple faith in men that all great leaders possess continued to give much of himself to make the road smoother, the trip more rewarding as we have journeyed down through the years and continue into the uncertain tomorrow; and

Whereas this good man made an appeal through our legislative agent, Bob Howe, to the several Representatives and Senators, to stand by their campaign promise and keep West Virginia building. For this only can be accomplished by keeping labor free in free America. Prior to this he appealed personally to our two Senators on behalf of the confirmation of Lewis Strauss. You know the answer as it is a matter of public record. Before Congress had barely convened in January they went contrary to our great leader on civil rights legislation. When the question arises as to what they thought is the best interests of our union—their hitting average is 100 percent against your wives and children and those yet unborn. For the far-reaching effects of this labor legislation will be here to plague us for many, many years to come if it follows the pattern of Taft-Hartley; and

Whereas during all this hour of betrayal three Representatives from West Virginia did not forget the men and women who sent them to Congress and will keep them there—Mrs. ELIZABETH KEE, Mr. HARLEY STAGGERS, and Mr. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY stood up and were counted on our side if you please. Through courage, honest devotion, and unsullied fighting spirit they proved their worth beyond question in this grave responsibility of their stewardship. Their integrity in office and faithfulness to trust has ever been their longing and aspiration—they covet and cultivate your friendship by deeds not words and promises; and

Whereas we believe that those who have been faithful to their trust should be rewarded—likewise our betrayers should receive our everlasting condemnation. We must have Representatives who realise that while their duties present a thorny and laborious problem, the reward of a task well done becomes progress toward the fulfillment of human destiny; therefore be it

Resolved, That Local Union 9375 of Tralee, W. Va., in regular meeting assembled, condemn the action of our Senators and Representatives in the National Congress who play footsie with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturers Association, and all other groups who prowl the streets and buildings in our Nation's Capital seeking to prevent the people who toil in America from having some of the better things of life, and commend for high honors, KEE, BAILEY, and STAGGERS; and be it further

Resolved, That we begin to plan now to eliminate from the lawmaking body those who stood against us in the supreme challenge and put our plans into action when we go to the polls in 1960.

Fraternally submitted.

This resolution was unanimously adopted at the District 29, United Mine Workers of America Labor Day celebration held at Pineville, W. Va., Monday, September 7, 1959.

The motion to adopt the resolution was made by Fred Wooten, Local Union 6026, Coalwood, W. Va., and was seconded by Ernest Moore, Local Union 7633, Thorpe, W. Va.

[From the Beckley (W. Va.) Post-Herald, Sept. 10, 1959]

TITLER BLASTS SENATORS FOR "STAB IN THE BACK"

West Virginia's two U.S. Senators, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of Elkins, and ROBERT C. BYRD, of Sophia, have been accused of "stabbing labor in the back" in a resolution already mailed to them and now being sent to every local union of the United Mine Workers of America in the State.

The resolution was adopted at the Labor Day celebration Monday in Pineville. George J. Titler, president of District 29, of the UMWA, repeated some of the charges made against RANDOLPH and BYRD in Pineville.

Titler said: "The labor unions and coal miners, especially in West Virginia, have been shocked and nauseated by the action of the so-called pro-labor BYRD and RANDOLPH in the 86th Congress.

"The first real stab in the back by RANDOLPH and BYRD, a stab at the coal miners of West Virginia, was when they allowed LYNDON JOHNSON to pull them around by the nose and get them to vote against Lewis Strauss when his confirmation came before the U.S. Senate for Secretary of Commerce.

"For 10 years we have been trying to get quotas on import of residual oil—and 2 months after Strauss succeeded in having this done the two Senators from West Virginia cut his throat from ear to ear. Their votes constituted the balance of power which rejected him.

"Their next two antilabor votes were for the Kennedy-Erwin bill and when they voted for the compromise Landrum-Griffin bill.

"In the last 10 years we have had three nasty thrusts of fascism in America. The first was the Taft-Hartley Act, the second the right-to-work laws in 19 States, and the third the Kennedy-Erwin and Landrum-Griffin bills."

The blunt resolution of protest came from UMWA Local 9375 at Tralee. It was unanimously adopted by those present for the celebration.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE TITLER,
President District 29, United Mine Workers of America, Beckley, W. Va.

DEAR GEORGE: I have noted the Beckley Post-Herald story of September 10, captioned "Titler Blasts Senators for 'Stab in the Back.'" The article refers to a resolution adopted at the District 29 Labor Day celebration in Pineville on September 7, and states that the resolution is being mailed to Senator RANDOLPH and to me and every UMWA local union in the State.

I have received the resolution. It came to me in an envelope mailed from Beckley and bearing your return address. I have noted the condemnation of my action, and that of Senator RANDOLPH and Congressmen HECHLER, SLACK, and MOORE, in voting for the labor-management reform bill which recently passed both Houses of the Congress.

The resolution speaks of "political chameleons" who, in the last political campaign, "swore allegiance" to the cause which the United Mine Workers of America "collective espouse." May I say that those who prepared the resolution, and I assume you took part in its preparation, might do well to remember that I stated, time and again, during the last campaign, that I intended to vote for a labor-management reform bill. I made this statement to the people several times during my appearances on television and otherwise. No individual need have been under any false impression as to where I stood, because I felt at that time, as I feel now, that the American people as a whole wanted and deserved some legislation to prevent, as much as possible, future corruption and racketeering in the labor-management field. The rank and file membership of many of our unions needed protection, and I am confident that many of the labor leaders themselves throughout the country realized that something had to be done.

The resolution goes on to state, in referring to the two West Virginia Senators, as follows:

"To this date they have not performed one single act that may be considered constructive in performing the task they purported to perform—the slogan on their campaign posters was 'build West Virginia With RANDOLPH and BYRD.'"

It is to be regretted that those who seek to criticize Senator RANDOLPH and me find it convenient to overlook the many efforts we have put forth in behalf of our State and our people. We have performed not "one single act" but many acts which should redound to the best interests of our constituency. What about the Coal Research and Development Act, which was cosponsored by the two West Virginia Senators? The efforts of Senator RANDOLPH and me in urging upon our leadership and upon the appropriate committee of the Senate that action be taken on this measure, were responsible in great measure for enactment of this legislation. What about the area redevelopment legislation which passed the Senate several months ago? Have those who criticize us today forgotten that my subcommittee held hearings in West Virginia on the need for such legislation and that Senator RANDOLPH appeared and gave testimony in its behalf? What about the Youth Conservation Corps Act? This bill, which Senator RANDOLPH and I joined in cosponsoring, passed the Senate, and its enactment into law would put many thousands of young men to work. What about the public works measures which have been made possible by the work of the West Virginia Senators on the Public Works Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee? These projects will put men to work at Summersville and Princeton and East Rainelle and at other places throughout the State. What about the appropriations made by my committee for armory construction in West Virginia? Ask our mutual friend, Congressman BAILEY, as to who was responsible for the inclusion of additional moneys for West Virginia in the military construction appropriation bill.

I could go on and on, if it were necessary, to recall the many accomplishments by the West Virginia delegation in the Congress, but I shall only touch now upon one other significant action by Senator RANDOLPH and me, inasmuch as you have been quoted in the press as alluding to the Strauss episode. You have criticized our vote in opposition to the confirmation of Lewis Strauss. You would have the rank-and-file membership of the UMWA believe that Mr. Strauss was solely responsible for the imposition of mandatory controls on imports of residual oil. You should have known that this is not the case. The voice of Mr. Strauss was only one voice, and who is there to say that his successor will not favor mandatory import quotas? In bringing up the matter of mandatory import controls on residual oil, why do you not give credit where it belongs? In my 7 years in the Congress I have been waging this fight, as have others of the West Virginia delegation. Prior to the imposition of mandatory controls this year, your two West Virginia Senators and the West Virginia Members in the House of Representatives waged a determined campaign to have the President institute such controls. We went to Acting Secretary Strauss; we met with the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Mr. Leo Hoegh; we went to the Department of the Interior; we took our fight to the late Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald Quarles; we went to Under Secretary Dillon in the Department of State; and Senator RANDOLPH and I climaxed our efforts by going direct to the President of the United States in the White House. We helped to fight the battles and carry the burden in the heat of the day, but your statement seeks to give Mr. Strauss the credit. Mr. Strauss has long since been gone from Government circles, but the import controls are continuing. Of course, I have no way of knowing how long they will remain in existence, because the New England area continues to bring considerable pressure on the President to get him to recede from his action. But the fact remains that your West Virginia Senators and your House Members were, in a very considerable measure, responsible for the import controls.

As for the unfortunate Mr. Strauss, the propaganda that was disseminated in his behalf backfired on him, and he is about as much to blame as is anyone for his own defeat. Some of the New England Senators were told that he helped to keep coal out of their States; conversely, the two West Virginia Senators were told that he was a friend of coal. So you can see that his supporters were working both ends against the middle. I voted against him because I did not feel that it was in the best interests of the country to have him confirmed, and I reached my decision after I had read the 1,128 pages of the hearings. I think I did the right thing, and I am willing to stand on my decision.

The resolution charges that the West Virginia Senators played "footsie with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and all other groups who prowl the streets and buildings in our Nation's Capital seeking to prevent the people who toil in America from having some of the better things of life * * *." Your two Senators have not played footsie with these groups or with any other groups. We simply do not wear anybody's collar around our necks.

The bill which passed the Congress will not hurt honest unions, and it will give added protection to the rank and file members in the unions. Honest union leaders have nothing to fear from the legislation. George, the flagrant disregard of the rights of the rank and file members of organized labor by men like Hoffa and Beck, and the corruption and racketeering that have been revealed in the fields of both labor and management, made it imperative that some kind of legislation be enacted. The people of this country, and this includes thousands of individuals in the ranks of labor, were determined that legislation should be written to prevent such future abuses. I came up in a workingman's home, and my sentiments have always been very friendly toward the lot of working people. I cannot condone, however, a reckless disregard of and a disrespect for the public, the Government, and the union movement itself, by those who would wreck organized labor in their efforts to build little empires for themselves. Men like Hoffa and Beck do not serve the best interests of laboring men and women generally, so I am convinced that I voted for that which was right, under the circumstances.

After the Kennedy-Ervin bill had passed the Senate, I told you, George, that labor would do well to support the Senate-passed bill—else you would get even stronger legislation before the session was over. It turned out as I said. Some people were adamant in their opposition to any kind of labor-management reform bill whatsoever, and, if I remember correctly, this represented the

position of your national office. A few labor leaders even went so far as to threaten Members of Congress who supported such legislation, and their threats reacted against labor. Many of the people who wrote insisting that we support the bill and many of the people who wrote demanding that no bill be passed at all were entirely unfamiliar with any of the provisions in the bill. I would venture to say that, in various instances, many of those who wrote protesting the bill had been incited to write to us by people like you, George.

I have been a friend of labor throughout my 13 years in public service, and I am confident that fairminded working men and women will not be misled by a few individuals who, because I have not voted exactly as would have pleased them in this instance, would seek to have the union membership believe that I have betrayed labor. I have had my battles with you before, George, and I do not say this disrespectfully, but a man can be with you 99 times and vote opposite to your views once and you will crucify him as one who has betrayed labor.

If certain labor organizations had cleaned house, the people would not have demanded that the Congress do the job. I realize that unions, generally, in West Virginia have not been subjected to dishonest leadership, and I have spoken with pride upon numerous occasions concerning the honesty and fairness of most of the union leaders in West Virginia, but this does not gainsay the fact that a situation had developed in the Nation which could no longer be tolerated.

If blame must be placed somewhere, then, let it rest upon the shoulders of Hoffa and Beck and others of their stripe. Let the blame also be shared by those who publicly defended Hoffa. Your two West Virginia Senators and your House Members did not "stab labor in the back," George; labor's position was undermined by a few reckless leaders who stubbornly refused to read the handwriting on the wall.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senator.

Schedules of Conferences and Visits With Residents of the Fourth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns in a few days, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Allen County, Lima: Wednesday, September 30.

Auglaize County, Wapakoneta: Tuesday, October 6.

Darke County, Greenville: Monday, October 5.

Mercer County, Celina: Wednesday, October 7.

Miami County, Troy: Tuesday, September 29.

Preble County, Eaton: Thursday, October 1.

Shelby County, Sidney: Monday, September 28.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problem with, or opinion concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

When You Buy Shoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Changing Times, the Kiplinger magazine carried an informative and pertinent article, entitled "When You Buy Shoes," in its August 1959 edition. I have introduced legislation—H.R. 1320—which would require the labeling of domestic and imported shoes. A portion of the Kiplinger article discusses labeling:

WHEN YOU BUY SHOES

The odds are that you will buy something like $25 worth of shoes this year. Multiply the number of people in your family by $25 and you will have an approximation (probably minimum) of what you can expect your normal annual family shoe bill to be.

Americans typically buy three or four pairs a year, though that figure varies considerably. Men usually get one or two pairs, women four or five, and children about five. And, of course, there are wide individual variations, too.

The price will average out to about $6 a pair—the industry expects to get about $3,600 million for 600 million pairs. But both the number purchased and the average price include not only dress and street shoes but also a sizable volume of low-cost slippers, sandals, play shoes, etc.

Whatever your shoe bill is now, you are going to be spending more. Retail prices have risen more than 10 percent over the past 3 years, are 30 percent higher than they were 10 years ago, and will almost certainly increase this fall.

Far more important than the squeeze on your pocketbook is the potential squeeze on your feet. Improper selection of shoes can lead to extreme discomfort and serious foot troubles—especially with growing youngsters.

The chairman of the National Foot Health Council says, "By the time children reach high school age, 65 percent of the boys and 80 percent of the girls show evidence of foot trouble." Much of it is caused by wearing poorly chosen shoes.

APPEARANCE, MATERIAL, STYLE

Can you judge a shoe by its appearance? No—but neither can an expert without dissecting it. It's not enough to know simply what materials (leather, synthetics, or fibers) are in a shoe. The quality of the materials, as well as the quality of both machine and hand work, varies widely, and it takes a trained eye—if not extensive tests—to detect the significant differences.

Would a label help? There is a shoe-labeling bill currently pending in Congress, intended by its sponsors to take some of the mystery out of shoe buying. It would require that all shoes carry a label specifying the materials used in their manufacture.

Critics of the bill point out that such labeling would offer you only limited assistance. For example, whether a synthetic is preferable to leather in a certain part of the shoe depends on the particular function the material is to perform. And it depends on the quality of the particular leather or synthetic used, which the label would not have to reveal under the bill.

Not only are you in the dark when it comes to appraising material and workmanship, but you are also at the mercy of style. Style is king in the shoe business, especially in women's shoes, and determines what your shoes look like and to a great extent the materials used in them and how they are made.

The extreme tapered toe of women's shoes today may often require a longer size for proper fit. But this is a small sacrifice of vanity to exchange for comfort and foot health. The National Foot Health Council says that the tapered toes do not cause discomfort or harm the feet provided they are properly fitted. (Tapered toes are on the way out, anyhow.)

This advice applies to the selection of shoes for any member of your family: fit is the most important consideration. Though you can't judge materials and workmanship, you can make sure the shoes you buy fit your foot.

HOW SHOES ARE FITTED

The fit of the adult shoe is more directly related to the shape of the last (the wooden form that determines the basic shape of the shoe, and on which the shoe is constructed) than to the shoe's length and width. A manufacturer may have from 2,400 to 5,400 lasts on hand to make his current styles in a variety of shapes and sizes.

Shoe size is a combination of measurements around the ball, the instep, the waist, and the heel of the last. But lasts of identical size can vary appreciably in shape and contour. They differ, for example, in the finer measurements from the big toe to the ball of the foot, or from the ball of the foot to the instep.

It is because of such variations that you probably have found that you can comfortably wear different sizes in different types of shoes. A size 6B may be made on a last molded more closely to your foot than the last of a 7AA, or vice versa. Or, to use a more obvious illustration, two people with the same measured shoe size probably do not find identical shoes equally comfortable. Their feet, while measuring the same size, are shaped quite differently.

Follow these rules in fitting shoes:

1. Take your time shopping. A shoe selected in haste and improperly fitted is a poor buy. You can assume that a $25 shoe is superior in quality of materials and workmanship to a $14 brand. But a less-expensive shoe properly fitted is preferable to a shoe at any price that doesn't fit your foot comfortably.

2. Insist on careful fitting by the salesman. This harassed fellow has been the victim of jokes and cartoons for years, but it's his job to assist you in finding the shoe that fits from among the assortment of sizes, styles, and lasts available.

3. Measure both feet (they may not be identical in shape, you know), not only the length but the width and the ball-to-heel span. This is all accomplished with the metal Brannock measuring device in common use.

4. Don't be a slave to a specified size. Fit the shoe to the foot, as the experts advise, not the foot to the shoe.

5. Don't choose a shoe on the basis of one appealing style in one brand alone. Try similar styles in the same or other lines. Re-

member that the wide variation in last shapes offers you a choice, in most styles, of a shoe that will fit the shape of your foot—if you will look for it.

6. If you find by experience a shoe that gives you outstanding comfort and fit, ask the salesman for the name assigned by the manufacturer to the last on which the shoe was built. Ask for that last type the next time you buy shoes. You may or may not find it again in the kind of shoe you want, but it's worth a try. This advice, unfortunately, is limited to men. Style changes in women's shoes often force changes in last types from season to season.

The most comfortable shoes for men, women or children are those that have: a straight-line construction along the inside line of the shoe from the heel to the big toe; a broad, round toe with about one-half to three-quarters of an inch of space between the end of the big toe and the inside front of the shoe; a firm, but not rigid arch that conforms to the natural arch of the foot; a snug heel counter.

For women's shoes that are to be worn regularly the heel should not be too high, too tapered or to steeply pitched for comfort.

If you find that you are unable to fit your foot comfortably with shoes available in regular retail stores, or if you are troubled by extreme discomfort, you had better consult a physician or an orthopedic specialist. Orthopedic or corrective shoes can be fitted or constructed from a last created to match your foot to alleviate irregular or abnormal foot conditions.

SHOES FOR CHILDREN

Style exerts an increasing influence in children's shoes. No longer do youngsters settle for a plain oxford or a loafer (in brown or black) and an occasional pair of saddle shoes. Parents are reeling these days from demands for ballerina-type slippers, lightweight casuals in a vareity of materials and colors, shoes with zippers, shoes with straps, buckles, etc. Too often proper fit is forgotten or neglected under pressure for the current craze.

The paradox in fitting a shoe to a child's foot is that it must provide proper support and, at the same time, room for the rapid growth of the foot. The chart at the left shows the astonishing rate of that growth. [Not printed in RECORD.]

The points made earlier about the most comfortable construction are of special importance in choosing children's shoes. In addition, you should look for enough width and circumference at the ball of the foot to provide room for growth of the metatarsal bones (a child's shoe should not be tight across the width of the shoe at the ball of the foot); a box toe that is high and wide enough to allow the toes to lie flat and wiggle; a broad heel base for foundation.

In the early years, a child will ordinarily outgrow his shoes before he outwears them. Less expensive shoes are all right for growing children (with normal feet) so long as they satisfy the requirements of fit and room for growth.

Have your pediatrician check a young child's feet and walk periodically. If there is any need for corrective, orthopedic shoes, he should be able to detect it and refer you to a competent specialist. A normal, healthy child's foot needs no special shoe, but neglect of a tendency to foot abnormality in the critical early years can lead to serious troubles.

The time and attention you devote to the proper fitting of your child's shoes, and to periodic checks to see whether they have been outgrown, will be the greatest contribution you can make to his foot health in later years.

Maine Needs and Must Develop Low-Cost Power for Industrial Expansion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, next month, a decision may be made which can determine to a large extent the future prosperity of the State of Maine and, indeed, the industrial future of the New England States.

I refer to the forthcoming report of the Engineering and Fisheries Boards of the International Joint Commission on the great Passamaquoddy tidal power project.

There have been indications that the current engineering investigations being carried on by the U.S. Army Engineer division of New England and other agencies of the United States and Canadian Governments will result in a concrete proposal for construction of the Passamaquoddy project. A two-pool project using Passamaquoddy Bay and Cobscook Bay for water storage already has been selected for detailed design. A companion project at Rankin Rapids on the upper St. John River also has been suggested as part of the most promising and economical combined project by Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley of the U.S. Army Engineer division in New England.

If the October report finds Passamaquoddy feasible as a power project, Maine can look forward to the possible injection of many kilowatts of low-cost power into the State's lagging economy.

Waterpower was the basis for Maine's early industrial development. Lacking in coal, oil, or other fuels, Maine developed her industry—primarily woolen and cotton milling—early in the 19th century, with the mills located on the State's rushing streams.

So rich was our State in waterpower that an 1869 power study estimated the total energy discharged annually by the rivers of Maine as equal to the work of 34 million men working without interruption for 1 year. Many of our early leaders saw in the "white coal" of rushing water the key to a great industrial development.

But what happened?

As other regions began to develop industry, Maine lagged behind. Like other New England States, Maine has "enjoyed" some of the highest electric rates in the Nation. The rivers, for the most part, went right on flowing to the sea.

Today, our State has an estimated 1,262,600 kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric power in its rivers, as compared to only 500,211 kilowatts of developed hydro, according to the latest available Federal Power Commission estimate. This does not take into account the tremendous potential of 'Quoddy itself.

Many reasons could be advanced for this lag, and many have. For example, it has been said that the rugged individualism of Maine people prevented any Federal development, and that there was no market for power from 'Quoddy or any other major project, and that industry does not concern itself greatly with the cost of electric power.

I will concede at once that Maine people are independent; but a greater factor, I believe, than personal antagonism to Federal development has been the bitter opposition of private utilities, clinging to a high-cost, low-use concept of electric service.

As for the lack of market for the power, the same argument was used when Muscle Shoals in Alabama and Grand Coulee in Washington State were proposed. In both of these cases, what actually happened was that abundance of power stimulated vast industrial developments which led to greater and greater demands for power and ultimately to the great power systems of the Tennessee Valley Authority and of the Bonneville Power Administration.

There is no reason to believe that 'Quoddy cannot be the Muscle Shoals of Maine and launch a similar rebirth of industry, progress, and better living standards for our people.

The third argument—that power costs are not important to industry—can be advanced in the case of some industries. But with increasing automation it becomes apparent that electric power is an ever-growing factor in most industries. Further, there are many modern industries which locate only where large quantities of low-cost power are available. Needless to say, these have not chosen Maine.

Our State produces 25 percent of the feldspar used in the United States, but exports it to four other States for the manufacture of porcelain and pottery. Aroostook County has one of the largest deposits of low-grade manganese ore in North America. An even more challenging propect is open to Maine—the vast Labrador iron ore deposits which some day may replace the ore of the Mesabi Range of the Middle West as the major source of America's steel.

The possibility that Eastport's excellent harbor can be used for shipping the raw materials and products of great new steel mills in the vicinity of a Quoddy power project is no idle dream. It makes economic sense. It can happen, if we can only provide the energy to process the raw materials at a competitive cost.

Not long ago the Governor of Washington State reviewed the changes which have come to his State as a result of hydroelectric power development by the Federal Government. The parallel between that great northwest State and our State of Maine is very close. In the early 1930's, the Governor said, Washington's economy was based primarily on agriculture, logging, wood products manufacturing, and mining. Agriculture and logging similarly are basic industries in Maine.

Today, after the development of only a portion of Washington's hydro resources, new industries have grown up in Washington, the population has increased rapidly, and its people enjoy a high degree of electrical living. Aluminum aircraft and defense establishments have brought their payrolls to Washington State. Its people use more than 2½ times as much electricity as the average American family, enjoying many more electric servants than the average Maine family.

The Governor of Washington declared that during a recent trip east to talk with industrialists about locating in Washington—

I was greatly impressed by the value of low-cost power to industry. * * * At a series of meetings with industrialists in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, we presented information on the industrial advantages of our State. The point evoking the greatest comment and even surprise among the industrial leaders was the abundance and low cost of our electric power in Washington State.

Before TVA, there was a saying in Tennessee that the average farmer woke to the clang of a Connecticut alarm clock, climbed out of his Baltimore bed and into a pair of Oshkosh overalls and Sheboygan shoes and Chicago shirt. He washed his face and hands in a Pittsburgh pan, using Cincinnati soap, and dried on a Trenton towel, sat down in a Chillicothe chair to a Patterson plate, filled with St. Joe grits fried in Kansas City lard. After breafast he put a New Bedford bridle on a Missouri mule, hitched him to a Peoria plow and, using Yankee cuss words, planted Columbus corn to satisfy a Massachusetts mortgage.

With certain variations in the menu, much the same story could be told of many farmers in my State of Maine today.

TVA has brought many changes to the valley it serves. Laboratories and factories have grown up in its industrial centers, the march of erosion has been halted, a reforestation program has renewed a once faltering lumber industry. Flocks of tourists pour into the valley to enjoy the man-made lakes, commerce moves along the inland waterways, valuable land along the rivers can be used without fear of major floods.

Will this story be told of New England 20 years from now? It is up to us.

Today, families in the New England States pay the highest average monthly electric bills in the Nation. Consider these averages for 250 kilowatt-hours of service, published in FPC's latest edition of "Typical Residential Electric Bills":

New Hampshire, highest in the Nation, $8.92.

Massachusetts, second highest, $8.91.

Vermont, third highest, $8.90.

Rhode Island, fourth highest, $8.74.

Maine, sixth highest, $8.51.

Connecticut, twelfth highest, $8.

At the other end of the scale, consider families living in the states enjoying a high degree of Federal hydroelectric development:

Washington, lowest in the Nation, $4.53.

Tennessee, second lowest, $4.84.

Oregon, third lowest, $5.40.

Alabama, fourth lowest, $5.42.

Perhaps the difference of $4 a month—close to $50 a year—is not of vital importance now to the average family. As the use of electric servants grows, however, this electric bill will become an increasingly important part of the family budget.

From industry's standpoint, power costs can be of real significance. As an example, take the private utilities serving in Maine and in upstate New York, where hydroelectric power has been developed on a large scale. An industry in Bangor, Maine, using 400,000 kilowatt-hours would pay $6,275 per month for electricity, while an industry in Niagara Falls, N.Y., would pay only $3,391 per month for the same service, according to the latest FPC figures.

These thousands of dollars could make the difference between profit and loss to many industries.

Some years ago, in 1951, the Committee on the New England Economy of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, headed by economist Leon H. Keyserling, prepared a detailed report on the New England economy which mapped the route the area could take to achieve lasting prosperity.

New England has many problems—

The report said—

but if there is one that stands out it is how to make the most of its resources, its human resources including its resources in ideas as well as its natural resources, and to facilitate the adaptation of its industrial structure to changes in its underlying competitive position.

'Quoddy is one of the most challenging ideas which Maine's human resources have come up with in many generations, just as the power of the tides is one of the State's great natural resources. We can develop both.

At another point, the report declares:

We are concerned over the failure of utilities in this (New England) area to seek larger use of power through more venturesome pricing policies. * * * In some other regions, the presence of public power has tended to force private utilities to be more venturesome in their rate policies. The use of electric power has been thereby stimulated greatly without any loss to the utilities.

In short, the injection of public power from 'Quoddy into the high-power-cost economy of Maine can stimulate a new approach on the part of the utilities. As has been shown in the TVA area and in the Northwest, low rates and the aggressive promotion of widespread power use can bring new industry a higher standard of living, and a handsome rate of return to existing utilities all in one package.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"The New England Economy," a report to the President, transmitting a study initiated by the Council of Economic Advisers and prepared by its Committee on the New England Economy, July 1951—Superintendent of Documents.

"Passamaquoddy Tidal Power: A New Source of Energy," address by Brig. Gen. Alden K. Sibley, U.S. Army Engineer Division, New England Corps of Engineers, Boston, Mass.

"The Power Policy of Maine," by Lincoln Smith, University of California Press, Berkeley, Calif., 1951.

Speech, "Progress Through Low Cost Power," by Hon. Albert D. Rosellini, Governor of Washington, to American Public Power Association, Seattle, Wash., May 27, 1959.

FPC publications: "Typical Residential Electric Bills: Cities of 2,500 and More," and "Typical Electric Bills, Residential, Commercial, and Industrial."

Civil Rights Commission Should Be Terminated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Commission should be terminated. There is no reason that I can see for its continuation.

The recent report of this Commission contains some of the most vicious proposals that have been presented. These proposals, if placed into law, would ultimately bring about the end of our type of constitutional government.

And one of the most vicious of these suggested plans is the proposal to create the Office of Federal Registrar. Such a proposal, in the first place, flies in the very face of our Constitution itself. In no age, and in no place, has any responsible public official in the past urged that the power of controlling elections be taken from our 50 States and placed under control of the U.S. Government in Washington; and yet this is in essence what the proposal to create the Office of Federal Registrar will do.

Should such a proposal become law, the Federal Registrar will be able to supersede any local registrar, appointed and controlled now by the several States, and permit the new Federal Registrar to operate the elections. It is true that there will be those who will argue that this provision should apply only to Federal elections. But, Mr. Speaker, a registrar does not list voters for only Federal elections. He sets up a register for voting—not for Federal voting, but for all kinds and types of voting and in all elections, under restrictions provided by State laws.

If such an Office of Federal Registrar which handles only Federal elections and which undoubtedly provides its own procedures and methods of handling the registration lists for Federal elections, are we not then setting up two different types of elections and two different types of voters? It is obvious that the Federal Registrar will do his own interpretating and construction of Federal statutes. These decisions may be en-

tirely different from the construction placed upon State and Federal statutes by the duly constituted local registrars or voters. As a result of that fact we may ultimately have two classes of voters: federally accepted voters and State approved voters. This situation will inevitably ultimately lead to Federal control of elections and to the loss of our States as we know them under our Constitution.

Even worse than this is the proposal to further amend the Constitution to provide additional power for the enforcement of civil rights. Already more power is available under the terms of our present Constitution than will ever be needed for this purpose. Further amendment will provide useless and redundant language in our basic law and will not make available one jot of additional needed authority.

What is needed, Mr. Speaker, is not further laws and further constitutional provisions, but what is needed is commonsense and realism in the handling of a most delicate problem. If there was ever a problem which calls for local handling, it is the racial problem. Such a problem goes directly to the root of our own private lives and personal relations in this land. Changes in customs, in habits, in local procedures, and in the manners of our people are all matters which should be handled locally. In my judgment they are not even susceptible of being handled on a State basis, but should be handled as close and near to our people as any problem of government which we now have before us. If commonsense and feet-on-the-ground reasoning returns to us, we will send this problem back to the grassroots for solution, as we should have done years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this Commission has not helped solve our racial problems. It has merely stirred up further trouble and turmoil, and has produced further racial hatred throughout areas of the Nation in which it has operated. I therefore am against the further extension of the authority of this body, and will vote accordingly.

Housing Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, once again I wish to add my support to the bill S. 2654. From the very first, I have been urging this session of Congress to produce a housing bill which would not only keep alive the many fine aspects of the Federal housing program already in existence, but would also provide new legislative bases for dealing with the urgent housing needs of the Nation. It has become evident that such a bill can be attained only by cooperation between the President and the Congress. In my judgment, the present bill, our third attempt for adequate housing legislation, represents just such an approach. I urge my colleagues to give it their speedy approval.

I am particularly delighted to find that this bill contains, as did its two predecessors in the House, my public disclosure proposal. This measure, section 407 of the bill, would require prospective redevelopers to make public the details of their proposals before any commitment of any kind could be made to them by local authorities charged with responsibility for title I projects. This provision, which has the blessing of the administration and of the distinguished chairman of the Housing Subcommittee [Mr. RAINS], will do much to remedy the defects which have developed in the operation of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 in New York City and elsewhere.

Savoia Lodge, Sons of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a recent excerpt from the celebrated Clinton Daily Item containing remarks in part which I made at the 50th anniversary celebration of the Savoia Lodge, Sons of Italy. This occasion was one of several very well arranged programs which were formulated by the able committee in charge of the lodge's 50th anniversary celebration.

The banquet was held in the imposing edifice, the Clinton Town Hall, and was largely attended by members of the organization, their families and many of their friends, including distinguished leaders of the bar, bench, and the public service.

I felt privileged indeed to add my voice to those which were raised in praise of the lodge; its members; its illustrious history, its many contributions to the country, the vital and inspiring role which citizens of Italian ancestry have played in developing the economy, strengthening of the Nation in peacetime and defending the country in time of peril. It would take many phrases indeed to elaborate adequately upon the great achievements and loyal citizenship and service of our dear friends of Italian ancestry.

Many volumes could be written on this subject, yet I was proud on this occasion to add my humble words to many that were spoken about the contributions of this outstanding group of Americans.

The people of the rich Italian heritage are very dear to me and have been a source of constant encouragement and support. I express warm gratitude to them for their inspiring loyalty and monumental achievements.

May this great, outstanding group continue to receive choicest blessings of the good Lord. May they steadfastly move into the future reinspired and rededicated to the high ideals they exemplify.

The excerpts follow:

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN PAYS TRIBUTE TO SAVOIA MEMBERS

Speaking at the 50th anniversary of Savoia Lodge, Sons of Italy, Saturday night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN highly extolled the contributions of that body and the Italo-American group as a whole.

"The patriotism, loyalty and achievements of people of Italian blood in war and in peace in behalf of the community, State, and Nation could never be exceeded by any other group," said PHILBIN.

"The history of this great organization in our beautiful town covers a period of marked material progress and advancement never before equaled in the entire history of the world.

"But it has been a period of great stress and turmoil as well—three bloody wars and now the cold war, an uneasy peace so-called, severely testing the fiber, stamina and courage of our people.

"It has been the hard work, honest, law-abiding, God-fearing citizenship of your group, and other fine Americans like you, your faith in and devotion to basic spiritual values of religion and patriotism that has enabled you to play such a vital, constructive role in sustaining the moral integrity and the safety and security of the Nation.

"With your great reliance in the Almighty and your high purpose and determination to preserve your ideals and rich heritage, the future of your great organization is bound to be a continued and growing contribution to Clinton and the country.

"I heartily congratulate and compliment you and wish for you all very many happy, glorious, successful years of service to your fellow man and devotion to our great Nation."

Speech by Hon. William C. Kern Before the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. BARR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on August 18, 1959, in New Orleans, La., one of my distinguished constituents, the Honorable William C. Kern, Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission, spoke before the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc. Many of the things that Mr. Kern had to say applied to some of the basic problems of this Congress. I think it only fitting and proper that this be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I heartily recommend it to all Members.

Mr. Chairman and members of the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers, Inc., I am delighted at this opportunity to address your convention. I am told that about 30,000 individual retail service station operators belong to the various groups that make up your Congress. That certainly makes this meeting wonderfully representative of independent small business. I believe that independent small business is at

the very heart of the political and economic traditions of America. Our free enterprise economy will remain viable and strong so long as the average citizen is free to start a new business, to make his own business decisions without coercion or intimidation, and to succeed, if possible, in making his business grow into big business by dint of his own initiative and hard work. It is the duty of all of us to keep it that way; that is what we at the Federal Trade Commission are trying to accomplish. However, as I shall point out later, in my judgment the spokesmen of many businesses, both small and big, are asking our Government to do more for them than they legitimately should ask with the result that individual initiative and hard work may, like the Indian, be vanishing from the American scene. Government handouts, special purpose and privilege legislation, and the curse of subsidies may be causing a spiritual atrophy that endangers our very existence as a nation. Too many demands are being made both upon the Congress for legislation and through the Congress upon the Public Treasury for the solution of every difficulty. It is about this that I wish to speak to you today.

But before I discuss this subject may I assure you that the Commission is thoroughly aware that your line of business has its troubles—and plenty of them. The Federal Trade Commission has been alive to those problems for a long time and has tried to do something about them. Indeed, perhaps our activity in this area has been disproportionate to our overall responsibilities. Let us review that activity for a moment.

As early as 1915, the Commission made its first general investigation of gasoline prices and of competition in the marketing of gasoline. From that time, over the years, there have been no fewer than 12 general investigations of various aspects of petroleum distribution and a number of other investigations on related subjects. In addition to such general inquiries, there have been a great many specific investigations of suspected law violations and a considerable number of these have ended in formal commission proceedings. There has never been a time when matters involving some aspect of your industry were not pending before the Commission.

I am sure that you are just as familiar as I am with the situation out of which these problems arise. The major oil companies are competing more-or-less vigorously among themselves for shares of the branded gasoline market. At the same time they are also competing with the unbranded products in the total market for gasoline. The supplier of gasoline frequently may be strongly tempted to reduce prices in particular territories or to particular stations—for example, to meet the price of a local competitor or cut into his volume, or to dump a temporary and localized surplus of gasoline without disturbing prices over a broad area. If the supplier is able to discriminate in price among his customers, it is obvious that his individual customers who do not receive the favored price will absorb most of the hard knocks of this competition.

Now the Commission has no business interfering with legitimate competition, even though a competitor might be injured or even destroyed as a result of it. Risk is inherent in business. But the Commission does step in when any of the laws it is charged with enforcing is violated. In relation to the pricing of gasoline, the competitive situation has frequently given rise to charges of price discrimination and price fixing—practices which do violate those laws.

The Standard Oil[1] case was one of the Commission's most frustrating experiences. The essential facts are that in the Detroit market the Standard Oil Co. sold gasoline to so-called "jobber" customers, who resold both at wholesale and also at retail. These "jobber" customers were charged 1½ cents a gallon less than regular service stations which competed directly with the so-called "jobbers" for retail business. The Commission's complaint charged that this price difference violated the Robinson-Patman Act. After long litigation, however, the Supreme Court decided that this was a price discrimination but did not violate the act because Standard Oil's lower price fell within an exception to the act that permits a seller to meet its competitor's price in good faith.

Depending upon one's point of view, the Supreme Court's decision either created or revealed a vast loophole in the Robinson-Patman Act. The price-meeting defense was held to be absolute. Thus, under this decision a supplier is perfectly free to discriminate in favor of a customer once that customer has been offered a lower price by a competing supplier—and this is true even though the discrimination might have a disastrous effect upon competition with the seller or with the buyer. Likewise, the powerful buyer is free to solicit discriminatory prices from various suppliers by the use of offers from other suppliers.

It goes without saying that the Standard Oil decision was completely contrary to the Commission's interpretation of the Robinson-Patman Act. From the beginning I strongly favored new legislation to close this loophole and supported the bill known as S. 11 or the "equality of opportunity" bill. In supporting that bill before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary I stated:

"It would be folly to permit a zeal for preserving an abstract 'meeting competition' concept to overshadow the main purpose of the Clayton Act, which was to outlaw practices leading to unlawful trade restraints or nurturing monopoly. That legislation of this kind should contain an exemption which, in the name of 'meeting competition in good faith,' actually lessens competition on the small-business level is an inexcusable anomaly calling for the correction offered by S. 11, which would permit the absolute defense except where the effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. In my opinion, a complete defense should not be granted to discriminatory practices that will suppress competition or foster monopoly."

However, I would be less than frank if I did not tell you that a well-organized opposition to this bill has made it so controversial that in my judgment its chance of favorable consideration by the Congress is not very bright.

Meanwhile, the Commission continues its efforts to halt illegal pricing practices in the petroleum industry.

The Sun Oil[2] case, which we decided this year, involved two charges arising out of a price war in Jacksonville, Fla. Without lowering prices to its other dealers in the vicinity, Sun cut one dealer's price by 1.7 cents a gallon to assist him in reducing the gap between his price and that of a neighboring off-brand station. From all the evidence and the circumstances surrounding the transaction, the Commission concluded that the dealer in return agreed to reduce his price by 3 cents. On these facts, the Commission found that Sun's price discrimination violated the Robinson-Patman Act. We held that the defense of "good faith meeting" of a competitor's price was not available to a supplier who discriminated to permit its customer to meet the price of the customer's competitor. We also held that the agreement between Sun and its dealer to fix and maintain the 3 cents lower price was a price fixing conspiracy in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The Sun case presented some of the typical problems of the price war. I think that it is a significant decision. It is particularly important because it limits the "good faith meeting" defense to the strict boundaries of the act.

Several other gasoline price cases are pending before the Commission. Generally they arise out of price wars. In addition to charges of price discrimination between competitors, some of them also involve such charges as territorial price discrimination, the use of temporary consignment contracts to coerce uniform prices and various kinds of pressure by suppliers to control retail prices. You will understand that it would be improper for me to discuss the merits of cases such as these while they are still under consideration. I mention them only to indicate that gasoline pricing problems continue to be among the Commission's major concerns.

Entirely aside from the pricing matters I have been discussing, another type of antitrust problem is common in your industry. This problem is caused essentially by the vast contrast in the economic power and trading positions of the oil companies and their service-station customers. One aspect involves the use by the supplier of its economic leverage in one commodity, or as a landlord, to influence or coerce the business choices of its customers or lessees in another field which the supplier does not dominate. The famous Standards Stations[3] case decided that an express contract between the supplier and dealers for the purchase of their "full requirements" of gasoline and TBA items violated section 3 of the Clayton Act when the effect was to foreclose a substantial part of the market to competitors. Following that case, the Federal Trade Commission became very active in preventing such contractual arrangements and I, as a trial attorney, tried a number of the more important cases in this field. As a result of this litigation, suppliers are no longer very apt to put full requirements, exclusive dealing, or tying arrangements into written contracts.

Evidence is now being taken by Commission examiners in three important matters known as the TBA cases. The complaints allege that oil companies supplying certain service stations and distributors exercise their influence and control over those stations and distributors to persuade them to purchase their TBA supplies from certain tire manufacturers. In return for this service, the complaints allege that the tire manufacturers pay the oil companies "override" commissions of varying amounts up to 10 percent on TBA items sold to stations and distributors dealing in the products of those oil companies. Once again, you will understand that I am unable to comment on the merits of these cases before they have been decided by the Commission.

In addition to economic problems of the kind I have been discussing, the Commission also protects the consuming public from the false and misleading advertising and labeling of products sold in commerce. Such phony or exaggerated claims by overzealous sellers are deceptive practices within the meaning of the Federal Trade Commission Act and may be prevented by cease-and-desist orders.

The reprocessed oil cases are typical examples of such practices touching on your business. There respondents distributed reclaimed and reprocessed oil in containers just like those in which new oil is marketed. They either did not disclose at all or disclosed inadequately that the contents of the cans had been previously used in automobile crankcases. The respondents argued that their product was just as good as new oil and, therefore, that the public was not injured by the practice. The Commission did not agree. We held that the consumer is entitled to know what he is buying and issued orders requiring clear and conspicuous dis-

Footnotes at end of speech.

closure, both on the oil companies and in advertising.

There is a constant procession of such cases from your line of business. Some deceptions that the Commission has proceeded against recently include:

A seller who advertised as "new" tires that had been previously used and then cleaned and painted to look new.

A manufacturer that falsely represented that its gasoline and oil additives are approved or recommended by the U.S. Government.

A dealer who represented as "top quality snow tires" ordinary tires that merely had a few additional grooves cut in them.

I could add many more examples. The Commission is constantly vigilant against such practices and the volume of our work in this field is steadily increasing. While we will never be able to put a halt to all false and misleading advertising, our persistent campaign against deception will restrain the more blatant offenders.

I hope I have not bored you with too much lawyer's talk. My point is that the Federal Trade Commission is acutely aware of the serious problems in the petroleum distribution industry. In fact we have an unprecedented number of pending cases involving your industry.

At the same time, we are experimenting with new means of securing voluntary compliance with fair advertising standards in your field of activity. The Tire Advertising Guides are an example. The public has been very much confused by the flamboyant advertising claims of tire makers and dealers. Last year the Commission attempted to relieve this confusion by issuing 12 specific guides to give the industry detailed notice of what the Commission considers to be deceptive about tire labeling and advertising. We hope that they will eliminate much of the deception caused by these claims. For those who persist in deceptive advertising, of course, the Commission's mandatory procedures will still be available.

Now let us leave your own industry problems and consider the vastness of our overall responsibilities. At present these include the Federal Trade Commission Act of 1914, as amended by the Wheeler-Lea Act of 1938 and the Oleomargarine Act of 1950; section 2 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936; sections 3 and 8 of the Clayton Act; section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended; the Export Trade Act known as the Webb-Pomerene Act; the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939; the Lanham Trade-Mark Act of 1946; the Fur Products Labeling Act of 1951; the Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953; and most recently the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act passed by the last Congress.

The sum and substance of all this legislation is a congressional mandate to the Commission to prevent unfair methods of competition and other unfair trade practices, to correct and prevent commercial deception of the American public, and to keep the channels of commerce free from the types of undue restraints and tendencies of monopoly condemned by these various statutes: a broad mandate indeed.

To accomplish this mandate we have an annual appropriation of some $6 million which enables us to hire a small staff of some seven hundred employees. Yet the economy we are expected to police has increased its national product from approximately $100 billion in 1940 to $483 billion in 1959. But lest you think that I am a typical bureaucrat seeking additional appropriations to augment an already swollen bureaucracy, let me state that I would gladly accept even a cut in our meager appropriation if I could by so doing bring about a cessation of what I have at the outset referred to as Government handouts, special purpose and privilege legislation, and the curse of subsidies which are threatening to engulf our entire free enterprise system. You and I as representatives of the great American middle class may well be the principal victims caught between high taxes on the one hand and a cheapened dollar on the other. Of course, many factors contributing to this problem do not come within the purview of the Federal Trade Commission. Nevertheless as a citizen and, I hope, a patriotic one, and as a member with you of that great middle class, and as an official close to the Washington scene, I am disturbed—and I feel that if I can alert intelligent groups like yours to the problem, perhaps your influence and the influence of others like you may be brought to bear on the power centers in Washington. This is not or should not be a partisan matter and both great parties might not only take heed but even join forces to combat the evil. For if foreign policy is traditionally considered bipartisan, why should not the preservation of our free enterprise system be viewed with a similar bipartisan approach? The leadership of both our great political parties might well join in a blueprint plan for a victorious solution of this problem of keeping our economy strong. Now what might that blueprint consist of? The overriding public interest in controlling threatened inflation, strengthening the dollar, balancing the budget and eventually reducing the tax burden on our people must be given paramount priority. Special handouts, subsidies (both domestic and foreign) must be eliminated in all areas, except those absolutely vital to national security. Small business and its sponsors can play a vital part. I believe you should have the right to a competitive position which permits you to fight it out fairly and openly with your competitors both large and small in the marketplace. But you should have no more than that. Nor do I believe that you require any built-in special security. I only wish that some of your small business champions had the same confidence in you that I do. We at the Commission are concerned about many legislative proposals granting special exemptions which would break down the antitrust laws. For example, several bills have been introduced to limit manufacturers in selling direct to retail outlets unless price differentials are established to protect the profit margins of competing wholesalers. Under such proposals the Federal Trade Commission would be required to investigate every wholesaler whose business would be affected and determine what his profit margin should be. This would put the Government in the price-fixing business and eliminate price competition at the wholesale level in the businesses affected. Such proposals are inconsistent with the free enterprise system and with the basic principles of antitrust law.

Other bills introduced seek to give auto dealers a virtual monopoly to sell cars at probably higher prices in territories assigned to them by the manufacturers, and any dealer selling outside his own territory would be required to pay a commission to the dealer in whose territory the sale was made. It seems clear to me that such special-privilege legislation providing for built-in territorial monopolies would not be in the best interests of the consumer nor does it foster the principle of vigorous competition at the retail level. Other bills of like character have been introduced; and, of course, we have as always a fair trade bill with us in some form or other. Yet let us not ignore so-called big business, or the farmer, or the unions from a consideration of this legislative search "to get theirs." Subsidies to the airlines, subsidies to the shipping lines, oil and gas depletion allowances and subsidies, and farm subsidies run into billions. Sometimes I wonder if there is any organized group in our economy that is without benefit of some subsidy. It seems to me there is only one forgotten group without some subsidy—the American taxpayer.

The unions continue to benefit by immunities granted under the antitrust laws at a time when labor was weak and fighting for its life. They should be continued to be fostered as an indispensable part of our economic fabric. However, now that labor is as powerful in the industrial arena as any combination of capital, surely the public interest suggests that these immunities be reexamined. Yet current criticism of some of the activities of some unions, such as "union featherbedding," bring to mind similar abuses on the part of industrial management. For example, I am reasonably certain that many corporate managements have successfully insulated themselves against some of the more serious effects of our present very burdensome tax structure by the creation of various schemes which may well be described as "executive featherbedding," such as overly liberal executive retirement and pension plans, stock option agreements, executive incentive plans, and the like.

Nor are our State governments beyond blame for another tremendous drain upon the public treasury. Increasingly vast sums are going out as grants in aid to the States. Even the most ardent States righters are agreeable, and indeed receptive, to Federal largess to the States. While Federal grants in aid for everything from highways to free lunches may seem desirable, certainly these expenditures should be weighed against the old-fashioned question "where do you find the money"? In my judgment only when disaster or emergency creates a situation beyond the control of local communities or the States should the powers of the Federal Government be brought into action; somehow and soon there must be a return to State, local, and individual responsibility. The whole area of grants to the States should be reexamined.

Finally, the Federal Government itself must bear its full measure of blame. Failure to resist the pressure of the farm lobby, the union lobby, yes, and the small business lobby, is a part of the story; failure to recognize that it is more important to keep our Nation strong than to attempt to win dubious allies by the inempt use of vast sums in foreign aid is also part of the story; and above all, failure to make a real effort to abolish these practices—failure to think in terms of the public interest as a whole, completes the story.

Now do you think I am a disillusioned cynic and view the situation as hopeless? No, I don't. Americans have always been able to rise to any crisis once they recognize it. None of us would tolerate for a moment seeing America reduced to a second-class power or, worse, to a slave state. With leaders brave enough to rise above political expediency and show us the way, we can and will remain indomitable. But the leadership must truly represent a resurgence of the public conscience—a conscience which recognizes that subsidies must be vastly curtailed or limited, a conscience which recognizes that special purpose and special privilege legislation must be abandoned, a conscience which recognizes that there should never be allowed to exist peculiar favorites of the Government at the expense of the general public.

I firmly believe that what this fine group and other important groups in our economy need is not more legislation to protect them and insulate them from competition or from price declines. Needed, instead, is the will to fight it out fairly as vigorous competitors in the marketplace, protected only by being assured that the competition required to be

met is itself fair, free, and open. This leads me back to the thought I expressed at the outset of these remarks, namely, that I conceive it as the paramount duty of the Commission to preserve and foster such a wholesome competitive climate. To accomplish this requires not a relaxation, but a more vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws.

I am satisfied that the greatest boon to business, both small and large, would be a sizable reduction in the present burdensome tax structure. You want to get the Government off your backs. But you will never accomplish this unless all the pressure groups get off the back of Government.

In closing may I say that above all else we need a courageous leadership, able to rise rise above sectionalism and political pressures. The type of leadership I envisage (and don't misunderstand me, for there are quite a few of them in this category in Washington today—for example, the names of RAYBURN and JOHNSON stand out as veritable towers of strength and patriotic courage)—the kind of leadership which I envisage is happily expressed in a few lines of verse which I read to you now:

"God give us men. The time demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor; men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagog
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

---

[1] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *Federal Trade Commission*, 340 U.S. 231 (1951).

[2] *Matter of Sun Oil Co.*, F.T.C. Docket 6641 (Jan. 5, 1959).

[3] *Standard Oil Co.* v. *United States*, 337 U.S. 293 (1949).

Khrushchev Marches On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, radio station WMUV, Bob Jones University, Greenville, S.C., is doing a superb job to bring our people the truth. The following radio editorial is excellent. I hope it will be read by all the Members of this Congress and yes, President Eisenhower:

WMUU RADIO EDITORIAL

"And the days dwindle down to a precious few. . . ." The words are part of the lyrics to "September Song." They were written by the late Maxwell Anderson almost a generation ago for the aging Peter Stuyvesant in the musical play "Knickerbocker Holiday." But they might have been written by Anderson not for a character in a play about early America but about his concern for America itself today.

The playwright who died just a few days after the Associated interview from which these statements are taken then went on to say: "Khrushchev has declared that Russia will bury us. I think he believes this. I think the Russian people believe the same doctrine, because that's what they've been taught. I've never been in Russia, but I gather from what I read it's routine in that area to be fanatical about our extinction. Of the present America, Anderson said: 'As a nation we're so spoiled, so luxury-minded, so carefree, so devoted to the pursuit of happiness, that we have let Russia get ahead of us in the armament race.'" And there we interrupt for a moment our quote from the late Maxwell Anderson.

Sometimes it is difficult not to become pessimistic about the future of our country the United States—not because of the strength of our enemy from without but because of our own weakness from within. We do not mean military weakness—we mean moral and spiritual weakness—the kind of weakness our quotation from Maxwell Anderson was talking about. It's the kind of efete, decadent weakness that existed in the Roman Empire just before it was swept away by the great heathen hordes from the north. Nowhere is this efeteness, this decadence more sickingly evident than in the silly, simpering attitude so many Americans have taken toward the forthcoming Khrushchev visits. The UPI newswire recently carried the following story:

"From the hundreds of invitations pouring in for Nikita Khrushchev's forthcoming visit, it's hard to say whether the plan is to bore him to death, scare him to death, or just wear him out. His presence is being sought for civic club luncheons, local fairs, and meetings of county commissions. It has been suggested he would enjoy visiting a Glenridge, N.J., Girl Scout troop and the junior women's club of Elk Grove Village, Ill. He also has been urged to attend a turkey day fete in Worthington, Minn., and to address the Brooklyn Ocean Front Men's Civic and Social Club. Protocol experts say one thing Khrushchev has to see first thing when he gets off the plane is about 1,500 hammers and sickles adorning the local light poles. We fly national emblems for all visiting big shots."

Can you imagine it? The hammer and sickle flying all over Washington. It sort of makes one wonder if it might not be prophetic. The silly, morbid curiosity to entertain and rub shoulders with the butcher and cold-blooded murdered Khrushchev reminds us of news stories of the slaying of John Dillenger, notorious gangster and murderer of the thirties. Some of you may remember that he was ambushed and shot down by police as he came out of a theater. The reports were that scores of people, mostly women, literally mobbed the place to get souvenirs. Some even mopped up his blood with newspapers to keep as a momento.

It reminds us also of the crowd of silly bobbysoxers who stood outside a police station a couple of years ago to cheer and throw kisses at a cowardly teenage thug who had ambushed another boy and shot him in the back.

What's wrong with us here in America? Have we gone crazy? As Eugene Pulliam said in a recent editorial:

"Don't the people of the United States any longer believe in honor, decency, and morality? Don't they and their Government any longer dare to affront tyrants and murderers, thieves, and liars—all of which Khrushchev is? This is the man under whose orders 17 young American soldiers died just last December when their unarmed plane was shot down without warning by Soviet Mig 19's. This is the man under whose orders Soviet troops smashed their way into Budapest and began the slaughter of the heroic patriots of Hungary who sought to win only their freedom from his foreign tyranny. This is the man under whose orders thousands of Hungarians were put to death, who lured their leaders by promises of good faith, and then had them murdered in violation of his pledges. This is the man who presides over an empire of millions of people yearning to be free from his savage rule.

"This is the man who boasts that he and his Communist comrades will 'bury us' and that one day our children will live under the same kind of dictatorship that he imposes on the slaves of his Communist state. His record for killing, lying, enslaving, and torturing is unmatched by any other tyrant in modern history—except, perhaps, his predecessor, Stalin. He is worse than Hitler and Mussolini combined.

"And we invite him into our American home as an honored guest? Why? In our opinion there is only one reason for such a travesty—fear. The American people and the American Government are afraid not to invite this barbarian bully to the 'land of the free and the home of the brave.'"

In conclusion, let's go back to our interview with the late Maxwell A. Anderson. The playwright asks the question, "But what if the Soviets did conquer the earth? With America and the Western world gone, what would happen?" He answers by saying that the flame of freedom might conceivably burn again after several hundred or even several thousand years but concludes: "But this would be cold comfort if the United States, as a nation, were to die young. Also, it would be inexcusable. We are not old enough to be so enfeebled by corruption, so unwary in statesmanship, so deficient in education, that we let the late starters catch and pass us. And yet, that seems to be exactly what we're doing. And because of it the Nation may not have long to live."

And with that final quote from the late Maxwell Anderson, we end our WMUU radio editorial for today.

The Poll Tax, a Price Tag on American Democracy, Should Be Abolished

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there have been many changes in American political and governmental life since the Constitution was adopted. When the Nation was formed, ownership of property was generally required as a qualification for voting. Indeed, even human beings were owned and traded, bought and sold as property in that long ago day. But as our democracy has developed all property qualifications fortunately have been abandoned, until now, a poll tax levied by five States is the only price tag on American democracy.

Three States now have cumulative poll tax requirements, that a citizen must pay a poll tax 2 or 3 consecutive years before he can vote in one election. These are such unreasonable burdens upon the franchise and so undemocratic as to shock the national conscience.

For this reason, I joined with 60 other Senators in sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 126 proposing to amend the U.S. Constitution to abolish the poll tax in Federal elections.

There are substantial numbers of residents in lower income brackets in these

States who are disfranchised by imposition of having to pay a poll tax. Experience in States which recently abolished the poll tax shows that thousands of additional citizens voted when they no longer had to pay this uneven economic burden to participate in selection of their elective officials.

All of us will agree, I believe, that the most important and most basic right in our great system of Government by consent of the governed is the right to vote in honest democratic elections at all levels of government.

Mr. President, surely thoughtful Americans should support this move to extend the right to vote in Federal elections to all Americans. This is fundamental to the democratic principles upon which this Nation was founded.

For this reason, I want to most strongly urge—and I hope many other Senators will join me—that the Senate Judiciary Committee favorably report Senate Joint Resolution 126 within the next few hours so that the Senate can have an opportunity to act on this proposal during the current session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 12, 1959, concerning the report entitled, "With Liberty and Justice For All," which has a section on the history of the right to vote in America.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 12, 1959]

THE CRC LOOKS AHEAD

Before Congress passes judgment upon the Civil Rights Commission it would be highly desirable if every Member could read its report or at least the 200-page abridgment entitled "With Liberty and Justice for All." The report is humanitarian in tone, constructive in outlook, and thoroughly grounded on the basic principles of the U.S. Constitution. In no sense is it a tirade against the South. Rather, it recognizes that the struggle for attainment of the great principle of equal justice is going on in all parts of the country in one way or another. In the great majority of its observations southerners and northerners on the Commission were in full agreement.

The Commission has, of course, uncovered many unpleasant facts about discrimination in voting, in housing, and in education. This was its special assignment. On the basis of these facts, local and State governments as well as Congress and the administration should be able to correct many injustices to minorities that are a reproach to our democratic system. But there is no muckraking in the report. The Commission sees the lights as well as the shadows in the panorama it has surveyed.

It notes, for example, that the southern States have outlawed "the hooded violence of the Ku Klux Klan"; that the right of minorities to vote is established in many areas of the South as well as the North; that segregation has ended in interstate transportation throughout the country and in buses and streetcars in a number of southern cities; that some Northern States are seeking to outlaw discrimination in housing. "The pace of progress during the 96 years since emancipation," says the report, "has been remarkable."

The Commission also sees that the many facets of the problem are closely related. The extension of voting rights may have disappointing results because of apathy and ignorance unless that reform is accompanied by better education and the elimination of demoralizing slums. What the Commission is pleading for is a general elevation of sights to "new and challenging targets." In addition to equality under the law, it says in effect, the country needs a great creative effort that will absorb the minds and hearts of men so completely as to submerge petty prejudices and emotions rooted in the past.

Aside from this play of enlightened imagination upon a baffling national problem, the CRC has offered numerous specific recommendations in the fields of education and housing, as well as that of suffrage. Not all of these are likely to be acceptable, but they do emphasize the desirability of continuing study in this field by a group of experts chosen from many backgrounds and dedicated to the general objectives of tolerance and human dignity. The Commission notes, moreover, that it has not yet had an opportunity to study directly discrimination in employment, in the administration of justice, and in public accommodations.

To cut the Commission off after it has made so promising a beginning and finds so much territory yet to be explored would be an inexcusable blow to the cause of civil rights and good human relations. Congress must not adjourn until provision has been made for the Commission's work to continue.

American Farmers Should Write the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, it has been stated in farming circles that sometime in the fall the President will make a nationwide radio and TV appeal for new farm laws in the 1960 session of Congress. If this is so, and I hope it is, I hope that the President will present the actual problems of agriculture and solutions to them positively, constructively, and comprehensively. Unless he departs from present Agriculture Department policy, any statements that he might make will serve only to confuse and add to the further breakdown of our general farm situation.

I hope that he will not take the line of some of our large prestige newspapers and magazines which have done much to unfairly present the farmers, their problems, hopes and aspirations to this Nation. I hope that he will make clear that farmers seek the return of importance and dignity which they deserve as citizens of the United States and an important element in our economy. I hope that he will support the family farmer who is truly the backbone of the United States.

I would like to include part of an excellent editorial by Howard A. Cowden on the subject of the President's talk:

WHEN THE PRESIDENT TALKS

The leading article on the front page of the Wall Street Journal on August 24 was under this headline: "Rural Power Reaches New Congressional Low As City Allies Desert."

In nearly two columns of type the paper detailed developments in Washington which point up the disappearance of the old farm bloc in Congress and the growing tendency of urban lawmakers to take a dim view of Government farm programs.

Chairman COOLEY of the House Agriculture Committee was quoted as saying:

"The farm organizations are divided, this committee is divided, the Congress is divided, the Agriculture Department seems to be divided, and we are all bogged down."

It is against this background that President Eisenhower is planning to make a nationwide radio and TV appeal for new farm laws in the 1960 session of Congress.

The President, I think, can do one of two things. He can present agriculture's problems and predicaments positively and constructively, or he can contribute to further deterioration of the nonfarm public's interest in these problems and predicaments.

The President's decision to make a nationwide farm talk, we are told, was inspired by the effect his recent TV-radio appeal had on the course of labor legislation. There are some major differences, however, between our farm problems and our labor problems. No one is charging farmers with corruption. No one is accusing them of under-cover operations or dictatorial tactics. Farmers have had no occasion to hide their activities behind the fifth amendment.

I hope Mr. Eisenhower does not take the current line of some of our big daily newspapers and national magazines and contribute further to agriculture's bad image in the public eye. I fear that he may do that—perhaps unwittingly—unless farmers bestir themselves in the meantime.

The President, I fear, is hearing too much unqualified criticism of farm programs and too little constructive comment on what is good in farm programs and what could be done to make them more equitable in the eyes of urban and rural folk alike.

I hope, therefore, that a lot of farmers will take the time this fall to let the President know where they stand.

Robert Evans Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Record, September 1, 1959:

ROBERT EVANS HONORED

Scranton-Spring Brook Water Service Co., by electing Robert R. Evans, of Dallas, as executive vice president, has recognized the efficiency of a young man who has been with the company about 12 years. He began his employment in 1947. He was appointed purchasing agent in 1948 and vice president in 1952. He was elected a director in 1955. The experience he has had is well suited to his broadened responsibilities.

In the Wilkes-Barre area, Scranton-Spring Brook has long functioned as a water-service company. It has operated the gas company in Scranton for many years. In 1951 it pur-

chased from Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. the gas-distribution facilities in Wilkes-Barre, Bloomsburg, Danville, Sunbury, Milton, and Williamsport. In 1956 the Kingston gas division was purchased from the United Gas Improvement Co. In addition to his other duties with these operations, Mr. Evans will have charge of the company's advertising and sales.

He attended Wyoming Seminary and its Dean School of Business. He served in the U.S. Army from 1943 to 1947, most of that time in Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. The Army Commendation Ribbon was awarded to him in 1946. Presently he is a Reserve officer.

A director of the Kingston National Bank, Mr. Evans is well known to the business community. Civicwise and fraternally, he has been responsive to calls for service to the public in many connections.

Need for Postal Service Improvement at White Bear Lake, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I received a letter signed by four very distinguished, highly respected men devoted to public service. All four of these gentlemen live in White Bear Lake, Minn., and as their letter indicates, are devoting substantial time and effort to improving postal service in that city.

This letter very well indicates the great need for improvement of postal service in that part of my district. It is obvious that the postal requirements on a population basis have increased 400 percent since facilities were initiated in 1937.

In every respect this letter carries the message of need, urgent need: urgent need to provide additional facilities for proper service; urgent need to house many thousands of dollars worth of equipment; urgent need to correct insanitary and intolerable working conditions for the postal workers.

Mr. Speaker, I know these men. I know them not to be wild-eyed spenders. Rather I know them to be sane conservators of public moneys, not 1 cent of which they would ask for if the need be not of utmost importance.

Mr. Speaker, I address myself to this problem on this occasion for the purpose of calling the attention of Congress, the President of the United States, the Postmaster General, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Administrator of the General Services Administration to the real needs of our Nation for improved postal facilities. I would be less than candid if I did not admit to the need in many other areas in our Nation. I urge that the executive agencies recognize this need and initiate improvements in postal service, if necessary, by charging the publishers of mass circulation magazines postage which will more nearly cover the costs of delivery.

The letter follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
OF WHITE BEAR LAKE,
White Bear Lake, Minn., September 8, 1959.
Congressman JOSEPH E. KARTH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KARTH: It has come to the attention of the Chamber of Commerce of White Bear Lake that requests for improvements for the local post office have met with the response that no money is available through 1961. A committee from the chamber has inspected the building and premises and call to your attention the following facts:

1. White Bear Lake is operating in a building constructed in 1937 when the post office here served a community of about 3,000, plus a rural community of about 5,000; whereas now the local post office serves a city of 13,000 population with approximately 25,000 additional in the area.

2. The local post office is operating 13 trucks, while there is access for loading for only 2 trucks.

3. Inside the building we found crowded working conditions and inadequate toilet facilities.

Due to our tremendous growth, we feel a great deal of improvement is needed and it is our thought that you could give us some assistance in the program we propose.

We recommend that the building be enlarged for an increase in working space. We also recommend that a garage be acquired so that trucks may be stored there rather than being parked back of the post office in the open. Such a garage should possibly include parking space for employees cars while working rather than having them parked on the streets.

For public safety we recommend that the driveway leading from Highway 61 be widened and a new drive built on the west side of the building, entering from Third Street. Large mail trucks bringing mail from St. Paul are at present required to back in from Highway 61.

When you get back to Minnesota, we will appreciate a visit and will be glad to inspect the post office with you. We extend to you a cordial welcome to any of the Tuesday noon luncheon meetings of the Chamber of Commerce of White Bear Lake.

Sincerely,

CLEO G. SMITH,
Chairman, Parking Facilities.
H. A. WARNER,
Chairman, Highways and Streets.
CHARLES A. HAUSSNER,
Chairman, Safety.
R. V. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Civic Improvement.

Schedule of Meetings in the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DELBERT L. LATTA
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress adjourns in a few days, I expect to return to my district and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the fifth district in the courthouse of each county seat between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

October 1, Van Wert County, Van Wert.
October 2, Defiance County, Defiance.
October 3, Ottawa County, Port Clinton—until noon.
October 5, Paulding County, Paulding.
October 6, Williams County, Bryan.
October 7, Putnam County, Ottawa.
October 8, Henry County Napoleon.
October 9, Fulton County, Wauseon.
October 10, Wood County, Bowling Green—until noon.

No appointments will be necessary. All problems which constituents have with the Federal Government will be proper subjects for discussion.

Until Congress reconvenes in January, I will be available for conferences with constituents by appointment in my district office at 304 Wood County Bank Building, Bowling Green, Ohio, except on the days scheduled above.

Memorial Day Address by Mr. Tom Eastman, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the following Memorial Day address was delivered at Parker, S. Dak., by a very fine lawyer and a treasured friend of mine, Mr. Tom Eastman. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address at this point in the RECORD:

MEMORIAL DAY, 1959

Commander and officers, members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, Gold Star Mothers, and ladies and gentlemen, may I first take a moment to express my thanks to the members of the veterans organizations for affording me the opportunity of taking part in this Memorial Day service. Not only am I pleased and proud to be a part of this service because I am a veteran, but also because it gives me the opportunity to take part in a ceremony by which we rededicate ourselves to the end that our American way of life may continue.

I would say a word to those of you who are Gold Star Mothers. Today in the midst of the celebrating, holiday moods, and relaxation, you wear the mantle of sorrow. This day brings back to you vivid memories of those whom you loaned into the service of their country, and into God's service. Each year as these services are conducted, this memory is brought again, fresh to your heart.

But I say to you, as you place that mantle of sorrow on your shoulders, wear it proudly. Hold your head high, for that mantle is a badge of a secure place in the history of mankind. You wear that mantle secure in the knowledge that countless thousands of children, in the future, will go to school and to the church of their choice, because of the gift which you have made to their future. Wear that mantle especially proudly today.

For today is the day that we have come to know as Memorial Day. In meetings such as this across the face of our land, the Amer-

ican people are gathered today to pay homage to the memory of those who, down through the pages of our history, have gone forth to defend and to secure our freedoms, and to give meaning to the right to call ourselves American citizens.

Memorial Day is a sacred day in our national year.

Were it not for the untold heroism of these men who have laid down their plows, their tools, and their books to take up arms in defense of these freedoms which we hold so dear, we would not be able to be gathered here today.

Following World War I, many new nations emerged as free nations. Men in those nations fought for freedom and for all that that word implies.

Yet today, in many of those nations, there are no services to mark the gallant fight which those men made. Today, in Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and many others, the celebrations which are held, are held only in the secret hearts of the people, in their dreams, and in their aspirations.

For today, those countries lie behind the Iron Curtain. This can happen to all people. This has happened to country after country.

This could have happened to us in this country, had those men, in whose honor we are gathered today, had those gallant men not held the heritage of freedom more precious than life itself. For truly, the price of freedom is high.

There is a tendency for people in general, and Memorial Day speakers in particular, to discuss freedom in its larger sense. Freedom of the seas, freedom of the air corridor into Berlin, freedom from unauthorized search and seizure. Freedom is all of this, but freedom is also a great deal more.

Freedom by its very nature, is a personal thing. It is something which you as an individual must exercise by yourself. The minute that you become a part of a group, acting by the will of that group, instead of by your own will, a bit of your freedom is gone.

We recognize, of course, that a part of our freedom must indeed be surrendered in order to provide a peaceful and stable community in which to live.

The history of Government is a history of freedoms and powers voluntarily given or forcibly taken from all people. Government must exist on the freedoms and rights taken from the people, either with their consent, or without it.

It is the philosophy of the Communist regimes, that all freedom must be taken from the people in order to provide a stable government. They hold that where a people have and exercise basic freedoms, to that extent the government is weakened. The American philosophy, on the other hand, holds that when people freely exercise the rights retained by them, freely practice their freedoms, to that extent the government is strengthened.

For in a free and peaceful economy, in a country where each person is proud to be an individual and proud to be a citizen, the government is then composed of those who are proud to be in government, proud to be able to be of service to these men and women who have asked them to so serve.

Not only, then, have these men whom we here honor secured that government and those larger freedoms for us, they have also by their efforts, secured for us the freedoms which we exercise in our everyday life.

Freedom is also a lot of little things. When you go forth in the morning to work your fields, perhaps it never occurs to you that this is an exercise of freedom, the right to which has been dearly bought, for no one tells you how many acres you may own, and indeed, there is no one to tell you that you may not own property at all.

When you go to the refrigerator or the deep freeze to select food to prepare for dinner, this too is an exercise of freedom. This, too, was bought for you on the battlefield. For as you look over your selection or as you stand in the store to decide which meat to buy, there is none to tell you that today is a meatless day, and no meat may be eaten.

You children, as you plan for the next school year, you plan for a future in a field wherein your interests lie. As you do this, give thanks in your heart to those men who bought for you, the right to select your own chosen profession.

When we make a telephone call to a close friend or a business associate, we should give thanks for the knowledge that no one is listening to our conversation to see if we voice some criticism of some government official.

Every 2 years, as our election time rolls around, as we debate the pros and cons of of the particular party which may be in office, or which is striving to attain that office, as we hear charge and countercharge, and as we attend meetings, let us also at that time recognize our obligations to those men who have made the supreme sacrifice that we might enjoy these freedoms.

How then do we recognize these obligations, and what is our obligation to these men? Is it not an obligation to insure that these freedoms which we enjoy today may be enjoyed by our children and our children's children?

We stand today on the threshold of an exciting new age. Those of us living today have been privileged to see a great many changes. Some of us witnessed the advent of the motorcar, others, the beginning of the air age. We are now witnessing the first faltering steps toward interplanetary travel.

But the new innovations which will come in the lifetime of our children, will be so many, so strange, and so awe inspiring as to make the changes of this last half-century seem slight by comparison. For change is a snowball, gathering speed and momentum and weight as it goes.

In this haste to meet tomorrow, this urgent necessity to speed into the space age, to develop new methods of propulsion, and to unlock new secrets of nature with our microscopes and our telescopes, we are much in danger of overlooking the fact that the great strides that have brought us to this point, that have made all of the advances into tomorrow possible, were made to a large extent, because we had a free society in which they could be made.

It was to the freedom of this country that an Einstein fled. It was to the freedom of this country that Enrico Ferimi fled. It was to this free nation that men of every color, race and creed have fled in times of trouble and oppression at home. America has always been the shining goal of every oppressed people.

It was in our free atmosphere that America was able to take the lead in scientific, cultural and economic advances.

This free atmosphere, this fresh air of freedom did not just happen. We here today bear witness to the terrible price that must be paid if a people are to remain free. It is for us here today to become rededicated, to renew our faith, to the end that this fresh wind of freedom that blows across our mountains and prairies, our rich farmland and our seacoasts, will not turn into the stagnant vacuum of oppression, dictatorship, and slavery.

But, we say, how can we do this? As we think to ourselves, we consider that each one of us is just one person, alone, and of little or no practical experience in the ways of government and diplomacy. How can one person help shape the course of destiny?

Yesterday morning, in listening to my radio, I heard a short sermon from one of the ministers in the Sioux Falls area. And he spoke of this very thing. I think I may mention here one of the things which he suggested. He suggested that we devote ourselves to teaching. Teaching not only by example, but teaching our young people directly wherever the opportunity arises.

In the Sunday school classes, at Cub Scout meetings or Scout troops, the 4–H, in the organized sports and activities of our young people during the summer months.

And for those of us who for one reason or another are not able to actively participate in these activities, to make our support felt in every way possible. In doing this, we will keep faith with those men to whose memory we pay our respects today.

In this way, we can continue during peacetime, the gallant fight which they so ably carried on during wartime.

In this way, perhaps more than any other way, we will make our contribution to the future of this country, and indeed to the future of the human race. For who can say but what, from the class which benefited from our guidance, may come tomorrow's Dr. Salk, Bernard Baruch, a Dr. Lawrence, or an Albert Einstein.

This then is our heritage which these honored dead have given us and this is our obligation to hold those freedoms sacred, to exercise them to the fullest, and to hand them down, intact to our children. If we do this, we will make our last journey, secure in the knowledge that we have indeed been of benefit to mankind, and of service to God.

I thank you.

Now a Business Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Reading (Pa.) New Era, calling for business reform:

NOW A BUSINESS REFORM BILL

Now that the labor movement is going to salaam regularly at the feet of Secretary of Labor Mitchell under the new labor reform law, we feel it would be a good idea in the interests of fairness to give similar autocratic powers to the Secretary of Commerce.

It's a well-know fact that the call girl racket is an adjunct of some industrial sales forces. Now when information is uncovered, why shouldn't there be a law requiring the Secretary of Commerce to investigate and prosecute?

The Labor Secretary is given unprecedented authority to snoop into labor matters and make them his own. He can dictate and destroy, if he so desires.

Is business any better that it should not be policed by the Commerce Secretary? After all, billions are paid in bribes each year. And if labor unions can be chained to the Labor Secretary, then industry and business should also be tied to the apron strings of the Commerce Secretary, thus keeping everyone on the "straight and narrow."

Last week the International Association of Machinists called for a full-scale probe of management practices.

Nothing came of the request—not even from management people who talked loudest for ending corruption in labor. If these people are sincere about gouging out corruption wherever it exists, they should be anxious for a peep into management's carryings-on.

There should be no objections to this plan. If management is as clean as it has contended during 2 years of McClellan hearings, then certainly business has nothing to fear. It should welcome a law giving powers to the Commerce Secretary to enforce rules telling the firms how to run their business.

Business advocated this for labor—and got it from Congress.

Let the press demonstrate equal diligence in uncovering the stories of internal graft, shakedowns by purchasing agents, gifts to individuals who can do the company some good, and even the stock options which are legalized ways of grabbing corporation stock at a discount.

Come to think of it, stock options in a way are a method of diverting corporation funds to individuals.

Where is the first management man willing to talk up for business reform with the same lung-bursting noise reserved for labor?

Science Age Studies Developed for Grades

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, a heartening national development in the last 2 years has been the determination at local levels to improve the standards of instruction in scientific subjects. While we face a general need to keep an eye on all phases of the education of our youth, to build new schools, to see that teachers are adequately paid, to modernize the teaching aids and curricula, it is good to see local programs in motion that will meet the devastating scientific needs dramatized little less than 2 years ago by the launching of sputnik.

While Hartford and other communities in my district have outstanding programs, and Connecticut itself has an overall scientific adviser at State department of education level to make proposals, I would like to include in the RECORD today a story of what is being done in the New Britain public schools, as reported in the New Britain Herald of September 3:

TO GIVE BASIC CONCEPTS—SCIENCE AGE STUDIES DEVELOPED FOR GRADES

To keep abreast of the rapid technological growth and to meet the need for an integrated science program for the lower grades, an elementary science program curriculum guide has been developed for the public schools.

This guide is the handiwork of the Elementary Science Curriculum Development Committee—one representative from each of the elementary schools—working under the guidance of Winaten B. Keck, former curriculum coordinator of the New Britain public schools, and Dr. John Read of Boston University.

This is an age of science. In one short day, a child comes in contact with scientific phenomena over and over again. The child examines the world around him, touching, tasting, smelling, listening, and always asking how and why things are what they are. Science is an integral part of the child's world. Just as certain basic food elements are necessary for the healthy physical growth of the child, so also, science functions as an essential component of a balanced educational experience of a child.

During the last decade there has been a rapid technological growth. The child of today lives in a world of nuclear energy and earth satellites as well as in a world of flowers and birds. His environment is increasingly subject to modification and control through science.

Since the elementary school must be concerned with helping the child to acquire useful, functional knowledge, skills, and understanding, it is but natural that science is given a significant place in the elementary school.

This guide aims to assist teachers in their work with science and to improve the effectiveness of science instruction in the elementary schools. It is designed to satisfy the child's inquiring mind, to stimulate curiosity, and to closely tie in with subsequent experiments presented in the junior and senior high schools.

The content of the guide is found in the everyday world of the child. The method, natural to children, is to investigate through observing, experimenting, manipulating, questioning, constructing, reading, and solving problems that are significant in daily living.

OVERALL CHART

The total science pattern for the elementary schools is included in a scope and sequence chart, which presents an overall view of the topical areas included in the science experiences of all children.

Basic science concepts have been developed. They represent the essential understandings and knowledges which form the basis of the instructional program in grades K–VI.

Also included is a list of appropriate pupil-teacher activities, basic and comprehensive, structured to attain the stated concepts. References to related films and filmstrips, and a pupil-teacher bibliography have been provided to complete a well planned, orderly, and flexible science program in New Britain's elementary schools.

Security in Family, Friends, Freedom, and Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech written by Judith Ann Rogers, a senior high school student from Albany, Oreg., in my congressional district. Miss Rogers wrote the speech for the "My True Security" program and was declared winner for the State of Oregon. She attended the national awards banquet here in the Nation's Capital in July:

THIS IS MY SECURITY, MY TRUE SECURITY
(By Judith Ann Rogers)

The tiny baby grasps tightly to its mother's outstretched fingers; the youngster, left alone temporarily by his parents, wails mournfully; the elderly woman grips the railing before descending the stairs: these people are all searching for something.

Will they find that thing for which they search? Some do, yet mental hospitals are full of those who have searched in vain.

Yes, security is an elusive thing—it is in great demand, yet no one has managed to find a way to bottle and sell it. One need not have dollars and cents to have it for those who have everything would give it all for security while some of the poorest people own the largest quantities of this precious possession.

The greatest problem in finding security is knowing where to look. Some surround themselves with the riches of the world, but when they have finished amassing a fortune, they realize that security is not found in silver or gold. Others seek it in a bottle or a hypodermic needle and, for a few hours, they may even think that their search is over, yet, when the effect wears off, security has disappeared.

What is this security which everyone seeks? If I were Sherlock Holmes or a Canadian Mountie out to get my man, I would want to know something of the subject of my search before I began. Although security is not something that can be tracked down by a private eye until it is behind bars, it is easier to find when it is understood.

We have observed these things about security—it cannot be purchased at any price; it is not found in material things; and it must be permanent to be the true thing.

Webster defines security as "the quality or condition of being free from fear, care, or anxiety." Since these are all chains that bind the mind, then might we say the security is a freedom of the mind?

Now, with the meaning clear, we may begin our search.

True security is like the roots of a tree. In the center is the trunk root, the family. Our parents shelter us from the fears of the world and see that our needs, both material and spiritual, are not neglected. Yet they take care to instill in us a sense of responsibility and judgment so that we might grow in the right direction when it comes time for us to branch out on our own.

Branching roots represent friends with whom we have laughed and cried, played and fought. The earth in which we are rooted is the society which encourages or discourages our growth. Just as an elm tree could not be expected to grow on the desert, or a palm at the North Pole, one could not expect us to grow in the wrong sort of society. Just as most trees grow best where the soil is loose and gives the roots freedom, security needs freedom to grow.

Tree roots cannot subsist by themselves—they reach out to soak up their lifeblood, food from the soil. Our lifeblood is faith. Without faith our security cannot exist. This is a threefold faith—faith in God, faith in humanity, and faith in oneself.

And so we see that true security is not in a clause of an insurance policy, or in the Government's promise of money for our old age. It is in family, friends, freedom, and faith.

Our Stake in Israel: An Act of Faith in Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by Rabbi Aaron Decter on the Voice

of Israel program over station WBBZ in southern New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The occasion was the 12th anniversary of the continuous presentation of this educational program to the Jewish and Christian communities of the area. Rabbi Decter is an outstanding citizen of Philadelphia, is coordinator of the Foundation for the Jewish National Fund, secretary of the American Committee for the Writer's Center in Israel, and former editor of Israel Speaks:

OUR STAKE IN ISRAEL: AN ACT OF FAITH IN MAN

On behalf of the Jewish National Fund Council of the Penn-seaboard region, I am delighted to extend greetings to all of our audience as well as to the dedicated men and women who have made the Voice of Israel such a remarkable channel of communication of ideas and information about Israel and its people. I am proud to greet you on your 12th anniversary of continuous service and to extend to you, not only our hopes and prayers for your good health and future dedication, but also to bespeak the good wishes and the prayers of all of those who are associated with the Jewish national fund; with the great work of land reclamation, soil afforestation of this great agency, whose purpose is to restore the land to its Biblical fertility. I am also proud to bring to you greetings of the men and women who are associated with the Israel Histadrut campaign, whose cooperative institutions are making Israel so unique.

What has been the character of the life of the people of Israel that has drawn so many members of the Afro-Asian bloc? It is because the people of Burma, India, Ghana, etc., have recognized that in Israel's social philosophies and in the lives of the people of Israel, animated as they are by the ideals of the visions of the Bible and by great social visionaries of every generation, there is a purpose: namely, to respect the human personality, to create social institutions that raise man above the subhuman, to decuate its people to release them from bondage to ignorance, to save them from the fear of disease and of death and to give them the opportunity to live in freedom, with hope and with dignity. It is because of this that a man like Prof. Robert Oppenheimer, another neighbor of this community, was able to say after visiting many countries and after visiting Israel, "There is only one country where I have been able to find hope for the world, and that is Israel." A man like Oppenheimer, who has been close to the work of atomic research which has been utilized for destruction, has found discouragement in sicentific work and disappointment with those who are guiding the destiny of millions of people.

There is need today to have men's minds and spirits strengthened by faith, faith in man's ability to overcome great and almost insuperable difficulties; faith in man's ability to create social engineering, whereby people can learn to live together; faith in man's wisdom and inteligence to resolve problems as they arise constantly. This faith, the people have inherited not only from the Torah, the Bible, they have inherited it from hundreds of years of difficulties, pogroms, disabilities and persecutions and because they have been the social heirs both of a great vision and a philosophy as well as a long history of difficulties, they have emerged in this, our day, with a determination that created a state and a democracy that by the quality and character of its social lving, will be able to inject new hope and give new stimulation to those who believe in the democratic way of life. There will be many difficulties that will have to be faced, difficulties not only in the continuous struggle against nature; the struggle against the desert and the Kibbush Hashima, the conquest of the desert; the struggle to maintain a level of normalcy between the development of agriculture and greater productivity in industrialization; the problems of absorption and integration of new immigrants by teaching them how to work, etc. All of these problems whether they be economic or social or psychological or even relationship with their neighbors will be overcome because the people of Israel have faith and vision. Through this faith in action, the people of Israel will enrich the world with a variegated texture of spiritual blessings, and bring light unto the nations.

Thousands of years ago, a people of farmers and of settlers met together in a great mystic union with the land of Israel, the Holy Land, and there created forms of religious manifestation rich and variegated in character that blessed and enriched not only the civilization of their day, but the lives of hundreds of millions of people in lands and civilizations far removed from them in time and space. For hundreds of years that land and that people have been divorced, one from the other, and the land has been abused, sowed under with salt, become the prey of unloving hands, the victim of the hostility of conquering armies in every generation. In our day, and this has been the privilege of our generation, we have seen and witnessed the resurrection of the people of Israel and the reestablishment of the State of Israel, Medinot, Israel.

Once again, the descendants of that small people of settlers and farmers, reunited with its ancestral soil, have recreated new forms of religious life, of social living, which are the manifestation of its unique religion—the genius for the noncombative and for the cooperative life. They are creating those forms of living which give manifestation to the ideals of brotherhood and of fellowship that was envisioned by Jeremiah and Isaiah, by Amos and Hosea. It is because of this that we can understand why the people of Israel and its government have been able to leapfrog the cold steel ring of enmity and hostility with which it has been surrounded by its immediate Arabic neighbors and to create by means of this leapfrogging, a warm and viable association of friendship and alliances with many members of the Afro-Asian bloc, such as Ghana, Lybia, Tunisia, Burma, India, and others.

William O. Sword, of Wilkes-Barre, Named Industrial Ambassador by U.S. Department of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, of September 9, 1959, which comments upon the selection of Mr. William O. Sword, president, Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund, to serve as member of industrial mission to Italy for the Foreign Trade Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce:

INDUSTRIAL AMBASSADOR

Departure of William O. Sword, president of the Wilkes-Barre Industrial Fund and spearhead of the rehabilitation movement in this community, on an industrial mission to Italy for the Foreign Trade Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce, is recognition for Greater Wilkes-Barre as well as for him personally.

Mr. Sword attained national prominence because of his activities in the field of industrial development here in recent years, although the community is indebted to him for other service as well. It was the stature he acquired in trying to put this area on its feet that brought him to the attention of Washington. Thus, the progress the community has made, as well as Mr. Sword's own contribution to it, was a factor in his selection for this important assignment.

Mr. Sword is unusually well equipped for this undertaking, not only by virtue of his public service and achievements in Greater Wilkes-Barre, but on the basis of his private interests. He has a broad experience in business and banking.

It is flattering to have the Government turn to Wilkes-Barre for assistance, thus reversing the usual procedure. This area yields to none in its output of leadership, providing America with scores of outstanding personages in peace and war. Mr. Sword now takes his place in that distinguished company.

Both Chan and Elevator Stuck—His Bartender Won't Join Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, with each passing day we see more and more evidence that the 86th Congress acted to protect the average American when it approved the final version of S. 1555, the so-called labor reform bill. I have just read with a great deal of interest an article which appeared in the September 10, 1959, issue of the New York World-Telegram and Sun which illustrates clearly the need for the type of legislation we have passed and which now awaits the President's signature.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article to which I have referred and commend it to the attention of my colleagues. May the signing into law of S. 1555 bring the elevator of the House of Chan back into operation:

BOTH CHAN AND ELEVATOR STUCK—HIS BARTENDER WON'T JOIN UNION

(By Sam Schraeger)

House of Chan so sorry elevator stuck. But cannot force bartender to join union.

You listen carefully—Sou Chan, head of House of Chan, explain. This is why outside freight elevator on Seventh Avenue, up in air three days now:

In April, man from bartenders' union come see Sou Chan and say: "We want to organize your bartenders." Sou Chan tell him: "All right; I talk to them."

One of the bartenders is stockholder so he see no need to be union man. Other bartender say: "I make $95 a week now. Union scale is $75. Why should I pay dues? Anyhow, I can only work in Chinese restaurant. Irish saloon on Third Avenue not hire me. I don't need union."

Sou Chan explain this to union man. Then Sou Chan go back to kitchen, make sure steak kew, see gyp guy, shrimp puffs,

treasure rolls come out the way customers at House of Chan like them. Sou Chan step outside for breath of air. And what he see?

There are two men carrying signs on Seventh Avenue and 52nd Street. Signs say "House of Chan unfair." Sou Chan shrug his shoulders, go back inside. "Well, they only do their job," he say to himself "Their job is organize, so they organize."

"We get along, union men and me," say Sou Chan today. "No trouble. Sometimes they say words not nice to say, but I don't pay attention."

Tuesday, outside freight elevator come all the way up. Loaded with bags of rice, plums, water chestnuts, snow peas. Servitors unload, and try to go back down to basement. Elevator not move.

Sou Chan telephone elevator man, tell him come fix. Elevator man come, start to fix. Then at noon, union pickets come. Elevator man belong union. He look at pickets. Then he stop work, leave.

Cop come. He tell Sou Chan: "If you don't fix that elevator, I'll give you a ticket."

Sou Chan say: "Please give me ticket."

Cop puzzled. He say: "You're too anxious. I'm gonna talk to the sergeant."

Sou Chan tell landlord. Landlord call his elevator man. Landlord's elevator man belong to union, too. Yesterday, he come, work until noon. Then he, too, see pickets, stop work, leave.

Sergeant come, tell Sou Chan: "You have to do something about that elevator or I'll give you a ticket."

"Please be so kind, honorable Sergeant, and give me ticket. Then I can straighten all out."

Sergeant no give ticket. He go away, call police department legal department, and they say: "Stay out of it."

Today, Sou Chan still no have ticket. Elevator still stuck. On elevator is this sign: "Elevator stuck, not struck."

"Elevator, like all faithful servitors at House of Chan, anxious to do best for you. "But pickets are problem for elevator fixers, keep it up and up, instead of usual up and down."

Plaque To Mark Burial Plot of Col. John Franklin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times-Leader, September 9, 1959:

PLAQUE WILL BE UNVEILED—TO MARK BURIAL PLOT OF COL. JOHN FRANKLIN

On September 23, the State will unveil a marker commemorating Col. John Franklin, last champion of Connecticut's land claims in this area, on the Athens-Shesequin Road in the vicinity of Athens, it was announced today by Dr. Elsie Murray, historian for Tioga Point Museum.

The highway marker will be placed at the foot of a knoll overlooking Tioga Point where Colonel Franklin, after whom Franklin Street in Wilkes-Barre is named, was buried in 1834 in a little cemetery which has been lately restored through a bequest from the family of the last local descendant.

According to his diary which is on file in Tioga Point Museum, Colonel Franklin moved from the Wyoming Valley region in 1790 following 2 years of imprisonment for defying Pennsylvania during the Yankee-Pennamite Wars. He settled on a farm located in the Susquehanna Co.'s 18th township, part of the original Connecticut claims in the Wyoming region.

Stone steps lead up to the lookout on the burial knoll, now known as the Franklin Memorial Park, which is opened to the public. Other burials in the Franklin plot include a family of surveyors and mapmakers who helped draw the New York-Pennsylvania line.

Internal Revenue Code Bewildering to the Private Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, most private citizens are somewhat bewildered by the complicated Internal Revenue Code. Tax time is not only painful because of the money that we must pay to the Government, but more significantly because of the uncertainty, anxiety, and fear that we might somehow run afoul of the many aspects of the Code.

The unfortunate aspect of our tax structure in the United States is that it lends itself to manipulation by the big business groups who are equipped with superior accounting departments, tax consultants, and legal counsel. These aides are not always available to the small businessman, the farmer, the worker, or the average citizen.

Mr. Leslie H. Wald, a former Internal Revenue agent, has recently offered a most interesting discussion before the eighth annual University of Denver Tax Institute. In this paper, Mr. Wald makes clear some of the pitfalls that confront the average taxpayer.

I suggest that the following article, which I include at this point in the RECORD, may be of interest to my colleagues and to U.S. citizens in general.

WHAT TO DO WHEN THE SPECIAL AGENT CALLS

(By Leslie H. Wald)

(Mr. Wald is an attorney at law in Denver, Colo., and is a member of the California and Colorado Bars. He is a former member, Enforcement Council, Chief Counsel's Office, Internal Revenue Service. This article is the paper which he presented at the Eighth Annual University of Denver Tax Institute.)

As a prophylactic symbol, the special agent is comparable to the bogeyman of nursery literature, helping taxmen discipline their wavering little taxpayers. What's so special about a special agent? Simply that his only job is to try to make a criminal tax case. Technical issues or determination of correct tax are out of his province. His is the long view: making an example of this taxpayer to put fear into onlooker taxpayers and cause them to report more fully and pay more tax. He has a job to do, namely, to get evidence sufficient to convict a tax evader; and if that evidence can be found, he'll do his job of trying to sew it together into a choking, unbreakable band. And if the evidence is missing, he gets out of the case, turns it over to a revenue agent, except to vote on civil fraud penalty. His vote is usually "Yes." So he's the F.B.I. of the "revenooers", stalking with a pencil instead of a gun, but still stalking a suspected criminal, to put him (or her) behind bars as a deterrent example to all queasy taxpayers who can read their newspapers.

In person, a special agent doesn't look like a cop, or a detective, or the U.S. Marshal in Gunsmoke. He's a disarmingly pleasant, harmless-looking, even frail fellow, often with a smile that looks like it stepped out of a Lawrence Welk program. Certainly he's not scary-looking.

That sets the stage for the drama which usually is enacted.

In most instances, when the special agent calls, either (a) the taxpayer's guard is way down, or (b) the taxpayer is guarded and sophisticated, but with illusions of superiority and omnipotence, of being shrewder than this here fellow, or (c) the taxpayer has fear in his guts and appeasement on his lips. Appeasement is all he can think of—like Chamberlain returning from Munich.

And thus begins the honeymoon, the period in which records are generously handed over ("May I take this journal with me for a day or two?" "Of course, anything you wish."); statements are generously made, and the loss of virginal constitutional rights is consummated on a table in the taxpayer's office.

This doesn't always happen, but it happens most of the time. If it didn't, criminal tax statistics would be hungrier. An old Intelligence Training School motto is, "It's easier to catch flies with honey than with vinegar." A more detailed version is quoted in *United States* v. *Frank*, a Third Circuit case in 1957, from a written manual of instructions to agents which got into the hands of defense counsel by some fascinating means not revealed:

"When the agent has completed the preliminary background on his taxpayer, he should then contact the taxpayer, informing him that a routine examination of his tax return is being made.

"Be cautious and alert and cultivate the confidence of the taxpayer without tipping your hand as he may cooperate to some degree with you, but if he finds out that you are on his trail, he may clam up, and from then on your job will be much more tedious and a lot of harder work is ahead of you."

So this is the normal delineation of the taxpayer: on his own, blindly cooperating. He's a child playing with fire; whether he's got appeasement, outsmarting, or plain nothing in his head for a motive. And I'm not referring exclusively to the taxpayer with some small or large stains on his soul. The fellow who tells himself, "Why, I have nothing to worry about * * * my books are open to the world * * * I haven't chiseled anything, etc., etc.," is still playing with fire in honeymooning with the special agent. You can hear the background chorus softly singing, "Methinks the taxpayer doth protest too much." Protesting to himself as well as to the world. Human nature and the workings of the mind play tricks.

For example: forgetfulness, genuine failure to recapture a moment of hesitation and indiscretion 2½ years earlier, when, late at night and weary, his fingers poised over an adding machine, worrying about bills to be met, he mumbled something convenient and at the moment reasonable to himself and put down something which in the cold light of today he cannot explain. This is the Freudian commonplace of forgetting something unpleasant. Or, he clearly remembers, but rationalizations have persuaded him that this

and that item are perfectly defensible, and he's ready, by gosh, to look puzzled, surprised and shocked that it's questioned—to emote to himself as well as to the agent. Or, he's clean as driven snow, he knows it in his heart and in his head, and he isn't deluding himself, he hasn't a drop of unreported income in the veins of his net worth—yet circumstances, sloppiness, the absence of proof of his position means that he'll have a devil of a time defending a circumstantial evidence buildup of a tax evasion case. The Perry Mason type of situation, the accretion of damning evidence against an innocent, does occur. Don't ever be so cynical and world weary as to close out that possibility.

Well, we can't do anything about the taxpayer who blindly honeymoons with the special agent without notifying his lawyer or accountant, short of distributing Balter's textbook on tax fraud to all motels and hotels to be placed in the drawer with the Gideon Bible; and that mass education would be mostly wasted since, while all people are concerned with heaven and hell, only a small percentage of taxpayers will face special agents.

What should the accountant or lawyer do, or not do, however, if and when the taxpayer has the sense to notify him?

First is the problem of being effectively notified whether it's a special agent or a fraud investigation. The taxpayer will merely say that some "revenooer" from the new customhouse wants to come over. Most of the time, of course, it's nonfraud. How do you know or realize that the agent has an informer's letter, or a TCR from the bank about an unusual currency transaction, or some other lead to a suspicion of a criminal case? If it's the special agent who comes to call, you should realize that. You should know their names or at least ask what office they're from. If it's a regular revenue agent, it's tougher.

Be sensitive to signs of fraud investigation. What does the agent want to see? What years? Old ones? It's bad, of course, to fall into a trap of seeing special agents under the bed when they're not there. Let me give you a horrible example:

Agent came to dentist (had return assigned routinely): "I'd like to see your records."

Taxpayer brings out journals.

Agent: "OK., now, where are the other records?" (He means the ledgers.)

Taxpayer: "Oh. You know. Well." And with resignation and dark thoughts about a technician he'd fired, he reaches in his desk and pulls out a little black book listing about $1,500 in unreported cash receipts—nothing that would have been discoverable by investigation.

This is known as "the guilty flee where none pursueth" type of windfall for the Intelligence Division.

The other trap, seeing routine investigation where third parties are being contacted, affidavits and photostating going on, is just as deadly to the taxpayer.

Assume you realize it's a special agent case. Should you be disarmed by the agent stating that he just wants to check out a third party's taxes, he's just getting this end of third party's transactions? Partially disarmed, yes—but just partially.

Frequently, Intelligence Division investigation of taxpayer X stems from having visited X while investigating Y's case. The agent makes a note (and not a mental one either) that X looks interesting, too; perhaps we should wait 'till we're through with him as a witness against Y, but let's take a look at him. This is known as the "chain reaction bump."

Illustration: Mr. A, who has a music store, let's say, is under investigation, and his books and invoices reflect a sale of an Elvis Presley album for $12 to Mr. Z; yet Mr. Z's check (peered at on bank recordak) was for $2,000. Maybe Z got change for his $12 purchase, but then again, maybe not. Agents go to Z and find he really bought a piano.

Hapless Mr. A gets a phone call from Z. "Can't you keep your cottonpicking books in shape? The agents have been here asking about that piano I bought."

A: "Your'e complaining. I'm the one in trouble."

Z: "They're nosing around and want to know why I charged off that piano to promotion expense."

This is a true story. Only the names and occupations have been changed to protect the inno * * * to protect. This is the "never ask for whom the bell tolls—it tolls for thee" situation.

Well, what is the opposite of blind honeymooning with a special agent? What is the optimum course of action for the accountant or lawyer drawn into a special agent situation by taxpayer who says, "O.K., what should I do now?"

As a pendulum reaction to blundering into taxpayer making his own case versus himself, or the accountant or lawyer's bitter memory of blundering for the taxpayer, a popular oversimplification at present is to answer the taxpayer: "Don't give the special agent anything; don't even give him the time of day, in any special agent type case." That is still blindness, although it's an opposite of blind cooperation.

The premises which must not be discounted are:

1. The special agent by definition is looking for unreported income and willfulness to make a fraud case, and already, when he shows up, has suspicions and leads and a background of information on the case, which he is not sharing with you, not disclosing. The investigation and soliciting of answers is directly aimed at getting admissions or records to support those suspicions and that background evidence. The agent has the facts of return and this background investigation freshly in mind; the taxpayer is hit cold and off balance; and the setup is thus weighted to pick up meat to put on the bones of suspicion.

2. Everything said by the taxpayer, everything looked at by the special agent, is being irreversibly written down and preserved by the Government side. A haphazard comment or off-the-cuff explanation of an item, a mere guess to appease this agent who keeps importuning for an answer, is immediately transfixed as a fact in the case. This will haunt the taxpayer and you when, months later, with memory refreshed by examination of all the details, taxpayer and/or you sit down to examine your position. Everything said or done with the agent is irreversible, indelible. The fulcrum on which victory or defeat in a tax evasion case turns is often the evidence picked up by the agent in the first meeting with taxpayers. The hasty answer will appear in the special agent's report under the section "Proof of Willfulness" as conflicting explanations or perhaps false statements to agents. On the taxpayer's side, he may not even remember [to tell you] what he said to that agent.

Given these two premises: (a) the background and predilection of a special agent when he first appears, and (b) the indelible preservation, for better or for worse, of what is furnished to him, the end of the syllogism is just commonsense.

Don't plunge in guessing and groping, taking a position on cooperation or noncooperation; instead, preserve the status quo without taking any irreversible steps in any direction, pending competent scrutiny of the case.

This means the taxpayer or his lawyer in his behalf does not chant the fifth amendment as the alternative to cooperation. The agent is merely told that he'll have to wait until taxpayers' representative has had a chance to look into the matter, that you're not taking any position except the sweetly reasonable one of looking before you leap, before you give advice of any kind to taxpayer.

To preserve the status quo, immediate, positive action is necessary:

1. All contact by taxpayer with agents must be cut off.

2. All contact by taxpayer with his accountant must be cut off, at least temporarily. An inevitable consequence of the fact that taxpayer's statements to an accountant are not privileged communications in Federal practice is that anything told by the taxpayer to the accountant is in effect told to the agents. The accountant must, if subpenaed, tell what the taxpayer said, however damaging. It is thus necessary that the accountant, if consulted, call in taxpayer's attorney at this point. In that connection, even if there were an accountant's privilege, it should be noted that the accountant would be dealing here with matters entirely outside his experience and training, i.e., criminal law, constitutional law, etc. For example, he may have heard that corporate records are not privileged under the fifth amendment. Will he know that a corporation does have some rights under the fourth amendment? What in the world would he do with a subchapter S corporation's records?

3. The taxpayer's books and records must be immediately secured into the possession of either taxpayer or his lawyer to preserve the right to withhold, if ultimately decision is made to withhold. For example, if the partnership general ledger is sitting in the C.P.A.'s office, you can count on it being picked up by the agents in this waiting period. An irrevocable step will have been taken, willy-nilly. The grabbing will obtain while the grabbing is good.

At the same time, the opportunity is availed of asking the special agent certain minimal facts (to the common end of hastening your decision on furnishing records, etc.): what years he is investigating; is it a preliminary or jacketed case; and anything else you might worm out.

When all steps are taken to preserve the status quo, then the lawyer must start working to develop the facts on which decisions will be intelligently made with respect to cooperation. The lawyer must find out precisely what happened before he got into the case; what's the taxpayer's full story; who are the important witnesses who will have to be interviewed as soon as possible; and what evidence is available to agents without access to taxpayer or his records. Accounting work must be done; and here we are backing right back into the dilemma of the accountant's privilege. The lawyer has snatched all the books away from the accountant and now he has to have an accountant look at the books. One popular way of accomplishing this is to have the lawyer hire the accountant and cloak him with the privilege of lawyer's employee. This is not foolproof; the cases are not clear on whether the privilege will stand up in this circumstance. A second safeguard would be to hire an accountant not already acquainted with taxpayer so that the agents will not know whom you have hired. Or, depending on the facts of the case, it may turn out to be perfectly all right to let taxpayer's regular accountant do work for you.

Having explored the facts of the case, a decision on cooperation may be made. A pragmatic approach is the usual one, cooperating on this, but not on that. It is not an all or nothing affair. You may furnish records, perhaps, but not a question and answer statement. Or, you may not furnish records except for canceled checks, which

the agent can secure the hard way, burning his eyes out over records. In any case, on all exchanges of information the agents deal through you, the lawyer, and at the very least, you are in contact with them and following through on what they are doing and asking.

There is no rigid checklist of things to do in this situation. It evokes the aphorism, "All generalizations are false, including this one." I just wish to mention in closing certain stumbling blocks, certain impulses which the accountant must stifle to do the proper thing in getting representation. After all, he is normally the first person contacted by the taxpayer after a special agent moves in. He must be aware of:

1. An impulse to carry over into this situation his habits of thinking and doing in an ordinary field audit; to say to himself and to taxpayer, "I've had a lot of clients visited by agents and none of them were hurt by sitting down and openly going over everything with the agent; if we play it coy, he'll start suspecting something's wrong, and you'll really be in for a heavy investigation." This, to me, is worse than lazy thinking; it's like continuing to drive on your side of the street when you're in England.

2. A thought that, after all, I have to live with agents and I don't want to thwart them. Well, he has to live with taxpayers, too. He has a duty to both sides. Agents should respect him for following this course of action. If they show momentary pique, it merely reinforces the point that the accountant did what he should have.

3. An impulse to wait and see. If serious, then I'll make a Federal case out of it. It's always serious when a special agent is involved and the longer the contact with agent without representation, the fatter the Government's chances of a case.

With the stage properly set for intelligent dealing with a special agent, the taxpayer has effective representation on the battleground of administrative defense of a fraud case. This battleground, with an obstacle course extending through group chief, assistant regional commissioner, intelligence, regional counsel, and Justice Department is vital. Many cases can be won or lost long before the publicity of an indictment and arraignment and trial.

Federal Reserve Board

SPEECH
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the country is in a fiscal crisis of major proportion. The administration, with the help of the Federal Reserve Board, has created this crisis in their determined and arrogant efforts to force Congress to repeal the interest-rate ceiling on Government bonds and thus saddle the country with an even higher level of interest rates than they have accomplished so far.

Yesterday one of the prominent financial papers, the Wall Street Journal, carried a feature story of a plan which is being considered in the White House to call Congress into special session this fall, and to put the President on television and radio to describe some dramatic incident that will inflame public opinion in support of the interest-rate repeal. The Wall Street Journal reports that one high administration official has spoken of the possibility of a money panic which would be so real that it would paralyze business and bring widespread unemployment. All this to happen probably late this fall before Congress reconvenes in January. The discussion of such a plan as this is a very disturbing thing. Furthermore, the extremes to which this administration has already gone to jack up interest rates gives some credibility to the possibility that it would actually pull off such a desperate stunt as this plan which is reported to be under consideration.

Is this administration simply incompetent to manage the public debt? Has it created this mess simply through bungling?

Certainly it is difficult to understand why such a mess could have been created simply through incompetence. The Federal debt today is a great deal smaller than it has been in many years past, both relative to the number of people in the country and relative to the national income. In realistic terms the administration has a small debt to manage. The previous Democratic administrations managed a much larger debt in real terms with a maximum 2½ percent interest rate on long-term Government bonds.

Furthermore, the total demand for savings today, including the demand for private investment, and the demand to meet the net exports of capital to foreign countries, is a smaller percentage of the national income than it has been in years past. Why is it, then, that the interest rates paid on savings have been jacked up to a 42-year World War I record, and yet our money managers are still not satisfied; they feel they have to bamboozle the public and bulldoze Congress into repealing the last remaining check and safeguard against exorbitant interest rates.

If we have a money panic in this country, it will be because of the failure of the Federal Reserve Board members to do their duty. They should be honest enough to send in their resignations rather than give any further aid and assistance to this scheme of trying to force Congress to repeal the ceiling. If we have a Federal Reserve Board that carries out the objectives, intentions and purposes of the Federal Reserve Act, it will be impossible to have a money panic in this country. So I think this question of a money panic is just something that we should not tolerate—even the consideration of it.

I am greatly encouraged by the careful attention that is being given by Members of this House to questions involving money, credit, interest rates and our national debt. The reason I have always advocated an administrative assistant for each Member of the House is so that Members can keep better informed, especially on matters relating to appropriations, taxes, debt management and monetary matters.

I know we do not have an opportunity at this time to provide for an administrative assistant, but I hope this opportunity will come soon. This would save the taxpayers thousands of dollars for every $1 that was appropriated for this purpose.

Congress appropriates money to the executive branch, to have all the administrative assistants to the secretaries, assistant secretaries, and third and tenth assistant secretaries; we appropriate money to help them do the job—even to do the wrong kind of job, such as thinking up arguments and schemes for willfully imposing bad policies.

We appropriate the money for the judicial branch of the Government to have the law clerks and administrative assistants needed by the judges, I think that is appropriate.

We appropriate the money for the Members of the other body to have from one to three administrative assistants. That is good. But why should we, the body where the most important bills originate—bills relating to taxes and to appropriations—not have adequate help? Not even the members of the Ways and Means Committee have administrative assistants nor do members of the Appropriation Committee. Where the public needs more help is right here in this body. Every Member needs at least one assistant to properly perform his duties.

If there is a weakness in our system of Government, that weakness is in the legislative branch not being equipped to do its job. Members of Congress are sincere people, and exceptionally able people. I have had the privilege of serving with probably 2,500 Members during the time I have been here—over the past 31 years—and I believe I could not have possibly been associated with a finer, better, more sincere, more honest and honorable people. But I also know that they have not been equipped to do a job of the magnitude they have to try to do. They need more expert help. Personally I would prefer to have an economist; other Members might, however, find their needs best met by other skills and training.

But each Member needs to have somebody who can help him keep up with legislation and with proposals that the Member cannot himself keep up with, because he just does not have the time to do it and perform his other duties.

Now back to this monetary system of ours.

What is it, what are its purposes, and what is wrong with it? Actually there is nothing wrong with the system itself, except in the attitudes and purposes of some of the people who are running it. Our commercial banking system is the finest in the world. The Federal Reserve System is an excellent system, and it has the means and powers for serving the country well.

Why was this System created?

Prior to 1913, when the System was established, we had a banking system which provided a rather inelastic supply of money. This gave great troubles. In periods of rapid economic expansion

there was not enough money to go around. The country went through periodic booms, money panics and then depressions.

So the first and foremost purpose of the Federal Reserve System was to establish a system which would provide an elastic money supply. The System does that. The people who designed this System recognized that money itself is not wealth. It is only a form of accounting in which economic activity takes place. Actual wealth is created only by the production of goods and services. People who designed the original Federal Reserve System recognized, as had been proved by the experience in Western Europe, that when the economy grows the country must have more money; more money should be created along with the economic growth that is taking place.

The original Federal Reserve System provided for the needed expansions in the money supply. This was a regional system with 12 independent banks. Each bank had authority to expand or contract the money supply of the region in accordance with the needs of the region. They were delegated Congress' power to create money and to regulate the value of money.

In 1935, in the depths of the depression, Congress made considerable changes in the Federal Reserve System. We made the System into what is truly a central bank, whereas previously the 12 banks had operated each with the powers of the central bank and, I might add, pretty much in a coordinated way. The central bank is a wonderful thing. I believe that Will Rogers once ranked the central bank as one of man's greatest inventions, along with the invention of the wheel. We should recognize, however, that this central bank of ours is run by a very small group of men who are exercising complete power of decision over the economic life of the Nation.

The regional banks no longer have any significant power or authority, although we read about decisions and actions which they have taken, which make it seem as though a great many different people are unanimous in what monetary policies should be.

What power of decision do these banks actually have? I have asked every Federal Reserve official who has appeared before our committees what discretionary authority the regional banks have and though most of these officials have tried to uphold the pretense that the regional banks are great centers of authority, they have actually been able to enumerate no discretionary authority which the regional banks exercise.

One of the most frequent assertions is that these regional banks fix their respective discount rates. And announcements of a change in the discount rate are made as though the decision has been made by the separate regional banks. But this is not true; they do not have the power to establish the discount rate. They go through the motions of recommending, but they have no power to establish. The discount rate for each bank is established by the Federal Reserve Board. And the Federal Reserve Board, in establishing the discount rate, is merely executing one step in the overall monetary policy decided upon by the Federal Open Market Committee.

Here, in this open market committee, are 12 men who rule over the economic life of this Nation, and to a considerable extent, over the economic life of the rest of the nations of the free world. They decide what interest rates shall be. They decide how much money and credit the country will have. They decide whether or not the economy will be allowed to grow or whether it will be squeezed. They decide how many jobs there will be. They make the forecasts of whether they think business is going up or down. They make the judgments as to what is good for the economy. They are the ones who decide when they think they can foresee some possible inflationary tendencies, and they decide what the price of Government bonds shall be and what interest rates the Treasury will have to pay to issue new bonds.

Did you know that today the central bank of this Nation is the only central bank in the civilized world that does not give aid and assistance to its parent Government? Up until about 1953, yes, our central bank behaved like other central banks in that it supported the price of Government securities at a reasonable level, recognizing, as do other central banks, that the interest yields brought about on Government securities set the pace for all interest rates. But today we have a central bank which disclaims that it has anything to do with prices and interest rates on Government bonds, and that these things are determined only by the supply and demand for money. Well, of course, the Federal Reserve authorities are determining the supply of money every day of the year, and they are also determining what the price of money or the interest rates on money is to be, and to a very considerable extent they set the interest rates on money without respect to the supply and demand for money.

Since this administration came into office, they have followed a high-interest policy and they have, during most of the time, followed a tight-money policy. They have followed these policies because these are the policies they like and prefer. They have a natural preference for policies which help the bankers and wealthy people of the country. But they have followed these policies also because these are the policies of this administration. We have all heard President Eisenhower claim, of course, that the Federal Reserve is an independent agency and that he will have nothing to do with the Federal Reserve or make any suggestions which might impinge upon its independence. Well, of this we can be sure. This fiction of the Federal Reserve's independence and the convenient device it provides for shifting off blame onto an independent agency would quickly disappear unless the Federal Reserve was following policies which the administration wants it to follow. In other words, it has an unhappy agreement over these bad policies. I know that President Eisenhower is a good and sincere man who wants to do what he believes is right. But he made a terrible mistake when he described the Federal Reserve System as an independent agency which has in effect the powers of the fourth branch of the Government. He was acting, I have no doubt, on bad advice. A fourth branch of the Government? Where does the Constitution provide for any fourth branch of the Government? Where does the Constitution say that we shall have an independent agency of the Government exercising powers to overrule the economic policies and even defeat specific programs decided upon by the constitutional lawmaking processes? There is none.

But this giving the Federal Reserve a free hand to run the country the way the administration sees fit has resulted not only in political irresponsibility, but in downright arrogance toward the Congress from which the Federal Reserve has received the delegation of power. For example, a few weeks ago the Ways and Means Committee had adopted a very good amendment to a very bad bill. This was the Reuss-Metcalf amendment which had been put on the administration's bill to repeal the 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling. The amendment did not make the bill a good bill. I was opposed to the bill, and I am opposed now to the proposal to break the interest-rate ceiling. But at least the Reuss-Metcalf amendment was in the public interest. It suggested to the Federal Reserve System that if and when it brings about increases in the money supply, it should do so to the maximum extent feasible by acquiring Government securities so that the interest payments on these obligations would go back into the Treasury. This suggested method of increasing the money supply is in opposition to allowing the private banks to increase the money supply and thus put the interest payments into bank profits.

But the Federal Reserve Board strongly resented any such suggestion coming from Congress, and Chairman Martin went to work lobbying against it. He made all kinds of nonsensical statements to make the public believe that should Congress make any such suggestion to him the result would be inflationary. That is a standard claim—"inflation." Everything that does not happen to suit Chairman Martin's wishes and preferences, he labels inflationary, just like the administration does.

Later, when Chairman Martin was before the Joint Economic Committee, we questioned him very closely about his reasoning on the Reuss-Metcalf amendment, and he admitted, as he had to, that either method of increasing the money supply would bring about the same amount of money and credit. He still contended, however, that the money supply should be increased, when it is increased, by reducing required reserves of the member banks. He made all kinds of statements which suggest that the reserves of the member banks represent money belonging to the banks, which the banks have deposited with the Federal Reserve banks, and consequently the

banks should be allowed to use more of their reserves when an increase in the money supply is needed. This is in contrast to the Federal Reserve's creating more reserves by acquiring Government securities.

This fiction about the origin and ownership of the bank reserves is one that the whole Federal Reserve System has been carrying on in all of its literature.

You will notice that in the Federal Reserve report the member banks have $18 billion in the reserves. You often hear that spoken of. Occasionally you will hear a banker say, "We have so much money in our reserves that we get no interest on. We should have interest on it. We get nothing for it." They have $18 billion in reserves. I asked the President of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York, "According to the records, you are supposed to have $5 billion of the reserves of your member banks in the New York Federal Reserve Bank, out of that $18 billion, this being the largest bank of all of them?" The President said, "Yes; but we do not actually have those reserves. It is more of a bookkeeping operation. We keep the books but the actual money we do not have."

That was no surprise or disappointment to me. As any university student of money and banking could tell you, the banks never deposited any reserves. The Federal Reserve System simply created these reserves, using the Government's power to create money, just as the private banks have created bank deposits, using the Government's power to create money.

Now, when the Federal Reserve System started, the banks were supposed to deposit their reserves in the Federal Reserve banks. And in fact they did put in some amount. No one is sure just how much, but we know that at an outside maximum it was no more than $1½ billion. And since that time the banks have put in no more. They have, however, been paid out of these reserve accounts about $29 billion in cash, and they still have in their reserve accounts about $18 billion, on which they have been permitted to create money at the rate of about $8 for each dollar of reserves.

It seems to me that it is time Congress took some drastic action about this arrogance and this misleading propaganda from the Federal Reserve System. If we cannot make suggestions to the administration as to what its policies should be, we can at least make suggestions to the Federal Reserve Board. After all, the Federal Reserve System is operating on a delegation of congressional power. It is what Chairman Martin sometimes calls an "arm" of Congress.

When the Republicans first came in, in the 83d Congress, I was sitting in a meeting that was presided over by Mr. Wolcott of Michigan. Mr. Wolcott asked Mr. Martin, "What is your relationship with the Congress as Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board?" And Mr. Martin said, "We are servants of the Congress." Mr. Wolcott said, "Well, we will not put it on that basis, but we will put it on the basis of principal and agent." Now the Federal Reserve is getting away from being the servants of the Congress and they claim there is another relationship existing.

I would, however, make this suggestion to the administration. If it finds that this fiscal crisis, of its own creation, gets so bad before the 1st of January, the President should give serious consideration, not to calling Congress into special session to take the lid off interest rates, but call the Federal Reserve Board in and make his pleas to them. Furthermore, I have this suggestion for Congress. If the President does feel it necessary to call Congress back into special session to deal with the fiscal crisis, then I think we can deal with that crisis by enlarging the Federal Reserve Board and demanding that some public interest members be appointed to the Board. And if these demands are not met, then it will be time to consider making a different kind of delegation of Congress' power to create money and regulate the value of money.

I heard a distinguished gentleman of the House on the other side say today that we should take that lid off because that would bring about lower interest rates. Now, we have all witnessed the power of the Madison Avenue public relations people—their power and their influence and their ability to make black look like white and I have no doubt the gentleman has been persuaded by the repetition of this statement. But this is too much for me to swallow: Remove the obstacle, take off the lid so that interest rates can go up, and we will have lower interest rates. That does not make sense to me—common, book, or horse. I hope the Congress holds the line at least on the 4¼ percent ceiling. We should not boost one rate when we know it will only make the other rates go up.

Mr. Speaker, traditionally the Democratic Party is a party of low interest. It has always been so since the time of Andrew Jackson.

Traditionally the Republican Party is the party of high interest, and it has always been so.

High interest helps the great money interests. It helps the wealthy families, diverts income to them and diverts income from the great masses of the people. High interest goes with the restrictive economic policy. It holds back economic growth, keeps money out of the hands of new business firms and small-business firms that might expand and take markets away from the monopoly industries.

Now I want to invite attention to speeches of mine in the RECORD of yesterday, at page 17466, "Why the Administration Cannot Sell Government Bonds," and also on page 17467, "The Administration Is Imposing High Interest on the Whole Free World; Now Has Four Interest-Rate Races Going: A Race Between Rates on Government Securities and Private Loans, A Race Between Short-Term Rates and Long-Term Rates on Savings Bonds and Rates on Marketable Bonds, and A Race Between U.S. Interest Rates and Interest Rates in Other Free World Countries."

In the most trying time in the history of our Nation, during World War II, when inflation was the greatest threat that it had ever been at any time in our history, we held Government rates down to 2½ percent and the bonds were selling at par. If it can be done in a period like that, it can be done at any other period in the history of our Nation. We have had this 4¼ percent rate for more than 40 years. We have gone through wars and depressions with it, and never before has any attempt been made to take that lid off.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

American Veterans of the Elbe River Linkup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Joseph Polowsky, of Chicago, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., *August 28, 1959.*

In the spring of 1958, and in the spring of 1959, during the 13th and 14th anniversary reunions of American and Soviet World War II veterans, there took place an unprecedented and extraordinary presentation of gifts of wide and enduring historic significance. The gifts directly concerned President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, and the honor and the good will of the 60 million American and Soviet World War II veterans and their families.

The first gift was from the Soviet side, consisting of a bratina, a large lacquered wooden drinking bowl of friendship famed in Russian history. The Soviet gift of the bratina was presented at President Eisenhower's office at the White House in Washington on Elbe Day, April 25, 1958.

The second gift was from the American side, consisting of the original patrol map used by the first American patrol to link up with the Soviet forces at Elbe River during the wartime alliance between the two countries. The American gift of the patrol map was presented at Premier Khrushchev's office at the Kremlin in Moscow on V–E Day, May 9, 1959.

The tradition of the bratina is that those who drink together out of the bowl will never raise their arms in anger at each other. The bratina, the drinking bowl of friendship, represents the first gift from the people of the Soviet Union to the people of the United States in the history of the two countries. The honor and the dignity of the tens of millions of Soviet World War II veterans and their families are directly involved in the bratina. The eyes of the more than 200 million Russians will be focused on the bratina, the bowl of friendship, on the day President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev meet in Washington.

Many brave soldiers gave up their lives during the Second World War to make possible the presentation of the friendly gifts of the bratina and the Elbe linkup patrol

map to the chiefs of state after the war. It must assuredly be the fervent hope of men of good will everywhere that President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev, carrying on the friendly traditions of the bowl, will often drink together out of the bratina when they meet in Washington. And, in the same spirt, may Premier Khushchev and President Eisenhowerhower often examine and appreciate the Elbe linkup patrol map when they meet in Moscow in October.

The 60 million American and Soviet World War II veterans, and their loved ones, remembering the moving, friendly circumstances under which the American and Soviet armies met at the Elbe River 2 weeks before the end of the Second World War in Europe, can take great pride in the fact that the whole postwar series of direct friendly person to person contacts—from Roswell Garst and the farmers in the summer of 1955, to the chiefs of state in the autumn of 1959, on to all the pepole in coming decades—was begun and established on a sound, enduring historical basis by the great 10th anniversary reunion of American and Soviet World War II veterans in the spring of 1955.

As a member of the first American patrol to link up with the Soviet forces at the Elbe River on April 25, 1945, I believe I voice something of the thoughts and feelings of all American and Soviet World War II veterans in this critical juncture in the history of the human race.

I therefore call upon the nations for a new birth of conciliation and friendship, a renewed sense of human responsibility, that the oath sworn on the blood-soaked historic ground at the Elbe River shall not have been taken in vain.

JOSEPH POLOWSKY.

Inflation and Interest on Government Securities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we discuss the issue of interest rates on Government securities today, we face again the issue which seems so unpalatable in this Chamber. That issue is the consequence of the calculated policy of living beyond our means.

The Federal debt is, too often, regarded as a mythical problem having little relationship to daily economic realities. I have heard it often referred to in this context by my colleagues here as they work for the passage of new spending programs or castigate those of us who believe that the Congress has pursued an irresponsible line of continually rising Federal costs in the cynical hope for political reward in the next election. There can be little doubt that this formula has been successful in the past. However, there is today a growing realization and awareness that this is a formula which is intellectually bankrupt, despicable, and against any morally defensible conception of the public interest.

This morning I received a letter from one of my constituents in southeastern Ohio discussing this issue in what I regard as a sound and carefully reasoned argument. In his statement, he points to the responsibility of the Congress for much of the inflation from which we suffer today and its blithe refusal to legislate the means for its control. He points out the fact, which I believe is undeniable, that the Congress is now taking a shortsighted view in increasing the interest rates on short-term obligations while leaving the rates on long-term obligations untouched. The effect is to popularize those Government securities which have almost the same qualities as currency, thereby increasing the amount of money in circulation and creating still another inflationary step.

Since I believe this letter is outstanding it its analysis of the situation, I wish to call it to the attention of the Congress. It is as follows:

Congress has refused to raise the interest rate that can be paid by the Government for long term bonds despite the following factors that are obviously forcing the Government's hand, many of these factors having been created by Congress itself.

Starting with the assumption that we are all against inflation, let us analyze what is happening.

Savings of corporations and individuals are the source of all capital investment. Taxes finance Government operations and where taxes are not sufficient to cover the expenditure, such deficit financing must come from these same savings. Even individuals who spend more than their income through installment purchases must obtain these extra funds from someone else's savings. Assuming that there is no inflation, these statements are axiomatic; you will find no disagreement between various economic schools of thought on these basic principles, however far apart they may be on other economic theories.

It therefore follows that if there is more demand for these funds than there is supply, the cost of borrowing will go up. This in turn increases the incentive to save until a point of equilibrium is attained.

The total savings of corporations and individuals (not including funds developed through equipment depreciation) for the year ending June 30, 1959, was approximately $27 billion. The demand for these funds have approximated the following total:

	Billions
Home building	14
Federal deficit	13
State and local deficit	3
Inventory buildup	8
Installment purchase excess of new debt over repayments	4
Total	42

Here we have a demand for $42 billion against a supply of only $27 billion. Not included is the demand for capital equipment funds in excess of the supply of such funds through depreciation. The demand at the moment is about $32.5 billion down from the $37 billion peak in 1957 but still above the supply furnished through depreciation. I do not have up-to-date figures on this difference but whatever it is, it must also come from the savings listed above. There are other miscellaneous items of demand not listed, not the least of which is school construction, but it is obvious from the above that we have enough to prove my point.

Industry and private individuals are willing to pay more than 4¼ percent (Government ceiling on long-term bonds) for the available money. The only recourse left to Government is to pay more for short-term loans on which there is no ceiling. Congress has refused to lift the ceiling on long-term bonds presumably for the reason that it would increase Government costs. This argument is not valid, however, when we look at the latest interest rate the Government had to pay for 26-week bills—4.2 percent, already at the maximum rate allowable by Congress for long-term bonds. And this is only the beginning; during the next 12 months, the Government will have to refinance $85 billion of maturing debt, most of it long term. What do you think will happen to the short-term interest rate by the time this $85 billion is refinanced? I don't see how it can stop below 5 to 5.5 percent. The next year there will be more long-term bonds maturing on top of the refinancing of this $85 billion.

The Government is in a trap. The Treasury Department is in a trap created by Congress, aggravated by congressional extravagances of wanting to do everything for everybody with no help forthcoming from the same Congress that created this absurd situation. They have, in effect, said, "It's your problem, not ours. Get the Federal Reserve to help you out by pegging the price of long-term bonds." This would mean that the Government would buy its own bonds at a predetermined price and they would end up owning all their own bonds as present owners unloaded to put their money into stocks and corporate bonds, tax-free municipals, or other Government-guaranteed bonds paying higher interest rates such as FNMA, etc.

This situation is impossible and is apparently based on the fact that prior to 1952 the Federal Reserve was pegging the price of bonds fairly successfully. This was stopped in 1952 because they were running into more and more difficulty accomplishing their goal and in agreement with the Treasury Department decided to let bonds seek their normal level. One reason that they were able to get by earlier was the excess of income over outgo of the social security fund. Even up to 1950 over 60 percent of the income was going into the trust fund which was used to purchase Government bonds. This trust fund came in very handy in helping to peg bond prices through purchase of Government bonds. Whereas from 1937 until 1956, the income exceeded outgo by an average of over $1 billion per year, the first deficit occurring in 1957, increasing to one-half billion in 1958, with increasing deficits expected in ensuing years. The present trust fund is $22 billion, of which $1 billion is in cash, with $21 billion being in bonds. Whereas this trust fund helped the Government in its financing in past years it is now a hindrance and is also adding to the pressure for higher interest rates. Incidentally, the reason for the deficit in the trust fund can be laid at the door of Congress since they expanded payments and coverage with little thought of the consequences.

When you add up this collection of facts you arrive at one or the other of two possible conclusions:

1. Congress has no conception of the problem it has created in Government financing, or

2. It favors full-blast ruinous inflation for the country, hoping that someone else will be around to handle the catastrophe that is bound to come. It has no consideration for future generations that will have to pay for this extravagance.

Increasing the short term percentage of our total debt will add fantastic quantities of money to the system and start pushing up prices in an ever-increasing spiral until the bubble finally bursts. So far the Federal Reserve Board has done an outstanding job against tremendous odds in limiting the supply of money as well as it has. However,

their job is going to get tougher as time goes on unless the interest rate ceiling on long term bonds is lifted.

Eight-Billion-Dollar Government Metals Reserve Only To Bolster Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read into the record an article which discusses the strategic metals stockpiling and shows it for what it is—a price support program for the metals industry. The article points out this stockpiling has already lost the U.S. Government $1.2 billion.

It is further indicated that after the Federal Government advanced M. A. Hanna $22 million to build a nickel plant Uncle Sam has generously bought $63 million worth of surplus nickel and promised to buy $45 million more from this concern.

Surely a good reserve of food is equally if not more important than is nickel. I do not believe the food reserve is a curse.

The following article is taken from the GTA Digest:

METALS CACHE MATCHES FARM SURPLUS

The much-publicized farm stockpile, which represents an investment by Uncle Sam of $9 billion, is almost matched by stashed-away defense reserves of strategic materials worth some $8 billion.

The strategic materials reserve is all owned by Uncle Sam, but only about $6.5 billion of the farm stockpile is in Uncle's name. The rest is owned by the farmers, but the Government has lent them money on it. Rather than pay off the loans, many farmers will let Uncle Sam take possession of the collateral.

By some, including Secretary of Agriculture Benson, the food stockpile is considered a curse, and he delights in calling it so. But the strategic materials stockpile, equally as expensive to the public, is accepted generally as a national necessity. Rarely is it mentioned. Even less is it criticized.

What the public may not realize is that half of the strategic materials reserve is made up of metals and minerals, most of them bought, not as a reserve, but to bolster prices.

It is a price suport program for the metals industry, pure and simple. Late reports say that 1959 first-half profits for the mining and metals industry are 123 percent higher than last year.

And, while price support payments to a single farm concern of $500,000 are headline material, though very uncommon, that's chickenfeed in the mining industry.

For example, the Government advanced $22 million to the M. A. Hanna Co. to build a nickel plant. Thus far Uncle Sam has bought $63 million worth of surplus nickel from Hanna, and is obligated to buy $45 million more.

The mineral surplus is cached away at 216 locations scattered throughout the country. It includes 74 minerals, including mica, nickel, cobalt, diamonds, manganese, silicon carbide, fluorspar, aluminum, bauxite, jewel bearings, and titanium.

Thus far Uncle Sam has lost $1.2 billion on the mineral purchase program through resale at a lower price. More losses are in view. The Government must keep buying certain minerals to rotate the stockpile and keep it from spoiling, much as is done with farm stocks. But when it sells the old minerals, the Government is forbidden to upset the private market.

In these times of peace and plenty, both stockpiles are being criticized, but the spotlight is on the farm surplus. Still there are many who say they are necessary and prudent safeguards. The question is how to draw the line between a necessary reserve and a surplus, whether it be minerals or farm products?

Death Took a Holiday—in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD F. McGINLEY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. McGINLEY. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Ralph G. Brooks of the State of Nebraska and the Nebraska Safety Patrol have shown the Nation that highway death does not have to go unchecked.

Governor Brooks, with the cooperation of the patrol which worked many extra hours, made an all-out drive over the Labor Day weekend to see just what could be accomplished through this kind of effort.

The result is history. Nebraska recorded one traffic death—that a pedestrian fatality in a city.

I have sent the following telegram to Governor Brooks:

Your faith in the belief that something can be done about traffic accidents and fatalities is graphically proven by Nebraska's Labor Day weekend traffic record. You, Col. C. J. Sanders and his men of the Nebraska Safety Patrol saved lives during this time just as surely as if you had been skilled surgeons at work in a hospital. This will not end suffering or sorrow from highway tragedies in the future, but it is a firm reminder to every public official that he would be remiss in his duties at whatever level of government if he did not study every possibility as to government's place in traffic safety.

The story of this shining hour in Nebraska's history, and of the work of the men who made it possible is well described in the news story which I wish to insert at this point:

[From the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, Sept. 9, 1959]

While the rest of the Nation struggled through a Labor Day weekend shrouded with traffic deaths, Nebraska apparently found a temporary answer to the problem.

Spearheaded by Gov. Ralph G. Brooks, who personally took part in patrol duty and issued two warning tickets, the Nebraska Safety Patrol under Col. C. J. Sanders staged one of its toughest crackdowns in its history.

The Governor, his aide Robert Conrad and Col. Sanders personally manned at times the two National Guard helicopters pressed into service.

The result of the enforcement crackdown showed in the statistic book.

Not a single highway fatality was recorded during the 3-day weekend. The only death to mar the record was a pedestrian in the city of Lincoln, making Nebraska's record one of the five best in the Nation.

The 1959 Labor Day holiday was the State's best record since 1936 when there were no fatalities recorded. For each of the intervening years there have been between two and seven fatalities on the Labor Day weekend.

Colonel Sanders pressed his 160 troopers plus patrol officers into cruiser duty. Even the criminal investigation division took to patrol cars. The troopers volunteered to extend their 10-hour regular shifts to 16-hour shifts.

Conrad, who heads the Governor's traffic safety committee, tabulated these results of the weekend's efforts:

The patrol arrested 1,075 motorists, of whom 37 were drunken drivers taken off the road; 2,317 were ticketed for vehicular defects, and 1,532 were issued warning tickets.

The total number of contacts were 4,924 for an average of 1,641 for each of the 3 days, compared with an average of 476 contacts per day for the patrol during the first 7 months of this year.

The longer shifts were the equivalent of 96 additional troopers patrolling the highways in addition to the 4 airplanes and 2 helicopters.

The troopers burned a train tank car of gasoline and drove an equivalent to six times around the world during the 3 days.

Governor Brooks, Colonel Sanders, and Conrad personally kicked off the crackdown by heading the dawn patrol Saturday morning.

Governor Brooks commented Tuesday that "this is not a record of which we can be proud but it is a record for which the entire State can rejoice."

Delaware Valley Shoe Servicemen Association Supports Shoe Labeling Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 7, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution which was passed by the members of the Delaware Valley Shoe Servicemen Association. The members believe Congress should approve shoe labeling legislation such as I have introduced in my bill, H.R. 1320. The resolution follows:

DELAWARE VALLEY SHOE SERVICEMEN ASSOCIATION

"Delaware County residents have a right to the same governmental protection when they buy shoes as they do when buying drugs or food."

With these words the Delaware Valley Shoe Servicemen Association, in a national drive initiated by Mr. Gardner, of Medford, Oreg., launched their plan to petition Congress to require labeling of materials used in footwear—as a protection against the use of inferior and low-grade products and components in shoe manufacture.

"There is little wonder whey we have so many children and adults with foot problems," states a spokesman for the association, "when the public is bound to buy shoes by appearance rather than by quality standards

that would assure the buyer of comfort, retention of shape and wear."

Each of the members of the Delaware Valley Shoe Servicemen Association is circulating a petition in his shop urging Congress for legislation of governmental control of footwear quality standards.

A Distinguished Constituent Reports on a Recent Trip Around the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and pleasure to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter that I received last month from a distinguished lawyer, banker and recognized economist in my congressional district, Mr. Chauncey E. Brockway of Sharon, Pa.

This report was written after he and Mrs. Brockway returned from a 5-month journey to 35 countries around the world. The story of this trip, which was taken at their own expense, makes such interesting reading that I want to share their experiences and impressions with my colleagues in the Congress and all those who are privileged to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

May I suggest, after reading Mr. Brockway's report, that my colleagues in the Congress secure a copy of H.R. 1921—which I introduced on January 9, 1959—and study one of Mr. Brockway's proposals for solving some of our economic problems in this country.

BROCKWAY & BROCKWAY, LAWYERS,
Sharon, Pa., August 4, 1959.

Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CARROLL: I wrote you one letter while Mrs. Brockway and I were on our trip around and up and down the world.

I am now beginning to put together some of the impressions that were made upon me from the contacts that we made.

I want to give to you the overall impression of the 5 months' trip, visiting 35 countries, taking us down to Australia in that part of the world; into the Far East; up into Formosa, Japan, and Korea; down through Bangkok, Rangoon; through India; the Near East (Lebanon, Syria, Jordan, and Israel); into Istanbul, Athens, Cairo; down through Africa as far as Capetown; and up to Portugal, Spain, Paris, London and home.

What was the first overall impression?

America is like the enormous Sleeping Buddha which I saw in Japan. But there is a difference. The Sleeping Buddha cannot be awakened, but his followers are being awakened. America can be awakened from its apathy, if once the people can be aroused to the danger that lurks on every corner of the highways of the world.

I realize only too well that if I were to write this for general publication that many people would say that I have a superficial view; that I am one of those people who spend 2 weeks on a trip in some country and then go home and write a book about my experiences.

I recognize that I have not spent the past 5 months in a living contact with the peoples of the world. Time and time again I had persons say to me:

"The hotel where you are staying is not representative of this country."

I recognize that fact very easily. At the same time I did not confine myself to sitting in those hotels. I went out into the streets. There I saw how people live. I saw how the "Hawkers" of Singapore feed thousands every day. I went onto the streets of Hong Kong, where thousands are living in hovels in which we Americans would not house a mongrel dog; I went into the street of thieves to see how they did business; I went along the rivers where thousands live in boats and never step onto land, except to get a little water from a pump; I went along the canals in Bangkok, where thousands are living in houseboats all of their lives.

We traveled along the banks of the Ganges, watching the Indians come to Benares for their pilgrimage to bathe in the holy waters of that river, the day before their "Holi" day, and traveled for hundreds of miles on the dusty roads of India, studying the rural peasant living in mud huts and pasturing the sacred cow along those roads.

This trip of 5 months took us into the Hawaiian Islands (now the 50th State of our Union) which with its Polynesian background will be many years before its people fit into the United States, as the first 48 States do.

You will recall that this last trip was preceded by one to Alaska, before it became a State; by a 12-week trip, visiting nine countries in Europe in 1952; a trip of 6 weeks (by air) into Europe and the Near East, in 1954, at which time the little party I was with were briefed by 130 different persons, including the Patriarch of the Greek Orthodox Church in Istanbul; Arab leaders in Lebanon and Jordan; Israeli officials in Israel; the mayor of Istanbul; Vatican officials in Rome and other political, educational and cultural leaders. This also included two trips into East Berlin and refugee camps in five countries. A total of 12 countries were visited on this trip.

Then came the planning of this past trip, beginning in January 1959, which lasted 5 months and 1 week, taking Mrs. Brockway and myself into 35 countries of the world, flying 57,000 miles in order to cover long distances quickly; 12,000 to 15,000 miles by auto, train and boat; many hours in every city visited talking to bankers, newspapermen, businessmen, guides, missionaries and other persons one naturally meets on such a trip.

Among those with whom I talked were shopkeepers; the operators of small manufacturing plants, where I saw the conditions under which men, women, boys and girls were working, using candles for light; visiting silk weaving plants and rug weavers. We also saw those attractions that are shown to the ordinary tourists: the mosques, shrines, temples, art galleries, a few picture shows. We drank Kava with the Fijians.

I looked into the thatched roof homes of many of these people, seeing the dirt floors covered with mats.

I attended a lunch given by the newsmen of one of the cities visited, where I listened to a top leader of one of the Far Eastern countries that is very much in the limelight these days say in reply to a question, "Where peoples' bellies are hungry, they will listen to propaganda."

Perhaps the impressions received, and the opinions formed, are wrong, but they came out of the same atmosphere from which our newsmen around the world are sending forth their dispatches to American newspapers; they came from the same background that surrounds our Embassies; they came from the economic background of bankers who are dealing with the local and international exchange of money.

What are some of the impressions with which I came home?

The real problems of the world calling for solution do not lie in Germany and Berlin during the next 5 to 10 years; those spots are large, diversionary sideshows. (I say this in the face of the endless words that have come forth from past conferences and that are pouring out of the present conference in Geneva, relating to Germany and Berlin.)

The real problems of the world (and they must be solved within the next 10 years, and in some instances, even 5 years may be the limit) lie in three spots: (1) the Far East; (2) the Near East; (3) Africa. Just at the present time it does not matter in which order you place them, from my viewpoint, but I believe that we have less time in the Near East than we do in the Far East and Africa.

My reason for this is, the Near East is so much more concentrated in territory than the Far East and Africa. You cannot extend the geographical limits of the Near East as you can the Far East and Africa. Both of them are tremendous portions of the world. I am not taking sides in this quarrel in the Near East, but I am trying to properly evaluate the situation from my conversations with both Arabs and Jews, Englishmen and some Americans. The economic pressure surrounding Israel is going to become tighter and tighter as the weeks and months go by. The web has been spun by the Communists and it is going to be terribly hard for the West to win in that section of the world.

That is a hard statement to make, but some of the actions of the United States in that section of the world are not being forgotten.

The Government of Lebanon wanted American troops to land, but the common man did not and does not understand why it was done and does not like it. The common man is the man to whom the Kremlin talks. We had promised to aid Egypt in building the Aswan Dam. The withdrawal of that promise opened wide the door to the Kremlin.

These are only two of the situations that are being played up to the common man. But they are samples of what I was getting in the Near East.

I was told to watch this Near East situation very closely over the next 18 months to 2 years.

If, and when, the Near East actually falls under the polical influence of the Kremlin, the soft underbelly of Europe is at stake. How can it be defended.

The feudalism of the Near East makes it a very vulnerable spot. The education that has been given to thousands of young people in such colleges as the American University in Beirut; Roberts College in Istanbul; the American University in Cairo, have produced a generation that is spread all over the Near East.

The solution of this problem does not lie in England, France, or Germany. It lies in the United States of America. But our present methods are placing the solution in the hands of the Kremlin.

Let us go to the Far East for a moment.

Singapore was preparing for an election when we were there. I was told that the extreme left socialists would easily win that election, but no one went as far as to predict that the P.A.P. Party would win 43 seats out of 51 in the legislative body of that island city.

The followers of the young Prime Minister (36 years old) are in complete control of the administration. As an indication of the anti-British feeling when we were there, the city administration snubbed the queen's husband when he visited Singapore only 10 days after we left.

Out of 1½ million population in Singapore 1 million are tied to Communist China in one way or another. It was easy to understand why they said they were neutral in this election. They were merely waiting to see who would be the winner there.

They are remaining neutral still, waiting to see how the elections go in Malaya, just across the strait. Tengku, or Prince, who resigned as the Prime Minister to campaign for his party in the various states of Malaya, has found the political going very hard as several of the States have supported the extreme left Socialists. He may win in this coming election, but if gains are made by the Communists, they will step up their pressure for the next election.

Up in the Philippines, the Huks, who were supposed to be completely suppressed, are coming back into the labor unions, using infiltration methods under different names. Their influence is growing again.

Over in Hong Kong, with its teeming millions, and hundreds of thousands of refugees living on the sidewalks, on the flattop roofs of apartment houses, and elsewhere, Red China has an opportunity of getting all the information it desires at this crossroads of the world. It will take more than a trip by Prince Philip (we were there just as he was leaving) to hold Hong Kong for the West.

In Burma and Thailand, the struggle is being won by the Communists because they are feeding propaganda to the common people. I was told of the marking of rice bags that had come from America, with the hammer and sickle, so that the common people obtained the impression that this rice had come from Russia. Farm implements from America were also marked with the hammer and sickle before they left the docks.

I was taken out onto the streets of Calcutta to look at the refugees living in hovels, who said India owed them protection and food because they were refugee Indians from Red China. This gentleman wanted to take me to a Communist meeting one afternoon, but said he dared not do so; that my presence would cause a riot, and in all probability I would be severely injured. It was here and elsewhere that I was told that West Bengal (the State in which Calcutta is situated) would go Communist in the next election; and that several other Indian States would, in all probability, fall to the Communists.

While we were in Darjeeling, the Tibetan affair occurred. Many papers stated that now Prime Minister Nehru, and the Indians, would know what tactics the Communists were using, and that as a result the Indians would turn against the Communists. It has been very interesting to me to see how carefully Mr. Nehru has referred to that situation. He, nor the West, can do a thing to assist the Tibetans without going to war, and once more the Communists win without opposition.

Let us go down into Kerala, the Indian state that went Communist 2 years ago, where violent anti-Communist rioting has taken place since the Tibetan situation. Mr. Nehru went down there at the behest of the Congress Party. Have you noticed how gingerly Mr. Nehru has handled that situation. He said there was no need for Congress Party intervention there. (In the last few days it has interfered.)

The Communist pressure will now increase all over India. Who calls the signals in India? Only one nation: the Russian Kremlin.

Go over into Bombay. We were there when they elected a mayor. That mayor was an untouchable 12 years ago; today he is the mayor of a city of 4 million people. That ought to give us an inpression of how fast changes are taking place in India.

Two of our hotels in India were former palaces of Maharajahs. Since the end of English rule, the Maharajahs have had their lands taken away from them and had them broken up into small holdings and given to the peasants who do not know what to do with the land, now that they are the owners.

The Maharajahs are now living on pensions, which end with their death. Their children must now find a way of making a living, using their ability if they have any; otherwise, they will fall by the wayside.

Over in Japan I was told that the once 12 most powerful families were on their way back to power, just as the cartel system is on its way back in Germany.

We think we have only Communists to fight. There is something, to my mind, that is much more fundamental.

We have been educating boys and girls around the world and when they go out into the highways of life, they find that their education is not recognized in the fields of commerce, politics, and social affairs; they are not allowed to go forward in the economic, political, and social activities of their countries. This, it seems to me, is the fundamental issue around the world, as well as in America.

What is the result? Young people, under 40 years of age, are rebelling at a system that does not recognize them.

So-called capitalism does not recognize their ability in this country; capitalism does not recognize the ability of these young people in other lands. They are not allowed to think. They are told they must fit into the groove of the past (of feudalism, of cartels, of great corporations) which is now dead, or dying, but trying hard to maintain the former "status quo."

Along comes the Communist, with his socialized program, telling these young people to follow him; that communism will get the recognition for them that they so much want. The same thing is happening in America with its 50 million high school graduates.

As the young people of the world have not been allowed to think things through for themselves, they are unable to see through the Communist or socially false propaganda, and they fall for it. Once in its grips they try to rebel, but it is too late. They are caught in that web that has a caste system as strong as that in India. While Bombay elected a former untouchable, the caste system is far from destroyed in that country, or around the world in its various forms in other countries.

Why do I write this way? In one country I met a retired representative of one of our largest American corporations. He said to me, "Now I'm retired; I have been here for years representing this company. Now I can talk. The tactics of this company fit right into the feudalism of the country, and that is on the way out."

The representative of another large American company said to me (he has been there for several years), "My company is doing business on the cartel system, and its days are numbered. I am glad I am getting out before the Communists take over."

All of this says to me, the labor union, with its power, is coming first to the Far East, the Near East, and into Africa, and then the Communist.

Men have learned how to drive an automobile, but when something goes wrong, they do not know how to find the trouble, but they will one of these days.

We are reaping the whirlwind of having sown a handful of education, mixed with a little bit of Christian teaching (Christianity tells a man that he counts for something), and as a result, we are producing a situation that is far more explosive than any hydrogen bomb.

We drove one day from Fort Portal in Uganda, down to some hot springs in the Great Rift that reaches from Lebanon down through Egypt and down into Africa. Here we saw the boiling water bubbling up out of the ground. The human element is just like that. We sensed it time and time again. On the surface things seems to appear calm but time after time I was told that there can be an explosion at any time; not in one country, but in many countries.

Look at the little countries that have obtained their political freedom from England, France, and Holland since the end of the war.

It apparently didn't mean anything to Alexander the Great; Greece, Rome, the Pharaohs. England, France, and the Dutch didn't learn any lesson from this stirring of the people.

The mighty have fallen in days gone by; the mighty are falling at the present time.

Doesn't this mean anything to America?

When I say America, I mean the people who control great wealth. The great corporations have been battling the rising power of labor unions since the days of Samuel Gompers. But the unions are getting stronger day after day, under a very rabid leadership.

Unfortunately, Mrs. Brockway and I did not help relations between these countries and America. Why? We cannot dodge the fact that we represented imperialist America. We were traveling, practically all of the time, when not on planes, by a private American car, with an English-speaking guide; and about 75 percent of our thousands of miles of automobile travel we had a second person, a driver who did not speak English.

Try to dodge the fact that we did not represent the American imperialist, if you can. You simply cannot do it. We were using principally Fords, Plymouths, and Dodges. The American who uses a Cadillac—well, he is to be hated. When I inquired who was using Cadillacs, I was told, "American officials, American touring Senators and Congressmen." What kind of an impression were they making upon these people? Tell me, if you can.

How do the Russians travel? In small cars, on bicycles, mingling with the people.

Who is going to win?

The billions and billions of dollars that we are pouring into the countries of the Far East, into Africa, into the Near East, where is it going? I do not know. I can only tell you what I was told. It is making the rich richer and the poor poorer. A banker put it this way to me, "We will continue to take your money as long as you want to give it away, but it is not making friends for you."

I went on this trip, Carroll, as you probably are aware, not just to see ruins, old temples and forts of a dead past, but for the purpose of learning, if I could, what is stirring the people around the world, as anyone who reads the daily papers, weekly and monthly magazines must realize.

There are many men coming onto the horizon of politics, like Tom Emboya and Lutthuli in Africa, whose activities Roy Wolensky, in the Rhodesias, and Prime Minister Verwoldt in South Africa, are trying to stop. Stop it they cannot; the wave that is rolling up is like a giant wave coming in from the ocean. A lot of people are going to get hurt.

I had a missionary tell me that there was a leader of 1 million Africans in his church; that despite the Christian teaching that he was giving to him, the biggest job he had was to convince this leader that the Communist propaganda with which he was being fed, was false. He said that a few months' time would tell the tale as to which side this leader would take, and it would not be the teaching of the missionary that would bring the decision, but the action of so-called Christian business and political leaders.

I have jumped around in this letter intentionally, just as the Communist does. You never know where the Communist will bring

forth the next "hot" spot for his propaganda.

This can be met, in my opinion, by only one positive program.

Our program must be much like that of the missionary in Burma with whom I talked. He told me that his work is quite close to the border of Red China; that he cannot reach these people with a spiritual message; that he is showing these people how to increase the weight of their pigs from 75 pounds to 150 pounds; that they ask him to come to their farms and teach them how to do this. After doing this, then he can get across a little of the teaching of Christianity. But woe to his program if someone from imperialist America comes along and exploits him in this pig business.

The American corporation is being held up to the common peoples of the Far East, the Near East, and Africa, as an exploiter.

A few contacts with businessmen who were willing to talk to me, when they found out my mission—and they were willing to talk if assured that I would not use their names—convinced me that the American industrial corporation must come to some plan similar to that which I have developed, and which you have been so kind as to introduce into the Congress of the United States.

Feudalism and cartels have no place in that program, as you well know, but the individual will have the opportunity to develop his ability to the very utmost. When this program is in effect, the rulers who are using force will be put out of business; the labor union officials who are ever seeking a stronger position in industry by calling strikes, will find that the common men will not support them.

More than one man said to me, "Brockway, how can we use your program?" I had to tell them that they could not, if they were saddled with a program that puts a tax upon a corporation, when it is merely another way to heavily tax the individual. I well remember what one man said to me about this program:

"America better hurry with your program, as in 2 or 3 years, this section of the world, moving at its present speed, will be completely lost to the West."

Since reaching London and coming on to America, and reading the columns of stories in the newspapers every day that I have, with the background which I now have of actually having seen some of the "hot" spots of the world, I can only pray that the so-called leaders of American industry will awaken to the fact that in their hands lies the solution of the present agitation of the Communist around the world; but that the sands of time are rapidly running out.

I hope I haven't bored you with this rather extended outline of some of the impressions that have been made upon my mind since January 19, 1959, when Mrs. Brockway and I left Sharon on this 5-month trip that took us across the Equator eight times.

Sincerely,

C. E. BROCKWAY.

Mobridge, S. Dak., Issues Challenge to Mobridge, Mont.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Mobridge (S. Dak.) Chamber of Commerce has issued a humorous challenge to the proposed city of Mobridge, Mont. I think Mr. Bob Bickett's letter of September 1 will be of interest to my colleagues and, under unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

MOBRIDGE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Mobridge, S. Dak., September 1, 1959.

Mr. GEORGE KOMERIK,
The First Mayor of the New City of Mobridge, Mont., Roy, Mont.

DEAR SIR: We, at Mobridge, S. Dak., were unaware until very recently that a new town was being built in Montana, near the new Missouri River bridge in Fergus County, which would be named "Mobridge, Mont." As you may have heard, our community of Mobridge, S. Dak., has long prided itself as being the only Mobridge in the world. Actually, we have long been puzzled because we could not understand why other cities have not adopted such an excellent name. Now, you have joined the club, and we have two Mobridges in two States; 2 down and 48 to go.

Our reason for writing you this letter, in addition to congratulating you on your new city, is that we wish to call your attention to the standards for cities named "Mobridge" as has been established by our community in the past 53 years. For example: To qualify as a Mobridge, first class, you must assemble a citizenry of 5,500 friendly people, who have stuck to their town, through thick and thin, dust, drought, grasshoppers, and Republican and Democratic administrations alike. (The number of citizens can be varied, the quality must be up to the standard as outlined). To qualify as a Mobridge, first class, you must have wide, blacktopped streets, a first-class water supply, and adequate transportation via railroad, and highway. You must have a ballpark, swimming pool, and other recreational facilities so that your young people have adequate opportunities for good clean fun. You must have civic-minded organizations, ready to assist with the work of building your city ever larger and better. (Of course, an active chamber of commerce is a must, without it you will spend a good deal of time charging windmills, instead of progressing, and taking advantage of your opportunities.) And last, but not least, you must have an Indian chief, of the stature of Sitting Bull, buried near your town, properly marked and cared for, as a tribute from your people to America's original citizens.

That's all there is to it. Whenever your town is formaly opened, we would appreciate an invitation to attend any ceremonies you may plan. And if you need any advice on how to be a Mobridge, first class, drop us a line, we've got 53 years of experience going for us, we may be able to help.

Every good wish.

BOB BICKETT,
President, Mobridge Chamber of Commerce, Mobridge, S. Dak.

Statement by Czechoslovak National Council of America With Respect to Upcoming Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter of transmittal from Mr. James Hovorka, president, Czechoslovak National Council of America, with headquarters in Chicago, with which Mr. Hovorka forwards a copy of the memorandum sent by the council to the President of the United States regarding the visit next week of Prime Minister Nikita Khrushchev of the Soviet Union.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA NATIONAL
COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Chicago, Ill., September 10, 1959.

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Speaking for Americans of Czechoslovak descent represented in the Czechoslovak National Council of America, we thank you for your extension of remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on August 11 and for including the article by Mr. David Lawrence who asks: "Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country?" Frankly, we do not.

We view with alarm the forth coming visit and have expressed our fears in a memorandum submitted to the President of the United States, a copy of which we are enclosing for your information.

Respectfully yours,
CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL
OF AMERICA.
JAMES HOVORKA, *President.*

MEMORANDUM OF THE CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONCERNING THE VISIT OF THE PRIME MINISTER OF THE SOVIET UNION

SEPTEMBER 11, 1959.

MR. PRESIDENT: The executive committee of the Czechoslovak National Council of America begs leave to submit the following memorandum.

The present international situation is of paramount importance to the future of the United States of America and to the well-being of the now captive nations of Europe. Under these circumstances we consider it our duty to draw your atttention to the anxieties and wishes of our members, tens of thousands of loyal American citizens of Czechoslovak descent, on whose behalf we speak.

We are prompted to take this step primarily by your decision to invite the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union to the United States and by your acceptance of his invitation to visit the Soviet Union.

The fact that the President of the United States extended an invitattion to Mr. Khrushchev and accepted his invitation to the Soviet Union is being erroneously interpreted in Czechoslovakia—equally by Communists and non-Communists—as a major shift from a tougher to a softer U.S. policy toward the Soviet bloc.

The communist authorities in Czechoslovakia seem to rejoice in this change of policy. They expect from it an increase of domestic and international respectability and they hope it will result in a weakening of the NATO cohesion.

The non-Communist majority of the people in Czechoslovakia appear to view this very same change of U.S. policy with regret and apprehension.

The non-Communists seem to consider Mr. Khrushchev's invitation to represent a refutation of the previous line of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R., as it was often stated by the President and Secretaries of State and formulated most eloquently by the Policy of Liberation and recently by the Captive Nations Week resolution.

The people of Czechoslovakia seem to be so confused by the latest development of U.S. foreign policy that they believe the exchange of invitations is to be a prelude to a new Munich agreement.

This wrong impression of a shift in U.S. policy may cause in Czechoslovakia and presumably in the other captive nations a major deterioration of the psychological situation with adverse results for the future security of the United States.

Some consequences of this psychological change are feared to be the following:

(a) A feeling that the United States is abandoning the people of Czechoslovakia and is giving up its hope and interest in an ultimate liberation of the captive nations.

(b) An impression that the United States of America is accepting the status quo in central and eastern Europe as being just, desirable and lasting.

(c) A stronger grasp of communism over the minds of the people.

(d) A weakening of the spirit of resistance and western sympathies throughout the captive nations with all the regrettable consequences for the NATO forces in case of a future outbreak of hostilities, which we all fervently hope will never come to pass.

(e) A loss of confidence in the integrity of American intentions and in the trustworthiness of American moral and legal pledges.

Against the backdrop of these premises we wish to recommend most urgently the following desiderata to your consideration.

Let it be made known to Mr. Khrushchev in a way which shall reach the hearing of the Communist government and the non-Communist people in Czechoslovakia:

(a) That Mr. Khrushchev's invitation does not represent a basic change in the line of U.S. policy toward the U.S.S.R. and their puppet governments in the captive nations.

(b) That in consequence the United States does not accept now—any more than before Mr. Khrushchev's invitation—the status quo in central and eastern Europe as just, desirable and lasting.

(c) That the cause of the captive nations shall be discussed by the President of the United States and his representatives with the Soviet Prime Minister and his representatives not only at the forthcoming visit, but at every future meeting or conference concerning itself with problems of European security, be it in the United Nations or elsewhere.

(d) That the U.S. spokesmen shall insist on the restoration of independence and freedom to the formerly sovereign nations of central and eastern Europe, as was solemnly pledged by the United States of America and the U.S.S.R.

(e) That the United States shall insist on free elections under effective international control.

(f) That, if a German peace treaty were to be discussed and if the Soviet Government were to insist on the presence of representatives of the Communist governments of Prague and Warsaw, the U.S. Government shall invite such spokesmen as have a right to represent the true interests of free Czechoslovakia and free Poland.

(g) That any European security pact will have to be preceded by the complete evacuation of all Soviet armed forces and other control organs from the territories of the captive nations.

In conclusion we wish to assure you, Mr. President, of the wholehearted support of any policy intended to alleviate the present hardship of our oppressed brethren and to accelerate the liberation of Czechoslovakia and all other captive nations.

Very respectfully yours,

CZECHOSLOVAK NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
JAMES HOVORKA, *President.*

The Fight Against Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as concern mounts with increasing evidences of juvenile delinquency and communities and governments mobilize their resources to combat this danger we must note the racket which thrives on such delinquency and, according to many eminent authorities, encourages delinquency in youth. I refer to the half billion dollar annual traffic in pornography. I append as part of my remarks an article on the fight against pornography from the current issue of The Jewish Veteran, national publication of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, the Nation's oldest continuing veterans organization, by Roy H. Millenson, my own legislative aid.

In appending this article, I should like to make an additional observation. I am convinced we can join to help stamp out the despicable pornography racket, which reaches into our very homes, without impinging upon traditional liberties. The recipe for roast pig is not a burned-down house. Publicity, religious, and lay leadership and due process of law can meet the challenge.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DISPLAY IN CONFERENCE ROOM B

(By Roy H. Millenson)

There are only four keys to open the locked doors of conference room B in the Post Office Building in Washington. For this chamber houses the exhibit by the Post Office Department as part of its drive against the half-billion-dollar annual mail order obscenity racket in the United States.

Smut in the mails is big business. With profits ranging as high as 5,000 percent and averaging in the neighborhood of 1,000 percent, dealers in pornographic matter are possessed of a growing enterprise which seeks to reach into every home in the Nation.

The Post Office Inspection Service has estimated that probably 700,000 to 1 million children this year will receive in the mail alluringly worded invitations to purchase smut from such dealers in pornography as French Features, Stagorama, French Novelties, G.A.L.S., Inc., Layne Movie Club, and Man Comfort.

The merchants of filth go far afield to obtain their mailing lists, resorting even to school yearbooks. A favorite device is to offer at a bargain price in a legitimate advertisement some item of interest to a girl or boy—an airplane model, for example—and once the order is received, the child's name is soon on a mailing list to receive solicitations through the mail for obscene material.

In a recent raid in New York City, in which 17 tons of highly obscene printed and filmed material was confiscated, a mailing list of 100,000 was found, including the names of many high school students.

Careful studies have shown it is impossible to estimate the ultimate effect of pornographic material in the hands of either adults or children.

However, it is safe to state that such material in the possession of one child will undoubtedly be exhibited to numerous others. It has been said that one difference between narcotics addiction and the effects of pornography is that the former stops when the addict injects the drug into his veins but the contaminative consequences of one piece of pornography in the hands of just one minor is incapable of measurement. The Post Office Department estimates that 25 percent to 40 percent of the $500 million of mail order smut ultimately finds its way into the possession of adolescents.

The analogy between pornography and dope addiction is not made lightly. A Senate committee which had made a study of this question observed:

There is a peculiar resemblance to narcotics addiction in exposure of juveniles to pornography. There is the same pattern of progression. Once initiated into the knowledge of the unnatural, the impressionable young mind with the insatiable curiosity characteristic of those reaching for maturity inevitably hunts for something stronger, something with more jolt, something imparting a greater thrill.

The dealer in pornography is acutely aware of this progressive facet; his array of material to feed this growing hunger is carefully geared to the successive stages. Like the peddler of narcotics, his only interest is to insure that his customers are "hooked"; he knows that once they are "hooked" they will continue to pay and pay.

The Post Office display confirms this. For in addition to the photos that go a degree or two beyond publicly-sold "girlie" magazines, there is a curtained exhibit of "hard core" matter which reaches the ultimate in obscenity in photographs, drawings, booklets, and devices. This "hard core" pornography goes beyond the usual bounds of depravity, seeking into every conceivable byway of sexual aberration. And, remember much of this material finds its way into the hands of teenagers.

A footnote of interest to readers of the Jewish Veteran is the fact that some drawings in the "hard core" exhibit have definite anti-Semitic undertones. Depicted were Jewish stereotypes similar to those used in Nazi propaganda. However, in this regard, the Post Office Department assured me that they "have not been aware of any concerted efforts to use pornographic matter in furtherance of anti-Semitism and feel sure that material of this nature that may have been observed was an isolated instance.

On the positive side, the Post Office Department has received from civic-minded organizations throughout the Nation hundreds of expressions of support for the campaign against obscenity. There is a public display of these letters; JWV members should be proud to note that as representative of the sentiment of the Jewish community was selected the letter from National Administrator Joe Barr attesting to the backing of the Jewish War Veterans. This support was emphasized by the resolution overwhelmingly adopted at the August national convention in New York City.

How can the individual citizen help in the campaign of the post office against commercialized filth in the mails? Its hand strengthened by a new law enacted last year, the Post Office Department is now intensifying its war against the "barons of obscenity." To do the job, it needs the help of every citizen, for the Government can act only after evidence has been obtained from the recipient of obscene mail. Should such material come into your hands, send the pornographic matter as well as the envelope in which it came, to your local postmaster. The Post Office Department will handle the case from there.

Last year, the Postal Inspection Service investigated some 14,000 complaints concerning obscenity in the mails—two-thirds of these complaints came from shocked parents who found lewd material sent to their youngsters. The fight against obscenity in the mails, as Postmaster General Summerfield has so well summarized it, is a task for "everyone who can, and will, contribute effort, and dedication to it."

The Importance of Followthrough on the International Public Health and Medical Research Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Wednesday, September 9, the Senate soundly approved, by unanimous consent, Senate Resolution 129, 86th Congress, for the observance of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

This action was, I believe, of deep international significance. It reasserts American leadership in medicine and medical research.

It is an action consistent with the outstanding record of the U.S. Senate in spearheading advances in international health.

The action is a source of pride to me not simply as author of Senate Resolution 129, but as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as chairman of the Senate's current international health study, as conducted by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations.

PLAN NOW FOR A SOUND BASIS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR

Certain facts should be clearly understood with regard to the proposed International Health Year.

A brief history of this project was previously presented in comments which I made in the Senate on June 5, 1959. At that time, beginning on page 8993, I traced the origins of the legislation.

I pointed out how the Senate, in August 1958, in the closing days of the 85th Congress, had unanimously approved Senate Resolution 361, which I had introduced for this purpose.

That resolution represented the first formal expression by any parliamentary or executive body anywhere in the world on this subject of what I call IHY—the International Health Year.

Senate Resolution 361 established unmistakably the U.S. origin of the concept.

Thereafter, in December 1958, at the initiative of the Soviet Ukraine—which is, incidentally, an inactive nonpaying member of the World Health Organization—the United Nations General Assembly—with U.S. support—approved the concept of the International Health Year. The U.N. General Assembly commended it to the World Health Organization.

Subsequently, at its 12th General Assembly, in May 1959, World Health Organization, while expressing deep appreciation and satisfaction in the concept of the year and while appreciating the value and importance of the year, stated that it found it necessary to postpone any action on plans for the possible year, for the present. WHO stated however, that it would take the issue up again in the World Health Assembly, convening in May 1960.

PURPOSE OF NEW RESOLUTION

The present Senate resolution is, therefore, designed to maintain the constructive momentum. It seeks to use the time period between September 1959 and May 1960 for the most constructive work possible.

Senate Resolution 129 envisions that the President of the United States will now take the lead. He will through his appropriate advisers help lay the basis for detailed planning of possible projects under the year.

By whom will this initial planning be done? By the expert Federal agencies most directly concerned with this subject, notably the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Science Foundation. Of assistance as well will be the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, which played so indispensable a role in the precedent for the International Health Year—the International Geophysical Year.

VITAL ROLE OF MEDICAL PROFESSION

But just as important, and indeed far more important than the role of official agencies, will be the role of private sources.

No single private source is more important than the medical community of the United States as ably represented through the American Medical Association. In addition, outstanding organizations such as the World Medical Association and specialized medical organizations such as the various academies and colleges concerned with particular medical fields will play a vital role. So, too, will the Nation's medical schools.

TWO-FOLD CATEGORIES OF PROJECTS

To find the right type of projects which the United States might formally and informally recommend is a real challenge.

We must remember that the very title of the year indicates its twofold nature: (a) International Public Health and (b) Medical Research.

Category (a) indicates improved service—assistance—care-type programs.

Category (b) indicates programs aimed at new discovery.

In turn, the projects under both categories must be thought through very carefully.

THREE TYPES OF CHALLENGES TO UNITED STATES

Here, as I see it, are three types of projects:

First. Independent U.S. projects for our own people.

Second. U.S. and international collaborative projects which will concern many people.

Third. Independent foreign projects on behalf of the needs in individual foreign nations.

In other words, the International Health Year is an opportunity to raise our targets.

Targets for whom?

First. For ourselves, as one nation.

Second. For all peoples, across the board.

Third. For other individual nations and regions.

Obviously therefore, all other nations will similarly have to think through what they propose to do and can do for themselves and/or for others.

AMERICA'S PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY

But as the leading power, no nation faces greater responsibilities or greater opportunities than ourselves.

No nation can do, has done or will do more in both public health and in medical research than ourselves.

The United States, of course, is but one of the member nations of the World Health Organization. It is not for us to attempt to tell World Health Organization what it should do. We have never presumed to do so. Rather, consistent with our past record in World Health Organization, we would simply submit to it the very best judgment which we could make available and seek to secure favorable action by the majority and if possible, all members.

THE BASIC WHO DECISIONS

So, would the other nations do likewise, WHO, would thereafter, through its able Director-General, Dr. M. G. Candau, through its executive committee and through its general assembly, decide (a) what is feasible, (b) what is desirable, (c) what is necessary, and (d) and how, when, where, and with what resources.

Let it be noted that the International Health Year will cost money. How much money will depend upon the projects to be decided upon, their nature and their scope. Neither Senate Resolution 361 of the 85th Congress, nor Senate Resolution 129 of the 86th Congress, specifically provides money.

But I am certain that when the time comes, the money will be forthcoming. It has been forthcoming for the International Refugee Year. It was generously and rightly made available for the International Geophysical Year.

NO CURE-ALL TO WORLD PROBLEMS

Here, however, let it be noted that the International Health Year is not purported to be the cure-all to the world's medical problems.

It is simply a means by which we can break through to higher levels of attack against those problems. It is a means by which we can raise the visibility of the people of the United States and the peoples of the world to the nature of health needs and resources.

Most major health problems, by their very nature, cannot be solved in a 12-month period, or an 18-month period, or even perhaps a decade or a quarter century. But that is no reason why we should not start or proceed ahead.

The value of an intensive period of collaboration has long since been proven, notably in the International Geophysical Year.

Research, in particular, never offers a guarantee of success. No one can devise a timetable for future discoveries. The problems of cancer for example, may be solved in 1960 or in 1970 or still later. No one can be sure.

Nor can the world's shortage of doctors, nurses, and other specialists be

solved overnight. Training takes time, long years.

But the time to begin is at hand.

CARRY ON EXISTING PROGRAMS

Here, too, a further fact should be noted. Nothing would be more contrary to the spirit of the International Health Year than to lag in present health programs.

In other words, we have a health job to do right now—in 1959, 1960, 1961, and in the period thereafter. We must provide every possible nickel which we can for these purposes. We must not hold back one iota, simply waiting for the International Health Year to commence in 1963 or 1964.

I point this out because the World Health Organization currently does not have sufficient financial resources to move ahead on one of its own great projects, namely: the worldwide malaria eradication program. As Dr. M. G. Candau has pointed out: Antimalaria funds must be provided right now if the present campaign is to be prosecuted to a victorious conclusion. Let us not, therefore, in preoccupation with what might be done in 1963 or 1964, forget what we must do right now.

IMPORTANCE OF HILL-FOGARTY LEGISLATION

As for U.S. congressional action, starting next January, we must not delay at all in the second session of the 86th Congress in moving ahead on international health legislation.

No single step would be more important than House approval of Hill-Fogarty legislation to create a National Institute for International Medical Research. The great coauthors, Alabama's distinguished senior Senator, LISTER HILL, and Rhode Island's devoted Representative, JOHN FOGARTY, are the leading builders of what could become the most important single institution for the International Health Year or any year.

The International Institute is not just necessary, it is indispensable. No one has more eloquently proved the case for it than its tireless champion, LISTER HILL.

TRIBUTE TO HEW DEPARTMENT

Meanwhile, fortunately, the International Health Year has been the subject of very careful consideration by outstanding authorities.

In May 1959 there was held here in the city of Washington a conference of the National Citizen's Committee for the World Health Organization. That conference heard a splendid address by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming. Dr. Flemming stated his enthusiasm for the concept of the year and his words were a source of inspiration to all present.

Secretary Flemming's comments were faithfully implemented in the World Health Assembly which started shortly thereafter in Geneva. No single individual contributed more to the effort of implementation than the able Surgeon General of the U. S. Public Health Service, Dr. Leroy Burney. I wish to pay tribute to Dr. Burney and to his special assistant for international affairs, Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, for the splendid contributions which they have made in this as in other respects.

I want to state, too, that outstanding in the careful consideration of this matter has been America's most foremost medical research leader, Dr. James Shannon, Director of the National Institutes of Health.

ROLE ON INTERNATIONAL HEALTH SUBCOMMITTEE

I am pleased to report that the International Health Study which is being conducted by the Senate Committee on Government Operations has been in continuous contact with these leaders and with this entire project. Indeed, I believe it is safe to say that no single source, in or out of Congress, has initiated, or has received more contacts, not only here in the United States but throughout the world, concerning the International Health Year than has this subcommittee.

For the health year, we must not set our sights either too high or too low. We must attempt to do the possible, but must not shrink from attempting new, bold, and imaginative programs.

DR. GUNDERSEN'S SOUND COMMENTS

A welcome cue for our role has come from the American Medical Association, to which I earlier refered. I should like to point out that the distinguished past president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gunnar Gundersen has urged that great body to offer leadership and maximum help to the proposed International Health Year.

As reported in the December 15, 1959, issue of the AMA News, Dr. Gundersen said that the health year would give medicine a chance to offer imagination on the international scene and make a contribution to world understanding.

Speaking at the opening of the 12th clinical meeting of the House of Delegates of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gundersen declared that "the time has passed for policies based on generalities, platitudes, and flagwaving." He then suggested that the association offer support and cooperation to proposals for the International Medical Year.

So, too, we look to the Nation's leaders in other life sciences—to biology and chemistry for example—for maximum contributions.

That is why I wanted to see Senate Resolution 129 enacted. What it does is flash a "green light" to the President of the United States and to the people of the United States.

It says "Please proceed ahead. Please hold the necessary conferences and assemblies, so that the broadest thinking, the best thinking which can be mobilized is made available."

EVERYONE MUST DO HIS PART

Who should be represented in these conferences and assemblies?

Everyone who can make a constructive contribution. Doctors and laymen, civic leaders and scientific leaders. There is room for all. There is opportunity for all. Let each do what he can. That includes, for example, the voluntary health agencies and the other great organizations which represent millions of Americans in all walks of life.

The International Health Year will be a success if all of us help make it a success. Where? Right in our own backyards, so to speak, as well as throughout the world.

My words include the Congress. They include the executive branch. I include great leaders like Dr. Detlev Bronk of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. I include labor and business and agriculture, women's organizations, veterans' groups, and professional organizations.

May I respectfully extend, therefore, this invitation to them. I extend it to the fine National Health Council and the American Public Health Association—which convenes next month in Atlantic City.

I extend the invitation especially to those who guard the Nation's health—our physicians to whom we look for continued guidance.

Let International Health Year meetings be held. Let problems and projects be explored. Let us get on with the task of the advance work.

I invite now the comments and reactions of the American public. They may wish to obtain copies of this legislation, together with a reprint of my June 5, 1959, comments and of a splendid article on the health year which was published in the May 29, 1959, issue of Science magazine, published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

I include now, an editorial from the May 12, 1959, issue of the New York Times which was published on the day of the opening of the 12th World Health Assembly in Geneva. This editorial rightly stressed the concept of continuity in health advances.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD HEALTH PLANNING

Another conference is opening in Geneva today. It will not be controversial, except as its members try to find ways to do a good job better. This is the annual Assembly of the World Health Organization, and its 12th meeting.

The function of this Assembly is to examine the proposals for the organization's operations next year. High on the list is the continuing fight against communicable and preventable disease. The gains made thus far are encouraging and this is the time to give fresh impetus to the various campaigns.

Part of this impetus should come from the plan to make 1961 an international "year" for medical research and its support. Appropriate legislation is before our Congress to further this plan. But in the minds of all those who are concerned with world health planning is the larger concept of more than a "year." It can be a decade or half a century. The very existence of a World Health Organization has shown us there there can be no narrow geographical limits in this field. There are also no time limits. The good fight must be waged until the last battle is won.

Appendix

Knowledge Is Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an address I delivered before the International Conference on Machine Searching and Translation, held in Cleveland, Ohio, on September 9, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

In this address I made special reference to my bill to establish a Department of Science and Technology. As my colleagues know, the Committee on Government Operations, on which I serve, earlier this year held extensive hearings on this proposal. Upon conclusion of the hearings the committee agreed that it would be well to establish a commission to further consider the establishment of such a department. This idea for a commission study was incorporated into a bill which I offered on behalf of myself and other Senators, S. 1851, and which was favorably reported to the Senate on June 18.

This bill merits the consideration and the approval of the full Senate. I do not believe that we can afford to further postpone consideration of this proposal in this period of great advances in science and technology.

In this connection, I invite my colleagues attention to an article from the Washington Evening Star of September 11 reporting that England's Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, has promised to appoint a cabinet member for science to keep British abreast of atomic energy and space research. I ask unanimous consent that this newspaper article also be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KNOWLEDGE IS POWER

(Address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before the International Conference on Machine Searching and Translation, Cleveland, Ohio, September 9, 1959)

Last month, in a rare news conference in the Kremlin, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev said that the object of his scheduled history-making visit to the United States next week, and the return visit later of President Eisenhower would be to find a common language, and a common understanding of questions to be resolved.

Without violent interpolation, I can say that the aim of this week's conference, "standards for a common language for machine searching and translation," is in the same ball park as Khrushchev's stated aim.

Although the present conference is scientific and not political, the language used to describe specific aims resembles that of politics and diplomacy.

1. To encourage an environment for working toward a common machine language or a series of compatible machine languages for processing scientific and technical literature so that it may be searched, selected, correlated, and translated by automatic equipment.

2. To characterize equipment requirements for use with common language systems or with compatible machine languages.

3. To create an environment in which it will be possible to foster agreements for cooperative processing and exchange of encoded materials for machine searching of the world's scientific literature.

4. To work toward initiating cooperative collection and analysis of scientific and technical terminology for preparation of dictionaries and thesauri for code establishment for use in machine searching and machine translation.

5. To promote cooperative research programs and free exchange of research materials.

6. To review interrelationships between machine literature searching and machine translation and to consider how progress in one field may advance the other.

I am convinced, both from my own personal experience, and from examining history, that the key to finding a common language on the international scene, as in the political, scientific, or other scene, is the willingness to seek a way to achieve mutual understanding.

My interest in the problem of machine literature searching and translation is deep seated, as a student, a teacher and a public official.

Later, the problem of utilizing recorded information faced me when I became mayor of the thriving city of Minneapolis. The importance of making decisions quickly became apparent to me when considering the drastic reduction in the time scale of information gathering for decision making and control during the past 40 years.

I discovered another dimension to this problem when I moved to the U.S. Senate. From that vantage point, I observed that the rapidly expanding research facilities of Government agencies, universities, and industrial concerns were pouring forth a cascade of new knowledge so great that existing arrangements for collecting and organizing the records no longer would control the flood. The inability to lay hands quickly on essential information has been leading to enormous intellectual and social waste which no business, no industry, and no government activity could either escape or afford.

As soon as I had the opportunity to do something about this problem I became busy. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I was able to have the committee staff study the library problem thoroughly, in connection with a bill that I introduced—to create a Department of Science and Technology—whose function it would be, among others, to take appropriate action toward "the development and utilization of mechanical aids and new devices for collating, translating, abstracting, indexing, storage and retrieval of scientific and technological information under the control of the Federal Government, and to coordinate such data as may be available from other sources."

Another function of the proposed new Department would be "to establish rules and regulations governing the distribution of scientific publications as may be necessary to assure maximum utilization. * * *"

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on this subject. The first group to testify was Dr. J. H. Shera, the distinguished dean of Western Reserve University's School of Library Science, and Dr. J. W. Perry and Dr. Allen Kent, director and associate director, respectively, of the university's center for documentation and communication research. They presented a comprehensive picture of the Russian activities in the field of collecting, analyzing, and dissemination of the world's scientific and technical literature. It was a revelation to me that this group had performed so much of the pioneering research work in the field of machine literature searching and in mobilizing national attention on the problem through three national conferences which they organized, in 1956, 1957, again in 1958, and now the present conference.

After their testimony there followed a parade of witnesses from Government, industry, and universities. Many spoke of the extreme needs for more effective control of scientific and technical information in order to advance the efficiency with which research in our Nation is conducted—particularly with regard to avoiding loss of our Nation's precious research time in duplicating work already completed or underway. I was shocked by the testimony of one research director in particular who estimated that the efficiency of chemical research in the United States is only 5 to 15 percent—with much of this low order of efficiency caused by incomplete control of the literature.

I heard other witnesses at the hearings who proposed the creation of a national center—financed with Federal funds—to coordinate the processing, abstracting, searching, and translation of the world's scientific literature output.

Estimates of $30 to $300 million were made as to the cost of such a center. Neither of these figures frightened me when I considered the estimated $7 billion annual research bill of our country. If the experience of the chemical research director who testified is valid for other industries, then the 15 percent efficiency would point to an annual waste of between $3 to $5 billion. I could not be staggered by costs of $300 million to some of that estimated waste. Nor am I frightened by the spectre of Federal aid in this important field. The annual Government expenditures to support research in our Nation is so great that it could well afford a centralized literature effort for its own purposes—even if it were necessary to establish such a center entirely for use in research programs supported by the Federal Government.

Other witnesses at the subcommittee hearings represented various of the abstracting and indexing services in this country. In general, they described the heroic attempts that they are making to keep abreast of the mounting flow of scientific literature. Most

of the editors of these services felt that they could more adequately cope with the scientific literature situation if more funds would be made available to them. However, they apparently did not clearly envisage the need for mechanized systems for searching and correlating the literature. I had the distinct impression that these editors were convinced that their responsibility for solving the problem was limited to providing the conventional tools such as printed abstracts and indexes. Also, at least one editor of a major service in this country felt that the reports of Soviet advances in this field were somewhat overrated, and that they were not making as much progress as might be inferred from their writings.

When the witnesses from Federal agencies testified, I detected that many of these persons were following the opinions of many of the editors of the abstracting and indexing services. There appeared to be a defensive attitude toward what they had done and an attempt to justify what they had not done.

I think that much of their attitude stemmed from the generally defensive attitude on the part of the executive branch of the Federal Government resulting from the electrifying discovery of the progress that the U.S.S.R. has been making—and brought to public attention by the announcement of the launching of the first Soviet sputnik.

It was a curious experience to see two types of witnesses before my committee talk right past each other.

There were the users of scientific information who were, in general, frantic in their desire for better information services—both with regard to desire for better coordination and coverage, and with regard to the development of better tools for exploiting the world's scientific literature. One survey reported at the hearings showed that industrial companies were engaged in supplementing existing services for abstracting and indexing of published literature. They reported that approximately 40 percent were incurring annual expenses of more than $5,000, and only 4 percent of more than $50,000, with the others expending from $10,000 to $35,000 annually.

The same survey showed that the median 1956 expenditure for professional societies in processing the published literature in their field for the benefit of their members was exceeded by almost 20 percent of the individual user companies that processed published literature for use by employees.

In the face of these costs, it was reported that 50 percent of the companies replying indicated that their internal scientific literature processing expenses could be reduced and the effectiveness of exploitation of the published literature enhanced by auxiliary services from various centralized sources.

It was also found that the user companies averaged about 10 abstracting and indexing services to which they subscribed. In this survey, 312 different abstracting and indexing services were identified—a commentary on the fragmentation of secondary information processing services that have sprung up in a frantic and uncoordinated effort to control the burgeoning literature.

On the other hand, many of the abstracting services and Federal agencies with responsibilities in this field were all for standing pat, or at least were proceeding with too much hesitancy.

A year after the first hearing had been held on the committee's proposed Science and Technology Act of 1958, the subcommittee held further hearings on proposals to create a Department of Science and Technology, and on a proposed commission, composed of Representatives from the legislative and executive branches of the Government and members of the scientific community, to determine whether or not a Department of Science and Technology would be desirable and, if so, what components of the Federal Government should be included therein.

The subcommittee also took this opportunity to review the progress that had been made in the field of documentation and machine retrieval within the year following its previous hearings.

As a direct result of the hearings, I cite the following areas where some positive action has resulted.

First, there was a stepped up program of translation of Russian scientific publications, both within and outside of the Federal Government. There was also a greater effort made to pool translations so that there would be less duplication in having various groups work on identical translations.

Second, there was a stepped-up program of research and development in machine translation and machine searching, with the National Science Foundation acting to coordinate work in this field. In accordance with one of the objectives of the committee's bill, the proposed Science and Technology Act of 1958, one of the responsibilities placed on the Foundation resulted from the enactment of Public Law 85-864, which provided in part:

"SEC. 901. The National Science Foundation shall establish a Science Information Service. The Foundation, through such Service, shall (1) provide, or arrange for the provision or, indexing, abstracting, translating, and other services leading to a more effective dissemination of scientific information; and (2) undertake programs to develop new or improved methods, including mechanized systems, for making scientific information available."

In accordance with this provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the National Science Foundation has entered into a contract and made a preliminary grant to the National Bureau of Standards for the operation of the program, to be undertaken by the Science Information Service, for the evaluation and development of existing programs in these fields.

During the past few years a number of other interesting developments have taken place, which have resulted in the improvement of the availability of scientific and technical information in the United States. The Western Reserve University Center of Documentation Research and Communications has been cooperating with the American Society for Metals and the General Electric Co. in developing a system of coding abstracts that can be stored and searched mechanically, and have developed a machine for this searching purpose. This is an excellent example of cooperative enterprise by university, professional society, and industry which could lead to a usable mechanical search system of textual and graphic scientific and technical material. There are approximately 58 similar and promising ventures underway throughout the country, in which Federal agencies are participating in many instances, (i.e. Air Research and Development Command, Air Force Office of Scientific Research, Office of Naval Research, National Science Foundation.)

A third area of constructive action has resulted in the stimulation of non-Federal groups, who have advanced a number of serious proposals to create a program for the centralized, mechanized exploitation of the world's scientific and technical literature. One of these that has been brought to my attention is the program of Western Reserve University, one of the organizers of this international conference. The pioneering documentation research center of the university is working toward the creation of a "model center for the mechanized exploitation of the scientific and technical literature." As a matter of fact, this plan is now before the National Science Foundation for consideration. Many of my colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives have shown a keen interest in this proposed program, and my committee has endeavored to see that its full potential is evaluated and utilized as a part of the Federal support program. I shall be looking with interest at the outcome of this project.

Mechanical systems and devices are part of the broad pattern of scientific information services, and this pattern is in turn a part of the processes of science. In order to properly mechanize processes or to design systems, we must be able to specify in great detail just how it is to be done. Much of this research must draw on the combined skills of trained information specialists and librarians, linguists, logicians, mathematicians, statisticians, computer engineers, operations research analysts, philosophers, psychologists, behavioral scientists, and specialists in the different scientific disciplines.

Involved in these cooperative ventures are many educational institutions (such as the University of Pennsylvania, Harvard Computation Laboratory, University of California, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, Cambridge Language Research Unit (England), Georgetown University, Columbia University, etc.) and large business concerns (such as the International Business Machines Corp., Radio Corp. of America, General Electric Co., Eastman Kodak Co., and Documentation, Inc., etc.). While great progress has been made in these joint ventures, and while it can be safely stated that mechanical translation is possible, still I must caution that we have not yet reached the stage where we have either the system or machine to accomplish it rapidly or economically; much more research and development work remains to be done before we reach that point.

Scientific societies, long the backbone of strong scientific effort in the United States, are passing through a period of self-appraisal and are actively seeking improvement of their publications and their publishing techniques. For example, the American Society for Metals supports an experimental mechanized literature searching project at Western Reserve University; the American Chemical Society has a program of research within its Chemical Abstracts services; the American Institute of Physics has commenced a similar study of the entire physics communication problem; the biologists are reviewing their entire information mechanism, and among the steps they have taken to improve their communications is the formation of a conference of biological editors and the planning of a central business and information office in the American Institute of Biological Sciences to coordinate and insure data compilation activities of a specialized type; the American Physical Society has established an express journal titled "Physical Review Letters," as an experiment in rapid dissemination of short notes on current research in physics.

Another very important development in connection with the documentation program is the establishment of an office of documentation within the National Academy of Sciences. The objective of this new office is to advise and assist not only activities within the National Research Council to insure proper direction, but it is also proposed that it will work out a system of maximum participation of leading U.S. scientists and engineers in the programs approved for support, in order to insure the highest possible contribution these leaders in the field of science can make toward the development of an adequate documentation center. The third objective of the office of documentation is to create an advisory board of scientists, whose abilities would be directed toward serv-

ing the National Science Foundation and nongovernmental groups working in the documentation field, and to assist the National Science Foundation in determining the areas where Federal funds or grants could be best allocated toward achieving the maximum goals in the development of an overall scientific information and documentation program and center.

A fourth result of the hearings of our Senate subcommittee has been the attempt to assess firsthand the scope of the Soviet effort in this field.

A great deal has been said about the efficiency and comprehensiveness of the Russian system of publishing scientific material in abstracts and making it available to Soviet scientists. They have developed an extensive organization, and are expending a great deal of energy in abstracting and indexing scientific material from all parts of the world. In addition, they are exploring vigorously the possibilities of mechanical storage and search in mechanical translation. We must not discount their effort, but there are some areas where there is doubt as to the superiority of Russian progress. For instance, it can be pointed out that "Chemical Abstracts," produced by the American Chemical Society, is universally acknowledged to be the greatest abstracting and indexing service in the world relating to the field of chemistry.

To illustrate the foregoing comparison, this year the American Chemical Society will produce over 130,000 abstracts of articles of interest to chemists; the Russians will produce less than 90,000. Further, "Chemical Abstracts" coverage is better, and its entries are issued more rapidly than those of its Russian counterpart. The Russians have better coverage in other fields, such as biology; however, "Biological Abstracts" has increased its coverage by 33⅓ percent during this year, and for the coming year it expects to very nearly equal the number of entries produced by the Russians; the currency of "Biological Abstracts" entries matches that of the Russian service.

It should be noted that indexes to the abstracting services of the Russians are available only for occasional years, a factor greatly handicapping search of their abstract literature. Obviously, it would be very difficult to search through hundreds of thousands of abstracts without the benefit of good indexes such as are provided by the indexing and abstracting services of the United States. As one example of the never-ending search in this country for better finding tools for more effective use of abstract publications, "Chemical Abstracts" is studying the feasibility of new types of indexes to supplement those already extant. Another is the formation of the National Federation of Abstracting and Indexing Services to effect better cooperation and to develop studies seeking better tools for the benefit of the scientists of this country.

In connection with these problems, the cosponsor of this conference, the Rand Development Corp., headed by James Rand, took a hand in financing a long visit by Wetern Reserve University's Allen Kent, to assess the U.S.S.R. accomplishments in this field. When he returned from this trip last year, he reported to my committee and advised us that the Soviet effort was indeed of significant magnitude, and that in many areas of abstracting, and in research the machine searching and translation, the Soviet attack on the problem was of a most significant nature. He reported that about 500,000 scientific papers culled from the world's published literature were being abstracted under the direction of their Institute of Scientific Information—a branch of the Soviet Academy of Science. The abstractors—as in the United States—were specialists in their fields and were contributing part of their time to this work. Furthermore, the Russians have organized an "Express Information Service" which took the cream of the published literature and long summaries of these were printed in Russian each week in 36 fields. In addition, work was going forward in the construction of an information machine.

As a result of this trip, and following contacts with the work in other countries, the present International Conference was conceived and organized. James Rand financed another trip for Kent to the U.S.S.R. to arrange for Soviet participation at the meeting. Also, Rand Development Corp. provided travel grants for a number of participants from overseas.

I should also like to extend my commendations to Mr. Rand for his testimony earlier this year before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, when he made some very important observations which were of inestimable value to members of that committee. In addition to submitting comparative figures relative to Soviet progress as compared to advancements in the United States in the science information field, he was also able to submit many additional facts relating to the problems of interexchange of information between the two countries, which he has done much to overcome in connection with his work.

I believe all of us can agree that Mr. Rand has performed an important service to our Nation in his attempts to arrange for the cooperative activity evidenced by this meeting. All of the participants are rendering an important service to world progress and peaceful cooperation by spending a week here in Cleveland to work out solutions to a very vexing problem.

You may have wondered when I would get to the theme of this talk, "Knowledge Is Power." Every business or Government manager knows the extent to which his ability to make worthwhile decisions and to exercise control is influenced by the amount of knowledge pertinent to a given problem that he may have available to him. The power of the individual to do good and useful work is influenced by his information resources. A company's power to do business in a competitive economy is directly related to the knowledge of significant market—the know-how—and other factors that it has available to it. In the same way, the power of a country to maintain its competitive position economically, scientifically, militarily, is strongly influenced by the convenient availability of important information at the time when it can best be used.

The effective exploitation of intellectual resources is perhaps the most urgent problem of our times, for upon it depends the solution to many problems, including that of survival itself.

The truth of the epigram that "Knowledge Is Power" is more apparent today than ever before, yet a disturbing paradox confronts those most vitally concerned with the production and use of knowledge. Until quite recently, it was axiomatic that a research project in any field should begin with a review of the literature in order to provide the basis for research planning and to avoid wasted effort in duplicating previous work. Previously recorded knowledge was the most important single tool of the investigator. However, today, with the inability to lay hands quickly on essential information, therein lies the paradox. Because of the chaotic state of our documentation services, our stockpile of knowledge has become an embarrassment of riches and we find ourselves ignorant in the midst of a plethora of knowledge.

A solution to the problem of documentary chaos will be found only when it is recognized that this is a problem in intellectual engineering, and that such engineering must be based upon a body of fundamental knowledge out of which sound principles of operation may be derived. Traditionally, the collection and organization of the records of knowledge has been the task of the social institution known collectively as the "library," and the library profession has developed, partly from philosophical principles and partly from pragmatic experience, a body of general principles and established methods.

Today, as I look over the program of the world's leading specialists coping with the problems of documentary chaos, I find only two librarians—the remainder are, by training, chemists, mathematicians, engineers, linguists, philosophers, logicians, physicists, lawyers, physicians, statisticians, lexicographers, and computer designers. I am pleased to see that the team of specialists attacking this problem has grown.

In seeking a solution, the problems of maintaining a common language, both intellectually as well as technically, is of extreme importance. The international attention and participation of this conference is most gratifying. I will leave Cleveland with a feeling of gratification that the problem of our documentation chaos is in good hands.

Returning again to the concept of knowledge as power, let us examine what we really mean by the word "power."

I believe that careful analysis reveals that knowledge gives man three types of power:

First, the power to comprehend. This is the realm of pure science and relates to the power of man to understand the universe and man's place in it. It includes, as well, the comprehension of natural law and the ability of man to understand his environment.

Next, we have the power to build. This is the realm of technology, and relates to man's power to build himself a better physical world. This includes better homes, better means of transportation and better instruments, generally, with which to enrich his life and add to his physical comforts and well-being.

Finally, we have the very vital power to harmonize. This is the realm of personal and group relationships, and relates to man as a social being and man in his relation to other men both at home and abroad.

Now I think it is evident that the problems to which this conference is addressing itself relate to all three of these powers. And I believe it is also evident that mastery over man's recorded knowledge is essential to his ability to comprehend his environment, to build for himself a better physical world, and to create a world that is free from tension and in which he can live in peace and harmony with his fellows.

It is primarily with reference to this third power that I have addressed my remarks this evening.

Strife and conflict, both among individuals and among nations, are born of ignorance. Our ability to reconcile our differences, to resolve conflicts and to create an atmosphere of mutual sympathy and understanding is related directly to our understanding of each other and of each other's problems, ambitions and points of view. I believe it is well established that people who understand one another are not likely to make war against each other. It has long been established that most of the great power conflicts occur in the political arena and arise out of misunderstandings, lack of knowledge of motives, objectives and backgrounds.

On the other hand, we have had much success in establishing mutual relations and understanding among nations in the intellectual arena. Notable among man's

achievements toward international understanding is the field of science, which has long been regarded as international, and I believe that history demonstrates that scientists have, in their professional contacts, done much to destroy international barriers. Therefore, the realm of science is clearly an admirable bridge over which we can pass from a world of tension to a world of peace.

The recent work in the field of international health of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations has also demonstrated this truth in that field, to a degree comparable to the accomplishments in the field of science, which have resulted in an acceleration of the work being performed by various public and private international organizations in both fields.

Unfortunately, however, increasing specialization in science tends to create barriers across this bridge and to obliterate the bands of communication that scientists have long maintained with each other. To improve the flow of scientific knowledge, both within our own country and between our own country and the other powers of the world, I have urged the establishment of a Department of Science and Technology which would serve the cause of international science as I hope our Department of State serves the cause of international peace.

I believe we will all agree that international understanding and agreement are fundamental to the free sharing of knowledge. Conversely, the free sharing of knowledge is also fundamental to international understanding and agreement. However, such understanding and agreement cannot be achieved without a common basis of communication. To achieve such agreement we must teach ourselves to work together, to plan and to develop solid working relationships in which all of us must share responsibility and contribute to the whole, even if it means that we must surrender something of immediate benefit to ourselves for the good of the group.

This conference is a very important forward step in the achievement of vital international understanding as it relates to the freedom of man to pursue knowledge and to share that knowledge with other men. It is particularly appropriate that these meetings are being held in Cleveland with Western Reserve University as one of its sponors, for it is here that the United States is making one of its more significant contributions to the communication and dissemination of man's recorded knowledge.

In conclusion, I believe we can all agree that knowledge is power—but it actually reaches its greatest heights and achieves its highest use when it is shared with others for the benefit of all.

Tonight we dedicate ourselves, not to man's enslavement of other men, or to a nation's conquest of other nations, but to the mastery of knowledge itself.

This conference is the prolog to man's ultimate conquest of knowledge. This is a heavy burden and a lofty goal, but it is vital to our survival, and I am confident of success.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 11, 1959]

MACMILLAN PROMISES SCIENCE POST IN CABINET

LONDON, September 11.—Prime Minister Macmillan's Conservative Party promised today to appoint a Cabinet Minister for Science to keep Britain abreast of atomic energy and space research.

The promise was contained in a manifesto asking the voters for support in the October 8 parliamentary election.

Macmillan, in launching the manifesto at a news conference, described the Conservative program as "imaginative and level-headed." He said the new aims represented a continuation of the party's past and present policy.

The opposition Labor Party, in an election pamphlet issued previously, declared the Conservatives during 8 years in power made foreign policy mistakes and administered Britain for the benefit of the property-holding class.

The Conservative manifesto said if the Macmillan government is retained in office its first legislative tasks will be to strengthen the machinery for coping with local unemployment.

The manifesto said the Conservatives hope to double Britain's standard of living in the next generation.

On foreign affairs the manifesto said Mr. Macmillan's initiative had brought about closer contacts between the big powers.

Both Mr. Macmillan and Labor Leader Hugh Gaitskell expect a summit conference to materialize in the next few months. Each man wants to speak for Britain. That has become a major issue in the campaign to win control of the 630-seat House of Commons.

A Memorial To All Presidents Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a Commission, to be known as the Presidential Memorial Commission, for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, conversion, and location, in the Capital City of the Nation, or its environs, of a permanent memorial or memorials, including cultural facilities befitting the Capital City of our country, to past Presidents of the United States.

The Commission is to be composed of four Members of the U.S. Senate, four Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, and four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States.

At the present time there are three monuments in Washington, D.C., to past Presidents which are visited by hundreds of thousands of our citizens each year. These are the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial, and the Jefferson Memorial. Presidents Buchanan, Garfield, Grant, and Jackson are commemorated by statues. The Congress has, in addition, authorized the establishment of a memorial to President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

There is much discussion of a memorial to President Woodrow Wilson, and the Senate has adopted legislation to establish a James Madison Memorial Commission.

The joint resolution I have introduced is similar to a measure sponsored in the Senate by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] who said in introducing it that—

The joint resolution will provide a fitting memorial to all Presidents. As each President completes his term of office he, too, will be recognized in this memorial.

He went on to say that—

Any man who is outstanding enough to have served as a President of the United States deserves a memorial which will take its place in the architectural splendor of the Capital City. Certainly it will provide a real lesson in American history and will commemorate the true meaning of democracy.

A Presidential Memorial Commission such as I have proposed would have a priceless opportunity to make a major contribution to the advancement of the cultural life of the Capital City of our Nation, which has often been called a "cultural backwater" and compared unfavorably with the leading cities of Europe and even of the U.S.S.R. Time magazine on February 23, 1959, in an article on the subject of "Capital Culture," declared that Washington, D.C., "has long been known as a cultural backwater."

The New York Times reporting on the subject of "Capital Revival" said on February 22, 1959, that—

The city of the Potomac was once regarded as a horrible example of a world capital that was provincial in its neglect of the cultural amenities. Compared with London, Paris, Rome, Berlin, and Moscow, it looked like an esthetic desert. Foreigners who liked to scoff at the United States would point to the paucity of artistic activity in Washington as another demonstration of American materialism.

The New York Times hastened to add that—

The comparison was never quite fair, for Washington has always been an artificial city, a Government center whose population fluctuates substantially with shifts in party power. Nevertheless, there seemed to be a basis for the charge that the community cared for little but the political and social game. The symphony orchestra was in the doldrums; there was no opera, and apart from Zelda Fichandler's arena stage, no continuous theater.

Some citizens complained that Washington was missing an opportunity. No longer a village on Foggy Bottom, they insisted, it ought to behave with the pride of a great Capital. It ought to be a showplace in the humanities and arts. Conscientious Congressmen introduced legislation and generally it was interred in committee.

Since the New York Times and Time magazine are both published in New York City, which has more cultural facilities than any other American city, they may be written off as prejudiced witnesses with the pride, snobbishness, and provincialism which seems to be inherent, in many cases, in those who live in great cities.

However, it is harder to explain away the following statement by the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star on July 19, 1959:

It is illogical to compare Washington with other capitals in its need for theaters.

Unlike London, Paris, Rome, and even isolated Berlin, it is not a major center of population, finance, art, culture, and the other elements of metropolis. While it is growing in all of these areas, it is primarily a political capital, like Ottawa in Canada, but much better off than Canberra in Au-

tralia which is woefully younger than either Washington or Ottawa.

Actually, Washington equates much more logically as Harrisburg to Philadelphia, Springfield to Chicago, or Albany to New York. As a world capital, naturally, it is obligated to stir itself culturally at a much faster rate than the political center of a single State. Yet, nothing could be more unreasonable than to expect it to become a Rome, Paris, or London in so much less time than these had to become Rome, Paris, and London.

With the visit of Soviet Premier Khrushchev this week on what has been described as a cultural mission it is important that all of us think concretely about the best way for the Capital City of our country to make a cultural breakthrough of significant proportions. A Presidential Memorial Commission could make a study of this subject which could guide us in the years ahead.

I am not inclined to favor more statuary memorials to our past Presidents and other great statesmen since the District of Columbia has nearly 200 of these. Even the use of the columns of the East Front of the U.S. Capitol Building itself should be used only in connection with a living memorial.

A National Conservatory of Music was authorized by the Congress in the 1890's, but was never built. The proposed Presidential Memorial Commission might well give some thought to how this might be finally established in the Nation's Capital with the cooperation of the five great universities located here, that is, George Washington University, Georgetown University, American University, Howard University, and Catholic University of America.

Leonard Bernstein and the New York Philharmonic Symphony Orchestra scored their great triumphs for American art at the Tschaikovsky Conservatory in Moscow last week, and it was at this same conservatory that Van Cliburn made the greatest cultural breakthrough of the decade only last year.

I have long felt that we should have a national program in the fine arts such as all European countries and the U.S.S.R. have, and as was recently established in Canada. Many South American countries have such programs. The establishment of such a national conservatory of music, and the theater arts, in the Nation's Capital would give great encouragement to our composers, writers; indeed, it would greatly encourage all of our creative people.

The offer of the Keith Theater and the Albee Building to the Nation's Capital by one of the leading citizens of the District of Columbia makes possible at last part of the program which the Congress envisioned in the 1890's. The Keith Theater could be a downtown showcase for the students of speech, drama, and music of all of the Nation's colleges and universities.

Museums and even a building to house productions of music, dance, and drama, and an experimental theater encompassing the fine arts, are a necessary corollary to a program for the living artist, but surely the one thing which would be most effective for our own people and for the impression that we make upon all foreigners is the extent to which art lives and affects our way of living through contemporary creative artistic endeavor.

The location of the Keith Theater and the Albee Building within a block of the White House is surely one of the choice locations in America.

Only today Mr. Joseph Intermaggio, acting director, of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, told me of his great personal interest in such a development as I have outlined here. The Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies is cooperating with the universities of the District of Columbia and the Brookings Institution.

It was his thought that many of the country's educational, and planning organizations might be interested in having space in the Albee Building. He mentioned specifically the American Educational Theater Association, the National Council of the Arts in Education, the American Planning and Civic Association, the National Conference of Mayors, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

It is important to note in this connection that in a survey report for the American Council on Education, submitted on January 2, 1958, by Dr. Donald J. Stone, dean of the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs of the University of Pittsburgh, it was declared that—

In one respect at least, the Nation's Capital is an underdeveloped community. It lacks adequate institutions to meet the needs of thousands of foreign visitors or temporary residents who come here under the auspices of the Federal Government, of foreign governments, international organizations, foreign or American private institutions, or on their own. Most of these foreign visitors are persons of status in their own countries. All told, there are each year between fifteen and twenty thousand of them.

The report called for an enlarged center which should foster the international enlightenment of the Washington community. This could be done by cultural and social programs of general interest which would include American and foreign music programs.

A national showcase for the fine arts such as I have in mind is familiar to all European and Russian cities which have conservatories of music and academies of fine arts.

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, U.S. Navy, in his testimony before the Committee on Appropriations, spoke of the excellent foundation laid in the Soviet 10-year schools in languages and in literature, not only of Russia but of foreign countries.

Admiral Rickover spoke with approval of the findings of Dr. Harlan H. Hatcher, president of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, and Dr. F. Cyril James, president of McGill University in Canada, that in the pursuit of scientific work the Russians have not neglected the areas of culture and the arts.

A recent study made at my request by the Library of Congress shows that the Nation's Capital, as a political entity, does less than any other major U.S. city for the fine arts. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia seems content to let the Federal Government or private benefactors support the arts. Such a course would be unthinkable in any European capital city or, indeed, even any large provincial city in Europe or the U.S.S.R.

I have briefly sketched some of the areas which the President Memorial Comission might cover. I would hope that the President would appoint distinguished educators and cultural leaders to it when it is finally established.

In conclusion, I would like to include as part of my remarks the study by the Library of Congress to which I have just referred, together with the text of my House Joint Resolution 530, and my H.R. 7989.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 530

Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for memorials to the past Presidents of the United States including Presidents James Madison and Woodrow Wilson

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a commission, to be known as the "Presidential Memorial Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for the design, construction, conversion, and location, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, or in its immediate environs, of a permanent memorial or memorials (including cultural facilities befitting the capital city of a great nation) to past Presidents of the United States including Presidents James Madison and Woodrow Wilson. The Commission shall be composed of twelve Commissioners appointed as follows: Four persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, four Senators by the President of the Senate, and four Members of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commissioners shall serve without compensation, but may be reimbursed for expenses incurred by them in carrying out the duties of the Commission. The Commission shall report such plans, together with its recommendations, to the President and Congress at the earliest practicable date, and in the interim shall make annual reports of its progress to the President and Congress.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to—

(a) make such expenditures for personal services and otherwise for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution as it may deem advisable from funds appropriated or received as gifts for such purpose;

(b) solicit and accept gifts to be used in carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution or to be used in connection with the construction, conversion or other expenses of such memorial or memorials;

(c) hold hearings, organize contests, enter into contracts for personal services and otherwise, and do such other things as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution; and

(d) avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, the National Capital Planning Commission, the District of Columbia Recreation Board, the National Capital Regional Planning Council, the National Park Service; and the Bureau of International Cultural Relations of the Department of State, and such Commissions, Board, Service, Bureau, and Council shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

H.R. 7989

A bill to provide for the adoption in the Nation's Capital of the practice common to many other cities in the United States with regard to cultural activities by depositing in a special fund 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia to be used for such programs, to advance the National Cultural Center and its educational and recreational programs, to provide financial assistance to the nonprofit art programs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, by amending the Act of April 29, 1942

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes," approved April 29, 1942, as amended (D.C. Code, sec. 8–211), is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately after "SEC. 4." and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) In addition to the trust fund authorized by subsection (a) of this section, there shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Board 1 mill out of each $1 of tax revenue of the government of the District of Columbia. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Board each fiscal year, an amount equal to the amount deposited in such special fund during the preceding fiscal year out of such tax revenue. Such appropriated amount shall also be deposited in such special fund.

"(c) All money in the special fund authorized by subsection (b) of this section shall be available to the Board to defray in whole or in part the expense of programs in arts and crafts, music, drama, speech, dancing (other than social dancing), lectures, forums for informal discussions, and other creative opportunities for leisure-time participation, as authorized in section 3 of article II of this Act, and the expense of carrying out the programs authorized by paragraph 3 of section 4 of the National Cultural Center Act."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect July 1, 1959.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1959.

To: Hon. HARRIS B. MCDOWELL (Attention Mr. Frain.)

From: Education and Public Welfare Division.

Subject: Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities.

This is in reply to your request of June 23, 1959, for information concerning municipal support of artistic endeavors and cultural activities and to describe the mechanics of this type of support. Your request also states that you are especially interested in determining what cities, if any, earmark a certain portion of their taxes for use in supporting artistic and cultural endeavors and how the amounts set aside by the larger cities compare with the $16,000 for cultural and art purposes in the D.C. Recreation Department budget.

The following table represents a brief summary of answers to letters, which we recently sent to chief finance officers in selected U.S. cities, requesting certain information about municipal financial support of artistic and cultural activities. The 56 cities selected to receive copies of our letter were chosen on the basis of their population size (as indicated in the 1950 Bureau of the Census report) or because they were known to give municipal financial support to certain artistic or cultural activities.

Number of letters sent	56
Number of replies to date (July 30, 1959)	38
Number of cities which indicated current support of artistic and cultural activities	34
Number of cities which indicated the lack of any current support of this type	4
Number of cities which indicated that a certain portion of taxes are set aside for such support (Evansville, Ind., and St. Louis, Mo.)	2

For the most part, letters received from the cities deal with: (1) sources of funds (i.e., general revenues, taxes earmarked for such purposes, etc.); (2) the artistic and cultural activities, organizations, institutions, buildings, etc., which receive municipal funds; (3) the amount of municipal funds expended for such purposes; and (4) how such funds are allocated to the various municipally supported fine arts and other cultural programs. With respect to your inquiry concerning Washington, D.C.'s $16,000 recreation budget appropriation for cultural and art purposes, the enclosed chart indicates considerably higher appropriations by most other large cities.

In preparing the enclosed chart we have attempted to limit the facts and figures included to those which seem most pertinent to the nature of your request. Information contained in the responses from the cities has been presented as we received it. Due to the lack of uniformity of methods of answering our questions, no attempt has been made to interpret the facts contained in the letters.

Furthermore, since a definition of the phrase "cultural activities" was not included in our letter to the cities, some of the information received and also listed on the enclosed chart may be extraneous to your purposes, depending on how one defines "cultural activities." In general, we have omitted the following types of activity from inclusion in this chart: Libraries and certain library fine arts programs (unless the latter were specifically mentioned), historical societies, academies of sciences, institutes (unless specifically called "art institute"), certain arts and crafts programs of recreation departments, planetariums, aquariums, zoological parks, botanical gardens, etc., societies of natural sciences, spring fiestas, and certain types of indirect assistance given by city, such as use of staff, office space, etc. (unless specifically mentioned in letters.)

We hope that this information and the accompanying chart will be helpful.

HELEN A. MILLER,
ANNE M. FINNEGAN.

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Akron, Ohio	$36,000	General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility).	Art museum.
	$5,000,000	Direct tax construction cost	Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena."
Atlanta, Ga	1 or 3 parts of a $100,000 recreation program	General fund (part of "recreation program")	Band concerts.
	$7,500	General fund	Atlanta Symphony Guild.
	$6,000	do	Atlanta Pops Concert.
	$5,000	do	Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars.
	$10,000	do	Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art.
Baltimore, Md	1959 appropriations:		
	$25,594	do	Municipal Museum.
	$119,994	do	Bureau of Music.
	$288,000	Endowment funds (estimated income)	Walters Art Gallery
	$15,000	General funds (pensions)	
Birmingham, Ala	$90,000 (this year's appropriation)	General funds	Birmingham Museum of Art.
Buffalo, N.Y	Appropriated in 1958–59:		
	$75,430	Real estate tax and other current revenues	Albright Art Gallery.
	$30,000	do	Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc.
	$27,300	do	Kleinhans Music Hall.
Chicago, Ill	Calendar year 1958:		
	$232,405.87	Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago.	Art Institute of Chicago.
	$232,309.11	do	Museum of Science and Industry.
	$232,405.92	do	Chicago Natural History Museum (field museum).
Dallas, Tex	$80,000	General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax."	Fine Arts Museum.
Detroit, Mich	1959–60 gross appropriation, $543,081	Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues	Arts Commission.
Evansville, Ind	1959 contribution, $9,200	Civil City of Evansville	Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
	1959 contribution, $9,200	School City of Evansville [1]	Do.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		

[1] City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per $100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—Continued

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Hagerstown, Md	$12,500 (provided for in annual budget)	General revenues	Washington County Museum of Fine Arts.
Houston, Tex	$19,500	do	Museum of Natural History.
	$20,000	do	Museum of Fine Arts.
	$3,000	do	Civic Theatre.
	$25,000	do	Houston Symphony.
Kansas City, Mo	For fiscal year ended Apr. 30, 1959:		
	$21,211	General fund; park funds	Nelson Art Gallery (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$9,925	General fund	Philharmonic Orchestra (free rent).
	$42,830	General debt and interest fund	Starlight Theater (debt service for facility developed by park department).
	$48,231	General fund	Museum (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$33,592	do	Liberty Memorial (operation and maintenance).
Los Angeles, Calif	Appropriation for fiscal 1959–60: $196,998	General revenues	Department of municipal art: bureau of music.
Newark, N.J	1959 appropriation: $525,426	Tax and general revenues	Newark Museum.
New Orleans, La	$40,000 annually	Appropriated by city	Delgado Museum of Art.
	Appropriated "this year":		
	$5,000	do	New Orleans Philharmonic Society.
	$2,500	do	New Orleans Opera House Association.
	$875	do	Crescent City Concerts.
New York, N.Y	$944,525 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Metropolitan Museum of Art.
	$904,989 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$1,329,559 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	American Museum of Natural History.
	$1,071,985 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
	$125,140 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Children's Museum.
	$95,866 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	do	Brooklyn Institute of Brooklyn Academy of Music.
	$69,510 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$127,000 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Museum of the City of New York.
	$50,250 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
Norfolk, Va	$2,000	General revenue	Norfolk Symphony Orchestra.
	$69,083	do	Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences.
Oakland, Calif	1958–59:		
	Salaries for a professional staff of 6 plus $2,000 allowance for books and $500 for pictures.	Annual appropriations by city council to library department from which library and museums commission adopts an operating budget.	Art and pictures department of main library.
	$70,377	do	Oakland Public Museum.
	$57,212	do	Art Museum.
	$31,577	do	Snow Museum.
Philadelphia, Pa	$25,000	General revenues	Academy of Fine Arts.
	$75,000	do	Robin Hood Dell.
	$25,000	do	Philadelphia Grand Opera.
	$624,760	do	Philadelphia Art Museum and Rodin Museum.
	$30,000	do	Johnson paintings.
	$10,000	do	Philadelphia Art Festival (every 2 years).
Pittsburgh, Pa	$35,000 (1959)	General revenues (through specific appropriations each year).	Pittsburgh Symphony.
	$20,000 to $30,000 (annually)	do	Free summer band concerts.
	$25,000 (approximate cost to city annually)	do	Arts and Crafts Center.
Providence, R.I	Current appropriations:		
	$24,877	General revenue	Museum in Roger William Park.
	$1,500	do	Band concerts.
Reading, Pa	$140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959)	General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs).	Recreation Bureau (sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.).
	$3,028 (1959)	do	Bureau of parks weekly band concerts.
Richmond, Va	$5,000	Direct appropriation	Valentine Museum.
Rochester, N.Y	1959–60 expenditures:		
	$10,000	General revenues or real estate taxes	Civic Music Association.
	$20,000	do	"Opera Under the Stars."
	Not indicated	Not indicated	Museum.
Sacramento, Calif	1959–60 budget amounts:		
	$4,500	General ad valorem taxes	Philharmonic Orchestra.
	$4,000	do	Park band concerts.
	$66,866	do	Crocker Art Gallery (city-owned).
	$17,000	do	Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department).
St. Louis, Mo	1958 Revenue: $320,007.53	Permanent levy of $0.02 per $100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907).	St. Louis Art Museum.
St. Paul, Minn	1959 city budget appropriations:		
	$13,500	Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget."	St. Paul Gallery and School of Art.
	$10,000	do	St. Paul Civic Opera.
San Antonio, Tex	$81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year)	Supported primarily by general fund	Witte Museum.
	$81,000	do	2 municipal auditoriums.
	$1,500	do	San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions).
San Diego, Calif	1959–60 city budget:		
	$57,159	General revenues	Fine Arts Gallery.
	$19,289	do	Serra Museum (local history).
	$48,715	do	Natural History Museum.
	$45,949	do	Museum of Man (anthropology).
	$10,000	do	San Diego Symphony.
San Francisco, Calif	1958–59 budget:		
	$158,365 (taxes, $120,665; other, $37,700)	Budget of the city and county of San Francisco.	Art Commission.
	$35,493 (taxes)	do	War Memorial Art Museum.
	$255,456: (taxes, $254,856; other, $600)	do	California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art museum).
	$367,942: (taxes, $367,692; other, $250)	do	de Young (art) Museum.
Scranton, Pa	An average of about $28,740 per annum over the past 10 years.	General funds	Everhart Museum.
Seattle, Wash	$233.37	City's annual budget funds without regard to income source.	Art Commission.
	$34,097.55	do	Art Museum.
	$18,000	do	Public Music.
	$62,743.57	do	Art division of the library department.

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—Continued

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Springfield, Mass.[3]	$33,127.93	General tax revenues	Museum of Natural History.
	$31,092.45	do	George Walter Vincent Smith Museum.
	$18,161.40	do	William Pynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum).
	$1,267	do	Springfield Museum of Fine Arts.
	Not indicated	do	Fine arts department of library.
Syracuse, N.Y.	$25,000 appropriation annually	General tax levy	Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).

[3] Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

Regional Corporation Would Provide Continuity in Water Resource Development in Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in his opposition to water resources development projects, President Eisenhower continually stresses the theme of economy versus water. Yet harnessing of our rivers for production of power, reclamation of agricultural land, control of floods, and development of recreational sites is creation of wealth—and investment in American productivity.

A recent editorial in the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, pinpointed this inconsistency, declaring—

Mr. Eisenhower has steadfastly refused to recognize the facts upon which the Congress approves these projects—they do not get approval until they show a favorable benefits-to-cost ratio. He has refused to recognize that these projects represent investments—investments that will be repaid many times over.

Water resources development is vital to development of the Northwest. To insure economic stability in that area of our country as we attempt to meet power needs of a growing population and an expanding industrial base, growth of electric power potential must be a continuing basis. The Eisenhower administration's opposition to new starts has destroyed this needed continuity.

However, this situation could be remedied, and on a long-term basis, by enactment of my bill, S. 1927, a proposal to create a Bonneville Regional Corporation with authority to issue revenue bonds to finance new starts approved by Congress and responsibility to supply the geographic area in which it would serve with an adequate supply of power.

The East Oregonian endorses this view, and states—

The best way out for this region in the face of such Presidential opposition is through a regional corporation that would permit the issuing of revenue bonds to finance water resources development projects. Because this would not require continued Federal appropriations, other than for non-reimbursable items, one assumes that the President would not oppose it. He has approved the regional corporation principle of financing in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial, which is entitled "A Regional Corporation Is the Way," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pendleton (Oreg.) East Oregonian, Sept. 4, 1959]

A REGIONAL CORPORATION IS THE WAY

Some Republicans in the Northwest must be thinking that one more such victory as President Eisenhower scored this week when the House upheld his veto of a public works appropriation bill and they will be completely undone. In this region of the country where water resources development means so much it will be extremely difficult for Republicans to defend a Republican president who refused to approve appropriations for water resources projects in the region.

The stand Mr. Eisenhower took in this matter was not, of course, new. He has consistently said that the Federal Government cannot afford to start new water resources development projects. In the past he has not been able to make it stick. But this year he got away with it when an override of his veto failed by one vote in the House.

Mr. Eisenhower has steadfastly refused to recognize the facts upon which the Congress approves these projects—they do not get approval until they show a favorable benefits-to-cost ratio. He has refused to recognize that these projects represent investments—investments that will be repaid many times over.

But for stubborn resistance by some extremists, water resources development in the Northwest has been a nonpartisan consideration. Knowing that full and comprehensive use of the vast water resources of the region will hasten development of the region people of both parties have stanchly supported all those projects that the Federal Government could best do.

It is difficult to understand why Mr. Eisenhower has not sensed this, has not comprehended the thinking of the vast majority of citizens in the Northwest. It is particularly so when one looks at the results of contests for House and Senate seats in the States of the Northwest since Mr. Eisenhower took office.

The Oregonian, a Republican newspaper, has pointed out that Mr. Eisenhower's opposition to Federal development of water resources in the Northwest is the best available argument for a regional corporation. We thoroughly agree. The best way out for this region inthe face of such presidential opposition is through a regional corporation that would permit the issuing of revenue bonds to finance water resources development projects. Because this would not require continued Federal appropriations, other than for non-reimbursable items, one assumes that the President would not oppose it. He has approved the regional corporation principle of financing in the case of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

This has seemed to us for a long time to be the best way for the Northwest. President Eisenhower's veto of this week makes us doubly certain that it is.

Nixon Culling Communist Bluff

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for inclusion in the RECORD a column entitled "NIXON Culling Communist Bluff," by George Todt, which appeared in the September 8 Valley Times, a newspaper serving California's San Fernando Valley.

I believe this column and the remarks therein, on how we must react to the Communist menace, is very timely in view of Soviet Premier Khrushchev's arrival in this country tomorrow. I believe it will be of interest to the Congress:

NIXON CULLING COMMUNIST BLUFF

(By George Todt)

A significant addition of new ideological concepts in the cold war between the politico-economic systems of the free and slave worlds was contained in a thought-provoking address by Vice President RICHARD NIXON before the 60th national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Los Angeles last week.

It was hardly the same old rehash of the identical mish-mash that we hear so repetitiously during these trying times.

Thanks to the young and erudite Mr. NIXON, we heard something different, and challenging, for a most welcome change.

Now let's try on for size a few of the most important excerpts of his intriguing and interesting address to the VFW:

"I think it is time for us to recognize that the Communists are not so smart and we are not so dumb. * * *

"We in the free world must stand up and fight for our ideas just as the Communists do for theirs. We have allowed too much to go unchallenged, the kind of talk that: 'The free nations are decadent, divided, and weak. The only and best way to progress in the newly developing countries is through communism. Communism rather than freedom is the wave of the future. The Commu-

nist leaders are too crafty and shrewd for us at the conference table. Their education system is superior to ours.'

"We have been on the defense long enough. It is time for us to take the offensive and help make the whole world realize that the Communist idea is not a superidea—that the Communist leaders are not supermen—and that the Soviet Union is not a supernation.

"We should not underestimate the deadly seriousness of the challenge which is presented to us because of the disciplined dedication of the Communist leaders. But let us not make the mistake of meeting that challenge with a negative, defeatist, static posture. * * *

"When Mr. Khrushchev challenges us to peaceful competition, let us go him one better and urge expansion of that competition to include the spiritual as well as the material aspects of our society. Let there be competition between ideas not only in the free world but in the Communist world as well. * * *

"When Mr. Khrushchev says that our grandchildren will live under communism, our answer should be: 'We do not fear the outcome, provided they have the freedom to choose the system they want.' We do not say in reply that his grandchildren will live under capitalism. The very essence of our belief is that we will not impose it on anyone else—and that every people should have the right to choose the kind of economic and political system which best fits its particular problems.

"But this we do believe: that all the people on this earth, including those of the Soviet Union, will inevitably demand and obtain more and more freedom. Because history teaches us that man was made to be free and that freedom—not communism or any other form of dictatorship—is the wave of the future. * * *

"Let our answer to the aggressive tactics of world communism not be simply defensive, negative, and fearful. The best answer to the Communist revolution is the kind of life produced by the American Revolution.

"The most effective antidote to communism is a program of intelligent, articulate, positive Americanism."

Now genius is often let loose in the land under the guise of unpretentious simplicity and a lot of us get fooled that way.

Those who will take the time to analyze very carefully what DICK NIXON has just said in the few telling paragraphs I have excerpted as the ideological meat of his address to the VFW will scarcely need to look further for an example of what I mean.

Actually, this constantly improving young man has laid his strategic groundwork in a sound and even brilliant way for what could indeed become "the wave for the future." Let's hope so.

Here he is preaching positive Americanism of the most constructive variety as the antidote to compulsory Communist one-worldism. He tells us to get off our dimes and toss apathy into the ashcan. In effect, he is saying: "Let's fight."

Well, isn't it about time for us to heed such words as these?

Trust and Confidence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, paying tribute to the career of Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, who will retire on December 31, 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Before this Congress reassembles in January, the active military career of a distinguished American marine will have come to a close.

Gen. Randolph McCall Pate, Commandant of the Marine Corps, will retire on December 31. It is, I believe, only fitting that the Senate pause for a moment in these crowded, final days of this session to pay tribute to this dedicated, devoted and highly competent Marine.

I shall not comment upon his total career. His selection to command the Nation's elite force in readiness is in itself eloquent testimony in the caliber of his earlier service.

Instead, I believe we should give recognition to the innate dignity and professional competence which has characterized General Pate's performance of duty in the four difficult and trying years of our national history during which he has led our incomparable Marines.

They have not been easy years for the Nation. Certainly they have not been easy or quiet ones for our Marine Corps or its Commandant.

General Pate has led a corps which throughout his stewardship has been forced to accept and be prepared for heavier and heavier burdens even as its resources were steadily reduced.

It is in coping with the many problems which have inevitably resulted from meeting increased responsibilities with ever lessening means at hand that General Pate's steadiness and strength of character have proved of such value to the Nation and to his corps.

The corps has responded promptly, effectively and efficiently to every emergency it has been called upon to meet. I am convinced that its very readiness, so constantly stressed by General Pate, has on more than one occasion during his tenure been the decisive factor in crucial moments of international difficulty.

Trust and confidence are the key words in the commission of any officer of our Armed Forces. No words more correctly describe the relationship which has existed between General Pate and the Congress. We learned early, both individually and collectively, that in our dealings with General Pate we could trust his honest, clear, straightforwardness and repose complete confidence in his sound, professional judgment.

Pretense is foreign to his makeup. In any matter concerning the Marine Corps, large or small, we have always been able to feel that from General Pate we could expect a factual report, open discussion, a spirit of helpfulness, the traditional Marine Corps insistence upon serving well and with honor.

This esteem in which he is held is partly reflected in the repeated efforts of the Congress to insure to the Nation a Marine Corps of adequate strength in these perilous times—in our insistence that the status of this always combat-ready expeditionary force continue to be that of a separate service—that funds for its operations not be merged with those of another service, and most certainly in the strong congressional conviction that the Nation's security continues to rest upon the bedrock of properly balanced forces.

General Pate will leave a Marine Corps combat-ready, alert, constantly prepared to the limit of its resources to meet any demand the Nation may place upon it. He may properly take pride in the professional, soldierly, disciplined forces he has commanded so well.

In turn, we and the American people whom we represent, may take a quiet pride in the honored career of this distinguished Marine officer who is about to leave the active service of his corps and country.

I am certain that he will carry with him into retirement the best wishes of all of us who have learned to admire and respect him as one of the very best and very finest of our great American military leaders.

Author of Captive Nations Week Resolution a Virginian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt about the impact made by the Captive Nations Week resolution upon recent international developments. The explosion that this resolution caused in Moscow is sufficient evidence of this. The attack against the resolution in Mr. Khrushchev's article in the advance October issue of Foreign Affairs gives further evidence of the deep penetration it has made under the skin of Communist imperialism and tyranny.

I am proud to say that the author of this resolution, which rings with the principles and ideals of Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln, is a constituent in my district in Virginia. He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University. Dr. Dobriansky is also member of the Republican Committee on Program and Progress, the widely known committee of "44" which has been at work on long-run principles and programs for the Republican Party. As vice chairman of its task force on national security and peace, Dr. Dobriansky has made several contributions to a forthcoming report in this field.

In his academic right, the professor is internationally known for his recent work on "Veblenism: A New Critique." He writes and lectures extensively on the subjects of communism, the Soviet Union, and the non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. In 1957–58 he was a member of the faculty at our National War College.

Relevant to his authorship of the Captive Nations resolution, I include in the RECORD the Chicago Daily Tribune interview of July 25, 1959, the August 6 article by David Lawrence on "U.S. People and Khrushchev," which appeared in the Evening Star, and Dr. Dobriansky's letter to the editor on "Irritating the Bear," that appeared in the July 29 issue of the Washington Post:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, July 25, 1959]

CREDIT PROF WITH CAPTIVE NATIONS IDEA—LAYS KHRUSHCHEV PEEVE TO INCLUSION OF U.S.S.R.

WASHINGTON, July 24.—A professor of Russian economics at Georgetown University here was disclosed Friday as the man who conceived the Captive Nations Week idea that aroused the ire of Russian Nikita Khrushchev.

He is Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, 41, who was born in New York City of parents of Ukrainian descent. Dobriansky first started work on the project more than a year ago.

The office of Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, who guided the resolution in connection with the observance through Congress, confirmed the educator's role.

NAMES NATIONS IN U.S.S.R.

Dobriansky told the Chicago Tribune that the impact of the congressional resolution on Khrushchev apparently lies in the fact that it includes not only the names of recognized satellites of Russia, but also of countries that now are a part of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"The resolution," said Dobriansky, "marks the first time that the United States has recognized by public law that captive nations exist within the U.S.S.R."

A check of the resolution bears Dobriansky out. Mingled in with Poland, Hungary, and other satellite nations are the following Soviet Republics:

White Ruthenia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Idel-Ural, Cossackia, Ukraine, Turkestan, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania. What is Turkestan now once was the Republics of Uzbekistan, Turkmenstan, Taikikistan, Kazakistan, and Kirzikstan.

If Russia had not taken the above countries by force, claimed Dobriansky, it would be a third-rate power now. He said the fact that the resolution contains names of Soviet Republics has received a big play in American foreign language papers read here by the Russian Embassy.

STIRRED BY NAGY FATE

Dobriansky said he got the idea for a congressional resolution recognizing the plight of captive nations at the time of the execution in mid-June of 1958 of Imre Nagy, Premier of Hungary at the time of its unsuccessful revolt against the Kremlin.

He said his first attempt last year consisted of a resolution introduced in the House by Representative ALBERT CRETELLA, Republican, Connecticut, which called for Presidential proclamations on independence or constitution days of 19 captive nations. The resolution died in the House Judiciary Committee on a tie vote. This year he lumped recognition into one Captive Nations Week.

IKE'S WORDING DIFFERENT

Dobriansky pointed out that the congressional resolution refers to Russian communism and Communist Russia as the aggressor in the plight of the captive nations while President Eisenhower's proclamation of Captive Nations Week, based on the resolution, refers to Soviet-dominated countries.

He charged the State Department watered down the proclamation because it is unimaginative in failing to realize the power of non-Russian nationalism, hostility, and resistance in the Soviet Union.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 6, 1959]

U.S. PEOPLE AND KHRUSHCHEV—CITIZENS' DISSENT AGAINST VISIT BY DICTATOR HELD CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

(By David Lawrence)

Do the people of the United States really want Nikita Khrushchev to visit this country? President Eisenhower assumes that they do. The governments of Sweden and other Scandinavian countries recently issued a similar invitation, but the Soviet Premier, after accepting it, decided not to go there because it was evident the people didn't want him to come.

What happened in Sweden between the time the invitation was extended and the announcement that Khrushchev had given up the idea for the present? A letter from Dr. Bela Fabian, written from Geneva a few days ago, tells the story. He is chairman of the Federation of Hungarian Former Political Prisoners and was in Sweden at the time of the planning for the visit of the Soviet Premier. Dr. Fabian writes:

"Naturally, Major General Zacharov, deputy chief of the Soviet security police, knew that the august committees were preparing mass meetings and demonstrations. In Sweden 10 meetings were to be held simultaneously on August 13. The one thing he did not know was whether the Swedish people would demonstrate by ostentatiously staying at home, so that the streets would be empty and there would be no one there except the police, or that there would be enormous crowds who would turn their backs on Khrushchev."

Dr. Fabian writes that the august committees contained a large number of members, among them prominent intellectuals, several Nobel Prize winners, university professors and writers. Many student organizations were represented.

Already there are varying points of view in this country as to what the reaction of the American people will be in the cities to be visited by Khrushchev. Certainly any disorderly demonstrations would only result in worldwide criticism on the theory that the Americans were not as courteous to the Soviet Premier as the people of the Soviet Union have been toward Vice President NIXON. But inside the United States—unlike the situation in the Soviet Union, where everything is controlled by the Government—the people have a right under the Constitution to speak. They have a right to picket peacefully, if they like, with placards expressing their ideas.

If the Scandinavian plan were put into effect in the United States by boycotting the parades or by viewing in silence the public events where Khrushchev makes his appearance, an ordely protest could be registered.

There may be some in this country who are willing to let bygones be bygones, but, among the hundreds of thousands of Americans who came here originally from the lands which now are held captive by the Communist dictatorship, there will be no suppression of emotions. Their point of view toward the Moscow autocracy which has ordered the murder or exile of so many innocent people in the last several years is deeply rooted. They cannot forget.

It is true that, after wars are over, friendly feelings toward former enemies often are developed. But the governments which ruled in Nazi Germany, in militaristic Japan, and Fascist Italy have been removed and free governments established. No such change has occurred in Moscow, where the same kind of regime is in power today as the one that broke the pledges given at Yalta in 1945 and at Geneva in 1955.

"Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all," wrote Dr. L. E. Dobriansky, professor of economics at Georgetown University, in a letter to President Eisenhower dated July 31. The Georgetown professor was the originator of the resolution adopted by Congress to proclaim Captive Nations Week. Expressing the hope that Khrushchev would not be invited to America, Professor Dobriansky added:

"It is patently naive to believe that a visit by the 'hangman of the Ukraine' would add anything to what he already knows about our country. * * * Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires in order to extend his empire."

There is talk now of arranging a parade of hearses in each American city where Khrushchev appears. On each hearse would be placarded the statistics of the number of persons murdered or exiled from each of the 14 captive countries in recent years. This is one type of orderly demonstration.

Another which is being suggested is that memorial services be held throughout the Nation to carry out the spirit of the resolution in behalf of the captive nations adopted overwhelmingly last month by both Houses of Congress. Nationwide prayers for the liberation of the captive peoples, as well as memorial tributes to the many who have been enslaved or killed by the ruthless Communist dictators, would at least let the rest of the world know that, however polite the Government has to be to any visitor, the people here have the right of free speech. They can express their dissent from the position of their Government, which has invited to free America at this crucial time the man who has threatened war unless the Western forces surrender Berlin and who has never withdrawn that threat.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1959]

IRRITATING THE BEAR

Since the idea of a Captive Nations Week originated with me, I should like to reply to the specious and inaccurate arguments you raise against it in your editorial of July 24, "Irritating the Bear."

On the basis of my own lecture experiences, and those of many others, before diverse American groups throughout the country I have no doubt whatsoever that this idea is in complete harmony with the thinking of the vast majority of our people. When the facts of the mortal cold war threat that confronts the security of this Nation are explained to them, they readily preceive the insidious nature of the enemy.

They are not taken in by the wiles of Moscow as, unfortunately, you appear to be. On this observance the Congress and the President are to be commended for reflecting the commonsense an freedom instinct of the American people.

Contrary to your simplistic comment on sympathy for the captive millions, this national observance goes far beyond emotional sympathetic expressions. Mere sympathy is the last thing the captive peoples need. Basically for our own security as well as their freedom aspirations, what the captive nations need most is the denial of what Khrushchev wants most. And these are respectability and legitimacy based on the security of a consolidated empire.

Your editorial reveals a total lack of comprehension regarding the prior and vital importance of all the captive nations, including those in the Soviet Union, for our own security. It indicates, too, an unawareness of what conditions of "neither peace nor war" mean.

Your suggestion that exile emigree groups sponsored this idea is without any factual foundation. One, the Assembly of Captive Nations, which is really a one-third assembly that speaks in behalf of a minority of captive nations, participated in the observance itself. Surely you would not deny them the right to join with us in this important event.

Further statements in the editorial are as groundless as your alleged points of information. In view of your obvious inability to grasp the concept of total cold war, it is not surprising that you deem the liberation policy "misleading and empty." Being a policy for conditions of "neither peace nor war," its meaning and content would naturally escape you. Furthermore, and factually, it is still the official policy of this administration.

To offer, as you do, Moscow's well-controlled "liberalization" as a substitute basis for our foreign policy efforts is, indeed, the height of intellectual folly. When the Marquis de Custine wrote over a century ago that "foreigners who have described Russia have united with the Russians to deceive the world," he was certainly writing for our

time, too. In less conspicuous but more effective ways terrorism prevails under Nikia the Sanguine as much as it did under Stalin in the late 1920's and early 1930's when another generation of misled Americans was cleverly duped.

All this and more demonstrates how a dearth of knowledge about cold war operations, as developed by Russian autocrats for centuries, can produce a deep and perilous naivete. It is neither "plain" nor a "fact" that, short of a hot war, we are powerless to advance the cause of freedom in Moscow's present empire. The more one examines the evidence on the Hungarian revolution, the more one is convinced that we missed a glorious opportunity. We muffed it because in our ignorance of what cold war operations necessitate, we were not prepared for such an opportunity.

Experience and lessons of history should have taught us by now that appeasement and deals on a basis of equality conduce to the very thing we want to avoid, i.e., a hot global war. You evidently have not profited by these criteria. Khrushchev, a political criminal no matter how you paint him, operates from weakness, not strength.

His outbursts against the congressional resolution can only be explained by the fact that the resolution points to his greatest weakness, namely the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. Without these nations, Russia would be a second or third rate power. The spread of such understanding exposes the fiction of equating the United States and the U.S.S.R. as two nations in supposedly peaceful competition.

In Moscow, Mr. NIXON should know better than to perpetuate this fiction. For, in truth, the cold war struggle is between our Nation and Nikita's substrate empire. It is the effect that this will have on his propaganda ruse that disturbs him most. No amount of sputniks, ICBM's, luniks, or grandiose economic plans can conceal this deep weakness in Moscow's position.

When you raise the scare of provocation and a hot war in this matter, you are concealing either your own lack of knowledge or a fear to face basic truths. Neither is of service to our freedom and survival. Don't worry, this action of Congress will not lead to a hot war. In fact, it works against it-and also in our decided favor in the cold war. Believe me, we are not trying to irritate the Bear whose appetite you wish to appease. Commonsense urges us properly to cage him so that you will not fall prey to him.

DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY.

The Future of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, an old acquaintance and friend of mine, Mr. Robert Harriss, is among the businessmen who have a deep concern for the future of agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement that he has prepared for presentation to the Senate and House Agriculture Committees.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESTROY AGRICULTURE AND DESTROY AMERICA

(Statement by Robert M. Harriss sent to the U.S. Senate Agriculture Committee and the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee)

Gentlemen, I am a native Texan, but now a resident of Florida. I have been interested in agriculture for the past 40 years and have farms and ranches in Texas, Florida, and old Mexico. I have also had experience in foreign exchange, currencies, and exporting and banking.

Agriculture being our greatest and basic industry upon which the existence of our Nation depends, I believe we agree that this problem should be given first consideration. It is all vital to our national security. I believe if we destroy agriculture we destroy America.

I also believe we will agree that paying our farmers not to produce for the past 25 years has proved uneconomic and destructive. It is against nature's or divine law. While we have been paying our farmers not to produce, Communist Russia and Communist China have been doing everything possible to increase their agricultural production. Our present surpluses are not a liability but could prove one of our greatest assets in combating communism, provided a constructive program is adopted for the disposal of same among the starving, hungry, and needy of the world.

I believe you will agree the American farmer, the man who is feeding and clothing the Nation is entitled to a fair or parity price on that portion of his major nonperishable commodities domestically consumed and leave him a freeman to compete in the world markets at world prices on any surpluses produced above his allotment for domestic consumption. Such a program would be rather simple in administering and would save the Government and taxpayers billions of dollars. If the farmer produced in excess of his domestic allotment he would have the option of either selling it in the world market at world prices or holding his surplus against his allotment for the following year. If the domestic consumption should prove less than anticipated then the excess production could be held by the Government for a reduction in the allotment for the following year. If the domestic consumption should prove more than the allotment, then the farmer or the Government could be permitted to sell the shortage out of their surplus.

Regarding the existing surpluses in major nonperishable commodities, the selling of them should not be left to the discretion of any one man. A portion of them should be stockpiled for national emergency and the selling of the remainder should be definitely fixed equally over a 5-or 10-year period but only for disposal in the world markets.

To facilitate the disposal of existing surpluses three things should be done without delay:

1. Government credit insurance to American exporters on liberal terms guaranteed by reputable foreign buyers.

2. Long-term loans with acceptance of foreign currency of friendly free nations as collateral.

3. Outright gifts to the people of certain nations who are in dire need of food and clothing and under the control of our Government.

Regarding the perishable crops: It would be impracticable to have a domestic allotment on these. However, I think you will agree that our farmers are entitled to the domestic market on these crops and should be fairly protected against the importation of perishable crops from foreign countries that they can produce with their cheap labor and low taxes at much less than our American farmers with high labor and standard of living and taxes. Many of our American manufacturers are now beginning to find that they cannot compete with foreign nations for this same reason. In a recent article Mr. Leslie Gould, one of the outstanding financial authorities in the country, stated, "Today, foreign steel producers can and are underselling American companies in the domestic market and in neighboring Canada. The same for many other goods."

There may be opposition from certain foreign sources regarding adoption of the domestic allotment plan and the orderly disposal of existing surplus commodities. However, why should we permit foreign sources to dictate our economic and agricultural program. Why should the domestic market not be protected for our own farmers at fair or parity prices and why should they not be left free men to compete in the world market at world prices on any surpluses.

In connection with the foregoing it would be well for us to take into consideration the following farm and agricultural statistics:

According to Government figures the national income has increased 100 percent during the past 12 years and at the same time agricultural income has declined 20 percent, and to make the situation worse the purchasing power of the paper dollar they receive has declined 33 percent. In other words, in terms of dollar purchasing power agriculture is receiving only about half of what they received 12 years ago. The farmers' situation is even worse. According to Government figures, the net farm income, compared to national income, was 104 percent more 12 years ago and, considering the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, he is only receiving a net income of about one-third what he received 12 years ago. Is it any wonder that during these 12 years the farm population has declined more than 6,500,000 despite the increase in the national population from 144 million to 174 million? Has not the influx of farm population to the cities and factories had a direct influence on unemployment and relief?

I do not believe the domestic allotment program would be the fundamental solution of our economic troubles, but it would be helpful and constructive for agriculture and our conomy and save the Government and the taxpayers billions of dollars.

I believe the most helpful step that could be taken for a sound national recovery would be a free gold market. Since the value of gold was arbitrarily fixed 25 years ago, the general price level and labor costs have risen about 300 percent, while the only recognized medium of exchange—gold, has been arbitrarily pegged at $35 per ounce. How can we have a sound recovery in our country or world recovery until we have a free medium of exchange on which exports and imports and world trade is based—gold. This would naturally result in a higher price for gold in terms of the unredeemable paper dollar, which would be essentially helpful not only to agriculture, industry, business, and labor, but a sound national and world recovery. This because such a free gold market would permit foreign nations to buy more of our agricultural and manufactured products for less gold. During the past 24 months we have been losing gold at an alarming rate; about $3 billion of gold has been lost during this period. In Associated Press, June 24, 1959, article by Mr. Sam Dawson, he stated "Uncle Sam's stock of gold is dropping below $20 billion for the first time since 1940, when it was nearly $25 billion. At the same time total payments by the United States to other nations continue to exceed receipts from them. Latests figures show exports slipping while imports hold high." New York Times article on financial page, June 25, 1959, also

stated U.S. gold stock was below $20 billion for the first time since 1940. About one-half the gold in the United States is earmarked or belongs to foreigners or foreign governments. Why wait for the inevitable to happan and, in the meantime permit confusion and inflation and economic conditions to grow worse? Until we establish a free gold market and find out what the paper dollar is worth in terms of gold, economists whose opinion I value and agree with, believe the inflation and debasement of the paper dollar will continue.

Some argue that because England, Canada, Australia, South Africa, Russia, and other countries urge higher price gold we should not cooperate in same. They also argue it would be helpful to Communist Russia. May it not be the case that because Communist Russia advocated higher price gold they do not want it because they know their advocacy would be a handicap in bringing it about? Also higher price gold is not important to Communist Russia as the free world, because Communist Russia produces gold with slave labor. The record shows the present price of gold is destroying the gold mining industry in the United States and adversely affecting allied mining. Eighteen years ago we produced 270 percent more gold than now. In any event we own a large part of the gold. Therefore, higher price gold would be helpful to our exports of agriculture, manufactured goods and our economy; also a free gold market is essential to free trade. In the long run this would be most detrimental to Communist Russia.

Not long ago Dr. Ludwig Erhard, Economic Minister om West Germany, who is credited with engineering Germany's prosperity to its present world position, when asked if he saw any end to the gradual decline in the purchasing power of money, replied: "There is no way of knowing whether the dangerous trend toward inflation will come to an end, so long as there is no real progress toward making currencies freely convertible into gold." Recently I attended an all-day seminar on the gold, dollar, and inflation question given by Dr. Franz Pick, who is considered one of the outstanding world authorities on gold and the money question. Dr. Pick was of the opinion that inflation, debasement of the dollar and confusion would continue and grow worse until we had higher price gold. With your permission I would like to leave a few articles that have a direct bearing on Dr. Erhard's and Dr. Pick's statements, if you desire them for the record.

As some of us may remember, in March 1933, when our country was in the depths of the worst depression in history, we were forced to place an embargo against the exportation of our gold. This was promptly followed by unbelievable economic recovery in agriculture, industry, business, and employment.

Economists, whose opinions I value, do not advocate the arbitrary raising and pegging the price of gold at a fixed price. We advocate a constructive monetary policy on gold, medium of exchange for 6,000 years; first, an embargo on the exportation of our gold followed by a free gold market, to determine what the value of the unredeemable paper dollar is worth in terms of gold. When this has been determined we can return to redeemable currency and with economy in Government and a balanced budget. We can go forward with a sound prosperity for agriculture, industry, and world trade and recovery.

Attached are some statistics, reports, and data, substantiating the foregoing, which I believe conclusively prove:

1. That inflation will continue as long as we are on a paper unredeemable dollar and end in disaster.
2. That in order to return to redeemable currency we must have higher priced gold.
3. We should stop the export of gold until it can be determined what the dollar is actually worth in terms of gold.
4. That higher priced gold would be of great benefit to agriculture, industry, and labor because it would make it possible for foreign countries to buy more of our surplus commodities and goods and make it more difficult to dump cheap foreign products on the American market.
5. On pages 9 and 10 of the gold report it shows the falsity of the Communist propaganda that higher priced gold would help Communist Russia and that the reverse is true—that higher priced gold would be of great benefit to the economy of our country, the free nations, and damaging to Communist Russia and other Communist countries.

EXHIBITS ATTACHED TO STATEMENT OF ROBERT M. HARRISS

1. U.S. figures, agricultural income, July 1958.
2. U.S. figures, farm income and population, July 1958.
3. U.S. figures, gross and net farm operator's income, July 1958.
4. Dr. Franz Pick figures, March 1959.
5. New York Times article, June 26, 1959.
6. New York World-Telegram Sun article, June 24, 1959.
7. The Gold Report, June 1, 1959.
8. Shields & Co. market report, June 2, 1959.
9. International gold market, Toronto, Canada.
10. Sears article in Commercial and Financial Chronicle, May 14, 1959.
11. Dr. Pick's article in the Northern Miner, April 23, 1959.
12. Gould article New York Journal American, June 15, 1959.
13. Dr. Rumely's telegram to President Eisenhower, March 10, 1958.
14. Extract from Robert M. Harriss' statement before the House Ways and Means Committe, May 3, 1932.
15. Extracts from Robert M. Harriss' radio address, station WOR, New York, February 17, 1935.
16. Gold report by Loyd L. Parker, August 21, 1959.
17. Gold reserve in Sunday New York Times, September 6, 1959.

Appropriations for Medical Research

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a letter that I have received from our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] conveying to me information what his subcommittee did in relation to appropriations for medical research. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] is entitled to the thanks of the American people for his great leadership in this great field of such vast importance to the American people and, in fact, to human beings throughout the world. As the result of appropriations made by the Congress, under the leadership of JOHN FOGARTY, great advances have been made in medical research, all beneficial to sick and suffering human beings.

This action alone is one of the great contributions of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. The information of the action of this Congress, in this important field, should be disseminated as broadly as possible.

AUGUST 19, 1959.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This is in reply to your recent note regarding appropriations that this session of Congress has made for certain public health programs.

Medical research undoubtedly attracts the attention and interest of the people to a greater extent than any other program in this field. The Federal Government's activity in medical research is largely centered in the National Institutes of Health. The following table will summarize, statistically, the appropriatiosn made for N.I.H. this year compared with the President's budget and last year's appropriation.

	Appropriation for fiscal year 1959	President's budget for fiscal year 1960	Appropriation for fiscal year 1960	Appropriation for 1960 compared with—	
				Appropriation for 1959	President's budget for 1960
General research	$28,974,000	$28,974,000	$45,994,000	+$17,020,000	+$17,020,000
Cancer	75,268,000	75,218,000	91,257,000	+15,989,000	+16,039,000
Mental health	52,419,000	52,384,000	68,090,000	+15,671,000	+15,706,000
Heart	45,613,000	45,594,000	62,237,000	+16,624,000	+16,643,000
Dental health	7,420,000	7,420,000	10,019,000	+2,599,000	+2,599,000
Arthritis and metabolic diseases	31,215,000	31,215,000	46,862,000	+15,647,000	+15,647,000
Allergy and infectious diseases	24,071,000	24,071,000	34,054,000	+9,983,000	+9,983,000
Neurology and blindness	29,403,000	29,403,000	41,487,000	+12,084,000	+12,084,000
Total	294,383,000	294,279,000	400,000,000	+105,617,000	+105,721,000

The budget for 1960 appeared on the surface to represent a leveling off of our medical research program but actually it would have been a definite and significant backward step. In the hearings, we developed the fact that increased costs in 1960 would amount to over $15 million which, under the budget, could have been met only by cutting back the level of medical research. It was further developed that the budget actually lacked more than $2 million of being adequate just to finance the

projects already approved in 1959 and would not allow for any new projects.

The President indicated, in his budget message, that he was doubtful concerning the adequacy of the amounts requested for the National Institutes of Health. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in his testimony on the budget, indicated on 15 separate occasions that the budget for National Institutes of Health was not necessarily final. His testimony left no doubt that he hoped to secure approval of an upward adjustment. The National Institutes of Health had submitted to the Secretary a proposal for an amendment to the budget to increase the requests for the various institutes. The committee finally recessed hearings to give the executive branch time to study the proposed amendment and send a more nearly adequate budget to the Congress. However, no revision was ever submitted.

The increase of almost $106 million which Congress made in the budget for medical research was almost unanimously agreed to. But there are a few in Congress and elsewhere who criticize this increase on the ground that we should economize and that such increases in the budget are inflationary. Such specious reasoning hardly deserves rebuttal. It is difficult to conceive of anything more anti-inflationary than a successful medical research program. It is obvious that disability is doubly inflationary—it reduces tax revenue on the one hand, and it increases the expenses of government on the other. It is equally obvious that medical research, which reduces disability and lengthens productive life, is doubly anti-inflationary—it increases tax revenue on the one hand, and decreases the expenses of government on the other.

But we would be less than human if we looked only at the economic side of the picture. It is estimated that 16 million of our people suffer in some degree from mental disorders. Almost as many are partially or totally disabled by diseases of the heart and the circulatory system, including cerebral vascular diseases. There are 11 millions of our citizens suffering from arthritis and rheumatic diseases. Cancer afflicts 700,000 and annually kills 250,000 people in this country.

Finding the answers to these and other diseases means more to humanity than it would ever be possible to measure in dollars and cents. And our medical scientists are finding the answers. The tendency is to think of the many horrible afflictions for which we do not have the answer and overlook the really wonderful progress that has been made. For example, 1 cancer patient out of 3 can now be saved as compared to 1 out of 4 in 1938. Because of new medical and surgical treatment developed during the last few years, approximately 80 percent of all people with epilepsy are capable of regular, productive employment. Research has led to methods that can reduce tooth decay by 50 percent. The major cause of blindness among infants has been eliminated. With new drugs and methods of treatment and diagnosis, it is possible to prevent crippling in 70 percent of the patients suffering from rheumatic disease. The hearings before the Committee on Appropriations contain literally hundreds of pages describing these and many, many other advances that have been made possible, to a considerable degree, by the Federal support of this program.

The Congress can certainly take a great deal of pride in the results of its work on these appropriations. We have provided for real progress in a field which is perhaps more important than any other to the health and welfare of not only our people, but people throughout the world.

There are other, closely related, Federal programs for which grossly inadequate provision was made in the budget. The work that this Congress did and the final action it took on these programs is obviously going to result in better medical services and better health for the people of this country.

In 1956 the 84th Congress passed the Health Research Facilities Act which authorized the appropriation of $30 million per year for grants, on a matching basis, for the construction of health research facilities. Experience has shown that even this amount falls far short of actually meeting the need. Unfinanced applications and formal notices of intention to file applications total about $80 million. But the President's budget sought to cut back the rate of progress we have been making by recommending an appropriation of only $20 million. This was corrected by Congress. The full $30 million was actualy made available for this essential program.

There is no Federal program in this area that has met with more enthusiastic support throughout the Nation than the Hill-Burton hospital construction program. This is another matching grant program with the Federal funds being matched by over 2 to 1. Previous Congresses have authorized a total annual appropriation of $211,200,000. That this is a conservative amount compared with the need is clearly shown by two facts—(1) the States and localities are in a position to match $879,960,000 during the next 2 fiscal years if there were no limitation on Federal appropriations; and (2) there is a shortage of 867,000 hospital bed capacity in the hospitals we have in this country today. Yet, in the face of these facts, the budget requested only $101,200,000, only half of the authorization and, according to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the amount recommended would not provide for any reduction at all in the backlog of need since it would only provide for the normal increase in the population and for replacement of hospitals destroyed by fire, and so forth.

Here again, the Congress corrected the obvious inadequacy of the budget and appropriated $186,200,000. There can be no doubt that the people will benefit from this action.

Because the pollution of our streams had become a national disgrace, Congress, in 1956, passed Public Law 660 which authorized the appropriation of $50 million annually to be granted, on a matching basis, for the construction of sewage treatment plants. That even this sum is inadequate is attested by the enormous backlog of applications that cannot be financed even though Congress has provided the full amount authorized each year since the law was passed. The House, of course, has recognized this by passing a bill this year to double the authorization. In the face of the great need and the great, ever-increasing popularity of this program, the budget recommended an appropriation of $20 million, a cutback of over half. Again Congress responded to the proven need and the obvious will of the Nation, and corrected the gross inadequacy of the budget. The final action of Congress provided the maximum authorization of $50 million.

I hope that the above will be helpful to you. If there is anything additional that I can do I would appreciate your letting me know.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. FOGARTY.

If Integration Needs Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent news column by Mr. George Todt which appeared in the September 11, 1959, issue of the Valley Times of North Hollywood, Calif. The column is entitled "If Integration Needs Force."

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the North Hollywood (Calif.), Valley Times, Sept. 11, 1959]

IF INTEGRATION NEEDS FORCE

(By George Todt)

Will Congress finish its business this weekend?

Admittedly—this is a goal aimed at getting out of Washingtn before Nikky arrives for fear the Red boss might be asked to address our legislators on Capitol Hill—much will depend upon the way the red hot issue of legislation on civil rights goes.

The fight over integration of schools and the controversial Civil Rights Commission is extremely touchy with neither side in a mood to accept dictation from the other.

The result could be a filibuster although, admittedly, the chances are that there will not be one. But you never can tell about issues as explosive beneath the surface as this one.

Over the last 5 years we have had more racial friction in our country than in all of our past history put together.

This is a sad commentary on our times and none are happier about it than are the leaders of international communism. They have been plumping for racial agitation in the United States for decades.

Well, now they've got it. Tovarisch, comrades.

Personally, I favor voluntary integration where it stems from mutual consent and from the heart. But not the kind which has to be forced upon those who don't want it. The latter is not the American way based upon freedom of choice through moral conscience.

How do the Negroes in the South feel about this matter?

This is a good question and an Associated Press story I noted recently from the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, datelined September 2, may give us a most revealing insight into this thought-provoking matter.

Here's the story, written in Birmingham, Ala., with the AP's headline: "Negroes Don't Want Forced Integration."

"A Negro group wired President Eisenhower Tuesday that most southern Negroes don't want forced integration. And the group asked for a Government-sponsored poll of southern Negroes to prove the point.

"The statement and the request were included in a 350-word telegram sent to Eisenhower by the Southern Negro Improvement Association of Alabama.

"Samuel H. Moore, of Birmingham, president of the group, said it had more than 5,000 members in Alabama.

"Moore told the President: 'I assure you that both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in public schools. Racial hate and racial prejudice that was dead is now reconstructed. Threat of forceful integration has created fear and hate in many of our former white friends.'

"Moore said he put these question to the President: 'Since this is free America, why not put your racial policy upon voluntary action of the citizens, not forceful compulsion? Why not have the Government take a poll of the southern Negroes?'

"Moore said that such a poll should be confined to southern Negroes because 'our northern Negro brothers do not live in the South and therefore do not understand our southern bicultural socitey.'

"He urged the President 'not to use force to integrate the schools and deny our race a major symbol of our progress—all-Negro schools.'

"Moore said, 'for lasting and enduring advancement of our race our progress must be achieved with good will from the white people among which we must live.'"

It ought to appear strange indeed to unbiased observers that the greatest demand for forced integration is emanating out of New York City—an area which has produced such dismal results from its program of forced integration dictated by political pressures.

Consider the words of the eminent New York syndicated columnist, Raymond Moley, who recently wrote:

"A count of 22,000 felonies by youths between 16 and 20, and the more shocking total of 14,700 felonies by children under 16 is the disgraceful harvest of politics and sentimentality in New York. Politics, to grab manageable votes, opened the doors. It is not necessary for the city to declare a curfew. Armed juvenile gangsters have already taken care of that. The people are already afraid to go out at night."

Few apt students of the incredibly bad New York situation have failed to perceive that forced integration is very much a factor in this deplorable instance.

Can the southern people—both Negro and white—be blamed for working against the New York model which has produced such an awful record of juvenile delinquency?

When will it be understood outside the South that the southern Negro has his pride as much as the white man—and doesn't care to be yoked unequally in an enforced mismatch by judicial decree?

Why do we permit racial agitators to sow hate where it didn't exist before?

Shall we ask Ivan?

The Real Democrat Spending Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, September 10, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of common knowledge that the Republican administration since 1953 has been far more concerned with controlling spending and inflation than the preceding Democrat administrations. The record of the two parties in Congress is equally evident, and recent efforts to create confusion by publishing misleading tables on the last page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should fool no one.

Clear evidence of the Democrat spending record and the real record of Republican responsibility is unmistakable when we use "constant dollar" figures for comparison instead of fluctuating, inflated dollars. To do this we select some particular year as an anchor, and express expenditures for all other years in terms of that year's dollars. For example, let us use 1954 dollars and see how much the budget has actually gone up or down each year.

Table No. 1 which I am inserting in the RECORD shows that from 1933 to 1953 Federal spending in constant dollars rose 524 percent.

Let us subdivide this 20-year period of the New Deal-Fair Deal and look more closely at the runaway spending trend.

In the first 6 years to 1939, spending rose 57 percent. In the next 10 years to 1949, it rose 137 percent. In the final 4 years to 1953, it rose another 68 percent.

But, a dramatic reversal occurred under the Republican administration. By fiscal year 1959, Federal spending in these real terms, had been cut a sharp 10 percent.

Another basis of comparison would take into consideartion the annual increase in population. In other words we should look at the number of citizens for whom the Federal Government must provide services, and who are available to share the burden of the expenses involved. Table No. 2, which I am inserting in the RECORD, shows that under Democrat administrations the Federal budget outlays per capita rose nearly 400 percent. Under the present Republican administration nearly one-fifth of that rise has been cut back. This is a remarkable and immediate reversal of the preceding trend.

Now, what is the outlook for fiscal year 1960? The President's budget proposes expenditures of $77,030 million. If this Congress has not exceeded that budget, Federal spending per capita this year will be cut by nearly one-fourth of what it was in 1953.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have a program of fiscal responsibility. If the spenders will not cooperate in keeping the Federal budget and the national economy on a sound basis, they should at least agree to the validity of the changing dollar value as an element to be considered when comparing spending records.

The validity of the comparison I am making here should be clearly evident when we remember that we are living on an inflationary plateau built by the Democrats. The administration now responsible for Federal budgets has no choice but to construct its program on that plateau. I am simply stating that the only way to make accurate and reliable comparisons of Democrat and Republican spending is by including the vast inflationary accumulations in the economy put there during and by Democrat administrations, with which this Republican administration must live.

TABLE 1

Time period	Change in total Federal budget expenditures in dollars of constant purchasing power	Change in per capita Federal budget expenditures in dollars of constant purchasing power
1933–39	Up 57 percent in 6 years	Up 50 percent.
1939–49	Up 137 percent in 10 years	Up 109 percent.
1949–53	Up 68 percent in 4 years	Up 58 percent.
1953–58	Down 19 percent in 5 years	Down 26 percent.
1953–59	Down 10 percent in 6 years	Down 19 percent.
[1] 1953–60	Down 14 percent in 7 years	Down 24 percent.

[1] Based on budget estimate.

TABLE 2

Fiscal year	Total Federal budget expenditures in millions of current dollars	Total Federal budget expenditures in millions of 1954 dollars	Federal budget expenditures per capita in 1954 dollars	Total population residing in the United States (thousands)
1929	$3,127	$7,027	$57.71	121,770
1930	3,320	7,943	64.54	123,077
1931	3,577	8,578	69.16	124,040
1932	4,659	12,196	97.69	124,840
1933	4,623	12,070	96.11	125,579
1934	6,694	15,495	122.61	126,374
1935	6,521	14,922	117.27	127,250
1936	8,493	18,109	141.42	128,053
1937	7,756	16,397	127.28	128,825
1938	6,792	14,733	113.48	129,825
1939	8,858	18,927	144.61	130,880
1940	9,062	19,281	146.12	131,954
1941	13,262	24,069	180.81	133,121
1942	34,046	55,450	414.05	133,920
1943	79,407	121,047	901.68	134,245
1944	95,059	147,836	1,112.51	132,885
1945	98,416	154,016	1,162.55	132,481
1946	60,448	82,805	591.24	140,054
1947	39,032	48,307	336.76	143,446
1948	33,069	39,181	268.10	146,093
1949	39,507	44,894	301.98	148,665
1950	39,617	44,215	292.36	151,234
1951	44,058	44,638	291.02	153,384
1952	65,408	65,935	423.31	155,761
1953	74,274	75,329	475.82	158,313
1954	67,772	67,772	420.45	161,191
1955	64,570	62,027	377.52	164,303
1956	66,540	61,158	365.80	167,191
1957	69,433	60,063	352.70	170,293
1958	71,936	61,014	352.15	173,260
1959	80,699	[1] 68,109	[2] 385.99	[2] 176,428
1960	[3] 77,030	[1] 64,677	[3] 360.12	[2] 179,600

[1] Projected on assumed price rise of 0.5 percent per year.
[2] Projected.
[3] Estimated in fiscal year 1960 Budget document.

Explanation of tables: The second column, "Total Federal budget expenditures millions of 1954 dollars," is obtained by dividing the first column by the implicit deflator or Federal purchases of goods and services for the corresponding calendar year. The expenditures and the deflators are obtainable from the economic report except for the latest years. There, the expenditures can be obtained from the budget document, but the deflators have to be projected.

The final column is the population residing in the United States. It is obtainable from the statistical abstract of the United States, except for the most recent years, which can be obtained from the census. The last 2 years have to be projected.

The third column is the second divided by the fourth.

The smaller table of percentages is computed from the larger table.

Premier Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the Hudson Dispatch of Union City, N.J., from one of my constituents, Mr. Samuel W. Silverman. Mr. Silverman, a resident of Point Pleasant Beach, expresses his hope that Americans who come in contact with visiting Premier Khrushchev will show respect for the Premier's official position.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESPECT KHRUSHY

POINT PLEASANT, *August 17, 1959.*

EDITOR, HUDSON DISPATCH:

I take great delight in endorsing editorial, "Let's Keep Our Guard Up All the Time," and your cartoon as well in August 12 issue, and reading the various opinions of the man in the street as to Khrushy visit to this country. Must admit that each one has the right to his opinion. I was against the visit of Khrushy to this country but must bow to the wishes of the majority and respect our President that it may do some good. Anything to bring about world peace is in order.

I agree with Ike—as long as he is coming, show him everything. Let him and the Russians know our strentgh. It can't do any harm. Can't agree with Governor Meyner to have him come to New Jersey—we don't want him here. I fear his visit may cause a great risk as some of our anti-Communist fanatics may not be controlled too well, because many of their relatives died across the sea on Khrushy's account and they may desire to seek revenge.

The majority of us have nothing but complete distaste for this living devil in sheep's clothing who represents nothing but evil; my advice to the American people is to pay very little attention to his visit; treat him with courtesy when you do come in contact with him, at least respect his position in the same way we do all other foreign statesmen. It is the duty of our national and state officials, as well as the officials of all municipalities that he may travel through to treat him with kindness and see that he is well protected from harm, at least while he is in our country.

His visit at least will awaken Russian people that our desire is for justice and peace, not only for ourselves but for the entire world. No public official, elected or appointed, has the right to snub Khrushy on this trip—they do have the right not to extend an open invitation, but if Khrushy desires to visit their municipality the official shall not make any statement indicating their contempt; the public does not have to come in droves to welcome him, but in any event those that do come out to greet him should show respect for his official position.

SAMUEL W. SILVERMAN,
National Director, Department of Americanism, Regular Veterans' Association of the United States.

Letter to Mr. Clyde Ellis, General Manager of the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of a letter I have today directed to the Honorable Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The letter, is self-explanatory and deserves the attention of every Member of Congress.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1959.

MR. CLYDE ELLIS,
General Manager, National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association.

DEAR MR. ELLIS: This letter is being written to you in the spirit of fair play and mutual understanding which should be manifest between your organization and the Members of Congress on strictly a nonpartisan basis if the best interest of REA, RTA, and the country as a whole are to be served.

As you well know, the rural electrification program and the expanding program as assistance in the improvement of rural telephone communications have always been the accomplishment of bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. Democrats and Republicans have joined in advancing these programs and in voting adequate funds for their development. Under Administrators selected both by Democratic and Republican Chief Executives, the programs have prospered and expanded. The statistics clearly demonstrate that the present REA Administrator, David Hamil, for example, has given efficient and sympathetic direction to the REA and RTA programs.

Under Mr. Hamil's administration, processing of loans has been expedited; collections from borrowers have an enviable record; adequate loan funds have been kept available. In the main, relationships between REA and RTA and Members of Congress have historically been friendly and productive regardless of partisanship. It is my conviction—and I hope yours—that they should be kept that way.

I give you this brief review, Mr. Ellis, of facts with which you are, of course, familiar simply to demonstrate the importance of keeping REA and RTA out of politics and free from the sharp repercussions of partisan campaigning which should have no place in worthy programs of this type.

I mention the foregoing because of rumors reaching me that the organization which you head and which draws its support from user-sponsored cooperatives is about to "enter the field of active partisan politics." I am sure this would be a most regrettable development.

On occasion reports have reached me of speeches you have yourself given before REA and RTA groups and annual meetings or of your public writings which carry a slanted political tinge. That, in itself, is most regrettable. I have also heard that some of your associates in the field have similarly shown an increasing tendency to move in the direction of injecting political discussions and considerations into their activities. Complaints of this type continue to reach my office, both from Congressmen who feel aggrieved over an attempt to use REA and RTA for political ax grinding and from REA subscribers who resent it.

Recently, it has been reported you propose to "loan" some of your employees to Democrat candidates for Congress to serve as campaign counselors or managers with the understanding they will be reemployed by you after the elections are over. I am not clear on whose payroll they would serve but assuming they would be taken off your salary lists while so serving such a temporary severance of connection with your office would not divorce them from the serious implications involved. Such a practice would be tantamount, of course, to putting your organization directly into political activity and do serious injury to the productive and effective cooperative support of REA and RTA which has meant so much to this movement in the past and is so necessary to its future development.

As chairman of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee, my responsibility is of course to support Republican candidates for office. All I ask for those I support is the consistent practice of fair play and the proper public identification of all political functionaries involved. Naturally, I do not want your organization or any other nonpolitical group supporting the Democratic candidates as a matter of partisan philosophy or to promote the personal political fortunes of anyone so long as it enjoys the reputation, tax advantages, and safeguards of being a nonprofit and nonpolitical organization. That is simply asking for fair play. To engage in the type of practices mentioned in this communication would, I am sure you must agree, necessitate your forfeiting the position of being a nonpolitical and nonpartisan service organization.

It is for this reason I am writing you this frank and earnest letter. I sincerely hope my reports are inaccurate but they seem sufficiently well founded to warrant this letter which I shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to which I hope you can give me a categorical reply which I shall also be happy to incorporate in the RECORD. I hope your reply will contain complete assurances that I have been falsely informed and that you are not going to besmirch the concept of your organization by making it and its employees and associates the handmaiden or tool of either political party.

Sincerely yours.

Dare Accepted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post and Times Herald contains an excellent letter in response to a recent editorial pertaining to pork barrel politics and the public works appropriation bill. The letter refutes this reference to pork barrel leg-

islation and is another fine addition to the volumes of testimony and facts which support the continued development and conservation of the Nation's natural resources.

The letter is signed by our very distinguished and able chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I was very pleased to see that Senator MURRAY has again spoken out so forcefully in support of our public works programs. Senator MURRAY has no equal in the Senate when it comes to the development of nature's resources in our State and the entire country.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial, appearing in the September 14 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald, appear at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 14, 1959]

DARE ACCEPTED

Your September 10 editorial, "Dare Accepted," imputes "pork-barrel politics" in the Congress on water resource programs as the cause of the double veto of the public works appropriation bill.

I dissent entirely from that interpretation of Congress action on programs for development and conservation of the Nation's water resources. As I stated to the Senate on September 4, "to brand the public works appropriation as overspending in respect to water resources (to quote the veto message) is both false and dangerous. It is dangerous because it threatens to trap us into continuing underdevelopment of our resources, continuing lost production, and lost opportunities to conserve and develop our resources."

The "no new starts" program that has prevailed for 7 years is not an economy program. It is a program that wastes human and natural resources. It does not husband public funds; instead, it minimizes public revenues. This restrictive program hoards money while it dissipates resources.

The paramount issue is that the Nation must maintain the basis of its strength and well-being. National growth requires extension of water resource programs just as it requires expansion of industrial production capacity. This policy is the basis for congressional insistence on "new starts," and on this basis, the Congress overrode the Presidential veto of the public works appropriation bill.

Your editorial argues that the double veto fiasco points to desirability of the item veto procedure. From this conclusion also I wholly dissent, but I do agree that there is need for major change in the approach to resource development programs. On August 17, for myself and 30 other Senators, I introduced legislation (S. 2549) to provide the needed new approach.

All resource programs lag far behind the need for them—in some cases, critically far behind. Properly developed and wisely conserved, our forests, rangelands, minerals, fuels, and the waters of our rivers and lakes can be adequate for a growing population and an expanded economy.

The present problem and the impending crisis are due not to scarcity but to neglect, underdevelopment, and despoliation. For too many years the administration has been looking the other way, and it has made the country live by the rule of "no new starts" no matter how urgently they are needed.

The measure that I have introduced (S. 2549) is comparable in form and structure with the Employment Act of 1946. It seeks for natural resources answers to problems comparable with the employment and economic problems dealt with in the 1946 act. Our experience with that act demonstrates that it provides a workable method. The combination of the Council of Advisers in the White House and the Joint Committee in the Congress provides continuing informed attention to the needs and capabilities of the Nation in the field of natural resources.

It is my intention to proceed this fall with hearings on the proposed Resources and Conservation Act with a view to readying it for enactment during the second session of Congress.

Under the Constitution, Congress has the responsibility to establish the programs for natural resources. The proposed Resources and Conservation Act will make possible exercise of this responsibility on a sound basis, and in a courageous spirit in keeping with the American tradition. This is required to maintain the United States strong at home and abroad—for our own citizens and for the free people everywhere who look to us for support of freedom.

JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
WASHINGTON.

A Source of Water for the Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Sept. 14, 1959]

A SOURCE OF WATER FOR THE LAKES

H. T. Blockley, a Canadian foreign service officer who helped draft the 1950 Niagara Treaty between the United States and Canada, has come forward with an answer to Canadian protests against Chicago's plans for more lake diversion. He said the opposition of his Government to the diversion bill now before Congress is based on emotionalism, not facts.

Mr. Blockley's suggestion is that water from the Albany River, which flows through wilderness into James Bay, could easily be turned backward into Lake Superior, as Canada already is doing with the Ogoki River. This method of conserving water is well known in the Canadian external affairs department and in the Ontario provincial government, he said. Mr. Blockley felt free to advocate the plan only because he has resigned his government job and is moving to California.

His proposal is one of the matters that should be taken up if our State Department ever gets around to negotiating the diversion issue with Canada, as Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has urged. The committee has before it a bill, passed by the House, to permit a slight increase in diversion at Chicago for a one year test.

There is nothing new about the suggestion to use Albany river water to compensate for taking water out of the Great Lakes. As long ago as 1926 Horace Ramey, retired chief engineer of the Chicago sanitary district, wrote an article for an engineering magazine pointing out that it would be possible to get an average flow of 12,000 cubic feet a second out of rivers in the Hudson bay watershed.

In 1939 Canada began doing so without consulting the United States, and since 1954 about 5,000 cubic feet a second have been diverted into Lake Superior from Long lake and the Ogoki river for power purposes. A few years ago when lake levels were high there were many protests against this diversion by lake front property owners in both the United States and Canada, who suffered heavy damages from storms.

Mr. Ramey agrees with Mr. Blockley that it would be a simple matter to turn Albany River water into Lake Superior, if Canada really is worried about the effects of diversion at Chicago. The solution also is well known to the U.S. Army Engineers.

So far it has been impossible for Chicago officials and Illinois members of Congress to explain the problem to the dimwits in our State Department. Twice President Eisenhower has vetoed lake diversion bills on their advice.

Maybe they will listen to a Canadian specialist on the subject of boundary waters. Mr. Blockley should be asked to give a deposition for the State Department, for Senator FULBRIGHT, and for the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Vital First Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the attached comments of Mr. Raymond Moley which appeared in the September 14, 1959 issue of Newsweek magazine.

Mr. Moley is a trustee of Vermont College, a so-called junior college for young women at Montpelier, Vt. I believe that his comments and those of Dr. Ralph E. Noble, president of the college and formerly Vermont's commissioner of education, on the benefits to be derived from a so-called junior college education are of general public benefit, and I commend them especially to the attention of my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Sept. 14, 1959]

THE VITAL FIRST YEARS

(By Raymond Moley)

MONTPELIER, VT.—This month hundreds of thousands of young people are enrolling in college, many for the first time. Parents pause, pen and checkbook in hand, to consider what is ahead. My suggestion is that they realize that the first 2 years are likely to be decisive. Only a little over half the freshmen will graduate—61 percent of the boys, and 48 percent of the girls. Many will regret in later years the diversions and the courses with little relevance to their later life.

Last week in this space I listed some of the problems and shortcomings of the 4-year liberal-arts colleges, their students, and faculties. Largely because of these, there has

grown to maturity over the past 60 years the 2-year junior college designed to round out and conserve what may be the end of the beginning, or the beginning of the end, of formal education. A third of our institution of higher learning are junior colleges attended by a quarter of our students. More than half of them are public and tax-supported. The rest are private. This piece concerns the latter.

Some junior colleges were formerly 4-year institutions where, for a variety of reasons, the final 2 years were amputated. Public institutions predominate in the Middle West and West. But in New England several originated in sectarian seminaries when good public high schools were scarce. I have selected Vermont College, here in Montpelier, to illustrate what a good junior college does and can do.

A GOOD JUNIOR COLLEGE

This college today materializes the educational ideals of a wise, competent, conservative, experienced educator, Dr. Ralph E. Noble, who 10 years ago resigned as Vermont's Commissioner of Education to become its president. The foundations were laid in 1865 as "the Vermont Conference and Female Seminary" by members of the Methodist clergy. Later it became Montpelier Seminary for young men and women. In 1941 it became Vermont Junior College, and in 1953, Vermont College. Its student body consists of about 325 young women.

In these 10 years, with the aid of individuals and local financial institutions, a group of fine buildings have been built which combine simplicity, utility, and rare beauty and taste. The college stands on a hill at the edge of the State capital.

The curriculum is designed to meet the needs of three classes of students: Those who will transfer after graduation to a 4-year liberal arts college, those who neither want nor need more than 2 years, and those whose purpose is to combine some liberal arts courses with preparation for a specific vocation. For the latter, preliminary training is provided for teachers of nursery schools, for secretarial assistants for physicians and dentists, hospital laboratories, and public health offices. Graduates receive the degrees of associate in arts or associate in science.

YOUTH PLUS MATURITY

About 25 percent of the graduates transfer to some form of advanced education. Of these, most go on in liberal arts colleges, others continue their vocational training. Many 4-year colleges welcome such transfers to help fill the ranks thinned by failures and dropouts.

Students from the local region or even Vermont are in the minority. The larger number of students come from New York, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Connecticut.

"The junior college," says Dr. Noble, "has been in existence long enough to have proven policies, but not yet so long as to be enslaved by tradition. It is old enough to bear mature responsibility, yet young enough to respond readily to the changing character of American life. Its ideal is the effective citizen, able to contribute constructively to the civic, economic, spiritual, and cultural life of the community."

This college is for women. But the general pattern applies with equal pertinence to young men. A 2-year college provides an alternative to the overextended, presently experimental, and expensive offerings of many 4-year institutions or a preparation for the final 2 years of same. With military service looming for most young men, 2 good years of college may be a solution to their serious problem.

Summary of 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I submit herewith a summary of the 86th Congress, 1st session, which I am sending to my constituents in the 10th District of California.

ON CAPITOL HILL WITH "CHARLIE" GUBSER, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS 10TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

SEPTEMBER 13, 1959.

DEAR FRIENDS: This letter is an effort to render a concise report on a session of your Congress as it approaches adjournment. I hope it is useful.

Getting water for the 10th District continues to be my most important activity. On the reverse side you will find a complete progress report.

Local projects for flood control, harbors, armory and hospital construction are ahead of legislative timetable. Progress is very satisfactory.

The national interest was not so well served. Handling of your tax money this session was not entirely in your best interest. With others I consistently voted for economy but we were outnumbered.

Did Congress cut budget? Technically yes, but practically no. Ten percent of alleged billion-dollar cut was only postponement of present obligation which must be paid next year. Cuts were in items stretching beyond this year while increases were for current items. This will increase debt and inflation.

Backdoor spending is a way Congress spends without having it appear in the budget. A new program may not cost much this year but it commits us to tremendous future costs. Often the Treasury is required to pay for these programs directly. This is backdoor spending. Congress has already "built in" $2¼ billion in budget increases for next year.

Nothing is free from Uncle Sam. He can only give what he takes from you in taxes less the handling charge. If America would just accept this fact we could handle problems locally at less cost and prevent more debt and inflation.

Landrum-Griffin bill was a victory for the American people. This bill protects the right to strike and picket in primary labor disputes; also protects innocent parties. It guarantees union members more rights; protects them from men like James Hoffa. Despite contrary propaganda it will not hurt legitimate unions and is in the people's best interest.

Cold war seems thawed but don't be fooled. We must remain strong to maintain peace. As Armed Services Committee member I believe we are strong; getting stronger.

Other laws enacted: Highway program continued with new gas tax caused by deficit financing last year. Some bond interest rates raised to boost lagging sales. Not raising others will put small business in competition with Government for short term credit making special session possible. VA pensions raised. Housing bill finally passed with some new public housing, reasonable funds for urban renewal and college housing. Hawaiian statehood. Draft law extended.

Things Congress didn't do: Civil rights and aid to education postponed to next year. Also restriction of passports to Communists and mailing of obscene literature. Farm problem still unsolved. Unfortunately price supports will continue.

Space limitations have forced me to generalize. For details please write me. Also please send your address if you'd like to receive On Capitol Hill regularly.

Before closing let me say "thanks" for the privilege of representing you.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. GUBSER.

SPECIAL REPORT FROM WASHINGTON: ACTION TO SOLVE OUR LOCAL WATER PROBLEM

Six long years of effort directed toward making it possible for my district to be served with imported water have definitely begun to pay off as several major hurdles were cleared this session. As we move closer to the realization of the Pacheco Tunnel project, I've prepared this brief review to show how far we have progressed.

As you know, I successfully sponsored a resolution in August 1958, which directed the Bureau of Reclamation to make a feasibility study of the Pacheco Tunnel project. The cost of this study was to be shared equally by the Federal Government and local agencies in the proposed project service area. When the Tricounty Water Authority quickly agreed to cooperate in the study and carry the local share of the financial burden, you can see that we had passed a most important milestone on the road to a water project.

San Luis legislation: This session, hearings were reopened on legislation to extend the Central Valley project by constructing the San Luis unit. I submitted an amendment which was accepted by the authors of this San Luis legislation. My amendment called for the construction of the Pacheo Tunnel as part of the San Luis unit, when a favorable feasibility study on the Pacheco Tunnel is completed.

The Senate Interior Committee reviewed the bill with my amendment and gave its approval to the revised bill. A delegation of tricounty representatives, which included Frank J. Polak, Francis Silliman, Dean George L. Sullivan, and Albert T. Henley, helped me immeasurably with their supporting testimony before this committee. I cannot express enough gratitude for the outstanding support given by these men.

The House committee, before which we also testified, adopted slightly different language regarding the Pacheco Tunnel but both bills recognize the project as necessary and a logical part of the San Luis unit. Final action is expected in January. I am confident that Pacheco will be authorized as a Federal project.

Meanwhile, action on the Pacheco project is moving along at an accelerated pace. The Bureau of Reclamation and the Tricounty Water Authority have been going ahead in high gear on the joint feasibility study. Secretary of the Interior Seaton has personally promised me he will give the study high priority in order to hasten authorization and construction.

The Tricounty Water Authority has turned over a large number of important engineering studies on the Pacheco Tunnel to the Bureau of Reclamation. The two agencies are working in close cooperation to develop the complete project requirements. The pace that has been set indicates that every effort is being made to complete this important work well before the time we had expected.

Some people seem to think that there is a sharp controversy between the Pacheco Tunnel project and the South Bay Aqueduct. In my opinion, there should be no argument because in any event the Pacheco project must be built. I say must be built because it is the only means by which San Benito, Santa Cruz, and Monterey Counties can be served with imported water. The two State plans for water service to these areas recognize this concept for they both employ a Pacheco Pass tunnel route for water importation.

I am not going to take the position of telling local citizens what they should do to solve their water importation problems but I definitely believe that it is my responsibility to make Pacheco project possible. In other words, I will continue to work to open a door and it is your decision as to whether or not you wish to use it.

The County Agent and Vocational Agriculture Teacher Magazine, the Des Moines Register and the Farmers Union Score Antifarmer Policies of U.S. Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President—

Is the Department of Agriculture antifarmer? If it is not—it certainly acts like it is.

The words I have just read were not written by me, nor am I the only one whose thinking they represent. The report detailing just how the Department of Agriculture has followed policies that are unfriendly to America's farm families is printed in a very significant article in the September 1959 edition of the National Union Farmer.

This excellent article, which was written by Washington farm reporter John Harms and was originally published in the County Agent and Vocational Agriculture Teacher magazine, points out:

The USDA is one of several agencies in the Government charged with running programs concerning special factors of the economy. For example, the Labor Department has the interests of the city worker at heart (and favors the minimum wage), the Veterans' Administration looks after the veterans (and refrains from asking for big cuts in benefits), and the Commerce Department is on the side of business and industry (and has never advocated an end to shipping subsidies or oil depletion allowances). The State Department, for its part, fights for foreign aid as though its top officials were running for election in foreign countries. The USDA, on the other hand, has a 6-year record of advocating legislative changes intended to withdraw benefits from the industry for whom it acts as spokesman.

Mr. President, in these few words which I have just read, Mr. Harms has put his pen on the major trouble with our national agricultural program today. Appointing Agriculture Secretary Ezra Benson to administer national farm laws in which he has no faith is about as sensical as naming a Moslem Muezzin to head the Baptist Church in America.

The article also points out:

Perhaps the biggest disservice USDA has performed for farmers in the damaging publicity which it not only condones, but actually put out in the form of public speeches.

This practice of the USDA in propagandizing against the farmers brings up another important article, also reprinted in the September 1959 edition of the National Union Farmer. This article, written by Charles Bailey, Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register, sets forth an even dozen false and misleading statements about agriculture which are being circulated these days and debunks every one of them.

As we approach the close of the 1st session of this 86th Congress, one of the genuine disappointments to most of us is that we have not enacted a new, workable farm program. We all know that this is a field vitally in need of remedial legislation, one as important as the labor legislation which took much of our time and effort this session.

In this period of alltime high cost of living, the plight of the family farm operator has gone from bad to worse. During President Truman's last 4-year term, net farm income averaged $14.3 billion a year. During the Eisenhower administration, net farm income has averaged only $12.3 billion annually and has resulted in some 800,000 farmers being driven from their land.

All of us, Mr. President, must assume some degree of responsibility for our inability, our failure, to legislate an omnibus farm bill. Nothing is more important to a long-range healthy economy for this Nation than finding a system under which farm families can receive a fair return on their products.

It is my firm belief that in the final analysis, Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson and the administration must be held largely accountable for the fact that a strong bill for farmers was not worked out. Senate and House Agriculture Committee plans for farm legislation were thwarted mainly because of an utter lack of cooperation by Secretary Benson and the administration with Senators and Congressmen who are dedicated to solving this critical farm problem.

Mr. President, it is a matter of sad and sorry public record that Secretary Benson and the administration have lacked the will or the ability to present any constructive solution to America's trouble on the farm. Instead, Benson whistles through a graveyard of bankrupt family farms, glibly posting statistics to show that surviving farmers' gross income is higher but failing to consider that the farmers' net income is lower, his unit cost of production is higher and his unit price for what he sells is lower, and nearly 20 percent of the Nation's farmers have gone broke in the last 7 years.

It is my strong hope that despite the dying-days opposition of this administration, and the continuing heavy threat of veto, that we will be in position to pass a strong and effective farm bill early in the second session.

Mr. President, I believe it is noteworthy that both of the excellent articles concerning the farm problems which I have mentioned were published in the National Union Farmer, the official publication of the National Farmers Union. All of us who are interested in the problems of American farmers have come to know and to appreciate the National Farmers Union as an organization dedicated to a better America in general, and a better rural America in particular.

In saying that I point out that there are more farm families in my State than in any other State in the Union. We are vitally interested. Much has been said about gas in Texas, but cotton brings more money into my State than all the natural gas production.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix the two articles from the September 1959 issue of the National Union Farmer, entitled "Is the USDA Antifarmer?" and "Farm Myths Exploded," they in turn being reprinted from the County Agent and Vocational Agriculture Teacher magazine, and the Des Moines Register, respectively.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Union Farmer, September 1959]

IS THE USDA ANTI-FARMER?

(This significant article by John Harms, Washington farm reporter, is condensed from the County Agent and Vocational Agriculture Teacher magazine.)

Is the Department of Agriculture antifarmer? If it is not—it certainly acts like it is.

The USDA is one of several agencies in the Government charged with running programs concerning special factors of the economy. For example, the Labor Department has the interests of the city worker at heart (and favors the minimum wage), the Veterans' Administration looks after the veterans (and refrains from advocating big cuts in benefits), and the Commerce Department is on the side of business and industry (and has never advocated an end to shipping subsidies or oil-depletion allowances). The State Department, for its part, fights for foreign aid as though its top officials were running for election in foreign countries.

The USDA, on the other hand, has a 6-year record of advocating legislative changes intended to withdraw benefits from the industry for whom it acts as spokesman. Is agriculture less important to the national well-being than, say, foreign aid, which costs about $3 billion of direct benefits; or veterans' benefits, which cost about $5 billion a year? Certainly the current farm program is not working, but does that mean that there is no need for a farm program? Is it possible that at least some of the blame for the failure rests with the USDA bureaucrats?

Perhaps the biggest disservice USDA has performed for farmers is the damaging publicity which it not only condones, but actually puts out in the form of public speeches. No other similar agency puts out so much propaganda about the economic sector it's supposed to represent.

No other agency has done so much in its sphere of influence to damage the economic status of the sector it serves without providing compensating influences * * * recent examples are the reduction in feed grain and

oilseed price supports and the revision in the parity index. Reliable estimates indicates these two moves alone will cost farmers at least three-fourths of a billion in income this year if market prices follow supports down as USDA fully expects them to.

A further major disservice performed by the USDA is its part in erecting an insurmountable wall of animosity between itself and the Congress. This, more than any other single factor, is what's preventing enactment of sorely-needed farm program reforms. USDA brass takes the easy way out, and blames Congress—while the surplus problem gets worse. Why is it that most lawmakers, both Republicans and Democrats, just don't believe the USDA spokesmen are out for the best interests of agriculture? Is it all politics?

Are the best interests of agriculture and the Nation furthered by stubborn insistence on a favored idea, or by honest effort at compromising differences—as most other Government agencies do all the time in their negotiations with Congress? Congress shows no intention of giving USDA what its leaders say it needs. Perhaps all problems would be solved if Congress were abolished.

Whether USDA is sympathetic to agriculture depends solely on the policy decisions of a handful of political appointees at the top—and not on the 98,000 able workers who daily do their level best to serve agriculture.

These employees, along with farmers everywhere, may well ask: If the USDA is not antifarmer, why is it doing everything in its power to run the farmer down?

[From the National Union Farmer, September 1959]

FARM MYTHS EXPLODED

(Some of the most false and misleading statements about agriculture these days have been exploded by the National Planning Association, a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization. Its new publication, Myths About Farming, deals with 12 of the worst. It is reported here, in part, by Charles Bailey, a Washington correspondent of the Des Moines Register:)

1. "If farmers were as efficient as city workers they wouldn't be in trouble."

National Planning Association cites figures showing that the index of output per man-hour in agriculture was higher than in on-farm industries and manufacturing 10 years ago and has risen faster in the intervening period as well.

2. "Farm price supports are causing the increase in the cost of living."

This myth the study says, has been circulated widely, even from such an eminent source as the White House. Nation Planning Association cites a statement by President Eisenhower that deliberate policy to bring the farmer his own proper share of national income has caused a very considerable amount of this increased cost.

3. "Farm surpluses will be gobbled up by increasing population."

National Planning Association calls this a widespread delusion. Actually, the study says, farm production will continue to run ahead of population for some time.

4. "Every farmer drives a Cadillac."

National Planning Association notes research findings that less than one-half of 1 percent of Iowa farmers owned Cadillacs in 1954, with about 12 percent owning either Buicks or Oldsmobiles. A 1957 study showed little change.

5. "The Federal taxpayer now hands out to farmers an annual gift amounting to one-half of the farmer's net income."

National Planning Association notes that much of total Federal farm spending does not go to farmers at all. An additional amount is in repayable loans, and even some of the price-support costs cannot be considered subsidies, it says, because they benefit needy persons and schoolchildren.

6. "Farmers don't need much cash. They raise most of their own food."

Farmers, National Planning Association says, pay most of the same monthly bills that city people pay. They spend 31 percent of their family living budget on food. They spend 65 percent of their gross income for production expenses.

7. "Farmers are getting along fine. There is no sense in giving them any help from Government, which means help from nonfarmers."

National Planning Association notes, with statistics, that farm expenses tend to stay steady or rise even though net farm income goes up and down. Further, it says, farmers turn out the same amount of food to meet the Nation's needs regardless of price fluctuation, and cannot adjust production to demand as industry can.

8. "Farm subsidy programs are keeping people on farms who ought to be getting out of farming and into city jobs."

National Planning Association cites statistics showing that farm population declined more sharply from 1950 to 1957 than in any similar period on record—during the period of "big farm programs."

9. "The Nation is carrying enormous surpluses of wheat, corn and cotton at a great expense to taxpayers."

National Planning Association says that "part of this myth is fact—stocks of corn and wheat are high." But it adds that some of the stocks are "needed reserves" rather than "surplus."

10. "The way to solve the farm problem is to reduce or remove support prices. Then farmers will reduce production and the surpluses will vanish."

National Planning Association prints a statistical table showing that from 1951 through 1958, farm costs stayed high, farm prices dropped—and farm production increased anyway.

11. "Put high supports—90 percent of parity or better—on farm products and we farmers will be all right."

National Planning Association lists some of the controversial points bearing on this familiar argument, and sums up: "Just raising the support price, without doing anything else, can make trouble and do little for farm income."

12. "Farmers have an advantage over nonfarm people, because of Government aid to agriculture."

This myth, National Planning Association says, is characteristic of newspaper handling of farm questions—but it's a myth anyhow. Farm people made up 11.9 percent of the population in 1957 but got only 5.9 percent of national income.

Per capita net income of nonfarm people was double that of farm people in 1957, even though there is a steadily decreasing number of farmers to split up total farm income.

Resolution of the County Commissioners of Thurston County, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by the County Commissioners of Thurston County, Wash., to read before Congress their resolution in behalf of in lieu of taxes legislation now before the House and Senate. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution at this point so all Members may have the opportunity of reading it in full:

RESOLUTION No. 2557

Resolution approving Senate bill 910 and its identical House version, House Resolution 5731 and House Resolution 6073

Whereas Senate bill 910 would provide a limited program whereby Congress would consent to nondiscriminatory payments in lieu of taxes; and

Whereas it is deemed for the best interests of all the counties in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the County Commissioners of Thurston County, Wash., unanimously approves Senate bill 910 and its identical House versions; House Resolution 5731 and House Resolution 6073.

This resolution is necessary for the preservation, health, and welfare of all the citizens of Thurston County, Wash.

Dated this 8th day of September 1959.

BOARD OF THURSTON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
GEO. ELDER, *Chairman.*
GEORGE F. YANCH.
WALTER MILLS.

Attest:

A. E. NELSON,
County Auditor and Ex Officio Clerk of County Commissioners.

Needed: A Strong Mutual Security Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during discussion on provisions of the mutual security bill, there were certain questions raised, both in the military and economic field, that I believe should be answered.

Overall, the mutual security program continues to be an essential part of our own defense, as well as that of the free world. In addition, it is not a complete economic loss, as some would have us believe.

I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement reviewing the merits of this essential program, as well as answering some of the questions that have been raised.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

I have listened with interest and, I believe, some profit, to the discussions on the mutual security program.

The program, I believe, serves the security interests of the United States—and the free world—and I shall support it.

We recognize, of course, that there are differences of opinion on: (1) how much should be spent; (2) what kind of aid—that is, military, economic, technical assist-

ance or other—should be supplied our allies and less-developed countries of the world; (3) how the programs themselves can be more effectively administered to serve the interests of free world security.

We recall that in the past, the leaders of both major political parties; the majority of the elected Members of the Senate and House of Representatives; specially-appointed committees comprised of representatives of labor, business, and other segments of the economy—all have generally agreed that the mutual security program, dollar-for-dollar, provides more defense than could be provided in other ways.

I am well aware, of course, that the more than $3.2 billion mutual security program is an expense to the American taxpayer.

As a taxpayer, myself, I am as deeply concerned about this as anyone else.

To put the picture in perspective, however, we might well recall that the Congress approved an appropriation of almost $39 billion for the defense program of the United States alone.

For expenditures that amount to less than 10 percent of our own defense program, we are getting twice the manpower, and tremendously increased naval, air and other powers.

Now, what has the mutual security program actually accomplished?

First, the program has provided the strongest link in the alliance of free nations, withstanding the efforts of communism to expand its area of control over more lands and people.

Second, in addition to warding off Communist enslavement of new areas, it has helped the less-developed countries of the world to get on their feet.

We recognize that substandard conditions, if allowed to exist, serve as the breeding ground for strife, discontent, or revolution. Particularly, they serve as hotbeds of communism which seeks to capitalize upon such conditions, wherever possible.

Third, the program, I am confident, has been a major factor in preventing a third world war.

I am well aware, of course, that there are differences of opinion—not only as to the merits of the program itself, but also as to where the emphasis in the program should be placed.

Such questions have arisen, for example, as what should be the proportion of money spent:

For direct military aid?

For military support of the armed forces of other nations?

For economic assistance?

For technical assistance for less-developed countries?

For the Development Loan Fund?

For other aspects of the program?

The funds, I believe, should be allocated on a flexible basis, according to the needs of the situation.

For those who would either kill the program entirely, or drastically reduce it, these questions, I believe, merit an answer.

First, is the Communist menace any less today that 2, 5, or 10 years ago?

And the answer, I believe, is "no." To the contrary, the Communist threat is greater and more powerful.

Second, are our allies—or other people just emerging as nations—more capable, individually, of withstanding the broad-scale military threats, as well as the economic, psychological, subversive, and ideological efforts at penetration by the worldwide Communist conspiracy?

The answer, I believe, is that nations of the free world, too, are stronger.

However, it would be extremely unwise, now, to cripple the program which has served as a major support for efforts to combine their strength to combat communism.

Let's not kid ourselves. The battle is not over. To the contrary, communism can be expected to remain a threat to our security for many years ahead.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

I am aware, of course, that questions, too, have been raised as to the effect on our own economy, not only of such expenditures as a burden on the taxpayer, but also as to competition which we are creating abroad for our own industries.

Certainly, this is a serious problem. As a matter of trade policy, I believe the situation needs to be thoroughly examined to see what can and should constructively be done; (1) To attempt to assure that there is maximum exchange of commodities between ours and other nations, on a mutually beneficial basis; but (2) to take those constructive measures that are essential—without raising any impenetrable walls—to provide the necessary protection for our domestic industries.

We cannot delude ourselves, however, into believing that the free world can withstand ever-growing Communist pressures by having allies that are economically weak—rather than strong.

If war can be averted—as we pray will be possible—one of the greatest tests of strength between the free and Communist worlds will be the capability of differing economic systems to provide for their respective peoples.

Overall, the mutual security program, I firmly believe, continues to be an essential part of our overall free world defense, and a good investment in security for the American people.

Worms in Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragedies of this session of Congress was the failure to complete action on H.R. 3610. In face of the threat of a pocket veto failure to go to conference is understandable.

The problem continues in Colorado. H.R. 3610 would have provided the incentive now lacking to cooperative action in adjacent communities. I hope action can be completed at an early date. An illustration of the problem in Colorado is the following item from the Rocky Mountain News of September 10, which may be of interest:

WORMS REPORTED IN ARVADA WATER UNIT

An Arvada housewife charged Wednesday she found worms in her drinking water.

Mrs. Martha Studenka, 38, of 6370 Janice way, said she found two worms in a water filter unit Wednesday morning when she invited her neighbors to inspect the filter.

"I thought I'd found a way to get the water clean when I got the filter, so I invited the neighbors over to look at it," Mrs. Studenka said. "As they were looking, one of the girls saw the worms."

She said her husband, Joseph, a truck-driver, bought their $14,000 home last November.

"Right after we moved in I noticed the water was dirty," she said.

"I couldn't get the washing clean, so I had to take it to a self-serve laundry to do it," Mrs. Studenka said. "Last spring, the water department people started using Clear Creek water because of the increased use of the water for lawns * * * then the situation got very bad.

"We bought a water softening unit thinking it would help clear the water, but the water's so dirty the machine couldn't keep it clean permanently," she said.

"By putting a new filter in the machine pretty often, I thought I'd found a solution to the problem, but now comes the worms," she said.

Mrs. Studenka said she discussed the murky water with officials of the Arvada Water Department and the Jefferson County Health Department.

"They told me the water is clean, but I have proof it isn't * * * and the neighbors are beginning to complain, too," she said. "I'm disgused * * * all I want to know is where the dirty water—and worms—are coming from and what's going to be done about it."

In addition to hauling her family's clothing to a laundry, Mrs. Studenka said she is afraid her children, Sharon, 13, Stephanie, 10, and Joe, 9, will become sick if they drink the water.

How Missile and Space Program Spending Enriches the Peacetime Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it is often said that our spending on missiles and space projects is a total waste for the real prosperity and future of our Nation. In large measure, of course, any spending for primarily military purposes is a drain on an economy. But since the exigencies of the cold war make it absolutely essential for us to make these expenditures, I think we have a right to look at the cloud's silver lining and review some of the real contributions being made to our future in the form of new goods, techniques and industries.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Edward J. Michelson, Washington correspondent of Forbes and Printer's Ink magazines and the Berkshire (Mass.) Eagle which appears in the September 14 issue of Missiles and Rockets. Accompanying Mr. Michelson's article I include an editorial from the same issue of Missiles and Rockets, entitled "The Warm Side of the Cold War":

HOW MISSILE AND SPACE SPENDING ENRICHES THE PEACETIME ECONOMY

(By Edward J. Michelson)

WASHINGTON.—Vast U.S. Government spending during the past cold war decade for missile and space research, technological military development, testing and space exploration activities is beginning to yield tremendous dividends in terms of American economic growth.

The Nation has spent billions for research and development in these fields. The current R. & D. budgets alone for the Department of Defense and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration total more than $4.2 billion. Of this more than $2.4 billion is for missiles and space activities.

From this cold war research, quantities of new consumer goods, services, and industrial processes are now appearing on the American scene. Even new industries have appeared as the results of inventions, techniques, and knowledge gained since the dawn of the space age.

One of these is the computer industry. Computers were developed as a result of military demands for faster figuring and the industry itself has developed as a result of the even greater demands imposed by missile and space operations.

Companies of virtually every size and description participating in missile and space programs today are alert to the opportunities for new industrial, commercial, and consumer ventures growing out of their work.

The firms surveyed by Missiles & Rockets range in size from General Motors to small electronics companies founded in the first half of the now-ending 1950's. In numerous cases, newcomers in nucleonics, avionics, metallurgy, "hardware" production, and plastics are planning to promote goods and services for industrial and consumer use even though the enterprises don't have sales promotion or marketing staffs. Their sole customer until now has been Uncle Sam.

One space age supplier, North American Aviation, Inc., has gone to the length of establishing a subsidiary, Navan Products, Inc., for the specific purpose of marketing its own and others' inventions.

Evidence that military-supported scientific and technological advances have already resulted in new goods now under development abounds. Westinghouse Electric Corp. is actually showing three prototype appliances in television commercials—thermoelectric devices for cooling and heating. Thermoelectric research has been a company interest sporadically since 1937, but it was Navy and Air Force requirements for highly efficient, lightweight prime energy sources of space vehicles that spurred this development.

Corning Glass Works cites an impressive array of products ranging from Pyroceram skillets and pans to silicone rubber interlayer material, making possible "windows" capable of resisting Mach 2 temperatures (approaching 500° F.). Emphasis is on improved glassmaking technology and higher quality materials for myriad uses, including nuclear food preservaton and power reactors.

BORN OF WORLD WAR II

Corning developed a mass-production process for the manufacture of optical glass to meet military needs during World War II. The company's scientists developed platinum-clad melting chambers and blending machines that made possible an unprecedented production rate of 50 pounds of optical glass per hour.

In the ensuing years the process was adapted to production of optical blanks of all sizes—for us in lenses for bombsights, periscopes, aerial cameras, wind tunnel windows, and missile-tracking optics.

The production technique allowed Corning to go into peacetime production of low-priced, high-quality lenses for spectacles, telescopes, and cameras.

The chief accent of management men responding to a survey questionnaire is on development of better, more durable materials, more reliable manufacturing techniques, and increased product reliability. This reatcion is inevitable; American businessmen have traditionally excelled in developing engineering ideas aimed at offering end products of higher quality, greater utility, and minimum unit manufacturing cost.

In the missile and space field, gains have been made in such areas as materials, electronics, equipments, medicine, propulsion, communications, areonautics, air traffic control and navigation, and knowledge of human psychology and physiology.

COMPETITORS RELUCTANT

For obvious competitive reasons, some firms are none too communicative. This is especially true of the motor car manufacturers. Chrysler Corp. acknowledges that its propulsion work for satellite vehicles is bound to generate scientific and engineering suggestions to be considered ultimately for application to its commercial product lines.

General Electric also is reluctant to speak in general terms of the potentialities of its space work assignments for other manufacturing divisions. GE regards space travel as an extension of terrestrial travel. GE also points to benefits in the development of materials—metallic and otherwise—which make possible recoverable nose cones capable of withstanding the stresses and strains of reentry.

SIZING UP MARKETS

Volume procurement of lithium has brought down the price, sparking producers' thinking about commercial markets. The sole commercial use that immediately comes to mind is in nickel-oxide storage batteries. Firestone and Shell Chemical are reported to be employing a litium catalyst in synthetic rubber production. Frank R. Cook Co., Denver, suppliers of silver-zinc batteries for guided missile power, look to civilian customers in need of lightweight and small (one-sixth to one-fourth the dimensions of conventional batteries) for portable and airborne applications.

Rosemont Engineering Co., Minneapolis, has only begun exploiting the market for a variety of precision platinum resistance temperature sensors developed for missiles. The company stresses the high accuracy and stability of its product for temperature measurements, in selling for all industrial or commercial applications.

CASES IN POINT

Raytheon Manufacturing Co. uses the term "fallout" for products originally designed for military needs. In World War II, Raytheon supplied three of four allied warships with surface search radars. Today Raytheon claims to be the largest single producer of such equipment for the world's merchant shipping and passenger lines.

In little more than 3 years, Raytheon's payroll has increased from 18,000 to 39,000. Where its ratio of government to non-Governmental activity was 60–40 percent in 1956, company responsibilities for the Falcon and Sparrow III, among other systems, have increased the ratio to 85–15 percent.

With an eye to the future, Raytheon's market planners are concentrating on resources which, combined with capabilities of companies Raytheon has been acquiring, will make the company name as familiar in commercial marts as it was before its radio-TV operations were sold to Admiral Corp.

A major rubber company, whose identity is withheld by request, reports that a high-speed, fabric-laminated tread tire used on recoverable test missiles is also being sold now for commercial jet aircraft. Marblette Corp., producer of resins for missile and rocket applications and atomic submarine construction, cites civilian uses for each type. One is already popular in plastic tooling, metal-bonding, adhesive and casting, and laminating operations; the other, in high-density casting compounds. The latter type resin is lead-filled for barriers against radiation.

SKF Industries is now producing for non-Government users all precision, special tolerance bearings for electric motors, including those of unique design, that the military had to have. Both Air Force and Navy needs have contributed greatly to such advances. A major Air Force contribution in recent years was the technique for plating nickel and tin-indium without electrical current to prolong the life of friction bearings and similar parts.

PEACE-TO-WAR-TO-PEACE

The inter-relationship of peaceful industrial research and that for defense is graphically illustrated in the case of Westinghouse Electric's interest in thermoelectrical developments.

The company began to study the possibility of converting electricity directly to heat in 1937. By 1939, the Westinghouse Exhibit at the New York World's Fair was showing thermocouples demonstrating this principle.

Early in the 1950's, management's imagination was fired by the possibility of thermoelectric household appliances which would be highly efficient, have no turning parts, nothing to wear out. The intensive laboratory activity for the next 3 years centered on a small but highly dependable prime source of electricity, a generator that would be gas-fueled at first but eventually nuclear-fueled.

The Navy happened to be in the market for such a power generator. Since Westinghouse had acquired considerable experience and knowledge in this field, the company was put to work. The objective: to build a lightweight, highly efficient generator capable of performing the selective cooling required for electronic gear in aircraft and in equipments such as those used in the Arctic for commuications networks.

The advent of the space age heightened the need for power generators for satellite vehicles. Westinghouse is subcontractor in this connection for projects on which the Martin Co. and Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing have prime responsibility. Westinghouse also has an Air Force order for a TAP–100 (Terrestrial Auxiliary power—100 watts) generator for remote locations such as the Arctic. Ultimately, such equipment, relying on nuclear fuel, can power relay stations for round-the-world communications.

A Navy contract calls for a 500-watt generator and a thermoelectric air conditioner for shipboard use, with a capacity of 1 ton. This unit is a parallel development of the baby bottle warmer-cooler, dehumidifier, and refrigerator prototypes already being pictured in ad copy as part of Westinghouse's projected line of thermoelectric home appliances.

IMPROBABLE DIVERSIFICATION

Most Americans are not only startled by the fact that billions in Government scientific and engineering research and technological development pay off in terms of new jobs, new products, new industries, and the resulting increase in economic wealth; they are also surprised to see that companies engaged in one line of manufacturing diversify into remote fields as a result of their defense activities.

The public thinks of Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. as a packaging business, with some ordnance work. Not generally realized is the new technique Food Machinery has for continuous welding of various types of aluminum, including those of considerable thickness.

Another example is the case of Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation, a division created because of the space age. Rocketdyne produces hydrazine liquid storable propellants. Rocketdyne officials say drugs based on hydrazine derivatives have been tested in terms of treatment for mental illnesses and tuberculosis. The company gives no indication that it contemplates entering the pharmaceutical industry. But it is significant that most of the 10,000 compounds that have been introduced in medical practice since 1939—the outbreak of World War II—were available much sooner than might otherwise be the case

because of mobilization requirements and wartime demands.

General Bronze Corp., a leading manufacturer of metal windows and other construction items, is preparing to spill over into the industrial and commercial electronics fields. A subsidiary devoted to space science and engineering requirements, G. B. Electronics, Inc., was established less than 2 years ago, to develop tracking antenna systems for missile support equipment supplied by prime contractors. The company has now gone in for infrared research, with prospects of turning out highly sensitive devices for such industrial uses as the detection of flaws in the welding of aircraft.

MOVING INTO AERONAUTICS

The aeronautics industry is eyed by numerous companies—even though some of the best-known aircraft manufacturers, such as Douglas and Northrop, are turning to such fields as data processing and reduction techniques, and systems for production control in highly automated plants, respectively.

Summers Gyroscope's inexpensive autopilot for target drones has applicability in light aircraft as a cheap pilot assist/safety device. Avco's Lycoming Division anticipates that within a year it will be selling commercial versions of its T–53 and T–55 gas turbines for helicopters. Marine and industrial versions also will be offered. General Precision Laboratory, prime contractor for the Federal Aviation Agency's semiautomatic traffic control system, cites its radar doppler automatic navigator (RADAN 500), for sale to business and commercial aircraft. The Stalker Corp., Essexville, Mich., mentions jet engines it builds for the military under GE subcontract as a line for other buyers.

RCA is optimistic as to the civilian usefulness of its radar equipment for Air Force and Navy weather studies. Stavid Engineering, Inc., Plainfield, N.J., has elaborate apparatus for locating lightning flashes over a 2,000-mile radius and for instantaneous transmission, monitoring and plotting of weather front locations and movements.

PEACEFUL ELECTRONICS

A vast array of precision instruments, refinements and improvements on automatic production control components, photographic equipment, and infrared appliances will go into industrial and consumer marts. Miskella Infra-Red Co., Cleveland, is transferring capabilities and know-how that go into its tasks for the Atlas satellite to new types of electronic lamps, hot dog roasters, switches, and ovens. ECO Engineering Co., a Newark, N.J., supplier of Redstone Arsenal, had to develop an inert thread sealing compound for that key customer. Now ECO counts on such sealing and antiseize compounds to appeal to pump manufacturers in the process industries.

The tremendous impetus which defense research gave to the miniaturization of electronic components continues. Dresser Industries' Southwestern Industrial Electronic Co., Houston, is "transistorizing and minifying" for portable radio and television sets. In addition, Southwestern makes microminiature roller, needle and ball bearings for compressed air-turbine dental drills. Another missile electronics suplier, Miles Reproducer, Inc., New York City, is promoting an automatic voice recorder which starts and stops at the sound of a voice, and a Walkie-Recordall which is a miniature conference recorder-transcriber.

LONG RANGE JOBS

An eloquent indication of the benefits to industry of current programs is the spate of large "engineers wanted" ads in metropolitan Sunday newspapers; most of the advertisers are space age research and development organizations.

In the hectic competition for the most desirable mechanical and electronic engineers, companies emphasize the long-range attractions of careers in their laboratories. The propeller division of Curtiss-Wright Corp., for example, specifically mentions that the design, development and testing work available on "advanced air vehicles" and the control concepts under development have "application in industry as well as many other areas yet to be fully explored."

A few winters back, after the Soviets had orbited their second satellite, a group of U.S. Congressmen landed in Sydney, Australia, on a transpolar Antarctic flight. One of them, Representative TORBERT H. MACDONALD, of Boston, was properly respectful in reading of the accomplishment in a Down Under newspaper. The hotel elevator operator was reassuring and consoling. "You Yanks needn't worry," he said. "You'll do all right. And when you get your satellites going round the earth, they'll be much better. They'll be air-conditioned."

The lawmaker from an area abounding in electronics production and research activities for the Space Agency and ARPA thinks this point was well taken. Experience has proven that every military undertaking in nuclear fission and fusion, astronautics, electranic computation, and new aerodynamic and hydrodynamic R. & D. is from the outset destined to pay off in new skills, technologies, industries, and related forms of economic wealth.

THE WARM SIDE OF THE COLD WAR

(By Clarke Newlon)

The visit to this country of Nikita Khrushchev is significant in several ways. Historically, he is the first Russian chief of government to set foot on American soil. Historically, also, he arrives near the second anniversary of his Nation's greatest technological triumph—the orbiting of Sputnik I. Politically, he is linked to the Administration's hopes of cutting down the military budget. Morally, he holds the hope of the West for a lessening of tensions, for disarmament, for global sanity.

It is very difficult to believe that the Soviet Premier will really change any of his communistic spots during his visit here, or immediately thereafter. However, we do believe it is far better for East-West protagonists to meet personally on almost any terms than to stand glowering at each other across the oceans and continents. And there is always the hope that the visit will enlarge the Premier's outlook.

With this in mind we would like to call his attention to the lead story in this issue of this magazine—a story dealing with the peaceful uses which American industry has found for products and techniques developed during the cold war of the past decade.

Khrushchev's contempt for capitalism is well and widely known. Alluding to America on October 10, 1957, he said: "There are still reactionary militarist forces in the world which are preparing for war and which do not want disarmament, fearing to lose their profits. The capitalists are worried about their profits."

It would be strange indeed if capitalists were not concerned to some extent about their profits, profits being one of the prime bases of capitalism. But it might surprise the Soviet Premier to learn the trend this concern takes.

As detailed in this week's story, a missile and rockets survey revealed that during the past decade military, missile, and space research has produced countless new products, new industrial techniques, and even entire new industries for peaceful, civilian usage. While working to produce better defense vehicles and spacecraft, American industry has never lost sight of the fact that it is inherent in its very nature to be always searching for ways to improve the everyday living of the American people. Missile optics produce better eyeglasses; the material created for a radome also makes more durable kitchenware; the search for a new fuel produces a new medicine and thus on.

No democratic society has ever looked favorably on military expenditures. The attitude has always been, understandably, that military spending is almost literally waste, that a dollar for defense could be spent for some worthwhile purpose if defense weren't necessary.

Within our military budget, which accounts for from 10 to 15 percent of our gross national income, many items have been produced which have great economic (as well as military) value. They have lessened man's labors, improved his health, and well-being, lengthened his life span. This is not and never will be an argument for increasing military budgets, of course; but it does demonstrate that these military expenditures have brought civilian benefits which otherwise might not have resulted—or at least would have been years longer in arriving.

The point which we hope will not be permitted to escape the attention of Premier Khrushchev is this:

Not only can this country devote its economy to building one of the greatest defense machines in the world, aid its western allies both militarily and economically, create and carry out a potentially great space program—it can do this and at the same time give its citizens the highest living standard ever known.

Not only has this country accepted the challenge of the cold war which the Russians have forced upon us, but in effect we are making it pay for itself through our vast production system and consumer capacity.

We think this is a tribute to the American system and to American industry. We doubt that the same thing is even remotely true in Mr. Khrushchev's country; his own technical leadership isn't geared to think of civilian well-being, either industrially or spiritually.

If this one fact can be brought home to the Soviet Premier it may both enlighten and discourage him somewhat—enlighten him to the fact that though we don't try to force our way of life on the world, we like it; and discourage his hopes of changing that fact.

Traditional Values in American Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, Dr. Ralph H. Gabriel, distinguished American historian, has prepared a study called Traditional Values in American Life for the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. Dr. Gabriel's study is to be used in a proposed series of round-table discussions on the theme, "Traditional Values in Modern Life in India and in the United States." The round-tables are to be held concurrently in India and in the United States under the sponsorship of the Indian National Commission for UNESCO and the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. A similar paper is being prepared under the auspices of the Indian National Commission dealing with traditional values in Indian life.

This project is planned as a bilateral contribution to UNESCO's project on Mutual Appreciation of Eastern and Western Cultural Values. Its aim is to help increase and deepen mutual knowledge, understanding, and appreciation between the people of the United States and the people of India.

Dr. Gabriel formerly held the chair of sterling professor of history at Yale and has been for the past year a professor at the School of International Service at American University.

In his foreword to the study, Dr. Gabriel says, "The present essay has attempted a kind of silhouette of the values of one civilization—that of the United States." He has summarized American values under the following headings: Politics, Law, Religion, Education, Social Values, Science, Economics, Art, and International Relations.

Dr. Gabriel's complete study is available from the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO. I should like to include here a part of his discussion of American values in politics, as they have evolved from the days of the American Revolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from Traditional Values in American Life printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Out of the heritage from England, the experience with government in the Colonies, the struggle for independence, the creation of the Republic, and the experience of more than a century and a half of independence have come American values in the area of politics. They include the following concepts and goals:

1. The concept of the State as a utilitarian device created to further the general welfare.

2. Freedom and responsibility of the individual adult person to have a voice in the Government under which he lives as exemplified in the right and responsibility to vote.

3. Freedom of access to knowledge of all kinds save only when disclosure of particular information would endanger the whole community. Sound judgments by persons having a voice in their Government must be based on knowledge as full and as accurate as possible.

4. Freedom to express orally or in writing opinions honestly held concerning economic, religious, political, or social matters. In the case of political opinions, this freedom is limited by the requirement that actions to carry opinions into effect must conform to the procedures for changing the policies or structure of the State as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. A further general limitation is that expression of opinion must not lead immediately to panic or disorder. Americans regard freedom of speech and freedom of the press as the cornerstone or republican institutions.

5. The protection of the free citizen against unreasonable invasion of privacy by officers of government.

6. The right of free citizens to assemble peaceably.

7. The supremacy of civil authority over the military in conformity with the principle that the civil authority is the decisionmaking power and the military is the instrument, when needed, to carry decisions into effect.

Efforts throughout our national history to realize fully the goal of citizen participation in government suggest the evolutionary character of American values. By the end of the first third of the 19th century practically all of the States had extended the right to vote to all males 21 or over. As the century ended most of the States had passed laws requiring that a voter cast his ballot in secret. These laws were intended to prevent the improper manipulation of elections by threats or bribery of electors. In 1920 an amendment to the Constitution gave to women of the United States the right to vote. In the first half of the 20th century, the States in the southern part of the United States where Negroes were very numerous sharply limited by legislative enactment or by administrative procedures the number of Negro citizens permitted to vote. In the middle decades of the century, the Supreme Court of the United States struck down these enactments and administrative procedures that came within its jurisdiction on the ground that they were contrary to the Constitution. In 1957 the Congress of the United States enacted a civil rights law, the purpose of which is to protect the right of the Negro to vote. The act represented a step forward in guaranteeing throughout the Nation full political rights to the colored man. Determined opposition in many southern communities, however, impeded its full enforcement. But the very fact that the goal had not been completely realized tended to focus public attention throughout the country on the transcendent importance of this value for the principle of government by the consent of the governed.

Since the establishment of the Nation each generation of Americans has faced in one form or another the problem of maintaining freedom of speech and of the press. The exercise of these rights has at one time or another been threatened in local communities where tensions arising out of religious, racial, or political issues exacerbated the relations between a dominant majority and a dissenting minority. In the decade that followed World War II, several disclosures of subversive activities in the Federal Government on the part of persons working in the interest of a foreign power created at a time of international tension widespread fears for the security of the Nation. Anxiety, affecting large numbers of the people and appearing in the Congress, created a situation in which public criticism of certain of the policies of the United States became a dangerous activity for the citizen. In these months of fear, however, many citizens in public addresses and writings and many newspapers in editorials stoutly maintained the ancient right to responsible and honest criticism. Such affirmations did much to rouse the public to the danger that ill-considered measures intended to maintain the security of the Nation might destroy the rights and liberties upon which its institutions depend. The Supreme Court in several important decisions struck a balance between the security of the Nation and the freedom of the individual. In these decisions the Court moved to preserve freedom of thought in an age of international tension. Experience, beginning in the early days of the Republic, has given force to the American maxim: "The price of liberty is eternal vigilance."

Khrushchev's Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues an excellent editorial on the recent foreign affairs article by Mr. Khrushchev which appeared in the Commonweal, September 18, 1959. This is one of the most thoughtful and closely reasoned statements on the article which I have been privileged to read.

The editorial says that the real difference between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies has to do with the basic conceptions of man and human society, conceptions which derive from the great Judaeo-Christian tradition and which emphasize the dignity and inviolability of the human person and the democratic freedoms that protect him from all manner of tyranny.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Commonweal, Sept. 18, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV'S CONDITIONS

In some ways it is curious that so able a dialectitian as the Soviet Premier should in his foreign affairs article have led up to his three conditions for peace by a series of palpably false assertions. Surely he would credit the elite which reads that informative American quarterly with enough knowledge of recent history to perceive the lack of any real factual basis for certain of his leading claims. Perhaps, in this trial balloon preceding his American visit, Khrushchev was counting more heavily on the impact that mass media summaries of his article would make on the less interested and less informed but wider American reading and listening public.

In any case these claims do little to build up confidence in his estimates of present conditions and his promises for the future. To begin with, how can we reconcile his contention that the Soviet Union has from its beginnings adhered to peaceful coexistence as the basic principle of its foreign policy with its actual expansionism of the past 40 years? The list of its successful conquests by force is a long one, from the Baltic States and other subject nations now within the Soviet Union to the satellites of Eastern Europe. Or how can Soviet "renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government, or mode of life, or for any other motive" square with the long-standing existence and activity of Moscow-directed Communist Parties in virtually every country in the world?

Mr. Khrushchev goes on to eschew economic imperialism because of the unlimited home market enjoyed by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, when it is widely known that the purchasing power of the individual citizen in those lands has been for years, and still is, far below that of its contemporaries in the West. As head of one of the most drastic and efficient totalitarian dictatorships the world has ever seen, the Soviet Premier has the effrontery to say that "it is the people who determine the destinies of the socialist states * * * the people who themselves create all the material and spiritual values of society."

Alongside the Khrushchev claim that the Soviet Union has reduced its vast armies by more than 2 million men must be set its marked growth in undersea, missile and nuclear-weapon strength. And its temporary discontinuance of thermonuclear tests must be balanced by Russia's adamant refusal, up to now, to agree to systems of international controls involving adequate inspection by non-Russians within the U.S.S.R. as well as by inspection teams made up of a number of nationalities operating in other countries.

In the light of these opening gambits, it is difficult to see how Mr. Khrushchev can expect Americans to have confidence that his conditions for peace will be acceptable. Doubtless it has been tragically misleading for us to address the captive nations in terms of liberation without any feasible means of effecting it. But as a people long identified with the democratic freedoms and the principle of national self-determination, we can hardly be expected to agree to the permanent subjugation against their will of the Hungarian and other subject peoples.

The German question scarcely looks more promising. Except that West Berlin might curtail its propaganda activities in the interests of a settlement, there seems to be little that the Western powers have to offer here. It is again barefaced effrontery for Khrushchev, with his East German puppet regime continuing against the manifest opposition of the people, to declare that "no attempts should be made to interfere from outside" with the process of German reunification. In view of Russia's flagrant violations of the Potsdam agreement and many others, how could any credence be placed in its promise to guarantee the independence of West Berlin and "the preservation of the existing way of life there"?

On the question of trade with the Soviet Union there might be somewhat more leeway. At one point Mr. Khrushchev calls for "extensive and absolutely unrestricted international trade," at another for "the exchange of everything produced by human genius in the sphere of peaceful branches of material production." There is a difference between the two phrases, particularly as one of the things that restricts American-Soviet trade is our embargo against exports of strategic materials to the Soviet Union. It appears possible that trade could be expanded on a pragmatic basis for the mutual benefit of both countries, especially wherever such exchanges of goods and services would incline the Soviets toward converting their impressive productive powers away from war industries to the makings of things that raise their general living standards.

As an able debater, Khrushchev has uttered a number of sober truths to accompany his fictions. His comments on the vulnerability of all of us to modern weapons, and the need of avoiding at all hazards an all-out shooting war, cannot be gainsaid. His reiteration of the challenge that his way and our way be permitted to compete unhampered for the allegiance of men and nations has its appealing side.

But he resorts to the clever debating trick of misstating the issue. He would have the contest between socialism and capitalism, rather than between communism and democracy. Once he has identified the American way with capitalism, a concept which inspires hostility on almost every hand, he has gone far toward winning the big debate before the peoples of the world. And it has been all too easy for Mr. NIXON and other American spokesmen to fall into this trap.

Mr. Khrushchev also likes to present the debate in terms of productivity and future standards of living. Here defenders of the American way are even more easily led down a debating cul de sac. Not only can we point to our color TV sets, air-conditioners, 1960 cars, deep freezes, and washing machines, but we can contrast present living standards generally under the two systems. Here Khrushchev cites comparative rates of growth and forecasts a rosy Communist future. That takes some of the starch out of our productivity argument, but it is not the main reason for warning against this pitfall.

The real difference between the Soviet Union and the Western democracies is not one of productivity, of low versus high living standards or—especially where the United States is concerned—of socialism versus capitalism. It goes far deeper than that. It has to do with the basic conceptions of man and of human society, conceptions which derive from the great Judaeo-Christian tradition and which emphasize the dignity and inviolability of the human person and the democratic freedoms that protect him from all manner of tyranny. That is the burden of our side of the debate with Mr. Khrushchev, but until we demonstrate that we are willing to make adequate sacrifices during this cold war period for the sake of these things in which we believe, we shall have a hard time convincing Mr. Khrushchev, other peoples—or ourselves.

Lessons From Harvey Point?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the Greensboro Daily News dated September 13 entitled "Lessons From Harvey Point?"

In the area of 50 miles, including the city of Elizabeth City, Edenton, and Hertford, N.C., on the Albemarle Sound, the Navy has completely built and closed three naval installations: an airfield costing many millions of dollars; a lighter-than-air base at Weeksville, near Elizabeth City, N.C., at tremendous cost; and now Harvey Point.

It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to understand.

LESSONS FROM HARVEY POINT?

This promised investigation into the fiasco of Harvey Point should not be allowed to trail off in mere words. North Carolina has a particular interest in it. But our concern goes much further. Is what happened with reference to this seaplane base and abandonment of the planes which were to be based there representative of the armed services'—in this instance the Navy's—lack of long-range planning and waste of millions of dollars of tax money?

It is not enough to assure contractors that they will not lose as a result of the sudden shift of plans, after $11,500,000 had already been spent on land acquisition and facilities and around $400 million in research work and development of the now outcast Seamasters. The taxpayers have already caught it in the neck; and a large sum which might have been spent on some other phase of our sorely pressed defense program has gone down the rathole.

The Daily News has looked upon the Harvey Point installation with quizzical eye ever since it was announced. We trust that any investigation will determine whether this completely new installation was necessary when facilities had only recently been abandoned at nearby Weeksville and Edenton.

Withal, there is the lesson for every community whose economy is geared to defense to realize the instability of that dependence and to seek to prepare for the day when its defense payroll may be sharply cut or eliminated. Our transcending desire is for peace, but there is a shudder at what might happen to our economy if, all of a sudden, peace did descend upon us.

Harvey Point calls for expanded study, in its implications, its immediate application, and its symbolism of defense helter-skelterism.

The Chaplain of the Senate Writes on Mr. Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, our worthy Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, has advised us neither to jeer nor cheer during the tour in this country of Premier Khrushchev, of the Soviet Union. I agree with this sound advice. Whenever I read the Chaplain's brilliant articles on the editorial page of the Washington Sunday Star, I realize anew what a talented and gifted man presides over the spiritual needs of the U.S. Senate. I ask unanimous consent that a particularly able piece of writing by Reverend Harris from the Star of September 13, 1959, entitled "Who Goes There?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, Sept. 13, 1959]

WHO GOES THERE?

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

"Who goes there?" Every true American sentinel on the ramparts of freedom will be forced to utter that challenge in the crucial days just ahead. The rotund Russian peasant who has fought his way to the top of the bloody Soviet pyramid is coming to the America he has long eagerly desired to see. He who despises spires comes to a Nation whose proudest boast is that it is under God and whose uncoerced pulpits, from sea to sea, as a follow; there is no such thing as honor. famous French visitor put it years ago, "are ablaze with righteousness." In his vast domain the ancient church is but a Charlie McCarthy on the knee of the police state. To this threatening Goliath who so soon will tread our soil, the sacred beliefs which made and preserve America, and lifted its spires against the sky of an expanding democracy where the people rule, are but the opiate of the people—nothing but a snare and a delusion.

Who goes there? It is one whose basic creed rises no higher than the dust beneath his feet. For him, everything in the universe is explained by whirling atoms. There is no God high over all. From that creed it follows as the night the day that for individuals or a nation there is no moral code to follow; there is no such thing as honor. The disciples of Karl Marx have no rule of action but expediency. Morals is anything that will make any contribution to the communization of the world—no matter who or how many are marked for liquidation in the pursuit of that objective. Nikita S. Khrushchev subscribes fully to the dictum of his master, Lenin, who decreed: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful methods, even concealment of the truth."

In the carrying out of that creed without pity or conscience Khrushchev's record is stained blood red by terrible ruthlessness,

in purges and perfidy, in executions and murdered freedom fighters, which put Nero in the shade. Upon his hands is the blood of our slaughtered sons in Korea. And upon his lips are the falsehoods charging the United States with deadly germ warfare. In very truth all this must be said as the cry is raised, "Who goes there?"

Inasmuch as we are standing under the spires of the Spirit let us enter church portals and listen to a prophet of the Most High, beloved these many years by his nation, Sweden, Bishop Bengt Jonzon. To any thought of inviting the boss to that nation, so close to the Red abomination as to feel its hot breath in their faces, the good bishop warns: "To invite Khrushchev to our country would be the same as letting an enemy through the frontlines in a shooting war. Every word and action of his serves a definite purpose to split the free world, to confuse our judgment, to break down the will to resist, to encourage defeatism." That's the answer of a great churchman to the question, "Who goes there?"

But in this crisis all Americans should vow that nothing be said or done to embarrass our President or to make more difficult his noble attempt to seek for some ray of hope as he deals face to face with the headman of the Kremlin. By personal contact, amid visible fruits of democracy in this promised land flowing with milk and honey, our peace-loving Chief Executive has taken it upon himself to face this ebullient, confident exponent of the false gods of materialism with the truth as it is exemplified, however imperfectly, in the American system. Of course, it is all a gamble. But the President is convinced, in these epochal days of dread and danger, that as the dictator sees and feels our America some of his erroneous, preconceived notions may be modified, as he realizes that we are all in the same boat now in the swift rapids, with the thunder of Niagara just ahead. The President, as he deals with this man with such enormous power in his hands, deserves the fervent prayers of the millions under the Stars and Stripes who believe in the God the Kremlin denies.

We can rest in confidence that our elected leader who faces the unelected Soviet spokesman has often declared that our democracy does not even make sense without God and without a deeply felt religion.

To the visitor who in these September days will be answering, in his pronouncements, the question "Who goes there?" America will be saying at every turn: "We believe that the American Revolution was tremendously more significant than the Russian revolution, and that the inspiring exemplar of the possibilities of the common man is not Lenin, but Lincoln—the Lincoln who said: 'Our reliance is in the true love of liberty which God has planted in our bosoms. Our defense is in the preservation of the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men—in all lands—everywhere.'"

And so, without any illusions as to who goes there, with eyes wide open we say to our President, with the plaudits of Europe ringing in his ears, "May God empower you as you face this noble gamble." Let us remember that even Paul the Apostle approved the murder of Stephen and counted it a stern duty to deal out threatenings and slaughter, and to make havoc for the early church. But Paul, as he was then, the high-handed persecutor, became Christ's devoted bondservant. Across the centuries his name stands next to the one he persecuted. Could not that miracle of transformation happen again?

Who goes there? One who if he could but see, like Paul, the light, and repent, and change his attitude, could go down in history as a great benefactor of humanity in this age on ages telling.

But as matters now stand, for loyal Americans, while there must be, of course, no jeers, there must be no cheers. This visitor must be received—not as a friend—for he is an enemy—with correct and dignified formality. If this avowed foe of the precious things we hold nearest our hearts should be received with fulsome welcome, or as a conquering hero, we would be doing something terrible to ourselves. To receive him, thus, America would be crucifying her own principles. Any applause will be to toll the bells of hope for all the captive nations who will be listening.

Courtesy does not even demand that we lend our physical presence. It is possible to look and listen by way of the radio and television. In any event, to be true to ourselves the reception accorded should be politely regular. Anything else will be a vote to sell the soul of America to the devil of tyranny.

The Khrushchev Invitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, since Soviet Premier Khrushchev, in his recent article for the magazine Foreign Affairs as seen fit again to chide the Congress for adopting the captive nations resolution, I believe it is particularly in order to place in the RECORD the views on the Khrushchev visit held by the principal author and sponsor of this resolution.

I refer to Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University and chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. Dr. Dobriansky is an authority on the empire-building activities of Soviet Russia and the role which Mr. Khrushchev has played in this brutal conquest.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include a copy of the telegram sent to President Eisenhower by Dr. Dobriansky prior to the announcement of the invitation to Mr. Khrushchev to visit the United States and also a copy of the statement to the press by Dr. Dobriansky on August 7, following public disclosure of the invitation:

TELEGRAM SENT TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER BY ORIGINATOR OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK IDEA

THURSDAY, JULY 30, 1959.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As the originator of the Captive Nations Week idea and resolution, I cannot adequately express in words our profound gratitude for your well-worded proclamation and also for your personal participation in a prayerful observance of the week in Gettysburg, Pa.

Contrary to the understanding of some, both the resolution and proclamation are unique documents. For the first time they direct world attention to the fact that the majority of the captive nations are in the Soviet Union and Asia. It is this truth that disturbed Khrushchev most. By pointing to the gravest weakness in the Communist empire we placed Nikita the Sanguine on notice that we are well aware of the empire character of the U.S.S.R. itself. Without the resources of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., Russia itself would be a second- or third-rate power. The spread of this truth enormously devaluates Moscow's propaganda bluff in any comparisons with our Nation.

In the spirit of the Captive Nations Week, we sincerely hope that you will resist the ill-advised pressure to invite Khrushchev to these shores. Wisely, we extended no official invitation to Mikoyan. Khrushchev's criminal record exceeds all. It is patently naive to believe that a spirit by the "Hangman of Ukraine" would add anything to what he already knows about our country. If he should acquire facts of incidental worth, it is equally illusory to think that this would produce a cessation of the cold war which, historically, imperialist Russia plays for keeps. Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to a dedicated enemy, the attributes he desires most in order to extend his empire.

Sincerely yours,

Dr. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Georgetown University.

THE STATEMENT TO THE PRESIDENT

(Delivered Aug. 7, 1959)

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America again cannot thank you enough for your historic Proclamation of Captive Nations Week. By act of Congress and your splendid proclamation, the United States has officially recognized for the first time the existence of the many captive non-Russian nations within the empire known as the Soviet Union. This represents a great stride in our real understanding of the prison house of nations parading as the U.S.S.R. It was most significant that while the Vice President was in Russia proper, Khrushchev had to hurry down to Ukraine to give a self-reassuring speech.

We are, however, gravely disturbd by the invitation extended to Mr. Khrushchev to visit this country. In our judgment, this invitation cannot but be deplored as another Russian cold war victory which Moscow is already celebrating as Khrushchev's triumph. To countless Americans, this planned action appears now as a cynical sequel to our first observance of Captive Nations Week.

In the view of this committee, the invitation constitutes another cold war defeat for the United States by placing the cloak of respectability and legitimacy on a political criminal, no matter how he is painted. Moreover, Mr. President, it so obviously contradicts your own test, put so often before our people, that you would not meet with Khrushchev unless there were some encouraging progress at Geneva. There was none. What this and a forthcoming summit meeting amount to are a dangerous retreat from the policy you so admirably upheld against all shortsighted pressures when Secretary Dulles was alive.

This step really ushers in a new phase in our foreign policy. We now seem to be reducing our last and most potent weapon of clearcut superiority, our discriminating moral world leadership. Secretary Dulles must have rolled in his grave when this invitation was announced. The pressures that sought to oust him over a year ago, have now, but momentarily, won their first round.

To us, who follow closely developments within the multinational Soviet Union, it is incredible that a genocidist and political criminal should be extended the official hospitality of this home of the free. His record in part shows: (1) As a party functionary in the early thirties (he played a brilliant role in the Moscow man-made famine in Ukraine that resulted in the annihilation of some 5 million lives; (2) for his excellent performances, he was elevated to high party posts in Ukraine and had a hand in the genocide of some 11,000 lives in Vinnitsa, Ukraine, before the war; (3) although a Russian, he paved his way to leadership in the party in Ukraine by conducting many purges; (4) following World War II, he was specially dispatched by Stalin to quell the patriotic national resist-

ance in Ukraine. This partial record explains why he is widely regarded in Eastern Europe as the hangman of Ukraine.

Terrorism comes easy with the Hangman of Ukraine. He showed it also in Georgia, Poland, and Hungary in 1956. Through his puppets, he showed it in Tibet. Only last month it was against the Ukrainian underground in the Carpathian Mountains. Fooling many of our Americans today as Stalin did before fully entrenching himself over 30 years ago, the hangman continues this terrorism by less conspicuous but more effective methods in the Soviet Union. To assert, as some do, that peaceable methods have featured his regime since the 20th Party Congress belies the facts.

This committee, doubtless in addition to millions of Americans, regards the arguments offered to justify Khrushchev's visit here as spurious. It is almost insulting to the intelligence of the American people that we are deemed by some as being naive enough to believe that Khrushchev does not already understand what the United States represents and possesses. Clearly, it didn't take the Russians long to understand where our atomic and missile secrets were. Khrushchev understands our country far more than many of us understand his empire in the Soviet Union itself and his centuries-fashioned methods and techniques. Those, like our visiting Governors to the U.S.S.R., who speak in mythical concepts of "the Soviet people" and "the Soviet nation," and with callous disregard of the Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian, and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., may well learn from the late Secretary of State Dulles. "The Soviet bloc," he said on October 10, 1955, "represents an amalgamation of about 900 million people, normally, constituting more than 20 distinct national groups." The untutored harm some of us do to the freedom aspirations of 110 million people making up the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. cannot be too strongly emphasized. The blemish this places on our own traditions and the reciprocal harm it incurs for our own security interests need hardly be stressed.

It is an illusion to think that this visit and the later calculated summit meeting will relieve pressures on Berlin, the Middle East, Laos, free Korea, free China, and, indeed, upon our United States. This action shows how woefully unprepared we are to cope with Moscow's cold war challenge. More than anything else that Khrushchev now wants is respectability and legitimacy to consolidate his empire. He is behaving in a tradition developed long before the Russian Revolution and we have not even begun to learn the lessons of Russian empire building. Some of us may just as well pay tribute to Ivan the Terrible who was the first to use the "friendship and peace" tool in his cold war conquest of the Khanate of Kazan in the 16th century.

In the light of these facts and reasoned judgments, our conscience moves us to join with other Americans in peaceful demonstration of protest and righteous condemnation against the hangman. The Russians—and, indeed, the Vice President traveled only in the Russian part of U.S.S.R.—had no crimes to denounce. By any stretch of logic, the hangman is no parallel case to our Vice President. We, as indeed many other Americans who will in time voice themselves, cannot but share the moved feelings of Richard Cardinal Cushing, Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Congressman WALTER JUDD, and many other outstanding leaders in our society.

In full confidence of your understanding and with God's many blessings upon you, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

General Bradley Tries To Save Taxpayers' Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Gen. Mark E. Bradley, Jr., Deputy Chief of Staff, Materiel, U.S. Air Force, is conscious of the great responsibility which rests on his shoulders. The watchword of his office is the wise use of funds appropriated by the Congress. General Bradley has to make many decisions involving very large sums of money. Many of the contracts which he authorizes must necessarily be done without the benefit of competitive bidding. For reasons of security, performance, and ability to produce, he must decide on who shall construct what, and for how much. Because of these difficult decisions and because of the fine character which he possesses, General Bradley is instituting many fine procedures designed to save the ultimate in the funds entrusted to his use.

In an address before the Air Force Association meeting in Miami on the 3d of September, General Bradley explained the policy of his office.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include therewith General Bradley's speech for insertion in the RECORD:

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. M. E. BRADLEY, JR., DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, MATERIEL, AT PROCUREMENT SEMINAR, AIR FORCE ASSOCIATION MEETING, MIAMI BEACH, FLA., SEPTEMBER 3, 1959

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen, your invitation to address this seminar made it clear to me that you consider the Air Force and industry partners in the business of defense. I agree that we are partners and that each of us often speaks for the other. But although we may have a dual mission we must never lose sight of the important mission of protecting the taxpayer's dollar. I assure you that the Air Force intends to do this at all times to the best of its ability.

Your invitation left me a choice of topics for discussion. I have, therefore, selected a subject, "Current Air Force Procurement Problems," in which I am sure you are vitally interested. Like most discussions of procurement this one too is basically about money. But it is a particular aspect of procurement money as it bears on Air Force-congressional relationships.

Air Force funds are, of course, appropriated by Congress. Congress bases the appropriation of funds for the Air Force primarily upon three considerations:

The type of proximity of the threat facing us;

The strength of the national economy;

The ability of the Air Force to use the money wisely and efficiently.

It is the third consideration—the ability of the Air Force to use its funds wisely—which I want to discuss today. This thought is highly important because it affects the relationship of the Air Force to Congress. Unless Congress is convinced that the Air Force handles its funds carefully, it will not be willing to grant the Air Force the sums it needs. The denial of funds would seriously affect the ability of the Air Force to execute its mission.

I am keenly aware of the fact, and I am sure you are too, that the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress seem to be convinced that the Air Force and industry—the partnership we are talking about—are not managing the defense dollar as well as we might. We have only to look at the reports of the Senate Appropriations Committee for the past 2 fiscal years to see why I say this. In both cases the committee expressed grave concern over spiraling defense costs. This year the House Appropriations Committee made a 1 percent across-the-board slash in the amount appropriated. The purpose of the slash was to obtain improved management of funds and economies in procurement. The final defense appropriations approved by Congress carried a one-half percent reduction in funds.

Congress did this partly because of the recent reports of the General Accounting Office on the misuse of funds by contractors. Several contractors had to refund substantial amounts to the Air Force on the ground that the money they had received was not earned.

You can help us improve our position before Congress if you will cooperate in three problem areas. These, then, are the sore spots we want to eradicate. First of all, as partners we must be able to depend on each other for reliable and accurate information when we are negotiating contracts. Secondly, when we arrange letter contracts, we must be able to expect definitization of contracts without undue delay. And thirdly, we in the Air Force must have cooperation from contractors in reducing costs. A fourth point I will mention already has your cooperation. This relates to small business. We are doing pretty well here, but I want to encourage further progress. Now, let me elaborate somewhat on these subjects that are so vital to our progress.

As partners we must be able to trust each other fully during our negotiations of target prices. Both of us must furnish the other with current and completely accurate information. Inaccurate or out-of-date information defeats the purpose of the incentive type contract. This type contract, properly used, benefits both the Air Force and industry. It benefits the Air Force because costs are substantially reduced. It benefits industry by making profits commensurate with your performance. It benefits the taxpayer by giving him more defense for his money. I appeal to all of you to see to it your company gives our negotiators good and up-to-date prices. If the Air Force is to continue to utilize incentive contracts, you must prove by your actions that this will be done.

It should not be necessary for one partner to require signed certificates attesting to the accuracy and currency of cost information. However, it now appears, from the facts furnished by the General Accounting Office,, that we will have to continue to require a certificate of accuracy.

We are acting in accord with the policy of requiring a certificate of accuracy already adopted by the Department of Defense. In the next revision to the ASPR this requirement will be extended to include all first tier subs where the sum involved is over $100,000 and where there is no effective competition.

As one of the partners in this business, then, let me urge complete cooperation in achieving the purposes of this certificate of accuracy. It is my feeling that whatever officer of the company signs the certificate of accuracy should give careful consideration to the responsibility he has to himself, his corporation, and the Government.

The Air Force expects its contractors to earn reasonable profits. Close pricing at the outset through all tiers will benefit everyone in the long run. But we cannot, and you would not expect us, to condone any action

which would not carry out the intent of the certificate of accuracy.

The second problem area is that of prompt definitizaton of letter contracts. Delays often occur because negotiators are reluctant to disclose information to our auditors and price analysts. As a result, negotiations over prices are lengthy and time consuming. I think it is important for contractors to recognize that these delays cost them money. For example, as long as a letter contract is in effect, the contractor is paid 70 percent progress payments. However, if this contract is definitized as a cost-type contract, the contractor gets 80 percent of the allowable items of cost. That's a 10-percent spread in financing which should not be overlooked.

We have an additional reason for avoiding delays. The House Armed Services Committee has indicated that it will insist upon complete and accurate cost information as a basis for negotiating contracts. Contractors can help us greatly here by giving us this information promptly. Failure to cooperate on this will reflect adversely on both of us.

We all recognize that letter contracts are valuable. They help us to buy that very scarce commodity—time. If we misuse the letter contract, we hurt ourselves and discredit the letter contract.

Here again the Air Force needs the help of its contractors. We must cooperate. The Air Force intends to keep the use of letter contracts to a minimum. We, for our part, will also definitize them as rapidly as possible.

The third problem is concerned with ever-rising costs. Air Force policy is to reduce costs wherever possible. Right now we are very much concerned about a specific area where we think we can make immediate substantial cost reductions. That is in overhead costs.

Overhead costs are troublesome because we are faced with a curious fact—although production runs have decreased overhead costs have not. Just a look at the figures tells us what we should expect.

In 1944, we produced 95,272 military aircraft, in 1933 the figure had shrunk to 10,626, and in 1957 it was down to 5,500. Clearly, the good old days of long production runs are gone. As firepower has increased, costs have increased and production runs have decreased and will continue to do so. I don't think I'm wrong when I say they've gone forever. This is a fact, gentlemen, and we must face it. Now, here's the curious part. As production runs have decreased direct labor hours have also decreased. However, overhead expense, especially engineering, is ever rising.

I know complexity has increased. I know many thousands more engineering hours are required to accomplish the development of these complex weapons. But I still have a feeling that industry is still holding to much of the capability required to meet the large scale, long run production programs of the past. Gentlemen, the good old days are gone, and the more we increase complexity, the higher we let our costs get, the less and less today and tomorrow are going to look like yesterday. Let's you and the Air Force join in a real soul-searching cost reduction program. I know some companies have made some progress but we need across-the-board action.

Complex modern weapon systems, are, by their very nature, more costly than any of our earlier systems. The basic cost of modern weapon systems is so great that we cannot afford to allow any unnecessary costs to creep into the price. Just compare the figures. A B-52 costs about 35 times as much as we paid for a World War II B-17. The B-58 Hustler, currently in limited production, will cost about twice as much as a B-52. Figures on the B-70 are classified, but they are considerably more than the B-58. If we let them, costs could even run us out of business.

But the contractor, as our partner in this business, can help us here. He should make a definite, firm effort to hold the line against increased costs, to hold back on items that his engineers or individuals in the Air Force may request until he is absolutely convinced that they are necessary. If he does this he will be helping us do our job and will be truly playing the role of partner. These are the shared responsibilities of the Air Force-industry team.

There is one more topic on which I'd like to comment before we finish this discussion. This also is a responsibility shared by Air Force and industry as partners in the business of defense. Of course, the ultimate responsibility always rests with the Air Force, but we do have to turn to you for considerable assistance.

Congress expects the Air Force to accept the responsibility to help keep our economy strong. One means of doing this is to distribute the work to the various levels of the industrial community. The Air Force must adhere to the basic procurement principles of quality, prompt delivery, and lowest price. At the same time, we must be sure that competent small business concerns are given every opportunity to share in our business. As you probably know, over 90 percent of industrial concerns in this country employ less than 500 people. These are the concerns we characterize as small business—the ones we're interested in here.

You may be interested in knowing that in the direct Air Force purchasing in fiscal year 1959, the dollar value of contracts awarded to small business concerns was 22 percent higher than in fiscal 1958. This is significant because in both years our total procurement remained approximately the same. The $920 million in prime contracts awarded in 1959 to small business was the highest figure since we started keeping such records about 9 years ago.

This large and impressive figure of awards to small business did not come about by chance. It is the result of an intensive small business program the Air Force has been carrying on since 1950. While this practice helps the national economy, it also benefits the Air Force in a very special way. Small business concerns over the years have not only been able to meet specifications and delivery schedules, but they have given us the lowest prices in a great many cases.

Let me give you a rather extreme example of what small business can do. When I was Director of Procurement and Production at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, we had a requirement for a thousand rather difficult items. We had been paying $3,000 per unit for them. We found a way of getting small business to bid on this device. Small and large firms competed and in the end the contract price was $670 per unit. The successful bidder was a small business concern. It did the job capably and on time. It saved the Air Force over two $2½ million, and made a profit for itself.

Our large contractors use many thousands of small concerns over the country as subcontractors and suppliers. Over 25 percent of the dollars we place with large prime contractors find their way to small business concerns a subcontractors in one tier or another. We are pleased with this. It is a respectable sum, but we are interested in seeing it increased. Here's where we turn to you again as partners in business. If you will make a special effort as large contractors to offer more competitive bid opportunities to small concerns, you will be helping us spread the work among the smaller concerns. Although we know it means more work and a special effort, the result will be worthwhile for both of us. It will pay off in lower costs. And you know how important that is.

By making these savings we will also convince Congress and the public that we are handling our appropriated funds in the most efficient manner possible. I think, gentlemen, that if we work together in these areas I have discussed, we will be able to satisfy Congress that we are carrying out our responsibilities properly. We have an important job to do and we must do it together.

As partners we share the burden of the mission we are entrusted with. We cannot share the final responsibility for the mission which the Air Force has been given. I thank we must also remember the Air Force is the senior partner, the one that has the ultimate responsibility. The Air Force, nevertheless, relies upon you for assistance in carrying out this responsibility.

I think I have said enough to give you a clear idea of some of the problems troubling us and what we think should be done to overcome them.

The U.S. National Exhibition in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, this summer saw a rather unique happening in the effort we are making to bring about a greater understanding between this country and the U.S.S.R. It saw a Russian exhibition in New York and a U.S. fair in Moscow. There is no need to discuss here the Russian effort, thousands of Americans including many Members of Congress have seen it. But few Americans and only a handful of Members of Congress have seen the exhibition we put on in Moscow. Having gone there as a member of the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, with its chairman, the Honorable WAYNE HAYS, of Ohio, it seems to me important that some record of the amazing thing that was done should go into the RECORD.

Our purpose was clear—to strengthen the foundations of world peace by increasing understanding in the Soviet Union of the American people, the land in which they live, and the broad range of American life, including American science, technology, and culture.

President Eisenhower, in a message prefacing the official guidebook, said:

> It is my fervent wish that by this means, and through the corresponding exhibition which your country is holding in New York City, the people of our two great nations may gain a better understanding of one another. Thus can the foundations be strengthened for our cooperation in the achievement of mankind's greatest goal—a fruitful and flourishing world at peace.

The exhibition was a joint endeavor of the U.S. Government, American industry, and other private groups and organizations. Government participation centers in the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, and the U.S.

Information Agency, with the Director of USIA, George V. Allen, serving as coordinator. Harold C. McClellan, Los Angeles industrialist and former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for International Affairs, was made general manager. Assistance and counsel on content were given by an advisory committee of 51 representatives of U.S. education, industry, foundations, science and the arts, as well as by a group of American newspaper and radio-TV correspondents formerly stationed in Moscow. McClellan and all those associated with him deserve the highest commendation and praise. They succeded beyond expectations in carrying out what Mr. McClellan expressed at the outset of this amazingly successful effort:

We definitely are not putting on either a propaganda show or a trade fair. It is going to be as comprehensive a presentation as we can make it of the way the American people live, work, and enjoy the fruits of their labor. It will reflect our attainments in the cultural and scientific fields as well as in the production of consumer goods. We will endeavor to exhibit the type of things the Soviets are interested in seeing. The Soviet people are tremendously curious about America, and we hope, in part, to satisfy that curiosity.

In no way was the American exhibition a trade fair, though there were industrial displays. It was an amazingly successful effort to project a realistic and credible image of America to the Soviets through exhibits, displays, films, publications, fine arts and performing arts. The exhibition reflects how America lives, works, learns, produces, consumes, and plays; what kind of people Americans are and what they stand for. America's cultural values were dramatically displayed in the 6 weeks when there was a corner of America in the heart of Moscow.

Nor were the outward and visible signs all that we sent there. The museum marvel was the fact that it was not just our Government that set it all up, but that in spite of the fact that it was not a trade fair, nearly 800 firms contributed products and/or foods to this national exhibition. Many paid all the shipping and underwrote the cost of maintaining their own—Russian speaking—personnel at Moscow. The cost of the plastic pavilions was borne by a group of leading firms in the plastic field. It has been impossible to determine the total value of industry's contribution, but it runs into the millions of dollars in goods, transportation, and services. That is the kind of people we are.

Could you have watched, as I did, the eagerness with which the Russians flooded in through the gates and seen them as they crowded into the exhibits, you would not question the success of the venture. To those of us who saw it, every penny put into it of Government and private enterprise money and effort, was well spent. Our fair was a living, breathing, heart-warming picture of what a free, independent, courageous and capable people have built for themselves and their children, and which they want for all the world.

The location in Sokolniki Park, 15 minutes by subway from downtown Moscow, serviced also by bus and trolley lines, could not have been improved upon. Not only did the Soviets provide various landscaping improvements in the park and extend the paved roads to the exhibition grounds, but they also made available water, gas, electricity, and sewage disposal and permitted the United States to landscape its exhibition area of 400,000 square feet. In addition the U.S.S.R. agreed to buy the aluminum geodesic dome building and the main exhibition hall for $375,000 after the exhibition was over. This has given us a return on our buildings, has saved us the cost of removing them and restoring the site to its original state, and leaves there a continuing reminder of modern American architecture and engineering achievement.

Let me give you as briefly as possible some of the main features:

THE GEODESIC DOME

A Kaiser aluminum gold-anodized geodesic dome building, 200 feet across and 78 feet high, with 30,000 square feet of floor space, was the information center about America, designed to handle traffic at the rate of 5,000 persons an hour.

The unique geodesic dome principle was developed in 1947 by the American architect-engineer R. Buckminster Fuller. It is like a huge half orange in appearance, and has no interior supporting pillars.

Around its inside perimeter were exhibits on space research, education, labor, health and medicine, agriculture, basic research, synthetics and nuclear energy. Around the exterior of the dome was a "Gallery of Americans"—5-foot photographs of American figures such as Benjamin Franklin, Walt Whitman, Abraham Lincoln, and Mark Twain.

A continuous documentary film portraying key aspects of American life was projected on one-third of the dome's interior circumference by means of the unique Charles Eames motion picture technique which uses seven simultaneous screens, each 30 by 20 feet, with a single Russian-language sound track.

Ramac 305, the "electric brain," provided split-second answers—in Russian—to thousands of questions about the United States.

Four American voting machines were on hand for Soviet visitors to vote for their favorite exhibits and displays.

THE EXHIBITION HALL

A 50,000-square-foot fan-shaped steel structure 28 feet high, glassed front and rear and covered by an accordian-pleated aluminium roof, displayed American cultural attainments and exhibits showing the results of the American economic system: the abundance so broadly shared by the people. These reflected the great freedom of choice enjoyed by the American family.

A special interior exhibit design of modular steel permitted maximum use of space. The display framework created mezzanine areas from which the visitor could observe exhibits above, below, and on the same level as himself.

THE PLASTIC PAVILIONS

Three plastic pavilions covering 15,000 square feet were located in three clusters. They housed:

First. The Museum of Modern Art's "Family of Man" Exhibit of 500 photographs assembled by Edward Steichen;

Second. An exhibit of contemporary American architecture showing models and 100 black-and-white photographs of schools, churches, shopping centers, skyscrapers and other buildings throughout the United States; and

Third. A display of American wearing apparel ranging from workclothes to formal attire. The majority of the models were nonprofessional, and included three American families who had been selected by the fashion industry to represent various economic groups. The live presentation consisted of a half-hour show four times a day, with commentary in Russian. This was really tops.

CIRCARAMA

This 360° "movie in the round" which was so successful at Brussels, was housed in its own circular building. Circarama was redone and brought up to date by Walt Disney with new sequences and a Russian sound track.

OUTSIDE AREA

Outdoor displays included:

An American six-room ranch-type home completely furnished.

Twenty-two 1959 automobiles from all U.S. manufacturers, the most luxurious to the most economical.

Sporting and camping equipment, ranging from skis and fishing tackle to sailboats and outdoor cooking facilities.

Farm equipment such as tractors and combines.

A children's playground featuring a concrete abode-type playhouse, an iron grid "magic carpet" and a sand lot for tots.

A Polaroid camera demonstration which not only illustrated the "picture-in-a-minute" technique but provided some 15,000 Soviet visitors with souvenir photographs of themselves.

Brightly colored kiosks where Pepsi-Cola was served free to visitors. Other kiosks displayed American newspapers, magazines and books.

VARIETY OF DISPLAYS

Exhibits on American productivity reflected a strong, growing economy. They included food demonstrations, home appliances, toys, clothes, cosmetics, television hi-fi presentation, musical instruments, a completely furnished model apartment, a home workshop, and an exhibit on packaging techniques. There also was a travel display showing American interest in travel throughout the United States and abroad.

In the food demonstrations, Soviet visitors saw for themselves how an American housewife can dish up a full-course dinner in a matter of minutes, using frozen goods and readymixes. Demonstrators prepared 110 varieties of food.

The clothing displayed consisted of fabrics and synthetic fibers, telling the story of the needle trades unions and the leather industry. There were also sew-

ing demonstrations illustrating the use of American patterns.

A fine arts display included 49 American paintings and 23 works of sculpture selected by a non-Government jury of experts as examples of the variety and wide range of American art produced from 1918 to the present.

A completely equipped color TV studio provided 8 hours of programing daily on a closed circuit, using 16 21-inch color TV viewing screens placed at strategic points throughout the exhibition area. The color camera was trained on Soviet visitors, and tapes played back so that the Soviets saw themselves on the TV screen.

Music in stereophonic high fidelity sound was broadcast to a children's play area and a picnic area.

CULTURAL CONTENT

Displays reflecting America's culture included some 10,000 books and a bookmobile, newspapers from every State in the Union, hundreds of magazines, paintings and works of sculpture, photography, high-fidelity music, record albums, the "Family of Man" exhibit, models and photos of 100 outstanding architectural achievements in the United States, do-it-yourself exhibits, crafts, and performing arts, including the New York Philharmonic Orchestra and an Ed Sullivan variety show, in a downtown Moscow theater. Religious activities were portrayed in many ways.

Several of our groups deserve special commendation, the 75 guides first of all. Chosen from a long list of applicants on the basis of personality, knowledge of Soviet and American affairs, and complete command of the Russian language, they did us proud. Well organized and carefully disciplined, they proved themselves—with amazingly few incidental exceptions—equal to their truly difficult jobs. They took groups about, were prepared to answer any and all questions, not only about the exhibition, but about America as well, and in themselves were exponents of our American way of life.

The models of our style show, made up another group who deserve high praise. Young, full of energy, charming, with a sense of artistry and freshness, they were a gay, happy note, and were much appreciated. Here again was evidenced a fine discipline and an enthusiatic devotion to the job of showing America to the Russians for which they deserve sincere praise.

Mr. Speaker, we can be very proud of the exhibition we sent to Moscow and of the personnel who represented us there. Let us keep to this high standard in all similar adventures yet to come.

Hon. J. Bayard Clark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to personally know the Honorable J. Bayard Clark who so ably served the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina here in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. Clark was recognized as one of the outstanding lawyers of North Carolina, a student of government, a Christian gentleman, and devoted to his family. He served with distinction on the Rules Committee and voluntarily resigned from the Congress to return to his home town of Fayetteville, N.C., and resume his law practice, which was always close to his heart.

In his passing, North Carolina and the Nation lose a distinguished leader. To his family I express my deep sympathy.

Interpretation of Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared, dealing with an interpretation of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act, be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Many building trade union officials advise me that there have been numerous questions submitted to them both by local union officers as well as contractors asking whether or not particular subcontracting clauses in their existing agreements are covered by the proviso to section 8(e) of the new Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. More particularly, the question has arisen by the Plumbers and Pipefitters International Union based on what is known as their fabricating clause. In the plumbing and pipefitting industry, contractors have a collective bargaining agreement with the plumbers and pipefitters local unions, recognizing the pipefitters local unions as the exclusive bargaining agent for all journeymen pipefitters engaged in fabrication and installation of pipe on a jobsite.

The collective bargaining agreement further provides that all pipe installed on the jobsite must be either fabricated on the jobsite or in a shop of the employer. By fabriction is meant the cutting, bending, or fitting of pipe. A pipefitter is a fabricator. His job is to fabricate pipe. Fabrication of pipe can be performed either at the construction site or in a shop.

There is a further clause in the contract that provides that the contractor may subcontract out the pipe that is to be installed on the jobsite for fabrication in another shop provided that the subcontractor by whom the pipe is to be fabricated has an agreement with a local union of the pipefitters and pays the prevailing building and construction wage rate for pipefitters engaged in the fabrication.

This subcontracting clause is agreed upon in order to protect the wage rate and working conditions of the pipefitters. It is a term and condition of employment.

Section 8(e) was written in the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, abolishing hot cargo clauses and other forms of contract boycotting activity. However, there was inserted the following proviso:

"Provided, That nothing in this subsection (e) shall apply to an agreement between a labor organization and an employer of work to be done at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work."

This proviso embraces and covers all forms of contracting or subcontracting clauses in agreements between building and construction contractors and building trades unions with respect to work to be done at the jobsite. The pipe installed on the jobsite must be cut, treated, and fabricated prior to installation. This is done at jobsite in some jobs or at the shop of the employer, or may be subcontracted by the contractor. This is all a question to be covered by the collective bargaining agreement.

The proviso permits plumbers and pipefitters local unions to bargain with their contractors relative to the contracting or subcontracting out of any fabrication of the pipe or the parties may agree that it may be done at the jobsite.

A question has arisen as to whether the plumbers and pipefitters fabrication clause falls within the proviso of section 8(e). It was the intent of the conferees that the quoted provision 8(e) applies wherever the work involved could be performed at the construction site. Fabrication can be and generally is performed at the construction site and since the fabrication clause relates to work which can be done at the jobsite, the fabrication clause contained in the national and local agreements of united association local unions is within the coverage of the construction industry proviso in section 8(e). This matter was expressely considered and discussed in the conference on the labor reform bill. By use of the phrase "relating to work to be done at the site of the construction" it is my belief that the conferees intended to cover all work which could be done at the site of the construction. The type of building and construction clauses which are outlawed and do not fall within the proviso are clauses which restrict the use and installation of manufactured articles. The proviso, in my opinion as a conferee, was never intended to prohibit a fabrication type of clause where the work or fabrication could be done or performed at the jobsite.

Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which was published in the September 8, 1959, edition of the Elizabethton (Tenn.) Star. This excellent editorial, entitled, "Face to Face," deals with the coming visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States. The editorial most fittingly points out that we must explore every avenue of peace while at the same time remaining wary and watchful of the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACE TO FACE

The coming visits of Premier Khrushchev to this country and of President Eisenhower to Moscow certainly reflects the enormous

pressures for peace that come from the people of both the Soviet Union and the United States. The leaders of the two most powerful countries in the world are reflecting, in action, what amounts to an overwhelming demand that every avenue that may lead to peace be explored.

The cold war is not going to end overnight. Mr. Khrushchev is not going to suddenly wave the flag for capitalism, and Mr. Eisenhower is not going to embrace communism. But when men of opposed views meet face to face and talk in frankness the chance for reaching an understanding necessary to coexistence may be enhanced.

We have seen this at levels other than those of chiefs of State or high officers of State. American and Russian artists, scientists and industrial leaders have exchanged visits. In every instance, so far as one can see, the results have been healthy. A new measure of respect has been gained on both sides. So has a measure of friendship.

It would be foolish to expect too much from the Khrushchev-Eisenhower journeys. We must remain wary and watchful with the the Russians. But these spectacular and unprecedented events hold hope for all the peoples of the world.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Medical Editor of New York, Heralds Portland, Oreg., as One of Nation's Major Medical Centers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the people of Oregon have worked and sacrificed over the years to build a medical center of great distinction and achievement at the University of Oregon Medical School, in Portland. This high quality was recognized during 1959 when the National Institutes of Health granted $1,297,000 for a medical research center building at the Oregon Medical School, to be matched by an equal sum from the State—a sum which the Oregon Legislature has now fortunately appropriated. I was gratified to be able to play a part in the obtaining of this grant, which will add still further to the stature of the University of Oregon Medical School.

Over the past weekend the eminent medical editor of the New York Times, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, visited Portland where he delivered the annual Sommer Memorial Lectures. Dr. Rusk, one of the world's leading authorities on rehabilitation, also participated in the dedication of the Horizon Home, at Portland, for the physically handicapped.

Dr. Rusk's pilgrimage to Portland made a powerful impression upon this man who is so great a symbol in the United States of humanitarianism and medical progress. In the New York Times for September 13, 1959, Dr. Rusk has written an unusually excellent article describing Portland as a major medical capital in general and rehabilitation center particularly. Knowing the high quality of medical care, medical education, and medical research in Portland as I do, I can only corroborate what Dr. Rusk has written.

Several months ago my colleagues of the Senate, under the guidance of the illustrious senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] voted the medical research facilities funds from which will come the $1,297,000 for the medical research center building at Portland. At that time I spoke of the stellar attainments of the University of Oregon Medical School and of medicine in our State generally. Now I have endorsement and backing from the illustrious Dr. Howard A. Rusk. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Dr. Rusk's article from the New York Times may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Title of this fine article is "Rehabilitation in Oregon," and I commend it to my associates of the Senate and the House, who I know share my respect for the good judgment and medical wisdom of Dr. Howard Rusk, of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REHABILITATION IN OREGON—DEEP INTEREST IN AIDING DISABLED FOUND IN THE NORTHWEST—NEW HOME DEDICATED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

PORTLAND, OREG.—Because the University of Oregon Medical School is here, Portland has long been the medical capital of Oregon.

This last week it was the postgraduate medical center not only of Oregon but also of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska.

The occasion was the first regional meeting of the Northwest Academies of General Practice. Because Oregon is now observing its 100th birthday as a State, the conference theme was the "Horse and Buggy Doctor."

An unusual feature of these sessions was that they were held in conjunction with the Sommer Memorial Lectures.

These lectures for the advancement of medical science are conducted and financed from a trust established by the late Dr. Ernest A. Sommer, an outstanding Portland surgeon and civic leader who died in 1936.

Two lecture series by national medical leaders are presented each year.

The spring program is presented in conjunction with the annual reunion of the Alumni Association of the University of Oregon Medical School. The fall program is held in association with the annual session of the Oregon State Medical Society or the Oregon Academy of General Practice.

The nearly 100 guest speakers who have participated in the lectures since 1941 comprise virtually a "Who's Who in Medicine."

FOUNDED IN 1949

Founded 10 years ago, the American Academy of General Practice and its State affiliates are dedicated to providing continuing postgraduate training to the more than 100,000 general practitioners in the United States. It is now the second largest medical organization in the Nation. Its membership is exceeded only by that of the American Medical Association.

This writer had the privilege of attending the first meeting of the then new American Academy of General Practice in Cincinnati in 1949.

In this column the following Sunday, he wrote: "In the undercurrent and overtones of the entire meeting, one sensed a tremendous, almost feverish, desire to absorb every scrap of information. * * * The eagerness with which they sought medical truth presages a bright future for medical progress."

The meeting here this past week gave evidence that during the last 10 years the general practitioners have not lost their enthusiasm for continuing education.

There is deep interest in rehabilitation in Oregon, even more than in some other States. This results partly from the great number of older persons who have migrated to Oregon because of the climate. Another factor is the large number of hazardous industries, such as timbering.

One of the first major rehabilitation centers to be established on the West coast was the Portland Rehabilitation Center. Portland also has an excellent Goodwill Industries and there is a Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation in the University of Oregon Medical School.

The State also has good programs of vocational rehabilitation and workmen's compensation and active chapters of such major voluntary health agencies as the National Foundation, the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, United Cerebral Palsy, and the Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation.

HOME IS DEDICATED

An important step forward in rehabilitation also took place in the neighboring State of Washington last week. Yesterday, the first specially designed home for physically handicapped, cardiac, and elderly persons was dedicated in the Belvedere section of Seattle.

The home, known as the Horizon Home, was built by Eastside Homes, Inc., mass homebuilders. It is one of the a number of such homes being built throughout the United States, patterned after the original Horizon Home built in St. Petersburg, Fla., last spring.

A similar home is now being constructed by James Rosati & Sons, builders of the St. Petersburg home, on the grounds of the New York University-Bellevue Medical Center in New York City. This "Functional Home for Easier Living," which is being contributed by the builders, will be used as a model for demonstration purposes and for the training of disabled homemakers.

It is expected that the house will be dedicated and opened permanently for inspection and study next month.

Address by Former President of the United States Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, that foremost private citizen of the free world and former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, recently delivered an address to the Midwest Democratic Conference in Kansas City, Mo.

As one of this country's greatest students of political science, former President Truman has always been a keen observer of the political scene. His remarks are particularly important.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I commend this to my colleagues in the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF FORMER PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES HARRY S. TRUMAN

I want to call attention here to the fact that this Republican administration has been a won't-do administration, with a Congress that might be called a will-do Congress.

The present Congress, had it had a will-do administration, would have made the greatest record in the history of the Congress, but the administrative end of the Government was against a farm policy of any sort. They have arranged things so that, while the promises made in Minnesota during the campaign of 1952 were that at least 90 percent of parity in the market place would be met—what that meant, no one knows—the present administration shows parity to stand at only 65 percent.

The farmers voted for it, and I cannot feel sorry for them. They even had an opportunity to remedy the situation in 1956 and didn't do it.

The financial policy of the present administration has been to make it exceedingly difficult for the little man, who has to borrow money, to get loans. They have followed a policy of increasing interest rates, and under the present setup there is a total of about $800 billion borrowed all along the line by all the people which does not include the national debt of the United States. They have allowed the people who lend money to assess the people, who have no other recourse, about $16 billion. The result of that is to increase the income of those people who are in a position to lend money.

This administration has padded the boards and bureaus, set up for the protection of the people, in such a way that the legislation, which was passed to work in the public interest, has been made to work for the special interest classes—The Security & Exchange Commission, the Commodity Credit Corp., the Federal Housing Administration, and the National Labor Relations Board are the ones referred to, and it is particularly true in the Rural Electrification organization. The administration has tried to turn over rural electrification to the private utility companies, which is true right here in this neighborhood. They have tried to make the people who depend upon cheap electricity subservient to the private utilities.

In the Senate, it was my privilege to sit on the committee which examined these utilities, and they have been going right back to the position which the SEC and Rural Electrification were intended to prevent.

They have raised interest rates to fantastic figures. The management of the national debt has been arranged so that the debt at the present time is much greater than at any other time in our history. And there are a great many figures which should show in the national debt which are hidden away in other places. These figures should be shown as a part of the national debt. Instead of the $290 billion debt shown, it is actually more likely to be much over $300 billion.

The cost of the management of that debt has increased at the rate of $500 million a year. The cost of the service of the debt is almost double the cost in 1951 and 1952.

The monetary capital of the country has been moved from Washington back to Wall Street. Franklin Roosevelt and I spent 20 years putting it in Washington where it belongs, just as Woodrow Wilson did when he was President of the United States and as Andrew Jackson did when he took the financial control of the country away from old man Biddle in Philadelphia and set it up in Washington.

People forget very easily. They don't remember the things that were done for their welfare and benefit, and when they let a lot of fakers take over and run the Government, and misrepresent the facts, they are up against just such a situation as we are faced with now.

It is up to the Democrats, after the convention in 1960, to pull us out.

Let me reiterate that as of now I have no candidate for 1960.

And no matter what you hear or read, I have had no candidate.

But let me make it equally clear that I expect to have something to say on this subject in good time.

As a former President, I have more than an ordinary interest in the future of our party and the Nation, and I hope I have the privilege of talking about individuals as well as issues. At any rate, you may be sure I intend to exercise that privilege.

I would like to see our party united, strong, and genuinely liberal and fighting liberal. I would respectfully suggest that all those who are exploring their chances for the Presidency ought to remember that our first goal is to get the ablest Democrat into the White House and not to split our party through bitter contention and rivalry. We must avoid a deadlocked convention. Surely it is not too much to ask everyone to subordinate personal ambitions to the needs of the country, since only the Democratic Party is able to solve the problems that the Republican administration is imposing upon the people.

The popularity of a man is important—but, popularity does not qualify a man for President.

There has been considerable glee among Republicans about the uninterrupted record of vetoes by President Eisenhower which Congress could not override.

This has made it appear that the Congress—with a Democratic majority—has, in fact, sustained President Eisenhower.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that a minority in Congress—just barely over one-third of the elected representatives of the people—has managed to thwart over 140 times the will of the American people as expressed by the majority of the Congress. And this one-third—working with a willing Republican in the White House—has managed to impose a minority rule upon the people.

This is the fact, and this is the truth, and this is how the people of the United States are being hoodwinked and defeated by the shameful use and, in fact, shocking abuse of the Presidential veto.

The administration is trying to pin a won't-do tag on Congress, and I am sorry to see some Democrats who ought to know better acquiescing in the acceptance of this label.

This Congress is a far cry from the Republican do-nothing 80th Congress which continually blocked legislation proposed by the President, whereas in this administration very little, if any, legislation has been proposed by the White House, leaving it to the Congress to propose necessary measures.

What we have is not a won't-do Congress, but a won't-do administration which has prevented a Congress, with a majority returned by the people on three occasions, from enacting badly needed domestic legislation.

This won't-do administration, in the domestic field, has been responsible for the mismanagement of the national debt and the worst mishandling of our fiscal and monetary policies in recent times.

In the face of an expanding world economy, and an exploding population, this won't-do administration has vetoed the Nation into a lot of trouble for now and in the future.

Eyewitness to History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the exchange of visits between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Khrushchev is receiving, as it should, widespread attention from all communications media. However, I would like to draw attention to one particular facet of this coverage which I consider to be of great significance.

The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. is sponsoring a series of 14 special programs on these important events, which are currently being broadcast over the CBS Television Network. The programs, called "Eyewitness to History," are up-to-the-minute reports which convey concisely to the American people the day-by-day procession of events. They also provide analysis and interpretation of the deeper meaning of this exchange of visits.

To accomplish this compete coverage, CBS News is utilizing its full facilities here and abroad. For example, one of the programs just this past Sunday, September 6, featured an analysis of the President's trip to Europe by several CBS News correspondents. These correspondents were specially flown back to the United States for this program.

CBS News, as a national news service, and the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., as one of the Nation's leading industrial concerns, should receive the highest praise for their efforts to keep the American people informed.

Steel Strike

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Labor Day, September 7, 1959, I attended the largest Labor Day rally in the history of the Calumet region of Indiana held in the Crown Point (Ind.) Fairgrounds. In former years a gathering of 7,000 to 10,000 people was an outstanding number for a Labor Day picnic. This year, both daily newspapers, the Hammond (Ind.) Times and the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune estimated the mammoth crowd as approximately 50,000. The headine on the second page of the Hammond Times estimated that the total attending Labor Day fetes in the Calumet region in Indiana in addition to the Crown Point picnic would approximate 120,000. This is the largest turnout for a Labor Day celebration in the history of Indiana.

Without exception, the steelworkers to whom I talked at the gathering are extremely resentful to the attitude of big steel officials in instituting an employment lockout of steelworkers throughout the country. They are familiar with the fabulous profits and the great number of inexcusable rises in the price of steel during the last 10 years. They are also resentful of the fabulous preferential stock concessions given high officials in the steel industry. Some bonuses and salaries reaching one-quarter million to one-half million annually to the executives in the industry.

This lock-out has now continued for 60 days and the American public is beginning to discover some of the facts as to the reason for this inexcusable tie-up in our economy.

I wish to submit a letter from the Voice of the People in the Hammond Times written by a steelworker, P. E. Vukovich of Hammond, Ind. The same speaks for itself.

STEELWORKERS BATTLE FOR ALL OF LABOR

Is the wage increase really the cause of inflation?

Not an evening goes by that the paper doesn't report an increase in price that will affect the workingman's pay check. If it isn't the local or gasoline taxes, it's a public utility requesting an increase in price from the Public Service Commission, and there are many already pending.

Milk and many other food items have increased in price and are continually going up. While the industries are telling us they are freezing wages to keep down inflation, prices are still going up. Everyone knows the 10 cents or 15 cents raise the workingman received last year will never make up in percentage the increased cost of living.

Already, advertising tells us that no matter what the outcome of the steel strike, autos and other products for 1960 will come out with a price increase.

Every union member should be proud of the stand the Steelworkers' Union is taking against big business. The outcome of this strike will affect the whole labor movement in this country. Having been in an 8-week strike myself I know there are many hardships encountered, as proven in past history from the fight for the 8-hour day and the paid holidays which we now enjoy. This time will be no exception.

Every working union member can help by donating his penny a day or equivalent when approached by his job steward or local union representative. Let's back the Steelworkers' Union to help keep the working conditions which they have improved over the bargaining table through the last 20 years, and to keep on bettering them.

With automation entering the picture in all industry, it is the responsibility of the company, as well as the union, to come up with a solution providing jobs for the displaced workingman being forced into the streets, due to progress which eliminated his job.

Let's all fight together, for the future of the union is at stake now. The benefits not taken away at the bargaining table, legislation will undoubtedly pass in order to harness the unions. Let's all back David J. McDonald and the Steelworkers' Union in their fight.

P. E. VUKOVICH.

HAMMOND.

Civil Defense a Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to see the favorable editorial comment which has appeared since my recent address to the Senate expressing my concern over the Government's present program for dealing with the fallout from nuclear weapons.

Among those editorials expressing support of my position, was the editorial "Time for Uncle Sam" appearing in the Septemer 2, 1959, edition of the Atlanta, (Ga.) Journal.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Journal, Sept. 2, 1959]

TIME FOR UNCLE SAM

HUBERT HUMPHREY told the Senate in a recent address that America never will have adequate protection against atomic attacks if the Government is content with a voluntary shelter program.

This argument has merit. The American public will not rise up to meet a crisis unless it senses imminent danger. Somehow or other, we have failed to fear the results of a nuclear war.

A recent study by the Joint Atomic Energy Committee revealed that 50 million Americans would lose their lives because of the nakedness of America's defenses against nuclear weapons.

Senator HUMPHREY proposes a Government-built nationwide network of shelters to protect against atomic fallous which would take more lives than the initial bomb blasts.

After 10 years of civil defense planning, it is obvious that Americans won't and can't protect themselves on an individual basis. Maybe this is one of those occasions when the Government should step in and do it for them.

Science Progresses—But Politics Lags Behind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at the Atlantic Congress, which met in London last June, the Honorable Lewis Douglas, former Director of the Bureau of the Budget and former Ambassador to the Court of St. James, made a very thoughtful address, in which he pointed out that science and scientists are revealing to mankind vast new horizons of knowledge, but that the political behavior of man has, on balance, been lagging behind, if not actually deteriorating. As Mr. Douglas says, many new manifestations of excessive nationalism—not patriotism—are emerging in almost every part of the world, old and new. Today, as we read the headlines that the Soviet Union has landed a rocket on the moon, is a good time to give sober reflection to the remarks of Mr. Douglas.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Your Royal Highness, my lords, and delegates to the Atlantic Congress, ladies and gentlemen, there are others who will address you with far more eloquence and far greater elegance than can I, but none will speak with greater sincerity or deeper convictions about the significance of the North Atlantic Community to the preservation and advancement of the type of civilization of which, with natural national modifications, we are all members. We all enjoy a philosophical, political, and general economic inheritance which is much the same. This is the foundation stone upon which the association of the North Atlantic countries, even in its military aspects, has been established.

One may define this philosophical, political, and economic community in many ways—ways which distinguish our own community from the community which lies to the east. We believe that the individual should be the master of the state, and not the slave. Others believe, as Professor Fisher has put it, in "the tyranny of the state gilded by the ethical beauty of sacrifice."

We may even define our part of the world as that part which has a conscience—a conscience which is pricked and causes us to bow our heads in shame whenever we behave in a manner which offends our generally accepted standards of moral behavior.

But however we may define the civilization to which we all belong, we both instinctively and consciously acknowledge that we are each of us part of it and that for it we are prepared to risk "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

The events of the last half century bear mute and convincing testimony to support this naked fact of recent history.

The North Atlantic Treaty, conceived in an atmosphere of apprehension, is one of the startling novelties, perhaps the most startling novelty, of the first half of this century. In one of the most highly revolutionary periods of history, which has witnessed the rise of new seats of authority and the greatest migration of the centers of power within the span of modern history, the North Atlantic Community has been formally conceived and formally established. That the North American part of the New World is irrevocably committed to the preservation of the civilization of which it is an integral part is, I suggest, the most important of the international developments since the turn of the century. Had this commitment existed in 1914 or in 1939, it is doubtful thta we would have been dragged through the frightful experiences—the loss of millions of young lives—the complete disruption of social, political, and economic life, which followed in their wake.

And now, 15 years after the end of the last war, we meet here as individuals drawn from the countries of the Atlantic Community in an attempt—a very serious attempt—to propose various means by which governments of the North Atlantic area may move together in the political, military, and economic spheres of human activity to preserve our civilization and to fashion our community into a more solid and more enduring cooperative bastion of freedom.

In this task, and indeed in the task which confronts governments, I am bold enough to suggest that we are caught on the horns of a dilemma. We are faced with a serious contradiction. On the one hand, science and scientists have revealed to mankind vast new horizons of knowledge. They have delivered into our hands not only an accumulation of knowledge which can be ultimately employed for the greater benefit and glory of peoples everywhere, but also which can be fashioned into the most frightful weapon—more lethal than anything which President Lowell of Harvard University had in mind when he asked the question many years ago, "Is the final gift of the natural sciences to man ultimate destruction?"

At the same time that science and scientists have been bequeathing this body of knowledge to us, the political behavior of

man has, on balance, been lagging behind, if in many respects it has not deteriorated. Many new manifestations of excessive nationalism—not patriotism—are emerging in almost every part of the world—old and new.

In this matrix, science has given us the means to destroy ourselves. Meanwhile, politics, in its broadest sense, seems to be less and less able to deal successfully with the complicated issues which science and technology have created.

This is the dilemma and the contradiction of our period. We are meeting here in this Congress to attempt to persuade our respective governments that time is pressing, that politics must take control of the forces that science has generated, that unrestrained sovereignty, once constrained for almost the stretch of a century from Waterloo to the Marne, must once again subject itself to self-discipline and to wholesome restraints. We are meeting here in the deep conviction that only by acknowledging in word and by deed our common determination, and our willingness to resolve our internal and our particular international problems—in terms of their consequences to our own community and those who are associated with us—will the Atlantic Community survive in all of its greatness in order that men and women in all parts of the world may mold for themselves a future of opportunity and plenty.

Only by resolving the contradiction between science and politics, by restraining national sovereignty, and by cooperative action—economic, political and military—among the members of the Atlantic Community, can issues common to our generation, be adequately met, and an enduring peace finally be fashioned out of a period of uneasiness.

Tribute to Senator Murray

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the Legislature of the territory of Guam has adopted a resolution expressing the heartfelt and sincere appreciation and gratitude of the people of Guam to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his excellent grasp of the problems of the territory of Guam, and for his willingness to assist the people of Guam.

No such resolution could be more deserved. It has been my pleasure to serve under the distinguished senior Senator from Montana as chairman of the Territories Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I can heartily second the resolution. Senator MURRAY has vast knowledge of the problems of Guam and has worked unstintingly to resolve them. He has provided leadership and inspiration for those on his committee who have shared his legislative responsibility for the people of Guam. I am sure all of my colleagues in the Senate share in the sentiments expressed in the resolution of the territory of Guam.

I ask that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 123

Relative to expressing the heartfelt and sincere appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, for his excellent grasp of the problems of the territory of Guam, and for his willingness to assist the people of Guam: Be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the territory of Guam—

Whereas the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, chairman of Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the U.S. Senate, has always been willing, courteous, and sympathetic to the problems of the territory of Guam; and

Whereas the Honorable Senator has always been courteously receiving and otherwise lending a sympathetic ear to the problems of Guam, by arranging conferences and appointments for the Honorable A. B. Won Pat, Speaker of the Fifth Guam Legislature; and

Whereas during the recent trip of the Speaker A. B. Won Pat to Washington, the Honorable Senator was especially kind, and courteous, and as well sponsored or authored legislation beneficial to the territory of Guam, including; particularly, the introduction of a bill to provide the territory of Guam with a resident commissioner to the U.S. Congress, and did also look into the matter of the dual wage system as practiced by the U.S. Navy here on Guam and other matters of concern to the territory; and

Whereas the people of Guam are cognizant to the various matters aforesaid, all of which are beneficial to the territory of Guam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Fifth Guam Legislature does hereby on behalf of the people of Guam express its heartfelt and sincere appreciation and gratitude to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY for his many and varied assistance in introducing legislation and other matters beneficial to the territory of Guam; and be it further

Resolved, That the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, Senator from Montana, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, and to the Governor of Guam.

A. B. WON PAT,
Speaker.
V. B. BAMBA,
Legislative Secretary.

Financing of Political Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the financing of political campaigns.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

The financing of political campaigns always has presented a troublesome problem, and there continues to be a great deal of discussion of the ways political campaigns are financed. Various proposals have been made. It even has been proposed that, instead of party funds being raised by contributions from individuals and organizations, that they be appropriated from the U.S. Treasury.

The objective of all of us is to preserve our two-party system and to strengthen it. The continuing struggle between the two parties enables our people to know both sides of every issue. That each party, through its candidates, may present its program, large sums of money are required to finance television programs, radio programs, for literature, for advertising, for maintaining headquarters and staffs, and for all the various media through which debate is conducted and the people obtain the facts to make their decision.

It is my opinion that the funds for this purpose should come from private sources. To be sure, simply by virtue of their contributions, certain individuals and certain groups have been able to exert considerable influence in governmental affairs. It is for us to find ways and means to correct the abuses. One of the ways is to encourage all the people to contribute to the party and to the candidates of their choice. In this way it will be the many, and not just a few, who will be taking an active voice in what is proposed and what is opposed by each political party.

I wish to call your attention to a program which has been undertaken in Illinois by the United Republican Fund to meet the twofold objective of raising the necessary funds for political campaigns and stimulate individual interest in political affairs.

As a result of its experience in 1958, the United Republican Fund of Illinois has decided to raise most of its funds for the 1960 election campaign through a dues-paying membership. This seems to me wise and sound.

The dues-paying membership campaign which has been designated Illinois' "Go for 60" campaign will allow large numbers of people to support the party instead of the limited number who formerly did so. The fund has six classifications of annual memberships which should fit the circumstances of most people who are interested in the success of the Republican Party. These are: Regular $5, associate $10, sustaining $25, contributing $50, sponsor $100, patron $500.

The "Go for 60" dues-paying membership plan has many important advantages. Under it large numbers of voters will assume the responsibilities of citizenship by taking an interest in the party in which they have a financial stake. No longer will there be a reason for those who wish to be active to be left out of party affairs. A modest stake will cause members to show a more personal concern for the party. In addition, the "Go for 60" program can broaden the base of party support, substantially increase the level of party income, regularize party financing, stabilize party organization, improve campaign planning, increase the effectiveness of political expenditures, build party strength and strengthen party loyalty, and greatly increase the number of active party workers to help rebuild the party at the grassroots level.

The obligations of citizenship involve both going to the polls and voting and individual contributions, however small, to the support of the party of one's choice.

Through the "Go for 60" program of dues-paying memberships, the United Republican Fund of Illinois is making an outstanding contribution to our country's political future—to saving the America we know and love.

James C. Worthy, fund president, and his immediate predecessor, Charles H. Percy, Samuel W. Witwer, the fund general cam-

paign chairman, and the fund board of governors deserve thanks and appreciation for their determined effort to solve this important problem.

Thanksgiving Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, relating to the theme of Thanksgiving Day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these troublesome times when all the world, and particularly our own great Nation, faces many serious problems that are worrying each and every one of us, it seems to me that a prayer to the Great Almighty can help to sooth our worried brows.

This prayer could and should be offered, regardless of race, creed or color, in the sanctity of the home, be that home a penthouse in Manhattan or a humble farmhouse in the hinterland of our country.

As we all know many, many years ago when this country was founded by the Pilgrims those hearty individuals, who landed on our rugged shores, knelt down upon this blessed soil and gave thanks to God Almighty for bringing them safely to this treasured land.

As a result there and then Thanksgiving Day became a national holiday.

Through the years many great songs have been written commemorating Christmas, and deservedly so. Who is there who does not know "Silent Night," "Adeste Fidelis," "White Christmas," and countless other great musical creations that have been written through the years commemorating this holy of holy days.

But strange as it seems our great composers with their prolific pens somehow or other, although undoubtedly they have tried, have not hit the public pulse through their music in commemorating Thanksgiving Day.

Fully realizing the importance of this day of days, it has come to my attention that two outstanding composers, namely Mr. Jimmy McHugh of Hollywood, who composed such famous songs as "Coming In On A Wing and A Prayer," "I Can't Give You Anything But Love Baby," "On the Sunny Side of the Street" and Mr. Paul Cunningham, immediate past president of the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers (ASCAP), who authored such great songs as "I Am An American," "Please Take A Letter Miss Brown," "All Over Nothing At All" and many others that time will not allow me to mention, have at last blended their gifted talents in a musical prayer entitled "Thank the Lord for This Thanksgiving Day."

I have had the privilege of hearing a beautiful rendition of this number sung by Mr. John Gary and recorded by Fraternity Records of Cincinnati. What struck me was the simplicity and sincerity of Mr. Cunningham's lyrical poem, which Mr. McHugh set to music. May I read it to you?

Thank the Lord for this Thanksgiving Day
As we share our pumpkin pie
Thanks to Him our children laugh and play
Underneath a peaceful sky
Rich or poor He watches over us
With a love we can't repay
So for all these blessings from above
Thank the Lord for this Thanksgiving Day.

To me this is a long overdue message of thanks to our Maker for the bounty He has showered upon us. To me, those "peaceful skies" that Mr. Cunningham writes about will continue to be calm and peaceful as long as we take time out—each and every day—to thank the Lord for watching over us. And in conclusion, to me this belated song of thanksgiving is not only appropriate but should be an inspiration to all of us not to forget Him—who never forgets us.

Soviet Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, the report of the first official U.S. education mission to the U.S.S.R. has very recently been issued by the Office of Education.

In view of the substantially greater enthusiasm of the New York Times for this type of tax-financed mission to Moscow than I have, it is interesting to note that the newspaper editorially rebukes "questionable and slipshod" statements in the report.

Under permission to extend and revise my remarks, I include the editorial from the September 7 New York Times:

MOSCOW'S BRAND OF EDUCATION

Youngsters in many parts of the country will be going back to school this week. The kind of education these youngsters receive, the excellence with which they are taught, the industry with which they study, all these will play important roles in determining our Nation's future. All this has always been clear, but it has become a major fact of public consciousness only in the last few years under the impact of increasingly successful Soviet technological competition with the United States. The realization that Soviet scientific prowess has its start in the schools has stimulated a widespread study of the Soviet educational system, one product of which is the report released Saturday on the observations in Russia of the Derthick team which visited that country somewhat over a year ago.

In the nature of the case it will be difficult for Americans to read this report without making comparisons between the Soviet system of education it describes and our own. Widespread public appreciation here of the emphasis on science and mathematics in Soviet schools has exerted an influence in our own schools for greater emphasis upon those subjects. The 17 characteristics of Soviet education this report praises are likely to be studied with particular care by those who will have in mind transferring positive aspects of Soviet schooling to our own schools.

Yet precisely because of the potentially powerful impact such a report issued by our Government and signed by our Commissioner of Education, may have on our own education, it is distressing that even superficial examination can find in this document questionable and slipshod statements which must throw a shadow over the document as a whole. How can Americans speak of Soviet teachers as well paid, for example, when elsewhere the report implies large numbers of Soviet teachers must receive the equivalent of less than $100 a month? Where is the proof of the claim that from 10 to 15 percent of Soviet national income is spent on education? How can there be talk about the lack of instruction on other economic systems in Soviet schools when a prime purpose of Soviet education is to present a deliberately perverted picture of non-Communist nations and economic systems to Soviet youngsters so they will believe more ardently in communism?

H.R. 6295—Mine Safety Legislation Is Imperative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H.R. 6295 to help the States, the mineowners, and the miners reduce accidents and promote mine safety in the metal and nonmetallic mines. The necessity of the enactment of such legislation was brought out forcibly in the 12th Congressional District, which I represent, on June 1 of this year through the disaster at the Sherwood Mine in Iron River, Mich.

My bill, H.R. 6295, would empower the Secretary of Interior, or his agents, to inspect and investigate metallic and nonmetallic mines and quarries whose products enter or affect commerce. The Secretary of the Interior would report to Congress annually giving the findings of the inspections and recommendations for any additional needed legislation. These inspections would provide information relating to health and safety conditions in the mines and the cause of accidents or occupational diseases originating therein. Such information would provide a basis for determining the best use of public funds for the advancement of health and safety of the miners, for the preparation and dissemination of educational materials for that purpose, and for the development of adequate reports to the Bureau of the Census and the Congress. It would promote cooperation between Federal and State agencies in improving mine safety. My bill also includes authorization for the establishment of a six-member advisory committee composed of metallic and nonmetallic mine and quarry owners and workers.

Mining is a hazardous occupation and the business of mining safety is a subject that all of us must be interested in if human lives are to be saved. Statistics show there are unnecessary deaths of 75 miners and injury to 5,000 others per year in the metal and nonmetal mining industry. I have long been interested in this subject and have given every effort to have an up-to-date safety program initiated. I do not believe anything can take the place of an on-the-spot inspection of a mine. Inspectors making periodic inspections would render a real contribution in cutting down the rate of accidents. Mine management is safety minded and with the Bureau of Mines making periodic inspections this would help the companies and save considerable expense for them because of the inspectors' recommendation to the companies.

I know you are not callous toward these conditions and I am sure you will

agree the existing "crazy quilt" variety of inadequate mine safety standards and poor enforcements should be abolished in order that proper and adequate protection is given to all those concerned.

On behalf of the many miners concerned in the United States and in the interest of more effective mine operations and a stronger, healthier Nation, I urge the Congress to enact my bill into law.

Let's Get It Straight, Mr. K.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of Saturday, September 12, 1959, which takes the form of a memo to Red dictator Khrushchev:

MEMO TO RED DICTATOR: LET'S GET IT STRAIGHT, MR. K.

TO NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV:

You should understand exactly why you have been invited to visit this country.

No one here imagines you a true friend of peace. You and your Communist partners in Peiping have kept Europe and Asia in turmoil nearly 15 years. Even now you stir fresh trouble in Germany and far-off Laos.

When we look upon you, we see the symbol of a regime which grasps for world dominion. You are the physical embodiment of a plan of conquest which has forced immense armament burdens upon most of the world.

Essentially this arms output is sterile, representing a waste of billions in resources and human effort. Yet it is necessary to save men's freedoms.

This great weight is especially crushing at this turn in history. The luckier, more prosperous nations struggle with the problems of a swelling population whose needs must be served at constantly inflating cost. The less fortunate backward lands, long schooled in poverty, strive painfully to lift their millions to higher levels of living.

You were not asked here, either, because anyone who knows the facts thinks you are humanity's benefactor.

Besides saddling the world with costly arms, you have kept your own people for decades at little better than depression levels, have sucked your satellites dry, and have preyed on the economies of all who would let you. All this in the name of friendship for the downtrodden.

When, as in the historic case of Hungary in 1956, one people dared to strike a blow to get free of your strangling grip, you responded with bloody repression which stunned even the most gullible of the world's uncommitted peoples.

You have, in short, done nothing to earn for yourself a respected place in the society of nations. On the contrary, you have done much to thrust yourself everlastingly beyond the pale fixed by decent men.

You are here—in simple fact—because by methods which the free world abhors and could never condone you and your associates have risen to a pinnacle of great power, power which we must perforce recognize.

We invite you in the remote hope that when you see America in its full panoply of energy and capacity and will to freedom, when you talk with President Eisenhower and other top Americans, you may get a glimmering of this truth:

You cannot reduce us and our free world friends by force of arms without leveling your own land to rubble. You cannot win a "peaceful competition" with us, either, for all that you may practice a thousand deceits and stratagems in the political and economic marketplaces around the globe.

You can endure only as you understand that we and our free friends intend to endure, as we are, unmolested by aggression of whatever sort from the Communist cults of power in Moscow and Peiping.

If we can infuse that much sanity in your outlook, and perhaps into your programs and plans, then we may be glad we asked you here, even though we detest everything you stand for and regret deeply the circumstances that have elevated such men as you to a position of decisive importance for the safety of free humanity.

Labor Reform Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have examined carefully the provisions of the conference report on the labor management reform bill and I intend to vote for it. I congratulate both the Senate and the House conferees on reconciling and adjusting differences between the Kennedy-Ervin bill and the Landrum-Griffin bill to arrive at a compromise, one which I can accept and which I believe will be in the public interest. Extremists, both in labor and in management, of course, will not be satisfied.

I have consistently favored legislation which could prevent excesses and abuses by unworthy, dishonest, and disloyal officials who have contrived to gain positions of power in the labor movement but have opposed legislation which, taking improper activities of union officials as its springboard, would punish organized labor or impair or even abolish legitimate organizational and collective bargaining activities aimed at improving the welfare of the working people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe my position is in harmony with that of the great majority of my colleagues. Sincere and intelligent men may well differ, however, in applying such general principles to the specific provisions of any measure.

As I studied the various versions of labor-management reform legislation, it seemed to me that the Shelley bill, the Elliott bill, and the Kennedy-Ervin bill, were too weak and would not reach effectively the racketeering and abuses of power by officials of labor unions exposed by the McClellan committee.

On the other hand, it seemed to me that the Landrum-Griffin bill, in providing, for example, for civil damage suits and other sanctions against unions peaceably exercising the right of free speech to persuade the public not to patronize an employer who refuses in good faith to bargain collectively with organizations of his employees, would strike a severe blow at efforts of employees to protect and advance their economic interests through unions. In my opinion this would constitute a major setback in the progress of the labor movement progress which has been accomplished with great difficulty and over bitter opposition in the last two decades.

Neither my colleagues nor my constitutents should be surprised that, on an issue of this magnitude and of such vital concern to the working people of America, I would resolve any doubts with respect to the Landrum-Griffin bill in favor of the working people and the labor movement. Although I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act, the last labor legislation to appear before us during my service in Congress, which proved not to be a "slave labor" law, I consistently have spoken for and voted for legislation both in labor and other fields which I believed to be in the interest of the working people of America. That position is clear not only from an analysis of my votes and statements, but it is also clear in the support I have enjoyed, not only from individual working men and women, but from labor organizations which, because of the positions I have taken, have volunteered their help, including financial contributions, in many a hard-fought and close congressional compaign.

I do not apologize for the reputation I have gained over the years for being in favor of the common man. Rather, I am proud of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of departing from the position I have taken on labor first, because I believe that position is in the best interest of the United States of America; second, because I believe it has the approval of the people whom it is my privilege to represent in the House of Representatives. But, Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the conferees between the Landrum-Griffin bill and the Kennedy-Ervin bill have reshaped the labor-management reform bill in such fashion that I can support it in the belief that it will curb abuses without stifling legitimate union activities.

Buy American Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include my letter mailed this day to the Honorable Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1959.

HON. JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: It has come to my attention that you now have before you a

case which raises a number of fundamental points regarding the present practices of determining reasonableness of costs of bids of domestic companies on Federal procurement contracts involving the Buy American Act. I assure you that this is a matter of deep concern to me and many of my constituents and I think one of great importance to the country as well. I refer to your file B-139912.

Congress passed the Buy American Act to assure our citizens that the Federal Government would spend the taxpayers' money to purchase goods grown or produced in the United States, produced with American labor and manufactured in American factories. This is the basic intent and purpose of the Buy American Act. The few Congressmen who spoke in opposition to the bills which led ultimately to the Buy American Act raised all the questions we hear today in support of a free trade foreign economic policy. The majority of the Congress considered these opposing arguments, but then proceeded to pass the measure by overwhelming votes in both Houses of the Congress. The majority decided that the Federal Government should stand firm in its loyalty to its own people and enterprises.

The Congress, however, did not wish to leave the Federal Government exposed to unfair or unreasonable bid offers from domestic producers, therefore, the act provides that the Federal Government shall purchase American products unless the cost of the domestic product is unreasonable. The Congress did not attempt to define what would constitute an unreasonable price offer since such a determination necessarily involves a number of variables from one product to another and from one set of specifications to another. Instead, the Congress charged the agencies with the responsibility of determining factually whether or not a low American bid is reasonable in cost whenever a lower foreign bid is involved.

Presently the departments and agencies of the Federal Government are following the requirements of Executive Order 10582, which provides essentially that American bids are to be considered unreasonable in cost if they exceed foreign bids by 6 percent or more. This means that the determination is not made on the basis of what it costs to manufacture a product in the United States with American labor and under American laws, but on the basis of bid prices of foreign producers—prices which, themselves may or may not be reasonable costs offers in terms of low wage economies.

Determination on the basis of foreign price offers is clearly in conflict with the letter and spirit of the Buy American Act. The debate in Congress of both the House and Senate of the bills which led to the adoption of the Buy American Act repeatedly referred to the need for protecting American industries and American jobs against low foreign wages and against devaluation of foreign currencies. The debate also referred to the need for strengthening the determination of reasonableness of costs in several statutory provisions in existence just prior to the passage of the Buy American Act, provisions which had been diluted because reasonableness of costs had been determined on the basis of foreign bid offers.

I realize, of course, that the Comptroller General has the basic responsibility of auditing Government contracts to assure economy of Government purchase. At the same time, as you well know, the Comptroller General audits these contracts to assure that they strictly adhere to the letter and spirit of acts of Congress. This also applies to the Buy American Act. In passing this act, Congress recognized that the Federal Government has a special obligation of loyalty to the American people as taxpayers, business entrepreneurs, and salary and wage earners. The object and purposes of the Buy American Act therefore require that reasonableness of costs be determined on the basis of costs of producing an article in the United States, under American laws, with American labor, paid American wages and under the American tax structure—Federal, State, and local. It is improper and illegal that these determinations be based upon the bid price of foreign producers. If the Federal Government seeks, through the use of the 6-percent differential, to save money in the favor of the public interests requirements of the Buy American Act, then instead of a 6-percent differential, a differential which exerts pressure on foreign producers to reduce their price offers would be more appropriate, then the Federal Government will save not merely 6 percent, but many times that percentage. These dollar savings, however, will destroy American jobs, business enterprises, and the entire American industries.

Certainly objectives of this sort are in direct violation of the basic intent of the Buy American Act. Such interpretations should not be tolerated.

This case goes to the core of the Buy American Act, a ruling requiring departments and agencies to make a factual determination of the reasonableness of the bids of domestic producers on the basis of costs to produce in the American economy is needed to sustain the Buy American Act and a considerable number of American jobs and American business activities. I hope your decision will lead to that end.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress.

Citizenship Day, September 17, 1959: A Fitting Example for Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, much comment has been made about the impending visit to this country of Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev. That he is coming is a fact which must be accepted. It would be well, I think, to accentuate the positive while he is here. The power of positive example is the best foot we can put forward. In this connection, I should like to point out that by joint resolution, the Congress has requested the President to designate the week of each year commencing September 17 as Constitution Week. What better or more positive example could we show than to devote a week during his visit to honor and reflect on the Constitution of the United States?

In addition, by another joint resolution, the Congress has designated the 17th day of September each year as Citizenship Day in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America on September 17, 1787. It has come to my attention that the District of Columbia plans a ceremony on Citizenship Day. The essence of the ceremony will be an actual session of District Court to be convened on the monument grounds by Judge Holtzoff for the purpose of swearing in new citizens. Here is an even more active and concrete example for our Russian visitor. What more fitting example of tribute to the principles we believe in than to see throngs of people standing in the shadow of the Washington Monument to witness the coming into their ranks of new citizens? Remember that this impressive function will take place on the anniversary date of the completion of the basic document from which all rights, privileges and liberties of our citizens, new and old alike, derive. This is a powerful, positive example which everyone should support. Those who can attend the Citizenship Day program should be at the Sylvan Theater at the Washington Monument no later than 2:30 p.m. this Thursday.

The United States Lags Behind Russia in the Study of Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, some time ago America was amazed with the news of the first man-made satellite to be put in orbit, Russia's sputnik. Today we are startled with the news of Russia's flag being planted on the moon. In the news we also read, "Soviet Launches Atomic Ice Ship."[1]

A year ago the Congress authorized the construction of an atomic icebreaker, and the President vetoed the bill, giving the reason that we were not financially able to build it.

I include in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the article announcing the test runs of the 16,000-ton ice ship, *Lenin*.

SOVIET LAUNCHES ATOMIC ICE SHIP

LENINGRAD, September 12.—The Soviet atomic-powered icebreaker *Lenin* was launched today and will set out on test runs within the next 48 hours, the Soviet news agency Tass announced.

The dispatch said the 16,000-ton vessel left its berth in the admiralty shipyard in Leningrad and headed out into the Neva River.

The icebreaker uses three atomic reactors. A recent announcement said the engines using electricity produced by atomic power will have 44,000 horsepower.

[1] Russia displayed in New York Harbor this past week the greatest ship afloat in the study of oceanography. It is a floating laboratory exploring scientifically ocean life, currents, ocean bottom, and every other phase of the mysteries of the seas. It is unfortunate that the United States is far behind in this field and lacking in such a comparable facility.

Appendix

George E. Clark, Retiring Bridge Tender After 35 Years in Essex County, Mass., Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to pay tribute to George E. Clark, of Lawrence, Mass., who has many courageous deeds to his credit during his 35 years of service as a bridge tender in Essex County, Mass. The following article about Mr. Clark appeared in the Eagle-Tribune, Lawrence, Mass., on September 12, 1959:

THIRTY-FIVE YEARS IN COUNTY SERVICE—LOCAL BRIDGE TENDER WILL RETIRE ON OCTOBER 1

A familiar colorful figure will be missing from a long held post come October 1 when George E. Clark, 118 Brookfield Street, retires after 35 years and 6 months in Essex County employ, including 33 years as a bridge tender. However, those who know him best say he will be far from inactive, though retired.

He is a man who has often been commended but never decorated for numerous acts of heroism as he went about caring for the Duck Bridge in the past 25 years, and before that, on the old Falls Bridge, since renamed the Edward F. O'Leary Bridge. Before his appointment to these posts, he worked as a painter, rigger, and iron worker on both bridges.

However, two bills now pending in Congress and in the Senate may result eventually in his being presented a gold medal.

Ever mindful of the safety of others, there are testimonials and citations that show he has saved many lives—both by actual deeds of daring and by timely warnings—yet various legislators cognizant of his deeds have failed thus far through the years in various bids to gain him the recognition of the coveted award, which has been held back on different technicalities.

ALERTED WORKMEN

For instance, there was the time on January 11, 1935, when the so-called Falls Bridge was being dismantled for renovation during flood conditions. He had been detailed to watch conditions as the river continued to swell and huge cakes of ice came crashing over the dam. About 5 a.m. on the day in question, after an all-night vigil in the cold, he noticed an impending danger due to damaged understructure, and he notified police. This resulted in police roping off the entrances and the bridge being closed off, so that a rerouting of traffic was accomplished.

His judgment was proven some 3 hours later when three 125-foot spans of the bridge collapsed. By his action, some 65 men working on the bridge had been prevented from going on it. They were standing on the street in safety when the terrific pressure of ice and rising waters sent the bridge crashing without any audible warning. He was commended for his alertness at the time by his superiors and the public safety department. He still holds a cherished letter from Charles R. Vose, then chief of police, which tells of his alertness in sensing the danger and adding "it was considered at the time that his action saved the lives of the 65 men, and probably of others who might have crossed the bridge."

It is on the basis of the above act that his name has been submitted for outstanding recognition.

MANY COMMENDATIONS

He also holds various commendations for his efforts from different public officials and administrative bodies through the years for his acts of heroism, duly accredited by witnesses.

Only recently, members of the city council and the governing bodies of the surrounding towns have recognized his services with letters of appreciation for work well done.

Typical of the letters Mr. Clark has received is the one from the chamber of commerce, which states that the chamber took pleasure in congratulating him upon the occasion of his retirement after 35 years of public service. "The records of the chamber many times refer to suggestions you have made for constructive improvements in our community. You have always been one who went far beyond the normal service to the community in supporting many worthwhile projects for the good of Greater Lawrence We are pleased that your retirement will in no way diminish your interest in community service. We hope you will enjoy many happy years of retirement, which you have richly earned," the letter states.

PUBLIC-SPIRITED CITIZEN

Through the years, he has also been extremely interested in various activities in the public interest and has worked untiringly to see these things brought to fruition. He was a prime mover in the Merrimack River flood control project and the eventual announcement that the Hopkinton-Everett Dam—largest of its kind east of the Mississippi and estimated to cost $30 million—was now a reality with ground-breaking ceremonies to be held shortly with Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON officiating was most pleasing to him. For several years past he has labored diligently to get action started on the project. Because of his unflagging interest in the project, his name had been added to the citizens' committee making arrangements for the ceremonies. He is the proud possessor of one of the pens used by President Eisenhower in signing the control compact law.

He is credited with introducing the bill that led to the erection of a footbridge over the railroad tracks from Boyd to Kent Streets, an effective means of getting across the tracks in the shortest possible route between points. He had the bill filed in the State House, Boston, in 1952 asking for $40,000 for this project which was eventually approved.

Another law in which he took an outstanding interest was one which lowered from 65 to 62 the age at which women may retire and allowing qualified permanently disabled persons to start collecting cash benefits at 50. Under this law, some 800,000 wives, widows and workingwomen from 62 to 65 were able to take advantage of the earlier retirement age.

In 1942, when the late Frederick Butler filed a bill asking for $56,000 for a new deck and grading for the Duck Bridge, Clark made it a point to speak up for the bill and helped effectuate the ultimate reconstruction of the bridge which replaced planking with the metal grating now on the bridge flooring.

More recently he took an active interest in the effort to have the Post Office Department issue a special stamp commemorating the first Postmaster General, Samuel Osgood of North Andover. He petitioned the present Postmaster General through Senator LEVERETT SALSTONTALL that he and his advisory committee give favorable consideration to such a stamp, but it was ruled that since Mr. Osgood was born in 1748 the stamp would not conform to the policy which the Department had established for commemorating stamps. However, the Department has promised to keep the Osgood stamp in mind when it can be issued in connection with some more significant anniversary.

His life-saving deeds extend back through the years when he was a younger man but still vitally interested in the safety of his fellow man.

NUMEROUS RESCUES

The retiring bridge tender, who will be 70 years of age on September 21, was but a boy when he rescued two boys, 6 and 7 years of age, from drowning in the Merrimack River, in 1900. Six years later, he rescued two men in a drunken condition from an overturned boat in the river while he was attending an outing.

In 1924 he recovered the body of a girl from the river and 20 years later saved a disabled veteran who was attempting to jump from the Duck Bridge. In 1945, he restrained a woman attempting to jump from the same location. An Andover woman was also restrained by him on the Duck Bridge in 1940 and a year later a Garden Street woman took iodine, jumped over the railing and was rescued by Clark. In 1939, and employee of the Wood mills dropped his pay out of a window and was in danger while trying to retrieve it from the water, until Mr. Clark came to his aid.

Back in 1932, three boys built a raft under the Joseph W. Casey Bridge and drifted downstream until the craft hit the abutment of the Duck Bridge and broke up. One of the boys managed to swim ashore but the other two had to be rescued.

FELLED BY ACID FUMES

His deeds have not always centered around his work on the bridges.

He was hospitalized on August 7, 1951, when four bottles of acid fell from a truck and broke on the roadway on Island Street at a time when many women were passing by on their way home from work. Clark noticed the predicament of numerous women affected by the acid fumes, so he went in and started leading them to safety. As a result he was badly burned and was blinded and was on the danger list at the Lawrence General Hospital for close to a week. He lost the sight of his left eye years ago and for 12 days he could not see out of the right eye because it had been burned by the fumes, as well as parts of his body.

On June 3, 1950, he had jumped in front of a diesel train that was express from Dover, N.H., to Boston to push a woman out of the way of the train which she had not heard due to defective hearing.

On another occasion on April 11, 1951, he spotted two boys on a home-built raft

floating down the Merrimack River while the river was very high. Sensing that they could be swept over the dam to their deaths, he directed the boys to keep paddling toward the north shore. He stationed himself on the iron catwalk near the dam and as they came near, some 50 feet away from the dam, he pulled them off the raft and onto the catwalk. Seconds later, the raft was swept over the falls.

In August 1939, Mr. Clark caught a gas smell on the O'Leary Bridge and investigated. He had the bridge closed to traffic. The next morning it was found that the 12-inch gas main had broken with the expansion of the new bridge. His action possibly saved the new half million dollar bridge from being blown up.

Mr. Clark is a tireless worker in affairs in which he takes an interest. The current resurfacing of Canal Street is due largely to his endeavors. His ability to get things done is largely the result of his perseverance and his personal contacts with those having charge of such matters.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

To enumerate all his accomplishments in a lifetime spent in this city would take a volume.

He was credited years ago with the discovery of a fire in progress on the roof of the Premier Theater at a time when 280 persons were witnessing a performance. He sounded the alarm and alerted management so that all present could be evacuated without injury. Also, he was present at the rescue of three men in a cave-in at Hampshire and Essex Streets when the F. W. Woolworth building was being erected. He sounded the alarm for the near disaster and was digging to keep the sand from covering the men when help arrived.

MAY GET MEDAL

Deeds of this nature are many and it may yet be that a man who has spent more than his normal share of a lifetime in helping to save lives will be rewarded by receiving a medal. Currently before the Banking and Currency Committee is House bill 1538, filed by Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, for this purpose. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL filed a similar bill in the Senate 6 years ago.

Mr. Clark was born in Providence, R.I., and has lived in this city since infancy. His father, the late Joseph Clark, served 2 years in Company I, First Rhode Island Volunteers with U.S. Senator THEODORE GREEN in 1898. He reenlisted a year later and served 2 years in the Philippine Islands with retired Gen. George Marshall in Company K. Another Lawrence man with Company K was the late James Joyce, a plasterer from "across the spicket."

FATHER OF SEVEN

Mr. Clark is married to the former Lillian Urquart and is the father of six sons and a daughter, six of whom saw service in World War II. He was a Republican candidate for U.S. Representative from the seventh district in the 1956 primary and was also a candidate for the same office in 1942. He was a candidate for the office of Governor's councillor on the Republican ticket in 1952.

He has been a constable for the past 30 years and was precinct officer of ward five beginning in 1918 for 6 years. He was a call fireman for 7 years, named in 1918. He is a member of the Republican city committee and was named to the Republican State convention seven times.

Members of his family include his six sons, Ralph, a police officer in San Francisco for the past 7 years; George of North Andover, employed at the Watertown arsenal; Charles H., an electrician in the Navy yard, San Francisco; Raymond J., at home, a body and fender man with a local motor company; twins, William G., a teacher at the Beth Page High School, Oyster Bay, Long Island, and Walter, with the Merchant Marine; a daughter, Mrs. Genevieve Steadman, who lives in Andover and is a telephone operator at the Lawrence exchange. There are 21 grandchildren and one great grandson.

What Khrushchev Is Like

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the eve of the arrival of Premier Khrushchev's visit, I ask unanimous consent that an article which I prepared, which appeared in the New York Post of September 13, and excerpts of which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of September 14, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This article was based on my visit with the Soviet Premier last year on my visit to the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, Sept. 13, 1959]

WHAT KHRUSHCHEV IS LIKE

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota)

I. INTRODUCTION

Nikita S. Khrushchev is a complicated human being with many moods. He is also a consummate politician, with my motives. And he has an alert perceptive mind. Nearly all his public statements are coldly calculated. I believe, although his phraseology may be spontaneous. He will often be telling the truth—at any time that he calculates that the truth will do him some good.

But his deceptively simple statements go first one way, then another. In one moment he will be expressing warm friendship and saying that he admires President Eisenhower. The next moment, he will be boasting about his missiles or the hideous hydrogen bomb.

All of us now have a problem of judging just which statements he means. We will have that problem until the day when Russian deeds more closely match their words. But we can learn something by listening to and studying Mr. Khrushchev.

After the 8-hour conversation I had with him a few months ago in his office in the Kremlin, I went to the American Embassy and dictated from notes I made during our discussion.

Since then I have changed some of my impressions, but I think it significant that Khrushchev in all his speeches and impromptu debates since, has brought up no major new topic. He is now bringing into the open some of the verbal roughhouse and boasting of strength which he has given to me and others. Is this open debate healthy for the peace of mind of the world? We will soon see.

In any case, his public and private personality and manner are not remarkably consistent. In a private conference he is deliberate and composed, always probing, nearly always controlled, never raising his voice. Of course his personality—to a great extent—and his policy, to a lesser extent, seem to be contradictory wherever he is.

Yet I think there is a basic psychological pattern behind many of his reactions, and many other observers agree that it is a key to the present-day political outlook of the Russian leaders.

A competitive man

That meeting of ours gave me an indelible impression—here is a man with an almost sentimental humility at times, who will switch over to an arrogance so extreme that it seems irresponsible. Thinking it over, I concluded that some of his cockiness and threatening manner comes directly from his feelings of inferiority. He and Russia are new arrivals in the great and grim business of 20th century power diplomacy. He has some of the same swagger which you may find in the "get rich quick boys" who has just muscled his way up in society.

Like all such comparisons, it is dangerous to take this too far. We cannot even compare Khrushchev's competitive spirit with the competition that a small firm, now become powerful, might have toward General Motors. He and Russia are engaged in trade competition with us, by the way, but they are also engaged in far more serious conflict on the social, ideological—and weapons production fronts. This particular new arrival throwing his weight around, could blow up the whole town. But let me be clear, the Soviet Premier is sophisticated in his chosen profession, I am not implying ignorance when I say new arrival.

But neither he nor his people feel comfortable in their new position in the world. The Russian people admire us keenly, they almost worship such names as Ford, yet at the same time they distrust capitalists. They want greatly to equal our production, to pass us, and to truimph over us—and at the same time or at in-between times, they still feel inferior, they look up to us, and they want our help, but hate to admit it.

A very human being

These are national attitudes reflected as a matter of policy in Khrushchev's statements—and on top of that he is personally competitive. He frequently makes startling competitive statements about other Soviet leaders. If you tell a joke, he wants to top it. When I told him that I expected the Democrats would soon be in power, and then our production and our ideas "will run you out of Gorki Park" he seemed to like it. At that point his mood was such that I am confident he felt rather pleased that the great American power might extend itself to compete with Russia—it flattered him. He laughed, although I meant this seriously, that there would soon be more exertion on our part. But he immediately set out to answer my comment.

If you know how a younger athlete may admire, and complete with, and be inspired by, and at the same time resent an older athlete, I think you have a basic clue to Mr. Khrushchev and to understanding the Russians. At the time when the younger athlete has finally developed and matured, the most inflammatory thing the older can do is to be condescending. Khrushchev personally and politically wants acceptance from the United States. I say this regardless of what arrogant remark he may make the same day you read this.

In my opinion we can expect trouble in communications at any time that people dealing with Mr. Khrushchev forget that Russia today is a great power and her First Minister is an able and resourceful man. A most likely error is to underestimate him, and often in the past, our leaders have underestimated the Russians. A few years ago an American official spoke of the Russians and the "oriental mind." This implies that some human beings are just naturally different. This sort of nonsense does us a great disservice. The Russians are human

beings, like the rest of the human race. We may find the Russians hard to understand, because their value systems are different from ours, but they are human beings, they have human minds precisely like ours, and we must find humane ways to communicate and to compete.

Mr. Khrushchev in particular has a receptive mind and very human traits.

Physical appearance and manner

In physical appearance, Mr. Khrushchev is well-groomed, rotund, rosy cheeked and bubbling with vitality. His energy and his engaging smile when he cares to smile, lend themselves to political appeal.

Sometimes he seems guilty of bad manners or ignorant of good taste. But most of the time he is out-going, gregarious, and hospitable. True, we have to remember that he and his colleagues can be coldly ruthless. We remember that they ordered the bloodbath of retaliation against the Hungarian uprising, for example. But there is no use denying that he seems friendly to the Russian people when he walks through the crowds.

Since he is 65 and overweight, it is worth noting that he has tremendous physical stamina. His physician has told him to eat and drink less, and he has talked to me and to half the world about his kidney trouble.

When we first shook hands, as the Premier walked around his desk to meet me, I formed a lasting impression, this man has a lot of bounce. He was well-dressed, in a blue suit, a white shirt with simple cuff links, and two small red stars on his jacket lapel. This formality was suited to what we had both expected would be a formal interview, but he seems more fond of informal clothes, and at his summer place he receives some visitors, as he did Eric Johnston, while wearing a cotton suit and no tie. Our meeting quickly became more informal.

At no time in our lengthy interview did he appear tired, and when we ate an impromptu supper he seemed relaxed and obviously not nervous as to what this unexpected discussion was doing to his schedule. Several times he did refer to his age, as if it were quite advanced, or as if he were worried about his health. Recent pictures have showed him looking somewhat haggard. My conviction is that he has extraordinary physical energy and consequently drives himself to exhaustion—as was indicated by the report of his visit to Poland. Yet after one night of good sleep in Poland he snapped back. At the time I say him, he was rosy-cheeked, bright-eyed, and healthy.

Mr. Khrushchev is a talker

Mr. Khrushchev is a talker. He is fond of oratory and conversation and debate, and quite good at all three. Of course we hear of his making speeches 3, 4, and 8 hours in length. Pioneer America has also had a tradition of debate and also of oratory. Perhaps this has something to do with distances and the frontier. In Nebraska, in the days of William Jennings Bryan, or in Wisconsin with Senator LaFollette, a 2- or 3-hour speech was considered just par. When I was a college student in Minnesota, Gov. Floyd B. Olson, who had been ill, rallied and made a memorable speech nearly 3 hours long, which literally brought tears to the eyes of the audience, many people standing stock-still for that entire period. Perhaps when people travel 150 miles to go to a political meeting they want to get their money's worth, so to speak. Trotsky and Lenin used to make marathon speeches, the Russians respect the man who is fast on his feet, and has staying power.

In any case Mr. Khrushchev will be a hard man to interrupt. He apparently loves being with crowds, loves parties and dinners, conventions and tours, wherever he will find opportunities to talk and—sometimes—to listen.

His conversational style is quite vivid, forceful and pungent. He sometimes illustrates with gestures, or by pointing at a map, or picking up an object. Not only does he use Russian proverbs or homey sayings, but he uses vivid metaphors. "Berlin is a bone in my throat," he would say, when he was insisting to me that the only reason we would have troops in Berlin was to prepare to strike against Russia.

At another place, talking about his thesis that America should "learn to live with various kinds of economic and social systems," he said, "only the blind cannot recognize different colors." I don't know whether this is a Russian proverb or just a sentence he coined on the spur of the moment.

The use of metaphors or old proverbs may sometimes be used as evasion. Politicians in all countries know how to avoid a clear blunt statement by replying with a colloquialism that does not directly answer the question. In Moscow that evening and often since then it has occurred to me that Mr. Khrushchev is a master of the evasive tactic.

Sometimes he appears to be quite candid. There were times when he could hardly have seemed more frank. A couple of times in our conversation he said to me, "Let's not speak of that, we would only disagree."

I would believe him when he says he does not wish a war and that he is familiar with the tragedy of war. I am certain of the real emotion that he was feeling when he spoke to me of his son and of other Russian sons who were killed by the Germans. He repeated over and over that "There will be no war while I am Chairman of the Council of Ministers."

This statement itself reminds us that we cannot base our policy to any great extent on the personalities which are on top in various countries at any one time. Still it is important to seek to gauge what kind of persons is now First Minister of Russia.

Here is a trait I always consider on the plus side.

Sense of humor

Mr. Khrushchev has a keen sense of humor. Of course, like many people who find their wit amuses others, he sometimes gets carried away. This pudgy fellow, cutting capers at receptions, was sometimes rated as a clown a year or so ago. But his sense of humor is sometimes very much like ours. I think many of his jokes will be pleasing if understood by an American audience. We like humor in political leaders. I would personally like to warn his audience that Mr. Khrushchev is disarming—but he is not disarming.

Surely Americans may enjoy Khrushchev's better witticisms, and they may even appreciate it when he makes a good point, without falling into the error of underestimating him.

Although I have been appalled at some of the joking threats the Premier makes about his rockets, I must say that, all in all, I think it is a healthy thing to find some humor in the Kremlin. I believe our world today might be entirely different if Adolf Hitler had had a sense of humor.

Khrushchev and the United States

Mr. Khrushchev has shown to many, as he has to me, an intense curiosity about the United States. He has a wide range of interests, he will be meeting all kinds of Americans, and he will often show them his favorable, human, and humorous side.

The political man

If Khrushchev had been born an American and had run for office here, I think he has the rough and ready energy, speaking ability, and skills in meeting people to have been successful. He could be an old-fashioned ward boss, and he could also be a candidate. Remember that in a sense the East and West are actually campaigning for the votes of neutrals. He is a tough campaigner in this global competition.

He is a master politician and a master propagandist and he is working all the time. As the old saying has it, he gets up early and lives late, and he wasn't born yesterday.

He is as much a politician as he is a dictator. This is a new thing to the Soviets and to us. Unquestionably his regime is supported by force, but for many reasons he has to be far more flexible than Stalin. The new times have brought to the top a man who is far different from his predecessors. Khrushchev knows how to maneuver and to be adroit and not merely hammer out his position. In pugilistic terms he can sometimes be a boxer like Jim Corbett or Gene Tunney, but still rating him in boxing terms, I would say he is also a slugger. Stalin's policies were more rigid and ponderous; I think it is more dangerous for us that Khrushchev can shift and weave as he does.

He is the kind of person who calculates constantly the effects of his every action. He made some remarks to me that were somewhat startling and seemed to me spontaneous, and I still think, to some degree, they were. But they were also perfectly in line with his general purposes and with his specific purposes for our discussion. Even when he appears to be angry—and he loves to point his finger at you or shake his fist—I believe that he does most of this for effect. He has a definite streak of showmanship.

In describing him personally, it is not possible to deal adequately with the policy reasons for Mr. Khrushchev's visit and the issues which reached a stalemate at Geneva. In terms of his personality, however, I know that he is intensely curious about the United States; he has personally wanted for a long time to see us here.

Politically, I believe there is a clear reason for his visit: Not only his councilors, but his constituents now want him to come here.

Premier Khrushchev knows that during and since the World War, millions of Russians have experienced something of Western industrial civilization. To some extent the war and its aftermath may have ended Russian isolationism. Not even the Soviet monolithic state, with all its propaganda, can withstand certain world trends. Moscow listens to American jazz music, and its listens to a great deal else from the West. Khrushchev's real constituency is not the entire Russian people, but the few million who are in the Community Party. Mr. Khrushchev appears to be somewhat insecure and nervous about his council of advisors-supervisors, and about his continued leadership of Communists, in Russia and elsewhere. His basic constituents are not just reading his controlled press. In libraries they read journals of all the world.

Mr. Khrushchev speaks constantly of young people, and of today and tomorrow. You will note that he almost never refers to the old days of the revolution—his real constituents cannot really remember it. He is an old Bolshevik and he will probably be the last of that line to hold the No. 1 spot.

Mr. Khrushchev prides himself on his persuasive powers and he has spoken (to me, and to others) with apparent conviction of his distaste for the secret police. He boasted to me, "I liquidate no one." And—despite his crude violence elsewhere—the survival of Khrushchev's former colleagues, Malenkov and Bulganin, would tend to bear him out. World public opinion, which has been shocked by the barbarism of secret police, torture and purge trials, and slave labor

camps, now seems to have some moderating though not controlling influence.

It is important that Khrushchev does not seem to feel that the classic doctrines of Marxism are the beginning and the end of governmental philosophy. Of course he is completely devoted to Communist ends, but I mean that he does not regard the philosophical doctrine as complete, perfect, and applicable to every situation now and in the future. He does not believe, as some Communists have appeared to believe, that human history virtually began with the Russian revolution. He often quotes the Bible—he was brought up a Christian in the Greek Orthodox Church, but was won over to atheism and communism. To one American, however, he spoke of ancient times, and said that Greece was the age of art, Rome was the age of law, and the Christian era was the greatest, the age of the common man.

Many surprising remarks come from this complicated man.

During his visit, he will undoubtedly make many seemingly offhand comments, which appear unpremeditated. Americans should remember that he is not only speaking to his hosts and to the American people but he has in mind other countries, the neutrals, the satellites, and always the men at home in the Kremlin. Some things in America he may be delighted with, but he will know that he simply could not express great enthusiasm for them without causing repercussions at home or in the ranks of some ally, such as China. We may forget this, but he will not forget it.

The nature of the cold war creates such pressures on all sides. Americans coming home from Russia will not be as enthusiastic nor as candid about some things there, as they might be, because such enthusiasm may be criticized at home. This is part of the tragedy of the cold war. This circle has to be broken or civilization will explode.

Both of us must speak some plain truths in public and private.

In the past year, specifically with the increased travel between the United States and Russia, we are learning to speak more candidly. We have lately been saying for all to hear some of the things that lie closest to our hearts and are more important for the life-and-death realities of the atomic age.

Surely it will help clarify the situation if we can make clear to him our strength and objectivism, and if Americans can more clearly understand the strength of Russia, and the nature of Communist objectives.

Many Khrushchevs

Premier Khruschev is the leader of a worldwide political movement, the prophet of a fanatic faith. The Chinese, for one example, suspiciously peer over his shoulder to see that he remains "pure in the faith," that he does not become dominated too much by Russian national motives.

Khrushchev is also chief of a reluctant empire, the symbol of tryanny to millions of enslaved people in the satellite countries.

Meanwhile, Khrushchev is production chief of all the factories and farms of a nation which is competing with us, night and day. The title of Khrushchev's latest book, a Russian best seller, of course, is "Toward Victory in the Peaceful Competition With Capitalism."

Finally, Khrushchev comes to us as a politically sensitive leader of millions of human beings. I do not believe Mr. Khrushchev can totally ignore the average Russian, who passionately hopes, as does the average American, that the hydrogen bomb will never be used by any nation upon any other.

We should listen politely and speak candidly to all of these Khrushchevs—the prophet, the human being, the production chief, and the dictator-politician.

We should listen with caution born of experience, but greet him with courtesy born of confidence. The eyes and the hopes of mankind are upon us.

Wright's Temple To Be Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of September 13, 1959:

WRIGHT'S TEMPLE TO BE DEDICATED—CEREMONY SLATED NEXT WEEK FOR MOUNT SINAI RE-CREATION IN PHILADELPHIA SUBURB

(By William G. Weart)

PHILADELPHIA, September 12.—Six years ago Frank Lloyd Wright accepted Rabbi Mortimer J. Cohen's challenge to design an American synagogue for the rabbi's congregation, Beth Sholom, in Philadelphia.

Before the architect agreed, Rabbi Cohen pointed out that there was no precedent in Jewish architecture, because Jews had accepted for their synagogues the prevailing building form of the communities in which they lived.

Eleven months later, November 14, 1954, Mr. Wright turned the first earth for the new synagogue of Beth Sholom (Hebrew for house of peace) at Old York Road and Foxcroft Avenue in suburban Elkins Park.

The groundbreaking proved premature. It took a nationwide search that lasted until May 1956, before officials of Beth Sholom could find a contractor willing to tackle Wright's design.

THREE CEREMONIES PLANNED

One week from tomorrow, the temple will be dedicated. Three ancient ceremonials will mark the service—the procession of the Holy Scrolls, the lighting of the Eternal Light, and the sounding of the shofar, the ram's horn trumpet.

Mrs. Wright will be the principal speaker at the dedication of her late husband's recreation of "Mount Sinai," the desert peak that was transformed into a mountain of light at the time of God's communion with the people of Israel.

The structure's dominant mountain effect is created in aluminum and glass. It blends the forms of a 175-foot-wide hexagon and a 100-foot-high pyramid of glass.

The edifice cost slightly under $1,400,000, including landscaping. The pyramid is supported by a tripod of three steel beams. The synagogue seats 1,051 and, on the ground floor, there is a Sisterhood sanctuary with 268 seats, as well as lounges and wedding rooms.

A RELIGIOUS TRIBUTE

In submitting the design to Rabbi Cohen in February 1954, Mr. Wright wrote:

"Herewith the promised 'Hosannah' (Hebrew for song of praise)—a temple that is truly a religious tribute to the living God. Judaism needs one America. Here you have a coherent statement of worship."

Rabbi Cohen replied:

"You have taken the supreme moment of Jewish history—the revelation of God to Israel through Moses at Mount Sinai—and you have translated that moment with all it signifies into a design of beauty and reverence. In a word, your building is Mount Sinai."

In Oklahoma City, 1,260 miles from Philadelphia, Beth Sholom found a general contractor, Haskell Culwell, willing to take on the job. At the time, he had already had experience in building Wright-designed projects that many contractors had termed "untouchable."

Mundt's Smalltown Research Commission Proposal Stirs Widespread Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, since introducing my bill (S. 2621) to establish a temporary Hoover-type Commission to study the problems of the American small town, I have been encouraged and impressed by the widespread interest and support developing for this proposal.

Many editorials have come in supporting the idea and letters of endorsement have come in from many States. Among the most valued of these editorials is one from the Brookings Register, published in Brookings, S. Dak. by an old and esteemed friend of mine, C. H. J. Mitchell who is widely recognized as one of South Dakota's outstanding editors. Brookings is one of the communities—a city of some 6,000 people—that this Commission would be designed to aid by the research it would undertake and the recommendations it would make.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, published in a recent issue of the Brookings Register, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE SMALL TOWN

Noting the continued discussion as to whether the small town is doomed or not, Senator KARL MUNDT has proposed that a commission similar to the Hoover Commission be named to make a comprehensive study of the problems which face these smaller communities.

Like most of us, Senator MUNDT does not believe the small town is doomed and neither does he believe it should. He recognizes that such towns cannot finance research projects in their own behalf but he earnestly believes that some such study should be made.

There are, of course, some small towns which fade away. There are many reasons for it. The development of transportation facilities is held to be one of the important factors. The Register likes to believe that fundamentally it is largely a matter of community leadership. If the citizens of these smaller towns are content to sit on their hands with a "so what" attitude, they are doubtless doomed. But those in which there is leadership and willingness to contribute to the general welfare are not doomed.

This newspaper has on many occasions insisted that there is a place for the small town newspaper. It is one of the institutions which can do much to rescue the small town from drifting into oblivion. But it

must be kept in mind that the newspaper must have adequate support to provide for its existence and to return a proper standard of living for those who operate it.

It is to be hoped that the legislation which Senator MUNDT has proposed will find acceptance in the Senate.

Steel Strike and Winter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the steel lockout brought on by the management of big steel is now going on its third month.

The following editorial reveals that with the coming of winter, the steel lockout may undermine the American economy for months after the long negotiations have terminated. The following editorial also reveals some facts which must be considered by big steel which could undermine our economy for the next 12 months.

[From the Hammond Times, Sept. 10, 1959]

STEEL AND WINTER

The record-breaking steel strike at this moment seems almost as far from settlement as the day it began more than 8 weeks ago, but there is one factor that may spur a serious effort to resolve the issues before long. That factor is winter.

As nearly everyone in the Calumet Region knows, most of the iron ore that is the basic raw material for steel mills is shipped by water. The practice is to ship enough ore during the spring, summer, and fall months to build plant stockpiles sufficient to maintain production during the winter when ice halts navigation on the upper Great Lakes.

When the steel strike began, the iron miners, who are members of the United Steelworkers of America, joined the steel plant workers in the walkout. The mines are shut down, like the steel plants. The ore boats that carry the raw iron from upper lakes ports are tied up for the duration of the strike.

The huge demand for steel that preceded the July 14 walkout gave the Nation's basic steelmakers little chance to build up stocks of ore to tide them over the winter months. When demand for steel is heavy ore boats may start the shipping season as early as late March, and given a break in the weather may continue hauling ore to Calumet Region and other steel ports as long as late December. But production planners realize weather is fickle and count on open water in the northern lakes only until mid-November.

Even if a break in the weather that delays the freezover of the northern Great Lakes, however, less ore can be shipped in the late fall. Chill weather tends to cake the ore, making loading and unloading of ore boats more difficult and time consuming. Steelmen agree that July and August are usually the best months for ore shipment because the ore is usually drier and easier to handle.

If the steel strike drags on to a point where not enough water-shipped ore is stockpiled, it is, of course, possible to ship ore to the mills by railroad. But rail freight adds immensely to the cost of the ore, and steelmakers usually shy away from this method of shipment unless a special type of ore is required for a special order of steel.

Conceivably, a shortage of ore next winter could result in putting the clamps on steel production and steelworkers' employment. The situation could become serious enough to result in short workweek after the strike is settled, even though the order books might be bulging.

Each day the steel strike drags on, therefore, means 1 day less that ore can be shipped out of the iron ranges of the north country to the lower lakes mills. The steel companies, the striking steelworkers, and the Federal Government all realize this fact. Each passing day builds more pressure for a settlement. Thus the threat of winter, which most of us dislike, may serve a useful purpose this year in hastening the end of the record strike.

The Remarkable Achievements of Charley Halleck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure to include excerpts from an editorial in the Council Bluffs Nonpariel, Council Bluffs, Iowa, which gives due praise to our great Republican leader, the Honorable CHARLEY HALLECK, as follows:

THE REMARKABLE ACHIEVEMENTS OF CHARLEY HALLECK

We have known CHARLEY HALLECK, of Indiana, ever since we started going to Washington every spring, more than 20 years ago. He impressed us as a comer the first time we met him and this impression has grown through the years.

Representative HALLECK is a down-to-earth Republican politician, from a State where politics is second nature. If there had been more Republicans like HALLECK in Congress, the Republican Party would be vastly stronger than it is in the Nation. He is a fine speaker, an expert organizer, and a fighter who never gives up.

Too many of the Republicans in both the House and Senate lack some or all of these qualities.

The Republicans in the House have taken on new life since HALLECK became minority leader at the beginning of the present session.

As one political writer put it, CHARLEY HALLECK, who not so long ago was certainly of no more than average height, is now regarded as not less than 10 feet tall.

Prior to his election as leader the Republicans almost invariably had been on the defensive and never seemed able to rise to any great opportunity. Furthermore they never took advantage of the great personal prestige of President Eisenhower.

Since he became leader HALLECK has come out of every meeting with the President with some biting challenge to the Democratic majority. Between meetings he kept needling the President to take more interest in legislative affairs.

It is not an exaggeration to say that CHARLEY HALLECK is more responsible than any other Republican for the President's aggressive attitude and his assumption of party leadership.

For the first time since he has been in the White House Eisenhower has acted like a politician and he has turned out to be a good one. One of the reasons is that he recognizes in HALLECK a master politician upon whom he can depend for action when action is necessary.

Every Republican Member of the House knows that HALLECK is watching him and if he misses an important rollcall he is likely to hear from the minority leader. And if he does a good job he is almost certain to receive HALLECK's congratulations.

HALLECK has also been quite successful in enlisting the support of the disenchanted survivors of the Democratic Party—the conservative southern Representatives.

CHARLEY's most recent and his most spectacular achievement was the recent passage of the Landrum-Griffin labor control bill. This was accomplished against the organized opposition of all the labor bosses. It was a remarkable feat, a typical all-out Halleck effort. He organized an effective nose-counting operation with an active worker in practically every State delegation. He then persuaded the President to make a smashing televised speech to the Nation in favor of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The result was the passage of the bill and the blocking of a technical maneuver which forced an overnight recess during which the labor bosses could bring all sorts of pressure to reverse the vote. Instead of dwindling and perhaps disappearing HALLECK saw the majority of the bill increase on every ballot.

The fact is HALLECK is doing as well and perhaps better with a small minority in the House than the Democratic leaders are doing with their big majorities in the House and Senate.

It is our firm belief that the Democrats would never have elected these big majorities if HALLECK had been Republican leader during all of Eisenhower's second term.

We also believe the Republicans would have a chance to elect a President in 1960 and regain control of the House if Republican Congressmen and Republican leaders in various States would work like HALLECK works.

Next to Vice President NIXON he is undoubtedly the outstanding active leader of the Republican Party.

American Legion Policy on Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Miles Kennedy, the able legislative representative of the American Legion headquarters here in Washington, has suggested to me that Members of Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, generally, might be interested in knowing the attitude of the American Legion on the important matter of improving American educational opportunities. Consequently, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Resolution No. 618, recommended by the convention committee on child welfare and adopted by the Legion at its recent national convention in Minneapolis-St. Paul, August 24–27, 1959.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 618, CONVENTION COMMITTEE ON CHILD WELFARE—AMERICAN LEGION POLICY ON EDUCATION

Whereas the American Legion has since its inception shown an interest in the education of American youth; and

Whereas the American Legion has, because of this interest in education, sponsored the GI bill, the junior GI bill, cosponsored American Education Week, promoted programs and legislation in behalf of education and is currently endeavoring, through the Education and Scholarship Committee, to encourage and assist students to further their education; and

Whereas the needs of our economy and our national security demand continued emphasis upon soundly conceived, universal education for our people; and

Whereas it is proper that an expression of the American Legion's viewpoints on education should be formulated and disseminated so that all American citizens may be aware of this American Legion interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion in 41st National Convention herewith assembled in Minneapolis-St. Paul, August 24–27, 1959, adopt the following as expressing the policy of the American Legion with respect to education:

I. FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTS

The American Legion has always strongly supported the principle that education is a necessary prerequisite to the successful functioning of a democracy. While recognizing the right of private and religious groups to maintain schools, the American Legion vigorously subscribes to the necessity of a universal publicly supported system of primary, secondary and college education to insure that every American child has the opportunity for an adequate education. The American Legion believes that popular self-government as created by the covenant set forth in the Constitution of the United States, cannot continue to exist unless there is the bulwark of a continuing system of free public education. Not only does proper national defense require trained personnel, but the daily operations of our local, State, and Federal governments, our farms, our professions, our commerce and industry, and, in fact, every phase of life today, demands that we have competent citizens, who are qualifed, willing and able to discharge their responsibilities.

Washington, Jefferson, and Madison stated clearly their beliefs that American citizenship should be based on a system of free public schools. These schools have been established and are recognized as the finest in the world. They are managed by lay boards in the most democratic tradition.

The availability of educational opportunity for every individual to pursue his own development is a prerequisite to the achievement of all other social goals. Our educational system must, therefore, be designed to provide every person the means to reach his highest potential, which in turn will provide our country as a whole with the high level of responsible citizens and specialized workers which it requires. In turn we will have greater assurance of economic growth, of sound decisionmaking, and the knowledge necessary to promote our national security.

The American Legion cannot subscribe to the European system of a small preferential system of elite education only for the classes; rather we put our faith in widespread public education for the masses. It is not meant to suggest that every student can derive the same benefits from education or that every student should go to college. Nor is it meant to convey the idea that the able or exceptional student should be held back to a group pattern.

This educational system should produce citizens who understand and who are dedicated to the principles of free enterprise, to democratic principles and processes, and whose devotion to freedom and human dignity go beyond mere lipservice.

II. BASIC STRUCTURE OF AMERICAN EDUCATION

(a) Community public school: Each community should be served by a system of public elementary and secondary schools which are sufficiently provided with modern facilities, well-prepared and adequately paid teachers, and a well-thought-out and carefully developed educational program. Education in this country should never be forced into a rigid pattern of conformance which would destroy the freedom of the individual or of each educational institution of the school system.

(b) Services for children with special needs: Adequate educational services should be available to children with special needs, including the talented, the physically handicapped, the mentally retarded, the emotionally disturbed, those with hearing, speech, language, reading, or other difficulties, and those handicapped by migratory status, in order to assist them with their special needs so that their highest potential may be achieved.

(c) Vocational education: The increasing processes of modern industry and social organizations require workers of special skill. Educational systems should be equipped to provide vocational training to all young people who do not desire higher education. Older workers who seek to advance their occupational skill or require retraining as a result of technological or other changes should also be served by a system of vocational education. We acknowledge and support the great contribution made in this field by private enterprise.

(d) Higher education: There must be maintained within this country a strong system of higher education supported and controlled by the several States. In addition to the public colleges and universities, our society must maintain and adequately support the private and church-related colleges and universities. Opportunities for a higher education should be available to all qualified persons. The processes of higher education should serve to enhance opportunities for individuals and thus benefit our whole society.

(e) Adult education: Public education systems should provide educational opportunities for adults in order to increase their cultural enjoyment, contribute to responsible citizenship, and widen the base of their knowledge.

(f) Nonpublic education: The American Legion recognizes the contributions of religious and private institutions in providing educational opportunities at all levels, and the necessity for their continued existence.

III. CONTROL AND FINANCING

The American Legion is opposed to Federal financing of schools to replace local and State financing. The genius of the American public school has been in its closeness to the people. Our structure of government in its historical development has placed the responsibility of public education upon the several States.

The American Legion advocates the proposition that under our system of government each State is vested with the authority, direction and control of public education within its borders in accordance with law. The American Legion further believes in the largest possible measure of home rule in public education and that States should delegate to local communities the greatest autonomy that is feasible.

It is recognized that conditions and needs change from time to time and the participation of the Federal Government may be desirable in times of national emergency and in certain restricted or specialized programs with minimal Federal control and direction.

IV. FEDERAL EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL INTEREST

(a) Armed Forces: The American Legion recognizes that the Federal Government has a continuing and justifiable primary responsibility for organizing, administering, operating, and financing educational programs of the Armed Forces.

(b) Research: The American Legion realizes that research, both basic and applied, will create the frontiers of tomorrow in economic, social, and civic life. The role of the Federal Government in research should primarily support requirements for the operation of programs of Federal agencies. The Federal Government, State public institutions of higher learning, and private agencies all have a responsibility to further the development of research.

(c) GI bill: In time of war when young men and women are required to enter the Armed Forces for extended periods of time, it is in the national interest for the Federal Government, as part of the program for the rehabilitation and restoration of these individuals to proper roles in civilian life, to provide special programs of educational benefits, and thus restore to them opportunities which they lost because of their service in time of war.

Experience under the American Legion sponsored G.I. bill demonstrates the soundness of such applied principle of rehabilitation. The education provided was not only of personal value to the millions of veterans who availed themselves of various educational opportunities, but during the present period of explosive economic development it is also supplying an augmented reservoir of trained manpower which is contributing to the national welfare. Further experience with the junior GI bill has augmented this experience.

V. ROLE OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

The American Legion maintains a tremendous program of educational and youth activities which are evident in every State in our Nation.

In addition to these Legion sponsored activities, American Legionnaires have as a responsibility the duty of serving on local school boards, and participating in community, State and national efforts to constantly improve education.

VI. CONCLUSION

The American Legion wholeheartedly subscribes to the proposition that every educational facility should be provided for the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of our people. It believes that curriculum study should be stimulated; that teacher preparation should be strengthened; that teachers' salaries should be improved; that testing and guidance programs should be extended and undergirded; that physical facilities for instruction should be expanded and bettered; that maximum intellectual opportunities should be provided for all students commensurate with capacity to absorb and apply irrespective of financial resources of the student or his family.

The American Legion further believes that the citizens of this country should be dedicated to the pursuance of excellence in the entire realm of intellectual endeavor; that our people should recognize and esteem those persons who have developed their intellectual abilities to the fullest extent; that teachers should enrich their knowledge and capacity particularly in the fields in which they teach and that scholarship assistance to deserving students should be expanded.

A major result of our educational process must be to provide people with the finest

training in the world in basic skills of communication, and in knowledge which will enable individuals to think for themselves, to think with facts, to think with understanding. School programs should be constantly reappraised to see that they accomplish these objectives.

Such an educational program will fulfill the dreams of the past, the aspirations of the present, and the needs of the future. The American Legion supports such a system of education, and believes that the vitality of our democratic way of life is dependent upon such schools.

Czechoslovakia and the Sudeten Germans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, in view of the attitudes of the Sudeten German leaders displayed at the occasion of the Sudeten annual rally in Vienna on May 17, 1959, it would appear appropriate to draw attention to the statement by Mr. REECE, of Tennessee, on the 22d of April 1958. Mr. REECE submitted to the House a lengthy account dealing with the case of the German expellees with special emphasis on the Sudeten German issue. On the whole, the statement was pervaded by unfounded charges against the Czech nation. On many points of fact and opinion, the critical reader may well wish to take issue with the gentleman from Tennessee who has seemed to disregard the obvious fact that the so-called Sudeten Germans themselves were mostly responsible for the whole sequence of events winding up with their removal from Czechoslovakia. The attempt to picture the Czechs as the villains rather than the victims of the east central European tragedy seems to make a large draft on the imagination. As some facts and various of his inferences were dubious and erroneous, attention should be directed to them. Thus Mr. REECE's position deserves careful analysis by all those who have the solution of the German-Czech problem at heart.

Mr. REECE asserted that 3.3 million Czechoslovak Germans were unjustly treated by the Czechoslovak Republic; an ill-constructed state of which the very existence had brought sufferings on millions of people. The gentleman from Tennessee went to to state that when Hitler occupied the Czech countries he only "violated the right to an independent national life of the Czech people just as the Czechs, two decades before, had violated that same right of the Sudeten Germans." Carefully disregarding 6 years of Nazi oppression Mr. REECE viewed the liberation of the Czechs by the American and Soviet Armies as the starting point of "a reign of terror" where "free elections, freedom of speech and press were abolished." The gentleman from Tennessee apparently forgot that it was Hitler, Henlein, and Frank who crushed Czech democracy in 1938–39. The innocent Sudetens were then outlawed and expelled in violation of the right of self-determination. Their expulsion helped to bring about the communization of the Czechoslovak state. The gravity of the accusation necessitates its closer scrutiny. The following remarks attempt to present a factual basis for summarizing the significance of many centuries of Czech-German relations. They are prompted by a desire to ascertain the reasons for such relatively unrestricted and far-reaching measures as the transfer of the German ethnic group from Czechoslovakia in 1945–46.

GENERAL REVIEW

The observer who tries to understand German-Czech relations out of their historical and geographical context often finds them unintelligble. For behind recent political crises lie many decades of Czech and German history which have helped create their modern forms. Central Europe has been a traditional ground of national conflicts. Despite the many economic, cultural, and geographical bonds between the two peoples, the struggle between Czechs, who lived in the Bohemian salient thrust deep into German territory, and Germans, who came into Bohemia mostly as colonists, has been one of the permanent features of the history of this area. The Czech countries formed a natural geographical unit commanding a central position in Europe which was fully recognized even by Bismarck.

Mr. REECE used the terms "the Sudeten Germans" and "the Sudetenland" regardless of accuracy and propriety. The Czech Germans were split in many areas and ethnic islands with different cultural and ethnical backgrounds. They did not form a single racial group. They had been originally related ethnically to the Central and Northern, East Franconian, Upper Saxon, and Silesian tribes. Inclusion within the same state drew together these various German groups. The term "Sudeten German" was coined only in 1902 and became popular during the Nazi era when it was used to impress international public opinion that the Czech Germans formed an independent branch of the German nation which had to be liberated by its union with the German Reich. The lack of geographical compactness split the Czech Germans into eight separate and isolated parts. Their leader Josef Seliger—so highly esteemed by Mr. REECE—stated himself in October 1918:

> The eight territorial fragments in which Germans are settled are separated from each other by broad belts of territories in which the Czech language is spoken, and they, therefore, cannot form a state or even a united administrative area. (Franz Koegler, "Oppressed Minority?" London, 1943, p. 22.)

When in 1918 the Czech Germans wanted to separate themselves from the newly founded Czechoslovak Republic they had to constitute several unconnected provinces which still contained a number of Czechs. In 1938, after Munich, Hitler again was compelled to break up the annexed Czech areas into several parts falling to Austria, Bavaria, Silesia. Only the remainder formed the so-called Sudetengau. Some 700,000 Czechs and 2,820,000 Germans were ceded to the Reich. Yet it was still impossible to draw the ethnographical line between the Czechs and Germans because many of each of them lived in the mixed German or Czech regions, in the linguistic enclaves or as dispersed individuals.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

The idyllic historical survey by Mr. REECE is contradicted by factual evidence. The Czech Slavic tribes were the first permanent inhabitants of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia. The German settlers came into the Bohemian Kingdom since the middle of the 12th century. The peak of the first wave of colonization came in the 13th century. The Hussite Wars brought about the retreat of the Germans. Under the Hapsburg rule (1526–) the influx of the German settlers has again risen and after the end of Bohemian independence in 1620 German became the second official language —beside Czech. The Czech-German conflict was very much alive during the whole course of the Czech history. At the beginning of the 14th century the old Bohemian chronicle of Dalimil recorded the declarations of a Bohemian prince.

> A German wife would not like my people; she would have a German household and teach my children German, and that would mean a division and ruin of my people.

A Latin tract written by a high Bohemian official at the time of the Bohemian King John of Luxembourg in the first half of the 14th century stated:

> Look Thou, philosopher, and consider Thous, who are wise, how this arrogant and deceiving nation seizes the most lucrative benefits and privileges and the richest estates and how it works its way into the council of the princes.

The religious reformer John Hus said in the Bethlehem Chapel in Prague at the beginning of the 15th century:

> According to all laws * * * the Czechs should fill the foremost offices in Kingdom of Bohemia.

In 1615 the Diet of the Bohemian Estates passed a law protecting the Czech language. They made a point of reminding King Ferdinand II that in Bohemia the Germans were only guests and aliens. The emigration of a part of the Czech Protestant middle class and aristocracy, the enormous confiscations of the Bohemian Protestant estates covering some three-quarters of the surface of the country, the immigration of many Catholic German-speaking aristocrats who took over the confiscated estates and the new wave of German colonization accounted for the fact that in the 18th century German has become almost exclusively the official language. The Germanization of the Czech countries had almost succeeded.

In 1827 a prominent figure of the Czech national revival, Josef Jungmann, stated:

> Our tragic fate has been to be the witnesses and the accomplices of the definite annihilation of our maternal language.

It was peculiarly distressing to see Mr. REECE introducing the German propaganda of the past and failing to mention the predicament of the Czech nation under the German rule. The fusion of the ideals of the French Revolution, romanticism and arrival of the industrial revolution contributed to save the Czechs from extinction in the German sea. The political awakening drew the attention of the Czechs toward the defense of the Czech language as the unique instrument with the help of which they were able to grow up to cultural and political maturity. The lingual equality presented to the Czechs a protective safeguard against the age-long process of Germanization. They just could not allow themselves to be submerged by the German wave for another time. As in the Habsburg Monarchy the Germans had occupied a leading position over the Slav majority—viewed by them as racially inferior—the Czech struggle for lingual equality met with a passionate resistance of the Czech Germans. The effort of the Austrian Prime Minister Count Badeni to secure to the Czech language an equality with the German language and to introduce a bilingual administration in Bohemia in 1897 failed as many Germans from Bohemia did not realize the approaching end of their supremacy and rallied under the colors of German national superiority. Political wrangling began to take on a bitter, vituperative tone.

The rise of a more intense German nationalism brought new elements into Austrian politics. New German parties bitterly denounced Jews and Slavs, and espoused the Pan-German objectives: The invectives and denunciations affected particularly the delicate climate of the Czech territory. Here the fierce and increasingly chauvinistic approach was gaining ground among the Germans. The National Socialist Party, mostly Czech German in origin and character, was founded in 1903. When the Nazi Party started in the Reich it thus absorbed many elements from its Austrian roots. According to the historian Henry Cord Meyer—"Mitteleuropa in German Thought and Action, 1815–1945," Hague, 1955, page 315—national socialism derived the essence of its spirit of intolerance, hatred, and arrogant racial and cultural superiority from the prewar friction on the German-Slav frontier. Hitler's political views and irrational motivations were solidly rooted in the tensions and frustrations of the German borderlands in Austria. The noted German historian, Prof. Gerhard Ritter, correctly noticed that:

> The most dangerous element [of nazism], its inflamed antagonistic nationalism, came not from Potsdam, but rather from Bohemia-Moravia and the other Austrian-German borderlands with their [Austrian] Pan-German movement, unbridled antisemitism, and notions of Raumpolitik * * * through Hitler the aggressive nationalism took possession of the Prussian sword. (Ibid., p. 334.)

To sum up, it is worth recalling the conclusions of another leading expert, Prof. R. W. Seton-Watson:

> With every decade of the long reign of Francis Joseph (1848–1916), it became more evident that the Germans of Bohemia were not disposed to grant linguistic or general political equality to the Czechs, but themselves aimed at the position of "Herrenvolk" toward the inferior Slav races. It is still not properly understood, how many of the ideas today condemned by us as Nazi and "Prussian" did, in fact, originate among the Sudeten Germans, and that the latter * * * never ceased to regard the Germanization of Bohemia as the ultimate goal of their endeavor. (In Vincent Urban, "Hitler's Spearhead," London, 1945, p. VI.)

In the light of these considered views, it would seem proper that there was not a sufficient examination of the documentary evidence before the remarks were entered into the record and judgments expressed, implying that the Czechs, and not the Germans, have been obstructing the way toward the national equality and tolerance.

THE CZECHOSLOVAK REPUBLIC

The gentleman from Tennessee depicted the Czechs as dangerously nationalistic while he viewed the Sudetans as federal minded unswervingly pursuing their liberal and humanistic policies. The factual evidence, however, does not corroborate Mr. REECE's allegations.

During the war of 1914–18 the Czech Germans had been consistently demonstrating their full-fledged support of the Austrian policy. Power rested with those among them who regarded themselves as the Herrenvolk and thought the war and the coming victory as the means toward national assimilation of the inferior Slavs. Attempts to introduce German as the only official language and the punitive measures against the Czechs who were sympathetic to the West revealed national vindictiveness as a kind of policy. The Czechs sided clearly with the democratic West and those dynamic democratic forces that sprang up in Europe prior to the war. The growth of progressive ideas in Western Europe found a strong echo among the Czech intelligentsia. It created the common cultural and political background for the promotion of national aspirations. The Czech political leaders became spokesmen for the democratization of the Hapsburg empire. They pleaded—against the German leaders—for the equal rights of small nations. The victory of the Allied Powers broke the ground for favorable reception of the efforts of smaller nations for their independence. As a result, the Czechoslovak Republic was proclaimed on October 28, 1918.

The gentleman from Tennessee described the constitution of Czechoslovakia as undemocratic and devised by a mostly Czech commission at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919. Yet it was on the basis of scholarly opinion and after a thorough examination of all the factors involved that the Czechoslovak frontiers have been fixed and the Germans kept within Czechoslovakia. For example the American experts Ch. Seymour, G. Johnson, J. Kerner, J. F. Dulles had visited the Republic and examined the situation on the spot. The Committee on Czechoslovak Questions concluded that—

> Bohemia forms a natural region, clearly defined by its fringe of mountains. The mere fact that a German population has established itself in the outlying districts at a relatively recent date did not appear to the committee a sufficient reason for depriving Bohemia of its natural frontiers. * * *
>
> The chain of mountains which surrounds Bohemia constitutes a line of defense for the country. To take away this line of mountains would be to place Bohemia at the mercy of Germany. (E. L. Woodward and Rohan Butler, "Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919–39," third series, London, 1949, I. 1938, 302. Hereafter the volume will be cited as DBFP.)

It was generally agreed that without the historic frontiers the Republic could not exist as an independent state. Thus the independent existence of 10 million Czechs and Slovaks was predicated on the presence of 3.2 million Germans within the same state.

Mr. REECE pictured Czechoslovakia as a mistake which cherished but one desire: to oppress the peace-loving and reluctant minorities. It was on the strength of this judgment that he concluded that the Czech Germans were right in having prompted the dissolution of the state in 1938. Alas, the evidence appears to suggest a far gloomier view as far as the Germans were concerned and fails to bring out any confirmation of Mr. REECE's scathing condemnation of Czechoslovak democracy.

The Czechoslovak Germans were better equipped with schools than the Germans, Poles, and Magyars in Prussia, Poland, and Hungary. So while there remained 1 German elementary school for every 862 German inhabitants in Czechoslovakia, there was 1 German school per 1,112 inhabitants in Prussia, per 952 in Poland, and per 1,191 in Hungary—DBFP, I: 191.

It was admitted by the Government itself that the German representation in the public services was inadequate in some branches, although the quota was met for ex. by the German teachers, professors, judges, and prosecutors. However, for many years the Germans preferred the better-paid private employment and therefore there was a lack of qualified candidates.

Mr. REECE pointed the land reform, and the great depression as two samples of the unjust treatment of the Germans. Yet the data proves otherwise. The land reform of 1919 was rather slow in being carried out. The Germans made complaints that some 400,000 hectares—1 ha=2.47 acres—were taken from them in the predominantly German area. This concerned, however, mainly the forest land near the frontier. The Ministry of Agriculture stressed that in the Czech territories of Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia 198,909 more hectares were requisitioned than in the mixed or German districts. Some 48,820 German families were allocated 57,270 hectares up to January 1, 1937. Elizabeth Wiskemann—"Czechs and Germans: A Study of the Struggle in the Historic Provinces of Bohemia and Moravia," London, 1938, pages 151–152—who gave the latter figures gathered on the spot, pointed out that she never heard any serious Sudeten German deny "that the German

tenants working on expropriated land were quite justly treated in being allowed to become its owners." Some 31.8 percent of the land distributed to the tenants went to the Germans. After the occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1939 the Germans endeavored to make good their complaints but the results were deceiving proving that, on the whole, the land reform was a highly successful nondiscriminatory measure. As far as the economic crisis of the early thirties was concerned Mr. REECE failed to understand that those areas with German majorities most seriously hit were industrial districts almost wholly dependent on the export trade, while those with the Czech and Slovak majorities were of a more rural character. The gentleman from Tennessee was clearly blaming the Czechs for economic conditions over which these had no control. As far as the social relief and unemployment benefits were concerned the Government came to support according to need only and not according to nationality, applying the sense of national justice and equity to its relief measures—see more in Urban, pages 57–60.

Yet the Czechoslovak nationality policy could not be entirely understood only by way of glosses on legislation or from printed matter. It was affected by the whole atmosphere of the country. The ideas of Thomas G. Massaryk, the first President of the Republic, pervaded all strata of population and were incorporated into the official ideology of the Republic. The mission of the Republic was held to be to promote democracy in its march forward. This ideological climate set the individual German as a free citizen of equal rights and gave to all minorities an opportunity of developing any political ideas they might be willing to hold and made forced denationalization impossible. President Eduard Benes outlined this conception of the Czech-German problem in his address on August 19, 1936:

Our political philosophy and morality takes the form of democracy, a democracy that provides us with the key to a solution of all our problems, since it postulates in all political negotiations a respect of the human person and complete civic equality. * * * I know that our Germans have complaints, desires and demands of a practical character. In the language and educational spheres * * * there are easy of disposal. * * * The greatest difficulties arise in the question of the state officials. A number of the German wishes are in this connection justified. Yet there is the question of confidence. A democratic state does not wish to entrust its administration to officials who profess Fascist, totalitarian, or Communist principles. * * *

President Benes concluded:

We have remained * * * a democracy which rejects all methods of violence in internal policy, the suppression of personal liberty and of the free expression of public opinion, a democracy which solves the problems of internal politics with the aid of evolutionary methods. (Czechoslovak Sources and Documents, "The Problems of Czechoslovakia. Speeches of President Benes in Northern Bohemia," Prague, 1936, pp. 15–19, 25.)

Yet the gentleman from Tennessee voiced little wonder that they—Sudeten Germans—began looking more and more for support from abroad, to understand—from Hitler. The reasons thereof were clearly put forth by Konrad Henlein, the leader of the Sudeten German Party, the largest political party of the Republic, in his secret report to Hitler:

The Sudeten Germans are today imbued with National Socialist principles and organized in a comprehensive, unitary, National Socialist Party, based on the führer concept. * * * The Sudeten German Party * * *has imbued the racial group and their sphere of life with National Socialist principles. In the face of democratic world opinion the Sudeten German Party has given proof that the National Socialist order of leadership and following corresponds with the law of the inner life of the German people, for not only has it been called into existence among the Sudeten Germans by their own free will, but in face of pressure by the Czech State. The Sudeten German Party must camouflage its profession of national socialism as an ideology of life and as a political principle. As a party in the democratic parliamentary system of Czechoslovakia, it must, outwardly, alike in writing and by word of mouth, in its manifestoes and in the press, in Parliament, in its own structure, and in the organization of the Sudeten German element, employ democratic terminology and democratic parliamentary methods. In consequence, it may appear to uninitiated German circles of the Reich to be disunited and unreliable. * * * The apparent lack of unity of the Sudeten German Party is intensified by the circumstance that at heart it desires nothing more ardently than the incorporation of Sudeten German territory, nay of the whole Bohemian, Moravian, and Silesian area within the Reich. (On November 19, 1937, "Documents on German Foreign Policy 1918–45; from the Archives of the German Foreign Ministry;" series D, 1937–45, Washington, 1949, II: 56–57.)

This fact did not prevent Mr. REECE to deplore that this party was forced to remain in opposition.

The results of the elections of May 19, 1935, gave full evidence of a popular groundswell in favor of Nazism among the so-called Sudeten Germans. The Sudeten German Party—SDP—received far greater support than the Reich German Nazis in the last relatively free German election held on March 3, 1933. The count gave Hitler, who was the Reich Chancellor, 43.9 percent of the total tally, while results in Czechoslovakia indicated that some 63 percent German voters cast their ballots to the Nazi tainted SDP in an absolutely free election. In 1938, all the aspects of Nazism were already well known. Yet the election of 1938 presented a unique event in Europe: In a democratic election more than 85 percent Czechoslovak Germans identified themselves with Nazi aims. It proved that National Socialism encompassed and expressed all the elements of the anti-Czech racial aggressive nationalism that had existed long before Henlein and Hitler rose to leadership. The SDP emerged as an instrument of a Nazi regime secretly cooperating with Berlin and plotting to destroy an independent State—a pivotal Western ally—and to wreck its democratic system. On March 16, 1938, the German Minister in Prague, Ernst Eisenlohr received from the SDP these assurances:

Course of German foreign policy as communicated by legation is to be sole determining factor for policy and tactical procedure of Sudeten German Party. My instructions are to be strictly observed. (Documents on German Foreign Policy, II: 169–170.)

In the summer of 1938 the Czechoslovak Cabinet offered to implement the most far-reaching demands of the SDP. Hitler instructed the Sudeten leaders to reject all Czechoslovak attempts of settlement and always to demand more than could be granted by Prague. The so-called Sudeten German problem was not a cause of the conflict, but a pretext. The true reason, according to the Germans themselves, was their aim to destroy the Czechoslovak Republic. Thus, contrary to Mr. REECE's claims until Munich—September 29, 1938—the so-called Sudeten Germans resolved to be a factor in the Nazi policy of the Reich, and the SDP enthusiastically followed instructions of Berlin.

Moreover, Mr. REECE failed to weigh the abuse of the right of self-determination by the Germans from Czechoslovakia who used it as an efficient instrument toward their antidemocratic aims. Despite Mr. REECE's affirmations, this abuse brought about the acknowledgement that the idea of self-determination was a limited and qualified concept which varied according to the concrete circumstances of each nation and the actual historical situation. It might be used only to establish conditions which would prevent national oppression and enable each nation to constitute its own state—see Alfred Cobban, "National Self-Determination," London, 1945. Such conception of the abusive slogans of national self-determination make enough room for the reestablishment of the Czechoslovak Republic in its historic frontiers and prevent the application of the principle to any ethnic group whose real goal was to serve as the spearhead of a foreign power.

At the time the rump Czechoslovak state abandoned by all the world was receiving democratic German and Jewish refugees fleeing the annexed Czech territories in 1938, the battlelines seemed to be clearly drawn between the Czechs and Sudetens. What for the ones was an imperialist struggle for greater living space and hegemonic position, for the others was a battle of death and life. The treatment of the Czech nation prepared by the SDP for the sake of German military victory over Czechoslovakia in 1938 displayed a degree of cruelty and violence that was rare even in the times of Hitler. It showed again that nazism was but a symptom of the truly destructive German nationalism. In its so-called Grundplanung OA, the SDP proposed a concrete plan to solve the German-Czech historical dispute—Czechoslovak Ministry of Information, "K. H. Frank on Trial Before the Czech Nation," Prague, 1946, pages 36–39. After the occupation of the Czech territories the leader of the Sudeten Germans would become their governor. The annexation would be proclaimed from Prague. After a period of military administration which would last for 5 years, the leader of the Sudeten Ger-

mans was to take over the administration. The German population would settle at certain zones, the schools would be only German, and Czech would disappear.

DISMEMBERMENT OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. REECE was oblivious of the history of the Czech nation after Munich. We do not read one word on the anti-Jewish demonstrations directed by the SDP during the night of November 9–10, 1938. We read nothing about the persecution of the Czech minority by the Sudetens. The gentleman from Tennessee seemed to be impervious to the fact that the SDP revealed to the whole world the real value of its allegations on the right of self-determination urging Berlin to push through its own extravagant claims to the purely Czech territory. Even the German Foreign Office became incensed against the arrogant behavior of the Sudeten representatives and their exorbitant demands—the National Archives of the U.S. Records of the German Foreign Ministry, container 2444. The Sudetens were exerting pressure upon Berlin for a tougher policy toward the post-Munich Republic. By advocating the subjection of the Czech nation and through the nazification of the Sudeten territory the SDP had crossed the line between politics and adventure. The remaining part of the German minority within the Czechoslovak State faithfully reenacted the Henleinist methods of pressure with all the familiar Nazi techniques of intimidation and threats. It urged the Prague Cabinet to exclude the Jews from public positions and to grant it freedom for Nazi activities. In the fateful days of the German occupation of Czechoslovakia—March 14–15, 1939—the Sudetens staged the anti-Czech and anti-Jewish demonstrations in Prague and Brno to enable Berlin to raise protests against alleged persecution of the Germans. In the early morning hours of March 15, the special trained groups of Czech Germans assumed the police authorities, seized the Czech Police Headquarters and gave aid to the Gestapo in its first wave of arrests. In the period from March 15 to May 23, 1939, 4,639 persons were arrested.

The delirious enthusiasm and the frantic cheers of the Czech Germans welcoming the entry of the German troops into the almost purely Czech part of the Republic stirred Czech indignation to a new height. Since 1933 the Sudetens were in a state of nationalist euphoria. Their vigorous nationalism has been nourished on violent anti-Czech and antidemocratic slogans. In 1939 after the many years of the lurid Nazi campaign against Czechoslovak democracy the Czechs finally lost their freedom and the Republic became a German protectorate. Far from harboring any regrets over their espousal of the Nazi pan-German aims, most of the Czechoslovak Germans anchored their present and future within the new Nazi order. Their decision was free and spontaneous: familiar with the ideology and practical program of totalitarian Germany, they chose Hitler.

THE PROTECTORATE BOHEMIA AND MORAVIA

Mr. REECE was eloquently silent on the Nazi reign of terror in the Czech countries. German policy was guided by the conviction that the Czechs had to be shown power. Any amiable attitude would be taken by them as a sign of weakness. On November 17, 1939, all the Czech universities were closed: Some 80,000 Czechs were turned out of their lands. The colonization of the Czech land was closely connected with the gradual and systematic Germanization of the Czech properties:

If we read the decrees by which German agents were established in former Jewish commercial and industrial firms in the years 1940, 1941 and 1942; if we read the names and origins of the persons who appeared in the lists of the newly nominated and elected members of the administrative and supervisory councils of industrial firms, cooperatives and banks we find everywhere that Sudeten Germans from Liberec and Jablonec, from Ústí and Rumburk, from Cheb or As appear side by side with Germans coming from various parts of the Reich. Sudeten Germans entered the Czech districts to direct the local administration, they were given the businesses, factories, etc., of Czechs who had been carried off to concentration camps or to execution. (Urban, p. 42.)

The backbone of German occupation was the German Security Police and the SS. The German rule developed into genuine police administration, supervising every aspect of the Czech public life. The Sudeten leader, K. H. Frank, became the state secretary and SS and police leader since March 1939. In 1943 he became Minister of State and legally the supreme head of the Nazi machine of brutal repression and the chief protagonist of the Sudeten element. It was a Sudeten German who applied personally the terroristic methods. Since 1939 Frank's spirit pervaded the everyday dealings of Germany with the Czech people. His conception was to repress with strictest measures, extensive arrests, and executions what he called the Czech mob. The German regime in Czechoslovakia had only one raison d'être: to conclude the German-Czech conflict by the final extermination of the Czech nation. The awareness of this prolonged secular collision affected the everyday intercourse of the two races and was reflected in the arrogant attitude of almost every Sudeten German.

Since the establishment of the protectorate discussions developed within official German circles concerning the final solution of the Czech question. On August 31, 1940, the Reich protector, von Neurath, asked for an audience with Hitler and sent him Frank's and his own memorandums. Frank proposed the complete Germanization as the goal of the policy of the Reich in the protectorate—"Trial of the Major War Criminals Before the International Military Tribunal," Nuremberg, 1945–46, XXXIII, page 260–271. Von Neurath agreed completely with the plan of Frank. Hitler accepted their solution: to Germanize the Czech nation, half of which would be expelled or shot dead—Ibid., XXVI, pages 375–376. Thus in the fall of 1940 the fate of the Czechs was determined. The German victory would bring about its total extinction. The office of the Reich protector in Prague and the race and resettlement main office SS were entrusted with carrying out the necessary preparations for the Germanization. As Vincent Urban put it:

The extensive machinery of the German occupation authorities centered in the office of the Reich protector and acting through the SS detachments and the Gestapo carried out one of the greatest attempts at denationalization of modern times; the wiping out of a nation of 8 million people with a high degree of culture and economic development. (Urban, p. 34.)

The natural reaction of the Czech people to the occupation of their country was the broadest possible organization of a resistance movement on a national scope. The staggering terror and the imminent peril of Germanization made the Czechs determined not to risk another repetition of the Sudeten attempt to disrupt their state:

Mr. REECE errs grievously in repeating—contrary to all available documents—the Sudeten contention that the transfer of the Czechoslovak Germans was not a spontaneous reaction of the Czech people but an act planned by Czech politicians in exile or even inspired by Communists. Mass executions and terror rendered impossible the whole idea of a peaceful cohabitation between Germans and Czechs. The Czechoslovak resistance movement and the exile Government formulated and proposed unanimously the removal of the disloyal majority of the German ethnic group to Germany as a necessary measure of protection. The horror, savagery, and brutality of the Nazi regime helped to create during the war the favorable terrain for the acceptance of the principle of the transfer by all the Great Powers, Great Britain, the United States, and Soviet Union. But the impetus toward the transfer was supplied by the Czech common people at home. The transfer of the Sudeten became an axiom for all the resistance groups through the entire era of German occupation, 1939–45. The idea arose, so to speak, from the necessities of Czechoslovakia at a time when no one knew whether the Czech people would have a chance to survive.

THE TRANSFER

In May 1945 Czechoslovakia drew up the balance sheet of her losses. The loss of life was 250,000 deaths from war and occupation among Czechs and Slovaks. More than 100,000 people became invalid or suffered permanent injury to health as the result of the occupation. All larger and a great many smaller cities were badly damaged, most of the plants destroyed and the communication system completely disrupted. The material damage and loss through the German occupation amounted to 1,289,5 milliard Czechoslovak crowns: According to the confession of the representatives of the Sudeten German themselves their war gains amounted to 6 millard dollars in terms of dollar values of 1938—Wilhelm K. Turnwald, editor, Dokumente zur Austreibung der Sudetendeutschen Munich, 1951, page 557. This tremendous property increase resulted from the confiscations of the Czech and

Jewish possessions, the work of the political and war prisoners and forced labor and the economic bleeding of the Czech countries.

As the last act of the long German-Czech dispute, the transfer of the Sudeten Germans was a natural response to circumstances created by the Sudeten themselves and implicit in the Nazi war regime. Being neither Communist-nor Soviet-inspired, the removal was a natural corollary of the Allied anti-Nazi policy and the war population movements. Far from being a flagrant violation of the rules of international law as it was affirmed by Mr. REECE, the transfer presented only an extreme solution which was to be applied where other means failed. One cannot conceal, of course, the gravity of this measure which was bound to bring along with it human sufferings. Its desirability in each case can be determined best by its results. The well-known American author, Joseph B. Schechtman, appeared to grasp the complexity of the whole problem in his final assessment.

In view of all the evidence provided by past experiences it cannot be denied that the redistribution of ethnic groups is a painful operation for the persons concerned. * * * Nevertheless there may be situations when the alternatives are even less desirable and where this is the case, transfer remains as the only solution. * * * It is by no means a universal method of solving all minority problems, and should not be applied until all other agencies have been explored. * * * The transfer of populations should be decited on only in the last instance, not as an ideal solution, but as a necessary evil. (Joseph B. Schechtman, "European Population Transfers, 1939–45," New York, 1946, pp. 467–468.)

The transfer of the Czechoslovak Germans—agreed upon by the Great Powers at Potsdam in 1945—was in full accordance with this balanced assessment. Enthusiastically espousing nazism, the enormous majority of the Czech Germans embraced pan-German objectives of Hitler and wrecked Czechoslovak democracy. The transfer was designed to prevent the recurrence of the shocking events of 1933–45, to aid the Czech nation to achieve the dignity of a decent living and to serve the immediate and long-range interests of the international order and peace. It generated, indeed, much individual injustice and imposed personal charges and burdens which were strongly resented by individual victims. The irregularities which accompanied the first days of the liberation were part of all revolutionary outbursts. Yet the organized transfer was carried out decently, in a humane way. The German anti-Fascists were exempted. The American authorities expressed their thanks to the Czechoslovak Government for the efficient and humane manner in which the regular transfer was carried out.

Mr. REECE indicated that 300,000 Germans from Czechoslovakia were victims of their removal. He evidently took over the figure published by Dr. Walter Becher on June 14, 1952—in the Hamburg weekly Der Sudetendeutsche. If we put to test the allegations of Dr. Becher we arrive at the conclusion that a part of the alleged 300,000 victims never existed, a further part is still living and the remaining 26,500 Sudeten German Jews were gassed by the Sudeten Nazis themselves—the character of Dr. Becher's allegations is indicated by the fact that Dr. Becher—so highly praised by Mr. REECE—was even unable to make a correct addition and through one error in addition succeeded to "annihilate" 12,000 Germans as "victims of the unchained hatred." One would wish that the gentleman from Tennessee did not use imaginary figures based on misleading and incorrect data in the two obvious attempt to discredit the Czech nation who had fought on the side of the United States in the two World Wars.

Notwithstanding the rosy picture set forth by Mr. REECE, even the most perfunctory perusal of the press of the Sudeten expellees in Western Germany will show that their leaders—some of them former Nazis—have been violently attacking the very existence of the Czechoslovak Republic since their removal. They want to return to their lost settlements, expel all the Czechoslovak settlers and dispose with "their" land, according to their heart's desire, by asking any future German Government to take them under its protection.

CONCLUSION

It was Hitler and his Sudeten followers who brought communism into Czechoslovakia. Without the war provoked by Germany east central Europe would still be free from the Communist domination and millions of Jews, Slavs, and Germans would still be alive. As a result of the Communist inroad into central Europe the Czechoslovak Republic succumbed to communism in February 1948. The return to democracy would probably be a difficult and delicate task. Yet the ultimate settlement of the German-Czech issue created most favorable conditions for the loyal cooperation and friendship between democratic Germany and a Czechoslovakia freed from both the communism and the nightmare of the internal German peril. The future democratic Czechoslovakia without her Sudeten fifth column then will be able to become a true security factor in this part of Europe. She may make possible by her very existence the establishment of an international democratic order in Europe.

U.S. News & World Report Highlights Labor's New Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Americans, generally, have come to understand and realize exactly what is included in the significant features of the Landrum-Griffin bill as it was finally adopted and included as the basic part of the labor reform legislation recently approved by Congress, they have come to appreciate that in reality it is a very important bill of rights for the American working man and woman, whether unionized or not.

In the September 14 issue of U.S. News & World Report, widely recognized, widely read, and highly authentic news magazine published here in Washington, the editors of that weekly magazine set out with clarity how this new labor reform legislation moves in the desired direction of giving rank and file dues paying members of America's unions the freedom of choice and powers of self-determination so dear to all red-blooded Americans in every walk of life.

As vice chairman of the so-called McClellan Labor Rackets Investigating Committee—the proper name of which is the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Improper Activities in the Labor-Management Field—I have said over and over again in committee, on the floor of the Senate, over radio and television, and in many States of the Union, that there is nothing basically wrong with the trade union movement in America that cannot be cured and corrected by giving the men and women who belong to the unions the tools and protections required to enable them to utilize full and fair democratic processes to run their own unions, to elect officers of their own choice from within their own ranks, to inspect the records, to demand and receive detailed financial reports on what is being done with their money, and to determine the contents of the contracts which provide the terms of their employment and the degree of income which they receive.

The so-called bill of rights in the new labor reform law takes trojan steps in the direction of achieving these degrees of self-government and self-determination for the fine, patriotic, hard-working men and women who pay the dues which support the American labor unions and their opulent leadership apparatus.

Our committee in its investigation in case after case has traced down as the major source of so-called union corruption or union dictatorship or union violence the sordid fact that such improper activities occur by the direction and through the planning of the type of labor leader who uses his dues-paying members as pawns and who makes it difficult or impossible for them to decide their own courses of action through democratic processes including the basic American right of a vote by secret ballot under circumstances which guarantee an honest count of the ballots cast. Here, again, this new labor reform bill contains provisions of which I am proud and happy to be the author which go a long way in the direction of extending and protecting these American voting rights for the rank and filer.

Mr. President, those interested in full particulars of how this new bill works in the interests of the rank-and-file dues-paying member in his relationships with those who lead—and sometimes run—his union should go to the nearest public library and read the full accounts contained in the September 14, 1959, issue of U.S. News & World Report. As a

sample of the information provided in this intelligent and factual magazine report, written by objective editors who are neither "prolabor" nor "antilabor," I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a "box score" on this subject taken from that issue of the magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, Sept. 14, 1959]

A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR UNION MEMBERS—UNDER THE LABOR "REFORM" BILL, UNION MEMBERS GET NEW RIGHTS TO HELP THEM CONTROL UNIONS, KEEP RACKETEERS OUT

Voting by secret ballot is to decide all union elections.

Union meetings must be opened to all active members in good standing.

Elections of officers must be held at least once every 3 years in local unions; every 5 years in national unions. Ex-convicts can't be elected to office within 5 years of their release from prison.

Freedom of speech, including the right to criticize union officials, is to be guaranteed to every member.

Union contracts must be available for inspection by members.

Financial reports must be made to members each year, showing receipts, expenditures, reserves, and salaries and expenses paid to officials.

The right to sue union officers, to stop them from violating members' rights or misusing union funds, is expressly stated in the bill.

Strikers get the right to vote in wage-bargaining elections, even if they've been replaced by new workers in a plant.

To enforce these rights: The Secretary of Labor gets increased authority over unions. Yearly financial reports must be filed with the Labor Department, and national unions must report on any "trusteeships" over local unions.

Republican Post Office Service Finally "Gets" Walter Noreen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Minnesota Union Advocate, June 30, 1959:

[From the Minnesota Union Advocate, June 30, 1959]

REPUBLICAN POST OFFICE SERVICE FINALLY "GETS" WALTER NOREEN

The U.S. Post Office Department, under the direction of Postmaster General Summerfield (who was given that post for his highly effective politically partisan work as Republican national chairman), has taken its latest step in what might be construed as a campaign to put the fear of GOP into postal and other Federal Government workers.

The Post Office Department has summarily fired Walter Noreen, who happens to be national vice president of the newly formed National Postal Clerks Union and president of the St. Paul local of that International.

He also is a past president of the St. Paul AFL-CIO Trades and Labor Assembly.

If all these union leadership activities give you the idea that this helped make him a special target of a Republican Party program to "get" militant union leaders who don't roll over and play dead to please Republican Party big-wigs, you aren't the only one who develops this suspicion.

Noreen's discharge was a "disciplinary" action taken by the Post Office Department for a statement he made last December in his capacity as president of the Trades and Labor Assembly.

Noreen's statement was critical of the Post Office Department's policy of hiring as temporary workers during the Christmas season rush people who already had full-time jobs.

Well, you maybe remember there were some 100,000 unemployed persons in Minnesota last winter, and approximately 5 million unemployed in the United States, so anyone with a grain of commonsense would object to hiring already employed persons at a time like this. Why not give these jobs to those who needed jobs?

Noreen spoke out in vigorous fashion against this shortsighted—he could well have called it a worse—practice, and the Department promptly accused him of bringing the postal service into "disrepute."

Well, there was "disrepute" all right, and today there is even more, but that is due to the practice initiated by the high officials of the Department, not by a criticism of a situation that should never have been created in the first place.

So the Post Office Department "disciplined" Labor Leader Walter Noreen. Was this "discipline" a suspension of 10 days or a few more, the kind of action that might be expected for a man with 16 years of service and rights as a postal employee?

Noreen was fired, dismissed summarily, with the dismissal effective immediately, and 16 years of service, seniority, rights, and what have you, gone down the drain.

When former Republican National Chairman Summerfield and his political crew set out to get a rank-and-file employee who dares to be a militant union leader and who has the courage to state his opinion of the Republican Party's attitude toward unions and toward individual workers who dare to call their souls their own, they go all the way.

Well, this suspension is being appealed, of course, and the final jury verdict is not in.

One bright aspect of the affair is that the local postmaster, Sig Bertelsen, and his staff, are not a part of what many trade unionists will classify as this persectuion of Walter Noreen.

Going back through the years, it would appear that there long has been a determined effort by high officials of the Post Office Department to "get" Walter Noreen, and get him good.

The Noreen file is pretty thick—and still is being kept, despite the fact that he was acquitted on various occasions of charges brought against him.

Doesn't an acquittal mean that the charges were false? Why weren't those who pressed false charges against Noreen investigated and dismissed?

Were they members of—or subservient to—the same political party that Summerfield served as national committee chairman? There are a lot of unanswered questions on this deal.

Texas Is a Better Place To Live Because of A. B. Tarwater's Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a great and good friend of the people of Texas, particularly a friend of the farm people, has died, but the benefits of his work live after him. I refer to the late A. B. Tarwater of Plainview, Tex., a member of the Texas Legislature from 1929 to 1941.

It can be said without exception or contradiction that Mr. Tarwater was a legislator on the side of the people. He fought fearlessly against those who would saddle Texans with a State sales tax and demanded instead higher proportionate taxes on those who were profiteering off of Texas' natural resources. He pioneered in the field of water development and soil conservation.

During the years from 1931 to 1934, when it was my privilege to serve as an assistant attorney general in Texas, I had the honor and pleasure of working with Mr. Tarwater. His remarkable ability and profound judgment commanded the respect of all who knew him. Today Texas is indebted to him for his great service on water and soil conservation laws, and for much other work.

He was courageous. I was deeply honored when he supported me in campaigns for good government in Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the RECORD a very excellent article from the June 10, 1959, Plainview Herald concerning Mr. Tarwater's remarkable career, entitled "A. B. Tarwater, 87, Dies Early Today, Heart Attack."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A. B. TARWATER, 87, DIES EARLY TODAY, HEART ATTACK

Death came suddenly about 8 o'clock this morning to A. B. Tarwater, 87, retired farmer and a member of the Texas Legislature for six terms, from the 41st through the 46th sessions, 1929–41.

He was the most forceful representative of the agricultural areas that ever belonged to the Texas Legislature. His thorough knowledge of parliamentary procedure, his strong reliance on statistical and factual matter, and his understanding of human nature gave him power. He had been a Government employee at Albany, N.Y., before coming here and there learned how to tap primary sources of information. Few dared conradict his statements in debate.

Gov. Price Daniel, who served in the Texas Legislature with A. B. Tarwater, sent the following message when notified of the pioneer legislator's death:

"In the passing of A. B. Tarwater, Texas has lost one of its most distinguished pioneers in the field of soil conservation and water development. I served in the legislature in 1939 with Mr. Tarwater and always had the highest respect for him. I join his friends in extending deepest sympathy to his family."

Although he was well known for his successful battles to tax oleomargarine, which was in strong competition with butter in a time that dairying was a mainstay in agriculture in this area, his greatest contribution was in the field of soil conservation.

He appeared for the oleo tax against such stalwarts as the meatpackers, bankers from packing cities, and the famous cattleman's lawyer, Dayton Moses.

The Texas soil conservation laws were drafted by the late Jimmy Guleke, of Amarillo, and revised by A. B. Tarwater, with the assistance of such men as Senator Clint S. Small, and RALPH YARBOROUGH, then of the attorney general's department. His big battle was to see that instead of U.S. domi-

nance, or State dominance that the soil conservation districts were formed through local elections and governed by boards locally elected.

During the big battle for control of oil production by the Texas Railroad Commission he fought for the market demand phase of the law, rather than economic basis. This course was highly favored by west Texas oil producers, as this area was just coming into production, and the flood of cheap oil from uncontrolled production of the fabulously large east Texas wells has demoralized the oil business. Conservation was also an aim of this law.

He favored taxes on natural resources, and fought Gov. W. Lee O'Daniel's sales tax proposals. Backed by industrialists and by major oil producers and the sulfur interests.

Tarwater's position was that the sales tax would exact $7 per year from the average citizen, to each dollar paid by natural resources.

He fought imposition of gasoline tax on farm-consumed, nonhighway gasoline, when it was a prime fuel for tractor and irrigation engines.

Irked at the inconsistency of posted prices for butterfat in this area, he urged the formation of the Plains Cooperative Creamery, which folded with the wane of dairying and liquidated a few years ago. It exerted a profound influence on prices in the area, and initiated movements to improve quality of product, feeding and care practices, and herd improvement.

Until his health impaired his strength and vision he maintained a keen and active interest in political and economic fields, and was always battling for farm people as their interests appeared to him.

Funeral services will be conducted at 4 o'clock Thursday afternoon at Edmonson Baptist Church of which he has been a member. The pastor Rev. R. L. Swanner, and Rev. E. S. Weathers, retired Baptist pastor of Plainview will officiate.

Arthur Bosworth Tarwater was born Februrary 17, 1872, in Knox County, Tenn. He later moved to Indiana and from there to Albany, N.Y., from when he and his family moved to what is now the Edmonson community northwest of Plainview.

He and Miss Mae Newgent were married December 2, 1903, at Veesburg, Ind.

Tarwater farmed and took an active part in community, area, and State affairs. He was a member of the Edmonson First Baptist Church and served his church in various capacities over the years.

He served for several terms as trustee of the former Runningwater rural school.

Survivors are his wife, two daughters, Mrs. Carl Belk, Edmonson, and Mrs. J. B. Masten, Jr., Plainview; two brothers, H. R. Tarwater, Lubbock, and B. D. Tarwater, Colvis N. Mex.; six grandchildren and five great-grandchildren.

The body will lie in state at Lemons Funeral Home. Interment will be in Plainview Memorial Park.

Struggle for Freedom in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the Readers' Column of the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader of September 11, 1959:

STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM IN POLAND

EDITOR, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

This month marks the 20th anniversary of Chancellor Hitler's grandiose ideas to invade Poland and conquer the world. It also marks the beginning of the most destructive and bloodiest war in history.

On September 1, 1939, hordes of German armored units suddenly crossed the Polish border from the west and north. The Polish Army, lacking armored divisions and aircraft, was unable to stop the German advance. Despite the heroic fight of the Polish Army and the civilian population, Poland was overrun by the Germans.

Shortly thereafter the Russians invaded Poland from the east and northeast.

This double invasion did not break the spirit of the Polish nation. They quickly organized an underground government and a home army of 700,000. The Polish spirit was not conquered; it went underground, where the battle for liberty grew stronger and stronger. Occupation of Poland constantly required 12 German divisions, badly needed on other fronts.

Reinvasion of Poland by the Russians in 1945 raised the hope the German invaders would be defeated and driven out of Poland. This dream was short lived and eventually turned into a nightmare.

The Russian invaders proved more destructive than the Germans. Gestapo techniques seemed amateurish in comparison to the experts of the Russian secret police.

Tens of thousands of the Polish underground army and government officials were arrested and deported to Siberia for elimination. Even this added tragedy did not break the spirit of the nation.

In spite of Poland's being placed in the satellite group, the struggle for freedom continues with unabated strength. Even when dominance seemed complete, the Poznan uprising of 1956 broke the myth and resulted in partial freedom.

History proves that the spirit of the Polish nation is never crushed. At the first opportunity it will rise to complete freedom and independence and its position among the concourse of free nations. It is still the eastern outpost of our Christian civilization.

STEFAN HELLERSPERK

EDITOR'S NOTE: Mr. Hellersperk, former Polish diplomat, will speak at the mass meeting at Sans Souci Park at 6 p.m. Sunday under the auspices of the Polish American Congress of Northeastern Pennsylvania. He will give an eye witness account of the German invasion of Poland. Taken into custody in 1945 by the Russian Communists because of his activities in the Polish underground, Mr. Hellersperk was deported to Siberia where he had a harrowing experience in concentration camps and coal mines for 32 months, during which his weight dropped from 165 pounds to less than 90 pounds. He returned to America in 1948, rejoining his wife, the former Melania Kocyan, daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Kocyan, city.

Northwest Public Power Association Endorses Bill To Require Senate Confirmation of IJC Commissioners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, recently Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, forwarded to me a copy of a letter sent by his organization to the able chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], endorsing my bill, S. 2594, to require Senate confirmation of U.S. Representatives appointed by the President to serve on the International Joint Commission.

Mr. Norwood states that—

We consider the position to be a highly sensitive, policymaking function not unlike that of an ambassador. * * * The position, of course, is of much more importance than some 80 percent of executive appointments which are now subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

I subscribe fully to Gus Norwood's remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of his letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1959.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This association, representing 105 consumer-owned electric systems which serve from 2 million people in Alaska, Montana, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington, is keenly concerned and is in favor of the recommendation of S. 2594 to require the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate with respect to appointments of the three U.S. Commissioners on the International Joint Commission.

Considering the growing importance of IJC we feel that it is necessary that our concept of chairmanship of this commission be raised. We consider the position to be a highly sensitive, policy-making function not unlike that of an ambassador.

The position requires specific knowledge in the field of water resources and electric power.

The Senate should review future appointments and give advice and consent only if the appointee is found to be qualified with respect to knowledge of the water resources and electric power fields and that he possess the statesmanship-like characteristics which are necessary for a person who represents the United States.

The position, of course, is of much more importance than some 80 percent of executive appointments which are now subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

Accordingly, we urge the enactment of S. 2594.

Respectfully submitted.

GUS NORWOOD,
Executive Secretary.

"Pork" Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, now that the tug of war is over between the executive and the legislative branches of the Government with respect to what shall be written into law in the form of the public works appropriation, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Wheeling

News-Register of Sunday, September 13, 1959, entitled "'Pork' Abroad."

This editorial certainly points up in a comparative sense that which we are doing on the domestic front and that which we are doing under foreign aid in the field of public works. After having read the editorial, I feel some confront in my record here in the Congress in opposing foreign aid. I do not believe that two different standards should apply—one for the American people and one for foreign countries.

In voting to sustain the President's veto of both public works bills, I felt that the President was wise in these vetos because they were in the cause of sound fiscal practice. However, a double standard cannot be used in matters that deal directly with the American people, even though it is based upon sound fiscal practice. I respectfully refer this editorial to my colleagues for their consideration:

"Pork" Abroad

The cause of sound fiscal practice would have been better served, no doubt, had Congress yielded to the President in the matter of a public works appropriation. It is undeniable that the device of adding to an omnibus public works bill project not recommended by the agencies charged with the responsibility of this type of planning breeds extravagance. There is basis for the complaint that, under these circumstances, many projects may be better designed to catch votes for Congressmen than to serve a real public need. There are 67 such in the measure which Congress now has passed over presidential disapproval. Even with a blanket cut of two and a half percent, made after the first veto stood up, the measure calls for the expenditure of more than $1,185 million to start these and other flood control and other works, and to continue projects already underway. Moreover, it was charged by the President and not refuted, that the addition of these 67 projects will cost the taxpayers a total of $800 million over the years; an obligation which would not have been incurred had they not been added to the original administration recommendation.

In the light of the precarious condition of the budget, the pressure of the debt burden, the desirability of curtailing our public expenditures and putting our fiscal house in order, Mr. Eisenhower probably took the sounder position in opposing this new construction.

But there was a fatal flaw in Mr. Eisenhower's armor. While preaching economy on the domestic front, demanding the severest sort of belt-tightening to make possible a balanced budget and to pave the way for tax reduction, the President has insisted just as vehemently on a policy of openhanded generosity in the field of foreign aid. He called originally for a foreign-aid program of $3.9 billion, and has fought every inch of the way against congressional attempts to whittle it down. In the bill now pending which would appropriate the actual money to keep the foreign-aid program going, provision is made for $800 million worth of works projects in foreign countries. As Senator Allen J. Ellender, Democrat, of Louisiana, pointed out in the veto debate, it borders on the ridiculous to balk at the expenditure of $800 million over a period of years for public works in the United States while endorsing the expenditure of an equal sum of our money during a single year for like improvements in distant lands.

The American people, this newspaper is confident, believe in the exercise of economy at the seat of government. But they can't understand why it should be an exclusively domestic enterprise; why the necessity for curtailment doesn't apply to foreign aid as to activity at home; why we should be called on to keep on sacrificing at an undiminished rate for other peoples, not all of whom have displayed much enthusiasm about doing something for themselves. This is particularly true in the light of compelling evidence of waste and mismanagement in the distribution and use of foreign aid. If then, there is to be any loose expenditure of tax dollars for public works, the American people would prefer that the money is spent at home where it can do them some good, even if there is a faint odor of pork about some of the undertakings.

Henry Fountain Ashurst Can Look Back on a Long and Notable Career in the Senate and in Public Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, yesterday was the 85th birthday of Henry Fountain Ashurst, former Senator from Arizona.

I desire to pay tribute to this man and his long and notable career. May he live to enjoy many more birthdays.

Mr. Ashurst, who now lives in Washington, represented Arizona for 29 years—from the time it became a State in 1912 until 1941. As a young lawyer in El Paso, Tex., from 1927 to 1931, not so far from the boundary of Arizona, I heard many legends of Senator Ashurst.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial from the Washington Post and Times Herald for Sunday, September 13, 1959, entitled "Birthday Boy," and and an article by Phil Casey from the same newspaper for Monday, September 14, 1959, entitled "Ex-Senator Ashurst Vocal and Fit at 85."

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 13, 1959]

Birthday Boy

Today is the 85th anniversary of that distinguished elder statesman, Henry Fountain Ashurst, who has found our Washington climate (humidity and all) so congenial that even after his long tenure in the Senate he has never shown the slightest disposition to return to Arizona. One explanation, perhaps, is that although from the beginning of statehood in 1912, Arizona returned him for five sucessive terms, he was never quite as much appreciated by his compatriots as by his congressional colleagues and by the congressional press galleries.

In Arizona they may have already forgotten the time when he was the handsomest member of a body more distinguished for dignity than for manly beauty. Doubtless they have preferred to forget that in a day when U.S. Senators felt it incumbent to dress for the part he was the most elegantly tailored of them all. They may even have forgotten the sesquipedalian chromatic rhetoric in which he excused or justified the occasional inconsistencies of his long legislative career; and how in the matter of purple periods this prodigy among cowpokes could hold his own with such masters as Reed and Stone of Missouri, Borah of Idaho, Williams of Mississippi, and Jim Ham Lewis of Illinois.

But all this is well and gratefully remembered here, at least by those old enough to be able to contrast the mellifluent magnificos of Senator Ashurst's day with the stodgy, solemn, statistics-spouting sobersides that have inherited their places in the pages of the Congressional Record.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1959]

Ex-Senator Ashurst Vocal and Fit at 85

(By Phil Casey)

Henry Fountain Ashurst, former Arizona Senator, hit 85 yesterday and said he feels fine and can still be heard a block away.

"I could go out on my veranda right now," he said, "speak for an hour without one throat lozenge, and you'd hear me for at least a block, distinctly."

The tall, white-haired and still vigorous Ashurst figures the voice that rang often and strongly through the Senate Chamber from 1912 to 1941 is still in great shape because he spent years developing it and quit smoking 22 years ago.

He began smoking and chewing tobacco when he was 12, gave up chewing when he got married, because his wife couldn't stand it, and quit smoking at 63.

Seated in the apartment he has lived in for 20 years at the Sheraton-Park Hotel, Ashurst gave fluent evidence that his memory is just about as good as his voice.

"I once said not a leaf yet falling from the tree of memory," he said, "but I guess some leaves are falling by now."

But he hasn't forgotten much.

" I had my first drink January 1, 1889, when I was 16," he said. "It was bourbon and I haven't found a bad one since.

"I was born in an uncovered wagon—in Nevada—not a covered wagon; they were like the Cadillacs of today, and we were poor. Ours was uncovered."

After 29 years as a Senator, Ashurst lost out in a primary race in Arizona and retired.

"I neglected my people. I didn't go home enough. I'd been in one office or another 50 years and I wanted a little freedom between the office and the grave. It's been the happiest period of my life."

Ashurst seems in great shape, and has no complaints. He's up early every day, works on correspondence until afternoon, walks a mile, rests, eats well, steering clear of heavy foods, reads 6 hours a day and goes to a party practically every night.

The reason he lost, he said, is simple.

He uses glasses only for reading and can read without them. His hearing is holding up well and his teeth are his own.

Ashurst admits to some regrets.

"I'm sorry for a lot of things," he said. "I had a hot temper. I made so many mistakes it's a wonder I pulled through. Now people call be uninsultable. You can't make me mad. It's not worth it. I'm uninsultable."

Southeastern Soil Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAMER H. BUDGE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include in the Record a speech given by the Hon-

orable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, before soil conservation district leaders in Charleston, S.C., on August 3, 1959.

I also include an editorial from the August 7 edition of the Greenville News, published at Greenville, S.C.

The speech and the editorial are thought-provoking and are worthy of deep study but not only Members of the Congress, but by all to whom a free, dynamic economy in America is of prime importance.

The speech and editorial follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

Our annual Federal expenditure for national defense is $40 billion.

We have given away nearly $200 billion in the last 20 years in various foreign aid schemes.

World War II cost us over $300 billion.

Our national debt is $285 billion and rising. Taxes are being constantly increased—local, State and national.

Experts predict foreign aid will cost another $100 billion in the next 30 or 40 years.

The great portion of this money has been spent to make the world safe for democracy, the war to end all wars, and the four freedoms. It has all led up to the present cold war with its fantastic expenditures. As a Nation we think in terms of dollars, high standards of living. We talk in terms of big deals and big things. Our leaders believe that the cold war will be won out in space with rockets, guided missiles and space ships. We stockpile atomic and hydrogen bombs in ever increasing numbers.

We could win the race to the moon and still lose this cold war in the field of agriculture. Khrushchev recently said that Russia is devoting 100 million new acres to agriculture. His people are urged and even driven to grow more and more. In the United States, with Government regulations, red tape and restrictions, we grow less and less. The income of the farmer is annually less and less and it is costing the taxpayers more and more. Russia is making a careful, calculated bid for the economic domination of the world. The cornerstone of her plan is greater agriculture production. They are sending agricultural experts into every area of Africa and South Asia. These agents are making friends and paving the way eventually for Russian agricultural and industrial experts.

On the other hand, we are, through the foreign aid program and the maladministration of our trade program, losing our agricultural markets abroad and teaching other people how to grow the things that we have traditionally grown, such as cotton and tobacco.

Not only Russia but Red China is vastly increasing her agricultural output and acres devoted to farm crops. Every country in the world is planting more and more. Rhodesia is exempting her farmers from land taxes to grow more. Turkey has exempted her farmers from income taxes to grow certain crops.

The American farmer is cultivating 27 million acres less than in 1930 and 20 million acres less than in 1945. There are 10 million less people on our farms today than in 1930. Slightly over 10 percent of our population live on the farm today. This is the smallest percentage of our total population than at any time in our history. It is probably the smallest percentage of any great nation or civilization in the history of the world. Our Constitution, Declaration of Independence, and Bill of Rights were largely written by rural men who were independent, self-reliant, believing in States rights, and local government. Our basic, fundamental, political, and social philosophy was rural. Today such a very small percentage of our people are on the farm thus adversely affecting our social, economic, and political philosophy.

Government price supports have not, cannot, and will not solve the American agriculture dilemma. Under the price-support program millions of people have been forced off the land, creating more unemployment in the cities. Farm income has annually gone down during the last few years—more than $1 billion each year. Surplus farm products are piling up in Government warehouses, costing the taxpayers more every day—over a million dollars a day storage cost alone. If agriculture is to regain its independence and be a real factor in the cold war, we must get the Government out of the farming business. In doing so, we must eliminate Government price supports and acreage controls. At the same time, we must freeze the present vast surplus in Government warehouses. This surplus must not be dumped on the market as it would bankrupt every farmer in America. We need to step up domestic consumpiton of our farm products and conduct research in order to find new uses for these products.

If the State Department were more sympathetic to this agricultural problem, we could regain our vast export trade in agricultural commodities. Our State Department represents foreign countries and, therefore, does not permit American agricultural products to really compete on the world market. The State Department is more interested in protecting the markets of foreign nations and teaching them how to grow the things we already have in surplus. We used to export 60 percent of our cotton crop. We used to export vast portions of our wheat. Export of these crops has fallen to a trickle. We were the only Nation in the world exporting tobacco at one time. Now some nations are even sending tobacco to America. The average tobacco acreage in the United States is 2.9 acres per farm. Thousands of farmers can plant only 4 to 5 acres of cotton. This is tragic. These farmers cannot possibly feed, clothe and educate their children while being held in such bondage.

Who first put the Government in the agriculture business? Who wrote the first Agricultural Adjustment Act, which was the beginning of our present dilemma? , If it had been written by Russia, it could not have served their purpose better. This program putting the U.S. Government on the necks of our farmers was initiated by Henry Wallace, Lee Pressman, Tex Tugwell, Alger Hiss, Frank Shea, notorious pseudoliberals and advocates of national socialism.

We have successfully resisted all efforts of the Farmers Union and others to put the Government in the cattle and livestock business. The cattle industry is still free. It is growing. It is expanding and bringing in the farmers more income. Why? It is totally free of Government regulations and restrictions as to how much we can raise and how much we can market. The hog market is at the present time falling off. We will hear a howl from the Farmers Union and others for Government price supports on meat. This would be disastrous as it would bring another segment of our agriculture economy under this fallacious and ridiculous program.

Likewise, the pine tree industry in South Carolina is a growing and flourishing one because it is free from Government price support programs and acreage controls.

You have been active in trying to secure for the southeastern coastal region a soil and water research laboratory. I pledge you my support and predict that next year $500,000 will be appropriated by the Congress for the construction of this much-needed soil and water research laboratory.

Much research needs to be done concerning water in the Southeast. We have only scratched the surface. Water will become more and more of a problem in the next 50 years. Water levels are changing in the United States. Water is becoming scarce in other areas of our country. Likewise, soil productivity in the Southeast is in desperate need of further research. Research is the key to the future.

States rights is most important in the field of agriculture. Now the Federal Government is threatening individual freedom and State sovereignty in the field of water rights. Recent Supreme Court decisions have had the effect of "subjecting the water and water courses to a dominant servitude invested in the Federal Government." The Court in 1955 in substance exempted all the Federal Government lands from any State laws concerning water rights granted under State water laws. Thus, in many cases usurping individual water rights formerly acquired from the States. Water is a powerful weapon. The Federal Government by control of all water could completely dominate and overwhelm the States and subjugate the individual to bureaucratic domination. We must fight centralization of the Federal Government in all segments of our economy. The alternative is complete servitude to the Federal autocracy.

The Communists in the early 1930's started their "agrarian reform movement" in the United States. According to Whitaker Chambers, they were successful in establishing a Communist cell in the old AAA program, which was the beginning of the Government agricultural program. The Communists and National Socialists realized from past experience in foreign countries that the farmers resisted socialism more violently than any other class of people. In the United States they planned to concentrate on the farmers, first getting them accustomed to Government regulations, Government restrictions, reduced acreage, and phony price-support programs.

We must get rid of these Socialist, Fascist farm regulations and controls or else in a few years America will be completely out of the farm business. We will be reduced to a third-rate power. Our farm population must be permited to expand and grow. We need the opportunity system the same as any other class of people. We cannot forever condemn our farm people to fewer acres, less opportunity, and a lower standard of living. This can only result in a weakening of our Nation in the face of an expanding, growing, Communist empire.

[From the Greenville News, Aug. 7, 1959]

REPRESENTATIVE DORN SPEAKS HIS MIND

Congressman BRYAN DORN may be a "voice crying in the wilderness" at the moment but his courage in refusing to indulge in easy demagoguery is bound to be recognized.

In his speech before the Soil Conservation District Supervisors of the Southeast, the South Carolinian spelled out in detail his conviction that the Federal policies of the past and present which are supposed to help the farmer have, on the contrary, come close to annihilating him.

The core of all those programs, the price-support system, "has not, cannot, and will not solve the American agricultural dilemma," the Congressman declared.

Rather than improving the farmers' standard of living, the net result of the price-support and crop-control program has been to force millions of people off the farms, reduce farm income, and create an overwhelming farm product surplus.

Congressman DORN pointed to the startling contrast between the farm products which are controlled by the Federal Government and those which are still free.

In conjunction with a State Department which is more interested in protecting the

agricultural economy of foreign nations than in helping our domestic farm economy, the programs have all but wrecked the once abundant foreign market for U.S. cotton, wheat, and tobacco, he declared. Much of that portion of the production of these crops which once was sold abroad is now overflowing Government warehouses where it poses a constant depressing threat on domestic prices.

On the other hand, both the cattle industry and the growing tree farm industry are expanding and flourishing, largely because it is free from Government price-support programs.

In his speech, the Greenwood native, himself a cattle farmer, traced the origin of the present farm programs back to the original Agricultural Adjustment Act.

"This program," he said, "putting the U.S. Government on the necks of our farmers was initiated by Henry Wallace, Lee Pressman, Rex Tugwell, Alger Hiss, Frank Shea—notorious pseudo-liberals and advocates of national socialism."

"We must get rid of these Socialist, Fascist farm regulations and controls," he continued, "or else in a few years America will be completely out of the farm business. We will be reduced to a third-rate power. Our farm population must be permitted to expand and grow. We need the opportunity system the same as any other class of people.

"We cannot forever condemn our farm people to fewer acres, less opportunity, and a lower standard of living. This can only result in a weakening of our Nation in the face of an expanding, growing Communist empire."

Congressman DORN's words are bound to come as something of a shock to some of his fellow South Carolinans, most of whom are more accustomed to being told that the main trouble with farming is that there are not enough Government controls and supports.

But, based as it is on his solid convictions about free enterprise and State and local rights, we cannot believe that his words will fall on fallow ground.

He has put into plain words the feeling of many of his constituents that the present farm programs are not suited to the American way of life, that they are bankrupting the Nation and that they have already come close to bankrupting the very segment they were supposed to aid—the American farmer.

A Tribute to Senator John McClellan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of the Congress and the country, a column from the able and respected pen of Gould Lincoln, entitled "McCLELLAN Real Labor Bill Victor," published in the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star of September 8, 1959.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Sept. 8, 1959]

McCLELLAN REAL LABOR BILL VICTOR

(By Gould Lincoln)

Amid all the talk of who won the victory in the recent passage by Congress of the antiracketeering, anticorruption labor bill, two facts stand out. First, the major credit for effective legislation belongs to Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, of Arkansas, chairman of the Senate committee bearing as its long name "The Select Committee to Investigate Improper Activities in Labor-Management Relations." Indeed, had it not been for Senator McCLELLAN's persistent and courageous stand and his ability to keep partisan politics—Democratic and Republican—in abeyance, there might have been no legislation. Second, the victory really belongs to the American people who made their emphatic demand for reform labor legislation known to Members of Congress.

The Senate investigating committee, composed of four Democrats and four Republicans, was created in early 1957—more than 2½ years ago. It grew out of investigations by the old Senate investigating committee once headed by the late Senator McCarthy of Wisconsin and then by Senator McCLELLAN. This inquiry turned up racketeering in labor-management relations in New York of a vicious character. The select committee was set up with full authority to go thoroughly into the whole subject which the old committee did not have. What the select committee revealed shocked the entire country. Senator McCLELLAN, a modest man, gives great credit to his committee members—Senators KENNEDY of Massachusetts, ERVIN of North Carolina, CHURCH of Idaho, CAPEHART of Indiana, GOLDWATER of Arizona, MUNDT of South Dakota, and CURTIS of Nebraska—and to his chief counsel, Robert F. Kennedy, brother of the Massachusetts Senator.

INCLUDES M'CLELLAN'S IDEAS

This was the first piece of major labor legislation passed by Congress in a dozen years. It is not the Kennedy bill, originally passed by the Senate after being amended, nor is it the Landrum-Griffin bill which passed the House. It is a compromise combination of both. It also carries important elements of the five bills which were introduced by Senator McCLELLAN, including in large part the "bill of rights" for union members. Indeed, it was the adoption by the Senate of McClellan's "bill of rights" as an amendment to the Kennedy bill which cracked the tough nut of labor legislation wide open. It shed the first ray of hope that an effective law might be written. This was watered down before the bill passed the Senate. But the spirit shown in the Senate gave encouragement to those Members of the House intent on writing still stronger legislation.

The leaders of organized labor have denounced the new measure as "worse than the Taft-Hartley Act"—which they called a "slave labor bill." James Carey, a vice president of the AFL–CIO, addressed a letter to every Member of the House who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill threatening that organized labor would work for their defeat at the polls next year. All of which sets the stage for a terrific battle in next year's elections, with organized labor working for political control of the Nation. A great deal will depend on the outcome of this struggle. But as of today, the union leaders seem to have bitten off a big chunk to swallow, when they reflect that the Senate finally passed the reform bill by a vote of 95 to 2, and the House by a margin of 352 to 52. It is true that the bill as reported from conference between the two Houses was modified and less drastic in some particulars than the Landrum-Griffin bill. But it is still a measuse with teeth, and it still represents a strong feeling that the honest union members must be protected in all the rights guaranteed him in the Bill of Rights embodied in the Constitution, and that certain practices by labor unions unfair and opening the way to hoodlum domination must be halted.

RISKED POLITICAL LIFE

Senator McCLELLAN knew that he was taking his political life in his hands when he started on the investigation of labor-management relations. He tried in vain to get help from important labor leaders in the framing of reform legislation. They turned a deaf ear. They said they could clean up the situation themselves. They wanted no legislation. They adopted a program of ethical standards. The AFL–CIO kicked Jimmy Hoffa and his Teamsters Union out when he would not comply. In the last round of the legislative fight, however, they and Mr. Hoffa were all found fighting against a strong reform measure.

The Arkansas Senator comes up next year for renomination and reelection. No one has yet announced to run against him. It has been reported, however, in Arkansas, that the union leaders are ready to spend $2 million there to defeat Mr. McCLELLAN. Certainly they will do their utmost to get rid of the man whom they most blame for the legislation now enacted. How many other Members of the Senate and House they will seek to unseat remains to be seen. It will be a fight that crosses both Democratic and Republican lines. And it will be a desperate and bitter fight.

House Joint Resolution To Provide a Program Re Federal Debt, Deficits, Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the Members of Congress, I am pleased to insert a recital of the critical condition of the Federal Government and a program for its correction. These matters are contained in the following joint resolution which was introduced today.

Whereas the U.S. Government has pursued a loose and irresponsible fiscal policy for the past 10 years; and

Whereas, due to this irresponsible fiscal policy, the national debt has reached the highest level in our history, $290 billion; and

Whereas there exists in our Government a lack of purpose to operate on an annual balanced budget; and

Whereas since the year 1950, the U.S. Government has incurred the following annual deficits, $3.1 billion, $4 billion, $9.4 billion, $3.1 billion, $4.2 billion, $2.8 billion, $12.9 billion, with relatively small surpluses in other fiscal years; and

Whereas since the Korean war, during a period of relative prosperity, the net operating deficit is more than $8.5 billion; and

Whereas these deficits have created a cumulative demand upon the nation's money markets thereby reducing the capital funds available for the expansion of our economy and the creation of job opportunities; and

Whereas there has been no executive or legislative policy or declaration indicating any intent to repay any part of the national debt; and

Whereas this careless fiscal policy is a major cause of our present inflation, the ever-increasing cost of living, and the reduction in the purchasing power of the dollar; and

Whereas this loose fiscal policy has generated and encouraged an insidious repudiation of debt; and

Whereas this irresponsible fiscal policy has reached such proportions that there is a rapid and increasing loss of public confidence in the will and the capacity of our Government to balance the budget, repay our national debt, and stabilize the value of our currency; and

Whereas this lax fiscal policy has created an artificial inflationary prosperity by an expansion of credit, increased circulation of currency, deficit financing, increased public spending, and an abnormal speculative and inflation anticipation buying; and

Whereas there must be an inevitable end to this type of deficit financing which even now has resulted in the resort by the U.S. Treasury of the tactic of robbing Peter to pay Paul; and

Whereas the lack of confidence in the Government's obligations is evidenced by the fact that its bonds are selling as low as 80 cents on the dollar; and

Whereas the fear of inflation on the part of the public has resulted in a net loss of more than $1 billion in the redemption over the purchase of U.S. savings bonds in the last 3 months; and

Whereas this unsound fiscal policy has resulted in a "hard" and "tight" monetary policy as shown by the following facts:

On September 10, 1959, the Federal Reserve Board raised its discount rate charged members banks to 4 percent. This rate is the highest rate since the year 1932.

This pinch in money supply will increase interest rates to 5 percent, 6 percent, and 7 percent to businessmen. It will result in the abandonment of many planned publicly financed construction projects.

Small businessmen will be particularly squeezed for operating capital.

This tight money policy will restrict and discourage the expansion of our economy and tend to increase unemployment.

In 1958, the U.S. Treasury paid 1¼ percent for 1 year money; today it must pay 4¾ percent; and

Whereas foreign countries and foreign citizens hold more than $18 billion of our short term securities; and

Whereas there is growing fear of inflation in the United States on the part of foreign investors; and

Whereas the liquidation of credits by foreign investors could create a serious fiscal crisis in this country; and

Whereas the bulk of the Nation's debt of $290 billion are in the form of short-term securities, so that they are approaching the convertibility demand of currency; and

Whereas the announced debt management policy of the U.S. Treasury to lengthen the debt maturities has been a complete failure, in fact, the debt is becoming increasingly short-term debt; and

Whereas the debt maturities are so fiscally precarious, that the U.S. Treasury will be required to raise the enormous sum of $85 billion in the next year for refunding and deficit spending; and

Whereas the combination of a loose fiscal policy and a tight money policy is the worst possible fiscal combination for a healthy and prosperous economy; and

Whereas an erroneous impression is being created that an authorization by Congress to increase interest rates will solve the Federal Government's fiscal crisis. In fact, this action would deal only with the symptom and not the cause; and

Whereas as a general rule, the loss of 50 percent of the purchasing power of a national currency within a generation is followed by runaway inflation and the loss of the balance of the value of the currency in a relatively shorter time; and

Whereas the purchasing power of the U.S. currency has dropped more than 50 percent in the last generation; and

Whereas this loose fiscal policy has created fiscal inflation, which in turn, has encouraged labor cost inflation. This situation has resulted in increasing seriously and inequitably the differential between the income for those segments of the population who have union bargaining power as against those of our working force who do not have union bargaining power; and

Whereas this fiscal disorder has encouraged the increase in some areas of costs at a greater rate than the increase in production; and

Whereas this uneconomic fiscal policy has resulted in pricing many U.S. manufactured products out of the world market, causing the import of foreign products, and thus creating unemployment in the United States; and

Whereas this Nation's loose fiscal policy discourages thrift, the accumulation and investment of capital, the risks of new industry, the expansion of present industry, and the creation of job opportunities; and

Whereas enormous wastages continue to exist in Federal spending both by reason of inefficient administration, contradictory legislative policies and uneconomic policies; and

Whereas a minimum of $5 billion per year could be saved in Federal spending without, in any way, endangering the defense program or reducing any necessary civilian program; and

Whereas, the recent history of England, France, and West Germany demonstrates that their expanding and prosperous recovery is the result of an austere, orthodox fiscal policy, after rejecting inflationary and socialistic experiments; and

Whereas many countries, today, who have allowed inflationary policies to prevail are suffering from internal dissension, stagnant economies, and unstable governments; and

Whereas loose fiscal policy and inflation unjustly wipe out and destroy cash savings, bank deposit savings, insurance savings, social security benefits, pension benefits, mortgages, and all other forms of deferred contractual benefits of the populace; and

Whereas inflation destroys the wealth of the many, it unjustly and uneconomically enriches the few; and

Whereas the United States, as the leader of the free world, is engaged in a life or death war with the Soviet on all fronts, economic, political, military and ideological; and

Whereas the continuation of unsound fiscal policies will result in inflation and its unforseeable disastrous consequences to both the safety of this Nation and to the survival of the free world; and

Whereas the Federal Government has exhausted its credit, it lacks a reserve to combat a depression or to meet any serious national or international emergency. This lack of financial reserve would require and plunge this Nation into an immediate totalitarian regime in order to wage a war; and

Whereas Congress has failed to adopt a sound fiscal policy; and

Whereas the executive department has also failed to announce a specific sound fiscal policy; and

Whereas the legislative committees in the House of Representatives that report bills authorizing expeditures, the Committee on Appropriations that recommends expenditures and the Committee on Ways and Means that recommends taxes to raise revenue, each act independently of each other, without any common coordinated fiscal objectives; and

Whereas the House of Representatives lacks the legislative machinery to cordinate the authorization, the spending of funds, and the raising of revenue; and

Whereas the fiscal condition of this country is so threatening to the welfare and safety of this Nation, that remedial action should properly be a bipartisan effort. Since fiscal policy is both a legislative and executive responsibility, remedial action should also properly be a joint effort of Congress and the President; and

Whereas the present hit or miss fiscal policies of the Federal Government are creating doubt, apprehension, and a lack of confidence in the investing public; and

Whereas the adoption of a firm, sound fiscal policy with a systematic and regular reduction of debt is an indispensable condition for the restoration of public confidence in our dollar, in the stopping of inflation, and in the restoration of a healthy, expanding economy; and

Whereas a firm policy decision by Congress and the President to pursue a sound fiscal policy, by an annual balancing of the budget, and by an annual repayment plan to reduce the Federal debt, would restore public confidence in Federal obligations; and

Whereas the restoration of confidence in the fiscal policies of the United States would, likely, reduce interest rates on Government obligations by one-half to 1 percent and thus saving $1,450,000,000 to $2,900,000,000 annually on interest rates alone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to annually balance the budget except in the event of war and to make a regular annual repayment of the national debt except in an emergency declared by joint action of Congress and the President.

SEC. 2. It is further declared to be the policy of Congress to coordinate expenditures and revenues so as to produce a normal surplus of $3 billion and a minimum surplus of $1 billion for the reduction of the national debt.

SEC. 3. The President shall recommend in his annual fiscal message such appropriations and taxes as will produce a normal surplus of $3 billion and a minimum surplus of $1 billion to be applied to the reduction of the national debt.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the House of Representatives a Finance Committee which shall consist of the four senior majority party members and the three senior minority party members of the Committee on Appropriations, and the four senior majority party members and the three senior minority party members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

(b) The Finance Committee shall coordinate the work of the legislative committees, the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means, and shall submit such reports and recommendations as it deems proper, to effectuate the fiscal policies set forth in this joint resolution.

(c) This section is enacted as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such, shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and shall supersede other rules only to the extent that it is inconsistent therewith. The constitutional right of the House to change such rules (including those prescribed by this section) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of other rules of the House, is hereby expressly recognized.

Keeping Up With the Khrushchevs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a very interesting article by Marguerite Higgins,

appeared in today's Herald Tribune. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It contains material that we must bear in mind during and after Khrushchev's visit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEPING UP WITH THE KHRUSHCHEVS

(By Marguerite Higgins)

WASHINGTON.—One of the most unsettling facets of the many-faceted Mr. Khrushchev is the utter aplomb with which he rearranges the truth to suit himself.

And it's not just the fact that he frequently insists on calling a spade a typewriter. There is, additionally, the resentment he conveys to those impolite enough to insist that—no matter what Mr. Khrushchev says—a spade is still a spade.

Indeed, no matter how outrageous the distortion of the facts, Mr. Khrushchev always manages to give the impression that he truly believes himself to be in the right.

You find yourself wondering whether it is remotely possible that Mr. Khrushchev has persuaded himself at least of the truth of his declaration to the effect that the Poles freely chose their Communist government or that Russia never has and never will interfere in the internal affairs of another country. These claims are in written form under Khrushchev's byline in such a learned journal as "Foreign Affairs."

But wait a minute. It was Khrushchev himself, wasn't it, who flew to Warsaw on that crucial October day of 1956 and actually ordered the Red Army to move on the city to enforce Russia's will and the continued presence of Soviet Marshal Rokossovsky as Poland's real boss? This particularly flagrant Khrushchevian interference in the internal affairs of Poland failed, of course, because the Poles made it plain they would fight rather than back down.

But intervention it was.

And yet 10 rubles to a doughnut that a principal basis of his peaceful coexistence gambit during the American tour will be repeated unabashed claims concerning the Soviet Union's angelic posture vis-a-vis the Eastern Europeans.

In addition to the aplomb with which Mr. Khrushchev puts a false front on events in the Communist part of the world, there is the redoubtable cockiness with which he sets about rewriting even American history.

For instance, in the latest issue of "Foreign Affairs," Mr. Khrushchev writes: "Capitalism in the United States has been in existence more than a century and a half, and the history of the United States has developed in such a way that never once have enemies landed on American territory."

It may be that Mr. Khrushchev simply never heard of the War of 1812 which, as wars go, was rather boring. But the War of 1812 did indubitably take place, the enemy indubiably were the British, and the British not only landed on American territory but marched to Washington and put the torch to Government buildings.

Now nobody over here gives a balalaika whether Mr. Khrushchev gets a little careless about early American history.

But there is a serious question whether, out of a misguided sense of politeness, Mr. Khrushchev is going to be allowed to get away with his propaganda on modern times and the whys and wherefores of Communist ways.

Already, for instance, some of the American press is busy printing compilations of Mr. Khrushchev's speeches put together in book form and doing so deadpan without comment or correction. This is sometimes known as "objective reporting." But is it? Or is it simply the easiest way out?

For there are many ugly questions to be asked lest this trip be turned solely to Communist purposes, which are to make the world safe for the "peaceful" spread of communism.

The most important questions are the most obvious, relating mainly to Mr. Khrushchev's amazing claim that all Communist states are, through the mere fact of being Communist, "committed to nonagression" and bound to "desist from violating the territorial integrity and sovereignty of other states in any form and under any pretext whatsoever." After Laos, Tibet, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, etc., have been dispensed with, Mr. Khrushchev could additionally be asked how this fine sentiment squares with the statement he made in Moscow this Saturday to the effect that Japanese-Russian relations would remain at low ebb so long as Tokyo and Washington kept their present treaty relationships. Mr. Khrushchev made the statement to Takeo Miki, of the Japanese Liberal Party, and no matter how you translate it it still sounds as if Russia was trying to tell "sovereign" Japan how to run its foreign affairs.

Mr. Khrushchev isn't sending rockets soaring to the moon and himself to Washington to help the Republican election chances. He is coming because he thinks he can turn this trip to Russia's advantage. You can't blame him for trying to make the world safe for communism. But neither can Mr. Khrushchev blame us for resisting. And the best way is always to expose his game for what it is.

Hon. Frank Walker, Former Postmaster General of the United States, Dies in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following announcement of the death of the Honorable Frank Walker, former Postmaster General of the United States, which occurred on Sunday, September 13, in New York. The following announcement appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on September 14, 1959:

FRANK WALKER, EX-POSTAL CHIEF

NEW YORK, September 13.—Frank Comerford Walker, 51st Postmaster General of the United States, died today in his suite at the Carlyle Hotel after a long illness. He was 73.

One of the most retiring members of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Cabinet, he was Postmaster General from September 11, 1940, to July 1, 1945.

He was Mr. Roosevelt's personal and political intimate for many years. He helped finance and organize the Roosevelt campaign in 1932, handled assorted political and administrative assignments from his chief and finally became a member of his Cabinet.

Tight-lipped and phlegmatic, he never made speeches, held press conferences or gave interviews. He believed "no publicity was good publicity," one of his friends said.

A successful lawyer and businessman, Mr. Walker was one of the wealthiest men in the New Deal. He was noted in New York for his quiet activities in Catholic charities.

He was vice president and general counsel of Comerford Theaters, Inc., a chain of moving-picture houses in New York and Pennsylvania.

Born May 30, 1886, in Plymouth, Pa., of poor Irish parents, he was taken to Butte, Mont., when he was 3 years old. His father, David Walker, later became an independent copper mine operator.

Mr. Walker attended Gonzaga University in Spokane, Wash., and received a law degree from Notre Dame University in 1909. He was elected to the Montana Legislature in 1913.

He moved to New York City in 1925 to practice law and forgot politics for several years. In 1928 he contributed $10,000 to the campaign fund of Mr. Roosevelt, then Governor of New York. He gave another $10,000 to start off the campaign which led to Mr. Roosevelt's first nomination and election as President.

Mr. Walker was chairman of the Democratic National Committee between 1943 and 1944. He also was a former treasurer of the national committee, executive secretary of President Roosevelt's Executive Council and executive director of the National Emergency Council.

Surviving are his wife, the former Hallie Boucher, whom he married in 1914, a son, Thomas J. Walker, Fort Lauderdale, Fla.; a daughter, Mrs. Laura Jenkins of New York City, and a sister, Mrs. J. J. McCarthy of Boston.

A solemn High Requiem Mass is scheduled at St. Ignatius Loyola Church here at 11 a.m. Wednesday. Burial will be in St. Patrick's Cemetery in Butte.

Visit of Premier Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the August 22 edition of the Sunset News and Observer of Bluefield and Princeton, W. Va.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD ON KHRUSHCHEV

One voice which has consistently been raised in warning over the possible adverse affects of the impending visit to the United States of Premier Khrushchev is that of West Virginia's junior U.S. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD.

We have said in this space previously that we go along with President Eisenhower's position that it may serve to bring better understanding between this country and the Soviet Union, and that it can impress upon Khrushchev the power of America and its determination to resist Communist aggression. We still hold that opinion. But there is another side to the matter, and Senator BYRD ably stated it on the floor of the Senate a few days ago.

"While many are calling for a great show of friendship and a festive welcome for the Soviet leader," BYRD said, "I feel that our conduct toward him should be in keeping with the grim realities of the world situation, and with full awareness of Mr. Khrushchev's role in that situation."

He reminded the Members of the statement made just 25 years ago by the Communist leader Dimitri Manuilsky:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today, of course, we are not strong enough to attack. Our time will come in 20 or 30 years. To win we shall need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard of confessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Then BYRD recalled to his hearers Khrushchev's statement about America only a short time ago: "Whether you like it or not, history is on our side; we will bury you yet," and he continued:

"The American people have a great passion for peace, and that passion, commendable as it is, sometimes blinds them to the past. I wish that more of the Members of this body and of the House of Representatives would remind those of our leaders who are responsible for issuing the invitation, of the miserable record of broken promises made by Soviet Communists.

"I will not stand along the streets to witness Khrushchev's triumphal passage through this city," he said "Were I to stand along those streets, I would stand in silence. It would be a silence stern and cold. I have nothing but contempt for the man."

These are forthright words, strong words. We admire Senator BYRD's courage for speaking his feelings. Certainly the points he makes must be kept constantly in mind as the country prepares for and receives the man whom BYRD characterizes as "the butcher of Budapest."

The free world is in a dilemma in its dealings with the Soviet Union. Have its leaders changed in any fundamental way? Does the Communist government still aim at world domination? How reconcile the statements of the present with the demonstrated aims of the past? There is only the record to go on—and that record plainly says to America; Be wary of Khrushchev.

The President of Polish American Congress Protests Visit by Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written to the Editor of the Wilkes-Barre Record by Attorney Charles Rosmarek, president, Polish American Congress, which appeared in that newspaper on September 11, 1959:

ROSMAREK DISAPPROVES KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT

To the EDITOR:

Twenty years ago on September 17, Russia, as Hitler's accomplice, stabbed Poland in the back, thus precipitating a worldwide conflagration, costing millions of lives and with it a chain of tragedies that just keeps on haunting the world.

It is ironical that Khrushchev's visit to this country should be time to coincide with this sad anniversary.

In my capacity as president of the Polish American Congress, representing 7 million Americans of Polish descent, I have conferred with President Eisenhower on several occasions just as I have with his predecessors, President Roosevelt and President Truman. While I have the greatest admiration for our President's dedication to peace, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not voice disapproval of Khrushchev's visit to the United States.

This is the same Khrushchev, who as a member of the Kremlin regime, shares responsibility for the mutilation of Poland, the forcible seizure of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, the Communist control of Czechoslovakia and other countries in Europe and Asia, the Katyn Massacre of 15,000 Polish war prisoners, the betrayal of the Warsaw uprising, the planned starvation of millions of Ukranians, the deportation of 40 million innocent people to Siberian slave camps, the slaughter of Hungarians, the murder of American soldiers in Korea, and the shooting down of unarmed American planes. This is also the same Khrushchev who, despite the fact that America rescued Russia from Nazi enslavement when Hitler was at her throat, has threatened to "bury" us in a war of annihilation.

Although a glance at the map will show that communism is the only aggressive force, Khrushchev recently announced that he is reinforcing his army and navy "to keep them in a state of high battle preparedness."

Let Americans beware. Unless we have a strong, firm, and courageous America, ready to meet every threat, Russia will attack us without warning, just as she did Poland 20 years ago.

There is no use of pretending. The master of the Kremlin is not coming here to promote peace. He is coming here with his entourage of master spies to survey the land he wants to conquer, to capture the front pages of the press of America, and to relax our guard by telling us that communism is never an aggressor and therefore America has no need to protect herself with H-bombs or overseas bases.

Although our Government will extend Khrushchev the courtesies demanded by protocol, we are told that we also owe him a courteous reception. We owe him nothing. We are under no obligation to greet anyone dedicated to our destruction.

This is one time when Americans of all persuasions should present a united front on the side of freedom and decency. In addition to religious services in all Protestant and Catholic churches and synagogues for the victims of communism, there should be in all cities, to be visited by Khrushchev, peaceable demonstrations of people carrying signs advocating "Freedom for Captive Nations." Is there anything wrong in asking the Russians to back up their words of peace with deeds?

Moreover, such an orderly demonstration would show Khrushchev and the world how a democracy works and how fortunate we are to live in a free country where we have a right to disagree with our leaders, without fear of reprisal, and they in turn approve of our right to disagree with them.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress.

State of Oregon Encourages Photography as a Fine Art

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few States have a more inspiring locale for the practice of photography than does my native State of Oregon. This is one reason that Oregon has produced some of the truly outstanding photographers of the Nation, such as Ray Atkeson, Hugh Ackroyd, H. Valdemar Lidell, all of Portland; Walter P. Dyke, of McMinnville, and many others.

In the New York Times for September 13, 1959, Jacob Deschin has written an article about efforts underway in Oregon to provide the first State-supported program in American history to promote and encourage photography as a fine art. His article also describes a statewide high school photography contest in Oregon, which has just been won by Kurt Rolfes, of Portland.

Because a good many bills pend before the Senate and the House to promote and advance the fine arts in the United States, I ask unanimous consent that the informative article by Mr. Deschin of the New York Times about these activties in Oregon be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1959]

PHOTO ART SUBSIDY—MOVEMENT ON IN OREGON FOR STATE SUPPORT

(By Jacob Deschin)

A movement is underway in Oregon for a State-subsidized program on a continuing basis to foster photography as a fine art. Believed to be the first such step in the country, the proposal was inspired by the success of the photography section during Oregon's recent 100-day centennial celebration.

A budget of $20,000 granted by the Oregon Centennial Commission to the newly formed photography section of the fine arts advisory committee, which has recommended the long-range plan, was used to cover the expenses of a diversified program of events that, it may be assumed, was characteristic of what might be expected of the suggested permanent plan.

A 149-print exhibition, "This Land—This Oregon," picked from nearly 10,000 prints in various collections, grouped the pictures under seven main themes, Oregon's scenery, the seashore, the forests, the farm, the small town, the big town (Portland), and the river and hydroelectric power. The show is now on permanent loan to the Oregon Historical Society.

A statewide high school photography contest sponsored by the committee, which offered a $1,000 scholarship for study at a photography school, was won by Kurt Rolfes, of Portland, for a photo-essay on the experiences of a racially integrated class.

WORKSHOP AND LECTURES

A photography workshop, under Minor White's direction, was the principal feature of a group of audience-participation activities handled by this native of Portland, now an instructor at the Rochester Institute of Technology. Students in the workshop group paid $35 each for a 10-day session of picturetaking and discussion of the results.

Other programs by Mr. White were free and included a public forum and a lecture on the creative aspects of photography, and a print clinic based on the work of Portland photographers, all given at the Portland Art Museum.

In addition, the program included two exhibits, one by Mr. White on a sequence theme, the other the instructive "Lyrical and Accurate," loaned by George Eastman House, which defined photography as an art by means of outstanding examples from the past and present.

In its recommendations for a State-sponsored photography-as-fine-art program, the

photography section of the advisory committee noted that photography's role in the centennial celebration demonstrated the feasibility of some continuing program of stimulating photography as a fine art in the State of Oregon; urged that the photography workshop be put on an annual basis, and suggested the appointment of a committee of qualified artist-photographers. Their function would be to advise the State in the expenditure of its funds and to assist in developing programs and activities of a culturally profitable nature.

West Hazleton (Pa.) High School First School in United States To Offer Farm Marketing Program for Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news article which appeared in the Hazleton (Pa.) Plain Speaker on Thursday, September 10, 1959:

FARM MARKET CLUB WILL BE NATIONAL MODEL—PENNSYLVANIA BEING USED AS TESTING GROUNDS BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

West Hazleton High School today became the first school in the United States to offer "Farm Marketing for Youth," a school club program that ultimately will serve as a model for a Federal program covering all high schools in the country.

The program, according to West Hazleton Supervising Principal Julius Schneider, is one of six being offered initially in Pennsylvania, but the other five are offered through facilities other than schools, he pointed out.

Howard E. Newcomer, vocational agriculture supervisor of Luzerne County schools, said a grant from the Federal Government to the Agricultural Extension Service of Pennsylvania State University is making the program possible.

CLUB FORMED

In line with the program, a Town and Country Business Club has been formed at the high school. It is made up of 40 students—15 girls and 25 boys. They were selected from a large number of applicants.

The West Hazleton activity is being offered through the cooperation of E. V. Chadwick, county agricultural agent, and the county schools office, headed by Supt. E. S. Teter.

Various business organizations in the area are cooperating with the club's program. The business places will serve as laboratories for the program and a followup on what is done in school.

Plans are underway to have the businessmen address the students in school and conduct discussions in conjunction with tours of their business places.

EXPANDED PROGRAM

In addition to acquainting the students with farm marketing, the club's activities will afford the students opportunity to analyze the various business programs and learn about the employment opportunities offered in farm marketing.

Serving as leaders of the Town and Country Business Club are William Swinesburg, vocational agriculture teacher at West Hazleton High School; Aubrey Vose, regional marketing specialist for the County Extension Service office, and Ralph Beard, assistant agricultural agent of the county.

After the program is established in Pennsylvania, it will be made available to other States in the Nation.

LIST LABORATORIES

These business organizations will serve as laboratories for the following subjects: GLF plant, Bloomsburg, "Inspection and Grading"; Genetti's Food Market, Hazleton, "Retailing"; Farmer's Cooperative Dairy, "Processing"; Kreisl Bros., Meatpackers, "Assembling"; Sears, Roebuck & Co., "Selling"; Karns Transportation Co., "Transportation," and Thomas C. Thomas, "Wholesaling."

The program will be brought to a close May 12 with a Town and Country Club dinner.

LIST SCHEDULE

Schneider today listed the following schedule for the current school term:

September 24, What Is Marketing?: West Hazleton School.
October 8, inspection and grading: West Hazleton School.
October 21, inspection and grading: GLF, Bloomsburg.
November 4, retailing: West Hazleton School.
November 18, retailing: Genetti's Food Market.
December 3, processing: Farmer's Cooperative Dairy.
December 17, processing: West Hazleton School.
January 7, assembling: West Hazleton School.
January 19, assembling: Kreisl Bros., Meatpackers.
February 4, selling: West Hazleton School.
February 17, selling: Sears, Roebuck & Co.
March 3, transportation: West Hazleton School.
March 16, transportation: Karns Transportation Co.
March 31, wholesaling: West Hazleton School.
April 12, wholesaling: Thomas C. Thomas, Wilkes-Barre.
April 28, marketing information: West Hazleton School.
May 12, Town and Country Business Club banquet.

Tribute to Igor Sikorsky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it was just 20 years ago yesterday that Igor Sikorsky developed the first helicopter in the Western Hemisphere.

We all know of the tremendous progress that has been made by the helicopters in the past two decades, and we in Connecticut are especially proud of the part played by the Sikorsky plant in Connecticut.

The September 13 issue of the Bridgeport Sunday Post carried an excellent account of the development of the Sikorsky helicopter, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Sunday Post, Sept. 13, 1959]

TRIBUTE TO IGOR SIKORSKY

America's most versatile aircraft, the helicopter, will be 20 years young Monday.

It was on September 14, 1939 that Igor I. Sikorsky lifted the wheels of his famous VS–300 just inches off the ground to record the first successful flight of a direct lift aircraft in the Western Hemisphere. This historic aeronautical occasion, which ranks in importance with the first flight of the Wright brothers, took place before a handful of skeptical mechanics and engineers in the factory yard of the Vought-Sikorsky plant here in Stratford.

HOPES QUICKLY FULFILLED

The fledgling helicopter came of age quickly. The unique ability to rise and descend vertically, hover in midair, or move forward or backward and to either side gave it a wide variety of military missions and commercial passenger, cargo and construction uses. It has had unmatched success as a rescue vehicle, saving thousands of lives both in battle areas and during civilian disasters and emergencies.

"Looking back to the first hopes of the modest VS–300, when we measured the endurance of flight in minutes and the altitude in inches. I can say that the progress of the helicopter has been encouraging and as much as we could expect," Mr. Sikorsky said yesterday.

"The saving of so many lives has been particularly gratifying. The increased reliability of helicopter components and the introduction of gas turbine engines, all-weather instrumentation and amphibious fuselages are providing new efficiency and comfort. With these advances we can expect the helicopter to become as important a part of our transportation system as the airplane and automobile."

USE TODAY WIDESPREAD

Today helicopters made by Sikorsky Aircraft, a division of United Aircraft Corp., are flown by all of the U.S. military services, 26 foreign countries, three of the world's four scheduled helicopter airlines, and independent operators.

Mr. Sikorsky is especially proud that the list of prominent people making frequent use of helicopters is headed by President Eisenhower, who flies from the White House lawn in the Marine and Army versions of the Sikorsky S–58. On his recent good will trip to Europe, Mr. Eisenhower was flown by helicopter to the Bonn, Germany, airport for the airplane trip to London. The President suggested to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of Germany that he, too, travel by helicopters rather than automobiles. "They are much less wearing on the nerves," the President said.

In saluting Mr. Sikorsky on the 20th anniversary of the first flight, Lee S. Johnson, general manager of Sikorsky Aircraft, said the success of the VS–300 was ressponsible for today's thriving helicopter industry.

"Before Igor Sikorsky flew the VS–300," Mr. Johnson said, "there was no helicopter industry; after he flew it, there was."

Mr. Johnson said that while the helicopter industry is an infant, it is a lusty infant, and the helicopter has become the most efficent means of providing point to point transportation for short- to medium-range trips.

REMAINS ACTIVE IN INDUSTRY

Mr. Sikorsky, who was 70 years old last May, is retired engineering manager of Sikorsky Aircraft. He continues in an active role with the firm as a consultant, and at present is playing a prominent part in developing the helicopter crane concept. Tests of the Sikorsky S–60 flying crane indicate that turbine-powered crane helicopters of the future will have wide military and commercial applications, and will become aerial "prime movers," analogous to such ground "prime movers" as locomotives or truck tractors.

Sikorsky Aircraft also introduced during the past year the single-turbine S–62 and the twin-turbine HSS–2, the first amphibious helicopters built with flying boat hulls. The

experience that Mr. Sikorsky and his long-time engineering associates had in designing transoceanic clippers was of considerable help in producing these two aircraft. The HSS–2 was developed with the Navy as an antisubmarine warfare weapons system.

Mr. Sikorsky had two successful areonautical careers behind him when he threw his full efforts into helicopter development. He had pioneered the manufactured of multi-engine airplanes in his native Russia, and after coming to the United States following World War I produced a series of amphibians and flying boats. In 1929 his company became a subsidiary of United Aircraft.

The helicopter, however, had always retained a prominent place in his thoughts. The first aircraft he ever designed and built were helicopters. This was in 1909 and 1910, but lack of suitable engines and the general standing of the aeronautical technique prompted him to turn to fixed-wing airplanes for the next three decades.

POSSIBILITIES VISUALIZED

In 1938—after 10 years of serious study, research work, and applying for patents—Mr. Sikorsky received approval from the United Aircraft management to proceed with the construction of a direct lift aircraft.

As early as 1930 Mr. Sikorsky had written: "A flying machine capable of normally taking off and landing from an area, say, 120 feet across will offer far greater advantages for everyday use than the present airplane * * *. Such a small place of the size mentioned could very easily be built on tops of buildings, in parks, aboard large steamships, and with very little or no expense could be made available anywhere out of town. * * * The belief of this writer is that a practical, direct-lift flying machine can be developed, and that it will be possible later on to manufacture and sell them in such numbers to fully justify the expense and trouble of the development period."

The VS–300 was designed in the spring of 1939, built in the summer and flown in the fall of that year. It had a four-cylinder, 75 horsepower, aircooled engine, a three-bladed main rotor 28 feet in diameter, a welded tubular steel frame, a power transmission consisting of V-belts and bevel gears, a two-wheel landing gear and a completely open pilot's seat located in front.

By November 1939, flights up to 1 and 2 minutes' duration were made. The VS–300 was held close to the ground by men holding ropes attached to the landing gear struts. As sufficient confidence was gained, the ropes were dropped and the first free flight was made in May 1940.

By the middle of the summer of 1940, the VS–300 was able to remain in the air for 15 minutes under reasonably satisfactory control. On May 6, 1941, with Mr. Sikorsky at the controls, the VS–300 established a world helicopter endurance record of 1 hour and 32 minutes, and the helicopter had taken a major step in proving its reliability and usefulness.

Harbingers of Better Living for Our Senior Citizens: Cleveland's Low-Cost Housing Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine is to be commended for its recent series of articles on the problems challenging our country as some 1,260,000 people each year become 65 years of age and face the changes in living which come with compulsory retirement. The articles should awaken us all to the unhappy plight of millions of older citizens who have little or no income, are ill, or have no relatives to care for them.

To quote from part II, July 20, 1959, of the series:

Today, as old age comes, millions exist on meager pensions and social security and, their life's work ended, may lose their will to live because of loneliness and idleness. They are so vulnerable that even a minor illness can end their independence and send them prematurely to the empty life of a nursing home. Many of these tragic declines could be prevented by fulfilling two basic human needs: a pleasant place to live and something to do. These are the essence of the new deals which, vastly expanded, could happily fill empty lives.

Life goes on to point up how certain cities and communities are meeting the economic and spiritual needs of the aging. Among certain of the "imaginative but sensible solutions for keeping the aged useful and self-sufficient", is the senior center in San Francisco. Supported by the United Fund, private donations, and maximum dues of $1 a month, it takes care of some 700 people. The center is open all year, 8 hours a day, 6 days a week, and "can be a reason for getting up in the morning and a place to come home from at night—a replacement for the working day."

Another significant provision for the elderly: Carroll Manor outside the District of Columbia is operated by the Carmelite Sisters, providing gentle care for some 200 residents who pay $150 a month, or $300 if they are sick.

Mr. Speaker, I was proud to see Cleveland's low-cost housing project cited in the series. Mr. Ernest Bohn, for many years director of the Cleveland Metropolitan Housing Authority, is also on the Advisory Committees of the White House Conference on Aging and the Federal Housing Administration. We Clevelanders are proud of the work he has done and is doing.

Apartment rents of the Cleveland project average $30 a month, a figure which can easily be afforded by couples whose combined income must be under $2,400 a year. Discussing our situation with Life's reporter, Ernie Bohn emphasized that older people "want more excitement than the going and coming of ambulances—that to keep the aged in the thick of things in the Cleveland project, 12 apartments on each floor are occupied by young couples with children under five." He explained that when the children grow older, the family is moved out into the Cedar Apartments public development. This arrangement has resulted in both the elderly and the very young striking up acquaintances beneficial to both. A touching story is told in pictures of toddler Roby McCoy making his daily cookie round at the homes of Mrs. Marie Sheridan and Mrs. Edna Powell. Such relationships make the older people feel very much a part of the normal human living going on at our busy Cleveland project.

Mr. Bohn pointed out that one fifth of the aged now in hospitals could fend for themselves in housing like Cleveland's. Many precautions are taken to make the development physically liveable and safe. There are elevators, nonskid floors and bars over tubs and toilets. To keep the residents' days busy, the first floor is a Golden Age Club with hobby shops and activities similar to San Francisco's Senior Center.

Mr. Speaker, preparations are now underway for the White House Conference on Aging to be held in January 1961. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, and Under Secretary Bertha Adkins are responsible for the planning and administration of this important conference. Desired information may be had by writing to Secretary Flemming, HEW, Washington 25, D.C.

Polish-American Congress of Wisconsin Recognizes Hopes and Dangers of Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just been furnished with a copy of a letter sent to the President of the United States by the Wisconsin chapter of the Polish-American Congress, Inc.

The members of this organization are loyal and dedicated Americans who have an especially deep concern over the forthcoming visit to this country of Premier Khrushchev. Many of them have relatives and friends living today in Poland, who will be very directly affected by any change in the world political climate which might result from this meeting. These fine Americans therefore have an especially ken insight into the sensitive nature of this visit and the high stakes that are inherent in this particular form of international diplomacy. I believe, therefore, that the opinions expressed in this letter to the President are particularly valid and noteworthy.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
WISCONSIN STATE CHAPTER,
Milwaukee, Wis., September 2, 1959.

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT EISENHOWER: The Wisconsin chapter of the Polish American Congress—representing a large segment of people of Polish descent, now living in Wisconsin, herewith, present to you its opinions, appeals, and recommendations, concerning the pending visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to the United States, and his scheduled talks with you, concerning existing world conditions.

We strongly urge, Mr. President, that in your conversation with Nikita Khrushchev, you will forcefully and unhesitatingly project

to the Russian Premier, the deplorable and highly objectionable state of affairs now existing in the Communist dominated and enslaved country of Poland.

Patriotic Americans of Polish descent, particularly those who had and have kinfolk in Poland, view with justifiable skepticism Mr. Khrushchev's guise of coming to this country as a leading missionary of world peace. His feeble claims of being against war, or that his government does not want war, are like so many particles of sand—readily washed away by the despicable whims and desires of him and his regime. This warranted disbelief of Mr. Khrushchev's proposals and intentions, will prevail and continue to do so until such time as the actual sincerity of the statements and purposes are proved to be true, by complete withdrawal of Communist forces from the soil of Poland and the other countries that are being forced to bear the unwanted domination of communistic rule. Let Mr. Khrushchev—with all his doubletalk—prove to the world that he is sincere by removing the burdensome yoke of suppression from the shoulders of the people of Poland, and the other communistic subjugated countries of the world. Then, and then only, will seething unrest amongst conquered peoples cease and true peace be restored to the world.

Fully aware of the communistic philosophy, we cannot condone—nor can you, Mr. President, the tenet, "That the means always justifies the end." Yet this is the very principle that every ambitious dictator—including Mr. Khrushchev—and totalitarian regimes live by.

We sincerely hope, Mr. President, that you will unequivocally state, to Mr. Khrushchev, upon his visit to this country, that the United States is the foremost citadel of hope to these beleaguered and despoiled countries now—enduring the tyranny of Communist domination, and will continue to be—until the faith of 100 million people who unwillingly surrendered their inalienable rights—forced by Soviet control, is restored to them.

May we strongly recommend, Mr. President, that you request of Nikita Khrushchev—on behalf of all freedom-loving people of the world—that the following directives be complied with by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

1. All Soviet forces to be completely withdrawn from all Russian captive European countries.

2. The establishment of free elections, conducted according to international law, and supervised by an international organization—in Poland and the captive countries of Central Europe.

May we appeal to you, Mr. President, that you stand firm in your convictions, remain steadfast in your beliefs and unfaltering and emphatically inform Mr. Khrushchev that even in this atomic age—as in the era of President Abraham Lincoln—no country could exist half enslaved and half free, so too, no world, regardless of the times, can exist peaceably under like conditions. To have peace, all people of the world must have their independence, they must be permitted to live in accordance with their inherent desires and traditions. Until this is accomplished the ominous shadow of war will always hover over the world.

Sincerely,

Dr. JOHN J. KAZMIEROWSKI,
Chairman.
EDMUND BANASIKOWSKI,
Chairman of Committee for Polish Affairs.
JAN STANISLAWSKI,
Secretary.
LEONNE D. WOZINSKI.

The Warren Court and the Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address entitled, "The Warren Court and the Executive Branch," by Robert A. Horn, of Stanford University delivered at the 1959 annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., Mayflower Hotel, September 10–12, 1959:

THE WARREN COURT AND THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

(By Robert A. Horn, of Stanford University)

Since the appointment of Chief Justice Earl Warren two appraisals of Presidential power today have received unusually wide attention. Prof. Clinton Rossiter concluded in "The American Presidency" that "the outstanding feature of American constitutional development has been the growth of the power and prestige of the Presidency," and predicted a continuation of that development. Mr. Walter Lippmann in "The Public Philosophy" declared that the "power of the Executive has become enfeebled, often to the verge of impotence" and attributed "the democratic disaster of the 20th century" to this "derangement of powers." The fact that two such eminent publicists and scholars, presumably examining essentially the same phenomena, could arrive at diametrically opposed opinions on the state of the Presidency today suggests some of the difficulties inherent in any effort to assess the effects of the Warren Court's decisions upon the Executive.

Some of the other difficulties which urge caution upon an analyst deserve mention. Neither Mr. Lippmann nor Professor Rossiter suggests that the courts have had a leading role in shaping the contemporary Presidency, whether for better or for worse. Of course major studies of the Office, and of the relations of the executive and judicial branches, cast doubt on any notion that the courts have ever played such a part, now or in the past.[1]

Great as the powers of the American Executive may be, moreover, most of them are exercised pursuant to statute or at least with regard for implicit or explicit expressions of congressional intent. At the same time executive officers possess broad discretion in statutory interpretation. Taken together these two facts make it clear that many cases involve the relations of the Court with both the other two branches, not simply with one of them. Yet to examine every case in which the validity of executive action under claimed statutory powers was challenged would carry us so far beyond our subject that we should lose sight of it. Some choice must be made, and the admittedly rough criterion of choice employed here is the amplitude of discretion felt with executive authorities. One important case in the Warren Court must serve to illustrate resultant exclusions. In form the decision in *United States ex rel. Toth* v. *Quarles*[2] directed the then Secretary of the Air Force to release from custody a civilian who, after being honorably discharged from the service, had been arrested by military authorities and returned from the United States to Korea to stand trial by court-martial for the murder of a Korean he was alleged to have killed while in service there. But Congress had provided in an article of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, against the advice of the Judge Advocate General of the Army, for the action taken by the Executive. The only discretion left to the military authorities, if it can properly be called that at all, was either to proceed as they had or to do nothing. In such a case the onus of transgression of constitutional bounds properly lies on Congress rather than the President or those who act for him.[3]

It is obvious also that the President, or even the Chief Executive plus those of his subordinates who may be called the great officers of state, is not synonymous with the executive branch of the Government of the United States. Wherever we place the "independent commissions," there is still a myriad of agencies and officials to whom Congress has by law committed more or less important types of executive authority, whatever the ultimate responsibility of the President under his constitutional directive "to take care that the laws be faithfully executed" may be. And if the President were not to rely completely upon the good faith and good judgment of others to make in his name countless decisions that the statutes in terms direct him to make, he would have no time for the important business of his office. Many decisions of the Supreme Court deal with the fairly routine exercise of these powers by bureaucratic components of the executive branch. In their sum these decisions have an important bearing on the executive branch. But the day is past when they are generally argued, let alone decided, as constitutional questions. Such cases in the Warren Court are omitted here, regardless of their cumulative importance for administrative, as distinguished from constitutional, law.

Finally, it must be remembered that although the business of the Supreme Court is largely of its own choosing, it is not of its own making. Questions of executive power must be raised by litigants if they are to be tried at all. The consequence is that the impact of judicial decision upon the executive is discreet although not entirely haphazard. The record of the Warren Court to date rests on only six annual terms. The statistical universe of its major decisions on executive power is much too small to permit that statistical elegance of which this writer is incapable were it attainable. Willy-nilly, to be other than impressionistic here is to indulge in "delusive exactness." But even if one thinks dramatically rather than statistically, its decisions on executive power are not the most controversial and exciting aspect of the Warren Court's work. Fortune has not brought it a case in this area which compares with the Steel Seizure case[4] in the Vinson Court, nor with its own action in *Brown* v. *Board of Education of Topeka*.[5] Yet it has been adding to what Mr. Justice Frankfurther has called the "coral reef of constitutional law" on executive power.

A baker's dozen of opinions concern us, but 2[6] of these 13 deal with the same question, in which on reargument the Court vacated the decision arrived at in its first opinion and decided the issue the other way. Thus an even dozen opinions[7] represent ultimate decisions of the Court. The Court was unanimous in only 4[8] of the 12, and in 1[9] of these 4 it is quite likely that only Mr. Justice Clark's nonparticipation kept it so. Two of the cases were disposed of by per curiam opinions[10] despite their importance,

Footnotes at end of speech.

and in one [21] of the two a dissenting opinion was filed. All 12 the Court took from lower Federal courts at its own discretion under its certiorari jurisdiction. Perhaps more interesting is the simple statistic that in only one case [22] did the Supreme Court affirm a lower court's decision (and on quite different grounds) and, in another opinion,[23] in which two cases were consolidated for decision, one of the two opposing decisions below was affirmed. It is this kind of record of reversals on certiorari which entitles us to be skeptical of protestations that denial of petitions for certiorari carries no intimation of opinion on the merits. One other statistic is startling, especially when seen in conjunction with these others. The Government won only 2 [24] of these 12 cases. And one [25] of these two is more properly described as a draw on the important constitutional issue of executive power presented. Clearly the Warren Court is no rubber stamp for the Executive. Just as clearly a majority of the Warren Court has been less sympathetic to claims of executive authority than the lower Federal courts.

The cases fall into two broad categories of questions. The removal power of the Executive is the overarching constitutional problem in seven cases,[26] all of which the Government lost. All but one [27] of the seven concern dismissals resulting from loyalty-security programs of the National Government. Expressed in the broadest terms, the other constitutional issue is the President's power over the conduct of foreign relations. But of the five cases in this area, three [28] are concerned with the President's authority to make executive agreements with foreign nations, and two [29] with executive power to limit through passport control the travel of American citizens abroad. Thus the Warren Court's concern with powers of the executive branch reflects the country's struggles in the cold war.

I. THE REMOVAL POWER

Of the seven cases (plus an eighth which was declared moot) on the removal power only one involves a removal by the President. Four more arose out of removals by other executive officers of employees in the executive branch. The remaining two cases break new ground, one dealing with the type of discharge papers which the military services may issue and the other with the loss of private employment as a consequence of security regulations. A majority of the Supreme Court has not yet upheld the dismissal of a single person by the National Government on loyalty-security grounds.[30]

So much has been written about the civil liberties issues in these loyalty security cases by the Justices and others that it is easy to forget that they are, after all, removal power cases. In considering questions about the removal power which they present, it is necessary to avoid the temptation to dwell upon civil liberties issues yet not to distort analysis by forgetting they are present. We can do so by keeping two facts in mind. First, either the President or Congress, and sometimes both, have repeatedly authorized and prescribed removal of those found to be loyalty or security risks. Second, the Supreme Court in passing upon such removals has never intimated that the establishment of such grounds for removal is unconstitutional; rather, it has repeatedly assumed the contrary. There can be no dispute about what "is," in these two respects, and for present purposes, there need be none about what "ought to be."

It will help keep the loyalty-security removal cases in perspective by considering first the one removal case in the Warren Court which is not a loyalty-security case, for the constitutional theory and the conception of executive power found therein also pervade and condition, if they do not determine, the loyalty-security cases. In *Wiener* v. *U.S.*[31] a member of the War Claims Commission sued to recover his salary after his removal by President Eisenhower because the President regarded it "as in the national interest" to have "personnel of my own selection" on the Commission. In less exalted language, the President thought the office was a patronage position and intended to treat it as such. And why not? In establishing the Commission Congress had been completely silent about removal, although the Rathbun case indicated that if Congress authorized the President to remove members for specified causes, a removal for any other reason would be held contrary to its intent. Congress, the President might fairly infer, had regarded the office just as he did. Indeed, if further circumstantial evidence of congressional intent were needed, there was the fact that Congress had not required a bipartisan composition for the Commission. Therefore why should not plum sauce for surfeited Democrats be plum sauce for famished Republicans?

But the Supreme Court held in a unanimous decision and brief opinion that the President had drawn the wrong inference, without even mentioning what it was or why he might reasonably have drawn it. Mr. Justice Frankfurter conceded that this is a problem in probabilities. But he concluded that "the most reliable factor for drawing an inference * * * is the nature of the function that Congress vested in the * * * Commission." That function was to adjudicate according to law the claims before it. Congress might have given this work to the regular Federal courts, whose decisions it would certainly be improper for the President to try to influence. It would be as bad for the President to attempt to influence a decision of this Commission, and "a fortiori must it be inferred that Congress did not wish to have hang over the Commission the Damocles' sword of removal by the President for no reason other than that he preferred * * * men of his own choosing. No such power is given to the President directly by the Constitution, and none is impliedly conferred upon him by statute simply because Congress said nothing about it."

Adverse criticism of the opinion may point to its admission that Congress might have exercised this function itself or vested it in an officer of the executive branch subject to the removal power of the President. (Indeed, Congress did consider giving part of the task to the Federal Security Administrator.) A sufficient answer to this is that weight ought to be given to the fact that Congress did not choose to place settlement of these claims in hands so open to political influence.

But if the nature of the function performed by the officer is the criterion for testing a claim of inherent Presidential removal power, of course many executive officers including cabinet secretaries heretofore considered subject to removal at the pleasure of the President also perform quasi-judicial functions. Will such duties be held in future to immunize them from summary removal? There is no reason to suppose so. But that is not to say that removal of such an officer solely because he refused to render a quasi-judicial decision entrusted to him according to a President's desire would be legitimate. Nor should the Court prospectively approve such a removal in obiter dicta. The question left open by this criterion of function thus seems to be more of a dialectical resource for those who are determined to find fault with the case than a practical danger to effective Presidential control of anything he is entitled to control or ought to want to control.

A more serious question left unsettled is whether the President has power, absent statutory authorization, to remove an officer performing such a function whom he believes guilty of crime or improper conduct. The Court probably had in mind Mr. Mack of the Federal Communications Commission, who resigned and thus deprived the President of the adventure of seeking an answer to this question, when it observed that here was no "removal for cause involving the rectitude of a member of an adjudicatory body, nor even a suspensory removal until the Senate could act upon it by confirming the appointment of a new Commissioner or otherwise dealing with the matter." But if "no such power is given to the President directly by the Constitution, and none is impliedly conferred on him by statute simply because Congress said nothing about it" in Commissioner Wiener's case, how, some will insist, could it have been different in Commissioner Mack's case? The short answer to this objection is that two such cases can be different because the Court can make them different, and it will if it considers wise public policy requires differentiation. Those shocked by such an answer should remember that the whole idea of an inherent power of removal is only a convenient fiction which has to be invented because the framers were as silent in the Constitution as Congress was in the War Claims Act.

Of the four cases of removal of Federal employees on loyalty-security charges, the Peters case and the Service case are relatively minor in importance, although they were the ones treated as causes celebres by the press, probably because they involved persons of prominence or notoriety in contrast to the obscure civil servants concerned in the two more important cases. *Peters* v. *Hobby* [32] was the first of these cases decided by the Warren Court, and provoked the greatest division among its members. The holding of the Court, announced in an opinion by the Chief Justice, is unusual in that not only the Department of Justice and able counsel for Dr. Peters, and the lower Federal courts, and Justices Reed and Burton dissenting, but also Mr. Justice Douglas concurring agreed that the procedure which the Court found unauthorized and therefore invalid was authorized.

Dr. Peters' principal constitutional contention had been that the use of secret evidence from unidentified informants who cannot be confronted and cross-examined invalidates such proceedings. It is not strange that it was not upheld; the Court had once before been unwilling and has twice since failed to do so. Some of the severest and most thoughtful critics of the Federal loyalty-security programs have ageed that in some circumstances the use of secret evidence and informants is justified.[33] But one must surmise that a majority of the Court were not prepared to deny Dr. Peters' contention either.

After Dr. Peters had been cleared without a hearing by the Loyalty Board of the Federal Security Agency the President's Loyalty Review Board had on its own motion reviewed his case and recommended that the Agency Board hold a hearing. The Agency complied, but the result of its hearing was a renewed clearance. The Loyalty Review Board thereupon determined again on its own motion to hold a hearing of its own, which resulted in a finding adverse to Dr. Peters and a direction for his dismissal. Executive Order 9835 provided that "The Board shall have authority to review cases involving persons recommended for dismissal. * * * Such cases may be referred to the Board either by the employing * * * agency, or by the officer or employee involved." Indisputably, Dr. Peters had not been recommended for dismissal by the Agency Board, nor had his case been referred to the President's Loyalty Review Board by himself or his Agency. On two counts the

Footnotes at end of speech.

Court held the Review Board had thus exceeded the authority delegated to it by the President.

The main question about this holding stems from another power delegated to the Review Board by the President, to wit: "The Board shall makes rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this order, deemed necessary to implement statutes and Executive orders relating to employee loyalty." The procedure of the Review Board in this case followed a regulation it had promulgated for "postaudits" of agency boards' actions. Just as indisputably there was nothing in the Executive order which explicitly forbade the Board to adopt that regulation. And the postaudit regulation, as the dissent pointed out, had been adopted at the beginning of the program and action under it had five times been formally reported to the President, who in amending Order 9835 by Order 10241 left postaudits undisturbed. Was it nevertheless inconsistent with the provisions of the order? Reasonable men not only might, they did disagree.

Before the case was decided President Truman's order had already been revoked by President Eisenhower in Executive Order 10450. Under it the Peters case could not have arisen, nor can such cases in the future. In that light the most lasting significance of the case for Executive power may well be an observation made by Mr. Justice Reed in his dissent: [34]

"The Court in this case is reviewing a Presidential order and rules made thereunder. I do not find it as easy as does the majority to analogize such review to judicial review of congressional acts and administrative interpretation of such acts. Certain differences are immediately apparent. The executive branch is traditionally free to handle its internal problems of admnistration in its own way. The legality of judicial review of such intraexecutive operations as this is, for me, not completely free from doubt."

Of course one can reply that these "intra-executive operations" affected important private rights. But so do countless others which have nothing to do with loyalty-security programs. Would the extension to them of the type and scope of review employed in the Peters case advance the rule of law, or would it be an insupportable obstacle to effective administration?

The administrative procedures in *Service* v. *Dulles* [35] were even more long drawn out than in the Peters case. Before he was finally fired by Secretary Acheson Mr. Service had thrice been cleared by the State Department's loyalty board, the second two times after hearings and findings approved by the Deputy Under Secretary. Three times the President's Loyalty Review Board had conducted "postaudits"; twice it had ordered new hearings by the departmental board, and the last time it had held it own hearing, which resulted in a decision adverse to Service. Of course under the holding of the Peters case all these proceedings after the first clearance by the State Department Board were void and were alleged to make his dismissal also invalid. The statement in Mr. Justice Harlan's opinion for unanimous Court (Mr. Justice Clark not participating) that "we do not reach" this contention is therefore curious, on first impression.

But in the Service case the action of the Secretary did not rest alone upon a delegation under President Truman's Loyalty Order. Congress had enacted and repeatedly reenacted the so-called McCarran rider, which provided that—

"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, * * * terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

In an affidavit concerning his dismissal of Service Secretary Acheson stated that he had acted under the powers conferred on him by both the Presidential order and this statute. But the Court found that only the McCarran rider's language "Nothwithstanding the provisions of any other law" could serve as a basis for the dismissal without a hearing before the Board of Foreign Service, which was otherwise required by law. Thus the reason for not resting the decision on the precedent of the Peters case becomes clear.

The Department of State had promulgated regulations detailing the procedures to be followed in loyalty-security cases which were made applicable to action under the McCarran rider as well as under the Executive order, and which had been appropriately reported to Congress. Under a regulation adopted in 1949, as the Court paraphased it, "the action of the Deputy Under Secretary, if favorable to the employee, was to be final, the Secretary reserving to himself power to act further only if his deputy's action was unfavorable to the employee." A regulation adopted in 1951 provided that a decision for removal should "be reached after consideration of the complete file, arguments, briefs, and testimony presented." Secretary Acheson had deposed that he "made no independent judgment on the record in this case" because he "deemed it appropriate and advisable to act on the basis of the finding and opinion of the Loyalty Review Board." Thus neither of the two regulations, whichever was applicable, had been followed.

But the decisive question was whether or not the Secretary was bound to follow them in exercising his absolute discretion under the McCarran rider. The Court, citing United States ex rel. *Accardi* v. *Shaugnessy*,[36] held that he was.

The Service case is full of ironies. From the point of view of human and political interest it is difficult to say which of the two—the finding that former Secretary Acheson had acted illicitly or the discretion to the late Secretary Dulles to make restitution—is the more delicious.

From the standpoint of precedent some irony lurks in the Court's reliance on the first Accardi case without reference to the practical reduction of the sweeping rhetoric of that opinion to shambles in the second Accardi case.[37] Especially is this so when one considers the different composition of the majorities in the two cases.

Then there is the ironical contrast with the Peters case, in which Presidential knowledge of administrative rules and practice under his order was deemed insufficient to support an inference of Presidential approval and adoption. Yet in the Service case congressional reenactment of the McCarran rider with knowledge of departmental regulations was held euivalent to legislative adoption.

Considering the phraseology of this statute, the irony becomes almost comic. If Congress intended to approve regulations limiting the Secretary's discretion and bind him to these limitations in future, language continuing to vest in him "absolute discretion" is a strange choice of words in which to manifest that intent. But there is more, although the point is not discussed in the opinion. Congress gave the Secretary this discretion notwithstanding any other provision of law. Surely the departmental regulations, if they were legally binding, as they were held to be, were in this sense law. Therefore one must try to understand that, despite this language, what Congress really meant was that the Secretary had absolute discretion "notwithstanding any other provision of law except such provisions of law as he has promulgated."

The decision in *Cole* v. *Young* [38] has more general application, although a limited practical effect.[39] While President Truman's loyalty-security program under Executive Order 9835 was in effect Congress in 1950 passed an act which notwithstanding any other law authorized the heads of 11 sensitive agencies in their absolute discretion to suspend without pay any civilian officer or employee and after notice to an employee with an opportunity to reply, and such investigation and review as he deems necessary to terminate the employment in the interest of the national security of the United States. The act also provided that the President could extend these provisions to any other agency when he deemed it necessary in the best interests of national security. By Executive Order 10450 President Eisenhower brought the entire executive branch under the act.

Subsequently Mr. Cole, a pure food and drug inspector in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was dismissed under this authority. In an opinion of the Court less tortuous than those in the Peters and Service cases, Mr. Justice Harlan held the dismissal void. From his examination of the act's legislative history and relation to the Truman program he demonstrated more convincingly than the dissenters were able to argue to the contrary that, despite its sweepingly literal language, Congress had intended the act to cover only those employees in sensitive positions within sensitive agencies, at least outside the agencies explicitly included in the statute. Secretary Hobby had not found that Cole's position fell into that category, for she had no reason to believe she was required to under the President's order. Avoiding an outright declaration that the President as well as the Secretary had acted illegally, the Court assumed "for purposes of this decision" that the act had been validly extended to the Department, although the dissent aptly noted that "the reasoning of the opinion makes that extension a fortiori unauthorized."

In his dissenting opinion Mr. Justice Clark exposed two major constitutional issues which the Court succeeded in ignoring only by its rather fictitious assumption, for by striking down the President's extension the Court would raise "a question as to the constitutional power of the President to authorize dismissal of executive employees whose further employment he believes to be inconsistent with national security. This power might arise from the grandt of executive power in article II of the Constitution, and not from Congress."

Should the inherent removal power of the President be interpreted to sanction dismissals for this reason and in this manner? The Wiener case perhaps hints the Warren Court doubts that it should be. But assuming that it should be, and that Congress intended to limit such inherent power by this law, can it do so constitutionally? Probably the majority would quote Justice Jackson's statement in the Steel Seizure case: [39]

"When the President takes measures incompatible with the expressed or implied will of Congress, his power is at its lowest ebb, for then he can rely only upon his own constitutional powers minus any constitutional powers of Congress over the matter. Courts can sustain exclusive Presidential control in such a case only by disabling the Congress from acting upon the subject. Presidential claim to a power at once so conclusive and preclusive must be scrutinized with caution, for what is at stake is the equilibrium established by our constitutional system."

Footnotes at end of speech.

But was the Court justified in being so cautious in the Cole case as not to scrutinize the question at all?

Vitarelli v. *Seaton*,[21] the fourth of the Warren's Court Federal employee loyalty-security cases, was decided June 1, 1959. Mr. Justice Harlan's opinion for the Court (which was unanimous on the important questions) is refreshingly straightforward. Dr. Vitarelli was a schedule A employee of the Department of the Interior working as an education and training specialist, and therefore could be dismissed at any time by the Secretary without giving any reason. Instead he was served with charges in 1954 and had a hearing before the departmental security board, after which he was dismissed in the interest of national security. Over 2 years later, while the case was pending in the district court (and 4 months after the Cole decision), the Department issued a new document, bearing the original date, purporting to revise and replace it, and omitting mention of any reason for dismissal. The Department's theory was that it thus retrocatively fired Vitarelli for nonsecurity reasons and mooted the case. Four members of the Court, dissenting from the Court's refusal to adopt this theory, agreed that this is the commonsense of it, but it is a democratic axiom that a minority does not have a monopoly on commonsense.

Although the proceedings had been taken under the same authority as in Cole's case, and Vitarelli's position had not been found sensitive either, the Court did not relay on its prior decision, presumaby because Vitarelli, unlike Cole, had no other statutory protection. I found bigger game to shoot at, even thought it again declined to decide on constitutional grounds. The Department had promulgated procedural regulations for its security cases, and citing the service case, the Court held it was bound to follow them.

In three important respects it had violated them. The regulations required that the statement of charges * * * "shall be as specific and detailed as security considerations, including the need for protection of confidential sources of information, permit * * *" petitioner was questioned by the security officer and by the hearing board in great detail concerning his association with and knowledge of various persons and organizations nowhere mentioned in the statement of charges, * * * and the very fact that they were asked and thus spread on the record is conclusive indication that security considerations could not have justified the omission of any statement concerning them in the charges furnished petitioner.

Departmental regulations also require "that hearings before security hearing boards shall be orderly and that reasonable restrictions shall be imposed as to relevancy, competency, and materiality of matters considered. * * * These indispensable indicia of a meaningful hearing were not observed. It is not an overcharacterization to say that as the hearing proceeded it developed into a wide-ranging inquisiton into this man's educational, social, and political beliefs, encompassing even a question as to whether he was a religious man."

And the excerpts of the hearing transcript set forth in the opinion show this description to be a model of understatement.

Finally the regulations give an "employee the right to cross-examine any witness offered in support of the charges. * * * It was not contemplated that this provision should require the Department to call witnesses to testify in support of any or all of the charges, because it was expected that charges might rest on information gathered from or by confidential informants. We think, however, that [they] * * * did contemplate the calling by the Department of any informant not properly classifiable as 'confidential,' if information furnished by that informant was to be used by the board in assessing an employee's status. The transcript shows that this provision was violated on at least one occasion at petitioner's hearing, for the security officer identified by name a person who had given information apparently considered detrimental to petitioner, thus negating any possible inference that that person was considered a confidential informant whose identity it was necessary to keep secret, * * * without calling the informant and affording petitioner the right to cross-examine."

Harmon v. *Brucker*[22] involved the discharge of two soldiers (or more accurately, ex-soldiers) on the grounds of security risks. The soldiers, who conceded the "absolute right" of the Army to discharge them, were seeking not restoration to their jobs, but honorable discharge certificates. The Army review board originally found they were only entitled to undesirable discharges, the Secretary of the Army approved that finding, and the statutes say that the board's findings are final subject only to review by the Secretary of the Army. The soldiers began litigation nevertheless, and during the course of it the Army decided to move them up to discharge under honorable conditions, perhaps in the hope of appeasing them or mooting their cases. The soldiers persisted in their claim that the Army could not consider, as it had, records of their preinduction activities to determine the appropriate form of discharge, although the statutes also say that the findings of the board shall be based upon all available records.

The Solicitor General of the United States denied the jurisdiction of the courts to review the Secretary's decisions but conceded that if they had power, the Secretary was wrong. This startling desertion left, so to speak, the Army's left flank exposed. In a per curiam opinion the Court swiftly put the Army to rout. Once again the Justices demonstrated that whenever they believe an administrative abuse demands judicial correction they have little difficulty in concluding that "final" does not mean final.[23] Here the Court said that if the Secretary had "acted in excess of powers granted him by Congress * * * his actions would not constitute exercises of his administrative discretion," and that a court had power "to construe the statutes involved to determine whether the respondent did exceed his powers."

Thus, reaching the merits by what might be called Operation Bootstrap, the Court quite reasonably concluded that Congress intended that "the type of discharge to be issued is to be determined solely by the soldier's military record in the Army," and therefore that the "records" referred to in the statute means "records of military service." In this way the Court avoided passing on the question whether the statute as construed and applied by the Secretary violated the due process clause. It would be unfair to say that in dissenting alone Mr. Justice Clark either deserted in the face of the enemy or poined the Army. All too many aspects of the case tempt one to flippancy, but the result stands in the great tradition of what the English call natural justice.

The most recent case in the Warren Court has a more attenuated relation to the removal power in appearance but a far more important one in reality than the Harmon case. When the Chief Justice announced the opinion of the Court in *Greene* v. *McElroy*[24] on June 29 of this year, the future of the Defense Department's industrial personnel security program, covering roughly as many persons in private employment as the entire number of military and civilian employees of the National Government, was left in doubt. The Court decided "only that in the absence of explicit authorization from either the President or Congress" the Defense Department could not deny clearance to an aeronautical engineer with the practical effect of barring him from his work by a "proceeding in which he was not afforded the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination." But the lengthy attack on the constitutionality of any denial of confrontation led Justices Frankfurter, Harlan, and Whittaker to concur only in the judgment "intimating no views as to the validity of those procedures," and Mr. Justice Clark, who dissented alone, to predict that the opinion "speaks in prophecy" on the constitutional question. W may leave that issue to the future, as the Court did, for the present case could raise far-reaching questions about the reciprocal participation in both initiative and responsibility for the development of public policy by the triad of President, Congress, and bureaucracy.

As the Chief Justice put it, "the question which must be decided in this case is not whether the President has inherent power to act or whether Congress has granted him such power; rather, it is whether either the President or Congress exercised such a power and delegated to the Department of Defense the authority to fashion such a program."

Thereafter he labored to prove a negative, and Mr. Justice Clark to establish an affirmative, answer. Regrettably, the two discussions do not seem quite to come to grips with one another.

For the question posed by the Chief Justice is, more precisely, two issues. First, what acts or omissions of action, or both in combination, should be taken as a legally sufficient indication that either the President or Congress has exercised the power of delegation? An Executive order or a statute respectively is the best. Some lesser document, "something in writing" is often enough. The spoken word, especially if reduced to print, may do. But if anything less were insufficient, government would be much more inefficient than it is and perhaps come to a halt. The other issue is, how specific a delegation, whatever its form, be made? This question of the requisite specificity of standards is a familiar one in case of congressional, but not Presidential, delegation.

Silence, an omission, presents the difficult problems under either issue. As a legally sufficient indication, silence with knowledge of the delegate's action must often import consent, although it is necessarily the least certain form of indication. But knowing silence as a form of delegation is also necessarily the least specific, and the most generous delegation that can be made. Silence thus poses two questions. Does it indicate any delegation? And if it does, what has been delegated? Perhaps it is a legal fiction that silence can delegate authority, and then it is piling fiction upon fiction to add that the scope of that authority can be drawn out of silence. If these are fictions they are necessarily generated by constitutional government, which requires that all authority establish its legitimacy on demand. Judicial appraisal of the meaning of silent approval is a task in discounting the magnitude of a delegation by its uncertainty.

What various acts or omissions could be a legally sufficient evidence of delegation to the Defense Department to carry out this program in all its details? The Commission on Government Security correctly stated that: "It is clear that there is no statute (or Executive order) which expressly authorizes the Department of Defense to establish an industrial security program."[25] All of the evidence "in writing" which might establish an "implicit delegation" by either the President or Congress is, to borrow the Chief Justice's words from another opinion, "at best, inconclusive."[26] That is, it does not justify the confidence with which he denied or Mr. Clark found im-

Footnotes at end of speech.

plicit delegation in the documents. We are left with silence, 18 years of silence, and of knowing silence. For it would be preposterous to assert that both Congress and the President did not know of the program, and not just constructively as all men are presumed to know the law, but actually, as anyone knows what he sees and hears. And they knew that the program included denial of confrontation."

The Chief Justice acknowledged that the ambiguous documents and the knowing silence were a sufficiently certain indication of a delegation, for he declared: "Even in the absence of specific delegation we have no difficulty in finding, as we do, that the Department of Defense has been authorized to fashion and apply an industrial clearance program. * * *" Without stopping there he continued: "* * * which affords affected persons the safeguards of confrontation and cross-examination," for the next question is, How generous a delegation shall the silence be taken to confer? The general principle is that whatever has been done is assumed to have been delegated, particularly, and for good reason, if the delegation is within the executive branch.

It is precisely at this point that the Court articulates an emerging, if not new, principle, as an exception to the general principle: "If acquiescence or implied ratification were enough to show delegation or authority to take actions within the area of doubtful constitutionality, we might agree * * * that delegation has been shown here." But the Court does not agree. Instead it holds—at least for this doubtful area—that: "It must be made clear that the President or Congress, within their constitutional powers specifically have decided that the imposed procedures are necessary and warranted and have authorized their use. * * * Such decisions cannot be assumed by acquiescence or nonaction."

The citations of authority for the point indicate its novelty. The oldest is Ex parte Endo.[8] Another is a case in the 1958 term.[9] The Watkins case,[10] the Peters case, and the Kent case are others. There are many fields within "the area of doubtful constitutionality." Will the new principle be applied in them all? And if it should be, what would be the impact on the bureaucracy acting in reliance on presidential delegations through silent consent?

II. THE CONDUCT OF FOREIGN RELATIONS

Executive agreements

When the Warren Court agreed to review the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit in *United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*[11] there was anticipation that a pronouncement on the President's power to make executive agreements which would rank with the Pink[12] and Belmont[13] opinions would be forthcoming. The case was a curious one. In the Agricultural Act of 1948 Congress had provided for price support of potatoes at 90 percent of parity. It becomes profitable to import Canadian potatoes, but to provide for this contingency Congress had authorized the President, after investigation and hearing by the Tariff Commission at his direction, to proclaim a quantitative limitation on such imports, not to exceed a restriction of 50 percent of such imports in a specified previous period. The President did not utilize this method to reduce imports of Canadian potatoes. Instead an executive agreement was concluded with Canada by which Canada agreed temporarily to refuse to permit the exportation to the United States of potatoes for consumption and the United States agreed to permit under license importation of Canadian potatoes for seed purposes under specified conditions, one of which was that the American importer would guarantee that such seed potatoes would not be sold by him as "table stock," that is, eating potatoes. The Capps firm imported about $150,000 worth (in terms of American support prices) of Canadian seed potatoes, and after some complicated sales, repurchases and resales to various firms most of these potatoes apparently found their way to consumers' stomachs instead of farmers' potato patches. The Government sued Capps for damages equal to the cost of buying up at support prices an equivalent amount of American-grown potatoes, on the theory that the Capps firm's assurance constituted a contract with the United States and that Capps had breached it.

Assuming that these novel circumstances constituted a contract and that the Government could sue for breach, the district court decided that the course of conduct of the importer did not amount to negligence or breach of contract. When the Government took the case to the court of appeals it lost again, but for a very different reason. Chief Judge Parker, citing particularly the Steel Seizure case, held that "the executive agreement was void because it was not authorized by Congress and contravened provisions of a statute dealing with the very matter to which it related." The opinion added:

"It is argued, however, that the validity of the executive agreement was not dependent on the act of Congress but was made pursuant to the inherent powers of the President under the Constitution. The answer is that * * * the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce is not among the powers incident to the Presidential office, but is expressly vested by the Constitution in the Congress. * * * Whatever the power of the Executive with respect to making executive trade agreements regulating foreign commerce in the absence of action by Congress, it is clear that the executive may not through entering into such an agreement avoid complying with a regulation prescribed by Congress."

It appeared that the Vinson Court's chickens had come home to roost in the Warren Court's potato patch—and at a most embarrassing time, when acrid controversy was raging over the Bricker amendment. But Senator Bricker's predecessor shooed them away for a unianimous Court. Prof. Arthur Sutherland had observed that Judge Parker's opinion had strangely neglected another provision of the Agricultural Act: "

"Section 22 of the Agricultural Act of 1948 includes this clause: '(f) No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a pary.' Quite clearly Congress seems to have expressed its expectation and approval of subsequent efforts to adjust Canadian-American differences by agreement, rather than by unilateral proclamation of import fees or embargoes."

Mr. Justice Burton did not avail himself of this rebuttal. Instead he held that "the district court was not clearly in error in making the findings it did or in directing the verdict for respondent on the ground that no breach of contract was shown." When he concluded that "there is no occasion for us to consider the other questions discussed by the court of appeals. This opinion does not rest on them." Capp's seed potatoes lost the distinction of going down in constitutional history with Schecter's sick chickens.

In contrast, the opinions on rehearing in *Reid* v. *Covert*[14] contain probably the most important interpretations of powers of the executive branch that the Warren Court has yet made. The constitutional issues in the case are various and complex, like the worldwide military activities of the U.S. Government which provide their setting. Unfortunately, so are the four opinions, none of which represents a majority of the Court. Since both Justices Frankfurter and Harlan in concurring opinions agreed only that the trial by court-martial in capital cases of civilian dependents of American military personnel overseas in time of peace, as provided by an article of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, is unconstitutional, and the vote of at least one of them must be added to those of the Chief Justice and Justices Black, Douglas, and Brennan to make a majority, this is all the case can be said to hold.

Members of the Court disagreed on these important constitutional questions: whether these were cases arising in the land or naval forces, whether, if they were not, Congress might nevertheless provide for trial by court-martial under the necessary and proper clause in conjunction with its power to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces, and whether all or only some of the guarantees of the Constitution etxend to American citizens subject to the jurisdiction of American officials on foreign soil. These are all important, and the different interpretations by the Justices are interesting, but they are questions of executive power only tangentially or not at all.

But in part II of Mr. Justice Black's leading opinion the question of the President's power to make executive agreements is placed squarely in issue. At the time an Air Force wife killed her husband in England and an Army wife killed her husband in Japan, the jurisdiction of the United States flowed from executive agreements with the respective countries, which provided for trials of such cases by U.S. military tribunals in return for cession of primary jurisdiction by the foreign nation. The Government had contended that even if otherwise unconstitutional the provision of the UCMJ in question "can be sustained as legislation which is necessary and proper to carry out the United States obligations under the international agreements with those countries." To this contention Mr. Justice Black replied:

"The obvious and decisive answer to this, of course, is that no agreement with a foreign nation can confer power on the Congress or on any other branch of Government, which is free from the restraints of the Constitution. * * * The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the National Government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and the Senate combined."

Since Justices Frankfurter and Harlan agreed that the statute in its full coverage was unconstitutional, it is clear that they also agreed in rejecting the Government's contention. Although Justices Clark and Burton based their dissent entirely on the power of Congress to legislate for the government and regulation of the military forces and therefore did not need to consider the question, they did not give the slightest intimation of support for the Government's argument that the statute could be sustained as legislation necessary and proper to carry out the executive agreement. It thus seems correct to say that on this question the Court was unanimous.

Thus was laid to rest, insofar as any Supreme Court decision can ever finally dispose of any great constitutional problem, a question that had been troublesome at least since *Missouri* v. *Holland*.[15] Indeed, Mr. Justice Black took pains to make this clear even to the most ardent supporters of the Bricker amendment by stating:

"There is nothing new or unique about what we say here. This Court has regularly and uniformly recognized the supremacy of the Constitution over a treaty. * * * There is nothing in *State of Missouri* v. *Holland* * * * which is contrary to the position taken here."

Footnotes at end of speech.

Another portion of Mr. Justice Black's opinion appears less successful, especially when compared to the action of the Warren Court in *Wilson* v. *Girard*.[47] For four members of the Court he took the position that "the Constitution in its entirety" applies to American officials dealing with American citizens abroad, rejecting the contention that "only those constitutional rights which are 'fundamental' protect Americans abroad" and insisting that "when the United States acts against citizens abroad * * * it can only act in accordance with all the limitations imposed by the Constitution." The parallel to his stand on total incorporation of the first eight amendments in the due process clause of the 14th amendment against State action is obvious.[48]

The Girard case is too recent and too well publicized for its facts to need or bear extended recital. While on guard duty during maneuvers in Japan the soldier had fired from a grenade launcher on his rifle a cartridge case which struck and killed a Japanese women gathering brass nearby. Under our treaty and executive agreement with Japan primary jurisdiction to try Girard, by court-martial, was in the United States if Girard's act was done in line of duty, and in Japan if it was not. It is important to bear in mind that from start to finish the United States maintained that Girard had acted in line of duty and that we therefore had primary jurisdiction. But like our other international agreements on the subject, those with Japan provide that the state with primary jurisdiction shall give sympathetic consideration to a request to waive its jurisdiction to the other state in any case which is of particular importance to it. Typically, of course, the United States makes rather than receives such requests, and typically they are granted. When Japan claimed primary jurisdiction over Girard we resisted until international tension became severe. Eventually, for what the Secretaries of State and Defense obliquely admitted in their joint statement to be "reasons of state" we waived jurisdiction. A district court then enjoined Secretary Wilson from surrendering Girard to Japanese authorities, and amid even greater tension the Supreme Court agreed to extend its regular term to review this decision immediately.

Three days after the case was heard, the Supreme Court (Mr. Justice Douglas not participating) gave its unanimous decision, reversing the district court and holding that there was "no constitutional or statutory barrier" to our waiver of jurisdiction. The decision was no doubt wise, and an impressive argument to support it is not unduly difficult to construct. The circumstances imperatively demanded its construction and presentation. But there is no other honest way to describe the brief per curiam opinion than as a pathetic failure to measure up to the Court's responsibility.

The Court simply declared that since "a sovereign nation has exclusive jurisdiction to punish offenses against its laws committed within its borders, unless it expressly or impliedly consents to surrender its jurisdiction" and since "Japan's cession to the United States of jurisdiction to try American military personnel for conduct constituting an offense against the laws of both countries was conditioned" by the provision for waiver of primary jurisdiction, the "issue for our decision is therefore narrowed to the question whether * * * the Constitution * * * prohibited the carrying out of this provision authorized by the treaty for waiver of the qualified jurisdiction granted by Japan." And the Court found nothing in the Constitution which did prohibit it. We may agree that it should not have found anything even if it had looked, but it did not bother to look.

Footnotes at end of speech.

Because of this failure to examine the relevant constitutional provisions, the Court put itself in one of two equally awkward positions. It was either begging the very question it posed or it was reasoning in a circle to reach an answer. The circular reasoning may be put thus. If there were no agreement with Japan, she would have primary jurisdiction to put Girard on his trial, in which he would have no constitutional rights. Therefore, an agreement by which the United States gained primary jurisdiction, even though with a qualification under which it waived jurisdiction and thus left him without the constitutional rights which he would have had under American jurisdiction, does not deprive him of these rights, since he would not have had any rights without the agreement anyway. In short, he was deprived of nothing by the agreement because he had nothing without it.

Consider how easily *Reid* v. *Covert* could have been disposed of under this formula. There, too, the foreign nations in the absence of an agreement had primary jurisdiction to put the American wives to trials in which the Constitution would not protect them. There, too, we obtained by agreement primary jurisdiction also conditioned by a qualification, namely, that we would try them by court-martial. But since without the agreement they would not have been entitled to the jury trial to which they would be entitled if subject to American jurisdiction, why should they be heard to demand, contrary to the agreement, what they could not have without it anyway? In short, they were not deprived of the right to jury trial by the agreement, because they had no right to trial by jury without it.

Now let us examine the opinion as a form of petitio principii, especially by the Chief Justice and Justices Black and Brennan in light of their conclusion in *Reid* v. *Covert* that the Executive could not validly negotiate away the specific (and absolute) constitutional rights of American citizens, there particularly to jury trial. The question in the Girard case was also whether the treaty and agreement deprived him of whatever specific (and absolute) constitutional rights he had. To be sure, since he was a soldier, he did not have the same specific constitutional rights as civilians. But if we read the Bill of Rights with absolute literalness, the only right civilians have that he did not is the right to indictment by grand jury. Let us concede, however, that Congress has from the beginning claimed the power to provide for trial of military personnel by court-martial instead of by jury and that the courts have consistently affirmed that claim. If one is sufficiently literal-minded he may insist that Girard therefore had, by statute, by executive practice, and by adjudication, a constitutional right either to trial by jury (which Congress not only can but does provide for some cases) or to trial by U.S. court-martial, nothing less and nothing more.[49] If that claim be correct, how can anyone deny, in view of their application to Girard, that the Executive through an agreement and the Executive and Senate combined through a treaty had negotiated away his constitutional rights? Yet we have it on good and current authority that the "prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the National Government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and the Senate combined."

The dilemma with which the Warren Court has thus confronted itself takes this form: either all the Constitution follows a command post flag or none of it does. There is only one logical way out of this dilemma. Fortunately that way is as just as it is logical. We can illuminate this path of escape by moving Girard's case in our imagination back to an Army post in the United States, say Fort Belvoir, Va. Congress could certainly provide for the trial of the same offense committed there by court-martial. There seems no reason why it could not provide for his trial by the regular U.S. courts of the State and district where the offense was committed although it has never done so. Or Congress could provide for his surrender to the Virginia authorities for trial in a State court. What Congress could not do constitutionally is just as clear. It could not subject Girard to any trial, civil or military, State or Federal, of a kind which amounted to a legalized lynching, made a mockery of due process of law, and violated "those fundamental principles of liberty and justice which lie at the base of all our civil and political institutions."[50]

This is the true and full measure of an American citizen's constitutional rights as a soldier at home. It ought to be, and in fact it is, the same measure of his rights overseas. The President in negotiating executive agreements, the President and Senate in making treaties, the Congress in legislating, and American executive authorities abroad have scrupulously preserved these fundamental rights.[51] Why, in freedom's name, could not the Court have said as much in Girard's case? For one reason, it did not take the time,[52] but more is involved. One must surmise that at least some members of the Warren Court mistakenly thought they must appear either illogical or unjust, and chose the lesser evil. For if the measure of the American citizen's rights as a soldier overseas is only that "subjective" "natural law" concept of due process, is the measure different—and greater—because he is a civilian overseas? And if so, why? To make it so would truly degrade the soldier to a second-class citizen and justify the deep suspicion of and bitter hostility to all executive-military jurisdiction which so unnecessarily inflames many pages of the leading opinion in *Reid* v. *Covert*. Would not all members of the Warren Court have been wiser to accept the advice of Professor Sutherland?[53]

"The basic decencies of the Bill of Rights should be guides for our officials everywhere. This does not mean that all details of the first eight amendments are mandatory procedure for every American official abroad. * * * We are necessarily remitted to some such standard as that imposed on State officials by the 14th amendment."

Passports and travel control

In *Kent* v. *Dulles*[54] and its companion case, *Dayton* v. *Dulles*[55] the Warren Court adopted as narrow a view of Executive power as it has yet expressed, largely by ignoring it. The position adopted by the Court and set forth by Mr. Justice Douglas had the support of a bare majority. The cases were brought by three citizens whose applications for passports had been denied; those of Kent and Briehl because they refused to submit non-Communist affidavits which were required of them under the State Department's regulations, though each had been given a hearing. Dayton had submitted an affidavit, had had a hearing, and ultimately was refused a passport on review and findings by the Secretary himself; these findings made clear that confidential information had been considered. The *Kent* case was made the vehicle of decision and the *Dayton* case was settled on its authority.

Until 1856 the Secretary of State issued passports in his discretion wholly as an exercise of inherent executive power. In that year Congress adopted an act which is still in effect, forbidding anyone else to issue a passport. Its language appears carefully chosen to recognize an inherent executive power and discretion rather than to delegate power: "The Secretary of State may grant and issue passports * * * under such rules as the President shall designate and prescribe."

Mr. Justice Douglas could hardly deny that there is "a large body of precedents" and massive official and scholarly opinion which hold issue of a passport is a "discretionary act." He appears not to disagree, but opines in the Kent opinion that "the key to that problem * * * is in the manner in which the Secretary's discretion was exercised. * * *"[55] This suggests that it was the procedures for such cases which, on insistence of the courts, the Department had established by regulation, that were in question. Since Kent and Briehl had been refused passports for failure to supply a non-Communist affidavit, and the Court did not claim that this requirement itself was invalid, and scarcely could have without overruling a parcel of its recent decisions, the mystery deepens.

In 1952 Congress passed an act which provides that in time of war or national emergency on Presidential proclamation it is "unlawful for any citizen of the United States to depart from or enter * * * the United States unless he bears a valid passport." President Truman had so proclaimed. Normally a passport has not been required to enter or leave the country, but the exceptions made by Congress and characterized as "minor" in the opinion of the Court include the War of 1812, World War I, and the entire period from 1941, prior to Pearl Harbor, until the present. In addition, the Executive had enforced the same rule under his independent power during the Civil War. The power to refuse a passport and the power to forbid exit without one are distinct, although discretion to refuse a passport becomes more important when one is required for foreign travel.

The Government acknowledged that a citizen has a right to travel abroad, which he cannot be deprived without due process. The Court proclaimed this to be a constitutional "liberty" for the first time. Again it would appear that the question therefore becomes the reasonableness of the procedures by which the Secretary exercised his discretion, but no so.

Instead discussion turns to the grounds upon which rather than the procedures by which discretion has been exercised to refuse passports. Mr. Justice Douglas holds that the only two grounds in the Department's peacetime practice are noncitizenship, in accordance with statutory provisions, and criminal activity. Mr. Justice Clark rightly states in the dissenting opinion that this is one of the two propositions "vital to the Court's final conclusion" and that it is "contrary to fact." The Court's opinion admits that ever since the Russian Revolution the Department at times denied Communists passports but states its practices had not "jelled" this into a third ground by 1926. One may wonder why the date in the Coolidge administration appears. In that year Congress had reenacted the 1856 statute in the United States Code. Mr. Justice Douglas, without discussion, treats this statute as delegating power to rather than recognizing power in the Secretary and as also limiting the grounds for refusal to the two already "jelled." Without explanation he shifts over to a denial sub silentio of any inherent power in the executive.

Worse, from the standpoint of intellectual honesty, is to come. Granted after 1926 passports were frequently denied on grounds of Communist membership. (And of course when the policy was to grant them, that was equally an exercise of discretion.) Admitted also, that in the Internal Security Act of 1950 Congress had made criminal both application for and grant of a passport if the applicant is a member of a "registered" Communist organization—a provision which may yet become effective. True, although unmentioned in the opinion, the legislative history of the 1941 statute forbidding travel without a passport clearly shows Congress recognized the Secretary's discretion to deny passports on security grounds. Indeed, any such law is essentially meaningless otherwise. True also, the provision in the act of 1952 was designed to replace and put on a permanent basis the emergency legislation of 1941, which was about to expire, and in passing it Congress knew that the Secretary did and expected that he would continue to exercise his discretion to deny passports to Communists.

Still, the Court hesitates to impute to Congress, when in 1952 it made a passport necessary for foreign travel and left its issuance to the discretion of the Secretary of State, a purpose to give him unbridled discretion to grant or withhold a pasport from a citizen for any substantive reason he may choose.[57]

It takes real skill to pack so many errors into a single sentence. First the 1952 act forbidding foreign travel without a passport is treated as a law regulating denial of passports. Further, the idea that the Secretary no longer has any discretion in grounds for denial except that which Congress gives him is reiterated as self-evident. Finally, despite the fact that the departmental regulation prescribing Communist membership and activity as the ground for denial is alone in question here, the hint is subtly conveyed that to concede this to be a rational exercise of discretion is equivalent to allowing the Secretary to keep at home people with red hair or blue eyes if the fancy strikes him.

Such performances, whenever the Court indulges in them and however lofty the ideals that motivate them, are bound to revive Justice Jackson's mot: "We are not final because we are infallible, we are infallible because we are final." In this way, however, the Court reached the conclusion that the stautes "do not delegate to the Secretary the kind of au-authority exericsed here."

III. CONCLUSIONS

No less an authority than Max Weber pointed to the conflict always potentially present betwen a modern bureacracy and the judiciary, particularly in Anglo-American jurisdictions: [58]

"For the field of administrative activity proper, that is, for all state activities that fall outside the field of law creation and court procedure, one is accustomed to claiming the freedom and paramountcy of individual circumstances. General norms are held to play primarily a negative role as barriers to the official's postive and "creative" activity, which should never be regulated. * * * Yet the point that this "freely" creative administration * * * does not constitute a realm of free, arbitrary action, of mercy, and of personally motivated favor and valuation * * * is a very decisive point. The rule and the rational estimation of objective purposes, as well as devotion to them, always exist as a norm of conduct. In the field of executive administration, especially where the "creative" arbitrariness of the official is most strongly built up, the specifically modern and strictly objective idea of "reasons of state" is upheld as the supreme and ultimate guiding star of the official's behavior."

But he observed the judicial process:

"American adjudication of the highest courts is still to a great extent empirical; and especially is it adjudication by precedents. * * * Formal judgments are rendered, though not by subsumption under rational concepts, but by drawing on analogies and by depending upon and interpreting concrete precedents. This is empirical justice. * * * It postulates substantive justice oriented toward some concrete instance and person; and such an ethos will unavoidably collide with the formalism and the rulebound and cool matter-of-factness of bureaucratic administration."

No words could be found more prophetic of the problems faced by the Warren Court as it attempts to provide substantive justice in concrete instances and for concrete persons affected by the efforts of an Executive necessarily guided by cool, rational, objective consideration of what reasons of state require to protect the security of the country in the cold war. It is a measure of the wisdom of that great scholar that he did not denigrate the vital purposes of either the bureaucracy or the judiciary when such conflict occurs. His wisdom certainly deserves the attention, and may we add, the emulation both of those members of the legal profession who recently accused the Warren Court of invoking technicalities against the protection of our Nation [59] and of that considerable number of political scientists who have regularly, and dare one say, monotonously denounced efforts of the executive branch to protect the Nation's security under both Presidents Truman and Eisenhower as merely irrational and viciously unjust. How petulant many of these demands that our Chief Executive and our Supreme Court apologize for sincere efforts to protect the Nation and to render justice sound.

The impact of the Warren Court's decisions on the executive branch can be summed up only tentatively. What the record makes clearest is the willingness of the Court to place limitations on executive power. There is a concept of executive power which tempts its holders to regard at least any new legal restriction upon what a President may do as somehow a subtraction from and diminution of his power. Apparently some critics, out of their rightful concern for the maintenance of a strong Presidency in today's world, have adopted that concept. The Warren Court has rejected it, for good reason. For this concept of power is a logical fallacy, perhaps alluring because it seems scientific. The President's power is not a quantum which will eventually be amenable to expression in mathematical terms when the calculus in which to compute it has been perfected. The analogy of executive power to horsepower it fatally misleading. The power of a President rests ultimately upon public confidence that he cannot lawfully do some things and will not try to do them. Thus a rule that the President may not arbitrarily remove an officer performing quasi-judicial functions, invoked in the Wiener case, or a rule that he cannot by an executive agreement deprive American citizens abroad of their fundamental right to due process, which is the likely meaning of the Covert and Girard cases in combination, or a rule like that enforced in the Vitarelli case, that in removing an official on security grounds the executive must observe the procedural regulations which he has proclaimed in an effort to meet constitutional requirements may each ulitmately enhance rather than diminish the power of a democratic executive.

In some cases, particularly *Peters* v. *Hobby* and *Greene* v. *McElroy*, there appears a tendency which, if it were to become more dogmatic or be given general application, would be a serious and unjustifiable judicial encroachment on executive authority. That tendency is to insist on an unrealistic and undesirable formalism in the relations between the President and his assistants in the executive branch. Mr. Justice Reed's admonition against analogizing these relations between superior and subordinates to those which obtain between coordinate legislative and executive branches is a wise one. It may seem the more remarkable that these analogies have been drawn by a Chief Justice who has had important and substantial experience as an executive head of a great government.

Footnotes at end of speech.

If these are the main results of the Warren Court's interpretations of executive power, what is to be said of the technique by which it has characteristically achieved them? Prof. Herman Pritchett in "The Political Offender and the Warren Court" has described it as follows: [40]

"Where the Court has contrived to invalidate official action, which it has done rather often, it has typically been for rather narrow reasons * * * certainly the starting point * * * is recognition of the caution the Warren Court has shown in taking new constitutional positions as to the rights of political offenders. The libertarian effects which the Court has recently achieved have been secured for the most part through the interpretation of statutes, not through the interposition of constitutional barriers."

When the issues facing the Court are so novel and so grave there is certainly much to commend in the gingerly tentativeness with which the Court has approached their resolution. But in speaking of the Court's obligation to judge Professor Pritchett added: [41]

"If the Supreme Court's primary obligation is to avoid taking a position on matters of acute public controversy or where the interests which the Court is protecting are not substantial enough to give the Court a reasonable measure of support if a hue and cry is raised by the decision, then this recent experience suggests that this self-restraint doctrine needs to reformulated."

The Warren Court has frequently avoided prematurely final decision of constitutional questions only at the price of appearing, even if it be not, disingenuous. At times, especially in *Greene* v. *McElroy* and *Kent* v. *Dulles*, the Warren Court has almost seemed to create an irrebutable presumption of presidential and congressional ignorance, and its versions of the process of government have taxed credulity. The worst damage wrought by such opinions is likely to be upon the Court itself. Men who begin to suspect, even wrongly, that their judges are less than candid in appraising the facts are likely to end by distrusting their statements of the law. Such a consummation is not to be wished for, and both the Court and its critics need to take thought promptly about how it may be avoided.

There are of course canons of propriety that control what may be said in a Supreme Court opinion. But would they have been breached if the Court had spoken to the President and Congress in some of these cases in words like these? When we say that you did not know and did not intend that those in the executive branch would do what they have done, we do not mean that you were unaware of their probable or subsequent action, or that you did not in some more or less casual way approve their acts. What we do mean is that we are not sure that you were aware of the full consequences that your intention or approval carry with them, and what we ask of you, before we must pass upon these consequences, is your reconsideration of them and your renewed assurance that in full knowledge of them you have concluded that pro bono publico they must be borne.

Some may hold that such candor would have been wrong, for undoubtedly it would express a far-reaching claim for the judicial power. The Court would thus have at its command a kind of suspensory veto as an adjunct to the possibility of wielding as final a veto power as it now possesses. But it has long been a truism among constitutional scholars that the only kind of veto which the Court has ever held over governmental action that public opinion persistently supports as "a felt need of the times" is a kind of suspensory or delaying power. At least, an admission that a greater freedom of action is justified in the Court's use of its suspensory veto power than older versions of the function of judicial review suggest would be an interesting parallel to the Warren Court's invention in the public school integration decisions of the novel and socially useful principle that actions admittedly less than constitutional may under appropriate circumstances be given temporary judicial sanction. Some of us might believe that both principles represent constitutional relativism at its best.

Something should be said about the basic jurisprudence, as distinguished from technique, which underlies these decision of the Warren Court. There is a type of legal theory which promotes the kind of constitutional construction that yields propositions like the following three. First, the President's inherent removal power must extend to all officers if it extends to any and may be exercised for any reason if it may be exercised for some. Second, if denial of confrontation and cross-examination is invalid in some governmental proceedings it is unconstitutional in all. Third, if any provision of the Constitution follows the American citizens in his relations with his Government overseas all of them do. The Warren Court rejected the first of these in the Wiener case. A majority has never accepted the second, suggested a reasonable substitute for it in the Vitarelli case, but then came perilously close to embracing it in the Greene case. The third was rejected by a majority explicitly in the Covert case and implicitly though silently by the Court in the Girard case.

The legal theory that animates constitutional construction which in turn produces such propositions of law is what has long been called "a jurisprudence of conceptions" or mechanical or conceptual jurisprudence. In another day it was attacked by scholars who saw in such decisions as those in *Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital* [42] wrongful judicial interference with orderly social adjustments to the problems of their time. Quite apart from the "value preferences" of those who attacked this "slot machine" theory of law are the logical objections to it. For in terms of logic does not all such mechanical jurisprudence come down to a manipulation, knowingly or ingeniously, of the twin fallacies of composition and division? [43] Any court, especially when confronted with novel and difficult questions, must be under a strong temptation to fall into them, because the psychic comfort they provide though illusory may be comfort nevertheless. Justice Sutherland may sometimes seem to have on the Warren Court his logical descendants, who can be identified by similar polemical style despite their rebellion against his taste in "values." But fortunately most members of the Warren Court most of the time deserve and are here given credit for a wise and courageous refusal to resort under great tension to the use of that judicial tranquilizer pill once so popular.

---

[1] See particularly G. A. Schubert, Jr., "The Presidency in the Courts," Minneapolis, 1957.

[2] 350 U.S. 11.

[3] Cf. the holding, 350 U.S. at 23.

[4] *Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579.

[5] 347 U.S. 483.

[6] *Reid* v. *Covert*, 351 U.S. 487, and *Kinsella* v. *Krueger*, 351 U.S. 470, were consolidated for rehearing and decision in *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1.

[7] Chronologically, they are:

(1) *United States* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*, 348 U.S. 296.
(2) *Peters* v. *Hobby*, 349 U.S. 331.
(3) *Cole* v. *Young*, 351 U.S. 536.
(4) *Service* v. *Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363.
(5) *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1.
(6) *Wilson* v. *Girard*, 354 U.S. 524.
(7) *Harmon* v. *Brucker*, 355 U.S. 579.
(8) *Kent* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 116.
(9) *Dayton* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 144.
(10) *Wiener* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 349.
(11) *Vitarelli* v. *Seaton*, 79 S.Ct. 968.
(12) *Greene* v. *McElroy*, 79 S.Ct. 1400.

[8] *U.S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*; *Service* v. *Dulles*; *Wilson* v. *Girard*; *Wiener* v. *U.S.*

[9] *Service* v. *Dulles*.

[10] *Harmon* v. *Brucker* and *Wilson* v. *Girard*.

[11] *Harmon* v. *Brucker*.

[12] *U.S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*

[13] In *Reid* v. *Covert*, 354 U.S. 1, the decision of the district court in *Covert* v. *Reid* was affirmed and the district court in *Krueger* v. *Kinsella* was reversed.

[14] *U.S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.* and *Wilson* v. *Girard*.

[15] *U.S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*

[16] *Peters* v. *Hobby*; *Cole* v. *Young*; *Service* v. *Dulles*; *Harmon* v. *Brucker*; *Wiener* v. *U.S.*; *Vitarelli* v. *Seaton*; and *Greene* v. *McElroy*.

[17] *Wiener* v. *U.S.*

[18] *U.S.* v. *Guy W. Capps, Inc.*; *Reid* v. *Covert*; and *Wilson* v. *Girard*.

[19] *Kent* v. *Dulles* and *Dayton* v. *Dulles*.

[20] In *Bailey* v. *Richardson*, 341 U.S. 918, the decision of the court of appeals upholding a dismissal stood affirmed only by a 4–4 division.

[21] 357 U.S. 349.

[22] 349 U.S. 331.

[23] See particularly E. Bontecue, "The Federal Loyalty-Security Program," Ithaca, 1953, pp. 246–248, and Association of the Bar of the City of New York, "Report of the Special Committee on Federal Loyalty-Security Program," New York, 1956, pp. 174–180.

[24] 349 U.S. at 354.

[25] 354 U.S. 363.

[26] 347 U.S. 260.

[27] *Shaughnessy* v. *United States ex rel. Accardi*, 349 U.S. 280.

[28] 351 U.S. 536.

[29] Cf. C. H. Pritchett, "The Political Offender and the Warren Court," Boston, 1957, p. 51.

[30] *Youngstown Sheet and Tube Co.* v. *Sawyer*, 343 U.S. 579 at 637–638.

[31] 79 S. Ct. 968. The Department of the Interior reinstated Dr. Vitarelli on June 26, 1959. He has not been since discharged under the Secretary's plenary power.

[32] 355 U.S. 579.

[33] Extensive citation would be supererogatory but see, typically, *Estep* v. *United States*, 327 U.S. 114.

[34] 79 S. Sc. 1400. Cf. *Taylor* v. *McElroy*, 79 S. Ct. 1428, held moot.

[35] Commission on Government Security, Report, Washington, D.C. 1957.

[36] *Brown* v. *Bd. of Education of Topeka.*

[37] The Commission on Government Security, appointed jointly by the President and Congress, had reported that fact to them both, op. cit., p. 262.

[38] 323 U.S. 283.

[39] *Scull* v. *Virginia*, 359 U.S. 344.

[40] *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178.

[41] 204 F. 2d 655 and 348 U.S. 296.

[42] *United States* v. *Pink*, 315 U.S. 203.

[43] *United States* v. *Belmont*, 301 U.S. 324.

[44] A. E. Sutherland, "The Bricker Amendment, Executive Agreements, and Imported Potatoes," 67 Harvard Law Review 281.

[45] 354 U.S. 1.

[46] 252 U.S. 416.

[47] 354 U.S. 524.

[48] See particularly his dissenting opinion in *Adamson* v. *California*, 332 U.S. 46.

[49] For such a literal-minded contention and its rejection by the Court, cf. *Madsen* v. *Kinsella*, 343 U.S. 341.

[50] *Palko* v. *Connecticut*, 302 U.S. 319 at 328, quoting *Hebert* v. *Louisiana*, 272 U.S. 312.

[51] For a thorough consideration see "Criminal Jurisdiction Over American Forces Abroad," 70 Harvard Law Review 1043.

[52] In *Ex parte Quirin*, 317 U.S. 1, Chief Justice Stone announced the decision in the Nazi saboteurs' case promptly but delayed

filing of an opinion. The same course would have been better in the Girard case.

[54] A. E. Sutherland, "The Flag, the Constitution, and International Agreements," 68 Harvard Law Review 1374 at 1380–1381.

[55] 357 U.S. 116.

[56] 357 U.S. 144.

[57] 357 U.S. at 125.

[58] 357 U.S. at 128.

[59] H. H. Gerth and C. W. Mills, "From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology," Galaxy Ed., New York 1958. The quotations are from the essay on "Bureaucracy" in the section subtitled "Bureaucracy and Law," pp. 216–221. It is believed their arrangement here does not misrepresent Weber.

[60] Report of the committee on Communist tactics, strategy, and objectives of the American Bar Association submitted to its house of delegates on Feb. 24, 1959.

[61] C. H. Pritchett, "The Political Offender and the Warren Court," Boston, 1958, pp. 60 and 62.

[62] Ibid., p. 71.

[63] 261 U.S. 525.

[64] M. R. Cohen and E. Nagel, "An Introduction to Logic and Scientific Method," New York, 1934, p. 377.

A Visit to the Federal Aviation Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of my colleagues, an interesting article entitled "A Visit to the Federal Aviation Agency," recording the impressions of Swiss aviation authorities who recently visited the Federal Aviation Agency.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VISIT TO THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The formation of the Federal Aviation Agency marks yet another step in both the history and the development of American aviation. The writer recently had the opportunity of visiting the headquarters of the new Agency and was given considerable insight into its development and current progress. To fully appreciate the reasons for its formation and the requirements it fulfills, it is perhaps necessary to retrace some of this past aviation history to obtain a clearer picture of the background from which the Agency was developed.

The speed of development and expansion of the aviation and air transport industries over the past 30 years has greatly exceeded the most optimistic forecasts. This is particularly marked in the United States of America where the air transport of passengers and mail has long been accepted as a necessary and permanent part of the American transportation picture. The recognition by the Federal Government of the need to provide a centralized control for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation dates back to 1926 when the first Air Commerce Act was passed. This act established an Aeronautics Branch of the Department of Commerce, whose function was to regulate the newly developing business of air transport. The Department was authorized to license pilots, develop air navigation facilities, promote flying safety, map airways and to furnish flight information.

By 1938 the ever-increasing popularity of air travel, together with the increasing numbers of aircraft of new types and higher speeds, began to complicate the movement of air traffic in the airways. An exhaustive study of commercial aviation was made by a Presidential Commission which paved the way for the writing of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This act created the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board and allocated specific responsibilities to the two branches. The Civil Aeronautics Administration was made responsible for air safety, air traffic control, operation of airways, aviation communications and the improvement of airports. At the same time the Civil Aeronautics Board was charged with writing civil air regulations, investigating accidents and regulating economic aspects of air routes and civil aviation. In 1940 certain amendments were made to the act and under the resultant reorganization the Civil Aeronautics Board remained independent while the Civil Aeronautics Administration was placed within the Department of Commerce.

At the end of World War II, it was in this framework that American civil aviation recommended its activities. The enormous advances made by aviation during and following the war rapidly became manifest. Larger and faster aircraft in steadily increasing numbers crowded into the airways and it became apparent that the air traffic control capabilities of the CAA were not designed to handle the situation. As early as 1948 the Air Coordinating Committee which had been established by the President 2 years previously in 1946, observed that "the existing techniques of air traffic control and tools available to CAA are marginal even by the pre-World War II standards." During the 1950's yet another factor arose which compounded the existing difficulties. This was the advent of jet-powered aircraft with their extremely high speeds, and requiring new techniques in air traffic control to enable them to be fitted into the overall airways traffic plan.

In order to resolve the growing problems of this crowded airspace, the first step was the creation in 1957 of the Airways Modernization Board, with the express purpose of speeding the necessary improvements.

In the terms of the act which created the Board it was also specified that Congress would establish an independent Federal Aviation Agency, and in 1958 legislation was passed which brought this into being. To direct this organization the President appointed Mr. E. R. Quesada to be the first Administrator of the new Agency on November 5, 1958.

Mr. Quesada had previously served as special assistant to the President for aviation matters and had been Chairman of the Airways Modernization Board. To assist him in the task of directing the new Agency, Mr. James T. Pyle was appointed Deputy Administrator. Mr. Pyle had previously been Administrator of the CAA, a body which was absorbed in its entirety in the structure of the new FAA.

This powerful and comprehensive organization is an independent Agency reporting directly to the President, and the Administrator has been given the broad powers necesary to promote the interests of American aviation, both civil and military at home and abroad. The formation of the FAA was commenced by the transfer of the Airways Modernization Board to its control as the Bureau of Research and Development, followed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the safety rulemaking section of the Civil Aeronautics Board complete with personnel, funds, and functions. Once established, on January 1, 1959, the FAA at once commenced to operate on a five-point plan described in the following principles.

1. To regulate air commerce so as to promote its development, safety, and requirements in national defense.

2. To control the navigable airspace and to regulate civil and military flight operations in the interests of safety and efficiency.

3. To develop and operate a common system of air traffic control and navigation for both civilian and military aircraft.

4. To develop a plan for the Agency's function in the event of war.

5. To prescribe minimum standards for design, materials, and workmanship in aircraft construction and construction of other elements of aviation.

The breadth of policy embodied in this five-point plan gives an indication of the magnitude of the problems with which the administrator and his staff are faced. It should be emphasized that the FAA concept is one of integration of services and facilities for both civil and military aviation so that it can safely and fairly apportion the use of the available airspace to both users. There is also the necessity to both expand and modernize the Federal airways system and to control the ever-growing volume of traffic. This has become even more urgent with the introduction of high performance aircraft into the traffic patterns, requiring more airspace than ever before.

In a recent interview Mr. Quesada explained to me how the FAA is attacking these problems. The first task is to maintain and operate facilities already in existence and by reducing the size of restricted areas to restore large tracts of airspace to public use. This was being achieved by complete derestriction of certain areas, and in certain other cases by allowing the use of restricted areas to civil aircraft when military operations were not being conducted. This was now possible owing to the closer integration between military and civil control in the FAA system. To achieve this integration new methods have been evolved. Military personnel are transferred for employment with the FAA rather than being attached for liaison. During the period of employment with the FAA the man is regarded as being an FAA employee even to the extent of being paid by the Agency and not by his parent service. By absorbing this personnel into its own structure rather than establishing liaison officers from the various services and commands, the FAA is assured of a closer cooperation without the tendency for interservice priorities to arise. Similarly the controllers on military airfields will eventually be replaced by civilian FAA employees to insure a greater continuity. In consequence military aircraft will use the airways under civilian control and with exactly the same degree of priority as civilian aircraft.

The second and largest part of the program is that of modernization of the airways; increased installation of radar and other electronic equipment, training larger numbers of traffic controllers, improving communications and developing new control procedures. This intensive research and development program is being undertaken with the target date of January 1, 1963, as the deciding factor. Mr. Quesada explained that this date represents the completion of the first stage in the modernization program and any new developments are judged on their availability for employment by that date. Any systems or ideas which may arise but which cannot be developed for employment in that time will be relegated to a long-term research program. By making this rule the FAA is assured of concentration on the present problem without being sidetracked on possibilities rather than certainties.

The third and last part of the overall program, and representing only a small proportion of the effort at the moment, is that of investigation of future developments and planning for the more distant future. This is being done with the next generation of high-speed aircraft in mind and has little bearing on the immediate modernization of the airways and facilities.

To undertake the responsibilities with which it is charged, the FAA anticipates employing nearly 40,000 personnel when fully staffed. More than 90 percent of this figure will be stationed in hundreds of FAA facilities throughout the United States and the world. Mr. Quesada went on to describe the main features of the organization and the main departmental responsibilities which have ben established throughout the Agency. Four major Bureaus constitute the operational strength of the FAA and their functions and interdependence can best be understood by describing their activities separately.

BUREAU OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

This was the first part of the FAA to be brought into existence and consolidated the research programs of the Airways Modernization Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Bureau operates the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center in Atlantic City, N.J. to evaluate ground navigation and traffic control equipment and procedures.

This Center is the FAA's proving ground and has been established in one of the busiest traffic areas of the United States to provide a "real life" environment of air traffic management studies. At the same time traffic free areas over the Atlantic Ocean provide a safe area for testing experimental devices. The development of semi-automatic air traffic control systems is one of the major tasks of this Bureau.

BUREAU OF FACILITIES

Is responsible for the installation and maintenance of all aids to navigation, both visual and electronic, in the air traffic control and navigation system. It is also the enginecring, construction and procurement authority of the FAA. The navigation aids for which it is responsible include VOR, VORTAC, ILS, high intensity approach lights, long range and surveillance radar installations, radio ranges, air route traffic control centers and airport control towers, data processing systems and communications. The Bureau installs these facilities and establishes the technicians to ensure their continued performance and reliability. One specialized responsibility is that of planning and developing the International Airport for commercial jets, now being constructed near Washington at Chantilly, Va.

BUREAU OF FLIGHT STANDARDS

The key word of this Bureau's activities is "safety." Its activities include establishment of the standards for use by manufacturers in the design and construction of aircraft, flight testing and airworthiness certification of all civil aircraft and maintenance standards and practices for civil aircraft. It tests and certificates the competence of all flight personnel, mechanics and dispatchers and sets the standards for mechanics training schools. Safety inspectors of the Bureau continually check the actual operation of commercial aircraft and their crews on routine flights. It also has the responsibility for flight checking the navigation aids, landing aids, radars and communication systems throughout the Federal Airways Systems.

BUREAU OF AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The function of this bureau is the control of air traffic, writing, and enforcing air traffic rules and regulations and determining the division and use of the airspace available. It operates the 35 Air Route Traffic Control centers and over 200 airport control towers. It is also responsible for the network of communications which interlink the control stations throughout the airways system.

To coordinate and supervise the work of the FAA throughout the United States and overseas possessions, regions have been established under the control of regional administrators. These regional offices are situated in New York, N.Y.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Kansas City, Mo.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Anchorage, Alaska; and Honolulu, TH. Over 90 percent of the personnel of the FAA are employed in the facilities operating in these regions.

Apart from the work of the bureau and regional offices a number of departments exist for the planning and administration of FAA policy and for coordination with other authorities. One of the most important of these is the Office of International Coordination. Mr. Quesada is very keenly aware of the necessity of maintaining as close relationships as possible with other governments and air traffic authorities. In his view the mandate of the FAA is world wide and any aviation developments in the USA are bound to affect aviation throughout the world. Similarly the USA cannot afford to ignore aviation developments abroad as only through the interdependence of this technical effort can the maximum mutual benefits be obtained.

The extent to which the FAA is working to obtain this exchange of technical and operational information can be judged from the work of the International Coordination Office. Apart from supporting the aims of the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, the FAA is strongly supporting the civil aviation activities of certain NATO groups and provides a full-time officer for this purpose. Another FAA officer sits on the Air Navigation Commission of ICAO and is alternate to the U.S. representative on the ICAO Council.

In order to strengthen the liaison and cooperation with civil aviation administrations of other countries a number of overseas offices have been established. There is an aircraft engineering office in Paris which assists foreign manufacturers in obtaining U.S. airworthiness certificates for their aircraft. Eight field offices in as many countries perform the necessary safety surveillance of U.S. flag operations in overseas areas and consult with and advise foreign flag operators flying to the United States in the promotion of air safety. There are also two flight inspection groups with flight check aircraft for the operational evaluation of various air navigation aids in cooperation and under agreement with other governments.

The establishment of the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center (NAFEC) at Atlantic City, N.J., is another illustration of the Agency's global thinking in terms of aviation development and safety. This modern airport is being equipped for experimental purposes with all types of new systems for evaluation by a large staff of scientists and engineers. It is the hope of the Administrator that engineers from other countries will visit this proving ground and that they will work alongside the FAA staff for as long as they are able in the development of equipment and systems.

The recent visit of a Swiss delegation to FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C., was yet another example of this international cooperation. The delegation consisted of representatives from the Swiss Federal Air Office and from the Air Traffic Services of Geneva and Zurich airports, which are operated by Radio-Switzerland. In the course of a visit lasting a week they were shown the structure and functions of the FAA and were given considerable information on the developments which were in hand for the modernization of the Federal airways system. The value of such collaboration is particularly apparent in the case of a small country such as Switzerland, whose airports are used by a large number of foreign-flag carriers, and where the geographic nature of the country necessitates an extremely accurate air traffic control system. From this visit to the FAA the Swiss delegation were able to obtain operational information drawn from a highly complex and crowded air transport system. At the same time this exchange of information is not entirely one-sided. The experience gained in Switzerland of air transport operations in a mountainous country of small area is of value and is welcomed by the FAA. The problems encountered in the siting and performance of radar, VOR's, and other navigation equipment and the methods employed to overcome these difficulties are of importance throughout the world and not only from a national standpoint.

In an age when no two points on the world's surface are more than 40 hours' traveling time apart, it is encouraging to see such strenuous efforts being made to expedite air transport internationally, and to bring its advantages within the reach of the greatest number of people. As the two most powerful "air traffic controllers"—if they will forgive the term, in the free world today, Mr. Quesada and Mr. Pyle are to be congratulated on the vigor and enthusiasm with which they are directing the efforts of the FAA to achieve this result.

Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the First Church in Jersey City for Italian Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include the following article which appeared in the Jersey Journal of September 11, 1959, commemorating the 75th anniversary of the first church in Jersey City for Italian families, Holy Rosary.

The 75th anniversary celebration will be a yearlong jubilee. Rev. Gerard M. Santora, pastor of Holy Rosary Church, plans a year of spiritual and social renewal. Father Santora has scheduled many outstanding events to commemorate this celebration. Father Santora said, "A parish is a family of families." I would like to add that the parish of the Holy Rosary in Jersey City is very fortunate in having as the head of its family of families Rev. Gerard M. Santora.

[From the Jersey (N.J.) Journal, Sept. 11, 1959]

HOLY ROSARY R. C. CHURCH TO CELEBRATE ITS 75TH ANNIVERSARY—FIRST IN JERSEY CITY FOR ITALIAN FAMILIES

(By Edward J. Sullivan)

Holy Rosary Church, mother church to Jersey City's big community of people with Italian lineage, will celebrate its 75th year with a year-long jubilee beginning next month.

The Reverend Gerard M. Santora, pastor, will announce plans for the diamond jubilee Sunday at masses in the Sixth Street Church.

Tens of thousands of North Jersey Catholics whose families can trace their American beginnings through Jersey City's first Italian-language church, are expected to participate in the jubilee events beginning October 7, Feast of the Most Holy Rosary, with solemn high mass.

"We plan a year of spiritual and social renewal," said Father Santora.

Next big event will be a family communion breakfast October 18 at the Jersey City Garden.

Michael Esposito, jubilee Jersey City, numbered only a coordinator, is marshaling a 168-member committee to organize the calendar of events culminating in a dress jubilee ball in October 1960.

Also planned are commemorative publications including an ambitious attempt to trace the history of every family which has had ties with Holy Rosary.

Another aim of the jubilee year will be to slice in half the parish's $420,000 indebtedness, so it can proceed with its building program.

The debt piled up in the past 9 years as the parish met its needs for a school addition, a new convent and a new rectory.

Next on the agenda, once the debt is halved said Father Santora, is a new youth center to provide wholesome guidance and recreation for the downtown youngsters.

Holy Rosary traces its beginnings to the 1880's in the Italian-speaking community of a few hundred dock and railroad laborers. For years they had traveled each Sunday to churches in New York. Then Italian-speaking priests were assigned to a little chapel alongside the railroad on Sixth Street.

The parish grew to meet the turn-of-the-century tide of immigrants who turned to their church for both spiritual and practical help in adjusting to the American environment.

From their clergy, and in their parish school they learned English and raised an English-speaking second generation that has long since burst out of strictly Italian-speaking neighborhoods and has become interwoven with Jersey City's social fabric in all economic directions.

Beside saluting Holy Rosary's historic role in the development of the Jersey City of today, Father Santora said, the jubilee year will also be a year of reunion.

Said Father Santora: "A parish is a family of families."

World Not Dueling Ground for Russia, United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, a very thoughtful editor, Edward J. Meeman, of the Memphis Press-Scimitar in Memphis, Tenn., has written an article which was published in his and other Scripps-Howard newspapers, pointing out that the time has come when we should pass to the other free nations of the world their fair share of the responsibility and the cost of the defense of their freedom and ours. Mr. Meeman points out that one of the best ways to work toward this end is by passage of the Humphrey-Morgan resolution, recommended by the Atlantic Congress, which would call together not more than 100 of the leading citizens of the NATO nations to study means of obtaining better unity, and report on these studies to their governments. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee have set this resoluttion for hearings next January, and during the recess I hope that Members of Congress will be giving it their thoughtful consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD IS NOT A DUELING GROUND FOR RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(By Edward J. Meeman)

Some hope too much, some fear too much, from the talks between Eisenhower and Khrushchev.

The great middle ground of opinion is aware of the dangers involved but convinced that the risks must be taken in order to avert the greater risk of nuclear war; that it is well for us to be fully alert to the dangers so as to avoid them as far as possible.

One danger of the talks is that the impression will be created that the conflict between East and West is a duel between Soviet Russia and the United States, the two strongest military powers on earth, a struggle for world power.

It's false. America wants no world power. We only want to assure that we can live in peace.

If we act like a world power, it is because World War II left us as the only strong nation in the free world, and if we did not protect ourselves, nobody would, and the other nations of the free world looked to us to protect them.

But the other free nations are getting stronger all the time—thanks to our Marshall plan and to their own remarkable efforts.

The time has come when we should pass to them, their fair share of the responsibility and the cost of the defense of their freedom and ours. The only difference between us and them is that we're just a little bigger—not so much richer as supposed, when you consider our unbalanced budget.

One of the best things that came out of the recent Atlantic Congress in London was the evidence that forward-looking citizen leaders of Western Europe are saying that Europe not only can and should assume more of the costs of NATO defense, but also of help for underdeveloped nations outside of NATO.

That is the path of progress. We need to move along that path.

One way to move is to pass the Humphrey-Morgan resolution which provides for a convention of leading citizens of democratic nations—the Atlantic Congress said it should be 100—to work for greater unity.

It's not a struggle between two giants, Russia and the United States, in which other free nations are only half involved or neutral. It's Communist tryranny versus freedom, and every free nation is as involved, and should be contributing as much, as the United States of America.

Let's look at the Ike-Khrushchev talks with that ever in mind.

And Laos, too.

The Launching of the Good Ship "James Lykes"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday, September 12, another splendid ship was added to the American merchant marine when the *James Lykes* was launched in my hometown, Pascagoula, Miss. This modern addition to our fleet was built by the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. This beautiful ship glided down the ways into the Pascagoula Harbor in a perfect launching. Thus, the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp., which has built so many splendid vessels, both for our national defense and our struggle to maintain the American flag on the high seas, made another worthwhile contribution to our national defense and commerce.

The *James Lykes* was christened by Mrs. Herbert C. Bonner, the gracious wife of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives.

On that occasion our able and efficient colleague, Chairman BONNER, made a most appropriate address. Administrator Clarence G. Morse of the Maritime Administration also made some brief, but very appropriate remarks. Other distinguished people, including Mr. Solon Turman, president, and Mr. Joe Lykes of the Lykes Brothers Steamship Corp., and Mr. Frederick J. Mayo, president of Ingalls, made brief remarks. Mr. Monro Lanier, vice chairman of the board of Ingalls, acted as master of ceremonies.

Congressman BONNER's remarks follow:

Mr. Lanier, my devoted friend and companion, our most gracious sponsor, Mrs. Bonner, Mr. Morse, "Mr. Joe" Lykes, Mr. Turman, and all the other splendid members of the great American clan of Lykes, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am most happy to have the honor and privilege of visiting this great shipyard again on this especially auspicious occasion—the launching of the SS *James Lykes*, the newest member of the greatest family of ships under the American flag. It is a personal pleasure to be in the Sixth Congressional District of Mississippi and in the city of Pascagoula, the home of my fine and able friend, Hon. WILLIAM M. COLMER, who represents this district in the Congress with distinction.

The Lykes fleet has to be big.

It started off from small beginnings, back in the 1880's, when the founder of the present Lykes family, Dr. Howell Tyson Lykes, shipped cattle to Cuba on a 109-foot schooner, named for himself. The precedent started by Dr. Lykes in the naming of his vessel naturally had to be followed as the tribe increased through seven sons and a daughter of his own, followed by the proliferation of subsequent generations.

Blood ties are strong in this remarkable family. Fairplay and equality of treatment bind the Lykes tribe together. So, over the years they have had no choice but to create a large fleet of ships to take the names of the numerous members of the family. The commerce of the United States, and particularly the economic welfare of our gulf coast, have been the benefactors of this curious compulsion to have ships named after every baby that was born in the family.

On this occasion, when we honor the name and memory of James McKay Lykes, who founded the present Lykes Bros. Steamship Co. in 1906, it is thrilling to think of the family unity and solidarity exemplified by the presence of so many members of the generations of Dr. Lykes here today. It is indeed difficult to separate Lykes people from Lykes ships. And it is therefore logical that among those in attendance today are Mrs. James McKay Lykes, widow of the energetic and farsighted man for whom this ship is named; Mr. Lykes' eldest son, James McKay Lykes, Jr., senior vice president and director of the steamship company in charge of west gulf operations; his younger son, Charles P. Lykes of Tampa, a director of the steamship company and president of the Florida corporation of Lykes Bros., Inc.; and his two daughters, Mrs. Ben F. Thompson of Houston, and Mrs. Cameron Duncan of San Antonio.

But this is far more than just another large-scale family get-together.

Over the many, many years that this country has sought to maintain its essential place in the field of international commerce through strength upon the seas, numerous methods have been tried. Each time the formulas have been found wanting, until the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The launching of this fully modern cargo ship, specially designed for the needs of today, gives us firm proof of the sound and farsighted principles and policies of the 1936 act, just 20 years from the launching of her namesake, prior to World War II.

The launching of this new ship is proof of more than simply the soundness of the 1936 act. It is proof of the human perseverance, loyalty and faith of its operators and its builders, in their partnership with the Government in service to our national interest.

The new *James Lykes* comes into being as the first of a whole new generation of cargo ships for the American merchant marine under a program to be carried out over the next 15 years. Through this program of orderly replacement of our war-built fleet the Federal Maritime Board and the participating American operators will at last overcome the difficult problem of block obsolescence which has plagued us in the aftermath of two World Wars.

The new *James Lykes* has been designed with the greatest of care and thoughtfulness for the trades she will serve. She carries out the concepts expressed recently by her great Naval Architect, Mr. William Francis Gibbs, in speaking of our maritime competitiveness, that American ships should be designed for the future, should be able to do any job that any competitor can do with his ships, and should be able to do it better.

The *James Lykes* will be a vessel of 11,300 deadweight tons, 495 feet in length, with a 69-foot beam. She is specially designed to carry—efficiently—bulk, as well as general cargo in two of her five holds. She will be able to travel at a sustained speed of 17.5 knots at 80 percent use of power. She will be fitted to carry 12 passengers in air conditioned comfort. All of her crew quarters will likewise be air conditioned.

I somehow feel very strongly that the spirit of James McKay Lykes is with us today, looking approvingly on the handiwork of those who have carried on after him toward the greater glory of the name of Lykes and the American flag on the Seven Seas.

May I finally also add very sincerely my highest congratulations to Mr. Morse for his vision and persistence in carrying the Government's end of this great exercise in cooperation forward, and to the Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. for another outstanding example of the highest quality of American shipbuilding.

Thank you.

The remarks of the Honorable Clarence G. Morse follows:

Mr. Joe Lykes, Mr. Turman, Mr. Lanier, Mr. Ingalls, Members of Congress, distinguished guests, representatives of the Army and Navy, friends of the American merchant marine, and our most gracious sponsor, Mrs. Herbert Covington Bonner.

It is indeed an honor to be here today, and to join with you in the ceremonies marking the launching of the SS *James Lykes*.

We in Washington who have labored to see our shipbuilding and ship-replacement program become a reality take great pride in this particular achievement.

First, it is always a pleasure to do business with Lykes Brothers Steamship Co., and it is certainly not amiss on this occasion to say that we admire and respect Lykes Brothers for their courage, their progressive attitudes, their contributions to American shipping and their willingness to put their faith and their fortune on the line on the future of the American merchant marine.

Another factor of special note on this occation is the careful and appropriation selection of our lovely sponsor.

The christening and the launching of a ship is a ceremony of deep significance, and the picking of a sponsor is a serious responsibility. In the selection of Mrs. Herbert C. Bonner to perform the honors for the SS *James Lykes*, the selection is an affirmation of basic American justice, for this great ship and the other great ships poised on the ways of shipyards throughout our land have been built because the Honorable Congressman HERBERT C. BONNER, of North Carolina, as chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, has worked and achieved, and inspired his colleagues to work and achieve, to assure that there shall be an American merchant marine, composed of the best equipped, safest, and most suitable types of vessels, constructed in the United States, and manned by Americans to serve our present and our future trade, commerce, and defense.

Mrs. Bonner, we have been with you on many occasions of note to American shipping but none more significant than the one in which we are today participating. This launching marks a most important step in Lykes Brothers Steamship Co.'s agreement with the people of the United States that calls for the construction of more than a half billion dollars worth of new ships over the next dozen years.

Your ship, Mrs. Bonner, expresses our faith in the future of American shipping.

Your ship redeems in part a 20-year agreement between Lykes Brothers Steamship Co. and the Government of the United States to assure six services on five essential U.S. foreign trade routes from U.S. ports in the Gulf of Mexico.

Your ship is evidence in steel of our resolve to remove the shadow of the phantom of block obsolesence that in past years has darkened the outlook for the American merchant marine.

Your ship means employment and benefits for people everywhere. It is a demonstration that we seek trade and not conquest, that the aim of our Nation is the mutually profitable commerce between people of good will everywhere which enhances the general welfare of our free world.

The Ingalls Shipbuilding Corp. has built yourship with strength and beauty, a tribute to the arts and crafts and skills of the growing industry of this great gulf area.

May your ship ever sail in peace and prosperity.

America's University Professors Give Selflessly of Their Time and Energies for a Better Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the university professors of America and our country's other teachers are some of the greatest philanthropists in the world.

These dedicated people give generously of their time and energies to prepare our young people not only to meet, but to improve conditions in our world. The 40-hour week is an unknown quantity to teachers. They perform a labor of love at a job which is never done. For this they are paid less than some unskilled workers receive.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by George W. Albee, chairman of the department of psychology at Western Reserve University and for the past 3 years also Director of the Task Force on Manpower of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, published in the Progressive magazine for September 1959 under the title "The Greatest Philanthropist."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST PHILANTHROPIST

(By George W. Albee)

Within a relatively few years our American system of higher education will have crumbled and disintegrated completely. As is so often the case with destruction from erosion, the ultimate appearance of a desert usually indicates that the destructive process has reached a state that it almost irreversible.

It seems fitting, therefore, at this time to pay a moment's tribute to a worthy hero. Unsung, unheralded—on the contrary, vilified, insulted, and harassed—there is one among us whose philanthropic financial contribution to the youth of our Nation has far exceeded the contribution of any other.

I speak, of course, of the American college professor.

How much does this philanthropist contribute each year to higher education? Let us see.

According to the President's Commission on Education Beyond the High School, college faculty salaries should be, on the average, 80 percent higher than at present to bring them up to a level comparable to their

pre-World War II value. (Let us forget for the moment that college professors were underpaid before World War II.) In order to avoid any possible criticism that our figures are inflated, let us deal only with full-time faculty members in degree-granting institutions. The median salary of faculty members is approximately $5,300 for the academic year. A conservative estimate of the number of full-time faculty members in the country is 200,000. If these teachers are working for salaries that ought to be raised 80 percent, they are contributing more than $800 million a year to higher education.

This is real philanthropy. It makes the contribution of other groups seem paltry indeed. According to the President's Committee, the amount contributed by business and industry both to educational institutions and to student assistance programs in 1957 totaled approximately $110 million. It will not escape the reader that the college professor is giving more than four times as much as business, industry, and alumni combined.

I should pause at this point to allow editorial writers across the country time to dry their tears of gratitude and take up their pens for the purpose of righting the record. Somehow the fiction has gained currency in the minds of the public that our colleges and universities are largely supported by generous gifts from industry and alumni. The fact that less than 7 percent of all current income of colleges and universities comes from private gifts and grants, and that endowment earnings add only another 4 percent to current income, may come as a surprise.

For those who find some fault with this line of reasoning, I am prepared to offer alternatives. Beardsley Ruml, who as a businessman and former Federal Reserve Bank Chairman hardly qualifies as a radical, has suggested, in all seriousness, that the average salary of the professor in the liberal arts college should be $15,000 a year and that top salaries of $30,000 should not be so infrequent as to evoke any surprise. The reader inclined to multiplication will find these figures bring current contributions of the college professor to higher education to roughly $2 billion a year.

A few hardheaded realists will argue at this point that one of Ruml's conditions was an increase in the ratio of students to faculty in order that these improved salaries might be more easily supported. He argues that there should be 20 students in our colleges for each faculty member, and he guesses that there are at present only 10. This argument would be more convincing were it not for the fact that somehow the Soviet Union manages to pay its college professors top salaries while maintaining a student-to-faculty ratio variously estimated at somewhere between 10 to 1 and 12 to 1.

The Russian professor is paid eight times the salary of the average Soviet factory worker. The American college professor averages approximately 33 percent more income than the American factory worker to show for his 10 extra years of expensive education. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, the annual income for all full-time American workers over 14 years of age was $3,800 in 1955. If the American professor were paid eight times this figure he would reach the $30,000 bracket that Ruml found himself thinking about as equitable. The difference between what the American college professor is earning and should be earning, according to this yardstick, comes close to $5 billion a year.

Philanthropy, anyone?

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce—Major Legislative Accomplishments, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, 79th Congress, and House Resolution 56, as amended, 86th Congress, I should like to submit a statement of the major legislative accomplishments of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Over 545 bills and resolutions were referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. Of these, 20 bills and 2 joint resolutions were reported to the House. As of this date, 14 have been enacted into public law, 3 have been approved by the House but not yet considered by the Senate, and 1 remained on the House Calendar upon adjournment of the first session.

The first bill of major importance which the committee considered and approved—H.R. 5610—provided increased railroad retirement benefits and placed on a sound self-supporting basis the railroad retirement and unemployment insurance systems. This was accomplished by eliminating the present long-range actuarial deficit in the railroad retirement system; by eliminating certain inequitable features of each system; by extending unemployment benefits; and by providing for the financing of the increases, changes, and extensions. The legislation was approved by the President on May 19 and became Public Law 86–28.

In the closing days of the 85th Congress, a bill which proposed to continue the Federal Airport Act at an increased level of $100 million a year through fiscal year 1963 failed to receive the President's approval. Accordingly, early this year the committee held further public hearings on the subject and reported H.R. 1011 to the House, which authorized Federal aid to airports totaling $297 million, to become available over a 4-year period, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960.

The Senate bill—S. 1—provided a total of $465 million over the same period of time. It passed the Senate on February 6, and on March 2 the committee reported H.R. 1011 to the House. Subsequently, the House passed S. 1, amended to include the amended language of H.R. 1011. The Senate bill went to conference, and after considerable deliberation the conferees were unable to reach agreement. New language was then incorporated in S. 1 to simply extend the provisions of present law—$63 million for 2 years—without any substantial changes, except to recognize the statehood of Alaska. The Senate bill, so amended, was agreed to by the House and signed by the President on June 29—Public Law 86–72.

A further amendment to the Federal Airport Act to make Alaska and Hawaii eligible to receive allocations from the discretionary fund—S. 2208—has passed the House and Senate.

A bill granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of airport facilities—S. 2183—cleared both Houses and received Presidential approval on August 11—Public Law 86–154.

At the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation and Aeronautics—Mr. WILLIAMS, of Mississippi—introduced a bill to authorize free or reduced rate air transportation for certain additional persons. The amendment to section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act would expressly permit such transportation for retired airline personnel; the parents of employees and retired employees; and members of the immediate family of persons injured or killed in an aircraft accident for travel in connection with the accident.

The proposed legislation is permissive. It would permit appropriate carrier action subject to Board control. The bill passed the House and it is presently pending before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Legislation was also approved to amend the Federal Aviation Act so as to permit the recording of security interests in specified aircraft propellers, as well as in aircraft engines. The purpose of the legislation is to facilitate the leasing or separate financing of propellers and aircraft engines needed to modernize the Nation's civil aircraft fleet. The bill—S. 1368—became Public Law 86–81 on July 8.

Another bill, introduced at the request of the Civil Aeronautics Board—H.R. 7112—authorizes the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency to use certified mail for service of notices, processes, orders, rules, and regulations. The legislation is permissive in nature. It was approved by the President on August 25—Public Law 86–199.

The committee reported a bill to preserve the historic Sully mansion buildings near Chantilly, Va., on property now being developed for a second Washington airport. This measure was signed by the President and is now Public Law 86–220.

As a result of a Federal Communications Commission interpretative opinion to the effect that the appearance by a legally qualified candidate in a newscast must be considered use of a broadcasting station within the meaning of section 315 of the Federal Communications Act, and that other legally qualified candidates for the same office must, therefore, be granted equal time, a bill was introduced—H.R. 7985—to provide

certain exemptions from the equal time requirement of the Communications Act.

A similar bill passed the Senate on July 28. On August 18 the House amended the Senate bill to include the language of H.R. 7985, as amended, by the committee. A conference committee met to resolve the differences between the House and Senate proposals. The conferees agreed on a compromise bill and the Congress approved the amendment. It is now on the President's desk at the White House.

Amendment to the Federal Trade Commission Act, authorizing resale price maintenance—fair trade—received further consideration of the committee this year. The primary purpose of the bill—H.R. 1253—is to enact a Federal fair trade law to protect the small individual businessman from unrestrained competition and retaliatory price cutting of larger retail establishments and discount houses which have been flourishing as a result of the breakdown of State resale price maintenance laws.

After extensive public hearings and executive consideration, the committee on June 9, reported the amended bill to the House. The Rules Committee held one public hearing on the granting of a rule and it is anticipated that the proposed legislation will be the subject of further hearings by that committee.

In the field of public health, H.R. 6325, providing for a 5-year extension of traineeship programs for public health personnel and professional nurses, was enacted—Public Law 86-105. These programs were authorized by titles I and II of the Public Law 911 of the 84th Congress, which expires June 30 of this year.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recommended legislation to strengthen the Commissioned Corps of the U.S. Public Health Service by providing for improved retirement benefits for members of the Regular Corps and the Active Reserve Corps. H.R. 6324 and a companion measure, S. 2220, were introduced as requested. The Senate bill has already passed that body and has also been approved by this committee and reported to the House.

Under the provisions of S. 56, the Surgeon General was authorized to construct, improve, extend, or otherwise provide and maintain essential Indian sanitation facilities—Public Law 86-121.

A 4-year extension of the Air Pollution Control Act was approved by both Houses. The present law expires on June 30, 1960. The extension continues the authority of the Surgeon General and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a program of research and technical assistance relating to air pollution.

Another measure dealing with the air pollution problem directs the Surgeon General to conduct a 2-year study of the effects on human health of substances discharged into the atmosphere by the exhausts of motor vehicles. This proposal—H.R. 8238—has already passed the House. It is now before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Early in the session the Federal Food and Drug Act was amended by the enactment of S. 79—Public Law 86-2—to permit the temporary listing and certification of citrus red No. 2 for coloring mature oranges. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has already recommended general legislation for the listing and certification for food color additives, and it is the intention of the committee as soon as feasible to study these suggested amendments to the Food and Drug Act.

Legislation was introduced to establish reasonable safety standards for passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government. The committee expects that if certain known safety features are provided on Government vehicles it will hasten the day when such safety features become standard equipment on all passenger-carrying motor vehicles offered for sale to the public. The bill, H.R. 1341, passed the House on August 26.

Congressional consent was given to the extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was entered into originally in 1935. Under the compact, the several oil-producing States are better able to effect conservation of this important natural resource, prevent its waste, and give aid to the petroleum industry in its effort to achieve a relatively stable situation. The joint resolution—House Joint Resolution 280—was approved August 7 and is now Public Law 86-143.

A bill to provide for equal treatment of all State-owned hydroelectric power projects with respect to the taking over of such projects by the United States—S. 114—was enacted—Public Law 86-124. This act repeals an exception contained in Public Law 278 of the 83d Congress, which expressly stated that "the provisions of section 14 and section 4(b)—of the Federal Power Act—shall continue to be applicable to any license issued for a hydroelectric development in the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence River." This legislation will enable the Power Authority of the State of New York, as the licensee of the St. Lawrence project, to come within the general language of the law exempting all State and municipal licensees from the recapture and original cost provisions in sections 4(b) and 14 of the Federal Power Act.

In addition to the important legislative proposals reported from the committee, which are summarized above, public hearings by the four standing subcommittees were held on such diversified subjects as freight-car shortages; amendments to various securities acts; serving alcoholic beverages on airplanes in flight; regulation of D.C. Transit; amendments to War Claims and Trading With the Enemy Acts; providing reimbursement for damage to the Ryan-Hemet Airport, Calif.; the Public Health Training Act of 1959; motor vehicle safety, and educational television.

In the closing days of the first session, H.R. 4815, to more effectively regulate D.C. Transit; and H.R. 6462, to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act re successor organizations, were ordered reported from the committee. An interim report on D.C. Transit was filed in the House on September 12—House Report No. 1185.

An investigation of the very complex problem of the allocation of the radio spectrum was begun by the Subcommittee on Communications and Power. This study will continue, and further consideration will be given to the other subjects mentioned above in the next session of the 86th Congress.

Senator Symington Opposes the Administration's Tight Money Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a press release containing excerpts of a speech made by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] before a large group of Democrats in Nashville on last Thursday night.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYMINGTON HITS ADMINISTRATION'S TIGHT MONEY POLICIES

NASHVILLE, TENN., September 10.—Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, said today that "the administration's tight money policy has increased the tax burden and slowed down desirable growth in the economy."

In a speech prepared for delivery before a statewide Democratic dinner here, the Missouri Senator stated:

"Right now there are two big strikes in this country. In the steel industry, workers are on strike. The administration refuses to help settle that strike.

"In the money market, capital is on strike. This strike the administration is eager to help settle by increasing interest rates on Government bonds.

"The cost of this settlement will be paid by you and me, as taxpayers.

"We have already paid $10 billion more in Government interest than we would have paid had interest on our debt stayed at the level of 1952. But the Republicans want us to pay still more.

"The fiscal mismanagement of this administration is responsible for most of this increased tax burden. Moreover, by pushing up the cost of borrowing, this policy has raised costs for all businesses, and dealt especially severely with small- and medium-size enterprises."

SYMINGTON also said that in the present session of the Congress "the Republican Party has returned to its historic mission of retrenchment, obstruction, and delay."

"They would appear to be happy in their knowledge that, with control of more than one-third of the Congress, plus the power of the Presidential veto, they can hold up progress for all the people in favor of privilege for the few. They can hold up the investments America should make, and must make, if we are to insure prosperity for our ever-growing population."

Senator SYMINGTON cited as an example the fact that the "Republicans in Congress voted almost to a man against any TVA financing plan which did not deliver control of the revenue bond program into the hands of the Bureau of the Budget—an agency not known as TVA's greatest friend."

Passage of a self-financing bill without such a provision, SYMINGTON said, "was a magnificent tribute to the representation in Congress from this section who have dedicated so much of their time to defend the principle and practice of TVA against Republican attack."

State Investigation of Chemical Corn-New York Trust Merger Called For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release issued by me on Monday, September 14, 1959, calling for investigation by the State Attorney General of the Chemical Corn-New York Trust merger:

Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, today described the action of G. Russell Clark, State of New York superintendent of banks, in approving the merger of the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank and the New York Trust Co. as "profoundly disturbing" and "in shocking derogation of the public interest." He called for an immediate investigation of the merger by the State attorney general under the Donnelly Act, the New York State antitrust law.

In a five-page letter to Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Representative CELLER reviewed the merger approval action in light of a recent finding by the Antitrust Division of the U.S. Department of Justice that the merger falls within the precise language of the Clayton Act, in that its effect "may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly." Criticizing the manner in which the decision was made, Mr. CELLER said: "A $4 billion merger of banking facilities is authorized as being in the public interest, not only in total disregard of an authoritative warning as to its effect upon competition and antitrust policies, but also without even a semblance of a public hearing."

The Clark ruling, Representative CELLER declared, disregards "the considered conclusion of the Nation's highest antitrust enforcement officer," and also "discloses such fundamental errors in applying the standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act as to raise a serious question of the superintendent's good faith."

In his letter, Representative CELLER charged that Mr. Clark's holding is characterized by a "startling misinterpretation" of the recent Bethlehem Steel decision, the leading decision construing section 7 as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. After enumerating similarities between the effects of the proposed bank merger and those of the steel company merger disapproved in the Bethlehem case, Mr. CELLER stated that the ruling "casts grave doubt upon the ability of the banking superintendent to exercise the duties of his office impartially and objectively in the public interest."

Mr. CELLER urged that, should investigation reveal that the merger runs afoul of the Donnelly Act, prosecution should promptly be instituted by the State attorney general to set the transaction aside.

The text of Mr. CELLER's letter is as follows:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1959.

The Honorable NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of the State of New York,
Executive Mansion,
Albany, N.Y.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: The action of Mr. G. Russell Clark, superintendent of banks of the State of New York, in approving the proposed merger between the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank and the New York Trust Co. is profoundly disturbing. As you know, the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has studied the effects of this proposed merger and has concluded that, in the language of the Clayton Act, its effect "may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly." Coming as it does on the heels of the recent Morgan-Guaranty Trust merger, this new combination brings together two more giant banks into another supergiant, greatly accelerates the trend toward concentration of the banking business, and undermines the very foundations of free enterprise competition.

The manner in which Mr. Clark reached this decision is no less unfortunate than the potential economic effects of the ruling. A $4 billion merger of banking facilities is authorized as being in the public interest, not only in total disregard of an authoritative warning as to its effect upon competition and antitrust policies, but also without even the semblance of a public hearing.

These factors combine to render Mr. Clark's action in shocking derogation of the public interest. Let me particularize. On June 8, Mr. Clark wrote to me that he had not consulted the Antitrust Division with respect to the merger in question and had decided "not to seek the Justice Department's written views as to antitrust questions arising under existing Federal laws," but would give careful consideration to such views if submitted. On August 19, I sent to you and to Mr. Clark a copy of a letter I had received from the Justice Department's Antitrust Division stating that the Division had studied the competitive consequences of this transaction and had concluded that "it may substantially lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly." Thus in the Justice Department's opinion this merger ran afoul of the standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act. Nevertheless, the New York banking superintendent has seen fit to disregard the considered conclusion of the Nation's highest antitrust enforcement officer.

Furthermore, the Clark statement justifying the merger discloses such fundamental errors in applying the standards of section 7 of the Clayton Act as to raise a serious question of the Superintendent's good faith in this matter. For one thing, the opinion is characterized by a rather startling misinterpretation of the case of the *United States* v. *Bethlehem Steel Company*, the leading decision construing section 7 of the Clayton Act as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950.

As an example, the Clark statement fails to mention that the degree of concentration among New York City banks is similar to that which in the steel industry was an important factor in the Court holding the Bethlehem-Youngstown merger illegal. According to the Clark statement, the 4 largest banks in New York City would control, after the merger, 62.2 percent of all commercial bank assets in the city; the 2 largest, 44.2 percent; and the 10 largest banks in New York City, 93.1 percent. I would point out that this degree of concentration is strikingly analogous to that in the Bethlehem case where the 6 largest integrated steel companies had approximately 68 percent of ingot capacity; the 2 largest approximately 45 percent; and the 12 largest about 93 percent.

It is equally significant that the Clark statement in its analysis of the bank merger neglected to consider that phase of the Bethlehem Steel case concerned with the appropriate lines of commerce. More specifically, Mr. Clark did not consider all the lines of commerce and sections of the country in which the Bethlehem merger was held to violate section 7. In the Bethlehem Steel case there were 12 separate lines of commerce within which the effects of the acquisition were found to be in violation of the statute, 8 of them in the United States and 4 more limited sections of the country. The following table sets forth some of these lines of commerce together with the market shares, separately and combined, of the merging companies:

Line of commerce	Area of the country	Bethlehem	Youngstown	Combination
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Iron and steel industry	Michigan	11.8	3.1	14.9
	Ohio	5.2	9.4	14.6
	Michigan and Ohio	9.1	5.7	14.8
	Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and New York	17.3	4.4	21.7
	Northeast quadrant	14.8	5.5	20.3
	United States	14.4	4.9	19.3
Seamless pipe	do	4.1	8.0	12.1
Electricweld pipe	do	1.3	6.9	8.2
Cold-rolled sheets	Michigan and Ohio	8.8	6.0	14.8
	Michigan	11.7	2.7	14.4
	Ohio	3.9	11.3	15.2

In each of the above-listed lines of commerce the combination of the two companies' market shares was held to be violative of the statute.

You will note that in the following lines of commerce involved in the Chemical Corn-New York Trust merger, as Mr. Clark himself found, market shares are combined to a degree that parallel those upon which a violation of section 7 of the Clayton Act was predicated in the Bethlehem case. This is shown by the following table:

Line of commerce	Area of country	Chemical Corn	New York Trust	Combination
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Voluntary and court trust	New York City	4.5	4.0	8.5
—the total share of the 9 largest trust companies would be increased from 86.9 to 90.9 percent.				
Agency and custody accounts	New York City	6.5	6.0	12.5
—the total share of the 8 largest city trust companies would rise from 70.1 to 83 percent.				

Line of commerce	Area of country	Chemical Corn	New York Trust	Combination
		Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Trustee for bond issues	New York City	5.0	5.2	10.2
—the share (based on the number of bond issues) held by the 7 largest New York City banks would rise from 81 to 86 percent.				
Stock transfer agents	New York City	6.9	3.7	10.6
—the share held by the 7 largest banks in the city would rise from 80.5 to 84.2 percent.				
Registrar accounts	New York City	6.1	4.2	10.3
Dividends disbursing agents	do	8.5	4.2	12.7
—the share of the market served by the 5 largest city trust companies would rise from 66.4 to 70.6 percent.				

Beyond that, the Clark opinion gave no weight to the legal significance of prior acquisitions by the merging banks. The Court in the Bethlehem decision by contrast emphasized the importance of the prior acquisition history in determining the legality of a proposed merger. It is interesting to note that 26 percent of Bethlehem's growth and 20 percent of Youngstown's growth had resulted from acquisitions. According to Mr. Clark's statement nearly 55 percent of Chemical's asset growth since 1935 has been contributed directly by mergers.

In the Bethlehem case the Court gave careful consideration to the increase in concentration in an existing oligopoly framework, stating that "tend to create a monopoly" clearly includes aggravation of an existing oligopoly situation. In the banking field a similar oligopoly situation has come about by means of a long series of bank mergers in New York City. However, Mr. Clark apparently regarded this history of mergers as of little or no relevance despite the fact that, as the congressional committee reports make clear, one of the primary reasons for congressional enactment of the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950 was to curb the increase in concentration and lessening of competition due to a trend of merger activity.

More than that, in considering the effects of this merger in the banking field, Mr. Clark failed to consider that there have been no new entrants in this field in New York City in recent years and that such entrants appear unlikely in the future. This factor was considered by Judge Weinfeld in the Bethlehem case to be of particular importance since it means that the competition lost by reason of the merger will not be supplied by any new entrant in the field.

Another basic error in the Clark opinion is that it considers banking competition only as it relates to all New York City banks and neglects to mention the very substantial competition between Chemical Corn and New York Trust which will be eliminated by this merger. Based on data which is readily available, there can be no doubt that such preexisting competition represents a most substantial amount of business.

These considerations cast grave doubt upon the ability of the banking superintendent to exercice the duties of his office impartially and objectively in the public interest. They also underscore the need for further action to undo the grevious error made by the superintendent in approving the Chemical Corn-New York Trust merger.

In all the circumstances it would seem essential that you, as the chief executive of the State, instruct the State attorney general to institute immediate investigation to determine whether this merger constitutes a violation of the State antitrust law, i.e., the Donnelly Act. Should such investigation indicate that the transaction runs afoul of this statute, the public interest would require that prosecution be instituted by the State attorney general at the earliest possible date to set aside this merger.

The people of New York State have the right to expect that their Governor be constantly and alertly sensitive to the compelling public need for maintaining a competitive system of banking in the State. I am sure that they will await your further actions in this matter with the greatest degree of interest.

Sincerely yours,

EMANUEL CELLER, *Chairman.*

Khrushchev's Visit to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is now too late to prevent Khrushchev's visit to the United States. The invitation has been made; it has been accepted. Khrushchev will be in the United States within a few weeks. He will see America and Americans for the first time. We have no other alternative now but to make the best of his visit. We must, therefore, maintain our dignity as a people during his visit. In a sense Khrushchev will be as a guest in our house; and though we all may be revolted by what he stands for, still propriety—indeed the honor of our Nation—requires a courteous reception.

I have never objected to exchange visits as such. Much can be gained by a mutual exchange of visits, for example, between American and Soviet scientists, technicians, and agricultural specialists. But I question the wisdom of inviting Khrushchev and indeed have many misgivings about his coming here. For this reason I want to inject a word of caution.

It is tempting, I know, for many Americans, who are by nature prone to view the world through the prism of rosy optimism, to expect that Khrushchev's visit together with bilateral negotiations with President Eisenhower can dissolve the problems plaguing Soviet-American relations. Possibly the press may inadvertently give the impression in the weeks to come that Khrushchev and the President can themselves set things right where others have failed. The fact that Khrushchev, as supreme ruler of the U.S.S.R., has the power to dissolve these differences, should he wish, and the fact that President Eisenhower heads the Nation which in turn heads the anti-Soviet coalition may well lend some credibility to this view.

But, it is a dangerous misconception of international relations, I believe, to assume that the visit of the leader of one state to another can solve deep and fundamental differences. To be sure, the differences that loom so large in Soviet-American relations are partly psychological and emotional. And, I do not doubt that a visit can act as a corrective to some of the misconceptions Khrushchev may have of the United States. But such a visit can only affect the general climate of relations. It may correct distorted images of the United States; but it cannot solve the great and overriding political problems. For the basic differences between Russia and the United States are political by nature. Only by political agreements that reflect realistically the power relationships between both states can these differences be totally eradicated. It is naive to expect that a visit by Khrushchev can result in such political agreements. If history can be our guide, it is reasonable to expect that only after the Communist regime in the U.S.S.R. has been replaced by a regime that is not dedicated to the subversion and overthrow of free governments will it be possible to dissolve political differences now dividing East and West.

This raises another serious implication of the Khrushchev visit. Whether intended or not, private talks between the President and the Soviet Premier can give the impression abroad of bilateral negotiations. Even to convey this this impression could, if widely accepted, dangerously weaken the Western aliance. I do not believe that it is a workable procedure for the President to act as an agent for the Western allies in such a negotiation, even if acceptable to the allies under certain conditions. Suspicions are bound to arise within the allied camp that could widen the fissures that already exist. Such an arrangement rests upon two assumptions: First, that the interests of all nations in the Western coalition are unitary; and second, that the United States can in fact negotiate objectively and disinterestedly for other powers when the vital interests of those powers are at stake. Recent negotiations in the Berlin crisis brought to light the wide range of differences within the allied camp on the very problems that would likely be on the agenda for an Eisenhower-Khrushchev conference. Moreover, it would be exceedingly difficult, indeed almost impossible, for the United States to negotiate a settlement of the German problem and satisfy the disparate interests of, let us say, both Britain and West Germany. Indeed, it would be imposing too much of a burden upon the United States. This would be particularly true in a situation where American interests may conflict with those of its Allies. Nations often act with the highest motives, but more often their actions and motives are related directly to their vital interests and are rationalized and moralized accordingly. It would be inconceivable that, in a given situation, during negotiations with the Russians, the United States would act contrary to its interests while attempting to oblige one of its allies.

Serious observers of the current international scene have long contended that one of Russia's primary objectives is to divide the Western coalition and destroy

NATO. For the past few years, Khrushchev stated very pointedly that the way to settle world problems was for the United States and Soviet Russia to confer bilaterally. As recently as the Vice President's trip to Moscow, Khrushchev repeated the same assertion. No doubt, when Khrushchev arrives in Washington he will do his utmost to create the impression for the benefit of world opinion that bilateral negotiations can be an effective device for insuring world peace. It is gratifying that the President is giving personal assurances to the allies of American intentions. But this shall not deflect Khrushchev, and there is no doubt that in the coming weeks Mr. Eisenhower's statesmanship will be put to a supreme test.

In addition to these two points I have discussed—that is, first, the doubtful effects of a visit in solving outstanding political problems, and second, the danger of bilateral negotiations—there is a third point, and that is the adverse effect a visit by Khrushchev may have on world opinion. Here, actually, I have two points in mind. First, there can be little doubt that the morale of the resistance movements behind the Iron Curtain will be severely shaken by press reports and pictures of Khrushchev visiting Washington, which in the mind of the anti-Communist Eastern European has been a symbol of world democracy and freedom. It will be difficult, I am sure, for many Eastern Europeans to reconcile this public demonstration of acceptance of a man who was responsible for crushing the Hungarian revolution and destroying freedom and democracy in Eastern Europe, with claims by the United States that it will not acquiesce in Soviet insistence on Western acceptance of the status quo in Eastern Europe. It seems to me that in this instance we cannot have our cake and eat it too. It is arguable that Khrushchev's visit here may well convey the impression that we are writing off Eastern Europe. In which case, the captive peoples, having no other alternative, may well acquiesce in permanent Communist control. What has heretofore been passive acceptance of Communist rule will now be total acceptance, and thus we will have lost a vital and vigorous force for freedom. Henceforth, at best the Communists could probably rely on the loyalties of the captive peoples; at the very least, they would be relieved of a serious problem of control.

The second point I wish to make is the effect the Khrushchev visit may well have on world opinion. Whether intended or not, the Eisenhower-Khruschev conference will convey the impression that great decisions are impending—decisions that will ease international tensions and insure world peace. Whether the visit will yield such grandiose results is high questionable. But, the hopes of humanity cannot be suppressed sometimes even in the face of hard reality. Should world opinion be inordinately optimistic about the results of the visit, no doubt, disillusionment on a grand scale will set in when the tallies are finally added up. Soviet Russia may well receive many assets in propaganda, while the United States, lacking the facility, as most democracies do, for cynical, tactical maneuver, may well incur serious liabilities. This happened after the Geneva summit conference in 1955; it can happen again. Summitry, to be successful, requires a symmetry of intentions and obligations. So far, the Russians have not obliged, and it is doubtful whether they ever will.

In setting forth these ideas, it is not my intention to be a doleful pessimist, and I hope that what I have said will not be taken in that spirit. My principal concern is that the American people will look at the impending visit of Khrushchev realistically and with thoughtful judgment. It is not prudent to allow one's expectations to rise too high in the coming weeks. Sober calculation ought to be our watchword, for reliance upon emotionalism is a poor substitute for sound, rational judgment: It can only lead to disillusionment when once the mists of emotionalism have been dispelled by the cold winds of reality.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article by Thurman Sensing which appeared recently in the Wheeling (W. Va.) News-Register.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) News Register, Aug. 11, 1959]

CONSEQUENCES OF CONSORTING WITH COMMUNISTS

(By Thurman Sensing)

Though it was undoubtedly motivated with the best sort of intentions and expectations, we must confess a considerable amount of revulsion with the invitation to the dictator of the Russians and the head of the Communists, Nikita Khrushchev, to visit this country as an honored guest of our Government.

While it would seem almost superflous, it is still in order to refresh our memories with some observations on communism and Communists.

The avowed purpose of communism is to overthrow the existing order in the world, to abolish private ownership of property and destroy freedom of the individual, to give the state complete control over the people and the people no control over the state, to make the individual simply a cog in a machine and a pawn to be moved at will. Such a philosophy is communism's only excuse for existence. Is there any reason to believe that anything will change it?

We know the threats and the boasts of this Communist leader that they can destroy us militarily, that they will "bury us" economically, that our grandchildren will live under a socialistic (he means communistic) form of government. Though whether these things come to pass is up to us and not up to the Communists, though they cannot happen unless we allow them to happen, still that is their firm belief and intention—and there is no reason to believe visits to this country will change it.

We know the past actions of the Communists. We know that they consider treaties as something with which to delude the opposition and something to be ignored and disregarded. We know that they talk out of both sides of the mouth at the same time, pouring water on a troubled spot at one end and setting a brush fire at the other. We know that theirs is a godless philosophy and that they recognize no Divine Being.

We know that Communist Russia financed the war against us in Korea (while remaining in the United Nations)—the only war this country ever lost, due to relinquishing our sovereignty over the war to the United Nations and to some timid leaders. We remember the butchery of the Hungarians when they again strove for some measure of freedom. We know that these same Russian Communists are the spiritual leaders of, and work hand in glove with, the Communist dictators of China, with all their crimes against humanity and especially including their recent ravishing of the old and honored nation of Tibet.

Can a visit to this country by this Communist leader and his subordinates change any of these things?

We also remember other times when our leaders sat down and talked in person with the Communist leaders at Teheran and Yalta and Potsdam—with terrible and irrevocable consequences. Of course, we don't have the same President now that we had then—not by any means—but these shadows will lie athwart this visit.

There is no question but that Mr. Khrushchev has been angling, both with threats and cajolery, for this visit for a long time. He knows it will give him prestige among his subjects back home and will offer him a wonderful soundingboard for propaganda. What else are the peoples of Asia and Africa and Central and South America and the islands of the sea to think than that we are now fraternizing with the Communists and receiving them as equals? Is that any way to preserve our standing in the world as the champions of freedom?

As more or less of a postscript, we notice Senator KEFAUVER has written the President a letter urging him by all means to have Mr. Khrushchev include a survey of the TVA in his tour of the United States. Well, if the thought is to make him feel at home, we should say that is a pretty good idea—because he will certainly find no free enterprise there! But what is Mr. Khrushchev himself to think when we parade the TVA before him with pride, than that we are already aping his philosophy of state ownership and state control—and that we are already on our way toward making his prophecy about our grandchildren come true?

We all want peace, yes, but must we obtain it at the expense of consorting with Communists and by the loss of our self-respect?

Why Is Khrushchev Coming?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article, "Why is Khrushchev Coming?" by William J. Conyngham, which appeared in the September 12 issue of America:

WHY IS KHRUSHCHEV COMING?

(By William J. Conyngham)

In the jagged and sometimes incomprehensible line of East-West relations since the death of Stalin, there is surely no more remarkable indication of the drift of events than the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange.

Nothing more clearly illustrates the momentous changes in popular and official opinion than the fact that—3 years after the Hungarian bloodbath—its perpetrator is invited to the Nation which, in 1953, said the liberation of Eastern Europe was a basic element of its foreign policy.

The causes of this phenomenon are unquestionably complex; but, in one of its dimensions at least, it points up the deep and continuing struggle for a peace which is equated with survival. Related to this, of course, is the sharp impact on public opinion of the new Soviet power revealed by sputnik. Fear of Communist imperialism, which was the core tension of the early years of the cold war, has been gradually replaced by a fear of Soviet national power.

There is a naive confusion at work in those who see in the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange a hope for fundamental rapprochement between the two systems. The tendency here is to see the Soviet Union as simply another nation-state, conducting its policy solely under the conditions and objectives of the Western family of nations. It assumes that the Soviet Union has essentially limited goals, which offer opportunities for negotiation, compromise and settlement within commonly assumed outer limits. The dual nature of the Soviet complex and, by extension, the Communist camp is conveniently ignored, and the role of ideology in the formation of the ends and means of Soviet policy is dismissed from the calculation.

It seems necessary to restate, in view of the Khrushchev visit, that the Soviet pursuit of world domination and a radical transformation of human society not only precludes a peace based upon commonly existing norms of justice, but substitutes for it a condition of struggle, by various means and at various levels of intensity, for as long as the two worlds are in existence.

There is the widely held belief that Khrushchev has been misinformed about the nature of the American class structure and the capabilities of our armed power. That he has very serious misconceptions of our society is undeniable, but they are notions which a rapid tour through a steel mill, powerplant, or cornfield will hardly touch. His ideas are not those of fact, certainly not those of private impression; they are in the order of moral and intellectual interpretation and stem directly from his commitment to the tenets of Marxism-Leninism.

The nature of that commitment has been described by recent visitors to the Soviet Union like Governor Harriman and Vice President NIXON. Khrushchev himself said last winter before the 21st party congress:

"We are united by the great teaching of Maxism-Leninism and by the struggle to put it in practice. We shall always preserve the purity of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. We shall fight against opportunists, against revisionists of all shades, and we shall be loyal to the working class. It is in this that we see our duty to the world Communist and workers' movement.

As a Communist, Khrushchev, of course, believes that all history develops in the conflict between those classes which own the means of production and those which do not. Further, he believes that since matter is the only reality and thus shapes all aspects of social existence, every social and political institution is drawn into the struggle on one side or the other. The American Government, he is certain, is merely an instrument of capitalism, using its monopoly of physical coercion to aid in the exploitation of the working class. In the class war, Khrushchev professes to see a series of contradictions or internal conflicts which carry the seeds of destruction for capitalistic society. The Soviet Premier has nullified in advance practically any impression that he might receive of the United States. This was evidenced last winter when he replied to those Marxist revisionists who held that capitalism had entered a new era, free of the crises of overproduction and mass unemployment. He said at that time:

"In postwar years there has been much talk in the United States and other capitalist countries about prosperity and the advent of a crisis-free epoch in capitalist development. But what is the real state of the postwar capitalist economy? In some 12 years the United States has had three critical production slumps—in 1948–49, 1953–54, and notably in 1957–58."

And Khrushchev continues:

"The continuous alternation of critical slumps and feverish uptrends speaks of the instability of the capitalist economy. Neither the arms race, nor any other measure, will ever rid the economy of the United States or the other capitalist countries of overproduction crises. Whatever the capitalist countries do, they will never eliminate the cause of crisis. Capitalism will never break the death grip of its own contradictions. They keep growing in size and scope, holding the threat of new economic upheavals. There is every evidence of a further deepening of the general crisis of capitalism in consequence of the radical shift in the balance of forces between the world socialist system and the world capitalist system, the disintegration of the colonial system and the exacerbation of social antagonism in the capitalist countries."

To hope that Khrushchev is open to spontaneous impression in the face of such an ideological formation is, to me at least, to presume that he is on the road to Damascus.

Khrushchev views the United States not only as an isolated national society, racked by conflict and internal decay, but also, according to Lenin's theory of imperialism, as an integral part of the world capitalist system and its mainstay.

Central to Khrushchev's purpose is visiting the United States is his grasp of the fact that the United States stands at the heart of the free-world system. And because it is a system, a functioning unit of integrated parts, Communist ideologists assert that the total power of the free world is not only being continuously reduced by national revolution in its weaker and remoter parts, but also that the power of the system can be materially reduced at its center, which—since the decline of Great Britain and France—is the United States. Thus, if the viability of the American economy weakens, the economies of those nations dependent on it will weaken to an even greater degree, and the total power of the system will be effectively lessened.

Of vital importance in the context of the Khrushchev visit is the ideological element which links Marx to Lenin. It was Lenin's thesis that capitalism achieved a measure of internal stability only through imperialism, militarism and the arms race. Without the aid of the cold war and of expenditures for defense, it is asserted, the American economy would be unable to escape the "contradiction" of overproduction and mass unemployment, thus aggravating the internal antagonists of the class struggle. In these terms, to achieve a unilateral reduction of arms would not only reduce America's capacity for military action, but would result in a further weakening of its social structure.

IN MR. K'S OWN WORDS

It should be pointed out that Marxism-Leninism is not only a way of understanding the meaning of the processes of history. It is also a method of changing it. The method itself is an integral part of the dialectical approach. Perhaps its most direct statement was expressed in the February 1959 issue of International Affairs, an English-language monthly published in Moscow. The classical principle of power politics—exploiting differences between allies to weaken them through division—was developed by the authors in this way:

"The Socialist foreign policy takes correct account of and utilizes the contradictions of the capitalist system. The most cynical example of the use of such tactics [divide and conquer] under contemporary conditions is the diplomacy of American imperialism, which attempts to sow discord and conflicts everywhere, to incite one people against another in order to divide and weaken the workingmasses, to enslave them to U.S. monopoly capital and to prepare for war."

The Communist leadership, on the other hand, uses the same tactics, but for different purposes:

"Socialist foreign policy makes use of such contradictions in order to consolidate peace, to prevent war not only between the Socialist and capitalist countries, but even between the capitalists states, to foil the aggressive designs of the imperialists, to systematically use the discord between them in order to consolidate peace and to secure an ally, "even through this ally," as Lenin said, "be temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable, and conditional."

"Ever since the Soviet state his existed its foreign policy has been supremely skillfull in making use of the contradictions of the imperialist camp for the benefit of the struggle for peace. This was demonstrated both between the two World Wars and during the Second World War."

The authors continue by listing the sources of conflict among the nations of the free world which it is the business of Soviet diplomacy to exploit.

"Since the war the contradictions between the capitalists have become considerably more acute. There are the contradictions between the big imperialist States and the smaller countries; between the United States, which aspires to world domination, and its NATO partners, who feel the pressure of American monopoly capital; between the imperialist States and the countries which have freed or are freeing themselves from colonial dependence; class antagonisms in each capitalist country; and also contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie itself between its aggressive elements and the more sober-minded businessmen who have an interest in extending economic contacts with the U.S.S.R. and the other Socialist countries."

The authors conclude:

"The correct use of these contradictions is one of the necessary conditions for success in the struggle for peace, for the creation of favorable foreign policy conditions for the all-out building of communism in the U.S.S.R. and the successful building of socialism in the people's democracies."

What, then, in view of the foregoing, are we to conclude as to the meaning of the Khrushchev visit? Rather baldly, Khrushchev's mission is meant to promote the basic objectives in the struggle between the two camps: one one hand, to increase the unity and power of the Communist world system; and, on the other, to weaken the cohesion and power of the West.

Let us examine a few of the contradictions which Khrushchev might hope to exploit. There is the matter of the "contradictions between the United States, which aspires to world domination, and its NATO partners, who feel the pressure of American monopoly capital." Possibly the single most important objective in the Soviet foreign policy has been to disrupt the Western alliance. To halt the rearmament of the West and the political and economic integration of Western Europe would be a major, perhaps decisive, victory in the conflict of the two

systems. And while Khrushchev could have little hope of getting a "Big Two" deal which would seriously weaken the Western defense by a withdrawal or heavy reduction in the American commitment, he might very well hope to stimulate the already potent conflicts of interest in the Western community.

SPEEDING UP THE U.S. DECAY

Khrushchev may well have in mind increasing the social antagonisms within the United States by alienating American public opinion from the antipopular foreign policy of its Government. He may stress the relaxation of tension through increased trade and cultural contact and the burdens and dangers of the arms race. By reiterating that the Soviet Union is interested only in competing with the free world in terms of standards of living and human betterment in general, Khrushchev may hope to increase popular pressure on Washington to decrease, if not eliminate, defense, foreign aid, and related expenditures.

The prospect of alienating public opinion from Government policy, however, is only part of the possible gain. There remains the possibility of exploiting "contradictions in the camp of the bourgeoisie itself, between its aggressive elements and the more sober-minded businessmen who have an interest in extending economic contacts with the U.S.S.R. and the other Socialist countries." Both Mikoyan and Kozlov have expressed interest in expanding trade relations. The Soviet Union is interested in securing credits to import heavy chemical equipment for its 7-year plan; its political effect would also be, over a time, to build a pressure group around the interests that would profit most from Soviet trade. In addition, it would weaken the U.S. embargo of strategic goods to the Soviet Union—which has been among the primary objectives of Soviet policy. To increase trade, therefore, not only strengthens the Communist camp economically, but also punches a few holes in the dike of containment.

There is little question that Khrushchev is convinced that victory over the West is historically inevitable, and that shifts in the world balance of power will increasingly favor the Communist bloc. The Bolsheviks, however, have never been conspicuously patient with history. Indeed, one of the chief characteristic of bolshevism has been its almost totall absorption with questions of power. To wage the struggle solely by methods short of war—political subversion, psychological warfare, or economic penetration—is to rely on methods which are uncertain and which require a high degree of instability in the target country.

It is, therefore, not inconceivable that part of the Khrushchev mission is to probe the will and the capacity of the American leadership, particularly of the President; to evaluate for himself whether the Western threat to wage nuclear war over Western Berlin is credible—he has to date remained adamant on his ultimatum—or to pursue some other, future objective, limited in itself and peripheral in a physical sense to American survival. If Khrushchev can secure a series of limited concessions through the threatened use of unlimited violence, then a fairly rapid advance can occur without his paying the price of nuclear war. As he undoubtedly is aware, rocket rattling has its uses.

In one sense, the visit of Khrushchev to the United States is an indication that the threat of massive retaliation seems more and more to lack credibility. And this, in turn, calls into question the permanence and stability of the nuclear stalemate which many have presumed to be a strategic factor in the East-West balance of power.

If, for example, Soviet technicians should develop an antibomber defense capability which would cut its losses to an acceptable level, then to threaten the use of force against force would be meaningless. Even in the contingency of full effectiveness, the balance of terror operates with varying pressures on different nations. The vital question, which many have asked, is whether the United States, vulnerable to nuclear devastation and unable to fight wars of restricted intensity, is prepared to suffer nuclear holocaust to prevent Communist encroachment in areas remote from immediate American interest. The stability of the nuclear stalemate and the political status quo have depended on the absolute effectiveness of the weapon and the certainty of its use. There is now some reason to question both.

It may be Khrushchev's task to find out how deeply the evidence of sputnik has modified our will to resist limited expansion. Or, in the language of the trade, to test the gap between military capability and political intention. Khrushchev will not (just as we cannot) identify the two as we did in the period of atomic monopoly.

The visit of Khrushchev, then, is nothing more or less than a weapon in that protracted struggle between East and West which will end, from the Communist point of view, only with the elimination of the free world. In this long struggle our best hope of avoiding both the evils of nuclear war and the triumph of communism lies in decreasing our vulnerability, increasing our capability and maintaining a firm intention to resist. If, as some would assure us, Khrushchev desires to gain time by reducing the intensity of that struggle, then we should be deeply grateful. For time may bring those changes that are necessary for human survival and that are undreamed of in the philosophy of Marxism-Leninism. Such a day is not yet with us, however; it would be the deepest folly to assume that it is. Moreover, such measures as the Eisenhower-Khrushchev exchange are not likely to bring it about.

Mrs. W. A. Whatley, of Sinton, Tex., Looks Back Over Her 77 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, time flies by so quickly that it is often difficult for us to recall just exactly what life was like 30, 40, or 60 years ago. An enlightening article appeared in the Corpus Christi Caller-Times of August 30, 1959, entitled, "I Remember: Mother of 10 Had 'Easy Life' in 1900's," in which Mrs. W. A. Whatley, of Sinton, Tex., looked back over her 77 years and recalled some of the experiences of her life.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Caller-Times, Aug. 30, 1959]

I REMEMBER: MOTHER OF 10 HAD "EASY LIFE" IN 1900's

(By Madeleine Greene)

SINTON.—Despite all our modern conventions, raising 10 children was a much easier task at the turn of the century than it is now, insists Mrs. W. W. Whatley.

"The reason is simple" she explained. "In 1902 a woman could be a mother full time while today she often tries to combine an outside job with her household chores."

After listening to Mrs. Whatley's description of life in the "old days," however, it is a moot point whether even the busiest of career mothers would agree with her.

As the wife of a farmer who owned land near Prairie Hill, her working day was a long, full one. The fact that each of the children was taught to do specific chores around the farm as they grew up lightened her load only slightly.

UP AT 4

"Rain or shine we were up at 4 every morning of the year," the mother of 11 said. "My husband thought that even if it was raining so hard you had to spend the day indoors you should get up at that hour for if you slept late even one day it would be too difficult to get up the next."

Breakfast out of the way, her husband in the fields, and the older children ready to start their 3½-mile hike to school by the time the sun rose, Mrs. Whatley was ready early in the day to to turn her attention to household tasks.

Preparing food for her large family took up much of the day. A large peach orchard and wild blackberries nearby kept the farmer's wife well stocked with new raw materials for canning.

"We canned our fruit in glass jars, and having no such thing as a Deepfreeze around in 1905 we stored them on shelves which lined the kitchen walls," she said.

OWN DAIRY

Milk from their own cows was poured into a cooler with a cloth around it and placed in the wind.

"We had no basement to use as a cooler, and the storm cellar was too small to store things in," she remembered.

In addition to milking the cows there was corn to be shucked and meal to be ground. The Whatleys grew almost all their food with the exception of the wheat from which to make flour for bread and pastries.

"I set aside Fridays for fancy baking," Mrs. Whatley recalled. "Using pure Jersey butter instead of shortening, I would make at least one big cake and a large supply of small 'tea cakes'—we didn't call them cookies in those days."

Washing and ironing for a family of 13 was another major operation. In the summer the clothes were washed in a pot of water set to boiling over an oak fire built outdoors. In the winter the fire was laid in the smoke house.

"I couldn't leave the little ones in the house alone while I scrubbed the clothes, so I lined a large box with an old quilt, put the children in it and carried them around with me in that," Mrs. Whatley said.

Ironing required five flat irons and sturdy walking muscles. "During the summer months my husband would keep a fire going behind an oak log, and when the wood had burned to charcoal, the irons were stood in the embers to heat."

She continued, "I alternated five irons, running from the house to the fire in the yard to trade a cold iron for a hot one every little while."

SOME PLAY

Life was not all work and no play for the Whatleys and their neighboring farm families. Sunday afternoon and evening were often spent at nearby homes singing and visiting.

All-day picnics were a holiday treat. "Oh the chickens I fried, the cakes I made for those outings," said Mrs. Whatley with a smile. "The only damper on the picnics were the flies which the children had to take

turns shooing away with limbs cut from the trees."

One of the most eagerly awaited events was the revival meeting held in brush arbor tabernacles. "We put the children on pallets on the floor while we listened to the preacher preach sermons that sometimes lasted an hour and a half."

Church activities took up much of the family's leisure time. Sunday morning services occasioned the rare trips to town the Whatleys made.

The first thing Mrs. Whatley did when they moved to their new farm near Sinton in 1923 was to join the church circle of the Methodist Church. Not long ago the circle was renamed in her honor.

Today, Mrs. Whatley, who celebrated her 77th birthday 2 weeks ago, is far from content to "just sit with my hands in my lap." The church continues to play an important role in her life.

Her still-nimble fingers are busy with needle and thread, making aprons which she has no trouble selling. And although she says with great emphasis "I am not a poet," the Sinton Evening News often publishes the verses she turns out.

Mrs. Whatley continues to do her own cooking—on a modern stove instead of the woodburning one from which she fed her growing family.

And she counts herself a fortunate woman for her children all live near enough to drop in during the week with her grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

The children are Walter W. Whatley and Mrs. Margaret Ellen Stanwood of Corpus Christi, C. C. Whatley of Robstown, C. W. Whatley of Banquete, Mrs. F. B. Hickman of Sinton, Mrs Pearl Wilson of Abilene, Mrs. F. E. Grupe of Mathis, A. A. Whatley of McAllen, Mrs. George Patterson of Taft, and James Leo Whatley of Gardendale, Calif.

Col. Loren W. Olmstead—St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. PILLION
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I could not permit this session of Congress to end without making this public acknowledgment of the extraordinarily fine public service that Col. Loren W. Olmstead rendered to the Buffalo area during his assignment as district engineer for the Buffalo district.

Colonel Olmstead served in Buffalo from August 1954 to July 1959. He is presently assigned to the Office of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army, in Washington, D.C.

During his stay in Buffalo, Colonel Olmstead compiled a most distinctive record of achievement. He earned the gratitude of the citizens of the Buffalo area for his kindness, patience, thoroughness, and his ability to get things done.

Colonel Olmstead was one of the main supporters of the development of Buffalo as a world seaport.

While stationed in Buffalo, Colonel Olmstead supervised and coordinated the successful completion of the American portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The large volume of traffic on the St. Lawrence Seaway justifies the hopes and expectations of those who actively participated in its authorization, planning and construction. This project is one of the world's great engineering and construction achievements. The U.S. Army Engineers are to be congratulated upon a tough job well done.

Colonel Olmstead deserves special mention because if any person can be singled out as the builder of the St. Lawrence Seaway it would be Colonel Olmstead.

During his short but productive stay in Buffalo, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers rendered substantial service to the port of Buffalo.

The relocation of the north channel is now under contract. This work was strongly opposed by many interests in Buffalo. Colonel Olmstead insisted upon this relocation of the channel in spite of strenuous opposition to the delay in the deepening of the Buffalo Harbor.

The model tests proved Colonel Olmstead to be right. By avoiding the deepening of the present channel which is in rock, the city of Buffalo will have a better, more safe, all-weather entrance. This relocation of the entrance will also save the U.S. Government between $8 and $12 million.

Plans for the Ohio Street Bridge have been processed and approved. An appropriation is contained in the 1960 budget.

The Niagara Falls redevelopment project was completed under the direction of Colonel Olmstead. This project was designed to perpetuate the beauty of Niagara Falls and to prevent continuing erosion.

Ellicott Creek was improved to eliminate recurring floods.

Smokes Creek was authorized and the planning completed under Colonel Olmstead's tour of duty in Buffalo.

The port of Buffalo is assured of a program of deepening that will allow utilization of the maximum depth of the St. Lawrence Seaway at the earliest practical time.

Colonel Olmstead was chosen 1958 Great Lakes Man of the Year in recognition of his distinguished service.

The Buffalo Evening News named Colonel Olmstead as one of the 10 outstanding citizens for 1958. Their citation of his accomplishments follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Jan. 3, 1959]

COL. LOREN W. OLMSTEAD

Although not a Buffalonian except through assignment here as head of the district office of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Colonel Olmstead has both endeared himself to the residents of the area with whom he has come in contact and has earned the city's gratitude as one of the best informed boosters of Buffalo as a world seaport.

As the man in charge of supervising construction of the American portion of the St. Lawrence Seaway, Colonel Olmstead succeeded brilliantly in holding the construction schedule to its rigorous timetable. After the seaway had been opened to limited operations last summer, he canceled previous plans and joined the Buffalo Evening News-sponsored seaway cruise as its guide, briefing passengers on what they would see en route and providing them with background which made the trip a significant success.

In diligently pressing the studies and engineering work looking to the deepening of Buffalo Harbor, and in supervising such projects as the remedial works at Niagara Falls, Colonel Olmstead has lived up to the finest traditions of the Corps of Engineers in all the work affecting the Buffalo district.

What makes him an honorary outstanding citizen, however, is the interest he has shown, beyond the call of duty, in alerting Buffalo's citizenry to the area's potential as a seaway port, and in keeping the public informed regarding its harbor requirements.

Colonel Olmstead's modesty, coupled with effective accomplishment, has earned for him the respect and gratitude of this community.

He is a credit to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The following is a summary report of the problems involved in the construction of this great project, the St. Lawrence Seaway:

One of the greatest facelifting jobs of all times is now completed—the St. Lawrence Seaway. Deep-draft vessels are now able to ply the waters of the St. Lawrence from the Atlantic Ocean into the lower Great Lakes. Massive structures were erected to harness the fast-flowing St. Lawrence for power and navigation purposes. Water elevators were constructed to literally carry ships from one level to another. Many islands were tied together making one large island and extensive excavations were dug to provide depths for future seaway traffic. Most concentrated portion of this work was between Ogdensburg, N.Y., and Montreal, Quebec. But all this was only made possible through the joint efforts of the United States and Canada. A billion-dollar improvement will soon become a fact. No attempt will be made in this article to discuss features of this gigantic undertaking in detail. Rather, it is desired to point out the role the Corps of Engineers played in this tremendous project.

Development of the St. Lawrence River was under consideration for over 100 years, but it was not until May 13, 1954, after long years of resolving the problems of legislation and finance, that it became a reality. On this date President Dwight D. Eisenhower affixed his signature to congressionally approved Public Law 358 creating the establishment of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. This agency was given the responsibility of constructing the U.S. portion of the seaway project consisting of two locks, extensive dredging and appurtenant works in that area known as the International Rapids section, between Ogdensburg and Massena, N.Y. The St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, the Canadian counterpart, was responsible for the construction of the navigation features in Canadian waters.

Development of the power features was undertaken by the Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, representing the United States and Canadian interests respectively.

On September 17, 1954, the Seaway Development Corporation appointed the

Corps of Engineers as their design and construction agents. Within a week the Buffalo district was directed by the Chief of Engineers to initiate work on this multimillion-dollar project. Recruitment of specialized technicians was begun immediately. Surveys and subsurbace explorations, together with the construction of models, were started promptly.

As rapidly as the field data was collected and compiled, structures were designed and engineering estimates were computed. On January 13, 1955, the Buffalo office was given the final decision on the size of the locks which are 800 feet long, 80 feet wide, with 30 feet depth over the sills. Twelve hundred and fifty-three days later the corps had completed for operation the principal segments of the U.S. portion of the seaway.

In the interim a myriad of problems arose and were resolved. Probably the greatest of these was time. What was originally scheduled as a 6-year program, then reduced to 4½, had been accelerated to 3½ years.

Close on the heels of time followed the contractors biggest nightmare, the excavation for the two locks—one in marine clay and the other in glacial till. Overburden at the site of the Bertrand H. Snell Lock consisted principally of marine clay. As one nationally known commentator put it:

> This purple chewing gum when dry was hard as rock. When wet, it resembled soupy mud.

Government specifications required that the foundations of each lock rest on bedrock. The problem was to remove millions of cubic yards of this material before actual lock construction commenced. The nature of the material was such that to excavate to the required depth, it was necessary to develop an area having a saucer-type appearance. Excavations were made on the basis of for every 1 foot dug vertically, a corresponding 2 to 10 feet of material was removed horizontally. At times the contractors' equipment chewing away at the clay appeared to be getting nowhere. In spite of these and many other perplexing problems the contractors met the nearly impossible construction schedule. Excavation for the Dwight D. Eisenhower lock was equally harassing. The overburden to be removed consisted of glacial till—when compacted it had the density of concrete. It consisted of fine gravel and boulders embedded in dense clay. This required the heaviest types of equipment for loosening and removal, and in some instances even had to be blasted prior to excavation. In addition to the excavation for the two locks, a 10-mile man-made canal, 450 feet wide, was dug through both types of material to carry ships around the power development. Over 39 million cubic yards of earth was removed. If this material was placed in 50-ton hopper cars, the train would extend nearly one-third the distance around the world.

While excavation of the two locks was underway near Massena, N.Y., engineers in Buffalo were working desperately to complete design features for lock construction. Plans and specifications for 51 major contracts were completed in a minimum of time. In this connection the Buffalo office solicited help from other districts in solving what might be called the third outstanding problem—that of hydraulics. The St. Paul District, at their St. Anthony Falls Hydraulic Laboratory, was requested to construct a model of the Eisenhower lock and conduct tests for the filling and emptying system that was installed in the lock. The corps' model makers at the Waterways Experiment Station in Vicksburg, Miss., were requested to construct a model of a section of the river in the South Cornwall area. Results of tests conducted on the Vicksburg model were used to develop methods to slow down the river velocity and eliminate crosscurrents. Such action would enable deep-draft vessels to safely navigate without loss of control. The corps' district in Buffalo was not alone in building the seaway. The Nashville district contributed materially in designing the machinery for the lock gates. Soil samples were transported to the laboratories of the north central division office in Chicago, Ill., for analyses and to the Ohio River division office in Cincinnati, Ohio. In the early part of the project the U.S. Lake Survey and the district office in Detroit, Mich., furnished men and equipment to assist in hydrographic surveys in the Messena area and Thousand Islands section, respectively. The Chicago district completed arrangements for the transfer of the giant dipper dredge *Paraiso* to the seaway site. In addition to the contributions made by the various district offices, the north central division office in Chicago, and the Chief of Engineers Office in Washington, D.C., was of inestimable value in the overall supervision of design and construction. It was because of the corps' extensive facilities and their ability to mobilize their resources that this project was accomplished in the unbelievably short time. It was a fine example of teamwork.

Any summarization of the corps' accomplishments on the seaway project would be incomplete without a brief mention of the aids to navigation that play such a prominent role to vessel operators. All during construction, navigation of the old canal remained uninterrupted. As improvements were made for the new channel it was imperative that ships transiting the St. Lawrence be able to find their way along new routes. The solution to this intricate problem was accomplished through the planning, programing, and construction of a comprehensive system of navigation aids for marking U.S. waters of the seaway by the joint efforts of the corps and the U.S. Coast Guard.

Although there still remains considerable dredging in the South Cornwall Channel by the corps, this work will not affect the opening of the seaway this spring for deep draft vessels. As the design and construction agent for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Corps of Engineers is proud of the safety record established on this project. Two national safety awards and three special merit awards by large insurance companies were presented seaway contractors for an exceptional record of only 7.17 disabling injuries per million man-hours of operations.

The two locks in operation since July 1, 1958, are considered among the most efficient in the Nation and will long remain a monument of outstanding achievement by the Corps of Engineers.

U.S. Foreign Policy and an International Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me, on August 31, 1959, before the inaugural banquet of the American Podiatry Association at the Starlight Roof of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY AND AN INTERNATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM

The cold war has ushered in an era of personal diplomacy requiring a maximum amount of foot power by the free world leaders—a lot of it is being exercised right now by Presidnt Eisenhower on this trip abroad and will be again when he visits Russia later on. Our President's trip is a convincing demonstration that we are prepared to make every effort, every sacrifice, and set foot when invited in any country on earth if it will prevent the world from exploding into the holocaust of atomic war. Also, great foot power is needed in the effort and sacrifice of Americans to hold the free world's own in the cold war. There is something symbolic therefore about your profession in terms of the present grave international tensions and their focal point at the moment in the impending Eisenhower-Khrushchev conversations here and in the Soviet Union.

In order not to be lulled into complacency by the latest Soviet peace drive so artfully promoted by Premier Khrushchev's visit here, we have to understand clearly our objectives. In addition to disarmament under United Nations inspection and control, the rule of international law, a strengthened United Nations, self-determination for the captive peoples and an end to Communist promoted international subversion of free world governments, we also have as a major objective the raising of living standards and therefore of health standards for the peoples of the world. Indeed, we are convinced in the free world that as the world's people are healthy and prosperous so the cause of freedom will triumph. We do not need to indoctrinate healthy and prosperous people with the concepts and ideals of freedom and individual dignity—they will indoctrinate themselves.

Therefore, high on the agenda for the discussions between President Eisenhower and Premier Khrushchev later this month should be a renewal of the proposal by the President that the U.S.S.R. join forces with United States in spearheading a full-scale assault against the killer and crippler diseases which ignore national borders to ravage entire pop-

ulations and limit the average life span of 1,800 million people in the world to under 50 years of age.

In his state of the Union message in 1958, President Eisenhower suggested a coordinated drive to stamp out malaria on both sides of the Iron Curtain, but this invitation was not accepted by the U.S.S.R. Today, it would be far more difficult for Premier Khrushchev to turn down an offer to work side-by-side with us in the life and death fight against cancer, heart disease, yellow fever and tuberculosis, as well as malaria and other tropical diseases. Indeed, the blueprint for massing the medical resources and research skills of the United States and other nations to cooperate in a global assault against the major diseases has already been formulated in our health for peace plan. The core of the plan is the International Health and Medical Research Act of 1959 authorizing $50 million for the purpose which passed the Senate on May 20, 1959, but which to this very day is still languishing in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives. It is imperative that this bill be passed by both Houses of Congress before adjournment so that the President will have it before him for signature upon his return from Europe and as he prepares for the Soviet Premier's visit.

The health for peace program establishes an Institute of International Medical Research within the National Institutes of Health which would administer grants for research into the causes, diagnosis, treatment, control, and prevention of mental as well as physical diseases, for rehabilitation of the handicapped, and with provision for aid to hospitals, universities and laboratories furthering such programs; it would also assist by loaning equipment, improving facilities and cooperating with world health groups, including the exchange of medical personnel with all participating countries—in such exchanges the U.S.S.R. and other Communist countries are included.

Since 1958 when the Soviet Union refused to lend any of its medical personnel or resources to the President's suggestion for a joint international medical effort against malaria, it has missed few opportunities to boast of the gains it has made in its national health record. The U.S.S.R. wishes us to believe that its budget for public health and physical culture has been increased 75 times in the last 30 years—that the average life span has jumped from 44 years in 1926 to 67 years today—that currently, 16,000 physicians are being graduated yearly (compared with fewer than 7,000 in the United States) that pioneer research work unattempted so far in the West is well underway in Soviet laboratories.

If in the face of these efforts to impress us with the Soviet health effort President Eisenhower should propose and Premier Khrushchev again refuses to participate in an international medical peace mission to benefit all peoples, then what more positive proof can the newly independent nations receive which will testify to the genuine concern of the free world for their welfare in contrast to the callous disregard of the Communists for any but purely political advantages. If on the other hand, Premier Khrushchev agrees to participate, then a truly historic and dramatic opportunity exists for us to raise health standards throughout the world, and to add years onto the lifespan of the baby born today in India where the average lifespan is 31 years, or in China where it is 40 years. The end result should then prove to be a material lessening of the causes for chronic poverty that threaten the stability of society in the newly developing nations and a new surge forward in the living standards of mankind.

Let me reiterate the absolute necessity for Congress to act now on the health for peace bill, so that the President will be fully prepared to back up immediately any proposal for international health he may decide to put to Khrushchev.

Just as there has been growing support for U.S. leadership in the health field abroad, it is becoming increasingly apparent that leadership at home may develop congressional action on a national health program open to members of all groups—too frequently not the case now under our regular health insurance or voluntary plans. The problem of health coverage by voluntary means is twofold: one, the inadequacy of coverage under existing plans and premiums; and two, the lack of coverage for the aged, the indigent and the unemployed. Both of these inadequacies will require some help from the Federal Government. This help may be through the voluntary health plan network now already covering 121 million Americans in some fashion, or by relatively direct Government action like that in the Ewing plan rejected during the Truman administration. I favor the former. This major issue will very likely have to be resolved in the next Congress. A Federal Health Study Commission such as I have proposed, which would appraise the scope and sufficiency of existing voluntary health plans and suggest some type of national health program in which the Federal and State governments may participate but in which voluntary cooperative organizations will give the coverage, could give us the best leadership. I believe Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, before which this bill is pending, and a leader in this field will give the bill a hearing soon.

The private relationship and free choice between doctor and patient should be preserved, and we should utilize the foundation we have already in existing voluntary cooperative health plans. The great attention paid last week at the convention of the American Hospital Association to proposals to reevaluate and broaden coverage presently available under voluntary health and hospital plans indicates an awareness by those within the profession that if improvement does not come from within, it may well have to come from Government.

A prime cause for concern, is, of course, the staggering increase in the cost of medical care today. A study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Labor Department shows that in the period from 1936 to 1956, hospital room rates increased 265 percent, general practioner's fees rose 73 percent, and surgeon's fees went up nearly 60 percent. Today, the cost of medical care continues to rise faster than any other component in the cost-of-living index—it was up 4.4 percent in July over a year ago and is now more than 50 percent higher than it was 10 years ago. Although premiums for hospital care coverage have been steadily rising since they were first included in the Consumer Price Index in 1950, the Blue Cross plans reported a $40 million deficit after paying out some $1.4 billion in benefits for 1958.

The sizable increase in the number of people who have joined voluntary cooperative health plans in recent years indicates that these plans have won popular acceptance as the soundest available way to meet the unpredictable cost of medical and hospital care. However, the fact that more than 121 million people held some sort of health protection leads to a very misleading diagnosis—the harsh counterweight to that large enrollment figure is that less than one-quarter of our total medical bill for 1957 was covered by prepaid hospital, surgical and medical insurance plans. With less than $3.6 billion of the $15 million total accounted for by these plans, that is symptomatic of the inadequacy of the protection held, to say nothing of the financial burden which must have been borne for the 50 million or more Americans who have no health coverage whatsoever.

One of the most discussed and one of the most controversial approaches to caring for the health needs of the aged is incorporated in H.R. 4700, the bill introduced by Representative AIME J. FORAND, Democrat, Rhode Island, which would extend health insurance to everyone eligible to receive social security checks, an estimated 9.3 million people, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, desirable as is the objective of extending health coverage to the aging, the estimate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the budget would have to provide an additional $1 billion annually under the Forand bill has discouraged so far the possibility of any final action by Congress this year.

I am more convinced than ever that the best middle-of-the-road approach at this point is the creation of a Health Services Study Commission such as I have proposed which would conduct a 2-year study to determine (1) what, if any, legislation on the Federal level is needed, (2) whether existing voluntary private and nonprofit programs are meeting current needs, and (3) whether our overall responsibility in making sure adequate health protection is available to the aged, indigent, and unemployed can be met by private agencies. This kind of national inventory of our health services is imperative. It will provide the truest assessment of not only the Social Security health insurance plan, but of alternatives to it including Federal reinsurance for private health insurance companies, direct Federal assistance to persons unable to finance their own medical costs to obtain coverage through voluntary cooperative health protection plans. One thing is certain, there is growing national sentiment for Congress to enter the practice of preventive medicine in the field of national health insurance before the condition becomes acute and medical costs reach a fever pitch.

Role of Africa in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the script of a radio speech which the Honorable WILLIAM T. MURPHY, of Illinois, had occasion to present over radio station WIND in Chicago, Ill., on Sunday evening, September 13, 1959.

Mr. MURPHY, who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee has worked hard and diligently on that committee. His knowledge of Africa is far reaching and his comments deserve the attention of every Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MURPHY's speech follows:

ROLE OF AFRICA IN WORLD AFFAIRS

At the start of this session of Congress, I was fortunate to be assigned to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. As a member of this committee, I requested and received a place on the Subcommittee on Africa. My interest in Africa as a continent, and in the people of this area, goes back many years.

Africa, with its huge area, has great variety. The continent's 11,693,000 square miles range from the parched flatlands of Timbuktu in French West Africa, to the uplands near the Congo Basin. Its climate is scorching hot near the Equator and temperate at Cape Town, South Africa.

Prior to World War I, most African countries were controlled by European nations—the British, Belgians, French, Portuguese, Germans, Spanish, and Italians. Only two independent nations existed—Ethiopia, a mountainous land in northeast Africa, has been an independent kingdom since ancient times; Liberia, on Africa's West Coast, was settled in 1822 by freed slaves from the United States. It declared its independence in 1847. The Union of South Africa, at the continent's southern tip, was settled by the Dutch in 1652, but was later taken over by the British. In 1910, the Union of South Africa was set up as an independent land within the British Commonwealth of nations.

In the period between the two world wars some important changes were made in the political status of several European-African possessions. The following German possessions were mandated by the League of Nations after World War I—South-West Africa to the Union of South Africa; Tanganyika to the British; the Cameroons divided up between the French and British; and Ruanda-Urundi to the Belgians. In 1922 Egypt gained its independence from the British.

After World War II, and in the past decade, Africa's nationalism and desire for self-government has been especially strong. As a result, six additional lands gained their independence—Libya, Sudan, Morocco, Tunisia, Ghana and Guinea. In 1960 the Cameroons and Togo, now United Nations Trust Territories under French Administration, the Federation of Nigeria, a British dependency, and the former Italian Somaliland, will achieve their independence. The principal remaining British dependency, in West Africa, Sierra Leone, is progressing toward self-government with no date as yet set for independence.

The French territories of West Africa have continued to evolve politically. With the exception of Guinea, they have chosen the status of autonomous republics in a French Community as a result of the constitutional referendum held on September 28, 1958. The French Community Executive Council retains jurisdiction over such matters as defense, foreign affairs, and currency. Members have been given the right to negotiate their withdrawal from the Community at any time.

Last January, Belgium announced its decision to revise its policy toward its dependent territories and to proceed with the liberalization of the political system in the Belgian Congo. Belgium had already created economic and social conditions in the Congo in advance of those of other African territories, while refraining from encouraging the growth of political parties and political life. The new Belgian program will change this significantly as representative legislative bodies are set up in the Congo and Africans are elected to them by universal suffrage.

In West Africa the trend toward regional association has been growing, although it is still too early to say confidently which pattern of association will evolve. So far, the new states have sought to retain most attributes of their sovereignty while recognizing the advantages which can accrue from cooperative planning in such fields as trade, transportation, communication, science, and culture.

The regional association of West African States began with the proclamation of the Ghana-Guinea Union in November 1958. This was reaffirmed in early May, this year, during the State visit of the Prime Minister of Ghana to Guinea. At that time the announcement was made of the founding of a Union of Independent African States which would welcome membership of other States. This Union envisioned a common defense council, flag, a Union bank of issue and currency, a customs union, and Union citizenship, in addition to citizenship in each member State.

Without modifying this Union of Ghana and Guinea, the heads of these States met in Sannequiellie, Liberia, in late July. They proposed a special conferance to be held in 1960 of independent African States as well as those with fixed dates of independence, to explore suggestions for a Community of Independent African States. Suggested for review at this conference would be resolutions specifically calling for retention of the principal attributes of national sovereignty and noninterference in the internal affairs of other members. Other proposed resolutions would enjoin the adherents of this association not to adopt policies contrary to the interests of the freedom and independence of the African people, but would urge efforts to build a free, prosperous continent, accelerating achievement of independence where possible. Finally, establishment of common councils for economic, cultural, and scientific research would be discussed.

Historically, our interest in Africa dates back to the early days of our independence. In 1786 Thomas Barklay of Pennsylvania negotiated a Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation with Morocco. In 1822 President James Monroe dispatched the U.S. Navy schooner *Alligator* to escort free American Negro colonists to the shore of West Africa. They founded what was finally proclaimed in 1847 to be free and independent Republic of Liberia. In the east, the American consul in Zanzibar arrived on that exotic island in 1833, actually preceding the first British consul. It was under the auspices of the old New York Herald that the journalist Henry Morton Stanley, proceeding from Zanzibar, undertook his historic journey into Tanganyika and Nyasaland in search of Dr. Livingstone.

Over the years American missionary activity on the African Continent has been extensive. Beginning in the early 19th century, it has grown until today more than 6,500 American missionaries representing scores of home offices, boards and orders in this country, are at work throughout Africa.

U.S. trade with Africa, which began in the days of the New England clipper ship, has grown to total about $1,200 million annually, and our direct investment to total more than $600 million. Sub-Saharan Africa today provides the United States with many of its most important raw materials such as uranium, cobalt, diamonds, columbite, gold, and manganese; minerals of strategic as well as commercial importance.

From the strategic point of view also, the continent of Africa, particularly North Africa lying as it does along NATO's southern flank, is important to the defense of Europe. To deter aggression and strengthen overall free world security, the United States maintains important naval and air bases in Morocco, an air base in Libya, and communication facilities in Ethiopia. Furthermore, the closing of the Suez Canal in 1956 demonstrated the importance of friendly African ports along the Cape of Good Hope route as an alternative for oil shipments from the Persian Gulf to the free world and for uninterrupted contact with the Middle and Far East.

In addition to these historical and strategic interests of the United States in Africa, Americans have a keen and natural popular interest in this continent to which 10 percent of our population can trace its ancestry. In the past year, for example, American educators, businessmen, Government officials, newspapermen, and tourists have played an increasingly sympathetic and constructive role in African development.

The interests of the United States in Africa constitute a very natural and logical basis for our policies and objectives there. The United States seeks to demonstrate to the African peoples a friendly interest in their welfare for their own sakes. We seek to encourage the sound and orderly development of the continent in a manner consistent with free world ideals.

We recognize that membership in the 20th century family of nations carries with it responsibilities; that the interdependence of the world community is an established fact, which must be appreciated in Africa, too; and that all peoples permanently resident in Africa have legitimate interests for which they can rightfully demand fair and just consideration.

The African people look to the United States for assistance in achieving social, economic, and political progress. They look to us for moral leadership and for a sympathetic understanding of their aspirations, and they expect us to apply our historic ideals to our foreign policy. This is a challenge to which the United States must successfully respond.

Our response to this challenge is governed in the last analysis by the reaction of the American people. For, in contrast to a totalitarian power, the policies of the United States are indeed influenced by public opinion.

In living up to our ideals, an institution deserving our continued and wholehearted support is the United Nations Trusteeship Council for its unique role in the sound and orderly political development of many African States. Of the four territories scheduled for independence during 1960, three—Cameroon, Togo, and Somalia—are United Nations' trusteeships.

In addition, the United Nations has provided a sounding board through which the views of the emerging African States can be made known to the rest of the world. Furthermore, participation in deliberations of the United Nations helps new nations play responsible roles in the community of nations. Six African States have joined the United Nations during the past few years—Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, the Sudan, Ghana, and Guinea—thus bringing the total African membership to 10. It is to be expected that the number will continue to grow during 1960 and the next few years.

Second only to the desire for political independence in the minds of the African leaders today is the enormous task of economic and social development confronting them. The need is too great for any one nation to cope with. The major share of the burden is and should continue to be borne by the European powers already closely associated with the various African nations and territories. Europe is now devoting more than $600 million yearly to African development. Other aid, such as that supplied by the United Nations and the specialized agencies, and that provided by the United States, should remain essentially supplementary.

The United States has set up programs by means of the press and radio, cultural presentations, libraries, films, lectures, the teaching of English and the exchange of persons,

we seek to develop appreciation for our history and institutions, and support for our foreign policies. There are 13 national or territorial programs devoted to this work cufrently operating in Africa under the U.S. Information Agency. In addition, Department of Commerce trade fairs and missions have contributed significantly in Morocco, Tunisia, Nigeria, and the Union of South Africa to the understanding of our country.

The response of American business is impressive. Direct private American investment totals more than $600 million and is continuing to grow. A large portion of this investment is in mining, with other undertakings including the operation of an airline in Ethopia, the manufacture of consumer goods, and the assembly of automobiles in South Africa.

In the period between 1946 and 1957 our trade with Africa—excluding Egypt and the Sudan—increased by 60 percent. The major share of our exports went to the Union of South Africa but our imports come from all over the continent. Parenthetically, the fact that the major share of our exports goes to the Union of South Africa, the most highly developed African nation, dramatically demonstrates one of the principal arguments for our continued contribtuion to the economic development of other parts of Africa, for the higher the degree of economic development, the greater our trade becomes.

The Communistic activities in Africa have increased to such a point that they have become a threat and a challenge to the free world. The people of the United States have always responded to a worthy challenge. Responsible African nations are emerging rapidly. We must stand prepared to contribute to their social, economic, and political progress. We must also endeavor to provide spiritual leadership in order that aid may be given them to withstand this communistic threat.

We can succeed only if we apply our historic ideals both in our foreign relations and in our relations with one another here at home.

"Tom" Tellepsen's Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, "Tom" Tellepsen's story is a story of success and achievement against great odds. Mr. Tellepsen came to this country from Norway in 1892, and as the president of the Texas Heritage Foundation said in honoring him recently, "Tom Tellepsen is an excellent example of what an immigrant with character and determination can accomplish in America under our form of government."

I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Houston Press of August 27, 1959, entitled "Tellepsen Made Dream Come True" be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Houston (Tex.) Press, Aug. 27, 1959]

TELLEPSEN MADE DREAM COME TRUE—CHAIRMAN OF BOARD OF BUILDING FIRM RECEIVES MEDAL—CAME TO AMERICA AS A CABIN BOY

When Torjus "Tom" Tellepsen left Norway in 1892 as a cabin boy on a sailing ship bound for America, he had only dreams of the success to come.

But with determination, the young Norwegian who worked as a carpenter here in Houston clung to those dreams and started making them come true.

This week Tom Tellepsen, chairman of the board of Tellepsen Construction Co., was honored by the Texas Heritage Foundation for the qualities which led to his outsanding success.

RECEIVED CITATION

He received the Texas Distinguished Service Medal and Citation, authorized by Congress to be presented to the person who has given outstanding service to Texas and the preservation of her heritage.

Maj. Gen. Paul L. Wakefield, Heritage Foundation president, said:

"Tom Tellepsen is an excellent example of what an immigrant with character and determination can accomplish in America under our form of government. Only in a land like ours could a man use his ability, genius, and knowhow to such great advantage. This Nation and Texas could use more Tom Tellepsens."

Mr. Tellepsen has built such Houston landmarks as the Shamrock Hilton, the Melrose and Medical Towers buildings, several hospitals in the Texas Medical Center, a number of Rice Institute buildings, as well as numerous Houston schools and churches.

HELPED BUILD DAM

The Tellepsen Construction Co. was one of the seven major contractors in the building of the Falcon Dam on the Rio Grande, and also did important work on Ellington Air Force Base and other large defense contracts during World War II.

Chairman of the board of East End State Bank, which he built, the bank frequently is referred to as "Mr. Tom's bank." Mr. Tellepsen also built and is one of the chief supporters of the Episocopal Church of the Redeemer.

Ralph E. Pearson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am interested not only in the present-day activities and problems, but in the history of the past. Many people, including the veterans of World War I, World War II, and of Korea, have had an opportunity to learn a great deal about other countries, peoples, and customs. Each of us has so little time to acquire knowledge of the world generally, but these people have at least been exposed to some of the world and conditions.

While we hope we will not be involved in another war, there is even in peacetime, and during cold wars, a definite need for even more knowledge in this area, if we are to prepare coming generations to cope with the increasingly complex problems and a world in which the speed of communication and transportation is bringing almost daily changes.

One of the big problems, at present, is the size of the Armed Forces. But whatever the size, our forces must be well trained and have esprit de corps. The Army according to a recent news article about moving a division museum from Fort Riley, believes that a knowledge of the proud history of the unit in which he serves makes a man a better soldier today.

I should like to pay special tribute to Col. Ralph E. Pearson, U.S. Army, for writing the history of the 318th Regimental Combat Team. He has entitled this remarkable history "En Route to Redoubt." He is deserving of the thanks and praise of all who served with this great regiment for his splendid and untiring efforts in compiling and writing this history. His outstanding ability, patience and understanding has reflected great credit to the U.S. Army. Unit histories such as "Enroute to Redoubt" are major contributions to our total history of World War II and a source of much pleasure to those who served in the 318th Regiment, their families and friends.

I believe that by giving a man a record of his wartime activities we make for greater solidarity and build a stronger nation for the future. We also give his children some world history with a personal tie-in. This is important in getting their interest.

One unit history, with which I am familiar, has brought pleasure to many former servicemen and some information about loved ones to many families who could find little comfort in the official records available to them. This report on where the unit was and what it did, also contains considerable information about many countries, peoples and activities in Europe from 1919 to date. I am sure it is typical of many other such histories, although more detailed and longer. This information, such as is contained in "En Route to Redoubt," a five-volume history based on the 318th RCT in World War II not only means a great deal to the parents, widows and children of the men who lost their lives but also is a permanent record and source of information for historians and former members of the unit and their children as well. Many hundreds of letters, to the author, from people, in all walks of life who are mentioned, or whose sons, fathers, or husbands are mentioned attest to the desirability of this kind of history. These histories tell about the men in company, battery battalion and regiment.

Buildings, streets and monuments at Army posts have been named for the heroes of our wars. A monument has been erected at Bastogne, and in many other places, here and abroad, as a tribute to the American soldier, but it

seems to me that more of the larger libraries should have unit histories, as well as the professional histories on how the wars are fought and where. Smaller libraries can profit by having the histories of units in which there was a sizable representation from the village, town or city. These unit histories tell much of the details about individuals, and of day-to-day happenings that usually do not even come to the attention of the commander of larger units. People who were there, or had members of their family there, can know more about what happened by reading such detailed accounts, not normally included in histories covering a theater of action, and political problems.

Usually these histories are the result of years of work by a consecrated individual, or a small group, members of an association. Normally, they do not get very wide circulation. It would seem a small, but probably beneficial assist in our overall problem of educating America and Americans, on global problems, if we could bring these intimate volumes by our amateur and professional historians to the attention of more Americans, especially those who have not had an opportunity to travel or who may, by reason of their generation, be involved in solving some of the increasing problems of the world of the future.

It is a product of our age that we leave no time to reflect our traditions and how this can guide our future. Colonel Pearson illustrates the look of wisdom in this course. For that I salute him.

The New Critique of the Regulatory Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Louis J. Hector, a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, before the administrative law section of the American Bar Association in Miami, on August 25, 1959. The title of the address is "The New Critique of the Regulatory Agency."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW CRITIQUE OF THE REGULATORY AGENCY

(By Louis J. Hector, member, Civil Aeronautics Board, section of administrative law, American Bar Association, Miami, Fla., Tuesday, August 25, 1959)

Gentlemen, lawyers these days find themselves engaged in many different occupations. At its meetings here in Miami, for instance, the ABA administrative law section has not been discussing law at all. We have been engaged rather in a management engineering project—trying to figure out how to get certain administrative jobs done with greater dispatch, wisdom, and responsibility.

This is a project which it is particularly important for lawyers to handle. For the problem is much broader than mere efficiency; it is rather the problem of achieving simultaneously maximum speed, maximum effectiveness, and maximum due process. Since this is a very delicate balance, and of vital concern to lawyers, we must tackle the job ourselves and learn what management engineering we need as we go along.

A good way to start a management survey is to take a typical transaction of the organization under study and trace it from beginning to end. This will often at one stroke show up most of the basic problems. Let me take, therefore, a recent case before the Civil Aeronautics Board—the seven States area investigation.

The purpose of the investigation was to formulate a plan for Federally subsidized, local air service for the Dakotas, Nebraska, Iowa, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. By the midfifties, railroad passenger service was being pulled out of this area at an alarming rate. Air service was supplied by the trunklines only to the larger cities. The smaller cities and towns faced a serious transportation crisis. On December 14, 1955, therefore, the Board ordered an investigation to develop a program for the area.

The Board started by asking the communities, the air carriers, and other groups for general statements of their desires. A large number of documents came in—161 in all. The processing of these took some time because it was all done by one man, the hearing examiner, but he was eventually able to recommend to the Board what proposals should be considered, and the Board on March 20, 1956, entered an order setting the scope of the proceeding.

The Board, however, didn't give the examiner any policy guidance at this time, or indeed for the next 2 years. They merely stated that the purpose of the investigation was "to review the local air service pattern in the area covered by the States involved and develop a sound patern of service to meet the needs of the entire area."

It was not that members of the Board did not have strong views on local service policies. But there was no custom of discussing general policy by the Board, and no machinery for conveying any such policy to the examiner.

The record in the Seven States case is 6 feet 2 inches high and by now we have covered 5 inches. It is at this point that the record begins to swell rapidly, and the built-in inefficiency of the process begins to take hold.

One man, the hearing examiner, will henceforth do all the work with no personal assistance of any kind. For the next year and 9 months, every fact, every statistic, every argument, every objection will go to him and to him alone. He is surrounded by hundreds of lawyers, economists, statisticians, mayors, presidents of chambers of commerce, and airline executives. But he cannot delegate any part of his job to anyone. He must personally listen to the witnesses for days on end, and then read for further months the mountain of written material they submit.

Even though most of the direct testimony was documentary the hearings in Omaha, and later in Washington, went on for 20 days. By this time there were almost a hundred parties, and 194 witnesses testified. They introduced over a thousand exhibits which added another 3 feet and 2 inches to the record.

Many of the witnesses represented cities and towns which desired air service, but a number of these did not provide very much useful information. This was not really surprising, for neither the Board nor the examiner had specified just what sort of information they wanted. In other words, the Board never went out and actively sought the facts; anyone who was interested just came in and brought whatever data he thought might be useful.

One party was the Bureau of Air Operations, a division of the Board, whose job it was to represent the general pubic interest. They participated actively in the case. It might be thought that the Bureau would consult with the members of the Board whose job it is to formulate aviation policy in the public interest, but under the rules, this was forbidden.

The hearings finally concluded on October 5, 1956, and the examiner then sat down all alone to work up a plan. By this time he had five and a half feet of pleadings, transcripts, exhibits, and briefs. It is small wonder that it took him another year and 2 months to finish the job, for he was still working all alone.

Finally on December 13, 1957, the examiner's plan for air service appeared—two volumes totaling 658 pages.

Of course, nobody was completely satisfied, and almost everyone filed exceptions and briefs saying what they liked and what they did not like about the examiner's report and why.

And now at last the five members of the Board, who for 2 years had sat in complete isolation from the matter, entered the picture. They tried to read the examiner's report, the exceptions, and the briefs, but since this was only one of many cases before the Board, since there were dozen of minor matters coming to their offices every day, since they spend a large part of their time in Board meetings and hearings, it was hard to get around to all this reading.

The grand public climax of the case came with 4 days of oral argument before the Board late in February of 1958. First there were 16 Senators, 22 Representatives, 3 Governors, and 1 mayor who took up a lot of the first day. Then the airlines got their chance. They were desperately pressed for time, because each one of them had only 30 minutes to talk about the case, but they did their best. Then each town and city came on for 10 minutes each—65 in all.

By 4:30 on the afternoon of the fourth day everyone was dazed from 21 hours and 35 minutes of steady talking, and the argument ended.

The Board met first to discuss the case a month later. They quickly decided that the examiner had been too restrictive in his award of routes, and that the proposed route pattern would, therefore, have to be substantially revised. So the Board sat down and did a large part of the examiner's job over again. In 15 sesisons totaling over 30 hours the Board drew up a new plan.

This was a difficult job because the Board members could not make any use of the Board's technical staff. They were assisted only by the general counsel's office. At one point, indeed, the Board considered sending the whole case back to the examiner, but it was quickly realized that this might well delay the decision for another year. So the members did the best they could and redrew the routes themselves.

By May 19, 1958, the Board had redone the plan and announced its general outlines in a press release. Then a special staff known as the "opinion writers" set to work and prepared another long document—157 pages—explaining and justifying the Board's new plan. No member of the Board participated in the drafting of this document although it purported to be a statement by the Board members of their reasons for the decision. This document was finally published on December 8, 1958, with an order that the new service could commence 60 days later—

well over 3 years after the need first became apparent.

Gentlemen, I think most of us agree that this kind of thing can't go on much longer. If a private business tried to conduct its affairs this way it would go broke. If we tried to make our foreign policy or plan our national defense this way, we would still be a third rate power. And if we keep on trying to plan our national transportation system this way, we will wake up in a national emergency one day and find that it won't do the job. Clearly these procedures must be overhauled.

Let us try applying some of the basic principles of management engineering. One of these is that any man engaged in a job must have a clear and definite concept of what he is trying to accomplish. Objectives and policies will change, of course, but at any given moment, they should be clearly defined.

Now it is clear that the examiner in the Seven States case had only the remotest idea of what the Board wanted him to do. True he had some miscellaneous Board precedents to go on, but no real policies to guide him in the formulation of a major new local service plan. So he floundered around for 2 years formulating his own plan only to have the Board disagree with him on basic policy and do the whole job over.

We all do a pretty good job, of course, on our procedural regulations, and on regulations dealing with technicalities such as inspections and accounting reports. But on the matters that really count, such as licensing and all the host of problems involved in rate regulation, the agencies have from the beginning preferred to stay in a sort of pragmatic flux where every case stands on its own feet. And the criticism has continued to grow.

There is another important management engineering principle dealing with policies: Almost any policy or plan, no matter how general, is a part of a larger policy or plan. Thus, in the Seven States case, one must assume that the plan for new subsidized air service was somehow coordinated into an overall transportation policy under which this was deemed preferable to continuing the rail service at a loss. One must assume also that the increased subsidy bill was a part of the overall budget and fiscal plan of the President. These assumptions are quite incorrect. The Board acted completely independently—without coordination with anyone. This is another characteristic of the administrative agencies which is today being closely questioned.

Let's take a somewhat different principle of management engineering and apply it to the Seven States case—the principle that after a man is told what his objectives are, he must be given the necessary tools to achieve them.

One thing that strikes us immediately in the Seven States case is that the examiner was brutally shorthanded. I am convinced that if our examiners are to perform any function other than keeping order at hearings, they must be given a great deal more assistance. Except in the most unusual circumstances, the examiner is the only man who ever really knows the record. While he must be given clear and definite policies and objectives from the commission which he serves, I believe that the commissions in turn must place greater reliance on his factual findings. That being the case, we have no alternative but to give our examiners the greatly increased measure of assistance they need to do a more thorough and efficient job.

Let us apply just one more management principle to the Seven States case, one first enunciated by Vilfredo Pareto, the Italian economist. It is stated with a succinctness which we lawyers can well emulate: "In any series of elements, a selected small fraction, in terms of numbers of elements, always accounts for a large fraction, in terms of effect." In other words: If you can find the main cause of a difficulty you don't have to worry about the other causes; if you can't find the main cause, then you can worry about the other causes forever without accomplishing anything.

I certainly don't purport here to isolate the main cause of our administrative difficulties, but one thing seems clear about the Seven States case: There was not too little judicial process here, there was too much.

The only critically controverted problem in this case was which subsidized, local service carriers were to get which routes—a licensing problem. Possibly even that need not be litigated. We do not let Federal contracts for highways or submarines by holding a trial. But even assuming, as I personally do, that in contested license applications, full due process and judicial procedures are required, certainly a great many irrelevant aspects of these could be eliminated, and then the agencies could concentrate with full judicial process on the basic issues in controversy.

The agencies have worked themselves into an odd position in recent years. Under a steady barrage of criticism, they have tried to judicialize larger and larger areas of their work. The paradoxical result has been not a greater amount of real judicial process but a lesser amount—more judicial trappings perhaps but less of substance.

Here one more principle of management engineering comes into play—the managerial counterpart of Gresham's law: "Bad administrative practices drive out good." As an organization tries to give the appearance of full judicial procedure in every matter, both big and small, inevitable compromises and subterfuges are required to get all the work done. These compromises inevitably spread throughout the organization and in the long run, there is less true judicial process in any matter, big or small.

Now we must face the growing body of opinion that these changes and improvements will never take place within the existing agencies. And this brings me to the "New Critique of the Regulatory Agency." By this I mean the belief in many quarters that the combination of rulemaking, policy formulation, planning, administration, adjudication, investigation, and prosecution in one agency simply does not work.

Last spring I gave a talk on the administrative agencies at one of our foremost liberal arts colleges. I surveyed the problems of the present agencies and how they might be solved. The reaction from the economics and political science faculty was startling. Many were old friends, and they spoke with great candor. In effect what they said was this: "Why don't administrators realize that one man can never do all these different jobs properly at the same time. Most of the inefficiency, the delays, and the ethical problems of the agencies result from the fact that they are each trying to do a number of jobs which should be split up among several agencies."

Gentlemen, this is not idle chaff. These are straws in the wind. These are a small sample of countless expressions of opinion, many of them from men with experience in Government who have thought long and hard about the problems of administration.

Administrators and judges have such completely different codes of ethics that a commissioner who tries to act like a judge is accused of trying to regulate in an ivory tower, while one who tries to act like an administrator is accused of becoming too friendly with the litigants.

So you get a kind of institutional schizophrenia, it is said, where men try to carry out duties and live by standards which are basically incompatible, and end up in a sort of amorphous procedural mish-mash which gets neither the administrative, the policymaking, nor the judicial job done properly.

The most devastating attack of all is: The administrative agencies are not responsible to the will of the people or for that matter to the will of anybody. As one commentator put it recently: "They are not independent, they're just irresponsible"—which I like to think referred not the character of the commissioners but to the fact that in truth we do not report to anybody. The decisions of the agencies are so technical that only a few people understand them. Congress steps in only intermittently and then usually in specific cases. The courts have little control because of our "expertise." The President under present thinking is not supposed to exert any influence at all. How can we expect then, it is asked to have the kind of coordinated national transportation policy or national economic policy that the public interest and the national defense require.

All the critics agree, I think, that adjudication must be performed by men occupying basically the position of judges, and that the Executive and Congress must keep their hands off. But policymaking is a different thing. This should be made by the Executive, it is increasingly felt, within the broad policy determinations of Congress.

The remedy proposed by the new critique is quite simple and familiar: Give to the Executive the functions of rulemaking, policy formulation, planning and routine administration. Give to a special expert tribunal or group of tribunals the task of deciding major litigated cases and of hearing appeals from administrative decisions. If there is a job of prosecution, give it to a separate executive agency.

Let me close with one more general principle which is my favorite of all of those propounded by the management engineers. It is this: Improvement in any situation comes in one of two ways: (1) Numerous small changes in the old plan of operation or (2) a few basic changes and a new plan of operation. Most of our thinking about the regulatory agencies in recent years has centered about numerous small changes in the present plan of operation. Now it is being suggested that the time has come for a few basic changes and a new plan of operation. Whether we agree with such proposals or not, the administrative agencies and the friends of the administrative process, cannot resent them. After all, the administrative agencies as we know them today are the result of a few radical sweeping changes in Government operations not so many years ago. Surely we cannot now in middle age object to others proposing new radical changes in Government. We cannot stand as epigoni of the old order merely repeating the old battle cries and saying that everything is just fine. We must face the many diverse proposals now in front of us, with the open minds, the realism, and the sense of dedicated responsibility which lie at the heart of all sound thinking about administration in the public interest.

Our Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty of inserting in the RECORD an article written by the famous colum-

nist, George E. Sokolsky, in the Long Island Press of September 12, 1959. The heading of the article is just about as factual as anyone could write on this subject. I commend this article to all Americans who have a real interest in the future of our Nation:

OUR FOREIGN COMPETITION

(By George E. Sokolsky)

It is not often that an industrial company uses its advertising space to sell not its product, but its thinking. Every American producer is being forced to consider the danger of foreign competition in the American market. The automobile industry never favored a high tariff for automobiles because it did not need protection. There was no foreign competition in the American automobile market, but that is not true today.

The Union Oil Co. of California has been using its advertising space to discuss its economic thinking. The product will take care of itself if the country's economic thinking is right. The advertisement that attracted my attention is entitled "Charlie Perkins—How wage hikes and taxes threaten your job." Charlie Perkins is, apparently, a real person.

This is the body of the advertisement and whoever wrote it knows his economics:

"Walk into nearly any store today with the idea of buying something.

"You'll see products from abroad right alongside our American made ones. Nails, woolen, and cotton fabrics, dinnerware, sewing machines, cameras, cars, bicycles, and watches are some of them. And practically in every case, the imports cost less.

"Foreign manufacturers now compete sharply with our own industries. And they do so without two handicaps every American business faces today.

"1. Wage hikes not based on increased productivity. These result in continually rising prices for U.S. consumers and ever-mounting production costs for our manufacturers.

"2. Growing taxes. Each year taxes take more of industry's dollars. This, too, is reflected in higher prices to the consumer.

"It makes you wonder. If we price ourselves out of world markets, what's next? If we don't stay competitive, isn't that the same as pricing you and me and all of us right out of our jobs?"

The issue herewith presented is correct. The contrary argument is: Many manufacturers are mighty eager to sell some of their output in other countries. Are not American-made sewing machines, typewriters, and farm machinery sold abroad?

Both arguments have some merit. However, we face a very frigid fact, namely, that if low-waged, low-taxed, low-priced, subsidized goods come into the United States to compete with high-waged, highly taxed, high-priced goods made with less efficiency than is possible because of labor union rules, we face the danger of a kind of competition which can throw 10 million to 15 million Americans out of work. That raises very serious social problems.

It used to be sound economics to say that if an American-made product could not compete with a similar product made elsewhere, it was the fault of the American manufacturer. He lacked efficiency. He lacked sound financial principles.

However, that is not true today. The United States, by a generosity unknown in the history of man, has rebuilt and rehabilitated industries throughout the world and created new ones with the result that American industry, which pays high taxes to aid its competitors find the subsidized competition tough going.

Second, American labor unions, fighting automation, have instituted various featherbedding arrangements to slow up production. These arrangements increase inefficiencies, raise the cost of production of American goods.

I recently watched an advertisment for electrical equipment used in connection with a television show. We tried quickly to figure what the cost would be if we purchased every household device in that commercial. Our guess ran to about $50,000 which, of course, is not necessary because nobody requires all the devices.

The dilemma that the United States faces is this: In order to maintain our standard of life which is based on the social assumption that this Nation will not have a proletariat, we must have full employment at good wages. The other side of the dilemma is that we cannot compete even in our own market with goods identically made by machinery tended by laborers who receive less pay, work longer hours, and use fewer featherbedding devices.

This problem will not be solved by demagogic speeches in or out of Congress. It requires profound study of the entire economic structure of this country. The proof of the peril is that the old free-trade unions in the textile and garment industries have suddenly become conscious of the danger to their industries by the flood of as good but cheaper goods from Europe and Asia.

The Hometowner in New Hampshire—A State With Two Faces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, last week the Fort Worth Press published an article entitled, "The Hometowner in New Hampshire; A State With Two Faces." I think all Members of Congress will be interested in reading this excellent piece of journalism.

In the interests of promoting even greater bonds of unity than now exist between the great New England region and the magnificent area known as the Southwest, I ask unanimous consent that this article, by Walter Humphrey, editor of the Fort Worth Press, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fort Worth Press, Sept. 2, 1959]

THE HOME TOWNER IN NEW HAMPSHIRE—A STATE WITH TWO FACES

(By Walter R. Humphrey)

JEFFERSON, N.H.—New Hampshire has two faces. One looks out on the sea; the other looks down from the mountain top.

This is a luxuriously green State, covered with forests of pine and maple and birch.

The birches, with their white, naked bark, often look like ghosts in the forest, intruders that don't belong there.

Here and there are spots of red and orange, where maples are jumping the autumn season, which still is 2 or 3 weeks off.

It makes you wish you could stay for the show, for the autumn display of color in the forests of New England is one of nature's genuine spectaculars.

Here at Jefferson we are in the high country, in the heart of the grandeur that is the White Mountains.

We dropped in on the 99-year-old Waumbek resort hotel late on a warm afternoon. What a spot this is.

Out of sight, far down below in the Israels River, named for two brothers of the famed Rogers Rangers, lost in this area.

South of us, in a sort of filmy majesty, stretch the Presidential Range, topped by the Northeast's highest mountain, Mount Washington.

Already a haze was settling in the distant valleys. Then it slowly spread over all the range. First, the peaks farthest away became robed in white, then the nearer ones. Only our nearest neighbor, Cherry Mountain, remained green until darknes took over.

Half the year these mountains are white with snow. For me, the White Mountains put on their summertime white and the style was becoming.

In the early days of the Waumbek, Boston and Maine trains came right up to where the hotel putting green now is.

But a revolution occurred in the resort business. The automobile and the depression pulled the railroads out, broke many of the fine resorts.

But they have come back because the restless American traveler keeps looking for new places to go. K. P. Kenyon, owner of the Waumbek, has made it blossom again.

So it is through much of New England. And these same people who are stanch New Englanders through the summer you'll find operating hotels in Florida for the winter.

We haven't seen another Texas car in New England, which proves that Texas is far away and that Texans have yet to discover this wonderland.

It's very much worth the long ride.

For New England, this has been a hot summer. But the weather has been capricious; whenever we have stopped for the night, showers have welcomed us.

Perhaps we brought them from Texas.

We broke the warm spell and the drought as well when we first invaded New Hampshire for a look at the short stretch of it that faces the sea.

We touched the Atlantic at Portsmouth, one of the old and glamorous towns of the New England coast.

Fishing ships for many generations have sailed from its harbor, and today the atomic submarines of the U.S. Navy put out from its naval base.

From the long veranda at James Barker Smith's Wentworth-by-the-Sea, I surveyed the bleak Atlantic through a cold drizzle which brought the temperature down to 54.

Out there on the horizon were the fuzzy outlines of the Isles of Shoals, of which there are eight at high tide and nine at low tide.

The two largest of these rocky islands are owned and used by the Unitarians and Congregational churches, one of the oldtimers told me. And there church groups rough it during the summer season. It's rough, too.

Wentworth-by-the-Sea is a busy place, where there's talk of fishing and clambakes and golf and the stock market * * * and can Rockefeller beat NIXON in New Hampshire?

Beginning here and going on upstate into Maine and back down into the White Mountains, we found Yankee hospitality.

New Hampshire is an easygoing State. No rush. You see mills on its clear rivers, logs floating down to be made into pulp and paper.

Its farms are small, just right for corn and apples and produce and poultry and small dairy herds. And its great winter crop is maple syrup.

But until the red and yellow maple leaves turn to brown and are blown to the ground

by the ocean and mountain breezes, tourists are a mighty big crop.

Mostly, they seem to come from New York and Jersey and Philadelphia. But others are dropping in, too.

It's a quiet land, with a Yankee personality that's both modest and proud.

We didn't see a dozen brick houses crossing New Hampshire * * * they like their frame houses and buildings built of their own lumber, and it's thrifty. And they don't mind keeping them painted.

Airport Nuisance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the September 10 issue of the Newark Evening News. This editorial, I believe, concisely and accurately sums up the present dissatisfaction with the record of Government agencies and commercial airlines in living up to their responsibilities to the people who live in the neighborhoods of Newark, LaGuardia, and Idlewild Airports.

The editorial follows:

AIRPORT NUISANCE

Rising complaints about airplane noise in the New York metropolitan area, stimulated by distressing experience with jet aircraft at Idlewild, have produced a congressional hearing and unsatisfactory testimony by the air industry and Government supervisors.

The Port of New York Authority is trying, with limited legal power, to suppress the nuisance. It reports an airline conformance with suggested noise reduction standards of just under 75 percent of all jet takeoffs during August. It is this 25 percent margin of noncompliance which is mainly causing the protest. And the port authority charges that one airline is making no effort whatever to comply.

Port authority consulting engineers have recommended standards which reduce the screams of the jets and the thunder of piston-engined aircraft to tolerable limits. But to meet these standards some takeoffs must be made with less than capacity fuel loads, requiring a refueling stop which cuts into profits. The airlines ought to know from history that when the profit motive conflicts with public convenience and necessity, the public usually wins out.

Remedies for the nuisance are available to public agencies. Its general counsel advises the port authority it can withdraw permission for jet operations at its airports. This, of course, would be an "extreme sanction" which the authority is reluctant to impose. The new Federal Aviation Agency claims full power to deal with the situation, but its administrator says noise abatement regulations cannot be issued until technical and legal studies have been completed.

In view of the exhaustive research undertaken for the port authority, the public will want to know precisely what other studies are needed and when they will be completed and what will be done about them.

Representative DWYER, of Union, says neither the airlines nor the regulating agencies are making any determined effort to lessen avoidable noise and low flying. With the exceptions noted by the port authority, this appears to be generally true. It is a shabby reward for the taxpayers who have provided millions for airline subsidies and for the construction of tax-free public airports.

Report of the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report to the people of Tennessee on the activities of Congress during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. This has been an extremely active session, and a lengthy one. Many of the bills considered here have been of direct concern to the people of my State, and I want them to know of our efforts.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR FRIEND: Now that Congress is approaching adjournment, I want to write you about some of my impressions of this 1st session. And I also want to take this opportunity to thank you for the comments, observations, and recommendations many of you submitted which have been so helpful to me in these past several months.

THE LEGISLATIVE AND THE EXECUTIVE

Before elaborating on specific measures, it should be pointed out that it is the responsibility of the Congress to consider the merits of each proposed piece of legislation and then vote according to the individual conscience of its Members. By the same token, it is the responsibility of the President to consider the merits of each piece of legislation reaching his desk, and sign or veto each measure according to his own conscience.

This session has been marked by many Presidential vetoes.

The President vetoed a measure which would have given the Rural Electric Administration a more independent voice in the making of loans to REA cooperatives. He vetoed a wheat program bill which would have offered price supports of 90 percent of parity in exchange for 25-percent cuts in plantings. The President vetoed a tobacco program bill which would have stabilized and frozen price supports.

The first two housing bills were vetoed, as were two civil works appropriations measures before Congress overrode his veto.

THE TVA SELF-FINANCING BILL

After a long and arduous fight, a TVA self-financing bill was approved by the Congress and signed by the President after minor changes were made at his request.

This was a piece of must legislation. TVA now may borrow money at interest from private sources as a means of increasing its production and distribution capacities.

A total of $750 million may be borrowed by TVA. This money will be repaid by the Authority from revenues received from the sale of electric power in much the same manner as a merchant borrows money from his local bank to modernize his store or enlarge his stock of merchandise.

It also means that TVA is in a position to adopt a long-range program of expansion, without having to press for annual appropriations from the Congress.

The TVA self-financing bill was important to everyone who lives and works in the Valley.

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

The Congress took a sharp knife and cut $1.4 billion from the President's budget.

LABOR LEGISLATION

In the field of labor-management, the first major piece of legislation since the original Taft-Hartley Act was approved by this session of Congress.

Passage of the measure ended a long drawn out and often bitter controversy in Washington and throughout the United States.

During the peak of the debate, all Members of Congress received hundreds, if not thousands, of letters and telegrams. Some persons wanted a "killer" labor bill, one which would do harm to the average working man by destroying his collective bargaining rights. Others wanted no bill at all. But all in all, the average citizen wanted a measure which would rid labor unions of racketeers and protect the rank and file workers without injuring the legitimate union movement.

The approved labor-management law provides that unions must file regular financial reports, bar former convicts from office, and disclose administrative procedures. It also guarantees freedom of speech, periodic secret elections, and similar rights to members of unions.

The measure gives States the authority to handle certain no man's land cases not now handled by the National Labor Relations Board.

The bill outlaws the hot cargo clause with certain exceptions for the garment and construction industries. It also closes other secondary boycott loopholes.

Another provision outlaws organizational and recognition picketing if the employer has validly recognized another union, or if the employer has held an NLRB election within the preceding 12 months. But such picketing might be considered legal if the employer had engaged in unfair labor practices during the election or in the process of recognizing the other union.

There are 18 million union workers and nearly 60 million nonunion workers in the United States. Good wages built the Nation and made it great. Workers, whether organized or not, are entitled to a decent share of their productivity. They are entitled to fair and honest treatment.

All of us will watch with interest, now that the bill has become law, to determine whether the measure lives up to the intent of Congress. If changes are necessary, the next Congress will have every opportunity to make them.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We live in an age of pushbutton warfare and we are one of the great powers on earth. Another great power, Soviet Russia, through her leaders, has said on numerous occasions that it has the thermonuclear power to destroy the United States within half a day.

Members of Congress, even before this session, have made every effort to determine whether this Nation is adequately prepared to deter Soviet aggression.

The Gaither report, which was kept secret longer than it should have been, said in part:

"The United States is moving in a frightening course to the status of a second-class power."

The Rockefeller report said:

"Unless present trends are reversed, the world balance of power will shift in favor of the Soviet bloc. If that should happen

we are not likely to be given another chance to remedy our failings."

Adm. Hyman G. Rickover stated: I think it is almost too late. This is what I worry about. * * * Some of my money for fiscal 1958 which was appropriated by Congress several months ago has not yet been made available to me."

Secretary of Defense McElroy said: "By 1962 the Russians may lead the United States in guided missiles by as much as 3 to 1."

General Thomas Power, Air Force Strategic Commander, stated: "I think you are just risking the whole country. That is how important I feel it is. The force which is now programed is not adequate because it is not coming fast enough."

Faced with these grim facts, the Congress approved a measure to create a new National Aeronautics and Space Administration with nearly $500 million to spend; extended the draft to 4 years; extended the Renegotiation Act under which the Government recovers excessive profits on defense contracts, and in general did its best to overcome the administration's avowed intention of lagging behind the Soviet Union in long-range missiles and other thermonuclear instruments of war.

National defense is a continuing struggle between those who would economize to a point of national risk and those who recognize the need for a first-class defense even if it means tightening belts.

In January, Members of Congress once more will examine the Nation's defense structure with an eye toward further improvements.

NEW FEDERAL JUDGES

A bill creating two additional Federal judgeships for Tennessee was reported out of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am hopeful of immediate action once Congress meets again in January.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Congress, at the request of President Eisenhower, raised the legal limit of the national debt to $295 billion. The national debt in 1952, when President Eisenhower assumed office, was $265 billion, or roughly $30 billion less than the present amount.

ALOHA

A 50th State was born this session of Congress with the admission of Hawaii. The borders of the United States now extend northward to within a few miles of Soviet Siberia and into the strategic Pacific.

HOUSING

Two housing bills were vetoed by the President, and a third measure was on his desk as Congress prepared to adjourn.

The need for a sound housing bill was obvious from the start. Millions of Americans live in areas which either have become, or soon will become, slums.

It is necessary for the Government to insure private mortgages if the great postwar building program continues for the benefit of citizens in Tennessee and throughout the Nation.

In addition, hundreds of colleges are hard pressed for classrooms and dormitory accommodations for their mushrooming enrollments.

A key section of the third bill extended the authority of the FHA. The Federal Housing Authority, assuming that such a provision would be approved, already had issued almost $5 billion of "letters of intent" to keep construction moving at a fair and honest pace.

The bill also established minimums of 3 percent on the first $13,600 of a house's evaluation; 10 percent on the value between $13,500 and $18,000; and 30 percent on all over $18,000.

Maximum interest on rental housing and management type mortgages insured by the FHA would be raised to 5¼ percent from 4½ percent with the interest ceiling on sales-type cooperatives raised from 5 to 5¾ percent. The maximum insurable mortgage would be raised from $20,000 to $22,500 for one-family units.

The bill also contained authorization for 37,000 new units for low-rent public housing to be built by local agencies as a stopgap step toward helping cities rehabilitate blighted areas.

Unfortunately the provision authorizing direct loans to colleges for classroom construcction and equipment was not included in the third bill. This provision was contained in the first two bills and it was criticized by the President as objectionable.

CIVIL WORKS

The President vetoed two civil works appropriation bills, but the Congress overrode his second veto.

Civil works measures long have been termed "pork barrel" by cynics of Government. Actually, civil works provides money for flood control and reclamation projects.

There is nothing "pork barrel" about a flood. More than 1,000 urban communities in the United States have been classified as flood-endangered areas. The flood threat is increasing with the expansion of suburbia.

During the tragic floods of 1955, damage in the United States was estimated at $1 billion, or approximately the total amount of the civil works measure which was approved over the President's veto.

We certainly must protect our industrial, commercial, and residential areas from floods.

Included in the measures was one designed to bring relief from the continual flooding of farm lands and highways in the Forked Deer and Obion River areas of the west Tennessee drainage area.

Another approved measure calls for a new channel for the Wolf River to help alleviate the flooded Shelby County bottomlands and to remove the somewhat famous unpleasant smells from the north and downtown Memphis.

The approved appropriations bill included 67 new projects, but the total appropriation was less than the amount requested by the President.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In this continuing struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc it is necessary for the United States to bolster the economic and military strength of our Allies.

This Congress established a new Inter-American Development Bank to finance projects in Latin America. Congress also boosted U.S. subscription to the World Bank.

A Foreign aid measure was approved which included $2.1 billion in military assistance and another approximately $1 billion in economic assistance.

NATO

An important meeting was held in London in June. It was called the Atlantic Congress and it was sponsored by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. NATO is composed of 15 free world nations who have pooled their military strength to deter possible Soviet aggression. The organization has been most successful in its continuing efforts to keep the Communists behind their Iron Curtain.

The Atlantic Congress was approved by NATO parliamentarians on a resolution which I submitted as chairman of the Political Committee. Some 650 citizens from the NATO countries attended the Congress. Means of strengthening economic, political and cultural ties were discussed and in many ways this was the most important international meeting of the year.

Following the Atlantic Congress, the Senate approved a resolution authorizing the NATO nations to meet again for the same purposes, but this time on a more official basis. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold hearings on the resolution when it convenes in January. The State Department has given a "green light" to the proposed plan.

TAXES

Congress extended for 1 year the Korean war corporation taxes and certain excise taxes. The transportation and local telephone taxes were reduced.

New levies were imposed on life insurance companies which will return the Government another estimated $215 million annually.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

It looked for awhile as if the Federal highway program would be faced with a financial roadblock. As a final resort, Congress increased the Federal gas tax from 3 to 4 cents. This tax becomes effective on October 1, 1959, and continues for 21 months.

Passage of the highway financing act assured by an amendment introduced by Senator GORE and me, construction of a highway bridge over Pickwick Dam near Savannah. This will add another vital link in our highway system.

RAILROAD WORKERS

The Congress approved a measure increasing pension and jobless benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

VETERANS

Provided $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans. Readjusted non-service-connected disability pensions and provided new pensions for widows.

AGRICULTURE

Extended the surplus farm products law. Introduced a Federal food stamp plan for needy families in a few trial areas of the country.

Put a ceiling of $50,000 on price support benefits.

POSTAL AND BOND INTEREST RATES

Congress declined to increase postage rates or interest rates on long-term Government bonds but did increase rates on E and H series savings bonds to a maximum interest of 4¼ percent.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

A $63 million matching Federal aid to States was approved this session for airport improvements for the fiscal years of 1960 and 1961.

WILD HORSE BILL

A bill prohibiting mechanized roundups of an estimated 20,000 wild horses in Western States was approved, much to the gratification of humanitarians everywhere.

HIGH PRICES

As chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, we turned the spotlight once again on the high cost of living. Hearings of the subcommittee have brought out the fact that once an industry obtains near-monopolistic control of a product, prices are increased far and beyond the worth of the product.

Nobody is against profitmaking, but price gouging is something else.

Upon subcommittee recommendation, this Congress passed a bill to tighten the Clayton Act so as to give speedier relief to small businessmen damaged by monopolistic practices, such as price discrimination.

The Senate passed a bill to make more effective antitrust enforcement by the Department of Justice by empowering the Attorney General to compel the production of documents in civil antitrust suits.

The subcommittee also held hearings and reported for consideration by the Judiciary Committee two important proposed bills: S.

11 (equality of opportunity bill), and S. 442 (premerger notification bill).

Hearings also were held in the administered price field in the bread industry, as well as administered price inflation and the public interest.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The right of every qualified American citizen to vote is basic and sacred. Any intelligent investigation of voting privileges is worthwhile. I hope that the Civil Rights Commission will get back on the track of investigating the matter of voting, and, at the same time, it will get out of some of the other fields into which, unfortunately, it has wandered.

As Commissioner Battle, a distinguished former Governor of Virginia, has said, we need to have considerably more discussion of the problems of human relations before legislative action is taken.

While I am highly displeased with much of the Commission's report, especially its inaccuracies, I believe that continuation of the study with a revamped Commission may be the best defense against more drastic or even punitive legislation. While the study is going on, a telling argument can be made against the enactment of any punitive legislation. Therefore, I believe extension of the Commission's life is the best way to prevent legislation which could be harshly unfair to the South.

For these reasons, I voted for extension of the Commission. I was joined in this vote by 71 other Senators, including my colleague from Tennessee, Senator GORE, and the Democratic majority leader, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON.

CONCLUSION

Now that the Congress is about to adjourn, it is my intention to visit every county in Tennessee as a means of reporting to the people, and at the same time obtaining advice and recommendations for use when the Senate convenes next January.

In addition, the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee will hold hearings during the next few weeks on such important questions as matched Government bids, the promotion of professional boxing, and administered prices in the drug industry.

I want to express my appreciation for all the letters and suggestions I have received during this session. Be assured that I welcome your continuing interest and recommendations for new legislation.

Sincerely,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
U.S. Senator.

Invitation to Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news editorial from the Concord Free Press of Concord, Mass., for Wednesday, September 9, 1959. This news editorial is entitled "Invitation to Mr. Khrushchev." This news editorial is written by Mrs. Edward J. Bander, of West Concord, Mass., a constituent and friend of mine. It illustrates many basic qualities in our free way of life. Certainly Mr. Khrushchev and the Russian people would profit by a visit to West Concord, Mass., as well as Concord, Mass., and to experience the happiness and contentment and peaceful living of free human beings living in a Nation under God:

INVITATION TO MR. KHRUSHCHEV

WEST CONCORD, MASS.,
September 1, 1959.

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: I see in the big newspapers lately how a lot of people in this country are being asked where they would take you and what they would show you if they had the chance during your impending visit to the United States of America. Well, Mr. K., I've been asking myself that question and I thought you might like to know what I decided.

I guess I should made it clear first, though, that I'm no high Government official or big political theorist or atomic scientist, or anything like that. In fact, I'm not even what you might call a "leading citizen" here in my home town. To be perfectly honest with you, Mr. K., I'm just one of the millions of little people you can see anywhere you go in America. Don't get the wrong idea, though—I'm very proud to be one of them and I share with all of them a conviction which you may have a little trouble understanding when you get over here: a conviction that my opinion is just as good as the next fellow's, no matter who he is. So that's why I don't feel the least bit hesitant about writing you this letter.

Now, if I could take you anywhere I wanted to in America, I'm sure I couldn't do much better than to start out by showing you all the famous landmarks in Concord, Mass., the town that has often been called the "Birthplace of American Freedom"—and believe me, you'd get a very generous sampling of the historical and cultural starch that has gone right into the backbone of this country from its earliest days right up to and including the present.

However, knowing what a busy schedule you'll have—if I could take you to only one spot, I'd have to give up all that and bring you, instead, to West Concord, Mass. Because there's a little flower garden that grows right behind the shanty at the railroad crossing here in West Concord, and that's the one thing I'd like most of all for you to see.

I suppose you're entitled to know why I'd bring you all the way over here to show you a flower garden, so let me try to explain.

You see, Mr. K., this little garden—which doesn't cover an area much more than 8 feet by 10 feet—involves a lot of those little people I mentioned earlier. Of course, it involves a few who are kind of big in their own way, too, but I wouldn't be surprised if they'd just as soon be counted among the little people I'm talking about.

Now about this garden. You understand, of course, that the land itself is owned partly by the town of Concord and partly by the Boston & Maine Railroad (which is a pretty fair-sized outfit in these parts), but the flower garden was started by a man from Concord named George Mulcahy. Mr. Mulcahy was one of the gate tenders for the railroad here in West Concord, and he really loved flowers. I guess maybe he thought pretty well of this country, too, because he set up a flagpole right at the edge of his garden.

Well, Mr. Mulcahy died a few years ago and anyone might have expected his little garden to be long gone by now. There are two main reasons why it isn't and they are, one Mr. George Turnbull, of Littleton (formerly of South Acton), and one Mr. Tony Garceau, of West Acton, and I'd like very much for you to meet both these gentlemen, Mr. K. You see, they were two of Mr. Mulcahy's fellow crossing tenders and after he passed on, they sort of agreed to try to keep his garden going between them. And it has worked out very well. Mr. Turnbull works the 7-to-3 shift and Mr. Garceau takes over on the 3-to-11, and between them they've really kept the garden flourishing. It's quite a bit of work for them, of course, but they don't mind. In fact, they've added a lot of new powers as they went along, some grown from seed (which Mr. Turnbull bought himself—we have no commissar for this sort of thing, you understand), some transplanted from Mr. Garceau's private garden—and others that have been donated by friends. For instance, Mrs. Aida Macone (who lives right across the street) donated the pansies which Mr. Turnbull set out together with a small square of marigolds right in the middle of the garden (in front of the signal box), and they look upon this particular spot as a kind of little personal memorial to their old mutual friend, the late Mr. Mulcahy.

Then there's the row of glads that runs the length of the fencing at one end of the garden—they were donated by Mr. Charles Lombardo, the local barber whose shop is across the street. Speaking of the fencing—it was freshly painted this year, compliments of Mr. John Damon (he's one of our town selectmen and also one of the present owners of the long-established and very successful Damon family business, the Concord Woodworking Co.—I suppose you'd call him a capitalist). Then there's the flagpole—completely repainted this summer with paint donated by Mr. Al Soffritti, of Concord.

Now you might figure that a long dry spell would raise havoc with the garden, Mr. K, inasmuch as there's no water in the shanty and there's no bureaucracy around to handle the problem—but if you did, you'd figure wrong. The boys can always get water, even thought it has to be carried by the bucketful—there's Lena's Launderette right across the way and then, heading down Church Street and Commonwealth Avenue from Lena's, there's Maguire's Town Taxi and Condons' Package Store, and the owners of all these establishments have a standing agreement with the boys to provide water anytime it's needed.

I'd certainly like for you to meet and talk with every one of the people I've mentioned, Mr. K. And then, if you have a few more minutes, I'd like for you to sit back and relax on one of the benches or old chairs just beyond the garden, underneath the big maple tree which shades the whole area. Maybe Miss Olive Hosmer will come by on her way to the library and stop to chat with you. Miss Hosmer is a member of one of Concord's oldest and proudest families but she never passes by without stopping to admire the garden—and she knows every flower in it.

Then, too, this is a spot where all the boys; young and old, get together to swap stories and opinions, and maybe you could listen in. Of course they don't always see eye to eye, and you might even get to hear them criticizing the Government—ours or yours or anyone else's, for that matter. But don't be alarmed if a policeman should come along and stop to listen—the area's just part of his beat and he's not going to haul anyone off to jail, because (strange as the practice may seem to you, Mr. K.), criticizing governments is quite a pastime in this country, as well as a privilege guaranteed every one of us from the moment we're born, along with the right to express honest differences of opinion on any matter.

So now maybe I can explain why I did so much talking earlier about the little people in this country, Mr. K. It was because I was going to tell you a lot of things about a pretty representative group of little people here in West Concord, representative of all the little people in America that you seem

to spend a lot of time talking about over there in Russia. You always sound as if you really feel quite sorry for us, because you figure that the big people over here don't give a hoot about the little people and that big and little alike, we're only interested in making money, so that we poor little people really don't have much of anything worth living for. And you seem to be saying lately that you think we little people are going to wake up one of these days and realize how superior your way of life is to ours, and then we'll switch over to yours voluntarily. I'd just like to say to you, Mr. K., don't hold your breath waiting for that to happen.

And if you are sincerely interested in the welfare of the little people of the world (and I think maybe in your own way you are), and you just can't make it out to West Concord this time 'round, could you still give some thought to the little people I've been telling you about? Because if you think about them enough you may realize one very important fact that it seems to me you're overlooking at the moment, and that is that even if we little people over here are as miserable and materialistic, with as little worth living for as you seem to think—we just don't realize it, Mr. K., and it's going to be a long time before we do.

So someday when you're sitting over there in the Kremlin feeling sorry for us, would you do me one small favor? Ask yourself, Mr. K., if the story of the little flower garden here in West Concord, exactly as I've told it to you (and every word of it was true)—ask yourself if it could all happen in your country today? Or could it happen—as our great American journalist-philosopher Harry Golden would say—"Only in America."

Sincerely,

F. W. B.

UNICEF: An Outstanding Example of International Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund is one of the best demonstrations we have of international cooperation on basic common responsibilities. What is more basic than children everywhere in the world? What is more important than that the countries and the people of the world work together in their behalf?

Focusing on the needs of sick, starving, and crippled children, UNICEF serves as the world meeting place where all governments, regardless of political ideologies, can unite in common cause against mankind's greatest scourges—disease, starvation, and ignorance. The vicious circle formed by these mass enemies of the human race is the natural breeding ground of war, and none of its victims can suffer more hopelessly than helpless, innocent children, who are, after all, the only hope for the future of the world.

As a longtime member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have tried to keep abreast of such organizations as World Health and UNICEF and have had opportunity to see at firsthand some of the work they do in the outposts of the world. I do believe that not until you have seen starving mothers and children drink the milk furnished them, not until you have seen literally thousands of penicillin injections given that will definitely cure yaws, or the sulphones that are slowly making inroads on leprosy, and other such, can you evaluate the work done. To see, further, as I have seen, the far-reaching results of malnutrition, of lack of sanitation, all of it unnecessary, gives one a deep sense of responsibility and obligation to the less fortunate, as well as a sense of gratitude that there do exist such organizations as WHO and UNICEF.

Whatever work is good, of necessity reflects the quality and capacity of the man at the top. UNICEF's stature today certainly tells the story of what Maurice Pate, its executive director, has brought to it. Associated with former President Herbert Hoover in the relief work in Europe following the First World War, he has applied his training and his knowledge with ability and wisdom.

Few people have any concept of the many problems there are in the day-to-day direction of an organization obliged to cope with differences of nationality, religion, customs and attitudes on the part of the staff itself. These same problems exist in the various governments so eager to gain the benefits of UNICEF aid for their own people. These difficulties are very clearly and sympathetically given in "Half the World's Children" written by Spurgeon M. Keeny, of Pennsylvania, the director of UNICEF's Asia regional office. I commend it to you.

The following information, prepared by the U.S. Committee for UNICEF, which has offices in the U.N. Building in New York City, has been prepared to furnish answers to some of the questions most often asked about the work of UNICEF by organizations, publications, and individuals:

INFORMATION ON UNICEF

1. For "all the world's children": The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) is the world's largest international agency devoted exclusively to the welfare of children. Its aid is completely outside the realm of politics; it is given without regard to race, nationality, creed or political belief.

2. Promotes self-help: UNICEF helps the governments of underdeveloped countries that request assistance (child population: about 750 million) to initiate or strengthen comprehensive measures to better the welfare of their children. The Children's Fund, in cooperation with U.N. agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and Technical Assistance (TA) provides equipment and technical skill—however, the full responsibility for running the health and welfare programs is assumed by the governments themselves. Eventually, the governments take over the entire responsibility for the programs started with UNICEF's aid; these often provide a model for permanent health services, and in this way the benefits of UNICEF's assistance are permanent.

3. How it works: The governments that request assistance provide an average of $2.50 in internal matching expenditures for every dollar spent by UNICEF for supplies not available within the assisted countries and to help the training of national personnel in the fields of health, nutrition and child welfare. Specifically, UNICEF provides basic medical equipment for maternal and child health centers; insecticides, drugs, and transport to initiate and run campaigns against endemic diseases usually affecting children, such as trachoma, malaria, yaws, leprosy, and tuberculosis; UNICEF also provides powdered milk and vitamins for child feeding; equipment for dairies and milk-drying plants and for the processing of high-protein foods; and UNICEF sponsors nutrition education programs carried out through schools and maternal and child health centers.

4. UNICEF Board: UNICEF operates under the direction of a 30-nation executive board which meets once a year (see list of members for 1959 hereafter). Its decisions are implemented by an Executive Director, New York Headquarters staff and a small staff of representatives in country, area and regional offices in many parts of the world.

5. Financial aspects: UNICEF is entirely supported by voluntary contributions. About 90 percent comes from governments and the rest from organizations and individuals. In 1958, 87 governments contributed 20 million dollars. UNICEF funds are allocated to programs according to need and only 6.8 percent go toward administrative costs.

6. U.S. contribution: The U.S. Government is in large part responsible for initiating the idea of a United Nations agency for assistance to the world's children. It has been the largest contributor since UNICEF was organized. The U.S. Government contribution in 1958 was $11 million. In recent years the U.S. contribution to UNICEF has represented a decreasing percentage of the budget of the Children's Fund since contributions from other governments have been on the increase. The U.S. percentage in 1957 was 55 percent, in 1959 it will be 50 percent.

7. Financial aid: Assisted governments do not receive money. UNICEF provides supplies and equipment to strengthen child health, welfare and nutrition programs on a basis which is worked out between the Children's Fund and the aided government concerned; technical advice comes from WHO, FAO or other UN agencies. Each project has to be approved by UNICEF's 30-nation Executive Board. UNICEF field workers see to careful dispensing of all supplies; training aides and stipends are closely supervised. Records are kept and audited by UNICEF and by the Board of External Auditors of the United Nations.

8. Citizen support: Citizens in both donor and recipient countries voluntarily support UNICEF work. UNICEF welcomes the interest and support of all responsible nongovernmental organizations and individuals. Its Executive Board has granted consultative status to 59 international nongovernmental organizations including all the major religious, civic, professional and service groups. In a number of countries, as in the United States, national UNICEF committees have been formed with the approval and cooperation of the governments concerned. UNICEF gratefully acknowledges the help it receives from these citizen organizations, and believes their record of supporting their governments' policies relative to the children's fund provides their best endorsement.

9. The U.S. Committee for UNICEF, a nonprofit organization incorporated under the laws of New York State, was established to stimulate interest in "all the world's children" and promote a channel for U.S. citizen participation in the work of the United Nations Children's Fund. The U.S. Commit-

tee is authorized by its certificate of incorporation to receive tax deductible contributions for the Children's Fund. Financial records are carefully kept and are audited by an outside accounting firm. The audited accounts are registered annually with Dun & Bradstreet, National Information Bureau, National Better Business Bureau and are available to other recognized accrediting agencies.

10. Committee projects: The U.S. Committee's primary purpose is to help more people become aware of UNICEF—why it is needed, whom it helps, and the result of its aid. This aim is promoted by three major annual projects:

(a) Trick or treat for UNICEF: This is a Halloween program which enables young Americans to contribute to the welfare of their less fortunate contemporaries around the world. The program has grown from a small, spontaneous beginning in 1950 to one in which millions of boys and girls take part each year. In donating their "treats" of coins to UNICEF, children not only enjoy all the traditional fun of Halloween, but derive pride and pleasure from the knowledge that they are helping UNICEF's vital work. At the same time, communities find the project an opportunity for wholehearted cooperation to convert a former "problem day" into one with a constructive purpose.

(b) UNICEF greeting cards: First brought out 10 years ago, they benefit the work of the Children's Fund. Each year since 1949, world famous artists have contributed paintings as designs, making possible a unique greeting card which does more than convey wishes for happiness—it actually brings happiness, in the form of milk and medicines, to many of the world's needy children.

(c) "Hi Neighbor": A book which annually describes five UNICEF-aided countries in terms of children's interests, supplemented by a record of songs and dances from the same lands.

13. UNICEF executive board members for 1959: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Equador, El Salvador, France, Germany (Federal Republic of), India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom, United States, Yugoslavia, Tunisia.

14. Countries and territories receiving UNICEF aid:

Africa: Algeria (French departments of); Cameroons under French administration; Central African Federation, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Southern Rhodesia; French Community, Central African Republic, Republic of Chad, Republic of Congo, Republic of Dahomey, Republic of Gaboon, Republic of Ivory Coast, Mauritanian Islamic Republic, Republic of Niger, State of Senegal, Republic of Sudanese, Republic of Voltaic, Gambia; Ghana;[1] Republic of Guinea; Kenya; Liberia;[1] Malagasy Republic; Mauritius; Morocco;[1] Federation of Nigeria; St. Helena; Sierra Leone;[1] Tanganyika under British administration; Togoland under French administration; Tunisia;[1] Uganda; Zanzibar.

Asia: Afghanistan,[1] Burma,[1] Cambodia,[1] Ceylon,[1] China (Taiwan),[1] Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong,[1] India,[1] Indonesia,[1] Japan,[1] Federation of Malaya,[1] Netherlands New Guinea, New Hebrides, North Borneo,[1] Pakistan,[1] Philippines,[1] Sarawak,[1] Singapore,[1] Solomon Islands, Thailand,[1] Vietnam.[1]

Eastern Mediterranean: Aden,[1] British Somaliland,[1] Esthiopia,[1] Iran,[1] Iraq,[1] Israel,[1] Jordan,[1] Lebanon,[1] Libya,[1] Somaliland under Italian administration, Sudan,[1] Turkey,[1] United Arab Republic,[1] Egypt,[1] Syria.[1]

Europe Austria,[1] Greece,[1] Italy,[1] Poland,[1] Spain,[1] Yugoslavia.[1]

The Americas: Argentina,[1] Bolivia,[1] Brazil,[1] British Guiana,[1] British Honduras,[1] British Virgin Islands, Chile,[1] Colombia,[1] Costa Rica,[1] Dominican Republic,[1] Ecuador,[1] El Salvador,[1] French Guiana (Department of France), Guatemala,[1] Haiti,[1] Honduras,[1] Mexico,[1] Nicaragua,[1] Panama,[1] Paraguay,[1] Peru,[1] Surinam, Uruguay, West Indies Federation: Antigua,[1] Barbados, Dominica, Grenada,[1] Jamaica,[1] Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Trinidad and Tobaga,[1] Turks and Caicos.

[1] Denotes those which also contribute to UNICEF's central fund.

How Hungry is "Toothy" Labor Law?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article that appeared in the September 13, 1959, edition of the Washington Post by the distinguished staff writer and labor economist, Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter. In light of the recently passed labor reform bill, the remarks of Mr. Nossiter are timely and pertinent to the question of the immediate future for industrial relations in the United States:

HOW HUNGRY IS "TOOTHY" LABOR LAW?

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Postnatal examinations of the labor bill, as thick last week as the cigar smoke at a gathering of union business agents, agree on only one central conclusion:

Congress has spawned a two-headed baby with its "Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959."

One head sinks some infant teeth into the corruption dramatized by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN'S Rackets Committee. The other nips at union organizing and strike weapons.

Ironically, the bill's sections dealing directly with corruption were written with comparatively little argument. The Teamsters Union complained loud, long, and vainly against powers given the Secretary of Labor to investigate reports. The AFL–CIO and a large minority of the Senate took a gloomy view at first of the "bill of rights" for union members grafted onto the measure by MCCLELLAN.

But the real struggles came over the bill's title VII—amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which touch on union power. The differences between "strong," "moderate" and "soft" bills turned essentially on how they treated union boycotts and picket lines.

A SIZE-UP

The experts are neither sure in their own minds nor do they agree with one another about the economic consequences of the measure Congress finally passed. Obviously, much depends on interpretations by the National Labor Relations Board, its independent General Counsel, and the courts. Sections of Taft-Hartley, particularly in the picketing and boycott area, are still unsettled 12 years after the bill was passed.

But, in a very tentative sort of way, the new law is expected to yield these results:

Organizing of the unorganized, which has not kept pace with the growth of the labor force since Taft-Hartley, will be slowed even further. This means that the largely nonunion South and the great mass of unorganized whitecollar workers will stay outside union ranks until organized labor comes up with new techniques and fresh appeals.

Craft unions like the plumbers and sheetmetal workers will be much harder hit than the mass-production industrial unions like Walter Reuther's Autoworkers. But industrial unions in migrating industries, like the textile workers and chemical workers, will also find it more difficult to organize or back up demands.

New crimps have been put in the economic and organizing power of the Teamsters, despite President James R. Hoffa's cries to the contrary.

WEAPONS SYSTEM

For the most part, industrial unions in steel, coal, and autos have organized the production worker in their jurisdiction. They back up wage demands by withdrawing these workers and shutting down production. They rarely rely on boycotts or on picket lines to sign up nonunion plants.

But both these latter weapons are important to the crafts, the Teamsters, and whitecollar unions .

The Taft-Hartley Act appeared to outlaw secondary boycotts and union pressure on an employer aimed at getting him to stop dealing with another firm, the primary firm with which the union had a dispute. Taft-Hartley prohibited a union from discouraging the secondary firm's workers' handling of the primary firm's goods. But it said nothing about direct pressure on, or agreements with, the secondary employer.

So the Teamsters slipped through this ban with "hot cargo" agreements. The Teamsters, for example, might be trying to organize a grocery chain's warehouse. Under the "hot cargo" pacts, truckers normally carrying goods in and out of the warehouse would agree not to transport the struck cargo. This pressure could persuade the warehouse operators to sign up.

DEPLETED ARSENAL

The new law, however, specifically prohibits such agreements with two exceptions: garment workers and, in a very limited way, building trades workers.

Moreover, the new law includes a section outlawing secondary boycott pressure against any person, not just workers of the secondary firm.

The boycott provisions also strike at many unions which depended on Teamster aid to enforce their organizing and economic demands. The retail clerks, for example, often have trouble winning a strike against a department store unless Teamster drivers refuse to pick up and deliver merchandise. Now, individual drivers may still decide on their own not to cross a clerks' picket line. But the Teamsters as a union can't make truckers agree not to send their drivers out with goods for the struck store.

A big, open question is what will happen to drivers who refuse to cross picket lines at struck shops. The Teamsters will attempt to write contracts with truckers providing that workers can't be fired for such refusals. If these contracts are upheld, the boycott provisions may not have nearly as much bite as has been expected.

Another feature of the boycott section prohibits workers from picketing stores selling goods coming from a struck plant. This is a marginal weapon, billed as an advertising device. Actually, it is a technique aimed at getting employees working in or servicing the store to bring pressure on the struck manufacturer through their employer.

SAGGING PICKETS

The new curbs on organizational picketing—lines set up around nonunion shops to bring workers into unions—will compel labor organizers to sell these workers on the advantages of the union before the union turns on economic heat. In the South and in white-collar offices, where suspicion and hostility toward unions is common, this won't be easy.

Unionists frankly admit they often set up organizing picket lines where many workers haven't been sold on the union. The picketing has been justified as necessary to protect the standards of organized shops. It was aimed at pressuring holdouts into the union and, in some cases, pressuring the employer by shutting off his deliveries.

Now, these lines can't be maintained for more than 30 days unless the union asks the NLRB for an election in which the union must win a majority of the votes to be certified. Moreover, unions can't picket an unorganized shop where an election has been held within a year or in which another union is the recognized agent.

Curiously enough, this last provision could seal racket unions into a shop. An employer could agree to recognize a crooked local which then might get certified by the NLRB. A legitimate union could picket this plant only if it could prove that the employer had connived with the racket local. Such proof is hard to come by.

But if this gives the crooked union leader any comfort, the bill's other six titles will send him scurrying to lawyers and accountants. In general, these sections rely on disclosure to prevent union officials from treating members' dues as their personal property.

All unions, down to the smallest local, will be required to report in detail how they got their funds and how they are spending them. A special fiduciary section requires union officers to spend and invest solely for the benefit of the organization.

Moreover, officials must report any side ventures they engage in or gifts they get from employers with whom their union bargains. This is designed to expose to public and members' views the kind of generosity some truckers have shown toward Hoffa and his predecessor, Dave Beck.

Employers and their union-taming middlemen, like Nathan Shefferman, are also required to report gifts to unionists and report expenditures to steer workers away from a union or into a favored organization.

But middlemen-lawyers need not report matters arising from a legitimate attorney-client relationship" and this could be a large escape hatch.

Hoffa's program to rehabilitate former convicts by putting them on Teamster payrolls may also be overhauled. The law prohibits erstwhile burglars, arsonists, embezzlers, and certain other felons from holding union office for 5 years after their conviction. However, some lawyers think that this section's ban against Communists in union office may be unconstitutional.

Another antihoodlum section requires officials handling union funds to be bonded for up to $500,000. Bonding companies don't like to write guarantees for men with records.

Perhaps the biggest and least-charter departure in the new law are sections aimed at breaking union autocrats stranglehold on their offices. Periodic, secret-ballot elections are now required. Union members are also guaranteed within some limits, the right to vote, caucus, pass on dues, sue their union, or speak against its policies without fear of retaliation.

It is still far too early to tell whether these sections will stir a prosperity-number membership; whether they can be used by employer agents to harass a union, or whether they will encourage a militancy in some timid unions that employers who fought so hard for the "bill of rights" never foresaw.

Gold, Foreign Aid, and Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, since this excerpt is pertinent to several recent speeches and remarks I have made in the House, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very provocative article by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., in a recent edition of the New York Times entitled "Big Trade Deficit Is Sparking Move To Cut Aid Funds."

Understandably, thoughtful Americans should be deeply concerned by the marked and steady decrease in the U.S. gold stock pile and by evidence and signs of waste, inefficiency and mismanagement in the administration of foreign aid.

The substantial shift in the balance of international trade and our steadily depleting gold stock pile can be viewed in no other way than with deep concern.

I have felt for sometime past that Congress should very carefully reevaluate and reshape our current monetary policies as well as our mutual security policies and reciprocal trade policies. Current trends are alarming and the growing evidence of maladjustment in these fields requires our immediate and most penetrating attention.

I appeal again to the executive department to exercise its authority and powers under current laws to stop the outflow of gold, eliminate waste and improvidence in foreign aid, and expeditiously check cheap foreign imports which are now threatening American workers, American industries and the American standard of living.

The article follows:

BIG TRADE DEFICIT IS SPARKING MOVE TO CUT AID FUNDS—UNITED STATES WORRIED BY DECREASE IN GOLD STOCKPILE AND RISE IN FOREIGN ASSETS HERE

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, September 5.—The big deficit in the U.S. balance of international payments, with its resulting outflow of gold and buildup of foreign assets in New York, has begun to have a major impact on administration thinking about foreign aid.

Powerful voices, centering in financial agencies, have begun to argue that the flow of Government capital abroad in the form of aid is too large for the continued strength of the dollar.

The underlying belief in top administration financial circles is that there is an entirely new situation in the world economy, with European currencies gaining strength while the dollar is showing the first faint signs of vulnerability.

EMOTIONS IN CONFLICT

The immediate results of this view came in President Eisenhower's trip to Europe, during which he urged that European nations undertake a far greater share of the burden of helping underdeveloped countries.

In a sense, the administration is torn between two powerful emotions. One stems from acceptance of the basic idea that the underdeveloped countries must be helped in the interest of the United States as well as for the good of those nations that get aid.

The other is a growing fear for the future stability of the dollar unless two related things happen: domestic finances are controlled and the balance of international transactions is righted. The U.S. deficit in international transactions was $3,400 million last year and will probably be even larger this year.

FUTURE SEEMS GLOOMY

As financial officials see the situation, it will do no good to anyone if there is a larger outflow of aid dollars but the dollar becomes of dubious value. This could happen, it is believed, if U.S. payments deficits continue on a large scale for many more years.

Such a deficit means that foreign countries as a whole obtain more dollars than they spend to buy American goods. They can take the difference in gold or can keep it in dollars and invest them in the financial markets in New York. These invested dollars are potential claims against gold. Already they total $15,651 million, not far below the gold reserve, which has dwindled to $19,524 million.

As the claims grow and the gold stock declined, U.S. short-term liabilities might eventually exceed assets. Even that would not necessarily mean a run on gold or some other crisis. But U.S. officials do not like to contemplate even the remotest possibility of such an event.

Besides, some of them, looking ahead, are unhappy at the thought of potential pressure on the United States from what, in effect, would be its foreign creditors. The United States, which has been exerting the pressure for years, does not want to be on the receiving end.

Foreign countries are already substantial creditors of the U.S. Government. They have invested about $6,200 million in New York in short-term Government securities. Thus, as one high official put it, "we're borrowing short from foreigners at home and lending abroad long."

The recent deterioration in the U.S. balance of payments has come about mainly because of a drop in exports and a rise in imports, not because of an increase in foreign aid. But as financial officials view the situation, foreign aid is the one element in the total balance over which the Government has considerable control.

It is regarded as certain that the new line of thought in the administration will be a major theme in conversations with foreign finance ministers at the annual meeting here later this month of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

European countries have been running strong surpluses in their balance of payments while the United States has been in deficit. To U.S. officials this means only one thing: Europe should become a much bigger exporter of capital and the United States a smaller one.

NEW VIEW ON INVESTMENTS

Officials worried about international-payments deficit are even beginning to take a less enthusiastic view of investment abroad by American business. Up until very recently, this was welcomed on every count, by conservatives and liberals alike.

Now, with the payments deficit uppermost in many minds, an investment abroad is fre-

quently seen as a double blow—first an immediate outflow of dollars, and, second, a probable set-back to American exports. The export loss occurs when an American manufacturer, for example, builds a plant in Europe to share in the common market rather than try to sell goods made in the United States.

This feeling accounts for the Treasury's opposition to a bill to provide new tax incenetives for foreign investment unless its benefits are limited to investments in underdeveloped countries.

A reflection of the growing concern about the international payments position of the United States came in the administration position on the Development Loan Fund in the foreign-aid bill. The President refused to support a Senate move to put the fund's financing on a long-term basis, increase its lending authority and get around the appropriations committees, even though the President's original position backed all three ideas.

Another reflection of the new line of thought, paradoxically, is U.S. support for the new International Development Association, even though this will cost the United States $330 million. Such a new institution has several merits in the eyes of an official worried about the U.S. payments deficit and the problem of the underdeveloped countries

It puts Europe in the lending picture for the first time on a formal, multilateral scale.

Because it will be equipped to make soft loans—loans with easy terms and repayable in the currency of the borrower—it should eventually ease the pressure for a larger and larger Development Loan Fund in the United States. The loan fund also makes this type of loan.

State Investigation of Chemical Corn-New York Trust Merger Called For

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following press release issued by the Honorable LESTER HOLTZMAN on Monday, September 14, 1959, calling for investigation by the State attorney general of the Chemical Corn-New York Trust merger:

Representative LESTER HOLTZMAN, Democrat, of New York, member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and of its Antitrust Subcommittee, today called for a full-dress investigation by the attorney general of the State of New into the merger of the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank and the New York Trust Co.

The New York lawmaker joined Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, in deploring the decision of New York State Superintendent of Banks, G. Russell Clark, to approve the merger.

"This decision flies in the face of our antitrust policies," he said, "and ignores the authoritative finding of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice that the merger's effect may be substantially to lessen competition, and tend to create a monopoly."

Mr. HOLTZMAN stated that failure of the responsible officials promptly to remedy this situation would reflect adversely on the administration of Governor Rockefeller. "The people of the State of New York," he said, "have a vital and continuing interest in a healthy, competitive banking system. They will not lightly accept the erosion of free enterprise in banking."

The text of Mr. HOLTZMAN's statement is as follows:

"The decision of Mr. G. Russell Clark, New York State superintendent of banks, to approve the proposed merger of the Chemical Corn Exchange Bank and the New York Trust Co. marks a trend in the concentration of banking facilities that must be stopped. This decision flies in the face of our basic antitrust policies and ignores the authoritative finding of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice that the merger's effect 'may be substantially to lessen competition and tend to create a monopoly.' What is more, it misconstrues the clear holding of the Bethlehem case, which disapproved a similar merger of steel companies, and will bring together two of the largest New York City banks into another banking colossus.

"I agree with the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative CELLER, that an immediate investigation should be instituted by the State attorney general under the Donnelly Act, New York's antitrust law. If violation is found, the merger should be set aside.

"Failure of responsible State officials promptly to remedy this situation will reflect adversely on the administration of Governor Rockefeller. The people of the State of New York have a vital and continuing interest in a healthy, competitive banking system. They will not lightly accept the erosion of free enterprise in banking."

Whose Ox Is Being Gored by Whom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill have complained about the type and tenor of some of the letters they have received. They are not alone in the assaults on their integrity. Those who voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill are receiving letters of the same type though from different sources.

The following letter from Mr. Sydney N. Coates, dated September 4, 1959, is typical of the correspondence I have received since voting against the Landrum-Griffin bill. My reply of September 10, 1959 is also set forth:

SEPTEMBER 10, 1959.

Mr. SYDNEY N. COATES,
Seattle, Wash.

DEAR MR. COATES: I have your letter of September 4, 1959.

I have not been threatened by any representative (unscrupulous or otherwise) of any section of organized labor.

For your information, I have received threats and insolent letters from people who assume that only those who voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill voted their consciences rather than the pressures, threats and emotions of their constituents, while all those who voted against it have no consciences but bow to the whim or the will of the unions.

On behalf of the 200 colleagues who joined me in voting against the Landrum-Griffin bill in the first instance, and on behalf of the 51 colleagues who joined me in voting against it in its final form, I resent such conduct and remind you that threats against legislators are un-American regardless of what prompts them.

I am happy to note that you will support every Senator and Representative who "is not biased by pressure from any group." Does that mean that those who think as you do will withhold their support from every Senator and Representative who submitted to the pressures of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and every other big business representative?

Very truly yours,
ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

SEATTLE, WASH., *September 4, 1959.*

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MULTER: You as our elected Congressman have been threatened in your position to legislate for the welfare of the country as a whole by an unscrupulous representative of one section of organized labor.

A threat of this kind cannot be left unchallenged by the people of our country. The enclosure is my personal answer. I have challenged Mr. Carey to step down as per my letter, and the cartoon from the Seattle Post Intelligencer supports the public's attitude toward this type of uncalled-for threat.

I will support every Senator and Representative in his right to exercise his judgment as he sees fit, provided he is not biased by pressure from any group.

Let me say in closing, that I know the people of our country have confidence in you as our leaders to fulfill the obligation of doing what is best for all. Our thoughts and prayers are with you constantly.

Very truly yours,
SYDNEY N. COATES.

Tribute to a Great Test Pilot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to an outstanding son of West Virginia who lost his life in the service of his country.

I refer to Comdr. Jon Edward Thomas, a native of Spencer in Roane County, W. Va., a distinguished officer of the Navy whose loss will be keenly felt by the Nation and his home State of West Virginia. Commander Thomas was one of the Navy's leading test pilots and testing-unit commanders. He was killed in line of duty at Moffett Field, Calif., on December 11, 1958.

Commander Thomas was in the 42d year at the time of his death. His naval career was one of great brilliance and reflected his fine qualities as an officer.

Attending Marshall College in Huntington, W. Va., Commander Thomas enlisted in the Navy a full 9 months before Pearl Harbor. During the same month that the United States was attacked at Pearl Harbor, he was commissioned an ensign and assigned to naval aviation.

In combat operations, he demonstrated the highest qualities of courage aboard various carriers and carrier escort vessels. The Navy depended heavily on his bravery and ingenuity in both war and peace.

After World War II, Commander Thomas was assigned as a liaison officer and test pilot with the British, French, and Netherlands navies from August 1948 to January 1951. This was during the period when the United States and its Allies were striving to forge a strong defense against Communist aggression through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

He later was assigned to test pilot training at the Patuxent River Naval Air Test Center. Then he was a project engineer and pilot in the fight test center at this vital installation.

In 1955, Commander Thomas was designated as air operations officer on one of our most important vessels, the U.S.S. *Forrestal*. A year later he was promoted to project coordinator for special weapons at Kirkland Field, N. Mex. At the time of his death he was serving his country as commanding officer of squadron 125.

Among the decorations awarded to Commander Thomas for his faithful and heroic service were the American Campaign Medal, Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal, World War II Victory Medal, Navy Occupational Service Medal—European Clasp, National Defense Service Medal, Philippine Liberation Ribbon, Order of the British Empire, and Netherlands Order of the Orange Nassau.

The loss of Commander Thomas is felt keenly by the Armed Forces of the United States, by his many friends and relatives in West Virginia throughout the world, and by all who respect and admire honor and devotion to the service of one's country.

Fifty-Acre Fair Celebrates the First 50 Years of Tel Aviv

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, dramatic changes have taken place in Israel during the last 50 years. The city of Tel Aviv is now celebrating its 50th jubilee. Tel Aviv has become a great center, not only for the government of this bastion of democracy, but also it is now a main artery in Middle East industry and commerce. Francis Ofner of the Chicago Sun-Times has done a special report on the celebration of the first 50 years of Tel Aviv, and I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

FIFTY-ACRE FAIR CELEBRATES THE FIRST 50 YEARS OF TEL AVIV

(By Francis Ofner)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—A gaily laid out, 50-acre fair is commemorating the jubilee of Tel Aviv, the first all-Jewish city in modern history.

Fifty years ago a handful of pioneers moved out of the winding alleys of age-old Jaffa to found, amid the sand dunes to the north, a suburb they called Tel Aviv, meaning Hill of Spring. It has become a metropolis of nearly 400,000 and is Israel's biggest single agglomeration of commerce, industry, arts, newspapers, and traffic jams.

WORLD MESSAGES

Its exciting history is told in plastic models, pictures, and diagrams at the Tel Aviv municipal pavilion, the heart of the fair. How the shaky summer huts of 1909 survived wars and riots to grow into a world landmark is symbolized by the nearby cities of the world pavilion.

Thirty-two cities in 20 countries have sent token exhibits, many with Hebrew inscriptions, greeting Tel Aviv.

There are spacious amusement parks, a heliport and commercial pavilions. The organizers intend that after a 2-month jubilee show the fair will become the site of regular international fairs and help to boost Tel Aviv's position as one of the Middle East's main centers of commerce and industry.

A DRAMATIC CHANGE

When the State of Israel came into being 11 years ago, the site of the exhibition on the north bank of the Yarkon River was a place for weekend picnics by those willing to hike far afield. By now it lies practically in the center of northern Tel Aviv, with fashionable hotels and modern shopping arcades surrounding it.

The main driving force behind this rapid growth has been the immigration that trebled the country's population since 1948. On a miniature scale, Tel Aviv has become to Israel what New York is to the United States. Neither is its country's capital, yet each is the biggest single concentration of both old settlers and new immigrants.

Like New York, Tel Aviv does not bear the stamp of any particular group. Its inhabitants, originating from more than 70 countries—with a strong core of native-born Israelis—have given it a distinctive character.

IDEALISM AND NECESSITY

Tel Aviv's vitality stems from idealism and necessity. The city was never a boomtown spurred by a gold rush or oil strike, or by sudden industrialization. The founding fathers' dream of a town where the mayor, policemen, and street cleaners would all be Jews simply brushed aside such obstacles as orthodox economics or the sweltering climate.

The need to take in ever-growing waves of refugees from Czarist Russia, Nazi Germany, the African, and Asian states rising under the hostile banner of Arab nationalism, and Communist-dominated Eastern Europe provided the impetus for the city's development and expansion.

Like many cities of Asia and Africa, Tel Aviv is a pattern of contrasts—but not the sharp contrasts of wealth and misery as in many older cities.

Here a company director may share a block of flats with a veteran bus driver, while more recent immigrants, highly qualified lawyers from Poland or former hawkers of the Moroccan bazaars, struggle alongside one another to strike roots in identical asbestos huts to which they were taken straight from shipboard.

Senator Scott Is Hailed Freshman of Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Friday, September 11, 1959:

SENATOR SCOTT IS HAILED FRESHMAN OF YEAR

(By John M. Cummings)

HARRISBURG, September 10.—The Republican half of the TV act of Clark and Scott has been designated freshman Senator of the year.

In recognition of the honor bestowed on this distinguished Philadelphian, silver-tongued EVERETT DIRKSEN, the minority leader of the Senate, gave SCOTT a bearlike hug while the cameramen recorded the touching scene for posterity.

HUGH SCOTT, nimble witted and aggressive, was elected a U.S. Senator from Pennsylvania last fall. A former chairman of the Republican National Committee and at the time of the election a Member of the House, Mr. SCOTT defeated the then Governor of the Commonwealth, George Michael Leader.

In the same election and, like Leader, running on the Democratic ticket, Dave Lawrence won the governorship. HUGH SCOTT, in point of fact, was the only winner on the Republican ticket in the statewide balloting. His victory stands as testimony to his own strength and the weakness of Mr. Leader.

The new honor bestowed on Mr. SCOTT comes at a time when some folks are pondering the likelihood of his being nominated for Vice President at next year's Republican National Convention. It is contended that a bloke capable of carrying Pennsylvania when the State, otherwise, was going Democratic, could be a wheelhorse of no little drawing power.

Pennsylvania ranks next to New York and California in the number of convention delegates and votes in the electoral college. The disposition, to which SCOTT certainly would offer no objection, is to link his proposed candidacy with the presidential prospects of Vice President NIXON.

Mr. NIXON, at this early stage of the proceedings, seems destined to win the presidential nomination of his party. To be sure, forces are at work promoting Governor Rockefeller, of New York, whose sensational defeat of Averell Harriman last year was a really outstanding achievement from the Republican standpoint.

Beyond New York, however, Rockefeller is an unknown quantity. Mr. NIXON, on the other hand, has been in the public eye for a number of years. His recent journey to Russia boosted his stock immeasurably, and contributed to the growing feeling that his nomination for the top spot on the Republican ticket is inevitable.

Senator CLARK, who teams with SCOTT in a political slackwire act on television, missed being designated freshman of the year after his debut in Washington.

It seems that the Democratic neighbor of Senator SCOTT in the Chestnut Hill section of Philadelphia talked his way into disfavor with a number of important lads in the Sen-

ate, including Majority Leader JOHNSON. And, by the way, JOHNSON's trial kite as a presidential prospect seems to be trailing its tail.

The new honor which has come SCOTT's way should be of substantial help in the billing of the team. Up Scranton way CLARK and SCOTT still is a brand of tobacco. They chew it.

My Report to the District on the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, it is my practice to keep the people of the Sixth Iowa District informed on the legislative work accomplished by the House of Representatives and to report on my activities each year through a year-end report. The following summary sets out the high points of the legislative work of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

ECONOMY

The underlying theme of this eventful session of the Congress has been "hold the line on Government spending." The Congress not only held spending within the President's budget requests but actually shaved further reductions in appropriations of the tax dollars.

I supported the House Committee on Appropriations in their efforts to cut the overall budgetary appropriations and voted for appropriation bills which contained these spending cuts. My philosphy is that we must appropriate every cent we need for the necessities of our people at home, including all the necessities for defense, but not one red cent for waste.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT

Although this has not been an altogether productive year for farm legislation, it has been most gratifying to me to serve the farmers of Iowa and the Nation as a member of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The Presidential veto of the wheat bill dampened hopes for major revisions of the farm programs. My omnibus farm bill was one which was shelved by continued veto threats. Mr. Benson, speaking on behalf of the administration, frankly stated that he would not let any legislation pass which raised the parity supports even so little as 1 percent, no matter how much production was reduced. This attitude created a complete stalemate as these views are not shared by the majority of the membership of the Agriculture Committee.

OFFICE ACTIVITIES

During this session I have introduced 33 bills and resolutions which can be divided into 4 main categories as measures to assist or otherwise to be of benefit to the farmer, the small businessman, the laborer, and the elder citizen. I have spent a great deal of time writing letters, testifying, and working for these measures as well as other legislation which you have urged me to support. Items, other than farm measures, which I have given particular stress include transmission lines for western Iowa, amortization deductions for small business, reduced interest loans for small businesses which build facilities to process surplus farm products into new industrial products or uses, raising income limitations of the Social Security Act, pensions for veterans and their widows, extension of rural mail routes, creation of food storage program for national emergencies, wildlife and conservation programs, education and scholarship loans to students, extension of GI bill, establishment of Great White Fleet, and a program for the annual reduction of the national debt.

The following list of the important issues which came before the House of Representatives during this session of Congress provides you with my voting record and the current status of the legislation:

How I voted	Issue	Status
For	Admission of Hawaii as our 50th State	Became law.
Do	Continuing direct loans to veterans	Do.
Do	Extending Federal aid to airports	Do.
Do	Removal of REA from total control of Secretary of Agriculture	Vetoed.
Do	Self-financing authority for TVA	Became law.
Do	Federal program to improve housing	Sent to President.
Do	Extension of water pollution control program	On Speaker's desk.
Do	90 percent price support and acreage reduction for wheat	Vetoed.
Do	Strengthen wheat marketing quota and price support program	Do.
Do	Mutual security for world peace	Became law.
Against	Lower reserve requirements for Federal Reserve banks	Do.
For	Labor reform legislation (S. 1555 on final passage)	Do.
Do	Extending Public Law 480 with food stamp amendment	Sent to President.
Do	Health benefits program for civil service employees	Do.
Do	Public works appropriation (veto overridden)	Became law.
Against	1-cent increase in Federal gasoline tax	Sent to President.
For	Research program for industrial uses of agricultural commodities	Awaiting conference.
Do	Small business research and counseling grants	Sent to President.
Do	Veteran's pension program	Became law.
Do	Increasing savings bonds interest rates	Sent to President.

The following is a reprint of the very generous remarks of the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK in connection with my activities in this Congress and on my part in the passage of the labor reform legislation which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on September 3, 1959.

Will Bicarbonate Be Necessary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from today's Wall Street Journal:

THE SECRETARY'S HAT

Like a lot of other people, the Secretary of Labor is becoming increasingly restive about the continued steel strike. Not only is the strike more and more troublesome to him officially, Mr. Mitchell has a very personal stake in an early settlement. The longer it drags, the closer the Secretary comes to losing his hat and to a possible case of temporary indigestion.

Last spring, when certain Members of Congress wanted to go on a vast spending spree to prevent unemployment and certain labor leaders were predicting dire days for the economy, Mr. Mitchell also made a prediction. He said that unemployment would be less than 3 million during October, and he also said that if it weren't he'd eat his hat on the steps of the Labor Department Building.

Now the latest figures show that for the period from mid-July to mid-August, employment was at an all-time August high of 67.2 million and unemployment dropped some 318,000. But because of the continuing steel strike, the unemployment reduction was less than normal. While steelworkers on strike are not considered unemployed, the men laid off in other industries certainly are without jobs. And at least 145,000 in the rail, coal, and construction industries are idle because of the steel strike.

If all these men had been at work during that time, the total unemployment as of September 1 would have been 3,281,000 or thereabouts. And if unemployment were to continue to decline in the same ratio as it has for the past 2 or 3 months, there's not much question Mr. Mitchell would be wearing his hat where he should come November.

As it is, he still has a fighting chance, for both the Commerce Department and the Securities and Exchange Commission report new—and considerably higher—estimates of over $33 billion in business expansion for all of 1959. Since expansion makes jobs and jobs create less unemployment, a steel settlement before October might find the Secretary just under the wire.

But even if he has to eat his hat, he won't be the only one on a distasteful diet. For a great many Congressmen and labor leaders who were predicting calamity for the country unless the Government opened wide all the spending spigots have a great many wrong predictions to eat.

Establishment of a National Fuels Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following address by Walter F. Schulten, vice president, Consolidation Coal Co., on September 10, 1959, to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, meeting at Spokane, Wash.:

The idea of a national fuels policy, one which would take into account the most efficient and constructive use of our national resources in this field, is not new.

Back in the Roosevelt era Secretary of the Interior Ickes headed a committee which suggested such a plan. It was again proposed by the so-called Paley committee, which studied our national resources, and as late as 1954 by a Presidential advisory committee.

Now, with the formation of the National Coal Policy Conference, it has been put forward again. Resolutions are now pending which would set up a joint congressional committee, composed of eight members from the House and eight from the Senate, to study and make proposals for such a policy. There are few dissenting voices; the suggestion has had the hearty approval of leading congressional and governmental officials. Any such policy will involve the highly competitive fuel industries and a determination upon their claims and counterclaims.

One primary reason for formulating and executing a national fuels policy is national security.

One of the primary questions which has been raised is the extent to which our country should be dependent upon foreign imports of fuel. This question also looms large in the case of other minerals and products.

Yet, it is important in this instance also, even though a subject for controversy. Imports of residual oil have risen sharply since the end of World War II. In 1945, they were the equivalent of 10 million tons of coal; in 1957 and 1958, they approximated slightly more than 40 million tons. These imports have displaced coal for industrial uses.

Last spring the President put restrictions in the form of quotas on the imports of petroleum, including residual.

This action was taken after a petition to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization which alleged that petroleum imports threatened national security. The basis of the claim was impairment of the ability of domestic industries, including coal, to meet wartime demands upon them.

Evidently the President felt the claims were justified. Otherwise, he would not have taken action in the face of the opposition of powerful interests.

In the case of coal, some of the reasons for his concern are evident. The displacement of bituminous coal by its competitors, oil and and gas, has been a post-World War II phenomenon, although the trend had started before the war began.

Even so, in 1940, coal accounted for 61.3 percent of the fuel energy consumed; oil, 18.1 percent; gas, 8.8 percent.

By 1958, the changes were startling. Coal's share of the total had declined to 33.4 percent, a los of 27.9 percent; oil's share was 27 percent, a gain of 8.9 percent; and natural gas had 32.4 percent of the fuels energy market, a rise of 23.6 percent. Only hydroelectric power had remained comparatively static, moving from 5 percent to 5.5 percent in the 18 years.

Some of coal's losses must be put down to technological progress. Once upon a time all railroad locomotives were fired by coal. Along came diesel oil which pushed coal almost completely out of this market, a loss of 100 million tons. The change from coal to oil and gas for household heating has hit coal hard also. There are no accurate statistics on this loss, but we do know that between 1940 and 1958 retailer deliveries declined by more than 60 million tons. Undoubtedly a great part of this loss was in home heating.

Substantial declines also have taken place in the industrial field, coal having lost more than 25 million tons in manufacturing since 1940. These losses have taken place during a period when the overall energy output was increasingly under the powerful stimulus of war and a rapidly expanding economy. Consequently, the measure of coal's loss actually is a good deal greater than the figures indicate.

In 1958, coal's production totaled 405 million tons, approximately 88 million tons below 1957 and 225 million tons below the record production of 1947. The f.o.b. value of 1958 production was about a half billion dollars below 1957. In all probability, the industry as a whole lost money in 1958, just as it did in 1954 when production was slightly less than 394 million tons.

In all likelihood also, there are individual oil and gas companies whose total earnings since 1945 have been a good deal bigger than those of the entire bituminous coal industry. I doubt that any other major industry has made less money than coal since the end of the last war.

This might not seem too important were it not for several factors not generally understood. For example, the so-called man in the street, the average individual, lost contact with our product with the decline of coal home heating and the disappearance of the railroad market. He knew that he had stopped using coal and he read story after story about its displacement on the railroad. Even the change in the diesel whistle, or siren tone, from the melodious blast of the steam engine dramatized coal's defeat. He thereupon drew the natural conclusion that coal was going the way of the oxcart and the farm wagon. Unfortunately, the coal industry has not altogether disabused him of that idea.

When the coal industry complains, then, of what it considers unfair competition from other fuels, when it urges a slowdown in the vast amounts of money being spent trying to develop civilian atomic energy, the average man pays little attention. To him, it seems that a dying industry is trying to stave off the inevitable and to stick around as long as it can. Even many newspaper editors, ordinarily well informed, think along the same lines. It makes no difference at the moment that coal, despite its difficulties, is our basic energy source. We have it in abundance, enough to last for all purposes for hundreds of years. It is efficient, stable in price, and serves many purposes. With respect to oil or gas, various estimates have been made of the domestic reserves of these two valuable products. In the case of gas, some say 15, some 20 years. A known fact, however, is that consumption increases. Some authorities say there is enough oil on hand to last 30 years, some say 40. The exact number may be of little moment since our domestic production is likely to become increasingly inadequate insofar as domestic needs are concerned.

It is coal then that we must turn to for the future and, as the President's action in imposing quotas on petroleum imports indicates, it is coal we must turn to in the event of an all-out war.

There comes the question immediately: Could the coal industry, as it is today, meet the demand which would be put upon it if we had an all-out war?

I am afraid that answer would be "No."

Why do I make that statement? During the study by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, which resulted in the curtailment of oil imports, the coal industry submitted some very pertinent figures to the Government agency.

The existing productive capacity of the industry was estimated at 520 million tons annually.

But, in the light of past experience, demands for more coal in the event of war probably would be increased 120 million tons annually to a total of 640 million tons or more.

How quickly could the industry gear itself to produce 640 million tons, the estimated wartime demand? That is a real question. Since 1948, more than 1,800 bituminous coal mines have gone out of production. Most are out completely. They are flooded, or have deteriorated in other ways, until it would cost more to bring them back than it would to build new mines. (NOTE.—Easily accessible strip coal not available as in World War II.)

To build a new mine, a deep mine that is, in these days of high cost and mechanization, is not easy nor cheap. The best estimates are that it takes from 2 to 4 years, or a 3-year average, to put one into production. Today, over 75 percent of our production comes from these below surface operations.

Our experts estimate that to maintain existing capacity of 520 million tons annually requires the expenditure of between $120 million to $200 million yearly. I doubt very much that this amount of money is being spent this way. In other words, with production and earnings as low as they are at present, I think, and others who know coal agree with me, our production capacity is declining.

How much would it cost to add the 120 million tons additional which would be needed if war came? It probably would take somewhere between $600 million and $1 billion. With conditions as they are now, where is that money coming from? Where is the incentive to attract venture capital?

Let us assume that the estimates of additional production needed are high. Nevertheless, I think we will all agree that—barring a knockout of one side or the other very early—there will be a greatly increased demand for coal. The Russian submarine menace may be even greater than the German one during the last war. Then, as you will recall, many oil tankers and other ships were sunk along our coastline before we got matters under control. Oil imports were cut 65 percent or more. If the same thing happens again, the Nation will again have to turn to coal.

No one knows what will happen during ah H-bomb war, but we cannot afford to take unnecessary chances. National security should dictate that we cannot afford to let the coal industry decline further. The industry must be permitted to restore its stability and prosperity if it can.

This brings us back to the National Coal Policy Conference, a unique organization. Cooperation between labor and management to help an industry is not new, although by no means common. But the Conference goes beyond that. It brings in the railroads, which are greatly dependent on the freight revenue from coal, their single best customer. It includes the coal-equipment manufacturers and the utilities which consume coal. What does the organization propose to do? As I have indicated, it has put forward once more the proposal for a national fuels policy.

In the case of coal, such a policy would fall outside the home heating and railroad areas. Coal thinks it is going to recapture, or at least be a larger factor in, that home market through the use of electricity which will be powered by coal. As for the railroad market, we do not know. As conditions are at present, a diesel engine powered with oil probably is more efficient than the coal-fired steam engine and certainly the oil is cheaper.

Specifically, coal feels that a constructive and sound fuels policy would put a stop to

what it considers the dumping of imported residual oil and also the dumping of natural gas.

I mentioned the sharp rise in oil imports previously. The importers of residual do not agree with our claims. If coal is wrong, we should stop complaining. But if we are right, the dumping of cheap residual should stop. It is not only unfair competition, it is competition which weakens an industry whose stability is necessary for national security.

Similarly, we feel that natural gas is being sold too cheaply to heavy industry and utilities at the expense, not only of coal, but of the home user of gas who pays several times the prices which the utilities and heavy industry pays.

This subject is complex. However, not long ago coal's arguments received substantiation from a very impressive source. The Federal Power Commission granted the application of the Midwest Gas Transmission Co., a subsidiary of the Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., to enter the Chicago market. One of the Commissioners, Arthur Kline, dissented, saying, in effect, that residential customers and other comparatively small users would be charged in order that steel companies and utilities in the Chicago area would get gas at very low prices. Actually, the evidence indicates that some of the utilities and big companies in and around Chicago will get gas from the Midwest Co. at less than the price Midwest pays Tennessee Gas for the product.

The Federal Power Commission follows the practice of granting so-called temporary certificates which permit the extension of natural gas pipeline service into new areas. Sometimes the expansion projects involve the expenditure of millions of dollars. As a practical matter, such a situation means that the temporary certificate is misnamed. It is a permanent certificate, coal's protests to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Federal Power Commission does not have jurisdiction over direct sales of natural gas. It cannot control the price at which a pipeline company sells its product to an industrial consumer. The gas company is then free to negotiate the best price it can. Where there is competition with coal, this best price ordinarily is enough to undersell our product.

With the passage of time, however, the price advantage at the wellhead which natural gas once had over coal has vanished. If gas was not sold at dump rates, coal, in many instances, would get the business. Most gas companies have a two-part rate system. Under this system, there is a service or demand charge, plus a commodity charge for gas purchased from the pipeline company.

To meet coal's competition in the industrial field, the pipeline companies are increasing the service charge, thus increasing the cost to the residential consumer and other consumers of comparatively small quantities of gas, individually speaking.

This is known as "tilting the demand charge." Coal regards it as rigged competition. Moreover, we must not lose sight of the fact that gas reserves are limited to a few years and that, if the product is dumped in the utility and industrial markets, in order to provide the pipeline a balanced load, someday the householder will seek it in vain.

There is a wide variance in charges paid by the users of gas.

For instance, in 1957 the residential consumer of natural gas in New England averaged a price of 211.6 cents per thousand cubic feet. The average of electric utilities was 41.1 cents per thousand cubic feet.

The natural gas industry defends the disparity on the grounds that it is necessary to have some market for gas in slack periods in order to maintain a balanced pipeline load. Otherwise, it is said, residential consumers might have to pay still more.

Coal replies that the use of any considerable quantity of natural gas for heavy industry and utilities at low prices is highly questionable as a matter of national policy in view of the limited reserves of gas.

Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, made the statement not long ago that enough coal was being displaced by the dumping of residual oil and natural gas to make the difference between an unhealthy and depreseed coal industry and a healthy and prosperous coal industry.

All the experts agree that coal has a bright future. I have seen predictions that coal consumption in 1975 is almost certain to be about 800 million tons, twice 1958 consumption. Some say it will be much higher.

Perhaps those long-range forecasts may be proven true but we live in the present. We cannot afford to sit by and wait for time to solve our troubles. If war comes, national policy must be such that the bituminous coal industry will be in a position to meet the demands which the emergency would generate.

Thus, we as a Nation must carefully examine the situation today and act in accordance with what we find.

Obviously, such an inquiry should be a thoroughly objective, nonpartisan, and impartial investigation with all viewpoints of each segment of the fuels industry given equal opportunity to be presented, analyzed, weighted, and considered in arriving at final conclusions.

It must not be forgotten that there are many points on which the fuels industries might agree and make common cause. For example, the depletion allowances for oil and gas today are under heavy attack. I am no expert in this field, but judging from my experience with coal, I doubt very much that the depletion allowances for oil and gas are too high. If there were no incentives to explore and take risks, the discoveries in this country and elsewhere which have added so greatly to the reserves of oil and gas might not have been made.

It should mean freer competition with no advantages to any fuel. It should mean private operation of the civilian atomic energy industry. It should mean conservation of resources for national security. It should mean assurance of adequate fuel for civilian and military use during peace and war.

Such a fuels policy will provide a fuels stability for the citizens, the fuels industries and the Nation.

National Association of Wool Manufacturers Urge Reexamination of Our Textile Foreign Trade Policy by the President

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a letter sent to President Eisenhower by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers with reference to British wool textile exports to the United States:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF WOOL MANUFACTURERS,
New York, September 3, 1959.

The Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: American wool manufacturers are deeply disturbed by Prime Minister Macmillan's injection of the wool cloth tariff-rate quota into your recent televised chat and particularly by Mr. James C. Hagerty's reported comment: "The United States is reexamining its entire policy of limiting imports of wool textiles."

We are aware of your 1958 directive to your trade policy committee to seek alternates for the Geneva reservation as we know you are aware of our efforts to resolve complaints from our clothing manufacturers and importers and British and other exporters. We supported the suggestion of the British Wool Textile Export Corp. for country-by-country allocation of the tariff-rate quota and the Clothing Manufacturers Association of the United States of America's proposal calling for a constant year-round rate of duty for certain high-priced fabrics. We understand the allocation proposal was considered impracticable. However, you, while not adopting the Clothing Manufacturers Association plan, did proclaim special treatment for the high-priced fabrics for 1959.

That your trade policy committee has, as yet, been unable to discharge its obligation should not open it to criticism. The committee is defeated by circumstances as were we in a like quest. In July of 1958 we reported to Secretary Weeks that formulation of alternate proposals for the Geneva reservation appeared an impossible task in the absence of quantitative limitations on Japanese imports of wool textiles and clothing.

The 1947 duty reductions on wool textiles should not have been made in the first place. Your implementation of the Geneva reservation in 1956 and thereafter should stand as sufficient proof of that. But, even had the reductions not been made, we would be confronted today with grave import problems.

Even at pre-GATT rates we would be vulnerable to (1) Unfair low-wage competition from the resurgent Orient; (2) unfair competition arising out of mislabeled goods from certain European sources; (3) unfair competition from imports subsidized at the source through multiple rates of exchange and other devices.

More than the personal fortunes of manufacturers, suppliers, distributors, and their employees are at stake. Your office, in January 1958, through ODM Director Gordon Gray, recognized "past experience in national emergencies has established beyond reasonable doubt that an adequate wool textile industry is essential to national security."

Under such tenuous circumstances and in a matter of such vital public concern we seek assurance that Mr. Hagerty's reference was to the measures encompassed in your directive to your Trade Policy Committee and in your recent establishment in the executive branch of a Textile Interagency Committee and a Textile Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce.

We believe, Mr. President, that reexamination of our textile foreign trade policy, through these channels, will reveal the need for stronger measures to assure fair competition in our home market.

Respectfully,

EDWIN WILKINSON,
President

J. H. STURSBERG,
Chairman, Executive Committee NAWM; President, Livingston Worsted Mills, Inc.

Unions Weigh Impact of Labor Reform Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I comment to the attention of our colleagues the following article by A. H. Raskin, which appeared in the New York Times of September 6, 1959:

UNIONS WEIGH IMPACT OF LABOR REFORM BILL—SOME ACTIVITIES WILL BE CURBED BUT HOODLUMS MAY BE AIDED

(By A. H. Raskin)

This is organized labor's gloomiest Labor Day since the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act over President Truman's veto 12 years ago. The swift approval given by Congress last week to a stiff union reform bill and the certainty of its signature into law by President Eisenhower has brought from union leaders the same doleful forecast of imminent destruction that marked the swing from the old Wagner Act to Taft-Hartley.

Labor made no secret then of its belief that the labor-management relations act, sired by Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio, and Representative Fred Hartley, of New Jersey, represented the first ugly thrust of fascism in this country.

THE LAW STAYS

It was castigated as a law conceived in sin and its promoters were called "diabolical men who, seething with hatred, designed this ugly measure for the purpose of imposing their wrath upon the millions of organized and unorganized workers throughout the United States."

Labor's political energies were rallied for repeal of this "slave labor act." The Congress of Industrial Organizations threw new effort into its Political Action Committee; the American Federation of Labor created its first political arm—Labor's League for Political Education.

Labor did well at the polls, but the law stayed on the books, largely through the same coalition of Southern Democrats and Northern Republicans that was responsible for the surprise victory of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House of Representatives this year.

The damage inflicted by the act never lived up to its advance billing. The outlawing of the closed shop necessitated only minor revision of closed-union practices in such traditional strongholds of compulsory unionism as the printing and construction trades.

The law did open the way for enactment of "right to work" bills prohibiting any form of union security in 18 States; it complicated the task of new organizing, especially in the South; it circumscribed labor's right to refuse to work on materials produced under nonunion conditions; it permitted the exclusion of economic strikers from voting in representation elections if they had been permanently replaced during the walkout and it increased the scope of injunctions in labor disputes.

The unions that suffered most were generally those that were weakest, particularly in such lightly organized fields as textiles, chemicals and retail trades. Well entrenched unions like the United Steelworkers of America, the United Automobile Workers, and the International Brotherhood of Teamsters continued to move forward in membership, wealth and economic gains for their rank and file.

The union that was the special target of the Taft-Hartley advicates—John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers—attained its best contracts and its greatest acceptance in the industry after the law was passed.

The passage of the new labor control bill has been marked by union charges that it is "killer legislation" enacted at the behest of big business to weaken, if not destroy, unions. One union official calls the new law "a hundred times worse than Taft-Hartley." Another says it makes the 1947 statute look like a Magna Carta for labor.

Less emotional analysts in labor's ranks are inclined to believe that their experience now will be much the same as it was when the original shift from the Wagner Act took place. The powerful unions will be only mildly affected; the weak ones will find it even harder to get ahead.

THE IRONIC SIDE

On the ironic side is the almost universal expectation among top unionists that the law will not curb the organization Congress was primarily interested in checking—James R. Hoffa's Teamsters. Most employers are so fearful of the truck union's economic muscle that they are more likely to knuckle under to the exactions of Hoffa's lieutenants than they are to avail themselves of the new law's remedies against coercive union tactics.

Equally ironic is the possibility that the law, for all its emphasis on stamping out union rackets, will prove a legal umbrella for hoodlum-infested paper unions. The bill prohibits picketing for union recognition where an employer has lawfully entered into an agreement with another union. This provides a strong incentive for deals by unscrupulous employers and racketeers who go into the union business by the simple expedient of printing a fistful of independent charters. Contracts with such complacent outfits can serve as insurance against recruiting drives by bona fide unions. Proving that there is anything sour about the arrangement is always difficult. With the added vigilance the crooks have learned as a result of the McClellan committee investigation, it is going to be even harder to establish collusion in the future.

BILL OF RIGHTS

The most substantial revisions in union practices will flow from the rules against picketing to force union recognition and the virtual ban on secondary boycotts. With the spread of subcontracting in many major industries, the prohibition on union action to compel the sending of work to unionized contractors or even to unstruck shops may mean a significant decline in the automatic extension of organization in the mass production fields.

To a considerable extent, the secondary boycott ban accomplishes one of the chief aims of those who have been trying vainly for many years to bring unions under the antitrust laws. It makes it illegal for unions to put pressure on employers not to do business with other employers as a means of influencing their labor standards.

The biggest uncertainty is over the impact of the new bill of rights intended to make unions better custodians of the democratic rights and cash of their dues payers. Some unionists are fearful that they will be subject to harassment for union gifts to political or charitable causes. Thus, they envisage suits by southern members in southern courts to punish international union officers for making grants to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Others worry about the prospect that crackpots or Communists will paralyze normal union processes by overindulging their rights to speak and to insist on votes at membership meetings. Still other fear that leaders will be so dependent on the favor of the rank and file that demagoguery will replace responsibility in their approach to their duties.

In the end, most union leaders expect that the Federal courts will establish a rule of reason on the application of the bill of rights so that it protects the individual without stultifying the will of the majority. Nevertheless, in this and other sections of the bill, there is anxiety that the States will be encouraged to adopt even more stringent laws of their own.

"This bill is as running over with States rights as the constitution of the Confederacy," one lawyer commented wryly.

Memorandum of the Lithuanian American Council to the President of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress a memorandum sent to me by the Lithuanian American Council which was sent to the President of the United States:

MEMORANDUM OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

In view of the forthcoming visit of Nikita S. Khrushchev, the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, to the United States for informal talks with President Dwight D. Eisenhower, the Lithuanian American Council, comprising numerous organizations of American citizens of Lithuanian descent, considers its duty to state:

First, that it is evident that Premier Khrushchev did not abandon the policy of aggression and expansion which had been practiced by his predecessor Joseph Stalin, but, on the contrary, continues the same policy with the same ultimate aim, Communist domination of the world.

Second, that Nikita Khrushchev comes to this country not to prepare the way for international understanding and eventual peace, but to further his new aggressive campaign against the Western democracies which he started on November 27, 1958, by submitting to the great powers of the West his ultimatum concerning Berlin. This has been clearly demonstrated by the attitude of Soviet Russia's Foreign Minister Gromyko at the recent Geneva Conference, and by the numerous pronouncements of Mr. Khrushchev himself threatening to destroy countries that will reject his terms for peaceful coexistence.

Third, that his absolutely unyielding attitude and aggressiveness has again been most clearly shown in the article "On Peaceful Coexistence," under his onw signature, in the recent issue of Foreign Affairs.

These facts, in the opinion of the Lithuanian American Council, indicate that the present ruler of the Soviet Union seeks by his visit to Washington and his talks with the President of the United States to enhance his prestige in the world Communist movement, to propagandize his program for the expansion of power of the Communist empire, and to tighten the Kremlin's stranglehold on the enslaved and subjugated nations in Europe and Asia.

The Lithuanian American Council is deeply convinced that this arrogant challenge by the

leader of the Soviet empire cannot be left unanswered—or an impression might be created of weakening of the leading power of the free world in its stand against aggressors. The reply to Mr. Khrushchev's claims and assertions should be firm and clear, and should be given as wide publicity as possible.

The Lithuanian American Council, therefore, suggests:

1. That the claims by Mr. Khrushchev of the exclusive right of Soviet Russia to control the destinies of the former free and independent nations which have fallen under the rule of Moscow, should be rejected; as a matter of fact, all of them were deprived of their rights and liberties by force or the threat of force and deception, against the will of the overwhelming majority of the people of those countries and in violation of international treaties and obligations.

2. That the Government of the United States should officially rectify, point by point, the gross distortions of historical facts which have been perpetrated by Mr. Khrushchev. Though the Government of this country does not fight Soviet Russia's Communist regime, as such, or any other type of political system in foreign lands, yet the obvious untruths concerning the establishment of the so-called Socialist Republics should be corrected. As a matter of fact, even the Communist regime in Russia itself has been introduced by a small minority using armed force against the overwhelming majority of Russian people—as was conclusively proven by the results of the election to the Constituent Assembly of Russia—and maintains itself by brutal coercion and bloody terror.

3. That, specifically, the Soviet Premier's lying statements concerning Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia when he baldly asserts that these Baltic States are in a similar position in the Soviet Union as Texas, Arizona, and California in the United States should be refuted. It is a well-known fact established by the select congressional committee that the Baltic States have been overrun by the Soviet Red army and forcibly and illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union, in consequence of the Stalin-Hitler conspiracy.

4. That attention should be drawn to the fact that while Mr. Khrushchev is demanding that the Western democracies do not interfere in the internal affairs of any part of the Communist empire, at the same time, he reserves for himself the indisputable right to organize, subsidize, and direct subversive Communist activities in the countries of the free world including the United States. The Lithuanian American Council suggests that this double-faced policy should be emphatically condemned as one of the main factors disturbing international relations and creating a constant menace to world peace.

The Lithuanian American Council sincerely appreciates President Eisenhower's unceasing efforts in search of a just and lasting peace, and has full confidence that he will not be swayed from his belief, repeatedly and publicly expressed that a durable and just peace must be based upon freedom of all nations.

The Lithuanian American Council hopes that the forthcoming talks with Soviet Russia's Premier will be used by the President as an opportunity to reiterate these principles and thus encourage the peoples of the free world and those behind the Iron Curtain to join their forces in the common struggle for the ideals of freedom and democracy.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
DR. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Executive Secretary.

CHICAGO, *September 10, 1959.*

The Volunteer Fireman: His Brother's Keeper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY A. PROKOP
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PROKOP. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered before the delegates of the 29th annual convention of the Northeastern Pennsylvania Volunteer Firemens' Federation at Archbald, Pa., on Friday evening, September 11, 1959:

Mr. Chairman, Father McGinley, Burgess Flanagan, distinguished guests, officers, delegates, and friends of the volunteer fireman, this is indeed a happy occasion.

I would be ungrateful if I failed to recognize the generous spirit that prompted your capable and genial president, Leo O'Hearn, to give such a laudatory introduction.

At the outset may I express my deepest thanks to your convention chairman, Dick McHale, and his committee for their gracious invitation for giving me this opportunity to address this group—a desire that I had since I became a member of this association many years ago.

During the past 11 years it has been my privilege and my pleasure to become closely associated with the members of our own Jefferson Township Community Volunteer Fire Company and the members of the other volunteer companies in our region.

Among other things, I found the Volunteer Firemens' Federation of Northeastern Pennsylvania to be highly educational. As a member of our own volunteer fire company, I today have the greatest respect and admiration for all you fine people who are associated with this unselfish activity of helping your fellow man. I have firsthand knowledge of your duties and responsibilities and a much fuller recognition of the value and importance of volunteer fire companies to our way of life in this great Nation.

At the same time, I have learned, as president of our local fire company, of the many problems with which you as officers and members are confronted.

The people of your community owe you, the volunteer firemen, a great debt of gratitude.

I also wish to emphasize the great value of the unselfish citizens who comprise our volunteer fire companies in time of local or national emergency. Their training and their skill and their knowledge can always be counted upon to counter the effects of an emergency of any scope. And while on this subject may I say that the members of the various committees that have worked so hard to make your organization such a great success also deserve congratulations for a job well done.

It is inspiring and encouraging to meet and speak to so many people who are interested in the welfare of their neighbor.

Yours, indeed, is a noble profession. A fireman's life is a dangerous one at times. Firefighting must often be carried on under severe weather conditions. The hours for volunteer firemen are unpredictable. It has been my observation that every fireman needs steady nerves, considerable physical strength, and enough stamina to enable him to maintain an intense degree of effort, over long periods, under almost unbearable conditions. A fireman has to be ready for anything, because he never knows what he may encounter next.

When speaking of firemen, one must say a few words about our able and courageous fire chiefs and their capable assistants—a fire chief or his assistant, who is in charge of the company, especially during a fire, needs all the qualities of a good general. He must know where to put his men and be prepared to lead them; he must know where to put his screens of water vapor to prevent the spread of fire by radiated heat; he must realize when a building is about to collapse, and bring his men out in time. He must be able to think and act quickly.

I need not tell you that speed is the essence in firefighting; a few minutes wasted in the early stages of a fire, or a wrong decision, can make the difference between a medium fire which can be easily mastered or a conflagration which will burn dozens of buildings.

I do not make these comments to remind you, the volunteer firemen, of the hazards of your job. Rather, I say these words as witness to the unselfish elements necessary for your vocation. You are, indeed, the epitome of the phrase—"my brother's keeper." Each of you deserves a vote of confidence and the wholehearted thanks of the people of your community.

Controlled fire is useful to man, but uncontrolled fire is one of man's worst enemies. Fire, my dear friends, is the world's greatest paradox. It is at once man's worst enemy and his best friend. At some time during the prehistoric ages man learned to make fire, and he learned how to use it. This discovery might properly be considered among the most important achievements in civilization. By day, we all know, that man roasted the meat of slaughtered beasts over his fire. And by night the glow of the flames at the entrance to his cave held prowling things at bay. His fire kept him warm, gave him security, and its lively glow served as a focal point for the nightly gathering of his clan.

Yes, fire became man's most useful companion, while at the same time it became his worst enemy. The pages of history hold many tragic accounts of fire. In our own country we think of the San Francisco fire, the Cocoanut Grove nightclub fire in Boston, the Chicago fire, the circus fire in Hartford, Conn., the fire of the *Morro Castle* beached at Atlantic City, and the flaming crash of the zeppelin, *Hindenburg*.

These are but a few of yesterday's tragic fires.

Today more than 300,000 well trained men throughout America stand ready to answer the fire-alarm tappers and gongs. You, as a portion of that great group of 300,000, know the enemy fire. You well know how patiently fire waits for some proper carelessness. And you also know how fast one must work, once the tiny spark has given life.

Volunteer firemen down through the history of our great Nation have been willing to take risks—very considerable risks—to save life and property. And I say again that many of our people fail to give you men credit for the great job that you are accomplishing for your community and for your people.

Let's go back a little in our early history in the colonial times, for instance, city householders and business owners were by law required to keep a specified number of leather buckets on hand for fire emergencies. Some of the larger cities owned hooked ladders. Smaller towns had no protection at all.

In 1730, New York City imported from Holland two fire engines—hand-pumping machines, of course, the only type known for a century thereafter. During the early years of fireifighting, companies were all of the volunteer sort, the members running at the sound of the alarm from their homes and offices—just as today—where you people leave

your work to join your fire company to help save life and property.

I am reminded that the Father of our Country, George Washington, was a volunteer fireman, an enthusiastic supporter of his local fire company, Friendship, in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Once, while on a visit to Philadelphia, in 1764, Washington purchased a fire engine which he presented to his volunteer company in Alexandria. Although it has never been established that he engaged in battling a fire, we can rest assured that Washington's ideals as illustrated in his life and character were synonymous with those high ideals of the volunteer firemen—courage, duty, and unselfish public service, dedicated to God and country.

History records that in Philadelphia the volunteer firemen were unusually well entrenched there in the early days of our Nation, due primarily to the fact that Benjamin Franklin had organized America's first fire company in Philadelphia.

We recall that the steam fire engine was invented in 1829–30, and began to supplant hand pumping about two decades later. With it came the professional salaried fireman and horse-drawn machines.

Late in the 19th century fireproof or fire-resistant buildings began to appear, the chemical fire extinguisher was invented, and was followed by the sprinkling system. With the development of the gasoline engine early in the 20th century, fire departments were motorized. Horses and many of the steam engines then disappeared.

Although efficiency in firefighting has increased each year, our annual fire losses in the United States have been on the increase during the past few years. In 1955 the National Board of Fire Underwriters reported fire loss in the United States to be $885,218,000; in 1956 losses totaled $980,290,000; and in 1957 they amounted to $1,023,190,000.

A recent statement also indicates that "fire takes annually in the United States over 11,000 lives."

I do not need to tell you that fire prevention becomes increasingly important. Your duties as preservers of lives and property are not limited to putting out fires. They also cover the area of fire protection and fire prevention. These require constant study.

In our towns and cities we need more responsible, dedicated citizens to back up our fire departments—citizens who will serve on fire prevention committees. The public should learn more about respecting fire and less about fearing it—more about controlling it and using it safely.

A more educated citizenry in the details of fire prevention will mean more lives saved, more property preserved, and less risk for you, the brave and honorable men, who comprise our volunteer fire departments.

A volunteer fire department is more than a group of men with shining red equipment. A volunteer fire department is an example of two qualities that have made America great—individual initiative and concern for the welfare of others.

One public service which seldom is recognized in full light of its performance is that of the volunteer firefighter. For he is more than just a fireman. Unpaid, he must make his livelihood by other means, therefore, he must be proficient in both.

Operating without the substantial funds which fully paid municipal departments have available, these volunteers also have to be enterprising businessmen, in that they frequently have to raise funds for their firehouse facilities and firefighting equipment by every ingenious method possible, such as picnics, social parties, membership drives, donations, envelope drives, dinners, ad books and selling chowder.

The volunteer fireman is virtually on call around the clock and so must ever share his home life with the task of helping and protecting his neighbor. Truly his brother's keeper.

As the trend of homes and industry is from congested cities into the open fields of rural areas, the role of the volunteer firemen has become most significant. With the increased burden of helping to protect these properties, business places, homes and farm buildings, many with severe hazards of considerable magnitude which were not anticipated when the volunteer fire departments in numerous communities were organized, it has been necessary for these men to further increase the strength of department both in personnel and equipment.

Therefore, every effort should be made by industry, businessmen, the volunteer fireman, and the people in the community to work closer together as times goes on in order that all may enjoy the fullest that each provide to the community.

A Welcome to the Harry S. Truman Library

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A WELCOME TO THE HARRY S. TRUMAN LIBRARY, INDEPENDENCE, MO.

THE HARRY S. TRUMAN LIBRARY IS A DISTINGUISHED INSTITUTION

The Harry S. Truman Library was established to preserve the papers, books, and historical mementos of former President Truman; to make them available to the people in a place suitable for study and research; and to provide a center to stimulate public interest in American history and government. It is administered by the National Archives and Records Service of the General Services Administration as an integral part of the Nation's recordkeeping system.

The building was built and furnished by the Harry S. Truman Library, Inc., without cost to the Government, from funds, amounting to $1,750,000 donated by thousands of individuals and organizations in all parts of the country. It was dedicated July 6, 1957.

Adjacent to Slover Park in the city of Independence, the crescent-shaped, Indiana limestone library building crowns a knoll facing U.S. Highway 24. A one-story, full-basement structure of modern architectural design, the library is 525 feet long, wing to wing, and has 70,000 square feet of floor-space. In addition to providing facilities for the preservation and use of papers and other historical materials, the building contains offices for the library staff, several large exhibit rooms, a photographic laboratory, an auditorium with a seating capacity of 250 persons, and a suite of offices for former President Truman and his staff.

For 166 years there was no systematic provision for the preservation of Presidential papers. Many have consequently been lost, dispersed, or destroyed. The papers and other historical materials of Presidents form an immensely valuable part of the historical and cultural heritage of our Nation. They are of public interest and the Nation has a special responsibility for seeing them properly protected, preserved, and, under proper policies, made available for research use. The tremendous increase in volume of Presidential papers in recent years has made it difficult, if not impossible, for ex-Presidents to assume personal responsibility for the care of their papers. Furthermore, the Presidents also accumulate thousands of printed items—a library, in effect—as well as countless gifts, many of which are of great artistic, cultural, and commemorative value. It is important that these materials be kept intact and administered together so that scholars and the public can arrive at an understanding of the President's career and the history of the period in which he lived.

The papers of former President Truman comprise an estimated 3.5 million documents. To insure their preservation they are housed in specially equipped, steel and concrete stack areas in which temperature, humidity, and light are scientifically controlled. Personal papers of Mr. Truman's associates and contemporaries that may be donated to the library from time to time and microfilm copies of original research materials in public or private custody that bear significantly on the Truman period and on the history of the Presidency will also be preserved in the library.

Adjacent to the stack areas is housed a collection of printed reference works, the nucleus of which is the body of books and pamphlets given to the library by President Truman. Emphasizing works on the Truman era, the history of the Presidency, and the history of American foreign relations, this collection will facilitate the work of the library staff and scholars as well.

The papers and books in the library will not be open for research until the latter part of 1958. Meanwhile, plans to enhance the usefulness of the library as a research institution are being developed by the Harry S. Truman Library Institute for National and International Affairs, a corporation established for that purpose.

The museum collections

An outstanding feature of the library is the museum, providing for the effective exhibit to the American people of the gifts of historical and commemorative value that were received by Mr. Truman. The location of the several exhibit areas and a suggested tour plan for visitors is given in the accompanying sketch. Although exhibits are changed at intervals, those described below are usually on display.

As visitors enter the main lobby, attention is focused on the table on which the United Nations Charter was signed at San Francisco in 1945. A copy of the charter and a bust of Franklin D. Roosevelt, father of the United Nations, by Sculptor Jo Davidson rest on its blue cloth-covered surface. Among other features of the lobby are, in full color, the Presidential seal as redesigned during the Truman administration; large oil portraits of Presidents Truman and Eisenhower by Artists John Slavin and Thomas E. Stevens; costly jeweled swords and daggers from the King and Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia; autographed photographs of Winston Churchill of England and other world-famous authors along with presentation copies of their books personally autographed for President Truman.

To the right of the main lobby, in a two-level, balconied foyer specially designed and illuminated for its displays, hangs a large and priceless Persian rug, given to President Truman by the Shah of Iran. Exhibited before it on a dais is a massive dining suite presented to him by the Philippine Government in gratitude for his support of Philippine independence. In this foyer is a case containing exhibits from President Truman's extensive collection of Bibles.

In the large museum room beyond this foyer are presented two exhibits designed to carry out President Truman's desire to make the Presidential Office more clearly

understood. The first deals with the six jobs of the President as Mr. Truman himself has often spoken of them—as Chief Executive, ceremonial head of state, legislative planner in dealing with Congress, head of his political party, commander in chief of the Armed Forces, and director of foreign policy. It includes such famous documents as the Truman fair deal message to Congress; color photographs of historic events, including the Potsdam Conference and the signing of the United Nations Charter; interesting mementos of the Democratic National Convention of 1948, the whistlestop campaign, and the Truman inauguration of 1949; valuable gifts from foreign statesmen and people, including a 2,500-year-old vase presented by the Greek nation in gratitude for American aid; historic flags and models of famous ships and planes; and many unique and colorful items that reflect the nature or significance of the President's role in domestic and foreign affairs.

The second exhibit in the museum room, which deals with the Presidency in the light of the provisions of article II of the Constitution, displays pictures of all the Presidents and a historic Federal document signed by or closely associated with the administration of each President. On loan from the National Archives in Washington, the exhibit includes such famous papers as John Adams' first inaugural address; the Jefferson request to Congress for funds for the Lewis and Clark Expedition; the Monroe Doctrine message; the Jackson bank bill veto message of 1832; pardons issued by Lincoln during the Civil War; the Alaska Purchase Treaty of 1867; Wilson's 1917 declaration of war against Germany; Franklin D. Roosevelt's Pearl Harbor message (from the Roosevelt Library at Hyde Park, N.Y.); and Truman's V–E Day proclamation.

In this room are also displayed the Bibles on which President Truman took his oaths of office; objects associated with his World War I service; a guest book bearing the signatures of Stalin, Churchill, and others who attended the Potsdam Conference; and early 19th-century building materials removed from the White House during its renovation in the 1950's.

In the garden room are seen Jerry Farnsworth's portrait of President Truman's mother; Kitt Sapp's paintings of the Truman home in Independence and the Grandview farm; color portraits of the five-star generals and admirals who served under President Truman; and a selection of original cartoons given to him by the artists who drew them. Among other items exhibited in this room are beautiful Satsuma vases from Japan; part of the silver service of the U.S.S. *Missouri*, lent by the State of Missouri; sculptor Felix de Weldon's original plaster model of his inspiring monument depicting the flag raising on Iwo Jima; and a Torah and a bust of Chaim Weizmann, first President of Israel, presented to President Truman in gratitude for his prompt recognition of the new State of Israel.

Directly back of the main lobby is a replica of the President's office in the west wing of the White House. The furnishings are exact reproductions of those in the White House, while the pictures, statuary, and the objects on the Presidential desk are the ones that decorated the room when President Truman occupied it.

In the west foyer leading to the auditorium a stately mantel, which of necessity was removed from the state dining room of the White House during its renovation, is exhibited. It bears as an inscription, carved on its stone front in the 1940's, these fitting words once written by President John Adams: "I pray Heaven to bestow the best of blessings on this house and all that shall hereafter inhabit it. May none but honest and wise men ever rule under this roof." Also in this foyer are exhibits relating to labor leaders and organizations in the United States, and items from President Truman's Masonic collection.

"This library will belong to the people of the United States. My papers will be the property of the people and be accessible to them. And this is as it should be. The papers of the Presidents are among the most valuable source materials for history. They ought to be preserved.

"HARRY S. TRUMAN."

HOURS AND FEES

The museum areas of the library are open daily from 9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., and from 2 p.m. to 5 p.m. on Sundays.

The library will be closed on Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's Day.

The admission fee is 50 cents for all persons over 12 years of age, except students in organized school groups for which application is made in advance, persons in the care of charitable institutions, and uniformed members of the Armed Forces, who are admitted free.

The money from admission fees is set aside for such purposes as the purchase of historical material and equipment for the library or the preparation and publication of guides to or reproductions of materials in its custody.

A trust fund account, authorized by law, enables the library to receive and expend any additional funds given by private donors for the benefit of the library, its collections, or its services.

The admission fee pertains only to the museum area. The offices, research room, and Mr. Truman's suite are not open to the public.

International Cooperation: A Prerequisite of Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to call to the attention of the Members, under leave to extend my remarks, a very fine analysis of the road to insure survival in our time.

Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, retired after a career of 34 years of service, prepared this analysis for a lecture to the advanced management course at the General Electric Co. on June 15.

Holder of the Distinguished Service Medal and Legion of Honor, General Hester is well known in recent years as a lecturer and writer on international relations. I commend his views to the thoughtful study of all Americans:

The central problem of our time is the survival of the human specie. This is a problem, according to Gen. Omar N. Bradley, which society has placed upon itself through the forging of military weapons of indescribable destructiveness. This view was dramatized by Gen. Douglas MacArthur on his 75th birthday, January 26, 1955, Los Angeles, when he characterized war between the great powers as a Frankenstein which could only end in mutual suicide and possibly destroy all human life on this planet. The President—Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower—epitomized this in political terms by saying at Geneva, 1955, that "there is no alternative to peace."

The first and almost unanimous reaction of military leaders to the explosion of the uranium and plutonium bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki, August 6 and 9, 1945, was that war could no longer be used as an instrument or adjunct of diplomacy; that it, therefore, was outmoded because of its destructiveness: 20,000 tons of TNT. Since that time, the hydrogen and super bomb—the fission-fusion-fission bomb—have been created the latter with a power a thousand times greater than those used over Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And this is not the end, for the scientists claim that even the power of these can be expanded almost indefinitely.

The magnitude of this new monster can be comprehended, if at all, only in terms of the explosive power released by all military forces during World War II (1939–45), estimated as 3 million tons of TNT. The superbomb which unexpectedly caused the disappearance of the Bikini Atoll is estimated to have contained six times the power exploded in that war, or 18 million tons of TNT.

Despite this, the physical power apologists, far from accepting the first spontaneous reaction to the now relatively feeble atom bombs exploded in 1945, are advocating more and bigger bombs along with multiple missile systems of unlimited range and power. They, of course, appeal to the strange logic of the deterrence of terror and limited warfare as though an overpowering fear produced rational action and agreed limitations could be placed upon war after the experience of a century of unlimited wars for unlimited objectives. And this time with an opponent whom they label in advance as completely untrustworthy. In truth, they use this alleged fact as the reason for their unwillingness to negotiate an end to the unlimited arms race.

This, of course, is the refutation of all modern history. If it were possible to limit war once the propaganda dogs were unleased, would it not be much simpler to negotiate a permanent peace instead? How do they hope to force a limitation upon an opponent, every agreement of which must kept step by step or thermonuclear war will be unleashed, when they cannot trust him under any circumstances? Does not the illogic of such an approach suggest that the advocates or limited war are either naive or dishonest?

War between the great powers, limited or otherwise, is, I repeat, irrational because of the power of modern weapons and the uncontrollable nature of war propaganda. The control of the latter was not possible even in the First and Second World Wars. How much less so must it prove in the electronic and television age?

Simply stated, this means that the present leaders of the world are faced with a completely new situation. For the first time in history man has the power to destroy the human specie. This makes it necessary to negotiate an agreement in advance of the conflict instead of at the conclusion as formerly; otherwise there may be no one to negotiate. Unless this stark truth is grasped; that is, that international cooperation must be substituted for conflict, there can be no future for man.

This hard fact becomes more acceptable once it is recognized that our opponents are not monsters, but, like ourselves, are people with the same faults, virtues, and hopes. A careful study of the history of different economic, political, and social systems, and extensive travel within the Iron Curtain countries should make it relatively easy to negotiate this hurdle. Certainly this has been my experience and is increasingly the experience of others as they travel to the other side.

One of the first things that a study of the history of relations between the so-called capitalist and Communist systems develops is that the cold war did not start in 1946 or 1947 as a consequence of Stalin's intransigence, but in 1917, sometimes intense as now and earlier, and at other times less so, as during the war period 1941-45. It even erupted into a hot war in 1918, when 12 former allies and the United States, an associate power, made war upon this new revolutionary regime now called the U.S.S.R.

A second fact disclosed by such a study is that there is nothing new about the present cold war, except the possibly improved communications system which makes it easier to spread rumors, half-truths, and falsehoods. This, of course, makes all three more dangerous. Basically, the same propaganda was used by the parties to all previous conflicts of an imperial, national, and ideological character—the Egyptians and Jews, Greeks and Persians, Athenians and Spartans, Romans and Carthaginians, Christians and Mohammedans, Catholics and Protestants, ad infinitum ad nauseum. It's an old, old story which all people should know about.

The above disclosures are not intended to assess blame in equal portions, or even to assess blame at all. It is a fact, nonetheless, that these conflicts have been led throughout history by the two-dimensional minded; that is, by those who believed that all colors were black or white and all conduct good or evil—the God and Devil concept of human life and international relations. The Russians and Chinese obviously are not all slaves and their leaders not totally evil and all of the West are not wholly free and their leaders not completely good. It is vitally important to recognize that all societies and human relations are gradations of gray. Naturally, most of us think our gray is of a little lighter shade, but certainly not pure white.

It is encouraging that most of those reporting on recent travels through Iron Curtain countries believe that both the people and leaders want a brighter future: That is greater quantities and better quality of supplies, improved medical care, better education, more culture, leisure and security. Certainly they have more of all of these than they have ever had before. And it is equally certain that their material standard of living is not nearly as high as that in the United States. The Russians and Poles, including their leaders, freely and frankly admitted this to me during my 12,000-mile 5-week trip through their countries in 1957. On the other hand, they know they are making progress and have confidence in the future.

For these reasons, there is no mass movement, nor is there likely to be in the near future, for the overthrow of the government in either Poland or Russia. No recent traveler to these countries, or careful student has reported more than usual gripes by the people common to all countries. This suggests that both governments are stable and not likely to fall as a result of subversion, external or internal. If this is so, then both sides should agree to discontinue subversion as unprofitable.

While I have visited China since the present regime achieved power almost all objective observers from Canada, England, France, India, and elsewhere report great progress has been made in agriculture, industry, education, and medical care. Regardless of how Mao-Tse-tung and his followers achieved power, or retain it, responsible observers report no serious challenge to that power and most agree that if there should be such a challenge at some future date, it would not be likely to come from Chiang Kai-shek. In the opinion of more then 600 million Chinese and much of the rest of the world Chiang and his supporters are stooges of the United States and this in itself, they believe, is enough to prevent his or his followers return to power.

If these conclusions, particularly about the U.S.S.R. and Red China, are correct, and the available evidence is overwhelming, a reevaluation of our foreign policies is imperative. And the disengagement of the military forces of the the East and West around the world should be made the first order of business. This should start in Europe, and the Rapacki plan offers a useful point of departure. The fact that Mr. Rapacki is the Polish Foreign Minister should not prejudice its study by the West. The Polish interests are not necessarily the same as those of Russia, or we would not now be giving Poland aid.

While the Berlin crisis is dangerous, it is not the cause of present tensions in that area, and even if it were possible, which it is not, to separate it from the German problem nothing substantial would be gained. The real problem is German unification, and it should be faced up to before it explodes into war. But Germany cannot be unified inside any great power alliance system. This would upset the balance of power which cannot be tolerated under the sovereign state system concept. Free elections, while desirable in a democratic world, have no relevance in the power-bloc system except for propaganda purposes. And this propaganda only promotes war.

The West favors free elections in Germany and Korea, where it has built-in majorities, but not in Vietnam, where it has a minority. The East favors them in the latter, while opposing them in the former two, and for identical reasons. Morality, unhappily, has nothing whatever to do with the so-called reasons for holding free elections. Naked power controls, and the leaders of both blocs know this. And it is time that all stopped the hypothetical that it does not.

Stated simply, this means disengagement of the polar power military forces in all critical areas is vitally important, and a compromise with the factors of power is a sine qua non of any possible peace. Germany must be made safe for Europe before unification by being neutralized militarily, and Europe must be made safe for Germany through a European settlement guaranteed by both great powers. Korea and Vietnam cannot be united under regimes that are hostile to China. This is simply a matter both of power and geography.

The poverty vacuum of the potentially rich Middle East can only be filled through cooperation between the two polar powers. And it is completely irrational to expect the Arabs and Israeli to settle their disputes so long as each can play the one great power against the other in the power struggle of the cold war. The Soviets have proposed such a solution and their sincerity should be tested through negotiations.

The success of negotiation here again will depend upon disengagement of great power military forces. Russia cannot be expected to accept exclusion from her own backyard, especially by a power geographically located thousands of miles away, and certainly not when that power has airbases and missile launching sites located only a few minutes and seconds from her vital centers. Exclusion and containment both are impossible in the thermonuclear-electronic age. Access to the raw materials of this rich area as elsewhere must be made available to those who need and are able and willing to pay a fair price for them. They must be made available without discrimination. And the profits from the raw materials of these areas must also be made available primarily for the development of the areas themselves. This is so because poverty is the greatest enemy of man. Disengagement in the Far East, potentially the most explosive of all areas, is vitally necessary, but may well prove the most difficult of all others to accomplish. Here one-quarter of the human race resides and its inhabitants are admittedly now the most revolutionary and dynamic in the world. Here again it will serve no useful purpose to try to assess blame.

Unless something can be done within the near future to reduce tensions here a third world war is almost inevitable. Obviously disarmament cannot be effective without the cooperation of the Red Chinese; not even the cessation of bomb testing now under discussion at Geneva. And it is unlikely that this cooperation can be had at the price of Chinese exclusion from the United Nations and nonrecognition by most of the Western nation states.

But how can recognition be effected when both Mao and Chiang refuse to accept the two-China policy and the United States refuses to withdraw recognition of the latter. The answer is, it cannot in the present climate and with the present policies: ours, Mao's or Chiang's. The only possible way of breaking the present impasse, it seems to me, is for the United Nations to step into the picture and offer to mediate. And even this is unlikely to succeed unless and until Red China is admitted to the U.N. Exclusion has always proved intolerable to those against whom it was exercised and China is no exception to this as she has shown many times.

As a contribution to the solution of this difficult problem, the United States should withdraw its active opposition to Chinese admission to the U.N. Even abstention would permit this to occur for it is becoming generally recognized that her present exclusion is a dangerous failure. But the problem of recognition still remains. And while recognition once was very simple our entangling alliance with Chiang makes Chinese recognition of the United States now difficult if not improbable.

This points up the urgency of normalization of relations throughout the state system. It should be noted that recognition has never been considered as approval of the character of any regime, but generally, merely a recognition of a hard fact of international life. If this were not so, the United States would have to withdraw recognition of many of her present allies and close associates. Fortunately most nations recognize this and have generally accorded diplomatic status to those regimes exercising the functions of governments over their people without a too close scrutiny of how this control was achieved. The United States would do well to return to this practice.

Normalization of nation-state relations should include travel and trade. This would reduce tensions and increase wealth for those participating in it. There is no longer any validity to the theory that these would increase the military potential of the supposed enemy. The launching of the sputnik, October 4, 1957, destroyed this for all time and, Clarence B. Randall, when chairman of the board of Inland Steel, reported to the President in 1954, after careful study of all the facts that restrictions on trade with the Soviet bloc were probably doing the West more harm than it was the East.

Since poverty is the greatest crime against man the resources of the world should be mobilized in a massive attack upon it. This should be made through the United Nations in order to do four things in addition to reducing the gap between the have and have-not nations: (1) Eliminate the charity character of present unilateral aid, (2) eliminate or reduce to the minimum power politics, (3) utilizes the total resources of war, (4) strengthen the United Nations.

This program could be easily financed through long-term loans at low rates of interest and through the savings from a reduction in the arms race. The latter is necessary anyway in order to avoid war, and can

be achieved without reducing any nation's relative security. In fact the security of all would be greatly increased by this action since the continuance of the present arms race must eventually end in world war III.

Only by doing these things can the U.N. be made into a world government with powers adequate but limited to world needs. Only through the establishment of world law, a world court to interpret those laws and a peace force to apply those interpretations can a world war be avoided and the survival of the human specie achieved.

Trade Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress has witnessed a continuation of the controversy between those who advocate freer trade policies and lower tariffs and those who seek the adoption of measures to restore equitable balance to our foreign commerce.

One of the principal arguments of those who want to push the Nation farther along the road to unlimited import competition is that other countries are reciprocating our generosity by lifting the obstacles to U.S. exports. They claim we are not just giving away tariff concessions and receiving little or nothing in return.

This theme was emphasized in a recent exchange of letters between the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Laws and Policy, Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. BOGGS], and the Under Secretary of State, Douglas Dillon.

Responding to the chairman's request for information, Mr. Dillon reviewed various so-called liberalization steps taken in the first 6 months of 1959 by many of our trading partners, among them Argentina, Australia, France, West Germany, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

But even Mr. Dillon conceded that there is still room for improvement abroad in the treatment of U.S. products. As he noted in his report:

> Despite the progress which has been made, however, a number of countries continue to discriminate against U.S. exports. In the coming months, the U.S. Government, through such forums as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the International Monetary Fund, and in bilateral discussions, will continue vigorous efforts based upon the new financial situation which exists in international trade—to bring about further rapid elimination of dollar trade discrimination.

Perhaps it is significant that only a few days before Mr. Dillon's report was released, the State Department received dispatches from American diplomatic sources in Athens, Greece, and Havana, Cuba, which illustrate the brand of "reciprocity" that is frequently extended to U.S. manufactures, in this case, textiles.

Following is the text of a dispatch from Athens, dated July 17, 1959:

> POLEMICS ON MEASURES FOR PROTECTING DOMESTIC INDUSTRY
>
> Actions taken last week increasing basic import duty rate on artificial fiber textiles from 26 to 34 percent as of July 4, and subjecting, effective July 10, all textile imports to advance payments equal to 280 percent of cost, insurance, freight value, brought loud protests from merchants and trade associations. Some trade representatives criticized measures as giving local textile industry virtual monopoly with all attendant evils, while others claimed effect would be to force small importers out of business and allow large importers to corner the foreign textile market. Minister of Coordination answered by saying inter alia that all industrial countries, including United States, protect their textile industries. He also said uproar against measures came from merchants who had been making exorbitant profits on imported fabrics and who disregard facts that their imports reduced national income and that Greek workers need employment. Manufacturing and labor groups lauded the measures and the Minister's defense of them. Manufacturers repeated their longstanding complaint that merchants deliberately and systematically disparage Greek textiles in order to make higher profits from imported materials. They said merchants sell much of these imports at regular prices even though they often acquire them as "seconds" and avoid full Greek import duty by underinvoicing. Latest development was yesterday's visit to Minister of Industry by certain merchant representatives who told Minister many merchants approve of the protective measures.
>
> Comment: Fight is not yet over and the trade groups will be working hard to have the measures rescinded. However, Coordination Minister's position and fact that they are already on the books makes reversal unlikely, though there is some slight chance that modifications may be made to placate merchants whose political influence cannot be completely disregarded.

Next is a Foreign Service dispatch from Havana, dated July 24, 1959:

> On July 23, Dr. Fidel Castro spoke at a meeting of the 10th national congress of textile workers. In his speech to the workers, he announced a policy of high protectionism for the textile industry. A literal translation of his remarks on this subject follows:
>
> "So it is that the revolution will go on with its work and we will continue seeing each other, developing all the economic possibilities of our country, among them, this industry (textiles) in which we aspire within 4 or 5 years at the most to double the number of workers employed.
>
> "We aspire to achieve the following goal: that it be possible for the nation to produce absolutely all the textiles it consumes and that nothing further be imported except the raw materials that we cannot produce here. The raw materials that cannot be produced here may be imported but they will be processed here. In Cuba, Cuban products will be consumed. To that end, we rely on the collaboration of this whole sector, workers and industrialists, to set to work so that we may reach the goal whereby all textiles that are consumed in Cuba will be produced in Cuba. For others, there will be a protective customs tariff as high as may be necessary in order that foreign textiles are not imported here. One of the reasons for the revolution is protection, not of foreign interests but of national interests. One of the reasons this is a revolution is that it protects Cubans, and because it protects Cubans, it has incurred the enmity of so many foreign interests.
>
> "We shall raise the customs tariffs as high as may be necessary. Do the Japanese wish preferential nation treatment? Well, we can give them such treatment, but with tariffs as high as they must be, and with that there will be no discrimination against the Japanese. They say that the only thing they want is not to be discriminated against. Very well, we will treat them the same way we treat others, but the customs tariffs shall be established in such a way as to protect, above all, the national industry. The goal must be achieved that here will be consumed only textiles produced in the nation by factories established in the nation and by Cuban workers. And when the peasants start buying clothes and start dressing their children and their families, we are going to require here twice as much clothing as is used today. Furthermore, when the 30 or 40 millions worth of textiles presently being imported are produced here we are going to have work for thousands of Cubans. That is the policy that will be followed by the Government on textile matters."

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. textile industry remains in serious difficulty, largely due to irresponsible trade policies. Hundreds of American mills have closed their doors since World War II, hundreds of thousands of jobs have been exported abroad.

The industry's setbacks at the hands of foreign competitors are well documented by the 86th Congress. A special subcommittee of the other body, in Report No. 42, disclosed, for example:

That total employment in U.S. textile mills dropped from 1,325,000 workers in 1947 to about 1 million in 1957, a decline of 24 percent.

That employment losses in mills producing yarn, thread, and broadwoven fabrics were even greater.

That between 1946 and 1957 a total of 717 textile mill liquidations were reported in the press; these liquidations displaced nearly 200,000 workers.

That from February 1951 to April 1958, employment in the American textile industry slumped by 438,000, or 32 percent; of this total, New England lost 158,000 jobs; the Middle Atlantic States lost 126,400 jobs; the Midwest lost 12,700 jobs; the South lost 102,000 jobs.

That the number of woolen spinning spindles in place in the United States dropped from 1,561,000 in 1947 to 744,000 in 1957, a decline of more than 50 percent.

That the number of worsted spinning spindles declined from nearly 2 million to 709,000, or 63 percent, in the same period.

Only recently representatives of both management and labor in the textile industry met with Members of Congress to review the plight of their industry and to urge prompt remedial measures. The National Cotton Council, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, and other groups have appealed to the Federal Government for assistance in their struggle to preserve a share of the domestic market from the inroads of sweatshop competition.

Great textile unions in the federation of American labor have called for legislative enactment of quotas and a sliding-scale tariff system to safeguard American jobs and job opportunities.

The revolutionary government of Cuba declares:

One of the reasons for the revolution is protection, not of foreign interests but of national interests.

The U.S. textile industry, and the scores of other industries distressed by unreasonable import competition, do not propose revolution as a satisfactory solution to their problems. As faithful guardians of democratic processes, they have submitted their case to their elected representatives and to the American people.

So far little has been accomplished to ease the burdens placed on major segments of the textile industry by the continued upsurge of imports. Many of the foreign garments and fabrics which are overrunning the domestic market are manufactured in Hong Kong and Japan, where wages average about 10 cents an hour and 14 cents an hour, respectively, including fringe benefits. The American garment worker, on the other hand, draws an average hourly wage of $2.12, including fringes.

With labor costs accounting for about one-third of the cost of a garment, is it any wonder that U.S. textile producers find themselves unable to compete with foreign manufacturers? Is it at all surprising that American labor raises its voice in protest?

DAV Services in Maine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Maine citizens has recently come to my attention. These splendid humanitarian services are not sufficiently appreciated by those who have benefited thereby, directly and indirectly.

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Maine, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

DAV SETUP

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have very substantially benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is Bill H. Fribley, Crestline, Kans. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer M. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff, of any veteran organization, of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C.

They there have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

DAV SERVICES IN MAINE

The DAV maintains one national service officer in Maine, Mr. John F. McPherson, located at the VA Center, Box 151, Togus. The new department commander, William G. Earles of South Portland, is a representative in the State legislature, and the department adjutant is Mr. Robert W. Libby, 11 State Street, Biddeford, Maine.

There is one Veterans' Administration hospital in Maine in which the DAV has a Veterans' Administration voluntary service representative; her name is Mrs. Esther Dee, 502 Allen Avenue, Portland, Maine, and she is located at the 869-bed neuropsychiatric and general medical hospital at Togus.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $29,794,000 for its veteran program in Maine, including $8,470,526 disability compensation to its 10,727 service disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Maine furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities. Less than 9 percent, 901, are members of the 10 DAV chapters in Maine.

SERVICE ACCOMPLISHMENTS BY THE DAV

This 9-percent record is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Maine veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	17,440
Claims folders reviewed	14,533
Appearances before rating boards	1,765
Compensation increases obtained	1,020
Service connections obtained	301
Nonservice pensions	295
Death benefits obtained	31
Total monetary benefits obtained	$709,309.09

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetay benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Maine veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV national service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointment retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious and other problems.

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible.

A VA claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses

his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of these claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

LOSSES BY REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,000 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28,000,000 per year. About one-half of 1 percent—0.005—of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Maine with a consequent loss of about $196,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veterans organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Maine to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent, expert national service officer.

COSTS OF DAV SERVICES

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim holder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

METHODS OF PROVIDING SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—minature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or thier widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Indento-Tag Department, 2,314 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Maine residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

MEMORIAL HONOR ROLL

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustees, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests, in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation to which it recently added another $100. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,000, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member—an excellent objective for all other States. Benefactors from 32 States have, up to this time, become enrolled on the memorial honor roll.

Inasmuch as only the interest earning from special donations will be available for appropriation to the DAV for its use in maintaining its national service officer program in the State of residence of each such benefactor, this is an excellent objective also for Maine. Each such special benefactor is enrolled on a permanent memorial honor roll which, updated, is then included in the annual report of the DAV and of its incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, to the U.S. Congress.

Each claimant who has received any such free rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue this excellent rehabilitation service for other distressed disabled veterans and their dependents in Maine by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 1707 18th Street N.W, Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100—$50 to those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans—payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations—the United Spanish War Veterans, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the AMVETS, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Disabled American Veterans. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compensation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Having been an active member for many years, Mr. Speaker, in veterans' organizations, it is my hope that disabled veterans of Maine will avail themselves of the services rendered by these groups of organized fellow comrades.

Report to the People of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin—XIII

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. BYRNES

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report to the people of the Eighth Congressional District of Wisconsin on my voting and attendance record for the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

The report includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. Its purpose is to collect in one place and in concise form information which is scattered through some 18,000 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The descriptions of the bills and the amendments or motions in the report are for purposes of identification only; no attempt is made to describe the legislation completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved. This word of caution is advisable in view of the fact that the descriptions used are, for the most part, taken from the official titles of the bills which, unfortunately, do not always reflect the nature or true purpose of the legislation. Upon request, I will be pleased to furnish more complete information concerning any particular bill, as well as a summary of the issues involved and the reasons for my vote.

The furnishing of this report continues a service I began in the 1st session of the 80th Congress. This is the 13th report of my voting and attendance record. These 13 reports show how I voted on 1,712 questions in the House of Representatives. Based on quorum calls and the record votes, they also show an attendance record of 95 percent.

Roll-call No.	Date 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 7	Election of Speaker. (Rayburn, 281; Halleck, 148)	Halleck.
3	Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 2256, providing $300,000,000 for veterans' direct housing loans and raising the interest rate from 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent per annum:	
4	Feb. 4	On motion to recommit with instructions to delete additional funds for direct housing loans. (Rejected 123 to 277)	Yea.
5	Feb. 4	On passage. (Passed 310 to 89)	Nay.
		H.R. 2260, extending the Universal Military Training and Service Act until July 1, 1963:	
6	Feb. 5	On passage. (Passed 381 to 20)	Yea.
7	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
8	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 205, providing for the consideration of H.R. 4221, providing for the admission of Hawaii into the Union:	
9	Mar. 11	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 337 to 69)	Yea.
10	Mar. 11	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 50, providing for the admission of Hawaii into the Union:	
11	Mar. 12	On passage. (Passed 323 to 89)	Yea.
12	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 1, authorizing a 1-year increase in the diversion of water from Lake Michigan at Chicago:	
13	Mar. 13	On passage. (Passed 238 to 142)	Nay.
		S. 79, permitting the continuance of established coloring practices in the orange industry:	
14	Mar. 13	On passage. (Passed 213 to 94)	Not voting.[1]
15	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.
16	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 1011, providing for Federal aid for airports:	
19	Mar. 19	On amendment reducing Federal aid for airports by $97,000,000. (Rejected 194 to 214)	Yea.
20	Mar. 19	On amendment to require that no commitments be made for expenditure of funds until such funds are appropriated by Congress. (Rejected 191 to 216.)	Yea.
21	Mar. 19	On passage. (Passed 272 to 134)	Nay.
		H.R. 2575, authorizing the appropriation of $500,000 for the Pan American Games in Chicago:	
22	Mar. 23	On passage. (Passed 258 to 108)	Nay.
23	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 4452, authorizing the increase in U.S. subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:	
24	Mar. 25	On passage. (Passed 315 to 57)	Yea.
25	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
27	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 1321, transferring from the Secretary of Agriculture to the REA Administrator the authority over rural electrification loans:	
28	Apr. 15	On passage. (Passed 254 to 131)	Nay.
29	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 5674, authorizing $1,200,000,000 for certain construction at military installations:	
30	Apr. 16	On passage. (Passed 378 to 7)	Nay.
31	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
32	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 144, transferring from the Secretary of Agriculture to the REA Administrator the authority over rural electrification loans:	
34	Apr. 30	On passage over veto of President. (Rejected 280 to 146, a two-thirds majority being required.)	Nay.
35	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
36	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
37	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
38	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 3460, authorizing the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance its power program with revenue bonds rather than by congressional appropriations:	
39	May 7	On motion to recommit with instructions to add amendments providing for budgetary control over TVA and repayment of Federal advances and interest. (Rejected, 182 to 231.)	Yea.
40	May 7	On passage. (Passed, 245 to 170)	Nay.
41	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
42	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 19	Quorum call	Present
		H.R. 7007, authorizing appropriation of $480,550,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1960:	
46	May 20	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 294 to 128)	Nay,
		H.R. 7175, making appropriations for Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration for fiscal year 1960:	
47	May 20	On motion to recommit with instructions to bar any Commodity Credit loan in excess of $50,000. (Passed 261 to 165)	Yea.
48	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 57, authorizing $1,975,000,000 additional Federal housing program:	
49	May 21	On amendment requiring direct congressional appropriation of funds. (Passed 222 to 201)	Yea.
50	May 21	On motion to recommit with instructions to substitute H.R. 7117 eliminating further authorizations for public housing, and eliminating or reducing other items in bill so as to more nearly meet the request of the President. (Rejected 189 to 234.)	Yea.
51	May 21	On passage. (Passed 261 to 160)	Nay.
52	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7176, making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and general government agencies for fiscal year 1960:	
56	May 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to provide restriction on President's emergency fund. (Rejected 171 to 229)	Nay.
		H.R. 7343, making appropriations for the Department of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for fiscal year 1960:	
57	May 27	On amendment providing $2,000,000 for construction of a new Federal prison. (Adopted 266 to 133)	Nay.
		H.R. 7086, extending the Renegotiation Act for 4 years:	
58	May 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to limit extension to 27 months. (Rejected 153 to 246)	Yea.
59	May 27	On passage. (Passed 381 to 7)	Yea.
60	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
61	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
62	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
63	June 3	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 7454, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1960:	
64	June 3	On passage. (Passed 392 to 3)	Yea.
65	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
66	June 5	Quorum call	Absent.
67	June 8	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 3610, amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase grants for construction of sewage treatment works:	
68	June 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to revise matching formula and reduce bill by $500 million. (Rejected 156 to 240)	Yea.
69	June 9	On passage. (Passed 255 to 143)	Nay.
		H.R. 7509, making appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of Army, Department of Interior, and Tennessee Valley Authority (public works) for fiscal year 1960:	
70	June 9	On amendment providing $500,000 for water lily eradication program. (Adopted 199 to 198)	Nay.
71	June 9	On amendment providing $75,000 for Eau Galle River project. (Rejected 192 to 205)	Nay.
72	June 9	On motion to recommit with instructions to reduce by 5 percent each construction item of $5,000,000 or more. (Rejected 149 to 251)	Yea.
73	June 9	On passage. (Passed 380 to 20)	Nay.
74	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1901, to maintain the price support level on tobacco at 90 percent of parity:	
75	June 10	On motion to recommit with instructions to freeze tobacco price supports at 1958 level for the years 1959–61. (Rejected 138 to 261)	Yea.
76	June 10	On passage. (Passed 250 to 149)	Nay.
77	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7246, increasing the price support level on wheat to 90 percent of parity, reducing acreage allotments and for other purposes:	
78	June 12	On motion to recommit with instructions to eliminate 15-acre exemption and to retain present minimum acreage allotment and parity scale. (Rejected 141 to 224.)	Yea.

Footnote at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
79	June 12	On passage. (Passed 189 to 177)	Nay.
80	June 12	Quorum call	Absent.
		H.R. 6596, creating a Coal Research Commission:	
81	June 12	On passage. (Passed 251 to 54)	Not voting.[2]
82	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 293, providing for consideration of H.R. 7500, authorizing the mutual security program:	
84	June 15	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 278 to 93)	Yea.
85	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
89	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1968, increasing the price support level on wheat to 90 percent of parity, reducing acreage allotments and for other purposes:	
91	June 18	On adoption of conference report. (Rejected 202 to 214)	Nay.
		H.R. 7500, authorizing the mutual security program:	
92	June 18	On passage. (Passed 271 to 142)	Yea.
93	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7749, providing that the permanent public debt limit be increased from $283,000,000,000 to $285,000,000,000 and providing for a temporary increase of $10,000,000,000:	
94	June 19	On passage. (Passed 256 to 117)	Yea.
95	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 288, providing for the consideration of H.R. 3, establishing rules of interpretation governing questions of effects of acts of Congress on State laws:	
96	June 22	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted, 233 to 116)	Yea.
97	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 57, authorizing additional Federal housing program:	
99	June 23	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted, 241 to 177)	Nay.
100	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 3, establishing rules of interpretation governing questions of the effects of acts of Congress on State laws:	
101	June 24	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 191 to 227)	Nay.
102	June 24	On passage. (Passed 225 to 192)	Yea.
103	June 29	Quorum call	Present.
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 294, providing for the consideration of H.R. 5752, providing that when a legal holiday occurs on Saturday, the preceding day shall for the purposes of pay and leave of Federal employees be considered a legal holiday:	
105	June 30	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 341 to 42)	Nay.
106	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1120, providing that cash in vaults may be considered part of reserves of member banks of Federal Reserve System:	
107	July 1	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 60 to 309)	Nay.
		H. Res. 295, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, which would transfer certain functions from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture:	
108	July 7	On adoption of resolution. (Adopted 266 to 124)	Nay.
		H.R. 4957, providing for the admission of statements and confessions as evidence in court cases:	
109	July 7	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 138 to 261)	Nay.
110	July 7	On passage. (Passed 262 to 138)	Yea.
111	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7500, authorizing the mutual security program:	
113	July 22	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 258 to 153)	Yea.
114	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
		H. Res. 326, providing for House concurrence in Senate amendments to H.R. 3460, authorizing the TVA to issue revenue bonds:	
115	July 23	On motion to end debate. (Adopted 244 to 166)	Nay.
116	July 27	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7072, providing for the participation of the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank and authorizing $450,000,000 appropriation for this purpose:	
117	July 27	On passage. (Passed 231 to 87)	Nay.
118	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8385, making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for fiscal year 1960:	
119	July 29	On passage. (Passed 279 to 136)	Yea.
120	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
122	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7740, amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to the preservation of acreage history and the reallocation of unused cotton acreage allotments:	
123	Aug. 5	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 309 to 90)	Yea.
124	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
125	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
127	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
128	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
129	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8342, providing for reforms in labor-management activities:	
130	Aug. 13	On amendment substituting provisions of H.R. 8400, the Landrum-Griffin bill. (Adopted 229 to 201)	Yea.
131	Aug. 14	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 148 to 280)	Nay.
132	Aug. 14	On passage. (Passed 303 to 125)	Yea.
		H.R. 7040, making appropriations for sundry independent offices:	
133	Aug. 14	On motion to insist on disagreement to Senate amendment increasing Federal contribution for certain civil defense activities from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000. (Adopted 242 to 166.)	Yea.
		H.R. 6004, establishing an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations:	
134	Aug. 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass bill. (Passed 335 to 31)	Yea.
		H. Con. Res. 369, expressing the sense of Congress against seating of the Communist regime in China in the United Nations:	
135	Aug. 17	On motion to suspend rules and pass resolution. (Adopted 368 to 2)	Yea.
136	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
138	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
139	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
140	Aug. 20	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8609, extending the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act:	
141	Aug. 20	On amendment authorizing food stamp plan. (Adopted 232 to 127)	Nay.
142	Aug. 20	On passage. (Passed 305 to 53)	Nay.
143	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 1341, requiring passenger autos purchased by the Federal Government to meet safety standards to be established by Secretary of Commerce:	
144	Aug. 26	On motion to recommit. (Rejected 125 to 264)	Yea.
		H.R. 5421, providing Federal subsidy for construction of certain fishing vessels:	
145	Aug. 26	On passage. (Passed 272 to 108)	Nay.
146	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2539, authorizing additional Federal housing program:	
147	Aug. 27	On motion to recommit with instructions to spread the $550,000,000 urban renewal funds over 2 years instead of 1 year and to delete the $50,000,000 loan fund for classroom construction. (Rejected 156 to 231.)	Yea.
148	Aug. 27	On passage. (Passed 283 to 106)	Nay.
149	Aug. 31	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 2247, authorizing the conveyance of certain real property to Sacramento County, Calif.:	
150	Aug. 31	On engrossment and 3d reading. (Ordered 205 to 94)	Not voting.[2]
		S. 2162, providing for a voluntary health insurance program for Government employees:	
151	Sept. 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 382 to 4)	Yea.

Footnote at end of table.

Roll-call No.	Date 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
		H.R. 7889, requiring establishment of marketing quotas for rice when production exceeds normal supply:	
152	Sept. 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 330 to 52)	Yea.
		H.R. 3151, authorizing the Federal Government to cooperate with certain cities in the enforcement of local income taxes:	
153	Sept. 1	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Rejected 251 to 133, a two-thirds majority being required)	Yea.
154	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 7509, making appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of the Army, Department of the Interior, and Tennessee Valley Authority (public works) for fiscal year 1960:	
155	Sept. 2	On motion to pass bill over veto of President. (Rejected 274 to 138, a two-thirds majority being required)	Nay.
		H.R. 4279, authorizing $6,000,000 for lower Rio Grande irrigation project, Texas:	
156	Sept. 2	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 282 to 114)	Nay.
157	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 2524, prohibiting, under certain conditions, States and localities from imposing a net income tax on income from interstate commerce and authorizing a study of problem:	
158	Sept. 2	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 359 to 31)	Yea.
159	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 8678, providing for additional financing to maintain Federal-aid highway program:	
160	Sept. 3	On passage. (Passed 243 to 162)	Yea.
161	Sept. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		S. 1555, providing for reforms in labor-management activities:	
162	Sept. 4	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 352 to 52)	Yea.
163	Sept. 4	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9035, removing ceiling on interest rates on series E and H savings bonds and permitting certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss:	
164	Sept. 4	On motion to recommit with instructions to add provisions removing the interest ceiling applicable to long-term marketable securities of the Federal Government. (Rejected 133 to 295.)	Yea.
165	Sept. 4	On passage. (Passed 378 to 7)	Yea.
166	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
167	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
168	Sept. 7	Quorum call	Present.
		H.J. Res. 352, authorizing appropriation of $75,000 for making a study and preparing plans for a proposed additional building for Library of Congress:	
169	Sept. 8	On motion to suspend rules and pass. (Passed 323 to 46)	Nay.
		H.R. 9105, making appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of Army, Department of the Interior, and Tennessee Valley Authority (public works) for fiscal year 1960:	
170	Sept. 8	On passage. (Passed 303 to 93)	Nay.
		H.R. 9069, providing standards for the issuance of passports and authorizing the State Department to deny passports to individuals affiliated with the Communist Party:	
171	Sept. 8	On passage. (Passed 371 to 18)	Yea.
		S. 2208, providing for the treatment of Alaska and Hawaii as Territories other than as States in the distribution of funds under the Federal Airport Act:	
172	Sept. 9	On passage. (Passed 309 to 75)	Nay.
173	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Present.
		H.R. 9105, making appropriations for civil functions administered by Department of Army, Department of Interior, and Tennessee Valley Authority (public works) for fiscal year 1960:	
174	Sept. 10	On motion to pass bill over veto of President. (Passed 280 to 121)	Nay.
		H.R. 8385, making appropriations for mutual security and other purposes for fiscal year 1960:	
175	Sept. 15	On adoption of conference report. (Adopted 194 to 109)	Yea.
176	Sept. 15	On motion to accept Senate amendment extending life of Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. (Adopted 221 to 81)	Yea.

[1] Absent. If present, would have voted "Yea."

[2] Absent. If present, would have voted "Nay."

Tributes to Judge Gustav L. Schramm, a Distinguished Juvenile Court Judge of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following biography and editorial tributes to Judge Gustav L. Schramm:

Gustav L. Schramm was born in Pittsburgh on May 11, 1898, the son of Rev. Alfred and Sophie (Lorch) Schramm; married to Louise Hammel; lives at 37 Mount Lebanon Boulevard, Mount Lebanon Township; educated in the Humboldt Elementary School and South Side High School, Pittsburgh; University of Pittsburgh: B.S. 1918, M.A. 1920, LL.B. 1924; Columbia University; Ph. D. 1928; St. Vincent College: LL.D. 1950; University of Pittsburgh: LL.D. 1954.

Lambda Chi Alpha (social), Beta Gamma Sigma (business-honorary), Delta Theta Phi (law), Order of the Coif (law-honorary), Omicron Delta Kappa (activities-honorary)—national president 1929–31, and Phi Sigma Pi (honorary member).

Member of the faculty of the University of Pittsburgh, 1918–53; attorney in charge of the Legal Aid Society of Pittsburgh, 1924–34.

Elected president judge of the Juvenile Court of Allegheny County in November 1933 for 10-year term; reelected in November 1943; elected for third term in November 1953.

Chairman, Panel on Juvenile Courts and Detention of the U.S. Attorney General's National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency, Washington, D.C., November 1946.

Junior Chamber of Commerce Certificate of Award for 1947 in recognition of outstanding achievement in the legal field.

Since 1948 instructor on the faculty of the FBI National Police Academy, Washington, D.C., on the juvenile court.

Pennsylvania Bar Association Distinguished Service Award for 1958.

Chairman: Committee on juvenile law and procedures of the American Bar Association; board of trustees of the National Juvenile Court Foundation; the Salvation Army-Juvenile Court Children's Fund.

Director: Children's service committee of the R. W. Grand Lodge, F. & A. M. of Pennsylvania.

District deputy grand master, 51st district, F. & A.M.; 33d degree.

Member: Council, section of criminal law of the American Bar Association; advisory section of the American Child Guidance Foundation; advisory committee of the Brashear Association; board of managers of the Kingsley Association; American, Pennsylvania and Allegheny County Bar Association; American Political Science Association; American Judicature Society.

Served two terms as president of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges; served two terms as president of the Pennsylvania Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

National Council of Juvenile Court Judges Meritorious Service Award for 1959.

[From the Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Sept. 8, 1959]

JUDGE SCHRAMM

The unexpected death of Gustav L. Schramm, Allegheny County's internationally acclaimed juvenile court judge, is a tragic loss.

If ever a man was struck down at the high point in his career, it was Judge Schramm.

Less than 48 hours before his death, Judge Schramm had been the central figure at the 10th session of the Pennsylvania Mason Juvenile Court Institute.

Attracted by Judge Schramm's achievements, scores of judges from all over the United States and from as far away as Korea and Alaska, joined Pennsylvania's top-ranking Masons and social workers in paying tribute to this modest man.

Founder and director of the institute, Judge Schramm had received the Distinguished Service Award of the Pennsylvania Bar Association only last year.

He was cited for having "created a juvenile court and a procedure for personalized treatment of juveniles coming into the court which has become a recognized model for juvenile procedures throughout the country.

This jurist who refused to wear a judicial robe so as not to overawe the children with whom he worked, firmly believed in making the punishment fit the child, not the crime.

After listening to police, social workers, attorneys, and parents so that he had all possible facts in the case, Judge Schramm talked privately with the child to probe in his own gentle way for the roots of the trouble.

This procedure, now widely acclaimed and imitated by other jurists, brought sharp attacks at various times from attorneys convinced that the time-honored procedures of

adult courts should also prevail in hearings for juveniles.

In recent years, however, Judge Schramm's record of success in dealing with more than 350,000 children in his nearly 26 years on the bench had served to still his professional critics.

Judge Schramm's pioneering work began with his election in 1933 to the juvenile court bench after enactment of a law making it the only court of its kind in Pennsylvania.

Reelection for his second and third 10-year term in 1943 and 1953 by impressive majorities offered convincing proof that Judge Schramm's work was appreciated by the general public.

Appreciation more difficult to assess doubtlessly fills the hearts of thousands of children he has helped.

He has shown the world how to make useful and happy citizens of children who had gone astray. Happily his methods will live on.

His devoted staff at the Juvenile Court Building in Oakland will see that the people of Allegheny County will continue to benefit from his philosophy.

[From the Post-Gazette, Sept. 7, 1959]

GUSTAV L. SCHRAMM

At a time when the problem of juvenile delinquency reaches frightening proportions nationally, the public can ill afford to lose the services of an experienced and dedicated public official like Juvenile Court Judge Gustav L. Schramm, who died suddenly on Saturday.

Thanks in large measure to his pioneering efforts, the problem of juvenile delinquency in this community has not degenerated to the jungle conditions found in New York City and, to a lesser extent, in Philadelphia.

Judge Schramm had been on the bench since 1933, when the legislature created in Allegheny County the first juvenile court in Pennsylvania. Since then he had become a nationally recognized authority in the field of juvenile delinquency. He built a nonpartisan court dedicated to the welfare and rehabilitation of youthful offenders.

The passing of Judge Schramm will be widely mourned. But he leaves behind a philosophy and a record of achievement which should prove useful to others in combating one of the Nation's most urgent problems. He served the public well.

[From the Post-Gazette, Sept. 7, 1959]

JUVENILE COURT JUDGE GUSTAV L. SCHRAMM

Judge Schramm died Saturday afternoon at his home of a heart attack. He was 61.

Judge Schramm was the only juvenile court judge in the history of Allegheny County. He was elected in 1933 when the State created the court as the only separate one of its kind in Pennsylvania. He was reelected to 10-year terms in 1943 and 1953 and would have served until 1964.

Last week Judge Schramm had conducted the 10th Mason Juvenile Court Institute, which he had originated 4 years ago. He had gone to the court at 3333 Forbes Avenue, Oakland, Saturday morning, and about 2:30 p.m. left for his home at 37 Mount Lebanon Boulevard.

He became ill while driving home and died at home at 3:30 p.m., before a doctor arrived.

FRIEND OF THOUSANDS

Recognition from many quarters had come to the judge during the 25 years he served as judge and in effect, as counselor and confidant to thousands of children who had wandered into trouble.

The most recent tribute was the announcement only last week that an international conference of juvenile court workers would be held here next year, with Judge Schramm presiding.

In 1958 Judge Schramm was presented the Distinguished Service Award of the Pennsylvania Bar Association for especially conspicuous service in the field of juvenile justice.

After serving as a visiting instructor before the Federal Bureau of Investigation Academy he was commended by J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the FBI.

Other commendation came from Supreme Court Justice Tom C. Clark and juvenile court judges and administrators throughout the United States.

INFORMAL IN PROCEDURE

Judge Schramm was president of the Pennsylvania Council of Juvenile Court Judges from 1951 to 1953 and was president of the National Council from 1949 to 1951.

Wearing a business suit and never a judicial robe, he held private conversations with the boys and girls brought before him. These informal chats were part of his procedure for handling their problems.

This process was the essence of the operation of Juvenile Court under Judge Schramm. It was designed, he frequently said, not to treat the juvenile as a criminal but as an effort to prevent him from growing up into a criminal, while at the same time protecting the community from wrongdoing.

NOT CRIMINAL COURT

Judge Schramm supported this informal procedure against proposed legislation which would, he felt, turn juvenile court into a criminal court similar to the type for adults. He felt the procedure he used was superior for handling the juveniles.

Before the court was formed, juvenile cases had been handled by common pleas court. When juvenile court was created, Judge Schramm was an attorney in charge of the Legal Aid Society.

He was sponsored by both parties but won in the 1933 Democratic Party primary and was elected with the backing of 100 civic and social agencies.

When he first took over the judgeship the court was in crowded quarters at 3336 Fifth Avenue. The present court building was completed in 1937.

FIT CHILD, NOT CRIME

Judge Schramm's guiding philosophy was "make the punishment fit the child, not a crime." He once said that juvenile delinquency is largely a problem of how much the community cares about its children.

Judge Schramm was a 33° Mason, a member of the executive board of the Boy Scout Council, a director of the YMCA, and was active in the Salvation Army.

He was born on the Southside May 11, 1898 and attended Humboldt Elementary School, South Side High School, the University of Pittsburgh and Columbia University.

His father, the Reverend Alfred Schramm, was pastor of German United Evangelical Church and his grandfather, the Reverend Gustav Lorch, had been pastor of the old church before that.

Judge Schramm is survived by his wife, Mrs. Louise Schramm.

Interment will be in Zimmerman Cemetery, 2511 Brownsville Road, Carrick Memorial donations may be made to favorite charities.

[From the Post-Gazette, Sept. 9, 1959]

SCHRAMM EULOGIZED IN COURTS—ATTORNEY, JURISTS SOUND PRAISES OF DECEASED JUDGE

Juvenile Court Judge Gustav L. Schramm, who died Saturday, was eulogized in common pleas and criminal courts yesterday.

Attorney Harold Schmidt, representing the Allegheny County Bar Association, praised Judge Schramm in common pleas court.

KNOWN NATIONALLY

Judge Harry M. Montgomery, in criminal court, paid tribute to Judge Schramm, who, he said, was largely responsible for the lack of organized gangs among juveniles here.

Judge Montgomery pointed out that Judge Schramm, whose funeral was held yesterday, was nationally known for his work among children.

Judge J. Frank McKenna addressed 215 jurors called for duty as common pleas court resumed jury trials. In criminal court Judge Montgomery seated the 16-member September grand jury.

CITY COUNCIL ADJOURNS

City council likewise took official notice of the passing of Judge Schramm. On motion of Patrick T. Fagan yesterday's session adjourned out of respect to his memory. The motion was adopted with a standing vote and a minute of silence.

The grand jury will consider some 800 cases this month. Foreman of the jury is James L. Cavanaugh, 210 Second Street, Aspinwall, a steelworker on strike from the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. southside works.

As a juror, he will receive $7 a day.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Sept. 7, 1959]

THE CHILDREN'S FRIEND

A notable career, filled with service to humanity, came to an end the other day with the death of Judge Gustav L. Schramm. At 61, he had served for 25 years as Allegheny County's first and only juvenile court judge.

Judge Schramm was a social scientist and teacher as well as an attorney when, in 1933, he took over the difficult task of creating a new juvenile court. That institution today is entirely his own creation. He built the staff and worked out the procedures.

As a result of his work, he became a national figure in his field, recognized as one of the most preeminent authorities on the handling of juvenile crime. He headed the State and National councils of juvenile court judges and won many citations for meritorious service.

Judge Schramm's concern was, first of all, the child. He brought to his work as judge no pat formula for making the punishment fit the crime. Instead he made the treatment fit the child and he listened with patience to the personal problems of literally thousands of mixed-up children every year.

His work was effective, both for most of his charges and for the community. It is perhaps due to this court—the only one of its kind in the State—that Allegheny County has been spared the kind of juvenile crime that has afflicted other large cities.

Judge Schramm valued above all else his position as a friend of children. He certainly was that and he leaves behind him a rich legacy of knowledge of how to help them.

[From the Pittsburgh Press, Sept 7, 1959]

HEART ATTACK ENDED JUDGE SCHRAMM'S LONG COURT CAREER

Judge Schramm, one of the Nation's leading authorities on juvenile crime, was at his desk at the Juvenile Court Building on Saturday morning and complained of feeling ill.

He left his office and went to his home at 37 Mount Lebanon Boulevard where he was pronounced dead at 3:30 p.m.

WROTE ARTICLES

The native-born Pittsburgher was the first full-time judge of the court and contributed many articles on the handling of juvenile criminals to legal journals.

He is survived by his widow, Louise.

Judge Schramm was educated at the Humboldt Elementary School and South Side High School before going to the University of Pittsburgh.

He received his batchelor of science degree at Pitt in 1918 and a master of arts degree in 1920.

Degrees were earned also at St. Vincent College and Columbia University.

Judge Schramm was a member of the Pitt faculty from 1918 to 1953, and attorney-in-charge for the Legal Aid Society of Pittsburgh from 1924 to 1934.

ELECTED IN 1933

His first election to the juvenile court bench was in 1933 when he won a 10-year term, as he did in 1943 and 1953.

He was chairman of the panel on juvenile courts and detention of the U.S. Attorney General's National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency.

In 1948 he became an instructor on the faculty of the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Police Academy, Washington, lecturing on "The Juvenile Court."

Judge Schramm was given the Pennsylvania Bar Association's Distinguished Service Award in 1958.

He was chairman of the committee on juvenile law and procedures of the American Bar Association, board of trustees of the National Juvenile Court Foundation and the Salvation Army-Juvenile Court Children's Fund.

HEADED LODGE GROUP

And he was director of the children's service committee of the R. W. Grand Lodge, F. & A. M. of Pennsylvania.

Judge Schramm also served two terms as president of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges and two terms as head of the Pennsylvania Council of Juvenile Court Judges.

Is a Yawn Coming On?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson as it appeared in the New Republic magazine of August 24, 1959:

IS A YAWN COMING ON?

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

They say that one great trouble with Khrushchev is his abysmal ignorance of America and Americans; but when he announced that he doesn't want to look at any Army installations because he comes as a peaceful man, not with a rocket in his pocket—well, with that he belted one clean over the centerfield fence. If he had made a lifelong study of Americans he couldn't have said anything better.

Perhaps, though, the commentators are right. It may be that Khrushchev spoke out of his knowledge, not of Americans, but Russians. If that is the case, it is another strong indication that Russians are people—a doctrine to be accepted hesitantly by anyone who dreads the accusation of being "soft on communism," but nevertheless a doctrine supported by massive evidence. If Khrushchev, saying what he knew the masses in Russia would like to hear, hit upon something that the masses in America very much like to hear, the implications are immense.

For, if we are alike in this, it is a reasonable assumption that we may be alike in other things. For instance, it may be that the Russians, too, are a horribly scared people, and if that is the case they must be appalled by the risk Khrushchev is taking in venturing into this country. As a matter of fact, judging by the superficial aspect of things, they are right. Any man who visits the haunts of the terrified is taking a serious risk, often a greater risk than one who goes among the vicious. The vicious, as long as they keep their wits about them, may be restrained by self-interest; but the utterly terrified are restrained by nothing. A badly scared visitor received by badly scared hosts is in a precarious position. If some American town proves to be another Caracas, no one need be surprised.

It is always possible, though, that the abject fright of this country is in considerable measure synthetic. That seems to be the case in Russia. At least the street crowds did not exhibit any notable fear of Vice President NIXON; on the contrary, they were consistently polite and in many places cordial. Politicians of the McCarthy type find terror a convenient means of garnering votes and they are adept at transforming reasonable misgivings into blind panic, or the appearance thereof. But when the thing is put to the test it frequently turns out that the common people were not half as scared as they had been told they were.

This is alarming to politicians whose political capital consists mainly, if not exclusively, of their ability to wave the Red flag as politicians of an earlier day waved the bloody shirt. If the head of the Russian Government is received quietly in this country, goes where he wishes without molestation, and returns to Russia in perfect health, it is probable that the politicians will have to find a new issue; and few of them have brains and character enough to do so.

The ruin would be complete if, after an uneventful Russian visit, the American President's visit to Russia should be marked by nothing more sinister than the presentation of bunches of flowers by little girls. If that should happen, even the politicians could see that as a vote-getter "the Communist conspiracy" is no longer infallible.

The whole history of this Republic attests that when it is no longer possible to stampede American voters by mere howling, the better class of men in public life have a chance to use their brains to settle issues in a reasonable way.

It is also historically true that the moment when the voters refuse to stampede usually comes suddenly, with no warning, and with no visible cause. It happened to McCarthyism. One day it appeared to be as invincible as ever, but the next day it was so dead that it wasn't even news. It happened to Palmer's witch-hunt after World War I. It happened to the Bloody Shirt shortly after 1885, when Kansans began to yawn as soon as Ingalls started to orate. It may be on the eve of happening to "the Communist conspiracy."

This is appalling to those politicians who have depended on the issue to hold their jobs, but nobody else need be alarmed. Certainly communism will remain a menace, but its threat will not be increased when we stop screaming and begin to take intelligent measures to deal with it. War is not an intelligent measure; but what to substitute for war calls for careful thinking, probably continued for a long time; and it is pretty hard to do careful thinking in the midst of a convention of whirling dervishes.

So if we can restrain such elements as the Puerto Rican Nationalists who tried to liquidate Truman and did shoot up the House of Representatives, perhaps Mr. Khrushchev's visit may be productive of some good. Perhaps it may even work the miracle of producing an American yawn when the words "Communist conspiracy" are uttered.

Trade Unionism, Its Needs and Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much rancor expressed in the debate over the need for labor reform legislation that I think it is time to inject a little kindness into the discussion. The most abused party, of course, has been the trade union movement which has traditionally been the principal protagonist for those of our citizens who work largely with their hands. It has become clear that our national stability and prosperity largely depend upon decent working conditions and wages for the bulk of those who labor with their hands but this fact was somewhat obscured in the recent discussion of the crimes of a limited number of officers of labor organizations.

I think, therefore, that we can all regain a lost perspective from the very excellent editorial which follows, taken from the September 7, 1959, editorial page of the Fresno Bee.

TRADE UNIONISM, ITS NEEDS, RESPONSIBILITIES

"Trade Unionism" was the title of a piece written by the late C. K. McClatchy, for more than 50 years editor of the Sacramento Bee. It appeared on May 27, 1911, in his personal column, "Merely Some Private Thinks," on the Bee's editorial page. This being Labor Day, its republication is both fitting and informative. C. K. wrote:

"Trade unionism has had and has its evils. It has fallen here and there under the domination of corrupt and cruel men. It has too often been blind to, if it has not condoned, the crimes of some of its members, while sheltering the guilty. It seldom has taken advantage of its power to do injustice. It has been used by scoundrels as a political weapon against the best interests of good government.

"Yet when everything has been said—alike that which is only suspected, as well as that which can be proved—it must be admitted that trade unionism on the whole has been not a vast benefit to the working class, but as well a blessing to civilization, to humanity, to mankind.

"Admit everything that has been charged against it, the offenses of trade unionism against organized capital, against justice, are not one hundredth part as rank as those of organized capital against the laboring classes, against common rights—offenses which still would be continued practically everywhere in their shame and in their infamy if it were not for trade unions; offenses which smell to high heaven today where no trade unionism flourishes to do battle in the name of common humanity against the sweatshop system and similar evils.

"Were it not for the wonderful work done by labor unions in the United States the laboring classes still would be working nerve-killing hours at miserable pittances. They would have no time for pleasures, for leisure, for mental improvement. They would be little better than the beasts of the field.

Not alone the United States, but civilization, mankind and womanhood, owe a deep debt of gratitude to the labor unions. He is either blind or will not see, who will deny this; either sightless to every patent fact that lies about him on every hand, or else a hater of labor unions because they have forced the hoggish class to which he belongs to pay living wages to toiling workers.

"That a union of workingmen sometimes leads to unjust and unjustifiable demands goes without saying. But a union of capitalists frequently results in oppression; in illegitimate if not illegal squeezing of the consumer; in an advance of prices for the necessities of life, justified in law but not in equity. In neither case should employer nor employee be deprived of all right to organize, solely because it happens that organization sometimes leads to injustice.

"The only weapon the laboring man has is unity. He should cling to it. He should be encouraged and aided to its possession. He is learning day by day to use it better; with more moderation; with more justice. Surely he would have to labor overtime in order to use it more unjustly than organized capital often does. And certainly no one has the legal or any other right to declare he shall not have such a weapon."

Fresh Evidence of the Need for the Item Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me the recent difficulties which we encountered with regard to the public works measure should have caused us to again focus our attention on the need for the item veto. I feel confident that the time will come when we shall have to enact something along these lines, and it seems to me the sooner, the better.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks entitled "Fresh Evidence of the Need for the Item Veto."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KEATING

FRESH EVIDENCE OF THE NEED FOR THE ITEM VETO

I voted to sustain the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill. I did so as a salute to the Chief Executive's political courage in disapproving a measure he knew was of great importance to numerous localities and States. I supported the President because I believed he was completely justified in denying his approval to a bill which contained a plethora of unauthorized, unbudgeted, unapproved items.

After all, Mr. President, we have established certain procedures which should be followed before rivers and harbors and other public works projects should be authorized and funds appropriated for them. Such proposals must gain the approval of the Corps of Engineers. They must be found fiscally sound by the Bureau of the Budget. They should be included in the President's budget.

When a project has cleared those hurdles—hurdles which Congress has created to save itself from wasteful and unneeded spending—then it should get a green light from the House, the Senate and the President. But we should not ignore the safeguards we have established. If we do, why erect them in the first place?

Certainly we cannot have it both ways. We cannot set up tests for each project to pass in order to avoid unnecessary spending, and turn right around and ignore those tests and appropriate funds which have not been justified.

Yet that is what this Congress has done in passing on two occasions appropriation measures literally riddled with unauthorized, unbudgeted items. It is the height of irresponsibility for us to continue on this course, and I commend the President for so sternly calling a halt.

I hoped, therefore, that we would sustain the President's action, and that the Appropriations Committees would finally see the light and promptly give us a bill which contained only properly approved projects. Unfortunately the veto was overridden.

My only regret is that the President was forced to veto his entire measure. I wish he possessed the power to prune out the unnecessary items in this appropriation measure, leaving the good parts, and approving only the budgeted and authorized items. That is the sound and orderly procedure. It can be made possible by giving the President the item veto power.

For many years I have advocated granting the President the power to veto individual items in appropriation bills. Vigorous and wise application of that prerogative by a number of our Governors has resulted in substantial savings, and there is every indication even more fruitful results could be obtained on the Federal level. Political scientists, students of government, and numerous others who have looked into this matter are convinced that it would be a healthy and desirable means for eliminating much of the fat and wasteful spending now contained in appropriations measures approved by Congress.

Most State Governors today possess this power, and it has been consistently advocated by occupants of the White House. President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message this year again called for the power of item veto, describing such authority as "one of the most important corrections that could be made in our annual expenditure program, because this would save tax dollars."

I agree wholeheartedly with the President's view of the tremendous worth of this additional grant of authority. It is my estimate that hundreds of millions of dollars could be saved annually by strong application of the item veto.

The two public-works bills vetoed by the President this year provide further evidence of the crying need for this grant of authority. To a lesser extent, the same may be said for the housing bill vetoed by the President.

Of course, as things now stand, our Chief Executive must either accept an entire appropriation bill, including all wasteful, unnecessary items, or veto the whole measure, including funds that are justified and needed. If the President had the item veto power he could have pruned the unbudgeted, unapproved provisions from the public-works bill and then have signed a measure that would be sound by every established yardstick.

I am pleased to note that the wise use by the President of his veto power this year has aroused new interest in the item veto proposal. For example, the Washington Post of September 11 pointed out that the failure of the majority leadership to improve on the first public-works appropriations bill "virtually insured the second veto which came so promptly." The Post went on to note that "Congress is unlikely to give up its close direction of rivers and harbors, reclamation projects, and the like until the extravagance of some of these ventures brings about public pressure for a more orderly system, free of pork-barrel politics. But even if Congress ultimately gets around the public-works vetoes they may at least have focused new attention on such abuses. The whole performance is a compelling argument for the item veto."

I subscribe strongly to that evaluation of the present situation as it relates to the need for granting the President the item veto power. The item veto is the only method by which logrolling can be expunged from appropriation bills. Certainly we should not deny the President any weapon he can employ to bring about reductions in unnecessary spending, and in my view the item veto would be the most effective tool we could possibly provide in this never-ending fight to save the taxpayers' money.

On February 3 of this year, in cooperation with a number of other Senators I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 44, which proposes a constitutional amendment to grant the President the power of item veto. Under the terms of this proposal, the President would have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill, just as he can now disapprove as a whole any bill presented to him by Congress. Such vetoes would be, of course, subject to overriding by Congress. This resolution is stated in terms of a constitutional amendment because I believe that is the clean-cut, decisive manner in which to approach the problem.

However, I am willing to support any sound legislative move embodying the same principle as the item veto, although I have some reeservations on constitutional grounds as to whether such authority can be delegated other than by amending the Constitution. On July 13 of this year I joined with Senator CURTIS and others in sponsoring S. 2373, which would authorize the President to reduce or eliminate, by Executive order, amounts from appropriations bills. Here, the President's action would be subject to normal congressional review and possible overriding by majority vote of either House. This proposal seeks the same goals as the direct item veto idea, and it has the additional virtue of not having to run the time-consuming gauntlet of approval by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

I am hopeful our experience in this session of Congress, where the President has wisely and vigorously employed the veto in the interests of all the American people, will impel a full study of all these proposals to curb wasteful spending. At a time when all of us should be dedicated to fiscal soundness, at a time when all of us should be searching out every means to balance the budget, a full congressional appraisal of the item veto and Executive order proposals is in order.

It is my hope that in the next session these ideas will be the subject of hearings by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and then a proposal will be brought to the floor of the Senate where I am confident of its success. Provision of authority for the President to cut down excessive and unwarranted congressional appropriations—be it by item veto or Executive order—is a step long overdue. No step will contribute more directly nor soundly to wise saving of taxpayers' funds.

I believe it would be helpful to have the text of these two proposals follow my remarks, and they follow:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 44

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"'*Article* —

"'SECTION 1. The President shall have the power to disapprove any item or items of any general appropriation bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate and have been presented to him for his approval, in the same manner and subject to the same limitations as he may, under section 7 of article I of this Constitution, disapprove as a whole any bill which shall have been presented to him.

"'SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, as provided in the Constitution, within seven years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.'"

"S. 2373

"A bill to authorize the President to reduce or eliminate by Executive order any appropriation or appropriations made by any Act or joint resolution of the Congress

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to eliminate or reduce by Executive order, in whole or in part, any appropriation or appropriations made by any Act or joint resolution, whenever, after investigation, he shall find and declare that such action will aid in balancing the budget or in reducing the public debt, and that the public interest will be served thereby: *Provided,* That whenever the President issues an Executive order under the provisions of this Act, such Executive order shall be submitted to the Congress while in session and shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days of continuous session of the Congress following the date on which such order is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such sixty-day period, there has not been passed by either of the two Houses a resolution stating in in substance that that House does not favor such order: *Provided further,* That the continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die, but, in the computation of the sixty-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than three days to a day certain. As used in this section, the term 'appropriation' includes an authorization to create obligations by contract in advance of an appropriation.

"SEC. 2. Any appropriations or parts thereof eliminated under the authority of this Act shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury, and the same action shall be taken with respect to any amounts by which any appropriations or parts thereof may be reduced under the authority of this Act."

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include copy of my newsletter which was released today:

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE, of West Virginia)

WASHINGTON, September 14, 1959.—One of the most encouraging developments insofar as the Fifth Congressional District is concerned was the action by the House and the Senate in overriding the President's second veto of an appropriation bill for flood control and navigation projects and other public works.

This means that the final legislative obstacle to beginning work on two urgently needed flood control projects in the Fifth Congressional District—Brush Creek at Princeton and Meadow River at East Rainelle—at a cost of about $500,000 each—has now been completed. Also included in the bill was nearly $71,000 to complete preengineering planning for the Williamson flood wall, as well as funds to continue the resurvey on the Big Sandy River.

Because of the importance of these projects to the Fifth District, I found it impossible this year to return home for Labor Day, as has been my custom. The House voted on Tuesday on the revised public works bill and those of us who are interested in providing adequate flood protection for our people had to spend Labor Day in Washington rallying support for the bill.

Both the House and the Senate passed the bill, the total of which was reduced by 2½ percent. The President vetoed this second bill but for the first time in 6 years the President's veto was overridden.

I cannot understand the President's veto. He objected to new starts included in the bill which had not been budgeted by the Budget Bureau—including the Princeton and East Rainelle projects. Yet, he does not object to the use of foreign aid funds to start almost identical projects in foreign countries.

It is popular to refer to the public works bill as pork barrel. But how in the world can anyone believe the projects in the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia are not justified. The loss from recurring floods has been tremendous and unless these projects are built, the areas involved can look forward to frequent recurrence of devastating and costly disasters.

There is yet one difficulty to be faced before the funds included in the appropriation bill can actually be spent.

President Eisenhower can freeze the funds for all projects not budgeted by the Bureau of the Budget. But if he does, the money will remain allocated to these projects and cannot be used for any other purpose. I sincerely trust he will not do this. There would be nothing to be gained by such stubborn action on the part of the President.

The Princeton and East Rainelle and Williamson projects are urgently needed. Our people have suffered long enough. Now that Congress has spoken in such a decisive manner, the President should permit Army engineers to proceed in an orderly manner and get the projects underway without further unnecessary delay.

At this time I would like to acknowledge the tremendous help of Speaker SAM RAYBURN and Senate Majority Leader LYNDON JOHNSON in helping secure approval of the projects in the Fifth District. These two men are sincere friends of West Virginia. They understand our problems and they have gone out of their way to be helpful, not only on this particular problem, but on other matters of great interest to our State.

FULL DISCLOSURE ON FOREIGN AID SPENDING URGED

The House, in approving the mutual security appropriation, adopted an amendment requiring the International Cooperation Administration to make a full disclosure to Congress on expenditures of foreign aid funds. The Senate has knocked this amendment out of the appropriation bill.

A determined effort will be made to keep this provision in the bill. I am a member of a Government Operations Subcommittee which serves as a watchdog of the foreign aid program. Our experience has been that ICA officials make a determined effort to cover up waste and misuse of funds. Requests for information are frequently denied.

A congressional mandate cutting off funds in the event information is withheld would be a big help in efforts to bring about better, more efficient operation of the program.

The Fabricating Clause as Effected by Section 8(e) of the Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, because of the limitation of time in the debate on the conference committee's report on the recently passed labor reform legislation, it was impossible during that debate for me to establish a very important point of legislative history relating to the effects of section 8(e) of the new Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. For that reason, I consider it imperative that the legislative intent be made clear on a proviso contained in this act.

Many building trade unions officials advise me that there have been numerous questions submitted to them both by local union officers as well as contractors asking the question whether or not their particular subcontracting clauses in their existing agreements are covered by the proviso to section 8(e) of the new Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. More particularly,

the question has arisen by the Plumbers and Pipefitters International Union based on what is known as their fabricating clause. In the plumbing and pipefitting industry, plumbing or pipefitting contractors have a collective bargaining agreement with the Plumbers and Pipefitters local unions, recognizing the Pipefitters local unions as the exclusive bargaining agent for all journeymen pipefitters engaged in fabrication and installation of pipe on a job site.

The collective-bargaining agreement further provides that all pipe installed on the job site must be either fabricated on the job site or in a shop of the employer. By fabrication is meant the cutting, bending, or fitting of pipe. A pipefitter is a fabricator. His job is to fabricate pipe. Fabrication of pipe can be performed either at the construction site or in a shop.

There is a further clause in the contract that provides that the contractor may subcontract out the pipe that is to be installed on the jobsite for fabrication in another shop provided that the subcontractor to whom the pipe is to be fabricated has an agreement with a local union of the pipefitters and pays the prevailing building and construction wage rate for pipefitters engaged in the fabrication.

This subcontracting clause is agreed upon in order to protect the wage rate and working conditions of the pipefitters. It is a term and condition of employment.

Section 8(e) was written in the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, abolishing hot cargo clauses and other forms of contract boycotting activity. However, there was inserted the following proviso: "*Provided*, That nothing in this subsection (e) shall apply to an agreement between a labor organization and an employer of work to be done at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work."

The proviso above set out embraces and covers all forms of contracting or subcontracting clauses in agreements between building and construction contractors and building trades unions, with respect to work to be done at the jobsite. The pipe installed on the jobsite must be cut, treated and fabricated prior to installation. This is done at jobsite in some jobs or at the shop of the employer, or may be subcontracted by the contractor. This is all a question to be covered by the collective bargaining agreement.

The proviso permits plumbers and pipefitters local unions to bargain with their contractors relative to the contracting or subcontracting out of any fabrication of the pipe or the parties may agree that it may be done at the jobsite.

A question has arisen as to whether or not the plumbers and pipefitters fabrication clause falls within the above quoted proviso of section 8(e). It was the intent of the conferees that the quoted provision 8(e) applies wherever the work involved could be performed at the construction site. Fabrication can be and generally is performed at the construction site and since the fabrication clause relates to work which can be done at the jobsite, the fabrication clause contained in the National and Local Agreements of United Association local unions, is within the coverage of the construction industry proviso in section 8(e). This matter was expressly considered and discussed in the conference on the labor reform bill. By use of the phrase "relating to work to be done at the site of the construction," the conferees intended to cover all work which could be done at the site of the construction. The type of building and construction clauses which are outlawed and do not fall within the proviso are clauses which restrict the use and installation of manufactured articles. The proviso was never intended to prohibit a fabrication type of clause where the work or fabrication could be done or performed at the jobsite.

Payment in Lieu of Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Resolution No. 1503 from the Mariposa County Board of Supervisors, Mariposa, Calif.:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, COUNTY OF MARIPOSA, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, RESOLUTION NO. 1503

Whereas over 50 percent of the land in the County of Mariposa, State of California, is under Federal control; and

Whereas Federal control of said land in said county is undermining the revenue structure of the local government; and

Whereas S. 910, payment in lieu of taxes, cosponsored by 33 bipartisan cosponsors, has been favorably reported out of committee by the Senate Government Operations Committee; and

Whereas H.R. 5731 and H.R. 6073 have been referred to the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, being identical versions of S. 910: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Mariposa, State of California, do hereby approve and respectfully urge passage of S. 910, H.R. 5731, and H.R. 6073, payment in lieu of taxes; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators THOMAS H. KUCHEL and CLAIR ENGLE and Representative HAROLD T. JOHNSON; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Supervisors of the County of Mariposa, State of California, respectfully request that the honorable Senators and Representative above mentioned read this resolution on the floor of the Senate and House of Representatives and have it published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Mariposa, State of California, this 10th day of September 1959, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors McGregor, Ellis, McCay, Miller, Conrad; noes: none; absent: none.

EUGENE MCGREGOR,
Chairman of the Board.

Attest:

GABRIELLE WILSON,
County Clerk and Ex-Officio Clerk of the Board.

The Labor Movement as It Appeared in 1911

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am submitting herewith an editorial which appeared in the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee on September 7, written in 1911 by the late C. K. McClatchy, editor of the Bee for more than 50 years. His observations written nearly 50 years ago regarding the labor movement and the responsibilities of union leadership are as appropriate now as they were then. Mr. McClatchy was certainly farsighted in evaluating the problems involving the labor movement and it is with respect and pleasure I submit his comments:

TRADE UNIONISM, ITS NEED, RESPONSIBILITIES

"Trade Unionism" was the title of a piece written by the late C. K. McClatchy, for more than 50 years editor of the Sacramento Bee. It appeared on May 27, 1911, in his personal column, Merely Some Private Thinks, on the Bee's editorial page. This being Labor Day, its republication is both fitting and informative. C. K. wrote:

"Trade unionism has had and has its evils. It has fallen here and there under the domination of corrupt and cruel men. It has too often been blind to, if it has not condoned, the crimes of some of its members, while sheltering the guilty. It seldom has taken advantage of its power to do injustice. It has been used by scoundrels as a political weapon against the best interests of good government.

"Yet when everything has been said—alike that which is only suspected, as well as that which can be proved—it must be admitted that trade unionism on the whole has been not alone a vast benefit to the working classes, but as well a blessing to civilization, to humanity, to mankind.

"Admit everything that has been charged against it, the offenses of trade unionism against organized capital, against justice, are not one-hundredth part as rank as those of organized capital against the laboring classes, against common rights—offenses which still would be continued practically everywhere in their shame and in their infamy if it were not for trade unions; offenses which smell to high heaven today where no trade unionism flourishes to do battle in the name of common humanity against the sweatshop system and similar evils.

"Were it not for the wonderful work done by labor unions in the United States the laboring classes still would be working nerve killing hours at miserable pittances. They would have no time for pleasures, for leisure, for mental improvement. They would be little better than the beasts in the field. Not alone the United States, but civilization,

mankind and womanhood, owe a deep debt of gratitude to the labor unions. He is either blind or will not see, who will deny this; either sightless to every patent fact that lies about him on every hand, or else a hater of labor unions because they have forced the hoggish class to which he belongs to pay living wages to toiling workers.

"That a union of workingmen sometimes leads to unjust and unjustifiable demands goes without saying. But a union of capitalists frequently results in oppression; in illegitimate if not illegal squeezing of the consumer; in an advance of prices for the necessities of life, justified in law but not in equity. In neither case should employer nor employee be deprived of all right to organize, solely because it happens that organization sometimes leads to injustice.

"The only weapon the laboring man has is unity. He should cling to it. He should be encouraged and aided to its possession. He is learning day by day to use it better; with more moderation; with more justice. Surely he would have to labor overtime in order to use it more unjustly than organized capital often does. And certainly no one has the legal or any other right to declare he shall not have such a weapon."

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under animous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would like to include my newsletter of September 17, 1959, to my constituents on the subject of Government bond interest:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By JAMES B. UTT)

This is what the summer TV programs bill as a repeat. However, while the subject matter is the same as that contained in my release of February 26, the script is somewhat revised. I do this for the purpose of bringing to the attention of the people in my district the serious financial crisis faced by the U.S. Government and to show that this crisis can be met if the politicians in Congress will show a little more love for their country than for themselves.

The spectacular headlines on the front page deal with high interest rates, but you have to turn to the editorials and the financial columns of the newspapers to find the basic causes. It is a complicated question and is little understood by the average citizen who is so adversely affected. In two special messages to the Congress the President has put us on notice of the impending crisis and has requested prompt and positive action to permit the Treasury to manage our debt upon a sound fiscal basis.

The Ways and Means Committee, to which this legislation was referred, spent weeks in executive sessions with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. At no point did the members of the Ways and Means Committee question the testimony of these 2 high Government officials, and at one time our committee voted 15 to 10 to provide the required legislation. The 10 Republican members and 5 Democrats voted affirmatively. However, the matter drug along for a week or 10 days, and then the committee reconsidered the matter and, on motion to report out the needed legislation, the vote was 14 to 11 against it with the 10 Republican members and 1 Democrat voting for it. What happened to make this committee reverse itself? The crisis had not vanished. There was no challenge to the testimony which we had received from the Secretary of the Treasury. The answer is simple—political instructions from the Democratic leadership. High interest rates was to become the Democratic campaign issue for 1960. Because high interest rates strike at every segment of our economy and the cause is complicated to explain; it appeared to be the only campaign issue left for the Democrats. Unemployment had disappeared, prosperity had returned, international relationships had improved, and the Republicans, backed by the President's vetoes, had slowed down the wild spending programs introduced at the first of the session. Ninety percent of the financial writers, including the Democratic South, have used millions of words urging the Congress to meet this crisis before it explodes; but the Democratic leadership turned a deaf ear to this warning and, when a substitute motion was made on the floor of Congress to grant the President the right to raise interest rates on long-term bonds, all but two Republicans and only one Democrat voted for it. The Democrats viewed with alarm the rising costs of money in the short-term market but would take no steps to remove the pressure by permitting the Federal Government to raise the statutory interest rate of 4¼ percent on long-term bonds. As a result, the Treasury is forced to go into the short-term market and compete with the needs of every consumer in America. This great demand, which far exceeds the supply, automatically forces an increase in the rental charge for the use of money.

We are a victim of our own prodigality. In other words, the chickens have come home to roost. For years we have been spending more than we could afford to spend and the deficits have built up. The $13 billion deficit last year had to be financed in the short-term market and created an unprecedented demand for money. On the other hand, if we had been able to have reduced our national debt by even a few billion dollars, we would have supplied money to the short-term market and interest rates would have gone down. As Americans we should not be proud of the fact that many of our Government bonds are traded in the market at 81 and 82 cents on the dollar, while bonds of the Japanese Imperial Government are selling at 100 to 101 cents on the dollar in the same market. In fact, there are a dozen foreign long-term issues selling at over a hundred cents on the dollar because these foreign governments are realistic and pay an interest rate sufficiently attractive to invite buyers.

The simplest illustration which I can give on the effect of supply and demand on the short-term market would run something like this: You have a pail of water (which corresponds to the supply of short-term money) with which you intend to water a large flock of chickens (the demand), but along comes a thirsty hog (the Federal Government) and preempts more than 50 percent of the water in the pail so that some chickens will either go without water or, figuratively speaking, would pay a higher price for what they get. If that hog was not thirsty and came along with another pail of water, there would be more than the chickens needed.

The crisis is so serious that I firmly believe the President will take it to the people on television and call a special session later this fall, as the maturing issues will have to be paid out of short-term borrowing and, every time the short-term interest rate goes up, the market value of the outstanding long-term bonds will go down. In other words, as the short-term rate goes up a percentage point, the market of the long-term bonds now selling in the eighties will drop a minimum of another five points. The only other alternative to this is printing-press money, and let me remind you that printing-press money issued in several of our neighboring republics has depreciated the value of their currency 99 percent, which in this country would mean that your dollar would be worth one penny in a very few years.

The Urgent Need for Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Madam President, the Oregon Journal, of Portland, on Septemeber 8, 1959, published a very thoughtful and informative editorial entitled "Oregon and the Nation Need Doctors." The article discusses the fact that not enough persons are being educated for the medical profession to keep up with our rapidly increasing population. The editorial also refers to a statement by the distinguished Dr. Howard A. Rusk, who was a guest in my native city over the weekend, where he delivered the annual Sommer Memorial Lectures to the American Conference of General Practitioners.

Madam President, I am particularly pleased to ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Oregon Journal be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, because the very gracious occupant of the Chair at time time [Mrs. SMITH] has herself been a great leader in the cause of medical research legislation. I think all the Nation, as well as all mankind, owe a debt to her and to her eminent colleague on the Committee on Appropriations, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], for their successful efforts to expand medical research, medical education, and health opportunities for our people and the rest of the people of the world. This year they helped greatly in bringing about expanded funds for the National Institutes of Health, which have done so much to explore new realms in the field of medical discoveries.

The editorial in the Journal also has drawn upon a recent article of mine in the August 1959 issue of the Progressive magazine on the critical shortage of members of the medical profession, and thus I believe the editorial should appear in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of Members of the Senate and House.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OREGON AND THE NATION NEED DOCTORS

Is there a dangerous shortage of doctors and medical education facilities in the United States—and in Oregon?

Oregon's United States Senator NEUBERGER, a leader in health and medical research legislation since he entered the Senate in 1955,

says there is. And he documents his case in the August Progressive magazine.

Dr. Howard A. Rusk, medical editor of the New York Times and international authority on human rehabilitation (who is lecturing in Portland this month) says there is, and that the situation is becoming worse.

A recent editorial in the University of Oregon medical school's report to its alumni publication says there is.

The Bayne-Jones report made last year to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare indicates that there is to the extent that the ratio of doctors to population is decreasing steadily and alarmingly.

And the Oregon State Medical Society admits that there is a current shortage of approximately 75 doctors in Oregon.

More specifically, Senator NEUBERGER says that our annual production of doctors will have to increase at least 27 percent a year to keep up with population gains. He adds that while our ratio of doctors to patients has been declining, Russia's has been increasing amazingly.

Oregon's ratio (with 1,970 doctors in practice today) is 1 doctor to 860 people. And while this is slightly worse than the national average, now 1 to 820, our ratio has improved from 1 to 920 in 1950 to today's 1 to 860, with a 20-percent increase in the number of practicing physicians since 1950.

In Portland, the State's principal medical center, the ratio is much better, about 1 to 550, but in one Oregon county we have no doctors at all, and we could place 75 additional doctors today—if we had them.

Nationally we have added only 6 new medical schools since 1950 (making only 85 altogether with 29,500 students) and three of them had not graduated any classes up to this year. Oregon's only medical school, the University of Oregon medical school in Portland, admitted only 79 students last year and has been stabilized at about 75 graduates a year. The situation would be more serious if the medical society did not place between 50 and 60 out-of-State doctors in Oregon each year.

Dr. Rusk estimates we'll need 5,250 more doctors each year to serve an estimated 230 million people by 1975.

Senator NEUBERGER estimates we need to spend between $500 million and $1 billion for new medical schools and research institutions in the next few years, just to prevent losing further ground. A new medical school costs around $35 million these days.

And Dr. Rusk also says we need 70,000 more nurses, 8,000 more occupational therapists, 3,500 more medical social workers, 6,000 more physical therapists, 10,000 more clinical psychologists and 3,000 dental school graduates.

With existing medical schools struggling to maintain their standards and faculties and students finding it harder and harder to finance 8 to 11 years of medical education, internship and residency, it's a staggering problem.

What's to be done?

Various suggestions include more scholarships for gifted medical students, more and more private gifts and grants, huge State expenditures for 15 to 20 new medical schools, and probably large Federal appropriations beyond those already being made for teaching hospitals and research centers.

Medical educators, Government officials, and the Nation's taxpayers face a terrifying problem. If they don't solve it, the penalty will be increased suffering and death for untold millions of Americans—our vaunted "miracle drugs," improved techniques and preventive medicine to the contrary notwithstanding.

The American Missile Lag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The American Missile Lag" which appeared in the March 1959 issue of the Free World Forum under the authorship of Mr. M. Stanton Evans, who, since he wrote that article, has become an editorial writer for the Indianapolis News.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Free World Forum, March 1959]

THE AMERICAN MISSILE LAG

(By M. Stanton Evans)

August 14, 1958, was a day for grave pronouncements in the U.S. Senate. Part of it was devoted to debating the subject of when and how the United States might surrender to the Soviet Union. It began when Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia, told his colleagues, with indignation, that he had heard that "some person or persons holding office in the Department of Defense have entered into contracts with various institutions to conduct studies to determine when and how and in what circumstances, the United States would surrender to its enemies in the event of total war."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, had placed in the RECORD, on August 8, an article by Brig. Gen. Thomas Phillips, which said:

"Three nonprofit scientific agencies working for the Defense Department or the services are making studies as to whether the United States can survive and continue to fight after an all-out nuclear attack. One is studying the conditions when surrender would be advisable, rather than try to continue a war that is already lost.

While administration spokesmen assert that the United States is not losing the arms race with the Soviet Union, and the public is confused between such declarations and those to the contrary by Congressmen and commentators, the scientists are proceeding on the assumption that the Russians have achieved, or rapidly are achieving, intercontinental military superiority with missiles."

Senator SYMINGTON commented that such surrender studies were "contrary to the great traditions of our Nation"—a statement with which the other participants emphatically agreed.

Senator William Knowland of California, however, challenged the assertion that any official study was underway as to how the United States might surrender. General Phillips' article had reference to a study about losses from atomic attack, but the study, as he understood it, has nothing to do with the possibility of surrender by the United States.

Here the discussion backed away from the techniques of surrender to the underlying issue which had generated the discussion. "I say on the floor of the Senate today," SYMINGTON declared, "with great sincerity, and based on my knowledge of the situation, that the possible enemy is ahead in the intercontinental ballistic missile field—I do not want to be an alarmist, but the American people have a right to know the truth."

This frightening conviction had supposedly stirred up the hypothetical surrender study. Yet, everyone had previously agreed that such a study of possible surrender suggests a moral degeneracy in the American Nation and, made public, deals a bruising psychological blow to the American people. Senator SYMINGTON expressed himself emphatically on this point.

Thus, according to Senator SYMINGTON's analysis, we get the following chain of causation: (1) The administration has let U.S. defenses slide scandalously; (2) the result is that there is abroad and in the land the conviction (or, as in the case of the "scientists," the assumption) that America is disastrously behind the Soviets in missile development; (3) from this conviction stems another—that we are, or soon shall be, at the mercy of the Soviets—and a surrender psychology is the result; (4) the consequent defeatism is, in his words, "contrary to the great traditions of our Nation," and the "beginning of a form of appeasement which, unless it is stepped on now, may mark the eventual death of this country."

Thus, we proceed from administration bungling to the possible eventual death of this country. The last three parts of the indictment, in the view of this writer, are correct. It seems obvious enough that a widespread conviction of Soviet weapons superiority can have a damaging psychological effect.

But responsibility for this psychological chain reaction has yet to be fixed—and can be fixed only by an inquiry as to the essential facts of relative U.S.-U.S.S.R. capabilities. If, as claimed by SYMINGTON, KENNEDY, LYNDON JOHNSON, et al., the United States is, in fact, behind, then there might be a case for fixing ultimate blame on the administration. Although the blame, as urged by some Republicans, might be traced to the Truman regime. But if the case is otherwise, and the United States is not, in fact, behind, then Senator SYMINGTON and others have an even heavier share of blame to shoulder—a fact which they refuse to contemplate. For, by their charges of a "lag," they are making "sputnik diplomacy" possible for the Soviets—even if the Soviets do not in fact possess superiority. If the principal effect of a missiles lead is to give a nation a bargaining advantage, then the entire point of having the lead is to convince the opposing nation of one's superiority. If the opposing nation can be so convinced whether or not the lead exists, the main object has been obtained, the bargaining advantage achieved.

Thus, the effect of convincing Americans of Soviet superiority is exactly the same in terms of cold war results, as actually taking steps to put the enemy in possession of the physical equipment. As long as we believe the enemy to be superior, and act on that belief, it does not matter whether the enemy is in fact ahead or not.

If they are not supported by the facts, the pronouncements of Senator SYMINGTON and his political allies are themselves responsible for whatever defeatist psychology is present abroad and in America. It is the object of this study to discover who, in truth, is responsible for our psychological difficulties; and this may be determined only by resorting to the facts available about United States-Russian accomplishments in the missiles field.

Not long after the surrender debate was laid to rest on August 14, Senator JOHN F.

KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, delivered a portentious address in the Senate entitled "U.S. Military Power—Preparing for the Gap." In brief, Senator KENNEDY argued that the United States is "* * * about to lose the power foundation that has long stood behind [its] basic military and diplomatic strategy." "Shortly," he said, "the Soviets will have several times as many intermediate range missiles to destroy our European missiles and SAC bases; and intercontinental missiles to devastate our own country, installations, and Government; and history's largest fleet of submarines, and possibly long-range supersonic jet bombers, to follow up this advantage. If by that time (the period 1960–64) their submarines are capable of launching missiles, they could destroy 85 percent of our industry, 43 or our 50 largest cities, and most of the world's population."

"There is every indication that by 1960 the United States will have lost * * * its superiority in nuclear striking power."

Senator HOMER CAPEHART, of Indiana, practically alone among the Members of the Senate, decided to question KENNEDY's utterance. It appeared to him that there was a rampant tendency in the Senate to sell the United States short. "It is always being said that Russia is all right, that the Russians have more than we have. I do not know on whose authority these statements are based."

America, locked in a crucial psychological struggle with communism, owes a debt of gratitude to the resolution displayed on this occasion by Senator CAPEHART. If more Senators on both sides of the aisle had shared his skepticism, the American people might be better informed, if not about the status of our military situation, at least about the status of our own information on the subject.

For when one begins to probe beneath the generalities of Senators KENNEDY and SYMINGTON and others, he finds that they are based on very little in the way of concrete evidence.

When Senator CAPEHART directly challenged Senator KENNEDY as to the validity of the missile lag claim, CAPEHART got this answer:

"I refer the Senator from Indiana to what General Gavin said, published in Life magazine a couple of weeks ago. General Gavin had top confidential information, because he was head of one of the most important branches of the U.S. Army before he retired."

From his remarks and from the analysis of his speech it is clear that KENNEDY himself does not claim to know the facts. His chief authority—the only one he names, is Lt. Gen. James Gavin, the former Army Research Chief, who quit the service because of his differences with high Pentagon officials concerning military policy.

What, however, is the nature of Gavin's own knowledge? Nowhere in his testimony before the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate, or in his book, did he lay claim to having special information concerning Soviet capability. His testimony, generally thought to be ringing indictment of U.S. fumbling in the missile field, yields a different impression if read with care. The principal part of his testimony touching on the subject involved an examination of pictures made available by the Soviets in their November 7, 1957, "birthday parade," in which they displayed some rockets and other equipment. Indicating the extent to which we are reliant upon Soviet cooperation for information about their project, Gavin said:

"They have kept this equipment within the Soviet geographic area. It has not been seen in the satellite areas, and we have not seen it until they chose to show it to us. It is interesting, too, they did not show us any of the associated ground equipment, such as radars and computers and equipment that must go along. They just paraded these missiles.

The most powerful missile in the Soviet display, as identified by General Gavin, had an estimated range of about 350 miles. Some Western observers thought it was just an old made-over V–2. Tass, however, proudly identified the 350–mile missile as its ICBM—a confusion which has never satisfactorily been cleared up.

Thereupon followed this exchange between Counsel Weisl and the general:

Question: "General Gavin, in the interests of security of which you shall be the judge, what other equipment, in the area of missiles, does the Russian Army to your knowledge possess?"

Answer: "Well, the Russian Army possesses a family of surface-to-surface missiles, as far as we know, out to, well, they have announced an ICBM range which we, I believe, have accepted."

The first point to be noted is that the counsel asked Gavin to state what equipment, to his knowledge, was in the Soviet arsenal. In his answer, however, Gavin attributed U.S. estimates as to Soviet strength to "we"—obviously meaning persons in addition to himself, and, in all likelihood, as indicated by the "I believe," excluding himself. Moreover, the action of "we" consisted of "accepting" what the Soviets "announced."

In the course of his Senate testimony, General Gavin offered practically no further substantive discussion of Soviet long-range capability. He instead got into a discussion of limited war, and pointed out what he deemed U.S. inadequacy, in terms of doctrine and armament, to fight limited engagements. An important issue, and one in which the general's position—or that of Prof. Henry Kissinger, which it strongly resembles—may be correct. Nevertheless, the most minute and convincing discussions of this problem can do nothing to enlighten us about the missile gap on which he is cited as an authority. General Gavin spent most of his time talking about Soviet preponderance in conventional weaponry—a fact which, as a matter of quantitative magnitude, is denied by no one—and even gave some intimations that the direness of his prophecies concerned this imbalance only. Since he was not systematically questioned on this point, we cannot draw a firm inference about it. The following exchange, however, lends itself to various interpretations:

"Senator SYMINGTON. Why would the Russians ever want to fight an all-out war the way things are going? Wouldn't there be much more chance of their fighting a peripheral war?"

"General GAVIN. This colors very much my answer to relative capabilities, because I believe this is the case."

If we turn from General Gavin's testimony to his book,[1] we similarly fail to find solid information on Soviet missiles. There are many good things to be said for his book, particularly for its resolute anticommunism and its insistence that we keep constantly in mind the Soviet intention of destroying us. For all this, it offers little in the way of information—except perhaps, for the manner in which it suggests how little information there really is on this subject.

To take a striking example: It is generally believed that the Soviets have a huge long-range bombing force. Western observers have at least seen enough of their planes to determine that their designs are based on our own. Groups of them have been seen in flight. So esteemed an observer as Henry Kissinger has reported that by 1959, "the Soviet heavy bomber fleet is expected to exceed ours in numbers." And, certainly—while we are entitled to wonder about the authority for Professor Kissinger's statement—compared to our information on Soviet missiles, our knowledge concerning their air forces is encyclopedic. Yet General Gavin says:

"There are many well-informed individuals in intelligence circles who doubt that the Soviets have huge fleets of manned bomber aircraft. Instead, they believe that the Soviets achieved a significant lead over us by jumping ahead to missiles quite a few years ago, while at the same time they led us to believe that the bomber threat was the most serious."

This theory of Soviet deception is a striking one, and one that requires serious reflection. But it brings to mind a corollary that apparently failed to occur to General Gavin: If the Soviets could practice such a deception in the field of long-range bombers (where our knowledge of their project is relatively detailed and our own mastery of the art is highly advanced), could they not, with much greater ease, deceive us in the field of outer-space weaponry (an infant science in which our knowledge is uncertain, and where our information concerning the Soviet project is absolutely nil)?

General Gavin does, in fact, make the same point about the state of our knowledge in the missile field—although he doesn't set out with that object in mind. In his book he states repeatedly that America has fallen behind badly in missile development; in this respect the book supports the Kennedy and Symington thesis better than does General Gavin's testimony. As in his testimony, he carefully avoids claiming, on the basis of his own knowledge, that we are behind. Rather, he calls on other people as his authorities.

General Gavin makes the general statement that, in his opinion, the Soviets are ahead of us militarily and that their specific strength in many areas puts them in a position of clear advantage.

After this statement he seeks to support his "missile lag" thesis by reference to the statements of other people. Since these references constitute the whole of his sustained effort to document his position, they deserve careful examination. General Gavin calls in the following authorities to support his views: H. Rowan Gaither; the "Gaither report," prepared by a committee once headed by Mr. Gaither; Gen. Dwight Beach, Dr. Edward Teller, and Dr. Wernher von Braun.

The first source is H. Rowan Gaither, a former president of the Ford Foundation who was commissioned by President Eisenhower to head the Security Resources Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee. General Gavin offers the following quotation by Mr. Gaither, taken from a New York Times dispatch of April 13, 1958:

"The relative strength of the United States in comparison with the Soviet Union and Red China is ebbing."

On what basis was this judgment made? Here is Mr. Gaither's own explanation of the remark:

"If we are to plan with any degree of hard realism, we must expect the Russians not only will maintain their rate of forward industrial and economic development. There are 40 years of explosive industrialization to support this belief. And let us not underestimate the potential power of Red China. It is on this basis that I must conclude that our relative strength is ebbing."

This, it will be observed, is quite a different matter from a firm judgment as to the relative capability in a particular kind of weaponry. Even assuming it to be entirely valid, it tells us nothing about United States-Russian capabilities. To pursue the matter further: What were the factual bases of Mr. Gaither's statements? He himself says:

"There are those who will argue that my assumptions put the Communist position in the most optimistic light possible, and, by contrast, our position in a pessimistic light * * * I fervently hope that, in this, history will prove I am in gross error."

[1] Gavin, James E., "War and Peace in Space Age" (New York, Harper, 1958).

It seems evident that Mr. Gaither was proceeding on safe assumption reasoning whereby, in the absence of concrete information, one arbitrarily determines that the Soviets are far in the lead. This mental procedure seems to stem from the idea that if the safe assumption is proved wrong, no particular harm has been done, and everyone can breathe a sigh of relief. As was suggested in the discussion of the reported surrender studies, however, this is not the case.

Second, there is the authority of the Gaither report. General Gavin invokes the authority of this report only indirectly, by quoting a comment on it from the British publication, New Statesman & Nation.

"The Gaither report," said this journal, "has revealed that, irrespective of any efforts which America may make, the Soviet preponderance in advanced weapons has reached such an absolute stage that America's national survival will depend, until 1961 at least, on Russian benevolence."

The general offers this amazing quotation as part of his mosaic of evidence. The statement is not an accurate paraphrase of the Gaither report—certainly a gloomy enough document without such embellishments—as the report was presented in the American press. Moreover, it is questionable whether the New Statesman and Nation actually saw a copy of the Gaither report itself, since it is still supposed to be a classified document.

If we assume, however, that the journal did in fact get hold of a "leaked" copy of the report, and if we further assume that its statement is an accurate reflection of what the report itself says, we still have settled nothing. We must try to answer the persistent question: upon what facts is the Gaither report based?

In the endless round of authorities alluding to the opinions of other authorities, the Gaither report is sometimes referred to as a repository of frightening information. Is this the final source of all the dire pronouncements, the first cause in the long chain of authorities, the fount of information where the facts are readily obtainable?

The answer would seem to be "No." There seems to be no doubt that the Gaither report indeed proclaims that we are in the greatest peril—which is probbaly why the administration has hesitated to release it. It is noteworthy, however, that the people most concerned about the Gaither report are those who have not read it; part of their concern, of course, is over the fact that the report is being kept from them, and perhaps their concern is justified. While the administration obviously seems to fear the impact the report might have on the people, it is not so obvious that the report is intrinsically convincing. In fact, it is of some evidential weight that the only people who have read the report, including the top military and civilian leaders of the country, have not been overly excited by it. If the proponents of the missile lag concept mean to support their case simply by appealing to the undocumented say-so of authorities, it hardly behooves them to impute an unheard-of mass dishonesty to our entire leadership. Their trust and scepticism seem to be entirely arbitrary, depending upon whether the authorities in question support or repudiate the doctrine of the lag. It is, of course, possible that the administration and the military, faced with overwhelming proof that we are behind, simply choose to suppress the evidence and to do nothing about it. That possibility, however, is not supported by any affirmative evidence—least of all evidence derived from the Gaither report itself. It should be remarked that, according to the New York Times' story recounting Rowan Gaither's remarks, a White House spokesman is reported to have said that "there was no factual information in the report that had not been made available to committees of Congress."

General Gavin quotes Gen. Dwight Beach of the Army as having testified "that the Soviets could have an ICBM capability in July 1958, although a very limited one." Let us, however, consider the way in which this testimony was qualified by General Beach and his superior officer, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, Acting Chief of Staff of the Army.

Congressman HESS, of Ohio, asked: "When do we anticipate that Russia will have its ICBM's operational?"

General Beach: "It is my understanding that the first one, the earliest could be operational, deleted."

Mr. HESS: "July of this year?"

Mr. Beach: "That is right."

Mr. HESS: "So there will be * * *"

Mr. Beach: "That is the very earliest."

Mr. HESS: (Deleted).

General Lemnitzer: "Well, I believe there is a variation of intelligence estimates on this point. Having a missile that could be used in tests and having them in quantity and in the hands of operational units are two very different things.

"I believe that the best answer to that question can be given by the intelligence people. I don't have any particular estimate."

Further enlightenment as to the nature of General Beach's statement was forthcoming when he offered this clarification:

"I said the first capability thought the Russians could have with ICBM, and it would be a very limited one, would be in July of this year, 1958, and as General Lemnitzer has stated that would be the first one. If that data is correct—it is certainly the earliest. * * *"

Later on, there was an exchange reflecting on the nature of information upon which General Beach based his tentative estimate, and the nature of information we have about the Soviet program. Discussing Soviet IRBM's, General Daley said:

"I believe to some extent when we show development here and operational the chart is misleading. These are actual reflections of firings which we believe we have data on.

"I am sure from intelligence that I am aware of, that the Russians were working in the IRBM field for many years. This has been shown—they were at least drawing designs, because German prisoners who came back I think as early as 1950 sketched out things that the Russians said they were using."

Congressman PRICE asked:

"We don't know, then, whether they have the concept or even thought of the IRBM as we think of it, at the same time? I am trying to draw a comparison of the progress that they have made when we began the race for IRBM's and ICBM's, to our own situation.

"Now, how would you compare that?"

General Daley: "Well, sir, I don't think—in the first place, I think this chart is not designed to show any such rate of progress in these particular fields.

"Really, it is a better statement of the state of our intelligence than it is a statement of their development."

To say that our intelligence does not yield a reasonable estimate as to the state of Soviet development is in itself an indictment of the state of our intelligence.

The guarded and hypothetical nature of General Beach's statement, and the thinness of the intelligence information with which it was associated, diminishes its value as an authoritative source for General Gavin's views.

Even more to the point, however, is the fact that General Beach's testimony was practically identical in content with that presented by General Gavin himself to the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. Both were elaborating the Army's views on the uses of missiles and Soviet capabilities, and both of the presentations emanated from the same sources within the Army. By quoting General Beach, General Gavin, was in effect, quoting himself.

General Gavin also refers to the remarks of Dr. Edward Teller, the famous nuclear physicist who appeared before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee. In the course of his testimony, Dr. Teller made it explicit that missiles work was not the field of his competence and insofar as he ventured statements on the status of the missiles race, it is clear that his remarks are primarily drawn from the opinions of others. He stated to the committee that the half-ton weight of the Sputnik II, as announced by Moscow, demonstrated powerful thrust capability.

"Of course," he said, "we do not have direct and complete proof that Sputnik II indeed was half a ton. What little I could find out from our observation is in agreement with this claim, and the Russian claims in this general direction have proved so far correct, and I think it would be a great mistake to proceed under the assumption that they are only bluffing."

Mr. WEISL. "Then you believe that the Russians have an intercontinental ballistic missile at this time?"

Mr. TELLER. "Well, I certainly do not know, I cannot say it with complete certainty, but I would like to say this: They have said that they have the weapon. There is every reason to believe that they have it at least in the stage where they have constructed it and tested it."

On other phases of the ICBM problem, Dr. Teller had these comments:

Guidance: "I do not think that we know enough about the Russian guidance system to be able to say * * * with definiteness; at least I do not know enough to be able to say with definiteness that they have the required accuracy at the present moment."

Reentry: "What we have done in the field, I cannot say for two reasons. One is that I do not know sufficiently the details, and second, the details are classified. What the Russians have done in this field, I just simply do not know. But I am sure that it is a solvable problem, and for all I know, they may have solved it already."

Despite the great respect this writer feels for Dr. Teller—as a scientist and patriot—his statements on this subject cannot be considered either "expert" or "factual." His basis for estimating Soviet superiority is entirely nonscientific. It boils down to two things: (1) accepting the say-so of the Soviets; and (2) reasoning by the law of the "safe assumption."

The last authority quoted by General Gavin is Dr. Wernher von Braun. Certainly Dr. von Braun is competent in the field of rocketry; so here one of Gavin's authorities, at least, is a real expert in the field, and seems to come out strongly in favor of his position. But what is the basis of the evidence offered by Dr. von Braun? He repeatedly told the committee that we are behind the Soviets but his questioners failed to follow up his statements to determine what information this conclusion was based upon. Dr. von Braun did relate, however, an interesting story as to how his opinion was dramatically reversed:

"Whenever a German rocket scientist came back from Russia he was interrogated on what he had seen there. On the basis of these reports, I personally came to the conclusion that the Russians not only had made poor use of the German talent they had taken along to Russia, but actually that there was a lot of mismanagement in their missile program. I came to the conclusion that the Russian program wasn't very convincing, and not really dangerous.

"Shortly thereafter, I obtained my American citizenship. General Gavin then decided it was about time for me to get the real story, what we really know about the

Russian program. And then, I must say, my opinion changed completely. It became obvious to me that those Germans that had been taken to Russia not only were poorly used but they were actually left completely in the dark about the fact that there was a Russian program outside of their own operation, outside of the places to which they were assigned."

Although Dr. von Braun gives the specific kind of information on which he based his negative opinion of the Soviet project (eyewitness accounts), nothing so specific is told us about the information which caused Dr. von Braun to change his mind. Was any specific factual information imparted to him when he was told the real story, or was he simply given the conclusion and assumptions prevalent among his superiors, and persuaded to operate from there? If the first alternative is the case, what was the information? Is it classified? If so, why wasn't that fact at least mentioned?

Most significant of all is the fact that Dr. von Braun had his original judgment corrected by General Gavin. General Gavin is the source of Dr. von Braun's information; yet he is supposed to be an authority for the general's own views.

Such is the analysis of the evidence produced by General Gavin. Unless there is further, unnamed evidence behind his judgments, they are all based on the conclusions of other people. All of which makes it unnecessary to comment further on Senator KENNEDY's speech and other speeches in the Senate.

Thus, we have an infinite regress of authorities quoting each other, but we are not given any facts convincing to the researcher who has no access to confidential data. Unless such data are produced the question will always remain: Is the United States really behind in missiles development or is the safe assumption theory simply dealing a psychological blow to our morale and to the morale of our allies?

Making the Services of Optometrists Available to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session my distinguished colleague from Texas, OLIN B. TEAGUE, introduced H.R. 7966 which would have made available to veterans of World Wars I, II, and Korea, the services of optometrists on the same basis as other medical services are made available.

I would like to include in my remarks the following resolution I have received from Anthony R. Massarelli, commander of Bayonne Barracks 96, Veterans of World War I of U.S.A., Bayonne, N.J.:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE BAYONNE BARRACKS NO. 96, VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I, SEPTEMBER 11, 1959

Whereas the Veterans' Administration for more than 10 years has utilized the services of optometrists in its facilities, but has denied to veterans entitled to outpatient vision care the privilege of availing themselves of the services of the VA; and

Whereas this has resulted in some instances in veterans being denied entirely the care to which they were entitled, and in other cases has forced them to travel as much as 100 miles or more in order to secure the services of an ophthalmologist when the services of an optometrist were available in the community where the veteran lived; and

Whereas the Honorable OLIN B. TEAGUE, of Texas, has introduced H.R. 7966 in the 86th Congress, for the purpose of making available the services of optometrists to veterans entitled to outpatient vision care: Be it

Resolved by the Bayonne Barracks No. 96 Veterans of World War I, at its meeting of Friday, September 11, 1959, Does hereby commend the action of Congressman TEAGUE in introducing H.R. 7966 and urge its enactment into law at the earliest possible date by the 86th Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our United States Senators from New Jersey, namely the Honorable HARRISON WILLIAMS and the Honorable CLIFFORD CASE as well as to Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER of the 13th Congressional District, the State and National departments of Veterans of World War I, requesting their support of the enactment of H.R. 7966.

ANTHONY R. MASSARELLI,
Commander.

The Consumer Finance Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, it is frequently said that the American standard of living is based on credit, and credit makes it possible for a poor man to enjoy many things formerly enjoyed only by the rich.

Credit is supplied by many institutions, such as banks, savings and loan associations, insurance companies, credit unions, and retail establishments. Today I want to direct my remarks to the small loan companies which have been and are fulfilling a special service to many communities.

Not too many years ago, unscrupulous lenders gouged their customers with usurious and extortionate interest rates and were justifiably labeled "loan sharks." I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the day of the loan shark is passing and we are witnessing the rise of thousands of respectable consumer finance companies which have helped countless people over rough spots.

I suppose the small loan company is the only agency which will gamble by handing out cash to a man they have never seen before. Who else would help out a man when the furniture store is ready to repossess the bed he sleeps on, the utility firm has cut off his service, and he is really up against it? Should a man facing these hardships humiliate himself by trying to get his friends and relatives to bail him out? I say there is a definite place for the small loan company, where a man can receive sympathetic treatment instead of the cold, fishy stare which he gets when he asks for credit without a large security or long seniority on his job.

Thanks to a model uniform small loan law, an overwhelming majority of the States have passed small loan acts which protect borrowers against unduly high interest rates and other practices which might injure those who borrow money. These small loan acts are additional protection also to the reputation of the honest and legitimate consumer finance businesses which have done so much to further the general welfare and meet the needs of those in the lower and medium income brackets.

Onion Futures—Public Law 85-839

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, you will recall that the Congress enacted Public Law 85-839 on August 28, 1958, making it unlawful for anyone to trade in onion futures upon any board of trade in the United States. The act provided that it should become effective on September 27, 1958. This legislation was given the most extensive consideration by the Congress after lengthy hearings held over a 2-year period before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the House Committee on Agriculture.

Public Law 85-839 reflected the considered judgment of the House of Representatives and the Senate that the trading in onion futures upon a board of trade was prejudicial to the orderly flow of onions in interstate commerce and should be prohibited. The purpose of this law was stated in the report dated May 26, 1958, of the Senate Committee on Agriculture—page 1—as follows:

This bill would prohibit trading in onion futures on any board of trade in the United States. In 1955, because speculative activity in the futures market was apparently adversely affecting cash onion prices, Congress added onions to the commodities subject to regulation under the Commodity Exchange Act, effective September 24, 1955. This has not cured the situation, however. It now appears that speculative activity in the futures markets causes such severe and unwarranted fluctuations in the price of cash onions as to require complete prohibition of onion futures trading in order to assure the orderly flow of onions in interstate commerce. The committee held hearings on this matter last year and again this year. The need for the bill is fully discussed in those hearings and the report of the House Committee on Agriculture, which is attached hereto as exhibit A.

As I have stated, this statute became effective on September 27, 1958, and ever since that date all trading on a board of trade in onion futures in the United States has been unlawful. On September 12, 1958, the Chicago Mercantile Exchange and others instituted a suit in the Federal Court in Chicago to enjoin the enforcement of Public Law 85-839 upon the ground that it was unconstitu-

tional. On the same day, U.S. District Judge J. Sam Perry granted plaintiffs' motion to convene a three-judge court and gave the Government leave to file a motion to dismiss within 6 days. On September 18, 1958, the Government filed a motion to dismiss the complaint with a memorandum in its support and a memorandum in opposition to plaintiffs' motion for a preliminary injunction. On September 23, 1958, a three-judge court, consisting of Circuit Judge John S. Hastings, District Judge J. Sam Perry, and District Judge Julius J. Hoffman, granted plaintiffs' permission to file an amendment to the complaint and on September 26, 1958, the day before the act became effective, the court granted a preliminary injunction enjoining the U.S. attorney from enforcing the statute pending the final determination of the complaint or until the further order of the court. Since that time there have been various efforts made by the Department of Justice to vacate the injunction and to obtain a final adjudication upon the merits of the constitutionality of the law but without success.

Assistant Attorney General George Cochran Doub, in charge of the Civil Division of the Department of Justice, has written me as follows:

In the Onion Futures case pending before the three-judge district court in the northern district of Illinois, the court has prevented the enforcement of Public Law 85-839 and the congressional policy embodied in that act for a period of 12 months without any determination of the constitutionality of the statute. Although it may be that upon an appropriate allegation of irreparable injury a court may enjoin the enforcement of an act of Congress for a few days or a few weeks to enable the court to convene and to adjudicate promptly the validity of a statute, I do not believe a court has any power to stay for such a prolonged period the operation of an act of the Congress and the continued maintenance of the injunction in this case constitutes a gross abuse of judicial power.

Mr. Speaker, the power of the judiciary to declare an act of Congress unconstitutional has been accepted in this country since the decision of the Supreme Court in Marbury against Madison, but as far as I know, the power of the judiciary to suspend the enforcement of a law of the Congress for an indefinite period has never been recognized. Indeed, I do not know of any legal scholar or any lawyer of standing who has ever asserted the existence of such a dangerous doctrine. I am in complete accord, therefore, with the views of the Assistant Attorney General and I believe that this House should take cognizance of this serious matter.

Unrestricted Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following:

On numerous occasions I have taken the floor to speak on the question of unrestricted imports and their effect upon the economy of our country.

Many times I find a questioning attitude on the part of some of my colleagues who, I am sorry to say, seem to have no concept of the magnitude of the variety of goods that have been flooding our market.

Setting aside the right or the wrong of high or low tariffs. Setting aside the question of high or low living standards.

Setting aside the argument of American-financed foreign competition. Setting aside everything except pure logic, I offer for the information of the membership of the House a very abbreviated list of ships and cargoes entering U.S. ports, September 9, 1959:

SAVANNAH

MV *Andrea Gritte*, August 25:

From Sidonia—galvanized tubes, 89 packages, order;

From Lisbon—marble slabs, 35 cartons, International Expediters.

MV *Marivia*, August 24:

From Santiago—rum, 50 cartons—McKesson & Robbins.

MS *Hassel*, August 21:

From Calcutta—burlap, 385 bales, Frank Samuel; 375 bales, order; 285 bales, D. C. Andrews; 1,526 bales, Ludlow Manufacturing; jute carpet backing cloth, 280 rolls, order; 360 bales, order.

MV *Ravnaas*, August 21:

From Calcutta—raw jute, 297 bales, order; burlaps, 75 bales, order; 25 bales, Louis Dreyfus; 50 bales, Produce Agencies; jute cotton bagging cloth, 350 bales, Innes Corp.; 310 bales, Belmont Burlap; jute cotton bagging, 200 bales, Riverside Bag & Burlap; 150 bales, Hanson & Orth; 400 bales O. G. Innes Corp.; burlap, 14 bales, White Lamb; carpet backing cloth, 600 bales, White Lamb & Finlay.

SS *Southwind*, August 19:

From Liverpool—Steel wire; low ortho, 60 drums, D. J. Powers; jute burlap, 164 rolls, Jute Industries; scotch whisky, 275 cartons, Brown Vinters; 100 cartons, Golan Import; 265 cartons, Schieffelin; 303 cartons, McKesson & Robbins; galvanized steel wire, 249 coils, John S. James.

From London—Black and galvanized pipe, 19 bundles, C. Tennant Sons; mustard bran, 270 bags, Atlanta Sales.

From Bremen—Burlap, 66 rolls, James Lees; 44 rolls, Miami Rug; 27 rolls, American Carpet Mills; 33 rolls, O. G. Innes; 34 rolls, A. De Swann; 22 bales, International Jute Products; staple fiber, 25 bales, P. Kaufmann; galvanized wire, 15 reels, Sherman & Reilly; beer, 401 cartons, Alko Distributing.

From Rotterdam—Beer, 375 cartons, Southern Marine Supply; formic acid, 65 drums, Order; bicycles, 205 cartons, Bert Scheuer; tea, 200 cases, 50 chests, Tetley Tea Co.; ironware, 12 cases, White Hardware; plywood, 10 packages, S. R. Heger Lumber; choir pile mats, 17 bales, William D. Huff; brass rods, 10 cases, Rohner Gehrig; wire mesh, 254 rolls, John S. James; hot rolled mild steel, 13 pieces, Order; burlap, 143 rolls, D. C. Motor Lines; 50 rolls, Stein Hall; steel wood screws, 29 cases, H. D. Kennedy.

From Antwerp—Tees, 50 lifts, Kurt Orban; flats, 21 lifts, Silbo Steel; wire nails, 500 cartons, Schuster Naval Stores; window glass, 51 cases, Veerman Inery; steel wire, 19 packs, Schuster Naval Stores; galvanized wire, 96 coils, Schuster Naval Stores; galvanized barbed wire, 500 reels, Schuster Naval Stores; steel wire mesh, 295 rolls, Amerlux Steel; steel channels, 17 lifts, Amerlux Steel; jute burlap, 20 bales, Textile Converting; bicycles, 6 cartons, L. D. Freedland; jute cloth, 8 rolls, A. De Swann; burlap, 234 rolls, Stein Hall; 167 rolls, White Lamb Finlay; 38 rolls, Robert F. Fitzpatric; 33 rolls, Gillespie & Co.; jute backing cloth, 30 rolls, Burlap Industries; galvanized staples, 100 kegs, Schuster Naval Stores; wire nails, 1,850 kegs, Schuster Naval Stores; galvanized wire, 314 coils, Schuster Naval Stores; steel wire, 125 coils, Schuster Naval Stores; hairon leather bends, 59 barrels, Atlanta Belting; staple fiber, 283 bales, P. Kaufman; galvanized wire, 155 coils, John S. James.

CLEVELAND

MS *Aragonese*, August 14: From Leghorn—Marble slabs, 22 pieces, United Marble.

From Genoa—Vermouth, 1,000 cases, Hammer Co.; wine, 15 cases, Hammer Co.

From Marseilles—Isogil hardboards, 106 bundles, A. W. Fenton.

From Cadiz—Wine, 50 cases, Rutman Wine.

MV *Virgilia*, August 28: From Bremen—Bicycles, 80 cases, Halle Bros.; Toys, 24 cases, Halle Bros.; Christmas tree ornaments, 21 cases, Halle Bros.; steel, 39,994 kilos rolls, tubing, Blasser Mericle; 3,680 kilos, rods, L. D. Peters; chemicals, 10 drams, Amer Feisol.

MS *Tinderfjell*, August 29: From Rotterdam—Wire rods, 1,132 coils, order; Cognac, 1,375 cases, Schieffelin & Co.; beer, 1,800 cases, order; canned ham and bacon, 287 cases, order; flower bulbs, 281 cases, A. Fenton.

From Hamburg—Brass rods, 199,659 pounds, order.

From Breman—Glass, 63 cases, lamp shades, order.

From Antwerp—Green salted hides, 610 bundles, order; liquors, 490 cases, Old Peoria.

From Rotterdam—Steel nuts, 105 kegs, M. E. Dey; flower bulbs, 107 cases, M. E. Dey; edible casine, 800 bags, Salentine.

TACOMA

MS *Bonneville*, August 30:

From Hong Kong—lumber—20,000 thousand board-feet, East Asiatic Co.; 21,000 thousand board-feet, Heidner & Co.

From Nasipit—lumber—40,000 thousand board-feet mahogany, Jordan Pacific Co.; logs—100,000 thousand board-feet mahogany, Buffelen Woodworking.

MS *Chili*, August 29:

From Bremen—miscellaneous—15 cases, Western Department Stores.

OS *Indian*, August 27:

From Port Mellon—kraft pulp—2,160 bales, West Tacoma Newsprint.

SAN DIEGO

MS *Dowa Maru*, August 25:

From Kobe—wire nails—100 cases, order; jute twine—250 cases, order; glass—65 cases rolled, San Diego Glass; rayon blankets—40 bales, order; bolts and nuts—320 bags, order; wire mesh—50 rolls, order; wooden candy sticks—75 cases, order; wooden ice cream spoons—50 cases, order.

From Nagoya—ceramic tiles—143 cases, quality marble; bolts and nuts—240 bags, Order.

From Yokohama—steel—117 bundles, bars, Winter Wolff; 177 bundles, bars, Southern Equipment; glass—56 cases, figured and window, order; fishing tackle—13 cases, A. E. Dann; toys—12 cases, A. E. Dann.

From Otaru—plywood—16 crates, U.S. Plywood; 54 crates, Robert S. Osgood; 24 crates, birch, Scarburgh Co.; 29 bundles, sawn birch, W. R. Grace; Iwakura board—25 crates, Scarburgh Co.

MV *Patagonia*, August 22:

From Newport—cycles—144 cases, American Machine; pipe and galvanized pipe—661 bundles, 43 slings, Brumley Donaldson.

From Hamburg—bicycles—765 cases, order; wire netting—300 rolls, Commercial Steel.

From Rotterdam—glass—50 cases, window, Cottrell Leist; canned ham—100 cases, Fed-Mart Co.

From Antwerp—glass—33 cases, window, order; bolts and nuts—175 bags, order; canned goods—252 cases, order; steel—9,510 kegs, furring channels, order; galvanized pipe—42 lifts, order.

SAN FRANCISCO

MS *Dona Aurora*, August 26:

From Manila—desiccated coconut, 975 bags, Peter Paul, Inc.

From Hong Kong—toys, 34 cartons, Harper Robinson, 72 cartons, F. W. Woolworth; artificial flowers, 76 cartons, Floral Trading; cotton goods, 10 cases, Shalon Baby Wear; 130 cartons, World Wide Services; 33 cartons, Interstate Motor Lines; 50 cartons, Parker Corp.; rattan furniture, 152 packages, Bank of America; 14 barrels, Decorative Imports; 150 barrels, American Trust; Lauan plywood (Japan), 312 crates, Fidelity Trading; rattanware, 21 cartons, L. Skany; 31 crates, imported merchandise; acrylic buttons, 21 cases, Schner Block; wool, hooked rugs, 52 barrels, M. Grossman; tennis oxfords, 63 packages, F. H. Kaysing; artificial flowers, 43 cartons, American Import; fishing tackles, 48 cartons, Getz Bros.; cotton goods, 40 barrels, Marubeni Iida; 20 barrels, Black Export & Import; radios, 142 cartons, CM Import Export; gardening tools, 48 cartons, B. Petranker; glassware, 105 cartons, B. Petranker; glassbeads, 11 cartons, Century Jewelry Corp.; frozen frog legs, 80 cartons, M. S. Cowen; woodenware, 128 cartons, B. Petranker; grass mats, 20 cartons, Vandor Imports; pearls and novelties, 9 cases, Perfect Pearl; wooden stools, 115 cartons, American Siam Factories.

From Nagoya—Earthenware, 62 cartons, Far East; earthen, 31 cartons, B. Petranker Import; florist goods and pottery, 38 packages, Tapscott's; frozen swordfish, 125 pieces, Atalanta Trading; paperware, 8 cartons, Commercial Market; musical jewelry boxes, 13 cases, Arts & Crafts.

From Yokohama—Double yarn pacquard, 3 cases, Hanover Bank; frozen albacore, 1,250 pieces (22 tons), order; frozen yellowfin, 1,133 pieces (45 tons), order; radios, 62 cases, order; lighters, 14 cases, order; brass and iron wares, 39 cartons, F. W. Woolworth; woolen sweaters and slacks, 254 cartons, A. J. Fritz; toys, paper crackers, 90 packages, order; optical goods, 25 cases, order; toys and decorations, 72 cartons, order; cotton poplin, 19 cartons, order; toys, 362 cartons, F. W. Woolworth; 209 cartons, order; sweaters, 6 cases, Macy's; 41 cartons, A. J. Fritz; glassware, 32 cartons, E. W. Rice; antiques and decorative wares, 102 packages, order; iris bulbs, 75 cartons, order; wood, iron and stainless steel wares, 39 packages, Macy's; novelties, 17 cartons, B. Petranker Import.

SS *President Jackson*, August 25:

From Cochin—Mats, 53 bundles Montgomery Ward.

PORTLAND, OREG.

SS *Washington*, August 30:

From Nasipi—Lumber: 50 bundles mahogany, General Hardwood.

From Manila—Plywood, 15 crates, mahogany, U.S. Plywood.

MS *Kookaburra*, August 30:

From Shimizu—Alumina, 8,596 tons, Harvey Aluminum; alumina sulfate, 1 bag, Harvey Aluminum.

From Niihama—Alumina, 5,185 tons, Harvey Aluminum.

SS *Colorado*, August 30:

From Kobe—Steel pipe, 201,304 pounds, black, Huro Co.; glass mirrors, 40 cases, N.Y. Merchandise; steel wire, 20,304 pounds, Nissho, Calif.; copper tubes, 9 cases, Nissho, Calif.; nails, 87 cases, Nissho, Calif.

From Nagoya—Cutlery, 8 cases, Coast Cutlery; procelain, 940 cases, order; tile, 104 cartons, Chrlich Harrison.

MS *Kokokoku Maru*, August 30:

From Kobe—Nails, 616 cartons, Nissho, America; 400 cases, W. R. Grace; bird cages, 21 crates, Intern. Expediters; sewing machine heads, 8 cases, Elize Mercantile; steel sheets, 8,417 pounds, Nissho America Co.; plywood, 20 crates lauan, Balfour Guthrie; chains and parts, 18 cases, Intl. Expediters; wool and rayon rugs, 80 barrels, Miron Grossman; lumber, 244 bundles, order.

From Nagoya—Tulip bulbs, 81 cases, McHutchison; porcelain, 1,965 cases, order.

From Yokohama—Raincoats, 12 cases rubber, Lipman Wolfe; plywood, 122 crates, Balfour Guthrie; toys, 113 cases, N.Y. Merchandise; steel wire rope, 4 reels (8,509 pounds), Nissho, Calif.; lumber, 72 bundles hardwood, Dant & Marshall.

MIAMI

MS *Arimasan Maru*, August 26:

From Yawata—Glass, 48 cases sheet, Air Control Board.

From Moji—Wire, 22 reels, C. M. Whitney.

From Kobe—Books, 34 cases, Leon Adjmi; Sandals, 1,250 cases, Tessler Import, 127 cases, Pastene & Co.; oil lamps, 26 cases, Florida Tack Supply; nails, 1,100 kegs, Reedy Forwarder; shoes, 25 bundles, Lindsey Importers and Exporters.

From Nagoya—Tile, 130 cases—Louis Goldey, 44 cases glazed mosaic, Global Tile Importers, 217 cases, Central Tile; Toys, 73 cases pianos, Langfelder, Homma & Carroll; Porcelain, 50 cases, Amsterdam Trading; Christmas lights, 26 cases, Lindsley Import and Export; stainless steel, 105 packages, World Exports.

From Shimizu—Tuna, 100 cases canned, Mitsui & Co. From Yokohama—binoculars, 36 cases, Tanross Supply; radios, 88 cases, World Exports; plywood, 115 cartons, Hoenigh Plywood.

CRNS *De La Mercedes*, August 24:

From Caibarien—Roofing title, 39,000 new and used, Milton Henrique.

MV *Oro Lobo*, August 22:

From Progreso—Shrimp, 580 cases, Frozen Food Processors; fish, 43 cases, Frozen Food Processors.

MV *Willi Bohmer*, August 19:

From Georgetown—Lumber, 290 pieces sawn greenheart, 63 round piles, Florida Greenheart.

MV *Searoad*, August 18:

From Havana—Pineapple, 300 cases crushed, Shafton & Co.; papaya pulp, 250 5-gallon tins, Shafton & Co.

MILWAUKEE

MV *Valeria*, August 28:

From Rotterdam—Bicycles, 19 tons, Irving Trust.

From Bremen—Beer, 8 tons, Federal District.

From Hamburg—Xmas ornaments, 24 ctns, Holtzermann, Inc.

MV *Caroline Smith*, August 27:

From Copenhagen—Fish preserves, 1 ton, Order.

From Gothenburg—Copper sheets, 23 tons, M. E. Dey.

From Gdynia—Lactic casein, 55 tons, Order.

MV *Concordia*, August 27:

From Liverpool—Leather lining, 1 ton, Wyenberg Shoe Mfg. Co.

Shoes—1 ton, Judson Sheldon.

Leather—8 tons, A. I. Scherer.

Linoleum—10 tons, Lowy Lino & Rug.

PHILADELPHIA

MS *Farida*, August 28:

From Paranagua—Coffee, 500 bags, American Stores.

From Ilheus—Cocoa beans, 3,000 bags, First National City Bank.

From Buenos Aires—Horse mane hair, 81 cases, Samuel Zeitlins; greasy wool, 15 bales, G. Ferguson; scoured wool, 27 bales, H. L. C. Bendike, 39 bales, Brown Bros. Harriman; textile cuttings, 8 bales, Girard Trust Bank; corned beef, 1,000 cases, Wilson & Co.; roast beef, 2,000 cases, Wilson & Co.

From Salvador—Cocoa beans, 1,000 bags, First National City Bank; 1,000 bags, J. H. Schroder.

From Buenos Aires to Baltimore (Philadelphia discharge)—Grease wool, 52 bales, Ott and Zimmerman; scoured wool, 44 bales, G. Ferguson.

From Salvador to Baltimore (Philadelphia discharge)—Piassava—100 bales, Maryland fiber.

SS *Mentor*, August 28:

From Kobe—Mandarin oranges, 3,000 cases, Mitsubishi Intern; Wilton carpets, 3 bales, Donald L. Baird; optical frames, 16 cases, Philadelphia Optical Manufacturing; wire cloth, 20 cases, Fenestra, Inc.

From Yokohama—Fishing flies, 6 cases, American Import; compasses, 3 cases, American Import; compasses, 3 cases, American Import; brass stems, 6 cases, 1,230 pounds, Baldwin Hardware; brass tubes, 45 cases, 10,091 pounds, Snyder Manufacturing; Lauan plywood, 36 cases, Pan Pacific Overseas.

From Shimizu—Mandarin oranges, 580 cases, Edward Bellet.

From Nagoya—Ceramic wall tile trims, 2,819 cases, Standard Tile; plywood, 80 crates, Heidna, Tacoma; sewing machine console tables, 104 cases, Brother Intern.

MS *Havjo*, August 28:

From Antwerp—Animal hair, 288 bales, order; staples, 100 kegs galvanized, Wilmod Co.; horse pancreas, 361 bags, Val Gelder Fanto.

From Rotterdam—Fruit, canned, 2,500 cases, D. Hauser; rags, 6 bales, Dumont Export Clothing; chains, 3 bundles, Anchor & Chain; horse fronts, 500 bundles, C. M. Simon.

From Bremen—Sweater clips, 25 bundles, Provident Tradesman; statice tartarica, 800 cases, Rice Bayersdorfer; steel wire, 22 barrels, Philadelphia National Bank; beer, 110 cases, Park Distributing; aluminum sheets, 24,134 kilos, Chase Manhattan Bank.

From Hamburg—Sodium antimonate, 500 bags (22,950 kilos), Pigment & Chemical; lead alloy, 181 ingots (5,086 kilos), Intercontinental Metal; brass pins, 5 cases, Globe Machine; pumpernickel, 60 cases, Penn Food; rye bread, 20 cases, Penn Food; bristles, 14 cases, N. Wagman, 46 cases, Gerard Trust Corn Exchange Bank; textiles, 36 cases, order; aluminum tubings, 24 cases, Morris Friedman; textile machines, 7 cases, Narrow Fabrics; bicycle bells, 40 cases, Victoria, 93 packages, American Viscose; waste rope, 907 bales, Perkins.

NEW ORLEANS

SS *Mayan Chief*, September 2:

From Honduras—Lead concentrate, 2,197 pounds, American Smelters.

From British Honduras—Lumber, 2,098 pieces mahogany—Order.

SS *Lempa*, September 2:

From British Honduras—Cohune, 140 bags—Order; Copra, 261 bags—Order; coconuts, 350 bags; Otis, McAllister; lumber, 1,424 pieces mahogany and cedar—Order.

From Honduras—Coffee, 413 bags—Order.

From Guatemala—Coffee, 1,153 bags—Order; Abaca fiber, 800 bales—Order; plywood, 20 bundles, U.S. Plywood.

SS *Clarita Schroeder*, September 2:

From Surinam—Coffee 2,945 bags—Order.

SS *Brattingsboro*, August 31:

From Cuba—Rum, 115 cases.

From Costa Rica—Abaca fiber, 2,515 bales—Order; coffee, 250 bags—Order.

From Canal Zone—Coffee, 750 bags; banana puree, 500 cases—Catz American; brushes, 14 crates—Order; charcoal irons, 16 cases—Order; pharmaceutical products, 28 drums, 51 cases—Order; sewing machines, 245 cases—Order; foodstuff, 589 packages, 25 cases—Order; toilet preparation, 101 cases—Order; batteries, 50 cases.

SS *Koiku Maru*, September 1:

From Japan—Tube mats, 85 bales—Order; sewing machine heads, 2,087 cases—Order, 201 cases, sewing machine exchanges; iron nuts, 35 kegs—H. J. Schuter; footwear, 25 cases—Mitsubishi International; canned tuna, 130 cases—Mitsubushi International; fish nets, 20 cases—Order; porcelain, 1,051 packages, 1,145 cases—Order; 1,598 cases—Sears Roebuck; paper, 25 bales—Order; lumber, 86 bundles maghogany—G. F. Tujague; cigarette lights, 42 packages—Order; canned salmon, 3,000 cases—Order; furniture, 404 cases legs—Blumenfield; miscellaneous, 61 cases—

M. Adeler's Son; plywood, 50 crates—U.S. Plywood.

SS *Balla*, September 1:

From Mexico—Agricultural implements, 45 cases, order; fiber, 410 bales, 100 cases, order; gum rosin, 106 drums, order; broomroot, 138 bales, order; istle, 80 bales, 125 cases, order; thread, 10 cases, order; cocoa beans, 42 bags, order; sisal fiber, 2,295, order; sisal paddings, 113 bales, order, sisal cloth, 344 coils, order; sisal baggasse, 170 bales, J. Fyfe; twine, 734 reels, 1,107 bales, 52 cases, 105 cases, order; 100 cases, 3 bales, Pan American Foods; 137 bales, 235 reels, 105 coils, Schermerhorn Bros.; bee honey, 993 drums, order; tequila, 119 cases, J. E. Comisky; rope, 385 bales, order; 172 bales, G. W. Rueff; 50 coils, Pan American Products; electric material, 14 cases, order; nets, 700 bales, Dyson Shipping; pineapple, 1,150 cases, G. W. Rueff; titanium dioxide, 110 bags, American Cyanamid; coffee, 1,269 bags, order.

SS *Arensdyk*, September 1:

From Germany—Fatty acid, 7 bags, 16 drums, 1 can, 2 cases, B. R. Hendrix; lamp shades, 40 cases, Lang Co.; bicycles, 490 cases, order; hardware, 2,500 cases, Fisher Cycle.

SEATTLE

F W *Lovejoy*, August 31:

From Powell River—Newsprint, 1,130, rolls, Order.

From Blubber Bay—Agricultural hydrate, 1,600 bags, A. R. Smith.

SS *Saragen*, August 31:

From Wellington—Beef, 26,267 pounds, General Meats; 42,059 pounds, Meats, Inc.; 70,247 pounds, Jilgs Sausage; 92,975 pounds, Meats, Inc.; 20,769 pounds, International Packers; 23,499 pounds, Levback Trad; 124,813 pounds, S. & P. Meats; 71,604 pounds, Low Cost Markets.

From Dunedin—Beef, 24,000 pounds, Bank of California; 16,704 pounds, Bob Bilyed Meat; 28,672 pounds, Balfour Guthrie.

Clover, 8,806 pounds, Chas. Lilly.

From Lyttelton—Veal and bull meat, 23,872 pounds, Home Frozen Foods; 9,887 pounds, S & P Meats; 72,240 pounds, Cudahy Packing.

White Clover, 56 bags, Chas. Lilly.

From Napier—Beef, 46,420 pounds, Order; 99,489 pounds, International Packers; 91,160 pounds, Bob Bilyou Meats; 31,200 pounds, Associated Grocers; 61,680 pounds, F. P. Dow.

From Auckland—Beef, 24,825 pounds, S & P Meats; 140 pounds, Pan America; 41,958 pounds, Order.

Liver Meal, 300 bags, Wessel Duva.

Frozen Meat, 85,942 pounds, Order; 16,747 pounds, Rath Packing; 94,059 pounds, Armour & Co.

TAMPA

MS *Wurttemberg*, August 31:

From Bremen—bolts and nuts, 233 cases, Biddle Purchasing; window glass, 340 cases, Florida Glass & Mirror; peat moss, 1,350 barrels, Bruco Peat Moss Corp.; toys, 42 cases, Metasco, Inc.; bicycles, 635 cartons, Metasco, Inc.

From Hamburg—beer, 400 cartons, A. J. Arango; liqueurs, 100 cartons, Key Liquors of Tampa; scrap tires, 4,908 pieces, Wholesale Tire.

From Rotterdam—ironware, 15 cartons, Standard Marine Supply; scrap tires, 228 pieces, Wholesale Tire Co.

From Antwerp—galvanized pipes, 37 lift bundles, Bank of the Southwest N.A., Portland cement, 59,400 bags, Blanc Sales; steel wire, 10 kegs, Schuster Naval Stores; steel, 340,590 kilos angles, beams, Franco Steel; 179,730 kilos angles, beams, Amerlux Steel Products; 44,800 kilos angles, J. L. Wilmotte; 27,880 kilos channels, A. J. Arango; 68,915 kilos, angles, beams, Fillette Green.

MS *Nopal Trader*, August 31:

From Buenos Aires—distillers grains, 2,221 bags, Jac. C. Uiterwyk; 4,620 bags, Order.

MV *Clarita Schroder*, August 29:

From Curacao—Greenheart lumber, 1,401 pieces, Greenheart, Inc.; Greenheart piles, 29 pieces, Greenheart, Inc.

MV *Privateer*, August 29:

From Havana—Tobacco, 50 packs, Sack & Menendez; 85 bales, Olica Tobacco; 91 packs, Standard Cigar; 11 packs, Delgado Leaf Tobacco.

Mr. Speaker, I have reduced the number in order that I can cover various ports of entry as well as type of cargoes.

This is only a small percentage of the ships and cargoes that arrived in all U.S. ports.

Following is a list of all the ports covered in this issue of the "Import Bulletin":

PORT INDEX

	Pages
Baltimore	18, 19
Boston	19, 20
Charleston, S.C.	20
Chicago	20
Cleveland	20
Detroit	20
Everglades	20
Houston	21
Long Beach-Los Angeles	21, 22
Longview	22
Miami	22
Milwaukee	22
Mobile	22
New Orleans	22, 23
New York	2 to 18
Philadelphia	23, 24
Portland, Oreg.	24
San Diego	24
San Francisco	24, 25
Savannah	25, 27
Seattle	27
Tacoma	27
Tampa	27, 28

Mr. Speaker, unless a Member takes time to read a copy of this valuable Bulletin put out by the Journal of Commerce, he is operating in the dark on reciprocal trade and foreign aid legislation.

No nation in the world has ever set up such an elaborate and deliberate plan to destroy its own enterprise and production as has this country.

I want to add at this time the following summarization of activities that I think Congress and the people ought to know about.

If any Member of Congress can justify spending taxpayer money to build up not alone competition in production, but to actually send teams of Americans around the world selling goods for our competitors and at the same time shutting down our own plants.

Maybe we are trying to build a new type of world and maybe most of us want it that way, but when you learn that the main purpose of Khrushchev's is to soften us up for Russian imports, created by slave labor, then maybe we better ask the question: "Who will inherit the new world?"

IMPORT NEWS HIGHLIGHTS

U.S. imports of manufactured products continued through July at a near-record pace, sharp declines in the value of five basic commodities pulled the total value of July imports 9 percent below June's record total of $1,370 million. The imports of machinery, vehicles, and other processed goods brought the July value of imports to $12,248 million or 19 percent ahead of the $1,050 million recorded in July of last year. This category of freight included the heavy shipments of automotive stocks, business machines, wearing apparels, and other finished stocks which have met with ready acceptance here in consumer markets.

U.S. imports of bovine hides and skins in the first half of 1959 showed sharp increases over the January–June 1958 total, according to the Commerce Department. Relaxation of existing trade barriers between the United States and the Soviet bloc may be one of the most important results of the forthcoming talks between President Eisenhower and Soviet Premier Khrushchev, informed experts in Washington report. The Federal Ministry of Economics reports that the volume of trade between Germany and the United States has increased in the first 6 months of 1959 by $46 million, as compared with the same period of 1958. In the first half of 1958, the trade volume was $794 million. The exports of the Federal Republic to the United States increased in the first half of 1959 by $122 million. Imports from the United States during the same period dropped $77 million, or about 15 percent, to $440 million. Japan has suspended the authorization of spun rayon finished goods exports to the United States beginning September 1 for an undisclosed period. Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton rejected an appeal by six lead and zinc smelting companies to scrap the current import quotas on two metals.

A five-man American trade mission representing the U.S. Department of Commerce has arrived to help Yugoslav exporters find new markets in the United States. The mission will stay in Yugoslavia for 5 weeks, visiting the Belgrade and Zagreb International Trade Fairs. The United States is trying to persuade Japan to end discriminatory import restrictions on dollar area goods. National Cotton Council opened fire on critics of its proposal for across-the-board import quotas to protect American manufacturers of cotton textiles. Ask for establishment of rigid import quota system. New outbreaks of rioting in Calcutta reported to have brought activity in the harbor to a virtual standstill.

More than 4,000 tons of pepper were exported from India during the first 6 months of this year with the United States topping other importers with 1,087 tons. The Soviet Union and Canada took the next largest quantities of 475 and 343 tons, respectively, according to the India Economic News-Letter. Indian hand-loom goods for export will soon be marked "certified" and "quality marked" to create confidence between exporters and importers, according to specifications and plans now being finalized by the All India Hand-Loom Board. The scheme will cover varieties of cloth other than those already standardized for export, providing requests to this end are made by the exporter or overseas importer. British scientists have discovered a new way of thawing frozen fish in bulk so that the whole of the mass thaws at a uniform rate. This is a problem that has troubled fish industry of the United States, Canada, and Europe for many years. The first full-scale exhibit of port equipment will be held at the 1959 convention of the American Association of Port Authorities scheduled to open December 7 in West Palm Beach, Fla., Dudley W. Frost, president, announced. Direct jetprop all-cargo service to the Far East and south Pacific from eastern, midwestern, and west coast industrial and trade centers will result in a 60-percent reduction in transpacific airfreight rates, Seaboard & Western Airlines announced last week. Raymond A. Nordn, president of the certified transatlantic freight-mail airline, said his company had presented a plan to the Civil Aeronautics Board calling for 25 round-trip, all-cargo flights weekly on 3 new transpacific routes.

The Tariff Commission advised President Eisenhower there is no need to reopen an in-

vestigation of the tariff increase on dried figs ordered in 1952 by President Truman. The Commission reported no change in conditions to warrant a new study. The Senate Finance Committee has ordered the Tariff Commission to investigate the effects of starch imports on the domestic industry. The Commission is to report back the results of the investigation by March 31, 1960. The report will be concerned only with the amount and effects of the imports and will not contain recommendations for any action. The Department of Agriculture has been requested to study the possibility of reducing pork imports from Canada. In a letter to Secretary Benson, they asked him to use his authority to cut imports if the Canadian Government decides to dump its surplus pork into the United States at depressed prices.

Mr. Speaker, somehow I've been haunted ever since Khrushchev's invitation by a hazy picture of a man with an umbrella and a placard saying "Peace in Our Time."

Munich isn't so far from Washington.

Realistic Looking Ahead: The Need for the Continuity of Government Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks entitled "Realistic Looking Ahead: The Need for the Continuity of Government Program."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALISTIC LOOKING AHEAD: THE NEED FOR THE CONTINUITY OF GOVERNMENT PROGRAM

(Statement by Senator KEATING)

Today we will have a visitor from abroad. I would be less than frank if I stated that he will be welcome. From the start, I have been dubious about the sagacity of extending this invitation to the leader of world communism, and I am still opposed to it.

However, the decision has been made by the best informed minds on this subject, and Mr. Khrushchev will soon be here. I am not optimistic about the outcome of his visit, but perhaps he will learn something of our power and our strength and more importantly, our dedication to the maintenance of our freedom and independence.

During the course of his tour, of course, the American people must be on their guard. We must never lose sight of what Mr. Khrushchev symbolizes and what he represents. We must never forget the bloody history behind him and behind the Communist conspiracy he directs.

He may utter seemingly candid words of friendship. But he represents the power and means of world destruction. He stands for subjugation of the individual, curbing of religion, and rule by force and tyranny.

Many millions of people pray that this visit will produce the first small step on the road to guaranteed peace in the world. I join in that hope, although I am skeptical about the positive results of the tour.

At the same time, we must remember that we must not lower the defensive shield which, in the final analysis, may have forced this visit. We must, in concert with our allies around the world, continually strengthen the military might which represents the only language the Communists understand.

Our defenses are impressive. The billions poured into them have produced missiles, aircraft, ships, and trained manpower—all the components of a modern and effective military machine.

These things our visitor can understand. He undoubtedly possesses many of the details of their efficiency and disposition.

He is also aware of the strategy that forms and directs these forces. He knows—and will know better by the time his trip is over—that it is our intention to shape such powerful weapons of retaliation that no nation will dare to mount an attack on this country.

He knows we are constantly improving our military power. But he also knows that many bombers in a full-scale surprise attack will get through. He is also aware that, up to now, there is no defense against the intercontinental ballistic missile.

What, then, is the purpose of the visit? What might our visitor have in mind as a fruitful area for personal study?

The most obvious purpose, of course, is to try to lull us into a state of complacency with a spate of smiles and reassurances of his desire for peace and understanding.

He also seeks to gain additional stature in the eyes of the world—a stature which means so much not only to the international conspiracy he directs, but which also means a great deal to his own personal and inflated ego. I feel certain Mr. Khrushchev looks upon his trip as a vehicle for a personal buildup—a booster for an egocentric politician who basks in the self-generated sunlight of the conviction that he and he alone shall lay down the terms on which world peace may be achieved.

Beyond that, it may well be that he intends to assess a resource that is critical to the strength of any nation. This resource—which is never surplus and can never be stockpiled—is the national will.

Our visitor knows the value of a tough-minded citizenry, determined never to accept defeat. He has seen it in his homeland.

In the span of a few short weeks in 1941, one-third of his country reeled under a devastating attack of the same order and magnitude as the destruction of a nuclear attack. He saw havoc which ranged from almost 50 percent to as much as 95 percent in such critical categories as armed manpower, civilian population, and key war industries.

His people survived and won despite the great obstacles.

The question of the moment may well be: Could we do as well under nuclear attack? You and I and all Americans believe we could. But we will never know until we are put to the test.

Our confidence that we can pass the test is tarnished somewhat by a profoundly illogical national attitude. Not only do many of us fail to buttress the national will in a manner readily available, but some of us apparently do not even understand the true value of this resource.

We should not have to be told that unyielding resolution in the face of danger can serve us threefold. Now—in the international poker of the cold war; later—in the event attack does come despite our efforts to win world peace; and after attack—when we try to "pick up the pieces."

It is obvious to everyone that the scales of decision in the competitive arena of diplomacy and military strategy can be tipped by the weight of sheer resolution on the part of our people.

Military strength alone is not sufficient unless it rests upon the strong will of the people. The policy of deterrence by the threat of massive retaliation means that we must contemplate the first blow. How can our people remain resolute unless they are prepared to take that blow?

Concurrently, the President and his aids cannot act with firmness in times of international crises unless they are assured of the steadfast support of the people.

There is no need to dwell on the value of moral fiber in an attack emergency. Neither is it necessary to describe the resolution mandatory upon all of us in our efforts to recover from the devastation of nuclear attack, if it comes.

But—and mark this well—courage in crisis, if it is to be effective and continuing, must rest on confidence and hope.

We can fulfill our quest for true confidence and hope in the face of nuclear dangers by successfully discharging the objectives of nonmilitary or civil defense—the other side of the coin of military defense.

I cannot emphasize too strongly my conviction that a fully effective civil defense will prove to our prospective enemies that (1) we will, if necessary, carry out our policy to deter and retaliate in kind; and (2) that we can survive, win and recover from total war. The will to survive and the ability to do so are mutually supporting. Together, they rank next to military power as the best deterrent to aggression.

The Nation's civil defense program today in general is logical and practical although in many ways it can be improved upon. It is logical because it seeks to provide what is necessary—no more and no less. There is calculated risk in the program—as in all human endeavor. But, its plans call for protection from nuclear dangers against which protection is possible.

Civil defense of today is logical because it is compatible with the urgency of the threat—according to the status of world conditions and in line with the best assessment of enemy intent.

Civil defense plans are practical. They are built, wherever possible, on existing government institutions, and systems. Only those things unique to civil defense exist independently of regular arms of Government.

Eventually, it may be determined that greater Federal responsibility should be exercised in the field of civil defense. But for the moment we must do the best we can with the existing structure.

Civil defense plans of today are practical because they are established on the principle of "first things first." Such things as nationwide instantaneous warning, fast dependable communications, and community or group leaders trained in radiation detection and other vital emergency skills must be provided.

Today's civil defense is practical because it is attainable. Only the degree of proper support provided by the Nation's leaders at all levels will limit or delay the success of the program as now established.

Let me review some of the important elements of nonmilitary defense that exist right now, today.

The national plan for civil defense and defense mobilization provides rhyme and reason. It establishes nonmilitary courses of action for national survival and recovery in the event of attack.

The plan sets forth the responsibilities of each level of government—Federal, State, and local—of industry, institutions, and organizations; and of the individual citizen. It

spells out just how the civil defense mission is to be accomplished and by whom.

This plan should be "required reading" for every official of government.

Part and parcel of the order provided by the national plan is the organization of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as a unit of the Executive Office. OCDM, as an extension of the authority of the Chief Executive, provides direction and central control to the civil defense responsibilities inherent in the normal activities of the regular Federal Departments and agencies.

No single plan of action can fit each area of the country. Each faces unique problems. Specially tailored survival plans now apply to a large percentage of the population. These plans, federally financed or guided, have been completed by 45 States, two Territories, the District of Columbia and 240 metropolitan areas and 2,100 local communities.

A round-the-clock national warning system is maintained. It can flash notice of attack to 276 key warning points in a matter of seconds. These key points fan out the warning to cities and towns in a matter of minutes.

An excellent communications system to State and regional offices will soon bypass all critical target areas. Radio is being installed to back up land lines.

The conelrad radio broadcast system is ready to give official emergency information and direction without giving navigational aid to the enemy.

The OCDM radiological defense program is designed to give a nationwide capability for detecting, measuring, and reporting radioactive fallout. A half-dozen Federal agencies operate more than 500 fixed monitoring stations. More than 88,000 local monitors have been trained. Instruction in radiological defense is provided to adult education groups and to high school and college science classes.

A national shelter policy defines the Government's responsibility to alert the people to nuclear dangers—radioactive fallout in particular—and teaches them how to meet it. Fallout shelters offer the best single protective measure for the greatest number of citizens. Under the program, government provides example, research, and surveys of shelter capabilities of existing structures. In addition, some States, led by New York are seeking imaginative yet practical solution to the need for more shelters for individuals.

Emergency relocation sites from which the Federal Government can operate under attack conditions are established and will be hardened against the effects of nuclear weapons.

Federal training centers provide civil defense instruction in the eastern, central, and western sections of the country.

Civil defense emergency engineering and medical stockpiles are maintained in dispersed locations. These vital stores, valued at more than $200 million, include 1,900 complete 200-bed emergency hospitals.

Requirements for the national stockpile of critical materials are largely filled. These materials are worth about $6 billion.

OCDM directs and coordinates policies and readiness measures for mobilization of the nation's resources and production. Such measures deal with the economic consequences of emergency mobilization, and include development of postattack priority systems.

A national defense executive reserve program is being expanded.

The national damage assessment center is designed to provide a quick national estimate of what we have lost and what remains after any attack.

These things are largely the hardware of nonmilitary defense. In addition, a key to civil defense—that which gives it heart and muscle—is the program of continuity of Government. This program to provide leadership, operating as it does under the aegis of the national plan, is the critical element in our preparations to meet attack.

Leadership is the foremost single commodity that must not be in short supply during and after attack. Only regular government, trained and ready for any emergency, can possibly give the leadership, direction, and authority that will be required.

No reasonable person believes that an attack upon our country will relieve government of its responsibility to serve and to function. Government at all levels will truly be on the "firing line" in the event of total war. City and county government will not receive a package of "leadership" from the State capitol. Neither can a shipment of "direction" be dispatched to the State from Washington after bombs or missiles start falling.

At the same time, the Federal Government cannot establish emergency lines of authority during an attack or for some time thereafter. All these things must be ready in advance. It's too late to start yesterday. We should start today.

Government also has a larger responsibility than that of assuring its own continuity. It has the same responsibility as the line officer in battle. The good officer asks of no man more than he himself can and will do. Similarly, government cannot reasonably expect the individual citizen to prepare his home and family for attack, unless government itself leads the way by setting the good example.

No longer should we enjoy the suicidal luxury of allowing civil defense to be considered as just another economic or social program. Civil defense today is not the arm-banded helmet-wearing block warden of the 1940's. It is a new dimension to our way of life. It needs to be carefully and constantly nurtured.

Civil defense is not, therefore, something that the people can handle entirely by themselves. Even the question of whether or not we need civil defense cannot readily be decided purely on the basis of the rather limited sources of knowledge available to the individual citizen. He needs leaders who will marshal facts for his consideration—leaders who will pose specific issues in a matter which, even though it ultimately could mean personal survival, seems nebulous and far in the future. Then, and only then, can the individual citizen decide for himself the need for civil defense—the direction it should take.

I'll recite just one incident that illustrates a typical public attitude, which is directly related to leadership. Amazingly, it concerns individuals who had the courage and foresight to prepare their homes against the threat of radioactive fallout.

A reporter for a large midwestern newspaper was assigned the task of judging the status of civil defense in a nearby city. He went to the local civil defense director to obtain leads on residents who had prepared home fallout shelters.

The reporter called 20 homeowners, whom the civil defense director personally knew had constructed shelters. Eighteen of these citizens denied having a shelter. The other two refused any publicity.

The only possible answer to this enigma is the fact that these conscientious citizens were afraid to run the risk of being labeled "crackpots."

This incident, and the state of the public mind which it illustrates, can be traced directly—I am convinced—to lack of example and proper leadership on the part of government. I am hopeful that in the days ahead the Congress and all leaders of public opinion will strive mightily to fill this void and awaken our people to the challenges and dangers which lie ahead.

One step public officials can take is by means of the continuity of government program which will provide the control and authority which is vital in an attack emergency. The survival and quick recovery of this country will depend on the ability of government to function.

It is probable that cities and entire States would be temporarily isolated. Direction and assistance from other levels and other areas could not be available for some time. Therefore, all governments must maintain continuity and the fullest possible self-sufficiency.

To insure this capability, OCDM has developed a program with four objectives:

First is provision for succession. This applies to executive, legislative and judicial branches. Succession should be at least seven deep for the Governor and three deep for other officials.

Second is the matter of alternate sites from which government can be conducted, in the event city hall or the State Capitol is hit.

Third is the preservation of records—those essential to continued operations of government—and those records vital for the protection of human rights.

Finally, in this area of continuity is the requirement for full use of personnel and resources of government. There are about 7½ million public employees. Every one of them must have an alternate assignment for action in an emergency.

There is a persistent myth that detracts from the effectiveness of this continuity of Government program. Many responsible leaders continue to believe that the military not only will conduct the active defense of the country, but will at the same time deal with a thousand separate civil emergencies in case of attack. This is directly contrary to the wishes and capabilities of the Department of Defense. Clear unequivocal agreement on the point has been spelled out at the executive level.

The acceptance of the responsibility by the States for writing into law the minimum continuity of government measures is a remarkable story of concerted action. Skilled observers have advanced the opinion that the success of this program constitutes the outstanding example of federally sponsored, peacetime, State legislation. I am confident that all Members will join with me in offering our congratulations to the State officials and the members of the State Legislatures who have accomplished such an outstanding job of making ready for the attack we pray will never come.

In mid-1957, when the continuity program first was assigned top priority, OCDM began to assemble a package of proposed legislation. These measures, prepared with the assistance of Columbia University, were designed to establish a sound legal basis for the first two objectives—succession and relocation.

The program contained four sample acts and a constitutional amendment, providing enabling authority. The package immediately drew the full endorsement of the Council of State Governments.

The council, as part of its program of suggested State legislation for 1959, recommended immediate enactment by the States. There are a number of points that should interest the Congress.

Obviously, before government can function in an emergency, there must first be duly authorized persons to operate it. Therefore, in the event of large-scale disaster, there must be substitute officials ready to fill the gap instantly. They must be legally equipped to exercise the powers and discharge the duties of office.

Two of the sample acts in the legislative package fill the requirement for succession.

One deals with the executive and judicial branches of State government and all branches of local government. The other deals only with the legislature. Both acts, however, have certain interesting common denominators.

Probably most important in this age of nuclear warfare is the proviso for predetermined automatic interim succession to office. Legislatures and Governors will not have time or opportunity during and immediately after attack to designate interim successors. Lack of warning and shock of extreme destruction will deny this possibility.

To overcome this possible dilemma, emergency interim successors will be designated and take the necessary qualifying steps prior to attack. They will, by operation of law under certain stated conditions, become fully vested with the powers and duties of the office to which they succeed. The action is self-executing.

There is the matter of sufficient depth of succession. Legislation proposed to the States requires designation of at least three, and in most cases not more than seven, emergency interim successors.

Another common characteristic of State successor legislation is the provision for all contingencies which would require succession, such as absence or inability to act.

Finally, there is the fact that the emergency interim successor obtains neither title nor tenure. He is divested of the authority by the filling of a vacancy in the usual manner or by the return of the incumbent.

The Interim Succession Act provides a method for achieving automatic continuity of the legislative branch of State governments. It requires preattack designation of emergency interim successors who will temporarily exercise the functions of a legislator should he be unavailable following an attack.

Research by Columbia University on the subject of interim succession disclosed that application of this procedure to legislatures is almost unprecedented. Existing constitutional or statutory provisions deal only with vacancies. However, under attack conditions it is certainly possible that a majority of the members of a legislature might be either killed, incapacitated, or unable to reach the place of session. In many cases it would undoubtedly be difficult to raise a quorum. It is to meet this unprecedented contingency that the legislation was designed.

The model State act imposes upon each legislator a continuing obligation to maintain at least three qualified successors at all times. Each legislator is required to review the list of emergency interim successors to his powers and duties to insure the current status of such designation. The power and duty of a legislator to appoint emergency successors continues even in the event of an attack. But an emergency interim successor cannot himself appoint additional successors.

The legislator himself designates his emergency interim successors and specifies the order of succession. However, alternate procedures are included. These procedures are analogous to those currently existing in various States for filling vacancies other than by election. These include:

1. Designation by the Governor.

2. Designation by the Board of County Commissioners or similar local government unit.

3. Nomination by the local political party organization and designation by the Governor.

All of the alternative measures (as distinguished from the basic act where the successors are to be designated by the office holder) carry the provision that the emergency interim successor shall, if the office is partisan, be of the same political party as the duly elected incumbent.

The act also deals with several other matters, such as recording and publication of designations, oaths of office, and suspension of quorum requirements.

Sample acts in the legislative package also provide the Governor with authority to change the place of session to a safe or more convenient location.

Another provision requires the Governor to call the legislature into session as soon as is practicable. There is also a proviso for automatic convening of the legislature 90 days after an attack, if the Governor has failed to issue a call.

The Emergency Interim Executive and Judicial Succession Act provides for additional officers who can act as Governor, interim successors to other State and local officers, and special emergency judges.

The sample act extends the line of succession for Governor to at least seven, since he occupies a key position in the event of attack. There must always be a person who can exercise the powers and discharge the duties of Governor. The additional officers upon whom the office of Governor would devolve are specifically set forth in the act. These usually would be officials such as the president pro tempore of the senate and speaker of the assembly or executive officers elected on a statewide basis.

New York State has recently extended the line of succession for the Governor from 3 to 11. An act signed in April provides this order of succession: Lieutenant Governor, temporary president of the senate, speaker of the assembly, attorney general, comptroller, superintendent of public works, commissioner of health, commissioner of commerce, industrial commissioner, chairman of the public service commission, and secretary of state.

The program of State and local continuity of government has enjoyed really amazing success. Thirty-four of the 43 States that considered the program this year have enacted some or all of the recommended legislation. That is a wonderful record and my hat is off to OCDM for its vigorous leadership in the field, and to those concerned in the States which have taken action.

Surely it is time for the National Legislative body to follow suit. If the type of attack which is now possible should ever strike this country it is a foregone conclusion that Washington will be high on the priority list of targets.

Some steps have already been taken. Recent actions insure continuity of government within the executive branch, and vacancies in the judiciary may be filled by the President. There has also been some discussion about the need for designating a specific place in the United States as an alternate Capital, should Washington be sufficiently destroyed in an enemy attack. There is considerable merit in that proposal, which I trust will be fully investigated.

However, the legislative branch needs to take action to fill a glaring loophole in its present procedures. As it stands today, the Constitution provides that Senators can be appointed on an interim basis, if they die or their seat in any other way becomes vacant. But when Members of the House of Representatives die or resign or are otherwise incapacitated their office can only be filled by either a special election or at the next regular election.

At a time when scientific advances and accomplishments in the art of war have reached the point where there is a very real possibility that a large number of Members of Congress could be wiped out in a single enemy attack, we should not delay in dealing with this constitutional gap. The lack of a quorum in the House, of course, could result in a complete paralysis within our representative form of government at a time when we could least afford it.

It is time Congress engaged in some realistic looking ahead to forestall congressional inaction in times of emergency—when congressional action would in all probability be most needed. This is a problem which has concerned me for a number of years, and as a Member of the House of Representatives I sponsored legislation to solve it.

On March 26 of this year I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 85, which is similar to the legislation I sponsored in the other body, and which provides the machinery needed if Congress is to function effectively in times of disaster. A somewhat similar measure, Senate Joint Resolution 39, sponsored by Senator KEFAUVER, has been reported to the Senate by the Judiciary Committee. Unfortunately, it appears no action will be taken on this important proposal in this session, but I am hopeful it will be a first order of business when the Senate convenes in January.

Senate Joint Resolution 39 provides, simply, that whenever vacancies occur in more than half the authorized membership of the House, the Governors of the respective States may make temporary appointments to fill the vacancies. The Governors would have 60 days in which to make these appointments. Eventually, of course, the people would fill the vacancies by election, as now provided in article 1, section 2, of the Constitution.

It is the fervent hope of all of us that such a power would never have to be invoked. In these tense times, however, when cities can be demolished in a split second, we should delay no longer. The need for prompt action by Congress is underscored by the fact that since this is a constitutional amendment, additional time will be required for ratification by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States.

I regret we have not had before us in this session legislation dealing with the problem of presidential inability. That is another related issue which should be resolved by Congress before long.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for the manner in which he has pressed forward with his resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 39. I want to emphasize that my desire for action in this field is so great that I would support Senate Joint Resolution 39 as it is presently drafted. It is a realistic and acceptable attempt to deal with this problem.

However, I have prepared a couple of amendments to the Kefauver resolution which I believe would make this an even better piece of legislation.

My first amendment fills a void in Senate Joint Resolution 39 which, although not too serious, I believe deserves attention. The Kefauver proposal provides no specific machinery for notifying the Governors as to when they may proceed to make temporary appointments.

I note that the committee report points out that the power could be invoked upon the "ascertainable fact" that vacancies exist in half the seats in the House. However, it strikes me that in the disorder which would follow a disaster of such proportions, it may well be an extremely difficult task for Governors to determine the extent of the losses in the House. There is thus a possibility of delay and confusion under the language of Senate Joint Resolution 39.

I therefore have drafted an amendment which provides for a proclamation by the President that sufficient vacancies do in fact exist in the House, so that State chief executives should proceed to exercise their powers of appointment. I feel this is a more certain way in which to deal with the mechanics of replacing Congressmen in a time of national disaster and I believe its adoption would do much to tighten up the operation of this proposal.

My second amendment deals with the number of vacancies which must exist be-

fore Governors would be authorized to make temporary appointments. Senate Joint Resolution 39 specifies that the number must exceed half of the authorized membership of the House. I believe that figure is too high.

It may be that the 50 percent vacancy figure was fixed with the idea of a quorum in mind. If that is so, it is an unrealistic number, for the simple reason that even with a full complement of Members today it is sometimes hard to muster a quorum. Even if half the Members survived, there would inevitably be many Members injured, sick, or otherwise incapacitated, thus making a quorum unlikely even if everyone who could possibly be present were there.

It is my firm conviction that a requirement of one-third vacancies would be more realistic. As a practical matter, this figure is high enough to necessitate a national emergency or disaster before it could be called into play. Today, it would require 145 vacancies in the House before the authority of a Governor to appoint replacements would come into effect.

It may be that an even lower figure would be wiser, but I offer this amendment as something of a compromise.

Incidentally, my amendment specifies that vacancies must exceed one-third of the authorized membership of the House. I have not set it at an exact figure because of possible temporary fluctuations in membership in the years ahead as new States may be added to the Union.

As I have previously noted, I am hopeful the Senate will act on this legislation at the beginning of the next session of Congress. It is my further hope that the House, which for various reasons has been reluctant to act on this problem, will follow the Senate's lead early next year.

Looking ahead, it might be well for the Governors of each State to give thoughtful consideration to means by which they can implement their part of this procedure. For example, it may be that the most efficient way of handling the possibility of interim appointments to Congress would be by drawing up each year, in advance, a list of designated alternates for each sitting Member of Congress. The existence of such lists—presumably confidential—would do much to facilitate prompt action by each Governor if the need arose for speedy appointment of temporary Members of the House in time of disaster. And such lists would be consistent with the continuity of Government program promulgated in the States by the OCDM.

Mr. President, although this type of legislation has not received the prominence it deserves, I believe we should tarry no longer. It is time we caught up to the many States which have already acted. Enactment of legislation to provide for filling vacancies in the House of Representatives in time of disaster can go a long way toward insuring the proper and effective operation of our Government no matter what the future may hold.

Furthermore, enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 39 or similar legislation will demonstrate anew to the world America's determined national will to face up to the dangers of responsibilities which go with being the leader of the free world.

Coastal and Intercoastal Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN JARMAN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Commerce has been instructed by the President to undertake a study of certain major problems of the transportation industry, to comprise both those elements relating to economic well-being of the industry and the country, and also the readiness of various segments of the industry to assume their proper roles in the national defense.

One of the most urgent and critical situations within the transportation industry is that of the general cargo common carriers coastal and intercoastal shipping lines. An abundance of statistics and testimony have been furnished to committees of the Congress last year and this year pointing up the drastic decline which has taken place over the last 20 years in this industry, with its attendant consequences in unemployment, scrapping of vessels, and all the resulting effects on both the commerce and the national defense of the United States.

There were nine companies in this trade in 1940, employing 108 vessels and carrying approximately 5½ million tons of cargo. This had declined to two companies by 1958, operating a total of 10 vessels and carrying less than 1½ million tons of cargo.

To my knowledge, no other segment of transportation has undergone an experience remotely similar to this and I urge that the Department study focus very heavily upon the causes and the cures for this situation.

Coastal shipping has always been of vital importance to the economy of the United States; the existence of most of our great seaboard cities was founded upon the availability of low cost deep water transportation along the coasts and between the coasts. The costs of deep water transportation, though subject to increases over recent years like the costs of everything else, still remain lower than the costs of land transportation. Unless coastal shipping is resuscitated, there will naturally ensue a long-term upward trend in transportation rates between these cities, once the moderating effects of low cost water transportation is removed. Many great ports of the United States, including such cities as Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Charleston, Galveston, and a number of others, are presently wholly without coastal general cargo service.

I feel certain that the management of the two remaining companies will be happy to furnish the Department's staff with what they believe to be the causes in the decline in coastal shipping along with their recommendations for remedial actions and I am hopeful that the Department will seek their views.

Annual Résumé of Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE CANNON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in compliance with the usual session-end custom, I include a statistical tabulation summarizing the work of the 1st session of the 86th Congress on the appropriation bills. The tabulation is limited to bills processed by the Committee on Appropriations through the traditional annual appropriations process and does not reflect action on those parts of the President's budget recommendations disposed of through revenue bills or so-called back-door appropriation bills processed outside regular appropriation channels.

Budget estimates of appropriations submitted to the House by the President during the session just concluded, and considered in bills from the Committee on Appropriations, totaled $74,077,609,151. These requests do not include the permanent appropriations recurring automatically under existing law without necessity of annual action. Interest on the Federal debt is the principal item. The January budget estimates for permanent appropriations for fiscal 1960 totaled $8,593 million; it is now known that rising interest costs will run this total up appreciably.

The Committee on Appropriations recommended $71,162,088,261, a net reduction of nearly $3 billion—$2,915,520,890 to be precise. With a single exception, the Labor-HEW bill, every bill was reported below what the President wanted. The vetoed public works bill was reported in the exact amount of the request, but the substitute version, enacted into law over the President's second veto, was slightly less.

Before passage, however, the House, contrary to recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations, insisted on restoring $158,583,500 of committee cuts. The House-passed bills aggregate $71,320,671,761, resulting in a net reduction of $2,756,937,390 below the corresponding Presidential estimates. That is a reasonable total reduction although deeper cuts could have been made without harm to essential functions of Government.

But, Mr. Speaker, while we made these reductions, however inadequate the cuts, the other body, not entirely out of character, insisted that we not only restore many of the reductions but that we exceed the budget requests on some bills. In summary, budget requests considered by the Senate—including items sent to the Senate after the bills passed the House—aggregate $74,859,008,445. Against this, bills passed by the Senate total $72,883,029,577, or $2,562,357,816 above House totals and $975,978,868 below the corresponding budget estimates.

Final amounts approved, again excluding permanent appropriations, total $72,977,598,352, or $905,431,225 below Senate totals but $1,656,926,591 above House totals. The final amounts represent a net reduction of $1,881,410,093 below the President's requests considered in appropriation bills. As noted, Mr. Speaker, these totals do not include amounts of authority to obligate the Government processed outside the traditional appropriations procedure.

The table on appropriation bills processed through the Committee on Appropriations follows:

Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, 86th Cong., 1st sess.

[NOTE.—Excludes permanent appropriations]

Bill	House				Senate					Final action, amount approved	Increase or decrease, compared to budget estimates
	Budget estimates considered by House	Amount reported by committee	Amount passed	House action compared with budget estimates	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Amount reported by committee	Amount passed	Senate action compared with—			
								Budget estimates	House action		
1959 APPROPRIATIONS											
2d supplemental	$2,864,954,526	$2,479,522,494	$2,657,402,994	−$209,551,532	$2,900,799,370	$2,820,040,054	$2,843,902,805	−$56,896,565	+$186,499,811	$2,764,500,380	−$136,298,990
1960 APPROPRIATIONS											
Supplemental	888,931,417	632,568,845	609,843,845	−279,087,572	1,218,090,555	1,076,186,108	1,076,186,108	−141,904,447	+446,342,263	977,345,608	−240,744,947
District of Columbia	(246,698,000)	(237,186,112)	(237,186,112)	(−9,511,888)	(245,990,000)	(241,589,402)	(241,702,402)	(−4,287,598)	(+4,516,290)	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)
Loan authorization	(35,400,000)	(33,800,000)	(33,800,000)	(−1,600,000)	(35,400,000)	(34,300,000)	(34,300,000)	(−1,100,000)	(+500,000)	(34,300,000)	(−1,100,000)
Federal payment	34,218,000	27,218,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000	34,218,000	29,218,000	29,351,000	−4,867,000	+2,133,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000
Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	4,628,097,000	4,628,097,000	−60,230,000	4,688,327,000	4,663,158,600	4,664,027,600	−24,299,400	+35,930,600	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000
Interior	491,101,400	472,198,800	472,198,800	−18,902,600	491,101,400	487,211,025	487,211,025	−3,890,375	+15,012,225	481,809,100	−9,292,300
Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	3,915,084,181	3,915,084,181	+158,235,600	3,756,848,581	4,124,460,581	4,124,460,581	+367,612,000	+209,376,400	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400
Independent offices	6,586,418,000	6,441,069,800	6,459,887,800	−126,530,200	6,586,418,000	6,561,578,600	6,561,578,600	−24,839,400	+101,690,800	6,504,382,200	−82,035,800
Agriculture	4,081,364,863	3,939,165,498	3,939,165,498	−142,199,365	4,081,364,863	3,975,505,148	3,975,774,848	−105,590,015	+36,609,350	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190
Loan authorizations	(388,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(+33,000,000)	(388,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(+33,000,000)		(421,000,000)	(+33,000,000)
General government	13,608,500	13,338,500	13,338,500	−270,000	13,608,500	13,568,500	13,568,506	−40,000	+230,000	13,462,500	−145,000
State-Justice-Judiciary	682,387,600	649,896,700	651,896,700	−30,490,900	682,387,600	650,674,700	650,924,700	−31,462,900	−972,000	648,941,200	−33,446,400
Commerce	732,191,000	674,687,300	675,297,300	−56,893,700	732,191,000	715,328,500	715,328,500	−16,862,500	+40,031,200	712,672,900	−19,518,100
Legislative	105,460,005	100,279,350	100,279,350	−5,180,655	133,648,180	128,797,380	128,797,380	−4,850,800	+28,518,030	128,797,380	−4,850,800
Defense	39,248,200,000	38,848,339,000	38,848,339,000	−399,861,000	39,248,200,000	39,594,339,000	39,594,339,000	+346,139,000	+746,000,000	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000
Public works (vetoed)	(1,185,406,259)	(1,185,406,259)	(1,185,906,259)	(+500,000)	(1,185,406,259)	(1,265,565,559)	(1,265,565,559)	(+80,159,300)	(+79,659,300)	(1,215,477,808)	(+30,071,549)
Public works [1]	1,185,406,259	1,185,309,093	1,185,309,093	−97,166	1,185,406,259		1,185,309,093	−97,166		[1] 1,185,309,093	−97,166
Atomic energy	2,718,715,000	2,660,529,000	2,660,529,000	−58,186,000	2,718,715,000	2,711,829,000	2,711,829,000	−6,886,000	+51,300,000	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000
Mutual security	[2] 4,436,277,000	3,209,782,000	3,191,782,000	−1,244,495,000	[3] 4,824,484,137	3,601,269,508	3,602,262,137	−1,132,222,000	+500,480,137	3,626,718,137	−1,197,766,000
Titles I, II, and III; (MSA, etc.)	[2] (4,436,277,000)	(3,209,782,000)	(3,191,782,000)	(−1,244,495,000)	[2] (4,436,277,000)	(3,305,131,000)	(3,305,095,000)	(−1,131,182,000)	(+113,313,000)	(3,249,095,000)	(−1,187,182,000)
Titles IV and V (supplemental and claims)	(.....)	(.....)	(.....)	(.....)	(388,207,137)	(386,138,508)	(387,167,137)	(−1,040,000)	(+387,167,137)	(377,623,137)	(−10,584,000)
Military construction	1,563,200,000	1,285,002,700	1,285,002,700	−278,197,300	1,563,200,000	1,428,178,700	1,428,178,700	−135,021,300	+143,176,000	1,363,961,200	−199,238,800
Total, 1960	71,212,654,625	68,682,565,767	68,663,268,767	−2,549,385,858	71,958,209,075	69,851,303,350	71,039,126,772	−919,082,303	+2,375,858,005	70,213,097,972	−1,745,111,103
Total, all bills	74,077,609,151	71,162,088,261	71,320,671,761	−2,756,937,390	74,859,008,445	72,671,343,404	73,883,029,577	−975,978,868	+2,562,357,816	[3] 72,977,598,352	−1,881,410,093
Total, loan authorizations	(423,400,000)	(454,800,000)	(454,800,000)	(+31,400,000)	(423,400,000)	(455,300,000)	(455,300,000)	(+31,900,000)	(+500,000)	(455,300,000)	(+31,900,000)

[1] Vetoed and overridden Sept. 10, 1959.
[2] Includes $500,000,000 for Development Loan Fund for fiscal year 1961 (not allowed).
[3] In addition, certain permanent appropriations became available automatically under previous law; January budget estimate was $8,593,000,000, but this is subject to upward revision principally due to increased cost of interest on public debt.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

"BACKDOOR" APPROPRIATION BILLS

The regular appropriation bills at one time disclosed the disposition of the President's spending requests, but in recent years, and especially last year and this year, the appropriation bills are only part of the record.

It is difficult to authoritatively summarize complete disposition of the budget under diffused processes whereby money is removed through the backdoor of the Treasury as well as through the regular appropriations procedure.

The other body, with the concurrence of the House, continues to insist on preempting the exclusive powers of the House to originate appropriations, resulting in bypassing of annual appropriations review and accounting by the departments for the vast sums expended.

The President twice vetoed the "backdoor" housing bill, terming it excessive and inflationary; it greatly exceeded, on a camparable basis, the President's requests. Excluding the vetoed bill, but including the final version, the following list of "backdoor" bills sent to the President totals at least $5,701 million identified, and some extra billions not precisely determinable. Furthermore, on a comparable basis, these bills exceed executive recommendations by some $231 million, plus additional billions not precisely identified.

Action on other propositions, such as postal rate increases, not handled through appropriations channels, affect the ultimate Treasury position.

New authority to obligate the Government ("backdoor spending") carried in legislative bills (86th Cong.)—Public debt transactions and contract authorities

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Final	Final compared with requests	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to final				Full basis	Comparable basis
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
S. 1094 (H.R. 4452): Bretton Woods Agreement Act (public debt) [1]	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	[1] $4,550,000,000		
H.R. 2256: Direct veterans loans (public debt)			100,000,000	300,000,000	100,000,000	+$100,000,000	+$100,000,000
S. 1 (H.R. 1011): Airport grants (contract authority)	200,000,000	120,000,000	465,000,000	297,000,000	126,000,000	−74,000,000	+6,000,000
S. 57: Housing Act of 1959: public debt and contract authority) (vetoed)	(1,650,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(2,675,000,000)	(1,975,000,000)	[2] (1,300,000,000)	(−350,000,000)	(+500,000,000)
S. 2539: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority) (vetoed)	(1,650,000,000)	(550,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	[3] (825,000,000) [4]	(−825,000,000)	(+275,000,000)
H.R. 8678: Highway Act of 1959							
S. 2654: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority)	1,650,000,000	800,000,000	925,000,000	925,000,000	[5] 925,000,000	−725,000,000	+125,000,000
Grand total	6,400,000,000	5,470,000,000	6,040,000,000	6,072,000,000	5,701,000,000	−699,000,000	+231,000,000

[1] $1,375,000,000 for immediate expenditure; $3,175,000,000 in nature of guaranty for World Bank bonds.

[2] In addition, provided for 45,000 public housing units (contract authority) estimated at $874,500,000 and, in addition, carried language permitting an additional number of about 145,000 at an estimated cost of some $2,825,000,000.

[3] In addition, provided for 37,000 public housing units (contract authority) estimated at $719,000,000.

[4] Increased gas tax by 1 cent from Oct. 1, 1959, until July 1961 at which time, for the 3 fiscal years 1962–64, bill actually appropriates to the highway trust fund, from the general fund, certain excise taxes estimated to total approximately $2.5 billion.

So, Mr. Speaker, while we cannot determine with absolute precision the status of the budget, it is conceded that we are on the highroad to still bigger and bigger budgets unless we stop granting licenses right and left to remove more and more money, through every door of the Treasury—money that is not even in the Treasury, money they must borrow—and borrow with increasing difficulty and at ever increasing cost.

Without the Congress directly turning a hand, the interest cost on our staggering Federal debt was estimated in the January budget at $500 million more than the previous year—and not long ago it was officially disclosed that the amount is now expected to go up another $500 million or so to a total of some $8,500 million.

This increase of $1 billion alone will doubtless exceed all the expenditure reductions effective in fiscal year 1960 resulting from cuts in appropriation requests. This colossal rise in interest cost in the short span of only 12 months dramatically, and distressingly, demonstrates the inevitable result of spending more than we take in. So heavy have been the appropriations urged by the President and voted by the Congress that the Treasury is on a hand-to-mouth basis in refunding the Federal debt. We have reached a fiscal crisis of gargantuan proportions.

In 23 of the last 28 years we have spent more than we took in. In the 6 fiscal years (1954–59) under the present administration, budget expenditures exceeded budget income by more than $19,400 million. And we have done this notwithstanding the fact that we were receiving the largest national revenues ever enjoyed by any nation in any period of time. In the fiscal year 1959, closed on June 30 last, the headlong rush to fiscal chaos saw the Treasury suffer from the biggest red-ink spending spree in peacetime history.

Here are the official figures:

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+), 6 fiscal years, 1954–59

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Net receipts	Net expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
1. Fiscal 1954	$64.7	$67.8	−$3.1
2. Fiscal 1955	60.4	64.6	−4.2
3. Fiscal 1956	68.1	66.5	+1.6
4. Fiscal 1957:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	72.5	70.3	+2.2
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	71.0	69.4	+1.6
5. Fiscal 1958:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	71.2	73.5	−2.3
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	69.1	71.9	−2.8
6. Fiscal 1959: [1]			
(a) Including highway trust fund	70.4	83.4	−13.0
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	68.2	80.7	[2] −12.5

Net budget receipts, expenditures, and deficit (−) or surplus (+), 6 fiscal years, 1954–59—Continued

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Net receipts	Net expenditures	Deficit (−) or surplus (+)
7. Total all 6 years:			
(a) Including highway trust fund	$407.3	$426.1	$−18.8
(b) Excluding highway trust fund as per budget	401.5	420.9	−19.4

[1] Fiscal 1959 figures are preliminary; subject to slight revision based on final reports.

[2] January budget forecast was a $12.9 billion deficit.

ANALYSIS OF BUDGET DEFICIT, FISCAL 1959

Mr. Speaker, there is the impression that recent record peacetime deficits resulted from declining revenues more than from rising expenditures. Nothing could be further from the facts. The situation is just the opposite. In fiscal 1958, for example, the budget went in the red by $2.8 billion, compared to a nominal surplus of $1.6 billion in fiscal 1957—a deterioration of $4.4 billion. That came about through decline in revenues of $1.9 billion and an increase in expenditures of $2.5 billion.

For fiscal 1959, the year of the largest peacetime deficit, the budget went from a 1958 deficit of $2.8 billion to a $12.5 billion deficit. This deterioration of $9.7 billion came from a nominal de-

cline of $0.9 billion in revenues and a huge increase of $8.8 billion in expenditures.

So, Mr. Speaker, the unvarnished truth is that our rapidly deteriorating fiscal situation has its roots in ever-increasing expenditures in excess of record revenues.

The following tabulation of official figures is in substantiation:

Analysis of budget deficits, fiscal years 1958 and 1959

[In billions]

	Fiscal 1957 actual	Fiscal 1958 actual	1958 actual change from 1957	Fiscal 1959		1959 actual compared with—	
				Original budget estimate	Actual	Original 1959 estimate	Actual 1958
Net budget receipts	$71.0	$69.1	−$1.9	$74.4	$68.2	−$6.2	−$0.9
Net budget expenditures	69.4	71.9	+2.5	73.9	80.7	+6.8	+8.8
Surplus, deficit, or change	+1.6	−2.8	−4.4	+.5	−12.5	+13.0	+9.7

NOTE.—Highway trust fund not included in "budget" figures.

DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the widespread impression persists that recent deficit spending results of necessity from heavy defense outlays. That has not been so, and is not now so. It is the nondefense expenditures—the frills and furbelows—that have unbalanced recent budgets, as the following table of official figures discloses:

Net budget expenditures—Defense and nondefense

[In billions]

Fiscal year	Major national security		All other programs		Total net expenditures	
	Defense-military	Total [1]	As per budget	Including highway trust fund	As per budget	Including highway trust fund
1. Fiscal 1953 (Korean war year)	$43.6	$50.4	$23.9	$23.9	$74.3	$74.3
2. Fiscal 1954	40.3	46.9	20.9	20.9	67.8	67.8
3. Fiscal 1955	35.5	40.6	24.0	24.0	64.6	64.6
4. Fiscal 1956	35.8	40.6	25.9	25.9	66.5	66.5
5. Fiscal 1957	38.4	43.3	26.1	27.0	69.4	70.3
6. Fiscal 1958	39.1	44.1	27.8	29.4	71.9	73.5
7. Fiscal 1959	41.2	46.4	34.3	37.0	80.7	83.4
Comparisons:						
a. 1959 compared with last war year (1953)	−2.4	−4.0	+10.4	+13.1	+6.4	[2]+9.1
b. 1959 compared with 1st year of present administration (1954)	+.9	−.5	[3]+13.4	[4]+16.1	+12.9	+15.6
c. 1959 compared with 1st year showing surplus under present administration (1956)	+5.4	+5.8	+8.4	+11.1	+14.2	+16.9
d. 1959 compared with preceding year (1958)	+2.1	+2.3	+6.5	+7.6	+8.8	+9.9

[1] On basis classified in 1960 budget (earlier years included "Defense support" which in 1960 budget is classified as "all other").
[2] Represents increase of 12.2 percent over war year of 1953.
[3] Represents increase of 64.1 percent over 1954.
[4] Represents increase of 77 percent over 1954.

NOTE.—Highway trust fund began with fiscal year 1957.

This tabulation points unerringly to the genesis of the situation. In the year just closed nondefense spending exceeded the first year under the present administration by 77 percent—up $16.1 billions with the highway fund included for comparability, while defense items dropped a half billion dollars.

Again, compare the year just closed with fiscal 1956 when the President first showed a small surplus. It was widely acclaimed at the time that spending was finally under control. In fiscal 1959 spending for non-defense items exceeded fiscal 1956 by $11.1 billions, again including the highway item.

Read it anyway you may, the record adds up to the same indisputable answer—non-defense spending has far outstripped defense spending. At the urging of the administration in a succession of record-breaking peacetime budgets, we have insistently and repeatedly provided more and more appropriations to be met with money we didn't have for things we could get along without.

These appropriation and backdoor bills, like the President's budget recommendations on which they are based, add up to more than the people can afford.

They, like the President's budget, are too big.

They, like the budget, are inflationary.

They, like the budget, will further cheapen the value of the dollar.

They, like the budget, will hike the cost of living for every American family to still another high watermark. Wages will buy less and less.

They, like the budget, will further erode the people's life insurance, pensions, and savings accounts.

They, like the budget, will throw more roadblocks in the path of the Treasury in refinancing the debt as it comes due—already the situation is of crisis dimensions.

A major proposal of the President's budget message was that we live within our means. On its face, it was in balance by the narrowest margin—$70 million, a mere pittance in the context of $77 billion budgets. Of course, it would have been out of balance except for the President's request that wartime tax rates be again extended—although he has previously insisted that tax rates are too high.

It was a spender's budget. It topped all previous record budgets from President Eisenhower. It proposed to spend more. It was at least $5 billion above the budget against which the people, and even the administration itself, rebelled 2 years previously.

It made no provision for payment on the debt. On the contrary, it proposed a further debt limit increase and urged that the increase be permanent, not merely temporary, thus foreclosing any reasonable prospect of debt reduction or reduction in the stupendous burden of interest cost in the foreseeable future.

It was a standstill budget at best.

It afforded no tangible hope for tax relief. That subject seems to have been all but forgotten.

Official revisions of the January revenue and expenditure estimates for fiscal year 1960 will not be available for several weeks, but there is every reason to expect the new forecast of spending will be higher. Another deficit, instead of the hairline original surplus prediction is a distinct possibility, even a probability. Just that much further down the high road to a fiscal debacle.

THE PUBLIC DEBT

Mr. Speaker, with these successive record-breaking deficit budgets has come the inevitable succession of increases in the national debt. The tax collector has been working around the clock to bring in money to meet the excessive expenditures. He has succeeded in taking more taxes from the people than ever before but, even with the help of wartime tax rates in time of peace, he has failed to collect enough to balance accounts. So, the Treasury had no alternative but to keep hiking the mortgage against future generations by selling Government bonds to pay for the profligacy of higher and higher budget recommendations and appropriations.

In consequence, the President has made six straight requests to raise the old $275 billion debt ceiling—twice to $281 billion, once to $278 billion, once to $280 billion, then to $288 billion, and this year to $295 billion—an increase of $20 billion over these last few years. Imagine such foolishness, Mr. Speaker—spending more and more beyond our means in times of record national revenues for nondefense purposes with no serious thought of the inevitable day of reckoning. Since the present administration took over, the national debt has increased $18,600 million. Only 2 weeks ago it stood at $290,506,390,464.80—the highest since the Republic was founded. That represents a mort-

gage of $1,635.22 against every man, woman, and child in America today. And it is nearly $11 billion above the highest of the World War II debt and $39 billion above the low water postwar mark.

As the table shows, piece by piece, step by step, the so-called temporary debt ceiling becomes distressingly permanent. No longer does the ceiling serve to restrain excessive spending; it is now a mere annual gesture.

The public debt

1. Actual increase, 6 fiscal years (1954–59):

[In billions]

July 1953	$266.1
July 1954	271.3
July 1955	274.4
July 1956	272.8
July 1957	270.5
July 1958	276.3
July 1959 (reflects increase during fiscal 1959 of $8.4 billion as compared to January budget forecast of $8.7 billion)	284.7
Actual increase, 6 years (July 1953–July 1959)	+18.6

NOTE.—Old statutory limit of $275 billion raised as follows:

For fiscal 1955 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1956 by $6 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1957 by $3 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1958 by $5 billion (temporary).
For fiscal 1959 by $8 billion (permanently to $283 billion); $5 billion (temporarily to $288 billion).
For fiscal 1960 (but as of June 30, 1959) by $10 billion (permanently to $285 billion); $10 billion (temporarily to $295 billion).

The red lights are flashing. But we blindly drive through them, ignoring the warnings, heedless of the day when we must pay the fiddler. But, the Treasury has to live with the dire realities of the situation every day of the week. It cannot ignore warnings. It has the job of refunding large parts of the debt coming due—something on the order of $75 billion in the next 12 months.

More and more people are refusing to buy Government bonds. They are cashing in savings bonds twice as fast as they are buying new ones. They know Government bonds are no longer attractive. The rates of interest are too low. The Treasury is unable to meet competition at the old rates. This competition for money to cover the deficits feeds on itself with the result that this year the carrying charge on the debt will exceed last year, we are told, by approximately $1 billion—it will cost us about $8,500 million. We operated the whole Government for that amount just 21 years ago.

Only a few days ago the Treasury paid 3.97 percent interest on 13-week notes—the highest rate for such short-term borrowing in the last 25 years. For 26-week notes it had to pay 4.47 percent. Government bonds have plummeted to the lowest price in history.

The Treasury is between a rock and a hard place. Ever-increasing inflation spawned by deficit spending put it there. The official cost-of-living index has been climbing to new record high water marks every 30 days for the last several months. And the buying power of the dollar keeps falling. It is now less than 48 cents—one for the price of two rather than the other way around.

All fiscal recommendations begin with the President. He makes the budget. He submits it. He recommends it. And he has been submitting all these record-breaking inflationary budgets. And the Congress has been concurring in deficit spending though at some reduction below the President's asking price.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow may be too late. An alternative is the possibility of witnessing the fulfillment of Lenin's prediction that we will spend ourselves out of existence.

DePaul Institute of Pittsburgh's Golden Jubilee, 1908–58

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the De Paul Institute, Castlegate Avenue in the Brookline, South Hills section of Pittsburgh, Pa., is one of America's outstanding schools for children who are sensory handicapped through deafness, or blindness, as well as for children who are hard of hearing, and children who are partially sighted.

Bishop Canevin, who was the fifth Bishop of Pittsburgh at the time of the dedication of DePaul Institute, on May 6, 1911, said "I think our Lord is pleased to be here." DePaul Institute and its dedicated, devoted staff have been blessed by great success and world wide recognition of their distinguished and top level work in the training of children with sensory handicaps. Modern day miracles of development of handicapped children are the products of their wise teaching and devotion. DePaul Institute has been a godsend to our whole community, and has the gratitude of the whole diocese, and the admiration and respect of our Pennsylvania civic minded citizens of all faiths.

Bishop John Wright, the new Bishop of the Pittsburgh diocese, on July 10, 1959, has written:

JULY 10, 1959.

One of the most inspiring experiences I have had since coming to Pittsburgh was my visit to the pageant staged by the boys and girls of DePaul Institute at the close of school this spring. I had heard high praise of the school long before I went there, but I was unprepared for the moving demonstration of the talent of the students and the magnificient training that talent receives at DePaul.

Since then I have reflected many times, and with great gratitude to God, on the number of young lives transformed by DePaul in its half century of service, on the graces enriching those lives of which the Sisters of Charity and their lay teachers have been the channels, on the generosity of our people which has made this school possible and on the wonderful influence, direct and indirect, that DePaul has had on the happiness of families and the general good of communities.

For all these blessings in the past, for the like blessings in the years to come, I join with all who rejoice in the work of DePaul as they praise the Lord who loves afflicted children and those who are good to them.

JOHN WRIGHT,
Bishop of Pittsburgh.

The work of DePaul Institute is now ably carried forward by the current director, the highly esteemed Reverend Thomas R. Bartley, M. Ed., under the leadership of Bishop Wright.

In June 1954, the Most Reverend Bishop John F. Dearden, appointed the Reverend Thomas R. Bartley director of DePaul Institute. Father Bartley's appointment marked a return to Brookline, where he had served as assistant in Resurrection Parish prior to his appointment to Sacred Heart Parish, East End.

An able administrator, Father Bartley, in 5 years since his coming to DePaul has made extensive improvements in the physical plant of the school. In the field of public relations, through chairmanships, speeches, radio and television broadcasts, Father Bartley has interested in the work at DePaul, many individuals, many religious, civic and service organizations; these have donated valuable equipment for the use of the deaf and blind and sight-defective children.

The two previous directors of De Paul Institute are:

The Reverend Thomas F. Coakley, D.D., first director of De Paul Institute, 1908–36: A scholar, a writer, a dynamic and vigorous leader, a man of vision and boundless energy, a zealous priest—Father Coakley provided "nothing but the best" for the deaf children. His service and devotion to De Paul began with his priestly life, immediately following his return from the North American College in Rome, October 16, 1908. He organized an aid society; he secured unnumbered benefactors; all his friends were De Paul-minded. He provided for the teachers' continued study and research; he kept the staff alerted to new developments in teaching procedures and equipment; he constantly sought to imbue the deaf children with greater appreciation of beauty in art, music, drama, through creating a cultural environment; urging them on to higher achievements. In time, he inspired, initiated, and directed the rapid progress that characterized De Paul from the very beginning. "From the shores of Europe, our own work shows up first-class," he wrote after addressing the deaf children in the great oral schools at Paris, Bordeaux, and Rome. And he came home, his conviction unshaken that "De Paul is the finest oral school for the deaf in the world."

The Reverend Raymond J. Doherty, second director of De Paul Institute, 1936–53: In January 1936, the Reverend Raymond J. Doherty was appointed to succeed Father Coakley as first resident chaplain and full-time director of De Paul Institute. Father Doherty's influence and zeal extended to every phase of school life and to every little child.

In June 1954, Father Doherty was appointed pastor of St. Rosalia's Church, Greenfield, where he is stationed at the present time.

The sisters and lay teachers are worthy of special tribute. Two outstanding sisters are:

A DEVOTED AND SACRED HERITAGES DE PAUL'S 50 YEARS

Sister Marie Antonio McLinden, teacher, principal, administrator (1908–30; 1936–57): Of all those who saw the beginnings of De Paul Institute, who "bore the labors of the day and the heat," Sister Marie Antonia labored the longest and is the sole surviving pioneer. She began the work of teach-

ing the deaf 50 years ago and was closely associated with Bishop Canevin and Father Coakley in shaping the ideals and policies of the school. Her entire life was spent in the work except for the 6 years (1930–36) she served as Assistant Mother of the Sisters of Charity, Greensburg, Pa. A very concrete tribute to her is cut into the stone of Our Lady of Victory Hall, named for the devotion to Our Lady of Victory Sister Marie Antonia instilled into the sisters and pupils from the very first days of the school on Troy Hill.

Sister Teresa Vincent Mahoney, child psychologist, principal, 1924–57: Sister Teresa Vincent succeeded Sister Marie Antonia as principal at De Paul Institute in 1930, remaining in office until 1957. It is owing to her vision and constant vigilance and indoctrination of teachers that there is at De Paul a solidarity, a unity and consistency of aim and methods that could scarcely be duplicated elsewhere.

ACTIVITIES

Running parallel with the religious organizations at De Paul, such as the sodalities and junior Holy Name Society, organized in 1926 and 1927, were the Scout programs, which also included the entire student body. Troop 241 Boy Scouts of America was organized in 1930 and the Girl Scout Troop 278 in 1935. The Cubs were organized in 1937, the Peeps and Brownies in 1938, and the Playmates in 1941. With the admission of the preschool children, De Paul made a unique contribution to the scouting program, the boys becoming Peeps and the girls becoming Playmates, with their own annual activities and court of awards.

The pursuit of Scout merit badges, field trips, study, social contacts, led to the discovery of aptitudes and acquainted the Scouts with a variety of occupations. Father Doherty, realizing the need to develop self-confidence in the deaf children, encouraged association and competition with hearing Scouts in camps, in crafts, in scout-o-ramas, where the deaf Scouts won many prizes. He also strongly endorsed and supported the athletic teams; and that the boys might have greater opportunities to compete with hearing athletes, he enrolled the older boys in the Catholic Youth Organization and the younger boys in the diocesan grade school basketball league. Thus was the way opened for social integration of the deaf with the hearing in a hearing world; thus was confidence built up, for in the spheres of scouting and athletics the deaf excelled.

One of the most publicized groups at De Paul is the harmonica band. It grew out of the rhythm band. Father Doherty took it to Forbes Field, June 20, 1936, to participate in the Music Jubilee. Ripley, who introduced the band, said that it was the realest "believe it or not" he had ever seen. He invited the whole group of 50 children to New York at his own expense; this invitation brought a similar one from Major Bowes for his New York program over a national network.

The harmonica band astonished even the conductor of the Pittsburgh Symphony, Mr. Antonio Modarelli, who visited De Paul in November 1936 to hear the children play. He was surprised at the deaf child's appreciation of tone quality, his awareness of pitch, resonance, volume, and accent, which carried over to the child's speech, giving it color and meaning. In April 1937, the band made its radio debut over KDKA; and in the following October Father Doherty took 40 members to Harrisburg to give a concert for the Pennsylvania Conference of Exceptional Children in the forum of the Educational Building. The band has always been an integral part of the Christmas plays and the June closing exercises.

In June 1954, Bishop Dearden appointed Father Doherty pastor of St. Rosalia's Parish in Greenfield and the Reverend Thomas R. Bartley third director of De Paul Institute. During Father Doherty's almost 19 years as director of De Paul, the enrollment increased from 150 to 731 pupils. Father Doherty's contribution to De Paul was phenomenal both in the spiritual and in the material order. He was always before the children as a shining model of all that was praiseworthy, entering into their joys, understanding their difficulties, guiding, counseling, making adjustments; always the teacher, helper, leader; zealous and enlightened.

Father Bartley's appointment marked a return to Brookline, where he had served as assistant in Resurrection Parish prior to his appointment to Sacred Heart Parish, East End.

Already in the 5 years since his coming to De Paul, Father Bartley has made extensive improvements in the school plant, as part of a program of modernization and remodeling. In the field of public relations, through chairmanships, speeches, radio and television broadcasts, father has interested in the work at De Paul, many individuals, religious and civic organizations, who have donated valuable equipment.

In 1955, a conference of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul was organized under the direction of Father Bartley. It was a happy day for the members when this, the first conference of deaf men in the world, was aggregated on July 29, 1957. The conference is under the patronage of St. Francis de Sales, one of the early teachers of the deaf.

In 1955, the Boy Scout Troop 241 celebrated its 25th anniversary. To date, 126 boys have won the Ad Altare Dei Cross; 42 are Eagle Scouts; 21 have won the Eagle Palm. In May 1957, 17 Girl Scouts were the first to receive the new National Catholic Award, known as the Marian Award. Previously, for 11 years, De Paul Scout leaders conferred their own Catholic award, the Ad Virginem. In January 1958, 20 Cub Scouts received the Parvuli Dei Award; they were also the first group in the country to qualify for this award. Thus, the schoolwide interest in scouting has not only motivated much of the fine arts and craft work but has stimulated the study of religion and the practice of works of mercy and charity, requirements for these new awards.

The year 1958 marked the golden jubilee year of De Paul Institute. Someone has said that St. Thomas Aquinas wrote the Summa of Faith, but that it was St. Vincent de Paul who wrote the Summa of Charity. The Summa of Faith was completed once and for all; but the Summa of Charity will continue as long as time and human need shall last. Chapters are still being written in that summa, and one of the most glorious of these began just 50 years ago in the year 1908, when Bishop Canevin opened a school for the deaf of the diocese on Troy Hill. It was a modest beginning in a rented house with three trained teachers for one deaf pupil. One person did the sowing; others did the reaping. Some labored; others entered into their labors. The seed planted 50 years ago has grown into a mighty tree and borne fruit many hundredfold. God giveth the increase.

From being a school for the deaf and hard of hearing alone, De Paul Institute has become a school for all types of sensory handicaps. Its growth over the 50-year period has been great in all directions; in physical expansion; in enrollment in the ever-widening span of its services. This growth is consonant with its aims to keep abreast of developing needs. At present the work includes:

1. Intensive general education of the deaf and the blind child from preschool through junior high school.

2. Education of the child with a hearing loss or impaired vision or speech to the point from which he can make normal progress in a regular class among unhandicapped children.

3. Rehabilitation of the child who has become handicapped in sight, hearing, or speech after his education has begun.

4. Guidance and direction of students attending regular high school or college.

5. A clinical testing program.

6. Counseling service for parents of handicapped children.

7. Adult education, including speech and speech reading; tutoring of special cases.

8. A teacher training program.

9. Conducted tours for civic groups, nurses, university classes.

10. Saturday speech classes.

What Do Red Phrases Mean?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Daily News, Monday, September 14, 1959:

PEACE, WAR, FREEDOM: WHAT DO RED PHRASES MEAN?

(By Henry N. Taylor)

No discourtesy is meant to Khrushchev, but as he comes among us with words like "peace" and "coexistence" and "noninterference"—it might be a good time to remind ourselves what Communists truly mean by such favorite phrases.

For Kremlinese is a language unto itself, often far more difficult to translate than mere Russian. Veteran students of communism point out how words like "peace" can mean almost the opposite when used by Mr. K. For instance:

Peace: In Kremlinese this does not mean absence of shooting. It means absence of capitalism.

Lenin said that until communism has elbowed capitalism off the globe, "peace" will be impossible and impermissible no matter how nonbelligerent relations may sometimes seem.

War: To Communists, this has never been limited to gunfire. War is what exists until the last capitalist is erased everywhere.

Lenin said weapons of "war" should include not only pistols but cocktail parties and conferences. Any believing Leninist—including Mr. K.—must consider himself at "war" with us today.

History: A favorite Khrushchev word, often paraphrased as the objective laws of social development, history means more to Moscow than just a record of events.

It is a force, irreversible, dictating the future, which will inevitably be global communism. Progress is measured only by how fast the past (which means us) succumbs to the future (which means communism).

Freedom: We think this means being left to do as we please. Not so Lenin.

Said he: "The flag of freedom will be waved against us. But every freedom is a fraud which contradicts the emancipation of labor from the oppression of capital."

Imperialism: This means any Western defense arrangement, from NATO to the smallest crate of rubber boots to Red-threatened Laos.

American troops abroad, even a squad of them vacationing at a beach resort, become a war base. When Russia and her allies make military plans, this is described as

comradely resistance to imperialist aggression.

Aggression: To us, stemming from the Latin "go toward," this means attacking people and taking something by force. In Communist eyes, you can be an aggressor without budging; just by failing to retreat in face of communism's inevitable advance.

Noninterference: In Kremlinese, this is loaded to mean only noninterference in the progress of communism.

Ditto for renunciation of force, reduction of tensions, and elimination of positions of strength. Khrushchev speaks of peaceful competition, but insists history sentences us to lose.

Revolution: Khrushchev says Western statesmen err in calling the Hungarian or Tibetan freedom-fights revolutions.

For the Kremlin, there is only one revolution, the progressing Soviet one. Thus Hungarians—and Americans too—are counter-revolutionaries.

Coexist: To us this means you go your way and we'll go ours.

But for Khrushchev this means, by definition from Karl Marx onward, we'll go our way and eventually you will too.

Democracy: This is what Mr. K. says exists in Russia.

In our language, democracy means self-government, with elected representatives enforcing laws which have survived genuine debate. But Lenin said: "The Soviet Socialist democracy is in no way incompatible with the dictatorship of one person."

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, when I came to the Congress, which was in the 81st Congress, I met one of the sweetest, nicest men I have ever known in my life. He and I were in the steerage of the Committee on Banking and Currency. At that time the Committee on Banking and Currency had an elevated level where the great and the senior members of our committee sat. Down below were those in the steerage. Next to me was the gentleman from New York. My association with him has enriched my life. There never came to the Congress a finer gentleman than IZZY DOLLINGER of New York, and in his six terms in the Congress he has shown the stature of a statesman of highest quality. I am informed that Congressman DOLLINGER will not be with us in the next session because he is on the eve of being elevated to a high political position in New York. The election will be in November, and I think there is no question that he will be elected. So he will not be here in the next session of the Congress. I would like to take advantage at this time, when the House has time from its legislative chores to listen to praise of those we love and who will not be here in the next session to express my affection and my esteem for one of the finest gentlemen I have ever known, a really great American statesman, the Honorable ISIDORE DOLLINGER of New York.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 31, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following newsletter of September 12, 1959:

WASHINGTON REPORT
(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER)
SEPTEMBER 12, 1959.

A bill to provide standards for the issuance of passports says: "Section 5. The Congress finds that the international Communist movement of which the Communist Party of the United States of America is an integral part, seeks everywhere to thwart U.S. policy, to influence foreign governments and peoples against the United States, and by every means, including force and violence, to weaken the United States and ultimately to bring it under Communist domination; that the activities of the international Communist movement constitute a clear, present, and continuing danger to the security of the United States; that travel by couriers and agents is a major and essential means by which the international Communist movement is promoted and directed; that a U.S. passport requests other countries not only to permit the holder to pass freely and safely, but also to give all lawful aid and protection to the holder, and thereby facilitates the travel of such holder to and in foreign countries; and that in view of the history of the use of U.S. passports by supporters of the international Communist movement to further the purposes of that movement, the issuance of passports to any person described in section 6 is harmful to the security of the United States and therefore passports should be denied to such persons."

The need for this legislation results from the 1958 Supreme Court decision (*Kent* v. *Dulles*) which countermanded the State Department's rights to deny passports to known Communists. As a result, 15,000 to 20,000 hard-core Communists in the United States have the right to come and go freely in their despicable work of attempting to undermine our Government and free society. An amendment to strike out section 5 failed and the bill passed. Eighteen Democrats comprised the only final opposition. Isn't a study of section 5, in the light of Khrushchev's impending visit thought provoking.

The problem of Laos further complicates pending Federal business—the Khrushchev visit, world peace, the relationship of the free nations as allies, U.N. effectiveness, and foreign aid. As the $225 million Lao foreign aid expenditures come to light it appears again that our expenditures have created greater problems, not solved them—an ineffective army, peoples' apathy, or hostility toward their government, and a greatly increased cost of living. Once again it becomes apparent that our foreign aid goals and accomplishments fail and should be studied and reevaluated before we spend more.

The President's veto of public works projects was overridden to the hurrahs of the Democrats, gleeful over their success. Only 5 Democrats (no Texans) joined 116 Republicans to vote to sustain the veto, 280–121. The President's position to me was logically sound. The 67 new starts of unbudgeted projects would still cost the taxpayers almost $800 million despite the heralded 2½ percent cut. Forgotten is the fact that there is already a backlog of authorized projects that would take 20 years for which to appropriate at the usual rate. So we're back to the same old problem that underlies our basic governmental economic difficulties—spending too much money, more than budgeted, a lack of fiscal responsibility and self-discipline. Unfortunately, good projects are hurt when hastily conceived political boondoggle or pork barrel projects are added. Like all Federal matters though, it's up to the people.

The third housing bill passed overwhelmingly, the President's two earlier vetoes forcing the Democrat leadership to compromise, resulting in more fiscally responsible legislation. Changes include: (1) Eliminate the loans for college classrooms, (2) extend FHA cut off date beyond October 1960, (3) extend the $650 million urban renewal expenditure from 1 to 2 years. Presidential objections which I share, that were not deleted include: (1) The housing for elderly programs, (2) 37,000 new public housing units (over 100,000 unit backlog has never been built).

The Ways and Means Committee is 1 of 20 standing committees of the House, yet handled 13 percent of all bills introduced. Of 10,360 bills (as of September 2), 1,585 were referred to Ways and Means Committee. Of these, 921 related to tax, 183 to tariff, and 381 to social security. Of the total, 49 were reported out this year by the committee (as of September 3). Besides 40 days of hearings, the committee met in executive session 91 times. Also, overall tax reform hearings are scheduled later this year.

Democrat leadership claims of budget cutting, as carried in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, have been branded erroneous and false. The alleged $324 million cut is $930 million in error; actually there is a $606 million deficit or more. Such falsification or distortion of facts is wrong, certainly it should not be carried in the RECORD. It will take some complicated explanations by the Democrats to disprove the "big spenders" tag, in view of their voting records.

In closing this year, perhaps Congressmen should remember the "10 cannots": "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot help small men by tearing down big men. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred. You cannot establish security on borrowed money. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Illinois will permit, I would like to say, if I may, speaking for the minority, on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that we would like to be associated both with the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Arkansas in paying our tribute to the fine service that Mr. DOLLINGER has rendered on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. We wish him well in his service to the State of New York in the important position of District Attorney of Bronx County.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas and the gentleman from Kansas.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it was with a good deal of satisfaction that I signed the discharge petition on the civil rights bill (H.R. 8601) which I consider to be a significant and much-needed legislative step forward.

It has been said that discriminatory practice against individuals based on consideration of religion, race, color, or national origin is our democracy's greatest unfinished business. I believe this to be true—that is why I am so eager to see early favorable action on H.R. 8601 which would make possible substantial progress in certain areas of civil rights. H.R. 8601 is a bill which is most modest in scope and made so, frankly, to win the widest possible acceptance. The bill deals with the obstruction of court orders in desegregation cases, flight to avoid prosecution with a broadened provision to include the destruction of any building or other real or personal property, preservation of Federal election records, extension of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, and education of the children of members of the Armed Forces.

Let me say at the outset that in my view this is not legislation directed at any particular section of the country, North, South, East, or West. There is no monopoly of prejudice in any one section of the country or for that matter any one area of the world. For example, the English who have prided themselves on their tolerance have witnessed savage outbreaks between Londoners and West Indians. The French have hounded and segregated Algerians in the cities of France. Anti-Semitism has flared up in Germany. Soviet Russia has not divested itself of anti-Semitism which under the Czars took the form of pogroms but which under communism means segregation in a Biro-bidzhan ghetto, purges, and virtual exclusion from important posts.

We in the northern United States of America are not without sin on the score of prejudice, but we have found that with properly enforced antidiscrimination laws that fairplay in human relations becomes not only legally but morally right. Equality, the equality of opportunity, is the great, wonderful secret of our democracy's strength and stability which the genius of the Founding Fathers conferred upon the Nation. Where this principle is defaulted upon or is abrogated, our total democracy suffers. That is why a civil war was necessary and why when the victory for justice and democracy was thrown away for a mess of political pottage, it has now become painfully necessary to rewin the legal and moral battle for the sacred democratic rights of those who have been disadvantaged.

It is one of the ironies of history that the political party of the Great Emancipator has so recently joined with many southerners to circumscribe and deny rights to another substantial minority of our own country—organized labor—by inflicting the Griffin-Landrum formula for labor-management relations upon the trade union movement. I fought this denial of rights as I have long fought against the denial of all constitutionally ordained rights and privileges to any group.

Action on the Griffin-Landrum bill has confirmed my conviction that the cherished body of democratic rights must be retained inviolate for all if the rights for any are to be preserved. Any erosion of rights if allowed to begin becomes progressively worse and extends to new groups.

I believe that the Civil Rights Commission has done our country a tremendous service by shaking us out of our dream state that "all's right with the world" as far as our Nation's treatment of minorities is concerned. The Commission in an outstanding report treats with three major problems of discrimination: In voting, in public education, and in housing. In describing these aspects of discrimination the report says:

> The fundamental interrelationships among the subjects of voting, education, and housing make it impossible for the problem to be solved by the improvement of any one factor alone. If the right to vote is secured, but there is not equal opportunity in education and housing, the value of that right will be discounted by apathy and ignorance. If compulsory discrimination is ended in public education, but children continue to be brought up in slums and restricted areas of racial concentration, the conditions for good education and good citizenship will still not obtain. If decent housing is made available to nonwhites on equal terms but their education and habits of citizenship are not raised, new neighborhoods will degenerate into slums.

I believe that the need for effective civil rights legislation is most imperative to restore the good health and the very survival of our democracy.

H.R. 8601 is an important means to achieving that worthwhile end. We cannot delay much longer in initiating necessary action because the damage delay might inflict could be tragically irreparable.

In the words of the report—

> What is involved is the ancient warning against the division of society into two cities. The Constitution of the United States, which was ordained to establish one society with equal justice under law, stands against such a division. America, which already has come closer to equality of opportunity than probably any country, must succeed where others have failed. It can do this not only by resolving to end discrimination but also by creating through works of faith in freedom a clear and present vision of the city of man, the one city of free and equal man envisioned by the Constitution.

Simmons Co. at Kenosha Treats Employees in Deplorable Manner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform this body, which only a week ago gave serious consideration to the curbing of unfair practices by labor leaders and labor unions, of an unfair labor practice which exists in my district. This unfair labor practice is one, however, where the union and its members are clean, honest, sincere members of the community. They work for the Simmons Co. and this company is being unfair and grossly unjust to its employees. This company has done business in Kenosha for 94 years. It has grown and prospered and today has branches throughout the United States. Its home office, however, is in Kenosha, Wis., where it has employed steadily approximately 3,000 men. Over 25 years of negotiation, the union met regularly with the employer and had a minimum of labor disturbances. I never remember of any strike being held at this company. The contract between management and labor is a normal one with the Simmons Co. paying the approximate average which labor receives in other plants in that city.

Two years ago, through duplicity, the Simmons Co. moved the soft goods end of their company from Kenosha. At that time, they stated they wanted to expand their hard goods industry. When the company started operations in Indiana in a plant about 90 miles from its Kenosha home, it was found that it signed a union contract apparently before it employed any help, or at least, when only a few men were employed. This contract, we believe, is a sweetheart contract because it is so substandard in comparison with the Kenosha contract that it would shock the conscience of anyone who read it. The wage rate is approximately 85 cents an hour less than they were paying and there are no clauses to protect the workingmen. In other words, management perogative clauses are all in labor of the com-

pany—none are in favor of the workingmen. In addition to this, women have been put on men's jobs at reduced rates and the savings, by these practices at the Indiana plant, are running, according to our best estimates, over $3 million a year.

The Simmons Co. has now, without notice, announced that it has sold its building and is moving the balance of its operation to Indiana. We presume that they will seek a sweetheart contract with the same union and although the men of Kenosha will protest this, the question is—will they be able to do anything about it? The company, in moving, refuses to take any of its Kenosha men along, saying that it owes an obligation to the community where it is moving to hire men from that area. The company is taking only a handful of its key personnel. The company has a pension plan but for men under 55 the termination of employment will completely ruin that pension plan. It will cause extreme havoc to those men over 55. This means that the security of these men and their families will be ruined and the company in separating its employees appears to be willing to pay back only the money which the men paid in. That is, they seem unwilling to pay back the contributions which the company made to this pension fund.

The Simmons Co., by moving, is leaving an old building which they have permitted to run down. They are ridding themselves of men who have been with them 30 or 40 years and will be hiring men who are younger and more productive and who can turn out more work in a day. Through this added productivity, through the savings on the pension plan that will be in effect, and the saving of the moneys already paid into the pension plan, through the hiring of women in place of men at reduced rates, and through the signing of a sweetheart contract, we estimate that the Simmons Co. will be saving in excess of $5 million a year. The men of Kenosha who worked for this company charge that this savings is being purchased at the price of their labor, sweat and loyalty. They claim it is being purchased at the price of their pension fund, which is their security in old age. The management of the Simmons Co., apparently, has lost consideration of the human element in business today.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that this could well be the commencement of a trend where industry, protected by the new labor law, can ruthlessly rid itself of old employees and move into a new community where a chamber of commerce is anxious to guarantee it a steady employee force who will work either without a union contract or at substandard wages, in order that there will be more industry in the community.

The trend of this can only bring down the standard of living in America and to reduce the standard of everyone to the standard of the lowest paid citizen in America. I say that, although there is need for labor reform, there is also need for management reform and I ask what provisions were in the bill recently passed to reform management, insofar as their relation with labor is concerned. Why did we have to pass this bill, in a frenzy, because of hysteria developed by the National Manufacturers Association? I ask whether or not it would not have been better to come back next January and to have considered this legislation in a more calm manner and to have placed in the bill provisions to control labor, yes, but also provisions to control management, such as the management at the Simmons Co. in Kenosha, Wis.

I respectfully submit this for the consideration of all Members of Congress during adjournment in the hope that when we return in January, we can pass legislation which will take care of this very serious situation.

Twentieth Anniversary of Invasion of Poland by Nazis and Communists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention today to a resolution and memorandum adopted by an estimated 4,000 residents of Chicago who attended a rally sponsored by the Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress on Sunday, September 13, 1959.

The purpose of this memorial service was twofold: First, to register a protest against the invitation of Premier Khrushchev to the United States, and second to call attention to the fact that on the 20th anniversary of the invasion of Poland, which occurred on September 1, 1939, the entire world should be reminded that this horrible war was visited upon civilization after a treacherous conspiracy between the Nazis and the Communists when they signed the infamous Ribbentrop-Molotov agreement.

I am today placing in the RECORD both the resolution and the memorandum which were unanimously adopted by those attending the rally because I think it is important in these crucial times, when so many would lead the United States to believe that all of the past crimes committed by the Soviet Union against civilized nations should be forgiven, that these people should be reminded of Communist treachery just as often as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution and memorandum follow:

RESOLUTION

The participants of the meeting called by the Polish American Congress, Illinois Division, on this day, September 13, 1959, at Lane Technical School Auditorium in Chicago to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the conclusion of the German-Russian pact of nonaggression and mutual assistance of August 23, 1939; the German attack on Poland on September 1, 1939; and the Soviet invasion of Eastern Poland on September 17, 1939, do hereby resolve that:

1. The Polish Nation, which 20 years ago, on September 1, 1939, rose to an unequal fight with invading Nazi Germany, has not regained as yet its full national sovereignty to which it is entitled. Sharing the same common national, historical, and cultural tradition, the Poles on this memorable day are paying a tribute to all those who either in the Polish Army at home or abroad, or as members of the national resistance movement, heroically, and without interruption kept fighting for liberation of their country in the tragic years of great challenge and unprecedented terror and persecution started by the Nazi invaders on that September 1, 1939.

2. The victory won on the battlefields during World War II over German imperialism was not followed by the expected period of peace and international justice because the exigencies of war and, above all, the shortsighted diplomacy of the Western Allies have led to the rise of a new danger the world is confronting right now in the form of imperialistic and aggressive aims displayed by the Soviet policy of conquest and expansion.

3. We remind the whole free world that the Polish Nation, which throughout all the time manifested its fighting spirit and deep faith in the return of freedom and independence and did it with the uncompromising attitude and immense contribution to the common world effort at terrific costs in population and property, this nation, its will disregarded by naked force, has been thrown into the empire of Soviet dictatorship and slavery and does not enjoy the right of self-determination, this unalienable right being one of the cardinal principles adopted by the Atlantic Charter as a moral and political program set by the victorious coalition of the Western Powers.

4. The Government of the United States activate and intensify a policy of liberation of Poland and all other captive countries from the Soviet bloc of slavery, such a policy thus becoming a practical continuation of the Week of the Captive Nations, officially proclaimed and solemnly commemorated in July of this year and ultimately enabling those nations to rejoin the world of Western culture and ideology to which they belonged for centuries and to which they keep striving to return.

MEMORANDUM

Shortly after the end of World War II in 1945, a special international Tribunal, established by the victorious Allied Powers at Nuremberg, pronounced the judgment in the case of major Nazi war criminals after having found them guilty of launching aggressive war and committing crimes against humanity during and in connection with the war.

Unfortunately, this was only an unfinished act of justice because there was no indictment and no sentence against Communist war criminals who committed exactly the same—if not even worse—crimes than those for which their Nazi partners have been convicted.

One should not forget that by the disgraceful Hitler-Stalin pact of mutual assistance and nonaggression from August 23, 1939, the Soviet Union is equally guilty as an accomplice in the conspiracy that touched off the disaster of World War II, and subsequently guilty of unprovoked armed invasion upon Poland, Finland, Baltic States, Rumania, and Hungary, these countries having been finally swallowed by the insatiable Soviet empire of exploitation and military conquest.

By committing mass murders on the citizens of the conquered countries, and by deportation of millions of human beings to the Soviet concentration camps where they were exposed to unescapable destruction, the Soviet Union is guilty of the abhorring crime of genocide on a scale surpassing the mass murders by Hitlerite henchmen.

And even quite recently, in 1956, the same Soviet Union has drowned in blood a merciless massacre, the heroic uprising of the Hungarian people in their dramatic fight for freedom and independence.

While all these inhuman and unpunished crimes of the Soviet regime are still fresh in the memory of the civilized world, one of the leaders of this notoriously criminal political system and one of the direct coinitiators and coexecutors of the crimes that will stand forever as an abominable disgrace of our times, this man, Nikita Sergiejewicz Khrushchev, arrives in our country to be received by our Government with honor and respect accorded to the invited guests on state visits.

The President of the United States, symbol of our national dignity and bearer of the high and priceless American ideals of freedom, justice, faith in God, and desire for universal peace, will have to, either as the host or guest, shake the hand stained with the blood of millions of innocent victims, murdered, tortured, and starved in the prisons and death camps by Russian tyrants and killers.

At a time when a deep and sincere desire and determination to preserve the peace and thus prevent the sufferings and disaster of a new war may persuade our highest Federal authorities to undertake such a humiliating step, we American citizens of Polish descent, knowing from tragic experience of our own and our friends and relatives, probably better than anyone else the history and the scope of Soviet crimes and abhorrent part played in those crimes by one of the leading henchmen. Nikita Khrushchev, regard it as our duty to raise our voice of conscience and voice of warning in defense of the same immutable moral principles which we feel should serve as the key to the relations among the states all over the world.

Once these principles are ignored, or even diluted, the road is open to the rule of blackmail, supremacy of naked force over law, and, ultimately, to chaos, anarchy, and total annihilation.

Showing our deepest concern for the future of Western civilization based upon these high principles of law and morality, we want to restate that, in our conviction, the announced exchange of state visits between Moscow and Washington is seriously endangering the moral prestige of the United States not only among the nations raped and dominated by the Soviet Union, but also within the free nations throughout the world.

Further, we want to emphasize that the invitation to visit the United States of America extended to that arch criminal Nikita Khrushchev, will be, no doubt, interpreted as a sign of weakness and uncertainty of the foreign policy of the United States which is now retreating to a humiliating gesture of receiving in this country a representative of a system built upon the violence and totalitarian dictatorship and aimed at the ultimate domination of the free world of free peoples through the conspiracy of international communism.

Such a gesture will be, not without reason, appraised as new evidence of appeasement toward an aggressive foe of peace and justice, effected by a conciliatory and friendly policy of concessions which, as the discouraging experience of the last 20 years teaches us, does not lead to lasting peace but only and exclusively to a further increase of audacity and new ultimative demands of the Communist aggressor in his road of threats and blackmail.

With feelings of deep devotion to the democratic ideals of a free and law-abiding country in which we live, we participants of the meeting called by the Polish-American Congress, Illinois Division, on September 13, 1959, in Chicago, do hereby adopt unanimously a resolution as follows:

1. Express the deep sorrow felt by millions of American citizens of Polish descent because of the invitation to the United States of America of Nikita Khrushchev, notorious Russian war criminal responsible for extermination and unprecedented sufferings of innumerable victims of the system led by him and disgraceful henchmen of nations suppressed by him and kept constantly in slavery.

2. Constraining ourselves not to demonstrate our true feelings toward the person of Nikita Khrushchev in a way which might have discredited our authorities during a reception customarily accorded to a guest from abroad, we urge the American people to keep in mind the register of sinister crimes carried by the Muscovite tyrant Khrushchev and show clearly and unmistakably our great disdain to him by preserving the attitude of full indifference and turn our cold shoulders in the dignifying silence to prove that we protest and mourn his visit to the United States of America.

Calling All Hogs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, in the comparatively short time I have been in Congress I have learned to appreciate the finer qualities of a colleague while at the same time disagreeing with his legislative philosophy. My distinguished neighbor in the Old House Office Building and a fellow member of the House Committee on Agriculture, the Honorable EARL HOGAN, is a fine, courteous gentleman and I am sure he is as highly regarded among his constitutents as he is among his colleagues of the 86th Congress.

In his promotion of subsidies to farmers who market lightweight hogs it appears, however, that he has ignored the lesson of agricultural history which points up the fact that what is intended to became a floor virtually becomes a ceiling with prices frozen at a low level. And, as with all other subsidized items, the producer increases his production at the guaranteed minimum and again we are up to our eyes in a commodity in which there is already a surplus.

Included with these remarks are an editorial and a news item taken from Midwestern papers which underscore the objectionable features of Congressman HOGAN'S proposal:

COUNT THIS ONE OUT

If Representative EARL HOGAN had run for Congress by promising Hoosier farmers $11 a hundred for hogs, he wouldn't have gotten enough votes to count.

The Hogan proposal to make Government payments for lightweight hogs can all too easily lead to just such a fixed, low price. Briefly, Representative HOGAN has offered a bill in Congress under which the Government would pay farmers up to $3 a hundred for lightweight hogs marketed when the price drops below $14 a hundred for this type. There are certain limits on the amount to be paid the individual farmer, and on the total annual cost of this temporary plan.

In theory, the payment would induce farmers to sell off some of the present large numbers of hogs instead of feeding them out to best grade. It is generally known that there are too many hogs. The market price has dropped to about $15 for best grades, and one way to get the price up is to reduce the number of pigs being grown and fed.

What could happen if the Hogan plan went into effect? Hog buyers can read and count like farmers and politicians. With an oversupply of hogs and an assured Government payment to the farmer of $3 a hundred, the processor will reason that he can pay $11 a hundred in the market and let the Government carry $3 of his costs for what are really $14 hogs.

Then would the farmer really be encouraged to reduce the number of pigs being produced? It is a fact that overproduction of hogs is the sole reason why prices have come down.

Again it's simply a matter of counting. Even at $15 a hundred, the average Hoosier farm operator can make some money on hogs. He's not making as much as he did when hogs sold for $20. He'd like to make more and when the oversupply is worked off, he will make more.

But if the market is fixed by a Government payment, the farmer who profits on 100 hogs at $15 will correctly figure that he can make even more by selling 200 hogs. The practical result of the Hogan plan would be more pigs, not less. Overproduction would be encouraged, and a vivid case in point for Indiana farmers is the wheat program.

There are other side effects. Government payment plans have tended to freeze farm markets, with the bottom also becoming the top. Areas now competing with Indiana farmers in hog production would get the same payment and same push to continue competition. At a time when everyone agrees that the temporary farm program is a failure, this would be a step to further Federal control of farming.

This proposal should be given a quick death in Congress. Hog farmers, working through the free market, will solve this problem in pigs for themselves.

KUHFUSS HITS CONGRESSIONAL PORK BILL

William Kuhfuss, president of the Illinois Agricultural Association, Thursday lashed a congressional effort to pass incentive payments for pork producers.

A bill to provide special payments for producers who will market lightweight hogs has passed the House of Representatives Agriculture Committee and is awaiting action in the House Rules Committee.

Kuhfuss said the bill is just like the other payment programs considered in the past few years—"It purports to benefit everyone, but actually benefits no one."

The bill provides a subsidy payment on all slaughter hogs marketed at live weights of from 175 to 190 pounds and places a guarantee on $14 per hundredweight on hogs.

While farmers fear hog prices may go to $10 in the near future, Kuhfuss pointed out that this is not the most important point to observe. In 1955, prices did drop down around $10, but they came back to $14 in 4 months and went to $16 in 8 months.

"In fact in the past 10 years, the average annual price has been $18.33, considerably more than the $14 guarantee proposed," he said.

"But, if the market were influenced by Government controls, chances are the $14 floor would also become a ceiling as with other programs. Commodities under Government controls today, without exception, are the ones in the most serious trouble.

"Even the housewife will suffer under such an idea," he continued. "The program will lower meat prices slightly, proponents say, but if she doesn't pay a price based at least partly on what the farmers get, she'll have to make up the difference in added taxes."

Summarizing the program Kuhfuss commented. "This kind of legislation can mean only one thing—runaway pork production unrelated to demand, reduced income for the farmer and a higher tax burden for all taxpayers."

Khrushchev's Real Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the Washington Star by Mr. David Lawrence on September 14, 1959. I agree with these views.

The article follows:

KHRUSHCHEV'S REAL GAME—PREMIER'S AIM IS SEEN AS DEADENING OF MORAL FORCE OPPOSING COMMUNISM

(By David Lawrence)

The American people are entitled to know the game Soviet Premier Khrushchev is playing.

It is a game of diversion—rockets to the moon, protracted conferences on disarmament and nuclear tests and summit talks that if, carried on for years, are intended to make the American people grow weary of international tension and finally to accept the immoral and unlawful conquests of millions of peoples now enslaved.

There are two instruments of power in the world today that can affect the peace of mankind. One is military, and it is designed to act as a deterrent to physical aggression. The other is moral force which when developed to full strength can influence whole nations and cause them to rise up against their oppressors.

Mr. Khrushchev's game is to deaden the moral force that has made liberty loving nations so articulate in world history in behalf of human freedom.

Khrushchev's game is to make it appear that, by exchanges of visits, by expansion of trade, by constant talk of peaceful coexistence, Americans are abandoning their dedication to moral force. This is expected to discourage revolt behind the Iron Curtain. For, if America becomes indifferent, the captive nations, it is presumed, will lose all hope.

Mr. Khrushchev's game is based on a belief that Americans are influenced only by selfishness and materialism—solely by the desire of businessmen for more trade—and that such idealism as remains can be anesthetized by wearisome and exhausting negotiations, or by implied threats of war through emphasis on missile and rocket development.

Mr. Khrushchev's game reaches a climax in propaganda intensity this week as he visits the United States. The dispatches and radio reports from America telling of "enthusiasm" for him, official honors paid and courtesies extended, together with news pictures of high American officials fraternizing with Mr. Khrushchev, will be displayed throughout Eastern Europe and behind the Iron Curtain, generally, as meaning approval of Communist policies by the people of the United States and their Government.

What can the American people do about it all? Various types of protests have been planned for the next 2 weeks and will be publicized widely. These devices are effective psychologically to some extent abroad, but it is here in Washington that the biggest opportunity has been missed.

The Congress speaks for the American people. It should have decided to stay in session throughout the Khrushchev visit to allow for an extensive debate on the cold war issues. This would have told the world in unequivocal terms that the American people have not forgotten what happened in Hungary and East Germany. It would have furnished an opportunity to ask Mr. Khrushchev openly what has become of the millions of persons exiled to concentration camps behind the Iron Curtain, and to expose to full view the operations of his autocratic government.

For moral force is potent when it effectively expresses a nation's ideals, and when it seeks by debate and discussion to underline and emphasize the basic principles of human freedom.

Actually there is only one issue. It is the self-determination of peoples everywhere—the right of the people to vote in free elections and choose their rulers. In the Soviet Union, only one party can vote and military duress is applied to suppress free speech and debate. Just the other day, Mr. Khrushchev himself publicly told a group of Soviet writers that they were overstepping the bounds in their criticism, and that he might have "to shoot a few of you, and my hand will not tremble."

Moral force means a constant emphasis on the right of peoples to govern themselves.

Moral force means the exercise of the right of free speech persistently, without regard to the inhibitions of official courtesy. For, while the President and high officials of our own Government must follow the "amenities," this does not bind the American people. There must, of course, be only peaceful demonstrations and never the slightest encouragement of disorder. But the American people ought not to be misled into allowing so-called "courtesy" to squelch those expressions of contempt for tyranny which ought never to be suppressed.

For the "butcher of Budapest," and the man who is responsible for the murder, exile, and imprisonment of tens of thousands of people in Eastern Europe, cannot be allowed to believe that his crimes have been forgotten. To kowtow to dictators, and let them misconstrue official courtesy as approval of their cruel acts, would be a backward step for America in world history.

Today tens of millions of people in the world are in bondage. Many of them are being tortured daily in concentration camps by the two big Communist regimes—in Moscow and Peiping. It is time to show the deepest sympathy for the oppressed and to speak frankly to the visiting ruler who has earned the doubtful distinction of having by his acts become the cruelest man in the world today.

Prayers are in order—prayers to the Almighty to give courage to the faltering and to find ways to bring the criminally guilty to the bar of justice. "Peaceful coexistence" should mean freedom for everybody, and not a world half-slave and half-free.

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

SPEECH
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is pleasant to hear these encomiums heaped upon my very dear friend, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, of New York. He is deserving of all. He has served quite a number of years in the House, and now he is being rewarded by his political friends and the citizenry in New York to become the district attorney of Bronx County. I am sure he will bring to play in that important office, the same high qualities that he has exemplified in this Chamber. I have been always happy in my association with him—I call him my friend. He is a duly dedicated public servant, as sagacious as he is kind—as persevering as he is gentle. We all, I am sure, wish him good fortune and good health in his new station.

Historical Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the real significance of historical sites has been recognized by one of the most progressive and forward looking civic organizations in this country, the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce.

All too seldom do businessmen take time out of their busy lives to give consideration to the historical values and the beneficial effect upon future generations of the preservation of important reminders of days long past.

In Kansas City, Kans., Mr. Speaker, is the Huron Indian Cemetery which is steeped in historical lore of the Indian of long ago. The city of Fort Scott has within its limits the site of the old fort named for Gen. Winfield Scott. The prairie or grassland near Bazaar, Kans., is ideal for the preservation of the frontier plains viewed by early pioneers.

Mr. Speaker, included in my remarks is the resolution adopted on August 25, 1959, by the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, of which I am proud to be a member.

RESOLUTION

Whereas it is proposed to establish two national parks in Kansas—one a historic park at Fort Scott, the other a prairie or grasslands park in the vicinity of Bazaar; and

Whereas the parks would be the first national ones in Kansas—neighboring States already having one or more; and

Whereas the Fort Scott site for the proposed historic park would preserve old structures, including a military bridge constructed in the Civil War; headquarters house erected in 1842 and now used as a museum; an original soldiers barracks; Fort Blair, one of three original blockhouses in the State, and national cemetery No. 1; and

Whereas the prairie or grasslands park would preserve in its natural state the flora and fauna of the virgin Kansas prairie and provide present and future generations with the priceless privilege of seeing and knowing the unique beauty of a plains area typical of that which existed in the historic and colorful days when they were seen by the first white men: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Board of Directors of the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, That it endorses these endeavors.

Adopted by the Board of Directors of the Kansas City (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting held August 25, 1959.

F. J. NASH, M.D.,
President, Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH GREEN, Jr.,
Executive Manager.

Mr. Nikita (the "Red Hitler") Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, freedom and decency are at stake in the visit of Mr. Nikita—the "Red Adolf Hitler"—Khrushchev to our beloved country. This is the first time in the history of the United States of America that a dictator, whose soul is sustained with the blood of millions of human beings, is to be given the red carpet treatment in the home of liberty. Indeed, never before in the history of the Western Hemisphere, has the slavemaster of numerous peoples been welcomed, officially or unofficially, to any American Republic.

It is alleged that this state visit will open the eyes of the Marxist-Leninist dictator to the strength of America and the united will of Americans to maintain their ideals. The truth is that every Marxist writer in the world is hailing the visit of Mr. Khrushchev, their chief prophet, as a triumph for the Soviet Government. If Adolf Hitler, in the midst of his campaign of extermination against God-loving people, had been invited to Washington, the whole newspaper, radio, and television industry would have expressed righteous indignation and pointed out the prestige value of such a visit to the vicious Nazi movement. American citizens, who love God and their neighbor, are equally indignant about the press, radio, and television buildup accorded to the "Red Adolf Hitler," Mr. Nikita Khrushchev.

The visit of the "Red Fascist" Khrushchev is a result of a careful, slick propaganda campaign which first brought Anastas Mikoyan, one of the worst Soviet conspirators, to this country as an unofficial guest. Part of the campaign was the subsequent reception given to Comrade Frol Koslov. After the visit by tyrant Khrushchev, we may expect another slick campaign to invite tyrant Josip Broz-Tito, still unrepentant about the murder of five American airmen who, inadvertently, flew over the territory of Yugoslavia.

It is a splendid civic and religious attitude to forgive and forget offenses, crimes, and sins when the sinner repents and shows firm signs of amendment. The tyrant Khrushchev is honored, however, at the very moment when his Marxist-Leninist partners in crime in the Far East are engaged in another series of aggressions. The peoples of Laos and of the Republic of Vietnam can testify about the peaceful coexistence offered by Kremlin agents. In fact, the evidence is overwhelmingly to the effect that Dictator Nikita Khrushchev and Mr. Mao Tse-tung, the Soviet gauleiter of China, are wholly unrepentant criminals. How many more million human beings have to be killed or enslaved in order that the hypocrisy of the Soviets and their sympathizers and fellow-travelers can be understood by the most naive onlookers?

The people of Wisconsin and the citizens of every State in the Union believe in representative government, in democratic procedures, in free elections, in a free press, and in religious ideals. Those who uphold these noble principles have a right to question the wisdom of a policy which, directly and indirectly, tends to glorify a political boss who, rightly, is called "the hangman of the Ukraine."

We who love freedom and democracy have a right to protest against the evils which will follow this visit. A bad precedent has been established. Citizens who love God and country must be on guard against future campaigns to undermine freedom and national security.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent to include the following statement by Col. August G. Rudd, retired, which was published in the New York Times on September 4, 1959:

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1959]

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT OPPOSED—OFFICIAL INVITATION IS VIEWED AS INCREASING SOVIET PRESTIGE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Washington officials have expressed concern lest Khrushchev's visit give "a shot in the arm to Communist activities in South America." Its alertness also should extend to the whole world, for there is real danger in regarding this visit as a simple gesture of good will, of little, or only localized, significance.

It is no secret that this opportunity long has been one of the major goals of Kremlin diplomacy. The Soviets have everything to gain and nothing to lose by this exchange of visits, in which the killer in the Kremlin is placed on an equal footing with the President of the United States, the last great citadel of freedom.

Since 1934 Khrushchev has been knee-deep in the bloody atrocities of the Soviet Union. It was he who cleaned up the Ukraine in a 12-year ruthless reign of terror. A single mass grave at Vinnetsa, uncovered by the Germans in World War II, found 10,000 victims, fully dressed, with hands tied behind them, each shot in the head. Khrushchev's shocking record of inhumanities is long and consistent, but his treachery and brutality to the freedom fighters of Hungary still rankles in the minds of all decent people.

GOAL OF WORLD CONQUEST

Now, by its official invitation, our Government is committed to making his visit a triumphal procession. In so doing it is offending the sensibilities of tens of millions of Americans and has taken unto itself a task that is not only dangerous but can be tragic in its ultimate consequences. Keep in mind that the Communists long have admitted that they intend to conquer the world, and now are boasting that they have taken about one-half of it in a space of only 40 years.

Every step in their conquest is planned. With this perspective, we can begin to see the advantages they expect from the Khrushchev "affair."

It will give a tremendous boost to Soviet prestige all over the world, and discourage the last hopes of freedom within the 16 enslaved countries. "Captive Nations Week" to them must appear to be a cruel hoax, as we honor their captors. It will be very sad news to those in the Soviet Union who still dream of freedom.

It will tend to cause dissension among our allies, and weaken our position in dealing with the Soviets, playing into the hands of Communists, their fronts, fellow travelers, and appeasers all over the world. Thus it will facilitate the infiltration and conquest from within other free nations.

It will encourage Red China to expect similar hospility and then admission to the United Nations.

If any agreements should be reached as a result of these visits, the Soviet record since 1933 proves conclusively that they would be worthless since the Red dictators have violated the most solemn obligations as soon as it served their purpose.

PROLONGED COLD WAR

The cold war could be ended tomorrow if the Kremlin so desired. All that is needed is for the Communists to cease their numerous campaigns of conquest. But they have given not the slightest indication of stopping this war in which they have been so strinkingly successful—16 nations and 800 million people enslaved.

There is no antagonism between the Russian and American peoples. But does anyone believe that strewing flowers in the path of Communist dictators will alter their determination to destroy us as the chief obstacle to their world domination? The door to peace must always be kept open, but if such naivete influences our policies we shall, indeed, be in grave danger.

At this very time this peace offensive was started the Reds launched new attacks on Laos and in India. Knowing Khrushchev's earnest desire for the visit, it would seem that the least we should have exacted as a quid pro quo was a cessation of new wars and threats of war. But their aggressions continue. This cold war (history may well record it as world war III) is principally psychological. Propaganda, publicity, and infiltration are the shock troops so long as they can win.

Khrushchev's visit has created new and pressing problems not only in Latin America but on all continents. As the Communists are quick to take advantage of favorable conditions, the free world should vigorously counter increased Communist activities, lest this visit prove to be another Soviet diplomatic victory.

AUGUSTUS G. RUDD,
Colonel, U.S. Army (Retired).
GARDEN CITY, N.Y., *August 26, 1959.*

A Note of Appreciation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, on this last day of the 1st session of the 86th Congress I want to express in the RECORD my thanks to my colleagues for their many kindnesses.

Seated in March for the unexpired term of the late George H. Christopher, I missed the benefit of orientation provided for the class of new Members. Although junior to this group everyone has been most considerate and even my fellow first-termers have been helpful.

I take this opportunity to thank the leadership of the House, the chairmen of the two full committees, of which I am a member and on which it has been my privilege to serve; as well as the chairmen of the subcommittees and those committee members with whom it has been such a pleasure to work; and all of those associated with the clerk's office, and the office of the doorkeeper, the document room, and the many liaison representatives who have been generous with their assistance to a new Member.

Finally, I want to say that all this friendliness has been heartwarming and I shall forever be grateful.

Ike's Household (Whew) Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting article has just come to my attention. It is particularly appropriate in view of the fact that the Congress has cut the President's budget estimates by more than $1,882 million.

The article was written by Ed Koterba and appeared in the Washington Daily News of May 14, 1959, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 14, 1959]

IKE'S HOUSEHOLD (WHEW) BUDGET

(By Ed Koterba)

I hope President Eisenhower has more success with the national budget than he's having with his own household budget.

He'll have tough treading to make ends meet at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue this coming year if the estimates I have are correct. And they are.

Take the cost of maids, for instance. Back in 1938, before inflation, when Eleanor Roosevelt supervised the household chores, they were hired at $19 a week.

In Ike's household budget for 1960, Mamie's going to have to pay her maids, out of our pockets, $50.80 a week, plus board. Mrs. Roosevelt required only five maids. Mamie has eight.

Domestic help around the White House in 1938 was paid $85,000. This year it's costing Mamie and us taxpayers $278,440.

Take a look at the garden expenses. In 1938, the Chief Executive required only five gardeners who drew total wages of $7,500.

Although the White House grounds haven't increased a square inch since then, Ike now needs 12 gardeners—at a cost of $45,110. The only major change in the grounds, as I see it, is the President's golfing green.

In the old days—back in 1938—our President needed only 60 police and Secret Service agents to guard him and his house. We paid 'em $150,650. Now, although there is still one White House and one President to protect, there are 160 agents around, for a total outlay of $1,055,000.

I mean, this high cost of living is going to do things to Ike's budget.

The total 1960 estimate comes to $5,401,000. This is for 615 people who work there, not including the President who gets $150,000.

This cost doesn't take into account Camp David, the expenses for which have never been revealed.

Then there's the President's two cabin cruisers, *Barbara Ann* and the *Susie E*, which cost the Government about $60,000 a year to keep shipshape, not to forget Ike's $3 million Super-Constellation, Columbine III, with its ground and flight crew of 28, which costs $711 an hour to operate. And two six-passenger planes, which cost about $35 an hour to run.

In addition, Ike has at his disposal several $350-an-hour helicopters, and a $1,000 motorized golf car which is driven by a Secret Service man.

Finally, there's his $30,000 bubbletop Lincoln, and a new Cadillac and a Chrysler Imperial with sliding roof, plus two armored Secret Service escort Cadillacs costing $130,000.

I'd say Ike's household budget will get its biggest shock when the Air Force delivers that jet airliner which is costing $4.7 million.

One thing sure, if the President's budget won't balance this coming year, he can't blame Congress.

Hon. Thomas Burke

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved to learn of the passing of Tom Burke, and to the members of his family I join with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] and others of my colleagues in expression of sincere sympathy. Tom Burke and I were of that group of new Members who came to the 81st Congress, feeling very keenly that in the elections of 1948 was a clear mandate for liberal legislation. We were bound together by mutual interests and the ties of a personal friendship that resulted from our association, grew ever warmer as the months of Congress in which we were fellow freshmen passed on and which continued until his untimely death. His service in the Congress was marked by loyal and effective championing of the causes in which he believed and from adherence to which he never retreated. He was outstanding among the new Members of the 81st Congress. I doubt if any Member of the House ever left after one term of service with more friends or a higher record of constructive liberal statesmanship. His heart was in the welfare of people, the men and women who are not in the seats of the mighty but do the hard work of the world, faithfully making their contribution to our country and to our times, and for whom he always was spokesman, advocate, friend, and champion. Tom Burke's passing is a loss to our country and to his former colleagues in this body it brings a very keen personal grief.

The Complex, Confusing, Litigious Labor Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, submitted herewith for the attention of Congress and the public is an analysis of the 1959 Labor Act, prepared by a staff of labor relations experts of the Research Institute of America, Inc. It is captioned "Management's New Rights Under the 1959 Labor Law" by Leo Cherne, the executive director of the institute.

The point I make is that this report is only the first of several interpretations, which may be internally consistent but in conflict with other reports. Undoubtedly all features of the act, with the possible exception of those sections dealing with internal union management, will be litigated in courts across the land. When the record is completed it will be certain that this law will have proved to be complex, confusing, and litigious.

It is my opinion that these vices, in the main, can be attributed to the fact that the compromise finally passed was based largely on the Landrum-Griffin bill. This proposal was hastily drafted and hastily considered without the benefit of close scrutiny by either labor, management, or the public.

It should follow that the public should give full credit to those legislators who endeavored to make an objective, reasoned choice between the competing proposals identified very incompletely to the public through public and private news media and propaganda. In other words, all Americans should recognize that this was an issue over which differences of opinion should produce no rancor or condemnation. The institute analysis reads as follows:

MANAGEMENT'S NEW RIGHTS UNDER THE 1959 LABOR LAW

Employers gained important new protections in the law resulting from the McClellan hearings, but the rights are narrowly circumscribed. To enjoy the benefits without exposing itself to new dangers, a company must know just where and how the new lines are drawn, as described in this report.

Note, too, that the new law has weakened management's hand in some respects, particularly in dealing with an economic strike; and has imposed additional reporting responsibilities on employers.

Unionized or not, almost every employer is potentially affected by the 1959 legislation. Its main impact will be felt in the following situations:

If a union uses picketing to force your employees to sign up, or force you to recognize the union, it will run into new curbs on such tactics.

You run less risk of a secondary boycott, since unions are now barred from pressuring your customers, suppliers, truckers, and so forth.

If you a small business, you are no longer in no man's land. The protection available to your larger competitors is now equally accessible to you.

Members in building trades are free to enter special hiring arrangements with their unions.

You will face fewer demands for payments and other abuses that come close to bribery or extortion.

If you face a strike on economic issues, you will have to be prepared to hold out much longer. Replaced strikers can now vote.

Promanagement people within a union are now given added opportunity to present their point of view—potentially affecting the attitude of the union as a whole.

You face a new complicated reporting task if any expenditures by your company affect employee attitudes toward the union or collective bargaining.

The economic impact of many of these changes will be felt immediately as both labor and management begin to anticipate the new balance of powers won and lost. This, despite the fact that legally the modifications of the Taft-Hartley law won't become effective until 60 days after the President signs the bill; other provisions of the new law won't go into effect until 90 days after enactment; and reports won't be due until even later.

CURBS ON PICKETING TO FORCE UNION RECOGNITION

If your workforce is not now organized and you have good reason to believe that most of your employees would just as well do without a union, your chances of successfully fighting off a unionization effort have now been greatly increased.

Your hand will have been similarly strengthened if your employees have already chosen a union, but you are being pressured to recognize another group.

In both situations the union seeking recognition will run into restrictions which the new law places on picketing. Aimed chiefly at Teamster tactics often called blackmail picketing, the new provisions will hamper other strong-arm methods as well.

WHEN PICKETING CAN BE STOPPED

Whether a union seeks to persuade employees to joint up or tries to force management to recognize it as the workers' bargaining representative, it can no longer use picketing in three basic situations:

1. Where the employees have, within the preceding 12 months, voted against unionization.

2. Where the employees are already represented by a union. The existence of a valid union contract bars any new election for up to 2 years (of course a bona fide union must be involved, not a company-dominated organization).

3. After the union has picketed for a reasonable period of time without filing a petition for an election among the employees. This time certainly cannot be more than 30 days and may possibly be less if the NLRB so orders.

Action: Once picketing in any of these circumstances has come to the NLRB's attention, the Board must immediately seek a court injunction to stop further picketing.

WHEN PICKETING MAY CONTINUE

Though many of the proponents of new curbs set out to bar all recognition picketing, the new law allows three important exceptions:

1. Once the union has petitioned for an election, it may carry on (or resume) its picketing. However, the NLRB must then move quickly to hold the election, shortcutting some of its usual time-consuming procedures.

Observation: The Board's newly granted power to let its regional officers handle election cases should help speed up this process.

2. When the NLRB has reasonable cause to believe the picketing union's charge that the employees' present organization is company-dominated. In such a case the Board must find the charge has no reasonable basis before seeking an injunction against the pickets.

3. So-called informational picketing, by which the union seeks to inform the public that the company is nonunion. Such picketing may go on indefinitely without violating the law, unless it causes truckers or other workers to refuse to cross the picket line.

Observation: This provision may actually favor unions more than did the fromer Taft-Hartley rule. In the Curtis case now before it, the Supreme Court may well hold that it was not legal under Taft-Hartley for a union to picket at all unless it had the backing of a majority of the employees; yet the new law allows some picketing even though the union does not have majority status.

SUPPLIERS AND CUSTOMERS ARE NOW SAFE FROM SECONDARY BOYCOTTS

If you have a dispute with a union, you will no longer have to contend with the indirect pressure usually referred to as a secondary boycott. Here is the important distinction which labor law makes between primary and secondary boycotts:

Suppose a union claiming to represent your employees concentrates its fire on you by, for instance, circulating "please do not patronize" and similar notices, the union would be engaging in a primary boycott, since your company is the target of its efforts. Such an action is well within the law unless the union does not in fact represent a majority of your employees.

But suppose the union tries to cave you in by picketing your suppliers, etc., to force them to stop doing business with you, such indirect pressure—that is, not placed directly upon you—is called a secondary boycott. Contrary to the intent of the authors of the Taft-Hartley Act, only some secondary boycotts were held to be illegal. Several loopholes in that law enabled unions to get around the prohibition. The new 1959 law has now closed most of these loopholes.

These practices are outlawed

It has been illegal right along for a union trying to organize or win contract improvements from company A to induce or encourage the employees of company B to strike, picket, or refuse to handle the goods of A. Under the new, reworded provision, however, additional practices are equally illegal. A union cannot:

1. Induce individual employees—like truckdrivers of the second firm—to boycott the target company. This is sometimes done, for instance, as they approach the gates of the target firm. Such inducement was not banned under the original Taft-Hartley Act, on the theory that it is aimed at individual rather than concerted conduct by the truckdrivers. The new amendments change all that.

2. Induce or encourage farm laborers, railway or airline employees, supervisors, etc., to refuse to handle the goods of a target company. Since such groups were technically not employees as defined by Taft-Hartley, the ban on secondary boycotts did not apply to them. The 1959 change in wording brings them under the secondary boycott restriction.

3. Persuade the second company itself, rather than its employees, to stop doing business with the target firm by threatening a strike or other economic retaliation. Such pressure on the management of supplier or customer companies is now specifically outlawed.

4. Force the second company, by strike or otherwise, to sign an agreement that it will not deal with the target company. Such a hot cargo agreement is illegal, and existing contracts of this type are declared unforcible and void.

Recommendation: When it comes to stopping an attempt at a secondary boycott, you may have a choice: either to go after the union yourself, if you are the target, or to have your supplier or customer take legal action. Especially where one of the companies involved is too small to qualify under NLRB's standards, it may be advantageous to let them take the lead—going to a State court may quickly produce an injunction against the boycott.

Important exceptions: As a concession to labor's viewpoint and in recognition of established industry practice, several exceptions were written into the law:

1. Publicity other than picketing may be used even on customers of a company with whom the union is having a dispute. For instance, a union in conflict with a manufacturer could use publicity to advise the public that a particular store handles goods produced in a struck shop. There are two important limitations: (a) the publicity must be truthful, and (b) it may not have the effect of inducing an employee of the second company (the store) to refuse to make deliveries or perform other services.

2. Refusal to cross a picket line will not be considered a secondary boycott provided two conditions are met: (a) the strike is duly authorized by a union that the company would legally have to recognize as bargaining agent for its employees and (b) the workers (such as truckdrivers) who refuse to cross the picket line do so on their own initiative without being induced by the union.

Anticipates: This is potentially a big and, from management's point of view, a very serious loophole. It could turn out to be one of the ways around the new law which the Teamsters' lawyers are said to be currently looking for. The reasons is that it would seem to permit truckers, for instance, to aid other unions by refusing to cross their picket lines.

3. In the garment industry, a special kind of subcontracting is established practice. Typically the jobber buys the piece goods, possibly even has them cut, but the actual sewing is done in contractor shops. The law enables the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, for instance, to continue requiring jobbers to agree they will not do business with nonunion contractors. The new provision guarantees that this practice does not violate the antiboycott provision by providing that the jobber and contractor will in effect be considered a single employer.

4. In the construction industry an employer may also make an agreement with the trade unions not to use nonunionized subcontractors at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work. But note that, if he refuses to make such a contract, the union cannot picket at the construction site. (A provision that would have exempted such picketing was knocked out of the bill in the last days of the congressional maneuvering.)

SMALL BUSINESS NO LONGER IN NO MAN'S LAND

Effective immediately, small companies have available legal means with which to stop unfair union pressures. Of course such companies may in turn be hauled into court if they engage in any unfair management practices. The new provision represents a radical change, since small business has been caught for more than 2 years in a labor relations no man's land.

The National Labor Relations Board flatly refused to handle any case involving a company with less than a certain minimum amount of interstate business. The NLRB's right to restrict its activities in this way has now been approved.

The State courts were previously unable to come to the rescue if the case involved an un-

fair labor practice or a question of representation governed by the aNtional Labor Relations Act since under the so-called preemption doctrine such matters were reserved to the Federal agencies and courts. (*Guss v. Utah*, 351 U.S. 1).

Now an employer (or a union) can go to a State court or any agency to stop any illegal activities.

Practices which can now be stopped: Up to now unions have been able to do many things with impunity to small companies trapped in no man's land. They could use blackmail picketing to force a company to pressure its employees into joining the union against their wishes or where the employees were already represented by another certified union. They could employ secondary boycotts to presuade customers to stop dealing with the company or to persuade carriers not to handle its goods. They could make excessive contract demands which amounted to bargaining in bad faith.

In turn, small companies will now find that they can be legally stopped from actions like firing an employee for union activity; threatening empolyees during a union-organizing campaign; trying to buy their allegiance with raises or other benefits; refusing to bargain in good faith.

When to turn to NLRB

Since the new law specifically prohibits the National Labor Relations Board from refusing to handle any cases which it now accepts, the standards presently in effect will continue. This means that you must go to the Board—rather than the State—for help if you qualify under the following rules.

For nonretail establishments, the Board will handle a case if the interstate outflow or inflow, direct or indirect, comes to at least $50,000 annually.

Direct outflow refers to goods shipped or services furnished by the employer outside the State. Indirect outflow includes sales within the State to users who meet any standard except an indirect inflow or indirect outflow standard.

Direct inflow refers to goods or services furnished directly to the employer from outside the State.

Indirect inflow refers to the purchase of goods or services which originated outside the employer's State, but which he purchases from a seller within the State.

Direct and indirect outflow are combined by the Board to determine if the $50,000 minimum is met. Direct and indirect inflow are also combined. However, for purposes of determining jurisdiction, the NLRB will not combine the value of outflow and inflow.

For retail concerns, the rule is that the Board will take jurisdiction if the annual gross volume of business comes to $500,000.

There are additional rules, too many to mention here, affecting special lines—associations, office buildings, utilities, transit systems, newspapers, and communication systems, and companies whose business has a subtantial impact on national defense.

If you are too small for NLRB

Under the new act you really get a break if you are too small for the NLRB. In the great majority of States you can turn to your local court for relief. In a few States you must go to the State labor relations board or similar administrative agency.

You don't have to wait for the NLRB to turn you down before making use of the alternatives now available. As soon as you know that you cannot qualify under the Board's self-imposed standards above, you can seek an injunction from your State court or file a complaint with your State labor relations board. In most cases you should receive quick and effective relief from the union pressure.

Your chances of getting prompt relief from a State court will actually be better than if you could turn to NLRB. One reason why the unions opposed this particular solution to the no man's land problem was the fact that they fear the conservatism of the average State court judge and dread a return to the injunctions of the 1920's.

Observation: Relief by injunction is of course only the first—though the most important—step. In order to settle the issue finally, the State agency will need authority to order an election. This is the reason why many State legislatures will be passing labor relations acts at their next sessions.

SPECIAL HIRING RULES FOR THE BUILDING TRADES

Recognizing the practices prevailing in parts of the building and construction industry, the new law allows certain limited exceptions. Companies may make arrangements with unions in the following situations:

Employers may legally sign a contract with the union even before the workers are actually hired.

Such an agreement may require the worker to join the union within 7 days after he starts on the job (against the 30 days provided in all other lines).

The agreement may require the employer to notify the union of employment opportunities, permit them to refer qualified applicants, specify minimum qualifications and set up priorities for employment.

Exception: Since such arrangements come very close to imposing a closed shop, the provision is specifically made noneffective in the 19 States which have right-to-work laws.

Observation: Any group of employees who are forced by such arrangements to join a union against their wishes can petition for a deauthorization election and eliminate the union shop.

Observation: Note that in a last-minute maneuver another special provision for the construction industry was not put into the law. Therefore the construction and building unions have no specal exemption from the boycott provisions; they may not picket a construction site against a nonunion subcontractor if such action would induce employees of other companies working on the same job to lay down their tools.

PROTECTION AGAINST OTHER ABUSES

In line with its general purposes of eliminating unsavory practices, the law establishes additional safeguards. Three of these reform provisions will be of particular interest to management:

1. Demanding fees from motor vehicle operators for the so-called privilege of loading and unloading trucks is made a crime.

2. Picketing for the purpose of exacting a bribe from the employer is declared to be a crime, punishable by a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment up to 20 years, or both.

3. Using threats of force or violence to interfere with or prevent the exercise of a union member's rights under the act is punishable by a fine of $1,000 or imprisonment up to 1 year, or both. Such a crime could of course be charged not only against a union but also against any employer who might resort to strong-armed methods in trying to prevent unionization of his employees.

REPLACED STRIKERS ARE GIVEN THE RIGHT TO VOTE

One of the few areas where unions achieved an important gain under the new law concerns the rights of employees who are out on strike. The new provision will make it particularly difficult for small companies to maintain operations in the face of a strike over wages and working conditions.

At issue here are strikes over economic issues, not those called in protest against an employer's unfair labor practices. The basic rule still stands: An employer hit by an economic strike has the right to hire permanent replacements for those striking employees who refuse his appeal to return to work. Once the replacements are hired, the employees still out on strike lose their right to reinstatement in their old jobs.

Under the old Taft-Hartley rule any such economic striker who lost his right to reinstatement also automatically lost the right to vote in his former place of employment. With voting limited to those who had voluntarily returned to their jobs and the newly hired replacements, the odds were that a new election would go against the striking union. This is the reason that President Eisenhower joined in denouncing this provision as "union busting."

The new law radically changes the voting rules. It provides that replaced economic strikers retain the right to vote in their old place of employment for 12 months from the start of the strike. This means that for 1 year any election would probably go in favor of the striking union. No matter how unreasonable the strikers' demands, therefore, an employer would have to hold out that long before petitioning for an election with any hope of ousting the union.

Illustration: One actual case which persuaded Congress to write the original Taft-Hartley provision illustrates the weird results which the new law may well produce again. When 54 employees struck, they were replaced by 52 new men. In an election the 2 groups stood firm and the vote was 54 to 52 for the striking union. The result was that the union, whose members were out on strike, was certified as representative of the new employees who had voted against it and in which they were not members. (Columbia Pictures Corp., 64 NLRB 490.)

DEMOCRACY IN UNIONS—AN AID TO MANAGEMENT?

Any company that might be tempted to seize upon the new bill of rights of union members as a means to bust the union itself will be asking for trouble.

The chief purpose of the new provisions is to protect the rights of the individual worker against dictation and abuse within the labor organization itself—and that's how they'll be applied by NLRB and the courts. But many employers, with a record of fair dealing with their workforce, will find that the new law has substantially improved their chances of getting a fair shake in return.

For this reason, members may want to inform all employees of their rights under the 1959 law. While unions are specifically required to tell members of the new provisions, there's nothing to bar management from restating these rights in a company announcement.

Caution: This kind of announcement is as far as any company should go. From that point on, it's up to any individual employee to stand up for his rights—or to combine with others of like mind to achieve their joint purpose. The new law specifically prohibits any employer, acting alone or through his association, to finance, encourage, or participate (other than as a separate interested party) in any suit or proceeding that a member of the union may bring against the organization.

Rights of the individual worker

One of the basic purposes of the new law is to guarantee to any individual or group within the union—including, of course, one which might be sympathetic to management—the right to advocate its viewpoint before the full union membership and to participate in all affairs of the organization.

In addition to all the rights and remedies that a union member may now have under any State or Federal law, before the National Labor Relations Board, or under any union constitution or bylaws, the new law specifically provides that every member of a union may meet and assemble freely with other members and express his views on business

before any union meeting or upon candidates in a union election.

Has the right to receive, upon his request, a copy of a collective bargaining agreement which affects him.

Must have equal rights and privileges within the union to nominate candidates, vote in union elections, attend membership meetings and participate in the deliberations of the union.

Is protected against dues increases and special assessments, unless they're approved by a majority vote, in a secret ballot, as prescribed by the new law.

Is protected against a fine, suspension, expulsion or other disciplinary action (except for nonpayment of dues) unless the member has been (a) served with written specific charges, (b) given a reasonable time to prepare his defense, and (c) afforded a full and fair hearing.

Has the right to sue in a court, bring a matter before an administrative agency, appear as a witness or petition any legislature, provided only that he has first exhausted reasonable hearing procedures within the union; these may not take more than 4 months to run through.

May sue in a Federal district court if he believes that any of his rights have been infringed upon or if he's threatened with disciplinary action for exercising his rights (presumably, the court would issue an injunction).

The only limitation on the member's exercise of this "bill of rights"—a limitation which potentially could be important to management as well—is the right of the union itself to adopt and enforce reasonable rules. These may deal with the responsibility of every member toward the organization as an institution, and restrain members in any conduct that would interfere with the performance of the union's legal or contractual obligations.

The importance of this provision lies in the fact that it could be used by the union to discipline a member for advocating another union (dual unionism) or engaging in a wildcat strike.

Union locals are also protected

Management is indirectly but importantly affected by provisions designed to protect a local union against arbitrary action by officers of the international with which it is affiliated.

Many union constitutions authorize the international officers to suspend the normal processes of government of local unions and to assume control of their property and funds—that is, impose trusteeships.

In addition to the legitimate functions of trusteeships, the McClellan committee spotlighted many instances where corrupt union officers have used them to plunder local unions and attack opposing political factions.

Observation: In line with other findings of congressional hearings, the new law establishes many additional safeguards. Primarily aimed at internal union problems and abuses, they will also make management's job easier to the extent that they keep out criminal elements and promote clean unionism. For example, the act bars from union office anyone who within the preceding 5 years has been a member of the Communist Party or within 5 years has served any part of a prison term for robbery, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, grand larceny. It imposes heavy criminal penalties for embezzlement of union money or property; for the willful failure of a union official to be bonded for not less than 10 percent of the funds he handled during the preceding year; for making loans to union officers or employees in excess of $2,000; for paying the fine of any officer or employee convicted for willful violation of the act, etc.

COMPANIES MUST FILE NEW REPORTS

Don't be lulled into a false sense of security by the fact that the main purpose of the law's new reporting requirements is to expose abuses by union officials. As is true under the Pension and Welfare Plan Disclosure Act, the unintended effect may well be to saddle the employer with nearly as much paperwork as is required of the union.

The law defines very broadly the information that employers must report in these groups:

1. Amounts paid to employees or their representatives, excluding only wages, checked-off dues, and contributions to certain specified welfare and trust funds.

2. Payments made for the purpose of coercing or influencing employees in their right to organize and bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. This would include payments made directly to the employees: for instance, amounts contributed to company-dominated or supported unions or employee committees. And it would also cover payments to labor consultants or other independent contractors who might influence the employees concerning their exercise of these rights.

3. Payments made to obtain information on the activities of employees or the union in connection with a labor dispute. However such information can be collected if it is to be used solely in connection with a proceeding before a labor board, a court or an arbitrator.

Observation: One of the strange aspects of the new law is that it requires the reporting of certain payments which, in another section of the law, are declared crimes. Undoubtedly lawyers for any company charged with failure to report such payments will plead that these reporting provisions are unconstitutional since they would compel the employer to furnish evidence against himself.

In practical application, the reporting responsibility imposed on employers will undoubtedly be narrowed. It is clear that, aside from what must bluntly be labeled bribes, the act is primarily intended to cover payments which reflect an unfair labor practice on the part of the employer. It is certain to be interpreted not to require the reporting of expenditures for house organs, letters to employees and similar purposes which are protected under Taft-Hartley's free speech provision.

Such a lightening of the reporting responsibility can be accomplished quite easily. The Secretary of Labor, who will administer these provisions, will issue forms and instructions for such reporting. He is specifically authorized to provide simplified forms for small business organizations (note, however, that the Secretary also has the power to require full reporting where he considers it desirable).

Recommendations: Most members will want to wait for these forms and instructions before deciding what payments should be separately recorded in their books and accounts. Also, don't overlook the requirement that all records will have to be preserved for 5 years.

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

SPEECH
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in what has been said by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and my chairman of my committee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], about our friend, ISIDORE DOLLINGER. Upon coming to this body, it was my privilege to immediately become acquainted with our distinguished colleague whom we are eulogizing tonight as he is about to enter upon a greater service—or, at least, a greater service to his immediate area. I shall miss him, and I shall miss the many opportunities that I have had to associate with him as I have with his friends and my dear friends, Congressman HOLTZMAN and Congressman RODINO and the others, who are so close to ISIDORE DOLLINGER. So I join gladly on this occasion to pay my tribute to this distinguished gentleman from New York and wish him well as he goes forward in his new service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Equality of Congressional Districts, H.R. 575

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced H.R. 575, to require that congressional election districts be contiguous and contain approximately the same number of inhabitants.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles by Gus Tyler, political director of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Mr. Tyler's articles appeared in the New Republic magazine of June 21, 1954, and June 28, 1954:

[From New Republic, June 28, 1954]

THE HOUSE OF UN-REPRESENTATIVES

(By Gus Tyler)

Our House of Un-Representatives, with its heavy percentage of overpopulated, underpopulated, and gerrymandered districts, is the handiwork of our State legislatures. The gross inequalities created by these legislatures express the even grosser inequalities by which these selfsame legislatures are created.

The most direct way to remedy the growing disease of unfair representation in the Congress would be to go to the State legislatures for relief. But, in this case, the doctor is sicker than the patient; in fact, it is the former who carries the contagion to the latter.

In the State legislatures of America, the more than 60 percent of the Nation's people living in urban areas are allotted 25 percent of the legislature. This makes a rural vote worth about four and one-half times as much as an urban vote.

In a report by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, titled "Government of the People, by the People, for the People" (1949), the following breakdown on representation is presented, covering 18 typical States:

Michigan: Wayne County (Detroit), with 40 percent of the population, has 27 percent of the representation in the lower House.

New Jersey: Eight urban counties with four-fifths of the population have 8 State senators, while 13 rural counties with one-fifth of the population have 13.

Georgia: Fulton County (Atlanta) with a population of 393,000 has 3 Representatives in the lower House; Echols County, with a population of 3,000, has 1.

Oklahoma: Oklahoma City with a population of 244,000 has 7 Representatives in the lower House; 7 rural counties with a population of 57,000 also have 7 Representatives.

Delaware: New Castle County (Wilmington) with 67 percent of the population has 42 percent of the representation in both houses.

California: Los Angeles County with 39 percent of the population has 2½ percent of the State Senators.

Missouri: St. Louis with a population of 816,000 has 18 representatives in the lower house and 18 rural counties with a population of 158,000 also have 18.

Pennsylvania: Allegheny County (Pittsburgh) with a population of 1,400,000 has 27 representatives in the lower house; 36 rural counties with a population of 1,200,000 have 36 representatives.

Oregon: The State average is 55,406 people per senator in urban areas and 9,072 people per senator in rural; 22,202 people per representative in urban areas and 5,272 people per representative in rural.

Illinois: Cook County (Chicago) with 51 percent of the population has 37 percent representation in both houses.

Connecticut: Hartford with a population of 166,000 have 2 representatives; Colebrook with a population of 547 also has 2 representatives in the lower house.

Colorado: Denver County with a population of 415,786 people has 1 representative for every 21,500 people while Baca County has 1 for every 6,207 people.

Ohio: Cleveland with 16 percent of the population has 7 percent of the representation in the lower house.

Iowa: Polk County (Des Moines) with a population of 195,835 gets 1 senator and so does Mahaska County with a population of 26,485.

Maryland: Baltimore with 47 percent of the population gets only 29 percent representation in both houses.

Rhode Island: Providence with 36 percent of the population gets 25 percent of the representation in the lower house.

Wisconsin: Each assembly district represents 67,447 urban people and 15,827 rural.

Montana: Silver Bow County (Butte) with a population of 53,207 has 1 Senator and so does Petroleum County with its 1,083 inhabitants.

A report made this year by the American Political Science Association points up the socio-economic results of unrepresentative democracy in the States. "This rural dominance," says the report, "is one reason why the States have not always been able to cope with the greater problems of an urbanized society, such as housing, metropolitan transportation fares, price control on foods, social insurance and community planning beyond city limits."

The shockingly unfair composition of the State legislatures is responsible for other social ills. Our major cities suffer financial strangulation at the hands of rural legislatures. In acute pain, the U.S. Conference of Mayors cries out that "while the State may tax its citizens in any way it pleased within the limits of the U.S. Constitution, the city must use the means allowed it by the State—the worst of all revenue raising bases—real-estate taxation. Acute financial embarrassment and near bankruptcy is a chronic condition in our American cities and towns—the cities and towns whose citizens and business concerns pay more than 90 percent of all taxes to all levels of government in the United States."

These self-same State legislatures with the industrial voter under-represented are also responsible for the rapidly multiplying "right-to-work" laws, going far beyond the Federal Taft-Hartley law in outlawing union shops.

These anachronistic legislatures are given ever wider areas of our economic life to control as the present Federal administration relinquishes its Federal supervision to the States. In effect, this means that a somewhat unrepresentative Federal Legislature is relinquishing control of vital aspects of our economic life to a grossly unrepresentative set of State legislatures.

It is to these same State legislatures that proponents of a Bricker amendment or a millionaire's tax amendment look for alteration of the Federal Constitution.

Finally, it is the totally lopsided State legislature that is the decisive voice in setting up the congressional districts through which the electorate will choose its delegation to the lower House of the Federal Legislature.

The rural versus urban conflict is not the only reason why the State legislatures are composed so undemocratically. Dr. Lashley G. Harvey, Boston University, after a study of State practices concluded that "large taxpaying interests frequently gain from rural domination and will go to great lengths to maintain existing apportionments." In a study of the California Legislatures, Dean McHenry found that "certain business interests in the State have found it easier to make their influence felt in the legislature through senators from rural areas. Privately owned utilities, banks, insurance companies and other concerns with crucial legislative programs have discovered some 'cow country' legislators more responsive to their demands and less committed to contrary points of view on key social and economic questions than are urban representatives."

A former president of the National Association of Real Estate Boards provided an ideological base for continuing inequality: "Today the greatest threat to democratic institutions, to the republican form of government, and ultimately to freedom itself, lies in our big cities. They are populated for the most part with the mass-man, devoid of intelligence, and devoid of civic responsibility. He talks only about rights and has no conception of responsibilities. He will vote for anyone who offers him something for nothing. Whether it be subway fares at half-price or public housing at one-third price * * *. Our one hope of survival as a free country is that rural and semi-rural areas still dominate most of the State legislatures through their representatives and still dominate the House of Representatives at Washington. Our best hope for the future is to keep it that way."

Still another reason why unrepresentative government is perpetuated in the State legislature is the political boss. The county boss, the center of the courthouse gang, likes the present unfair setup because his control of some thinly populated county makes him a big shot in his party through his ability to elect people regularly to the State legislature. His representatives are just as powerful as the representatives of the more populous counties—and that multiplies the influence of the back-county boss in his party.

The prevalent system of districting and apportionment in the State is a self-perpetuating plot to maintain the undemocratically established power of the rural areas, a few large taxpayers and the county bosses.

The primary device for maintaining an unrepresentative system in the State legislatures is the ancient system of rotten boroughs. A system of districting may have been worked out some 50 years ago in a State. In the intervening couple of generations, there may have been radical shifts in population. But the State legislatures just sit tight and refuse to redistrict or reapportion.

After the census of 1940, only 18 States out of the 48 bothered to reapportion. The others permitted the silent gerrymander to perpetuate districts wherein radical population changes had taken place. Mississippi reapportioned in 1890; Delaware in 1897; Illinois and Alabama in 1901. Prior to 1953, the modern State of Connecticut had not reapportioned its lower chamber since 1818 and its senate since 1903.

In other States, inequality is built right into the constitution. Towns, no matter how small, are guaranteed a seat; a county, no matter how small, is guaranteed a seat; other counties, individually or jointly are limited in the number of seats they may have—no matter how large their population. In some of these States, the constitution is unenforcible because it is mutually contradictory. Thus, a constitution will provide that seats be allotted on the basis of population and will then provide that certain areas be guaranteed a minimum of seats.

Above all, to quote Dr. Lloyd M. Short, University of Illinois, in a 1952 study, "State constitutional provisions with respect to legislative reapportionment are more honored in their breach than in their observance."

In the absence of an aroused and informed public, representative government in State and Federal Legislatures tends to become increasingly unrepresentative.

[From New Republic, June 21, 1954]

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(By Gus Tyler)

Millions of dollars and millions of words will be poured out this year to determine what party will control Congress. Yet the party with most votes in the congressional contests may not be the party with a majority of representatives. Who controls Congress may not be decided by the electorate but by unrepresentative State legislatures.

For instance: There is a proposal currently before the Massachusetts legislature to increase the Republican delegation to Congress by two and to decrease the Democratic delegation by the same number. This will not be done because of a shift in public opinion but because the State legislature decides to do it. In 1952, the GOP elected eight Representatives from Massachusetts while the Democrats elected six. Should the legislature so move this year, a vote in 1954 identical with that in 1952 would give the GOP 10 Representatives and the Democrats 4.

Massachusetts is no exception. The juggling of legislative districts to produce artifical majorities is becoming universal:

In the U.S. Congress, one Representative from Texas represents a district with more than four and a half times as many people as that of another Representative from Colorado.

In one State legislature, a member of the lower house represents an area 300 times as large as that of another representative.

In 1952, Democratic candidates won a majority of the popular votes in the congressional contests, but the party ended up with a minority in Congress.

In the 48 State legislatures, the urban areas representing about 60 percent of the Nation's population are allotted 25 percent of House seats.

One American's vote is not equal to another's vote in 1954. The cases where one equals one are exceptional rather than normal.

This year, about one-third of the congressional districts are so stacked, cracked, or packed as to win for the lower Chamber of our Federal legislature the title of "House

of un-Representatives." The rigging of seats is deliberate, and artfully so—violating the spirit of the Federal Constitution and the letter of many State constitutions.

Such unrepresentative representation in the House was not one of the compromises written into the Federal Constitution by its authors. The historic compromise between area and population was made in the Senate. It was not intended that the compromise be extended to the House.

James Madison keynoting this issue, openly stated his fears that special interests, in control of State legislatures, would fix elections to Congress in such a way as to retain power for these same interests in the national legislature. Said Madison:

"The inequality of the representation in the legislatures of particular States would produce a like inequality in their representation in the national legislature, as it was presumable that the counties having the power in the former case would secure it to themselves in the latter."

Out of this fear came article 1, section 4 of the Constitution empowering Congress to regulate or alter the manner of electing the House of Representatives so as to guarantee its democratic composition. For a time in our national history, Congress used this power to restrain abuses of the States. Right now there are virtually no restraints on the tailormaking of districts to produce congressional delegations congenial to given parties, interest groups or sectional prejudices. Between 1842 and 1929, there were Federal restrictions, providing in various degrees for districts that were contiguous, compact and almost equal in population; these no longer exist. The courts want to keep hands off—to avoid the charge of judicial interference with the composition of the legislature. The State legislatures can't be counted on to do very much about it—they are the prime culprits. What's more, State legislatures themselves are creatures of rigged districts, even more unrepresentative than the Federal legislature. Political parties do little to restrain one another on the tacit theory that juggling apportionment is one of the acceptable, though not-so-nice, rules of the political game.

So the evil grows. Only an aroused public conscience can bestir the parties, the State and the Federal Legislatures to remedial action.

Here's the way the Congress of the United States is composed. The total population of the country (minus the population of Washington, D.C.), after the decennial census, is divided by 435, the fixed number of Congressmen since 1911. The resulting figure is the average size, by population, of a congressional district. The population of the separate States is then divided by the average size of a district and the State is assigned a certain number of seats in the House of Representatives. It is then up to the State to carve out its own congressional districts. The separate States may elect all their Congressmen at large; or may elect some at large and some from districts. The separate States may make some congressional districts huge in population and others small; may carve out a district that looks like a rattlesnake or may block out a neat geometric design. In short, they may do as they please—and what they please to do is scandalous.

Consider the present House membership. An average seat should represent some 350,000 inhabitants in a perfectly representative situation. If you allow, as does the American Political Science Association, for a 15-percent margin to accommodate geographic, county and other reasonable adjustments, a Congressman should represent between 300,000 and 400,000 inhabitants.

In the present House of Representatives, there are only 252 Members who fall in this category. The other 183 come from districts either under populated or overpopulated.

Here are the figures showing what population is represented by present House Members:

Population in thousands:	Number of districts
150 to 200	3
200 to 250	25
250 to 300	62
300 to 350	147
350 to 400	105
400 to 450	53
450 to 500	13
500 to 550	8
550 to 600	2
600 to 650	2
800 to 850	1

The very heavy percentage of over- and under-populated districts is neither causal nor accidental. It is purposely weighted against the urban areas.

The 13 most populous districts represent the following cities: Houston, Tex.; Dallas, Tex.; Atlanta, Ga.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Birmingham, Ala.; Seattle, Wash.; San Antonio, Tex.; Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio; Detroit, Mich.; Miami, Fla.; Bridgeport and surrounding cities in Connecticut; Hartford, Conn.

The enormity of misrepresentation is most dramatically displayed in contrasting a single district against others in the same State:

In Texas, the Houston district, represented by ALBERT THOMAS, is larger (809,701 population) than the total of the 17th District (226,739 population) plus the 6th District (228,112 population) plus the 4th District (227,735 population). Obviously, if you live in Houston, your vote is worth only about one-quarter of what it's worth if you live, let's say, in Cross Plains.

In Georgia, the Atlanta district with a population of 618,431, is larger than the total of the Eighth District with 267,251, plus the Ninth District with 246,227.

In Indiana, the 11th District of Indianapolis is as large as the total of the 6th and 9th Districts.

In Michigan, the 16th District of highly industrial Detroit has a population of 525,334, which is some 120,000 more than the totals of the 12th District (178,251 population) plus the 11th District (227,810 population) located in the woodlands of the Upper Peninsula.

In Ohio, the 3d District with a population of 545,644, includes Dayton, and is larger than the total of the 15th District (226,341 population) in the farmlands of southeast Ohio plus the 23d District (240,223 population) pieced out of GOP wards in Cuyahoga County.

In Florida, the Fourth District, covering Miami, has a population of 525,401, which is greater than the total of the Seventh District (220,479 population) plus the Eighth District (210,428 population).

This system of over-populating and under-populating congressional districts in order to make an urban vote worth only a fraction of the rural vote thus guarantees that the House of Representatives shall be heavily weighted against a sector of the population currently estimated at 64 percent of the Nation. At the end of the century, the Nation was 39.7 percent urban; by 1920, it was 51.2 percent urban; by 1950, it was 64 percent urban. The prevailing system of congressional malapportionment and districting is an attempt to preserve the political configurations of the past against the socio-economic contours of the present.

These inequities of overpacked and understacked districts are viciously multiplied by the craftsmanlike use of gerrymandering. Because millions of American voters learned in their high-school years that gerrymander was a word coined about 150 years ago from the name of the unconscionable Governor of Massachusetts, Elbridge Gerry, who carved out a district looking like a salamander to guarantee a seat for his party, these grown-up voters assume that the practice of gerrymandering is an historic fossil no longer extant—or only feebly so.

Actually, the gerrymander marches on: his footprints are all across the political map of America.

In the case of Massachusetts, mentioned earlier, under the gerrymander the Democrats with 46.8 percent of the congressional vote in Massachusetts, would get 28.6 percent of the State's congressional delegation. To accomplish this political legerdemain, the GOP will have to create a Third Congressional District that by contrast would make the original gerrymander look like a pattern for fairplay. The district would be a long corridor starting in the southwest portion of the State, near Springfield, wandering north, then bifurcating itself with one arm reaching down to the Connecticut border and the other arm reaching eastward to the suburbs of Boston.

In Ohio, heavily Democratic Cleveland has been so split that Cuyahoga County guarantees two Republican and two Democratic seats. The 22d and 23d Districts are Republican; the 20th and 21st are Democratic. The artificial character of the districts is obvious from the map. The inequity is compounded by the fact that the two Democratic districts have a total of 847,837 population while the two Republican districts have a total of 545,695. In other words, 60 percent of the people of Cuyahoga County have two Congressmen (Democrats) and the remaining 40 percent also have two Congressmen (Republicans).

In California, the lazy, crooked Y shaped 26th District was used by the Republican-dominated State legislature as a Democratic dumping ground to clear opposition party pockets out of the 15th and 16th Districts—thereby assuring GOP representatives from the latter two. Result: the Democratic 26th District has a population of 480,827, which is 120,000 more than the neighboring 15th District (360,139 population) and more than twice that in the neighboring 16th District (223,139 population).

In North Carolina, the 8th and 11th Congressional Districts are the products of a Democratic plan to make certain that the historically Republican mountain counties in the northwestern corner of the State shall have not more than one GOP representative by dumping the GOP votes into the 10th district. The congressional districts chop up the hill country and run down the Piedmont toward the seaboard, so that with 68 percent of the votes in the State, the Democrats control 90 percent of the seats, whereas in neighboring Tennessee (where no such gerrymander is practiced), the Democrats with 70 percent of the vote carry only 77 percent of the seats.

New York State was neatly juggled in the reapportionment before the 1952 election to gain five seats for the Republican Party. Following the new census, New York lost two seats in the House of Representatives. The two districts abolished by the GOP—on a straight party vote—were both in New York City, where the Democratic Party usually elects the Congressmen. This was done in spite of the fact that in predominantly Democratic New York City, the average congressional districts have a population of 358,721, while in predominantly Republican up-State New York the average congressional district is 330,396. A new district was created in heavily Republican Long Island. And then, in Democratic Brooklyn, a thoroughly artificial district (12th District) weaved its way through the streets of the borough, avoiding low income areas and housing projects, to give Johnny Crews, Brooklyn GOP boss, his own Representative in Washington. This GOP district has a population of 317,635 while the five surrounding and contiguous Democratic dis-

tricts have populations of between 367,000 and 382,000.

Commenting on this atrocity, the New York Times stated:

"The law is a blatant gerrymander, designed for one purpose only—to squeeze an additional Republican representative out of the city of New York in outrageous disregard of the proper standards for congressional districting."

Assemblyman Lewis Olliffe (Republican) in demanding later that the skulduggery be repeated in the districting for the State legislature, pointed out to his GOP colleagues that if it had not been for the above mentioned apportionment strategy of the Republicans in New York State, "the Congress would be Democratic today."

Olliffe was right. The GOP control in the House in the 83d Congress is the product of a gerrymandered majority.

An Address on the Vulnerabilities of Russian Communism by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, Author of the Captive Nations Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Khrushchev tours parts of this country, it would do well for the American people to give serious thought to the deep, underlying weaknesses of the Red czar's empire. Despite the bluff and bluster of Moscow's propaganda machine, Moscow fears any American exploitation of the opportunities presented by these real, inherent weaknesses.

This past summer Khrushchev himself displayed his fears with his crying pains over the Captive Nations Week Resolution. That resolution was originated and authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, a professor in Soviet economics at Georgetown University. Dr. Dobriansky is also the national chairman of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

At the very time Khrushchev was blasting away against the resolution, its author was addressing the National Strategy Seminar held at the National War College here in Washington. The address, titled "The Political, Economic, and Social Vulnerabilities of Communism" depicts the areas of vulnerability in the Russian Communist empire and suggests certain practicable areas of approach for us.

Because of the pertinance of this address to American thinking about the aims and purposes of Khrushchev's visit here, I include the address in the RECORD.

TEXT OF REMARKS BY DR. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY, ON "THE POLITICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL VULNERABILITIES OF COMMUNISM," GIVEN ON JULY 22, 1959, AT THE NATIONAL STRATEGY SEMINAR HELD AT THE NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

General Armstrong, members of the faculty, and friends:

As I stand here, I cannot help but feel that I am going to be the personification of an anticlimax.

After you have heard Congressman JUDD and his brilliant eloquence, after you have heard the informative dissertation here by my friend, Mr. Lyons, and then in view of the fact that I don't have too much time available to me, I hope that I shan't strike that anticlimax too readily.

I do feel in a way as some of the students at Moscow University when they assembled one day and the professor at the university was talking about the interplanetary junketing that was possible in the near future. He said, "We will be able to travel to Mars, to Pluto, to Venus."

After his lecture, he turned to the student body and asked, "Are there any questions?"

At that time a student in the back of the lecture hall raised his hand and he said, "Professor, please tell me, when can we travel to Vienna?"

In this case, with the distance and mileage that I am to cover here, I hope that I will be able to do it in the time available.

One is very vulnerable when treating the many and numerous vulnerabilities that characterize the Communist empire. One could go ahead and enumerate, in a way Mr. Lyons has done, the various points of vulnerability on the sociologic, economic, religious, political, diplomatic, and numerous other spheres of this particular empire.

Another way, however, is to rank these points of vulnerability in some order of importance, seeking the main spots, or the crucial spots of vulnerability in this particular area.

As Mr. Lyons has pointed out, it will be my purpose to emphasize one area of vulnerability over others, not because I am at all attracted particularly to this point, but rather because I think that it is particularly relevant to any cold war activity that we might launch.

We should recognize that the future will not be one of any military foray or conflict with the Soviet Union only but rather will be, just as in past centuries—not to speak of the past decade—in the area of what we have called cold war activity. When looking over this past decade, one might be thinking of an article with the title "From Atomic Monopoly and Air Supremacy to Surrender Research." Rarely in the history of mankind has a country lost so much in so little a time than our own dear United States within this past decade.

This certainly is a source of great comfort to the people in Moscow and the Kremlin, and to their supporters. It can indicate to them that if they can realize their 7-year plan, if they can maintain and expand their military hardware, if they can for propaganda and other shows continue with their explorations into space, they are building up at the same time their instruments for cold war activity. They can expand their empire in this way whether it be in the Middle East, Asia, or elsewhere, and avoid any real global conflict.

For example: If in the event, let's say, of Iraq, because of internal Communist activities, supported to be sure by Moscow, there should be an overturn, ask yourselves what could the West really do? Would you say send SAC in there? Would you employ nuclear weapons? Aren't we neutralized by the special type of cold war activity that Moscow wages?

I would be the first to admit that this is an old technique. It is not the creation of Communists. It is a technique by which Russians were able to build up an empire, over the past, from Ivan the Terrible right down to the Russian Revolution. They have been able to use ambassadors; they used internal conflicts, as in the case of Poland, between classes, long before Marx; and they certainly employ these tactics to the greatest extent today.

If we should decide to engage them in this area, it won't be a matter of fighting on our side of the 50-yard line constantly, let them nibble away at us, and neutralize our armaments and instruments of military warfare; rather, we would have to seize some of their vulnerabilities and do it as cautiously, as skillfully as they have done and are doing in the area of the free world. In that case, we must study many of these vulnerabilities with great care.

One vulnerability, of course, is in the party itself. The party, as it exists today, appears to be completely Leninist in its form, in its rigidity, in its discipline. It continues to show the same strength that it had in the past. And it certainly is a medium for the advancement of the new class that definitely exists in the Soviet Union and the many new classes that are emerging in other areas of the empire.

I don't believe, however, that Mr. Khrushchev is fully entrenched to warrant any prime minister or any other person to say that his is the only voice. Surely he has made great progress in the past year and a half, and certainly since the 20th party congress; but to jump to the conclusion that, therefore, he has assumed a completely Stalinist position in the Soviet Union, I think, is unwise.

Now, looking at this area, what could be the point of vulnerability? To me it seems that this varies with time and circumstances. The Soviet Union was most vulnerable in this area upon the death of Stalin in March 1953. Those years were full of turbulence within many areas of the Soviet Union. The death of Stalin, followed by the liquidation of Beria, than the so-called triumvirate and up to the February 1956 congress, when you had a complete denigration of Stalin first by Mr. Mikoyan and then by Khrushchev; these were opportunities for the West.

They revealed a weakness, a weakness that came from a lapse in the succession process. There was a power conflict on the part of individuals and their supporters within this great party machine.

It contributed more than anything else to the numerical weakening of the Communist Parties in the West. Of course, we like to take credit for it, as for the decline of numbers in Italy and elsewhere at that time; but actually when many in these Western areas saw what was going on, and the contents of Mr. Khrushchev's speech were released, there began immediately a doubt, questions arose, and many actually deviated completely; a repetition pretty much of a situation in August of 1939.

Another point in connection with the party is the matter of the doctrinal revisionism. That surely is another vulnerable point. That, of course, takes into consideration the thing that we call Titoism. And the more you have of this revisionism, the greater the possibility for an undermining of the party position.

These are, to be sure, important points of vulnerability in connection with the party dictatorship. But it depends on time and circumstance.

If Mr. Khrushchev should die tomorrow or a week hence, there will be a problem. To what extent could we seize upon that, especially if we are so ill prepared as we indeed are today? But that is a thing nevertheless to be considered in any launching of a planned cold war activity which seeks a victory over time.

A second area that I would like to touch upon is sociological. Here we have a number of points which I shall consider very quickly. You have heard, of course, of the managerial discontent on the part of individuals who are connected with the various enterprises or trusts within the Soviet Union. They want

greater jurisdiction, more freedom in determining how to make goods, how to process them, and the like.

This is not a new thing. It has characterized the Soviet Union since the very first 5-year plan. And it was one of the factors pressing for the so-called economic decentralization that has taken place in the Soviet Union.

But all the evidence on this matter of economic decentralization affording greater latitude to these managers has shown, actually, that they continue to be almost as restricted as ever.

This, too, is a force. How crucial a force? To that question, I would answer not as crucial as many make it out to be.

Another force in the sociological area lies in the field of education. We have heard a great deal about this, and here is another example of cold-war accomplishment on the part of Moscow. After sputnik, a year or so ago, we ourselves went into a rather excessive self-criticism of our own educational system and processes.

In this case the thinking goes, as they improve their education, more people are brought within that kind of training, which some consider to be superior to ours. In effect this reasoning, as Mr. Lyons time and time showed, really is doing the work of Moscow and is bringing about doubt and confusion in the United States. But the theory goes here that there will be a mellowing process, and through such education individuals, regardless of whether they are scientists, technicians, peasants, and the like, will begin to question, will begin to doubt. And, consequently, pressures will arise which will make the dictatorship in the Soviet Union more responsive to the needs of the people, make it less warlike, and in time that will be the basis for a blending, if you will, of their institutions with ours, and we get into the coming millenium.

The fact here is that, sure, education can be a liberalizing force, but the main point is education for what, and in what? It is certainly not a liberal education that we speak of. When one looks at the education, let's say in Nazi Germany, even in Japan, there was a great deal of education. You wouldn't say that Germany was below what the Soviet Union is at now. And yet that did not prove to be that instrument of evolution that many speak of today.

There is a high degree of naivete here; although one can recognize this as a source of trouble for the Kremlin, it is not crucial.

Let's look at other spheres; for instance, the religious. Well, many people who go to the Soviet Union report that there is a religious revival. But they may have seen the same churches twice. Oftentimes you find that one church seems to be filled to capacity simply because another church had been eliminated.

There is no concrete evidence of any vast religious revival within the Soviet Union. This, too, could be another force to be exploited, to be sure, but hardly a crucial one.

A fourth point would be, of course, with regard to the literati. I think Mr. Lyons handled that very effectively. The Pasternak case and numerous others, not only within Russia but within the non-Russian areas in the Soviet Union are of importance.

We had one, Bahriany, before the House Un-American Activities Committee.[1] He managed to escape from the Soviet Union after having played quite a role through his writings while he was in the Soviet Union pressing for human freedom and also national freedom. He himself is a Ukrainian.

Another area we want to look into is the economic. In this area, just as in the previous areas, a great deal of very questionable thinking is going on in many circles in the United States.

The main pressure here is, of course, for consumer goods. But this, too, is not a new pressure. This pressure has always existed since the centralization that took place from 1928 on.

Mr. Melenkov wrote it out in this decade, and Mr. Khrushchev to some extent is satisfying it. The 7-year plan, as you know, attempts to bring about an 80 percent increase in the industrial output by 1965 in the Soviet Union. But you notice that 0.9 of the new investment is going into the heavy and capital goods area.

In the area of housing, acute shortages exist. Despite the fact that Mr. Khrushchev attempts to increase that by one-third, the likelihood is, in view of the other considerations, that that will not be entirely fulfilled.

The same thing with real income. The plan contemplates an increase of about 40 percent in real income of the people in the Soviet Union. But what many don't recognize is that the realization of this 40 percent is entirely dependent, or to a great extent dependent, upon a concurrent increase of 70 percent in agricultural output.

That leads then into a great deal of problems; there is the matter of peasant resistance. Peasant resistance not along freedom lines as such, but to be able to get a better price for his product and at the same time to continue to have his garden unit and not be submerged in a larger collective such as Mr. Khrushchev contemplates, namely, the state farms.

The point here is that they, the Russian colonial planners, are confronted by many problems, and these problems in toto make up an economic vulnerability. Khrushchev has made a promise. Whether he will be able to realize that promise is a very crucial question that we shall have to follow and look at in the course of these years.

There was a great deal of propaganda at the launching of the sixth 5-year plan. As you know, within a year that had to be scrapped. And the 7-year plan, in a sense, is to take up what the sixth 5-year plan had contemplated.

The fact is that the Soviet Union is confronted—which Mr. Khrushchev himself admitted—by strained investible resources. It certainly will need a great deal of capital and more to be able to fulfill these goals.

In addition, in many areas resources are lacking, or at least the resources are being progressively depleted. There, of course, they might depend, as indeed they are, upon the minerals from China and also from some parts of central Europe.

Whether they can purchase these depends upon heightened productivity. Whether they will be able to achieve that is a question to be looked at.

So this is an important area, a vulnerability especially from a propaganda viewpoint; in whetting the appetite of the people in the Soviet Union for more and more consumer goods.

The next area is the political area. In the remaining time I should like to develop the matter of the non-Russian nations in this empire known as the U.S.S.R. I should like to dwell on the force of nationalism throughout the Soviet empire, and on the relation of Moscow, which is in Russia, not only to Warsaw, Budapest, but also, within the Soviet Union, to Kiev, Minsk, to Tashkent, and numerous other capitals in the non-Russian republics within the Soviet Union.

In doing so, I am not impervious to the contentions of others that there are freedom forces operative within Russia itself. On the contrary, many of the points brought out by Mr. Lyons are quite true. But oftentimes I feel that there is an unnecessary and perhaps a very misleading confusion, when we do not use proper concepts in connection with the Soviet Union. And as a consequence, in having this confusion in any cold war activity we would not know what to feed one area of this empire and what to feed another area.

Let me give you a few illustrations of the confusion that arises even in the utterances of people in the highest places of our Government and in our own politics.

Mr. Acheson, for example—who has said better things, but I just wonder whether he understood what he said—in a recent talk at the Colgate Foreign Policy Conference at Colgate University last July, spoke on "A Critique of Current Foreign Policy." In it you come across this: "The Soviet Union is not only a vast and powerful nation * * *." There is the rest of it, and end of quote.

To him the Soviet Union is a nation. The concept of nation, is it like ours? Is it really one with a spirituality that unites all the various people within our Nation? Well, it would seem so on the basis of this quote.

Mr. Herter, for example, appearing before the House Foreign Affairs Committee this year, in a section of his statement said, "The most immediate is the threat of Communist imperialism. The world's second most powerful nation, the Soviet Union," and he goes on.

Mr. Allen Dulles, another example of the confusion of terms, before the Edison Electric Institute last April likewise speaks of the Soviet Union as though it were a nation, as though you had a Soviet people, as though you had a common basis that would account for the behaviors not only of the Russians but of the Lithuanians, Latvians, Ukrainians, and numerous others within the Soviet Union.

I think this is highly suggestive. This isn't a matter of just flippant semantics, as some of us are prone to say; the fact is that not only do ideas have consequences, but words have consequences as well, in view of the fact that words usually are the eyes of one's ideas.

It seems to me that one, in treating the Soviet Union, must constantly bear in mind that you have a very important non-Russian periphery, running from the Baltic, and consisting, of course, of the three Baltic nations, the Estonian, Latvian, Lithuanian, then coming through Byelorussia, and Ukraine, and from the Ukraine into the very vital area of the Caucasus where you have distinct nations, the Georgians, Armenians, and the Azerbaidzhans.

Then in central Asia, at the moment, you have five republics. Anyone familiar with the history of the Soviet Union knows that Moscow is very anxious to divide this area permanently and actually broke what was Turkistan into five distinct republics.

Also, in the area of the so-called Soviet Far East, even in 1917 there were people, many of them Russian, who developed decentralist tendencies, and actually set up their own republic at that time, which lasted until about 1921–22.

Consequently, the Soviet Union, populationwise, resourcewise, and in many other areas, as I will indicate in a moment, is by no means a nation. The problems that confront the Russian people are not necessarily the same problems that are confronting the other peoples and nations with the Soviet Union.

Let us quickly take up population. The Soviet Union has released statistics of its population this past spring; it places it at 202 million. But the fact is that in considering this population figure, one has to do it in terms of what has taken place in the past, not only within the Soviet Union, not only before 1922–23, but even for that, going back into the history of the whole Russian empire.

These statistics have been played with. The statistical sampling procedure employed

[1] Ivan P. Bahriany, "Control of the Arts in the Communist Empire," consultation, June 3, 1959.

was not of the sort that any Western statistician would accept.

Consequently, the conservative least one could say is that about one-half of the population of the Soviet Union is Russian; the other half is non-Russian. People like Lenin and numerous others, when it was worth their while, pointed out, prior to the Russian revolution, that over one-half or about 57 percent of the population in the Russian Empire was non-Russian.

This, however, takes only the Soviet Empire as a whole, but when one looks into the individual republics, it is significant that in many of these areas, which are national areas, there is a vast majority of non-Russians as against the Russian. Of course, Moscow doesn't release that kind of figures to show what the composition of the non-Russian population is, for example, in Ukraine or in Armenia, as against the Russian.

Another point to impress this perspective upon you is the matter of resources. If you were to look into the resources of the Soviet Union—we make a great deal of that—you will find that although the R.S.F.S.R. appears well endowed with resources, certainly to sustain even agriculturally the Russian people within the R.S.F.S.R.; yet in the Soviet Union the major resources are found in the non-Russian areas. Oil, for example, in the first Baku region is in a Moslem, non-Russian area; also the Fergana Valley, the second Baku, is again in the area of Turkistan.

The same is true for agriculture. The most important single agricultural base is Ukraine. Many minerals and other resources are found in the Caucasus and elsewhere.

In view of all this, one can't help but wonder what would Russia proper be if, at the time of the Russian revolution, the non-Russian revolutions for independence on the part of these many areas which are now within the Soviet Union had permanently succeeded.

There was a Russo-Georgian war that lasted into the year 1920–21. The Georgian people attempted to sustain and maintain their independence. They were even recognized by Moscow, not to speak of many Western powers. In varying degrees that was true of Ukraine. It was true of a number of a other of these non-Russian republics. Without these, Russia itself would be reduced to a second-rate power.

This situation must constantly be kept in mind, this kind of division, this natural kind of nationalism.

I could go on for an hour to indicate to you from the 1920's right down to the present time the persistence, the sustained nature of the resistance, the pressures on the part of many of these non-Russian nations to gain greater autonomy, to gain greater independence, and eventually complete national freedom.

Just a few weeks ago you must have read—and I understand there is great validity to this—of the dispatch of the Red Army, presumably for maneuvers, into the Carpathian area, where there have been, down to the present day, political bases of the Ukrainian underground and even Slovakian units that have opposed the Kremlin and its secret forces.

Operating in this area does not mean that we are opposing the Russian people. On the contrary. I could cite many bits of evidence, especially in this decade, that Russians and non-Russians in slave labor camps and elsewhere are actually collaborating. These Russians, and these non-Russians, which Mr. Lyons and others would regard as extremists, understand respective national aspirations.

In conclusion, we might ask, of what importance is this force of nationalism, operative in the Soviet Union itself, to us if we should launch cold war activity? The ramifications appear immense.

Look at it in terms of the party. There has been a rumor of late—and it is not the first time—that an attempt is being made to bring about the establishment of a Russian Communist Party instead of the present overall Communist Party of the Soviet Union. In that case, if you have that, and you have the Ukrainian Communist Party and others, again a feeling of independence would build up despite the fact that the Communist framework would remain. Some have even suggested the following in the U.N.: You have Byelorussia and Ukraine represented in the U.N. What is there to stop Mr. Lodge or someone else from saying, "You have these two republics. You don't need a Mr. Gromyko or any other representative for the Soviet Union as a whole. We want someone from the R.S.F.S.R. In other words, have a true bona fide Russian representative in the U.N."

Another point, going into the psychological field. Why do we restrict our publication of America just to the Russian language? Why isn't it possible to have America circulate in the Ukrainian language, in the Turkistanian language and numerous others, to indicate that we are not only concerned with the Russian people, seeking to gain their confidence and their loyalties, but that we are also concerned with these of the many non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union.

One need only look and read the constitution of the Soviet Union. It promises separate military units. Can you visualize what would happen if you had a separate Georgian Army, a separate Ukrainian Army, a separate Bylorussian Army?

In the case of Hungary, Moscow realized what would happen if you have a nationally compact unit. But that also suggests to us that the military forces of the Soviet Union are not monolithic.

It is not even nationally integrated. As a matter of fact, about 42 or 43 percent of the forces in the Soviet Union happen to be non-Russian. The policy pursued by Moscow is always to make sure that military personnel coming from a certain republic are not stationed in that republic.

Many Ukrainians will be found right above northern Korea. National forces are dispersed.

In conclusion, I don't know whether we have arrived at Vienna or not. But, as I said, it was a little trying, especially after this heavy barrage of informative and instructive talks that you had this morning. It is really a pleasure to be with you.

Tailoring Banks' Annual Reports for Both Depositors and Stockholders—Part I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1959, I introduced my bill, H.R. 1035, to protect the integrity and independence of national banks. My bill would strengthen the laws relating to ownership of stock in such banks.

In this connection, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following articles which appeared in the publication Banking, April and May, 1959 issues. These articles were written by Henry P. Hill, a partner in the accounting firm of Price Waterhouse & Co.

He is an alumnus of Brown University and of the University of Pennsylvania. He is a certified public accountant in several States and a member of the American Institute of Accountants and the New York State Society of Certified Public Accountants. In the former organization he is a member of the special committee recently appointed to study the question of statistical sampling in auditing. In the New York State Society of CPA's he is a member of the committee on cooperation with bankers. In the past year or two he has addressed the eastern regional convention of the National Association of Bank Auditors and Comptrollers and various local meetings in the same field. He has written articles for several publications and at present is a member of the editorial board of the "What To Read" department of the Journal of Accountancy.

The articles follow:

TAILORING BANK'S ANNUAL REPORTS

(By Henry P. Hill)

Something is wrong with published financial statements of banks. This is a recurring theme in the writing of both accountants and bankers. In late 1957, for example, the accounting profession, through its magazine, was addressed by a bank president on the failure of banks as an industry to adopt uniform accounting principles in their financial reports to the public. In September 1958 a special committee of the Connecticut Bankers Association issued a report entitled "Suggestions for Uniform Financial Reporting by Banks."

This preoccupation with lack of uniformity is not a new thing. In 1952 a committee of the National Federation of Financial Analysts Societies reviewed the annual reports of 28 of the largest banks in the country and reported that "the variations in content of the reports are so broad as to make one wonder how there could be so many varieties of reporting to stockholders."

In the face of this kind of criticism, banks in recent years, particularly the large publicly owned banks, have had considerable improvements in their annual reports. The improvements, however, seem to have been in the direction of more complete disclosure instead of toward more widely accepted accounting principles. From the standpoint of the owners of the banks the average report is still not good.

MOST COMMON CRITICISMS

What precisely are the criticisms usually made of the financial reporting of banks? Perhaps the most fundamental one is that the majority of banks do not clearly identify the amount of net income for the year. Many smaller banks, in fact, do not even include in their published figures a statement of earnings. Large or small, those that do publish such a statement often include entries in the undivided profits account which by their nature should be included in the determination of net income.

Second, banks often do not describe the basis on which assets are stated nor the amount and character of related reserves. In an industrial company, for example, it is considered important that the gross cost of the capital assets be shown and that the amount of depreciation taken so far be deducted from this figure to arrive at the net undepreciated amount carried forward to the next period. It is a rare bank, however, that shows in its financial statements anything except the net amount of the banking house and other capital assets.

Third, banks do not follow acceptable methods of depreciating capital assets to

charge the cost of these assets systematically to the operations of the periods covered by their useful lives. Instead, many banks have written off capital assets with an eye to the year's profits and have varied the writeoffs with the profits. In some cases these write-offs have been charged to the undivided profits account, with the result that both the statement of condition and the statement of earnings are incorrect.

Fourth, bank accounting is characterized by an extreme conservatism. Every opportunity to write down assets is availed of, and, in addition, many reserves are provided that cannot be related to the assets. Unallocated reserves for security and loan losses are cases in point, as are the treatment of capital assets and security premiums and discounts mentioned elsewhere in this article.

Fifth, only in unusual cases is it possible to derive from a bank's annual report an analysis of the movement in the reserves during the period. Many times through these reserves it is possible to provide in good times for losses that may come in less favorable times. The losses, however, never appear in the earnings statement and thus escape the notice of the average reader, and the provisions being made out of undivided profits likewise never appear in the earnings statement.

Sixth, the determination of interest from and profits and losses on sales of investments in securities is unrealistic. Many times the earnings statement shows as interest earned the coupon rate of interest paid by the issuer rather than the interest earned by the bank on its investment. Since the price paid for the type of security generally held by banks is determined by the market rate of interest, and the coupon rate which was fixed when the securities were issued is merely one of the elements in determining this price, there is serious doubt that the resulting figures can have any use whatever to the person attempting to analyze the bank's income.

INTERESTS OF DIFFERENT PARTIES

The general tone of bank accounting seems to result from the history of banking in the United States, which years ago was punctuated with panics and bank failures. Even today in a sound bank the ratio of the bank's investment to depositors' funds is small, and in the more liberal climate of past decades it might have been even smaller. Banks' depositors were poorly protected and bank failures had social as well as economic effects upon a group of people who outnumbered by far the banks' owners.

It was, and is, socially desirable, therefore, that the accounting and reporting practices of banks be designed to inform and protect the depositors of the bank. In this respect, banks differ from industrial organizations, where the primary objective of the reporting is to apprise the owners regarding their financial condition and achievements. This social aspect of bank reporting has produced the kind of thinking characterized earlier as conservative. Actually, as accountants have said many times, what is conservative in one fiscal period will usually turn out to be overly liberal in a succeeding period. An unjustifiably high depreciation rate, for example, will understate income in the earlier years when the capital assets are being depreciated and will overstate the income when those assets become fully depreciated but are still in use. The result is that over a long period, instead of achieving conservatism, banks' statements of income have achieved a high degree of distortion.

It is not desirable, however, that the interest of the investors be overlooked. True, the depositors of the banks still outnumber the owners in number and in amount of investment, and their financial interest in the bank should be clearly stated. On the other hand, the owners of banks, particularly the larger publicly held banks in the metropolitan centers, constitute an important and growing segment of the financial community. As the number of stockholders in these banks gets larger it becomes more and more important that shareholders' earnings and shareholders' equity be fairly reported. For example, there are reported to be at least 14 banks in the United States with more than 10,000 shareholders each.

THE ACCOUNTANT'S VIEW

Accountants, particularly professional accountants who may deal more with commercial and industrial organizations than with banks, are apt to overlook the fact that there are these two groups with an interest in the financial condition of a bank and that the interests of these two groups are not the same. Thus, professional accountants may attempt to apply commercial and industrial rules to bank accounting. Bankers, on the other hand, having been schooled in the requirements and conservative thinking of the regulatory authorities, conditioned by years of experience with the present form of bank reporting, and desirous of eliminating differences between book and tax income because of the special rules of the Internal Revenue Code, are inclined to reject the views of the professional accountants as being primarily designed for someone else. They disregard the fact that the principles of income determination advocated by the accountants have been found quite useful in the financial statements of the banks' own borrowers.

A PROPOSED SOLUTION

Actually, it should be possible to devise financial statements that will be useful and informative both to the depositors and their watchdogs and to the shareholders. Such financial statements should clearly indicate the assets available for the protection of the depositors and should state these assets at current realizable values. "Current realizable values," in this sense, means that market values of all assets having a ready market should be disclosed. While it has a liquidating connotation, it does not carry any implication that the prices used would be those that would be found to exist under panic conditions.

The same financial statements should disclose the shareholders' equity and earnings on a long-term continuing basis. Assets that have been adjusted to market values for the purposes of reporting the amount of equity protecting the depositors should be adjusted to cost for stockholders' purposes if the nature of these assets is such that they will probably be held until maturity and will be worth face value at that time. From the depositors' standpoint it may be desirable to show the market value of the United States Government securities owned, but from the standpoint of the shareholders there is no point in writing down to market a security that may be selling below par at the moment because it carries a low coupon rate. Such a write-down simply transfers income from one accounting period to another.

TAILORING BANKS' ANNUAL REPORTS FOR BOTH DEPOSITORS AND STOCKHOLDERS (II)

(By Henry P. Hill)

It should be possible to devise financial statements that will be useful and informative both to the depositors and their watchdogs and to the shareholders. Such financial statements should clearly indicate the assets available for the protection of the depositors and should state these assets at current realizable values. "Current realizable values," in this sense, means that market values of all assets having a ready market should be disclosed. While it has a liquidating connotation, it does not carry any implication that the prices used would be those that would be found to exist under panic conditions.

The same financial statements should disclose the shareholders' equity and earnings on a long-term continuing basis. Assets that have been adjusted to market values for the purposes of reporting the amount of equity protecting the depositors should be adjusted to cost for stockholders' purposes if the nature of these assets is such that they will probably be held until maturity and will be worth face value at that time. From the depositors' standpoint it may be desirable to show the market value of the U.S. Government securities owned, but from the standpoint of the shareholders there is no point in writing down to market a security that may be selling below par at the moment because it carries a low coupon rate. Such a write-down simply transfers income from one accounting period to another.

STATEMENT OF CONDITION

Exhibit I shows a statement of condition designed to achieve both purposes at the same time. In this statement I have made an attempt to meet the requirements of the two interested groups by segregating the net assets into those primarily available for depositors' claims and those of a capital nature. Another way to think of this separation is to consider as banking assets those assets that will eventually become converted into cash through the banking process and to think of the assets and liabilities that will be consumed, amortized, or otherwise availed of through the income account as equity assets.

Following this concept, the first figure in Exhibit I to be noted is the one described as "excess of banking assets over liabilities to depositors and others." A perusal of this model financial statement will show that this caption shows the amount of the net equity, both realized and unrealized, that is available for the protection of the depositors over and above the face amount of their claims.

For this purpose, Government and municipal securities have been stated at market value regardless of whether this is above or below cost. Cost would be interpreted as amortized cost, both premiums and discounts at acquisition being amortized and, as will be described later, in the case of rollovers or wash sales might be cost of prior issues held. The significance of this concept will be developed later.

Loans and discounts would be stated net of the loan loss reserves allocated to specific loans. In the case of instalment loans it would be acceptable to provide a lump sum reserve to avoid the necessity of providing specific reserves for a large number of loans of small face value. Commercial loans, however, would be evaluated individually and specific reserves set up for those loans that the management thought would be doubtful of collections. The other banking assets would be stated pretty much as they have been in the past, as would the current liabilities.

SHAREHOLDERS' NET ASSETS

The next significant figure in the model statement of financial condition is the total equity of shareholders. This, it will be observed, is arrived at by adding to the assets available for depositors' protection the net undepreciated capital assets, deferred charges and credits to income, and unallocated reserves except those that are really surplus reserves. It is true that in a forced liquidation of a bank the capital assets would produce some funds that could be used to satisfy the depositors' claims. This would not happen, however, as long as the bank was a going concern. On a going concern basis the undepreciated value of capital assets in a statement of financial position is a residual amount showing the portion of the cost that remains to be applied against future earnings.

The same can be said of prepaid expenses. As to other deferred items, it will be noted that two kinds of balances have been shown. The first, unearned discount, follows the concept which has been applied by many banks for a long time. This account is simply the unearned portion of the face amount of loans made where the interest is deducted at the time the loans are made.

GAINS, LOSSES ON SECURITIES

"Unrealized gains and losses on securities" is a more interesting account for the purposes of the present discussion. This account reflects the difference between the market value of the securities carried in banking assets and the amortized cost of these same securities. If the aggregate market value of the securities is in excess of their amortized cost, this account would have a credit balance which would be taken into income in subsequent periods when the portfolio was liquidated. Conversely, if it were necessary to write the securities down in order to state them at their market value, this account would show a debit balance since from the stockholders' standpoint the loss attributable to this decline in market value would never be realized if the securities were held to maturity.

The unallocated reserve accounts would include reserves which the management felt were necessary for precautionary measures but which could not be applied to specific assets carried in the statement of financial condition. A bank with a high-grade loan portfolio, which by the Treasury tax formula could record a loan loss reserve in excess of presently anticipated losses, would carry the excess in this account. Precautionary reserves for losses on securities would be similarly treated. Because these reserves are classified as unallocated does not mean that they are set up at the whim of the management. There are times when the management should provide reserves for possible occurrences that at the moment of provision cannot be applied against a specific asset. What is important is that these reserves represent costs that should be applied against current year's earnings. On the other hand, general purpose contingency reserves set up to equalize profits between years do not qualify and should be provided by an allocation of undivided profits or surplus as described later on.

SHAREHOLDERS' EQUITY

The total equity of shareholders arrived at by this computation would ordinarily be the aggregate of the capital stock, surplus, undivided profits accounts, and general purpose contingency reserves, if any, and these balances would be stated at the foot of the statement of financial condition. General purpose contingency reserves would be considered an allocation of undivided profits, and all entries would, therefore, be made to and from undivided profits. In other words, it would not be permissible to use this reserve to absorb losses that should be reflected in the statement of earnings. For this reason amounts provided in such reserves would not serve to reduce earnings. Reserves required for specific purposes which should be provided out of current income would appear in the capital assets and liabilities section of the statement of condition.

In summary, we have provided for a three-way split in reserves: (1) those that reduce the carrying value of a banking asset and are provided out of banking income, (2) those that do not apply to a specific asset and are therefore the concern of the stockholders but which nevertheless reflect by their provision a real diminution in income of the period, and (3) those that are purely precautionary and for this reason are really only a segregation of the bank's capital.

STATEMENT OF INCOME

The model statement of income, exhibit II, attempts to follow a similar pattern and segregate the amounts applicable to banking operations from the results of other transactions. It will be noticed that approximately two-thirds of the way down the attached exhibit a subtotal is arrived at entitled "Net income from banking operations." Of the captions entering into the computation of this figure, a few deserve comment.

BANKING OPERATIONS

Interest income from security investments is stated net of amortization of both discounts and premiums. Tax considerations aside, it is doubtful that any investor in Government and municipal interest-bearing obligations considers either discount or premium as anything save an adjustment to bring the coupon rate to the market interest rate. It seems proper, therefore, in the financial reporting to state the interest income from securities on the basis of the interest earned on the actual money invested in the securities.

Federal and State income taxes applicable to operating expenses have been included in operating expenses, since they are both inescapable and permanently with us. This is a matter of personal preference, however, and those banks interested in showing the before-and-after tax figures could do so without disturbing the basis on which these statements have been composed.

OTHER INCOME

As for other profits and losses, it will be noted that those comprise a number of items often included in the undivided profits account. From the standpoint of the owners of the bank, however, it seems clear that they are a part of the determination of the net profit for the year, which is the reason they have been so treated in this statement. This, it may be noted in passing, is what the Federal Reserve Board does in its statistics on member bank earnings. (See, for example, "Member Bank Earnings, First Half of 1958"; Federal Reserve Bulletin, November 1958, page 1275; especially the footnotes on page 1275.)

SECURITY TRADING PROFITS

A few comments on some of the captions in exhibit II would be in order. "Net profit on sale of securities" would usually be a much smaller amount than heretofore. This is true for two reasons. First, amortization of discounts would qualify as interest income some of the amounts formerly considered as profits on sales; second, the treatment of profits on sales advocated by the writer would substantially reduce the trading profits now ascribed to investment securities.

If a bank sells some of its U.S. Governments and reinvests in other U.S. Governments for the purpose of changing the average maturity of its portfolio or improving its yield, no profit has really been achieved. What has it accomplished except to exchange pieces of paper? As long as the funds remain invested in U.S. Governments the transactions should be treated as an exchange rather than as a completed sale. This is true, even though the two transactions did not take place simultaneously. Unless a portion of the portfolio had been liquidated, it seems to me that no profits or losses should be recorded. The only profits or losses that should be recognized are those realized when the total investment in U.S. Governments declined for more than an short interim period. Similar treatment would be afforded investments in municipal securities.

There are some who even advocate considering the investment in U.S. Governments, municipal securities, and loans all as the investment of depositors' funds and would advocate carrying forward all profits or losses realized where the aggregate amount invested in these assets did not materially change. From the standpoint of theory they have a stronger position and are probably right. The mechanical problems of computing and amortizing the amount to be carried forward are substantial, however, and for practical reasons only, it is my opinion that this treatment should be applied to the U.S. Governments, municipal, and loan portfolios as if they were three separate portfolios. Whichever way the final decision is made, it need not affect the considerations of the attached financial statements, since it will not change the problems of statement presentation.

PROVISIONS FOR GENERAL RESERVES

One other account, the "additional loan loss reserve provided," deserves comment. This caption would show the amount of loan loss reserve provided in the current year that did not represent actual losses on specific loans. In other words, the amount added to "estimated losses on collection" in the banking assets section of the statement of financial condition would be an operating expense. On the other hand, any amounts added to "unallocated reserves for losses on loans" in the statement of financial condition would be provided by a charge at this caption.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, banks should follow generally accepted principles of accounting, and the attached form of financial statements shows how they can. Adoption of this style of financial reporting would make available several specific advantages, since (1) by this method banks can prepare financial statements for their owners showing on a realistic basis the actual net income for the period and the financial position on a going concern basis, (2) the accounting for income from investments in securities can be shown in a manner that truly reflects the economic considerations, and (3) the conservatism necessary to the protection of depositors because of the banks' quasi-public position can be observed. It is hoped that by these methods of financial reporting publicly owned banks' annual reports can be made more useful to the management, the depositors, the public, and the shareholders. These proposals are, perhaps, too far reaching for the individual bank to act upon unilaterally, but the state of flux that present bank reporting finds itself in and the repeated recognition of the problems in the literature indicate that the time may have arrived for the industry, through its organizations and the regulatory authorities, to arrive at a program for improvement of banks' financial reports to their owners.

EXHIBIT I

Statement of financial condition at Dec. 31

	1958	1957
Banking assets:		
Cash and due from banks	XX	XX
Marketable securities, at market value:		
U.S. Government direct or guaranteed obligations	XX	XX
State and municipal	XX	XX
Other bonds, notes, and debentures	XX	XX
Corporate stocks, including stock of Federal Reserve bank	XX	XX
Loans and discounts, less estimated losses on collection	XX	XX
Mortgages	XX	XX
Real estate held temporarily	XX	XX
Other banking assets	XX	XX
Customers' liability for letters of credit and acceptances issued by us	XX	XX
Total	XXX	XXX

EXHIBIT I

Statement of financial condition at Dec. 31—Continued

	1958	1957
Liabilities to depositors and others:		
Demand deposits	XX	XX
Time deposits	XX	XX
Bills payable	XX	XX
Accrued taxes	XX	XX
Accounts payable and other current liabilities	XX	XX
Our liability under outstanding letters of credit and acceptances	XX	XX
Total	XXX	XXX
Excess of banking assets over liabilities to depositors and others	XX	XX
Capital assets and liabilities:		
Banking premises and equipment at cost:		
Land XX		
Buildings XX		
Accumulated depreciation (XX)		
Furniture and equipment XX		
Accumulated depreciation (XX)		
Total	XX	XX
Investments in affiliated and subsidiary companies	XX	XX
Amounts deferred to income of future periods:		
Unearned discount	(XX)	(XX)
Unrealized (gains) and losses on securities	XX	XX
Prepaid expenses	XX	XX
Unallocated reserves:		
For losses on loans	(XX)	(XX)
For losses on securities	(XX)	(XX)
Total equity of shareholders	XXX	XXX
Capital:		
Capital stock	XX	XX
Surplus	XX	XX
Undivided profits	XX	XX
Reserve for contingencies	XX	XX
Total equity of shareholders, as above	XXX	XXX

EXHIBIT II

Statement of income for the year ended Dec. 31

	1958	1957
Interest income from loans	XX	XX
Interest income from security investments, including pro rata portion of discounts and premiums at acquisition	XX	XX
Income from fees, commissions, and other banking operations	XX	XX
Gross income from banking operations	XXX	XXX
Operating expenses:		
Salaries and wages	XX	XX
Pension and profit sharing benefits	XX	XX
Interest paid on time deposits and money borrowed	XX	XX
Depreciation	XX	XX
Losses on loans and securities	XX	XX
Taxes other than income taxes	XX	XX
Other expenses	XX	XX
Federal and State income taxes related to earnings from banking operations	XX	XX
Total	XXX	XXX
Net earnings from banking operations	XX	XX
Other profits and losses:		
Profits and losses on sale of securities, net	XX	XX
Additional loan loss reserve provided	XX	XX
Federal and State income taxes applicable to other profits and losses	(XX)	(XX)
Net profit for the year	XX	XX
UNDIVIDED PROFITS ACCOUNT		
Balance, Jan. 1	XX	XX
Net profit for the year	XX	XX
Dividends paid	(XX)	(XX)
Transferred to surplus	(XX)	(XX)
Balance, Dec. 31	XX	XX

Farming the Escape Valve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, so many people who are not farming or in related employment very freely advocate a free economy for agriculture as the answer to the farm problem, when, in fact, there would be little or no farm problem if there were a free market economy outside of agriculture. An editorial in the Des Moines Register of Tuesday, September 8, 1959, comments upon some papers by two economists and contributes to the analysis of alternatives to removing all controls and supports from the agricultural economy. I hope my colleagues will study and consider the editorial, which is as follows:

FARMING THE ESCAPE VALVE

Two economists of the U.S. Department of Agriculture have expressed doubts that doing away with Government farm income support programs and letting farmers go it alone would solve the farm problem.

At the recent annual meeting of the American Farm Economic Association at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., William E. Hendrix and John M. Brewster, both of the Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, presented papers concluding that a Government "let alone" policy would not cure the farm problem—but only made it worse.

They believe that if farmers are to have parity income, people will have to leave agriculture for other industries faster than they now are. Advancing technology in farming, combined with a very slow growth in demand for food, calls for a heavy movement of labor out of farming.

This would put farm income in better balance with nonfarm income—both because there would be fewer people to divide up the farm income, and because it would hold increases in farm output more nearly in line with food demand.

The theory of a free market system is that when an industry is over-producing and incomes are low, people will flee the industry and enter others until a balance is reached. Moreover, employers will actively seek the lower-cost labor available in surplus areas.

But Hendrix and Brewster point out that opportunities in nonfarm industry are not opening up fast enough to absorb the surplus of farm labor. They attribute this to a lack of free competition in nonfarm industry. "Near monopoly conditions in labor markets," says Brewster, and lack of free price competition in nonfarm industry prevent free movement of farm people into nonfarm occupations.

That is, labor unions tend to prevent free entry into some industries. And business firms do not always compete vigorously by lowering prices and expanding output, preferring to "live and let live."

Farm leaders sometimes have argued that if farm people were given employment information and guidance, plus financial help in moving to the city, full adjustment in agriculture would take place. But Hendrix and Brewster believe such a policy would not help much. It would only mean a transfer of underemployment from farm to city, so long as opportunities are limited to the cities.

In short, if we really had a free market economy outside of agriculture, there would be no farm problem. It isn't the rapid technological advance of agriculture relative to market growth which causes the farm problem, says Hendrix. It is the "unique" free market system under which agriculture operates.

If this analysis is correct, obviously removing the relatively minor Government controls over farm markets would make the farm problem all the worse.

Hendrix says there are three theoretical solutions:

1. A program of "positive laissez faire" (that is, rigorous antitrust enforcement for both business and labor unions to make markets really free).

2. Monetary and fiscal policies to achieve and maintain rapid economic growth despite imperfect price and wage competition. This implies an inflationary boom which would increase demand for labor.

3. "Comprehensive supply controls" in commercial agriculture plus direct subsidies to underemployed farm people.

None of these three theoretical solutions is likely to be adopted in full measure or even in large part. Each of them runs in conflict with deeply held beliefs and strong pressure groups. Consequently, the "administered," less competitive sectors of the economy in industry and labor are likely to continue to use competitive agriculture as "the escape valve" (Brewster's phrase) for the bulk of the Nation's underemployment.

Comparing Educational Standards of the United States and the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article pertaining to testimony given by Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover before the House Appropriations Committee, which appeared in the Washington Daily News on September 12, and which describes in great detail Admiral Rickover's personal comparison between the educational standards of the United States and the Soviet Union.

I think that every American should soberly reflect on this very penetrating analysis of Admiral Rickover, the father of the American atomic-powered submarine. I believe, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, that this interview should open the eyes of all Americans on how woefully lacking we are in adequate educational standards to meet the great scientific threat from the Soviet Union.

Admiral Rickover has indeed made a telling contribution toward bringing this very important subject in the public form. I urge all my colleagues to give serious thought to this entire subject because I have infinite faith and confidence in the views and penetrating knowledge of Admiral Rickover.

We cannot afford to ignore this great American's sincere warning. I should like to recall that it was only because of Admiral Rickover's stubborn insistence that the United States proceeded to de-

velop an atomic submarine that we can today boast of a nuclear underwater fleet which gives us a formidable advantage over our enemies. I hope that we Americans will heed Admiral Rickover's latest observations with the same degree of concrete action that we supported his program for development of the atomic-powered submarine.

Mr. Speaker, Admiral Rickover's remarks follow:

THE REAL RACE WE ARE IN IS TO SEE WHOSE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM BETTER PREPARES FOR THE WORLD OF MODERN SCIENCE

(By Milton Berliner)

Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover told the House Appropriations Committee, at a closed meeting, that compared to Russia "our children are being shortchanged" in education.

Admiral Rickover, in his recent visit to Russia, made a special investigation of the educational system there—as well as in the Iron Curtain country of Poland.

His report to the House Appropriations Committee, available today, warned that "the real race we are in with communism is to see whose educational system best prepares youth for the world of modern science and technology."

He warned also that "by 1961, the Russians will have 2 million scientists and engineers, and we will have only 1.6 million."

"Ours is not merely a deficiency in quantity; it is deficiency in quality as well," the Admiral said.

"We do not have sufficient numbers of scientific and technical people who are good enough in their particular fields and who have a broad liberal education.

"Without a broad liberal education such people remain narrow specialists, and they are not as useful to our Nation as they could be."

He returned from his trip, he testified, feeling that "the Russian educational system has been designed more efficiently to serve their national and ideological objectives than our school system serves the objectives of our democratic capitalism."

CHILDREN ARE 2 YEARS AHEAD

Admiral Rickover told the committee that:

"Russian children are at least 2 years ahead of the American high school graduates in sound, basic education." (Mathematics, the sciences, mastery of mother tongue, knowledge of their own classical literature, and of major foreign nations, foreign languages, history.)

"Russia, through her 10-year schools, produces a much larger talent pool than we obtain through our public school system.

"Fewer talented Russian youths are apt to waste their potentialities in vocational courses when they could become scientists, engineers, writers, historians, or teachers.

"In the United States, a child may squander his best learning years on easy know-how courses which require no homework but which earn him the same credit toward a high school diploma as academic projects.

"Too many people here think of a liberal education as a luxury, something of no immediate usefulness," the Admiral said. "It is true that, except for the basic elementary skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic, which everyone needs today, a liberal education does not in itself prepare one to earn a living.

"For this one needs in addition some specialized skill—this can be manual or intellectual, that is, vocational or professional. This specialized skill should properly come after one has completed his general education and through it has discovered his particular talents.

"To allow a child to choose typewriting instead of physics, machine shop instead of history or a foreign language, is to let a minor make a decision which will affect the whole course of his future life; a decision he is too young to make intelligently.

"In other modern democracies, vocational subjects are to some slight extent taught in schools attended by children who are not academically talented, but they are never considered a substitute for general education. Here we stop teaching basic subjects to slow learners too soon; we shift them too early from education into training."

"NOT ONLY RUSSIA"

In genuine education, U.S. schools not only are behind Russia's but those of northern and western Europe, Admiral Rickover told the committee.

He said it was not true, as many believe, that the percentage of Russian children completing the 10-year school was a small one.

The numbers are about the same as those graduating from U.S. high schools, he said.

But, he stressed: "Our high school diploma tells us nothing about the scholastic achievement of its possessor."

A Russian 10-year school graduate must pass a "maturity" examination, verifying the amount of knowledge acquired.

The Russian student, Admiral Rickover testified, has no choice of subjects to be examined upon but must pass in seven academic subjects—Russian language and literature, a foreign language, algebra, geometry, physics, chemistry, and history.

"The Russian examination therefore covers a much broader field than our college board achievement tests," he said.

"I hope that American parents and teachers will look at these exams and realize that our children are being shortchanged," Admiral Rickover said.

"I hope they become angry enough to force their school boards to improve the curriculum, to improve the teaching, and to stop wasting the time of our children with fun subjects and other matters unrelated to education."

He submitted to the committee copies of these Russian examinations, commenting that "I hope this set definitely shows them [parents and school boards] that our schools are not the best in the world."

OVERDOING SCIENCE?

Admiral Rickover disabused Representative BEN F. JENSEN, Republican, of Iowa, of "a fallacy which has been spread in this country."

Representative JENSEN had asked the witness if he thought Russia was overdoing the emphasis on science to the extent that "they are not teaching the things which are basic to the strength of a nation economically."

Admiral Rickover: "If we were all alone in this world and could work our own destiny without being bothered by anyone, we could do many other things. But suppose you are the most cultured, the most educated and religious person in the world and you have the greatest degree of freedom, and suppose there is somebody opposing you who is not as fine a person as you, but who is 2 feet taller than you are and who is much stronger than you are and gets into a fist fight with you, who is going to win—regardless of all your good qualities, regardless of your great faith and charity and everything else? This is the situation we are faced with."

Representative JENSEN: "The forces of the Devil never have been and never will be the victors over the Soldiers of the Cross so long as God is in his Heaven. I have one more question. We are told that a great number of the Russian children do not even have an opportunity to go to school. Do you believe that to be true?"

Admiral Rickover: "No, sir. That is not so."

Representative JENSEN: "How about in Siberia?"

Admiral Rickover: "The majority of Russian children do not have an opportunity to go on to university, but every Russian child not only has an opportunity to go to school, in fact, he must go. Look, as I have said, we have seven States in this country that require compulsory education for only 8 years, 33 for 9 years, 7 for 10, 2 for 11, and 1 for 12 years. There is a 7-year compulsory education all through Russia now, and by 1961 it will be 10 years. It is a fallacy to believe that all Russian children do not go to school."

Representative JENSEN: "I speak at many high schools, to groups of high school students, and I am always agreeably surprised to know how well informed they are in all matters pertaining to the sciences. They amaze me with their knowledge in this field."

Admiral Rickover: "It would be interesting to see if the high school graduates in your district can pass the Russian 10-year examination."

"WHAT KIND OF CHILDREN?"

Representative JOHN J RHODES (Republican of Arizona) observed that perhaps it was a question of what kind of children we want to raise.

"I doubt," he said, "that we want to raise children like the Russians do; anyway I cannot imagine what pills they feed these children to make them so brilliant they can absorb the physical sciences, the social sciences, and still have what we would call a normal childhood. Something must be left out. You are not saying we should change our way of life because of this?"

Admiral Rickover: "No, sir; we should not. We must recognize that formal education is only one part of the training of youth. As I said, there is a distinction between training and education. The function of the home and of the church is to train our youngsters. Children, when they are born, are little savages.

"The training they get in the home and in the church, if it is good, will prevent them from becoming big savages when they are 20 years old; we have plenty of big savages in this country.

"Now the function of formal learning—and it can be done best in school—is to train the intellect. This distinction between training and education is not thoroughly understood.

"When you teach a boy how to operate a lathe you are training him; you are not educating him. Training does not develop his mind. Education is a process by which the mind is developed. In education the Russians are doing better than we.

"There is no purpose in bringing up the difference in ideology between communism and democracy; it is not relevant in defining education.

"You have the same system of education in Western Europe as in Russia. You have it among the totalitarian States and you have it among the democratic States. It can produce a Hitler or it can produce a Thomas Mann."

HERE'S THE DIFFERENCE

Admiral Rickover pointed out that Soviet children are compelled by law to complete at least 7 years of schooling.

"They have 7 years in rural areas; 10 years in the cities," he said. "But let me tell you what this all means—the difference between 10 and 7 years—because the boys and girls who graduate from the Russian 7-year schools know as much as many of ours who graduate from high school."

"I have my doubts about that," said Representative ALBERT THOMAS, Democrat, Texas.

Admiral Rickover: "Here is a strange thing about having doubts: everybody wants to

hear the good things. Now, the good things can take care of themselves, but you have many competent observers who come back and make reports.

"If Russia succeeds in making 10 years compulsory for all her children, she will be well ahead of us. Graduates of the Russian 7-year schools have had in classroom hours the equivalent of 14 Carnegie units in Russian language, grammar, and literature, 7½ in mathematics, 1½ in history, 1½ in geography, 1½ in biology, 1½ in physics and chemistry combined, 2 in a foreign language, or a total of 29½ Carnegie units in solid subjects, besides drawing, singing, physical education, technical drawing, and some practical work in shop or agriculture.

"All of them have done a great deal more homework than is customary in our schools. We have today 7 States in the United States that have compulsory 8-year school, 33 that have 9, 7 that have 10, 2 that have 11, and 1 that has 12 years.

"But that is not the whole story, because it isn't only the number of years the children go to school, but also how much time they put in. For example, when you compare the years spent at school by a Danish child, you must consider that he goes to school 280 days while ours go 180 days—this means that 9 years' schooling in Denmark is equivalent in class-hours to 14 years here.

"I believe that you would find that children with minimum ability to absorb academic subjects abroad who go to school perhaps only until age 14 or 15, have learned at least as much as similar children who graduate from high school here.

"These are unpleasant facts but according to the best information we have they are true. If they did not greatly worry me, I should certainly not devote almost all my leisure time to education. I am here because of this. I have to take off time from my real work to be here. I do not have a minute's time."

Representative THOMAS: "It is not hurting you to come over here. If you are making a sacrifice——"

Admiral Rickover: "I am not making a sacrifice. I am doing it because it is my duty to do it."

Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, Missouri: "Do you think we are educationally equipping our children for the space age?"

Admiral Rickover: "No, sir; I do not. That is the gist of what I have been trying to say. I think that many American parents consider teenhood as chiefly a time for the children to have a lot of fun; abroad it is considered a period of preparation for adulthood. I firmly believe that many of our children, left to themselves, would do much better at school if their parents by their own lazy habits did not set them a bad example; if the parents were not so solicitous about the children having a good time, giving them cars, fancy clothing, and so on."

ON TEACHER TRAINING

As for teacher training, Admiral Rickover testified that the Russian secondary school teacher "has the equivalent in education of about what a lawyer has in this country."

Representative G. P. LIPSCOMB, Republican, California: "Admiral Rickover, why do you not tell us something about the other side of the coin, such as what happens to students when they do not cut the mustard, and about the state taking over children at the age of 4 or 5? What is your opinion of that?"

Admiral Rickover: "You must not misunderstand what I am trying to say, sir. I am not advocating that we copy the Russian political-social system. I am only addressing myself to one respect, to education—to the training of the intellect—and it is my contention that in the training of the intellect the Russians are doing a better job than we.

"It is unfortunate that every time one mentions the accomplishments of some foreign country people think that he is advocating that we adopt their government and their way of life. I have frequently been accused of recommending adoption of the Russian system because I say some good things about it. I believe there is a saying—'Know thy enemy.' It is also a truism in military matters that intelligence is most important. You must find out what your opponent is doing; and the same is true in science, and it is true in education.

"There is nothing wrong in finding out what the Russians or anyone else does. We must not get to the point that we say the Russians do nothing well. You know, until about 4 or 5 years ago, our own Navy people were saying that the Russians couldn't be good seamen. Now we are worried about the large number of submarines they have and what they might do to us.

"We mustn't delude ourselves. If we fail to admit, when it is true, that other countries are doing something better, we harm ourselves. In fact, if they do something better than we do, we shouldn't be ashamed to adopt it.

"As it is, the Russians do not, in my opinion, have a greater secret weapon—one which undermines our ability to win the cold war more effectively—than our own progressive educational system; and they didn't have to do a thing to get it. We set it up ourselves, with the best intentions in the world. If I were the Russian Government, I would do all I could to keep us from changing our present system of education.

"They select about the top 30 percent of their secondary school graduates to go to the university. The rest of them either go to technical schools, are drafted into the army, or become workers."

Representative THOMAS. "They go to the technical schools?"

Admiral RICKOVER. "Some of them go to technical schools."

Representative THOMAS. "They do not throw them away, by any means."

Representative J. VAUGHAN GARY, Democrat, Virginia. "To what extent is the accomplishment of these children due to totalitarian discipline?"

Admiral RICKOVER. "It has little to do with totalitarian discipline because there are plenty of children who will take their places if they do not want to study. The Russian system in that respect is no different from the system in Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Switzerland, Holland, Norway, France, Germany, or England. This is a thing that is not understood here. The children simply study harder because they fully realize what education will mean to their future."

Representative GARY. "Are they not under state discipline to make them work harder?"

Admiral RICKOVER. "No, sir. You cannot make people study harder in school by compulsion. Their parents urge them to study, and the children want to study because they know if they are to get ahead in the world they have to become educated. They do not have well-to-do parents taking care of them and giving them automobiles when they are 16 years old."

Representative THOMAS. "Parents do not have automobiles to give them."

WHAT'S TO BE DONE?

Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, Democrat, Texas, wanted to know what the United States could do about the situation.

Admiral Rickover suggested that:

"First, we must recognize that our schools are not the best in the world.

"Then, we must recognize that we are not the only ones who have free education."

The one-track system be eliminated.

Specifications be set up as to what we want our high school graduates to know when they finish.

National standards be set for teachers.

There be Federal aid to teachers.

Scholarship aid be given to talented poor children.

Federal equalization funds be used to help the poorer States provide as good an education as the richer States.

"Somehow," Admiral Rickover said, "we must convince our children that their future depends on their really becoming educated."

He believed the American school year could be pushed up to 240 or 250 days a year, against about 180 now.

"It seems to me," he said, "that we must change our attitude as to what constitutes the 'good life' and realize that to become well educated enhances the human personality and makes life more interesting; it also gives one greater versatility in the ability to do things, including earning a living."

Admiral Rickover criticized the U.S. Office of Education for having "fallen down on the job of alerting us as to what goes on in the schools of other countries."

"The whole question of our relative standing compared to the Russians was brought out by the people in the Office of Education," he said.

He recalled how a report on Russian education, written by an Office of Education Russian expert, was edited to the point where it became meaningless.

"There was left out," he said, "the great emphasis placed by the Russians on teacher training. Many paragraphs were reworded, resulting in errors."

Appropriations, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN TABER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I submit herewith two tables for printing showing the process of the appropriation bills, and both the legitimate and illegitimate variety.

The total amount made available under all appropriations coming through the Appropriations Committee into the Congress was $72,977,598,352. The illegitimate back-door appropriations totaled $5,701 million. This amount was $231 million above the budget.

The details of these things are shown on table II. Table I shows the first group.

This means that the Congress has made available to the Executive better than $80 billion which is more by far than our tax receipts can possibly come to.

The tables follow:

TABLE I.—*Comparison of budget estimates and appropriations, 86th Cong., 1st sess.*

[NOTE.—Excludes permanent appropriations]

Bill	House				Senate						
	Budget estimates considered by House	Amount reported by committee	Amount passed	House action compared with budget estimates	Budget estimates considered by Senate	Amount reported by committee	Amount passed	Senate action compared with— Budget estimates	Senate action compared with— House action	Final action, amount approved	Increase or decrease, compared to budget estimates
1959 APPROPRIATIONS											
2d supplemental	$2,864,954,526	$2,479,522,494	$2,657,402,994	−$207,551,532	$2,900,799,370	$2,820,040,054	$2,843,902,805	−$56,896,565	+$186,499,811	$2,764,500,380	−$136,298,990
1960 APPROPRIATIONS											
Supplemental	888,931,417	632,568,845	609,843,845	−279,087,572	1,218,090,555	1,076,186,108	1,076,186,108	−141,904,447	+446,342,263	977,345,608	−240,744,947
District of Columbia	(246,698,000)	(237,186,112)	(237,186,112)	(−9,511,888)	(245,990,000)	(241,569,402)	(241,702,402)	(−4,287,598)	(+4,516,290)	(241,289,076)	(−4,700,924)
Loan authorization	(35,400,000)	(33,800,000)	(33,800,000)	(−1,600,000)	(35,400,000)	(34,300,000)	(34,300,000)	(−1,100,000)	(+500,000)	(34,300,000)	(−1,100,000)
Federal payment	34,218,000	27,218,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000	34,218,000	29,218,000	29,351,000	−4,867,000	+2,133,000	27,218,000	−7,000,000
Treasury-Post Office	4,688,327,000	4,628,097,000	4,628,097,000	−60,230,000	4,688,327,000	4,663,158,600	4,664,027,600	−24,299,400	+35,930,600	4,643,363,000	−44,964,000
Interior	491,101,400	472,198,800	472,198,800	−18,902,600	491,101,400	487,211,025	487,211,025	−3,890,375	+15,012,225	481,809,100	−9,292,300
Labor-HEW	3,756,848,581	3,915,084,181	3,915,084,181	+158,235,600	3,756,848,581	4,124,460,581	4,124,460,581	+367,612,000	+209,376,400	4,016,485,981	+259,637,400
Independent offices	6,586,418,000	6,441,069,800	6,459,887,800	−126,530,200	6,586,418,000	6,561,578,600	6,561,578,600	−24,839,400	+101,690,800	6,504,382,200	−82,035,800
Agriculture	4,081,364,863	3,939,165,498	3,939,165,498	−142,199,365	4,081,364,863	3,975,505,148	3,975,774,848	−105,590,015	+36,609,350	3,971,362,673	−110,002,190
Loan authorizations	(388,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(+33,000,000)	(388,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(421,000,000)	(+33,000,000)		(421,000,000)	(+33,000,000)
General government	13,608,500	13,338,500	13,338,500	−270,000	13,608,500	13,568,500	13,568,500	−40,000	+230,000	13,463,500	−145,000
State-justice-judiciary	682,387,600	649,896,700	651,896,700	−30,490,900	682,387,600	650,674,700	650,924,700	−31,462,900	−972,000	648,941,200	−33,446,400
Commerce	732,191,000	674,687,300	675,297,300	−56,893,700	732,191,000	715,328,500	715,328,500	−16,862,500	+40,031,200	712,672,900	−19,518,100
Legislative	105,460,005	100,279,350	100,279,350	−5,180,655	133,648,180	128,797,380	128,797,380	−4,850,800	+28,518,030	128,797,380	−4,850,800
Defense	39,248,200,000	38,848,339,000	38,848,339,000	−399,861,000	39,248,200,000	39,594,339,000	39,594,339,000	+346,139,000	+746,000,000	39,228,239,000	−19,961,000
Public works (vetoed)	*(1,185,406,259)*	*(1,185,406,259)*	*(1,185,906,259)*	*(+500,000)*	*(1,185,406,259)*	*(1,265,565,559)*	*(1,265,565,559)*	*(+80,159,300)*	*(+79,659,300)*	*(1,215,477,808)*	*(+30,071,549)*
Public works [1]	1,185,406,259	1,185,309,093	1,185,309,093	−97,166	1,185,406,259		1,185,309,093	−97,166		[1] 1,185,309,093	−97,166
Atomic energy	2,718,715,000	2,690,529,000	2,660,529,000	−58,186,000	2,718,715,000	2,711,829,000	2,711,829,000	−6,886,000	+51,300,000	2,683,029,000	−35,686,000
Mutual security	[2] 4,436,277,000	3,209,782,000	3,191,782,000	−1,244,495,000	[2] 4,824,484,137	3,691,269,508	3,692,262,137	−1,132,222,000	+500,480,137	3,626,718,137	−1,197,766,000
Titles I, II, and III; (MSA, etc.)	[2] (4,436,277,000)	(3,209,782,000)	(3,191,782,000)	(−1,244,495,000)	[2] (4,436,277,000)	(3,305,131,000)	(3,305,095,000)	(−1,131,182,000)	(+113,313,000)	(3,249,095,000)	(−1,187,182,000)
Titles IV and V; (supplemental and claims)	(——————)	(——————)	(——————)	(——————)	(388,207,137)	(386,138,508)	(387,167,137)	(−1,040,000)	(+387,167,137)	(377,623,137)	(−10,584,000)
Military construction	1,563,200,000	1,285,002,700	1,285,002,700	−278,197,300	1,563,200,000	1,428,178,700	1,428,178,700	−135,021,300	+143,176,000	1,363,961,200	−199,238,800
Total, 1960	71,212,654,625	68,682,565,767	68,663,268,767	−2,549,385,858	71,958,209,075	69,851,303,350	71,039,126,772	−919,082,303	+2,375,858,005	70,213,097,972	−1,745,111,103
Total, all bills	74,077,609,151	71,162,088,261	71,320,671,761	−2,756,937,390	74,859,008,445	72,671,343,404	73,883,029,577	−975,978,868	+2,562,357,816	[3] 72,977,598,352	−1,881,410,093
Total, loan authorizations	(423,400,000)	(454,800,000)	(454,800,000)	(+31,400,000)	(423,400,000)	(455,300,000)	(455,300,000)	(+31,900,000)	(+500,000)	(455,300,000)	(+31,900,000)

[1] Vetoed and overridden Sept. 10, 1959.
[2] Includes $500,000,000 for Development Loan Fund for fiscal year 1961 (not allowed).
[3] In addition, certain permanent appropriation became available automatically under previous law; January budget estimate was $8,593,000,000, but this is subject to upward revision principally due to increased cost of interest on public debt.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations are included in this table.

TABLE II.—*New authority to obligate the Government ("backdoor spending") carried in legislative bills (86th Cong.)—Public debt transactions and contract authorities*

Bill and subject	Executive requests		Senate	House	Final	Final compared with requests	
	Full basis	Basis comparable to final				Full basis	Comparable basis
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
S. 1094 (H.R. 4452): Bretton Woods Agreements Act (public debt) [1]	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000	[1] $4,550,000,000		
H.R. 2256: Direct veterans loans (public debt)			100,000,000	300,000,000	100,000,000	+$100,000,000	+$100,000,000
S. 1 (H.R. 1011): Airport grants (contract authority)	200,000,000	120,000,000	465,000,000	297,000,000	126,000,000	−74,000,000	+6,000,000
S. 57: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority) (vetoed)	(1,650,000,000)	(800,000,000)	(2,675,000,000)	(1,975,000,000)	[2] (1,300,000,000)	(−350,000,000)	(+500,000,000)
S. 2539: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority) (vetoed)	(1,650,000,000)	(550,000,000)	(825,000,000)	(825,000,000)	[3] (825,000,000) [4]	(−825,000,000)	(+275,000,000)
H.R. 8678: Highway Act of 1959							
S. 2654: Housing Act of 1959 (public debt and contract authority)	1,650,000,000	800,000,000	925,000,000	925,000,000	[3] 925,000,000	−725,000,000	+125,000,000
Grand total	6,400,000,000	5,470,000,000	6,040,000,000	6,072,000,000	5,701,000,000	−699,000,000	+231,000,000

[1] $1,375,000,000 for immediate expenditure; $3,175,000,000 in nature of guaranty for World Bank bonds.

[2] In addition, provided for 45,000 public housing units (contract authority) estimated at $874,500,000 and, in addition, carried language permitting an additional number of about 145,000 at an estimated cost of some $2,825,000,000.

[3] In addition, provided for 37,000 public housing units (contract authority) estimated at $719,000,000.

[4] Increased gas tax by 1 cent from Oct. 1, 1959, until July 1961 at which time, for the 3 fiscal years 1962–64, bill actually appropriates to the highway trust fund, from the general fund, certain excise taxes estimated to total approximately $2,500,000,000.

Conferees Changed Landrum-Griffin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the press has claimed in appraising the 1959 labor-management reform bill passed by this Congress that there was relatively little change between the bill reported out by the Senate-House conferees and approved by Congress, and the original Landrum-Griffin bill originally passed in the House.

I should like to call attention of my colleagues to the fact that such an assumption is grossly misleading. It is obvious that those who would make such a statement have studied neither the original bill approved by the House nor the conference report subsequently signed into law by the President.

There were 15 substantive changes made in the Landrum-Griffin bill at the insistence of the conferees and it was these changes which made the conference report acceptable to many Members of this House who originally voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill. I believe Senator KENNEDY deserves a great vote of thanks for insisting on these changes which helped make this legislation acceptable to those who opposed the measure originally approved by the House.

I am indeed happy to associate myself with Senator KENNEDY's determined efforts to get at those who have abused their privileges in the labor-management relations field without destroying the legitimate aims of honest unions.

The analysis follows:

MAJOR CHANGES MADE IN LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM BILL BY CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

The following changes safeguarding the rights of workingmen were made upon the insistence of a majority of the conferees:

1. Subcontracting: The legality of restricting subcontracting in the garment industry in order to keep out sweatshops was established.

2. Consumer appeals: The right to publicize nonunion goods to consumers, without causing a secondary work stoppage, is recognized in the conference agreement. Employees will also be entitled to publicize, without picketing, the fact that a wholesaler or retailer sells goods of a company involved in a labor dispute. All appeals for a consumer boycott would have been barred by House bill.

3. Organizational picketing: The conference report preserves the right to engage in organizational picketing provided that a petition for an election is filed within a reasonable time not to exceed 30 days. Unless the union won the election, the picketing would have to cease. The House bill would have virtually banned organizational picketing.

4. Informational picketing: The right to engage in purely informational picketing without filing a petition for an election is secured provided that the picketing does not halt the pickup or delivery of goods or the providing of services by the employees of other employers.

5. Primary strikes: The conference report recognizes the right to engage in primary strikes and primary picketing, thereby eliminating the danger that the House bill would sometimes invalidate such picketing.

6. Defense to picketing: Although the conference agreement contains a prohibition upon picketing an employer who has a contract with another union, language was added to the House bill which would make it a defense to show that the General Counsel had issued a complaint charging the employer with unlawfully dominating, maintaining, or assisting the other union.

7. Union liability for damage suits: The section imposing liability on labor unions for damages in the case of unlawful organizational picketing was eliminated.

8. Federal-State jurisdiction (no man's land): The conference report permits the States to take jurisdiction over labor cases over which the Board currently refuses to assume jurisdiction. Under the House bill the NLRB could have refused jurisdiction over additional cases. The Board's present jurisdictional standards are broader than they have ever been, thus insuring more unions and employers protection of the act than at any time in the history of the act.

9. Economic strikers: The House bill contained no provision permitting economic strikers to vote in representation elections. The conference provision permits strikers to vote in representation elections within 1 year after the commencement of a strike.

10. Struck work: The conference report preserves existing law on the question of the right of labor to refuse to work on struck goods. The House bill would have limited this right.

11. Prehire contracts in the construction industry: Conference report permits prehire contracts in construction industry accepting Senate provision on this subject. Conference report also permits unions and prime contractors in construction industry to enter into agreements by which contractor refuses to subcontract to nonunion operators.

12. Bonding: Conference report places a $500,000 limitation on amount of bond required to be taken by a union officer; the House bill had no such limitation.

13. Elections: Conference report makes the Secretary of Labor responsible for bringing suits in a Federal court to remedy improper elections. The House bill would have provided that individual members could bring suits in U.S. district courts to overturn improper elections.

14. Membership lists: House bill gave candidates for union office the right to inspect and copy from membership lists in union shops. Conference report restricts this to one inspection 30 days prior to an election without right to copy.

15. Employer reporting: Conference strengthened immeasurably employer reporting section 203 which was meaningless in the House bill.

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

SPEECH
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me. You cannot know how proud this moment makes me. I daresay I have known ISIDORE DOLLINGER intimately, socially, and professionally longer than anybody in this House. My first experience with him was when it was my privilege to employ our distinguished colleague as one of my law clerks, and that goes back a long, long time. That is why I have so proudly watched his progress in the political, as well as the professional life of our community.

It was my pleasure to see him go to the Legislature of the State of New York after he had made his mark at the bar. In our State capital he made an outstanding record as a fine, good, liberal, progressive legislator. Then he joined me here where he has done so well. Here, also, he earned the respect of all who knew him and gained the affection of all those who had the privilege of associating with him. I am sure this next step in his forward progress up the political ladder will afford him the opportunity for greater accomplishments in his career where he may render wider service to the people of his city, his State, and of his country. We will miss him here.

As he goes on to new and greater success, we wish him well.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Wall Street Journal has given deserved recognition to the importance and long-range potential of the national rural development program. This program, now going forward in 30 States and some 200 counties, has as its aim the development of economic resources in disadvantaged rural areas. In short, it is trying to do something for the small farmer on low-production farms.

Early this week the Journal ran a lengthy and extremely interesting article on rural development, by one of its staff correspondents. Among other things, the article reported that specially qualified young agents were at work on the program in all participating States.

According to the Journal:

The program places great emphasis on local initiative. The special agents work directly under the extension services of the State colleges which receive Federal money to cover the extra salaries. A State committee decides what area will receive the rural development services. The agent has the assignment of acting merely as a catalyst from income boosting efforts of the local chamber of commerce and other groups.

Employment of special rural development agents marks a significant new tack for the State extension services. These agencies traditionally hire county agricultural agents to advise commercial-scale farmers on the best time to plant corn, or whatever, according to research findings at the State agricultural college. This top-level clientele takes most of the regular county agent's time, and he ordinarily has little to do with poorer farmers who don't grow much. But subsistence-scale farmers are the rural development agents' special target.

The Wall Street Journal is obviously impressed with the approaches being used in the rural development program. The September 11 issue carried an editorial pointing out that some farmers receive little of the benefits of highly publicized farm programs and need special approaches to deal with their income problems.

I commend this editorial to the attention of my colleagues and, with unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE OTHER HALF

Just the other day our Mr. Large reported on another plan of Uncle Sam's to help the Nation's farmers, and we're happy to learn this one, so far at least, doesn't seem as burdensome for the taxpayers as the rest.

This one is called the rural development program. It operates in 30 States (mostly in the South) and Puerto Rico and it costs all told $2 million a year, which is about the cost, Mr. Large notes, Uncle Sam has to pay just for storing the crop surplus on hand for 36 hours.

Rural development consists not of handing out money or loans or signing up farmers at a goodly price not to plant things. It consists mainly of advice to farmers and communities to try to raise their incomes by promoting better marketing programs and facilities or even plants and small factories to create off-farm jobs.

Now the reason the rural development program is handing out advice instead of money is that his particular program is working among farmers who receive little if any benefit from the giant price-support programs. These farmers either grow the wrong kind of crops—which is the kind Uncle Sam doesn't pay off on—or they grow too little of the supported crops to qualify.

Yet these farmers number more than half the farmers in the Nation. There are 2.7 million of them. They supply only 10 percent of the Nation's farm products. The commercial farmers number around 2 million, and they are the happy recipients of almost all of the tax-supported farm handouts.

Now there must be millions of taxpayers all over who don't realize that the wasteful farm-supported program actually makes prosperous fewer than half the farmers in the Nation, which makes the farm program more than twice as costly per farmer as the taxpayers thought. And what it has cost in total losses since 1954 is $5.8 billion.

It ought to be remembered when the farm bloc Senators and Representatives start their annual mournful chant about the necessity of keeping the farms going that they're talking about fewer than half the Nation's farmers.

And when half the farmers come to realize how their own Federal taxes help permit the other farmers to live higher on the hog, Congress might come to its senses and do something about this annual plowing under of all the taxpayers.

The Late Honorable Thomas H. Burke

SPEECH
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the passing of former Congressman Thomas H. Burke, of Ohio, who served in the 81st Congress, has brought sadness to my heart. I would like to add my voice in praise and gratitude to those of my colleagues who remember Tom when he walked the Halls of Congress and took an active part in the proceedings on this floor.

He came to Congress with the 81st Congress, the beginning of my own congressional career, and early in those days we became close friends, and worked together toward mutual goals. He was a true gentleman, kind, helpful, courteous, gentle but firm, outspoken but wise. A high-type American—the kind this country needs to keep it strong and free. His services during his short stay in Congress, and during his other governmental assignments left their prints on the path of progress. Labor and education were his main interests, and both received benefits as a result of his interest and activity. He was a good man, this man—Thomas H. Burke.

Another friend is gone, but I shall long remember his kindness to me. To his family, which he so dearly loved, I extend heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. Fidel Castro: Military Dictator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 20, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article about Mr. Fidel Castro's Cuba. It is clear that Dictator Castro is determined to exploit the laboring people of the Republic for his personal advantage. We all know that free unions are essential to democracy.

The article is worthy of consideration by my distinguished colleagues and is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

[From Latin American Events]

NEWS AND COMMENTARIES

CUBA

The latest agreements adopted and publicized by the Cuban Confederation of Labor (CTC), the second organization of this nature in ranking, internationally speaking, which in proportion to Cuba's 6 million inhabitants has more than 1,500,000 members among its 1,560 unions and 33 industrial federations, invites reflection and objective analysis of the country's internal problems, as well as its international relations and obligations.

Cuba is a signatory to the international agreements drafted by ILO and duly ratified by the Senate of the Republic, which recognize the right to strike and condemn the use of labor organizations for political or military ends; and such principles are contained in Cuba's Constitution of 1940.

The CTC's agreements precluding the exercise of the right to strike and militarizing the unions, implicitly defies such international agreements and the Constitution of the Republic. It is the most antilabor step ever taken in the history of the Republic.

Let us briefly explain why Castro's communistic regime took those steps. When the CTC took command of union reins in 1944, its outstanding characteristic was its anticommunistic fervor and eliminated Communists from labor organizations. When Castro and his comrades came to power, he gave Communists the whole Direction Bureau and the majority of the key positions. At present, it can be assured that the Com-

munist Party controls the organized labor movement in Cuba.

It became necessary, therefore, to overrule the right to strike and militarize the labor movement, the Communist way, in order to divert attention from two measures which would have great repercussions:

1. Hand the nation's economy over to the Russians by means of a bank loan.

2. Violate the nonintervention doctrine, without using bearded soldiers for invasion, by simply carrying out a boycott movement, already started against the Dominican Republic, by requesting the cooperation of the organized labor in the United States in order to choke said country economically.

How are the Communists in Cuba achieving those ends? Fidel Castro's government, according to the press, has arranged for a $60 million loan with the Dutch Continental Co. under the direction of a Mr. Matelwich (namely, Moscow government) with the collateral guarantee of agricultural surplus and its byproducts, tobacco, and cocoa.

The floating of this loan, which was done without taking into consideration the opinion of the affected parties, will undoubtedly result in a considerable reduction in the salaries of the sugar workers; it will shorten the duration of the next sugar crop, with less wages to be earned by workers, and will cause a vertical downfall in the final molasses price, and eventually affect the basic factors of Cuba's sugar production. If the report is true, this loan places Cuba, economically and as far as its labor relations are concerned, in the hands of the Russians. And we must not forget that the Soviet Union is one of its largest competitors, since technicians predict that Russia's sugar production next year will exceed 6 million tons.

And by forcibly taking over Cuba's organized labor movement, the Communists also gain control of Cuba's representation in international organizations, such as ILO (ORIT), etc. These representations will be used for political ends, in an effort to attack governments refusing to surrender to the requirements of international communism, thus resorting to the boycott. The workers have, like in the Soviet Union, already been officially militarized. Juvenile militia corps, like in Russia, have been organized; groups of pioneers, and children instructed to accuse their parents if they express themselves against the government, as done in Russia, have been formed.

It is regrettable that there are still candid people in the United States who are vainly trying to find Castro's Communist affiliation card to prove that the Cuban minister is unconditionally under orders from Moscow.

CHILE

The liberal deputy, Raul Aldunate Phillips, declared before the Chamber of Deputies, that Cuba's Secretary of Education Armando Hart took advantage of Chilean hospitality during his recent visit to Santiago as a member of the Cuban delegation to the meeting of foreign ministers in Santiago (Chile).

Making reference to the speech made by Hart in a public gathering sponsored by the Communists on the eve of the meeting of American foreign ministers, Aldunate said: "Mr. Hart seemed to be trying to educate our people on how to incite armed forces to rebellion." Aldunate continued: "I protest against that form of taking advantage of the Chilean hospitality. It seems as though Cuba's Minister of Education, who has come to our country on an official visit is endeavoring to lecture the Chilean people on how to destroy our well-reputed armed forces, an attitude which I consider as ignominious." Mr. Hart stated in that Communist gathering that it was ignominious to try and hold free and honest elections in Cuba.

Chile is still talking about the 42 bearded and armed men commanded by Raul Castro, Chief of Cuba's Armed Forces who pretended to invade its national territory. This attempt to violate Chile's national sovereignty produced genuine indignation among the Chilean people, who supported President Alessandri's energetic attitude forbidding the invaders to leave the premises of the airport and returning them to their unfortunate island.

GUATEMALA

As previously informed in one of our newsletters, the communists, under the leadership of Moscow, Montevideo and Mexico City, are trying to overthrow the President of Guatemala, Gen. Idigoras Fuentes and intend to replace him with ex-President Arbenz, who is one of the chief Communist leaders in Latin America.

They have now started with a campaign of sabotage and terrorism, mainly in Guatemala City, tending to provoke popular unrest and a state of alarm and uncertainty, which would reflect on the business activities of the Nation. On August the 27th, nineteen dynamite bombs went off in the Capital city alone; one of these exploded at a distance of 200 yards from the Palace of Congress at the time when the Chamber of Deputies was in session.

As is customary with the Communists, they will try by every possible means to antagonize the students against the constitutional Government and to provoke clashes with the public forces which will result in some victim, preferably among workers or the high class of people.

Finally, they will strive for a split between the Government and the Catholic Church, and once this is accomplished, they will then stage the revolution and will try to attract and induce the elements of right wing and the moderates or center ones, who oftentimes fall in the trap.

If the Army remains loyal to the Democratic Government, the one elected by the people and in an election accepted by all political parties, then President Idigoras will be able to stay in power. However, if he shows signs of weakness and he allows the Communist plan to succeed in breaking up relationship with the Catholic Church, we would certainly be running again into another Communist regime in the largest of the Central American republics. All of this could happen, as has been the case in Cuba, with the complete indifference of the remaining countries of the continent, who have not yet decided to enforce the Caracas Declaration, which should be taken more like a preventive obligation than a punitive act.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress will be published not later than Monday, October 5, 1959. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Report of the Minority Leader on the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in conformity with the unanimous-consent request which I presented to the Senate and to which there was agreement, I submit herewith the "Report of the Minority Leader on the 1st Session of the 86th Congress."

In this report I have sought to be factual, impartial, and unbiased in setting forth the record with particular reference to those items that I conceive to be of greatest importance. Another report, to be printed as a Senate document, will contain a résumé of all major legislation with which this session of Congress has dealt. These reports, I am sure, will be found at once constructive, informative, and useful.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN REVIEW OF THE 1ST SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS

I. STATE OF AFFAIRS WHEN THE 86TH CONGRESS CONVENED

With the hour of adjournment near at hand, we have reached the stage for a frank appraisal of the work of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

For a full understanding of the work of this session, an appraisal must be something more than the cold statistics of laws enacted and laws left dangling until we meet again next January.

Congress does not meet in a vacuum. The conditions in which Congress meets strongly influence the outcome of legislative programs. And what goes on behind the scenes is often of equal or greater importance than what is done on the stage in the full glare of the public spotlight. A vote of 90 to 1 in the Senate on the final passage of a bill, for example, rarely reveals the important issues that were involved as the bill moved through the various stages of the legislative process.

The composition and control of Congress itself is affected by the national elections. The legislative program reflects the recommendations of the President and the judgment of congressional leaders. And the final result is influenced by the state of the Nation and the moods of the people.

In short, a better understanding of the work of this session will be had if we look at some of the conditions and forces which influenced the final results.

Condition of the economy when Congress convened

The work of the Congress was also strongly influenced by the condition of the national economy at the time Congress met.

At election time in 1958 there had been about 4 million unemployed. By January the number had increased to nearly 5 million, owing to the usual slack which follows the heavy temporary employment of the holiday season.

But as the President correctly noted in his state of the Union message, the Nation enjoyed a strong and expanding economy.

"A year ago the Nation was experiencing a decline in employment and in output. Today that recession is fading into history, and this without gigantic, hastily improvised public works projects or untimely tax reductions. A healthy and vigorous recovery has been underway since last May. New homes are being built at the highest rate in several years. Retail sales are at peak levels. Personal income is at an alltime high.

The President forcefully indicated that it was not the proper approach to a sound economy to push the panic button and call for a wide variety of great expenditures and new functions.

On the contrary, he pointed out that we can afford everything we clearly need, but it is wise to avoid waste, to spend prudently, to balance the budget, to deal firmly with the basic causes of inflation which could disrupt the sound growth of our economy, to encourage confidence, and to induce new private activity into the national bloodstream.

The 1958 election and a divided Congress

The sound policies endorsed by the administration are largely responsible for the record employment and personal income achieved during recent months. The administration deserves great credit for having resisted the many proposals to embark on extensive public works programs of dubious value during the 1957–58 recession.

It is unfortunate that the United States during this critical period of world history has been plagued with a divided Government where the executive branch is in the hands of the Republican Party and the Democrat Party has the responsibility for the enactment of the President's recommendations. In spite of these difficulties, a substantial record of accomplishment has been achieved which attests to the patriotism and inherent commonsense of the Congress. Immediately following the election, certain labor groups attempted to take credit for the election of a Democrat Congress and few believed that the 1st session of the 86th Congress would enact constructive labor legislation, which had been opposed by labor bosses who had infiltrated the Democrat Party. It is significant that the conference report on the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 was adopted in the Senate on a vote of 95 to 2, and in the House by a vote of 352 to 52. Thirty-three Republicans Senators supported this measure and 138 Republican Members of the House of Representatives.

Several matters merit some comment in appraising the work of the 1st session of the 86th Congress and providing for a better understanding of the forces and motivations which dictated the actions which were taken.

Both Houses of the Congress have been overwhelming Democrat. In the House of Representatives, prior to the admission of Hawaii as the 50th State, the ratio was 283 Democrats to 153 Republicans. This gave the Democrats 65 percent of the membership with a majority of 130. With the admission of Hawaii as a State, one more Democrat Member was added to the House of Representatives. In the 85th Congress, the Democrat majority was 35. Not since 1937 has there been a smaller Republican membership in the House.

In the Senate, the ratio was 64 Democrats and 34 Republicans prior to the admission of Hawaii. At the present time, the ratio is 65 Democrats and 35 Republicans. Again the Republican membership in the Senate is the smallest since 1941. Under our two-party system, the American people always have the opportunity to assign responsibilities to the party of their choice. It must be remembered that in 1937 there were only 16 Republicans in the U.S. Senate and 89 in the House of Representatives. Yet, within the short space of a decade, there were 51 Republicans in the Senate and 244 in the House of Representatives. The Republican Party had been given a clear mandate by the American people to legislate during the difficult period of readjustment from World War II. The record of the Eisenhower administration since 1952 in recommending economic policies which have led to a rapid recovery from the recession of 1957–58 gives promise that the Republican Party will be given legislative responsibilities again in the near future.

One of the consequences of a national election is the change in the committee structure of the Congress. In the 85th Congress most Senate committees gave the Democrat Party a majority of a single member. However, in the 86th Congress, in most cases, the Democrats enjoy a 2 to 1 ratio over the Republicans. Therefore, it was necessary to get substantial support from the majority party to make the Republican position prevail.

The equation for legislative action is quite simple. It consists of attitudes plus voting

power. The presence of 31 more Democrats than Republicans, giving that party a 65 percent majority in the Senate, places not only great power but also attendant responsibility on the Democrat Party for the welfare of the country.

The heady wine of the election results led other groups which supported the Democrat Party and claimed credit for the victory to take off on flights of exhilaration, casting off economy and moderation as they zoomed their spending proposals into space. These groups were eager, determined organizations who were anything but shy in asserting their causes. They buttressed the so-called liberals who had been elected in the Democrat sweep and who impatiently awaited the opening of Congress so that they could bring the millenium to the American people.

The Americans for Democratic Action issued a program under the fetching title, "A New Deal for the 1960's." Its first line read: "Americans for Democratic Action interprets the November elections above all, as a demand for a New Deal.* * * This should be the overriding objective of the 86th Congress." There followed a list of proposals and recommendations so ambitious, when calculated in terms of expenditures, as would have bankrupted the Nation and given wings to the flights of inflation.

Political union leaders of the AFL–CIO were scarcely less modest in demands upon Congress. Claiming a major share of the credit for the election outcome, they were ready and insistent in clamoring for immediate action on a host of proposals, all of which carried astronomical price tags.

Among the Senators- and Congressmen-elect, a considerable number looked upon the election as a mandate to indulge in generous liberality with other people's money and to cure all of the ills of the Nation, real and fancied, by more Federal laws.

All such influences combined more or less to impress on the Democrat leadership in Congress that this was a new era, this was the space age, this was a time for bold and dynamic action, and that the so-called mandate derived from the people in the November election of 1958 was to be used to send the country spininng to new levels of something or other.

Immediately after the election, the prospective majority leader of the Senate, with his customary modesty and good sense, sought to tone down the exuberance of his followers and to put at rest the Nation's fears that a phalanx of Democrat spenders was poised for the opening gun of the 86th Congress.

Leaving a conference with the President at the White House a few days after the election, the Senator spoke in general of a program of "prudent progressivism" in the bracing air of confidence that the Congress would go forward to meet the challenge of the times. The Democrats would cooperate with the Republican President for the "2 more years" of his term and when they disagreed, they would present "constructive alternatives."

Later, but still in general terms, the majority leader listed "the kind of things I believe must be done." This was simply a topical list of items. How they were to be done, and at what cost to the Nation, was wisely left to the unfolding future.

II. THE PROGRAMS UNFOLD

The majority program

As the session opened, Congress was soon to see what lay behind the bold, dynamic program of the Democrat majority. The bright blueprints of glittering generalities began to take shape in the form of specific bills.

It included, among other things, a Federal aid to airports bill by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and others. Bearing the title S. 1, this was a 5-year program to cost $565 million, a sum quite in line with concepts of the space age.

Then came a housing bill (S. 57), introduced by Senator SPARKMAN, and others, with provisions so broad and generous that it seemed as if a housing program was to take the form of castles in the air. Running well into the billions, the bill embraced urban renewal grants, college housing loans, new public housing units, direct loans to veterans, millions for planning and for training planning and housing technicians.

Indeed, so generous were the loans and grants to be that the bill looked more like a campaign document for 1960 than the work of "prudent progressivism" promised by the majority leader. Only a nursery building program for expectant mothers was missing from the bill, but possibly that was an oversight in the process of covering so many beneficiaries.

Among the other major measures sponsored by Members of the Democrat Party which were never enacted were the following:

Independent Rural Electrification Administration: In 1953, following a recommendation by the Hoover Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration was incorporated into the Department of Agriculture. This action recognized that the REA provided a service mainly to the agricultural community. The action of the Eisenhower administration, pursuant to the Reorganization Act, recognized the responsibility which the executive branch holds in the administration of such a program. The Democrat 86th Congress attempted to alter the normal chain of command and to reestablish the REA as a separate, independent agency within the Department of Agriculture. In effect, this would permit the almost uncontrolled use of $3 billion of public credit without effective Executive or congressional supervision. In President Eisenhower's words, this would result in a "major retreat from sound administrative policies and practice."

The measure introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, passed the Senate 60 to 27 on April 8; passed the House, 254 to 131 on April 15; and was vetoed on April 27. The veto was overridden by the Senate, 64 to 29, on April 28, and the veto was sustained by the House 280, to 146, on April 30. Thus, the President stopped dead in its tracks this deliberate attempt to discredit the Chief Executive and his Secretary of Agriculture by removing an important administrative function of the U.S. Government from proper regulation.

Social security—medical care: Congressman FORAND introduced in the House H.R. 4700, a bill amending the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, whether or not cash benefits have been applied for and are being received. Payments may be made for hospital services furnished an individual for 60 days of hospitalization in a 12-month period or for hospitalization in a nursing home for 120 days in a 12-month period less the period of actual hospitalization. Patients are free to choose the hospital or nursing home to be attended. The provisions of this act are to be administered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare after consultation with a National Advisory Health Council created by the measure. If enacted, the bill would constitute a big step forward in the movement to nationalize medicine.

Similar bills were introduced in the Senate: S. 881 by Senator MORSE, and S. 1056 by Senator MURRAY.

Construction of medical, dental, and public health educational facilities: Senator NEUBERGER introduced S. 2170, a bill to authorize a 10-year program of grants for construction of medical, dental, and public health educational facilities. For the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1959, and for each of the 4 succeeding years it authorized $50 million for grants for the expansion and improvement of existing schools of medicine, dentistry, and public health, and an additional $100 million for a 10-year period beginning July 1, 1959, for grants for the construction of new schools of medicine, dentistry, or public health. No action was taken on this proposal.

International medical research: Senate Joint Resolution 41, sponsored by Senator HILL and 63 other Senators, proposed the establishment in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of a National Advisory Council for International Medical Research and the establishment in the Public Health Service of a National Institute for International Medical Research. The purpose of the bill is to help mobilize the efforts of medical scientists, research workers, technologists, teachers, and members of the health professions generally, in the United States and abroad, for assault upon disease, disability, and the impairments of man, and for the improvement of the health of man through international cooperation in research, research training, and research planning. It authorizes $50 million annually to start the program.

While this measure appeals to the emotions, it must be viewed as one more spending measure added to the numerous international contributions already being made by the United States, such as the World Health Organization and the United Nations International Children's Fund (UNICEF).

The resolution passed the Senate by a vote of 63 to 17. Subsequently, the resolution was referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. There was no provision for this item in the President's budget, and it has not been enacted into law.

Unemployment compensation: The Democrat mandate program also called for the enactment of legislation to encourage permanent maximum unemployment compensation. Senator KENNEDY and 33 cosponsors introduced S. 791, a bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to the State, to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program. In addition to providing a permanent maximum unemployment compensation benefit period of 39 weeks, it would also provide unemployment benefits amounting to 50 percent of employees' weekly wage although it was limited to a maximum of two-thirds of the average weekly wage within a State.

The enactment of this program would have destroyed merit rating, a feature which has been a part of the combined Federal-State unemployment compensation system since its inception. This measure encourages employers to provide uninterrupted employment for their employees and would also have federalized unemployment compensation. In many cases it would have deterred any incentive for individuals to seek private employment even though their skills and efforts were badly needed in the furtherance of our normal free enterprise economy.

Unemployment commission: As the 86th Congress assembled, the prophets of gloom and doom were convinced that the recuperative powers of our free enterprise economy were no longer adequate to assure employment of our growing population. The majority leader proposed the establishment of a commission to study the employment situation in the United States. In order to dispel any partisan connotations over this vital issue, the minority leader and 66 Senators joined in sponsoring this impartial study of the employment situation. It is significant that the bill providing for this study (S. 1631) was introduced on April 8 and passed

the Senate on April 10. However, the American economy was progressing at so rapid a rate that this measure never received consideration by the House as it was obviously unnecessary. Instead, a more modest study—by a Senate committee—was scheduled. This action thoroughly vindicates the position of the President and his economic advisers that the course which he had laid down at the beginning of the recession to restore the American economy without undue Government intervention was sound and in the public interest.

Youth Conservation Corps: Added to their already inflationary program was a Democrat proposal (S. 812) establishing a Youth Conservation Corps which was patterned after the Civilian Conservation Corps of the depression era. This measure proposed a nonrepayable yearly Federal expenditure of $375 million to $450 million, which would eventually cost nearly $4 billion over a 10-year period.

Supporters of this program have justified it on the grounds that it is an antidepression remedy, it is supposed to combat juvenile delinquency, and it is urged as an aid in natural resources conservation.

The present state of our economy would hardly justify enactment of this proposal. In 1933, when the CCC was established, there were 12,830,000 unemployed, or 24.9 percent of the total labor force. Today, there are only 3,744,000 unemployed, or just 5.1 percent of the labor force.

S. 812 provides for a regimented barracks life for 50,000 to 150,000 young men between the ages of 16 and 21, who "are citizens of the United States of good character." If they must be of good character, the bill is certainly not designed to mitigate juvenile delinquency. If enrollees must be of good character before they can enter the camps, it will not be possible for juvenile delinquents to be admitted to the camps. Of the 7,106,000 young men in the United States between the ages of 16 and 21, the enormous cost of this program would benefit only seven-tenths of 1 percent of the eligible young males in the country.

In commenting on the effect of the program in terms of the conservation program, the Departments of Agriculture and Interior indicated that they could do a much more effective job in the field of conservation by recruiting people trained in that type of work with the same funds.

This measure was passed in the Senate on August 13, 1959, by a vote of 47 to 45, but no action was taken by the House in the first session.

In agriculture, there was to be a new farm program to cure all the evils compounded over a quarter of a century, but the details of the program were not revealed, possibly because the majority did not, itself, know how to do the job.

Labor-management reform and civil rights were touched upon gingerly, possibly because the Democrat majority found itself in a hot box on each of these matters.

In the labor-management field the abuses uncovered by the McClellan committee had generated a heavy public demand for an end to labor racketeering, for protection of the rights of rank and file workers against unscrupulous union leaders, for protection of business and the public from secondary boycotts, organizational picketing, and other related abuses.

How to meet this demand and yet not offend union leaders whose powerful political support they sought, posed a real dilemma for the Democrat majority. The only possible way out seemed to be the Kennedy bill prepared with the aid of labor bosses and sweetened by changes in the Taft-Hartley law long sought after by union leaders.

In the civil rights field, the situation was equally difficult for the Democrat majority. The Republican administration and the public were pressing for further progress ever since 1957 when the Senate Republican minority leader forced the bill, passed by the House and embodying Republican administration recommendations, to the Senate floor where it was passed to become the first civil rights measure to be enacted in over 80 years. After Little Rock, the pressure for further legislation increased and it was clear that the 86th Congress would have to do something about it, reluctant as the Democrat majority was to touch the issue—even with the asbestos gloves offered by the majority leader in the form of a relaxation of the filibuster provision in Senate rules.

But what to do? The northern wing of the Democrat Party joined with a stronger body of Republicans to insist upon action. But the southern wing of the Democrat Party held back. How to satisfy the demand for civil rights enforcement without splitting the Democrat Party was the dilemma facing the majority leadership.

Nothing in the bold, dynamic program of the majority leader pointed the way out until a bipartisan approach took the preliminary step at the opening of the session of attempting to change rule 22—the filibuster provision which long had been the graveyard of civil rights issues. With his hand forced, the majority leader made a virtue of necessity and played a creditable part in finding a workable solution of the matter. After this skirmish, the real struggle for further progress in civil rights had to await the pleasure of a Senate committee controlled by Democrat opponents of the civil rights bills. As we shall see, the eagerness of this committee to bring forth a civil rights bill was anything but dynamic.

Such were the ingredients of the strange dish that came to be the Democrat majority program—a generous batter of spenders' delight, well moistened with the heady liquid of further expansion of the Federal Government, a liberal helping of welfare borrowed from their taxpaying neighbors, a dash of depression blues, a pinch (not more) of labor reform and civil rights, all raised to program proportions with the yeast and warmth of the 1958 elections. And this tasty dish—bearing the label "Caveat Emptor"—was set before the Democrat leadership to bake in the legislative oven.

The administration program

In contrast with the strange concoction cooked up by the Democrat majority, the Republican administration presented the Congress with a carefully worked out, responsible program. It aimed at balanced progress in meeting the Nation's needs. The price tags on the President's recommendations were moderate, and they added up to a little less than the expected revenues, so that there would be something in the cashbox to apply on the heavy national debt.

Few people really know how carefully worked out the administration's program is. The job has to be well done because, unlike the free-wheeling Democrat majority in Congress, the administration has to operate a huge Government, carry out the vast programs at home and abroad, pay the bills, and keep the Treasury solvent.

The budget is the administration's plan to do these things. Government Departments and the Budget Bureau start work a year before the President transmits the final budget message to the Congress. Between January and June they study carefully all the programs Congress has directed them to operate by previous laws. They study the requirements of national defense, the condition of the national economy, and the needs of the people.

Then each Department and agency comes before the Budget Bureau to present and justify its requirements. This is followed by a period of cutting and trimming until estimated Government spending is brought in balance with estimated Government revenues.

If this cutting and trimming is not done firmly, the Government will slide into deficits, heavier debt, and more taxes, as was done for so many years during the New Deal. We are paying for the excesses of the New Deal now by high inflated prices, by a heavy cut in the purchasing power of the dollar, and by enormous interest charges on the gigantic Federal debt.

The Budget Bureau takes the whole fall of the year to shape up the final program and then goes over it with the President in December. At that time all the big decisions on the program are finally made and the budget message is crystallized.

This is the heart of the program which the President submits to Congress in three basic messages: the state of the Union message, the budget message, and the President's Economic Report.

By the Constitution and the laws of the land, it is the President's duty to do these things. Charged with the duty of approving or vetoing the laws passed by Congress, he is a part of the legislative process as well as the Chief Executive of the Nation. Congressmen represent districts; Senators represent States; but the President is elected by and represents all the people.

When the administration program goes to Congress in January, it is the duty of Congress to consider it, to act upon the recommendations according to its best judgment, and then to appropriate the money and to pass the laws to carry out the program for the fiscal year which runs from July 1 to the following June 30.

Following this careful procedure, then, the administration's program was developed. It covered many of the same fields embraced within the Democrat majority program, but with a difference in approach, as we shall see.

It included the following items:

1. The submission of a balanced budget for next year.

2. The reduction of Federal operations in any area where private enterprise can do the job including legislation for greater flexibility in extending Federal credit, and in improving the procedures under which private credits are insured or guaranteed.

3. Necessary action to make more effective use of the large Federal expenditures for agriculture and to achieve greater fiscal control.

4. Review and revise operating and benefit standards of the agricultural conservation program.

5. The development of a program designed to encourage greater participation by private enterprise in economic development abroad.

6. The adjustment of other fees and charges so that persons receiving special services will more nearly pay the cost of these services, which include fees to the Patent Office and to other agencies which render services benefiting a limited group of our citizenry.

7. Authorize revenue bond financing for TVA generating facilities.

8. Strengthen and improve housing mortgage insurance programs.

9. Continue for 1 year beyond June 30, 1959, the present tax rate on corporate income and the excise taxes on automobiles and parts, cigarettes, distilled spirits, and wines and beer.

10. Increase temporarily the Federal tax on motor fuels, raise the tax on aviation gasoline, and impose a similar tax on jet fuels.

11. Authorize a revision in postal rates.

12. Enact a permanent plan for the taxation of life insurance companies and adjust the present laws relating to the taxation of cooperatives.

13. Specify the treatment processes which shall be considered as mining for the purpose

of computing percentage depletion allowances in the case of mineral products.

14. Grant wider administrative authority in setting interest rates and make certain adjustments in rates for various credit programs, as follows: Veterans' Administration programs of guaranteed and direct home loans; Federal Housing Administration programs of rental (including armed services) and cooperative housing (Sections 207, 803, and 213 of the National Housing Act); the college housing program of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; the loan program of the Rural Electrification Administration; and the ship mortgage loan program of the Maritime Administration.

15. Provide the President with authority to veto or reduce the amounts for specific items in appropriation bills and in other bills authorizing expenditures.

16. Raise the permanent debt limit by $2 billion, to $285 billion, and authorize a further temporary increase for the fiscal year 1960.

17. Amend the Employment Act of 1946 to make price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy.

18. Extend Federal regulation to bank mergers accomplished through the acquisition of assets.

19. Require notification to the antitrust agencies of proposed mergers by businesses of significant size engaged in interstate commerce.

20. Empower the Attorney General to issue civil investigative demands in antitrust cases when civil procedures are contemplated.

21. Make Federal Trade Commission cease-and-desist orders final when issued for violations of the Clayton Act, unless appealed to the courts.

22. Authorize the Federal Trade Commission to seek preliminary injunctions in merger cases where a violation of law is likely.

23. Amend the Securities and Exchange Act to extend the privilege of regulation A filings to a wider range of security issues.

24. Enact a program that will provide assistance, through development loans and grants for technical studies, to communities that have suffered substantial and persistent unemployment; and technical aid for the diversification of rural low-income areas and of towns heavily dependent on a major industry.

25. Enact a long-range program to conserve helium gas.

26. Provide for extending the coverage of the Federal-State unemployment insurance system to employees of firms having fewer than four workers, to employees of Federal instrumentalities, nonprofit organizations and certain other groups, and to workers in Puerto Rico.

27. Bring the provisions of the District of Columbia unemployment insurance system up to the standards recommended for the States.

28. Strengthen the State systems of workmen's compensation (State responsibility).

29. Extend the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

30. Improve the 8-hour laws applicable to Federal and federally assisted construction projects.

31. Carry out the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination based on sex.

32. Require reporting and disclosure of financial dealings between employers and employee representatives and their agents, and the filing of public reports on the status of union finances, organization, and procedures.

33. Prescribe standards to promote democratic procedures in union affairs.

34. Modify the law governing secondary boycotts, organizational and recognition picketing, and representation elections; and provide that States be given jurisdiction in labor-management disputes where the National Labor Relations Board declines to exercise authority.

35. Correct shortcomings in the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

36. Review and revise operating and benefit standards of military service credits for railroad retirement.

37. Expand non-Federal participation:
(a) Urban renewal.
(b) Flood control.
(c) School aid in federally affected areas.
(d) Waste treatment construction grants.
(e) Vocational education grants.
(f) Public assistance.
(g) Feed and seed assistance in disaster areas.

38. In other areas of human rights—freedom from discrimination in voting, in public education, in access to jobs, and in other respects—the world is likewise watching our conduct. The image of America abroad is not improved when schoolchildren, through closing of some of our schools and through no fault of their own, are deprived of their opportunity for an education.

The government of a free people has no purpose more noble than to work for the maximum realization of equality of opportunity under the law. That is the concept under which our founding papers were written. This is not the sole responsibility of any one branch of our Government. The judicial arm, which has the ultimate authority for interpreting the Constitution, has held that certain State laws and practices discriminate upon racial grounds and are unconstitutional.

39. Enlarge the resources of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

40. Provide additional authorization for the Development Loan Fund.

41. Extend the mutual security program.

42. Extend the authority for sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and for the donation of such commodities for famine relief and other assistance.

43. More effective cooperation with the United Nations and its specified agencies including a reexamination of our own relation to the International Court of Justice.

44. Continue military draft, Reserve forces, and related legislation.

45. Repeal limitations on minimum strength of military Reserve forces and on disposal of unneeded military real estate.

46. Authorize sale of surplus military and other real property.

47. Review and revise operating and benefit standards of (1) Veterans' pension and other programs, (2) foreign bidding on certain military contracts.

48. Authorize statehood for Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia.

49. Disposition of the Alaska communications system and related facilities.

The important fact about such a program is that it has to be a balanced program. It has to deal with the immediate present and the long-range future. It has to balance the needs for defense with the needs for civilian operations. It has to balance domestic programs with oversea programs. It has to balance Government income and outgo. When it proposes spending, it has to think of taxes and debts and the need for protecting the spending power of the dollar.

It just isn't a question of balancing the budget, but the bigger problem of balancing all the parts within the budget. No Government will ever have enough money to do all that is demanded of it. First things have to be put first, and all other things in some proper order. If this is not done, we risk many dangers and even the solvency of the Government itself. The well-being of all our people depends upon a balanced plan of Government operations.

So long as Congress bears this in mind when it considers the budget, no great harm can be done if it enacts some new proposals or changes some of the President's recommendations. Congress never has to dot every "i" and cross every "t" in the President's program. After all, by the time Congress acts upon the President's program, some 18 months have elapsed and many conditions have changed. Congress has to take note of these changes in its legislation. But if it throws the whole thing out of kilter by taking potshots here and there, there is bound to be serious trouble.

That is what the Democrat majority threatened to do with all their freewheeling spending proposals. It is no excuse for them to say, "We appropriated less than the total sum the President requested—we balanced the budget." The question is: How was it done? If it was done by throwing a great many items within the budget out of line, just as much harm can be done as if the budget total itself was unbalanced.

Look at it this way: If a father spent half of his week's wages on golf clubs, leaving the children without needed shoes and the family with less groceries than it needs, it would certainly be no excuse for him to say: "I did not spend more than I earned." The same principle holds true of Government and the Nation's needs.

At many points, the Republican administration's program came into sharp conflict with the bills presented by the Democrat majority. The next section of this report will describe in detail what then happened, what issues arose, and how they were resolved.

III. BATTLE OF THE BUDGET

Nowhere was Operation Retreat and Fallback more apparent than in the celebrated battle of the budget.

The President submitted a comprehensive budget plan, providing adequate funds for each of the many and diverse activities of the Federal Government, all fitted into an over-all framework of balance between revenues and expenditures. The President proposed various programs of assistance in the fields of housing, airports, depressed areas—all of which were carefully considered as parts of a total Federal program, with benefits and costs fully evaluated and balanced.

Specifically, the President submitted the following balanced budget in January 1959:

Receipts	$77,100,000,000
Expenditures	77,030,000,000
Surplus	70,000,000

This program was conditioned on Congress providing certain necessary increases in revenue, particularly in the areas of (1) the motor fuel tax, (2) postal rates, (3) so-called "user charges" for special Government services, and (4) miscellaneous revenue increases, including closing of tax loopholes. Congress granted only part of what was requested in motor fuel taxes and miscellaneous revenues, and none in postal rates or user charges. These failures to act were offset by unexpected increases in other revenues, due to the very sharp recovery in economic activity; but this same recovery also necessitated added expenditures. As a result, it appeared that the hoped-for surplus would be upset by about the amount of the neglected revenue requests.

The Democrat majorities in Congress embarked in January with great promises as to the programs which the Federal Government would undertake. In program after program—we were promised—the Democrats would do more than the President proposed.

But, when the President made plain his determination to stand firm on his balanced budget, public opinion rallied to his side. Congressional leaders were impressed by pub-

lic opinion. As the session progressed, Congress' efforts to put up an outward show of fiscal restraint, in contrast to their earlier promise to spend, reflected their recognition that the President's position was basically in tune with the wishes of the people.

Despite unwarranted increases in some budget items, Democrat majorities on the Appropriations Committees cut back other programs, including mutual security and defense funds, sufficient to convey the appearance of substantial reductions below the President's requests for appropriations for fiscal 1960. But several millions of the claimed cuts in appropriations were, in reality, only "postponements" and will have to be restored in supplemental appropriations next year. And of the remaining claimed cuts—about $1 billion—most of them will not affect actual expenditures in fiscal year 1960, since long "lead-time" items were involved.

The strength of public support for the President's balanced budget stand was reflected in the effort by the Democrat leadership to draw attention toward reductions in formal appropriations bills and away from major increases in its own big spending proposals where actual appropriations will not be made until later budget years.

Of course, it is customary for the legislative to appropriate less money than the Executive requests in the formal appropriations bills. This has happened in every Congress, even during World War II and the Korean war.

Yet a somewhat different picture emerges if we take an overall view at not only formal appropriations bills, but also the major programs involving authorizations for later appropriations and/or public debt transactions which never require appropriations. In housing, airports, depressed areas, and other fields, Congress repeatedly tried to mortgage the future far beyond Executive requests.

Even here, however, public demand for fiscal responsibility exercised an effective restraining force. As shown below, original Democrat-sponsored bills were cut way back when it became clear that the President, backed by Republicans in Congress, was taking a determined fight to the country in the interests of preserving the value of the dollar. In many cases, Presidential vetoes enforced the demand of public opinion.

But again, many reductions claimed by the Democrat leadership were "paper" reductions. In some cases, for example, Congress took a multiyear administration request and cut it back to 1 or 2 years, appearing to reduce dollar totals, when, in fact, they were committing taxpayers' dollars far more than the original administration request. In short, they claimed to cut spending; but, in fact, they cut the calendar, while raising the rate of spending.

On the important issue of backdoor financing, people who believe in keeping a close rein on the spending of the taxpayers' money won a significant victory. A Democrat-sponsored effort was made to convert the Development Loan Fund to a 5-year $5 billion public debt transaction, cutting it loose from the appropriations process for the first time. A point of order was raised against this effort to bypass orderly appropriations procedures. While the issue was not pressed to the fullest, a clear-cut victory was scored to the extent that the Development Loan Fund was reduced way back and put on an authorization basis. The President has made known his position that this administration will never request further backdoor spending.

IV. OPERATION RETREAT AND THE BOX SCORE

What happened when these two opposing programs met in the legislative halls was a joy to behold. Any comparison of the measures as introduced with the same measures as signed by the President indicates all too clearly that there was a broad retreat and significant fallback from the New Deal-type of measures in the Democrat majority program.

The session just closed was a vindication of the President's good management in devising a program that made good sense to the people.

The victory belongs to the public which so strongly supported the President on the main issues of a balanced budget and responsible government. Had the people not been aroused, the Democrat 86th Congress would never have jettisoned the key measures of New Deal-type spending.

Republican Members of Congress who stood strongly for sound finance, for moderate progress, and for the correction of abuses such as in labor-management relations can be proud of their record in this session. Although they were in the minority, they fought the good fight and won.

Every veto message but one sent to Congress by the President has been sustained despite Democrat majorities in both Houses. The Democrat-controlled House couldn't muster enough votes to prevent the biggest lobby ever assembled by political labor leaders from taking a drubbing on labor-management reform.

The Democrat congressional leaders even silenced their party's national chairman, Paul M. Butler, who publicly demanded that they set a liberal course even if the measures passed ran into the President's vetoes.

That retreat and backtrack from an insupportable Democrat majority program is the main earmark of this first session of the 86th Congress becomes abundantly clear in the detailed analysis of the major public laws acted upon. Item by item, they are as follows:

Agriculture

The main agricultural problem facing Congress was again what to do in the case of a few commodities for which outmoded price support programs have been too long continued.

The 85th Congress had grappled with the same problem and, after much lost motion, came up with compromise legislation dealing with cotton, corn, and feed grains, and rice. That wasn't perfect legislation, certainly, but it was a good compromise, and it dealt with the commodities generally held to be in the most trouble at the time.

It was evident even then that something ought to be done in this first session of the 86th Congress about wheat and perhaps about tobacco and peanuts.

Farm picture generally bright: Except for these three crops, and the problem of what to do about mandatory price supports in general, the agriculture picture was, and today is, fairly bright. Production is at the highest levels in history. Gross farm income is at a record level. Per capita farm income is the highest in history. Farm ownership is at a new peak, and the amount of money the individual farmer has invested in his farm, or the amount he has paid off on his mortgage, has never been higher. Transportation, telephones, television, electricity, and other aids to good living are more widely available on farms than ever before. The standard of living on farms is the highest ever. Of course there are serious unsolved problems, not the least of which is the cost-price squeeze. But, in general the main problem was and is what to do about the 16 commodities now under mandatory price supports, and particularly wheat, tobacco, and peanuts.

That was the problem at the start of this last session, and it is still the problem now. For the fact of the matter is that no law—not even one like last year's compromise Agricultural Act—has come out of this Congress.

It is true that wheat and tobacco bills were passed. But it is also true that these bills moved toward higher supports and stricter controls, and were therefore vetoed by the President.

Wheat problem: Wheat particularly presents an alarming problem demanding attention. By next year the Government will have $3.5 billion invested in wheat. A wheat carry-over of 1.3 billion bushels existed in July and one of 1.5 billion bushels is indicated for next June 30. The cost to the taxpayers is $1.5 million every day for interest, storage, handling charges, and transportation. The $3.1 billion already invested by the Government in wheat represents a third of the total cost of all programs designed to support farm prices and income. But only 6 percent of all farmers benefit from this investment in wheat.

This situation in regard to wheat is indicative in the extreme of the overall problem of Government attempts to control production through acreage restrictions and to protect farm income through price supports.

Inaction of Congress: Because no major farm law has been produced during this session, and because it is generally felt that many people think Congress should have produced such a farm law, there have been attempts to fix the blame for this inaction of the Congress. Although Congress is the lawmaking body, there have been attempts to fix Congress' failure to act in this instance upon the Secretary of Agriculture.

The cry has gone up to the effect that he said he would write out the law for Congress, but didn't do so. To begin with, he did write out the law for Congress, as appears later. But, even if he did not do Congress' work for it, and even if he said he would, how does this get Congress off the hook? It cannot. The responsibility to write laws rests with Congress—even farm laws.

Definite program offered: But, let the record speak.

On January 29, 1959, President Eisenhower and Secretary of Agriculture Benson recommended that Congress either abandon parity and relate mandatory farm price supports to average market prices, or, if it insisted on keeping parity, allow the Secretary to set supports anywhere from zero to 90 percent of the parity price.

"The price-support and production-control program has not worked," the President said. He said there were three main things wrong with it:

"1. Most of the dollars are spent on the production of a relatively few large producers. * * * It does not help the farmers in greatest difficulty. * * *

"2. The control program doesn't control. Mandatory supports are at a level which so stimulates new technology and the flow of capital into production as to offset, in large part, the control effort. * * *

"3. The program is excessively expensive. * * * Budgetary expenditures primarily for the support of farm prices and farm income are now equal to about 40 percent of net farm income."

Specific recommendations: The President made these specific recommendations:

"I recommend that prices for those commodities subject to mandatory supports be related to a percentage of the average market price during the immediately preceding years. The appropriate percentage of the average market price should be discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture at a level not less than 75 and not more than 90 percent of such average. * * *

"If, despite the onrush of science in agriculture, resulting in dramatic increases in yields per acre, the Congress still prefers to relate price supports to existing standards, the Secretary should be given discretion to establish the level in accordance with the guidelines now fixed by law for all commodities except those for which supports presently are mandatory."

The President also served notice that he opposed direct payment and multiple-price programs. "Difficulties of the present program," he said, "should not drive us to programs which involve us in even greater trouble. I refer to direct payment programs, which could soon make virtually all farm people dependent, for a large share of their income, upon annual appropriations from the Federal Treasury. I refer also to various multiple-price programs, which would tax the American consumer so as to permit sale for feed and export at lower levels."

Administration program spelled out: The President said more than this. He gave considerable detail as to both what he wanted and what he did not want; but these were the highlights.

Now, atttached to the President's message to Congress was a memorandum for the President from the Secretary of Agriculture. It went into still more detail, stressing the alternative presented by the President and applying them particularly to wheat, tobacco, and peanuts. This memorandum also went on to call for extension of Public Law 480, extension of the conservation reserve, and certain other recommendations.

Thus the administration program was very well spelled out, even before Secretary Benson appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on February 16 and 17. It was spelled out in even greater detail at that time. Again the Secretary presented in more detail the alternate programs outlined by the President, preferring, as the President had, the program to relate support prices to average market prices within a range of 75 to 90 percent.

Legal language provided: It is true that the Secretary did not bring with him to the committee the legal language covering his and the President's recommendations. He did agree to supply such legal language, and subsequently did. Wheat legislative language was sent March 12, 1959. Legislative language for peanuts was forwarded on April 2, 1959. Legal language with reference to extension of Public Law 480 was forwarded on April 17, 1959. Legislative language for tobacco was forwarded on April 20, 1959. On May 1, 1959, there was forwarded a combined draft on all of the above legislation.

How then, can one explain the cry that the Secretary said he would send proposed legislation to Congress but did not?

Could it be that this was a kind of smokescreen to cover up the fact that no general agreement could be reached among those most critical of the Eisenhower-Benson program? It is hard to be sure. It is interesting, however, that at the time there were newspapers and other reports to the effect that Senate Democrats jointly would propose their own broad farm legislation, but those reports died out, and, of course, no such joint proposition is before Congress.

No cure-all offered: It may be accurately charged, and had been, that Secretary Benson did not send to Congress a so-called omnibus farm bill designed to cure all the ills of all the farmers and straighten out all the kinks in all the history of farm legislation in one fell swoop.

But it cannot be accurately charged that the Secretary ever said he would be so rash as to attempt such a feat.

The record of the hearings before the Senate committee makes it abundantly clear, for instance, that it was agreed no changes would be proposed for the crops covered by the Agricultural Act of 1958. So, any so-called 1959 omnibus bill would be less than "omnibus," at least to that extent.

Excerpts taken out of context, together with the fact that, as usual, the hearing transcripts were edited for clarity, have been used to try to show that the Secretary of Agriculture said he would send up legal language for an all-inclusive new farm law. But the most any objective appraisal of the entire record shows is that the Secretary agreed to send to Congress the legal language which, indeed, he has sent, but which Congress has seen fit to ignore.

Responsibility of Congress: But, no matter how much may be said about what the Secretary of Agriculture did or did not do, said or did not say, the undisputable fact remains that Congress is the lawmaking body, Congress has the power and the obligation to make the laws, and when Congress fails to take action in a field where action is needed, Congress and Congress alone is ultimately responsible.

Extension of Public Law 480: Late in the session, Congress passed a bill (H.R. 8609) extending Public Law 480, the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act.

The final measure, as worked out in a Senate-House conference, extended title I (sales of surplus commodities for foreign currencies) for 2 years to December 31, 1961, with an increased authorization of $1.5 billion per year. It also extended title II (famine relief donations) for the same period with an increased authorization of $300 million per year.

Among other features of the measure was one authorizing the establishment of a permissive 2-year food-stamp plan for the distribution of $250 million worth of surplus food per year to needy people in the United States.

Anti-inflation legislation

During most of this session's deliberations decisions were shaped largely by the shadow of mounting inflationary pressures.

Defense against inflation was a paramount concern. The President's vigorous stand for a balanced budget, supported by Republicans on Capitol Hill, was motivated basically by a desire to protect the value of the dollar against further attack from inflation. Not only in the overall battle of the budget, but on many individual legislative battlegrounds—like housing, airports, depressed areas—Republicans stood against inflation and for a stable cost of living.

But, in addition to these important issues, several proposals were advanced dealing directly with the problem of inflation.

Senator PRESCOTT BUSH introduced legislation (S. 64) which would amend the Employment Act of 1946, to establish the prevention of inflation as a major goal of economic policy. This bill was endorsed by the President in his 1959 Economic Report.

The Republican Party is in accord with the objectives of the Employment Act, but believes that increasing employment opportunities must be found within a stable, noninflationary economy. Balance must be maintained in the goals of economic policy. Therefore, the act must be amended to include a stable price level—as well as ample job opportunities—as our objective.

Democrats in Congress presented an alternative solution which would require either the Federal Trade Commission or the Council of Economic Advisers to review price increases by leading firms. This proposal amounted to price control by admonition. Such a procedure would destroy the foundatons of our free economy, and impair the usefulness and objectivity of the Council of Economic Advisers.

The Joint Economic Committee is currently reviewing the economy and is conducting a special investigation which the Democrats have sponsored to determine how growth and price stability may be achieved simultaneously. The work of this committee will be appraised very carefully.

The President's own battle against inflation led to the creation of a Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth. Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON is Chairman. This Committee was created "to follow governmental and private activities affecting costs, prices, and economic growth; initiate studies by Government or by groups of private citizens of price stability in relation to economc growth; seek ways to enhance productivity in the American economy and to build a better public understanding of the need for reasonable price stability in a free society and of the conditions necessary to achieve this objective."

This Committee is concerned with fostering economic policies which will promote growth of the national income without inflation. It has issued several instructive interim reports.

Atomic energy

In contrast to the Democratic policy for direct Government participation in the development of large-scale nuclear reactors, the President recommended that this program be developed by private enterprise. As a compromise measure, Senator ANDERSON, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, introduced S. 2094 which appropriated $55.5 million for the cooperative power reactor program. This bill was enacted into Public Law 86-50 on June 23, 1959.

In his budget message, the President noted that the United States, at the Second Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva during September 1948, had demonstrated the range and scope of its research and development in the peaceful application of this energy.

The Congress, in response to the President's program, authorized $229.9 million for the Atomic Energy Commission for 1960. Portions of this appropriation will be used for civilian reactors, biology and medical facilities, reactor development supporting facilities, and isotopes development facilities. In addition, the necessary amounts were appropriated to maintain our defense needs under the national security program.

In addition, the President called for expanded participation in international undertakings, such as Euratom. The Congress followed his recommendation by authorizing $10 million for a Euratom development and research program.

An appropriation of $2,683,029,000 (H.R. 8283) for the Atomic Energy Commission, to cover all of its various activities including the production of fissionable materials, the purchase of uranium, and the operation of its facilities, was signed into Public Law 86-164 on August 18, 1959.

On January 19, 1959, the President declared:

"This administration intends to explore all possible means of attaining armament control under adequate inspection guarantees despite the recent suspension of negotiations on means of avoiding surprise attack."

Testing of nuclear weapons by the United States has been suspended since October 31, 1958. Although the suspension was originally to last for only a year, it has been extended for an additional 2 months.

Civil rights

One of the most significant facts of our time is this: the Civil Rights Act of 1957 was the first important civil rights legislation to be enacted in over 80 years. The Democrats always talked about civil rights but never did anything about it.

And, it must be remembered, it was the Republican leadership in the last Congress which made civil rights legislation possible. It happened this way: The administration civil rights bill (H.R. 6127) passed the House June 18, 1957. Ordinarily it would have been referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee where it surely would have died—because of a committee filibuster. However, through a deft parliamentary maneuver, former minority leader William F. Knowland objected to referral of the bill to the Judiciary Committee and he rounded up enough votes to sus-

tain his objection on a rollcall vote. This action had the effect of placing the bill on the Senate Calendar where it could be called up for consideration by a majority vote at any time. Which it subsequently was.

The act passed in 1957 was designed basically to protect the voting rights of the Negro. It set qualifications for Federal jurors, independently of State laws, and provided for an additional Attorney General to handle civil rights laws. Moreover, it established a six-member, bipartisan Commission on Civil Rights with a life of 2 years. The law as finally passed was limited in scope principally because of Democrat opposition to part III of the bill. This section dealt with enforcement powers to protect not only voting rights, but a variety of civil rights.

Four Republican Senators on January 17, 1959, introduced a bill (S. 435) to give the Attorney General authority to seek civil injunctions against segregation in schools, parks, and other public facilities—the very authority removed from the act of 1957. These four Senators were JAVITS and KEATING, of New York, CASE of New Jersey, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania.

Forced to show his hand by this action, Majority Leader JOHNSON introduced a civil rights bill which was woefully inadequate. This fact is attested to by the subsequent action of many of his Democrat colleagues.

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, January 29 introduced still another civil rights bill (S. 810), cosponsored by a bipartisan group of 17 Senators. The provisions of the bill were identical to those of H.R. 3147 previously introduced in the House. It is significant that in a statement accompanying the bipartisan measure, DOUGLAS attacked the civil rights measure introduced earlier by JOHNSON. He called the Johnson bill an "ostrichlike proposal" that ignored the school integration problem. "You cannot determine," DOUGLAS declared, "whether it is for or against compliance with the Constitution."

In a February 5, 1959, civil rights message, President Eisenhower made seven specific proposals for legislative action this year. They were:

"(1) Provide expressly that force or threats of force to obstruct court orders in school desegregation shall be a Federal offense.

"(2) Give the FBI additional investigative authority in crimes involving the destruction of schools or churches by making interstate flight to avoid detention or prosecution a Federal offense.

"(3) Authorize the Attorney General to inspect Federal election records and require that they be preserved for a 'reasonable period of time so as to permit such inspection.'

"(4) Provide a temporary program of Federal assistance to State and local agencies to help meet additional costs directly occasioned by desegregation programs. Also, provide a temporary program to make technical assistance available to State and local educational agencies in preparing and implementing desegregation programs.

"(5) Provide temporarily for education of children of members of the Armed Forces when State-administered public schools are closed because of desegregation difficulties.

"(6) Establish a statutory Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts.

"(7) Extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission until 1961."

The President declared that "Two principles basic to our system of Government are that the rule of law is supreme, and that every individual, regardless of his race, religion, or national origin, is entitled to the equal protection of the laws. We must continue to seek every practicable means for reinforcing these principles and making them a reality for all."

Filibustering in the Democrat-controlled Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has prevented any action by the full Senate on the civil rights issue, despite attempts by Republican Members to have a bill reported. The subcommittee did vote, however, to remove the section dealing with enforcement powers from all bills having such provisions.

Debt management

The Democrats have long advocated easy money and low interest rates regardless of the fact that permanent inflation would ultimately require controls or result in the destruction of our entire monetary system. For some years the Democrats have attacked the sound fiscal policies of the Republican administration.

The management of the Federal debt, so much of which is now being forced into inflationary short-term obligations, presents a serious problem to the Treasury as well as the Federal Reserve Board and the banking system of our country. If inflation is to be prevented and controls are not to be imposed, it is necessary for the Federal Government to compete with other borrowers in the money markets of the Nation for necessary funds to finance the Federal deficit.

The President, in a special message delivered to the Congress on June 2, 1959, requested the removal of the present 3.26 percent interest rate ceiling on savings bonds. The Congress enacted H.R. 9035 which would increase the maxmum rate to 4¼ percent.

However, a corresponding request for removal of the 4¼ percent ceiling on all long-term U.S. bonds was never granted. Democrats on the House Ways and Means Committee, after months of wrangling, decided to grant only the savings bond request—despite a renewed presidential plea for action on August 25, 1959.

At the present time there is no maximum interest rate applicable to short-term Government indebtedness which does not exceed 5 years duration. In order that more of the Federal debt may be funded into long-term maturities, the ceiling on interest rates on securities maturing after 5 years will have to be removed.

The President also requested an increase in the permanent debt limit to $285 billion as well as an increase in the temporary debt ceiling covering the Government's operations through June 30, 1960. The necessary congressional approval was enacted on June 25, 1959, and was signed into Public Law 86–74 on June 30, 1959.

Depressed areas

In the case of depressed areas legislation, the retreat and fallback was total. Initially, the Senate committee demanded all or nothing and reported out the Douglas bill at full cost and without modification. An effort on the floor to substitute the administration bill was defeated; so was a compromise offering. Then the unmodified $389.5 million Democrat package was forced through by the surprisingly narrow margin of 49 to 46. Chronologically, the closeness of that vote—on a measure which had sailed through the Senate on two previous occasions by much wider margins—was perhaps the first real portent of the coming operation fallback. As it turned out, after that close Senate vote, the depressed areas legislation died completely, even despite a tentative move in the House to cut back the amount by one-third.

Education

The Democrats raised the age-old question of Federal aid to education again in the 86th Congress.

Senator Murray submitted S. 2, designed to extend Federal influence into the field of education by providing $25 per school-age child in fiscal 1960 with the grant rising to $100 per child in the fourth year. It has been estimated that this would cost $1,085,000,000 in the first year, and that the total would rise to a staggering $4,746,000,000 in the fourth year. The total expected expenditure would have $11.4 billion over a 4-year period. The bill would also extend Federal regulation further into the field of education by prescribing the manner in which the money would be spent, specifying that the only programs for which it could be used would be school construction or teachers' salaries. The bill also provided that the money should not be given to a State unless it has met certain requirements in terms of what the proposal calls the school effort index. This bill was never reported.

Senators MCNAMARA and HART introduced S. 8, designed to authorize an emergency 2-year program of Federal financial assistance in school construction to the States. It authorizes $500 million a year and would distribute the Federal funds to States on the basis of population and wealth. The States would be required to match the Federal funds. Toward the end of the session, this bill was reported from committee, but no further action was taken.

Public funds can never be spent without some degree of regulation and control. Those who advocate Federal largess to assist education, health, and other worthwhile local activities, delude themselves if they believe that such programs can be accomplished without inviting complete centralized control over what traditionally have been local responsibilities. Yet both these bills would further interject the Federal Government into the field of education.

Experience also indicates that every tax dollar must be collected locally and then returned for admittedly worthwhile projects less the Federal overhead. The American people have the ingenuity and ability to finance these necessary and obviously beneficial programs without being subjected to this unnecessary overhead expense.

Senator HUMPHREY introduced S. 1087, a bill to establish a program of scholarship aid to students in higher education and to provide facilities and assistance to institutions of higher education. It would establish a National Council on Student Aid and authorizes such sums as may be necessary for administering the awarding of certificates of scholarship. The scholarship stipends are not to exceed $1,500 for any academic year, and the duration of any student's education shall not exceed 4 academic years. The awards shall be made without regard to sex, creed, race, color, national origin, or residence.

The President's program was introduced by Senator MORTON and seven cosponsors as S. 1016. It authorizes a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting the debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare requested this legislation. Recognizing that our schools are presently housing almost 2 million students in excess of their capacity and another 2 million students are housed in inadequate or obsolescent buildings, he requested this program so that public schools—both elementary and secondary—could finance up to $3 billion worth of construction during the next 5 years.

If enacted, the maximum annual Federal payments would be about $85 million. According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Federal Government would "annually advance half of the funds required by needy school districts to pay the principle and interest charges on bonds issued by the districts to finance school construction projects." The administration's program also indicated specifically that the Federal authorities would "exercise no

direction, supervision or control over the personnel, curriculum or program of instruction of any school or school system."

A second proposal would make it possible over the same period for institutions of higher learning to accelerate the construction of $2 billion worth of facilities which will be needed in the years immediately ahead to provide for the ever-increasing numbers of youth reaching college age. The program was announced as a 5-year emergency measure.

No major legislation in this field was enacted by the Congress in this session.

Federal aid to airports

The bold, dynamic program heralded by the Democrat majority—if such it was—got underway with S. 1, Federal aid to airports.

This first bill pointed up significantly the differences in the philosophy of the administration and that of the Democrat-controlled 86th Congress. The bill, introduced by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, and others, called for a 5-year program to cost $565 million. In its astronomical dimensions it was quite in line with the concepts of the space age.

Ignored was the fact that President Eisenhower vetoed a similar bill last year after Congress adjourned and this year had recommended over the next 4 years to aid States and communities to develop airports—the amounts of $65 million for the first year, $55 million in 1961, $45 million in 1962, and $35 million in 1963, or a total of $200 million.

It was obvious—and he took this into consideration—that due to the immense strides made by the aviation industry, the ever-increasing use of planes for transportation, the Federal Government would have to give aid to the industry. This aid would be in the form of increased navigational aids, longer runways for jet and other large planes, traffic towers, and other facilities for passenger safety.

However, with the usual lavish disregard of the taxpayers' money, a bill was presented which included such luxury terminal facilities as cocktail lounges, bars, night clubs, theaters, private clubs, garages, hotel rooms, commercial offices, and other similar features. As attractive as some of these things might be, certainly by no stretch of the imagination can they be classed as essential to the safety of passengers or increased aid to navigation unless it was intended to provide radar between a cocktail lounge and a night club.

As originally passed by the Senate, S. 1 provided for a 4-year extension of the act with expenditures of $100 million a year, plus $65 million in discretionary funds or over twice as much as the President proposed. Also, there was included continued Federal participation in the construction of terminal facilities, except for parking lots and areas used for commercial enterprises not related to public aviation.

As passed by the House, S. 1 provided a 4-year extension at $63 million per year, with $65 million in discretionary funds for a total of $317 million or $117 million more than the President requested. However, it prohibited use of Federal funds for the construction of any airport building or parking lot. But, in both of these bills, the frills still remained.

Due to the resolve of those who were determined to aid in the needs of the ever-burgeoning aviation industry, but who were determined that the taxpayers' hard-earned money need not aid in the building of cocktail bars, hotels, and night clubs, a compromise bill was finally passed extending the time for making airport grants for 2 years—1960 and 1961.

Here again, for purely political reasons, the Democrat-controlled Congress refused the President's request for a 4-year extension on the cynical grounds that it is their hope that a change of administrations will take place and the way will be freely opened to go on the spending spree they intended to in the first place.

As it stands, the extension was made for 2 years in the same amounts of $63 million annually as was authorized previously. The administration had made it perfectly clear that the funds were to be used portal to portal, as it were, following the safety concept which begins when the doors of the airplanes close about the passengers, continuing until the doors are opened after the passengers reach their destinations.

Much to-do was made that the authorization was below the President's request and therefore a saving. What these pseudo-savers fail to mention is that the program as approved by this Democrat-controlled Congress is but for 2 years, whereas the President's request was for a 4-year program.

The Democrat leadership's false claim of savings was achieved by comparing:

A 4-year administration program of $200 million with a 2-year congressional program of $126 million. If we want to have an accurate comparison, we should compare:

A 2-year administration program of $120 million with a 2-year congressional program of $126 million. Or we could also compare:

A 4-year administration program of $200 million with a 4-year program projected to $252 million.

When the bill finally reached the President's desk in June, S. 1 might be termed the bell-cow of the budget-busting measures for it carried in its final version $6 million more than the President's budget called for over the 2-year period. I am aware of the Democrat boast that they claim to have saved $2 million under the President's request. But they fail to point out that this claimed savings is the difference between the $65 million the President recommended for the first year in grants instead of the $63 million voted. They are as silent as the grave about the second year (1961), when the President recommended a sum of $55 million, while the sum voted was $63 million for that period. It was signed into law despite this, since the act would have expired on July 1 with all Federal aid stopped at that time for much-needed grants for air safety.

Holding the line in its concept that the lives of American people are more important than an ornate club bar or night club, States and communities now can go ahead with real safety measures helpful to aviation transportation in this air-minded age.

Hawaii

The Republican platforms of 1952 and 1956 carried a strong, positive plank for Hawaiian statehood. For almost 7 years in a Democrat-controlled Congress, Republicans fought for admission of Hawaii to the Union. Now, at long last, after a long fight, it is a State—and a member of the Union only after ceaseless Republican efforts in Congress. The people of Hawaii had repeatedly expressed, in one form or another, their desire to join the Union, and through the constitution which they enacted in 1950, they showed conclusively their contempt for those connected with the Communist Party by stipulating that they may not hold any public office.

The Congress has also enacted legislation requested by the President to facilitate the transition of Alaska from its status as a territory to its new position as a self-governing, sovereign State. H.R. 7120 was signed into Public Law 86-70 on June 25, 1959. Similar measures will, of course, be taken with reference to Hawaii.

Republicans have fulfilled the mandate contained in the 1952 and 1956 Republican platforms to grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii.

Highways

The Federal Government has undertaken a long-range Interstate Highway System based on the expected needs of traffic in 1975. The initial program provided for the creation of a trust fund to be expended on a matching fund basis in the Federal Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958. As it was enacted, the law provided that the program be financed principally by a tax levied on motor fuels.

In his budget message, the President recommended that this tax on automotive fuels be increased by 1½ cents per gallon, since taxes at the existing rate were not adequate to meet the needs of the program. The President and the Congress have believed that this program should be financed principally by highway users, who are its chief beneficiaries. It has always been recognized that a portion of the cost, particularly in the case of the Interstate System, is a proper charge of the Federal Government in connection with the national defense and the promotion of interstate commerce.

The legislation which the Congress sent to the President did not meet his demands, as it increased the rate only 1 cent per gallon instead of the 1½ cents which had been requested. The 1-cent increase should result in a revenue increase of approximately $330 million annually. If the President's request had been granted in full, the additional revenue would have totaled approximately $495 million. If the projected program is to be continued on a pay-as-you-go basis, the rate of highway construction must slow down somewhat, due to the failure of Congress to provide the full 1½-cent tax increase.

Housing issues

There is no divergence of opinion that adequate housing for all of our citizens is a worthy goal and that Federal assistance in certain instances is necessary to achieve that goal.

The questions arise as to where that assistance is to be given and in what manner—through loans, matching grants, or outright gifts.

It is in answer to those questions that the philosophy of the Republican and Democrat Parties part company.

One of the first important pieces of legislation to reach the floor of the Senate was S. 57, the so-called omnibus housing bill, which was sponsored by the Democrat majority. This inflationary measure at the beginning called for a budget-shattering authorization of $2,964,725,000, as compared with the administration's request which would have had an ultimate price tag of $1,660 million. The committee's recommendations would have involved expenditures of $235.8 million more than had been provided for in the President's budget for fiscal year 1960. This legislation was introduced during a period when the President's proposed budget provided a slim surplus of $70 million.

The administration felt that the general objectives of the housing program are excellent. But, the administration felt that more might be done through private enterprise, and that under no conditions should a public program be undertaken at the expense of creating a chaotic inflationary situation. The administration proposals were embodied in S. 65, introduced by Senators CAPEHART, BUSH, BENNETT, and BEALL; S. 612, introduced by Senators BENNETT and CAPEHART, and S. 1017, introduced by Senators MORTON, SALTONSTALL, PROUTY, YOUNG of North Dakota, SCOTT, JAVITS, BUSH, MUNDT, ALLOTT, CASE of New Jersey, and COOPER.

S. 57, as finally passed by the Congress, was reduced to $1.4 billion, clearing the Senate by a vote of 56 to 31. The President vetoed the bill, and his veto was later sustained by the Senate by a vote of 55 to 40.

There was not only a matter of cost above the President's budget which was involved in this bill. It contained some major innovations. In its departure from current law and practice, it would have meant new Federal intervention in the housing field.

It would not be amiss to say that perhaps the President would not have vetoed the bill on cost alone, but when Congress voted completely new programs of Federal loans, at subsidy prices, for such as college classrooms, the veto became inevitable.

The President stated in his veto message:

"For many months I have been looking forward to approving a sound and constructive housing bill. New homes are now being built at near record rates. I had hoped to receive from the Congress legislation that would further advance the cause of better housing for Americans within the limits of fiscal responsibility.

"To my disappointment, the Congress has instead presented me with a bill so excessive in the spending it proposes, and so defective in other respects, that it would do far more damage than good."

The President then called attention to the fact that the bill would tend to substitute Federal spending for private investment by requiring the Federal National Mortgage Association to buy mortgages under par under its special assistance program, regardless of the price these mortgages command in the open market. In addition, the bill also limited the fees FNMA may charge when purchasing mortgages.

The provisions of that bill, authorizing college housing and college classroom loans at subsidized interest rates, additional Federal purchases of cooperative housing mortgages, and a new program of short-term loans by the Federal Government on the security of mortgages, would also substitute public for private financing.

The President called attention to the program placing needless limitations on the FHA program and impairing its soundness. Instead of removing the wholly unnecessary limit on the amount of the mortgage insurance authority of the FHA, the bill would continue these programs on a hand-to-mouth basis. Also, through lower downpayments and longer maturities, the bill would introduce underwriting provisions of questionable soundness into a number of FHA's loan insurance programs.

The President pointed out, in his veto, that the bill contained provisions which were discriminatory and unfair, because the way the bill was written, a few large cities, by making early application, could tie up all the funds available under the urban renewal program. The administration was specifically prohibited from preventing this discrimination against the smaller cities which had not as yet entered the program and did not have planning staffs. Further, S. 57 would extend credits to cities retroactively by counting streets and other local improvements they already intended to construct as part of the cost of urban renewal—this inclusion to take in improvements made by cities up to 5 years before comemncement of the project. With local cash contributions averaging about 14 percent of the cost of acquiring and preparing a project site for development, S. 57 would have reduced these contributions ever further.

As is readily seen, the subsidies for these various projects would come out of the pockets of all taxpayers, regardless of any advantage their particular city or town might derive from the bill.

What would have been the effect on the budget?

It is difficult to estimate because of the lag between commitments to spend funds and the actual spending. Under the vetoed bill, most of the dollar amounts were commitments for future spending, with small effect on the 1960 budget.

The urban renewal grant program, for instance, involved a 6-year $2.1 billion commitment, accounting by far for the largest item in the bill.

College loans have a lag of about 28 months between legislative authorization and actual expenditures, according to HHFA estimates.

Those who believe in large spending programs—who believe the Government should intrude itself into the whole fabric of our national life regardless of the cost, present or future—decided, for political reasons, to attempt to override the President's veto of S. 57. Quite frankly, on the floor of the Senate, they stated that regardless of results, they would make the attempt for that reason. The attempt was made and failed.

Hurriedly, then, a new housing bill was concocted—still containing some of the features objected to by the President.

The political overtones were evident. Not only did this bill exceed the President's recommendations, but, by limiting the duration of the FHA mortgage insurance authority to October 1960, the spenders made sure that a housing bill would have to be enacted in 1960—an election year—which they hoped would give them an opportunity to include some of the vetoed measures.

Left in the bill was authorization for 37,000 new public housing units, despite the fact, as the President pointed out, there are over 100,000 previously authorized public housing units as yet unbuilt.

Also, despite the President's objections, the new bill contained the new $50 million loan program to help build college classrooms. No one doubts the necessity for more classrooms in colleges, but, by the wildest stretch of the imagination, they cannot be called housing and have no place in a housing program. Apropos of this program and the new $50 million program to help build homes for older people, the President, in his first veto message, had stated: "To the extent that these and other programs merely displace private financing they lead to Federal spending that is entirely unnecessary."

Left in the bill was the "backdoor" direct loan method of financing urban renewal which bypasses the regular appropriation process. This leads to more deficits, but since it does not show up on the books, it is ignored.

Heedless of the President's warnings, the House and Senate approved the new bill, which, although less costly than the original bill, still contained all the features which the President had found objectionable.

Despite the claims of the Democrat spenders that they had reduced the President's budget figures, the shorter spending periods for some of the measures would have made so-called savings artificial and short-lived.

The President fired back this second bill with a clear veto message, showing how Congress still failed to balance costs and benefits properly. Again a politically inspired move to override this veto failed, this time by a margin of 58 to 36.

So, a reluctant Democrat leadership—having failed twice to force through excessive spending housing bills—finally passed a moderate bill, which the President could accept.

This then, briefly, is the story of housing legislation, touching only the highlights. The picture is clear. Under the guise of helping the people in various aspects of the housing field, an attempt was made to thrust the Federal Government into subsidized housing of all types—some of it far afield from actual housing itself. All this would have been at the expense of the taxpayer, at the expense of deficit financing, at the expense of inflation.

It recalls the old political slogan—spend, spend, tax, tax, elect, elect.

But because of a determined and reasoned defense by the President—enforced by two vetoes—Congress was forced to come down to a more moderate bill, far more in keeping with the genuine housing needs of the people.

No better illustration of the effective leadership of the Eisenhower administration occurred during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Labor legislation

One of the most bitterly contested issues in the 1st session of the 86th Congress was labor union reform. The McClellan committee began hearings in February 1957 and uncovered wholesale evidence of crime, corruption, and collusion operating in the field of labor-management relations.

Shocked at these disclosures, this Republican administration called for prompt corrective legislation last year. A bill falling far short of the administration's recommendations was passed by the Senate. In the House of Representatives Speaker RAYBURN kept the bill on his desk for 40 days and prevented it from being adequately debated in committee. Finally on August 18, in the adjournment rush, an attempt was made to take up the measure under a suspension of rules—a device to limit debate and prevent floor amendment. It was defeated. The Democrat chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, GRAHAM A. BARDEN, of North Carolina, declared it was "an insult to the House and no compliment to their intelligence" to expect passage under suspension.

So, for political purposes, labor reform was killed for 1958—a congressional election year.

In his January 28, 1959, labor message, President Eisenhower again urged prompt action by the 86th Congress. He said there was a need for effective legislation—

"To safeguard workers' funds in union treasuries against misuse of any kind whatsoever.

"To protect the rights and freedoms of individual union members, including the basic right to free and secret election of officers.

"To advance true and responsible collective bargaining.

"To protect the public and innocent third parties from unfair and coercive practices such as boycotting and blackmail picketing."

An administration bill (S. 748) was introduced by Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, a member of the McClellan committee and ranking Republican on the Senate Labor Committee. This bill would have adequately met the specific recommendations of the McClellan committee's first interim report.

The President's recommendations as contained in S. 748 were sound, balanced, and realistic. They were neither pro nor antiunion—nor were they pro or antiemployer. Most important, they called for needed amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act relating to secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing. Moreover, they called for elimination of the so-called "no man's land." (The "no man's land" is created by the inability of the National Labor Relations Board to adjudicate all labor-management disputes involving interstate commerce which properly lie within its jurisdiction—thus leaving thousands of small unions and employers without legal remedy since the Supreme Court has held that Federal labor legislation preempts State statutes.)

Unfortunately, the Democrat-controlled Senate Labor Committee, possibly with an eye on the 1960 elections, ignored the President's reasonable recommendations. Instead it reported out the pathetically weak Kennedy-Ervin bill—S. 1555. This measure was conspicuous not for what it accomplished but for the objectives it failed to achieve.

Its most obvious failures were the following:

It did not impose fiduciary obligations, which could be enforced by rank and file union members, on union officials.

It did not impose the effective sanctions of denial of tax immunity and access to the National Labor Relations Board, the National

Mediation Board, etc., on unions violating the bill's provisions.

It did not solve the "no man's land" problem by permitting the States to exercise jurisdiction in those classes of labor cases which the NLRB refused to entertain.

It did not limit organization and recognition picketing by unions which clearly do not represent a majority of the employees of the picketed employer.

It did not close the loopholes in the present law dealing with secondary boycotts.

When the Kennedy-Ervin measure reached the Senate floor, many attempts were made to strengthen it. Most of them were rejected by a solid Democrat bloc. The highlight of the debate was Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN's, Democrat, of Arkansas, introduction of his "bill of rights" amendment. This dramatic move took on added significance for two reasons: (1) MCCLELLAN is chairman of the Senate Labor Rackets Committee; and (2) his sponsorship of the "bill of rights" amendment indicated a sharp split between himself and Senator Kennedy—chief sponsor of S. 1555 and chairman of the Senate Labor Committee.

Briefly, the McClellan bill of rights amendment provided equal rights to each union member; identical voting rights and equal protection under a union's rules and regulations; freedom of speech and assembly without interference from or penalty by the union; freedom from arbitrary financial exactions with a stated limitation on initiation fees; protection of the right of a member to sue; procedural safeguards against arbitrary disciplinary action by the union; the right of candidates for office in a union to obtain its membership list; and enforcement provisions and penalties for violations.

The union democracy amendment was passed by a vote of 47 to 46. All but 2 of the 46 votes against this very necessary amendment were cast by Democrats in opposition to the party's chairman of the rackets committee—the most informed man in the Senate regarding labor reform.

The bill of rights provision was later modified to eliminate obvious loopholes and what some feared would be used as union-busting provisions. Also Federal bureaucracy was taken out of the amendment, leaving its enforcement to union members. Moreover, the modifying amendment removed the extremes raised by the McClellan amendment but clearly assured the rights of union members.

An amendment to plug Taft-Hartley loopholes respecting blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts was defeated by a vote of 24 to 67. All but two Senate Democrats voted against this vitally important amendment.

The same fate was dealt another McClellan amendment which would have eliminated the "no man's land" problem. It was rejected by a vote of 39 to 52. Of the 52 votes in opposition to the amendment, 43 were cast by Democrats.

On final passage, the Kennedy-Ervin bill—weak though it was—was endorsed by a 90 to 1 vote. Republicans voting for the bill were, in the main, convinced that even though the measure fell far short of the Nation's need, it was better than no bill at all.

In the House of Representatives, the labor reform issue was more involved but more easily resolved. In the first place, there were three bills—as well as the Senate-passed Kennedy-Ervin measure—which the House considered. One was a very mild bill (favored by the AFL-CIO) introduced by JOHN F. SHELLEY, Democrat, of California, which was quickly defeated; the second was the committee bill—a middle-of-the-road measure comparable to the Kennedy-Ervin bill—which had the backing of the Democrat leadership; and the third was the Landrum-Griffin bill. The latter was the strongest and met with the specific recommendations of the McClellan committee as well as the administration objections to the Kennedy-Ervin bill.

At first blush—what with unprecedented lobbying by some labor leaders and support of the leadership—it appeared that the middle-of-the-road committee bill would get final House endorsement.

President Eisenhower took the issue directly to the people.

In an August 6 nationwide radio-television address he called for the passage of a fair and effective law. Specifically, he said:

"I want only effective protection from gangsters and crooks for the people of America—for the men and women who labor with their hands, their minds, their energies, to make America a better place for themselves and for their children."

The President cited a typical example of blackmail picketing and declared emphatically: "I want that sort of thing stopped. So does America." Then he gave a typical example of secondary boycotting. Again he declared: "I want that sort of thing stopped. So does America." With respect to the "no man's land" problem, he said: "I want the no man's land abolished, because I believe that small unions and small businessmen have rights, just as everyone else."

Mr. Eisenhower then told the people which legislation the administration favored, which legislation was needed to curb abuses revealed by the McClellan committee.

"In the House of Representatives the Labor Committee bill is even less effective than the Senate bill. It, too, fails to deal with picketing and boycotting practices which I have described.

* * * * *

"Neither the Senate bill nor the House committee bill will really curb the abuses the American people want to see corrected.

* * * * *

"The administration bill is still before the Congress. There is also before the House a bipartisan bill jointly sponsored by two members of the House Labor Committee—Mr. LANDRUM, of Georgia, a Democrat, and Mr. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, a Republican. The Landrum-Griffin bill is a good start toward a real labor reform bill, containing many of the corrective provisions which I have urged."

The House August 14 passed the Landrum-Griffin bill by a vote of 303 to 125. While patterned after the Senate-passed Kennedy-Ervin bill, it was much stronger in that it outlawed most forms of organizational picketing, all secondary boycotts, all forms of hot-cargo agreements, and provided criminal penalties for union officials who violate members' rights. Moreover, under provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill, a formula was worked out which resolved the no man's land problem.

The measure then went to conference where Senate and House conferees battled it out for 12 days. Senator KENNEDY, conference chairman and sponsor of the original Senate bill, promised August 17 to return to the Senate for instructions if the conferees could not reconcile the Senate version, which did not include the President's Taft-Hartley requests, with the House version which did.

Prolonged Senate debate was threatened when Senator KENNEDY August 28 introduced a resolution asking the Senate to instruct the conferees to insist on a Taft-Hartley compromise proposed by him. The same day, the minority leader introduced a resolution asking instructions to accept the House version. Debate was precluded by the final agreement of the conferees late September 2.

The final bill marked a signal victory for the administration. It was largely the House bill and contained at least 90 percent of the administration's recommendations. The conferees reached agreement after Senator KENNEDY dropped his demand for a provision to let building trades unions picket a joint construction site.

As finally passed, the measure provided a bill of rights for individual union members outlining voting privileges, and other activities within his union. It also gave him the right to file a Federal civil suit for relief if his rights were abused, and made it a crime, subject to fine and imprisonment, if violence or threats were used to interfere with rights guaranteed by the bill.

Annual financial reports by unions and some employers (who deal with labor relations consultants, "middlemen" etc.) are required. (These records must be kept intact for 5 years.) Penalties are provided for those who fail to carry out the requirements of this section.

Specific regulations concerning trusteeships are imposed which will eliminate the abuses some unions have been guilty of in placing local unions in a virtual state of suspended animation under the guise of trusteeships.

The measure also spelled out rules and regulations with respect to union elections giving the rank-and-file member much more freedom in electing his union officers.

Fiduciary obligations are imposed upon labor union officers. Criminal penalties are provided for those who steal, embezzle or otherwise misappropriate union funds entrusted to them. Extortion picketing is also outlawed.

With respect to the Taft-Hartley amendments requested by the President, the measure was very specific.

It permits State labor relations agencies and State courts to assume jurisdiction over labor disputes the NLRB declines to handle, but bars the NLRB from enlarging the categories of cases it declines to handle. This takes care of the "no man's land" problem.

The bill permits the President to designate an acting NLRB General Counsel if the office becomes vacant.

It makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to try to coerce or threaten an employer directly (but not to persuade or ask him) in order—

To get him to join a union or sign any illegal "hot cargo" contract.

To get him to stop doing business with another firm or handling its goods.

To get him to recognize a union if the NLRB had already certified another union as his workers' bargaining agent.

To force him to assign work to members of one union, rather than another, in a jurisdictional dispute between unions representing his employees.

To get any other employer to recognize a union not certified as the representative of his employees in an NLRB election. (Direct coercion of an employer by a union for these purposes was not previously covered by the secondary boycott prohibitions.)

Moreover, the bill as it went to the White House makes it an unfair practice for a union to induce supervisory workers, or any single worker, to refuse to handle goods, or to strike, for any of the purposes outlined above. It also specifies that union inducement of employees not to handle work "farmed out" to their employer by a struck firm is not a secondary boycott.

The bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a union and an employer to sign a so-called "hot cargo" contract under which the employer agrees not to do business with any other firm; nullifies any such existing contracts; exempts from this provision garment industry contracts barring a jobber from subcontracting work on a single garment to unorganized shops, and building industry contracts barring a firm from subcontracting work at its job site to an unorganized firm.

The conference-approved measure further bars organizational or recognition picketing by a union: if in the absence of an unfair

labor practice by an employer, the employer already recognized another union or there had been any NLRB certification election in the previous 12 months; or if the union had been picketing for 30 days and had not asked for an election. If the union claimed its picketing was purely informational, it could picket for longer than 30 days without seeking an election, provided the picketing did not cause the employees of the firm involved to stop working or prevent deliveries or pickup of goods.

The bill also brings under picketing and secondary boycott prohibitions of the bill and the Taft-Hartley Act several groups of workers not previously covered, including railroad, airline, farm, and local government workers.

The bill permits the NLRB to allow strikers fired during a strike and not entitled to reinstatement to vote in an NLRB representation election conducted within a year after the strike began.

It bars a union from picketing a retail store to advertise that the store is handling the goods of a firm the union was striking, but permits other forms of such advertising—handbills, for example—if they do not cause the store's employees to stop working or prevent pickups and deliveries.

Finally, the bill permits building trades firms and unions to sign union contracts in advance of a construction job, even if the union had not won an NLRB certification election or did not represent the majority of the existing or potential employees. Such contracts could require the employees to join the union within 7 days (except in States with laws barring the union shop), require the employer to hire through the union, or permit the union to set up experience and training qualifications for employees.

National defense and related matters

The big fact of life that we as a nation must face is the continuing cold war, coupled with the ever-present threat of hot war.

This explains the intense emphasis of the Congress and the administration on national security and mutual security, on foreign affairs, on scientific research and space exploration, on atomic energy, and all related matters.

To be unprepared to sustain the cold war struggle or to repel attack should it come is unthinkable.

It is a fact that dominates our policies as the administration and the Congress explore every avenue in the unceasing quest for durable peace.

President Eisenhower has repeatedly shown that he is devoting his life to the quest for peace.

While the Communist-dominated nations speak of a desire for friendship, their leaders have precipitated military strife in the tiny kingdom of Laos at a critical period when the leaders of communism and the free world are supposedly attempting to find a possible solution to the cold war.

In his state of the Union message to the Congress, the President said:

"Keeping the peace in today's world more than ever calls for the utmost in the Nation's resolution, wisdom, steadiness, and unremitting effort."

He went on to say:

"We cannot build peace through desire alone. Moreover, we have learned the bitter lesson that international agreements, historically considered by us as sacred, are regarded in Communist doctrine and in practice to be mere scraps of paper."

Defense expenditures dominate our budget: More than two-thirds of our Federal budget goes for defense and preparedness in case of future war and to pay for past wars.

For current preparedness, we face costs of $40 billion for our Armed Forces and $3 billion for mutual security; and for costs arising out of past wars, $5 billion for the Veterans' Administration and $8 billion for interest on the public debt. Yet, until the threat to our survival diminishes, we dare not let up in our efforts to stay strong against any potential enemy or to let our guard down.

Every American has the sincere hope that the world situation will resolve itself so that energies and resources of all mankind may be devoted to utilizing the magnificent scientific and technological achievements of this generation to provide higher living standards rather than concentrating so large a share of our energies on the defense of our precious liberties as well as those of our allies against aggression.

The question of our Nation's survival transcends partisan politics. Republicans and Democrats alike cooperated in this session of Congress to keep America strong, both militarily at home and in partnership with our free world allies.

Each year the Congress makes a further investment in military equipment and troops to strengthen our defense forces. This session of Congress approved $40.5 billion in new funds for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, and Department of Defense for pay, equipment, missiles, ships, aircraft, operations and maintenance, research and development, and military construction.

As is its constitutional prerogative, the Congress made some changes in the budget requests for the Armed Forces. Generally speaking, the changes made this year were in recognition that time and events had overtaken a budget that was prepared many months ago. The administration likewise moved with the times. At the urging of Congress, the administration revised its air defense plan involving the Bomarc and Nike-Hercules missiles. Congressional appropriation action reflected this changing emphasis, cutting back even a little further in those programs.

On the other hand, the Congress voted funds to step up our offensive ballistic missile programs and our efforts to defend against ballistic missiles fired at us by an enemy. Congress provided extra funds for general war preparedness. Congress also approved extra funds for limited war forces, especially for Army modernization of combat equipment. Antisubmarine warfare funds were increased.

Congress took care of the No. 1 priority of the Navy—a modern attack aircraft carrier—by providing $35 million for procurement of long leadtime components—mainly atomic reactors—for a new nuclear carrier to replace a conventional carrier of World War II vintage. The Senate had earlier voted the full cost of a nuclear carrier ($380 million), and the House had first omitted any funds for another carrier although the President's budget reqested $260 million for a conventional carrier. In this way, the Congress approved the President's recommendation for a replacement carrier with modern equipment and a flight deck sufficiently large to handle the Navy's very high speed aircraft.

Congress approved the military personnel strengths proposed in the budget for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, but added funds for more Marines, Army Reserves, and Army National Guard. In the case of the Marines, $43.1 million extra was added for an end strength of 200,000 on June 30, 1960, compared with the budget strength of 175,000. Both Houses approved additional funds for 300,000 Army Reserves and 400,000 Army National Guard, increases of 30,000 and 40,000 respectively over the budgeted strength. Congress made the higher personnel strength figure a mandatory floor in the case of the Army National Guard.

Congress also extended for 4 years the induction provisions of the draft act, the Reserve enlistment program (6-month trainees), the doctor and dentist draft act, special pay provisions for doctors, dentists, and veterinarians, and the Dependents Assistance Act.

Summing up, for military functions of the Defense Department, Congress provided funds totaling $39.2 billion ($19,961,000 less than the budget request), and, to help finance defense costs, $430 million in cash transfers from revolving funds $90 million more than the budget). For military construction, Congress approved $1,363,961,200, which was $199,238,800 less than the budget request. There was general agreement that the increases would further strengthen our forces and the reductions would not impair our forces and the reductions would not impair our defense posture.

Natural resources—public works

Since 1955 the President has recommended legislation to authorize the sale of revenue bonds by the Tennessee Valley Authority. On August 6, 1959, the President approved H.R. 3460, which authorized TVA to sell up to $750 million worth of long-term bonds to pay for future expansion of power facilities.

President Eisenhower was reluctant to sign the measure because it contained a provision which directed that TVA's annual power construction program be sent to the President, who, in turn, would pass it along to Congress for consideration. The President could recommend changes, but any changes Congress made would be by concurrent resolution, not subject to a Presidential veto. However, the Congress enacted legislation which repealed this provision and it was approved by the President on August 14, 1959 (Public Law 86–157).

The 1960 budget required expenditures of $1.1 billion for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and related activities of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The President stated that "In view of this record program, no funds are provided in the 1960 budget for starting construction of new water resources projects."

Over this recommendation, the Democrat-controlled Congress passed a public works appropriation bill which included 67 unbudgeted projects estimated eventually to cost over $800 million. In vetoing the bill, H.R. 7509, the President said that "It ignores the necessity for an orderly development of America's water-resources within the Nation's fiscal ability." The bill totaled $80,071,549 more than administration requests.

A second bill was passed and sent to the President still containing the 67 unbudgeted projects. The legislation was again vetoed, but both Houses overrode the veto.

In order to help initiate a program to find new ways to use coal and cheaper methods of production, the Congress passed H.R. 6596, which established a Coal Research and Development Commission. The Commission would have the responsibility of carrying on research to develop new and more effective uses of coal, to expand existing uses, and reduce the costs of production and distribution.

For the last 2 years the administration has proposed major mining legislation, but the Congress has failed to take any decisive action on establishing a national long-range minerals policy. However, piecemeal remedies were proposed and the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported two such measures. House Concurrent Resolution 177, passed by the House on August 26, 1959, requests the President to examine existing programs for their effectiveness in stimulating depressed mining industries, to advise Congress on actions taken to this end, and to suggest necessary legislation. S. 1587 charges the Secretary of the Interior with carrying out a national mining policy and orders him to report to Congress annually on the state of the domestic mining industry and recommend legislation nec-

essary to implement the policy. Both bills declare it to be in the national interest for the Government to encourage development of domestic mineral resources, a sound mining industry, and research to promote efficient use of mineral resources.

Space programs

During the past year tremendous progress was made in the development of our knowledge of outer space. The administration has sought to show the world the many peaceful uses to which abilities in this field may be put. Last Christmas the President expressed his sentiments for peace and good will to the entire world from a satellite which transmitted his voice as it circled the globe. More recently, the United States successfully launched two monkeys into orbit, Able and Baker. They were returned to the earth's atmosphere unharmed. This is a major scientific breakthrough.

For the Nation's civilian space agency, Congress approved appropriations totaling half a billion dollars, $500,575,000 in exact figures.

This was $29,725,000 less than the budget request, despite strenuous efforts of the Senate to grant the full $530,300,000 requested for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

It was a 14-percent cut in the NASA budget request for supplemental 1959 funds and a 5-percent cut in the regular 1960 appropriations request. A 20-percent slash was made in supplemental 1959 funds asked for Project Mercury, the man-in-space program. Instead of $20,750,000 in research and development funds for manned space flight, the final supplemental amount allowed for 1959 was $16,675,000. Substantial funds for this project were approved for 1960, but if the man-in-space program is to go ahead as budgeted, funds will have to be taken from other space projects to make up the 1959 cut.

Authorizing legislation for the full amount of the budget requests for 1959 and for 1960 was approved by both Houses of Congress. But House delay on the actual appropriations resulted in a point of order that the authorization for 1959 supplemental funds had expired. Thus, research and development and construction and equipment funds requested for 1959 were stricken from the House bill.

As the appropriation bill passed the House, 1959 funds were cut 59 percent and 1960 funds, 9 percent. Considering the total request ($530,300,000) for the 2 years, the House cut overall was $68,225,000, or 13 percent.

The Senate, however, restored all the cuts and unanimously (79 to 0) granted the full amount of $530,300,000 asked for 1959 and 1960 to carry forward the Nation's important space projects and activities.

But the House conferees refused to restore more than $38,500,000 of the House reduction, leaving a $29,725,000 final reduction, which amounted to a 5.6-percent cut in the budget request.

The Senate backed in full the program presented by the head of the Nation's civilian space agency, T. Keith Glennan, who asserted:

"Any reduction in the NASA's tight budget will have a critical effect on the Nation's space program."

Mr. Glennan testified:

"Moreover, if the Congress slices an already lean NASA budget at a time when this Nation has barely begun its space effort, the world will conclude that the United States is having second thoughts about facing the Communist challenge in this field.

"Our present budget has no slack whatsoever.

"As further evidence of our tight belts, I would like to state that we do not have a single 'backup' vehicle for any of our scientific experiments. Each must be a one-shot affair, and if the booster malfunctions, we will simply have to lay the experiment aside."

Space projects that might be cut back or delayed by cuts in NASA appropriations include Project Mercury man-in-space flight; Project Rover nuclear propulsion program; work on the 1½-million-pound thrust, single-chamber engine needed to carry manned expeditions to the moon and back; the Vega rocket propulsion system to place more than 5,000 pounds in an earth orbit; the Centaur space vehicle to place more than 8,000 pounds in a 300 mile orbit and capable of soft-landing a 730 pound scientific payload on the moon; and our tracking and data acquisition network.

Nevertheless, the House conferees were adamant and insisted on allowing only $91,400,000 for salaries and expenses, a $3,030,000 cut; $16,675,000 for research and development, 1959, a $4,075,000 cut; $318,675,000 for research and development, 1960, a $14,395,000 cut; $21,825,000 for construction and equipment, 1959, a $2,425,000 cut; and $52 million for construction and equipment, 1960, a $5,800,000 cut. This made a total of $500,575,000 for NASA, a reduction of $29,725,000 in the Budget request.

Taxation

General revenue revision: The President has requested a general survey and revision of our tax structure. The Ways and Means Committee has indicated that such a study will begin in November 1959.

Corporate and excise taxes: The Congress has enacted legislation to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate tax rate and the excise taxes on alcohol, cigarettes, automobiles, and parts in accordance with the President's request. If this legislation had not been enacted, the corporate tax rate would have reverted to 47 percent as of July 1, 1959. The tax rate extension act also contained provisions to reduce the tax on personal transportation from 10 to 5 percent effective July 1, 1960. The act also provides for repeal of the tax on local telephone service effective July 1, 1960. In addition, Congress raised the gas tax by 1 cent a gallon, specifically to finance the Interstate Highway System.

Life insurance companies: The taxation of life insurance companies has long posed a difficult problem and special provisions of a temporary nature were enacted periodically. The first session of the 86th Congress enacted permanent legislation to provide an equitable formula to tax income of life insurance companies. It is based on a consideration of net investment income, underwriting profits, and capital gains. This legislation will increase the Federal tax yield by about $500 million.

State taxation of interstate commerce: The entire concept of State taxation of interstate commerce by the individual States was confused in February 1959, by two Supreme Court decisions which upheld "the constitutionality of State net income tax laws levying taxes on that portion of a foreign corporation's net income" earned within the taxing State. The implications of these rulings left the business community in a climate of uncertainty as to whether several States could tax the same transaction and as to whether a State could tax the profits on the sales made within its jurisdiction, even though the firm has no offices within the State.

As a stopgap measure, the Congress passed S. 2524 on September 3, 1959, which provided for limitations on any State imposing a tax on a foreign corporation engaged in interstate commerce. In addition, the measure provided for a congressional committee to study the problem for the purpose of recommending permanent legislation to the Congress.

Incentives for foreign investment: The President requested the development of a program designed to encourage greater participation by private enterprise in economic development abroad.

The administration's program was incorporated in H.R. 5, introduced by Representative Boggs. This legislation would provide for the creation of special American corporations called foreign business corporations. These corporations would receive special tax treatment in that their taxes would be deferred until such time as they are returned to parent domestic corporations or paid out in dividends to American stockholders. These corporations, although operating on foreign soil, would be considered to be domestic corporations. Such a program would provide incentive for private investment abroad. There has been no action upon this legislation although the House Ways and Means Committee has tentatively approved the bill.

Veterans

During this past session, several steps were taken to liberalize the benefits available to veterans. Foremost among these was a major change in pension payments which increased benefits for well over a million non-service-connected veterans and their dependents. This new pension payment plan which, in principle, was one of the President's 1959 legislative recommendations, set up pension payments on a sliding scale, geared to need, instead of the flat payments made previously.

In addition, widows and orphans of World War II and the Korean conflict were granted the same pension benefits as widows of World War I. This equality of eligibility feature is expected to provide, in the first year, pension payments to 206,000 World War II and Korean veterans' widows and orphans who previously could not establish eligibility.

Other measures benefiting veterans this session included: an additional amount of $100 million (over the $150 million already authorized) for direct home loans for veterans in rural areas where private mortgage money was scarce; a provision of $18 million in medical research; $32 million in hospital construction, which with balances from prior years will permit expenditures for hospital construction of $67 million; and an increase of $24 million in hospital care. Several lesser measures, although not of major significance but nevertheless of benefit to veterans, were also enacted, such as broadening the definition of the term "child"; providing medical care for veterans residing abroad with peactime service-incurred disabilities; and others.

Pending in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee at the end of the session was a measure, sometimes referred to as the GI bill for veterans of the cold war, to provide readjustment assistance for peacetime post-Korean veterans. This bill has passed the Senate July 21, 1959.

V. MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

Rule 22

The first order of Senate business during this session of Congress involved changes in Senate rules relating to limitation of debate. Also, for the first time in its history, the Senate voted directly on the question of whether its rules were continuing.

By vote of 72 to 22, the Senate adopted a rule change providing that (1) a filibuster could be ended by vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting instead of by two-thirds of the entire Senate membership, (2) cloture was extended to motions to proceed to consider a change in the Senate rules, and (3) the Senate rules shall continue from one Congress to the next unless they are changed as provided in these rules.

The rule change thus made followed rejection by vote of 60 to 36 of a proposal that the Senate declare, in effect, that it was not bound by the rules of any previous Senate,

except to the extent to which it was willing, my a majority vote, to be bound.

The rule 22 amendment was effected against a backdrop of conflicting issues. On the one hand was the perennial issue of how to advance the cause of civil rights in the face of opposition by a determined minority of Senators. In this connection, the advancement of civil rights has long been a Republican objective and continues to be in the Republican tradition. This cause has more than once been thwarted by inability to secure the votes necessary to invoke limitation of debate, thereby bringing to an end a filibuster or a threat of one.

In 1957, however, a civil rights bill was enacted. It was the first such legislation to become law in over 80 years, and it had passed the Senate without a filibuster. Some sponsors of stronger civil rights legislation now sought through rule 22 changes to end the threat of filibuster against that objective.

On the other hand, there was the undoubted fact that rule 22, during the long history of the Senate, had protected the prerogatives of individual Senators and the rights of minority groups in the Senate against arbitrary action by a majority. In addition, there was the fact that the Senate never before had undertaken to write its rules at the beginning of a new Congress. The rules had always carried over from one Congress to the next. Thus, the working of a drastic rule change with respect to Senate rules, especially rule 22, could have even more extreme consequences in terms of the effect of that action on the Senate as an institution.

The size of the vote by which the new amendments to rule 22 were adopted (70 to 22) lent emphasis to the proposition that Senate rules could not be changed by drastic means. Moreover, rule 22 would continue to safeguard individual prerogatives and minority rights in the Senate, while at the same time it would insure a reasonable rule for providing an end to filibusters whose sole object is to prevent the Senate from reaching a vote on an issue.

Nominations

Major nominations: While, in general, major nominations of the President were confirmed, this rule was not without a notable exception. That exception was the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

In our entire history only one other Cabinet nomination, that of Henry A. Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce, has taken considerable time. Between the date of its referral to committee and final approval, the total elapsed period was about 5 weeks.

Now let us see what happened in the case of the Strauss nomination. His recess appointment by President Eisenhower was announced on October 24, 1958. On November 13, 1958, he entered upon his duties as Secretary of Commerce. His nomination was sent to the Senate for confirmation on January 17, 1959, and it was immediately referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The committee took no action whatever for 2 months, until March 17, when it held its first hearing. Thereafter, over the period between March 17 and May 14, there were 16 days of hearings, with a printed record of over 1,100 pages. The nomination was reported to the Senate by a divided vote on June 4. Debate commenced on June 5 and ended June 18, when the Senate rejected the nomination by vote of 49 to 46. From the time of submission of the nomination to the date of final action, 22 weeks had elapsed.

But foot-dragging and delay were only among the least unusual features concerning this nomination. It involved a man who had served with distinction in various outstanding capacities under five Presidents. His background and competence for the post were above reproach.

Despite this, the hearings, at times, were conducted more as a trial of an accused than as an inquiry into the fitness for Senate confirmation of a Presidential nominee. Witnesses were not limited to those who came voluntarily to testify against the nominee—some were sought out. There were charges by innuendo. The hearings were cluttered with irrelevant testimony. Minutiae of a record of over 40 years of distinguished public service of the nominee were carefully combed for whatever material prejudicial to him could be found. Red herrings like the Dixon-Yates case were carefully planted. It made no difference that there was no proof of the nominee's lack of honesty and that his participation in the Dixon-Yates case was insignificant. More important, apparently, was that this case had come to have political overtones.

It is somewhat ironic that, only a short time after Senate rejection of this nomination and after his opponents had condemned the nominee for his businessman's viewpoint that the Dixon-Yates contract was valid, the U.S. Court of Claims upheld the contract as legally valid, stating that there was no conflict of interest involved.

Opponents criticized the nominee for his part in the loss of security clearance by Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. It made no difference that Mr. Strauss was but 1 of 9 top-echelon Government officials who had had responsibility for making a decision and that seven had ruled against Oppenheimer.

Mr. Strauss was condemned for being too security conscious. And while, in the face of the international Communist conspiracy, opponents could not criticize his early advocacy of a program to develop the H-bomb, he was heaped with abuse for claiming too much credit for the part he had played.

In the end, personal and political antagonism to the nominee's personality, his views and opinions prevailed. Precedent was shattered and a Presidential appointment was rejected for the first time in our history on the basis of criteria that had never before been used.

Unbridled partisan political demagoguery was a characteristic not only of the Strauss nomination, however. A case in point was the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be Ambassador to Brazil. The conduct of hearings on her nomination was such that, despite her proven competence, her usefulness for service in the office became too greatly impaired. Even though confirmed, she resigned immediately thereafter.

Politically motivated tactics such as these have not only denied to the Government the services of highly competent people, but have tended to discourage others from serving.

The judiciary and related offices: For almost 8 months of the session, the Democrat majority dragged its feet on the confirmation of Federal judges, district attorneys, and marshals. Delay in confirming judicial appointments was particularly bad because of overburdened court dockets, an overworked Federal bench, and the consequent long delays forced upon litigants. Justice too long delayed becomes injustice and weakens the people's confidence in government.

One nomination languished so long in the Senate Judiciary Committee that, to avoid personal difficulties and embarrassments, the nominee requested the President to withdraw his name. Other distinguished men had to wait for months while politics determined their careers.

It was not until the closing days of the session, and only after concessions were made to the Democrat leadership, that they consented to break the log jam.

Investigations

The power and authority of each branch of Congress to conduct investigations is one of the most effective of all instruments for assembling useful data and information on which to base legislation. Obviously, the data and facts to be assembled must and should be germane to a legislative purpose. This fact was emphasized by the Supreme Court in the case of *Watkins* v. *United States*, 354 U.S. 178 (1957), in which the Court commented on the constitutional limitations upon congressional investigations, as follows:

"We have no doubt that there is no congressional power to expose for the sake of exposure. * * * The theory of a committee inquiry is that the committee members are serving as the representatives of a parent assembly in collecting information for a legislative purpose. Their function is to act as the eyes and ears of the Congress in obtaining facts upon which the full legislature can act."

The Court also said:

"The power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process. That power is broad. It encompasses inquiries concerning the administration of existing laws as well as proposed or possibly needed statutes. It includes surveys of defects in our social, economic or political system for the purpose of enabling the Congress to remedy them. It comprehends probes into departments of the Federal Government to expose corruption, inefficiency or waste. But broad as is this power of inquiry, it is not unlimited. There is no general authority to expose the private affairs of individuals without justification in terms of the functions of the Congress."

Coupled with almost unlimited subpena power this investigative authority must be prudently and discriminately used if there is to be confidence in and real usefulness for the results.

The first session of the 86th Congress appears to have broken all records for investigations not only in terms of money but in terms of variety and number.

The money authorizations for investigations as nearly as they can be compiled at this time totaled $8,787,000. This total represents authorizations to select and standing committees of both the Senate and the House. In addition, two such authorizations were provisions for funds to joint committees. For example, the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems received a total authorization of $55,000 for 1959.

The following is a tabulated breakdown of authorizations for investigations funds:

Investigations Funds, 86th Congress

SENATE COMMITTEES

Standing:	*Authorized*
Aeronautical and Space Sciences	$10,000
Agriculture and Forestry	25,000
Armed Services	200,000
Banking and Currency	180,000
District of Columbia	10,000
Finance	10,000
Foreign Relations	520,000
Government Operations	345,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	220,000
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	527,500
Judiciary	1,552,500
Labor and Public Welfare	130,000
Post Office and Civil Service	100,000
Public Works	135,000
Rules and Administration	85,000
Select and special:	
Small Business	120,000
Labor-Management	750,000
Water Resources	175,000
Unemployment Problems	100,000
Senate total	5,195,000

Investigations Funds, 86th Congress—Con.

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Standing:	*Authorized*
Agriculture	$50,000
Armed Services	150,000
Banking and Currency	105,000
District of Columbia	10,000
Education and Labor	160,000
Foreign Affairs	150,000
Government Operations	640,000
House Administration	20,000
Interior and Insular Affairs	60,000
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	475,000
Judiciary	200,000
Merchant Marine and Fisheries	75,000
Post Office and Civil Service	75,000
Public Works	125,000
Science and Astronautics	300,000
Un-American Activities	327,000
Veterans' Affairs	110,000
Ways and Means	300,000
Select and special: Small Business	260,000
House total	3,592,000
Grand totals	8,787,000

It should be noted that the grand total set forth in this tabulation of $8,787,000 represents authorizations for but the 1st session of the 86th Congress, and is already more than two-thirds of the $12,109,090.28 which was authorized during the entire 85th Congress.

The personnel involved in these investigations is indeed substantial. A large number of staff members were involved. Furthermore, many persons were serving on investigative committees who may have been obtained from Federal agencies either on a reimbursable or nonreimbursable basis.

For example, in the Senate alone, the total number of staff members involved in such investigations during the period January 1, 1959, through June 30, 1959, was 391. The following is a tabulation of the total number of such employees on Senate investigating committee staffs, by committee:

Armed Services Preparedness Subcommittee	23
Banking and Currency	7
Housing Subcommittee	8
Foreign Relations	7
Foreign Policy, Disarmament, Latin American and Canadian Relations Subcommittee	8
Disarmament Subcommittee	1
Government Operations:	
Subcommittee on Reorganizations and International Organizations	8
Permanent Investigations Subcommittee	13
Interior and Insular Affairs, two resolutions	25
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	31
Judiciary:	
Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee	10
Administrative Practice and Procedure Subcommittee	6
Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee	2
Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee	47
Trading With the Enemy Act Subcommittee	8
Constitutional Rights Subcommittee	15
Refugees and Escapees Subcommittee	3
Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights Subcommittee	14
Internal Security Subcommittee	24
Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee	13
Labor and Public Welfare	9
Problems of the Aged Subcommittee	8
Labor Subcommittee	7
Post Office and Civil Service	1
Investigation of Federal employee group life insurance program, the civil service system, and the postal service	6
Study of administration of the postal service and desirability of Federal health program	7
Public Works: Investigations Subcommittee	4
Rules and Administration: Privileges and Elections Subcommittee	8
Labor-Management (McClellan) Committee	53
Small Business Committee, two resolutions	15
Total	391

The cost of these investigations is not confined to Government personnel but necessarily includes the cost to the countless private individuals and organizations who must prepare testimony and make personal appearances. In many instances these appearances or hearings are mere duplications of previous investigations and the new testimony is no different from that previously given.

Notwithstanding the obvious fact of overwhelming Democrat control of Congress and, therefore, of the subjects under investigation by congressional committees, the administration stood up remarkably well under the scrutiny of such investigations. They failed notably to turn up corruption and scandal in Government under a Republican administration.

It may be of some interest to note the wide range of subjects of inquiry, however. The following is a list of such subjects, taken at random:

Problems of hungry children in the District of Columbia.
Effectiveness of the juvenile court systems.
Problems of independent logging operators and small sawmill owners.
Navy Department refusal to supply gun factory report to Representative RICHARD E. LANKFORD.
Lamb and meat grading.
Underseas warfare.
Distressed poultry areas.
Juvenile delinquency control.
Employee radiation hazards.
Importation of foreign excess property.
Present and future problems relating to management of the radio spectrum.
Oceanography and ocean research.
Psychochemicals.
Unsuccessful firing in certain missile programs.
"Monkey shot" outer space project.
Soviet Fair art exhibit.
Dual distribution practices of certain tire manufacturers.
Administered prices in the baking industry.
Antitrust laws and professional team sports.
The insurance industry.

VI. PRESIDENTIAL EXERCISE OF THE VETO

From time to time during the session, in speeches on the Senate floor and away from the Senate, there was much talk of the "veto pistol" and of government by veto. In fact, a wholesome respect for the President's veto power by the majority was a decided factor in its retreat from the positions which it first asserted on a number of bills. The dimensions of the original Democrat program were dictated by the alleged conviction of the majority that it had a mandate from the November elections for bold, dynamic, and almost unrestrained action in many fields.

The legislative power which the Constitution bestows upon the Congress and the President is a responsibility which must be fulfilled in accordance with the respective oaths of office. The Constitution specifically states that "Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall, before it become a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it." This is not a negative power, as it is so often interpreted. The Constitution requires that the President shall sign it if he approves and does not limit this power except to state that if he does not approve, he shall return the measure to the House in which it originated.

Thus, the President has legislative power equivalent to the two Houses of Congress. This power is not a privilege, it is a responsibility which is bestowed upon the President. If the President did not indicate his disapproval of legislation which he did not favor, he would not be fulfilling his constitutional obligations.

It has been said that the Presidential legislative power is a negative one, because he cannot propose legislation in the sense that the House of Representatives or the Senate can propose legislation. This is not true. The President may, and in fact is required by the Constitution to make proposals. The Constitution charges the President with the responsibility to "give to the Congress information of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

Over the years, it has become the practice of the President and his advisers in the executive branch of the Government to draft and submit legislation to the consideration of the Congress. Also, it has become a tradition that the ranking Member of the President's political party on the committee or subcommittee to which the bill will ultimately be referred will introduce the President's proposed legislation. For example, the President submitted to the Congress his proposal for labor legislation. It was introduced by Senator GOLDWATER, who is the ranking Republican member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

The President's determination to check inflation and to achieve a balanced budget through the use of his veto power was one of the most important instruments for energizing confidence both at home and abroad not only in a sound dollar but in our desire to preserve fiscal integrity. It was one of the truly effective forces in achieving a reduction in appropriations and a retreat from the "backdoor" approach to the national coffers.

The basic concept of the Republican Party is that by achieving a balanced budget and preserving the value of the dollar, confidence is generated, investment is stimulated, jobs are created, and the vitality of our free enterprise system is maintained.

The attitude of the country toward the President's courageous leadership was manifested by congressional acquiescence to more realistic spending. This sound Republican approach was supported by the great influx of written opinion which came to the desks of Members of the legislative branch over a period of many months.

This interest throughout the country, the President's determination, and the vigorous Republican support in the House and Senate was like a powerful alchemy which completely converted the alleged mandate to spend into a wholesome political passion to economize and proved by all odds to be the greatest force in achieving a balanced budget.

Another way of showing that Mr. Eisenhower did not abuse his responsibility in the exercise of the veto is to compare his action with that of his two immediate predecessors, Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The following table sets forth this comparison:

President	Regular veto	Pocket veto	Total vetoes	Vetoes overridden
Roosevelt, F. D.	371	260	631	9
Truman	180	70	250	12
Eisenhower	61	86	147	1

In addition to the relatively few important vetoes of legislation during this session of Congress, there were several outstanding instances where the threat of a veto resulted in operation retreat by the Democrat-controlled Congress. One of these was S. 1, the Federal airport bill, which passed the Senate early in February. Only the day before the Senate had passed the housing bill which the President subsequently vetoed and which, if enacted into law, would have unbalanced the tight but balanced budget submitted in January by the President. The airport bill would have thrown the budget still further out of balance by providing annual expenditures at the rate of $100 million instead of authorization at a much lower rate which the President had requested. This legislation thereafter shuttled back and forth between the House and the Senate until June 17 when it passed the Congress and went to the White House, providing for a continuation of expenditures at the existing rate, to wit, $63 million per year.

Action on the TVA funding bill, H.R. 3560, was one of the most significant occurrences during this session. From the very outset the President made it abundantly clear that since TVA was an executive agency, he did not propose to diminish the authority of his office over all executive agencies, because he esteemed any such action as a disservice to the Executive Office itself and to those who would succeeed him in the years to come in these responsibilities. Accordingly, when House and Senate agreed to virtually bypass the President in the manner of authority and control over the power program of the Tennessee Valley Authority, it was generally felt that the President, in view of his pronounced views on the subject, would entertain the idea of vetoing such a measure.

What happened becomes one of the most significant chapters in legislative history. After endless conferences both branches of Congress finally agreed to take immediate action on an amendment to the bill which was then before the President for signature, to cure this defect in the bill. The Congress thereafter passed and the President approved S. 2471, which effected a cure of this defect. All this emphasizes the President's constitutional role in the legislative process, and was one of the most interesting legislative retreats in the history of Congress.

President Eisenhower, up to the time of the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, had exercised his veto power on 147 occasions since his inauguration. His views were sustained by the Congress in all but one instance, the public works bill.

Had it not been so close to the end of the session and had it not been a public works measure in which congressional interest ran high, it is quite likely that this veto would not have been overridden. In that case, President Eisenhower's remarkable record of having all his vetoes sustained would have been something new in legislative history.

Even so, the record of only one veto lost in almost 7 years of Presidential tenure is a superb testimonial to the good sense and high national purpose on which President Eisenhower grounded his objections to legislation.

While we are speaking of records, we have another interesting fact to add to the history of vetoes.

In a single session, the President vetoed each of two bills twice: the housing bill and the public works bill. A preliminary check of presidential vetoes in the past fails to show any similar occurrence in our history.

It is necessary to go back more than a hundred years (117 years to be exact) even to find another instance in which a President vetoed only one bill on the same subject matter twice in the same session of Congress.

This took place in President Tyler's administration. During the second session of the 27th Congress in 1842, President Tyler vetoed two successive tariff bills.

Times were different then and Congress took care of only a small amount of the Nation's legislative business because President Tyler vetoed a total of only 10 bills.

So President Eisenhower's two double vetoes in the same session is something of a historical record.

In appraising this unique record, it is important to note that only during the first session of the 83d Congress did the President enjoy the opportunity of cooperating with a Congress controlled by Republican majorities in both Houses.

VII. MEASURES AWAITING ACTION NEXT SESSION

There are a number of the President's legislative requests which have been ignored by the Congress. A few of the more important are listed below:

Early in the session the President submitted a balanced budget. Although the upturn in the economy has resulted in increased revenue estimates for the coming year, the authorizations for increased spending by the Democrat Congress have resulted in a probable deficit in the budget for the forthcoming fiscal year.

The President's program specifically requested authority for the Executive to veto or reduce individual items in appropriation bills. The Congress has taken no action on this request.

Although price stability and the control of inflation is the most serious problem confronting the economy, the Congress has not amended the Employment Act of 1946 to make price stability an explicit goal of Federal economic policy as the President had requested.

The Congress also ignored the President's request that the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act be extended to cover approximately 2 million additional workers. Although hearings have been held, this proposal has not been acted upon.

The so-called Simpson-Keogh bill is an important bit of unfinished business. The bill would allow self-employed persons to set up voluntary retirement programs, within limits, on the same tax basis as employees who are now covered by employer-employee pension plans. Passed by the House, this bill received hearings in the Senate Finance Committee and will unquestionably be a major item of business before the Senate in the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

A bill to release the Treasury from its unrealistic 4¼ percent interest rate ceiling will demand attention very early in the next session. As long as the ceiling is held at 4¼ percent, the Treasury cannot sell long-term bonds. This forces the public debt into short-term bonds (where there is no ceiling) and stokes the fires of inflation. Not only is it inflationary, but the ceiling on long-term rates does not even prevent interest rates from rising. The full impact of rising interest rates is merely transferred out of the long-term money market to the short-term money market where the upward pressure is immediately placed on all other short-term rates, including consumer installment debt.

Legislation restoring interest rate flexibility will have urgent priority in the next session. President Eisenhower gave this action a "must" tag as late as August 25, 1959.

The Senate Rules Committee has before it a resolution which would, in effect, prohibit so-called backdoor financing. This resolution grew out of the successful challenge to backdoor financing procedures thrown up against the proposed 5-year Development Loan Fund proposal. The Rules Committee is studying this question and results of the study could turn into one of the important questions before the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The President's area assistance program awaits action after having been frustrated for the fourth successive year by Democrat insistence on their own more costly measure. The Democrat bill extends the Federal Government's responsibility far beyond what it reasonably should be and commits the Federal Government to guarantee what it can never produce—namely, perpetual prosperity to each and every village and town regardless of changing economic conditions. But because the Democrats in Congress have insisted on this controversial approach, the President's self-help, locally oriented program remains to be enacted.

The House Ways and Means Committee has scheduled fall hearings on general tax reform. The Treasury Department has been cooperating with the committee in extensive studies backing up these hearings. If action could be kept free from politically inspired appeals to voter blocs, long-needed tax reforms to stimulate economic growth and progress could be an important possibility in the next session of Congress. Reduction of total tax revenues, however, can be considered only in the context of budget balance, and some start on paying off the burdensome public debt.

In 1958, the Congress enacted the Postal Policy Act of 1958 establishing for the first time on a statutory basis the principle that postal rates should be adequate to cover all costs of operating the postal establishment.

In 1959, the President recommended in his budget message an adjustment in the postal rates so as to increase the revenue of the Post Office Department by $350 million in order to bring about the objectives of that act.

In his message the President also indicated that there are certain public service costs which the Post Office should not be required to cover out of its postal revenues. In accordance with the President's message, the concept of public services as defined in the act requires these necessary but special costs to be charged against the general Treasury revenues. Therefore, he asked the Congress to correct this situation by amending the Postal Policy Act of 1958 to assure a more equitable sharing of postal operating costs between mail users and the general public. Such a program would result in adequate funds not only to meet the requirements of the Post Office Department, but also to carry on the research and capital programs which are already underway.

Congress failed to give the President the requested postal legislation. Failure to plug up the $350 million deficit in postal revenues played a major part in upsetting the balance in the President's budget.

The next session of Congress will also face the need for legislation in the following fields, discussed in detail above: agriculture, civil rights, education, and amendment of the Employment Act.

Other bills pending in committee as the first session closed included:

Alaska mineral leasing bill (H.R. 6940), passed by both Houses but vetoed in 1959.

Home rule for the District of Columbia, passed by the Senate on July 15, 1959, but blocked in the House District Committee.

The GI bill for post-Korean veterans, passed by the Senate on July 21, 1959, and pending in the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Aid to educational television, passed by the Senate on April 13, 1959, and referred to the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Bank mergers legislation, passed by the Senate on May 14, 1959, and referred to the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Air pollution control legislation, passed by the House on September 1, 1959.

VIII. FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Although the Constitution places the basic responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs upon the President, the responsibility falls upon the Congress to enact legislation to implement his foreign policy. They con-

tinue to determine the course of our national policies.

Many of the difficulties which have confronted the American economy, particularly American agriculture, stem from two world wars during a period of 45 years. Actually for the past 20 years, the American economy has been largely influenced by the overriding necessities of maintaining our defenses first against Fascist aggression during World War II, and, more recently, to preserve the balance of peace against Communist encroachments.

High defense expenditures, military stockpiling, atomic energy installations, research programs for missiles and advanced weapons have all contributed to the inflationary pressures, high taxes, and a huge Government debt. The wise conduct of foreign affairs during this troubled period will provide an opportunity for those concerned primarily with our domestic affairs to bring them into balance and equilibrium.

The Congress is to be commended for its strong bipartisan support of the Administration in the field of foreign affairs.

While there have been honest differences of opinion with reference to the most appropriate policy to follow in promoting our domestic economy, Republicans and Democrats alike have supported the basic objectives of American foreign policy as they have been enunciated by President Eisenhower.

The death of one of the world's greatest statesmen, the late John Foster Dulles, our former Secretary of State, was a severe blow to our quest for peace.

When Congress convened the Soviet threat to upset the existing status in West Berlin still hung over the Western Powers. The firm stand taken by President Eisenhower with obvious bipartisan approval in Congress averted a crisis and led to the Geneva meetings of Foreign Ministers.

At these meetings, firm insistence by the United States and our Western allies on their right of access to West Berlin under wartime agreements had the direct effect of persuading the Soviet Union to back away from its earlier threats to alter the status of West Berlin through unilateral action.

Mutual security

The program termed "of transcendent importance" to U.S. security by President Eisenhower, one of the great military leaders of all time, did not fare so well in the Democrat-controlled 86th Congress.

The President has called our expenditures for mutual security "fully as important to our national defense as expenditures for our own forces." He has stated his conviction that "for the safety of our families, the future of our children, and our continued existence as a nation, we cannot afford to slacken our support of the mutual security program."

The Democrat-controlled Congress reduced the President's request of $3.9 billion for mutual security, military, economic, and technical assistance to other countries.

In connection with the Development Loan Fund portion of the mutual security legislation, an attempt was made to invoke the "back door" approach to the Federal Treasury, bypassing the Congress and the whole appropriations process. The Democrat-controlled Senate Foreign Relations Committee proposed a 5-year loan program of $1 billion each year—an aggregate commitment of $5 billion—to be obtained directly from the Federal Treasury. For the 5-year period the Development Loan Fund would not have to come before the Congressional Appropriations Committees and justify its requests for funds to carry out its program. The representatives of the American taxpayers would have had no opportunity to check up on the activities of the Fund to insure proper expenditures.

The administration had requested $700 million for the Development Loan Fund for the single year 1960, the funds to be obtained through the customary appropriations process.

In the face of spirited opposition of Senate Republicans and the administration, Democrat sponsors of the back-door approach had to retreat. The Senate authorized appropriations for a 2-year period: $750 million for 1960 and $1,250 million for 1961, to be obtained in the usual manner through congressional committees. These amounts were later reduced in House-Senate conference to $700 million for 1960 and $1,100 million for 1961. Thus, the final version voted by the Congress approved the principle of appropriations rather than direct spending by the Fund out of the Treasury.

Some disappointment was felt by the administration when Congress failed to appropriate the full amount of funds requested for mutual security, but in the last analysis Congress has an equal responsibility with the President to use its judgment on the size of these appropriations.

Congress strengthened the hands of our allies by providing for the loan of two submarines to Italy, two submarines to Turkey, and two destroyers to the Republic of China.

Other measures

The Congress further strengthened American policy by the passage of a joint resolution designating the third week in July as Captive Nations Week so as to call to the attention of the world, and particularly to those people subjected to Communist imperialism, that "the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence."

In other areas Congress substantially supported the President's recommendations in matters of foreign policy. It increased the U.S. subscription to the capital stock of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (Bretton Woods Agreements) by $3,175 million, and the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund by $1,735 million.

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development have played an important role in furthering our foreign policy as well as in the overall development of economic stability throughout the world.

The President, on February 12, 1959, asked the Congress to authorize the U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund to request and consent to an increase of 50 percent in the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and authorize him to vote for an increase of 110 percent in the capital stock of the Bank, and, subject to such increase becoming effective, subscribe on behalf of the United States to 31,750 additional shares of stock in the Bank, amounting to a doubling of the U.S. subscription.

On March 19, 1959, the Senate proceeded to consider a measure (S. 1094) to implement the President's request. The President had requested that the authorization be made effective immediately. This request was based on the political and economic situation which confronted us. In a deliberate attempt to achieve political gain by unbalancing the 1960 budget, the Democrats amended this legislation to provide that the authorized funds should be included in the 1960 budget. In other words, they could not be spent until after July 1, 1959. There is no justification for such an amendment except that it provided a supposed political gain for the Democrat Party. The American people will not be fooled by such tactics. They recognize that if the 1960 budget is unbalanced, the blame lies completely with the Democratic Party in control of the legislative branch of the Government.

Congress also provided for U.S. participation in a new Inter-American Development Bank patterned after the Bretton Woods institutions with a subscription of $350 million to the capital stock of the Bank and a $100 million subscription to the fund.

In the field of international sports events, Congress authorized an appropriation of $500,000 in support of the third pan-American games to be held in Chicago, 1959; and extended an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1964 Olympic games at Detroit, Mich.

A number of treaties of commerce and friendship and others covering consular rights, avoidance of double taxation, fishing rights, communication agreements, and commodity agreements such as sugar and wheat were approved by the Senate in the course of the session.

Most important are the International Wheat and Sugar Agreements. The International Wheat Agreement (Executive E, 86th Cong.) was an extension of a similar agreement which was first entered into in 1949. It provides for a subsidy of 70 cents on the export of wheat and is intended to stabilize world markets in this commodity. The Sugar Agreement (Executive D, 86th Cong.) has a similar basic purpose, namely, price stabilization but achieves these objectives in a different manner. The treaty assigns quotas to sugar exporting countries and provides that importing countries will limit their imports from countries which are not participating.

The Senate also approved a protocol to the Convention on Duties and Rights in the Event of Civil Strife.

As Congress adjourned, the United States rounded out its seventh year since the end of the Korean war in which no American boys were engaged in foreign wars.

IX. THE STATE OF THE NATION AS CONGRESS ADJOURNED

The 86th Congress was elected on November 4, 1958. At that time, the country was emerging from a recession.

President Eisenhower, in numerous statements during 1959, indicated that the policies he had advocated to promote sound recovery without either inflation or undue Government interference with the economy would once again produce new record levels of personal income and employment. The Republican position has been vindicated thoroughly. Most recent figures for the summer of 1959 show that personal disposable income will hit a record level; more people had jobs than ever before in history, and unemployment had receded to about 5 percent of the labor force.

As the recovery reaches vigorous boom proportions, the most important problem which has faced our country in the last 6 months has been the emerging threat of inflation. In his Economic Report to the Congress in January, the President said:

"Our objective must be to establish a firm foundation for extending economic growth with stable prices into the months and years ahead. This will not come about automatically. To attain our goal, we must safeguard and improve the institutions of our free competitive economy. These are basic to America's unassailable economic strength.

"If price increases were to accelerate, the continuing upward movement would sooner or later undermine the confidence on which our economic system depends and would eventually release drastic corrective forces."

It is essential that an inflationary spiral such as was seen during the administration of Harry S. Truman should not be repeated. During the period from 1945 to 1951, the Consumer Price Index rose 34.1 points, a 44.3-percent increase. During the period from March 1953 to June 1959, it rose only 10.9 points, a 9.6 percent increase.

In order to prevent renewed inflation, the President in his budget message presented a balanced budget. Throughout the session he made a vigorous defense of fiscal responsibility in issue after issue.

The strange approach of the Democrat-controlled Congress to issues affecting the Nation's economy was manifested by a spending program which was strongly reminiscent of the dark days of the depression.

Despite record levels of prosperity and mounting inflationary pressures, Democrats in Congress came up with one expensive piece of legislation after another. In the Senate they even pushed through a bill creating a Youth Conservation Corps, similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the dismal 1930's.

With prosperity all around them, it was difficult to see how the Democrat liberals could reach back more than 25 years for their theme. In 1933, there were 12 million unemployed, almost one out of every four members of the labor force. Today, there are less than 4 million unemployed, about one out of every 20 workers. There were 39 million people employed in 1933, but total employment is now 68 million—the highest in the Nation's history.

Despite all the signs of prosperity, the Democrats sought to push through depression-born, inflationary programs which would cost taxpayers billions and billions of dollars, increase the national debt and stoke the fires of inflation.

In contrast, the calm judgment of the Eisenhower administration and Republican leadership in Congress during the 1957–58 recession reaped dividends for the Nation as the first session of the 86th Congress ended. Instead of embarking on a crash program to counteract a recession already fading into history, the administration refused to panic and simply stepped up programs already in the works.

The effects of this adherence to fiscal sanity were dramatically evident in the first half of 1959.

. The major economic indexes—output, income, and employment—hit alltime highs.

The gross national product was at a record $484.5 billion in the second quarter of 1959—up $14.5 billion from the first quarter and up $53.5 billion from the recession low in the first quarter of 1958. Almost 85 percent of this advance was in real terms, since prices were relatively stable.

Compensation of employees also reached new record levels of $278.9 billion. On the other hand, corporate profits after taxes at the beginning of the year were at an annual rate of $23.8 billion, which is about the level attained in 1956 when gross national product in current dollars was only $443.6 billion or 91.6 percent of the current level. In spite of the dire predictions of the Democrats, the 1959 prosperity has been widely shared.

Employment rose all through the spring and summer of 1959 to a record 67.6 million jobs. Unemployment fell. More Americans were at work than at any time in the Nation's history.

Average weekly factory earnings reached $90.09, compared with $83.50 in July 1958. Factory workers' earnings increased over the year by 10 cents per hour and $6.59 per week—with the cost of living relatively stable.

The American free enterprise economy has demonstrated its ability—without artificial respiration—to once again reach unsurpassed levels which have advanced the living standards of Americans beyond those attained under any other form of government.

Republican policies in 1959 were based on the confidence in our free institutions which the record demonstrates they deserve.

We have a tremendous future before us. We stand now at the threshhold of a half-trillion-dollar economy.

We have the opportunity to bring to millions of American families the higher living standards, the greater security, the fuller measure of human dignity that are made possible by our expanding productive power and broad purchasing power.

The record of this session has vindicated Republican policies geared to the strength, not the weakness, of our great country.

The Late Honorable Frank C. Walker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death on September 13 of the Honorable Frank C. Walker takes from our ranks a good man, a cultured gentleman, a fine husband and father, and a great American.

A close personal friend of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, and of the former President, Harry S. Truman, Frank Walker served our country in a number of offices in an outstanding manner. He served as executive secretary of an executive council to coordinate the activities of the Government; later, he became Chairman of the National Emergency Council, which Council was established to coordinate the work of Government agencies dealing with the depressions of the early 1930's. He performed both tasks in an outstanding manner.

In 1940 he was appointed Postmaster General in which important Cabinet position he served until 1945. In this office Frank Walker also made a notable record.

A strong Democrat, his party elected him in 1943 as chairman of the Democratic National Committee, in which position he served with loyalty and distinction. He recognized that the Democratic Party is the only national political party. Frank Walker understood and appreciated the importance, tactically, of unity within the party. Like Thomas Jefferson, he felt that disagreement is no cause for separation of friends.

In 1946 Frank Walker was a delegate to the first meeting of the United Nations General Assembly.

Throughout his life, he was interested in civic and charitable activities, donating generously, and giving untiringly of his time. For example, in 1950 in a community effort to advance the economic life of Scranton, Pa., Mr. Walker headed a community campaign to attract new businesses and to build industrial plants in Scranton.

Mr. Walker served as national chairman of the Notre Dame Foundation, and as president of the university's board of lay trustees. In 1948, Notre Dame University awarded him its laetare medal, conferred annually to an outstanding layman of the Catholic Church.

Frank Walker was also a director of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation; also the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, and was treasurer of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Library, Inc.

Frank Walker symbolized through life those fine ambitions that made him, as one of his friend once said, "One of God's noblemen."

His many friends will miss him very much.

Mrs. McCormack and I extend to Mrs. Walker and her son and daughter our deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Tax Foundation Review of Budgetary Actions in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to the Tax Foundation review of budgetary actions in Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, RELATIVE TO TAX FOUNDATION REVIEW OF BUDGETARY ACTIONS IN CONGRESS

When the President submitted his 1960 budget in January he requested new spending authority totaling $76.8 billion. Supplemental requests brought the total to $78.2 billion. I am advised that as compared with the total requests, new spending authority finally enacted at the end of the recent session of Congress totaled $77.4 billion, a reduction of $806 million.

These figures are revealed in a review by Tax Foundation, Inc.

The review strictly follows budget presentations and it covers spending authority—appropriations, authority to spend from debt receipts, etc.—enacted by the recent session of Congress to become available in fiscal year 1960.

It must be kept in mind that these are not expenditure estimates for fiscal year 1960. Expenditures in the current fiscal year will be made not only from these new spending authorizations but also from the unexpended balances remaining in other spending authority enacted in prior years. By the same token, some expenditures from the new 1960 authority will not be made until later years.

The Tax Foundation figures also reflect the failure of Congress to enact increased postal rates. The President's January requests contemplated $350 million in additional postal revenue from proposed increases in these rates to eliminate the estimated postal deficit. Appropriations to the Post Office Department allow for meeting the postal deficit in an indefinite amount.

The Tax Foundation review shows a reduction of $881 million under budget requests in appropriations, and an increase of $75 million over budget requests for authority to spend from debt receipts and through other backdoor financing.

Undoubtedly the effect of the four Presidential vetoes on money bills and threatened vetoes is reflected in the reduction.

The Tax Foundation is an independent research organization which I regard as the best in the field of government at all levels.

As a matter of routine, the Tax Foundation for years has been keeping a running box score on bills authorizing expenditures during their passage through the legislative procedure. This review, showing final action by Congress on spending legislation during the session just ended, is the last of a series

of three status reports published by the foundation this year.

The Tax Foundation's review follows:

"TAX FOUNDATION TABULATION SHOWING FINAL ACTION IN RECENT SESSION OF CONGRESS ON NEW SPENDING (OBLIGATIONAL) AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 1960

"The tabulation of the Tax Foundation, Inc., includes all new spending (obligational) authority, under which obligations may be incurred without further action by Congress, for the fiscal year 1960. It embraces current and permanent appropriations from the general fund of the Treasury and so-called back-door spending authorizations, which include contract authority, under which contracts may be entered into but requiring later appropriations, and authority to expend from debt receipts, or in other words to draw upon the Treasury without going through the appropriation process. The amounts in the tabulation are those applicable to fiscal 1960, and do not include either supplemental fiscal 1959 authorizations at the recent session or those for fiscal 1961, or other future years.

"Many of the tables which are published are not comparable to official data of the Budget Bureau in that they relate only to appropriations and fail both to include other forms of new spending authority and to exclude appropriated postal receipts and appropriations for liquidation of prior contract authority, neither of which provides new authority for spending from the Treasury.

"The Tax Foundation tabulation does not include authorizations to appropriate, which may involve large spending programs but which place discretion in the Appropriations Committees with respect to actual appropriations.

"Total new spending authority for fiscal 1960, according to the Tax Foundation data, is about $77.4 billion. This is $806 million less than the total of amended budget requests but $607 million more than first estimated in January. An increase of $1.4 billion in the total of amended budget requests over the original January total is accounted for to the extent of about $1.4 billion by deferment to fiscal 1960 of proposals intended for action in the closing months of fiscal 1959. This shift, however, was offset by about $700 million of items in the original fiscal 1960 budget which were not actually submitted to Congress. New proposals and increases accounted for about $700 million in the total of amended budget requests.

"Supplemental 1959 authorizations enacted at the recent session totaled $7.4 billion, which with fiscal 1960 new spending authority made a total of $84.8 billion for the session. This was $1.1 billion less than the combined estimate in the January budget document, but $2.4 billion more than the session total of last year.

"The $77.4 billion total of new spending authority for fiscal 1960 is a substantial reduction from the total of $81.1 billion for fiscal 1959 but far greater than in any other year since the Korean war. Supplemental items in the next session will mean an increase in the fiscal 1960 total.

"The $77.4 billion for fiscal 1960 includes three general classes of new spending authority: (1) amounts arising from actions in appropriation bills, and which thus have been subject to annual review of spending programs by the Appropriations Committees; (2) "back door" financing, including contract authority, and authority to expend from either public or corporate debt receipts, the latter applying to authority for the Tennessee Valley Authority to use funds derived from the sale of revenue bonds; and (3) permanent authorizations of a definite or indefinite character, including appropriations, contract authority, and authority to expend from debt receipts.

"New spending authority in appropriation bills, including loan authorizations in the Department of Agriculture bill but excluding appropriated postal receipts and amounts for liquidation of contract authority, totals about $67.2 billion. This is about $881 million less than proposed in amended budget estimates.

"'Back door' financing accounts for about $1.4 billion, which is $75 million above budget requests. The excess over the budget would have been much greater except for the veto of two housing bills and threats of a veto of other legislation, including extension of the airport grant program. The comparisons in the tabulation relate only to amounts applicable to fiscal 1960.

"Permanent authorizations total about $8.8 billion. The figures in this classification are taken from the January budget. The amounts in indefinite authorizations, such as for interest on the public debt, are subject to revision.

"Fiscal 1960 new spending (obligational) authority

[In millions]

Bill, program, or grouping by type of new obligational authority	Amended budget estimates	Passed by House	Passed by Senate	Final Congress action	Final action versus estimates
Appropriation bills:					
Department of Defense	$39,248	$38,848	$39,594	$39,228	−$20
Independent offices	6,584	6,458	6,559	6,502	−82
Department of Agriculture (including REA and Farmers Home Administration loans)	4,469	4,360	4,397	4,392	−77
Mutual security and supplementals	4,324	3,192	3,692	[1] 3,627	−698
Total postal appropriations	(3,899)	(3,847)	(3,877)	(3,859)	(−40)
Deduct postal receipts	(3,727)	(3,377)	(3,377)	(3,377)	(−350)
Appropriations for postal deficit	172	470	500	482	[2] +310
Treasury-Tax Court (in Treasury-Post Office bill)	789	781	786	784	−5
Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare	3,757	3,915	4,124	4,016	+360
Atomic Energy Commission	2,687	2,629	2,680	2,652	−36
Military construction	1,563	1,285	1,428	1,364	−199
Public works (passed over veto)	1,182	1,182	1,182	1,182	([3])
Department of Commerce, etc	732	675	715	713	−19
State, Justice, Judiciary, USIA	683	652	651	649	−34
Interior Department, etc	491	472	487	482	−9
Legislative	134	100	129	129	−5
District of Columbia, Federal funds	70	61	64	62	−8
General government	14	13	14	14	([4])
Supplemental	1,218	610	1,076	[5] 977	−241
Reappropriations	163	163	163	163	
Deduct appropriations to liquidate contract authority	248	227	266	266	−18
Net total in appropriation bills	68,032	65,639	67,977	67,151	−881
Backdoor financing:					
Contract authority:					
Urban renewal in final housing bill	350	350	350	[6] 350	
Airport grants	65	63	100	[7] 63	−2
National parkway			2	2	+2
Authority to expend from debt receipts:					
College housing loans	200	250	250	250	+50
FNMA cooperative housing mortgages		25	25	25	+25
TVA revenue bonds	750	750	750	750	
Aid to depressed areas	[8] (50)		300		
Total backdoor financing	1,365	1,438	1,777	1,440	+75
Permanent authorizations:					
Appropriations	8,593	8,593	8,593	8,593	
Contract authority	80	80	80	80	
Authority to expend debt receipts	150	150	150	150	
Total permanent authorizations	8,823	8,823	8,823	8,823	
Total new obligational authority	[9] 78,220	75,900	78,577	[10] 77,414	−806

[1] Includes $3,226,000,000 for mutual security, $704,000,000 less than 1960 budget; advance approval of $500,000,000 of 1961 authorizations denied.
[2] Reflects failure to increase postal rates.
[3] Reduction of $97,166.
[4] Reduction of $145,000.
[5] Contains additional $7,000,000 for postal deficit.
[6] An additional $300,000,000 for fiscal 1961.
[7] An additional $63,000,000 for fiscal 1961.
[8] Appropriation authorization.
[9] $1,413,000,000 above January estimate.
[10] $607,000,000 above January estimate.

Liberation of the Captive Peoples of Eastern Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the brief resolution adopted by the Rockford branch of the Lithuanian American Council urging the President in his talks with Prime Minister Khrushchev to be firm in his support of liberation of the captive peoples of eastern Europe.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 6, 1959.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Senator from Illinois,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We submit the following resolution adopted by the Lithuanian American Council, Rockford Branch:

"Whereas, the present dictator of Soviet Union Nikita Khrushchev, who keeps under his heel many former independent nations, among them three Baltic States, comes this

month, as a guest of President Eisenhower, to this country; and

"Whereas, the fiasco of the rebent Conference of Foreign Ministers in Geneva, Switzerland, definitely showed that the Soviet Government has no intention to make any concessions to the West regarding Berlin and Germany and refuses to withdraw its ultimatum: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this gathering of the Lithuanian American Council considers that the invitation of the Soviet dictator to this country will not lead to the elimination of essential differences between East and West, but it may harm the cause of freedom by creating an impression in the world opinion that the Government of the United States has forsaken the victims of Soviet imperialism; further be it

"Resolved, That this gathering requests the President of the United States to be firm in his talks with the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union, and to remind him that no just and lasting peace can be established in the world unless the Soviet Union restores sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and withdraws its armed forces from the so-called satellite countries.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL,
JOSEPH BACEVICH, *Chairman.*
P. A. DELTUVA, *Secretary.*

Permanent World Trade Exposition in Brussels, Belgium

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me on the World Trade Exposition in Brussels, Belgium.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The success of the free world and our free enterprise system is and will continue to depend in the largest measure upon a prosperous world trade. International commerce depends upon freedom and good will. The validity of agreements freely entered into and the sanctity of private property are the cornerstones on which international trade is built. Our chambers of commerce, boards of trade, and the American Foreign Trade Council recognize the importance of these factors. They are continually stressed at their meetings as the basis for the success of world business.

I have learned with much pleasure that a friend of mine, Mr. Leon F. Bergere, realizing the importance of world trade, has taken the initiative in establishing a Permanent World Trade Exposition in Brussels, Belgium. The World Trade Center and a Universal Trade Center in Brussels will foster good will and international commerce. Here there will be on exhibit the many products of the varied industries of the world. Manufactured articles and raw materials will be on permanent display. With the increasingly large surplus of products of our agriculture, manufacturing plants, as well as other finished products and raw materials, a world trade center can become a most useful adjunct to increased world trade. Sellers and buyers may and will then meet at a common, centrally located market.

Facilities for international banking, transportation of all kinds, technical services, advice and information established at the World Trade Center, are bound to be of invaluable assistance not only to those engaged in international trade but also to tourists, visitors, and the government representatives of the nations participating in the exchange.

It is of particular interest to me that it is planned to establish at the exposition an exchange bureau where there will be assembled the methods and means of handling international and domestic mail and parcel post. We will be enabled at a central location to learn of the improvements in facilities, and the methods and means of personal and commercial communications. A central office where ideas and improvements from time to time may be exchanged between the participating nations will serve as a continuing medium of improvements. Our mail service, domestic and foreign, and trade relations generally are bound to be improved as a result of the establishment of the world trade center.

I congratulate Mr. Bergere upon his industry and foresight. I trust success will attend this worthwhile project.

"Today in Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, during this session of the 86th Congress whenever I wanted the complete story on what happened here on Capitol Hill during the day, I did what so many of my colleagues tell me they did: I turned on my radio that night and listened to the distinguished radio commentator, Joseph McCaffrey, and his nightly report on "Today in Congress."

Not only were Mr. McCaffrey's reports on the workings of Congress informative, they were lively and interesting as well. He drew on his vast knowledge of the workings of Congress gained from his 12 years' experience covering Capitol Hill to bring us an oral congressional record from which we could get a comprehensive picture of all the important happenings of the day on the floor, in committees, and elsewhere here on Capitol Hill. To me, one of the most outstanding features about Mr. McCaffrey's report was the way he spiced the headline-making events with coverage of the many vital and constructive efforts here on the Hill which are overlooked by other news programs because they are not of the sensational and headline-catching variety. He also gave time to the personalities, the human interests, and the humor of congressional affairs which made his program so well-rounded.

"Today in Congress," Mr. Speaker, was sponsored as a public service for the second straight year. I know I do not speak just for myself when I express my deep appreciation to this fine organization and to its member airlines for making it possible for Congress to have its own radio program, devoted exclusively to our activities and our work. It was a real aid to me in my effort to keep abreast of the fast-moving events breaking here on the Hill, as I know it was to the other Members of Congress as well as Government officials and others who are in positions which require them to keep in close contact with congressional developments.

To Luce, After Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph Alsop which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 14, 1959:

TO LUCE, AFTER LAOS
(By Joseph Alsop)

DEAR HENRY LUCE: Although I rather doubt its being wholly welcome, I feel impelled to write you this letter after returning from a short but fairly intensive on-the-spot look at the trouble in Laos.

The idea of the letter originated in Hong Kong, on my way home, when I belatedly discovered that last-but-one issue of Time. The contrast was so remarkable, between your dismissal of the new Communist aggression in the Far East in a few patronizing paragraphs, and your ikon-portrait of President Eisenhower and close to six pages of paean about his European trip. Your implied order of priorities is cheerfully accepted by a large section of public opinion; and you are both the symbol and quite largely the creator of this public opinion.

Having been in Sam Neua and Vientiane when the President was in London and Paris, I cannot judge the solid results achieved by his trip. His purposes, certainly, were as high as his purposes always are. But after the closest, most prolonged study of your report on it, I can find no more evidence of solid political achievement than you would expect from any personal appearance tour designed to instill confidence and to spread good will.

In Laos, on the other hand, one saw a wholly new—even terrifyingly new—stage of a vast political process. It is a process that used to interest you in the past.

You surely recall your loud denunciations of President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson for their failure to prevent the loss of China. What is happening now in Laos grows out of that failure and the peace President Eisenhower made in Korea, and the subsequent partition of Indochina. But even though Laos is small and obscure, the success of the Communist aggression there will still be a new stage in this process. It will resemble the stage when a spreading cancer ceases to be operable.

If you have any doubt about this, you only have to look at the map and the record. As a nation, Laos may be small, obscure, disordered, and primitive, but its geography is intensely significant. Like a long potential troublemaker's finger, it pokes south from the border of Communist China, past Communist North Vietnam on the east, into the middle of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand. All these three nations will be immediately imperiled by a Communist triumph in Laos.

Cambodia's Prince-Premier Sinanouk must now bitterly regret his recent visit to Saigon, to patch up his differences with the West's friend, President Ngo Dinh Diem of South Vietnam. By the same token, Indonesia's President Sukarno has now gone off on one of those sudden trips he always takes when he is in doubt about the way the wind is blowing. The outlook in Indonesia has been improving lately; but a disaster in Laos will greatly strengthen the Communists there, and in Malaya, Singapore, and Burma, too. In short, the fate of Laos is only too likely to determine the fate of all southeast Asia.

This might not be the result, if the record did not strongly reinforce the map. The record shows that the Eisenhower administration's influence was used to create the existing anti-Communist government in Laos. The record further shows that the Laos warned the American Government that their anti-Communist government and policy would provoke an attack from North Vietnam. The record finally shows that the President's accredited representatives replied by telling the unfortunate Lao they could have entire confidence in the support of the United States and the military protection of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization.

In these circumstances, failure to safeguard Laos against the new Communist aggression will leave the United States with the reputation all over Asia that the old Hebrew prophet first gave to Pharaoh—we shall be regarded as a broken reed that pierces any hand that leans upon it.

The Communist arrogance and contempt for American power that is revealed by the new aggression in Laos has, of course, been predictable for some time. It is a natural result of our persistent neglect of the military power balance, which has long disquieted people like General Gavin—the people you therefore sneeringly accused of suffering from "sputniksyndrome."

But now the challenge is not just predictable. It confronts us squarely with just as much functional menace as the challenge in Korea that President Truman first invited by disarmament, and then responded to so admirably. Don't you think that in these circumstances the challenge deserves to be taken as seriously as a personal appearance tour, even a Presidential personal appearance tour?

And don't you think it may be time to do something drastic about the defense problem as well?

Sincerely,

JOSEPH ALSOP.

Statement of the Speaker

SPEECH
OF
HON. SAM RAYBURN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a very short statement.

I think you all deserve all of the holiday you are going to get. This is the 1st term of the 24th Congress in which I have served. I have never known a group of men and women assembled in this Chamber who I thought were more dedicated to the job they were trying to do here than the Members of the 86th Congress.

We have done, in my opinion, a tremendous and outstanding job. I think we have really worked to the limit of our ability and our strength to try to do the things that we thought were in the interest of all the people of the United States of America.

In broader fields, we have been almost unanimous in everything that had to do with our foreign affairs, hoping that our way of life and the leadership of the United States of America will prevail. We are and we must be the leaders of the world if there is going to be a free world and a place fit to live in to rear the boys and girls who will be the men and women in the numberless years, I trust, that this, the mightiest, the best, and the freest government ever devised by the wisdom of statesman, will live.

When the Constitution of the United States was struck off after 4 short months in Philadelphia in 1787, from May until September, they brought forth a document which a great English statesman, Gladstone, said was the greatest document every struck off at one time by the hand and brain of man.

We have had Congresses since then controlled by both parties and during all of that time the ancient faith has been lived up to. Today that document has been unchanged in its essentials and its fundamentals because it set up a representative form of government and no amendment that has been adopted to that Constitution from then up to now has changed it one particle.

I want to wish you all a well-deserved and a happy holiday until I see you again in January.

Khrushchev's Russia—8

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the final article of the series by correspondent Harrison E. Salisbury which has been appearing in the New York Times on the Soviet Union.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT MAY MARK TURN IN RELATIONS

(By Harrison E. Salisbury)

Nikita S. Khrushchev arrives in the United States to start what is primarily a journey of exploration. He is, in a sense, a Communist Columbus seeking a new route to shorten the distance between East and West.

What Mr. Khrushchev is seeking specifically is a short-cut to a new pattern of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The analogy between Mr. Khrushchev's venture and that of Columbus may extend even further. Columbus was looking for new trade routes. He found, instead, a new world. Mr. Khrushchev, too, may discover things he never expected.

It will be the first time, for instance, that Mr. Khrushchev has had a chance to evaluate for himself the strengths and weaknesses of the United States.

He will be seeing in action for the first time the American free enterprise system with its endless diversity, productivity and creativity. For the first time he will be able to weigh the reality of U.S. capitalism against the caricatures of the Marxist classics.

Nothing would be less realistic than to suppose that the impact of what Mr. Khrushchev sees in the United States would cause him to lose faith in the Communist doctrine.

But it would be equally unreasonable to suppose that Mr. Khrushchev's views, conclusions, and policies would not be modified in the light of American reality.

Mr. Khrushchev's career in the years since Stalin's death has been marked by experimentation and reevaluation on a grandiose scale. An example was his reassessment of Stalin at the Soviet Communist Party's 20th Congress. It is not his habit to cling to outworn concepts.

Mr. Khrushchev, of course, is not entirely a free agent. His policy must be forged under the internal pressures of the Soviet system and the compulsions that guide the relations of that system with the outer world.

Nor are all the factors in the situation new. Mr. Khrushchev, for instance, arrives in the United States with certain well-defined concepts about future relations between the two countries.

He has said on many occasions that what he would like is a two-power world, directed by the United States and the Soviet Union. He has talked in these terms with Adlai E. Stevenson, Senator Hubert Humphrey, W. Averell Harriman, and Vice President Richard M. Nixon. He undoubtedly will talk in similar terms with President Eisenhower.

If the Big Two agree, Mr. Khrushchev contends, the peace of the world can be assured. No one would challenge their combined strength.

Let us shake hands on such an agreement, says Mr. Khrushchev, and turn to peaceful competition. We will see which system—Communist or capitalist—can create the better way of life.

PATH NOT AN EASY ONE

Mr. Khrushchev's words are pleasant. The idea seems attractive. The objective of world peace is unimpeachable. But, as Mr. Khrushchev is well aware, the path to a two-power world is neither simple nor easy. For instance, what role are allies to play in the two-power world?

It is well to emphasize at this point that the United States has never indicated that the concept of a two-power world would be acceptable to it or that it is prepared to set up with the Soviet Union any share-and-share arrangement for managing world affairs.

The two-power idea did not spring full-blown from Mr. Khrushchev's brow. It is a concept he inherited from Stalin. The late dictator often advocated it in discussions with President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Stalin's thought was that the Soviet Union and the United States would take a map and divide the world. Each country would assume responsibility for peace and order within its sphere. Neither would interfere in the other's zone. Fringe disputes or conflicts without geographic limit would be settled by mutual agreement of the Big Two.

STATUS QUO ACCEPTED

Mr. Khrushchev has not expressed his ideas with quite such bluntness. But they follow the same general pattern. Each big power would recognize the paramount interest of the other in certain regions.

This would mean recognition of the Communist status quo in Eastern Europe and in Asia. It would recognize the capitalist status quo in Western Europe and the Western Hemisphere.

The two big powers would take it upon themselves to suppress any disorders or threats to the peace by the little powers.

Such a system, of course, would cause the North Atlantic alliance to wither on the vine—long the No. 1 objective of Soviet foreign policy. At the same time it would kill the Soviet-Chinese alliance. It would relegate the North Atlantic powers and China to secondary roles in world affairs.

A Pax Russo-Americana would reign throughout the world.

Such vast questions as the fate of the emerging nationalist movements in Asia, the new states of the Middle East and the future of the dependent areas of Africa would be decided over the Soviet-American conference table. The United Nations would become a mere appendage to big-power decisions.

Just to list the consequences that would flow from such Soviet-American collaboration is to make it evident that the objections from the U.S. side would be virtually insurmountable. The United States could not be expected to embark upon a policy that would cause it to abandon its world responsibility of the United Nations.

THE IMMEDIATE ISSUES

Such a world could be attained only if the two powers were able first to resolve the whole category of immediate conflicts that now divides them—Germany and the Berlin question, disarmament, atomic control, and trade.

Such a world could be attained only if the two big powers spoke the same language; if they defined their terms in the same way; if they understood each other's concepts and objectives in the same fashion.

The initial step, in other words, would require the clearing away of the tangle of misconceptions, misunderstandings, falsifications, and outright lies that have become imbedded in the fabric of Soviet-American relations.

This is what President Eisenhower had in mind when he suggested that the exchange of visits of himself and Mr. Khrushchev would "melt the ice a little."

The source of much of this distortion lies in the propaganda apparatus of the Soviet Union—newspapers, magazines, and commentators who have over the years reported the news as a kind of a gloss on Karl Marx "Das Kapital" instead of attempting to provide a clear, objective report of contemporary history.

Mr. Khrushchev, like all Soviet leaders of his generation, has long viewed the United States through the eyes of Pravda, the Communist Party paper, or of official observers whose bias is identical with Pravda's. His trip is bound to be replete with surprises.

A Soviet official who was here recently said that propaganda and slanted reporting had badly distorted his picture of the United States. He felt that long-term effects of such reporting by correspondents and diplomats had produced serious consequences.

If the effects of slanted reporting have seriously affected the conceptions of high-ranking officials, the consequences have been even more marked as far as the Soviet public is concerned.

Soviet people have been dependent upon the strictly controlled Government press and radio for information about the outside world. The areas of ignorance which have been created are enormous.

The effects of concentrated propaganda, however, are not always necessarily to the liking of the propagandists. Many Russians, sated with the dull diet of slanted news and commentaries, have virtually ceased to read the Soviet press or listen to the radio. Others automatically reject Soviet statements, assuming them always to be falsified.

PRAVDA'S STYLE ASSAILED

"Everything in Moscow has changed—but Pravda," an astute young Soviet editor observed. A well-known Soviet writer said he had stopped writing for the daily press.

"They ask for an article," he said. "You write it in your own style, reporting a situation in your own words. But before publishing it the editor improves the article by a few changes. He improves it so that it reads just like every other article in the paper."

Perhaps, because Mr. Khrushchev has become aware of these defects, a conscious effort is underway to make Soviet newspapers more reliable mirrors of reality. Soviet reporters are now doing on-the-scene American-style reporting. How seldom Soviet reporters are accustomed to move out of their Moscow cubbyholes is indicated by the fact that for many of those who accompanied Vice President NIXON it was their first glimpse of Siberia.

The effort to break out of the cliché-world into reality is not without repercussions. For example, Aleksei I. Adzhubei, new editor of Izvestia, has begun to reprint articles from the foreign press about the Soviet Union. Critical passages are severely excised but even minor criticisms produce violent reactions among bureaucratic officials long accustomed to read only rosy prose.

One of Izvestia's reprints was a dispatch by Max Frankel of the New York Times, giving a positive picture of present-day Siberia. But Mr. Frankel noted that some Siberian hotels had no toilet paper.

For weeks, thereafter, Soviet officials complained to foreign correspondents about this reference. Whether or not Mr. Frankel's report was correct made no difference. The officials were offended that toilet paper had been mentioned at all.

When they were reminded that Mr. Khrushchev had made some very sharp remarks about the plumbing in Siberian hotels, they replied: "Yes, but he did not set that up as an index of Siberian culture."

Actually, Mr. Adzhubei has been a leader in bringing fresh and more realistic techniques into Soviet journalism. He insists that his reporters go out to the actual scene of events. He gives prominence to letters from his readers, especially those reporting life in terms of human interest.

Mr. Adzhubei edited the youth newspaper Komsomolskaya Pravda before taking over Izvestia last spring. He instilled in his staff a spirit of competition most unusual in Soviet journalism.

The tendency of Soviet officials to edit the picture of the world to fit a preconceived pattern is what gives to Mr. Khrushchev's journey to the United States its real exploratory character.

Not until he has completed his 13-day stay in the United States will Mr. Khrushchev himself be in a position to understand what it would mean to live in a two-power world shared by the Soviet Union and the United States.

FOR ENDING "COLD WAR"

Mr. Khrushchev wants to end the "cold war." Of that there can be no lingering doubt. He often talks of the good that will flow from bringing the arms race to an end. He notes the huge tax burden in the United States and the handicap that arms production places on his plans to improve the life of the Soviet people.

He makes no secret of his hope that better relations with the United States will enable him to devote more attention to domestic problems. He is well aware that the heritage of the years of Stalinist oppression is far from liquidated.

But he is also proceeding on the firm assumption that the Soviet economic and social system will prove itself more productive than that of the United States. He is a convinced if somewhat unorthodox Marxist.

But Mr. Khrushchev's evaluation of the productive vitality of the capitalist system is rooted in ancient pictures—his boyhood experience in the Donets Basin coal mines and in Marxian descriptions of mid-19th century England.

His trip to the United States will require him to rethink a number of basic assumptions regarding the comparative vitality of the two systems.

Already the relaxation and comparative freedom of interchange between the Soviet Union and the United States have had sharp repercussions within the Soviet Union.

The opening of the American National Exhibition in Moscow caused Mr. Khrushchev's subordinates to carry out a savage press campaign against the favorable impression of the United States conveyed by the show.

"The better you and the Russians get along, the worse your press is going to be in the Moscow papers," a foreigner who has lived many years in Moscow observed.

FUTURE OF THE SYSTEM

This man's reasoning was simple. Once the pressure is off, once the ordinary Russian no longer fears war or "capitalist encirclement," his demands will build up very rapidly. He will expect his life to become just like that in the United States.

The incentives that the Communist system has long employed have been rooted in external threats. With the threat removed and the public demanding a better life, what happens to the system?

These are the calculations that Mr. Khrushchev will be reviewing as he flies from the east coast to the west, as he observes the flow of cars on the highways, the bulging shelves of the supermarkets and the precision of the automated assembly lines.

This is the new world that Mr. Khrushchev, in his role as the Communist Columbus, will have to evaluate.

TO MEET RULING CLASSES

Mr. Khrushchev will meet for the first time the "ruling classes" that he has long believed control the real levers of power in the United States—the "60 families" whose wealth and influence, so he has supposed, dictate American policy.

It is an article of faith to a devout Communist like Mr. Khrushchev that the "ruling classes" of the United States will fight any relaxation with the Soviet Union to the bitter end.

When Mr. Khrushchev discovers that Wall Street bankers and leading industrialists have the same differences of opinion over policy as occur among the "laboring masses," he will be confronted with another set of reevaluations.

If Mr. Khrushchev possessed a doctrinaire mind there would be little hope that his journey of exploration might produce positive results.

A disillusioned Soviet diplomat not long ago said he saw no prospect of an end to the "cold war" until the Soviet Union moved its capital back to Leningrad from Moscow.

What he meant was that the traditional attitudes of Moscow—parochialism, suspicion, provincialism, hostility to foreigners, bureaucracy, and isolationism—provided an impenetrable barrier to any real meeting of minds between East and West.

Not until Soviet policy once again comes under the more sophisticated influence of the great city on the Neva, built by Peter the Great as Russia's window to the West, would it be possible to create an atmosphere of real confidence between East and West.

The Soviet diplomat may be right. But the new ideas and new impressions to which Mr. Khrushchev is exposed in his journey of exploration may stimulate his creative mind to new paths of thought.

It has long been evident that in two great areas of conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, differences have been narrowing imperceptibly. Given a will toward agreement, the Soviet and United States positions on disarmament and atomic controls would prove more similar than is generally supposed.

The German question is more complex, although Mr. Khrushchev insists that no one—East or West—really wants German reunification. This leaves the Berlin question as the great enigma.

There are diplomats who contend that Mr. Khrushchev will never compromise on Berlin. But all things are relative.

ELASTICITY POSSIBLE

If Mr. Khrushchev could reduce the pace of the arms race, if he could free the Soviet economy from its arms burden to give the Russian people a more abundant life, if he could take the first steps toward laying the foundations of normal relations with the United States, he might find more elasticity in the Soviet negotiating position than the West has assumed.

Mr. Khrushchev and his principal aids are placing great emphasis on the desirability of large-scale trade between the United States and the Soviet Union. Mr. Khrushchev realizes that the most realistic possibility for bringing the Soviet living standard up to the United States level is to enlist the aid of the American industrial system.

Thus there are substantial compulsions in the direction of making the concessions that would lead to rapprochement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

There is another even more formidable compulsion. This is the looming shadow of China, her crushing population superiority, her rapid industrialization, her imminent emergence as a nuclear power.

Mr. Khrushchev may not find the America he expected when he lands today. But he may well discover to his surprise that the friendship of the United States, not to mention the cooperation and collaboration America offers to nations that are not antagonistic to her, is a prize well worth great efforts to obtain.

Sewage Treatment at Dulles International Airport

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, important contributions to the discussion concerning sewage treatment at Dulles International Airport were made in a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star by Harry Otis Wright, Jr., a civil engineer of nearby Fairfax County. Inasmuch as certain pertinent and sound arguments contained in the letter were deleted by the editors before publication, I include the full text as part of my remarks:

FAIRFAX, VA., *September 4, 1959.*
The EDITOR, WASHINGTON EVENING AND SUNDAY STAR NEWSPAPER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR EDITOR: Your recent editorials on the Chantilly Airport sewage is predicated upon the premise that it is impossible to successfully treat sewage.

There is considerable governmental apparatus set up to control pollution of the streams in Virginia, also in nearby States.

The water control board in Virginia, headed by the present speaker of the house of delegates, has jurisdiction over all Virginia streams. This board is composed of five men from different parts of the State, all civic leaders in their areas. They have a paid staff of well-qualified technical people with special training in sanitation and water-pollution control. This staff works in conjunction with the State health department whose staff of engineers, scientists, biochemists, physicians, and others review and check all proposed designs for plants for the treatment of wastes. If and eventually when, the consulting engineer designer of a proposed plant has so designed it as to satisfy this staff that it is satisfactory, they then recommend approval to the water control board which then ballots on whether or not to approve the plant. The Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is closely associated with the State health departments and has a staff of technically trained people to observe all phases of the State health departments programs. The Surgeon General has a particular interest in the Washington water supply. I wonder if you checked with Dr. Scheele, who at present occupies that position, before editorializing on the "Calamity to Washington," a sewage treatment plant at Chantilly Airport would be.

All of the cities up the Potomac River and its tributaries dump effluent from their sewage treatment plants into these waters; some very large cities like Cumberland. Many large towns dump raw sewage into this river; Strausburg is one.

All the cities and manufacturing centers along the Ohio River dump treated effluent and sometimes raw wastes into the river. These waters are treated and utilized by cities downstream.

Many of the cities in Europe dump effluent into streams and the water is reused by cities downstream.

Richmond, Va., uses water for its water supply that has been used by Lynchburg, Charlottesville, and other towns.

This country is growing fast and it is no longer possible to prevent the spread of suburbia upstream from existing communities on the pretense that it will pollute their water supply. We simply have to realize that water has to be used over and over again however unesthetic it may seem. The effluent water from the proposed Dulles International Airport treatment plant will be of a better quality than that in Broad Run into which it is proposed to flow. Broad Run and its tributaries meanders through rural and agricultural terrain on its way to the Potomac River. It carries pollution from barnyard wastes, outhouses, septic tanks, slaughter houses, also fertilizer from pastures and planted fields. There is little doubt that some unesthetic cows may even further pollute the stream while standing in it and drinking the water.

The change in taste that is supposed to occur is alleged from nitrates and algae; such conditions require still tranquil bodies of water. The river is too turbulent and turbid for algae to live hardly at all, much less in quantities large enough to affect taste, and more nitrates will result from runoff over fertilized fields than will remain in the sewage plant effluent. If the sewage treatment plant should break down there are provisions that limit the amount of pollutant discharged; this is done by ponding, aquatic life and aeration. The science of wastes treatment has come a long ways in the last 30 years.

Sincerely,
HARRY OTIS WRIGHT, Jr., P.E.

Letter to Mr. Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a very fine letter addressed to Premier Khrushchev by Curt Whaley, publisher of the Powell (Wyo.) Tribune. In his letter Mr. Whaley calls to Mr. Khrushchev's attention the fact that it is the voters who make the long-term decisions in our form of government. He further calls upon Mr. Khrushchev to renounce the Soviet policy of internal interference with the governments of other nations if he seeks to inspire the confidence and respect of the American people. I commend this letter to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTER TO MR. KHRUSHCHEV

POWELL, WYO., *September 11, 1959.*
Mr. NIKITA KHRUSHCHEV,
Soviet Premier,
Blair House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KHRUSHCHEV: This editorial-letter is writen for the purpose of informing you the voters of United States make the long-term decisions for our country.

The citizens of this country must be considered when our President and Congress make decisions—for our Nation is a democracy. The voter of Main Street, each urban settlement, ranch and farm has the power to select our President and Congressman. Here decisions are not made by one man or group of men. The ordinary citizen has a voice in putting men in positions of power.

We welcome you to the United States of America because we believe you should know the power of the ordinary citizen in our country—his rights and privileges under our Constitution.

It is our hope—while you are visiting us—that you will prove to yourself this is so. During your visit, it is our hope you will visit the plant of a newspaper. In the United States you will find thousands of small and large newspapers. No one—I repeat—no one tells a newspaper publisher what he must print or what to write. Readers have freedom to express their criticisms and opinions in these newspapers.

Citizens in this Nation, when aroused to anger over a national or international issue, often write—or travel to Washington to see their Congressmen. Citizens are treated with respect and courtesy by Government officials in United States because of our democratic form of government. Persons in power in our Government must respect the rights of individuals, as well as their opinions, else they will not be returned to power by the voting citizenry.

We would remind you the way to deal with the United States of America is not only through the top man, our President, who is elected to represent us, but through our delegate to the United Nations, our Ambassador to the Soviet Union, our Senators and Representatives in Congress.

In other words, Mr. Khrushchev, you must sell your ideas to the citizens of this Na-

tion—the millions of voters in the United States. We are the rulers of our country. Mr. Eisenhower does not tell us what to think—what we must do, or what I must write.

It is not easy to influence the thinking of people where a free press exists. They have minds of their own and make decisions.

It is our belief that the peoples of every nation should have this right—they should not be held in captivity without the right of freedom of religion, speech, voting franchise, and freedom from want. Why cannot the Germans decide for themselves how they want to live—the Poles, Czechs, Slavs, Hungarians, Latvians—and others?

If you really want peaceful coexistence among the peoples of the world, you will have to renounce your policies of interference in the form of government desired by citizens of these nations. Our citizens are informed of the promises broken by you and your predecessors in power. You must earn our respect and confidence, if you want our trust—our lasting friendship.

Respectfully yours,

CURTIS WHALEY,
Publisher, Powell Tribune.

The Lubbock Plan—Project Alert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the people of Lubbock, Tex., recently formed a citizens' committee for the purpose of conducting a campaign for the revitalization of the American national character and repudiation of international communism. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD appropriate excerpts from the report of this project issued in August 1959.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTION

In December 1958, the Chief of Naval Operations invited certain subordinate commanders in the Navy to consider and recommend ways and means whereby the Navy could contribute more effectively to the prosecution of the cold war.

Perhaps this term our phrase-makers have coined—the cold war—is unfortunate in that it connotes merely a nuisance rather than a threat. But nonetheless we are at war. We have been at war for over 30 years, a deadly inexorable conflict between the American concept—the freedom and dignity of mankind—and the slavery of world communism.

This cold war is here to stay. It is not a war with Russia as a country or with China as a country. It is a war against the doctrine of international communism which seeks to bring everything and everyone in this world under its complete domination.

But while our Communist enemies relentlessly pursue their course of cold war offensive, we here in America and others in the free nations of the world tend to look upon the cold war as a form of hopeful peace, which it is not. We have failed therefore to muster our full strength to fight and to protect ourselves. Were this Nation to become involved in a shooting war tomorrow morning, all Americans would band together with a determination to win it and win it quickly. All of our resources, regardless of expense and regardless of personal sacrifice, would be thrown into the battle.

Our way of life is threatened in this cold war just as certainly as it would be in a hot war. Yet we have failed to recognize that a supreme national effort is required if we are to survive as a nation.

The Communists are proceeding according to plan—a plan first expounded by Lenin years ago when he said, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

And fall we may, for unwittingly all too many Americans serve the cause of their own decline and disaster. Too many Americans, by pursuing selfish interests, sacrifice the common good. Too many otherwise patriotic citizens and misguided idealists weaken the moral fiber of liberty by failing to recognize their responsibility for its preservation. Our forefathers gave us liberty and freedom. It remains for us to be worthy of them.

A glance at any daily newspaper is enough to confirm our unworthiness. Traffic violations, drunkenness, drug addiction, crimes of senseless savagery, vandalism, juvenile delinquency, a sneering contempt for law and order—all these and many more are abundant proof of the downward path we are following.

Now this gloomy picture is distressing enough to me as an American citizen. It is even more distressing to me as a member of our military service, for it forebodes a collapse of the personal integrity and discipline which is the backbone of a successful and victorious military organization.

I believe that this downward path, this climate of complacency and apathy, of cynicism and lowered moral standards, of materialism, irreligion and lack of faith in our society aids and abets the Communist cause. The evil of communism is succeeding because we are doing little or nothing about it.

The wise military commander carefully analyzes all facets of the situation before committing his forces to action. So should we as Americans take stock nationally as we enter into a stronger campaign in the cold war. The American people must recognize the threat that we face from international communism. We must understand that the continuation of their cold war tactics can win for the Communists their ultimate goal of complete world domination unless we face up to the challenge and willingly undertake a national effort of tremendous proportions. Let us assert once again those qualities which have made this Nation great—honor, industry, integrity, courage, and an abiding faith in God.

What is needed, then, is a national program of reeducation in these virtues. We should undertake at the same time a national program to reach the American people more about communism—its objectives and its methods of operation. We should, in other words, gird our loins for a long battle, with full knowledge of the threat that we face and with full appreciation of the heritage we would preserve.

Throughout this Nation there are thousands of organizations and individuals who are seeking to attain these objectives within their own spheres of influence. Their efforts have accomplished much, but much more remains to be done. What is lacking is a concerted, coordinated effort to bring the facts to the attention of all Americans, not for just a season or a year, but over the long term, until this increased awareness and increased national effort brings us victory in the cold war being waged against us.

Before such a project could be undertaken on a national level, however, it seemed necessary to demonstrate that it would work on a community level. Could a community plan and carry out effectively a program of the required magnitude? The citizens of Lubbock, Tex., have answered that question resoundingly in the affirmative by their vigorous execution of Project Alert.

Lubbock is a city admirably suited for such a pilot program. It has excellent newspapers, radio and television stations, and two fine institutions of higher learning. Its many churches attest to the fact that this is a community under God, one that may well be expected to take the lead in the battle against godless communism. Above all, its citizens are proud and independent Americans, eager to serve their community and their Nation.

I am, of course, pleased that members of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve and the Advisory Council on Naval Affairs played a part in Project Alert, but since the importance of the program transcends service ties, I am particularly gratified that the actual direction came from the mayor of Lubbock and his committee of representative citizens from all walks of life.

This booklet is a report of the achievements of the Lubbock plan. It is also a guide for similar action by other communities. By making this report possible, Lubbock shows the way toward a reaffirmation of our national character—a rebirth of our national virtue—and toward ultimate victory in the cold war.

W. G. SCHINDLER.

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *August 1959.*

PHASE 3: THE FOLLOWUP

The mayor's advisory committee realized early in their planning that the 30-day period allocated for the first phase of the campaign could serve only as a point of departure. They knew that the project must continue if it were to achieve even a fraction of its potential.

That this realization was shared by the community was evidenced by the responses to a postcampaign public opinion survey conducted by the Naval Reservists at the request of the mayor's committee. The survey posed these questions:

1. Did you or any organization to which you belong hear any lectures given by speakers for Project Alert?
2. If so would you consider yourself better informed? In what way?
3. Do you believe such a program should be continued in order to reach more people?
4. Have you any suggestions or criticisms to make regarding Project Alert?

An overwhelming majority of those interviewed had heard of Project Alert and were generally familiar with its objectives. Without exception, the interviewees recommended that the program be continued. Of those who had heard Project Alert speakers, all felt that they were better informed to some degree. Perhaps most important of all, everyone interviewed indicated that his interest in learning more about the problem and in contributing to its solution had been aroused.

Here is a random sampling of comments reported by the interviewers:

"It is my understanding that this will be a continuing program and I firmly believe that it should be continued. All Lubbock organizations should have the chance to hear the speakers present the information that has been prepared."

"It is my personal opinion that something like this should have been started a long time ago and I believe that we will fail to reach as many people as possible if the program is allowed to stop at this point."

"It is my opinion that the program has led to more people being informed about the

menace of communism and has caused more people to take stock of themselves and to ask themselves very serious questions about their own retardation of our moral potentialities."

"I believe that a weekly program should be set up on both radio and television to elaborate upon the information given in the speeches. In this way, perhaps people who are not in organizations or in churches may be reached."

"I have been amazed at the revelations that have come from Project Alert. I only hope that more is to come and that more people may be reached."

"Project Alert has done more to bring about a spirit of cooperation among our citizens than any other one thing we have undertaken. It has been good for all of us."

"At first I wondered about the merit of Project Alert. I now realize its importance to everyone in the United States."

Further evidence of growing public interest in the campaign came from the Lubbock city librarian who reported a very noticeable increase in activity in books touching on the theme of Project Alert.

The mandate was clear. The citizens were interested and they wanted more. Quickly, the mayor's committee decided that they would get more. Lubbock plans now to continue Project Alert indefinitely.

The basic organization will be headed by a small group taken from the original advisory committee, the parent-teachers association, the ministerial alliance, and the administrative heads of local educational institutions, including the public schools.

Discussion groups have been formed throughout the city. A materials subcommittee is still functioning; the speakers bureau is now set up on a permanent basis; new radio, television, and newspaper schedules will be prepared; a local luncheon club has been asked to take over the duties of the speakers placement committee and additional short subjects will be shown in local theaters. Other nationally known speakers, the first already scheduled, will come to Lubbock. Project Alert has entered into a state of permanency.

The advisory committee was not content, however, to report only the successful side of the story. All persons associated with the campaign were asked to review it discerningly and to analyze errors of omission and commission. From this review, the advisory committee has prepared a series of recommendations, not only for its own future use, but for consideration by other communities contemplating a similar program.

Lubbock's recommendations are:

1. Sanction and sponsorship for the project must come from the highest possible level—the mayor, the city council, the chamber of commerce, or other highly placed and respected organizations or individuals.

2. As in any organization, control of leadership must be assigned and the resulting responsibility must be accepted by one or not more than two individuals. In Lubbock, one individual had the primary responsibility for carrying out the basic organization of the project and supplementing it with changes dictated by events. An assistant to the chairman was responsible for getting people to meetings of the various committees and also acted as coordinator for all committees appointed by the advisory committee. Without one or two individuals who are willing to spend some 3 or 4 hours a day in the initial stages of planning, a program of this type cannot expect to get underway.

3. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that meetings and the comments therein should not be allowed to get away from the control of the presiding officer. At any public meeting, it is very likely that there will be special interest groups who have no thought other than to raise their own personal prejudice against other individuals or organizations. If such a thing is allowed to dominate a meeting, the effect can be disruptive to the community effort. It should be stressed continually that all members of the committee and, indeed, all citizens of the community are working on a purely educational and informational program.

4. Greater time should be allowed from the initial planning stage to the first scheduled talk by local speakers. From the experience gained, it is suggested that at least 3 months of planning be done prior to any announcement of the formation of a committee. This work of planning and basic organization may be done by two or three or more individuals, either in ACONA or in a similar citizens' group. Such basic planning down to the last detail will insure that the program is ready and that community interest is present or can be aroused.

5. This greater leadtime is also important in arranging for speakers. Many organizations require a great deal of advance notice to arrange their programs to accomomdate a series of talks.

6. In addition to the series of talks, it is desirable to have prepared one or more 20-minute talks, synthesizing the entire program. The use of visual aids with these talks would be helpful and could also be used on television presentations.

7. Outside speakers are valuable not only for their message, but also for their publicity potential, but they are by no means necessary for success. Each community has within its boundaries the men, women, and materials to devise and execute a worthy program.

8. Great emphasis should be placed on getting the theme of the project before young people. One Project Alert worker summed up this objective when he said, "Let's get the story before the schools, where tomorrow is being made." To this end, the Lubbock organization might be modified to include a separate subcommittee for youth groups.

It is difficult to measure the success of a program like Project Alert. The effectiveness of an advertising campaign can be rated in terms of increased sales; a political campaign can be judged by the number of votes cast. A month-long pilot program, however, dealing with public attitudes and opinions, cannot be subjected to any specific yardstick to determine its results. It can be measured only in terms of the effort expended and the audience reached.

This, then, is the story of Project Alert in Lubbock, Tex. It is a story of much hard work, of dedicated leadership, of concerted effort, and of communitywide cooperation. It proves one thing: The job can be done.

Mexican Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 150 years ago today, on September 16, 1810, the Mexican people first demanded their freedom from the oppressive rule of the Spanish viceroys.

On that day Father Miguel Hidalgo y Costilla, a member of the lower clergy who had been profoundly influenced by the doctrines of liberty, equality, and fraternity of the French Revolution, gave the shout—"el grito"—of revolt and independence in the city of Dolores in northern Mexico. Hidalgo and his followers won several victories against the Spanish Royalists, but in 1811 they were finally defeated and their leaders were executed. Nevertheless, the banner of independence was not allowed to fall and the struggle continued for 10 long years until the last viceroy was crushed and Mexico became independent in 1821.

Since that date the path of an independent Mexico has not been smooth. Between 1821 and 1876, for example, Mexico had two regencies, two Emperors, several dictators, and enough Presidents to make no fewer than 74 governments. From 1876 until 1911, except for a short interval of 4 years, the country was under the dictatorship of Porfirio Diaz. Diaz was overthrown by the revolution of 1910 but the troubles of Mexico continued. The country was beset by civil wars, attempted revolutions, and political oppression. It was not until the Presidency of Lájara Cardenas, who was elected in 1934, that some measure of peace and stability came to Mexico. This atmosphere of peace was soon broken by World War II. On the other hand, however, the war brought a strengthening of Mexican-United States relations and in general left Mexico materially stronger.

We in the United States owe a great deal to our southern neighbors. The whole concept of the Western cowboy, his trade, his horse, his clothes, and his techniques are part of the rich heritage that Mexicans have contributed to our way of life. Originally, the first Americans who settled in Texas in the 1820's thought of themselves as farmers. It was their Mexican neighbors, whose herds had roamed the ranges since the early 1700's, who introduced them to the lariat, the branding iron, and the roundup of the longhorns. Soon it became an insult to refer to a Texan as a farmer. He was a "vaquero," or its English translation, cowboy. California, Colorado, New Mexico, and Nevada all bear the lyrical names that the Mexicans, who had lived in the borderlands since 1598, first wrote on their maps, as do innumerable rivers, mountains, cities, and towns from Texas to the Pacific Ocean. It was these Mexicans who eased the way for the immigrants pouring into the Southwest by freely sharing with them the immense fund of experience they had accumulated. In more recent years the Mexican-Americans have not diminished their contribution to our country; 375,000 men of Mexican origin served in the Armed Forces and because so many of them deliberately sought the most dangerous assignments they suffered casualties far out of proportion to their numbers. The Mexican-Americans also won a phenomenal number of awards for gallantry in action. For example, of the 26 Texans who received the Congressional Medal of Honor, 5 were of Mexican descent.

Unfortunately, though the Mexican-Americans contributed richly to the rapid development of the Southwest, few of them benefited from the vast changes that followed annexation. They were children of a simple folk culture speaking what was now a foreign language; strangers in a land they one had shared

with the Indians. Thus, while the living standard of other Americans rose, that of the Mexicans fell appallingly. Yet, to so many Mexicans south of the border, their northern neighbors seemed so rich that they began to head north in search of jobs—which usually lasted only for the length of the harvest. Thus, was born the problem of the migratory farm worker, or bracero, of whom over half a million enter this country each year.

Much has been done to improve the status of the migratory worker, and in fact all the Mexican-Americans. But it still not enough. On this, the anniversary of Mexican Independence Day, it is fitting that we once again rededicate ourselves to helping those Mexicans less fortunate than ourselves to whom we owe so much and make it possible for them to share in our great fortune as citizens of this great Nation.

American Tides To Be Turned

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Ernest K. Lindley article from the August 31, 1959, issue of Newsweek:

THE UGLY CULT
(By Ernest K. Lindley)

Against the ominous backdrop of the Communist aggression against Laos, I should like to point to some of the mistakes we are making, or seem to be slipping toward, in the struggle for Asia. By "we" I mean not just our Government, or parts of it, but unofficial Americans. And I am not concerned here with past mistakes. The favorable tide I found on my recent survey of 17 Asian nations and colonies exists in spite of them. My concern is about current and possible future mistakes that might reverse this tide:

1. The worst general mistake is to pay attention to such a preposterous book as "The Ugly American," a grotesque cartoon of a few misfits and errors of the past. Some of its suggestions for improving American operations in Asia are out of date—already having been put into effect. Some are ridiculous. At the same time, it ignores some of the things Asians most need from us. As a result, anyone who takes this book seriously is misinformed about the present situation and badly advised as to the future. (For an informed American's critique, see the article by Thomas W. Wilson, Jr., in Harper's for June.)

Few free Asians I saw on this trip had read this book. They were too intelligent to take it seriously, although some remarked that it furnished propaganda for our common enemies and one noted that it was insulting to Asians. The distinguished Thai editor, Kukrit Pramoj, has written an urbane reply (with implied reference also to Graham Greene's "The Quiet American"). He calls it "The Loud and Beautiful American." Due to appear in the September issue of Pacifica, it deserves an audience throughout America.

It is the effect of "The Ugly American" on Americans, including some of Congress and certain sections of the press, which disturbs a U.S. observer just returned from Asia. One shudders to think how many more people, here and throughout the world, may be misled by the movie version.

2. Sensational journalism in "The Ugly American" vein. A recent series of largely unverified charges concluded that our aid program in South Vietnam is a "fiasco." Even if every charge were true—which is not the case—the net effect was a wrong impression of the situation and what has been achieved. Vietnam has made more striking progress in more ways than any other of the 17 Asian nations and colonies I revisited on my recent tour. Overall, the American aid program there has been a great success. These articles were an affront to an ally who has accomplished wonders but is still battling the Communists. They made propaganda for the enemy. And the Communists are also making propaganda use of the resultant congressional inquiries. Saying that they prove we regard our Asian allies as colonies, not as independent nations.

3. Congressional rehashes of bad situations that had already been cleaned up. Prime example: Laos. (See my column, p. 34, Newsweek, June 1.) This inquiry directed attention to an obsolete past at the very time that a new, clean, courageous government was braving the gathering storm that has now broken.

4. Cuts in military aid. It is folly to reduce the military forces of the frontline free nations of Asia. Laos is a stark warning. We may have overarmed one ally—Pakistan—although I don't think so. The solution is a settlement between India and Pakistan, followed by a joint defense of the subcontinent, as advocated by President Ayub Khan of Pakistan.

5. The failure to put our development loans on a 5-year basis, so that Asian development programs can be more systematically planned.

6. Too much redtape. It slows and hampers our aid programs. Congress should try to reduce it.

These are the serious mistakes, a prescription for defeat. Of course, we should always be on guard against corruption and waste—although it's unreasonable to expect Western standards of all the new Asian governments. But we can't win the struggle for Asia—and the world—by beating the heads of our friends and the many competent, experienced, dedicated Americans who represent us overseas. Let us rid ourselves of this ugly cult, this masochistic defamation of American intelligence and character and of the Asian leaders and peoples who stand with us in the struggle for freedom.

A Splendid Portent: The Town Affiliation of Napa, Calif., With Como, Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to call attention to a significant event of international good will.

The town of Napa, Calif., has officially established a sister-city program with Como, Italy. This is a matter of great pride to me. Napa, situated in a most beautiful valley of the same name, is filled with warm and friendly people, many of them having their origins in Italy. This valley produces the finest wine grapes, equal to any the world over. The sight of the ordered rows along the valley floor, contrasting with the wild growth and stone outcroppings of the ringing hills, affords a beauty scarcely to be matched elsewhere in the United States. It is fitting that Napa should join hands with the city of Como. My memory of it as one of the loveliest in Italy, make it a fitting partner for Napa in California, with similar topographical contrasts. Como, situated on a beautiful lake near the Swiss border, is primarily a tourist center, surrounded by small, well-kept farms, formal villas, while the incredible beauty of the Alps looms above. The industry of Napa is steel fabricating, cement products, gloves, clothing and fine leather, corresponding to Como's auto fabricating and quality silk industries.

The relationship between the cities will grow strong with the years. The characteristics they share—of beauty, of warmth, and friendliness, of small tradesmen, of industry, of tourism, of small but flourishing agriculture, of keen cultural interests, will knit the communities together.

The idea for town affiliation arose out of the people-to-people program of 1956. This was launched by President Eisenhower in September of that year, as a means of building new roads for national understanding. At the White House conference the President said:

If our American ideology is eventually to win out in the great struggle being waged between opposing ways of life, it must have the active support of thousands of independent private groups and institutions and millions of individual Americans acting through person-to-person communication in foreign lands.

Such fine sentiments mean little without implementation. Some 70 cities are presently participating in the program. Napa now takes its place as one of these. The impetus was supplied by its mayor, Joe Greco. From the outset he has seen the tremendous possibilities of friendship with a city of another land. He himself is of Italian ancestry as is his wife. Once imbued with the idea, it was to his credit, more than any other, that the project reached fruition. He wrote to the mayor of Como, Lino Gelpi. Napa's sheriff, John Claussen, an amateur radio operator, offered his services to communicate with friends in the Como area.

Finally, Mayor Greco flew to Italy to formalize the relationship. Let him tell it in his own words:

It was necessary for us to take a taxicab from the airport in Milano to the hotel in Como, Italy, where we were royally received by the mayor of that city, Avvocato (attorney) Lino Gelpi. I presented to him a case of six bottles of our Napa Valley wines and a gold key to the city of Napa, inviting him to visit with us some time in the very near future.

The reception in Como will be something that will live in my memory for a good many years to come. Mayor Gelpi will long be remembered for his generosity. We had at our disposal his official car and driver. We were entertained at the best places. Cavilier Carlo Piatta and Chief of Police Hugo Bianchi drove us on a sightseeing tour around Lake Como, the funicular (railroad) and all of

the museums. They really showed us and gave us a fine tour of all of the places of interest.

One of the very important and amusing things was a tour of the Tempio Voltiano, on August 7. The place was in charge of a Mr. Antonio Besano who acted as a caretaker and the person to escort you through this very famous memorial. When he heard that I was from Napa, Calif., and the Napa Valley, he asked me if I knew Mr. Pringle who came from the Napa Valley where he is an official of the Schramsberg winery. He told me that he has enjoyed a friendship of many years with Mr. Pringle. Each person who helped entertain us received a pair of our Napa Glove Co. gloves. We then traveled to Milano where we stopped at the Grand Continental Hotel.

From Como, Mayor Greco toured over Italy, meeting mayors and city officials. Everywhere he met with the same warm, outgoing reception that he had met in Como. There was the gracious exchange of gifts, the symbols of our industry in Napa, fine wines and well-made gloves. In this manner, he visited Milan, Turin, Rome, Naples, and Salerno. He met relatives whose existence he was not even aware of previously. Late in August, this ambassador of good will returned to his native land.

Even then, his mission was not yet completed. He talked personally with His Excellency Signor Manlio Brosio, Ambassador of Italy, who congratulated him on the trip as a "wonderful gesture of good will," expressing the hope that it might be emulated by others.

The city of Como, Italy, seeking a champion here, asked Perry Como, the world-renowned singer, to act as honorary mayor of the city whose name he bears. Mr. Como graciously accepted the office. In honor of the event, Mayor Greco designed and had struck a medal for presentation to Mr. Como.

Plans are already underway to demonstrate the city-to-city affiliation in practical terms. The city of Napa wishes to demonstrate to Como, Italy, how American ideals are reflected in our way of life. It will give our people of the Napa Valley a way of combating Iron Curtain propaganda. Mayor Greco, the city council, and members of the board of supervisors will join in urging participation by the people of Napa Valley. Citizens will write letters to pen-pal friends in Como. Sheriff Joe Claussen and others will establish radio contact. An idea to exchange children's school art will be encouraged. Exchanges of tourists and notables will be arranged. Support will be enlisted on the widest possible base, from the chamber of commerce, Kiwanis, Rotary, Lion's clubs, from organized labor, industry, and schools.

At the national level, a volunteer, nongovernmental committee, headed by Mr. Mark Bortman of Boston, stands ready to give professional assistance. All of this gives point and purpose to the statement of Senator CLAIR ENGLE: "The people-to-people program carried out through the sister city mechanism is the most dynamic development in the field of U.S. foreign relations since World War II." The city of Napa, together with its dynamic mayor, Joe Greco, together with Como and Mayor Gelpi, will do their parts to make this promise an actuality.

To me this is a most hopeful, encouraging portent. My warmest salutations go to all who give this splendid project a helping hand.

Another Worthy Program of American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the complexities involved in the fulfillment of today's legislative requirements mandate a better informed and more aware populace. I was pleased to receive a letter from Ernest A. Tupper, manager of the Government Relations Department of the American Can Co., dated September 11, 1959, with which Mr. Tupper enclosed a copy of a message to all of the company's employees urging that they take an active interest in the party of their choice. I trust that other segments of industry will follow this fine example.

The letter follows:

AMERICAN CAN CO.,
Washington, D.C., September 11, 1959.
The Honorable ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: The attached message from Mr. William C. Stolk, president of our company, will reach our 50,000 employees shortly, and will, I believe, be of considerable interest to you. It is another example of the sincere efforts our company, and other business organizations, are making to stimulate more and more people to work for good government through the political party of their personal and individual choice.

In Mr. Stolk's letter he urges all employees to begin now—instead of waiting until campaign time—to become an active worker in a political party. He urges employees of our company to go to party meetings, to volunteer for party organization work, to pay party organization dues, and to contribute to the cost of nominating and electing people who will stand for the principles in which they believe.

Our management is firmly convinced that efforts designed to reawaken people to the responsibilities of citizenship—efforts supplemented by programs designed to add to their political education and their understanding of basic issues, should contribute toward making our country a better country, and make the task of the elected official easier, more satisfying, and more rewarding.

I trust you approve of this kind of corporate activity and that you welcome our efforts.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST A. TUPPER.

TO ALL AMERICAN CAN PEOPLE, A MESSAGE ABOUT POLITICS

This message, I hope, will stir every American Can employee to become an active worker in party politics—and to begin now instead of waiting until major political campaigns are at climax. I am convinced, and would like to convince you, that the need is urgent for each one of us to work vigorously and continuously in party politics of our own choice, on our own time and at our own expense.

Government is like private business in one respect. The value we receive from it is in proportion to the effort we put into it.

In previous statements—including my Chicago public affairs speech reported in the July 9 Canco News Letter—I have urged all American Can people, and everyone else who has time and money invested in American business, to lead out and speak out on public issues, first deciding for ourselves what is right in public affairs, and then doing our best to sell other people on the merit and sense of our convictions.

If we are going to succeed in translating our personal convictions into the performance of good government, we have to do more than just talk about them. We have to join with others sharing our convictions, in the concrete task of selecting and electing public officials dedicated and committed to the same objectives.

There is only one way to do this: Choose the political party which, in its known aims, comes closest to being for the kind of government you are for. Go to its meetings, in your own home precinct and elsewhere. At your party's meetings, promote and support the positions and goals you know are in the direction of good government. Be active in selecting candidates (or delegates to conventions) who will work for those goals. Volunteer for party organization work. Pay your party organization dues; and contribute money to help pay the costs of campaigning to elect your candidates.

In forthcoming issues of Canco publications, our government relations department will explain political party organization at all levels; and will describe how you can arrange for your personal political contributions to flow in support of the causes and candidates which you, as a citizen, believe in and want to support.

The summary of my message can be repeated from the closing part of my previously reported Chicago speech: "The payoff * * * will come only if and when knowledgeable people actually support the cause of good government with their own personal effort. * * * A vastly increased number of people must be encouraged, stimulated and urged to work in their own precincts and wards for good government, through the party of their individual and personal choice. * * * The decision to work or not work to promote the cause of good government must, of course, be left to the individual's personal conscience."

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. STOLK,
President.

Steve Parker: Show Business Ambassador of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, members of show business, as you know, have long been good-will ambassadors for the United States. One such good-will ambassador is producer Steve Parker who has personally done a great deal to improve our relations with Japan.

Mr. Parker, who is married to actress Shirley MacLaine, resides at 4061 Royal Oaks Place, Encino.

A token of the appreciation of Mr. Parker's efforts on the part of the Japanese nation was the recent award which was presented to him by the Japanese Consul in Los Angeles designating him "Man of the Year."

More recently, Mr. Parker rounded up the leading entertainers in Japan and brought them to the United States to be featured at the New Frontier Hotel in Las Vegas in his "Holiday in Japan" production. Critics have hailed this show as a worthy representation of the Japanese culture, one which will help many Americans understand that Oriental nation.

It was for bringing this production to America that Mr. Parker received the Japanese Government's "Man of the Year" award.

During the past 4 years, Mr. Parker has also helped create Japanese understanding of America and of American business methods. While conducting his own entertainment enterprises in Japan, Mr. Parker has always been so courteous that he has created infinite good will for America and has even been commended for this by our Ambassador to Japan, Mr. Douglas MacArthur II.

He has further added to this country's respect abroad by instructing Japanese film makers in American motion-picture technical know-how.

One documentary film, entitled "Onsen," which he made in and about Japan was awarded first prize at the Southeast Asia Film Festival, thereby bringing further prestige to America in the Orient.

Another of his films about Japan, "Geisha," won first prize at the World Film Festival in Brussels, Belgium.

Mr. Parker has been extremely active in promoting Japanese charities, as have been he and Mrs. Parker in promoting national and local charities in the southern California area.

Marquardt Contributes to San Fernando Valley Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, once replete with orange trees, walnut groves, and farmland, the topography of California's San Fernando Valley has progressively changed within the past two decades to a major industrial and residential complex.

Today, more than 850,000 people reside in the valley area; more than 20,000 large and small businesses flourish. Contributing to the vital national defense effort and to the economic and sociological welfare of the valley community are a number of major industries engaged in research, development, and production of aircraft, missiles, rocketry, nucleonics, and electronics.

The valley's growth spiral is no mere coincidence but representative of a cycle which found its beginnings during the 1940's when the first groups of far-sighted industrialists gambled on the potential of the area. As farm turned to factory and residences replaced orchards and groves, more industry and more people were attracted to the San Fernando Valley. This influx has generated an unprecedented community development program for new homes, schools, churches, shopping areas, hospitals, roads and streets, utilities, and recreational facilities.

Typical of the pioneer firms which established headquarters in the valley is the Marquardt Corp. at Van Nuys. The company, during its 15-year history, has achieved particular recognition as the developer and producer of the first operational supersonic ramjet engine, the cruise propulsion system for the Bomarc area defense missile.

Last month, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, joined by more than 300 civic and business leaders, sponsored a salute to Marquardt testimonial luncheon in honor of the company's achievements and contributions to the community during the past decade and a half.

Marquardt had a most beginning as the result of studies advanced in the field of ramjet propulsion by the company's president and founder, Roy E. Marquardt. His research perceived the feasibility of utilizing waste heat to recover thrust at high speeds—a fundamental of the ramjet propulsion theory. The studies resulted in a Navy ramjet research contract under sponsorship of the University of Southern California, where Mr. Marquardt then served as director of aeronautical research. The company was formed in Los Angeles in 1944 to develop, manufacture, and test these first ramjet engines. These early projects established operational feasibility and contributed to new state-of-the-art design, manufacturing, and test techniques to support the propulsion studies. The initial ramjet work also fostered pneumatic control design and development—at first, as directly applicable to ramjet control, and later, more broadly in the supersonic inlet control field.

By 1948 the need became apparent for new facilities conducive to Marquardt's rapidly expanding operations. The San Fernando Valley offered an ideal site for physical expansion, particularly in the category of highly specialized advanced testing facilities. The valley, then boasting a population of approximately 250,000, provided a potential labor pool from which industry could draw qualified professional and semiprofessional personnel. When Marquardt leased the old Timm Aircraft plant at Van Nuys, the company was comprised of 170 employees, with approximately $50,000 in capital equipment and facilities.

Reflecting the growth of the valley, Marquardt has since expanded and diversified, and today, the company represents an enterprise which is national, and in some instances, international scope. In addition to its power systems group—propulsion, controls, and accessories, and test divisions—and ASTRO division at Van Nuys, the company operates a ramjet engine production plant at Ogden, Utah. Last year, Marquardt embarked upon a diversification program through the acquisition of its Pomona division and a subsidiary, Cooper Development Corp. in Monrovia, thus broadening its capabilities in the development of engine and missile systems, weapons support equipment, and research rocketry. In addition, the company has offices in Washington, D.C., Dayton, Ohio, and Orlando, Fla. Field service representation is also maintained at SAC bases throughout the United States, and in Canada, England, and West Germany.

Since establishing itself at Van Nuys, Marquardt has increased its personnel by 3,500 percent, two-thirds of whom are valley employees. The company's facility appreciation approaches $9 million in property, plant, and equipment—(exclusive of Government-furnished equipment and facilities)—an 18-fold increase over the original Van Nuys facility. An established valley landmark is the $15 million Air Force-Marquardt Jet Laboratory. This facility, which is capable of testing altitudes approaching 200,000 feet and mach numbers of 7 and beyond, makes possible the development of an entirely new generation of supersonic propulsion systems.

The future of ramjet propulsion continues to hold promise for advanced military applications as well as commercial uses. The Bomarc program and other weapon system concepts offer great potential for ramjet-powered antimissile applications. Advanced versions of the ramjet, combining it with rocket power, make ramjets feasible for space operation. Commercially, ramjet-powered transports are envisioned flying coast-to-coast in 1 hour by 1970.

By year-end 1959, Marquardt will have expanded its capabilities in the nuclear propulsion field with the addition of a nuclear systems division at Van Nuys. Anticipating its higher sales and earnings record in its history, the company, in its interim financial statement for the first 28 weeks of 1959, reported sales of $34 million and earnings of $860,000, up 34 percent and 50 percent respectively for the same period in 1958. Its current backlog is approximately $72 million, and the company is projecting a 70 percent increase in earnings over 1958 by the end of the year.

Representing an annual payroll of more than $23 million in the valley community alone, Marquardt paychecks are funneled through the usual channels of local commerce. Its combined payroll, including Pomona, Monrovia, and Ogden, Utah, provides more than $38 million invested in its respective communities.

The Marquardt Corp. is also representative of valley industry's sociological force, contributing its corporate and individual support to community welfare. In addition to its corporate sponsorship of youth groups and charities, the company encourages generous donations to worthy causes through its employee Give Once Club, a payroll deduction plan boasting participation of 85 percent of its employees.

Such firms as the Marquardt Corp., in anticipating the advantages offered by the valley locale, have prospered and have set a pattern for continued industrial expansion. During the 1958–59 period, four major industries in the valley expended $26 million in plant expansion and improvements and at least seven

sizeable industrial firms are in the process of establishing valley plants or have announced plans to expand existing facilities.

So-Called Civil Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I am sure no Member of this House will register surprise when I reveal that I am unequivocally opposed to the approval of any appropriation for the extension of the Civil Rights Commission.

Members know that I have consistently raised a protesting voice against any move which would stir up, either calculatingly or inadvertently, unrest in what would otherwise be harmonious relations between two or more races.

The people of Alabama and the Fourth Congressional District, which I very proudly serve, know of my position on this matter, for when I offered myself to the people of this district to serve them as their Congressman in 1950, I expressed my opposition to any breakdown in the racial segregation which a majority of all our people sincerely want.

Some of you will recall that I appeared before the committee last year, as I had before, in an attempt to prevent the enactment of the so-called civil rights measures which were dreamed up by certain professional ultraliberals to placate certain pressure groups.

I was in this Chamber at about this time 2 years ago urging that the unprecedented civil rights legislation then before us be rejected to protect the rights of the people, to preserve the rights of the States in conducting their own affairs, and to protect the use of the taxpayers' hard-earned money.

The Civil Rights Commission, which is under discussion again now, was authorized in that bill. Proponents were arguing for an oh-so-simple, trial period of only 2 years for this Commission. I asked then whether anyone honestly thought that the minority pressure groups who spawned such a powerful tool would allow it to perish once it was created.

Of course, I knew the answer before I asked, but if anyone had doubts they are now allayed. We are now faced with a proposal to extend this Commission for another 2-year period.

And for what? Newspaper reports have it that all of the members of the Commission but one—the newest member, a Negro—are ready to throw in the towel and will not accept another term if offered it.

The Chairman of this Commission has stated that many of the questions referred to it simply have no right answers. There evidently is confusion and discouragement concerning the function of this Commission.

I think the so-called report of the Civil Rights Commission which was recently submitted to us is the most incriminating evidence of all against this body.

This report is nothing more than a lengthy and costly attempt to justify the questionable action of the 85th Congress in creating such a commission. The document purporting to be a report rambles along through more than 600 prejudiced pages, and in the last analysis it is best described by one of the Commissioners who himself said it was an argument advocating preconceived ideas.

The Civil Rights Commission, armed with malicious intent, went out to find alleged irregularities whether they existed or not. In the process, it was itself a tool to stir up racial unrest and to set back harmonious race relations.

In my own State of Alabama, we saw the arrogant meddling of the Civil Rights Commission. It swooped down upon us, intimidating our officials and harassing our citizens in an attempt to find some grain of trouble upon which it could pounce.

I think Members need to reflect soberly and sincerely before they rush headstrong into following the lead of the civil rights bill of 1957; because one is sorely mistaken if he believes he is furthering the cause of racial advancement through the enactment of legislation such as this.

Congress, in enacting the bill setting up this Commission and the special division in the Justice Department, fanned the coals of mistrust and conflict which have smoldered since the Supreme Court 5 years ago betrayed the constitutional concept of government and sought to effect sociological changes through usurpation of power.

The action of the 85th Congress on this bill was the result of gain-seeking radicals attempting to implement this abuse of public trust through legislating a people's moral behavior. People do not change fundamental beliefs by force, and the Supreme Court and the Congress should realize this.

The Civil Rights Commission, by trying to project the Federal Government into such areas as elections, not only is treading on shaky legal grounds, it is helping to bring to a head the racial conflict which has been fostered through the past decade.

The emotional side—effects which accompanying this matter are splitting this Nation, leaving in its wake discord and strife.

The South has made tremendous progress since Reconstruction Days with the problem of accommodating a large minority group, distinct in race and culture, with a different origin and with different customs and practices. Our area was able to do what no other nation or section of a nation has ever been able to accomplish satisfactorily. It devised a system wherein two races of mankind could live peacefully with mutual respect. It is a system of separate-but-equal opportunities and facilities, allowing each race to work out its own destiny within its own people, allowing at the same time each race to preserve its own racial integrity. The Negro has benefited greatly from this mutually agreeable system; his race has made more progress in this country and made it faster than any other race of people in this history of man.

Pressure groups and politicians living outside the South have failed to understand our bicultural society and have fallen victim to plots and plans which seem to advance a minority group but which actually destroy the only society which protects this group.

An association of Southern Negroes recently reported to President Eisenhower:

> Racial hate and racial prejudice that was dead is now reconstructed. Threat of forced integration has created fear and hate in many of our white friends.

Extension of the Civil Rights Commission can only aggravate this situation. The Commission has served no good purpose. It has provided no new rights and granted no new privilege. It has only agitated trouble.

For the good of all concerned, this Commission should be allowed to die.

The provision authorizing its extension should be stricken from the mutual security appropriations bill, where it certainly has no right to be.

I have always tried to support adequate aid to our friends and allies. It has been my belief, and it still is, that it is infinitely better to send money and technical assistance to foreign lands than it is to send our boys in uniform.

However, if the appropriation for extension of the Civil Rights Commission is not removed from this bill, I will have no alternative but to vote against it.

At this point, I wish to insert an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Anniston Star in Anniston, Ala.:

[From the Anniston Star, Sept. 13, 1959]

CARPETBAG RULE THREATENED AGAIN

Nobody in this part of the country expected to receive a fair and sympathetic report from the U.S. Civil Rights Commission that was appointed by the President several months ago to make a study of the voting rights extended to the people of the country, which meant primarily the Southern States.

The Commission was composed in the main, of college presidents and other theorists who seldom leave their cloistered halls to get out into the midstream of life as it is being lived in the United States today.

Had the situation been otherwise, had they read the newspapers as they have related one orgy of racial crime after another in the large cities of the United States, they might have reported otherwise. For no person in his right mind would want to put the ballot into the hands of those who are making a mockery of the law and of common decency.

Admittedly, the South for many years has thrown up certain safeguards against the indiscriminate exercise of the franchise. Until the last few years, most Southern States imposed a poll tax and a literacy test, together with other restrictions that applied to voting by all citizens, white or colored.

But as education has advanced on the part of both races, thereby making it possible for more of the citizenry to cast an honest and intelligent vote, the poll tax has been abolished or reduced so as to enfranchise a larger segment of the citizenry.

Great progress was being made along that line, and we probably never would have had any outside interference against our civil rights as guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States had the Eisenhower political managers not put the Supreme Court of the United States on the bargain counter.

At the Chicago Convention of the Republican Party in 1956 when it seemed that Bob Taft might win the nomination for the Presidency, Ike's campaign managers promised to give the first vacancy on the Supreme Court to Governor Warren of California, if he would deliver that State's votes to General Eisenhower.

Warren delivered the goods, as it were, and as ill fate would have it, the first vacancy happened to be created with the death of Chief Justice Fred Vinson. And knowing that he was by no means qualified for that great responsibility, an effort then was made to get the California Governor to accept a lesser appointment.

But Eisenhower's emissaries strove to no avail. And it was because of that appointment of a legally incompetent man to exercise the vast power of Chief Justice that we here in the South are once more threatened with carpetbag rule and all the evils that accompanied reconstruction in this great area.

We already have seen Federal troops occupy and surround schoolhouses in Little Rock, Ark., prodding men, women, boys, and girls with the bayonets of their rifles in an effort to set up an educational system under martial law. And now we are threatened with the loss of our civil rights under the sentence of Ike's smelling committee.

Not only have we here in the South already seen the Constitution of the United States prostituted to pay a gambler's debt, as it were, but now as a consequence of Eisenhower's election and the appointment of a political theorist as Chief Justice, we are about to lose our whole Bill of Rights.

If the alleged abuses in the exercise of the ballot to which Ike's commission complains had been staged in any other setting than that of the South, we would have heard no more about it after their visit to this part of the country.

But if they are so exercised over the purity of the ballot and the inalienable rights of the people to vote, why doesn't the Eisenhower commission urge the granting of the franchise to the people of the District of Columbia?

We know the answer to that question as well as the commission knows it and as well as it is known by some hypocrites in the Congress. It is because if all the people were allowed to vote, as is threatened in the South, the Capital City of our Nation probably would have an ignorant and criminal Negro for its mayor.

That is unthinkable to a responsible majority of the Members of the House and Senate, as well as to the civil populace of Washington, who already are suffering losses through the impairment of property values resulting from the great influx of Negroes to the District since the second emancipation proclamation was laid down by Warren et al.

But the District of Columbia is by no means the only part of the United States that has suffered as a result of the attempt to integrate all the people of the country into one conglomerate whole.

New York, San Francisco, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Kansas City, St. Louis, Detroit, and other of our larger cities in the North and West, are undergoing a saturnalia of sexual and other crimes that is without precedent in the entire history of this country.

In the opinion of this paper, therefore, it is far more important to invoke the majesty of the law in these large centers of population than it is to make a national issue out of the loss of some registration papers in a little community near Tuskegee Institute, to which the Alabama Legislature has just voted another large appropriation as an evidence of friendly racial relationships.

In spite of the memories of Reconstruction and carpetbag rule, in spite of an amendment to the Federal Constitution at the point of bayonets in order to punish the South, more of our sons on a per capita basis have volunteered to defend the Union in two world wars than any other region.

It would seem, therefore, that the U.S. Government could find something more constructive and of greater moment to worry about in this crucial period of history than to dig up the dry bones of yesteryear's tragedy to flaunt in the face of honorable citizens of our common country.

Résumé of Activities of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting to the House a complete résumé of all action taken by the Committee on the District of Columbia during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

I consider the House District Committee one of the ablest and most outstanding committees in the Congress. During the past few Congresses, we have had as members of the committee five chairmen of other ranking committees in the House, and this year we have chairmen of two other ranking House committees as members of the District Committee.

I have experienced no difficulty in securing a quorum at all times even though every member of the District Committee is also a member of another major committee. The members of the House District Committee seem to be interested in the problems confronting the Nation's Capital, realizing that Washington was set aside as a Federal city, and are eager to devote much of their valuable time to making laws for the District of Columbia as a part of their congressional duties.

We are all interested in keeping Washington the most beautiful city in the world, and we make every effort to give the Police Department the assistance necessary to keep this a safe city for visitors to the Nation's Capital. Every person in the United States has a personal and financial interest in the city of Washington, in which millions and millions of dollars of taxpayers' money are spent annually for the purpose of housing Federal Departments, the Nation's Capital, and the White House. We have been successful in having several Federal buildings approved for the District of Columbia costing hundreds of millions of dollars while very few Members have been able to secure congressional approval of a single Federal building or any funds whatsoever for their individual towns or districts. Therefore, we feel that the people residing in the District of Columbia have the best of representation in the Congress.

I personally feel that the executive department of the Commission form of government here in the District of Columbia should work more closely with the Congress as I am certain we could accomplish more for the Nation's Capital if we were better informed regarding the background of all the employees who are administering and enforcing the laws we pass.

I want to take this opportunity also to thank Senator ALAN BIBLE and the other members of the Senate District Committee for their excellent cooperation in solving our mutual problems in connection with the affairs of the District of Columbia, and I am certain that during the 2d session of the 86th Congress we shall be able to pass all the legislation necessary to operate the Commission form of government successfully in the District of Columbia.

We are proud of the record made by the Committee on the District of Columbia in the 1st session of the 86th Congress during which we have secured House passage of 24 House bills and 11 Senate acts. I am pleased to present the following detailed account of the actions of our committee during this session:

DISTRICT BILLS, ACTS, AND RESOLUTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH WHICH THE HOUSE DISTRICT COMMITTEE HAS TAKEN ACTION DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

H.R. 20, premarital examination of applicants for marriage licenses, provide for.

H.R. 76, small claims and conciliation branch of Municipal Court, amend act to increase jurisdiction to $100.

House Joint Resolution 297, Heliport, Commissioners authorized to make study concerning establishment, construction, and operation of.

H.R. 306, oldest inhabitants in the District of Columbia, conveyance of certain real property to.

H.R. 345, ophthalmic products, prohibit advertisement of retail sales price of.

House Concurrent Resolution 388, memorials to great statesmen of the United States in District of Columbia should be living memorials, provide for.

H.R. 580, law, practice of, amend act.

H.R. 835, attachment, and garnishment, amend law by modifying provisions for.

H.R. 836, attachment, and garnishment, amend law by modifying provisions for.

H.R. 874, banking system, dual, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 875, dangerous weapons act, amend, creating a presumption in connection with the possession of.

H.R. 1378, Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H.R. 1379, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 1380, Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H.R. 1647, Association of Childhood Education International, exempt certain real and personal property from property tax in District of Columbia.

H.R. 1844, Life Insurance Act, District of Columbia, amend.

H.R. 2317, licensing and bonding of collection agencies, provide for.

H.R. 2318, closing-out sale, provide for regulation of.

H.R. 2321, home rule, provide for elected commission form of government.

H.R. 2322, mileage tax, exempt certain common carriers of passengers from.

H.R. 2329, wages, exempt from attachment and garnishment in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2511, penalties for willful concealment of goods on premises of stores, provide for.

H.R. 2518, evidence, provide for admission of in courts of District of Columbia.

H.R. 2519, responsibility for criminal conduct, provide for.

H.R. 2522, retirement of judges of municipal court, municipal court of appeals and juvenile court, amend.

H.R. 2530, widows, widowers, minor children, amend act granting right of possession of property.

H.R. 2749, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, amend to make benefits apply to widows, orphans.

H.R. 2750, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of Police and Fire Departments.

H.R. 2755, penalties, establish certain increases for habitual criminals.

H.R. 2756, admissibility of confessions in criminal prosecutions, provide for.

H.R. 3004, evidence, rules to follow in insanity cases.

H.R. 3030, retirement compensation, Director, Metropolitan Police Force Band, provide for.

H.R. 3298, taxes, income, charitable contributions, deductible even though activities not carried on in District.

H.R. 3494, clergymen, communications made to them shall be considered privileged.

H.R. 3656, Unemployment Compensation Act, amend.

H.R. 3663, schoolchildren, purchase bus tickets from commissioners at reduced prices.

H.R. 3664, schoolchildren, amend act relating to fares.

H.R. 3735, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of Police and Fire Departments, their widows, widowers and children.

H.R. 3855, public adjusters, provide for licensing of.

H.R. 4005, physical therapy, regulate practice of by registered physical therapists.

H.R. 4071, Business corporation act, amend.

H.R. 4072, regulation of the practice of dentistry, amend act.

H.R. 4073, placement of children in family homes, amend act.

H.R. 4109, chiropractic—provide for issuance of a license to Anderson Brown.

H.R. 4192, ministers, certain communications considered privileged.

H.R. 4282, Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown, supplement and modify act relating to corporate powers.

H.R. 4283, Income and Franchise Tax Act, 1947, exempt certain officers of executive branch from payment of.

H.R. 4286, school census, amend act providing for taking of.

H.R. 4400, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 4454, trustees, certain corporations, eliminate restriction on number of.

H.R. 4492, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of Police and Fire Departments, their widows, widowers, and children.

H.R. 4585, garnishments, amend law by modifying provisions for.

H.R. 4630, H.R. 4631, H.R. 4632, H.R. 4633, H.R. 4634, H.R. 4635, H.R. 4636, H.R. 4637, H.R. 4638, H.R. 4639, H.R. 4640, H.R. 4641, H.R. 4642, H.R. 4643, H.R. 4683, H.R. 4694, H.R. 4715, H.R. 4726, H.R. 4754, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 4810, sales tax, exempt sales of food for human consumption.

H.R. 4820, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 4853, indecent publications, amend act relating thereto.

H.R. 5210, A.B.C. Act, amend, permit Board to use discretion in requirement relating to the serving of beer at public tables.

H.R. 5244, domestic relations branch of municipal court, extend jurisdiction to cover the adjudication of the interests of husband and wife of personal and real property.

H.R. 5490, licensing of persons engaged in budget planning services, provide for.

H.R 5534, George Mason Memorial, name of 14th Street Bridge.

H.R. 5549, garnishments, amend law by modifying provisions for.

H.R. 5633, medical expenses, amend Income and Franchise Tax Act relative to deductions of.

H.R. 5677, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 5889, indigents in judicial proceedings in the District of Columbia, provide for representation.

H.R. 6123, indecent publications, amend law relating thereto.

H.R. 6163, creation of Office of Administrator for Legal Assignments, provide for.

H.R. 6272, license, pharmacy, provide for issuance to Diodato Villamena.

H.R. 6301, tax refund to retail dealers on motor-vehicle fuels lost due to evaporation and shrinkage.

H.R. 6302, National Guard, amend act with respect to the compensation of certain civilian employees of.

H.R. 6378, American Society of International Law, use certain real estate in District of Columbia as natianal headquarters.

H.R. 6454, American War Mothers, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.

H.R. 6585, Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, amend, grant additional compensation to coaches.

H.R. 6662, Hospital Center Act, amend, extend time during which appropriations may be made.

H.R. 6668, corporations act as trustees under deeds of trust, amend Business Corporation Act to permit.

H.R. 6738, fire prevention and safety laws applicable to schools in District of Columbia, strengthen.

H.R. 6772, annuities payable to certain annuitants from teachers' retirement and annuity found, increase.

H.R. 6773, Real Estate Commission, empowered to suspend or revoke licenses for certain activities by licensees.

H.R. 6820, tax refund to retail dealers on motor-vehicle fuels lost due to evaporation and shrinkage.

H.R. 6821, law, practice of, prohibit certain persons from engaging in.

H.R. 6893, Stadium Act, amend with respect to motor-vehicle parking area.

H.R. 6929, illustrations in District of Columbia annual report, allow use of.

H.R. 7074, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transfer tax exemption from building formerly owned by them to property now owned.

H.R. 7124, tuition, payment of by certain persons who attend public schools in District of Columbia.

H.R. 7145, mortgage loans by insurance companies, permit loans up to 75 percent of property value.

H.R. 7375, A.B.C. act amend, require retailers and wholesalers to file with A.B.C. Board minimum price of alcoholic beverages.

H.R. 7429, guardian, minor child, actions relating to.

H.R. 7458, bags, plastic, prohibit sale and distribution of.

H.R. 7493, taxicabs, installation of meters in, repeal section 8 of Appropriations Act, 1960.

H.R. 7507, tax, income and franchise, amend act with respect to deductions for charitable contributions.

H.R. 7639, license to practice dentistry, permit Hans Musaeus to take examination.

H.R. 7653, dogs, reguired to be kept on leash when they are in streets or other public places.

H.R.7683, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transfer tax exemption from building formerly owned by them to property now owned.

H.R. 7714, television service contractors, dealers, technicians, provide for regulation and licensing of.

H.R. 7907, St. Ann's Infant Asylum, amend act of incorporation.

H.R. 7989, Cultural Center, national, provide for deposit in special fund in the Treasury of the United States 1 mill out of every $1 for the advancement of.

H.R. 7996, National Woman's Party, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.

H.R. 8081, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.

H.R. 8143, Cultural Center, National, provide for deposit in special fund in the Treasury of the United States 1 mill out of every $1 for the advancement of.

H.R. 8204, suits against employees of District of Columbia government arising out of their operation of vehicles in scope of employment, defense of.

H.R. 8223, Cultural Center, National, provide for deposit in special fund in the Treasury of the United States 1 mill out of every $1 for the advancement of.

H.R. 8225, paregoric, amend Uniform Narcotic Drug Act to permit dispensing of by oral as well as written prescription.

H.R. 8285, salary increase, teachers, school officers, board of education employees.

H.R. 8320, District of Columbia Teachers College, authorize conferring of M.A. degree to certain students.

H.R. 8326, salary increase, teachers, school officers, Board of Education employees.

H.R. 8357, pensions, trusts, exempt from laws relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income.

H.R. 8391, Junior College Division within District of Columbia Teachers College, authorize.

H.R. 8392, Stadium Act of 1957, amend.

H.R. 8415, Nonsovereign State, provide for admission of District of Columbia into Union as a.

H.R. 8493, Space Cadet Corps, incorporate.

H.R. 8527, pensions, trusts, exempt from laws relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income.

H.R. 8693, Domestic Relations Branch, Municipal Court, extend jurisdiction to cover adjudication of the interests of husband and wife of real and personal property.

H.R. 8696, Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, amend to remove certain inequities.

H.R. 8697, Redevelopment Act of 1945, amend with respect to the requirements for adoption of a redevelopment plan for a project area.

H.R. 8709, trading stamps, permit use of in District of Columbia.

H.R. 8734, age, prohibit unjust discrimination in employment because of.

H.R. 8768, A.B.C. Act, amend, require retailers and wholesalers to file with A.B.C. Board minimum price of alcoholic beverages.

Senate Joint Resolution 52, heliport, Commissioners authorized to make study concerning establishment, construction, and operation of.

S. 643, assessment for public improvements, to permit District of Columbia officials to use registered and certified mail in notifying property owners of.

S. 644, census, school, to amend the act regarding.

S. 645, dangerous buildings, to amend act regarding removal of.

S. 660, Business Corporation Act, to amend.

S. 685, Association for Childhood Education International, exempt certain real and personal property from property tax in District of Columbia.

S. 715, indecent publications, amend law relating to.

S. 745, condemned buildings, to conform the method of collecting assessments on.

S. 746, children, regulate placement of in family homes, amend act.
S. 866, illustrations in District of Columbia annual reports, to allow the use of.
S. 949, ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, provide for incorporation of.
S. 1159, Alley Dwelling Act, to amend to facilitate the acquisition of real property.
S. 1315, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., provide for incorporation of.
S. 1370, Redevelopment Act of 1945, to amend section 13 of.
S. 1371, birth certificates, transcripts of, to authorize Commissioners to fix and collect fees for in an amount which will reimburse the District for the cost of issuance.
S. 1372, Domestic Relations Branch, Municipal Court, extend jurisdiction to cover adjudication of the interests of husband and wife in real and personal property.
S. 1456, appointment of two additional juvenile court judges, provide for.
S. 1681, home rule, provide for in District of Columbia.
S. 1921, United Spanish War Veterans, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.
S. 1966, insurance adjusters, public, provide for licensing of.
S. 2035, guardian, minor child, actions relating thereto.
S. 2445, District of Columbia Teachers College, authorize conferring of master of arts degrees to certain students.

BILLS AND ACTS WHICH HAVE PASSED HOUSE DURING 1ST SESSION OF 86TH CONGRESS

H.R. 303, Oldest Inhabitants in the District of Columbia, conveyance of certain real property to.
H.R. 836, attachment and garnishment, amend law by modifying provisions for.
H.R. 1844, Life Insurance Act, District of Columbia, amend.
H.R. 2317, licensing and bonding of collection agencies, provide for.
H.R. 2318, closing out sale, provide for regulation of.
H.R. 2322, mileage tax, exempt certain common carriers of passengers from.
H.R. 3030, retirement compensation, Director, Metropolitan Police Force Band, provide for.
H.R. 3735, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of police and fire departments, their widows, widowers, and children.
H.R. 4072, regulation of the practice of dentistry, amend act.
H.R. 4192, ministers, certain communications considered privileged.
H.R. 4282, Sisters of the Visitation of Georgetown, supplement and modify act relating to corporate powers.
H.R. 4283, Income and Franchise Tax Act, 1947, exempt certain officers of executive branch from payment of.
H.R. 4454, trustees, certain corporations, eliminate restriction on number of.
H.R. 5534, George Mason Memorial, name of 14th Street Bridge.
H.R. 6123, indecent publications, amend law relating thereto.
H.R. 6378, American Society of International Law, use certain real estate in District of Columbia as national headquarters.
H.R. 6585, Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, amend, grant additional compensation to coaches.
H.R. 6662, Hospital Center Act, amend, extend time during which appropriations may be made.
H.R. 7145, life insurance, amend act to regulate, permit insurance companies to allow mortgage loans up to 75 percent of property value.
H.R. 7683, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transfer tax exemption from building formerly owned by them to property now owned.
H.R. 7907, St. Ann's Infant Asylum, amend act of incorporation.
H.R. 8225, Uniform Narcotic Drug Act, amend, permit paregoric to be dispensed by oral as well as written prescription.
H.R. 8392, Stadium Act of 1957, amend.
H.R. 8527, trusts, pensions, exempt from laws relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income.
S. 643, assessment for public improvements, to permit District of Columbia officials to use registered and certified mail in notifying property owners of.
S. 660, Business Corporation Act, to amend.
S. 685, Association for Childhood Education International, exempt certain real and personal property from property tax in District of Columbia.
S. 746, children, regulate placement of in family homes, amend act.
S. 866, illustrations in District of Columbia annual reports, to allow the use of.
S. 949, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, provide for incorporation of.
S. 1371, birth certificates, transcripts of, to authorize Commissioners to fix and collect fees for in an amount which will reimburse the District for the cost of their issuance.
S. 1372, domestic relations branch, municipal court, extend jurisdiction to cover adjudication of the interests of husband and wife in real and personal property.
S. 1921, United Spanish War Veterans, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation.
S. 2035, guardian, minor child, actions relating thereto.
S. 2445, District of Columbia Teachers College, authorize conferring of master of arts degrees to certain students.

DISTRICT BILLS AND ACTS WHICH PASSED BOTH HOUSE AND SENATE DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS AND WERE SENT TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS SIGNATURE

H.R. 303, Oldest Inhabitants in the District of Columbia, conveyance of certain real property to (Public Law 86–216).
H.R. 836, attachment and garnishment, amend law by modifying provisions for (Public Law 86–130).
H.R. 2317, licensing and bonding of collection agencies, provide for (Public Law 86–217).
H.R. 2318, closing out sale, provide for regulation of (Public Law 86–219).
H.R. 3030, retirement compensation, Director, Metropolitan Police Force Band, provide for.
H.R. 3735, Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act, applicable to retired former members of police and fire departments, their widows, widowers, and children.
H.R. 4072, regulation of the practice of dentistry, amend act (Public Law 86–93).
H.R. 4282, Sisters of the Visitation, of Georgetown, supplement and modify act relating to corporate powers (Public Law 86–32).
H.R. 4454, trustees, certain corporations, eliminate restriction on number of (Public Law 86–83).
H.R. 5534, George Mason Memorial, name of 14th Street Bridge (Public Law 86–86).
H.R. 6378, American Society of International Law, use certain real estate in District of Columbia as national headquarters (Public Law 86–208).
H.R. 6662, Hospital Center Act, amend, extend time during which appropriations may be made (Public Law 86–85).
H.R. 7145, mortgage loans by insurance companies, permit loans up to 75 percent of property value.
H.R. 7683, Veterans of Foreign Wars, transfer tax exemption from building formerly owned by them to property now owned.
H.R. 7907, St. Ann's Infant Asylum, amend act of incorporatoin (Public Law 86–202).
H.R. 8225, paregoric, amend Uniform Narcotic Drug Act to permit dispensing of by oral as well as written prescription (Public Law 86–206).
H.R. 8392, Stadium Act of 1947, amend.
H.R. 8527, pensions, trusts, exempt from laws relating to perpetuities, restraints on alienation, and accumulation of income (Public Law 86–201).
S. 643, assessment for public improvements, to permit District of Columbia officials to use registered and certified mail in notifying property owners of (Public Law 86–46).
S. 660, Business Corporation Act, to amend (Public Law 86–106).
S. 685, Association for Childhood Education International, exempt certain real and personal property from property tax in District of Columbia (Private Law 86–156).
S. 746, children, regulate placement of in family homes, amend act (Public Law 86–177).
S. 866, illustrations in District of Columbia annual reports, to allow the use of (Public Law 86–101).
S. 949, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, provide for incorporation of (Public Law 86–47).
S. 1371, birth certificates, transcripts of, to authorize Commissioners to fix and collect fees for in an amount which will reimburse the District for the cost of issuance (Public Law 86–178).
S. 1372, Domestic Relations Branch, Municipal Court, extend jurisdiction to cover adjudication of the interests of husband and wife in real and personal property (Public Law 86–241).
S. 1921, United Spanish War Veterans, Inc., exempt certain property from taxation (Private Law 96–161).
S. 2035, guardian, minor child, actions relating thereto (Public Law 86–268).
S. 2445, District of Columbia Teachers College, authorize conferring of M.A. degrees to certain students.

DISTRICT BILLS WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS AND ARE PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE

H.R. 1884, Life Insurance Act, District of Columbia, amend.
H.R. 2322, mileage tax, exempt certain common carriers of passengers from.
H.R. 6123, indecent publications, amend law relating thereto.
H.R. 6585, Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, amend, grant additional compensation to coaches.

DISTRICT BILLS WHICH PASSED THE HOUSE DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS, WERE AMENDED AND PASSED BY THE SENATE, AND WHICH WILL PROBABLY BE SENT TO CONFERENCE FOR ACTION

H.R. 4192, ministers, certain communications considered privileged.
H.R. 4283, Income and Franchise Tax Act, 1947, exempt certain officers of executive branch from payment of.
H.R. 6123, indecent publications, to amend law relating thereto.[1]
S. 715, indecent publications, to amend law relating thereto.[1]

[1] These two bills, one passed by the House and the other by the Senate, contain differences which will probably be resolved in conference.

New Aid Against Forest Fires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the effectiveness of a new firefighting tool was well demonstrated

recently when a forest fire raged out of control around the city of Deadwood, S. Dak.

That tool is bentonite, a white clay which is powdered, mixed with water, and dumped on forest fires from low-flying aircraft to smother crown fires.

More than half of the world's production of bentonite comes from plants located at Belle Fourche, S. Dak.

It is possible that the historic city of Deadwood would be nothing but ashes today were it not for the prompt and effective use of this firefighting agent by the courageous men who fought back the flames.

United Press International, reporting on the use of bentonite in the fire, called it "a miracle worker." It credited Paul Bechtner, Chicago, general manager of the American Colloid Co., with first hitting upon the idea.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask that this article by United Press International be reprinted.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Argus-Leader, Sept. 13, 1959]

CLAY MIXTURE EFFECTIVE AGAINST DEADWOOD FIRE

BELLE FOURCHE, S. DAK.—Bentonite, the clay of a thousand uses, is proving itself in a dramatic new job in South Dakota.

The white, extremely water absorbent clay, has turned out to be a miracle worker in fighting forest fire.

Put to its first major test in combating the raging fire in the Deadwood vicinity last week, the bentonite slurry dumped from planes is drawing high praise from the smoke-begrimed linemen to the top Forest Service official who has seen it in action.

In fighting fires the bentonite, shipped from a plant here in powder form, is mixed with water to form a slurry and pumped into planes such as B-24's and Navy TBM patrol bombers.

The pilot zooms in low over his target, releases his tank of slurry—and the crown fire is out.

Those who have watched the magic slurry work say it is just like snuffing a candle. All that remains is the ground fire at the base of the trees and a puff of white smoke.

Workers say a cold wave follows the plane, a sharp relief to the workers and a fire deterrent.

Fighting fire with bentonite is the brain child of Paul Bechtner, Chicago, general manager of the American Colloid Co.

The idea was first tried in a Black Hills demonstration several weeks ago.

Forest Service officials were so impressed that further demonstrations were made at Missoula, Mont., and Boise, Idaho.

But it was in the Deadwood fire that the slurry appeared to have proved to be the newest weapon to combat fires in forests.

Details of the development were outlined here by Joe Hofer, office manager for American Colloid's Belle Fourche plant, which has been doing the basic work on the idea.

Hofer said in combating fires, efforts are made to cool the blaze and snuff it out. Bentonite slurry has the capacity to both cool and to smother.

He said a demonstration of the slurry had been scheduled at Custer Tuesday, but when the Deadwood fire broke out, all hands turned to combating the blaze.

At first only two planes were used. Then the slurry proved so effective that two more were brought in. By noon Thursday, over 50,000 gallons of slurry had been dumped on the Deadwood fire and four planes were in action.

Firefighters have credited the slurry with preventing the Deadwood blaze from breaking out of control on the hill behind St. Joseph's Hospital at Deadwood Wednesday afternoon.

Thus far, Hofer said 1,116 bags of bentonite—55 tons—have been shipped to the mixing headquarters at the Spearfish airport.

Hofer said Forest Service officials who have seen the slurry work say "benonite is the weapon to use."

In battling the Deadwood fire, the first load was dyed so the pilot could see how his load was dumped. After that, however, there just wasn't time to bother with dying the slurry.

Claude Acord, American Colloid plant superintendent here, and Dick Pridgeon, assistant superintendent, supervised the mixing and loading operations.

The local plant had to construct a special pump to transfer the slurry from mixing tanks to the plane. The pump was taken to Missoula, Mont., for a demonstration and Forest Service officials here were so impressed they wouldn't let the pump be returned.

So the plant here constructed a new pump, luckily finishing it just in time to help fight the Deadwood fire.

Hofer said several demonstrations are scheduled in Chicago, West Virginia, and other spots.

However, he said before they are conducted, the local crews will take a rest and construct more equipment.

Bentonite is a colloidal clay that swells 13 times its dry weight when it becomes wet.

It is used in many ways by industry, including the manufacture of face powder, gunpowder, and steel. It is used to seal dams and is an important component of the "drillers mud" used in oil-well drilling.

Boneonite is mined in open pit mines along the Belle Fourche River and in Wyoming and Canada. It lies in beds several feet thick, at the surface of the ground or with as much as 20 feet of dirt overburden.

Processing consists of drying it in huge kilns, grinding it to a powder, and packaging.

More than half of the world's production of bentonite has come from plants located in and near Belle Fourche for the past 25 years. There are now four plants headquartering at Belle Fourche.

Failure of Congress To Provide Needed Changes in Existing Farm Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the close of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I wish to take this opportunity to make a frank and honest appraisal of the failure of Congress to provide needed changes in existing, obsolete farm laws which virtually everyone agrees are not really beneficial to farmers or agriculture generally.

Throughout history agriculture has often been faced with problems of shortages or surpluses. At the present time we are blessed with a God-given agricultural abundance brought about by a combination of generally good growing conditions and most important—the efficiency, creativeness, and hard work of farmers and ranchers.

The surpluses of some crops, particularly wheat, which have been created in most instances through unwise, unneeded, and unrealistic production incentive programs present serious problems, should have had remedial attention by this Congress. A stable, sound, expanding, and prosperous agriculture demands that Congress realistically face this pressing domestic problem. But the Democrat-controlled Congress has failed to act despite the presentation of reasonable, realistic, and beneficial proposals from this administration which had bipartisan support.

It is most unfortunate that this Congress has failed to accept and discharge its responsibilities on fundamental farm legislation.

The failure to honestly and courageously legislate to improve the farm surplus situation may be partially attributed to the surplus of another element. I refer to the surplus of demagoguery about agriculture during this session that has prevented attempts at statesmanship and placed roadblocks in the path of needed and beneficial legislative changes.

It almost appears sometimes that there are some public figures who would prefer to perpetuate certain farm problems so that they can exploit them for political purposes rather than dealing with them decisively and constructively in an attempt to find a real solution.

I know it is most disillusioning to many Members of the Congress to witness the efforts by some of our colleagues to shift responsibility for the failure to enact needed farm laws. Lest anyone forget, under our constitutional form of government it is still the Congress that passes the laws, and it is intellectually dishonest to infer that the executive branch is to be blamed because new laws were not passed.

There has been an overpowering surplus of demagoguery in recent months by some public figures who repeatedly emphasize in speeches and statements the need for changes in the farm programs. These same speeches and statements usually also attack and minimize the recommendations submitted by the President in his agricultural message last January and followed with testimony by the Secretary of Agriculture and the actual submission of draft legislation.

It almost appears some persons reason that the more they attack, the less they are obliged to offer constructive suggestions. Carried to extremes it would almost seem some have concluded that if they attack the administration enough they can completely divert attention from their failure to offer anything constructive.

Yes, there has been a great surplus of attacking and criticizing from some Members of Congress and a great shortage of constructive suggestions.

I am convinced that the American people will not be fooled by such demagoguery and unethical political tactics. The people of this Nation will remember that the House of Representatives in the 1st session of the 86th Congress was controlled almost 2 to 1 by the Democrats.

The proportion in the Senate is almost the same. It does not make much logic for Democrats to attack the administration for shortcomings in farm legislation when the Congress is so overwhelmingly controlled by their party.

In the House Committee on Agriculture there are 22 Democrats and 12 Republicans. With this kind of proportion there has been a feeling of futility on the part of the minority.

Let me cite some examples: In the case of poultry and eggs there were severe attacks upon the Department and the administration. But those who shouted the loudest for some kind of action were most bankrupt of ideas when it came to suggesting or passing any legislation. In contrast, the Department has proceeded with poultry and egg promotion programs cooperating with farm groups and the poultry and egg industry. The Department has also initiated buying programs, and we are making progress with a difficult situation.

All of us want poultry and egg farmers to receive a fair return for their labors, but the demagogic attacks and unfounded charges by some public figures have certainly done nothing to improve the situation.

The Congress is controlled 2 to 1 by the Democrats. If they have some magical plan for poultry and eggs, why do they not pass it. The fact of the matter is they know that everything is being done that can feasibly be done, but many are not fair enough to admit it and would rather inflame public opinion by critical statements.

Certainly we are not going to repeat the egg fiasco of 1950 when the Government purchased eggs and stored them in caves in Kansas until they rotted and were destroyed at great expense and great damage to the poultry and egg industry.

The hog situation is similar. Historically, we have ups and downs on the hog price charts. I know it is the objective of most Members of Congress to lessen the intensity of drops in hog prices, but the worst thing for the hog industry is a lot of reckless statements. The next worst thing would be the passage of some of the cockeyed proposals that would get the Government in the hog business at the time we are trying to get less Government intervention in other so-called basic crops where we have had such a sad experience. Some of the wild production payment schemes for hogs that have been discussed would cost hog producers and other taxpayers considerable outlays of money and would seriously weaken the entire hog industry which is today basically sound.

The case of tobacco and wheat is especially graphic in evidencing the failure of Congress to pass realistic corrective legislation. After weeks of trials and procrastination Congress finally sent the President legislation for wheat and tobacco that would have continued obsolete farm laws which have created the very difficulties we are now trying to straighten out.

Nearly everyone admits that existing farm laws are not adequate for a modern dynamic agriculture. Yet the Democrat-controlled Congress passed a farm bill that would have rigidly pegged prices at a time when we are striving to compete and expand markets. Winston-Salem, N.C., a few years ago was the largest tobacco market in the world, but today it is in southern Rhodesia, Africa. Cotton is another vivid example of what happens. This country has lost two-thirds of its world cotton market because of unrealistic inflexible pricing.

And yet with these facts, Congress has the nerve to insult the intelligence of the American people and pass farm legislation that would give us more of the same. Two wrongs do not make a right. In fact a continuation of the old outmoded laws would have further compounded our perplexing farm surplus problems and fortunately the President vetoed both measures for wheat and tobacco.

The vetoed wheat bill also would have made a compulsory cut of 25 percent in acreage for each wheat farm. Now this may not be a serious problem in some of the inefficient wheat raising areas where a few years ago they were producing virtually no wheat at all. These small 15-acre plots are mostly in areas where the farmer could take the cut in acreage and divert those acres into some other alternative crop almost equally as good.

But the traditional wheat-growing farmers of this country could not live with the 25-percent cut in acreage. It is unfair to them and devastatingly damaging to our Nation's agriculture that is dynamic and must be allowed to expand and prosper along with the rest of the expanding and prospering economy.

It is inconceivable that Congress would attempt to saddle the American farmer with repetition of programs that have such a proven bad record. I cannot imagine a single Member of Congress going to the precincts and telling his constituents, whether they be farmers or other taxpayers, in the towns and cities that he voted for the continuance of a program that has been proven so unworkable. This Congress had an opportunity to support and pass the Belcher amendment on wheat which was conceived on a bipartisan basis. The Belcher amendment was supported by the administration and offered a reasonable realistic compromise by providing more freedom to plant and a minimum price support providing adequate protection without the restriction and unfeasible incentives of existing programs that have done irreparable damage to the wheat industry and the traditional wheat farmer.

The responsibility for lack of statesmanship in agricultural legislation must objectively be laid at the feet of the Democrat controlled 86th Congress. This is a matter of great concern, not only to farmers but our entire population. We hear the statement that when farm income drops so do the sales of steel companies and the farm machinery manufacturers. This is so true, but here again what are the facts?

In recent weeks several of the farm machinery companies have reported the best years in their history. Steel sales were an all-time high until the recent strike and much of this was purchased directly or indirectly by farmers and ranchers.

Certainly there are serious problems facing individual farmers and ranchers with their operations. The cost price squeeze and related problems are everyday examples of this and certainly the Department of Agriculture and the Congress are striving to correct these in every feasible way. Let me cite some basic statistics which prove that agriculture is fundamentally strong:

First. Although the cost-price squeeze still exists as a basic problem, spiraling inflation has been almost halted. During the period from 1940 to 1952, the index of prices paid by farmers, including interest, taxes and wage rates, increased more than 100 percent. From January 1953 to August 1959, this index rose only 5 percent.

Second. Farm assets are at an alltime high—$203 billion as of January 1, 1959.

Third. Farmers have only $11 in debts for each $100 of assets. In 1940, the ratio was $19 for each $100.

Fourth. Owner equities rose 8 percent last year to a peak on January 1, 1959, of $197.8 billion.

Fifth. Farm ownership is also at a record high. Two out of every three farms are free of mortgage debt.

Sixth. The family farm continues to dominate agriculture. Ninety-six percent of our farms and ranches are family operations, about the same percentage as 30 years ago.

Seventh. Farm exports in the past 3 years have averaged over $4 billion annually—higher than any other 3-year period in the Nation's history.

Eighth. Big exports are benefiting the American people in two major ways: They strengthen farm prices and incomes and, by meeting urgent requirements of needy people abroad, they promote the interests of world peace.

Ninth. The inventory value of livestock on farms for January 1, 1959, was $18.1 billion—higher by 29 percent than a year ago.

Tenth. The level of living on farms is the highest in history, based on the percentage of farms with electricity, telephones, automobiles, and the purchasing power of the average value of farm products sold or traded.

These 10 points are evidence that agriculture is not in the hardship plight that some demagogs would have us believe. We are making progress and we will make further progress if there is less demagoguery that undermines confidence in agriculture and related industries. We will make additional progress if reasonable, realistic, and beneficial farm legislation is enacted early next year.

Without the needed legislative changes, the Department of Agriculture is continuing to do the best possible job with the means available.

Secretary Benson is a dedicated man and a fighter for the best interests of farmers. He has been a farmer most of his life. He has worked as a county agent and a representative of farm groups in many capacities.

No man or no group has a monopoly on all good ideas for the benefit of agriculture. But, certainly, Secretary Benson who has given his life to agriculture is a proven authority, especially in comparison to some of the self-appointed farm experts whose credentials and experience are very much lacking.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following report:

REPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE SUBMITTED BY EZRA TAFT BENSON, SECRETARY

FOREIGN AGRICULTURE SERVICE

This administration is proud of the part it has played in making U.S. agricultural commodities available to other countries of the world.

In the past 3 years, agricultural experts have been higher than in any other similar period in American history, averaging over $4 billion annually. Currently yearly production from 40 million acres of U.S. cropland is moving overseas. That represents an area equal to the harvested acreage of the eight Rocky Mountain and the three Pacific Coast States.

These exports have strentghened prices and incomes of our farmers. Exports, though essential to every segment of the agricultural economy, have been especially important to wheat, feed grain, and rice producers; cotton and tobacco farmers; fruit growers; poultrymen; and producers of oilseeds.

At the same time, our shipments of food and fiber have strentghened American foreign policy. As we know, communism flourishes in a climate of want and hunger. Therefore, in meeting urgent human needs in the underdeveloped countries of the world, we are making our abundance—as Persident Eisenhower has requested—serve the cause of world peace.

The highly favorable farm export situation that prevails in this country today did not, in any sense, 'just happen." It is the direct result of a carefully conceived plan of operation put into effect by this administration when it came into office in 1953.

Export statistics show that work was needed—and that work was done. From a low point of $2.8 billion in the fiscal year 1952–53, our farm product exports were built up steadily. In 1956–57, oversea shipments amounted to over $4.7 billion—an all-time high record. Export volume has strayed high to date, averaging over $4.1 billion in the past 3 years.

In setting up a program to enlarge foreign markets, the administration has built soundly.

One of its first steps was to abolish the old Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, which had functioned largely as a study and research agency, and replace it with a Foreign Agricultural Service. The new FAS was given a major specific responsibility—to expand export of U.S. farm products. All its other activities have been correlated with that overall objective.

A phase of the reorganization was reestablishing the agricultural attachés as a part of the Department of Agriculture. Today, attachés represent the interests of American agriculture in 51 different posts throughout the world. As employees of the Department of Agriculture, rotating between service in the United States and at foreign posts, attachés' activities abroad are closely coordinated with overall U.S. farm policy.

The administration recognized early that market expansion for U.S. farm products in many countries is being held up by high tariffs, embargoes, quotas, restrictions, and similar barriers to trade. Accordingly, it has been administration policy to press continuously for trade liberalization. The pressure is applied through the diplomatic service (including participation by the agriculture attachés), American participation in periodic meetings under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and activities of the International Monetary Fund. Much work remains to be done, but a number of countries have already lowered their barriers to American farm products.

The administration also recognized that farmers, transportation agencies, exporters, importers, and many other groups require accurate, timely information on foreign agricultural developments. To meet this need, the Foreign Agricultural Service has strengthened its reporting on a great many factors of foreign trade—foreign production, prices, policies, trade barriers, competition, and marketing oportunities.

A broad program of market promotion was launched by the Foreign Agricultural Service several years ago to acquaint foreign consumers with the high quality and wide variety of American farm products. In Switzerland, for example, promotion has pushed exports of poultry meat from virtually nothing in 1954 to an estimated 16 million pounds in 1959. In most of the countries where American cotton is being promoted, per capita consumption has risen significantly. In Japan, where a big effort has been made to promote wheat as a food, imports of U.S. wheat rose from an average of 38 million bushels in the 5 years 1950–54 to 51 million bushels in the 1957–58 marketing year. There are many other instances of successful promotion efforts, including participation in food trade fairs around the world. Much of this promotion work is carried on with the enthusiastic cooperation of U.S. farm and trade groups.

The administration has followed a fixed policy of emphasizing export sales for dollars. Largely because of the administration's efforts to keep prices of its commodities competitive in world markets, dollar sales in recent years have been substantial, accounting for 63 percent of the total exports. Dollar sales, of course, represent the traditional, the permanent way of transacting business in this country. Dollar sales of Government-owned commodities also promote the biggest return flow of cash to the U.S. Treasury.

However, some foreign countries lack dollar exchange. Recognizing this practical obstacle to trade, the administration supported enactment of Public Law 480—the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954—which authorizes sales for foreign currencies. Foreign currency sales have turned out to be an unusual but effective means of utilizing surpluses, accounting for over a fourth of U.S. exports on a value basis since 1954. In the fiscal year 1959 more than half of the U.S. wheat exported—about 230 million bushels—was sold for foreign currencies. Also moving out of the country under the foreign currency authorization were two-thirds of our exports of edible oils, a fourth of our rice shipments, and a fifth of our cotton exports.

This administration has made good use of barter wherever feasible—exchanging surplus farm products for easily stored and urgently needed critical and strategic materials obtainable only in foreign countries. More than 60 million people in about 85 countries are receiving U.S. food through voluntary relief agencies carrying on foreign assistance programs. Other millions of needy people abroad have been assisted by grants of food and fiber to ease the effects of drought and other emergency conditions. This sharing of our abundance is doing much to create good will for the United States in areas where Communist regimes are trying hard to win the allegiance and the minds of men.

Despite this good record, President Dwight D. Eisenhower last January called for the surplus-producing nations of the world to explore anew additional means of using surplus food in the interests of world peace. Following the President's food-for-peace proposal, meetings were held with representatives of the exporting nations—Argentina, Australia, Canada, France—and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). In an atmosphere of friendly cooperation, possibilities and problems were explored. Possibilities showing particular promise include:

Establishment of reserves to meet emergencies.

Increased donations for school lunch, institutional, and refugee feeding.

Refugee resettlement.

Projects for community self-help.

Several Government agencies are cooperating in food-for-peace planning.

Through cooperation with the other surplus-producing countries will come sound building. And sound building of food-for-peace progams is, in the administration's view, more important than speed—important as speed is.

In the months that lie ahead, the administration will continue to work for high-level exports of farm commodities. In this effort, the administration is sure in the knowledge that it is working not only in the interests of farmers, and the industries related to agriculture, but also in the interests of all the people. High-level exports will continue to strengthen farm prices and incomes for the agricultural segment of the economy—they will continue to promote peace. Despite the problems involved, our agricultural abundance is a valuable national asset. Wisely used, this asset can and will make a substantial contribution to the solution of the great problems of our time arising from hunger, insecurity, and fear of war.

COMMODITY STABILIZATION SERVICE

Dairy prospects brighter

The best balance in years between milk production and consumption of dairy products is being achieved in 1959. A greater volume of dairy products is flowing into consumer use through commercial channels. Government purchases so far this marketing year are down 25 percent from 1958. They are the lowest for the period since 1953 when heavy buying began. Continued extensive movement of Government supplies into many diverse channels of use has pulled the total dairy price-support inventory to its lowest level in 6 years. The market is now in a position to function virtually free of an overhang of Government stocks.

Sound price-support actions, within legislative authorizations, are contributing to this improved stability for dairy producers. Milk production has remained at a relatively stable level for the past 2 or 3 years. Increased consumption is eating into the milk surplus.

Corn program improved

During the past year, a basic change has been made in the corn program to bring about long-needed improvements. The old unworkable system of acreage allotments has been discontinued, and farmers are now at liberty to make their own decisions on corn planting. The level of price support is no longer dependent entirely on the outmoded parity standard but is based primarily on the price level of recent years. This new program was placed in effect following a favorable vote of more than 70 percent of corn farmers voting in a referendum in November 1958.

Better cotton program

The past year has marked the beginning of a move toward eased production controls and more realistic price supports for cotton. A definite halt has been called in the type of program which, through the years, has led to the loss of cotton export markets and the takeover of part of the domestic market by synthetic fibers.

New legislation enacted in 1958 made it possible for upland cotton farmers to make a choice in 1959 between complying with their "regular" farm acreage allotment, or planting a 40-percent larger allotment at a 15-point lower level of support. About 69,000 farm operators chose the greater freedom to produce, and increased their allotments by more than a million acres.

Further progress is assured for the years ahead. After 1960, the legal minimum for regular upland cotton price support will be lower than the old 75 percent of parity. This can serve to make cotton more competitive with synthetic fibers.

Continued improvement in wool

Continued progress is being made in expanding U.S. wool production, which in 1959 is reaching toward the highest level in 12 years. Each year more sheep are on U.S. farms and ranches, giving promise of future increases in production of strategic material which had dropped drastically during the 1940's and early 1950's.

The wool incentive program which began in 1955 is restoring sheep producers' confidence in the future of their industry. The payment program to encourage additional production is self-financing through use of duties collected on imports of wool and wool manufactures.

Grain storage adequate

Record-breaking grain crops and supplies are being adequately stored this year, in contrast to some former times when such smaller supplies created serious storage problems. Close cooperation among farmers, commercial warehousemen, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture during the past few years developed a coodinated attack in this vital area. Commercial warehousemen, with the Department's guidance in pinpointing areas of probable storage shortage, have greatly increased commercial capacities. The commercial space for grains and related commodities is now estimated at more than 4 billion bushels, nearly twice what it was in 1951. Farmers have also increased their capacity, with help from special Government loans to build new storage or improve existing facilities. As a result of this planned expansion, the Commodity Credit Corporation was able again this year to avoid buying any additional storage bins or facilities of its own.

Big surplus movement

During the past 6 years, surplus agricultural commodities with a cost value of more than $16.5 billion have been moved out of the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory and into useful consumption through the Department of Agriculture's coordinated disposal programs. Wheat, cotton, corn, and other feed grains, and dairy products accounted for nearly $13 billion of the total. This tremendous operation helped to hold down the size and cost of the Government's surplus stocks, at the same time making the commodities available for current use both at home and abroad. While sales for cash accounted for more than half of all inventory disposal, special programs, such as those authorized by Public Law 480, were utilized effectively.

Exports drawn from commercial stocks

Payment-in-kind export programs, under which commodities for shipment are drawn from commercial stocks instead of from Commodity Credit Corporation inventories, have been broadened and made more effective during the past year. Under these programs, export demand is brought to bear directly on commercial markets, to the advantage of both industry and farm producers. Only the commodities used to make in-kind export subsidy payments come from Government stocks. By strengthening commercial market prices, these programs cut down on the flow of surplus commodities to CCC under the price-support program.

The shift to the payment-in-kind export program was begun with wheat in the fall of 1956. It has since been extended to corn, oats, barley, rye, grain sorghums, rice, and cotton.

THE CONSERVATION RESERVE

During this year, 250,000 farmers will receive more than $350 million for participation in the conservation reserve program of the soil bank. In return for these payments, they will hold nearly 23 million acres of cropland out of production during the 1959 crop season. If they had not been held in the reserve, these acres would have added to the already large surpluses of many agricultural commodities.

The conservation reserve contracts are for 3, 5, or 10 years. The contracts require a reduction in the total acreage of crops on the farm, and in addition call for the land to be devoted to conservation uses. Over 20 million acres of the reserve this year are in grass. Nearly 2 million acres are growing a stand of forest trees, with about 1 billion trees planted by the close of the 1959 season. Plantings of clover to benefit wildlife are being established on nearly a quarter of a million acres.

The 23 million acres in the conservation reserve are not producing surplus crops; they are not contributing to dust storms; they are not adding to the load of silt carried down stream by our rivers. They are helping to conserve our national resources.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The Eisenhower administration has initiated the first real program to deal with the needs of the small low income farmer. The rural development program was devised and is operating successfully in providing help to those farmers and rural communities who really need it. This is in contrast to the effect of some of the other farm programs that have helped those who need it the least.

The rural development program, now going forward in some 200 counties in 30 States, enlists private and public cooperation to raise levels of living in areas with many underemployed rural people.

Rural development committees have been organized in each of these States. State and local leaders are working toward a better balance between agriculture, industry, and other sources of income in these counties. Six Federal departments are supporting the work of State agencies, private citizens, and organizations. The program involves research, education, and community action.

Experience gained in the original program areas by participating groups has now permitted a widening of the program beyond the pilot stage in many States. To keep pace with these developments, Federal departments and agencies are redirecting many of their regular activities to serve more effectively the needs of rural people with seriously low incomes.

A major achievement is increasing national awareness of the harmful impact on the Nation's economic and social life of underemployment among rural people, the basic cause of low incomes on small farms and in rural towns.

In 1959 most rural development counties showed an increase in the number of off-farm job opportunities. Industry expansion continued. Several areas built new market and processing facilities. Farmers' marketing cooperatives were formed in some areas. Reorientation of agricultural production on small farms continued, with vegetable, livestock, and poultry enterprises increasing in numbers and output. Vocational training and vocational guidance received added attention.

The Department of Agriculture during the year continued to contribute special funds to the rural development program through allocations to the States by the Federal Extension Service, and additional expenditures for conservation work in demonstration counties and for research in cooperation with State experiment stations.

A major national workshop was held at Jackson's Mill, W. Va., in May 1959. This meeting brought together representatives of 34 States and all Federal Government agencies concerned in the program. Highlights of the meeting included addresses by Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson; Dr. Karl Brandt, member of the Council of Economic Advisers; Under Secretary True D. Morse; and prominent State, agricultural, and economic development leaders. There was also intensive discussions among those attending the meeting of economic and social needs in underdeveloped rural areas and methods of strengthening rural development programs. The educational importance of this meeting cannot be exaggerated.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

More than 12 billion pounds of surplus foods have been donated to school lunch programs, charitable institutions, and needy persons at home and abroad since 1953 under food distribution programs of the Agricultural Marketing Service. These foods have been supplied to more than 80 million people in this country and around the world.

Under the national school-lunch program, slightly more than 12 million children ate more than 2 billion nutritious lunches in 60,800 schools during the 1958–59 school year. In addition to Federal assistance in the form of surplus foods and appropriated funds, these schools purchased locally foods valued at about $515 million, a considerable market for farm products.

The special milk program, inaugurated in 1954, has resulted in a tremendous increase in milk consumption in schools, child-care institutions, and summer camps. In the 1959 fiscal year, over 2 billion half pints of milk were served to children in 78,300 schools and 1,100 institutions under the program.

Voluntary use of USDA inspection services for fresh and processed fruits and vegetables expanded continuously, and hit a record high level during the 1958–59 season.

Cotton classing for farmers under the Smith-Doxey Act increased from 63 percent of total United States ginnings in the 1952–53 season to 93 percent in the 1958–59 season—the highest percentage on record.

As a service to growers, all tobacco sold at auction is federally inspected and graded prior to sale. Since 1953, this service has been extended to nine new tobacco auction markets.

New Federal standards have been developed for many farm products in the last 5 years to bring to more than 360 the number of products on which quality standards are now available.

Crop and livestock reports issued by the Department give the public vital information on the Nation's agriculture. The reports are on acreage, yield, and production of crops; numbers, production, and slaughter of livestock and poultry; stocks of commodities on and off farms; prices paid and received by farmers; and farm employment and wage rates.

Intensive research aimed at improving agricultural estimating and forecasting has been conducted by the Department the past 6 years. New services have been added covering cattle on feed, potato utilization, and citrus production, and the indexes of prices paid and received by farmers were revised for the first time since 1950. The changes made in the overall program are paying off in more timely, accurate, and comprehensive crop and livestock reports.

The Federal milk marketing order program, which stabilizes marketing conditions and assures farmers of minimum prices for their

milk, has been developed extensively since 1953. The program now includes 76 orders which regulate the handling of about 40 billion pounds of milk, as compared with 49 orders regulating handling of 26 billion pounds of milk in 1953. Nearly 189 thousand dairy farmers are now selling their milk in Federal milk marketing order areas.

Administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act has been strengthened during the past 6 years. An amendment passed by Congress in 1958 extends the jurisdiction of the USDA to all livestock transactions in interstate commerce. The program has been expanded to 1,528 posted markets, compared with 300 in 1953.

Poultry inspection, a major consumer protection service previously on a voluntary basis, was made mandatory for all poultry and poultry products moving in interstate or foreign commerce by the Poultry Products Inspection Act, effective January 1, 1959. As a result, the volume of poultry inspected during fiscal 1958 totaled nearly 3.5 billion pounds, and approximately 480 poultry processing plants were operating under inspection, compared with 254 in 1953.

Grading of farm products has increased considerably since 1953. Nearly 2 billion pounds of poultry were graded in fiscal 1959, as compared with slightly more than one-half billion pounds in 1953. Shell egg grading rose from 10 percent to 20 percent of eggs sold off farms. Inspection and grading of dairy products increased from about 1.6 billion pounds to approximately 2.8 billion pounds, and Federal grading of carcass beef increased from 21.6 percent of total production in 1950 to about 51 percent in fiscal 1959.

New emphasis and focus has been given to marketing research in the Department of Agriculture since 1953 when it was centralized in the Agricultural Marketing Service. This work is giving positive push to expanding marketing for farm products and improving marketing efficiency.

Savings in marketing costs resulting from this work are benefiting the American public by many millions of dollars each year, far outweighing its cost.

Mechanized grain aeration and fumigation in grain storage, developed through this research, is already saving more than $3 million each year in storage costs and the total is mounting year by year.

Improvements in handling of fruits and vegetables are saving over $5 million per year in marketing costs.

Research which has already led to establishment of new terminal markets in Philadelphia, Pa.; Atlanta, Ga., and numerous other cities in the last few years is cutting marketing costs for farm products by millions of dollars per year.

And these are but a few outstanding examples of similar savings spread across the fields of transportation, storage, processing, handling, and merchandising of farm products.

As part of the drive to streamline agricultural marketing, greatly increased attention has been given research to expand new and existing market outlets. This work represents a frontal attack on agriculture's need to gain markets, some of which it has been "researched" out of by nonagricultural industries. The market development work of the Agricultural Marketing Service, since 1953, has brought to light much information of value to farmers and marketers of farm products, including vital information on consumer preferences, consumer reactions to newly developed products, consumer wants, and market reactions to tests of merchandising and promotion techniques.

FOREST SERVICE

During the last year, the Forest Service has made substantial progress in its three major fields of responsibility—the administration and management of the national forests; cooperation with the States and private forest landowners; and forest and range research.

In March 1959, Secretary Benson submitted to Congress a program for the national forests. This program was proposed to increase facilities of the national forests and to help meet the resource and recreational needs of a growing population and expanding economy. The Forest Service, at the Secretary's request, had launched Operation Outdoors in 1957 to build up recreation facilities. It has now inaugurated the broader program for the national forests, including both long-range conservation objectives and interim action proposals concerned with needs of the next 10–15 years.

Cash income from the national forests rose to $124 million for fiscal year 1959, the highest in history. In October 1958 the billionth dollar of national forest receipts from timber sales, grazing permits and other uses, was deposited in the U.S. Treasury. While the first billion dollars was received over a more than 50-year period, the next billion in income from these public lands will come in during the next 10 years or less if current trends continue.

National forest timber cut in fiscal year 1959 jumped 1.9 billion board feet to a new high of slightly more than 8½ billion board feet of timber with a value of almost $114 million. This compares with a cut of 6.4 billion feet in fiscal year 1958 and the previous high of 7 billion feet in fiscal year 1957.

More than 113,000 acres of national forest rangeland were rehabilitated during 1958 by reseeding and by the control of undesirable plants. The number of trained range management personnel on the national forests was increased.

A study has been launched of resources available for outdoor recreation on lands managed by the Forest Service. This study will supply information useful in meeting future recreational demands on the national forests. The information will also be available to the National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission, established by Congress in 1958.

A recently completed 3-year project on a part of the San Isabel National Forest in Colorado has slowed surface runoff to the point where it no longer carries silt. Castlerock Creek, once subject to flash floods and quick dry-up, is now a year-long live stream supporting fish life.

During fiscal year 1958, more than 1½ billion trees were planted on America's forest lands. Of that impressive total 86 percent was on lands in private ownership. In calendar 1958, farmers planted trees and shrubs on 397,000 acres under conservation reserve (soil bank) contracts.

The fire control record set in 1957 for all forest lands, public and private, was improved upon in 1958, due largely to successful research in firefighting methods and equipment and to the continuing successful Smokey Bear cooperative forest fire prevention campaign. The increased use of smokejumpers, helicopters, and aerial spraying of chemicals has been of substantial aid in reducing fire damage during the past year.

During 1958 the Forest Service, in cooperation with the State foresters, conducted 25 meetings across the country in an effort to find ways of improving the 4½ million small forest ownerships which are a key to the Nation's future wood supplies. In general these lands are producing only a small part of their potential.

An important Forest Service landmark of the year 1958 was the publication of the final report on the Nation's timber situation, "Timber Resources for America's Future." This report, the most comprehensive ever made on the subject of the Nation's timber, emphasizes the need to step up wood products production by 83 percent to meet expected population increases and resulting demands by the year 2000.

Research in forest genetics has proved that some forest trees possess an inherent resistance to certain insects and diseases, and hybrids having this important quality are now being raised for large-scale planting on national forests. Results of recent experiments to improve forest tree nursery techniques not only insure better seedings, but permit substantial economies in commercial production of planting stock as well. From studies in watershed management scientists have discovered ways of manipulating forest cover on critical watersheds to increase water yields. Other research has made significant and valuable contributions to knowledge in the fields of forest fire suppresion, forest products utilization and marketing, insect and disease control, and in the improvement of forest range for game and livestock.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service continued to provide technical assistance to farmers and ranchers throughout the country in applying effective conservation programs to the land. Assistance was furnished to an expanding number of small watershed projects, to an increasing number of soil conservation districts, to the agricultural conservation program, and to others in moving ahead with the soil and water conservation job.

During the 1959 fiscal year most of the field work in the Department's national soil and water conservation needs inventory was completed. The first nationwide compilation of its kind, the needs inventory is scheduled to be completed in 1960.

Improvements also were achieved in making and coordinating snow surveys for water forecasting in the Western States, and in the national cooperative soil survey in which the rate of soil mapping was stepped up approximately 18 percent over a year earlier. Soil scientists and range conservationists in fiscal 1959 made soil and range surveys on nearly 49 million acres, an increase of 8 million acres over 1958.

The SCS provided technical assistance to 2,791 soil conservation districts in fiscal year 1958, 40 more than in 1957. Service technicians assigned to districts worked with more than a million district cooperators in applying conservation programs and helped 91,335 develop new basic conservation plans.

Almost 95 percent of the Nation's farms and ranches and 90 percent of the farmland now are in soil conservation districts. By June 30, 1958, they had 1,794,411 cooperators operating about 540 million acres, or about 46 percent of the Nation's farmland.

As of August 1, 1959, the SCS was assisting 469 local organizations in preparing project plans under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566), 103 more than a year earlier; of the total, installation of works of improvement, 59 more than a year earlier.

As of August 1, 1959, 2,961 farmers and ranchers had signed contracts under the Great Plains conservation program (Public Law 1021) which was launched in August 1957. The contracts signed covered more than 8 million acres for which the farmers had prepared complete conservation plans. During the 1959 fiscal year the Secretary of Agriculture designated 11 additional counties as eligible to participate in the program, bringing the total to 332. In July 1959, an additional eight were designated as eligible. The contracts call for 30 percent of the total cropland involved to be returned to permanent vegetation, mostly grass.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE

The work of the Cooperative Extension Service of the Department, working with the State land-grant colleges and universities, has been intensified to further meet the total

farm and home management and adjustment needs of farm families. The Service also has increased assistance to communities in planning their own self-help adjustment programs, as typified by the rural development program, and has rendered greater assistance in the marketing of farm products and in helping more people better understand public affairs affecting them.

The result has been more specialized and intensified service in line with changing needs and, at the same time, more families assisted. The number of farm families assisted with improving efficiency has increased since 1953, despite a declining farm population. The 12½ million farm and nonfarm families assisted represents an overall increase of 50 percent.

More than 11,000 of the 70,000 farm families given such assistance in 1958 reached the point where they could carry out their own plans without further special assistance. This freed extension agents to extend this more intensive educational assistance to families in other communities.

Though the major extension effort is still devoted to assisting the nearly 4 million farm families with their production efficiency, and management problems, an increasing percent of extension time is being devoted to assistance with marketing, public affairs and community development problems.

The number of overall county advisory committees and councils with which extension agents are working increased from 3,874 in 1953 to 4,395 in 1958. The 1½ million local leaders, helping spread extension recommendations in their communities, is an increase of 20 percent over 1953.

Most suburban, small town, and city people are calling on extension agents for help, particularly, in connection with family living and consumer food buying. The number of homemakers assisted in nutrition or family feeding problems has increased 55 percent since 1953, and the number assisted with clothing problems 53 percent.

The 2¼ million boys and girls in 4–H Club work is nearly 10 percent more than in 1953. Major progress has been made in giving club members more training and project experience in management, basic science, and careers beyond farming available to them.

RESEARCH

Important developments in research and regulatory activities that have made agricultural headlines in recent years cover many fields. Examples include:

1. Establishment of pioneering research in numerous categories directed toward the discovery of basic natural laws and new facts and principles. At this time 15 such labaratories have been established.

2. New research facilities to insure future progress for agriculture have been established. The Plum Island Animal Disease Laboratory for research on foot-and-mouth disease and other foreign diseases of animals was dedicated in 1956. The National Seed Storage Laboratory, Fort Collins, Colo.; the Fruit, Vegetable, Soil, and Water Laboratory in Weslaco, Tex.; and the Fruit and Vegetable Products Laboratory, Winter Haven, Fla., were dedicated in 1958.

Five new laboratories are going into operation this year: The Soil Sedimentation Laboratory, Oxford, Miss.; the Soil and Water Laboratory, Watkinsville, Ga.; the North Central Conservation Field Laboratory, Morris, Minn.; the Water Conservation Laboratory, Tempe, Ariz.; and the Laboratory for Wool Research, Albany, Calif. The National Animal Disease Laboratory at Ames, Iowa, is scheduled for completion late in 1960. And contracts will be let during the present fiscal year for: the Crops Research Laboratory at Logan, Utah; the Boll Weevil Laboratory, State College, Miss.; and new entomology laboratories at Tifton, Ga.; and Brookings, S. Dak.

3. Successful completion of the program to help stamp out foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico. This protects our own livestock producers from the dangers of a source of infection close at hand.

4. Cooperation with Florida in eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in less than 2 years after it was discovered in Florida and spread to 28 counties.

5. An expanded program looking toward eventual eradication of brucellosis. At the end of summer (1959) 20 States and Puerto Rico had achieved the status of modified certified brucellosis-free—a sevenfold increase over the number when the program started in 1954.

6. Release of the first isomgerm varieties of sugar beets removing the final obstacle to the mechanization of the crop.

7. Greatly expanded efforts to build farm markets through utilization research and development—work designed to aid processors in producing convenience foods, ease-of-care fabrics, and in turning farm surpluses to new industrial materials. Funds for this work have been almost doubled since 1953. Additional work initiated under Public Law 480 permits USDA to pay for cooperative research in scientific institutions abroad with foreign currencies from the sale of U.S. farm products.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Farmer Cooperative Service has continued to effectively carry on its research, educational, and advisory service work with farmer cooperatives in order to help farmers make better use of these mechanisms for improving their bargaining position and economic status.

This has meant intensifying its efforts to help these farm businesses adjust their operations to the many economic changes influencing agriculture.

The problems confronting farmers because of the growth of vertical integration and contract farming are an example. FCS has made a series of case studies of highly integrated cooperatives and has been developing some measures of the extent of integrated operations in cooperatives. It has issued publications based on surveys of what has been happening in petroleum and dairy cooperatives.

FCS has also been providing basic information for a number of cooperatives considering the possibilities of merger. Results of its studies have recently been used in mergers of four egg and poultry cooperatives in New England with a regional farm supply association and of two dairy associations in the Midwest. Other cooperatives are using studies of FCS in evaluating whether or not mergers will contribute to more efficient operations for their members.

To help keep up with the increasingly complex problems of cooperatives, FCS has been studying ways to help them strengthen their management. It has issued a report on the extent and ways key employees and farmer directors get management training. To help cooperatives develop better directors, it is now completing a study to find out what directors know about their jobs and what evaluation may be placed on their performance.

The Service has sponsored several national conferences of bargaining associations. It has been cosponsor of a series of regional member relations conferences to help cooperatives find ways to give their members a better understanding of their operations. Its studies have also contributed to annual conferences on research by those regional farm supply cooperatives that have established economic research departments.

Cooperation with land-grant colleges has increased. Starting in 1954 it has jointly sponsored five regional conferences and two national ones for research workers who deal with cooperative problems.

FCS has continued its efforts to help strengthen marketing operations of cooperatives—studying grain storage in the South to improve handling and get greater returns for this increasingly important crop in that area; conducting research to find the best ways to operate livestock auctions in the South and in the Northeast; and making numerous cost studies to help cooperatives reduce their operating costs.

One of the problems limiting the effective development of farm supply cooperatives is credit control. In 1955, FCS initiated a series of studies in various parts of the country to find better ways for cooperatives to handle farmers' accounts. It is also making a series of studies on inventory handling and control by farm supply associations.

The increased interest in possibilities of farmers using cooperatives to help improve their marketing and buying power is reflected in the larger number of requests for information and for publications issued by this agency.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Helping farm families strengthen their positions on family-type farms throughout the 50 States of the Nation and Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands continues to be the objective of the Farmers Home Administration. The agency serves the farmers eligible for its credit by making and insuring loans suited to their individual needs and accompanying the loans with whatever farm and home management assistance is needed. The agency does not compete with other leaders.

The agency's loans help eligible farm families operate more efficiently; become owners of family-type farms by buying land and improving land and buildings; carry out measures of soil and water conservation; develop water systems for irrigation and farmstead use; take measures to protect small watersheds; and build or repair farmhouses and other essential farm buildings. The agency also extends emergency credit to farmers in areas hard hit by floods, drought, or other natural calamities.

The administration has sponsored measures in the past 6 years which have expanded the Farmers Home Administration's regular loan services, increased the number of the agency's credit services, and improved the efficiency of its operations.

To meet the increased cost of modern farming, the maximum amount a family-type farmer may be indebted for operating loans has been increased from $10,000 to $20,000.

To implement the rural development program, eligible farmers who have part-time employment off the farm may obtain operating and farm development loans.

The scope of the emergency loan program has been broadened in the past 6 years, especially in areas that experienced prolonged droughts and in other areas where farmers suffered losses to crops and property from hail, windstorms, and other causes.

Soil and water conservation loans, formerly available only as water facilities loans and in 17 Western States, are being made to farmers and their associations throughout the Nation.

The agency now is making loans to qualified organizations to help pay for planning and carrying out structural and land treatment measures to protect and develop small watershed land and water resources. The first loans of this type were made in 1959.

Loans to buy or improve farms and for soil and water conservation are made from funds advanced by private lenders and insured by the Farmers Home Administration, as well as from appropriated funds. This insured loan program has been greatly improved since 1953. Use of private capital reduces the need for appropriated funds. Routines for handling insured loans have been simplified and many steps have been

taken to increase the attractiveness of this form of investment. While insurance companies and other large lenders have invested heavily in insured farm loans, country banks have come to be the principal sources of insured loan funds. Insured loans made during the fiscal years 1954 through 1959 totaled $202,457,000. During the 6 previous fiscal years the insured loans totaled $65,708,000.

There has been a general increase in the total loans of all types, made and insured, in the past 6 years. The fiscal 1959 total was $361,629,000. In 1953, the total was $228,461,000.

A similar increase is noted in borrowers' repayments. Collections totaling $347,700,000 were made in fiscal 1959, compared with $174 million in 1953.

Improvements made in the administration of the agency's operations since 1953 include speeding up loan service by placing more authority in county supervisors' hands, developing a well-organized training program for new employees, strengthening the audit system, shortening regulations, eliminating unnecessary forms, and consolidating four area finance offices into one national finance office.

The staffing pattern has been rearranged and placed on a more efficient basis which has resulted in the need for fewer employees and in greater opportunities for advancement by the more capable employees.

The agency has increased the emphasis on helping borrowers develop sound farming systems, making certain that it does not compete with other lenders, graduating borrowers to other sources of credit at the earliest opportunity, and helping applicants for credit make full use of private and cooperative credit sources.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

During this session of Congress there has perhaps been more demagoguery and unfounded charges involving rural electrification than any other subject. It is a tragedy that this aspect of the Department of Agriculture's program that is so universally supported in the Congress should be subjected to the political shenanigans of a few who would unethically distort the true picture. I won't take the time to repeat or refute the incredible and ridiculous charges that were made in recent months against the Administration and against Secretary Benson involving rural electrification, but will let the record of accomplishment speak for itself.

Since January 1953, the Rural Electrification Administration has stepped up its activities to help 985 active rural electric systems and 661 rural telephone systems to meet a continuously rising demand for their services.

During fiscal year 1959, loans to rural telephone companies and cooperatives by REA reached a record fiscal year high of $98.9 million. Total telephone loans now stand at $575.2 million, and more than four-fifths of this amount has been loaned under this administration.

Loans to rural electric systems during fiscal 1959 totaled $177.3 million. About two-thirds of these funds will be used to help borrowers increase system capacity to meet the increase in the use of electricity by rural people. More than 32 percent of the $3.9 billion in electric loans approved since REA began has been approved during the little more than 6½ years of this administration.

In recent years, REA has given particular attention to the needs of its borrowers for an expanding supply of power at lower cost. It has pressed the search for more economical means of power production and has assisted electric borrowers in obtaining substantial savings in initial investment and operating costs through interconnection, joint operations, and more efficient generating units.

During fiscal 1959, loans were approved to provide additional generating capacity in the amount of 163,600 kilowatts. Generation and transmission loans have accounted for almost 30 percent of the total loaned for rural electrification since January 1, 1953, compared with only 19 percent before that date. These have included first loans to five new G. and T. federations and to two established borrowers for conventional generating facilities to be used at proposed atomic energy plants. One of these atomic plants (Elk River, Minn.) is under construction.

Rural electric systems financed by REA serve more than 4.6 million consumers. About 800,000 of these received service during the past 6 years. This current rate of growth—about 130,000 a year—is expected to continue.

The average cost of power to rural residential consumers has dropped about seven-tenths of a cent per kilowatt-hour since 1952. The cost now is 2.65 cents per kilowatt-hour, the lowest in REA history.

REA activities since 1953 have brought strength and direction to the rural telephone program. This plus an improvement in supplies of materials and equipment after settlement of the Korean conflict, has speeded the job of giving better telephone service to rural communities. In early 1953, some 40 REA borrowers had cutover 85 dial central offices to bring new or improved service to 7,500 subscribers. As of June 30, 1959, 531 borrowers had cutover 2,062 new dial exchanges. Loans approved since January 1, 1953, will benefit about 900,000 farm families and other rural subscribers. Total telephone loans to date will benefit about 1,200,000 rural subscribers.

Given encouragement toward interdependence and self-reliance, REA borrowers have made substantial financial growth since 1953. Net worth of electrification borrowers has more than tripled, increasing from $161 million at the end of December 1952, to $515 million on December 31, 1958. During the period January 1, 1953 to June 30, 1959, the number of electrification borrowers behind in their payments dropped from 45 to 2. Payments on debt in advance of due date have risen from $52.5 million to about $146 million. In the much newer telephone program advance payments now stand at almost $1.6 million, and all but 13 borrowers are current or ahead of schedule on debt payments.

REA has streamlined procedures to speed processing of loans, give improved service to borrowers, and reduce administrative costs. With 11 percent fewer employees, REA is now carrying out much bigger electric and telephone programs than in 1952. Working with industry, REA carries on constant research to hold down construction costs and improve performance and service.

To help borrowers keep ahead of new power demands, REA has developed new techniques and approaches to long-range planning for rural electric systems. Borrowers will be able to schedule construction for several years ahead and to expand at minimum cost. New telephone construction is also planned to meet needs over an extended period.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, I submit these facts for consideration of the Congress and the Nation. When the smoke from inflammatory statements by demagogues has cleared away, these facts will continue to stand.

The Democrat-controlled Congress has failed to pass needed changes in existing, obsolete farm laws. While virtually everyone agrees a fresh approach is needed, Congress has not acted.

Meanwhile, agriculture is moving forward not particularly because of what Congress is doing, but in many cases, in spite of what Congress has failed to do.

Let the record stand and let the Nation know it.

Tragedy in World's Refugee Camps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, on August 11, 1959, I introduced S. 2513, to authorize the admission into the United States of certain refugees, as a legislative means, in my opinion, of carrying out obligations and meeting responsibilities of the United States in the world refugee year.

The world refugee year runs from July 1, 1959, until June 30, 1960.

The United Nations, with the necessary cooperation of the countries throughout the world, hopes to solve some of the critical problems concerning refugees who are outside their homelands because of war or other armed hostilities, political situations, or natural disasters. The plight of many of these stateless persons appears hopeless unless the nations of the world work together in giving them grounds for hope rather than despair.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by William R. Frye, published in the Sunday Star of Washington, D.C., August 30, 1959, entitled "San Sabba Symbol of Tragedy in World's Refugee Camps."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN SABBA SYMBOL OF TRAGEDY IN WORLD'S REFUGEE CAMPS

(By William R. Frye)

TRIESTE, ITALY.—San Sabba, the forbidden camp of Europe, is a tragic spectacle of inhumanity and suffering with overtones of courage, tenacity, and struggle for a better future.

For something like a year, San Sabba—a refugee camp in an abandoned warehouse here—has been closed to outsiders because Italy feared publicity on what had become an international scandal. I am the first newspaperman to visit this camp since the day its doors slammed shut.

Much has been done to clean up San Sabba. Men still come out of its brawls with knife wounds, wine still flows freely at 3 cents a glass, and some of the girls are still drawn into prostitution, but it is no longer the hellhole it used to be.

Except for family quarters, men's and women's barracks are physically separated now and guards are posted to keep them apart at night—with what success remains to be seen since refugee guards can be bribed. There are 700 single men here as a against 90 girls and they have just come out of the pressure chamber of Yugoslav communism.

TO HELP THE CHILDREN

Stellio Crasnig, Italian camp director, showed me with pride the plot of earth be-

side a shed where he plans to build a playground for the children—and nearly every family has several. There already is a nursery complete with babysitter for youngsters of ill or working mothers, obviously built with care and compassion.

But none of this can do more than perfume the dirty underwear of San Sabba, or make it anything but a tragedy to have to live there. Some 1,270 refugees, nearly all of them from across the Yugoslav border a scant mile away, constitute the present camp population.

They are packed in like fish in the hold of a ship. Beds are jammed together, 17 to a barren barrackslike room with no space between. Despite all efforts, the building is disintegrating inside and out, and laundry hangs from stair wells as if to underline the tenement appearance. Railroad tracks which once brought in rice for storage still run down the middle courtyard.

A 7-year-old boy and his little sister, 6, were riding tandem on a wooden rocking horse when I came into the yard. Brown-haired with bright brown eyes, they were delightful children—with a gayety and spontaneity which only a child could manage in San Sabba.

Their names were Bruno and Luciana Mlakar. They had never known any other home. Their parents had fled from Pola, Yugoslavia, when Bruno was an infant of 3 months. Luciana was born in camp.

Soon thereafter, their father deserted the family, leaving his wife with the children. No country wants a destitute family without a breadwinner; it isn't economically profitable. So Virginia Mlakar, 30, is stuck in San Sabba with no prospect that either she or her children will ever get out.

A REFUGEE TWICE

Ivan Karcenko, 64, a gray-haired mason with a deeply lined face, came to see me. He has been a refugee twice in his life—once from Russia in 1920 and again from Yugoslavia his adopted home, in 1950. Both times, he said, he fled for the same reason—to escape Communist oppression.

Karcenko has been in San Sabba more than 9 years. He prays to emigrate to the United States and has been told that the wheels are turning—but he has heard this before and it has always turned out to be a bitter illusion.

"If only I can get somewhere while I am still able to work," he said wistfully. To men in forced idleness for years, regular work seems the next thing to heaven.

"They've been telling me for 8 years, you will go. But I stay. This time it will be the same old story."

I said I hoped not. His eyes filled with tears, and you could see that hope had not yet died. For plenty of others it has. There are 111 people at San Sabba who have been there 10 years or more. Most of them have been passed over dozens of times by governmental selection missions.

They are too old (some governments refuse to consider anyone over 40) or they have had TB or they once got into a fight and served a jail term or perhaps, like Mrs. Mlakar, they just aren't considered economic assets. Few countries base their immigration policies on humanitarianism.

Just such people—people who have been in refugee camps for tragically long periods of time—are being given top priority by the U.N. this year, World Refugee Year. By next year, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees hopes to have them all out of camps.

This would not mean that the refugee problem had been solved; far from it. But at least the pipeline would have been cleared so that new people entering it could see a little light at the end of the tunnel and not be faced with indefinite years of dreary camp life.

COMING IN BY HUNDREDS

Some 400 refugees a month are flooding into San Sabba. It is not considered discreet, since Yugoslavia is a friendly neutral, to emphasize that they are fleeing from communism; but it is a fact.

Here in Italy, according to Mr. Crasnig, 95 percent are given refuge. Others say the figure is a bit lower, but at any rate nearly everyone but criminals, known prostitutes, and spies are admitted.

In Austria, well over half the Yugoslav refugees were turned back and forced to repatriate—a fact which has aroused a storm of protest. Austrians say publicly that it is because they are economic refugees, that is, just people who want a better life, not political refugees escaping persecution.

Privately, Austrians say: "If you are so concerned about these people, why don't you take some of them yourself?" As evidence that the outside world sets one standard for Austria and another for itself, they point to the case of the four Yugoslavs who stowed away on a Danish freighter and were denied entry by half a dozen countries, including Canada and the United States, until finally, last week, Austria gave them refuge. Refugees are already a tremendous burden on the Austrian economy.

The U.N. is working hard to make World Refugee Year a success and so are many other organizations. But money is slow in coming in; some countries have not even organized United Fund drives. And most immigration legislation is still impersonal, cruel, and restrictive.

It is obvious from this side of the ocean, after a survey of camps in four countries, that a lot more will have to be done. If World Refugee Year fails, the doors of San Sabba will slam shut again—not to keep the world out, but to lock tragedy in.

Resolution of Polish Legion of American Veterans, Bay City, Mich., September 5, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I wish to insert into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted by the Polish Legion of American Veterans at Bay City, Mich., September 5, 1959.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE POLISH LEGION OF AMERICAN VETERANS AT BAY CITY, MICH., SEPTEMBER 5, 1959

The Polish Legion of American Veterans Department of Michigan and Ladies Auxiliary meeting in convention hereby resolve as follows:

"Whereas (1), our constitution in its preamble provides that one of the purposes of our organization is to 'combat the destructive propaganda of communism and other alien influences endeavoring to weaken or destroy our American institutions and democratic form of government'; and

"Whereas (2), we are mindful of the obligation we owe to the land of our Forefathers, also being mindful that this is the 20th anniversary of the invasion of Poland by Nazi and Communist armies, and being mindful of the fact that Poland is subject to pressures by the armed forces of Soviet Russia and that the Communist government in Poland was foisted on that country contrary to the will of its people, and that as a consequence, civil liberties and the right to the pursuit of happiness do not exist in Poland, and all basic human rights are trampled; all of which is contrary to the basic freedoms which we Americans regard as fundamental for all human beings; and

"Whereas (3), we anticipate the exchange visits between President Eisenhower and Nikita Khrushchev will serve as a means of relieving tensions between East and West, but we also anticipate that such visits can be misinterpreted by the entire world as condoning the Communist system by the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That (4), as loyal American citizens, we respect the decision of the President of the United States in extending this invitation. However, we do not feel that the resulting visit merits any enthusiasm from us, nor do we feel that Mr. Khrushchev is entitled to anything more than civil courtesy. He should not be subjected to any personal affronts or indignities, but all citizens of our country should receive him for what he is, namely, the head of the Government of the U.S.S.R. and the leader of the world Communist movement; and further be it

"*Resolved* (5), that during his stay in the United States, Mr. Khrushchev be given every opportunity to study the American way of life, our high regard for civil liberties, and our high standards of living, and the opportunities for advancement which can only be enjoyed by a free people; further be it

"*Resolved* (6), that our President, his Cabinet, and our Congress remind the leader of the Russian people that we demand the withdrawal of all Russian troops from Poland, free and unfettered elections in all the captive countries, and the return of local self-government for all the peoples of the world, as an inherent right of free men."

BENJAMIN C. STANCZYK,
Common Pleas Judge, Detroit, Mich., Chairman, Post 1.
EDWARD C. SZYMANOWSKI,
Post 7.
JOSEPH JAKUBCZAK,
Post 2.
CHESTER WIERZBINSKI,
Post 12.

National Milk Producers Federation Opposes Use of Oleo by the Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter which I received from the National Milk Producers Federation in opposition to the Navy's use of oleomargarine in their rations.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1959.
Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: This is to urge you to oppose enactment of S. 2168, relating

to the use of oleomargarine in Navy rations.

Very real progress is being made in reducing the stocks of butter and other dairy products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. For the past 3 or 4 years, CCC butter stocks have been held within reasonable and manageable proportions. The situation is particularly good at the present time, and all current stocks have been committed to available outlets. A similar situation existed for a short time in the fall of 1956 when there were no stocks for which a disposal outlet was not available.

This does not mean that the problem has been solved, nor that we have reached a stage where we can throw overboard the outlets which have made this progress possible.

One of the programs making an important contribution toward improving the support program is the utilization of dairy products by the Armed Forces. Congress on several occasions has passed legislation making it possible to greatly increase the use of butter and other dairy products by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard, and by the military and veterans' hospitals. This has been done on the theory that since we have abundant supplies of dairy products, and need to find outlets for CCC stocks, we ought to let our military forces have as much of them as they want and can use.

S. 2168 would be a reversal of the progress made in this direction. We believe it would be a mistake to interfere with the military use program in view of the important contribution it is making toward keeping CCC stocks of butter and other dairy products within reasonable bounds.

Since we have abundant supplies of butter, it does not make sense to feed our fighting men oleomargarine and then give away the butter overseas or convert it to byproduct uses.

It seems to us, also that the very small benefits, if any, that might result to agricultural producers of cottonseed oil under this bill are quite disproportionate to the rather substantial harm that would be done to dairy farmers and the dairy support program.

The only parties who would really benefit under S. 2168 are the oleomargarine manufacturing companies. These are few in number and large in size, and we think it is not unreasonable to assume that whatever gains they made under S. 2168 would not be passed back to the farmers.

S. 2168 would not result in economies to the Government as its proponents claim. This is because decreased use of butter by the Navy would be counterbalanced by increased Government purchases under the support program. Thus a dollar saved in Navy rations would mean a dollar lost under the support program, plus storage and disposal costs.

Although cotton also is under a support program, the factors are not the same. Cottonseed oil is less perishable and is more easily diverted to nonfood uses. The cost of removing cottonseed oil from the market, should that become necessary, at 11 or 12 cents per pound is much less than the cost of removing butter at about 58 cents per pound.

A great deal of thought has been given to attracting young men to the armed services and to holding in the services men who have been trained. Changing our policy of providing the fighting forces with the very best of food would not further this goal.

It has not been necessary in the past for the Navy to use a butter substitute any more than it has been necessary for it to replace its meat ration with cheaper vegetable calories, and there is no compelling reason why it should do so now. On the contrary, there are substantial reasons why this long continued policy ought not to be changed.

E. M. NORTON,
Secretary.

Sun Dance of the Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, from July 29 through August 1 the Oglala Sioux Tribal Sun Dance was observed on the Pine Ridge Reservation of South Dakota. Ben Chief, the honorary sun dance chief, was on hand to welcome the many visitors, both white and Indian, who flock to South Dakota each year to partake of the natural beauty of the Black Hills and the colorful attractions of the State, ranging from the world's only corn palace at Mitchell to the sun dance of the Sioux.

There is a real tragedy, however, in the efforts of my fellow South Dakotans of Indian descent to recapture something of the past glory of the mighty Sioux Nation. Their magnificent history is well known to every American schoolboy, and yet today the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can say that the "poorest, sickest, and least educated" of any racial group in the United States are our Indian citizens. These are our true marginal men—unable to go back to the old culture and ill equipped to participate in the new. This is why a point 4 program for our American Indians such as I have introduced in Congress is a necessity.

It is significant that in the sun dance celebration the tribal committee tried to make the "sun dance a place where better health is the goal." Our Indian people have too much to contribute to the advancement of American civilization for us to neglect the imaginative resources at our command to enable them to move forward to take their rightful places with Americans of all creeds and colors.

The Shannon County News has an interesting article by Will Spindler describing the event and a news column bearing on the public health emphasis of the sun dance. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I insert these in the RECORD:

PINE RIDGE SUN DANCE DRAWS HUGE CROWDS

(By Will Spindler)

The colorful, picturesque 25th Annual Pine Ridge Sun Dance is now history and was one of the most successful events since the revival of the ancient sacred ritual back in the middle 1930's. An estimated 6,000 people were in attendance during the 4 days of July 29 to August 1.

The colorful parade on Saturday morning was one never to be forgotten and one of the best in several years. Included in it were many historical floats by tribal members of the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Indian Reservations, as well as from visiting tribes from Wyoming, Nebraska, Iowa, Oklahoma, New York, North Dakota, and other States, the sun dance beauty winner who will appear next week at the Sheridan, Wyo., All-American Indian celebration, the American Legion band and color guard of Pine Ridge, colorful clowns, and a long line of cowboys and cowgirls on horseback.

Highlighting the spectacular celebration was the reenactment on the first 3 mornings of the colorful, sacred sun dance itself. This was witnessed by several thousand spectators, including Fred Hackett, of Kansas, the largest donor yearly to the sun dance, Rosebud Tribal Council President Robert Burnette, Vernon Malan, and Ernie Schuskey of the State college, Brookings, and other distinguished visitors.

The tribal council and American Legion were in charge of the celebration, with Ben Chief as the president. Among those in charge of events were Matthew High Pine as official announcer, Leo Vocu, Lloyd Eagle Bull, Levi Fast Horse, Jake Herman, noted rodeo clown, artist, and writer, Charles Janis, Francis Janis, and others.

Many tourists and visitors from all over the Nation were present, which attested to the fact that this annual sun dance is becoming better known and more popular with each passing year. All in all, it was an extremely colorful sun dance and much praise is due the Indian people of the Pine Ridge Reservation for staging such a delightful and memorable event.

PUBLIC HEALTH AT THE SUN DANCE

Looking east from the Pine Ridge PHS Indian Hospital the past week, an area about a mile distance was filled with about 300 tents circling a large arena, edged with a shade for the many visitors. A passage around the shade seemed like a large aisle for people to walk to all sides and visit the many stands and entertainment surrounding the aisle. In the main arena, one of the most colorful Indian dance ceremonies in the United States was held during the 4 days.

The Pine Ridge tribal council sponsored the sun dance ceremonies and should have the appreciation of all this part of South Dakota for the tireless effort to improve all conditions concerning health, safety, convenience and entertainment for the large gathering of people. The reservation bureau of Indian affairs, under the direction of Superintendent L. P. Towle, supported the tribal council greatly.

Through aid of the Public Health Service and the Lakota public health committee, the tribal council strived hard to control disease and sickness that could have happened if preventive measures were not planned.

As you arrive at the sun dance grounds on the southeast corner, a Public Health Service and Lakota health booth was arranged with messages of the health needs of the Pine Ridge Reservation. This year, since the biggest problem on the reservation is infant sickness of all kinds, the theme was on better care for babies under 1 year of age. Demonstrations, signs, discussions, and health bulletins were presented.

Richard Ruddell, field worker for the State tuberculosis and health association, aided in the health displays as well as making it possible for paper cups to be used at the sun dance.

Also at the booth dental displays were shown, televiewer slides were shown, and molasses milk was served free to demonstrate how powdered milk could be made a healthier drink.

Minor first aid was administered by the public health nurses and practical nurses as well as explaining to visitors at the booth the needs for better health of infants.

Probably the greatest health work was done in the field of sanitation which will be told in a separate article. All of these things were made possible under the direction of Dr. Lewis E. Patrie, medical officer in charge of the Pine Ridge PHS station and the cooperation of Alfreda Janis, chairman of the Lakota public health.

The hospital and health committee combined in entering a float in the parade on Saturday. The theme of the float was "Let's Join Hands To Save Our Babies." Kathleen Janis, Ramona Janis, Dolly HeCrow, and

Clarence Runs After, Jr., rode the float. Moses Catches drove the wagon for the parade.

It was very fine working with Frank Wilson, tribal chairman; Sam Stands, vice chairman; Lloyd Eagle Bull, tribal secretary; Leo Vocu, tribal treasurer; and others on the committee to make the sun dance a place where better health is the goal.

What You Can and Cannot Do Under the New Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during my years as a member of the Senate Labor Committee I have been fortunate in having the invaluable counsel of Mr. Michael Bernstein. I do not know another lawyer in the United States who can speak as knowledgeably or who knows the Taft-Hartley law better than this man does. Therefore, I think it is fitting that the magazine, U.S. News & World Report, in presenting an explanation of the recently passed Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 to its readers, called upon Mr. Bernstein to review the specifics of this law. The information contained in this interview is, I feel, of interest to my colleagues and to all Americans whether they are directly or indirectly associated with either management of unions.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix the first part of this interview published in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT YOU CAN AND CANNOT DO UNDER THE NEW LABOR LAW

(Interview with Michael J. Bernstein, a counsel of Senate Labor Committee)

(Will the new labor law change a way of life for unions? What new rights will workers have? Are employers to have more freedom in running their businesses? These questions, and many others, are raised by passage of the most important labor legislation since the Taft-Hartley Act. Here is a primer of the new law that answers a long list of questions. This primer cuts through the technical language and explains the law in simple terms. You get an explanation of the bill of rights, secondary boycotts, hot cargo, extortion, picketing, and other unfamiliar phrases. The explanation, given to U.S. News & World Report in an exclusive interview, comes from Michael J. Bernstein, a labor-relations expert, who helped draft the bill. Mr. Bernstein has long been a counsel for the Senate Labor Committee.)

Question. Mr. Bernstein, what's going to be different for unions under the new labor reform law? What does the bill of rights do for individual union members?

Answer. Under the new bill a member has a right to attend union meetings, in the first place.

Question. Was he ever denied the right to attend a meeting?

Answer. He could be. Presumably, if the union constitution now says that only a certain class of members should be permitted to attend meetings, why, that's the way it is. There are some unions in which this is true. For instance, the Operating Engineers have what are known as class A and class B locals, and only the class A local members have rights to vote, to attend meetings, participate in the discussion and so on—but all members must pay dues.

Question. So there is no such thing as a class B member under this law?

Answer. That's correct. Now, mind you, those distinctions in the Operating Engineers are not based on race, color, or anything like that. It's a matter of seniority, with the favored few in the class A local.

Now, that type of thing would be eliminated. The member would have the right to attend the meeting, he would have the right to express his views at the meeting freely—but, of course, this would be subject to the union's right to impose reasonable rules for the conduct of the meeting.

Question. Could they, for instance, limit the amount of time he could talk?

Answer. That's right—provided it was done on a nondiscriminatory basis. I think it would be a violation of this provision if they permitted certain members to speak—what shall I say?—for half an hour at a time, and others would be limited to only 2 minutes or 5 minutes. It would have to be applied in a nondiscriminatory fashion.

Question. Would they have more freedom to express themselves and take part in the proceedings and vote and so on?

Answer. Yes, and the language specifically says that "every member shall have equal rights and privileges within such organization." So that means that, if there are limitations upon the rights of the members, there have to be limitations on all of the members, equally.

Question. If a man were delinquent on his dues, for example, could he be barred from voting?

Answer. Well, now, actually the language of the bill of rights doesn't say anything about that. It says equal rights and privileges to do certain things: to nominate candidates, to vote in elections or referendums, to attend meetings and to participate in the deliberations and voting upon the business of such meetings.

I would think that they would have a right, for instance, to prohibit members who are delinquent from voting, provided it was done on a nondiscriminatory basis. In other words, if they had a uniform rule with respect to delinquency and voting, that would be all right.

In another part of the bill they have a safeguard against the checkoff. For example, some union constitutions, such as the Teamsters', say that a member doesn't have the right to vote unless his current dues are paid by a certain date. If they're not paid by that date, he can't vote. Under a checkoff, sometimes the union claims that the member hasn't paid his dues because the union hasn't received them. That may simply be due not to the delinquency of the union member, but to the fact that the employer hasn't forwarded the money to the union.

A specific provision in another part of this bill says that, where they're operating under a checkoff agreement and the man is having his money deducted from his pay envelope, then such lateness or tardiness may not be used to disqualify him.

Question. Does this all mean that the ordinary union member will have more say about how much he pays in dues and initiation fees?

Answer. There's a specific provision in the its improper practices, and affirmatively to changing of the amount of the dues and assessments, initiation fees, except upon certain majority decisions. In other words, it has to be done by democratic procedure. The officers cannot arbitrarily decide to change the amount of the dues, even if the constitution gives them authority to do that—it must be done in accordance with the democratic voting procedures which are set forth in the bill of rights.

Question. What if they're denied these rights? Can they sue?

Answer. They have a right to sue in a Federal district court for appropriate relief in a civil proceeding, which would include injunctions. Now, an injunction would mean, if they got it, that the court would order—order the union to cease and desist its improper practice, and affirmatively to take such steps as might be necessary to eradicate the effects of the improper practices they have already engaged in.

Question. Can you see this as putting a heavy load on the courts?

Answer. All new litigation puts some load on the courts.

Of course, in another part of the bill—not in the first title, which is the bill of rights—there are also criminal penalties, with respect to denial of these rights. There's a provision in title VI which says that "it shall be unlawful for any person through the use of force or violence, or the threats of the use of force or violence, to restrain or coerce or intimidate, or attempt to do these things, to any union member in order to interfere with the exercise of these rights." And that's a crime.

A RIGHT TO CRITICIZE

Question. Is there anything more you would like to say about the bill of rights?

Answer. I might also say one other thing that's sort of important. Most unions make it a subject for disciplining—even up to expulsion—for a union member to be critical of his union or his union officers, particularly if he's critical outside the confines of the union membership or the union hall—in other words, if he makes his criticism public, by writing a letter to the newspaper. This would protect that right. He has a right of freedom of speech and expression, including criticism of the union.

Question. He can write to the editor and complain?

Answer. That's right.

Question. Let's take the matter of union recordkeeping. Will the unions have to keep many more records than they have had to keep in the past?

Answer. Let me put it this way: I don't know what the practice is in many unions, but, if the union is running its affairs properly in the fiscal field—financial field—then actually the only thing that it would be required to do under this bill that it is not now doing is to take from its books and accounts and records the material which this bill requires, enumerates, and put it in the form of a report, which is then submitted for filing with the Secretary of Labor.

Actually, under the present law they do make such reports—under the Taft-Hartley Act. The only difference is that these reports are not made public, whereas, the reports that they would have to make under the new law, the Secretary is required to make public. They are public documents, and anybody has a right to look at them. This is not permissive; this is mandatory.

Question. So that the books of every union——

Answer. Not the books, now—these are the reports. Now, there is also a provision which makes it a crime for the union to fail to preserve the basic books and records on which the reports are based for a period of 5 years.

Question. By "reports" you mean financial statements?

Answer. That's right. And, in addition to that, the union member has a right to go

into court. He's entitled, just as is the general public, to see the reports. But, in addition to that, he can go into court, the union member may, and for "just cause"—that's the phrase used, he must have some basis—he may get an order compelling the union to let him see not merely the reports but the basic documents and records on which the reports are based.

Question. What this amounts to is that unions are going to have to give more information to their members than in the past——

Answer. And to the public, which means to the press, as well. Just the fact that the union member can get a look at the basic documents on which the reports are based is to some degree a safeguard against falsification of the reports. If all you do is see the report itself, you have no way of knowing, unless you have some auxiliary information, that the report is false—if it is.

Question. He can see how his money's being spent then——

Answer. He can also see the records, the basic records from which they prepared the report.

Question. Is there some provision requiring unions to supply copies of collective-bargaining agreements to the members?

Answer. That's right. If the local union signs a collective-bargaining agreement, upon request, each member of the local may get a copy of the collective-bargaining agreement. In other words, the union must give it to him.

Question. Is that standard practice in unions now?

Answer. No, it is not. If it's a collective-bargaining agreement signed by an international consisting of many locals, then the international must furnish to each of the locals a copy of the contract, and the local must keep it in a place where all of the members of the local can see it.

Question. Does the bill also say that every union must inform its members concerning the provisions of the new law?

Answer. That's right.

Question. How's that to be done?

Answer. I suppose what they'll do is simply post a copy of the law on the union bulletin board.

Question. That would be sufficient?

Answer. I think so.

Question. What about salaries of union officers? Must they be made public now?

Answer. Yes. One of the items that has to be reported under the reporting provisions for labor unions is the salary, allowances, and other direct or indirect disbursements, including reimbursed expenses to each officer and employee who received an aggregate of more than $10,000 during the fiscal year.

Question. If an officer of a union lends union funds to somebody, does he have to tell the members how much he's lending and to whom?

Answer. Here are the things that have to be reported: "direct and indirect loans made to any officer, employee or member which aggregated more than $250, and direct and indirect loans made by the union to any business enterprise." In other words, there are two types of loans that must be reported—loans made by the union to any officer, employee, or member, and loans made by the union to any business enterprise.

Question. Does this apply to pension funds as well?

Answer. No. Pension funds, you know, are covered under a separate section of the Taft-Hartley Act—section 302.

IF GIFTS ARE ACCEPTED

Question. What about union officers accepting gifts of money or securities from employers?

Answer. There is a complete, separate section which requires individual officers and employees of labor unions, without any limitation as to salary, and except for employees who perform purely clerical or custodial duties—all others, all officials, all employees, to report to the Secretary transactions which are broken down into six different types of transactions which constitute conflict-of-interest transactions. These are transactions which create a suspicion that the union official or employee is on both sides of the table, so to speak. In other words, he's getting a benefit from an employer, while at the same time acting as a representative of the union.

Now he must report those. It's spelled out in very great detail. In addition to reporting those, I would think that any union official or employee who had to report any of these transactions—these conflict-of-interest transactions—would also be in violation of another provision which imposes a fiduciary status on such officials and employees, and makes them liable to suit by union members if they do engage in these transactions.

Question. Are employers also liable for advancing such funds?

Answer. That's right. There are separate provisions, which are an amendment to this section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act, which make it a crime, generally speaking, for an employer to make payments or loans to unions, union officials, union representatives, and for union officials, employees, and representatives to accept such payments or loans from employers.

Question. Are there any restrictions on such things as testimonial dinners given by employers for union officials?

Answer. Well, you see, that's a question of interpretation. Now, actually, some of us fought against this language in the criminal provision, because we think, if you construe it literally, that, for example, you get a situation like this: An employer is aware of the fact that a union is going to begin an organizing campaign in his plant. Now, under existing law, he has a right to speak against the union and to distribute literature critical of the union, as long as his speech or his literature does not embody a threat or a promise of benefits. In other words, he can't say to the employees, "If you don't join the union, why, I'll raise your wages." That would be an unfair labor practice, a violation of existing law.

Or he can't say to them, "If you join the union, why, I'll have to fire half of you." That would be a violation of existing law.

Now, the question arises under the new bill: Suppose he gives all of his employees a dinner for which he pays. He's got 90 percent of his employees at the dinner, and he gets up and makes a speech and tells them about the disadvantages of unionism, and how many crooks and racketeers there are in unions, and that employees who have joined unions have found to their regret that they're paying money for dues and initiation fees, and so on, and not getting the benefits they had promised, and so on. Now, he makes no promise and he makes no threat. So he's not in violation of existing law. Query: If he pays for that dinner—let's say it costs him $5 a head for each of 500 employees—that's an expenditure of $2,500, right? Has he given something to his employees in order to get them to persuade the rest of his employees not to join a union?

Now, the literal language of this new bill would seem to make that a crime. Also, it would require him to report this expenditure to the Secretary of Labor, and, literally applied, would make it a crime for him to engage in this type of activity.

Question. What about the kinds of dinners that employers sometimes give labor leaders?

Answer. Well, now, that sort of thing is just a testimonial dinner.

Question. Where they might give a union president a Cadillac——

Answer. Ah, now, that's the point. It's not the testimonial dinner that's significant—it's the giving of something of value to him—a Cadillac, or any other thing that costs money. I would say that the union officer who received that sort of testimonial would have to report it under the conflict-of-interest reporting provision. And that, in all probability, under the fiduciary-obligation provision, union members could bring suit against him to recover that Cadillac or the value thereof for the benefit of the union.

Question. What about the employers who gave the gift?

Answer. Well, the employer who gave him that, under the literal language of the provision I just referred to in connection with the type of dinner I described, might be guilty of a crime. Because that new section specifically says, and I'll read it to you just so that you can see how literally the language covers that sort of situation: "It shall be unlawful for any employer or association to pay, lend or deliver, or agree to pay, lend or deliver any money or other thing of value to any labor organization or any officer or employee thereof, which represents, seeks to represent or would admit to membership any of the employees of such employer."

I don't think there's any question that the literal language covers the type of situation that you picture and comes pretty close to getting a situation which is much more innocuous than I pictured.

WHEN INTERESTS CONFLICT

Question. Can we go a little further into that? I'm thinking about business transactions between employers and union officials. What are the restrictions?

Answer. There are six specific types of business transactions between a union official and an employer which constitute a conflict-of-interest transaction, which he would have to report and which, simultaneously, would constitute a breach of his fiduciary obligation—I'm talking about the union official—and would open him up to a suit by the union members, a civil suit. It might also amount to a criminal violation under this other section that I read to you.

Question. What types of transactions are those?

Answer. Well, let me give you a few: "Every officer of a union shall file with the Secretary a report describing any transaction of this type: Any stock, bond, security, or other interest, legal or equitable, which he"—that's the union official—"or his spouse, or minor child, directly, or indirectly held in, and any income or any other benefit which he or his spouse or minor child derived from, an employer whose employees such union represents or is actively seeking to represent."

Question. Is there any restriction against a union lending money to an employer who needs financing for his business?

Answer. No, except that remember they have to report that under the provision I described previously. Any loan to a business enterprise has to be reported so that the public and the membership knows the details of the loan. But there's no prohibition against it. So that, for instance, Dubinsky and Potofsky in New York can continue as they have done in the past to make loans to employers who are on the rocks, for the purpose of saving the jobs of the people who work there, provided they put the information in the report which they file with the Secretary of Labor, which is then public information. [David Dubinsky is president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union; Jacob S. Potofsky is general president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.]

The basic philosophy behind these provisions we're discussing now—and I'm not arguing their merits—is that, if you get a sufficient spotlight in terms of public information about these transactions, their undesirable effects can be minimized.

SCANNING PERSONAL FUNDS

Question. Do union officials have to make public their own personal holdings?

Answer. Yes, where they are involved in any one of these conflict-of-interest transactions.

Question. Otherwise not?

Answer. Otherwise not.

Question. What about employers? Do they have to file reports of their financial dealings with union officials, if they have any?

Answer. Here's what they have to file reports in connection with: An employer who makes any payment or loan of any kind to any union must report it—to a union, any payment or a loan to a union or its officers, with an exception, of course, for banks, credit unions, insurance companies, and so on, because, obviously, financial lending institutions of that kind are always making loans not only to unions but to many others. In other words, if their regular business is the making of loans, they do not have to report. But if it's an employer who is engaged in some business other than the making of loans, then, if such employer makes a loan or a payment to a labor union or its officials, it must be reported. That's one.

Now, the second thing that an employer must report is where he directly makes any payment to any of his employees, to any of his employees—employees, this has nothing to do with union members—for the purpose of getting employees who receive the payment to persuade other employees with respect to union organization.

RAISES CAN BE ILLEGAL

Question. In other words, he can't offer them a bribe not to join a union?

Answer. No, that isn't quite it. It's more precise than that. Under the present law he can't offer them a bribe not to join a union—that would be a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, because that's a promise of benefit. This is if he calls in 10 of his employees that he knows are antiunion—he doesn't have to persuade them—and he says to them, "Look, if you will circulate among the rest of the employees and use your persuasive efforts to get them not to join the union, then I will pay you each $25 a week extra." He has to report that.

Question. That's forbidden?

Answer. He commits a crime in making such a payment, and also he must report it.

Any expenditure that he makes where the purpose is directly or indirectly to interfere with the rights of his employees to join a union he must report. In other words, if he makes any expenditure the purpose of which is a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, that he must report.

That's all for the employer as such. Here's another thing he must report but which is more indirect: If he makes an agreement or an arrangement with a labor-relations consultant, the purpose of the arrangement being for the labor-relations consultant to persuade employees not to join unions, then the employer must report that arrangement, giving the details thereof and any payments made pursuant to that arrangement.

Question. In every case when you say "report" you mean to the Secretary of Labor?

Answer. Right—he has to file a formal report to the Secretary of Labor on an annual basis.

Question. Doesn't this add up to a lot more recordkeeping for employers and unions?

Answer. Sure, sure.

Question. And for the Secretary of Labor, too?

Answer. That's right—no question about that.

FINES: UP TO $10,000

Question. What is the penalty for not making reports of this nature?

Answer. Failure to file reports is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine of up to $10,000 and a year in prison. Moreover, the Secretary of Labor is given power to bring civil suit, to go into a Federal court and get an order compelling those who are required to report to do so or be in contempt if they don't. There's a double sanction.

Question. Do you think we've covered now the requirements of employers?

Answer. Just to complete it—mind you, I just said that the employer must report any arrangement he has with a labor-relations consultant. The labor-relations consultant has to make a report, too. If he enters into such an arrangement with an employer, then he must report not only that arrangemnt and the money that he receives under it, but all of his labor-relations activities, even with other employers, for the whole year. If he enters into one such agreement, then he's got to reveal all of his activities in the labor-relations field.

Question. Is this broad enough to mean that every employer who is covered by this law who employs a labor-relations consultant must report the terms of that arrangement to the Secretary of Labor?

Answer. If the purpose of the arrangement is to have the labor-relations consultant persuade employees with respect to joining unions.

There is an exemption from the reporting requirement for any information given by a client to his attorney in the normal, confidential, attorney-client relationship, which means, in my opinion, that, if the labor-relations consultant—if the person who is performing the labor-relations consultant's services—is an attorney and is retained as such, then information given by the employer to that attorney—then the attorney, even though he's a labor-relations consultant, in my opinion, need not report it, because it's given to him in his capacity as an attorney.

Question. Any company that employs a labor-relations consultant to watch legislation, as some companies do in Washington, has no such obligation?

Answer. That's right.

Then there's a further qualification of that: The labor-relations consultants, the arrangements involving whom have to be reported, have to be independent contractors. In other words, this has to be an individual or a person who is not working for the employer but whose relationship to the employer is contractual. In other words, if he is a regular staff man, if he is a permanent employee of the employer who performs labor-relations work—he's on the regular payroll—then the employer does not have to report any payments made to him by way of salary, and that person doesn't have to report any receipts or activities and so on that he engaged in.

This requirement, with respect to labor-relations consultants, applies only with respect to independent consultants, like lawyers, as with the same type of relationship in business terms—a contractual, rather than an employer-employee relationship.

Question. There's a section on trusteeships. What's this about and what's required there?

Answer. Well, the international unions have had for many years a mechanism whereby they can control or discipline their locals. In other words, if the local does something that's contrary to international policy, what the internationals are permitted to do under practically all union constitutions is to step in and take over the local. They throw out all the incumbent officers, they put the local in charge of a trustee designated by the international, and he runs the local affairs. He collects the money in the way of dues, he runs it—there are no elections. What happens is that the local completely loses its autonomy.

Now, this may or may not be justified. However, this has been subject to great abuse. At one time, of the 800 locals in the Teamsters, I think over a hundred of them were in such trusteeship. From the standpoint of the incumbent international officers, this is a great advantage, and let me tell you why: International officers in most unions are elected through the delegate-convention method. If the president of an international union in which there is an opposition can throw a substantial percentage of the locals into trusteeship, then he has control of the delegates to the international convention from those trusteed locals. So he can go into the international convention with a minimum percentage of delegates sewed up.

HOW HOFFA GAINS POWER

In other words, Hoffa [Teamsters President James Hoffa] names the delegates, the convention delegates, in the trusteed locals. So he can move into the convention, let's say, with 25 percent of the delegates in his pocket to begin with, because they're his handpicked people in each local. The union members in the trusteed locals are not permitted to select the delegate.

This is the basic reason.

Now, in the Operating Engineers, there was evidence in the McClellan committee to show that there have been locals in trusteeship for periods as long as 30 years—have been completely deprived of all local autonomy. The only privileges that the members of those locals enjoyed is that, if they didn't join the local, despite its completely dependent position, they couldn't get a job. And, when they did join it, their only right was to pay dues. All the money was siphoned off to the international, and the international would select the delegates for each of those locals in the international convention.

Now, what this provision in the new law does is to put certain limitations on the way these trusteeships can be imposed and to limit their validity to a period of 18 months. Let me put it this way: You don't limit their validity—they are presumed to be valid for 18 months, unless you can show that they've actually violated their own constitution or bylaws, or that they have violated some of the limitations laid down in the section itself. And, at the end of 18 months, although they may be continued thereafter, anyone can challenge them—any union member can complain to the Secretary, who can go into court and ask that the trusteeship be dissolved. This is the Secretary of Labor. And after 18 months the presumption is against the validity of the continuance of the trusteeship.

The first 18 months they're presumed valid, and you've got to show by clear and convincing proof that they're in violation. Once 18 months are up, then it's the union—the international has to show by clear and convincing proof that the trusteeship should be continued. So that you have this break.

Question. Will this prevent local officials from milking some of these locals?

Answer. That's right—this specific provision that, while the local is in trusteeship, none of its funds can be transferred out of the local, other than the normal per capita dues payments which locals normally pay to an international.

Question. Let's talk a little bit about elections. Do unions have to hold elections more often than in the past?

Answer. The answer is yes. There are some unions, many unions, which do hold elections as frequently as is now required under this bill, but there are some who do not. This would give them a maximum of 5 years for international and of 3 years for locals.

Question. And these elections must be by secret ballot?

Answer. The elections must be by secret ballot, they cannot be by proxy voting, there

must be written notice—15 days' written notice to every single member—before the election is held, that an election is going to be held. The rival candidates must be provided with equal facilities for the distribution of their campaign literature, as enjoyed by the incumbents. Once during the 30-day period preceding the election, any candidate has the right to come into the office of the union and inspect the list of the members covered by a union-shop agreement.

Question. No limit on the number of candidates?

Answer. No limit on the number of candidates. It says "bona fide candidates," and that's something a court would have to determine, if you get some guy who's in there—who's not a genuine candidate but is just in there to make trouble. But courts deal with questions of that kind.

Question. Are all the rival candidates entitled to have an observer present at the casting of the ballots and at their counting?

Answer. That's right.

ABUSES HAVE BEEN BAD

Question. What is this designed to get at? What kind of abuses have occurred?

Answer. Oh, well, this is an area where the abuses have been really very bad. In many unions the elections are just simply—well, they are like Soviet elections.

Question. Do you mean they are either not held, or there is only one candidate?

Answer. One candidate, or, if there's another candidate, nobody knows that he's running—his name never gets mentioned, his literature never gets sent out, he isn't permitted to have any observers at the casting of the ballots, he has no observers present at the counting of the ballots, he doesn't know when they're being miscounted, whether they're falsified, and so on.

In fact, they've even got a little provision in here which says that, when an international has an election, either through the convention method or direct referendum, as some do, the counting of the ballots, the tallying, has to be done separately for each local, and they have to be kept separate. That's a very, very important safeguard.

Question. There will be no elections by acclamation?

Answer. Nothing like that. All the election records have to be kept, including the ballots, for a period of at least 1 year. And all violations of all this are subject to criminal penalties.

And I might add one other thing that's in this election provision, which is very important, and that is this:

There's a procedure, not only protecting the electroal process, the regular electoral process, but there's a guarantee of a procedure to get rid of officers—removal provisions. In other words, if the union constitution doesn't have a provision which permits the removal of officers guilty of misconduct, then the complaining union members can go to the Secretary of Labor, and he can initiate a suit in which the court will order such an election for the removal of an officer.

Question. Can an individual union member initiate a suit?

Answer. No, not under these provisions. This has to be done by complaint to the Secretary, who makes an investigation, and if he finds out in his investigation that this provision is being violated, then he brings the suit.

Question. So, if I am a member of a union and I feel that I've been denied some voting rights, I go to the Secretary of Labor?

Answer. Right.

GUARDING UNION MONEY

Question. Can a candidate for union office use union money to promote his candidacy?

Answer. No. There's a specific prohibition against any candidate for union office using any union funds of any kind—or any employer funds.

Question. What about the safeguards in the legislation against embezlement, theft, etc.?

Answer. Well, now, embezzlement of union funds, as well as of any other funds, is now a crime in every State in the Union. This would now make it a Federal crime, which it is not now.

Question. What is the advantage of making it a Federal crime?

Answer. What's the advantage of making kidnaping a Federal crime? You see, there's a certain—what shall I say?—feeling that in local areas—well, local law enforcement breaks down for one reason or another, sometimes as a result of little deals between politically powerful union officials and local law-enforcement officers. The feeling is that, if you can get the FBI to do the investigating and the U.S. Department of Justo do the prosecuting, you get a much better chance of getting these things handled effectively. And that's about it.

Question. What does the law do specifically to keep union officers from misusing or stealing union funds?

Answer. There's a specific provision with respect to embezzlement.

Then, in addition to that, there is a provision that I spoke to you about earlier which imposes on union officials a fiduciary responsibility. Now, this is a rather difficult thing to explain to the layman. As you probably know, for instance, a bank official, an insurance official, a trustee, an administrator or executor of an estate, a guardian of a ward, a trustee of a trust—all of these people are handling other people's money. And, under the law as it has developed, the law has taken the position that the responsibility and obligations of the people in that position go beyond their merely contractual obligations.

You don't look for the letter of their obligations, you go beyond it, and you say: These people have to exercise a care which goes beyond what the letter of the contract requires, you see. They are held to a much higher degree of care than in the ordinary contractual business arrangements.

So that people like that can be held responsible, not merely for acts of commission, but for acts of omission.

Now, let me give you an illustration: If, for example, you have an executor of an estate, the beneficiaries of which are minor children who do not come into the estate until they reach majority, and during that period the executor is in effect the trustee who invests their money—he might make an investment which realizes profit but, if it can be shown that, with reasonable care, he could have made a better investment, he can be held liable for the difference—between what he got, what he realized, and what he didn't realize—and may be made to pay that out of his own pocket for the benefit of the estate.

In other words, the fiduciary status imposes a very, very high degree of obligation. That's one aspect.

The other aspect is that if a person who is in a fiduciary status even innocently makes a profit or reaps an advantage by virtue of his position, even though it is not to the detriment of the people he is representing, he is held to have acquired that profit or that benefit for their advantage—he can't keep it himself.

Under this provision, union officers are subjected to that type of responsibility with respect to union funds, property, and so on, and with respect to any transactions in which they may engage in which they profit by virtue of their position—where they profit personally by virtue of their official position.

The Nixon Touch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the typical NIXON touch has been added to the Russia moon shot. NIXON creates doubt by suggesting it is not so. He wants proof or maybe confusion, you figure it out.

This is the same NIXON who rose to the Vice Presidency of the United States by being a rabid anti-Communist, follower of the late Joe McCarthy and one of the worst red-baiters in the history of the U.S. Congress.

Those of us who have kept silent, to date, on the Khrushchev visit have very good reasons for so doing.

Yesterday it meant disgrace, ridicule, loss of job and prestige, and even jail sentences to speak of Communist achievement or even to suggest coexistence.

Today we hear of the reformation in Russia; the need to coexist has now become the order of the day.

One wonders, what is to be tomorrow's line? Where oh where are the $200-odd billions spent in foreign aid to keep our allies from socializing politically or commercially with Russia, where are the $400-odd billions spent in the arms race.

If we had minted our money in silver dollars we could have climbed up to the moon on the billions we have spent kidding ourselves and our friends.

When NIXON went to Moscow he opened up Pandora's box and let loose the world's greatest propaganda flood ever set loose upon our honest, sincere and trusting world.

Now we find ourselves sandwiched between Russian moonshots, handshakes, bluff and personal magnetism and American Madison Avenue buildup over radio, TV, and the press on the Eisenhower-Khrushchev meetings changing the hammer and sickle into a cheese knife and a slice of watermelon.

Somewhere along the line the American people may decide one of two things, they may say Russia is alright lets deal and trade and be buddy-buddy with the commies or they may say, this is a lot of malarkey, commies are still commies, they are still trying to take our kind of life away from us, this exchange meeting business is nothing but more political expediency and right now we want to know what is the position of the United States in this new and jumpy mess we have gotten into.

These are the worries of all the world, especially that part of the world we have tried to lead to believe we were their friends. The captive nations may also be wondering about this new type tea party.

Lost in the shuffle has been the complete change from the Dulles diplomacy to the Eisenhower-Nixon new look in foreign relations. One wonders where Herter is in on all this new anti-Dulles diplomacy.

Herter was hailed by all the leaders in this country as a worthy successor to Dulles and one who would maintain the Dulles line of action. We have not only buried Dulles but it seems that we have made Herter and the State Department a minor office run by a page boy.

I happen to be one who believes Herter has the ability, experience, and the will to head the State Department. It is too bad he has been placed in the shadows in order to build a new Eisenhower and elect a GOP President.

When this country starts acting like a grownup and quits fooling around with make-believe, we will not have to worry about Russia or anybody else.

All we need is our own self-confidence and in the words of F.D.R. we have nothing to fear but fear itself.

Congressman Charles A. Boyle, Final Report, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a summary of the 86th Congress, 1st session, which I am sending to my constituents:

DEAR FRIENDS: As I write my closing newsletter of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the leaves of the Washington trees are turning yellow, the grass of the Washington parks and lawns are putting on their fall coats of brown, and eight of my kiddies are back in school; seven in Arlington, Va., and Pat, the oldest, matriculated at Loyola University in Chicago. This session, which has been the longest peacetime session since 1922, concluded as I moved to adjourn the House sine die while acting as majority leader for the fifth consecutive year.

The ever-growing bigness of government had necessitated the leadership again this session to use the much-overworked emergency provision of the 1946 Reorganization Act to keep us here in Washington. For without invocation of that procedure, the Congress should adjourn July 31 of each year. Although the bills introduced and pending in this session are not functus officio, and do not die between the first and second terms of the session, there is considerable irritation to the public because so many important and worthwhile bills are not processed for want of time. A good example of this situation obtained in Congressman O'BRIEN's lake diversion bill, which, after passage by the House, was in the 11th hour of the session, referred to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The move resulted in postponing final action on this important bill until sometime after we return in January of 1960.

LABOR MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

The most controversial and heated piece of legislation to reach the floor of the House in years was the labor management reform bill. Pressure was brought to bear upon the whole Congress, and was accentuated through mass media by the President, the Senate Rackets Committee and prolabor and antilabor forces. As a result, Congress was besieged by carloads of mail and the Capitol was crowded with hundreds of lobbyists and pressure groups. Labor-management reform was supported almost unanimously by Congress, but how to effect remedial legislation that would clear corrupt elements out of unions without imposing punitive measures on all unions caused much heated disputation on the bills.

The Senate passed the Kennedy-Ervin labor-management reform bill on August 25, 1959, by a vote of 90 to 1. When the legislation reached the floor of the House, the committee bill was sidetracked, and the Landrum-Griffin bill was substituted. The Senate and House bills were then sent to a conference committee to work out the differences between them. On September 4, 1959, I voted in favor of the conferees labor-management bill. It is my belief that failure of Congress to carry out this responsibility might well have touched off a wave of antilabor sentiment that could have set back the cause of honest unionism.

CONGRESS OVERRIDES PUBLIC WORKS VETO

By a vote of 280 to 121 in the House and a vote of 72 to 23 in the Senate, the Congress overrode the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill by more than the necessary two-thirds vote, on Thursday, September 10. The measure automatically became law.

This action represented the first time in 6½ years that Congress had been able to override one of the 146 bills rejected by the President. Among the appropriations in this bill are a number of flood control, navigation, and reclamation projects which have considerable merit and are necessary for the welfare of our country. To note, as Mr. CANNON pointed out, "this legislation is a precedent."

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Recently, for the first time in a decade, hearings were held in the House on self-government for the District of Columbia. In past years the Senate has passed many home rule measures but all have been bottled up in House committees. As a sponsor of H.R. 5677, a bill on home rule for the District, I believe the time has come to install the rights of local self-government to nearly 1 million citizens of the District of Columbia. To me, it is a glaring contradiction that those who live in the very shadow of the Capitol of freedom and democracy, are denied the privileges of citizenship accorded everywhere to free people of the world. In a bipartisan-sponsored move, I signed with my fellow colleagues, a discharge petition to bring the vital issue of home rule promptly to the House floor for a vote. Although final action was not forthcoming prior to adjournment, the discharge petition will rest on the Speaker's desk to be called up as one of the first orders of business in January, when the 2d session of the 86th Congress convenes.

GREAT WHITE FLEET—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 319

A considerable amount of publicity has recently been given to the idea of reviving the Great White Fleet of Teddy Roosevelt days and to put such a fleet to work for world peace. I have introduced a resolution which, according to a recent report, has the support of 351 Members of Congress in both Houses. This resolution calls for the President to use part of our mothball naval fleet to help carry surplus food and technical assistance to distressed and undeveloped areas in the world. Through this action, we can at least place a part of our mutual aid program on a person-to-person basis to insure maximum benefit to our country and to cost only a fraction of our foreign-aid program. It is my sincere hope that this program will be endorsed by the American people and soon become a reality. It has been publicized in a recent series of articles carried by Life magazine.

STATES RIGHTS

House Republicans joined with southern Democrats to pass the States rights bill, titled H.R. 3, for the second year in succession. The brief but far-ranging bill is designed to prevent Federal laws from striking down State laws in the same field where there is no irreconcilable conflict. It would do this by limiting the power of Federal courts to interpret Federal law. I again registered my opposition to the bill, as the effect of the proposed legislation could be to subordinate Federal legislation to State laws despite the specific constitutional provision that Federal law under the Constitution shall be the supreme law of the land. Passage of the bill in the present form would give rise to serious uncertainties as to its effect on judicial construction of State statutes applicable in the field in which Congress has the power to act, but has not yet acted. The measure would effect an appreciable increase and duplication of effort and result in annoyance occasioned by the necessity of complying with a mutuality of overlapping laws. The Senate killed the bill by one vote last year, and because I believe in the supremacy of Federal law and the Constitution, I hope that it will meet a similar fate in this Congress.

WORLD PEACE AND WORLD LAW

Last month, a committee was formed of Members of both Houses of Congress to promote peace through the advance of the rule of law in international relations. Unhappily for our time, communications and weaponry have so outdistanced the law and so shrunk and imperiled the earth that unless there is a broad and peaceful extension of the rule of law over the earth, there may be no one left to be ruled. The committee that was formed vigorously endorsed House Concurrent Resolution 211 calling for a revision of the U.N. Charter so as to develop and guarantee the rule of international law. Similar committees have already been formed within the Parliaments of the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Italy, and Japan. To my way of thinking, this resolution and the formation of our committee, reflects thinking in a direction that is inevitable. Disputes between nations must be settled by the rule of law, not by the rule of war. The question is no longer whether world law is necessary, but how it can be made a reality. Through my periodic reports from Congress, you will be kept advised of our progress.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

The last week of Congress was highlighted by the drive for adjournment. Congress, for the third time this session, passed an omnibus housing bill. The President vetoed the first two, and as we adjourned, has not acted upon the third bill. It is my hope that the President signs this bill or many Federal housing projects, including urban renewal, will be eliminated or drastically curtailed for lack of funds. As Congressman RAINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, said on the floor of the House, the first housing bill was the best bill; the second was a good one, and the third compromise legislation was a fair one.

It was indeed sad to see neither the first nor the second bill receive the President's signature when they were pared down by congressional leaders in order to fit the needs of the country without overtaxing the economy. Representative government is based on the art of compromise, and I feel Congress performed its obligation by reconciling its original request in this field to gain the approval of the administration. In turn, it is my belief that the President failed to meet the Congress half way, and a fair hous-

ing bill is the only legislation that will be enacted this session.

NEW VETERANS PENSION LAW

This year, Congress passed a new pension bill for veterans who are permanently and totally disabled from injuries or disease that are non-service-connected. This new bill provides for an increase in pension payments for many veterans. The most important feature, however, is the granting of pension benefits to thousands of widows and dependent children of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict. Under the present laws, the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War II and Korean conflict, were eligible for pension benefits only if the veteran was receiving compensation from the Veterans' Administration at the time of his death for a service-incurred disability. The new law grants pension benefits to these widows and children on the same basis as has long been granted to the widows and chairman of deceased World War I veterans.

Under the new law, benefits payable are based on annual income from all sources, including Social Security and Railroad Retirement. Welfare aid is not counted as income. In the case of a veteran and spouse, all income of the spouse over $1,200 must be counted as the veteran's income for pension purposes.

This new law, Public Law 86-211, becomes effective July 1, 1960. Veterans on the pension rolls prior to that date will have the right to retain their present pension or elect to receive the new benefits if they so desire. The Veterans' Administration will shortly advise these veterans as to their rights under both the old and new law.

For assistance in applying for these benefits, I suggest you contact the Veterans' Administration regional office at 2030 West Taylor Street, Chicago 12, Ill.

BOND INTEREST RATES

On September 12 in a special Saturday session, Congress enacted compromise legislation to meet President Eisenhower's request for authority to increase rates on long-term Government bonds. The agreement reached after a long deadlock would allow the Treasury to boost interest rates on series E and H savings bonds to a ceiling of 4½ percent. These bonds, the types held by many individuals now, pay a top of 3.26 percent. The compromise also would give the Treasury authority to encourage big investors in long-range marketable bonds to swap them in advance of maturity for new issues, paying higher interest. Under previous lower rates of interest, the Government has had considerable difficulty in interesting big investors in buying Government bonds because they could receive higher interest rates on private investments.

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

As I conclude this newsletter and prepare to leave Washington, my departure coincides with the arrival of Premier Khrushchev. I am sure the American public will receive him with courtesy and consideration. This is not because we approve of his acts or trust his motives, but because he is the leader of a powerful nation with whom we must deal wisely and realistically to avoid a nuclear war caused by miscalculation. The great opportunities afforded by the talks far outweigh the dangers which might conceivably exist. I do not think Mr. Khrushchev will change Soviet policy because of what he sees during his visit to this country. What will interest him, it seems to me, is that he will be able to judge for himself, in his official contacts, what are the levers of power and decision in the American Government and in the American society.

The last piece of legislation to pass the House was the mutual aid bill which had been amended by the Senate to include an extension of the Civil Rights Commission scheduled to expire by its terms on November 8, 1959.

During the adjournment, I will be available to discuss and handle any and all inquiries, requests, and matters within the scope of congressional activities. Feel free to call or drop me a note and I'll be happy to arrange a mutually convenient appointment.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. BOYLE,
Member of Congress.

Washington office: 1415 New House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C.; Capitol 4-3121, extension 5315.

Chicago office: 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Financial 6-0440.

Tribute to Firefighters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, in the hectic rush of our modern life we seldom take the time to remember the facilities that keep our communities functioning. An absolutely essential occupation is that of fireman. A community without the equipment and the men to fight fires could not exist.

Representing a heavily rural district I am aware that many of our towns and villages are serviced wholly or in part by volunteer firemen who besides holding down their regular occupations are also willing to volunteer their services along with their neighbor in community action once danger threatens.

We are aware that fighting fires is dangerous work. Statistics bear out the fact that firefighters suffered more than six times as many one-the-job injuries in 1958 as the average American worker. It is less well known that fighting fires is an occupation that carries a medical disease hazard that adds to the physical danger.

Dr. Herman N. Bundesen underlines this additional problem in an interesting article published by the International Association of Fire Fighters. We can all agree with Dr. Bundesen that "To them, we all owe a deep debt of gratitude." Under unanimous consent to enter my remarks, I insert it in the RECORD.

"HERE'S TO HEALTH"

(By Herman N. Bundesen, M.D.)

ILLNESS FROM OCCUPATIONS

Many occupations have certain obvious drawbacks, such as danger, low pay, or poor working conditions.

Now we know that certain occupations can also have an adverse effect on the heart and blood vessels, or other organs of the body.

OCCUPATIONAL HAZARDS

We know that there is a greater tendency in men such as physicians, to develop heart disease. Men in the field of advertising are supposed to have a greater tendency toward ulcers.

However, certain strenuous occupations, such as firefighting, may have an adverse effect on the heart and blood vessels.

FIREMEN'S DISEASES

High blood pressure is common in firemen. Especially prevalent in firemen are angina, a condition in which the amount of blood going through the blood vessels supplying the heart is limited, and coronary thrombosis, a condition in which a clot forms in the blood vessels supplying the heart.

It is believed that the stress and strains, extremes of temperature, gas and smoke connected with firefighting may increase the tendency toward these diseases in this occupation.

RESULT OF STRESS

High blood pressure, hardening of the arteries, and other such diseases definitely are influenced by conditions of stress. These conditions occur in firefighters.

Emotional and muscular effort may cause great elevation of blood pressure in these individuals. After a blast, the blood has been known to remain elevated for weeks in persons who were in the vicinity of the explosions. Stress can also cause changes to occur in the heart.

WORK CONDITIONS

Firemen must carry on during emergency situations and in extremely hot or cold weather. Heavy work in high temperatures adds to much of the burden of the heart.

Firemen are often exposed to carbon dioxide gas which may diminish the amount of oxygen that reaches their vital organs. This can increase their chances of suffering a heart attack.

These are brave men and everything possible must be done by all of us to protect them from the hazards of their occupation. To them, we all owe a deep debt of gratitude.

Report on Activities of Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report on the activities of the Committee on Un-American Activities during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. This period covers the period from January 1, 1959, to and including September 1, 1959.

REPORT BY CHAIRMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS

During the period beginning January 1, 1959, and ending August 27, 1959, the committee interrogated 87 witnesses in public session and 70 witnesses in executive session.

SOVIET ESPIONAGE

Continuing its efforts to develop the fullest possible information on Soviet spy organizations both here and abroad, the committee interrogated Petr S. Deriabin, a former officer of the Soviet Secret Police—KCB. Mr. Deriabin's identity had been kept secret by U.S. security agencies since his defection in 1954. Publication of his testimony by the committee was the first revelation in the free world of the knowledge he had of Soviet espionage operations as a result of his years of service in the secret police.

Mr. Deriabin revealed that the KGB is divided into two major sections, one of

which is charged with protecting the internal security of the Soviet state, and the other with carrying out espionage and various terrorist activities in foreign countries. The internal security section, he said, has approximately 16,000 officers who are charged with maintaining surveillance over and providing protection for the leaders of the Soviet Government. The foreign section of the KGB has about 3,000 officers assigned to its Moscow headquarters, and 15,000 more stationed in other countries of the world. This section, according to Mr. Deriabin, handles not only espionage but "assassinations, kidnaping, blackmail, and similar activities." Deriabin confirmed the testimony of other defectors from the Soviet Secret Police to the effect that Communist exchange delegations always include a number of intelligence or counterintelligence agents. He identified several who had been sent to the United States in recent years in various cultural exchange groups. While Deriabin could not give exact figures on the size of the Soviet Military Intelligence Force—GRU—he stated that it had many more agents than the KGB.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA COMMUNIST PARTY

In extensive hearings in Los Angeles in which 65 witnesses testified, the committee thoroughly explored the structure, objectives, and leadership of the southern California district of the Communist Party, a section that ranks second in importance in the U.S. conspiracy only to that of New York. The significance of the booming State of California in Communist plans for subversion of the United States can be gaged by the fact that, whereas this State was formerly combined with Arizona, Nevada, and the former territory of Hawaii to make up the Communist Party's District 13, it was itself divided into two separate districts—the northern California district and the southern California district—in early 1957. A State coordinating committee was established to control and direct the operations of the two districts. Though the great majority of witnesses invoked the fifth amendment the committee with the help of several friendly witnesses was able to uncover a mass of information concerning the party's leadership and its methods of operation.

CURRENT COMMUNIST STRATEGY AND TACTICS

In hearings held in Pittsburgh, Pa., on March 10, 1959, the committee developed additional information on techniques now being used by the U.S. Communist Party aimed at hamstringing the committee's efforts to develop information by planning disruptive and obstructive conduct at its hearings. Information on the party's decentralization techniques and other underground security measures adopted to provide protection for its continuing large-scale operations was also developed.

Mr. and Mrs. Hamp Golden, who had served as FBI undercover operatives in the Communist Party for 12 years, explained how the Communist Party attempts to influence Members of Congress and other Government officials by deluging them with letters and telegrams on pending legislation and other national issues. They also described the operations of a number of Communist fronts in the Pittsburgh area and identified the Communist Party members who manipulated these organizations along the lines ordered by the conspiracy. Both Mr. and Mrs. Golden expressed the conviction that, though its visible members were fewer, the Communist Party is today more dangerous than it was in the past.

SECURITY IN DEFENSE PLANTS

The second day of the Pittsburgh hearings was devoted to the still largely unsolved problem of providing adequate security for industrial establishments holding defense contracts. Government officials testifying on this subject before the committee pointed out that Defense Department contracts do not preclude the employment of Communists within such facilities, or their working on parts of highly classified weapons, so long as they do not have access to classified information. In adition, the Defense Department cannot exclude Communists from communications facilities and powerplants, both of which are vital to our defense effort and production.

A. Tyler Port, Director, Office of Security Policy of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Personnel and Reserve, testified as follows on this point:

"The potential for bringing defense production to a halt by sabotage of power facilities is enormous, and the repercussions would be, I think, disastrous because if the power itself is cut off defense plants cannot produce and we will thus be denying ourselves the weapons which are so essential to our national defense effort."

The committee also produced evidence in its hearings that five prime contractors for the Department of Defense in the Pittsburgh area have contracts with the Communist-controlled United Electrical Workers Union, which serves as bargaining agent for their employees. Four officials of this union who were subpenaed to testify in the hearing invoked the fifth amendment when asked questions concerning their membership and activity in the Communist Party.

DEPORTATION AND DENATURALIZATION PROBLEMS

The third day of the committee's hearings in Pittsburgh revealed a serious loophole in U.S. security caused by the fact that the Government finds it impossible to deport alien Communists who have been ordered deported in accordance with the law because the Communist nation of their origin refuses to grant them travel documents. It also highlighted the great difficulties the Government encounters in trying to denaturalize active, hard-core Communists who have obtained U.S. citizenship by falsely denying party membership at the time of their naturalization.

Seven persons who were or had been the subjects of deportation or denaturalization proceedings testified before the committee in the course of these hearings. All but one, who was granted a continuance of his appearance on the grounds that deportation proceedings had not been completed, invoked the fifth amendment when asked about their Communist Party affiliations and activities. The deportation of one of these six persons had been frustrated by the refusal of an Iron Curtain country to grant travel documents for him. Deportation proceedings of the other five had been rendered ineffective because of a number of Supreme Court decisions.

In one of these decisions, *Rowaldt* v. *Perfetto*, the Supreme Court held that mere proof of an alien's Communist Party membership was not enough to warrant deportation, and that the Department of Justice would have to prove what the Court called "meaningful association" with the Communist Party. In another, *United States* v. *Witkevich*, the Court ruled that an alien against whom a deportation order had been outstanding for more than 6 months could not be required by the Attorney General to answer questions concerning Communist Party activities. In *Novak* v. *United States* and *Maisenberg* v. *United States*, the Court decided that to denaturalize a person who had obtained citizenship while a member of the Communist Party the Department of Justice not only had to prove that the person had been a member of the party and that the Communist Party advocated violent overthrow at the time, but also that the defendant knew at the time of his naturalization that the Communist Party engaged in such illegal advocacy. In the cases of the witnesses who appeared before the committee, all are now free to continue their Communist activities in this country.

INFILTRATION OF THE MEATPACKING INDUSTRY

In hearings held in Chicago on May 5, 6, and 7, 1959, the committee produced evidence of heavy Communist Party penetration of the meatpacking industry in that area. Ten officials of the United Packinghouse Workers of America, including the editor of the union's newspaper, were identified as party members in the course of the hearings. When they testified, they denied present membership in the conspiracy, but invoked the fifth amendment when asked if they had gone through the motion of a technical resignation so that they could testify they had resigned from the party while continuing their activities in the Communist operation. Three others who were identified as party members denied present membership, but invoked constitutional privileges when asked about membership in recent years.

John R. Hackney, an international representative of the Amalgamated Meatcutters and Butcher Workmen, who had been a member of the Communist Party, stated that the conspiracy had made special efforts to penetrate the meat industry "because the party felt that the meat industry was essential to the national economy, and it was important that they build the party within the meat industry in the event that we had war with other nations, that we could control the meat industry and its various outlets."

Concerning the present state of Communist infiltration of that industry, Mr. Hackney stated:

"From my most current information and my experience and my activities in the party, I would say that the party is stronger now in the meat industry than it ever has been."

PASSPORT SECURITY

In hearings held in Washington, D.C., on April 21–24 and June 5, 1959, the committee highlighted the dangerous situation resulting from the Supreme Court passport decision of June 1958, and pointed up the great need for legislation to grant the Secretary of State the power to deny passports to Communists, and to invalidate passports which had already been issued.

Through the testimony of two State Department security officials, and evidence introduced into the record in the course of the testimony of 14 uncooperative witnesses with Communist and subversive backgrounds who presently hold passports or recently held them, the committee revealed that since the Supreme Court's decision, many leading U.S. Communists had been enabled to travel to the Soviet Union and had done so; that hundreds of persons with subversive backgrounds who had not applied for passports in many years had rushed to obtain them immediately after the Supreme Court decision; that passports have been granted to persons denied them in the past because of their Communist activities, and to persons who, in their appearance before the committee, invoked the fifth amendment to avoid saying whether or not they presently, or at any time in the past, had engaged in espionage against the United States for the benefit of the Soviet Union.

The hearings also revealed that witnesses who had obtained passports subsequent to the Supreme Court decision had traveled to Iron Curtain and non-Communist countries, where they had engaged in various activities designed to further the interests of the Soviet Union and to hamper the policies of the United States.

AMERICAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION, MOSCOW, JULY 1959

The committee chairman, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER, addressing the House of Representatives on June 3, 1959, stated that,

of the 69 artists whose works had been chosen for display at the American National Exhibition in Moscow in July and August of this year, 34 had records of affiliation with Communist fronts and causes. Twenty-two, or one-third of the total, he said, had significant histories of association with the Communist movement.

In hearings held in Washington, D.C., on July 1, 1959, two artists whose works had been selected for the exhibition testified. One of them, Ben Shahn, invoked the fifth amendment when asked if he had ever been a Communist Party member or had ever contributed his art works for the benefit of Communist enterprises. The other one, Philip Evergood, invoked constitutional privileges when questioned about present as well as past party membership, and also, when interrogated about his numerous activities in behalf of communism in the art field. Several other artists represented in the exhibition concerning whom the committee has evidence of Communist Party membership were not available to testify, having obtained passports and left the country after the Supreme Court passport ruling of June 1958.

Mr. Wheeler Williams, president of the American Artists Professional League, largest organization of artists in the United States, testified extensively on the Communist use of art as a weapon. He expressed the opinion that, in subverting the arts, the Communists had been "successful beyond their wildest hopes," and that the Soviet Union would be delighted with the fact that so large a proportion of artists chosen for the U.S. exhibition in Moscow had Communist Party or front affiliations. Mr. Williams gave the following characterization of the works chosen for the American exhibition in Moscow:

"It includes a number of 'social protest' painting of no aesthetic or artistic importance; at least one revolting satirical lampoon; a heavy load of meaningless doodles in paint and bronze; and a few traditional works, only one or two of which have any outstanding merit. If it is judged on merit alone, it is a dismal and dreary potpourri.

"It fails utterly to give 'a true image of America' as it contains next to nothing to show the wondrous natural beauty with which God has endowed our beloved lands, to portray its glorious history, its heroes or its valiant people of varied races, and nothing to picture the wondrous architecture of our cities or charm and beauty of our villages and towns."

COMMUNIST TRAINING OPERATIONS

In hearings held on July 21 and 22 in Washington, the committee probed the indoctrination techniques used by the Communist movement to turn ordinary American citizens into dedicated hard-core conspirators. The hearing concentrated on the Faculty of Social Science in New York City, which is now the major Communist Party educational institution in this country. Evidence produced in testimony given in the course of the hearing establishes that the Faculty of Social Science is the successor of the Jefferson School of Social Science which had been dissolved by the Communist Party following the order of the Subversive Activities Control Board that it was a Communist front and should therefore register with the Attorney General. Twenty lecturers or officials of the Faculty of Social Science have been connected with the Jefferson school. Ten of them were subpenaed to testify in the hearing and invoked the fifth amendment when questioned concerning Communist Party affiliation and activity. The hearing also produced evidence that the Communist Party is carrying on secret training programs in conspiratorial tactics and strategy in key cities of the Nation.

TESTIMONY OF CLINTON EDWARD JENCKS

Jencks, a former official of the Communist-controlled International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, testified before the committee in Washington on July 22. A number of years ago Jencks had been convicted of falsely signing a non-Communist affidavit under the Taft-Hartley Act. The Supreme Court, in the now-famous decision bearing his name, subsequently reversed his conviction on the grounds that the Government had not made available to him confidential reports made to the FBI by a witness who testified against him.

Jencks recently applied for and was awarded by the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Fund in Princeton, N. J., a graduate fellowship to study at the University of California with the purpose of entering the teaching profession. Testifying before the committee, Jencks admitted that in applying for the fellowship he had submitted a statement intended to make foundation officials believe that he had not signed the non-Communist affidavit falsely. Asked if he was telling the truth when he conveyed this impression, he refused to answer, invoking the fifth amendment. In the course of his trial for violating the Taft-Hartley Act, Jencks had been identified as a member of the Communist Party by several witnesses, including one former Communist who had been an official of the International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers.

REPORTS

Communist legal subversion

This report, though based only on testimony concerning Communists in the legal profession given incidental to the committee's investigation of other phases of Communist activity in the decade 1947–57, revealed that over 100 members of the bar had been identified as members of the Communist conspiracy before this committee. The report unveiled the techniques used by the Communist Party to undermine the United States, its Constitution and laws by party members trained in the law. It also brought up to date previous information published by this committee on the National Lawyers Guild, the major Communist front for lawyers in the United States. It gave information on the manner in which Communist lawyers abuse the courts of this country and attempt to instigate contemptuous behavior on the part of witnesses before congressional committees. On the basis of testimony given before this committee and information contained in the committee's files, it reviewed the various services rendered the Communist Party by members with legal training—the recruiting of fellow lawyers, espionage and subversion of government, service as officials of the Communist Party, assisting the party in circumventing the laws of the United States, taking leadership roles in Communist fronts, running for public office and serving as propagandists for Communist causes. Going to the crux of the problem Communists in the legal profession pose to the bar and citizens of this country, the report asked this question:

"How can a lawyer maintain his oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States when he is an agent of a conspiratorial apparatus designed to destroy the Constitution?"

Report on the southern California district of the Communist Party

This report, based on hearings and intensive investigation outlined the organizational structure of the California district of the Communist Party and the role Communist fronts are playing in party operations in that State. It also summarized the major elements of the program adopted at the April 1957 convention of the southern California District of the Communist Party and developments in special fields that followed the convention: youth recruitment, the new party line on Negroes, and stepped-up labor infiltration efforts. Also reported was detailed information on internal strife within the district, the names of 14 members who had recently resigned from the party, and biographical sketches of 85 Communist leaders and personalities in the district. Sixteen important Communist Party documents were included in the apepndix of the report.

Communist lobbying activities in the Nation's Capital

The stepped-up lobbying operation in Washington designed to influence Members of Congress along lines favored by the Communist Party was described in this report. It revealed that a cited Communist front, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, and three major Communist-controlled unions—the United Electrical Workers, the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, and the International Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers—maintain full-time lobbyists in the Capital. The three union lobbyists—Russell Nixon, Jeff Kibre, and Herman Clott—have all been identified as Communist Party members and have invoked the fifth amendment when questioned about party membership by congressional committees. The report pointed out that by concealing their Communist connections and the nature of the organizations they represent, these lobbyists in effect defeat the basic purpose of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946, which is designed to keep Congress fully informed of the interests represented by those attempting to influence it. The report recommends amendment of the act so that it would require lobbyists to state whether they are members of the Communist Party or have been such since 1948, whether the organization they represent has ever been found to be Communist-controlled by a congressional body and whether such finding had ever been rescinded.

CONSULTATIONS

Language as a Communist weapon

The manipulation of language constitutes one of communism's most potent weapons in its drive for world domination, Dr. Stefan T. Possony, authority on psychological warfare and revolutionary techniques and political scientist of Georgetown University, told the committee. Communists, he said, consider words not as a means for communicating truth, as other people do, but as tools for promoting their revolutionary aims.

The key to Communist use of semantics is found, Dr. Possony said, in these two principles:

"Every Communist communication must convey an orthodox, that is, revolutionary activating message to the party and its followers.

"This same communication must convey a different, i.e., soothing, pacifying, and paralyzing message to the opponent of communism."

By utilizing language in this fashion, Communists mislead the non-Communist world as to their true intentions. In his consultation, Dr. Possony explained how Communists deceive many people and even political leaders in the free world by the use of terms such as "peaceful coexistence," "democracy," etc., which have an entirely different meaning to them than they have in normal usage. He also pointed out that negotiations, too, are considered by the Communists to be a conquest technique and are used by them to weaken the will of free people to resist.

Communist persecution of churches in Red China and northern Korea

In this consultation, five Protestant church leaders, natives of China and Korea, de-

scribed the brutal campaign carried out by the Chinese and northern Korean Communists during the past 10 years to destroy all vestiges of Christianity in those countries.

At the present time, as a result of this campaign, no truly Christian churches are operating in Red China or North Korea, they said. The only ones permitted to operate are propaganda churches with ministers "picked by the Government to fill the pulpits and indoctrinate the people in communism." These churches are also used as showcases to hoodwink visitors from foreign lands into believing that freedom of religion exists in Red China.

No religious worship of any kind is permitted in the communes of Red China, and the institution of the commune system has enabled the Government to completely end the operation of churches in all areas where the system is in effect. The five clergymen also described the method used by the Communists in both countries to bring about the closing of the churches. These included the use of horrible tortures of ministers and active Christians to wring false confessions of espionage and similar crimes from them.

Control of the arts in the Communist empire

Ivan P. Bahriany, Ukrainian poet, novelist, and artist, who lived and wrote for years under Communist rule, described how the Soviet Government exercises strict control of all forms of artistic and literary expression so that they become vehicles for the service of the state. Mr. Bahriany, who was sentenced to a slave labor camp in Siberia for refusing to follow the party line in his writings and escaped to the West at the end of World War II, said that numerous writers whose works had not been deemed loyal to the Communist regime have been persecuted, imprisoned, and liquidated in the Soviet Union.

There are very dangerous features for the West in the present cultural exchange program, Mr. Bahriany said. Essentially, these exchanges are being used by the Soviet Union to deceive the non-Communist world by presenting false pictures of conditions in Communist nations—pictures which, for example, create the impression that artistic and literary freedom exist when there is really none behind the Iron Curtain and Moscow has for years carried out a concerted campaign to destroy all national cultures in captive areas under its control.

Who are they?

Continuing its series of biographical sketches prepared by the Library of Congress on leading figures in the history of world communism, the committee published a document on Karl Marx, the founder of communism and the chief theoretician of its early period. Marx was a sour, brooding, truculent man; lonely, unfeeling, friendless, and in constant revolt against society. He was an intellectual fanatic, grossly intolerant, arrogant, and self-assured. Dogmatic and insolent as he was, he treated with scornful contempt everyone who did not agree with him completely on everything. He developed a completely materialistic interpretation of life which proclaimed, as one of its basic truths, unremitting class struggle, the inevitability of continuous clashes between the bourgeois and proletariat until the former class had been liquidated. This sketch of Marx is a glimpse at the mysterious processes of a life which produced the ideological base for the most devilish and menacing force mankind has ever experienced.

WORK IN PROCESS

The committee has a heavy schedule of additional hearings and investigations, reports, and consultations for the remainder of the year 1959.

Summary of Veterans' Legislation, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress 16 bills have been enacted into law which originated in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The substance of this legislation is important, and I think that the 1st session of this Congress has indeed been an outstanding one insofar as the subject of veterans' legislation is concerned.

I list below a summary of our activities, showing the 16 laws enacted as well as the bills which have been passed by the House and are pending in the other body, and the bills which have been reported and are awaiting disposition of the House during the second session.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The 1st session of the 86th Congress has been most productive insofar as legislation for veterans and their dependents is concerned. Our program for veterans and their dependents is unequaled anywhere else in the world, and the most important veterans' bill considered each session is the Veterans' Administration appropriation bill which finances the operation of our extensive veterans' program.

There are 22,600,000 veterans living in the United States. The Nation's veterans, together with their families, make up about 45 percent of the total population of the United States. The Veterans' Administration is the third largest agency of Government in expenditures. Its operations are exceeded only by the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture. Seven percent of the Treasury's income from taxes is spent on veterans' benefits.

The Veterans' Administration operates 170 hospitals and on any average day the Veterans' Administration's patient load exceeds 114,000. The insurance program operated by the Veterans' Administration is the biggest undertaking of its kind on earth. The face value of Government life insurance policies for veterans is valued at nearly $43 billion and there are over 6 million policies in force.

The veterans' housing program is an important phase of the Nation's housing program. We are inclined to think of the Federal Housing Administration as the principal housing agency, but the fact is that in recent years the Veterans' Administration has been responsible for a greater volume of private residential housing than has the Federal Housing Administration. Under the housing programs for veterans of World War II and Korea, a total of $46 billion has been loaned. The Veterans' Administration has guaranteed more than $25 billion of this amount. The Veterans' Administration has had very satisfactory repayment experience and losses on veterans' loans have been less than losses on conventional loans.

More than 10 million veterans have been trained under the education and training programs administered by the Veterans' Administration. One-half of all World War II veterans received some training. Two out of every five Korean veterans have enrolled in training. Total expenditures on educational benefits for World War II and Korean veterans has now exceeded $20 billion.

The compensation and pension programs account for the biggest single area of expenditure in the Veterans' Administration. We spend just over $2 billion annually on compensation for service-connected disabilities and service-connected deaths. We spend about $1,150 million on pensions for veterans and dependents. Our total expenditures for both compensation and pension for next year will be $3,307 million. These payments go to 3 million veterans, widows, and dependent children.

To finance this extensive program for veterans and their families, it is necessary that the Congress appropriate more than $5 billion each year. The appropriations bill for this fiscal year for the Veterans' Administration was $5,042,544,000. The magnitude of this figure certainly makes it obvious that the most important piece of veterans' legislation going through the Congress each year is the VA appropriations bill.

In addition to appropriating funds for the continuance of veterans' programs already in operation, the Congress passed a number of laws which amended and extended existing programs.

VETERANS' HOUSING

Public Law 86–73 makes an additional $100 million available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for immediate use in the direct home loan program. Congress made these additional funds available for the purpose of reducing extensive waiting lists which had developed throughout the country. Under the direct home loan program the Veterans' Administration makes home loans to veterans residing in small towns and rural areas. Private financing has not been available in smaller towns and rural communities and it has been necessary for the Congress to make funds available to the Veterans' Administration for direct loans in these areas. The demand for financing has always exceeded the supply of money. Early in this year the waiting list of applicants had reached 58,000 throughout the United States and the limited amount of money available to the Veterans' Administration was totally inadequate. The additional $100 million was made available for the specific use of the Veterans' Administration in reducing waiting lists.

This same act permitted the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to raise the interest rate on Veterans' Administration guaranteed and direct loans not to exceed 5½ percent per annum. The provision of law requiring the Veterans'

Administration interest rate be not less than ½ percent below the FHA rate was repealed.

This same legislation authorized the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refuse to appraise homes for builders and lenders suspended by FHA.

Public Law 86–239 expends the program of assistance for severely disabled veterans in acquiring homes equipped with special facilities made necessary by the character of their service-connected disabilities. This act brings into this program those with compensable permanent and total disabilities incurred when such disability includes, first, blindness in both eyes, having only light perception; plus, second, loss, or loss of use, of one lower extremity such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair. Also, it removes the limitation that where eligibility is based on loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities that such loss must have been due to certain specified conditions.

GUARDIANSHIP

Public Law 86–146, commonly known as the guardianship bill, was enacted to establish better controls over the estates and funds of incompetent veterans where the veteran is under a guardianship and does not have close relatives. In the past, some of these individuals have accumulated large estates and upon their death these estates were passed on to distant relatives, who had little or no close connection with the veteran and no legitimate claim to funds paid by the Treasury for the veteran's benefit.

Public Law 86–146 restricts payment upon death of an incompetent veteran of gratuitous veteran benefits deposited in the "personal funds of patients' trust fund" to a wife, child, or dependent parent. If the veteran does not have relatives in these categories, the funds are returned to the Treasury of the United States. This legislation provided a control on the building up of estates by incompetent veterans receiving hospital care at public expense. This step was taken to prevent the accumulation of large estates. Where the veteran is hospitalized in a State institution, his funds can be used to pay for his care.

FORFEITURE

Prior to the passage of Public Law 86–222, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had the authority to forfeit the rights of veterans, widows, children, and dependent parents to all gratuitous benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Forfeiture was authorized in two categories:

First. Where the Administrator finds the one claiming benefits has been guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy;

Second. Where a false or fraudulent statement has been made concerning any claim for benefits.

The forfeiture decision of the Administrator was final and not subject to review in the courts. Forfeiture, if adjudged, forfeits all benefits and continues for the lifetime of the forfeited individual, unless pardoned by the President.

This law continues the authority of the Administrator to forfeit in all cases where the guilty person resides, or is domiciled, outside the jurisdiction of the U.S. courts.

Where the accused resides, or is domiciled, within the United States at the time of the offense, the new law eliminates the authority of the Administrator to impose a forfeiture based upon false or fraudulent statements. Forfeitures previously imposed are not affected. This law also provides for automatic forfeiture of rights to gratuitous veterans' benefits in all cases of conviction of certain specified offenses involving loyalty or security. A Presidential pardon restores the right to benefits.

Authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make an apportionment award of disability compensation to dependents of veterans in cases of administrative forfeiture for fraud or forfeiture for offenses involving loyalty or security is terminated.

COMPENSATION

Public Law 86–187 increases the presumptive period for service connection for the disease of multiple sclerosis from the present 2-year period to 3 years.

Public Law 86–188 provides that Hansen's disease—leprosy—developing to a degree of 10 percent within 3 years from the date of a veteran's separation from service shall be considered to be service connected.

Several other bills relating to compensation were being processed by the Congress when it adjourned. This legislation carries over to the second session.

The House had passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 268 which provides a statutory award of $47 a month for deafness in both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction.

H.R. 283, pending in the Senate, provides that if a veteran, as a result of a service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or one or more creative organs, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month for each such loss, or loss of use of, independent of any other compensation provided. Present law limits payment to one statutory award of $47 per month for all such losses, except where the losses are in addition to other combinations of disabilities specified in the law. Under this bill, the total payment in any case may not exceed $309 unless the loss or loss of use is in addition to certain combinations of disabilities specified in the law, in which event the total payment may not exceed $450. The loss of more than one creative organ would, for this purpose, be considered a single "loss." In peacetime cases the rates are 80 percent of the above-mentioned rates.

H.R. 5996, pending in the Senate, authorizes payment of a lump sum of the total amount of compensation, representing the statutory awards of $47 monthly for the anatomical loss, or loss of use of, a creative organ and $67 monthly for arrested tuberculosis, which would have been payable for the period August 1, 1952, to date of bill's enactment had claim therefor been filed on August 1, 1952. This bill applies to cases in which condition was determined to be service connected before August 1, 1952, and would require reduction of amount payable by any such statutory awards paid during that period.

H.R. 7211 has been reported by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and was pending on the House Calendar when the Congress adjourned. This is a very important bill which establishes a new statutory rate of disability compensation for certain service-connected seriously disabled veterans. A monthly rate of $265 would be authorized for a veteran who has a service-connected disability rated as total and, one, has additional service-connected disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 percent or more; or, two, by reason of his service-connected disability or disabilities is permanently housebound.

PENSIONS

The non-service-connected pension legislation enacted this session of Congress for veterans and widows is the most important veterans' legislation of this session. The new pension act, Public Law 86–211, modifies the non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World Wars I, II, and the Korean conflict and for their widows and children. This bill will provide $308 million in additional benefits during its first year of operation. It will provide more than $1 billion in additional benefits during its first 5 years of operation. Seventy percent of all pensioners, married and single veterans, widows, and orphans, or 838,000 cases, will get substantial raises in pensions under the new act. Seventy-two thousand veterans and widows will be added to the pension rolls because the income limits are being raised from $1,400 to $1,800 for the single person and from $2,700 to $3,000 for the married person. Two hundred and six thousand widows of veterans of World War II and Korea will be added to the rolls as a result of the equalization feature which makes widows of veterans of World War II and Korea eligible for a pension on the same basis as widows of World War I veterans. This extremely important provision will provide $22 billion in benefits to widows and dependent children in the next 40 years.

The new pension act will help a total of 1,116,000 veterans, widows, and children during its first year of operation. The new act will become effective July 1, 1960. Any person on the rolls on that date will have the privilege of remaining under the old program, with no change in pension rate, or eligibility status. If a person can benefit under the new act and, as has been pointed out, 838,000 cases on the rolls will benefit under the new act and may choose to elect the higher benefits of the new program.

The new pension act brings into existence several new concepts. The non-service-connected pension programs for veterans and widows of World Wars I, II, and Korea have been based on the concept of need. However, the needs test operated unfairly in some instances and were ineffective in others. The new pension legislation creates the sliding scale concept of need. In other words, the veteran or widow with very little other income or resources receives more, while

the veteran with substantial outside income and other means receives correspondingly less.

The new law and the Veterans' Administration regulations regarding counting income are approximately the same with one or two important exceptions. Under the new program all income from private and public retirement systems, annuities, endowments, and the Social Security program are counted as income after the individual has received payments back from those programs equal to his contributions. The income of the spouse, if not estranged, is counted as income except that $1,200 of the spouse's income is exempt. The new pension act grants discretionary authority to the Veterans' Administration for finding the net worth of the veteran, or widow, or child, which could lead to a determination that the applicant is not eligible for a pension because of high net worth. This provision has operated in the past in the case of dependent parents. It has been applied generously by the Veterans' Administration and has served to exclude only those individuals with very substantial net worth, who are not actually in need of help.

The new pension act does not change the basic eligibility requirements which now exist. A veteran must have served 90 days during a period of war and must have received an honorable discharge and his disability must not be the result of willful misconduct or vicious habits. The Veterans' Administration maintains a schedule of required non-service-connected disabilities in conjunction with age. At age 65 or over, only a 10 percent disability is required. Under 55, a veteran must have a single disability of 60 percent or two or more disabilities, one of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disabilities to a total of 70 percent. For the intervening age group of 55 to 60 and 60 to 65, the percentage of disability is reduced. The Veterans' Administration must make a finding that the veteran's disabilities are permanent in nature and as a result of the disability the veteran is unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment. Upon being determined eligible under these requirements, the veteran is subject to the income limits which I have described. These income limits are being changed by the new legislation to the sliding scale concept. The detailed schedules are available for those who are interested.

The non-service-connected pension programs have been liberally administered by the Veterans' Administration. The non-service-connected pension rolls for living veterans are increasing by more than 10,000 a month. It is estimated that by the end of 1961 half of all living World War I veterans will be on the non-service-connected pension rolls.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Congress passed two laws this session relating to education and training programs.

Public Law 82–236 provides war orphans' educational assistance to children of veterans of the Spanish-American War where the veteran dies as a result of a disability incurred in or aggravated during that period of service. The orphans of World Wars I, II, and Korean veterans are now eligible. Many persons were surprised when this legislation was being considered in Congress to learn there are 33 children of Spanish-American War veterans young enough to participate in the program.

Congress passed another law liberalizing the provisions of the education and training program for Korean veterans which relates to changes of program. This amendment provides that a veteran may change from one program to another where the first program is a prerequisite or generally required for entrance into pursuit of the second program. This will not be counted as a change.

There are several important bills for educational benefits which have passed certain stages of the legislative process and which will be before the Congress in the next session.

H.R. 4306 will extend educational assistance for children of persons who die as the direct result of armed conflict or while engaged in the performance of extrahazardous service during peacetime after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service. This bill has passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

The Senate has passed and sent to the House S. 1138, known as the peacetime benefits bill. This bill provides for education and vocational training, vocational rehabilitation for those veterans who suffered service-connected disabilities, and guaranteed and direct loan assistance in the purchase of homes, farms, livestock, and machinery to be used in farming operations. This bill is also limited to those veterans who entered service after January 31, 1955, and will be before this committee next session.

MISCELLANEOUS LEGISLATION

Other legislative acts passed by the Congress in the first session are as follows:

Public Law 86–103 extends for 10 years—until June 30, 1970—the present authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines.

Public Law 86–109 requires that the Veterans Canteen Service pay reasonable charges for the use of space, buildings, and structures furnished by the Veterans' Administration, the amount of charges to be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

Public Law 86–113 liberalizes statutory bar to benefits available to a veteran discharged during a period of hostilities on his own application or solicitation as an alien by presuming that he was not so discharged in the absence of affirmative evidence establishing the fact.

Public Law 86–116 grants to employees of the Manila, Republic of the Philippines, office of the Veterans' Administration, who are U.S. citizens, certain allowances and benefits similar to those enjoyed by Foreign Service personnel—transportation, home leave, and so forth.

Public Law 86–152 extends authority of the Veterans' Administration to provide hospital and medical care abroad to include U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad who require hospital care and medical treatment for peacetime service-incurred disabilities.

Public Law 86–195 includes as a "child" for purposes of laws administered by Veterans' Administration, with certain exceptions, one who was a member of the veteran's household at the time of his death and who was adopted by the veteran's spouse within 2 years after the death, unless at the time of the veteran's death the child was receiving regular contributions toward his support from some individual other than the veteran or his spouse, or from any public or private welfare organization furnishing services or assistance to children.

Public Law 86–212 makes applicable to a competent veteran who disappears the provisions of existing law which provide that where an incompetent veteran who is receiving compensation for a service-connected disability disappears, the Veterans' Administration may pay to his wife, children, and parents the compensation otherwise payable to such veteran, amounts payable to each not to exceed the amount payable if the veteran had died from a service-connected disability.

The House has passed and sent to the Senate H.R. 270, which increases the monthly pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor from $10—payable to those honorably discharged upon attainment of the age of 65 years—to $100—payable at any age and without regard to whether the holder was discharged or is on active military duty.

West Virginia Has Famous Mule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, down through the years this Nation has built a number of traditions around mules. There is the Missouri mule; the Columbia, Tenn., mule; the Army mule; and there was football's famous "seven mules," playing in front of Notre Dame's storied "four horsemen."

West Virginia, as usual, is not to be outdone. Before the days of mechanization, our great coal industry depended upon mules to haul the wealth out of the ground. It is only natural that such widespread dependency on mules should produce one animal of outstanding talents.

Such a mule was "Bert" whose accomplishments were nearly as remarkable as those of the latter-day, fictional "Francis." The story of Bert has been related by Charles Callaway in the magazine section of the Wheeling News-Register for September 13. Under leave, I include this article as a part of my remarks:

SAGA OF A MULE WITH CHARACTER—"BERT" HAD A FONDNESS FOR BLACKBERRY PIE AND MINERS STILL RECALL HIS ANTICS

(By Charles Callaway)

His name was Bert.

His hair was red, his stature majestic.

His eyes were sad or twinkling with a dash of the Ol' Ned—as the occasion demanded.

Bert was a mule—the likes of which will never be found in West Virginia again.

Bert had character—and he was a character.

He wouldn't go to work until you gave him a chew of tobacco.

He is the only mule who ever upset a coal mine over a piece of blackberry pie.

He is the only mule of record who repeatedly got arrested on disorderly charges after hard work hauling bank cars in a coal mine.

His saga was written in the rich coal fields of southern West Virginia as he moved like a coal loader from one mine to another as a seam worked out. But his fame reached far and wide, even into the northern West Virginia hills where coal miners chuckled, "That ol' Bert—he's the one."

One of the favorite stories about Bert centered around the times when a new mule skinner would be hired at Bert's mine.

There was one fellow who proclaimed his prowess with "bank" mules long and loud as he applied for a driver's job.

He didn't know it, but the "super" was a man of talents, among which was that of leading a boaster to the edge of a cliff and letting him hang there.

The new driver was ordered to report the next morning and use Bert as his lead mule. "Bert will show you the mine," the super said. The new man laughed and opined that he would "show the mule a thing or two."

The word had spread the next morning, and there was darned little work done on the outside of the mine for a time.

Try as he would, the new driver couldn't get the harness over Bert's head. He fumed and cussed, finally lost his temper and kicked Bert in the ribs.

Bert got a hurt look in his eyes as he innocently shied away from such belaboring and in the process stepped on the driver's foot so heavily the man's cry of anguish could be heard half a mile up the holler, according to an ear witness, one Hoss Anderson, who was so startled he spilled a set of mash.

Time and again mine workers passed the spot where the driver was fussing and cussing with Bert and made inquiries as to how things were going. The replies would have drawn admiration at any other mine, but the superintendent had at one time been a first mate on a Mississippi steamboat and his vocabulary made all others sound like that of an errant Sunday school teacher.

Finally, when the perspiration was pouring off the new driver and he was near tears of exasperation the super walked up, patted Bert on the head and unobtrusively slipped him a morning chew of Apple plug.

Bert practically put the harness on himself before the astounded eyes of the new driver.

All went well after that. The driver became known as a good driver who got the coal out of the hole. It was a simple process. He kept his mouth shut and let Bert run things. The driver became known as Silent Sam, a name he kept until his dying day—the day he left this vale of tears with a pair of loaded dice in his right hand.

Bert was loved by every man who knew him, but when the blackberry season was in full swing, even lover could not overcome the wrath of hungry men.

Bert was crazy about sweets, especially pies—but most especially blackberry pie.

Coal miners in those days carried their lunches and coffee in those round metal buckets that came in two sections, the coffee in the top part and the big meat sandwiches and dessert in the bottom part. The blackberry pie was always on the bottom.

Time and again Bert would wander away from his driver while waiting for a loader to top a car and find a dinner bucket or two, no matter how well hidden by their owners.

He would lift off the lid, kick over the bucket and mess up the contents considerably getting to the pie. That pie to Bert was the same as a shot of heroin to a dope addict—he couldn't resist it.

One day a member of an electrician's crew heard some unusual sound coming down an entryway. He investigated and came upon Bert and a Hungarian coal loader not too long off the boat from the old country.

The miner, tears of rage running down his cheeks and cursing the mule in his native language, was beating Bert mightily with a pick handle. The whacks resounded throughout the mine section.

With every blow Bert would shiver and look around with a self-pitying countenance and soulful eyes that asked, "Why am I being misjudged now?"

Bert didn't realize it, but his big mouth was ringed with the unmistakable juice of blackberries. Twice he had made the Hungarian go hungry, but the third time around was too much for the immigrant.

Bert did penance 3 days in the stables for that misdemeanor and America was at peace with Hungary again.

His weekend forays into town were the talk of that town.

One Saturday evening the mineowner was driving through town when a grocery store erupted, a throng of screaming customers, most of them women, running as if their lives depended on it.

Among the stumbling, frightened patrons was a large red mule, jostling people right and left and looking back at the store, his ears straight up in the air with fright.

It was Bert, and he had good reason to be scared.

Chasing him was a stout, howling butcher who owned the store. In one hand he waved a meat cleaver, in the other a butcher's knife the size of a sword from the Dark Ages.

Bert, after knocking down a few more fleeing customers, eluded the butcher bent on mulecide but later was corraled by the law and placed in his special mule cell converted from an unused one-car garage.

Bert had been minding his own business that evening, until the aroma of baked goodies wafted through the door of the grocery store and onto Main Street.

He did the natural thing by walking daintily into the store and up to the shelves where the pies and cakes were so enticingly displayed. It was not until he had chomped through a big angel food cake with white icing on it that the first lady noticed the strange customer pushing against her. She screamed, and the store was wrecked.

The police thought they knew the wanted mule. They were certain when they caught Bert looking over a fence at a pie cooling on the kitchen window sill of an unsuspecting housewife—his jowls spattered with white cake frosting.

On Monday morning, Bert was bailed out of the pokey along with a group of hung-over coal miners and everyone went back to work * * * giving out honest toil until the next payday when the miners would elude their wives and Bert would jump a fence.

Bert's colorful saga came to an end when old age overtook him on a Raleigh County farm where he spent his last days limping on a leg that had been broken by a mine car a second time.

There's a story that followed his death about a group of people who had a picnic on the very spot where Bert was buried.

They suddenly ran screaming from the field. One of the terrified people exclaimed, "The earth shook beneath us."

The owner of the farm is supposed to have investigated the remains of the picnic and remarked with a shake of his head:

"They should never have opened up that blackberry pie they had for dessert."

Syria's Plight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to insert an article entitled "Syria's Plight," which appeared in the summer 1959 issue, No. 54, of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

This particular article points up the growing deterioration in the Syrian economy since its absorption by Egypt:

SYRIA'S PLIGHT

A "ROSY" FUTURE

In February 1958 the union of Egypt and Syria was proclaimed. The announcement was marked by a profusion of optimistic commentaries and orations by Egyptian politicians and propagandists. Nasser himself described the event as "this immortal and decisive day in our history." During his 21 days' tour of Syria, on which occasion he accorded the Syrians the privilege of seeing him in person, he said: "Our belief in Arab nationalism, on which we establish the unity of Syria and Egypt, compels us to work all the time with the same conviction with which we built up the U.A.R. to achieve the aspired Arab unity of our homeland from the Atlantic Ocean to the Persian Gulf."

The establishment of the United Arab Republic may have been regarded by Nasser as the harbinger of Pan-Arabic unity, but to neighboring Arab states it appeared as a dark cloud that threatened to engulf the entire Middle East. This was undoubtedly the major motive for the creation of a counterbalance which took the form of a federation between Iraq and Jordan. Thus, there came into being alongside the United Arab Republic the so-called Arab Federation headed by the late King Faisal of Iraq.

It was not long before the mills of the Cairo propaganda machine began to grind out a steady barrage of abuse against this rival Arab state. It was depicted as a tool of Western imperialism and devoid of any future. Nasser himself denounced the Arab Federation as not only contrary to the wishes of the people but "directed by imperialist plans to disunite the Arabs." (Radio Cairo carried this commentary on the Arab Federation: "The agreement reached in Amman, which produced what they call the 'Arab Federation,' is something artificial and confused. It is not destined to survive, because it does not reflect the will of the peoples in Iraq and Jordan and their aspiration to a free Arab unity. It has been established for purely negative reasons, namely, to distract the Arab peoples in Jordan and Iraq from the attempt to get rid of the regimes there and join the United Arab Republic,

the pure and natural nucleus for total Arab unity." The very bitter attacks against the Arab Federation confirmed the fears of other Arab states that the appearance of the United Arab Republic was not a cause for rejoicing but for eternal vigilance.

It is true that the theatrical performances of Cairo's strong man greatly impressed many Syrians, but as the months rolled by, the mood began to change. Today, Cairo is profoundly disturbed lest the doubts and fears which swept the Arab world when the U.A.R. was established, may undo his handiwork in Syria. Whether Nasser sincerely believes that the U.A.R. is a viable setup, is impossible to determine. Tis public statements, of course, are imbued with optimism. During his visit to Syria commemorating the first anniversary of the U.A.R., he assured his listeners that the unity between Syria and Egypt "would continue to score victories. * * * Today after 1 year of unity between Syria and Egypt, 1 year after the establishment of the U.A.R., we feel more determined and more confident of our course toward the future."

PROTEST AND UNREST

A few days after Nasser made this optimistic forecast, several thousand citizens of the Syrian city of Homs came flocking into the streets shouting such slogans as "Down with dictators" and "Down with one man rule" (Christian Science Monitor, March 18, 1959). These highly political slogans grew out of a protest by the people of this city over the fact that on the day before a Syrian youth had been beaten to death by Nasser's security police, because he had criticized the U.A.R. leader. It is noteworthy that this incident was sufficient to generate a mass protest challenging the very power of Nasser's rule. Obviously, action of this character was not merely the result of a sudden surge of emotion. Its deeper roots will be found in Syria's sharp decline, both in wealth and in prestige, since the day that Nasser laid hands on that country. Syria's disenchantment became evident within a few months after Nasser took over. On May 1, 1958, the New York Times reported:

"The fruits of economic union with Egypt are developing a bitter taste in Syria.

"Damascus newspapers reaching Beirut record a growing protest by industrialists, business men, farmers, and labor union leaders against the attempted imposition on the former free economy in Syria of the strict controls imposed by the revolutionary council in Egypt since 1954.

"That is only the latest of a series of measures taken by the new United Arab Republic to integrate the economies of Egypt and Syria, the two regions of the new union. Syrians say privately it is an attempt by Cairo to drag Syria down to the same low standards as Egypt. * * *

"The Damascus press has not been completely indoctrinated, it would seem, although six newspapers have had to go out of business because of the withdrawal of subsidies. Syrian papers dutifully denounce the protesters as enemies of the state. But they print the protests so that all literate Syrians can read—and literacy is much higher in Syria than in Egypt—the complaints made by these enemies against restrictive state controls they had not known before."

POLITICAL CLAMPDOWN

Facts have come to light which underline the growing crisis implicit in the Times report, although the Cairo regime has tried in every possible way to conceal the truth. When the unity of both states was achieved, it was assumed that there would be political equality. However, this hope was destroyed almost at once when the key spot in the new government was given to Nasser himself. Then, Cairo became the capital of the U.A.R. at the expense of Damascus and its proud traditions. Politically, the Syrians were put into a straitjacket. Their parliament and political parties were dissolved. The top echelons in the army were purged. This was also true of the Syrian civil service. The Government of the U.A.R. became topheavy with Nasser's faithful henchmen. The very ruthlessness of the purge was in itself indicative of the fact that the Nasserites did not trust the Syrians. For this matter, it can also be said that the Syrians were not at all wedded to the idea that Cairo was especially ordained to rule over their fate. Consequently, from the political standpoint Syria has become a nonentity within the U.A.R.

Every Syrian newspaper which dared to voice an independent thought, has been closed down. Public opinion has been effectively gagged. More and more Syria looks like an occupied country.

ECONOMIC DISTRESS

The oppressive hand of Cairo has not only been felt in the political sphere, it has also weighed heavily on the economic and living standards of the Syrian people. In the first place, the union of Syria and Egypt was hardly a "natural" from the economic standpoint. The economies of both countries are to a large extent mutually competitive. The standard of living in Syria has always been higher than that of Egypt. The Egyptian economy is authoritarian while Syria's has always been based on private enterprise and freedom of commercial intercourse. In contrast to weaknesses of the Egyptian pound, Syrian money has always been "hard." From the standpoint of geography the union is an economic freak since there is no common frontier. Historically, Syrian nationalism has always had more sympathetic relations with Iraq than with Egypt. These factors have now made their impact, and the net result is that the Syrian economy is in serious trouble. The difficulties have been complicated by the fact that the Egyptians, installing themselves as the political overlords of Syria, have promulgated laws and regulations which are diametrically opposed to the needs of Syrian economy.

The dangers of Egypt's economic policies have been reflected in the declining value of the Syrian pound. Always a sensitive barometer, money exchange values are most revealing. Thus, when Cairo let it be known that the Egyptian and Syrian currencies would be unified by the summer of 1959, the Syrian pound fell form 3.60 to the dollar to 4 to the dollar. The swift reaction caused consternation in Cairo. As a result the Cairo regime tried to assuage the fears of Syrian commercial circles, but to no avail. The Syrian pound has never recovered its former strength and unemployment has increased. Indeed, it has been reported that when the union was first established, the wavering of the Syrian pound induced a substantial withdrawal of capital from Syria. It has been obvious to experts that fusion between the two currencies will inevitably result in a marked depreciation of the Syrian pound. The Wall Street Journal quoted a Damascus economist on this subject: "If and when the currencies are united, any holder of Syrian capital will be about 30 percent poorer unless things change greatly."

Syria's trade with the outside world has also been hard hit. Unlike most Arab countries, the Syrian economy is closely linked with her exports and imports. Therefore, any damage to commercial prospects must necessarily have wide economic and political repercussions. As the year 1959 ushered in, the London Financial Times, reporting from Syria, noted: "Commerce in Aleppo—Syria's largest trading center—is extremely depressed. Overshadowing the country's economic troubles is the nervousness of the business community regarding the possible consequences of the union with Egypt."

The growing stagnation in commerce was intensified by the serious drought which reduced Syria's cereal crops by 40 percent as against 1957. Indeed, instead of exporting cereals which Syria has done in the past, she was forced to import grain. However, this serious situation was aggravated by the imposition of stringent import regulations which increased prices and encouraged speculation on a grand scale. Furthermore, these import restrictions paralyzed commercial activity and tightened credit. In short, Nasser tried to solve the crisis by imposing upon the free Syrian economy the same authoritarian regulations which govern Egypt.

TRADE CRISIS

The Lebanese crisis of last year was also a powerful blow to Syria's commercial fortunes. It is generally admitted that the Nasserites played an important role in instigating outbreaks of violence against the Lebanese Government of Camille Chamoun. Lebanon has always been one of Syria's important markets and served as a vital commercial link between Syria and other parts of the world. These links were seriously disorganized during the Lebanese rebellion. The Syrian-Lebanese border was sealed, thereby impeding normal commercial exchange between the two countries.

To make matters worse, the troubles in Lebanon cut off Syria's oil supply. This provided Egypt with the opportunity to take over. With the Lebanese oil refineries no longer available, Cairo filled the breach by delivering oil to Syria by sea. This was supposed to be a temporary arrangement in view of the fact that it was highly uneconomical for Syria. However, even after peace was restored in Lebanon, Egypt continued to exercise a stranglehold on Syria's oil supplies and there is no prospect that she will ever relinquish her grip. The Lebanese newspaper Le Commerce du Levant-Beyrouth Express summed up the burdens which Syria is forced to shoulder thanks to Egypt's high-handed tactics in matters of trade: "The imposition, on Syrian trade, of the same legislation that has been applied in Egypt has struck at the very heart of Syrian commerce, namely the freedom of trade with foreign countries. The results of the import restrictions have been—

"(a) To stifle Syria's trade with foreign nations, especially with the neighboring countries, with whom Syria has always maintained regular commercial ties, since their economies are mutually complementary;

"(b) To do away wtih the competition that has always had a beneficial effect on the Syrian economy.

"Hence the current limitation of Syrian commercial activity and the decline of its purchasing power on foreign markets."

CAIRO'S EXPLOITING HAND

Cairo propaganda has tried very hard to depict Egypt as a country which opposes imperialism and exploitation. Its treatment of Syria belies these claims, for in a very real sense Syria has become the stamping ground of Cairo speculators and get-rich-quick businessmen. They have followed Nasser into Syria and are taking full advantage of his control over this country. The manner by which Egypt took advantage of Syria's need for oil during the Lebanese crisis is a case in point, but this is by no means the entire picture.

Egypt's economic difficulties have been mounting ever since Nasser came to power. This has been a decisive factor in Nasser's moves to expand his influence throughout the Middle East. Prof. Charles Issawi, an authority on the Middle East, wrote: "Nevertheless, Egypt's economic difficulties remain very acute, and an increasing number of Egyptians are looking to other Arab countries for help in solving them; their hopes are centered on finding outlets for surplus population and markets for manufactured goods and on sharing the vast oil resources accruing to other Arab countries" (Current History, February 1959).

In a similar vein John Law, writing in the U.S. News & World Report refers to the efforts of the Egyptians to exploit the economic resources of other Middle Eastern States. "Nasser," he writes, "is said to be counting on the spirit of Arab brotherhood to prompt his neighbors to buy Egyptian. If they don't, he'll be in trouble." It is against this compelling need that one can understand Nasser's drive in Syria.

To what extent Nasser can solve Egypt's problems at the expense of Syria remains to be seen. In any event, he will leave no stone unturned. He has partially abolished customs duties on Egyptian-Syrian trade. This measure, coupled with increasing prohibitions of imports from large portions of the Western World, serves two purposes: (1) it channels Syrian foreign trade to the countries of the Eastern bloc with whom Nasser is very chummy; (2) it opens up the Syrian market to Egyptian goods without the fear of outside competition. Since Syrian industry was not depending on government handouts and subsidies of one kind or another, the Egyptian industrialists have a far greater advantage. The important Syrian cotton industry was also hit hard by a discriminatory export tax. Egyptian banks and insurance companies took advantage of the union to establish themselves in the "northern region." Consequently, the total Syrian economy has come more and more under the thumb of their Egyptian "brothers."

The Lebanese newspaper referred to above, had the following to say with respect to Egypt's economic activities in Syria: "The Syrian industrialists have given expression to their fears concerning the future of their concerns in the face of Egyptian competition. It is a fact that since the tariff barriers between the two regions have been removed, the Syrian market has been swamped with Egyptian goods, to the detriment of domestic products. * * * Syrian industry cannot stand up to this competition with Egyptian industry, and it is liable to go under, in the face of this competition under unequal conditions."

It should also be noted that the Egyptian sector of the U.A.R. has grabbed the lions share of foreign aid for economic development. It has been reported that Egypt is accelerating its major scheme for economic development while Syria's 5-year plan (1956–61) has, for all intents and purposes, been placed on ice. Syria's development plans are now to be stretched over a much longer period. The respective budgets of both, Syria and Egypt, also emphasize the growing disparity between the two countries. For example, whereas military expenditures for Egypt showed a rise of about 9 percent in 1958, the Syrian increase was 67 percent. The growing military burden for Syria is reflected in the tax situation. Thus, direct taxes in Syria jumped by 43.5 percent while the level of taxes in Egypt remained unchanged.

Naturally, the Egyptians are aware that Syrians of all classes and interests are growing more resentful. Consequently, Nasser recently promised that around $84 million would be made available from Egyptian industrialization funds to help Syrian development. Commenting on these promises, an unnamed European diplomat in Cairo told the Wall Street Journal: "There certainly aren't any funds in the present U.A.R. budget for Syrian development. They may put in some figures, but that doesn't make much sense when Egypt hasn't any funds to spare."

AGRICULTURE IN A MESS

As mentioned previously, the agricultural situation in Syria borders on crisis. The agrarian reforms trumpeted by Cairo have not led to satisfactory results. On the contrary, they have created severe unrest which, in turn, has adversely affected other sectors of the Syrian economy. Chracteristic of Egypt's steamroller tactics in other fields, the land reforms instituted by Nasser disregard conditions in Syria and were patterned along Egyptian lines and requirements. The very nature of the Syrian land is such that it requires much more extensive land cultivation rather than intensive farming as practiced in Egypt. By arbitrarily breaking up the land into small parcels, Nasser has actually endangered the food supply of Syria and threatens one of Syria's most valuable exports, i.e., agricultural supluses.

OIL

The picture would not be complete without a word about oil. For Nasser oil means power and through power, empire. He has said as much in his book "Philosophy of Revolution." In an interview with the Christian Science Monitor in February 1959, Nasser discussed the strategic importance of oil "in our land." He did not define "our land" but on the basis of his other statements and writings it is safe to assume that he refers to all of the Middle East. He told the Christian Science Monitor interviewer "that the geographic position and abundance of oil has elements of strength which will be a source for our own strength."

This outlook with its threatening overtones to the West is also an important factor in his program for Syria. It is interesting to note that two separate sources thousands of miles apart have come to the same conclusion in this respect. Thus, the New York Times oil expert, J. H. Carmichael wrote: "The union of Egypt and Syria generally is considered a step aimed at consolidating the Arab world in a single political unit which would control the vast oil resources stretching from the Persian Gulf through north Africa to the Atlantic."

The well known Lebanese newspaper L'Orient declared: "Nasser's objectives are very clear: by dominating Syria he can control the Iraqi oil pipelines and through Yemen he will gradually control all the means of oil transportation, and constitute a direct threat to King Saud."

Needless to say, Nasser has lost no time in developing measures vis-a-vis Syria which would strengthen Cairo's control in the oilfield. In September 1958, the so-called General Petroleum Authority was set up, its headquarters naturally located in Cairo. Its powers are far-reaching in scope and significance. All negotiations concerning oil pipelines passing through Syria will now come within the province of G.P.A. which will also control oil imports and exports and the pricing of petroleum products. It will be the deciding factor with respect to prospecting activities, whether through the state or private concerns. It will have the right to inspect petroleum company accounts "to guarantee a state's right in respect of amounts due to it from these companies." Its word will be final and decisive on all future oil activities within the U.A.R.

In October 1958, Cairo proceeded to acquire "full control over the development of the oil resources of the Syrian region" (London Financial Times). This move means simply that the oil resources and facilities within Syria are now within the grip of President Nasser. It should be borne in mind, however, that so far as Nasser is concerned his grab of Syrian oil is but the beginning.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

From this brief survey it is clear that Nasser has managed to antagonize practically all of the classes in Syria who are now experiencing in a most concrete way his concept of "Arabdom." The plight of the Syrians has become a topic of great concern in the Middle East. The Jordanian newspaper Hawl al-Aalam wrote: "Akram al-Hourani, leader of the Socialist Renascence Party (in Syria) and UAR vice president, has shown signs of remorse recently over his part in bringing about the Syrian-Egyptian merger. He indicated, it is reported, that he would not remain silent about the intolerable state of affairs that has developed: there is no freedom, no political activity, only a police-state terror regime. It is inconceivable that Syria should pass over this situation in silence." The same newspaper reported on December 18, 1958: "Leaflets sharply attacking President Abdul Nasser were distributed on the streets of Damascus during the night. The leaflets also severely criticized the establishment of the Syrian-Egyptian union. * * * The situation in Damascus is growing tenser from day to day, because of the high cost of living as a result of the drop in the value of the Syrian pound."

Even Radio Damascus, despite the Nasser terror, was forced to admit the rumbling sounds of the volcano: "A number of skeptics have asked what have we accomplished in this first year of the union? And they demand an answer and ask you to point out the miracles that have been performed. We explain to them that in the process of unification there are no miracles, no higher power. And still they come back, with doubtful faces, and they ask: Oh, brothers of the Republic, what has union done for you?" The Lebanese newspaper L'Orient wrote:

"This union is artificial because these two countries do not have a common border. There, one is faced with an unnatural act. The Syrian economy has shown immediate signs of disintegration while the Syrian region has become a heavy burden on the Egyptian Province of the UAR. * * *The political consequences of the union are even graver than the economic ones."

Unfortunately, the growing unrest and resentment has not been presented to the Western public as fully as it might be. From time to time reports do appear. The Associated Press reported:

"Baleful signs for Gamal Abdel Nasser are beginning to appear on the troubled horizon of the Middle East but U.S. officials are taking no comfort from them.

"But Nasser is now confronted with a disenchanted and restive Syria within his own camp and a strong new Arab force outside it. * * *

"Reports are that some in Syria, unhappy over playing second fiddle in the UAR, would like to break away and join up with Iraq."

The Manchester Guardian carried a report by its Damascus correspondent dealing with the "celebrations" over the first anniversary of the establishment of the UAR. Discussing the severe economic plight of the Syrians, the Guardian correspondent wrote: "There is a certain irony in the fact that Syrians are not sure whether today is a public holiday or not. * * *

"The principal problem is how to achieve this amalgamation without bringing the Syrian standard of living down to the Egyptian."

When the UAR was established, Nasser proudly pointed to this example of unity for the whole Arab world to heed and to follow. But did Nasser marry Syria for love—or for money? From the evidence on hand it would seem that under cover of his professions of deep attachment he sought to gain Syria's resources so as to help solve Egypt's own problems of poverty. The occupation is now complete. In every department of government, even in the schools, the Egyptianizing process continues relentlessly. Historical comparisons can be misleading, but when we view the fate of Syria at the hands of Nasser, we cannot help but think of Bismarck's Prussianization of Germany.

No one can tell how long the Syrians will tolerate their present status. Certainly, they have a long and proud history of their own. They may regard the Egyptians as their brothers, but it is doubtful that they will accept indefinitely the role of vassal to Nasser. The story of Syria can have a positive ending if it is taken to heart by other Arab States which have been tempted at times to join hands with Cairo.

Baron von Steuben Day, September 17

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many men of great fame and illustrious name, born and brought up in other lands, took active part in our War of Independence and have thus endeared themselves to our people.

Names like Lafayette, Pulaski, Kosciusko, and others have become virtually household words throughout the country. The name Steuben has also attained similar well-deserved prominence. On the 229th anniversary of the birth of that gallant, gifted, and intelligent German who bore that famous name, we will pay our tribute to his blessed memory.

Baron Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben, professional soldier, distinguished military expert, and able inspector general of our Continental Army, was born near the city of Magdeburg in central Germany on September 17, 1730. He served in the Prussian Army first as regimental officer and then as staff officer. In 1761 he was promoted to the rank of captain, and 2 years later he was cited in a personal letter from Frederick the Great for his services. Thereafter he served as general staff officer at the royal headquarters and as one of the aides-de-camp to the King. It was this specific training as staff officer that later qualified Steuben to the highest post as staff officer in the Continental Army.

When he joined Washington's staff in late 1777 he brought a technical training that was unknown in either the French or the British armies at that time.

His coming to America was almost accidental. In the spring of 1777 he met a friend of Benjamin Franklin in Germany who drew his attention to our War of Independence. At once his imagination was fired; in the summer he set out for Paris with letters to Franklin and Silas Deane. When Steuben met them, he told them of his accomplishments and his rank as captain.

But to Franklin and Deane that rank did not carry sufficient prestige; it was decided to "clothe" him with a high rank. Accordingly he was given letters by Franklin, Deane, and others in which he was introduced as a lieutenant general. Armed with these letters, and accompanied by an aide-de-camp, he arrived at Portsmouth on December 1, 1777.

In February of the following year he went to York, Pa., the temporary seat of the Government. He was received there with honors by the Continental Congress. When a special committee waited upon him to ascertain his aims, he waived all claim to rank or pay and asked only for his expenses as a volunteer in the Army. Then in keeping with his lofty ideals and perfect fairness, he stated his aims and terms. If his services were to contribute to the success of the American cause, he would expect compensation for his sacrifices in leaving Europe, but if his services should not prove beneficial, he would make no claim. His services were accepted at once, and he was directed to report to Washington at Valley Forge.

From then on the career of Steuben throughout the course of the War of Independence is well known. The profound impression he made upon Washington, his immediate appointment as acting inspector general of the Army, then 2 months later to the full rank of inspector generalship with the rank of major general, his miraculous performance in the rapid military training of our forces, his distinguished role as general staff officer of Washington on the battlefield of Monmouth, and at the successful conclusion of the war his preparation, with Washington, of a plan for the future defense of this country are fully chronicled in our annals. After his honorable discharge in 1784, he became a citizen of this country. He died in New York City on November 28, 1794.

On the 229th anniversary of the birth of this great soldier of freedom we pay our tribute in honoring his noble service to our country.

Peace With Justice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which appeared in the Catholic Standard of Friday, September 11, 1959, written by His Excellency Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington. I consider Archbishop O'Boyle's communication to the parishioners of the diocese of Washington of the greatest importance and significance to the peace of this troubled world.

The letter follows:

PEACE WITH JUSTICE

DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST: You are well aware of the tremendous issues involved in the exchange of visits between the leaders of the two most powerful nations on earth. Ever since the close of the Second World War, the survival of mankind has been threatened by frightening weapons of war and by tension or open conflict.

As Catholics and Americans, we have an obligation to beg God's help for those seeking to bring about better relations between nations. Yet we would be unfaithful to our Saviour's commandment of fraternal charity if we were to accept a tenuous peace for ourselves while millions of our fellowmen are deprived of basic freedoms.

The fundamental issue in the cold war is simply this. We believe in God. We believe that every man has God-given rights. We believe that the state exists for the good of the individual. We do not believe that any individual should become a mere tool in the hands of an autocratic dictator. Believing this, we cannot and we must not forget that the present struggle between East and West concerns the personal dignity, the personal worth and the personal destiny of vast numbers of people who are now voiceless and defenseless in state-dominated servitude.

May all of us, therefore, turn in this critical hour to Our Father in Heaven and ask Him to grant us peace—but a peace based on justice for every human being. We pray for this just peace not only for America but for the enslaved millions in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Lithuania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, East Germany, Yugoslavia, North Korea, North Vietnam, China, Tibet, and in Russia. This is a long litany—but it represents untold sufferings, and we should be frequently mindful of it.

I am asking our faithful people to attend holy mass and to receive holy communion Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. Tuesday is the Feast of Our Sorrowful Mother, and on that evening mass will be celebrated in every church of the archdiocese. I ask all who can to attend this special mass, and I urge all to recite the prayer for peace and freedom after these masses and every day thereafter until God deigns to grant our prayer.

During these 3 days, we shall pray that God may enlighten our own leaders and those of other nations so that we may have an enduring peace with justice for all, true and full freedom for the captive nations and the conversion of the Russian people.

May God bless you and keep you.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

PATRICK A. O'BOYLE,
Archbishop of Washington.

Historical Values

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the real significance of historical sites has been recognized by one of the most progressive and forward looking civic organizations in this country, the Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce.

All too seldom do businessmen take time out of their busy lives to give consideration to the historical values and the beneficial effect upon future generations of the preservation of important reminders of days long past.

In Kansas City, Kans., Mr. Speaker, is the Huron Indian Cemetery, which is steeped in historical lore of the Indian of long ago. The city of Fort Scott has within its limits the site of the old fort named for Gen. Winfield Scott. The prairie or grassland in Pottawatomie County, northeast of Manhattan, is ideal for the preservation of the frontier plains viewed by early pioneers.

Mr. Speaker, included in my remarks is the resolution adopted on August 25, 1959, by the Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, of which I am proud to be a member. This resolution had the full endorsement of the historical committee of the chamber, of which Clayton Dial is the chairman.

The resolution follows:

"Whereas it is proposed to establish two national parks in Kansas—one an historic park at Fort Scott, the other a prairie or grasslands park in Pottawatomie County, northeast of Manhattan; and

"Whereas the parks would be the first national ones in Kansas—neighboring States already having one or more; and

"Whereas the Fort Scott site for the proposed historic park would preserve old structures, including a military bridge constructed in the Civil War; headquarters house erected in 1842, and now used as a museum; an original soldiers' barracks; Fort Blair, one of three original blockhouses in the State, and national cemetery No. 1; and

"Whereas the prairie or grasslands park would preserve in its natural state the flora and fauna of the virgin Kansas prairie and provide present and future generations with the priceless privilege of seeing and knowing the unique beauty of a plains area typical of that which existed in the historic and colorful days when they were seen by the first white men: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the board of directors of the Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, That it endorses these endeavors."

Adopted by the board of directors of the Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce at its regular meeting held August 25, 1959.

F. J. NASH, M.D.,
President, Kansas City, Kans., Chamber of Commerce.

Attest:

ELLSWORTH GREEN, Jr.,
Executive Manager.

Castro Regime in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following article by my friend, the Reverend Father Joseph F. Thorning, Ph. D., D.D., honorary professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a pontifical institution, and an associate editor of World Affairs, Washington, D.C.

It may be borne in mind in connection with ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico, that this individual, who was awarded the Stalin peace prize 5 years ago, has a wife who owns numerous properties, and a brother, Mr. Dámaso Cárdenas, who has also grown wealthy at the expense of the small farmers and businessmen in Mexico. In this context, one can understand the facts recorded by an eminent historian, Bishop Joseph H. L. Schlarman, who for many years studied conditions in Mexico and served as president of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference:

It is commonly known in Mexico that certain politicos like Abelard Rodriques, Lázaro Cárdenas * * * and others are owners of landholdings far in excess of the 150 hectares allowed by law.

How does this take place? Bishop Schlarman answers that—

A number of maximum landholdings are recorded in the names of relatives, or that even fictitious names are used.

The author of "Mexico: A Land of Volcanoes"—Milwaukee, the Bruce Publishing Co., 1950—on page 575, calls this technique "circumventing the law."

Bishop Schlarman continues:

Thus they can register one 150-hectare holding (known as a lote) in the name of the husband, one in the name of the wife, others in the names of the sons, etc., and by proper personal and financial influence with the Governor of the State or in Mexico City it can be arranged that these holdings are adjoining. Then, too, it is the common practice for politicos to invest their money in city property, hotels, etc. They become millionaire bankers and hotel magnates.

Obviously, this explains the popularity of so-called agrarian reform in Soviet China, Fidel Castro's Cuba, and other regimes influenced by the teachings of Karl Marx and V. I. Lenin.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1959]

CASTRO REGIME CONDEMNED—COMMUNIST FELLOW TRAVELERS AND SYMPATHIZERS SEEN IN KEY JOBS

(The writer of the following letter is associate editor of World Affairs and honorary professor of international relations in the Catholic University of Chile, a Pontifical institution.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Buried in Herbert L. Matthews' whitewash of Fidel Castro's Cuban revolution (July 16) is an admission that calls for diligent research and straightforward reporting. After denying that there are any Marxist-Leninist operators in key positions in Cuba, Mr. Matthews mentions "the much less clearly defined zone of fellow travelers, Communist sympathizers and those who are tolerant of known Communists and communism."

Is this not the very area in which the most notable damage has been done to the vital interests of the free world? It must be known to Mr. Matthews that card-carrying Communists are the least dangerous members of the international conspiracy directed by the Kremlin.

Vicente Lombardo Toledano, who recently was invited both to Moscow and Havana as a guest of honor, has given yoeman service to many Soviet policies. Although specialists on inter-American affairs do not claim that Señor Lombardo Toleando is a "Red," they recognize, with fairly complete unanimity, that his activities, "aims" and "loyalties" are those of an intelligent "fellow traveler."

A similar description may fit ex-President Lázaro Cárdenas of Mexico, who, according to the Times, is probably "the outstanding example of the radical but non-Communist public figure in Latin America" (July 28). Prior to the triumphant embrace between Premier Castro and General Cárdenas, the latter had been "guest of honor" in the U.S.S.R., in several captive nations and in Red China. Nevertheless, the Times rejoices that General Cárdenas should "openly give his blessing to the Cuban revolution."

VIEW ON COMMUNES

Readers of the Times have a right to know that, on January 30, 1959, the Mexican ex-President, an intimate friend of Lombardo Toledano, gave his "blessing" to the brutal system of "communes" in Soviet China. Only the most complacent fellow traveler would have been prepared to broadcast the following praise:

"In China there are favorable conditions for the success of the People's Comunes. Their organization, labor distribution and the distribution of goods and benefits are the result of direct decisions of the peasants and the artisans without any bureaucratic interference."

This may illustrate how "interesting and important" it was that Lázaro Cárdenas should have been a "guest of honor" in the new military dictatorship of Fidel Castro in Cuba. His "blessing" for what goes on in our good neighbor Republic should be considered in the light of his public benediction for bloody collectivization in Mao Tse-tung's Chinese Empire.

It may be noted that General Cárdenas, a "winner of the Stalin Peace Prize," undertook his travels as a vice president of the "World Peace Council." The latter organization would have little trouble in qualifying as a Soviet-front group. One wonders why good reporters in Havana did not ask Cárdenas about the "peaceful mission" of the Red Chinese in Tibet.

LAND DISTRIBUTION

It is true, as the Times emphasizes (July 28), that the work of Señor Cárdenas "in the field of land reform and his expropriation of foreign oil interests in 1938 are historic." Nevertheless, Cárdenas (Jan. 21, 1959) complained that many Mexican farmers "lacked lands."

The explanation is simple. The "same leaders who pioneered the radical distribution of lands," including former Presidents Lázaro Cárdenas and Abelardo Rodríguez, are "now among the biggest farmers in Mexico." (P. 141, "Look Southward, Uncle," by Edward Tomlinson, 1959.)

The record suggests that the editors and some correspondents of the Times can dig a little deeper for the facts and present them "without fear or favor."

(Rev. Dr.) JOSEPH F. THORNING.
FREDERICK, MD., *August 8, 1959.*

President's Veto Threatens West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, when President Eisenhower stuck the coal research bill in his pocket and let it die he was saying in effect that he intended to let West Virginia, and all other States, where coal plays a principal part in the economy "wither on the vine."

This was how the late Frank Knox described Navy strategy in the Pacific during World War II. It was successful. Unless and until we have someone in the White House who understands this problem, West Virginia will continue to "wither on the vine."

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the following joint statement released to the press by my very able and esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN M. SLACK, and me.

VETO OF THE COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BILL

(Statement by Representative C. M. BAILEY and Representative J. M. SLACK)

In the hands of the President, the veto has become a knife in the back of every West Virginian. There are no valid reasons for the President's veto action. This subject has been discussed for more than 10 years, the bill was heard extensively in committee and was fully debated in both Houses. The President's so-called reasons are foggy, generalities designed to obscure the real causes of this veto, of which there are two.

First, it would set up an independent commission, to act independently, and thereby cut into the prerogatives of an existing department which is presently doing nothing about coal problems, and probably never will. The Eisenhower administration is more inter-

ested in a system of built-in bureaucracy than in establishing a method to counteract a major economic problem. This is noticeable throughout the White House approach to much of the legislation of this Congress, such as the vetoes of the public works, housing, and rural electrification bills. Yes, this is not the first veto designed to protect bureaucrats.

Second, it shows again the whip of the monopolistic, competitive fuel industries that can be cracked over the White House. During the past months, these lobbyists have been stating openly that the coal-research bill would be killed. They boasted it would never come out of conference. However, they failed in that move. Yes; the oily tentacles extend right into the President's study at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

The veto method is worth noting, and we hope that all West Virginians will remember it. This bill passed the House by an overwhelming 251 to 54 vote, more than enough to override a veto. It had powerful bipartisan support. A veto would undoubtedly have been overridden if the Congress were still in session. This is a typically sneaky approach of the Dewey way of the GOP. It was repudiated in 1958, and will be driven from public office in 1960.

The coal industry represents the best American example of free enterprise standing alone without favor or special privilege. It asks no special favors now, only a chance to grow with the country on the basis of sound research. We will be charitable to this extent—we doubt that Mr. Eisenhower reads the bills he vetoes, or if he does, understands them. Before attempting to lecture his Soviet visitor on the virtues of representative democracy, it might be wise for General Eisenhower to learn the full responsibility of the job he now holds, and he might begin by studying the affairs of the Congress instead of listening to a few pet advisers whose loyalty is confined to special pressure groups.

We intend to reintroduce a new coal-research bill in the first minute of the first day of the second session of the 86th Congress, and to press for immediate action.

Citizenship Day, September 17, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, if any single day in our history may be considered of premier significance, that day is September 17, 1787. It was on this date that the greatest political document ever penned by man was signed.

But the Constitution was so much more than a legal charter. It was, and forever remains, both a testament to inalienable human rights and a challenge to civic maturity. It guarantees basic freedoms and demands fulfillment of equally basic responsibilities. It is, in short, the ultimate arbiter of every American's rights and duties as a citizen.

That the Constitution is our primer of citizenship is officially manifest not only by the designation of September 17 as Citizenship Day, but also in the establishment of Constitution Week, which has been observed every year since 1955 during the period September 17 through September 23. The significance of Citizenship Day, however, has in no sense been lessened. It is still celebrated for its own intrinsic importance; but it also heralds a full week of commemoration of a heritage that is unique in all recorded history.

Although the objective student must admit that our fundamental body of law—the Constitution—is not a perfect instrument, he must at the same time treat with contempt the detractors of the men who labored far better than they knew that hot summer in Philadelphia so long ago. Despite fantastic developments in every field of human endeavor, as well as in social relationships, the Constitution, with its incredible elasticity, promises to serve so long as the United States exists as the greatest bulwark of our people's liberty and welfare. One of the more impressive testimonials to the wonderous wisdom and foresight of the Fathers is the fact that the Constitution contains only 22 amendments. True, it does not lend itself readily to amendment; but the fact remains that the people could have forced the adoption of innumerable amendments had they not been convinced through the years of the essential worth and permanence of the work performed by the delegates to the Philadelphia convention.

By setting up a Government of limited powers the Constitution recognizes the natural rights of the individual. All rights that he retains and does not delegate to Government, either State or National, constitute his natural, God-given rights; these are the liberties that a man must enjoy if he is to be a responsible human being. The Constitution recognizes the citizen's right to such freedoms, but it did not create them. They are part of every man's nature and can neither be given nor taken away by any government. The Constitution adds security to these rights by proscribing any infringement upon them by either the Congress or the States. This is the glory of the Constitution.

But if government by the people is to remain the world's most startling success story, more is required than a legal system that guarantees citizens the right to act with responsibility and wisdom. The people must forever exercise that right. They must forever recognize that the term "right" and "duty" cannot be separated in any context of citizenship; that one term suggests the other; and that for every right there is a corresponding duty. Our freedoms were not cheaply won; and they cannot be cheaply preserved.

The Late Honorable Thomas A. Burke

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join other Members of the House of Representatives in paying tribute to our former colleague, the Honorable Thomas A. Burke, who represented the Ninth Ohio District in the 81st Congress.

I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with Tom Burke on the House Committee on Education and Labor. No matter what the political affiliation of the men with whom he came in contact, he respected their opinions and their right to full expression of their views. He was a kindly and courteous man, and Members on both sides of the aisle were sorry when he was not returned to the 82d Congress.

To his family and many friends I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

The Things Which Divide Us Are Very Small and Unimportant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include an article by Miss Sally Sue Witten entitled "The Things Which Divide Us Are Very Small and Unimportant," which will be published in the Pilot Log for October 1959.

Miss Witten was a member of the American delegation to the Atlantic Congress and her article is an interesting summary of the background and proceedings of the Congress.

The article follows:

THE THINGS WHICH DIVIDE US ARE VERY SMALL AND UNIMPORTANT

The Atlantic Congress held in London, England, June 5 to 10, 1959, was a gathering of 650 representatives of the 15 countries which belong to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Queen Elizabeth effectively enunciated the broad scope of the Congress by saying in her address at the opening session: "The Atlantic Community is not an exclusive club, but itself belongs to that wider brotherhood which comprises all men of good will. * * * Two elements have long been the main principles of enlightened European thought and action: respect for the freedom of the individual and the dignity of human nature and a simple faith in God. These principles show more clearly than anything else that the things which divide us are very small and unimportant compared to the things which unite us."

The proposal to hold the Atlantic Congress as a major event during the 10th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was made by the Parliamentarians Conference of NATO. The Parliamentarians decided that delegates invited to attend should include not only members of parliaments and legislative bodies but a preponderance of private leading citizens broadly representative of labor, industry, education, science, the military and other walks of life.

The United Kingdom's Hospitality Committee's pleasant plans for social activities eradicated whatever remained of the myth of British "reserve." The Lord Mayor of London entertained us at Guildhall. Although Mr. Selwyn Lloyd was not able to come home from Greece to attend, the Foreign Secretary was host, in absentia, to a reception at Lancaster House. There was a thrilling special midnight performance of

"My Fair Lady" at Theater Royal, Drury Lane. Ambassador and Mrs. Jock Whitney graciously entertained American delegates at their home.

With dedication to the principles of freedom and dignity for all peoples, delegates to the Atlantic Congress set to work to discuss what NATO might do during the next 10 years to further the application of these principles to the problems of facing the NATO countries in their relations with each other, with other free and uncommitted countries, and with the Soviet bloc. Communist news agencies, as usual, could not comprehend that Allied countries which differ on comparatively minor issues (e.g., the difference between the United States and France on the control of atomic warheads) can unite and work together in the ultimate objective of freedom for the entire world.

The American delegation had 130 members because it is the largest country of the alliance in population. Nineteen American delegates were women. The American delegation was chaired by Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America. Cochairmen were Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator JACOB JAVITS, and Congressman WAYNE L. HAYS.

Delegates took note of the fact that NATO as a military alliance has preserved peace in Europe. Not 1 inch of European soil has come under Soviet domination in the 10 years of NATO's existence. While continued emphasis must be placed upon military strength as a deterrent to Soviet aggression, the Congress declared that the time is ripe for NATO countries to build an Atlantic Community with responsibilities extending to political, economic, social, and scientific fields. Considerable emphasis was placed upon the need to help the less developed countries help themselves.

One of the threads which wove through all discussions was the fact that free nations must profess and practice with fervor and enthusiasm the high ideals to which they are dedicated. It is so easy to be complacently lulled by the ideological concepts of communism, and to forget that it is only by totalitarian efforts and the cruelest forms of human indignities that they have been able to make the advances that they have made. Are we more dedicated to materialism than to freedom?

Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University in Washington, D.C., in an eloquent address to the Congress focused attention on our need to be motivated in our decisions in international politics by the highest standards of justice, decency, and dignity. With respect to foreign-aid programs, he said we have got to go to underdeveloped countries and say, "We have come to you not to offer you aid for the sake of your military helpfulness, not to offer you economic assistance as people put a halter on a bag of oats before a mule's mouth in order that, while you are eating the oats, we may lead you upon a pathway to take up a load which otherwise, of your own free will, you would not take, but to offer men this program purely in order that they may be free in the same sense that we are free."

The Atlantic Congress was not an "action" body. It was a forum. It could not legislate and it could not order anything to be done. Its reports recommend such action as more frequent consultation among member states; improved military structure; closer economic integration; establishment of a Studies Center for the Atlantic Community to serve as a clearinghouse and an intellectual focus; and specific measures for the purpose of diffusing throughout the world basic information which will help people assess and understand more clearly the ideological aggression of totalitarian communism and to better appreciate the true value of liberty. Its reports will receive consideration by the Parliamentarian's Conference and other NATO bodies.

The major results of the Atlantic Congress will come because its delegates returned home with increased understanding and renewed enthusiasm for achieving solutions to world problems which are just and righteous. "The things which divide us are very small and unimportant." In spite of differences among the free NATO nations on amounts of appropriations, control of atomic arms, location of military bases and other matters, the uniting force of belief in freedom and faith in God is strong indeed.

The great force, which Pilot Clubs and individual Pilots have, can play an important role in preserving the basic concepts of freedom. We recognize the importance of keeping ourselves informed and participating actively in the many ways that informed citizens can use to assure our governmental bodies that public opinion wants their decisions here and abroad to be made in view of the highest principles of freedom and human dignity. Possibly even more important, Pilot Clubs in every community can give support to organizations and institutions dedicated to educating the youth of America in the traditions and concepts of freedom and liberty in order to be assured that tomorrow's leaders will be guided by the best standards of justice and belief in the worth of the individual.

An Indian Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, for years citizens of Kansas City, Kans., and the entire Midwest have striven to preserve a little plot of ground in which numerous members of the Wyandot Indian Tribe are buried. Not only is Huron Indian Cemetery of great historic value for this reason but the many fights and legal encounters which have prevented its destruction add to its historical significance.

In the center of Kansas City, Kans., this ancient burial ground is situated between the famous Truman Library and the Agricultural Hall of Fame, and if assurance can once be given that the graves will not be disturbed the city of Kansas City, Kans., would beautify and improve the site.

One of the leaders in the civic effort to have the cemetery designated a national shrine is a Kansas author, Mrs. Wilma Himes Kollman. In the Quindaro Query of August 28, 1959, an article written by Mrs. Kollman appears. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article, as follows:

HURON CEMETERY

(By Wilma Himes Kollman)

Fate, in her avarice, is having a wonderful time with the Huron Cemetery issue; for over 60 years she has laughingly played one side against the other. Chuckling with glee, when a hardy soul masters her for a short time, she turns her tricks against her masters as she did the Conley sisters.

Undoubtedly she was somewhat taken aback when, in the latest melee, the entire city responded led by two capable leaders, elected of the people: Mayor Paul F. Mitchum and Representative NEWELL A. GEORGE.

Representative GEORGE inherited this complicated problem created by his predecessor, Errett Scrivner. One of his first acts in office was to introduce bills nullifying the 1956 congressional actions that legalized the sale of the only historical heritage we have.

The Interior Department recommended that Mr. GEORGE's bills not be considered.

Countering this blow, Mr. GEORGE asked for a committee hearing to determine the worthiness of his bills and cited the unkept promise of the Interior Department to hold a hearing for this purpose within Kansas City, Kans.

The hearing was granted, and a subcommittee of five men was appointed for this purpose. The joker fate laughingly slipped into the action at this point was that one of the committeemen appointed was ED EDMONDSON, Congressman from Oklahoma, representing the very district whose people are urging the sale of this property.

A 2-hour hearing was set for May 18 in Washington, D.C. A delegation of 12 people from Kansas City, Kans., led by Mayor Mitchum went to Washington to testify for the preservation of this historic ground. Mrs. Ferner from Pennsylvania, one of the descendents, also went. Nine of us were not allowed to testify due to the intervention of Mr. Scrivner who took up our time. These 2 hours were more or less a farce as far as ascertaining the historical value of this land was concerned.

Mr. GEORGE arranged for a continuation of the hearing to be held here on June 27.

Four of the five committeemen arrived and all testified who wished to do so at the hearing. Mr. EDMONDSON of Oklahoma did not come, but sent a letter stating he was opposed to Mr. GEORGE'S bills.

No decision has been released by this committee and when the latter part of July arrived, and the sale was apparently proceeding as though there was not to be either a decision or congressional action upon this issue. Bids were asked for and received on both the grounds and for the removal of the bodies.

Two law suits were instituted against the Interior Department, and the Oklahomans known as the Wyandotte Tribe asking for a restraint against the transfer of property and removal of bodies. The suits were filed by the city and five of the descendents of those buried there. The restraining order was granted.

August 1, the deadline as far as the 1956 law was concerned, and fate laughed aloud—all bids received for the property proved beyond doubt the people of Oklahoma had been misled as to the monetary value of the land; it was far below what was expected. While the bids for the removal of the graves was far higher than anticipated. The Interior Department acting on behalf of the Oklahomans refused all bids.

It was interesting to note that not one bid for either of these projects was submitted from a Kansan.

Reliable information from the Capitol states that the reason no decision was handed down by the committee, was that all four who held the hearing were in favor of the preservation, while Mr. EDMONDSON, from Oklahoma, who did not come is against. The law requires a unanimous decision from these committees; therefore further legislation on Mr. GEORGE'S bill is impossible.

A trusteeship is now being prepared, to which the Interior Department will turn over the property and end all negotiations with the so-called "Wyandottes" of Oklahoma.

On August 10 Representative GEORGE introduced another bill to have the Wyandot Burial Ground declared a national historic site. If he is successful, we will have more time to figure how to preserve this permanently. We wish him luck.

Distributing the Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gerald W. Johnson which appeared in the New Republic magazine of September 7, 1959.

DISTRIBUTING THE LOSS
(By Gerald W. Johnson)

You can't buy a war on credit. This harsh fact of life is distasteful not only to politicians of all parties, but to financial manipulators, promoters, and advertising men of all sorts. Nevertheless it is a fact that in war the food is consumed, the fuels are burned, the steel is splintered or sunk in the ocean, and the men are killed then and there, not at some future date. All the so-called borrowing is simply a bookkeeping arrangement that may, or may not assist the more or less equitable distribution of the loss.

So much is apparent even to a superficial observer. What escapes him is the logic of pretending that evidences of indebtedness created by war are real wealth, or anything but phony money whose existence operates, under Gresham's law, to drive out the good.

Of the total national debt of the United States, now approaching $300 billion, fully five-sixths were contracted for the purpose of waging two major wars and one minor one. Possibly one-sixth was spent for schools, housing, roads, dams and other tangible values, and is therefore the kind of debt that an industry incurs for plant expansion. To the extent that it is wisely spent, such borrowing increases, rather than diminishes, the debtor's wealth. But borrowed money spent for war is gone forever, and the Nation is poorer, not richer.

Yet if that is true all the gabble that fills the air about preventing inflation, whether by the President, by Congress, by the steel companies or by the unions, is about as relevant to our present predicament as would be eloquent promises to prevent the battle of Gettysburg. The thing has happened, and you can't prevent what has already happened.

It must be admitted that it is poor politics to assert that the United States emerged from the latest war poorer than it went in. It is poor politics because the issue then becomes one of distributing the loss with some approximation of equity, and the politician whose policy is chefly concerned with distributing losses is a gone gander. It is unreasonable to expect it of Mr. Eisenhower. It is equally unreasonable to expect it of the Democratic Congress. And to expect both to agree on the adoption of such a policy would be sheer lunacy.

For the only means of distributing a national loss with some semblance of justice is ruthless taxation continued until the liquidation of the phony wealth represented by securities resting on no tangible value. In 1946 we adopted that policy and in 3 years reduced the national debt from $252 billion to $216 billion; but then Korea exploded and by the time that was settled Eisenhower was in, with his dream of balancing the budget and reducing taxes at the same time. He did reduce taxes by some $7 billion a year; but what happened to the budget is too painful to contemplate.

When the cost of living stands at the highest point in history and creeps up a bit month by month, inflation is already here, and the pertinent question is how to reduce it. One sure method is to let it go until the strain becomes intolerable and a buyers' strike inaugurates a depression that will wring the water out of the bloated economy. We went through that after 1929 and the idea of a repeat performance is too appalling to entertain.

But what alternative is offered? Mr. Eisenhower's program of cutting off all expenditures, even those that promise a handsome return on investment, is simply warmed-over Hooverism, and we know what that led to. As for the opposition, its titular leaders are too deeply involved with oil and segregation to command any great confidence; and no other voice can speak with authority.

The national debt of the United States is excessive, not because of its size, which is less than a single year's national income, but because so great a proportion of it rests upon no tangible value, but is a historical accident in the sense of Gibbon's definition of history—"the crimes, follies, and misfortunes of mankind."

This century's three wars have been paid for, but a rational distribution of the loss has not been seriously attempted—or not since Truman's abortive effort. As long as that state of affairs continues the economy lies under a constant threat; but it will continue until our leaders summon up the desperate courage to face the fact and apply the harsh remedy.

Perhaps it is too much to hope; but surely it is not too much to ask them to refrain from statements that are no more than rehash of the utterances of Hoover and Mellon in 1928, when we had reached a permanent level of prosperity and were within sight of the day when poverty shall be banished from this Nation. Wisdom they may be unable to supply; but surely they can refrain from again crooning to us the lullabies of Sweet-singer Coolidge.

Address of Petras Dauzvardis, Consul of Lithuania, at Lithuanian Youth Center, Chicago, Ill., September 13, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following address delivered by the Honorable Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania, a resident of my congressional district, given before the Lithuanian Freedom Rally at the Lithuanian Youth Center in Chicago, Ill., on Sunday, September 13, 1959:

ADDRESS OF PETRAS DAUZVARDIS, CONSUL OF LITHUANIA, AT FREEDOM RALLY SPONSORED BY THE CHICAGO LITHUANIAN COUNCIL, SEPTEMBER 13, 1959

My duty at this meeting of the Chicago Lithuanian Council is to present the case of Lithuania which contradicts and vitiates the allegations and claims of the Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev, chief of the occupational regime of Lithuania, made in an article in the October issue of Foreign Affairs.

In explaining the slogan of "peaceful coexistence," among other things, Mr. Khrushchev states the following:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence in its simplest expression signifies the repudiation of war as a means of solving controversial issues. It presupposes an obligation on the part of all states to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty in any form and under any pretext whatsoever.

"The principle of peaceful coexistence signifies a renunciation of interference in the internal affairs of other countries with the object of altering their system of government or mode of life or for any other motives.

"We always have stood and we stand today for noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries."

Is it so? Let us look at the record, as Al Smith used to say:

Lithuania and Soviet Russia concluded a treaty of peace on July 12, 1920, whereby Russia recognized without any reservation the sovereignty and independence of the State of Lithuania and renounced for all time all sovereign rights over Lithuania's people and territory.

The peace treaty was followed by a nonaggression pact, signed on September 28, 1926, which stated: "The Republic of Lithuania and the U.S.S.R. mutually undertake to respect in all circumstances the sovereignty and territorial integrity and inviolability of each other. Each of the contracting parties undertake to refrain from any aggressive action whatsoever against the other party."

In addition to this nonaggression pact, on July 5, 1933, Lithuania and the Soviet Union signed a convention for the definition of aggressor. It defined an aggressor thusly: "An aggressor * * * shall be * * * that state which first commits any one of the following acts:

"1. Declares war against another state.

"2. Invades by its armed forces, even without a declaration of war, the territory of another state.

"3. Attacks by its land, naval, or air forces, even without a declaration of war, the territory of another state.

"4. No considerations of a political, military, economic, or any other nature shall serve as an excuse or justification for aggression as specified in the foregoing articles."

The last bilateral treaty between Lithuania and the Soviet Union was the mutual assistance pact signed on October 10, 1939. This document was and is an example of Soviet duplicity and treachery. The pact solemnly reaffirmed the treaties of peace and nonaggression, reiterated the pledge of peaceful solution of differences, provided for mutual assistance and friendship, denounced participation in any alliance or coalition directed against one another, and stated that "the realization of the treaty must not infringe the sovereign rights of the contracting parties, especially the structure of their state, their economic and social systems, military instruments, and altogether the principle of nonintervention of one state in the internal affairs of the other state."

Presenting this pact to the Supreme Soviet for ratification October 31, 1939, Minister of Foreign Affairs Molotov solemnly and publicly proclaimed: "This treaty stipulates the inviolability of the sovereignty of the signatory states and the principle of nonintervention in each other's internal affairs. * * * We stand for scrupulous observance of treaties and declare that all nonsense about sovietizing the Baltic countries (Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia) is only to the interest of our enemies and of all anti-Soviet provocateurs."

If we compare the texts of the Soviet-Lithuanian treaties and Molotov's declaration with the text of the quoted excerpts from the article by Soviet Premier Khrushchev, we will find that they are similar in substance and even in the wording. They denounce war and aggression, proclaim respect for sovereign rights and territorial integrity and inviolability of the principle of noninter-

vention in another state's internal affairs; in other words, peaceful coexistence.

Now, how do these words by Soviet leaders compare with their actions?

As we observed before, Lithuania and the Soviet Union had all the treaties and pacts necessary for peaceful and friendly coexistence. Lithuania could not be and never was dangerous to the Soviet Union. She accepted the terms of the Soviet-proposed mutual assistance pact which permitted the U.S.S.R. to establish military bases on Lithuania's territory. The treaty prohibited the contracting parties from entering into an alliance or coalition with any third party directed against one of them. Lithuania abided strictly by the terms of the treaty and her pledges.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, broke her pledges even while concluding the mutual assistance pact and was acting in bad faith and with malicious intent. This is proven by the fact that 12 days earlier, on September 28, 1939, she had signed a secret agreement with Nazi Germany to divide Lithuania between them, viz:

"SECRET SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

"The undersigned plenipotentiaries declare the agreement of the Government of the German Reich and the Government of the U.S.S.R. upon the following:

"The secret supplementary protocol signed on August 23, 1939, shall be amended in item 1 to the effect that the territory of the Lithuanian state falls to the sphere of influence of the U.S.S.R., while, on the other hand, the Province of Lublin, and parts of the Province of Warsaw fall to the sphere of influence of Germany (cf. the map attached to the boundary and friendship treaty signed today). As soon as the Government of the U.S.S.R. shall take special measures on Lithuanian territory to protect its interests, the present German-Lithuanian border, for the purpose of a natural and simple boundary delineation, shall be rectified in such a way that the Lithuanian territory situated to the southwest of the line marked on the attached map shall fall to Germany.

"For the Government of the German Third Reich:

"J. v. RIBBENTROP.

"By authority of the Government of the U.S.S.R.:

"V. MOLOTOV.

"Moscow, *September 28, 1939.*"

This dastardly agreement was executed by the Soviet Union in June 1940 by the forcible seizure and occupation of Lithuania, in direct contradiction of Khrushchev's bragging, and in flagrant violation of treaties, sovereign rights, and territorial integrity, and by disruption of Lithuania's political, economic, and social system and military instruments, the inviolability of all which were so eloquently pledged in the mutual assistance pact and the declarations by Premier Stalin and Foreign Minister Molotov.

In view of the fact that Lithuania was forcibly seized and is still occupied by the forces of the Soviet Union, either Stalin and Molotov both told premeditated untruths in 1939 or Khrushchev is telling the same untruth in 1959.

In his article in Foreign Affairs Khrushchev says: "We always have stood and we stand today for noninterference in the internal affairs of other countries." So what have they done, and what are they doing today in Lithuania?

Or again, Khrushchev says: "We always abided, and we shall abide, by these positions." Does Khrushchev mean by this statement that he will follow the policy of Stalin and Molotov: to say one thing and do the opposite? Or does he mean that he will right the wrongs done by Stalin and Molotov, that he will restore sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania and the other Soviet-enslaved countries and reestablish normal relations with them, based on law and respect for sovereign rights and territorial integrity and inviolability?

As long as the Soviets continue to illegally occupy Lithuania and the other countries forcibly seized by them, they will remain aggressors, violators of treaties and international law, enemies of peace and humanity.

From the day of the Soviet seizure of Lithuania, Lithuanians have demanded, now demand, will not cease demanding that the Soviets withdraw their occupation troops, police, agents, and colonists from Lithuania; that the Soviets return to Lithuania all the Lithuanian deportees and draftees in Soviet military service; and that the Soviets abide by the United Nations declaration and the Soviet-Lithuanian peace treaty, and restore sovereign rights and self-government to Lithuania of which she was forcibly deprived by the Soviet Union.

Iraq—Oil—Egypt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include herein an article which appeared in the summer issue—No. 54—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc.

The article is entitled "Iraq—Oil—Egypt" and deals with Nasser's intrigues and ambitions to lay hands on Iraq and thus acquire strategic oil deposits.

The article follows:

IRAQ—OIL—EGYPT

In analyzing the Iraqi coup of July 1958 we observed that the politics of the Middle East could be compared to a "bucket of worms." Developments since then, particularly as they relate to Iraq's domestic and foreign affairs, serve to reemphasize the bewildering maze of crosscurrents and contradictions.

Iraqi politics is in a state of flux. Some of the contending forces have receded temporarily while other elements have emerged on top. Since the final outcome of these conflicts cannot be predicted at this stage, Western policymakers should proceed with caution. Too often in the past has Western policy been based on an oversimplification of the issues in the Middle East. This has resulted in serious setbacks for the Western cause. Now, Iraq becomes a major test case with respect to our ability to act with maturity.

THE GERMAN FACTOR

In our previous article on Iraq we dwelt at length on the German factor, without minimizing other influences at work including the agents of Moscow and Cairo. We did so because so little had been reported in the Western press with regard to the age-old ambitions of German imperialism in the Middle East and its resurgent activities in the postwar period. Though the remainder of this article will be devoted to the latest turn of events, we should like to recapitulate briefly some of the essential facts concerning German interests in the Middle East.

The crushing of at least several rebellions against the Kassem regime has undermined, for the time being, the pro-German as well as the pro-Nasser elements in Iraq. Whether this simultaneous decline is coincidental remains to be determined. In any event, pro-Germans and the Nasserites no longer possess the influence they had shortly after King Faisal was brutally murdered.

A number of key participants in the revolt of 1958 had close ties with the Germans during World War II. They became prominent members of the Kassem regime. It now appears that practically all of them have been ousted from positions of influence. A rather dramatic example is the case of Rashid Ali Al-Kilani. Rashid Ali was the ringleader of a pro-Nazi revolt in Iraq during the most difficult days in World War II. After the Allied victory, Rashid Ali fled and ultimately wound up as an honored guest of Cairo.

When King Faisal was overthrown, Rashid Ali picked up his bag and proceeded toward home, counting on his former reputation to take over the reins of government. Nasser himself went out of his way to encourage Rashid Ali's return. It is interesting to note that just prior to his arrival in Baghdad, Rashid Ali was given a state dinner by Nasser. On this occasion Rashid Ali was hailed as the natural leader of the Iraqi people and Cairo newspapers freely predicted that he would be elected president of Iraq. Today, Rashid Ali is in jail having been convicted of plotting the overthrow of the Kassem government.

MOSUL OIL

The decline of the German influence should not be regarded as final. It would be naive to believe that German agents, masked as patriots, will not seize the opportunity to reach for power. In March 1958, the revolt in the Mosul area took place under the leadership of Col. Abdel Wahab Shawaf. The Mosul area, of course, contains some of the largest oil deposits in the Middle East. However, it is not generally known that since 1956 the Germans have been making intensive explorations of a 5,800-square-mile petroleum development concession in northeast Syria. One of the chief German geologists for the German oil company, Deutsche Erdöl A.G., bragged that this concession was just across the border from the oilfields in Mosul which were producing 1 million tons of oil annually.

As noted in our previous article, the Germans have had an eye on the Iraqi oilfields since before World War II. They are now very pleased with the concession arrangements in northeast Syria and the cooperation of the United Arab Republic. Thus, the giant Mannesmann tube manufacturing concern has been conducting negotiations with Cairo for the building of a pipeline from the Syrian oilfields to the Mediterranean. Deals of this sort have great promise and would even be more attractive if the Government of Iraq were friendlier to Cairo. Consequently, the establishment of a pro-Nasser government in Irak could open up great possibilities for the Germans in the Mosul area and thus tie in with their concessions just across the Syrian border. It has even been reported that Bonn has been prodding the United States to be nice to Nasser. Whatever the outcome, the fact remains that the Germans and their agents are a force to be reckoned within the complicated struggle now raging in the Middle East.

REDS IN IRAQ

Currently, the Communist influence in Iraq has grown considerably and it is a danger that cannot be ignored. The extent of Communist influence in the Iraqi Government has been widely discussed in the press. There have been some very spectacular claims made to the effect that for all intents and purposes Iraq has become a satellite of Moscow. On the other hand, there are those who say that the new Iraqi Government wants to be neutral and will gradually develop democratic institutions. As is always

the case, extreme evaluations are wide of the mark.

It is our considered judgment based on a careful evaluation of information available to us, that the Iraqi government is not Communist but that the Communists do wield considerable influence, particularly in mass organizations and in the streets of the large towns. Of course, things can change very rapidly in one direction or another, but at this writing the situation does not warrant the conclusion that all is lost. A New York Times correspondent, writing from the Middle East, points out that many of the reports which tell of alleged Communist domination of the Kassem regime, emanate "first in Cairo and Damascus newspapers, which are not known for reliability when embarked on a major political campaign." The reporter cites a number of instances where the Cairo propaganda machine deliberately falsified information so as to paint the color red on the Kassem government. Needless to say, Cairo has been furious over Kassem's defiance and especially his success in beating down efforts to overturn his government. Having been thwarted in the field of coups and assassination plots (specialties of the Nasserites), the Cairo government has launched a massive campaign to prove to the world and in particular to the United States, that Kassem is a Moscow stooge.

We hold no brief for the Kassem regime which came to power through a bloody coup. However, prudence dictates that Western policymakers stay clear of Nasser's maneuverings. Nasser's campaign against the Iraqi government may be embellished with anti-Communist slogans, but there is more to it. The New York Times diplomatic correspondent, Dana Adams Schmidt, wrote: "The U.A.R. leaders have raised the cry of 'Communist' in Iraq partly as cover for the fulfillment of their own ambitions. They seem to want to create a situation similar to the one that preceded Egypt's takeover in Syria—a situation in which President Nasser would save Iraq from the Communists."

On May 2, 1958, the prominent Egyptian writer, Fikri Ebadha, wrote in the newspaper Al-Musawar: "Cairo in the international political dictionary means that it is the capital of an Arab nation which sooner or later will include 80 million people. Cairo is the capital of oil, right, left, east, and west." The former Foreign Minister of Iraq, Mohammed Fadhel Jamali (now in jail under the Kassem regime), warned the U.N. Security Council in June 1958 that Egypt was out to dominate all the Arab lands and "to control Middle East oil." Oil ranks high in Nasser's calculations and is a decisive motivating force in his present campaign to do away with Kassem.

OIL HUNGRY EGYPT

The drive to dominate the oil of the Middle East is an intrinsic part of Nasser's dream as outlined in his book "The Philosophy of Revolution." As the country which aspires to become the center of the Arab world, Egypt has few natural resources. It is precisely this contradiction which Nasser has sworn to solve by hook or by crook. Thus, he has been working with all his might to grab the oil of Kuwait. This valuable area produces an income of $300 million per year from oil. Nasser would like to lay his hands on these riches. By the same token he has sought to grab control of all of the oil pipelines in the Middle East. If these pipelines were in his hands, another source of important reveneus would be available to him. Nasser's desperate efforts to grab the oil revenues of the Middle East is indicated by the following episode which also sheds light on his present feud with Kassem:

In December 1958 Nasser wrote a letter to Kassem asking him for a loan of 10 million dinars from Iraqi oil revenues. Kassem refused. He notified Nasser that all of the oil revenues were allocated to improve and develop the Iraqi economy. Having failed in his bid to get funds from Iraq, Nasser turned to the ruler of Kuwait. He sent a sharp letter to Sheikh as-Sabah threatening to bring about a coup in Kuwait if the sheikh refused to aid Egypt by giving 10 million pounds from Kuwait's oil revenues. The threats worked. The sheikh hastened to Egypt where he met Nasser and agreed to loan him the money.

In a sense one must give credit to Nasser's ingenuity. Although Egypt has hardly any oil of its own, Nasser acts as though it were the biggest oil producer in the Middle East. It is astonishing how he has been able to get away with it. Thus, it was Cairo which recently organized the so-called Arab oil conference. Oil producing countries were invited to participate and to discuss ways and means of improving their position so far as oil revenues were concerned. The conference was not only organized by Egypt, it was held in Cairo under the chairmanship of an Egyptian.

The Egyptians have also set up the so-called oil studies institute where they plan to train Arabs to run the oil industry. It has been estimated by a noted American economist after visiting Egypt "that within 5 years the Egyptians would be technically capable of taking over all the oil installations in the Middle East and running them themselves" (the New Statesman). While some may regard this as exaggerated, the fact to bear in mind is that the Egyptions are building up a huge oil apparatus althought their indigenous oil supplies are meager. Obviously, the Egyptians must be preparing for the future. This is made clear by the Middle East Economist, published in Cairo. Discussing the significance of the Cairo sponsored oil conference, this publication calls for a refining revolution in the Arab world before the market is completely taken up as a result of more and more refineries built in Europe. Observing that some western companies are reluctant to invest in oil refineries in the Middle East because of unstable political conditions, the magazine warns: "But it should be realized that the question of refining cannot make any difference from the political viewpoint. The crude oil is already in Arab hands and political factors could stop its export at source" (London Financial Times). Obviously, this threat requires little elucidation and is an accurate reflection of the ultimate aims of the Nasser regime.

NASSER'S PET PROJECTS

Cairo efforts to grab the oil resources of the Middle East under the banner of all for one and one for all is part of Nasser's overall plan to exploit the Middle East. Cairo has cooked up a number of schemes to accomplish this objective. One of Nasser's pet projects is the creation of a so-called development fund which would be dedicated to the improvement of the economic conditions of all of the Arab countries. As conceived by Cairo, the organization of this fund would be located in the Egyptian capital and the UAR would garner 50 percent voting control over the fund's use. There is nothing altruistic in this plan. As observed by the Christian Science Monitor specialist on the Middle East, "the UAR would stand to benefit most from the use of the funds." The fund idea has had tough going because of the reluctance of Iraq to participate. However Cairo has succeeded in establishing what is now called the Arab Development Bank. This bank is supposed to help members of the Arab League and its capital will consist of contributions from the Arab countries. Here again Cairo dominates the setup. Most of the key personnel of the bank will be Egyptian and the headquarters will be located in Cairo. Moreover, the United Arab Republic will be the controlling shareholder of the institution. It is even contemplated that the World Bank will participate with the Arab Bank in certain development schemes. Should this materialize, then we will have the rather ironical spectacle of the Western democracies, including the United States of America, subsidizing the Nasser government which is dedicated to the destruction of Western interests in the Middle East.

A third project dreamt up by Cairo is the creation of a so-called Arab common market. Egyptian Undersecretary of State Youssef Barsoum contends that the common market has come to be a vital necessity for the preservation of Arab economic interests. This noble sentiment was reduced to its real terms in a report published in the New York Times: "The principal exponent of the common market is the United Arab Republic. It now is in the early stages of an industrial revolution and would stand to profit most from the elimination of customs and other barriers to unrestricted movements of capital goods and services." The common market idea, the Arab Bank and the Arab Fund have a common denominator, i.e., the exploitation of the resources of the Middle East in order to build up an empire under Nasser's domination."

IRAQ WON'T COOPERATE

It is precisely at this juncture that Nasser is confronted by the resistance of the Iraqis. By refusing to cooperate in any of these projects, Iraq has put a damper on Nasser's ambitions. Needless to say, this has infuriated Egypt's strong man, since it slows down his timetable of conquest and indeed endangers the whole structure upon which he hopes to build his power. Thus, the clash between Iraq and Cairo goes much deeper than indicated by newspaper headlines. It is a conflict which stems from Nasser's unabated drive to absorb all of the Middle Eastern States. When he speaks to Western audiences he is careful to deny such ambitions. For example, in an interview over the BBC Nasser said that the unity of the Arab states "should be formed with the will and approval of the peoples of these countries, unanimous will and approval and not majority will and approval." On the other hand, when he talks to his own supporters, the language is more blunt. In a speech in Damascus, Nasser declared that the U.A.R. had a special role which "is the mission of the entire Arab nation." The following day he repeated this theme. "It is the United Arab Republic," he shouted, "which has taken upon itself the mission of carrying Arab nationalism."

The idea of uniting all of the Arabs by the free consent of all of the people is Nasser's way of lulling the West into believing that he is at heart a man of peace and good will. However, in a special circular to the officers of the Egyptian Army, Nasser did not mince his words: "Brethren, we meet today to review the plans which Egypt should follow in the future to realize our great objectives from the gulf to the Atlantic Ocean. The aircraft which can reach Tel Aviv within an hour can also reach Tripoli, Khartoum, and Riadh. I hope that we will not be compelled to resort to such action. But, as you know, we built our armed forces and equipped them in order that they might serve as an instrument for the achievement of Arab unity under Egypt's leadership. We did not build our armed forces merely to hold annual military parades in Cairo. He who deceives himself by believing that union can be achieved by sweet talk must only open his eyes wide to see the present Egyptian Army. We are confident that the Arab States and their leaders will get accustomed to seeing our armed forces as a means of achieving Arab unity. Thus our armed forces can impose their protection on territories beyond our borders." (The exact occasion when this document was issued is not known although it was published for the first time in the Jordanian press on July 3, 1957.)

Obviously, every Arab country which takes pride in its sovereignty and independence must reject this "blood and iron" method of unity. Of course, Arab leaders who dare to stand up, are immediately branded as "traitors." At one time it was the King of Saudi Arabia, at another time the King of Jordan, another time the Prime Minister of Tunisia, and another time the former Prime Minister of Sudan. All of them, at one time or another, have been vilified. Yet, Nasser calls the Arabs of other countries his brethren. The pattern is clear. Nasser brooks no rivals. Nor will he tolerate any one who questions his right to speak for all of the Arabs. Arab nationalism, that very elusive concept, has become his private property. There can be no genuine Arab nationalism unless it bears his imprimatur. Wherever Arab nationalism has triumphed, Nasser claims credit. Thus, in the case of the Iraqi revolution of last year, Radio Cairo broadcast to the entire Arab world that it was "Nasser who more than anyone else shouldered all the burdens of defending the Iraqi revolution—military and political."

ANOTHER ASPECT

There is another significant aspect of the raging Iraqi-Egyptian conflict which is most instructive. Ever since the State of Israel came into being, people the world over have been told by Arab propagandists that all would be quiet and serene in the Middle East were it not for that "bridgehead of Western imperialism"—Israel. Unquestionably, many people have been taken in by this explanation of the Middle East crisis. Indeed, we must admit that even some of our own top experts in the State Department have been attracted by this line.

But Israel has had nothing to do with the hair-pulling match now going on between Nasser and Kassem. Nor did Israel have anything to do with Nasser's attempt to subvert the Jordanian and Lebanese Governments last year. As one Middle East authority observed, the real source of tension in the Middle East is not the relationship between the Arab peoples and Israel, but "rather derives from the nonpopular, nondemocratic and nonindependent character of the Arab regimes." It has been precisely the policies pursued by these Arab States which has turned the Middle East into a caldron of hate and instability. It is the Arab masses above all who must suffer from these blood feuds and from the insatiable ambitions of dictators.

Fight Against Obscene Literature Must Have Public Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, laws against sending obscene literature through the mail must have the working support of the general public to be effective. Only then will we be able to determine whether the legislation enacted by Congress is adequate.

The tremendous militant interest of many people have been evident in hearings to block mailing of lascivious material and to punish offenders. As one Member of Congress, I am impressed and grateful that witnesses included our Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish clergymen.

In view of this interest and the religious community's perennial attacks on lewd printed materials, I would like to suggest that ministers, priests, and rabbis set a common date for a weekend in which the laws would be explained and cooperation encouraged from the pulpit. Such action would be most helpful.

Saga of Personal Valor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article of historical importance which first appeared in serial form in the Pittston Sunday Dispatch, and written by Mr. Charles McCarthy, of Pittston, Pa., a leading writer of the history of northeastern Pennsylvania. The first installment of this fine story appeared in the Dispatch on Sunday, September 13, 1959, and will be concluded in about 2 more weeks. The Dispatch is to be congratulated for its high degree of selectivity of human interest stories, and Mr. McCarthy is to be congratulated, also, for his painstaking work in putting this story together.

The aforementioned article follows:

TWENTY-SEVEN FROM PITTSTON REGION GET CARNEGIE MEDALS FOR UNSELFISH ACTS OF HEROISM

(The story of the personal valor of some of Greater Pittston's citizens, which clearly indicates the high caliber of the character of those who settled and developed this area. Data compiled and prepared by Charles A. McCarthy, who maintains continuing research into the background and history of northeastern Pennsylvania.)

From time to time, this newspaper receives queries about Carnegie Medal awards, and the queries have increased recently since the many heroic incidents associated with the Knox mine disaster.

Naturally, for factual data on such things, one turns to Greater Pittston's virtually official historian, Charles A. McCarthy, of Butler Street, Pittston, Pa.

McCarthy dug into records and maintained heavy correspondence with the Carnegie Fund, to obtain full, factual data on the Greater Pittston recipients of the Carnegie Medal.

In the Pittston region a grand total of 27 medals have been awarded, 21 on account of mining accidents and 6 in a nonmining category. A total of 14 was awarded as the aftermath of a single mine accident.

One medal awarded in this accident was a silver medal and went to John T. Brown. Two silver medals awarded for heroism in other than mine accidents went to Luther J. Heal and Jesse A. Wilson.

A close scrutiny of the complete list of winners of Carnegie Hero Medals indicates that no similar size section of the United States has as many holders of this distinguished award to civilians as has the Greater Pittston region.

FOUNDED IN 1904

The Carnegie Hero Fund Commission was founded in 1904. It bears the name of Andrew Carnegie, canny Scotsman, who migrated to this country and became one of the Nation's leading producers of steel. Mr. Carnegie gave the money to establish the commission.

It was the purpose of Mr. Carnegie in setting up this organization to have some means of duly recognizing civilians who performed spontaneous feats of heroism in behalf of their fellow man. Since the fund was founded the commission has awarded medals and various sums of cash to those who qualified.

This week and for the next several weeks the Dispatch will carry a list of all those who received Carnegie Hero medals in Pittston and a brief synoposis of the incidents for which the hero medal was granted.

COMPLETE LISTING

The running story on the medal winners will begin with the first medal awarded up to the present day.

Today's story covers the following medal winners:

Patrick F. Walsh

Patrick F. Walsh, aged 29, a miner, helped to rescue John R. Eustice, aged 52, a timberman, from a cave-in at No. 14 Drifts, in Jenkins Township, on August 22, 1907. While the roof was working, the walls squeezing and small stuff falling at intervals, Walsh crawled over a fall for a distance of 25 feet to Eustice who with four others had been caught by the caving roof. With the assistance of three others, Walsh dug Eustice from under the coal and debris wher he lay injured, and carried him to safety. Eustice recovered. Walsh was awarded a bronze medal, No. 389, and $1,000 for a worthy cause, as needed.

George R. Jopling

George R. Jopling, aged 55, a miner, helped rescue John R. Eustice. He was helping to prop up the dangerous roof preparatory to the rescue of the men when he heard Eustice call for help. He crawled over the fall, found Eustice and summoned help. Jopling was awarded a bronze medal, No. 390, and $1,000 for a worthy cause, as needed.

John Merrick

John Merrick, aged 50, a miner, helped to rescue John R. Eustice. Merrick was awarded a bronze medal, No. 391, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Benjamin R. George

Benjamin R. George, aged 26, a miner, helped to rescue John R. Eustice. George was awarded a bronze medal, No. 392, and $1,000 for a worthy cause, as needed.

Thomas Huntley

Thomas Huntley, aged 40, an outside mine foreman, helped to rescue John R. Eustice. Huntley was awarded a bronze medal, No. 393, and $1,000 for a worthy cause as needed.

James M. Flanigan

James M. Flanigan, aged 20, a mine car tender, rescued William Derrig, aged 19, a laborer, and John W. Mullery, aged 21, a mine-car tender, in a mine in Inkerman section of Jenkins Township, after an explosion, on May 7, 1909. Flanigan went into an abandoned drift, immediately following an explosion of gas and brought out Derrig. He returned, others refusing to go with him, and got Mullery. Both Derrig and Mullery were severely injured, the former dying 1 week later. Flanigan's hands were burned from beating out fire in the men's clothing. Flanigan was awarded a bronze medal, No. 388, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed. A resident of 340 South Main Street, Flanigan later moved to Somerville, Mass.

John T. Brown

John T. Brown, aged 46, a mine foreman, helped to save Joseph Lucas, aged 33, James E. Dougher, aged 27, and Anthony Gowrey, aged 43, and saved Frank Kleish, aged 21, from suffocation at Hoyt Shaft of Ewen Col-

liery, in the Port Griffith section of Jenkins Township, on January 10, 1911. Brown led four men into the heading of the coal mine, one-half mile from the shaft, immediately following an explosion which had defected the air current, and filled that and other headings with afterdamp. They found Lucas, unconscious, and carried him to fresh air. Returning, Brown and four others found Dougher, whom they also carried out. All had been somewhat affected by the afterdamp. Brown and three of the men went through another heading into the gangway where the explosion occurred, where they found Gowrey. A second explosion seemed imminent, but Brown stayed alone with Gowrey until the others brought in a stretcher. While the men carried Gowrey out, Brown continued through the gangway until he found Kleish, delirious, and carried him out. Brown was completely exhausted, but after going to the surface he soon recovered. Lucas and Dougher were revived. Gowrey was badly burned. Kleish died from his burns. Brown was awarded a silver medal, No. 524, and $1,000 toward the purchase of a home.

James L. Conlon

James L. Conlon, aged 36, an assistant mine foreman, helped to save Joseph Lucas and Anthony Gowrey. Conlon was awarded a bronze medal, No. 525, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Martin F. Mangan

Martin F. Mangan, aged 26, a mine footman, helped to save Joseph Lucas, James E. Dougher, and Anthony Gowrey. Mangan was awarded a bronze medal, No. 526, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Andrew J. Devers

Andrew J. Devers, aged 54, a miner, helped to save James E. Dougher. Devers was awarded a bronze medal, No. 527, and $1,000 for a worth purpose, as needed.

Jacob Modlo

Jacob Modlo, aged 22, a mine driver, helped to save Joseph Lucas and James E. Dougher. Modlo was awarded a bronze medal, No. 528, and $1,000 toward the purchase of a new home.

Andrew J. Horan

Andrew J. Horan, aged 44, a miner, helped to save James E. Dougher. Horan was awarded a bronze medal, No. 529, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Michael J. Madden

Michael J. Madden, aged 37, an assistant mine foreman, helped to save Anthony Gowrey. Madden was awarded a bronze medal, No. 530, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Thomas F. Gallagher

Thomas F. Gallagher, aged 25, a car runner, helped to save Joseph Lucas, James E. Dougher, and Anthony Gowrey. Gallagher was awarded a bronze medal, No. 593, and $1,000 for a worth purpose, as needed. The son of Mr. and Mrs. William Gallagher, of Chestnut Street, in the Inkerman section of Jenkins Township, he later moved to Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Patrick J. Gallagher

Patrick J. Gallagher, aged 43, a mine tracklayer, of 155 East Oak Street, in the Browntown section of Pittston Township, helped to save Robert E. Fear, aged 18, of 157 Swallow Street, Browntown section of Pittston Township, from a cave-in at a bootleg mine hole, located in the rear of 175 East Oak Street, in the Browntown section of Pittston Township, on May 8, 1917.

Robert Fear and Sylvester W. McKeon, aged 12, of 43 Lincoln Street, in the Browntown section of Pittston Township, descended the slope of a hole that had caved in the ground and entered the chamber of an old mine of the Pennsylvania Coal Co. to gather coal. They were caught by a fall of earth overhanging the entrance to the chamber, and Fear was buried to his chest, and McKeon was buried to his hips. Cracks at the top of the hole and the dropping of clay earth overhanging the chamber indicated another cave-in was imminent. Gallagher descended the hole to Fear and began extricating him by clawing away the earth with his hands. Later he used a shovel. After removing a six-inch thickness of earth from around Fear, a small mass fell from the overhang and filled the depression. Gallagher continued working; and after he removed the earth to Fear's hips, a man who had descended the hole and aided McKeon assisted Gallagher in extricating Fear, whom they then took to the top of the hole. During the night there was another fall of earth which filled the entrance to the chamber. Patrick J. Gallagher was awarded a bronze medal, No. 1487, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Edward F. Norton

Edward F. Norton, aged 33, a mine laborer, of 164 East Oak Street, in the Browntown section of Pittston Township, helped to save Sylvester McKeon, on May 8, 1917.

Norton descended the hole to McKeon and began clawing away the earth from him with his hands. After he removed the earth to McKeon's knees, a man descended the hole and assisted him in extricating McKeon, using a shovel. Norton then carried McKeon to the top of the hole. Norton was awarded a bronze medal, No. 1488, and $1,000 for a worthy cause, as needed.

Michael J. Franklin

Michael J. Franklin, aged 37, a mine tracklayer, of 97 East Oak Street, in the Browntown section of Pittston Township, helped to save Sylvester W. McKeon and Robert E. Fear, on May 8, 1917.

Franklin was the man who assisted Norton in extricating McKeon and then assisted Gallagher in extricating Fear.

Franklin was awarded a bronze medal, No. 1489, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Awards to Gallagher, Norton and Franklin were made on October 31, 1919.

Robert Hughes

Robert Hughes, aged 50, a miner, helped to rescue Thomas A. Coleman, aged 37, a miner, and Louis J. Doran, aged 45, a mine laborer, from a cave-in near Hillside breaker in Avoca Borough, on November 8, 1932.

While Coleman and Doran were digging coal in an abandoned entry that connected with a new shaft, which was narrow and 43 feet deep, a collapse occurred in the entry, Coleman was buried under shale as he stood at the bottom of the shaft. Doran was knocked to the floor of the entry and lay under shale 4 feet deep, 18 feet from the shaft. No one offered to aid Coleman and Doran, except Hughes and Joseph P. Tigue, who descended by means of a windlass-rope. They stood within the entry and with their hands removed the shale from Coleman. Occasionally shale sloughed off the sides and dropped from overhead. Hughes and Tigue removed the shale to Coleman's hips in 3 hours, and Coleman was then pulled out on the rope. Hughes and Tigue worked all afternoon and far into the night in efforts to make a trench through the shale to Doran. They had planned to remove all debris as they proceeded but they gave up that plan in order to reach Doran as soon as possible. They erected posts on the shale and piled the shale behind boards that rested against the posts and finally reached Doran. While they were removing debris from over him, the sides of the entry caved; and Hughes and Tigue ran to the shaft. Shale and slate fell, blocking the middle of the entry. Slightly injured by falling material, Hughes and Tigue were hoisted on the rope. During the remainder of the night and the next morning all of the shale and other debris was removed by men under safe conditions, adequate braces having been placed; and Doran was taken out. He sustained injuries from which he died 7 hours later.

Hughes was awarded a bronze medal, No. 2753, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

Joseph P. Tigue

Joseph P. Tigue, aged 43, a miner, helped to rescue Thomas A. Coleman and Louis J. Doran. He was awarded a bronze medal, No. 2754, and $1,000 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

An interesting sidelight to the daring rescue of Coleman and Doran concerns the entry into the mine by Rev. Edmund J. Langan, Ph. D., who at the time was a curate at St. Mary's Church in Avoca Borough and who is currently serving as pastor of the Church of St. John the Evangelist of Pittston, to bring the last rites of the church to the beleaguered men. Against the sound advice of experienced mining men and at the peril of his life, Dr. Langan had himself lowered into the mine where he brought solace to the hapless victims.

Henry R. Skibitski

Henry R. Skibitski, aged 32, a miner, helped to rescue Frank Chas, aged 44, a mine laborer, from a cave-in at No. 6 Colliery of Jermyn, Green Coal Co., in Jenkins Township, on March 30, 1943. Two runaway mine cars were derailed in an air course of the mine, causing the roof to collapse for 17 feet in the air course and in a crosscut that extended 6 feet off the air course at one end of the cave-in. Chas, who was in the crosscut, was pinned by a timber on which rock rested. While the debris moved and settled somewhat and a few rocks fell, Skibitski, followed by John Kuchinsky, from the end of the cave-in crawled 12 feet in a narrow passageway at one side of the cave-in under debris and reached Chas. They placed blocks under the timber; and with bars Kuchinsky and then Skibitski dug at rocks under Chas, freeing him. They dragged Chas into the air course, lifted him across one of the cars, and lowered him to the floor beyond the inner end of the cave-in. Chas had sustained a cut on his head, and his legs were numb. After 20 minutes, the debris having fairly well settled, Kuchinsky aided Chas over the car; and all crawled through the passageway into a safe section of the mine. Chas recovered. Skibitski was awarded a bronze medal, No. 3336, and $500 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

John Kuchinsky

John Kuchinsky, aged 37, a miner, helped to rescue Frank Chas. He was awarded a bronze medal, No. 3337, and $500 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

NONMINING AWARDS

John C. Scureman

John C. Scureman, aged 55, a salesmen rescued Karl A. Keller, aged 11, from electric shock which occurred as the aftermath of a fire in Joseph Langford's barn, on Luzerne Avenue, in West Pittston Borough, on March 24, 1907.

Heedless of warnings of others, Scureman grasped the ankle of the boy, who lay unconscious holding a live wire, and pulled him free from the wire, but was himself knocked down by another wire coming in contact with his neck. He was disabled 18 days.

Scureman was awarded a bronze medal, No. 249, and $2,150 to be applied to the liquidation of his debts.

Luther J. Heal

Luther J. Heal, aged 27, a blacksmith, saved Joseph Collins, aged 7, from a mad dog, at Pittston, on May 6, 1907.

Heal saw the dog bite his son and then start toward Collins. Not stopping to re-

move his son to the house, he pursued the dog and attracted the animal to himself. It snapped his hand as he attempted to grab it, but he held it, under both knees, until it was shot.

Heal was awarded a silver medal, No. 164, and $250 to reimburse him for pecuniary loss sustained on account of injuries.

Jesse A. Wilson

Jesse A. Wilson, aged 23, a stationary engine fireman, of 150 Tompkins Street, Pittston, and later a resident of West Pittston, risked his life to save Joseph A. Duffy, aged 3, of 151 Tompkins Street, Pittston, from a fire which occurred at the Patrick Egan home, at 154 Tompkins Street, on July 16, 1909.

Wilson rescued Duffy from burning by breaking a first floor window and scrambling into a smoke and heat filled room and going into an adjoining room, one end of which was in flames, picking up the child, whose clothing was ablaze, and carrying it to a window and dropping it outside. Dazed, Wilson staggered backward, but quickly recovered and tumbled out of the window. His hands were badly burned and his hair was singed. The child died 2 hours later.

Wilson was awarded a silver medal, No. 400, and $1,000 to be applied toward the purchase of a new home. Wilson married Lavina Heal, a sister of Arthur Heal, who was previously mentioned as a medal winner.

Robert W. Jacques

Robert W. Jacques, aged 14, a mechanic's helper, of Fourth Street, West Pittston, saved Harold R. Eder, aged 16, a mechanic's helper, from drowning at Harvey's Lake, on July 27, 1919.

Eder fell from a raft at Harvey's Lake, in Laketon, 175 feet from shore, where the water was 12 feet deep. The raft drifted away from him and Eder swam a short distance toward a boat but was tired from swimming and lost control of himself. Jacques, fully dressed, dived from the boat and swam 50 feet to Eder, who was thrashing wildly. As Jacques reached Eder he put his hand under Eder's arm to support him; but Eder grasped his shoulders and climbed upon him. Both sank and Jacques squirmed and pushed Eder from him under water and swam to the surface. When Eder arose, Jacques again supported him; and he and another youth who reached them then swam 8 or 10 feet with Eder to the boat, which had been rowed toward them by a man after having been taken near the shore by two girls.

On November 3, 1922, Jacques was awarded a bronze medal, No. 1734, and $500 for a worthy cause, as needed.

Patrick J. Judge

Patrick J. Judge, aged 39, a toolroom attendant, who moved to 1071 Exeter Avenue, in Slucum Patch section of Exeter Borough, in March 1937, rescued Selma A. Zeck, aged 10, from electric shock, on August 12, 1936. The incident occurred on the Lackawanna and Wyoming Valley Railroad (Laurel Line), near the Stafford Avenue bridge in Scranton. While crossing the railway track, Selma tripped and fell on the third rail charged with a current of 650 volts of electricity.

Judge hurried to the site and saw the young, unconscious girl. Without any consideration of his own safety, he stood astride the rail and took hold of the youngster under her armpits. He received a severe shock which sent him reeling backward 9 feet. Returning, he stood on the ties, took hold of her clothing at the back, lifted her 2 feet up from the rail, and carried her from the track. He received no further shock. Selma was revived but sustained serious burns on her chest, neck, arms and legs.

Judge, who had an artificial leg of wood, was awarded a bronze medal, No. 2994, and $1,000 toward the purchase of a home.

Nazareth Tomasetti

Nazareth Tomasetti, aged 42, an employee of the Scranton-Spring Brook Water Co., a resident of 238 Broad Street, Pittston, was honored for his heroic rescue of a fellow worker, Howard Shannon.

The incident occurred on September 9, 1952, on Market Street, near the intersection of South Main Street, in Pittston. Tomasetti and Shannon were working in a trench preparatory to making repairs to a water main when the side of soft, sliding sand gave way and buried Shannon up to his shoulders. Tomasetti cleared the sand from the upper part of Shannon and held his back to the side of the trench to prevent further caving. Adam Hudak, a third water company employee summoned aid. Following an hour and one-half of fervid work, Tomasetti and other workers freed Shannon. Shannon survived the ordeal.

Tomasetti was awarded a bronze medal, No. 3810, and $500 for a worthy purpose, as needed.

The suggestion for the award to Tomasetti was initially made by Charles A. McCarthy, then serving as executive secretary of the Greater Pittston Chamber of Commerce, to the Junior Chamber of Commerce. The Jaycees, through its secretary, Edward J. Burke, filed the reports which led to the award to Tomasetti. At a dinner honoring Tomasetti, held at Fox Hill Country Club, the principal speaker was Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD.

ITALIAN GOVERNMENT AWARD

Lombardo Francesco, of 120 South Main Street, who died on January 26, 1920, was the holder of a medal presented to him by the Italian Government for his heroism in a mine disaster which occurred in Italy.

A Comment on the Khrushchev Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, associate professor of economics at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., and the father of the Captive Nations Week, made comments of interest regarding the visit of Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev to this country. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the press announcement from the Georgetown University News Service covering Dr. Dobriansky's observations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Russian Premier Khrushchev is ignorant of the American ideas of freedom and democratic processes, and his visit here will be futile in this and other respects, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, associated professor of economics at Georgetown University, said today (Monday).

Speaking on the "In Our Town" TV program over WRC, the author of the Captive Nations Week resolution cited as evidence of this the Russian Premier's reference to the resolution in this article on coexistence. He quote the Premier as saying:

"It would be interesting to see incidentally how the authors of the resolution would have reacted if the parliament of Mexico for instance, had passed a resolution demanding that Texas, Arizona, and California "be liberated from American slavery.' * * * Sometimes comparisons help to understand the essence of the matter."

Answering Khrushchev on this, Dr. Dobriansky pointed out that "the people of those States vote regularly and often for the kind of freedom they enjoy and their fathers enjoyed." He added that if a free, secret ballot vote on the American order were held in Lithuania, Ukraine, and other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., they would vote overwhelmingly for liberation from Russian domination.

He said that Khrushchev will put on the same "patent medicine act as the 10 Soviet writers here last month. They complained and denounced the resolution," he said, "and then pointed to several of their members who were non-Russians from the Lithuanian and Georgian republics. Mr. Khrushchev will seek to denounce the resolution by exhibiting certain contented non-Russian captives in his entourage.

"That's why he invited the Don Cossack writer, Sholokov, to join him on his tour. Other names like Shevchenko, non-Russian sounding, are on the official party list. He will use these to try to show that there are no captives among the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R."

Mutual Security Appropriation Bill, 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Speaker, when the Civil Rights Commission was set up at the last session of Congress, I stated that once having gotten its foot in the door, it would at this session be back for an extension and for additional money. Here in the early morning, or should I say late morning for it is after 4 o'clock, we find the supporters of this notorious Commission bringing it from the Senate where it has been attached to the mutual security appropriation bill. I would willingly stay here the rest of this year in order to defeat this legislation; however, I know that the die is cast and that it will be pushed through because both major political parties want to claim it as their child.

The Commission has just made its report with a separate volume styled as an abridgment of the report. I note that two of the Senators who supported the establishment of this Commission state that the report is not a very satisfactory one and that they hope the Commission will get out of some of the fields into which it has wandered and that there is really no excuse for either careless staff work or half-baked proposals and that the report shows the results of both. The Civil Rights Commission in its report said, "The Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court is the supreme law of the land." We can all agree that the Constitution is the supreme law of the land, but when the Supreme Court makes an interpretation that is erroneous, may I respectfully submit that the supreme law of the land is still the Constitution and not the interpretation made by the Supreme Court.

While time will not permit any extensive debate on this issue, I do promise here and now that there will be plenty of debate if and when this Congress attempts to place the recommendations of this Commission into effect. The Commission recommends Congress turning over to the Federal Government the process of registering voters in various States for Federal elections. It would deliberately have this body change entirely our system of government and take over the functions of the States. This Commission by the very nature of its report has served notice that it will, if at all possible, tear down the Federal and State systems as they now exist and have the Federal Government take over.

You may by your vote here this morning give the Commission another one-half million dollars to squander and bring forth another report. As for me, I want in no way to associate myself with it. The show put on in my State by this outfit had the appearance of a four-ring circus. The advance agents made it that way regardless of the good intentions of some of the members of the Commission. The members of the Commission could not themselves make detailed plans for the show on the road.

The continued efforts to make colored people live and go to school with the white race is doing more to hurt the cause of education and good will among the races than any other one thing that has ever happened in America.

I believe that a study of the hearings and the report of the Commission will convince any fair-minded, unbiased person that he can agree with the statement of the former Governor of Virginia, John S. Battle, a member of the Commission, who, in characterizing the report, stated:

> I must strongly disagree with the nature and tenor of the report. In my judgment it is not an impartial factual statement, such as I believe to have been the intent of the Congress, but rather, in large part, an argument in advocacy of preconceived ideas in the field of race relations.

Mr. Speaker, an aroused citizenry will one day bring this Congress to its senses and stop this continued meddling by the Federal Government and then, and not until then, will conditions change for the better—when people of all races may live in peace, good will, and harmony.

The Raid on Northern Industries

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time that I may bring to the attention of the House and to the Nation a matter that will have vast repercussions on the future of our country and to which all of the Members of the Congress from the North, as well as those from the South, the East, and the West should be alerted.

I feel that I would be remiss in my duty to my constituents and to Chicago and to Illinois if before the sine die adjournment of this session of the 86th Congress I did not do all in my power to rouse the section of the country from which I come to a greater sense of awareness.

If the people of the section from which I come are not sufficiently aroused to the present industrial trend, I can foresee the possibility of the industries of the North being relocated in the South and the cities of the North, especially those in the Middle West, declining to the status of trading centers for an agricultural region.

I wish to make it clear that I am not standing out against the development of a natural trend. I wish every section of our country to develop, and I wish each section to have its share of the industries. All of that will be good for our country. Anything less will be harmful. We cannot have a country, one section backward and underprivileged, and another section having a monopoly on the sources of prosperity. Nothing could be more disastrous to us all. A country where the workers in one section are paid less for the same work as the workers in another section is a divided country. A country so divided cannot meet the challenge of our world destiny.

What I do object to, and what will not be healthy for our country, is the injection of unfair stimulus to build up the industries of one section of our country by tearing down the industry of another section. Boxers in a contest are governed by the rules that forbid hitting below the belt and other practices that violate the spirit of fairness. So is it in all of our sports, baseball, football, and in racing in which giving a stimulus to a horse prior to a race is subject to the severest penalties.

INDUSTRIAL FUTURE OF THE SOUTH

The industrial future of the South is bright. It will create new industries because of its many advantages. It will build up new and expanding industries because they will find a local market and will find a market in foreign lands easily accessible because of geographical position.

These industries, developed through normal processes, will give the South an industrial position advantageous to both the South and the North. While new industries in the South are developing that section of our country, thus adding to the purchasing power of the entire Nation, the industries of the North will continue to expand and new industries will be established in the North to add to the general prosperity of our Nation.

That, Mr. Speaker, is a future to which I confidently look forward.

MULTI-BILLION-DOLLAR LURE

But what we are witnessing now is something of an entirely different nature. It is not a normal development of a trend. Newsweek describes it as a multi-billion-dollar effort on the part of the South, not to establish new industries, but to raid the industries of the North. It takes the form of subsidies given to northern industries to relocate their plants in Southern States, of tax exemptions in some States running for a period of 99 years, and the promise of lower wage scales. I have seen some of the communications to northern industrialists in which great emphasis is given to the savings that can be made in wages, and in most of these communications the explanation is given that wages are lower because labor is not organized.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is unfair competition. Moreover, it is a representation unfair to northern industrialists. Everyone knows that as the South gains industries so will grow the demand on the part of the workers in those industries for wages and working conditions comparable to those in the North. This is as it should be. American workers should receive the same pay for the same work regardless of the geographical location of the plant.

There will be labor organizations wherever industry locates because American workers are going to demand and get a fair share of the profits of enterprises in which they are partners with management. Despite the roadblocks that many States and communities in the South are building, it is as certain as the following of day the night that labor in the South will attain the same full benefit from collective bargaining as has been attained by labor in the North. It may be in some communities a hard and a bitter struggle, but it will be much briefer than held out in the promises to northern industrialists to relocate in the South.

BUYING POWER OF WORKERS

We are one country. We have the same traditions. Inherently, Mr. Speaker, we have the same sense of fairness. I might add the same amount of commonsense. And commonsense will tell anyone that you cannot have a continuing prosperity unless you have buying power to move from factory to consumer the production of the joint partnership of labor and management. This buying power, commonsense tells us, does not come from excessive profits to a relatively few deposited in banks and put out in investment. The fact that the North today has such buying power comes in a very large measure from the wages paid to our workers as a result of the efforts of organized labor.

I can conceive of nothing more harmful in the long run to the South and nothing more unfair to other sections of the country than the raid on Northern industry with the lure of lower nonunion wages.

SOUTHEAST BUSINESS EXHIBIT

Mr. Speaker, I had not intended on this final day of this session again to go into a matter which I had so thoroughly covered with a recital of statistics at an earlier period of the session. The reason that I am speaking today is that just prior to my leaving my office to come to this Chamber I read a letter written under the date of September 8, 1959, by Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., Chief of Legislative Affairs for the U.S. Navy. I presume the letter received by me was

similar to that sent to all Members of the House.

In this letter Admiral McCain calls attention to the Southeast Exhibit of Business Opportunities at Birmingham, Ala., under the cosponsorship of Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee. The letter states that the purpose of the exhibit is to encourage wide participation of both big and small business in the many business facets of national defense, and that the U.S. Navy has been named the coordinator for the Department of Defense for this exhibition. The letter further states that a similar letter with its accompanying enclosure was being sent by the U.S. Navy to businessmen throughout the United States.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I can find no fault. Indeed, I would think it commendable of our Government and of the Navy to give encouragement to regional exhibitions that would bring together the industrial producers of the respective regions in order that they could be made better acquainted with the opportunities for participation in our defense program. I presume, although I have not had time to check on it, that similar exhibitions had been held in other regions of our country, or if not already held are in the planning stage.

I noticed in Admiral McCain's letter the announcement that a similar letter with accompanying enclosure was being sent to businessmen throughout the United States. There probably is a good reason for that, although I would think that the main interest would be among the businessmen in the region where the exhibit was located. But if that has been the practice in the case of all other regional exhibits I will not criticize.

NATURE OF THE ENCLOSURE

Now, Mr. Speaker, I get down to the matter which concerns me. The accompanying enclosure referred to in Admiral McCain's letter is an 8-page brochure. Page 1 is a letter by Rear Adm. R. L. Swart inviting participation in the Southeast Exhibit of Business Opportunities. It bears the seal of the Department of Defense, United States of America. Pages 2 and 8 of the brochure are blank. Page 3 contains some data concerning the exhibit and on pages 4, 5, and 6 is an explanation of the exhibit in detail and page 7 is a blank application for participation. I presume that pages 4, 5, 6, and 7 were furnished by the promoters of the exhibit, and with that in the main I have no objection.

What I do object to, and very seriously object to, is this which appears on page 3:

> Further, all business firms who are contemplating new plant sites, new locations for their business or the utilization of idle facilities in place should send their industrial planning people to the Southeast Exhibit. Site locations and the industrial complex of the seven sponsoring States will be exhibited and qualified people from industrial development commissions will be present to discuss these locations privately with your staff in conference rooms adjacent to the exhibits.

This is addressed to "all business firms who are contemplating new plant sites, new locations for their business." They are promised that if they come to this exhibit they can have private conversations on the matter of cite locations and the "industrial complex of the seven sponsoring States."

I acquit Admiral McCain of any intention to be a party to the raid on northern factories. In sending his letter with the accompanying enclosure to businessmen throughout the United States I think he had in mind only the rendering of a public service but the fact remains that his letter with the accompanying enclosure, with the implied invitation to relocate plants has put our Government and our Navy in the position of inviting businessmen from Illinois as well as from other States to a place where they can have private audiences on available locations in the South for the removal of their plants from Illinois and on "the industrial complex of the seven sponsoring States."

Mr. Speaker, I would not wish my Government, the government of all our country, to be put in the position of inviting businessmen from any other section of the country to come to Chicago for the purpose of giving Chicago an opportunity of inducing them to leave some other State, to come to our State. We are not going to build up our country into ever expanding strength if our Government, even inadvertently, seeks to build up one section by tearing down another.

THREAT TO CHICAGO FACTORIES

I know perfectly well what is meant by business firms who are contemplating new plants sites, new locations for their business. During this session of the Congress on three occasions delegations have come from Chicago to meet with our Congressmen from our area. My colleague from other districts in the North must have had similar experiences. In each of the three instances that I have mentioned the facts were about the same; a plant needing modernizing and considering meeting the expenses of that needed modernization with subsidies offered by some Southern States, enjoying tax exemption for a long period of years and a great reduction of the labor item by reason of labor for the large part being unorganized, and the employer dealing as to wages and working conditions individually with each of his employees.

So I know perfectly well what is means to invite business firms who contemplate new plant sites to come for private discussions as to available site locations and the industrial complex of the seven sponsoring States. I can make a pretty good guess as to what will be said at these private discussions on what the letter states to be "the industrial complex."

Why the discussion should be private I have no way of knowing, but I can make a pretty good guess. And as long as I am a Member of the Congress I shall continue to alert to the best of my ability the people of the section of our great country from which I come.

I have no quarrel with my colleagues from the South. I give to them commendation for their loyalty to what they believe the best interest of the section from which they come. A great change is taking place in our country, and of that change our southern colleagues are alert. I marvel often at the degree of unalertness of many of my Republican colleagues from the North. When I see them on so many occasions, when the legitimate interests of the North are at stake, march up the aisle to vote against the section from which they come, I wonder at their unawareness.

RAID ON NORTHERN INDUSTRIES

Mr. Speaker, healthy competition is good for all of us. There is so much that we can accomplish if we work together. There is room for industrial expansion in all regions of our country, but it must be a competition governed by the rules of fairplay. A raid on northern industries, with a lure of subsidies, tax-exemptions, and low wages will end in nothing good either for North or South, neither for management nor for labor.

Every time an industry moves from the North to the South some measure of the impact of a closed factory falls on every northern home. To the workers in the factory, and their families, it means unemployment with little likelihood of relief. They cannot follow the factory to the South because among the South's lures in the seduction of our industry is lower nonunion wages, and northern workers, accustomed to the dignity of labor in our region, are not wanted. To the local merchant a closed factory, lured away by subsidies, tax exemptions, and low wages, means fewer customers with money to buy his wares. In some measure no segment of our economy is unaffected.

The South, I repeat, will attain a period of prosperity greater than any she has ever known. The South will learn what we have learned in the North that in equality is both the strength of organized society and the contentment of its individual members. Time marches on and with the dethronement of the status quo there is a temporary bewilderment, and then from the dethroned status quo comes a march on to higher peaks and broadening horizons.

I close with one sentence from a southern industrialist of far vision. In a speech before a meeting of the American Management Association in the fall of 1955, John C. Whitaker, chairman of the board of R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., in North Carolina, condemned some southern communities for trying to lure plants from the North with promises of cheap labor and tax exemptions.

The New York Times of September 20, 1955, quoted Mr. Whitaker as saying:

> Such companies do not make good employers or first-class neighbors, no matter where they are located.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am happy to yield to my good and distinguished friend from New York, the former mayor of Schenectady and the first Democrat from his district in 42 years.

Mr. STRATTON. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his interest in keeping industry in the Northern States rather than in the South. I share that with him fully. But in order to keep the record straight, Mr. Speaker, is it not true that this information to which the gentleman refers, which was sent out by the Navy, is similar to an

invitation which has gone out at other times in many other sections of the country? I believe that this is similar to an industrial exhibit which was held, for example, in New York State about a year ago, and one that I think was held either in Ohio or Indiana some months after that. Is this not, Mr. Speaker, one of a series of industrial exhibits designed to encourage the cooperation between individual producers and the Navy Department rather than as the gentleman implies something directly and specifically dealing with attraction of business to the Southern States at the expense of us in the North?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would hope that the gentleman is correct in that and that similar letters were sent out on other regional exhibits. I can assure the gentleman that, although my small service was with the Army, I share his pride in the Navy with which he served with such outstanding courage and distinction in the execution of most important missions. I am sure that there was no intent on the part of the Navy to do anything except its usual good job for all the regional exhibits. It was unfortunate that the promoters of the southeast exhibit inserted in the copy they furnished the Navy for distribution among businessmen nationwide, this invitation to private conferences on advantages to runaway northern plants. That is what I object to.

Mr. STRATTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I agree that the Navy should not pit one section of the country against another, and I do not think they have done so. What the gentleman refers to is that during the past year and a half or 2 years the Navy has been engaged in conducting a series of industrial exhibits of similar nature in other parts of the country. One took place in my State. The entire purpose of it was to make it easier for businessmen doing business with the Government to get their fair share of defense contracts. That I think is the legitimate function of the Navy or any department of Government in its procurement functions, but certainly if it goes beyond that I would agree with the gentleman that it was entirely out of line and improper.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his clarifying contribution.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. As soon as I have replied to the comment by my friend from New York. This administration paid the price of the Presidency in the first year of the administration by giving to Southern States the tidelands oil, potentially worth in value twice the entire national debt and which three times the Supreme Court of the United States said belonged to all the people.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to my very dear friend from North Carolina, the able chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. BONNER. I would like to allay the gentleman's fears with respect to the State of North Carolina. In the press recently great play was given to the fact that the Governor of North Carolina is heading a delegation abroad, not in the North, but to Europe and the Continent; and with him will go the director of the department of conservation and development, and businessmen throughout the State, to interest foreigners in coming to North Carolina and investing their money, to use North Carolina as a base of commercial operations.

There is a peculiar significance in this situation, for here today this Congress will vote to give these very nations foreign aid, nations that the Governor of North Carolina is going to visit and invite to come to North Carolina and invest their money, put up their capital, and open business establishments and manufacturing plants.

I want the gentleman to know that the State of North Carolina gives no tax exemption to anyone, and we offer no special inducements. We offer a beautiful climate, a peaceful people, and an area with an atmosphere in which all can prosper and enjoy life alike. It makes no difference who you are or what you are, you are treated equally and you are treated justly under the laws of the State.

We are not trying to take away business from any State.

I am sorry the gentleman is disturbed, if some industrialists in his State finds a favorable atmosphere in the State of North Carolina to do business.

I wonder if there is any objection to the Governor of North Carolina going abroad and trying to bring back home to America some of the money we have given away in Europe? Is there any objection to that?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. No one has a higher regard for the State of North Carolina than the gentleman from Illinois who now addresses you.

Mr. BONNER. I am sure that is so.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I might say that association in this body with Members from the great State of North Carolina has deepened the gentleman's affection and regard for North Carolina.

The gentleman will agree with me, I think, that North Carolina in seeking on its merits to attract industries should not face competition from States that use the lures of subsidies and tax exemptions?

Mr. BONNER. No, we do not. We are going abroad to bring back some of this foreign aid money.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. The gentleman is getting a little bit away from base. The gentleman in presenting so eloquently and convincingly the virtues of North Carolina said that North Carolina is attracting only with its natural advantages, its fine climate, and nice people, and that North Carolina does not resort to subsidies and does not give tax exemptions.

Mr. BONNER. No, we do not give tax exemptions. We have a minimum wage law, we have a fair area of labor management and labor relations in my district. There is one of the largest labor organizations in the State in my district and they get along peacefully and wholesomely. We get along fine down there. I wish the Central Government would be in as good financial condition as is the State of North Carolina, and could have as good leadership as we have in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I am glad that the great son of North Carolina seems to agree in the main with what I have said. It is to the interest of all our States, and to our country that industrial locations should be determined by natural trends, and not those artificially created for a temporary advantage by the use of subsidies, tax exemptions, and lower wage scales.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, who at 24 was one of the youngest men ever to sit in the State Senate of South Carolina and came to this body in the 80th Congress as one of its youngest Members.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. I would like to say to my distinguished and able colleague from Illinois we are more worried about plants going overseas. If the gentleman will recall, during the debate last year on the so-called reciprocal trade program, we read into the RECORD a letter from the ICA to the Textile Manufacturers Association of the United States telling them: "If you will close your plant in America, fire your employees, under this foreign aid program we will give you water, electricity; oh, yes, we will give you cheap labor at 9 and 10 cents an hour. We will guarantee you a profit. We will insure you against war."

I am worried about that. If I am not mistaken, the gentleman from Illinois voted for that program and voted to send our plants overseas and deprive millions of Americans of jobs. I understand the whole automobile industry in a few years under this program will be overseas using cheap labor, using labor with no social security, no unemployment insurance. And I might say to the gentleman from Illinois that in his great State he has people unemployed today by this fallacious foreign aid and bogus reciprocal trade program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, according to my friend, if I understood him correctly, he would justify low wages in some sections of our country in order to furnish competition with low wages abroad. With that I cannot go along. I would sooner have the United States of America with industry everywhere on the same footing and paying the same wages for the same work, regardless of the State in which the industry is located, than to be diverted from this objective by our concern over foreign countries. I am sure as a nation we can and will meet the competitive challenge of foreign nations. In the United States of America there are many horsepowers be-

hind every worker. Even in Europe there is less than one horsepower behind each worker. Under such conditions I think we can meet the challenge of foreign lands, but we cannot in the North meet the challenge of one section of our country where they pay a wage lower than ours and use that as a lure in raiding our industry. If pursued, and not effectively combated, this inevitably would result in undermining our national economy by making us a nation of low wages and inadequate buying power.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to remind the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that we are dealing not with horsepower today, we are dealing with jobs, of which we are getting darned short in America.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I appreciate as always, the observations of my good friend from West Virginia. I can imagine my sage friend's amazement when the President of the United States vetoed a bill as being pork barrel, when the projects that were covered in that bill were for the development of the resources of our own country and were the very projects in nature of those he demanded for foreign countries and persistently demanded more and more money.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I think the gentleman from Illinois has, as usual, put his finger on a trend which, if carried to its ultimate conclusion, could be very harmful to the people of the North and of the entire United States. I wish to associate myself with him in the remarks he has made and to say in addition, as a freshman Member of Congress, that I have received a great deal of guidance and assistance from the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and wish to express my appreciation of the help and guidance he has given me during this first session of the 86th Congress.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. May I say that my friend from Michigan has added new luster and glory to the name of O'HARA.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois, now in the well of the House, know that $17 billion of American money has been invested abroad to build factories, to use the most modern machinery that we have, but to use the cheap labor abroad instead of our labor, to produce goods to ship into this country; and that they have in the last 10 years developed jobs for over 1 million foreigners, and taken that many jobs away from our own working people. That, in my estimation, is the really critical situation that we are facing.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I hope my friend from Illinois, who served with such distinction in our State senate and who has served with outstanding distinction in the Congress, will agree with me that whether it be cheap labor in one section of our country or in a foreign land, we do not want that cheap labor adversely affecting our sons and daughters, the people in Illinois. The future of the South is in wage and working conditions comparable to those in the North. There will be no future for the North of the sort we envision if we start taking backward steps to meet either foreign competition or raids on our plants from other sections of our own country.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have to yield to my dear friend from Mississippi because he has such power in the Rules Committee, and we are such close friends even though we so widely disagree in our philosophy.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, may I say in response to that triple threat that I particularly appreciate one part of it, that the gentleman regards me as his friend. I might say that I am not unhappy that we disagree in our philosophy.

I am a little surprised at my very genial and gracious friend, the poet of the House, the man of good will, getting up here this morning and taking advantage of this little vacuum in the hours preceding adjournment, to raise the sectional flag.

I might suggest to the gentleman that if he waited until a little later in the day, he might find a more appropriate occasion for that, because I know the gentleman will be in the forefront when that occasion arises.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 minutes additional.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is complaining about the South.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. No, I commend the South and the loyalty of its members to their constituents. I merely said that they outsmarted us, because they are better horse traders.

Mr. COLMER. I would not even accept that. The gentleman must recognize certain facts. One is that the section from which he comes, a great section of this country, had considerable advantage over the section that I have the privilege of serving in this House. I am sure he remembers, great historian that he is, that it has been only a few generations ago that that beautiful section of our great, common country, was laid waste. We had to start from the very bottom. That, plus the fact that the gentleman's section had advantages of water power, the only power that existed in those days, which meant that his part of the country grew and prospered. But now we are coming into our own. There are considerations of our climate and our labor. And, by the way, the gentleman might come down there sometime and take advantage of the situation and do a little of the same thing that Mr. Khrushchev is going to do when he comes over here—learn something about that section of our common country. He will find that labor is organized, that labor is paid a decent wage. But industry, recognizing the advantages of the great supply of labor that has been converted from agricultural pursuits to industrial pursuits, along with the climate and all of the other elements has found it attractive to go down there. That is what is making the South grow and prosper. And I think my friend should be proud of that rather than to complain about it on this occasion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has again expired.

The Honorable Wendell E. Green

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the last Thursday in August the circuit and superior courts of Chicago in Cook County, with the necessary exception of an emergency court, were closed. That day one of the most respected jurists on the circuit bench, the Honorable Wendell E. Green, was being buried, and his fellow jurists were gathered in mourning at the funeral services at St. Thomas Episcopal Church, where Judge Green had been a vestryman.

Judge Green was the first Negro ever to sit on the circuit bench of Cook County. It was in 1950 that he was appointed by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson to fill a vacancy in this high court of record. He was elected in 1951 and reelected in 1957. So highly was he esteemed by the lawyers of Chicago for his integrity, his legal learning and his judicial demeanor that he stood first in the poll conducted by the Chicago Bar Association.

He was born in Topeka, Kans., the son of an Episcopal minister. He was graduated from the University of Chicago and admitted to the Illinois bar in 1920. He quickly took his place among the ablest of defense counsel who practiced in the old criminal court building just north of the river. I saw him frequently in the years that followed in an era of great and renowned defense counsel. I always placed Wendell Green in the very top flight. He was masterful in examination, eloquent and convincing when addressing a jury.

In 1942 he was elected to the municipal bench, reelected in 1948. Thus four times, twice when a candidate for municipal judge and twice when a candidate for circuit judge, the people placed their stamp of approval on a man who was a good citizen, a great lawyer and a learned

and just judge. Chicago has lost a son she ill can afford to lose. He left to his city, his State, his country and his profession a heritage of high standards.

My deepest sympathy goes to the widow, Lorraine, a member of the Chicago Board of Education, and to his brother.

U.S. Army Commended for Decision To Make Wider Use of Air Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, charged with the responsibility of making certain our defense dollars are spent wisely and prudently, it always is a welcome opportunity to be able to commend one of our armed services for taking steps to reduce expenses.

In this case, I want to call attention to a recent memorandum issued by the Army Chief of Transportation, Maj. Gen. F. S. Besson, Jr., in which General Besson points out that "air transportation as the primary mode of transportation to and from overseas for Army passenger movements in peactime is under active consideration."

On September 8, 1959, I sent General Besson a letter in which I commended him for recognizing the economies in money and manpower gained from use of air transportation in the movement of Army passengers. In my letter I expressed the feeling that the Army's transportation bill could be reduced further through wider use of air transportation for troop movements between stations in this country. I told General Besson of my concern that the Army has not been taking advantage of the tremendous economies to be realized from sending more of its passengers in groups by charter air transport which is the most economical air transportation available since its cost approximates one-half the cost of sending passengers on an individually ticketed basis via first-class air service. I was happy to receive a reply signed by Brig. Gen. F. T. Voorhees, Acting Chief of Transportation, Department of the Army, informing me that the Army has this matter under active consideration.

In addition to increasing the savings in money, wider use of charter air transport service is called for on the basis of national defense. The majority of the charter air transport carriers are supplemental air carriers who represent an important weapon in the Nation's arsenal, because they occupy a significant role in our mobilization planning. In any future military emergency these carriers will unquestionably be needed to fill the military airlift gap just as they were called upon to do in the Berlin crisis of 1948 and 1949 and the Korean conflict of 1950. The Congress, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Defense Department all agree that the continued existence of these air carriers is of real value in the terms of national security.

Restricted as they are in the amount of civilian air transportation service they can perform, these carriers must look to Government business for the additional source of revenue needed to enable them to modernize and expand their fleets. So we see that wider us of their services by the military represents a sound investment in national defense with a savings in manpower and payroll as a clear byproduct.

Increasing Air Traffic and the Noise Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems in the Fifth Congressional District is the noise nuisance and danger from low-flying airplanes. New York International Airport—Idlewild—is located wholly within my district. This is a problem that has been with us for a goodly number of years but has become more acute with the advent of the commercial jet airliners. Commercial jet operations commenced at Idlewild in October 1958.

While the situation in my congressional district is probably the worst in the United States today, I know that the problem is not confined to the New York area. Therefore, for the information of all, I think it well to review here what we in Queens have found to be the problem, because I know many Members of Congress who have large airports in their districts have a problem and theirs will become more acute as air traffic grows and more and more jets are put into operation.

In July 1955 I called a meeting at the Federal Building, Idlewild Airport, to which was invited civic leaders in our area, officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, representatives, and other Long Island Congressmen. It was my thought that we could get together, discuss our problem and possibly work out a solution which would make Federal legislation unnecessary. This did not prove to be the case.

Because of the fact that those who had control over the operation of the airports and air traffic took no action, I found it necessary early in 1956 to introduce legislation which I felt, if enacted, would go a long way toward alleviation of the problem. The three bills I introduced, briefly, would, first mandatorily lift the minimum ceilings for operation of commercial airliners; second, evoke criminal penalties for the violation of regulations governing the flight of airplanes; third, ban the operation of jet airliners from airports located in cities or counties having a population of 1 million. These bills were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In July 1956 the Subcommittee on Transportation held hearings on these three bills. No future action was taken.

These same bills were introduced in the 85th Congress, but no action was taken by the committee.

During all this time, I continued to correspond with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Port of New York Authority, and the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee, seeking their cooperation in working out regulations which would bring about a manner of operating air traffic so that the noise therefrom would be reduced to a level that the airport neighbors could tolerate. I must say that very little was accomplished. The Port of New York Authority, which operates the airports in the New York area, namely, Newark, N.J.; Teterboro, N.J.; La Guardia, N.Y.; and New York International did ban jet operations until such time as they were tested and it was thought that the noise level was such that the airport neighbors could endure same. In October 1958 permission was granted by the New York Port Authority for the operation to and from Idlewild of the Boeing 707 and the Comet IV, under specified conditions without subjecting neighboring communities to intolerable noise.

The conditions under which the Port Authority permits jets to operate at Idlewild include a mandatory runway use procedure that requires that jet aircraft use overwater takeoffs whenever wind and other conditions permit. When these conditions do not permit, the planes are supposed to conduct their flight so as not to create a noise level to exceed 112 perceived noise decibels. Also takeoffs at night are to be permitted only over water from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.

These conditions sound good, but it has not worked out so well in practice—weather conditions and other alleged reasons seem much too often to prevent "overwater" takeoffs and exceptions are continuously made to the rule regarding night flights. Also, you will note these regulations all affect takeoffs, not landings.

Due to the fact that jet operations were an accomplished fact in January, I reintroduced my bills on minimum ceilings and criminal penalties. Failure to get action on previously introduced legislation and feeling a new approach was warranted, I also introduced House Resolution 162 to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the powers and functions of agencies over the operation of aircraft. I think it appropriate here to review some of the reasons I felt it necessary to introduce this legislation.

Prior to the enactment of the Federal Aviation Act and the establishment, under this act, of the Federal Aviation Agency, there was no regulation, backed up by law, which gave anyone jurisdiction over the noise problem of the aviation industry. In the New York area, as previously stated, the New York Port Authority specified certain criteria for the operation of jets. When these were announced it was reported in the press

that Gen. E. R. Quesada stated that he would do everything he could to eliminate these restrictions on jet operations—this in October 1958 before he assumed office in January 1959 as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. In addition to the regulations of the New York Port Authority, we have now the Federal Aviation Agency and the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee, a voluntary intraindustry committee to coordinate civil air transport operations in the metropolitan New York-New Jersey air terminal area. My experience proved that each time I tried to pinpoint responsibility for noise nuisance there was "buck passing" from one agency to another. To me, it seemed necessary that we go into this question of responsibility and determine who was responsible in each given instance for a particular problem and then, if there was no specified area of responsibility, by legislation fix same and give the proper organization the power to enforce it. For these reasons, House Resolution 162 was introduced.

House Resolution 162 was referred to the Committee on Rules. On July 29, 1959, I appeared before this committee in support of same. The committee realized the problem and was most sympathetic. However, because of a possible conflict in interest with the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, action was deferred so that consultation could be had with the chairman of that committee. On August 18, 1959, Hon. Oren Harris appeared before the Committee on Rules in opposition to House Resolution 162. It was his contention that the subject matter properly belonged before his committee. During his appearance before the Committee on Rules he, at the request of the chairman, agreed to call a meeting of his committee to go into the problem.

I might say here, that I had not been idle in the time that no committee action was in progress. I was corresponding with and meeting in person with those who I felt could be of assistance in finding a solution to this problem of noise. At a conference in my office on August 13, 1959, with Gen. E. R. Quesada and other Member of Congress from Long Island, I specifically requested General Quesada to give me the legal views of the Federal Aviation Agency on the authority to deal with the aircraft noise problem. Under date of August 24, 1959, I received a letter from General Quesada in which he stated:

> Thus, while I feel I have the basic legal authority to issue air traffic control regulations to suppress jet aircraft noise for the protection of people and property on the ground, I am, of course, not in a sound position to issue any such regulations until appropriate technical and legal studies are completed.

Mr. Speaker, this was the first time I had had anyone come out and state that authority existed for controlling noise. So, the Federal Aviation Agency says they have the power, under law, but they are not in a position to exercise it.

On August 26 and 27, 1959, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce called an executive session of the Subcommittees on Transportation and Aeronautics and Health and Safety to consider House Resolution 162. Appearing before the subcommittees, in addition to myself, were Gen. E. R. Quesada, Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency; Hon. James R. Durfee, Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board; and Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, president, Air Transportation of America. On request, representatives of the Port of New York Authority were allowed to sit in. At the conclusion of the meeting on August 27, the chairman announced that he intended to hold an open hearing in New York at New York International Airport at which time public testimony would be taken from the agencies involved with the air traffic problem, civic groups and private citizens. This meeting was held on September 7, 1959, Labor Day.

At the September 7 meeting the Port Authority testified as to their efforts to curtail noise, Mr. James C. Pyle, Assistant Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, reiterated that the Federal Aviation Agency has "the authority to step into this picture and do something," and Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, executive director, National Air Transport Coordinating Committee, reviewed the aims and purposes of his committee in this field.

Supposedly, all of us had one objective in mind—the abatement of noise without sacrificing safety. However, before the committee, the spokesman for the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee made the following statement:

> Responsibility for rules and regulations which govern the flight operation of aircraft lies with the Federal Government, and not with any other agency. You gentlemen, having been in on the drafting of the legislation of the act, I am sure appreciate that as much as anybody.
>
> It is, in our opinion, not appropriate that the airport operator seek to enforce flying regulations which are appropriately the responsibility of the Federal Government. Safety in air transportation will not be gained by a duplication in flying regulation.
>
> While the airlines and National Air Transport Coordinating Committee are wholeheartedly in favor of working with the airport operator for the reduction of noise, as they have done and will continue to do, there would be less confusion and there might be more result if the airport operator would not endeavor to form and enforce rules in an area which has logically been reserved to Federal jurisdiction.

From my work with the agencies, I have found that the Port of New York Authority has been earnestly concerned with the noise problem as it affects the airport neighbors and here we have an example of one agency which is supposed to be working on the same problem publicly belittling the other. It is important to know also that the Port of New York Authority was a member, to the extent of contribution to the finacial support, of the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee. As a result of the testimony of the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee spokesman, the Port of New York Authority on September 10, 1959, announced its resignation from the National Air Transport Coordinating Committee.

I believe that it has been conclusively proved that my constituents and I have not exaggerated the existing problem. Something must be done so that those living in the vicinity of large airports may enjoy their homes in relative peace and comfort, worship in their churches without undue disturbances, have their children educated without continued cessation of classroom work while planes pass over, and secure a good night's sleep without being awakened time and time again throughout the night.

Mr. Speaker, as I said before, this is a problem that is going to get worse unless action is taken now to meet it. The FAA states that it has authority under the Federal Aviation Act to issue regulations curbing noise, but it has not chosen to use this authority.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot urge too strongly that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce take affirmative action by recommending passage of effective Federal legislation prescribing mandatory regulations in this field.

Ambassador of Good Will to People of Laos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we have been much concerned over the news from Laos, and have been asking ourselves what we have received in return for the millions we have poured into that country. At such a time it was heartening to receive from a constituent the article from Our Sunday Visitor that I am extending my remarks to include. This is the story of a young American who gave himself to Laos, and, as Our Sunday Visitor states, became by his service and sacrifice one of our country's greatest ambassadors of good will. Now at 32 he is dying, but long after the millions we have tunneled into Laos are forgotten, Tom Dooley and his work will be remembered by the primitive peoples of that land.

The article from Our Sunday Visitor follows:

A PRAYER FOR TOM DOOLEY

(By Dale Francis)

The very least any of us should do for Tom Dooley is to say a prayer for him. But Dr. Tom Dooley, being the man he is, would probably ask you to say a prayer for Medico instead.

Chances are you've already heard of this valiant American. A graduate of Notre Dame, a medical doctor, a man with a mission, Tom Dooley is one of the great heroes of our times.

A handsome young man with professional skill, he could have been a great success in private practice in some American city. He could have belonged to the best clubs, mixed with the very best people. Instead he chose to give his life to the poorest of the poor. He

went into the most primitive of areas to try to heal the sick.

Laos lies between Vietnam and Thailand, bordering on the north on Communist China. Tom Dooley works in the jungles of Laos, a dedicated man who has convinced the people he serves that Americans are good people, that Americans not only send material goods, they come themselves to sweat, to suffer, to struggle against the hardships of primitive life.

Dr. Tom Dooley has been one of the greatest ambassadors of good will this Nation has ever had and the good he has done has spread. He formed Medico, an organization designed to bring help to primitive peoples everywhere through the labors of sacrificing men and women.

Medico has grown until now its work has spread into eight countries and it will grow more as others learn about it, as young doctors volunteer to work in primitive countries, as young technicians make sacrifices to help the least of those in the world.

A few weeks ago Tom Dooley was working in the jungles only 25 miles from the border of China. He was too busy to pay much attention to the growth on his chest, but when the time came he had a few hours, he asked another doctor to remove it. He did. A biopsy was made. Tom Dooley has a melonoma, one of the deadliest of all cancers.

He is only 32 years old. He has crowded many worthwhile achievements into these short years, but he hopes that before his life is ended he will have accomplished even more. He hopes to finish another book and he hopes to get Medico on a sound financial basis.

As I said, the very least any of us can do for Tom Dooley is to pray for him but there are millions of people of all faiths in the United States who should do more, who should help him get Medico on a sound basis so that it will continue even if Dr. Tom Dooley is not there to guide it. There must be many young men who believe as Tom Dooley believes in the importance of helping those who are in greatest need, certainly there will be more volunteers willing to go into primitive lands.

This is a nonsectarian organization, it is supported not by people of any one faith, its workers include people of many faiths. They teach no religion except that which they teach by example, showing their love for even the least among us.

Public Law 86–211: The Veterans' Pension Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the President has approved H.R. 7650, the Veterans' Pension Act of 1959, and it has been designated Public Law 86–211. The President signed this bill at Chequers in England on Saturday, August 29, 1959.

This is an event of tremendous significance. It is fair to say that this is the first basic sweeping, far-reaching provision of the pension structure of the Nation since the time of the Revolution. Up to now we have made a liberalization here, increased the rates there, and made generally minor changes. The bill which was reported unanimously by the Veterans' Affairs Committee represents several years of study, thought, and serious consideration by the committee and its staff. On this project, of course, we have had the full cooperation of the Veterans' Administration and for that we are extremely grateful.

It would not have been possible to enact this measure into law had it not been for the leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE. He has displayed rare tact, judgment, and legislative skill in successfully piloting this measure into its final stage. I am sure that I speak for all other members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and most of the Members of the House of Representatives when I express these sentiments.

The bill was passed by the House on June 15, 1959, by a division vote—226 yeas to 34 nays. The Senate followed suit on August 13 by a record vote—86 yeas to 6 nays.

Basically, this legislation which is effective July 1, 1960, emphasizes and strengthens the principle of paying pension on the basis of need and disability. Today we have three rates of pension payable to our veterans—$66.15 monthly if the veteran is less than 65 years of age and has been on the pension rolls for less than 10 years; $78.75 if he is 65 years of age and has been on the rolls for 10 or more years; $135.45 if he is in need of aid and attendance or if he is so helpless or blind so as to require the constant aid of another person.. Income limits of $1,400 if single and $2,700 if with dependents must be met.

The determination of permanent total disability is made on a liberal basis. Such rating is granted—where the requirement of permanence is met—when there is a single disability of 60 percent, or two or more disabilities one of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent, and unemployability attributed thereto.

Although age alone is not a basis for entitlement to pension, it is considered in association with disability and unemployability in determining permanent and total disability. The aforementioned percentage requirements are reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60-percent rating for one or more disabilities, with no percentage requirement for any one disability; at age 60 to a 50-percent rating for one or more disabilities; and at age 65 to one disability ratable at 10 percent or more. When these reduced percentage requirements are met and the disability or disabilities involved are of a permanent nature, a permanent and total disability rating will be assigned, if the veteran is determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of such disability.

Public Law 86–211 retains the age, and disability requirements listed above provides for a pension of $85 monthly for a veteran with less than $600 annual income; $70 if his income is between $600 and $1,200; $40 monthly if his income is between $1,200 and $1,800. For a veteran with one dependent and having less than $1,000 annual income the pension is $90; it is increased to $95 if he has two dependents, and to $100 if he has three or more dependents. These rates are increased by $70 for the veteran who needs regular aid and attendance. For the first time the Administrator is authorized to furnish an invalid lift to this latter classification of veterans. This will be a real benefit since many of them are bedridden.

In connection with the rates of pension I think that Members of the House will be interested to know that nearly 200,000 veterans who are presently on the pension rolls have less than $100 annual income. Thus it is readily apparent the economic impact which this bill will have and the very practical effect it will have in helping this group meet its daily living problems.

The bill also provides substantial increases for widows and children. The rate today for a widow is $50.40 monthly. This is increased to $60 if she has less than $600 a year income. If she has one child, the present rate is $63 and that has been increased to $75 for a widow with less than $1,000 annual income.

The most costly feature of this Public Law 211 is the so-called widows' equalization or parity. Up until now the widows of veterans of World War II and Korea have had to show at the time of their husband's death that he had some service-connected disability, however slight, in order to qualify for a non-service-connected pension. The widows of World War I veterans do not have to meet such a qualification and one of the provisions of Public Law 86-211 removes this disparity and places the widows of these three conflicts on an equal footing. This is of the greatest significance and in my judgment marks a real step forward.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the savings provisions which are a part of Public Law 86-211 give the fullest protection to the group of veterans who are presently on the pension rolls or who will come on the rolls prior to July 1, 1960. If it is to their advantage or to the advantage of a widow to elect to remain under the present rates, he or she may do so and be protected in that right so long as they may live. In other words, each veteran will have the choice of deciding whether he can receive a higher pension under the new law or under the old law. In either event his rights will be protected.

Now a word as to cost. The first-year cost of this proposal will be $309 million and it will drop each succeeding year for the first five years, when in the fifth year it will be $165 million. By the turn of the century, the year 2000, the total cost will be $9,319 million. Of this amount, $22 billion may be attributed to the widows equalization provision. Savings in excess of $13 billion are possible under the veterans' rates, to make the net cost approximately $9 billion as I have indicated earlier.

I want to close by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I think we have gone a long way toward solving our pension problem. The bill is a positive and constructive step forward.

Atomic Energy and Our U.S. Shrimp Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, just last month the very able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PRESTON] presented to this body some of his views on our domestic shrimp market. He indicated actions necessary to alleviate the severe slump in the domestic shrimp market and pointed out very vividly that the shrimp industry in the United States is presently undergoing its greatest struggle for survival, due to a combination of factors.

Mr. Speaker, I have been studying the problem of our shrimp industry, which is a matter of very great concern to me, because the shrimping industry is of the greatest importance to thousands of my constituents in Florida. I am sure that all of you know that the shrimp ranks first in dollar value among all commercial fish in the United States today, yet the small amount of research conducted in the past years by the Federal and State agencies, while it has yielded some very valuable information, has merely scratched the surface of what can be a great and continuing boon to the shrimp industry in the United States today—indeed its very salvation.

Great strides are being taken by our U.S. industry through steadily increasing uses of radioactive isotopes and radiation methods made possible under the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission atoms-for-peace program.

All indications to date reveal that, despite the relatively small amount of research and development moneys expended by our Government thus far in this most important field, our standard of living—in spite of inflationary trends—and our national economy can be improved a hundredfold through the development and application of radioactive isotopes and radiation to industry of their very many proven uses in the fields of rubber, paper, steel, chemicals, electronics, and so forth, and their potential application to our fishing industry. My learned colleague from Georgia indicated his concern, and rightly so, over the tremendously increased imports of shrimp into the United States from foreign countries. I believe that he said some 40 countries ship at least some shrimp imports to the United States. This concern was very ably demonstrated in his quote of the figures from the U.S. Bureau of Fisheries. According to that Bureau the shrimp imports for the month of March 1959 totaled 8,492,000 pounds, or almost double the 4,986,000 pounds imported during the same month in 1958. I need not tell you, Mr. Speaker, what effect this has upon our own shrimp industry and its thousands of employees.

In view of the current status of radiation preservation of fish and other seafood products as I have learned of it, I can say that I am indeed encouraged with the great possibilities offered the U.S. fishing industry and urge that we fully support that portion of the atoms-for-peace program having to do with radioisotopes application to the preservation of food, including fish and other seafood products. Vast amounts of money can be saved, production can be increased, prices reduced, yet profits increased if we are able successfuly to preserve these very popular, very nourishing, yet highly fragile seafood products, thus eliminating the necessity for refrigeration, storage, and other costly aspects of the industry. If we are the first country to perfect this method, and we certainly should be the first, then I believe we would not need to be concerned about the amount of imports by other countries because we could then compete with them completely successfully, to such an extent that these imports would decrease and perhaps in time disapear.

The American fishing industry has approximately 160 separate species of fish and shellfish which are sold in several thousand different market forms. Data should be made available to enable the processor to evaluate the relative economics of radiation preservation against those of icing, freezing, canning, and curing. There is no question but that in many cases slight increases in processing costs could be absorbed to make available fishery products in much more acceptable form. We are not the only country experimenting in the methods and techniques of using radioisotope irradiation for the preservation of fish. For example, a Prof. B. S. Swighart at Harwell, England, said in an address last month that the possibilities of low-level irradiation doses prolonging the shelf life of poultry and fish are equally promising. Fish appear to be more sensitive to the development of rancidity and color changes because of their greater susceptibility of fish oils to oxidation. Codfish cakes show a rather high acceptability even after treatment with sterilization doses. This is also true for other seafood products such as cooked crabmeat and oysters. Many other seafood products such as crabmeat, lobster meat, kippered herring, finan haddie, and so forth, have shown promise. Further articles on irradiation processing of foods in Britain indicate that nonfatty fish, cod and lemon sole, prove more suitable for radiation treatment, but even with these, however, flavor changes limit the maximum acceptable radiation dosage. A substantial increase in storage life of the order of three times under refrigeration was obtained when the radiation treatment was combined with an antibiotic dip. Conclusions to be drawn from these are that preliminary work strongly indicates that there will be commercial application for the radiation preservation of fish and other seafood products to extend storage life. Much experimental work remains to be done, however. Irradiation facilities located at dockside or on board ship will be required for future operations. Commercial application of radiation to extend the storage life of fish products will be contingent upon securing wholesomeness approval by the Food and Drug Administration.

The Atomic Energy Commission recently stated that its studies on the radiation preservation of foods have shown that the preservation of fish by ionizing radiations stand, perhaps, the closest toward being technically feasible of all the foods studied to date. The Commission recently authorized a small research contract with MIT for the purpose of determining the requirements for making fish preservation by irradiation an economic and industrial feasibility.

Mr. Speaker, I understand under this contract at MIT it is proposed to evaluate on a national level the possible uses of ionizing radiation for the preservation of fish. This study is to encompass the following points and provide answers to the following questions:

First. What is known regarding the technical status of the preservation of fish today?

Second. What are the more promising species and which are those less suitable for these purposes? What research work and what developmental work is necessary to provide radiation-preserved products on the market? This work may be arbitrarily broken down into the following areas: (a) Technological requirements, (b) economic considerations, (c) packaging requirements, (d) storage requirements, (e) radiation sources, (f) preferred method of irradiation geometry, (g) wholesomeness and toxicity testing.

This study will further show where the research and development should be undertaken nationally, who the people are, who might best do the work in each of its various aspects, how the work should be phased out in terms of time and in terms of money, what the other methods of sterilization of preservation of fish are, which may be competitive—such as antibiotics—when the Atomic Energy Commission should lend, diminish or cease its support entirely and when private industry should take over this work. Finally, how much money should such a program cost? All of this will be phased out in detail.

Mr. Speaker, I am most encouraged to know of research of this type being conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission and, from some knowledge of many of its past successes, I have every reason to be encouraged that the Commission will be successful in accomplishing this most important objective of preservation of fish and other types of seafood. I need not point out the importance of the U.S. fishing industry to our national economy, nor will I reiterate the many problems facing that industry today. Since the beginning of time when man first learned that fish are edible, the industry as such has almost been taken for granted. It has lagged far behind in the application of modern techniques, research, and development, and in Federal Government support. Speaking from firsthand knowledge of the U.S. shrimp industry, I know that very limited amounts of research moneys of Federal and State agencies have been allocated in the past years for carrying out essential research on shrimp in the

Gulf of Mexico. The amount of funds is certainly not commensurate with the present value and the future importance of this resource.

The taxpayers of the United States have made a justifiable yet an enormous investment in the atom—some $10 billion in all. If dividends—tangible, direct money returns to the Government—can be earned on this huge investment, then in fairness to the U.S. taxpayer they should be earned. I submit that dividends are now being earned on the Government's modest investment in the AEC isotope program and that this program is now the only segment of the atoms-for-peace program where the Government is receiving direct money returns on its investment—these returns taking the form of greater amounts of taxes paid on profits earned through the application of radioisotopes to their industry. With the increased use of isotopes in our industry will naturally come increased benefits to the national economy in the direct form of savings reflected and increased taxes willingly paid to the Government. The Government benefits; the user of the isotopes benefits through more profits; and the whole economy improves.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this body will agree that the AEC isotopes development program with its many, many possible applications toward the improvement of our national economy through increased efficiency in our industry is one of the best bargains ever bought by the U.S. taxpayers. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this particular aspect of the atomic energy program is but an infant in comparison with the atomic power development program or the weapons program. It has barely begun its research into all of the many potential uses which will improve the lot of all mankind. I believe that this program in the Atomic Energy Commission will, in the not too distant future, repay tenfold the total cost of our vast U.S. atomic energy industry. I, therefore, urge that we at all times encourage and support the speedy development within the Atomic Energy Commission of its research and development program to promote the wide use of radioactive isotopes by both our Government and private industry.

The Descendants of the Adam Wolf Family of Blair County, Pa., Have Preserved Their Noble Heritage by Over a Century of Honest and Wholesome Living

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, there are countless examples of business success achieved under the incomparable American free enterprise system yet none of them exceed in impressiveness the story of the Wolf family of Altoona, Blair County, Pa.

It was over a century ago that Adam Wolf a German immigrant landed in Hollidaysburg, Pa., and combining his talents as a cabinetmaker and undertaker, as was the custom at the turn of the century, he opened a store that was to prove the forerunner of the largest chain of independent furniture stores in Pennsylvania.

In the year 1902 Charles E. Wolf, a son of Adam Wolf, opened the City Furniture Store in Altoona which marked the beginning of the first store in the present chain of 17 modern furniture stores, 15 of which are located in central Pennsylvania while the other 2 stores are in Cumberland, Md., and Keyser, W. Va.

George A. Wolf and Herbert T. Wolf, sons of the late Charles E. and Annie C. Wolf, head the organization, with George A. Wolf as president and his brother Herbert T. Wolf as general manager. Their mother Mrs. Annie C. Wolf was president of the firm at the time of her death.

George and Herbert Wolf inherited the keen business acumen of their parents and their high regard for moral values in life with the result the Wolf firm has enjoyed remarkable success. The 17 modern stores were developed under the direction of George and Herbert Wolf who have employed modern methods of merchandising that are in the best traditions of American business life in the retail furniture field.

The Altoona store, which is headquarters for the Wolf chain, occupies an entire city block in depth, is six stories high and contains over an acre of actual display area.

A typical family organization the officers of Wolf Furniture Co. are sons and grandson of the founder, Charles E. Wolf, and are as follows: George A. Wolf, president; Herbert T. Wolf, general manager; Herbert T. Wolf, Jr., buyer; and Gerald P. Wolf, treasurer. The firm is fortunate in having a large staff of competent employees many of them having from 10 to over 30 years of loyal and efficient service.

This year marks the 57th anniversary of the founding by Charles E. Wolf of the Altoona store. From the founding of the Hollidaysburg store by his father, Adam Wolf, over 100 years ago, four generations of the Wolf family have held the reins of what has become a flourishing business venture that has developed into a virtual furniture empire. Thus the theme of the 57th anniversary celegration—"A proud past, a promising future"—is not only meaningful but an accurate description of the experience and outlook of the Wolf family in the business realm.

Through the long and successful history of the Wolf family its members have not allowed their progress in the business field to outshadow their interest in their community, State or Nation.

A member of the family Ensign George Anderson Wolf, U.S. Navy, son of Mr. and Mrs. George A. Wolf made the supreme sacrifice in defense of his country when the Japanese perpetrated the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor. Ensign Wolf was among the 1,103 officers and enlisted men who went down with their ship the U.S.S. *Arizona* which still lies submerged in the waters of Pearl Harbor.

The present officers of the Wolf Furniture Co. are all active in civic and church affairs giving unstintingly of their time, money, and efforts in advancing the best interests of the community. Thus it is a pleasure to salute such a fine American family on the 57th anniversary of the founding of the first store in the present chain of 17 modern furniture stores.

In conclusion the Altoona, Pa., Mirror in the September 5, 1959, issue paid tribute to the Wolf family in an editorial entitled "It's Grand Family," which I wish to include at this point in my remarks, together with an article in the September 4, 1959, issue regarding the anniversary dinner honoring Wolf Furniture Co. employees:

[From the Altoona Mirror, Sept. 5, 1959]

IT'S GRAND FAMILY

When families get together a grand good time is enjoyed by all, and when the store family of the Wolf Furniture Co., comprising 17 units, held an appreciation dinner at the Penn-Alto Hotel this week, tributes were numerous, gayety prevailed, and every member of the family was lauded.

The dinner was the occasion for awarding service insignia to firm members and employees with 30-, 20-, and 10-year records, and the group is large.

Previously, 11 won 30-year, 6 20-year, and 25 the 10-year awards. This year the Altoona stores added 2 30-year workers, 4 with 20 years' service, and 12 with 10 years, while the 16 branch stores turned up 1 30-year employee, 5 with 20 years, and 19 with 10-year records.

The Wolf Furniture Co. name is a household one throughout 17 communities in the State and in West Virginia and Maryland communities, too, for the firm has shown a tremendous growth, thanks to fine leadership and excellent employee and supervising groups. The employees, however, are given full credit for this progress, and the appreciation dinner most heartily lauded the men and women in the organization.

The founder, Charles E. Wolf, and his wife, Mrs. Annie C. Wolf, president at the time of her death, were recalled, along with John J. Wolf, merchandising manager, all giving the business its first start, and each building up the business for the sons of the founding family to carry on. Grandsons today add to the tradition as operating directors.

The Wolf Furniture Co. family is a happy one, as was demonstrated at the elaborate appreciation dinner, and everyone shared in the praises and in the display of loyalty to a firm that has been a leader in advancing Altoona, as well as all the communities where stores now are operating.

The evening was climaxed with an excellent talk by Howard W. Lindaman, music man, former councilman, and champion pepper-upper in the Altoona community. His address drew rounds of applause as he recalled the courtesies, the business ability, and the fine accomplishments of the Wolf family over the years.

The Wolf Furniture Co. family is certainly one to be pround of. It's one of pep and enthusiasm and loyalty.

[From the Altoona Mirror, Sept. 4, 1959]

WOLF FURNITURE EMPLOYEES FETED AT DINNER EVENT

The second appreciation dinner in honor of Wolf Furniture Co. employees of the Altoona and 16 branch stores was held in the

Logan room of the Penn-Alto Hotel Thursday evening.

In his opening remarks, Gerald P. Wolf, toastmaster, said that the dinner was to honor the firm employees. He introduced a number of guests, including business and professional leaders.

Greetings were by John Wolf, son of Herbert T. Wolf, and a June graduate of Notre Dame University, where he majored in business administration; Herbert T. Wolf, Jr., and James Dilling, new supervisor of the 16 branch stores.

Growth of the Wolf stores was praised by the main speaker, Howard W. Lindaman, who recalled his 6 years of experience as a salesman. Mr. Lindaman, a longtime customer, traced his store association.

George A. Wolf, president, presented the service awards to the Altoona personnel, while Herbert T. Wolf, Sr., made the awards to the branch employees and also talked about his recent European trip. Awards were made to employees with 30, 20, and 10 years of service.

Introduced were Miss Zelia Reynolds, a retired employee, and Mrs. Marian Stoltz, who has 34 years service with the firm and was presented a bouquet.

P. Edmund Riley, introduced as "Mr. Wolf Furniture," with 37 years' service, presented gifts to George A. Wolf and to Herbert T. Wolf, Sr.

The invocation was by Raymond Higgins, of Tyrone; the benediction by Raymond Kerns. Song conductor was E. E. Rudisill and music was by the Alleghenyaires, while Karl F. Irvin presented dinner music.

The Altoona response when the awards were made was by James E. Potter, while the branch response was by Wilford Fisher, of Bellefonte.

Recipient of the gold and diamond-studded pins included:

ALTOONA STORE

Thirty-year award: Raymond C. Kerns, James E. Potter.

Twenty-year award: Harold Brubaker, James A. Goss, Marthella D. Mays, Donald A. Wertz.

Ten-year award: Donald Baird, Robert Beasom, James Dilling, Reta Glunt, Edna Kimlin, James Knisely, Richard Koch, Charles McConahy, Rose Marie Marasco, Oscar Schmidhammer, Gerald P. Wolf, Anthony Zsifkov.

BRANCH STORES

Thirty-year award: Raymond Higgins, Tyrone.

Twenty-year award: Eugene Beckwith, Lewistown; William Clemens, Hollidaysburg; Wilford Fisher, Bellefonte; Louis E. Patton, Lewistown; Arch Rounsley, Lock Haven.

Ten-year award: Eugene Baker, Huntingdon; Robert Conrad, Lewistown; Alma Frahn, Williamsport; Walter Goody, Barnesboro; Augustus Hussleton, Lock Haven; Leo Isner, Cumberland; Charles Keefe, Barnesboro; James McNeish, Philipsburg; Ronald Olear, Barnesboro; Anna Palm, Lewistown; Joseph Parsons, Tyrone; Frank Pavelko, Barnesboro; Catherine Rattenni, Cumberland; Wallace Riley, Clearfield; William Senson, Tyrone; Mary Shoemaker, Bellefonte; Mary Signorino, Lock Haven; Frank Simpkins, Lewiston; Blanche Wilks, Barnesboro.

A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, truckdrivers all over the United States are noted for their helpfulness to motorists who are in trouble on the highways. They take a great and justifiable pride in the innumerable reports which come in from people who have been helped, frequently out of serious trouble, by the efforts of some passing truckdriver.

My attention has just been directed to a courageous act by a truckdriver—one which in this case saved the lives of some Galveston neighbors and constituents of mine. The truckdriver involved here went far beyond the traditional helping to change a tire, or pulling a car out of the ditch. He plunged into the water and saved some members of the Galveston family from drowning. The man's name is William Mount. He drives for the Associated Transport Co., and is a member of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Local No. 515, of Chattanooga, Tenn. I am indebted to the Washington office of this organization for the information which it is now my privilege to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. A letter of commendation from one of the beneficiaries, Mrs. H. D. Dixon, of my home city of Galveston, tells the story in an unusually effective way. The letter follows:

GALVESTON, TEX., *July 14, 1959.*

Mr. MAYOR,
Rossville, Ga.

DEAR MR. MAYOR: I tried to call you at your office when we first returned home from Florida but I was unable to reach you by phone, then the long holiday so I am taking the liberty of writing to you as I feel that you should know about one of your citizens as he is truly a man that any city or community will be proud of.

During the last days of June we stopped off in Panama City on our way home from Florida and on the morning of June 27 we went bathing at the beach there across from Reid's Trailer Courts and Cabins. There were four of us, my daughter, Betty Jo, Mrs. Albert Vassallo, Cathy Vassallo, and myself. After only a few minutes in the water we were caught in the undertow and were in serious trouble. There was only one lifeguard on the beach and he had more than his hands full with the four of us. Mr. Mount, from your city, who lives at 709 East Circle Drive, with no thought of himself or the danger grabbed the tow rope that the life guard had been unable to bring with him and swam out to my daughter and myself who was battling the undertow thus saving our lives, the lifeguard had gone farther out to the aid of the other members of our party and together they brought us all in to safety. I have had a pretty rough time of it having swallowed a lot of salt water and have become completely exhausted but other than that with the help of Mr. Mount whose bravery and courage will be forever in our hearts and by the grace of God we are all safe and sound. I feel very strongly that Mr. Mount should get recognition there in your hometown paper and also to his church for his very worthy deed, and the Florida papers play down any things that might be harmful to their tourist trade. Mr. Mount is employed by a trucking firm but in the excitement we did not learn the name of it. He has a lovely wife and three darling children. I will truly appreciate any help that you might give us on this matter.

I will close thanking you again for helping in any way that you can to bring this matter to Mr. Mount's friends and neighbors. The world is a better place for having people like him in it.

Respectfully,

Mrs. H. D. DIXON.

Mrs. Vassallo resides at 2505 Oak here in Galveston. Our daughters are 11 years old.

H. H. D.

Protest on Award of Contract to Foreign Producer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MILLIKEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of Members of Congress, I should like to insert in the RECORD a copy of the letter which I wrote on September 9 to the Comptroller General of the United States with reference to the award by the U.S. Corps of Engineers of a contract for hydraulic turbines for the Big Bend Reservoir in South Dakota. I have particular interest in this matter since the low American bidder, Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., is in my congressional district:

SEPTEMBER 9, 1959.

The Honorable JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CAMPBELL: I wish to protest the award by the U.S. Corps of Engineers of a contract to a foreign producer of the hydraulic turbines for the Big Bend Reservoir in South Dakota. The low American bidder, Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., has supplied the letters of protest which they have sent to you. I refer to file B-139912. Your decision in this matter will have long term impact on companies throughout the Nation which are selling to our Federal Government.

Aside from any Buy-American Act consideration, it is in the interest of the Federal Government and of national defense for the Government to limit its purchases of hydraulic turbines to American suppliers. These are the prime movers which are supplying hydroelectric energy for national health, safety, welfare, and defense. These turbines are designed to perform over a period of 50 years or more. Therefore, the original equipment should be purchased in this country so that replacement parts will be quickly available in time of war or peace.

The Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. has stated in its several letters that it has offered to supply these hydraulic turbines to the Federal Government at a fair and reasonable price. Its bid is based upon work to be performed by American labor in American shops, and equipment to be produced from American parts, materials, and supplies. Its bid was 100 percent in conformity with the intent and objectives of the Buy-American Act and in support of American enterprise, labor, laws, and standard of living. But it lost the contract.

In its next proposal to the Federal Government to supply hydraulic turbines to the Tennessee Valley Authority for the Wheeler Dam, the corporation figured its price on the basis of the maximum amount of materials and labor that could be purchased from overseas and still have the bid called an American bid under current interpretations of the Buy American Act. The company offered hydraulic turbines which will contain 49-plus percent foreign-made components and materials. These will be made by foreign workmen in foreign plants, and will contribute nothing to the American economy. Through this extreme measure, the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp. was able to be the low bidder, and at least save a crumb for the American workman.

Thus, current interpretations of the Buy American Act have forced this company to purchase from foreign producers fully finished castings and other parts, which for years they had been purchasing from American suppliers in support of American wage earners, American enterprise, and in conformity with the letter, spirit, and intent of the Buy American Act. It is clear that current interpretations of the Buy American Act are forcing American producers to obtain parts and materials from foreign producers in order to compete for sales to our own Federal Government, under a statute which in the first instance requires the Federal Government to limit its purchase of supplies to those produced in the United States, made from supplies also produced in the United States.

It is your duty, under the Buy American Act, to make certain that the contract for the hydraulic turbines for the Big Bend Reservoir, referred to in file B-139912, be awarded to the low American bidder. Failure to repect the foreign bid in this instance will set a precedent which will shatter the Buy American Act.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. MILLIKEN, Jr.
Member of Congress.

Record of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service During the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. TOM MURRAY

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the 1st session of the 86th Congress has established a remarkable record of continuing progress with respect to Federal employee and postal legislation.

The committee record in behalf of Federal employees is especially noteworthy in the light of the major employee benefits granted in the closing session of the 85th Congress, including a 10-percent retroactive salary increase for over 500,000 postal employees and nearly 1 million classified employees, a 10-percent cost-of-living annuity increase for 260,000 retirees and 80,000 survivors, and a number of fringe benefits. The additional employee benefits granted in the present Congress are particularly significant when viewed against this backdrop of liberal salary increases and other benefits to which they will be added.

The record of the committee also is a tribute to the diligence, interest, and fine cooperation of every member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Both personally and as chairman of the committee I welcome this opportunity to express to each member my deep appreciation for a job well done. The members have been most loyal and conscientious in their attendance at committee meetings and in the close attention they have given to committee legislation and special studies. In my judgment, we have never had a committee membership more able, more informed, and more devoted to carrying out our complex—and often controversial—responsibilities.

This summary is provided with the thought that it will be helpful to all Members during the recess as a convenient reference to committee actions during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE BENEFITS

HEALTH INSURANCE

The Federal employees health benefits program (S. 2162), sent to the President by the House September 14, 1959, is one of the most beneficial employee measures approved in any recent Congress. There is no finer example of able and constructive legislative deliberations than demonstrated by our committee in taking this extremely complex and controversial legislation and working out a bill that has the unanimous support of every committee member, the wholehearted agreement of employees' organizations and of private enterprise that will provide the services, and the approval of the administration.

This legislation establishes a health program, with the Government sharing the cost, to protect Federal employees and their dependents against the high, unbudgetable, and financially burdensome costs of medical services. Employees will be able to purchas protection, at very low cost, from the oppressive expenses of normal medical care and often crushing expense of major or catastrophic illness or injury. The program also improves the competitive position of the Government in the recruitment and retention of competent civilian personnel.

Addition of the health program to the existing fringe benefits package for Government employees—which already includes retirement and survivor annuities, group life insurance, annual and sick leave, pay for job-connected injury or death, uniform allowances, and other benefits—places the Government on a substantially equal level with progressive private enterprise in respect to employee fringe benefits.

Basic and extended health protection is made available to 2 million employees and their dependents—some 4.5 million individuals. There will be free choice among four separate health plans, including a service benefits plan, such as the Blue Cross-Blue Shield organizations offer; an indemnity plan, such as now offered by certain insurance companies; any one of several Federal employee organization plans; and a comprehensive medical plan on either a group-practice or individual-practice prepayment basis. The plans will provide a wide range of hospital, surgical, medical, and related benefits. Both the service and the indemnity plan will include at least two levels of benefits. Thus, each employee will be able to select the plan best suited to his own needs.

The Government's contribution generally is 50 percent of the cost, but not less than $1.25 or more than $1.75 biweekly for an individual employee and not less than $3 or more than $4.25 biweekly for an employee and family, subject to certain special exceptions. Employees need not pass any physical examination and, in the event of separation from Government service, may convert their coverage to a private plan without physical examination. No person may be excluded because of race, sex, health status, or—at time of first opportunity to enroll—age.

This legislation enriches the Federal employees' fringe benefits package by a minimum $222 million annual health program, with the Government and the employees sharing the cost. It is widely regarded among employees as the equivalent in value of another liberal pay increase, on top of the 10-percent raise granted just last year.

OBSERVANCE OF LEGAL HOLIDAYS

The committee developed and approved H.R. 5752, now on the President's desk, to correct inequities in existing laws which deprive certain Federal employees of the right to a workday off when a holiday falls on Saturday or an employee's day off in lieu of Saturday. The bill requires that every employee receive a workday off for each one of the eight legal holidays every year, regardless of the day of the week on which any holiday may fall.

OVERSEA TEACHERS

Public Law 86-91 provides an up-to-date system of personnel administration, for teachers in schools conducted by the Department of Defense for dependents of the Department's personnel in oversea areas, which is comparable to the school systems in most public primary and secondary school jurisdictions in the United States. This legislation was developed through the Civil Service Subcommittee studies in cooperation with the Department of Defense and places in effect an Executive recommendation. It is also a direct implementation of a unanimous committee recommendation contained in House Report No. 2109, 84th Congress.

This act eliminates serious problems in the compensation and employment conditions of oversea teachers which stem primarily from the fact that they have been employed under civil service laws and rules designed for full-time classified employees—not for the teaching profession. For example, although the school year lasts only 9 or 10 months, oversea teachers' salaries have been on an annual basis, as in the case of the usual classified employees, so that they were being paid only nine- or ten-twelfths of the annual salary. They have been subject to the Annual and Sick Leave Act, which is entirely unsuitable in view of the school recess periods at Christmas and Easter and in the summer months. They have been receiving no pay or any of the usual oversea differentials and allowances during these recess periods.

Public Law 86-91 removes these teachers from the Classification Act of 1949, the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951, and other unsuitable laws and regulations. They will have a separate salary and allowance system adapted to the requirements of the school program and consistent with that followed in the school system in the District of Columbia. No oversea teacher's salary will

be higher than the salary for a comparable position in the District of Columbia school system.

This new law will contribute greatly to maintaining instructional and scholastic levels in schools for dependents of oversea personnel comparable to the levels which would be available were such personnel on duty in the United States.

OVERSEAS DIFFERENTIALS AND ALLOWANCES

Another important employee measure, developed by the committee through its Civil Service Subcommittee studies over the past several years, is contained in H.R. 7758, passed by the House September 7, 1959. This bill will improve and strengthen administration of overseas activities of the Government by establishing a coordinated and reasonably uniform system to compensate American citizens employed abroad by the Government for additional costs, hardships and inconveniences incident to their working assignments abroad. There will be uniform treatment for all oversea employees, to the extent practicable.

The bill embodies the principle that the Government should provide equal treatment for its oversea employees in respect to the additional expenses they incur because of their assignments abroad, over and above expenses of Government employees in the United States, and the hardships, inconveniences, and other differences in environment or conditions of employment which justify additional compensation or allowances.

The bill consolidates a wide variety of existing provisions of law granting allowances and differentials for the several categories of Federal employees in oversea areas. Provision is made for a temporary lodging allowance after arrival at a new oversea post and before final departure from the post; reasonable repairs to make substandard living quarters habitable; the inclusion of water as a utility covered by quarters allowances; advance payment of quarters allowances; allowances for maintenance of dependents where a separate establishment is necessary for them away from the post of duty; a post allowance to compensate for living costs higher than in Washington, D.C.; a transfer allowance upon assignment to a foreign post or at a post in the United States between foreign assignments; transportation of children—one round trip to the United States and back—for secondary or college education; a hardship post differential not exceeding 25 percent of basic pay for foreign conditions of environment warranting additional compensation; payment for packing and unpacking, transporting to and from storage, and storing furniture and household and personal effects of employees assigned to foreign posts; payment of unusual expenses incident to the operation of official residences suitable for chief representatives of the United States, and other senior officials designated by the President, at foreign posts; and transportation of the motor vehicle of an employee to his oversea post subject to a general limitation that only one such vehicle may be shipped during each 4 years of oversea service.

Home leave, such as now provided for the Foreign Service, is authorized for other employees who complete 24 months of continuous service abroad, in addition to the usual annual leave. Authority to accumulate up to 45 days of annual leave, now available to classified civilian employees abroad, is extended to employees of agencies operating under the Foreign Service Act or related law. Existing income tax exemptions for foreign areas allowances—but not post differentials—are continued in effect for the foreign areas allowances contained in the bill.

The value of the additional employee benefits provided by this legislation is estimated at $3 million annually.

FORFEITURE OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT BENEFITS

H.R. 4601, developed in a special committee study after adjournement of the 85th Congress and passed by the House April 14, 1959, will correct certain harsh inequities caused by Public Law 769, 83d Congress, which prohibits Federal retirement benefits based on service of an individual who has committed any one of a great many types of minor as well as serious offenses. The committee bill continues and strengthens the existing prohibition against any Federal annuity or retired pay in the case of an offense involving the national security of the United States but restores other annuities—including survivor benefits—previously denied because of comparatively minor offenses having no relationship whatever to the national security. In many instances the offenses were so trivial there was no penalty and the individual continued in, or returned to, work and rendered long and faithful service until retirement. In these cases, there is no doubt of the individuals' complete loyalty or any semblance of an offense against the national security.

EARLIER COMMENCING DATES FOR RETIREMENT ANNUITIES

Under H.R. 8289, passed by the House September 14, civil service retirement annuities will commence the first day after separation from the service if immediate benefits are payable or, in the case of deferred benefits payable at a certain age, the first day after the prescribed age is reached. Benefits of surviving widows and children will begin the day after the death of the employee or annuitant on whose service they are based. Under present law, annuities and survivor benefits commence the first of the month following separation from the service or death, as the case may be. The bill is particularly helpful for widows and children, since their survivor benefits will become payable immediately after death of the employee or annuitant whereas under existing law the benefits are not payable for periods of as much as 30 days after death.

EXECUTIVE, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH POSITIONS

The committee approved three bills authorizing new top management and scientific research positions necessary for the effective conduct of vital defense functions and other essential Government programs.

S. 1845 authorizes pay adjustments for Patent Office Examiner in Chief and designated Examiners in Chief from the present $12,770–$13,970 level to maximums of $17,500 and $15,150, respectively; an increase from 146 to 260 in the number of supergrade positions—$14,190 to $17,500—in the Treasury Department; and a net increase of 94 in supergrade positions available to the Civil Service Commission for allocation to other departments and agencies against a considerable backlog of requests—of which 20 are earmarked for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 4 for the Bureau of Prisons, 3 for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1 for the Department of Labor, 15 for the Small Business Administration, and 1 for the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, upon justification by these departments and agencies. Pay of executive positions is adjusted as follows: Commissioner of Social Security from $17,500 to $20,000; and Deputy Commissioner and Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service, Administrative Assistant Attorney General, and Administrative Assistant Secretaries of Agriculture, Labor, and Treasury from $17,500 to $19,000. The Administrator, Agricultural Research Service, presently paid $17,500 under the Federal Executive Pay Act, is transferred to one of the scientific research positions provided by the bill. The Departments of Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, respectively are granted 10 and 5 additional scientific research positions in the salary range $12,500 to $19,000.

Public Law 86–36 removes National Security Agency personnel from the Classification Act since the Agency security functions make it impossible to give the Civil Service Commission normal position classification and duty data; reestablishes the 50 existing Agency scientific research positions under the new act; and authorizes the Agency Director to fix salaries of other employees, as justified by levels of responsibilities, in relation to Classification Act salary rates, with not more than 50 supergrade positions in the $14,190–$17,500 range.

H.R. 6059 increases from 303 to 372 the number of supergrade positions—salary range $14,190–$17,500—and from 292 to 450 the number of scientific research positions—salary range $12,500–$19,000—in the Defense Department to perform necessary duties resulting from the greatly increased complexity and tempo of our defense effort.

POSTAL LEGISLATION

"CLEAN MAIL" LAW

Unanimous House approval of H.R. 7379 completed one of the finest public-interest actions ever undertaken and brought to fruition by a legislative subcommittee in a single session of the Congress. The bill will greatly strengthen the hand of the Postmaster General in carrying out his lawful responsibility to exclude from U.S. mails matter which is so repugnant to public policy as not to warrant the privilege of the postal service.

This legislation is the first, and it is believed the strongest, step in this Congress in an all-out committee effort to knock "pornography for profit" out of the mails in response to rising public

anger at the veritable flood of vile matter that is bombarding homes, schools, children, men, and women throughout the Nation.

The bill also is a tribute to the unflagging zeal and the two-fisted attack of our Postal Operations Subcommittee on the insidious traffic in writings, pictures, movies, and the like—now flowing through all avenues of commerce—which has become a public scandal. The subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, has developed and placed in effect a two-phase campaign to protect the public, as explained in the later discussion of the subcommittee studies.

H.R. 7379 makes two important changes in the law. It extends from 20 days to 45 days the time in which the Postmaster General may detain mail addressed to any individual or firm which he finds sending obscene or fraudulent matter through the mails. The existing 20-day period is entirely inadequate. The only way to stop purveyors of filth is to cut off the incoming flow from their illicit ventures, as will be done under the bill. The second change authorizes detention of mail when "the public interest" is affected due to the obscene or fraudulent nature of the matter giving rise to the detention order, in lieu of the existing authority to detain mail when necessary "for enforcement" of the statute excluding obscenity from the mails. This "public interest" standard is a tried and proved one, under which responsibilities for the enforcement of other public protection laws, such as the Securities and Exchange Act, have been carried out successfully in the public interest.

POSTAGE RATES FOR BOOKS AND LIBRARY BOOKS

H.R. 4595, pending in the Senate, revises and clarifies postage rate provisions under which books, library books, and related materials are mailed at special low rates. Either the third- or fourth-class rate or the book rate, whichever is cheaper, will apply to mailings of books and certain other educational matter. The book rates are extended to "sound recordings" in lieu of the existing application to "phonograph recordings." Periodicals may be mailed at the book rates in either bound or unbound form. Guides or scripts may be mailed with films and filmstrips at the book rates. Certain meaningless language is removed from the book and the library book postal rate provisions.

MINIMUM CHARGE ON THIRD-CLASS MAILINGS OF ODD SIZES AND SHAPES

Public Law 86-56 revises the minimum per piece charge for third-class mail of odd size or shape from 6 cents to 3½ cents. This revision eliminates serious hardship imposed by the 6-cent rate on churches, church organizations, nurserymen, and other small businesses and also removes difficult operating problems arising in the Postal Establishment because of the 6-cent charge.

OTHER LEGISLATION

H.R. 163, sent to the White House September 9, credits service—for retirement purposes—of U.S. commissioners, who are compensated by fees, on the same basis used to credit such service of other Government employees who are compensated by fees.

H.R. 8241 eliminates certain inequities which have operated to deprive former Members of Congress reemployed in appointive positions of their earned retirement annuities. Conditions affecting reemployment of former Members of Congress are placed on substantially the same basis now provided by law for other retired Government employees.

H.R. 6830, pending in the Senate, clarifies the law relating to sworn statements by publishers having second-class mail permits and extends to magazines the requirement—now applied to most newspapers—that the sworn statements show average number of copies of each issue sold or distributed to paid subscribers. The publishers support the bill, which will facilitate postal operations.

H.R. 5571, pending in the Senate, makes career postal employees with 3 years of service eligible for postmasterships at their offices, if otherwise qualified, even though they reside outside the town or the office delivery limits.

Public Law 86-169 authorizes credit to postal revenues of commissions on toll telephones in post offices; amounts received by employees for witness fees, travel expenses, and subsistence when subpenaed to apepar officially in private litigation; and collections for loss of first-class registered matter not restored to the original owner.

Public Law 86-33 facilitates the training of postmasters by specifically authorizing such training under the Government Employees Training Act—Public Law 85-507.

Public Law 86-122 eliminates from Government salary laws an obsolete provision which is contradictory to existing budget and appropriation procedures. The provision elimnated purported to authorize salary costs, incurred in part in one fiscal year and in part in the following fiscal year, to be charged to the following year appropriations.

SPECIAL STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

MANPOWER UTILIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization has continued its study, begun in the 85th Congress, of the contracting out of Government responsibilities for administrative and management services, especially in the research and development of guided missiles. A preliminary report issued by the subcommittee in April points out several improvements made by the departments and agencies since the subcommittee began its investigation in November 1957. For example, the report shows that a recent Navy reorganization has corrected overlapping and duplication found within the Department of the Navy missile program at the time of the initial investigation.

Subcommittee hearings last December pointed up areas of possible conflict of interest in the Air Force ballistic missile program. The Secretary of the Air Force subsequently issued policy statements setting forth guidelines for research and development contractors dealing with hardware-producing contractors.

Among several other needed improvements, Department of Defense rotation policies for military officers have been revised so as to be more flexible and thereby reduce personnel turnover. Turnover in several key job areas in the military departments having primary responsibility for missiles was found by the subcommittee to be excessive.

As a continuation of the subcommittee's analysis of the missile program, the subcommittee chairman on February 10 requested the General Accounting Office to conduct an investigation and furnish answers to several basic questions raised by the subcommittee in its study of the utilization of scientists and engineers in the missile programs of the Defense Department. Close liaison has been maintained with the General Accounting Office in the development of this information and, when it is received, the subcommittee plans to issue a final report on the utilization of manpower in the missile programs.

Public hearings were held in February extending the scope of the study, and supplementing the preliminary report, on the utilization of manpower in the missile program. The hearings, which resulted in House Report 688, 86th Congress, related primarily to the Government's policy of contracting out the training of military personnel.

This report indicates a policy trend in the field of Government contracting which if uncorrected may well lead to avoidance of primary responsibility imposed on Government departments and agencies. The growing habit of responsible Federal officials to fall back on the contracting device whenever faced with a difficult or unpleasant task is a radical departure from fundamental principles relating to the performance of duties and responsibilities of our Government. This tends to create waste and extravagance and undermines the morale of the career Government employees.

The report recommends that the Defense Department operate its own training program for personnel assigned to military assistance and advisory duties and reappraise its policies relating to contracting for management or personnel services and for the performance of functions historically performed by the Department.

Working with representatives of the Department of Defense, several civilian departments, and the General Accounting Office, the subcommittee developed a new procedure, in the form of a manpower questionnaire, for determining employment trends and for evaluating manpower programs and policies at local field activities. The General Accounting Office will use the manpower questionnaire in the course of its regular audits of the activities. This manpower questionnaire should provide considerable basic information that previously has been lost through editorial processes in the chain of command. Currently the manpower audit is being conducted by the General Accounting Office in three military installations and two civilian field activities.

During July the subcommittee held public hearings as a further continuation

of its investigation of the effect on utilization of Federal employees of the Government's policies on the contracting out of functions historically performed by the Government. Representatives of the General Services Administration, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and the International Cooperation Administration appeared and testified. As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee set for further consideration certain matters, such as the Government's policy of contracting out custodial services, the Department of Defense practice of allowing defense contractors to inspect their own work, and the allowances and benefits currently being paid personnel sent overseas by the International Cooperation Administration.

The subcommittee has increasingly noted the tendency in the executive branch to administer programs by committees, often with outside consultants. To provide initial data on this aspect of Government procedure, the Departments of Defense and Commerce have been requested to furnish the subcommittee information concerning their use of committees, including, among other matters, the number of committees which they now have, the composition of such committees, and the degree of overlap and duplication of these committees with other organizations in such Departments. The material is due November 1, 1959.

The subcommittee program for the recess period includes the following:

First. Analysis of new grade GS–15 positions created in the past year, as a followup on House Report 2706, 85th Congress, entitled "Legislative Control of Federal Positions and Salaries," which showed that in recent years the entire Classification Act compensation structure has been rewritten and revised upward by administrative action.

Second. Hearings in the late fall, in accordance with past subcommittee policy, at which the military departments, other selected departments and agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission will report on progress in improved manpower utilization. Among other matters for these hearings, the Department of Defense has been requested to collect information regarding the use by the military departments of U.S. citizens employed overseas. The information will include the number of employees by major geographic areas, types of work performed, and the benefits and allowances authorized for these employees.

Third. Onsite reviews of the results of the General Accounting Office use of the manpower questionnaire referred to above. It is expected that these reviews not only will point up local personnel and management problems at the activity level, but also will indicate broader manpower areas of interest for the consideration of top management in the departments.

POSTAL OPERATION SUBCOMMITTEE

The Postal Operations Subcommittee devoted primary attention, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, to the growing problem of use of the U.S. mails for the dissemination of obscenity and pornography.

The subcommittee conducted an intensive study directed toward corrective measures and held a number of hearings and conferences to obtain necessary information and recommendations from recognized authorized and from leaders at all governmental levels and in private life.

The subcommittee study and hearings have demonstrated that the circulation of obscenity and pornography, and its effect on the youth of America, by no means are confined to material moving through the mails. Lewd and lascivious writings, movies, photographs, pictorial representations, and other unfit matter finds its way into the hands of men, women, and children indiscriminately from every conceivable source. Although the subcommittee's basic jurisdiction relates to the postal service, there is an equally compelling need to keep this filth off the untold thousands of newsstands, drugstore counters, comic book displays, and other sales devices that are so attractive to youngsters. Its ready accessibility in these blatant sales offerings naturally seems to an adolescent to indicate its general acceptability and thereby builds a false impression in their young minds of the true moral standards of our society.

The truth of the matter is, young people in every city, town, and hamlet are being literally bombarded from all sides with a loose portrayal of sex that cannot help but weaken the moral fiber of these future leaders of our Nation. Nor does the damage end there. We have positive proof, in fact, of a direct and very dangerous connection between the reading and viewing of sordid literature and pictures and the frightening increase in juvenile crime and misbehavior.

Use of the U.S. mails is part of what appears to be a master plan for the wholesale promotion and condut of commerce for profit in obscenity and pornography. The problem has reached such serious proportions as to be of grave concern to every decent man and woman in America. This traffic in vileness is all the more vicious because its product is being aimed more and more to the young people and children—those known by the purveyors of filth to be the most susceptible and, therefore, the most likely source of ready income.

Thousands of fathers, mothers, teachers, ministers, priests, and laymen have asked intervention by the Congress to put a stop to unbridled dealing in smut. Many conscientious citizens have written to the subcommittee and to individual Members of Congress indicating their extreme concern and inquiring as to how they might unite with other right-thinking people in their communities to combat this menace to our society. The subcommittee plans to work in cooperation with these volunteers and with organized governmental, community, and civic groups which share our objective. The subcommittee report entitled "Obscene Matter Sent Through the Mail," containing findings and recommendations as well as a suggested program for community action, will be issued in the near future. The report is intended, and should serve, to bring the full power of public indignation to bear in this crusade and to encourage communities and civic groups to take effective action against the unscrupulous fringe of thoughtless people who deal for profit in filth and smut with no thought of the public welfare.

The subcommittee held public hearings in Washington during April and May to receive the testimony of the Postmaster General and other postal officials regarding the problem of enforcing existing law which declares obscene matter to be nonmailable. Supporting testimony was received from the legislative chairman of the Churchmen's Commission for Decent Publications; the president of the National Council of Catholic Men; the executive secretary of the Board of Christian Social Action, American Lutheran Church; the secretary of public affairs of the National Association of Evangelicals; the director of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs; and other leading authorities. Further valuable information was developed at hearings held in Philadelphia, Pa., during July, where the subcommittee was privileged to receive the testimony of a great American authority on the subject, Hon. Michael A. Musmanno, justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania; the U.S. district attorney; the chief psychiatrist of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia; the executive director of the Youth Study Center of Philadelphia; and many other law enforcement officials and civic leaders.

On the basis of the results of its study and hearings, the subcommittee wrote the bill, H.R. 7379, to strengthen the law which declares obscene material to be nonmailable and to make it a more useful and effective instrument for the protection of the public. This bill, which has passed the House unanimously, is discussed more fully above.

CIVIL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE

The 1st session of the 86th Congress was highlighted by virtual completion of the Civil Service Subcommittee program, instituted in the 84th Congress, to improve and strengthen civilian personnel administration in the oversea activities of the Government. The subcommittee report, unanimously approved by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and printed as House Report 2109, 84th Congress, contains a broad range of major recommendations relating to employment and working conditions of U.S. citizens employed by the Government abroad. These recommendations deal with four primary areas wherein corrective measures were found desirable as a result of a number of hearings and conferences held by the subcommittee in eight foreign nations in which the majority of Americans employed overseas are assigned to duty.

The first such primary area of recommendation—that the competitive civil service be extended to American citizens employed overseas—was placed in effect by executive action in the 84th Congress in accordance with the subcommittee recommendation.

The second, for the establishment of an effective and suitable compensation and employment system for teachers and

other personnel in schools conducted by the Department of Defense for dependents of the Department's oversea personnel, was placed in effect by Public Law 86-91, discussed earlier. This act provides an up-to-date school system for these oversea teachers and other school personnel, along the lines of the District of Columbia primary and secondary school system, and is expected to greatly facilitate and improve oversea school activities while at the same time reducing personnel turnover and recruitment problems to a minimum.

The third, for clarification and coordination of the then widely varied policies with respect to allowances and differentials for the several categories of oversea civilian employees of the Government, is embodied in H.R. 7758, approved by the House September 8, 1959, as noted earlier. This bill will improve the operation of critical defense and other oversea activities of the Government through the establishment of a coordinated and reasonably uniform system of compensating American citizens for extra expenses and for hardships and inconveniences incident to their oversea assignments.

The fourth primary area of recommendation, for the establishment of a badly needed medical and health program for American citizens employed by the Government abroad, is embodied in H.R. 5178 and several companion bills on which final hearings were completed during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. Since this bill, like the other committee recommendations, is approved by the administration, early action is expected in the second session to place the proposed medical and health program for oversea employees in effect so that these employees will have appropriate health services and facilities on a reasonably uniform basis.

The subcommittee report and recommendations were highly commended in a letter from the White House, in these words:

I would like to say first that this was an excellent report, carefully prepared and reflecting a comprehensive review of the facts, both in the overseas hearings and in the staff research. I believe that the liaison between your office and both my White House office and the Civil Service Commission has been a fine example of cooperative effort between legislative and executive branches of Government in developing sound legislation in this field of personnel administration.

CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS SUBCOMMITTEE

The Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics held hearings concerning the 1960 census, and the new techniques developed by the Bureau of the Census, to utilize modern, high-speed electronic data-processing equipment to obtain a faster publication of the 1960 census of statistics at lower cost. It is anticipated that the bulk of the reports will be issued at dates 12 to 18 months ahead of those corresponding reports 10 years earlier.

The Director of the Census Bureau described an auxiliary electronic device called the FOSDIC, standing for the initial letters of film optical sensing device for imput to computers. This piece of equipment will be used to microfilm copies of appropriately designed census questionnaires, read the positioned marks entered by the enumerators, and transcribe the information to tape in the form of magnetic spots, ready to be read by the electronic computer. The FOSDIC tape will then be placed in the electronic computer, where the results will be reviewed, tabulated, and finally transferred to other tapes for use on high-speed printing equipment.

Hearings were also held on the use of electronic data-processing equipment in other Government departments and agencies. The subcommittee hearings disclosed that there will be an increase of more than 300 percent in the number of Government employees engaged in office automation in the next 4 years. The present 4,000 employees engaged directly in the use of electronic data-processing equipment will increase to 13,000 by 1963.

Officials of the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office testified that they saw no danger that the growing trend to office automation will mean large-scale layoffs for Federal workers who have no experience or training in automation. They indicated that more often office automation has been adopted as a matter of necessity in order to get tasks done that could not be accomplished otherwise, rather than to get current work done by fewer employees.

It is contemplated that public hearings will be held at a later date, at which time representatives of business and leaders of industry and labor will be given the opportunity to testify with respect to the impact of Government reporting requirements. The subcommittee's approach to this inquiry will be with a view to reducing the cost to Government of obtaining and processing information and minimizing the burden upon business enterprises and the general public.

Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, Bureau of the Census, and other Government agencies will be called upon to explain the part their agency plays in the Government's statistics operation.

It is also contemplated that further hearings will be held regarding the use of electronic data-processing equipment by Government departments and agencies. Inquiry will be made as to the position taken by the Bureau of the Budget on the findings and recommendations developed for the Bureau by the private management firm in its study of personnel problems of the U.S. Government in the adoption and use of electronic data-processing systems.

The subcommittee undertook a study of all statistical activities in the Federal Government. Inquiry is being made as to how many different agencies are asking the same people for identical or similar information. Information will also be developed to indicate the number and types of reports that businesses are required to submit to the various Government agencies.

Special attention will be given to eliminating outdated reports which may at one time have served a useful purpose but which are no longer of use. The study will include development of information as to the number of employees, and the cost involved, of all departments and agencies in the collection, compilation, preparation, and publication or other reporting of statistical data. The study will include not only those statistical activities which the department or agency conducts directly, but also those conducted by firms or organizations outside the Government under contractual arrangements.

The Federal statistical system is distinguished by decentralization and complexity. Although the Bureau of the Census is a large, well-equipped organization with a variety of statistical functions, it has by no means a monopoly on data collection and compilation. Over 60 bureaus, services, commissions, administrations, boards, and other agencies have important statistical functions. In addition, other agencies, while not considering their activities as statistical, collect or compile data for administrative, regulatory, or operating purposes.

Any serious critic of the public burden of Government reporting requirements upon business must recognize that a middle ground is to be sought. It must be conceded that the Government and the public, including business itself, need detailed and timely statistical information, and that at least some of it can be collected efficiently only by the Federal Government. However, unremitting attention must be devoted to limiting the burden to the least amount consistent with the needs and benefits. In this connection the subcommittee is in the process of drafting a report entitled, "Business Reporting Requirements of the Federal Government."

A Year of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a very interesting editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the National News, official newspaper of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.:

A YEAR OF PROGRESS

The official year for National Commander Fred J. Hollenbeck, of the Veterans of World War I, comes to an end in approximately 2 weeks. During the 12 months that have elapsed since the national convention in Springfield, Ill., last year, the organization has taken on new stature.

As of August 31, the membership of the Veterans of World War I stood at 144,000, a gain of nearly 50,000 members. During the same period of time, the number of barracks amounted to 1,972, an increase of 514 over the 1958 total. Three new departments were instituted bringing to 43 the State departments now functioning.

True, the group did not fare too well on the legislative front. The passage of H.R. 7650 was strenuously opposed by the veter-

ans of World War I. But in this instance, the cards were stacked against the organization from the very beginning. The measure was rammed through the House of Representatives under a special rule which virtually cut off debate. When the bill came to the Senate, only Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, put up a determined fight against the proposal. He could enlist but 13 other Senators to go along with his amendment which would have granted veterans of World War I a pension of $90 per month at age 65 subject to income limitations.

This action points up most effectively the drastic need for additional members. Only by increased membership can the veterans of World War I impress the Congress on matters of legislation. An auspicious start has been made by Commander Hollenbeck and his national Chief of Staff M. George Deutsch, ably assisted by other national officers and the entire membership of the group.

Many persons, skilled in organization work, feel that what is needed is a professional organizer who can go out at the barracks level and stimulate a grassroots recruiting drive. An activity of this nature costs money but if successful, would return bountiful benefits for the cost of the promotion. Undoubtedly, a variety of proposals will be offered at the Louisville meeting and will be considered seriously by the delegates to the convention.

Congratulations to the national commander and his national officers for a banner year.

The Tight Money Policy—Who Loses and Who Gains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Eisenhower administration's fiscal and debt management policies have been extremely costly to the American people. Tight money, high interest rate policies have picked the pockets of the average citizen and the small businessman and resulted in windfall profits to large banks and other financial interests. These administration policies have produced a topheavy economy, spurred inflation, curtailed our economic growth, and brought recession, unemployment, and unnecessary human suffering.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following analysis of the losers and gainers from the administration's tight money policy, prepared by the National Farmers Union and appearing in their Washington newsletter for September 11, 1959:

THE TIGHT MONEY POLICY—WHO LOSES AND WHO GAINS

Congressional debate about raising interest rates on Government bonds is highlighting a critical economic policy which affects nearly everyone in the country. Farmers, who always need credit to carry on operations, have been hit directly by higher interest rates. They have also been hit indirectly, along with a great many other people.

And the administration's tight money policy is getting even tighter, not looser.

Here are the essential facts on this complicated subject. Some of the figures are so big that they are almost incomprehensible, but they will show how you and your neighbors fit into the picture.

HOW DID IT ALL START?

Nine days after President Eisenhower took office, his Secretary of the Treasury offered Government securities at 2¼ or 2½ percent to replace the previous rate of 1⅞ percent. This is how the Government regularly borrows money to meet expenses, but the increased rate added more than $30 million to the U.S. taxpayers' bill for repaying the public debt. It was to be followed by a series of many similar increases which have not yet stopped (although suspended for a while a few years ago).

Why was it done? The explanation was that higher interest rates would dampen the economy, preventing any further inflation.

WHO DIRECTED THE POLICY?

The new Secretary of the Treasury was George Humphrey, industrialist and financier. His new deputy, who handles monetary policy, was W. Randolph Burgess, who had been board chairman of National City Bank, one of New York's largest, and long an advocate of higher interest rates.

Tight money is now a definite part of the administration's policy and is supported also by the independent Federal Reserve Board, which can help any President keep interest rates low if it wants to.

WHAT WAS THE IMPACT?

As soon as Treasury borrowings started paying more in interest rates, other rates were naturally raised to make them equally attractive to investors. A vicious circle was created which still prevails, because the U.S. Treasury is the pacemaker.

In quick succession, rates were increased on private bank loans, farm price support loans, FHA loans to home buyers, GI housing loans, installment credit, municipal bonds and nearly everything involving an interest charge.

WHO BENEFITED?

Persons and institutions with money to lend received a windfall almost immediately because they could lend their money for a higher return.

The total benefits to banks, for instance were estimated by Seymour Harris, noted Harvard economist, to be $600 million a year from every 1 percent the Treasury succeeded in raising interest rates and ultimately $1 billion a year by virtue of the general increase in total bank assets. (Nearly one-third of the public debt is loaned by commercial banks.)

This windfall was all the sweeter because it came at a time when bank profits were booming. U.S. bank income the year before (1952) reached a record high of more than $5 billion.

Net profits, after taxes, also hit a new high—$990 million, according to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's official report. FDIC pointed out that the most striking earnings development was growth of income from loans (interest payments), which was 15 percent above the previous year and double what it had been 5 years before. This trend has continued.

WHO LOSES FROM TIGHT MONEY?

Anyone who is a debtor automatically loses from having to pay more for borrowed money—and some will have to continue to pay it for 25 years or so, even if rates on new loans go down. There are also other losers.

Taxpayers: This is the biggest group of losers.

In 1952, before the tight money policy, it cost taxpayers $5.8 billion every year to pay interest on the national public debt. Eisenhower estimates it will cost $8.6 billion in 1960—an increase of nearly one-half

This is more than the entire cost of the Federal Government in any New Deal year before World War II.

Between now and the end of 1960, the Treasury plans to borrow about $100 billion (mostly to pay off maturing bonds which were isued at the old, much lower rates). Each boost of one-fourth of 1 percent would add $250 million to the cost of carrying the debt each year. In 20 years it would add up to $5 billion.

An increase of 1 percent on the $100 billion borrowing would add $1 billion a year, or $20 billion in 20 years, to taxpayers' burdens.

None of this increased cost gives the taxpayer any additional service. In fact, it eventually increases the cost of whatever other services he must buy.

Effect on other debts: The Federal debt is only about one-third of all debts in the country—State, local, business, consumer, etc. The rest of the debt in the United States—over $700 billion—is also affected.

The economy is paying $8 to $10 billion more this year for the use of money than it would have paid at 1952 rates, before the tight-money policy started.

About $100 billion of personal, corporate, State, and local debt will be negotiated between now and the end of 1960. An increase of only one-quarter of 1 percent on this will add $250 million to the cost of this debt in the first year alone. A 1 percent increase would add $1 billion the first year. (This hits businessmen, particularly the smaller ones who cannot issue securities or sell stock to raise capital.)

It also hits community services by raising the cost of bonds for public improvements such as schools, highways, and sewers.

Effect on individuals: Every person who has borrowed money since 1952 or does so in the near future has been hit personally by higher interest rates. This group includes:

Home buyers: Interest rates on FHA financed homes have been raised several times. In 1952, a $10,000 FHA loan at 4 percent for 25 years would cost a total of $15,840 to repay (including $5,840 interest). In 1959, the same loan—now cost 5¼ percent at least—will cost a total of $18,000 (of which $8,000 is interest).

This increased cost of $2,160 is roughly equivalent to one bedroom and a bath.

Corresponding increases have been ordered on GI home loans and have taken place in private home financing.

Installment credit: About 60 percent of all auto and major household appliances are bought on installment credit, especially by low-income families, of course.

A mere one-half of 1 percent increase, for example, on a $2,000 balance on the purchase price of a car financed over 24 months would boost total interest payments from $220 to $240, or more than 9 percent higher.

Farmers: The USDA index of interest payable on an acre of real estate has risen from 104 in January of 1953 to 189 at the present time—a boost of four-fifths.

Loans available from the Farmers Home Administration (only when private credit is not vailable) have been boosted from 4 to 5 percent—one-fourth.

Cooperative credit institutions such as PCA's have had to follow the Government's lead and increase rates substantially.

Rural electrification loans are still fixed by law at 2 percent, but the administration is fighting for an inerease which would double interest costs, pointing to the increased cost of Government borrowing as its reason.

NATIONAL POLICY

These are some of the hard facts involved in the current reluctance, if not refusal, of Congress to give President Eisenhower authority to boost the interest rates on most Government bonds even higher. (Meanwhile, Congress has felt it necessary to let him increase the rate on ordinary savings bonds so that people will not continue to cash them in large quantities in order to

obtain higher yields elsewhere on their savings.)

A famous economist, J. K. Galbraith, of Harvard, has expressed himself forcefully against the administration on this issue. "Few things are such a proven failure," says Galbraith, "as the tight-money policy."

One reason that long-term Treasury bonds cannot be sold at rates below the present congressional ceiling, he says, "is that the administration has created the expectation of higher interest rates. This has caused investors and the banks to hold off buying lest rates do rise and they suffer a capital loss."

Professor Galbraith declares that the administration's request for still higher rates "is thus the result of its own mistaken policy. It is a remedy neither for past error nor present inadequacy. It presages a further rise in all rates. It would in the end be damaging to every homeowner, farmer, smaller businessman, and other borrower to whom interest is a charge he cannot pass on."

Congressman John D. Dingell Reports to the People of the 15th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as I do at the conclusion of every session of Congress, I am reporting to my people on the 86th Congress, 1st session.

During this session I served on the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I maintain two offices to serve the people of my district, one in Washington, D.C., and the other in Detroit at 7310 Grand River Avenue.

I. SUMMARY OF BILLS INTRODUCED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL

SOCIAL SECURITY

H.R. 3851, to reduce the retirement age for men to 60 and for women to 55.

H.R. 3850, to raise the amount which may be earned by social security recipients, without reduction in social security benefits, from $1,200 to $1,800.

H.R. 3897 and H.R. 5923, to provide that social security beneficiaries receive 60 days of hospitalization each calendar year. H.R. 5923 is identical to the Forand bill on which hearings have been held and which a number of us intend to work to enact next session.

H.R. 3853, to liberalize the definition of permanent and total disability to allow many disabled persons now improperly excluded from disability retirement to secure benefits under that section of the Social Security Act.

CIVIL RIGHTS

H.R. 351, an omnibus bill outlawing discrimination in employment, transportation, housing, and voting, and establishing a vigorous Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission and Federal Fair Employment Practices Code. This bill would outlaw lynching and the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting.

H.R. 352, to authorize the Attorney General of the United States to file civil actions for injunction on behalf of citizens whose civil rights are interfered with or are threatened with interference.

H.R. 353, outlawing lynching and crimes of violence perpetrated because of race, creed, or color of the victim.

H.R. 354, outlawing discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color and establishing a strong Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission to enforce fair employment practices.

H.R. 4261, to make permanent the Federal Civil Rights Commission and to enable the Commission to continue working for full equality for all under law.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTORY HEALTH INSURANCE

H.R. 4498, to provide for a program of Federal contributory health insurance sustained by contributions from employer and employee alike to a fund like the social security trust fund. From this fund each citizen would be entitled to full payment of all hospital bills, doctor bills and medication. Thus, for the first time Americans would be offered a full and complete guarantee of effective health protection. No longer would full and adequate medical care be the property of only the well-to-do.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

H.R. 3558, to better provide for the needs of the unemployed by establishing Federal standards for unemployment compensation, so that payments to unemployed covered by State programs would be two-thirds of the weekly wage of the unemployed individual or half the average wage within the State, whichever is less, and to provide that duration of benefits be not less than 39 weeks.

MINIMUM WAGE

H.R. 6239, to increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour to raise the wage level in the low wage parts of the country. This bill would reduce the inducement of industry to move from Michigan into low wage areas.

LEGISLATION TO HALT BOMBINGS OF HOMES, SCHOOLS, CHURCHES, TEMPLES, AND OTHER BUILDINGS

H.R. 500, to outlaw transportation of explosives in interstate commerce for the purpose of destroying homes, property, or life of another. This bill was offered to help punish those responsible for bombings because of race, creed, or color and make vigorous Federal action possible in cases of this kind.

When such bombings occurs under this bill it is presumed that it was done with explosives transported in interstate commerce, which would enable vigorous, immediate Federal action.

FOOD STAMP LEGISLATION

H.R. 5191, to provide for issuance by the Secretary of Agriculture of surplus food certificates to the needy and persons on welfare in the several States. Such certificates would be redeemable for surplus commodities through regular channels of distribution. This bill would distribute to the needy many foods not available under present wasteful and inefficient programs. I am happy that in part through my efforts substantially identical legislation has been enacted by this Congress and should shortly become law.

II. LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE 86TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

A. BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS

Contrary to what the President would have us believe about his desire for economy, his budget requests were cut substantially by the Congress.

In his original budget to the House the President requested $74,077,609,151, providing for appropriations and other new obligational authority. His revised budget request to the Senate for this purpose was $74,859,008,445. The amount approved by the Congress was $72,977,598,352, a cut of $1,881,410,093.

In addition, the President requested $6,400 million to provide funds for lending authority within the Department of the Treasury. The amount approved by the Congress was $5,701 million, a cut of $699 million.

The total of all the President's budget requests to the House was $80,477,609,151, and his revised budget requests to the Senate totaled $81,259,008,445. The Congress cut this to $78,678,598,352, a decrease in the President's budget of $2,580,410,093.

B. IMPORTANT LEGISLATION ENACTED

HAWAII ADMITTED AS THE 50TH STATE

Public Law 86-3 admitted Hawaii as the 50th State.

EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

Public Law 86-7 extended benefits of the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 for 3 additional months to jobless whose State payments expired before April 1, 1959.

SURPLUS FOOD FOR THE NEEDY

H.R. 8609 extends Public Law 480 for sale, barter, and donation of American surplus foods abroad but includes new provisions similar to H.R. 5191, my bill to establish a food stamp plan for distribution of surplus foods to needy through certificates issued by the Secretary of Agriculture and authorizes $250 million to carry out this program. I vigorously supported the floor amendment which accomplished this.

VETERANS

Public Law 86-73 authorizes $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans and raises interest rates on veterans' loans from 4¾ to 5¼ percent, which will again make such loans available.

Public Law 86-211 increases non-service-conected pensions to veterans of World War II, the Korean conflict, and their survivors, and establishes payments based on need. Under this law no veteran now pensioned will receive a benefit cut. It offers a substantial increase in benefits to widows and dependent children.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Public Law 86-28 increases the pension of railway employees and liberalizes railroad employees' unemployment compensation.

HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

S. 2161 provides that the Government will pay part of the cost of private health

insurance carried by Federal employees after July 1, 1960.

HOUSING, URBAN RENEWAL, HOUSING FOR THE LOW-INCOME GROUPS AND HOUSING FOR THE AGED

This Congress enacted S. 2654 to provide for housing for the aged, substantial funds for urban renewal, low-priced public housing for low-income groups, to extend for 5 years the time during which families of veterans have preference for admission to public housing projects, and to liberalize FHA mortgages to enable more Americans to own their own homes.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The Civil Rights Commission was extended for 2 years on the last day of the session by adding a rider to the mutual security appropriations bill. This was a major triumph in view of the fine report of the Civil Rights Commission.

LABOR REFORM LEGISLATION

The House and Senate after bitter debate and conference enacted a compromise labor bill. Although not in complete accord with my ideas, I did support this compromise labor bill to strike at corruption and to eliminate an issue which had diverted Congress long enough from other areas of important legislative activity.

III. LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF THE HONORABLE JOHN D. DINGELL

I have attempted to carry out a liberal, vigorous legislative program. I have taken particular interest in Federal programs for research into disease and for hospital construction. I have worked to expand the responsibilities and capabilities of the Food and Drug Administration to protect our consumers from filthy, adulterated food, from foods given chemical treatments of unknown safety, and to protect the Food and Drug Administration from constant attacks by special interest groups. I worked hard to secure enactment of food stamp legislation to help all our people have an adequate diet.

I have worked for the liberalization of the social-security program and have testified repeatedly before the Committee on Ways and Means urging liberalization of this program.

I have appeared at every opportunity before the House Committee on the Judiciary testifying for good civil rights legislation and was a sponsor of the discharge petition which brought H.R. 6127, the civil rights bill of the last session, to the floor of Congress for vote to become law. I am presently active in securing signatures on another discharge petition to bring H.R. 8601 to the floor for more progress in this most important field.

This bill provides more effective enforcement of the civil rights of Americans. The bill provides stiff penalties for obstruction of court orders in public school desegregation cases and makes flight in interstate or foreign commerce to avoid prosecution or punishment for damaging or destroying any building or other real or personal property a crime. It requires preservation of Federal election records and authorizes their inspection by the Attorney General. It would enable the Federal Government to provide for the education of all children of members of our Armed Forces, whether or not they are residents on Federal property, when public schools have been closed because of desegregation decisions or orders.

I worked for legislation to raise the minimum wage and to assist the unemployed of the city of Detroit and State of Michigan by enactment of minimum standards for unemployment compensation.

During previous sessions of Congress I supported S. 2888, a stringent reform bill requiring registration, reports and full disclosure of all welfare and pension funds, which became law. During the 85th Congress I supported the Kennedy-Ives bill to reform and clean up corruption in the labor movement. That bill was defeated by Republican Members who wanted an issue and no legislation. This session I supported the Kennedy-Elliott labor reform bill reported by the the House Labor Committee. I opposed the so-called Griffin-Landrum bill because it was an effort by antilabor groups to injure the rights of honest working men and women under the guise of striking at corruption and racketeers.

The Griffin-Landrum bill would have favored sweatshops and low wage nonunion areas to the injury of our Michigan businessmen, industries, and workers. It would have been a major inducement for Michigan industry to move to low wage areas which under that bill could not be organized so that workers could achieve a fair wage.

Multiple Use and the Proposed Wilderness Preservation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam is a very important landlord. Among other properties, he possesses large areas of lands containing various resource values. Many conflicts arise in the constructive conservation and wise use of these values. Most of them must be conserved, in the general use of the term, by the landlord himself but in the development and harvesting of those which should and must be put to use, private enterprise carries the greatest responsibility. To solve the conflicts and to regulate the private development of the public's lands in the most advantageous manner for the landlord is a continuing and difficult responsibility.

Recently at the mining convention of the American Mining Congress held in Denver, Colo., the Honorable AL ULLMAN, Representative from the Second District of the State of Oregon, delivered a most interesting and constructive paper on the "Multiple Use and the Proposed Wilderness Preservation System." Because of the thoroughness, and yet succinctness, with which Congressman ULLMAN presented his subject, and the value that such address can have for all Members of Congress, I am pleased to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MULTIPLE USE AND THE PROPOSED WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM

(Remarks of Hon. AL ULLMAN, Representative from Oregon, before the 1959 mining convention of the American Mining Congress, Denver, Colo., September 14, 1959)

It is a privilege and a pleasure to join this fine convention of the American Mining Congress and to participate in your deliberations on these matters of important public policy. As a Member of Congress and of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I feel a keen responsibility for the wise and full use of our vast public resources.

Congress, nearly a century ago, recognized that mining on the public lands should be encouraged to develop mineral resources for the Nation's benefit. Congress has since settled on a policy of multiple uses of public lands on the basis that it is not in the national interest to promote any one use unduly at the expense of other uses.

A reorganized Federal wilderness system is now being sought by some who believe that the wilderness is becoming unduly subordinated to other uses of Federal lands. The proponents of the reorganized system define "wilderness" as "an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain."

My discussion of pending wilderness measures cannot be couched in definite terms since hearings have not been held by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This, however, does not prevent me from offering definite views on the general principles and policies involved.

My statement will cover the background of the current proposals, some principles of natural resources use, the relationship with the National Outdoor Recreational Resources Review Commission, and an analysis of pending bills, departmental views, and areas of disagreement and agreement.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROPOSED SYSTEM

The wilderness bill, as it is called, first appeared in 1957 in the form of measures introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and others.

Apparently these measures had their beginning on June 4, 1948, when Congressman Raymond H. Burke, of Ohio, then chairman of the Subcommittee on Conservation of Wildlife Resources, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, asked the Legislation Reference Service of the Library of Congress to study the preservation of wilderness areas. That study was issued in 1949 as a committee print.

In 1955 an address "The Need for Wilderness Areas," was delivered in Washington, D.C., by Howard Zahniser, of the Wilderness Society. This address was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator HUMPHREY in February of 1956.

Senator HUMPHREY's legislative draft was then prepared and it was further developed during a conference of the Federation of Western Outdoor Clubs at Portland, Oreg., in April of 1956.

Senator HUMPHREY explains that his bill assumes that we can preserve an adequate wilderness system without sacrificing other programs, but that there will not for long be any such areas to be preserved unless deliberate steps are taken now to preserve them.

Although it is true that there has been some encroachment on our Federal and private wilderness lands, it is my belief that this threat can be well contained under a sound and balanced land use program.

Wilderness use, I think we should agree, is a valid use among others, and should take its own place in a multiple-use pattern but should not be allowed to violate the basic

principal of the greatest good for the greatest number.

We are all aware of the scientific, educational, scenic, and recreational aspects of wilderness. The fact that such uses are rather intangible ought not to be allowed to reduce their importance as against tangible uses which can be more readily evaluated.

A difficult technical problem in the evaluation of any recreational use is that no economic yardstick is readily available by which to measure it. This is also true of such things as fish, wildlife, and pollution control, which are not competitively priced in the marketplace. This explains the feeling of need among many groups to seek protection in statutes.

Also, certain commercial abuses have aroused these groups, such as those occurring so often when the mining laws are exploited by nonmining interests for nonmining uses.

The Bureau of Land Management informs us that about 9 out of every 10 average mining claims are held for purposes other than mining. Public lands held for multiple uses, including wilderness, and not available under any other law, can be located under the mining laws, with no opportunity for consideration of the importance of mining compared with other uses.

A result like that in the Al Sarena case gives credence to the need for change in our mining laws or their administration.

MULTIPLE USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The general principle of multiple use is this: Each acre or area should be used for the combination of uses in which its productivity is highest. Only in allocating each acre and area according to its productivity can we expect to reach the highest efficiency in satisfying wants. This is the key to wise use, which is the essence of conservation.

Fortunately, most of our land can contribute in more ways than one to the satisfaction of our wants. This is especially true of Federal lands that are administered under principles of multiple use.

Little of our Federal land is limited to the output of only one commodity, service, or use. Determining which acreages and how intensively to employ and develop them in each use is the basic economic problem associated with Federal lands.

The conflict between the wilderness concept and downstream water use is well known in the West. It was not until recently that emphasis has been given to the nature and extent of these differences.

Sol Resnick, a University of Arizona hydrologist, testified before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that upstream operations to produce added water supplies in his State would be greatly impaired if the high runoff producing areas were to be set aside in a wilderness preservation system.

It is reported that President Theodore Roosevelt, a true conservationist, in each of six annual messages to Congress, referred specifically to the benefits to be derived from reclamation. Speaking of irrigation in his message of December 3, 1906, he said: "The Federal Government should seriously devote itself to this task, realizing that utilization of waterways and water power, forestry, and reclamation of lands are all interdependent parts of the same problem."

In hearings held by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs several years ago, Mrs. Gifford Pinchot outlines the role of her distinguished husband in the conservation movement. She said that the first of the three great purposes of Mr. Pinchot was "to wisely use, protect, and renew the natural resources of the earth." She summarized by saying, "In other words, the greatest good, for the greatest number, for the longest time."

It is important that all concerned have a clear understanding of the far-reaching extent of the present Federal wilderness system that has developed under this multiple-use concept. In the national forests, for instance, wilderness as a proper land use has been recognized as national policy for over 30 years. As of 1957, there were nearly 14 million acres in 81 different wilderness-type areas within our national forests.

The national parks are thought by the Department of the Interior to fit comfortably into the wilderness category. I believe that that is a fair conclusion. A new national wilderness system would add little or nothing to wilderness use so far as national parks are concerned.

The multiple-use policy has been extended significantly in the past several Congresses. For example, there is Public Law 585, 83d Congress, providing for mining locations on land covered by mineral leases. There are Public Laws 167 and 359 of the 84th Congress providing for the surface management of unpatented mining claims, and permitting mining locations on land reserved for power development. There is Public Law 337, 85th Congress, providing for the operation of the mining and mineral leasing laws on public lands in military reservations. There is Public Law 66, a measure that I introduced in the present Congress, providing for the recreational leasing of the so-called O. and C. timber lands in Oregon.

The economic problem of proper land use cannot be solved once and for all. The relative productivity of each acre or area for different combinations of uses changes with the changing times—as the population grows, as technology develops, as we change our tastes or desires. We must have solutions to the problem that can be adapted to changing conditions. Our success in doing so depends largely on our accuracy in anticipating the extent of future changes.

NATIONAL OUTDOOR RECREATION RESOURCES REVIEW COMMISSION

There must be carefully considered the relationship of the wilderness bills to the work of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I am a member. The Commission from the beginning has had a mission of reviewing not only public recreational resources but also public wilderness areas, and the need for them. This review is now well on its way.

I am aware that a distinction is drawn between recreation use and wilderness use. I recognize that these two uses are not exact equivalents. However, the overlapping area seems to be broad. The wilderness bills themselves hold out that wilderness areas will be used, among other things, for recreational purposes.

Among those suggesting a delay until the Resources Review Commission's report is made is the Oregon division of the Isaac Walton League. The Oregon division, at a 1958 meeting with 20 chapters represented, did not endorse the wilderness proposal, although substantially agreeing with its objectives.

The Recreation Resources Review Commission's membership includes four Senators, four Members of Congress, and seven public members. It is chairmaned by Laurance Rockefeller, of New York. The members are people who have long been identified with the broad area to be studied.

Mr. Francis Sargent, former Commissioner of Natural Resources of Massachusetts, has entered on duty as Executive Director of the Commission, and a capable staff is at work in the Commission's office in Washington, D.C.

The Commission's evaluations are to be made on a State-by-State, region-by-region, and a national basis. Local and community relationships will play an important part. The act establishing the Commission defines outdoor recreation resources as the land and water areas and associated resources of such areas of the United States and its possessions which provide or may in the future provide opportunities for outdoor recreation, irrespective of ownership.

The Commission expects to serve as a clearinghouse of information and ideas. Its review will cut across all activities dealing with outdoor land use. Its work is already in progress.

It seems desirable as orderly legislative procedure to have available the facts and conclusions developed by the Commission before any far-reaching change is made in our Federal wilderness system.

We are looking to the Commission to recommend reasonable standards for the recreational use of Federal lands, including wilderness. Catastrophe to wilderness use could not occur before September of 1961 when the Commission's conclusions are to be reported.

PENDING LEGISLATION AND DEPARTMENTAL VIEWS

There is no single wilderness bill before the Congress. Actually 11 bills are pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The typical bill reflects modifications based on Senate hearings and discussions in the preceding Congress. The bill's purpose has been editorially described as a "modest innovation."

The typical bill blankets all existing Federal wilderness areas into a National Wilderness Preservation System. The System would serve the public purposes of recreational, scenic, scientific, educational, conservation, and historical use and enjoyment, at the same time leaving the areas unimpaired for future use as wilderness. The national forests would continue to be used for multiple purposes including wilderness.

Contained are procedures for bringing national forest lands, national park system lands, national wildlife lands, Indian lands, and Federal lands of other classes within the system. Public notice and public hearings are provided for. Deadlines are prescribed. Apparently the final decisions in cases of protest would be made by the heads of agencies, reviewable by the courts only under extraordinary circumstancs.

Also provided are procedures to accomplish later adjustments such as area additions and eliminations. Each of these, so far as new authority granted in the bill is concerned, would become effective only after a waiting period during which Congress might adopt an opposing concurrent resolution.

The measures prohibit use by commercial enterprises conflicting with wilderness purposes. Of special interest to miners is a provision that would allow prospecting and mining in a particular national forest area, along with water and related road projects, only if the President determines that such use will serve the public interest.

The bill would establish a new Federal agency—the National Wilderness Preservation Council.

The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has held no hearings but has available the record of Senate hearings and has received the views of several departments.

The Department of the Interior feels that the traditional method of establishing or adding to national parks by act of Congress would be preferable to the procedure offered by the bill. Under the Department's recommendation, the highest and best use of each proposed wilderness unit would be individually examined.

The Department of Agriculture sees no need for the National Wilderness Preservation Council. The Department asked that the bill be amended to allow 15 years in which to determine the wilderness status of present primitive areas, now being restudied and reclassified.

The merit of the departmental conclusions, and that of all other matters associated with the pending bills, remain for the consideration of the committee.

AREAS OF DISAGREEMENT AND AGREEMENT

In conclusion, it seems evident that the discussion and hearings to date have indicated substantial areas of disagreement and agreement.

My own reaction is that the main disagreement to be resolved pertains to the proper organization of governmental control of Federal land use in general.

The users of Federal lands organize themselves into groups to influence Federal land-use policies and decisions and such action is often effective. A persistent question for the land administrator is how much weight to give to the presentation of a given point of view, especially if opposing views are not present or are not organized.

The most tragic blunders in public land administration usually have resulted from listening to only one of the affected sides or groups.

A few years ago the Presidential Advisory Commission on Water Resources Policy concluded that the greatest single weakness in Federal water-resource programs was the lack of coordination between Federal agencies and with State and local interests. I suspect that this is also true in Federal land-use programs affecting wilderness and other uses.

In this respect the statement of Arthur M. Roberts, of the Forestry and Conservation Association, during Senate hearings on wilderness legislation, is significant. He said: "The bill implies a dissatisfaction with the competence of the professional forester and the career land administrator. It would set the precedent of making Federal land-use decisions by a balance of political pressures rather than by the discretion of experienced career administrators as at present."

The point has been made that the quality of wilderness areas to be preserved, and not quantity alone, is important. I was impressed by a statement before the Senate Interior Committee by Keith Petrie, who styled himself as a "devoted believer in wilderness areas," but who wisely asked: "Wouldn't it be more logical to set aside smaller areas and maintain a true wilderness status along with some other areas where horses could be used, and other areas where mechanical transportation can be used?" His question suggests that greater flexibility of land use and control is needed than can be obtained through actions that can be taken only by the Congress or the President.

Concerning the present Federal program, I was particularly impressed by a grassroots statement which was made by Virlis L. Fischer, past president of the Mazamas, the well-known Oregon mountaineer club. Fischer is a man who has visited on foot every wilderness-type area in the States of Oregon and Washington. He stated that "the wilderness is not likely to disappear, because the Forest Service is doing an excellent and thoroughly commendable job of preserving it." I could venture the observation here that some commercial interests think that the preservation job of the Forest Service is a bit too thorough.

Fischer went on to say: "I further believe, and it has been well demonstrated, that public opinion is powerful enough to protect the parks in time of emergency from the vagaries of an undependable Secretary." He added: "It is even good for public opinion to assert itself on occasion."

There is wide agreement, I am sure, as Senator JACKSON has phrased it, that "it is the obligation of this generation to preserve for future generations a quantity of wilderness in its untrammeler, natural state."

The area of difference lies in how to accomplish this, the amount and location of areas to be retained in wilderness-like status, and how to reconcile the wilderness uses with other uses, in small areas and in large, so as best to serve the interests of people, locally, regionally, and nationally, and best to administer the Federal lands as a public trust.

PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on September 17, 1959, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 47. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a personal exemption for children placed for adoption and to clarify certain provisions relating to the election of small business corporations as to taxable status;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect;

H.R. 5711. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes;

H.R. 5733. An act for the relief of Park National Bank;

H.R. 6059. An act to provide additional civilian positions for the Department of Defence for purposes of scientific research and development relating to the national defense, to improve the management of the activities of such Department, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6067. An act to amend section 4544 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that, if the money and effects of a deceased seaman paid or delivered to a district court do not exceed in value the sum of $1,500, such court may pay and deliver such money and effects to certain persons other than the legal personal representative of the deceased seaman;

H.R. 6190. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6672. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation;

H.R. 7452. An act for the relief of William B. Jackson;

H.R. 7476. An act to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8385. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8392. An act to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8437. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease BLM 028500;

H.R. 8464. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide salary increases for the police for the National Zoological Park;

H.R. 8685. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the Presidential appointment of a Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 531. Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 6, 1960.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 439, 86th Congress, he did on September 17, 1959, sign enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles:

H.R. 47. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a personal exemption for children placed for adoption and to clarify certain provisions relating to the election of small business corporations as to taxable status;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect;

H.R. 5711. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes;

H.R. 5733. An act for the relief of Park National Bank;

H.R. 6059. An act to provide additional civilian positions for the Department of Defense for purposes of scientific research and development relating to the national defense, to improve the management of the activities of such Department, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6067. An act to amend section 4544 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that, if the money and effects of a deceased seaman paid or delivered to a district court do not exceed in value the sum of $1,500, such court may pay and deliver such money and effects to certain persons other than the legal personal representative of the deceased seaman;

H.R. 6190. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6672. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation;

H.R. 7452. An act for relief of William B. Jackson;

H.R. 7476. An act to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8385. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8392. An act to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8437. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease BLM 028500;

H.R. 8464. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide salary increases for the police for the National Zoological Park;

H.R. 8685. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the Presidential appointment of a Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 531. Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 6, 1960.

And enrolled bills of the Senate as follows:

S. 1473. An act to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass.;

S. 1944. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the verification of pleadings;

S. 2162. An act to provide a health benefits program for Government employees;

S. 2282. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1952;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Sergiusz Rudczenko;

S. 2362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit equipment installation ton, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project; and

S. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit equipment installation costs against rental under lease to Union Township of LaPorte County, Ind.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, reported that on the following dates that committee had presented to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On September 17, 1959:

H.R. 47. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a personal exemption for children placed for adoption and to clarify certain provisions relating to the election of small business corporations as to taxable status;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect;

H.R. 5711. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes;

H.R. 5733. An act for the relief of Park National Bank;

H.R. 6059. An act to provide additional civilian positions for the Department of Defense for purposes of scientific research and development relating to the national defense, to improve the management of the activities of such Department, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6067. An act to amend section 4544 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that, if the money and effects of a deceased seaman paid or delivered to a district court do not exceed in value the sum of $1,500, such court may pay and deliver such money and effects to certain persons other than the legal personal representative of the deceased seaman;

H.R. 6190. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6672. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation;

H.R. 7452. An act for the relief of William B. Jackson;

H.R. 7476. An act to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8385. An act making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8392. An act to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8437. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease BLM 028500;

H.R. 8464. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide salary increases for the police for the National Zoological Park;

H.R. 8685. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the Presidential appointment of a Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 531. Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 6, 1960.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p. m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p. m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2400 Tilden St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

THE PUBLIC LIBRARY
SEP 28 19
ANN ARBOR, MICH.

Congressional Record

United States of America — PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 105 — WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1959 — No. 166

Appendix

Housing the Aged: A Lesson From Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. KASEM
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KASEM. Mr. Speaker, one of the major problems facing us today, and a problem that will increase to monumental proportions if broad steps are not taken soon, concerns the care of our aged.

While in Europe attending the 14th International Convention of Local Authorities, Mayor Owen Lewis, of La Verne, Calif., kindly consented to extend his trip and make a thorough study for me on how the problems confronting many of the nations of Western Europe regarding the aged are being met.

I am certain that every one of my colleagues will benefit by reading the excellent and comprehensive report Mayor Lewis has made to me. The full text is as follows:

REPORT TO HON. GEORGE KASEM, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BY OWEN H. LEWIS, MAYOR, CITY OF LAVERNE, CALIF., ON CARE OF THE AGED IN EUROPEAN NATIONS VISITED BY MAYOR LEWIS IN 10 WEEKS' TOUR OF WEST GERMANY, ENGLAND, HOLLAND, DENMARK, NORWAY, SWEDEN, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND, ITALY, FRANCE, AND BELGIUM, MAY 21–JULY 27, 1959

My recent tour of Europe permitted me to witness what may be the most epochal change in the history of the Continent. Everywhere I went I was struck by the dynamics of reconstruction after the world's most destructive war. Today, hardly a trace of the global holocaust remains. Even cities like Hamburg and Rotterdam, 80 percent destroyed by allied bombing raids, have almost completely obliterated the scars of conflict. Towering apartment houses, bustling factories and new superhighways are the characteristics of these reborn cities.

No nation in Europe has escaped the modern boom of construction and facelifting. An American, touring the continent in 1959, cannot help but feel the pulsating rythm of progress. Our image of our European neighbors as picturesque, but backward countries, must be cast aside. Instead, we must adopt a new attitude of admiration for their courage and strength in the face of monumental adversity. We must benefit by the lessons to be learned from their reconstruction and study the areas in which older cultures than ours have produced social conditions near the ideal for many segments of their population.

At your request, my attention was directed during my tour to the conditions in which the aged of these nations live. Generally speaking, Europe's over-65 citizens are enjoying a standard of living measurably higher than they had before World War II. As the war-torn countries have swept away the rubble of battle and struggled toward a new destiny in the nuclear age, they have shed many 19th century social concepts in favor of new standards geared to an economy of abundance.

This is particularly true in the field of the aged and aging. Paradoxically, it was the extent of destruction during World War II that fostered some of the great social advances I witnessed. In the area of housing, for instances, this was a notable factor. Square mile after square mile of many cities had been leveled by opposing forces. Reconstruction was an immediate necessity when the shooting had stopped. Thanks to American economic aid, our allies and conquered enemies were enabled to undertake this rebuilding on a scale never before attempted. Broad, long-range planning was not only possible, but imperative. Older citizens have benefitted spectacularly.

In Rome the visitor is impressed by the beehive activity in housing construction. Unlike American cities, Europe's metropolitan centers are vast complexes of apartment buildings. Surburbia, as we know it, is virtually nonexistent. Consequently, huge apartment projects are the rule, under strict governmental supervision and, sometimes, control. A rigid percentage of new housing is earmarked for the elderly. Low rents are the policy, and applicants are strictly screened to make certain that those in the greatest need receive the first available facilities. While Italy is not among the most prosperous of the Continent's recovered nations, it is making huge strides in providing for its senior citizens, so that eventually all may enjoy their declining years in decent dwellings in economic security. In the years to come, it is entirely possible that Italy may rid her teeming cities of the slums in which the elderly and needy were condemned in the prewar years.

My 5 days in Rome were busy ones. However, with the cooperation of the municipal government and our own U.S. consular officials, I was able to visit most of the city's important housing developments. Functional architecture is characteristic of all of these vast projects. At the same time, lines and masses combine to offer a beautiful simplicity of design that will make these monolithic structures impervious to shifting tastes in generations to come.

Of all the European nations, the most breathtaking to an American is West Germany. Bolstered by American aid and spurred on more recently by an unparalleled industrial boom, West Germany is the undisputed leader in European progress. Her cities—West Berlin, Frankfurt, Hamburg, Munich, and others—are gleaming jewels of modern architecture. Here, too, the mushrooming population of elderly men and women is recognized by the planners. Whole blocks of new apartment buildings are given over to older tenants. Because West Germanys' federal retirement system is the most generous in Europe, providing senior citizens with a pension equal to about $220 per month, West Germany's older people enjoy

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress will be published not later than Monday, October 5, 1959. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

the most abundant retirement in the world today. In recent years, the development of adequate, low-rent housing for the elderly has even further improved their status.

In startling contrast to West Berlin, East Berlin is still a debris-littered city. On a visit into the Communist zone, I was amazed to see women laboring with the most primitive of tools in the wreckage of bombed-out buildings. Some carried stones in baskets. Others swung heavy hammers at still-standing masonry walls.

The most notable architectural achievement in East Berlin is a huge memorial to the Russian soldiers who died battling Hitler's armies. Its magnificence is dimmed by the pervading poverty and lack of progress.

Sweden is another nation in which the American traveler cannot fail to register amazement. Huge apartment buildings are rising everywhere in Stockholm, the capital, where 90 percent of the population are apartment dwellers. The public assistance commission, a separate State agency, has broad authority and many demands for meeting the needs of the country. Socialized medicine and state-owned housing, make their solution for the care of the aged problems quite different from our own.

The social welfare of Sweden covers the care of aged and sick who are able to manage at home. A trial organization, since 1953, has been started and is called home help activity. Efficient and qualified help for the aged through domestic aid for a few hours each day, for example, cooking, cleaning, shopping, and laundry, is given so that they can avoid going to an old age home.

Pensioners' flats are a greatly appreciated form of housing for old people and individuals without means. In these flats pensioners can live considerably more comfortably, safely, and cheaply than in the older houses to which they formerly took recourse. Each pensioner's flat has common rooms which are used for social activities, coffee parties, and other recreational functions suitable for the needs. Each has a single room and there are double rooms for married couples. By 1953 there were 7 blocks, altogether 1,629 flats, for pensioners in Stockholm, the state having granted 25 percent of the construction costs. They were arranged among ordinary family flats to avoid the stamp of category houses. Recently, in order to change the character of the welfare institutions as homes for the poor, as vacancies allowed, they have begun to receive even people who cannot be said to be in real need. There has been strong reason to favor bridging the gap which formerly prevailed in the matter of providing for those with and without means, so charges are being fixed so that pensioners can pay the feed for board and lodging in these homes out of their old age pensions. All rents are controlled by the state. There are old age homes for those who cannot look after themselves or cannot manage with help at home; there are charitable institutions for poor people who are able to work a little but who from various causes—for example bad conduct—who are not considered suitable subjects for assistance in the open welfare; there are welfare homes for such persons as need constant attention; and there is also public assistance in housing for the aged, as described above.

In all of the Scandinavian countries the state operates all hospitals, old folks homes, schools, and also preschool nursery homes. In Oslo, Norway, I found that for an apartment in a building designed for old people, the applicant is required to pay an initial cost of approximately 6,000 Kroner, or $950 down, then about $20 per month as rent. This seemed to be the policy and the prevailing rate in all of the Scandinavian countries. They have an ecclesiastical tax for the maintenance of the state-owned churches and I was informed that, while this tax is not compulsory, about 98 percent do pay it. In general, the taxes were very much greater percentagewise than in our own country, but the States does offer more services in medicine and housing as outlined above.

My tour not only included countless inspection tours of housing developments for elderly people, but it brought me in personal contact with high municipal officials of the various countries I visited. In almost every case, these dignitaries agreed that the care of their aging men and women was one of the most important problems of our time.

Among these officials were Lord Mayor Harold Gillett, of London; Burgermeister Van Hall, of Amsterdam (who lived in the United States for 10 years); Lord Mayor S. Munk, of Copenhagen; Mayor Lorenzo Salvejar, of Florence, Italy; Jean Paul Vichy, President of the Municipal Council, Paris; Mayor Urbano Ciochettie, of Rome; Mayor M. D. Ferrari, of Milan; Mayor S. Speciale, of Venice, and Councilwoman V. Remons, of Stockholm.

In addition, I had conferences with Paul Hertz, Chief American Economic Administrator in West Berlin, U.S. Consul-General James Garrity in Venice, and American consular attachés in many other cities.

My European tour began as part of the mayor's goodwill European tour, which started the day after I visited your office in Washington, D.C., last May 21. In the ensuing 44 days, our group visited London, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, Stockholm, Hamburg, Berlin, Frankfurt, Interlaken, Switzerland, Milan, Venice, Rome, Nice, and Paris.

At the conclusion of the mayor's tour, Mrs. Lewis and I undertook our own European trip, driving more than 2,500 miles in 19 days. During this period we went to Darmstadt, Heidelberg, Munich, Garmisch, Berchteagaden, and Baden-Baden, Germany; Basel, Switzerland; Rotterdam, and The Hague, Holland; several Belgian cities; and Vienna, Salzburg, and Innsbruck, Austria.

In Switzerland, we learned that the care of the elderly is largely a local matter, administered by the various cantons, or states, under Federal supervision. Under this Swiss program, elderly citizens enjoy a very liberal retirement pension, from a fund to which employees, employers, and the government all contribute. Additional funds are allocated by the cantons.

Swiss old age retirement benefits are available to men at age 65 and to women at age 60. The amount is determined by the span of the applicant's working life.

Housing for the elderly is not so great a problem in Switzerland as it is in many other European nations, since much of Switzerland has an agricultural economy. In the villages, the care of the aging remains a family responsibility to a great degree, particularly with respect to housing. However, the cities are moving ahead in this field, with many new apartment buildings reserving a proportion of their facilities for the elderly.

Austria, too, is increasing its benefits for the elderly. Like Switzerland and many other European nations, pensions are similar to our social security system. However, benefits are greater, in proportion to average wages received by the working population. This is due, largely, to the three-way participation in the social security fund. One unusual feature of the Austrian system is their practice of distributing food stamps to pensioners from time to time. This is done for two reasons: to discourage the development of a black market in scarce commodities, and to offer the elderly the benefit of occasional surpluses in other foods.

Holland and Belgium are notable for their efforts in providing housing for their aging citizens. Both nations have stimulated vast building projects in their major cities, primarily for elderly citizens who can no longer compete economically in obtaining housing on the open market.

An interesting sidelight in Holland was our visit to one of The Hague's unique settlements for elderly citizens, dating back more than three centuries. At that time, a custom sprang up among wealthy burghers, who endowed small pensions for older men and women. Selected tenants were permitted to live in these secluded hotels until the end of their days. The custom died out among later generations of rich men, but the original pensions survived. Naturally, they accommodate only a small percentage of Holland's aged, but they have served to make the Dutch aware of the right of the aged to dignity and security. Now this awareness is being translated into action as the nation engages in its 20th century effort to provide decent housing for its elderly.

Another noteworthy fact about Holland was the extreme courtesy shown the aged. On streetcars, in the busy streets, in stores, cafes—everywhere—tradespeople offer special services to the elderly, which other customers defer to them without complaint.

In summary, my report must reach this inescapable conclusion:

European nations, in their heroic effort to erase the scars of a holocaustal war, have not forgotten their wage earners of yesterday. Generous provisions are made for their welfare in many fields, including the areas of economics and housing. Naturally, the benefits offered the aged are limited by the resources of the various countries. The United States could well study the attitude of our European allies toward their elderly. By adopting some of their policies and improving on others, with the limitless wealth enjoyed by this Nation America could establish a standard of living for retired men and women that would be a social milestone for generations.

Latin America: The Hidden Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most penetrating article by Adolph A. Berle, Jr., recently published in the Reporter magazine. Mr. Berle crystallizes the important economic and political issues which confront U.S. policy in this hemisphere. This is an article based upon Mr. Berle's long study of and diplomatic service in Latin America.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LATIN AMERICA: THE HIDDEN REVOLUTION

(By A. A. Berle, Jr.)

Latin America is entering a new and possibly crucial phase. At stake is a continent. The issue is whether the southern section of our hemisphere stays with the democratic West. For the first time since the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed in 1823, the Americas could break in two. This statement is not a rhetorical one. The possibility is, I think, greater than in 1939, when Hitler and his then ally, Franco, tried to achieve this same end. Fidel Castro's revolution in Cuba, and the swift and thus far partially successful, attempts of a small but well-organized Communist minority to seize the reins of power in Cuba are the immediate events that have forced the attention of a lethargic United

States. They are merely the visible phenomena of a deeper crisis.

From 1952 to January 1, 1959, Latin America (or more accurately Spanish America, because Portuguese Brazil ended its dictatorship in 1945 and in any case goes by its own rhythm) was the scene of a vast democratic revolution, comparable in dimension to the Russian revolution of 1917, and the Chinese revolution that culminated in 1950. Because so many countries were involved, it did not have the great impact on world opinion that occurs when a single empire changes control. Further, since the revolution was liberal and friendly to the United States—and since we are overwhelmingly ignorant of our closest neighbors—little note was taken. So the story has to be summarized here.

It began in tiny Costa Rica, just north of Panama, the best-governed and most stanchly democratic of the Central American Republics. There, in 1948, Costa Ricans held their usual constitutional election, choosing as President Otilio Ulate. But outgoing President Rafael Calderón Guardia, already allied to a small Communist minority, sought and secured support from his neighboring Nicaraguan dictator, Anastasio Somoza (father of the present dictator), and in this he was promptly supported by the Communists. At this point enters a major figure in the current struggle—cultivated and capable José (Pepe) Figueres, an accomplished economist and engineer (he had studied at MIT). With a small group of Costa Ricans, he took the field against Calderón Guardia's combination of Communists and Nicaraguan mercenaries. After a campaign of 6 weeks, he defeated them in a pitched battle behind the city of Cartago, reorganized the government, and restored Ulate to the Presidency. When Ulate's term expired in 1953, Figueres ran for President, and was overwhelmingly elected. He undertook the political and social regeneration of Costa Rica. As it turned out, his achievements went far beyond Costa Rica.

At that time most of Latin America was dominated by dictatorships, either of the demagogic or of the military type. Perón ruled Argentina; Rojas Pinilla had taken over Colombia; Pérez Jimónez ruled Venezuela; General Odría governed Peru. The dictatorships of Somoza and Trujillo in Nicaragua and the Dominican Republic were solid, and Fulgencio Batista was holding Cuba. The stanch but militarily impotent liberal governments, led by Costa Rica and Uruguay, seemed in a hopeless position. The dictators, particularly Rojas Pinilla, Pérez Jiménez, and Trujillo, ceaselessly attacked them and their leaders by assassination threats, forged slanders, and intrigues in Washington. Most of the honorable and able leaders in the countries ruled by dictators escaped imprisonment or death only by taking refuge elsewhere. Many found asylum in Costa Rica, while their governments, not always unsuccessfully, tried to have Washington bring pressure on Figueres to throw them out of Costa Rica and out of the hemisphere.

A CONTAGION OF FREEDOM

In 1952 the big change began. In Bolivia a revolution directed by its present President, Hernán Siles Zuazo, one of the great spirits in Spanish America, finally overthrew an ancient, ineffective oligarchy and a social order that had hardly changed since the Spanish conquest. A social revolution followed that is still underway. It is one of the bright spots in American diplomacy that the United States, in this case, speedily moved to support the right side. Argentina in 1955, by the combined efforts of liberals and the military, succeeded in throwing out Perón. A transition government, honorably carried on by Gen. Pedro Aramburú, held a straightforward free election in 1958, bringing to power the present President, Arturo Frondizi. In 1956, Honduras threw out its dictatorship, and recalled its liberal leader, Ramón Villeda Morales, who had been in exile and under heavy threat in the Costa Rican capital of San José, where Figueres had befriended him. He was elected President of Honduras in 1957.

General Odría, the dictator of Peru, with a wisdom not emulated by many of his contemporaries, voluntarily terminated his dictatorship in 1956. The incoming regime recognized and made peace with the popular Aprista Party, which largely represented the Indian and proletarian workers of Peru. It subsequently elected Manuel Prado as President; his government is a coalition between conservatives and Apristas, and has a clear popular mandate.

On May 10, 1957, under the battering of a liberal opposition, Gen. Rojas Pinilla fled Colombia after successfully emptying the treasury. An outstandingly capable man, Alberto Lleras Camargo (he had been Ambassador in Washington and is one of the wisest of South American statesmen), was chosen President a year later. In January 1958, the Venezuelan dictator, Pérez Jiménez, fled the country in the face of a nationwide revolutionary upsurge that engaged the support of students, of the Catholic Church, indeed of practically everyone save a small group of Jiménez hangers-on. Rómulo Betancourt, leader of the largest democratic party, was elected President 9 months later. He also had been in exile in Costa Rica, had been chivvied out at the behest of Washington, and had been granted asylum in Puerto Rico, where he was kindly received by his old friend, Gov. Luis Múñoz Marín. A few months later, the smoldering revolution of Fidel Castro reached Havana, slightly ahead of three or four other movements designed to upset the corrupt dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista. On January 1, 1959, Batista fled. A provisional government of excellent men headed by Manuel Urrutia took office, but it has not yet established its power to govern. The real power lies with Fidel Castro, and with a group around him—and in the streets.

So in the space of about 7 years, most of Spanish America, from Cape Horn to the Florida Strait, changed hands. Of interest is the fact that in their hour of exile and peril many of the men now governing found asylum and comfort through the courage of José Figueres, and the wisdom and broadmindedness of Gov. Múñoz Marín of Puerto Rico.

SHADOW OF THE PAST

So far, so much and so good. The old style caudillo-general or his counterpart, the demagog, and their dictatorships had been proved not only hateful but obsolete. The three remaining—Somoza II in Nicaragua, Trujillo in the Dominican Republic, and Stroessner in Paraguay—are on the defensive. In Nicaragua, the only question is whether the transition can be secured peacefully, as in Peru, or must involve bloody drama, as was the case in Cuba.

A few weeks ago, the second phase of this huge struggle began. It revolves, quite simply, around the Communist issue.

In the previous phase communism had not been a major issue since Pepe Figueres outmaneuvered and outfought it in 1948. True, the dictators, notably Trujillo and Jimenes, had sedulously spread the impression that everyone opposed to their dictatorships and their corruption was Communist—a not unskillful use of the technique of the late Senator McCarthy. Some of them had resources McCarthy did not have, notably some expert counterfeit and forgery shops where documents could be fabricated "proving" their point—until a laboratory as good, say, as the FBI laboratory in Washington, got to work on them. There were apparently quarters in this country where such balderdash was taken seriously.

Following Castro's seizure of Cuba, he or his government invited Figueres, no longer President of Costa Rica, to visit Havana. Figueres went. He had every right to expect friendship. He had helped Castro when Castro had few friends, as he had helped other Cuban exiles. He was worried, for Castro had made a trip uninvited to Venezuela, and had there seen fit to attack Puerto Rico as a colony of American imperialism. By implication, he had attacked Gov. Luis Múñoz Marín, one of Figueres' closest friends. Figueres had been invited to speak at a mass meeting in Havana, but was asked not to discuss Puerto Rico. So, before a vast throng, after congratulating Cubans on becoming free and saluting their revolution, he pointed out that Latin America was part of the Western World and must stand with the West; that, having overthrown one dictatorship, the Cuban revolution and its brother revolutions must not permit dictatorship to rise again either through demagogy (as in the case of Perón) or through Communist seizure such as had been attempted against him in Costa Rica in 1948.

"That speech would have been considered neutralist in Chicago," Figueres commented wryly after the event. But Fidel Castro rose, and in a long tirade—repeated the following evening over television—attacked the United States, attacked the West, attacked Figueres, attacked Betancourt, attacked the democratic leaders in Latin America. They were "agents of American imperialism." Latin America could not stay with the West, and certainly not with the imperialist United States, in any conflict. And so forth. It followed the Communist line from beginning to end—and everyone knew it. The speech, like Figueres', echoed from Cape Horn to the Rio Grande. Its effect was to crystallize Latin American partisanship with breathtaking speed.

It was highly reminiscent of Europe in 1945. All the movements resisting Hitler in each country were then considered as one. But, at a given moment when Stalin so decreed, every resistance movement split. One wing was pro-Communist, blackguarding the United States, Great Britain, and others, following the Moscow line. The other stood with the western allies and for democratic government. Exactly this happened in mid-April of 1959 throughout Latin America. Small but well-organized bands of propagandists entrenched in various quarters unmasked their batteries. Their targets were José Figueres, the recognized continental leader of democratic thinking, and President Rómulo Betancourt in Venezuela, perhaps the ablest politician in South America. Their broader attack was on the entire liberal-democratic movement.

This time they made no bones about it. True, the State Department had treated Figueres and Betancourt with notorious shabbiness, had decorated and flattered their enemies, and had been anything but enthusiastic when they moved into leadership. To accuse them of being agents of Yankee imperialism was the most ironic of big lies. But it seemed the hour had struck for the Communist seizure of power; and the battle is joined.

CASTRO AND THE COMMUNISTS

To the United States, the contest is most noticeable in Cuba. Fidel Castro has just visited us, making sweet noises and, incidentally, saying the exact opposite in New York and Washington of what he previously said in Cuba and Venezuela. The reasons may not be far to seek.

Fidel Castro says he is not, and I think he is not, a Communist. He is merely a guerrilla leader who commands the admiration in Latin America properly due to an in-

dividual of great courage who fought a winning battle against huge odds. Cuban Communists had consistently supported the Batista dictatorship; only in the last few months of Castro's campaign did they change sides. One Cuban Communist central committeeman then moved into Castro's camp in the Sierra Maestra. He has since spent much of his time with Castro.

The Costa Rican Communist leader, Manuel Mora, who is considered an extremely able propagandist, likewise moved into the picture. It is clear that a number of other Communists are assuming positions in various parts of Castro's amorphous regime: Courts-martial, set up to execute perpetrators of atrocities under the Batista government, soon became mere people's courts, murdering inconvenient editors or political figures. Castro has recently announced that the death penalty will no longer be applied except in cases of outright counterrevolutionary activity; it will be interesting to see how far this phrase stretches.

The idea that Cuba ought to elect a President with a popular mandate is repudiated by Castro and his cliqué; some sort of social revolution must first be carried out. It is not specified what this will be, or what it will do, or where it will go. A chief and constant theme is anti-Americanism.

The same tune is sung everywhere by pro-Communist groups in Latin America. The United States is chief target; the liberal democracies presently trying to bring a better economic order to their countries are the secondary targets. The unanimity convincingly suggests that orders were given from the Communist high command in Moscow, presumably through a command post in western Europe. It also suggests that the situation is being used to assist the Soviet Union diplomatically in its current Berlin-Middle Eastern push.

THE UNDERLYING REALITIES

Let us sort out, from the political noise, the underlying realities with which we have to deal. It has been clear to anyone with eyes to see that the dying Latin-American dictatorships would not be able to hold on. They were also the worst possible long-range allies of the United States. Help or cordiality extended in their direction merely meant convincing the oppressed peoples of their countries that the United States was their enemy. Happily, the liberal democratic leaders who now control most of South America are men with education and with experience of the United States. They are quite aware of the difference between the reality of the United States and the ineptitudes of its politics often reflected in the Government of the United States. Most of them have been in close contact with American liberal thinking.

On the other hand, they know that their own countries must go through a social as well as a political reorganization. They are not clear whether the United States understands that fact. The outstanding necessity is to put an end to the division between age-old oligarchic, irresponsible power cliques and a proletariat living out its life in hunger and disease, without hope of improvement. Figueres' first act in Costa Rica was to nationalize the banks, and he was right; no other way would have made credit available to all of Costa Rica.

The Bolivian revolution, like the Mexican revolution against Porfirio Diaz in 1911, marked the end of Spanish feudalism. Social change on a sweeping scale is inevitable in all Latin-American countries, except in democracies like Uruguay or Costa Rica where continuous evolution has been possible. For practical purposes this means, first, assurance that land is reasonably distributed or available. Second, that credit is available to everyone on reasonable terms and not monopolized by private usurers and moneylenders. In short, a popular banking system. Third, that the governments together, and almost necessarily with the United States, work out a system of economic planning so that prices of the principal products will be more or less stabilized, the flow of necessary imports will continue, and the industrialization of these countries will go forward rapidly. Fourth, and perhaps most important, that there will be a vast and solid expansion of popular education.

It also means that the United States will have to assist a continuously expanding Latin American economic system. So far as the United States is concerned, it must stand not merely for private enterprise (who in the world wants to die for that?) but should spearhead a battle for personal, political, and economic freedom, by any method, socialist or private, that seems best adapted to meet local conditions.

In fairness to the United States, which has not been getting much of a break in Latin America, it should be said that Washington has made major moves in this direction. The Eisenhower administration, perhaps without realizing it, sharply changed course in the right direction nearly a year ago when it faced up to the fact that the Latin American economic problem had to be met. It did follow the Brazilian initiative toward continental planning which goes by the name of "Operation Pan-Americana." Governor Meyner, of New Jersey, speaking in Rio de Janeiro and representing the Democratic opposition in the United States, gave powerful support to this view. Washington did give limited approval of the idea of continuous planning, and has taken an active part in the Committee of Twenty-one, established by the Organization of American States, whose report is expected shortly. U.S. Treasury experts supported and have assisted in drawing up a project for an Inter-American bank, a measure long overdue. During the Roosevelt administration such a treaty was drawn but it was blocked in the Senate by one of the New York banks through its private influence with the late Senator Carter Glass. Now the project has been restudied and should come before the Senate before too long.

Limited support has also been given to price-stabilization schemes that should remove at least some of the hazards from Latin American trade. Coordination of public and private investment from the United States in these countries also can and should be attempted. Actually, sustained assistance for 10 years, costing $12 billion—half the size of the Marshall plan—could reorganize the Latin American economy in a decade.

WHAT WE CAN DO AT ONCE

Most urgently the United States should dramatically reverse its position in respect of the new governments. It should, rather dramatically, indicate its solid support of the liberal democrats who are now running most of Latin America. Especially it should make a clear demonstration of good will toward President Romuló Betancourt, presently under Communist fire in Venezuela. It can and should give solid evidence of cordiality to Lleras Camargo in Colombia, Frondizi in Argentina, and Villeda Morales in Honduras (he also needs immediate and direct help: his is a poor country). The United States should establish the principle that it can and will make long-range plans with governments that have held free, honest, and open elections, and must deal with others only on a de facto, day-to-day basis. Incidentally, this means insisting that Cuba hold an honest election, without the terror that stalks there now, before Washington commits itself to long-range plans of economic aid.

Latin America will be setting its direction in the next couple of years—with Washington if it can, without Washington if it must. If it is to be with Washington, we must contribute not only capital but also long-range planning and technical advice, so that the economic development of the southern part of our hemisphere may contribute to the economic and political growth of the free world as a whole. If we let Latin America drift away, it will be to the detriment of the peoples of the hemisphere as a whole. The Marshall plan proved that, with the cooperation of the nations we assist, we can do a lasting job of rehabilitation and improvement abroad. In Latin America, we are facing conditions that cannot be easily compared with those of Western Europe. But in Latin America, too, we can do the job—and now is the time to do it.

Amending Mutual Security Act of 1959

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 16, 1959

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7500) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, out of 11 weeks of faithful attendance at the hearings on the mutual security bill and a participation in the discussions in the executive sessions, at which every member not only spoke his or her mind, but was ready and eager to battle, I came away with the conclusion that no one has all the answers.

There are 31 members on our committee, and if any 2 followed the same pattern of thought on any 2 particular matters I did not detect any sign of such soulful compatibility.

Now, we came out of the 11 weeks' huddle with one solution, all of us, that we had to have a mutual security program. It is noteworthy that the four who signed the minority report began the statement very cautiously with six powerful words. Let me quote the exact words: "We assuredly believe in mutual security. Two very able members, in signing a statement of additional views, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], said in their very first eight words: "The undersigned support the mutual security program wholeheartedly."

Thus it is plain that the committee of 31 members is in complete agreement that there must be a mutual security program. There is this difference, and this only:

The majority members believe in repairing what we have, tightening up the program, profiting from experience, and meeting the crisis of our generation with the same faith in our own people and the same will to overcome obstacles as shown by earlier generations.

The four on the minority side want to junk what we have, and at this stage, I might say this very critical period in our history, and next year start all over again. Let this year pass by. Forget all about the Berlin crisis. Forget all about

the battle we are having to hold our ground in the minds and the hearts of the people of Africa, the people in the Orient, the people in Latin America, the people all over the world who are seeking the pinnacles of human contentment in a world rebuilding. Forget all about them for a year. Just get on our knees and pray that next year we can come up with a better program.

The majority on the other hand say, "Yes, there have been mistakes made and very, very bad mistakes made in administration, and maybe in some of our legislative thinking, but the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been seeking to correct those mistakes, to tighten up the program, and has provisions in the bill before you to do just that. Either we meet the crisis of today with a mutual security program, improved and tightened, but not abandoned, or we take grave chances of what will happen in the year we take off to think up another program."

Mr. Chairman, I have the warmest affectionate regard for the gentleman from Georgia. I know the tenderness of his heart. I know the sincerity of his convictions. I listened, with a sense of his sincerity and shared with his emotion when he said, as long as there are little children who are hungry and go to bed without food, there will be the danger of communism. Why, certainly, there will be. As long as anywhere in a rich world there is poverty and children go hungry to bed there will be unrest and the seeds of dissension and of wars. And we have got to think of the little children, we have got to base all that we do on the realization that our Government cannot be stable and continue stable if we do not consider the little children and their welfare. But while the objective of the gentleman from Georgia and my own are the same there is a difference in our approach. I would not wait until we have a program, perfect in every detail, and leave the little children of the world to shift for themselves and continue to go hungry until we have come up with what in our human vanity we might think perfection itself.

It is not within human power ever to reach perfection, but if our hearts remain stout and in our mistakes we find lessons, and not discouragement, we will make progress toward the perfection we seek.

The mutual security bill of 1959 is the best mutual security bill ever presented to the Congress. It is a compromise bill. I would have cut more out of the arms progress and put more into the economic program. You do not make friends and promote peace in your own neighborhood by calling the boys and girls into your backyard, giving them the best of revolvers and telling them to go out for a good time but be careful not to hurt anyone. You can do much more in creating a friendly, peaceful neighborhood by improving the environment in which youth is being brought up, and economics does play a large part in creating environment.

Others on our committee thought the other way. But 27 minds got together after argument and debate and the result was a compromise bill for which every member of this body can vote in good conscience.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs is not defending the extravagance and the waste that have marked the administration of the mutual security program in certain areas. It is its own watchdog subcommittee that has unearthed much of this extravagance and waste, its own watchdog subcommittee chaired by the able and dedicated chairman of the full committee, Mr. MORGAN, and working in close cooperation with the subcommittees of Congressman WILLIAM DAWSON'S Committee on Governmental Operations chaired by Mr. HARDY and Mr. FOUNTAIN.

The mutual security bill of 1959 reflects the determination of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that extravagance and waste must end. It contains more provisions and safeguards to that end than ever before were written into legislation.

Later when we are under the 5-minute rule I shall offer an amendment that if adopted will save the taxpayers a possible loss of half a billion dollars. The bill as it now stands authorizes the Investment Guarantee Fund to insure against losses due to civil strifes without any increase in premiums. The investment guarantee program up to date has done a magnificent job. If in the urge to get new business it increases coverage to include losses from civil strifes the entire program easily could blow up with a loss of the half billion dollars the Government already is obligated. I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. Chairman, this year the committee without impairing the program one iota is cutting down the total amount of the authorizations. Next year the cut will be larger, as more and more through the committee's studies the extravagances and the waste are eradicated. As I have said, this is a bill for which every Member can vote in good conscience.

The Light Begins To Dawn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the debate on the provision of the mutual security appropriation bill which extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, I pointed out the arbitrary nature of its findings and recommendations and the fact that many of its allegations of denial of voting rights of Negroes in the South were either grossly exaggerated or completely groundless. Recognition of this fact by persons from all sections of our Nation would emphasize the utter uselessness and, indeed, danger of the very existence of this Commission.

It is encouraging to note that in some northern journalistic quarters there has been delinquent appreciation of the circumstances involved and a recognition of the dangers inherent in attempts to legislate in this area.

In an excellent editorial in the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle of Monday, September 14, 1959, the inaccuracies of the report of the Commission on Civil Rights have been pointed out. In addition, it is reported that at least some segments of the northern press have undergone a change of attitude toward the problems of the South. The editorial demands the attention of every thoughtful person, and it is for this reason that I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LIGHT BEGINS TO DAWN

A former Chronicle reporter now residing in upstate New York wrote us over the weekend that newspapers in that area, long choraling an eternal hymn of hate against the South, seem to be altering their tune.

The letter from Esther Young Mewhsen contained an editorial from the New York Daily News which illustrated her point. It concerned itself with the Civil Rights Commission's charge that Negroes in the South have been deprived of their voting rights.

While the Daily News editor seems somewhat guilty of listening to his own propaganda when he used the phrase "widespread Southern practice of keeping Negroes from voting," the conclusions to which he finally came in his editorial indicate the frigidity of attitude by the northern press toward the South may be thawing.

"We believe there is good reason for hoping that the South, given time and some northern understanding of the South," the editor wrote, "will eventually solve all its racial problems as well as they can be solved in an imperfect world."

That realization on the part of a New York editor at this late date points up how low the lines of communication between the South and the North have fallen. We here have long contended that the problem is ours, and ours to solve. Moreover, we have long held that the good people of the South—both white and colored—were reaching a solution when pseudo-sociologists cloaked as justices retarded that effort at attainment. More recently, advocates of force legislation have, by their activities, created an even wider clevage between a heretofore mutually cooperative white and colored citizenry in the South.

Now that that fact is becomining obvious outside the South, the editor of the Daily News writes: "Our own feeling is that Congress had better go easy on trying to make people politically moral by law. That seldom works."

The gentleman of the Daily News evidently has taken a closer look at the horrible situation in his own backyard.

We would suggest, too, that he read in full the report of the Civil Rights Commission to which he alludes in his editorial. He will discover that deprivation of voting rights is not widespread. That it exists at all is deplored by the press of the South, and by the better citizens of the South. But while we reluctantly confess that there are, indeed, violations of Negroes' rights to vote, we would point out to the Daily News that the Commission found it confined virtually to two States, Alabama and Louisiana.

Furthermore, he might find that more than 160,000 Negroes vote in Georgia, have housing opportunities which the chairman of the Civil Rights Commission admitted were better than in "many cities in my section of the country."

And the Daily News editor would discover, too, that of all the complaints lodged with the Commission dealing with voting and other alleged rights violations, a goodly number originated from States well outside the South, that Georgia and South Carolina—two States for which the Chronicle is proud to speak—have records far better than does the State of New York where civil rights complaints are concerned.

Canham Writes on Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I take particular pleasure in presenting for, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in, the Appendix of the RECORD a very excellent article on Alaska written by Mr. Erwin D. Canham, editor of the Christian Science Monitor, when he was in the 49th State in his capacity as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON BERING STRAIT, ALASKA.—Hope springs eternal—and anew—in Alaska.

The thrill and satisfaction of statehood have nourished the feeling that perhaps Alaska's breakthrough into more adequate development of its immense natural resources may be not far ahead. But, at the same time, there is an awareness that statehood has brought new problems. No longer does the paternal hand of Washington intervene and guide, and the decisions taken in Juneau are sometimes bold and expensive.

Meantime, as 1959's short summer ends, the houses and industrial plants and commercial buildings which have not been completed because of a carpenters' strike stare you in the face in every inhabited place. Now they cannot be finished during this brief building season, and before the winter is over the economic effects may be severe.

But Alaska will pull itself together next spring and push forward under the constant, exhiliarating stimulus of the riches of nature which are so grandly apparent. Oil prospecting is taking place all over the State. Valued metals and minerals are being investigated and evaluated. There is always hope—not very well based—that perhaps an increase in the price of gold might give the gold-mining industry a badly needed boost.

ARCTIC ENTHRALLS VISITOR

Military expenditures continue to stimulate the Alaskan economy. The summertime tourist trade is bound to grow. A governmental commission is studying how to build a highway or railroad up along the coast from Puget Sound. The Canadians in British Columbia and the Yukon territory are planning hard toward the development of the immense power and mineral resources which are tied in with Alaska and need to cross Alaska on the way to tidewater. The Peace River project alone is breathtaking, and the Yukon remains a great untamed giant.

For the visitor like myself, Alaska is a magnificent experience.

My introduction was thrilling. Flying from Seattle to just south of Ketchikan, where the long Alaskan panhandle reaches to the British Columbia coast, the skies were overcast. But as we reached Ketchikan, the clouds had broken, and from there to Juneau it was 200 miles of superb beauty. Wooded islands and inlets where an ax or a forest fire had never struck, snow-capped mountains and mighty glaciers, deep inlets and fiords—all were primitive and untouched.

Then, the following day, flying from Fairbanks to Nome and Kotzebue, and spending the night in a little Eskimo village on Bering Strait, was a glimpse of the Arctic which enthralls. Here in Kotzebue we are 100 miles or so from Little and Big Diomede Islands. Big Diomede is in the U.S.S.R., the other side of the international dateline.

I have just been talking with some of the Little Diomede Island Eskimos, who will soon start their trek back home for the winter. I asked one litle boy: "Where would you rather live, here in Kotzebue with all the other people and the coming and going of tourists (perhaps 50 daily) or out on Diomede?" Without an instant's hesitation he replied: "Diomede." And so I concluded that the Eskimos are not being altogether spoiled in their contact with the rest of us.

ESKIMO PARTLY MODERNIZED

They are certainly a delightful people. On Sunday morning, here in Kotzebue, I went to the Friends' Meeting House, because most of the Eskimos went there. The service was largely composed of hymn singing, and there was no sermon. Three Eskimo, two men and a woman, told simply and with feeling what finding the Christ had meant to them.

And all the Eskimos sang with open throats, pouring out the old gospel hymns they have learned to love so well. There was no collection, but we contributed. The Friends have just finished a fine high school building for the Eskimos at Kotzebue. Hitherto, all pupils have gone more than 1,000 miles away to the high school at Mount Edgecomb, Sitka, where they stayed all winter.

The friendliness and cooperation of the Eskimos were very apparent. They need these qualities, for life in the Arctic barrens demands all of man's spiritual resources. But they love it, and find deep beauty in their land and its way of life. They are partly modernized, of course, and buy much the same groceries at the stores that we do—at a markup.

Nome, which is the American town nearest the Soviet Union, lives under the shadow of impending termination of gold-dredging activities. But there is tin a little way down the coast, and possible oilfields not far away, and plenty of gold to be dredged if the price improves. There is no highway into Nome, ships have to be lightered and don't come very often, and defense activities seem largely to have passed Nome by.

AIRBASES DOMINATE CITIES

Citizens remember the days of World War II, when the Japanese had attacked Dutch Harbor, and Nome officials were told they would have to defend themselves. They mounted a small fieldpiece on a truck, and drove round and round the town's one or two streets and waterfront. But the Japanese never came.

The Soviets did come, however, during the long period of the trans-Siberian airlift. Nome's memories of the Soviets seem to be largely favorable. But now the town feels isolated and alone, as its people gaze across Bering Strait and can almost see the Soviet planes lift off their bases on the other side. They know there is abundant U.S. defense, but it is a long way back from their beachhead.

In Anchorage, the atmosphere is all defense, and so it is at Fairbanks, the interior metropolis. Huge airbases dominate these cities. Both are also on major commercial air routes over the pole from the Orient to Europe. They are on the main street of intercontinental travel. Each is growing fast and steadily, but terribly hampered through the carpenters' strike.

Each, incidentally, has fine newspapers with active civic policies. These papers had a great deal to do with the successful fight for statehood. Nome, likewise, has a newspaper: The Nome Nugget, published twice a week under the active editorial and publishing hand of Emily Boucher. It was such a pleasure to talk with her in her two-room shop on Nome's frontier main street. I was reminded of the country weekly in Maine where I first set type and ran a job press.

What a vast, spectacular, challenging land. Timber enough to print all the world's newspapers and build most of its houses. Waterpower enough to provide all the energy a vast indutry could possibly require. Minerals to serve that industry. Petroleum and natural gas, evidently in great abundance. Land still to be homesteaded and raise a fair crop. Beauty and game sports at every doorstep. The wholesome life of the small, struggling, proud, cooperating community. An excellent university. Churches and clubs and civic life. And lot of places, not far away or inaccessible, where perhaps man has never before set foot.

Alaska's breakthrough will come. Meantime, it copes with the problems of statehood after the first exhilaration has worn away. It is America's perpetual physical frontier: A sample of our national past, preserved in 1959. It smells and feels much as Maine must have in 1850, Michigan in 1900, Oregon and Washington in 1925, all modified by the air age. Things move faster nowadays. So they will for Alaska, but we cannot foresee when or just how.

Hon. Thomas H. Burke

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the passing of Thomas Burke, happening so close on the heels of a wave of disclosures of management-union corruption and the attendant deluge of antilabor hysteria, is a sobering reminder of an enduring truth about the labor movement: from it come men of highest integrity, great devotion to the service of mankind, and outstanding judgment in public affairs. Thomas H. Burke was one of these men.

He came to Congress from the ranks of UAW, his union, where his own gifts of intelligence and concern for his fellow man had been blended with the traditions of this democratic and militant union to make of him a most strong, wise, and serious advocate of the common man in the U.S. Congress. His work as a member in the House Committee on Labor and Education preceded my service on that committee but its imprint remains there.

In the years since I came to Congress, I knew Tom as a reliable spokesman for the labor movement, alert to political motives, probable effects and administrative subtleties of bills relating to labor, education, the national economy, and civil rights—the fields of interest to which he was most ceaselessly devoted. He was a constant help to Members of

Congress who want to understand and serve the interest of the laboring man but who lack the wisdom which comes from years of firsthand knowledge of labor's struggles and the role of unions.

Tom had this wisdom, born of his years as an organizer, officer, and leader of the United Automobile Workers Union in Toledo, and had the gift of sharing it courteously and eloquently with the friends of labor in Congress.

I pay respect to his significant life of service. I join his many friends in Congress and in the labor movement to extend sympathy to his family at this loss of a dear and generous friend of mankind.

Ludicrous Picture: America Floundering in Unshared Food Asked To Pray for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is no secret in these Halls that my strongest yearning and most intensive effort in these last 9 months has been to awaken a desire with my colleagues to recognize America's agricultural abundance as our greatest tool for peace.

One of the finest presentations on this subject was just printed in the Des Moines Register, written by Rev. William D. Bair, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Paullina, Iowa.

I present his cogent comment:

WOULD USE SURPLUS FOR PEACE

To the OPEN FORUM EDITOR:

The one most striking feature of America's agriculture today is the huge stockpile of food and fiber that lies deteriorating in great bins, caves, warehouses, holds of ships, every conceivable bit of storage space across the face of the land. It is ludicrous to picture in our imagination our population floundering and smothering in this great hoard of unused food and fiber while the 1 billion people of the world's population who are living on the perilous edge of starvation look on in anguished need.

MORE FITTING POSTURE

In these days our Nation has been called upon to pray for peace. This calls another ludicrous picture to mind * * *. Our people on their knees praying for peace * * * a posture that ill-becomes us when to be on your knees is to be swallowed up in this vast hoard of food * * *. Again in the background of that picture do you see those 1 billion people * * * sick, hungry, homeless, crying out in their need?

As God hears our prayers for peace, how He must yearn that we would know the ways of peace. How meaningless our prayers when they are unaccompanied by things that can make for peace. How can God give peace to a people who are willing to drown in their own surplus rather than share in an effective manner with their starving neighbors?

How dare we think we can stand before God as His righteous people until we fall on our knees in sheer exhaustion from carrying our surplus to our starving brothers. This would be a much more fitting posture for our prayers.

Immediately the hue and cry is raised how difficult it is to get this food to other countries without disturbing world markets, without making them slaves in their dependence on us. Of course, there are difficulties. What great thing has ever been done without difficulty? Don't be deluded by the prophets of pessimism and indecision into thinking this is an impossible task.

The United Nations study report entitled, "Uses of Agricultural Surpluses to Finance Economic Development in Underdeveloped Countries—Pilot Study in India," shows that agricultural surpluses can be used in a manner that will feed hungry people and at the same time provide for the economic development so sorely needed. The United Nations stands ready to implement this program.

We have a bill presented to the House of Representatives by Iowa Representative LEONARD WOLF to provide for such a program under the United Nations. There is a bill in the Senate presented by Senator HUMPHREY providing for such a program under a U.S. Peace Food Administration. Now we await some imaginative, bold, and decisive action on these bills by our legislators.

WHAT CAN BE DONE

What can we as individuals do in this situation? We know that Congress was moved to action on a labor bill by the great pressure of public opinion as many people wrote to them. Have you made known to your Representatives your feelings in the matter of sharing our food?

We can also help by giving our support to some of the nongovernmental agencies set up to help share our surplus. We can give generously through our local churches, we can support generously the CROP (Christian Rural Overseas Program) drive which is the food-collecting agency of Church World Service, or we can give through one of the many other agencies which are concerned for the well-being of the half of our world population who will go to bed hungry tonight.

It is long passed time for the American people to translate talk of compassion, prayers for peace, and bulging storehouses, into concrete deeds of sharing to create the world economic conditions in which peace can endure.

WILLIAM D. BAIR,
Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Paullina, Iowa.

What You Can and Cannot Do Under the New Labor Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix the second part of an interview that the magazine U.S. News & World Report had with Mr. Michael Bernstein, reviewing the recently passed Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RIGHT TO SUE

Question. Are they required to be bonded?

Answer. Oh, that's another, separate provision. Now, under that provision I've been talking about, this high degree of responsibility is imposed on them, and union members are given a right to sue for a violation of that fiduciary obligation.

Question. If they suspect some skulduggery, can they sue?

Answer. Right. And they can get restitution.

Question. Can they do this on their own?

Answer. That's right. All they have to do is make a demand on the union, on its officers, and, if the union doesn't sue, then they may sue. Now, they sue here not on their own behalf, but on behalf of the union.

Question. In this situation the Secretary of Labor is not involved?

Answer. That's correct.

Now, in addition to that, I think we've come to one of the strongest provisions in the bill: Every union officer—agent, representative, employee other than a clerical or custodian employee—who handles any union money, or funds, or property, must be bonded. And he must be bonded under a personal bond—not a position bond. Now, this is the difference between the two:

For instance, a company like Lloyd's of London will give you a position bond. In other words, they don't care who the incumbent of the position is. They'll issue you a bond for the job of say, secretary-treasurer of a union. Now, they charge a high premium which is based upon the average rate of loss for all positions of that kind. You see, it's a statistical risk they take, and the only purpose of such a bond is to provide reimbursement if the individual who occupies that position turns out to be a bad risk. But he himself—the individual who occupies the position, Joe Jones—is not bonded, you see.

Under this bill, Joe Jones has to be bonded. That means the bonding company has to make an investigation of him to determine his financial reliability. If they turn up anything in his record which casts any doubt on his financial reliability, they won't give him a bond.

Question. Shady characters don't have as much chance, then?

Answer. That's right.

Now, the bonding companies, under this bill, have to meet two tests: One, no labor union, no labor-union officer, official, employee or representative can have any interest in any of these authorized bonding companies, direct or in indirect. That's one test. And, two: The bonding companies—and I'll give you the exact language—"Such surety company shall be a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury under the act of July 30, 1947, as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds."

And that eliminates the Lloyd's-of-London type of operation—and I might just add a bit of interesting sidelight information, tell you that a very substantial number of Jimmy Hoffa's officers are bonded by Lloyd's.

Question. If a union official is convicted of any crime, can a union pay his fine?

Answer. There's a specific prohibition against paying the fines of union officials who are convicted of violations of this law.

Question. Just this law, not necessarily other laws?

Answer. That's right. Now, of course, you know there's a prohibition against a criminal's holding office——

Question. What are the restrictions against criminals or ex-convicts holding office?

Answer. Under the present law, the Taft-Hartley law, there's a requirement that, if a union wishes to use the services of the National Labor Relations Board, its officers must file with the Board a non-Communist affidavit, and, simultaneously, the union must file with the Secretary of Labor a financial report. Those two provisions of Taft-Hartley are repealed.

Question. There will be no more non-Communist affidavits?

Answer. That's right.

Now, in place of these two, as you see, we have a complete system of financial reporting, so we don't need the old type of financial report.

And in place of the non-Communist affidavit, we have this prohibition which says that no Communist and no person convicted—there's a long list of felonious crimes—or who has served a prison sentence for any of those crimes may serve as a union officer—and there's a whole list of the various types of officers: Business agents, organizers, shop steward, representative, president, vice president, secretary, treasurer, and so on—if in the preceding 5 years he has been a Communist, or has been convicted of any one of these enumerated crimes, or within the preceding 5 years completed serving a sentence for any of those crimes.

It's a crime, then, for any individual who falls into these two categories—ex-convict or Communist—to hold union office. It is also a crime for the union to permit him to hold office.

Question. By "crime" do you mean a felony or a misdemeanor?

Answer. Misdemeanor.

Question. What's the penalty for violation of this provision?

Answer. Ten thousand dollars and 1 year in jail.

PICKETING: THE CHANGES

Question. Now let's get to picketing. Just what kind of picketing is involved and what will the new law do about it?

Answer. Well, first of all there is what they call extortionate picketing. This is made a crime punishable by $10,000 and imprisonment for not more than 20 years.

Here is what is meant by extortionate picketing: Extortionate picketing is completely phony, phony in this sense: That the purpose of the picket line has absolutely no connection with any labor-union objective, such as wages, working conditions, organizing the employees—nothing like that.

Its simple purpose is exactly the same as that of a man pointing a gun at you and saying, "If you don't give me your money I'll shoot you. Give me the money and I'll remove the gun." That's what the purpose of this picket line is. It's to go to the employer and say, "For $5,000 you can have the picket line removed." That's just one.

Question. They are not demanding that he unionize?

Answer. That's right. They are not interested in that. The purpose of this picket line has nothing to do with any union affair. They are merely using a union device to extort money.

Question. Is that prevalent?

Answer. It has been used. Johnny Dio [convicted labor racketeer] has used that.

BAN ON BLACKMAIL

Question. Doesn't the bill also deal with blackmail picketing? What is that?

Answer. The blackmail-picketing provision is an amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act and deals with labor practices—not crime. And I'll tell you right off the bat: The purpose of this picketing, even though it will now be outlawed, is not extortion. Let me tell you what it is.

Under existing law, employees select a union to act as their bargaining agent or representative. That is under the existing law. Now, the law says that, when a majority of them pick a union to act as their bargaining agent, that bargaining agent so selected becomes the exclusive representative of all the employees, not just those who voted for the union or who belonged to it.

In other words, if there are 100 employees in the plant and 51 want the union to represent them, then that union becomes the representative of all 100 employees. The employer has a legal obligation to bargain with that union and with that union only. He can't bargain individually with the 49 employees who didn't want the union. The union speaks for all. The contract that it reaches with the employer sets the working conditions, the wages, the hours, the fringe benefits for all 100 employees.

The individual employees lose their individual bargaining rights. This is the basic principle of the Taft-Hartley Act as it was and the Wagner Act before it.

Suppose an employer whose employees don't want to join the union—or the majority of whom don't—has a picket line thrown around them, and the union says, "We want you to sign a contract with us." He says, "Well, I can't. I violate the law if I do that. My employees don't want your union, and you don't represent a majority, and, therefore, I am prohibited by law."

Now, what is an employer to do in a situation like that? Under the present law he is between the devil and the deep blue sea. If, on the one hand, he remuses to accede to the union's demand, he is faced with a permanent picket line. If, on the other hand, he does sign a contract with them, he violates the Taft-Hartley Act. This is what is known as "recognition" picketing.

Question. Is this a variation of what is called organization picketing?

Answer. Yes. Again, the union doesn't represent a majority. In fact, frequently it doesn't have a single employee member in the plant. It uses the picket line for the purpose of trying to persuade the employees to join the union. But how does it do it? By throwing a picket line around the employer. The object is to cause the employer economic loss. That, therefore, has the tendency to induce the employer to try to force his employees to join the union so that he can get rid of the picket line, which again is a violation of the picket law. He can't do that.

Or, the alternative is to cause the employer substantial economic loss, with the result that he may have to lay off some of his employees. So this is a threat of economic loss to the employees. It is a form of economic coercion on them to get them to join the union. Economic coercion is prohibited by existing law—to use economic coercion against employees.

However, unfortunately, the National Labor Relations Board has never seen fit to hold these two types of practices to be violations of the law, and that is what the new bill does.

Here is the way it does it: It says, "Where the object of the picketing is recognition or organization," and I have explained the two terms, "then picketing may not be carried on at all if the employer has already signed a bona fide agreement with another union"—the nonpicketing union.

The employer signs an agreement with Union A when the majority of his employees wants it. The contract is for 2 years. So in that 2 years, Union B may not lawfully picket them.

Point 2: A union—any union—petitions the NLRB for an election to determine the bargaining representative. Now, on every NLRB ballot, not only do you have the name of the union or unions which are seeking representation, but you also have another choice for the employees—it is called no union. Now, if in this election no union should win, then the union may not picket for recognition or organizational purposes for 12 months following that unsuccessful election—no union may picket.

The third one: If a union starts picketing for organizational or recognition purposes, it may do so up to 30 days, provided it doesn't fall into one of these other two categories that I have mentioned. At the end of the 30th day, it must stop its picketing unless an election is held by the Board. That gives the employer a chance to get an election at the end of the 30th day, and, if a union loses, then one of the other provisions comes into play—the fact that you can't have picketing for 12 months following an election.

There is one exception to that. If the union makes it clear that it doesn't fall under the first provision, about the employer's having a contract with another union, or if it doesn't fall in the second prohibition, that an election has been held within the preceding 12 months, the union may then picket indefinitely, provided its signs and its literature and its appeals make it plain that all it is seeking to do is to advise the consuming public that the employer does not employ union workers or that he has not got a collective-bargaining agreement with the union. It may not be for organizational or recognition purposes.

And even if they confine their signs to these two very limited areas, if at any time an employee from some other employer, who has come in, say, to make a delivery, or to make a pickup, refuses to cross that picket line, then at that moment the employer can immediately get an election and then the 12-month prohibition comes into play.

AFFECTED: ALL UNIONS

Question. Does this apply to all unions?

Answer. All unions. There are no exceptions.

There is only one defense the union can raise to the charge that they are engaged in this type of picketing illegally. That is, if they can show that when the employer signed the contract with that other union it was a "sweetheart" contract. If they can show that the contract the employer signed with the in-union is a sweetheart contract, then the out-union is not—you can't enjoin it from picketing.

Question. Would you explain what you mean by a "sweetheart" contract?

Answer. A sweetheart contract is a deal between the employer and the union to sell out the employees. It is illegal under existing law. But now it would not only be illegal, but it would be a defense.

In this connection, if the employer can prove that this picketing prohibition which I have just described to you has been violated, then the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board must—must go into a Federal district court and ask for an immediate injunction—immediate.

In other words, he can't wait until there is a full-scale hearing before the Board with all the appeals—the final disposition of the case may not take place for 12 months, during all of which time the picketing would go on. He must at the very beginning—he has no discretion, if he finds that there is a prima facie case of violation—he must go to a Federal district court and ask for an injunction. Now the Federal district court doesn't have to grant it, but he must ask for it.

Question. We hear a great deal about secondary boycotts in connection with this legislation. Will you explain what a secondary boycott is?

Answer. Let me illustrate it with a concrete situation: The union has a dispute with Employer A. Employer A is the employer who employs the members of that union. It doesn't make any difference what the dispute is about. It could be wages, working conditions, hours—the employer may refuse to deal with them—it doesn't matter. He has a dispute with the union.

Employer A does business with Employer B. He buys from Employer B—let's say raw material—or he sells to Employer B finished products. It doesn't make any difference. The union, having failed to induce Employer A to accede to their demands, then throws a picket line around Employer B with whom they have no dispute.

The purpose of that picket line around Employer B is to induce the employees of Employer B to stop working, the ultimate objective being to get Employer B to stop doing business with Employer A. That's the classic form.

CLOSING LOOPHOLES

Question. Isn't that prohibited under the Taft-Hartley Act?

Answer. Yes, as I've stated. But let me give you a variation that is not prohibited under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Take the same set of facts. The union has a dispute with Employer A. Employer A does business with Employer B. Instead of throwing a picket line around Employer B, the business agent of the union goes directly to Employer B himself in his office and says, "Unless you stop doing business with Employer A, we will throw a picket line around your plant." That's not illegal under present law, because there the inducement to cease doing business is made directly upon the secondary employer and not through his employees. Now that would be illegal under the new bill.

Question. That was a loophole in the old law?

Answer. Right.

Question. Does the new legislation close any other loopholes?

Answer. The term "employer" as it's defined in the Taft-Hartley Act excludes certain types of employers. Among them, the most important being railroad employers and their employees, because they are covered under the Railway Labor Act.

Suppose you get a situation like this: The union has a disptue with Employer A. A, in order to finish his economic processes to make his profit, has got to ship his goods via railroad to its ultimate destination. So the union throws a picket line around the railroad spur at which Employer A's products would normally be loaded onto the freight car. The purpose of that picket line is to induce the railway employees to refuse to load that stuff or to handle it. The Board has said that, under the present language, that is not a violation because railroad employees and railroad employers are not employees or employers under the Taft-Hartley Act.

Now, under this new bill, instead of using the term, "to cease doing business with another employer," it says "to cease doing business with any other person." Person includes everybody. That closes that loophole.

WHO IS AN EMPLOYER

Question. So railroad workers are covered then in that instance?

Answer. Let me put it this way: Employers are protected against secondary boycotts even though one of the two employers involved is a railroad employer, or an agricultural employer—they're also exempt—or a governmental body—municipality, or a nonprofit hospital. These are all employers who are not included in the definition of employer under Taft-Hartley and that, therefore, you didn't have a violation of secondary boycott if they were one of the parties involved. Now the term "employer" is actually employer in its dictionary sense. So that's the second loophole that's covered.

Question. Are there any others?

Answer. Yes, there's a third one. Suppose, for example, the union having the dispute with Employer A sends a business agent to Employer B, and instead of throwing a picket line around Employer B, or instead of going to Employer B himself and asking him not to do business with A, they pick out a half a dozen key employees—key individual employees of B—and they ask each one of them individually not to work on the goods of Employer A—not to handle them.

Now, the Supreme Court has said that, in order for it to be an unlawful secondary boycott, the inducement on employees not to work must be an inducement upon them to cease working in concert. It has to be a concerted ceasing to work, not a merely individual ceasing of work.

So that—in the hypothetical case I give you—by going to each one of these individuals and asking him not to handle this struck employer's goods, you don't get a violation under existing law, because this is not asking them to concertedly cease working. Well, under the new bill, an individual inducement would be just as much a violation of the law as a concerted inducement. Those are the three major loopholes that have been plugged.

They've plugged one more which is the secondary boycott in futuro, or to put it more plainly, it's the agreement by an employer to permit a secondary boycott to be carried on against him. That's the hot cargo.

Now, the term "cargo" is misleading, because it gives the impression that this only involves transportation activities. But, actually, the term should really be "hot goods." "Hot goods" are goods which come from any enterprise or business or plant or establishment or factory which has a dispute with the union. Those are hot goods.

Question. Does it also apply if there is no union?

Answer. It doesn't make any difference. A union can have a dispute with an employer even if there's no union, and the dispute can be precisely that. What a hot cargo agreement is, is this: The union goes to Employer A and says, "We want you to sign a contract with us which will contain a provision that you will not require your employees to handle any goods or perform any services that come from another employer with whom we have a dispute." In other words, it's an agreement to enter into a secondary boycott.

Question. That form of prohibition is new, then——

Answer. The Supreme Court, under existing law, has held that such an agreement—let's call it "hot cargo" because it's the way everybody knows it—is not illegal "per se." In other words, it isn't null and void. You could, under existing law, make such a contract if the employer lived up to it.

Let's take a concrete case: The union and employer A make an agreement in which employer A says that he will not give any of his business to any other employer that the union designates as unfair under the usual term. He violates that. He does do some business with employer B, who's on the union unfair list. So he violated his "hot cargo" agreement.

The Supreme Court has said that the union still retains the right to go into a court of law and sue the employer for breach of contract for whatever he can get out of that, but that it does not have the right to pull a strike on him or a picket line to make him live up to the contract. And what is left open? Under existing law, nobody knows the answer. Does the union have the right to throw a picket line around an employer or to pull a strike on him to compel him to sign such a "hot cargo" agreement in the first place?

TIGHTENING THE LAW

Question. Are "hot cargo" agreements illegal under the new legislation?

Answer. For all purposes. You can't strike to compel an employer to sign one. You can't strike to compel an employer to live up to one and you can't take it into a court and sue for breach of contract. But, there are two exceptions. The garment industry is exempted.

Question. Would you explain why?

Answer. The reason behind it is this: The garment industry enters into this type of agreement. This is the Amalgamated Clothing Workers and the International Ladies Garment Workers—they're the principal ones. They enter into agreements with their contractors.

You see, a lot of work in the garment industry is done through subcontracting. In other words, the major manufacturer subcontracts out a lot of the subordinate operations—operations which are necessary to get your completed product. For instance, a manufacturer, let us say, of men's suits, might have a subcontractor who is an independent legal enterprise—say, doing the buttonholes. There's a lot of that goes on.

Of course, there was a tremendous amount of sweatshopping in this industry. So the unions many years ago signed contracts with the employers whereby the employers agreed that they would not hand out these subcontracts to nonunion subcontractors. That's the so-called antisweatshop, "hot cargo" agreement. And their lawfulness is now guaranteed in the new law.

BUILDING: AN EXCEPTION

Question. Isn't there an exception to the construction industry, too?

Answer. The exception to the construction industry is only a partial one. They don't get what the garment industry gets. They are left in status quo. They can't engage in secondary boycotts as far as the construction industry is concerned. Those are outlawed completely.

But a building-trades union may enter into a contract with a contractor—building contractor—whereby he agrees that he will not let work to any subcontractor who is nonunion. This is not illegal. Now here's what it may do: The union may go into a court and sue him if he fails to live up to that agreement. But they cannot strike or picket him to make him live up to it, which is the law now, and we left it open as to whether they could strike or picket him to compel him to enter into such an agreement. Whatever the courts decide under existing law on the latter question will be applicable to the building-construction industry.

So that the building-construction industry is left to the law as it is now; the garment industry gets complete exemption from the prohibition and all other industries get a complete prohibition.

There's just one more, actually, important provision. That's the "no man's land."

Question. Yes, what about that?

Answer. What that provision does is this: It says that the Board may do what it has been doing for many years—it may refuse to take all the cases, to handle all the cases, over which it has jurisdiction.

Question. What types of cases does it refuse to take?

Answer. It has set up certain standards. It says, for instance, I think, that hotels—they will not take hotels unless they do a gross business of at least $500,000 a year. That's just an example. They have different monetary standards for different types of enterprise. They have a separate set of standards for retailing, and so on.

And all of those cases which fall below those figures the Board refuses to handle. Now, under existing law the States are prohibited from handling them so you have a "no man's land." In other words, in these small enterprises involved in labor disputes which may entail violations of law, you have a situation where the Board refuses to assert jurisdiction and the States are prohibited from doing so. So you have no legal forum in which the party who has been hurt can get relief.

You have the situation which the lawyers always refer to in such critical terms as a right without a remedy.

Question. They have no place to go——

Answer. No place to go. Now, this new bill says that, in those cases or types of cases in which the Board refuses to assert jurisdiction, the States have carte blanche without any limitation, to apply their State law and to handle them in their own way with

one qualification. That qualification is this. The Board's standards for asserting jurisdiction, which were in effect on August 1, 1959, which means the present one such as for instance, $500,000 for hotels—they represent the limit beyond which the Board may not go in giving up jurisdiction.

I'll give you a concrete example: When this new bill becomes effective, the Board will have before it a standard with respect to hotels which says that the Board will not take cases involving hotels which do less than $500,000. If the Board wishes, it could change that standard and say it will not take hotels which do less than $300,000, because that would mean the Board would be taking more cases. But it cannot say, "We will not take cases of hotels which do less than $600,000," because that would mean the Board would be taking fewer cases.

So that, in other words, the States may act in those situations where the Board refuses to act, but the Board's present standards may not result in the Board's hereafter refusing to take cases which it is taking now.

MILLIONS MORE COVERED

Question. How many businesses would you think would be covered?

Answer. Roughly, you could estimate it at about 2 million enterprises.

Question. And how many people would that include?

Answer. I don't know. They are mostly small, pretty small. I just don't know the figure.

There's one other provision that's attached to that which is nearly as important, but, in order to make the picture complete, I might as well give it to you:

In the "no man's land" we had a problem of no forum. There's also a problem of the time lag in the Board. It takes the Board so long to decide a case because it has such a tremendous docket, a tremendous backlog.

What we've done in the new bill is to say this: The Board has 23 regional offices, each headed by a regional director. Under the present law, the Board has to make the final decision in all election cases—you know, elections in which the employees select these bargaining representatives.

The new bill provides that the Board may—not must, but may—delegate to the 23 regional directors full authority to handle and conduct these election cases, and to make final decisions in them, subject to an appeal to the Board. So there's an attempt, by decentralizing, to cut down some of the Board's caseload and pass it on to these 23 regional directors, taking a lot of the load off the Board and thus enabling it, the Board, to expedite its remaining cases.

Question. All of these provisions will be subject to interpretation by the Labor Relations Board and the courts over the years, is that correct?

Answer. Right. What I've given you was what I myself believe this law does; and, let me say, I think what everybody in the conference committee agreed it was intended to do.

RIGHTS OF STRIKERS

Question. What about a man who is on strike. Does he have any rights he hasn't had before?

Answer. Under existing law, where you have a strike which does not result from a violation of law by the employer, I might point out this: If a union strikes because the employer is violating the Taft-Hartley Act, then his strikers always remain his employees. He can never replace them, if they want their jobs back. They remain his employees for all purposes. If they want to come back, the employer must take them back even if he's got another replacement in their place.

But if the man strikes or the employees strike simply because of disagreement with the employer—what is known as an economic strike in which the employer has not violated the law, and is actually perfectly within his rights in refusing to grant the union's demands—then the law says that he has a right to replace these strikers. And when he replaces them they are not entitled to have their jobs back. Then the question arises: Suppose a situation like that occurs—you have a strike and the employer has replaced with permanent replacements a number of the strikers, and then there's a Board election. Who votes?

The present law says that the replaced striker, the guy who went out on strike and somebody else filled his job, may not vote. His replacement votes. What we did was to amend the law to say that the Board may permit that replaced economic striker to vote under rules and regulations laid down by the Board, but, in any event, not after the first year of the strike.

Question. What about the new law's provisions on prehire contracts?

Answer. They gave the building trades what they have wanted for a long time and what, in fact, they are doing in violation of the law consistently all over the country.

As I think I said earlier in this discussion, the basic principle of the law is that a union becomes the exclusive bargaining agent of employees if it represents a majority of them. That is, it's unlawful for an employer to bargain with a union if it does not represent the majority. And it is unlawful for both the employer and the union to enter into a collective-bargaining agreement, if the union doesn't represent a majority.

What was done in this bill is to give the building-trades unions and their employers in the building and construction industry the right to enter into such agreement without violating the law because of the peculiar needs and problems of the construction industry.

Question. Would you say that this new law will apply more to small businesses than to large?

Answer. Yes, very definitely. I think, if you go down the line of the provisions, as far as internal affairs of the unions are concerned—I would say there is no direct concern to employers as such, except as they are public-spirited citizens and not employers. With respect to the Taft-Hartley amendments on picketing, "no man's land," boycotts, and all of these things—none of these have the slightest significance for General Electric, General Motors, Westinghouse, and so on. None whatsoever.

WHEN LAW IS EFFECTIVE

Question. Does most of the law take effect within 60 days after the President signs it?

Answer. Yes, except for some of the filings—reporting requirements where, because of the difference of the fiscal year and so on, there are some special provisions. But the act as a whole becomes effective 60 days from the day the President signs it.

Report to My Constituents on the 86th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, September 12, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, while the record of the Congress as a whole cannot be fully analyzed until the second session draws to a close next year, we have grappled with many problems during this first session and have seen some very noteworthy achievements take place. At this time I would like to summarize briefly some of the accomplishments as a report to my constituents.

This session will perhaps be best remembered for its passage of a strong labor reform bill. After almost 2 years of extensive investigations and exposures by the McClellan committee in the Senate, an aroused public demanded that Congress take action on legislation to cope with unscrupulous activities in the labor-management field. The result was the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House and Senate by an overwhelming majority. The first major labor legislation since the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947, this measure, signed by President Eisenhower, is prounion and propublic. It is not an antilabor bill. It guarantees many basic rights to labor-union members. Among these are equal rights to union members in the conduct of union affairs, protection against arbitrary dues increases, protection of the right to sue, free and fair union elections, safeguards against improper disciplinary action, and protection of union funds. The bill's strong ban on secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing protect the public against abuse of union monopoly powers and the provision giving State labor boards jurisdiction over disputes now refused by the National Labor Relations Board will strengthen the hand of small business in labor disputes.

When the 86th Congress convened last January, with the Democrats holding a majority of almost 2 to 1 in both the House and Senate, the trend seemed to indicate that this would be the spendingest Congress in history. Bills estimating a 5-year price tag of $117 billion were introduced in the first few weeks. It took the President several vetoes to make his point that if Congress wanted to spend more money on additional projects, it would have to raise taxes to pay for them or face the twin consequences of deficit spending and continuing inflation. By the end of the session, action or inaction by the spenders had pushed the budget figure up to nearly $79 billion from $77.1 billion submitted by the President. While they trimmed regular appropriations requests, they boosted authorizations for future spending, some of it by the back-door route which bypasses the regular appropriations committees. The so-called decreases do not cover, for example, $231 million in authorization for back-door spending not sought by the President. Fortunately, however, with the strong hand of President Eisenhower, together with the public's demand for economy, we were able to hold some of the line at least on spending. There is a chance that a balanced budget, as sought by the President, may yet be achieved before the close of the fiscal year because of revenue increases. This would indeed be a truly noteworthy achievement for the fiscal integrity of the Nation.

Of major importance to Ohio was the passage of legislation making it possible to continue the Federal aid highway program. In 1956, in response to popular

demand, Congress approved the construction of a 41,000-mile system of interstate highways designed to bring highways up to acceptable standards by 1972. To finance the program Congress established a highway trust fund in which are deposited the proceeds of the Federal gasoline taxes, and certain excise taxes. At the time the highway program was adopted, it was estimated that the $25 billion to be raised for the highway trust fund would complete the system. However, in April 1958, as an antirecession measure, Congress passed an accelerated highway building program but did not provide the necessary means for financing. As a result of this action, the highway trust fund faced a deficit of $1.3 billion by July 1961 if existing commitments to the States were met. To meet this deficit and keep the program on a fiscally sound basis President Eisenhower proposed that the gasoline tax be increased by 1½ cents a gallon. After a delay of many months the Committees on Public Works and Ways and Means finally worked out a compromise calling for a 1-cent per gallon increase over a 22-month period. As a result of this action, Ohio and other States will be able to continue their highway building program without any major curtailment.

Once again this year it was necessary for Ohio Members to appear before the Public Works Committee to oppose the Lake Michigan diversion bill. This bill, if enacted, would permit Chicago to divert more water from Lake Michigan thereby causing a lowering of the level of all the Great Lakes. In spite of a valiant floor fight by Ohio and other Great Lakes congressional delegations, the bill passed the House. However, because of the increased opposition of Canada, when the bill reached the Senate floor, it was killed for the time being by a vote to refer it to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

After three trys the Congress finally passed a housing bill acceptable to President Eisenhowever. The President had found it necessary to veto the first two bills because of their inflationary aspects, and also because they contained provisions which he felt had no place in a housing bill, such as loans for the construction of college classrooms. The bill finally enacted provided sufficient FHA housing insurance authority to provide for early 1960 construction planning, a 2-year, $650 million urban renewal program, authorization for 37,000 public housing units, and $50 million in direct loans for housing for the elderly.

For our veterans, the Congress passed a bill making a major overhaul in the system used to determine pensions payable to veterans with non-service-connected disabilities and to their widows and children. The new bill provides a sliding scale of monthly pensions based on the needs of the veterans. Under this measure no veteran now on the rolls will have his pension reduced or taken away; however, if he qualifies for a higher pension under the bill he can elect to come under its provisions. Generally, the bill will provide higher pension rates than those now applicable.

In the field of Foreign Affairs, we sat many weeks in the committee on the mutual security bill. The legislation which finally emerged from the House-Senate conference provided for an authorization of $3,556,200,000 for the fiscal year 1960—a reduction of $353 million from the President's recommendations. The Appropriations Committee, which provides the funds, further reduced the amount to $3,225,813,000—some $704 million less than the administration had requested.

In the Foreign Affairs Committee we added a new section to the Mutual Security Act calling upon the Secretary of State to set up an Office of Inspector General and Comptroller to enforce fiscal responsibility in any and all mutual security programs.

Another matter of vital concern to the committee was legislation dealing with standards for the issuance of passports. On June 16, 1958, the Supreme Court ruled that the regulations of the Secretary of State denying passports to supporters of the world Communist movement were invalid because of a lack of specific legislative authority. The President on July 7, 1958, requested the Congress to enact legislation granting authority necessary to deal with this matter. The bill which finally passed the House this session authorizes the Secretary of State to deny passports to or revoke passports of persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement. Such denial or revocation is made contingent upon a finding by the Secretary that the activities or presence abroad of such persons would be harmful to the security of the United States, and any denial or revocation of a passport under this authority is made subject to judicial review.

A great historical achievement of this session was the passage of statehood for Hawaii. The 99th and 100th Senators were seated as well as an additional Member of the House. Now, for the first time in 160 years, there is no Territorial Delegate serving in the House.

As an interesting finale to the long, long session, I went with my subcommittee chairman, the Honorable WAYNE HAYS—Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations—to Moscow. Primarily we went to see the U.S. fair, to see for ourselves the standards set and upheld and to evaluate somewhat its effectiveness. It would be difficult to imagine any combined effort of Government, private industry, and the whole personnel group which could have done a better job. The eagerness of the visitors told the story. The hunger, on the faces of those in the book exhibit especially, in the area where they could pick up and read magazines and books somehow made the whole effort, which was a tremendous one, more than worthwhile. Mr. Harold C. McClellan and all those associated with him, young and old, in and out of Government and industry, deserve their country's grateful thanks.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress is over at last. Sine die adjournment came, as you know, at 6:21 a.m., after a long, long night. Now we have half of September, all of October, November, and December before we come back, on January 6. May we use the time well wherever the days find us.

Did You Read It, Justice (?) Warren?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, those who advocate so-called civil rights measures in the Congress apparently do so under the mistaken impression that there is an overwhelming demand among the Negro people of the South for integration of the races. While I am not at liberty to speak for other sections of the country, this is certainly not the case in the State of South Carolina, or the South in general. This is best illustrated by a statement of opinion from the Southern Negro Improvement Association, a group of some 5,000 southern Negroes, that the majority of southern Negroes are unalterably opposed to the integration of the races in the South. Legislation which has the integration of the races as its purpose will only tend to destroy the amity and harmony between the races in the South, which has existed for generations. These facts have been piognantly presented in an editorial appearing on Thursday, September 10, 1959, in one of the most outstanding weekly newspapers in the South, the Williston Way, of Williston, S.C.

I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DID YOU READ IT, JUSTICE (?) WARREN?

We sincerely hope that Earl Warren, self-appointed dictator over school affairs in this country, reads a copy of the telegram sent recently by Samuel H. Moore, president of a group of some 5,000 southern Negroes called the Southern Negro Improvement Association of Alabama, to President Eisenhower.

Moore told the President that the vast majority of southern Negroes do not want forced integration. This is a statement with which we fully agree as we have long been of the opinion that the majority of neither race wants integration, all of this race hassle having come about through the efforts of a few politicians trying to make political hay, leaders of the NAACP and a handful of misguided "do-gooders."

In his telegram, the Birmingham Negro leader asked for a Government-sponsored poll of southern Negroes to prove his contention. That such a poll would show an overwhelming majority opposing forced integration is beyond doubt.

Moore told the President in his wire:

"I assure you that both races in the South are unalterably opposed to the integration of races in the public schools.

"Racial hate and prejudice that was dead is now reconstructed. Threat of forceful integration has created hate and fear in many of our former white friends.

"Since this is free America, why not put your racial policy upon voluntary action of the citizens, not forceful compulsion? Why

not have the Government take a poll of the majority of southern Negroes?"

Moore said that such a poll should be confined to southern Negroes because our "northern Negro brothers do not live in the South and therefore do not understand our southern bicultural society."

He urged the President not to use force to "integrate the schools and deny our race a major symbol of our progress—all-Negro schools."

If Warren did read this telegram, we can't help but wonder if he scampered off to look at his latest copy of Gunnar Myrdal's communistic mouthings to see if he couldn't find a paragraph on which to hang his answer. Warren, as we have said before, has done nothing but give aid and succor to the Communist Party by his illogical decisions on school integration—decisions that so far have done nothing constructive.

Goals and Hopes, 1959: Some Achieved, Others Remain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me on the achievements of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When this 86th Congress assembled last January, the people were told of ambitious programs of legislation which would be enacted and there were predictions that a host of national problems would be attacked vigorously and effectively.

A backward look shows, I deeply regret to say, that in truth one must search painstakingly through the record of the first session to find noteworthy achievements. Though we passed several excellent pieces of legislation, much more remains to be done if we are to discharge our responsibilities to the Nation. Thankfully, a number of measures with unquestioned merit passed one branch or the other, or were put on the calendar ready for early consideration, and can be enacted in the coming year providing a spirit of determined cooperation motivates the second session.

The characterization that some 1959 goals were achieved relates directly to legislation which I have no hesitation in describing as truly significant and constructive and with which I personally had more than a little to do. The Labor-Management Act of 1959 will stand as a monument to the ability of Congress to subordinate selfish interests, to resist intimidatory pressures, to respond to the will of the people, and to approach a pressing national problem from the viewpoint of the overwhelming public interest. The admission of the territory of Hawaii to our Union as the 50th State is a heartwarming and an inspiring demonstration that America not only preaches but in the fullest sense of the word practices democracy in its highest sense.

The labor reform law is without doubt the outstanding legislative accomplishment. This long-overdue statute will protect the public and the members of labor organizations as well against selfish and unprincipled abuses at the hands of some arrogant labor bosses who regrettably have achieved positions of great power. It does not damage or threaten to harm trade unionism. It will put an end to unwholesome conspiracies between a minority of conscienceless employers and labor leaders.

I am gratified that the final version of this legislation contains, with some minor modifications, the compromise bill of rights for union members, which I had the honor of sponsoring in the Senate. As a result, the rank-and-file cardholding laborer in America now is free to speak up in defense of his opinions, to advocate policies and practices in the conduct of union affairs, and to enjoy all of the rights of self-determination within his labor organization which the United States advocates in the field of political government.

In admitting Hawaii to our Union, the 86th Congress has strengthened our Nation and provided encouragement to peoples of many races praying for recognition and greater dignity. I was ranking minority member of the subcommittee which drafted the Statehood Act. Our most distant 50th State will be a meeting place for the ideologies, the religions, the cultures, and the social beliefs of the East and the West. Now enjoying all the benefits of statehood, Hawaii beckons to other polyglot areas of the globe as a beacon showing the way for those with determination and faith. The island State will be a symbol for others working for unconditional acceptance in the family of nations.

The inventory of creditable legislative actions properly should include the measures to resolve the fiscal difficulties which threatened continuance of our Interstate Highway System and to extend the Federal program of investigation into the grave national problem of air pollution. Less satisfaction can be derived from the manner in which there finally came laws extending Federal aid for airport improvements and continuing assistance in the field of housing.

Only partial progress was made toward carrying out President Eisenhower's imaginative and dynamic recommendations for further steps in the international field, moves which would have carried forward U.S. efforts to bolster the prospects of long-lasting peace, through building up less fortunate nations and for countering the Communist threat of economic penetration.

As a convinced supporter of our President in the field of foreign policy, I was happy to have the opportunity to vote for additional moneys for the Development Loan Fund and for establishment of the Inter-American Development Bank. These are meritorious investments in the cause of democracy and peace. I am heartily in accord with the principle of placing greatest possible emphasis on loans in place of grants.

The Inter-American Bank is an especially commendable enterprise. Together with other free republics of the Western Hemisphere, we are sharing in providing the capital for this institution in proportion to our capacities and resources. This is a worthwhile example of international partners putting their shoulders to the wheel in a common interest.

Two years ago, after a thorough review of our mutual-security program, the Development Loan Fund was created. It is to the great credit of Congress that this constructive supplement to our foreign economic policy has been supported with actual appropriations, although not as liberally as circumstances require. This Fund exists to help the economic development of peoples less fortunate than ourselves. It does so by providing long-term repayable loans, instead of grants or gifts, to economically and technically sound projects in a characteristically American fashion.

The question may be asked, Why do we need more such programs and institutions? The answer can be found in recent challenges flung by Soviet Premier Khrushchev. He has emphasized the Communist intention of infiltrating neutral nations and even those siding with Western democracies by economic means. The Soviet leader himself supplied the explanation when he told a group of the Senate: "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for promoting better relations between countries." Stated less diplomatically, this means simply using aid and trade to advance the spread of world communism. The United States cannot afford to lose by default in this field of competition.

In the same way, I felt we were taking constructive action by responding to the President's recommendations in the area of national defense. For myself, I regret some reductions were made in appropriations for certain of the mutual-assistance programs, inasmuch as I am thoroughly persuaded we must continue providing military aid to free peoples.

The negative or debit side of the congressional ledger is a cause for disappointment and, in a sense, stands conspicuously as a shameful blot.

It is deplorable the 86th Congress lacked the fortitude to subscribe entirely to the President's proposals for reinforcing the Treasury's fiscal position by removing an unrealistic interest ceiling which handicaps the sale of Government securities.

Who can enjoy peace of mind in regarding the perpetuation of the farm surplus mess, the refusal to deal realistically with the folly of maintaining a $9 billion accumulation of warehoused agricultural products, and the unwillingness to revise the unworkable price support formulas?

The disgraceful postponement of additional civil rights legislation which the President recommended looms as a painful obstacle in the way of attempts to guarantee minorities of American citizens full enjoyment of the prerogatives and privileges due under our Constitution.

While the Senate in the early days of the session approved a change in rules relating to cloture, my own view is that very little was accomplished in effectively providing for the elimination of the undemocratic filibuster from the Senate. In the closing days of this session, we continued the Civil Rights Commission amid a general commitment that the balance of the President's civil rights proposals will be debated early next year. That will give the country an opportunity to judge whether or not the Senate rules change gives us any more opportunity to proceed, in orderly fashion, toward a final vote on public questions. Let it be clearly understood that the Senate Judiciary Committee has refused to approve any civil rights proposals at all. Thus, if a motion is made to take from the committee any bill on this subject, it is easy to prophesy that an animated talkathon will be launched by way of preventing a vote on the motion. That will be the time to judge whether the rules change is effective. I suggest that if there is to be any civil rights legislation along the Eisenhower lines, it will be the Members of the party of Lincoln who will be required to lead the fight to win.

The slim record of achievement during the recently ended session may be due in large part to the fact that the United States is passing through another one of our occasional cycles of divided governmental responsibility.

With a Chief Executive and Cabinet from one party and with the leadership and the preponderant majority of the Congress representing the opposite political faith, controversy and disagreement were understandably inevitable. To the undeniable credit of the greatly outweighed Republican minority and a segment of Democrats with capacity to rise above partisanship, the brakes were applied successfully to a variety of ill-advised, hastily conceived, freewheeling, spending proposals.

The taxpayers of our Nation should feel grateful that we in the minority thwarted a gigantic would-be boondoggle appealingly put forward under the label of aid to economically distressed cities, and that by upholding two Presidential vetoes we forced abandonment of most objectionable give-away features of the housing bill.

The curse of air pollution, which first was recognized as a real menace as well as an exasperating inconvenience in my own State of California, has been the target of scientific attack by Federal agencies in support of many local, private, State, and other non-Federal groups for a number of years. The Congress which just adjourned gave renewed assurance that resources, know-how, and facilities of the U.S. Public Health Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Standards, and other Federal units will be utilized further in the war on smog.

As I pointed out to the Senate several times, this problem is national in scope and significance. There is no denying that while much has been learned regarding causes and character of this phenomenon, our engineers, chemists, physicists, and other technical experts still do not feel they are on the verge of any breakthrough in solving it. Therefore, it would have bordered on the ridiculous to continue the Federal research and investigation program for only 2 years. That was why I insisted the public interest can best be served by a 4-year extension of the 1955 act, which I also had the honor of authoring. Hence, I am heartened the 86th Congress concurred in my urging that this activity be authorized for continuance until at least June 30, 1964.

The threatened breakdown of our highway construction program has been averted, although the way chosen out of our fiscal dilemma is not 100 percent satisfactory. It would have been far wiser and sounder had we raised the gasoline tax 1½ cents for 4 or 5 years, in accord with the recommendations of the President and his advisers. I fear that in these days of ever-mounting demands on the Federal Treasury we will confront another crisis less than 2 years hence.

Writing a promissory note in the form of future diversion of some of the automobile excise taxes in order to pay the Federal share of interstate highway projects is liable to mean only a new necessity of finding a source of replacement revenue to maintain our level of governmental income for general purposes.

It was a matter of pleasure for me that the Congress did see fit to enact some legislation providing limited welfare benefits for our people. In this field, I was happy to be cosponsor of the bill which now is law increasing assistance to retired railroad workers and to have brought about inclusion of California firemen and policemen in the social security system.

Some measures which I had the privilege in cosponsoring moved through the Senate and may next year be approved by the House and thus in time constitute forward progress. Among these are a resolution creating an international medical research institute, to pool the knowledge of many nations in the hope of conquering diseases and ills which know no national boundaries, and another setting up a commission to deal more imaginatively and effectively with recurrent unemployment.

In the next session, I also trust that after years of delay and uncertainty, decisive action will be taken on legislation to provide local governments with limited payments in lieu of taxes which constitutionally cannot be levied on Federal property. The experimental bill, of restricted scope, of which I am a cosponsor, finally received endorsement of the Government Operations Committee and is on the Senate Calendar. This measure, despite its conditional application, would lighten the financial load on many counties in California, where the Federal Government owns almost half of all the land.

The constant hopes of California for Federal assistance in dealing with and overcoming recurrent water problems were borne out to varying degrees in the 1959 session.

A meaningful and reassuring step forward in this field was the decision to provide funds with which the Reclamation Bureau may plan for and proceed with installation of hydroelectric generating facilities at Trinity Dam. This immense new unit of our Central Valley project is progressing ahead of schedule; hence, it would have been foolhardy and undeniably contrary to the national interest to delay longer this decision. In the long run, I am certain the Nation along with California will rejoice that the attempt to emasculate the Trinity law under the guise of a mislabeled "partnership" in power production failed again in the House of Representatives. With this beguiling but unwise proposition buried, the Federal Government now can go ahead at full speed to make certain the Trinity unit will be able to grind out kilowatts as a byproduct to delivering life-sustaining water when the reservoir reaches a working level in 1963.

The first session took commendable action toward satisfying southern California's mounting requirement for added water for domestic, industrial, and municipal purposes and simultaneously meeting central California's acute immediate need for supplemental supplies for agricultural use when the Senate approved the San Luis legislation which I introduced with my colleague, Senator ENGLE, as cosponsor.

Despite heated controversy over the right of Californians to distribute and utilize their own water subject only to limitations in State laws enacted by their own legislature, the measure authorizing joint Federal-State construction of San Luis Dam and Reservoir now is in position for favorable final action early in 1960. As this bill has been reported to the House, I trust that before this time next year Congress will have placed its stamp of approval on the forward-looking plans for building facilities on the west side of San Joaquin Valley essential to rescuing agricultural lands threatened by falling water tables and imperative in bringing into reality intrabasin transfers which will provide added quantities for the thirsty coastal areas from Santa Barbara south through Los Angeles to San Diego.

Similarly, California as a whole can applaud the creation by the Senate of the Select Committee on National Water Resources. With shortages threatening in many areas, new requirements materializing, and pollution uncontrolled, this body of which I am vice chairman will strive to chart a course by which the United States can rectify the shortcomings of nature, profit from the ingenuity of the human mind, adapt new technical and scientific methods, and lay the groundwork for programs carrying the United States into a richer future.

Ever grateful for Federal assistance in conserving and utilizing its water resources, California once more is indebted to the Congress and the executive branch of the Federal Government for continuing aid in protecting its people and their material developments against ravages of nature.

Further participation of the Army Engineers in flood prevention and flood control projects will enrich our State and in turn benefit the entire Nation. With 1960 funds provided for public works, planning and construction will be carried on the length and breadth of our State with such widely separated developments as San Jacinto River-Bautista Creek in Riverside County in our southernmost extremity and the Eel River in the northern Redwood region.

The appropriations will finance continuance of works in the populous Los Angeles metropolitan area, and Black Butte Dam on a tributary of the Upper Sacramento River, and permit a start on New Hogan Dam on the eastern edge of the Central Valley. Funds contained in the 1960 Public Works Appropriation Act will bring near completion badly needed harbors at Playa del Rey and Port Hueneme, and will make possible desperately required improvement at the Port of Redwood City and at Half Moon Bay. Among the long-range flood protection programs which now can be prosecuted with unrelenting vigor are those in the Santa Ana River Basin and on the lower San Joaquin and the Sacramento Rivers.

With our population having passed 15 million and considering our vast area of nearly 160,000 square miles, California requires Federal assistance in these fields. The Congress recognized this by providing $57,082,000 for building and $117,000 for planning flood control works, as well as $13,128,000 for prosecuting improvements of rivers and harbors for navigation.

In addition, because the constant growth and undiminished development of our State mean we must ceaselessly anticipate future needs, the 1960 funds include $575,000 for navigation surveys and examinations and almost $310,000 for flood control investigations.

One highly significant action by the 86th Congress illustrates how the Federal Government can extend a helping hand to local groups who wish to overcome their own problems.

The recent session wisely provided upwards of $10,764,000 for six small water supply and water distribution projects in California which have been planned and engineered by and will be built by local conservation and irrigation districts. These loans under two farsighted laws enacted by the 84th Congress to supplement and complement undertakings by the Federal Government will be repaid by the local groups so that no net expenditure is imposed on the National Treasury, yet Congress contributes toward material progress in overcoming serious water shortages.

By this means, brighter opportunities will be opened for residents of the Chowchilla, Saucelito, Santa Ynez, Pleasant Valley, Georgetown Divide, and Jackson Valley areas of my State.

Forest resources of California are tremendous. Millions of acres of timberland held by our Federal Government are of great present and even greater potential worth to the entire Nation, as well as to the citizens of my State. It is gratifying, therefore, that the 86th Congress made possible a beginning of the comprehensive program for broader utilization and better protection of our national forests. I was happy to have a chance as a member of the Appropriations Committee to support items for fire prevention and suppression, especially in the thickly settled southern California coastal plain, where serious blazes present a subsequent menace of disastrous floods, and for additional access roads so tourists, vacationists, and sportmen, as well as lumbermen, may derive ever-increasing benefit from remote locked-up areas.

The record of the 1st session of the 86th Congress may not be brilliant in comparison with past performance, but the manner in which it was carried on demonstrates the merits and advantages of our traditionally American two-party system.

Our concept of liberty, based on freedom of choice at the ballot box, can be translated into action only through the vigor of our political organizations and the earnestness of the elected representatives of the people. As Senate minority whip, I am devoted, along with my Republican colleagues, to strengthening our party and making it responsive to the needs of the people.

The final decisions reached by majorities of conscientious, patriotic legislators guaran-

tee the permanence of government of the people, by the people, and for the people, in the Lincoln tradition. Our kind of free government would be impossible under patchwork coalitions which guide some Western nations or under the subservient followers of one-party dictatorships that characterize other lands, both inside and outside the Iron Curtain.

Congressman William S. Broomfield Reports to the People of the 18th District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, Congress has completed the first year of what has proved to be so far an extraordinarily busy session. In this report to the people of the 18th District of Michigan I would like to emphasize that it was public opinion, pure and simple, which helped decide many of the issues of the day for us here in Washington.

In almost every instance the legislation passed here in Congress this year was sound and worthwhile. Out of the hundreds of bills enacted into law, only two or three deviated from the principles of a balanced budget and a continuing fight against further inflation which has cost our citizens so dearly in the past.

BALANCED BUDGET

First of all, we were able to achieve a balanced Federal budget, and we have a good chance of even coming out with a surplus by the end of the current fiscal year next June.

Congress appropriated some $73 billion for the multitude of operations of the Federal Government. This amount is $1.9 billion under the amount requested by President Eisenhower, in spite of the fact that a great many Members of Congress were complaining that the President's budget was too stringent in the early months of this session.

It took 10 Presidential vetoes to bring Congress into line with administration policy of maintaining the purchasing power of our dollars, but the President's veto was overriden only once.

Major accomplishments of Congress during the legislative year which just concluded are:

Labor reform: A sound workable program to protect union members, employers, and the general public from violence, extortion, misuse of power, and corruption on the part of some of our labor leaders. This bill, certainly one of the most important enacted by Congress and signed into law by the President, is a direct victory for the people of our Nation, who let their Representatives and Senators know in no uncertain terms that they favored a sound, enforcible labor reform bill.

LABOR BILL OF RIGHTS

In addition to the fund reporting by unions, members are guaranteed the right to attend union meetings, make their views known, nominate candidates for union offices, and vote secretly for these candidates.

A number of unfair labor practices are barred by this new law, in most instances to protect employers and employees of firms who have no active part in a labor dispute.

This bill will permit honest unions to carry on as they have in the past without restriction of their legitimate objectives, but it will serve as a sharp curb against the corrupt elements which have infiltrated into high places in some of our strongest unions.

Statehood for Hawaii: Our first island State was added as a full-fledged member of the Union. Creation of this, our 50th State, carries out a promise made to Hawaii during the last century and means that all territories of our Nation have now achieved statehood.

Gasoline tax: Continuation of our 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System was assured after congressional approval of a 1-cent-a-gallon gasoline-tax increase for a period of 22 months.

DEATH VERSUS DOLLARS

The issue in this matter was death or dollars. If our present traffic accident death rate continues, we will have lost more Americans to traffic accidents by 1975 than our Nation lost in battle in the Civil War, Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and Korea combined. This new system of superhighways, while is being built at a rapid rate, has reduced death tolls by as much as 40 percent.

If this extra gasoline tax had not been approved, then a number of States—including Michigan—would have been forced to cut back their construction programs for a 2-year period.

REIMBURSEMENT DEFEATED

Also, I am happy to say that a fight conducted both in my own Public Works Committee and on the floor was successful in defeating a provision which would have reimbursed a handful of States to the tune of $4.2 billion to pay for toll roads which will become a part of the Interstate Highway System. Every cent we can find should go into the construction of these new, safe superhighways. Congress can consider reimbursement of these toll-road States at a later date after the Interstate Highway System is completed. Otherwise, we would have been faced with spending all of our highway funds to pay for roads which are already in existence and none on new construction, which is the purpose of the entire program. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of these new highways. There is no reason why a few States should be paid 100 percent or better for these roads.

Housing bill: After three tries, Congress approved a housing bill which met with the approval of the administration. Home buyers were given aid to the tune of $8 billion in new authorization for FHA.

GI LOANS INCREASED

Downpayments were reduced, while a new 5¼-percent ceiling on GI home loans was approved to meet current market conditions.

Urban renewal projects will be continued by new authorization included in the housing bill, and colleges will be permitted to obtain loans for dormitories.

Taxes: An additional $175 million a year will be raised through a new system of taxing insurance companies. Current taxes on corporations, cigarettes, liquor, and autos were extended. The power of States to tax corporations in another State was curbed. Hearings and discussions on general revision of income and excise tax laws will start in November, and it is hoped that proposed legislation will be ready to be acted upon by Congress early next year.

Veterans' pensions: A general revision of pension laws was approved by Congress, which, in most instances, increases pensions to veterans to veterans receiving non-service-connected benefits, widows and children of disabled veterans.

NEED STRESSED

Emphasis was placed upon need rather than outright, automatic benefits. Korean veterans were given liberalized educational benefits.

National debt: Because of the budget deficit during the last fiscal year, Congress regretably had to increase the permanent debt limit from $283 billion to $285 billion, while the temporary ceiling was raised to $295 billion. It is hoped that this rise in the national debt, so inflationary in nature, will be stopped by this year's balanced budget and by continuation of sound fiscal policies on the part of Congress.

Health insurance: Federal employees will begin to enjoy medical and hospital insurance at low cost.

GOVERNMENT PAYS HALF

This bill provides that the Government will contribute up to one-half the cost of this insurance, while the employee will pay the remainder. It is expected that this bill will bring health insurance benefits in line with those plans now in effect in many segments of private industry.

Defense: Continued a program of providing funds for missile development, and antimissile missiles to guard our cities against atomic attack; provided extra funds for Army modernization, cut funds for antibomber misile programs, authorized construction of an atomic-powered aircraft carrier, extended military draft for another 4 years. In all, a sound program was enacted to guarantee that our Nation is ever in readiness to cope with Communist aggression in any part of the world.

PUBLIC WORKS "PORK BARREL"

There were two notable failures by Congress. The first was overriding the President's second veto of the public works appropriation bill. This bill contains 67 new projects not authorized by the Bureau of the Budget or the Corps

of Engineers. They are of doubtful value. The danger is that although first-year costs are comparatively low, they will cost our Federal Government some $800 million in future years to complete. In effect, Congress has given authority to dig 67 new basements for buildings which are not necessary. Next year, we can expect that the money to complete these "pork barrel" public works projects will be sought in Congress at a huge, continuing expense to our taxpayers.

As a member of the House Public Works Committee, I consistently opposed this bill to feather the nest of a few Congressmen who want to point with pride at a Federal project in their district.

TVA EXPANSION

Also passed into law was a bill to permit the Tennessee Valley Authority to float bonds to finance new power projects. This bill contains a number of dangers, one of which is expansion of the TVA network of tax-supported facilities at the expense of other areas of our Nation. In Michigan, we have been faced with the situation of State officials from TVA areas coming into our State to lure industry into their home areas. Michigan has contributed a vast amount of tax dollars to help pay for these TVA facilities. In effect, therefore, Michigan workers are being asked to pay taxes so that they can have their jobs taken away from them by cheap, tax-free power provided by TVA.

Other bills passed: Federal aid to States for airport construction and improvement, increased authorizations for the school milk fund program, renegotiation law to recapture excessive profits on defense contracts, new authority for small business loans, rigid enforcement laws to make prosecution of antitrust suits easier, aid to schools in federally impacted areas.

BILLS SPONSORED

Since last January, I have sponsored a number of bills on a great variety of subjects. One of the most important of these is a proposed constitutional change to prevent passage into law of "pork barrel" projects designed to enhance a particular Congressman in the eyes of his constituents by authorizing useless or doubtful Federal projects. This change would permit the President to extract such items from appropriation bills containing otherwise important projects. This is one change which has been requested by Presidents of both political parties for the past half century. So far, Congress has failed to back this very necessary constitutional amendment.

Still another bill I sponsored would do away with our present farm subsidy and price support program. Under the terms of this bill, our present surplus stocks would be "frozen" for a 2-year period while we figured out an orderly plan to dispose of these surpluses which are costing us literally billions of dollars a year in subsidy and storage payments.

COSTLY FARM PROGRAM

Congress failed miserably in dealing with this problem during the current year. Our Agriculture Department budget is the third most costly item for our taxpayers, topped only by defense and interest payments on our national debt.

It seems that some Members of Congress and those who are receiving huge Federal subsidies for storing surplus farm products are the only ones who want to continue the present program. Recent polls of farmers have shown that the majority of them are opposed to our present price support and subsidy programs, and that they feel they should either be curtailed or abolished.

There is a great amount of public funds, dollars collected from the pockets of our citizens, which could be saved by an end to this program of paying farmers for not raising crops, for storing crops which our Nation does not need. We should place these surplus crops on the world market where they belong and permit the price of farm goods to seek their own level. Food, clothing, and products of agricultural goods would be cheaper for all of our citizens if this were permitted to happen.

It is my hope that Congress will take prompt notice of these facts of farm life next year.

SOCIAL SECURITY REVISION

There is a very serious change which needs to be made in our social security laws if our senior citizens are not to continue suffering because of Federal inaction. This change is incorporated in a bill I have introduced to raise the amount permitted to be earned in addition to social security payments. The present limit is $1,800. This should be raised to at least $3,000. The House is expected to consider this proposed change I have introduced early next year when revisions of the social security laws are considered.

Encouragement of the settlement of homesteaders in our new State of Alaska is the reason for another bill I have introduced. It would permit surplus foods to be distributed to these settlers until such time as they obtain title to their land. In my opinion, one of the greatest dangers these settlers face in their first year is lack of food. By distribution of this food from our enormous surplus stocks we would take away much of this fear and thereby encourage more families to settle in this new State. Alaska faces no problems which cannot be licked with the help of more residents. Our Federal Government should take proper action to insure that this State is settled, as it has in former years, to encourage settlement in other States of our Union.

OBSCENE LITERATURE BAN

A bill which I cosponsored to provide the Postmaster General with powers to detain first-class mail in cases dealing with obscene and lascivious literature has passed the House of Representatives and will undoubtedly be acted upon by the Senate early next year. This bill is an effort to further curb the activities of the filth-mongers, who have made a big business out of peddling obscene material to children. This is one kind of racket which must be stopped in its tracks, and I intend to continue to support this bill to the fullest in the hopes that these powers will be granted by Congress so that another weapon can be provided to cut off the huge profits which these dealers in obscenity are making for themselves.

At least a partial victory was won in my efforts to make its mandatory that the cost of overseas congressional junkets be revealed. New rules have been adopted by the House requiring its Members to report their expenses to their respective committee chairman. Not all of these trips abroad are unnecessary or wasteful, by any means. But a Member of Congress should have no difficulty in explaining his reasons for such trips and expenditures of funds to his constituents if he does take them.

BOND ISSUE BACKING

Two other bills I introduced are now in the hands of House committees. The first would provide that the full faith and credit of the Federal Government be placed behind municipal bond issues for sewage treatment and water supply. The reason for this bill is to provide lower interest rates for communities for these very vital projects. At present, our cities and counties are having a difficult time obtaining money at a rate that is not prohibitive, mainly because bond risks are figured on available tax base, not on what will happen in the future. Federal backing of these bond issues would permit communities to construct needed facilities for the future at lower interest rates.

LOCAL REIMBURSEMENTS

In addition, I have introduced a bill which would require the Federal Government to reimburse local communities for local taxes and special assessment payments. At present, the Federal Government is exempt from paying such taxes, and a great number of communities are suffering because of this. Local communities have to provide facilities for Federal installations at no cost or accept whatever the Federal Government decides to contribute as handouts.

Under this new plan, a board would be established which would set up equitable reimbursements to our local communities for the use of these municipal facilities. This would be a much fairer way of doing business.

NEED FOR ACTION

So far, Congress has dodged a number of very important issues, which I hope will come up for final action early next year. We must decide on a broad new program of civil rights so that all our citizens in every corner of our Nation will be able to reap the full benefits of American citizenship and education. We must come up with a farm program which does away with the present topsy-turvy system of paying farmers for not growing crops, which wastes more than a million dollars a day in storage of surplus crops alone, which prices our farm goods out of the reach of our own citizens as well as out of the world markets. We must provide a realistic interest rate policy on our national debt which will not serve to further inflate our economy. We must raise the existing interest rates on long-term bonds just as we have done for savings bonds so that our mam-

moth national debt can be managed on a sound basis.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

We must provide home rule for the District of Columbia. We must give the citizens of this Capital City a right to vote and a right to help in our elective process. We must provide these people with the right of self-determination and stop the practice of using Congress as a mammoth, unwieldly city council.

I have signed discharge petitions to bring the home rule issue to the floor of the House, and I hope that we will at least be permitted to discuss the merits of this matter next year.

OAKLAND COUNTY POLL

Earlier this year, I conducted a poll among 12,000 of my constituents on issues facing Congress. I was careful to send these questionnaires to areas which represented a fair cross section of Oakland County, Mich., the congressional district which I represent. It is revealing at this time to note that a great many of the recommendations of my constituents were in substantial agreement with the action taken by Congress during this first session.

For instance, 63 percent of those who answered the poll indicated that they favored an increase in the gasoline tax to maintain pay-as-you-go financing for our Federal highway program. These citizens said they would be willing to pay the 1½-cent increase requested by the President. Congress approved a 1-cent-a-gallon increase and earmarked a portion of auto excise taxes for this vital program.

HOUSING FUNDS

Some 66 percent were opposed to further increases in funds for housing. Congress held the line on its spending on this program to comply with the President's recommendations. Most of the cuts were in public housing, where the Federal Government has a backlog of better than 100,000 units which have not yet been built although they have been authorized.

Sixty-eight percent opposed added payments under the soil bank plan, while 82 percent opposed our present farm subsidy programs. The soil bank was held at its present levels, but no action was taken to get rid of the subsidy program, mainly because the Agriculture Committee refused to bring any such measure to the floor of the House.

AIRPORT GRANTS

Sixty-seven percent were opposed to increases in grants to airports, and Congress held the line on this program.

A measure which would have permitted the Federal Government to invest its money in cocktail lounges, motels, plush waiting rooms and other luxury facilities was defeated. Federal money will be concentrated on providing vital safety facilities for our Nation's system of airports, safety facilities which are badly needed because of the start of jet passenger service from one end of our Nation to the other at near-sonic speeds.

Those questioned favored a hold-the-line approach on further postal subsidies, and I am happy to say that our Federal Government did not raise the funds available to the Post Office Department for this purpose, nor were new laws passed to increase these subsidies.

UNITED STATES-SOVIET EXCHANGE

Almost 70 percent favored a freer flow of political leaders, students, farmers, businessmen, and so forth, between the United States and the Soviet Union, and we have seen that this matter has been taken care of by a greatly increased number of such visits in both directions during recent months.

It is interesting to note that those who were in favor of greater Federal spending were 64 percent in favor of raising extra revenues necessary through higher taxes, rather than through an increase in our national debt, which has now reached the staggering sum of $290.1 billion. Because we were able to pare costs and trim unessential programs, no tax increase has been necessary and none is foreseen for the coming year. We have proved that a great amount of money can be saved by wise and judicious appropriation and authorization of funds by Congress, and by enlightened and sound administration by our President and his executive branch of the Federal Government.

LABOR REFORM

Although the question of proposed labor reform legislation was not included in the questionnaire—because no labor reform bills had been seriously considered by either the House or the Senate at the time the questions were formulated—no questionnaire was necessary on this issue. The mail into my office and those of most of my colleagues in the House became a deluge. In almost every instance, union members and nonunion members asked for strong labor reform legislation, and they got it.

This was a remarkable example of democracy in action, of the weight of the individual voter making his wishes known on a problem of importance to all of us in the United States. The House Post Office reported that mail has never been so heavy since President Truman relieved General MacArthur of his command in the Far East.

All in all, it demonstrated that the people of our Nation know what they want, and they are not taken in by propaganda schemes and campaigns. It shows that they still can make their views felt on Members of Congress, and that our principles of government are still sound and working in topnotch shape.

SOUND BUDGET

They have voiced similar approval of attempts to run our Federal Government in an orderly fashion with a balance between income and outgo. They have proved that they are more interested in maintaining the value of the dollar at home and abroad than in being lured by the lorelei of free Federal projects for their areas which would surely force our Government even closer to the financial rocks.

VOTERS VICTORIOUS

The voter has proved that he is still king in this country, as he should be, and that we in Congress are but servants of the people, not their masters.

If there is any doubt of the strength of our people, in their belief in freedom and individual expression, in the control which they have over their Government, then they should look to the record of Congress for an indication, as well as to a national income which is rising to record heights, a gross national product which is expected to increase sharply by the end of the year, and a renewed confidence and stability by all segments of our population in our ability to continue to lead the world in achievements in every field of worthwhile endeavor.

One method of making our democracy work is to bring a Congressman close to those he represents, to see that he makes himself available to hear complaints, to answer questions about the Federal Government and its operations, to discuss future policies of Federal agencies as established by the House of Representatives and the Senate.

DEMOCRACY IN ACTION

As I have in the past, I intend to continue my policy of talking things over with my constituents. During the month of October, I intend to visit every community in my district. Also, my district office at 2300 North Woodward, Royal Oak, will be open as well as my office in Washington in room 1422, New House Office Building. If any of the residents of Oakland County would like to discuss any matter with me, I will be most happy to do so.

The record we have achieved so for in Congress in balancing the budget, holding the line on useless and unnecessary Federal expenditures, drafting adequate labor reform legislation, and providing for continuance of our highway construction program, has been excellent in almost every case. We must continue this dedication to duty, in making sure that the hard-earned money collected from our taxpayers is used wisely and well.

CITIZENS' INTERESTS FIRST

Next January, Congress will convene again to debate the problems facing our Nation and the world, and will try to come up with the right answers. It is my hope that next year will be as successful in its attempts as the present one, and that issues will be met head-on and problems solved promptly and efficiently, always keeping the interests of our citizens in mind.

The best method by which this can be accomplished is through close cooperation between the Congressman and his constituents. Letters and personal discussions are invaluable aids in learning all sides of an issue, and I intend to spend my time between now and the reconvening of Congress in finding out the views of those I represent. All are welcome to come in and discuss Federal problems with me.

Hon. Thomas H. Burke

SPEECH

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, the death of our fellow Congressman and friend of

many of us, Thomas H. Burke, is a grievous loss to Congress and to the labor movement. Tom Burke will long be remembered here for his integrity and for his diligent work on behalf of social legislation. I am proud that Ohio sent Tom Burke to Congress. His work here on the Education and Labor Committee in the 81st Congress was outstanding, not only because he could draw on his years of experience as a union man, but because he was ever willing to listen to the views of others as well as to express his views to them.

He was a most fundamental and thoroughgoing believer in the democratic process. He loved debate. He loved analysis. He loved the freedom of intellectual exchange on the tough matters that come before the Congress. He had faith that right would prevail if reasonable men would honestly and sincerely meet their legislative challenges. And what was "right" for Tom Burke was the public interest.

Most outstanding about my friend Tom, I think, was the charm with which he could at once advocate strenuously those causes dearest to him and yet exhibit an almost palpable desire to understand his opposition. This quality, the mark of a guileless honest democratic intellect, will sustain him in the memory of colleagues on both sides of the aisle in the House.

He brought much to the Congress both as a Member and as a legislative representative for his union and he leaves us improved for the long hours he spent here with us.

Of Tom's life, the men and women of labor who sent him to us can be most proud. We, his friends in Congress, share with them the appreciation of this exceptional and saintly man. We grieve together with all of them and with his family at his passing.

In Washington With U.S. Senator Hugh Scott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of activities and comments upon my first session in the U.S. Senate, which I propose to send out as my regular newsletter to the people of Pennsylvania upon adjournment.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN WASHINGTON WITH U.S. SENATOR HUGH SCOTT

"It may be laid as a universal rule that a government which attempts more than it ought will perform less." (Lord Macaulay.)

By substituting "Congress" for the word "government" in Lord Macaulay's quotation, you can get a pretty good summary of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

In January the Democrats came roaring into Washington with 2 to 1 majorities in both Houses of Congress and the mistaken impression that they had a mandate which included the keys to the U.S. Treasury. Before President Eisenhower had an opportunity to deliver his state of the Union message, spokesmen for the many wings of the Democratic Party began issuing manifestoes.

Those spendocrat legislative programs, frequently drafted just before a press conference, varied somewhat in details, but all seemed to agree that each thing wrong with the country could be cured by spending another billion dollars. But they reckoned without the immense power of the Presidency, the militant Republican minority and the outrage of the American public which gives mandates to nobody.

The President offered the Nation a program to preserve prosperity and encourage progress, under a Federal budget of $77.1 billion. He warned that he would oppose Federal expenditures above that sum because they would require either increased taxes or borrowing—that hidden tax which creates inflation and drives up the cost of everything we buy.

In the following 9 months the President was able to stop almost every measure he did not want through the use of the veto or the threat of the veto. I was firmly in support of the President's proposals in every area except housing and public works—two fields where I believe the Nation, and our Commonwealth, need more help than the administration programs offered. I voted for substantial reductions in spending in other areas to compensate for the slight increased spending provided in the housing and public works bills.

Although the President could not get all the legislation he requested of Congress, since the Republicans constituted only one-third of the votes, he did succeed in forcing through several important laws. The most notable of these was labor reform.

Many legislators can claim authorship of the labor reform bills and amendments accepted by either the House or Senate. But the law as finally enacted should be called the "Eisenhower act," because it contains the key reform provisions which he urged upon Congress and which he explained to a nationwide television and radio audience. The public response to the President's broadcast was overwhelming. My office alone received some 9,000 letters and telegrams (all of which were answered, I am proud to say). These reforms will protect equally the public, union members, and honest union officials from the marauding of the minority of embezzlers, thugs, and extortionists in organized labor.

But although the President was able to stop almost everything he opposed, the "Won't Do" Congress balked in many areas very much in need of legislation. Civil rights, area redevelopment, and farm subsidies are three that are worth examining.

In civil rights, the President proposed a reasonable seven-point program. I cosponsored those proposals, plus two more which would have gone further than the President requested. Congress passed only one, to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

For area redevelopment, the President proposed legislation which would provide $53 million for depressed areas like those we have in Pennsylvania. Believing that more money was needed, I sponsored an area redevelopment bill which would provide $203.5 million, and which I am hopeful that the President would sign if enacted. The Democrats sponsored a similar bill providing $389.5 million. The President is certain to veto the last, and for that reason, I voted against it when it reached the Senate floor.

The Democratic area redevelopment measure passed the Senate, but when it went to the House, the House Banking and Currency Committee trimmed it down to $251 million—almost the amount of money which I had proposed. Then it went to the House Rules Committee, whose chairman, Representative HOWARD W. SMITH, Democrat of Virginia, promptly pigeonholed it.

This situation on area redevelopment gives the Democrats the opportunity to tell whichever half of the story they find most palatable to their constituents. The members of the Spendocrat wing can point to the big bill they pushed through the Senate. The members of the conservative wing can point to Mr. SMITH who goes off to his Virginia farm whenever he needs to stop progressive legislation.

This measure is hindered by a further political problem. No Democrat wants to enact a bill, like the one now before Rules, which is similar to one introduced by HUGH SCOTT, a Republican.

Finally, Congress failed miserably on farm legislation. The President urged Congress, in his state of the Union message and in a special message on the wheat bill, to reduce subsidies which are hurting farmers, consumers and taxpayers alike. But the Democratic majority enacted a bill (that I fought at every step) to raise subsidies, which in these times of farm surpluses is like pouring water on a drowning man. The President promptly vetoed the bill and nothing was enacted.

If logic were to prevail, we could say confidently that some farm subsidy relief is likely to be enacted in the next session of Congress. But logic does not prevail among those who are more concerned with the welfare of wealthy farmers and farm corporations than they are with every one else in the Nation.

Also of interest to Pennsylvanians:

I was sponsor and cosponsor of 14 bills and resolutions which became law. They include Hawaii statehood, increased benefits for retired employees under the Railroad Retirement Act and "Captive Nations Week." I supported and voted for the public works appropriations bill which provided funds for flood control, locks, dams and navigational aids to many areas of the Commonwealth. I helped in the Senate with Congressman GAVIN'S bill which authorizes a fish hatchery in northwestern Pennsylvania; also Congressman BUSH'S bill to establish Little League Baseball Week.

Other legislation which passed and which I voted for included: increased veterans pension benefits, Federal employees health insurance, extension of emergency unemployment compensation, two improvements in the immigration laws, mutual security, a bill to clarify taxation of interstate business and the highway financing bill.

Montana Increases Its Share of Federal Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to the State of Montana increasing its share of Federal funds.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MIKE MANSFIELD

MONTANA INCREASES ITS SHARE OF FEDERAL FUNDS

Montana has again increased its share of Federal funds that are distributed throughout the 50 States in the form of grant-in-aid programs, salaries and maintenance for Federal agencies, and construction funds for various federally sponsored projects. A survey of fiscal year 1959 expenditures indicates that Montana received slightly more than twice the amount that the State contributed in the form of income and excise taxes.

In fiscal year 1959, which came to a close on June 30, 1959, Montana and its residents received $286,288,970 in Federal moneys, an increase of $52,165,414 over the previous fiscal year. According to early estimates an additional $11,020,115 will be channeled into the State during the current fiscal year, 1960.

In fiscal year 1958 the Treasury Department collected $138,940,000 in income and excise taxes in the State of Montana. On the basis of these tax collections in our State compared with the amount of money spent by the Federal Government in Montana during the same period, Montanans received $2.06 for every $1 collected in taxes by the U.S. Treasury.

The Department of Agriculture continues to be the largest contributor to the economy of the State. This includes funds expended in its many diverse activities, such as research, the Forest Service, the soil-conservation program, the soil-bank program, the Rural Electrification Administration, and the Farmers' Home Administration, to mention only a few. The second largest contributor is the Department of Defense with the increased Air Force activities at Malmstrom Air Force Base at Great Falls and the Glasgow Air Force Base. The Department is planning new Army National Guard Armory construction at Butte and Plentywood.

The Department of Commerce is also among the top three big spenders in Montana. A large part of their expenditures is centralized in the Bureau of Public Roads and its work on the construction of the Interstate Highway System, which is now well underway in the State. Also, the Bureau of Census activities will increase during the current fiscal year, in view of the preparations and work needed for tabulating the new 1960 census.

On the back of this sheet is a tabulation of the expenditures made by the departments and agencies of the Federal Government that are active in Montana—actual expenditures for fiscal year 1959, estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1960, and a column indicating whether we may anticipate an increase or decrease in the funds to be expended in the current fiscal year. [Printed below in RECORD.]

The 1st session of the 86th Congress has been a busy Congress—we worked hard—and Senator MURRAY, Congressmen LEE METCALF, LEROY ANDERSON, and I were fortunate in obtaining some big items for Montana, but we also actively supported legislation which will benefit Montanans in many different ways. We are in the Nation's Capital to assist and to help, whether it be a major emergency such as the earthquake in southwestern Montana or whether it be a problem of concern to only one individual.

Federal expenditures in Montana, by Federal departments and agencies

Department	Fiscal year 1959 actual	Fiscal year 1960 estimate	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Agriculture: Agricultural Research Service, Extension Service, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, ASCS, Agricultural Marketing Service, soil bank program, Commodity Stabilization Service, CCC, REA, FHA, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, General Counsel	$101,992,229	$98,845,151	−$3,147,078
Defense: Army, Navy, Air Force	72,817,000	77,419,000	+4,602,000
Commerce: Bureau of Census, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Public Roads, Weather Bureau	31,886,615	38,057,106	+6,170,491
Interior: Bonneville Power Administration, Bureaus of Land Management, Indian Affairs, Reclamation, Geological Survey, Mines, Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, National Park Service	29,221,807	34,799,715	+5,577,908
Veterans' Administration	18,527,000	18,527,000	
Health, Education, and Welfare: Printing House for Blind, Office of Education, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, Public Health Service, Social Security Administration	11,092,394	10,098,751	−993,643
Post Office	9,521,221	9,852,000	+330,779
General Services Administration	6,161,751	4,859,800	−1,301,951
Labor	2,848,398	2,599,871	−248,527
Treasury: Bureau of Customs, Internal Revenue, Savings Bonds Division	1,378,438	1,393,825	+15,387
Justice: Legal activities, Immigration and Naturalization Service	767,574	777,500	+9,926
Interstate Commerce Commission	46,602	51,425	+4,823
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	27,941	28,000	
Total	286,288,970	297,309,144	+11,020,115

Raytheon's Modern Flight Facility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, Raytheon Manufacturing Co. is one of the industrial giants that is contributing so much to our national defense.

Its research and development programs are among the best.

It was my privilege to be a guest at the dedication of the Raytheon flight facility at Bedford, Mass.

This facility will represent the first military use of this advanced concept in hangar construction, and is a monument to the Navy's "forward look" philosophy.

The list of speakers at the dedication ceremony include G. E. Bottjer, master of ceremonies; T. C. Wisenbaker, manager of Raytheon Missile System Divison; Capt. T. C. Herlihy, district supply officer, First Naval District; Capt. T. J. White, deputy district public works officer, Bureau of Yard and Docks; C. F. Adams, president of Raytheon Co., and Rear Adm. R. E. Dixon, Chief, Bureau of Aeronautics.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD the following address delivered by Rear Admiral Dixon, which I recommend to all persons who are interested in our Nation's continuing progress in defense:

HANGAR DEDICATION REMARKS BY REAR ADM. R. E. DIXON, CHIEF, BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS, BEDFORD, MASS.

Congressman LANE, Mr. Adams, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, aside from the fact that I am greatly honored to appear here today, it is a real pleasure to visit New England. It is also a real pleasure to meet with old friends here, and to make new ones.

We in the Bureau of Aeronautics think we have a good air-to-air guided missile, and its name is Sparrow III. We take a good deal of pride in Sparrow III for several reasons:

It is the result of a genuine cooperative effort between the Raytheon Co. and the Navy. We in the Navy like to think we have excellent relations with American industry, and the Sparrow III program from the beginning has illustrated this. It was Raytheon who had the initiative to come to us with a superior guidance system for air-to-air missiles which was accepted and made into a superior overall missile system. May industry always feel free to come forward with what it thinks is good, and may we always have the foresight to recognize it when it comes.

Sparrow III is operational in the fleet. This is where it counts; this is the proof of the pudding. There can be no better documentation of its success than to tune in on what fleet pilots who have fired the missile think of it. While I cannot read to you from classified reports from the fleet, I can tell you that Sparrow III's success has been more than noted by Navy all-weather squadrons everywhere. These squadrons now honestly feel that they have in hand a realistic and effective air defense system, in spite of admitted complexities of the all-weather intercept problem.

Although, as we say, Sparrow III is now in the fleet and on McDonnell F3H–2N aircraft, we are also most expectant of similar success when the fastest all-weather fighter in the world, the McDonnell F4H–1, joins the operating forces, also with Sparrow III.

Concerning the Sparrow III-F4H–1 system, I always get a bang out of an incident which happened near St. Louis, and which perhaps dubiously describes F4H plus Sparrow. It seems that an F4H–1 with dummy Sparrows was being ferried to St. Louis from the West when all its radios went out over western Kansas. The F4H pilot saw an Air Force B–47 headed in the direction of St. Louis and got a piece of one radio working to the extent of being able to talk to, but not receive from, the B–47. The F4H pilot would ask questions to which the B–47 people would answer "yes" or "no" by head shaking. On determing that the B–47 was going to St. Louis, the F4H pilot asked to accompany it. He later learned that the B–47's pilot had a conversation with St. Louis that went something like this:

"We have a Navy airplane in tow with radios out; they will come in with us."

"What kind of a Navy airplane is it?" asked St. Louis.

"We don't know what the heck it is, but it looks like the one Buzz Sawyer flies."

Ladies and gentlemen, our purpose here today is to call attention to this fine new hangar you see before you. We have mentioned airplane and missile systems, but it is in this hangar that work will be done to finally bring the elements of such a system together. It is here that the missile, its launcher, and the control apparatus inside the airplane are joined to round out the all-weather air defense weapon. We are talking about the airplane-missile system now being put together for the Navy, but we should also bear in mind that this hangar will serve as a center for many other developments of a research and testing nature.

When we in the Bureau of Aeronautics outlined specification for this hangar, we did not call out much more than the facts that we wanted:

Low construction cost.
Low maintenance cost.
Rapid design and construction.
Flexibility in its use.

What you see here, I think, stands as a tribute to the all who had anything to do with its design and construction. This hangar is a truly versatile facility. So far as I know, it is the only suspended roof type hangar built for the armed services; the cables by which the roof is suspended are prestressed. This type suspension roof, incidentally, is well on the way to becoming a standard type in future Navy hangar construction.

The hangar's modular design gives it flexibility in terms of being readily expandable into a larger installation should the need arise. As you inspect it, you will notice other evidences of the sharp thought that has gone into it, such things as two sizes of doors for different size aircraft; improved fire protection; provision in the large doors for seasonal temperature changes, and so on.

But perhaps the main feature of this hangar is that it is more than an aircraft hangar. It combines hangar, workshop, and laboratories, providing in one spot a self-contained, self-supporting activity, so designed in the interest of economy and efficiency.

If we may turn our attention from hardware to people for a moment, I would like to to say that we in the Navy are aware of the fact that the individuals who will work in this hangar are the ones who will make it come alive. The finest facility ever built is for naught without the spirit, the drive, and the dedication of its inhabitants to the job to be done. Where this hangar is concerned, and where people who will work in it are concerned, we in the Navy have no doubts.

Mr. Adams, it becomes my pleasurable duty and privilege to commission this Bedford hangar and to dedicate it to the work our country is going toward strong defenses for lasting peace in the world.

Thank you.

A New GI Foreign Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the United States to protect the rights of servicemen stationed overseas is again arousing the interest and indignation of the American press. Under leave previously granted, I include the following editorial from the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch of September 10, 1959.

A NEW GI FOREIGN TRIAL

The iniquitous status of forces treaties, by which American service personnel overseas are made subject to the criminal laws and court procedures of some 50-odd countries where our men are stationed, still are in effect.

Not much has been heard of them lately, largely because no conspicuous cases of mistreatment or injustice to GI's have been publicized. Now an instance has appeared which brings the issue again to the fore.

Three American soldiers in Turkey were arrested for alleged black market currency operations.

When they denied the charges the Turkish police struck and tortured them. One sergeant was kicked, beaten, and deprived of water during 18 hours' questioning. Another reported that he was hung upside down from a rafter and belabored with a rubber hose.

Army authorities learned of the mistreatment and finally intervened on the men's behalf. But the U.S. State Department, fearful of offending the Government of an ally, tried unsuccessfully to hush up the story.

It now has found its way into the American press.

The U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that murderers and rapists and other criminals in this country must be hustled before a magistrate for arraignment without delay, otherwise confessions obtained by interrogation are invalid.

But the GI, oftener than not an involuntary draftee, serving his country in a foreign country has nothing resembling this protection.

Not only can he be tortured and mistreated indefinitely, but his case is heard in a foreign court, subject to a judicial code which in many instances is harsh and unfair by American standards.

The Turkish episode is still another reminder of a glaring error which Congress should move to correct in simple justice to every man overseas in an American military uniform.

Address of Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, Before Second Annual Convention of the Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, September 8, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the speech which I delivered to the convention of the Illinois State Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations in Chicago on Tuesday, September 8, 1959, in which I analyzed some of the basic issues before the Congress, the labor movement, and the country in connection with labor legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE ILLINOIS STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, TUESDAY AFTERNOON, SEPTEMBER 8, 1959

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS (U. S. Senator from Illinois). My old friend Reuben Soderstrom, friends and fellow members of the labor movement of Illinois, I understand that today is politicians' day [laughter] and that you want to get rid of us so that you can get on with the business of the Illinois labor movement.

We meet, good friends and brothers and sisters, at a critical time in the history of our country and in the history of one of its central institutions, the labor movement. We are faced, not only with the question of how we may best resist the threats to freedom posed by communism, but also with the issue as to how we may best eliminate dishonesty and unsavory alliances within the American labor movement itself, at the same time that we encourage honest and progressive unions to fulfill their historic mission of helping the weak and developing democratic institutions which strengthen our national life.

As one who has been a member of the labor movement nearly 40 years, and who has worked with you to enact measures to help the conditions of labor, I think I am entitled to speak frankly to you, and I shall do so this afternoon and make what I am afraid will not be regarded as a political speech.

We need to remember that honest unionism has its internal as well as its external enemies. Both groups have contributed to the legislative crisis with which we have been faced in Congress and in the Nation.

LABOR'S INTERNAL ENEMIES

First, let me speak frankly about the internal enemies of labor. The misdeeds of a substantial group of so-called labor leaders—as revealed in evidence presented to the McClellan and other committees—are both more serious and more widespread than was formerly believed. These men have done more harm to the labor movement than anything that has happened in a long time.

There is no use for us of the labor movement to pretend otherwise, or to try to protect them merely because they carry a union card.

It is true that these wrongful acts are not characteristic of the vast majority of unions. But they are still too many and too serious.

It is true that the responsible leaders of organized labor, such as George Meany, Walter Reuther, Al Hayes and a host of others, have fought these abuses with all the strength they possess and have taken severe disciplinary action against many of the worst offenders. All credit to these men and to the AFL–CIO which has stood behind them. But it is still true that valiantly as these honest leaders have fought, and real as the improvements which they have effected are, there is nevertheless a whole deluge of abuses which they have not been able to cure, but which definitely need to be removed and to be removed as soon as possible.

It is true that unions are not the only places where gross abuses of power and downright corruption occur. It is true that between 600 and 1,000 cases of bank embezzlements by hitherto trusted officials come to light every year, while numerous other cases are hushed up and are never known about. It is true that hundreds of millions of dollars ($300 millions, according to the last figures I heard of) of social security contributions withheld by employers from the payrolls of their workers have never been turned over to the Treasury as should have been the case.

But this does not excuse those union officials who have misappropriated the money contributed by their members.

It is true that there is a good deal of corruption in business circles in the widespread padding of expense accounts, in charging off excessive entertainment costs as business expenses to reduce their taxes, and in the use of gifts generally to purchasing agents as a covert form of bribe.

These are some of the moral sicknesses of American society and of erring human nature. I do not blame labor for resenting the general tendency to headline its failures and to play down or bury the news of comparable business corruption and abuse. But the fact that dishonesty and breaches of trust are practiced by many of the same people who point the finger of scorn at labor does not excuse those few labor leaders who have the same lax standards. The fact that others are doing something wrong does not give anyone a hunting license to go and do likewise.

The very fact that labor is a movement dedicated to helping the individually weak and to aid the relatively more hard-pressed groups in the Nation should make members and officers live according to a higher standard than that of the average of society.

No sane person expects men in the rough and tumble of life to become plaster saints. But, even though as mortals we are not perfect, and at times are even sinful, this does not mean that we should give up the struggle to make ourselves and our institutions better. And we do not have to be granted the credentials of a saint before we have the obligation to help clean up ourselves and the world about us.

After a fairly wide acquaintanceship, I can say that I have known only three saints, of whom at least two (one of them Jane Addams, of this city) were bitterly attacked. If we only permitted the saints to take the lead in the field of reform, there would be far too much work for too few people. So the rest of us erring mortals must struggle on at the task.

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH LABOR

I would like, as I speak about these matters and about some of the things in which some labor leaders have erred, to emphasize, however, what is right in labor as well as what is wrong. For we should not forget, and society should not ignore the fact, that when the labor movement began in this country, we had the 12-hour day and the 6-day week, and in steel the 7-day week; that it has been through the efforts of the labor movement, plus the increase in productivity, that the hours were reduced, first to 10 and then 8, and Saturday became a holiday, so that men could see their families on weekends.

It is true that the labor movement has raised the wages of labor. Formerly common labor was 20 cents an hour, and skilled labor was perhaps 40 or 50 cents an hour. Those days are gone, and the standard of living of the American workers has risen, both because of increased productivity and because of the increased pressure of unions.

As one who has had nearly 30 years of experience in struggling for a better protection for old age and protection against the risks of unemployment, I can say this, that we never would have been able to pass old-age pensions and unemployment insurance if it had not been for the devoted work of the labor movement.

My acquaintanceship with Reuben Soderstrom began in those days, and we owe many a debt of gratitude for the way he has helped in both of these matters.

We could not have passed a minimum wage law had it not been for organized labor seeking to raise the wages of those who were not themselves members of unions, but who because of economic weakness suffered from low wages.

We should struggle on to improve the health and health care of the American people. And I can say that in all these battles, we generally have nearly all of the employer groups in the country against us and nearly all the labor groups with us.

The Nation owes the men and women who struggle for these causes a debt of gratitude, because after they have been put into effect, the bitter opponents begin to concede that these measures should have been adopted before they were. But it is always afterward, never before.

I want to pay tribute also to men like John Fitzpatrick who 50 years ago, when the Chicago Federation of Labor was dominated by the racketeers, with Ed Nockels and others threw out, at the risk of their own lives, some of that early group and made the Chicago Federation of Labor a clean organization.

I want to pay tribute to the men and women who at personal sacrifice have defended the rank and file of their members. Those are innumerable.

So along with the statements of what is wrong with labor, let me emphasize again what is right with labor. But let me make two very simple points, and I ask you to ponder about them.

MISLEADERS SHOULD BE RETIRED

It is intolerable to me that men like Dave Beck should have had such tremendous power in a section of the labor movement. It is intolerable that such men as Eugene C. James of the old Laundry Workers Union, and Jimmy Hoffa and Joey Glimco of the Teamsters should continue as union leaders. It is intolerable that others like them should still be in positions of power. It is the duty of all good union men to see that misleaders of labor like these should be retired from office at the earliest possible opportunity and that rules and procedures be adopted which will prevent any such abuses of trust in the future. This is a crucial duty and upon its adequate performance much depends.

CONSTRUCTIVE GOVERNMENT HELP IS NEEDED

My second observation is likewise very simple. This essential job cannot be adequately performed without affirmative and constructive help from Government. Congressional investigating committees are frequently unfair and often violate the rights of privacy of individuals. But the committees have two powers which are essential in digging out corruption and abuses. They can issue subpenas and compel attendance. They can then put witnesses under oath and subject those who testify falsely to prosecution for perjury.

This has enabled facts to be brought out which the AFL–CIO with all the best intentions in the world, would never have been able to disclose. Responsible labor leaders have freely acknowledged to me that the investigation of welfare and pension funds—which I presided over—gave them facts that were the basis of significant cleanup actions which they took.

I do not believe that we could have exposed the men who disgraced the old laundry workers union, or the wine and distillery workers union, and who were in league with some of the most evil forces in this country, if we had not had these powers.

I took pains however to see to it that labor as a whole was not criticized, and I put in the record the facts about honest pension and welfare funds, such as the Painters Union under Charlie Youngblood, and others, Rand and Tom Burke here [applause], to see that a balanced picture was presented.

Moreover, it became apparent that legislation could also do much to help clean up the abuses which were revealed.

It was quite clear more than a year ago that the McClellan committee—like my investigation which resulted in a law to protect welfare and pension funds—had brought to light enough information to provide a sound basis for legislation.

However, there were those who used the findings of the McClellan committee as an attack not so much on the crooks and on corruption as on the labor union movement itself as a whole and the legitimate and needed functions of unions to organize and bargain collectively. In fact, there were members of the McClellan committee itself who seemed far more anxious to smear Walter Reuther and the clean and effective unions than they were to ferret out corruption and wrongdoing.

SENATE PASSED STRONG ANTICORRUPTION BILLS IN 1958 AND 1959

Nonetheless, the Senate of both the 85th and 86th Congresses passed a good strong cleanup bill without the punitive features which were aimed not at corruption but at the labor movement itself.

The first basic principle of those bills was disclosure. Sunlight is a great disinfectant. Much of the evil in the world comes from the fact that men think they can sin in private and their sins will never come to light. To require that essential facts about union receipts and expenditures (or company receipts and expenditures) be made public is an effective way of seeing that the money of the members is well and honestly spent. This was also the basic requirement in my welfare and pension fund disclosure law which, though weakened in the House, still is a great step forward and furnishes a foundation upon which we can build.

The Kennedy bills had similar sets of requirements and, in addition, provided against a number of unethical practices, which I would like to list:

1. There was to be full publicity to members, the general public, and to Government about union receipts and expenditures.

2. Strict penalties were provided for the embezzlement of union funds, false reporting, destruction of records, rigging elections, etc.

3. Men convicted of criminal offenses were debarred from holding office or positions of trust for 5 years after the termination of their sentence.

4. Blackmail or shakedown picketing was outlawed.

5. Periodic and democratic elections of union officers were required; once every 3 years and by secret ballot in local unions, and once every 5 years in the international unions.

6. Trusteeships of local unions by their internationals were limited to 1 year.

7. There were included requirements for partial reporting of management expenses in the field of industrial relations in order to expose union-busting dealings with men like Nate Shefferman.

The bill which passed the Senate last year by an overwhelming vote was defeated in the House by the familiar coalition of the vast majority of the Republicans and the Southern Dixiecrats. This year, substantially the same bill was reported out of committee, including some "sweeteners" such as legalizing prehire agreements in the building industry and allowing economic strikers to vote.

In 1959, on the floor of the Senate, a so-called bill of rights for union members was added. This prohibited coercion against union members and provided criminal penalties to enforce the right of free speech within unions with orderly hearings and trials in cases of expulsion. One very dangerous requirement—later deleted by the Senate—was that each candidate for office was to be furnished with the mailing list of members. This could have been used by employers who, by putting up dummy candidates, could have obtained possession of these lists and thus put economic pressure upon the members.

There were also added provisions outlawing the hot cargo contracts in the transportation industry, dealing with the no man's land problem, restricting picketing where another union had valid bargaining rights or an election had just been held, etc.

KENNEDY BILL WAS MORE EFFECTIVE CLEANUP BILL THAN LANDRUM-GRIFFIN

Now let me emphasize that the drafters of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which was substituted for the Kennedy bill in the House, incorporated virtually all of these features of the Kennedy bill, but in many cases, imposed weaker penalties and greatly softened the requirement on management reporting. The extraordinary spectacle was therefore presented that the bill which the business community was demanding as a tough bill was actually less severe in correcting crookedness and abuses of power inside the unions than the Kennedy bill, which was derided as a "cream puff," "milk toast," "watered-down" measure.

Jimmy Hoffa quickly sized up the situation and correctly remarked that there was nothing in the Landrum-Griffin bill which would hurt him.

Now I am sure that those in the labor movement know that this is true. But there has been so much misinformation on this subject and so much propaganda from the press, the chamber of commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers that I think it is worth quoting what Senator GOLDWATER, from the extreme right, had to say on the floor of the Senate on August 18, 1959, and I commend this to the editorial writers of the Chicago newspapers. [Applause.] I now quote from a statement of Senator GOLDWATER:

"There are many significant provisions in S. 1555, the Senate bill, which are far more effective in reaching the evils of racketeering, dishonesty, corruption, and abuse of power than are the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill, and, hence, in these respects the Senate bill is actually tougher than the House bill."

That is the end of GOLDWATER, and now I will go on with DOUGLAS. [Laughter.]

Thus, what we did in the Senate was to pass an effective cleanup bill—a bill which was a better bill and which went further than the Landrum-Griffin bill in those areas which needed attention. The Senate bills, in both 1958 and 1959, were properly aimed at the real problems and quite properly avoided, in most cases, provisions aimed at weakening legitimate union activity.

In the Senate we largely prevented the adoption of provisions aimed at making a genuine "cleanup" bill a union "smashup" bill.

Furthermore, notwithstanding all the propaganda to the contrary, the Senate bill included both fair and adequate provisions concerning extortionate picketing (which, incidentally, the Landrum-Griffin bill copied almost word for word), hot-cargo agreements, and the "no man's land" cases.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL STRUCK AT LEGITIMATE UNION OBJECTIVES

In the House, however, events took a different turn. The chamber of commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, most of the press, the President, and the Republican Party determined to strike at the fundamental objectives of legitimate unionism in the guise of trying to do something about corruption. Not until July 27, and not until after the House Labor Committee had reported out a good bill embodying, for the most part, the principles of the Kennedy bill, did the Landrum-Griffin bill even see the light of day.

As I have already pointed out, it copied the provisions of the Kennedy bill in many respects, except that it weakened those provisions and penalties having to do with the real abuses which the McClellan committee brought to light. But it added three general provisions which were aimed at breaking the weak and struggling unions which are now so valiantly trying to organize in the South and other nonunion areas.

It was especially severe on the textile workers, the retail clerks' unions, and the furniture workers, and in the three provisions which dealt with the subject of "no man's land" cases, organizational picketing, and secondary boycotts.

There was a lot in it which would have hurt honest and legitimate trade unions. Let me deal with these three areas in turn.

"NO MAN'S LAND"

1. When the National Labor Relations Board had jurisdiction, but, for one reason or another, had declined to exercise it, the Kennedy bill provided that the State agencies were to exercise it, but in doing so were to abide by the Federal decisions and the law in Federal courts. The Landrum-Griffin bill provided that State law or lack of law was to prevail. Since most States do not have labor-relations acts—38 out of the 50 States do not have labor-relations acts—this meant that there would be no basic guarantees of the right to join unions and bargain collectively so far as "no man's land" was concerned.

When these provisions went to the conference committee of the two Houses, the Senate made the great concession of accepting the Landrum-Griffin provision, but providing that the area of this no man's land was not to be enlarged beyond what it now is, namely, primarily in the field of small establishments. The fact that this proposal at first was spurned by the Landrum-Griffin supporters showed that they wanted and expected the Labor Relations Board to give up jurisdiction over a large area to which the Labor Relations Act now applies and, by a future administrative refusal to act, to deprive workers of the legal protections which Congress willed them to have. In other words, the industrial jungle which prevailed prior to the Wagner Act was to be allowed to creep back through failure of the Labor Relations Board to act.

The one true remedy for this problem for which I will work, and have worked, is to provide the Labor Relations Board with sufficient funds and personnel so that the law can prevail for anyone, and every one, and then see that we get men on the Board and on the administration of the Board who believe in enforcing the law, instead of using the law to defeat the organization of labor. [Applause.]

So much for no man's land.

BAN ON ORGANIZATIONAL PICKETING

2. Second, and perhaps most important of all, the Landrum-Griffin bill would have outlawed virtually all forms of peaceful, organizational picketing. I have already pointed out that the Kennedy bill had outlawed blackmail and hot cargo picketing. It had also prohibited picketing by one union after another legitimate union had been recognized—and I emphasize that word "legitimate." It cannot be a fake union—or for 9 months where the workers had by vote rejected collective bargaining.

But the Landrum-Griffin bill shut off virtually all organizational picketing, even when the employer was himself guilty of unfair labor practices. Since under the Labor Board's decisions, an employer can campaign against a union inside the factory and can call the employees together in captive audiences for that purpose, to prevent unions from peacefully trying to persuade workers outside a factory or place of business to join a union is highly unfair.

It was designed, as I have said, to prevent unionism from getting a foothold in unorganized industrial areas. This would have kept the South nonunion territory and would have enabled southern employers to pay lower wages and grant fewer fringe benefits than in the North and Midwest. This would have helped them draw industry away from such States as our own, to the damage of our employers and localities as well as our labor. I wonder if this was fully realized by the employers who wrote demanding that the Landrum-Griffin bill be enacted into law.

Now let me emphasize that I most emphatically do not believe in the use of violence or threats of violence in connection with picketing. Nor do I believe in mass picketing, for this blocks the streets which are the property of the community and down which nonunion workers—like anyone else—are entitled to walk. Such acts as these are already illegal under the common law, and they both can and should be dealt with by the local police and courts.

But I do believe that advocates of unionism have the right under the Constitution to try peacefully to persuade other workers to join a union and to do this by signs and by nonthreatening and nonabusive language. If a sweeping prohibition of these rights had been confirmed by law, then the beginnings of unionism in most unorganized areas would have withered on the vine. It would have been virtually impossible for it to have grown, and its present strength would have been gradually eroded.

SWEEPING SECONDARY BOYCOTT PROVISIONS

3. Finally, the Landrum-Griffin bill would have returned to the old mistaken doctrine laid down over 30 years ago by a reactionary court in the Bedford Stone case. It said that the workers in one plant have no legitimate interest in what happens in another plant and cannot withhold their work or custom because the plant is nonunion or is out on strike. By giving all forms of the secondary boycott a bad name, the Landrum-Griffin bill sought to atomize labor and insulate the workers in a nonunion plant from receiving the help which union men elsewhere in the same or allied trades would give.

I concede that the whole question of secondary boycotts is one of the most tangled in labor law and one of the most difficult to regulate. The Taft-Hartley Act sought to impose a more or less blanket restriction which applied primarily to mass or concerted secondary action by labor.

But the Landrum-Griffin bill sought to go still further by imposing these restrictions on union appeals to "any individual," and by broadening the provisions to apply to any union acts "to threaten, coerce or restrain any person." The bill also extended the narrow Senate provisions so as to cover all so-called hot cargo contracts. It would have prevented virtually all secondary action against a firm regarded as "unfair" by organized labor. This would have prevented the garment trades by agreement with the jobbers from eliminating sweatshop conditions in the shops of subcontractors. It would have prevented all appeals to consumers of "unfair" products. It would have prevented workers in plant X from refusing to work on "struck goods" transferred from plant Y, or building trades workers from refusing to work on nonunion material or side by side with nonunion workers. The legal position of the secondary boycott should not be subjected to any such meat-ax treatment.

OLD GOP-DIXIECRAT COALITION PASSED LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL

As we all know, or should know, the Landrum-Griffin bill was put over in the House by the old coalition of northern conservative Republicans and by southern Dixiecrat Democrats. I want you to listen to this account of the vote very carefully, if you will. On the key vote by which the Landrum-Griffin bill was substituted for the House

committee bill by the margin of 229 to 201, all but 17 Republicans voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill as did all but 13 Congressmen from the South. Only 17 out of 153 voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill, and 134, I believe, voted for it. The vote of the Republicans was approximately 8 to 1. And this applied also to the southern Democrats; of the 105 southern Democrats, only 13 voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill, and 91 voted for it, one being absent. So that the South voted almost 7 to 1 for the Landrum-Griffin bill. And this was the coalition.

Now I hope I will not be accused of being partisan if I say that the members of the Democratic Party from the North and West stood almost man to man against the Landrum-Griffin bill with only rare exceptions. [Applause.] Of the 201 votes against the Landrum-Griffin bill, 184 came from the Democratic Party, and of these 184, 171 were from the North and the West. And if we come down to cases, there are 14 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois, and 11 Republican Congressmen. All 11 Republican Congressmen voted for the Landrum-Griffin bill; all of the 14 Democrats from Illinois voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill. [Applause.]

Those figures I think can be put down on cards and you should keep them inside your pocketbook. [Laughter.]

I want to say here, too, that part of the bargain was probably a trade by the Republicans of their votes on effective civil rights measures in return for southern support to get the unions. This is the essence of the bipartisan coalition, in which Mr. HALLECK, our neighbor from Indiana, with the aid of the Illinois Republicans, with the possible exception of one Member, and the southern Democrats, led by HOWARD SMITH, of Virginia, go along together. The two groups killed civil rights. The two groups put in antilabor legislation.

This powerful coalition, therefore, seems to have as its main purpose the stifling of the rights and ambitions of those groups in our society who are at the bottom of the economic and social totem pole. I refer, of course, to the weak and struggling unions of the South and other unorganized areas, and to the Negro in the South and elsewhere whose rights can only be gained when he is guaranteed the equal protection of our laws by civil rights legislation and the right to organize and bargain collectively through the unionization of the South. These 229 Congressmen and the forces behind them must bear a heavy burden, for not only do they in effect support the privileges of the strong and powerful, but they have actively worked against the interests of the weak and the poor.

HEAVY PRESSURES GENERATED BY THOSE HOSTILE TO LEGITIMATE LABOR GOALS

They were able to put this over because many employer groups have used the public indignation aroused by the Hoffas, Becks, and Glimcos to strike a body blow at labor organizations themselves. I received at least 10,000 letters and telegrams demanding that I vote for the Landrum-Griffin bill. Many of them were completely sincere, although those who wrote them were imperfectly informed. Some of the letters—I do not know how many—appear to have been coerced and, to support this belief, I now read from two letters which I have received; one signed by a brave woman whose identity I will not, of course, reveal, and the other which though unsigned gives every indication of being genuine. This is the first letter:

"It was my unfortunate duty as an employee of * * * [the name was given, but I will not read it] to have to type an extremely harsh and abusive letter addressed to you. The letter was largely concerned with the Landrum-Griffin bill and was written by one of the executives in the department in which I work.

"I have very little knowledge of the Landrum-Griffin bill but have every confidence that your opposition to it is prompted by a deep concern for what is best for our country as a whole." [I hope you will forgive me if I read the next sentence.] "My husband and I have always regarded you as one of our most capable and dedicated statesmen and have admired your independent stand on all issues.

"The extremely poor working conditions in this company, which has a long record of strong opposition to the labor movement in every way and which is one of the most profitable in the State, is a strong argument for the good the unions have accomplished in other companies."

This letter for the Landrum-Griffin bill was apparently signed by her, but she wanted to clear her conscience by writing me that she was coerced into writing it.

The second letter is this:

"I dare not sign this letter, but beg you to read it.

"I wonder how many other stenographer-secretaries have spent days and days writing and wiring Senators and Congressmen urging support for the Landrum-Griffin bill—contrary to their personal convictions, but in the names of various firm executives, their friends, relatives, and employees. This is not 'thought-control' as in Russia, but certainly not a wholesome atmosphere.

"Please, in evaluating your mail, consider the availability of secretarial service to management who advocate strong labor control—and the lack of it (in large part) to those supporting labor.

"ONE OF YOUR ARDENT SUPPORTERS."

Perhaps the truth of the whole drive was well summed up by our Chicago philosopher, Mr. Dooley, who from his saloon on Archer Road observed as follows over 30 years ago; when he was discussing the open shop:

"An' so it goes on, Hinnissey. An' who gits the benefit? Thrue, it saves th' boss money, but he don't care no more f'r money thin he does f'r his right eye.

"It's all principle wid him. He hates t'see men robbed av their indipindence. They must have their indipindence, regardless av anything else.

" 'But,' said Mr. Hennessey, 'these open-shop min ye menshun say they are f'r unions iv properly conducted.'

" 'Shure,' said Mr. Dooley, 'iv properly conducted. An' there we are: an' how would they have this conducted? No strikes, no rules, no contracts, no scales, hardly iny wages, an' dam few mimbers.' " [Laughter and applause.]

As a result of the tremendous pressures which were generated by those groups who are hostile to the legitimate goals of organized labor, there was an organized attempt to have the Senate accept the Landrum-Griffin bill without any change at all. And a motion to that effect was made by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, the leader of the Repunblican Party. I am happy to say that we resisted these pressures and instead sent the bill to a conference between the House and Senate. I myself would have voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill had it come to a vote in the Senate, because I believe that its punitive provisions more than outweighed those provisions which were designed to get at genuine abuses. I made my position clear to the Chicago papers which attacked me for it.

I was asked by a Chicago newspaper, immediately after the Landrum-Griffin bill was passed by the House, what my attitude would be. I suppose it would have been possible for me to have hedged and to have said I would consider this when the bill came over. But I felt that would not be proper, and I declared that I would vote against the Landrum-Griffin bill if it were not appreciably modified, and take the consequences.

Immediately thereafter the one Chicago newspaper which in the past has supported me came out with an editorial denouncing me. They were, however, kind enough to publish a copy of my reply. If it will mean, as it probably will mean, the united opposition of the reactionary forces of this State, and all the newspapers of this State, I stand by that position. [Applause and cheers.]

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE ELIMINATED WORST PARTS OF LANDRUM-GRIFFIN BILL

I am happy to report that the conference committee greatly limited and modified the worst parts of the Landrum-Griffin bill which went far beyond any attempt at genuine reform. The conference modifications resulted in the following major changes:

We saved the garment industry from the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill which would have outlawed their present contracts with jobbers which provide for wages and working conditions in the shops of third-party contractors who actually produce the clothing. Instead, we were able to write in a proviso so that their practices which have ended sweatshop conditions in that industry could continue. A similar protection was inserted for subcontracting agreements for on-site work in the building construction industry.

We also saved the union movement, and the communities and industries that depend upon its rising standards, from the punitive provisions of Landrum-Griffin which would have virtually outlawed all organizational picketing. While these provisions now are not perfect, they changed the fundamental aim or effect of the Landrum-Griffin bill, which was to almost totally prevent the organization of the South and the nonunion areas.

While picketing at secondary-boycott sites is outlawed, the House bill went further and would even have prevented the passing out of handbills or ads in the newspapers. This provision in the House bill was changed so that handbills, radio programs, advertisements, etc., aimed at the public, including consumers, would at least be permitted in these secondary situations. I think that is proper and an exercise of our constitutional right of free speech.

Under the compromise, we also protected the right of employees of a secondary employer to refuse to cross a picket line in the case of a primary strike. The Landrum-Griffin bill, as written, appeared to take this right away.

The conference took out the restrictions of Landrum-Griffin on the right of employees to refuse to work on struck goods.

The conferees eliminated a section of the Landrum-Griffin bill about which no one was even aware until the very last minute—because it was camouflaged in legal language—which would have permitted damage suits against unions which were picketing for legitimate organizational purposes.

Under the Landrum-Griffin bill, union membership lists could be copied by employer stooges and such lists could have then been used by the employers to campaign against an existing union official, and for a management-dominated candidate for union office. The compromise provided that any member who is a bona fide candidate for union office could inspect such lists, but could not copy them, and that mailings must be made by the union.

The Landrum-Griffin bill provided for reporting by the employer in the case of labor consultants, like the union-undermining Nathan Shefferman, or in the case of expenditures of funds against the unions, but only when such expenditures were illegal under the law. The absurdity of this alleged protection is apparent when we ask ourselves,

"How many employers are going to turn themselves in for illegal activities?" Yet we all know that for almost every union official who has gone wrong, a mangement official has made a payoff. The conference committee largely took the provisions of the Kennedy bill on this issue which provides for the reporting of these expenditures, whether legal or illegal.

We also won the provisions that economic strikers can vote in NLRB elections for at least 12 months after the strike begins. And the Senate sections authorizing prehire agreements in building construction were restored to the bill. These were great improvements over the Landrum-Griffin provisions.

FURTHER MODIFICATIONS NEEDED

I do not want to leave you with the impression that the conference committee came out with a perfect bill. There are still some provisions which should be changed or modified, and I hope that this can be done in the next session of the Congress.

The first has to do with the no man's land provisions of the bill. We modified the worst provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill in this matter. Under the Landrum-Griffin bill, as I have said, the no man's land cases were to be turned over to State agencies, and were to be settled by State law in State courts. We all know what this would have meant in States like Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and some of the nonunion rural States of the Midwest Great Plains. A further defect was that under the Landrum-Griffin bill, it was possible that the NLRB would in the future actually give to the States jurisdiction over cases which it now itself handles.

We modified these provisions so that the NLRB could not refuse jurisdiction over cases it would now take under the standards which presently prevail. We further gave them authority to delegate some of their decisionmaking to the regional directors in election cases. Thus the net effect was to keep Federal jurisdiction in those areas where it now exists, and also to provide a better opportunity for the Board to handle a greater number of cases through its regional offices.

The bill does provide, however, that State agencies or courts may assume jurisdiction over the cases which the Board declines. Because this opens up the possibilities of serious antiunion restrictions in the States like Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina and some of the nonunion rural States of the Great Plains, as well as in the right-to-work States, I think this provision should be amended. I hope we may by later legislation provide that when the State agencies handle these cases, Federal law with appeals to Federal courts should apply so that we can have some uniform application of labor law throughout the 50 States, and not let the higher standards and business stability of organized areas be threatened by the competition of union-busting, open shop areas.

In addition to the inadequacy of the no man's land provisions—even though they improved greatly on the Landrum-Griffin bill—there is also the problem of employees in the construction industry whose traditional rights were certainly under attack by the secondary boycott provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill. It has left serious questions of legality with respect to strikes, picketing and boycotts involving contractors and subcontractors, and whether or not so-called on-site picketing in the construction industry would be legal under the bill. I am joining Senator Kennedy in backing further legislation (S. 2643) to correct these weaknesses.

I feel vindicated in my original position that the Senate should not adopt the Landrum-Griffin bill and that the bills should go to conference between the two Houses. I say this because the final bill modified most of those provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill which went beyond any attempt to stop crooks and racketeering but which struck at the basic and traditional rights of legitimate trade unions.

Consequently, we now have a bill which I supported in good faith and which, for the most part and with some few exceptions, is aimed at the crooks and corruption and those practices which genuinely needed to be changed. At the same time—again with a few exceptions—the bill does not strike down those legitimate union activities which the Landrum-Griffin bill, as it passed the House, would have done.

POSITIVE ACTIONS BY UNIONS THEMSELVES ARE ALSO ESSENTIAL

Legislation and law enforcement, of course, are not the only answers to what is needed for a strong and clean labor movement.

The honest, responsible and democratic operation of unions by their members and leaders on their own initiative is also essential—now as always.

Legal requirements can be—and I believe will be—of great assistance. But they are no substitute for the constant vigilance and positive actions of thousands of local and international unions and of millions of loyal and honest union members. This voluntary self-control is also a mighty bulwark against corruption, and for members' rights, stable labor-management relations, and the public interest.

The internal moves to keep labor's house clean and to scrape off the barnacles or leeches that seek to use the movement for their own selfish ends are also a major protection against ripper legislation which enemies of labor often propose in the false guise of reform. I shall always oppose such hypocritical drives—as in the so-called right-to-work bills—still being pushed in many States. But labor's own record of voluntary action will be its best assurance to the public of the responsibility and maturity which they expect.

The work of the ethical practices committee under the leadership of Al Hayes has been a major step in this direction. I know of no comparable effort by employer groups to rid their ranks of the less-publicized, but no less-prevalent, abuses on management's side. The activities of the ethical practices committee deserve your full support. And I hope that in the internationals, the State and central bodies, and in the locals, as well as at the top level of the AFL–CIO, labor can use this difficult situation in which it has been placed by a small minority of its people, to show the public the essential honesty and responsibility of a movement which has done and must continue to do so much for the achievement of the best promises of American life.

Now let me say this. I have noticed in talking with some rank-and-file unionists that they will excuse the activities of men like Jimmy Hoffa by saying he brings back good contracts to them, he has improved our wages and working conditions, and therefore we do not care what he does, so long as he brings back the bacon for us.

Well, I want to say if that attitude is persisted in, if the activities of corrupt leaders are excused simply because in Robin Hood fashion some of the largess is distributed to the rank and file, the American labor movement will be discredited.

Frequently in politics when some of us have tried to clean up situations we are told, "Well, so and so may be corrupt, but he gets things for the people in his district." And they will excuse him.

What we need in this country is higher ethical standards amongst voters, amongst citizens, amongst employers, amongst professional men, and yes, amongst unionists as well. [Applause.]

In the days when the commies were infiltrating some of the unions and had leadership in some of the unions, some rank-and-file members would say, "Well they may be commies, but they bring back the bacon for us. Why should we oust them?"

Well, thank God the American labor movement has cleaned house in that matter, and I hope we clean house in this matter just as we did in the commie matter. [Applause.]

I can remember the excuses in the 1920's for Sam Insull. When he was bribing the politicians of both parties, people would say, yes, he is a corruptionist, but he turns the lights on for us, or our stock is going up in value. And it was not until there was a financial collapse that Insull lost his standing before the general public. The evils which Samuel Insull sowed in the field of politics in Illinois and Chicago continue until this very day, and it would have been well for the business community of this city if they had shown some moral sense in dealing with Mr. Insull.

I can remember in the summer of 1929, going up and down LaSalle Street, trying to find some businessmen who would help us try to get the financial practices and rate schedules of Mr. Insull probed, and we could only get one man in the entire city of Chicago who was a businessman or a banker to stay with us.

So when people say that labor should clean house, I say, yes, most certainly labor should clean house; but did you clean house on Insull? Are you cleaning house on the people who practice abuses amongst your members? Are we politicians cleaning house as we should?

The truth is that we are sinful and mortal men; but we should try to be better, and for the sake of the labor movement, we folks have to clean house. I say we folks have to clean house because if the Becks, the Hoffas, the Glimcos continue to dominate certain unions, continue to dominate those unions which they now dominate—I have to be careful in what I say—we are in for even worse times than we have at present. Do not let them wrap the flag of the decent honest labor movements around them and drag you down to destruction. Do not let them do it. [Applause.]

THE STEEL STRIKE

Now let me say a word or two about the steel strike. This strike has gone on too long. There is no question but that it affects the entire labor movement and that your interest in the strike, therefore, is as great—if not as direct—as that of the men who are now on the picket line.

The antiunion forces in the country are now making a drive against unions in general. As I have pointed out, these forces wrote provisions into the Landrum-Griffin bill which were aimed at the weak and struggling unions, and at the legitimate activities of stronger unions, in the guise of fighting corruption. The steel industry is further using the cry of "inflation" not only to prevent any forward step in wages or working conditions, but also in an effort to reduce the hard-won rights which now exist.

Now I have examined very carefully the facts which the Department of Labor published only a few days ago on conditions in the steel industry. While hourly wages in the industry averaged $3.10 per hour, when one looks at the average annual earnings of the wage employees, we find that in 1958 these were only $4,840 and, in fact, averaged $510 less than in 1957. Thus, while the industry points to the $3.10 hourly figures in its full-page ads, you and I know that $4,800 per year is barely enough to provide for even the basic needs of a family of five.

But yet we all know that for industry to pay an adequate wage, production must provide the funds to do so. What are the facts about production and productivity in this industry?

The report does not adequately show the tremendous increase in productivity in the steel industry in the first half of 1959, for the Department of Labor combined the figures for the last half of 1958 with the first half of 1959 so that no firm figure for the first 6 months of 1959—when productivity increases have been very high—could be shown.

I believe that working men and women have a right to share in the increase in productivity and the increase in the efficiency of their work. Even from the facts on productivity increase given in the report—which show a 20 point or 13-percent increase in output per man-hour from fiscal year 1958 to fiscal year 1959—it is clear to me that there can be some improvement in wages and working conditions in the steel industry.

This can be based entirely upon increased productivity and can be done without increasing the price of steel or producing inflationary conditions.

These facts present a firm basis on which bargaining in good faith can take place. I say that it is time for the industry to get on with it and try to work out a solution based on the facts. This will benefit the industry, the employees, and the public as a whole.

As you, my friends in the Illinois AFL–CIO, make your plans for the coming year in this convention, I know you recognize that the challenges to the labor movement are great. Your growing power has brought new responsibilities, and an increasing economic, legislative and political pressure from your opponents.

But your opportunities for service to your members, to the underprivileged of all groups, to the economic growth of our country, and to the defense of freedom everywhere are also great.

Now, good friends, it would have been easy for me to have come here, and to have made a conventional speech, saying that all was well in the house of labor, and denouncing the political reactionaries, but ignoring the true issues. But true friends are not those who conceal truth from their friends. Frank speaking, even at personal cost, is necessary in these matters. So I hope that we can go forward, on a double front; that we can cleanse the movement itself, just as John Fitzpatrick and Ed Nockels cleansed the Chicago Federation of Labor 50 years ago, and that at the same time we can defend labor from the attacks of its enemies, get back some of the rights which have been taken away from us, push forward to protect the unorganized and the unskilled, and defend the human and civil rights of all Americans regardless of their race, their color, or their national origin. Thank you very much.

[The delegates responded with a standing ovation.]

To Bridge the Scholarship Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1959, I introduced my bill, H.R. 4220, to provide for a college scholarship program. In this connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues the article by Fred M. Hechinger, education editor of the New York Times, which appeared in the New York Times of September 13, 1959. Mr. Hechinger is also author of "The Big Red Schoolhouse."

The article follows:

TO BRIDGE THE SCHOLARSHIP GAP—LACK OF FUNDS PREVENTS THOUSANDS OF TOP-LEVEL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS FROM GOING ON TO COLLEGE—IS ENOUGH BEING DONE TO CORRECT THIS CONDITION?

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

"Don't tell me that an able boy or girl can't get a college education if he wants it," said my neighbor at a men's service club luncheon in honor of able high school students. "They don't all have to go to expensive schools. There are plenty of scholarships for the really topnotch students. And for the others there are the inexpensive State or municipal colleges."

This view reflects two widely held popular fallacies. The first is that there are enough scholarships to permit all able students who so desire to go to college. There are not. The second is that students attending the relatively low-cost publicly financed institutions of higher learning are not on scholarship. They are—each and every one of them—with the taxpayers providing the scholarship funds. This means that if more students are to be admitted to such institutions, more scholarship money is needed, exactly as would be needed in any effort to admit more needy students to the Ivy League.

For years, the myth has been perpetuated, fed annually by ill-informed, sensational news reports, that vast amounts of scholarship funds go begging. Inevitably the writers manage to dig up a few scholarships left by egotistic eccentrics, attached to so many strings that it is virtually impossible to get the money and a "qualified" student together. But the total amount of such unused money is insignificant.

Significant is the wide and widening gap between the money truly available and the need. What are the facts?

Every recent authoritative study, including that of the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, the report of the National Manpower Council, and the Rockefeller Report on Education, agrees on this central finding: between 100,000 and 200,000 high-school students in the top quarter of their class fail to go to college because they lack the necessary funds.

Consider these basic figures, as published by the Bureau of the Census for the year 1957–58: only 10 percent of the Nation's families had incomes exceeding $10,000 a year; 40 percent were between $5,000 and $10,000; 35 percent between $2,000 and $5,000; the remaining 15 percent below the $2,000 mark.

It is easy to guess from these statistics that the cost of a year at college—including expenses, it may range from $800 to $3,000 in privately financed institutions—places higher education, without scholarship aid, beyond the reach of a substantial number of persons.

Nor has the high cost of learning begun to level off. When colleges open this fall, many of them will have raised their tuition charges again. In 1948 Harvard's tuition was $525; this year it is $1,250. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, reports that the cost of a college education has jumped about 33 percent over the past 4 years and will rise at least as much again during the 4 years ahead. While the colleges have tried to increase scholarship aid to keep up with the rise in tuition, costs keep outrunning the aid dollars needed to keep the doors of higher education open to all who might benefit, regardless of their parents' bank accounts.

Even this does not tell the entire story. As the economic barrier seems to get higher, the psychological barrier becomes more forbidding. Children of noncollege families are in danger of being given the impression at home that college is for the sons and daughters of the rich. In an eastern factory city, with a population of 180,000, the local high schools this year sent only 15 to 20 percent of their graduates to college. A residential suburb, only 10 miles away, sent more than 80 percent. The barrier of economic need was undoubtedly serious; but even a generous supply of scholarships would not have done away with the 60 percentage-point difference—unless there had been, at the same time, firm guidance and counseling, both for students and for parents.

The crux of the matter, however, is money. How much financial aid is actually available? During the past academic year, the Nation's colleges and universities themselves offered their more than 3 million students about $225 million. This sum included all categories of financial assistance—loans, scholarships, campus jobs, fellowships, graduate assistantships, etc. Added to this was another $75 million from all other sources—State, Federal, community, corporate, etc.

The actual amount of bona fide undergraduate academic scholarship aid, not including loans or self-employment, is hard to assess. The most reliable estimates by education authorities place it in the neighborhood of $100 million. If we were to try to send to college the 100,000 to 200,000 able young people who now fail to continue their education because of financial barriers, additional annual scholarships totaling $60 million to $160 million (figuring the average tuition cost at $800) would have to be provided. And this estimate does not, of course, take into account the additional cost that such a program would mean to the colleges in terms of additional outlay for facilities and faculty salaries.

The figures sound forbidding, and it is easy—as well as futile—to haggle over the exact amounts. But whatever the ultimate need, the central fact is clear: present scholarship money is far from sufficient to meet the justifiable demand. Thus we continue to waste a most valuable kind of manpower.

And yet it is misleading to think of the problem as simply one of looking for more money. At least as important is a more realistic concept of the ways in which scholarships ought to be granted. Listen, for instance, to this typical conversation, recorded by the admissions office of a good college:

"How much money can I get?" asks the applicant.

"How much do you need?" the financial aid officer wants to know.

The student thinks for a moment. "I'm not sure I need any help, but Dad told me that I should be able to get a fat scholarship since I'm first in my class and have good college board examination scores," he says.

"Conversations of this kind have been fairly common in the past, but seem to be less so this year," reports Theodore S. Bacon, Jr., associate dean at Amherst College. "With some exceptions, there has been a major shift in the use of scholarship funds during the last decade."

What is the direction of that shift?

As the name itself implies—and it is probably unfortunate that the label has survived—scholarships were originally meant to be financial rewards for outstanding scholastic achievement. Whether or not the student needed such aid was of little importance, and it was not at all unusual for well-to-do parents to boast of their children's scholarships. Mr. Bacon recalls an application for a scholarship from a family which held well over a quarter-million dollars in assets; another from a family which still owed $6,000 on a yacht. "At the other end of the spectrum," he says, "are those with no visible assets. These people will frequently offer their last dollar to provide their children with the type of education that they themselves could never afford."

The unreasonableness of granting scholarships to those who can afford to pay—in addition to the inequities such a system works on the student of limited means—becomes clear when one realizes that even today's skyrocketing tuition at a privately financed college usually covers little more than half the cost of the student's education. The balance must be made up from endowment income and gifts. This means that even the nonscholarship student receives a substantial hidden scholarship. Since it is generally agreed that college teachers are underpaid and should be entitled to whatever additional funds may be found, it is not farfetched to say that each and every professor contributes indirectly to the scholarship aid of many students who don't need it. (In the publicly financed institutions the difference between tuition and actual cost of education is even greater.)

In recent years, however, the trend has been toward financial need as the determining factor in awarding scholarships. While there have been some ideological objections to the means test, the overwhelming majority view seems to be that in order to maintain a free and democratic flow of deserving young people through the academic pipeline, students desiring scholarships should be required to demonstrate both their capacity to study and their need for financial aid. Today 39 States have some form of scholarship program and 21 of them use some kind of means test to determine the amount of the award.

Perhaps the most dramatic move to focus public attention on the scholarship problem was the creation of the national merit scholarships in 1955. Established with two original grants of $20 million from the Ford Foundation and $500,000 from the Carnegie Corp. of New York, the scholarship agency now invites private donors to contribute to the permanent pool. This year's sponsors include about 90 corporations, foundations, and professional associations. Each merit scholarship is named for its sponsor and represents a commitment within a range of $4,500 to $6,000.

Here, too, the principle of need has been carefully incorporated. A minimum stipend of $100 annually for 4 years goes to winners who are not in need of aid. But the average grant is about $730 a year, with the maximum set at $1,500. While the total number of grants—850 were given in April—seems insignificant, the impact far exceeds these figures: more than 14,500 high schools entered 480,000 students in the 1958–59 competition; there were 10,000 finalists, and a study of last year's contest showed that several million dollars' worth of other scholarships came to the aid of those remaining finalists who did not win merit scholarships.

From the point of view of dealing realistically with the financial crisis of higher education, not just the scholarship dilemma, the most important aspect of the merit scholarship idea may well be that each grant carries with it an unrestricted gift to the college of the student's choice. This contribution, which relieves the college of the burden of its own "hidden" scholarship, may range up to $500 a year, depending on the institution's tuition charge. (Similar matching grants are now also offered in conjunction with some corporate scholarships.)

On their own, business and industry in recent years have substantially expanded their scholarship programs. General Motors, for example, recently selected 118 winners from a field of 20,000 students competing for awards ranging in value from $200 to $2,000 a year for 4 years, according to need. (More and more scholarships are now given on a 4-year basis, eliminating the traditional problem that arose when students were started on their academic careers without sufficient help to make it possible for them to follow through to graduation.) The list of benefactors is expanding and now includes advertising agencies, publications, manufacturers, and retailers. Local 32–B, Building Service Employees, is only one of a number of labor unions which have joined the scholarship pool.

Efforts are also being made to supply the colleges with fuller information on the financial status of scholarship applicants. A most constructive step in this direction was taken recently by the college entrance examination board through creation of the college scholarship service. Under this program, parents of scholarship applicants file a detailed, confidential statement—an elaborate form that looks more complicated than a Federal income tax blank—giving a complete picture of every aspect of the family's financial obligations. The service then sends copies of this statement to all the colleges listed as possible choices by the parents.

As of this term, according to C.S.S. Director Rexford G. Moon, Jr., about 210 colleges, among them some of the top institutions, will be members of the program. These colleges, he says, control 60 to 65 percent of all dollars currently given by colleges and universities in financial aid.

In addition to direct financial aid, student loan funds are open to many men and women at the college level. The subject of loan funds is a good deal more controversial than that of scholarships. Some persons consider it immoral to burden a student with a debt repayable at the end of his college career. Those in favor reply that installment buying is now a way of life and add that experience has shown that higher education is a safe and productive investment for qualified students. Mr. Moon estimates that a student who contributes earnings from a summer job can probably get by with a loan of about $500 a year. "At this rate," he says, "no student would owe more than $2,000 at graduation, a figure somewhere between 30 and 50 percent of his first year's salary."

A loan program, incidentally, is operated under terms of the National Defense Education Act. Each college that wishes to participate must match every nine Federal dollars with $1 of its own. It is interesting to note that in recent months a number of institutions have refused to accept such funds in protest against the provision that students benefiting from the money must sign loyalty oaths.

Whatever aid is forthcoming from Federal or private student loan programs, most observers believe the key to making higher learning available to more qualified persons, regardless of economic status, is increased scholarship funds. They also agree that the burden of providing such aid cannot continue to be met by the colleges. As it is, the colleges are putting about $43 million of current income a year toward scholarships—and this in addition to the built-in, hidden scholarship aid offered to all tuition-paying students.

Recently some colleges have begun seriously to question the entire present pricing structure of higher learning. Last year, Bennington College became the first institution to rebel against the hidden scholarship tradition. It increased its total charge to $2,650—$1,600 for tuition and $1,050 for room, board and health services. But the charge is adjusted to each student's financial situation and monthly payment plans and low-cost loans are offered.

The scholarship problem is still with us. The best that can be said at this point is that financial need as a criterion for granting aid will more and more become the determining factor. If the Bennington experiment should be the beginning of a trend to charge those who can afford it the full cost of their children's education, then it is likely that even the State universities will have to consider raising their relatively low tuitions.

But whatever the course of the future, the high and still rising cost of college for the great mass of lower income families will have to be met by increasing scholarship aid from a multitude of sources: public-spirited citizens and organizations, business and industry, the States and probably, before too long, the Federal Government. The current trend away from haphazard handouts is encouraging. As this trend leads to a meaningful, comprehensive aid program, there is hope that the needy student and available aid dollars will meet as a matter of course.

This will still cost a great deal, but not nearly as much as the waste of human talent which our country must currently enter each year on the debit side of the manpower ledger.

Rev. Ralph J. Diefenbach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the tragic plane-crash death of Rev. Ralph J. Diefenbach saddened thousands of Texans. Few men have crowded such a full and good life into 45 years.

He was truly a man who lived to serve his fellow man, and in so doing became a legendary figure while still in the prime of life.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following material on this outstanding American:

A resolution by the Houston-Harris County Tuberculosis Association.

A story from the June 13 Houston Chronicle entitled "Father Diefenbach's Tragic Death Is Serious Loss to Church and City."

A story from the June 11 Houston Chronicle entitled "Plane Crash That Killed Priest, Three Others Probed."

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE HOUSTON-HARRIS COUNTY TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION

"Whereas the sum total of human progress results from the selfless service to mankind of those to whom humanity is more important than self and human welfare is the purpose of life rather than personal gain, and the service that a man performs is the only measure of his achievement and his worth; and

"Whereas Father Ralph J. Diefenbach, who proudly and humbly identified himself only as a parish priest, yet whose boundless faith and energy always kept him active and conspicuous in innumerable affairs in which the well-being of his fellow men, both within and outside his own Catholic faith, was in his short life and forever after shall be a magnificent symbol of the Christ-centered life and a strengthening inspiration to all men who yearn and strive to do their duty to God and man, who devotedly served his parishioners as the good shepherd of the flock, yet found time also to serve those of other faiths whose needs came to his attention, ever showing sympathy, understanding, enduring patience, and love; and

"Whereas in countless ways and places the mark of this man of God has been left, always lifting those whom it has touched, making Houston a cleaner, better, and more

Christian community, thereby benefiting every citizen; and

"Whereas more especially Father Diefenbach has effectively served and led in the public service program of the association, and has been a servant of God and humankind who can never be replaced, and whose death has left a vacancy that will never be filled: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Houston-Harris County Tuberculosis Association, jointly as a corporate body and as the individual citizens of whom it consists, express its deepest and most profound gratitude for the incomparable work and example bequeathed the citizenry of Houston and Harris County by Father Diefenbach, and spread across its official records for perpetuation in its permanent archives verbal evidence of this expression in humble gratitude to God for giving the community this Christ bearer."

In witness whereof, the undersigned have caused their signatures to be affixed hereto, this 14th day of September, anno Domini, 1959.

ROBERT V. MOISE,
President.

C. A. NEAL PICKETT,
Secretary.

EMMELINE RENIS,
Executive Director.

G. MAXFIELD TAYLOR,
Vice President.

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 12, 1959]

FATHER DIEFENBACH'S TRAGIC DEATH IS SERIOUS LOSS TO CHURCH AND CITY

The tragic death of Rev. Ralph J. Diefenbach in the crash of his light plane, along with three friends from Dallas, has saddened many thousands of Houstonians who knew the priest as one of the city's outstanding religious and civic leaders.

Father Diefenbach was a man of many talents and boundless energy. First and foremost a parish priest, and one of the most effective in the entire Galveston diocese, he also was indefatigable in a broad range of civic activities. He was a musician and a producer of television programs.

Only 45 years of age, he had packed a vast amount of accomplishment into his two decades as a priest, so much so as to become almost a legendary figure while still in his prime.

After serving as assistant pastor of St. Joseph's Church here, Father Diefenbach became a chaplain in the Army and rose to the rank of major. In 1945 he became internationally known when he returned the hand of St. Stephen to Budapest. Refused permission by the Russians to cross the Iron Curtain, he delivered the Hungarians' prized religious relic to Cardinal Mindszenty anyway.

Returning to Houston, he was assigned to take over the newly created St. Theresa's parish. He built the church, school, and Parish. He built the church, school, and other structures on the church property and remained pastor until his death. His outstanding work in establishing the Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies won for him the Father Kenna award, highest honor of the Holy Name Society. He was the first priest in the Southwest to receive this honor. He also was active in the Catholic Youth Organization.

In the past 14 years Father Diefenbach had served on a great number of boards of civic, cultural, and philanthropic, as well as religious, organizations. He was widely known and admired. Among his many other activities he had been police chaplain here since 1955.

[From the Houston Chronicle, June 11, 1959]

PLANE CRASH THAT KILLED PRIEST, THREE OTHERS PROBED

A team of Government investigators Thursday combed the wreckage of a private plane, to determine the cause of the crash which killed Rev. Ralph J. Diefenbach and three other persons.

The craft plummeted to earth shortly after taking off from Andrau Air Park Wednesday afternoon.

The victims were: Father Diefenbach, 45, owner of the Cessna four-place plane and pastor of St. Theresa's Catholic Church; Ray J. Lockwood, 48, of Dallas, an Army Quartermaster Corps auditor; Mrs. Katherine Lockwood, 41, Lockwood's wife, and their 13-year-old daughter, Patricia Lockwood.

Charles Finch, of Fort Worth, is heading the Civil Aeronautics Board investigating team.

A preliminary inquiry by Emerson Carpenter, CAA safety agent here, failed to establish the cause.

APPEARED TO STALL

A witness said Father Diefenbach's plane appeared to stall while making a left turn at 300 feet, following takeoff.

A spokesman at Andrau Air Park said the flying priest failed to regain control of the plane as it plunged earthward after flipping over on its back.

He said the plane had been righted just before the impact, then skidded 40 feet along the ground before the left wing tip caught the ground, and wrapped the craft up like a ball.

The four bodies were found badly mangled and crumpled together behind the engine in the plane's cabin. Safety belts still restrained the bodies.

PLANNING VISIT

Carpenter said the plane was en route to Galveston, where Mrs. Lockwood and her daughter planned to visit a relative, Mrs. W. L. Nelson.

Lockwood was to have returned to Houston with Father Diefenbach.

Father Diefenbach, a licensed pilot, had served as police chaplain here since 1955.

He received international attention shortly after the end of World War II, when he returned one of Hungary's most prized religious relics—the hand of St. Stephen—to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

The relic was removed from its treasure trove during the war and became lost.

American soldiers found the relic—hand of Hungary's first king—and Father Diefenbach, a chaplain with Gen. George Patton's 3d Army, was assigned the task of returning the prize.

ESTABLISHED PARISH

He established the parish of St. Theresa's at 6622 Haskell in 1946, after being discharged from the Army's Chaplain Corps as a major. He also was spiritual adviser to the Holy Name Union of the Diocese of Galveston.

Under his 13-year leadership, St. Theresa's built a new church, a 17-classroom school, library, cafeteria, and rectory. The parish membership exceeds 1,000 families.

Father Diefenbach was the recipient of the 1956 Father McKerns Award from the Holy Name Society.

The award is the Holy Name Society's highest priestly honor, and is given to only two U.S. priests each year.

Father Diefenbach was the first priest from the Southwest to receive the honor.

He was cited by the society for the "excellence of your work in establishing the Galveston Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, and in fostering its gratifying growth since 1952."

CIVIC LEADER

Father Diefenbach was active in numerous civic and welfare organizations, and helped mold Houston's Catholic youth organization.

He was a graduate of St. Thomas High School in Houston, and of St. Mary's Seminary here.

Father Diefenbach served as a lieutenant colonel with the 143d Infantry Regiment of the Texas National Guard's 36th Division.

He was well known as a television director and a musician.

The Lockwoods were personal friends.

They are survived by another daughter, Ann, 19, who did not accompany her parents to Houston.

Rev. Thomas M. Cemon, pastor of St. Michael's Catholic Church, and a personal friend of Father Diefenbach, was summoned to the crash scene to administer last rites over the bodies of the victims.

WITNESSED CRASH

Rico Rodriguez of 4009 Artdale, a maintenance worker at the airfield, witnessed the crash. He told investigators:

"I watched the plane as it left the runway. It headed into the wind and climbed quickly. It must have been a little too quickly, for the plane seemed to stall. Then it nosed over and plunged straight down."

Father Diefenbach, an accomplished pilot for more than 10 years, had purchased his second-hand airplane early this year.

The Vexing Problems of Our Aging Population Demand Affirmative Legislative Action

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, although the desperate plight of the aged has been apparent for years, it has been reemphasized by the White House Conference on Aging Act, approved by the 85th Congress, together with recent testimony before a Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

That the problems of our elderly citizens are not to be minimized is clearly revealed by highlights in the testimony given before the special Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

It is disclosed that there are some 15 million Americans 65 years of age or over, which represents an increase of over 400 percent in the number since the turn of the century. It is estimated that by 1975 the number of Americans who have passed 65 years of age will be 20 million.

In his testimony before the special Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, it was predicted by Dr. Maurice E. Linden, director of the Philadelphia Mental Health Division, that—

In the year 2000, Americans will enjoy an average longevity of 82 years.

He added:

Physiologists tell us that the human physical and chemical organism is so designed

and engineered by nature as to be capable of living to 125 years providing no impeding disease occurs.

The immensity of the problem of finding a solution to the needs of the aged and aging was admitted by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Department of Health, Education, and welfare consultant when he told the Senate subcommittee that "the very size and complexity of development of service for our aged makes overall planning for such services difficult."

Meanwhile, over 15 million Americans 65 years or over are struggling for existence on pitifully low incomes. For example, three-fifths of them in 1958 had annual incomes of less than $1,000; one-fifth had incomes between $1,000 and $2,000; while the remaining fifth had incomes of more than $2,000. When you consider the fact that the value of the dollar is about 48 cents, it is not difficult to realize the agonizing plight of over 15 million Americans, whose toil and taxes in their productive years made a major contribution to the future welfare and growth of this Republic.

Another disconcerting fact is that there are millions of our aged who through no fault of their own were denied the opportunity while employable to acquire social-security coverage with the result that now in their declining years, they are forced to rely on the public-assistance programs in the various States, which carry the stigma of charity in the minds of many recipients.

The overall problem of our aged is growing in its intensity when it is remembered that in the United States in 1900 there were only 3 million people over 65 as compared to over 15 million in 1959. When you consider the recent statement by the U.S. Public Health Service that a child born in 1958 could expect to live 69½ years, the lengthening of the life span through the development of miracle drugs and the advancement of medical science presents convincing evidence to support the assertion that the problems of the aged are constant and not diminishing.

Meanwhile, amid the suffering and privation of millions of our elderly citizens, a series of studies, conferences, and congressional hearings have proceeded year after year in an effort to cope with the most compelling social problem facing this Nation. Yet while we grope our way toward a solution to the distressing problems of our aged, they in turn have found the expression "the golden years of retirement" an empty and meaningless phrase.

In the field of legislation, since my election to the 76th Congress 20 years ago, each succeeding Congress has had a variety of legislative measures pending before it designed to provide an adequate and uniform old-age pension law. Unfortunately, we have never been given the opportunity to consider fully old-age pension legislation, with one exception, and that was during the 76th Congress, when the House of Representatives defeated the original Townsend plan, which has since been modified and reintroduced in succeeding Congresses by a host of Members on both sides of the aisle.

During this 1st session of the 86th Congress, the revised version of the Townsend bill is exemplified by H.R. 4000 and H.R. 4001, which are identical bills embodying the Townsend plan for national insurance. Over a score of Members of the House of Representatives, representing both political parties, have gone on record as expressing their willingness to become cosponsors of the legislation.

Briefly, the 1959 Townsend plan as embodied in H.R. 4000 and H.R. 4001 is presented as an amendment to the Social Security Act, repealing or suspending, as the applicable case may be, the various provisions of old-age, survivors, and Federal disability insurance and instituting in place thereof the Townsend plan program under title II of the act.

Sponsors of H.R. 4000 and H.R. 4001 point out that the features of the Townsend plan bill include coverage for all American citizens alike; double the average benefits of the aged and disabled on social security; greatly reduce costs of public assistance on the State and Federal levels; automatically adjust benefits to changes in costs of living; wipe out fear of poverty in old age; and end loss of purchasing power by Americans aged and disabled; thus maintaining high employment.

In view of the fact that this 1st session of the 86th Congress is nearing adjournment, there is no possible chance of securing committee or floor action on H.R. 4000 or H.R. 4001. For that reason and since during my congressional career I have devoted much time and study to the problems of our elderly citizens who as a group are increasing over three times as rapidly as the rest of our adult population, it is my sincere hope that early in the next session of the 86th Congress which will convene in January it will be possible to secure legislative action on H.R. 4000 and H.R. 4001. It is my considered judgment that in view of the mounting seriousness of the plight of the aged that concerted action must be taken on securing hearings on the legislation so that its merits may be presented publicly.

Such action is imperative in view of the compelling need to rescue our elderly citizens from their plight and thereby restore attractiveness and worthwhile meaning to the descriptive pharse, "the golden years of retirement."

The Straightened Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some weeks ago I inserted some material in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which was in the nature of an answer to certain observations carried in Newsweek magazine with respect to the efficiency of the postal service.

Since that time there has come to my attention an article in the Postmasters Gazette for September 1959, written by Charles E. Puskar, the national secretary of the National Postmasters Association, under the title of "The Straightened Record." I believe this data should also be inserted in the interest of accuracy and in justice to the splendid work being done by the Post Office Department under the very capable and dedicated direction of Arthur Summerfield, the Postmaster General. I therefore ask unanimous consent to submit Mr. Puskar's article as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STRAIGHTENED RECORD

(By Charles E. Puskar)

There have been few items appearing on this page of the Postmasters Gazette which have aroused such a widespread and passionate response as the reproduction of the letter which I wrote, as a national officer of our association, refuting the libels and untruths contained in a recent article in Newsweek magazine, entitled "Why Your Mail Was Late."

Postmasters from all over the country wrote in words of encouragement and approval. Many of them wrote letters themselves to the editor of the erring magazine. Congressmen expressed their agreement in writing. In fact, the response has been so great that I find I must acknowledge it in these columns rather than answering through individual letters. There simply isn't time to do the polite thing in this case, but I want you to know that I appreciate every communication and President Baker and I are extremely gratified that the membership feels the way it does on this most important issue.

Some postmasters have asked permission to have my letter to Newsweek reproduced in their local newspapers. This is not only permitted but recommended, so that our patrons will know that the accusations in the Newsweek article were false.

The only response that has been lacking has been that of Newsweek magazine itself. Not only has it refused to print the official letter from the National Association of Postmasters protesting the slur on our ethics and our efficiency but it has refused to print any of the other letters from aggrieved postmasters refuting their specious and self-interested arguments.

I did receive a letter from a Mr. Dwight W. Norris, signed "For the Editors," but this is in no way a reply. Mr. Norris makes no attempt to answer, or to apologize for, the witless insult which his editors spawned and broadcast against all postmasters, all postal employees, and against the postal service itself. Instead, his three-page letter consists of an attempt to prove that the article was in many ways favorable to the Post Office Department and the service for which it is responsible.

Of course, no apology will ever be forthcoming. The argument that postmasters (and other employees) are little more than political hacks has been used for years by the advocates of continued low rates for magazines, with the inference that the postal deficit is due to our inefficiency and not to the bargain-counter rates which they continue to pay.

Any admission of error on the part of the editors of Newsweek would be like an admission of flagrant heresy on the part of a ranking churchman. It would be something that could not be tolerated. If the publishers ever admitted the truth—that the Postal Establishment is manned by more than half a million sincere and dedicated public serv-

ants who are doing a tremendous job of moving the U.S. mails despite manifest and manifold difficulties and obstacles—they would have to develop a new line of argument, and they have been unable to do this during the last 30 years of organized opposition to postage rate increases. It may even be true that these publishers and editors are beginning to believe their own arguments.

The able columnists of Newsweek continue each week to inveigh against high Government spending and inflation. However, when the case of postage rates comes up, the attitude of the editors is consistent and unalterable. They simply don't care who is holding the Federal cow as long as they can continue to milk it.

Louis Kossuth, Hungarian Patriot (1802–94)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Louis Kossuth is undoubtedly the most colorful, the most venerated, and the best-known Hungarian in the modern history of the Hungarian people. He is at the same time one of the great pioneers and brave fighters for national freedom and democratic government in 18th century Europe. In addition, Kossuth may also be considered the greatest patriot of modern Hungary, and quite properly the father of modern Hungarian nationalism.

Lajos, or Louis, Kossuth was born in the small town of Manok in Hungary on September 19, 157 years ago, and was the son of a country lawyer. As the oldest of four children, he was originally destined to follow in his father's footsteps. At 19 he had already completed his studies at the University of Budapest and was back in Manok practicing law with his father. His talents and amiability, and his zeal for doing something good and extraordinary, at once won him great popularity. In 1825 he was appointed a deputy member of the National Diet (Parliament). He held that post first for a 2-year term, and then for another year in 1832. During those years had begun the formation of a Hungarian national party. Soon Kossuth became prominent among the liberal leaders of that party. In the late 1830's he began the circulation of his famous newsletters which included speeches made but not published at the National Diet. This was not to the government's liking, and attempts were made to suppress the newsletters. Then in 1837 he was arrested on a charge of high treason and condemned to 4 years' imprisonment. This imprisonment, it is said, served Kossuth well. There he had time to study the Bible and Shakespeare and acquired a wonderful knowledge of English.

Upon his release he became the editor of a newly founded liberal party paper. Thenceforth Kossuth was not content with reforms alone. By his violent attacks on Austrian authorities he aroused the Hungarian national pride. The government in Vienna was alarmed by his popularity, and attempts were made—by Metternich himself—to quiet him by the offer of a lucrative government post. But Kossuth was not to be bribed. In 1847 he was elected to the Diet in Budapest. There he became the leader of the extreme liberals. His eloquence and his impassioned appeals in dramatic situations made him the national leader of all liberals and nationalists. And in March of 1848, when the news of the Paris revolution reached Budapest, at once he became the leader of the European revolution. Again the government attempted to quiet him down by taking him into the Cabinet as Finance Minister. But Kossuth's soul still yearned for national freedom and liberation from the Austrian yoke. In July he had asked his countrymen to arm in self defense, in defiance of the government in Vienna. Soon the country was fighting the Austrians, and Budapest was under attack. In this struggle Hungarians fought heroically under Kossuth's leadership, and for more than a year they held back their superior foes, until the latter were joined by the Russian forces from the east. Thus caught between two powerful forces, Hungary's spirit of freedom, generated by Kossuth, was crushed in August of 1849, and Kossuth himself barely saved himself by escaping to Turkey.

With his forced departure from Hungary, Kossuth's career as the leader of his people in Hungary was at an end. Eventually he went to England, and there he was given a hero's welcome. In 1851 he came to this country, where he was welcomed with similar honors. He returned to Europe and lived the rest of his life in Italy, where he died on March 24, 1894. His body was taken to Budapest, and there he was buried amid the mourning of the whole nation.

Today freedom-loving and brave Hungarians may not be allowed to observe the birthday anniversary of their great patriot and loving fellow man, but we in the free world join all Hungarians in the free world in honoring the blessed memory of this great fighter for freedom and liberty on the 157th anniversary of his birth.

Lesson of History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following very interesting editorial which appeared in the Lawrence (Mass.) Sunday Sun:

LESSON OF HISTORY

"History repeats itself" is rather a worn-out expression. It is not always so. It is not a rule. But it always is a possibility.

We wonder if, as a nation, we have learned the facts of life. People who stop to think about it are able to recollect with grim clarity the visit of two Japanese diplomats to Washington back in 1941 on a mission of peace.

While they were here, being wined and dined by ever-trustful Americans, the Armed Forces of their country attacked Pearl Harbor, precipitating the bloodiest, most costly war in all history. That we were caught flatfooted is an embarrassing fact.

It took us years, tremendous loss of life and incredible amounts of money to work ourselves out of the mess created by trust and antipathy.

For those who doubt our stage of unpreparedness, there still are available pictures of American soldiers training in the field and equipped with broomsticks for machine guns.

We are considerably better off today than we were then. Roosevelt, the arch politician, was President. Today, we have a dyed-in-the-wool soldier as President—a man who served with distinction in that debacle World War II.

We think Dwight D. Eisenhower has a good grasp of the situation and the possibilities reposing therein. He has kept our muscles functioning militarily. We have a good Army, a superb Navy, and a powerful Air Force. As to the latter and perhaps the most vital factor in our defense, we hope we have more than just a few working models of those superplanes we see on our screens.

Mr. Khrushchev has been a guest in our country during the past week. Maybe his visit is all on the up-and-up. But we don't know why we should trust the Communists, in the light of what happened in the case of the Japanese. The latter were bent on world conquest. Their goal was to dominate and enslave the world. The Communists have the same objective.

This is a terrible age in which we live, with the threat of war surrounding us. But it is no worse than it ever has been. We can recall World War I. We were unprepared then, as we were for World War II. Actually, we were not quite ready for war with Spain in the dying years of the 19th century. But, as in the cases of the subsequent two world wars, we threw all we had into it and won it. It has been the same down through history. We were always off guard, with never enough to go around; but we came out all right in the end.

No one dreamed, in 1898, or in 1917, or in 1941, that in 1959 the worst conflict of them all would be in the making. No one dreamed of the intervening episode of Korea, where we took a bitter beating because Henry Truman so ordained it at a time when our forces in that far-off land had the enemy on the run.

With Khrushchev here on what might be termed a mission of peace, we should keep history in mind. It has a way of repeating itself. The diplomats, the statesmen, do not fight a war. They go into action only when they are in a position to play the cards. Thankfully, we are watchful today against a stacked deck—and we must maintain that watch so long as there are people like Khrushchev stalking the world.

The Republican Record in the 86th Congress, 1st session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party gave America

three great gifts in the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

A major breakthrough on world peace.

A closely balanced budget.

A law to clean the crooks and power-grabbers out of unions.

Not one of these tremendous attainments would have been given a ghost of a chance last January. And Democrats fought the balanced budget and effective labor reform right down to the wire.

The breakthrough for peace was a personal victory for President Eisenhower. His European visits cemented Western unity in advance of the exchange of visits between himself and Nikita Khrushchev. Coupled with Vice President NIXON's triumphant trips to Russia and Poland, the President's mission erased the myth that America has no friends abroad. America can be proud of them both.

Though no one man, no one party, and no single nation can guarantee a permanent peace, the Republican President has taken the boldest, most imaginative steps toward that goal of any statesman on the globe.

Today the whole world knows—and Khrushchev had the opportunity to learn—that the cold war can be brought to an end. The world already knew that under President Eisenhower's leadership peace has been maintained for 7 years, without appeasement of Russia or Red China.

The nearly balanced budget represents another Republican miracle. And clear proof that voters will respond to a sound, pay-as-you-go principle in Government finance, resisting the "free money" bait which the Democrats attached to nearly the whole of their vast spending programs.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress once again established the Republican Party as the party which stands for a sound, honest dollar.

The first session also reestablished the Democrat Party as the spending party. The session had scarcely begun before the spenders had introduced bills carrying an estimated 5-year price tag of more than $117 billion, most of it in addition to the carefully trimmed $77.1 billion budget submitted by the President.

Democrats advanced budget-busting airport, housing, and community facilities measures, but no plan for financing these projects. The delicately balanced budget depended upon additional revenues before new programs could be undertaken.

By the end of the session, action or inaction by the spenders had pushed the budget figure up to nearly $79 billion. While they trimmed regular appropriations requests, they boosted authorizations for future spending, some of it by the "back door" route which bypasses the regular appropriations committees. The so-called decreases do not cover, for example, $231 million in authorizations for "back door" spending not sought by the President.

Nevertheless, a near miracle occurred. The pace of the spenders slowed. Repeated warnings by the President and the Republican leadership brought carloads of mail demanding economy. The Democrats' wasteful housing bill, after a series of setbacks, including two Presidential vetoes, was revamped to the administration's position and passed. The spenders' bills seeking wildly extravagant funds for depressed area relief and aid to education failed to emerge. The spenders' wasteful proposals for airport construction were abandoned in conference, and a less costly measure substituted.

It is clear that but for Republican leadership, backed by strong public demand for economy, 1960 Federal spending would have been far more than the total finally approved. There is a chance that a balanced budget as sought by the President, may yet be achieved before the close of the fiscal year because of revenue increases.

Strong and constructive labor reform legislation was another Republican achievement which seemed impossible last January. Efforts to strengthen the Taft-Hartley Act failed last year. Few thought a good bill could survive this year.

And here the Democrats presented a curious spectacle. On the one hand, a special Senate committee had produced the evidence of union abuses which clearly showed a strong bill was necessary. Yet somehow the Democrats sponsored only weak bills in which they had considerable help by union bosses.

The turnaround came after President Eisenhower's televised address to the Nation which crystallized the whole picture of union corruption and the need for a cleanup law. Again a courageous band of Republicans in Congress followed through on the public demand for reform which the President's address created.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, as finally signed by President Eisenhower, is not an antilabor bill. It is prounion and propublic.

It guarantees many basic rights to labor union members. Among these are equal rights to union members in the conduct of union affairs; protection against arbitrary dues increases; protection of the right to sue; free and fair union elections; safeguards against improper disciplinary action and protection of union funds.

At the same time, Democrats themselves admit that the bill will destroy no basic union rights.

The bill's strong ban on secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing protects the public against abuse of union monopoly powers, and the provision giving State labor boards jurisdiction over disputes now refused by the National Labor Relations Board will strengthen the hand of small business in labor disputes.

Before leaving this labor reform issue, it is interesting to recall that while some union leaders can be expected to attack the Republican Party for legislation which would curb their abuse of power, their complaints go far beyond the labor issue. Republican efforts to curb extravagance in public housing and farm programs, for example, also bring attacks by the so-called union leaders, although these issues have nothing to do with labor.

But if improved hopes for peace, less Federal spending, and real labor reform were the main Republican achievements in this session of Congress, there are many others which fall closely behind these measures.

During the whole session, the President and the Republican Members fought to refinance the growing costs of the vital 41,000 mile Interstate Highway System. The Highway Trust Fund, set up 3 years ago to receive special revenues for highway building, was nearly exhausted. Over $2 billion was needed to keep the program going in fiscal 1960. There were two ways to get this money. One was through an additional Federal tax on gasoline. The other was through transfer of the $2 billion-plus from the general fund of the Treasury. This last step would only have meant postponing a tax increase.

The President believed that the wiser course was to face up to the tax increase this year, and a 1 cent per gallon tax on gasoline finally was agreed upon. This increase will be applied only until July 1, 1961. Thereafter, about half of the present excise taxes on autos and parts and accessories will be transferred from the general fund to the highway fund. These steps will permit work on the Intersate System to continue, though at a slightly reduced rate.

Though Democrats took the "easy way" of cutting the President's foreign aid requests, Republicans in the House pushed through a bill—H.R. 7500—calling upon the Secretary of State to set up an Office of Inspector General and Comptroller to enforce fiscal responsibility in any and all mutual security programs.

Statehood for Hawaii, a Republican platform pledge, succeeded with the personal backing of the President and strong bipartisan support. The new State will raise the Senate membership to 100 and House membership temporarily to 437.

SUMMARY

The basic Republican achievement in the first session was to demonstrate that, despite the Democratic majorities elected in 1958, public opinion still supports government in the public interest. The session also showed that President Eisenhower and Republican Members in Congress were capable of recognizing their opportunity for leadership and forcefully carrying through. At the close of the session, the Nation's confidence still rests with President Eisenhower and the Republicans in Congress.

Visit of Nikita Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked when I read in the press about the Department of State's preparations for the welcoming ceremonies for Mr. Nikita Khrushchev. His visit to the

United States is an insult to all of the subjugated nations for whom America is the ideal of democracy and a beacon of hope. It blasts the hopes of captive people everywhere and strengthens the hand that holds them down.

Moral principle alone should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to our enemy. Passage of time does not outlaw the murder of an individual or a nation, and Mr. Khrushchev is the ruthless dictator who ordered Russian tanks to smash the Hungarian freedom movement, rose to prominence as the hangman of the Ukraine, and maintains himself in power as the butcher of Budapest.

May I remind you of some of Mr. Khrushchev's statements such as, "We shall bury you" and "Your grandchildren will live under socialism," and I charge that he has no interest in peace and never intends to make any contribution toward it.

I characterize this visit as a 1959 Pearl Harbor by the Premier of the most brutal government and political philosophy of all history. I warn that we must not become infected by the Communist virus being brought here by Nikita as a representative of a system of atheistic tyranny.

While the Premier is here, church bells should ring on behalf of the people slaughtered behind the Iron Curtain, and prayers should be said over and over again for the enslaved people of the world and true peace on earth.

Let us not overlook the fact that the President of the United States is the head of a state and is entitled to a higher degree of courtesy than Mr. Khrushchev who, technically and legally, is not the head of a state.

Resettlement of Arab Refugees—A Significant Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Gideon Weigert as it appeared in the American Zionist, September 1959 issue:

RESETTLEMENT OF ARAB REFUGEES—A SIGNIFICANT START

(By Gideon Weigert)

JERUSALEM.—On July 1 was inaugurated International Refugee Year, and once again the attention of the world has become focused on the situation of these distressed people, among them the 700,000 Palestine Arab refugees. These since 1948 have been living in several Arab host countries, where UNRWA is looking after their minimum wants in the way of food, children's education, vocational training, health, and social welfare.

But after all is said and done, what has been achieved in making a start in actually solving the problem, and what practical steps exist to bring about a solution in the not too distant future?

Up-to-date projects have been initiated both in Jordan and Israel. Though limited in scale, these have the target of attempting to make a start in breaking the ice and to resettle such refugees on the land. This article will deal with some of the merits of these two schemes, their failures and achievements.

In December 1955 the Jordan Government enforced emergency defense regulations as renewed waves of violence broke out against the 4-year-old Majali government in Amman, which had intended to negotiate adherence of the country to the Baghdad Pact.

Objects attacked by the Egyptian-incited masses included the Arab development project for refugees, financed mainly by Iraq and operated by Mussa Alami. Serious damage was caused to the project. Its farm near Jericho's Allenby Bridge over the Jordan River suffered huge financial damages.

Several months passed before the man who had initiated this unique project could weather the shock. But soon Mussa Alami began his activities anew as if nothing had happened. The refugee workers who had dispersed all over the Hashemite kingdom during the blood riots returned. Alami then proceeded to the United States to collect funds for his project. Contributions came from various sources, and today the traveler going through the Jordan Valley near Alami's farm near Jericho will again find the desert in bloom, an oasis nestling in the wilderness.

What is this Arab development project, the first and only constructive Arab scheme of its kind to resettle the Palestine Arab refugees ever to be carried out? And who is Mussa Alami, its director?

For decades, the name of Mussa Alami had been associated with the politics of Palestine Arabs. His last post, toward the termination of the British mandate in Palestine, was director general of the Arab propaganda offices in Washington and London. When in 1946 Mussa Bey, as he is generally known, left the political stage, he turned to a field of activities hitherto completely unknown in the Arab world: an Arab development project for Palestine Arabs.

The idea had sprung up as early as 1945 at the foundation convention in Alexandria, Egypt, of the six-member Arab League. Early in 1946 the league's Council decided that a project should be established which would enable the Palestine Arab farmer to develop his land in such a way as to obviate his being in a state of chronic indebtedness, a situation which inevitably forced him to sell his land.

That meant development, intensification of cultivation, and modern methods of irrigation being introduced. The Council decided that the sum of £1 million should be raised by the member states toward this project. However, as with so many other plans decided upon by the league, this one too, remained mere ink on paper. Internal disputes, intrigue, and rivalry, all these made it certain that the decision would never be implemented.

The only Arab state which gave the plan serious consideration was Iraq, which early in 1946 allocated £250,000 to help put it into effect. This actually represented Alami's sole capital in launching the project. Singlehanded, he set out in 1947 to purchase a tract of desert land, comprising 8,000 dunams (2,000 acres) in the Wadi Araba Valley near Allenby Bridge. At a later stage, he bought an additional area of 12,000 dunams (3,000 acres).

With the outbreak of the Arab-Jewish hostilities at the end of 1947, Alami's activities came to a temporary standstill, and were not resumed until the beginning of 1949. He then proclaimed that the most immediate aim of his project was to gather together refugees and farmers, and to raise their morale by bringing them back to the land, and to create from them a new nation.

The beginning took the familiar pattern of all resettlement schemes in this part of the world—a desperate search for fresh water sources in the desert. More than 10 of the first drillings proved failures. Finally, in 1950, water was struck and for the first time the foundation for the first resettlement project for Palestine Arab refugees was laid.

Since then, 25 additional wells have been drilled, more than 3,500 dunams have been prepared for intensive cultivation, and more than 400 refugees have found a new and permanent home.

Through the years the project operated 24 different crafts and agricultural branches. By the middle of this year Alami had expected to have 8,000 dunams under full cultivation. The annual income from the project's agricultural yield reached the £5,000 mark, and its director became convinced that he would soon be able to cover all his running expenses.

Most of the income came from vineyards, banana and date groves, and citrus fruit, but the workshops for carpentry, shoemaking, tailoring, and mechanical work were also beginning to show a profit.

An interesting aspect of the situation is that the Jordan Government, in whose territory the Alami project existed all this time, had never contributed a penny toward the maintenance of this unique Arab endeavor. No one knows better than the Jews of Israel that there is no more difficult task to achieve than to conquer the desert. There is no doubt that Alami and his handful of assistants have shown commendable stubbornness and patience in seeing their project through the series of setbacks and difficulties which were its fate for over a decade.

But above all, the Arab development project in the Jordan Valley, in its second decade of existence, shows what can be done once there is the will and determination to do constructive things.

It is for this reason, perhaps, that the Arab States including Jordan seduiously choose to ignore the project and refrain from providing assistance, morally or financially, lest the world look upon it as a model for what can be achieved in the sphere of the resettlement of Arab refugees.

And it is clear beyond doubt that were the Alami development project not the only Arab one in existence, and had there been, for instance, a score of others similar to it, the authorities in Damascus, Cairo, Baghdad, Amman, Beirut, and Gaza undoubtedly would have dropped their pernicious policy of regarding the Arab refugees as so many political pawns, and the lot of these unfortunate people would today be happier and they would have been well on the road to a constructive and final solution.

Alami recently launched a new project, a branch of the Jericho farm in the form of a model village for some 100 Bedouin refugee families in the Hebron hills. This time the Jordan Government is actively supporting the scheme by providing equipment for constructing the approach road to the village site. There will be communal buildings, a mosque, a school, and other facilities.

In Israel recently, a group of displaced Arabs who, ever since the War of Independence, had lived in Umm el Fahm in the northern tip of the "Little Triangle" area, moved into brandnew homes—each of two rooms with all conveniences, measuring 50 square meters, situated just outside the village in a new housing development scheme.

This group, headed by Abdul Kader, consisted of villages displaced during the fighting in 1948 from their native village in Lajjoun and represents the first of 3,000 families (totalling close to 20,000 persons) who have been uprooted from some 25 Arab villages in Galilee and the "Triangle." They became refugees, either voluntarily or unwillingly, and since then were dispersed

throughout Arab villages in Galilee, in Nazareth, and other places.

They had lived in rented rooms, in huts, in sheds. Ever since 1950 when the care for them was handed over to the U.N. Refugee and Relief Works Administration (UNRWA) they represented one of the toughest problems facing Israel in the matter of the minorities. Their resettlement remained a major headache for the authorities not so much because of a lack of funds as for their psychological attitude, with their misery forming a fertile source of activity for Communist propaganda.

The problem of these Arab D.P.'s was their refusal to accept repeated offers for the payment of compensation or resettlement—that is, until the outbreak of the Sinai hostilities. Until then, these Arabs were always haunted by the fear of taking up offers to resettle on the lands offered by the Government because these were largely composed of abandoned Arab property and would be reacquired by their absentee owners if and when there would be an Arab comeback after a second round with Israel. An additional fear was that in such a case they would also be branded as collaborators.

The first radical change in this Arab attitude was felt by the authorities directly following Israel's victory in Sinai, when it became clear to the Arabs in Israel that the general Arab ambition of wiping the Jewish state off the map was a mere dream. Early last year the Israel Government decided to allocate I£10.5 million for the resettlement of these displaced persons. This was the first serious move to solve the problem and took the wind out of Communist sails.

Of this sum, I£8 million were earmarked for housing projects, and the balance for rehabilitation loans. Another I£10 million were allotted from the Development Budget for cash compensation for land requisitioned from these persons and other Arab farmers and now returned in the form of new agricultural units, each averaging from 35 to 60 dunams.

The 20 Umm el Fahm families are to be followed by the settlement of another 12 at Kafr Misr, close by Nazareth, where, under Father P. Gauttier, a new housing project is in the last stage of completion on a hill with a breathtaking view, just overlooking the "capital of Galilee."

There are over 100 housing units being completed, with the promise of another 140 to be built by the end of this year. Each displaced-person tenant gets an easy-payment long-term loan of I£2,500 from the Government and provides I£3,000 out of his means. The 3,000 inhabitants of six villages forcibly abandoned on the order of the authorities (these include Ikrith and Bir'am on the Lebanese border and two other villages, Bakkara and Gha'ama, in the demilitarized zone next to Syria) will receive a special I£2,500 grant.

Another 1,000 families live in permanent places of residence, and they will receive about I£1,000 each to effect necessary repairs to their dwellings. Under the guidance of Sheikh Saleh Salim, member of Knesset, 18 families from Saffuria village have moved into new houses at Umm K'bei, just outside Nazareth.

It is true that there remains among some Arab circles in Israel a feeling that the neighboring Arab countries might still get control over Israel, or at least Galilee, and that the acceptance of any alternative place to their former farms would amount to treason. This seems to be the case of the displaced persons from Bi'ram, for whom 45 new housing units had been completed at Jish without any of them moving in.

So far, all efforts to persuade these persons, all Maronites, have failed, including those made by the Bishop of Tyre, M. Dumat. There may, of course, emerge other similar cases, but there is the definite feeling prevailing now that the backbone of this problem has been broken.

Most of the 150 displaced-person families are impatiently waiting to move into their new housing projects at Sha'ab, Jaljulia, and Masra, and recently there has been a flood of applications for more houses which exceeds the abilities of the Housing Division of the Ministry of Labor to erect them within a short space of time.

There is no illusion that the problem of the 20,000 uprooted Arabs in Israel has finally been solved. There are still many obstacles to overcome. On the other hand, the very fact that by the end of 1959 some 1,200 displaced Arab families will have moved into new permanent housing, or will have had their dwellings properly repaired, means that a fine beginning has been made by Israel in settling a most delicate issue.

Negro Opportunities Are Cited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, history is being made in Prince Edward County, Va. Many of our people pretend not to understand the true situation. It has been said that the officials of Prince Edward County are denying educational opportunities to the Negro children. The officials of Prince Edward County are making no distinction between the white and colored children. They are not denying educational opportunities to anyone. They simply are exercising their constitutional right not to tax the people of Prince Edward County for the operation of integrated schools.

On September 12 there appeared an editorial in each of the Richmond newspapers, to wit, the Richmond Times-Dispatch and the Richmond News Leader, pointing out very cogently the true situation in Prince Edward County. A day or two before this, a letter from Mr. J. Barrye Wall, editor of the Farmville Herald, appeared in the Lynchburg News answering an editorial appearing in the Lynchburg News of September 2. So that the people might know the issues involved and have a clear picture of the Prince Edward situation, I am including with my remarks the editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of September 12, 1959, the editorial in the Richmond News Leader of September 12, 1959, and the letter from Mr. J. Barrye Wall to the editor of the Lynchburg News which are as follows:

[From the Richmond News Leader, Sept. 12, 1959]

AFTERWORD ON PRINCE EDWARD

For the past few days charges have been flying about that Prince Edward County has "denied" its Negro children an education and "deprived them of their right to free schools." Welfare Secretary Flemming has assailed the county's treatment of the Negroes as "indefensible." Liberal commentators on television are doing their Ivy League worst to make it appear that the county has defied the law and scandalously trampled upon the poor colored children.

Let us set the record straight.

Prince Edward County has not defied any order of any court anywhere, from the Supreme Court on down. The county was put under orders by the courts to do one thing, and one thing only. The county was directed not to deny any colored student admission to the county's public schools solely by reason of the student's race. Prince Edward County stands today in a position of absolute obedience to that order. The county is not denying any Negro child any right or facility or benefit offered any white child.

When the county, through its established government, decided to abandon public schools, all citizens of the county became equally free to go their own way.

This decision was announced in May. At any time during the past 4 months the Negro people of Prince Edward could have done precisely what the white people have done: They could have exhibited some gumption, some leadership, some initiative, some pride in seeing their children educated, some get up and hustle. They could have organized an educational corporation (white neighbors in Farmville sincerely offered their help in such a venture). They could have hired teachers (there were more than 70 Negro teachers available in the county for employment). They could have arranged the use of church facilities (the county has at least a dozen well-established Negro churches).

More than anything, they could have applied for State tuition grants that would have assured them the necessary funds—up to about $350,000—to maintain a private educational program. And if this had seemed insufficient, they could have solicited financial help from rich and powerful sympathizers.

They did none of these things. On one recent Saturday afternoon, the white people of Farmville were out in the rain laying cinder blocks for a four-room addition to a church Sunday school; the white people were carrying in books for a library; the white people were making desks and tables for an elementary school. And their colored brethren were loafing on Main Street, taking their ease in Zion.

Let us have plain talk: The white parents of Prince Edward County have worked hard to solve the problem of educating their own children. And the Negro parents, facing the same problem, have not worked at all. If the Negro people are unwilling to make an effort, this is no fault of the Prince Edward Educational Foundation.

We do not presume to understand why Prince Edward Negroes have neglected a responsibility the white parents have assumed. The explanation given in the county is that every time two or three Negroes have so much as ventured a gesture toward obtaining a tuition grant or organizing a private school, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, through its local leadership, has put a foot down. It is said that the NAACP would rather see these 1,700 Negro children have no education, than to see them educated in private schools established by members of their own race. They make better martyrs that way. If this be true, then the blame for the plight of these colored children falls not on the courts, and not on the county government, and not on the white parents, but squarely on the NAACP.

Perhaps Roy Wilkins would like to comment on this. We would be happy to have a letter from him explaining what his national association has done for the advancement of the colored children of Prince Edward County this fall. If the NAACP has encouraged the Negro parents to show some initiative, apply for nondiscriminatory tuition grants, and educate their own sons and daughters, Mr. Wilkins surely will want to say so.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Sept. 12, 1959]

THE NAACP HAS BEEN SHOWN

The shutting down of all the public schools in Prince Edward County could have been avoided if the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People had pursued the same policy there that it has pursued in Clarendon County, S.C. In the South Carolina county the NAACP has not pressed its case, although it filed suit there years ago, and won in the U.S. courts, just as it did in Prince Edward.

The organization seems to have realized that if integration was forced in Clarendon County, the public schools would close. It seems not to have believed that this would occur in Prince Edward. It proceeded to press for court orders in Prince Edward, and got them. The results are now obvious to all.

The white citizens of Prince Edward are approximately 100 percent determined not to have compulsory mixed schooling in their county. The NAACP must have known this. Yet it bulled ahead, despite the urgings of some of its best friends and most ardent supporters.

Who are the primary sufferers in this situation?

The answer is not debatable. The primary sufferers are Prince Edward's more than 1,700 Negro children. They have no schools.

There is genuine good will toward them in the county and State, and a desire on the part of many whites to help them.

Blanton Hanbury, president of the Prince Edward School Foundation, said yesterday that schools will somehow have to be provided for them, even if this has to be done by the county's white citizens.

It seems safe to say, however, that if the whites are to make a real effort in this direction, the Negroes themselves will have to show a positive interest in getting privately financed schools set up. As of now, they are merely collecting small sums in an effort to send a limited number of colored boys and girls to schools elsewhere.

There is reason to believe that many Negroes in Prince Edward would welcome an opportunity to take part in financing their own system of education, if the NAACP would stop pressuring them not to do so. Lawyers in that organization have led the Prince Edward Negroes to believe that legal tricks are in the offing which will open their public schools. As of now, these attorneys have merely talked about what they are going to do in this regard. Meanwhile the Negro children of Prince Edward sit in idleness, their fine new high school and all their other schools closed tight.

In shutting its schools, Prince Edward County has been forced to take a step which nobody in the county wanted to take. But the fact that the white people of Prince Edward did not flinch, when the showdown came, should be a lesson to the NAACP. That organization may have thought they were bluffing. It knows differently now.

The NAACP knows, furthermore, what to expect in other Virginia counties with heavy colored populations if it prevails on the Federal courts to order compulsory school mixing there. The schools in those counties will shut down, just as they have in Prince Edward.

[From the Lynchburg News]

NEGRO OPPORTUNITIES ARE CITED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEWS.

Sir: In your editorial of September 2 you discussed a report of the findings of two Emory University professors prepared for the Southern Regional Council regarding the operations of private and public schools. You refer to the situation in Prince Edward County.

In the course of your discussion you ask this question: "For how long will the courts and the Federal Government permit the (Prince Edward) County to deny educational opportunities to the Negro children?"

The following short excerpt from an editorial in the Farmville Herald of September 4 may throw some light on the question:

"The county of Prince Edward does not deny educational opportunities to the Negro now or at any time in the past.

"The Perrow plan provides for all children. A grant of at least $21 is available to every child in Prince Edward County, for use in private nonsectarian schools, or in public schools outside the county.

"The colored people can provide education for their children by two or three easy steps.

"1. Form a corporation or an association under the laws of Virginia to operate a private school, either segregated or integrated.

"2. Establish a school accredited by the Virginia Department of Education, which can be done.

"3. Apply for scholarship grants offered by the State of Virginia through the Perrow plan of freedom of choice.

"4. Acquire buildings for school use. These may be buildings privately owned or built, or surplus schools owned by the county. They even may be rented in the discretion of the school board.

"The county of Prince Edward has not denied the Negro children any rights they possess, any more than it has denied the white children of their rights. If any rights have been denied by anyone we suggest that the NAACP-pressured Federal courts have denied both the white and Negro children of Prince Edward a public school education by the unconstitutional decision of May 17, 1954. They have forced many localities in Virginia to bend to their will of racial integration—but not Prince Edward County—if Prince Edward does not wish to compromise its principles, then let them do it without criticism from anyone."

J. BARRYE WALL,
Editor, Farmville Herald.

Record of Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., Fifth District, Michigan, in the 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a report of my voting and attendance record during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

The record includes all rollcall votes and all quorum calls. The description of bills is for the purpose of identification only; no attempt has been made to describe the bills completely or to elaborate upon the issues involved.

The purpose of this report is to collect in one place information which is scattered through thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I want to be able to provide any interested constituent with a simple compilation of my voting and attendance record.

During this session there were 90 quorum calls and 86 rollcall votes. Because of attendance as an official delegate at the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union I was not in Washington for 11 quorum calls and 20 yea-and-nay votes. Prior to leaving for these meetings I missed three quorum calls and two rollcall votes for an attendance record of 96.5 percent. An explanation of my position on each of the rollcalls missed is given in the chart by an announced "pair" or in the footnotes.

During my 11 years in the House of Representatives, including the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I have responded to 1,965 out of 2,048 quorum calls and rollcalls for an overall attendance record of 95.9 percent.

Voting and attendance record of Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., 5th District of Michigan

Roll-call No.	Date, 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
1	Jan. 7	Quorum call	Present.
2	Jan. 7	To elect Speaker of House. (Rayburn 281 to Halleck 143)	Halleck.
3	Feb. 4	Quorum call	Present.
4	Feb. 4	H.R. 2256, to recommit motion designed to delete additional funds for direct housing loans. (Defeated 123 to 277)	Yes.
5	Feb. 4	H.R. 2256, to provide additional funds for direct loans, to remove certain requirements with respect to the rate of interest on guaranteed loans. (Passed 310 to 89.)	No.
6	Feb. 5	H.R. 2260, to extend until July 4, 1963, the induction provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. (Passed 381 to 20)	Yes.
7	Mar. 4	Quorum call	Present.
8	Mar. 5	Quorum call	Present.
9	Mar. 11	H.R. 4221, to adopt H. Res. 205, the open rule providing 6 hours of debate on measure to provide for the admission of the State of Hawaii. (Passed 337 to 69.)	Yes.
10	Mar. 1	Quorum call	Present.
11	Mar. 12	S. 50 (substituted for H.R. 4221), to provide for admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. (Passed 323 to 89)	Paired for.[1]
12	Mar. 12	Quorum call	Absent.[2]
13	Mar. 13	H.R. 1, to require a study to be conducted of the effect of increasing the diversion of water from Lake Michigan into Illinois Waterway for navigation. (Passed 238 to 142.)	No.
14	Mar. 13	S. 70, to amend Federal Food and Drug and Cosmetic Act to permit the continuance of established coloring practices in orange industry. (Passed 213 to 94.)	No.
15	Mar. 16	Quorum call	Present.

Footnote at end of table.

Voting and attendance record of Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., 5th District of Michigan—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
16	Mar. 17	Quorum call	Present.
17	Mar. 18	Quorum call	Present.
18	Mar. 19	Quorum call	Present.
19	Mar. 19	H.R. 1011, an amendment to reduce from $297,000,000 to $200,000,000 the amount of Federal aid for airports over a 4-year period. (Defeated, 194 to 214.)	Yes.
20	Mar. 19	H.R. 1011, an amendment to require annual appropriations for Federal aid for airports. (Defeated, 191 to 216.)	Yes.
21	Mar. 19	H.R. 1011 (S. 1), to authorize Federal aid for airports totaling $297,000,000 for a 4-year period. (Passed, 272 to 134.)	No.
22	Mar. 23	H.R. 2575, to authorize the appropriation of $500,000 for the 3d pan-American games to be held in Chicago. (Passed, 257 to 109.)	No.
23	Mar. 24	Quorum call	Present.
24	Mar. 25	H.R. 4452 (S. 1094), to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to increase the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund and its subscription to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. (Passed, 315 to 57.)	Yes.
25	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
26	Apr. 14	Quorum call	Present.
27	Apr. 15	Quorum call	Present.
28	Apr. 15	H.R. 1321, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 11 of 1939 to transfer from Secretary of Agriculture to REA Administration the authority of approving or rejecting rural electrification loans. (Passed 234 to 131.)	No.
29	Apr. 16	Quorum call	Present.
30	Apr. 16	H.R. 5674, to authorize certain construction at military installations. (Passed 377 to 7.)	Yes.
31	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
32	Apr. 29	Quorum call	Present.
33	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
34	Apr. 30	To override President Eisenhower's veto of Rural Electrification Administration bill. (Defeated 280 to 146; ⅔ majority required)	No.
35	Apr. 30	Quorum call	Present.
36	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
37	May 6	Quorum call	Present.
38	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
39	May 7	Quorum call	Present.
39	May 7	H.R. 3460, to recommit to committee, bill to amend TVA Act of 1933 relative to financing its power program with proceeds from revenue bonds. (Defeated 182 to 23.)	Yes.
40	May 7	H.R. 3460, to amend TVA Act of 1933 relative to financing its power program with proceeds from revenue bonds. (Passed 245 to 170)	No.
41	May 11	Quorum call	Present.
42	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
43	May 18	Quorum call	Present.
44	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
45	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
46	May 20	H.R. 7007, to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1960. (Passed 294 to 128.)	No.
47	May 20	To recommit Department of Agriculture appropriation bill in order to insert provision limiting farm price-support loans to $50,000. (Passed 262 to 105.)	Yes.
48	May 21	Quorum call	Present.
49	May 21	S. 57 (Housing Act of 1959), to adopt Thomas amendment to require direct congressional appropriation of funds in lieu of present Treasury authorization method of financing. (Passed 222 to 201.)	Yes.
50	May 21	S. 57, on motion to recommit bill and insert provisions of H.R. 7117, for the text of the committee substitute amendment. (Defeated 189 to 233.)	Yes.
52	May 25	Quorum call	Present.
53	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
54	May 26	Quorum call	Present.
55	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
56	May 27	H.R. 7176, on recommittal motion to insert language limiting President's handling of emergency fund. (Defeated 171 to 229)	No.
57	May 27	H.R. 7343, to increase appropriations of Department of Justice by $2,000,000. (Passed 266 to 133)	No.
58	May 27	H.R. 7086, on motion to recommit bill to limit the extension of Renegotiation Act to 27 months. (Defeated 153 to 264)	Yes.
59	May 27	H.R. 7086, to amend and extend for 4 years the Renegotiation Act of 1951. (Passed 375 to 7)	Yes.
60	May 27	Quorum call	Present.
61	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
62	June 2	Quorum call	Present.
63	June 3	Quorum call	Present.
64	June 3	H.R. 7454, on final passage of $38,400,000 defense appropriation bill. (Passed 393 to 3.)	Yes.
65	June 4	Quorum call	Present.
66	June 5	Quorum call	Present.
67	June 8	Quorum call	Present.
68	June 9	H.R. 3610, to recommit the bill in order to add an amendment requiring States to match the Federal grants for construction of sewage treatment works. (Defeated 156 to 240.)	Yes.
69	June 9	H.R. 3610, on final passage of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. (Passed 254 to 142.)	No.
70	June 9	H.R. 7500, to add to public works appropriations bill the sum of $500,000 for water lily eradication program. (Passed 199 to 198.)	No.
71	June 9	H.R. 7509, to add to public works appropriations bill the sum of $75,000 for planning of a river project in Wisconsin. (Defeated 192 to 203.)	No.
72	June 9	H.R. 7509, to recommit the public works appropriations bill in order to reduce by 5 percent each construction item of $5 million or more. (Defeated 149 to 251.)	Yes.
73	June 9	H.R. 7509, on final passage of the public works appropriations bill. (Passed 380 to 20.)	Yes.
74	June 10	Quorum call	Present.
75	June 10	S. 1901, to recommit the tobacco price support bill in order to freeze price supports at 1958 level for next 3 years. (Defeated 138 to 260.)	Yes.
76	June 10	S. 1901, to amend sec. 101(c) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and of 1945 to stabilize and protect the level of price support for tobacco. (Passed 250 to 149.)	No.
77	June 11	Quorum call	Present.
78	June 12	H.R. 7246, on recommittal motion to insert provisions of Belcher amendment (H.R. 7611) for text of H.R. 7246, to amend existing laws with respect to acreage allotments and price supports for wheat for 1960-61. (Defeated 141 to 224.)	Yes.
79	June 12	H.R. 7246, to amend existing laws with respect to acreage allotments and price supports for wheat for 1960-61. (Passed 188 to 177.)	No.
80	June 12	Quorum call	Present.
81	June 12	H.R. 6596, to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a coal Research and Development Commission. (Passed 251 to 54.)	Yes.
82	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
83	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
84	June 15	H. Res. 293, to adopt the rule providing for the consideration of 4 hours of debate on, and the waiving of points of order against, H.R. 7500, to amend Mutual Security Act of 1954. (Passed 277 to 93.)	Yes.
85	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
86	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
87	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
88	June 16	Quorum call	Present.
89	June 17	Quorum call	Present.
90	June 18	Quorum call	Present.
91	June 18	S. 1968, on accepting conference report on bill to strengthen wheat marketing quota and price support program. (Defeated 202 to 215.)	No.
92	June 18	H.R. 7500, to amend Mutual Security Act, as amended. (Passed 271 to 142.)	Yes.
93	June 19	Quorum call	Present.
94	June 19	H.R. 7749, to increase amount of obligation issued under 2d Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time. (Passed 255 to 177.)	Yes.
95	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
96	June 23	H. Res. 288, to adopt rule providing for consideration and 5 hours' debate on H.R. 3 to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed 233 to 116.)	Yes.
97	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
98	June 23	Quorum call	Present.
99	June 23	S. 57, to adopt conference report on Housing Act of 1959. (Passed 241 to 177)	No.
100	June 24	Quorum call	Present.
101	June 24	H.R. 3, on motion to recommit bill to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Defeated 191 to 227.)	No.
102	June 24	H.R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws. (Passed 225 to 192)	Yes.
103	June 29	Quorum call	Present.

Voting and attendance record of Representative Gerald R. Ford, Jr., 5th District of Michigan—Continued

Roll-call No.	Date, 1959	Measure, question, and result	Vote
104	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
105	June 30	H. Res. 294, to adopt rule for consideration of H.R. 5752 relating to observance of legal holidays by Federal employees. (Passed 339 to 42.)	No.
106	June 30	Quorum call	Present.
107	July 1	On motion to recommit S. 1120, respecting reserves required to be maintained by member banks of the Federal Reserve System. (Defeated 60 to 309.)	No.
108	July 7	H. Res. 295, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959. (Passed 266 to 124.)	No.
109	July 7	H.R. 4957, to recommit bill to amend United States Code to provide for admission of certain evidence and confessions. (Defeated 138 to 261.)	No.
110	July 7	H.R. 4957, to amend United States Code to provide for admission of certain evidence and confessions. (Passed 262 to 138.)	Yes.
111	July 20	Quorum call	Present.
112	July 21	Quorum call	Present.
113	July 22	On motion to adopt conference report on H.R. 7500 to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954 as amended. (Passed 257 to 153.)	Yes.
114	July 23	Quorum call	Present.
115	July 23	H.R. 3460, on motion to order previous question on H. Res. 326, a resolution to agree to Senate amendments to H.R. 3460, the TVA financing bill. (Passed, 244 to 166.)	No.
116	July 27	Quorum call	Absent.[1]
117	July 27	H.R. 7072, to provide for the participation of the United States in Inter-American Development Bank. (Passed, 230 to 87.)	Absent.[1]
118	July 28	Quorum call	Present.
119	July 29	H.R. 8385, mutual security and related agencies appropriations bill. (Passed, 279 to 136.)	Yes.
120	July 30	Quorum call	Present.
121	July 31	Quorum call	Present.
122	Aug. 3	Quorum call	Absent.[4]
123	Aug. 5	H.R. 7740, to suspend rules and pass bill to amend Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to preservation of acreage and reallocation of unusual cotton acreage allotments. (Passed, 308 to 90.)	Yes.
124	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
125	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
126	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
127	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
128	Aug. 12	Quorum call	Present.
129	Aug. 13	Quorum call	Present.
130	Aug. 13	H.R. 8442, to adopt Landrum-Griffin amendment (H.R. 8400) to replace language of labor-reform committee bill. (Passed 229 to 201)	Yes.
131	Aug. 14	H.R. 8342, on motion to recommit labor-management and disclosure bill (Griffin-Landrum text). (Defeated 149 to 279)	No.
132	Aug. 14	H.R. 8342, on final passage: Labor-management and disclosure bill (Griffin-Landrum text). (Passed 303 to 125)	Yes.
133	Aug. 14	H.R. 7040, on motion to disagree with Senate amendment No. 1 which would increase from $10,000,000 to $25,000,000 the Federal contribution to civil defense. (Passed 240 to 166.)	Yes.
134	Aug. 17	H.R. 6904, to establish an Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations. (Passed 335 to 31)	Yes.
135	Aug. 17	H. Con. Res. 269, expressing sense of Congress against seating of Communist regime in China as representative of China in United Nations. (Passed, 368 to 2.)	Yes.
136	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
137	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
138	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
139	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
140	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Present.
141	Aug. 20	H.R. 8609, to adopt the request for separate vote on Sullivan amendment authorizing institution of food stamp plan for distribution of surplus commodities. (Passed, 232 to 127.)	No.
142	Aug. 20	H.R. 8609, to amend Agriculture Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954. (Passed, 305 to 53.)	No.
143	Aug. 24	Quorum call	Present.
144	Aug. 26	H.R. 1341, on motion to recommit bill to require passenger-carrying motor vehicles purchased by the Federal Government agencies to meet certain safety standards. (Defeated, 125 to 265.)	Paired.[5]
145	Aug. 26	H.R. 5421, to provide program of assistance to correct inequities in the construction of fishing vessels. (Passed 272 to 108)	Paired.[6]
146	Aug. 27	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
147	Aug. 27	S. 2539, on recommital motion designed to delete provision of $50,000,000 loan fund for construction of classrooms and to spread the $550,000,000 urban renewal funds over 2 years in lieu of 1 year. (Defeated 156 to 231.)	Paired for.
148	Aug. 27	S. 2539, to extend and amend laws relating to provision and improvement of housing and renewal of urban communities. (Passed 283 to 105.)	Paired against.
149	Aug. 29	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
150	Aug. 29	H.R. 2247, on engrossment and 3d reading of bill to authorize the conveyance of certain real property to Sacramento County, Calif. (Passed 203 to 94.)	Paired.[8]
151	Sept. 1	S. 2162, on approving Government employees health insurance bill. (Passed 382 to 4)	Paired.[9]
152	Sept. 1	H.R. 7889, to require rice marketing quota for rice when the total supply exceeds the normal supply. (Passed 330 to 52)	Paired.[9]
153	Sept. 1	H.R. 3151, to suspend rules and pass bill relating to withholding for purposes of income tax imposed by certain cities on the compensation of Federal employees. (Defeated 251 to 133; ⅔ required for suspension passage.)	Paired.[9]
154	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
155	Sept. 2	H.R. 7509, to override President's veto of public works appropriation bill. (Defeated 274 to 13; ⅔ required)	Paired against.
156	Sept. 2	H.R. 4279, to authorize Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas La Feria division. (Passed 281 to 114.)	Paired against.
157	Sept. 2	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
158	Sept. 2	S. 2524, to prevent under certain conditions States or political subdivisions from imposing on a person a net income tax on income from interstate commerce. (Passed 359 to 31.)	Paired.[9]
159	Sept. 3	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
160	Sept. 3	H.R. 8678, Federal Aid to Highway Act of 1959. (Passed 243 to 162)	Paired for.
161	Sept. 4	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
162	Sept. 4	S. 1555, to adopt conference report on Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959. (Passed 352 to 52)	Paired.[9]
163	Sept. 4	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
164	Sept. 4	H.R. 9035, to recommit bill to permit issuance of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above existing maximum and to permit Treasury Secretary to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss. (Defeated 133 to 256.)	Paired for.
165	Sept. 4	H.R. 9035, to permit issuance of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above existing maximum and to permit Treasury Secretary to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss. (Passed 378 to 7.)	Paired.[9]
166	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
167	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
168	Sept. 5	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
169	Sept. 8	H.J. Res. 352, to suspend rules and pass bill to authorize study and review in connection with proposed additional building for Library of Congress. (Passed 323 to 46.)	Paired.[10]
170	Sept. 8	H.R. 9105, fiscal 1960 appropriations for public works. (Passed 303 to 93)	Paired against.
171	Sept. 8	H.R. 9069, to provide standards for issuance of passports. (Passed 371 to 18)	Paired.[9]
172	Sept. 9	S. 2208, to provide for equal treatment for States of Alaska and Hawaii under Federal Airport Act. (Passed 309 to 75)	Paired.[10]
173	Sept. 10	Quorum call	Absent.[7]
174	Sept. 10	To override President's veto of public works appropriations bill. (Passed 280 to 121)	Paired against.
175	Sept. 15	H.R. 8365, to adopt conference report on mutual security bill. (Passed 194 to 109)	Yes.
176	Sept. 15	On Senate amendment to extend the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. (Passed 221 to 81)	Yes.

[1] Long standing speaking engagement.
[2] Speaking engagement in Michigan.
[3] In Michigan, if present would have voted "Yes."
[4] In Michigan.
[5] On official leave to attend Interparliamentary Union; if present would have voted "No."
[6] If present would have voted "No."
[7] On official leave to attend Interparliamentary in Warsaw as delegate from House of Representatives.
[8] If present would have voted "No."
[9] Would have voted "Yes."
[10] Would have voted "No."

Federal Reserve's Tight-Money Policy a "Merry-Go-Round"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal-American, which appeared in the Journal-American of September 11, 1959:

FEDERAL RESERVE'S TIGHT-MONEY POLICY A "MERRY-GO-ROUND"

(By Leslie Gould)

In boosting the discount rate to 4 percent—the highest since 1930—the Federal Reserve is taking another one of its long-shot gambles.

The gamble this time is that there will be no easing in the money market in the foreseeable future—that is, in the final quarter of the year. Also, that inflation is still the biggest threat.

The increase is the fifth since just a year ago, when it was raised from 1¾ percent to 2 percent.

In August of 1957—2 years ago—the Federal Reserve made another gamble and it was a wrong one. It put the discount rate up to 3½ percent, when the stock market and business were declining. It never did recover from that mistake in judgment. It had to reverse itself 3 months later. It may have to do so again.

FOLLOWS PRIME RATE RISE

The Federal Reserve, which is the architect, or whatever you call it—maybe plumber is the more correct word—of the tight-money program, claims that it merely was following the market. Commercial banks raised the prime rate for money to 5 percent 2 weeks ago, so the Federal takes the position after waiting a week that there was nothing else it could do.

The discount rate is the charge the Federal makes to commercial banks borrowing from it. The commercial banks will make a loan at their higher rates and then discount it at the Federal Reserve. With the money borrowed from the Federal the commercial banks make another loan.

STEEL STRIKE CAN CHANGE PICTURE

The normal procedure is to keep down the spread between the commercial bank rates and the discount rate, so that there is no chiseling. Actually, there has been very little chiseling and the Federal Reserve has ways and means of controlling that.

The smarter course for the Federal would be to wait just a little before moving as hastily as it did in 1957. For one thing, a continuance of the steel strike beyond October 1 will change the picture. It will slow down business and this in turn will be reflected in easier money.

There are other indications that there may be some slowdown in business after the very rapid recovery from the 1957–58 slide in business—a slide, which, incidentally, the Federal Reserve helped aggravate by its tight-money policy. It can do this again.

NOT A CREDIT INFLATION

The Federal Reserve is taking the position that this is a credit inflation—which it isn't. The 1929 inflation was a credit one, with too much money being siphoned off into the stock market. This isn't happening today. Except for some of the jiggles and monkey business through mystery moneylenders, this is a cash investment stock market.

The inflation of the last few years stems from the wage-price spiral and the heavy deficit spending by all governments—Federal, State, and local. The Federal Reserve's tight-money policy is having no influence on either—except making it tougher and more expensive for governments to borrow.

By putting up the cost of borrowing, the Federal Reserve's tight-money policy is adding to the inflation. Businesses pass along the higher cost of borrowing, the same as wage and material price increases.

HELPED BRING ON RECESSION

The only way the Federal Reserve's tight-money policy can check the wage-price inflation is to bring on a business recession, which it helped do in 1957. That would be a mistake.

Tight money is slowing down the home-building boom. With prime interest rates at 5 percent, mortgage lenders are demanding and getting from 6 percent and in some parts of the country 8 percent.

The Federal Reserve's on-again-off-again tight-money policy is becoming a merry-go-round—only the public isn't getting the brass ring. It isn't getting a free ride. It is being taken for a ride.

Two Great Dangers of Visit: A Letdown or Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Roscoe Drummond which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 14, 1959:

TWO GREAT DANGERS OF VISIT: A LETDOWN OR DELUSION

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—The summit conference between Prime Minister Khrushchev and President Eisenhower involves two grave risks which, if seen clearly in advance, can be greatly reduced.

I am not referring to the security risk, the danger of some untoward incident or the possibility of a discourteous public demonstration while Mr. Khrushchev is the guest of the Nation. These are minor risks and not likely to develop.

The real dangers are these:

Risk No. 1: The risk that the big buildup—of hope and expectation that the Eisenhower-Khrushchev personal meeting will end the cold war—will bring a massive letdown by settling absolutely nothing, hope shattered, expectation blunted.

The only protection against this risk is a fuller awareness that the Khrushchev-Eisenhower meetings can produce no more than the minutest beginning in a better direction.

Risk No. 2: The risk that the Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks will create a dangerous delusion, that the talks, all of which will necessarily be private, will leave the appearance of relaxing tensions but will settle nothing and that what will be relaxed will be our alertness and our defense.

This is what happened after the Big Four summit meeting at Geneva. The only protection against it happening again is for the President to substitute a candid report to the Nation on his talks with Mr. Khrushchev for the usual doubletalk diplomatic communique.

Mr. Eisenhower has himself warned against a summit conference without advance preparation to make sure it would be somewhat productive. He has always held that such a meeting would be hurtful because it would almost certainly dash the hopes of the world, leave things worse off than before.

True, these Eisenhower-Khrushchev talks are not exactly a summit conference since they are not for purposes of negotiation but only exploratory. But that is a pretty fine distinction. The truth is that nearly the whole world expects something to happen at these Washington meetings and many people expect that something important and good will happen.

Mr. Eisenhower says he has profound hope for some real progress but that no one would dare predict such an outcome.

To guard against false expectations we need to keep these facts in mind;

Prime Minister Khrushchev boasts of the military strength and missile superiority of the Soviet Union. He shows no sign of feeling the need to make concessions to get concessions.

His avowed purposes are to force or fool the West into liquidating NATO and to persuade the United States to shrink its forces and influence back to continental United States.

Mr. K is not abandoning the Soviet aim of implanting communism everywhere in the world and so far Moscow has not been able or willing to plant it without coercion.

The Soviet Union does not want a nuclear war but it has shown no willingness to leave other nations free to choose their own way of life. One Western diplomat has put it this way: "Khrushchev wants peace, but he wants peace at no price."

Conceivably Mr. Khrushchev will view some things differently when he sees America and when he talks with the President. But he will not see them much differently. It may be useful to have Mr. K in our midst but cutting back the cold war is going to take a long, painful, painstaking effort. There are no shortcuts.

One thing that will be needed to guard against false optimism will be for the President to report quickly and candidly after his talks with Mr. Khrushchev at the end of the visit. The appearance of relaxed tensions can only serve Moscow's interests. These conversations will inevitably look better than they are if Mr. Eisenhower fails to speak out at once and frankly.

Wrongs Existent in the New Labor Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, during my campaign and since, I have repeatedly stated and announced that I was in favor of a strong labor control or labor reform bill to curb excesses. I stated that I favored the original Kennedy bill introduced last year and that I would vote for the Kennedy bill as originally drafted by Senator KENNEDY this year. I stated that I believed there were abuses in labor which needed correction, that the public should be protected from labor leaders

who abuse both their power and their financial position. In supporting the Kennedy bill, I kept faith with that promise. I did not pledge to vote for a bill which amended the original Wagner Act and I do not believe that Congress should have been forced to vote at one time on two separate measures—a labor reform bill and a bill amending the basic labor law, known as the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act.

I, therefore, voted against the conference committee bill because it did more than contain good and sound labor reform legislation. It contained amendments to the labor law which I felt were not pertinent and did not belong in the labor reform bill. A study of the bill definitely indicates to me that the bill, as finally drafted, does materially change the Wagner Act and does all but emasculate it, for the reason, that under the terms of this bill, a large percentage of American labor and industry, I believe in excess of 50 percent of all the working men and women of America and over 90 percent of all employers, will be denied rights that organized labor and management have enjoyed from the time the Wagner Act was passed in 1934 up to the present time. I believe that any bill which does this emasculates the Wagner Act. Let me pinpoint exactly what I mean.

Prior to the decision of *Guss* v. *Utah* (353 U.S. 1) various States having labor-management laws were able to exercise jurisdiction in the regulation of labor disputes involving employers whose business affected interstate commerce over which the National Labor Relations Board declined to exercise its jurisdiction.

The Guss decision made this impossible and created a vast area which was subject to no regulation. An area in which the Federal board, in many instances, refused to act and in which the exercise of State authority was banned. It was estimated that the "no man's land" area applied to approximately 25 percent of the working force and 90 percent of all employers. This was set forth in a bulletin of the U.S. Department of Commerce—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, pages 4–6, table 1A. This bulletin was known as County Business Patterns.

Even before the Guss against Utah decision, in States where there was no State labor board, no one had jurisdiction of cases in which the National Labor Relations Board failed to act. Both management and labor in those cases were denied the benefit of a labor court or labor control.

In my home State of Wisconsin, it was estimated, in 1958, that approximately 29 percent of the working force and about 92 percent of all employers were within the no man's land, as a result of the Guss decision. In many of the States, particularly in the South, this percentage was much higher. It is to be remembered that 37 of the States of the Union have no State labor board at all, and it is only in 13 States that machinery has been set up to hear the cases which fall witihn the no man's land provision. In addition to this, the National Labor Relations Board has such a backlog of cases that many matters which should be expeditiously determined are delayed for such a period of time that they also must be considered to be in no man's land. I doubt if any State having right-to-work laws, such as many of the 37 have, will bother to pass State laws similar to the new Federal labor law or that they will set up State labor boards to hear labor cases.

Of major concern to this Congress has been the elimination of racketeering in labor-management relations. It is hard to conceive of a better opportunity for racketeering to flourish, than to have no regulation available, either at a State or Federal level, to govern labor disputes either among the smaller employers and smaller collective bargaining units throughout the land, or among some of the larger units which are not engaged in interstate commerce. The National Labor Relations Board should have been directed to take jurisdiction of "no man's land" cases and apply a uniform Federal law.

By the turning over, through the labor reform bill, of the "no man's land" cases to the States, we have thrown these matters into State courts for handling. In those States, 37 in number, where there are no labor boards, labor laws, or labor courts set up to take jurisdiction, it means that we have permanently placed those cases which the National Labor Relations Board does not handle—in a permanent "no man's land."

It means that we are denying the people involved in these labor disputes, both the employers and the employees, the right to a hearing before a tribunal of law. We are supplanting the rule of law with the rule of economic power. This is as it was before the passage of the Wagner Act during the Roosevelt administration in 1934. Today large areas of our country have returned to the same type of labor chaos we had before passage of the Wagner Act in 1934.

We heard extensive testimony indicating that service industries, usually employing small numbers of persons, had been the most easy prey for the racketeers. The continuing vacuum in the labor relations law, in at least 35 States or possibly 37, encourages rather than discourages the continuance of unfavorable practices in labor-management relations. The Guss decision indicated that courts wanted uniformity in labor law, but it is hard to see how uniformity will be achieved by turning labor matters over to the varying laws of 37 separate States in addition to the National Labor Relations Board. The only uniformity apparent to me is the fast-growing practice of returning stable labor relations, which have been fostered by State and Federal statutes, to the anarchy which existed prior to the enactment of the Wagner Act, Employment Peace Act, and the Taft-Hartley Act.

In the no man's land cases now assigned to States that have no State labor law or State labor board, the right of employees to be represented by labor unions and to engage in active bargaining will now be determined by economic force, rather than by secret ballot; the right of employees to be free from discriminatory discharge and other abuses because of union activities will be dissipated; and the rights of employers in these areas to be free from illegal picketing and from secondary boycott will go unprotected even under the terms of the new law, because this law will not apply in these instances. In 1958, 62 percent of all charges of unfair labor practices filed in the first quarter of that year were filed by individuals. It is difficult to understand how such individuals, over whom the NLRB has jurisdiction, should have rights and remedies more worthy of protecting by a uniform Federal labor policy than those individuals who are employed in enterprises falling within the no man's land area. This same argument applies to the rights of labor organizations and in particular, to the rights of employers who are located in those areas, and who will now find themselves without any tribunal before which they can bring their labor grievances, and who will be at the mercy of labor leaders, corrupt or otherwise, and who will have to fight it out on the basis of economic power as between the power of their own organization and power and wealth of the union with which they are dealing.

The only uniformity apparent to me in the no man's land area is a chaos of no regulation which has now been permanently written into the labor-management law. If the Southern States, those which have right-to-work laws, continue with the same viewpoint that they have had over these many years and choose not to pass labor legislation, it amounts to forbidding the States from enforcing labor relations violations, either upon the complaint of management or labor if the violations are in the no man's land area.

Let us look for a moment at what this will mean to the average employer. Now that the Federal law turns these matters over to the States, the employer can be sued by any employee in the State court because of an alleged violation by the employer of a union contract or because the employer failed in some manner to do what the employee alleges should have been done. This is going to subject employers from these States to a rush of lawsuits brought by individual employees and by their labor organizations. These will be civil suits, damage suits, if you will, wherein the injured party will be seeking a remedy in terms of dollar damages. This is not in accordance with the terms of the Wagner Act. It is a gross change, and one of the changes which I say emasculates the original Wagner Act. Large increases in these suits can be expected in the absence of any other means of resolving labor disputes. The individual workman and his labor organization must now also be aware of the fact that it can be sued in a State court. You can only think for a moment before you realize the serious implication that this will have throughout the Nation.

Insofar as uniformity of labor law in the future is concerned, we need only think of what will happen when 37 States start deciding cases, under 37 different laws, if they eventually pass them, and when 9 circuit courts of appeals pass on

National Labor Relations Board decisions. It will be almost impossible for any State administrative agency to guarantee consistency of interpretation, no matter how hard it tries and no matter what the spirit of the administrators toward the statutes is. This, again, is a return to the situation that we had prior to the passage of the Wagner Act in 1934. It is chaos—it is chaos both for management and for labor in a large area of labor-management relations. This includes all business which is not engaged in interstate commerce and it includes many small businesses and retail establishments in addition thereto, plus all cases referred by the National Labor Relations Board.

For a moment, let us analyze what has been so frequently stated here in Washington during the discussion of the labor-management bill. The charge has been repeatedly made that Southern States have been doing everything within their power to get eastern and northern industry to move from their home locations to the South. It has been charged that southern areas have guaranteed a work force which will work at a rate of pay below the union rate which the company pays in its present locations. It has been pointed out that the Southern States guarantee a docile work force which will not organize a union because of the existence of right-to-work laws in many of the Southern States. It has been pointed out that guarantees have been made to the owners of industry as to the substandard labor relation situation which will exist if they move to the Southern States. The charge has been made that much eastern and northern industry has taken advantage of these representations and has already moved. I can only speculate as to what this will mean. In my hometown of Racine, Wis., if industry, to avoid our average wage of about $2.35 per hour, moves to a southern State where the wage is only $1.25 per hour, how can the industrial committee of the chamber of commerce under the direction of George Wheary bring new industry to Racine, in the face of this substandard competition? Yet it is the removal of industry from Racine and the rest of the First District of Wisconsin that the 1959 Labor Reform Act tends to induce, in favor of southern competition. This is the result of a Dixiecrat-Republican alliance over labor and civil rights.

The thought, however, has been that in any of these industries where the National Labor Relations Board had jurisdiction, the inviting State could not guarantee that their glowing promises would be kept, for the reason that the Federal law would apply. The workingmen in the East and North had an opportunity of picketing the plant if there was just cause. They have an opportunity of asserting that there has been an unfair labor practice, and taking the employer before the National Labor Relations Board. On the contrary, the employer if he lived up to all the laws, had a right to go before the National Labor Relations Board, to secure justice insofar as he was concerned. It is important, however, that in many of these cases, the union men who were thrown out of work were able to follow the plant into a new location, and through collective bargaining, and through the assertion of economic power, as permitted under the Wagner Act, were able to get concessions to save jobs and get wage increases for the working force.

Now the Southern States through the passage of this law are able to have the Federal Government write into its charter a law protecting them and guaranteeing the enforcement of the southern statutes affecting labor which are on their books. In other words, the Southern States with 1890 labor laws, can now enforce them without any fear of recriminations by unions, by the previous working force, or by the public generally. When these Southern States send their products made with substandard labor, and nonunion labor—at prices which will only tend to hurt northern manufacturers and when this merchandise is shipped back into the other States for sale, it will be unlawful to conduct a secondary boycott. It will be unlawful to engage in any practical activity which will tend to force the hand of the employer to comply with more reasonable labor management relations. Industry can now move into the South where right-to-work laws exist and with virtual immunity pay such wages and pursue such labor policies, and then sell on the competitive market with northern industry. The result of this will be to bring down wages in the North to the level of wages paid in the South and the ultimate result will be to reduce the standard of living of all Americans to the standard of those working in these sweatshops. Yes, this again emasculates the Wagner Act and returns labor-management relations to the same basis it was prior to the passage of the Wagner Act during the Roosevelt administration in 1934.

The Landrum-Griffin conference report bill will not only slow down further the growth and the strength of the trade union movement but it will eventually lead to more regressive developments. By this, I mean that this has only whetted the appetite of the enemies of labor and their drive will soon start to bring labor under the heel of the antitrust law and the passage of a national right-to-work law. I say that if this happens, it will be the breakdown of American democracy.

The Landrum-Griffin conference report bill was a vote to speed the flight of industry from the North to the largely unorganized South. Yes, industry will now move into not only the unorganized South but also, the never-to-be-organized South.

Another strongly motivating factor in my vote against the Landrum-Griffin conference bill was the open invitation for the powerful unions of the Nation to take over the small, struggling unions. Under the terms of this conference agreement, only the well-entrenched international unions, with great assets and legal talent, will be able to meet the legal delays, the legalistic entanglements, and slanted antilabor decisions of the State courts, operating under State statutes and decisions. This, in turn, means that the small unions which cannot afford to fight against these handicaps will be absorbed by the big unions, which have caused the people of America, who have been given an antilabor brainwashing over the past several years, to demand so-called reform legislation. The Landrum-Griffin conference report, in its seventh section is not corrective. It is punitive and destructive of legitimate union aims and activities.

This bill, as stated above, means that small unions because of all the provisions placed therein, will be required to seek membership in the bigger and more powerful unions, and the day of union merger is here, just as is the day of business merger. As we get big unionism to match big business, we will indeed have a new type of economy. I ask you—is this for the best interests of America and the people of America? I do not think so and I, therefore, voted against the conference bill.

It is to be remembered that the teamsters organization, including Hoffa and Beck, were not Democrats and were not supporters of the Democratic Party in the last several campaigns. They backed the Republican Party and recently I saw a picture of Dave Beck standing side-by-side with our President and the two of them were smiling at each other. It is to be noted that the Teamsters Union was discharged from membership in the AFL–CIO and I question what the status is of Beck and Hoffa, insofar as their membership is concerned, in the Republican Party.

It is noteworthy also to see that the hysteria which the chamber of commerce and the National Manufacturers Association worked up over the activities of these two Republican labor leaders was the very thing that the Republicans and southern Democrats here in Congress used to put American labor in a straitjacket—labor supported the Democratic Party because the Republican Party always refused to understand or sympathize with their problems. There is no question about it, we in the North feel that the Republicans and the Democrats of the South made a deal, with the South supporting the labor bill which is so beneficial to members of the Republican Party, and the South—in return for the North supporting the anticivil rights legislation.

Of course, we were not present at the conference and can only presume what must have taken place for the North and virtually the Solid South to vote so uniformly on this bill. I feel that the southern Democrats and the Republicans made a deal on labor and civil rights, just as it is charged the Republicans made a deal on colored support in the last election.

It is going to be noteworthy to see, when northern businessmen receive an analysis of this bill, that they are going to find there is as much bad in it for them as there is good. I voted against this bill because it was bad for businessmen as well as bad for labor. I was wholeheartedly in favor of the first six sections of the labor bill.

Business can now be sued and harassed in the State courts by their em-

ployees and their labor organizations. They can now be held liable in money damages. Can you imagine an employer, when a union starts to organize his plant, raising his employees wages? This employer can now be sued for having engaged in an unfair labor practice in trying to prevent the formation of a union. Can you imagine the employer being held liable in money damages with a judgment rendered against him because of this activity? Yet, this is exactly what can and will happen to employers under this act.

In 1934 President Roosevelt, because he had a social conscience and because he wanted to bring stability out of labor chaos, proposed and had passed the Wagner Act, in order to make labor and management relations stable and in order to promote the growth of the trade union movement and to raise the standard of living of the American people.

With the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill, we are denying the privilege of the Wagner Act to a large percentage of American men and women. We have emasculated its terms and while we have not denied its use entirely, we have curtailed its use and so limited it as to make it ineffective and inoperative. We have taken away from American union men and women, the powers that they need to deal on an equal footing or terms with management when labor disputes arise. I am happy to have been one of those who voted against the conference committee report and bill, and again, I repeat, it is my opinion that this bill emasculated the Wagner Act. I believe, in making this statement, that any newspaper should read carefully before impugning my motives. If it wants to disagree, that is its right, but on a matter of this importance, I do not believe it has the right to disagree and impugn motives at the same time.

It is interesting to note that the 52 votes against the bill, 27 came from New York and Pennsylvania. These votes were not votes against the labor reform provisions of the bill any more than mine was, but these were votes against enacting a Federal law which would freeze a right in the Southern States to continue a raid on northern and eastern industries and mills. These votes opposed giving Federal sanction to archaic State labor laws of the South and preventing the Federal Government from enforcing fair labor-management standards in Southern States; then enabling Southern States to compete unfairly with the North and East by selling sweatshop products to our people. Yes, permitting the South to become an industrial empire at our expense while, at the same time, it reduces the standard of living of all American working men and women.

I will not mention the unfair bonding provision of the act which excludes all but a few chosen bonding companies from getting the bonding business of union officers and trustees.

The employer is much worse off, under this act, insofar as informational picketing is concerned, for the reason that it may now go on indefinitely, whereas it is felt that the Curtis case, now before the Supreme Court, will uphold the principle that picketing is not legal, under Taft-Hartley, unless the union had the backing of a majority of the employees. Under the new act, this is not necessary.

The State courts of the Nation will be filled with injunctive proceedings by both management and labor because, when the National Labor Relations Board failed to act, either side, just as in the 1920's, can go to court for an injunction. Employers can be sued in State courts for an injunction to stop firing employees for union activities, for threatening employees during a union organizing campaign, for trying to buy their allegiance with pay raises or for refusing to bargain in good faith. Unless the States pass appropriate laws, thsee injunctive suits can never be settled in 37 States, because the State courts lack the authority to go further; to do such things as ordering an election or determining right of representation. There will be labor chaos and economic force supplanting order and peace in the labor-management field.

The special privileges given the building trades do not apply in the 19 States that have right-to-work laws. These privileges are in effect a closed shop right, which is outlawed in the right-to-work States.

As long as I am a Member of Congress, you may be assured that I will not vote for any legislation that does violence to any segment of our economy. This includes both management and labor. Neither will I vote to aid Southern States at the expense of my home State and other Northern States.

I believe in assisting all segments of our economy, if I can do so without injuring or tearing down some other segment of the economy.

Valuable Tome Acquired by Knights of Malta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following announcement made recently by Charles L. T. Pichel, O.S.J., secretary to the board, Knights of Malta, Shickshinny, Pa., concerning a very rare antique tome containing what is believed to be the first account of the famous Knights of Malta published in the English language:

VALUABLE TOME ACQUIRED BY ORDER

What is believed to be the first account of the famous Knights of Malta published in the English language is contained in a 13-page chapter of a very rare antique tome now 336 years old, having been published in London, 1623.

The book was first published in 1620 in the French language by the author Andrew Favine, "a Parisian and advocate in the High Court of Parliament."

Full title of the English volume is "The Theatre of Honour and Knighthood, or A Compendious Chronicle and Historie of the whole Christian World." The title page continues to explain, "Containing The Originall of all Monarchies, Kingdomes, and Estates, with their Emperours, Kings, Princes, and Gouvernours; Their Beginnings, Continuance, and Successions, to this present Time."

Further description on the title page states: "The First Institution of Armes, Emblazons, Kings, Heralds, * * * With all the Ancient and Moderne Military Orders of Knight-hood in every Kingdome * * * with their Originall, Lawes, and Observations."

Only one other copy of this work is known to exist in the United States, and that copy reposes under special guard in the reserve room of the New York Public Library.

Although the book carries a short account of the Sovereign Order of Saint John of Jerusalem, nevertheless, it contains facts and information about this order and all other orders, of the time, not found in the regular sources and textbooks, thus becoming a priceless acquisition for anyone interested in these ancient orders of chivalry.

This tome was located about 3 months ago in a secondhand bookshop in a London suburb by an official of the Order of Saint John familiar with its rare contents and age. It is in excellent condition. This first English translation of 538 pages measures 8¾ by 13½ inches by 3¼ inches thick. It may be seen at the convent of the order, Shickshinny, Pa.

Khrushchev's Visit Called Plot To Dull Moral Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by David Lawrence as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of September 14, 1959:

KHRUSHCHEV'S VISIT CALLED PLOT TO DULL MORAL FORCE

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, September 13.—The American people are entitled to know the game Soviet Premier Khrushchev is playing.

It is a game of diversion—rockets to the moon, protracted conferences on disarmament, and nuclear tests and summit talks that, if carried on for years, are intended to make the American people grow weary of international tension and finally to accept the unmoral and unlawful conquests of millions of peoples now enslaved.

There are two instruments of power in the world today that can affect the peace of mankind. One is military, and it is designed to act as a deterrent to physical aggression. The other is moral force which when developed to full strength can influence whole nations and cause them to rise up against their oppressors.

Khrushchev's game is to deaden the moral force that has made liberty-loving nations so articulate in world history in behalf of human freedom.

Khrushchev's game is to make it appear that, by exchanges of visits, by expansion of trade, by constant talk of peaceful coexistence, Americans are abandoning their dedication to moral force. This is expected to discourage revolt behind the Iron Curtain.

For if America becomes indifferent, the captive nations, it is persumed, will lose all hope.

Khrushchev's game is based on a belief that Americans are influenced only by selfishness and materialism—solely by the desire of businessmen for more trade—and that such idealism as remains can be anesthetized by wearisome and exhausting negotiations, or by implied threats of war through emphasis on missile and rocket development.

Khrushchev's game reaches a climax in propaganda intensity this week as he visits the United States. The dispatches and radio reports from America telling of enthusiasm for him, official honors paid and courtesies extended, together with news pictures of high American officials fraternizing with Khrushchev, will be displayed throughout Eastern Europe and behind the Iron Curtain, generally, as meaning approval of Communist policies by the people of the United States and their Government.

What can the American people do about it all? Various types of protests have been planned for the next 2 weeks and will be published widely. These devices are effective psychologically to some extent abroad, but it is here in Washington that the biggest opportunity has been missed.

The Congress speaks for the American people. It should have decided to stay in session throughout the Khrushchev visit to allow for an extensive debate on the cold war issues. This would have told the world in unequivocal terms that the American people have not forgotten what happened in Hungary and East Germany. It would have furnished an opportunity to ask Khrushchev openly what has become of the millions of persons exiled to concentration camps behind the Iron Curtain, and to expose to full view the operations of his autocratic government.

MORAL FORCE IS POTENT

For moral force is potent when it effectively expresses a nation's ideals, and when it seeks by debate and discussion to underline and emphasize the basic principles of human freedom.

Actually there is only one issue. It is the self-determination of peoples everywhere—the right of the people to vote in free elections and choose their rulers. In the Soviet Union, only one party can vote and military duress is applied to suppress free speech and debate. Just the other day, Khrushchev himself publicly told a group of Soviet writers that they were overstepping the bounds in their criticism, and that he might have "to shoot a few of you, and my hand will not tremble."

Moral force means a constant emphasis on the right of peoples to govern themselves.

Moral force means the exercise of the right of free speech persistently, without regard to the inhibitions of official courtesy. For, while the President and high officials of our own Government must follow the amenities, this does not bind the American people. There must, of course, be only peaceful demonstrations and never the slightest encouragement of disorder. But the American people ought not to be misled into allowing so-called courtesy to squelch those expressions of contempt for tyranny which ought never to be suppressed.

For the "butcher of Budapest," and the man who is responsibile for the murder, exile, and imprisonment of tens of thousands of people in Eastern Europe, cannot be allowed to believe that his crimes have been forgotten. To kowtow to dictators, and to let them misconstrue official courtesy as approval of their cruel acts, would be a backward step for America in world history.

Today tens of millions of people in the world are in bondage. Many of them are being tortured daily in concentration camps by the two big Communist regimes—in Moscow and Peiping. It is time to show the deepest sympathy for the oppressed and to speak frankly to the visiting ruler who has earned the doubtful distinction of having by his acts become the cruelest man in the world today.

Prayers are in order—prayers to the Almighty to give courage to the faltering and to find ways to bring the criminally guilty to the bar of justice. Peaceful coexistence should mean freedom for everybody, and not a world half slave and half free.

The Fight in 1959 for Hawaiian Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I submit my impressions of what I think was one of the major accomplishments of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, and convey my congratulations and thanks to my colleagues in the House of Representatives who worked so hard and cooperatively toward their goal. The subject of which I speak is the granting of statehood to the Territory of Hawaii and bringing this island empire into the family of States of our great American Union.

Aside from the overwhelming majority of the people of Hawaii who had struggled for years to gain admission of their territory as a State, I feel that I as an Alaskan who is also less than a year old as a fully endowed American citizen, probably have a better basis than most for understanding the human values involved. As the sole Member of this House from the now second newest State, my memory is fresh as to how it feels to be a colonial on the outside looking in, as contrasted with the fulfillment of being on the inside looking out.

As a youth raised in Alaska, and as an adult who has spent his mature years in Alaska, I had never been eligible until less than 10 months ago, to vote in a Presidential election, or until less than 10 months ago, to vote for U.S. Senators and a Representative to the Congress, or even for Governor.

The people of Hawaii had, until passage on the enabling legislation, been in exactly the same situation. The frustration—the feeling of helplessness in charting our own course of destiny—is something that can be fully understood and appreciated only after having experienced it. It is basic to our American heritage of economic and political independence—something ingrained in the minds and hearts of Americans, that has its origin in the years long before the American Revolution lead to the establishment of the Original Thirteen States. As Americans, our educational backgrounds, our cultural evolution—even our economic philosophy—all have taken a part in establishing in each of us the craving for sovereignty—not absentee government.

The people of a territory organized by the Congress under the American flag can for a period of years be satisfied to conduct a program of limited self-government—under tutelage, if you please—but only with the promise and in the hope that it will be only a temporary situation. After having gained experience and a fair degree of political maturity and economic self-sufficiency, the people of such a territory find themselves eager to be graduated and awarded the full measure of American political rights and responsibilities. The people of Hawaii had undeniably demonstrated that they and their great homeland were ready for graduation. This Congress refusing to be further delayed, tackled the problem early in the session, and before the Congress was many weeks old, embraced the Territory of Hawaii as an inalienable part of the Union, and removed them from the twilight zone of territoriality. Another goal of the Democratic Party achieved.

But I would not leave the impression that the only benefit derived has been for the people of Hawaii. Far from that. The United States as a whole will benefit from the enabling of these peoples to fully participate in the conduct of our national affairs, thereby obtaining the benefit of the fine contributions which all of us know they will make as our 50th State. We have already seen clear evidence of this in the Senators and Representative the State of Hawaii has sent to the Congress. Serious, honorable, intelligent and dedicated men—men of good will—men from varied ethnic groups—a real lesson in democracy.

We in the House naturally know our colleague, Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, better than we know those in the other body. A Japanese-American, lawyer, combat veteran, and hero, a young man of vision and determination, he typifies Americans everywhere. This able gentleman will, I am certain, do great credit to the State of Hawaii, the United States of America and the House of Representatives. His youth and vigor are priceless assets, and we shall all be proud and thankful to have him in our midst.

In closing, I would say that in granting statehood to Hawaii, the 1st session of the 86th Congress has built another monument to the greatness of the United States.

More Economic Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Reese H. Taylor, chairman of the board of the Union Oil Co., of California, and I have been having some interesting correspondence. Again, under unanimous

consent previously granted, I include one of Union's Oil's advertisements, in which that company appears to be educating the public in the basics of economics. I feel that it is doing no such thing, but is, in fact, misleading it.

Following the advertisement, which appeared in the September 7, 1959, issue of Life, is my reply to Mr. Taylor.

The matters follow:

THE ONLY WAY YOU CAN REDUCE YOUR TAXES

"From time to time there are factions who argue that special taxes should be levied against a business or industry.

"And there is always the same reason given—these special taxes will help to relieve the burden of the 'little man,' the average taxpayer.

"This is a beguiling promise. And a great delusion.

"Take our own company as an example. Union Oil has no source of income except what our customers pay us. So every dollar we spend in the conduct of our business is a customer's dollar.

"It's a customer's dollar whether we pay it out for a truck, a tanker, a service station, a salary or a tax.

"Each time our taxes are raised, we have to get the extra money out of the customer by increasing prices.

"Every business does the same thing, or it couldn't keep its doors open. No matter what company pays the taxes, its only source of income is its customer.

"Direct and indirect taxes are, in fact, a major part of overhead of every business. And they always have to be paid. By you."

Arthur Mackenzie is assistant manager of our tax division.

His logic, we think, highlights a simple truth. You cannot lower your own tax burden by increasing someone else's.

The only way to reduce everyone's taxes—including the ones you pay, is to cut needless Government spending at all levels.

Your comments invited. Write: chairman of the board, Union Oil Co., Union Oil Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mr. REESE H. TAYLOR,
Chairman, Union Oil Co.,
Union Oil Center, Los Angeles, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. TAYLOR: You may remember that once before, at the end of July, I took the liberty of addressing certain remarks to you concerning an advertisement which the company of which you are the able chairman placed in the July 13 issue of Life. That one contained some very dubious generalizations by you and by Mr. Charlie Perkins, purchasing agent of your company. Your new advertisement in the September 7 issue of Life, containing certain statements presumably made by the assistant manager of your tax division, Mr. Arthur Mackenzie, is, frankly, every bit as alarming to me as your earlier statement. It is hard for me to believe that any person whom you would be willing to have on your payroll as an assistant manager of your tax division could set forth for publication such naive nonsense as is contained on page 11 of Life's September 7 issue.

We can, of course, agree that taxes are one of the costs of doing business, and in this respect are like any other cost—wages, materials, services, etc.—that a business has to pay. In the long run, of course, no business can succeed which does not cover these costs and have enough profit to serve as an incentive to continue its operations. But to conclude from this fact that "each time our taxes are raised we have to get the extra money out of the customer by increasing prices" is an utterly fallacious conclusion, as any freshman student of economics could tell you. Raising prices to the consumer is, in fact, sometimes not even a feasible alternative. If a tax were imposed, for example, on fuel oil, but not on natural gas, or on other competitive fuels, it might be economic suicide to raise the price of fuel oil. In this respect, again, taxes are like any other cost which may go up. Sometimes a business finds it prudent to pass the increased cost on to the consumer, sometimes it is utterly impossible. Alternatives must be constantly examined, such as cutting other costs, increasing productivity, changing the product mix of the company, reducing dividends, and cutting executive salaries.

The conclusion you reach that "you cannot lower your own tax burden by increasing someone else's" is again quite untrue, as any student of the history of taxation knows. Every change in tax rates inevitably shifts the relative tax burden in one direction or another. If more taxes are gained from excises on tobacco, liquor, and playing cards, consumers of these items are assuming a part of the tax burden which otherwise would fall on others. If the oil industry gets a depletion allowance that is considered by many tax experts and myself as excessively generous, a relatively heavier burden falls on other businesses and individuals. If the tax rates on individuals are steeply graduated, those with lower incomes benefit directly. If corporate taxes are reduced, corporations, their officials, and their stockholder-owners, and in the rare instances where such reductions result in price cuts, even their customers may benefit. But a correspondingly greater burden falls upon the rest of the economy.

Of course, in the abstract, it is easy to say that cutting needless Government spending at all levels is the only way to reduce everyone's taxes. But this platitudinous generalization is of absolutely no help to anyone concerned with the determination of what the Government should spend. As you well know, Mr. Taylor, there is not a single Government program which does not have its spokesmen and advocates, those who insist that spending on their particular programs is essential and necessary. Nothing is of more constant concern to the Members of the Congress than seeing to it that the appropriations it authorizes are necessary for the security and welfare of our people. Our committees are vigilantly on guard against waste, fraud, and inefficiency. Aided by the General Accounting Office, and the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress is constantly aiming to keep Government expenditures to a point where they are economically sound and benecial to the American people.

But, Mr. Taylor, you must not forget that in a growing country such as ours, and in a world fraught with dangers to our national security, we would fail in our duties to our people, if we were directing our attention exclusively toward cutting expenditures. Russian military might has taught us to redouble our efforts for a strong national defense—and that costs money. Sputnik showed us the spectacular advances of Soviet science, and demonstrated the need for accelerating American education in science and technology—that too costs money. Our growing population and expanding economy make expenditures on schools, highways, hospitals, imperative. None of this comes cheap. If you feel, Mr. Taylor, that these, or any other specific Government programs should be abandoned, I should be glad to hear about it. But please don't just ask for cutting down Government spending at all levels. That is too much like saying you're against sin.

Let me assure you I don't like taxes any more than you do. I have to pay them on my salary, just that way you do on yours. Excise taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, eat into my income in a painful way. But I would never be able to live with myself if I thought for a moment that reducing these taxes was more important than the security of the United States and the welfare of its people. I am sure you feel the same.

No, let's not just "cut needless Government spending." Let's eliminate needless Government spending. But let us be sure that we know what spending is needless before we start to swing the meat ax around cutting down programs whose termination or reduction would place the security and the welfare of our people, of our children, and of our children's children in jeopardy.

With best regards,

Sincerely,

CHARLES O. PORTER,
Member of Congress.

Kirby-Woolworth Saga

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader entitled "Wilkes-Barre Notes Milestone," the occasion being the anniversaries of the Kirby-Woolworth Stores:

WILKES-BARRE NOTES MILESTONE

From tiny acorns mighty oaks spring.

The first acorn that developed into the F. W. Woolworth Co., with 3,290 stores in 11 countries around the globe, was planted in the town of Lancaster in southern Pennsylvania in 1879 by Frank W. Woolworth, whose name the firm continues to bear. He was one of the three Watertown, N.Y., store clerks who toyed with the idea of offering merchandise, priced at 5 and 10 cents to attract the general public. Shoppers flocked to the establishment and the experiment was a huge success.

Another clerk, Fred Morgan Kirby, decided to launch such an enterprise in Wilkes-Barre. In partnership with Sumner Woolworth, he opened a store on East Market Street on September 10, 1884, and it, too, was a success.

Three years later, Mr. Kirby became the sole owner when he purchased the interest of his partner who decided to concentrate on a similar store at nearby Scranton, seat of the newly formed county of Lackawanna.

In the meantime, a man named Seymour H. Knox had founded a 5-and-10 store at Erie and one E. P. Charlton had gone into business at Little Falls, Maine.

The initiative of these pioneers paid off handsomely. In 1912, F. W. Woolworth had some 300 stores in a chain throughout the country. Mr. Kirby's modest establishment in central city had grown to 96 stores under the firm name of F. M. Kirby & Co. The others, too, prospered. Merging their interests, the F. W. Woolworth Co. was organized and the rest is familiar history.

To commemorate the 80th anniversary year of the F. W. Woolworth Co. and the 75th anniversary of one of the original stores, established in this instance by Mr. Kirby in Wilkes-Barre, a special celebration will be held in this city. It will be opened with a reception and dinner in the Westmoreland Club tonight with top Woolworth executives and civic leaders in attendance and will be continued with Kirby-Woolworth Founders Days, starting September 24.

The eminence the F. W. Woolworth Co. attained was no accident. Its founders built

on a solid foundation, as the career of Mr. Kirby attests. Today, its executives and employees have stirring examples from the past to guide them. It is easy to understand the firm's progress and enterprise under these stimulating circumstances. Today's Woolworth store, still known as Kirby's in Wilkes-Barre, is a far cry from the modest five-and-tens of yesteryear, but, basically, the principles are unchanged.

Mr. Kirby lives on in Wilkes-Barre, not only in the memory of a generation that knew him personally, but in the many monuments he has left—his modern store, the park that bears his name, the magnificent health center on North Franklin Street and in every so many civic undertakings with which he was identified. A grateful Wilkes-Barre will never forget him.

It is especially gratifying to this city that Mr. Kirby's son, Allan P. Kirby, a native son, not only is following in the footsteps of his distinguished father as a businessman, financier, and philanthropist, but is carving a notable career of his own. As head of the Allegheny Corp. and the New York Central Railroad, as well as a director of the F. W. Woolworth Co., and other enterprises, he has become a nationally known figure. The Kirbys, father and son, have a special place in the affections of Greater Wilkes-Barre as we are reminded by the current Kirby-Woolworth milestone.

It is a privilege, on behalf or the community, to extend congratulations and best wishes on this momentous occasion.

Agriculture and the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress has now drawn to a close. At this point it seems especially appropriate to review for a few moments what this session of Congress accomplished and what it did not accomplish on one of the more prominent problems of our economy today—the agricultural problem. I believe most Members of the Congress will agree that agriculture occupied a great deal of their time during the past few months.

Agriculture is very important to every man, woman, and child in these United States. Agriculture is our most basic industry upon which our whole existence depends and from which a large segment of the population makes a livelihood. Agriculture is vital not only to the millions who are engaged in it directly but to many more millions of people whose interests and occupations are tied closely with agriculture in the transporting, processing, delivering, and servicing of our food and fiber. Indeed, our very lives depend upon this very vital industry, and its importance is well recognized by Members of Congress. It is with this recognition that we give prominence to the problems of agriculture.

We should give agricultural legislation first consideration in our deliberations. The American farmer must receive equitable treatment at the hands of government.

We all agree that the man who is feeding and clothing us so efficiently and well—the American farmer—is entitled to a fair return for his efforts. He should not be shackled with regulations and restrictions which will be adverse to his welfare and that of the American public.

Much has been said about the farm mess. Probably most people are aware of the so-called farm problem. The inclination has been to point the finger of blame at the farmer. I rise to the defense of the farmer in this situation. He is not to blame, as most informed people know. If there is anyone to blame, it is someone other than the man on the farm.

Many opponents have cast particular blame on the administration for the farm problem. Actually, many of those who would blame the farmer or the administration for the farm problem are trying to cover up their own lack of responsibility. Actually, no individual should be blamed for the farm problem. But certainly the bulk of responsibility should be accepted by the Congress itself.

Our constituents know that it is the responsibility of Congress to draft, debate, and pass needed legislation. That is not the responsibility of the administration or anyone else. The responsibility can only be that of the Congress. We cannot dodge that responsibility.

We must accept the truth for what it is. One truth that is self-evident is the fact that the 86th Congress is controlled by the Democratic Party in a ratio of around two to one. As a matter of fact, the House Committee on Agriculture, as constituted, includes 22 Democrats and 12 Republicans. By this majority the Democratic Party must accept the principal responsibility for congressional action or inaction as it regards agriculture. The responsibility rests squarely on the Democrats in the present session. That majority party has controlled the legislation during this session from start to finish. By an overwhelming majority, as exists this session, the Democratic Members, if they so chose, could have brought forth the kind of legislation which is so badly needed. Instead, they did little to provide a sound, practical, and workable farm program. The majority party failed to face up to the realities of the farm situation despite an ever-increasing volume of criticism over the tremendous surpluses that are accumulating and the mounting costs of the farm program. The majority party, by failing to act, has provided the basis for still greater farm problems in the future.

The desire of the Democrats to act as politicians instead of statesmen has created a farm situation which will be much harder to correct than if remedial action had been taken. Because the majority party chose to take a course of inaction as pertains to sound farm legislation, the farm problems will accumulate even more another year.

The Democrats have quibbled on the farm problem. They not only failed to take the initiative in writing needed new basic farm legislation, they chose to avoid those difficulties by doing nothing about them, or in those instances where they tried to do something they took such ridiculous action that they knew beforehand the legislation would be vetoed.

The party in control of Congress this session made no strong attempt to provide sound remedial legislation for farmers. Again and again they dodged the issues that were squarely before them. Their main attempts were in the form of criticism of the administration. Honesty and statesmanship would have been a wiser course. Because of the delaying tactics that have been used the farm problem will undoubtedly worsen. It is entirely possible that the hue and cry that will be raised in the future will force legislation which will compel the withdrawal of some of the assistance programs needed by farmers.

The problems of agriculture and the differences between those of us who are close to agriculture are often far out of proportion to our accomplishments and our agreement. Bipartisanship efforts for greater agricultural research, for an expanded school milk program, for improving and strengthening the farm credit system, the expansion of activities on the control and eradication of plant and rodent pests, and the extension of Public Law 480 each stand as constructive and sound steps taken in the first session of this Congress for the overall improvement of Agriculture.

During the 86th Congress I personally and in conjunction with my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Agriculture urged the Secretary of Agriculture to take what I feel were two constructive steps in our agricultural program.

The first was to expand the types and varieties of commodities eligible for donation to needy persons and to welfare institutions. In particular, this covered peanut butter and some vegetable shortening. I am happy to say that later in the year the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit to carry out my recommendations. My second recommendation was that the Secretary take a long and hard look at recent developments in the hog-marketing situation in Canada. We from the Corn Belt are very much concerned over recent reports that the Canadian Government is considering the institution of a compensatory payment program on live hogs and dumping its surplus into the United States. While everybody is for mutually advantageous trade, we should not sit idly by. If Canadian Government-subsidized pork is dumped into this country at a time when our free livestock industry is facing an overabundant supply of pork, we may have to limit imports. I have been assured by the administration that it will closely scrutinize developments in Canada and take appropriate action if necessary.

I am disappointed, however, that we in Congress have not been able to approach some of the really huge problems of agriculture, such as surpluses and farm income, in an equally statesmanlike and bipartisan manner. I am disappointed that the Congress has not seen fit to seriously consider the President's recommendations on agriculture while sending to him completely unsound and unacceptable proposals.

There has been a lot of political talk about the corn crop, about the poultry situation, about food distribution, and about the hog situation. But there has been absolutely no action by the Congress on these important aspects of agriculture. The administration has conducted purchase programs on both eggs and pork and it has been doing an outstanding job of distributing our surplus food to needy people, to welfare institutions, and to children in the school lunch and school milk programs. The following table illustrates the dramatic increase in our food distribution activities under this administration:

Surplus foods distributed in the United States

Fiscal year	Quantity	Cost
	Pounds	*Dollars*
1953	161,100,000	68,700,000
1954	417,800,000	155,200,000
1955	492,500,000	167,700,000
1956	789,100,000	234,600,000
1957	1,061,900,000	236,400,000
1958	871,600,000	185,400,000
1st half 1959	558,400,000	113,700,000
Total	4,352,400,000	1,161,700,000

[In thousands]

Fiscal year	Children in school lunches	Needy persons in institutions	Needy persons in family units	Total
1953	9,300	1,300	100	10,700
1954	9,400	1,400	1,100	11,900
1955	10,200	1,300	3,290	14,790
1956	10,900	1,400	3,170	15,470
1957	11,900	1,400	3,485	16,785
1958	13,600	1,400	4,665	19,665
1st half 1959	14,100	1,400	5,230	20,730

The logical inconsistency of the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress on farm legislation was readily apparent on the two important farm bills vetoed by the President. These bills dealt with wheat and tobacco.

The tobacco bill merely tampered with tobacco price supports, while the wheat bill would actually have raised price supports, while the wheat bill would actually have raised price supports.

The tobacco industry was thoroughly aware of the fact that the ever-rising parity formula with tobacco price supports keyed to it at 90 percent of parity was steadily pricing this great industry out of the world market. The industry also was keenly aware that further acreage cuts would be necessary on an already drastically cut acreage unless price supports were lowered and the surplus buildup was reversed.

The Democratic leadership fully realized these tobacco "facts of life." But rather than face the problem squarely and forthrightly they pushed through Congress a bill which would freeze future tobacco price supports from going higher in dollars and cents than they were in 1959. This was a real freeze bill—only the freeze was in effect a ceiling price, not a sound approach to help tobacco farmers. The bill also provided that this freeze or ceiling price on tobacco would remain in effect until 90 percent of the old parity formula reached the 1958 level of support or until 90 percent of the new parity formula dropped below the 1958 level. This proposal was mere political window dressing designed to fool farmers.

Anyone who studied the tobacco situation knew that the old formula—which is based on tobacco prices received over 40 years ago—would not catch up to the 1958 level for at least 5 years.

Expecting the new formula to drop below the 1958 level was sheer wishful thinking. Experts stated it would not happen in the foreseeable future.

The sum and substance of the vetoed tobacco bill was that the Democratic-controlled Congress did not want to admit the failure of the 90 percent of parity price support program on tobacco. They wanted their cake and they wanted to eat it too. They wanted to continue 90 percent of parity for tobacco above all else, but they did not want to lose any more exports or face further acreage cuts.

When the bill came to the floor of the House, I offered an amendment, which was supported by the minority, to call a spade a spade and freeze tobacco price supports for 2 years at the 1958 level. There was no sound reason why tobacco should set the precedent of being the only commodity under the old parity formula. The Democratic-controlled Congress rejected my amendment and then professed profound misunderstanding when the President vetoed the bill. As the President pointed out:

> The bill's demerits are fundamental and far reaching. The bill takes a long step backward by resurrecting 90 percent of old parity as one basis for determining support levels for tobacco. The Congress itself discarded the old parity formula years ago.

The tobacco bill was not sound legislation. It was mere shadowboxing.

It was indeed ironic that at the conclusion of the debate on the tobacco bill, which would have accepted a 90 percent of parity religion in tobacco price supports, the Democratic leadership called up the wheat bill that raised price supports. The tobacco bill at least recognized what the present harmful program was doing to it. The wheat bill, on the other hand, not only failed to recognize the shortcomings of the present wheat program but it also stepped backwards to a disproven 90 percent of parity concept on this important crop.

As we pointed out in our minority report on the wheat bill, the shortsighted approach made by this legislation would have cost the taxpayers of the United States an estimated $110 million per year more than the present program, and it would not begin to deal with the problem of surplus in this basic grain.

There was a great deal of argument about the cost of this bill, but the record is clear that experts within the Department of Agriculture—not me, not the Congress, and not the Library of Congress—estimated the increased cost of the bill to taxpayers to be $110 million per year.

In addition, this wheat bill, which was not supported by farm organizations or wheatgrowers, would have imposed a 24 percent cut in the acreage allotment of every wheat farmer in America. It would have imposed some of the most stringent penalties to farmers ever on the lawbooks. It would have left the referendum outcome in the hands of only one-third of the wheat farmers in this country.

It was undoubtedly the poorest piece of farm legislation in this session of Congress. Even the Democratic-controlled House rejected the bill after it had gone to conference with the Senate. But rather than assume their rightful responsibility, the Democrats passed the buck to a sincere and conscientious President. Knowing fully in advance that it would be vetoed, they attempted to shift the blame for their own failure to the shoulders of this administration.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we in Congress face the issues on agriculture squarely and honestly.

It is my earnest plea that the 86th Congress forgo its political ambitions and approach the problems of agriculture in a statesmanlike and candid manner.

There have been a number of efforts in the 86th Congress to find an easy way out of the farm problem. There have been many who have shown by their frantic efforts that they are under the illusion that there is an easy way out. There is no easy way out of the difficult position that the farm economy now finds itself. The farm problem must be recognized as being, in large part, the result of the laws passed by Congress under the impression that those laws were for the great benefit of the farmer.

There are too many who consider themselves a friend of the farmer, and who are under the illusion that you can tamper with the economics of farming for political purpose and gain, and do good to the farmer. That just is not so. We can see the fallacy of that thinking all around us right now, in the form of the tremendous, costly, surpluses of such important farm crops as wheat, corn, and cotton.

Some people, including a number of the majority party in Congress now, apparently believe there is no surplus of farm products—that we can sell anything if we try hard enough. This has been appropriately described as trying to sweep our problems under the rug. There is a market potential, and we should do whatever is practical to develop our markets. But there is a limit to what we can sell, and a limit to what we can even give away. Too many are prone to close their eyes to the hard facts of reality in agriculture, and recognize that our production capacity today exceeds our markets. Sometime this fact must be faced—sometime soon. The time is already far past when we should have recognized it. The majority party must recognize that and face up to it. Their shadowboxing with the farm problem during the past session must stop. They must get down to the business of facing the facts before it is too late.

The Battle of the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, one of the major battles of the session just concluded involved the impact of congressional and Executive action on the budget.

The Congress reduced the President's requests by $1,881 million. There was one request we could not reduce—that was the request for additional sums to pay interest. The January budget request was for $8.1 billion for interest for the present fiscal year. The President's message of June 8 estimated the interest cost at $8.6 billion. With the subsequent increases in interest rates, we may expect the actual figure for fiscal 1960 to be nearly $9 billion.

The administration's hard money policy has, in the past year alone, added nearly $1 billion to the cost of operating the Federal Government. Since 1953 it has added approximately $3 billion a year to the annual cost. These increases in the tax burden did not add $1 worth of service to the people of the country. They did subtract from the services we can perform.

The additional sum we will spend in interest this year is more than the sum of all of the major budgetary items in dispute between the Congress and the President.

The annual cost of the housing bill vetoed by the President was roughly $100 billion a year. The clean streams bill, H.R. 3610, which rests in conference would have cost an extra $50 million in the House version or $30 million in the Senate version.

The depressed-areas bill which rests in the Rules Committee would have cost only a few million dollars apart from the loan program it contained. The airport bill was cut by $37 million and service to the public was cut as a result.

The public works bill was vetoed because it included 67 construction items authorized by the Congress which would have cost this year about $35 million. The President claims they involved a future commitment of $804 million. But these are not sums wasted as interest payments are wasted. These are investments in the water resources of America.

The highway program for 1960 was cut back by $300 million under Presidential pressure.

In addition to these items of expenditure, Mr. Speaker, there has been a continuing battle over certain loan programs. It is regrettable that the administration cannot see the difference between expenditures and loans. For example, the loan program of $50 million for college classrooms cut from the housing bill would not cost the taxpayer anything. Every cent would be repaid with interest.

It would be most helpful if the public discussion of complex fiscal matters would be conducted in a manner which adds to public understanding. The misrepresentation and deceit which surrounds administration discussion of these issues betrays a contempt for the intelligence of the public or else an inadequacy on the part of these officeholders. The American people are entitled to a candid explanation of the facts, not only about the public purse but about all public issues.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that every dollar which this Congress saved the taxpayers by trimming these essential services and essential investments in the public welfare are being spent in this same year in payments to moneylenders because of the administration's refusal to adopt sound monetary, credit, and fiscal policies.

The Democratic Party deserves credit for its refusal to permit the Treasury to commit the taxpayers to 30- and 40-year loans in this period of high interest rates. It appears regrettable that rather than mend its ways the administration chooses instead to abuse us for defending the taxpayer's interest.

The Democratic Party is to be congratulated, Mr. Speaker, for persisting in its desire to give the taxpayers service for the money taxpayers pay. We shall continue to do so, notwithstanding the calumny and misrepresentation which appear to be our lot. For we have faith in the good judgment of the people at the polls.

Talk by Former Senator Benton at Distinguished Service Awards Luncheon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, a witty and brilliant address by the former Senator from Connecticut, the Honorable William Benton, was delivered last Friday at the congressional distinguished service awards luncheon of the American Political Science Association.

Senator Benton's remarks stole the show at the Mayflower. I commend them to my colleagues for perusal:

COMMENTS OF HON. WILLIAM BENTON AT THE CONGRESSIONAL DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS LUNCHEON, AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., SEPTEMBER 11, 1959

When I was serving as Assistant Secretary of State late in 1945, Secretary Byrnes tossed me at the Congress. As he prepared to leave for 5 months at the Paris Conference in the spring of 1946, he dumped a mass of proposed legislation in my lap and told me to put it through. After objecting strenuously and telling him that this was his job or Dean Acheson's job, I asked him how to do it. He said, "First try to find the keyman and sell him; then ask him who the next man is and go to see him; then go back and report to the keyman; then ask both of them who the third man is, and always keep reporting back; and keep going." Later, from another source, I was advised, "Hire as your assistant a man with a southern accent." I did better than that. I got one with the accent who was the protege of one of the most powerful Senators and the son-in-law of a former chairman of one of the most important committees of the House.

My first call was on Gene Cox who was blocking one of my bills in the Rules Committee. He informed me that the unanimous approval which I had secured after my testimony to the Foreign Affairs Committee really didn't help me. The reason? Only two members of the committee, Congressman Cox explained, carried any real weight in the Congress, and one of them not much. Secretary Byrnes on his return, impressed by my conversion of Congressman Cox, referred to him as a mighty man.

This call started my increasingly intimate acquaintance with the most remarkable group of men I've ever known. I shall always treasure as among my greatest triumphs the part I played in winning such Congressmen as Everett Dirksen, Dewey Short, and Karl Mundt to the support of what 2 years later became known in the 80th Congress as the Smith-Mundt bill. I well remember how surprised I was when Arthur Vandenberg, my keyman in the Senate, selected Senator Smith for the role that brought him world fame with the remark that Alex Smith had had something to do with Princeton. And I remember also Senator FULBRIGHT's surprise when I named the act he had created and sponsored the Fulbright Act and announced in a State Department press release that the scholarship fellows would be known as Fulbright fellows. This is how good administrators try to pay off to good Senators when the Senators have a good idea. A trophy I prize, which hangs on the wall of my office, is one of the two pens with which President Truman signed this act. Senator FULBRIGHT has the other.

Perhaps more remarkable are the wives. I once told the Young Democrats at Yale that if they aspired to political careers their first make-or-break decision was their choice of a wife. Unlike most wives in the business community, the wives of our Senators and Congressmen are full-fledged partners. Sometimes, as Senator MARGARET SMITH and many others illustrate, they do even better when the other half passes on. They are assuredly the most gifted and able group of women ever automatically selected by the profession of their husbands.

Yet since the founding of our Republic, sneering at Congress has been a popular American sport. Mark Twain won laughs when he denigrated Congress by saying, "It could probably be shown by facts and figures that there is no distinctly native American criminal class except Congress."

My boyhood contemporaries laughed at Artemus Ward's quip, "I am not a politician and my other habits are good."

Even Congressmen join in the sport. The eloquent Dewey Short once referred to the Congress as that "supine, sporific, supercilious, pusillanimous body of nitwits." (Perhaps Chairman CARL VINSON, one of our award winners of today, will ask Assistant Secretary Short about this remark the next time he appears before his committee.)

No wonder it has been almost axiomatic that Members of the Senate and House have virtually no chance to run for President. Senator Knowland is the most recent Senator of some prominence who seems to have believed the axiom. I hope that Senators HUMPHREY, KEATING, and WILLIAMS, our other three winners, will prove impervious to it.

Now of course we can agree that there are occasional nitwits on the Hill. And unfortunately those Congressmen who are the least responsible may be those who get the most publicity—at least, for a time—or until they're censored. As Woodrow Wilson, a perhaps not forgotten former president of your association, pointed out in his famous doctoral thesis—there is a kind of built-in irresponsibility in our congressional system. The Constitution puts a premium on congressional controversy. And who can too readily blame the Congressman who seeks

the publicity of the headlines? Politics, like the theater, depends on personal publicity. Just as Brigitte Bardot's picture in the paper is converted into ticket sales at the box office, so the politician hopes his headlines will be translated into votes at the polls—or into campaign contributions which in turn translate into votes.

But what about the Congressmen who perform the nonglamorous drudgery which is the heart of effective work by the Congress? Often they remain virtually unknown, unnamed, unheralded, unsung, and unappreciated except by their colleagues. Yet these specialists in the art of the possible, these compromisers and choosers of the lesser evil, these followers and leaders of public ignorance and public insight—these are the men on whom our democracy depends. They are the ones who put in the night hours of solitary study—the attendance at often tedious committee meetings—which lie behind the construction of appropriation bills, tax measures, and major substantive legislation of all kinds.

Einstein once remarked that the world is more likely to die of bad politics than bad physics. It would seem to follow that good politics and constructive politicians should be duly honored if we can find a way to do it.

Thus I congratulate the American Political Science Association on its innovation today. I am flattered that an article of mine in the New York Times Sunday magazine, titled "For Distinguished Service in the Congress," stimulated the awards you are about to confer. Today your association formally responds to a question I asked in this article, "Do we (Americans) lack the resourcefulness to assess key political policymakers, and to bring them out in the open so that we can better judge their deeds and know who they are?"

Further, I'm pleased that the William Benton Foundation was in a position to finance Dr. Kirkpatrick and his associates through their many months of painstaking planning on how to pick the four Congressmen and Senators who are with us today, those who have been judged to have turned in the best performances, those in the national interest—and regardless of the local or national publicity.

I am hopeful, of course, that these biennial awards will enhance the prestige of Congress. Perhaps they will help rectify the imbalance of the headlines by providing a moral equivalent which will not only prove personally rewarding to the four recipients but which may generate publicity that in turn can be translated into the votes at the polls which every politician needs if he's to stay alive. On the Dave Garroway TV show this morning, I expressed this hope for our four winners and most particularly I congratulate these pioneers of today. They are the advance guard in our parade of recognition. They have been selected from the entire Congress and this will be the last such selection in the history of the awards—because henceforward prior award winners will be ineligible. Their records exemplify why Congress is a great and effective body—why it is the forum for the American people, the watchdog of our safety and welfare, and the bulwark of our democratic processes.

War on Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD the following speech which I made before the Pennsylvania State Board of the American Bakery and Confectionery Workers, AFL–CIO:

WAR ON UNIONS

In the April 1958 edition of Steel Labor, the United Steelworkers of America warned their membership by a front page story that "war had been declared on the unions."

They pictured many brochures received by my office that were being used to undermine union activities, union leaders, and the union membership in general.

The war on unions gained in momentum. Labor forces were not mobilized; and we find out that the American labor movement has lost, by default, the first battle.

The year 1959 shall be known as the year of crisis for labor.

Let us go back, just a little, and see just what happened.

For many, many years propaganda and pamphlets, which were definitely antilabor, have been shoved aside and ignored. Many who received them felt there was no planned program on the part of big business who refused to accept labor as a part of our economic life and who objected to negotiating with labor to give them their share of the profits of our capitalistic system.

While I was a member of the Pennsylvania Senate I received many pamphlets and speeches against labor; but, in 1956, when I took office in Congress, I was amazed by the amount of antilabor material that came to my desk daily.

Brochures, books, reprints of speeches by leading industrialists, copies of editorials, and all kinds of folders and statements that were nothing but out-and-out "union busting" throwaways were being received by me and by every other Congressman and Senator down in Washington.

On numerous occasions, when addressing union meetings back here in the district, I pointed out this fact; indeed, I stressed the seriousness of the atmosphere that was being created in Washington concerning labor in general.

When the McClellan committee came into being, in January 1957, they started their investigative hearings. Every exposé they made concerning labor—any segment of it—was played up by the daily papers, from coast to coast. The television stations gave "blow by blow" shows of the hearings. The radios, in our cars and in our homes, repeated again and again stories of isolated cases of violence and corruption until they convinced the listening public that these were normal, everyday occurrences.

The year 1958 saw the start, therefore, of the labor bills.

The Kennedy-Ives bill was passed by the Senate—with only one vote against it. That was Senator BARRY GOLDWATER'S—and he opposed it because he said it was too weak.

That bill was defeated in the House by a coalition of reactionary Republicans from the North and the southern Democrats because, they said, it was not strong enough.

The year 1959 will be noted in the history of the labor movement as the greatest year for all those who opposed unions—for the antilabor forces, with their high-powered advertising companies, joined ranks in a well-planned campaign of brainwashing the American public.

Not until the House voted and the Landrum-Griffin bill went to the Senate for conference, did the rank and file of labor wake up and realize the setback they had received.

It was then too late to do much about it.

The representatives of organized labor were on the job, they had talked with the Members of the House and the Senate; but—let's be honest—we were not swamped by mail from home, from our district, from the average union member.

The reason for it, the average member of each and every union was confused. The Madison Avenue boys had done an excellent job in painting a foggy picture.

Bernard Nossiter, a columnist in the Washington Post, analyzed the labor bill lobby very calmly and revealed and reviewed what has happened to the citizens of our country—and that includes the members of labor, organized and otherwise. He says:

"Sophisticated business lobbying—combined with conscious manipulation of public mood—is being credited with a major role in the passage of the strong labor bill. Details of this skilled operation began coming out this week."

He goes on to say that the core of the technique was to focus on the "uncommitted House Members—particularly those in marginal districts. In those districts a deliberate effort was made to translate public anger at the disclosures of union corruption, by the McClellan committee, into a barrage of letters urging the Congressmen to vote for a tough bill."

The major organizations involved were the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—aided by many of their own State groups, such as the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American Retail Federations, the National Small Business Men's Association.

Mr. Nossiter states that while these groups did not march in perfect steps together—the degree to which they cooperated and coordinated their efforts was the greatest that had been experienced by business.

They did not descend upon Congress; they went after only those Members who were in marginal districts. That is, the men who won by only 5 percent, or less, of the popular vote and who had never voted on a labor bill. They found there were about 120 in this group.

However, they discovered that, out of these 120 Members, some definitely favored a bill, but were not committed; and by a process of elimination they decided to concentrate on 54 Congressmen and the districts in which they lived.

The McClellan committee, with all its publicity and exposes, had set the public mood.

So early in June this group started their major effort.

They set about systematically to arouse the constituents in these marginal districts and get them to flood their Congressmen with mail demanding the passage of a "strong labor bill."

One important tool was the television show "Sound of Violence."

Do you remember seeing it, or hearing about it—the hour-long show portraying union hoodlums in the jukebox field that the Armstrong Cork Co.'s Circle Theater had shown in April? An estimated 25 million saw that and heard, at its end, an appeal from Senator MCCLELLAN asking the American people to do something about the evils shown in the play.

The Armstrong Cork Co. very obligingly decided to show the drama again in July, and the business lobbyists cooperated fully.

Mr. Nossiter states that local affiliates of the National Association of Manufacturers and other trade associations told their members where and when the show could be seen. They advised employer members to urge their employees to watch it, and they encouraged their members to get their employees to write their Congressmen on the labor bill.

The Washington Post states that:

"The strategists discovered that TV stations in 27 key congressional districts would not carry the rerun of the show. Arrangements were made to get eight of these stations to run it as a public service or under local sponsorship. Newspaper ads were taken in 20 of the important congressional districts urging people to watch and then write their Congressman."

Not satisfied with that, the paper further states that "an estimated 4½ to 5 million mailing was made telling about the show

and requesting letters be written to Congress; and an estimated 15 to 20 million persons were said to have watched the rerun of the show."

Late in July the Landrum-Griffin bill was introduced in Congress.

The heat became even hotter in Washington.

These organizations made brief tape recordings for radio and TV, featuring Congressmen LANDRUM and GRIFFIN, and starting in August these tapes were run quite frequently as public service features or under local sponsorship in 35 of these crucial congressional districts.

In one congressional district, the paper pointed out, a good sized corporation sent its foremen out to ring neighbors' doorbells; they claim that this produced 3,000 letters in 1 week which urged that particular Congressman to vote for a stiff bill.

The vote for this bill came on August 13, and it won by 28 votes.

Since the entire group of 54 had originally been selected on the premise that they leaned toward a soft bill, the lobbyists claim their work helped produce this victory.

"Business lobbyists, so pleased with their efforts, expect to use these techniques with more success in the future," so states Mr. Nossiter of the Washington Post.

That is what happened:

No doubt you have read the recent reports appearing in the papers that business—big business—is realizing that it must become active in politics, in the affairs of our Government. The Gulf Corp., for instance, has announced that it will endeavor to get its people interested in the part they must play in politics.

Only a couple of weeks ago the papers reported on a group of political science students from the various large corporations in and around Pittsburgh who went to Harrisburg to learn how laws were passed and see the house and the senate in action.

If anyone over the age of 10 today thinks that business has not been active in politics for the last 50 years or more, his education has been very inadequate.

What have the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the national right-to-work advocates been doing?

I would certainly call the steady barrage of mail, letters, articles, copies of speeches, and antilabor material that I have been receiving ever since I went to Washington a program of activity in politics.

I think they meant to say they are going to become "more active."

And, when you see how they worked on this so-called labor reform legislation, you can see what is in store for us.

The chips are down.

We are in an economic war.

Although the leaders and representatives of big business pay lipservice to good unions, they are out to do away with them, if possible.

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER—I believe you have heard tell of him—said: "I am for unions, but I like the unions without officers or members."

Mr. Roger Blough, the Wall Street lawyer now the head of the United States Steel Corp., said:

"Unions have gone too far, too fast."

Mr. Blough, incidentally, was much in favor of the Landrum-Griffin bill, or even a stronger one, if it could have been passed. He was all for Government control of the unions and Government interference with the internal affairs of labor organizations. However, he lost no time, nor did he hesitate, in telling the Government—and President Eisenhower—that he wants no Government interference with his steel strike. He wants no factfinding body to look into his problems.

Up to date, the President has cooperated fully with Mr. Blough.

Why?

Drew Pearson told us why just a week or so ago. He stated:

"Personal friends of the President (who are members of industry active in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the national right-to-work organizations) have convinced him that he should stay out of the present steel strike controversy so the steel companies can give the unions a defeat it will not soon forget."

Mr. Pearson further pointed out that the following individuals contributed $214,250 to Mr. Eisenhower's 1956 campaign for reelection and he listed:

"National Steel, with Mr. George Humphrey contributing $37,200.

"Republic Steel, with Messrs. James Black and George Allen (Ike's bridge crony and farm partner) contributing $16,000.

"United States Steel, with the executives of the company contributing $26,800.

"Armco Steel, with Mr. and Mrs. Charles Payson, Mr. Kenneth Spencer and other officers contributing $96,450.

"Bethlehem Steel, with its executives contributing $8,750.

"Inland Steel, with Mr. and Mrs. E. L. Ryerson contributing $3,150.

"Jones & Laughlin, with its executives contributing $25,800."

If that is not taking an active part in politics, what is?

I would say that the steel business invested rather heavily in Ike, and, up to date, their investment has paid off. He is doing as they ask.

Do you realize that if steel management can get a contract they dictate every other corporation will do the same thing, or try to?

We must realize right now this is no cold war on distant shores.

This is a hot war right here at home—on how our own economic future will turn out.

Let me show you just how serious it is.

The Landrum-Griffin bill was passed by a coalition of northern Republicans and southern Democrats—after the President of the United States had made a public appeal for its passage by means of a coast-to-coast television program.

The reason why it passed is not too difficult to find when you look at the economic picture.

The Congressmen from the southern right-to-work States, almost unanimously, supported this bill—that is, Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia.

Do you know the per capita income in these States—that is, the average yearly income down there? Well, here they are:

Alabama	$1,300
Arkansas	1,200
Florida	1,800
Georgia	1,400
Mississippi	1,500
North Carolina	1,300
South Carolina	1,200
Tennessee	1,400
Texas	1,800
Virginia	1,600

In Pennsylvania our average income is $2,100.

Did you know that in those Southern States—where they are continually fighting against Federal aid to education and the improvement of our schools—the percentages of draftees turned down because of illiteracy is—

Alabama	42.6
Arkansas	32.1
Florida	31.3
Georgia	37.0
Mississippi	49.9
North Carolina	32.4
South Carolina	49.8
Tennessee	28.9
Texas	23.1
Virginia	31.9

In Pennsylvania our turndown was only 9.5.

Did you know, or could you believe, that in Georgia laws prohibit mass picketing? In Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas there is no compulsory workman's compensation laws? There is no minimum-wage law in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North and South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas. Arkansas, the home of the great defender of the laboring man, Senator MCCLELLAN, has a minimum-wage law. It is 10 cents per hour.

A mayor from one of the cities of Mississippi wrote a northern manufacturer, and said:

"No one will tell you whom you must employ. All detrimental State laws for industrial operations have been repealed. The closed shop in Mississippi has been outlawed. Industrial wages are from 50 cents to 95 cents per hour lower than in the Northern States."

The passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill will guarantee the continuation of cheap labor and unbelievably poor working conditions for the workers.

The northern Republicans, who voted for this bill, apparently want to see those conditions and wages exist in the Northern States as well.

Oh, I was in favor of the original purpose of the so-called labor reform legislation—to eliminate crooks and racketeers in both management and labor.

But the Landrum-Griffin bill did not do this.

The truth is—rather than being a reforming bill it turned out to be a deforming bill.

Mr. A. H. Raskin, of the New York Times, stated:

"On the ironic side is the possibility that the law, for all its emphasis on stamping out union rackets, will prove a legal umbrella for hoodlum-infested paper unions. The bill prohibits picketing for union recognition where an employer has lawfully entered into an agreement with another union. This provides a strong incentive for deals by unscrupulous employers and racketeers who go into the 'union business' by the simple expedient of printing a fistful of independent charters. Contracts with such complacent outfits can serve as insurance against recruiting drives by bona fide unions. Proving that there is anything wrong about the arrangement is always difficult. With the added vigilance the crooks have learned, as a result of the McClellan committee, it is going to be even harder to establish collusion in the future."

Mr. Raskin goes on to say that:

"The most substantial revision in union practices will flow from the rules governing picketing to force union recognition and the virtual ban on secondary boycotts. With the spread of subcontracting in many major industries, the prohibition on union action to compel the sending of work to unionized contractors or even to unstruck shops may mean a significant decline in the automatic extension of organization in the mass production fields.

"To a considerable extent, the secondary boycott ban accomplishes one of the chief aims of those who have been trying vainly for many years to bring unions under the antitrust laws.

"It makes it illegal for unions to put pressure on employers not to do business with other employers as a means of influencing their labor standards."

There are numerous other points that I could bring out that, in very subtle ways, will hinder the organizational work and growth of the unions.

Under the new law, the Washington Post reported over 55,000 labor unions would have to file reports on their organization within the next 90 days. In addition 37,000 financial reports and 1,000 reports on trusteeships would have to be made before April 1.

As a sidelight they also stated that 400 to 800 new employees would have to be hired to handle all the paperwork these reports entail.

The President, who does not hesitate to veto legislation on the pretense of cutting expenditures and living within his budget, will not veto this bill that would add possibly 800 new jobs—these are jobs to hamstring labor. The legislation he saw fit to veto would only help people.

The average union member must waken up, he must realize that all this hogwash the "soap salesmen on TV and radio" are selling is just that; he must realize that the sponsors of these programs—the news, dramas, plays, and so forth—are not investing millions in TV and radio time to improve the worker's lot. They are not.

They must make their investments pay off.

And they are doing just that—when they can dictate to the President of the United States and tell him to stay out of the strike picture, when they can convince working men and women to bombard their Congressmen with letters asking for punitive legislation that will retard the progress of the working people in America.

Business is indeed active in politics.

If labor doesn't want to lose what little it has left it better become active, too.

Labor today—or ever, in fact—hasn't the millions required for advertising by television, radio, and the newspapers; we must count on legwork, on personal contact with neighbors, friends, and fellow union members; we must go back to ringing doorbells and the telephone campaigns if we want to stay as a participating part of this economy of ours.

The battle of automation is on us right now; provisions must be made for many displaced workers; displaced by machines, not by other workers.

Provisions must be made for better education for our youth so that they will be prepared to take their place in the new automation age and the dawning of the space age.

Provisions must be made for proper medical care for our citizens and especially for our elder citizens now on pensions and social security.

Much is to be done for the general welfare of our people.

This is no time to sit back and relax. We must fight to regain what we have lost and go to even greater heights.

It is up to you, your fellow union members, your friends, and your associates.

The future depends on you.

In Memory of Nikola Petkov

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is remarkable that Khrushchev should affect the air of offended innocence when Americans received him during his visit here in a spirit of cool reserve.

Khrushchev wants us to forgive and forget Soviet misdeeds of the past and present. But the catalog of these offenses against humanity is long and serious, and we as a morally sensitive nation cannot ignore them. There is something tragically coincidental that the commemoration of the death of Nikola Petkov, the Bulgarian agrarian leader, should fall during the visit of Premier Khrushchev to the United States; for more than anything else this anniversary should be a reminder that the Soviet Government respects only force and power in international relations, and that it does not hesitate to employ the harshest means to achieve its ends.

Nikola Petkov represented a genuinely democratic segment of Bulgarian political life. His political attitudes fall within the great American tradition of democracy. Petkov had sought desperately to preserve even a small segment of Bulgarian democracy. But the future of his nation, as that of all other east European states, had been foredoomed by 1947. Against the assertion of total Soviet power over Bulgaria, Petkov could not prevail. On June 5, 1947, he was arrested and in August was tried on false charges of conspiracy against the government. A Communist-manufactured publicity campaign demanded the death penalty. Tried by Communist judges and in a state where local Communists and the Soviet conquerors were bent on establishing a Soviet satrapy out of Bulgaria, Petkov did not have a chance for survival. He was condemned to death on August 16. The death sentence was carried out on September 23, 1947.

Thus, for all practical purposes, the way was cleared for total sovietization of Bulgaria.

In the charges brought against Petkov, there was no truth; nor was there even a pretense of justice as we know it in his trial. This was a political act brutally calculated and carried out to destroy a man who opposed Soviet power.

As Americans we cannot be insensitive to such grave injustices and acts of brutality. The death of Petkov was one of many inhuman Soviet misdeeds that altogether helped create in the American mind a disturbing image of Soviet power and political conduct. This is not a distorted image, and all the state visits of Soviet leaders, who must, after all, share some moral responsibility for these acts, cannot change it.

It is with this thought in mind that again we commemorate the death of a great Bulgarian, Nikola Petkov.

Resolutions of Zionist Organization of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, on September 10 through 13, the Zionist Organization of America held its 62d annual convention at the Willard Hotel in Washington, D.C. This fine organization of American citizens of the Jewish faith, since its inception in 1897, has propagated the concepts of American freedoms throughout the world. It has worked for the establishment and maintenance of the democratic State of Israel, and has done much to introduce the American way of life there. In addition to the American House in Tel Aviv, this organization also maintains an agricultural school in the country, at Kfar Silver, the only American-chartered school in Israel granting diplomas under the authority of the regents of the University of the State of New York.

On numerous occasions it has been cited for outstanding work in the public interest, as for instance on its U.S. savings bond drive during the last war.

Its convention in Washington was representative of the sentiments of its nationwide membership with units in some 700 major communities across the country. The resolutions which it adopted were not only thoroughly and spiritedly discussed at the convention, but they were considered by all of the local units prior to the convention. Thus, they comprise the serious and thoughtful views of its full membership. They are not merely the opinions of a resolutions or a steering committee. They are the considered views of thousands of Americans about aspects of the existing international situation.

Because the resolutions are so relevant to current affairs, under unanimous consent, I include them in the Appendix of the RECORD. They follow:

EISENHOWER PEACE EFFORTS

The convention salutes the President of the United States and offers its prayers for the success of the efforts he has undertaken to find a road to peace with justice. May he be granted strength and health to continue to pursue every avenue toward the removal of world tensions and the danger of war.

The Zionist Organization of America recognizes that the free world must stand firm to resist and repulse encroachments upon the freedom and rights of nations, wherever such encroachment may be attempted. At the same time it must be ready to search for all reasonable accommodation between the great powers, consistent with principle and in a spirit of good will and cooperation.

U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

The Zionist Organization of America hails and warmly supports the continued adherence of the United States to its generous policy of assisting underdeveloped nations to build up their economies and their societies, in freedom and independence. Mankind can conceive of no nobler ideal than that of sharing with other peoples the bounties with which the American Nation has been blessed.

We take deep pride in the realization that our country continues to play a significant role in the development of Israel's economy and the preservation of her security.

We respectfully urge the continuation of the grants-in-aid and other economic assistance by our Government to the State of Israel, to maintain her independent democratic existence.

THE SUEZ CANAL

The convention has noted with grave concern that the United Arab Republic has now virtually sealed the Suez Canal to all Israel commerce. The present deadlock makes inescapable the conclusion that the long efforts by the United Nations to enforce the

decision of the Security Council to maintain the Suez Canal as an international waterway open to all nations has resulted in failure.

Nasser's defiance of the United Nations and the Security Council's decision as well as of the Constantinople Convention and his violation of his own pledges in relation to the canal are bound to encourage anarchy in the Middle East and to undermine the authority of the United Nations. His persistent flouting of international commitments must further endanger peace and stability.

The convention notes hopefully that the Government of the United States is on record against the United Arab Republic's blockade and is pledged to take action to uphold the rights of Israel and the maritime community as a whole. The Zionist Organization of America respectfully urges the Government of the United States to use its influence with the World Bank to obtain ironclad guarantees for free canal transit for the shipping of all nations including Israel, as a condition for the granting of any financial aid for the improvement of the Suez Canal.

BOYCOTTS AND BLOCKADE

We urge the U.S. Government to use its best efforts to end the illegal boycotts and blockade which are carried on by the Arab States against the State of Israel and against American firms and individuals friendly to Israel.

White Sox Live in Second District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 86th Congress nears the end I think it is proper that I should acquaint my colleagues with the inside secret of why the Chicago White Sox are on the eve of winning their first pennant in 40 years. I appreciate the fact that my distinguished colleague and beloved friend from the 5th district, Mr. KLUCZYNSKI, has a prior claim on the White Sox because their park is in the district that he so ably represents, and also JOHN KLUCZYNSKI is one of the most loyal and rabid White Sox fans that Chicago has ever known. But, Mr. Speaker, the circumstance of the location of the park is small indeed to the circumstance of where the players live when they are in Chicago. If they did not get good rest at night and good food and live in the choicest of residential environment, how could one expect them to win ball games?

Here, Mr. Speaker, is the inside secret. The White Sox players when they are in Chicago live in the great Second District. Everybody knows of Early Wynn. His name will go down as that of one of baseball's immortals, and Billy Pierce, and Dick Donovan and Gerry Staley, all deserve to be in the hall of fame. They may play baseball in a lot in JOHN KLUCZYNSKI's district, but they get the strength and build up the morale to win games by living when they are in Chicago among the good people and in the beautiful environment of the Second District.

As my colleagues so well know, I have always maintained that most of the good things of the world either come from or have some connection with the Second Congressional District of Illinois. I am happy to have this opportunity of informing my colleagues before we adjourn that when the White Sox finally cinch their first pennant in 40 years the Second District will be claiming a lot of the credit.

Noel Nelson, whom Ken Harding and others at the last Democratic National Convention will favorably remember, has furnished me with the evidence. Fourteen of the White Sox players and two coaches live at the Piccadilly Hotel, at 5107 Dorchester Avenue, in the heart of the district that I have the honor to represent. They are Jim Landis, center field; Bubba Phillips, third base and outfielder; Nellie Fox, second base; Jungle Jim Rivera, outfielder; Sherman Lollar, No. 1 catcher; Luis Aparicio, shortstop; Ken McBride, pitcher; John Romano, No. 2 catcher; Gerry Staley, relief pitcher; Rudolpho Arias, pitcher; Turk Lown, relief pitcher; Ray Moore, pitcher; Bob Shaw, pitcher; Norman Cash, infielder; Tony Cuccinello, third base coach; Don Gutteridge, first base coach.

Early Wynn, Billy Pierce and Billy Goodman live at the Flamingo Hotel at 5520 South South Shore Drive. Al Lopez, the great manager of the White Sox, and Earl Torgeson, the great first baseman, live at the Shoreland Hotel. Pitcher Dick Donovan lives at the Country Club apartments, 5530 South South Shore Drive.

Miss Nelson adds:

Now, Congressman, as you can see from the above, we have so far 19 out of the 25 regular players on the team, plus the manager and two coaches who live in your district. You know, of course, that they are not permanent or voting residents—but this is where they live about half the year, while they are playing. Moreover, I know that for years the majority of the players have lived at the Piccadilly or Flamingo hotels. Nellie Fox, for instance, I believe has stayed at the Piccadilly ever since 1950, when he came to the White Sox. The manager of the Piccadilly Hotel told me that Barry Latman might move in there within the week.

It may turn out that most of these remaining players plus the two other coaches may live in the district. Also, as you of course know, Bill Veeck, owner of 56 percent of the team, lives at the Sherry Hotel, and I believe this is his legal residence. In fact, I'm sure of it.

To the list furnished me by Miss Nelson should be added, of course, the name of "Chuck" Comiskey, grandson of Charles Comiskey, whom we all called "the Great Roman," and son of Louis Comiskey. The Comiskey of the third generation is a product of our Second District, and a graduate, if I remember correctly, of a high school in Hyde Park.

Anniversary in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, September 15 will mark the 10th anniversary of the election of Konrad Adenauer as Chancellor of the Federal Republic of West Germany and also the 10th anniversary of the election of President Heuss.

On that day telegrams of congratulation to Chancellor Adenauer will come from many prominent Americans, including the Vice President of the United States and Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of the Catholic Diocese in my own city of New York; there were special broadcasts including those of Germania Broadcast and WGES in Chicago and special editorials including one in the Aufbau, of New York, on President Heuss.

I believe it would be of interest to my colleagues for the text of these messages to appear in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Chancellor Adenauer has become identified with certain historic movements in the German Federal Republic which have stamped him as a leader for peace, freedom, and justice. His espousal of the integration of free Europe and of the pan-European role of the German people; his firm yet wise position on German reunification and Berlin; and his understanding in settling Jewish claims against Germany and standing fast against Arab intransigence have all secured his stature as a great statesman in the estimation of the free world. President Heuss' leadership in these affairs has added immeasurably to the hopes of the whole free world for a new Germany.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the messages and editorial referred to.

Also, Mr. President, I append an interesting article on this anniversary, which appeared in the New York Post on Monday, September 14.

There being no objection, the messages and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAMS OF GREETING

His Eminence Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York:

"On this happy occasion I am pleased to felicitate His Excellency Dr. Konrad Adenauer and congratulate him on his courageous and effective leadership as Chancellor of West Germany. He has been a bulwark for the preservation of peace in his country and also throughout the world. I renew my personal friendship and admiration for him recalling the occasion when he was a welcome guest in my home and in St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York. May God grant him strength to continue his challenging work to preserve the God-given rights to people at home and everywhere."

Adlai E. Stevenson:

"Only a few people leave lasting impressions on their own generation. Certainly the leader of Western Germany in its period of spectacular recuperation from disaster is such a person. I join countless fellow Americans in expressing our great respect and admiration for Chancellor Adenauer and for the peaceful, prosperous, free, and friendly Germany he has helped create."

Former Military Governor, U.S. Zone, Germany, Lucius D. Clay:

"I am delighted to know that you are commemorating Chancellor Adenauer's 10th year in office. His leadership in the rebuilding of democracy in West Germany, in bringing West Germany into the free world, and in trying to create a new French-Ger-

man relationship based on understanding and trust have contributed much to the growing strength of the free world and to his stature as a statesman. He has earned our respect and friendship."

U.S. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY:

"I am happy indeed on this 10th anniversary of the ascension to office of Germany's distinguished Chancellor Konrad Adenauer to join with the millions of people who are grateful for his outstanding service. I am very happy and proud to call him friend."

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON:

"I appreciate this opportunity to join with you in commemorating over station WGES the 10th anniversary of the Chancellorship of Konrad Adenauer. It is indeed fitting on this occasion that special tribute should be paid to this dedicated statesman and leader who has had such a vital part in guiding the physical and spiritual reconstruction of Germany and in restoring her to a position of honor in the community of nations. With every good wish to you and your listeners."

U.S. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY:

"I am delighted to join in giving high praise to the distinguished German leader, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. His unyielding opposition to Soviet pressure and Soviet threat deserve the gratitude of the free world. Under his leadership, German democracy and freedom have flourished."

U.S. Senator STYLES BRIDGES:

"Re your telegram today. My message follows 'Chancellor Konrad Adenauer's name will have a special page in world history, honored and distinguished as a man who saved his country in its darkest hour from Communist infiltration and gloriously piloted it to the free world pinnacle on which it stands today'."

Congressman EMANUEL CELLER:

"I send greetings to Chancellor Adenauer on the 10th anniversary of his leadership and my compliments to President Heuss and his able successor in the Presidency, Heinrich Luebke, Foreign Minister Brentano, and Economic Minister Erhard for work well done. Out of rubble and ruins, the Chancellor and his cabinet have built a strong republic, which is oriented westward and has done all and sundry to buckle itself as a staunch ally to the United States and Western democracies."

Former High Commissioner John J. McCloy:

"Through a particularly trying period filled with domestic and international problems of the greatest magnitude Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has emerged as one of the world's leading statesmen. He with President Heuss has given character and direction to the new German state which has brought about a political stability and recovery as pronounced as the economic rehabilitation of the country.

"Chancellor Adenauer's warm spirit of Western European unity based upon a new and broad understanding with France has marked him as an international figure as well as the leader of his own country. I am very glad to learn that you are commemorating this 10th anniversary of his term in office as it is fitting that this man's contributions to his nation and the free world should be especially recognized."

Minority leader, House of Representatives, CHARLES A. HALLECK.

"I am happy to join with the many Americans who are paying their respects to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer for his leadership during the past decade. We all wish for him many more years of useful service to the cause of mankind."

Julius Klein, major general (retired):

"I am honored to join millions of Americans and freedom-loving people all over the world in extending congratulations to Chancellor Konrad Adenauer on this his 10th year of office. The Chancellor has proved himself as a leading spokesman against Soviet aggression and a courageous advocate of democracy. I congratulate the Germania Hour, America's oldest foreign language broadcast, on this special program."

Gov. William G. Stratton:

"The reconstruction, progress, and production of Germany under the leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer is a dramatic demonstration of the ability of a free people, working under a free government, to improve their standards. It is an inspiration to all freedom-loving people throughout the world. I extend my congratulations and best wishes to the Chancellor on this occasion of his 10th anniversary in office."

Congressman THOMAS E. MORGAN, chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Acknowledging your telegram advising that on September 15 you will commemorate in a special program the 10th anniversary in office of Germany's distinguished Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, it is indeed a pleasure for me to join with you in honoring Chancellor Adenauer as one of the great and outstanding statesmen of our time. Chancellor Adenauer's selfless dedication to the welfare of his people and country has won our highest admiration and esteem."

Mayor Richard J. Daley:

"As mayor, on behalf of all of the people of Chicago, I am happy to join today with the Germania Broadcasting Co. in commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the administration of Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of the German Federal Republic.

"Under his stewardship, the people of West Germany have enjoyed a new era of government, the triumph of democracy as compared to the despotism of Eastern Europe. In the past decade, Chancellor Adenauer's Germany has come to produce twice as much coal as East Germany, three times as much electricity, and eight times as much steel. This productivity was reflected last year in a favorable balance of trade in excess of $2 billion and a foreign exchange gold balance of $5 billion. Such achievements have had a healthy economic impact on the free world, and the people of Chicago look forward to the day when ever more ships from the great Federal Republic tie-up in the new international seaport that is Chicago. As mayor, I have long been aware of the great and enduring contributions which Americans of German descent have made in helping to build Chicago as one of the great cities of the earth. It was not by chance that one German-born citizen, John Peter Altgeld, became an outstanding Chicagoan and a great Governor of Illinois.

"The same devotion to democracy which made Governor Altgeld great may be seen today in the able leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer. We pay tribute today to the great strides of West Germany under his administration as a partner in the defense, democracy, and economic sufficiency of the Western alliance."

[From the New York Post, Sept. 14, 1959]

A HOUSE BY A RIVER

(By Seymour Freidin)

The Bundestag had a birthday the other day, but nobody seems to have remembered it.

The West German Parliament is housed in a low-slung pile of masonry fronting on the Rhine. It's been closed, except to some painters slapping whitewash in a desultory way on a few bare spots. The 500 parliamentarians, including Chancellor Adenauer, are still on vacation.

It seemed a little strange, however, that the 10th anniversary of the Bundestag should have slipped by unnoticed. This is where the latest experiment in German parliamentary democracy is practiced. This is where the German economic miracle was planned.

As a capital for West Germany, Bonn is convenient for practically only one man. Adenauer is virtually the only politician in Germany who thinks Bonn is a pretty good place for a capital. He has lived in the Rhineland all his long life.

The wisecracks about Bonn's place in the political sun are about as long and hoary as Joe Miller's jokebook. Many are quite valid, especially those touching on the drabness of activity inside the Bundestag. Debate is totally uninspiring and torpor characterizes the political outlook of most of the participants.

Adenauer himself is probably the outstanding reason for this somnolence. He is the most powerful figure inside and out of the Bundestag. His majority is dutiful. The same obedience to party discipline exists in the opposition Social Democrats. They don't get out of line either.

But to call the Bundestag an instrument of revenge-seeking militarists, as Khrushchev has often done, distorts the whole picture. The Russians need only to look across to East Berlin and see their image in what is called the Volkskammer—the People's Chamber. This is a real rubber-stamp job. And it contains, proportionately, far more veterans of the Nazi Party than the Bundestag.

This Communist German Parliament will soon celebrate its own 10th anniversary. The division of Germany became complete in 1949 when the two Germanys set up shop in two Parliaments. Nothing can become more permanent than the self-perpetuity of office holders.

One of the immediately discernible differences between the two German Parliaments is the right of opposition. If the debate in Bonn is uninspired and colorless, that is the fault of the opposition. Adenauer has lots of critics. They get a hearing and they get big press play. But they don't get votes, which is nobody's fault but their own.

Up in East Berlin, where the comrades are preparing the usual spontaneous celebration to mark the Volkskammer's 10th birthday, a man's present loyalty atones in full for his past. That is another great difference with Bonn. An odorous record here is frequently exposed, held up to parliamentary and public examination.

But consider the case of Ernst Grossmann in East Germany. He became a party golden boy and a hero of labor. The Volkskammer often applauded him and greeted news of his high decorations with fervent thanks. Grossmann won commendations from both Stalin and Khrushchev.

Grossmann, it later developed, had been an SS (Elite Guard) man and an officer at one of the worst Nazi concentration camps. The Communists deliberately concealed his past until it was dug up from under them. Then they had no choice but to get rid of Grossmann, by now a member of the central committee. It could not have happened in the Bundestag here. The opposition would have seen to it.

In East Germany there are about 50 men like Grossmann sitting in the Volkskammer. Nobody has so far shown any crusading zeal to get rid of them.

The Bundestag's first 10 years have not been uplifting for parliamentary traditionalists. But compared with the first decade of the Volkskammer, it looks like the mother of parliaments.

[From Aufbau, New York]

A PRESIDENT RETURNS TO AUTHORSHIP—THEODOR HEUSS' FAREWELL TO BONN

(By Manfred George)

Last Saturday, Dr. Theodor Heuss, President of the West German Republic, again turned into plain Theodor Heuss, private

citizen of Germany. And this private citizen exchanged the presidential palace for a small, comfortable villa in the vicinity of Stuttgart. This much-honored and honor-deserving man took upon himself the heavy burden of the presidency after the Second World War. Now that he has resigned after 10 years of official service, he has chosen a beautiful, blessed countryside for his retirement residency.

During his 10 years in office he accomplished what scarcely any leader of the German people had ever been able to do: he stayed clear of party fights; yet that in itself would only have been interpreted as weakness or shrewdness. At the same time, however, he won for himself such respect, such authority and genuine love that he became what once used to be referred to as a father of the people.

If one just recalls the embattled figures of Ebert and Hindenburg, or even the last Kaiser, the difference in the people's attitude toward Heuss immediately becomes apparent. He really was "Papa Heuss." And the most wonderful thing about it was the fact that he was a strong personality, a man whose importance did not only stem from the amiability of his character or his popularity, but that above all he exercised moral authority during a time when great suffering had to be alleviated.

In addition, those were the years in which a totally demoralized people, enslaved by the Nazi tyranny, partly had lost its commonsense, partly had been humiliated by the brown-shirted usurpers who had tortured it and robbed it of honor and human dignity. This people needed primarily a leader who was above the fights of the opinions of the day, beyond influences and considerations, who was a guardian of intellectual values and an arbitrator of moral issues.

It was on the basis of his great humanistic intellect and his humanity that Theodor Heuss was so beautifully effective. He was a real stroke of luck for the Germans.

His retirement now represents the natural end of a task which at the very outset had been limited in time. For Theodor Heuss it does not mean retirement from learning and productivity. It is a return to privacy, to his garden and his desk, and to the creative activity which will make up the total balance of a wisely spent life.

He will go his way not only accompanied by the good wishes of his countrymen but of all those in the world who saw in President Heuss the personification of the true Germany.

Record of the 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress has been a long and highly productive one in the sense that the Democratic majorities moved steadily forward on a progressive, sound, and responsible course. The necessary authorization and appropriation bills were given careful scrutiny, they were trimmed where this seemed desirable, and they were passed expeditiously. The country's foreign policy was upheld, the mutual security funds deemed essential were voted after the President's proposals had been properly considered and reviewed in accordance with legislative responsibility and obligation.

The 86th Congress, as did preceding Democratic Congresses, reduced the budget requests of President Eisenhower. The President asked for $74,858 million. The Congress lopped $1,882 million from this. In the two sessions of the 85th Congress, the budget submitted by the President had been cut over $6 billion.

The Congress labored diligently to reduce spending authorizations below those recommended by the President, without sacrificing important programs to strengthen the economy in the long run.

It is only candid, however, to report that the session was in many ways a frustrating one, because the Eisenhower administration tried to reverse the election of very solid majorities last November by the formidable threat of vetoes.

An odd thing seemed to happen to the administration. Whereas President Eisenhower only a couple of years ago—in January 1957—presented what might have been called a New Deal budget, showing a great deal of concern for social services the people need and deserve, he showed in 1959 that he had backed clear away from this position. In 1957 he was almost directly attacked by the man who was then his Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, and the upshot was that he surrendered. He became increasingly obsessed with what he chose to call the spending issue, and he never again bothered to ask himself whether what he labeled spending was for a good purpose or a bad, wasteful purpose. He used to talk about modern Republicanism and progressive conservativism and the middle of the road. But these phrases disappeared after his surrender to Humphrey, who left the administration to become president of a large steel company.

The record is clear—on such subjects as housing, school construction, slum clearance, health programs, which are of enormous importance to the great majority of Americans who live in cities and in suburban areas close to cities, he moved steadily to the right of the late Senator Taft. He became more conservative on these subjects, and even on labor legislation, than Taft had been. Because of this, the record of the session was a record of the collision between realistically progressive Democratic ideas and the President's rigid determination to veto the results of the 1958 election.

We must understand two things:

First. There has been no political cold war between the President and the Democratic Congress such as the Republicans used to predict. This is the third Congress in succession in which Democrats have held a majority under a Republican White House, and yet partisanship has been held to a minimum.

On foreign policy, the President has been upheld. No one has attempted to embarrass him in regard to such things as the meetings with Khrushchev, or our relations with our North Atlantic allies. The basic foreign policy of the United States, which originated with President Truman and two great Secretaries of State, George C. Marshall and Dean Acheson, has been sustained wherever the President felt it carried him.

Second. The President, on the other hand, might be considered to have used his veto power and the threat of his veto to wage a kind of political cold war on the 1958 election returns by stubbornly blocking the development of domestic programs the people have repeatedly shown they demand. As of the close of this session, he allowed no new programs, and only the vigor of Congress prevented him from scaling down those already in existence.

My own work has been concentrated, as usual, in the area of the two committees on which I serve—the House Committee on Armed Services and the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

It is fair to say that American development of a nuclear-powered aircraft has been pushed through by our efforts and against the opposition of the administration, which, in familiar fashion, has seemed more worried about budget balancing than about the security of the Nation. It has seemed to feel, at least, that a technically balanced budget was a greater element in our security than nuclear-power development. It is a viewpoint with which I do not agree.

I worked as a member of a special subcommittee headed by Congressman HOLIFIELD, of California, which delved deeply into the subject of the dangers from nuclear fallout, on which the future of the whole world may depend, and the subcommittee broke through the barriers created by the administration to produce an interim report that both abates unnecessary fears and emphasizes the directions in which we should move.

The subject of radiation hazards in industrial operations also was studied comprehensively. This is a whole new field, involving safety precautions, public health, insurance responsibilities, and the proper obligations of the Federal Government in meeting a new national problem. It is a difficult area, involving State and Federal cooperation, but the work must still be done, and we have made progress.

In addition, I was directly involved in one of the President's celebrated vetoes.

In cooperation with Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, I sponsored a bill to reverse an Eisenhower administrative reorganization plan of 1953 which, in the judgment of Congress, placed the lending policies of the Rural Electrification Administration in the hands of the REA's enemies. A resolution was passed to cancel the reorganization plan and restore the REA as an agency operating with some initiative and creative responsibility, but still subject to the direct administrative control of the Secretary of Agriculture. It was the belief of Congress that the administration had violated its 1953 promises that the REA would not be hamstrung by the reorganization plan.

The President vetoed the bill, and a valiant effort to overturn the veto failed by just four votes in the House. I was deeply disappointed, because I believe in the REA and do not think that its proud record justified the Eisenhower-Secretary Benson treatment of the rural elec-

tric-and-telephone systems as an unloved stepchild. In another sense, also, I felt that the failure of the overriding vote was disappointing, because it gave the White House political advisers a sense of security in threatening that various other measures would be vetoed. The effect was that there was little pressure on the administration to try to find reasonable areas of compromise, and the end result was that Congress was unable to pass perfectly reasonable programs that would have commanded the general support of the public.

The palace guard went too far, at last, on the second public works bill authorizing water development projects even after Congress had reduced the public investment to the total the President set as his limit. At this both Houses rebelled, because it is intolerable for a veto of such projects to be defended on the argument that nobody but the Budget Bureau has any policy control in the development of America's waterways, rivers and harbors. Congress, too, has a role to play, and it asserted its constitutional rights to authorize projects for the enhancement of America's national resources.

This ended the President's record for "never having a veto overridden"—a record temporarily preserved only by the device of a White House survey leading to his signature on an earlier airport construction bill because he was reliably informed by his party leaders that he could not win on a veto.

The efforts of Congress to pass a sound and fair labor-management bill were seriously impeded by administration efforts to make political capital from an issue that should have nothing to do with partisanship.

Looking backward, perhaps everyone can realize that all the bills seriously offered in Congress were equally strong in the sense that they would impose ground rules that honest union leaders are glad to accept and which, in fact, they long ago accepted in practice in overwhelming numbers without the need of a law. But the Republicans in Congress did not want the Democrats to get credit for passing an effective but fair bill, so they shouted that our bills were "weak." A GOP spokesman let it slip out that he wanted a "killer" or no legislation at all, and this was the attitude of the administration. President Eisenhower even endorsed a section of the legislation that his own Secretary of Labor Mitchell had opposed in testimony, and the Secretary had to swallow the reversal.

Insofar as the legislation actually injures honest unions, particularly small and weak unions in antiunion low-wage sections of the country, it will be bad class legislation rather than a reform proposal. It will damage Illinois industry and industry specifically in Madison and St. Clair Counties, where our unions are strong, well established and are not going to be broken. By encouraging low-wage sections to continue to try to attract runaway business, it may increase the differential in prosperity and good wages between areas. I would have greater preferred a sound reform bill, limited to reform, rather than anything advocated as "killer" legislation and sponsored with partisan purposes.

There are a great many credits in the record of the session in which Congress resisted attempts of the administration to kill useful and desirable programs.

For instance, the White House group says that Federal spending in what are called federally impacted areas, where there are large concentrations of people due to defense or other Government activities, is wrong. Several school districts in Madison and St. Clair Counties participate in this program. Congress did not agree and refused to nonappropriate the program out of existence.

The White House also tried to scale down or abandon the relatively new antipollution program, under which cities are helped to meet their massive problems of water pollution and sewage disposal. The matter of pure water supplies is surely a national issue, but Mr. Eisenhower's advisers tried to argue that self-reliance would be sapped unless we abandoned our efforts to promote the swift development of antipollution systems with Federal aid.

Congress refused to go along with this, and after both Houses had passed bills to increase the program, instead of killing it, it was agreed to hold the measure in conference committee until next January when Congress is back in session and action can be completed without risking a pocket veto. After Congress reconvenes, the President will have to veto the bill directly by refusing his signature or let it become law. The total program will not be seriously impeded by the 4 months of delay.

Congress repeated its pattern of the last several years and insisted on authorizing and appropriating more money for medical research than the President said he wanted. The sum is not bing in a relative sense, and it would be folly to let people die unnecessarily of cancer and cardiac diseases when substantial breakthroughs may be made by the investment of a few millions more in money.

This Democratic Congress has been an economy Congress. Despite the hocus pocus constantly talked about by the administration, the session has actually slashed the proposed spending programs of the Budget Bureau in bill after bill. It has slashed the proposed authorization bills, sending each of them under the careful scrutiny of expert committees and trained committee staff experts.

A certain trickery is involved when people toss around Government spending figures without any clear sense of ethics. One might suppose, for example, that an administration that talked about economy so frequently would have a proud record of budget balancing, but in fact President Eisenhower rolled up a record peacetime budget deficit of $12 billion for his last fiscal year. Even more embarrassing to him, however, was the danger that he might have another deficit in fiscal 1960, which is an election year. So we saw instance after instance in which, for bookkeeping purposes only, the White House tried to get spending charged against last year rather than the 1960 fiscal books. It does not mean either more or less spending, but merely involves a political talking point.

There can be trickery also in such things as the highway program. Mr. Eisenhower insisted on raising gasoline taxes to pay for the Interstate System, which was threatened with a slowdown. There were obviously many ways to raise the money—by general revenues or by setting aside funds from taxes already imposed, as well as by raising gasoline taxes again. But the administration kept on demanding the highest possible raise in gasoline taxes—which would give the White House credit for keeping the program rolling and Congress the blame for imposing special new highway-user levies that, in the opinion of many of us, were unnecessarily and improperly high. A compromise was obviously required, and it would have been easier to get if the administration had not adopted so self-righteous an attitude in regard to its own proposals.

Perhaps the greatest service of the session has been in its demonstration of the clashes of philosophy between the administration and the Democratic majority. Look at the record of programs blocked by vetoes or threats of vetoes:

They include an effort to develop a new farm bill. They include Federal aid to schools, where administration hostility forced the scaling down of bills and even the smaller programs were not given a green light.

They include housing, where the President vetoed a comprehensive but compromised bill, then vetoed a somewhat scaled down bill, and finally accepted only a third measure.

The President gave no affirmative leadership for an improved minimum wage system, to meet needs that are now apparent to modernize a sound program. When the administration was asked to help modernize the unemployment compensation system, it refused, and said that no such thing was justified. When hearings were held on a bill to improve the social security system by liberalizing retirement age provisions, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare went before the committee and said he was against it.

A highly respected liberal Republican, Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, said after the last election that the President's trouble was that he didn't understand the difference between waste and useful and desirable public investment. I thoroughly agree, and I regret that the session has demonstrated that this failure in comprehension in the White House has been more flagrant rather than modified.

The result is to leave us a great deal of work for next year—and the work will have to be done no matter what the difficulties are.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress came to an end at 6:21 a.m., Tuesday, September 15, after finally approving the mutual security appropriation bill and extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. It had been in continuous session longer than any other session of Congress since 1951.

One-fourth of the Historical Buildings in Existence in This Country in 1941 Have Since Been Destroyed, Many of Them by Modern Highways Financed by the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, according to a recent estimate one-fourth of the historical buildings in existence in this country in 1941 have been destroyed, many of them by the modern highways financed in part by the Federal Government.

This is a shameful thing. Many kinds of criteria are considered by the highway builders in reaching their decisions as to where highways should be located but criteria as to the national, regional, or local historical and architectural significance of buildings which may lie in the path of these highways are not taken into account. I think that President Eisenhower and the Federal highway officials must shoulder a large part of the blame for this disregard of the precious and irreplaceable heritage which is being destroyed by the Federal highway program. I have said before and I will say again that never before have powerful Federal officials shown so little interest in, or knowledge of, the importance of the great heritage which is ours in the buildings linking us with our past.

We are horrified when we read about the destruction of great libraries or priceless art by military commanders in the field from ancient times to the World War of recent years. In this century all governments have set up elaborate procedures to prevent such destruction whenever possible. But how much more must we condemn the heedless, thoughtless destruction in peacetime of our priceless cultural heritage by high Federal officials who will not raise a finger to require that Federal funds shall not be used to aid such destruction?

A Saturday Evening Post cover of July 18, 1959, by the distinguished artist, John Falter, of Bucks County, Pa., calls attention to the loss of our Nation's historic sites and structures due to the accelerated pace of highway construction. The painting shows engineers laying out a new highway route through the wing of a typical historic old Bucks County stone farmhouse while the owner waves his hands in anger and frustration.

This anger and frustration has become increasingly widespread as the federally assisted highway programs takes an increasing toll of our historic sites and structures. John Oakes called attention to this situation in an article: "Conservation: Our Historic Sites Are in Danger"—New York Times, December 1, 1957; as did Nona Brown in the same newspaper—September 28, 1958—in an article entitled "The Fight To Save the Nation's Landmarks." A recent Reader's Digest article early this year entitled "Wanton Disregard of Our Nation's Heritage" points out that at least 25 percent of the finest historical and architectural buildings existing in 1941 have since been destroyed.

The urgency of this situation requires the immediate passage of several bills which have been introduced in this Congress by Senators JAMES E. MURRAY, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and JOSEPH S. CLARK, Jr., and by a number of Members of this House, particularly my H.R. 285, H.R. 3509, H.R. 4046, and H.R. 6680. The major stumbling block to the enactment of this legislation is the lack of any report by the administration setting forth the position of President Eisenhower on this matter of historic preservation. It is a matter of record that when the administration is really interested in something it can furnish a report on legislation within a matter of a few days at most, yet months have dragged by without a report on this legislation which has as its purpose the preservation of our cultural heritage.

There are increasing signs that the American people are getting fed up with the run-around the administration is giving them on this subject, Mr. Speaker, and are determined to do something about it. One heartening example of this newly found determination, which could have important results in encouraging similar action elsewhere, took place recently in New Jersey.

Here is what happened, something reminiscent of some of the farm auctions of the depression years of the 1930's when neighboring farmers simply refused to bid more than a nominal sum for the farm, its stock, and its equipment which was up for sale. Then, having bought the farm, it was given back to the hard-hit farmer who had owned it.

On Tuesday, September 8, 1959, the historic Old Brick Tavern at Perryville, in Hunterdon County, N.J., was sold to make way for new Interstate Highway 78 which will connect Phillipsburg, N.J., with the Holland Tunnel. The Trenton (N.J.) Evening Times declared on September 10, 1959, that—

> Fortunately for history, Robert Trubek, of Clinton, N.J., paid $250 to secure the building which was built in 1813 to serve as an inn for stagecoach travelers between New Brunswick and Easton.
>
> Trubek, who was the only bidder, will spend $20,000 to move the tavern to a new site where it will be reconditioned and then sold. Any profits will be to the Hunterdon County Medical Center in Flemington.

The rest of the story is told by B. A. Sorby, of the Delaware Valley Protective Association, who wrote me that—

> Lack of awareness on the part of highway officials as to the great loss of historic sites and buildings occasioned by current construction is graphically illustrated by the Hunterdon County Democrat's story of September 10 which stated: "There was some pleading on the part of the auctioneer for other bids (on the tavern) on the grounds that both the State and Federal Governments had an interest in achieving the highest possible net return."

Mr. Sorby adds that—

> Not only was Mr. Trubek allowed to preserve the building as part of our historic heritage, but the State and Federal Governments were urging that he be forced to pay the highest possible price for the privilege.
>
> Best wishes for success in obtaining immediate passage of your bills.

Let us hope that this action by the good people of New Jersey proves contagious, and that the citizens of other States are encouraged to emulate this fine example even to the extent of staging another Boston Tea Party if necessary to save our historic shrines.

I include here the text of my bill H.R. 6680, regarding which I shall continue to hope, perhaps in vain, that the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget will report favorably before the end of this year. I also include some correspondence, and articles from the Trenton Evening Times, the Trentonian, and the Hunterdon County Democrat which, taken together, reports on this matter in much greater detail than I have been able to.

The matters follow:

H.R. 6680

A bill to amend the Historic Sites Act of August 21, 1935, to provide a method for preserving sites, areas, buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local historical significance which are threatened with destruction by federally financed programs, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461), is amended to read as follows:

"It is hereby declared that it is a national policy to preserve for public use historic sites, areas (including sections of cities), buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local significance for the inspiration and benefit of the people of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1462) is amended by redesignating paragraph (k) as paragraph (m) and by adding after paragraph (j) the following new paragraphs:

"(k) Carry out (insofar as practicable and appropriate) the same duties and functions with respect to historic areas (including sections of cities) as those which are specified in the preceding paragraphs of this section with respect to historic sites, buildings, and objects.

"(l) Protect and preserve, in the manner provided in section 8 and through the performance of such other functions of the type described in this section as the Secretary may deem appropriate, historic sites, areas (including sections of cities), buildings, and objects of national, regional, or local significance."

SEC. 3. Such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 8. (a) Whenever the Secretary receives a petition from any State or political subdivision thereof, or from the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, or any other organization recognized by the Secretary for purposes of this section as being concerned with historic preservation, alleging that a Federal project or program or a State or local project or program financed in whole or in part with Federal funds will seriously damage or destroy a historical site, area (including a

section of a city), building, or object of national, regional, or local significance, or upon his own motion, the Secretary shall conduct an investigation, which shall include (but not be limited to) holding public hearings or affording the opportunity for such hearings, for the purpose of determining whether or not such site area, building, or object is of national, regional, or local historical significance.

"(b) Whenever the Secretary determines under subsection (a) that a site, area, building, or object is of national, regional, or local historical significance, he shall forthwith determine whether or not the proposed project or program will seriously damage or destroy it.

"(c) Whenever the Secretary determines under this section that a site, area, building, or object of national, regional, or local historical significance will be seriously damaged or destroyed by a Federal project or program (actual or proposed) or by a State or local project or program which is or will be financed in whole or in part with Federal funds, he shall submit such determination to the head of the Federal department, agency, or instrumentality under the jurisdiction of which the project or program is to be carried out; and after the receipt of such determination the head of such department, agency, or instrumentality shall not commence or further proceed with such project or program, or expend or approve the expenditure of any Federal funds (or further Federal funds) for such project or program, unless and until such project or program has been modified and the plans, specifications, and contracts thereunder amended so as to provide to the satisfaction of the Secretary for the preservation of the historic site, area, building, or object involved. Such modification or amendment may be made notwithstanding any provision of law limiting the right of a department, agency, or instrumentality to modify a project or program or amend plans, specifications, or contracts, but shall otherwise be subject to all the provisions of the law under which the project or program is being or will be carried out."

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and other organizations recognized by the Secretary as being concerned with historic preservation, shall make a continuing study of the tax advantages, technical and financial assistance, and other incentives which could be provided (by legislation and otherwise) to promote and encourage the restoration and preservation of sites, areas, buildings, objects, and antiquities in the United States of national, regional, or local historical significance by the Federal Government, and by States, political subdivisions, private organizations, and individuals, giving appropriate consideration to the methods which have been used to encourage such restoration and preservation in other countries and in areas of the United States where intensive programs for historic preservation have been successfully carried out.

DELAWARE VALLEY
PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION,
Stockton, N.J., September 14, 1959.

FRANK THOMPSON, JR.,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. THOMPSON: In reference to my letter of August 8, 1959, with enclosures, in regard to the Old Brick Tavern, near Hampton, N.J., and your bills H.R. 285 and H.R. 4046, please advise the status of these bills. The information is needed for news articles I am writing.

Apparently the need for immediate passage of these two bills is increasingly realized now that the Federal highway program is again underway. The Doylestown (Pa.) Intelligencer states: "CURTIN backs bill to protect shrines." No mention is made of the author or number of the bill, but I assume Mr. CURTIN was referring to your proposed legislation.

The Trenton Evening Times (September 10) story, "Vintage Homes Versus Pikes," is based on the enclosed release which I sent out to the New York Times, New Brunswick Daily Home News, Newark Evening News, Newark Star-Ledger, Easton Express, Hunterdon County Democrat, Lambertville Beacon, South Rutherford Leader-Free Press, Red Bank Register, and Doylestown (Pa.) Intelligencer. I do not know how many of these papers carried the story other than the Trenton Times.

The Trenton Evening Times of September 14 carried a followup story on Mr. Trubek's plans for restoration of the tavern.

Lack of awareness on the part of highway officials as to the great loss of historic sites and buildings occasioned by current construction is graphically illustrated by the Hunterdon County Democrat story of September 10, which stated: "There was some pleading on the part of the auctioneer for other bids [on the tavern] on the grounds that both the State and Federal Government had an interest in achieving the highest possible net return." Apparently not only was Mr. Trubek to be allowed to preserve the building as part of our historic heritage, but the State and Federal Government were urging that he be forced to pay the highest possible price for the privilege.

Best wishes for success in obtaining immediate passage of your bills.

Yours sincerely,

B. A. SORBY.

NATIONAL TRUST FOR
HISTORIC PRESERVATION,
Washington, D.C., August 19, 1959.

MR. B. A. SORBY,
DVPA Director for Raven Rock,
Stockton, N.J.

DEAR MR. SORBY: Thank you for the carbon of your letter of August 8, to Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., concerning the old Brick Tavern, on Route 22. We have been informed about the plight of this house some time ago, and I enclose carbons of my correspondence concerning this important landmark. I hope very much that my letters to the Federal and State road commissioners may be helpful, and, at your request, I am sending a letter to the editor of the Democrat, Mr. D. H. Moreau, a copy of which is enclosed.

With all good wishes,

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD H. HOWLAND,
President.

[From the Trenton Evening Times, Sept. 10, 1959]

VINTAGE HOMES VERSUS PIKES—BATTLE OVER HISTORIC LANDMARKS

An angry homeowner watches a group of surveyors plot the course of a new turnpike or expressway which will surely cut across the yard of his old stone farmhouse.

That scene is repeated as many homeowners in New Jersey prepare to do battle with the State highway department on the age-old issue of new roads versus vintage homes.

The Hunterdon County Historical Society, the Delaware Valley Protective Association, and individuals such as D. H. Moreau, editor of the Hunterdon County Democrat, have been battling the relentless advance of modern highways through Hunterdon County's historical heritage.

"No one gets excited about any of this unless it hits close to home," said one anti-highway man. "And by then it's often too late."

One big hope of the homesteader who is resisting with all his resources the new superhighways is a congressional bill now stalled in committee.

Introduced and promoted by Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, JR., the land-saving bill would bar Federal-supported highways (which includes most major projects) from adversely affecting historical sites, buildings and objects of national significance. Thus far THOMPSON's bill has gone nowhere, however.

One-fourth of the historical buildings in existence in this country in 1941 have been destroyed, according to one estimate.

Pointing up the problem in New Jersey are two mammoth Federal-supported highway projects soon to be undertaken by the State highway department. Both projects will affect this country's architectural history.

On Tuesday the historical Old Brick Tavern in Hunterdon County's Hampton was sold to make way for new Interstate Highway 78 which will connect Phillipsburg with the Holland Tunnel.

Fortunately for history, Robert Trubek, of Clinton, paid $250 to secure the building which was built in 1813 to serve as an inn for stagecoach travelers between New Brunswick and Easton.

Trubek, who was the only bidder, will spend $20,000 to move the tavern to a new site where it will be reconditioned and then sold. Any profits will be to the Hunterdon County Medical Center in Flemington.

And a similar preservation move is welling up in Shrewsbury, near Red Bank, where the mayor, town council, and residents are trying desperately to halt the proposed widening to four lanes of a two-lane highway in the town's center.

The town is now planning a celebration of the 300th anniversary of the Shrewsbury Grant issued by King Charles in 1664. Colonial structures in the town will be renovated for the celebration.

[From the Trentonian, Aug. 31, 1959]

SEEK TO SAVE FAMED OLD BRICK TAVERN

(By Eleanore Nolan Shuman)

The fate of the venerable Old Brick Tavern at Perryville, 2½ miles west of Clinton, is uncertain but public interest is great. Will the State raze it after it takes possession tomorrow or will some private source provide funds to have the structure moved? The picturesque building, considered one of the best examples of early American architecture in Hunterdon County, is important for its historic as well as its artistic values.

Famed as a dining place on the old Brunswick-Easton Turnpike, the tavern entertained travelers and traders. Here, it is said, thousands of cattle and sheep changed hands annually. Just as the landmark became established because of its location on the turnpike, so now it faces extinction because of its situation on a modern freeway. U.S. Highway 78, under joint Federal and State construction, calls for the removal of the building for it prevents the construction of an underpass at the Jutland-Norton intersection. No crossings are allowed on highway level.

The edifice, an important part of the heritage of New Jersey, was restored faithfully by its last two owners, Mr. and Mrs. Francis Marckstein, who found the place in a frightful condition when they purchased it 4 years ago. The ballroom, probably the handsomest room of the period in Hunterdon, contains a mantel, a work of art, that was restored after hours of hard and painstaking work.

The interior details of the house are of great merit and the Marcksteins were quite encouraged when they sold their home to the State last June, because they were told to leave everything intact. This led them to believe that perhaps some of the valuable

items, such as the mantels and trim, might be preserved.

The architecture of the building is of the colonial period although it was built as late as 1813. This is possibly because the architect-builder, Cathhart, convinced the original owner that a dignified building would attract the genteel carriage and stagecoach trade. The building was almost completed in September 1813 when a courier rode up the highway and told the mechanics working on the building of the surprise victory of Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry over the British Fleet on Lake Erie. The craftsmen who were just putting on the last pair of rafters decided to celebrate. They finished their work, nailed a small bush on the peak of the roof as was the custom, poured some whisky over it and christened the place Perryville, which name it still retains as a post town.

The tavern was popular during the pre-Civil War period but with the decline of the turnpike traffic due to the perfecting of the railroad, the building, after 1873, was used as a dwelling. Since the Marcksteins worked on it, the place has been restored to the original.

Many groups are fighting to keep the building intact, particularly the Delaware Valley Protective Association, which is pledged to preserve the charm of the Delaware Valley. Under the leadership of Hal Clark of Doylestown, and Berthold A. Sorby of Raven Rock, a wealthy donor may be influenced to contribute toward the moving and conserving of the structure. The undertaking is expensive but the building is a historic scenic asset that must be preserved.

The Delaware Valley marches on. Its progress is heartening. Sometimes there is a little too much progress and historic values are forgotten. As travelers speed over distance-melting superhighways, they seldom consider the old structures they are speeding through but the public is beginning to care as they realize that our valuable historic heirlooms cannot be replaced.

[From the Hunterdon County Democrat
Flemington, N.J., Aug. 6, 1959]

BULLDOZERS WILL RAZE OLD BRICK TAVERN UNLESS STEPS TO SAVE IT SOON MATERIALIZE

(By D. H. Moreau)

What will happen to the "Brick Tavern" at Perryville after the State takes possession September 1?

From all that has been revealed it will be razed. Bulldozers will move in and level the proud building, reminiscent of a century and a half ago when men traveled by stagecoach between New Brunswick and Easton and this was one of their stopping places—one of the handsomest and finest of its day and still one of the best examples of colonial architecture in this part of New Jersey.

There is talk, yes, of efforts to save the building, but so far they are only in the talking stage; for all intents and purposes the structure has but 3 weeks to stand.

Mr. and Mrs. Francis J. Marckstein, who bought the building 4 years ago, after receiving solemn assurances from officials in the highway department that the then existing Route 22 would not encroach further in that direction, are sick at heart.

IN PATH OF PROGRESS

"It has been hard to take. I have shed all the tears I am going to shed. We've just had to face the fact that we cannot stand in the path of 'progress' and are trying to be philosophical about it all", said Mrs. Marckstein as she ushered us into the commodious kitchen of the once popular tavern. In June the Marcksteins signed an agreement of sale with State highway negotiators.

The kitchen, like the entire building, was in a frightful state when she and her husband took possession. Skilled in the handcrafts and an engineer in his own right, Mr. Marckstein starter working on the old building and continued with the able assistance of his wife until well into 1958, when it seemed that nothing would dissuade the engineers from changing the course of the new freeway toward which the U.S. Government had appropriated millions. Formerly designated FAI 102—it is now U.S. 78 on the official records.

KITCHEN A MUSEUM

The big kitchen, with its broad fireplace, furnished with the utensils gathered by the Marcksteins who spent years collecting and dealing in antiques, stands as a veritable museum—a display that would grace Williamsburg, Va., or Shelburne, Vt.

As a concession to this modern age Mrs. Marckstein had installed a new electric range, refrigerator, and some other appliances, but everything is in keeping with the days when meals were prepared in this big kitchen for hungry and travel-weary patrons of the stagecoaches. These lumbered past, bound for Easton and the West, or headed for Brunswick and the Raritan River boat to New York.

Incidentally, the building did not have running water when the Marcksteins took possession. There was electricity, a few single bulbs suspended from the ceilings served as a reminder that Thomas A. Edison had improved on coal-oil lamps and candles. Heat has also been installed—but not a pipe or a duct is visible.

LOVELY DOORWAY

The center room, which in stagecoach days was reception-dining room, is entered from the highway through a handsome arched doorway, with its heavy six-panel door. This was two rooms when the Marcksteins took over. A partition had been run through its center and the broad fireplace had been boarded up for a stove. It is quite different now, restored to its original simplicity and commodiousness. This room is handsomely and comfortably furnished in period antiques, including windsor dining chairs, an antique table, and upholstered easy chairs. There is a simple shelf mantel over the wide tapered fireplace.

At the far end and to the left one enters what in former times had been the bar room. This originally had been two rooms as there were two fireplaces and evidences of a partition. The Marcksteins believe these two rooms were ladies sitting rooms in the original tavern. A later owner had installed a chair rail with wainscoting beneath—as protection from bar customers who were wont to lean their chairs against the walls.

The mantel at the south side of this room is beautifully designed, giving full evidence that the builder and designer of the tavern was no ordinary craftsman. The bar was long since removed; the records show that no license was held there since early in the present century. As stated, there is no opening where formerly there was a fireplace on the side which served as a combination parlor and hall. In one corner a stairway leads gracefully to the upper floor.

GRAND BALLROOM

There are two small bedchambers at the west end, atop the stairs. To the left you enter what is now the large master bedroom. The Marcksteins and many who have seen the room, believe it once served as a ballroom. On this room the builder spared nothing when it came to providing a handsome and appealing interior. The ceiling is surprisingly high for a room of the period. In the center of the east wall is a mantel which has made the mouth of many a decorator water.

"It's the finest I've seen anywhere and I have seen a good many," said Mrs. Marckstein. Its exquisite hand carving is in keeping with the design of the smaller and less ornate mantel on the first floor. And the motif is carried out in door and window trim.

The Marcksteins worked for weeks to bring out the detail of this lovely mantel, which had been covered with innumerable layers of paint of different colors, not to mention soot, smoke, and dirt. To top it off, a later generation of owners had built a partition from wall to wall running smack into the fireplace and mantel. But they had spared this work of expert craftsmanship. Today the trim is finished in a lovely Williamsburg green and the bedroom furnishings are in keeping, including the handsome bedspreads, a little rocker-chair crib by the fireplace, attractive sidetables, drapes, rugs, and other furnishings all of the period. Few museums boast a finer interior than this. And it is authentic, even to the wide-board floors, all hand finished.

Over the kitchen end there is a single, low-ceilinged chamber, replacing what in later years had been two rooms. The old building now has 7 rooms, as compared with 11 when the Marcksteins took over from the estate of Mrs. Clarence Zabriskie. The Zabriskies had once tilled the surrounding acres, now whittled down to a single acre at the southwest intersection of the Jutland-Norton road and Route 22.

WHY PERRYVILLE?

The history of Brick Tavern and how its site got the name Perryville is told in Snell's History of Hunterdon and Somerset Counties, published in 1881. Snell says in his chapter on Union Township:

"Another tavern was one that was built by Cornelius Carhart, along whose lands the New Jersey Turnpike ran. It was built of brick and is sometimes called the Brick Tavern. It was erected in September 1813, at the time of Commander Perry's victory on Lake Erie, the news of which was received through a courier as workmen were putting on the last tier of joists, who were so overjoyed at hearing of the victory that when they put on the last pair of rafters and nailed the bush on the peak, as was the custom of the day, and poured some whisky out of a bottle on it, they unanimously called it Perryville, which name it still remains as a post town. But it has not grown much since that day, only one dwelling and a blacksmith shop having been added to the tavern. It was a place that for many years (until the time of railroads) entertained drovers and droves—more than any one hotel in all this section of country; thousands of cattle and sheep annually changed hands here. Railroad facilities have in great measure broken up the traffic."

How come that Brick Tavern is in architecture of the colonial, rather than a later period? By 1813 concessions were being made by builders to a more modern style. Mrs. Marckstein believes that Carhart must have been an older man who adhered to the colonial style or possibly the architect-builder convinced him that it was worth the extra cost to erect a building of more dignified style to attract the carriage and stagecoach trade.

As a stopping place for drovers, the inn may have been found a bit too dignified and stylish—leading to interior changes like making two sitting rooms into a larger barroom and cobbling the ball room into two bedchambers.

HARDESTY HOUSE

But tradition says that the Brick Tavern catered to the inner man only. The old Hardesty House, farther west a few hundred yards and on the opposite side of the road and erected in 1843, put the drovers and the stagecoach patrons up overnight after they had been wined and dined at Brick Tavern. Here Monroe DeMott, Clinton real estate broker, who a few years ago restored Hardesty House, found plenty of evidence that lots of

patrons, horses, and cattle had been accommodated.

The big buildings back of Hardesty House burned last year. The barn, 80 feet long, had many stalls for horses and a carriage house, 150 feet long, with more than ample space for coaches and wagons. Hardesty House had plenty of rooms also for accommodating the drovers and travelers.

When Mr. DeMott was excavating near Hardesty House he uncovered one of the old turnpike mileposts with the legend "32 Mi. to Brunswick." He set it in concrete and it now graces the front yard of the house, now owned by Wintrop Clement.

TAVERN SIGN

The swinging tavern sign which formerly hung on the turnpike side of Brick Tavern now graces the walls of the Hunterdon County Historical Society in Flemington. Its weathered face bears the likeness of "Old Hickory"—General Andrew Jackson.

Dr. I. S. Cramer, late of Flemington, rescued the sign years ago and it was given to the Historical Society for its collection of antiquities.

There had been at least two buildings across the Jutland road on the opposite corner—a blacksmith shop and barn. Only one of these remains.

The more popular entrance to the tavern in the days when it still served as a licensed place of refreshment was through the door in the west end. This formerly had a broader porch with a peak roof, as evidence in the brickwork shows. The bar was long since removed but the legend persists that it was a lively place—and at times a place of great solemnity.

THE WAKE

Once the proprietor, one Peter Mulvey, patronized his own barrel a bit to excess and passed out. His patrons solicitously lifted the proprietor's bulk to the top of the bar, folded his arms, placed candles either side of him as for a wake. When Mulvey came to and noted the joke that was being played on him he quickly cleaned house of the jokesters.

David Wean and his sister, Miss Ella Wean, of Pittstown, whose uncle's wife was a daughter of Peter Mulvey, recall having visited the place when the Mulveys were there. Mr. Wean remembers 55 or 60 years ago when the hotel was conducted on the premises. To the best of the recollection of members of the Mulvey family, Peter conducted the tavern about 11 years, commencing in about 1874. At that time the farm contained about 100 acres.

Published records of the line of ownership fail to show Mulvey's ownership.

PRIOR OWNERS

Cornelius Carhart, Jr., sold the tavern and 100 acres April 1, 1833, to Daniel VanSyckel. The price was $4,661.77. Earlier deeds show that the elder Carhart had sold his son four parcels between 1794 and 1805, 8 years before the tavern was erected.

VanSyckel owned the property until 1864 when John T. Leigh bought it for $7,000 and resold it the next year to Joseph VanSyckel for $8,450. Two years later Joseph VanSyckel sold it to Joseph Stires for $9,000. Those were boom (post-Civil War) times. The railroad had not yet made its impact on turnpike travel.

By 1870 the crash had come and traffic had gone to the rails. Richard Bellis, sheriff, took over, selling the property to Mary Taylor, who in turn in 1873 sold it to Cornelius V. Hall. Apparently the Taylors had been tenants before Mary Taylor bought, because a map printed in 1851 shows the building and the legend "S. Taylor Hotel." Another township map of 1860 designates the site with the name "John M. Leigh."

In 1879 H. C. Beldon, sheriff, conveyed the property back to Mary Taylor and in 1889 the sheriff, this time John T. Cox, stepped in, selling the property to the executors of Charles T. Tomlinson, deceased. William Deremer bought the place in 1902 and soon conveyed it to Clarence A. Zabriskie. The latter family never conducted a hotel there but used it as a farmhouse, and after his death Clarence's widow, Mary J. Zabriskie, continued to live there. In 1955 the Marcksteins became the owners.

THE FUTURE?

The Marcksteins plan to move soon to a dwelling in Petticoat Lane, between Annandale and Cokesbury, which they bought recently from Andrew Fox. Mr. and Mrs. Marckstein have been given not the slightest clue as to the State's plans for "Brick Tavern." They were told that everything in the building must be left intact, which has encouraged them to feel that some of the valuable items, such as the mantels and trim, may be preserved. The Marcksteins, when told that the building stood in the highway's path, inquired into the possibility of moving the structure. They found that it would have to be encased in a steel framework for reinforcement and would have to be moved in two sections, the kitchen wing being separated from the main structure. They said that lack of nearby property on which it could be placed and the necessity of removing electric power lines to provide clearance, discouraged them.

Recently some individuals have given further study to the possibilities of moving the house in the direction of "The Hensfoot," near the Jutland school and preserving it for some public purpose or selling it eventually, any net return to go to a charity. These plans are still nebulous.

It looks at this writing as though, soon after September 1, the bulldozers will take over.

Needed: A Department of Science

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I made concerning the need for a Department of Science.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED: A DEPARTMENT OF SCIENCE

More than 2 years ago, before the adjournment of the 1st session of the 85th Congress, the Committee on Government Operations, through its Subcommittee on Reorganization, of which I was chairman, undertook a study directed toward the reorganization of the civilian science program of the Federal Government. That was 2 months or more before Sputnik No. 1 was sent into orbit by the U.S.S.R.

Immediately following this important development in the science field, which indicated that the Soviet Union was far ahead of the United States in the space field, there was a tremendous upsurge of public opinion in support of immediate action to eliminate existing deficiencies in the civilian science program of this country.

Pursuant to action taken by the Committee on Government Operations, the Subcommittee on Reorganization developed legislation entitled "The Science and Technology Act of 1958," which was introduced in the 2d session of the 85th Congress as S. 3126. This bill proposed the creation of a Department of Science and Technology; Standing Committees on Science and Technology in the Congress; to establish National Institutes of Scientific Research; to authorize a program of Federal loan and loan insurance for college or university education in the psysical and biological sciences, mathematics, and engineering; to authorize the establishment of scientific programs outside of the United States; and for other purposes.

The program outlined in the report submitted to the Senate in the form of a Senate document (S. Doc. 90, 85th Cong.) resulted in many legislative actions designed to carry out the objectives set forth in Senate Document 90. In furtherance of the program the Subcommittee on Reorganization held hearings on certain aspects of the civilian science activities, particularly as they related to the Federal Government's documentation program, and issued a summary of actions taken by the Commmittee on Government Operations and other committees of the Congress soon after the convening of the 86th Congress. This was printed as Senate Report No. 120 of the 86th Congress on March 23, 1959. Although a number of constructive actions have been taken to bring about improvement in the civilian science structure of the Federal Government and certain new agencies have been created, there still remains much overlapping and duplication among the existing Federal agencies and it is essential that the necessary reorganizations be effected without further delay.

Among the steps already taken to accomplish necessary reorganizations in the civilian science field was the appointment of a Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology; the creation of the President's Advisory Committees on Science and Technology and on Government Organization; the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific Research and Development, later superseded by the Federal Council for Science and Technology; the extension of the authority of the NACA through the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the establishment of Committees on Science in the House and Senate.

While these steps have been helpful and undoubtedly are necessary actions toward accomplishing the overall objectives of perfecting Government operations in the field of science, further consideration must be given to still existing inadequacies not only in these agencies but in other areas which must be coordinated with operations of a similar or related character and reorganized under more cohesive administrative controls.

There are approximately 50 agencies which perform some science and research activities having direct application to the overall science program of the Government. In addition to the four Presidential advisory groups dealing with science, there are three major independent science agencies or commissions, the National Science Foundation, the NASA, and the AEC, and more than 40 components of other departments and agencies which operate science and engineering programs supposedly related to the major departmental mission for which the departments were established, or for which special agencies were created. Some of these internal agencies, such as the National Bureau of Standards, Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce and science functions of other departments which are performing services not directly associated with the primary mission or even related functions of the departments in which they are now located. Consequently, they do not receive the technical administrative direction necessary to insuré operation at their highest potential. On the other hand, some of these internal agencies, which include the National Institutes of Health, the Agricultural Research Service, the Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the Science Advisor to the Secretary of State, perform serv-

ices which most authorities on science programs of the Government feel do have direct application to the program areas of the respective departments in which they are located and should retain their present status.

From the beginning, the committee, in its studies of these problems, studiously avoided involving the civilian science activities with the applied science and research programs of the military departments which pertain to national defense and come within the jurisdiction of other committees, or with advisory or coordinating agencies or officials within the Executive Office of the President performing high administrative and policy functions under the direction of the President.

The major objective of the Science and Technology Act of 1958, which I introduced as chairman of the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, was to bring about, under a Secretary at the Cabinet level, coordination and centralization of those Federal activities in the field of basic civilian science, now scattered among existing departments, as well as those which had grown haphazardly following World War II.

The Subcommittee on Reorganization has continued to press for action by the Congress during the past 2 years on its original proposal to create a Department of Science and Technology. Early in the 86th Congress a bill was introduced, S. 676, to create such a Cabinet post. Hearings were held on this and related measures, during which it developed that there were so many varying points of view as to whether a Department of Science should be established and as to what Federal activities should be incorporated within such a Department, that the committee proposed that a commission patterned after the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government should be created to recommend legislation designed to reorganize the civilian science programs of the Federal Government. That bill, S. 1851, Calendar No. 400, was reported favorably to the Senate on June 18, 1959, and has been pending on the calendar since that date.

According to a news release issued September 11, the British Government is now proposing to establish a Cabinet post on science. This action is strikingly opposite from the position taken by the U.S. Government, which refuses to take the lead in establishing a coordinated science program within the Federal Government. The British Science Mission, attached to the British Embassy in Washington, has secured from the Committee on Government Operations full details regarding that committee's studies and recommendations and, although our Government has failed to recognize the failings of the present program and the urgent necessity of taking aggressive and constructive action, the British have utilized the very same material to accomplish the objectives of the legislation this committee has been advocating.

It took a sputnik to get action on other areas of the original science and technology act proposed by the committee in the 85th Congress. I trust that the new moon rocket which has been successfully launched by the Soviet Union will awaken this Congress to the need for action without further delay. I realize that there is little chance to get action on the bill proposed by the Committee on Government Operations this session, but I feel that it is my duty to point up to the Senate that there is presently pending, and has been pending on the Senate Calendar for more than 2 months, constructive legislation which, had it been approved as recommended, would have placed the United States in a far more advanced position to meet the challenge of Soviet science than will be possible when the Congress reconvenes next year.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, those who know human and monetary values are the same, despite political slogans, will be interested in this editorial from the Dallas Morning News:

VALUED BY YARBOROUGH
(By Lynn Landrum)

Senator YARBOROUGH is proud that he and others in Congress defeated the so-called budget experts by voting to unbalance the budget to the extent of $50 million for loans to indigent colleges so that they could construct more classrooms, thereby increasing their insolvency further.

"One of the greatest deterrents to progress in our time, says the Senator, "is the so-called budget experts who know the price of everything but the value of nothing. We have defeated these so-called experts. We put human values above monetary values when we passed the housing bill with a start toward building college classrooms and proper housing for the aged."

The columntator attended classes at the University of Texas at a time when pine plank shacks were lettered instead of numbered serially. And the alphabet was barely able to take care of the structures. The columntator is unable to say that the shacks materially lowered the intellectual content of the lectures delivered in these substandard edifices. It may be that marbled halls and carved masterpieces would have feasted the mind and charmed the soul. The columntator doesn't know. At the time, the elbows of his coat and the seat of his breeches were shiny from age and use. But, inside, he took what the professor said, turned it over, tugged at the seams, sniffed it—and wondered how much of it was hand-me-down wisdom and how much was homespun truth. And that, for him, was education.

The pine boards and the leaky roof were incidental and unimportant then. They have never seemed important since—except as a sort of visible and palpable evidence that there is a limit to what the taxpayer can pay for.

Human values? Is it a human value that every dollar Senator YARBOROUGH adds to the budget deficit detracts from the columntator's life insurance values when the time comes that the widow has to live on those values?

Is it human value that every time Senator Y spends money the Nation hasn't got he increases the loss which the columntator's savings have sustained because his series E bonds won't cash out for as much buying power as the columntator put into them 10 years ago?

Is it human value that every time Senator Y gets generous with money that the Treasury doesn't have he is carrying out the policy of two enemies of the American way of life, Harry Hopkins and Joseph Stalin?

Harry the Hop said: "We shall spend and spend and elect and elect."

Stalin said: "America will spend itself into bankruptcy and fall into our hands like a ripe plum."

And Senator Y says: "We put human values above monetary values."

Ought America to play Russian roulette with national bankruptcy as the loaded cylinder?

What Is the Truth About Russia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, what is the truth about Russia? What are the people like? How do they live? What do they want? Are they a menace to us? Should we suddenly change our way of thinking about them and relax our guard? How far can we trust Mr. Khrushchev?

These are hard questions to answer. There are too many conflicting ideas and reports. It is difficult to know what to believe. I am one of the increasing number who have been to Moscow. In a brief time these are things I saw.

A church built for 800, crowded to overflowing with an estimated 2,500 who filled every inch of space. They stood in the aisles and spilled out into the streets from every entrance in a drizzling rain. And this was one of three 2-hour services held during the day. This in a Communist nation where God is not recognized and there is no religion except service to the state. But here in this crowded church were no police, no visible threat to the search for God. And never have I seen more hunger for God or a greater yearning for hope of the future than in that gathering in Communist Moscow.

The service was Protestant and there was much to carry me back to childhood country services I had known in the United States. The distinguished, bearded old minister read each line of the hymns, followed in beautiful chorus by the voices of the congregation. A large communion cup was passed—it was first Sunday—with a napkin which each worshipper used to wipe the lip of the cup before passing it on. The wine was real—no grape juice imitation—and it seemed to me some parishioners took a bigger drink than custom required.

But tragedy walked heavily in that church despite its overflow crowd and the hunger for God in the faces of the people. There were almost no young people; almost no men—only women, old women. The young people have other things, other beliefs, to occupy their minds. The men are afraid for their jobs, or their standing.

The Communists oppressed all religious services at first. Not only are they atheistic, but the church in Russia was too closely associated with the ruling class. The czars were held next to God. Now the Communists allow religious services, but discourage them. As a result, Moscow which had 400 churches before the Red revolution, now has 40 with twice as many people in the city. But the training of ministers and priests is starting again.

At the other end of the scale are the children. They are being taught to live without God. Fresh, apparently happy, well fed and carefree, they looked very

much like the children of the democracies, except that most dressed uniformly and the boys wore the emblem of the hammer and sickle. For 10 years they go to school 6 days a week, with course work much more rigorous and intensive than ours. Languages, math, and science are stressed throughout. Then the good ones are screened for trade school and university, the others go into the labor force. There are no frills. The children are educated—not entertained. These 10 years are considered the equivalent of 12 of ours. In fact, some have said these 10 years leave Soviet children as well educated as junior college graduates in the United States.

The result, an indoctrinated, disciplined, and highly trained citizenry drilled for the job on hand and well prepared for it. Is this a process to be emulated by the democracies? Certainly not. But it is a process which can well get the most out of the minds and bodies of people who live in a controlled economy. Church going is a voluntary thing which has come into disrepute in Russia. Not so education. It is a fetish but a required one, which instills doctrine much more firmly than the knouts of the czars or Stalin's firing squads.

I saw the Russian Fair in New York City and I saw the U.S. Exhibition in Moscow. Both were very good exhibits. I am confident ours was well worth the money we spent. It contains some strikingly American things. One of these was the Circorama which was a circular building in which the audience was completely surrounded by a moving picture of Americana. It was a magnified and tremendously effective improvement on cinerama. A thrilling panorama of American scenes completely surrounded the audience and you had the sensation of being on a moving platform which took you from one end of America to the other. The typical American home and American automobiles were big sensations. So were many other items.

Two million seven hundred thousand people saw our exhibition in 6 weeks. Many thousands had to be turned away. Much more is known about America in Russia today as a result of the American Exhibition. To the Americans who viewed it and doubtless to many Russians it was not perfect. There were too many pictures instead of actual objects. The Russians have seen pictures of their own advanced achievements and those of the satellite nations. They are much more impressed with something they can touch and examine. I felt that our art selection as a whole was poor. In no sense did it measure up to Russian paintings at the New York Fair, and I expressed a frank dislike for some of the examples of modern art which were displayed. One of the fair officials told me he had actually seen Russians stand and look at those paintings with tears in their eyes. I told him it was enough to make most anybody cry.

There were things in the Russian fair in New York which were very skillfully interlaced with propaganda. There were folksy examples of beautiful everyday products such as laces and ceramics which appeal to nearly everyone. The first book in the Russian book section was an Orthodox Russian Bible. They stressed free medical care which touches home to every person who has paid a high medical bill in the United States. They pointed up their educational system, the existence of which many Americans are just beginning to learn.

They used an easy to reach well known New York building. Our exhibition was housed in a more inaccessible park in buildings which had to be speedily designed and built. They were striking, but they did not measure up in the eyes of the Russians to a series of unusually beautiful, permanent exhibition buildings which were designed for each of the 24 Republics in the Soviet empire as part of a perpetual fair. This would be equivalent to a fair in Washington with separate buildings to house and set forth the history of products of each of the 50 States of the Union.

The Russians have an ability to put their best foot forward and to disguise and hide the shabby facts of life which still exist for the great majority of their people. For instance they can line up almost as many jet airliners on the Moscow Airport as can be found in all the remainder of Europe or America combined. This is impressive but it does not compensate for rough, muddy roads, truck or horse drawn transportation, and slow, inadequate train service which most of the populace must depend upon.

In their battle to make Moscow the showplace of the Russian empire, they have lined a few main streets with huge, many storied, impressive appearing apartment buildings. Perhaps these are just a facade. Certainly they are not the deep solidly constructed buildings of the United States, but they are there and a few years ago they were nonexistent. Many more are under construction. But wherever you turn, just a block away still stand the poor, small, crowded structures in which most of the populace still lives, with several families taking turns at each bathroom and kitchen. Construction, which some call good and others bad, is proceeding rapidly and each day brings improvement. High rents, which are the bane of existence in so many places are nonexistent here. Rents are graduated at about 5 to 7 percent of the earnings of the tenant.

Moscow boasts a subway system which undoubtedly is the best in the world. The stations are showplaces of glass and marble. Perhaps this offers pride in communal achievement with offsets crowded living and sometimes outdoor privies and community wells.

To search out the bad and ignore the accomplishments in Russia would be foolhardy. They are making progress and their progress is accelerating. The unveiling of the MIG 15 during the Korean war was the first concrete demonstration of this progress. It astounded our aircraft designers by its capabilities and numbers. Then came the sputniks with more spectacular and equally unanticipated accomplishments. Russian diplomatic and propaganda gains have not been accidental. They are just as well planned and just as spectacular. The Russians play a shrewd, hard, patient game in which the left hand professes not to know what the right is doing.

Because Russia historically is a backward nation in which many millions live under hardship and oppression; and because we are reluctant to assoicate success with a form of government hostile to our own, we are accustomed to underestimate the Russians. We overlook the fact that they have produced many great leaders whose brilliance was lost in the nearer glitter of Western statesmen and scientists. Now we know Russia can produce great accomplishments when they concentrate on specific objectives.

Russian industry has, of course, concentrated on weapons of war, with primary stress on missiles and other new superweapons. Trucks and heavy farm equipment have had major attention. Gradually, as tooling up has progressed, there has been a shift toward production of consumer goods and export items. The fact that factories may be outdated and unsafe is of no consequence where manpower is unlimited and no value is placed on human life. Their jets may be inefficient, but they provide swift links with the farflung corners of the Russian Empire. Production all along the line is low compared with ours and methods are often crude, but there is no unemployment, and costs are unimportant to a government which owns everything. In Russia every shoulder has been put behind the same wheel. There are no dissenters. Stalin liquidated them. His successor wears a velvet glove, but it still covers an iron hand.

By our standards, the people live very poorly. Their food is principally cabbage, potatoes, and bread. Meat once or twice a week is the rule. But I did not see anyone who appeared hungry. There is a system of social security for those who cannot work. The clothing of the people is plain and unattractive. But I saw no one in rags. Cosmetics seldom are seen, and equally scarce is the hair styling of the West. Their furniture is limited and generally poor, but there are radios and a surprising number of television sets. They have commercial transportation and some freedom of movement. This adds up to a far different story than that of life under the czars. In simple truth, the Russian people—unattractive as the picture may be to us—are better off than they have ever been. They are harnessed to their wheel of life, but they are beginning to enjoy advantages which they never knew before, and they are told by the best propagandists in the world that conditions will continue to improve. Actually, Russia has always been a police state. The czars and the ruling class held the power of life and death over their frightened and miserable subjects. Stalin geared them to a specific pattern of development and intensified the power of the police. Now there is some relaxation of severity; the people breathe more easily and find it pleasing. By American standards, they still are a backward people, but they do not know anything

about American standards and have not had much chance to learn. We should give them that chance at every opportunity.

Neither they nor the satellite people will revolt. There is not anything to revolt with. There is no prospect of help if they were to revolt. Russian troops are everywhere. The puppet governments know which side their bread is buttered on and play the Communist line without deviation. Contrary to general belief, the satellite forces are not equipped with the newest Soviet weapons. There is always the chance they might go over to the other side in a real showdown. But Hungary demonstrated the chances for a real showdown between East and West are exceedingly remote, and no one wants to risk being another Hungary. As conditions improve a little—and they also are improving in the satellite nations—there is less likelihood of revolt. Hunger and misery as a cause for revolt are gradually being reduced. The people of the satellites in many instances knew better days before World War II than they have known under communism. But their conditions now are better than at any time since they came under Communist domination.

In Russia there is no private ownership of land. All land and buildings were seized by the state, without compensation to the owners. Those who resisted were exterminated or imprisoned. The former owner of the American Embassy in Moscow, now leased by the United States, was smarter than most. He traded title to his property for a visa. This procedure for communization of property was part of Lenin's hatred for all who cast a longer shadow than he, but he masked it under his interpretation of Marxism. Now there is a slight shift away from this pattern. A person who is in favor may under some conditions lease a small plot of ground to work in his spare time, or even to build a house on. Savings accounts are encouraged. Investments generally are in government bonds, on some of which 3½ percent interest is paid. Those who receive interest generally are selected by nationwide lottery. There is some installment buying, but mostly on a layaway plan in which the merchandise is held by the seller until purchase is completed.

Normally a worker progresses by accomplishing the work quotas which are assigned to him. Nearly all work is on a piecework basis. Basic salaries generally are about the same for all except highly trained personnel such as doctors and engineers. Theirs runs higher. The starting scale appears to range from less than 300 rubles per month for some unskilled workers to more than 5,000 for a few top technical and scientific people and artisans. By diligent work and by enjoying the favor of the party leaders a person may progress up the scale until he has doubled his starting salary or a little more. In the same way he can get better living quarters. Some can earn considerably more than the official scale. These include dentists, artists who are allowed to earn extra income and Communist officials.

Women workers are seen everywhere in Russia, often doing the most menial types of work. Women street cleaners appear to predominate. Others work in the fields. They appear to do the same work as men in road and building construction. Many are also found in fields requiring top skills. It is said that women doctors predominate.

Since the economy is state owned and controlled, there is no requirement to show a profit. Service therefore may be and often is poor in public places. In the hotels this is particularly evident. Redtape and regulation are rampant, and an attempt to cut through or bypass the redtape just produces additional delays. There is no other stone-faced indifference to match that of the Russian bureaucrat.

The press, the radio, and the TV are strictly controlled. There is only one line of thought, the carefully censored party line. Everything published or printed must conform.

The Russian is a reserved individual. In public he is not in any sense an extrovert. But for the most part the people give the impression that they would like to be friendly. Time after time I led off with a smile and a word of greeting to individuals. Usually, after a somewhat startled look and a delay of a second or two, there would be an answering half smile and some response in Russian. On a few occasions there appeared to be mild hostility, but no general animosity.

Movements in Russia are less restricted probably than at any previous time. You are given the idea that you can go anywhere and see anything you want. But you will find that you are being shuttled into certain carefully selected areas where you will be shown the best side of everything. If you suggest or request diversion into other areas you will begin to encounter excuses and slowdowns. If you insist on going where you are not wanted you may not be told it is impossible, but things just seem to happen to your plans. Your waiter will begin to take twice as long as he normally would to serve you. Your Intourist guide and car may become lost before you start the trip or may take an entirely different route after it is started.

It has been said many times that only a very few people in Russia are Communists. This is true and deliberate. The Soviet leaders have complete control of the masses and do not want too much competition at the top. The party pie can be sliced only so many ways. A few likely prospects are allowed to join the party, notably among the young but most people make no effort to do so. They assume government is out of their hands and none of their business.

Scattered throughout the Soviet satellites there are remnants of the former governing class and former property owners. In Russia nearly all of these were liquidated or driven out. It is terribly depressive to talk with one of these because they are people who live without hope. Most of them live from hand to mouth and know there is no hope of change for better. Their property was taken from them without compensation. Their jobs are gone. The people whom they formerly looked upon as inferiors now dictate their livelihood. They do not make it an easy existence.

All along the line communism maintains a solid grip on the countries behind the Iron Curtain. There is no reason to expect political miracles. There is no more likelihood of a quick shift in policy behind the Iron Curtain than there is reason to anticipate the democracies will turn to socialism. There are no nations which are in position to break away from Communist dictatorship. Any that try will be subjugated with varying degrees of ruthlessness. Hungary and Poland are the extremes in the way in which satellites are dealt with, but the grip of communism is just as secure in each for the time being. State socialism is an accomplished fact with which we shall have to live for an indeterminate time. Possibly as conditions improve and as the people learn more of life in the democracies they will demand and get more of the better things in life. But this will take time.

To look for a sudden overthrow of communism, supported as it is by vast military organizations which dominate a defenseless population is to refuse to look facts in the face. It is equally unrealistic to think that communism is looking for a war with the democracies. The Soviets are doing too well without a war. They will use it only as a last resort. But in the meantime they have concentrated on massive weapons of destruction and in their ability to overrun vast territories if necessary. And there will continue to be one instance after another where the Communists bite off bits and pieces of territories all over the face of the globe.

When Khrushchev said, "We'll bury you," he simply meant socialism will triumph over capitalism and that the Communist hierarchy fully believes. Whether by fair means or foul is of no consequence. With them the advantages of communism is a religion—the only religion they recognize. There is no opposition party to offer the people an alternate course. It is state socialism or nothing. The populace knows nothing about the advantages of capitalism. They get steady doses of propaganda for their system of government and against ours. Anyone who disagrees too openly finds himself in prison. A few years ago he would have been shot. That is some improvement. The fly in the ointment is the fact that conditions of the people behind the Iron Curtain are improving. It is hard to argue with even a little success when we have nothing else to offer them.

Now this final word. To return to the democracies is like a breath of fresh air. Not only do you see the difference; you feel the difference. Instinctively you find yourself taking a closer look at America and all that it offers to each of us. The important thing is that America not forget its own objectives, its own capabilities, its own accomplishments. When the great Franklin D. Roosevelt said, "We have nothing to fear but fear itself," he might well have included this new threat from a new ideology. America is

far, far ahead in nearly all the things which make for good living and provide opportunity for the individual. If we falter now, it will be our own fault. There may well be a requirement for belt tightening. Competition from abroad, both in trade and in world leadership is certain to increase and to become more difficult to meet. We must be geared to take these in our stride by dedication to our ideals and by renewed determination to preserve them. Unlimited resources still lie within our reach. We stand at the threshold of a rich civilization which, with proper guidance, can become a universal civilization. Our system demonstrably works better for the good of the greatest number. The American ideal, remote for many, yet attainable, beckons to all mankind.

The President of Rutgers University Calls for an Educational and Cultural Commission in New Jersey

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, New Jersey's quest for culture was discussed by the New York Herald Tribune in an editorial on September 14, 1959, with particular reference to a speech given by Dr. Mason W. Gross, president of Rutgers University of New Jersey, at the annual meeting of the Constitutional Convention Association of New Jersey.

The editorial writer advises us that—

It's perfectly true that few New Yorkers find it necessary to cross the Hudson on purely intellectual pursuits.

And makes the further point that—

New Jersey's trouble seems to be that it lies between two of America's most flourishing cultural centers, New York and Philadelphia.

The New York Herald Tribune editorial concludes by saying that—

We hope Dr. Gross succeeds in transforming New Jersey into a cultural hotbed. We will watch him with sympathy and anticipation from our own oasis.

What provoked this and other editorials was the proposal by Dr. Gross that an educational and cultural commission be established in New Jersey, to advise New Jersey in its quest for culture. In an effort to obtain some background information on what such a commission might accomplish I have turned to a New York State proposal for a cultural commission. New York Assemblyman Bentley Kassal in an illuminating letter in the New York Times of June 22, 1959, declares that—

For the past 3 years, as a member of the State legislature, in cosponsorship with Senator MacNeil Mitchell, I have introduced bills aimed at creating a New York State Arts Council. * * * It was my intention to have the State appropriate $500,000 for the encouragement and support of cultural activities after a similar sum has been raised by voluntary contributions.

Assemblyman Kassal goes on to say that—

It is intellectual blindness to deny the government role in cultural matters. With a constantly shrinking workweek, and an inevitable increase in leisure time, ways must be found to channel people's spare time and energy into constructive activities.

The development and growth of New York as a cultural center must redound to the benefit of its citizens. If we wish to retain the television industry, aid in the production of apparel and architectural designs, increase tourism and travel to the State, it is necessary that we help New York become the cultural center of the world. * * * The Governor himself recognized this urgent need in his annual message to the legislature this year and it is hoped that this partnership of government and private citizens will shortly bring fruit in the creation of a New York State Arts Council. I feel that this should be one of the keystones in any program for future governmental action.

Here, then, we come to the heart of the matter. Dr. Gross would like the State of New Jersey to take its proper place in the front rank of those four or five States which are culturally and educationally among the top in the United States. He has called for the establishment of a temporary educational and cultural commission, similar in a number of respects to the Mitchell-Kassal plan which has so interested Gov. Nelson Rockefeller that he recognized this urgent need in his annual message to the legislature this year, according to New York Assemblyman Bentley Kassal. Governor Rockefeller is, I think, a very competent judge in these matters, since the Rockefeller family has done as much for the advancement of education and the arts in the United States as any family in the country.

I am happy to be able to say that New Jersey Assemblymen Charles E. Farrington and Francis J. Werner have sponsored legislation similar to that which has been developed by New York State Senator MacNeil Mitchell and Assemblyman Bentley Kassal.

I include here the New York Herald Tribune editorial, the letter to the New York Times, the speech by Dr. Mason W. Gross, and the legislative measure offered by New Jersey Assemblymen Farrington and Werner for the information of my colleagues:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, September 14, 1959]

NEW JERSEY'S QUEST FOR CULTURE

While it's perfectly true that few New Yorkers find it necessary to cross the Hudson on purely intellectual pursuits, none of us had ever thought of our fair sister State of New Jersey as a cultural desert, a wasteland of the arts. Yet that, more or less, is how Dr. Mason Gross, president of Rutgers, described it in an address which urged, as first steps toward improvement, creation of a State study commission and voter approval of the $66,800,000 higher education bond issue in November.

It's too early to tell whether Dr. Gross' appraisal of current cultural conditions is going to spread consternation in the Amboys and alarm in the Oranges. New Jersey's trouble seems to be that it lies between two of America's most flourishing cultural centers, New York and Philadelphia (yes, Philadelphia). Dr. Gross does not indicate in what numbers or with what frequency these two founts are visited by intellectually parched Jerseyites. In any case, he would prefer to see replenishment available closer to home.

As for the "shockingly low public commitment to culture" that Dr. Gross decries in New Jersey, it is, alas, no monopoly of the Garden State. Confidentially, we sometimes wonder whether the finer things of life aren't stuck permanently in the Lincoln Tunnel or some place. In any case we hope Dr. Gross succeeds in transforming New Jersey into a cultural hotbed. We will watch him with sympathy and anticipation from our own oasis.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 1959]

FOR STATE ARTS COUNCIL—PARTNERSHIP OF GOVERNMENT AND INDIVIDUALS FAVORED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

On June 17 you printed an editorial entitled "A Commission on the Arts" in which you commend the role of the Federal Government in the area of the arts. Lest there be any misunderstanding as to the role of State governments in the arts—not only for the sake of the arts but also for the general economy of the State—certain facts should be noted.

For the past 3 years, as a member of the State legislature, in cosponsorship with Senator MacNeil Mitchell, I have introduced bills aimed at creating a New York State Arts Council. This was not intended to deny the responsibility of individuals to support cultural pursuits. My purpose was to supplement this support by the active participation of government.

It was my intention to have the State appropriate $500,000 for the encouragement and support of cultural activities after a similar sum has been raised by voluntary contributions. Rather than discourage private support, such a promise of additional help might well be a spur to individual contributions.

It is intellectual blindness to deny the government role in cultural matters. With a constantly shrinking workweek, and an inevitable increase in leisure time, ways must be found to channel people's spare time and energy into constructive activities.

The development and growth of New York as a cultural center must redound to the benefit of its citizens. If we wish to retain the television industry, aid in the production of apparel and architectural designs, increase tourism and travel to the State, it is necessary that we help New York become the cultural center of the world. We have the brains, we have the talent, and we have the money. If we merely add the will, we can achieve the results.

The Governor himself recognized this urgent need in his annual message to the legislature this year, and it is hoped that this partnership of government and private citizens will shortly bring fruit in the creation of a New York State Arts Council. I feel that this should be one of the keystones in any program for future governmental action.

BENTLEY KASSAL,
Member of the Assembly.

NEW YORK, *June 18, 1959.*

SPEECH BY DR. MASON W. GROSS AT CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION ASSOCIATION ANNUAL MEETING, PRINCETON, N.J., SEPTEMBER 12, 1959

During the past few weeks you members of the Constitutional Convention of 1947 must have had many opportunities to recall the furious heat and mugginess of that historic summer in New Brunswick. It is a pity that you are unable to devise any constitutional provisions covering the matter of New Jersey's weather, but with that exception, today, 12 years later, you must still find ample

reason to congratulate yourselves for what you did accomplish. No one expects a constitution to solve the problems of a State, but what one can hope for it is that machinery for settling those problems can be set up in orderly, clear, and simple terms. To this clarification and simplification you made tremendous contributions. The people of the State of New Jersey are greatly in your debt, and as their self-constituted spokesman for this evening, I express to you our thanks for what you accomplished on our behalf.

The weather is not the only important topic on which the constitution is silent. Despite the fact that my distinguished predecessor, Dr. Robert C. Clothier, was the presiding officer of the convention, on the subject of higher education in the State the constitution has nothing to say. This is not in itself surprising, but it is worthy of note that higher education does receive explicit attention in the constitutions of some of our States. In Michigan, for example, the regents of the University of Michigan are set up by the constitution as a fourth arm of the State government, on a par with the executive, legislation, and judicial branches. This status undoubtedly helped the university to grow to its present position of eminence amongst the world's great universities by giving it prestige and strengthening its autonomy. However, today in Michigan there are two other huge public universities, Michigan State and Wayne State, which have also developed great strength. Michigan State is still a division or responsibility of the State department of agriculture, and it is a valid question whether the preeminence of the University of Michigan constitutionally is as important in the struggle for budgets and appropriations as a victory over Michigan State in football, I must apolog'ze for my uncouthness in even mentioning football here in the Princeton Inn 2 weeks before the great day.

I personally believe that it is probably just as well that your draft of a constitution did not include any provisions for higher education. From 1947 until today, and for the foreseeable future the picture of higher education in New Jersey involves so many changing factors that the time is not yet ripe for drawing up in the quasi-permanent language of a constitution a system of education institutions comparable to the system of courts. What I do find interesting, however, is that apparently the question of including some provision for higher education did not even come up, although the very fact that other States had such provisions would have constituted adequate justification for at least a brief discussion.

This, I believe, can be construed as one of the many indications that in 1947 the people of New Jersey in general, and even their ablest leaders, did not consider the question of public, tax-supported higher education as one of the more important questions facing the State. In 1920 80 percent of the college students resident in New Jersey received their college education outside of the State, and even in 1947 the percentage must have been about 60. Today it is about 50 and falling and like a falling barometer this is a sign of trouble. But in 1947 we could still think in terms of the great educational centers of New York and Philadelphia as solving New Jersey's problem, together with the apparently endless stream of colleges and universities both public and private, stretching through New England, New York State, Pennsylvania, and even further, all eager to enroll New Jersey students. This eagerness was perhaps less apparent in 1947 than it was both before and after, because of the hordes of GI-bill students, but everyone thought of that situation as being temporary, and ignored it in long-range planning. Furthermore there were many private institutions within the State able to take up the slack. There were six State teachers colleges, and the Newark College of Engineering, and the State had just designated Rutgers as the State university, an instrumentality of the State for providing higher education. Surely there was no problem.

Now I promise you that I am not going to give you tonight the kind of pep talk that I expect to give every other night between now and election day, on the necessity for passing the college construction bond issue. Let me point out here that today's problem could have been viewed in the flesh in 1947 had we known where to look. Then it was the nurseries, the play schools, and the kindergartens; today it is the high schools; and tomorrow it will be the colleges. But we did not see it as problem in 1947, and today it is with the most extreme reluctance that we are at long last beginning to face it.

To me the fascinating and at the same time discouraging thing about this problem in New Jersey is the fact that for the next several years our situation will be worse in at least one respect than it will be for the other States in the Union. Only New Jersey has been so uniformly dependent on other States for the education of its citizens. No other State comes even close to New Jersey in the percentage of its students who go out of State for their education. And now that the colleges and universities outside the State have made it quite clear that while they still hope to take as many, and possibly even more, New Jersey students than they have taken in the recent past, they cannot possibly keep up with the birth rate, and New Jersey will have to take over. It is for this reason that the public colleges in New Jersey must expect doubled enrollments in 1965 rather than in 1970, the date fixed for most other States.

Now I would like to suggest to you that this educational dependence is only one form of dependence on other States, and that while it is obvious that we can no longer remain in a state of educational dependence it will soon be realized that other forms of dependence are just as serious. I am thinking principally of what I may call the cultural dependence of New Jersey on her neighbors, and primarily on the cities of New York and Philadelphia. Let's face it—if New Jersey is educationally impoverished and in debt, she is culturally almost bankrupt. I may be ignoring some local activities, but in general it seems true to say that there is no legitimate theater, and even very little popular theater except for the summer re-runs; there is absolutely no opera and no ballet; most of the effort at symphonic music fall far short of professional standards, and there is no effort at publicly supported chamber music. Exhibitions of first quality of painting or sculpture are at a minimum, and even local shows designed to encourage genuine developing talent are few and far between.

One must give credit where credit is due, and I would be the last to underestimate the work of many individuals in the State, both in official and in private capacities, who have worked hard to develop cultural programs. The State library and the State museum, the Newark Public Library, and the Newark Museum, the universities and colleges, all have done what their budgets would permit, and it has been imaginative and good. In many cities private groups have organized concert programs, which have helped to fill the gap, but in most cases the gap reappears only too obviously when the out-of-State orchestra or virtuoso has left town. Still the herculean effort made by some few of our fellow citizens indicates that there is a real felt need for something more.

Many answers are given when one begins to deplore this situation. The first always is—New York and Philadelphia. But this is no real answer. In fact for the bulk of our people it is no answer at all, and for those who have been able to profit from the cultural life of the neighboring metropolises, the opportunities are becoming increasingly difficult as transportation becomes more and more clogged, and costs in general mount. It is obvious that it is much easier to sit at home and watch TV or tinker with a hi-fi set.

Another answer is that there is no demand for culture in New Jersey. This is like saying that there is no overwhelming demand for school among our 8-year-olds. I would point out that there is an increasing demand for the approximations to culture—TV, hi-fi and stereo, radio and the movies, and paperbacks. It is on this kind of base that a true cultural structure can be built.

But just consider what an appalling thing it is to believe that there is no demand for culture. Mr. Whitehead defined culture as "activity of thought and receptiveness to beauty and humane feeling." A society without culture is a society without either a mind or a soul, a society which tends to man's physical desires only while his wits become dull and his feelings are desensitized. In such a society there is no joy in living and no tragedy in dying. We flee from the cities where there is no point to life, only to discover that in the suburban developments life is just as weary, flat, stale, and unprofitable. If we really believe that there is no demand for culture in our society, then let us at least give up all this nonsense about slum clearance and urban renewal, for all that can mean without culture is that we are building more spacious but equally tasteless jails.

Hobbes once described the life of man without culture as "Solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short." It will no longer be solitary, except in a spiritual, sense, nor will it be short, for we have learned only too well how to prolong it, except when crime intervenes. But poor, nasty, and brutish it will inevitably be.

The degree of culture which any community achieves can be measured in terms of its commitment to "activity of thought, and receptiveness to beauty and humane feeling." Or—to put it the other way around—the degree of brutishness in a community can be measured in the same terms. What is being measured is the extent to which the community, in its institutions, its investments, and its communal behavior, publicly and expressly fosters and cherishes these cultural values. For one community to defend itself by arguing that its members can find cultural opportunities in another community, is for the first community to brand itself as impoverished and sterile and on its way to becoming a slum.

It is obvious that education and culture are closely intertwined. Where the cultural commitment is low, the educational performance will be low also. Where educational dependence is permitted, cultural dependence will be justified and tolerated. Where activity of thought is held in low regard all the other educational and cultural values will suffer. In fact, a community with low cultural achievements simply cannot know what good education is.

And this is where I come in. As a university president my first and last obligation is to insure the highest quality of educational performance at the university. As president of the State University of New Jersey I must hope that our graduates, having been educated in our cultural traditions as well as in some special branch of knowledge, will be able to carry forward and enrich the culture of our State, our cities, and all our communities. But if there is no demand for culture in the State, then there will be no demand for this kind of education; in fact there will be positive and definite opposition to it. Or if educational dependence is accepted, then we will be told that the students who want that sort of education had better go to Harvard or Oxford, because a State

university is supposed to be doing something entirely different.

I have said that where there is no commitment to culture there can be no understanding of education. If I may refer to Mr. Whitehead again, after having given the definition of culture which I have been using here, he goes on to say: "What we should aim at producing is men who possess both culture and expert knowledge in some specialized direction. Their expert knowledge will give them the ground to stand on, and their culture will lead them as deep as philosophy and as high as art." Of the two aims which Mr. Whitehead here suggests, culture and expert specialized knowledge, the latter is so much the easier to grasp that most people would accept it as the whole of education. I suppose that the commonest conception of a college or university is that it is a training school, designed to prepare recruits for preexisting jobs or professions. Fashions change as to which are the more important jobs for which the bulk of the students should be trained. Not long ago it was business, because America was business. Now it is physics, because of sputnik.

This may be somewhat absurd, but the basic point is still true, that at the core of one's education there should be some specialized body of knowledge or some special skill. This should be developed not in a narrowly practical sense but with its fullest implications for society and for the advancement of knowledge. And it is correct to think of colleges as the places where this kind of specialized learning can be acquired.

But an equally important role of colleges and universities is to preserve the values which civilization has so laboriously achieved over the centuries and to transmit them by way of the students to the future.

These values are enshrined in literature, ancient and modern, in art and music, in historical documents, in the great monuments of philosophy and religion, in the fantastically successful history of science, in law and political science, and in the records of how our forefathers struggled to achieve and to preserve these values.

WE ARE SUCCESSFUL IN KNOW-HOW

Much of education is properly concerned with the question "How?" And I suggest to you that the strongest evidence that our educational institutions have been fabulously successful in that area is that we could almost consider know-how as our national motto. But equally important in education is the question "Why?" And here we are not in the realm of techniques but the realm of values. It is the characteristic of a slave or a robot merely to know how to achieve a given objective. It is the defining characteristic of a free man to be able to discriminate among ends and to choose that which he values most.

Great teachers are not men who have mastered all the rhetorical gimmicks and can put on a good show. They are men who themselves feel so deeply the values they are trying to communicate that they actually communicate by contagion before the student fully grasps the explicit meaning. It is in this way that the values of civilization are transmitted from one generation to another. But the great teacher will not remain or thrive except in a university which he feels has the same deep commitment to culture that makes life meaningful for him. And at the next remove, the university itself cannot preserve this deep commitment unless it finds itself in a society which has some commitment to these cultural values. Without that cultural support the same activities will take place on the campus, many of the same people will teach many of the same courses, and outwardly all will appear serene. But the contagion will be gone, and the culture will be shallow and superficial.

NEW JERSEY A DEBTOR STATE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

I have thus far tried to point out a few things about our State. In the first place I have reminded you of what the State department of education has amply demonstrated, namely, that New Jersey is a debtor State so far as higher education is concerned, but that the time is coming when she will have to pay her debts. I have indicated that there is a shockingly low public commitment to culture and the lasting values of civilization in the State, and that New Jersey has acquiesced in a condition not merely of educational dependence but also of cultural dependence upon her neighbors. I have further tried to point out that cultural dependence is really a contradiction in terms, and that where there is no commitment to culture in a community, there soon appears to be no reason for continuing to live in that community—a fact which the planners of urban redevelopment do not seem as yet to have taken sufficiently into account (Newark seems to be an exception to this). And as president of your State university I have tried to show you that educational values and cultural values are interdependent, and that where there is no community or State commitment to the public support of cultural values, the scheme of educational values and educational performance will necessarily run the risk of becoming shallow, superficial, and false. I could also argue, of course, the converse of this proposition and demonstrate that where the educational program is shallow and superficial there will be no enduring and self-perpetuating understanding of culture and the values which our civilization has struggled for so long to achieve.

I believe that this situation is very serious indeed. We have heard critics of our State claim that she is only the bedroom to some other States. One has said that New Jersey as a State is simply not a viable entity. And up and down the State we find both the State government and local governments wrestling with the fact that so many of our cities are sinking into slums and that drastic and frightfully expensive action is needed. And we hear that "there is no demand for culture in New Jersey."

NEW JERSEY NEEDS SOME SELF-RESPECT

New Jersey intrinsically has so much to offer her citizens that it is a tragedy that this negative attitude is predominant. What we so desperately need in the State, and especially in the urban areas, is a sense of self-respect amounting to pride. But one cannot take pride in a drab and meaningless jungle of buildings. It is perhaps ironic that what we can legitimately take pride in is our splendid new superhighways, which take one from one end of the State to the other, or in one door and out the other, as rapidly and smoothly as possible. The corridor State is another of our nicknames.

The trouble is that one cannot take pride in oneself and at the same time admit that it is an integral part of one's program to sponge on one's neighbors. The permanent debtor is not a proud figure nor can he muster up much self-respect. His situation becomes desperate when his creditors begin to turn their backs on him.

I believe that we have reached the point in New Jersey where it is becoming increasingly clear that something must be done. The problem is: what to do and how to do it. Many people in many parts of the State are tackling parts of the problem. The economic and physical aspects of community renewal are under close study in many areas, and the acute nature of the problem of higher education has won widespread recognition—enough I hope to insure passage of the bond issue. I do not believe, however, that we will come anywhere near the solution of our problem until we recognize that a healthy community is one where not only are the physical and economic wants of the citizens provided for, but their spiritual needs also. We must become culturally self-sustaining.

URGES CULTURE COMMISSION

As a first step, marking the public and official recognition of this crisis, I would like to see the establishment by the appropriate authority of a group to study the situation and make recommendations—call it temporary educational and cultural commission.

I would like to see such a commission undertake a study of at least the following areas:

1. The population problem confronting the existing colleges and universities for the next 15 years at least.

2. The adequacy of the existing physical facilities as well as those which the bond issue will provide.

3. The adequacy of existing curricula to the needs of the people of New Jersey.

4. The general financial health of our educational institutions as compared with those in other States.

5. The apportionment of funds for the natural sciences as compared with the social sciences, the arts, and letters, for both instruction and research, and including adult education.

6. The availability of cultural facilities throughout the State—theaters, concert halls, galleries, museums, libraries, etc.

7. The extent to which cultural facilities have been considered in connection with the various urban renewal projects underway or proposed throughout the State.

8. Methods of financing cultural projects.

9. The possibility of developing community cultural centers, perhaps in conjunction with a growing program of 2-year community colleges.

10. The general interrelationship of cultural and educational programs.

I could easily add to this list, but it would be unnecessary, because any commission which got this far into the problem would discover the other areas for itself. What is more, I believe that if the commission really sought out what was being done in other States and communities in this country, it would soon grow very optimistic about what could happen in New Jersey. In any case, I am sure that the report of the commission would be an eye opener for us all.

To suggest the appointment of such an ad hoc commission is not to imply that the existing institutions do not know what they are doing. We at the university would, I am quite sure, welcome such a study, if only because the objective evaluation of our work by an impartial group of citizens could only be helpful to us.

May I be so bold as to ask you, a group which has already done so much to revitalize the State of New Jersey, to give this suggestion some thought and to discuss it with your neighbors. I am really disturbed by the staleness of the air around us. We seem to have so few fresh ideas, so little cultural inspiration, to sharpen our minds and brighten up our spirits. The era of educational and cultural dependence is working itself out to its own drab and flat conclusion, and the word renewal is on everyone's lips. What is desperately important is that any real renewal shall be a renewal, and not just a superficial rearrangement of the old tired elements. I believe that New Jersey is ripe for such a renaissance, and only needs guidance of the sort that a responsible commission could

give it. With this guidance I am tremendously optimistic that we can do the job.

ASSEMBLY No. 535

An Act establishing a State Art Commission in the State Department of Education and prescribing its powers and duties

Be it enacted by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The State Art Commission is hereby created in the State Department of Education, which shall consist of fifteen citizens of New Jersey, to be appointed by the Governor, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and the following shall serve as members ex officio:

The Commissioner of Education, who shall be chairman;

The Commissioner of Conservation and Economic Development;

The president of the New Jersey State University;

The State librarian; and

The director of the division of the State Museum in the State Department of Education.

2. The term of each member of the commission, other than the ex officio members, shall be 8 years, except that the terms of one-third of the members first appointed shall be 1 year, and that of one-third shall be 2 years. All vacancies on the commission shall be filled by the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

3. The members of the commission shall serve without compensation, but shall be paid all actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.

4. It shall be the duty of the commission to undertake studies of, and make recommendations relating to, the adoption of appropriate methods by the State and the counties and the municipalities of the State for encouraging creative activity in the performance and practice of the arts and the stimulation of greater participation in, and appreciation of, the arts by the citizens of this State and the use of the arts in the best interests of the State and Nation. In the selection of subjects to be studied and in the formulation of recommendations, the commission may obtain the advice of any interested and qualified persons and organizations.

5. The commission shall make recommendations in writing to the Governor with respect to such studies.

6. The commission shall have power to adopt its own rules of procedure and to prescribe regulations for the submission to it of all matters within its jurisdiction. The commission shall appoint an executive secretary.

7. The State Department of Education shall furnish such offices for the commission as shall be required, and shall also furnish to it such clerical and other assistants as it may require and fix the compensation of the persons so employed.

8. The expenses of the commission and the compensation of employees shall be paid out of appropriations to be made to the State Department of Education.

9. This Act shall take effect immediately.

What Would Khrushchev Do if He Had 60 Billion Loaves of Bread To Spare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, Congress has just completed action on the extension of Public Law 480, the program under which our Government makes available to underdeveloped nations the products of America's agricultural abundance.

During Senate debate on this proposal, an effort was made, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], to expand and broaden this beneficial program. I was pleased to join in supporting this effort. Channeling of our surplus commodities to peoples of the world not so fortunate as to possess the ability to produce sufficient food to care for their own needs is a great humanitarian goal.

In a September issue of Reporter magazine there appeared an excellent article on this subject entitled "Too Much Food in a Starving World" written by Karl E. Meyer.

Mr. Meyer makes a cogent argument for a food-for-peace plan which will transcend the concept of surplus disposal. He states, with regard to such a program:

The difficulties and limitations of the program are obvious, and they have been stressed enough by those who regard our unwanted food as a mixed blessing. What hasn't been given equal stress is the enormous potential for human good that lies locked in our storage bins. Isn't it worth wondering what Mr. Khrushchev might do if he had 60 billion loaves to give away?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOO MUCH FOOD IN A STARVING WORLD—WHAT WOULD KHRUSHCHEV DO IF HE HAD 60 BILLION LOAVES OF BREAD TO SPARE?

(By Karl E. Meyer)

"I would like to see him go into our great farmland and see our farmers, each one operating on his own, not regimented." (President Eisenhower.)

What may impress Mr. Khrushchev most during his brief visit to Iowa is the insistence of the American farmer on producing more food than his Government wants him to—a form of hardy independence that any Soviet planner might envy. What may amaze our visitor even more is that the administration regards vast food surpluses as a kind of calamity, a painful embarrassment to leaders intent on budgetary tidiness.

Many American taxpayers are also amazed. At last count, the Government's investment in our surplus supermarket is $8.8 billion—indeed, the cost to the Treasury for just keeping the unwanted surplus has soared beyond $1 billion in the past year, and will probably reach $1.4 billion by 1961.

The food molders; the world is hungry; the question is self-evident: Why can't the United States turn its burden into a bounty and help banish want from the world? And even leaving moral considerations aside, the problem is especially pressing because of the changing nature of the Soviet challenge, as epitomized by Mr. Khrushchev's visit to this country.

This is the background for a debate linking food surplus with foreign policy that has been engaging the Capital, if only on a sporadic and desultory basis. The chances are excellent that the tempo of debate will quicken, for three reasons. First, Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—who is volubly tenacious, whatever his other merits or failings—has seized on the issue for proposing an ambitious food for peace plan aimed at turning our abundance into a more useful national asset.

Secondly, the administration, in part because of the Humphrey offensive and partly because of proselytizing from within, has moved a quarter step away from its previous policy of more or less hoping that a providential swarm of locusts would solve the present surplus problem. Mr. Eisenhower, too, has taken up the Food for Peace slogan, and even Secretary of Agriculture Benson has adopted a more stoic view of the abundance that is the despair of his department. Mr. HUMPHREY could hardly improve on one of Mr. Benson's recent statements: "We look upon our agricultural abundance, with all the problems it involves, not as a burden but as a blessing. This blessing, if wisely used, can and will make a substantial contribution to the solution of the great problems of our time arising from hunger, insecurity, and fear of war.

The third reason, however, is perhaps the most important. It is simply that for better or worse our food surpluses seem to have become a permanent problem for the American economy, and unless we are to suffocate in a blanket of plenty, some orderly solution must be found. Consider one statistic. Experts calculate that our current wheat production alone—Mr. K will probably see part of it being harvested—will be about 1.1 billion bushels. Of this, around 600 million bushels will be sufficient for domestic needs, leaving an excess of 500 million bushels, or more than enough to choke up the port facilities of most underdeveloped nations if it were merely given away. In comparison, this year's food grain production in India is estimated at about 273 million bushels. And that for India (with a population of 400 million) is a record crop.

LOAVES AND FISHES

The extraordinary productivity of the American farmer is the indisputable first cause of our embarrassment of food riches. In most of the countries of Asia, including vast stretches of Mr. Khrushchev's homeland, the problem is still to goad the farm population to adopt modern methods for better production, and to soften an obdurate conservatism. The problem in the United States is of quite another order. With admirable efficiency, the American farmer quickly acquires the newest skills, uses the best chemical fertilizers, plants the latest hybrid seeds—and increases the incidence of ulcers in Mr. Benson's department.

A few figures illustrate the phenomenon. In 1820, the average American farmworker produced enough to supply the needs of 4.1 persons; by 1940, the figure was 10.8 persons, and by 1956, it jumped to 20.8 people. The productivity of the American farmer has thus grown more since 1940 than it did in the previous 120 years.

Two reasons help explain why. Coupled with the wartime exhortations to increase production has been a technological revolution in agriculture which has consequences that are awesome and still only dimly understood. New chemical fertilizers and hybrid seeds have achieved marvelously fecund results. According to data gathered by Cargill, Inc., a major grain-trading firm, corn acreage has declined more than 25 percent since 1930, but the production of corn has climbed from 2 billion bushels to nearly 3.8 billion, or from 20 to 52 bushels an acre.

It becomes apparent that the surplus problem would not necessarily be solved if all the marginal and less prosperous farmers were coaxed to the cities. The less successful farmers amount to 56 percent of our farm population, but account for only 7.1 percent of total farm sales. In other words, if our farm population were cut in half over night, the Government's storage bins would probably still be bursting.

The situation is rich in ironies. Ezra Taft Benson, perhaps the most frugal minded member of a penny-pinching Cabinet, has

spent more in 6 years than the combined outlays of all previous Secretaries since the post was created 97 years ago. Mr. Benson's critics take cruel delight in the figures: he has spent about $31 billion, as against a total of $27.6 billion for all his predecessors.

No small part of this money has been used for the wholly unproductive purpose of just storing the unwanted food. Last year, the Department of Agriculture paid 60 private firms more than half a million dollars each in storage fees. The total payments to these companies exceeded $119 million, with the largest check going to the C-G-F Grain Co. of Fort Worth, Tex., a tidy sum of $14,787,434.06. In addition to the private companies, a bureaucracy of 6,300 Government employees is needed to supervise the storage of surplus. Aside from some 237,000 storage bins scattered through 23 States, 225 Liberty ships lie at anchor along both coasts with about 43 million bushels of wheat in their holds.

The prosaic tables of the Commodity Credit Corporation—keepers of the surplus supermarket—fail to communicate a vivid idea of our overflowing larder. Perhaps an interesting calculation made not long ago by the Magazine of Wall Street puts it in the simplest terms. Before this year's crops, each American family had an investment interest of $131.89 in surplus commodities and owned 14 bushels of wheat, 21 bushels of corn, 300 pounds of grain sorghum, a fifth of a pound of tobacco, a peck of soybeans, and a bushel of barley. According to a cereal-chemistry analyst in the Department of Agriculture, a bushel of wheat can yield more than 60 loaves of bread. With our present wheat surplus at well over a billion bushels, we could therefore produce upwards of 60 billion loaves—or 25 loaves for every person on the planet. And with his year's anticipated surplus alone, another 13 loaves could be piled on for good measure.

A FOUNDATION HAS BEEN LAID

There is, however, an enormously complex process involved in taking a bushel of wheat from a government granary and turning it into bread to be used somewhere else. Problems of world trade, transportation facilities, currency, contracts, and political considerations all intrude. Nonetheless, since 1954 this country has learned to master some of the difficulties involved and has already used vast quantities of unwanted food to good purpose.

This has been done under Public Law 480, a program relatively unsung because its title is deadeningly impersonal and its proclaimed object—"surplus disposal"—inspires neither affection nor respect. Originally it was conceived as a stopgap instrument for disposal of a temporary surplus. But the surplus seems to have become a permanent feature of American agriculture, and so has the law. Each year, it has been renewed, and each renewal has seen an enlargement of its scope.

The breadth of the law is expressed in its three titles. Title I authorizes the sale of up to $1.5 billion a year in surplus commodities for local (or "soft") currencies, and specifies various ways in which the money paid for our food can be used. The second title permits the donation of food to meet emergency calls, at the rate of $250 million a year. Under title III, the Government is authorized to barter surpluses for strategic materials, to use foodstuffs in the United States for school-lunch programs and for feeding the needy, and to give food to nonprofit voluntary agencies for overseas relief programs.

To date, the value of programs undertaken through Public Law 480 exceeds $7.6 billion, and last year alone up to 30 percent of our total agricultural exports moved under contracts made possible by the law. The diverse projects realized through the law make an impressive and instructive list. Just a partial catalog would include:

Item: Some $814 million received from the sale of food for soft currency has been committed to such projects as extending the railroads of Brazil, building a hydroelectric plant in Iceland, aiding the irrigation of Israel, expanding a cement plant in Thailand, erecting bridges in Paraguay, financing low-cost workers' housing in Greece, clearing the way for farm-to-market roads in Colombia, setting up an agricultural credit system in Ecuador, and fostering an industrial complex in Austria which includes iron, steel, textiles, paper, and chemicals.

Item: In addition to providing food for more than 14 million American schoolchildren, 4.5 million needy families, and 1.4 million persons in charitable homes, surplus stocks have been distributed to more than 100 million people overseas through 22 voluntary relief organizations and such official agencies as UNICEF.

Item: Under the 270 market-development programs made possible by the law, about 18 million people have seen 31 trade exhibits in 15 countries. Other funds have gone to distributing cheddar cheese in Brazil, ice cream bars in Yugoslavia, and nutritional advice on using the soybean in Japan—and inevitably, money has also been used to celebrate the pulchritude of various "queens" and "maids" who lend their talents to furthering commodity sales.

Item: Food sales have paid the expenses of 2,687 individuals in educational exchange programs. Money has been allotted in Austria, Colombia, and Turkey for textbook translations. Workshops and chairs in American studies are being established in foreign schools under a program just underway.

Item: Unwanted surpluses valued at nearly $1 billion have been bartered abroad for strategic materials—ranging from antimony to zinc, from cryolite to muscovite splittings—that are needed in this country.

Item: About $490 million worth of food has been granted since 1954 to help alleviate distress in 36 countries. In Tunisia, an emergency work program employing 40,000 persons has been made possible through a grant of $3.3 million of surplus wheat—with the food providing part of the wages.

What makes the record of achievement particularly remarkable is that it has taken place under—or rather, in spite of—an administrative procedure that might baffle the most determined applicant. "It is a remarkable and shameful fact," Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out, "that no one is really in charge of the store that sells or otherwise distributes billions of dollars worth of surplus agricultural commodities. There is literally no one in high authority in the entire Government who devotes full time to the administration of Public Law 480."

All told, nine major agencies are involved in administering the law. Sitting atop this bureaucratic jungle-gym are an Interagency Committee on Agricultural Surplus Disposal and an Interagency Staff Committee on Surplus Disposal. The program thus appears faceless as well as nameless; two coordinating committees rouse neither enthusiasm nor esteem. In practice, nearly everybody in the nine agencies has a veto and no one below the President can remedy cases of administrative arteriosclerosis. Negotiations for agreements can be long, frustrating, and at times acrimonious. The efficiency of the American farmer finds scant imitation in the program designed to distribute his products abroad.

A SLOGAN IS BORN

Yet there is general agreement in Washington that Public Law 480—warts and all—has been an instrument for good, both in human terms and in helping development on a modest scale overseas. No one wants to scuttle the program, least of all with vaster surpluses in prospect next year. Instead, the debate in the Capital centers on what form the program should take.

Senator HUMPHREY and his supporters believe Public Law 480 should be renamed, put on a permanent basis, given more purposeful direction, and enlarged in scope. The White House, on the other hand, apparently wants to renew the program for 1 year pretty much as it is—with a little brighter cellophane packaging, tied up in a ribbon reading "Food for Peace." The major new ingredient in the administration proposal is a plan for encouraging the creation of national food reserves abroad, so that countries now vulnerable to famines could have a food bank to draw on in lean years to come. But the law, in its essentials, would remain the same.

Underlying the administration's public position is an anguishing dialectical dilemma that a connoisseur like like Mr. Khrushchev might appreciate. On the one hand, it is a fixed article of faith in Secretary Benson's Department that surpluses are a transient phenomenon, the legacy of foolish past policies which could be removed if the Democrats in Congress passed the Benson farm program undiluted. But on the other hand, Congress remains unrepentant, the administration's remedies that have been applied simply haven't worked, and the surplus stores continue to swell. Thus, the White House has become an unwilling recruit in the Food for Peace ranks, and has swallowed its dogmas to the extent of conceding that the surpluses are not always necessarily a burden but can sometimes be a blessing.

The exact story of how Mr. Eisenhower placed his seal of approval on the slogan "Food for Peace" forms one of those minor semicomic episodes which enliven life along the Potomac. One knowledgeable Washingtonian did a little detective work and put together this chronology of events:

In his farm message to Congress on January 29, the President first promised to explore the possibilities of food for peace. The words were apparently stuck in at the last minute by a Presidential speechwriter. Other members of the White House staff, not knowing the source of the language, placed frantic calls to the Department of Agriculture asking what was up. Agriculture, meanwhile, was making the same urgent queries at the White House. C. Douglas Dillon, then Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, ordered his staff to find out how the phrase crept in. Ten days later the answer was found. It seems that a lower echelon official in Agriculture had offered the suggestion over the phone to a White House aid, who in turn had persuaded the speechwriter to insert the phrase. Five days later, the Department of Agriculture took to a White House meeting four papers suggesting what the President might have meant. The result was that on April 10 Mr. Benson announced that he was calling a food for peace conference of wheat-exporting countries. Thus, in a familiar Washington cycle, a seed planted by a ghostwriter sprouted into a conference which then appointed a committee which presumably will produce a report—a wan bloom for a ghostwriter to press in his memory book.

In a moment of becoming candor, one high official in the Department of Agriculture explained what was behind the game of appearances. "Put that pencil down and listen a minute," he said. "There are certain common conceptions which we all believe in: Christianity, motherhood, the family, and food. Those are things that folks everywhere understand. When you have food, you don't damn it. You just don't damn food."

THE HUMPHREY PLAN

On this point, Senator HUMPHREY and the administration are wholly in accord. In his food for peace plan, prepared after extensive hearings and cosponsored by 15 other Democratic Senators, the purpose is proclaimed in a might paean which serves as the preamble to his bill:

"Because of the increased productivity made possible by science and technology, there is now, for the first time in history, no reason in physical scarcity for the continued existence of hunger anywhere on this earth. * * * The Congress * * * declares it to be the policy of the United States to move as rapidly as possible in cooperation with other friendly nations toward putting its abundance of food and fiber more effectively in the service of human need."

Basically, the Humphrey plan would switch the emphasis from surplus disposal to an affirmative approach, commit the country to a long-term program at a slightly stepped-up rate, and provide for administrative invigoration under a Peace Food Administrator. The title of that office, incidentally, is a typical Humphrey touch; the Senator has turned the name of the old War Food Administrator of wartime days on its head. As the Minnesotan conceives the job, the Peace Food Administrator would preside over a 5-year program permitting the sale of surpluses at the rate of $2 billion a year, compared with the present limit of $1.5 billion. The Administrator would report only to the President and would be given authority to chop through the bureaucratic underbrush to insure that the food ended up on somebody's plate.

Senator HUMPHREY's provisions for the international food for peace bill would enable the Administrator to strike a variety of bargains. As in the White House plan, he could provide grants of food to fill up national food reserves. But he could also agree to 10-year programs of long-term supply contracts for our unwanted produce. In addition, the Humphrey legislation would create whole categories of new uses for the soft currency paid for our food.

Two aspects of the Humphrey plan have drawn administration fire. First, the Department of Agriculture stoutly dissents from the view that there is any need for administrative reform. According to Assistant Secretary Clarence L. Miller, the present program "is now effectively coordinated." Secondly, embodying the long-term principle in the structure of the law runs squarely against the official doctrines of Mr. Benson's Department. Thus Mr. Miller warned Congress that the 10-year feature of the Humphrey plan "will tend to create the unfortunate impression that surpluses will be with us for at least that forward period."

On both counts, however, Mr. HUMPHREY can quote from a series of studies made of Public Law 480, including several by committees appointed by the administration itself. The latest is the report of the Draper committee, presented to the White House on July 13, which concluded: "While the present large surpluses may, for a variety of reasons, be reduced or eliminated in the years ahead, this does not seem likely in the near future. Since surpluses can be expected for some time, their value for development purposes should be realized to the fullest extent possible."

In its overall survey of our economic assistance program, this Presidential group further believed "that more effective use can be made of our surplus * * * by changes in administrative arrangements to coordinate more effectively the use of these commodities and local currency sales proceeds with other economic assistance programs." This should include, the committee suggested, the assigning to a single agency more flexible authority for programing the local currencies we acquire. Mr. HUMPHREY might well ask if the administration reads its own reports, which, like the surplus, seem to grow every year.

The issues at stake in the debate over food for peace are essentially the same as those in the general debate on foreign aid. Like other economic-aid programs, Public Law 480 was conceived as a short-term, emergency measure. But like the others, it has become permanent in all but name. Senator HUMPHREY is asking that the bans of permanence be read, and the common-law reality be legitimized by putting the program on an orderly institutional basis.

Does it make sense to continue our aid programs on a year-to-year legislative basis, as if Mr. Khrushchev were apt to take one look at Main Street in Des Moines and suddenly call off the cold war? In the case of food, as in other foreign-aid programs, a long-term program makes a good deal of sense. For one thing, it would encourage the kind of continuity and purposeful direction so notably absent from our sprawling foreign-aid apparatus. For another, it would enable consuming countries to count on an assured supply of American foodstuffs in their long-term development plans. This could provide an incentive for the expansion of port facilities and transportation in countries where limited facilities now limit purchases of our unwanted food.

Moreover, the food for peace program must be seen as a supplement to other aid programs—not a complete aid program in itself. An Embassy official from one food-buying country has this to say: "More food? We'd rather have dollar loans, so that we could buy more industrial equipment. Anway, are the soft-currency loans we get really an addition to our economy? We have all the local currency we need. But won't there be a tendency to consider food sales as a form of aid, even as a substitute for aid, in Congress?" But this tendency certainly constitutes a less formidable danger than it once did, if only because so many traditional isolationists from the farm belt have come to recognize their own vital self-interest in any program that can be counted on to absorb significant amounts of this country's farm surpluses.

Mr. HUMPHREY has rallied a good deal of support—both in Washington and elsewhere—behind his plea for a long-term approach. There is another side of the problem, however, on which there is far less agreement. What will the effect of a stepped-up program of food sales be on existing market patterns of the world? It is on this point that the State Department has centered its opposition to the Humphrey plan. Other food-producing countries, some of which even have surpluses to worry about, are understandably nervous at the prospect of low-cost bargains from our supermarket wiping out their hard-currency markets—solving, as they see it, our surplus problem at their expense.

Mr. HUMPHREY replies by pointing out that Public Law 480 sales have simply not, as some feared, amounted to a dumping program. So far, the surpluses distributed have become additional food supplies, and have not markedly displaced purchases from other food-producing countries.

Still, an expansion of our food program could pose grave dangers for a world market already in precarious balance. There is no clearinghouse of non-Communist nations where the needs of food-producing and food-consuming countries can be integrated in an orderly way; indeed, Secretary Benson's impromptu five-nation Food for Peace Conference held in Washington last May was something of a surprising departure for an administration which has resisted a multination approach to world food problems. As with other foreign-aid measures, many feel that the need is to internationalize as well as institutionalize existing programs.

The difficulties and limitations of the program are obvious, and they have been stressed enough by those who regard our unwanted food as a mixed blessing. What hasn't been given equal stress is the enormous potential for human good that lies locked in our storage bins. Isn't it worth wondering what Mr. Khrushchev might do if he had 60 billion loaves to give away?

Rights and Responsibilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article by Mr. Gus Tyler, director, Training Institute, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, AFL–CIO. It appeared in the April 1959 issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist:

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

(By Gus Tyler, director, Training Institute, International Ladies' Garment Workers Union)

The protection and progress of the worker on the job must remain the broad continuing base of effective trade unionism. But if this bread-and-butter duty is not to deteriorate into business unionism or worse, if it is not to result in an uninspired, even corrupt, leadership with inert, even fictional, membership, then the trade union needs a greater goal than the contract, a broader religion than the dollar sign.

It must be concerned with industry as a whole, with the economy, with the nation, with democracy. The social view has a double value. It makes the union an integrated and contributory force in the community, and it raises the spiritual level of both the leadership and the rank and file.

The American economy of the second half of the 20th century is much too much of a legislated economy for the unions to believe that they can defend the economic status of their workers solely through contract.

SPECIAL PURPOSE

In its political work the trade union must place primary emphasis on social purpose rather than personal power, on program rather than patronage.

This is not only morally desirable; it is also the most realistic way to proceed, because the only way a trade union leadership can deliver the votes of its membership is by convincing its membership that a program of a candidate is desirable.

The key to those votes is understanding. The workers must know why they should vote, for what they should vote and for whom they should vote. Concentration on the political education of the worker would not only keep labor politics on a high plane but also revolutionize American politics. by teaching millions of voters that politics is a struggle of ideas and ideals and not just a contest among labels, faces, names, and prejudices.

The modern union needs professional leadership in the same way that modern government needs professional guidance. Finding the proper relationship between professional administration and democratic control is a necessary part of a new philosophy which seeks unions conducted along efficient, ethical, creative lines within the framework of a vigorous democracy.

The structural devices for democratic direction and control must vary from trade to trade, union to union, but the form is less important than the spirit—namely, professional performance under democratic controls.

UNION SECURITY

From the point of view of both servicing the member and maintaining civilized industrial relations, the union security clauses with their predictable flow of income through dues are highly desirable.

However, because of the large sums of money involved, because they are to be held and used in trust for the membership and because dues payments are obligatory, there must be public accountability of union finances.

Preferably, this should be complete and voluntary. Failing that, it should be compulsory under legislation that allows freedom of action for the union while protecting the membership against theft, misappropriation or malfeasance.

Unions require autonomy—in structure, in policy.

Autonomy is necessary because of the wide variety of circumstances in the crafts, trades and industries to which different unions must make adjustment. It is also required because of local customs, ethnic attitudes, traditions.

The labor movement in recent years has felt the need to modify the old concept of autonomy. This feeling arose from the fear that the good name of labor would be blackened by the behavior of some unions and unionists.

RESPONSIBILITY

Although labor as a whole had no legal responsibility for every part thereof and lacked the constitutional means of correcting the behavior of any part thereof, it nevertheless recognized that it had a collective responsibility for each of its constituents before the public. This realization created a concept of modified autonomy: If you want to carry the family name, you must not disgrace the family. A minimum standard of conduct is established and the ethical codes are enforced with warnings, requests for reform and ultimate expulsion.

As quasi-public institutions, deeply and immediately affecting the public interest, unions cannot hope to escape and should positively seek some degree of public regulation. They should demand a body of public law that would make union officers accountable not only to the membership but to the public for proper handling of finances and conformity with a union's democratic constitution.

REGULATION

The alternative to proper legislative regulation of unions is no legislation. This is acceptable and feasible if there is no misuse of funds or power by trade union leadership. But so long as there is any sizable or well-publicized abuse—a probability made more likely in the absence of public regulation—the national temper will ultimately turn against unionism to demand not just that the abuses be eradicated but that the unions themselves be destroyed.

Can these six strands of proposed policy be woven into a pattern of balanced rights and responsibilities?

A union has the right to protect, advance and champion its dues-paying members against all and any. But it has the responsibility to understand how its activities affect the total society of which it and its members are a part.

A union has the right to security, a union shop and a regular income. But it has the responsibility to guarantee internal democracy and to provide a proper accounting of its funds.

CODE OF ETHICS

A union has the right to autonomous action. But it has the responsibility to join with its fellow unionists to establish and enforce a collective code of ethical, democratic and socially minded behavior.

A union has the right to develop methods and personnel that will provide a professional level of operation. But it has the responsibility to place this professional machinery under democratic controls.

A union has the right to political action. But it has the responsibility to turn its political power to high social purpose.

A union has the right to free action within a democracy and to establish legal status. But it has the responsibility to work within that democracy to define and regulate its legal status so as to give further strength and moral purpose to democratic society.

The Red Willow Dam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to discuss briefly Red Willow Dam and Reservoir near McCook, Nebr. First authorized 15 years ago, the project was reauthorized last year and first construction funds were appropriated this year.

When Red Willow dam is finally built, it will be a tribute to the combined and sustained efforts of countless people in the McCook area in our State and here in Washington. There were untold numbers of men and women involved in this long struggle. A number of their names come to mind readily, but there were too many who worked too long and too hard to eulogize them individually now.

The fight for Red Willow was long and the obstacles numerous, but we have finally won that fight and construction seems to be only months away instead of the far-distant dream which it has been over the years.

For my part, I have fought vigorously for this project. Cooperating with our two Senators from our State of Nebraska, we got the reauthorization legislation enacted last year. In this we received strong support from the Secretary of the Interior and the President of the United States. All agreed and understood that Red Willow is an integral and vital part of the Frenchman-Cambridge project in Nebraska.

It was with this understanding that we once again appealed to the Congress this year for funds for construction of the project. This appeal met with sympathetic understanding from both the House and Senate Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee. For this, we owe much gratitude to the effective backing we received from the Honorable BEN JENSEN, of Iowa, the ranking minority Member of the House Committee. Without his support we could not have won our fight.

This year's victory, however, does not end the story. Only when Red Willow stands a complete project; when the waters of Red Willow Creek are stored for the use of mankind rather than permitted to run riot to destroy men and their works, only then will the story be fully told.

When it is told, a myriad of names of many fine men and women will stand out in bold letters for the great service they have rendered their area, their State, and, in fact, their Nation.

I am proud to have been of some service in getting this story written.

The Late Honorable Thomas H. Burke

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to appropriately mark the passing of a friend. This is particularly true of Tom Burke, who spent his life fighting effectively for liberal and humanitarian programs.

When I first met Tom, he was a legislative representative of the CIO. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I worked with him for years. I admired and respected his ability, diligence and devotion.

A former member of that committee, Tom was chairman of the Subcommittee on Federally Impacted School Areas in the 81st Congress. His was a leading role in the enactment of one of the programs most important to education in this country, Public Laws 815 and 874, under which Federal aid goes directly to local school districts for construction, maintenance and operation—including textbooks and teachers' salaries—in areas of Federal impact, such as military bases or Indian reservations.

In the 8 years that these laws have been on the statute books, the Federal Government has spent more than $901 million on 4,506 projects to build classrooms to house more than 1.3 million children. More than 768 million Federal dollars have been appropriated for operation and maintenance of schools in 3,546 districts with a total enrollment of 8.6 million children.

Although he will be remembered longest for his work on behalf of the Nation's schoolchildren, Tom Burke was also particularly active on laws relating to accident prevention, industrial safety and equal pay for equal work for women.

Tom leaves his widow, two sons, three daughters—and a grateful Nation.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
OCT 6 1959
PERIODICAL READING ROOM

Congressional Record

United States of America — PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 105 — WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1959 — No. 167

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress will be published not later than Monday, October 5, 1959. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

Endorsements of Work of Senate's International Health Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the work of a Senate subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations in its international health study.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

ENDORSEMENTS OF WORK OF SENATE'S INTERNATIONAL HEALTH STUDY

I appreciate the confidence which the Senate kindly demonstrated in work in which I am privileged to serve as chairman when it approved on September 9, Senate Resolution 176. This resolution provided for an additional $10,000 for a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations for the conduct of its international health study.

This study was originally authorized under Senate Resolution 347, 85th Congress. It was extended under Senate Resolution 42 of the 86th Congress. Now, this modest additional sum will be provided to enable us to carry on our work.

It is a work which, has met with general approval throughout our Nation.

Virtually since the establishment of the health study in August 1958, an unending volume of congratulatory messages have poured in to the subcommittee. Hundreds of these commendations have covered not only approval of the study in principle, but approval of its work in practice.

These kind commendations have come from eminent doctors, researchers, deans of medical schools, editors of medical publications, biologists, chemists, and others.

I have now compiled some of these commendations and wish to share them with my colleagues.

OUR APPRECIATION OF TRIBUTES FROM CONGRESS

The quotations which follow refer to sentiments from the American public in general and from the medical profession specifically.

An additional entire section could have been prepared in terms of the kind reception which has been given to our study by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

In particular, we have welcomed the reactions which have come from the two most distinguished experts in Congress in this field. I refer to the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], dean of the Senate's work in this area, and the able chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable JOHN FOGARTY.

I could cite as well messages from other Members of the Senate. No Member of Congress has given us more encouragement than our able colleague from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], who, down through the years has devoted himself so ably to the cause of advancing medical research.

FIVE PUBLICATIONS DUE IN NEXT MONTH

I should like to make a few additional points with regard to this study:

Thus far we have issued five committee publications. By this time, next month, I believe that we may have released an additional five publications; and before the end of this year perhaps still another five publications.

These various booklets cover a vast array of topics in international medical research and medical assistance. Often, they bring together data for the first time ever presented by a congressional committee.

The reception to these publications, in particular, has been unanimously favorable. Quotations from some of those comments will be found in the paragraphs which follow:

Very shortly, we are sending to the Government Printing Office the sixth print in our series. It is entitled "Health in Laos—Background Information on Medical Problems in an Underdeveloped Country."

This particular print symbolizes the speed and care with which, I believe, the subcommittee has addressed itself to urgent problems of America's international health program.

Let it be noted that the subcommittee did not actually commence operations on this study until mid-October 1958. Since that time the factual record will show that the subcommittee has covered about as broad a range of activity as any subcommittee with comparable resources with which I am familiar.

I mention this not for any personal reason; nor do I cite the endorsements of the subcommittee for any personal reason.

A TRIBUTE TO THE SENATE

This is a team effort—involving six members of the subcommittee and the staff.

We have all been working together harmoniously to get the facts and present the facts.

So, I collect these commendations with humility and not to draw attention to any one individual. Rather I seek this means of paying tribute to a body which does deserve tribute, namely, the Senate itself and the committee process itself.

I present this material in effect, so that the public will see what I for one believe is substantive congressional work of a caliber which all men of good will can and will approve, irrespective of partisan or other factors.

Often, we legislators read and hear criticisms of the Congress and of its committees.

Here then are views of a different kind from highly responsible Americans. And they are views on an all-important subject—human health.

Since much of this correspondence which will be quoted has been sent to us in confidence, it is necessary to withhold the identity of the individuals who sent the commendations. I have, however, used a brief descriptive introduction to denote the background of the individual who has written in.

Finally, let me note this fact: It is not the purpose of this subcommittee in its study to analyze specific health legislations that is not in our jurisdiction.

Rather it is the standing jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE PRESENTED IN JANUARY 1960

But it is safe to say that out of this Government Operations subcommittee will come recommendations on the basis of which important health legislation can be formulated and advanced.

Already the Senate has enacted into law a number of recommendations which I personally as an individual Senator, rather than formally as subcommittee chairman, have submitted.

I believe, too, that in the 2d session of the 86th Congress, certain subcommittee recommendations which we will formally make, as a body, as of January 1960, will likewise be introduced and, I hope, ultimately enacted into law.

When the Senate Rules Committee considered Senate Resolution 176, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. McCLELLAN] sent to it a detailed memorandum setting forth some of the facts with regard to the broad nature of the subcommittee's work. I have taken a few pertinent excerpts from that memorandum and attach them to these quotations.

There follow now:

1. The excerpts from the memorandum sent to the Rules Committee, describing some of the work of this subcommittee.

2. The excerpts from a few of the many messages of approval which have come to the subcommittee.

EXCERPTS FROM MEMORANDUM OF AUGUST 25, 1959, PRESENTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES, SUMMARIZING THE WORK OF THE SENATE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH STUDY

1. The subcommittee is engaged in as what has been described as the most "comprehensive such study of international health ever undertaken by a congressional committee."

It is necessarily comprehensive because the goals set forth in the authorizing resolution were both broad and diverse.

In seeking to fulfill these goals the subcommittee naturally has had to secure expert scientific judgment throughout the United States and the world.

2. This judgment has now been received by the subcommittee in length, diversity, and high quality.

The subcommittee has received well over a thousand helpful letters as reports from medical specialists and other scientists alone. This is in addition to a still larger number of messages from interested laymen.

The experts' correspondence includes innumerable detailed suggestions, often in the form of 5 to 10 pages single space memorandums. These have come from such diverse and highly respected sources as—

1. Deans of medical schools throughout the United States and foreign countries.

2. Winners of the Nobel Prize in chemistry, physiology, and medicine.

3. Officers and committee chairmen of the American Medical Association, and of many specialized medical groups in fields such as petdiatrics, cancer, heart disease, etc.

4. Officers and committee chairmen of scientific organizations at home and abroad in such fields as biology, chemistry, biophysics, biochemistry, etc.

5. Presidents and other officers of American pharmaceutical companies.

6. State health officers and other medical experts of the 50 States of the Union.

7. Ministers of health of foreign countries.

8. Presidents of medical academies and secretaries of medical associations abroad.

9. Editors of American medical journals.

10. Officers of American voluntary organizations engaged in medical research and assistance.

11. American Ambassadors stationed overseas.

12. Presidents of American scientific research foundations and institutes.

13. Heads of rehabilitation centers throughout the United States.

14. Presidents of American businesses with extensive health programs overseas.

And others.

This wealth of analytic material represents, in the subcommittee's judgment, a tremendous asset. The analysis of this correspondence, to be followed by the formulation of recommendations, is necessarily a time consuming and complex task. It is, however, a task which should prove extremely rewarding to the Congress and to the American people.

3. Within the year since the setting up of the study the subcommittee has been engaged in other specific health tasks as well. Thus:

(a) It will be recalled that in November-December 1958, the chairman of the subcommittee personally held conferences in nine European countries with medical leaders.

(b) Here in Washington there have been literally scores of informal conferences with individual medical experts and representatives of Federal agencies.

(c) In addition, 2 days of formal hearings were held on July 9 and 16, 1959. At that time, outstanding experts testified on more than a dozen types of medical problems.

(d) To date, the subcommittee has issued five separate committee prints. These have not only been well received, but in at least one instance two entire printings have been entirely exhausted in supply. Indeed, if all of the bulk requests for other prints had been approved, virtually the total supply would be exhausted today.

COMMENDATIONS OF SENATE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH STUDY RECEIVED IN CORRESPONDENCE

The winner of a Nobel prize:

"It is a source of great encouragement to me to find that in recent years some Senate investigations are being conducted with such high standards of judgment and values as those maintained by your own subcommittee and a few others. * * *

"The corrected (material is) being returned today to (your subcommmittee staff) whose intelligent and helpful cooperation I much appreciate."

The president of an organization providing international health assistance:

"I cannot commend too highly the efforts of your committee in promoting greater interest on the part of the U.S. Government in international health and medical research."

The editor of a Minnesota medical journal:

"The thoroughness in which you have gone about compiling information and getting advice in connection with your subcommittee is indeed commendable. One can never tell where a good idea will come from, and the more sources the more likely a well prepared program."

The editor of a nationwide medical journal published in New York:

"I think the subcommittee should be congratulated on the fine work they are doing in the field of international medical research."

The president of one of America's greatest petroleum corporations:

"I heartily endorse the study that your committee is making, looking, as I understand it, toward a higher degree of coordination between various organizations, both governmental and quasi-governmental in these fields."

A researcher in a major U.S. corporation:

"I would like to take this opportunity to commend you and your committee most highly for the uniformly excellent, valuable, and interesting publications which have appeared to date."

A member of the faculty of a major American medical school:

"I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating you on the very high caliber of the publications which have so far been made.

"I have found these of very great interest and of assistance to me in the teaching of international health in this school. I would be very happy if you would continue to send me all of the publications of your committee. I can assure you that none will be wasted."

The dean of a school of public health:

"I am in receipt of your committee report on the status of world health, and wish to congratulate you upon the excellence and conciseness of this report. It is a most valuable document, demographically and epidemiologically.

"Our school of public health plans to incorporate this material into our regular instructional program, and for this purpose would very much appreciate receiving 100 copies of the report.

"Again may I express our thanks for an excellent and useful document."

The dean of another school of medicine:

"I want to thank you for sending me your comprehensive report, 'United States and the World Health Organization,' which I have read with profit and pleasure. It gives a clear and lucid exposition of the workings of an organization which is most important to the well being of our United States. I agree with your 10 principal findings and particularly with your statement on page 4 where you say 'Only when the highest echelons of government take a deep and continuing interest in health problems can further substantial progress be made.' "

A faculty member at Harvard Medical School:

"I should like to compliment the subcommittee on its excellent work and hope that these views may be of assistance to it."

A director of research at the University of California Medical Center:

"Let me congratulate you and your committee on important work well done."

A superintendent of a board of recreation in a New Jersey community:

"I have just finished a quick reading of your Committee Print No. 5 on Cancer. I believe that you and the members of your committee are to be congratulated on the splendid job you have done with this report."

The minister of health in a Mideast nation:

"It is a source of continuing pleasure and inspiration to observe the expanding interest which the Senate of the United States and, particularly, the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations is taking in problems of international health."

A dean of veterinary medicine at a Midwest university:

"I personally feel that your proposed committee print on veterinary medicine is an excellent idea, one of great challenge and one that will be very beneficial in informing the public of the many and varied facets of veterinary activities."

A Federal research official:

"May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the splendid work you are doing in advancing all phases of international relations and especially in the health field."

An officer of the International Hospital Federation:

"Your personal interest and leadership and that of your colleagues on the subcommittee of the U.S. Senate is inspiring and should do much to advance further our common objective of a state of good health which we desire for all mankind."

A distinguished physician at the Mayo Clinic:

"I have read with a great deal of interest and considerable care the outline which you sent me concerning the Committee on Reorganization and International Organization.

"The author of the outline certainly has a very comprehensive knowledge of the problems involved and if the outline could be followed the results would make a notable contribution to the organization of governmental or quasi-governmental agencies in the field of international health."

The dean of a Pacific coast medical school:

"I have reviewed the material which you sent concerning Senate Resolution 347 (for the international health study). I believe that the objectives of this */* * legislation are sound.

"Best wishes in your efforts to move forward with legislation which will further enhance these objectives."

A vice president of an American pharmaceutical company:

"After looking over your subcommittee's program, we think it excellent."

The executive director of a medical institute:

"I wish to congratulate you and your staff on the excellent report 'International Medical Research.' I was particularly impressed with the succinct, but well-rounded, outline."

An officer of the American Psychiatric Association:

"You are certainly undertaking a broad-based and very important investigation and I can assure you that the American Psychiatric Association will aid this project in every way possible."

The dean of a Southwest school of medicine:

"The timely purpose of your committee in focusing attention upon the variety of organizations which are participating either in international medical research or international medical service programs is to be commended."

The dean of a west coast school of public health:

"All of us are deeply grateful to you for providing us the initial committee print, itemizing as it does so very effectively so many of the contributions of international medical research. This is a most exhaustive and valuable opinion."

A distinguished Canadian neurologist:

"I am writing to let you know how much we feel that your work is appreciated. I believe that your approach to the problem of understanding between the West and the East is very sound and most promising for the future. I would like to have you know that we who are engaged in scientific pursuits and medical research are thoroughly back of you in this undertaking and will give your firm and energetic support."

A Minnesota expert on children's problems:

"Thank you very much for the three initial publications issued by your committee. They were very well done and contain a lot of basic material about health in the world."

The executive secretary of a Minnesota voluntary health agency:

"The first report of a study of international health and medical research was most impressive and I must commend you and your subcommittee on the excellent preparation and material. This report should certainly have an extremely wide and receptive audience. I would be grateful if your office could send me an additional six copies which I would distribute from here."

Three citizens in Palo Alto, Calif.:

"We wish to congratulate you for your service to mankind and to the Nation in attempting to promote coordinated further research into cancer and heart disease, and to the cause of world peace by enlarging the area of cooperation between scientists and governments of Communist nations and our own. This is a particularly valuable work of statesmanship and one for which the American people owes you a debt of gratitude."

A distinguished leader of the American Medical Association:

"For myself, the members of the committee * * * and the council * * *, I wish to express appreciation of your invitation to make recommendations concerning international health research and assistance programs in which the United States participates. As I am sure you are aware, the American medical profession is firmly convinced of the worth of such projects, since new discoveries in medicine are never the exclusive province or property of one nation, and from the standpoint of expressing the true American spirit of cooperation and helpfulness. * * *

"I wish to assure you again of the committee's great interest in your study and its appreciation of your desire to make certain that health research is conducted efficiently, economically, and with a view to the ultimate improvement of the health, not only of our own citizens, but of our fellow men throughout the world."

The secretary general of a medical association in the Far East:

"We received two prints sent me by your heartful kindness such as namely 'the Status of World Health' and 'International Medical Research.'

"It was very effective and usefulness for us.

"We also knew your plan of studying international health, current congressional activities of interest especially to establish a National Institute of International Medical Research.

"How brilliant plan it is.

"I suppose perhaps so many existing human pain and suffering by numerous ailments shall be reduced or eradicated by your Senate's new activities."

The dean of a Midwest medical school:

"I most certainly highly approve of the preliminary work plan for the study of international health programs.

"As a former (officer) of the Association of American Medical Colleges' Committee on Foreign Medical Education, I was struck by the many governmental and nongovernmental agencies involved in international health programs.

"I believe the committee will be able to accomplish a great deal in redefining our many programs and offering us better information."

The Fight in 1959 for Adequate Water Resource Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, the President's record of never having had a veto overriden by the Congress finally fell before a determined effort to get along with the task of developing our Nation's water resources.

It has been said that the difference between an Old Guard Republican and a "Modern" Republican is that the former believes as a matter of principle that nothing should be tried for the first time, whereas the latter believes as a matter of principle that a new idea should be tried for the first time, but now is not the time.

Whichever faction the administration belongs to has made little difference as in 4 years out of 7 White House policy has been "no new starts" on flood control, navigation, power generation, and reclamation projects.

Even a presputnik fourth-grade child could figure out that even though the administration in 1953 took over a going program for the orderly development of our water resources, if we never started any new projects to replace those which were completed, this important national effort sooner or later would come to a halt.

After months of hearings—over 800 witnesses were heard by the House Appropriations Subcommittee alone—and deliberation by both House and Senate, the Congress in mid-August passed a $1.2 billion public works appropriation bill.

Nine days later the President vetoed the bill. In his veto message he singled out for criticism 67 unbudgeted projects, 67 new starts added by the Congress. In typical modern Republican fashion, he implied that these might be all right in the future "at the proper time," but that now was not the time. He was concerned not so much about the impact on the fiscal year 1960 budget—an additional cost of about $50 million—as on the total $800 million cost he said would be necessary to complete all of the new projects.

In all too familiar fashion, the President used some debatable arithmetic to arrive at the total future cost of $800 million. Careful analysis shows a future impact closer to $500 million. Thus, for example, the largest single project, the Allegheny River Reservoir in Pennsylvania, already was under construction but had been held up by litigation which the Supreme Court recently ended. Its cost, $113 million, should not be called a new start. Three of the projects carrying a total future cost of $49 million had not yet been authorized by law, and therefore the appropriation would lapse. Six small reclamation loans were included in the total of $17,100,000—since this money would be repaid, it should not have been counted. One item of $59,607,000 for the Trinity River powerplant in California was recognized as necessary in the President's veto message but counted in the total nonetheless. Nine of the projects, all small, would be completed in 1 year, and thus have no impact on budgets after 1960, the ones the President was concerned about. The elimination of these 20 projects and other similar adjustments brings the total down to about $500 million.

The real controversy, then, boiled down to an argument over whether Congress should appropriate money to start 47 new projects having a total impact on

budgets beyond the current one of $500 million. Most of these 47 projects were small ones. The largest has a total estimated cost of $71,400,000; only one other would cost more than $50 million. Thirty-three would cost less than $10 million. All told, they represent an increase of approximately 10 percent over the total cost of all projects in the President's budget. In fiscal year 1960 we will complete 40 projects with a total cost of $300 million. Should these be replaced with new starts, or should the national program be allowed to taper off? This was the essential question before the Congress.

On September 2 the House failed by 1 vote to override the veto. A determined House Appropriations Committee, not willing meekly to rubberstamp the Presidential dictate nor to abandon the policy of starting new projects to replace those completed, quickly reported out a new bill with all controversial projects left in but with a 2½ percent reduction across the board for all projects, old and new. The 2½ percent cut guaranteed that the total spending for public works in fiscal year 1960 would be no more than called for in the budget.

The President quickly vetoed the new measure, as expected.

On September 10 the House, by a vote of 280 to 121, and the Senate, by an equally decisive vote of count of 73 to 23, voted to override the veto.

The measure became law without the President's approval.

The Rich Richer and the Poor Poorer—Increase Disparity Demands a Moral Revolution

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Mr. Samuel Jacobs, appearing in the July-August 1959 issue of the Humanist magazine.

The concluding paragraph of Mr. Jacobs' challenging article presents a clear picture of the scope of the task confronting our Nation:

The world needs a revolution, not just to oppose communism but to help create human dignity and freedom. It needs the kind of revolution that can be fashioned in schoolrooms, factories, and mills. This is the kind of revolution that Americans know a great deal about. But, if it is to take place, it must begin with a revolution in our own thinking that will make Americans aware of the vital role that we can play in creating a worldwide upsurge in human accomplishment. In economic terms, such a revolution in our thinking is essential if the American giant is to reach his full strength for the economic job that must be done to help set the people of the world free. There is still time for us to wake up to our opportunities, but there is no time to spare.

Here is the full text of the article:

THE RICHER RICH AND POORER POOR—INCREASING DISPARITY DEMANDS A MORAL REVOLUTION

(By Samuel Jacobs)

The American people went into the Marshall plan easily and naturally. The appeal was simple and fitted American humanitarian impulses, particularly because the plan served primarily countries that suffered from a war in which we had been on the winning side.

Compared with the job of economic development in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, the European problem was an easy one. The countries involved had already been industrialized; they needed only to be rebuilt. Their cultures were technological and thus similar to ours. The intricate structure of attitudes, motivations, and behavior patterns needed for 20th century industrial living was in place, complementing our own, matching our readiness to give with a readiness to receive.

In the short time that the plan was in operation, the recovery was rapid. In Germany it was even dramatic and somewhat startling. It was clear that our international aid program was related to something that worked.

For the countries whose problems of economic emergence now confront us, what has to be done is infinitely more complicated. The cultural difference between them and us is much greater; so is the difference in living levels. For instance, while the per capita income in the United States during the 1952–54 period was 3½ times as high as in Germany, it was 8 times as high as in Brazil and more than 9 times as high as in Japan.

The median per capita income for 54 countries of the world studied by the U.N. for the 1952–54 period was approximately $445, about a fourth of the income in this country at that time and approximately what it was here a hundred years ago. Only Venezuela, Argentina, and Israel, of all the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, were above the worldwide median.

In the fact of these differences, the task of helping to raise living standards in these countries is big enough in absolute terms; raising them faster than we raise our own, to narrow the gap between us, provides a problem in economics and a challenge to international morality that are indeed intimidating.

Far from yielding to time and the effort that has already been made, the gap between the industrialized and the nonindustrialized countries is widening, and particularly the gap between the United States and most of the rest of the world. In 1938 this country had about 6 percent of the world's population and about 26 percent of the world's income. By 1949 our share of the population had increased to 6.5 percent, but our share of the income had jumped to 41 percent.

In Asia, on the other hand, the share of the world's population had declined somewhat, from 53 percent in 1938 to 52 percent in 1949. However, in the same period Asia's share of the world's income had declined from 17 to 11 percent.

In Africa the story was a little different, but the ending was very much the same. That is, while the share of the world's population increased from 7 percent in 1938 to 9 percent in 1949, the African share of the world's income dropped slightly.

THE EFFECTS OF AUTOMATION

The trend toward richer rich and poorer poor—certainly as far as relative position is concerned—has been continuing. Dr. Kingsley Davis recently pointed out that "15 of the richest industrial countries in 1938 had an average per capita income roughly 10 times that of the 20 nonindustrial countries. In 1952–54 the same industrial countries had an average per capita income about 11 times that of the same nonindustrial countries."

It is not in relation to industrialization alone that the problem presents itself. In agriculture too there is a problem to be met, and it is not being met well. Last December the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture reported that the world's agricultural production has been barely keeping up with the increase in population. Surpluses here are matched by deficits in other places.

Technological developments in American industry promise that the gap will continue to widen. American industry is adopting automation. Production is increasing, while hundreds of thousands of our workers are being set free to do other things. (It is not yet at all clear that we shall have the wit to put these people to work producing other things; there is still the possibility that these displaced workers will constitute a large group of permanently unemployed, making no contribution in the economic system of America. Nevertheless, the concern in other countries, both the industrialized and the nonindustrialized, with the consequences of this new industrial revolution in America is great.)

Recently, UNESCO's International Social Science Bulletin[1] devoted an issue to "The Social Consequences of Automation." From the many statements of concern with what is happening as a result of automation, it is hard to select the quotes that typify the rest. However, the following statement by the leader of the Yugoslav delegation to ECOSOC may serve:

"The new technological revolution which is now taking place before our eyes will not, of itself, contribute toward a more balanced economic development of the world. Automation and nuclear energy, these two main achievements of contemporary technology, are already being applied in the developed countries on an ever-increasing scale. The increase in the productivity of labor achieved through the introduction of modern technology, is assuming sometimes overwhelming proportions. * * *

"All this new technology is concentrated in the countries which have already the highest income, the largest capital formation and the highest productivity of labor.

"Automation and modern techniques, which are used in the developed countries, enable these countries to reduce constantly their production costs and at the same time to expend mass production in unheard-of proportions. This obviously places the economies of the countries which are making efforts toward an overall economic development in an ever more difficult position. This new disadvantage can no longer be met in underdeveloped countries by the old devices of pressure on wages.

"In other words, this development of technology is a new element which tends to widen the already existing gap between the developed and underdeveloped areas of the world."

Last October, Prime Minister Nehru of India complained to the joint conference of the international development finance agencies that, in the developed countries, "The pace of progress through the development of science and technology is tremendous," while for countries like India "it is a struggle for survival."

But not only the underdeveloped countries like Yugoslavia and India are concerned. The same concern is felt in countries that are definitely our technological contemporaries, if not our economic equals. Take Sweden, for example.

Over the past 80 years or so, the growth in Sweden's national income has been most

---

[1] Vol. X, No. 1, 1958 (UNESCO Publications Center, 801 3d Ave., New York)

impressive. The increase in per capita income resulting from the more rapid increase in income than in population has, in percentage terms, exceeded ours by a considerable margin. In 1952–54 Sweden stood next to Switzerland, with the second highest per capita income among the countries of Europe—at about 50 percent of the per capita income in the United States.

Now, Swedish observers view American technological development with deep concern. To change over to automated production methods as in this country would be tremendously expensive. Corporations like General Motors and United States Steel can take these huge outlays in their colossus-like stride. But few other countries of the world can marshal the great sums, which flow so readily in America, to pay for rapid automation of industry. Even Sweden will find it hard to keep up with American progress and may have to see the gap, which it has worked so hard to narrow, widening again.

And if this is true of Sweden, how much more is it true of the countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America?

POPULATION PRESSURE

Obviously, the problem is not alone with the economic factor; the population problem is one side of the coin, the other side of which is production of goods and services. That the rich get richer while the poor get children may be an inelegant way of saying it, but it does express one of the crucial realities in the international economic development problem.

Whether or not the Malthusians are right about the inadequacy of the world's resources for larger populations, there is an inescapable, Micawber-like arithmetic that must be taken into account in considering the immediate increase in per capita incomes. It confronted America in the late 1700's, when population increased rapidly through immigration, and the national income increased slowly, if at all, held down by the suspension of trade during the Napoleonic Wars, among other things. It implacably confronts the emerging countries of the world today. As Dr. Davis put it in the comparison referred to above, "Over the period covered, 1938 to 1952–54, the population of the 15 industrial countries rose by 7.6 percent; that of the nonindustrial countries by 10.7 percent. If the rates of human multiplication had been reversed, national income remaining the same, the gap between the two groups in per capita income would have been narrowed rather than widened."

The problem can be put simply in this way: only when the increase in production is greater than the increase in population can living standards rise. For many years American output of goods and services increased by about 4 percent per year, and population increased by about 1.5 percent per year. Under these circumstances, part of the increase in production could be diverted into new plant and equipment, seed for even further increases, and still leave plenty of room for an increase in the production of consumer goods to take care of the increase in population and to increase living levels for everybody.

This nice fat margin of production over population increase is not typical of the world, however. For example, in Brazil the increase in production has been approximately as high as ours. However, the population increase has run at approximately 3 percent per year. In this kind of situation, a country is lucky to hold its own. Any effort to get ahead of the game may result in lowering living standards for at least a time, and governments fall for less than that.

Last November, Brazilian spokesmen proposed that the Latin countries, whose average per capita incomes at the time averaged $312 per year, embark on a drive to raise those incomes to an average of $480 by 1980. With population increasing at an average rate of 2 percent per year, to accomplish this goal would require a production increase of 4.5 percent per year, a truly heroic effort. Success in such an undertaking would require large foreign loans, increased private investment, control over inflation, and increased exports to Russia and China. It will be interesting to see how the drive works out, if it is indeed undertaken.

The investment in plant and equipment to bring about any such goal as Brazil is discussing would have to be great. It has been estimated that the underdeveloped countries of the world ought to be increasing their capital investment at the rate of 10 to 12 percent per year to get a proper hold on the problem; it is actually running somewhat less than half that amount. Some years ago the U.N. estimated that to raise the per capita incomes of the underdeveloped countries by 2 percent per year would require that these countries get $10 billion per year from outside their own resources, $3 billion of it in grants. This would work if these countries made much better use of their own savings than they now make and it would double their living standards in 35 years.

A complicating problem, however, is the fact that in some countries the rate of population increase may well become greater over the years immediately ahead. In India, for example, the rate of population increase today is about 1½ percent per year, not a high rate as rates go. However, this rate of increase is so low because the death rate is so high. With better sanitation and improved economic conditions, the death rate can be expected to go down and the population can be expected to increase still faster. Further, the U.N. said recently, in the countries in which the birth rates are now high, the trend is toward even higher birth rates, so a decline in death rates will have truly explosive effects.

Left to itself, the population problem will naturally come under control, but very slowly. In Europe the death rate went down for more than 50 years before the birth rate began to fall. Even though whatever happens, happens faster these days than it used to, it is doubtful that the natural decline in birth rates will do very much to solve the problem in the near future.

What the United States can do to help with this problem in the very short run is hard to see. But certainly whatever can be done to encourage the educational efforts now underway in many of the countries that have this problem must be done.

AMERICAN FEARS

In the meantime, the voices of despair are heard in America. In August of 1958, for example, a distinguished U.S. Senator took the floor to argue that the American people would not stomach (his phrase) an extended program of international aid to the underdeveloped countries of the world. The President has long argued that the burden of the cold war makes it impossible for us to do more than we are doing. Read the statements; what they amount to is that the world must first disarm. Then we must reduce taxes—and that on corporations and high incomes—before we can do more than we are now doing.

It is on this basis that the proposal to set up the Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) has been kept in deep freeze for 8 years. Since our objection was based on our plea that we couldn't afford to contribute to it, the proposal has even been denied the opportunity of proper debate, in which its merits and demerits might have been worked out. Yet in recent months the United States has agreed to go along with a small-sized fund, intended to keep the underdeveloped areas safe for American private investors who, however, at least so far, have been able to find plenty of opportunity to use their money at home in highly profitable ways.

The approach we take to this problem persuades the American people to an irrational fear that we have not the economic strength to hold up our end of the job that has to be done. Americans are persuaded that we are too poor to contribute our share; a great many people really believe that economic disaster will result from our making a contribution to world economic development commensurate with the size of the job that must be done.

But even more persuasive than the predictions of domestic debility are the recurring recessions and the economic insecurity that they induce. Even in so-called prosperous times, the Government's official list of the economically distressed areas contains the names of many of the country's populous industrial and mining centers, many of them embracing large cities and a wide radius of the surrounding country. In more congressional districts than the American people are aware of, hundreds of thousands of American workers are counted as persistently and continuously unemployed. Even when the rest of the country is doing well, no one knows when jobs will be available for these men and women. And in many areas it is not difficult to relate unemployment to economic competition from abroad, or to draw the lesson that this is what aid to economic development abroad may mean for other areas of our own country.

Certainly to a worker whose unemployment compensation benefits have been cut off because he has been unemployed too long, for whom there is now nothing left but welfare as long as the welfare funds hold out, it makes sense to believe that charity ought to begin at home. To the 9 million families in which someone was unemployed some of the time in recent months, to the businessmen whose stores have closed during the same period, and to the many millions who learn from the experiences of these people, the arguments against international aid must sound impressive. At best their experience leads them to listen sympathetically to the arguments for caution and contriction rather than for courage and imagination. Since we have never allowed our people to understand how rich this country really can be, it is hard to convince them that, at worst, an adequate international program would only slow down somewhat the rate at which our economy is becoming even richer and fatter.

HOW RICH WE COULD BE

Here is one way to show what is happening.

In 1957, the high per capita income of this country resulted from the fact that the average employed person produced at the rate of $6,500 per year, a truly impressive output of goods and services. A conservative private research organization has published an estimate that, in effect, forecasts production in 1975 at the rate of $9,500 per employed person (at present prices), a most impressive increase, yet based on truly conservative assumptions. The increase in per capita income and in living standards that can result from even this increase in ability to produce is tremendous, if we have the wit to keep the production going. In other words, according to this research service, in 1975 our gross national product could reach $835 billion instead of the $440 billion of 1957, an increase of more than $20 billion per year.

How conservative this estimate is, is shown by the conclusions reached in the recent Rockefeller report that in this country "a growth rate of 5 percent is possible if we realize fully our impressive opportunities for economic expansion. If the problems of growth are formidable, we have also found the impetus to our economy enormous". (vol. 4, p. 64.)

A growth rate of 5 percent would give us an output of approximately $1,100 billion in 1975 instead of the $835 billion estimated in the forecast referred to above. What a tremendous burden of guilt must be ours as we face the people of the world, knowing how little we are doing compared with what our resources permit us to do.

Now, the UN estimate of the amount of outside capital required by the underdeveloped countries worked out to about 2 percent of the annual production of the industrialized countries at that time. If we were now to accept the responsibility for contributing 2 percent of our total production to international development—approximately $9 billion per year—this large sum would be no more than half the potential increase in our output during the first year. If the arrangement were kept up, in 1975 the production per employed worker available to us for our own use on the basis of the more conservative estimates would be $9,300 instead of the predicted $9,500. We would have increased the domestic benefits of increased producing power by 43 percent instead of the predicted 46.

Indeed, there is poverty at home, and we must take steps to eliminate it. In 1957, about 6½ percent of American families had incomes of less than $1,000. A total of nearly 25 percent of our families had incomes below $3,000. Past studies indicate that if the figures were available to measure the cost of the "City Worker's Family Budget," they almost certainly would show that the average family income, $4,971, was not enough to pay for this far from ideal level of living.

Certainly by far the major part of this increase in per person production ought to go into raising the living standards of these low income families. More money ought to go into health, education, and many other services. But this increase in the gross national welfare need not be given up in order to help the emerging countries.

Certainly our ability to provide food for our people, schools for our own children, factories for our growing labor force would in no way be endangered. Yet what a force on earth America might become, what a stimulation to the solution of the world's economic difficulties could be accomplished.

A MORAL REVOLUTION

Compared with the Eisenhower proposal of $4 billion for international aid, both military and economic, in 1960, a proposal to lift the aid $9 or $10 billion seems fatuous. Even well-intentioned liberals smile in indulgent disbelief when this proposal is made publicly. Yet our inability to create such a program, if we are indeed unable to do so at this time, is not the result of economic conditions. It is not because our soil will not produce or our factories are inadequate to the job. The problem is more difficult than that, and the work to be done is more difficult than the simple task of inventing new machinery, devising new technologies, and harnessing new sources of power.

To do the job, the American people must create a revolution in their own thinking. They must refuse to go on living under the false pall of insecurity and the fear of their own good impulses that now determine policy in the field of international aid. They must come to understand how much America could produce for our own and world consumption if our economy were set free to do the job. They must demand to be told what ways of housekeeping must be installed so that the productive power of America may be geared up to the needs of the world, instead of being kept cramped and constricted while a world of people go in want for lack of what we will not produce. They must then insist that these new housekeeping methods be incorporated into national policy.

The failure to solve this problem not only cheats us of billions of dollars' worth of production we ought to have for our own use and enjoyment, for the elimination of widespread poverty in our own Nation; it also discredits us doubly in the eyes of the world—for our failure to recognize our opportunities to assist with the job of economic development, and for our inability to solve the housekeeping problems on which full employment and continued economic growth depend.

There is one American product that we have ready for instant export: universal public education, the magic ingredient of our own phenomenal growth. The effect of this ingredient in stimulating economic development was described recently to a regional conference of the AHA by Theodore W. Schultz, of the University of Chicago economics department, who pointed out that approximately 50 percent of the economic growth that took place in this country after 1870 was to be accounted for by our investment in our people, by the money spent on education and on health, and particularly on the former.

Had we endorsed SUNFED when it was first proposed 8 years ago, the investment in the people of the underdeveloped countries in health, education, and economic plant would now be 8 years ahead of where it now is, for that is what the plan called for.

The world needs a revolution, not just to oppose communism, but to help create human dignity and freedom. It needs the kind of revolution that can be fashioned in schoolrooms, factories, and mills. This is the kind of revolution that Americans know a great deal about. But if it is to take place, it must begin with a revolution in our own thinking that will make Americans aware of the vital role that we can play in creating a worldwide upsurge in human accomplishment. In economic terms, such a revolution in our thinking is essential if the American giant is to reach his full strength for the economic job that must be done to help set the people of the world free.

There is still time for us to wake up to our opportunities, but there is no time to spare.

Izaak Walton Conservation Director Urges Preservation of Vanishing Shoreline

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, an excellent and informative article appears in the September issue of Outdoor America, official publication of the Izaak Walton League, entitled "Save Our Shorelines." The author of the article is Joseph W. Penfold, of Washington, D.C., the able conservation director of the Izaak Walton League of America. Mr. Penfold sets forth the basic reasons why we must preserve our vanishing seacoast in parks and reserves and recreation areas before it is too late.

Mr. Penfold argues thoughtfully and persuasively in favor of adoption of S. 2460, which has been introduced in the Senate by a bipartisan group of Senators, among whom I am happy to be, headed by the very able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the article by Joseph W. Penfold in Outdoor America be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAVE OUR SHORELINES

(By J. W. Penfold)

"The last 5 miles of undeveloped beach between Miami and Dayton," reads an ad in the Wall Street Journal, "$1 million down; the balance on easy terms."

"National Steel Co. Lets Contract for $100 Million Steel Mill on Indiana Dunes," is a recent eye-catching headline. "Area had been sought for public park."

And a few random samples from the news:

Reports show attendance at National and State park areas up 14 percent above last year's record high.

A Pennsylvania park developed to handle 5,000 people was swamped with 250,000 over the July Fourth weekend.

"As a result of action to abolish the State park strip along the Overseas Highway," comes another plaint, "before very long, there won't be one spot along the 100 miles of Florida Keys where a fisherman can launch his boat without paying tribute to some developer."

Items bearing the same message, in endless variation, can be found in the press almost every day, in almost every section of the country which boasts of ocean- or lake-shore frontage. In the aggregate, they—both the number and urgency of the cases of local crisis—add up to a frightening conclusion: Our shorelines are vanishing in a tidalwave of urban sprawl.

Demand for water frontage—acute almost everywhere—has reached a peak in Florida, where bulkhead, dredge, and fill replace the natural shorelines with barren canals, boat slips, and the stench of stagnant water. That such "improvements" may destroy the breeding and nursery grounds for important commercial and sport fishes and obliterate winter feeding areas of hard-pressed waterfowl populations disturb the developers not one whit.

Nor will the trend be reversed. The pressures on our shorelines arise naturally from growth. But the need for wise development is snatched as a shield by the fast-buck operators. And thoughtful Americans thus must seek means whereby the public values may survive in a trend which reflects burgeoning populations, improved standard of living, and a yen for the outdoors.

There can be but one answer and it's not a new one in any sense. The Indiana Dunes presents the classic case:

Over 40 years ago Stephen Mather, first National Park Service Chief, urged that the 30 miles of Indiana Dunes along the Lake Michigan shoreline be designated for preservation in the National Park System. He foretold that except as it was so, it would be lost to the public in the years to come.

In the early 1950's, the Izaak Walton League's Indiana Division tried to set aside the dwindling dunes, preferably as a State park, but found little support from a still apathetic public.

Today conservationists, faced with overwhelming odds, are attempting to save the last 4-mile stretch not already lost to industry and city growth. We are apparently too late to save it all; a steel mill is under construction; the beach and dunes area—which could serve recreation needs of the new mill's workers, their families, and countless other new residents—has now been whittled down to 2 miles.

Just 2 miles. Not much—but doubly valuable because of it. Perhaps this small remaining fraction of what was once a glorious public potential can be salvaged if public officials display the vision the situation demands.

There are, fortunately, men of good will who are determined that the sad tale of Indiana's Dunes will not be repeated again and again throughout the country.

Within the past few months the administration sent to Congress a rather sharply reduced version of a bill to do something about our fast-vanishing shoreline. It would provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to establish three national shoreline recreation areas not to exceed 100,000 acres in total, and an authorization to spend up to $15 million for the acquisition of lands. The areas to be selected were not named.

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER, of Oregon, demonstrated bipartisan recognition of the problem by introducing the measure at the administration's request. Senator GORDON ALLOTT, of Colorado, cosponsored it.

This bill (S. 2010) was so patently inadequate, however, that key Members of Congress who had given the problem thorough study appraised it as hardly a start on the task of preserving examples of superlative shoreline for the public.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, chairman of the powerful Interior Committee, Senators CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico; PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois' determined fighter for the Indiana Dunes, and NEUBERGER joined forces to prepare a broader, more comprehensive bill. Introduced on July 29 as S. 2460, Senators MOSS, of Utah; KEFAUVER, of Tennesssee; MANSFIELD, of Montana; RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; LANGER, of North Dakota; MCNAMARA, of Michigan; GRUENING, of Alaska; HART, of Michigan; MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; GREEN, of Rhode Island; ENGLE, of California; BIBLE, of Texas; BYRD of West Virginia, and MUNDT, of South Dakota, joined as cosponsors.

At almost the same time JOHN DINGELL, of Michigan, LEE METCALF, of Montana, and JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, were introducing similar bills (H.R. 8445, 8449, and 8519) in the House. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of Colorado, House Interior Committee chairman, has expressed a favorable attitude and called for departmental reports on the bills.

The 10 shoreline recreational areas that would be authorized under the bill would be established as described and pictured on these pages. [Illustrations not printed in RECORD.]

The legislation itself is simple in the extreme:

1. It authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to "take appropriate action toward the establishment of national shoreline recreational areas," following recommendations by the National Park Advisory Board, consultation with the Governor of the State concerned and public hearings in the area.

Objections raised on grounds that the measure places too much power in the hands of the Interior Secretary seem to be based on imperfect understanding.

Congress can be trusted to study each area carefully before the original bill is passed. Public hearings are required. And routine appropriations processes offer Congress an annual review of land acquisition programs in each authorized area.

2. It provides for the establishment of the basic regulations for their administration. Recreation uses which have been traditional in the areas will be continued, such as fishing, hunting, and water-fowling.

3. It provides for assistance to the States (up to one-half the cost, subject to rather stringent regulations and appropriations) in the acquisition of State-managed shoreline areas which are best suited for inclusion in the State park systems.

4. It provides for thorough study of potential areas by the National Park Service, with the cooperation of the appropriate State, to determine if they warrant establishment either under the national or State park systems.

5. It authorizes funds up to $50 million for acquisition of the national areas, $10 million for assistance to the State acquisition programs, and a nominal sum for the necessary study of additional areas. Funds are anticipated to be spent over a series of years.

The scope and purpose of the program has been most dramatically expressed in the slogan coined by Senator DOUGLAS: "S.O.S.—Save Our Shorelines."

The legislative sponsors, the administration, the Isaak Walton League, conservationists, and the public know that to save anything of our heritage for ourselves and the generations to come we must act.

May we all have the courage to act promptly and vigorously.

Political and Economic Developments in Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the political and economic developments in Korea.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On May 14 last I rose in this Chamber to discuss certain ominous political developments in the Republic of Korea. I pointed out that the South Korean Government had shut down the Catholic-sponsored newspaper, Kyung Hyang Shinmoon, which had been critical of President Syngman Rhee's regime. I inserted, along with my remarks, editorials and signed articles from the Washington Post and Times Herald, the Christian Science Monitor, and the Commonweal which likewise expressed serious misgivings about various efforts of the Korean Government to silence or obstruct political opposition.

I had hoped that my modest statement, together with constructively critical editorial comment in this country, would encourage the millions of Koreans who are earnestly working and praying for the full fruits of genuine political democracy and sustained economic development. I even harbored the hope that some steps might have been taken to lift or ease some of the present restrictions against the opposition Democratic Party in Korea.

But my hopes, I regret to say, have not been fulfilled. The opposition newspaper closed down last April 30, under an official charge of "treason," is still silent. An AP dispatch dated September 8 from Seoul stated that the Kyung Hyang Shinmoon "lost its second legal battle in 10 days against Government action suspending its publication. The Seoul Appeals Court at a 3-minute session declared the suspension order was constitutional. The publisher announced he would appeal to the Supreme Court." (Washington Post and Times Herald, Sept. 9, 1959.)

In addition to the restrictions on free political debate and activity which I mentioned in my May 14 comments, I would like to point out that the South Korean Government has erected further barriers to the civil liberties of its people.

In my earlier comments I referred to the three restrictive laws adopted by the Korean National Assembly last December 24, adopted incidentally while members of the Democratic Party were physically restrained by the Government from entering the chamber. These laws, designed to restrict the opposition party and to perpetuate the party in power, have not been repealed. Under the so-called local autonomy law, which gives President Rhee the "right" to appoint local officials, 559 elected mayors and other administrators will be replaced this month by Presidential appointment. Previous to the enactment of this law, these officials were elected by the people they represent.

Further, the New York Herald Tribune of May 20, 1959, reported the Korean Government "warned political parties may well be outlawed if they fail to submit reports to the Government on political activities. A Government memorandum said political parties should notify the Government 10 days in advance of any political gathering and submit a report on the result of such a meeting within 5 days after it is held." This appears to be a clear attempt to intimidate if not to destroy the Democratic Party.

Mr. President, democratic government requires understanding tolerance and self-discipline. I do not want to be placed in the position of glibly recommending that every government be patterned after the American form. But I submit that the minimum requisite for democratic development is the right of an opposition party to exist, to publish its views and to organize freely. I submit that this basic right is seriously compromised in the Republic of Korea today.

If I believe in free political debate in Korea, I believe in the same right here. In this spirit I recently included as an extension of remarks two views on the Korean situation which are somewhat different from my own. One was a report, "Korean Comeback", by Ernest K. Lindley, which appeared in the August 3 number of Newsweek. I agree with much of this statement, but I was frankly in error when I said that "the Republic of Korea has attempted to work within the framework of the 1948 Constitution." The three restrictive laws passed by the National Assembly on December 24, 1958, violate the spirit if not the letter of the Constitution. And the restrictions on freedom of the press and on assembly also violates the spirit of the Constitution. I also said in my introductory remarks to Mr. Lindley's report: "I have spoken out on certain actions in the Republic of Korea which were not compatible with a free society. Evidence of strong-arm tactics by the majority party cannot be excused or ignored."

Later I inserted in the RECORD an article which appeared in the August 19, 1959, number of the Christian Science Monitor. It was written by Robert T. Oliver and entitled, "South Korean Skies Clear." This article paints an encouraging picture of economic development in Korea. This was a source of gratitude to me. But after it appeared in the RECORD I was informed by several reliable sources that the article was seriously inaccurate.

I feel an obligation to set the record straight and note certain facts about the Korean economy which do not correspond to the picture portrayed by Mr. Oliver.

With respect to the economic prosperity of the Korean farmer, as cited by Mr. Oliver, between June 1957 and July 1959 the prices which Korean farmers have received for their grain have declined approximately 38.3 percent, while over the period from December 1958 to the present, the prices of goods which they must purchase to live have risen approximately 17 percent. Today the Korean farmer is worse off than he has been at any time since 1955. To counteract the plight of the Korean farmer, the Government has found it necessary to establish a grain exchange program under which they can convert ther rice holdings for other grain, in-

cluding wheat flour, available from Government stocks..

Regarding the prosperity of Korean industry, let me refer you to a report of the Pusan Chamber of Commerce published in April or this year. A survey conducted by 12 of the chamber's field investigators, covering 1,112 plants and employing about 28,000 workers, shows that only 30 percent of the plants were working full time, that 14½ percent had suspended operations completely and that the remainder were working only part time. Subsequent investigation revealed that these adverse conditions of the industrial manufacturing phase in the Korean economy are confined not only to the Pusan area, but were also found to be present in the entire field of Korean manufacturing industry. The April 1959 issue of the Korean Chamber of Commerce lists on page 43 the following relevant data on this subject. Of a total of 45 classes of businesses, covering 5,251 industrial establishments 2,261 or 43.1 percent were in full operation; 1,465 or 27.9 percent were operating on reduced schedules; and 1,525 or 29 percent of these plants were completely shut down. The factors which brougt about the reduced operations of these facilities are given in the report as follows:

1. Lack of credit: 50.8 percent.
2. Lack of effective market: 27.7 percent.
3. Difficulties encountered because of excessive taxes: 9.6 percent.
4. Power shortage: 1.8 percent.
5. All other causes: 10.1 percent.

A recent official Republic of Korea Government survey places unemployment at 6 percent of the total population, which would yield a figure of about 1.3 million. Since the government survey makes no allowances for underemployment, particularly, underemployment in rural areas, this figure understates substantially the real facts. Trained American observers estimate total unemployment as being in excess of 2 million. When one considers that the total ROK active work force is probably not more than 8½ to 9 million, we see that roughly 22 to 25 percent of the active work force is totally unemployed.

Next, let me make a few observations on the much-advertised stabilization program in Korea which was designed to cure her inflationary ills. In this connection, I would like to summarize very briefly the results of a recent staff study by Robert F. Emery of the U.S. Federal Reserve Board. According to Mr. Emery, the three Korean stabilization programs have been only partially successful. The real aim of price stability, he says, has been achieved. But this has been partially fortuitous since there has been a significant increase in agricultural output each year. Some objectives of each program, he adds, have been achieved, but these have tended to be in the minority. Although Korea, in the opinion of Mr. Emery, has succeeded in obtaining greater price stability, there still exists major economic problems. One is the attainment of economic self-sufficiency and independence from U.S. aid. Another obstacle to self-sufficiency, he notes, is the difficulty of expanding export markets. There is a great need, he says, for the Koreans to come to terms with the Japanese on many problems since Japan is the natural market for many Korean products. For economic progress, it will also be important, says Mr. Emery, for Koreans to provide an attractive climate for domestic and foreign investments with economic stability through appropriate monetary and fiscal policies.

In an interview given in the Far Eastern Economic Review for March 1959, Mr. In Sang Song, Minister of Finance of the Republic of Korea, reaffirms most of Mr. Emery's conclusions, although the Minister is not quite as optimistic of Korea's future as the American observer. Thus, the Minister, when asked to estimate the period within which the Republic of Korea might reach self-sufficiency, stated: "On present assumptions, it is very hard to say. If I am obliged to answer, I would say that self-sufficiency is very hard to envisage in the foreseeable future."

In a recent editorial the Korean Republic, the official Republic of Korea English language newspaper, comments as follows: "Every Korean economic official, every American aid administrator, and every Korean import-export trader is aware that foreign trade imbalance is this country's primary problem. For the moment, balance is achieved through help from America. But that is an expedient and a temporary one. Unless something is done, the day will come when Korea's modernized economy will stand on the brink of ruin because it cannot buy what is required to keep the wheels turning." Incidentally, Korean exports during the past year fell more than 30 percent.

These few facts clearly indicate that economic developments in Korea are not quite so encouraging as Mr. Oliver would have us believe.

With respect to Mr. Oliver's statement that educational developments in Korea have been most encouraging in recent years, it is true that the Korean school situation has improved tremendously since 1953. But it must also be pointed out that much of the credit for this development is the result of American Army efforts in building schools in Korea, of the ICA training program for primary and secondary schoolteachers, and finally and perhaps most importantly, of the heroic sacrifices of Korean parents in behalf of their young ones. This Korean parents do at considerable cost and hardship to themselves and their children since education in Korea has not infrequently deteriorated into what we Americans would call an unconscionable extortion in which even the poorest of peasant parents are victimized by avaricious school officials.

Finally, I would like to say a word about our foreign aid program in Korea. As a strong supporter of development loans, technical assistance and economic grants, I am deeply concerned that our aid program be administered as efficiently and honestly as possible. We have an obligation to the American taxpayer as well as to the ordinary Korean citizen for whom the aid is intended.

Since our aid program started in 1953, we have allocated more than $2.8 billion for Korean economic aid. Considering the need and the threat, this great sum is not out of line. But we must ask ourselves whether this aid is being efficiently and honestly administered. We must ask whether any of it is being diverted for illegal purposes, purposes for which it is not intended. With this in mind, Mr. President, I intend shortly to devote myself to a thorough study of our aid program in Korea.

In conclusion I want to make it abundantly clear that I have long admired the courage and steadfastness of the brave and patient Korean people. They have suffered great hardships both at the hands of the Japanese and the Communists. They deserve the best that this troubled world can offer. They deserve security, political and economic security.

At this point, I include the following supporting documents along with my remarks: an editorial from the official Republic of Korea English language newspaper, the Korean Republic, entitled "Know-How of Trade," which appeared on August 21, 1959; an article, "South Korea's Economic Future—Self-Sufficiency 'Unforeseeable,'" which appeared in the March 26, 1959, Far Eastern Economic Review; and the conclusion of a staff study by Robert F. Emery of the Federal Reserve Board, "The Korean Financial Stabilization Programs," August 25, 1959.

[From the Korean Republic, Aug. 21, 1959]

KNOW-HOW OF TRADE

Technical assistance granted under the American aid program has been highly important to Korea. Many U.S. technicians have come here to teach and to work with their Korean counterparts. Hundreds of Koreans have been sent to the United States and other countries to study at universities, in technical institutes, and with various industries.

As foreseen by William E. Warne, the former UNC Economic Coordinator, results have been gratifying. Best of all, this is a project that will pay increasing dividends as the years go by. The skills imparted and absorbed will not disappear, but will be passed on to others and will contribute to the technical base that Korea must have for its modernization.

With the financial stringencies of the 1959–60 American aid year, technical assistance may be cut slightly. But both Americans and Koreans are determined to maintain the program at maximum intensity, and even to augment it in certain categories.

One of these is the area of international trade, where Korea has much to gain but very little experience to work with. Before the turn of the century, this was the "hermit kingdom," and trade outlets to foreign lands were frowned upon or forbidden entirely. China was the only exception, and that country had its own difficulties with the "barbarians" from European civilizations.

Then came the Japanese occupation period. Any Korean goods that went beyond the borders of Japan were handled by the Japanese. Korea had no chance to acquire the slightest know-how about foreign trade. The Japanese were succeeded by the American military government, and no sooner had we regained sovereignty than we were plunged into the tragedy and destruction of the Korean war.

From 1953 until a year or so ago, all energies had to go into reconstruction and rehabilitation. There was neither time nor opportunity nor exports for foreign markets.

Now, however, we are entering upon a new era. Some of our industries will produce exportable surpluses—textiles, flatglass, household utensils, and handicrafts, for example. In good harvest years, rice will be available. Korea is rich in minerals that await exploitation and the development of foreign markets.

Every Korean economic official, every American aid administrator, and every Korean import-export trader is aware that foreign trade imbalance is this country's primary economic problem. For the moment, balance is achieved through help from America.

[From the Far Eastern Economic Review, Mar. 26, 1959]

SOUTH KOREA'S ECONOMIC FUTURE—SELF-SUFFICIENCY "UNFORESEEABLE"

Question. How would you sum up the results to date of the U.S. aid program to Korea, Mr. In?

Answer. It is quite good so far. The first stage, of course, was relief; most of the money in the beginning was spent on disease control and similar objectives. The second stage was to rehabilitate the facilities that had been destroyed—factories, schools, hospitals, and so on. That stage was completed last year. Everything except housing is now above its prewar 1949 level. The third stage, from 1958, was economic development. The United States and the Republic of Korea have agreed to establish a long-range economic council to build up the Korean economy.

U.S. money has throughout been used to procure raw materials, equipment and services, and the Korean currency, which has been produced in the form of counterpart funds, has been used partly for military support, partly for rehabilitation and economic development.

Question. What is the total sum received so far in U.S. aid?

Answer. Approximately U.S.$2,000 million.

Question. And it has been slightly lower in the last year or two?

Answer. It reached a peak of $323 million in 1957. Last year the total was $215 million, and for 1959 it will be $210 million.

Question. It is envisaged on both sides that the U.S. aid program will gradually taper off?

Answer. The purpose of both Governments is to make the Korean economy viable and self-supporting. First of all the objective is to produce more goods internally in order to decrease expenditure on imports, for example, of cement, cotton yarn, textiles, flat glass, and paper.

Question. Are you already self-sufficient in those commodities?

Answer. Almost, but not all. We can now export glass and cotton textiles, but in the others we are not quite self-sufficient. In the future, if we get a fair entry into world markets, I am sure we shall be able to export quite considerable quantities of cotton textiles.

Question. Which markets do you have in mind, Mr. In?

Answer. Last year we sold about U.S.$1.5 million worth of cotton yarn to Hong Kong and sheeting of similar value to the United States. Our major market would be south Asia, especially Burma, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Question. You are confident of gaining entry to these markets in spite of competition, for example, from Japan and Hong Kong producers?

HOPES FOR TEXTILE EXPORTS

Answer. Yes, we have after all two particular advantages. Wages are low in the Korean industry in the first place, and it is equipped with very modern plant from the United Kingdom and the United States, in the second place.

Question. You believe that in quality and price your products have a good chance?

Answer. Yes, our quality matches that of our competitors, and our prices are competitive, we believe. One problem is the question of using American imported agricultural surplus raw cotton. The U.S. authorities object to this cotton being used in export goods.

Question. They wish you to replace such cotton by private purchase. Is this already being done, in fact?

Answer. We are still discussing this problem, and the two countries are approaching basic agreement on the matter. Another difficulty is that our industry is still enjoying a growth in domestic consumption. Manufacturers are reluctant to develop the overseas market in this context, regarding it as too risky. We have, you see, little experience of foreign markets.

Question. Is any action being taken at Government level to promote exports?

Answer. Well in the first case we subsidize the foreign exchange to meet the difference between the domestic price and the export price. Secondly, we have sent joint trade missions of Government and commercial representatives to Vietnam and Thailand. But this program is not yet active, and we shall be sending more missions shortly.

Question. Can we return to the question of the long-term importance of the U.S. aid program, Mr. In?

Answer. Yes. U.S. aid to Korea will undoubtedly decrease year by year, not necessarily gradually. I would put it this way, that the trend is downward. Now our balance of payments position is very unfavorable, and to fill the gap we must export more. There is a great potential in several fields. We have good mineral resources—tungsten (though the world market is depressed at the moment), graphite, phosphor, iron ore, and anthracite coal. Japan should be a big market for these minerals.

Then there is fish and marine products. The China proper market has been lost, but we should be able to increase our shipments of aga-aga and other fish products to overseas Chinese communities in Singapore, Malaya, and other south Asian countries. Already we are exporting dried fish, and Japan should be able to take some raw fish. Handicrafts is another potential, particularly for the North American market.

Question. Are you also relying on higher rice exports?

Answer. Rice is a major export item. We tried last year to sell abroad 200,000 metric tons, but succeeded only in exporting 5,000 tons to the Ryukyu Islands. Japan should be a major buyer, but she has long-term arrangements with other southeast Asian countries. Next year we expect to export rice to Japan, Israel, and the Philippines.

Question. You have the same target of 200,000 tons for 1959?

Answer. Yes. That would bring in some US$30 million.

Question. Are woolen textiles another potential export?

Answer. The emphasis now is on the domestic market, but there is enough capacity for internal requirements, and with ultramodernized German machinery installed in Taegu we will soon be able to export.

Question. To which markets?

Answer. To those which Hong Kong serves. Our wage levels should make us competitive in those markets.

Question. At the moment you import all your wool tops?

Answer. We are now importing some raw wool from Australia, but a wool-top factory is to be built soon, and from 1961 or so we shall not need to import wool tops any more.

Question. Going back to the broader question, Mr. In, how long do you think it will take for Korea to become self-supporting?

Answer. That depends on two other questions: How long will the present military tension last? When will divided Korea be unified? At the moment we spend 36½ percent of our budget on defense, and as long as that is necessary we shall need some outside assistance. North Korea, on the other hand, has hydroelectric power, iron ore, and better quality bituminous coal. A steel industry could be developed there on a large scale. South Korea has the labor resources, but the North has the natural resources and fuel.

Question. Assuming no change in these factors, what is your estimate of the period within which self-sufficiency might be reached?

Answer. On present assumptions it is very hard to say. If I am obliged to answer, I would say that self-sufficiency is very hard to envisage in the foreseeable future. We have 630,000 soldiers in this country, the third largest army in the world. Given the continuance of military tension, U.S. military aid should go on.

Question. I would like to ask about the question of inflation, Mr. In. For the past 2 years you seem to have been rather successful in holding prices down. Is this likely to continue?

Answer. In 1955 we agreed with the United States that if prices rose by more than 25 percent the hwan would be devalued. A financial stabilization program was drawn up. In fact the money supply increased markedly at the end of 1958, but prices remained stable.

This was partly because of the rise in production and the supply of commodities, and partly because of the new confidence in the stability of the hwan currency. Savings have risen considerably over the last 2 years, and we are confident this trend will continue.

Question. What is the position of foreign investment in Korea, Mr. In?

Answer. We welcome it. A foreign investment encouragement law has been submitted to our Congress, drafted by U.S. experts, and we had hoped it would be passed by the end of last year. But there has been some delay. It will be enacted very soon. It opens the door wide to foreign capital, and contains three major elements: (1) Guaranteed remittance of profits and interest in foreign exchange; (2) certain guarantees against expropriation; and (3) taxation incentives of 3- to 5-year tax holidays.

Question. There is no limit to the percentage foreign holdings in a new company?

Answer. None.

Question. And no restriction on the employment of foreign staff?

Answer. No.

Question. Do you have significant inquiries from potential overseas investors now?

Answer. Many offers have come, but mostly people are awaiting for the new law to be passed. There is interest in goldmining, stevedoring and manufacturing by U.S. concerns, and also some inquiries from Germany and Austria.

Question. Do you attach any hopes to increased tourist trade in Korea?

Answer. We are already earning considerable foreign exchange from U.S. forces in Korea, and now my Government has agreed on a basic policy on tourism. A new Tourist Promotion Institution will soon be set up.

Question. Is not the exchange rate a handicap for tourists?

Answer. There is no chance of changing the official rate of 500 hwan to one U.S. dollar. Actually the exchange rate has a triple meaning—for imports, for ICA-financed goods and for changing money for the U.N. forces here. We intend to maintain the official rate.

Question. But the new import tax effectively changes the rate as far as imports are concerned?

Answer. The minimum for ICA and Korean foreign exchange imports is now effectively 650 to 1, yes.

Question. Finally, Mr. In, it is sometimes said by economists that a country in the position of Korea would do better to invest its money in raising the quality, quantity and grading of its agricultural and primary products than by trying to industrialise too fast. What is your comment on that?

Answer. Our growth of population cannot be supported by agriculture alone. A country like Korea, with 30 million people—22 million in the South and 8 million in the North—must be industrialized.

Question. Thank you very much, Mr. In.

The Korean Financial Stabilization Programs

(By Robert F. Emery)

The three stabilization programs have been only partially successful. The general aim of price stability has been achieved, but this has been partly fortuitous since there has been a significant increase in agricultural output each year. Some aims of each program have been achieved but these have tended to be in the minority.

Nevertheless, the programs have been useful in that they have highlighted certain worthwhile aims which might have been largely ignored otherwise. In addition, the programs have provided a framework for continuous review and revision of the plans to achieve stability. It is quite likely that less stability would have been achieved in the absence of the programs.

Although Korea has succeeded in obtaining greater price stability, there still exist many serious economic problems. A major one is the attainment of economic self-sufficiency and independence from U.S. aid. This will be difficult to achieve unless the large military force is reduced to moderate size. Another obstacle to self-sufficiency is the difficulty of expanding export markets. There is a strong need for the Koreans to come to terms with the Japanese on many

problems, since Japan is the natural market for many Korean products. For economic progress, it will also be important for Korea to provide an attractive climate for domestic and foreign investment, with economic stability maintained through appropriate monetary and fiscal policies.

These goals will not be achieved overnight. As U.S. aid declines—it probably reached its peak in 1957—Korea will be forced to take steps to become increasingly self-sufficient. The recent achievement of relative price stability has already been helpful in increasing time deposits and creating funds for investment. This in turn should help promote increased investment, leading to higher exports and increased output in general. While the volume of U.S. aid will probably continue to decline, Korea will undoubtedly continue to receive technical assistance from the United States as the country continues to work toward economic self-sufficiency and a higher standard of living.

A Look Ahead at Federal Welfare Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks a speech I was privileged to deliver at the northeast regional conference of the American Public Welfare Association on Friday, September 11, 1959, held at the Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J.

The speech follows:

A LOOK AHEAD AT FEDERAL WELFARE LEGISLATION

(Speech delivered by Representative FRANK THOMPSON, JR., Member of Congress, Democrat of New Jersey, to Northeast Regional Conference of the American Public Welfare Association, Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, N.J., September 11, 1959)

In his fine book, "The People, Yes," Carl Sandburg included a vignette from our pioneer past which, it seems to me, is especially appropriate for this occasion. He pictures an early sodbuster in Kansas, leaning on his gatepost, studying the horizon and trying to understand "why God ever made the grasshopper and why 2 days of hot winds smother the life out of a stand of wheat and why there was such a spread between what he got for grain and the price quoted in Chicago and New York."

A newcomer drove up in a covered wagon asking, "What kind of folks live around here?"

"Well, stranger," the sodbuster replied, "What kind of folks was there in the country you came from?"

"Well," said the newcomer, "they were mostly a lowdown, lying, thieving, gossiping, backbiting lot of people."

Said the sodbuster, "Well I guess, stranger, that's about the kind of folks you'll find around here."

But as the dusty gray stranger had just about disappeared beyond the horizon, another wagon drove up.

"What kind of folks live around here?" the driver asked.

Again the sodbuster countered, "Well, stranger, what kind of folks were there in the country you came from?"

"They were mostly a decent, hardworking, law-abiding, friendly lot of people," was the reply this time.

"Well," said the sodbuster, "I guess, stranger, that's about the kind of folks you'll find around here."

I like to think that you as welfare administrators and social workers and I, as a politician, have in common an abiding and unconquerable faith in people, however tired, despairing, or hostile they may be when they come to us. Both of us know when we go to work each morning that the day will bring to us people with new problems—very human problems having to do with their own individual well-being. Mine may come in the form of a crudely scrawled letter, laboriously written in pencil on grubby paper, asking why an orphaned grandson raised by his grandparents from a baby, is not entitled to social security benefits under the law? Or why a needy family which moved from one State to another in search of a job, has been denied assistance? Or, on the other hand, perhaps it is a neatly-typed letter from an irate taxpayer demanding to know why his good tax money is being spent to support the shiftless, the lazy, and the no good.

It is an ancient and honorable battle in which we are engaged, each in his own way. For centuries there have been those who have said that providing education for the common people would give them false notions of their own importance; that the proper treatment for those who have fallen on hard times is a debtor's prison; or that the people are a "great beast." Others in our own generation have—in the name of some people's republic—exploited human weakness and misery as an instrument for the advancement of the state.

May I say right here that I am profoundly aware of the statesmanship your organization has shown through the years in providing legislators with the necessary facts, and the even more necessary goals for better welfare legislation. I know that, for almost 30 years the American Public Welfare Association has been providing forums such as this one to consider the social and economic needs of people, and creating a climate for Federal, State, and local cooperation to meet these needs. I know that the really remarkable advances in public welfare during this period can usually be traced to the deliberations, and the action of this organization. Starting in 1930, at a time when public welfare was still viewed with suspicion, its support contributed to the first Federal emergency relief bills in 1933, and to the Social Security Act in 1935. Through the years since that time, even though the headlines shifted from relief programs to the threat of war, to war itself, then to unprecedented prosperity and foreign policy, you have continued to provide often-unheralded leadership in the sacred task of promoting the general welfare.

Your leadership, and your advice, has led to the expansion and the liberalization of our social security system so that now 9 out of 10 of the working people of this country are provided with its protection. Your wisdom has led to a new program of benefits for the disabled and the social security benefit structure has been revised upward to bring it more in line with the needs of people in an expanding economy.

But I know you would be the first to say that we have only begun to meet the total problem which faces us in this area. There is no better illustration of this fact than the subject you have chosen for me, "A Look Ahead at Federal Welfare Legislation."

Because I know I am addressing a group of professionals, I do not at this time propose to deal with such subjects as revised matching formulas for the Federal-State public assistance programs or the precise amount by which social security benefits should be increased, as important as these matters are. I know your program is sound in these respects.

Rather I would like to look briefly at what seems to me to be the most important immediate issue and then to look further ahead at some of the upcoming problems which we as legislators and you as public welfare people must be thinking about.

Right on our doorstep is the problem of the continuing growth in our population. We can, in the years immediately ahead of us confidently predict that there will be more marriages, more babies, more school children, more disabled or chronically ill persons, and more old people. By 1965, it is reliably estimated, our population will have grown by 16 percent, or 26 million people. And it will have grown especially at the younger and older ends of the age scale. The number of people in the age group past 65 is increasing at the fastest rate. It is expected to be 25 percent larger in 1965 than it was in 1955. During the same period, the number of children under 15 is expected to increase by 17 percent. In contrast, the number of people between age 15 and 65 is expected to increase by only 13 percent during this decade. This means that there will have to be more medical, educational, and welfare services—more schools, more child services, more hospitals, more nursing homes, and other specialized institutions. It means the social welfare services—public and private—must expand at least 15 percent in the next 10 years if we are merely to maintain our current level of services in proportion to population.

You are already aware of the dimensions of some of these problems. Of immediate concern is the problem of providing better health care for all of our people and particularly for our aged. In his testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives in July of this year, Prof. Wilbur J. Cohen, representing the American Public Welfare Association, pointed out that, more and more, the new applications for old-age assistance come from persons who, although they are receiving social security benefits, cannot meet their medical requirements with this limited income. As a result, medical care payments in public assistance in 1958 are estimated at $400 million.

Then he listed the following cold, hard, facts:

The number of aged persons is increasing over a thousand each and every day. Both the number and proportion of the aged in the population is increasing.

Since 1947–49 the overall consumer price index has increased about 24 percent. Medical care costs have risen over twice as fast—49 percent. But hospital room charges have risen 105 percent—and are continuing to increase.

Hospital room rates have increased 71.2 percent from 1948 to 1956, while all medical care costs increased 31.7 percent. Private expenditures for hospital services have increased from 1 percent of per capita disposable income in 1948 to 1.16 percent in 1952, 1.33 percent in 1954, and 1.43 percent in 1956—a 43 percent increase from 1948.

In 1955 public and private expenditures for hospital care in all general and special, short- and long-term hospitals was $4.3 billion, of which 26.6 percent came from general tax sources. If mental and tuberculosis hospitals are included, the total expenditures reached $6 billion, and the portion coming from tax sources was 43.8 percent. From these figures, it can be seen that the issue is not whether public funds shall be used to finance hospital care but in what manner and to what extent.

This is a matter upon which I need your advice. I am, of course, aware of the advantages of using the method of social insurance to meet these needs in the manner

set forth in the Forand bill. And I am impressed with the way the American people—who are sometimes accused of being overly addicted to buying now and paying later through installment plans—have in their social-security plan endorsed the method of accepting a regular reduction in their take-home pay to provide for themselves in the future. An important feature of the Forand bill, in my opinion, is the fact that it uses this method so that the cost of health protection in retirement is paid during the individual's working lifetime rather than during the period when he is retired and, therefore, living on a reduced income. The bill has the further advantage that the costs of protection are related to ability to pay, whereas most private voluntary health plans must use a flat rate which increases with the number of dependents. Thus, in a voluntary plan an individual with several dependents, but an income of only $2,400 a year, pays a higher premium than does a single individual with no dependents earning $4,800 a year. From a social point of view, this is not only undesirable, but unnecessary. And by applying the tested social concept of social insurance the Forand bill would adjust this inequity so that the $2,400-a-year man with several dependents would pay just half of the amount required from the single man earning $4,800 a year. Moreover, the cost of this protection would, under the Forand bill, be shared equally by the employer.

But I must say, honestly, that I need your advice on one point which troubles me. There is, I believe, considerable evidence that we have not yet solved the problem of good hospital utilization. Responsible hospital administrators and some members of the medical profession are concerned, I know, with the fact that present prepayment plans have sometimes resulted in an overuse of hospital facilities for relatively minor ailments. I hope there will be careful study of this matter, with some imaginative thinking, so that the beneficial purposes of the Forand bill will not be frustrated by the possible overuse of our critical short hospital facilities.

We are just beginning to understand the possibilities of what I believe you refer to as progressive patient care. In brief, as I understand it, its purpose is to put the right patient in the right bed by providing short-stay hostels for elderly patients undergoing examination but not requiring expert nursing; convalescent facilities for patients who have not recovered enough to return to their own homes but do not require full-time care; the development of out-patient geriatric clinics in close association with hospital departments of physical medicine, and to put more emphasis on home care programs.

Private nursing homes, I understand, have been increasing rapidly, usually without any formal affiliation with community hospitals, often with inadequate supervision, inadequate diets, no physiotherapy, and medical care only on the basis of immediate need. You know better than I do whether we have the kind of nursing homes we need to provide the nursing home care described in the Forand bill.

We need more experience with home-care programs, such as the one developed at Montefiore Hospital in New York City, under which the patient who no longer requires hospital care but needs continuing medical, nursing, and related services is transferred to his home while the hospital continues to supply medical service at any hour, social service, nursing care through the visiting nurse service, housekeeping service is necessary, and transportation for treatment at the hospital at greatly reduced costs.

We need to construct more chronic disease hospitals which would serve as centers for professional and public education, for research, for training professional and auxiliary personnel, and for the development of administrative leadership, as well as for the care of patients. Such hosiptals could be designed to provide rehabilitation, including therapeutic or curative workshops, and as a center for convalescents and home-care activities.

I hope that the public welfare legislation of the future will take account of some of these problems. And I hope that interest in building better nursing homes, and better chronic disease hospital centers can be aroused at the community level, because some of the legislation needed to help build the kind of medical plant I have described is already on the statute books in the form of the Hill-Burton hospital construction program.

Looking to the long-range future, with which I am especially concerned today, I would like to speak very briefly of the new problems and the new opportunities which will call upon your courage and imagination—and the courage and imagination of the Congress—if we are to build the kind of public welfare program which America deserves.

One of these problems arises from the increasing mobility of our people. Surveys by the Census Bureau show that 9 out of 10 Americans have moved at least once during their lifetime and that 1 out of 5 change their residence every year. They are moving west; they are moving from farms to cities; and they are moving from the large cities to the suburbs. Although social mobility is one of the finest aspects of American life, I do not need to tell you that it also creates some problems. This is an area which the Federal Government has largely ignored. Meanwhile, the vestiges of the Elizabethan poor laws which at this very time, are denying a full measure of aid and comfort, are taking their toll of many needy people.

Your proposal that the Federal Government should participate financially only in those assistance and other welfare programs which are available to all persons within the State who are otherwise eligible without regard to residence, settlement, or citizenship requirements would help to solve some of these immediate problems. But I think you will also agree with me that more cash alone will not do the job. We must also have more trained people to assist these unrooted and dispossessed families in the adjustments they must make by reason of their mobility. And, most important of all, perhaps, we must overcome a natural tendency at the Federal level in our prized State-Federal system of government, to overlook our responsibility for the rights of those modern pioneers who cross State lines in search of a better life.

In particular we must be concerned with the migrant agricultural workers—who are responsible for the full vegetable counters in our supermarkets. I am glad to know that the Honorable HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., of New Jersey is chairing a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is conducting hearings on this important and complex problem. Moving from crop to crop to make a living, they often live in a shadowland which denies regularized schooling to their children, the rights of establishing residence so that they can vote and qualify for welfare services, or the kind of community life which most of us enjoy.

By far the greatest challenge to our social thinking of the future, in my opinion, can be stated, however, in just one word—automation. A recent study by the National Planning Association sees automation as the key to the greater productivity we need to meet the competition from Communist countries, as well as the "higher living standards and easier life that our people are demanding." But automation also bids fair to produce the kind of severe resettlement problems which plagued 17th and 18th century England following the enclosure movement. We can also anticipate that, over the next 5 or 10 years, the great changes of automation to come will produce a surplus of job-seekers and that, as this study points out, "not only individuals but entire communities may be bypassed * * * if automation makes it cheaper for industries to build whole new plants than to remodel exsiting ones." The study further states:

"Since the need for labor will not be so great, these plants can move away from areas

"Since the need for labor will not be so where the labor supply is large; and as nuclear power develops they will no longer be tied to existing power sources * * * whole communities may need assistance if their inhabitants are not to become victims of the age of automation."

Welfare planning for the future, therefore, must take account of the fact that industry, too, is increasingly mobile; that our present unemployment insurance structure is totally archaic under such circumstances; that even the much-needed Federal help for the general assistance program is only a stopgap measure in alleviating the need arising from these sweeping changes. It calls for programs for retaining of workers in the new skills of the age of automation and an increase in the number of teachers of these news skills; it calls for new concepts in community planning and for a better understanding of resettlement techniques and opportunities; and, finally, it calls for a reassessment of our social security, unemployment, retirement, and disability programs to eliminate the discouraging gaps into which so many of our workers fall.

Labor Secretary James P. Mitchell and Health, Education and Welfare Secretary, Arthur S. Flemming, have, as you know, been calling for the employment of older workers. Yet the Federal Government itself does very little to train or employ older workers. Without positive steps to enable older workers to find employment on a fair basis with other workers, these words of the Federal officials fall pretty flat.

Dr. Harry J. Johnson, president of the Life Extension Foundation, points out that other countries do not have our type of mandatory retirement programs because "Other nations do not feel they can face the industrial consequences of shelving a large segment of their most productive people when they are still able to work."

The chairman of the National Committee on the Aging, G. Warfield Hobbs, points out that half of the country's 9,000 scientists and 32,500 engineers over 65 are retired and he comments that "We talk of educating youngsters in science but we overlook those we already have."

At the present time, even if a Federal employee wants to work past his mandatory retirement age and is capable of doing so he finds that he cannot because of the narrow restrictions imposed by the very officials of the Federal Government who have been busily exhorting private industry to set an example in the employment of older workers.

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, has been holding some very productive hearings in Washington. The subcommittee says, in its summary of expert views, issued recently, that—

"If a man has the misfortune to lose his job at the age of 45 or over, his chances of finding new employment are slim. * * *

"If the Federal Government does not pursue a policy of making possible full employment, or almost full employment, we will be wasting our human resources. This is both foolish and destructive. Older workers who are willing and able to work have a legitimate claim to employment, and have every right to governmental recognition of this claim."

Charles O'Dell, director of the department of older workers of the United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, and formerly special assistant on older worker programs to the Under Secretary, Department of Labor, told Senator McNAMARA's subcommittee that "the Secretary was unwilling to contemplate legislative measures but was greatly interested in educational measures to do something for the older worker."

That is exactly the point I have been making.

To my mind, one of the most challenging aspects of this new age for our public welfare people and our legislators alike, is the prospect of increasing leisure time. The National Planning Association's study predicts that "the 3-day weekend, or the 3-month vacation" may be a reality within the next decade. It adds that this additional leisure, unless we learn what to do with it, may well tend only to increase the individual's "sense of insecurity * * * isolate him psychologically, create problems which he is unprepared to face and drive him to socially harmful actions." For, as David Reisman has held, "many Americans look on additional leisure as a threat, a problem, a burden, or hazard."

In contemplating these new problems let us remember the ringing words of Franklin D. Roosevelt when, in the face of similar problems he took the position that "the only thing we have to hear is fear itself." I hope our thinking is big, creative, and broad in its scope. For it may well be that we have somehow stumbled into an era which can produce not only fearful bombs, or rockets to the moon—but also can provide the means of combating those ancient enemies of all mankind—hunger and disease.

Those of us who carry the conviction that our people can be trusted—that they are mostly a decent, hardworking, law-abiding friendly lot of people if they have a chance to be—must look forward to the opportunities for a better life offered by this new age. Our concept of appropriate welfare measures has been remarkably expanded at this point in history—from the beggar waiting outside the castle; through "Christmas baskets for the poor"; through grocery orders and bundles of clothes on a more or less orderly basis; to the increased dignity of cash relief, and primary reliance on social insurance.

With Federal leadership, and with your sustained efforts and concern, I believe our concept of the appropriate scope of welfare programs will be expanded to include not merely the attainment of adequate food, shelter, and medical care, but also those other aspects of the better life which includes the right to live with meaning rather than merely to exist. On this note, I would like to close, as I began, with another quotation from Sandburg's "The People, Yes."

"The people so often sleepy, weary, enigmatic, is a vast huddle with many units saying:

"'I earn my living. I make enough to get by and it takes all my time. If I had more time I could do more for myself and maybe for others. I could read and study and talk things over and find out about things. It takes time. I wish I had the time.'"

College Daze

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Plainfield Courier-News of Wednesday, September 9, 1959. Because of the interest all of us have that our children will have the advantage of a college education, I was interested to note in this article what the National Defense Education Act is doing for these young folk. With the ever-rising cost of education which would certainly burden parents or perhaps even make it impossible for them to make a college education available for their children, it is heartening to know that more and more students are taking advantage of assistance offered through loans under this act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE DAZE

If you haven't seen a college bill in the last few years, you're in for a shock.

According to the National Education Association, college expenses doubled between 1940 and 1950 and will double again by 1960.

Today, the NEA tells us, it costs between $1,800 and $2,600 to send a teenager to a privately supported school and the tab for 4 years of undergraduate education can easily total $10,000.

Even live-at-home students attending public colleges spend an average of $625 a year, not counting clothing.

Because of this high cost of education more and more high school graduates and college students are expected to look for assistance from loans made under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

On the basis of a review of loan fund applications made to the U.S. Office of Education, colleges and universities expect nearly 121,000 students to apply for loans under the NDEA during the 1959–60 school year. They are expected to apply on the average for $500.

Those seeking loans apply directly to the institution. The loan repayment period begins 1 year after the student has completed full-time study. The loan carries interest of 3 percent on unpaid balances over a 10-year period.

Without the help of these student loans, many young people desiring a college education but whose family cannot afford the full amount, would be unable to obtain this higher learning.

Testimonial to Hon. Charles A. Wolverton, Former Congressman From the First Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the people of the First Congressional District of New Jersey gave Charles A. Wolverton a memorable testimonial dinner earlier this year. Former Congressman Wolverton, the dean of New Jersey legislators, who served for 32 years in Congress, retired at the conclusion of the 85th Congress. Back in April, 1,500 of his friends gathered in Camden Convention Hall to thank him for his years of devoted service.

It is hard for me, who served with Charlie Wolverton for even a handful of these years, to believe that he is really gone. Former Congressman Wolverton will never say goodby to his people, to their problems, and to the needs of his area, no matter how many farewell dinners may honor him.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Camden Courier-Post which describes this dinner, as well as a partial text of Charles Wolverton's remarks at this dinner.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Courier-Post, Camden, N.J., Apr. 16, 1959]

FIRST CITIZEN—1,500 HONOR WOLVERTON AT DINNER

(By James M. Neville)

The First Citizen of South Jersey was honored Wednesday night at a memorable dinner by 1,500 friends in Camden Convention Hall.

Charles A. Wolverton, 78, of Merchantville, the dean of legislators who served 32 years in Washington from the First Congressional District, said, "This is the first time I've had a testimonial dinner. I'll never have another, so here's my chance to talk."

Wolverton already had been given a painting of himself. He also received three plaques. His high achievements in the public interest had been cited by colleagues in the House of Representatives.

THANKS FRIENDS AT DINNER

"First, I'd like to express the feeling in my heart tonight, and my deep appreciation for all your attendance here.

"I'm indebted to you also for the honor and privilege you have accorded me to represent your district in the Congress of the United States, which is, numerically, the largest in the entire State, and I have served for the longest period in the history of New Jersey.

"The privilege which you have given me is enhanced by the importance of the times during which I served—32 years, nearly a third of a century—in the administrations of five Presidents—Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower.

"During the same time, I have served under seven House Speakers—Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrnes, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin, and Rayburn again, then Martin and then Rayburn again."

SERVED IN VITAL ERAS

"The period between 1926 and 1958 was one of the most important, historically, in our Nation.

"Import because it registered a distinct change in many of our traditional policies of Government, particularly in the years following the depression of 1929.

"All this necessitated legislation, national and international, and created an intense program of scientific study and research.

"When we realize the magnitude of it all, is it any wonder that I contemplate the participation of my own membership in the Congress which permitted me to have a small part in helping the formation of such policies? I have a feeling of gratitude to the citizens of the district which embraces Camden, Gloucester, and Salem Counties for having me serve."

CLOSE CONTACTS WITH LEADERS

"My services have enabled me to have close contact with the leaders of other nations—Stalin, Nasser, Nehru, Prime Ministers, and Cabinet Ministers of practically all of the European countries, Near East, Far East, and countries of the Orient.

The former Congressman related an incident 3 years ago in Moscow during a reception he attended which was hosted by Molotov, then in high favor with the Soviet.

"As he approached me, he noticed I had a glass of tomato juice in my hand; laughingly, he said, 'Why drink that? Why don't you drink something like this?' and he pointed to the spirits or wine in his glass."

TELLS OF PLUGGING CAMDEN

"I replied, 'because I always have sober judgment when I drink tomato juice. And, furthermore, I drink it because we make it in Camden, the city from which I come.' Molotov then said, 'Oh, yes, Camden. You make many things there.'"

Wolverton said it was very pleasing to have this acknowledgment of Camden, along with many other similar experiences in foreign lands.

"And tonight, with this splendid demonstration of friendship upon your part, I am deeply touched. I feel overwhelmed.

"This is, indeed, a distinguished gathering. As I realize the character of the people who are here I feel a just pride. I honestly feel unworthy of it all. I can only say from the depths of my heart: I thank you."

PRAISED BY VAN ZANDT

An earlier speaker, Congressman JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Republican, Pennsylvania, referred to Wolverton as "a distinguished American." The Congressman said that speaking at the dinner on behalf of his colleagues in the House for 21 years "is one of the highlights of my own congressional career."

"The curtain has descended on the legislative life of one of the greatest Members in the history of the House of Representatives," Representative VAN ZANDT stated.

"In his 32 years, his record of legislative accomplishments is almost unbelievable."

PROTECTED PUBLIC

"It includes the Securities Act of 1933 and subsequent laws pertaining to securities and the securities markets for the protection of the investing public. Also the Federal Power Act of 1935, the Federal Communications Act, the Natural Gas Act, the Civil Aeronautics Act, various railroad retirement acts, the Unemployment Insurance Act and the Transportation Act of 1940."

VAN ZANDT stressed the religious side of Wolverton.

"Charlie is a deeply religious man but never imposes his beliefs on others, nor condemns those who do not follow in the accepted pattern of a Christian way of life. He is my type of American."

LAUDED BY M'CORMACK

Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat, of Massachusetts, majority Speaker in the House of Representatives, said the retired Congressman "is my dear and valued friend." MCCORMACK has served 31 years in the House.

"Charlie is truly one of the outstanding Americans in our time—one of the most trying in history. His perception, his courage and his refreshing independence has brought the respect of all who know him."

Harry W. Pierce, president of the Camden County Chamber of Commerce, in the opening remarks, said, "We are here tonight to honor our former Congressman, to show how much we respect him and love him and our deep gratitude for his many years of service.

"We welcome him back to take his place of usefulness in our community."

MANY TELEGRAMS RECEIVED

Pierce said a sheaf of telegrams had been received from friends far and wide of Wolverton, including special greetings from President Eisenhower, Governor Rockefeller, of New York, Governor Meyner, and Vice President NIXON.

Pierce, chairman of the board of New York Shipbuilding Corp., presented Wolverton with the chamber of commerce award plaque "for outstanding and distinguished citizenship who has given unselfishly in the development and growth of the community and its people."

A Courier-Post plaque award, with an editorial on Wolverton set in bronze was presented by James M. O'Neill, executive editor.

A third plaque award was presented by the pharmacists of Camden County "for interest in the advancement of the small businessman and Camden County" by Herman Rappaport.

A painting of the honored guest by Albert Sandecki, of Haddonfield, was presented by the artist.

Mrs. Dora E. Rose was given a dozen of red roses by Sam Fulton, toastmaster "from her many, many friends." Mrs. Rose served as secretary for Wolverton for many years.

The Reverend Donald C. Bakely gave the invocation. Miss Evelyn Rote sang the national anthem. Entertainment was provided by Mendel Tubis and his orchestra and Edward Roecker sang several songs.

EXTRACTS FROM ADDRESS OF CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS, AT THE TESTIMONIAL DINNER GIVEN IN HIS HONOR AT CONVENTION HALL, CAMDEN, N.J., APRIL 15, 1959

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, and my friends, I am deeply touched and overwhelmed by this great demonstration of friendship from so many citizens from every part of the First Congressional District, and by the kind thoughts and friendly words that have come from so many distinguished friends by telegram and letter.

I honestly feel unworthy of it all. I cannot find words that will enable me to adequately express my feelings, nor my appreciation. I can only say from the very bottom of my heart, I thank you.

The citizens of this congressional district have honored me beyond my due. For 32 years they have given me the privilege of serving them in the Congress of the United States. If I have done well, then, I would like you to know that your many kindnesses, your many evidences of friendship, and your expressions of confidence throughout the years have been a constant inspiration to me to put forth my best efforts. I thank God that with the inspiration you have given, and the help that has come from Him, my service may have been of some help, even small, in promoting the welfare of the people of this congressional district and the people of our Nation in general.

And in expressing my appreciation for your attendance here this evening may I also express my very great appreciation to my long-time and close friend, the Honorable JOHN MCCORMACK, the distinguished majority leader of the House. No one knows better than I do what it has meant for him to leave his important duties and come this long distance to be here this evening. JOHN, I can never forget it. Your attendance this evening seals forever in my memory the genuine friendship that existed between us during all the years we have served together in the House. Although the center aisle of the House may have divided us in political affiliation, it has never separated us in our friendship, and often has not separated us even in our political thoughts and acts. Long life to you, JOHN. I trust that your past honors, which you justly deserve, will be but the forerunner of even greater honors to you in the future.

And, to you, JIMMIE VAN ZANDT, I likewise wish to express my deep and sincere appreciation for your presence here this evening and the kind words you have spoken. Your forceful and dynamic personality has always been an inspiration to me as it has been to the other Members of the House on either side of the center aisle. Your service to our country, both in times of peace and of war, make you one of the most distinguished Members of the House. Your courage and zeal in fighting at all times for the cause of right and justice to all has made you outstanding. We cannot have too many like you in the public life of this Nation.

And, now I wish to express to our distinguished former Governor Alfred E. Driscoll my appreciation for his presence tonight. I know of no man in private life more sought after as a public speaker. Even tonight before coming here he addressed a distinguished audience at the Einstein Medical School of Research in Philadelphia. He is always on the go, and, yet was willing to come here. I can truly say my heart leaped with joy when I learned he would be here and address us. There is no man whom I have met through my years of political activity for whom I have a higher regard. His honesty, integrity, and zeal in the common good should be an inspiration to all. He was a great Governor and as time goes on this fact will be more and more realized and acknowledged. Men of the calibre of Governor Driscoll are few and far between. We need today and always will need men of his stature and vision and sincerity in public life.

And, may I take time to express to my friends both in and out of the chamber of commerce, my appreciation for your efforts to make this occasion the great success it has been. Your task has been no easy one. There have been a myriad of details that had to be met and arranged. Each has been performed in faultless fashion. I wish I could thank each of you by name, but please realize each of you that I thank you each and every one most sincerely for the part you have taken. And, likewise to my friend, Eddie Roecker, and the musicians who have provided such delightful music, I thank you—you were wonderful.

Tonight, as I look out over this vast assemblage I see the men and women who are not only prominent, but useful citizens in their several communities. The men and women who recognize they have a responsibility toward their fellow men beyond being merely a good citizen. The men and women who do things to promote the general welfare.

This is, indeed, in the very fullest meaning of the words, a distinguished audience. I see here those who are active in the business, financial, industrial, educational, religious, and charitable activities of this Congressional District, and those who are actively affiliated with both political parties. As I realize the character of the people who are here I feel a just pride.

I am, indeed, indebted to each of you not only for your attendance here tonight but for the honor and the privilege you have accorded me to represent this district in the Congress of the United States. It has been a great honor and privilege to be the Representative of this particular district, the largest numerically in the entire State, and for a longer period than anyone else in the history of the State, a district that contains industries whose names are known throughout the world. As an illustration there comes to my mind an incident that occurred at a reception I was attending in Moscow, about 3 years ago, given by Mr. Molotov, who at the time was in high favor. As he approached me he noticed that I had a glass of tomato juice in my hand; laughingly, he said, "Why do you drink that? Why don't you drink something like this?" looking at his own glass of wine or spirits. I replied, "Because I always have sober judgment when I drink tomato juice. And furthermore, I drink it because we make in it at the Campbell Soup Co. in the city of Camden, from

which city I come." "Oh, yes, and you make a great many other things there in Camden."

The service that you have enabled me to have as a Member of Congress, has brought many experiences and close contact with the leaders in other nations that have been most rewarding: Stalin in Russia, Nasser in Egypt, Nehru in India, Prime Ministers and Cabinet Ministers of practically every European country, also in the Arabic nations of the Near East and Far East, and countries of the Orient, including Korea, and its President, Syngman Rhee, the leaders in Japan, the Philippines, Australia, New Zealand, the Presidents of South American countries and Africa, and, never to be forgotten, my personal interview and discussion with Pope Pius concerning communism.

The privilege which you have given me is greatly enhanced by the importance of the times during which I have served—32 years, nearly a third of a century. It has covered the administrations of five Presidents—Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. During the same time, I have served under seven Speakers of the House—Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrnes, Bankhead, Rayburn, Martin, and Rayburn again, Martin again, and now Rayburn again.

This period of time between 1926 and 1958 has been one of the most important in the history of our Nation—important because it has registered a distinct change in many of the traditional policies of our Government. It constitutes an epoch in our national history.

Just to note a few: First, a recognition of Federal responsibility for the individual welfare of our people in time of national distress. The recession of 1929, with its disastrous results, was the cause that led to this great change of policy, which in the past had left the people to shift for themselves and business likewise. The WPA, often ridiculed, but yet a most necessary innovation to save our people from starvation; and then Federal guarantee of bank deposits. If this had been in existence at the time the depression broke, it would have prevented most of the financial distress that resulted. And then there were many kinds of financial aid to business and helpfulness assistance to low-income groups to promote home ownership. And then there was also all the regulatory legislation that brought control or regulation of monopolistic enterprises, legislation to improve health conditions, including Federal participation in the cost of constructing hospitals and other similar facilities. And with the advent of remarkable progress in science there came the necessity to regulate and control even the use of the air for communications by radio, television, and/or aviation. And now, following the discovery of atomic energy, there has come even the necessity to regulate and control of outer space.

All of this has necessitated legislation, national and international, and created an intense program of scientific study and research. When we realize the magnitude of it all, is it any wonder that as I contemplate the participation on that, my membership in the Congress had permitted me to have, even the small part, to help in the formulation of these policies, that I have a feeling of intense and everlasting gratitude to the citizens of this congressional district for having permitted me to serve in the Congress. I know no words that could adequately express my gratitude.

And tonight, with this splendid demonstration of friendship upon the part of the citizens of this congressional district, my cup of happiness is full and running over. I thank you—I thank you—and may God's richest blessing be with and abide with each of us and our beloved country in the days and years to come.

Final Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress was filled with contraditions.

Its overall record was uninspiring; yet, it produced some notable and far-reaching results.

The session lasted longer than any peacetime session in 19 years; yet, it put off until next year so much controversial business as to assure that the presidential election year of 1960 will be one of the stormiest in congressional history.

The majority party in both Houses of Congress began the session with majorities of almost 2 to 1; yet, most of the major legislative issues were shaped by a united minority party acting in concert with a great President and an aroused public.

KEEPING PEOPLE INFORMED

In this, my final report to the people, I shall summarize briefly the highlights of this congressional year as they appeared to me and as they concerned the people of Union County. I have found, in company with many of my colleagues here, that this yearend summary is a valuable way to carry out my promise to keep the people of Union County informed of the activities of their Representative in Congress.

For me, the session ended in a dramatic and significant way.

Shortly after 4:20 a.m., Tuesday, September 15, the final two rollcall votes were cast in the House—votes which, incidentally, kept my voting participation record at 100 percent.

In view of the arrival of Soviet Premier Khrushchev just a few hours later that day, the two bills—both of which I supported—were especially symbolic. One provided funds for the mutual security program, the military and economic foundation of free world strength, and the other extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission, a guardian of the rights and freedoms that belong to all our citizens, regardless of race, religion, politics, or national origin.

These votes, I hope, expressed for Mr. Khrushchev at least in part the American ideal of freedom at home and freedom abroad.

WELCOME TO AMERICA

Immediately after voting, I raced to Washington National Airport and caught a 5 a.m. flight to Idlewild International Airport—just in time to welcome to our country another arrival from Soviet Russia, this one a victim of the tyranny and oppression of nearly 16 years in a Siberian slave labor mine.

For me, it was a heart-warming way to conclude the congressional year, the final event in a yearlong struggle to reunite a Hillside father with the son he thought had died at the hands of the Nazi invaders of Poland in 1940.

Despite the happy ending, the legislative record of the first session was a hodgepodge of successes and failures.

The two chief successes—budget reduction and labor reform legislation—account for the characterization of the session as the year the people spoke and the Congress listened.

The year did not begin this way. The big Democratic majorities opened the session with promises of huge spending programs to lift the country out of a recession than even then—as President Eisenhower had predicted—was rapidly ending.

A BALANCED BUDGET

The session closed, nevertheless, with a balanced budget in sight and with Administration spending requests cut by about $1.3 billion, though the House earlier had trimmed an additional billion dollars which the Senate later restored.

The reasons: a vigorous economic recovery and record high employment which made many proposed programs unnecessary, hundreds of thousands of letters and telegrams demanding that wasteful spending be stopped, and a series of courageous Presidential vetoes which blocked excessive spending.

The same kind of public insistence accounted for passage, too, of an effective labor reform bill. Repeated disclosures of corruption, abuse of power and disregard of union members' rights made it impossible to ignore the public demand for legislation to clean up certain elements in the labor movement.

REMOVING THE MILLSTONE

The law signed by the President is a sound one. No decent union or honest union official will be hurt or handicapped by it. On the contrary, the constructive efforts of the AFL-CIO and many individual unions to make of the labor movement a more effective and responsible vehicle for the welfare of working people should be greatly strengthened. Racketeers and unprincipled bosses have hurt labor. This law will help free labor of a heavy millstone around its neck.

I hope that responsible labor leaders will think twice before making a political issue of the labor reform measure. The Landrum-Griffin bill was first passed by the House, 303 to 125, and later in modified form by the Senate, 95 to 2, and again by the House, 352 to 52. On all the votes, a majority of both parties supported the bill.

Moreover, union members and the general public will wonder about opposition to a bill which, for the first time, provides enforceable guarantees of members' rights. The future of American labor, after all, depends on the respect and cooperation it earns from the American people as a whole.

Among other accomplishments of the first session, all of which I supported, were these:

A good housing bill which will bolster a vital part of our economy.

HELP FOR THE NEEDY

A comprehensive rewriting of veterans' pension laws which adjusted benefits more closely to needs and provided benefits, for the first time, to needy widows and orphans of World War II and Korean war veterans.

Stronger Federal prohibitions against mailing pornographic literature and increased penalties were approved by the House.

An immigration law which will make it easier and faster for American residents to be reunited with their families.

A new cooperative health and hospitalization insurance program for Federal employees.

Increased appropriations for health and medical research in the fields of cancer, heart, and cardiovascular diseases—the principal causes of death—as well as other serious diseases. This bill also included funds for research into cystic fibrosis, a deadly disease that strikes particularly at little children. Since this is a matter of special interest with me, I worked closely with Appropriations Subcommittee Chairman FOGARTY to assure sufficient funds for this important work.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Statehood for Hawaii, our 50th State, which formally entered the Union on August 21.

Continuation of the Interstate Defense Highway program at a somewhat reduced level.

An increase from 3¼ to 4¼ percent in the interest rate ceiling on Government savings bonds—to help do justice to the small bondholders and to encourage this more desirable way of financing the national debt.

Provision for more loans for small businesses.

Increased price supports for already-glutted markets in wheat and tobacco—which an ill-advised Congress approved—were stopped by Presidential vetoes. I voted against these bills.

Both my committees were active this year. The Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I am ranking minority member, continued its lengthy investigation of the waste and inefficiency in the billion-dollar programs involving sales of cotton and other agricultural surpluses.

We are hopeful that our recommendations will help save millions of dollars for American taxpayers.

MAKING A LAW

The subcommittee's most satisfying accomplishment was final passage of a bill, cosponsored by Chairman FOUNTAIN and myself, creating an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. We are confident that the Commission can contribute greatly to improving Federal-State-local relations and placing them on a more logical, efficient, and economical basis. I found it most satisfying to have been a part of this legislation from its very beginning—our nationwide hearings, the drafting of recommendations and a bill, the joint House-Senate conference and then final passage in both Houses and on to the White House for the Presidential signature making it the law of the land.

The Banking and Currency Committee was just as busy. Two measures stand out: First, the passage of a housing bill that conformed, after two Presidential vetoes, with the major provisions I recommended in my minority report to the first bill, especially a new program of loans to encourage the construction of special low-rent housing for elderly people; and second, the authorization for United States participation in the Inter-American Development Bank, which will make loans to Latin-American countries in an effort to raise living standards throughout our Western Hemisphere.

UNION COUNTY IN WASHINGTON

The interests of Union County also figured in the record of the 86th Congress' first session:

After unnecessary delay, Congress granted consent to an interstate compact creating the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency, which will provide for coordinated use of existing commuter facilities in the metropolitan area, and will prepare a long-range plan to help solve the commuter crisis.

Congress appropriated funds which, I expect, will complete the two huge navigation projects in our area: The deepening of the Arthur Kill Channel for larger oceangoing vessels, and the vertical-lift railroad bridge over the channel between Elizabeth and Staten Island. I supported both projects in testimony before the Appropriations Committee.

Progress was also made in meeting some of the post office needs of the county. The Post Office Department, at my urging, provided new buildings for Mountainside and Berkeley Heights, and approved a substation for the Bayway area of Elizabeth. In addition, I secured the personal cooperation of the Postmaster General for a review of Union County facilities and assurance of early action on the more important requirements.

REPRESENTATION DAY BY DAY

But most of the congressional business affecting Union County consisted of the day-by-day activities involved in representing a growing, diversified, articulate congressional district—one of the largest in the country.

Helping people through the often tangled procedures governing social security, veterans' benefits, immigration, the military services, and cooperating with labor leaders, union members, business and professional people and others in their relations with the Federal Government—this is a large part of a Congressman's work and the source of some of the most satisfying things I have been able to accomplish.

There are obvious gaps in this review of Congress' record. Those gaps tell the story of Congress' failures. And they foreshadow a 1960 session of crowded legislative calendars and intense controversy.

For instance, despite the pressing need to raise the unrealistic limit on earnings allowed for recipients of social security, and the dozens of bills—including my own—to increase these limits, no action was taken. Likewise, no education legislation of any significance was passed this year, in spite of Russian progress and our own very apparent shortcomings. Nor was civil-rights legislation passed, or an adequate bill approved providing necessary authority for long-term debt management.

The issue of nepotism in the staffing of congressional offices, which created such a scandal earlier this year, has not been satisfactorily resolved. And the question of excessive noise from jet aircraft at the Newark Airport, about which I testified before a House committee, must be settled properly.

COSTLY FAILURES

On two problems in particular congressional inaction was costly: the failure to revise the tremendously expensive and wasteful farm program, and the failure to help commuters by amending last year's Transportation Act to require greater consideration of the public interest before passenger trains are allowed to be removed.

Both these situations demand early attention from Congress next year. Fortunately, I have obtained assurances from the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee that my commuter bill will be considered as soon as the Senate acts on Senator CASE's companion bill.

It is becoming all too obvious that further efforts to reorganize and streamline the Defense Department are urgent, and legislation to accomplish this has already been offered. Major tax changes will also be proposed.

No final action was taken this year on the fair trade bill; changes in the unemployment compensation laws were sidetracked, minimum wage legislation bypassed, and medical care for the aged postponed.

Some of these bills are essential; some very desirable, especially if conditions and budgets permit; and others are merely controversial.

All of them, however, guarantee a lively 2d session for the 86th Congress.

During the period Congress is in session, it is impossible to be in Union County as much as I would like. But I know you expect me to remain on the job here in Washington on a fulltime basis. As in past years, this session demonstrated again that anything less than fulltime attention is simply not enough. There is no time for other jobs or outside interests.

BACK AT HOME

From now until Congress reconvenes next January, I shall be spending most of my time in Union County, meeting and talking with as many of my constituents as possible, learning what you think about the great issues facing our Nation, studying local needs, and helping wherever possible with problems you or your neighbors may have with the complex Federal Government.

It has been a great privilege to represent you at the seat of our Nation's Government, and I deeply appreciate the confidence you have placed in me. I look forward to continuing this work next year; to exchanging ideas and views with you through your letters, your replies to our opinion survey, and my report to the people; and to serving you in every way possible, both in my Washington and Elizabeth offices.

One last word: there may be a few duplications in the lists we are using to send this report to you and your neighors. If you receive more than one copy, please overlook it; it is unavoidable. Also, if

you do not now receive my report to the people regularly, and wish to do so, please let me know. Thank you very much.

Colombia's Success Impresses U.S. Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, recently the New York Journal of Commerce carried a story written by Mr. John F. King of their Washington bureau which should have particular interest for all of us.

It tells of the financial success story now being written by the Government of Colombia. One year ago, the article says, Colombia's economy was in a shambles as a result of the disastrous rule of the dictator government of President Rejas Pinila, who was overthrown in 1957.

But today, due in part to an austerity program, the nation is financially stable. Full credit is due to the government of President Alberto Lleras.

The program has greatly reduced the nation's commercial debt outstanding in 1957 and has boosted gold and dollar reserves from $87 million to $207 million. Under the program, Colombia has become completely self-sufficient in sugar and cotton.

Most important, all of this was accomplished while the world price of coffee—on which Colombia must depend for 85 percent of her foreign exchange income—was in a long decline.

This is an inter-American success story in which we can all take pride.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ECONOMIC REFORM MAY WIN U.S. CREDITS—COLOMBIA SUCCESS STORY IMPRESSIVE

(By John F. King)

WASHINGTON.—A number of financially troubled Latin American countries might profit from reading the economic success story being written by the Government of Colombia.

This is the view of U.S. international finance experts, well educated in Latin America's money problems of the past few years, who are now talking with a Colombian loan mission about new credits for the country's growing industry.

Just a year ago, Colombia's economy was a shambles, wrecked in 5 years of mismanagement by the dictatorial government of President Rojas Pinilla, who was overthrown in early 1957. Today, thanks to close observance of an austerity program drawn up by the International Monetary Fund, Colombia is back on its feet.

REAL WELCOME

The performance of the government of President Alberto Lleras has been so remarkable, in fact, that for the first time in recent memory Washington is genuinely welcoming an economic mission from Latin America.

The Colombian delegation, headed by National Bank Chief Ignacio Copete, is seeking development credits. But the development projects Colombia wants financed are not the grandiose programs usually associated with the term "economic development."

What the Colombians want is capital equipment, on shorter term credit, to maintain and upgrade existing transport, communications, and power installations, plus equipment for a modest expansion of Colombia's small but growing industry.

This is not to say Colombia has no ambitions for bigger undertakings. A blueprint for long-range development was drawn up in collaboration with the World Bank some years ago and it is still the hope of the Colombian Government that bolder steps in this direction may be made.

NEW CONCEPT

But Colombia's economic planning today has taken a new turn. Instead of hydroelectric projects and the like, the Government's planning centers on budget control and cost accounting.

The Government's new planning office, under the able direction of youthful Jorge Franco, who also is a member of the mission here, constitutes a new concept in Latin American government. Its aim is to bring an end to economic policy improvisation and make economic stability the hallmark of the country, not a rare and phenomenal occurrence.

The more spectacular type of economic development will be possible eventually, but priority goes to the more immediate goal of economic stability, Colombia's planners maintain.

Coupled with the moratorium on politics worked out last year between Colombia's two major parties just prior to the fall of Dictator Rojas. Mr. Franco's brand of planning has helped the country achieve the main objectives of stability over the past year.

CLEARING DEBT

It has seen the reform program of import, credit and foreign exchange restriction clear up all but $50 million of the $400 million in commercial debt outstanding in 1957 and boost gold and dollar reserves from $87 million to $207 million. Reserves were $300 million when the Rojas regime took over in 1953.

Moreover, the program has seen Colombia within the last year become completely self-sufficient in sugar and cotton, formerly big drains on Colombian foreign exchange, and resume its exports of cattle and textile products.

All this was done, it is emphasized, when the world price of coffee, which still accounts for 85 percent of Colombia's foreign exchange income, was in a long decline.

RESERVES HIT $210 MILLION

BOGOTÁ.—The Banco de la Republica (Colombian Central Bank) reported that its reserves climbed to $210 million as of August 31, 1959.

Official figures also showed a favorable balance of trade for Colombia totaling nearly $23 million.

Observance of National Wine Week—A Quarter Century After Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I should like to invite the attention of the Members and the Nation to National Wine Week, October 10 through October 17, which this year also marks the silver anniversary of the Wine Institute in California. It signifies also the passing of a quarter of a century since the repeal of prohibition.

Wine growing is an essential outlet for an important portion of the fruit crop of the Nation. There are 543 bonded wineries throughout the country operating in 22 States, and these crush about 1½ million tons of grapes each year. The principal growing areas lie through California, the Pacific Northwest, the States surrounding the Great Lakes, including New York, and in the Southeastern States.

Winegrowing is essentially a farmer's occupation, conducted by and for farmers. It is estimated that at least 75 percent of the fruit crushed by wineries is a direct farmers' operation, and that only about 25 percent is handled on a commercial, arm's-length basis. In their work our winegrowers are the most painstaking of dedicated taskmasters. Winegrowing is an important element in the farm economy.

California long has been proud of its table wines, the production of which is particularly important in the north coast district which I represent. The Sonoma-Mendocino area and the Napa Valley are two of the four fine dinner-wine districts linked around San Francisco, the wine capital of America. The others are the Livermore-Contra Costa and Santa Clara-San Benito-Santa Cruz areas. These areas are noted particularly for their red and white dinner wines but also produce excellent sparkling wines and appetizer and dessert wines. Last year these wine districts produced 49 percent of California's table wines and 1.2 percent of the State's dessert wines.

I should like to invite particular attention to the vineyards to the north because it is here that I am primarily concerned—in Sonoma and Mendocino Counties and in the Napa Valley. The vineyards lie in serene valleys stretching along both sides of the Redwood Highway. As in other coastal districts, many of the vineyards also form orderly patchwork on the hillsides—a situation suited particularly to the growing of premium quality red and white table wines. This picturesque region each year draws hundreds of thousands of visitors who come to enjoy the warm hospitality of the winegrowers.

Winegrowing is the oldest farm industry in California. For many decades it was the most important of the State's many agricultural industries. Today grape growing ranks second among all California crops and is our No. 1 food crop. The industry is rooted in the Spanish colonization by the Franciscan fathers. As each new mission was established, vines were planted as one of the first steps in transforming a wilderness into a civilization. Padre Junipero Serra, who established Mission San Diego in 1769 and planted wine grapes there, discovered that California was especially favored for winegrowing. Descendants of the wines planted by the missionaries still are bearing. Derived from Spanish grapes which reached California via

Mexico, the variety was called the Mission grape.

In the early 1830's choicer grape varieties were brought from Europe to Los Angeles. Within a generation wine growing was the principal industry of the Los Angeles district although the area has long since lost that association. But the great change from the Mission grape to finer, pedigreed European varieties occurred a generation later and was brought about by Agoston Haraszthy. This Hungarian nobleman, since called the father of modern California viticulture, first grew new European varieties in San Diego in 1849. In 1857 he established his Buena Vista vineyard near Sonoma, north of San Francisco. As did other immigrants with wine growing backgrounds, Haraszthy realized that California was a wine land of bright promise. Here was little of the excess of cold or sun, or hailstorms, or severe mildew, or other factors often troublesome in European wine districts. In 1861, under commission from the State of California, Haraszthy went to Europe and brought back more than than 100,000 cuttings of about 300 varieties of grapes, all choice wine types. Haraszthy's bringing of these parent vines was followed by the great modern expansion of the industry.

In 1874 the dread insect pest of the vine, phylloxera, struck a crippling blow to the California wine industry. Another virulent scourge wiped out vast vineyards in the Anaheim district of southern California and won the name Anaheim disease. Vineyards of that district were never replanted. But research learned that the European vines could be made safe from phylloxera by grafting them to hardy native American vine roots. Mass replanting was accomplished and the production for wine continued upward. In 1912 U.S. production of wine reached a preprohibition peak of 56 million gallons, with 90 percent of it from California.

Today, a quarter century after repeal and the rehabilitation of the vineyards, laid fallow by prohibition, the demand for California wines has more than doubled. Approximately 125 million gallons a year now are consumed. Much of this increase can be attributed to grower advertising and education programs carried on for the industry by the Wine Advisory Board and the Wine Institute with headquarters in San Francisco.

I am sure my colleagues will want to join with me and the people of my district and my State in our observance of National Wine Week, honoring the oldest farm industry in California.

Tribute to Walter Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMIE L. WHITTEN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the retirement of my good friend, Walter Lee, is a real loss to the Congress. Never have we had a more capable, affable, and conscientious man to handle the highly complex matters which come before the Judiciary Committee.

I first knew Walter Lee when he was an outstanding public official in Mississippi many years ago. Then, as now, he reflected credit to himself in his handling of any job. Through the years we have been close personal friends. While we lose him here, it is Mississippi's gain, for he and his wonderful family are returning to Jackson to make their home.

We wish for him many happy and fruitful years in that fine city, Jackson, in what to me is the finest State, Mississippi.

Tenth Anniversary of Dr. Konrad Adenauer's Assumption as Chancellor of German Federal Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when the Chancellor of Germany, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, had arrived at his 10th year as Chancellor of the German Federal Republic, the President of the United States and Secretary of State Herter forwarded to him certain telegraphic messages. The telegrams express my own personal sentiments. I am happy to ask that they be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

His Excellency Dr. KONRAD ADENAUER,
Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn:

On the 10th anniversary of the assumption of your duties as Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, I send most cordial personal greetings. On behalf of the American people I congratulate you for your historic contribution not only to the affairs of your own country but to those of the European community as a whole. Through your dedication and inspiring leadership, the Federal Republic has risen out of the chaos of war to a position of influence and responsibility in the community of free nations. Moreover, there has been developed in Germany a government guided by the principles of democracy and motivated by a sincere desire to play a positive role in the great movement toward European cooperation and integration. Your effective work in developing understanding between our two peoples has also been a contribution of major significance. It was a most valued and enjoyable opportunity to confer with you in Bonn recently, and I wish you many more productive years in the interests of your own country and those of the free world.

With assurances of my continued esteem and friendship,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

SECRETARY OF STATE HERTER'S MESSAGE TO CHANCELLOR ADENAUER

As you complete your 10th year as Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, I wish to convey to your heartiest congratulations for a decade of fruitful endeavor for Germany and the free world. In the face of great odds you have guided the material and spiritual restoration of your nation on the path to peace and freedom. I wish you the best of health and strength. I shall continue to rely on your close and friendly cooperation as we seek to realize our common objectives.

The Fight in 1959 for Effective Water Pollution Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, effective control and abatement of water pollution is essential if our Nation is to continue to grow and prosper. Once a plentiful resource, water has become and will become in the future more precious than any other single resource we have.

By 1980 reliable experts predict that the demand for water, caused by increasing population and expanded industrialization, will equal the available supply of 600 billion gallons a day. It is obvious that within the next two decades we will be unable to waste a single drop of the water supply which is so essential to the Nation's economy, public health and security as well. Polluted water, Mr. Speaker, is wasted water and we must therefore begin now to provide the necessary facilities to prevent this waste.

Three years ago a Federal grant-in-aid program was instituted providing $50 million each year to the Nation's communities to assist them in the construction of sewage treatment plant facilities. As a result of this program construction of such facilities has increased 75 percent over the average construction level of the previous 5 years. While this is great progress, we are still falling behind in sewage treatment plant construction at the rate of approximately $200 million a year. For this reason I introduced H.R. 3610, which would provide an additional $50 million a year for community grants-in-aid. Experience under the existing program shows that for every Federal grant dollar, 4 local dollars are invested in construction. Thus, the additional Federal aid provided for in my bill would boost construction to the level necessary to provide the needed facilities.

On June 9, 1959, H.R. 3610 passed the House overwhelmingly. Late in the session the Senate passed an amended version providing only $80 million a year for the next 10 years rather than the $100 million figure provided by the House. Because of the lateness of the session it was impossible to arrange a conference and so the measure will go over until next year, when early in the session the conferees will meet and iron out the differences between the House and Senate bill. Passage of this legislation by the House and Senate by overwhelming votes in both bodies indicates a recognition on the part of this Democratic Congress of the seriousness of the water-pollution

problem and an acceptance of the responsibility in meeting it. This was all the more significant, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the adamant opposition of the administration and the Republicans in Congress to adequate pollution-control and abatement legislation. While professing to be against water pollution, the administration and its spokesmen oppose every measure designed to solve the problem. They attempt to sidetrack effective legislation with unworkable gimmicks, such as the telephone-tax rebate scheme which actually was advanced by the administration subsequent to the repeal of the tax by the Congress.

In an almost Alice-in-Wonderland setting, Mr. Speaker, we heard administration and Bureau of the Budget spokesmen oppose H.R. 3610 and offer as an alternative to it a rebate to the States of a percentage of the telephone tax if the States would divert these funds to treatment plant construction, although the administration required no assurance from the States that the funds would be used for this purpose. This is not a new administration proposal, but it is almost unbelievable that they persist in advancing it after the telephone tax upon which it is based has been repealed.

Another roadblock gimmick advanced by the Republicans in the House, after even they rejected the administration's proposal, was the proposition that any Federal grants in the future must be contingent on a matching State grant. After what must have been a diligent search, the proponents of this proposition cited the Federal aid highway program as a precedent. They conspicuously failed to mention the Hill-Burton hospital construction program, the Federal-aid airport program, school construction in federally affected areas, slum clearance and urban renewal, and flood prevention and watershed protection programs, all of which provide Federal grants-in-aid to communities without the requirement of State matching grants.

This proposal is obviously a back door attempt to kill the existing Federal grant program by attaching to it a condition precedent which everyone knows has not been met in the past, and there is no assurance it will be met in the future. Mr. Speaker, in spite of outright opposition and outlandish counterproposals, the Congress was able to pass an effective bill. The details will be worked out as stated above and I want to assure you and the Nation that this Democratic Congress will not give up in its attempts to solve the serious problem of water pollution.

Report to the Voters of the 10th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress convened and adjourns with war clouds engulfing the entire world. The density of the clouds fluctuated with the actions of the leaders of the Kremlin. As heavy and ominous as the clouds were with the appearance of the sputnik and lunik, and the Soviet moon shot, they increased with the overt, aggressive actions of the Soviets in the Middle East, the Far East, Tibet, Latin America, Central America, including Cuba, in Europe again with the Berlin impasse, and once more in southeastern Asia—Laos.

A diminishing of the war clouds followed appeasement of the comrades in the Ministers' meeting, a pending but never accomplished summit meeting, and finally plans for an exchange of heads of state.

Thus, it can be said with no exaggeration that Congress met and adjourns in one of the most trying times in the history of the United States.

The international outlook for the Democratic-controlled Congress was not made felicitous by the Republican-controlled executive branch of the Government. Congress convened labeled by President Eisenhower, in his role as leader of the Republican Party, as being controlled by political radicals, spendthrifts and gloomdoggiers.

Bear in mind that when Congress convened, President Eisenhower, in his state of the Union message, promised "a sensible posture of defense against the growing might of the Soviet Union," and in the next breath he warned we must "guard against feverish building up of vast armaments." The observing public saw Congress placed publicly between the horns of the dilemma.

Congress was faced with the problem of meeting the Soviet menace, of placating the administration in its request for the highest budget in peacetime, of grappling with a $9 billion interest on the national debt, of increasing the limit on the national debt, and of passing a Mutual Security Act. Domestic issues became secondary and/or dependent upon the cost of meeting the Soviet menace, balancing the budget and controlling inflation.

The entire policy of the Republican administration was in a state of fluctuation. A cooperative state of mind and action on the part of Democratic legislators was tried to the point of frustration. President Eisenhower requested legislation and then vetoed bills because they were too much or too little. Most of the bills passed to date have been cut below the President's recommendations.

The visit of the Soviet Premier is repugnant to me because no credence can be placed upon the word of a Mikoyan, a Kozlov, or a Khrushchev. The gain, if any, does not outweigh the loss of trust by our allies, the creation of more apathy and misinterpretation by Americans, causing a quasi-insecurity among free people everywhere, and the propaganda use this visit will be made of in Moscow and other capitals inimical to the U.S.S.R. All of this created confusion in Congress on legislation without positive leadership from the executive branch.

Adherence to the absolute moral principles upon which our country was founded should dissuade us from conferring respectability and legitimacy to the dedicated enemy of free men and free institutions.

The reversal of policy and the confused and confusing pattern of weak Executive leadership has, in effect, pulled the rug from under the Congress. Despite this background, the record of the 86th Congress, 1st session, has made history on the positive side of the ledger, thanks to a strong and dynamic Democratic leadership.

The total request for authorization presented to Congress by President Eisenhower was $80-odd billion. That which was finally appropriated by the Congress was over $78 billion. Congress reduced about $2,580 million from the President's request. In spite of this there will be a deficit of $12 billion. This does not include the near $8 billion interest on the national debt. In line with the same financial difficulty, the General Accounting Office which reviews all Federal spending is investigating the $60 billion to $125 billion reported obsolete surplus military material property of the armed services. The sale or relocation of this material should certainly cut back Federal spending in the years to come.

INTERNATIONAL

FOREIGN AID

Looking back over more than a decade of foreign aid, several major trends can be observed. A reduction in the mutual security program has been made possible by closer congressional scrutiny of the many detailed items that go into the foreign aid package, by more careful administration resulting from tighter ground rules written into the law, by the improved economic position of many aid recipients chiefly in Western Europe. These nations are able to carry all the costs of their economic development and almost all of their military responsibilities.

Within the program itself three major shifts in emphasis have taken place. First, the percentage of total aid that goes into nonmilitary—or economic—projects is greater. Military equipment can be shipped abroad very rapidly. But economic aid cannot be shipped. It must be transplanted through people and existing institutions. Adaptation to changing economic circumstances is relatively slow. Corresponding changes in social outlook, in values, and in institutions must be made if economic assistance is to have any firm roots. Although we now give aid in one or several forms to almost every country outside the Iron Curtain, it must be done at a rate that can be absorbed by the recipient. Hence, we have been moving into projects that are modest in their capital requirements.

A second shift has been away from outright grants of money to loans. The Development Loan Fund, created in 1957, is an instrument of our aid program that has made possible this change. The greater use of loans places on the borrower a responsibility for more careful planning of the use of the money and for devising means to repay the loan through improved tax systems. These loans are repayable in local currency. It is quite possible these repayments

made in local currency will be reloaned to borrowers in that particular currency.

Finally, and perhaps most significant for the future, is the fact that more of our aid is going to non-Western countries. The newly established Governments of south and southeast Asia and of Africa are receiving technical and economic assistance. The importance of this aid lies not so much in the amounts involved as in the fields of activity for which it is used. Chief among these are agriculture, education, and public health. This is the real grassroots approach that will lay the base for future economic development.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

In this session Congress took an important step toward contributing to the economic development of Latin America. It authorized U.S. membership in the Inter-American Development Bank.

This new hemispheric agency will make loans in Latin America for projects to supplement other sources of credit. It will also assist these countries in formulating development programs and in engineering projects. Its technical assistance will help these nations obtain capital from other sources as well as from the Inter-American Development Bank.

CANADA

In our greater concern with situations and countries overseas there has been a corresponding neglect of our relations with Canada. Yet Canada is one of our best customers and most important allies. Two years ago, Members of Congress undertook to correct this indifference and, as a result of the Coffin-Hayes report, I introduced in the House of Representatives House Joint Resolution 254, which became Public Law 86-42. This law authorized the participation of the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada. A Canada-United States interparliamentary group was subsequently organized. I deem it a great privilege and honor to have been appointed by Speaker RAYBURN to be the chairman of the House of Representatives delegation on this important interparliamentary group. This is the first interparliamentary group in the history of the United States.

At meetings last June, we gave attention to defense efforts and to economic and trade problems. Among the more important of the latter that we discussed were oil, copper, natural gas, uranium, lead, and zinc. Questions affecting the boundary waters between the two countries were also considered.

It was not the purpose of the meetings to solve problems between the two countries. But we did educate each other in the dimensions of the problems and the political attitudes in both countries that affect solutions. All of us who participated gained a new insight into the importance of keeping problems between the two countries under constant study. I look forward to the meetings to be held in the United States next winter.

NATIONAL

NATIONAL DEFENSE

With Russia's recent announcement of a stepped-up military program, it is more important than ever for the United States to maintain its military forces, develop new and superior weapons, and to provide manpower for our Armed Forces. The Democratic Congress, recognizing the U.S. position of world leadership, authorized a defense program which not only meets the present need, but, from the economic viewpoint, curbs unnecessary spending. Under the defense appropriation, new emphasis was given to research and development and our missile projects. The question raised by many is the overemphasis on the deterrent power with a weakening of brush-fire capability.

The general defense appropriation was $39,228,239,000, in comparison to an appropriation of $39,602,827,000 last year. Allocation of funds were made as follows: Air Force, $17.2 billion; Army, $9.2 billion; Navy, $11 billion; operations of Department of Defense, $1.3 billion.

In order to maintain our Military Establishment at 2,520,000 men, the draft laws, including those pertaining to doctors, were extended to July 1, 1963, by Public Law 4.

Our future security, from a military standpoint, is to the greatest extent based upon missile development. During the last session of Congress a new agency called the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was created to coordinate and direct missile development. This agency is now in full operation and is doing everything possible to close the missile gap between the U.S.S.R. and the United States. At this session, under Public Law 45, the Congress appropriated $485,300,000 for the work of this agency in the coming year. The largest single item provided for is $70 million to be utilized for research into the problem of manned space flight.

Other laws enacted which relate to national defense and internal security are:

Public Law 149: Authorizes a $1.2 billion program of construction projects at Army, Navy, and Air Force installations here and abroad in accordance with our modified continental air defense plan.

Public Law 23: Provides $110 million for construction of modern amphibious warfare vessels and landing craft. This will permit greater utilization of new operational concepts developed by the Marine Corps.

Public Law 50: Under this law the Atomic Energy Commission is to embark on a $229.9 million new construction program. Much of this will be devoted to the civilian atomic power program.

Public Law 89: The Renegotiation Act was extended to December 31, 1961. Under the administration of this act excess profits on defense contracts should be recovered.

Public Law 155: Strengthens control of officer personnel of the Regular Armed Forces by providing for involuntary retirement.

Public Law 96: Extends to August 1, 1963, the special enlistment program provided by section 262 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952. This is the program which permits an 8-year enlistment by boys between 17½ and 18½ years of age, 6 months of which is active duty, the remainder being spent in the Reserve.

GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

By virtue of action of the 86th Congress, the territories of Hawaii and Alaska were admitted to statehood. This action overshadows all others in the area of governmental reorganization. The admission of the new States was long awaited and, I am sure, was welcomed by all. I am confident that both of the new States will take their place, with the other 48, in contributing and participating in the economic and social growth of the United States.

The Senate rule to close debate was amended to require a two-thirds vote of those present and voting, instead of two-thirds of the full membership. This important change will be most helpful in preventing extended filibustering when matters such as civil rights are being considered.

Public Law 238: Increased to $3,000 the limit on claims which the Government may settle administratively.

Public Law 209: Under this law an award known as the National Medal of Science was established. It is to be awarded to individuals making outstanding contributions to national security and public welfare.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

To meet the highest peacetime budget ever presented to Congress and at the request of the President, it was necessary to authorize a permanent national debt limit to a total of $285 billion. A temporary increase of $10 billion, making a total of $295 billion, was authorized to June 30, 1960. These increases were necessary to continue our defense and foreign aid programs without drastic and crippling reductions in national spending for roads, housing, and the general public welfare. The President's promise of a balanced budget has not been fulfilled. The Congress, however, in attempting to curb inflationary trends, made cuts in most of the financial requests made by the executive. This is but another example of this Congress' determination to take up the reins of leadership where they were dropped by the President.

There were no important changes in the income tax laws other than a new tax imposed on underwriting profits and investment income of life insurance companies.

The 52-percent corporate income tax rate and the existing schedule of excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles, parts and accessories were continued. There was, however, a reduction in the transportation tax from 10 to 5 percent and the tax on local telephone calls was repealed. Both of these changes will become effective June 30, 1960.

At the beginning of the session, the President requested a 2-cent-per-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax. The Democratic Congress found that our Interstate Highway program could continue with little or no increase in the tax. Under constant threat by the administration of discontinuance of highway construction, we had no choice other

than to yield and vote a 1-cent-per-gallon increase, which will remain in effect for 22 months, until July 1, 1961. Two billion dollars has been appropriated for Federal aid to highway construction for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

PUBLIC WORKS

The President's second veto of the public works bill was the first of his vetoes which the Congress overrode. This worthy bill, which earmarks $24 million for improvements to New York Harbor and the Hudson River, is based on a minimum domestic spending level and will not have the inflationary effect claimed by the President.

More adequate airport facilities have been guaranteed by the passage of Public Law 72, which extends the Airport Act to June 30, 1961, and authorizes $126 million of Federal grants to States on a 50–50 matching basis. This is particularly important to modernization of airport facilities in the heavily trafficked New York area.

HOUSING

After two vetoes by the President, a compromise public housing bill was enacted. The bill authorizes expenditure of $1 billion, of which $50 million is earmarked for loans to aid housing for elderly persons. This excellent provision was one of those objected to by the President. It was only after a hard fight by the Democratic congressional leaders that the President consented to this provision. A total of 37,000 new public housing units are authorized by the bill.

SMALL BUSINESS

A bill to increase the lending authority of the Small Business Administration from $500 million to $575 million was passed by the House and the Senate. I was particularly happy to vote for this increase, since it has always been my feeling that small business is the backbone of our country.

CIVIL RIGHTS

In the closing hours of the congressional session, the life of the Civil Rights Commission was extended for 2 more years. While I had hoped for more affirmative action in this area, no civil rights bill reached the floor for a vote. In January I will fight for a broader civil rights program and expect that this will be one of the first orders of business.

VETERANS AND SERVICEMEN

Public Law 211: Increased non-service-connected pensions of World War II and Korean veterans and their survivors on a revised scale based on need.

Public Law 99: Extends for 2 years, to July 1, 1961, the privilege of free importation of gifts from servicemen abroad.

Public Law 239: Provides grants to aid totally disabled veterans to acquire specially equipped housing.

CONCLUSION

The responsibility of serving the residents of my district for the past 9 years has been a great privilege. My office is open 6 days a week and letters sent to my Washington office receive immediate attention. My address is EDNA F. KELLY, Member of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.

During such times as Congress is not in session and I am not out of the country on matters concerning my chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Europe of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am available to see my constituents personally at the Madison Club, 739 Eastern Parkway, Brooklyn, on Monday and Thursday evenings.

Common Markets Abroad and Uncommon Problems for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I recently read a very thoughtful article by Alfred C. Neal, president of the Committee for Economic Development, entitled "Common Markets Abroad and Uncommon Problems for the United States" which will be published in the forthcoming European-Atlantic Review.

Dr. Neal discusses the potential economic and political repercussions of the European Common Market, and the little free trade area, and the interests of the United States in these developments.

Dr. Neal believes that it is in the interest of the United States to ride with these developments through at least two steps: First, the establishment of an International Development Association as an adjunct to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—as Senator MONRONEY has proposed and as this Congress has approved; and, second, the development of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation—the OEEC—into an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation—the OAEC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Neal's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMON MARKETS ABROAD AND UNCOMMON PROBLEMS FOR THE UNITED STATES

(By Alfred C. Neal, president, Committee for Economic Development)

The contradictions imposed by international boundaries concern us more today than ever before. Any American could go out to an airport and, in a few hours—certainly fewer hours than it takes to get a good night's sleep—could be in any part of Europe. On arrival, he would be impressed by the fact that some of the major material symbols of American life, such as automobiles and refrigerators, were nowhere to be purchased. By and large, Europe still discriminates against dollar goods. At the same time, he could buy all of the Danish cheese and a lot of other things that we want which are not available in the United States except in limited quantities because the United States imposes quotas on these products.

In another few hours from Europe he could be in one of the underdeveloped countries of Africa or the Middle East where people are trying to live on less than $100 a year per person, about one twenty-fifth of the American standard. Here one encounters incomprehensible inefficiency in government, in communications, and disease and poverty on all sides. Underpopulated and overpopulated areas exist almost side by side. Yet overpopulated areas must develop faster than others even to maintain their existing standards of living. From Western Europe, one could in another few hours be in the heart of Soviet Russia where everyone is carefully educated to believe that the capitalist system will go down and the Communist system will triumph because capitalism must choke itself on the goods it overproduces. With these diverse and contradictory conditions so close to us, it should not be too difficult to see that international relations and foreign economic policies ought to be the concern of every citizen of America. Not only in my country, but in all of our free world, more thought should be given to ways in which the economic strength of the Western World can be better organized to produce a richer life, not for ourselves alone, but for the hundreds of millions who live in the so-called underdeveloped nations of the world.

The bulk of the free world's production and wealth, and most of its scientific and technological capacity is to be found in the North Atlantic countries—the United States and Canada, and the countries of Western Europe. But there is growing concern on the part of many observers that the strength of the Western World is threatened by the development of splits, both within Europe and between Europe and the United States. The impact of the Common Market is a case in point.

In the years immediately following the war the picture we had of Western Europe was an area devastated by war, whose major industries had been destroyed and which was threatened by communism from without and within. Ten years ago anyone who suggested that Europe would become a major industrial competitor of the United States in a great many lines would have been ridiculed. Anyone who suggested that the dollar shortage might be reversed and that the United States would become concerned about its capacity to earn foreign currencies would similarly have been ridiculed. Yet these things have happened.

Western Europe, with the aid of the Marshall plan, has not only restored its industrial base, it has greatly expanded and improved it. We have only recently become aware of the fact that in the last 10 years the countries of Western Europe have been growing at a faster rate than the 3-percent rate of the United States. German production has grown, for example, at an annual average rate of 8.4 percent; France at 5.8 percent; Italy at 5.5 percent. The rapid industrial growth of Western Europe has been paralleled by a similarly rapid increase in exports and a favorable turn in its balance of payments. The gold and liquid dollar reserves of Western Europe rose from $6.2 billion at the end of 1949 to $17.6 billion at the end of 1958. In the same period, the gold stock of the United States declined from $24.6 billion to $20.6 billion.

The recovery of Western Europe has been accompanied by the growth of international agencies, the latest of which is the European Common Market. This market contains as many people as does the United States, and will produce more than half as much as we do when fully operative. It is inherently congenial to the United States, which is the largest of the world's common markets, and its creation has been the objective of U.S. policy for many years.

But the Common Market's potential economic and political repercussions may be greater in the long run than those of the first atomic bomb. The world is already on the way toward eliminating many of the

senseless political barriers to trade and to other economic influences. A common market has been organized in Central America, the countries of South America are discussing or negotiating at least two common markets in their territory, and in west Africa numerous small states have been fermenting to form some kind of economic federation of their own. I believe that we should support vigorously all such movements that are of reasonable size and consistent with the GATT.

I believe that Americans should take pride both in the fact that Marshall plan aid was an indispensable condition for the recovery of Western Europe, and that Western Europe is moving forward without developing the kind of hopeless outlook which followed the First World War and which had so much to do with laying the conditions for the second one.

Another repercussion from the formation of the Common Market has not been so favorable. Britain, the Scandinavian countries, and other European members of the OEEC not included in the Common Market face a growing discrimination against their products which will occur as the level of tariffs within the Common Market is reduced, while the common tariff against outsiders is maintained. The proposal to establish a free trade area which would include both the Common Market and the outer countries has been rejected. As a result a little free trade area has been formed among the so-called "outer seven," comprising the three Scandinavian countries, Britain, Austria, Switzerland, and Portugal.

But the formation of the little free trade area creates in turn new problems of its own. It can be welcomed as a device which can lead to the same type of rationalization and expansion which is occurring within the Common Market. But the animus behind it is somewhat different. In the minds of many of the proponents it is not something which is good in itself, but only a move to offset the Common Market and to strenghen the bargaining position of the seven with the six Common Market countries. There is no question that there is a possibility of a split developing in Europe between these two groups.

In this situation, it is the United States which, I believe, can have a decisive influence. It is not in our interest to witness a widening of the split between the seven and the six. It is not in our interest to have the Common Market disrupted or destroyed. It is in our interest to have closer economic relations both between the seven and the six, and between both of these groups and the United States and Canada. The whole economic strength of the North Atlantic countries needs to be mobilized, not only to achieve the benefits of growing prosperity to themselves, but to counter the threat of the Soviets and to do the job that needs to be done in the underdeveloped world. Under these circumstances, I think that it is imperative that the United States take the initiative in using the authority granted by the renewal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to bargain both with the seven and the six in the common interest of all three groups. The discrimination exercised by the Common Market against all outsiders could be reduced as its common tariff is reduced. Our good intentions would be demonstrated and our machinery for negotiation would be improved if we were to join the OEEC and help to convert it into an Organization for Atlantic Economic Cooperation (OAEC) which would deal with all of the major economic problems of common concern to the Western World. Any conflict within the OEEC is a conflict in which we have vital interests sufficient to justify our intervention.

We should realize that the split in Europe is dangerous from the standpoint of our economic competition with the Communist world. We must realize too that, just as Europe needed our aid in the period of its own reconstruction, we now need Europe's aid in the further task which lies before us of developing the underdeveloped world. There is danger that the Common Market countries will concentrate their own foreign investments in their own associated territories and will thereby develop a new form of empire building (which I am sure the Russians will immediately label as a "new imperialism"). There is similar danger that Britain will concentrate its own foreign investments, and those of its associated countries in the little free trade area, in those parts of the world that are of special importance to Britain, particularly in the dominions and colonies. The underdeveloped countries of the world would look with suspicion upon any such development, and could not be expected to acquiesce in it.

These dangers would be avoided if the countries of Western Europe and of North America were to join in a new multilateral effort to aid the development of underdeveloped countries and were to pool a substanial amount of the government capital available for this purpose in some such organization as the proposed International Developed Association. If this were done, the recipient countries would realize that no strings were attached which were designed to further the national interests of the capital-supplying source. Nor would they feel obligated to invite Russian or satellite participation to maintain a pretense of neutrality.

The United States has another and more selfish reason for working to avoid the split in Western Europe and to bring about a combination of effort for development assistance. That reason is that we can no longer afford to do the job alone.

There are good reasons why the United States cannot continue to carry the most of the burden of economic development assistance. In the 10 years 1949 through 1958, the United States had a balance of payments deficit aggregating $14 billion; this amount we have lost from our gold stocks or have added to the dollar balances of foreign countries and international institutions. Very nearly the same amount has been added to the gold and liquid dollar assets of the countries of Western Europe. During most of this period the United States enjoyed a seller's market for its goods and of course carried the major burden of both economic and military aid to our friends and allies throughout the free world. We were at the same time exporting private capital at a rate proportionately greater than that of Western Europe, and this is expected to continue to grow. For the 2 years 1957–58 the deficit in our balance of payments averaged more than $1.3 billion, whereas the surplus of Western Europe amounted to almost $2 billion. While I would not predict disastrous consequences from a continuation of U.S. programs of economic aid, it seems obvious that the burden of supplying aid is now resting too heavily upon American shoulders.

Is Western Europe bearing its share of the burden of development assistance and capital export? The eight Western European countries most capable of sharing the burden—Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Denmark, France, Germany, Norway, and the United Kingdom—have a population about as large as that of the United States and a combined gross national production almost half as large as that of the United States (and considerably larger if corrected for differences in purchasing power). They have gold and dollar reserves equal to 60 percent of the U.S. gold stock. It has been estimated that these eight countries should, therefore, be able to export at least approximately two-thirds as much capital as the United States. This would mean that they should increase their own capital outflow to the underdeveloped parts of the world by about a billion dollars a year.[1]

I am not suggesting that the U.S. flow of capital to the underdeveloped parts of the world be reduced, but I am suggesting that the European flow might be increased. An additional billion dollars a year of investment from European sources would go a long way toward meeting the requirement for additional investment in the underdeveloped areas to raise their rate of growth from something that is unacceptable to something that represents real progress; that is to say, enough to double their per capita rate of growth.[2]

How might this additional aid from Europe be combined with American aid in such a way as to help to bring about greater unity among the North Atlantic countries? A mechanism has been proposed and has been favorably received both in this country and in England, and I hope that it will enjoy a similar favorable reception in other areas. It is to establish an International Development Association (IDA) as an adjunct to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

We need this kind of concerted approach to prevent the burgeoning strength of the Common Market in Europe and the parallel development of the little free trade area from splitting Europe apart and from further dividing Europe from the United States. The initiative should come from the United States to strengthen the mechanism for negotiation by transforming the OEEC into the OAEC. Also, through creation of a broader organization, such as IDA, Western Europe could share more fully and more in proportion to capacity the burden of developing underdeveloped areas of the world. Force is given to this suggestion by the fact that the recent Atlantic Congress of the NATO countries in London recommended action along the very same lines.

---

[1] The U.S. nonmilitary government and private capital flow to underdeveloped areas alone amounts to $3.75 billion annually. Two-thirds of this amount would be $2.5 billion annually, and the present Government and private capital outflow of these countries amounts to only $1.6 billion. Therefore, the eight Western European countries could increase their capital outflow by, roughly, $1 billion a year. (See paper by J. Herbert Furth in "Freedom of Trade and Stability of Exchange" for U.S. delegation, Atlantic Congress, June 1959.)

[2] See "Operation Breakthrough," by Paul Hoffman, Foreign Affairs, October 1959.

Editorial Comment on Senator Symington's Proposal for a Foreign Service Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the widespread interest shown by Members of Congress in an article in This Week magazine by Missouri's Senator STUART SYMINGTON proposing the establishment of a foreign service academy to train our diplomats, I am sure the following editorials on the proposal appearing in Missouri newspapers recently

will similarly be of interest to the membership:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Aug. 15, 1959]

LET'S SCHOOL OUR DIPLOMATS

Vice President NIXON told the Russian people in his formal address in Moscow he was amazed at the number of people he met who are studying English. "What we need are millions of American students who understand Russian," he said.

The neglect of foreign languages by Americans is in part behind the proposal of Missouri Senator STUART SYMINGTON to create a school for diplomats, a foreign service academy. It would be to the State Department what West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy are to our military security.

Fifty percent of our entire Foreign Service officer corps does not have command or even one foreign language, the Senator says.

Seventy-five percent of the new men coming into the Foreign Service cannot speak a foreign language.

The U.S. Ambassador to Moscow is our only such envoy assigned to a Communist country who speaks the language of the country in which he is stationed.

By contrast, 9 of every 10 Russians sent abroad speak and write the language of the country to which they are assigned.

These are harsh and astounding truths. If this situation persists it can only happen that we will continue to lose valuable ground in international influence and prestige.

In introducing his bill to establish the diplomatic school, Senator SYMINGTON warned that Russia's foreign representatives are better trained.

"Dedicated, intensively trained representatives are at work for the Communist cause throughout the world," he said. "We have not matched this effort either in size or degree of training."

The 4-year foreign academy course would admit women as well as future career diplomats who would become eligible for the more than 8,000 jobs overseas. From starting pay of $5,200 they could work up to top bracket salaries of $37,500.

The Nation is spending $40 billion a year to bolster our military defenses, more than $3 billion annually in foreign aid.

These expenditures are essential, and equally important is it that we spend a few million dollars training our official diplomats to understand the lapguage and culture of the countries we must deal with daily.

We have been far too casual and uncoordinated in our approach to this task. Some of our Government representatives have been the cause for embarrassment with their cocktail-and-canape approach.

The American way of life is a valuable commodity in need of the world's best-trained salesmen.

[From the Mexico (Mo.) Ledger, Aug. 13, 1959]

WEST POINT OF DIPLOMACY FOR THE COLD WAR

"If we are determined to remain a free people, we cannot continue to be indifferent to the energetic and effective Communist missionaries Moscow is now sending to the four corners of the earth. Every Communist revolutionary sent out to infiltrate, divide, and conquer must be matched by a free-world advocate of 'lasting peace through justice and law'—someone thoroughly trained in the language, the economy, and the customs of the country to which he or she is assigned."

The above is from an article by Missouri's U.S. Senator STUART SYMINGTON. It was published in This Week magazine. The article is in support of a bill the Senator introduced last January for the establishment of a foreign service academy much along the lines of West Point for the Army and other similar service schools.

The Foreign Service Academy should, like the service schools, charge no tuition.

Students would be selected on the basis of merit and required to take competitive entrance examinations. The Academy would prepare young men and women to serve in any of the governmental agencies which operate overseas.

The Russians are making a planned, determined effort to develop the most linguistically proficient diplomatic corps in the world.

SYMINGTON said that our programs are "uncoordinated and casual compared to the training efforts behind the Iron Curtain. It will take years to develop a comparable task force of trained American representatives. But we can and should begin that preparation now."

The Senator's suggestion seems to us to have merit.

Why not train for the cold war?

Today we have no such preparation.

Why not prepare the country to meet such trained men from other nations—especially the U.S.S.R.?

Certainly the bill should have the fullest considreation.

We believe in preparedness in this country. Too often it has been almost too late to prepare.

However, the cold war is with us. Russia will see that it continues as long as Russia feels it is profitable to continue it.

Why not meet the Soviet on its own "hearth" and not suffer because we lack vision and are not ready?

[From the Carthage (Mo.) Press, Aug. 6, 1959]

UNITED STATES NEEDS TRAINED DIPLOMATS

Missouri's junior Senator has come up with a solid suggestion which has more merit than 90 percent of the legislation passed by Congress.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON suggests the creation of a Foreign Service Academy—a sort of "West Point for diplomats"—to put a little steel and a little "smart" into our often sluggish and ill-trained Foreign Service. In an article appearing in This Week magazine, a Sunday metropolitan newspaper supplement, the junior Senator declares, "We now have three schools—West Point, Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy—which prepare our youth for a possible hot war. Surely, we can afford one which will equip them to serve their country in the cold war in which we are now engaged."

He suggests students be selected on a merit basis and be required to take competitive entrance examinations. The Academy, he says, would prepare young men—and women—to serve in any of the governmental agencies which would operate overseas. He urges the curriculum include not only basic college courses, but also instruction in the language, culture, history, and economy of foreign countries.

SYMINGTON embodied his plan in a bill, S. 15, which he introduced in the Senate last January 9. He accompanied the proposed bill with a thumbnail report on Russian activities in the field of diplomatic training.

The rumored presidential candidate told his upper House colleagues 1,000 young Russians are enrolled in the Soviet Institute of Foreign Relations, supervised by their Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in a 6-year study course. "As a result," says SYMINGTON, "9 out of every 10 Russians sent abroad read, speak, and write the language of the country to which they are assigned."

By comparison, SYMINGTON points out, American diplomats are inadequately schooled in the language and culture of the country in which they work, they live an isolated life among other Americans and are virtually uninformed about local developments around them.

"Asians," he says, "have a new phrase: the 'Golden Ghetto.' To them it means the plush places where American diplomats and other representatives hold their cocktail parties, dinners, and other social events." He cites statistics which show 50 percent of the entire Foreign Service Officer staff lacks a speaking knowledge of any foreign language and 75 percent of its new recruits are in similar shape.

"Llewellyn E. Thompson, U.S. Ambassador to Moscow, is the only U.S. Ambassador in a Communist country who speaks the language of the country to which he is assigned," SYMINGTON declares.

"The ultimate future of the world," the Senator concludes, "whether it is to be free or slave, will not be settled on the battlefields, but rather in the minds of men. Dedicated, well-trained representatives are at work for the Communist cause all over the world. We have not matched this effort, either in size or degree of training."

This writer agrees, mainly because of a frightening little personal experience. After successfully passing the tough battery of preliminary examinations for entry into the Foreign Service, he was not contacted for 6 months, then summoned peremptorily from his home in Carthage to Chicago for a final oral quiz before a three-man board of examiners composed of a full consul and two vice consuls.

The consul asked one question: He said, "What, in your opinion, is the basis of U.S. foreign policy as applied to Communist countries?" The writer began a detailed explanation of the factors which he believed influence American policy in Europe, in the Balkans, and in several sections of Asia, but the consul shook his head. He shook it several times and declared the whole thing could be summed up in one word. This floored the writer.

Finally, the writer asked, "Well, what is it, then?" The full consul drew himself up, glanced at his subordinates and announced smugly, "Containment."

The writer came home, figuring anybody who can sum up the U.S. view of the Red world in one word shouldn't be a mere consul—he should be God.

[From the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune, Aug. 3, 1959]

A FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

Senator STUART SYMINGTON spoke out in an article in This Week magazine on behalf of a measure now pending in the Congress, Senate bill 15, which would provide for the establishment of a national academy to train young men and women for the Foreign Service. When he introduced the measure last January 9, Senator SYMINGTON said: "The ultimate future of the world, whether it is to be free or slave, will not be settled on the battlefields, but rather in the minds of men," and there has been much in the international picture since that time, particularly in the last few weeks, to support that statement. In Moscow, in Geneva, and elsewhere around the world, day by day, decisions are being made which will affect the future of the whole world for many years to come. We work with frantic speed and the expenditure of billions in treasure to build our defenses for tests which may never come, but we do little to prepare our future representatives at world conference tables for negotiations which we know are inevitable—which even now are underway.

We have, as the Senator points out, three academies, the Military Academy at West Point, the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs, to train future leaders for the three military

services. His bill, Senate bill 15, contemplates establishment of a fourth, a foreign service academy, tuition free and with entrance based upon competitive examinations, for young men and women who wish to prepare for the Foreign Service. In addition to the basic college course, it would offer instruction in the language, culture, history, and economy of foreign countries—a background to provide intelligent communication and understanding of the nations with which we have to deal.

The cost of this move toward international understanding and peace would be trivial compared with what we are spending for education for war. We agree with Senator SYMINGTON'S summation of the problem in his magazine article. He wrote: "If we are determined to remain a free people, we cannot continue to be indifferent to the energetic and effective Communist missionaries Moscow is now sending to the four corners of the earth. Every Communist revolutionary sent out to infiltrate, divide, and conquer must be matched by a free world advocate of lasting peace through justice and law—someone thoroughly trained in the language, the economy, and customs of the country to which he or she is assigned. Tomorrow is too late. We must start today to train our people to merchandise the most valuable commodity in the world—the American way of life, with its individual dignity and its investment in freedom."

Progress of Mental Health Treatment in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the care and treatment of mentally ill is one of the chief health problems and concerns in America. It is in this area that large expenditures of funds and talent are being made.

Happily, much progress is being made. One of the outstanding examples thereof is found in the State of Nebraska, which embarked upon a meaningful and effective program about 10 years ago.

It was my privilege as chairman of the county commissioners to have participated in the beginnings of this program. It required the cooperation of a great many officials and agencies including the University of Nebraska, the board of control, the County of Douglas, the U.S. Public Health Service, the medical profession, and a host of others.

The program was directed to providing early and concentrated treatment, and at the same time to train skills at all levels to enable achievement of that program.

According to U.S. Public Health reports, my native State of Nebraska stood second in the Nation in reducing the number of patients confined in mental hospitals. In 1955 the patient population in Nebraska mental hospitals stood at 4,800. Last year it was down to 4,200. This splendid record was excelled only in our neighbor State to the south, Kansas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial in the September 14, 1959, issue of the Omaha World-Herald setting out the high spots of this splendid, promising achievement.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIX HUNDRED FEWER PATIENTS

For many years the patient population in Nebraska's mental hospitals crept upward at the rate of about 100 a year. No end seemed in sight, and no solution—except the building of more additions to the three hospitals.

In the early 1950's, the State embarked upon a program of intensive treatment, rather than mere custodial care, for the mentally ill. This led to the opening, late in 1954, of the Nebraska Psychiatric Unit, on the grounds of the University of Nebraska College of Medicine in Omaha. The unit was designed to coordinate the work of the mental hospitals, to screen many of the patients scheduled to be admitted, and to provide early and concentrated treatment in many cases.

The results of the program are now apparent.

In 1955 the patient population in Nebraska mental hospitals stood at 4,800.

Last year, according to reports of the U.S. Public Health Service, this was down to 4,200.

According to U.S. Public Health Service reports, Nebraska stood second in the Nation (Kansas was first) in reducing the number of patients confined in mental institutions.

Had the old rate of increase continued, Nebraska would now have 300 more, rather than 600 fewer, mental patients in its hospitals, so the total reduction might be stated at 900.

Since it costs about $1,000 a year to keep a patient in an institution, Nebraska is making a saving of $900,000 a year in custodial cost. This, of course, is not the whole story. Where the breadwinner in a family is confined, the public often must support a family as well.

The dollar saving, of course, is not the most important one. How much the Nebraska program has paid off in alleviating human anguish cannot be measured.

The program is only well underway. Further gains may be expected. But the people of Nebraska may well feel proud of what has already been accomplished.

Amphibious Demonstration Landing at Erie, Pa., July 22, 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a report of an amphibious demonstration landing at Erie, Pa., July 22, 1959, in connection with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway and the now historic Operation Inland Seas under the direction of the U.S. Navy.

It was my privilege to accompany Rear Adm. E. B. Taylor, U.S. Navy, commander of Task Force 47, on the U.S.S. *Willis A. Lee* and witness part of the demonstration.

The U.S. Navy marked the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway with its now historic Operation Inland Seas by directing a naval task force of 28 warships and 7,500 men into the Great Lakes during the month of July 1959 for amphibious assault landing demonstrations and port visits. In command of Task Force 47 was Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy, aboard the destroyer leader U.S.S. *Willis A. Lee*—DL–4.

It was fitting that the seaway's opening should be celebrated by a visit of sailors, marines, and ships of our Navy. This was the first appearance of U.S. warships in the lakes, since Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry built and launched his own ships on the spot in 1813. The opening of the Great Lakes has created a tremendous inland sea of some 75,000 square miles and in effect extended the U.S. coastline by more than 3,000 miles.

An amphibious operation, one of the most complicated military maneuvers, is defined as "an attack launched from the sea by naval and landing forces embarked in ships and craft, involving a landing on hostile shores." The organization which conducts such an operation is called the amphibious task force.

For the demonstration landing at Erie, Pa., on July 22, the amphibious task force commander was Capt. R. B. Derickson, Jr. U.S. Navy, commander of amphibious squadron 8, embarked in the attack transport U.S.S. *Cambria*—APA 36. With the task force commander in his command ship was the landing force commander, Lt. Col. W. E. Antley, U.S. Marine Corps, in command of the U.S. Marine Corps 2d Battalion, 6th Regiment of the 2d Marine Division.

Many months of planning went into the operation leading up to the demonstration on Erie's Presque Isle beach. Early in the spring of 1959 Navy and Marine officers visited each port of call in the Great Lakes, speaking with civic leaders and port authorities. Captain Derickson and Lieutenant Colonel Antley met with the mayor of each city that had been selected for an amphibious demonstration.

Simultaneously, officers and men of underwater demolition unit 2, more familiarly known as frogmen, operating from the high speed transport U.S.S. *Kleinsmith*—APD 134—and, from a submarine, were conducting underwater reconnaissance missions for intelligence purposes. Accurate hydrographic information of the landing beaches prior to landing is essential. This includes the beach slope, type of bottom, location of natural and manmade obstacles, mines, surf conditions, and existing currents. This information was passed to beachmasters, boat coxswains, and commanding officers of landing ships. While operating in beach surf zones the frogmen were able to gather other vital information regarding the location of coastal defense and antiboat guns, "enemy" fortified installations in the

immediate beach vicinity and the accessibility of the beach for tracked and wheeled vehicles.

As a result of the visits made in the spring of 1959, five cities were chosen for amphibious assault landings: Chicago, Milwaukee, Cleveland, Erie, and Rochester.

For the assault demonstration, seven ships provided by the amphibious force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet, which is commanded by Vice Adm. George C. Towner, U.S. Navy, landed 1,500 marines of the 2d Battalion, 6th Marines, from Camp Lejeune, N. C. To provide realism to the landings, hypothetical military situations were developed. Five small independent countries, bordering on the Great Lakes, friendly with the United States and Canada, were tottering from internal disorders created by anti-Western rebels. Each of the five countries had asked for U.S. help.

The problem at Erie, the country known as powershovelland, was to rout the enemy and return control of the city to its citizens.

With H-hour approaching, the transport group of the task force arrived off Erie's Presque Isle beach and prepared to land the landing force. Meanwhile ships of the gunfire support group and aircraft from the landing force aviation group continued last minute bombardment which theoretically had been taking place for days. The landing site was systematically bombarded to destroy specific installations, defenses, and troop concentrations which would interfere with the landing.

On the shore, immediately behind the enemy held beach, some 30,000 spectators had been gathering since the previous evening to witness the historic amphibious assault.

About 3,000 yards off the beach, the attack transport U.S.S. *Cambria*—APA 36—the command ship of the amphibious task force, commanded by Capt. E. C. Finney, U.S. Navy, stood by to debark her troops. Her troops capacity is 1,386 men, or 1 Marine battalion. Captain Derickson directed the operation from *Cambria*.

Lying just to seaward of the *Cambria* the attack cargo ship U.S.S. *Oglethorpe*—AKA 100—commanded by Capt. C. W. Flenniken, U.S. Navy, began her primary mission of delivering the marine heavy equipment to the landing beaches. This ship's amphibious lift capacity is 9,755 tons.

On either side of *Cambria*, two landing ships tank, U.S.S. *Terrebonne Parish*—LST 1156—commanded by Lt. Comdr. E. E. Sullivan, U.S. Navy, and U.S.S. *Suffolk County*—LST 1173—commanded by Lt. Comdr. P. E. Lowen, U.S. Navy, prepared to launch amphibious vehicles loaded with marines, through their huge bow doors. Also in the task force were the landing ships dock U.S.S. *Donner*—LSD 20—commanded by Comdr. Homer Tolivaisa, U.S. Navy, and the U.S.S. *San Marcos*—LSD 25—commanded by Comdr. J. J. May, U.S. Navy. The LSD's have a large well deck which is used to transport preloaded troop equipment in landing craft. The craft are launched through the ship's stern by flooding the well deck. This is known as ballasting down. On their afterdeck the LSD's have a helicopter platform from which two troopcarrying helicopters can be operated.

Directly off the beach about 2,000 yards the seventh ship in the amphibious task force, U.S.S. *Kleinsmith*—APD 134—commanded by Lt. Comdr. P. A. Schwemley, U.S. Navy, acted as base ship for underwater demolition team personnel, the frogmen who conducted underwater reconnaissance and demolition missions. She also marked the line of departure which was the seaward end of the boat lanes.

An underwater demolition team boat from the *Kleinsmith* approached the beach with swimmers on a mission of searching out and destroying underwater and beach obstacles which might interfere with the approach of landing craft. Using evasive tactics to avoid enemy gunfire, the UDT boat utilized a rubber boat tied alongside for casting the frogmen. Each swimmer carried several packs of high explosives used to destroy obstacles on the beach.

After planting their explosive charges, the frogmen swam seaward for pickup by boat. Each man was snared by a recovery loop attached to the speeding boat. This maneuver calls for the utmost in precision timing and physical strength.

While the frogmen carried out their part in the operation, a squadron of A4D Sky Hawk jet aircraft from Marine Air Group 14, Cherry Point, N.C., maintained a protective air patrol over both the task force and landing beach.

As the UDT boat returned to its ship, landing vehicles tracked—LVT's—loaded with marines, prepared to form the first wave to hit the beach.

In order to further prepare the beach area for landing, destroy enemy defenses, and neutralize the defenders, a simulated tactical atomic bomb was detonated over the beach. The planners had settled on an airburst in order to accomplish maximum effect and preclude the possibility of creating residual radiation which deny the beach and surrounding area to our troops. The bomb was delivered by the smallest of all atomic bombers, the A4D Sky Hawk, on a low altitude bombing maneuver. These maneuvers are known as over-the-shoulder or loft bombing and were developed to enable high speed aircraft to deliver weapons from low altitude to escape enemy radar, and to afford the pilot and aircraft a reasonable chance to get away from the effects of the atomic blast.

Following the A-bomb explosion, HUS marine helicopters, in vertical assault, began lifting assault troops from the flight decks of two dock landing ships. Continuous waves of helicopters landed marines behind the enemy shore defenses. Others helo-lifted vehicles, equipment, and supplies ashore.

During normal vertical assault operations, HUS helicopters operate generally from an amphibious assault ship, an LPH. The LPH is designed to transport and operate helicopters, to provide servicing and maintenance facilities for them, and living accommodations for that portion of the battalion landing team based aboard. The HUS can also operate from many other types of amphibious ships such as the LST and LSD used in the landing at Presque Isle.

The first wave of marine landing vehicles tracked personnel—LVTP 5—hit the beach according to plan just 45 minutes after the invasion began. These amphibious vehicles swim at 6 knots and their tracks provide them with the means to ride over partially submerged reefs and obstacles offshore. On land an LVTP can travel at 30 miles per hour and traverse obstacles which would normally stop wheeled vehicles. They are provided with .30-caliber machineguns and are capable of carrying 35 fully equipped troops. Overhead cover keeps the seas and spray out, and gives protection from flash and radiation of atomic weapons.

The second wave, consisting of landing craft vehicle personnel—LCVP's—dropped their ramps and discharged their troops on the beach. The marines advanced rapidly, taking advantage of such meager cover and concealment as the beach afforded. An enemy pillbox which had not been destroyed by bombing and naval gunfire opened fire on the invading troops. An officer of the landing force signaled for a flamethrower attack on the pillbox, and in seconds it was destroyed.

Wave after wave of landing craft surged shoreward, carrying first the assault troops, and then heavy equipment including tanks and bulldozers. The newest and most powerful antitank weapon, the ONTOS, sped from a landing craft into the surf and onto the beach. In addition, LCU landing craft disgorged marine M–48 tanks into relatively deep water along the beachline. These tanks can wade through about 8 feet of water when prepared for this type operation. The M–48 tank mounts a 90-millimeter gun and weighs less than 50 tons. Two machineguns: a .30-caliber machine gun mounted coaxially with the 90-millimeter gun and a .50-caliber machinegun on a cupola mount for use against ground and air targets add to its firepower.

Last to come ashore was a utility landing craft—LCU—with a Marine Corps Honest John rocket and launcher. The Honest John rocket is the longest range artillery weapon used in the Marine Corps, propelling a 2½-ton projectile over 15 miles. It is simple in design and simple to operate. It has considerably more battlefield mobility than conventional artillery and one round can deliver on a target the demolition effect of hundreds of artillery shells.

With the arrival of the Honest John, the landing was completed. Having established their beachhead, the marines set up a command operations post and informed the amphibious task force commander that the beach was secured.

With the scheduled waves on the beach, the nonscheduled waves commenced their landing, followed by the general unloading of logistic support, rations, ammunition, gasoline and oil,

and other material necessary to maintain the landing force on the beach.

Naval activity on and immediately seaward of the beach is heavy and must be controlled by a coordinator, the beachmaster and his beach party team. He is a naval officer trained in boat control, ship to shore communications, and the various forms of liaison which direct the amphibious operation from water to land. This is the final link in the Navy's chain for getting the marines ashore.

Included in the beach party team at Presque Isle were 30 sailors of Beachmaster Unit 2 from the naval amphibious base, Little Creek, Va., who brought to the beach such traditional naval skills as visual signaling, seamanship, and boat handling, salvage and repair. Landing ships and craft were constantly on the move bringing in additional troops, supplies and equipment. They landed at designated off-loading sites marked by range markers and flags and when safely unloaded retracted from the beach to reload in the transport area.

To assist him in controlling this traffic, the beachmaster was in communication by radio, semaphore and flashing light with the boat group commander, primary control vessel, and ships in the transport area. By means of these communications, landing ships and craft with their embarked troops and equipment were beached at the right place and at the right time.

Attached to the beach party team was a salvage section composed of 1 officer and 12 sailors of the amphibious Seabees. It was their job to salvage damaged and swamped landing craft during the operation, in order to keep the beaches clear for oncoming boats and landing ships.

The beachmaster and his beach party team with its varied skills is prepared to assist in beach defense if required. Every man is combat equipped and trained in basic landing force tactics.

The amphibious task force at Presque Isle demonstrated its capability to prepare the beachhead with naval gunfire, air bombing, rocketing and strafing, prior to landing the landing force. It then supported the force ashore with air and naval gunfire; and finally provided continuous logistic support during the entire amphibious operation.

The demonstration at Presque Isle was an example of the balanced fleet concept of the Navy. Combatant ships to carry the offensive war away from the United States and to the shores of the enemy; amphibious ships to transport and land the landing force and to maintain them at the objective; fleet aviation to protect the task force and provide close air support to the landing force; and landing forces of Marines, armed, trained, equipped, and ready to be committed to preserve the peace we have fought so hard and long to win.

Although a campaign of peace and good will, history will record Operation Inland Seas as a naval operation ranking in significance with Commodore Perry's actions in Lake Erie on September 10, 1813.

To paraphrase Commodore Perry—we have met the people of the Great Lakes and we are proud to have had the opportunity.

The Public Works Veto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, my attention has just been called to an editorial by Mr. David Lawrence in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report. That editorial is so biased and contains so many inaccuracies that in my humble judgment an answer is required.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the pertinent portion of that editorial be placed in the RECORD, together with a reply which I will prepare.

There being no objection, the pertinent portion of the editorial and the reply were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IRRESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT

(By David Lawrence)

By overriding the President's veto of a bill to provide more than $1 billion for various public works projects, Congress in the last few days has dramatized for the Nation the irresponsibility of our present-day Government.

Many meritorious provisions are contained in this particular bill, but 67 projects are included which have never been passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget or given the necessary study by the Army Engineers, who usually examine in advance all such proposals. The President pleaded in vain that these 67 projects be eliminated now and examined later.

Why, then, did more than two-thirds of the Members of both Houses of Congress vote to enact the bill anyway?

Only because selfishness apparently reigned supreme, as considerations of local politics seemed to replace the courage that statesmen ought to exhibit in dealing with the national interest.

Worst of all, however, the country was given an exhibition of disorderly government—a species of legislative anarchy.

Time and again Congress has felt the "lure of the pork barrel" as Members from one section are bludgeoned into voting for bills that benefit another section in order to get support for their own projects.

The remedy, of course, is to amend the Federal Constitution to permit the President to veto any item in an appropriation bill so that it would require a two-thirds vote to enact into law any single provision to which the Executive, as the representative of the national interest, takes exception. New Jersey, for example, has such an article in its constitution, and it is working well.

This reform has long been advocated by Senator HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, Democrat, and many other experienced legislators. But it doesn't seem to catch the fancy of the modernists or the so-called liberals who prefer the reactionary practices of the past.

The record of the two parties, moreover, on the public works bill tells a story of the failure of the majority party in Congress. Thus, the Democrats in the House voted 260 to 5 in favor of the measure, while the Republicans voted 116 to 20 against it. In the Senate, the Democratic majority likewise voted to override the veto.

That's the way the two major parties lined up on the issue of fiscal responsibility and orderly government.

REPLY TO MR. LAWRENCE

I was much disappointed to read the editorial by Mr. David Lawrence in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report entitled "Irresponsible Government." The first portion of that editorial dealing with the action of the Congress in overriding the President's veto of the public works appropriation bill displays what in my judgment is a threefold lack of knowledge on Mr. Lawrence's part of the subject matter about which he was writing.

The principal fields in which Mr. Lawrence's homework is deficient are (1) The program itself. That is, the objectives, accomplishments and present posture; (2) the 67 individual projects that were the subject of the veto; and (3) primary responsibility in this field, that is, the President vis-a-vis the Congress.

This year as in previous years, the Senate Appropriation Committee's reports and labor debate on the bill discuss the overall program and the urgent necessity for the continuation of the program on a long-range, well-planned basis.

Of course, Mr. Lawrence is entitled to his own views as to whether or not the Federal Government should participate in such programs as resource development. But to my surprise, this question is not even considered by Mr. Lawrence. In fact, he says, "Many meritorious projects are contained in this particular bill, but—," and then he launches into an attack on the 67 unbudgeted new starts.

The point he completely misses is the fact that most of the meritorious projects to which he refers were in fact started by the Congress in previous years—just as these 67 projects are being started this year—and were the occasion for sharp rebukes of the Congress at that time by the President. It is apparent, then, that next year when the President recommends funds for the continuation of these 67 projects they will have reached a new plateau and will themselves be classified as meritorious under Mr. Lawrence's reasoning process.

What is more, Mr. Lawrence would lead the reader to believe that the 67 unbudgeted projects have never been presented and passed upon by the Bureau of the Budget or given the necessary study by the Army Engineers who usually examine in advance all such proposals.

In this contention Mr. Lawrence has made two grievous errors: (1) That was not the reason for the President's veto. He should have read the veto message. (2) With respect to the 52 Corps of Engineers projects in the bill, in each and every case the Corps of Engineers testified as to an engineering capability for construction, which means that these projects had been given the necessary study by the corps. Also in connection with the authorization of these projects the appropriate reports of the Corps of Engineers were referred to the Bureau of the Budget and to other interested Federal agencies in accordance with procedures existing at the time of submission of the respective reports. Each of the 67 projects has been studied by the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation, as the case may be, and considered by the legislative committees of both Houses of the Congress, or has been specifically authorized in a law signed by the President. By and large, planning funds for these projects were recommended by President Eisenhower and the Bureau of the Budget for planning, either in the current or prior fiscal years.

I repeat: If Mr. Lawrence had read the President's veto message he would have found that the question raised was entirely a matter of timing rather than of the merits of the projects.

Before discussing the justification in this particular case I think it is interesting to note that the Congress has always reserved

to itself the field of internal improvements. This is especially true of waterway improvements. The Congress acts in this area under its commerce, war, Federal property, and general welfare powers. Indeed, the Supreme Court of the United States has said: "It is for Congress alone to decide whether a particular project, by itself or as a part of a more comprehensive scheme, will have such a beneficial effect on the arteries of interstate commerce as to warrant it. That determination is legislative in character." (*Okla. v. Atkinson*, 313 U.S. 508, 527; 1941.)

In connection with the Senate's consideration of the second public works appropriation bill, I provided the Senate with a critique of the President's veto message. It is surprising that Mr. Lawrence did not acquaint himself with the facts in this case before undertaking his editorial.

I would not expect him to read the 3,200 pages of testimony taken by the Senate subcommittee of which I am chairman over a period of several months prior to its decision on this bill. I do not suppose he even glanced at the last hundred pages or so which are devoted entirely to testimony by the Corps of Engineers with respect to unbudgeted new starts recommended by Members of Congress and outside witnesses. Nevertheless, he sets himself up as some sort of authority in this field.

If we had felt that he had the time to review this testimony or any portion of it, he would have found a detailed justification for every project. In each case he would find that the engineers testified that they could economically and efficiently use at least the amount of money provided in the vetoed bill.

Mr. Lawrence seems to take the position that the President alone should make the decision as to whether or not there should be any new projects and to make the individual selection of such projects as may be recommended.

Certainly if Mr. Lawrence intended that any serious study or consideration be given to (a) a determination of whether there should be new projects, or (b) which ones should be started, he does not really contemplate that the President would do this job. He has in mind the delegation of such authority to some bureaucrat in the Bureau of the Budget or other branch of the executive department who is probably totally unfamiliar with the problems involved.

He refers to the overriding of the veto as a "species of legislative anarchy." Certainly Mr. Lawrence has a better understanding of our Government than is implied in that phrase.

Under our Government the President has the responsibility of submitting an executive budget to the Congress. The Congress has the constitutional responsibility of examining and approving or modifying the recommendations of the President.

It was certainly within the President's constitutional authority to veto the public works appropriation bill or any other bill. It is also within the constitutional prerogative of the Congress to reconsider the bill in the light of the Presidential veto.

If Mr. Lawrence now believes that the Congress must approve every proposal submitted by the President his philosophy has changed completely from the days when he criticized the dictatorship of President Roosevelt.

If the Congress is to be accused of anarchy because once in 6½ years they override a Presidential veto, one could easily conclude that in Mr. Lawrence's opinion a considerable saving could be accomplished by eliminating the legislative branch of the Government and turning the workings of our Government over to a nameless, faceless group of bureaucrats who would rule our country by executive fiat, beyond the reach of private citizens.

Public Power a Yardstick of Fair Electricity Costs for All America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I am shocked by the propaganda campaign for private electric power companies have been carrying on in nationally circulated magazines.

A recent advertisement asks the question, "How much is public power costing the people of your State?"

The answer to this query is quite simple: Nothing. Federal funds invested in the development of our national hydroelectric resources are not costs charged to the American taxpayer.

Before any such project is approved by the Congress, it must pass rigid examinations which prove that benefits to be derived will exceed costs. They are, if you please, our Nation's investments in the full use of our natural resources, which in every case are self-liquidating from the sale of wholesale electric power.

Such projects produce electricity at wholesale costs which are less than half those the power companies formerly demanded. They are also a competitive influence, a yardstick by which the American people are able to measure the fair costs of electricity, even outside the areas of Federal power development. This competitive influence spreads like the ripples from a stone dropped in a pond. All America now benefits in some substantial degree from lower rates created by this competition.

I should like to rephrase the power companies' question and ask, "How much is propaganda advertising costing America's independent electric light and power companies, and how much is it costing their rate-paying consumers?"

The costs of a national advertising campaign designed to discredit our national resource policy and indirectly to question the integrity of all Members of Congress who during the past half century have supported our great Federal power program, are not so easy to determine.

When the Federal Power Commission rapped the knuckles of a group of 76 power companies last July 15 for including the costs of politically inspired propaganda advertising in their retail power rates, it listed the contribution made by each of the companies.

These companies paid a whopping $1,286,083.15, or an average of nearly $17,000 each, for just the 1957 advertising campaign. How much has the 1958 campaign cost? And how much is the 1959 campaign costing?

The answer, based on the 1957 figures, would be millions.

I submit that the power companies should not be denied the right of freedom of expression. Let them have their say. I would like to see them build their business and promote their own services by positive, constructive advertising. But, so long as they engage in a campaign which nurtures doubts and fears in the mind of the American people then I want to see these millions spent from their own funds, and not handled as operating expenses which are deducted from income for income tax purposes on the one hand and added to their consumers' electric bills on the other.

Aggressive Secularism Seen Undermining Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. GLENN BEALL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, during the recent annual meeting of the American Bar Association in Miami Beach, His Excellency John J. Wright, bishop of Pittsburgh, Pa., delivered a most challenging and thought-provoking address.

This address was presented at the red mass which was held in conjunction with the meeting and which was attended by approximately 1,500 registrants, including Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, high officials of the Federal and State Governments, and leading lawyers of this country.

An account of Bishop Wright's remarks was printed in the Voice, the publication of the diocese of Miami, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGGRESSIVE SECULARISM SEEN UNDERMINING NATION

The solemn gathering for the red mass, offered for the members of the bench and the bar, permits me to serve as spokesman for those who bear witness to the law of God in speaking to those who are privileged to write, interpret, or apply the law of the land.

There was a time in our country when any dichotomy between the law of God and the law of the land was rarely real and never intentional. It was assuredly never as systematic as developments under the influence of aggressive secularism have sometimes made it seem.

Quite the contrary, those who bore witness to the law of God were wont to preach and to pray for enthusiastic, wholehearted obedience to the law of the land, because in so doing they were logically and loyally defending the civil corollaries of their sacred teachings.

At the same time, those whose public duties bound them to the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of the law consciously sought to promote piety and virtue, not merely to define the limits of the law's negative interest in these, and did so convinced that thus they best served the civic common good and the rights and needs of human personality adequately considered.

PRUDENT REALISM

Our forefathers, for reasons of prudent realism, provided in their constitutions for

the separation of the organized church and the organized state; but their idealism, even in temporal matters, was informed and inspired by the Judaeo-Christian tradition, and especially by the influence of Revelation as transmitted by the church; and so there is reflected in the basic laws which they wrote a blend of divine faith and human wisdom, a happy medley of the hopes of earth and the will of heaven.

The U.S. Supreme Court, speaking by Mr. Justice Brewer, on one occasion declared in remarkably direct terms the religious, indeed, the organized Christian character of the American tradition within which the law of the land became an effort by positive human legislation to apply the broad precepts of the law of conscience and the law of God, unto the service of virtue and the perfection of personality.

The Court said: "If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs, and its society, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth. Among other matters, note the following: The form of oath universally prevailing, concluding with an appeal to the Almighty; the custom of opening sessions of all deliberative bodies with prayer; the prefatory words of all wills, 'in the name of God, amen'; the laws respecting the observance of the Sabbath with a general cessation of secular business and the closing of courts, legislatures, and other similar public assemblies on that day; the churches and church organizations which abound in every city, town, and hamlet; the multitude of charitable organizations existing everywhere under Christian auspices—these and many other matters which might be noticed add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of formal utterances that this is a Christian nation."

IMPORT OBSCURE

So far the words of the Court; nor is their import obscure. Without prejudice to the strict religious tolerance that obtains for all faiths, without disparagement of the notable influence on our national life of the devout members of other faiths; this Nation was considered in its inspiration and its life a Christian Nation.

The traditional habits of mind and attitudes of our people, as well as their institutions and laws, were those which have been developed under the dominance of the Christian faiths, embryonic in the promises made to Israel, born together with the church on Pentecost 2,000 years ago, and coming to maturity with a strength so vital that it communicated itself to the cultures of those peoples who once made Europe great and America possible.

The men who most contributed to the early building of our Nation feared God. They did so with a holy and a wholesome fear, and because they did they wrote into the preamble of the constitution of my own native State, typical of that of many, devout words of homage to their Creator, with a recognition of their dependence on Him and an explicit prayer for His direction in the mighty task of building their Commonwealth.

FOUNDERS FEARED GOD

They feared God, and so they did not talk glibly of a mere freedom to worship God, a freedom which they had scant intention of exercising or implementing. Rather, they wrote in the second article of their Constitution words of right, but also of duty. They said: "It is the right as well as the duty of all men in society publicly and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and Preserver of the universe."

Such men feared God. They would have found unintelligible the suggestion that there is and need to be no connection between the law of God and the law of the land, between personal morality and civic public virtue.

Every American who walks in their tradition and who is in his right mind, acknowledges that morality and legality, like church and state, have separate areas of competence, separate formalities and separate sanctions; but the legislators, justices and lawyers who fashioned our basic legal traditions would have been appalled by the contention, now so often, so glibly, and so effectively advanced, that such separation means divorce of the law of the land from the law of God, and that religious morality and civic virtue spring from totally distinct and completely separate, if not mutually antagonistic, sources.

LAW OF THE LAND

Nothing could be further from the mind of the men who wrote the basic laws of our States, the Founding Fathers who placed the Bible, God's law, on the very rostra where they took their oath to defend the law of the land. They would have had no trouble defining blasphemous or vicious as applied to efforts to represent them as indifferent to the relation of civil obligation to moral duty, the law of the land to the rule of reason and the rule of reason to the law of God.

They would have resented as fraudulent the current kind of censorship by exclusion, thought-control by silent, carefully editing, reflected in a paperback edition which purports to offer collegians and others the basic thought of Thomas Jefferson and yet edits out all the characteristic references to God, to virtue, to morality and to the blessings of religion which the author of the Declaration of Independence made so frequently.

Fortunately the bench and bar are not yet without men who dare—and the word "dare" is needed—to speak in the spirit and accent of the founders and fashioners of our legal heritage, as did that Protestant judge on the west coast who recently braved the wrath of the new secularists, and incurred it, by suggesting from the bench that a Catholic boy would improve his regard for the law of the land by increasing his respect for the law of God and his consequent attendance at Sunday mass.

INSURGENT SECULARISTS

The Catholic bishops of America have drawn the fire of the insurgent secularists, and some of their own, because of their defense of the traditional American concept of the sovereignty of God over church and states alike, the concept of the necessary relation between all ultimately valid laws and the postulates of the law of God.

Sometimes criticism of the Catholic bishops for their opposition to the spirit of secularism has come from surprising, even disappointing, quarters. But equally often, there is consoling evidence that in the appeal for the spiritual philosophy of the Founding Fathers, Protestants and Catholics can and do speak as one. Nor are they alone.

For example, when the Catholic hierarchy issued its collective pastoral on the damage of secularism in the national life, Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, an executive of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, made it clear that his coreligionists, whatever their positions on other and secondary matters, would stand together with us in what he called the "common fight against the inroads of humanistic secularism and the attacks of atheistic communism" which would "undermine the spiritual foundations upon which our freedoms, civilization, and our culture necessarily rest.

STANDARD OF MORALITY

Those foundations have always included the recognition that there are not two standards of morality. There is only one. It is God's standard. That standard is the norm and rectitude, righteousness, and justice. That single standard covers all man's relations to God, to himself and to the world about him.

It applies to every conceivable situation in life—in the home, in business, in the school, in the political field, or in the field of entertainment. The thoughts of men are many; the will of God is one—and so by its very nature, God's standard precludes that duplicity which not only tempts man to live his life on two levels, one of morality, the other of legality, while beguiling him into thinking that this can be done without any compromise of moral principles.

Such a two-faced way of living explains the scandalous anomaly evident at times in our national life of paying lipservice to God while failing to honor His claims in daily life. Of such a way of life, the God is neither Jehovah nor Jesus Christ; it is Janus—and we do well to pray earnestly and resolve mightily that we will always be at one in repudiating the two-faced god of the pagans.

That God's standard has disappeared more and more from our national life is due, as the Catholic bishops and the Presbyterian moderator both bear witness, to that totalitarian secularism and practical atheism which rule out all idea of the sovereignty of God.

Against such lamentable pretensions we must bear, in season and out, uncompromising witness to God's dominion over all the works of His hands, ourselves and our societies included. We must be vigilant and prompt to affirm the sovereignty of God and His place in human affairs wherever opportunity presents. Where there is talk of the service we owe anything less than God, we must recall the principle by which St. Joan resolved every question pertaining to rival loves and loyalties: The Lord God must be first served.

TEMPORAL AFFAIRS

The undermining of the standard of God's law in temporal affairs has been further hastened by the denial or neglect of the primacy of the spiritual, with a consequent debasing of human personality and degrading of human society. Ours is in large part a technical civilization, a know-how rather than a know-why civilization, and, therefore, one in which material and mechanical values inevitably tend to dominate thought and action. Excessive emphasis on know-how to the exclusion of speculation on know-why have produced the cult of the body, the predominance of the material, the worship of the gadget, an indifference to the spiritual, and a repudiation of the moral.

We may note this in professional discussions, especially those pertaining to sociology, medicine, and politics. Take, for example, the question of social disease which touches on all three. It offers an obvious example of how medical treatment on the material level alone, scientific techniques of know-how without reference to moral considerations of know-why, are woefully inadequate as means to the protection or the perfection of persons.

Obviously in the case of the treatment of social disease, the problem is never purely scientific—and neither can the solution be. These actions and the offenses involved are never merely legal questions; they always include moral elements that are at the heart of the matter.

NEOSECULAR APPROACH

And yet, in Social Medicine, a publication of the New York Academy of Medicine, I read this significant paragraph typical of the neosecularist approach:

"Not long ago health administrators thought that if only some excellent curative agent were available to treat venereal disease

cases, the problem could be solved fairly promptly. Now penicillin is providing more satisfactory treatment than the most sanguine might have dared hope, and yet we find that instead of diminishing, the venereal disease rate is rising. Recently the venereal disease director of one of our best State health departments said that he is convinced that the problem is much broader than that of treatment alone.

"There must be a concerted assault on all aspects of the situation if effective control is to be secured. Treatment must be pushed as completely and carefully as possible. There must also be an attack by all community agencies which can help to remove conditions leading to promiscuity. Sex education must be improved and decent recreational opportunities made available. Home ties will have to be strengthened, prostitution repressed, and intensive efforts made to rehabilitate socially those now engaged in prostitution and perversion."

MORAL CONSIDERATIONS

Now what all of us, you and I, should find discouraging, what, as a matter of candid fact, we should find downright dishonest in this paragraph, as in the whole report, is the studious avoidance of the use of the word "moral." There is talk of "family relations," "prostitution," numerous other notions all involving morality, moral codes, moral judgment, moral relations, moral questions—but a careful and surely not accidental omission of the word "moral." The omission is significant and I am afraid it is symptomatic. It is also fatal, fatal not merely to morality, but in final terms, to the work, prestige, and interest of medicine, sociology, and law.

It exemplifies that repudiation of the primacy of the spiritual which is the unhappy byproduct of a know-how without know-why civilization, and of the effort to divorce the laws and procedures of the land from the law and the providence of God.

It should be our common concern to give the lie to any such pretense of the independence of valid legal philosophy from moral philosophy, and divorce of valid human law from the ultimate law of God. For all human laws, whether ecclesiastical or civil, have their source in God's law; otherwise they are meaningless. All human sanctions ultimately depend for their force and their meaning on the sanction of the conscience that is sensitive to the law of God.

The appeal to that conscience must be made by both the teachers of the law of God and the practitioners of the law of the land or all law is in peril. So intimately bound up with one another are the laws of the land and the law of God, that he who mocks the one, undermines the other—while he who serves either becomes the noble servant of both.

NOT TWO STANDARDS

The spiritual foundations upon which Western civilization rests have always included the recognition that there are not two standards of morality, the bishop stressed. There is only one. It is God's standard.

"This standard," he said, "precludes that duplicity which not only tempts men to live his life on two levels, one of morality, the other of legality, but beguiles him right into thinking that this can be done without any compromise of moral principles.

"Such a two-faced way of living," he said, "explains the scandalous anomaly evident at times in our national life or paying lipservice to God while failing to honor His claims in daily life. Of such a way of life, the God is neither Jehovah nor Jesus Christ; it is Janus—and I pray that we will always be as one in repudiating the two-faced god of the pagans."

Highlights of Congressional Activities of the 86th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

THE NEW CONGRESS

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, the convening of the new 86th Congress on January 7 saw the division between the parties more pronounced than it has been since the early days of the Roosevelt ian era—the New Deal. In the House of Representatives the division was 282 Democrats to 153 Republicans; in the Senate 62 to 34.

PROGNOSTICATIONS AND PREDICTIONS

It was a field day for the political analysts. Their predictions as to what might be expected because of the lopsidedness of the membership were as numerous and varied as their reasons for the cause of the Democratic trend. Dire and somber were many in their forecasts, anticipating a spendthrift and wasteful Congress; others, just as dour and gloomy, anticipated traveling over wide-open roads toward the welfare state. Others, concluding that the Democratic trend evidenced the public's dissatisfaction and disclaimer of the administration's policies—which placed greater importance upon strengthening and restoring the economy of foreign countries than upon clearing the stagnant and polluted economic waters at home—predicted aggressiveness in meeting and dealing with our own domestic problems.

FACTS AND REALITIES

As the session unfolded, it became evident that the 86th Congress was solid and substantial. Although the existence of a divided government substantially hampered the legislative efforts, the calendar of achievements emphasizes the basic reality that the Congress was a most productive one in terms of National needs. In meeting many of the domestic demands, the administration offered nothing other than an adamant and negative attitude—but the Congress, through appeasement methods, was able to get through a program adequate to meet the requirements on a temporary basis.

Unfortunately, in the field of agriculture, which has always been looked upon as the barometer of our economic life—and of first importance to Kentucky and the Sixth Congressional District—progress was stymied due to this no progress attitude being implemented by the veto power of the President.

THE WORK OF CONGRESS

The Congress remained in session for 251 days, adjourning September 15. This represented the longest session since 1951. There were 13,837 measures introduced; 2,237 measures reported, and approximately 289 public and 185 private bills enacted into law. To record its proceedings over 18,810 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were used.

COST OF GOVERNMENT

Government operating costs, like the cost of living, went up. And, while the Democratic Congress acted with alacrity to dispel the stigma which the administration so avidly attempted to affix to it—spendthrift and wasteful—the final sums appropriated represented the largest peacetime expenditure fiscal year in our history. Yet, the end result reflected approximately $1.9 billion less than the moneys the President originally requested.

As in recent previous years, analyses of the contemplated "costs" disclose that well over one-half the operational moneys required and appropriated were for military and defense purposes:

Analysis of appropriations

Appropriated—86th Cong., 1st sess.	$72,978,000,000
Less deficiencies incurred in fiscal 1959	2,765,000,000
Appropriations for regular operations, fiscal 1960	70,213,000,000
Less:	
Defense Department, operations	39,223,000,000
Military construction	1,364,000,000
Mutual security (military and defense activities)	2,100,000,000
Total security, military needs and activities	42,692,000,000
Balance, other than military and defense activities	27,521,000,000

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Dominating the administration's idea of importance was its program calling for continuation of the so-called mutual security program—foreign aid for rehabilitation and development. While substantially reducing the money request of the President for these programs' operations, the moneys authorized and appropriated by Congress were, in its opinion, adequate for the needs.

In addition, the Congress authorized participation by the United States in the Inter-American Development Bank, established primarily for the purpose of bettering the economic positions of the nations of the Western Hemisphere, and to strengthen their trading potentials in the international field.

Further, the Congress authorized increased subscription for U.S. participation in the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. These organizations are comprised of friendly nations, and have for their purpose and objective the stabilization of the various monetary systems, and providing a source of money for repayable long-term loans for eligible reconstruction and development projects.

ON THE HOME FRONT

Fiscal management: Following the urgent request of the administration, the Congress authorized an increase in the debt limit of $2 billion, which fixed the limit officially at $285 billion. In addi-

tion, it provided for a temporary increase of $10 billion to $295 billion, expiring June 30, 1960. In this connection, it is interesting to note that the interest cost of carrying the national debt has increased about 40 percent since 1953, the latest estimate being about $9 billion in interest in 1960.

Statehood: Provided for, contingent upon its acceptance, the Territory of Hawaii to be admitted to the Union as the 50th State.

Labor-management relations: Enacted an effective law to close the door of opportunity for unscrupulous persons preying upon honorable labor, management, and the public. In view of recent actions taken by certain labor leaders, the effectiveness of the law is already being evidenced.

General: Although confronted with stubborn opposition, the Congress was able to provide in a limited way for the continuation of housing, airport, health, and water-conservation Federal-participation programs.

The Congress provided for a supplementary financing program to provide moneys to defray the cost of continuing work on the Federal Interstate Highway Systems.

Authorized 43 new atomic-energy projects.

Increased lending authority of the Small Business Administration; authorized the Federal Reserve Board to lower reserve requirements of member banks; limited holding-company control of savings and loan associations; and expanded the lending and borrowing authority of national banks.

Extended the life of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, which assists buyers in small communities to find financing; raised limitations on expenditures under the special school milk program; extended for 5 years programs for training public health personnel and advanced training for professional nurses; extended for 4 years the Federal air pollution control program; and provided for a health insurance program for Federal employees.

GROUNDWORK FOR FUTURE ACTION

This Congress did not complete action on every proposition before it. No Congress has ever been able to do this in any one session. Even though the session has ended, the Congress endures. The problems that have not been settled will be carried over and considered the next session.

Groundwork for consideration of many issues has been laid through committee hearings, and so forth. During the interim, before the convening of the next session, committees will explore many important areas; principal among these will be made by the Ways and Means Committee respecting our present tax structure and the administration of our social security laws.

Further exploration of the field of agriculture will be made and it is hoped that from these will be devised new approaches to the many problems incident to the welfare of our farmers. Also, we are hopeful that time will see a mellowing of certain attitudes, so that agriculture might receive more friendly and sympathetic consideration.

This Congress has rendered effective service commensurate with its obligations to the Nation. Of course, of prime importance, and of great concern to me, are the specific needs of our own congressional district. The call upon me by individuals of our district has increased with each session. I received over 15,000 communications, and have been able to assist many of you with your problems. It is a genuine satisfaction to be of help, and to witness your interest and understanding in our democratic processes, in which we all place our hope.

Public Law 480 Operations Are Becoming Too Much Like Alice in Wonderland for Comfort

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of August 20, 1959:

OUR KIND OF PEOPLE

"It really looks as though the Americans are going to extend Public Law 480 once again." The Mad Hatter laid down his newspaper and stared fixedly over his bifocals at Alice.

"Is that good?" Alice asked.

"Yes and no. I daresay the Americans think it's good. It means they can trade more of something they don't want and can't use for more of something else they don't want and can't use. Sometimes I suppose it's better to have more of something else than more of just plain something."

"Stop. You're talking in circles again," Alice said sharply. "What has all this nonsense got to do with Public Law—what was it?"

"Four eighty. Let me explain this: The Americans grow a lot more wheat than they can eat or sell; other things, too, but let's take wheat. The Government buys what they can't use or get rid of. It's been doing that for years. Now it has so much wheat and other crops there's hardly any place left to store it. Soon there'll be no room for people."

"Dear me. Why don't they stop growing so much wheat, then? Or people?"

"I knew I should have never broached this subject to a woman," the Hatter said angrily. "That's very complicated, I'm talking about Public Law 480. Under Public Law 480 the Government can dispose of some of this by——"

"Dispose of it? Does that mean give it away?"

"Well, no. They give some away, but they can't give it all away. Like I said, it's very complicated. Some North American farmers still sell their wheat overseas. So do some other countries. But the American Government pays very high prices for the wheat it buys; it does that to keep prices up. So if it gave away all its wheat, prices would break because nobody is going to buy anything he can get for free. Then the farmers and other countries producing wheat would be very angry. They are angry anyway, of course."

"Then you mean they sell it?"

"Well, yes, by which, of course, I mean no. Let's say the Americans 'sell' $100,000 worth of wheat they don't want to Wamaria; you remember Wamaria? Splendid little country. Well, the Wamarians either pay for it in metals or in $100,000 worth of their own currency, the wampa."

"Oh, this is beginning to sound very tiresome," Alice said impatiently. "Then the Americans do sell it. What's so unusual about that? They can use the metals or go out and spend the wampa someplace else."

"Not so fast," the Hatter said, raising an admonishing finger. "Not everything is as simple as it looks. The Americans don't need or want Wamarian metals any more than they want or need their own wheat. So far as the wampa is concerned, it isn't worth much anyplace outside of Wamaria; it isn't even worth much in Wamaria. Do you follow?"

Alice looked thoughtful. "It is beginning to sound interesting, now."

"Yes, and what happens is, instead of just being stuck with surplus wheat the Americans are now stuck with metals they don't want, with wampa, or both. Sometimes, though, they'll use some of the wampa to build, say—a road in Wamaria. Then they'll loan or give the road to the Wamarian Government."

"That is very curious," Alice replied. "Now let me think. If they want to give Wamaria wheat, why not give them that and forget the road? Or if they want to give them a road, why not build the road and forget the wheat? Why make it so complicated?"

"You just don't know the North Americans, my dear. To know them is not only to sympathize with them, but to like them. Whether they sell their wheat is of no importance to them. What is important is to get rid of it; and, in the process of getting rid of it to look like they're selling it. Remember, appearances are very important in North America."

"Still, it still makes some sense," Alice said. "I suppose they put all those wampa aside for a rainy day; then when they need them they'll spend them."

The Mad Hatter laughed uproariously. "Indeed they won't. Yes, they accumulate them, just like they accumulate wheat. But the only way they got any wampas out of Wamaria was promising that they wouldn't spend them, except when and if the Wamarian Government said it was OK, and that will probably be never."

Alice sighed again, smoothed down her dress and looked dreamily up into the trees that arched above the garden. "You know what, Hatter," she said after a minute, "I think I'd like North Americans. They sound like our kind of people."

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I again take this opportunity of reporting to my constituents, the people of Berks County, the 14th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

PURPOSE OF REPORT

This report summarizes my activities during the 1st session of the 86th Con-

gress, the position I have taken on important issues coming before the Congress, and the record of the Congress itself. It supplements my radio broadcasts, news reports and newsletters.

COMMITTEE WORK

I have served on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and the Committee on House Administration. The Commerce Committee has wide jurisdiction over transportation, communication, public health, railroad retirement, and matters affecting Federal regulatory agencies. I am also a member of the Health and Safety Subcommittee.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills I introduced call for improvements to the Social Security Act, an increase in benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, to improve the unemployment compensation system, to broaden representation on the Federal Reserve Board, and to expand the public health training program. Other bills I have introduced are to prevent wholesale abandonment of passenger train service, to limit publishers' second-class mail subsidies, to provide a health benefits program for retired Government employees, to encourage the hiring of middle-aged and older workers, and to increase earnings of the social security trust funds.

BOOSTING BERKS

Berks countians are particularly interested in the many Federal projects and programs in our area, all of which directly benefit our local economy and our people.

Each month an estimated 24,000 Berks County residents receive social security benefit checks totaling $1.5 million. Thousands more receive railroad retirement benefits and veterans' pensions. Unemployment compensation also helped several thousand unemployed Berks workers and their families.

Federally guaranteed home loans have been obtained by many Berks residents. Small business loans have been made to a number of firms to improve and expand their business. Efforts of local leaders to bring new industry into Berks County have had my full cooperation. Planning and construction work on several federally assisted highway projects has moved forward.

In Reading, the Walnut Street urban renewal project has become a reality, while the Cherry and Court Streets projects are moving ahead in their planning stages. The Reading Housing Authority's aged housing project has been approved. All are being assisted by Federal funds. The new $650,000 Naval and Marine Corps Training Center in Reading will soon be dedicated, while ground has been broken for construction of the National Guard Armory in Kutztown. $275,000 in Federal funds will go for construction of a new terminal building at the Reading Municipal Airport.

A number of Berks' townships and boroughs have received Federal funds for planning construction of sanitary-sewer systems and water-supply systems. Berks' industry continues to receive a considerable amount of defense contract and subcontract work.

RECORD OF THE FIRST SESSION

The 1st session of this Congress was characterized by the consistent refusal of the President and his administration to meet Congress halfway in working out the type of legislative program in the best interests of the American people. The use and threat of the veto, made real progress on many of the most important issues difficult and often impossible.

For example, Congress was forced to pass three housing bills—two vetoed. The unbroken string of 145 Eisenhower vetoes was finally broken when both the House and Senate overrode his second veto of the public works appropriations bill.

Like most Congresses, much of the work of the first session will not bear fruit until next year. Some worthwhile legislation was enacted during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. In many areas, partial action was taken by either the Senate or the House. In others, little progress was made. Each of these categories of legislation are discussed below.

CONTROL OF CONGRESS

Despite the largest paper Democratic majorities in the House and Senate in two decades, the actual margin of control on most issues in the 86th Congress has been in the hands of the administration, aided by a coalition of Republicans and conservative southern Democrats. The coalition relies on the veto power of the President and the ability of the conservative majority on the House Rules Committee to prevent many major legislative proposals from reaching the House floor for debate.

This combination has blocked enactment of such vital measures as aid to education, area redevelopment, civil rights, improved unemployment compensation standards, and amendments to the Employment Act to promote price stability. Also a more adequate housing and urban renewal program, an expanded water pollution control program, community facilities legislation, a Youth Conservation Corps, a hospitalization and medical insurance program for social security recipients, natural resource development, and many similar types of programs essential to the well-being of our people.

ADMINISTRATION FISCAL POLICIES

The last fiscal year ended with the largest peacetime deficit in our history—$12.5 billion, despite the fact that the 85th Congress reduced the administration's spending requests by over $5 billion. The 1st session of the 86th Congress cut President Eisenhower's budget by $1.8 billion.

The cost of living stands at a record high. Effects of the economic recession are still being felt in hundreds of communities throughout the Nation. Unemployment continues to be a major economic problem.

The national debt has risen to $290 billion, an increase of more than $20 billion since President Eisenhower took office. Interest on the national debt has increased sharply because of the hard money, high interest rate policies of the administration.

The annual cost to the American taxpayers of these policies is an estimated $10 billion over pre-Eisenhower years in higher taxes, higher payments on homes, cars, business loans, and other items bought on credit. Hard money policies have raised the interest rates on business loans and Government bonds to their highest levels since the 1930's and continue to be the major inflationary force in our economy.

Hard money has made it more difficult for many small businesses to borrow for expansion purposes and is a big factor in causing higher local and State taxes. Many State and local governments have been forced to curtail needed public works, school construction, and other essential projects. Our rate of economic growth has been sharply curtailed as a result of these administration economic and fiscal policies, while the Soviet Union exceeds our rate of growth by an ever larger margin.

Past efforts in Congress to conduct a full investigation of administration fiscal policies have been blocked by the conservative coalition. Renewed efforts must be made in the next session for such a probe. I believe the people are entitled to know the facts about these financial dealings which are harmful to all but a small minority of citizens.

One of the most important victories in this session of Congress was the rejection by the House by a 2 to 1 vote of the administration's request for an increase in the legal ceiling on long-term Government bonds. Interest on series E and H savings bonds owned by millions of Americans was properly raised. I saw no good reason why interest rates on bonds bought by the average citizen should be so much less than those held by big financial interests. Congress did, however, stand firm against lifting the long-term bond rate which has already reached the record high in 35 years, but the President is pressing hard to increase these already high interest rates.

UNFAIR DOUBLE STANDARD

While paying record high interest to large banks and insurance companies which purchase Government bonds, the administration has been borrowing from the social security trust fund at abnormally low rates of interest. Under this double standard, the people who have paid into the trust fund are being short changed by $260 million a year or $750,000 a day.

This loss would help pay the cost of needed improvements in the Social Security Act. The administration has regularly opposed liberalized amendments to this law. Its fiscal policies actually rob old folks of social security benefits to which they are justly entitled. I have introduced a bill to require the Government to pay the social security trust fund a comparable rate of interest to that which it pays big financial interests. This would put a stop to this shocking double standard.

CONGRESS VERSUS IKE

In the more partisan atmosphere of the session, a number of bitter fights between Congress and the administration developed. Among the victories scored

by Congress were the rejection of the President's request for an increase in the bond interest rate ceiling, the refusal to consider his request for another increase in first-class postal rates, and the overriding of his veto of the public works money bill.

Congress also ignored the President's opposition to the water pollution control program, rejected his proposed cutback of the Federal school aid program in districts affected by governmental installations, and scaled down his request for increased Federal gas taxes.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM

In the last Congress I strongly supported the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill. It was defeated then by the coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats.

There was virtually no difference in the anti-racketeering provisions of the Kennedy-Ervin bill passed this year by the Senate, the House committee bill which I supported, the Landrum-Griffin bill eventually passed by the House, and the final conference version finally enacted into law.

I opposed the substitution of the Landrum-Griffin bill for the committee bill because I felt that a number of its provisions were overly restrictive and punitive. Several sections of the bill would have made it virtually impossible for unions to organize in backward areas of the South, thus affecting the competitive position of northern industry and northern workers who enjoy decent labor standards.

The conference committee headed by Senator KENNEDY made some 15 changes in the Landrum-Griffin bill, removing many of the most objectionable features which would give unfair competitive advantages to southern industry. Because I felt that reform legislation was necessary, I voted for the final conference version of the bill enacted into law.

Here is a summary of other major legislation enacted by the 1st session of the 86th Congress, legislation of general interest which had my support and vote:

MEASURES ENACTED

Hawaii was admitted as our 50th State.

An omnibus housing bill was finally passed, providing public housing units, an aged housing loan program, continuation of the urban renewal program, the college housing program, and the FHA loan-guarantee program.

The Federal Airport Act was extended.

Health insurance was provided for Federal employees and their families, with the Federal Government paying part of the premium cost.

Increased funds were voted for hospital construction and for medical research on cancer, heart disease, and other killing and crippling diseases. Funds were provided under the Hill-Rhodes Act for public health education purposes.

The Renegotiation Act was extended for 3 years, providing for the recovery of excess profits on defense contracts.

Corporate and excise tax rates were generally extended. The tax on local telephone calls was repealed and the transportation tax on persons reduced from 10 to 5 percent, both effective on June 30, 1960.

The draft law was extended for 4 years, although I personally favored only a 2-year extension and a study as to how military manpower could be better utilized.

At the administration's request, the national debt ceiling was raised to $285 billion, with a temporary increase to a $295 billion ceiling.

The uninterrupted construction of the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System was assured by enactment of a temporary 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax. I opposed the President's request for a 5-year 1½-cent-per-gallon increase and supported the compromise measure only as a last resort to prevent the stoppage of the highway program because of the anticipated deficit in the trust fund later this year.

Funds were provided for our National Defense establishment and for continuation of the mutual security program. Participation in the Development Loan Fund, the Inter-American Development Bank, and increased subscription in the International Monetary Fund and World Bank were authorized.

The air-pollution control program, of importance to Pennsylvania and other industrial States, was extended for 4 years. I was selected by House Speaker SAM RAYBURN to serve on the Senate-House conference committee on this legislation. The public health traineeship program was extended for a 5-year period.

Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act benefits were extended for 3 months to jobless whose State payments expired before April 1, 1959.

The Federal Credit Union Act was broadened and liberalized.

The non-service-connected veterans' pension program was revised to base the amount of pensions on need. While agreeing with many of the provisions of this bill, I could not support the fundamental changes which it makes in the entire pension system. The new law also ignores what I believe is the need for a separate pension program for World War I veterans. However, World War II and Korean widows were made eligible for pensions on the same basis as World War I widows. The new pension levels will not reduce the pension of any veteran now on the rolls, but will apply to those becoming eligible for pensions after July 1, 1960.

PARTIAL ACTION

Partial action was obtained on other important legislative proposals during the first session.

Area redevelopment legislation to provide Federal loans and grants to economically depressed sections of the country was passed by the Senate, approved by the House committee, but is stalled in the House Rules Committee.

A comprehensive civil-rights bill has been reported by committee, but is also blocked by the Rules Committee, as is a Federal school-aid bill for construction of needed classrooms and to improve teachers' salaries. A Federal-aid school-construction bill has been approved by a Senate committee.

A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to promote price stabilization and a bill extending coverage under the unemployment compensation system have also been stalled by the Rules Committee.

A measure to establish a Youth Conservation Corps to work in national parks and forests has been passed by the Senate.

The "health for peace" bill has also been passed by the Senate, as has legislation to curb monopolistic bank mergers, and a bill to provide GI educational, home purchase, and rehabilitation benefits to post-Korean veterans. A bill providing home rule for residents of the District of Columbia was also approved by the Senate.

The House has passed bills to tighten the postal laws against obscene material, to reduce the cabaret tax from 20 to 10 percent, and to permit tax reductions of up to $2,500 a year for self-employed persons who set aside part of their income annually for voluntary retirement plans.

Other measures approved by House committees included a bill to provide grants to local communities and nonprofit agencies to finance projects to combat juvenile delinquency, and a bill to establish a National Fair Trade Act.

No action was taken on bills to raise the minimum wage and broaden coverage under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Hearings were held on my public health education bill and on a proposal to provide a hospitalization and surgical insurance program for persons eligible for social security benefits. Hearings on measures to liberalize the Social Security Act will be held in the next session.

AVAILABLE FOR MEETINGS

This report obviously cannot discuss each of the measures mentioned in much detail. Other issues before Congress have not been dealt with because of space requirements. As in past years, I again welcome the opportunity to appear before any group in Berks County to speak and answer questions on any issue which may be of interest. Contact my office in the Reading Post Office Building with any such request or on any other matter with which you are concerned.

Halfway Through the Khrushchev Visit We Need To Pause and Remember the Facts

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Edgar Ansel Mowrer written just before Mr. Khrushchev arrived on our shores:

HOPEFUL AMERICANS NEED TO BE WARY

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

Every human being is interested in the hope for peace represented by Nikita Khrushchev's current visit to the United States. But no American should forget what Mr. K is and what he stands for. Here are a few cardinal points:

1. Despite some relaxation at home, Khrushchev is the dictator of the world's last giant empire, Russia, the most persistent and successful imperialistic entity on record, which has grown from a small 15th-century duchy to something over twice the size of the United States.

2. Soviet rulers talk anticolonialism and weep crocodile tears over the oppressed colonials, while continuing to practice colonial dominion over almost a hundred captive peoples. Some of these yearn for independence and a few, the Ukraine, Georgia, etc., have actually revolted against Moscow and been suppressed as independent Hungary was suppressed in 1956—by Khrushchev. In some of its colonies, the Baltic States, Birobidzhan, etc., the U.S.S.R. has practiced deliberate genocide by exiling and murdering thousands and replacing them with Russians.

NIBBLING EXPANSION

3. Russian policy has traditionally shunned major war, unless attacked, and expanded by nibbling its neighbors to death—the same method it is practicing today in the name of communism.

4. Czar Nikita is also high priest of communism, a worldwide conspiracy concealing

a naked love for power behind a materialistic ideology and false economics. His aims are thus conquest and forced conversion of the conquered.

5. Since, except for a few months in 1917, the Russian peoples have never known political freedom, it is foolish to expect them to be anything but the docile instruments of their Communist rulers.

6. The U.S.S.R. began its political career by betraying its allies of World War I and making a separate peace with Germany. This is in accord with Communist morality: only that is right which serves communism—whether mass murder, arbitrary rule, unspeakable cruelty, suppression of the truth, lies or deception of friend and foe. The 42 years of Soviet history are heavily strewn with the fragments of broken agreements.

7. In 1939 Stalin deliberately provoked World War II by agreeing with Hitler to divide Poland. When the two thieves fell out, Hitler attacked Stalin. Hard-pressed Britain, followed by the United States, could do nothing but welcome the U.S.S.R. as an ally and supply it with the means whereby it successfully defended itself. Yet Stalin yielded nothing of his plan to dominate and communize eastern Europe and treated his Western allies as half enemies.

BROKE PROMISES

Once he had used our common victory to snatch all he could, he coldly broke with the West, violated his promises, managed to communize Czechoslovakia, helped China go Red, supported the Red Chinese in Korea. Despite the American monopoly of the atom bomb, he refused to yield an inch of his conquests. Nowhere since 1945 (except perhaps in Greece and Austria) has communism retreated. In the last 3 years Khrushchev has openly threatened war over Suez and West Berlin.

8. Although Nikita's method of ruling differs from Stalin's, there is no evidence he has abandoned the latter's ambition of dominating the world—not indeed by open war but by threats, lies, and minor aggression (as in Laos), all smothered in the syrup of peaceful coexistence.

9. Despite Ike's invitation to visit the United States, Mr. K. still demands Western abandonment of West Berlin.

Against this background, Americans, while hoping for peace, will do well to be wary.

Spirituality and Prayer: Last Secret Weapons Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following remarks by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, on the Manion Forum Network:

DEAN MANION. The Manion Forum is proud to present His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston.

Cardinal CUSHING. Thank you, Dean Manion. About 100 years ago a disorderly cynical man, bitter and rebellious against society, wrote a couple of books. A gay fellow, wealthy, atheistic, revolutionary, collaborated with him.

Their names were Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

"The Communist Manifesto" and "Das Kapital" were the titles of the books.

Filled with the theory, and the philosophy of atheistic communism, these books became known as the bible of communism.

Marx and Engels taught that throughout history there was a struggle between the rich and the poor. It was the war of the classes.

They believed that eventually capitalism would destroy itself through warfare and economic depressions.

Refusing to await this eventuality they called upon the workers of the world to rise up against the capitalists and put an end to the existing social order by revolution. Violence was their road to success.

"Workers, arise. You have nothing to lose but your chains. You have a world to win."

Despite this vigorous appeal of Marx and Engels, the results were disappointing. Another and more practical exponent of atheistic communism was needed.

In due time he appeared. Almost 60 years have passed since has arrival. He also wrote a book and called it "What Is To Be Done?"

What was done by that writer and his followers explains our present-day crisis and affects the future of every inhabitant of this earth. When the book was published, in 1902, its author was in exile. Living frugally on small subsidies from the political underworld, dressed in a cheap suit, and scorning all the values of his middle-class heritage, this man was the self-appointed leader of a handful of outcasts.

To the property owners, capitalists, statesmen, clergymen, and generals of his day, this lawyer and his circle of impractical agitators belonged to the lunatic fringe of society.

The power elite of that day ignored his pamphlets; they didn't read his book. I doubt if many property owners, politicians, teachers, statesmen, clergymen, and generals of our times have read his book.

Yet that man and his impoverished disciples, inspired by Marx and Engels, exploited the practical, concrete ideas set forth in his book, "What Is to Be Done?" Their successors have seized two continents and set fire to all others by engineering the most skillfully executed power grab in human history.

Today, whole libraries, as well as the graves of some 20 nations and at least 40 million people, bear witness to the deadly political science of a movement whose conquests exceed the combined empires of the greatest conquerors in history and whose accelerating capability to lay waste the world is the touchstone for determining our national and even our private objectives. That lawyer's name was Lenin.

LENIN TURNED ON THE POWER

Five thousand miles and nearly six decades removed from the publication of his book, "What Is To Be Done?" Americans who never heard of Lenin must face the consequences of his indomitable will and his fearful talent.

Prior to this day the various forms of socialism were sentimental daydreams and quack experiments. But to Lenin, communism was not a crackpot idea; it was a power technique. It was more than a philosophy, it was a religion without God, a revolution without free men, a triumph of organized weapons of every category.

Under Lenin's tutelage, Communists became international conspirators and down through the years they have aspired to dominate and to rule the world.

Today they control two-fifths of the earth. They have swept beneath the Iron Curtain 900 million souls.

They libel their competitors; they poison the courts of public opinion; they blackmail governments. They belittle presidents, kings, queens, prime ministers, every one in their pathway.

And, thanks to the materialistic philosophy taught in higher institutions of learning, thanks to the apathy and indifference of the multitudes, to the subtle propaganda of an international fifth column and to unnumbered spies, pinks, reds, fellow travelers and followers of the line theorized by Marx and translated into action by Lenin in his book, the Communists have never wanted for collaborators.

They have never failed to find bankers and businessmen, professors and students, eccentrics and geniuses, traitors and sympathizers, politicians and would-be statesmen to overlok their frauds and forgeries, their lies and calumnies, their murders and slaves, their wars, hot and cold, that are part of the bloody record they have written on every page of the history of the past five decades.

And it all started with Lenin, who, weary of the talk, the debates, and the slogans, asked the question that all practical men with a purpose, good or bad, are obliged to ask, "What is to be done?"

Our position in the second half of this 20th century is the result of our failure to ask the same question, "What is to be done?" not against the upside-down social order of this country, but against one infinitely worse, communism. We baptized this conspiracy when our Government recognized it; we canonized it when we invited its leaders to our shores.

"What is to be done?" cried Lenin in his book. Communism was his answer. What is to be done, I ask, to contain, curtail, and conquer this monstrous thing? My answer must be that of a priest. Statesmen and others loyal to our tradition must answer for the political, economic, and social order of America.

What must be done? Go back to another book—the Book of the Gospels, where we will find the way, the truth, and the life. That Book contains the doctrines and the precepts of Christ just as the "Manifesto of Communism" contains the principles of communism.

Go back also to the Book of the Crucifix. That Book contains the story of a revolution by love, greater by far than the revolution by blood found in the book of Lenin.

WITHOUT SPIRITUALITY—NO MORAL LEADERSHIP

The spiritual answer to communism is the way of life taught by Jesus Christ. Those of us who are Christians must live in accord with the teachings and the precepts of the Gospel. Once we accept the Gospel, we can never be the same again.

We must be dedicated to live the life of Christ within the framework of our nature, place, and condition. Until we so live we shall not attain moral leadership in a world that lacks leadership; nor shall we give the multitudes behind the walls of slavery the hope and courage that they will never get from our boasted power and wealth.

Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Khrushchev have produced the Communist man; he is enslaved, silenced, a little better than a dumb animal.

Christ and His Gospel have produced saints; they are free, perfect men, a little less than the angels.

The Book of the Bible and the cross, carried by every explorer who set foot on the Western Hemisphere, can change the world.

Lenin realized this. When he was awaiting the summons of death and had the opportunity of reflecting on the results of his book and the revolution it inspired, in sorrow and fear he cried out:

"I have made a great mistake. Our main purpose was to give freedom to a multitude of oppressed people but our method of action has created worse evils and horrible massacres. It is a deadly nightmare to feel that I'm lost in this ocean of blood coming from innumerable victims.

"It is too late to turn back now. In order to save our country, Russia, we should have had 10 men like Francis of Assisi. With 10 such men, we should have saved Russia."

And who was St. Francis of Assisi? Everybody's saint, probably the most perfect human reproduction of Jesus Christ and His Gospel that the world has ever seen.

Mr. Khrushchev, guest of our President, it is not too late for you to turn back. That you will do so I have encouraged millions of people to pray for you and your people during your visit to our country.

At the same time, we are praying for the multitudes in your captive nations and for the unnumbered dead whom you sent to premature graves. They will become a nightmare to you as they did to Lenin, Marx, and Stalin before they died.

Time is running out. With your visit to America everything has now been tried to placate you, to convert you. You wanted this visit. All things considered it is probably your greatest victory in the cold war.

Having failed in all our efforts to satisfy you, we have turned to our secret weapon—prayer. God grant that it will be effective.

DEAN MANION. Thank you, Cardinal Cushing.

How Independent Is Peking of Moscow?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, for years American thinking on the Far East has been influenced, and in academic circles largely dominated, by a group of writers and teachers led by Fairbanks of Harvard, Lattimore, the old IPR clique, and a few others. In part, because of the volume of their writings, there is danger that their views, or perhaps I should say their "line," will come to be accepted as authoritative by the oncoming generation of scholars in this vitally important field.

The old agrarian reformer pose was demolished by the Chinese Communists themselves, but the myth that Chinese Communists are different lingers on. Their apologists are hard put just now to justify the communes within China, the confessed fakery of the great leap forward with its fake production figures, and the naked barbarism in Tibet. About the best the supposed experts can do for the moment is to take refuge in the alleged realism of the theory that we can safely rely upon Peiping's presumed independence of and even possible antagonism to Moscow.

It is important for the long future as well as for the present that the superficial scholarship of the above group be challenged now before it becomes a sort of orthodoxy. An excellent beginning has been made by Prof. Karl A. Wittfogel, a European scholar whom I first came to know in China in 1937, at a time when he too was somewhat beguiled by the proclaimed liberalism and democracy of the Chinese Reds. During the years he has studied the basic documents and deeds and based his thinking on hard facts instead of trying to adjust the facts to fit old and comforting theories. Dr. Wittfogel is director of the University of Washington's Chinese history project and author of several books, including "Oriental Despotism." In the following article from the New Leader of July 20, 1959, he analyzes the historical origins of a concept that has strongly influenced Western views of Chinese communism for many years—the notion that Mao Tse-tung's doctrine and practice deviated heretically from Moscow:

PEIPING INDEPENDENCE
(By Karl A. Wittfogel)

In 10 short years Mao Tse-tung's China has become a major power whose every move gives rise to endless speculation. Some western analysts believe that Peiping, although a primary factor in Asia, is only a secondary factor in world politics; others warn against underrating its global importance. The very argument illuminates the significance of the issue. Elementary political considerations require that we obtain as thorough an understanding of Mao's regime as possible. What are the possibilities—and the limitations—for achieving such an understanding in America today?

Understanding is an intellectual exercise that involves two interrelated yet distinct processes: factfinding and interpretation. An examination of American attempts to understand Communist China reveals that we are highly effective in gathering relevant data and highly ineffective in comprehending their meaning. Confronted with this double assessment, we are usually not too disturbed by the second stipulation (and this attitude underlines the overall problem); but we are genuinely surprised by the first. Do we not, as Americans, have special difficulties in getting the facts, since our Government, besides having no diplomatic relations with Peiping, also refuses to let our nationalists visit mainland China?

Under different conditions, this policy might indeed be a decisive limitation, but in the Chinese case its negative effect can be largely discounted because of the way in which the Communist system operates. Like other Communist states, the Peiping regime virtually controls all spheres of life, including the movements of foreign visitors and their opportunities for independent inquiry. Of course, these visitors see something—and what they see may have value—but generally they are unable to pierce the many smaller bamboo curtains that have been erected inside the big Bamboo Curtain along the territorial borders.

The Peiping government makes independent personal contacts between foreigners and Chinese intellectuals almost impossible; and its terror potential is so well recognized that even the most casual opinion is expressed with great caution. Hence the assertions made up to 1957 by a number of journalists that, to judge from appearances, the Chinese intellectuals generally liked the Communist regime were largely guesswork, and poor guesswork at that. The "Hundred Flowers" episode of May and early June 1957 showed that the majority of all Chinese intellectuals, students included, hate their rulers.

Peiping is equally determined that foreigners have only guided contacts with the Chinese toilers. In the summer of 1954, one of my friends accompanied the British mission to the Chinese mainland led by Earl Clement Attlee. Meeting him later, I asked why none of its members had commented on the collectivization that was then gaining momentum. The delegates, he answered, had wanted to see the villages, but they were kept from doing so. A Swiss journalist, Peter Schmid, who visited China in the winter of 1955–56, when collectivization had been completed, was treated with great courtesy, but he also met with stony resistance when he wished, on the spur of the moment, to make a short excursion to a village. His guide—who otherwise was most amenable—told him that such a visit could be undertaken only after official permission was obtained from Peiping, and he added almost indignantly: "I am sure, in Switzerland too, a foreign journalist cannot just go into the villages and talk with the people."

But while on-the-spot observations are restricted to the point of frustration, another type of inquiry—the critical study of Chinese Communist publications—is potentially very rewarding. The activists and officials of the Communist regime must communicate with one another, and partly and unavoidably they exchange factual and evaluative information through the press. Of course, they do this cautiously and in an Aesopian language that is supposed to inform insiders without betraying essential facts to outsiders. This, however, is no easy task, particularly when an issue must be treated concretely and in detail.

Thus, in veiled form, the Chinese Communist newspapers and magazines contain much relevant information, and this information is being most comprehensively gathered and translated outside the Bamboo Curtain by the American consulate general in Hong Kong. Systematically utilizing many dailies and periodicals—often from the far corners of the country and inaccessible to the foreign colony in Peking—this agency is assembling a wealth of data on Communist China. If the members of the Attlee mission had consulted the Hong Kong press translations, they would have been aware of the advancing collectivization and the rising bitterness in the villages which they were not allowed to observe. It is not too much to say that our Hong Kong consulate is probably doing a better job of gathering facts on Communist China than any other non-Communist organization.

But this excellent and important collection of raw material does not have the impact it deserves, since no adequate arrangements have been made to facilitate its analysis. Whoever wants to use the Hong Kong material must plow through mountains of data with only an alphabetical listing of titles to help him. Readers of the New York Times, which provides an index for everything it publishes, are better served. The same country that is willing to spend hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of dollars to gather vital facts is unwilling to spend $50,000 on an analytic index to aid in their interpretation.

These disparate conditions reflect a national weakness that is making serious students of American policy highly apprehensive. Henry Kissinger is convinced that our present political insecurity results from an extreme dependence on empiricism and an equally extreme avoidance of conceptual thinking. Robert Strausz-Hupé, James Dougherty, William Kintner, and Alvin Cottrell, in their recent book, "Protracted Conflict," deplore our inability to utilize large concepts in formulating long-range political strategy. I fully agree with the substance of these criticisms. But I believe that we suffer less from an absence of political concepts than from the inadequacy of those we invoke, and that we are handicapped not so much by lack of a long-range perspective as by a complacent, status quo perspective that was understandable in the 19th and early 20th centuries, but that is pathetically outmoded since the development of modern totalitarian systems of power.

The analyst who fails to distinguish between the conditions and attitudes of our multicentered society and those of the totalitarian world is like the person who fails to see the difference between a young cat and a young tiger. Such a person may note in-

teresting details of metabolism, eyesight, or skin texture; and he may even make meaningful comparisons between these features. But, lacking adequate concepts, he will not recognize the specific characteristics of the young beast of prey, which, sufficiently matured, may spell the doom of the inept observer.

Marxist-Leninist communism is a system of analytic and interpretative ideas and a cluster of organizational and strategic devices for the establishment and maintenance of total political, economic, and ideological power. The masters of the Communist apparatus-state stress power economy (internal and international) at the expense of subsistence economy. They constitute a ruling class whose proprietary and managerial control, social privilege, and ideological self-glorification surpass the prerogatives enjoyed by any other dominant elite known to man. The class consciousness of the new 'men of the apparatus" (apparatchiki) is matched, and perhaps surpassed, only by the class consciousness of the members of the totalitarian out-elite—the Communists in non-Communist countries whose hunger for total power is intensified by the difficulties they encounter.

These are elementary facts. Recalling them, we easily recognize the misconceptions that underlie certain widespread interpretations of Chinese communism. Time and again we are told that the Chinese Communists may want to assert their independence from Moscow to the point of open conflict. The upholders of this claim misjudge the primary attractions of total power, class interest and historical perspective which—despite continuous conflicts on a secondary level—unite the Chinese and Soviet Communists. Clarity on these facts facilitates the realistic appraisal of the relations between Moscow and Chinese communism, because it permits a realistic appraisal of the circumstances under which each of them operates. It exposes the fictitious nature of the argument that the Chinese Communists are conditioned to act independently of Moscow because, under Mao's guidance, they created a tradition of acting originally, and even heretically.

This argument, known as the Maoist thesis, is historical in form, but political in content. It arose, and persists, on the basis of inadequate concepts of Soviet communism (especially Leninism) and Chinese communism (especially the attitude of Mao Tse-tung). In 1948, John K. Fairbank, in his book, "The United States and China," suggested that Mao's policy, because of the special role it gave the peasants, followed the Chinese tradition of revolution rather than the Marxist. In 1951, under Fairbank's guidance, Benjamin Schwartz, in "Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao," elaborated the thesis that Mao pursued an unorthodox (Maoist) peasant policy. And in 1952, Conrad Brandt, Benjamin Schwartz, and John K. Fairbank bulwarked the Maoist thesis further in "A Documentary History of Chinese Communism," which presents translated Communist texts in chronological order along with interpretative comments.

According to the authors of the Documentary History, Mao took his first conspicuously heretical step in a study of rural conditions in his home province of Hunan (Report on an Investigation of the Hunan Peasant Movement), which he wrote in February 1927; and allegedly he manifested his importance as an original theoretician in 1940 in his pamphlet, "On New Democracy."

In his 1927 report, so say the authors of the "Documentary History," Mao did something "no previous writer of the Marxist-Leninist school had ever conceived of." He presented as "the 'revolutionary vanguard' of the bourgeois-democratic revolution • • • the poor peasantry," rather than the workers ("Documentary History," p. 79). He thus committed "a heresy in act" toward one of the "vital core presuppositions of Maxism-Leninism" (Schwartz: "Chinese Communism and the Rise of Mao," pp. 191 and 199; cf. also p. 78).

These are extraordinary assertions. Any serious student of Maxism-Leninism knows that Lenin distinguished between several types of bourgeois-democratic revolution, and that after the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 he devised a new type of peasant policy for the "backward" colonial and semicolonial countries of the East. In contrast to Tsarist Russia, where there had been a proletarian minority that could assume revolutionary leadership, the Communists of "backward" Eastern areas should, with Moscow's aid, rest their power strategy on the peasants or other nonproletarian "toilers," if proletarian support was unavailable. In 1920, Lenin pointed out that the new policy he was outlining was based on limited experience; and quite logically he argued for it primarily in terms of the problem of organizing revolutionary Soviets. But he did not—as Schwartz in passing remarks—only "speculate" on the possibility of Communist-led Soviets in nonindustrial areas. Far from it.

Referring to the Bolshevik experience in Central Asia, he stated as proven fact that Communists could successfully establish Soviets of peasants or toilers in "backward" colonial countries; and he insisted that, under comparable conditions, they continue to do so: In the noncapitalist colonial countries of the East, "Soviets are possible • • • they will not be Workers' Soviets, but Peasants' Soviets, or Soviets of Toilers" (Lenin: "Selected Works," New York 1943, X, p. 198; cf. pp. 236, 241, 242, 243 ff.; cf. also p. 231). Lenin's thesis was repeated emphatically by such top-ranking Comintern dignitaries as Grigori Zinoviev, G. I. Safarov, and Bela Kun. And while in February 1926 the Comintern leaders did not raise the slogan of Soviets, they went considerably beyond Mao, who credited the peasants with only 70 percent of all achievements in the Chinese democratic revolution. They called the peasants "the most important and decisive factor of the Chinese national-liberation movement" (International Press Correspondence, 1926, p. 649).

In the doctored edition of his "Selected Works" which began to appear in the early 1950's, Mao eliminated the sentence containing the 70-percent formula, obviously because he considered it too modest. Adherents of the Maoist thesis suggest that he did so because, in retrospect, he considered it too high. The arbitrariness of this interpretation is apparent when we remember the Comintern attitude in 1926-27 and a later statement by Mao, for which, by the way, he invokes Stalin's authority: "The Chinese revolution is virtually the peasants' revolution." Not 70 percent, but "virtually."

Lenin did not foresee the intricacies of the subsequent developments in large colonial or ex-colonial countries such as China and India; he did not foresee a political situation in which Communists would seize power in nonindustrial regions of a country that also possess industrially advanced regions; and, of course, he did not foresee the shifts in the interpretation of the slogan, "Peasant Soviets," that occurred during the intraparty struggle in the U.S.S.R. in 1926-27. But the gist of Lenin's 1920 directives is very clear—and very close to what supposedly is the "Maoist" position: In the nonindustrial areas of the backward East, the Communists should endeavor to seize power on a mass basis that essentially consisted of peasants or other nonproletarian toilers.

Obviously, then, the authors of the "Documentary History" are wrong when they describe the Leninist position as rejecting the idea of an eastern Communist-led democratic revolution based on the poor peasants. They are also wrong when they describe Mao's 1927 position.

In February 1927 Mao did not recommend the revolutionary policy we have just outlined, and this for good reason. Mao's Hunan report was written at a time when the Chinese Communists were maintaining a united front with the Kuomintang, and, following Moscow's orders, they were making every effort to continue it. Mao, who was then a high-ranking dignitary in the Kuomintang (and, of course, in the Communist Party), stressed the leadership of the poor peasants in the rural revolution and the importance of the peasants (70 percent) in the national revolution under a hierarchy headed by the revolutionary authorities, that is, the revolutionary Nationalist government which was heir to Sun Yat-sen's Canton regime and which was controlled by the left Kuomintang and supported by the Communists.

The authors of the "Documentary History," who consider Mao's Hunan Report a "revolutionary classic," present only one-third (the first two sections) of the document without indicating that the original text is much longer. Yet even this third makes it clear that Mao is commenting on the peasant policy of the revolutionary Nationalist government. In a later chapter which discusses local revolutionary organizations, only one party is mentioned—the Kuomintang. When both parties are mentioned, as happens once, Mao places the Kuomintang before the Communist Party. In conformity with with the Moscow-imposed united-front policy, the earlier versions of Mao's report do not refer to the leading role of the Communist Party. Significantly, the few sentences that make this claim appear first in the doctored version of volume I of Mao's "Selected Works" published in 1951.

Thus the Hunan Report does not call for Communist leadership. Nor does it try to rally the poor peasants behind the Communists by promising them land. Complying with the Comintern line and with the official policy of the left Kuomintang, Mao hailed the advance of the social and political revolution in the villages, and in this connection he was willing to use terror to the limit; but he hedged on the key economic question—the confiscation and distribution of the land. In the 1951 version of Mao's Hunan Report, we find a brief request that the land question of the poor peasants be solved. But in the earlier versions even this vague sentence is missing. More cautious than the Moscow leaders and some of his Chinese comrades, but congruent with Comintern directives not to disturb the united front with Kuomintang by promoting a drastic confiscation policy, Mao, in the original report, does not raise the land question at all.

The authors of the "Documentary History" do not comment on this crucial fact. Although they admit that in the late spring of 1927 the All China Federation of which Mao was the director, committed serious "opportunistic" errors, they do not state that on November 14, 1927—after the collapse of the united front in June-July and after the Communist-initiated autumn crop uprising—the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party removed Mao from the Politburo because of gross neglect of the agrarian revolution: "In the area of the [Hunan] uprising, the program of the land revolution and of the establishment of political power was never considered. The lack of such a program led the peasants to think that the uprising was nothing but Communist trouble-making. • • • Comrade Mao • • • was in fact the central figure of the Provincial Committee of Hunan. For the mistakes made by the Hunan Provincial Committee he must shoulder the most serious responsibility; and therefore he must be dismissed from his position as candidate to the Provisional Politburo

of the Central Committee" (Kuo Wen Weekly, vol. 5, No. 3, Jan. 15, 1928, pp. 6 and 7).

These developments explain why M. N. Roy, who in 1927 had visited China as a high Comintern official, could say that Mao "in the critical days of 1927 represented the extreme right-wing view of the leadership of the Communist Party." In Communist jargon, belonging to the extreme right wing of the party means pursuing the prescribed political line with utmost caution.

Roy's appraisal fits not only the Mao of the crisis situation; it is indicative of Mao's entire political behavior from 1923 to 1927, the time of the united front with the Kuomintang. Western, and even more, Asian students of Marxism-Leninism could greatly benefit from a realistic analysis of this period, which saw the first major attempt to utilize the forces of Asian revolutionary ("anti-imperialist") nationalism for Communist purposes. Mao played a prominent role in this fateful attempt; his so-called caution was nothing else than an extraordinary ability seemingly to support the Nationalist cause while actually promoting the interests of the Communists. (For a time, Mao was even acting head of all propaganda work of the Kuomintang.) Under these circumstances, it is most unfortunate, but entirely understandable, that Mao included in his "Selected Works" only two of his many writings of this period.

In their treatment of the early Mao, the authors of the "Documentary History" have distorted the historical record and contributed to significant political misconceptions about Chinese communism. Concentrating on only one of Mao's writings of this period, and then only on one-third of it, and misrepresenting both Lenin's position and Mao's policy, they have succeeded in converting a primary source of political information, namely, Mao's united-front career, into a primary source of confusion.

As just explained, the Maoist argument took as its starting point a faulty interpretation of Mao's policy of 1927. It was fortified by an equally faulty interpretation of Mao's policy of 1940 as expressed in his pamphlet, "On New Democracy."

The key thesis of "On New Democracy" is simple enough. In the middle phase of the Sino-Japanese war (after the conclusion of the Hitler-Stalin pact, which got the European war going and greatly strengthened Moscow), Mao Tse-tung, now the head of the Chinese Communists, was under less pressure to make concessions to the Chinese Nationalists than he had been in the prepact period. In accordance with Moscow's desire to protect its eastern flank, Mao maintained the anti-Japanese alliance with the Kuomintang, but he felt free to discuss the future development of China in terms of a not-yet-completed revolution. The second stage of this development was the Socialist revolution, but the first and immediately significant stage was the bourgeois-democratic revolution, which aimed at the establishment of a democracy. Challenging the political ideas of his Kuomintang allies, Mao stated that the to-be-created order would be a "new" democracy, which would come into being through a new type of bourgeois-democratic revolution. Instead of being led by the bourgeoisie, this new bourgeois-democratic revolution would be led by the proletariat and, being part of the proletarian and Socialist world revolution, it would evolve into socialism.

The serious student of communism realizes at once that the just-mentioned ideas were initiated by Lenin as early as 1905 and that after the Bolshevik revolution they were developed by Lenin and Stalin. Both men stressed two important new features—(1) the relation between the bourgeois-democratic revolution, Leninist style, and the proletarian world revolution, and (2) the supreme importance of the Leninist bourgeois-democratic revolution for the colonial and semi-colonial countries of the East, including, of course, India and China.

The authors of the "Documentary History" are fully aware of the Leninist-Stalinist origin of the theory of the new bourgeois-democratic revolution and democracy; but they claim that Mao was less well informed. Indeed, they claim that he presented this theory as his own: "as a genuinely new contribution to Marxist-Leninist theory—a contribution which had originated in China and which presumably placed its author, Mao Tse-tung, in the ranks of the great theoreticians of Marxism." They dramatize their thesis by saying that "the gesture to create a new theory re-emphasizing 'the historic peculiarities of the Chinese revolution' originated with Mao Tse-tung himself. It was a gesture with profound implications. It suggested that innovations within the Marxist-Leninist tradition could originate not only in Moscow but in other sectors of the world Communist movement as well" (Documentary History, pp. 260 ff.).

Examination of the text of On New Democracy leads to very different conclusions. It shows that Mao, after describing the Chinese bourgeois-democratic revolution as part of the proletarian world revolution states that this correct thesis of the Chinese revolution was already being propounded in China between 1924 and 1927, but that at that time the meaning of this theoretical proposition was not yet fully expounded, and consequently it was only vaguely understood (Mao; "Selected Works," III, p. 112). Thus, Mao does not claim that he created this theory in 1940, or that the Chinese Communists, who were vaguely familiar with it since the twenties, created it then. In fact, he states: "This correct thesis—of the Chinese revolution—propounded by the Chinese Communists is based on Stalin's theory." And to make his point crystal clear he reproduced two long Stalin quotations, the second tracing the key argument back to Lenin. In his concluding sentence, "From this it can be seen that there are two kinds of world revolution," Mao once more acknowledged that he received his correct thesis of the new democratic revolution and democracy from Stalin and Lenin.

The avowed purpose of the "Documentary History" is to provide textual documentation for the major developments of Chinese communism. How then do its authors deal with these passages that are so important for establishing Mao's originality—or lack of originality? Very simply indeed. They omit them. After presenting Mao's exposition of the "correct thesis," they skip over his remark that it was poorly understood by the Chinese Communists in 1924–27 and over his decisive statement that it was based on Stalin's theory. They also skip over Mao's quotations from Stalin. The passage they then reproduce begins with the words: "From this it is clear" [the official translation, as given above is "From this it can be seen"]. No reader would know from this arrangement that the summarizing phrase refers, not to Mao's presentation of the correct thesis, but to its acknowledged Soviet source.

It may be argued that On New Democracy is a long pamphlet and that therefore a selective reproduction is legitimate. This is true with one obvious qualification: The selected passages should indicate the major points of the text; and if the introductory note stresses the importance of a certain thesis, then the editors are in honor bound not to omit passages that are crucial to the validity of this thesis. Anyone may reproduce whatever he wants from Hitler's Mein Kampf, but if he claims that Hitler was not really an anti-Semite and then omits passages that prove the contrary, he would not only violate fundamental rules of scholarship, but misrepresent history as well.

The authors of the "Documentary History," who created the Maoist myth in 1951–52, had ample opportunities in subsequent studies of Chinese thought to correct their errors. But instead of doing so, they repeated their key conclusions, which, as we have seen, are in the main based on a misrepresentation of Mao's behavior in 1927 and 1940. In a review of Mao's "Selected Works" written in 1955 Schwartz failed to comment on the Hunan report, which in addition to being much longer than the version published in the "Documentary History," had been doctored by Mao in a way which made the Maoist interpretation of the report completely problematic.

In 1958 Brandt, in a monograph on the Chinese united-front period of 1924–27, repeats the claim that in the Hunan report Mao "put himself on record with a view that conflicted sharply with Moscow's" (Brandt: "Stalin's Failure in China," 1958, p. 107). And in the same year, the senior member of the group, John K. Fairbank, in a revised edition of "The United States and China," repeated the two key theses of the Maoist school. According to Fairbank, in 1927 Mao asserted the vanguard role of the poor peasants "heretically"; and in "On New Democracy" Mao "put himself on the level of Marx-Engels-Lenin-Stalin as an original contributor to Communist theory."

These faulty views have gained wide currency in the United States. Their damaging consequences are not restricted to their impact on purely academic understanding. For the political confusion they have engendered has strongly affected opinion-molders and policymakers in this country, and has thus hampered the development of a clear, consistent and farsighted policy for coping with the Chinese Communist threat. In this important respect, these views have done a distinct disservice to the free world.

It is vital to our survival that the record be set straight, and a small but growing number of Far Eastern specialists are doing just that. A realistic comparative study of the historical roots of Chinese and Soviet communism is possible. And such a study enables us to remove the widespread misconceptions regarding the character and intent of the present Chinese and Soviet regimes.

We know that Chinese Communist society, like other Communist orders, is faced with many conflicts. We know that numerous conflicts existed—and continue to exist—between the Chinese Communists and Moscow. But we know also that any analyst of these internal and international tensions is apt to misjudge their significance as long as he believes that, because of a peculiar Maoist tradition, the Chinese Communists tend to be heretically different from orthodox Communists.

This belief has supported the feeling that Mao's land policy of 1949 expressed again his inclination to be an agrarian reformer—actually, he deprived the peasants of the land newly distributed to them as soon as he was strong enough to do so. It has strengthened the view that Mao's collectivization was different because it was gradualistic—actually, the gradualistic pattern was outlined by Stalin as early as 1930, and it was put into practice in East Europe after World War II. It has encouraged the pleas for U.S. recognition of Communist China as a means of weaning Peiping away from Moscow—actually, recognition would bulwark Mao's conviction that the West is stupid and tottering and will be destroyed faster through the combined efforts of the Communist bloc. It has favored the idea that Mao was different and perhaps heretical, when in 1957 he made an analysis of contradictions under socialism—actually, this problem was comprehensively discussed in the U.S.S.R., particularly after Andrei Zdhanov's speech in 1947—and when he listed among them contradictions between the government and the people.

In the last instance Mao elaborated a point that Khrushchev had made in his criticism of Stalin on February 24–25, 1956. But Mao generalized and explained in public what Khrushchev had treated specifically and behind closed doors. Thus Mao's procedure displayed distinctive features, and this was also the case when he set out to organize supercollectives: communes.

These problems deserve the most careful consideration. But our analysis will be adequate only if we are fully aware of the conceptual and evaluative mistakes of the past and if we systematically develop the tools needed for the comparative study of Chinese doctrine and strategy.

The survival of the free world hangs in the balance today. Though this is no time for name calling, it is no time, either, for withholding vital criticism such as has been made here. It has been said that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. Today, the ideas which the scholars and opinion molders hold are no less crucial for the decisions the policymakers will make. Where, then, we may ask, are the schools, the universities, the foundations, and research centers that will determine victory—or defeat—in the present cold war?

Robert H. Goddard—House Joint Resolution 19

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a recent very ably written and timely editorial, "The 40-Year Trip to the Moon," which appeared in a recent edition of the Worcester Telegram.

This editorial, commenting on the gold medal authorized by Congress in recognition of the great scientist, Prof. Robert H. Goddard, deals with significant portions of the career of this great man.

Viewing his relations with the Government in retrospect and appreciating that out of his early scientific papers published many years ago came the basic ideas that made possible the recent rocket flight to the moon, it is evident that this honor has been all too long delayed.

To send a rocket to the moon was Professor Goddard's dream. Beset by an army of incredulous skeptics and doubting Thomases, he persisted with little encouragement indeed to conduct his complex experiments.

Looking back at his sorry experiences and the shabby treatment he received from Government officials and others, one fact stands out with stark clarity—lack of vision, yes, with few exceptions, even lack of common courtesy and consideration from Government officials and the industrial and academic leaders of Goddard's day.

A crippling intolerance of his ideas faced him at almost every turn. More often than not, he was rejected and turned aside. In only a few instances was he encouraged and helped. Only his incredible courage and tenacity sustained him.

If Government officials had exhibited, even so moderately, a degree of interest in Goddard's revolutionary concepts that the Germans displayed in the few years prior to World War II, this country would, without a doubt, be so far out in front in the current missile race and in space exploration that no other nation could presently match us.

But we cannot cry over spilled milk, nor in pardonably lamenting the stupid decisions of Government officials and others that turned Professor Goddard brusquely aside when he was on the threshold of miraculous achievements. It is too late to cancel out these grotesque errors of judgment.

That they have gravely handicapped this Nation in its military posture, in national defense, and in exploration potential could never be denied. These errors have irreparably harmed American science and the national interest, safety, and well-being.

That they have given to our possible enemies immeasurable advantages which the American Nation itself should have achieved is very clear.

We can only make the best of these grave mistakes and the ghastly critical situation that has directly flowed from them.

At the same time, we should more than piously hope that such mistakes shall not be made again; more importantly, that they are not being made even now, as numerous indications suggest.

I am gratified that at least House Joint Resolution 19, which I introduced in the Congress, also sponsored by my distinguished colleague, Congressman DONOHUE, was so fittingly passed and written into law. It at least affords some measure of belated recognition for one of history's greatest men.

The editorial referred to follows:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram, Sept. 14, 1959]

THE 40-YEAR TRIP TO THE MOON

"In my experiments I generally used a powder with an energy content of 563 calories per pound. With such a propellant, it would be possible to shoot a device * * * as far as the moon." (Dr. Robert H. Goddard in his paper on "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," submitted to the Smithsonian Institution in 1919.)

It was never given this man to see his dream come true. But he knew—40 years ago—that scientists could and would land a rocket on the moon. Goddard's conviction and the basic work which he did in the field have proved to be the most important propellant of all.

While the Russians are getting credit for landing the first manmade device on the moon's surface, it is appropriate to acknowledge the man who first told us (and them) that the feat could be accomplished.

Congress has voted a gold medal in honor of the late Robert H. Goddard, and no tribute could be more deserved. As the pioneer of rocketry, he merits all the honor that we—or the space age—can give him.

Goddard was a shy man and was repelled by the sensationalism with which his theories about space flights were treated in the press. As a man of science, he was appalled at the popular distortions of his ideas and the exaggerated reports of his undertakings. He wanted a privacy he could rarely achieve, but he also wanted an acceptance of his theories that a fearful and incredulous public denied him.

Thanks to the vision and generosity of a few individuals, Charles D. Walcott, of the Smithsonian Institution, Charles A. Lindbergh, and Daniel Guggenheim, Goddard was able to carry his experiments forward on a modest scale. If he had been able to persuade the American military leaders of his time that the rocket could be utilized as an instrument of national defense, the story of World War II might have been far different. As it was, the United States did not recognize military rocketry until the Germans—by copying some of Goddard's later models—produced the V–2 weapons used against Britain.

Emerson's observation that "to be great is to be misunderstood" was all too applicable to Robert H. Goddard. But on the day last week that Congress voted a gold medal in his honor, the Strategic Air Command launched a ballistic missile which traveled 4,400 miles from California to Wake Island. On the same day, in the Caribbean, a recovery crew aboard a Navy destroyer pulled from the water a test version of a space capsule designed to carry the first American astronaut into space.

The quiet Worcester physicist whose determination and genius opened a new epoch in human history had at last beyond all question been recognized both by his Government and by science.

And the newest scar on the moon's surface is testimony to Goddard's greatest. With his rockets he launched the whole science which has produced such triumphs.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the tremendous public interest and sincere concern that citizens across the land have displayed in the visit of Soviet Dictator Khrushchev to the United States, I enclose what I consider to be one of the most interesting and thought provoking editorials that I have seen regarding this question.

This editorial appeared in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily Calumet, one of the outstanding community newspapers in the country:

LEST WE FORGET

LEST WE FORGET—WHAT THEY HAVE SAID

Khrushchev said:

"If you don't like us, don't accept our invitations and don't invite us to come to see you. Whether you like it or not, history is on our side. We will bury you."

"If anyone thinks that our smiles mean the abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

"The Communists will destroy capitalism, not with nuclear weapons but through the spread of the ideology. We are as sure of this as we are sure the sun will rise tomorrow. All we have to do is grease our ideology with butter."

"Communism will sooner or later rule the world. We live in the epic of revolution."

What Lenin said:

"Promises are like pie crusts—made to be broken."

"We have to use any ruse, dodges, tricks, cunning, unlawful method, concealment, and unveiling of the faith."

"We will encircle the United States which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

What Stalin said:

"Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or iron wood."

What Trotsky said:

"We are in the phase of permanent revolution. It will go on, without interruption, until one side or the other is lying conquered on the ground."

What Kosiov said:

"My trip to America has only confirmed what I thought of this country before I arrived. I repeat the words of Mr. Khrushchev who asserted that 'the children of the present-day Americans will live in a Communist society.'"

What Dimitrov said:

"We are sometimes accused of departing from our Communist principles. What stupidity, what blindness * * * all the ins and outs of our tactics are directed to a single end—the world revolution."

"We must always remember that one sympathizer is generally worth more than a dozen militant Communists. A university professor, who without being a party member lends himself to the interests of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a 100 men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police. Every man has his value, his merit. The writer who, without being a party member, defends the Soviet Union, the union leader who is outside our ranks but defends Soviet international policy, is worth more than a thousand party members."

What Manuilski said:

"War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. To win we will need the element of surprise. The bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. There will be electrifying overtures and unheard-of concessions. The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down, we will smash them with our clenched fist."

LEST WE FORGET—WHAT THEY HAVE DONE

Nine hundred million enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain.

Twenty-eight million in Communist slave labor camps.

Millions upon millions of innocent men, women, and children killed by Communists since 1917.

They have already enlisted the aid of 1 million Americans to Communist causes.

Four hundred and fifty American prisoners of the Chinese Reds still in the hands of Communists after 73 meetings at Geneva. We have failed to have a single American released or accounted for.

During the past 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists, including Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. The negotiators spoke 106 million words (700 volumes). All this talk led to 52 major agreements, and the Communists have broken 50 of them. As Lenin says, "Promises are like piecrusts—made to be broken."

Khrushchev's Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, when it was announced that the President had invited Premier Nikita Khrushchev to visit our country I received a great deal of mail concerning the wisdom of this decision. Among the many letters I received was one from James A. McCulley, an interested and devoted citizen who makes his home in Glen Dale, W. Va., my hometown.

In this letter Mr. McCulley sets forth three points which he believes we should follow during the period of time that this man is in our country.

Mr. McCulley feels strongly upon the subject on which he writes, and I submit his letter for inclusion in the RECORD, respectfully referring its contents to the attention of my colleagues:

GLEN DALE, W. VA., *August 11, 1959.*

Hon. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ARCH: I write to urge you to vote for Congressman LANE'S resolution which calls for the Congress to oppose officially the proposed visit of Premier Khrushchev to our country. The resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, August 4. Also I would urge you to use every effort and influence at your command to stop Khrushchev's visit.

Let there be no misunderstanding as to my position in this matter. I hold that no good can come of this visit. This conclusion is based on lessons of contemporary history. To accord the Butcher of Budapest a hero's welcome, and that in effect is what is planned, would label our recent solemn proclamation of Captive Nations Week a sham and a mere lipservice. It would throw to the winds our efforts and sacrifices and expenditures of billions of the American taxpayers' money for the past 14 years—all aimed at winning the captive nations to our side.

I resent the announced plan and appeal to the press, TV, and radio by those arranging the visit, an appeal to mold public opinion so that a hero's welcome will be given the despot who but a few weeks ago boasted that he would bury American democracy and that President Eisenhower's grandchildren would live in America under communism. This kind of scheming on the part of those in Government is utterly repulsive to me as an American citizen. In American democracy government is the tool of the people. The people are not tools of the government.

I have had great respect for and confidence in President Eisenhower. In this case I believe his intentions are good and sincere, however not well founded. I believe the President has been ill-advised and misled—perhaps deliberately—by individuals in or out of Government and whose political beliefs are rooted in the ideologies of Russian communism rather than in American democracy.

If worse comes to worse and the visit takes place, then I urge the following course of action by the American people in the vicinity of Mr. Khrushchev's itinerary:

1. Desert the streets and highways while Mr. Khrushchev is in the area. This would symbolize to all that the American people want nothing to do with this murderer of millions, and that those who have made this visit possible have deserted American principle.

2. Pull the shades in all homes, stores, business houses and buildings, turn out the lights and drape the store fronts and entrances in black. This would symbolize our sorrow for the countless victims of atheistic communism which Mr. Khrushchev represents. Many of these innocent victims are relatives and friends of good American citizens.

3. Display the Stars and Stripes upside down. This would tell all that we are a disgraced nation in distress so long as Mr. Khrushchev remains within its borders.

I was quite disappointed to read that you favor Mr. Khrushchev's visit under certain conditions or with certain qualifications, details of which were not given. You have been a most capable representative for our district. I know of no one in the past who has been so capable and so hard working. I have always voted for and supported you. In some instances I may not have been in harmony with your decisions, however, I have always felt that you have had the welfare of the people at heart.

In this case I ask that you reconsider and take a firm stand against the proposed visit of the Butcher of Budapest. There are too many in this district whose relatives and friends have been murdered or who languish in prison because of Mr. Khrushchev and company.

Sincerely,

JIM MCCULLEY.

DAV Services in Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. WATTS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WATTS. Mr. Speaker, an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Kentucky citizens has recently come to my attention. The organization rendering these services, the Disabled American Veterans, is well known to all of us, but the breadth and extent of their great humanitarian efforts apparently passes unnoticed and certainly is not appreciated to the extent that they should be.

DAV SETUP

Of the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans, and so forth, which have State departments and local chapters, the DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have been either wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war.

Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran. Its present national commander is Bill H. Fribley, of Crestline, Kans. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is

Elmer N. Freudenberger; its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris, all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities, some 2 million, the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV National Headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time trained national service officers.

DAV SERVICE OFFICERS

One hundred and thirty-eight of them are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert to the problems of other less well-informed claimants.

The DAV national service officer in Kentucky is Mr. James M. Howard, located in the Veterans' Administration regional office, 1405 West Broadway, Louisville. Veterans' Administration hospitals coming under the jurisdiction of this office are a 350-bed general medical hospital at Fort Thomas; a 1,171-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Lexington, a 494-bed general medical hospital at Louisville, and a 186-bed tuberculosis hospital at Outwood, Ky.

KENTUCKY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

The department commander is Mr. Troy Bowling, Lexington, Ky., and the department adjutant is Mr. Edward A. Gafford, 1908 Woodfield Road, Louisville, Ky. Mr. Gafford also is a past national junior vice commander; presently he is a member of the Kentucky State Parole Board and chairman of the Finance Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. Mr. Raymond D. Webb, Louisville, an employee of the Kentucky Selective Service System, serves as the assistant department adjutant; he is a disabled naval veteran with long government service.

During the last fiscal year, the Veterans' Administration paid out $95,358,000 for its veteran program in Kentucky, including disability compensation to its 38,486 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Kentucky furnish substantial purchasing power in all communities.

Only about 12 percent, or 4,529, are members of the 62 DAV chapters in Kentucky. This is a strange record in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officer in behalf of Kentucky veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	72,502
Claims folders reviewed	60,418
Appearances before rating boards	40,717
Compensation increases obtained	4,743
Service connections obtained	1,526
Nonservice pensions obtained	2,162
Death benefits obtained	621
Total amount monetary benefits obtained	$2,952,001.58

These figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years, they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, resulting in monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32; and in the central office they handled 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Kentucky veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

SERVICES BEYOND STATISTICS

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized advice, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter. Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans, only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members, their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guarantee loans for homes, farms, and business, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable, useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems. Every claim presents different problems.

VETERANS' BENEFITS NOT AUTOMATIC

Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans, not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult, too many times impossible. A Claims and Rating Board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed, pertinent facts are essential. The Veterans' Administration, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the laws administered by it, only under certain conditions.

PROSECUTING CLAIMS

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances, and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations, and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skill, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed, because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV Acting National Director of Claims Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims which have been prepared and presented with the aid of the DAV, or other veterans' organization's national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case as to those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocate.

VA REVIEWS

Another fact not generally known is that, under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued, and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 2 percent—0.018—of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Kentucky, with a consequent loss of about $560,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Kentucky to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

DAV COSTS FOR SERVICES

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent, expert national service officer.

Measured by the DAV's overall cost of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating-board appearance, or, again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection

obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

FINANCING DAV SERVICES

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the veterans service organization receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. In the case of the DAV it is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income on its Idento-Tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they had previously sent in a donation, more than 1 million owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's Idento-Tag Department, 4,176 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Kentucky residents.

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as will enable it to maintain the invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans, if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years, the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustee, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000 exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all serviced claimants, DAV members, and other social-minded Americans, by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by bequests in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

PERPETUAL REHABILITATION FUNDS

A special type of memorial trust fund originated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veterans members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member.

SUPPORTING AMERICAN ORGANIZATIONS

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation services in Kentucky by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 1707 18th Street, NW., Washington, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member.

Every American can help to make our government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints, labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal and civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veterans organizations—United Spanish War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, the Veterans of World War I, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Amvets. All of America's disabled defenders, who are receiving disability compansation, have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

Congress and the Doctor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, many important national issues of concern to America's doctors are presently pending before the Congress of the United States. These issues range from proposals for a form of compulsory national health insurance to Federal aid for medical schools, and from tax equality for professional retirement programs to inflation. The latter—inflation—constitutes our most serious domestic problem.

In the recently completed 1st session of the 86th Congress, active consideration was given to several of these subjects. It is likely that the second session, beginning next January, will find further legislative action being taken. Accordingly, as the elected Representative of the patriotic citizens of the 18th Pennsylvania Congressional District, it is appropriate that a report of these legislative matters be made to the distinguished doctors whom I am honored to include among my constituents.

Before dealing with specific legislative subjects, I would observe that present-day conditions demand that the medical practitioner be knowledgeable on political considerations. Such factors as the numerous social programs being advocated which affect the practice of medicine, the increasing importance of the economics of medicine, the 30-year trend toward greater reliance on Government paternalism in solving human problems, and the expansion of governmental research and health regulatory activities make it imperative that every doctor keep informed on legislative issues before the Congress. It is equally important that doctors fulfill their citizenship duty by standing for principles of Government in which they believe as Americans and by supporting the candidates who stand for those principles.

It was my privilege recently to prepare a commentary for publication in the AMA News in which I urged doctors to abandon their traditional avoidance of political matters. In that article I said that awareness by the doctors of the political realities is necessary in the interest of good medicine for the benefit of our Nation's citizenry. I acknowledged that "medical doctors are fine patriotic Americans with one very serious shortcoming." The serious shortcoming to which I referred was the way in which doctors shun politics and political activities as though such things were someone else's responsibility. I went on to urge doctors "to assume their full citizenship roles with greater diligence by participating in that American institution—politics." In that article I said in part as follows:

> American physicians should acquaint themselves with the principles and the records in office of the two great national political parties. They should support with their endeavors and their resources the candidates of the party they find best qualified to assume responsibility of government at the Federal, State, and local levels. Through their daily contact with the people, doctors and other professional men are particularly qualified to understand the needs and concerns of the citizens they serve and can bring their leadership to bear in achieving meritorious national objectives.
>
> This political activity of a doctor would be in his self-interest as a citizen and even more important it would be in the best interest of our Nation and our community life across the land.

In essence, it is my conviction that the issues confronting our Nation are so crucial in terms of human welfare, the preservation of our free enterprise way of life, and the continued greatness of our Nation that America's doctors must find opportunity to become patriotic political forces so that our communities, States, and Nation can benefit from their informed viewpoints.

Among the legislative highlights of direct interest to medical practitioners on which action was taken during this past session of Congress was a bill, H.R. 10, which I was privileged to cosponsor, providing tax deferment on self-employment income paid into a restricted retirement program. This so-called Simpson-Keogh bill would remove from our Federal tax structure a present discrimination against self-employed individuals and would tend to give to such taxpayers comparable retirement opportunities with that accorded under present law to employed persons. I am happy to report that we were successful in having this legislation approved by the Committee on Ways and Means and by the House of Representatives. It is now pending before the Senate Finance Committee, and it is my hope that the legislative process on this meritorious proposal can be successfully completed next year.

Other matters of direct interest to doctors within the legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means on which I serve as ranking Republican member come under the

subject of social security amendments. These include old-age and survivors insurance coverage for physicians, medical and hospital care for OASI beneficiaries, and the administration of existing health and medical programs under the Social Security Act.

The question of whether or not doctors should be mandatorily brought within the coverage of the Social Security Act is a problem that the Congress has been considering for several years. Recently a number of State medical societies, including Pennsylvania, have gone on record as being in favor of such an extension of coverage. It is possible that this subject will again be before the Congress next year. It must be acknowledged that there are valid arguments representing both the pros and cons of this question.

In summary form the arguments in favor of such coverage for doctors include the facts that doctors as consumers pay at least in part the cost of covering other individuals under the act. This results because the employment taxes to some extent are passed on as a cost of doing business. If the doctor is required to pay for the protection of others under the program, he might just as well participate in the program himself. Social security benefits are tax free and as such could be an important consideration in a doctor's retirement plan either for age or disability as well as protection for his survivors.

The arguments against coverage of physicians include a recognition of the fact that doctors for the most part do not retire as early as most other groups and that they would therefore not have a reasonable expectation of recouping in benefits the amount of their tax contributions. This is a factor of increasing significance in the years ahead when the tax rate ultimately is scheduled to go as high as 6¾ percent on an annual taxable base of $4,800 on self-employed income. It will be my purpose to continue to give careful study to the relative merits pertaining to this issue so that I may properly represent the best interests of the medical profession.

The second legislative matter concerning social security that is of direct interest to the medical profession involves the so-called Forand bill, H.R. 4700, which would provide hospital, nursing home, and certain medical benefits for OASI beneficiaries. This legislation was the subject of public hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means this past July. During the course of these hearings the Medical Society of the State of Pennsylvania was ably represented before the committee by a distinguished general practitioner from nearby Indiana, Pa., Dr. Daniel H. Bee, who is chairman of the board of trustees of the State society.

Dr. Bee properly expressed concern over the efficacy of handling the medical care problems of the aged through Federal intervention, the effect such a program would have on existing voluntary health insurance plans, the impact of the proposal on individual initiative and self-help and the possible disruptive consequence to the all-important physician-patient relationship. Dr. Bee pointed out the great progress we have made in our State of Pennsylvania in providing medical care for our aged and he called attention to the fact that in our State no aged or indigent person has gone without medical care providing he seeks this care from his physician.

In a speech in the House of Representatives which I made on August 27, 1959, on this subject, I called the attention of my colleagues to the progress that the medical profession working in conjunction with the insurance industry is making "to assure adequate medical care for all our citizens on a nondiscriminatory basis and within the framework of our free enterprise system." I went on to say:

> This progress is being made without subjecting the medical profession to domination by the dictates of Government bureaucracy and without launching our Nation on the discredited path of a system of national health insurance. It is encouraging to me that our citizens dealing on the basis of free enterprise have made the progress that has been achieved in meeting their medical and health needs by individual and collective initiative without reliance on Government paternalism.

I am confident that further consideration of the Forand bill will be before the Committee on Ways and Means and the Congress next year. It is important that those who do not believe that H.R. 4700 represents a workable solution to medical care needs for the aged should develop appropriate alternatives. It will, of course, be my purpose next year to continue my endeavors in cooperation with the medical profession to guard our citizens and Nation against the disastrous consequences of compulsory national health insurance.

In November of this year the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Social Security Laws will conduct a public hearing on the manner in which the social security disability program is being administered. It is likely that medical organizations will be represented by spokesmen at these hearings.

Other important legislative highlights in the past session of Congress included an expanded program of nursing home development with the Federal Housing Administration guaranteeing up to 75 percent of private loans for construction of proprietary nursing homes. A health insurance program for civilian Federal workers was also approved. The Medicare program of treating qualified dependents of military personnel in civilian hospitals was also approved. For fiscal year 1960, $400 million was authorized for the National Institutes of Health and an augmented Hill-Burton program of Federal aid for hospital construction was also authorized. With respect to international implications of medicine the Senate approved a $50 million annual program for international medical research, and it is likely that this proposal will receive House consideration next year.

The foregoing summary calls to the attention of the medical practitioners in the 18th Pennsylvania Congressional District some of the legislative considerations before the Congress. It is my hope that during the adjournment period and during the legislative session next year I will have opportunity to discuss these matters and other national issues with the distinguished members of the medical profession in my district either individually or at meetings of their respective county medical societies. It is my hope that by working together in this way for the betterment of our citizens' health and the improvement of the medical services available to them, we can contribute to soundly conceived medical progress.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to give deserved praise to the great contribution the doctors in my district have made to the public advancement through their professional service and through their selfless contributions to community welfare. The role of a doctor is one of great responsibility, and I am proud of the manner in which the members of the medical profession in my constituency have without exception wholeheartedly and capably fulfilled that responsibility.

Water Recreation Facilities in Colorado

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, water recreation facilities are precious in Colorado. We are far from the great oceans and natural lakes of this country. Many of the big water bodies we have in Colorado are manmade.

For this reason we perhaps relish and cherish water sports and water recreation in Colorado to a greater degree than the areas blessed with abundant water.

The sport of water skiing, for example, had its American introduction at Sloan's Lake in Denver many years ago.

A Coloradan who deserves a full measure of credit for development of Colorado water recreation facilities is R. James Malloy of 811 South Gilpin Street, Denver.

Jim Malloy, an employee of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, working through private citizen organizations on his own time, has devoted virtually all his after-work hours to development of new facilities for boaters, water skiers, swimmers, and fishermen.

Recently Jim Malloy's friends in Colorado boating organizations recommended him for the Denver Post's gallery of fame as Colorado's No. 1 sportsman for 1959.

On August 29 Jim Malloy was saluted in the Post's gallery of fame for his "successful efforts to have Cherry Creek Reservoir developed as a State recreation area."

The Post said:

Even before this project was completed Malloy was working toward the opening of other recreation sites, and some of them have been or will be opened to the public soon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of appreciation from Jim Malloy's friends to the Denver Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 10, 1959.

Mr. CAL QUEAL,
The Denver Post, Inc.,
Denver, Colo.

DEAR MR. QUEAL: We are writing this letter in appreciation of a Colorado and Denver citizen who we feel should because of his personal accomplishments in the last 4 years in the field of recreational development for the people of Colorado be given public recognition.

We refer to R. James Malloy, a respected member of practically every boating and wildlife organization in the State and who some 4 years ago was the first person to start a crusade to impound water behind Cherry Creek Reservoir. His and our dream was culminated this summer when the State parks and recreation department opened this area for the people of Colorado.

Because of the hundreds of letters he wrote to Federal agencies, State officials, and to the Colorado congressional delegation, and the many personal conferences with all concerned in pursuit of his dream that this area should be fully developed as a recreational area, he can truly be called the father of the Cherry Creek recreational development.

Coincidently with the Cherry Creek project, he had his sights on other recreational areas that he felt should be made available to the people of Colorado. After 2 years of negotiation, on April 24 of this year, he personally negotiated a contract and agreement with the Denver Water Board to open Antero Reservoir for boating and boat fishing only, with Cheesman, Gross, and Eleven Mile Reservoirs to follow next year. The operating contract between the Denver Water Board and the State parks and recreation department was signed on July 28, 1959, and Antero Reservoir should be opened for public use no later than August 15, 1959. As a result of his efforts, future years will see thousands of Colorado families enjoying these areas. For years in his talks before boating and wildlife organizations he has stressed and pleaded for more effective planning and use of Colorado's outdoor recreation resources. A recent statement we heard him make is: "Boating, fishing, camping, hiking, skiing, and hundreds of other recreational opportunities can and must be wisely developed so that present and future Coloradans can more fully enjoy their own State—the greatest State in the Union." In collaboration with Harold Lathrop, State director, parks and recreation department, and at the request of Senator Dunkley, of Denver, he wrote Colorado's boating bill which was passed by the last general assembly. He is a hunter, fisherman, boater, and water skier. We feel that he can be called Colorado's No. 1 sportsman and boater.

He is a supervisory official of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and he has accomplished these things on his personal time without financial remuneration from any organization.

We feel that he is a credit to the State of Colorado and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation who employ his services.

Because of his aggressive leadership throughout the years, we recommend him to you for proper public recognition and your newspaper's "Hall of Fame" as Colorado's No. 1 Sportsman for 1959.

Sincerely,

Patrick W. Chamberlain, Representing the Rocky Mountain Boat Racing Club, Inc., Arvada, Colo.; Gene Wenzinger, Representing the Riviera Lake Boating Club, Denver Colo.; Paul L. St. Onge, Representing the Outboard Boating Club of Metropolitan Denver, Denver, Colo.; Robert T. Roath, Representing the Mile Hi Boat Racing Club, Denver, Colo.; James B. Jurgens, Representing the Inboard Association, Denver, Colo.; C. N. Centers, Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Flotilla No. 2012, Denver, Colo.; Leon S. Brunner, Jr., Representing the Metropolitan Wildlife Association, Englewood, Colo.; Wilfred Howard, Jr., Representing the Denver Municipal Boating Association, Denver, Colo.; John L. Shumaker, Representing the Sailboat Association, Littleton, Colo.; Tris Calomino, Representing the Calomino Marine Co. and Past President, Marine Dealers Association, Denver, Colo.

The Authoritative Story of Genocide in Tibet by Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the New York Times of June 7, 1959, and an epochal document on Communist genocide in Tibet prepared under the auspices of the International Commission of Jurists under the leadership of the distinguished senior advocate of the Supreme Court of India. It tells in sober terms a story of naked barbarism by the Chinese Communists seldom equaled in history. Is the world to pass by on the other side? If so, the United Nations will move a long step along the road to failure followed by the League of Nations when it ignored or merely deplored the Japanese militarists' aggression in Manchuria in 1931 and Mussolini's assault on Ethiopia a few years later.

The test is not of Red China; it long ago revealed its true character and objectives to all except the willfully blind. The test is of ourselves and the other free nations and peoples of the world. Are we content to be next?

The editorial and the report follow:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1959]

GENOCIDE IN TIBET

The International Commission of Jurists, under the chairmanship of a distinguished Indian lawyer, can hardly be called a propaganda organ. Its findings should be accurate and impartial. After an exhaustive 2-month study of the Red Chinese assault on Tibet it has made ready its report for the United Nations and its appeal to jurists throughout the world.

The Peiping regime, it has found, has adopted a systematic policy that constitutes an attempt to destroy the national, ethnic, and religious group of Tibetans by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm. The Commission estimates the number of those killed thus far at 65,000.

This is a forthright charge of genocide and the Commission cites the United Nations Convention of 1948 as having been violated. Having brought such an indictment, the Commission calls upon the United Nations to take appropriate action and upon jurists throughout the world to help the Tibetan people in their struggle for freedom and justice.

In this instance the case of Tibet has been placed in a somewhat different light from that of most previous discussion. The emphasis, hitherto, has been largely political, with attention given to Red China's violation of the pledges of autonomy for Tibet and the attack on individual liberty.

The Commission broadens the whole base of the outrage. It is seen as a deliberate attack upon a whole people, a specific culture, and a human as well as political structure. The methods are simply mass murder and organized suppression. The Commission is trying to defend the right of peoples not merely to be free but actually to stay alive.

It is difficult to see how the United Nations can, in honor, ignore such a report. Certainly it must be taken into account whenever there is any discussion of the status of the Red Chinese regime among civilized nations.

SUMMARY OF A REPORT ON TIBET SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON JURISTS BY SHRI PURSHOTTAM TRIKAMDAS, SENIOR ADVOCATE, SUPREME COURT OF INDIA

PRESS CONFERENCE ADDRESS

1. When the uprising took place in Tibet, we in the International Commission of Jurists were obviously concerned with developments taking place there. The Commission's main concern is with the legal aspects of the situation in Tibet in connection with (a) the interpretation of the position of Tibet under international law; (b) human rights to the extent that fundamental rights and freedoms of the people of Tibet are systematically violated or affected; (c) the threats of the events in Tibet to the rule of law and international peace.

2. The International Commission of Jurists has not yet commented on the situation in Tibet because it was anxious to make certain of the facts of the case. I was asked by the Commission to investigate the matter on the spot and especially the legal and human rights aspects of the case. It was with this mandate that I organized a team of experts to examine closely and objectively, as lawyers, the Tibetan situation. After 2 months of work, we have completed the preliminary part of the investigation. We have collected documents, interviewed people and reliable witnesses from Tibet, and studied the events as reported by the press and radio, including the Chinese press and radio. These materials have been turned over to the International Commission of Jurists. They have been examined and scrutinized. On the basis of this, the Commission has taken certain decisions, and I have been asked by the Commission to convey those decisions to you.

3. I would first like to give you some idea of the results of our investigation. The situation in Tibet has evoked widespread concern and sympathy all over the world. The understandable exception to this are the Soviet dominated countries and the Communist parties in Asia and elsewhere.

What is happening in Tibet is reminiscent of the conquest by some European countries and domination over Asian and African

people on the plea of bringing progress in those lands, described by complacent persons as the "white man's burden." In a sense it reminds one of the brutal suppression in Hungary. Unfortunate Tibet is presented at the same time with forced progress and brutal suppression at the hands of the Chinese Government.

4. It is not necessary to go very far into the historical background of Tibet beyond stating that from 1912 to 1950 Tibet was virtually an independent country. No Chinese writ ran in Tibet: there was no Chinese law, no Chinese judge, no Chinese policemen on the street corner; there was no Chinese newspaper, no Chinese soldier, and even no representative of the Chinese Government.

5. In 1950 China assured India that China had no intention of incorporating Tibet into China by force or otherwise and was willing to negotiate with Tibet regarding the future relationship of Tibet with China. But a few weeks later the invasion of Tibet took place—on October 7, 1950. On October 19, 1950, Chamdo in eastern Tibet was captured and on the 24th Peiping announced that the forces had been ordered to advance into Tibet "to free 3 million Tibetans from imperialist oppression."

6. As a result of the invasion, in December 1950 the Dalai Lama moved with his Cabinet to Yatung near the Sikkim frontiers where he remained until August 1951. In the meantime a Tibetan delegation had proceeded to Peiping for negotiations as a result of which an agreement was signed on May 23, 1951, which is popularly known as the 17-point agreement. Its main features were:

(1) Chinese armies were to be allowed to enter Tibet for consolidating national defense.

(2) Tibetan people were entitled to regional autonomy under the leadership of Central Peoples Government.

(3) The Central Government were not to alter the existing political system or the status and functions and powers of the Dalai Lama.

(4) Policy of religious freedom was to be carried out and religious beliefs, customs were to be respected and Lamas and monasteries were to be protected.

(5) Language and school system, agriculture, and economy were to be gradually developed and no reforms were to be carried out by compulsion.

(6) While the Chinese were to handle external relations Tibet would be free to have commercial and trading relations with neighboring countries.

(7) The Chinese Government would set up a military and administrative committee, in which "patriotic" local personnel would be absorbed, for the implementation of the agreement.

7. The dismemberment of Tibet took place in 1951, the Dalai Lama being left with authority only in the western portions of Tibet but with a Chinese general exercising effective control. In September 1954 the Dalai Lama and the Panchen Lama were invited to Peiping where they attended a meeting of the state council, at which they had to submit to a number of decisions, including the formation of a preparatory committee for the autonomous region of Tibet.

8. Two years later, in 1956, Mr. Chou En-lai assured Mr. Nehru that China did not consider Tibet as a province of China, but as an autonomous region. He also said that it was absurd for anyone to imagine that China was going to force communism on Tibet, though reforms would come progressively. They proposed, however, to postpone the reforms for a considerable time. About that time the Dalai Lama was in India, and Mr. Nehru conveyed these assurances to him.

9. In 1957 Mr. Mao Tse-tung in his so-called hundred flowers speech said that reforms in Tibet would not be introduced during the period 1958–62 and that the introduction of proposed reforms would depend on the wishes of the Tibetan people.

This in brief is the historical background.

10. After the 1950 aggression and the 1951 agreement, the people of Tibet have insisted that Tibet should continue to enjoy the same internal autonomy as before, while the Chinese talked of limited regional autonomy within the framework of the Chinese Constitution. The Chinese persistent effort has been to incorporate Tibet as an integral part of China.

Let us now turn to what happened in Tibet from 1951 onward.

11. It is stated by Tibetan sources that soon after 1951 the first impact of Chinese control was felt in the feverish construction of roads and highways. The labor for this work was Tibetan men, women, and children, laymen and monks, many of them forcibly drafted for the work. It is alleged that up to 200,000 were forced into these labor projects and about one-fourth of them are said to have died from the cold weather, hunger and fatigue. As one witness reported: "The financial and physical losses sustained by our people were great. By building the gigantic roads the economic loss sustained goes into thousands of acres of agricultural land. The Chinese destroyed agricultural lands, irrigation systems and ancient consolidated holdings by indiscriminately using the tracks in the name of highway priority. Numerous religious monuments, shrines, Mani walls and even houses of poor peasants that were in the path of the highway or road were destroyed." The systematic destruction of religious monuments and shrines for propagating communism will be dealt with later. The destruction of these and forcing the monks to forced labor shocked the Tibetans tremendously.

12. There is no doubt that since 1952 there has been large-scale Chinese immigration into Tibet, particularly in the northeast and eastern areas. According to reliable sources, about 5 million Chinese have already been settled in Tibet and some 4 million more are going to be settled. The present population of Tibet is estimated at 3 million people. The Tibetans naturally feel that as a result of this vast settlement of Chinese in Tibet, a complete destruction of Tibetan identity will be brought about in the foreseeable future. The Chinese immigrants have been brought into Tibet ostensibly for the purpose of bringing wastelands under cultivation but actually the immigration was followed by large-scale confiscation of lands and buildings belonging to monasteries and private persons, by levies of special taxes on everything the Tibetan possessed—and here the monasteries were discriminated against and subjected to exorbitant taxation—and the depletion of decades-old granaries which affected the most fundamental sensibilities of the Tibetans who regarded them as a religious-like symbol of pride and sign of prosperity.

13. The efforts by the Chinese to destroy systematically private trade and commerce will not be described in detail here but will be included in the final report. The destruction of religious freedom however requires mention. Through the Chinese press, which became firmly entrenched as the sole source of press information in Tibet, a precise and deliberate campaign has been conducted against the Buddhist religion and the lamas, and against Buddha himself. I would like to quote from a Chinese controlled newspaper published in the Tibetan language:

"Karsey Daily, page 2, dated November 22, 1958:

"To believe in religion is fruitless. Religion is the instrument of autocratic feudal lords and religion works home no benefits whatever to the people. To explain this we trace the historical background of the origin of the Buddhism. The founder of Buddhism was Sakya Muni, son of the King Sudodhana of India. His kingdom was very aggressive among all the Indian kingdoms of the time. It always used to invade the small kingdoms. It was during the reign of Sakya Muni, his subjects revolted against him and later other small kingdoms also rose against him spontaneously. As they attacked Sakya Muni he accepted the defeat but escaped amidst the fighting. Since there was no other way out for him he wandered into the forests. Having founded Buddhism he brought about a pessimism and idleness in the minds of the people, weakening their courage, and thus reached his goal of redomination over them. This fact is recorded in the history."

Those who know of the life of Buddha will see the clear intent of the press campaign.

14. Our information indicates that this attack on religion was combined with a systematic religious persecution. We have evidence of instances and cases where the heads of monasteries have been killed, imprisoned, publicly humiliated. One case in our files, for instance, refers to a very highly respected lama who was stripped, dragged with a rope over rocky terrain, as a result of which he died, his abdomen being ripped open by the dragging. In the Kham Province alone 250 monasteries were destroyed; cases have been reported of head lamas being dragged to death by horses, and a fairly large number sent as prisoners to concentration camps in China. Of seven leading lamas charged with offences which fit into the general scheme of attack on religion, only one—Zongsar Khentse Rimpoche—escaped to India. The others have all been executed or are now in prison.

15. From the beginning of the occupation in 1950, the process of indoctrination began. A number of front organizations for youths, women, and workers were set up. Several thousand persons were sent to Peiping for training in Communist ideology.

16. A curious offshoot of this indoctrination was the Mimang movement, a people's movement which started in Lhasa. Resistance to Communist occupation found its first expression in village meetings called by the Communists as part of their indoctrination and propaganda campaigns in 1952. At these meetings anti-Communist resolutions were passed and thus began a national resistance movement which became known as the Mimang movement and which spread all over Tibet. Its chief aim became the revocation of the 17-point agreement. This movement had the support of the Lukhwanga and Lobsang Tasic (Lama), the two prime ministers. The Chinese became alarmed and Mimang was ordered to be suppressed. Its leaders were arrested. The Dalai Lama was forced to demote the Prime Ministers, although they continued to function as ministers. Mr. Lukhwanga left Tibet in 1957 and has since been in India.

17. All this led to tremendous discontent and by the middle of 1956 risings began in the Khampa area situated within the jurisdiction of the Chamdo liberation committee, one of the three administrative areas set up after the 1950 occupation. This resistance spread to several areas and, so far as our information goes, is still quite active in the eastern areas, although it seems to have been suppressed in the areas round about Lhasa. Since the rebel area is mountainous and difficult terrain for the army to operate in, large-scale aerial bombing has been resorted to. In the accessible parts veritable terror has been let loose on the population. Reliable estimates of the persons killed come to about 65,000. The number of persons deported is stated to be about 20,000. These figures include the recent massacres in and around Lhasa. It is reliably reported that after the suppression of the rising in Lhasa all males between the ages of 15 and 60 have

been removed from the city to some unknown destination.

18. Coming now to the recent incidents in Lhasa, which ultimately led to the flight of the Dalai Lama, a little background to the immediate flareup may be useful. A number of incidents had happened in the last 2 years when high personages, believed not to be sympathetic to the Chinese, were invited to parties by the military commanders. These were either killed or imprisoned. This became widely known in Tibet.

19. On March 9, 1959, the Dalai Lama received an invitation from the local military commander to attend a cultural program at the military headquarters. He was asked to come unaccompanied by any of his ministers or his bodyguard, a most unusual request. In view of the stories mentioned above, as soon as the news of the invitation became known, a large number of people surrounded the Norbulinga Palace, where the Dalai Lama was in residence. This happened on the 10th. All the ministers except one gathered in the palace, the exception being a minister who was considered to be pro-Chinese and who was prevented by the people from entering the palace.

20. One Phakpala, who brought the invitation and was considered to be a Chinese stooge, was killed by the mob in the street and a few thousand people marched to the Indian and the Nepalese consulates dragging the body of this person and proclaiming, "We are not under Chinese rule; we want independence."

21. The Dalai Lama asked the people to be calm and announced that he would not go to the show. In spite of this, the people continued to stay round the palace throughout the night of the 10th.

22. On March 11, 1959, a meeting of all Government officials was called at the palace. A few pro-Chinese officials did not attend, and a proclamation was issued in the name of the Cabinet that Tibet was independent. Among the Cabinet Ministers present at the meeting were Surkhang, Neushar, Gastang, and Shasur.

These gentlemen are at present in India with the Dalai Lama.

23. On March 12, 1959, a meeting was held at Shol, below the Potala Palace. Practically the whole population of Lhasa seem to have been present. At this meeting it was decided to prepare documents regarding the claim of independence. A letter was sent to Mr. Shakabpa, which never reached him, mentioning these facts, and he was asked to announce to the world the facts of the Chinese oppression and the decision of the Tibetan people regarding independence. This meeting was almost in continuous session between the 12th and 17th of March, and the people gathered entirely unarmed. After nightfall two shells were fired on the palace, but fell in an artificial lake in front of the palace. Machineguns and firing of arms were heard. At 10:30 p.m. and thereafter the Dalai Lama and some of his party which arrived in India left the palace one by one.

24. The shells were evidently fired by the Chinese as a warning in the hope of getting the Dalai to surrender, but nothing happened on the 18th. On the early morning of the 19th at 1 a.m., a serious bombardment of the palace began. The Chinese were evidently not aware that the Dalai Lama had left 24 hours earlier. This bombardment completely destroyed the palace and the city was also greatly damaged. The estimated loss of life is about 20,000 persons. I am informed that there were sufficient Chinese troops in Lhasa at the time who could have taken perhaps milder action, but the continuous bombardment was intended to strike terror among the people.

25. Since in spite of the bombardment the Dalai Lama did not come out and surrender, the Chinese then suspected that the Dalai Lama had left and, as a result, numerous aerial search parties were sent. These planes, flying low, machinegunned groups of people wherever seen. This was done indiscriminately in many places on the possible escape routes of the Dalai Lama in the hope that the groups so attacked might consist of the Dalai Lama's party.

26. From the facts stated above the following conclusions may be drawn:

(a) From 1950 onward as a result of Chinese aggression a practically independent country is being turned by force into a province of China and the struggle of the Tibetans has been to regain their independence.

(b) Even the terms of the 17-point agreement of 1951, guaranteeing broad autonomy to Tibet as mentioned above, have been consistently disregarded.

(c) There has been arbitrary confiscation of property belonging to monasteries, private individuals, and Tibetan Government.

(d) Freedom of religion has been and is denied to the Tibetans. The Chinese authorities have been attempting to destroy the Buddhist religion of the Tibetans and their faith and also their monasteries, shrines, and monuments. A large-scale policy of Communist indoctrination and an abusive antireligious propaganda have also been launched.

(e) The Tibetans have been denied freedom of information.

(f) There has also been a systematic policy of killing, imprisonment, and deportation of those opposed to the regime. According to reliable sources the total number of persons so far fallen victims to the mass killing amounts to a colossal total of 65,000.

27. The above events establish that there has been a deliberate violation of fundamental human rights. There is also a prima facie case that on the part of the Chinese there has been an attempt to destroy the national, ethical, racial, and religious group of Tibetans as such by killing members of the group and by causing serious bodily and mental harm to members of the group. These acts constitute the crime of genocide under the genocide convention of the United Nations of 1948.

28. Upon examination of the material submitted by our investigating committee, of which the above is only a short summary, the International Commission of Jurists has decided:

(a) To publish a preliminary report, with all relevant documents and commentaries, and to distribute it as widely as possible.

(b) To communicate the report to the United Nations and other interested international organizations and agencies, requesting them to initiate such action as they might consider appropriate.

(c) To distribute the report to bar and other legal associations and faculties of law, requesting that they give it immediate publicity and support.

(d) To invite the investigating committee previously established to expand its activities under the name "Legal Inquiry Committee on Tibet" and to continue to collect and obtain evidence in the form of documents, interviews, commentaries, and statements for the preparation of the final report.

(e) To examine all such evidence obtained by this committee and from other sources and to take appropriate action thereon and in particular to determine whether the crime of genocide—for which already there is strong presumption—is established and, in that case, to initiate such action as envisaged by the Genocide Convention of 1948 and by the Charter of the United Nations for suppression of these acts and appropriate redress.

(f) To call upon the lawyers and jurists of the world to express their solidarity with and to support actively the work undertaken by the International Commission of Jurists to help the Tibetan people in their struggle for freedom and justice.

Telegram From Joe Jenness, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on September 12, 1959, I inserted in the RECORD a letter that I had directed to the Honorable Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. At that time I promised to insert Mr. Ellis' reply in the RECORD. To date I have received no reply from Mr. Ellis; but under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a copy of a telegram that I have received from Mr. Joe Jenness, acting general manager of the above-mentioned association.

The telegram follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *September 14, 1959.*

Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14 carries in the Appendix a statement by you and the reproduction of what purports to be a letter from you to Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of this association. To date we have not received the letter, but, assuming the copy in the RECORD is correct, we hasten to answer it.

Mr. Ellis is at present accompanying a Senate delegation on an inspection tour of hydroelectric power installations in Russia. He did not have an opportunity to see or know of the letter you inserted in the RECORD.

The "rumors" to which you refer have absolutely no basis in fact and are completely false. It seems to us that the "spirit of fair play" to which you repeatedly refer in your letter would have been better served had you attempted to investigate the "rumors" before you became an instrument for spreading them further. We see nothing "fair" about your letter and the innuendoes it contains, or the manner in which you made it public before we had even had a chance to see it, much less answer.

This is not a partisan organization. Members of both political parties make up its membership, its employees, and its board of directors. We are deeply appreciative of the support for rural electrification which individual Congressmen of both parties have extended. In like manner, we regret and deplore the fact that at present a few Congressmen, notably those who have repeatedly voted against measures supported by rural electric systems, seem bent on smearing this association and its employees. The creation and circulation of the unfounded "rumors" to which you refer seems to be a case in point.

We are not going to "loan" any employee to any candidate, Republican or Democratic.

Neither are we going to grant a leave of absence for any such political purpose, nor in any other way permit or condone anything similar to the "rumors" which you say you have heard. I hope this is sufficiently clear. We hope you will immediately follow through on your promise to insert this reply in the RECORD.

JOE JENNESS,
Acting General Manager.

Colorado Wheat Farmers Organize To Dispose of Crop Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, 20,000 Colorado wheat farmers are doing something about crop surpluses.

They have organized a marketing organization called the Colorado Wheat Administrative Committee, with headquarters at 1636 Welton Street in Denver, and managed by a Colorado wheat farmer, Ted Fiedler.

The committee of Colorado wheat farmers has joined with similar groups in Kansas and Nebraska to form the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, which has established sales offices all over the world in an effort to market Great Plains wheat.

The farmers tax themselves one-half cent per bushel of wheat to promote sales of their wheat in foreign markets.

Colorado wheat farmers deserve high recognition for their initiative and enterprise in approaching the wheat disposal problem through their own private marketing organization, supported by a self-imposed tax.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Bill Miller on Colorado wheat farmers which appeared in the Rocky Mountain News of Denver, Colo.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE WHEAT FARMERS TURN SALESMEN
(By Bill Miller)

Colorado's wheat farmers, more than 20,000 of them, are taxing themselves and using the money to develop new markets for their product.

They have joined farmers in Nebraska and Kansas and have opened sales offices in several foreign countries.

In an all-out effort to help themselves, the farmers have decided they must become salesmen, diplomats, and public relations experts if they are to continue courting their first love—quality wheat.

These are strange and new roles the farmers are playing * * * roles that the general population, especially city dwellers, will have difficulty associating with the farmer.

MENTAL PICTURE

For the city dweller nurtures a mental picture of the farmer in patched overalls and strawhat with outstretched hand toward Washington.

Thus the farmer has been caricatured by cartoonists in the public press.

"The Government pays them for all the wheat they grow and for keeping land out of productivity. And those surplus crops * * * the Government keeps buying them and then has to pay for storage."

This is a popular lament, a litany that has been chanted over and over again, a complaint that is justified.

No one realizes it more than the farmer.

IN REAL TROUBLE

As one eastern Colorado wheat farmer put it:

"Hell, it's getting so I'm afraid to walk down the street. I get the feeling that people are pointing their fingers at me and blaming me personally for everything from surpluses to high taxes to the cold war with Russia."

Farmers and the various associations they belong to, do a lot of bickering and squabbling among themselves. But they all agree on one thing.

The American farmer, especially the wheat farmer, is in real trouble.

"We are caught in a bind," another farmer explained. "Ten years ago we were getting $2.50 for a bushel of wheat and I could buy a tractor for $1,900. Now I'm getting $1.70 for a bushel of wheat and it would cost me $2,600 to buy the same kind of tractor."

Statistics compiled by the U.S. Department of Agriculture illustrate what this farmer was talking about.

During 1947–49, the average Colorado wheat farmer, according to the Department, was realizing a 13.7 percent return on his investment. Last year that percentage had dropped to 3.3 percent.

His hourly earning was $3.34. Last year his earning dropped to $1.23 an hour.

"Yet many people insist we are getting rich by living off the Government," this farmer said. "Understand, we are not going around in rags, but a good many of us are living off our tax depreciation schedule. It's just a question of how long we can continue."

A BILLION BUSHELS

Collectively, U.S. wheat farmers grow a billion bushels of wheat each year. Right now, there are approximately 2.3 billion bushels in storage.

The annual U.S. consumption of wheat is approximately one-half billion bushels and another 100 million bushels are used for feed and seed.

Thus, if all American farmers stopped raising wheat, the surplus in storage would carry the country for 2 to 3 years.

Why not do this?

The answer is, thousands of American farmers would be bankrupt. The ensuing chaos would be felt by all Americans.

And from the wheat farmer:

"We are proud of our occupation. That's all many of us know—how to grow the best hard wheat in the world."

Despite an acreage allotment program, which has cut acreage devoted to wheat growing by one-third, farmers produce more wheat than ever. This is because the farmer has increased his per-acre yield from 12 to 34 bushels.

THEY CAN'T STOP

Thus the farmer, to make inroads on the surplus that plagues him and all of America, must either grow less or sell more.

"And we sure don't want to stop growing wheat," a farmer in the Julesburg area explained. "That's all we can grow out here. Sure, we can play around with sorghums and millet and oats, but we're lucky if we can break even on that kind of crop.

Realizing this, the Great Plains farmers are determined to develop additional markets, to show the world's population how to eat wheat, to find new uses for wheat in the United States and, most important to many, to acquaint Americans with his problems.

"We simply have to do a better public relations job," a farm leader explained.

Colorado farmers are taxing themselves one-half cent on every bushel of wheat they sell to launch this public relations program.

And they have established offices in Europe, South America, and Asia, staffed the offices with experts in the hopes of finding new customers in the world market.

Annual Report to Constituents by Hon. Stuyvesant Wainwright, of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is my seventh annual report from Washington to Long Island. I submit this report at the end of each session so that our people may have a public accounting. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I will address myself directly to the men and women of Suffolk and Nassau Counties.

This was a year of contrast. This was a big-spending Congress. It had heavy Democratic majorities in both Houses. The administration under President Eisenhower's leadership wished to steer a moderate course. The President's philosophy was to pay for the Nation's spending rather than forever ignore the national debt. Congress, not deterred by the President's position, paid little heed. To me it was encouraging to note the thousands upon thousands of letters and cards that poured into congressional offices protesting big spending.

This Congress has not been all negative. There are certain positive factors. For example, Hawaii was ushered in as our 50th State. This was an historic vote. In the field of foreign aid Congress gave the President a strong bill. Undoubtedly the subject of most public interest was labor legislation.

In my report last year I mentioned that the 85th Congress failed to give the American people a much needed labor reform bill. This year the President signed a measure essentially similar to the one for which I voted, the Griffin-Landrum bill. This will, we hope, be an effective stop to labor gangsterism. It may permit democracy within the American labor movement. Because of my vote in favor of the Griffin-Landrum labor bill certain labor leaders on Long Island refused to allow me to address the rank and file members on Labor Day. President James Carey of the Electrical Workers Union wrote me a threatening letter. The leader of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks has indicated that he will seek to purge me in the next election because of my attempts to curb racketeering in the labor movement.

Other important pieces of legislation were the housing and the public works bills. In regard to housing I supported

the Federal Housing Administration program for Long Island. Building is an important part of our economy and must be sustained. The public works bill, the "pork barrel" of Congress, contained a sum which I obtained for the continued dredging of Fire Island Inlet. On the other hand, it also contained many millions of dollars of unauthorized projects. Therefore, when the President vetoed the bill, I supported his veto. This was the crucial test whereby the President's banners were upheld by one single vote.

While evidence mounts daily that crime is on the increase, particularly in the major cities, Democratic leaders in Congress refused to cooperate with the Eisenhower administration in providing funds for the research and correction of this tragedy facing the American scene. Furthermore, one of our supreme advantages over the Soviet type of government is protection under that great document, the American Constitution, yet Congress failed to enact any new form of civil rights legislation at this session due to the fact that the Democratic leadership did not wish to offend the southerners.

As for public legislation introduced by me, the one that received the most comment on Long Island was H.R. 7575, designed to restrict irresponsible trading on future prices of potatoes. I do not believe that gambling of this kind is a sound practice, especially when it involves the livelihood of the producing element in this country. Amongst other legislation I initiated were bills for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Council on the Arts; Federal grants for studies of juvenile delinquency; an amendment to the Highway Act to provide not less than a billion and a half for interstate and defense highways; the encouragement of competition in procurement by the armed services; American war damage claims, the assistance of universities in marketing and retiring bonds, and H.R. 3389 for the encouragement of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

In addition to the bills which I have just enumerated, it was a pleasure to have convinced Congress to recognize Moriches and Shinnecock Inlets as Federal projects. The public works authorization bill, which includes these projects, is still pending. Despite the reported opposition of the New York State Park Commissioner, Robert Moses, I think that the program has a good chance of passage during the second session of Congress. In this same regard, certain articles which I have written about the "bridge which doesn't go anywhere"—across the Shinnecock Canal—might interest Park Commissioner Moses in supporting funds for the construction of the approaches. The beach erosion stabilization program is almost completed and should be included in the 1961 planning year for the budget. Our individual public works projects, such as Montauk Harbor, Port Jefferson Harbor, the Federal channel in the Great South Bay, Brown's River, and many others, were reviewed by Col. Charles Duke, the new Army District Engineer. He made his first tour of Long Island as my guest early this summer.

In the important field of mail service we added 10 new post offices and 3 new branch offices to the facilities of the congressional district. The branch office located in the Central Islip State Hospital should receive special note as this one turned into a personal battle with the Post Office Department which we were luckily able to win. We have extended rural free delivery to Manorville and improved services at Center Moriches, Port Jefferson, and Sayville. The continued growth of Long Island requires the continued expansion of these necessary postal facilities.

During the course of the past 7 years this report has served as a barometer in terms of predicting the economic future. These reports have been highly accurate, including a prediction of the slump of late 1957 and 1958. A significant factor in this favorable outlook is the allocation of many millions of dollars as our portion of national defense contracts. I have continually required the Defense Department to certify that Long Island get its adequate share of defense contract allocations. However, we also received more than a million dollars in house and home agency aid. The town of Huntington, as a specific case, was the beneficiary of over $600,000 for urban renewal. Perhaps not so pleasant an aspect of continued expansion and prosperity is demonstrated by the number of housing complaints handled this year. Many dozens of these cases were referred to my office, and I am happy to report that the vast majority have been successfully resolved. At the time of this report only 11 are still pending.

Not all is success. Many years ago the Bluepoint oyster and the oyster from Long Island Sound provided incomes and good living to a large number of people. The oyster is being destroyed by the starfish. Congress can help eradicate this destruction to a national resource. Yet, due almost exclusively to a lack of personal understanding on the part of key people on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the measure has been quietly and effectively pigeonholed. In the meantime the industry perishes.

The major time-consuming operation of a Member of Congress is not legislation; it is the care of his constituents in terms of their individual requests. This office receives nearly 100 letters a day asking assistance on some matter or other. It is impossible for me to check out personally each letter. I read them all and make sure proper action is taken. This year we processed many hundreds of servicemen's and military cases as well as an unusually large number of veterans' problems. We have had over a thousand requests for different publications, documents, and surveys. We have helped in the procurement of numerous visas and expedited over 200 passport and citizenship cases. In addition, I have held almost daily meetings with constituents who come to Washington to get action. This means cutting redtape.

Two personal events are worth mentioning. First was my appointment to the Foreign Affairs Committee. This senior group is always a most sought-after billet. Also, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN reappointed me to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy. This is especially pleasing in that it is not customary to reappoint Republican Members to the Board. The merit of giving a comprehensive examination for the service academies has proved its worth. A congressional district usually has one appointment to each service academy for a particular year. This year from the First Congressional District four of my applicants were appointed to the Air Force Academy, three to the Naval Academy, two to the Military Academy at West Point, and five to the Merchant Marine Academy. No other Member of Congress can boast this record.

Finally, in an effort to keep the public informed as to events here in Washington, I have continued to write a weekly news column. This is published as a public service in your local newspapers. Through the courtesy of the various Long Island radio stations I have brought you a special radio report every Sunday. At my own expense the annual questionnaire was mailed out so that your views could be obtained. This report is distributed under similar conditions. In addition, some 30 special reports have been disseminated as events occur. I have held office hours in Huntington, Long Island, and in Wainscott on alternate weekends so that those who cannot afford the trip to Washington can receive proper service.

It has been a pleasure and an honor to serve you in Congress. I hope I shall continue to be able to render you these services. Your comments, suggestions, and criticisms are always welcome. No man is perfect, myself least of all. An effective democracy must involve, by its very nature, the interest and opinions of all its member citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to address my annual report to the people of the First District of New York.

Legislation To Assist Areas Containing Large Portions of Federally Owned Property

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit for the record the following resolution passed by the Board of Supervisors of Mendocino County, Calif., in support of legislation to assist such areas which contain large portions of federally owned property:

RESOLUTION NO. 3321 OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF MENDOCINO COUNTY, CALIF., URGING SUPPORT FOR CONGRESSIONAL BILLS S. 910, H.R. 5731, AND H.R. 6073

Whereas counties generally are having great difficulty in raising revenues necessary

to meet obligations for services required by expanding populations; and

Whereas counties having considerable Federal property within their jurisdictions find it increasingly burdensome to raise revenue required for governmental purposes by reason of the reduced tax base resulting from said Federal ownership of property; and

Whereas congressional bills S. 910, H.R. 5731, and H.R. 6073 are aimed at and would help alleviate the inequities arising from such Federal ownership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Mendocino, State of California, That its congressional representatives be, and they are hereby, urged in their respective congressional chambers to support congressional bills S. 910, H.R. 5731, and H.R. 6073; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator CLAIR ENGLE, Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, and Congressman CLEM MILLER.

Communists Talk Only When They Are Confident They Can Gain Something, and We Lose Something

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. B. H. Ridder, president of Northwest Publications, Inc., which publishes, among other things, the daily newspapers in St. Paul and Duluth, Minn. This article appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of July 17, 1959—before the Khrushchev visit had been announced, although we know now that the invitation had already been extended. The analysis by Mr. Ridder, based on his conversations with informed and level-headed Europeans, was and is painfully accurate, showing again how the Soviets use talks, not to end the cold war, but to win another battle in it. Their unvarying objective is not to lessen the cause of tensions, which is their own expansionism, but to use the tensions to advance their own cause. After all, they created the tensions for that purpose. They start doing something, whether in Germany or the Middle East or Laos, which they have no right to start, in order to get us to make concessions which we have no right to make, in order perhaps to get them to stop doing what they had no business doing. It has been an obvious but alarmingly successful tactic. Why should they abandon it?

Naturally they want talks: they may be able to win and they cannot lose. Why? Because we are still not trying to win.

They are out to win a world; all we seem to want is to enjoy the world. Forces on the march regularly prevail over those seeking merely to hold a position—by giving parts of it away here and there.

That was the fatal course pursued by Athens and by Carthage at the peak of their power. Philip of Macedon and Cato and his cohorts of Rome not only defeated, they destroyed Athens and Carthage respectively; neither ever came back. Is that to be the fate of the United States while we pursue comfort and the easy way that false prophets tell us there must be somehow somewhere?

The soberly warning article follows:

ONLY SOVIETS GAIN, EUROPEANS SAY—WEST ON DEFENSIVE IN RUSS TALKS

(By B. H. Ridder, president, Northwest Publications, Inc.)

MONTE CARLO.—We have had sufficient time and opportunity to meet and assess a wide variety of public opinion as well as a small number of very well informed journalists and governmental officials, with the result that we have found a uniformity of conclusions with respect to Geneva and Russia.

The West is and has been strictly on the defensive during the last 10 years. It has been following a course of timidity and yielding to the stresses of a many-allied front with no strong dominating personality capable of assuming a united front. Every crisis has resulted from something that the Russians wanted and that we held. As, for example, in Korea or Formosa or wherever else the Russians sought expansion. It was always their move or desire to move that produced a crisis, never anything that we wanted or thought ourselves entitled to have.

In the Hungarian revolution there was a splendid opportunity created for the calling of a summit conference to avoid a world war because of our planned intercession. The Russians discuss and negotiate because that is a one-way street by which they can compromise to get what they want. They first demand everything and compromise on something, which to them is a net gain.

They create a serious crisis in order to be bought off with some tangible benefit and an expansion of their world in some direction. This is a tactic which has proven uniquely successful.

In the present instance of Berlin, they forced a crisis where no crisis had existed for 10 long years, at least no serious one. They demanded possession of the city and our complete withdrawal. We have been talking at Geneva for many long weeks. We have offered concessions, while the Russians have been adamant. The Europeans are asking, what is the purpose or advantage in making concessions in giving in a little here or there, while the Russians maintain their original position with more violence and authority than ever before. If they want to talk Berlin, why don't we talk about the occupation of Eastern Europe by Russian armies?

The answer is a simple one. The Russians will not discuss with us what they have, only what they want from us. We are not equal partners in the discussions. They are expanding by crumbling away our defensive positions.

European opinion believes that we are called to a conference by the Russians for the purpose of surrender and only for surrender. Nothing will be discussed by them unless it involves an advantage for Russia and the reverse for us.

It is reported in the press in Switzerland that when Koslov was in Washington recently some influential Senators asked him what the United States should do in order to get the Russian Armies out of Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. Koslov is reported to have completely lost his temper and told the Senators that "it was none of our business what they did in Russian territory and that we had better keep our hands off."

The question of the occupation of the satellite states is a matter of supreme importance to the whole world and not alone to the western world. If that cannot be discussed, why do we talk Berlin?

The theory that we are avoiding war as long as we talk is a fatal doctrine. We are talking only because the Russians are getting something by talking and we are losing something.

The Russians don't want war now because they will in time get everything without it. I believe that I am reporting very fairly and accurately what we have heard since we started in Europe and as a postscript, they believe that if we got real tough, the Russians would fold up their tents and steal away.

Professor Slichter Asks: "Is U.S. Inflation Inevitable?"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, under the chairmanship of Vice President NIXON, in its recent reports, has reemphasized the absolute necessity for preventing further inflation. At stake are the savings of millions of Americans, as well as our competitive position in world markets.

Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, Lemont professor at the Harvard Business School, has adopted the premise that continued inflation in the United States is inevitable. The professor developed his ideas in an article which appeared in the London Financial Times on June 8, 1959. While I cannot accept his belief in the permanency of inflationary trends, he does diagnose correctly the basic cause of the problem as follows:

One of the frequent results of technological research is the creation of good opportunities for profit. But large profits encourage trade unions to make ambitious wage demands. Furthermore, large profits encourage business enterprises to make liberal concessions in order to avoid strikes.

The wage settlements made by the most profitable employers with the most aggressive unions affect the other wage settlements. The less profitable employers do not give as much as the most profitable employers, but when highly profitable concerns make liberal wage settlements, many other wage settlements are influenced. Hence, it is not surprising that the combination of thriving industrial research and aggressive unions pushes up wages far faster than the rise in productivity.

In the 10-year period 1948 to 1958 average hourly earnings of all workers in private industry rose almost twice as much as real output per man-hour. In a consolidated income statement for all American industry, wages and salaries are two-thirds of all costs—twice as important as all other costs combined. When this element in cost rises year after year twice as fast as real product per man-hour, an upward creep in the price level is obviously inevitable.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if costs are going to continue to rise year after year at a rate twice as fast as productivity, inflation is inevitable. It is difficult, however, to subscribe to Professor Slichter's belief that the American labor move-

ment is so devoid of statesmanship that it would continue to press for wage increases which so greatly exceed the general rise in productivity.

Professor Slichter's article referred to the problem of measuring the extent to which inflation has been a factor in the American economy. In this connection, he said:

There is no satisfactory measure of general price changes in the United States and that the published indexes have an upward bias—due to their failure to measure improvements in the quality of goods. The magnitude of the upward bias is unknown, but it is sufficient to exaggerate greatly the small upward movement of prices.

I completely concur with this statement, and I hope that the price economists in the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Department of Agriculture will devise some formula to reflect the vast improvement in the quality of the goods and services that Americans now enjoy. For example, the cost of medical care has become an increasingly important item in the budgets of many individuals. Yet, the quality of medical care has changed greatly during the past decade. A few years ago, a physician had a stethoscope and relatively simple instruments with which to examine his patients. Today, cardiograms, X-rays, laboratory tests, and wonder drugs of all kinds are employed as standard medical practice. To be sure, they cost more, but patients lose far less time from their productive activities, to say nothing of enjoying better health and a longer life.

The price index for automobiles, appliances, and countless other durable goods has also risen, but their physical characteristics have changed so drastically that, in effect, the purchaser actually receives better values than he did only a few years ago. Even in the case of food, many housewives are purchasing packaged maid service when they buy frozen dinners ready to serve after a half-hour in the oven.

In suggesting that efforts should be made to measure the upward bias in price indexes, Professor Slichter has rendered a distinct public service.

Mr. Speaker, my chief concern with the thesis advanced by Professor Slichter lies in his belief in the inevitability of continuous inflation, and his only solution is to encourage more foreign competition. In this same article from the London Financial Times, he said:

Too much must not be expected from foreign competition, partly because American industry (particularly manufacturing industry) is low cost industry and party because of powerful protectionist sentiment that keeps duties high and puts pressure on the Government to impose quotas or higher duties as soon as a few goods enter the country.

That too much effect on American prices should not be expected from foreign competition is indicated by the fact that in 1958 American exports of finished manufactures were 2.4 times imports of finished manufactures. But on many items, especially those requiring considerable handwork, foreign producers can undersell American producers. If the protectionists can be prevented from keeping out foreign goods, foreign competition will be a useful check on rising prices here as well as a stimulus to a better allocation of capital and labor among industries, and a useful spur to efficiency. If the people of the United States truly wish to make a hard try to halt the slow rise in prices, let them begin at once a gradual program of eliminating duties and quotas.

Mr. Speaker, American management and labor, I am sure, will find ways to insure that the benefits of technology are reflected in better values for American consumers and that we may continue to enjoy our share of expanding world markets. We must not be engulfed by foreign products produced by unorganized cheap labor.

I am pleased to include Professor Slichter's complete statement, as follows:

IS U.S. INFLATION INEVITABLE?

(By Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, of Harvard University)

Two circumstances are mainly responsible for the belief that the price level in the United States is likely in the long run to be slowly rising. One is the rapid growth of technological research that seems likely to continue indefinitely. The other is that the country has a powerful and aggressive trade union movement.

The growth of technological research is a natural result of competition, since firms which neglect research are likely to find themelves handicapped by high costs and by products that are out of date. Measured by the number of specialized scientists and engineers engaged in this activity, research and development work in 1956 was 5 times as large as it was in 1930; measured by the proportion of the gross national product devoted to research, it was 13 times as large. Research increased right through the recession of 1958, and the latest McGraw-Hill survey of spending indicates that business concerns plan to increase their research expenditure by 10.7 percent in 1959 and by 17.1 percent between 1959 and 1962.

EFFECTS OF HIGH PROFITS

One of the frequent results of technological research is the creation of good opportunities for profit. But large profits encourage trade unions to make ambitious wage demands. Furthermore, large profits encourage business enterprises to make liberal concessions in order to avoid strikes.

The wage settlements made by the most profitable employers with the most aggressive unions affect the other wage settlements. The less profitable employers do not give as much as the most profitable employers, but when highly profitable concerns make liberal wage settlements, many other wage settlements are influenced. Hence, it is not surprising that the combination of thriving industrial research and aggressive unions pushes up wages far faster than the rise in productivity.

In the 10-year period 1948 to 1958 average hourly earnings of all workers in private industry rose almost twice as much as real output per man-hour. In a consolidated income statement for all American industry, wages and salaries are two-thirds of all costs, twice as important as all other costs combined. When this element in costs rises year after year twice as fast as real product per man-hour, an upward creep in the price level is obviously inevitable.

What chance is there of changing the fundamental conditions that have produced the upward creep in the price level? The chance, I fear, is only moderately good. Specialized research and development are bound to grow. But cannot union power be limited by taking away some of the extraordinary privileges and immunities that unions enjoy?

Certain unions should be deprived of the right to engage in coercive picketing for the purpose of forcing men to join and the right to conscript neutrals in trade disputes for the purpose of helping the union defeat its opponents But, though these charges would remove inequities, they would not greatly affect the bargaining power of most unions.

SHOULD UNIONS BE SMALLER?

A more ambitious scheme is the proposal to destroy the monopoly power of trade unions by breaking up unions into several parts. But breaking up unions is not a promising method of dealing with the problem of excessive union power. The only method of breaking up unions that would make much difference would be one that divided the employees in large companies, such as General Motors or United States Steel, into several rival unions.

Then the problem would be to prevent collusion among them. And even if there were not collusion, the bargaining power of the unions would still be strong—as is shown by the experience of the American Can Co. and the Continental Can Co. which bargain with the United Steelworkers in some plants and the International Association of Machinists in other plants. And breaking up unions would create new and difficult problems for there would be rivalries among the new unions that would produce irresponsible and demagogic union leadership.

SELECTIVE CREDIT RESTRAINT

Inflation could no doubt be halted by a tight credit policy that produced an appreciable amount of unemployment. But the deliberate refusal of the community to use all of its resources would be intolerably wasteful. The amount of unemployment needed to produce stable prices would vary with circumstances. In 1958, with bad weather producing a rise in farm prices, an unemployment rate of 6.8 percent did not prevent a 2.7 percent rise in the Consumer Price Index.

Moreover, general credit restraint is too sweeping a policy and impedes economic activity at too many points where restraint is harmful. It needs to be replaced with a series of selective controls on real-estate credit and short-term consumer credit, which for all their leakages are preferable under most circumstances to draconian general restraints on credits.

Must we conclude that in the long run full utilization of resources and stability of the price level in the American economy are incompatible? The answer is probably "yes"; but two qualifications are important. One is that there is no satisfactory measure of general price changes in the United States and that the published indexes have an upward bias, due to their failure to measure improvements in the quality of goods. The magnitude of the upward bias is unknown, but it is sufficient to exaggerate greatly the small upward movement of prices.

GROWING FOREIGN COMPETITION

The second important qualification is the possibility that American prices will be held down in the long run by growing foreign competition. Too much must not be expected from foreign competition, partly because American industry (particularly manufacturing industry) is low-cost industry and partly because of powerful protectionist sentiment that keeps duties high and puts pressure on the Government to impose quotas or higher duties as soon as a few goods enter the country.

That too much effect on American prices should not be expected from foreign competition is indicated by the fact that in 1958 American exports of finished manufactures were 2.4 times imports of finished manufactures. But on many items, especially those requiring considerable handwork, foreign producers can undersell American producers. If the protectionists can be prevented from keeping out foreign goods, foreign competi-

tion will be a useful check on rising prices here as well as a stimulus to a better allocation of capital and labor among industries and a useful spur to efficiency. If the people of the United States truly wish to make a hard try to halt the slow rise in prices, let them begin at once a gradual program of eliminating duties and quotas.

Rural Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks several important national news media have featured lengthy articles on the rural development program. The latest in a growing list of influential newspapers and magazines recognizing and reporting on this important program is Coronet magazine, which reaches more than 3 million readers throughout the country.

Coronet's nationally known agricultural and conservation writer, Peter Farb, reports that the rural development program is sparking a "rebirth of rural towns" all across the Nation. His article is an excellent summary of a program that is receiving increasing attention in the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Farb's article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

THE REMARKABLE REBIRTH OF OUR RURAL TOWNS

(By Peter Farb)

When Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College made a study, about 12 years ago, of Choctaw County in the southeastern part of the State, it was amazed to find that the greatest single source of income there was old-age assistance and relief checks. Nearly half of the population had drifted away to more enterprising communities.

If it weren't for the local banker in Hugo, Okla., the county seat, and other energetic citizens, the sheriff's sign would today be nailed to the whole of Choctaw County. Instead, a citizens' committee undertook the colossal task of creating jobs and wealth where none existed previously.

They improved agriculture by helping the farmers switch to truck crops, set up a corporation with $50,000 working capital to build a cannery to process the new vegetable crop, and brought in registered dairy heifers from California, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Then they set out to bring new industry into the county. A glove manufacturer agreed to locate a new factory in Hugo—but he wanted the community to provide the $200,000 building.

That was when the whole town mobilized. The owners of the projected factory site decided to contribute it outright. Two banks donated $5,000 each, and so did the electric and gas companies. Donations of gravel and lumber poured in, electricians wired the factory in their off-hours, and citizens gathered at the railroad siding in the evening to unload steel and cement blocks. As a result, the $200,000 factory was erected for only $89,000—and provided the community with a 10-year payroll of approximately $2 million.

Since then, Choctaw has added six more industries, built new churches, a modern hospital, and remodeled the shopping area. Bank deposits are up, income has soared, and young people are staying in a county that has come to life.

Many of the techniques used by Choctaw already have been duplicated by about 100 other counties in 30 States. In each county, local residents have launched what is known as a rural development program which is lifting rural areas out of the economic doldrums.

Unlike its city counterpart—urban renewal—which often requires tremendous Government loans for slum clearance, the rural development program relies mainly on the manpower, pioneer energy, and civic pride of a county's citizens.

Typical is Butler County, Kentucky. A group of farmers, businessmen and civic officials sat down together and worked out a long-range plan to improve their lot.

Now Butler County glistens with fresh paint. Bulldozers toil at reclaiming worn-out pastures; old buildings are being remodeled for use as community centers, or else torn down as fire hazards. There's a new badly needed health center, a plumbing school now teaches farmers to install their own water systems and the water supply itself is being made safer. Rev. R. L. Burnett, pastor of two rural churches, has reaped an unsuspected benefit from the rural development program. "My church attendance has increased over 20 percent," he states.

Rural areas have long been in need of rejuvenation. In 1954, a year of record prosperity, about one quarter of America's farm families still earned less than $1,000 in total income. Health conditions have often been so poor that in World War II farmers had the highest rate o. rejection from military service. Rural communities have been losing population for years, and opportunities for youth in these areas have almost been nonexistent.

Much of the current interest in rural development stems from the activities of Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse, former president of Doane Agricultural Service of St. Louis, a large farm-and-town management consulting firm.

Morse was one of the originators of the rural development program idea, and first tested it in Tupelo, Miss., right after World War II. After studying the area, he concluded that the job could be done with local resources—if the whole county were effectively organized.

First, Tupelo businessmen raised $30,000 a year out of their own pockets to assist the farmers in overhauling their rickety farms. (Later they were repaid when the town's business increased almost twice as rapidly as the State average.) So dramatic was the change that delegations from hard-pressed counties in 23 States visited Tupelo, and some returned home to put similar programs into operation as quickly as possible.

One such group was from Asheville, N.C. In 1949 it retained True Morse to do the same sort of "partnership for progress" job in 16 counties in the western part of the State. Local businessmen were inspired to invest $250,000 of their own money in growth, but in return, they saw retail sales increase by 74 percent and new multi-million-dollar factories locate there. Says Morris L. McGough, executive vice president of Asheville's agricultural development council: "The communities have reached back into the past and recaptured the art of working together."

To see if the same thing could be done on a national scale, Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson called a conference of State and local leaders in 1955. They decided to select some of the counties in the Nation that most needed rehabilitation and use them as models. Five departments and one agency of the Federal Government agreed to aid the rural development program, and Morse was named chairman of the joint committee. To date, the program has cost the Federal Government less than $7 million, approximately what it spends for merely storing surplus crops for less than 1 week.

The most remarkable thing about the rural development program is the way it gathers momentum. In Macon County, Tenn., a local committee was able to borrow about $175,000 to erect a factory, but was still $100,000 short of its goal. So about 600 farmers and local businessmen dug into their pockets and contributed the bulk of it. Additional dollars were contributed by town workers who voluntarily turned over $5 or $10 a month out of their wages. Enough money was raised to complete the factory, which now provides jobs for nearly 600 local people, with an annual payroll of about $1,350,000.

The entire Upper Peninsula of Michigan, 15 counties in all, has started its own resource development program. Each county is concentrating on the resources it most wants to develop. In some, the tourist and resort business provides the largest source of income, so motels and cabins have been remodeled and new recreational facilities constructed. In one county, more than 300 high school students were trained for summer resort jobs.

Starting a rural development program isn't very difficult. At first, all that is needed is a local leader to begin it. In Monroe County, Ohio, it was a minister, Rev. Keene Leibold. In Hardin County, Tenn., bank president, Con Welch was the sparkplug who arranged for a $40 million papermill to locate in the county.

The most important step, however, is to set up a rural development committee that represents all the economic, religious, and educational groups in the county. Then find out what's wrong in the county. What conditions can be bettered? Who can help? Often it turns out that a nearby utility industry or farm organization has been aching to improve conditions in the county all along. If your State already has a rural development program, ask the dean of agriculture at your land-grant college for technical assistance.

Finally, be sure that you've organized all the way down to the neighborhood level. Many counties have found rural development clubs successful weapons. There are 13 such clubs in Tippah County, Miss., which keep churches and school buildings in good repair; they have also constructed roadside parks. Each month, 1 day is put aside as a workday: a farm is chosen by lot and everyone works to improve it.

A strong rural development program in your county can bring about what Secretary of Agriculture Benson believes has been the program's most important contribution to rural life. "A general attitude of resignation and complacency, a feeling that nothing can be done about economic ills, has been replaced," he says, "by a new awareness of community resources, community strength, and the real possibility that incomes can be raised."

Program of Economic Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, on September 3, appearing at page 16517 in the RECORD, I called attention to a news item carried in the press which indicated

that a program of economic aid to the members of the Central Treaty Organization for the current fiscal year had been announced by an official of the State Department on September 2. I pointed out that the foreign aid appropriations bill had not passed and suggested that if the press comments were accurate the announcement of a program was premature and improper.

I am glad to be advised concerning the actual announcement which Mr. Donald D. Kennedy made. Mr. Leonard J. Saccio, Acting Director, International Cooperation Administration, has furnished me with the pertinent portion of Mr. Kennedy's statement, which reads as follows:

At the time of the London meeting, I stated that the total U.S. economic aid in all forms to the pact members under our bilateral program for the year ending June 30, 1958, amounted to around $300 million. The total for the year ending June 30, 1959, comes to around $470 million—up over 50 percent. I mention this only to provide factual support to general statements as to our interest in and strong desire to help those associated in this organization.

Clearly, Mr. Kennedy's remarks were in connection with appropriations made in prior years. Whatever may have been the actual expenditures in fiscal year 1959, his comments would indicate that $470 million had been obligated from the fiscal year 1959 appropriation.

I am glad to have the record complete and bring it to the attention of the House.

A Special Report on the Labor-Management Reform Act by Representative Jessica McCullough Weis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, millions of words have already been written about the Labor-Management Reform Act. Certainly it was the most controversial, the most far reaching, and the most important piece of legislation enacted by this 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Hundreds and hundreds of my constituents wrote me at the time this legislation was being considered, and because of its importance I submit the following report prepared by Congressional Quarterly on the major provisions contained in the bill as it was finally accepted by both Houses.

It is, of course, impossible to evaluate the provisions of this bill until they have actually been put into effect and we have had an opportunity to observe the consequences. But I am convinced that the bill will go a long way toward rooting out the corruption and racketeering which had worked its way into the labor-management relations field. At the same time, I do not believe that this bill will harm the clean, democratically run union; it will, in fact, protect and promote honest trade unionism.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert at this point in the RECORD the report on this legislation:

REPORT ON THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT

I. BILL OF RIGHTS

Guarantees union members "equal rights and privileges" to nominate candidates, vote for union officers, participate in union meetings and caucus with other members under "reasonable rules and regulations" established by the union.

Bars unions from raising dues or initiation fees or making special assessments except by secret-ballot majority vote or, in national and international unions, by majority vote of the executive board or convention.

Bars unions from preventing a member from appearing before any governmental judicial, legislative or administrative proceeding, or from suing the union; provides that the member exhaust "reasonable" union hearing procedures for up to 4 months before instituting a proceeding against the union; bars employers from financing or prompting such suits.

Requires a union, before disciplining a member, to give him written charges, a full and fair hearing and reasonable time to prepare his defense.

Requires unions to furnish members with copies of collective bargaining contracts, and to inform members of the provisions of the bill.

Permits a union member whose rights under the bill of rights section were infringed, or who was fined, expelled, suspended, or disciplined by the union for exercising any right guaranteed him by the bill, to file a Federal civil suit for relief; makes it a crime, subject to a $1,000 fine and 1 year in prison, to threaten or use violence in order to interfere with rights guaranteed union members by the bill.

II. LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTS

Requires all unions to adopt constitutions and bylaws and to register them, and other information outlining their financial and organizational structure, with the Secretary of Labor.

Requires unions to file annual reports with the Secretary detailing assets and liabilities, receipts and sources, payments to any employee receiving more than $10,000 from the union, loans to union members or employees aggregating more than $250 to one person, loans to businesses and other disbursements; the information would be made available to any union member on request, and a member could sue in Federal or State court to get permission to examine records necessary to verify the reports.

Requires officers and employees of unions to file annual reports with the Secretary outlining possible conflict-of-interest payments and receipts and stock and other financial transactions of themselves or members of their family with employers or employer middlemen.

Requires employers who paid money to union members or representatives, other than ordinary wages, or to labor relations consultants (middlemen), for the purpose of influencing employees on their collective bargaining rights, to report the details of such payments to the Secretary of Labor; similar reports would be filed by labor relations consultants but lawyers would not have to report on legitimate lawyer-client relationships and payments.

Makes all the reports filed under this section public information, to be made available for inspection by the Secretary.

Requires anyone filing a report to maintain records to corroborate it for 5 years.

Makes it a crime not to file a report, to make false statements on it, or to destroy or make false entry in records required to be kept; permits the Secretary of Labor to seek injunctions and orders in Federal courts to prevent or stop violations of the reporting section.

III. TRUSTEESHIPS

Requires any union exercising trusteeship over a union local to file semiannual reports with the Secretary of Labor detailing the conditions of the trusteeship and the financial condition of the local; makes it a crime not to file, to file falsely or to destroy records; makes the reports public information.

Permits trusteeships only for the purpose of carrying out the "legitimate objects" of the union; makes it a crime to count the votes of a local under the trusteeship in a national union election unless the local's delegates were chosen by secret-ballot majority vote, or to transfer money, except normal yearly assessments, from the local to the national union.

Permits the Secretary of Labor or a member of a local under trusteeship to file civil suits to prevent violations of the trusteeship requirements; in such suits, a trusteeship would be presumed valid for 18 months from the date of its establishment, not to be disturbed except on "clear and convincing proof" of bad faith in establishing it. At the end of 18 months, it would be presumed invalid but could be extended by the court.

Elections

Requires local unions to elect officers by secret-ballot majority vote at least once every 3 years; national unions and intermediate bodies at least once every 5 years and 4 years, respectively, by secret ballot or vote of delegates elected by secret ballot.

Requires these elections safeguards: Bona fide candidates given the right to require the union to comply with reasonable requests to mail the candidate's campaign literature to members of the organization, at his expense (enforcible by civil court suit); in unions with union shop contracts, the candidate would also have the right to inspect the membership lists; candidates given the right to have observers at polls and counting of ballots; reasonable opportunity given to nominate; preservation of ballots; no use of union or employer funds to finance a candidate.

Permits the Secretary of Labor to conduct an election for recall of a union officer guilty of serious misconduct if the union did not have adequate recall procedures.

Permits a union member who claims the union is violating its own or the bill's election or recall safeguards, and who has sought remedy through internal union procedures but has not received a decision for 3 months, to ask the Secretary of Labor to seek a Federal court order for a new election or recall election under the Secretary's supervision.

Fiduciary and other safeguards

States that union officers occupy positions of trust and are obligated to handle and spend union money and property solely for the benefit of the union and its members, in accord with its constitution and bylaws.

Permits union members to sue in Federal or State courts to recover damages or ask an accounting when a union officer is alleged to have violated the trust imposed above, and the union has made no attempt to recover.

Makes it a crime to embezzle, steal, or otherwise misappropriate union funds; makes it a crime for a union officer handling union moneys not to be bonded.

Bars a union from lending more than $2,000 to any officer or employee, and from paying the fine of an officer or employee convicted of violating the bill.

Bars from union office for 5 years persons convicted of specified felonies or of viola-

tions of the reporting or trusteeship provisions of the bill; Communist Party members would be barred for a similar period. All such persons also would be barred from serving as labor relations consultants or as officers of associations or groups of employers dealing with any union. Violation would be a crime. An existing requirement that officers of unions seeking to use the auspices of the National Labor Relations Board sign non-Communist affidavits is repealed.

Outlaws payments, except bona fide wages and fringe benefits to union representatives by employers or employer "middlemen," and makes it illegal to accept or solicit such payments; outlaws truck unloading fees.

Makes it a crime to picket for the purpose of extortion.

Gives the Secretary of Labor power to investigate, with the right of subpena, suspected violation of any provisions of the bill except the "Bill of Rights" and the Taft-Hartley Act amendments.

IV. TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Permits State labor relations agencies and State courts to assume jurisdiction over labor disputes the National Labor Relations Board decline to handle, but bars the NLRB from enlarging the categories of cases it declined to handle.

Permits the President to designate an acting NLRB General Counsel if the office were vacant.

Makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to try to coerce or threaten an employer directly (but not to persuade or ask him) in order: to get him to join a union or sign any illegal hot cargo contract; to get him to stop doing business with another firm or handling its goods; to get him to recognize a union if the NLRB had already certified another union as his workers' bargaining agent; to force him to assign work to members of one union, rather than another, in a jurisdictional dispute between unions representing his employees; to get any other employer to recognize a union not certified as the representative of his employees in an NLRB election. (Direct coercion of an employer by a union for these purposes was not previously covered by the secondary boycott prohibitions.)

Makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to induce supervisory workers or any single worker, to refuse to handle goods, or to strike, for any of the purposes outlined above. (Previously, supervisors were not covered by the secondary boycott prohibitions, and inducement of a worker to stop working was banned only if he ceased working in concert with other workers.)

Specifies that union inducement of employees not to handle work "farmed out" to their employer by a struck firm was not a secondary boycott.

Makes it an unfair labor practice for a union and employer to sign a so-called hot cargo contract under which the employer agrees not to do business with any other firm; nullifies any such existing contracts; exempts from this provision garment industry contracts barring a jobber from subcontracting work on a single garment to unorganized shops, and building industry contracts barring a firm from subcontracting work at its jobsite to an unorganized firm.

Bars organizational or recognition picketing by a union: if in the absence of an unfair labor practice by an employer, the employer already recognized another union or there had been any NLRB certification election in the previous 12 months; or if the union had been picketing for 30 days and had not asked for an election. If the union claimed its picketing was purely informational it could picket for longer than 30 days without seeking an election, provided the picketing did not cause the employees of the firm involved to stop working or prevent deliveries or pickup of goods.

Brings under the picketing and secondary boycott prohibitions of the bill and of the Taft-Hartley Act several groups of workers not previously covered, railroad, airline, farm, and local government workers.

Permits the NLRB to allow strikers fired during a strike and not entitled to reinstatement to vote in an NLRB representation election conducted within a year after the strike began.

Bars a union from picketing a retail store to advertise that the store was handling the goods of a firm the union was striking; but permits other forms of such advertising (handbills, for example) if they do not cause the store's employees to stop working or prevent pickups and deliveries.

Permits building trades firms and unions to sign union contracts in advance of a construction job, even if the union has not won an NLRB certification election or does not represent the majority of the existing or potential employees. Such contracts could require the employees to join the union within 7 days (except in States with laws barring the union shop), require the employer to hire through the union, or permit the union to set up experience and training qualifications for employees.

Activities of the Committee on the Judiciary, 86th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives found itself charged with major responsibility in many areas of congressional concern.

Of the 10,676 bills introduced in the House, 28.7 percent of this total was referred to this committee. Of this number, 1,002 were public bills, House and Senate, and 2,284 were private bills, likewise of House and Senate, giving to this committee 3,286 bills in all. Exclusive of private legislation, approximately 185 hearings were held on legislation pending before the committee. Seventy-six public bills were acted upon favorably by the committee, of which 44 became public laws; 29 of which are still pending before the Senate; two pending before the Rules Committee, H.R. 8601, civil rights bill, and H.R. 2739, Patent Office fees; and one pending House action on amendment proposed by the Senate, H.R. 5747, bankruptcy bill.

Of the private immigration bills, 140 became private laws; 4 are pending in the Senate; 173 individual bills were incorporated in House joint resolutions; 15 were deleted from joint resolutions by the Senate; 401 were tabled; and 49 were deferred.

Of the private claim bills, 86 were enacted into private law; and 97 are pending in the Senate; 178 passed the House.

Of major public interest are such bills as H.R. 8601, the civil rights bill; H.R. 3, to establish rules of interpretation governing questions of the effect of acts of Congress on State laws; S. 2524, relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce; S. 726, to amend section 11 of the Clayton Act to provide for the more expeditious enforcement of cease and desist orders issued thereunder, and for other purposes; H.R. 3088, to amend sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; H.R. 6118, to amend section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957—immigration and nationality; H.R. 5896, to provide for the entry of certain relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens; H.R. 2725, to amend chapter 3 of title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the use of motor vehicles to hunt certain wild horses or burros on land belonging to the United States, and for other purposes. Of these, the civil rights bill, H.R. 8601; H.R. 3 which has involved the doctrine of Federal preemption; and S. 2524, State taxation of income from interstate commerce, were probably the bills of greatest controversy. S. 2524 was enacted into law adopting the minimum exemption standard prohibiting the States from taxing income from the mere solicitation of orders to be fulfilled and shipped from out of the State. H.R. 3, enacted by the House, is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the civil rights bill, perhaps most controversial of all, is pending before the Rules Committee of the House.

A review of the activities of the subcommittees, which follows, indicates the enormous amount of work done and is evidence of the faithful performance of the individual members of the committee in reviewing and reaching decisions on the matters before them. I am grateful for the cooperation and the conscientious consideration which the members gave to this committee. I appreciate, also, the harmonious and excellent staff work which has enabled the Members to go forward vigorously in the discharge of their responsibilities.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, DURING THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary has special jurisdiction over all legislation pertaining to immigration and nationality, and jurisdiction over any legislation assigned to it by the chairman of the full committee.

In the field of immigration and nationality, Subcommittee No. 1 has acted on the following bills:

H.R. 2807 creates a single, separate, statutory form of judicial review of administrative orders for the deportation and exclusion of aliens from the United States. Aliens may seek judicial review of an order of deportation by filing a petition in the U.S. circuit court of appeals, orders of exclusion to be reviewed exclusively by writs of habeas corpus. Such orders shall not be reviewed until all administrative remedies have been exhausted. The bill provides for trial de novo of substantial claims to American nationality by persons who have been ordered deported. The bill passed the House on July 6, 1959.

H.R. 3088 amends certain provisions of sections 353 and 354 of the Immigration and Nationality Act which specify exemptions from the loss of U.S. citizenship by naturalized citizens by including parent or parents of a U.S. citizen who is or are accompanying such citizen for the purpose of remaining with him while he has his residence abroad for reasons specified in the law. Honorably discharged veterans who served

during the Korean conflict are included in the exemption from automatic loss of citizenship by reason of residence abroad, which exemption is enjoyed by veterans of the Spanish-American War, World War I, and World War II. The bill changes from 25 to 15 years the residence requirement which precludes the loss of citizenship by naturalized citizens residing in a foreign country. The bill was enacted into law on August 4, 1959 (Public Law 86–129).

H.R. 5896 reclassifies close relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens admitted for permanent residence in the United States in the preference portion of the immigration quotas and expedites reuniting of certain families. Alien adult unmarried sons and daughters of U.S. citizens are reclassified to the second preference classification; alien adult sons and daughters of aliens admitted into the United States for permanent residence are placed in the third preference classification. Immigrants registered on the consular waiting lists prior to an established date, who have a preferential quota status, and spouses and minor children of aliens admitted into the United States under the Refugee Relief Act of 1953, who have a preference status, are considered to be nonquota immigrants; accompanying spouses and minor children are held to be nonquota immigrants. Spouses and minor children accompanying fourth preference beneficiaries are included in that category. The number of alien children adopted by U.S. citizens in whose custody they remained for over 2 years is limited to two unless necessary to prevent the separation of brothers and sisters. The bill passed the House on July 6, 1959, and was enacted into law September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86–363).

H.R. 6118 extends for 2 years section 6 of the act of September 11, 1957, the discretionary authority vested in the Attorney General to grant waivers of exclusion in the case of spouses, parents, and minor children, including minor adopted children of U.S. citizens or of aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence, notwithstanding the fact that such close relatives are afflicted with tuberculosis.

The same bill also extended the law relating to the immigration of orphans. The bill authorizes the Attorney General to investigate the facts in each case to determine the validity of the adoption and the good moral character of the interested parties.

The bill was enacted into law September 9, 1959 (Public Law 86–253).

As usual, Subcommittee No. 1 worked extensively on private immigration and nationality legislation, and the summary of that action follows:

One thousand, six hundred and ninety-five House bills, House joint resolutions, and Senate bills were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. Of those, 140 became private laws, 4 are pending in the Senate, 173 individual bills were incorporated in House joint resolutions, 15 were deleted from joint resolutions by the Senate, 401 were tabled, 49 were deferred, and 913 are pending before the committee.

In addition, there were 5 Senate concurrent resolutions, 1 House concurrent resolution, and 1 House resolution, covering the cases of 185 aliens, which were approved by this committee.

Under the general jurisdiction of Subcommittee No. 1, the following bills were considered:

H.R. 1992 extends the application of chapter 37, title 18, United States Code, relating to espionage and censorship, to acts committed anywhere in the world by repealing section 791 of that title, which provides that the provisions of chapter 37 shall apply only within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, on the high seas, and within the United States. The bill passed the House on March 2, 1959.

H.R. 4154 permits the indictment and trial of an offender or joint offenders who commit offenses abroad against the United States, in the district where any of the offenders is arrested or first brought; and also prevents the statute of limitations for tolling in cases where an offender or any of the joint offenders remain beyond the bounds of the United States by permitting the filing of an information or indictment in the last known residence of any of the offenders, or in the event that the residence of any of the offenders in the United States is not known, by filing indictment or information in the District of Columbia. The bill passed the House on March 16, 1959.

H.R. 8461 amends the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules on Judicial Procedure by extending the life of the Commission for an additional 2 years, to December 31, 1961. The purpose of the Commission is to investigate and study existing practices of judicial assistance and cooperation between the United States and foreign countries with a view to achieving improvements. The bill passed the House on August 17, 1959, and was enacted into law September 16, 1959 (Public Law 86–287).

S. 355 adds a new section to title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit the use by collecting agencies or private detective agencies of any emblem, insignia, or name, or the words "national," "Federal," or "United States," or the initials "U.S.," for the purpose of conveying, or in a manner reasonably calculated to convey, the false impression that such business is a department, agency, bureau, or instrumentality of the U.S. Government. The bill passed the House amended on August 17, 1959, and was enacted into law on September 21, 1959 (Public Law 86–290).

S. 1947 (House companion bill, H.R. 7126) confers on the Customs Court the authority to appoint various clerks and other employees and to authorize the appointment of a marshal and deputy marshal, which appointments are intended to be in accordance with presently prevailing laws relating to such appointments in other U.S. courts. The bill passed the House on August 31, 1959, and was enacted into law September 9, 1959 (Public Law 86–243).

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 2—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS, AS ASSIGNED SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER CLAIMS

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee conducted hearings on 30 different days. These covered public as well as private claims measures.

Consideration was given to a total of 327 bills and resolutions.

The subcommittee considered two bills which provided for the amendment of the tort claims provisions of title 28 of the United States Code. H.R. 6000, providing for an increase in the administrative settlement authority of section 2672 of that title, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations contained in an executive communication from the Post Office Department. The bill passed the House with the amendments formulated in the subcommittee, which provided for increasing the authority of heads of agencies to settle tort claims against the Government by payments up to $2,000. This limit was increased by the Senate to $2,500, and the House agreed to that amendment. The bill became Public Law 86–238. The other bill relating to the Tort Claims Act as now codified in title 28, was H.R. 7577, concerning the liability of Government drivers. The subcommittee held an extensive hearing on H.R. 3283, introduced in accordance with an executive communication from the General Services Administration, and related bills on this subject. The subcommittee's recommendations as to amendments to H.R. 3283 were accepted by the full committee and were embodied in H.R. 7577 which was reported by the committee. It passed the House but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

H.R. 4821, providing for amendments to the Texas City Disaster Relief Act, was the subject of a hearing before the subcommittee. The subcommittee recommended amendments to the bill to limit the proposed changes to certain categories of claims. The bill was reported with those amendments, and the bill passed the House and Senate in the form recommended by the subcommittee. The bill became Public Law 86–381.

The subcommittee considered two bills amending section 2734 of title 10 of the United States Code concerning claims arising in foreign countries as the result of the noncombat activities of the Armed Forces of the United States. H.R. 2741 provided that the Secretary of the Treasury would have the same authority to act in behalf of the Coast Guard in the settlement of such claims as only the Secretaries of the military departments previously possessed. The bill passed the House and Senate, and became Public Law 86–223. The other bill, H.R. 2740, would increase the period during which such claims might be filed from 1 to 2 years, and was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of an executive communication from the Department of Defense. It passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

A bill, H.R. 470, which would permit the settlement of claims arising as the result of the use of a motor vehicle anywhere, or the use of property of the United States on a Government installation when the claims would not be cognizable under any other law, was favorably considered by the subcommittee and was reported to the House by the full committee. The bill passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

The subcommittee also considered a bill, H.R. 7529, which would confer jurisdiction on the Comptroller General to waive indebtedness based on erroneous payments by the Government to its employees, members of the military services, or persons formerly in such categories, when the department concerned recommends relief and collection would be against equity and good conscience. The bill was reported to the House and passed, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

The Committee on the Judiciary reported three bills validating certain payments to Armed Forces personnel, their dependents, or employees of the military departments. H.R. 2975 validated certain quarters allowances to civilian employees who served in London, England, between January 1, 1949, and August 16, 1958. That bill passed the House and Senate and became Public Law 86–26. H.R. 4615 validated a group of about 80 transportation requests and payments of mileage or per diem, or both, to members of the naval service for travel performed in accordance with the terms of the bill. The bill became Public Law 86–25. H.R. 8106 provided statutory authority for all temporary storage of household effects of members of the Navy under an interpretation of the joint travel regulations of the uniformed forces which was subsequently challenged by the Comptroller General. The bill passed the House, but no action was taken in the Senate prior to adjournment.

A number of bills granting relief of State or political subdivisions within States were referred to the subcommittee. Among the bills recommended favorably was H.R. 322, compensating Monmouth County, N.J., for damage to a bridge, which became Public Law 86–128. H.R. 7605, for the relief of the State of Oklahoma, which was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the

Court of Claims in a congressional reference case, provided for the payment of $652,019.71 in settlement of the claims of that State based on the agreement embodied in a stipulation between the State and the Federal Government. That bill became Public Law 86-369.

The bill, S. 1330, providing for an additional payment of $4,000 to the city of Fort Myers, Fla., by an amendment to an act passed in 1958, was reported by the committee. That bill became Public Law 86-180. The bill, H.R. 2390, for Madeira Beach, Fla., settled the city's claim for the cost of erosion control, and became Public Law 86-353.

The subcommittee considered a number of bills which did not relate to its special jurisdiction over claims. The bill, H.R. 2725, barring the use of aircraft or motor vehicles in the hunting or capture of wild horses or burros, and similarly barring the pollution of water holes used by such animals to kill them or effect their capture, was such a bill. It was reported by the committee, passed the House and Senate, and became Public Law 86-234. A bill, H.R. 4012, providing for the observance of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and the establishment of land-grant colleges, was reported by the committee after being favorably recommended by the subcommittee. The bill passed the House, was reported in the Senate, but no further action was taken in that body prior to adjournment. The subcommittee held hearings on bills concerning standards to be observed in the establishment of congressional districts, and also on bills to provide representation of indigent defendants in criminal proceedings in the Federal courts. The subcommittee had not made a final recommendation to the full committee as to these two subjects at the time of adjournment. The subcommittee also considered the bill, H.R. 8107, which was the subject of a 2-day hearing. This bill, which would have imposed criminal penalties for the use of U.S. savings stamps for trade promotion, was adversely acted upon by the subcommittee.

The following tabulation indicates the workload of this subcommittee in connections with claims against the Government:

Referred to subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	538
Private, House joint resolutions	1
Private, House resolutions	11
Private, Senate bills	23
Total	573
Public, House bills	76
Public, House joint resolutions	13
Public, House resolution	1
Public, Senate bills	2
Total	92
Grand total	665
Approved by subcommittee:	
Private, House bills	195
Private, House resolutions	6
Private, Senate bills	18
Total	219
Public, House bills	13
Public, House resolutions	1
Public, Senate bills	1
Total	15
Grand total	234
Private, House bills adversely	54
Private, Senate bills adversely	1
Public, House bills adversely	28
Total	83
Reported to House:	
Private, House bills	181
Private, House resolutions	6
Private, Senate bills	15
Total	202
Public, House bills	13
Public, House resolutions	1
Public, Senate bills	1
Total	15
Grand total	217
Passed House:	
Private, House bills	178
Private, House resolutions	6
Private, Senate bills	15
Total	199
Public, House bills	13
Public, House resolutions	1
Public, Senate bills	1
Total	15
Grand total	214
Pending in Senate:	
Private, House bills	97
Public, House bills	2
Total	99
Public laws enacted	11
Private laws enacted	86
Bills vetoed (private)	9

Sent six private claims bills of the House to the Court of Claims by House resolutions.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND REVISION OF THE LAWS.

This subcommittee processes such general legislation as is referred to it and also legislation relating to patents, trademarks, and copyrights. It also has jurisdiction over the revision of the laws, classifying all laws of a general and permanent nature to the 50 titles which comprise the United States Code. In all, 161 bills were referred for the subcommittee's consideration; 18 bills were acted upon favorably; 55 bills were recommended for tabling; and 88 bills are pending. The following statement highlights some of the legislation processed by the subcommittee.

General legislation

General: The subcommittee processed H.R. 3, a bill establishing rules of interpretation for Federal courts involving the doctrine of Federal preemption. This bill, which has already passed the House, sets up a statutory rule of construction to guide the courts in future actions in construing existing statutes by providing that no act of Congress shall be construed as indicating an intent on the part of Congress to occupy the field of law to the exclusion of all State laws on the same subject unless Congress so states or unless there is a direct and positive conflict between the congressional act and the State law so that the two cannot be reconciled or consistently stand together.

In the field of evidence, the subcommittee favorably recommended and the House passed H.R. 4957, relating to the admissibility of evidence (popularly referred to as the Mallory bill). This legislation resulted from the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Mallory v. U.S.*, 354 U.S. 449, and provides a statutory rule of evidence for the admissibility of confessions and other evidence in criminal proceedings. This legislation is written so as to protect the constitutional rights of the individual as well as the rights of society in the field of criminal law enforcement.

Another bill of major importance is H.R. 2369, introduced as the result of the Supreme Court decision in the *Yates* case (354 U.S. 298) wherein the conviction of 14 known Communists for violating the Smith Act was set aside because, among other things, of the meaning of "organize" as that term is presently interpreted in the act. The instant legislation, which has already passed the House, clarifies the term "organize" so as to mean a continuing process of organizing groups and recruiting new members for the Communist Party.

The subcommittee also processed H.R. 3216—habeas corpus. This legislation is intended to restrain the abuse of the use of this great writ in lower Federal courts by prisoners who have been convicted in State courts and who seek to have the action of the State courts reviewed and reversed by the lower Federal courts.

Other bills relating to the courts generally on which this subcommittee acted, and which have already passed the House, are H.R. 2978 (peremptory challenges) and H.R. 7559 (interlocutory relief).

Pending in the subcommittee and worthy of mention is H.R. 4186, which would permit appeals by the United States in criminal proceedings after the commencement of the trial on denial of motions to suppress evidence. This legislation is under study and the views of the Judicial Conference of the United States have been requested.

Compacts: Three bills relating to interstate compacts passed both the House and the Senate. They are H.R. 7474, reestablishing a part of the boundary line between the States of Virginia and West Virginia; House Joint Resolution 465, granting additional authority to the Missouri-Illinois Bi-State Development Agency; and H.R. 5711, which is a recently concluded compact between the States of Indiana and Illinois setting up a bi-State agency known as the Wabash Valley Commission, to develop the natural resources of the Wabash Valley area.

Pending in subcommittee is House Joint Resolution 402, which would give permission to the District of Columbia as well as the States of Virginia and Maryland to enter into a compact to regulate transportation in the greater Washington, D.C., area. Since Congress in this instance will be performing a double function (granting congressional consent to the States of Virginia and Maryland and also acting as a principal contracting party for its agent, the District of Columbia), a thorough study is being made in an effort to resolve the many practical, political, economical, financial, and other problems inherent in a bill of this nature, so that the compacting parties, in a cooperative and united way, may regulate transportation in the National Capital area.

Crimes: Among the bills of a general nature on which favorable action was taken by the subcommittee were H.R. 6817, to broaden the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act; S. 1647, relating to penitentiary imprisonment; S. 1645, concerning computation of prisoner good time allowances; H.R. 6309, delimiting the restrictions on the shipment of water hyacinths; and H.R. 4386, concerning the destruction of boundary markers on Indian reservations.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings on H.R. 15 and some 38 similar bills making it a Federal offense to import, transport, possess, or use explosives in interstate commerce. This legislation was introduced as the result of bombings of schools, churches, synagogues, and public buildings in various sections of our country. While no action was taken on these measures, it should be pointed out that the text of one of the bills, H.R. 4344, formed the basis for title II of H.R. 8601 (civil rights) which was favorably reported by the full committee.

Patents, trademarks, and copyrights

Patents: The subcommittee considered H.R. 2739 which increases fees payable to the Patent Office. There has been no increase in patent fees since 1932, although salaries and other administrative costs of the Patent Office have risen considerably. It is felt that these increases will permit the Patent Office to increase its personnel and to reduce further the tremendous backlog of applications in the Patent Office. Because of the backlog, it presently takes 3 to 4 years to process patent applications.

Copyrights: The subcommittee approved H.R. 4059, which will authorize suits against the United States where the Government or its employees have infringed copyrights owned by individuals and others. Today the Government is immune from being sued although the Government employee is not. The instant legislation permits suit in the Court of Claims and exempts from liability the Government employee when he is acting within the scope of his employment.

The subcommittee conducted exhaustive hearings on H.R. 5921, which would remove the present exemption in the copyright law on coin-operated machines. The removal of the exemption would authorize authors and composers to license the public performances of songs, etc., when played on jukeboxes. Because of the great interest in this legislation as well as the many legal and practical issues involved, the subcommittee plans to give further study to this legislation before taking action in the matter.

Revision of the laws

Classification of laws to codes: The subcommittee's primary function regarding the revision of the laws is the classification of the public laws to the United States Code and the District of Columbia Code. During the first session of this Congress there have been more than 250 public laws comprising somewhat more than 500 pages in the Statutes at Large. These, together with some 75 or more laws awaiting the President's signature at the time of adjournment, will have to be examined to determine their classification to the United States Code. This work will be completed during the recess.

The laws of a general and permanent nature will be incorporated in the first supplemental of the United States Code, 1958 edition, and the laws relating to the District of Columbia will be incorporated in a cumulative supplement VIII of the District of Columbia Code, 1951 edition.

Preparation of code supplements and new edition: All the work in connection with the preparation of the new edition of the United States Code has been completed. Preparation of copy for the printer entailed the preparing of more than 25,000 sheets and more than 76,000 inserts embracing the laws enacted since the publication of the 1952 edition of the Code. This copy resulted in more than 14,000 printer's galleys which have been read for correction. To date more than 9,000 pages of proof have been received, read, and returned to the Government Printing Office, constituting all the text and the tables for the new edition. There will be almost 2,500 pages of index still to be received and read. It is estimated that the entire new edition will consist of 13 volumes and at the present date 5 volumes have been delivered by the Government Printing Office.

In connection with the preparation of the supplement for the District of Columbia Code the reports of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, Courts of Appeal, and the District Courts, since July 1, 1958, have been studied in order to incorporate notes to decisions affecting the Code. All the laws relating to the District of Columbia enacted during the first session of the Congress will likewise be studied, classified, and incorporated in the next cumulative supplement.

In all the work on the new edition and supplements of the United States Code the committee has had the benefit of the excellent services of the West Publishing Co. and the Edward Thompson Co., lawbook publishers.

Enactment of titles into law: During the past 16 years the work of improving the United States Code by enacting into law the several titles of the Code has been carried on by the subcommittee. At the beginning of this Congress 15 titles of the United States Code had been enacted into law and one title was eliminated by consolidating it with title 10, "Armed Services." At the beginning of this session a bill to enact into law title 39, the Postal Service, was brought up to date and introduced. It was speedily considered for the second time by the subcommittee and ordered favorably reported to the House by the committee. This bill passed the House early in March and is now pending in the other body. It is hoped that it will be enacted into law during the second session of this Congress. During the past 3 years the staff of the subcommittee has worked very closely with the Office of General Counsel of the Civil Service Commission in the preparation of a bill to enact into law title 5, Government Organization and Personnel. This work culminated in the introduction of a bill near the end of this session. At the present time a draft report is being prepared to be circulated as a committee print explaining to the interested agencies and departments the source of each section of the revised title and explaining precisely what the intention of the committee is. This draft report will be circulated during October with the hope that the views of the executive departments and agencies will be received early during the second session so that the bill may be favorably reported.

Similarly, preliminary work has been going on for more than a year in the preparation of a bill to enact into law part II of the District of Columbia Code, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and has also culminated in the introduction of a bill near the end of this session. A preliminary draft of the bill had earlier been circulated to the courts, the District government, and other interested parties for an expression of views. It is hoped that this bill may also be reported favorably to the House during the next session of this Congress.

Cooperation with other committees and agencies: Throughout the year the subcommittee's law revision counsel maintains a system of cooperating with other committees of the Congress and with the other two branches of Government. Innumerable inquiries regarding the proposed classification of laws are answered and assistance given in connection with the drafting of bills, particularly those affecting titles of the code that have been enacted into law.

Summary of Subcommittee No. 3

Bills referred	169
Bills on which hearings were held	65
Bills favorably reported to full committee	19
Bills reported to House	19
Bills adversely reported to full committee	56
Bills passed House	17
Senate bills processed	2
Bills pending in subcommittee	94
Bills pending in Senate	15
Bills which became public law	6
Bills vetoed	0

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER BANKRUPTCY AND REORGANIZATION

The continuing increase in the number of bankruptcy cases has caused Subcommittee No. 4 to devote much of its time during the first session of the 86th Congress to the problems of simplifying bankruptcy procedures to expedite the handling of those cases. Experience has shown that the Bankruptcy Act contains a number of needless formalities and cumbersome procedures. Hearings were held on a substantial number of bills directed at those problems. They include the following:

H.R. 4340: This bill simplifies the filling of vacancies among referees in bankruptcy and in doing so will have a salutary effect on keeping calendars current. The bill has been passed by both Houses and signed by the President.

H.R. 4345: This bill eliminates the requirements that referees transmit certain papers to the clerk of the court prior to bankruptcy. This, too, has become law.

H.R. 4692: Under present law, the district judge has the responsibility for issuing orders of adjudiciation in voluntary bankruptcy cases and orders of reference in both voluntary and involuntary cases. This bill would relieve him of that administrative duty. It has become Public Law 86–64.

H.R. 4693: This bill will achieve an economy in the cost of administering the bankruptcy system by consolidating the referee's expense fund and the referee's salary fund into a single fund. It is now Public Law 86–110.

In addition to these improvements in internal administration, the subcommittee acted on a number of bills simplifying procedures for the parties to a bankruptcy proceeding.

Thus, H.R. 6816 would eliminate the requirement that proofs of claim must be submitted under oath.

H.R. 8858 would eliminate the need for the verification of pleadings under oath and thus make the procedure in bankruptcy consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This has become public law.

H.R. 6556 would clarify the filing time for review of orders of referees, and H.R. 7233 would require claims in chapter XIII proceedings to be filed within 6 months after the first meeting of creditors.

It has been called to the attention of the subcommittee that certain abuses have arisen in bankruptcy proceedings. The subcommittee acted favorably on a number of bills to eliminate those abuses.

H.R. 5747 strengthens the provisions of the Criminal Code in respect to the concealment of assets by individuals in contemplation of bankruptcy.

H.R. 8708 gives the referee additional authority to scrutinize the fees paid to attorneys to insure that they are reasonable and fair.

H.R. 4346 eliminates false financial statements as a bar to the discharge of an individual, nonbusiness bankrupt and thus eliminates the practice of using such statements to intimidate a debtor.

H.R. 4150 authorizes the bankruptcy court to determine the effect of discharge, upon the application of both the creditor and the bankrupt.

All of these bills have passed the House.

In order to make possible wider use of the wage earner plan type of proceeding under chapter XIII, the subcommittee approved legislation eliminating the monetary limitation and eligibility for filing under chapter XIII. This has become public law.

Two bills of major substantive consequence to the Bankruptcy Act were also considered by the subcommittee and both have passed

the House. They are: H.R. 2236 and H.R. 7242. H.R. 2236 places a 3-year limitation on the priority and the nondischargeability of taxes, H.R. 7242 is a highly complex bill which seeks to insure an order of distribution consistent with the underlying purposes of the Bankruptcy Act. Both bills are now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In addition to fulfilling its primary legislative responsibility in the field of bankruptcy, the subcommittee considered a number of other bills referred to it. The subcommittee acted favorably upon H.R. 2979, authorizing district court judges to appoint law clerks without first obtaining the approval of the chief judge of the circuit. This bill has become Public Law 86–24.

The subcommittee approved H.R. 4060, which relieves the Comptroller General of the responsibility for fixing the date on which the statute of limitations commences to run in certain Miller Act payments. This bill is now Public Law 86–135.

The subcommittee ordered favorably reported H.R. 5396, which authorizes the transfer of certain maritime claims between the district court and the Court of Claims. This bill has passed the House and is now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

A very large number of holiday and incorporation bills were referred to the subcommittee and a number of these have been enacted.

A statistical summary of the work of the subcommittee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress follows;

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee	108
Number of public bills on which hearings were held	36
Number of public bills reported to full committee	40
Number of reports filed	25
Number of public bills passed House	25
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	9
Number of Senate bills disposed of	6
Number of public bills approved by the President	12

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5—GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED—SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER ANTITRUST MATTERS

Subcommittee No. 5—which exercises general jurisdiction over a variety of subjects, including such topics as civil rights, the Federal judicial system, and particular jurisdiction over antitrust matters—had referred to it a total of 186 bills, 50 of which were disposed of by recommendations to the full committee. Seven bills were enacted into public law.

A total of 26 days were spent in conducting hearings on various bills referred to this subcommittee.

This subcommittee devoted considerable time to the consideration of a number of bills relating to various civil rights proposals. During the course of the hearings over a thousand pages of testimony was taken from various witnesses, including Representatives in Congress, Cabinet members, State and local officials, as well as private individuals. At the conclusion of the hearings, this subcommittee recommended to the full committee a civil rights proposal, which was subsequently reported to the House as H.R. 8601. At the close of the first session, this bill was pending before the House, as was a request to the Rules Committee for a hearing to grant a rule for consideration of the proposal.

Among the bills enacted into law was one raising the travel and subsistence allowance for Federal judges from $15 to $25 per day maximum. Another new public law defined a new official station for retired judges, and a third waived existing provisions of the judicial code so as to permit new court facilities to be constructed for the district court at Durant, Okla. Another bill enacted into public law was a Senate bill which provided for a U.S. Park Commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park. A new public law amended the existing provisions of the Federal judicial code so as to permit noncitizens the privilege of filing actions in forma pauperis. Another public law granted the consent of the Congress to an interstate compact between New York and New Jersey relating to transportation. Finally, a proposal which increased the authority of the Attorney General to acquire land adjacent to Federal penal institutions was enacted into public law.

Number of public bills referred to subcommittee	186
Number of public bills on which hearings were held	58
Number of public bills reported to full committee	50
Number of reports filed	9
Number of public bills passed House	8
Number of public bills pending in the Senate	0
Number of Senate bills disposed of	1
Number of public bills approved by the President	7

ACTIVITIES OF THE ANTITRUST SUBCOMMITTEE

Legislative

Thirty-one bills were assigned to the Antitrust Subcommittee during this session. The subcommittee considered 18 of these bills during 9 days of hearings. One bill, S. 726, was reported to the House, and on approval by the President on July 23, 1959, became Public Law 86–107.

On May 27 and May 28, 1959, the subcommittee held hearings on H.R. 432, H.R. 2977, H.R. 6049, and S. 726, bills designed to facilitate enforcement of the prohibitions of the Clayton Act against price discrimination, tie-in arrangements, mergers, and interlocking directorates. These bills changed Clayton Act enforcement procedures to make the cease and desist orders issued by the Commissions and Boards with jurisdiction under section 11 final orders in the same manner as the cease and desist orders now become final when issued by the Federal Trade Commission, pursuant to the procedures set forth in the Federal Trade Commission Act. Automatic finality of its Clayton Act orders had been requested by the Federal Trade Commission for more than 20 years.

Previous enforcement procedures of the Clayton Act permitted a defendant to engage in the same illegal practices three times before effective legal penalities could be applied as a result of action by the Commission or Board vested with jurisdiction. These procedures were changed to permit the Commission or Board's cease and desist order to become final and conclusive 60 days after its issuance, or upon completion of judicial review.

Once final, the cease and desist order is enforced through direct reference to the Attorney General of the facts of the violation. Punishment is by fine recovered in a civil action brought by the United States. S. 726 became Public Law 86–107 on July 23, 1959.

On June 25 and 26, 1959, the Antitrust Subcommittee conducted hearings on a series of identical bills, which would amend section 2(a) of the Clayton Act so as to provide for mandatory functional discounts—H.R. 848, H.R. 927, H.R. 2788, H.R. 2868, and H.R. 4530. These bills would make it necessary for a manufacturing seller to grant in good faith "a reasonably adequate" price differential to wholesalers. The bills would require such differential to be "reasonably calculated" to allow the wholesalers' customers to compete with like firms which purchase directly from the seller. During the hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from the sponsors of the bills, representatives of the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice, and from spokesmen from the National Association of Tobacco Distributors, National Frozen Food Distributors Association, National Candy Wholesalers Association, National Oil Jobbers Council, and the American Bar Association.

On August 20 and 21, 1959, the subcommittee conducted hearings on two bills, H.R. 7191 and S. 753, which would authorize cooperative associations of milk producers and marketing agencies owned by such associations to bargain in concert for the sale of milk and milk products with groups of dealers, processors, or other purchasers. These bills would expand the exemption from the antitrust laws that has been granted in the Capper-Volstead Act to agricultural cooperative associations, to additional marketing arrangements by milk producer cooperatives. S. 753 had been passed by the Senate on April 30, 1959.

During the hearings, the subcommittee received testimony from the sponsors of the bills, representatives of the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, and spokesmen of the National Milk Producers Federation, as well as from representatives from a number of milk cooperative associations and independent dairies.

In September 1959 the Antitrust Subcommittee held the first 3 days of hearings on a series of bills designed to exempt from the antitrust laws a number of activities in the organized professional team sports of baseball, basketball, football, and hockey—H.R. 2266, H.R. 2370, H.R. 2371, H.R. 2372, H.R. 2373, H.R. 2374, and H.R. 8658.

During the hearings the subcommittee devoted particular attention to the problems involved in extending the antitrust exemptions for these sports to arrangements that affect other industries, particularly the broadcasting and telecasting industry. The subcommittee received testimony from several Members of the Congress, from the commissioner or organized baseball, and from representatives of television stations in Topeka, Kans., Buffalo, N.Y., Terre Haute, Ind., and New Orleans, La.

Investigative

On May 26, 1959, the Antitrust Subcommittee issued its report on the investigation it had conducted during the 85th Congress on the consent decree program of the Department of Justice. This 379-page report was based on a record of hearings which contained more than 4,500 pages of testimony from 34 witnesses. The subcommittee report was signed by Chairman CELLER and Representatives PETER W. RODINO, JR., LESTER HOLTZMAN, and HERMAN TOLL. There was also a minority report, signed by WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, WILLIAM E. MILLER, and GEORGE MEADER.

In the administration of the antitrust program of the Department of Justice, the subcommittee ascertained that approximately 75 percent of all equity proceedings that have been instituted by the Attorney General to enforce the antitrust laws have been terminated by negotiation rather than by litigation. Since World War II there has been a general trend toward more consent judgments, and in recent years the practice of negotiating settlements has accelerated.

As a result of its study, the subcommittee concluded that currently there are too many consent decrees accepted by the Department of Justice in relation to judicial decision after litigation. As it now operates, the report states the consent decree program of the Department of Justice results in the judicial function being superseded by an administrative procedure in which there are no rules to safeguard the public interest and the interest of parties who are not involved as parties in the Government's case.

The Antitrust Subcommittee recommended that the Department of Justice revise its consent decree procedures: (1) To provide

notice to the public of the terms of proposed consent decree; (2) to establish a waiting period between agreement by the Government and the defendant and the entry of the decree; (3) to afford private parties affected by the terms of the decree an opportunity to intervene in the Government's case in order to present objections to the court to the terms of the consent decree; (4) to require, when a consent decree is submitted to the court for approval, an accompanying written statement to be filed that sets forth the facts involved in the litigation, the defendants position, the meaning of the provisions used in the decree, and the reasons that are the basis for the Department's compromise.

To supplement its survey of the Antitrust Division's general consent decree policies and procedures, the subcommittee made two case studies. For these studies the subcommittee selected the oil pipeline consent decree, *United States* v. *The Atlantic Refining Co., et al.*, civil case No. 104060, District of Columbia, December 23, 1941, and the A.T. & T. consent decree, *United States* v. *Western Electric Company and American Telephone and Telegraph Company*, district court of New Jersey, January 24, 1956.

In connection with its investigation of the Federal Communications Commission's relationship to negotiations for the A.T. & T. consent decree, the subcommittee ascertained that the Commission had failed, despite repeated recommendations by its staff over a number of years, to investigate telephone rates or even to conduct a general telephone rate inquiry. The subcommittee noted, also, that as a result of a $65 million long distance telephone rate that had been authorized by the FCC in 1953 without a hearing, long distance telephone users may have been overcharged $159 million in the years 1955, 1956, and 1957.

To remedy this situation, the subcommittee recommended that the FCC institute "promptly a comprehensive formal rate investigation." Shortly after the report was issued, the FCC acted upon the subcommittee's recommendation. As a result of preliminary study, on July 24, 1959, the FCC ordered A.T. & T. to cut long distance telephone rates by $50 million a year.

In connection with its investigation of the oil pipeline consent decree, the subcommittee studied the effects of Interstate Commerce Commission regulation on enforcement of the oil pipeline consent decree. The subcommittee concluded that while the ICC nominally is responsible for regulation of the oil pipeline industry, in practice the industry itself decides what the ICC will do, and is able to determine the extent and character of its own Federal regulation. As a result, the interests of the general public have been subordinated to the private interests of the oil pipeline companies.

On the basis of the subcommittee recommendations, the ICC terminated two long-standing practices which have contributed materially to the orientation of its activities to the oil industry viewpoint. The ICC no longer permits personnel of the pipeline companies to work in the Commission offices in order to assist in the preparation of ICC records and recommendations. In addition, the ICC has severed its relationship, which had existed since 1933, with the Engineers-Accountants Valuation Subcommittee of the American Petroleum Institute. In its report, the subcommittee commended the ICC for these actions.

Shipping investigation

During this session, the Antitrust Subcommittee staff has continued the preliminary inquiry into antitrust problems in the operation of ocean shipping conferences. This inquiry was started on August 1, 1958. For more than 9 months staff counsel have been examining thousands of documents in the files of 60 ocean freight conferences and 8 individual U.S.-flag steamship lines.

The documents selected for public hearings by the subcommittee staff reveal business practices by steamship companies and ocean freight conferences that raise serious questions under the antitrust laws. The documents also present equally serious questions with regard to the effectiveness of the antitrust exemption provisions in the Federal maritime law, as well as the adequacy of Federal Maritime Board regulation of competitive practices in this industry.

Public hearings have been scheduled to begin in New York City in October 1959. It is expected that the hearings will be extensive and that representatives from all segments of the ocean freight industry will be called upon to testify to assure that the subcommittee receive all opinions on these vexing factual problems.

European television

On March 16, 1959, Chairman CELLER released the report on his study of television broadcasting in the United Kingdom, France, and Italy. This report, entitled "Aspects of Television in Western Europe," was based on Mr. CELLER's firsthand study in the fall of 1958 of European television operations. It supplements the Antitrust Subcommittee's investigations during the 84th and 85th Congresses of the American television broadcasting industry.

Konrad Adenauer Celebrates 10th Anniversary as Chancellor of the Republic of West Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me relative to the Chancellor of the Republic of West Germany, Konrad Adenauer, who celebrates his 10th anniversary in office September 15.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

Many of my colleagues, and public officials throughout the country, including the President and the Vice President, have paid tribute in recent days to one of the great statesmen of the world, a true champion of freedom and democracy.

I refer, of course, to the Chancellor of the Republic of West Germany, Konrad Adenauer, who celebrates his 10th anniversary in office on September 15.

At this time I wish to join in the felicitations and to express the hope that God may grant Chancellor-Adenauer many more years in which to carry on his brilliant fight for peace and justice among nations.

The transformation of West Germany out of the chaos of war into a healthy and powerful nation is due in no small part to the statesmanlike qualities displayed by the Chancellor during his 10 years in office, to his rugged determination to fight for freedom for his people against all odds. Communists repeatedly have threatened to "throw the book" at this 83-year-old champion of democracy, but he has moved forward steadily, never flinching in the face of the warlike utterances from Moscow.

The Chancellor, a man of big heart, who has gained the respect of the entire free world for his unceasing efforts to atone for the crimes of the Nazi regime, takes little credit upon himself for the remarkable progress made by West Germany under his able administration.

Instead, he has shown himself not above extending thanks to others, including former enemies of his country, for the helping hands they have extended to help West Germany rise again from the ashes of total war.

During the celebration of his 10th anniversary in office, the Chancellor said of the United States: "The brotherly hand stretched out to the conquered nation made possible the restoration of the Federal Republic as a democratic and free state in the community of nations."

Here is a man whose name and whose accomplishments in the cause of peace forever will be etched in the pages of history.

The Federal Aviation Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOS. E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Federal Aviation Agency is rounding out its first year of existence. This agency is responsible for air traffic control for all civil and military flying in the United States, for the inspection of aircraft and ground equipment, and for numerous other matters of great importance affecting aviation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report of the operation of this agency under the direction of Gen. E. R. "Pete" Quesada. This report was prepared by Mr. E. K. Barnes of the staff of Interavia's World Review of Aviation and Astronautics, one of the world's leading aviation publications.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The formation of the Federal Aviation Agency marks yet another step in both the history and the development of American aviation. The writer recently had the opportunity of visiting the headquarters of the new Agency and was given considerable insight into its development and current progress. To fully appreciate the reasons for its formation and the requirements it fulfills, it is perhaps necessary to retrace some of this past aviation history to obtain a clearer picture of the background from which the Agency was developed.

The speed of development and expansion of the aviation and air transport industries over the past 30 years has greatly exceeded the most optimistic forecasts. This is particularly marked in the United States of America where the air transport of passengers and mail has long been accepted as a necessary and permanent part of the American transportation picture. The recognition by the Federal Government of the need to provide a centralized control for the regulation and promotion of civil aviation dates back to 1926 when the first Air Commerce Act was passed. This act established an Aeronautics

Branch of the Department of Commerce, whose function was to regulate the newly developing business of air transport. The Department was authorized to license pilots, develop air navigation facilities, promote flying safety, map airways, and to furnish flight information.

By 1938 the ever-increasing popularity of travel, together with the increasing numbers of aircraft of new types and higher speeds, began to complicate the movement of air traffic in the airways. An exhaustive study of commercial aviation was made by a Presidential Commission which paved the way for the writing of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. This act created the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Civil Aeronautics Board and allocated specific responsibilities to the two branches. The Civil Aeronautics Administration was made responsible for air safety, air traffic control, operation of airways, aviation communications, and the improvement of airports. At the same time the Civil Aeronautics Board was charged with writing Civil Air Regulations, investigating accidents and regulating economic aspects of air routes and civil aviation. In 1940 certain amendments were made to the act and under the resultant reorganization the Civil Aeronautics Board remained independent while the Civil Aeronautics Administration was placed within the Department of Commerce.

At the end of World War II, it was in this framework that American civil aviation recommended its activities. The enormous advances made by aviation during and following the war rapidly became manifest. Larger and faster aircraft in steadily increasing numbers crowded into the airways and it became apparent that the air traffic control capabilities of the CAA were not designed to handle the situation. As early as 1948 the Air Coordinating Committee which had been established by the President 2 years previously in 1946, observed that "the existing techniques of air traffic control and tools available to CAA are marginal even by the pre-World War II standards." During the 1950's yet another factor arose which compounded the existing difficulties. This was the advent of jet-powered aircraft with their extremely high speeds, and requiring new techniques in air traffic control to enable them to be fitted into the overall airways traffic plan.

In order to resolve the growing problems of this crowded airspace the first step was the creation in 1957 of the Airways Modernization Board with the express purpose of speeding the necessary improvements.

In the terms of the act which created the Board it was also specified that Congress would establish an independent Federal Aviation Agency, and in 1958 legislation was passed which brought this into being. To direct this organization the President appointed Mr. E. R. Quesada to be the first Administrator of the new Agency on November 5, 1958.

Mr. Quesada had previously served as Special Assistant to the President for aviation matters and had been chairman of the Airways Modernization Board. To assist him in the task of directing the new Agency, Mr. James T. Pyle was appointed Deputy Administrator. Mr. Pyle had previously been Administrator of the CAA, a body which was absorbed in its entirety in the structure of the new FAA.

This powerful and comprehensive organization is an independent agency reporting directly to the President, and the Administrator has been given the broad powers necessary to promote the interests of American aviation, both civil and military, at home and abroad. The formation of the FAA was commenced by the transfer of the Airways Modernization Board to its control as the Bureau of Research and Development, followed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the safety rulemaking section of the Civil Aeronautics Board, complete with personnel, funds, and functions. Once established, on January 1, 1959, the FAA at once commenced to operate on a 5-point plan described in the following principles:

1. To regulate air commerce so as to promote its development, safety, and requirements in national defense.

2. To control the navigable airspace and to regulate civil and military flight operations in the interests of safety and efficiency.

3. To develop and operate a common system of air traffic control and navigation for both civilian and military aircraft.

4. To develop a plan for the Agency's function in the event of war.

5. To prescribe minimum standards for design, materials, and workmanship in aircraft construction and construction of other elements of aviation.

The breadth of policy embodied in this 5-point plan gives an indication of the magnitude of the problems with which the Administrator and his staff are faced. It should be emphasized that the FAA concept is one of integration of services and facilities for both civil and military aviation so that it can safely and fairly apportion the use of the available airspace to both users. There is also the necessity to both expand and modernize the Federal airways system and to control the ever-growing volume of traffic. This has become even more urgent with the introduction of high-performance aircraft into the traffic patterns, requiring more airspace than ever before.

In a recent interview Mr. Quesada explained to me how the FAA is attacking these problems. The first task is to maintain and operate facilities already in existence and by reducing the size of restricted areas to restore large tracts of airspace to public use. This was being achieved by complete derestriction of certain areas, and in certain other cases by allowing the use of restricted areas to civil aircraft when military operations were not being conducted. This was now possible owing to the closer integration between military and civil control in the FAA system. To achieve this integration new methods have been evolved. Military personnel are transferred for employment with the FAA rather than being attached for liaison. During the period of employment with the FAA the man is regarded as being an FAA employee even to the extent of being paid by the Agency and not by his parent service. By absorbing this personnel into its own structure rather than establishing liaison officers from the various services and commands, the FAA is assured of a closer cooperation without the tendency for interservice priorities to arise. Similarly the controllers on military airfields will eventually be replaced by civilian FAA employees to insure a greater continuity. In consequence military aircraft will use the airways under civilian control and with exactly the same degree of priority as civilian aircraft.

The second and largest part of the program is that of modernization of the airways; increased installation of radar and other electronic equipment, training larger numbers of traffic controllers, improving communications and developing new control procedures. This intensive research and development program is being undertaken with the target date of January 1, 1963 as the deciding factor. Mr. Quesada explained that this date represents the completion of the first stage in the modernization program and any new developments are judged on their availability for employment by that date. Any systems or ideas which may arise but which cannot be developed for employment in that time will be relegated to a long-term research program. By making this rule the FAA is assured of concentration on the present problem without being sidetracked on possibilities rather than certainties.

The third and last part of the overall program, and representing only a small proportion of the effort at the moment, is that of investigation of future developments and planning for the more distant future. This is being done with the next generation of high-speed aircraft in mind and has little bearing on the immediate modernization of the airways and facilities.

To undertake the responsibilities with which it is charged, the FAA anticipates employing nearly 40,000 personnel when fully staffed. More than 90 percent of this figure will be stationed in hundreds of FAA facilities throughout the United States and the world. Mr. Quesada went on to describe the main features of the organization and the main departmental responsibilities which have been established throughout the Agency. Four major bureaus constitute the operational strength of the FAA and their functions and interdependence can best be understood by describing their activities separately.

Bureau of Research and Development: This was the first part of the FAA to be brought into existence and consolidated the research programs of the Airways Modernization Board and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Bureau operates the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center in Atlantic City, N.J., to evaluate ground navigation and traffic control equipment and procedures.

This center is the FAA's proving ground and has been established in one of the busiest traffic areas of the United States to provide a real life environment of air traffic management studies. At the same time traffic-free areas over the Atlantic Ocean provide a safe area for testing experimental devices. The development of semiautomatic air traffic control systems is one of the major tasks of this Bureau.

Bureau of Facilities: Is responsible for the installation and maintenance of all aids to navigation, both visual and electronic, in the air traffic control and navigation systems. It is also the engineering, construction, and procurement authority of the FAA. The navigation aids for which it is responsible include VOR, VORTAC, ILS, high intensity approach lights, long range and surveillance radar installations, radio ranges, air route traffic control centers and airport control towers, data processing systems, and communications. The Bureau installs these facilities and establishes the techniques to insure their continued performance and reliability. One specialized responsibility is that of planning and developing the International Airport for commercial jets, now being constructed near Washington at Chantilly, Va.

Bureau of Flight Standards: The key word of this Bureau's activities is "safety." Its activities include establishment of the standards for use by manufacturers in the design and construction of aircraft, flight testing and airworthiness certification of all civil aircraft, and maintenance standards and practices for civil aircraft. It tests and certificates the competence of all flight personnel, mechanics, and dispatchers, and sets the standards for mechanics training schools. Safety inspectors of the Bureau continually check the actual operation of commercial aircraft and their crews on routine flights. It also has the responsibility for flight checking the navigation aids, landing aids, radars, and communication systems throughout the Federal Airways Systems.

Bureau of Air Traffic Management: The function of this Bureau is the control of air traffic, writing and enforcing air traffic rules and regulations, and determining the division and use of the airspace available. It operates the 35 air route traffic control centers and over 200 airport control towers. It is also responsible for the network of communi-

cations which interlink the control stations throughout the airways system.

To coordinate and supervise the work of the FAA throughout the United States and oversea possessions, regions have been established under the control of regional administrators. These regional offices are situated in New York, N.Y.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Kansas City, Mo.; Los Angeles, Calif.; Anchorage, Alaska; and Honolulu, Hawaii. Over 90 percent of the personnel of the FAA are employed in the facilities operating in these regions.

Apart from the work of the bureaus and regional offices a number of departments exist for the planning and administration of FAA policy and for coordination with other authorities. One of the most important of these is the Office of International Coordination. Mr. Quesada is very keenly aware of the necessity of maintaining as close relationships as possible with other governments and air traffic authorities. In his view the mandate of the FAA is worldwide and any aviation developments in the United States of America are bound to affect aviation throughout the world. Similiarly the United States of America cannot afford to ignore aviation developments abroad as only through the interdependence of this technical effort can the maximum mutual benefits be obtained.

The extent to which the FAA is working to obtain this exchange of technical and operational information can be judged from the work of the International Coordination Office. Apart from supporting the aims of the International Civil Aviation Organization, ICAO, the FAA is strongly supporting the civil aviation activities of certain NATO groups and provides a full-time officer for this purpose. Another FAA officer sits on the Air Navigation Commission of ICAO and is alternate to the U.S. representative on the ICAO Council.

In order to strengthen the liaison and cooperation with civil aviation administrations of other countries a number of oversea offices have been established. There is an aircraft engineering office in Paris which assists foreign manufacturers in obtaining U.S. airworthiness certificates for their aircraft. Eight field offices in as many countries perform the necessary safety surveillance of U.S. flag operations in oversea areas and consult with and advise foreign flag operators flying to the United States in the promotion of air safety. There are also two flight inspection groups with flight check aircraft for the operational evaluation of various air navigation aids in cooperation and under agreement with other governments.

The establishment of the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center (NAFEC) at Atlantic City, N.J., is another illustration of the agency's global thinking in terms of aviation development and safety. This modern airport is being equipped for experimental purposes with all types of new systems for evaluation by a large staff of scientists and engineers. It is the hope of the Administrator that engineers from other countries will visit this proving ground and that they will work alongside the FAA staff for as long as they are able in the development of equipment and systems.

The recent visit of a Swiss delegation to the FAA headquarters in Washington, D.C., was yet another example of this international cooperation. The delegation consisted of representatives from the Swiss Federal Air Office and from the Air Traffic Services of Geneva and Zurich airports, which are operated by Radio-Switzerland. In the course of a visit lasting a week they were shown the structure and functions of the FAA and were given considerable information on the developments which were in hand for the modernization of the Federal Airways system. The value of such collaboration is particularly apparent in the case of a small country such as Switzerland, whose airports are used by a large number of foreign flag carriers, and where the geographic nature of the country necessitates an extremely accurate air traffic control system. From this visit to the FAA the Swiss delegation were able to obtain operational information drawn from a highly complex and crowded air transport system. At the same time this exchange of information is not entirely one sided. The experience gained in Switzerland of air transport operations in a mountainous country of small area is of value and is welcomed by the FAA. The problems encountered in the siting and performance of radar, VOR's and other navigation equipment and the methods employed to overcome these difficulties are of importance throughout the world and not only from a national standpoint.

In an age when no two points on the world's surface are more than 40 hours traveling time apart, it is encouraging to see such strenuous efforts being made to expedite air transport internationally, and to bring its advantages within the reach of the greatest number of people. As the two most powerful "Air Traffic Controllers"—if they will forgive the term, in the free world today, Mr. Quesada and Mr. Pyle are to be congratulated on the vigor and enthusiasm with which they are directing the efforts of the FAA to achieve this result.

The Atlantic Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, Mr. Harold Zellerbach, acting chairman of the board of Crown-Zellerbach Corp., and Mr. Calvin J. Nichols, director, World Affairs Council of Northern California, were delegates at the Atlantic Congress, which was held in London last June and participated in by about 650 delegates from the NATO nations.

Mr. Zellerbach and Mr. Nichols recently appeared on the "World Affairs Are Your Affairs" radio series, presented on KNBC, San Francisco. I think their discussion was a very thoughtful presentation of some of the problems faced by the free world and discussed by the congress. I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of the broadcast be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. NICHOLS. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This evening the World Affairs Council will endeavor to bring you some background discussion of an important meeting which was held in London early in June of this year, the meeting of the Atlantic Congress. This is a meeting that was widely publicized in Europe but not in the United States. We have as our guest on this program Mr. Harold Zellerbach, chairman of the executive committee of the Crown-Zellerbach Corp., who was a delegate to the Atlantic Congress meeting and also a member of the U.S. National Committee for the Atlantic Congress. Mr. Zellerbach, I think our audience would be interested to know who convened this Congress, how the delegates were selected, and what its purpose was, generally.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. The Atlantic Congress was called by the NATO parliamentarians—who are members of the various NATO country parliaments and the U.S. Congress. The delegates were selected—that is, the U.S. delegates were selected by the U.S. Board of Directors of our delegation. This delegation was headed by Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, the honorary chairman, and Mr. Eric Johnston, who was general chairman. We also had a cochairman, the Honorable Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, Senator JACOB JAVITS, and Representative WAYNE HAYS. All these three Congressmen are members of the NATO parliamentarians.

Mr. NICHOLS. I think it is rather interesting that this conference was one where the delegates were not under any instructions of their governments. They were all free to speak their own minds and vote as they saw fit on the issues presented. How was the congress financed—how were the costs of this congress met?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, the reason, of course, Mr. Nichols, that we could speak freely was that we put up our own money. This was all done by private funds. Therefore, it had no tinge of Government money in it and we weren't responsible for our remarks.

Mr. NICHOLS. That's a very interesting point. I think maybe the audience would be interested also to know something about the personalities that participated in that conference. I was impressed with the fact that it was opened by Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II; that the Prime Minister of Great Britain chose to make one of the opening speeches. And of course we had a number of other very interesting and distinguished guests—General Norstad, Dr. Mordecai Johnson, president of Howard University, Mr. Paul Henri-Spaak, Hugh Gaitskill, and any number of others. Also, the American delegation itself was an impressive list of people representing a great many fields. I suppose, Mr. Zellerbach, in selecting those delegates an effort was made to cover quite a wide range of fields. Would you like to comment on how that was done?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. People were selected on the basis of their knowledge in the particular field they were to cover at the congress. For example, I attended the economic sections of the meeting because of my own background in the business world. We had Senators and Representatives there who attended the political groups. We had military men attending the military sections. And then we had a great many educators there who attended the cultural sections. And these were selected from all parts of the United States. It was quite a broad and, to my way of thinking, a most competent delegation.

Mr. NICHOLS. How many were in the U.S. delegation?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. There were about, as I recall, 110 delegates at the meeting. There were more invited. We were supposed to have about 130. I think between 110 and 120 actually came to the meeting.

Mr. NICHOLS. On the question of fields represented—in the cultural field, for example—I think it was interesting that a number of newspaper editors, people like Cass Canfield, editor of Harper's; Palmer Hoyt, editor of the Denver Post, and others of prominent papers and periodicals in the country, were represented. Also, people of various religious faiths were represented, so there was a good cross-section. Now, let's turn, if we may, back to the question of the purpose of this conference and its theme. I wonder if you would like to comment on that.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. When I was invited to become a delegate, naturally I wanted to know the purpose of the Congress and what results they hoped to achieve from a meeting of 5 days. I learned that since NATO was strictly a military alliance and had been the

so-called whipping boy of the Communist countries—that is to say, the Western nations were accused of being warmongers—it was felt that NATO should expand its usefulness into other fields. Thus the basic purpose of this Congress was to see how NATO could be strengthened in fields other than the military over the next 10 years.

Mr. NICHOLS. By the way, I believe that all the NATO countries were represented except Iceland, and Iceland was not represented because of the fishery dispute. Of course, we had participation not only of European countries, but Canada and the United States were very much concerned and very much interested in this meeting. The Congress itself covered a wide range of subjects. As you say, the emphasis was on other than military problems. This means a good deal of concern with economic problems, with spiritual and cultural problems generally, as well as political. I think from here we ought to turn to major fields that were covered by the resolutions and the principal items that were proposed. I wonder if you would like to lead off with some comment on what happened in probably one of the most important committees, namely, the Economic Committee of the Congress?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I should be very happy to, because after all this is something that has given business in North America, including both the United States and Canada, quite a bit of concern. We have seen the development of the European Common Market in the last few years. This has taken hold much faster than any of us dreamed it ever would. As a consequence of this, the so-called seven outer nations, or those not in the European Common Market group, are beginning to worry about the effect of the Common Market on their own economies. And the United States and Canada are a little worried as well. As a consequence, part of the work that I think this Atlantic Congress did, was to reappraise whether or not the Atlantic Community or the so-called European Common Market groups should be expanded into the Atlantic Community of Nations, including the United States and Canada and also the other outer seven group. With the rising standards of living and the breaking down of tariff barriers between the European Common Market countries, this welds 160 million people who are going to buy and need things into a common group. In other words, we have in the United States 175 million people, and we think that we have a lot of business to do here. Well, just imagine what is going to happen in Europe. We not only have the present group of 160 million in the Common Market, but then when you add double that with the seven outer fringe countries, and add United States and Canada, you can see this becomes a very potent economic market for the free Western countries.

Mr. NICHOLS. Before that, however, isn't there the danger that unless a real effort is made to bring these two groups together, you could have a situation develop where one group would be competitive with another? It seems to me that this would be one of the things that members of the Congress would be quite anxious not to have happen. As I recall, while we were meeting in London the seven countries that you refer to were actually holding a meeting in one of the Scandinavian countries at that very time. Do you think there is any danger of competition between the so-called six Common Market countries and the seventh?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, yes, there could be danger if they don't get together on a common-ground basis. One of the reasons that England did not originally come into the European Common Market was that she was committed to her former colonies—the so-called United Kingdom bloc of countries. But I think now Great Britain is beginning to see the error of her ways in not joining originally with the European Common Market. I think we American businessmen have been quite apprehensive—that if this European Common Market starts to put up tariff barriers, the United States and Canada will be excluded from 160 million people, and all these people have a very high standard of living. The standards are perhaps not as high as we have here in North America, but compared to some of the underdeveloped countries very much higher. So this is also a problem.

Mr. NICHOLS. In other words, this is an area in which it is absolutely essential that all members of the Atlantic Community work together, to try to find a common solution, otherwise, you are going to have the prospect of struggles within the group, or the possibility that the United States and perhaps Canada will be left out of this kind of arrangement. What were the other aspects of the economic problem that were considered by the Congress, aside from the question of European organization and avoiding restrictive trade barriers?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, part of that problem, of course, is monetary. Many of you listeners have, I am sure, been to Europe within recent years and you will remember very distinctly that every time you went into one of these countries you had to count your money at the border when you entered and when you left. Currencies were not stabilized; one year you went to France and the franc was 350 francs to the dollar, officially, and on the black market you probably got up to 400. Well, today, when you go to France the franc is stabilized at, I think, 490 and there is no black market. You don't have to worry whether or not you are getting your francs at the cheapest cost. Now, with the so-called currency barriers eliminated, as well as the limitations on merchandise that can be imported into these countries—you can see that the manufacturers who produce the best products at the lowest prices are the ones who will get the business. Therefore, if the United States with all these tariff barriers and monetary barriers eliminated, can produce products better and cheaper than they can in Europe, then we will get the business, as against having to sit on the outside if tariff barriers are erected against our industry.

Mr. NICHOLS. One of the things that interested me very much in hearing the report of the Economic Committee was the extent to which they expressed concern about the less-developed countries, that is, Asia, Africa, and so on. In fact, members of the Atlantic Community seemed to be showing considerable concern for this area of the world, much more than I had personally realized. I wonder if you would like to comment on this aspect of the work of the Economic Committee?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. Well, just suppose I quote a sentence here from the declaration of the Atlantic Congress in 1959, under the economic title—that "governments should promote the maximum economic growth and production employment and living standards and should avoid restrictive economic measures, take all feasible actions to reduce tariff barriers and maintain monetary stability." In view of the services rendered by CEPC and EEC and those one might expect from any other form of effective multilateral association, governments should work especially for an increase in the benefits of a closer economic integration. Now, substantially that takes in the underdeveloped countries—Africa, the Near East, even Asia—because these are countries where millions of people exist on the lowest living standards. And if the rest of the world—the so-called Western bloc of countries—could raise the living standards of these nations by just so much as 1 or 2 percent, just translate that into the amount of goods and services these people are going to require. That would certainly bring prosperity throughout the world.

Mr. NICHOLS. I agree, and it seems to me that there was a general recognition widely shared by all of the delegates, that you could not have a strong Atlantic Community unless you also had a strong free world. In other words, we are dependent upon achieving conditions in the less-developed countries that will make freedom a real possibility and will give it a chance to grow. The other thing that you said which interested me, and I share your opinion on this, was the great awareness on the part of delegates of the great importance Africa is going to play in the future. The success of economic programs for the development of Africa means a great deal to the future of the Atlantic Community. In this country, I have felt that we haven't yet fully grasped what is happening in Africa. In the Atlantic Congress meetings many more people were aware of this and concerned about it, and I think this is one of the things the American people are going to want to give more attention to. Suppose we leave the economic problems for the moment and turn to some of the other issues considered. Of course, as you said in the beginning, although the emphasis was not on the military, nevertheless, there was some attention given to military problems. I wonder if you would just like to comment briefly on what the Congress did in this field.

Mr. ZELLERBACH. I think the easiest way is again to refer to the declaration of the Congress in the military field. That is, forces forming the European shield should be brought as soon as possible up to the minimum strength laid down in the agreed strategic concept of NATO, that governments should give continual attention to improving the military structure of NATO, and in particular should force increasing interdependence throughout the military field. I think everybody attending the Congress agreed, that this declaration basically was a sound one, and that all NATO countries should continue to implement NATO in its military aspects, as the one area protecting us from Communist attack.

Mr. NICHOLS. This is absolutely right. This is an area we cannot afford to neglect while we look at the other problems. It was interesting, and we simply do not have time to go into it in detail here, to note that at the very time the Congress was meeting, General de Gaulle was making his announcement with respect to the French position on the use of American planes for carrying atomic weapons and, in effect, asking that they not be based there. The Congress, as I recall, at least the committee that reported on military issues, gave a good deal of attention to the importance of the widest possible exchange of atomic information among the members of the alliance. This is obviously going to require a lot more attention. The other two major fields that were covered, of course, were the political and the cultural. In the political field the overriding concern was, as I recall, that there should be a constant and increasing amount of consultation among all members of the alliance—that no country should consider "going it alone" on any plans and programs affecting any other members of the community, without advance consultations. I suppose this was a carryover from some of the concern expressed when this had not been done in the past. On the other hand, there was, as I could gather, a certain feeling that a lot had been accomplished in this direction that we shouldn't lose sight of. This had to be a continuous process. On the cultural side, there were several proposals. The declaration, again, cites the major points with which they were concerned. The Congress, of course, spent a good deal of time discussing in a pretty lively fashion the need for countermeasures in combating the Soviet ideological warfare.

There were proposals for different techniques in doing this, but this was of great concern to a number of people. There was also the recommendation that a study center be set up for the Atlantic communities as a clearinghouse and intellectual focus. Another recommendation underscored the need for further integration of scientific research and, in particular, pure research. Also, there was a good deal of talk given to strengthening the information programs of NATO itself so as to keep the public better informed on the issues before the Atlantic community and before NATO. I gather these were probably the major fields covered. Perhaps we ought to turn our attention in the short time we have left to another evaluation of this Congress. How effective do you think it was in getting active participation on the part of the delegates? What was your impression of this?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. My impression was that all the delegates were most interested and very faithful in attending their section and committee meetings, as well as the plenary sessions. I know I was there practically the entire time, and most of the other delegates were there, too. As far as the recommendations are concerned, I think these ought to be implemented through the NATO parliamentarians, holding their next meeting in November of this year. At this time, the declaration of the Atlantic Congress and what it stood for will be considered by them for future implementation by their various parliaments and by our own Congress. There also has been a suggestion that a smaller group of 100 citizens be called together next year to further go into the recommendations of the Atlantic Congress and to stay in session until they can come up with some definite, firm recommendations to the NATO parliamentarians, which they in turn will have to implement through their own governments.

Mr. NICHOLS. It is interesting to note that already the report has been made to our Congress by members of the congressional delegation who attended and even one recommendation has been embodied in a report, for example, on the mutual security bill, so gradually I think we will see some of these results implemented. Now, to summarize very briefly some of the main points in our discussion, I suppose we would agree that we were both impressed with the concern of all the representatives with increasing needs for consultation, coordination, and increasing efforts in the economic, cultural, and political fields, while at the same time strengthening the military alliance—but not putting the major emphasis on the military aspect at this time. Secondly, there was a great concern expressed for the less developed countries and a recognition that their future was a major responsibility of the Atlantic community. Also, there was a real awareness of the economic problems and the need for an integration of efforts, particularly in the European area, to avoid restrictive barriers. Also, the role of the private individual was recognized, certainly evidenced by the fact that so many private individuals participated in this conference. Lastly, I think I would have to say that I was very impressed with the amount of creative thought demonstrated at the Congress and the vitality of the ideas. This was an encouraging experiment in an international conference. Is there anything you would like to add in closing, Mr. Zellerbach?

Mr. ZELLERBACH. In closing, I would say that my fellow citizens should be very happy that we were able to participate so actively in this Congress, and that unless you, my fellow citizens, get behind this kind of work and actively support it, we are going to have more trouble combating the Communist countries and what they say about us than ever before.

Mr. NICHOLS. Thank you ever so much, Mr. Zellerbach.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 439, agreed to September 15, 1959, the Vice President, on September 17, 1959, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1473. An act to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass.;

S. 1944. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the verification of pleadings;

S. 2162. An act to provide a health benefits program for Government employees;

S. 2282. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1952;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Sergiusz Rudczenko;

S. 2362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project;

S. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit equipment installation costs against rental under lease to Union Township of La Porte County, Ind.;

H.R. 47. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a personal exemption for children placed for adoption and to clarify certain provisions relating to the election of small business corporations as to taxable status;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect;

H.R. 5711. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley compact, and for related purposes;

H.R. 5733. An act for the relief of Park National Bank;

H.R. 6059. An act to provide additional civilian positions for the Department of Defense for purposes of scientific research and development relating to the national defense, to improve the management of the activities of such Department, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6067. An act to amend section 4544 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that if the money and effects of a deceased seaman paid or delivered to a district court do not exceed in value the sum of $1,500, such court may pay and deliver such money and effects to certain persons other than the legal personal representative of the deceased seaman;

H.R. 6190. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6672. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation;

H.R. 7452. An act for relief of William B. Jackson;

H.R. 7476. An act to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8385. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8392. An act to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8437. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of United States oil and gas lease BLM 028500;

H.R. 8464. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide salary increases for the police for the National Zoological Park;

H.R. 8685. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the Presidential appointment of a chief counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 531. Joint resolution establishing that the 2d regular session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 6, 1960.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States on September 17, 1959, the following enrolled bills:

S. 1944. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the verification of pleadings;

S. 2162. An act to provide a health benefits program for Government employees;

S. 2282. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1952;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Sergiusz Rudczenko;

S. 2362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project;

S. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit equipment installation costs against rental under lease to Union Township of La Porte County, Ind.; and

S. 1473. An act to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On September 14, 1959:

S. 53. An act to amend the acts approved April 16 and June 27, 1906 (34 Stat. 116 and 519), so as to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands on the Huntley reclamation project, Yellowstone County, Mont., to school district No. 24, Huntley Project Schools, Yellowstone County, Mont.;

S. 252. An act to authorize Col. Philip M. Whitney, U.S. Army, retired, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Government of the Republic of France;

S. 825. An act to revise eligibility requirements for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of Arshalouis Simeonian;

S. 1164. An act to authorize the appointment of a commissioner for Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.;

S. 1221. An act to amend the act authorizing the Crooked River Federal reclamation project, Oregon, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands;

S. 1555. An act to provide for the reporting and disclosure of certain financial transactions and administrative practices of labor organizations and employers, to prevent abuses in the administration of trusteeships by labor organizations, to provide standards with respect to the election of officers of labor organizations, and for other purposes;

S. 1618. An act for the relief of Matilda Kolich;

S. 1645. An act to amend section 4161 of title 18, United States Code, relating to computation of good time allowances for prisoners;

S. 1647. An act to amend section 4083, title 18, United States Code, relating to penitentiary imprisonment;

S. 1891. An act for the relief of Donald G. Coplan;

S. 1958. An act to amend section 12 of the act of March 5, 1915, to clarify types of arrestment prohibited with respect to wages of United States seamen;

S. 1973. An act to extend the validity of the passport to 3 years;

S. 2035. An act authorizing persons maintaining or defending actions in the District of Columbia on behalf of a minor to give releases of liability, and requiring persons receiving money or property in settlement of such actions or in satisfaction of a judgment in any such action to be appointed as guardian of the estate of such minor;

S. 2101. An act for the relief of Ourania Ben Blikas;

S. 2291. An act to authorize the erection of a plaque in honor of the late Honorable Sam D. McReynolds on or near the site of the Chickamauga Dam;

S. 2390. An act to authorize the exchange of certain lands in or in the vicinity of Everglades City, Fla., in furtherance of the administration and use of the Everglades National Park;

S. 2424. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to provide that the equal-time provisions with respect to candidates for public office shall not apply to news and other similar programs;

S. 2457. An act to provide equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government;

S. 2524. An act relating to the power of the States to impose net income taxes on income derived from interstate commerce, and authorizing studies by congressional committees of matters pertaining thereto; and

S.J. Res. 25. Joint resolution to change the name of Roosevelt Dam, Reservoir, and powerplant in Arizona to Theodore Roosevelt Dam, Lake, and powerplant.

On September 16, 1959:

S. 36. An act for the relief of Page A. Wilson;

S. 640. An act for the relief of Annibale Giovanni Pellegrini;

S. 667. An act for the relief of Pauline D. Kimbrough;

S. 977. An act for the relief of Nassibeh Mildred Milkie;

S. 994. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Spokane Valley project, Washington and Idaho, under Federal reclamation laws;

S. 1149. An act for the relief of Capt. Thomas J. McArdle;

S. 1171. An act for the relief of Katharina Hoeger;

S. 1575. An act to amend the act of August 1, 1958, to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing studies of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides, upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses of those invaluable natural resources, and for other purposes;

S. 1627. An act for the relief of Mrs. Paula Deml;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Marguerite Fueller; and

S. 2500. An act to authorize the appointment of Elwood R. Quesada to the retired list of the Regular Air Force, and for other purposes.

On September 21, 1959:

S. 335. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies or private detective agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency;

S. 464. An act for the relief of Julia Mydlak;

S. 1436. An act to amend the act of June 14, 1926, as amended by the act of June 4, 1954 (68 Stat. 173; 43 U.S.C., sec. 869);

S. 1944. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act in regard to the verification of pleadings;

S. 2181. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920;

S. 2208. An act to provide that Alaska and Hawaii be eligible for participation in the distribution of discretionary funds under section 6(b) of the Federal Airport Act;

S. 2219. An act to authorize appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, to increase the authorization of appropriations for the support thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 2230. An act to amend the National Cultural Center Act;

S. 2445. An act authorizing the conferring of the degree of master of arts in education on certain students who enrolled in the District of Columbia Teachers College prior to July 1, 1958, and who, prior to July 1, 1961, are certified by the president and faculty of such college as having met all requirements for the granting of such degree;

S. 2504. An act to authorize the sale at current support prices of agricultural commodities owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide feed for livestock in areas determined to be emergency areas, and for other purposes;

S. 2569. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; and

S.J. Res. 103. Joint resolution authorizing the National Geographic Society to erect a memorial on public grounds in the State of Virginia to honor Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd.

On September 22, 1959:

S. 1473. An act to repeal the act of May 27, 1912, which authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to sell certain land to the First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass.;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Sergiusz Rudczenko;

S. 2362. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey to the city of Arlington, Oreg., certain lands at the John Day lock and dam project;

S. 2517. An act to amend section 7 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; and

S. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to credit equipment installation costs against rental under lease to Union Township of La Porte County, Ind.

On September 23, 1959:

S. 1845. An act to provide for the reestablishment of the rates of basic compensation for certain Government positions, and for other purposes;

S. 2282. An act to amend the act of July 17, 1952;

S. 2568. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with respect to cooperation with States; and

S. 2654. An act to extend and amend laws relating to the provision and improvement of housing and the renewal of urban communities, and for other purposes.

On September 28, 1959:

S. 2162. An act to provide a health benefits program for Government employees.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 689, 84th Congress, 2d session, the Vice President approved the appointment of the following Senators as members of the United States group to attend the NATO parliamentary conference in November, to be held in Washington, D.C.: Mr. FULBRIGHT, Chairman, Mr. WILEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. HART, and Mr. HARTKE.

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 196, 86th Congress, 1st session, the Vice President approved the appointment of the following Senators to be members of the Committee on Unemployment Problems: Mr. MCCARTHY, Chairman, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. SCOTT.

OCEANOGRAPHIC STUDIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of September 11, 1959, the names of Senators SMITH and CLARK were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2692) to advance the marine sciences, to establish a comprehensive 10-year program of oceanographic research and surveys; to promote commerce and navigation; to secure the national defense; to expand ocean resources; to authorize the construction of research and survey ships and facilities; to assure systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments; to enhance the general welfare and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Senators SMATHERS, SCHOEPPEL, BARTLETT, YARBOROUGH, CASE of New Jersey, ENGLE, SCOTT, MCGEE, BUTLER, and HART) on September 11, 1959.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED

The President of the United States, subsequent to the sine die adjournment of the Congress, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

On September 14, 1959:

H.R. 6781. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain additional property to be included within the Independence National Historical Park; and

H.J. Res. 281. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1959 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes.

On September 16, 1959:

H.R. 213. An act to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees, and to permit the States of California, Kansas, North Dakota, and Vermont to obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for policemen and firemen in positions covered by a retirement system;

H.R. 839. An act to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wapato Indian irrigation project, Washington, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2978. An act to amend section 1870 of filing claims for credit or refund of overpayments of income taxes arising as a result of renegotiation of Government contracts;

H.R. 2987. An act to amend section 1870 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the district courts to allow additional peremptory

challenges in civil cases to multiple plaintiffs as well as multiple defendants;

H.R. 3816. An act for the relief of Mukhtar Mohammed;

H.R. 5873. An act for the relief of Clara H. Hall;

H.R. 6508. An act to grant minerals, including oil and gas, on certain lands in the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont., to certain Indians, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6579. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the temporary free importation of extracts, decoctions, and preparations of hemlock suitable for use for tanning;

H.R. 6669. An act to amend the act of July 14, 1945, to provide that the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College may use certain real property heretofore conveyed to it by the United States for general educational purposes;

H.R. 7571. An act to amend section 7 of the act of July 28, 1950 (ch. 503, 64 Stat. 381; 5 U.S.C. 341f), to authorize the Attorney General to acquire land in the vicinity of any Federal penal or correctional institution when considered essential to the protection of the health or safety of the inmates of the institution;

H.R. 7744. An act for the relief of John I. Strong;

H.R. 7870. An act to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, as amended;

H.R. 8196. An act for the relief of Everet Bumgardner;

H.R. 8197. An act for the relief of Lawrence M. Furtado;

H.R. 8198. An act for the relief of Martin Ackerman;

H.R. 8199. An act for the relief of James J. Manning;

H.R. 8310. An act for the relief of Joseph H. Cornell;

H.R. 8461. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1958, establishing a Commission and Advisory Committee on International Rules of Judicial Procedure;

H.R. 8575. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a gold medal in honor of the late Prof. Robert H. Goddard; and

H.J. Res. 493. Joint resolution making a technical correction in section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (relating to national banks).

On September 21, 1959:

H.R. 163. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act with respect to the crediting of service of U.S. commissioners for purposes of such act;

H.R. 616. An act to designate the dam across the Lampasas River in Texas as Stillhouse Hollow Dam;

H.R. 1455. An act conferring U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Gerardo Rafael Dobarganes y Torres;

H.R. 1499. An act for the relief of Gordon Langlands Johnston;

H.R. 1520. An act for the relief of Eva Gurman;

H.R. 1665. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vassiliki P. Theodorou;

H.R. 1701. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Leschner;

H.R. 1735. An act to provide for conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Yalobusha County, Miss., to W. A. Nolen and Wiley W. Walker;

H.R. 1778. An act to amend section 17(b) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939;

H.R. 2077. An act for the relief of Bernard Barrett;

H.R. 2090. An act for the relief of Giuseppa Ferrante (Sister Candida);

H.R. 2245. An act to amend subsection 432(g) of title 14, United States Code, so as to increase the limitation on basic compensation of civilian keepers of lighthouses and civilians employed on lightships and other vessels of the Coast Guard from $3,750 to $5,100 per annum;

H.R. 2247. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the county of Sacramento, Calif.;

H.R. 2301. An act for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Ellison;

H.R. 2302. An act for the relief of Agnes Lorraine Pank;

H.R. 2386. An act to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Mobile, Ala., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land;

H.R. 2695. An act for the relief of the Inter-County Telephone & Telegraph Co., Fort Myers, Fla.;

H.R. 2946. An act for the relief of Cecil E. Finley;

H.R. 2982. An act to fix the official station of retired judges assigned to active duty;

H.R. 3111. An act for the relief of Rachel Nethery;

H.R. 3180. An act to extend for an additional 3 years the time within which the State of Michigan may commence and complete the construction of certain projects heretofore authorized by the Congress;

H.R. 3410. An act for the relief of Mrs. Leonard O. Erickson;

H.R. 3608. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire certain land on the island of Guam;

H.R. 3792. An act to admit the vessel *John F. Drews* to American registry and to permit its use in the coastwise trade while it is owned by Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corp. of New York;

H.R. 3801. An act for the relief of Harry and Lily Stopnitsky;

H.R. 4002. An act to authorize the use of Great Lakes vessels on the oceans;

H.R. 4134. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Scotty James, of Sitka, Alaska;

H.R. 4603. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam for the purpose of permitting the Government of Guam, with the consent of the legislature thereof, to be sued;

H.R. 4656. An act to amend section 401b of the act of July 14, 1952, to permit applications for moving costs resulting from any public-works project of a military department to be filed either 1 year from the date of acquisition or 1 year following the date of vacating the property;

H.R. 4714. An act to quiet title and possession with respect to certain real property adjacent to the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Denver, Colo.;

H.R. 4839. An act for the relief of Peter F. de Ullmann;

H.R. 4857. An act to amend section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the exemptions from the admissions tax for athletic games benefiting crippled or retarded children shall apply where the participants have recently attended designated schools or colleges as well as where they are currently students;

H.R. 5257. An act to amend section 1915 of title 28, United States Code, relating to proceedings in forma pauperis;

H.R. 5357. An act for the relief of Loretta F. Ossorio;

H.R. 5477. An act to authorize Maj. Gen. Bernard W. Kearney, U.S. Army (retired), a former Member of Congress, to accept and wear the Philippine Legion of Honor in the degree of commander, conferred upon him by the Government of the Philippines;

H.R. 5645. An act for the relief of Christopher J. Mulligan;

H.R. 5692. An act to provide for the establishment of Minute Man National Historical Park in Massachusetts, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5910. An act for the relief of Zelda Glick;

H.R. 6128. An act to provide for the division of the tribal assets of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina among the members of the tribe and for other purposes;

H.R. 6190. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey the Army and Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the State of Arkansas, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6269. An act to amend section 265 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 to define the term "a member of a reserve component" so as to include a member of the Army or Air Force without specification of component;

H.R. 6368. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place certain pumice stone on the free list;

H.R. 6405. An act for the relief of Vukasin Krtolica;

H.R. 6546. An act for the relief of Nancy Mae Floor;

H.R. 6672. An act to authorize longer term leases of Indian lands on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation;

H.R. 6720. An act for the relief of Andrew Choa;

H.R. 6733. An act for the relief of Paul & Beekman, Inc., and others;

H.R. 6809. An act for the relief of Lt. (jg) James W. Little;

H.R. 6884. An act for the relief of Mrs. Barbara May Boswell;

H.R. 6886. An act for the relief of Liliana Caprara;

H.R. 6888. An act to amend section 4132 of the Revised Statutes, section 37 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, section 2 of the Shipping Act, 1916, and section 905(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

H.R. 6954. An act for the relief of Frol Martin Simonov;

H.R. 7125. An act to provide for a study of the feasibility of establishing the President Adams Parkway;

H.R. 7145. An act to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended;

H.R. 7225. An act for the relief of Sylvester L. Gardner;

H.R. 7256. An act for the relief of Miss Remedios Villanueva;

H.R. 7437. An act to authorize the use of funds arising from a judgment in favor of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes of Indians of Oklahoma, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7474. An act granting the consent of Congress to the compact entered into by the States of West Virginia and Virginia with respect to a certain part of the boundary between such States;

H.R. 7518. An act for the relief of Rudolph Rozman;

H.R. 7550. An act for the relief of Vartanouche Kalfayan;

H.R. 7629. An act to extend section 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act for 2 years, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7683. An act to provide that the tax exemption heretofore accorded the Veterans of Foreign Wars with respect to certain property in the District of Columbia, formerly owned by such organization but never used for its intended purpose, shall apply instead to other property subsequently acquired and used for that purpose;

H.R. 7857. An act for the relief of Richard C. Long;

H.R. 7935. An act for the relief of Father Kenneth M. Rizer;

H.R. 8035. An act to designate the Dyberry Dam and Reservoir, Lackawaxen River basin, Pennsylvania, as the General Edgar Jadwin Dam and Reservoir;

H.R. 8189. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of captain to the grade of major;

H.R. 8409. An act to extend the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949;

H.R. 8437. An act to provide for the reinstatement and validation of U.S. oil and gas lease BLM 028500;

H.R. 8514. An act to authorize the sale of 40 acres of land owned by the Creek Tribe of Indians;

H.R. 8582. An act to authorize the San Benito International Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande near Los Indios, Tex.;

H.R. 8587. An act to provide for the equalization of allotments on the Agua Caliente (Palm Springs) Reservation in California, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8593. An act to amend the act of June 23, 1949, as amended, to provide that telephone and telegraph service furnished Members of the House of Representatives shall be computed on a unit basis;

H.R. 8609. An act to extend the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8678. An act to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1956 and 1958 to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8694. An act to authorize the Starr-Camargo Bridge Co. to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Rio Grande City, Tex.;

H.R. 8725. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make technical changes in certain excise-tax laws, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8911. An act to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial tablet at Garden Key, Fla., in honor of Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd;

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution granting consent of Congress to a compact entered into between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey for the creation of the New York-New Jersey Transportation Agency;

H.J. Res. 465. Joint resolution approving certain additional powers conferred upon the Bi-State Development Agency by the States of Missouri and Illinois;

H.J. Res. 477. Joint resolution relating to the exclusion of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 479. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens;

H.J. Res. 513. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December 1959 as "Wright Brothers' Day"; and

H.J. Res. 531. Joint resolution establishing that the second regular session of the 86th Congress convene at noon on Wednesday, January 6, 1960.

On September 22, 1959:

H.R. 2390. An act for the relief of the city of Madeira Beach, Fla.;

H.R. 2449. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Twin Cities Arsenal, Minn., to Independent School District No. 16, Minn.;

H.R. 3030. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force" so as to provide retirement compensation for the present director of said band after 10 or more years of service;

H.R. 3781. An act for the relief of Mrs. Anna Loftis;

H.R. 3782. An act for the relief of the estate of Willard Phillips;

H.R. 4279. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, La Feria division;

H.R. 4938. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect;

H.R. 5004. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to undertake continuing research on the biology fluctuations, status, and statistics of the migratory marine species of game fish of the United States and contiguous waters;

H.R. 5067. An act to repeal section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended;

H.R. 5431. An act to provide a further increase in the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service;

H.R. 5733. An act for the relief of Park National Bank;

H.R. 5752. An act to provide for absence from duty by civilian officers and employees of the Government on certain days, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5896. An act to provide for the entry of certain relatives of the U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens;

H.R. 6067. An act to amend section 4544 of the Revised Statutes of the United States to provide that, if the money and effects of a deceased seaman paid or delivered to a district court do not exceed in value the sum of $1,500, such court may pay and deliver such money and effects to certain persons other than the legal personal representative of the deceased seaman;

H.R. 7452. An act for relief of William B. Jackson;

H.R. 7476. An act to extend the duration of the Federal air pollution control law, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7640. An act for the relief of James F. Conroy;

H.R. 7745. An act for the relief of Mrs. Willie Soher;

H.R. 7979. An act to waive section 142, of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Oklahoma holding court at Durant, Okla.;

H.R. 8305. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

H.R. 8599. An act to amend the Small Business Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8685. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the Presidential appointment of a Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9035. An act to permit the issuance of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum, to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to designate certain exchanges of Government securities to be made without recognition of gain or loss, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 310. Joint resolution to authorize the designation of the period of October 17 to October 24, 1959, as National Olympic Week;

H.J. Res. 317. Joint resolution to change the designation of Child Health Day from May 1 to the first Monday in October of each year;

H.J. Res. 446. Joint resolution to waive certain provisions of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in behalf of certain aliens; and

H.J. Res. 478. Joint resolution relating to permanent residence and deportation of certain aliens.

On September 23, 1959:

H.R. 47. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a personal exemption for children placed for adoption and to clarify certain provisions relating to the election of small business corporations as to taxable status;

H.R. 3254. An act for the relief of Thomas Forman Screven, Julia Screven Daniels, and May Bond Screven Rhodes;

H.R. 5711. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the Wabash Valley Compact, and for related purposes;

H.R. 6059. An act to provide additional civilian positions for the Department of Defense for purposes of scientific research and development relating to the national defense, to improve the management of the activities of such Department, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7244. An act to promote and preserve local management of savings and loan associations by protecting them against encroachment by holding companies;

H.R. 7605. An act for the relief of the State of Oklahoma;

H.R. 8392. An act to amend the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 with respect to motor-vehicle parking areas, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8464. An act to amend the act of October 24, 1951, to provide salary increases for the police for the National Zoological Park.

On September 24, 1959:

H.R. 4894. An act for the relief of the Georgia Kaolin Co.; and

H.R. 6904. An act to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

On September 25, 1959:

H.R. 4821. An act to amend the act of August 12, 1955, Public Law 378, 84th Congress (69 Stat. 707), so as to provide additional relief for losses sustained in the Texas City disaster.

On September 28, 1959:

H.R. 8385. An act making appropriations for Mutual Security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS DISAPPROVED

The message further announced that the President had disapproved the following bills of the House; his reasons for such actions are as follows:

On September 16, 1959:

COAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 6596, A bill to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by creating a Coal Research and Development Commission, and for other purposes.

The Department of the Interior currently administers research and conservation programs for coal, as well as for other mineral resources. If an additional agency for this purpose were now to be created, the Department of the Interior's established interest in such matters would be diluted and the result could only be a blurring of the lines of governmental responsibility in this important area of concern.

The first Hoover Commission recommended that the various functions of the Government be grouped into major departments and agencies on the basis of purpose. The creation of a new coal research agency by approving H.R. 6596 would be a serious set-back in the progress that has been made in following the Hoover Commission recommendations for improving the organization of the Federal Government. The bill is also undesirable because it could serve as a precedent for the creation of other such special agencies.

One provision of H.R. 6596 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research. This feature of the bill is highly desirable and I urge the Congress to enact legislation granting such authority to the Secretary. H.R. 3375, or S. 1362, now pending in the Congress, would accomplish this purpose, and have been endorsed by the administration to stimulate research, as well as production and conservation of coal.

On September 21, 1959:

PEONY PARK, INC.

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 3096, entitled "An act for the relief of Peony Park, Inc., and others."

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the total sum of $100,706.50 to nine operators of ballrooms in Nebraska in refund of cabaret taxes paid by the claimants during the period September 1948 through October 1951.

By judicial decision the cabaret tax here involved has been held to have been properly collected from the claimants during the period covered by the bill.

Until January 1951, however, interpretation and enforcement of the applicable statute by the Internal Revenue Service were not uniform throughout the United States. Accordingly, until the interpretation of the law was clarified by judicial decision, and until enforcement of the law became uniform throughout the United States after January 1951, similarly situated taxpayers in many States were not required to pay the tax. The cabaret tax, however, was uniformly enforced within the State of Nebraska and was paid by establishments within the competitive area of the claimants. Moreover, during the years 1948 to 1950, the tax was enforced in at least 17 jurisdictions, and during the major portion of the year 1951 was uniformly enforced throughout the United States against similarly situated taxpayers.

This bill not only would refund to the nine claimants a tax which was properly collected, but it would also discriminate against many other similarly situated taxpayers to whom no relief would be granted. Furthermore, the bill might unjustly enrich its beneficiaries by refunding the cabaret tax without regard to whether the ultimate burden of the tax was borne by the claimants or passed on to their patrons.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

On September 21, 1959:

FEDERAL BOATING ACT OF 1958—TO EXTEND

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 8728, to amend the Federal Boating Act of 1958 to extend until April 1, 1961, the period when certain provisions of that act will take effect.

The Federal Boating Act of 1958 provides for the establishment of a new system of numbering small undocumented vessels. Under the act, the part of the new system to be administered by the U.S. Coast Guard is to go into effect on April 1, 1960, at which time the authority for the existing system would be repealed. The bill would extend this effective date from April 1, 1960, to April 1, 1961.

This legislation was originally considered necessary because it had not been possible to obtain a supplemental appropriation for the Coast Guard to administer the new system. Since Congress passed the bill, however, the funds required for the implementation of the Federal Boating Act have been included in the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1960. Consequently, the extension of time provided in the bill is no longer needed.

On September 22, 1959:

NATHANIEL H. WOODS

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 2631, for the relief of the estate of Nathaniel H. Woods, deceased.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the sum of $13,476.50 to the estate of Nathaniel H. Woods in refund of an estate tax which was erroneously paid.

The major portion of the estate tax in question was paid in December 1951 on the assumption that the first of two wills left by the decedent was valid. The second will, under which no estate tax was due, was admitted to probate on April 16, 1953, and, after prolonged litigation, was sustained as the valid will in December 1955. A claim for refund was not filed until June 1956. It was rejected by the Commissioner and the Federal courts because not filed within the period of limitations prescribed by law.

It appears that the 3-year statutory period of limitations for filing a timely claim did not expire until April 16, 1956—3 years after the executor qualified under the second will and more than 4 months after the conclusion of the litigation upholding the validity of the second will. A protective claim for refund could have been filed at any time during the 3-year period after the qualification of the executor under the second will. It was not necessary to await the conclusion of the prolonged litigation concerning the wills. Even after the conclusion of the litigation, there remained more than 4 months in which to file a timely claim. The record in this case discloses no justification for the failure to file a claim until June 1956.

The statute of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. The limitation not only bars taxpayers from obtaining refunds, but also the Government from collecting additional taxes. Granting special relief in this case, where a refund was not claimed in the time and manner prescribed by law, would discriminate against other similarly situated taxpayers and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval of the bill.

On September 22, 1959:

MRS. LOURENE O. ESTES

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 6335, for the relief of Mrs. Lourene O. Estes.

Mrs. Estes, on her income tax returns for 1952 and 1953, reported as income certain disability payments received from her employer. Prior to the time the taxpayer filed these returns, the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit had held that such disability payments were excludable from gross income, although the Internal Revenue Service had ruled to the contrary.

On April 1, 1957, the U.S. Supreme Court decided that disability payments of the type here in question were excludable from gross income. On April 15, 1957, Mrs. Estes filed claims for refund for 1952 and 1953 based upon the excludability of the disability pay received by her. These claims were rejected because filed after the expiration of the 3-year period of limitations prescribed by law for the filing of such claims.

During the last Congress, I approved legislation designed to grant general relief, on a nondiscriminatory basis, to taxpayers who had received disability pay which was excludable from gross income under the Supreme Court decision. This general legislation does not provide relief for taxpayers, such as Mrs. Estes, who did not attempt to protect their rights by filing timely claims for refund.

The statutory period of limitations, which the Congress has included in the revenue system as a matter of sound policy, is essential in order to achieve finality in tax administration. A substantial number of taxpayers paid income tax on disability payments received by them and failed to file timely claims for refund. Accordingly, to grant special relief in this case, where a refund was not claimed in the time and manner prescribed by law, would be to discriminate against such other similarly situated taxpayers and to create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, therefore, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

On September 23, 1959:

MRS. MARY D'AGOSTINO

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 1387, for the relief of Mrs. Mary D'Agostino.

Mrs. D'Agostino's claim for gratuitous national service life insurance benefits, filed April 20, 1956, was denied by the Veterans' Administration because it had not been filed within the statutory time limitation of 7 years after the date of death of her son on December 22, 1940. The Veterans' Administration has also determined that, even if her claim had been timely filed, Mrs. D'Agostino would not have been eligible for the benefit because her son's death had occurred not in line of duty and did not meet the criteria specified in the law for such benefits. A subsequent statutory liberalization of line of duty criteria had no retroactive effect.

H.R. 1387, in addition to waiving the time limitation, would retroactively apply to this case the liberalized line of duty criteria enacted in September 1944. H.R. 3733 and H.R. 6529, 83d Congress, also sought retroactively to apply liberalized eligibility standards which, as a matter of law, had only prospective effect. In disapproving those measures I indicated that it seemed to me irrelevant and unwise to accept as justification for those bills the fact that an ineligible beneficiary could qualify under the then existing law which was never intended to have retroactive effect. My view has not changed and applies with equal force to the present case.

Approval of H.R. 1387 would be discriminatory and would create an undesirable precedent. Uniformity and

equality of treatment for all who are similarly situated must be the steadfast rule if Federal programs for veterans and their dependents are to be operated successfully. Approval of H.R. 1387 would not be in keeping with these principles.

On September 23, 1959:

MRS. ELBE HAVERSTICK CASH

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 1434, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Elbe Haverstick Cash.

This bill would pay to Mrs. Cash $5,000 as compensation for the death of her son as a result of maltreatment in a Veterans' Administration hospital in 1955.

Mrs. Cash's son entered a Veterans' Administration hospital in 1943 due to service-connected mental illness. He was hospitalized continuously in VA facilities until his death in 1955. During this entire period, Mrs. Cash received on her son's behalf service-connected compensation ranging in amount from $138 to $190 monthly.

It appears that in February 1955, while attendants were changing his clothes, Mrs. Cash's son became unruly. In the ensuing struggle the attendants set upon him, causing serious injuries from which he later died. Although the attendants involved were found not guilty of criminal acts, they were either fired or otherwise rigorously disciplined for their part in this tragic affair.

In addition to receiving $5,000 under a National Service Life Insurance policy, Mrs. Cash, as a dependent parent, currently receives death compensation at the rate of $75 monthly. This is paid to her under general provisions of law which provide that where a death occurs as a result of hospitalization by the VA benefits are payable as if such death were service connected. Mrs. Cash has no remedy under the Federal Tort Claims Act, since that act specifically bars claims based on assault and battery.

My strong feeling of sympathy for this mother in the unfortunate loss of her son is matched only by my distress that an incident of this kind should happen in a Government hospital. These strong feelings do not, however, alter the fact that there is a generous, comprehensive, and assured system of benefits provided for the survivors of veterans who die, in whatever manner, as a result of hospitalization by the VA. Mrs. Cash is currently a beneficiary of this system.

The situation here closely parallels that resulting when a serviceman suffers a service-connected death. In such cases, regardless of the manner in which death occurs, I firmly believe that the assured and general benefits to which survivors are entitled by law should be their exclusive remedy. This principle has led to the disapproval of other private bills granting special awards in such cases (see H.R. 1315, 85th Cong., "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Page," disapproved on Sept. 7, 1957). I perceive no basis for reaching a different result under the analogous circumstances of the present case.

On September 23, 1959:

HAROLD WILLIAM ABBOTT AND OTHERS

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 8277, an act for the relief of Harold William Abbott and others.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $23,317.61 to 11 individuals in refund of transportation taxes collected after 1945 and before 1952 for transportation in connection with fishing parties. Refund of these taxes has been barred because claims for refund, and appeals from the rejection of such claims, were not filed within the time prescribed by law.

The relief sought in this bill is similar to that sought in a bill which I disapproved last year, H.R. 3193, "For the relief of Toley's Charter Boats, Inc., Toley Engebretsen, and Harvey Homlar."

On March 31, 1953, a Federal court held that the transportation tax did not apply to the type of transportation involved here. At the time of this decision, there remained a period of at least 9 months in which to file timely claims for 1950 and a period of at least 1 year and 9 months in which to file timely claims for 1951. Approximately $10,000 of the amount involved in this bill represents taxes collected during the years 1950 and 1951, which would have been refunded to seven of the claimants except for the fact that they filed their claims for refund more than 2 years after the date of the Federal court decision. The record in this case discloses no reason justifying this delinquency in filing claims.

Refund of a large portion of the amount involved in this bill was barred by the statute of limitations prior to the Federal court decision. The basic purposes underlying the statute of limitations continue to obtain in cases where a taxpayer, after having paid a tax, discovers that the interpretation of the law has been changed by a judicial decision. Granting relief in this case would discriminate against other taxpayers similarly situated and would create an undesirable precedent.

Under the circumstances, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

On September 24, 1959:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—POLICE FORCE AND FIRE DEPARTMENT

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 3735, an act to increase the relief or retirement compensation of certain former members of the Metropolitan Police Force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, and the U.S. Secret Service; and of their widows, widowers, and children.

I am unable to approve the 10 percent increase in relief or retirement compensation which the first section of this bill proposes for its beneficiaries. Policemen and firemen who retired before October 1, 1956, are already receiving much more generous treatment than any other group of retired District of Columbia employees. This results from the Equalization Act of 1923 which provides for an automatic proportionate increase in pensions equal to any salary increases granted active duty policemen and firemen. The equalization feature has operated so effectively that a significant number of these retirees presently receive a larger pension than their annual salaries while on active duty. Also, under the 1923 law these retirees have forged far ahead of District government annuitants subject to the civil service retirement program. In the interests of fairness, the present disparity should not be further increased.

I could readily accept the other provision of the bill which proposes to adjust and improve the benefits payable to the widows and surviving minor children of deceased policemen and firemen who retired prior to October 1, 1956. The circumstances of this group are different and I sincerely hope that the Congress, early in the next session, will enact the improved benefits which this class deserves.

On September 25, 1959:

HOWARD F. KNIPP

I have withheld my approval from H.R. 2068, an act for the relief of Howard F. Knipp.

The bill would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to compute the income tax liamibitl of Howard F. Knipp for the calendar years 1947 and 1948 so that his distributive share of the earnings of the John C. Knipp & Sons partnership, for its fiscal year beginning on February 1, 1947, would be determined on the basis of a full partnership taxable year ending on January 31, 1948.

The records of the Treasury Department show that Mr. Knipp, a calendar year taxpayer, was a member of a two-man partnership which had a fiscal year ending on January 31. The death of Mr. Knipp's partner on November 21, 1947, raised the question of partnership termination on that date. If the partnership terminated on that date, Mr. Knipp had to include in his income for the calendar year 1947 a much greater amount than would have been the case had the partnership continued until the normal end of its taxable year.

On June 2, 1953, the Bureau of Internal Revenue assessed a deficiency against Mr. Knipp on the ground that the death of his partner terminated the partnership and its taxable year. The Tax Court approved the Bureau's position on October 31, 1955, and that court's decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit on April 10, 1957. On October 14, 1957, certiorari was denied by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The question of the partnership termination in this case has been litigated before the courts in an orderly manner. Approval of this bill would encourage demands for legislation overruling court decisions in individual cases and would create an undersirable precedent. The bunching of income in this case has admittedly worked a hardship on Mr. Knipp, but this is mitigated to some extent by the fact that for a number of years Mr. Knipp had the advantage of deferring payment of tax each year on 11 months of this firm's profits until the following year.

Congressional Record

United States of America — PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 105 — WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1959 — No. 168

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

OCT 9 1959

PERIODICAL READING ROOM

Appendix

NOTICE

The last issue of the daily Congressional Record for the first session of the Eighty-sixth Congress will be published not later than Monday, October 5, 1959. It is requested that copy and proofs of speeches withheld for revision, or extensions of remarks as authorized by either House, be submitted to the Government Printing Office or to the Congressional Record Clerk, Statuary Hall, Capitol, before that date.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

CARL HAYDEN, Chairman.

The Report of the United Nations Legal Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space: A Provisional Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a very significant speech made by Mr. George J. Feldman at the 10th annual meeting of the International Astronautical Federation. Mr. Feldman is an outstanding American who served at great personal sacrifice last year as director and chief counsel of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. During the present session of Congress, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has paid official tribute to his leadership, judgment, and deep sense of public service. In addition to his unusual personal qualities, he has had a varied and distinguished career in the legal profession and the world of finance.

Mr. Feldman's speech appraises the report of the United Nations Legal Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. In particular, Mr. Feldman expresses the view that the peaceful uses of outer space, both in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 and in the resolution creating the United Nations committee, refers to nonaggressive rather than nonmilitary uses. He suggests a definition of aggressive space vehicles and activities as those than can cause direct harm to objects on the earth's surface, and proposes that this definition, in terms of prohibition, be incorporated in international law.

I commend Mr. Feldman's remarks to everyone who is interested in the exploration and use of outer space:

THE REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS LEGAL COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE: A PROVISIONAL APPRAISAL

(Remarks of George J. Feldman at the 10th annual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation, London, England, September 4, 1959)

Hope mingled with satisfaction but tinged with disappointment—those are my present emotions as I look back at the work accomplished by the United Nations Legal Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The committee report[1] is disappointing—not because of anything it says but because of what it fails to say—because its discussions are so preliminary and its conclusions so tentative. The judgment of the committee on its own report was probably summed up by the observation made by the representative of Brazil at the June 23 meeting that "the committee had made only a preliminary investigation of the subject." You know the Latin saying, "Parturiunt montes, nascitur ridiculus mus"—or, as it is usually expressed in English, "The mountains labored and brought forth a mouse."

In May and June of this year (if I may be permitted a brief autobiographical digression), I devoted a large part of my time to the deliberations of the United Nations Committee. Consequently I know some of the difficulties it faced. The subject was new to many of the participants. They had been trained in a variety of different legal disciplines, and they represented diverse national interests. Furthermore, the subject itself is difficult, involving a number of complex problems, and dealing with facts, as well as their scientific, economic, political, and military implications, which are still largely unknown. Unfortunately, a pall was thrown over the proceedings by the refusal of five countries to participate. Considering these difficulties, there are grounds for satisfaction in the limited accomplishments represented by the committee report and the debates on which it is based. The committee succeeded in airing many aspects of the subject, identifying the legal problems that are likely to arise in the exploration of outer space, indicating the significance and priority of such problems, and reaching agreement on general principles to be followed in the future. Lastly, I believe there is reason to hope that the deliberations and the report of the committee will result in a broader understanding by all nations of the practical legal problems involved in space activities, and will provide a firm foundation on which the principles and rules of international space law can ultimately be built.

On December 13, 1958, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution reading in part as follows:

"The General Assembly * * * 1: Establishes an ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of outer space * * * and requests it to report to the General Assembly at its 14th session on the following * * * (d) The nature of legal problems which may arise in the carrying out of programs to explore outer space."[2]

Although the General Assembly resolution followed closely a Soviet draft resolution of November 18, 1958, the Soviet Union refused to participate in the committee's work owing to a dispute over the membership. As a result, four other nations[3] also refused to participate. There is no doubt that the nonparticipation of these nations imposed a serious handicap on the committee at the outset. Nevertheless, the committee meetings were attended and the report was ap-

[1] United Nations General Assembly, document A/AC.98/2, June 12, 1959.

[2] A/RES/1348 (XIII), Dec. 13, 1958. See 5 United Nations Review 12 (Jan. 1959).

[3] Poland, Czechoslovakia, India, and the United Arab Republic.

proved by representatives of Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, France, Iran, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Perhaps it is worth noting that some of the members of the committee had already expressed their views on one or more of the legal problems on which the committee was required to report. There had been previous debate in the General Assembly and particularly in the Political Committee (committee No. 1). The various views on space law previously stated by members of the Legal Committee are necessary to a clear understanding of their deliberations and of the report.

Their observations concerned some of the fundamental questions of space law: What legal rules govern events in outer space? The Chicago convention or other international flight agreements? The municipal laws of subjacent st ates? (According to the maxim, cuius est solum, eius est usque ad coelum, national sovereignty would extend into outer space without limit.) In the alternative, is outer space res nullius (i.e., subject to appropriation) or res communis (not subject to appropriation, but free like the high seas)?

During the debate in the Political Committee, the representative of Italy expressed the view that the Chicago convention governs airspace alone, and that there are no legal norms for outer space. The representative of Australia stated that any extension of the usque ad coelum doctrine into outer space would be "absurd." Other representatives seemed to acquiesce in these views. A number opposed the suggestion that outer space may be res nullius,[4] and some explicitly termed it res communis (or res extra commercium).[5]

It is significent that the only nations which, up to now, have ventured into outer space on a large scale—the United States and the Soviet Union—took no position whatever on these fundamental questions of space law. Their representatives had refrained from stating any views on the legal status of outer space.

With this background, it is easier to understand the report of the Legal Committee. In order to keep its task within manageable limits, the committee agreed to consider certain selected (not all) legal problems of outer space, to divide them roughly into two groups (not to rank them individually) according to priority, and to indicate, without recommendation, various means by which answers to such problems might be pursued.

The treatment in the report of the specific legal problems of outer space is not adaptable to detailed analysis in such a brief appraisal as this. My overall judgment, however, is that this part of the report, which includes most of the text, leaves a great deal to be desired. Each problem is stated; the questions it might raise are posed; helpful analogies and related rules of law are mentioned; but almost no attempt is made to formulate solutions or even to analyze legal and practical implications.

The report does, however, state certain general principles, as follows: the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice are "not limited in their operation to the confines of the earth"; the members of the United Nations, as sovereign equals under the charter, recognize the common interest of mankind in outer space and the common aim that it should be used for peaceful purposes only; air law and maritime law may provide fruitful analogies, but space law is unique because of "many specific factual conditions, not all of which are now known * * *"; and, lastly, a comprehensive code of space law is not practicable or desirable at the present stage of knowledge or development, although there is a need to take "timely, constructive action" and "to make the law of space responsive to the facts of space."

At this point you are probably thinking that the principles stated in the committee report are all very well, as far as they go, but are hardly enough. There is a little more, however, than meets the eye. In the draft report prepared by the working group of the Legal Committee, the fruitful analogies were said to be not only air law and maritime law but "the principles and procedures developed in the past to govern the use of * * * other regions of the earth." At its fifth meeting, held on June 11, the committee unanimously adopted the proposal of the Argentine representative that the phrase "other regions of the earth" be eliminated on the ground that they referred to Antarctica and perhaps to other territories which are subject to national sovereignty, whereas "the general trend of the report was in favor of treating outer space as res communis omnium. * * *"[7]

The action of the committee in striking out the phrase "other regions of the earth" may fairly be interpreted as giving implicit approval to the views expressed by members of the committee in previous debate, rejecting the possibilities that events in outer space may be governed by the Chicago Convention or the municipal laws of subjacent states, or that outer space may be subject to appropriation res nullius.

I should like to make two other comments on the general principles stated in the committee report.

Although the report recognizes that the United Nations Charter is not limited to the earth, some committee members would certainly not agree with this statement as to all the provisions of the charter. Specifically, the representative of Mexico described article 51, relating to self-defense, as a "transitory" provision and not applicable to events in outer space.[8] I take issue on this point. Surely, the right of self-defense does not depend on the United Nations Charter; and, surely, it would be just as valid in outer space as on the earth's surface. There is ample and ancient authority in general international law for nations to take any necessary steps to protect themselves.

Secondly, the report states that "a comprehensive code of space law is not practicable or desirable" at the present time. I agree with this statement if the word "code" refers to a body of detailed and rigid rules, but not if it means the drafting of a legal framework or the outlining of a legal system. The beginning of space law may be skeletal; they may be unilateral; they may even be nongovernmental, like certain unofficial codes of safety standards. In any case, the important thing is to begin now—to conduct research, hold discussions, and work out a basic framework of space law subject to later elaboration as we learn more about the space environment and space activities. The danger is not so much that space law may be formulated prematurely as that it may not be formulated in time. Accordingly, I would reverse the statement made in the committee report. Instead of saying that a code of space law is not practicable or desirable, although there is a need for action, as the report now does, I would prefer to say this: although an immediate comprehensive codification of space law may not be necessary or desirable, the committee recognizes the need for timely, constructive action. The difference is mainly a matter of emphasis, but it is an important difference nonetheless.

The committee report then goes on to list and discuss the urgent legal problems of outer space. Conspicuously missing from this list is the question of where outer space begins, or where the air space ends. This classic problem of space law appears later in the report, among the matters accorded a secondary priority.

Except for this one omission, I would agree generally with the committee that the problems described in the first list are entitled to priority. In addition, they can probably be solved, or at least tackled, without reference to any of the problems in the other list, including the delimitation of outer space. And yet I cannot view with complacency the indefinite postponement of the delimitation problem. It may be true, as the committee says, that an international agreement based on current knowledge and experience would be premature. Again, however, the important thing is to begin now—conduct research, make studies and investigations, and work out the principles on which an agreement may ultimately be based (subject to change in the light of later knowledge). If an agreement must be made tomorrow, the studies must begin today. Since nations are very unlikely to relinquish their sovereign rights in the air space above their territories, any agreement governing space flight will have to be accommodated to the fundamental rules of air law. This will not be an easy task. Preliminary studies will be necessary, and will take time—perhaps years. Can we run the risk that solutions will not become urgent in the meantime?

One other general comment deserves to be made. Perhaps the point can be brought out most clearly by referring to an observation made by the representative of Japan at the June 11 meeting of the U.N. Legal Committee: "* * * if the Committee said that outer space was freely available to all for exploration and use for peaceful purposes, that statement might be interpreted as implying an immediate prohibition of the use of outer space for other purposes. The Committee should not, however, give the impression that it was trying to enter the field of disarmament."[9]

Let me say at once that the Committee was in no danger of giving such an impression in the way the representative of Japan supposed, unless the word "peaceful" is taken to mean "nonmilitary." Unfortunately, the discussion among other members of the Committee, immediately following the observation quoted above, clearly indicates that they also interpreted the word in exactly that sense.

Incidentally, I am not convinced that space lawyers should go to such lengths as they sometimes do in order to avoid the subject of disarmament. During the 121st session of the Nuclear Conference held in Geneva, for example, the Soviet Union agreed in principle to the use of satellites for policing nuclear explosions in outer space. It certainly appears that the use of outer space bears certain direct relations to disarmament, and can provide some of the means by which disarmament could be accomplished.

The word "peaceful" is unfortunately beginning to play the part of a wet blanket upon discussions of space law. It plagued the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space because it appeared in the resolution[10] adopted by the General Assembly, which established the Committee, its name and its mandate. You will recall, however, that the resolution was originally intro-

[4] See remarks by representatives of Austria, Chile, Greece, Iran, the Netherlands, Peru, the Philippines, Sweden, and Yugoslavia in documents A/C.1/SR.982, 983.

[5] See remarks by representatives of Chile and Italy, document A/C.1/SR.982, pp. 8 ff. Cf remarks by representative of Brazile on Legal Committee, document A/AC.98/C.2/SR.2, p. 5.

[6] See document A/AC.98/2/L.1, p. 3.

[7] See document A/AC.98/C.2/SR. 5, p. 7.

[8] See document A/AC.98/C.2/SR.2, p. 6.

[9] See document A/AC.98/C.2/SR.5, p. 7.

[10] See note 2 supra.

duced by the United States (on November 13, 1958), with the concurrence of 19 other nations. The word "peaceful" as used in the resolution, therefore, has a readily ascertainable ancestry. In the past few years, it has appeared in Presidential messages and in acts and resolutions of Congress. It is not too much to say that the word has become a term of art in the United States, with distinctive meaning no longer bound by ordinary usage. This distinctive meaning has been fixed, above all, by the use of the word in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. I served as executive director and chief counsel of the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration, which bore the responsibility for that act from its earliest drafts to its final passage. In my opinion, the word "peaceful" as used in the act, means nonaggressive rather than "nonmilitary." That, I believe, was the intent of Congress. The same meaning of the term may be found in international law. It also appears to be the most reasonable interpretation.

I have insisted on this point because I am convinced of its importance. If "peaceful" means "nonmilitary," and outer space can be used for peaceful purposes only, what happens to the inherent right of self-defense guaranteed by article 51 of the United Nations Charter and by general international law? If "peaceful" is understood to mean "nonaggressive," on the other hand, the legal control of outer space will be greatly facilitated. It would certainly not be impossible, or even especially difficult, to distinguish between aggressive and nonaggressive use.

I venture to propose a tentative definition of "aggressive" space vehicles and activities as those that can cause direct harm to objects on the earth's surface. Those would be prohibited. All others would be permitted. This definition might be incorporated in international law by agreement, of course, or even by unilateral declaration and practice. In time, I believe, it would prove its value. Even if it latter had to be modified, it would represent an improvement over the present situation, in which, as the representative of Italy observed during the debate in the Political Committee, there are no legal norms governing events in outer space.

Returning for a final word to the report submitted by the legal committee on the peaceful uses of outer space, I consider that the major shortcoming of the report is its failure to deal with the question whether the word "peaceful," as used in the mandate and proceedings of the committee, should be understood to mean "nonmilitary" or "nonaggressive."

In spite of all criticisms and reservations, I nevertheless believe there is reason to hope, as I said at the beginning of this discussion, that the United Nations report will lead to a broader understanding of the legal problems involved in space activities, and will help to lay a firmer foundation for the ultimate structure of space law. Much study and discussion will be necessary before the rules of outer space can be formulated. The United Nations committee has made a brave beginning. For us, the challenge is not to let it be the end.

Book Listing Removed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Connecticut's insurance commissioner, Mr. Alfred N. Premo, recently discovered that a book which is recommended reading in most States for those wishing to take examinations for real-estate licenses classified deaf mutes along with drunkards and insane persons as "lacking full contractual ability."

Commissioner Premo has removed the book from the recommended list in Connecticut and has received assurances from the author, Robert W. Semenow, that future editions would not contain this reference.

This matter was brought to Commissioner Premo's attention by Mr. Joseph Oquisanti, of East Hartford, Conn., who is now endeavoring to bring this question to the attention of the appropriate agencies throughout the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the Hartford Times on Friday, August 28, 1959.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAF QUASH UNFAIR REFERENCE: BOOK LISTING REMOVED

(By John K. Borland)

Deaf mutes have won their Connecticut battle against a real estate book listing them along with "drunkards and insane persons" as lacking full contractual ability.

The $6.50 book entitled "Questions and Answers on Real Estate" has been recommended for some time by the Connecticut State Insurance Department for reading by those wishing to take examinations for real estate licenses. But no more.

An East Hartford businessman, Joseph Okie, is credited with detecting the objectionable reference and pressing the fight to have the section corrected and the book eliminated as suggested reading for Connecticut licensure.

Although not handicapped himself, Mr. Okie picked up sign language to be of help to a deaf mute member of the family. Since then, he has helped hundreds of such people with their business and other problems.

Mr. Okie about a month ago thought he could be of more help to deaf people with real estate problems. He applied for a broker's license, and the State insurance department gave him instruction sheets which recommended this book published by Prentice-Hall of New York as helpful reading.

On leafing through the book, he came on page 107 which listed deaf mutes under the section entitled "Insane Persons."

Mr. Okie got fired up in short order. He vowed to do something about this insulting, incorrect reference.

"I've dealt with deaf mutes for years, and they have more on the ball than we do in many ways," he commented to the press. "These people have been contracting for purchases for years, and this is a most unfair blow to their ability and responsibility."

After contacting deaf mute friends, he and others called on State Insurance Commissioner Alfred N. Premo. The latter became incensed, and promptly sent a sharp letter to the book's author, Robert W. Semenow, of Pittsburgh, Pa.

"These people feel that simply because of their physical handicap they should not be classified with insane persons and drunkards," he wrote. "The several thousand deaf mutes in Connecticut are normal in every respect, carry on a livelihood, raise families and live like all physically able people."

Commissioner Premo then added:

"On the basis of these complaints, we can no longer recommend the book."

From Mr. Semenow came an apologetic letter, saying the matter would be corrected in the next published edition. He promised to send free copies of that edition to any libraries designated by Mr. Premo.

While gratified that the reference will be eliminated, Commissioner Premo said he will not change his decision not to recommend the book "while this classification of deaf mutes appears."

Mr. Okie and his deaf mute friends, however, are not going to let the issue rest there. They plan to circulate the story throughout the country through the use of a national magazine for the deaf.

"We want to see that every State which may have recommended this book be warned of the insulting reference, which could make many real estate salesmen reluctant to deal with deaf mutes," he said. "We want to see that deaf mutes everywhere are protected against such a slur on their capacity to make contracts."

In fact, Mr. Okie says negotiating with a deaf mute for a purchase is much more precise than with others. That's because "it's usually conducted in writing between the two parties in the transaction."

A Couple of Ordinary Guys Make History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, L. S. Hembree is contributing greatly to the thinking of our people with outstanding editorials.

Mr. Hembree is with an outstanding newspaper, the Anderson Independent, Anderson, S.C.

The following is a classic example of his forthright and timely editorials:

A COUPLE OF ORDINARY LOOKING GUYS, BALD AND AGING, MAKE SOME HISTORY

You sat there before the TV, and you saw the short, chubby, elfin-faced man step down from the huge jetplane and place his foot for the first time on U.S. soil he despises.

You saw the taller, thinner, more grim-faced man who greeted the visitor.

You saw the flunkies and the lackeys scurrying about, just as they have done since man long ago began endowing tribal chieftains, kings, potentates, and chiefs of state with bits of fleeting power.

The two men looked ordinary enough.

Both were bald. And both reminded you of somebody's grandfather, which, in fact, they are.

You saw them ride down the wide streets of this Nation's Capital, the visitor waving his hat and grinning, the host appearing uneasy and slightly on edge.

The waving hat gathered no applause. The smile sparked no cheers.

Over all there was a tenseness, a mass coolness, a feeling akin to that known to any host or hostess forced to answer call of duty and entertain an unwelcome guest.

You reminded yourself the date was September 15, 1959.

It was a date that could go down in history.

Or it was a date that could disappear from history and time, buried in nuclear bomb ashes.

What you saw was historic. No doubt about that.

It was a meeting between two men representing nations harboring the most destructive power of all time.

The short, chubby, elfin-faced visitor, smiling and affable on the surface, is the most powerful and most dangerous single individual and mass murderer in the world today.

Under the bald skull, you reminded yourself, is a cunning, disciplined brain.

It is a reality of our times that the explosion of a tiny blood vessel or the shifting of a cell in that brain could trigger a world cataclysm.

The silence of the watching Americans along the streets of Washington reflected this knowledge. Many of them remember trigger-happy Tojo—he, too, believed he could destroy our beloved Nation.

It was not the silence of fear, despite the man's awesome power.

It was the silence of disapproval and distrust.

Here, the silence said, is a man with blood on his hands.

Here is a man whose life has been dedicated to a cause that has slain, starved, and enslaved millions of people throughout the world.

Here, too, is a man who has promised to "bury" the United States of America.

Why, then, do we receive him, this international Al Capone?

You look again at the grim-faced host. He is the President of a free people. In the dying days of his administration—sorely disappointing years that began with such high promise—he at last has decided to exercise his own power and leadership.

We receive the blustering murderer because he was invited by our Chief of State, who is desperately gambling that by personal diplomacy he may turn the murderer from his ways before it is everlasting too late for all mankind.

You pray that he succeeds. You pray no fool harms the visitor while he is on our soil; that vengeance and retribution come from his own kind in his own land, if such must come.

You see the visitor delivered safely to his first destination, the Blair House. The marching units turn the corner. The bands put away their instruments. The flunkies and the lackeys scurry hither and yon.

The commentator reminds you that you have seen history. You wonder how much of it was inspired by the ambitions of NIXON, who is just back from Russia and wants so much to be President.

The scene fades away on the TV screen, to be replaced by a quiz show.

And you're not sure about the right answers on that show, either.

Hon. Thomas H. Burke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me on the late Honorable Thomas H. Burke.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO

Thomas H. Burke was in his lifetime my good friend. He and I were colleagues in the House of Representatives throughout the 81st Congress. The death of this fine American is not only a loss to those of us who knew him personally and were his friends, but to the entire labor movement and to all Americans.

Tom Burke was a man of unquestioned honesty and integrity, whose life was dedicated to the advancement of men and women who toil. He was an outstanding American labor-union leader in the finest sense of the word. His years of devotion to the cause of furthering social legislation and his faith in the democratic form of government have earned him an honored place on the long list of distinguished Americans.

I am proud that Ohio sent Tom Burke to Congress. I am honored that I was privileged to serve with him. To his family and many friends I extend my deepest sympathy in their great loss.

Challenge in Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very perceptive and important speech delivered by Dr. Wernher von Braun, at the National Military-Industrial Conference, April 7, 1959, in Chicago, Ill.

Dr. von Braun's abilities, qualifications, and contributions to the cause of freedom are too well known to require comment. His views on the challenge of Soviet space technology and objectives deserve the close attention of every American citizen.

The speech follows:

CHALLENGE IN SPACE

(By Dr. Wernher von Braun, Director, Development Operations, Army Ballistic Missile Agency)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, the fifth National Military-Industrial Conference has focused attention upon the Soviet economic challenge to the free world. It is one of the most formidable weapons to be employed against our welfare and security by a ruthless competitor. Not the least significant fact about this situation is the obvious testimony this bears to the degree of success achieved in the Soviet drive toward industrialization. The Kremlin would deny to the Russian people the potential benefits of increasing productive capacity to whatever extent is necessary to exploit the products of that capacity to our disadvantage.

I understand you have been engaged in formulating strategy and tactics by which to defeat this threat in response to the call of our President. He has said that "we must meet it as resolutely and imaginatively as we are meeting the better known military and scientific challenges, through the full use of all our resources, both spiritual and material."

I propose tonight to examine another Soviet challenge. It is directly related in resources to some of those aspects of Russian expansionism explored in your discussions. It is intended to extend Communist influence into areas remote from earthbound relationships. We dare not underestimate Soviet capabilities and objectives in the limitless dimensions beyond the earth's sensible atmosphere. We must understand the total implications to our future welfare if the Soviets succeed in their drive to achieve a dominant position in outer space.

Not many months ago these matters would have seemed incredible to most of our people. Subsequent events have lent substance and credibility to them. No longer do the loud cries of Soviet propagandists disturb our tranquility although they cannot be lightly dismissed because of their impact upon the neutral and uncommitted peoples. Rather, it is the undisputed existence of a substantial capability in space technology and in missile-oriented industry behind the Iron Curtain. In the space of only 17 months, the Communists have surpassed our best efforts.

This is not an isolated phenomenon. It is integral to the Soviet plan to achieve supremacy by defeating freemen in almost every phase of human activities. No single area of that plan for conquest can be evaluated competently without regard to contributing elements. Thus the spectacular demonstrations of Soviet rocketry reflect astonishing progress in many fields: electronics, chemicals, metallurgy, missile guidance, propulsive systems, and others.

The breadth, depth, and momentum of the Soviet space program clearly indicate that it has received and will continue to enjoy the aggressive support of the Communist regime. The results achieved, and the profound influence they have exercised upon the international scene, have given the Kremlin dictators ample opportunity for vodka toasts. We can only guess at the echoes of these technological feats heard in the obstreperous boastings of the Soviet leaders. Not all the repercussions of satellite and space probe launchings are confined to the scientific community.

In the phases of the Russian space ventures about which information is available in the open literature, a close parallel can be found to much of the current and projected space research and investigations of this country. This is by no means surprising. It is as if two nations of widely different political and ideological philosophies decided, almost simultaneously, to explore the same unknown seas. Note that I said "almost"; the advantage of initiative is with the competition. The state of the art compels employment of much the same type of ship. The information available to the shipbuilders and to the crews about winds, currents, reefs, and fueling stations is quite comparable. The differences have to do with propulsion, possibly the navigational equipment, and certainly with the ultimate goals of the explorers and those who expect to capitalize on the fruits of discovery.

Prudence dictates that we should carefully size up that rival fleet and try to determine its goals if we are to avoid Russian custom stations on the Moon and Mars and insure the results of exploration in space will not jeopardize the security of freemen. The Communists have always employed human and other resources to subjugate helpless peoples and to extend their empire. I find no reason to expect any radical change in that strategy with respect to outer space and worlds beyond our own.

A brief summary of what is known about the Soviet program may be helpful. I would qualify it, however, with the observation that the data published in Russia suggests a tremendous, well-coordinated effort and that the disclosures themselves are by no means unpremeditated. They are assuredly intended to convince the unwary of Communist mastery and thus serve its strategic purpose.

The first conclusion which I have already mentioned is that the Russian space program parallels much of the current and planned space programs of this country.

The second is that a substantial part of the Soviet effort is directed toward manned space flight and the eventual exploration of the moon and nearer planets by human crews.

The third is that Soviet scientists and technicians are exclusively concerned with their own work and pay little heed to any possible competition from another quarter.

Finally it must be remembered that Soviet policy is to withhold specifics about any one project until it has achieved success, then to exploit it to the maximum. While they seem ready and willing to boast of the scientific aspects of their program, there is an ominous absence of any reference to possible military implications. Like the iceberg, we only know what the Russians want to tell us—the great mass of their work is shrouded in secrecy.

While we are concerned with the so-called race into space and its ominous portent, the Russians appear so sure of their technological leadership and their ability to retain the initiative that they do not even consider the possibility someone else might beat them to the moon. Frankly, I do not know who could.

I have chosen a few items at random from recent Russian publications to serve as indicators. In December 1958, the president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Professor Nesmeyanov, discussed a new 7-year plan for the advancement of science. He pointed out that "considerable attention will be given to the development of new means of astronomical investigations by cosmic rockets and artificial earth satellites."

According to other Russian technical writers, each Soviet orbiter is the product of a continuously elaborated design program which draws upon the experience of previous launchings. More satellites are programed for near and distant orbits, of prolonged and relatively short useful lifetimes, according to the publications.

Much attention is being paid to reentry methods preliminary to manned space flight. Dogs and other animals are employed in these experiments—without criticism, I suspect, from well-meaning pet lovers who decry the same kind of useful studies here. The Russians claim a successful recovery in August, 1958 of a capsule containing two dogs which were carried to a height of 450 kilometers in a payload of over 1½ tons. Whether they acquired the ability to bark at their masters on this short excursion into freedom, the literature does not report.

A recent Soviet book on astronautics talks of permanent earth satellites useful as intercosmic way stations, of manned flights to the moon, of human visits to the nearest and then the most distant planets of the solar system, finally of visits to planets of another system. Russian technicians suggest galactic propulsion systems employing ionic and nuclear energy, even quantum rockets propelled by the flow of electromagnetic waves.

At points as far separated as Franz Josef Land and the Antarctic, Soviet rockets and satellites have been fired that were equipped with instrumentation to study the upper layers of earth's atmosphere and phenomena unique to outer space. We are told that satellite sensors confirmed the distribution of cosmic radiation according to longitude and latitude. This is strongly reminiscent of the Van Allen radiation belt discovered and measured by the Explorer earth satellites and the Pioneer space probes launched by the U.S. Army's rocket team in connection with the International Geophysical Year.

The successful launchings of earth satellites, in thes words of one Soviet writer, "paved a clear road into cosmic space." He said these accomplishments "indicate the regular advance of the level of Soviet science and technology and the might of Soviet industry." I believe much the same thing could and should be said about the space achievements of this country, but for one reason or another too many commentators seem to be so preoccupied with our alleged inferiority as to deprecate some very solid demonstrations of our capabilities.

Other technical papers appearing in Russia of late disclose a keen interest in solar batteries and plans for larger energy sources of this type which would, again I quote, "make possible worldwide transmission of television programs beamed from satellites, the establishment of astronomical observatories beyond the atmosphere, and the continuous observation of meteorological processes." You will find the same applications discussed in the national advertising of the larger missile-related corporations of the United States.

The Soviets claim they accomplished direct measurement of certain atmospheric characteristics with Sputnik III. Also they measured the composition of ionized gases in upper layers of the atmosphere, the concentration of positive ions and the air pressure. These phenomena are important to the calculation of trajectories of space vehicles and to the maintenance of radio contact with them in flight.

Another indicator of the direction of Soviet interest was the claim that Sputnik III carried magneto-sensitive transducers to assist in orienting the vehicle in space. This orientation would be essential to accomplish photography of earth's surface from a satellite, to return satellites to earth, and to assist the navigation of ships, aircraft, or interplanetary vehicles. A Russian writer claimed Sputnik III could carry one or two human passengers and equipment on a 10-day space journey. This vehicle, I might add, utilized thousands of semiconductors and its programing unit was completely transistorized.

I believe this sampling indicates the Soviet program is at least as comprehensive as is ours at this point in time. It makes use of tracking, recording, and experimental stations spotted throughout the Communist world so that the peoples of satellite nations are supposed to be persuaded that they are contributing to it.

The lunik space probe, in the opinion of U.S. rocketeers, proved once more that the Russians have rocket engines of substantially higher thrust than any we have fired. Chances are that for this flight they employed the same booster utilized to launch Sputnik III. An additional stage was probably placed on the two-stage booster to push injection velocity up to the level necessary to break out of earth's gravitational field. The velocity actually achieved may have exceeded expectations. Russian sources reported the final stage weighed approximately 3,000 pounds. The payload itself and its electrical power supplies weighed approximately 700 pounds compared to the Pioneer IV probe of 14 pounds which became the first made-in-the-U.S.A. satellite of the sun.

It is obvious that substantial accuracy was required for the lunik rocket trajectory. We must therefore conclude that the Russians have an impressive long-range rocket guidance system. It may also be surmised, on the basis of the evidence that Soviet guidance systems can constrain rockets carrying warheads over intercontinental ranges and hit cities or relatively small target areas. This is the grim fact and there should be no misunderstanding about it. How many of these rockets may be in the arsenal, I do not know. It should also be kept in mind that due to the geographical situation, the Soviets can exploit medium-range missiles of lesser ranges, perhaps only a few hundred miles, to blackmail our NATO allies.

I am convinced the Soviet intention is to reinforce penetrations on economic, political, and psychological fronts wherever and whenever opportunity affords by the naked threat of thermonuclear destruction instantly available in the guise of missile carriers. Of vastly greater significance in the days and years ahead, they expect to attain dominance in space the better to compel the recognition of Soviet supremacy upon the peoples of earth. Both objectives could, in my opinion, be achieved without ever firing a missile against a target in the free world, or without ever releasing a glide bomb from a military vehicle in space that could be directed to any spot on earth's surface. Remember—whether a satellite carries scientific equipment or lethal warheads is simply a matter of choice exercised by the authority controlling the vehicle.

I say these things are possible and indeed they are. What then is the alternative open to us? It seems quite clear the only recourse, and I do not for an instant believe we intend to sit idly by and await the day of Communist judgment, is to forge ahead with all possible speed and achieve an overwhelming competence in space by the exploitation of our impressive technological and industrial resources. Then even the most ambitious among the Red dictators may be persuaded of our determination to keep space free of political implications and to search out its mysteries and wonders in the best interest of all men. The prospect of communization of other worlds is one from which we can only recoil in disgust unless we assert the necessary leadership.

It is one thing to state this determination and quite another to accomplish it. Admittedly a gap exists between our rocket capabilities and those of Russia in the space area. It is very difficult to say when that gap can be closed because this would require complete knowledge of the competition's resources and the speed of his advance—information we do not have or which is not available for the purpose of this discussion.

I would call your attention to a little matter of history just to afford some perspective. The assumption that nothing was done in this country during the years when the Soviet Union was busily engaged in rocket development climaxed by the sputnik simply does not jibe with the fact. It may be quite true that not enough was done, but let me cite a few statistics from the Army's files about which I have personal knowledge. For example, the first modern U.S. military ballistic research vehicle was fired December 1, 1944. The first U.S. high altitude sounding rockets were fired in September 1945, attaining altitudes in excess of 40 miles. The first American surface-to-surface guided missile was fired in May 1947, over a range of 62.5 miles. The first ballistic missile to attain an altitude of 250 miles was fired in February 1949. In December 1955, we fired over the full range the first inertially guided large ballistic missile, the Redstone, now deployed with U.S. Army troops in NATO. In September 1956, an Army Jupiter C multistage rocket attained an altitude of 682 miles and a range of 3,300 miles, the first deep penetration of space.

The groundwork for space vehicle instrumentation was laid at White Sands Missile Range during the years following World War II. Rockets carried aloft sensing devices, photo cells, density and pressure meters, even live monkeys. When we turned to satellite launchings, beginning with the first Explorer in January 1958, the instrument packages borrowed heavily upon the early knowledge obtained in the period from 1945 through 1949.

We did not work on large rocket engines of the Lunik order for the reason that such powerplants were not required for the military missile systems in development from 1955 on. We are at work now and have increased the speed of our effort. It may still require as long as 5 years to overtake the Soviets and move out in front and stay there. Unless we continue to accelerate our mo-

mentum, I advised the U.S. Senate that within 10 years it will be too late—we could not then hope to catch up and by then the Russian foothold on the nearer planets might have attained stature which could not be challenged.

One of the most vital of the current programs is Project Saturn, a clustered booster we are assembling for the Advanced Research Projects Agency. This will make available a thrust of more than 1 million pounds, twice as powerful as the largest so far fired by our competitors. Saturn is really the first of the second generation of U.S. space vehicles. Those of the first generation, and we are still within that time frame, depend entirely upon existing missile systems developed by the Armed Forces to meet the requirements of national defense. Our space payloads have consequently been limited to the thrust potential of these systems and this situation will obtain until true space vehicles are ready for use.

With the Saturn vehicle it will be possible to launch a communications satellite capable of serving the worldwide needs of the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force, the submarine fleets of the Navy, and the tactical commands of the Army.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration supports a project aimed at obtaining boosters larger than Saturn. Since this program is essentially new it must recognize the time required for engineering and its availability is a matter of several years away.

Meanwhile, we should be prepared for other dramatic Soviet experiments: man in space, possibly the landing of an instrumented vehicle on the Moon, terrestrial and weather observation satellites, photography and mapping of the entire Earth's surface. We must expect such happenings because they are part of the logical development of that broad program I have described.

Dr. Keith Glennan, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, recently told the Congress his agency is proceeding at all possible speed with the expanding space program. I can assure you no grass is growing under the feet of the Army team in Alabama, even though, in my opinion, they might move faster if added funds are provided. We would much rather wear out shoe leather now than to be trading in a Soviet state store a generation hence.

Those of us who are closest to the situation sometimes feel our concern is pretty much a private matter not generally shared by the country as a whole. In some quarters this is taken to be a rivalry between competing fireworks manufacturers with little consequence except possible damage to national pride.

I am reminded of the tale from Terence. A certain seer warned Caesar to be on his guard against a great peril on the day of the month of March which the Romans call the Ides; and when that day had come and Caesar was on his way to the Senate, he greeted the seer with a jest and said: "Well, the Ides of March are come," and the seer said to him softly, "Aye, they are come, but they are not gone."

We have not succeeded, I believe, in awakening America to the peril so grave it cannot be overstated.

We should, in my opinion, substantially increase basic and supporting research programs which extend beyond the immediate defense need. A great deal of engineering effort has gone into the exploitation in recent years of the discoveries of science. Rocketry is but one of many areas in which this logical process has occurred. But we have reached that point where the well of fundamental knowledge in the natural sciences is about exhausted, and pitifully few people are trying to refill it. Soon we must reach the stagnation point if everyone continues to take out what he can use and does nothing about replenishing the source.

I have suggested that project funds ought to be increased in all areas to provide money for promising investigations which may crop up in the course of development. No one can anticipate their occurrence or their possible yields, but I believe sizable returns could come out of relatively small investments. Even if many proved unfruitful, we should at least have learned what not to try next time and that negative information would save money and time later.

It is also essential to approach space projects in much the same manner in which we carry on the development of complex weapons systems; that is, by system rather than piecemeal. Instead of developing a booster, then deciding what upper stages will be adapted to it, what guidance system should be used, and what kind of experiment should be launched, the whole project should become an integrated undertaking in the interest of compatible design and telescoped scheduling. The nature of the competition and its momentum do not permit the leisurely approach; we must work with a genuine sense of urgency.

As a final warning I would restate my conviction that this is not a technical struggle between competing teams of rocket builders. We are under heavy attack on all fronts by an energetic and resourceful adversary who has built up a massive technological effort. This is being strengthened by an enormous reservoir of scientific and engineering talent constantly replenished by a state-directed educational program. While the attack has been at least temporarily deterred from military adventure, it is being pushed in all other directions. This is becoming a test of the stamina, the resourcefulness, the courage, faith, skill, and ingenuity of every American. At stake is the future of freedom, human progress, and now the universe itself.

The age of space can for our children become the greatest of all the periods of history, or it can end in catastrophe so terrible that the mind cannot grasp the consequences. The choice is ours to make but only if we exercise our selection in time. A long time ago the philosopher, Machiavelli, said that "God is not willing to do everything and thus take away our free will and that share of glory that belongs to us." Let's get to work.

Imports of Surplus Military Rifles Impair the National Security and Endanger a Vital Connecticut Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the following statement which I have prepared concerning the serious damage to our domestic arms industry posed by the large-scale importation from abroad of surplus military rifles.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

IMPORTS OF SURPLUS MILITARY RIFLES IMPAIR THE NATIONAL SECURITY AND ENDANGER A VITAL CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY

I want to bring to the attention of the President of the United States and to the Members of this body a problem which is most important to the national security of the United States and to the economy of the State of Connecticut.

The problem

This is the problem of hundreds of thousands of surplus military rifles being imported into the United States, sold here as sporting rifles at prices with which the American arms industry cannot compete, and thus threatening to destroy the defense readiness of this industry which is so essential to our national defense.

On June 29, 1959, six of the leading firearms manufacturers filed a petition with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization asking for relief against these excessive imports of military surplus. It is my hope that the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will act urgently and act favorably on this petition so that the President will impose quotas on these surplus imports and remove this threat to our national security.

Industry's responsibility

In April of this year, General Lemnitzer, the Army Chief of Staff, told the Senate Armed Services Committee:

"In my opinion, the introduction of the new (nuclear era) weapons in no way diminishes the role of the ground soldier."

As recently as August 3 the Army revealed at the Army Association meeting here in Washington what it described as its "ultimate weapon"; the fighting soldier of the future. This ultimate weapon is to be equipped with all the modern gear science has developed—including the new lightweight M–14 rifle; and it was even announced that the Army is developing an even lighter rifle for the soldier of the future:

"The individual weapon that the soldier of the future carries is the M–14 rifle chambered for the 7.62 mm. round. It is believed, however, that today's technology which is being applied by military-scientific teams will eventually produce for the soldier a weapon extremely light in weight and of high velocity. This weapon, in conjunction with other types now under development, will make it unnecessary for the soldier of tomorrow to clash with the enemy in hand-to-hand and bayonet-to-bayonet type combat."

Of special importance is the fact that it was made clear at the Army meetings in August that the policy of the Defense Department with respect to small arms requirements places major production responsibility on private industry. Modern weapons are developed by a combination of engineering skill in the Government arsenals and the research and production skill of the firearms industry. Industry's first assignment is to participate in the development of the new lighter rifles; industry's second assignment is the production and quantity output of these modern weapons. But increasing military surplus imports have reduced the capability of the American firearms industry to carry out these mobilization assignments and are threatening to cause still greater injury to the small arms industry.

Action is needed and action is needed now.

The industry

The American small arms industry consists of 22 companies with major plants and offices in 12 States of the United States. Its products are distributed through approximately 1,000 wholesalers and over 100,000 retailers located in every State in the Union. Every Senator in this body has constituents

who are affected by this problem. As a part of the mobilization base of the United States, the small arms industry is called on in times of a national emergency not only to produce arms but also to develop new designs for our country and for our allies and to modify existing arms for more economic and speedy production. The technical skill and know-how acquired by this industry from years of specialized experience and given to other industries during wartime is a matter of record, as is the magnificent wartime production record of each company in the industry.

Connecticut's contribution

In the State of Connecticut, I am proud to say, we have the largest concentration of manufacturers of commercial sporting arms. These companies include, among others, High Standard Manufacturing Corp., Remington Arms Co., Inc., Marlin Firearms Co., O. F. Mossberg & Sons, Inc., and Winchester-Western Division, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. These companies manufacture a large percentage of the centerfire rifles produced in the United States. The thousands of workers employed by these companies and their suppliers reside in every congressional district in our State and are a vital segment of the Connecticut economy.

These American firearms manufacturers, together with firearms manufacturers in Massachusetts and New York, have the only capacity in private industry for rapid expansion of arms production. The industry's skilled manpower, equipment, and research personnel can be transferred to emergency arms production with minimum leadtime. This defense readiness of the domestic firearms industry is maintained in peacetime by its commercial market without burden on the Federal budget.

Surplus imports threaten defense capability

The industry's defense capability has been severely impaired by increasing imports of surplus military rifles sold at a fraction of their cost. Between 1955 and 1958 surplus rifle imports have increased over 20 times from 8,402 in 1955 to 171,965 in 1958. By 1958 imports actually exceeded domestic sales. In 1959 import figures for the first 7 months indicate that surplus military rifles are being imported at a rate four times greater than in 1958, the record year for surplus imports.

These surplus rifles are coming primarily from Italy, England, Sweden, and Germany. Reports which the industry has received indicate that other countries, including the U.S.S.R., are about to release additional supplies of surplus Carcanos, Lee Enfields, Mausers, Manlichers, and other centerfire rifles. In short, there appears to be no end to the supply abroad; and since the United States is the only major market for these guns—European governments refuse to permit their people to buy these military rifles—the outlook for the American firearms industry is very grave indeed.

The effect to date

The effect to date of these surplus imports on our American industry has been severe:

Centerfire sales: down 50 percent.

Employment: one-third of the skilled production workers lost.

Profits: down 99 percent to eight-hundredths of 1 percent of sales.

Research expenditures: down 13 percent.

This tremendous impact is due to the extremely low prices of surplus military rifle imports. This year their average imported cost has been under $6 after shipping costs, duty, etc. Such rifles sell at prices from $14 to $30 in direct competition with American sporting rifles retailing between $80 and $130.

Connecticut's skilled workers hard hit

Of greatest importance, I believe, is the loss to the industry and thus to the defense readiness of the United States of the many hundreds of skilled production workers, some of whom had 30 years or more of specialized experience in arms production. Many of these laid-off employees have taken other jobs or moved from their communities to other areas and are not, therefore, available for arms reemployment in the event of an emergency. The seriousness of the employment decline cannot, of course, be measured solely in numbers because part of the manpower loss has occurred in job categories for which there are few or no replacements in any industry except the arms industry. Unless this decline is arrested, therefore, the consequences to our national defense posture could be very grave.

Industry supported by peacetime market

Of particular importance is the fact—startling to me—that Government defense contracts do not support this essential industry and make up for displaced sales. From 1950 to 1953, during the Korean war, total firearms sales by these companies to the U.S. Government amounted to $2,075,222. In the 6 years since Korea total firearms sales to the Government amounted to only $839,000. Thus, this industry is self-supporting; it relies almost entirely on its commercial sporting arms market to maintain its plant and equipment, skilled employees, and research and development.

Threat of U.S. surplus

In addition to surplus imports, the U.S. Government owns large supplies of surplus military rifles, the numbers having been estimated at several millions. At the request of the Department of Defense, the Business and Defense Services Administration of the Department of Commerce recently undertook an impact survey to determine the effect of sales of domestic surplus on the American market. Pending the outcome of the BDSA survey, the Department of Defense, I am happy to say, has discontinued the sales of surplus rifles except for small amounts of surplus generated locally at Army surplus disposal depots. I am hopeful that the BDSA report will be favorable to the American arms industry and that the threat of our own surplus will no longer burden this stricken industry.

Proposed solution to import problem

In view of the threat to the industry's mobilization base created by increasing imports of surplus military rifles, the leading manufacturers of the industry filed a petition with the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization under the national security provisions (sec. 8) of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, asking that imports of surplus military rifles be reduced by quotas to their average of 1945–1955. Anyone who has studied the legislative history of section 8 would agree that the American firearms industry was precisely the kind of industry Congress had in mind in providing for administrative relief against excessive imports.

The relief requested in the OCDM petition is, in my judgment, entirely reasonable. It does not embargo all surplus rifles from being imported into the United States—it only reduces them to their historical post-war level: 1945–1955.

Of equal importance: the proposed restriction does not run counter to our international trade policy nor is it inconsistent with our defense objectives.

Imports of surplus rifles make no defense contribution; the importers have no production capacity and carry on no arms research.

Restricting imports of noncommercial military rifles will not affect the economies of our allies and friends since surplus sales make no contribution to the commerce of these nations and are not important to their balance of payments. Surplus rifles are not part of normal international trade.

CONCLUSION

The facts show that the small arms mobilization base of the United States is in jeopardy.

The present and future threat to the defense capacity of the American arms industry is grave.

The national security has been and will continue to be impaired unless relief is granted.

The proposed relief is entirely reasonable and is consistent with American international trade policy.

I urge that the OCDM act favorably and act urgently on this problem which is so vital to our country's security.

The United Nations Report on Space Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 1, 1959

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, an address delivered at the recent annual meeting of the Federal Bar Association by Mr. Spencer M. Beresford, the special counsel of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Mr. Beresford is a well-known commentator on space law. His address discusses the United Nations report on that subject, submitted recently to the General Assembly. I believe his remarks will interest everyone who feels concern about the development and evolution of a body of law to govern activities in outer space:

THE UNITED NATIONS REPORT ON SPACE LAW

(By Spencer M. Beresford)

According to legend, an ancient Chinese monk, asked "What is truth?" replied "Yes."

It is difficult to avoid the feeling that the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space has given a similar answer to the question, "What is space law?"

The Committee report does point out a number of legal problems involved in space activities, and poses many questions that the various problems may raise. It even refers to familiar analogies, principles, and related rules of law by which answers to such questions might be pursued. On the other hand, hardly any attempt is made to formulate legal or practical implications or possible solutions. Furthermore, the matters discussed in the report have almost all appeared in earlier writings on space law, often in more detail and usually in greater depth. In short, the United Nations report adds little to previous discussions of the subject, and is descriptive rather than analytical.

At the same time, it may well be that the deliberations and report of the United Nations committee are necessary steps on the road to international agreement. They can serve the purpose of acquainting participants and readers with the subject, and of indirectly informing policymakers and the general public. In particular, the report singles out certain problems as urgent, and indicates their nature and significance. Perhaps it can thus provide a common basis of international understanding for further research, discussion, and agreement. Viewed in this light, the achievement of the United Nations committee was not to solve problems,

but to reach a consensus which can serve as a groundwork of further progress.

As a result of such reasoning, in large part, the American Bar Association Committee on the Law of Outer Space, in reporting to the house of delegates at the 1959 convention, noted with general satisfaction the useful exploration of problems of space law carried out by the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.

It is hardly necessary to say that my observations on this subject are personal and not official.

To all appearances, the United Nations committee limited its undertaking by deliberate choice. Its mandate from the General Assembly read in part as follows:

"The task of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space under paragraph 1(d) of General Assembly Resolution 1348 (XIII) is to report on 'the nature of legal problems which may arise in the carrying out of programs to explore outer space.'"[1]

Without doing violence to the quoted language, the committee could have interpreted this mandate as broadly as any of its members might wish. It chose, however, to interpret the mandate narrowly. Its limitations were therefore self-imposed.

The tasks of the committee as originally proposed by various members[2] exceeded its accomplishments. The first proposed task was to list the legal problems of outer space. The committee listed 10 such problems, assigning priority to 6. Obviously, this list is far from complete. The second proposed task was to indicate the significance, implications and priority of each problem. The committee divided its 10 problems into 2 groups according to priority, but did not rank them individually. It made no serious attempt to analyze their implications. The significance of each problem, in the sense of its relative importance, partly appears from the discussion of its nature and from its assigned priority. The third proposed task was to formulate solutions. In this regard, the committee report is virtually silent. The final proposed task was to formulate relevant general principles. A few general principles are expressly stated in the report; others (discussed below) may be fairly inferred.

The committee report observes that as a matter of principle the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice are "not limited in their operation to the confines of the earth."[3]

While no exceptions are made in this reference to the Charter, the records of debates reveal that some members of the committee would prefer to exclude the right of self-defense guaranteed by article 51. In the view of the Mexican representative, "* * * his delegation could not agree that all the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice were applicable to the international relations that might develop in outer space. When the first committee had studied those problems at the 13th session of the General Assembly the Peruvian representative had drawn a distinction between the principles and purposes of the Charter, which were general in scope, and the transitory provisions of those instruments, which had been included solely for reasons valid at a given moment in history; it would therefore be better not to bring into the debate transitory provisions, such as article 51 of the Charter, to which reference had already been made."[4]

The quoted remarks of the Mexican representative suggest that the application of the Charter to outer space, affirmed in the committtee report, may be less inclusive than it seems. At any rate, the views of the committee members were not unanimous on this point. The committee agreed in principle, but will its members agree in practice, when specified Charter provisions are invoked?

As for the right of self-defense, there is ample authority in general international law, apart from the United Nations Charter, for nations to take any necessary steps in their own defense, whether on land, at sea or in the air or outer space.

One of the principles affirmed by the committee report is "* * * the common interest of mankind in outer space and the common aim that it should be used for peaceful purposes only."[5]

In the second paragraph of the report, "it was recognized that the terms of reference of the committee referred exclusively to the peaceful uses of outer space."[6]

There is evidence in the committee debates that the members interpreted the word "peaceful" to mean "nonmilitary."[7]

The importance of this point justifies a review of the various contexts in which "peaceful" has been authoritatively used with reference to outer space.

The term first appears in disarmament proposals submitted by the United States to the United Nations Political Committee (January 14, 1957), and then in a resolution of the General Assembly (December 1957). President Eisenhower used it in a letter to Premier Bulganin (January 13, 1958), and in his message to Congress calling for a civilian space agency (April 2, 1958). Finally, Congress declared in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 that "* * * activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

In the same act, however, Congress provided for the conduct of certain space activities by the Department of Defense and the armed services. It thus appears that, in the view of Congress, the "peaceful" uses of outer space are compatible with military uses.

Against this background, on December 13, 1958, the General Assembly adopted a resolution, introduced by the United States in concert with 19 other nations, establishing an Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.[8]

In summary, then: (1) The provision for military space activities and the simultaneous declaration that outer space should be devoted to peaceful purposes, in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, indicates that the term "peaceful," within the meaning of the act, applies to some military as well as civilian uses of outer space; (2) the term "peaceful" in the resolution creating the United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was derived from the act, and was therefore presumably intended to convey the same meaning.

As a practical matter, the range of activities in outer space will be narrow indeed, if all that lend themselves to military purposes are prohibited. For example, a radio satellite can relay military as well as prvate and commercial messages. Are the benefits of reliable worldwide communications, and the easing of overtaxed frequencies, to be denied on that account? Are we also to forego the use of satellites for the navigation of commercial ships and aircraft, for weather forecasting and for ice and forest-fire patrol, on the ground that they lend themselves to military applications? Such questions appear to answer themselves.

In a speech delivered at the 1959 annual meeting of the International Astronautical Federation, one of the principal architects of the National Aeronautics and Space Act, Mr. George J. Feldman, observed that the word "peaceful" has become a term of art with a distinctive meaning. He continued:

"In my opinion, the word 'peaceful' as used in the act means 'nonaggressive' rather than nonmilitary. That, I believe, was the intent of Congress. The same meaning of the term may be found in international law. It also appears to be the most reasonable interpretation.

"I have insisted on this point because I am convinced of its importance. If 'peaceful' means 'nonmilitary,' and outer space can be used for 'peaceful' purposes only, what happens to the inherent right of self-defense guaranteed by article 51 of the United Nations Charter and by general international law?"

The American Bar Association committee on the law of outer space, in its report to the house of delegates at the 1959 convention, took a similar view of the term "peaceful" as applied to the uses of outer space as follows:

"In the sense of the charter, and in international law generally, it is employed in contradistinction to 'aggressive.' Thus any use of space which did not itself constitute an attack upon, or threat against, the territorial integrity and independence of another State would be permissible; the high seas, for example, can be used for the maintenance of a naval force in being without any violation of international law, and may be employed 'peacefully' for maneuvers, testing of weapons, and so forth. * * *.

"It is the opinion of this committee that the only uses of space that are prohibited are those that fall within the prohibitions of the charter, and that, until such time as a disarmament agreement dealing with space activities can be arrived at, the United States is fully justified in using space for such military purposes as are consistent with the terms of the charter."

Passing to another point, the United Nations committee report then states that air law and maritime law may provide fruitful analogies but that space law is unique because of "many specific factual conditions, not all of which are now known."

There is no reason to question that judgment. It may be pointed out, however, that air law and the law of the sea, as analogies for space law, would lead to diametrically opposite results. The high seas are free, but every nation has sovereign rights in the airspace above its territory.

Also, the law of the sea is a hodgepodge of rules and rights. Besides the high seas, there are territorial waters, through which a qualified right of innocent passage has long been observed; and there are different rules for certain bodies of water, for the exploitation of natural resources in the sea, and for various other purposes. As for air law, the indefinite extension of national sovereignty into outer space would so restrict space activities that it is very unlikely to gain international acceptance.

With one exception, neither air law nor maritime law can provide any general analogy for the law of outer space. The exception is the regime of the high seas, which could be extended (as many writers have proposed) to outer space in general. Whether it could reasonably be extended to celestial bodies as well is a question that will be considered later.

In many instances, it is true, the legal problems encountered in the use of outer space will resemble problems already settled at sea or in the air, and will lend themselves to similar treatment. Examples are the rights of aircraft forced down on foreign territory and the registration of vessels.

Lastly, the United Nations committee "* * * considered that a comprehensive code was not practical or desirable at the present stage of knowledge and development," although "* * * the committee also recognized the need both to take timely, constructive action and to make the law of space responsive to the facts of space."

Perhaps the emphasis given by the committee to the statements quoted above is misplaced. What deserves emphasis is not

Footnotes at end of speech.

the inexpedience of a comprehensive code but the need for action. Furthermore, whether a code of space law would be expedient at the present time is partly a question of semantics. Space law need not be rigid or detailed, especially at first. It need not be comprehensive. It need not even be a code in the sense of a systematic body of principles or rules. At the same time, as the committee recognized, some rules of law must be applied to human activities in outer space; and they may not be much to our liking unless we act soon to give them shape.

After stating the principles which we have now discussed, the United Nations report sets forth the urgent legal problems of outer space, as follows: liability for injury or damage caused by space vehicles; allocation of radio frequencies; interference between space vehicles and aircraft; identification and registration of spacecraft, and prior notice and coordination of launchings; and, lastly, the reentry, landing, and return of space vehicles together with their equipment and personnel.

All the problems given priority in the United Nations report were listed last year as urgent legal problems of outer space in the "Survey of Space Law" issued by the House Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration.[9] Beyond a doubt, the problems listed by the United Nations committee (and earlier by the House committee) are entitled to priority. There may be some question, however, whether other problems of comparable priority should not be added to the list. For example, the United Nations committee regards territorial claims to celestial bodies as a nonpriority problem. Now that a rocket has landed on the Moon, this problem may deserve priority. Also, the committee mentions near the end of its report, almost as an afterthought, that certain space activities require international measures to insure maximum effectiveness. The need for international agreements for carrying out such activities may be more urgent than the committee seems to think.[10]

The United Nations committee gives no answer to the familiar question, "Where does outer space begin"? The report discusses several possible answers, and refers to the view that it may eventually be necessary to determine the limits of outer space, commenting only that an international agreement on the subject at present would be premature.[11]

The conflict between air law and the legal regime of outer space appears to be an unavoidable problem that cannot be postponed indefinitely. On the other hand, the problem is not yet urgent; it could be settled in any of several ways; and agreement on a solution by all the members of the United Nations committee was hardly to be expected.

Although the United Nations committee deferred the question of national sovereignty in outer space, some of its members made no secret of their views. During previous debate in the General Assembly and the Political Committee, they stated that outer space would be res communis or res extra commercium—free to all nations for all uses, like the high seas.[12]

At the same time, the committee refused to draw a distinction between "open" outer space and celestial bodies.[13] Such a distinction may be necessary in order to provide incentives and safeguards for fixed investment incurred in the development and exploitation of natural resources in outer space. At the very least, the problem deserves further study.

The United Nations report speculates that the overflights of national territory by IGY satellites may have established the rule that outer space is "freely available for exploration and use by all."[14] This may be merely another affirmation that outer space is res communis. It would be difficult to agree, however, that the IGY overflights established any new rule of international law. In fact, the report does not actually say this, but merely suggests it as a possibility. The IGY overflights do not yet constitute such a long-continued accumulation of precedents as is traditionally considered necessary to make a change in international law. Besides, the IGY theory of space law calls to mind the explanation given by Herodotus of the sun's position in winter. Herodotus supposed that the sun moves south in winter, like the birds, in order to keep warm. A less farfetched explanation of the fact that no nation has ever objected to the flight of artificial satellites through outer space above its territory is that satellites are not "aircraft" within the meaning of the Chicago convention.[15]

In a short speech such as this, it would not be practical to discuss in detail all the specific legal problems of outer space listed by the United Nations committee. Rather than touch on each problem without coming to grips with any, the following discussion will deal exclusively with the first problem listed by both the United Nations report and the "Survey of Space Law"—liability.

The problem of personal injury and property damage caused by spacecraft is mentioned in almost all writings on space law. Discussion of the subject has nevertheless been very limited, and has dealt almost exclusively with international and not with domestic claims.

The United Nations report, of course, confines itself to international problems. In giving priority treatment to "liability for injury or damage caused by space vehicles," the report separates it from the subject of "interference between space vehicles and aircraft." For convenience, the same separation will be made in the following discussion.

In the future, personal injury and property damage, especially on the ground, are likely to be caused by spacecraft on a significant scale, even without negligence. For some time to come, the place where spacecraft return to earth will be largely uncontrollable and even unpredictable. In 1956, for example, a Snark launched from Cape Canaveral went out of control and wandered to South America, where it was lost over the Brazilian interior. Some spacecraft will return to the earth without ever leaving the atmosphere, after abortive launchings or other mishaps. On June 19, 1959, for instance, a 2-foot fragment of a Thor missile, destroyed shortly after firing at Vandenberg Air Force Base, narrowly missed a woman working in a flower field; other pieces rained on the California countryside.

Both the rationale of absolute liability and the analogy of aircraft cases suggest the imposition of absolute liability for injury and damage caused by spacecraft.

In Anglo-American law and under the legal systems of many other countries including the Soviet Union, absolute liability is imposed without fault for harm resulting from ultrahazardous activities. The rationale is that certain ultrahazardous activities should be permitted because of their social utility, but only on condition that liability is imposed if harm results. Some examples are blasting, keeping wild animals and, at least until recently, flying airplanes. Similar reasoning could well apply to spacecraft.

At one time or another, 21 States and territories of the United States have adopted section 5 of the Uniform Aeronautics Act, which imposes absolute liability for ground damage caused by aircraft. Today, however, section 5 of the act remains in force in only six States (Delaware, Minnesota, New Jersey, North Dakota, South Carolina, and Tennessee). In most other States, liability for ground damage caused by aircraft is now based on negligence, but with multitudinous variations as to the presumption of negligence and the doctrine of res ipsa loquitur.[16]

For some time to come the only parties responsible for the flight of spacecraft are likely to be national governments, which enjoy some degree of sovereign immunity. In the United States, for example, a citizen damaged by an American space vehicle might not be able to maintain an action under the limited waiver of immunity granted by the Federal Tort Claims Act. Although there is celebrated opinion to the contrary,[17] it seems reasonably clear that sovereign immunity is not waived by the act in cases of absolute liability.[18] Even if negligence is suspected, in an action for damage caused by spacecraft, it will probably be difficult to prove, since the necessary evidence may not only be complex and technical but may be known only to the Government, and protected by rules of military security. To make matters worse, under the Federal Tort Claims Act liability turns upon the peculiarities of local law; section 1346(b) provides that the liability of the United States shall be "in accordance with the law of the place where the act or omission occurred." Another obstacle to recovery is the so-called discretionary function exemption, which excludes all claims based on discretionary governmental functions or duties.[19]

International claims present even greater uncertainties. Diverse solutions may be expected under Anglo-American law and, all the more, under the legal systems of other countries.

The United Nations report poses several questions about injury or damage caused by space vehicles, including the grounds of liability. While it makes almost no attempt to formulate solutions, an incident at the final meeting of the legal subcommittee reveals the prevalence of the view that liability for damage caused by spacecraft should be based on fault. The representative of Belgium objected to a statement in the draft report that damage would be done by spacecraft "despite all reasonable precautions." He argued that the phrase "despite all reasonable precautions" was inconsistent with the text that followed, dealing with the question of fault. As a result of his objection, the phrase was deleted.[20] At the same time, however, the United Nations report refers to the Rome Convention of 1952, which, it states, "could be taken into account, inter alia" in any future study of liability for injury or damage caused by spacecraft. Although it makes no recommendation, the report thus calls attention to an international agreement on ground damage caused by foreign aircraft, adopting the rule of liability without fault.[21]

The other questions on the subject posed by the United Nations report are as follows: For what kinds of injury may damages be recovered? Should a different principle govern, depending on whether the place of injury is on the surface of the earth, in the airspace, or in outer space? Should the liability of the launching state be unlimited in amount? When more than one state participates in a particular space activity, is the liability joint or several?[22]

These questions present no special difficulties. Along with still other questions, they should be taken into account in any international agreement on injury or damage caused by spacecraft.

Finally, the United Nations report recommends that consideration be given to "agreement on submission to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in disputes between states as to the liability of states for injury or damage caused by space vehicles."[23]

The International Court of Justice has often been proposed as the proper forum for

Footnotes at end of speech.

space litigation. In order to be effective, any international agreement on liability for harm caused by spacecraft, in particular, should provide for the jurisdiction of a court (or courts) and for the enforcement of judgments. Otherwise, the only redress for private citizens, apart from voluntary payment or arbitration, would be the prosecution of their claims through diplomatic channels by their governments. But why should the jurisdiction be limited, as the report implies, to disputes between States? What will happen to the private individuals and corporations that suffer injury or damage from spacecraft?

Apart from judicial remedies, administrative settlement may provide additional relief, even for international claims. For example, some claims for harm caused in foreign countries by American spacecraft could be settled under the Military Claims Act.[34] The maximum payment, however, would be $5,000, and the injury or damage must have occurred as a result of or incident to the noncombat activities of civilian employees or military personnel of the armed services. Also, the settlement provisions of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 are not limited to claims arising within the United States;[35] but, again, the maximum payment is only $5,000.

Notice that administrative settlement may be made without regard to negligence, local law, or discretionary functions. On the other hand, the maximum administrative settlement for domestic claims under either the Military Claims Act[36] or the Federal Tort Claims Act[37] is only $1,000.

In conclusion, liability for injury or damage caused by spacecraft is still in a formative stage, lacking uniformity even within the United States. Both domestic and international claims are beset with uncertainty and confusion. Since space activities are bound to be nationwide and even worldwide, a satisfactory solution would seem to require both uniform national policies and an international agreement.[38]

---

[1] A/RES/1348 (XIII), Dec. 13, 1958.
[2] See document A/AC.98/2, p. 1.
[3] See document A/4141, p. 62.
[4] See document A/AC.98/C.2/SR.2, p. 6.
[5] See note 3, supra.
[6] Idem, p. 61.
[7] See, for example, document A/AC.93/2/SR.5, pp. 7–8.
[8] See note 1, supra. H. Con. Res. 332, 85th Cong., also refers to the peaceful exploration of outer space.
[9] There is one difference: the problem of interference between space vehicles and aircraft was not listed separately in the survey, but was included under liability for injury or damage caused by spacecraft. See "Survey of Space Law," H. Doc. No. 89, 86th Cong., 1st sess. (reprint), pp. 22–28.
[10] International cooperation in space activities that could not be conducted effectively (if at all) by the United States alone has been proposed by writers of many other countries including the Soviet Union. For a recent example, see Pokrovsky, G. I., "On the Problem of the Use of Outer Space," International Affairs (July 1959), p. 106.
[11] See note 3, supra, pp. 67–68.
[12] See the discussion in document A/C.1/SR.982, 983 and A/AC.98/C.2/SR.2. The representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union, however, expressed no opinions on the legal regime of outer space.
[13] A favorable reference to the legal principles governing "other regions of the earth" was deleted in order to repudiate the view that natural bodies in outer space may be subject to appropriation (i.e., national sovereignty). See document A/AC.98/C.2/SR.5, p. 7.
[14] See note 3, supra, pp. 63–64.
[15] For further discussion of this point, see "Survey of Space Law," supra, pp. 11–13.
[16] E.g., *D'Anna* v. *United States*, 161 F. 2d 335 (4th Cir. 1950), involving a presumptive liability statute; *O'Connor* v. *United States*, 135 F. Supp. 590 (E.D.N.Y. 1956), involving a res ipsa loquitur statute.
[17] See, for example, Haley, Andrew C., "Space Vehicle Torts," 36 U. Det. L. Rev. 294 (1959).
[18] See Beresford, Spencer M., "Liability for Ground Damage Caused by Spacecraft", F.B.A.J. (July, 1959), part III.
[19] See 28 U.S.C. 2680(a).
[20] See document A/AC.98/C.2/SR. 5, p. 8.
[21] Convention on Damage Caused by Foreign Aircraft to Third Parties on the Surface (Rome, 1952). English text reprinted in 19 J. Air L. and Com. 447 (1952). Although never signed by either the United States or the U.S.S.R., and signed but not ratified by the United Kingdom, the Rome Convention of 1952 came into force on Feb. 4, 1958, following the fifth ratification.
[22] See note 3, supra, p. 64.
[23] Idem.
[24] See 10 U.S.C. 2734 (supp. V).
[25] See Public Law 85–568, sec. 203(b)(13), 72 Stat. 426, 431.
[26] See 10 U.S.C. 2733 (supp. V).
[27] See 28 U.S.C. 2672.
[28] As to the need for an international agreement, see "Survey of Space Law," supra, pp. 22–26; see also op. cit., note 18, supra, part IV.

Labor-Management and Disclosure Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the address by President Eisenhower on the need for effective labor reform delivered from his office at the White House, Thursday evening, August 6, 1959, as actually delivered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Americans, I want to speak to you tonight about an issue of great importance to every man, every woman, and every child in this Nation. It is above any partisan political consideration. It affects every American, regardless of occupation, regardless of political affiliation.

I speak of labor reform legislation.

In these few minutes I hope to place before you some salient facts affecting this matter so that all of us may more fully understand what is at stake.

This Nation needs a law to meet the kind of racketeering, corruption, and abuses of power disclosed in many instances by the Senate investigating committee headed by Senator MCCLELLAN. For 2 years I have advocated such a law.

For many months, newspapers have carried extensive accounts of racketeering and corruption in labor-management matters. Many of you have actually witnessed disclosures of this corruption on television in your own homes. It is a national disgrace.

The legislation we need has nothing to do with wages, or strikes, or problems we normally face when employers and employees disagree. Nor am I talking of any new approach to collective bargaining. Nor about any new labor-management philosophy. I am talking solely about a reform law, a law to protect the American people from the gangsters, racketeers, and other corrupt elements who have invaded the labor-management field.

You know, a great deal is being said and written about this subject. We hear one bill called a weak bill, another a strong bill, and so on. The American people are not interested in adjectives or in labels. They are interested in a law which will eliminate the abuses.

I want only effective protection from gangsters and crooks for the people of America—for the men and women who labor with their hands, their minds, their energies, to make make America a better place for themselves and for their families.

We all know that only a small minority of individuals among unions and employers are involved in corrupt activities. We know that the vast numbers of employers and union officials are honest, and deplore corruption as much as you and I deplore it.

But any corrupt minority is too large.

The damage that such a minority does to working men and women, and to the American public cannot be tolerated.

After all—employers and unions operate in this field under the sanction and protection of Federal law. The people very properly look to their government to pass effective laws to stop abuses.

To date, legislation to correct these deplorable conditions has not been enacted. Meanwhile, the evidence of abuses has continued to mount before congressional committees. Chief among the abuses from which Americans need protection are the oppressive practices of coercion.

Take a company in the average American town—your town. A union official comes into the office, presents the company with a proposed labor contract, and demands that the company either sign or be picketed. The company refuses, because its employees don't want to join that union. And remember, the law definitely gives employees the right to have or not to have a union—clearly a basic American right of choice.

Now what happens? The union official carries out the threat and puts a picket line outside the plant to drive away customers, to cut off deliveries. In short, to force the employees into a union they do not want. This is one example of what has been called blackmail picketing. It is unfair and unjust. This could force the company out of business and result in the loss of all the jobs in the plant.

I want that sort of thing stopped. So does America.

Take another company—let us say, a furniture manufacturer. The employees vote against joining a particular union. Instead of picketing the furniture plant itself, unscrupulous organizing officials, in this case, use another scheme. They picket the stores which sell the furniture this plant manufactures. The purpose is to prevent those stores from handling that furniture.

How can anyone justify this kind of pressure against stores which are not involved in any dispute? They are innocent bystanders. This kind of action is designed to make the stores bring pressure on the furniture plant and its employees—to force those employees into a union they do not want. This is an example of a secondary boycott.

I want that sort of thing stopped. So does America.

The blackmail picket line and the secondary boycott cannot possibly help the working men and women of America.

Another important problem is that of the so-called no man's land. Under existing law, the States have practically no authority over labor cases, according to Supreme Court decision.

Here is a typical example of what can happen in this situation: A labor dispute occurs

at a small plant. The union—or the employer—goes to the Federal Labor Board. The Board says the case is too small for Federal action—because it has only a small effect on interstate commerce. Then the union—or the employer—goes to State officials, but they can't do anything because the States have no authority. That leaves the worker and his employer in this no man's land—cut off from Federal or State help.

What is the result? The disputing parties have no recourse to law. So, all too often, the dispute is settled—if we can use such a word—by force, with a test of strength between them, with damage to one or both, and to the community.

I want the no man's land abolished, because I believe that small unions and small businessmen have rights, just as everyone else. I want to give the States authority to deal with cases the Federal Board cannot and should not handle and, by all means, we must not bring every case to the Federal level, as some have proposed. In this kind of situation the States can act more promptly and more effectively than can the Federal Government.

Now any reform bill worthy of the name must also protect the individual rights of union members—within their unions. It must assure them of fair elections. It must assure them of honest handling of their money—money made up by dues often collected under auspices of Federal law. It must also give to the Government effective authority to investigate and enforce these provisions. Unless it does these things—and deals effectively with the problems of coercive picketing, boycotting, and the no man's land—it is not a reform bill at all.

Now let us examine what Congress has done so far this year. Has its action measured up to the minimum requirements I have outlined to protect the American people? I regret to say that, as yet, the answer is no—definitely no.

The bill which passed the Senate in April is not effective. It does not deal with or curb the picketing or boycotting practices I have described. And while it purports to deal with the no man's land, it gives no real relief.

In the House of Representatives, the Labor Committee bill is even less effective than the Senate bill. It, too, fails to deal with picketing and boycotting practices I have described. Its provisions relating to the no man's land go precisely in the wrong direction. And it actually exempts about 70 percent of all unions from reporting on their finances. It even removes criminal penalties against those who violate the rights of union members.

Neither the Senate bill nor the House committee bill will really curb the abuses the American people want to see corrected.

However, Congress need not limit itself to such a choice.

The administration bill is still before the Congress. There is also before the House a bipartisan bill jointly sponsored by two members of the House Labor Committee—Mr. LANDRUM, of Georgia, a Democrat, and Mr. GRIFFIN, of Michigan, a Republican. The Landrum-Griffin bill is a good start toward a real labor reform bill, containing many of the corrective provisions I have urged.

Again I emphasize: Labor reform is not a partisan matter. Further, I don't come before you in any partisan sense. I am not a candidate for office. In this or other issues, I do not seek the support of any special interests. I am only trying to make sure that American workers and the public get the kind of protection that Americans deserve.

Nearly 100 years ago Abraham Lincoln in his memorable address spoke of the sacrifices made so that, in his words, "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth." That was the question he posed to our Nation in his generation.

In our lives and actions, the people of America, in private and public sectors, daily face millions of choices with this continuing question always in the background.

As the Congress prepares to vote on labor reform, this great question is still, as always, with us. In the basic sense, the issue is: Shall the people govern? If they do not, crooks and racketeers could prevail.

This business of government—including this question of labor reform—is your business. It is every citizen's business.

Americans want reform legislation which will be truly effective. It is my earnest hope that Congress will be fully responsive to an overwhelming national demand.

Thank you and good night.

Third-Class Mail Rates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in the Postal Rate Readjustment Act of 1958 the Congress very wisely approved a provision which directs the Secretary of Commerce and the Small Business Administration to conduct surveys to determine the impact of bulk third-class mail increases on small business firms and the economy as a whole. These surveys are being made at the present time.

Third-class mail is the principal advertising tool of tens of thousands of firms in the United States, the overwhelming majority of them small operations. Since 1952 the bulk third-class rate has been increased 150 percent. Many witnesses appeared before the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the prolonged rate hearings to testify against such a burdensome hike in one of their main costs of doing business.

On the other hand, the Post Office Department claimed that the 2½-cent minimum piece rate which it recommended would have no harmful effects. The burden of the Department's argument was that the increase would have the salutary effect of reducing the volume of third-class mail while increasing its revenues.

A speech delivered by Mr. Horace Hart, Director, Printing and Publishing Industries Division, Department of Commerce, delivered in Montreal at the annual meeting of Associated Third Class Mail Users, discusses in some detail the steps being taken by the Commerce Department to fulfill the task assigned it in the last rate act. Since no State or congressional district is without its share of the 235,000 third-class bulk mail permit holders, all Representatives and Senators will be interested in the progress of this particular economic impact study. At long last the Federal Government will have gathered valuable data regarding the Nation's second largest advertising medium. When the surveys of the Commerce Department and the Small Business Administration have been submitted to the Congress we will be in a far better position to judge the wisdom of rate increases already legislated on bulk third-class mail and the desirability of reducing or further increasing them. The information which Secretary of Commerce Mueller is gathering will be of tremendous assistance to us in making sound decisions in the complex postal rate field.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech by Mr. Hart.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE STUDY OF THIRD-CLASS BULK MAIL RATES—PROGRESS REPORT

(By Horace Hart)

I would like to begin by telling you why the Printing and Publishing Industries Division of the Department of Commerce has the assignment to study the impact of postal rate increases of bulk third-class mail. This survey was authorized by the 1958 Postal Rate Act.

The Commerce Department's primary function is to foster and promote commerce and industry. It does this in many ways. The Weather Bureau, Patent Office, Bureau of Public Roads, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Bureau of the Census, Maritime Administration, and the Bureau of Foreign Commerce are all a part of the Department of Commerce and engaged in activities that affect the business community in some way. In addition, there is the Business and Defense Services Administration, whose principal duty is to serve business and act as a link between business and Government.

When directed by Congress to find out how the third-class rate increase affected the business community, the Secretary of Commerce turned to his Business and Defense Services Administration. The BDSA through its 25 industry divisions serves industry and trade, the general public, and economic researchers. Twenty-four of these divisions are cooperating in the postal rate study as representatives of industries that use direct-mail advertising. The 25th, the Printing and Publishing Industries Division, which represents industries that produce, as well as use, this advertising, has the prime responsibility of conducting the survey, evaluating the returns, and reporting its conclusions.

In our work to date we have been impressed with the enormous importance of direct mail. When we began to assess its coverage we learned that there is scarcely a product or service which is not being sold either directly or with the aid of direct mail. We have been impressed too with the willingness of top management to come to Washington when necessary to further the progress of our survey. Many keymen from your industry have given this program their undivided attention.

Statistics in this field have been notably lacking. Basic information we needed from the Post Office has already led to their expending thousands of man-hours to give us correct answers.

Most significant, the survey has emphasized the importance of the direct-mail industry.

With so many different industries and businesses represented in this audience, I should like to tell you about some of the services—of which the bulk mail survey is an outstanding example—that BDSA performs. Besides providing numerous services to the general public and economic researchers, the 25 industry divisions I mentioned

serve and represent some 500 production or manufacturing industries. We in the Printing and Publishing Industries Division, for example, are responsible for some 20 industries, including newspapers, periodicals of all kinds, book publishing and book manufacturing, greeting cards, business forms, the several printing industries, and the allied typesetting and platemaking industries.

Although BDSA emphasizes service to business, it has certain broad responsibilities under the Defense Production Act. These include the development of measures to insure the continuity of production and management in the event of emergency. Since almost no activity can proceed without printed material of one kind or another, our part of this program has been to locate and identify printing and related equipment that could be used to turn out Government orders, forms, labels, training manuals, ration books, and the host of items needed in a wartime economy, as well as those essential to civilian welfare. We are surveying all printing plants employing 50 or more people in order to obtain a national inventory of equipment. The information will be tabulated, coded, and made available in the several regional offices throughout the country for the confidential use of Government officials engaged in mobilization planning.

We are recruiting a corps of industry leaders in all parts of the country to be trained for Government service as an Executive Reserve in the event of an all-out attack on the United States. I find this program particularly impressive because of the quality of top-level executives who have volunteered for service and whose interest has been so evident during the modest amount of time they spend with us annually for training. These Reservists would staff the operation of an emergency production agency.

When Government is asked for some study or service, it brings to bear on the problem all of the research time, talent, and resources it can muster. Almost without exception our services stem from a request to meet a specific need. Among our programs are broad-gage economic studies, such as the bulk third-class mail survey, usually initiated at the request of some group or agency outside BDSA. Some of you may be familiar with the pulp, paper, and board supply-demand study completed in 1957. Undertaken at the request of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, it included projections of demand for the major grade groups of paper and board through 1965. The study has been updated annually and includes data on production capacity, revised to include all newly constructed projects.

The use to which industry puts reports of this kind may be illustrated by two examples. After the initial report was issued, the balanced supply-demand picture for some grades of paper showed that there was no immediate need of added capacity. Consequently, expansion plans of certain producers, plans which involved the expenditure of $50 million, were postponed. Another result of the study has been increasing attention on the part of the paper industry to the amount and kind of printing papers that will be needed in the years ahead for books, periodicals, advertising matter, and other commercial printing.

There is a tremendous amount of information available from Government sources that has a real dollar-and-cents value to you—a fact that I wish I had known when I was in the printing industry. An easy way to locate the material or get the answer to an immediate problem is through the BDSA industry divisions. Among the most interesting requests we received in recent months was one from the director of the American exposition in Moscow. No doubt you have read of the electronic computer that supplies answers to questions asked by Russian visitors. All of the data relating to American industry was supplied by BDSA. It included 100 questions and answers on American advertising and marketing methods. When he punches the proper buttons, Ivan Ivanovitch can become reasonably well informed on direct mail advertising and selling.

I said earlier that BDSA serves as a link between the business community and Government. As such it is in a unique position to advance industry's point of view in Washington. Currently we are consulting with the Copyright Office regarding its study of the copyright law, and with the Tariff Commission regarding comprehensive changes in tariff classifications which it will recommend to the Congress. We have cooperated with the Department of Labor in some of its industrial studies, and we have pressed the industry point of view with many agencies whose regulations affect advertising.

We have also acted as a spokesman for industry with respect to legislation, either by preparing proposed comment for the Department on individual bills that affect specific industries, or by recommending support in the Department's annual legislative program of measures that will help the industries for which we are responsible.

I have thought it worthwhile to give you this background before discussing the bulk third-class mail rate study.

We have three great aims in this study. First of all, we want to develop information that will assist Congress in its future deliberations on third-class mail rates. Second, we want our report to be objective, one that is completely unbiased, one that will be respected by all interested parties because it is based on facts. Third, we want to provide information, heretofore unknown about an important segment of the economy.

Keep in mind that our assigned task is to determine the impact of the increased bulk third-class rates on the economy. To do this we must first know the part that bulk third-class mail plays in the economy, who uses it, the extent to which they use it, how they use it, and the measure of goods and services sold primarily by such advertising. We hope we may be able to come up with important information on trends and developments in this field. In any event, we want the report to be a thoroughly constructive document, one that contains important new information about this advertising medium that has significance over and above the limited area of ratemaking.

I want to emphasize the care taken to use sound procedures and scientific methods in this study. The first of its kind, we wanted it to be a model for others that may be necessary in the future to guide the decision makers.

Very early it became evident to us that the information we needed could only be obtained firsthand from users and producers of third-class mail. We decided to obtain some of the data through a series of questionnaires. In addition, we agreed that case histories, obtained through personal interviews, would be necessary to supply valuable background material and permit analyses in depth of various situations that would be useful in evaluating the purely statistical results of the questionnaire survey.

Our first difficulty came when we began to prepare the questionnaire. As pioneers in this field, we did not know exactly what information individuals and companies could supply. So we did what many of you do: We tested a limited group of mailers. The results of the test questionnaire were then tabulated and became the basis for the final questionnaires.

You may be interested to know how we fared with this test. Approximately 85 percent of the questionnaires were returned. While not all of the questions were answered, we were extremely pleased with the results and expect to do even better on the actual survey. The Bureau of the Census cooperated in developing the questionnaire and the mailing list. Census will also tabulate the returns. Generally speaking, Census wants a return of not less than 90 percent on a voluntary questionnaire, such as we are using.

At a recent meeting with members of your organization in Washington, we were told we could not get figures on net profits. However, this question was answered on 65 percent of the test questionnaires. Respondents have confidence in the Bureau of the Census. That agency may not disclose individual company information, under penalty of fine and imprisonment. Information supplied on individual questionnaires will be seen only by Census agents. The information supplied to us will be a composite of individual returns, tabulated according to our specifications. We will have no information about individual firms, nor do we want any. Therefore I hope that no one included in the survey will have any qualms about answering the questions.

Now as to the questions to be asked: There are the usual ones about kind of business, principal activity, method of selling the goods and services of the establishment, gross receipts, operating income, and personnel. These, of course, identify the business by type and size and tell us how the establishment operates. In addition, we are asking about total advertising expenditures and expenditures for bulk-third-class mail other than the cost of postage. There is a question about the purposes for which third-class mail is used—to obtain direct orders, to obtain prospects for followup by salesmen, to obtain outlets or distributors, for general advertising, and so on.

Another question concerns the percent of gross receipts traceable directly to third-class mail. Still another deals with the shift of mail from first or fourth class to third and the possibility of advance mailings to beat the January 1959 deadline. One of the most important questions deals with operating changes resulting from the increased rates. In other words, we want to know what you are doing about mailing lists, the number of names on mailing lists, the number of mailings, the number of pieces that make up an individual mailing. We are asking about the use of other advertising media, changes in the selling prices of goods and services, and changes in the quality of the product or service.

Two periods are covered by the survey, one before the first one-half cent rate increase went into effect and one after. We had little choice in this matter. The increase to 2 cents went into effect January 1, 1959. Since we were not to begin the actual survey until July of 1959, we had to compare the first six months of 1958 with the first 6 months of 1959. While it might have been better to use 12-month periods, we could not have done so and meet our deadline of March 1, 1960. As it is, we are comparing two like periods; and although we have missed the holiday season of 1959, we also omitted it from 1958.

I want to tell you something about the procedure used in setting up the mailing list for this questionnaire. Our universe, as the statisticians say—and I feel that this is a most appropriate term to use in connection with direct-mail advertising—consisted of the 235,000 firms that paid the bulk third-class fee in 1958. From these permit holders the Bureau of the Census, which was the prime initiator of scientific sampling techniques in the early 1930's, selected a sample of 18,000 firms to receive the questionnaire.

The sample of firms and organizations was a two-stage sample. In stage 1, a sample of the 36,000 post offices in the United States was drawn; in stage 2, a sample of bulk mailers within the post offices was drawn.

First, the post offices were classified into nine groups according to their annual receipts. In the top group were all post offices with annual receipts of $15 million and over. All 22 in this size class were included in the sample, as were all 298 in the next size class; that is, post offices with receipts ranging from $1 million to $14,999,999. The other 700 post offices in the sample were random selections at various rates from 1 in 2 for the third-ranking class to 1 in 500 for the smallest post offices, those having annual receipts of less than $1,500.

All of the post offices selected for the sample were instructed to (1) provide an alphabetical list of all firms that paid a bulk fee in 1958; (2) assemble and sort by name of sender all mailing statements turned in to the post office by the mailer during the first 6 months of 1958; and (3) for each of the 160,000 names, give the amount of postage spent in the first half of 1958 on bulk mail.

To supply this information, post offices had to sort 1,500,000 mailing statements, the individual pieces of paper completed by mailers when they deposit shipments of bulk mail.

From the 160,000 names supplied by the post offices, the Census Bureau designated a sample of 18,000. The sample included (1) all bulk mailers reported by post offices in the five smallest groups; that is, post offices whose annual receipts were less than 200,000; (2) all mailers reported by the top four groups of post offices who spent at least $20,000 on bulk third-class during the first half of 1958; and (3) a selection, based on variable sampling intervals, of the remaining names supplied by the top four groups of post offices.

Interestingly enough, while the number of post offices drawn into the sample is only 3 percent of the total, the number of bulk-fee payers reported by these post offices is 68 percent of the total. Furthermore, 1 percent of the post offices in the sample—those whose total annual receipts are $1 million or more—contain 60 percent of all bulk-fee payers.

This panel will be supplemented by about 2,000 firms which paid the bulk fee for the first time in 1959, this portion of the sample also being drawn from names supplied by the post offices.

In addition to the questionnaire for users of bulk third-class mail, we also have a separate questionnaire for producers and processors of the advertising, that is, the printing industry and the lettershop industry.

The question has arisen as to the possibility of a strong impact on these industries because, of course, one way of compensating for the increased third-class rate would be to reduce the cost or volume of the printed material. A significant reduction of this sort would affect industries already operating on a low margin of profit.

I wish to make it quite clear that I am not saying that has happened, but rather that the possibility has caused special attention to be given to these industries. Consequently, a special questionnaire was designed for them and will be mailed to a carefully selected sample.

The questions include the ones needed to identify and classify the activity—kind of business, number of employees, and gross receipts. Respondents will also be asked to give the percentage of gross receipts attributed to production and processing of direct-mail pieces in each of the two 6-month periods surveyed. Other questions cover changes in the size, weight, and grade of paper used; changes in envelopes; changes in the use of color and methods of reproduction; changes in processing methods; and changes in volume.

I might add that we also have a special questionnaire for governmental users of bulk third-class mail. As you probably know States, cities, counties, and other governmental units are substantial users of bulk third-class mail.

The personal-interview portion of the survey is already underway and will continue for some time. It is, of course, not possible to cover all the industries and companies that we would like in this way, but we will interview enough people to obtain additional information about direct mail, how it functions, what it attempts to do, and what part of our economy it represents.

We called upon the heads of the 25 industry divisions in the Business and Defense Services Administration, as well as of other Government agencies of long experience with industry, to aid us in selecting companies for personal interviews. These case histories are not to be used for drawing general conclusions but rather to supply background material.

We have received splendid cooperation from the people we have already seen. The information obtained in the interviews will be held in confidence. We will not publish company names, and we expect to show to the people interviewed a copy of the material pertaining to their companies before it is used in the study. While this is largely background material, we believe it will be helpful to anyone interested in gaining a fuller understanding of the direct-mail advertising.

If the direct-mail industry and the Congress wish it there is little doubt in my mind that the statistics developed through this survey can be kept current, no matter what the future rate picture may be. The importance of this industry would argue in favor of such action.

The economic climate today is far different from that in which the legislative language was drafted. This is bound to have its effects on the results we obtain but we will do our best to weigh our findings so that they will be valid no matter what course the economy takes.

I hope that I have given you a better underatanding of the role the Business and Defense Services Administration plays. We cannot be an effective link between Government and industry without mutual cooperation and exchange of information. We want you to bring your problems to us and to keep us informed of trends in your industries. We hope that we can call upon you for information, advice, and assistance; that the link between us will be a two-way street.

One of our most helpful and useful sources of information are the trade associations located in Washington. I could not but help being aware of the role that was played by your organization, demonstrating the need for this study. By the time it has been completed—hundreds of men in industry and Government will have participated in making it as complete, as reliable, and as constructive as possible.

In closing I would like to say this to all of you: Consider the Printing and Publishing Industries Division of BDSA your home in Government. When you are in Washington, I hope you will call on us.

Milk Industry Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend my colleague from Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON, and to take this opportunity of again thanking him on behalf of the subcommittee studying milk industry problems for his cooperation during the time we have worked on the situation in the Denver area.

The consumers in his State have a champion who has been most effective in looking after their interests, both for the present and for the long range. Our work has been made a great deal easier and certainly more effective by his timely, able, and courageous assistance. He is due much credit for the progress already made.

I also want to commend Mr. Scott Daniels, executive director of the National Independent Dairy Association, for the great help he has rendered this committee. In Denver, as in many other areas, his help has made important and essential contributions to the work of the committee. I have come to know him as another true champion for the American free enterprise system in its finest sense.

We know from the overwhelming facts that have been given to us that our dairy industry is under heavy pressure toward monopoly. If this trend is not stopped, the time is coming when milk consumers will be at the mercy of monopolistic interests. Milk is far too important to be permitted such a fate. Men like Congressman JOHNSON and Mr. Daniels are greatly needed in our endeavors to keep the milk industry on a free competitive basis.

Statement Concerning Gering Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to comment briefly on one of the most important projects in Nebraska contained in the recently approved public works appropriations bill. I refer to the Gering-Mitchell Valley flood control project for which at long last the Congress has appropriated $341,250 to start construction work.

This project has been authorized for 15 years. Its construction is long overdue.

Mr. Speaker, had the Congress acted 4 years ago to provide construction money, this project would have cost less than $1 million. As it is we will have to expend in the vicinity of $4 million to complete the project by beginning now. In the event flooding conditions come during the construction period it is possible that these costs would rise rapidly.

During the course of hearings on the public works appropriation bill, information was brought out both in the House and before the Senate that if this project is not started now and completed within the next 3 to 4 years, it will be too late to do anything at all about the Gering Valley. A great deal of very valuable, very productive land will be

washed away completely. The property will become completely valueless. And in an era when our population increase foretells of a time when this Nation will be a have-not nation as far as food production is concerned, the loss of this valuable land would be a national tragedy instead of merely a local one. We cannot allow that to happen.

The U.S.A. From the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GALE W. McGEE
OF WYOMING
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the April 1950 issue of Harper's magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S.A. FROM THE AIR

(By Wolfgang Langewiesche) [1]

I

I used to think of the U.S.A. as one thinks of a golf course. It was simply terrain on which to practice your technique. The technique was "cross-country flight"; XC for short, when you wrote it up afterward in your log book. Flight was much newer then, in the early 1930's. Merely to circle the airport still filled you, every last cubic inch of you, with a sensation that was like nothing else. And to quit circling, to head out straight cross-country—that was flight, raised to the second power. Boy.

I used to look down, in those ancient days, and watch my fat little rubber tire hang idle over the depth. It went across somebody's roof: no jolt. Treetops; a highway; then a river. You flew out from over land to over water; no sink. No coolness. Imagine that: walking on land and water like a god. What a machine. And what a pilot (me). Bring on your skyscrapers, so I can top them. Bring on your hills, so I can cross them. Bring on your distances, and I shall eat them up. Bring on your country, and I shall ignore it.

Well, you find out.

I remember my first flight over New England. Ignore it? I wished I could. Instead, I thought: "What horrible country." You see, the thing about XC was—that fat little tire was always looking for a field to roll on. The engine might quit any time: that was official doctrine. It never did quit, even then—much less now. But the fear of it was carefully drilled into you. Any time at all, in the midst of the most delicate figure 8, when you were trying to make some farmer's barn hold still off your wing tip, bang, would come a tremendous silence as your instructor pulled back the throttle and said: "Forced landing." Then you quickly picked a field (really you were supposed to have one all picked out: always have a field in mind) and you went gliding down in a long S-turn—through the key position—down across the trees—down into the field—down until the grass began to tickle your tires. Then he was kind enough to open the throttle for you and let you climb out. To shoot a good forced landing was considered about three-quarters of the art of flying. And so you judged country mostly by its fields.

New England rated low indeed. Those gloomy hills, all wooded. Those nasty little pastures with the naked rock poking up right through the middle. Those ugly stone walls around every plot of land—just imagine you overshot and rolled into one of those. Horrible country. Not a decent field in sight. Then I caught myself: What are you saying, man? You are supposed to find this charming. Don't you have any education? This is the cradle. * * * Hell, you know it's charming. Look at that white steeple nestled in the green. Trouble with you, you can't take it; you're scared. But of course I was right in the first place: it was a horribly tough country they picked to settle; there was no decent field, nor a flat place to put one. They themselves called it a howling wilderness, and it very nearly starved them to death. Besides, most of them left it, first chance they got, for points west.

How different North Dakota felt. I had spent a week flying in the canyons of Idaho—a mountainside off each wing tip, a wild river below—with the thought of engine failure strictly repressed, of course: no use thinking about it where you simply can't afford one. I had flown down into North Dakota through night, a black night, with nothing visible but the beacons along the airway; and again the forced landing idea had been switched off—there are lots of badlands on that route. Toward morning, not to get too low on gas, I had sat down on an auxiliary field to wait for daylight. It was deserted. (Those fields are not built to serve a town, but to serve the airway—they sit there, every 100 miles or so, their boundaries outlined by lights, just in case.) Parked there under the beacon tower, I had fallen asleep right in the airplane.

I woke up, and it was daylight. I started her up, and took off. Still dull in mind, I cleared the fence. There it was: landings unlimited. You cleared the fence, and you had cleared everything. As far as the eye could see, big fields—flat as a table and bigger than airports. And smoothly cultivated: where farm machinery can roll, an airplane tire can also roll. It was fall, and most of them were stubble. The nice, combed-looking stubble of machine-sown wheat: a guaranteed surface, along with unlimited room.

"This," I thought, "is 100 percent OK. This is the rose without the thorn; this is the meal that is all dessert; this goes in easy." In fact, I swear I had a strong sensation as if I were a little boy again and had just been handed a dish of whipped cream with chocolate.

"I think I'll just roll my wheels on that one." I had only flown a minute, but why not? "I'll fly straight for exactly 3 minutes, and then close my throttle." Nothing to it—just glide straight ahead. I thought it would be fun to roll up to a fence and jump it and sit right down again, so I did. Why not? "I think I'll spiral up to 1,000 feet and cut my ignition and stop my prop." Done.

Now, I don't claim it is a red-hot and brand-new idea that North Dakota is different from New England. I tell it to show you how a pilot reacts to the country; he does react; he can't help it. And not as a tourist; he is not ever "just looking." He has business with the country, and the country with him.

I once had a piece of business with the Missouri River. I had undertaken to fly a small seaplane from coast to coast; up the Missouri, down the Columbia. Don't ask me why; I guess it was to prove it could be done. It was a short-range ship. You had to gas up often. Each time, you became a boat. For a little while you were a river pilot, back in Mark Twain's day. True, Mark Twain piloted on the Mississippi. But he himself says that the Missouri is twice as tricky, and a Missouri pilot twice as much of a pilot.

"The river was an awful solitude, then," wrote Mark Twain in 1883, as of the early French explorers' day. "And it is now, over most of its stretch." It still is, old man. Flood plain with willows; for miles on either side, it's empty. I would always land near a bridge, because only for a bridge would a road come to the river; and only on a road could I hope to get to a filling station—a 5-gallon can in each hand. But a bridge is an obstruction, and near it may be that fearful seaplane trap, an electric wire strung across the river. (Hard to see.) So I would land a little way off, or what looked from the air like a little way. Once on the water, I would be deep in that solitude, the bridge out of sight around the bend.

The water was silent, oil-like, smooth, a very thin mud. How muddy it was. You got your hands wet, handling the ropes; then the western air would dry them, and they were suddenly caked with a thin layer of dry mud; you'd rub your hands, and it would come off as a fine dust.

Now to get back to the bridge you had to "read the river." But from 5 feet up, not from the lordly pilothouse atop the Texas deck. Those ripples, did they mean a puff of wind or a shallow place? This upwelling here, that was a log stuck under the water. It might rip your pontoons open. (You call that a sleeper.) There was also the kind of log that is caught on one end; the other end slowly comes out of the water, and then the current pushes it down again. (That you call a sawyer.)

My pontoons drew about 8 inches of water—about the same as the old river steamboats. I ran aground many times. The old steamboats did, too. They would then walk—put a spar overboard and stem it against the bottom and push. I did much the same—rolled up my trousers, waded out, and lifted on one wingtip to push one pontoon forward a few feet; then waded over to the other side and pushed the other one forward. Hard, wet, slow work. "Mark Twain?" I used to think: "Mark O-point-twain."

So, deep in the 20th century, air age and all, you personally met this continent: Its mountains, plains, rivers. You were an emigrant, thinking about decent fields. You were a river pilot or a canal man or a wagoner or a mountain man. You walked down Fifth Avenue thinking—hey, you people, I know a way to get across the Rockies with one single hump that you can clear at 6,000 feet. (Maria's Pass, up near Glacier Park—I had dragged that seaplane through there.) Of course nobody cared—you were a hundred years out of step.

For instance, about the Alleghenies. To us they still were what they once had been to everybody—a big barrier. They are not high, but if there isn't some weather cooking on one side, its' cooking on the other, or on the ridges; they get moisture from the Atlantic and the Great Lakes and the gulf. In those days, few pilots knew how to fly blind; none of us small fry did. So, when the clouds were down on the ridges, the barrier was closed.

I remember my first trip over the Hell-Stretch—where the New York-Cleveland airway goes across the ridges. (The early air-mail pilots had called it that.) That day, a low, gray, ragged ceiling kept us low. In the low perspective, the valleys and the towns are hidden. You don't realize there are really quite decent fields down in the river bottoms. All you see is an endless forest, coming at you in waves—a green blue, melancholy. Some of the waves were high. We

[1] An early light-plane enthusiast and now a research pilot for the Kollsman Instrument Division of Square D Co., Wolfgang Langewiesche came to America from Germany in the twenties. He has written 17 articles for Harper's since 1941.

tried to climb, and bits of cloud started slapping us in the face. It was not good.

Well, it's not supposed to be good. I found this later in a book. Talleyrand had once traveled this same stretch. He had crashed through these very woods under us. The branches slapped him in the face as the clouds now slapped us. He lost sight of his servant. He called out, "Are you here?" And the fellow answered, "Unfortunately, my lord, I am." That seems to be the built-in feeling of that country. I now looked at my passenger, sayings, with my eyebrows: "Are you still with me?" He pointed down, he pointed all around, and then held his nose.

You discovered anew, for yourself, things that once had to be discovered. For example (still talking about the Alleghenies), that you could fly at water level from the seaboard to the Middle West: you got right on top of the historic Erie Canal. That way, you could squeak through under clouds that were solid on the hills. Another bad-weather route went through Pennsylvania. Up the Susquehanna River to Lock Haven; up another valley to Altoona. This far, you could fly even if perhaps it was like a tunnel, valley sides with the ceiling across it: there were nice long fields along the river. At Altoona you sat down.

You had now only one ridge between you and Johnstown, which is the headwaters of the Ohio. So, you sat and smoked cigarettes and watched the ridge. When it came out of the clouds, you hopped into your ship, spiraled up at wide-open throttle, and went for that ridge. On top, you picked up the main line of the Pennsylvania railroad. You got right on the quadruple rail and scooted down the incline into Johnstown. There, you got on the river and wound your way out to more open country. Clever, isn't it? Well, I found out this was exactly the idea of the old Pennsylvania Canal—an engineering wonder that flourished just before the railroad age. They took the barges to the very same spot. Then they had a marine railway that hauled the barges bodily up that same ridge, and down that same incline on the other side. There they could float away to points west. It goes to show: a place sends out something like a magnetic field—a field of ideas. You fly through there, and those ideas generate in your mind.

II

Now, flying has changed. You have more speed, more radio, perhaps two engines. Even with only one, the forced landing obsession has faded out. You try again to treat the country with contempt. You try to think of it as pure expanse—graph paper, yours to make lines on. But it still doesn't work out that way. The country still makes itself felt. In fact, speed sometimes makes you feel it more. It's like a phonograph record: the needle has to slide to bring out the tune.

I like to see east change to west. I like that moment, on the New York-Pittsburgh-St. Louis route, when you get to the last ridge, called Laurel Ridge. There, at the end, the dislikable Alleghenies are almost real mountains. On the brow of the ridge, facing west, there is a bald, stony strip, scoured clean by the west winds and the sleet and the rain. An airway beacon stands up there, alone. Then the stuff falls steeply away under you. You slide out across there, and you enter the Middle West. It feels different. It feels easylike. Not that the country turns nice right away. Right around Pittsburgh, it is a tortuous jumble—small, steep hills, slag fields, deep-cut railroad tracks, lots of smoke. But you know it will calm down. A pilot gets the habit of thinking ahead of the airplane. The now and here is no longer so important in the faster airplane: Now and here, the engine percolates, the weather is OK, the gadgets work, you have lots of gas. What's ahead is what matters. And so you study cloud shapes, listen to weather reports, and feel out the situation ahead. And there, you know, comes flat country, come open fields, come comfortable cities, big airports, runways with clear approaches. The squeeze, that makes the easterner elbowy and unfriendly, squeezes also in flying. In the East, airports are small, obstructed by power lines, hills, gas works, squeezed in between the cemeteries and the insane asylums. West of the Alleghenies, they give you room.

So now, if the ceiling is low, you can stay under it and push on; you know the terrain gets better all the time. Or you can go on top of the overcast; you know that when you want to get down, no hills will stick up into a low ceiling. And so you feel, ahead of time, way up in the air, that certain ease and plenty of the Middle West.

Presently, you pick up the section lines. Now that is something. It is really one of the odd sights of the world, and it is strictly an air sight: a whole country laid out in a mathematical gridwork, in sections 1 mile square each; exact, straight sided, lined up in endless lanes that run precisely—and I mean precisely—north-south and east-west. It makes the country look like a giant real-estate development, which it is. One section has 640 acres. A quarter section, 160 acres, is the historical homestead. You sold your goods, you crossed the sea somehow, and they gave you that. "Land-office business" used to be done in this matter, and no wonder.

Get this right. These section lines are not something that an attentive eye can distinguish in the landscape. They are the landscape. Compared to this gridwork, the natural landscape—flat here, a little rolling there, a river valley, a pond—just can't quite catch your attention. In fact, the natural landscape has long fitted itself to this scheme. A man has a wood lot, his neighbor a cornfield; the boundary between woods and field is, of course, the fence line; but the fence line is part of the grid. More than people know, all their coming and going is channeled by that grid. Their roads—except for the biggest highways—run and jog along the grid. In fact, from the air, the lines are mostly marked by roads.

For flying, the section lines are wonderful. They make this country in reality just what a pilot wants country to be—graph paper. You can time your shadow with a stopwatch across two lines, and get your exact speed. You can head the airplane down a section line and check your compass. But you hardly need a compass. You simply draw your course on the map and see what angle it makes. Then you cross the sections at the same angle. You can't miss. If you want to go exactly west, you get on a fence and follow it. The fence presently leaves off; the line becomes a highway. The highway curves off, but the line goes on as a fence again, as a lane between fields, as a farm road, then perhaps as the main street of a town, a highway again. It is easy on the brain.

It's true what the foreigners say—it all looks pretty much alike. A town comes out of the haze, moves through below you, falls back—only (you sometimes think) to run through some secret passageway and plant itself again in front of you.

Flying, you tell these towns apart as you tell stars—by constellation. This one, of about the fourth magnitude, with a smaller one to the north of it—that must be this one on the map. Those three-in-line, that's those.

What is it like, this American town? Well it isn't crowned by a castle, that's for sure; nor by a cathedral either. By an insurance skyscraper, more likely; or by a hotel, perhaps; but most likely by nothing. It is not fortified, and never was: no crowded old town, no ring-shaped boulevard where the walls used to be. Neither is it like a town I once saw in the South—a company town with a street plan like the branches of a tree with the mill at the root. And it is not a village.

It is always a small city. It is laid out with streets at right angles, and has at its center a little downtown, perhaps only two streets crossing each other, perhaps a few blocks. In there, it's naked and stony; it achieves a certain businesslike ugliness. There is a well-developed parking problem. And at night, that downtown core glows with bright lights and red neon signs, where the seller entertains the buyer and the boy the girl.

The rest is quiet streets with little houses and lots of trees. It fades out into the farmland in an indifferent way—streets and avenues already marked out on the ground, but still empty. You can tell—it expects to grow. Add a few blocks on the outskirts, and the downtown gets a bit more stony. Keep adding, and Farmerville becomes Bloomington, Bloomington becomes Springfield, Springfield becomes, say, Indianapolis.

There is always a wrong side of the tracks to the town. In the thirties, when the price of paint made a bigger difference, this used to show up plainly. There is always a giant high school, and certain other standard furniture—a gasoline bulk plant, race track, institution (may be a veterans' hospital, may be a teachers college, may be a county poorhouse). These things are marked on the flying maps, not because it is remarkable that a town should have them, but because it helps you tell the towns apart. This town has its high school at the east end. If this is the town I think it is, there should be an institution on the north edge. Sure, there it is. You make a pencil mark on the map and fly on.

Somewhere now, about a third of the way across the country, you notice something has changed. The fields are bigger; the air is clearer. Things have opened up. There is less junk around the landscape—I mean by junk, I guess, things of which a pilot cannot immediately see the sense and purpose: a clump of trees here, a different-colored patch of field there, an old abandoned factory building—that sort of thing. The landscape is tidier. Each farmhouse sits on its land as if it had just been set there; each fence shows straight and strong, as if it had just been strung. Each town seems to say, "Look, I am a town." Things have a sharper edge to them.

What's happened is that you have crossed the line between the forest and the prairie—the line that was there in Indian days. The white man has cleared the forest and plowed the prairie, and has made them both superficially alike—both farmland. But still the difference shows. Maybe it's the different color of the soil. Maybe it's that up to here, the country has been darkened by the last poor remnants of the old dark foreste—a clump of trees, a wood lot—and here the trees leave off. Maybe it is simply the drier, clearer air. At any rate, you have moved one more notch west.

Here, in the less cluttered country, your map reading must change. A town may be so small that it would rate only a circle, o, further east—here it gets the full treatment. The map shows it as a yellow area, shaped like the town's built-up area. A town may be so small that further east it wouldn't be on the map at all—here it gets at least an o, and a name. This I like. It reminds you of the way each person counts for more out West. Go west, young man, and put yourself on the map.

And I like the names of those towns. It used to be that a prince would graciously call a town after himself—Williamstown or Fred-

ericksburg or Charles' Rest, or what not. Out here, the ordinary man sat himself down, founded himself a town, and named it, by gosh, after himself. I like to check them as I fly. Here comes Charlie. Howdy, Riley. Wie geht's, Hoehne. Hello, Kline. Landusky, Henderson, Milliken, Goessel, Weir, Swink, McPhee, how are you doing?

Or the man would name the town after a woman of his: Beulah, Maybell, Dolores. I had often flown over a town named Beatrice, Nebr., and I had thought: "Poor Beatrice, whoever you were (farmer's wife? railroad president's daughter?)—that really wasn't much of a present to give a woman." It is a nice town, and all that, but it isn't exactly—you know—it hasn't got glamor, out here in the sun-blasted country between Omaha and Wichita. (It hasn't got glamor if you were over Manhattan yesterday and will be over the Hollywood hills tomorrow.) Well, I came over Beatrice again one night. Now people don't know this, but a town at night is the most beautiful thing made by man in the past hundred years—especially an American town, where they don't spare the current. A brave sight, too, out there, where towns are far apart, with a lot of darkness in between. People went out into this vastness, built a home town here, and lit all those lights. A proud sight, just by being there. And I thought: "Beatrice, wherever you are now, you ought to be proud. It looks real nice."

Now, halfway across the country come the Great Plains. It happens fast, in a matter of minutes. A grassy butte sticks up right through the fields. A bit of badlands shows up. The pattern of the farms opens up to detour around it and comes together again. A gully shows up—Grand Canyon in miniature. You know the signs. You are getting west another notch. You hitch yourself up in your seat and take new notice.

Ahead the country rises a step, and the step is a bluff: its face is eroded; it grins at you like the teeth of a skull. As you pass over, the farms fall back. The last you see of them is a mile-square wheatfield draped over some hump, abandoned. It reminds you of a wrecked ship on a beach—tried to go where it should not be, and got in trouble. Ahead are the vast khaki plains, rising toward the west. There's nothing to see but vastness, clarity of air, distance. The sun glistens on a window of some ranch house 50 miles away. A train, very far away, is a small black thing under a smoke plume, like a ship at sea.

You head straight out there, and the world fades out: badlands, the dry, bare hills. That fellow yammering about the "lone prairie"—he's been there. You suddenly remember you have no water aboard, no strong shoes, no big hat. You are lucky if you see a ranch hidden deep down in some secret canyon in a patch of green. More likely, you see next to nothing; a barbed wire fence, some cattle, a windmill pumping beside a water hole.

You fall in line and follow the railroad. Everybody and everything else does, in that country; even the civil airways. Now the U.S.A. slenders down to a mere strip—river-plus-railroad-plus-highway. Along this strip are the irrigated fields, the towns, the airports. And the railroad is the great sight—doubly great by default of everything else. Its long straightaways and mathematical curves, the way it goes on and on through empty country up toward the West.

Finally these bright yellow-green plains rise under you like a wave about to break; over the crest comes a white spot that turns out to be snow. There, between two high mountains, is a gateway, where the river comes out. Toward this gate you have been steering all along; so was the railroad; so was the highway; so were the radio beams along the airway. You go in through that gate, and East has changed to West.

III

The air view is an honest view: "You can't kid me" is your attitude as you look down. "So that's how it is." For example, the great famous dams—Hoover, Norris, Grand Coulee. In the ground view, the thing you marvel at is how big they are. The glamor photographs show them that way—small human figures, dwarfed by this gigantic wall behind them. Well, from the air, it's the other way round. It strikes you how small they are. Hoover Dam especially—it's actually hard to find. The eye sweeps all over the naked rock and the shores of Lake Mead before you find it—hidden down in a gulch. It makes you smile. Some boy has jammed a rock into this stream at just the right spot—and has managed to dam up one hell of a big lake. Small cause, big effect: clever little devil. And that, I'm sure, is the correct view. An engineer would say so. He would always try to build the smallest possible dam, not the biggest.

Or, New York City. What's it all about? On the ground, why you know: Time, Life, Look, Quick, Flair, and Harper's; Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborn; Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane; NBC, CBS, ABC; words, ideas, paper of all sorts. But, from the air, I regret to state, New York looks like a place where steamships tie up to piers. The piers catch your eye, not Radio City or Wall Street skyscrapers. Manhattan, with all those tentacles sticking out into the water, looks like some biological exhibit—some organ specially developed to draw nourishment from the sea.

The foreground doesn't hide the background. Looking down at a place from the air, you see everything, literally, that's there. You may not notice everything; you may not understand the half of it; but at least you've seen it. What's this? Why does it look so odd? It's been amusing, for example, to watch the college campuses; the old fake Gothic, ivy-covered; the stadium with its vast parking space; the new research factory; the rows of quonset huts. 'Taint Oxford, brother. You run your own private census all the time. This thing—why do I see more and more of this? Not much can happen in the country that you don't notice, often ahead of the papers and magazines. For example, much will be written soon about our cities, how they have grown in area, not to say exploded; how the FHA town, way out on the potato fields, is taking the place of the tenement; and so on. Why sure: pilots have seen that grow for years.

Everything people do, and perhaps everything they think, makes its mark sooner or later on the ground. (That's what reconnaissance is all about.) I used to amuse myself, looking down at Washington, by tracing the idea of checks and balances in the city plan and the shape of buildings. I've seen, in the South, a little country church with a swimming pool behind it: a fine point of theological doctrine—baptism by total immersion—clearly written into the landscape. That is the kind of writing you try to read.

The American landscape is a palimpsest. Underneath what is written in it now, in concrete and barbed wire, there is older writing.

To bring out old writing, a man might photograph a document under trick light. The same in flying. Over the forests of New England, winter light is best. The trees must be bare, so the eye is not stopped at the tree-top level. There must be snow on the forest floor, because that lights up the inside of the forest and makes it easier to look down into it.

Then you see, underneath the present-day forest, the farms of long ago. They did have decent fields there after all. Not decent to land on, but lovingly made, cleared out of the forest, carefully fenced by stone walls. Each rock once was picked up by hand, carried out of the field, carefully placed. It's said they made their children do that, to make them hard-working and God-fearing. Stern stuff. It's all under the forest. The forest is still only scrubby; but already it is full of dead trees helter-skelter, like virgin forest. The 1938 hurricane put them down, and nobody cares. History did a high-speed job here.

The second layer in this palimpsest is in strong plain writing: those section lines are the main part of it. I believe this was written by Jefferson and perhaps Rousseau, but I don't know. About this, the main feature of the U.S. landscape, it is curiously hard to find anything in books. But I have often admired this scheme. Remember—it was drawn up on paper before the country had even been explored. The lines were run before the people came: so it was literally a blueprint for a future society. I think it is a diagram of the idea of the social contract: homestead by homestead, men would sit each in his own domain free and equal: each man's domain clearly divided from his neighbor's.

I mean, it wasn't the only way they could have parceled out the country. They could have gone out there with manor houses, each with a bunch of cottages around it. (You do see some of that in the South.) They could have built villages nestling around a commons and a church. They might have built forts. Today, I think, we would build a headquarters first. There would be a row of houses; a communal water tower, housing for bachelor workers, a hospital, a recreation area. Radiating out, I imagine, would be roads, and off the roads would be the fields. The whole development would be star-shaped, and right in the center would be of course the administration building.

But they picked the layout where every man is his own boss. Even now, this is the main feature of the American landscape: The square-cornered parcels, big in the West, small in the East, big in the country, small in the cities, of which each means a man. I realize they rent 'em, they are mortgaged, they grow the stuff by Government subsidy, all that; but it is still true—the design of the landscape, seen from the air, is a design for independent men.

In the years I've been flying, I have seen the American landscape being redrawn. A third set of lines has begun to show up on top of the others—a new style. Contour plowing is an example. It makes the marble-like pattern of fields and furrows, dictated not by property lines, but by the terrain. It is a new thing—and the new thing goes right across those straight, right-angled fences. Two farms that are divided by a section line are drawn together by this joint pattern. You can tell—two men, one plan.

Strip farming, too. I remember one evening on the Montana prairie. The whole plain—those parts that were tilled at all—was in a strict rhythm of dark strips of fresh-plowed earth, yellow strips of stubble, alternating bing-bong. The sun shone on this pattern, and it almost dizzied the eye—like some fantastic checkered fabric.

That does not just happen by the chance judgments of independent operators. You could see a marshaling force at work. It was, in style, like those newsreel shots you used to see before the war, from countries since gone under, where "the youth" was doing calisthenics on the parade field. "One," and an acre of humanity was heads; "two," and it was tails. I hurry to say that I have nothing against contour plowing or strip farming. Flying gives you too vivid a view of erosion, of blowing dust, of destroyed land. I remember the first time I

saw really eroded farms, out in Nebraska, in the dry years. I said practically out loud: "Well, this, of course, has to stop." But that's just it—you see these changes in the landscape, you understand why they are made, and you can't mistake the meaning. New ideas of society are cooking here, and a blue pencil works, redrawing the old designs.

You see the same thing going on in cities. Those "housing projects." You can tell someone thinks the human resources should be stored in bins more orderly, more manageable. And bins are all they are. But the funny thing about such architecture or city planning is: It makes a lot of sense in the air view. Seen from above, straight down, the dreary mass takes on a certain rhythm, an order, even a wit. This block here, this block there, the star-shaped thing in the middle. This building brackets that one, which brackets that, and so on. The reason is, I think, that such things are conceived, sketched, approved, by someone who looks at humanity in a perspective much like a pilot's: He is way up, on the policymaking level, and he looks down on a desk.

IV

What kind of country is this, anyway? There is always a lot of fresh dirt dug up, wherever you look. Old Alexander Botts gets around with his earthworm tractor and fixes the place up to suit himself. The whole country bears the tracks of the caterpillars, the bulldozers, the listers, the middlebusters, the ditchdiggers, the power shovels, the dredges, the pipeline-laying outfits.

A superhighway goes hellbent. I mean, you can see it go. It's got this far with actual pavement, actual traffic; for another 70 miles, it is fresh-dug dirt. For still another hundred miles, it is a trace through the farmland; it's started pushing over trees, moving houses, cutting hills in two: look at it go. It gets to a river, 10 miles broad—really a branch of the ocean; you can see it's going to walk right across. The steppingstones are already laid.

Doughty said of his Arabs that they were "unfeaty." Well, then, the word for those people down there is "featy"—big operators. Even the farms are all power and precision; nothing yokelish, nothing idyllic. I like to watch the plowing as I fly over. The plow moves fast—faster than any animal could pull it. The fellow rides on it. He leaves six furrows at a time. You see results even during the brief minute that you can keep a field in sight. A brush seems to be drawing fresh brown paint across the green. The other day, 3,000 feet somewhere above the Corn Belt, we smelled something peculiar. Hot wire? Insulation searing? Quick now, check switches, check fuses, check meters, check the map for the nearest airport—shucks, it was pigs. Must have been lots of pigs, somewhere below. That's how they operate. When they raise pigs, they raise pigs.

They make mistakes too; they make big ones—and are not afraid to write them off. Witness those dead wheatfields on the plains, those ghost towns, those abandoned railroads. There's a canal across Florida—a big, deep, ship canal. Only it doesn't really go across, it exists only in sections. They changed their minds.

They get big results. At least they get big production. I remember India from the air. India is one of the few other places in the world that has any real farmland. (Most of the world, after all, is desert or mountain or jungle or ice or ocean.) Well, it was all there: the fields, vast plains of them, just like here. The furrows, weakly scratched perhaps and a bit wavy, but just the same, it was careful, painstaking farming. It was all there but the product. No corrals full of cattle; no grain elevators; hardly any roads to carry the stuff away: most of the stuff gets eaten right in the villages; there is not enough net production to make visible signs in the landscape.

Over here, you can see the stuff: the wheat of the prairies shows even in upstate New York, along the St. Lawrence, in huge grain elevators with steamships docked at their base. Through much of the West, grain elevators stand like skyscrapers. Cattle? Acres of cattle, brown and white mottled, in the corrals and stockyards. Fruit? By the trainload, going east from California. Cotton—bales in huge piles. Iron ore: All the railroad tracks near Lake Superior are covered with the rust-colored dust, spilled off the cars; on the Great Lakes, the ore boats make a steady procession all summer long.

It is a shirt-sleeve country. Gracious living, so-called, has made few traces in the landscape. You do see places on the eastern seaboard that make you think: "Hey, Mack, who do you think you are? Come out from behind that chateau. I knew you when you used to eat down at Joe's Diner." Well, half an hour west of tidewater, all nonsense stops, and it doesn't start again till you reach Hollywood.

The cities, too, such monsters as Chicago, turn out to be, when you fly over them, still mostly earth, with light, wooden, modest houses on it. Sometimes this still strikes me: If you had asked me when I was a boy in Europe, I would have said that the Americans (such as are not cowboys) must of course live in some superurban way, in penthouses among the skyscrapers. Somehow it pleases me that they don't. Those factories that glow from inside at night with bluish light; those highways—the masters of them live in little houses up some tree-lined street.

The Outlook for Legislation That Will Affect Business in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most articulate spokesmen in the field of economics is our esteemed colleague from Missouri, the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS. Mr. CURTIS recently reviewed the legislative action we have been engaged in during this session of the 86th Congress and speculates on what we might expect in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, following are the remarks by the gentleman from Missouri which I am sure will be most interesting and informative to all:

THE OUTLOOK FOR LEGISLATION THAT WILL AFFECT BUSINESS IN 1960

(By Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS of Missouri)

I am always hesitant about making any political forecasts partywise or legislativewise. What happened and, more startling, what didn't happen in the almost adjourned 1st session of the 86th Congress makes me more hesitant than ever about predicting what the 2d session of the 86th Congress will do.

However, one does have a better idea of what a second session of a Congress will do than a first session, if only for the reason that a second session begins where the first session left off and does not start anew. Bills that were introduced in the first session do not have to be reintroduced. Bills that were reported out of committee or passed by one body remain in status quo and do not have to retrace again their legislative steps.

A great deal of what will happen depends upon the economic condition of the Nation. Those who erroneously judged what the first session would produce, I believe did so because they had not anticipated the rather unexpected rate of recovery from the recession. However, there is little question that this rapid recovery enabled President Eisenhower to maintain his position of cutting back on new appropriations contemplated by the Congress and took the steam out of the bold and imaginative program that majority leader Senator LYNDON JOHNSON announced for the Congress in January 1959.

A great deal of what the next Congress will do depends upon the concern and interest shown by the people. Certainly there would have been no Landrum-Griffin Labor Act if the people, by and large, had not shown an unexpected interest in anti-labor-racketeering legislation. I used the adjective "unexpected" advisedly, because for several months the Congress dragged through its hearings and its marking up a labor management bill without any political leaders of the Congress seemingly aware of the fact that the people were deeply concerned about what the Congress was or was not doing. It is perfectly true that President Eisenhower, the press, and radio and television commentators did an unusually good job of simplifying in a rather accurate manner what the true and somewhat complicated issues were, but if the people had not been interested in the matter I am satisfied that the news media would have drifted off to reporting other issues with which they thought the people might be concerned.

I take the trouble to develop this thought a bit because you gentlemen here, and your counterparts throughout the Nation, have it in your power to no little degree to determine what the legislation affecting business for 1960 will be.

Business (as a whole) showed no concern about three pieces of legislation passed in the last session of the Congress which, in my opinion, deeply affected all American business. The only concern shown was by the businesses immediately affected by the three pieces of legislation. The complexion of the private enterprise system was considerably affected by these measures.

As a politician and a legislator, I have become quite conscious of a politically active and surprisingly powerful group who do concern themselves with the more lasting effects of specific pieces of legislation upon the complexion of the private enterprise system. The difficulty is, as far as I am concerned, that this group believes that a federally planned economy is necessary to cope with the problems that our society faces today and, accordingly, it promotes any bit of legislation which moves our society closer to this goal. I think it is necessary for those who believe that better economic decisions are reached through the interplay in a free and competitive marketplace than through bureaucratic planning and decision to be more politically active in promoting this basic idea. To do this, proposed legislation must be analyzed to determine whether it is good or bad in attaining this goal and the analysis publicized for political effect.

The first law was the increase of taxation on the life insurance companies by about 90 percent. Why does this concern the private enterprise system? Because the pressures on the Congress to expand the social security program by increasing benefits and increasing social security taxes to pay for these benefits are directly related to the extent to which the private insurance companies can handle the job of providing for

the retirement of our people and spreading the risks to them from death and disability. There is no question that the ability of the private insurance companies to meet the social problems I have referred to has been seriously cut down as a result of this tax increase. The insurance industry can live with the taxload, but it will find it difficult to keep pace with the growing needs of our people in these areas. In essence, we are merely substituting Federal Government capital formation and bureaucratic administration for private capital formation and private administration.

The second law was the extension of the Renegotiations Act. Why did this law effect the private enterprise system and not just the aviation companies who claimed to be hurt by its existence and its administration? Because this law sets the entire climate for doing business with the Military Establishment which spends the bulk of the Federal moneys for goods and services. The present procurement practices of the Federal Government, affected as they are, by the Renegotiations Act are not in accord with the basic principles of a free and competitive market. Indeed, they tend to weaken and destroy competition in the marketplace and substitute in its stead competition in a bureaucracy.

The third law was the cut in the excise tax on telephones. Why should a relatively minor cut in an excise tax in an isolated area affect all business? Primarily because it was one other break in the line against tax reduction until basic reform and tax reduction can be brought about. Last year it was the railroads and the truckers who broke the line; this year the telephone companies. Are we to presume that these two excises were the most economically damaging taxes or tax rates in our Federal tax system? Or are we to conclude, as I am afraid we must, that these were the two taxes concerning which the most political pressure was generated for their easing? Secondarily, the telephone excise-tax cut, like the freight excise-tax cut the year before, was accomplished at the sacrifice of important constitutional and congressional procedures which, from a practical standpoint, means much to business. Both of these cuts were accomplished by an amendment in the Senate to a House tax bill on another subject. Under the Constitution, the House alone can originate tax legislation, and, under proper congressional procedure, only amendments germane to that House bill can be made by the Senate. Under Senate procedures, there is no way of protecting a tax bill on the floor of the Senate, as there is in the House, through the granting of the traditional closed rule against all amendments by the Rules Committee. The floodgates of Senate-originated tax legislation through improper amendments to House bills have been opened up by both the railroads and the telephone companies in their ill-considered haste to help their own causes. Along with the Senate amendment to cut back the telephone excise tax, another Senate amendment to eliminate the stock-dividend credit almost prevailed. If this had been accomplished, the limited good attained in shifting some investment capital in the private sector of our economy would too quickly have been lost. I know nothing that would have been more damaging to the private-enterprise system if this had occurred. Business should examine congressional procedures and also the composition of the present 25-member House Ways and Means Committee to determine whether it is to their interest to continue to undermine the time-tested and beneficial procedure which vests the taxing powers essentially in the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

To recapitulate, what happens in the 2d session of the 86th Congress which affects business depends greatly upon the economic well-being of the country. It also depends upon what businessmen themselves do or do not do.

There are some small clouds on the horizon which should alert us to the possibility that 1960 will not be the great boom year presently predicted. However, if 1960 does live up to its expectations, I do not believe there will be very much legislation which specifically affects business passed. There will be no tax revision or tax reduction of any consequence. I regret to make this prediction, because I feel very strongly that tax revision is badly needed. Indeed, if basic tax reform does not come soon, we are going to have another recession, largely as a result of our tax structure. The hearings on basic tax reform this year that the Ways and Means Committee has scheduled this fall will be as unproductive legislative-wise as were the hearings the committee held the first session. The Treasury Department still remains unconvinced that there is such a thing as the law of diminishing returns in taxation and looks at each proposed tax revision which lowers a rate or removes an item from the tax base, even though the rate or the item clearly impedes healthy economic growth, as a loss of tax revenue. Even though our knowledge of economics is still quite primitive, surely the gross underestimates and overestimates of Federal revenues by the Treasury Department over a period of years, resulting from its failure to estimate economic growth or recession accurately, should convince Treasury that economic growth alone produces billions of dollars of additional revenue and recession cuts out billions of dollars of revenue.

There is no question in my mind that the Congress will take the interest ceiling off long-term Federal bonds. Possibly we may not even wait for the second session of Congress for this to come about. The money market may become so acute in the next month that a special session will be called to accomplish this purpose. The failure of the Congress to act responsibly in the field of Federal debt management by giving to President Eisenhower the power he requested to sell long-term Federal bonds in the marketplace has produced one of the clouds on the economic horizon that I mentioned.

It is fantastic that the Democratic leaders of the Congress should be willing to risk the economic health of our country in the hopes of maintaining a public image they believe their party has of being against high interest rates. In the first place, if this image exists, it is based upon illusion—not reality—and, therefore, cannot long remain. In the second place, refusing to face up to reality will cause higher interest rates than necessary. The large Federal debts resulting from continued deficit financing cause high interest rates, and further deficit financing will make it worse. Yet, up to the present, a do-nothing course is the one the Democratic leaders of the Congress have steered.

I have mentioned the pressures on the Congress to expand the social security program. There are two basic areas in which the increase will come about: (1) Raising the base wage upon which social security taxes are based. The theory is that since the program was first enacted the average wage in the United States has increased greater than the previous increase made in the social security base wages; (2) extending the coverage to include hospitalization and medical costs (the Forand bill). At the present time I regretfully predict that legislation along both these lines will probably be enacted at the next session of the Congress. Social security taxes will be increased, the increase—as usual—to go into effect after the 1960 elections, the increased benefits to go into effect shortly before. All of this increased tax will, of course, be reflected rather quickly in an increase in the cost of living index.

Inflation is apt to be out in the open before the second session is too far along. In this event stand-by controls over credits and some prices probably will be voted. The President probably would veto the bill and the veto be unsustained.

New Federal appropriations will be stepped up and the Federal expenditure rate will be increased. Through juggled bookkeeping, however, a semblance of a balanced budget will be presented. The net result, however, will be inflationary because expenditures will exceed revenues.

There will probably be some legislation liberalizing the tax treatment on foreign investment, but there will be no extension of the Western Hemisphere Trading Corporation Act with its 14 percent tax differential to others areas of the world.

Regrettably, there still will be no sensible farm program. Nor will there be coordination of the various foreign aid programs. There may be some real steps taken toward military unifications in the procurement and distribution field, but there will be little movement of the Federal Government and, in particular, the military out of the fields of private enterprise they have usurped. Twenty-six and one-half billion dollars of military surpluses will be dumped at the same time we are generating more surpluses through inefficiency and triplicate procurement procedures.

There probably will be a correction of the Small Business Lending Corporation Act to permit holding companies to enter the field. There probably will be an extension of the investment trust tax treatment to include equity holdings in real estate.

There probably will be some increase in minimum wage and some extension of it. After all, this is an election year and the party in control of the Congress will go a long way to smooth down the ruffled feathers of the powerful national labor leaders. The only factor that might change this picture is our export-import picture. Competition in foreign trade is reaching the point where the national labor leaders are becoming concerned about whether our costs will hurt us in the foreign market. The attitude of the labor leaders in Western Europe where competition in the foreign trade market has always been a powerful economic force toward increased labor costs should give us an indication of what the attitude of our own labor leaders might be.

There will be great pressure basically to alter the unemployment compensation program to federalize it. I do not believe this pressure, even under the climate of an election year and the desire to placate the labor leaders, will be sufficient to change a system which has proven to be quite successful in three recessions. However, a downturn in the economy and an upturn in unemployment could rapidly change this picture.

I believe something will come out of the studies the Joint Economic Committee is presently engaged in, into the problems of price stability, maximum employment, and economic growth. My own hopes are that something will be done in the area of anti-trust legislation and not in the area of credit and price controls. I think those who believe in the private enterprise system must recognize that if the marketplace is not kept free and competitive the pressures on the political government to regulate prices administratively are vastly increased. Much is gained through self-discipline, but I find entirely too little self-discipline in our society in all phases of social and economic action.

To sum up, I think the second sessions of the Congress will produce little legislation that will affect business, primarily because President Eisenhower will veto most measures that the Congress would pass through

the political pressures that I have mentioned and, in most instances, I believe the Congress will sustain the vetoes. On the other hand, I believe there are so many basic things that need correction, to recapitulate: Tax laws, farm program, military unification, fiscally sound foreign aid—that business and the economic welfare of the Nation will be adversely affected by the predicted inaction of the second session of the 86th Congress.

Import Restrictions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have discussed with my colleagues here on the Senate floor the problem of excessive oil imports, a matter of continuing concern to this Nation and particularly to my State of Kansas. As you know, following many, many months of careful study and deliberation, President Eisenhower instituted the mandatory oil import program under authority granted him by Congress by the so-called National Defense Amendment—section 8 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958.

The program has now been in operation about 6 months. Although it has not solved all of the problems of the independent oil producer arising from excessive imports, it has reversed the dangerous trends that were leading this Nation down the path of complete dependence on foreign oil.

Not long ago I received a copy of a letter addressed to some of my distinguished colleagues from New England in which the Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, Inc., referred to my remarks made here on the Senate floor regarding the operation of the import program.

The New England group was somewhat critical of my appraisal of the program, particularly as it applies to imports of residual fuel oil.

Understandably, there are differences of opinion on this important issue. For that reason, I wish to place in the RECORD copies of this exchange of correspondence in order that my colleagues may have the benefit of the two points of view. Also I would like to include for the RECORD a recent letter to the membership of the Independent Petroleum Association of America from its general counsel, Russell B. Brown, covering the latest developments on this matter.

Again, let me say that the program has stemmed the tide of excessive oil imports and in my opinion, is serving the overall best interest of the security and welfare of the Nation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 8, 1959.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senator PRESCOTT S. BUSH,
Senate Office Building
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATORS: On page 16 of the August Oil Producer's Independent Petroleum Association of America trade magazine, there appeared an article which referred to both of you specifically.

This article claimed that Senator CARLSON's remarks on the floor of Congress were effective in reducing opposition to the mandatory oil import program, and that New England Congressmen were "reassessing their ideas about the import program." While I feel that you were probably unimpressed, although courteously attentive to the Senator's arguments, I should like to react to it in the hope that, by such, you can more easily substantiate your current position.

Senator CARLSON bases his arguments on the premise that the Presidential order of March 10 is in the best interests of national security.

We in New England do not agree with the premise and feel that the President was misinformed; hence, do not agree with the conclusions which Senator CARLSON reaches.

I should like to reiterate that oil has international significance, and in times of emergency the whole must be considered. Certainly, this is a basic tenet of any discussion of our national security needs.

Several facts indicate that the United States needs healthy available imports equally as much as, if not more than, a government dominated and protected domestic oil industry.

First, to protect our allies, the U.S. oil industry in the past, in cooperation with Venezuela, supplied oil-short Europe with product during the Suez crisis. In the future, it is entirely possible that the United States, especially (being a net importer of petroleum products), may be required to rely heavily upon neighbors for fuel, as they have on us. To ask these neighbors to find new markets now may mean that such fuel may not be available at a future time when we need it most. Obviously, we cannot even now produce all we need, let alone in such an emergency.

Second, so far as the east coast is concerned, it is shorter from Venezuela to Boston than it is from the gulf, and since neither the existing pipeline facilities nor any other means of transport are adequate to carry the needed volume of fuel, it must be concluded that the shortest line may well be the safest, in the interest of national security, so far as the industrial east coast is concerned.

Third, since the United States of America is not living in a vacuum (a fact long acknowledged by expenditures of billions of dollars, starting with the Marshall plan), we must continue to support our neighbors and help their economies flourish. The United States of America encouraged foreign investments by U.S. oil concerns, asked that these concerns be treated equitably, and cannot pull out without disrupting the economies of U.S. citizens and foreign nations.

The biggest apparent contradiction which I find in the Senator's remarks is that he credits the mandatory controls system with increasing U.S. drilling activity (manifestly because producers will get greater dollar recovery because of the import system), then turns and states there has been a net reduction in dollars recovered, and assures readers that Government surveillance will keep prices just and reasonable.

These statements do not appear to be compatible.

I also question the Senator's price analysis. He mentions the average price of all products, say in Boston. I do not know what this is, and anything short of a system whereby the price of each product sold times the number of gallons of products sold at that price in Boston, weighted properly, then grouped by refinery recovery on each product, would seem to be worthless.

I do not know where such sales figures are available on a daily basis, which is what would be needed to do the analysis properly, and I'm not sure that this procedure of adding apples and oranges is significant to the argument.

Looking at his price comparison, I should like to use figures seasonably comparable, rather than taking a February price and company it with a June price. Also, since residual oil now costs New Englanders 10 cents a barrel more today (when there is a glut of oil on the world market) than it did before the import controls (or the Senator's speech), I shall use September 1 figures for the last several years:

No. 6, Boston, tank car: 1953, $2.29; 1954, $2.19; 1955, $2.69; 1956, $2.83; 1957, $2.96; 1958, $2.46; 1959, $2.56.

While the Suez crisis understandably bid the price of No. 6 to a high level, it is equally understandable why after the crisis, under free competition, it would normally seek somewhat lower levels. What is alarming, however, is that No. 6 price should jump 10 cents a barrel between 1958 and 1959, at a time when oil is flowing out of everyone's ears. Clearly, the mandatory program is the basis for the increase.

As to the director of the program determining if price increases are just and proper, I take the liberty of stating that Uncle Sam has been unsuccessful in finding a price that is just and reasonable for the gas producer, since the famous Phillips decision of 1954 (in which 8 prior years of litigation failed to also set successful criteria for judging what is just and reasonable).

This editor sympathizes with the marginal farmer and the oil producer. However, the sympathy should end when we must support marginal operations which cost us so heavily in subsidy and control, which becomes a burden to our total citizenry, and also has the effect of stifling progressive domestic producers who cannot get themselves extricated from Government control and grow normally. This helps neither the producer nor the consumer in the long run.

Cordially,
INDEPENDENT OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION,
WILFRED H. HALL, *Executive Secretary.*

Mr. WILFRED H. HALL,
Executive Secretary, Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, Inc., Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. HALL: I appreciate your sending me a copy of your letter of September 8 to Senator AIKEN and Senator BUSH, wherein you take issue with my contention that the Presidential order of March 10 limiting oil imports is in the best interest of national security.

At the outset, I would like to point out that perhaps no issue has had such careful study and consideration on the part of Government as that of oil imports. You may disagree and it may be that you have information superior to that available to the Government but both the executive branch and the Congress, after several years diligent study, have concluded that it is essential in the interest of national security to encourage the exploratory and development efforts of the domestic petroleum industry and that to do so, it is necessary to place a reasonable limitation on oil imports.

The action taken by the President is extremely moderate. It is not drastic or precipitate in degree. This is evidenced by the fact that total petroleum imports during the last half of this year are estimated to average 1,630,000 barrels daily as compared with 1,750,000 barrels daily for the last 6 months of 1958. It is obvious, therefore, that any contention of drastic effect either here at home or abroad cannot be attributed to the President's oil import program.

In your letter you refer to the United States as "being a net importer of petroleum products," and conclude that as a result the United States in the future may be required to rely upon outside sources for its petroleum requirements. You further state: "Obviously, we cannot even now produce all we need."

It is true that the United States is now a net importer of petroleum products but it is erroneous to conclude that this is evidence that we are not self-sustaining. The fact is that domestic production of crude oil presently is substantially shut-in. Almost 3 million barrels daily, approximately one-third of our productive capacity to produce crude oil, is shut-in for lack of market. This is more than total imports. Of course, no one is advocating that all oil imports be eliminated.

Further in your letter you state: "We must continue to support our neighbors and help their economies flourish." I fully agree with this general proposition but in applying it I feel that we must use a degree of reason. In the first place, the domestic petroleum industry has made a very substantial contribution in carrying out the objective you state. Since World War II oil imports have roughly tripled. An examination of what has happened since 1955 is further revealing. Since then domestic production has been almost static whereas most foreign areas have enjoyed substantial increases. For example, comparing 1958 production with 1955 production, the picture is as follows:

	Percent
United States	−1.5
Venezuela	+20.5
Middle East	+31.0
Far East	+21.5

During this same period, imports into the United States from each of these areas have increased very substantially.

It seems to me that these facts demonstrate that the domestic petroleum industry has made a substantial contribution to the economies of the other oil-producing areas in the world.

You state that you find an apparent contradiction in my statements that U.S. drilling activity has increased since the mandatory oil limtation was imposed and that stability in the producers' market is still lacking. I believe that you will find that these statements are compatible. Statistics indicate that there has been some improvement in drilling activity as reflected by the fact that during 1959 the total wells drilled is some 6 percent above 1958. I am confident that this increase in activity is due to an anticipated improved market situation on the part of oil producers. It is true, however, that so far under the oil import program domestic production has not increased as expected and crude prices have declined. For these reasons, domestic producers have not had the improvement in market outlet which is essential to a sustained expansion of drilling activity.

In your letter you further state that you question my price analysis and cite the fact that residual fuel oil in September 1959 sells in Boston at $2.56 as compared with $2.46 in September 1958. You overlook, however, that the September 1959 price of $2.56 continues to be substantially below the $2.96 price in September 1957, the $2.83 price in September 1956, or the $2.69 price in September 1955. I doubt that you will find many other commodities which are selling substantially below their price of September 1955.

It appears to me that there is ample evidence that the President's oil import program has not operated to impose unreasonable prices upon consumers.

Very truly yours,

FRANK CARLSON.

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C.

To the Members of the Independent Petroleum Association of America:

Despite a marked improvement in general business conditions during the past year, the domestic petroleum industry continues in an unhealthy state. Low production allowables, uneconomic refinery runs, burdensome inventories of refined products and weakening prices are evidence of the industry's problem.

Although the present situation is serious, the outlook is not hopeless. No one doubts the demand for oil will increase in the future. This requres a healthy, expanding industry—not an industry weakened by depressed prices and reduced output.

Looking ahead, there are certain encouraging factors that could provide a basis for a renewed confidence and a further realization of the domestic industry's potential. The problem of burdensome inventories is being corrected by restricting crude oil production, but there is an urgent need for a more realistic level of refinery operations. An improved inventory position and increasing seasonal demands within the next 60 to 90 days should result in a substantial recovery in crude oil production from the present depressed level. It is essential that prices also recover to meet the higher costs of providing additional supplies.

Looking ahead, the mandatory import program is one of the encouraging factors. Under the program for the remaining months of this year, total imports of crude and products are scheduled to be about 200,000 barrels daily less than during the same period last year and at least 500,000 barrels daily below what they would have been had import trends continud.

Experience may prove that the current import limitations are not adequate to accomplish the long-range objective of maintaining a healthy domestic industry. Progress has been made, however, with imports no longer taking an increasing share of the market in the United States.

The need to continue the import program on a firm basis has become increasingly obvious. It is disturbing, therefore, to be faced with widespread attacks on the program and efforts to undermine its effectiveness. During recent weeks, much of this effort has been directed at the limitations on imports of residual fuel oil.

Public statements as to possible shortages of residual fuel oil have been made by officials of importing companies, such as the address last week at the meeting of the Texas Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association by Mr. M. A. Wright, a director of Jersey Standard.

Mr. Wright stated: "The members of the oil industry who are in the heavy fuel oil business anticipate a difficult time in supplying their customers this winter. Present forecasts indicate sizable shortages under the existing import allocations."

One effect of statements such as the one above is to scare the public and thereby lessen confidence in the industry. Here is an official of one of the largest suppliers of this product telling his customers there will be a shortage. A Washington newspaper reported that Mr. Wright had "warned the country" regarding this shortage.

The loss of public confidence from such statements is reflected in the fact that Congressmen and Senators from various New England States have expressed concern as to possible residual fuel oil shortages to President Eisenhower.

I do not believe it is either justifiable or constructive to create fear and doubt in the minds of the consumers as to the ability of the industry to meet our oil requirements, particularly by people who have it within their power to avoid such shortages.

It was both gratifying and commendable that Capt. M. V. Carson, Jr., Oil Import Administrator, quickly pointed out that there is no evidence indicating any shortage will occur.

In report No. 795 of June 11, 1959, I pointed out that the evidence clearly showed there was an ample supply, rather than a shortage, of residual fuel. This was supported by the fact that residual fuel prices had declined by 20 to 30 percent during the past 2 years. Developments since June substantiate the conclusion that adequate supplies of residual are available under the import program. Further, these developments support the Government's policy of maintaining the limitations on imports of this product.

For example, prices of residual fuel continue at relatively low levels. This is reflected in the following table:

U.S. refinery market	Residual fuel oil prices per barrel				
	Feb. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1958	Feb. 1, 1959	June 1, 1959	Sept. 1, 1959
Gulf coast	$2.75	$2.35	$2.00	$2.00	$2.00
New York	3.30	2.75	2.37	2.37	2.37
Midwest (group 3)	2.45	1.45	1.90	1.60	1.40
California	2.70	2.70	2.15	2.15	2.15

Source: Platt's Oilgram Price Service.

These low prices are inconsistent with the existence, or even the threat, of shortages. Likewise, inventories of residual fuel oil are adequate. In fact, these inventories exceed the "desirable" levels as submitted to the Texas Railroad Commission by the executives of 24 companies including Jersey Standard last March. This testimony showed a desired level of about 50 million barrels of residual fuel stocks as of November 1, 1959. Actual inventories on September 11, when residual stocks normally are less than on November 1, amounted to 59 million barrels, or 9 million barrels above the consensus of the 24 companies as well as Jersey's own estimate.

Imports of residual fuel oil during July (the latest month for which official figures are available, provide further evidence that there is no threat of shortage or need to increase import quotas. In that month, according to a recent analysis by the Interior Department, less than 12 percent of the total allocation for the last 6 months was imported. In contrast, July imports amounted to 14 percent of the 6-month total import volume in 1957 and 1958. In other words, imports of residual fuel oil have been less than normal. This indicates there was no fear on the part of importing companies at that time of any impending shortage.

Finally, the basic purpose and underlying intent of the import program is the assurance of adequate supplies of all petroleum products for the American consumer. The program specifically guards against shortages or unreasonable prices.

There are means within the current program which assure petroleum consumers of adequate supplies at reasonable prices. They are:

1. A provision which gives the Government flexibility on a month-to-month basis to review the existing residual fuel oil allocations and revise them upward or downward as demand increases or declines.

2. Importing companies can bring in more low gravity crude and process it for a higher yield of residual.

3. As Captain Carson stated, companies which have imported their maximum under the Government's allocation could, should a spot deficiency occur, purchase residual from other importers or domestic refiners.

We have suggested that, if and when circumstances might change so as to justify increased imports of residual fuel, it would be desirable to provide that each importer having an allocation to import crude oil would have the option to import residual fuel on a barrel-for-barrel basis to be charged against his crude oil allocation. The large importers of crude oil (who generally are the large suppliers of residual) would then be in a position to provide additional residual fuel at any time at reasonable prices.

The fundamental problem today is surplus, not shortages, depressed prices, not unreasonable prices. Restoring the industry to a healthy condition, capable of meeting the increasing demands of the future, is the real matter that should be of mutual concern to industry, Government, and the general public.

Very truly yours,

RUSSELL B. BROWN,
General Counsel.

The United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space: Accomplishments and Implications for Legal Problems

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under leave to extend my remarks, I present an address given by Mrs. Eilene Galloway, special consultant of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, at the 10th Annual Congress of the International Astronautical Federation. The address was given at the second space law colloquium held on September 4, 1959, Lincoln's Inn, London, England.

The address follows:

THE UNITED NATIONS AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE: ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR LEGAL PROBLEMS

(An address by Eilene Galloway, special consultant, Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, U.S. Senate, presented at the 10th Annual Congress, International Astronautical Federation, Space Law Colloquium, Lincoln's Inn, London, England, September 4, 1959)

THE CHALLENGE TO THE LEGAL AND SCIENTIFIC PROFESSIONS

Since the International Astronautical Federation held its first colloquium on the law of outer space at The Hague in 1958, historic steps have been taken by the United Nations toward the objective of an orderly development of the international forces released by the space age. It is important to include an account of these recent U.N. activities in the proceedings of the second space law colloquium because of their significance both to the IAF as an organization and to its members as individuals.

That the talents of lawyers and scientists should be brought to bear simultaneously upon the problems of outer space was recognized by the United Nations in its first organized approach to this subject. The work was facilitated by the solid background of analysis which the international legal and scientific professions had furnished through the years. The foresight revealed in the studies on space law which were published during the decade prior to the launching of the first earth satellite meant that future courses of action could be charted with much greater assurance than would otherwise have been possible. Close coordination between scientists and lawyers enabled the working committees of the United Nations to estimate the probable consequences of successful space exploration for mankind as a whole.

The need for foresighted thinking directed toward the rational solution of space age problems will continue to be a challenge to individuals and organizations during a period of rapid scientific and technological progress. Laws, treaties, and conventions could restrict or encourage space projects. Unregulated activities could ultimately defeat their own ends in vital segments of space activities, e.g., in the use of radio frequencies for obtaining satellite data. The protection of the common interest of mankind in space activities will require continuous and harmonious working relationships between the professions of science and law.

If we are to make a maximum contribution toward the solution of these problems during the forthcoming year, we must know what progress has been made thus far; what questions require study and analysis on a priority basis; and how we can work effectively through official and recognized nongovernmental organizations to achieve the benefits of international cooperation.

UNITED NATIONS AD HOC COMMITTEE ON THE PEACEFUL USES OF OUTER SPACE

On December 13, 1958, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution establishing the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space.[1] The common interest of mankind in the exploration of outer space was recognized, and the use of this new environment for peaceful purposes was stressed. The General Assembly especially wished "to avoid the extension of present national rivalries into this new field" and commended the pattern of scientific cooperation so successfully developed in the program of the International Geophysical Year. Attention was called to the provision of article 2, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Charter which provides that "the Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members." The point of view of the General Assembly was that the most complete information concerning the problems involved in the peaceful uses of outer space would have to be obtained before specific programs could be recommended.[2]

The membership of the ad hoc committee represented 18 nations from widely distributed parts of the globe: Argentine, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Sweden, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. The committee was requested to submit its report to the 14th General Assembly whose meeting would be held in New York in the autumn of 1959. Full information was requested on the following subjects:

(a) The activities and resources of the United Nations, its specialized agencies and of other international bodies relating to the peaceful uses of outer space;

(b) The area of international cooperation and programs in the peaceful uses of outer space which could appropriately be undertaken under United Nations auspices to the benefit of states irrespective of the state of their economic or scientific development, taking into account the following proposals, among others:

(i) Continuation on a permanent basis of the outer space research now being carried on within the framework of the International Geophysical Year;

(ii) Organization of mutual exchange and dissemination of information on outer space research; and

(iii) Coordination of national research programs for the study of outer space, and the rendering of all possible assistance and help toward their realization.

(c) The future organizational arrangements to facilitate international cooperation in this field within the framework of the United Nations;

(d) The nature of legal problems which may arise in the carrying out of programs to explore outer space.[3]

The Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and Poland decided not to participate in the work of the committee, the reason advanced by the Soviet delegate, Mr. Sobolev, being that "its membership has a one-sided character and is not consistent with an objective consideration of this important problem." He thought the ad hoc committee could not undertake any practical tasks without Soviet participation and that as a consequence not a single step forward would have been taken in a year's time.

The U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, replied that—

"The composition of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space is more than fair to the Soviet Union and its adherents, and, in spite of the differences which have developed, we still hope that the Soviet Union will recognize these facts and ultimately decide to participate. The work of the committee will proceed in any event, but we hope that it can proceed cooperatively.

"The proposed ad hoc committee has important work before it. The Soviet Union can make a great and unique contribution to its work. In spite of the differences which the Assembly has witnessed here tonight, we still hope that the Soviet Union will not withhold the great contribution which it can make to international cooperation in this field. The United States, for its part, pledges wholehearted cooperation in the future work of this committee."[4]

By the time the ad hoc committee began its work on May 6, 1959, the United Arab Republic and India declined to participate in the study and formulation of the report requested by the General Assembly. Disappointment regarding this situation was expressed by a number of representatives of the 13 nations engaged in collecting factual information, and they hoped that the absent members would ultimately decide to join in the effort to lay the cornerstone for international cooperation in space exploration.

The ad hoc committee elected Dr. Koto Matsudaira (Japan), as its chairman, and Dr. Mario Amadeo (Argentina), vice chairman. Mr. Joseph Nisot (Belgium), was elected rapporteur. To facilitate the proceedings, two committees of the whole were established: the technical committee with Dr. D. C. Rose (Canada), as chairman, and the legal committee whose chairman was Prof. Antonio Ambrosini (Italy). These committees held altogether 25 meetings during which working papers and discussions resulted in separate reports on the problems under study. The Secretary-General submitted a report on United Nations organisational resources and activities considered pertinent to the studies under way. After careful consideration of all this information, the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space was adopted unanimously on June 25, 1959.[5]

Footnotes at end of speech.

PROBLEMS OF ORGANIZATION

The legal problems of outer space, which are of primary concern to those participating in the space law colloquium, are an integral part of the total international space situation which also includes science, technology, and appropriate organizational arrangements. The facts in these related fields must be obtained before the area which can be regulated by international law can be determined. For example, the high-priority problem of allocation of radio frequencies to space vehicles requires the simultaneous collation of facts concerning the technical limits of the radio spectrum, the most suitable form of international organization for handling the assignment of frequencies, and the practicability of devising regulations to which national governments will adhere.

The task of determining the most appropriate type of international organization for handling outer space problems is similar to that of a nation faced with the necessity of organizing its own internal resources for exploration. The main requirement in both cases is that of coordinating existing facilities, resources, and personnel before adding whatever elements may be lacking in order to achieve specific space objectives.

Coordination is the key organization problem because space exploration depends upon the successful combination of scientific and engineering disciplines which were organized in various patterns within nations and on an international scale long before the advent of the space age. There is no separately identifiable space science which dictates its own easily organized national or international institution; instead, there are new applications and developments of known disciplines: physics, chemistry, astronomy, physiology, and psychology, each of which includes many specialized branches. In addition, there are engineering problems whose solution also depends upon bringing together and expanding a number of technological fields.

In connection with this complicated situation, the U.N. ad hoc committee had two directives from the General Assembly to study and report on existing and future organizational arrangements for international cooperation in space activities for peaceful purposes.

Under the directive to explore "The activities and resources of the United Nations, of its specialized agencies and of other international bodies relating to the peaceful uses of outer space," the ad hoc committee surveyed both nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations.

The major scientific fields concerned with experimentation in outer space were found to be already organized in a number of nongovernmental unions designed to promote and coordinate research, exchange information, and publish reports. Coming within this category are:

International Astronomical Union (IAU).

International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics (IUGG).

International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC).

International Scientific Radio Union (URSI).

International Union of Pure and Applied Physics (IUPAP).

International Union of Biological Sciences (IUBS).

International Union of Theoretical and Applied Mechanics (IUTAM).

International Union of Physiological Sciences (IUPS).

International Union of Biochemistry (IUB).

The International Union of Mathematics (IUM) was found by the Committee to have some interest in space research, while three of the unions were not included in the space field: the International Geographical Union (IGU), International Union of Crystallography (IUCr), and the International Union of the History of Science (IUHS).[6]

The International Council of Scientific Unions, whose General Assembly is composed of national representatives from 45 nations as well as from 13 scientific unions, has successfully demonstrated its capacity to coordinate voluntary scientific activities on a worldwide scale. The ICSU maintains relations with national governments represented on its Council, and also with the United Nations, particularly the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) from which it receives an annual grant of approximately $200,000.

The outstanding results of the International Geophysical Year, particularly the space research program and type of organization followed by the Special Committee for the IGY (CSAGI) are evidence of what can be accomplished by a nongovernmental institution such as ICSU which draws its strength from highly professional and enthusiastic individuals. The continuation of this work has been provisionally entrusted by the International Council of Scientific Unions (until December 31, 1959) to the Committee on Space Research (COSPAR) whose purpose is "to provide the world scientific community with the means whereby it may exploit the possibilities of satellites and space probes of all kinds for scientific purposes, and exchange the resulting data on a cooperative basis."[7]

The ad hoc committee considered that three nongovernmental organizations which do not have an affiliation with ICSU are of significance to the development of international space activities: The Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS), the Union of International Engineering Organizations (UAIT), and the International Astronautical Federation (IAF). Of the latter, the committee report states:

"The International Astronautical Federation (IAF) was founded in 1950 by representatives of a number of national societies interested in rocketry and space exploration meeting in the first International Astronautical Congress. The constitution of the IAF, adopted in 1952, states that the purposes of the organization are to promote and stimulate the achievement of space flight as a peaceful objective, to secure the widespread dissemination of technical information, to stimulate public interest in space flight through the major media of mass communication, and to foster research and development."[8]

When we add to the nongovernmental organizations the list of those intergovernmental agencies whose work is essential or related to the full development of space activities, it is even more evident that coordination is the key requirement of organization in this field. In accordance with its charter, the United Nations has developed numerous methods of promoting the harmonious solution of international economic and social problems, including those of a scientific nature.

Joint programs have been promoted and developed by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, and the Secretary-General. From the coordination of the activities of specialized agencies there may emerge substantive proposals which enable the General Assembly to carry out its responsibility for the development and codification of international law.

The ad hoc committee concluded that the intergovernmental organizations which now have a substantial interest in space activities are as follows:

United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

World Meteorological Organization (WMO).

International Telecommunication Union (ITU), and its two technical committees:

International Telegraph and Telephone Consultative Committee (CCIT).

International Radio Consultative Committee (CCIR).

International Civil Aviation Organization.

Those organizations which do not now have space programs but are likely to develop related projects in the future are:

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

World Health Organization (WHO).

Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO).[9]

A detailed study of any one of these organizations reveals that the problems relating to the exploration of outer space (and to its use for peaceful purposes only) are integral parts of programs which include many other factors. Outer space has simply been added as a new environment into which existing and projected human activities are being extended. For example, the World Meteorological Organization was already engaged in establishing a network of stations for observations, in promoting standardization, and in applying the benefits of more effective weather data to shipping, aviation, and agriculture. As the ad hoc committee indicated, "The existing WMO concern and responsibility in the design of codes for the worldwide exchange of data and the coordination of meteorological telecommunications could readily be extended to deal with satellite data."[10]

Similarly, the International Telecommunication Union has been engaged for some years in drafting regulations for the use of all forms of radio communication whether by telegraphy or telephone, television, or radar. Since rockets and earth satellites equipped with radio transmitters may cause interference, or be interferred with, in communications, it is inevitable that the function of allocating radio frequencies must be extended from existing facilities to include the new projects designed for outer space.

The logical spheres of activity in space research of each intergovernmental and nongovernmental organization cannot be divided into neat compartments because they are interrelated and constantly producing reactions upon each other. Many of these reactions are the natural result of rapid advances in the applications of science and technology; others stem from scientific facts to which adjustments must be made in determining effective organizational structures and practicable international law.

In considering the future organizational arrangements which could be undertaken within the framework of the United Nations, the ad hoc committee concluded that this was neither the time to establish a new autonomous intergovernmental agency nor would it be practicable to delegate the overall task to one of the existing specialized organizations. The continuance of present procedures was favored, together with the suggestion that information on space activities be included in the reports of the specialized organizations to the United Nations.

For the present, the report suggested that the General Assembly might wish to establish a committee whose membership and terms of reference would be similar to those of the ad hoc committee. In addition, the Secretary-General could create a small representative unit of experts within the Secretariat as a focal point for studying ways and means of bringing about international cooperation and resolving legal problems.

RESULTS OF THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

It is significant that even that portion of the report of the ad hoc committee which

---

Footnotes at end of speech.

was primarily devoted to the scientific and technical aspects of the peaceful uses of outer space also emphasized problems of organization. Almost half of the final report was based upon the study and survey made by the Technical Committee which had been given the task of delineating what programs could appropriately be undertaken by the United Nations with particular reference to continuation of the IGY-type of space research, mutual exchange and dissemination of information, and coordination of national research programs in outer space.

There are many scientific and technological characteristics of space activities which create an actual requirement for organized international effort. Cooperation is not only a desirable objective in promoting worldwide understanding and peaceful relations, but also a necessity if certain objective experiments are to result in specific applications for the benefit of mankind. With the substance of such matters we must become entirely familiar if we are to develop a body of law and regulations for their control.

The orbits of earth satellites are truly international paths, not limited by national boundary lines and yet affecting all nations in the uses of outer space and the problems thereby created. The people of all lands have a stake in the improvement of weather forecasting, radio communications, geodetic and mapping surveys, navigation satellites, manned space flight and exploration.

The nature of the scientific and technical problems underscores the need for international arrangements for their orderly development. Tracking stations must be located in many places on the face of the earth if data is to be effectively received and efficiently evaluated. The ad hoc committee has pointed out that "No single country extends over a sufficient range of latitude and longitude to be able to track earth satellites adequately from its own stations." [11]

The limitation of the radio spectrum is perhaps the outstanding scientific fact which dictates the necessity for agreement between nations on practicable controls for radio frequencies. The judgment of the ad hoc committee, based upon the findings of its technical committee, is that "* * * the availability of radio frequencies which will not be interfered with by terrestrial radio transmissions is a matter of life and death to the progress of space activities." [12]

International consideration must be given to the problems of reentry and recovery, especially of manned space vehicles. The return of equipment to the launching nation will require some type of agreement, as will the necessity for identifying space vehicles, determining liability for damage, and preventing contamination of celestial bodies.

The committee report emphasizes that progress in space exploration depends upon the contributions of experts in science, engineering, and supporting research fields wherever they may be found throughout the world. No nation could have a monopoly on space activities which depend upon many types of participation, some of which do not require the great economic effort involved in launching vehicles, e.g., the design and production of equipment for satellites, tracking facilities, and analysis of findings. The committee also recognized—

"That the great forward surge of space activities may also tend to widen the gap between the technologically advanced nations actively launching vehicles into space and other nations watching and wishing to take part in space activities, but feeling unable to do so. The problem is to make available and to exploit the possibilities that exist for participation by nations at all levels of development, from supporting research or operation of tracking stations to launching small vehicles or joining with others in more advanced undertakings. A related problem lies in arranging the sharing of basic scientific information and topical data so that widespread participation is possible." [13]

The conclusions derived from the study of technical subjects are concerned with the ways and means by which we can achieve an orderly future development of all the factors essential for success. In summary form, the conclusions which will be presented to the General Assembly for determination are as follows:

1. An international agency for outer space is not yet needed, but international cooperation and coordination of existing resources, facilities, and personnel should be encouraged and supported by the United Nations.

2. Immediate international action is required in the allocation of radio frequencies for space vehicles. This should be accomplished by the International Telecommunication Union and the states which are members of the 1959 Administrative Radio Conference in order to assure adequate bandwidths for the next 3 years. The ITU should also study such problems in connection with communications satellites.

3. An international center related to the United Nations is needed to serve as a focal point for cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space.

4. The United Nations should review progress and plans in this field in approximately 1 year.

5. International cooperation in the conduct of space activities can be achieved in such areas as the use of radio frequencies, central registration of orbital elements to identify space vehicles, termination of radio transmissions which are no longer needed, destruction of recovery of spent satellites, identification of space vehicles, the return of equipment to launching nations, and avoidance of the dangers inherent in the contamination of celestial bodies.

6. International cooperation in joint projects could be furthered by programs which would emphasize simultaneous launchings of sounding rockets; international use of launching ranges; the creation of international launching centers for sounding rockets; contributions from the scientists of many nations in the instrumentation of satellites; international systems for tracking and telemetering, data processing, interpretation of data and its exchange; educational programs of the type in which UNESCO has had great experience; sponsorship by the United Nations or ICSU of an international team to launch satellites and space probes; using world data centers for space information; and encouragement of national committees on space activities in individual nations.

7. The areas of space activity in which international cooperation should be strengthened include the development of national scientific capabilities; improvements in the exchange of information; the encouragement of individual specialists and ororganizations; support of programs whereby nations launching satellites could include space experiments of other countries; and the development of space activities by established intergovernmental agencies so that they may become increasingly subject to international agreements.

It is apparent even from this greatly reduced and concentrated list of subjects that the technical committee provided a thorough background for problems of organization and the law of outer space.[14]

RESULTS OF THE LEGAL COMMITTEE

Under the chairmanship of Mr. Ambrosini (Italy), the legal committee held five meetings, considered the working papers which were submitted by the delegations from Italy, Mexico, and the United States, and maintained a liaison with the technical committee as well as with various representatives of specialized organizations with space programs. The final report of the legal committee was incorporated into that of the ad hoc committee and unanimously approved on June 25, 1959.[15]

The task of the legal committee was to analyze and submit to the full committee "The nature of legal problems which may arise in the carrying out of programs to explore outer space." This assignment was necessarily related to the terms of reference of the entire resolution passed by the General Assembly (1348, XIII), and therefore was concerned solely with the peaceful uses of outer space. There was considerable discussion, however, as to just what would be involved in reporting adequately on this matter, and three points of view were put forward.

One viewpoint was that the committee should confine itself to identifying and listing legal problems without offering solutions.

A second school of thought favored adding to the list the reasons why the problems were significant and arranging them in order of priority.

A third view was that legal problems could be studied in accordance with general principles of justice from which deductions could be made and applied to specific space laws.

The prevailing opinion was that the committee should proceed with caution and patience, Mr. Ambrosini pointing out that "the legal committee, by the very nature of its functions, would not be working on as firm a basis as would the technical committee, especially as the sphere of work assigned to it was often affected by political considerations." [16] The lack of sufficient experience and scientific information was given as the reason for not being too ambitious. There emerged a consensus that since it was obviously impossible to define all the legal space problems that might arise, the committee would proceed by identifying and classifying problems on a priority basis, distinguishing between those which would respond to early treatment and those whose solution appeared to be in the more distant future. Furthermore, it was decided that the determination of priorities would include some analysis of how the problems could be met, but would not involve recommendations for their solution.

Some general observations were made by the committee which considered that the United Nations Charter and the Statute of the International Court of Justice were not confined to the earth and that their provisions could be extended to include activities in outer space. Special attention was called to the fact that the United Nations is based upon the sovereign equality of all its members and that the General Assembly had expressly resolved that international space programs for peaceful uses should be considered in connection with the benefit of States irrespective of the state of their economic or scientific development.

Opinion was unanimous regarding the necessity for studying the principles and procedures which apply to the sea and to airspace in order to determine their relevancy for outer space regulation. Various types of space activities by governments and private groups might engender different kinds of legal problems—administrative, procedural, and regulatory.

There was a firm commitment to the idea that it is neither practicable nor desirable at the present time to devise a comprehensive code of space law. The committee report stated that "* * * the rule of law is neither dependent upon, nor assured by, comprehensive codification and that premature codification might prejudice subsequent efforts to develop the law based on a more complete understanding of the practical problems in-

Footnotes at end of speech.

volved." [11] At the same time, it is necessary to keep the law in pace with the facts and to insure close cooperation between scientists and lawyers. The committee suggested that its list of legal problems should continually be reviewed by whatever means the General Assembly should deem fitting.

Six problems were listed by the committee as being susceptible of priority treatment.

First, the committee came to the conclusion that the satellite programs of the International Geophysical Year were based upon the premise that nations had permission to launch such vehicles even though they traversed an orbit above national boundary lines. It was concluded, therefore, that within the context of strictly peaceful uses, "with this practice, there may have been initiated the recognition or establishment of a generally accepted rule to the effect that, in principle, outer space is, on conditions of equality, freely available for exploration and use by all in accordance with existing or future international law or agreements." [12]

Second, the problem of liability for injury or damage caused by space vehicles raised a number of legal questions. Answers are needed to such questions as the type of injury and kind of conduct which should establish liability. Should the fact that damage occurred on land, in airspace, or in outer space be a governing factor? Should a launching nation be liable for unlimited damages? Should joint international projects carry with them liability that is joint or several? On the question of who will determine liability and insure payment for damages, the committee considered that study of an agreement providing for compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice should be given priority. Also, the experience of the International Civil Aviation Organization on such matters should be analyzed to determine to what extent the Convention on Damage Caused by Foreign Aircraft to Third Parties on the Surface could be applied to space vehicles.

Third, the problem of the allocation of radio frequencies to space vehicles follows the scientific and technological evaluation of this important matter. The legal committee called attention to the fact that the International Telecommunication Union is already qualified to function in this area, and that documents concerning frequencies for earth satellites will be considered by the Administrative Radio Conference of the ITU which opened in Geneva on August 17, 1959, for meetings which are expected to last for several months.

Fourth, the avoidance of interference between space vehicles and aircraft is a problem whose legal implications require early study by governments.

Fifth, the identification and registration of space vehicles and the coordination of launchings would necessarily imply the formulation of rules and regulations of vital interest to the legal community.

Sixth, the reentry and landing of space vehicles will create the necessity of making arrangements with nations affected by the descent and landing. Multilateral agreements would be desirable to take care of situations involving accidental landings. The committee also thought that the rules of international law which now apply to aircraft landing in distress might also be made applicable to space vehicles.

In addition to these six top-priority problems, the committee analyzed a number of other areas which can be expected to involve legal measures. Official definitions of airspace and outer space were deemed premature at this time, and the committee believed that the problems to which it had given highest priority did not depend for their solution on a legal distinction between these two areas in the space environment. It was suggested, however, that one approach to the problem would be to establish the limits of airspace and outer space within a practicable range. Another idea which could be explored is use of the type of space activity as a basis for legal control.

The legal questions which might arise in the exploration of celestial bodies were not ranked with high-priority problems at this time, but a number of interesting suggestions for meeting this situation were advanced: That sovereignty should not be claimed by a nation over celestial bodies; that such areas should be used solely for mankind's benefit; and that an international administration might handle such matters.

The committee believed there was not much present danger in space vehicles interfering with each other, but thought this was a future possibility. The rules and regulations which now apply to air traffic might be related to space travel.

And, finally, the committee thought that international legal measures might be required to handle technological achievements, particularly in the case of meteorological satellites.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE LEGAL PROFESSION

The ad hoc committee report has made a significant contribution toward the orderly development of science and law in the peaceful uses of outer space. From this report scientists and engineers can be apprised of the legal problems incident to space exploration; and the legal profession has been given the latest scientific and technological evaluations to assist in advancing solutions to present and future problems. Both groups may profit from the description and analysis of the international organizations now operating in this field and determine ways in which coordination can best be achieved.

The report has delineated a rich field for research and analysis which can be of practical value to the International Astronautical Federation in considering the appointment of committees to study the problems of space law. The way is also open for individuals to contribute their thinking to the first historic guidelines for international cooperation in outer space.

The main legal problems which might arise in space exploration and require study directed toward their solution have been identified:

1. To what extent is the recognized international law of the sea and in airspace analogous to the problems of outer space, and in what ways is the space environment unique?

2. What can we learn from the administrative and procedural methods of existing intergovernmental organizations which might have an application to space activities?

3. How can it be determined whether the practices established and observed by the International Geophysical Year may have resulted in international recognition of the freedom of outer space for exploration under present and future international law?

4. What are the advantages and disadvantages of the various proposals made for the solution of the problem of liability for injury or damage caused by space vehicles?

5. Should the International Court of Justice be given compulsory jurisdiction over disputes between nations concerning liability for damage from space vehicles?

6. Is the experience of the International Civil Aviation Organization concerning surface damage caused by aircraft applicable to space vehicles?

7. What contributions can be made by the legal profession to the International Telecommunication Union in dealing with the problem of allocation of radio frequencies to space vehicles?

8. What proposals can be made for the solution of the problem of interference between aircraft and space vehicles?

9. What legal factors are involved in the identification and registration of space vehicles and the coordination of launchings, both for individual nations and for international arrangements?

10. What rules of existing international law might govern the legal problems which are likely to arise in the reentry and landing of space vehicles? What are the areas in which new substantive agreements between nations may be needed?

11. Is there a requirement in terms of national sovereignty for differentiating between airspace and outer space, and, if so, what are the advantages and disadvantages of the various proposals which can be advanced to meet this problem?

12. What are the international legal implications of the task required for the formulation of safeguards against contamination of celestial bodies and the earth as a result of space exploration?

13. What is the relation of the concepts of national sovereignty to the exploration and exploitation of outer space, and what proposals would have to be considered in arriving at a solution of the problems involved?

14. What legal arrangements of administration, regulation and control would be involved in meeting the problem of coordinating existing international organizations which have space programs or whose activities can logically be extended to include space activities?

---

[1] Resolution 1348 (XIII), Dec. 13, 1958.
[2] U.N. Doc. C.1/L.200/Rev. 1; adopted in committee I on Nov. 24, 1958, by a vote of 54 to 9 with 18 abstentions and in plenary session on Dec. 13, 1958 by a vote of 53 to 9 with 19 abstentions.
[3] Ibid.
[4] "The Peaceful Uses of Outer Space." United Nations Review, January 1959, pp. 10–12, 75–79.
[5] U. N. Doc. A–4141, July 14, 1959. 76 p.
[6] Ibid, p. 7–8.
[7] Ibid., p. 10.
[8] Ibid., p. 14.
[9] Ibid., p. 16–26.
[10] Ibid., p. 21.
[11] Ibid., p. 42.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid., p. 29.
[14] U.N. Doc. A/AC.98/3, June 11, 1959, 37 p. U.N. Doc. A/4141, July 14, 1959, pp. 27–60.
[15] U.N. Doc. A/AC.98/C.2/SR.1, June 30, 1959; A/AC.98/C.2/SR2, June 30, 1959; A/AC.98/C.2/SR.3, June 30, 1959; A/AC.98/C.2/SR.4, July 17, 1959; A/AC.98/C.2/SR.5, July 17, 1959; A/AC.98/C.2/L.1, June 9, 1959; A/AC.98/2, June 12, 1959. Working papers: Italy A/AC.98/L.6, May 21, 1959; Mexico A/AC.98/L.8, May 30, 1959; United States A/AC.98/L.7, May 27, 1959. Part III on Legal Problems, Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space A/4141, July 14, 1959, pp. 61–70.
[16] U.N. Doc. A/AC.98/2, June 12, 1959, p. 1.
[17] U.N. Doc. A/4141, July 14, 1959, p. 63.
[18] Ibid., p. 64.

The Fight in 1959 for Freedom of Information

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the year 1959 saw the present administration

carry secrecy to unprecedented lengths. Officials in the executive branch far down the administrative line from the President have taken it upon themselves to deny information requested by Congress and its agent, the Comptroller General. The denials were in violation of duly enacted laws, including the Budget and Accounting Acts of 1921 and 1950 and the mutual security authorization of 1959. Administration officials, with increasing frequency during the year, claimed a privilege beyond the law to determine what information Congress—and therefore the public and the press—shall have about the operations of executive departments and agencies.

Congress, and the House Government Information Subcommittee in particular, have been challenging administration officials to cite statutory authority for withholding information. In many documented cases, information has been released after it was shown that there was no authority for secrecy. Such progress, slow and painstaking, has been recorded in reports of the House Government Operations Committee based on the subcommittee's work.

At the same time, however, officials, unable to produce statutory authority for the secrecy they are imposing, have found it handy to claim an undefined, unlimited "privilege." Research has shown conclusively that such a sweeping claim is recognized by neither the Constitution, the statutes, nor the courts.

Administration officials argue that the only information they withhold is advisory material, consisting of "personal opinions." How a document, written by a Federal official as part of his official job, can be a personal matter has never been explained. Nevertheless, subcommittee hearings have shown that information withheld from the Comptroller General included blank forms and the table of contents of a report on procurement activities of the Military Sea Transportation Service. By no stretch of the imagination can such material be considered personal opinions to be hidden from congressional or public view for fear that the official involved may be inhibited from expressing the truth as he sees it. The doctrine of secrecy has been extended so far that the head of the International Cooperation Administration which administers the foreign aid program testified that he believed he could withhold from Congress any document in possession of his agency.

Unfortunately, the most flagrant abuses of the claim of privilege have occurred when Congress has sought to examine the efficiency in the use of tax funds in the field of defense, space research, and foreign aid—each an area of immense importance and immense cost.

Fortunately, Congress served notice this year that it will no longer tolerate the unbridled imposition of secrecy by thousands of satellite presidents in the executive departments and agencies. The Mutual Security Appropriations Act of 1960 provides that if information is refused about a foreign aid project, funds for that project will be cut off automatically unless the President personally supports the refusal and sets forth his reasons for so doing. This is but a first step in the reassertion of the constitutional rights which are basic to a democratic society and a representative form of government. But it does place the issue of secrecy squarely in the hands of the President. What he does about it will determine whether the Government of the United States follows the constitutional principles or whether Congress must take further, more drastic steps to prevent government in secret.

Foote & Jenks, of Jackson, Mich., Celebrate 75th Anniversary—One of Nation's Oldest Flavor Houses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this year represents the 75th anniversary of one of Michigan's outstanding firms, Foote & Jenks, Inc., of Jackson, Mich. Foote & Jenks was founded in 1884 and is not only one of Michigan's oldest manufacturing concerns, but one of the Nation's oldest flavor houses serving the food and drug and beverage industries of the Nation.

We in Michigan are proud of the outstanding long service of this firm. I ask unanimous consent that there should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief history and outline and description of the work of this famous concern.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME EARLY HISTORY

Two enterprising young men, Charles E. Foote and Charles C. Jenks, graduate pharmacists from the University of Michigan, pooled their modest savings and opened a retail drug store in Jackson, Mich., in 1884. This was the beginning, modest to be sure, but these were men of vision, restless and energetic, made of the stuff that forecasts progress and growth.

They found their great interest to lie in the backroom, rather than behind the counter and it was there that they began the first experiments and discoveries which led to the existence of the present firm of Foote & Jenks, Inc.

The ensuing 75 years has seen the realization of a dream in the best American tradition of free enterprise. The founders invested their young manhood, their energy, and what little money they had in this small business. They hopefully looked beyond its walls. They followed their noses into the perfume business and through it into the flavor field. In doing so they got themselves into the complicated and difficult realm of the manufacturing business, with help to pay, inventory to finance, and competition to conquer. Their early struggles are a matter of record and the business today is a monument to their imagination, their ambition, and their sacrifice.

RESEARCH BRINGS PROGRESS

For 46 years the original building, plus a multiplicity of rented warehouse spaces, housed the firm while its stature grew 10 times. In 1947 the business was moved into America's newest and finest manufacturing laboratories, a spacious one-floor, day-lighted brick and glass building, with its own sidetrack facility, set in beautifully landscaped grounds which provide space for plant additions as wanted.

In this building are to be found the most up-to-date instrumentation, automatic equipment, and custom-built machinery existing anywhere in the flavor industry. Consistent and constant improvement of equipment is reflected in complete changes in tankage facilities which were once entirely of wood, become all glass-lined metal, then became wholly monel metal and, today, are 100 percent stainless steel.

Production machinery in the manufacturing laboratories includes high-speed colloid mills, homogenizers of 3,500 pounds capacity, ultrasonic emulsifying devices which were the first to be used for the purpose in America, an ion exchange water purification system, 10-ton refrigeration connected to hermetically sealed agitation chambers, power and gravity filtering equipment, and power and gravity conveyors to all warehouse areas.

Production is governed by a control laboratory, the instrumentation of which is modern right up to the point of the newest chromatographic analysis devices. In this laboratory batch samples of every product are retained on file until evidence exists that the batch has completely passed into customer's food and beverage products and has been consumed with gusto by the American people.

Development and research activities are a daily, monthly, yearly, and "forever must" in the research laboratory. Inclusion of ample funds for this activity in budget thinking has made the company pioneers in the production of new flavors as well as in the consistent improvement in form of old favorites—as required by the constantly growing and improving industries which provide the country's foods and beverages.

The management attitude toward constant change and improvement and its acceptance of modern methods is reflected in office operations where every department is fully equipped with up-to-the-minute business machines, including a punchcard operation which provides source material for electronic integrated data processing.

THE CORPORATE STRUCTURE

The founders incorporated the business in 1893 and established the policy of employee ownership and management which endures to this day. Ownership in the form of shares of stock is vested entirely among current employees. Directors of the company are elected by the employees and the board of directors elects the officers. Individual length of service of employees ranges from 1 year to 40 years with a current average tenure of 16 years. Employees share in profits, stock dividends, and in benefits provided by the company in the form of group insurance and pension plans.

THE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Paul W. Thurston, who was hired by the founders in 1919 to wash bottles, rose through shipping, purchasing, advertising and sales activities to the presidency in 1957. He is the third president of the company, succeeding H. L. Jenks, retired in 1957 who in turn succeeded C. E. Foote, one of the founders.

John L. Laughlin, vice president, research and development began in 1940 as a laboratory assistant and became the corporate officer in charge of the department in 1957. He is a charter member and a director of the Institute of Soft Drink Technicians, a member of the Institute of Food Technologists and chairman of the research committee of the Flavoring Extract Manufacturers Association.

Worth Weed who became treasurer in 1956 was employed as a salesman in 1946. He has served as president of the Michigan Dairy Boosters, president of the Michigan Allied

Dairy Association and long-time member of the floor committee of the Dairy Industries Supply Association.

Don C. Jenks, grandson of the founder, joined the company in 1940 and worked through manufacturing, laboratory, accounting and purchasing to be elected secretary in 1951. He has served two terms as president of the Flavoring Extract Manufacturers Association and is a member of its board of governors. The company's officers are directors and the directorate is completed by Harry C. Devlin who was employed in 1925 as a manufacturing assistant and became superintendent of manufacturing in 1956.

TWO NEW DIVISIONS

In 1958 the Pharmaceutical Flavor Clinic, Division of Foote & Jenks, Inc., was formed with a nationally recognized pharmaceutical authority, Dr. Sereck H. Fox, as its consulting director. Dr. Fox is an adviser to the U.S. Pharmacopeia, to the British Pharmacopeia and is a fellow in the New York Academy of Sciences. Specialized laboratory personnel work under his supervision on projects for the manufacturing pharmaceutical industry in the task of making bad-tasting medicines taste good—or at least acceptable to patients of all ages.

A wholly owned subsidiary, the Needs Corp., was formed in 1958 for surveying diversification opportunities in both allied and unrelated fields. Officers are Thurston, Laughlin, and Jenks with I. Z. Mathany (F. & J. advertising manager) and K. R. Wright, who is F. & J. packaging and shipping superintendent, completing the Needs Corp. directorate.

THOSE WE SERVE

Foote & Jenks, Inc., serves the ice cream manufacturers, the confectioners, the baking industry, the pharmaceutical manufacturers, and the soft drink bottlers. F. & J. research has provided these industries with flavors that have long enjoyed a nationwide reputation for sheer excellence.

Sales are made direct to customers in 47 States and 26 foreign countries with contact maintained by a force of 14 sales and service representatives plus an export office in New York City. Presently the company has direct representation covering special assignments in Hawaii, Latin America, and Europe. Licensed manufacturing is done in Canada with a special staff contacting the trade there.

The company's personnel take greatest pride in the fact that many customers have been served for more than 25 years, including 194 for more than 40 years and 27 for more than 50 consecutive years. Many of these long-time customers also boast of business lives consisting of 75 and more years.

THE RAW MATERIALS

From the spice markets of the Orient, from the exotic, romantic green islands of the South Pacific, from far away places with strange sounding names come the materials which the F. & J. flavor specialists expertly process and blend. The finished product enables those we serve to market products which bear famous brand names and enjoying countrywide recognition for highest quality.

ORCHIDS FOR INDUSTRY

Not all diamonds are set in wedding rings. Many are used by the tool and die industry for cutting purposes. Similarly, not all orchids go to the junior prom. The industrial orchid, botanically identified as Vanilla planifolia, is a tropical vine, its flower a beautiful orchid, its fruit the vanilla bean. The vanilla bean has been a major import item of Foote & Jenks, Inc., for 75 years. Careful selection and processing of the vanilla bean provides the delicious flavor for ice cream, cookies, cakes, and desserts, to mention only a few. The pharmaceutical industry uses the extract to impart good taste to medicinal products. Substantial portions of the world supply are grown by natives of Mexico and Madagascar, whose annual crop may amount to those beans which can be carried to the market in the growers' hands. The green beans, similar in appearance to the catalpa pod, are cured by the heat of the tropical sun to develop the naturally delicious aroma. Thousands of natives thus are required to provide a single ton of beans which is a batch size purchase for Foote & Jenks, Inc.

OUR 75TH YEAR

In observance of its 75th anniversary the firm has been honored by recognition from the President of Mexico and the President of the Malagash Republic (Madagascar) through their Ambassadors in Washington, as well as by the American Vanilla Bean Association, for its activity, leadership and growth in the production of pure vanillas made from vanilla beans grown and cured abroad.

Similar recognition has been tendered by the International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, the National Association of Retail Ice Cream Manufacturers, the American Bottlers of Carbonated Beverages, and the National Confectioners Association. The White House is included by virtue of a complimentary and encouraging citation over the signature of Presidential Advisor David W. Kendall.

LOOKING AHEAD—IN RETROSPECT

Annually all employees meet together to review the year just closed, plan for the future and break bread together in traditional friendship and good will. This all-hands meeting follows the annual meeting of stockholders at which it is always pointed out that all stockholders are employees and that most employees are stockholders. At the last such meeting, Thurston, the president, noted that in comparatively recent years the business had built, equipped and paid for its modern buildings; had enabled its employees to own over a hundred thousand dollars worth of automobiles—at least a quarter-million dollars worth of life insurance—more than a half-million dollars worth of homes. He stated that dollars earned and spent in the birth, rearing and education of children—together with expenditures for the comforts which go with today's high standard of living run to sums which may well be a matter of conjecture. In referring to the founders he said, "74 years of company history lie behind us. That period of time has seen the realization of a dream in the best American tradition of free enterprise. Our sound position today is a monument to the imagination, ambition and sacrifice of C. E. Foote and C. C. Jenks who had the vision to found this company in 1884 in trust and confidence that the American competitive system would reward a closely followed policy of good goods and honest dealings. Time has justified their faith and our duty lies in the continuance of that policy to the end that our customers are well served and that free, competitive enterprise may continue to offer its rewards for both vision and hard work."

Technological Advance and Farm Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a recent report made by the National Planning Association on "Technological Advance and Farm Policies."

The National Planning Association is a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization, established in 1934, devoted to planning by Americans in agriculture, business, labor, and the professions. This report, presented by the Agriculture Committee, states that the crux of the farm policy problem as it has emerged in the last 6 years is overrapid technological advance and that farm price and income trends will continue to worsen unless producers find some acceptable means for balancing supplies with markets available at reasonably satisfactory prices. It is an important contribution to obtaining a clearer understanding of the complex problems which must be dealt with by new farm legislation at the earliest possible moment.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE AND FARM POLICIES

Technical advance in agriculture has been of untold value to this country. We are the best fed of all nations. Food is cheaper in relation to workers' earnings than in any period of our history or in any other country in the world. Technical advance also has released millions of workers from agriculture for productive employment in other lines of activity, thus making an important contribution to our rapid growth. But farm technical advance is now proceeding at such a pace that it prevents the usual supply and demand forces from stabilizing supplies and prices at reasonable levels.

Each year for the past 6 years $1.5 billion to $2.5 billion of farm products have been removed from commercial markets by the Government loan, storage, and surplus removal opertaions. Furthermore, there is an upward trend in these overabundant supplies, for in the last 2 years the amounts removed would have been even greater except for the soil bank program. Through its acreage reserve features this prorgam has idled 17 million acres of land formerly devoted to the allotment crops—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, and tobacco. An additional 10 million acres of land formerly devoted to general crops were idled in 1958 by the conservation reserve features of the soil bank.

An exploration of the economic relationships between technological advance and farm price support policies must start with this recent economic history.

It is evident that if farm production were brought into balance with commercial market outlets at recent price levels, farm income would be reduced by the amount of these recent annual surpluses. That is, farmers would not receive the $1.5 to $2.5 billion they have been getting from sales of products to the Government. (Government payments, largely for the soil bank program, totaled an additional $1.1 billions in 1958.)

If the supplies now diverted to Government storage and disposal, plus the potential supplies held in check by acreage allotments and the soil bank, were channeled through commercial markets, market prices would be much lower. Statistical analyses of farm prices and supply relationships indicate that farm income including Government payments would drop by $4 to $6 billion.

Farm leaders and farmers have been greatly confused on this. Continued loan, storage and surplus disposal operations, combined with the acreage allotments and the soil bank in recent years, have prevented increased supplies—equivalent to 6 to 10 percent of annual farm output—from glutting commercial markets.

Two items of recent history are informative on the subject of price changes associated with moderate changes in food supplies. Meat animal marketings on a weight basis were reduced 4 percent in 1958 as compared with 1957. Most of this reduction was in beef cattle marketings. The demand for beef is less inelastic than for most livestock products. However, these 4 percent smaller meat animal marketings (mostly beef cattle) sold for about 16 percent higher prices and producers received almost 15 percent higher gross receipts in 1958 than from the larger supplies in 1957. Consumers' disposable income was approximately the same in both 1957 and 1958. The usual annual growth in demand for meat resulting from the upward trend in consumer incomes was absent in 1958 because of increased unemployment.

Another example of the relation between supplies and prices for foods is the frost damage to the citrus crop in Florida in the winter of 1957–58. Citrus fruit and frozen orange juice are products with a less inelastic demand than most foods. Moderate changes in supplies usually have been accompanied by moderate changes in prices. Yet, Florida citrus producers who marketed 13 percent less fruit than a year earlier because of the frost damage in 1957–58, received prices 47 percent higher and gross receipts 27 percent higher than a year earlier.

These two items of recent economic history are not conclusive. But they strongly support the conclusions of economic analysts who estimate that if the potential 6 to 10 percent more products had been channeled into consumption through commercial markets in recent years, prices would have been 15 to 40 percent lower than they were. Conversely, if market supplies were reduced 6 to 10 percent, farm income from commercial sales would rise, by 15 to 40 percent.

Farmers and farm leaders have been inadequately and often erroneously informed regarding the economic effects of recent price support policies. Widespread lack of information among farmers on the extent to which existing price policies have prevented the increased output from depressing current farm income, prevents them from making a sound appraisal of alternative farm policies.

IMPLICATIONS OF FARM TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE

The crux of the farm policy problem, as it has emerged in the last 6 years, is that output-increasing technical advances are being adopted at a rate which causes total farm output to increase faster than the demand for food and fiber is expanding. Utilizing both a smaller crop acreage base and a shrinking labor supply, farm output increased 23 percent between 1950 and 1958 (and would have been even higher except for the soil bank program and other acreage restrictions), while population increased only 15 percent.

The economies of this rapid rate of farm technological advance and its relations to farm price levels all too often have been presented to the public in a most confusing manner.

In the first place, most new technologies are output increasing. Farmers adopt the new methods in order to lower unit costs of production, but they usually expand volume in doing so. It is possible for a new method to lower costs without expanding volume, but that has not been the case with most modern farm developments.

Farm technological advances usually are irreversible in the aggregate. Once adopted they continue to be used. One reason for this is that many new technologies require special capital—large investments. For example, new special machinery, or feed handling buildings and equipment, or production of hogs with year-around farrowing. Once the capital investment is made, the new production methods are continued even though prices fall.

Another reason why technological advances are irreversible is the fact that they usually are cost reducing. Even though prices decline due to the increased volume, the individual farmer makes more income (or loses less) by continuing the new method with the larger volume. Examples of such cost-reducing, supply-increasing advances are the new additives in mixed feeds, new fertilizer, new chemical compounds in pesticides and weed killer, improved strains of seed or breeding animals.

A lack of understanding of these aspects of aggregate technological advance is responsible for many mistaken views with respect to expected shrinkage in total farm output under the influence of lower price levels. Most expansion in total farm output in recent years has been the result of technological advance. And, since technical advance is largely irreversible in the aggregate, lower farm prices in the short run will contribute little toward correcting the current imbalance in supplies in relation to available markets at reasonably stable prices.

Relatively favorable farm prices and incomes, the healthy financial position of most agricultural producers and their higher level of education in recent years, all have speeded the adoption of technical advances. An agricultural industry lacking capital accumulations, with inadequate credit facilities, experiencing low prices and managed by entrepreneurs with a low level of competence would have been unable to make the investment necessary for much of the technological advance in recent years.

But it is equally important to observe that the availability of the new technologies for adoption were largely the result of our scientific research and educational programs, supported to a considerable extent by public funds.

PRICE LEVEL ONLY ONE OF MANY FACTORS IN TECHNICAL ADVANCE

Given the present backlog of new technologies now available or in the testing stage, and given the present educational level and financial position of agricultural producers, farm output will likely continue to expand faster than available markets for an indefinite period, even though farm product prices decline substantially.

The adoption of efficient multiple farrowing equipment by hog producers at present is not likely to be stopped by lower hog prices in the future. It is not likely that the prospects of lower milk prices will reverse the upward trend in artificial insemination of dairy cows or the trend toward year-round feeding of dairy cows in dry lots.

Lower corn prices will not slow down the trend toward growing corn continuously on the most productive soils. Improvements in seed strains of hybrid grain sorghums cannot be stopped by low prices.

New short-strawed strains of wheat, yielding twice as many bushels per acre as those now in commercial production, are reported in the quality improvement stage. Even though wheat prices drop to feed grain levels, farmers will adopt these new higher yielding strains as soon as they become available.

Some people have assumed that moderately lower farm prices would result in a decline in fertilizer use. Yet, technical studies in the Department of Agriculture indicate that at the levels of use of fertilizer in 1954 farmers were receiving marginal (additional) returns of $3 per dollar spent on fertilizer. With a slightly higher rate of fertilizer use in 1959 and somewhat lower farm product prices, marginal returns from fertilizer use may have dropped to $2.50.

With widespread returns from fertilizer use at this level there is little reason to expect a decline in aggregate fertilizer use even though farm prices decline substantially. There is no reason for farmers to use less nitrogen on their corn until corn prices drop to about $.80 per bushel since the marginal cost of the corn produced by the nitrogen is probably 60 to 80 cents a bushel.

Few developments can be predicted with certainty in the economic world. Such evidence as can be assessed, however, suggests that, because of the rapid rate of technical advance, recent supply, price and income trends will continue to worsen unless producers find some acceptable means for balancing supplies with markets available at reasonably satisfactory prices.

COMPETITIVE POSITION OF LARGE FARMS

Many farm leaders believe that the larger, more efficient farms would be able to continue profitable business operations even though all current restrictions on production and marketing of farm products were eliminated and prices dropped accordingly.

Under such conditions they assume total farm income would be lower. But they believe that the number of farm families would decline faster than the decline in total farm income so that average farm family incomes might even be higher under these conditions than in recent years.

This might occur if the rate of technological advance slows down. However, production costs on the larger farms with considerable hired labor do not appear to be substantially lower than those on the more efficient family farms. Furthermore, the backlog and oncoming stream of new technologies, including the possibilities for further substitution of capital for labor, are so great that their adoption is expected to continue to expand output faster than markets expand. This too-rapid rate of output expansion, fueled by competitive efforts to survive under falling prices and rising costs, may well continue even though the number of farm operator families in agriculture drops by one half or more.

With free competition prevailing in agriculture, it is profitable for individual farms to adopt new technologies even though farm prices continue to fall. Fully as important, most of the resources previously committed to agriculture—tractors, improvements in land, specialized machinery and much of the previously committed labor—cannot shift to alternative employment—hence these resources continue to be used in agricultural production throughout their working life in spite of low returns from their use.

With these economic forces in mind, prices can be expected to fall faster than costs can be reduced even on the larger, more efficient farms, as well as on the smaller farms.

THE LIMITATIONS OF MARKET EXPANSION

Many farm and nonfarm people mistakenly believe that there are great possibilities for expanding the markets for food. There has been far too little critical evaluation of the economic possibilities of expanding profitable markets for food and fiber in the industrialized countries of the Western World, and far too much unfounded hope of solving the problem created by rapid technical advance by the traditional business practice of expanding markets.

In the United States, for example, consumers' diets now contain about 30 percent more animal protein than in 1935–39. As compared with 20 years ago, consumers on a per capita basis are now eating 36 percent more animal proteins from meats, poultry, and fish. Per capita consumption of these products is 15 percent higher than 10 years ago. These trends show that consumers can and will eat more meats and other livestock products. But they will do so only at the expense of other foods and at a sharp reduction in prices.

To solve the current feed grain-livestock situation by increased feeding and marketing of livestock, the rate of marketing would have to be increased 10 to 15 percent immediately. Then marketing would have to increase on an annual basis at a rate equal to about twice the rate of population increase. Crop production and gains in efficiency in feeding livestock are both increasing at about the current rate of population increase. Together, this means an expansion in livestock output twice the rate of population growth. Given the high current rate of consumption, further increases to this magnitude can only be achieved by selling the products at sharply reduced prices.

There is wide agreement among economists and statisticians who have studied recent trends that the demand for food in the industrialized nations of the Western World is increasing very slowly. It is increasing by the amount of the population increase each year plus a rate equal to 10 to 20 percent of the increase in real per capita income.

There is no evidence that increased promotional efforts in recent years have expanded the total food market in these countries beyond its natural growth resulting from increases in population and real income per capita.

LIMITATIONS OF FOOD FOR PEACE AS A SOLUTION TO OVERRAPID TECHNICAL ADVANCE

In each of the past 4 years $1 to $2 billion of surplus agricultural products have been exported to needy people in other parts of the world under Public Law 480. There is general agreement that these exports, outside commercial market channels, have been of great benefit to the peoples receiving them. There is also general agreement that programs fo this type should be continued in the future.

Some, however, believe that little good has been accomplished by substantial portions of these exports and that future programs should be on a more limited and a more closely supervised basis.

Others foresee immense benefits flowing from greatly expanded special food and fiber export programs in the future. They take the position that all our present surpluses could be utilized effectively in foreign economic aid programs.

It appears unnecessary here to attempt a reconciliation of these widely different views. Sufficient stocks are on hand to permit an expansion of Public Law 480 programs if a determination is made that such an expansion is desirable. But it appears most unlikely that foreign economic aid programs could effectively use foods at the rate of even $2 to $4 billion a year to say nothing of greater quantities.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the conditions outlined above, it is doubtful that any farm program can do more than slow down the rate of increase in farm output and slow down the decline in farm prices and income. But in terms of equity perhaps that is all that is needed. Technological advance lowers costs, hence in equity it should lower prices. Perhaps the most that any government policies could or should attempt, is a sufficient increase in the bargaining power of farmers to permit a sharing of technical advance between producers and consumers. Before even these limited and wholly reasonable objectives can be achieved, however, the current widespread mistaken diagnosis of the price problem in agriculture must be corrected and a massive educational program based on the relevant issues must must be inaugurated.

The Crisis in Outdoor Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission—ably led by Mr. Laurance Rockefeller, as chairman, and ably guided by Mr. Francis W. Sergeant, as executive director—has now begun the critical task assigned to it by the last Congress.

Under terms of the act this task includes:

To inventory and evaluate the outdoor recreation resources and opportunities of the Nation and to determine the types and location of such resources and opportunities which will be required by present and future generations.

To make comprehensive information and recommendations leading to these goals available to the President, the Congress, and the individual States.

The Commission's report—under terms of the act—is not due until September 1, 1961. Action based on its recommendations cannot be expected until 1962. Meanwhile, the squeeze on existing outdoor recreation facilities constantly grows more acute. We have a serious national shortage of the first magnitude on our hands now. And we are falling further behind each year.

One of the most respected workers in this vineyard is Marion Clawson, director of studies in land use and management for Resources for the Future, the nonprofit corporation established with cooperation of the Ford Foundation.

In a paper published in the March 1959 issue of American Forests magazine, Dr. Clawson warns that we are working up to a grade A crisis in outdoor recreation, "unprecedented both in size and character"—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 23, 1959, pages A2548–A2551.

He concludes that within the next 40 years a combination of growing population, rising family incomes and increases in leisure time and travel might raise total demand for outdoor recreation to about 10 times the present level.

He also suggests that the pressure will be felt differently on the three main types of recreation land, with perhaps a fourfold rise for user-oriented areas like city and county parks, sixteenfold for such intermediate areas as Federal reservoirs and State parks, and as much as fortyfold for resource-based areas like the national parks and national forests.

In a subsequent paper, published in last April's National Forests, he lays out a few of the specific, immediate problems and suggests some of the ways they might be resolved.

Because of its pertinence and because of the urgency of the problem, under consent to extend my remarks, I include Dr. Clawson's commentary in the RECORD:

THE CRISIS IN OUTDOOR RECREATION—II

(By Marion Clawson)

From all indications the present congestion in the national forests, National, State, county, and city parks, and other outdoor recreation areas is not a case of temporary growing pains, but rather a mild taste of a real crisis.

What are some of the specific, immediate problems growing out of the snowballing demand for outdoor recreation? What can we do about them? What are the prospects of success?

To tackle the last question first, I believe that the prospective huge increase in recreation demand can substantially be met, though probably not entirely, and certainly not altogether in ways that most of us are used to and would prefer. Only through fortunate coincidences of history and geography have we in this country been able to make such gains in population, prosperity, and urbanization without, until quite recently, feeling a squeeze on open space. Now that events have caught up with us we must pay the price of maturity—greater costs (whether borne by individual users or by all the taxpayers) and greater formality in arrangements. Never again will it be as easy as it used to be to go outdoors and get away from it all.

Within these limitations it still should be possible to satisfy at least the greater part of the coming demand for outdoor recreation, without too oppressive a system of regulations. But this can't be accomplished automatically by going along as we are now, or even by stepping up the scale of present efforts. Today's activities, useful as they are, are not only too small, but too scattered. The greatest need of all is for a more coordinated attack on the whole problem of outdoor recreation.

The best way to grasp the necessity of a comprehensive approach is to look first at the various pieces of the total situation. This method may sound like a paradox, but it will show better than any other way that there is no satisfactory separate solution to the worst of the trouble spots.

PROSPECTS FOR USER-ORIENTED AREAS

First, let us glance at the prospects for user-oriented recreation areas—the city and county parks that are designed almost entirely for the use of people living quite nearby, usually in densely settled communities. There are about 750,000 acres of such land today. Under the standards agreed upon by most park specialists, about twice as many acres are needed now to take care of present demand in anything like an adequate manner. Assuming a fourfold increase in demand, about 5 million acres would be needed in the year 2000. Between 1950 and 1955 new lands of this kind were being acquired at the rate of about 20,000 acres a year. Even if this rate were to be sustained for the next 40 years, less than one-fifth of the necessary new land would have been acquired.

A big jump in purchases of user-oriented recreation land is clearly called for. This is especially true because of the special needs of the fast-growing suburbs that have sprung up around the built-up cores of older cities. Beset with pressing problems of schools and paving and sanitation, few of the new suburbs have done must about providing public

space for recreation. With each passing year the land that might be bought for parks grows scarcer and more expensive. It may well be that the combined acreage of city and county parks will not be expanded to 5 million or even 3 million acres by the year 2000. Suitable land in or near many of the older cities is simply no longer available. Fortunately, not all of the prospective demand will have to be met by adding space. Much pressure can be taken off by additions and improvements in special facilities like swimming pools, small children's playgrounds, baseball diamonds, tennis courts, and the like, and by better scheduling and supervision of play. If people are willing to pay the cost—which will be considerable, with new land averaging perhaps several thousand dollars an acre to buy and perhaps equal sums to improve—a combination of more land and improved facilities should enable us to keep up pretty well with the demand for user-oriented recreation areas.

INTERMEDIATE AREAS ARE MOST FLEXIBLE

Second, there are the intermediate recreation areas. These comprise about 9 million acres—5 million in State parks and 4 million used for recreation in Federal reservoir areas. At least another million acres, and perhaps as many as 5 million, are needed now to meet fully the present potential demand. (This is a particularly hard estimate to hazard, because the national totals hide so many regional differences; some parts of the country have more than enough of the intermediate type of recreation land to fill current needs, while other sections are critically deficient.) A demand in the year 2000 of 16 times the present level would not bring a need for 16 times as much intermediate recreation land, which is just as well, for the multiplication works out in the neighborhood of 200 million acres. But a total of 70 million acres would not seem to be excessive, and 35 million acres would be a rock-bottom minimum, calling for far more careful scheduling and intensive use than we have today.

The chief impediment to filling the demand for this kind of public recreation land is cost, for the requirements of type and location of acreage are not excessive. Although scenic beauty and other natural advantages are desirable, almost any kind of land will do. With the aid of a few dams to make artificial lakes, and some plantings and other simple improvements, land that is of low value for either agriculture or forestry can be made into quite acceptable sites for all-day picnics, swimming, and boating, overnight camping, and other intermediate recreation uses. And, since there is so much flexibility in selecting locations, the actual cost of land might be only $300 to $500 an acre. If we really want to, we can meet the need for intermediate recreation areas.

RESOURCE-BASED LANDS WILL SUFFER MOST

For the third category, the resource-based recreation lands, the story is entirely different. Here the prospective increase in demand between now and the year 2000 is the greatest; perhaps as much as 40 times the present level. But the possibilities of increasing present acreage are decidedly limited, because the bulk of the lands of outstanding natural beauty or historical interest are already available for recreational use. (In the West much of the land in private ownership, in national forests, and even in national parks is nearly identical in character and appearance.) The total amount of Federal land devoted primarily to recreation now comes to about 40 million acres. This includes all of the national parks system—nearly 25 million acres—and around 14 million acres of the national forests (about 62,000 acres of improved camp and picnic sites, with the rest studiously unimproved wilderness areas). In addition, the remaining 165 million acres of national forest lands are open to recreationists, and are increasingly used for that purpose. About half of the 60 million visits to the national forests last year were to areas not formally set aside for recreation.

In recent years there have been small gains in acreage of the national park system, and small net losses in total acreage of the national forests. Any large future increase in either class of lands is unlikely. Even if there should be a substantial increase in Park Service funds for buying new land (the present figure is only $1.5 million a year), the net additions to resource-based recreation land still would be a drop in the bucket. Whatever additions are made will probably be either for buying up privately owned pockets within present boundaries of national parks and monuments or for acquiring some of the few miles of ocean beach that have thus far been overlooked in active private development. No matter how hard we try, it is difficult to see how more than 10 to 20 million acres can be added to the present total of 230 million acres of public land potentially available for resource-based recreation.

And this is not all. The recreation lands where the increase in demand will press most heavily are, by reason of their unique qualities, the very ones that will suffer most through overcrowding. Suppose that somehow it were physically possible to get 40 times as many visitors in and out of the resource-based recreation lands: long before that unlikely goal could be reached, the special attractions that draw people to the parks and forests would be gone. The one-time grandeur and quiet, the sense of being close to nature, would retreat in the face of paved roads and parking areas, trodden vegetation, and human bustle. And I am not considering here the specialized problem of preserving truly primitive areas, which in itself, as every Congressman knows, is no mean question, with important values at stake on both sides. I am thinking rather of the lands intended for wider use.

THE THREAT OF OVERUSE

Defenders of the parks and forests are constantly on guard against the threat of mining, lumbering, and other commercial exploitation of our best-grade recreation lands. There has been justification for these fears and there still is, though not as much, I think, as in the past. The greatest threat in the future will come from the recreationists themselves. Overuse can ruin a recreation area as thoroughly as a bulldozer, partly through actual physical damage (though there the bulldozer is more efficient) but mostly through destroying its capacity to provide intellectual and emotional experience. Those of us whose memories run back 30 years or so have seen how crowding has changed some of the Nation's best-loved recreation spots—Grand Canyon, where attendance increased 15 times between 1920 and 1956; Yellowstone, where the gain was 18 times; Glacier, where it was 33 times; and many others. What will be the effects of increases to 10, 20, or 40 times present levels?

Since the resource-based lands are so clearly going to be the real trouble spot of the future, it might seem best to concentrate our planning and action on these lands and let the rest take care of themselves. That is what many people do think, and there is much commonsense in their instinct. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the only way out of the growing dilemma is a comprehensive effort that will include all three categories of recreation land.

To be sure, there are many things we can do about the resource-based lands themselves. For example, we can undertake further development work on a considerable scale. While a comparatively few famous areas in the parks and forests suffer from overuse, there are other potentially attractive areas that are hardly used at all. But there are strict limits to this kind of expansion. There are not many sites that can be heavily used, and even they must have wide buffer zones of land where people are scarce. Furthermore, recreation is sometimes incompatible with other essential uses, to which preference must be given in the overall public interest. Secondly, we can do more to space out use of recreation lands over the year instead of bunching it up in short summer seasons. Rising interest in winter sports and all-weather camping already is bringing some improvements, but here again the possibilities are limited. Thirdly, we can put top limits on attendance in the areas that are under the greatest pressure, either by requiring reservations in advance or by simply closing the gates whenever capacity is reached. Defenses of this kind are probably inevitable for some areas, but as widespread policy such rationing of top-quality outdoor recreation would be little better than an admission of defeat, and hence no solution at all.

USE OF PRIVATE LANDS

Another way to ease the pressure is to make more recreation use of private lands. One hopeful sign is the way that the large timber-owning companies are opening areas to vacationists. At least 65 of these firms maintain at least 137 private parks. No doubt there are more; complete statistics have never been gathered. Some public utility companies also provide parks. More of this kind of thing can be expected, partly because of its sound public relations value but mostly, perhaps, because of a real sense of public obligation felt by owners of large tracts of good recreation land. But there are limits to such expansion; only a relatively few private landowners can afford such a sense of noblesse oblige. Most of the smaller owners, who hold most of the private land, are not in a position to provide campgrounds and other facilities for public use. Also, the person who freely offers the use of his acres for hunting, fishing, or other uses runs real risks of damage to the land or its resources.

Does the public have a right to expect access without charge or for only a nominal fee? Perhaps ways can be devised, either privately or with the assistance of local or State governments, by which associations of sportsmen or other recreationists can make fair arrangements with groups of landowners for specified uses of good recreation acreage.

Between them, these two ways of expanding recreation on private lands may be equivalent to adding many million acres to the resource-based public lands. But there is little chance that such gains will fill more than a minor portion of the total increase in recreation demand. By far the greatest present use of private lands is in small tracts off in the woods or on lake or ocean shores. This kind of use is becoming more and more expensive. Even if it did not dwindle, it would not meet much of the new need for space, for in terms of persons served per year it is an extremely inefficient use of recreation land.

So the quest for a large-scale solution comes back to public land. And it is painfully clear that the measures we have mentioned, though useful and necessary, won't be enough to do the job.

THE COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH

Suppose that instead of looking just at the resource-based public lands, we look at all public recreation land; then the future prospect is not nearly so gloomy. As we have seen, the acreage and capacity of the intermediate recreation areas like State parks can be increased by just about any amount the American public is willing to pay for; and considerable expansion of user-oriented areas, at least in the form of county parks, is also possible. If the potentialities of these

two types of areas are developed to the full, the distinctive resource-based areas will be freed to perform the task for which they are uniquely fitted, instead of also bearing, as they do today, much of the load that the user-oriented and intermediate recreation areas could carry.

Most of the answer to the critical problem of the national parks and national forests lies in improving the capacity of all recreation lands. This is our best hope of not being swamped by the rising tide of recreation demand. That is why the city and county parks, which usually are considered as quite a separate problem of urban development, and the State parks, which sometimes are considered separately, have received so much attention here. That is why, too, the comprehensive approach is essential to meeting the outdoor recreation problem of the future.

By the "comprehensive approach" I do not mean rigidly centralized planning and administration. Far from it. There always will be room for separate responsibility and initiative by local, State, and Federal Governments, and by private groups. That is part of the American pattern. What I do mean is that the various agencies and groups need to be more aware of the total situation for outdoor recreation, and more responsive to it. Although in many instances—but not all—there is friendly cooperation between workers in the recreation vineyard, each of the many units is naturally digging in its own backyard, and sometimes the dirt flies over into the neighbor's plot. The National Park Service, for example, must always consider its own legislative charter. So must the Forest Service, the Corps of Engineers, and other Federal agencies. The various State agencies must think first of their own electorate and legislature. Most of the private groups have special clienteles with particular interests. Corporate and individual landowners usually have objectives which may be incompatible with recreation. Lost opportunities are the inevitable results. This is too bad, for the family planning a vacation or weekend outing doesn't care whether the facilities are provided by Federal, State, or local governments or by private owners. They want to have a pleasant time outdoors within the limits of their budgets of time and money.

As one example of how a better approach would help, let us take a look at how recreation acreage is distributed throughout the country and at how the present locations compare with current and future patterns of population. Less than a quarter of the cities have enough nearby recreation space. The shortage is especially marked in the South. A great many States don't have enough intermediate recreation areas. Here, too, portions of the South are in a particularly bad way. But so also are several of the Mountain States, probably because they rely so heavily on the national forests and national park areas. More than 80 percent of the federally owned resource-based areas are in the West, where only 13 percent of the people live. By the year 2000 there will have been a westward shift in population; although the northeast and north central regions will have more people, they will have a smaller share of the national total. But more important than regional shifts is the prospect that most of the increase in population will be urban. Large cities from southern Maine to northern Virginia will form an almost continuous zone of heavy settlement, which already has been referred to as a megalopolis. There will be other great concentrations around the Great Lakes and along the gulf and Pacific coasts. In a word, the contrasts on the population map of 2000 will look much like those for 1950, only more so.

More city, county, and State areas in the urbanized regions will not only meet increases in the present pattern of demand, but will also offer attractive alternatives to families who otherwise would have no choice but to strike out for more distant, resource-based recreation lands. More of such user-oriented and intermediate areas in the West will provide, perhaps even better than today, for thousands of families who use Federal lands because no others are available.

There will be more and more situations in which development of local and intermediate recreation areas will be more urgently required in the long-range, nationwide interest than in the immediate direct interest of a particular city, county, or State. If we are to keep up with growing recreation demand, there must be better ways of keeping the whole picture before even the most localized agencies and for encouraging local actions that will contribute to countrywide improvement.

USE OF THE FEE SETTING

Another great advantage of a comprehensive approach would come in the complicated area of fee setting. This is bound to be a live issue in any case, for any serious effort to keep up with demand for outdoor recreation is going to cost a lot of money—perhaps $50 billion or more just for buying and improving land between now and the year 2000, at the land-cost and required-acreage rates on user-oriented and intermediate land suggested earlier in this article. Most of the money will probably continue to come from local, State, and Federal taxes; the rest—very likely an increasing proportion—will come from direct charges on users of recreation land and facilities. The basic problem is to reconcile two widely held principles that often clash in application: That equal recreation opportunity for all is a public responsibility and that direct beneficiaries should pay for services rendered. This issue is already familiar, and there is no use in going into it here. The sense of public responsibility will keep a ceiling on fees, though there may be some hot arguments over just where a particular ceiling ought to be.

The chance to do something new will lie in using the scale of charges to promote more effective use of all outdoor recreation areas. This would mean setting fees with an eye to their general effects on recreation as well as on the particular area and agency involved. For instance, the fees for using most of the top-grade, resource-based areas might be considerably higher than they are today—an average of around $25, say, instead of around $3. This would reduce the number of casual visits and leave room for more people with a deep love of camping or sightseeing in remote areas. The more casual vacationists would be diverted to intermediate or user-oriented lands where fees were lower. Similar distinctions might be drawn between county and State facilities. Another reason for giving more attention to the relation between the charges in different places is the increasing mobility that will come from more cars and better roads. Many of the larger county and State parks are serving more and more people from outside their political boundaries. The only way to share the burden equitably (unless a State or county deliberately sets out to capture tourist trade) is to get back more of the costs from the users.

The comprehensive approach to outdoor recreation cannot, as we have already noted, be imposed from the top down. It will have to come from voluntary cooperation of all levels of government and private groups. The most promising forward step in many years was the establishment of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. Although even its broad charter for studies and recommendations excludes city recreation facilities, it includes all the others, a breadth of scope that represents a long step forward. Even more important, its operations and its report may offer suggestions for continued planning on a comprehensive scale.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND FUNCTIONS RELATING TO OUTDOOR RECREATION AREAS

GOVERNMENT BRANCH OR AGENCY—GENERAL FUNCTIONS

Federal Government (1)

Congress: Passes laws, makes appropriations, investigates.

President: General direction of executive branch.

Department of Agriculture: Directs agricultural and forestry programs.

Forest Service: Manages national forests.

Department of the Interior: Directs various resource programs.

National Park Service: Manages national park system.

Fish and Wildlife Service: Manages Federal wildlife areas.

Bureau of Land Management: Manages grazing districts and public domain.

Bureau of Reclamation: Builds and operates reservoirs.

Department of the Army: Has certain civil works responsibilities.

Corps of Engineers: Plans and builds flood control and navigation projects.

State governments (49)

(Situation differs greatly among States; common situation described here.)

Legislature: Passes laws, makes appropriations, investigates.

Governor: General supervision over executive branch.

Park board [1] or department: Manages State park system.

Forestry board [1] or department: Manages State forests.

Wildlife board [1] or department: Manages State wildlife refuges.

State highway department: Manages waysides and other areas along highways.

Counties

(About 3,000—most do not have specialized recreation agencies.)

Usually have some general governing group, often called commissioners or supervisors.

May have park and/or recreation departments or officers, to manage parks (if any) and to direct activities on playgrounds or other outdoor areas.

May manage school systems, including use of playgrounds for general recreation.

Cities

(Over 4,000 with 2,500 or more population—more than half have specialized recreation agencies.)

Generally have mayor, city council, and sometimes appointed general manager.

Like counties, may have park departments or officers, recreation directors, and school administration, each of which is concerned with management of particular outdoor recreation areas.

---

[1] May be an agency independent of the Governor.

Clara Barton, of Oxford, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks, I include therein a brilliant article on Clara Barton, founder of the American Red Cross, by the able writer of the Worcester Gazette editorial staff, Mr. Albert B. Southwick.

Since the great Clara Barton was born in Oxford, Mass., in my district, it is quite natural that our people should be particularly proud of her immortal contributions to the cause of humanity:

CLARA BARTON AND THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

(By Albert B. Southwick)

She was 40 years old and a politically appointed copy clerk in the Patent Office in Washington, D.C. She was physically unattractive, short and homely. She was in poor health and spirits.

Thus Clara Barton on the eve of one of history's great careers.

Born in North Oxford, Mass., in 1821, she was trained to be a schoolteacher. She had to give it up at 33 because of throat trouble. Political finagling landed her the Patent Office job, where she stayed for the next 7 years.

Then, in April 1861, Fort Sumter fell, the savage guns began to roar, the cries of the wounded began to resound from the battlefield, and Clara Barton found her destiny.

Some legends have no factual substance behind them. But the Clara Barton life was greater than the legend, tremendous though that was to become. With her devoted band of volunteers, she and her wagon trains of supplies, food, and bandages moved across the ravaged battlefields of Virginia behind the armies, feeding the wounded, binding up their bloody bodies, ministering to them in the hour of death, trying to keep track of the nameless graves.

GREAT EPIC

It was one of the great epics of human compassion, and it is only fitting that Charles Hurd's new book, "The Compact History of the Red Cross," (Hawthorn, $4.95), should begin with a graphic description of it. For out of that experience was born the drive, the dedication, the know-how and the determination that culminated in the establishment of the American Red Cross in 1881, by that same frail, indomitable little woman, Clara Barton.

Controversy swirled around the beginning of the Red Cross in this country, and controversy has been no stranger to it ever since. Initial resistance to any official tieup with the International Red Cross came from the traditional American feeling about "entangling alliances" with anything European. But, by one means or another, Miss Barton and her followers gradually got their way. When the battleship *Maine* was sunk in Havana Harbor, Clara Barton was on the scene in a few days. At 75, still frail, she went ashore at Siboney, followed by a train of six-mule Army wagons, to find a field full of wounded, dying men. "I had not thought to ever make gruel again over a campfire," she wrote, but she did, and once again, as in 1861–65, became "The Angel of the Battlefield."

CONTROVERSIAL FIGURE

But Miss Barton was getting old, and the Red Cross was facing new challenges. Her autocratic rule was challenged again and again after 1900, and she finally resigned in 1905, to die in 1911 at the age of 90. According to Hurd, her exact place in Red Cross history is still a matter for violent controversy. Like many another pioneer, she clung too long to power and to the old way of doing things. But her contribution is undeniable.

The American Red Cross as we know it today was largely shaped in the First World War, according to Hurd. It set up hospitals, operated them, ran ambulances, fought plague and starvation, dispensed $120 million—a huge sum for that time—served the needs of refugees, built up its famed system of volunteers, and, in short, did a tremendous job.

Then came the backwash.

In February 1920, Senator John Sherman of Illinois attacked the Red Cross for mismanagement and extravagance, claiming that it used 40 percent of its funds for salaries and traveling expenses. The Hearst papers called it a cold-blooded, highly professionalized charity trust that was usurping Government function. Its Russian relief program inspired violent attacks from the liberals, who accused it of supporting the old order; and from the conservatives, who said it was helping the Bolsheviks.

TWO CHARGES

In the era of prohibition, when tobacco was also banned in some States, two charges were brought against the Red Cross. First, it was charged with having sold cigarettes to soldiers in the trenches. Second, it was charged with having given away cigarettes thus demoralizing young American manhood.

Such charges have been going on ever since.

In World War II, the Red Cross was really an efficient, going organization. One of its supreme services during those years was the collection of 13,300,000 pints of blood for the armed services.

Indeed it is blood, and the fractionation of it, that has been one of the Red Cross great contributions to human welfare. Its laboratories and funds have led the way to gamma globulin, serum albumin, fibrinogen and other blood fractions of such importance to medical science.

Yet it is the blood collection program that has aroused the most recent attacks and controversy. The myth has spread that the Red Cross charges money for the blood it gives. Here in Hurd's words, are the facts:

"Red Cross blood is free, given freely by donors and handled as a charge paid from funds of national headquarters and chapters. In recent years the hospitals and clinics drawing upon the Red Cross blood banks have paid the small cost of the special containers in which it is packed. Hospitals using this blood do make regular charges for administering it. In too many cases, patients have not understood that their bills in connection with blood transfusions of Red Cross supplies have been exclusively for service, not for the blood itself.

WRONGLY CRITICIZED

"Yet despite this continuing battle for understanding, the blood program has become a miracle of organization and, under Red Cross development, a service that would be difficult to duplicate otherwise."

These words apply to the Red Cross itself. Misunderstood, wrongly criticized, subject to human and organizational mistakes, it has become an essential part of our national life.

It is fitting praise for Hurd's book to say that it gives an honest and appreciative picture of this great organization, which deserves the wholehearted support of every American.

Analysis of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today, September 14, 1959, the President signed into law the new labor reform bill, and in doing so substantially achieved his own goals in this legislative area.

The new act, herein referred to as the conference report, with a few significant modifications, is essentially the Landrum-Griffin bill which passed the House on August 14, 1959. It also incorporates most of the President's recommendations originally made by him shortly after the opening of the 86th Congress early this year, 1959. Moreover, the President, immediately following the inclusion of the bill of rights for union members in the bill which passed the Senate late in April 1959, publicly expressed his approval of that provision, no similar provision having been included either in the President's original recommendations or in the Kennedy-Ervin bill either as introduced or reported in the Senate.

Again, a few days before the passage of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House on August 14, 1959, the President, in a nationwide radio and television broadcast, stated his support of the Landrum-Griffin bill, and specifically indicated those provisions of that bill which, in substance, embodied his own proposals and which were either totally absent or inadequately provided for in the measure passed by the Senate. He had previously criticized the latter as being a weak and ineffectual proposal.

This memorandum analyzes the various provisions of the new labor law, and where appropriate, indicates those changes made in the original Senate bill—Kennedy-Ervin, S. 505—at the initiative of Republican Members of the Senate, as well as those made by the sponsors of the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House.

DEFINITIONS

Section 3(i) defines a labor organization to include "any conference, general committee, joint or system board, or joint council."

Organizations or associations of this type were not defined as labor unions in the bill reported by the Senate Labor Committee to the Senate. In executive session, I offered an amendment to include them which was rejected. On the floor, I again offered this amendment, which was, in substantial part, approved.

Failure to include such an amendment would have meant that these so-called intermediate labor bodies would have been exempted from the bill's many restrictions, requirements, and sanctions designed to achieve the minimum of necessary reform in labor unions. Among the organizations so exempted would have been the Western Conference of Teamsters, formerly headed by Frank Brewster, one of the most corrupt and dishonestly run labor organizations among the many shocking situations revealed by the McClellan rackets committee.

Section 3(k) defines "secret ballot" in labor union voting and elections. In committee, I offered an amendment to prohibit voting by proxy. This was rejected in the committee bill as reported but was adopted by the Senate, thus closing a significant loophole by eliminating one of the devices used by corrupt union

officers to perpetuate themselves in office.

Section 3(m) defines "labor relations consultant." The Senate committee rejected my amendment to define this term, but the Senate nevertheless adopted such an amendment. Inasmuch as the bill regulates the activities of these consultants, the failure to define them would have resulted in chaos, confusion, and endless litigation to determine precisely who were meant to be covered by such regulatory provisions.

Section 3(n) defines "officer" of a labor organization. The Senate bill, as reported from committee, contained no such definition despite the many provisions of the bill regulating and restricting the activiites of union officers, and the many prohibitions and sanctions, including criminal ones, directed against them as part of the reform program. Inasmuch as the Supreme Court had held that the term "union officer" as used in Taft-Hartley applies only to those so designated in the union's constitution, and does not apply to those not so designated even if they perform the functions of officers, the rejection in committee of my amendment defining the term, constituted an open invitation to unions to evade those provisions of the bill expressly designed to eliminate dishonesty and corruption in unions and among union officials. Fortunately, the Senate itself approved the inclusion of the needed definition.

Section 3(o) defines "member" or "member in good standing" of a labor union. No such definition was in the bill reported to the Senate despite the fact that a number of its provisions referred to "union members" or "members in good standing," particularly with respect to the rights of union members to vote, run for and hold union office, and certain limitations on trusteeships imposed by international unions on subordinate or local labor unions. Such definiiton was proposed and accepted on the Senate floor.

Section 3(q) defines "officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative" of a labor organization to include elected officials, and key administrative personnel of unions, whether elected or appointed. This provision, although necessary to illuminate certain provisions of the bill, was never included in the Senate bill at all, but was accepted in conference from the Landrum-Griffin bill.

All of the foregoing definitions, so necessary to an effective labor reform bill, yet so inexcusably omitted at one stage or another of the Senate bill's progress, are contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill both as introduced and as it passed the House, as well as in the conference report overwhelmingly approved by both Houses of Congress, and signed into law by the President.

In the Senate Labor Committee, I offered an amendment to exclude from the coverage of the labor reform bill, labor unions composed of government employees at all levels of government.

Inasmuch as these unions, in most instances, do not have the right to strike or even to compel their governmental employers to bargain collectively with them, and even more significantly, are powerless to compel employees to join and hence are truly voluntary associations, I believe that they should be free from the regulations imposed by the new bill. As long as their members were free to resign from such unions without any harm or injury to themselves resulting therefrom, the members exercised an ultimate control over their officers sufficient, if properly exercised, to assure freedom from corruption, racketeering, and other abuses.

This amendment was accepted in the bill as reported and both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report similarly exempt government-employee unions.

TITLE I—BILL OF RIGHTS OF UNION MEMBERS

The Senate bill, as reported, contained no bill of rights for union members. These provisions were offered on the Senate floor by Senator MCCLELLAN, and adopted with some modifications. The Landrum-Griffin bill, as introduced and as passed by the House, contained such a bill of rights.

Section 101(a)(1) gives every union member an equal right within his union to nominate candidates, to vote in union elections, to attend union meetings, and to participate in and vote upon the business of such meetings subject to reasonable regulation imposed by the union's own governing rules. House and Senate provisions were the same.

Section 101(a)(2) gives union members the right to meet and assemble freely with each other, to express any of their views and opinions, to express their views at union meetings on candidates for union office, and on any of the business before the meeting subject to the union's established and reasonable rules for conducting meetings, as well as to the union's right to establish reasonable rules as to the responsibility of members toward their union and to prohibit conduct by members that would interfere with the union's carrying out its legal or contractual obligations.

The Senate and House bills were almost identical in this respect with one important difference. The Senate-passed provision could be construed to limit the right of free speech by union members to communications made to other members and not to persons or sources outside the union. Thus, for example, there would have been no right of a union member to write a letter to a nonunion newspaper or publication criticizing the union or its officials. In the Landrum-Griffin House bill there was no such limitation on the right of the union members to express themselves freely. The conferees accepted the Landrum-Griffin provision.

Section 101(a)(3) provides that union dues, initiation fees, and assessments shall not be increased except by secret vote of the union members in good standing after reasonable notice of intention to vote on such question, or by majority vote of the delegates at a union convention following at least 30 days notice that such question will be voted on, or by majority vote of the union's executive or governing board in which case the increase shall be effective only until the next convention.

Section 101(a)(4) protects the right of a union member to sue in the courts or to initiate proceedings before administrative agencies, even if these are against the union or its officials. This is an absolutely essential safeguard because many union constitutions provide for disciplining any union member who sues the union or its officers. This provision was substantially identical in both the Senate and House bills with this important difference.

The Senate bill required the union member to exhaust his internal union hearing procedures before bringing suit, but permitted the union to spread these procedures over a 6-month period. As a result, a union member who wished to file charges of unfair labor practices against the union with the National Labor Relations Board would lose this protection of the bill of rights because the Taft-Hartley Act requires these charges to be filed within 6 months of the commission of the alleged misconduct. I attempted on the floor to correct this gimmick by shortening the waiting period of 6 months set forth in the bill of rights so as to preclude the possible loss of a union member's right to go to the NLRB. This proposal was not accepted.

The Landrum-Griffin bill, both as introduced and as passed, cut such waiting period to 4 months thus eliminating the gimmick and preserving the union member's rights both under the bill of rights and under the Taft-Hartley Act. The conferees accepted the provision of the House bill.

On the Senate floor, however, when Senator MCCLELLAN'S original bill of rights previously approved, was in the process of being modified, it was proposed further to limit this right of a union member to bring legal action to suits or proceedings brought by him which were not, directly or indirectly, financed, encouraged, or participated in—except as a party—by any employer or employer association.

I objected vigorously to this sweeping limitation. I pointed out, for example, that many banks were "employers" as defined in the bill, and hence that a union member would lose the protection of his right to sue if he borrowed money from a bank to finance his suit, or if a relative or close friend, who was also an employer, helped him in his suit.

At my urging, therefore, the Senate modified the limitation to apply to interested employers only, the legislative history making it clear that employers such as those in the foregoing examples were not included in the limitation which would apply only to employers who had a concrete interest in the litigation because of some relationship in the union other than the mere connection with the union member bringing the suit.

Section 101(a)(5) prohibits a union or its officers from in any way disciplining a member—except for nonpayment of dues—unless the member has been first, served with written specific charges; second, given a reasonable time to prepare his defense; and, third, given a full and fair hearing. The House and Senate bills were identical in this provision.

Section 101(b) makes null and void any union governing rule which is inconsistent with the bill of rights.

Section 102 gives a union member the right to sue a union in a Federal court, including the right to an injunction against the union, for violating his rights.

Section 103 preserves any other rights and remedies which a union member may have under any other State or Federal law, or before any other court or agency, or under any union constitution or bylaws. It thus guards against the application of the preemption problem in connection with the newly granted bill of rights, and preserves any broader safeguards for union members which may be contained in some union constitutions or bylaws.

Section 104 requires unions to make available copies of their collective bargaining agreements to those of their members who are covered by such agreements. The Secretary of Labor is given authority to enforce this provision by civil suit in a Federal court, including the securing of an injunction.

Section 105 requires every union to inform its members of the provisions of the new law. This provision developed from a proposal made by Senator JAVITS in committee and accepted in the bill as reported to the Senate.

TITLE II—REPORTING BY UNIONS, THEIR OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES, AND BY EMPLOYERS

1. REPORTS BY UNIONS

Section 201(a) requires every labor union to adopt a constitution and bylaws and to file copies thereof with the Secretary of Labor, together with a report containing all of the significant data concerning the structure and organization of the union, such as names and titles of officers, initiation fees, dues, work permit fees, other periodic member payments, qualifications for membership, audits, expenditure authorization, selection of officers, discipline procedures, and so forth, and so forth, so as to give a complete picture as to how the union is authorized to operate in all significant fields of its activity. This is substantially the same in both the House and Senate bills with these important differences.

The House bill required every union to adopt a constitution and bylaws. The Senate bill did not, despite the fact that there are some unions which have neither constitution nor bylaws, leaving their members completely in the dark as to their rights or as to the powers and authority of their union and its officers. The conferees adopted the House provision.

In committee, I offered an amendment requiring the reporting of fees to be paid by transferred members which was accepted in the bill as reported. Similarly, the committee accepted a minority amendment requiring the report to state the address of the union's principal office as well as any other address at which the union's books and records were kept. Both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report contain these amendments.

The Senate bill did not require reporting the fees charged by the union for work permits nor the procedures for issuing the same. These are a device whereby a union which cannot provide all the labor needed on a job permits nonunion employees to work, excludes them from membership in the union, but charges them for the privilege of working. Both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report contain this requirements.

The Senate bill did not require the union to report periodic payments in lieu of dues required from nonunion employees. These are a device for securing the equivalent of union dues in States where compulsory union membership agreements are illegal, thereby attempting to circumvent what appear to be the prohibitions of such State laws. Both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report contain this provision.

At the insistence of the minority members, the Senate Labor Committee accepted several amendments in the bill as reported which required the union to report its procedures for disciplining or removing union officials and for imposing fines, suspensions and expulsions of union members including the grounds upon which such disciplinary action may be taken, as well as any provision made for notice, hearings, judgment on the evidence, and appeal procedure. Both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report contain these requirements.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, as well as the committee bill reported to the Senate, merely required the union to report its procedures for the election of officers and stewards. On the Senate floor, this was expanded to reporting its procedures for the selection of officers and stewards and of any representatives to other bodies composed of organizations' representatives, with a specific statement of the manner in which each officer of the union was elected, appointed, or otherwise selected.

This much more comprehensive and effective provision is included in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 201(b) requires every labor union to file an annual report with the Secretary of Labor, broken down into categories prescribed by the Secretary, showing the following information about the union's financial status for the preceding year: First, assets and liabilities at the beginning and end of the year; second, receipts and their sources; third, all payments made to each officer, and to each employee who received a gross of more than $10,000, from the union or any affiliated union, or from any other local of the same internationals; fourth, any loan made to any officer, union employee or member aggregating more than $250, together with the purpose of, security for, and arrangement for repayment of such loan; fifth, any loan to any business enterprise, together with its purpose, security, and arrangement for repayment; and, sixth, any other disbursements and their purposes.

The bill as it passed the Senate did not require reporting payments made by the international to officers, employees, or members of any of the affiliated locals, or made by a local to officers, employees, or members of the international with which such local was affiliated. The Landrum-Griffin bill closed the loophole and the House provision was included in the conference report. Similarly, the Senate bill, as introduced—S. 505—did not require reporting of direct or indirect disbursements to union officers and employees other than salaries and allowances. In committee this amendment was offered by members of the minority and accepted in the form in which it appeared in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Again, the Senate bill, as introduced—S. 505—although it required reporting of loans by unions to union officers, employees and members, as well as to business enterprises, did not require a statement of the purpose of such loans. Members of the minority of the Senate Labor Committee insisted that such a provision be included and it was so included in the Senate bill as reported and ultimately in the Landrum-Griffin bill, the Senate bill, and the conference report.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill—S. 505—as introduced, required unions to report loans to any union officer, employee, or member, only if it aggregated in excess of $500. In committee, members of the minority sought to require the unions to report all such loans, regardless of amount. The issue was compromised by reducing the amount to $250, and that is the figure which appears in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 201(c) provides that every labor union must make the information it is required to report available to all of its members, and gives each member a right to sue in a Federal court to compel the union to permit such member, for just cause, to examine "any books, records, and accounts necessary to verify such report." The Senate bill, as reported, contained no provision of any kind giving union members any access to such basic union books, accounts, and records. The amendment to that effect which I introduced in committee was rejected, but was adopted by the Senate, substantially in its present form, when I renewed this amendment on the floor. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report both contain such a provision.

The Senate bill, S. 505, as originally introduced, permitted the Secretary of Labor to exempt from the financial reporting requirements described above, small unions having fewer than 200 members and gross annual receipts of less than $20,000. In the opinion of minority members of the Senate committee, this constituted a possible loophole permitting some of the most corrupt unions to escape the reporting requirements, and thus avoid the publicity concerning their affairs which it was the professed purpose of the bill to achieve. In committee, my amendment to remove this permissive exemption was rejected and a similar amendment offered on the floor by Senator CASE of New Jersey was likewise rejected. The Landrum-Griffin bill contained no exemption for any union and the conference report is the same.

2. REPORT OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF LABOR UNIONS

Section 202(a) requires every union officer and nonclerical, noncustodial employee, to file a report with the Secretary of Labor describing any holding or transaction involving himself or his immediate family and occurring during the preceding year, which would constitute a conflict-of-interest on the part of such union officer or employee. No report is required in the absence of such a holding of interest or participation in any such transaction.

Briefly, what must be reported are holdings of interest in or the receipt of economic benefits from employers who deal or might deal with such union official's union, or holdings in or benefits from enterprises which do business with such union official's union. Section 202(b) exempts from these reporting requirements any bona fide investment or income therefrom in securities traded on a national securities exchange, or shares in an investment company, or securities of a public utility holding company, which such securities exchanges and companies are registered under applicable Federal law.

These provisions of the conference report, as did the Landrum-Griffin bill, close a number of loopholes and correct a number of serious defects which were present at one stage or another of the Senate bill's progress from initial introduction to final passage.

Thus, under S. 505, the Senate bill as introduced, the only benefit's required to be reported were income from conflict-of-interest transactions. Under the internal revenue laws there are a number of types of benefits which do not constitute income. A capital gain is not income; a genuine gift is not income; a prize for which no services are rendered is not income. To close this loophole, minority members in the Senate committee secured an amendment extending the reporting requirement to any income or other benefit with monetary value, a provision which is in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Again, the original Senate bill although requiring disclosure of income derived from a business which buys, sells, or leases to the reporting official's union failed to include the language "or otherwise deals with" his union. An amendment to that effect by the minority was accepted by the Senate committee and is in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

The original Senate bill required a report by a union official of a payment to him from an employer or an employer's labor relations consultant only if it was in return for the union official's undertaking to influence or affect employees in the exercise of their rights under Taft-Hartley. The minority in the Senate committee secured an amendment extending the reporting requirement to any employer payment to a union official regardless of its objective, except for those payments specifically exempted from the criminal prohibitions in section 302(c) of Taft-Hartley. This provision is in the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Throughout this section of the bill as it passed the Senate there was a failure to include reimbursed expenses as information to be reported under the heading of "Income or Other Benefits," as well as a failure to include benefits received by the official's spouse or minor child in one of the listed conflict-of-interest situations. These omissions were corrected in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

The Senate bill, as passed, required these conflict-of-interest reports from union employees, only if their gross payments from the union exceeded $5,000. This left a gaping loophole for the corrupt union official whose financial gains from his doubledealing activities were greater than what the union paid him. To avoid reporting, such an official would merely arrange for his compensation from the union to be fixed at a figure of $5,000 or less, and he could then continue to receive his ill-gotten conflict-of-interest gains without disclosing them either to his union members or to the public. Both in committee and on the Senate floor, I was unsuccessful in securing an amendment to require all union officials to report these conflict-of-interest situations regardless of what the union paid them. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report, however, both close this loophole by requiring these reports without any such exemption.

As introduced, the Senate bill required a report of a conflict-of-interest holding only if the interest was actually still held at the moment of reporting. This would have permitted a union official to divest himself of such holding just prior to the reporting date, and thus, lawfully, to avoid reporting. The minority in the Senate committee closed this loophole by securing an amendment which required a report of an interest which a union official holds or has held during the preceding year. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report achieve the same result as this Senate committee minority amendment.

And, finally, the Senate bill as passed, in granting an exemption from these conflict-of-interest reporting requirements with respect to the types of securities or shares described above, used language which would have granted the exemption to a union official who received his "benefit with monetary value" from the employer in the form of such securities or shares. Thus, under the Senate bill's language, if an employer had paid off a union official with whose union he was bargaining by giving him $10,000 in General Motors stock, this would not need to have been reported. The Landrum-Griffin bill, as well as the conference report, limited this exemption to bona fide investments made by the union official in such securities or shares, and thereby required reporting of any payoff regardless of the form it takes.

3. REPORT OF EMPLOYERS

Section 203(a) requires employers to report annually to the Secretary of Labor the terms, details, and identity of the parties involved, of any of the following payments or transactions, made by him during the preceding year:

First. Any payment or loan, direct or indirect, of anything of value—including expenses—or any promise or agreement to pay or lend, to any labor union or labor union official or employee, except payments or loans exempted under section 302(c) of Taft-Hartley or made by enterprises whose business consists of making loans and payments such as banks, insurance companies, et cetera;

Second. Any payment including expenses to any of his employees to get them to persuade other employees in the exercise of their union organizing or collective bargaining rights unless the latter employees are informed simultaneously or previously that such payments are made;

Third. Any expenditure an object of which is to violate the Taft-Hartley Act by interfering with, restraining or coercing employees in the exercise of their union organizing and bargaining rights under that act;

Fourth. Any expenditure an object of which is to obtain information about the activities of a union or of employees in connection with a labor dispute involvin the employer unless the information is to be used solely in an administrative or arbitration proceeding or in a civil or criminal court case;

Fifth. Any agreement or arrangement with a labor relations consultant who is not a regular officer, supervisor or employee of the employer, under which the consultant undertakes, directly or indirectly, to persuade employees in the exercise of their union organizing or bargaining rights, or to supply the employer with information about the activities of a union or of employees in connection with a labor dispute involving the employer unless the information is to be used solely in an administrative or arbitration proceeding or in a civil or criminal court case;

Sixth. Any payment—including expenses—pursuant to such agreement or arrangement with a labor relations consultant.

There was one basic difference between the House-passed Landrum-Griffin bill and the Senate-passed bill in connection with the employer reporting requirements. Under the Senate bill the employer was required to report any payment or expenditure or any arrangement with a labor relations consultant an object of which was to persuade employees in conection with the exercise of their union organizing and collective bargaining rights even if such payment was completely within the law. Under the House-passed Landrum-Griffin bill, reports from employers with respect to expenditures in connection with employees' rights, were required only if such expenditures were designed to interfere with, restrain and coerce employees in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In conference, a compromise was reached. As indicated above, the employer, under the conference report, must report such expenditures only if an object is interference, restraint, or coercion, except where he gives something of value to any of his employees in order to get them to persuade other employees

with respect to their union organizing and collective bargaining rights. This type of payment constitutes interference in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act, but even so, need not be reported if disclosed to the employees being persuaded. As will be shown below, the requirement to report expenditures designed merely to persuade, as provided in the Senate bill, is retained with respect to arrangement with and activities by labor relations consultants.

Several other changes were accepted by the Senate conferees at the insistence of the House conferees in connection with the employer reporting requirements. Thus, the Senate bill required reporting by both employers and labor relations consultants of expenditures for information about activities of employees and unions in connection with a labor dispute. The House conferees, supported by the minority of the Senate conferees, secured an amendment limiting this reporting requirement to a dispute in which the reporting employer himself was involved, and not to labor disputes in general as provided in the Senate bill. The Senate bill, through the same process, was also modified by broadening its exemption from reporting expenditures for information to be used in administrative, arbitration and civil judicial proceedings to exempt information to be used in criminal proceedings. Thus, if the union, any of its members, or any of the employees, engage in criminal acts in a labor dispute—violence on a picket line, for example—the employer need not report any money he spends to secure evidence of such criminal conduct, if his purpose is to submit the same to the public prosecutor for use in a criminal proceeding.

Section 203(b) sets forth the reporting requirements for labor relations consultants. It provides that any person who pursuant to an agreement or arrangement with an employer undertakes to first, persuade employees as to the exercise of their rights to engage in union organizing and collective bargaining activities; or, second, furnish an employer with information about the activities of employees or a union in connection with a labor dispute involving the employer with whom he has the agreement or arrangement, must do the following:

First. File a report with the Secretary within 30 days of entering into the agreement or arrangement giving all the details concerning it.

Second. File annually with the Secretary for the preceding fiscal year if he received any payments pursuant to the agreement or arrangement, a report setting forth all receipts from all employers, and the sources thereof, on account of labor relations advice or services, as well as any disbursements and their purposes, in connection with such services, and this information shall be set forth as broken down into categories prescribed by the Secretary.

Section 203(c) exempts from all of the employer and consultant reporting requirements any information with respect to services in advising employers or agreeing to represent them before any court, administrative agency, or arbitrator, or agreeing to engage in collective bargaining or negotiate a collective bargaining contract in behalf of the employer.

Under section 203(d), no employer or consultant reports need be filed unless the specific circumstances set forth above are present.

Under section 203(e), as indicated above, none of the reporting requirements are applicable where the services are rendered by a regular officer, supervisor, or employee of the employer.

Section 203(f) preserves the rights of free speech and communication which are protected by section 8(c), the existing free speech section of title I of the Taft-Hartley Act. This specific safeguard was not in the Senate bill, but was accepted by the conferees just as it appeared in the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Section 203(g) defines "interfere with, restrain or coerce" as used in the employer and consultant reporting provisions to mean an unfair labor practice committed by an employer in violation of section 8(a) of title I of the Taft-Hartley Act. This, too, was taken by the conferees from the Landrum-Griffin bill.

ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATIONS EXEMPTED

Section 204 exempts an attorney in good standing in any State from reporting any information which was lawfully given to him by any of his clients in the course of a legitimate attorney-client relationship.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no exemption for the confidential communications made by a client to his attorney. In committee, I offered an amendment to that effect which was rejected. I renewed this amendment on the Senate floor and it was there agreed to. Such exemption is included in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

REPORTS MADE PUBLIC INFORMATION

Section 205(a) makes all the reports filed with the Secretary public information and authorizes the Secretary to publish any of the information so obtained, to use it for statistical and research purposes, and to publish studies and analyses based on such information.

Section 205(b) directs the Secretary to issue regulations for the examination, by any person who requests it, of such information.

Section 205(c) directs the Secretary to issue regulations providing for the sale, at cost, of copies of such reports. He is also directed to furnish such copies free of charge to appropriate authorized State agencies. Any person who has filed a report under the act need not file a similar report or furnish the same information under any State law if he gives the State agency a copy of his report filed with the Secretary.

The Senate bill, as introduced, did not authorize the Secretary to make conflict-of-interest reports available to State agencies. An amendment offered in the committee by the minority members, closed this loophole and it remains closed in the conference report, as it did in the Landrum-Griffin bill.

RETENTION OF RECORDS

Section 206 requires every person who must file one of the above reports to maintain records which will furnish enough detailed and necessary basic information to verify, explain, clarify or check the accuracy and completeness of such reports, including, but not limited to vouchers, worksheets, receipts, and applicable resolutions. These records must be kept available for examination for at least 5 years after the filing of the reports to which they pertain.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, did not require the making and preservation of these basic records with respect to conflict-of-interest reports by union officials. The minority members in committee succeeded in extending the requirement to these latter reports as well and the bill, as reported to the Senate, so provided. The conference report retains this essential safeguard as did the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The Senate bill as passed merely required the preservation of these basic records under conditions and for periods of time prescribed by the Secretary. The Landrum-Griffin bill, as well as the conference report, eliminate this discretionary authority of the Secretary and lay down a flat and unequivocal order, which permits of no exceptions, that they be kept available for at least 5 years. The 5-year period coincides with the length of the statute of limitations for criminally prosecuting acts of perjury under Federal law.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 207 sets forth the effective dates on which the foregoing reports must be filed with the Secretary.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

Section 208 authorizes the Secretary to issue rules and regulations prescribing the form in which the reports must be filed and such other reasonable rules and regulations—including rules requiring reports on trusts in which a union is interested—as he finds necessary to prevent circumvention of the reporting requirements. The Secretary is also directed to prescribe by general rule—and not on a case-by-case basis—simplified reports for unions and employers if he finds that because of their size—which actually means their lack of size—a detailed, regular report would be unduly burdensome. Once granted, he may revoke this permission to use a simplified report only if, after investigation, due notice, and an opportunity for a hearing, he decides that the reporting requirements are being or may be circumvented through the use of the simplified report.

The Senate bill as introduced (S. 505) authorized the Secretary to permit the use of simplified reports without any limitation as to size. This would have given the Secretary power to permit even very large employers and unions to use the simplified reports and thus to evade the detailed publicity about their financial affairs which it was the professed purpose of the legislation to achieve in order to cure the evils and abuses revealed by the McClellan committee.

The minority in the Senate committee secured the amendment limiting the use of simplified reports to small employers and unions, thus plugging a dangerous loophole, and both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report contain the same limitation.

The Senate bill contained a provision authorizing the Secretary to exempt from the reporting requirements for unlimited periods of time any union "or class thereof temporarily convened either for the sole purpose of negotiating a labor agreement or for carrying out educational activity."

In the discussions concerning this exemption which took place in the Senate committee, it was never quite clear as to precisely what types of organization were intended to be included in this exemption. No realistic concrete example of such an organization was ever precisely described. The Landrum-Griffin bill contained no similar exemption, and a majority of the conferees, concerned that this provision might afford a loophole through which some unions might evade the reporting requirements of the bill, refused to include it in the conference report.

CRIMINAL PROVISIONS

Section 209(a) makes it a misdemeanor punishable by imprisonment and fine up to $10,000 and 1 year, for any person who willfully violates the provisions of title II, that is, primarily the reporting requirements.

Section 209(b) makes it a similar misdemeanor for any person knowingly to make a false statement of a material fact or fail to disclose a material fact in any document, report, or other information required under title II.

Section 209(c) makes it a similar misdemeanor for any person willfully to make a false entry in or to conceal, withhold, or destroy any books, records, reports, or statements required to be kept under title II. The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 905) as introduced omitted the words "conceal" and "withhold" and merely prohibited "destroying" any books, records, and so forth. In committee, I offered the amendment inserting the words "conceal" and "withhold" which was accepted, thus closing an obvious loophole. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report both include this amendment.

Section 209(d) provides that each individual who is required to sign a union report under section 201 or an employer and consultant report under section 203, shall be personally responsible for the filing of such reports and for any statement contained therein which he knows to be false. This means that where the union or the employer, as such, are required to file reports, the officials who are required to sign these reports in behalf of the union or employer, as agents or representatives thereof, are just as responsible for both the filing and the truth of the reports, as are the principals in whose behalf they sign. The penalties imposed on the principals for noncompliance, are equally applicable to these officials.

CIVIL ENFORCEMENT

Section 210 provides that whenever it shall appear that any person has violated or is about to violate title II—which means primarily the reporting requirements—the Secretary may bring a civil action in a Federal district court for appropriate relief including injunctions. This means, among other things, that where there has been a failure to comply with these reporting requirements, the Secretary, through a judicial action, can compel such compliance even though it may not be possible to secure a criminal conviction for such noncompliance. And it should be emphasized that in invoking this remedy, the Secretary need not wait until a violation has occurred, but may initiate it even when it appears that no violation has as yet taken place but that it may occur. Hence this particular provision, if properly administered, provides the strongest possible guarantee that the reporting requirements of the bill will not be circumvented or violated.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505) as introduced, contained no provision of any kind giving the Secretary this authority so essential to the effective enforcement of the bill's reporting requirements. In committee, at my urging, such an amendment was accepted and included in the Senate bill as reported. It is in the Landrum-Griffin bill as well as in the conference report.

TITLE III—TRUSTEESHIPS

Section 301(a) requires every labor union—usually an international—which imposes a trusteeship on a subordinate union—usually a local—to file with the Secretary within 30 days, and twice a year thereafter, a report signed by the international president and treasurer, and the designated trustee, containing first, name and address of the trusteed local; second, the date the trusteeship was established; third, the reasons for establishing or continuing the trusteeship; and, fourth, the nature and extent of the participation by the members of the trusteed local in the selection of delegates to conventions or other policy-making bodies, as well as in the election of the international's officers. The initial report must also include a complete account of the financial condition of the trusteed local at the time the trusteeship was imposed. During the life of a trusteeship, the international must file, on behalf of and concerning the trusteed local, the annual financial report required of all unions under section 201(b), signed by the president and treasurer of the international.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505) as originally introduced, did not require the trustee designated by the international to sign the above report. In committee, Senator PROUTY offered an amendment to that effect which was accepted. It appears in the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report as well.

The Senate bill did not contain the provision requiring the international, during the life of the trusteeship, to file on behalf of the trusteed local the annual financial reports required of all labor unions, and hence provided a loophole which both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report have plugged effectively. Moreover, the Senate bill's provision allegedly requiring unions to keep and preserve the basic records and documents on which the trusteeship reports are based was ambiguous and could have been construed as not requiring such keeping and preservation. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report make this requirement unmistakably clear.

Again, as indicated above, the Senate bill, as passed, failed to make applicable to these trusteeship reports, the provision described—section 210—authorizing the Secretary to bring suit in a Federal court for injunctive as well as other relief, to compel compliance where there is a violation or threatened violation of the reporting requirements of the bill. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report remedy this defect.

And finaly, the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, made no provisions for access by union members to the basic books and records from which the trusteeship reports were prepared, thus rendering it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for the union members to apply some reliable check to the truth and accuracy of the reports. In committee, I offered an amendment to this effect which was rejected. I again offered it on the Senate floor where it was agreed to. A similar provision is contained in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 301(c) makes it a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment up to $10,000 and 1 year for any person willfully to violate section 301, which means primarily the trusteeship reporting requirements.

Section 301(d) similarly makes it a misdemeanor for any person knowingly to make a false statement of a material fact or fail to disclose a material fact in any required trusteeship report, or willfully to make any false entry in or withhold, conceal, or destroy any documents, books, records, and so forth, upon which such report is based.

The Senate bill, as passed, failed to include the prohibition against making a false entry in such basic books or records. This left a gaping loophole for frustrating the object of this part of the bill—accurate public disclosure of the essential factors connected with a trusteeship. This loophole is closed both in the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 301(e) like the corresponding provision in title II dealing with financial reporting of unions, described above, makes personally responsible for filing trusteeship reports and for knowingly false statements contained therein, each individual who is required under the bill to sign such report in behalf and as the agent or representative of the international union from whom such report is required.

PURPOSES FOR WHICH A TRUSTEESHIP MAY BE ESTABLISHED

Section 302 requires unions—usually international—to impose trusteeships over subordinate unions—usually locals—only in accordance with the constitution and by-laws of the international and for the following purposes only, regardless of inconsistent provisions in such constitution or bylaws: First, to correct corruption or financial malpractice; second, to assure the carrying out of collective bargaining agreements or other duties of a bargaining representative; third, to restore democratic procedures; or, fourth, otherwise to carry out the legitimate objects of the international.

The Senate bill, as passed, imposed these limitations for imposing trusteeships only on national or international unions, by which it is true, they are usually imposed. However, it is possible that a trusteeship may be imposed by a labor organization other than a national or international union, and the Landrum-Griffin bill uses language broad enough to encompass every trusteeship imposed by one union over a subordinate body. The conference accepted the provision of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

UNLAWFUL ACTS RELATING TO LABOR ORGANIZATION UNDER TRUSTEESHIP

Sections 303(a) makes it unlawful during a trusteeship; first, in any convention or election of international officers to count the votes of delegates from the trusteed subordinate union—or local—unless the delegates were chosen in a secret ballot election in which all the members in good standing of the trusteed local were eligible to participate; or, second, to transfer to the international any current receipts or other funds of the trusteed local except the normal per capita tax and assessments. Upon the bona fide dissolution of any labor union its assets may be distributed in accordance with its constitution and bylaws.

Section 303(b) makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by not more than a $10,000 fine and a year in prison, for anyone willfully to violate the preceding subsection 303(a).

ENFORCEMENT

Section 304(a) provides that upon the written complaint of any member of a trusteed local charging that the international has violated any provision of section 302 which prescribes the conditions under which and the purposes for which a trusteeship may be imposed or the provisions of section 303 dealing with voting rights and the selection of convention or other delegates in a trusteed local as well as the safeguarding of its receipts and other funds, the Secretary of Labor must investigate and if he finds probable cause to believe that such violation has not been remedied, he must, without identifying the complaining union member, bring a suit in a Federal district court for appropriate relief, including injunctions, to remedy the violation.

Any member of a trusteed local or such local itself, if they are affected by such violations, may sue in a Federal district court for similar relief.

It should be noted that these two types of civil action are not applicable to violations of section 301 which requires trusteeship reports to be filed with the Secretary. These latter violations, as indicated above, are punishable through criminal prosecution and subject to a civil suit, brought by the Secretary at his own discretion, under section 210.

The Senate passed bill, unlike the Landrum-Griffin bill, failed to permit members of a trusteed local or such local itself to bring a suit. The conferees adopted the provision of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Section 304(b) provides that the civil suits for violation of sections 302 or 303 may be brought, first, in the district where the international has its principal office; or, second, in any district in which the authorized officials of the international are conducting the affairs of the trusteeship.

Section 304(c) provides that a trusteeship validly established in conformity with sections 302 or 303, and authorized or ratified by the executive board or other constitutional governing body of the international, shall be presumed valid and not subject to attack for 18 months except upon clear and convincing proof that the trusteeship was not established or is not being maintained, in good faith, for one of the four allowable purposes set forth in section 302. After the first 18 months, the trusteeship is presumed invalid in any such civil court action and the court must order it discontinued unless the international shows by clear and convincing proof that the trusteeship is still needed in order to achieve one of the four allowable purposes set forth in section 302. It should be noted that a trusteeship cannot be dissolved for a violation of the provisions of section 303 dealing with violations of voting rights, selection of delegates, and the use of the trusteed local's funds. These violations can be remedied by the civil court actions previously described, but they do not affect the continuance or bring about the discontinuance of the trusteeship.

The Senate-passed bill did not provide for termination of the trusteeship upon proof that although properly established, the trusteeship was not being maintained for one of the four allowable purposes in section 302. Thus, a trusteeship validly established to restore democratic procedures in the trusteed local, one of the four allowable purposes, might continue to be maintained after this purpose had been achieved, for a purpose other than one of the allowable four. Under the Senate bill, none of the provisions permitted any action for terminating such trusteeship inasmuch as it had been validly established in the first place. The Landrum-Griffin bill corrected this defect and the conferees accepted the provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

REPORT TO CONGRESS

Section 305 requires the Secretary to submit to Congress 3 years after the bill become law, a report on how the trusteeship title has operated.

COMPLAINT BY SECRETARY

Section 306 provides that any of the rights and remedies granted by the trusteeship title are in addition to any other rights or remedies under any other provisions of Federal or State law. In other words, there is no Federal preemption under this title, except that once the Secretary of Labor files a complaint in a Federal court alleging a violation of any provisions of the trusteeship title, the jurisdiction of the Federal court becomes exclusive—all other rights and remedies are preempted—and any final judgment of such court is res adjudicata, that is, conclusive and binding on every other court.

TITLE IV—ELECTIONS

TERMS OF OFFICE; ELECTION PROCEDURES

Section 401(a) requires every national or international labor union except a parent federation like the AFL–CIO itself, to elect its officers at least once every 5 years by secret ballots cast by its members in good standing or at a convention of delegates chosen by secret ballot.

The Senate bill, as passed, applied this requirement solely to the officers named in the union constitution. As a result, other officials, not so named, but authorized to perform the functions of officers and thus falling within the definition of "officer" in the bill, could be elected at intervals greater than 5 years, thereby defeating one of the indispensable objectives of reform legislation, to wit, an opportunity to compel rotation in office thereby enabling the membership to get rid of an undesirable incumbent officer and replace him with one whom they prefer.

The Landrum-Griffin bill closes this loophole by requiring all national or international officers—as defined in the bill—to be selected at least once every 5 years. The conferees accepted the Landrum-Griffin bill provision.

Section 401(b) requires that local union officers be chosen at least once every 3 years by secret ballots cast by its members in good standing. The Senate bill contained the same loophole with respect to these local officers as it did in connection with the election of international and national officers, as described above, and was similarly corrected by the conferees in accepting the Landrum-Griffin bill provision.

Section 401(c) provides that every union, except a parent federation like the AFL–CIO, has a duty, enforcible by a suit in a Federal court brought by any bona fide candidate for office in such union, to comply with all reasonable requests of any candidate to distribute by mail or otherwise at the candidate's expense, campaign literature in aid of his candidacy to all the union's members in good standing, and to refrain from discriminating in favor of or against any candidate with respect to the use of its membership lists; and, whenever the union or its officers authorize such distribution on behalf of any candidate or of the union itself, it must make similar distribution at the request of any other bona fide candidate, with equal treatment as to the expense thereof.

Every bona fide candidate has the right, once within 30 days before the election, to inspect a list containing the names and addresses of all the union's members who are covered by a compulsory union membership collective bargaining agreement, which list must be kept at the union's principal office by a designated official. The union must establish adequate safeguards to insure a fair election, including, but not limited to, the right of any candidate to have an observer at the polls and at the counting of the ballots.

Under the Senate bill, contrary to the Landrum-Griffin bill, these safeguards, designed to insure both equal treatment for all candidates for union office and fair union elections, were applicable only to elections for local union office and not to the elections of national or international union officers. The conferees closed this loophole by adopting the Landrum-Griffin approach.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no provisions guaranteeing equal treatment of bona fide candidates for union office, thus leaving every advantage in the hands of the incumbent union officers. Thus, it would have done nothing to correct the conditions, so prevalent in many unions, which permit the incumbent officers to perpetuate themselves in office indefinitely. In committee, minority members offered an amendment which required equal opportunity for all candidates with respect to the use of the membership lists for transmitting campaign literature as well as the requirement permitting all candidates to have observers at both the casting and counting of the ballots. This amendment was accepted in the Senate bill as reported. It is also part of the Landrum-Griffin bill and is retained in the conference report.

As reported, the Senate bill contained no provision requiring that bona fide candidates be permitted to make a physical inspection of the union's membership lists. Senator PROUTY offered an amendment to that effect which was rejected. The Landrum-Griffin bill contains such a provision permitting inspection of lists of members covered by a union-shop agreement and the conferees accepted such provision.

The Senate bill requires the union to establish safeguards for a fair count of the ballots. The Landrum-Griffin bill contained a much broader protection—it required adequate safeguards for a fair election which goes beyond a mere count of the ballots. The conferees accepted the language of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Section 401(d) provides that officers of intermediate bodies, such as general committees, system boards, joint boards, or joint councils, must be elected at least once every 4 years, by secret ballot among the members in good standing, or by union officers, elected by secret ballot as representatives of such members.

Section 401(e) provides that in any of the foregoing elections required by section 401, a reasonable opportunity shall be given to nominate officers, and every union member in good standing shall be eligible to be a candidate, and to hold office subject to reasonable qualifications uniformly imposed except for those disqualified as criminals and convicts under section 504, and to vote for or otherwise support the candidates of his choice, without being subject to any disciplining, interference, or reprisal by the union or any of its members. Not less than 15 days before an election, a notice thereof must be mailed to each member at his last known address, and each member in good standing is entitled to one vote.

No member whose dues have been withheld by his employer under a check-off provision voluntarily authorized by such member under the collectve bargaining agreement shall be ineligible to vote for alleged failure to pay dues on time. The votes cast by members of each local shall be counted and the results published separately. The constitutionally designated union officials, or the union secretary, shall preserve for 1 year the ballots and all other records pertaining to the election which shall be conducted in accordance with the union's constitution and bylaws if they are not inconsistent with the provisions of title IV of the bill.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, provided merely that a reasonable opportunity be given to nominate candidates. In committee, minority members offered the amendment that every member in good standing be eligible to be a candidate, to hold office, and to support the candidate of his choice, without being subject to penalty, interference, or reprisal of any kind by the union or its officers. This amendment was accepted. A similar provision is in the Landrum-Griffin bill as well as in the conference report.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, dispensed with the 15-day mail notice to members of an election, if the union constitution and bylaws specified a regular time for holding elections. Minority members in committee objected to this provision, insisting that the 15-day mail notice be required in all union elections without exception but their objection was rejected in the bill as reported to the Senate, which in turn rejected the position of the majority members of the committee and accepted that of the minority members. The Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report are the same as the original position of the minority members of the Senate committee.

Section 401(f) provides that when union officers are chosen in convention by delegates elected by secret ballot, the convention must be conducted in accordance with the union's constitution and bylaws if they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title IV, and such union's constitutionally designated officials or its secretary must preserve for 1 year the credentials of the delegates and all minutes and records of the convention pertaining to the election of officers.

Section 401(g) provides that no union funds derived from dues, assessments, or any similar levy, and no money from an employer shall be contributed or used to promote the candidacy of any person for union office where such election is regulated by the provisions of this title IV. Such union funds—but not money from an employer—may be used for notices, factual statements of issues not involving candidates, and other expenses necessary for the holding of an election.

The Senate bill, as reported, did not limit the use of union funds to "a factual statement of the issues," so as to prevent the incumbent officers running for reelection from presenting such factual statement in a manner designed to further their own candidacies. On the floor of the Senate, Senator MUNDT offered the amendment, which the Senate accepted, limiting the presentation to a "factual statement of the issues" so as to preclude such candidates from gaining an advantage thereby. The conference report contains the same safeguard.

Section 401(h) provides that a member of a local union may complain to the Secretary that the constitution and bylaws of his local do not provide an adequate procedure for the removal of an elected officer guilty of serious misconduct. If the Secretary, after a hearing in accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, finds such complaint to be true, then the officer so charged may be removed for cause shown, and after notice and hearing, by the members in good standing voting in a secret ballot conducted by the officers of such union in accordance with its constitution and bylaws insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title IV.

Section 401(i) provides that the Secretary shall promulgate rules and regulations prescribing minimum standards and procedures for determining the adequacy of the removal procedures referred to in the preceding section 401(h).

ENFORCEMENT

Section 402(a) provides that a union member who has, first, exhausted the remedies provided by his union's or its parent body's constitution and bylaws; or, second, invoked such remedies for 3 calendar months without obtaining a final decision, may, within 1 calendar month thereafter, file a complaint with the Secretary alleging the violations of any of the foregoing provisions of section 401 or the provisions of the union's constitution and bylaws pertaining to the election or removal of officers. The challenged election shall be presumed valid pending a final decision thereon and in the interim the business of the union shall be conducted by the officers elected or in any other manner provided in the union's constitution and bylaws.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S.505), as introduced, required a union member to invoke his union remedies for 4 months rather than 3 before complaining to the Secretary that the election provisions of section 401 had been violated. The minority in committee secured an amendment reducing this to 3 months as it appears in the conference report.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, failed to provide that such a complaint could be filed by a union mem-

ber where his union's constitution and bylaws did contain an adequate removal procedure but the union or its officials were refusing to permit such procedure to be invoked or applied. In committee, I offered an amendment to correct this defect which was accepted, and it is contained in the Conference Report.

Section 402(b) provides that the Secretary must investigate such complaint by a union member, and if he finds probable cause to believe that a violation of this title IV has occurred and has not been remedied, he must within 60 days after such complaint has been filed, bring a civil suit in a Federal district court to set aside the invalid election, if any, and to direct the conduct of an election, or of a hearing and vote upon the removal of officers, both under his own supervision and in accordance with this title IV and such rules and regulations as he prescribed. The court is authorized to take such action as it deems proper to preserve the union's assets.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, failed to give the Secretary the authority to supervise the hearing and vote upon the removal of officers. The minority members of the Senate committee offered an amendment to supply this omission which was accepted in the bill as reported and included in the conference report. Again, the Senate bill, as introduced, gave the court power to preserve and safeguard the union's assets if the court's decision declared an election to be void. The minority members of the Senate committee pointed out that this would permit the unlawfully elected officers to dissipate the union's assets during the substantial period which must elapse before the court reached a decision. They therefore offered an amendment permitting the court to take the necessary steps to preserve the union's assets as soon as the suit was begun. This was accepted in the bill as reported and is in the conference report.

Section 402(c) provides that if upon a preponderance of the evidence after a trial on the merits, the court finds, first, that a union election has not been held as frequently as required by section 401; or, second, that any violation of section 401 may have affected the outcome of a union election, the court shall declare the election, if any, to be void and direct a new election under the Secretary's supervision, and in conformity with the union's constitution and bylaws as far as that is practicable and consistent with the law. The Secretary must promptly certify to the court the names of the persons elected, and the court must thereupon enter a decree declaring such persons to be the union's officers. If the suit is for the removal of officers, the Secretary must certify the results of the vote and the court must enter a decree declaring whether such persons have been removed as officers of the union.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, authorized the court to declare an election void only if the violation of section 401 actually affected the outcome of the election rather than may have affected such outcome. The difficulty of proving such an actuality would be so great as to render the professed remedy practically worthless. Minority members in committee secured an amendment correcting this glaring defect and the amendment is contained in the conference report.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, made no provision in this subsection 402(c) for authorizing the court to entertain a suit for violation of the provisions pertaining to the removal of union officers. Minority members in committee offered an amendment to supply this serious omission which was accepted and included in the conference report.

Section 402(d) provides that a court order directing a union election, dismissing a complaint, or designating elected officers of a labor union, shall be appealable in the same manner as the final judgment in a civil action, but an order directing an election shall not be stayed pending appeal.

APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS

Section 403 provides that no union shall be required to hold elections of officers more frequently or in a different manner than is required by its own constitution and bylaws except as otherwise provided by this title IV. Existing rights and remedies to enforce the union's constitution and bylaws with respect to elections before such elections are actually held are preserved and not preempted, but the remedy provided by this title IV for challenging an election shall be exclusive, that is, shall preempt all other provisions of law.

In the Senate committee, the proponents of the Kennedy-Ervin bill inserted language, which, literally read, would have permitted the union, by modifying its constitution and bylaws, to evade the bill's requirements as to the form and manner of conducting elections for officers, and to hold such elections at longer intervals than the maximum of 5 and 3 years, respectively, required by this title IV. The minority members objected vigorously and the bill, as reported, accepted their objections, and closed this loophole in the language to preclude such evasion. The conference report adopts this safeguard.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, completely preempted the entire field of union election procedures and requirements and their violation. As a result of the objections of members of the minority in committee, the compromise which is also in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report, was accepted, preempting only those rights and remedies in connection with challenging an election which has already been held, but preserving all other rights and remedies with respect to elections before they are conducted.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 404 provides that the union election provisions of this title IV shall become applicable, first, 90 days after enactment of the bill into law in the case of a union whose constitution and bylaws permit their amendment or modification by action of its constitutional officers or governing body; or, second, where such change in constitution and bylaws can only be made by a constitutional convention of the union, not later than the next constitutional convention of such union after the enacting date of this bill, or one year after such date, whichever occurs sooner.

If no such convention is held within such 1-year period, the executive board or similar governing body empowered to act for such union between conventions, is empowered to make such interim constitutional changes as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title IV regardless of any provisions in the union's constitution and bylaws to the contrary.

These provisions are not to be construed as permitting a local and international election of union officers to be deferred until 3 and 5 years respectively after the act becomes effective regardless of how many additional years have elapsed since such elections were held. Thus, for example, an international which has not held an election for officers in the 10 years preceding enactment of this bill, is not granted an additional 5 years after such enactment, before being required to hold such an election. Such election must be held, at the very latest, not more than 1 year after date of enactment.

The Senate bill, as introduced, reported out of committee, and passed by the Senate, provided a grace period of up to 2 years for complying with the election provisions of this title IV. The conference report reduced this to 1 year.

TITLE V—SAFEGUARDS FOR LABOR UNIONS

FIDUCIARY RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICERS OF LABOR UNIONS

Section 501(a) provides that union officers, agents, shop stewards, and other representatives occupy positions of trust in relation to the union and its members as a group. It makes it their duty, taking into account the special problems and functions of a labor union, to hold the union's money and property solely for the benefit of the union and its members; to manage, invest, and expend the same in accordance with its constitution, bylaws, and any resolution of the union's governing bodies adopted thereunder; to refrain from dealing with their union as an adverse party or in behalf of an adverse party in any matter connected with their duties and from holding or acquiring any pecuniary or personal interest which conflicts with the interests of the union; and to account to the union for any profit received by them in whatever capacity in connection with transactions conducted by them or under their direction on behalf of the union. A general provision in the constitution and bylaws of the union or a general resolution of its governing body purporting to relieve any such union official of liability for breach of the duties imposed on him by this section is void as against public policy.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no provision of any kind imposing fiduciary status and obligations on union officials. In committee, minority members protested vigorously against this omission and

urged an amendment to impose such status and obligations and for an effective remedy against any breach thereof. This amendment was rejected and instead a statement was included in the policy section of the bill as reported to the Senate—in other words, in the preamble—declaring it to be the policy of the United States to encourage the faithful observance by union officials of their fiduciary responsibilities by requiring them to file conflict-of-interest reports—which the bill required anyway under title II—and to file reports on all expenditures by them, for community welfare, educational or charitable purposes, loans, and other transactions involving union funds—which were not required under the bill to be filed by them personally.

This statement in the preamble was a mere pious gesture, having no legal effect, providing no remedy for enforcement, and designed to create the misleading public impression that the bill effectively placed union officials in the status of fiduciaries, a status which the public was demanding.

On the Senate floor, an amendment was adopted, imposing a fiduciary status on union officials with respect to money or property in possession of such official by virtue of his office. No remedy for breach of such obligation was provided, nor did the amendment specifically provide that such officials were under a legal duty to refrain from engaging in conflict-of-interest transactions or holdings. The Landrum-Griffin bill both imposed the fiduciary status and provided a remedy for breach thereof. The conference report provided such remedy—as described below—and made it clear that involvement of a union official in a conflict-of-interest situation was a breach of his fiduciary responsibility.

Section 501(b) provides that when any such union official is alleged to have violated his fiduciary duties, and the union or its governing board, or its officers, refuse or fail to sue or recover damages or secure an accounting or other appropriate relief within a reasonable time after being requested to do so by any member of the union, such member may sue the official in a Federal district court or a State court of competent jurisdiction to recover damages or secure an accounting or other appropriate relief—including injunctive relief—for the benefit of the union. No such suit shall be brought except upon leave of the court obtained upon verified application—meaning a sworn application—and for good cause shown, which application may be made ex parte—that is to say without notice to the union to appear in court and offer its defense.

The judge may allot a reasonable part of the recovery in any such suit to pay the fees of the lawyer bringing the suit for the union member, and to compensate such member for any expenses necessarily paid or incurred by him in connection with the litigation.

As indicated above, at no stage of the Senate bill was a remedy for breach of fiduciary duty provided. It is in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 501(c) provides that any person who embezzles, steals, or unlawfully and willfully abstracts or converts to his own use, or the use of another, any of the moneys, funds, securities, property, or other assets of a labor union of which he is an officer, or by which he is employed, directly or indirectly, shall be guilty of a felony and fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years or both.

This section makes embezzlement or any unlawful taking of union funds a Federal crime in addition to its already being a crime under all the laws of all the States. In addition, under section 501(b), described above, a union member may bring suit, where such an unlawful taking is engaged in by a union official, for breach of the fiduciary duty of such official.

Although the Senate bill, both as introduced and as reported from committee, also made such unlawful taking of union funds a Federal crime, it did not permit a civil suit by a union member unless the union official charged with the taking had been already convicted in a criminal proceeding of actually having committed such a crime. Thus, in effect, no recovery in a civil action for such unlawful taking was permitted except upon proof of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt rather than upon the mere preponderance of the evidence which is all that is required for recovery in a civil suit.

I offered an amendment in committee to permit such civil suit at least upon indictment of the union official, as well as conviction, but this was rejected. On the Senate floor, an amendment was adopted permitting such suit upon a mere allegation of an unlawful taking, but the conference report solves the entire problem by providing an adequate civil remedy for breach of the fiduciary obligation including an alleged embezzlement or other unlawful taking of union funds or property by a union official, and relief is awarded on a mere preponderance of the evidence.

In the Kennedy-Ervin bill—S. 505—as introduced, the provision making embezzlement and unlawful taking a Federal crime was applicable to the funds and property of all tax-exempt organizations, not merely to labor unions. In no hearing before any congressional committee at any time had there ever been even the slightest evidence that such crimes were being committed in connection with the funds or property of any tax-exempt organizations other than labor unions. In committee, the provision was made applicable to labor unions only, as it is in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

And finally, the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, although permitting a union member to bring a civil suit to recover embezzled or unlawfully taken union funds against a union official convicted of such unlawful taking, required the union member to wait until the union or its governing body or officers had themselves failed or refused to bring such suit following a demand that they do so. But no time limit was placed on how long the union member had to wait before bringing suit where the union failed to sue.

In committee, I offered an amendment which was accepted in the bill as reported to the Senate, requiring the union member to wait no longer than 6 months where the union failed to do so following such demand.

BONDING

Section 502(a) provides that every officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative of a union, the property and annual receipts of which exceed $5,000, or of a trust in which such union is interested, who handles funds or other property of such union or trust must be bonded for the faithful discharge of his duties.

Each such person's bond shall be fixed at the beginning of the union's or trust's fiscal year and shall not be for less than 10 percent of the funds handled by him or his predecessors during the preceding fiscal year, but not more than for $500,000. If the union or trust does not have a fiscal year, the bond shall be at least $1,000 for a local union and $10,000 for a trust or any nonlocal union.

Such bonds must be individual or schedule in form—that is, the individual holding the office must personally be bonded and not merely the position he holds—and shall have a corporate surety company as surety thereon. Any person who is not covered by such bond shall not be permitted to receive, handle, disburse, or otherwise exercise custody or control of the funds or other property of such union or trust.

No such bond shall be placed through an agent or broker, or with a surety company, in which any labor union or any of its officials have a direct or indirect interest. Such surety company shall be a corporate surety which holds a grant of authority from the Secretary of the Treasury under the act of July 30, 1947 (6 U.S.C. 6–13), as an acceptable surety on Federal bonds.

Neither the Senate bill, as introduced, nor as reported by the committee to the Senate, contained any provision for the bonding of union officials. Senator McCLELLAN, on the Senate floor, secured adoption of an amendment requiring bonding of union officials handling the funds or property of such union or trust. But the bonding provision contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill was more effective in the following respects:

First. The bond must be a personal one, thus insuring a thorough investigation by the bonding company of the financial reliability of the applicant for the bond. This results in prohibiting any individual to handle union funds if he is unable to secure such bond because the results of his investigation are unfavorable. This constitutes a built-in safeguard against the holding of union office by many of the crooks, racketeers, and criminals who have infiltrated the labor movement. There was no similar requirement in the Senate bill;

Second. No bonding company is eligible to furnish a bond for any union official pursuant to the bonding requirements of the bill if any labor union or union official has any interest in such company or in the agent or broker through whom the bond is placed. There was no such safeguard in the Senate bill.

Third. The only bonding companies which are eligible to provide bonds under this section are those on the approved list of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Senate bill contained no such requirement.

In conference, the conferees adopted a provision imposing a maximum ceiling of $500,000 on the amount of any single bond required. This is twice as great as the $250,000 maximum provided in the Senate bill.

Section 502(b) provides that any person who willfully violated the bonding provision shall be guilty of a misdemeanor or punishable by fine and imprisonment up to $10,000 and 1 year. This would apply to both the individual who, as a union official, handles union funds or property without having such bond and to the labor union or its officers who knowingly permit him to do so.

The bonding provision in the Senate bill merely prescribed bonding for union officials handling union funds or property. Unlike the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report, it failed to provide any remedy, sanction, or penalty, civil or criminal, for a violation of the bonding requirement.

MAKING OF LOANS; PAYMENT OF FINES

Section 503(a) forbids any labor union, directly or indirectly, to have out on loan at any time a total of more than $2,000 to any officer or employee of the union.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, was so worded as to permit the union to make a series of loans, to any single union official, as long as each separate loan was not more than $1,500 when it was made, and without regard to such official's preceding indebtedness to the union and without any limit to the total indebtedness thereby permitted to be incurred by such official.

I offered in committee an amendment which was accepted, limiting the total indebtedness to be permitted to any union official by the lending union to the stated amount. This approach is the same as that in the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 503(b) prohibits any labor union or employer from directly or indirectly paying the fine of any officer or employee convicted of any willful violation of the bill.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no such provision. At the initiative of minority members in committee, an amendment containing this prohibition was included in the bill as reported to the Senate. It is also contained in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

Section 503(c) makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by fine and imprisonment of up to $5,000 and 1 year, for any person to violate the loan limitations and prohibition against payment of fines contained in this section 503.

PROHIBITION AGAINST CERTAIN PERSONS HOLDING OFFICE

Section 504(a) prohibits any person who has been a Communist Party member or who has been convicted or served any part of a prison term for conviction of certain enumerated felonies or of violation of title II—reporting requirements or title III—trusteeships—or of conspiracy to commit any such crimes from serving first, as an officer, official, or employee—other than clerical or custodial—of any labor union; or, second, as a labor relations consultant to any person engaged in an activity affecting commerce or as an officer, official or employee—other than clerical or custodial—of any group or association of employers dealing with any union, for 5 years after termination of Communist Party membership, or for 5 years after such conviction or imprisonment, unless having been so convicted or imprisoned, (A) his citizenship rights having been revoked, have been fully restored, or (B) the Federal Parole Board determines that such person's service as a union official, labor relations consultant, or employee of an employer association would not be contrary to the purposes of this act.

Before making such determination, the Parole Board must hold an administrative hearing and give notice thereof to the State, county and Federal prosecuting officials in the jurisdiction in which such person was convicted, and the Board's determination shall be final.

No union or union officer shall knowingly permit any person to assume or hold any office or paid position in violation of this prohibition.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, although prohibiting union officials and employees from so serving if they had been previously convicted of violations of the reporting requirements and trusteeship provisions of the bill, made an exception for paid personnel paid $4,000 per year or less. This was knocked out in committee and no such limitation is in either the Landrum-Griffin bill or the conference report.

Neither the Senate bill (S. 505), as introduced, nor as reported from committee, provided that the 5-year prohibition against holding union office or employment should run from the termination of imprisonment as well as from conviction, whichever occurs later. This would have permitted the 5 years to run while a felon was actually serving his prison term, and in many cases, permit him to hold office less than 5 years after such imprisonment or even immediately on the termination thereof. This was corrected on the Senate floor. Neither the Landrum-Griffin bill nor the conference report contained this defect.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, forbade a labor union or any officer thereof, knowingly and willfully, to permit any person to hold any union office or paid position if he had been convicted of or imprisoned for violation of the reporting and trusteeship provisions of the bill, but not of any of the other felonious crimes referred to above.

In subcommittee, the majority proposed that even this limited prohibition be further limited to hold only the union officers, and not the union itself, responsible for permitting such persons to hold union office or employment. As a result of the vigorous objection of members of the minority, this further limitation was deleted in the bill, as reported to the Senate, but still only applicable to persons in violation of the reporting and trusteeship provisions of the bill.

The conference report makes it unlawful for the union or its officers knowingly to permit any person to hold union office or employment in violation not only of the reporting and trusteeship provisions of title II and III, but also those guilty of any of the other enumerated felonies, as well.

Section 504(b) makes it a misdemeanor, punishable by fine and imprisonment up to $10,000 and 1 year for violation of the foregoing provisions of section 504(a).

Section 504(c) provides that for the purposes of this section 504, a person shall be deemed to have been convicted and under the disability of conviction from the date of the judgment of the trial court or the date of the final sustaining of such judgment on appeal, whichever occurs later, regardless of whether such conviction occurred before or after the date of enactment of this act.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 302 OF TAFT-HARTLEY

Section 505 amends section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act. That section forbids employers to pay or deliver anything of value to any representative of his employees. It is now amended as section 302(a) to apply also to employer associations, labor relations consultants to employers, or persons acting in the interest of an employer, and to include loans as well as payment and deliveries. The prohibition is extended also to payments, deliveries or loans to first, labor unions, their officers or employees, which represent, seek to represent, or would admit to membership, any of the employees of such employer; or, second, any employee or group of employees of such employer, in excess of their normal wage, for the purpose of causing them, directly, or indirectly, to influence any other employees in the exercise of their right to organize and bargain collectively, or, third, any union officer or employee with intent to influence his actions, decisions, or duties as a representative of employees or as such union officer or employee.

Section 302(b)(1) of Taft-Hartley is amended to forbid all persons falling in the above categories—to whom payments or loans under section 302(a) may not be made—to request, demand, receive, or accept, or agree to receive or accept, any such payment, loan or delivery.

In the Senate bill, as introduced, reported and passed by the Senate, although it was made a crime for an employer, consultant, and so forth, to lend, as well as to pay or deliver, it was made a crime for the recipient only with respect to payments or deliveries and not to loans. Thus, under this provision an employer committed a crime by making a loan to an official of the union he bargained with, but no crime for the union official to accept the loan. The Landrum-Griffin bill corrected this loophole and the conference report includes this correction.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, in prohibiting payments or loans to employees for the purpose of

persuading other employees in the exercise of their rights, failed to limit this prohibition to payments in excess of normal wages, and hence, merely paying of the usual and normal wages under these circumstances would have been unlawful. Minority members in committee offered an amendment limiting such illegality only to payments, and so forth, in excess of normal compensation, which was accepted in the bill as reported. This amendment is included in the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

A new provision is added to section 302 of Taft-Hartley, designated as 302(b)(2). This makes it a crime for any union, or for any person acting as an officer, agent, representative or employee of such union, to demand or accept from the operator of any motor vehicle—as defined in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act—employed in the transportation of property in interstate commerce, or the employer of any such operator, any money or other thing of value payable to such labor union or to an officer, agent, representative, or employee thereof as a fee or charge for the unloading, or in connection with the unloading, of the cargo of such vehicle, but this prohibition does not make it unlawful for an employer to make any payment to any of his employees as compensation for their services as employees.

The conference report also amends section 302(c) of Taft-Hartley which sets forth certain exemptions to the prohibition against employer payments and their acceptance under sections 302 (a) and (b).

The first exception in section 302(c) is expanded to exempt payments by an employer to any employee whose established duties include acting openly for such employer in matters of labor relations or personnel administration, or to any representative of his employees, or to any officer or employee of a labor union, who is also an employee or former employee of such employer, as wages for his services as an employee of such employer.

To the five exemptions listed in section 302(c), the conference report adds a sixth: anything of value paid by an employer to a trust fund established by a union for the purpose of pooled vacation, holiday severance or similar benefits, or defraying costs of apprenticeship or other training programs, all subject to the same conditions applicable to welfare and benefit plans under Taft-Hartley prior to its amendment by this bill.

In all stages of the Senate bill, from original introduction to final passage by the Senate, the fourth exemption of section 302(c) exempting checkoff of union dues was amended to exempt checkoff of periodic payments in lieu of dues. These periodic payments are a device now being used in some States to circumvent State right-to-work laws. The Landrum-Griffin bill provided no exemption for these payments and the conference report is the same.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

INVESTIGATIONS

Section 601(a) authorizes the Secretary, when he believes it necessary, to determine whether any person has violated or is about to violate any of the provisions of this act except the bill of rights in title I and the amendments made to Taft-Hartley, to make a complete investigation of such places, persons, and records as he deems necessary to determine the facts. The Secretary may report to interested persons or officials—the Department of Justice, for example—concerning the facts required to be shown in any report required by this act and concerning the reasons for failure to file such report, or concerning any other matter he deems appropriate as the result of such an investigation.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, required the Secretary to investigate only if he had probable cause to believe that any person had violated any provision of the reporting title of the act only. Minority members of the committee offered an amendment which did three things: First, it struck out the requirement of "probable cause" as a condition for initiating an investigation; second, it broadened the Secretary's investigative power so that it applied not only to provisions of the title requiring the filing of reports, but to violations of any of the provisions of the entire act; and, third, it further broadened the Secretary's powers to extend not only to violations actually committed, but to those which he believed were about to be committed. These amendments were accepted in the Senate bill as reported, and are included in the conference report, together with an amendment making the use of the investigatory power discretionary with the Secretary instead of mandatory.

The effect of these provisions as they appear in the conference report is to give the Secretary of Labor the same unlimited investigatory power he is presently authorized to exercise under the Fair Labor Standards and Walsh-Healey Acts, and which are presently possessed by other Federal agencies such as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in investigating actual or possible violations of the statutes which they administer.

In the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, the Secretary was not only limited to investigating violations of the reporting requirements of the bill, but to reporting such violations to the members of the affected union only. In committee, as a result of a proposal by minority members this was broadened to permit the Secretary to report any facts contained in a required report or resulting from his investigation, to interested persons and officials. The conference report is the same.

Section 601(b) provides that for the purpose of any investigation under this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10—relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents—of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officers designated by him. This gives the Secretary the same powers given to him in the Fair Labor Standards Act by a substantially identical provision.

EXTORTIONATE PICKETING

Section 602(a) forbids picketing of an employer where the purpose is the personal profit or enrichment of any individual—except a genuine increase in wages or employee benefits—by taking or obtaining any money or other thing of value from such employer against his will or with his consent.

Section 602(b) makes it a felony punishable by fine or imprisonment up to $10,000 and 20 years to picket in willful violation of the foregoing prohibition in section 602(a).

In the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, this type of extortionate picketing was also prohibited but merely as a new union unfair labor practice added to the Taft-Hartley Act instead of the serious felony which it is. Moreover, the language of the provision in the Senate bill did not exclude genuine wage raises or increased employee benefits from the concept of "personal enrichment of any individual." Thus, under the Senate bill, a picket line against an employer to induce him to grant a wage increase, would, in the literal language of the provision, constitute a violation of it.

Minority members in the committee offered an amendment to exempt genuine wage and employee benefit increases from the prohibition, and to make its violation a crime instead of an unfair labor practice. These amendments were accepted in the Senate bill as reported and are included in the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

RETENTION OF RIGHTS UNDER OTHER FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS

Section 603(a) is part of the antipreemption provisions of the act. It provides that except as explicitly provided to the contrary, nothing in the act shall reduce or limit the responsibilities of any union or any officer, agent, shop steward, or other representative of a union or of any trust in which a union is interested, under any other Federal law or under the laws of any State, and, except as explicitly provided to the contrary, nothing in this act shall take away any right or bar any remedy to which union members are entitled under such other Federal law or the law of any State.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, and the bill as reported to the Senate did not contain this section nor any similar antipreemption provision, thus raising a serious question about the validity or enforcibility of State laws in the areas covered by this act. This antipreemption provision is contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill and included in the conference report.

Section 603(b) provides that nothing contained in the first six titles—excluding title VII which amends Taft-Hartley—shall be construed to supersede or impair or otherwise affect the provisions of the Railway Labor Act or any of the obligations, rights, benefits, privileges, immunities of any carrier, employee, organization, representative, or person subject to such act; nor shall anything contained in said six titles—except sec-

tion 505 amending section 302 of Taft-Hartley—of this act be construed to confer any rights, privileges, immunities, or defenses upon employers, or to impair or otherwise affect the rights of any person under title I of the Taft-Hartley Act.

EFFECT ON STATE LAWS

Section 604 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to impair or diminish the authority of any State to enact and enforce general criminal laws with respect to robbery, bribery, extortion, embezzlement, grand larceny, burglary, arson, violation of narcotics laws, murder, rape, assault with intent to kill, or assault which inflicts grievous bodily injury, or conspiracy to commit any of such crimes.

This is the act's antipreemption provision with respect to State criminal law. It is designed to make it clear that State criminal laws prohibiting the same felonies, conviction of which constitutes a disqualification for union office, are not preempted but left in full force and effect and completely enforcible.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, did not contain this or any similar provision preserving the authority of the States to enact and enforce their own criminal laws. In committee, Senator DIRKSEN offered an amendment, which was accepted in the bill as reported, preserving State authority to enact and enforce their criminal laws, thereby preventing Federal preemption in this area of the law. As modified somewhat on the Senate floor, this safeguard was included in the Landrum-Griffin bill as well as in the conference report.

SERVICE OF PROCESS

Section 605 provides that for the purposes of this act, service of summons, subpena, or other legal process of a court of the United States upon an officer or agent of a labor union in his capacity as such shall constitute service upon the labor union.

This provision was not contained in the Senate bill. It was taken by the conferees from the Landrum-Griffin bill.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Section 606 makes the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to the issuance, amendment, or rescission of any rules or regulations, or any adjudication, authorized or required under the provisions of this act.

OTHER AGENCIES AND DEPARTMENTS

Section 607 authorizes the Secretary to make such arrangements or agreements for cooperation or mutual assistance with other Government agencies in the performance of his functions under this act as he may find practicable and legal. He may utilize the facilities or services of any department, agency, or establishment of the United States or of any State or its subdivisions with the lawful consent of such department, agency, or establishment; and each department, agency, or establishment of the United States is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary and, to the extent permitted by law, to provide such information and facilities as he may request for his assistance in the performance of his functions under this act.

The Attorney General or his representative shall receive from the Secretary for appropriate action such evidence developed in the performance of his functions under this act as may be found to warrant consideration for criminal prosecution under the provisions of this act or other Federal law.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no such provision, and its omission would have seriously handicapped the Secretary in adequately carrying out his duties under the act and thereby made it more difficult to achieve the desired effective labor reform. Minority members in committee offered an amendment to supply this omission which was accepted in the bill as reported and included in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

CRIMINAL CONTEMPT

Section 608 provides that no person shall be punished for any criminal contempt allegedly committed outside the immediate presence of the court in connection with any civil action prosecuted by the Secretary or any other person in any Federal court under the provisions of this act unless the facts constituting such criminal contempt are established by the verdict of the jury in a Federal district court trial, which jury shall be chosen and empaneled in the manner prescribed by the law governing jury trials in criminal prosecutions in the Federal district courts.

This safeguard was not in the Senate bill either as introduced or as reported. It was included in the Landrum-Griffin bill and in the conference report.

PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN DISCIPLINE BY UNION

Section 609 makes it unlawful for any labor union or union officer, agent, shop steward, employee, or other representative thereof, to fine, suspend, expel, or otherwise discipline any of its members for exercising any right to which he is entitled under the provisions of this act. Any union member who has been subjected to conduct constituting a violation of this section may sue under section 102 for appropriate relief including injunctions in the Federal district court for the district where the alleged violation occurred, or where the principal office of such union is located.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no such provision. It was added in committee by an amendment offered by minority members and accepted in the bill as reported. This provision was included in the Landrum-Griffin bill with a civil enforcement sanction instead of a criminal penalty as in the Senate bill. The conference report embodies the approach of the House-passed bill.

DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER ACT BY VIOLENCE

Section 610 makes it a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment up to $1,000 and 1 year for any person through the use of force or violence, or threat of the use of force or violence, to restrain, coerce, or intimidate, or attempt to restrain, coerce, or intimidate any member of a labor union for the purpose of interfering with or preventing the exercise of any right to which he is entitled under the provisions of this act.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no similar provision. It was added in committee by an amendment offered by minority members and accepted in the bill as reported. This provision was included in the Landrum-Griffin bill as well as in the conference report.

SEPARABILITY PROVISIONS

Section 611 provides that if any provision of this act, or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances, shall be held invalid, the remainder of this act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

TITLE VII—AMENDMENTS TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced in the Senate, contained a number of amendments to Taft-Hartley, all of which were supported by the labor movement, none of which reflected the wishes of management, and none of which had any significant relevance to that internal reform of the labor movement which the American public was demanding.

The bill as reported from the committee, with few modifications of any importance, also contained these Taft-Hartley amendments. At some time before the bill went on to final passage in the Senate, the leaders of the American labor movement, particularly of the AFL–CIO, publicly made it perfectly plain that they would oppose any labor reform bill which did not contain these Taft-Hartley amendments favorable to them, amendments which in popular parlance became known as the sweeteners.

As this analysis will indicate, these sweeteners were either wholly eliminated or substantially modified in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report, and in their place are to be found instead, Taft-Hartley amendments substantially and directly connected with the problem of labor reform, particularly as related to corruption, racketeering, gangsterism and lack of democratic procedures in some sectors of the labor movements.

FEDERAL-STATE JURISDICTION

Section 701(a) amends section 14 of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley Act—by adding a new subsection (c) which provides as follows:

First. The Board—NLRB—is given discretion, either by decision or by published rules adopted pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, to decline to assert its jurisdiction over any labor dispute involving any class or category of employers where, in the Board's opinion, the effect of such dispute on interstate commerce is not substantial enough to warrant the Board's exercise of its jurisdiction, but the Board is prohibited from so declining with respect to any dispute over which it would have asserted jurisdiction under its own jurisdictional standards as they prevailed on August 1, 1959.

Second. The courts or agencies of every State and territory—including Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands—are authorized to assume and assert jurisdiction over all disputes over which the Board lawfully declines to assert jurisdiction as authorized under the preceding paragraph, and to apply their own laws, both procedural and substantive, in disposing of these cases.

These provisions overrule the Supreme Court's decision in the Guss case, for the first time establish a statutory basis for the Board's refusal to assert jurisdiction, and not only eliminate the so-called no man's land in the law of labor-relations, but effectively solve the no man's land problem by providing not only a forum, but relatively expeditious relief for small employers and their employees, and the labor unions which have a relationship to such employers.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill, S. 505, as introduced, took the opposite approach to eliminating the no man's land. It required the Board to assert its full jurisdiction at all times, that is, to take every case, no matter how small the impact on interstate commerce, as long as the enterprise involved was technically in or affected such commerce. Theoretically, this would have eliminated the no man's land but actually it would have failed to solve the basic no man's land problem, a fact recognized and admitted even by some of the supporters of the proposal. Given the tremendous backlog of the Board, requiring it to take every case would only have increased its backlog and made even relatively quick relief in most cases impossible.

In committee, I offered an amendment which took substantially the same approach as the provision which has now become part of the law. My amendment was rejected. Instead, the committee reported out a provision which professed to compromise the issue, but which, under another guise, for all practical purposes required the Board to take every case within its statutory jurisdiction.

Again, on the floor of the Senate, Senator MCCLELLAN and Senator ALLOTT offered an amendment substantially the same as that offered by Senator GOLDWATER in committee. This too was rejected. Instead, the Senate adopted a provision modifying the committee bill's provision somewhat by permitting State labor agencies—not courts—to take cases which the Board declines to take, but requiring the State agencies to apply Federal law—Taft-Hartley—in deciding such cases, and limiting all appeals from the State agencies to the Federal courts exclusively.

The Landrum-Griffin bill used the same approach as that contained in Senator GOLDWATER'S amendment. This was adopted by the conferees subject only to the limitation with respect to the Board's jurisdictional standards prevailing on August 1, 1959, previously referred to.

Section 701(b) amends section 3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—as follows:

The Board is authorized to delegate to its regional directors its powers under section 9 to determine the appropriate unit for collective bargaining, to investigate, to provide for hearings where it determines a question of representation exists—that is, a question as to who shall represent employees as exclusive collective bargaining agent—and to direct an election or take a secret ballot under section 9 (c) or (e) and certify the results thereof, except that upon the filing of a request therefor with the Board by any interested person—anyone who is or might be concretely affected by the proceedings—the Board may review any action of a regional director delegated to him under this provision, but such a review shall not, unless specifically ordered by the Board, operate to halt any action taken by the regional director.

This is a new provision, not in either the House or Senate bills, designed to expedite final disposition of cases by the Board, by turning over part of its caseload to its regional directors for final determination.

Under this provision, the regional directors can exercise no authority in representation cases which is greater or not the same as the statutory powers of the Board with respect to such cases. In the handling of such cases, the regional directors are required to follow the lawful rules, regulations, procedures, and precedents of the Board and to act in all respects as the Board itself would act.

This decision is not mandatory. The Board may grant it, but need not, if it so prefers. It may delegate fewer than all of its statutory powers in representation cases, withholding some from the regional directors and reserving them for its own exercise. Thus, if the Board so decides, it may reserve for its own handling and decision, those representation cases which arise from petitions filed in connection with the new antipicketing, unfair labor practice provision section 8(b)(7), of the National Labor Relations Act. Or it may refuse to delegate authority to handle all or any part of the proceedings in contested representation cases.

This authority to delegate to the regional directors is designed, as indicated, to speed the work of the Board. In a sense it replaces the provision for prehearing elections contained both in the Senate bill as reported and as passed, and which both in committee and on the Senate floor was opposed by some members of the minority and which was contained in neither. The Landrum-Griffin bill contains no such provision, nor does the conference report.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as reported, contained a provision narrowing the definition of a "supervisor" in the Taft-Hartley Act, thus bringing under the act's coverage as employees, a substantial number of personnel who were theretofore excluded as supervisors, that is, representatives of management. I vigorously resisted this change and it finally was considerably limited in scope by the committee and as thus modified, included in the bill reported to the Senate.

No such provision, even as modified, is contained either in the Kennedy-Ervin bill or in the conference report.

ECONOMIC STRIKERS

Section 702 amends section 9(c)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—as follows:

Employees engaged in an economic—as distinguished from an unfair labor practice—strike who are not entitled to reinstatement are eligible to vote under such regulations as the Board finds to be consistent with the purposes and provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in any election conducted by the Board within 12 months after the beginning of the strike. After 12 months have elapsed, such economic strikers may not vote. The Board, even during the first 12 months of a strike, may deny the vote, for example, to strikers who have engaged in criminal or unprotected activity for which the employer has the right to fire them, or to strikers who have ceased to be employees, as defined in Taft-Hartley, because they have "obtained other regular and substantially equivalent employment."

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, merely repealed the existing prohibition against voting by economic strikers not entitled to replacement, without attaching any limitations either as to time or circumstance and without expressly authorizing the Board to impose such limitations. The result would have been to give replaced economic strikers, not entitled to have their jobs back, the right to vote in Board elections indefinitely, and even if they had engaged in unprotected or illegal activity.

In committee, I offered an amendment to impose a time limitation but my amendment was rejected. On the Senate floor, this provision was modified to allow the Board to permit such strikers to vote under regulations consistent with the purposes and provisions of the act. This Senate bill provision was accepted by the conferees as modified by the addition of the 12-month time limitation on such voting rights.

VACANCY IN OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL

Section 703 amends section 3(d) of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—as follows:

In case of a vacancy in the office of the General Counsel, the President is authorized to designate the officer or employee who shall act as General Counsel during such vacancy—without Senate confirmation—but no person so designated shall so act, first, for more than 40 days when the Congress is in session unless a nomination to fill such vacancy shall have been submitted to the Senate—this prevents the President from keeping such appointee indefinitely in the job without Senate confirmation—or, second, after the adjournment sine die of the session of the Senate in which such nomination was submitted—this is because with the Senate's adjournment the President has the power immediately to make a recess appointment and the office therefore need not remain vacant.

Under Taft-Hartley only the General Counsel is authorized to issue complaints in unfair labor practice cases, that is, only he can initiate the official proceedings in such cases. Heretofore, when his office became vacant, until the Senate

confirmed the President's new appointee, the office had to remain vacant and no complaints could be issued. This brought the work of the Board to a halt in connection with new unfair labor practice cases and perforce left these violations of law unremedied and the victims thereof without an operating forum. This new provision makes it possible to preclude any such stoppage in the operations of the NLRB by permitting the President to designate an employee of the Board only, to act temporarily as General Counsel, possessed of all of the statutory powers of that office and until replaced by a permanent successor under the prescribed limitations described above.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no similar provision. In committee, I offered the provision as an amendment which was accepted in the bill as reported. It is included in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

BOYCOTTS AND RECOGNITION AND ORGANIZATIONAL PICKETING

Section 704(a) amends section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act—Title I, Taft-Hartley—as follows:

It closes the three major loopholes which have heretofore existed in the Taft-Hartley Act's prohibition against secondary boycotts.

First, it does this by making it an unfair labor practice for a labor union to "threaten, coerce, or restrain," by economic and other means, any person—usually the secondary employer with whom the union may have no other dispute—to cease, in any way, or to any degree, to do business with any other person—usually the primary employer with whom the union may have a dispute. Under previous law, such pressure did not violate the ban on secondary boycotts because it was brought to bear directly on an employer rather than indirectly through inducement of his employees, the latter being the only means which the Board had held the law to prohibit.

Secondly, by substituting the term "person" for the term "employer," it broadens the scope of the latter term to its full dictionary meaning instead of the limited meaning which it has under the definition of "employer"—and "employee"—in Taft-Hartley. "Employer" is defined in Taft-Hartley to exclude employers subject to the Railway Labor Act; agricultural employers; all governmental agencies, bodies, or corporations; Federal Reserve banks; and nonprofit hospitals. "Employee" as defined does not include employees of the above excluded employers.

Thus, if the employers and employees involved in a secondary boycott are not "employers" and "employees" within the meaning of the above Taft-Hartley definitions, then the secondary boycott did not constitute a violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Substituting the term "person" for "employer" in section 8(b)(4) makes such secondary boycotts illegal despite the fact that the employers and employees involved are among those excluded from the Taft-Hartley definitions of "employer" and "employee."

Under the Taft-Hartley Act, prior to these amendments, as construed by the Supreme Court, a union's inducement of an individual employee of a secondary employer individually to cease working or handling the goods of the primary employer was not an unlawful secondary boycott. The Court held that an inducement to cease working or handling was illegal only if directed at employees for the purpose of inducing them so to cease in concert, not individually. The new amendment in the conference report closes this third loophole by making an inducement to cease working or handling individually, also an unfair labor practice under section 8(b)(4).

This new amendment in the conference report also makes secondary consumer boycotts illegal subject to certain narrow and limited exceptions. Thus, under previous law a labor union having a dispute with the producer, company A, could lawfully picket the distributor, company B, who carried company A's products for sale, for the purpose of inducing consumers not to patronize company B, subject to certain restrictions imposed by the Board. Under the new amendment, such picketing becomes illegal, but the union is permitted to engage in publicity—by means other than picketing—truthfully advising the public that company B the distributor—the secondary employer—is distributing goods produced by company A, the producer with whom such labor union has a primary dispute. But even this permitted—but limited—type of union activity becomes unlawful if such publicity has an effect of inducing any individual employed by any person other than the producer, company A, in the course of his employment to refuse to pick up, deliver, or transport any goods, or not to perform any services, at the establishment of the secondary employer who is engaged in such distribution, that is, the distributor, company B.

The amendment does nothing to impair or disturb the decisional rules evolved by the Board in connection with the significance of the situs—primary or secondary—of the inducement in determining its legality. It does not eliminate, restrict or modify the limitations on picketing at the site of a primary labor dispute which were applicable prior to this amendment. The rules laid down in certain decisions with respect to such picketing are still the law, as for example, in *NLRB* v. *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council, et al.*, 341 U.S. 675 (1951); *Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers, etc. and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.*, 110 NLRB 455 (1954); *Moore Drydock Co.*, 81 NLRB 1108; and *Washington Coca Cola Bottling Works, Inc.*, 107 NLRB 233 (1953).

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no provision dealing with secondary boycotts. In committee, I offered the secondary boycott provision of the administration's labor reform bill as an amendment. It was, in substance, the same as the new provisions described above. It was rejected and the bill as reported contained no such provision. On the Senate floor, Senator MCCLELLAN offered a secondary boycott amendment which, in substance, was the same as that offered in committee by me. The amendment was not agreed to.

The Landrum-Griffin bill contained a provision on secondary boycotts, for all purposes practically the same as that contained in my rejected amendment. With the exceptions noted above, the conference report adopted these provisions of the Landrum-Griffin bill.

Section 704(b) amends section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—by adding a new unfair labor practice prohibited to both employers and labor unions, dealing with the problem of "hot cargo" agreements and designated as section 8(e) which provides as follows:

It is an unfair labor practice for a labor union and an employer to enter into any contract or agreement, express or implied, whereby such employer ceases or refrains or agrees to cease or refrain from handling, using, selling, transporting or otherwise dealing in any of the products of any other employer, or to cease doing business with any other person, and any such agreement contained in any contract or agreement entered into either before or after the enactment of this provision shall be unenforcible and void for all purposes.

This means that such contractual clauses are per se illegal. It is unlawful for either party even to execute such an agreement, to insist that the other party bargain about or enter into it, to use any form of coercion or restraint—economic or otherwise—to compel the other party to enter into it or to live up to it even if his refusal to do so is in breach of a voluntary agreement to abide by the agreement, and finally, such breach does not constitute a good cause of action in a suit at law to recover damages for the breach or to secure specific performance of the agreement.

The new provision provides an exemption from all of these prohibitions—and from all of the prohibitions in the secondary boycott provisions of section 8(b)(4), as amended, as well—where the employer and the union involved, whether as contracting parties under this section 8(e) or as disputing parties under section 8(b)(4), are engaged in the apparel and clothing industry, and where the relationship between such employer and other employers in said industry—that is, between primary and secondary employers—is that of a jobber, manufacturer, contractor, or subcontractor and where first, the subcontractor performs his work for and on the premises of the contractor, jobber, or manufacturer; or, second, the subcontractor performs his work for and on goods or materials supplied by such contractor, jobber, or manufacturer; or, third, one employer is engaged in an integrated process of production with the other employer. Where these conditions are met, secondary boycotts are lawful as are "hot cargo" agreements and may be enforced by all the means prohibited in other industries under sections 8(b)(4) and 8(e).

There is a further exemption from the prohibitions against "hot cargo" agreements only, under section 8(e), with respect to a segment of the building construction industry and the labor unions representing employees in that segment of the industry. This exemption is granted only where the employer with whom such an agreement is signed is in the construction industry and engages only in construction work at the site; it does not apply where the employer, although in the construction industry, is not engaged in construction work at the site such as enterprises primarily engaged in supplying or transporting building construction materials. Where an employer falls into this limited category, it is not an unfair labor practice for such employer and a labor union to enter into an agreement whereby such employer ceases or refrains or agrees to cease or refrain from handling, using, selling, transporting or otherwise dealing in any of the products of another employer, or to cease doing business with any other person, and such an agreement is not per se unlawful. Unlike the exemption for the apparel and clothing industry, the prohibitions of the secondary boycott ban in section 8(b)(4), as amended, are however, applicable to these situations.

Thus, although employers and unions who are under this exemption may lawfully enter into such agreements, and may resort to the courts for their enforcement under applicable principles of contract law, no coercion or restraint—economic or otherwise—may be used by any party to such agreement, even if entered into voluntarily by both parties, to compel the other party to live up to the contract or to refrain from breaching it.

The new provision is silent with respect to the lawfulness of coercion or restraint—economic or otherwise—by one party to compel the other party to enter into, or even to bargain about entering into such an agreement. This question was one of those left unresolved by the Board and the courts under Taft-Hartley prior to this new legislation, but now specifically outlawed in all situations not falling within the exemption for the clothing and apparel and construction industries. It is the intention of Congress that the new legislation leave it in the same unresolved status under the building construction industry exemption and that the Board and the courts decide the issue for the building construction industry as if these new amendments contained in section 8(e) had not been enacted and in accordance with the previously applicable law. In other words, it is the congressional intent that section 8(b)(4), as amended, banning secondary boycotts, apply without qualification in the building construction industry and that the principles enunciated in the *SandDoor* case (Local 1796, *United Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *NLRB*, 357 U.S. 93), the *Denver Building Trades* case (*NLRB* v. *Denver Building and Construction Trades Council, et al.*, 341 U.S. 675), and the *Moore Drydock* case (*Moore Drydock Co.*, 81 NLRB 1108), remain fully applicable.

Neither the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, nor the committee bill as reported to the Senate, contained any provision dealing with "hot cargo" agreements. In committee, my rejected amendment on secondary boycotts contained a provision outlawing such agreements. On the floor, the Senate adopted an amendment outlawing "hot cargo" agreements only where they were between labor unions and employers who are common carriers subject to part II of the Interstate Commerce Act. This was designed to get at Jimmy Hoffa and the Teamsters Union exclusively. But it failed to accomplish even that.

Common carriers subject to part II of the Interstate Commerce Act represent only a part of the jurisdiction of the Teamsters Union. Other carriers and transportation enterprises not under part II of that act also employ members of and bargain collectively with the Teamsters Union. This is also true of the warehousing industry, the storage industry, and some segments of the retailing and wholesaling industries. "Hot cargo" agreements in these industries, involving mainly the Teamsters Union, would have been unaffected by the provision in the Senate passed bill.

The basic ban on "hot cargo" agreements in the new section 8(e), as described above, is contained in the Landrum-Griffin bill, and with the exemptions and modifications described above, was accepted by the Confereees.

Section 704(c) amends section 8(b) of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—by adding a new union unfair labor practice, designated as section 8(b)(7), and designed to outlaw recognition and organizational picketing when they occur in certain specified circumstances. Under this provision, it is an unfair labor practice for a union, in three specific situations, to picket or cause to be picketed, or threaten to picket or cause to be picketed, any employer where one of the objects of such conduct is to force or require an employer to recognize or bargain with a labor union as the representative of his employees—recognition picketing—or to force or require the employees of an employer to join or select such labor union as their collective bargaining representative—organizational picketing—unless such labor union is currently certified as the representative of such employees—that is, unless the union has won a representation election conducted by the NLRB. The three situations in which such picketing or union conduct is unlawful are:

First. Where the employer has lawfully recognized, in accordance with Taft-Hartley, any other labor union, and such other union has either won an NLRB representation election and been certified by the Board, or such other union and the employer have signed a collective bargaining agreement during the term of which the Board will not conduct a representation or decertification election; or

Second. Where within the preceding 12 months a valid election under section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act has been conducted—as indicated, only the labor union which won such election and was certified by the Board may picket in such situation, but no other union—or

Third. Where such picketing has been conducted without a representation petition under section 9(c) being filed within a reasonable period of time not to exceed 30 days from the commencement of such picketing.

This third prohibited picketing situation simply means this: A union may not picket for recognition or for organizational purposes for more than a reasonable period which may be less than 30 days if the Board so determines, but may not be longer, without a petition for a representation election being filed with the Board. If no such petition is filed in such period, then at the end thereof, but not later than the 31st day from its commencement, such picketing, if continued or resumed, becomes an unfair labor practice.

This third prohibited picketing provision contains two provisos. The first provides that if a representation petition is filed with the Board within such reasonable period but not later than the 30th day following the start of the picketing, and regardless of whether such picketing has ceased and has not been resumed, the Board must, as quickly as possible, direct and conduct an election in the bargaining unit the Board finds to be appropriate, even though the requirements of section 9(c)(1) which are otherwise a condition of the Board's entertaining a petition for a representation election have not been complied with. These requirements are: First, for an employer petition, an allegation that an individual or labor union have requested recognition as the exclusive bargaining representative of his employees; and, second, for petitions by employees or labor unions, an allegation that a substantial number of employees in such bargaining unit—at least 30 percent of the employees under present NLRB policy—wish to be represented for collective bargaining and that their employer declines to recognize their representative as the exclusive bargaining agent as defined in section 9(a).

If a union wins such an election and is certified by the Board, it may picket without violating this section 8(b)(7); if no union wins the election, then no union may picket for recognition or organization for 12 months following the same, in accordance with the second prohibited picketing situation described above.

The second proviso to the third prohibited provision grants the following exemption from said third prohibition only—and not from the first two:

Where the union engages in picketing or other publicity for the sole purpose of truthfully advising the public that an employer does not employ members of or have a contract with a labor union. In those circumstances, such picketing may be carried on indefinitely. However, if one of the effects of such exempted picketing is to induce any individual employed by any other person—other than

the picketed employer—in the course of his employment, not to pick up, deliver, or transport any goods or not to perform any services, and a reasonable period—not longer than 30 days—has elapsed since such picketing began, and regardless of whether it has ceased thereafter and not been resumed, the employer may file a petition pursuant to which the Board shall conduct an election in the same manner, under the same procedure, and with the same effects as described above; for example, if no union wins, such picketing is banned for the next 12 months, and so forth, and so forth.

There is a further provision in this new section 8(b)(7) which provides that nothing therein makes lawful any conduct which would be unlawful under any of the other unfair labor practice provisions of section 8(b)(1) through (6). Thus, for example, conduct not unlawful under the new section 8(b)(7), by virtue of the exemption therein, may nevertheless be an unfair labor practice if engaged in contrary to the prohibition against coercion and restraint of employees in section 8(b)(1) or to the prohibition against secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes in section 8(b)(4).

These new bans on recognition and organizational picketing, commonly known as blackmail picketing because of their frequent use as devices to achieve corrupt and racketeering objectives, were completely absent from the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced. In committee, I offered as an amendment the anti-blackmail-picketing provisions of the administration bill which were substantially similar to those in the new act, as described above. My amendment was rejected; and the bill as reported to the Senate, like the bill as introduced, contained no provision on the subject of blackmail picketing.

On the Senate floor, Senator McCLELLAN'S picketing amendment, similar in important respects to my amendment, was defeated. Senator PROUTY thereafter offered an antipicketing amendment also along the lines of the administration bill, but more limited in the scope of its prohibition. This proposal was watered down by a number of amendments, and finally adopted in the much narrower, weaker and far less effective form in which it appears in the Senate passed bill.

The Landrum-Griffin bill contains substantially the administration's antipicketing provision, identical with those offered by me in committee and rejected by the majority. In conference, it was fundamentally the Landrum-Griffin proposal which was agreed to by the conferees after some modifications making for greater clarity and preciseness, making it easier to determine the prohibition's applicability in particular fact situations, and granting the very limited exemption from the prohibition, described above.

Section 704(d) amends section 10(l) of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley. Section 10(l) prior to its amendment, provided that the NLRB gives priority in case handling to secondary boycott cases under section 8(b)(4) and that when the NLRB regional office official handling a secondary boycott charge, after investigation, believes the charge to be true and that a complaint should issue, he must, on behalf of the Board, ask a Federal district court for an injunction or restraining order pending the final adjudication of the case by the Board. These provisions do not apply to unlawful jurisdictional strikes under section 8(b)(4)(D). The new amendment makes these provisions of section 10(l) also applicable in charges alleging violations of new section 8(e) dealing with "hot cargo" agreements and violations of new section 8(b)(7) dealing with recognition and organization picketing.

In connection with applying these priority of treatment and "mandatory" injunction provisions of section 10(l) to charges of violations of the antipicketing provisions of section 8(b)(7), there is a proviso which contains one exception. If a charge is filed against an employer alleging that he is committing an unfair labor practice in violation of section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act—dominating, interfering with, or contributing to the support of a labor union by an employer—and if, after investigation, the regional official has reasonable cause to believe that such charge is true and that a complaint thereon should issue, he is forbidden to apply for an injunction or restraining order against the picketing union under section 10(l), as amended, even if he decides to issue a complaint against such picketing union alleging a violation of section 8(b)(7), as amended.

Neither the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, nor the Senate bill, as reported, contained mandatory injunction provisions applicable to "hot cargo" agreements and blackmail picketing, although such amendment was rejected when I offered it in committee in conjunction with my antipicketing amendment. The bill, as it passed the Senate, amended section 10(l), to make the mandatory injunction provision applicable to cases involving the violation of the new section 8(e) which made "hot cargo" agreements unfair labor practices in a narrow segment of the motor transport industry. But the mandatory injunction provision was not made applicable to the newly added but narrow ban on blackmail—recognition and organization—picketing in section 8(b)(7) of the Senate bill. Instead, section 10(l) which provides for the mandatory injunction authority, was amended by making its last sentence alone applicable to such picketing, thereby creating the erroneous impression that the mandatory injunction procedure applied. However, the last sentence of section 10(l) deals with jurisdictional strikes in violation of section 8(b)(4)(D), and provides that the Board may, not must, seek an injunction in a Federal court. This procedure was made applicable to violations of new section 8(b)(7) dealing with picketing; in other words, not the mandatory but the discretionary injunction provisions were applicable to illegal picketing.

The Landrum-Griffin bill made the mandatory injunction provisions applicable to violations of both section 8(e) dealing with "hot cargo" agreements and section 8(b)(7) dealing with blackmail picketing, and this approach is included in the conference report.

Section 704(e) amends section 303(a) of the Taft-Hartley Act. That section authorizes a suit for damages in a Federal district court by anyone injured in his property or business by reason of conduct by a labor union which would be in violation of the language of section 8(b)(4) prohibiting secondary boycotts, certain types of recognition strikes, and jurisdictional strikes, such language being identically repeated in section 303(a).

Section 8(b)(4) having been amended to outlaw certain types of union activity not previously unlawful, it was necessary to amend section 303(a), as well, to make its provisions for damage suits equally applicable to the newly proscribed union conduct.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained no such provision. In committee, I offered such an amendment in conjunction with my amendment to close the loopholes in the secondary boycott provision, section 8(b)(4). These were rejected. No such amendment was contained in the Senate passed bill inasmuch as that bill did not include any new secondary boycott provisions.

The Landrum-Griffin bill contains this amendment to section 303(a) as does the conference report.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Section 705(a) amends section 8 of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—by adding a new subsection (f) thereto permitting prehire collective bargaining contracts in the building construction industry.

The new subsection 8(f) provides that an employer whose primary activity is building construction and a labor union whose members are building construction employees—and which has not been established or aided by employer unfair labor practice—may enter into a collective bargaining agreement covering such employees without thereby committing an unfair labor practice even if first, the majority status of such union has not been established in accordance with section 9 prior to the making of the agreement; or, second, the agreement requires membership in such union after the 7th day following the beginning of employment or the effective date of the agreement, whichever is later—instead of the 30th day as theretofore provided for all industries—or, third, the agreement requires the employer to notify such union of job openings with such employer, or gives the union an opportunity to refer qualified applicants for such job openings; or, fourth, the agreement specifies minimum training or experience qualifications for employment, or provides for preference in filling openings based upon seniority with such employer, in the industry, or in the particular geographical area.

Two provisos to this new section impose the following limitations:

First. No employer may discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of nonmembership in a union, if he believes that such nonmembership is the result of a discriminatory exclusion from union membership by the union, or of some cause other than a refusal by the employee to tender the periodic dues and initiation fees uniformly required of all members. This limitation is presently in the law as the last proviso to section 8(a)(3).

Second. A prehire agreement—under paragraph (1) above—lawfully entered into, shall not be a bar to a petition for an NLRB election filed pursuant to section 9(c) or 9(e)—this means a petition filed by an employer, by employees, or by a labor union. Such election may be held even during the life of such a prehire agreement.

Section 705(b) provides an additional safeguard with respect to agreements lawfully entered into pursuant to this new provision for the building construction industry. It makes it plain that nothing in the new provision has any weakening effect on section 14(b) which authorizes State right-to-work laws, that is, that nothing in the new provision permits the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor union as a condition of employment—compulsory union-membership contracts—in any State or territory where such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law.

The Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, contained the prehire building construction provision described above but with several differences. In its original form in the Senate bill, these prehire contracts could lawfully be entered into by any labor union. In committee, I offered an amendment limiting them to labor unions of which building and construction employees are members, and no others. My amendment was accepted, and is contained in the conference report.

Again, the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, authorized these contracts to require minimum training apprenticeship as a condition of employment. Inasmuch as apprenticeship training in some crafts and occupations can be secured only through the union, this provision would have been equivalent to the complete closed shop, that is, to requiring membership in the union as a condition of getting and holding a job in the industries employing those crafts and occupations.

I offered, in committee, an amendment eliminating the word "apprenticeship" thus permitting "minimum training" as a condition of employment, thereby setting up a purely objective job qualification, one wholly unrelated to membership or support of a union. This too was accepted, and is contained in the conference report.

PRIORITY IN CASE HANDLING

Section 706 amends section 10 of the National Labor Relations Act—title I, Taft-Hartley—by adding a new subsection "(m)" which provides for priority in the handling by the NLRB of unfair labor practices which are violations of sections 8(a)(3) and 8(b)(2). These are acts of discrimination against employees in connection with their jobs by employers or labor unions because of their membership or nonmembership in a union or because of their engaging or refusing to engage in concerted activities protected by the Taft-Hartley Act.

This provision was in neither the Kennedy-Ervin bill (S. 505), as introduced, nor in the bill reported by the committee to the Senate. It was offered by Senator Mundt as an amendment on the floor and agreed to by the Senate. It is also contained in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF AMENDMENTS

Section 707 provides that the amendments made by this title VII to the Taft-Hartley Act shall take effect 60 days after enactment, and no provision of title VII shall be deemed to make any conduct engaged in prior to its enactment an unfair labor practice if it would not have been an unfair labor practice at the time it was engaged in.

The Senate bill, at no stage of its development from initial introduction to final passage, contained any specific effective date for these Taft-Hartley amendments. This would have made them effective on enactment, and as a result of such lack of notice and opportunity to prepare, both labor and management might well have been caused both confusion and hardship. The 60-day deferral of the effective date takes care of the problem. It is in both the Landrum-Griffin bill and the conference report.

The conference report also repeals sections 9(f), (g), and (h) of title I of the Taft-Hartley Act which provided for the old financial reporting requirements and the non-Communist oath for labor union officers. These repealers were immediately effective on enactment of the conference report, but they are not retroactive in effect.

CONCLUSION

The conference report, as enacted into law, is the result of a combination of many factors. There is no question that the investigations and revelations of the McClellan Rackets Committee were the primary cause for the irresistible public demand for an effective labor reform law.

The new law itself contains provisions derived from several sources and a number of individuals. Thus, Senator McCLELLAN is truly the father of the new bill of rights for union members. The bonding and fiduciary provisions in the Senate bill were first offered by him on the Senate floor, and appear in the conference report, even though in a more finished form. His too, at least on the Senate side, are the prohibitions against interfering with union members in the exercise of their newly acquired rights. And, although rejected by the Senate, he did offer, on the floor, amendments on no man's land, secondary boycotts, and blackmail picketing. Effective provisions on these three issues are in the conference report.

In the Senate Labor Committee and on the Senate floor, I offered amendments on almost every aspect of the Senate bill which I regarded as weak or inadequate. Some of these were accepted—most were rejected. But an overwhelming majority of my amendments, or their substantial equivalent, are contained in the conference report which has now become the law.

The new act, both in its major provisions, and in its basic approach, reflects the Landrum-Griffin bill, as passed by the House, the labor reform program of the administration, and the proposals made by Senator McCLELLAN and myself.

Little Old New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a column by Ed Sullivan which appeared in the New York Daily News on September 4, 1959:

LITTLE OLD NEW YORK
(By Ed Sullivan)

With New Yorkers in terror of walking the streets of this city after nightfall, it has been proposed by J. Edgar Hoover, members of the judiciary and of the clergy that (1) New York City police instantly be given greater police powers, and (2) that able-bodied policemen engaged in clerical work, ticketing of cars, and searching for prostitutes be replaced by women so that the police can be returned to their beats. All of these measures would immediately reduce the jungle aspects of New York City. Taxpayers again could walk the streets at night freely and safely; nurses leaving their hospital posts late at night would have some measure of protection; taxicab drivers on the night shift would not be bludgeoned; the areas bordering Central Park and the other great parks of the city would be swept clear of thugs. The mothers of the 20 youngsters who have been knifed to death in New York City since July, I think, would certainly approve of all of these things. In fact, the only two New Yorkers who object to such measures seem to be Mayor Bob Wagner and Police Commissioner Steve Kennedy.

Wagner and Kennedy obviously believe that the members of New York's Finest are not to be trusted. They apparently are convinced that our police would instantly start whaling the tar out of decent citizens. This is the silliest conclusion that either Wagner and Kennedy ever have come up with. It dates back to the late Mayor LaGuardia's emasculation of the powers of New York City police when LaGuardia was after Harlem votes. If you will examine the records of this city you will find that LaGuardia's politically inspired action opened the dikes for a general breakdown of law enforcement in our city. He was supported, at that time, by a group of fuzzy-thinking liberals, just as Wagner and Kennedy are being supported now by similar groups of daffodils, equally vocal. I think most of us would prefer to accept the seasoned judgment of J. Edgar Hoover plus evidence of our own eyes which reveal that the greatest city in the world has been taken over by a group of knife-wielding young punks.

When we were in Moscow and Leningrad, 2 weeks ago, if we had heard that 20 youngsters had been knifed to death in either or both of these cities, Rise Stevens, Marge and Gower Champion, the Barry Sisters, and the

rest of us would have hidden in the American Embassy at Moscow for protection. But murder has become a commonplace item in the city of New York and the grievous fault must be laid at the doorsteps of our mayor and our police commissioner. It is an ironical fact that these two high city officials have taken the handcuffs of New York's Finest to handcuff the police. This, I submit, is lunacy come full cycle. When we were in Europe, we read that Tammany had proposed Wagner as the Vice Presidential candidate of the Democratic Party. Judging from New York City's experience, would Wagner's first act in Washington be to disband the FBI and eliminate the Secret Service and Treasury agents on the grounds that they could not be trusted as he doesn't trust the police of New York City? The mothers of the 20 youngsters killed in cold blood since last July must conclude that New York City is a lunatic place.

Report to the People of the 12th Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. DORN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, September 9, 1959

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, each year it has been my custom to submit to the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York, whom I have the honor to serve, a questionnaire setting forth various questions which will be considered by the Congress of the United States in its deliberations.

I appreciate the fine response to the questionnaire and am gratified to say that the people of the 12th Congressional District of New York are intensely interested in their Government and are willing to take time to participate in it by expressing their opinions and advice to their Representative in the Congress.

The following is the questionnaire and the results in percentages:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of the President's policy of moderate government?	71	18	11
If "no" should he turn to the right (10 percent), left (6 percent), no opinion (84 percent).			
2. Do you favor a continuation of our present foreign policy?	68	21	11
(a) Continuing foreign military aid?	76	15	9
(b) Continuing foreign economic aid?	66	26	8
(c) Maintaining our forces in Berlin?	83	10	7
(d) Our defense of Quemoy and Matsu?	70	20	10
(e) Our defense of Formosa?	78	13	9
3. Do you favor ending of nuclear bomb tests?	40	53	7
4. Do you believe that past "summit meetings" have served the best interests of the United States?	31	56	13
5. Reduction of the Federal debt before reducing taxes?	78	18	7
6. Reduction in nondefense Government spending if existing functions are curtailed?	64	29	7
If "yes" would you suggest cutting foreign aid (16 percent), farm subsidies (28 percent), public works (14 percent), highways (10 percent), veterans' aid (13 percent), slum clearance (11 percent), others (8 percent).			
Do you favor:			
7. Raising minimum wage to $1.25 per hour?	67	26	7
8. Requiring registration of pension and welfare funds of labor unions and disclosure of financial transactions involving them?	93	4	3
9. The enactment of a strong civil rights program to enforce the voting rights of all citizens?	80	13	7
10. Making it a Federal crime to bomb churches, synagogues, or schools?	89	8	3
11. Further reduction in the age at which persons shall be eligible for social security benefits?	60	37	3
12. An increase in social security benefits?	70	26	4
13. Direct Federal grants to States for education?	56	38	6
14. More liberal credit and lower interest rates for small business?	77	17	6

The response to the questionnaire by thousands of residents of our district has been of great assistance to me in carrying out their wishes. Many persons who answered the questions also submitted comments on other issues and suggestions for solutions to some of the problems of the day.

They are the people who elected me to represent them in the Congress of the United States. If there is any way in which I can be of service to them I hope they will not hesitate to call upon me. During recess both my Washington and Brooklyn offices remain open. I have a competent staff and my services and theirs are available to my constituents. I want them to know that even when Congress is not in session I am on the job.

Polish Independence Day: A Day of Tribute and Reminder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to join all Polish-Americans in their commemoration of Polish Independence Day, which falls on November 9. This was the day on which, in 1918, in the aftermath of the First World War, Poland was proclaimed an independent state.

It is fitting that all of us take note of this day, both by way of tribute and by way of reminder.

It should be a day on which we pay tribute to all the Polish people, who struggled so bitterly for independence and freedom, and who were forced to part with it so quickly.

At the same time, it serves as a poignant reminder of the true nature of Russian tyranny and imperialism.

Particularly at this time, when Khrushchev has just been with us professing peace and friendship, it is important to remember the fate of another country which was also once assured that Russia was her friend. As we begin to assess Mr. Khrushchev's words and intentions, it will not hurt to be reminded of the Katyn massacre, or of the betrayal at Warsaw. It will not hurt to remember what happened to another, weaker, people which put its trust in Soviet promises.

Poland's hopes were bitterly shattered, her momentary independence terminated, and her people placed under Russian subjugation. But despite Russian domination, the spirit of her people has remained strong. Hope has remained in their minds and hearts. It is this hope and spirit which we must applaud today, and which persuades us that one day, somehow, Poland may once again be free.

Story of Naming of Old Glory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now, Post No. 5 of the American Legion at Nashville, Tenn., has been interested in the flying of the American flag over the grave of Capt. William Driver who named our flag Old Glory.

This group of patriotic Americans has erected a fitting flagpole over the grave of Capt. William Driver in the City Cemetery at Nashville.

Mr. Speaker, this story of the naming of Old Glory is a most interesting one and I am sure it will be of great interest to patriotic American citizens everywhere.

I want to commend this outstanding post of the American Legion for having brought this matter to my attention and I feel that it would be a fitting tribute to Captain Driver to fly our flag throughout the day and night over the grave of this distinguished American.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced on August 31, 1959, in the House of Representatives a bill—H.R. 8957—to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours each day over the grave of Capt.

William Driver in the City Cemetery, Nashville, Tenn. This bill has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and I am hopeful that the appropriate subcommittee of this great committee will hold a hearing on the bill early in the next session of the 86th Congress and that ultimately it will receive the approval of the committee and be passed by both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

I deeply appreciate the tremendous interest of Post No. 5 of the American Legion in this patriotic effort in the honoring of the memory of Captain Driver.

The most interesting story setting forth the history of the naming of the U.S. flag as Old Glory by Capt. William Driver follows:

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES—ITS HISTORY AND SYMBOLISM

(By James A. Moss, colonel, U.S. Army, retired)

STORY OF NAMING OF OLD GLORY

It was on March 17, 1824, in Salem, Mass., upon the occasion of the celebration of his 21st birthday, that William Driver, whose heart and soul were in his occupation of sailing the seas, was presented by his mother and a group of Salem girls with a beautiful American flag they had made for him. "I name her Old Glory," said he, in response to the greetings of the givers—and thus was it that the name, Old Glory, made its advent into the history of our country. From that day on Old Glory accompanied William Driver whenever he went to sea, and many were the notable voyages made under its flying folds—twice around the world, once around Australia, and several cruises among the Archipelago Islands.

When in 1837, Captain Driver quit the sea and settled in Nashville, Tenn., as usual Old Glory accompanied him. On occasions such as Washington's Birthday, the Fourth of July, and St. Patrick's Day (also the anniversary of Captain Driver's birthday) Old Glory could be seen gracefully waiving from a rope extending from the captain's house to a tree across the street.

However, when in 1861 Tennessee seceded from the Union and hostilities began, Old Glory mysteriously vanished.

The morning of February 25, 1862, Union soldiers entered Nashville and took possession of the city. On that morning Captain Driver, accompanied by Captain Thatcher, of the Sixth Ohio Regiment, and several soldiers, came home, and calling his daughter Mary Jane, asked her to help him rip a bedcover he was holding. And lo and behold. As the comforter was ripped apart, there was Old Glory, which, for safekeeping, had been sewn between the folds of the cover when Tennessee had seceded and American flags were objects of attack in Nashville. At the sight of Old Glory the soldiers cheered, and then helped to fold the flag which Captain Driver took in his arms as the party left for the State House. As the captain climbed to the dome of the building and raised Old Glory over the capitol, he exclaimed, "Thank God. I lived to raise Old Glory on the dome of the Capitol of Tennessee; I am now ready to die and go to my forefathers."

One day, not long before the good old captain went to join his forefathers, he placed in the arms of his daughter a bundle, saying:

"Mary Jane, this is my old ship flag, Old Glory. It has been my constant companion on many voyages. I love it as a mother loves her child; take it and cherish it as I have cherished it, for it has been my steadfast friend and protector in all parts of the world, among savages, heathen, and civilized. Keep it always."

The flag that Capt. William Driver named Old Glory was kept and guarded as a precious heirloom in the Driver family until 1922, when it was sent to the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, where, carefully preserved under glass, surrounded by other priceless relics of the Nation, in silent eloquence it now tells to us of today, as it will to posterity, the beautiful story of Old Glory.

Food for Our Needy Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, for a long time now we in the United States have found ourselves in the curious and shameful position of seeing around us all the wealth and prosperity of the richest nation in the world and of seeing amidst all this wealth some of our fellow citizens going hungry.

In my opinion, it is a thoroughly disgraceful thing for the wealthiest nation in the world to allow any of its citizens to go hungry. Yet there are many Americans going hungry every day. Surely this is not the American way. It is not the human way either. What is worse, this shameful circumstance has been going on at the same time that our Government has been holding huge quantities—presently $9 billion worth—of surplus food in storage. This has been the deplorable situation for some time.

Happily something has finally been done to remedy this implausible disgrace. Legislation establishing a food stamp plan to distribute surplus foodstuffs to our own needy has finally passed Congress. This passage comes after several unsuccessful tries. For myself this was the fourth Congress in which I introduced food stamp legislation. In its final form the bill which passed will permit the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute up to $250 million worth of surplus foods to those in need. The mechanics of the distribution are simple. Food stamps will be issued to the needy and they will simply redeem these stamps at the nearest retail outlet participating in the plan for food items on the surplus list of the Department of Agriculture. Participation in the plan is not mandatory for anyone, although reaction by retail food merchants has been largely favorable.

State officials and local welfare authorities have also been enthusiastic. Last year 32 State Governors testified in favor of the enactment of food stamp legislation. I am sure that when this plan goes into operation, the wisdom of Congress will once more be made manifest. For, indeed, this is wise legislation. It is proper and humane legislation. This program will accomplish the dual objectives—both desirable—of supplying food to our hungry and indigent fellow citizens and of reducing in this wonderfully simple way the huge food surpluses that perennially plague our farmers, economists, and Government.

I believe the present bill will prove to be only a beginning. I beieve that the basic concept and the scope of the plan will burgeon beyond all anticipation. It is not too much to think that eventually the whole of our farm surplus may be reduced to a proper minimum by this simple and humane expedient of feeding our hungry countrymen. Let us hope so.

Tribute to Donald B. Fitzpatrick

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I think it is always a testimonial to an American citizen if he gives freely of his time, without compensation, in an advisory capacity to his Government. That has happened in the case of Mr. Donald B. Fitzpatrick, who is in charge of recruitment and training of engineering personnel for the Allen-Bradley Co., of Milwaukee, Wis.

He came to Washington and served 6 months, without compensation, as adviser to the Director, Electrical Equipment Division of the Business and Defense Services Administration. I think a testimony to a citizen of such character, who has displayed such unselfishness to his country, deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, under unanimous consent, I include a tribute to Mr. Fitzpatrick in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in connection with my remarks:

During the past 6 months, Donald B. Fitzpatrick, in charge of recruitment and training of engineering personnel for the Allen-Bradley Co., of Milwaukee, Wis., has served as W.O.C. adviser to the Director of the Electrical Equipment Division, in providing technical advice on the mobilization activities of the Business and Defense Services Administration and the Department of Commerce, as they applied to the products and facilities of the electrical industrial controls and related equipment.

Mr. Fitzpatrick served in the Navy during World War II. After discharge, he attended Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and Purdue University and obtained his electrical engineering and master of science degrees. Through 1955 he taught control engineering at Purdue University. Both as a professor and with his company, his interests have been in the building of our defenses through scientific and engineering education. While serving as professor, and because of his interest in the underlying causes of juvenile delinquency as a deterrent to complete utilization of the Nation's resources, he used his free time cooperating with the Indiana State police in observing and analyzing causes.

His informal interest in psychology was later directed to the preparation and conducting of industrial exhibits.

The 6 months active service in the Electrical Equipment Division, BDSA, just concluded, is a prelude to his becoming associated with the BDSA executive reserve.

His wide knowledge of electrical controls enabled him to prepare reports affecting the overall mobilization readiness of the electrical industry, especially the highly important motor and control segment. America's posture of readiness has been advanced by the self-sacrificing willingness of Mr. Fitzpatrick in preparing himself for active participation under emergency conditions and by his review and criticism of mobilization plans.

On August 14, Mr. H. B. McCoy, Administrator of the Business and Defense Services Administration, presented to Mr. Fitzpatrick, on behalf of the Secretary of Commerce, a certificate of merit in recognition of his outstanding Government service during the past 6 months. In addition, the Secretary of Commerce gave Mr. Fitzpatrick a flag that was flown over the Capitol as a token of recognition of his service to the Nation, the Business and Defense Services Administration, and the Department of Commerce. Mr. McCoy in his own behalf presented a personal letter of congratulations.

Schedule of Hon. William G. Bray for the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, September 8, 1959

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, in order to discuss the problems, interests, and wishes of the people of the Seventh Congressional District, I will meet interested persons at the various post offices in accordance with the following schedule:

Monday, October 26:
9 a.m., Oakland City.
10:15 a.m., Somerville.
11 a.m., Mackey.
12 noon, Fort Branch.
1:30 p.m., Owensville.
2:45 p.m., Haubstadt.
3:45 p.m., Buckskin.
5 p.m., Princeton.
Tuesday, October 27:
8 a.m., Francisco.
9 a.m., Patoka.
10 a.m., Hazleton.
10:30 a.m., Decker.
11:30 a.m., Vincennes.
2 p.m., Monroe City.
3 p.m., Wheatland.
4 p.m., Bruceville.
Wednesday, October 28:
8:30 a.m., Emison.
9:30 a.m., Oaktown.
10:30 a.m., Freelandville.
11:30 a.m., Ragsdale.
1:30 p.m., Bicknell.
2:30 p.m., Edwardsport.
3:15 p.m., Westphalia.
4 p.m., Sandborn.
Thursday, October 29:
9:30 a.m., Indian Springs.
10:30 a.m., Shoals.
11:30 a.m., Loogootee.
1:30 p.m., Alfordsville.
2:30 p.m., Burns City.
3:30 p.m., Crane.
Wednesday, November 4:
8:30 a.m., Harmony.
9 a.m., Knightsville.
10:30 a.m., Carbon.
11 a.m., Brazil.
1:30 p.m., Staunton.
2:30 p.m., Cory.
3:30 p.m., Poland.
Thursday, November 5:
9:30 a.m., Bowling Green.
10:30 a.m., Centerpoint.
11:30 a.m., Clay City.
1:30 p.m., Coal City.
2:30 p.m., Patricksburg.
3:30 p.m., Spencer.
Friday, November 6:
9 a.m., Freedom.
10 a.m., Gosport.
11 a.m., Quincy.
1:30 p.m., Eminence.
2:30 p.m., Hall.
3:30 p.m., Monrovia.
Monday, November 9:
8:30 a.m., Harrodsburg.
9:30 a.m., Smithville.
10:15 a.m., Clear Creek.
11:15 a.m., Stanford.
12:15 p.m., Bloomington.
2:30 p.m., Unionville.
3:30 p.m., Ellettsville.
4:30 p.m., Stinesville.
Tuesday, November 10:
9 a.m., Solsberry.
10 a.m., Owensburg.
11 a.m., Koleen.
12 noon, Bloomfield.
1:30 p.m., Doans.
2:15 p.m., Scotland.
3:15 p.m., Newberry.
4 p.m., Switz City.
Thursday, November 12:
8:30 a.m., Worthington.
9:30 a.m., Jasonville.
10:30 a.m., Coalmont.
11:30 a.m., Midland.
12:30 p.m., Linton.
2 p.m., Marco.
3 p.m., Lyons.
Monday, November 16:
9 a.m., Farmersburg.
10 a.m., Shelburn.
11 a.m., Hymera.
12 noon, Sullivan.
2 p.m., Fairbanks.
3 p.m., Graysville.
Tuesday, November 17:
9:30 a.m., Merom.
10 a.m., New Lebanon.
11 a.m., Paxton.
12 noon, Carlisle.
2 p.m., Pleasantville.
3 p.m., Dugger.
Thursday, November 19:
9 a.m., Odon.
10 a.m., Elnora.
11 a.m., Plainville.
12 noon, Washington.
2 p.m., Montgomery.
3 p.m., Cannelburg.
Friday, November 20:
8:30 a.m., Trafalgar.
9:30 a.m., Nineveh.
10:30 a.m., Edinburg.
11:30 a.m., Franklin.
1:45 p.m., Needham.
2:30 p.m., Whiteland.
3:30 p.m., Greenwood.
4:30 p.m., Bargersville.
Monday, November 23:
9 a.m., Morgantown.
10 a.m., Centerton.
11 a.m., Brooklyn.
12 noon, Mooresville.
2:30 p.m., Paragon.
3:30 p.m., Martinsville.

The Future of Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during the Communist World Youth Festival in Vienna, Austria, last summer, a daily newspaper, the Vienna Daily News, was published as an unofficial and independent voice against the official Communist line at the festival. I was asked by the editor of this paper to prepare a statement for the paper which was published in seven different languages and circulated widely among delegates and visitors to Vienna.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my article "The Future of Democracy," inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Vienna Daily News, July 30, 1959]

THE FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

(By Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota)

The word democracy will probably be the most used and the most misused word during the Vienna Youth Festival of 1959. Ever since the enlightenment the democratic creed has been the leading political philosophy in the Western World and in many parts of Asia and Africa as well. Today both the Communist world and the free world claim to be the standard bearers of genuine democracy.

The young leaders at this festival and their counterparts throughout the world cannot escape the fateful choice between the two major competing political philosophies in the world today, both of which claim to be democratic.

Let me state what I believe genuine political democracy is. Democracy means "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," to use the words of Abraham Lincoln. Almost every believer in democracy would agree with this definition, but there is considerable disagreement in applying it in practice.

PERVERSION OF MARXISM

"Government for the people" means that certain basic human rights must be guaranteed to all citizens, even to minority groups whose views may differ radically from those of the majority. In the United States, for example, Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, and Communists as citizens enjoy the same basic rights and privileges. They are protected by the same laws. If they are accused of violating any of these laws, they are tried by the same courts. All political groups have a right to freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

"Government by the people" means there must be free and periodic elections, in which the citizens can choose between alternative sets of leaders to govern them. A free election is not a single slate election. A free election is a secret election. A free election offers the voter choices between men and issues. A free election is open to all citizens

of voting age regardless of sex, creed, or color. In all candor, I must admit that the United States has not yet fully met this last requirement of a free election, but we are making progress in breaking down the last barriers which prevent some of our citizens from exercising their democratic birthright.

"Government of the people" means that political minorities should have the right to organize and to propagate their views as long as they do so peaceably. This includes the right to organize an opposition party, the right to seek public support for the views and candidates of that party, the right to vote for the party, the right to run for office if selected as the party candidate, and the right to serve in public office if elected.

Genuine democracy must meet these three standards if it is to be worthy of the high tradition which gave it birth. Not all governments which call themselves democratic meet all these standards, and some governments do not meet any of them.

Democracy grows out of the history and character of a people and it cannot be imposed by fiat. I believe that democratic government is the most effective form of government ever conceived by man, because it takes into account both man's longing for justice and man's inclination to injustice. Genuine democratic government is probably the most difficult form of government to achieve, but I believe it is worth the effort.

FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY

Does democracy have a future? Viewed against the backdrop of history, modern political democracy is still a relatively new and untried form of government. In the past three decades democratic government has been severely challenged from without by new systems of totalitarianism and tyranny which rule by coercion and fear rather than by freely given consent. Democracy is always challenged from within by ignorance, by apathy, and by the pursuit of special privileges at the expense of a common good. The future of democracy cannot be taken for granted—but it can be encouraged and promoted.

I believe democracy will survive and grow if those who understand its true meaning dedicate their lives to its fulfillment. It will survive if true democrats the world over recognize the peril in which genuine representative government stands today. Democracy can be the faith and fact of the future if the young people of today dedicate themselves to the proposition that "government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth."

The New Spirit in Immigration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, one of the more notable accomplishments of the recent Congress was in the field of immigration. The bill which Congress passed has now become Public Law 363—part of the immigration code of the land.

I should like to point the deserving finger of recognition at Representative FRANCIS WALTER, of Pennsylvania, for the long and arduous work he put in on this bill. Compliments are in order also for Representative CELLER, of New York, who was instrumental in getting the bill out on the House floor and for Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, who assisted in the improving amendments added in the Senate.

However, the most commendable aspect of all is that this act has written into the impersonal objectivity of our immigration laws the essence of the great American spirit. In short, a place has been made for the human element. A statement made on the floor during the debate on this bill hit exactly the right note:

This measure firmly reasserts the principle that the reuniting of families shall be one of the basic and permanent cornerstones of our immigration policy. By passing this bill we show once again that America, even though she operates through the cold quotas and figures of the Immigration and Nationality Act, is willing to change those figures where human suffering is at stake. We demonstrate that, in the final analysis, our democratic feelings shape our decisions.

Basically the bill reclassifies certain close relatives of U.S. citizens and aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States. Such reclassification will expedite the reuniting of certain families. The bill also provides for the granting of nonquota status—that is, without regard to any existing quota—to certain close relatives of U.S. citizens and legal permanent resident aliens if these relatives were registered on a quota waiting list before December 31, 1953, and in whose behalf petitions were approved prior to January 1, 1959. This provision will benefit approximately 57,000 persons.

Mr. Speaker, this is basically a bill to reunite families that we have been seeking to bring together. It will help people who have been waiting hopelessly, often for years, to join their families here in the United States. As was said on the House floor, it is a bill that any person who has any human feeling must be glad to see become law.

Perhaps the true essence of the new law has best been summed up by Senator PASTORE when he called it an equitable bill fashioned sincerely in the American mold that makes for the sanctity of the family and the security of the home.

Let's Not Forget a Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD published on September 18, 1959, contains a statement and a report from the Secretary of Agriculture, Ezra Taft Benson, relative to the serious obligation we have to the farmers and people of America.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the September 8, 1959, issue of the San Diego Union in the RECORD. This editorial again points up the burden on us all:

LET'S NOT FORGET A FARM BILL

President Eisenhower said recently that he would take his fight for sensible farm legislation to the American people. The fact that Mr. Eisenhower's nationwide appeal on behalf of the Landrum-Griffin labor bill stimulated the Congress into action augurs well for a like presentation of the farm case.

The public had a great stake in the battle for beneficial labor legislation, and let the Congress know it. The Nation's taxpayers have an equally important stake in getting the Congress to do something about the farm mess.

The present system of price supports and output controls is woefully inadequate. Last January the President again acted to put agriculture programs back on a sensible, business-like basis in keeping with the free enterprise system. He recommended to Congress a change that would allow the support prices of farm commodities to move gradually into line with actual market prices. Thus prices would reflect current conditions of supply and demand.

This is reasonable. It would make price, rather than governmental acreage and marketing controls, the most important determining factor in production. A gradual conversion of the price-support mechanism from an instrument of subsidy into one of real stabilization would cause least dislocation to the farmers.

But the Democratic-controlled Congress, occupied with politics and star-chamber investigations of Presidential appointees, has done nothing. Could it be because the Congress thinks the public is indifferent?

Indifference is one thing we cannot afford with the farm problem. It is the biggest drain on the taxpayers aside from defense. It benefits only one-sixth of the taxpaying population. And there is strong evidence that the farmers benefiting most from the present program are those least in need of help.

Expenditures for the support of farm prices and farm income are estimated at $4½ billion for fiscal 1960. They may go even higher. It is obvious that such expenditures endanger hopes for balancing the budget and whittling down our national debt of $290 billion.

We have had the insatiable farm price-support program since the early New Deal days. It came in as a temporary and emergency measure. In the process of its overlong and unwelcome stay, it has threatened to eat us out of house and home. The bill so far is in excess of $19 billion.

Corrective action has been delayed far too long. The President has a strong case, and he is taking it to the right jury • • • the people.

The Seasons To Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BOYLE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the current Khrushchev visit, the question of comparative philosophies of the United States and the U.S.S.R. have been brought into clearer focus. I commend to the attention of my colleagues, the following article from the pen of Leo Lerner, editor of Lerner home news-

papers, entitled, "The Seasons To Come," which I feel sincerely merits the study of the American people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article:

[From the North Town News]

THE FIRST COLUMN

(By Leo A. Lerner)

THE SEASONS TO COME

We are a "things" people.
We love things.
We have things.
We want things.

I know a man who is in love with his hi-fi. The only time I see an expression of complete happiness on his face is when he is playing his records, or just looking them over, holding them in that special way that shows he respects them.

This man is to be envied because he is so completely happy with his things.

Being a "things" nation has its drawbacks. As Walter Lippmann said in his column a few days ago, our preoccupation with things leaves us in an embarrassing position with regard to Russia. Lippmann says the Russians are "cohesive" because they have a purpose.

This is not really an insult to the United States, but just a comment that we have probably lost our way in our spiritual and democratic growth because we are somewhat too satisfied with our consumer goods distribution system, which sees to it that nearly everybody can have sewing machines that make buttonholes; and extra soft toilet tissue.

In fact we give a sort of spiritual flavor to our worship of things. We call it a way of life and we get kind of arrogant about it.

Mr. Khrushchev, on his visit, is getting a very convincing display of all the good things that we have. We thought we would bowl him over, but he seems to be resenting it a little. He is beginning to look like a jealous in-law.

Comfort and things are laudable, even necessary, but I feel that we would make a better showing in the world if there were a sound democratic foundation under our apparent consumer-goods worship.

If, as a nation we were doing more for our poor and unfortunate, we would look better; and if we were not making such asses of ourselves over the race problem, we would look better. All of us would feel better if we were more effective in selling democracy abroad.

President Eisenhower is both courageous and farseeing in his efforts to get together with Premier Khrushchev and try to work out a mutual understanding for peace, but he is not to be admired for his failure to push through Congress an adequate education bill that would put Federal funds behind new schools, colleges, medical schools, and hospitals.

I think this problem depends on the individuals in our society. Those who take their share from society and give nothing back are merely parasites. The fact that we have done well for ourselves does not necessarily mean we have a noble purpose.

This is obviously now a world community, and in order to live in it, we have to change some of our ways. We have to give as much as we get. More, perhaps. But by this I don't mean just foreign aid as much as I mean a part of our hearts, a deep desire to win the world with our own basic goodness.

These goof-ball demonstrations across the country against Khrushchev were crude, inhospitable, and silly. They were vain moral pretensions, vulgar, and inhospitable. You are not much of a hero when you bait Khrushchev from behind the desk of a Hearst newspaper.

America needs to purify its motives and to follow its words with example.

It needs to build ethical bases, instead of just military bases.

Democracy needs to be reintroduced as a way of life in America, and every man should ask himself before he goes to bed at night what he has done that day to advance democracy, even a tenth of a millionth of an inch.

The best words I have read during Mr. Khrushchev's visit are those of our friend Mr. Lippmann, who says:

"There are some among us, it would seem, who think that the Soviet challenge—the most formidable in the history of Western society—can be dealt with by not talking with the Russians, but by passing resolutions condemning communism and then by continuing business and pleasure as usual. They fancy themselves as great defenders of our civilization when they make a speech or write an article which answers some point made by Mr. Khrushchev.

"They are mistaken. The contest will not be won by nitpicking and pinpricking. These Americans do not realize the might of our adversary. The only answer to Mr. Khrushchev is to stop worrying whether he will seduce us, to stop huddling together for fear of his witchery, and to become again the confident and purposeful people which, except when we have duped ourselves, we really are."

Our "things" civilization grew from a strong root of freedom and democracy. Now the roots are becoming sclerotic. We must cultivate them and water them, and give them food, so that they will grow new leaves and new branches for the centuries of seasons to come.

General Pulaski, Polish Soldier of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, October 1 is the day which we have set aside to honor Casimir Pulaski, the Polish soldier of liberty.

Our country has never forgotten the services and sacrifices of this great Polish patriot, who gave his life, 180 years ago, for the cause of American independence.

Pulaski's entire life was dedicated to the struggle for liberty and freedom. In Poland, he was born to wealth and privilege. Yet he did not hesitate to give up everything for his ideals and for his country. In a period when Poland was preyed upon by her neighbors, and kept in a state of weakness and decay by foreign invaders, Pulaski arose as the man who was willing to take desperate steps for the liberation of his nation.

By the time he was 21, he had fought and defeated the Russians in several battles. By the time he was 24, all Europe knew him as a great fighter and patriot; as one who was willing to fight and die for Polish freedom.

When he was forced to flee Poland, he set out for America, largely through the auspices of Benjamin Franklin, who recognized the value of his services to the War of Independence. He went to yet another country to fight once again for liberty.

His contributions to the Revolutionary cause are a matter of history. His daring and skill won the trust and support of George Washington. The zeal and exploits of his legion won the admiration and gratitude of all the Colonies.

Pulaski died, at the age of 32, at Savannah, in the thick of a battle for liberty. His is the story of a patriot and fighter: "an enemy of kings."

But Casimir Pulaski is more than a great soldier, patriot and idealist. He is the symbol of the unconquerable spirit of Poland, which today once again is beset by foreign invaders. His memory symbolizes the centuries-old struggle of Poland against subjugation, and the hope and the dedication in the hearts of Polish patriots everywhere to the cause of liberty. May Poland's valiant sons—the heirs of Casimir Pulaski—one day restore their great nation to sovereignty and independence.

Vienna Youth Festival: An Appraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on three previous occasions this year I have addressed the Senate on the World Youth Festival held this year from July 26 to August 4 in Vienna, Austria. Those three occasions were on March 10, July 23, and July 27.

My remarks were concerned with two main points. First, I wanted to say a word about the nature and purpose of these Communist-sponsored youth festivals which occur every 2 years; second, I attempted to make a case for the participation of intelligent and well-informed American young people and students.

This is the first youth festival held outside of the Iron Curtain. It presented an unique opportunity for an encounter between young people indoctrinated with the Communist idealogy and young people committed to democracy as we know it in Western Europe and the United States.

In a letter to the student body heads of American colleges and universities, I urge unofficial U.S. participation in the festival. The purpose of such participation was to present the case for genuine democracy, especially among delegates from the uncommitted countries of Asia and Africa.

The World Youth Festival of 1959 is now history, and I should like to take this occasion to say that I am convinced that the unofficial participation by American youths, guided to a great extent by the work of the independent service for information on the Vienna Youth Festival, was a great success. Many unofficial contacts, meetings, conversations, and debates were held between these unofficial delegates and

other participants in the festival. Those who participated in this way learned a great deal about Communist propaganda as well as about technique that can be used to reach persons from uncommitted areas. I am sure this experience in persuasion will pay off in the future.

In connection with appraising the festival, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three articles, as follows:

First. "Festival Branded 'Communist Tool' by U.S. Delegates," which appeared in the Vienna Daily News, an unofficial, non-Communist newspaper published during the festival, on August 5, 1959. This article illustrates the activities of the American group.

Second. "Moscow's Experimental Venture: The Vienna World Youth Festival," by Morton Schwartz, which appeared in Problems of Communism, September–October 1959. This publication is put out by the U.S. Information Agency.

Third. "Counterblast at the Vienna Festival," by Friedrich Katscher, which appeared in the August 17–24, 1959, the New Leader. Mr. Katscher shows how the democratic youth at the festival stymied the Communist impact.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Vienna Daily News, Aug. 5, 1959].

FESTIVAL BRANDED "COMMUNIST TOOL" BY U.S. DELEGATES

A statement issued by the majority of the U.S. delegates yesterday denounced the festival as "a tool for the advancement of world communism," at which the truth was distorted, free speech was suppressed and non-Communists were "beaten up by the festival police."

The statement was issued by an eight-man steering committee elected to represent the delegation which never obtained recognition from the Communist organizers of the festival. It was handed out by spokesman John Meller, 22, of Chicago, a student of political science at Stanford University. It said that the Americans remained throughout the festival to wage a continuing fight for freedom of speech and to try to give the festival delegates a fair and undistorted picture of life in the United States.

"But we did not expect," the statement said, "that the festival organizers would be as blatantly partisan as they were * * * and we did not expect that intimidation and violence would be used against those whose sentiments, political or nonpolitical, were not those of the festival organizers."

Meanwhile, Jean Garcias, general secretary of the International Preparatory Committee which organized the festival, said it had decided to send a delegation to the Foreign Ministers' Conference in Geneva.

The party will include one member from each of the countries whose foreign ministers are meeting in Geneva, and one delegate from each of the five continents. Mr. Garcias said the delegation would wish the Ministers a successful conference and would hand them a copy of the closing statements of the festival.

He said 18,864 delegates from 112 countries attended the festival.

[From Problems of Communism, September–October 1959, published by USIA]

MOSCOW'S EXPERIMENTAL VENTURE: THE VIENNA WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL

In their biannual effort to foster "the consolidation of the democratic forces of youth," the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY) and the International Union of Students (IUS), two major constellations in the solar system of Communist-front organizations, jointly sponsored the Seventh World Festival of Youth and Students in Vienna from July 26 to August 4 of this year. Under the banner of "Peace and Friendship" and behind a smokescreen of singing, dancing, cultural exhibitions and sports contests—an official handout stated that there were "on the average 80 events per day"—a major campaign was waged to demonstrate the moral and socioeconomic superiority of socialism over capitalism and to persuade the delegates, particularly those from the underdeveloped countries, that Communist "victories" are not only inevitable but desirable.

The history of the World Youth Festivals demonstrates that far from being nonpolitical and nonpartisan, as their publicity claims, they have consistently and unquestioningly followed the dictates of Soviet foreign policy. The first three festivals, held in Prague (1947), Budapest (1949), and East Berlin (1951), reflected the Soviet policy line in the most venomous stage of the cold war: They attacked the non-Communist leaders of Asian and African nationalism as "bourgeois imperialist lackies"; they directed violent condemnations at the United States, Britain, and the "Western imperialist warmongers"; they welcomed and then expelled Yugoslav youth delegates; they celebrated the Chinese Communist victory.

With the death of Stalin, the festivals held in Bucharest (1953), Warsaw (1955), and Moscow (1957), adopted the less blatant and more flexible tactics of the new Soviet policy: Asian and African national movements were praised and infiltrated instead of boycotted and condemned, non-Communist personalities and organizations were courted so as to add respectability to the festivals, and emphasis was placed on the need for international cooperation to solve the problems facing world youth. The festival in Vienna has been a continuation of this post-Stalin policy.

A major effort was made by the sponsors to make the event appear nonpartisan. As evidence, they pointed to the well-known figures who have endorsed the festival—e.g., Sean O'Casey, J. D. Bernall, Paul Robeson. Because the WFDY and the IUS have become so well known as Communist-front groups, they followed their usual custom of creating their own front—the International Preparatory Committee (IPC) of the Vienna Festival—as the organization formally responsible for operations. It was maintained that the festival staff was international and representative of all political tendencies, but most of the IPC members were WFDY and IUS veterans. Jean Garcias, the secretary of the IPC, is a 34-year-old French Communist official who worked at WFDY headquarters for 5 years prior to being sent to Vienna in April 1958 to take charge of preparations. At the 1957 Moscow festival, the leading organizer was Alexander Shelepin, former First Secretary of the Soviet Komsomol, vice president of IUS from 1946 to 1953, first vice president of WFDY in 1953–54, reelected for a 2-year term in the same office in August 1957—and three times a member of the IPC staffs formed to organize festivals. It is perhaps not surprising that his long years of service to the "youth of the world" were rewarded by his appointment last December to succeed Gen. Ivan Serov as chief of the Soviet security organization, the KGB. It is probable that 32-year-old Valentin Vdovin, Komsomol secretary at WFDY headquarters since 1955, Soviet secretary in IUS from 1951 to 1954 and close associate of Shelepin, played the major behind-the-scenes role during the Vienna activities.

As further proof of the non-Communist character of the festival, IPC literature repeatedly pointed to the choice of Vienna as its site. All previous festivals, with the exception of the 1947 gathering in Prague, which preceded the Communist coup by 6 months, have been held in the capitals of Communist countries. Keenly aware of criticism of the past gatherings as strictly Soviet bloc demonstrations, those responsible decided that moving the festival out of the bloc to a neutral capital would win respectability and prestige for the event and its sponsors. Though the advantages of total cooperation from local authorities, power over visas, mobilization of "volunteer" labor, direction of the mass media, and help from the police and army, were in this case absent, Vienna was not without its advantages. Four-power occupation of Vienna, from 1945 to 1955, had given the Soviets an opportunity to set up a number of front organizations in their sector. Though the major front groups with permanent headquarters there—the World Federation of Trade Unions and the World Peace Council—were expelled after the occupation for endangering Austrian neutrality, a network of services and facilities had been maintained. These organizations were instrumental in making the festival arrangements—housing the delegates, providing translation equipment and secretarial services, acting as a funnel for the vast moneys poured into the festival, etc. Such facilities are available in very few places outside the Soviet bloc.

The tone of the festival was set by the opening ceremonies at Wiener Stadium. For approximately 4 hours a crowd estimated at 50,000 was treated to a parade of 11,000 delegates, many in colorful national costumes, a gymnastics display by 1,200 athletes from Czechoslovakia (who were specially imported for this demonstration and returned home that same night), dancing by national groups from every continent, and an impressive fireworks display. As each delegation passed the reviewing stand they were greeted with the same words, "Friendship, peace—we welcome the young ambassadors of peace in Vienna." At the height of the proceedings several thousand "peace doves" were released. (Unfortunately for some of the spectators, the pigeons added their own personal touch to the festivities.) The peace and friendship chant—"Frieden und Freundschaft," "Mir i druzhba"—was on the lips of all of the delegations as they circled the stadium.

The most impressive delegations were from Iraq, China, the various East European countries, and the Soviet Union. As the Soviet delegation was being announced a barrage of fireworks suddenly began, and rocket-launched parachutes bearing the official festival flag dropped from the sky. There was no question but that the really important delegation had arrived. At the IPC press conference the following day the fact that the fireworks began just as the Soviet delegation was announced was deemed to be coincidence. It was explained that in agreement with the Viennese Fire Department, the fireworks display was set for a certain time. However, the delegates were one-half hour late as they marched into the stadium. The fact that the time specified coincided with the announcement of the Soviets was "purely accidental."

Another interesting tactic was the fact that the Japanese delegation carried the only overtly political banners in the opening parade, though they later appeared among other groups. As the Japanese slowly circled the stadium they bore signs which read "Atom-Free Zone in Asia." "Ban A- and H-Bombs." Throughout the whole festival, the Japanese played the major role in propagandizing the antinuclear weapons theme. At the August 1 "Celebration in Honor of Friendship and Peace Among the Peoples,

Against Atomic Weapons, for Disarmament and Peaceful Coexistence," a Japanese chorus sang "The Song of Hiroshima." They were introduced by a girl who gave an eyewitness account of the horrors of the first atom-bomb explosion. At this same demonstration, which began with a 2-hour parade along the Ring, Vienna's grand boulevard, banners were carried by various delegations protesting against nuclear weapons tests and the cold war. The Soviet delegation carried signs in Russian, German, French, English, and Arabic. Two delegations shouldered banners calling for a "Summit Conference for Peace."

The tendentious use of the "peace" slogan was more obviously revealed at the meeting "On the contribution of the youth of Asia and the Pacific region to the cause of peace, so that the Pacific Ocean will be a peace ocean, which is the common interest of the young people of Asia and the Pacific region." The tone of this meeting reflected the official Soviet position with regard to the existence of American bases in the Pacific.

During the festival's student program, organized by the IUS, many seminars, conferences, and lectures were held. Though discussion was essentially unrestricted and there were some opportunities to present non-Communist interpretations of the subject at hand, the complexion of these meetings was determined by the IPC, which selected both topics and speakers. Invariably these gatherings proclaimed the superiority of the Communist system and lashed out against the moral debauchery of the capitalist system, whether the subject under discussion was "The Problems of Contemporary Literature," "Nature and Man in the Light of the Achievements of Contemporary Science, Technology and Philosophy," or "Problems in the Conquest of Space." For instance, Soviet Prof. Georgi Vinogradoff, a member of the Academy of Sciences, speaking in a seminar on "Atomic Energy, Today and Tomorrow," included in his remarks on Soviet progress an attack against the atomic rearmament of West Germany. Many incidents of this type could be cited.

The most blatant examples of Communist propagandizing were to be seen at the international exhibitions of art and photography. Of these, the most unashamedly partisan pièce d'art was a posterlike Guatemalan painting, variously depicting an ugly-faced American soldier shooting an Oriental with hands tied behind his back, a partially buried "U.S. Air Force" bomb, another bomb from which vermin are crawling and carrying doves of peace, North Korean troops descending upon the imperialist marauders. Less obvious were three Japanese photographs showing respectively a column of marching Japanese troops, a group of American GI's, and Japanese youngsters playing at war with toy pistols: The caption under these pictures read "A city in which the American Army and Japanese Wermacht are situated." On the side of positive propaganda there were the expected themes: Friendship, personified by a smiling and waving Khrushchev in an East German photograph; socialist economic progress, highlighted by the predominantly industrial scenes in the North Korean, Rumanian, and Chinese displays; Soviet scientific achievements, subtly indicated by numerous watercolors on space travel done by young Soviet children, hung in the special children's section of the exhibition. In the American photographic display, pictures of privation and squalor dominated. The only caption to be found read "Slums and Young Toughs."

Though the Soviet delegation never took an overbearing lead in the various festival activities, the dominance of Soviet influence was felt everywhere. The ubiquitous impact of the 800-strong contingent, constantly chanting "Mir i Druzhba" and singing Dunayevski's "March of Enthusiasts" (the unofficial anthem of the WFDY); the Soviet trucks bearing the Soviet "Kino-khronima" klieg lights, used at every outdoor rally; the ever-present horde of Soviet newspaper photographers and radio correspondents carrying their portable tape recorders—all bore witness to the guiding hand behind the festival. At every festival event, the Soviet participation was the featured performance. Though others frequently made the passionate appeals, the Soviet speakers assumed the role of "elder statesmen." Virtually always together in large groups, the young (and some not so young) Soviet delegates were constantly smiling, waving, shaking hands, and distributing lapel pins.

The delegates were assisted—and applauded—by large numbers of Soviet tourists (approximately 4,000), who also carried about seemingly inexhaustible supplies of pins. Thousands of "tourists" also arrived from Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia. Communist supporters from all parts of Austria were reported to have been brought to Vienna to attend the August 1 rally on disarmament. These moves to insure a show of enthusiasm from the sidelines apparently reflected the apprehension felt over the reception that would greet a festival outside the Iron Curtain.

That such apprehension was to some extent justified became clear in perhaps the most unique feature of the festival, as contrasted with past gatherings—and that was the presence of a counteractive opposition in Vienna. Austrian non-Communist youth groups set up information centers throughout the city, usually near the site of a festival activity. Large crowds, even including some people from the Communist delegations, frequently formed at these points to discuss political questions. There was notable cooperation between various nationalities of anti-Communist young people. Catholics and Socialists worked well together and with independent student groups. Anti-Communist literature was distributed by the Austrians, and a two-volume pocket edition of Dr. Zhivago, in Russian, was also available. The Austrian youth groups also arranged bus tours to the heavily fortified Hungarian border. The anti-Communist youth could count themselves successful in contacting eastern European delegates, particularly the Poles and East Germans, but unfortunately did not seem to attract much non-European attention.

The splits which occurred in some of the delegations, particularly the American, certainly disturbed the total harmony which usually prevails at the festivals. Garcia's heavy-handed efforts to get sole recognition for the fellow-traveling minority of the U.S. participants were widely known and provoked some adverse comments from other delegates. Frequently, but not uniformly, efforts were made to exclude unidentified delegates from the seminars. Special privilegs were accorded Communist newsmen, while representatives of the Western press had difficulty in obtaining admission to some conference activities. The latter discrimination, however, was not known to the delegates themselves.

As for the general public reception, the coolness of the local population to the festival must have been something of a surprise to those delegates who remembered the huge Moscow throngs cheering them on in 1957. The Viennese, who lived with Soviet occupation troops for 10 years, gaped rather than applauded.

A major defeat for the festival was the opposition of the Big Three of neutralism—Nasser, Nehru, and Nkrumah. Though it was never acknowledged by the IPC, there was no one present representing the UAR. Perhaps to compensate for this boycott, the nearly 400 delegates from Kassem's Iraq were given much attention. Most of the delegates from India and all from Ghana were students from European, mainly British, universities rather than representatives coming directly from their own countries. There was no official Pakistani delegation either, and one lone Burmese peace partisan carried his nation's banner in the procession.

Despite the presence of an opposition, the record of the Vienna Festival does not show that it was substantially deflected from the aims and traditions established by its predecessors. The dominant policy lines—peace and friendship, nuclear disarmament, anti-colonialism, Soviet-Communist invincibility—were forcefully propagated. In addition to the activities at the festival proper, many of the delegates were invited, at small or no cost to themselves, to visit various countries of the Socialist camp before the festival or on their way home. Most of the Asian delegates traveled to Vienna through the Soviet Union with the financial assistance of the Soviet Festival Committee. The Australian delegation, for example, came to Vienna via China and the Soviet Union. At every step along the route, their hosts made sure that they were greeted by huge throngs of enthusiastic well-wishers and supporters.

"It must be realized that the festival is not only for song and amusement: it is above all a political event on a world scale," said one Communist paper (Trybunu Ludu, May 25). That the organizers and sponsors took their task to heart has been clearly demonstrated.

MORTON SCHWARTZ.

[From the New Leader, Aug. 17–24, 1959]

COUNTERBLAST AT THE VIENNA FESTIVAL

(By Friedrich Katscher)

VIENNA.—Now that the World Youth Festival, held here from July 26 to August 4, is over, it is possible to draw up a balance sheet on it. This was the seventh such gathering, but the first held in a non-Iron Curtain city. Was it a success from the point of view of its Communist organizers? Did their calculated risk, in sponsoring it in a nominally neutral but actually anti-Communist, pro-West city, pay off? Or were the disruptive efforts of the many anti-Communist youth groups sufficiently successful to teach Moscow not to try such an experiment again outside the Iron Curtain? On balance, the latter would seem to be the case, though the Festival's propagandistic activities cannot be said to have been wholly without an effect on the delegates.

Some 18,000 youths from approximately 100 countries, representing three main geographical areas—Western, Afro-Asian and Iron Curtain—participated in the Festival. The Western group included Communists, fellow travelers, anti-Communists and indifferent people who came only to have a good time at inexpensive rates. The distinctions were not so clear among the Afro-Asians; many had no fixed political views and were open to influence in either direction.

The delegations from the Soviet-dominated countries consisted of both convinced Communists and young people eager to see something of the unknown but attractive West. The Communist managers of these delegations took every precaution to insulate the latter from the seductions lurking in Vienna. The Hungarians, Czechs, Rumanians and Bulgarians had been screened in such a way that they mostly included people who knew no western language. They were secluded like monks from any undesirable contacts with westerners and were transported by special buses from place to place. Many of them had their lodgings on heavily guarded ships anchored in the Danube.

The vast majority of Viennese remained completely aloof from the proceedings. In this they were abetted by the city's non-

Communist press, which undertook what it called "Operation Silence" about the festival: A few days before the jamboree began, all the newspapers explained editorially that they were clamping a news blackout on the event because they considered it not news but propaganda. And a few days after the festival's close, the press published brief roundups about it. For the duration of the festival, there was total silence about it in the press.

Austrian Communist activists, though small in number, played an important role by guarding the seclusion of the Iron Curtain youths and by using violence against open opponents. To counter them, the Federation of Austrian Youth and the Federation of Austrian Students played a key role in the major effort to weaken the impact of the Communist enterprise. These movements, under the slogan, "Friendship Yes, Communism No," worked with many other groups to explain why they refused to participate in the festival, but were eager to make contact with individual participants to tell the story of the free world.

The story was told in many ways. A four-page newspaper, the Vienna Daily News, was issued 12 days running in 7 different editions—English, German, French, Russian, Spanish, Hungarian, and Czech. All festival programs and attractions were regularly listed on an inside page, but cleverly interspersed with them were also listings of all the anti-Communist counterattractions. The paper also printed world news that placed the Soviet bloc in a poor light, and featured items about the dissensions and quarrels at the festival itself.

The newspapers, as well as books, leaflets, posters, and other printed materials, were widely distributed at the more than a dozen information centers set up by anti-Communist youth groups in booths near the camps where the delegates lived, near railroad stations, and at other focal points. The printed material in the Western languages was read by the Western and Afro-Asian participants, but it is difficult to assess the extent to which this literature reached the Iron Curtain groups.

Some success, at least, may be inferred from the fact that their living quarters were subjected to a thorough search for contraband books and periodicals by Communist guards. Some of the Austrian youths who were distributing the literature were severely beaten by the Communist commandoes, and a German television cameraman was also beaten and his camera destroyed (but the film saved) as he recorded how the Communist camp guards violently attacked the non-Communist youths.

The anti-Communist literature included a beautifully illustrated booklet called "Westwind," which described how young people live in the West; Boris Pasternak's "Dr. Zhivago" and Milovan Djilas' "The New Class" in several languages; and a much-sought-after magazine on modern art. The main anti-Communist information center housed an exhibition of "Young Painters of Today" and featured a phonobar where jazz recordings could be heard through earphones. Young Austrians and others speaking foreign languages were present throughout the day to answer questions about life in the West and to engage Communist and other disputants in the many lively discussions that took place.

Young Socialists from the West, from the Afro-Asian countries and from Austria itself, as well as young exiles from Hungary, Spain, and Algeria, performed a highly useful function. The Socialists, whose traditional and stanch history of opposition to all forms of totalitarianism and imperialism is a matter of record, sponsored a big rally against colonialism with prominent speakers from Africa and Asia, a commemoration of the Hungarian revolution with Anna Kethly, the Hungarian Social Democratic leader, as speaker, and a meeting on World Refugee Day (August 2) where refugees from Algeria, Spain, Hungary, and Tibet (the Dalai Lama's brother) spoke. Unfortunately, most of the young people from behind the Iron Curtain, except for the Poles, who were comparatively free and accessible, were either confined to their quarters or did not dare come.

Guided tours were arranged through Vienna and to factories in and out of the city. Seventy-one Soviet delegates took part in the factory tour. Visits were also organized to the Hungarian border. There were from 8 to 12 bus trips daily to the "murder frontier," and Western and Asian delegates were duly appalled by the visible manifestations of the Iron Curtain—the barbed wire entanglements, mine fields, watchtowers with searchlights and machineguns.

Three movie houses played motion pictures without censorship and free of charge. Among the films shown were documentaries on the 1953 East German uprising and the Hungarian Revolution, two films based on George Orwell's novels, "1984" and "Animal Farm," and Ernst Lubitsch's classic satire, "Ninotchka." Four free jazz concerts, advertised with the slogan, "Music Knows No Borders," filled Vienna's largest auditorium.

Perhaps the lowest act perpetrated by the Communists was to spread word that the Austrian Government had suspended the right of political asylum for the duration of the Festival and would arrest and return any refugee. The Vienna Daily News at once refuted this lie and quoted an official of the Austrian Ministry of Interior to the effect that "Austria is a free country and offers asylum to any political refugee." Two days after the festival closed, the Ministry announced that three East European youths who had come to the festival—a Czech metal grinder, a Rumanian music student, and a Hungarian music student—have asked for asylum, which was, of course, granted.

On balance, it would seem that more was gained than lost by allowing the Communists to hold their festival here. In the free atmosphere of this city, Communist supervisors were unable to keep control over all the participants from non-Communist countries. They won few new adherents and undoubtedly lost some, especially among the Iron Curtain youths who had their first breath of a free society and their first glimpse of its products. Though it would be self-deception to maintain that the Communists were wholly unsuccessful, it will probably be a long time before they stage another such rally in a Western city.

Problems Facing Congress When It Returns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the adjournment period is traditionally one of reevaluation of past achievement and reassessment of future goals. I would like to discuss some of the problems which we have not yet solved, and which, in my opinion, should have immediate priority when Congress returns.

Many of these problems are concerned with serious gaps—areas of underdevelopment—in a country which is otherwise the most fully developed in the world. One of the biggest jobs before Congress, it seems to me, is to see to it that no group is left behind in the general prosperity.

This is, after all, an era of unprecedented national productivity and national wealth. With all the great resources at our command, there seems no reason why we cannot channel our productivity not only for an attack on the conquest of space, but for an attack on the very real problems yet remaining to us here on earth.

OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

One group for which we have failed to make adequate provision is our elder citizens.

Our elder citizens are a permanent and rapidly increasing part of our society. There are 15 million Americans 65 years or older in the United States today. According to present estimates, this figure will exceed 20 million by 1975.

Our scientific and medical achievement, which promises more and more of us increased longevity, leaves us with a great responsibility. We have helped people to live longer; now, we must help them to make those added years fruitful and more productive.

Instead, we end to treat them as a useless appendage, and we do very little to help them solve their problems. In this area, as in others, we tend to excel in scientific advances and suddenly wake up to find we can not keep pace sociologically with what we are doing scientifically.

The problems facing the aged are numerous: problems of mental and physical health, problems of finances, social integration, employment, and housing.

The urgent and pressing need for public housing for the elderly is being illustrated by the current experience in my State of New Jersey. In the first such project in the State, which opened on September 16 in Asbury Park, some 700 applications were received for facilities which could accommodate only 10 percent of that number. I am pleased to point out that New Jersey is planning several other housing projects of a similar nature, including the construction of 500 housing units in Newark which is expected to begin shortly.

I might mention that my State has been one of the first to recognize the need for constructive programs for the aged. Activities relating to the elderly have been transferred from the department of health to a special division on the aging, to demonstrate that the problem is not simply one of health, but rather a complex one requiring separate and specialized treatment. For some years now, New Jersey has been holding conferences on the State and community level and has begun positive activities on the basis of these studies and discussions.

The experience of New Jersey and of States with similar programs will be made available to the rest of the Nation

at the forthcoming White House Conference on the Aging. This conference is the result of a resolution sponsored by Congressman FOGARTY and myself, among others, in the 85th Congress, in order that all the experts and resources of the country may be pooled to determine what can best be done to help our senior citizens attain a full and useful adjustment.

It is my understanding that preparations for this conference, which will be held in January of 1961, are well advanced. The recommendations of the conferees will be available by May of that year, and Congress will be well advised to give their report immediate attention.

SOCIAL SECURITY

But the financial problems of the aged do not have to await further study. They can be solved immediately by amendment of the social-security laws.

I have long advocated a liberalization of benefits, and particularly of the income limitations, which are unfair and unrealistic. Instead of penalizing those older citizens who can and wish to engage in some form of employment, we should be encouraging them to engage in productive activity to the extent of their ability.

In addition to the elimination of the income limitations, I should like to see action in the second session on H.R. 1955, a bill which I introduced to reduce the age of eligibility to 60. Men who have worked for 40 or more years deserve the opportunity to spend a few more of their later years in comfort and leisure. The high rate of productivity which we have achieved in this country should make it possible for all working men and women, by retiring earlier, to share in its benefits.

Finally, I would like to see a system of health insurance for the elderly. I have received many letters from constituents who are concerned, and rightly so, with the difficulty of affording adequate medical care in their later years. Private health insurance companies have failed to adequately care for this need. It is therefore incumbent upon us to provide for adequate health insurance through the social security system.

HOUSING

In its recent report, the Civil Rights Commission delivered the following indictment:

> Congress has declared the goal of the Federal Housing policies to be a "decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family" with "the elimination of substandard and blighted areas." Yet, despite this national goal, and despite the national wealth, and despite the science and technology of the 20th century, the mounting housing needs of the American people are not being adequately met.

The Commission went on to point out that in 1950 there were 16 million substandard housing units in the United States, and that at least 2 million citizens occupy slum-type dwellings in New York City alone.

In testimony before congressional committees mayor after mayor of every major city stated that while local units could help—by enforcing housing codes and by sharing the cost—they could not make a dent in the problem of housing, slum clearance, and urban renewal without Federal assistance.

Yet, despite these facts and figures, the administration has maintained that we cannot afford either public housing nor adequate urban renewal.

In the face of determined Republican opposition, and over two vetoes, the Congress barely managed to retain the provisions for 37,000 new housing units—not enough to cover the needs of a single major city—and an equally scant $650 million for the clearance of slums.

I think the economy of failing to expand our housing program is short-sighted. It takes no account of the long-run expenditures for prisons, courts, police protection and health care which represent the hidden costs of the slums. Nor does it consider the fact that every neglected slum breeds more slums and presents future problems of even more gigantic proportions.

But the question transcends mere monetary considerations. The cost must be calculated in terms of human misery: In the failure to permit millions of Americans to live in conditions of sanitation and relative comfort, and in the depriving of millions of youngsters of the chance to develop into sound, contributing citizens.

The need for an expanded housing program has been fully documented. I hope that we may focus our attention more sharply on the problem and work toward a more adequate solution.

OUR ROLE IN EDUCATION

We are presently faced with tremendous scientific accomplishments by our foremost enemy. In a strikingly short period, Russia has managed, partly through emphasized education, to catch up with us in many areas and overreach us in others. Yet we seem willing to permit the educational potential of our population to remain largely untapped.

This is a tragedy, not only to the country as a whole, which must do without the contributions of those who lack the opportunity to develop to the full extent of their abilities, but also to those thousands of young men and women who are forced to lead dissatisfying and unproductive lives.

Education has too long been a forgotten program in our society. Partly due to the old bugaboo that Federal aid will mean Federal domination, we have for years put off doing something constructive in this direction. Now, that the National Defense Education Act, has passed, let us hope that this time-worn debate has been relegated to the mothballs to which it belongs. The Defense Act, token effort though it is, at least breaks through this one barrier, and establishes once and for all the principle that the Federal Government has a significant responsibility in the education of American youth.

But the National Defense Education Act was only a drop in the bucket, a little spurt in response to sputnik. Under it, a timid $770 million was authorized, to be spent over a period of years. Under its loan program, many youngsters were given the opportunity to continue their studies in 1958 and 1959, and many more will be given that opportunity in the years immediately ahead. But how many thousands of equally capable young men and women must still live out lives of frustrated ambitions and denied hopes?

Nor is an expansion of the scholarship-loan program the only thing that is necessary. We should become involved in school construction; and we need more teachers, better salaries, more classrooms, broadened curriculms, additional counselors, and school psychiatrists. I wonder how much of our juvenile delinquency might be solved if potential delinquents had uncrowded classrooms and competent, unharried teachers to help them grow and learn as individuals.

We need not only more scientific training, but extended curriculms in the humanities as well. A literate, educated citizenry is as important to our national defense as are trained physicists, not only because educated citizens can vote intelligently, but because they can provide the leadership and the ideas in the years to come.

The States cannot provide these facilities themselves. They need aid and direction from the Federal Government. We in Congress must take hold of our responsibilities and launch an intensive, full scale attack on the problem.

MINIMUM WAGE

One of the most immediate problems to face Congress on its return in January will be the minimum wage legislation. The bill which I, along with many others, introduced, would raise the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour and extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act to many other workers, including those in retail and cannery industries.

The arguments for adequate minimum wage legislation are too well known to require repetition. We are all aware that, while many of our working men and women are the best paid in the world, many, many others are trying to raise families on substandard wages. And all of us know that inadequate standards permit unscrupulous employers to compete unfairly with other industries in other parts of the country which pay fair wages.

It is my understanding that the administration, after some vacillation, has decided to oppose any increase in the minimum wage and to recommend only very limited extension of minimum wage coverage.

I hope that Congress, notwithstanding this opposition, will see fit to make substantial improvements in the minimum wage law. We cannot have a healthy, balanced economy if some segments of our population are enjoying unprecedented prosperity and others are denied the right to earn $1.25 an hour. Our increasing productivity must be utilized so that everyone may share in a better standard of living.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The record of the first session of this Congress on civil rights was a great disappointment. As a member of the Civil Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary

Committee I had hoped that this session would bring positive achievement in the fight for equal rights and opportunity for all.

The subcommittee reported to the full committee an eight-point program which to my mind is the absolute minimum legislation which must be enacted. We recommended:

First. Obstruction of court orders in the area of school desegregation is to be a Federal crime.

Second. Flight to avoid prosecution for bombing is to be a Federal crime.

Third. Federal election records are to be retained for 2 years, and may be subpenaed by the Attorney General.

Fourth The Civil Rights Commission is to be extended for 2 years.

Fifth. The Attorney General is to be authorized to institute civil proceedings against those who deny to others equal protection of the laws.

Sixth. The President's Commission on Equal Job Opportunity under Government Contracts is to be given a statutory basis.

Seventh. Schools are to be set up for the education of children of the Armed Forces stationed in areas where the schools have been closed because of desegregation.

Eighth. Grants are to be to States to aid them in effecting desegregation.

As we all know, only one of these proposals received consideration.

But the problem is not taking care of itself. The report just released by the Civil Rights Commission draws a graphic picture of how racial minorities are being denied rights which other Americans take for granted. The report pointed to communities which practice wholesale disenfranchisement of Negro citizens—frequently by intimidation and violence. And the documentation of discrimination in housing and education is equally shocking.

These conditions make immediate legislation necessary. The first session left the situation untouched. It will be up to the second session to enact effective civil rights legislation, along the lines I have outlined.

FOREIGN SERVICE ACADEMY

At this time of increasing tensions, which seem bound to be with us for the foreseeable future, a whole reassessment of the mechanics and machinery of our foreign policy is long over due. One of the directions this reassessment might take is whether we are equipped with adequate represenatives abroad.

Publications like "The Ugly American" have raised serious questions about the efficacy of our diplomats and the adequacy of their qualifications. But whatever the merit of that particular book, the recent visit of Khrushchev to this country points up the immense complexities of our relations with the Soviet Union, and the absolute need for diplomats and foreign affairs experts who are sufficiently trained and knowledgeable to deal with the situation.

I introduced a bill this past session which would establish a foreign service academy wherein young men and women interested in a foreign-service career could be trained at an early stage in their education for the complexities of the task which awaits them. Such a program could provide us with a pool of dedicated, trained people from which we could draw our diplomatic representatives. Moreover, it would insure that these representatives would be thoroughly familiar with the language, customs and people of the countries to which they are subsequently assigned.

Thought might be given, also, to whether or not heavy contributors to political campaigns necessarily make the finest ambassadors. We expect our doctors to study medicine and we send our lawyers to law school. I wonder whether we should not expect all our diplomats to undergo similar training. A Foreign Service Academy might go a long way in establishing a tradition of professionalism in all levels of the diplomatic service.

RESEARCH

Although we have made great strides in medical research, our achievement is probably far less that it might have been if we had been willing to give it our fullest support. Many diseases—cancer, heart disease, arthritis,—remain unconquered. They continue to kill many Americans every year.

Life, and the physical ability to live it fully, is, after all, the most prized possession we have. We have the responsibility to do whatever possible—without stint—in the war against disease and untimely death. We must be prepared to pour money and men into medical research to insure that our lives will be vigorous ones.

We have led the world in many of our scientific endeavors; we can also show the way here. Our advances in medical research could well be shared with others all over the world, and could prove to be one of the best approaches we could utilize in creating friendship and understanding. Certainly helping other countries in their battle against disease would be a wonderful way of spreading good will and bringing people together.

OTHER GOALS

These are just some of the goals before us. In addition, we must ask ourselves where we are going in civil defense, and what measures we must take to strengthen ourselves on this score.

We must reevaluate and increase our technical assistance program, so that other countries may be better able to approach our standard of living.

We must reexamine our entire tax structure, with a view toward both closing existing loopholes and lifting the burden from those least able to pay. Particular attention must be given to proposals for increasing tax exemptions to individual taxpayers.

We must redouble our efforts to prevent waste and inefficiency in Government spending. I am hopeful that my bill, H.R. 8105, will be given prompt consideration. This bill sets up a Joint Committee on the Budget, which would oversee all budgetary matters in order to forestall waste and effect the greatest efficiency and economy in Government expenditure.

Finally, we must deal in adequate terms with the problem of unemployment. Despite our economic recovery, 35 major labor areas are still classified as "critical," that is, with an unemployment rate exceeding 6 percent. We might also consider whether the 6 percent "norm" is not too high, and whether we can ever afford to be complacent about unemployment when this many Americans are out of a job. Nor can we ignore the implications of automation, and the need for directing future labor surpluses into other activity. All of these problems make necessary a long-range program which is designed to both prevent unemployment and make it less painful when it occurs. And particular emphasis must be placed on helping our depressed areas, which remain pockets of unemployment regardless of the general prosperity.

All these goals are not visionary. They are perfectly possible if we know how to set our sights and properly plan for their accomplishment. We are entering an era in which our achievements in the realm of space are almost phenomenal—certainly they were unthought of in the past. The conquest of space is fast becoming a reality because we were unwilling to say "it is impossible." Instead, we mobilized our efforts and are approaching success.

Why should we not have the same approach to problems on earth—problems we know about and understand. Surely we can win success with these as well if we attack them frontally and determinedly move forward.

We cannot rest on today's laurels. To be content with the status quo is inevitably to retrogress. There is only one direction, and that is forward—to further progress, expansion, and development, and to the elimination of all the gaps in our economy between those who have and those who have not. We can accomplish all these things if we are willing to focus all our attention and effort to the achievement of the programs I have outlined.

An Analysis of U.S. Policy and Communist Vulnerability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an excellent article appeared in the September 7 issue of New Leader magazine pointing out the vulnerabilities of the Communists. This article was written by one of our outstanding scholars on communism, Bertram D. Wolfe, and I recommend it as valuable reading to all who are concerned over the current world struggle between the free world and the Communist forces. I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "An Analysis of U.S. Policy and Communist

Vulnerability," be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ANALYSIS OF U.S. POLICY AND COMMUNIST VULNERABILITY

(By Bertram D. Wolfe)

Vulnerability implies an alert and determined opponent, ready to take advantage of every weakness and every opening. Only then do weaknesses and inconsistencies become vulnerabilities. But this determination and this readiness are today lacking in the free world.

The Communists know that they are engaged in what Prof. Robert Strausz-Hupé and his associates at the University of Pennsylvania Foreign Policy Research Institute have called a protracted war. They know that they are engaged in a war to the finish, a war for the world. Every separate issue, every negotiation, every conference, every utterance they regard as a move in that war, whereas for us in the West each is treated as a separate concrete issue to be settled once and for all in order that we may relax.

We aim to persuade our opponents that our intentions are friendly. We aim to reassure the Soviets as to their security. We aim to trade concessions, which in practice means only to give away positions we possess, so that the other side, which offers nothing in exchange, can renew the battle from a more advantageous position.

Edward Gibbon once wrote, "Persuasion is the resource of the feeble; and the feeble can seldom persuade." We are not feeble. Actually, America and the free world are at this moment stronger economically and militarily than the opponent that is determined to destroy us. But we are acting as though from feebleness, thus endangering peace by making the Communists underestimate our strength and luring them, without intending to do so, into the folly of an attack. Thus, the very moves we make to preserve peace are moves which profoundly endanger the peace.

Insofar as we act as if we were weak, as if our task were to persuade the unpersuadable and to settle what cannot be settled, instead of to win the war the Kremlin is waging against us; insofar as we have permitted the Communists to divide the world into their peace zone, where we may not and do not intervene, and our war zone, where the entire world and the United Nations and they also may intervene—to that extent it is not they but we who are vulnerable. We are proving vulnerable because of our incapacity and unwillingness to use the openings which their system has provided, does provide, and will continue to provide.

What we need, first of all, is an understanding of this universal, unitary, unending war to the finish. Second, we need a revolutionary strategy, to put the revolutionary forces of our time at our disposal and deny to them their use and exploitation. Only then will their system prove more vulnerable than ours, as potentially it is. With this caveat in mind, let us examine first their theoretical foundations and, second, their strategical and tactical vulnerabilities.

THE THEORETICAL FOUNDATION—MARXISM

The theoretical foundation lies in something called Marxism. We must first examine the self-refuting inconsistencies in Marxism and its prophecies that have been refuted by history.

The prophecies: One hundred and ten years ago, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels issued their call to arms in the Communist Manifesto, with its dogmatic pronouncements and apocalyptic expectations. A decade later, Marx undertook to lay bare the law of motion of industrial society in a work called "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." Those 110 years have not dealt kindly with Marx's predictions and have mocked and refuted the very law of motion which he claimed to have discovered.

The heart of those works was an expectation of an early apocalypse. The world was headed toward immediate and total catastrophe. In 1848, this catastrophe was only days, or at most weeks, away. It would come with the next street skirmish. Before the year was up, it was to come with the next war, within the year. When it came neither with the street skirmishes nor with the wars which Marx advocated, he decided it would come with the next downswing in the business cycle. But the apocalypse failed to appear.

The second startling thing about the Communist Manifesto, which aimed to be the program for the revolution of 1848, is that it prophesied the end of nationalism. Yet 1848 witnessed the greatest explosion of nationalism in the history of Europe. And now, in the 20th century, two world wars and their revolutionary aftermaths have proved that nationalism is the one great cause for which millions are ready to fight and die. It has spread from Europe, which was its home, to Asia and Africa, which in Marx's time knew not the nation. National feeling provides great vulnerabilities in the Soviet empire, if we have the wit to exploit them. At the same time, it provides great vulnerabilities for the free world in Asia and Africa, because the men in the Kremlin do have the wit to exploit the nationalism which the Communist Manifesto said was on the way out or was already out.

Marx's third prophecy dealt with the increasing polarization of society. It treated industrial society, in mythical Hegelian terms, as a system, all the parts of which were so connected that no change could be made in it; the system could not be improved or reformed; it could not evolve; it could only be scrapped. The defects were treated as integral to the system and incapable of being removed defect by defect, and replaced by other structures or circumstances, but only shattered, replaced by another system. The special mission to do the shattering was assigned by Marx to the working class. When this did not come immediately, as the Communist Manifesto anticipated, Marx began his long work to give a scientific foundation to this expectation of the apocalypse.

Marx's "Capital" has this as its function. The book is strangely constructed so that most of it consists of empirical evidence, striking descriptions of the workings of industrial society, drawn from the England of Marx's day, or rather the England of the day before Marx's day. He took most of the evidence from the Parliamentary Blue Books, reports of a Parliament that had already investigated the evils of early industrialism and was busy regulating, moderating, reforming and removing the evil excrescences of industrialization. His book thus gives overwhelming evidence of this evolution and reform, as he himself is compelled finally to point out. When he is discussing the achievement of the 10-hour work law, regulation of child labor, and other such achievements of the England of his day, he writes: "Capital is under compulsion from society. The factory magnates have resigned themselves to the inevitable. The power of resistance of capital has gradually weakened. The power of attack of the working class has grown with the number of its allies. Hence, the comparatively rapid advance since 1860."

If one reads Marx's "Capital" as an empirical student should read it, the overwhelming evidence of the Blue Books drives one, as it drove him, to this conclusion. Yet when one comes to the last chapter, "the last for which the first was made," a chapter called "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation," one finds that Capital came into the world, conceived in original sin, "a congenital bloodstain on its cheek, dripping with blood and dirt from head to foot, from every pore." And it is destined to leave it now in a fearful cataclysm, a day of wrath and doom, by the workings of "the imminent laws of capitalist production itself."

"One capitalist kills many"; all other classes are destined to be proletarianized; and, as if by mitosis, society is to be polarized. "Along with the constantly diminishing number of magnates of capital * * * grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this grows too the revolt of the working class. * * * The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter upon the mode of production. Centralization of the means of production, and socialization of labor, at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." Thus the conclusion of 1848 is tacked on again after the mass of empirical material to the contrary which makes up the bulk of the volume. But for this it was not necessary to study the Parliamentary Blue Books.

Such has been the perversity of history that it has not vouchsafed the revolution Marx expected in the countries of advanced industry, but has vouchsafed revolutions which invoke Marx's name only in underdeveloped countries on the eve or in the incipient stages of industrialization, in countries shaken by the impact of the West's economy and equality upon autocratic institutions which Marx regarded not as presocialist but as prebourgeois or nonbourgeois.

Industrial society not at the end but the beginning of its development. Another thing which would startle Marx were he to be resurrected today is the succession of industrial revolutions which followed his industrial revolution. He knew the development from cottage artisanship to machinofacture, from the use of wind and water and animal and manpower to the use of steam power. This was the industrial revolution that Marx studied. But the industrial revolution is unending. He thought that industrial society had reached "the end of its development" in 1848 when he pronounced its doom so stirringly. Actually it was but at the beginning of the development of its productive forces. Since then have come the age of electricity, of conveyor belt, combustion engine, synthetic chemistry, electronics, automation, fission, fusion; and the end is nowhere in sight, unless atomic war should bring a cataclysm indeed, but not Marx's cataclysm.

Not polarization but depolarization: The society which he thought was to polarize until it had reached the breaking point of total polarization has actually been depolarizing. Intermediate classes have not disappeared, they have multiplied. The industrial proletariat has not become the whole of society, except for the little handful of magnates at the opposite pole; it has lost in numerical weight in society while it has gained in status and in economic and political power. Classes have become more fluid and more equalized. Not merely in comparatively classless America, but in once caste-ridden England and France and Germany as well.

In America, absurdly Marx would think, one man, woman, and child in every eight is today a stockholder in the great corporations which he thought were going to provide the little handful of capitalists to be destroyed. Main Street frequently exercises more power than Wall Street, and labor and farmers have more influence on legislation than corporation executives or bankers. The latter could

only fume impotently and curse "that man in the White House" while we went through the tremendous revolution in our society known as the New Deal. And even the owning class was divided in its attitude.

The state thus has proved refractory to Marxist prophecies. In place of becoming an executive committee of a shrinking bourgeoisie, as he described it, it has been increasingly democratized, subjected to pressure of the labor vote, the farm vote, and the intermediate class votes, even to the pressure of strategically located minorities such as the Negroes in the big cities of the North. Out of labor's influence on Government and out of the classless pressure of the whole of society, has come a state regulation of economic life, a legal limitation of the hours of work, a minimum wage, collective bargaining, the legislated right to organize, and a whole sweep of social security legislation. "The state," as the French Socialist, Marcel Déat, wrote, "has undergone a process of socialisation, while socialism has undergone a process of nationalization."

The growing supremacy of politics over economics: In Marx's day there was a general superstition of which Marx was the most prominent advocate but which was general for most of the leading thinkers of his age: the superstition that economics determine politics. The 20th century has made it a commonplace that politics tends to determine economics. In fact, totalitarianism is, from this angle, an attempt totally to determine the economic and social structure of society by putting one's hand on the powerful political lever, the lever of unified centralized and exclusive power.

Thus what has happened to the economy is that it has been increasingly politicalized. Moreover, the whole notion of an autonomous economy, with its own autonomic laws, on which Marx based himself, and on which Marx's opponents in the mid-19th century based themselves no less, all this has become obsolete and revealed itself as no longer a workable hypothesis. In its place has come the increasing social and political regulation of the economy. Politics determines economics through tariffs, protectionism, quotas of export and import, currency regulation and manipulation, regulation of the interest rate, deficit spending, price floors, price ceilings, parities, subsidies, state fostering of cartelization as in Germany, state persecution of cartelization as in our antitrust acts in the United States, supranational economies like Benelux, the inner six common market, the outer seven free-trade area, and all the other supranational economies that are beginning to grow up. And in vast areas of the world there is total politicalization and autarchy. Not a word of what Marx has written is helpful in approaching the problems of our era. Whether these features are to be welcomed or to be feared, they have surely produced a world which makes the projections of Marx and the projections of his 19th century opponents alike irrelevant.

The worker rejects his mission: Unkindest cut of all, the worker himself has not consented to be increasingly proletarianzed, increasingly impoverished, and to have thrust upon him the mission with which Marx endowed him. If the worker has engaged in a class struggle, it has been one to put off from himself this increasing proletarianization, increasingly impoverished, and to have thrust upon him the mission with which Marx endowed him. If the worker has engaged in a class struggle, it has been one to put off from himself this increasing proletarianization and impoverishment and this mission which Marx and the Marxists would confer upon him. In this struggle, the workers have displayed stubbornness, tirelessness, courage, selfishness, solidarity, skill, incapacity to recognize when they are defeated, and the power to enlist the sympathy of the rest of society in fighting off this prophetic destiny and this prophetic assignment.

Unlike the intellectuals who offered them Socialist leadership, they have no stomach for being reduced to naught, the better to prepare themselves for becoming all. To win the suffrage on the continent of Europe, to influence and exert control over government, to legalize and contractualize improvements in the hours of their lives that are spent in labor, to win some security and dignity within the system in which they live, to become something in the world in which they have their being, rather than to be everything in the world which exists only in the fantasy of the utopians, of whom Marx was perhaps the greatest—it is to these aims that they have rallied. For this they have fought their struggle, and to these aims they have succeeded in rallying most of modern society.

Those who "being naught were to become all," having become something, the whole scheme loses its tidy outlines. Thus, the flaw in the foundation itself, the theory on which communism claims to build, lies in the fact that a hundred years of subsequent history have reduced every theoretical tenet of Marxism to a shambles.

Marxism as an ism: Insofar as it has claimed to be a science, it is dead. Marx and Engels in their last years were uncomfortably aware of this, and were beginning an uneasy and reluctant patching or revising of their dogmas. But after their death the revisionists who followed were outlawed and condemned, and ceased to be Marxists, and those who claimed to be Marxists survived only with the aid of the frozen orthodoxy of a dogmatic creed no longer subject to scientific examination or revision. Indeed, in this lies the strength and the staying powers of Marxism after Marxism as a science has proved itself bankrupt. As a science, it has produced only invalid results, but it is also an ism—Marxism. There is no "Lockeism," no "Smithism," "Millism," "Durckheimism," "Micheletism," "Rankeism" or "Gibbonism," but there is a Marxism. And this is a fundamental difference which we must strive to understand.

Besides having claimed to be a science, it has been a creed which can be clung to by faith when the intellect questions and rebels. While as a theory Marxism can be refuted by intellect talking to intellect, the strength of the Marxist movement as such lies not in the realm of ideas but in the realm of emotions. It is an ersatz religion, and this is harder to reach with rational argument and harder to cope with.

The world revolution of our time: Though the Marxist revolution never occurred, and is not likely to occur, we do indeed live in an age of revolution, a revolution which began before Marx's time and which will outlast our own lifetime. It is not the revolution which Marx predicted, nor did it grow from the seeds he sowed. His theory was but one of the misunderstandings of this revolution. The West's rapid expansion to all the continents of the world upset all the world's surviving civilizations. Western society planted everywhere the seeds of its own creativeness, its own problems, and its own dissensions.

This is a world revolution in the true sense. The Communists did not create it, but they study ceaselessly to utilize it for the spread of their power and for the destructions of ours. We did create it. But we do not try to understand or to utilize it, nor to aid it in finding new forms of abundance and of freedom. The Communists seek to give neither abundance nor freedom. What they propose to do is to extend their power and their sone: to set up regimes of specialized productivity for power and for war, not regimes of plenty and freedom; to link the revolutionary forces afoot in the world to their war for the winning of the world. Whoever harnesses the forces of that revolution which the West has set in motion yet has not striven to understand, whoever manages to put these forces in politics and economics, in science and technology, in all fields of life to its use, and to deny them to its opponent, that side will win the struggle for the world.

Insofar as the Communists are doing just that and we are not, they are slowly winning the war and will continue to win the war which will occupy the rest of our century. And, therefore, in spite of the inconsistencies, cruelties and absurdities of their system, the balance of vulnerability has been swinging from their side to ours.

THE STRATEGY AND TACTICS—LENINISM

Leninism is the strategy and tactics for waging this war, for utilizing the revolutionary forces afloat in the world for the purpose of building totalitarian single-party power throughout the world. Leninism claims to be Marxism: the Marxism "of the period of imperialism, world war and world revolution." Leninism claims to be Marxism, yet in all essential respects it has stood Marxism on its head as Marx claims to have stood Hegelianism on its head.

Marx: Economics determines politics. Lenin: Politics determines economics.

Marx: Revolution comes after capitalism has reached its pinnacle and comes first in the most advanced countries. Lenin: Revolution comes first where capitalism is weakest—"the break in the system at the point of its weakest link."

Marx: The revolution will come first in England, or perhaps Germany or France. Lenin: The revolution comes first in Russia, where capitalism is weakest, and then we carry the revolution to advanced Europe, or failing in that, to Asia and Africa from backward Russia in order to deny to the advanced countries their outlets and markets, cut them off from the backward part of the world and cut the undeveloped countries off from them.

Marx: The working class is destined to develop its own consciousness, its own theory, its own organization, its own party, and its own revolution. Lenin: The working class left to itself is capable only of bourgeois thought. Not the "bourgeois-minded and vacillating" working class but a revolutionary elite, a classless vanguard party, is the guardian of the working class. It dictates to the working class. It rules over the working class—and all other classes. It uses the working class as a battering ram because the urban working class is the most unified and concentrated, but it uses the peasantry as a battering ram too, and it tries to use discontent in all classes. And piling up the discontents, it aims to put in power not the working class but its own elite vanguard nonclass party.

If this is so, a revolution can be made in a backward country where the working class is not ripe, and the vanguard party can profess to be establishing a dictatorship in the name of the proletariat where it is only beginning to come into existence. Or, as in China, the peasantry can be used as the battering ram. And when the scepter of power has been seized, the vanguard party can claim that it has established the dictatorship of a proletariat which does not yet exist. Or where is the proletariat of north Vietnam? Ho Chi Minh, dictator in the name of a dictatorship of a nonexistent proletariat through a nonexistent party of the proletariat, dictates over a society which is not only not socialist but is still precapitalist.

Leninism can be understood as a strategy and tactics for the conquest of power, for the maintenance and expansion of power, for making that power absolute and total; as a prescription for the building of a party designed to seize and hold power; as a strategy and tactics for the utilization of

the discontents, the unrests, the disturbances and the revolutionary forces which the West has set afloat in the world—to the end of subverting and destroying all that the West stands for, and all that the West dreams of. It is a revolutionary strategy for the winning of the world and for the remaking of man according to Lenin's blueprint. As such, it is, of course, highly vulnerable if there is standing over against it an alert, determined and watchful opponent, ready to utilize the revolutionary situations and strategies and to contest for the leadership of the forces set free by Western civilization itself.

THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION—PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE

The Russian revolution is now over 40 years old. In the four decades that this new power has existed and become total, all of its original promises have turned into their opposites. Here is where an alert opponent would find more vulnerabilities than he would know what to do with if he were really on the job.

1. It promised land to the peasants. But in the end it took away even the land which the peasants had under the czars, and it herded them into a new state-owned serfdom.

2. It promised perpetual peace. Instead it has produced a totalitarian state which forever wages a twofold war—a war on its own people to remake them according to its blueprint, and a war upon the world. And I don't mean the word "war" figuratively but literally. When it wages war on its own people, it is a real war, a war of nerves, a war of quarantine (the Iron Curtain), a war of propaganda, of agitation, of conditioning, of psychological warfare, of physical warfare, of prisons, of concentration camps, of bombardment by loud speakers and press and movies and all the means of cultural conditioning and, when necessary, a bullet in the base of the brain. At the same time it has used this war upon its own people to keep them mobilized for unending war to win the world.

3. It promised production for use, that is, for the sake of the consumer and consumers' goods. Instead it has set up production for production's sake, for the sake of expanding the oppressive power of the producer-owner state.

4. It promised plenty, and it has produced perpetual scarcity of all the goods that make life gracious, pleasant, easy, cultured, rewarding, full of promise and possibility.

5. The state that was to wither away has expanded to totality. Lenin promised that "every cook is to become master of the affairs of the state." Now the state is the master of the affairs of every cook.

6. It promised freedom, and it has abolished all freedoms.

7. It promised the workers' paradise, and has immured its people behind an impenetrable wall and turned their country into a prison for their thoughts and for their very lives, which cannot be penetrated by learning what happens on the outside, nor by the freedom to discuss what is happening to themselves on the inside.

8. It has raised the banner of national self-determination and anti-imperialism, but it has become the most aggressive, the most oppressive, the most rapidly expanding imperialist power in the history of man.

Thus, and I have named only a few of these potential vulnerabilities, all the revolutionary slogans which Lenin sought to use and which the Kremlin uses today against all peoples, governments, and institutions, could easily be turned by a determined opponent, in tune with our age and ready to use revolutionary strategy, into weapons in our hands. The Communists' hands would prove nerveless and lifeless if we would but grasp the weapons which they are using against us, which are not theirs by right and by right can be made to belong to us, for they are indeed our weapons.

We, not they, are today the advocates of genuine agrarian reform and the right of each man to till his own land. There is no country in the world more badly in need of agrarian reform than the U.S.S.R. itself.

We, not they, are the advocates of a just and enduring peace, based on the respect for the rights and the existence of all nations in being or aborning or yet to be.

We, not they, are the champions of the rights and freedoms of workingmen, the freedom of movement, the freedom to change jobs, the freedom to build organizations of their own choosing under their own control, the right to elect their own officials, to formulate and negotiate their own demands, the right to strike, the right to vote for a party and a program and candidates of their own choice.

We, not they, are able to call the armies to fraternize across the trenches, for it is they who must cut off their armies from the news of what is happening in the West, and we who must make our armies and theirs understand what is happening in their land.

We, not they, are the champions of the freedom of the human spirit, of the freedom of the arts and sciences, freedom of conscience, freedom of belief and worship, freedom from scarcity and want, and from the tyranny of irresponsible and omnipotent officials. Though in all these things the free world has its own imperfections and lapses, these are the things that the free world stands for and in good measure realizes, and these are the things which totalitarianism completely destroys and makes high treason even to think upon.

In the battle for the future shape of the world, all the creative and explosive weapons are in our hands if we have the wit and the understanding to take them up. If we do not, then there are no psychological or ideological vulnerabilities of communism. If we do, the Communists are vulnerable on every front and at every moment and in every layer of their society. Whether the answer to this question is yes or no will determine the outcome of the protracted war that is likely to occupy the rest of our lives and the rest of our century.

The Dividend Credit Tax Loophole: Who Benefits and How Much

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN V. CARTER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to invite your attention and that of my colleagues to another great giveaway area of our present Federal tax system where, instead of being of benefit to the public in general, a comparative handful of wealthy people are allowed to reap a multi-million-dollar harvest through the stock dividend credit loophole.

At this point I will include a table to demonstrate just who reaped the benefits, according to figures of the Internal Revenue Service for the year of 1957:

Total number of returns filed	59,825,121
Number claiming dividend credit	2,980,335
Percent of total returns claiming credit	5
Total number of taxable returns filed	46,865,315
Number claiming dividend credit	2,888,207
Percent of taxable returns claiming credit	6.2

Distribution of return showing dividend credit (taxable returns only)

Income level	Returns showing credit		Dividend credit claimed	
	Number	Percent of total	Amount	Percent of total
			Thousands	
Under $5,000	668,636	23.2	$15,685	5.3
$5,000, under $10,000	1,002,887	34.7	37,931	12.7
$10,000, under $20,000	736,272	25.5	56,337	18.9
$20,000, under $50,000	381,631	13.2	79,764	26.8
$50,000 and over	98,781	3.4	107,666	36.3
Total	2,888,207	100.0	297,383	100.0

You will note that in 1957 dividend credit claimed, or, in other words, revenues denied to the Government by virtue of this loophole, amounted to more than $297 million. And who do you think got the lion's share of this money? Three and four-tenths percent of the people claiming this credit—those in the over $50,000 income bracket—received 36.3 percent of that $297 million. By way of contrast, those people in the under $5,000 bracket, who comprised 23.2 percent of the returns claiming dividend credit, got only 5.3 percent of the $297 million. It is my understanding that this loophole is now costing the Federal Government in excess of $335 million, and in addition to that, there is a $70 million loss due to the $50 dividend exclusion provision, taken by stockholders prior to the actual tax computation.

I think you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that this type of loophole in our Federal tax system is clearly contrary to the principles of progressive taxation and the ability to pay. Neither can the elimination of this loophole be termed as harmful to incentives. Bear in mind that this money arises as stock dividends of corporations, corporations that have their own built-in methods through which to raise expansion capital. Today's administered prices are yielding record-high profits. In addition, other tax benefits yield them enormous depreciation reserves. The October 1958 issue of Survey of Current Business, page 20, shows that between 1947 and 1957 manufacturing corporations got only about 2 percent of their new money from stock sales. Seventy-four percent came from retained profits and depreciation reserves, and the remainder from borrowing.

So once again, Mr. Speaker, as I have done in the past, I call upon my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee to be ever mindful of their duty to all Americans when they are in the process of framing our tax laws, to be unyielding in the face of pressure from special interest groups, and to place the burdens of taxation where they can best be borne.

Summary of Congressional Action, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a brief summary of action of the 1st session of the 86th Congress which is being distributed to my constituents in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio:

SUMMARY OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, 1ST SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS, PREPARED BY JOHN E. HENDERSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 15TH DISTRICT, OHIO

The following is a brief summary of the 1st session of the 86th Congress which extended from January 7 through September 14, 1959.

STATISTICAL DATA

1. Of 12,037 bills introduced, 380 were enacted into new public laws during the session. Another 236 private bills for the assistance of individuals were enacted.

2. The House of Representatives was in session a total of 141 days. Senate sessions covered 140 days.

3. It took 18,180 pages of fine print to record the proceedings of the House and Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In addition, over 8,400 pages of comments and extraneous material were published in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

4. There were 87 rollcall votes in the House.

5. The session authorized the expenditure of $78,678,598,352 by the Federal Government.

In addition to the billions mentioned above, here are some of the ways in which the action of Congress will affect you:

NEW TAXES

1. Extended the corporation income tax of 52 percent for another year.

2. Continued wartime excise taxes for another year.

3. Extended excise tax on telephone service, but added a termination date of June 30, 1960, for the tax on local phone service.

4. Extended excise tax on transportation to June 30, 1960, but agreed to reduce tax from 10 percent to 5 percent next year.

5. Increased life insurance company taxes to the extent of $215 million.

6. Increased the Federal gasoline tax another cent per gallon. Following the 2-cent increase in Ohio, I voted against this measure.

OTHER

1. Congress increased the national debt limit to $285 billion, with a further temporary increase to $295 billion. This further postponement of the day of repayment passed easily, delaying the inevitable time when the rising debt must be paid.

2. Extended the Draft Act to July 1, 1963.

3. Hawaii admitted to statehood. It is hoped these two new States, Hawaii and Alaska, will not insist on receiving special concessions accorded territories, but that they can carry on all of their local functions as equal States of the Union.

4. Enacted emergency legislation to prevent States from imposing income taxes on business transactions of corporations in another State where the firm maintains no plant, factory, office, or warehouse in the taxing State.

5. Continued the school lunch program.

6. Extended legislation to permit the barter of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities for certain needed resources from abroad.

7. Passed labor reform legislation (the so-called Landrum-Griffin bill).

8. Continued the foreign aid program. More billions, with not enough Members voting no.

9. Passed legislation establishing a new formula for payment of veterans pensions for non-service-connected disabilities. The legislation also gives widows of World War II and Korean conflict veterans pension rights similar to those previously enjoyed by World War I veterans' widows.

10. Irked Khrushchev and the Soviet Union by designating July 4 as "Captive Nations Week" and passed a resolution expressing the feeling that Red China should not be admitted to the United Nations.

11. Authorized the TVA to issue bonds for financing its operations.

12. Strengthened the Federal Trade Commission's powers to enforce its orders against unfair competition in American business.

13. Increased the interest rate on series E and H Government bonds.

14. Amended the Federal Communications Act to eliminate confusion in the requirement to grant equal radio and TV time for political candidates.

15. Enacted housing legislation. The President signed the third version passed by Congress.

16. Extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission to investigate charges of efforts to deny individuals the exercise of their constitutional rights.

ON THE MINUS SIDE

1. Among the failures of the session was the neglect of farm legislation. Congress failed to come to grips with the problem of farm surpluses, soaring storage charges, acreage controls and price supports. The present extravagant program, a demonstrated failure, has been with us for more than a generation. It does little to help the small farmer who needs help and is vastly increasing the cost of Government borne by farmer and nonfarmer alike.

2. Failed to answer the significant problems of inflation. The gusto of the majority to enact costly new legislation was blunted in mid-session by public demands against new spending which would apply new inflationary pressures. Increasing reduction in the value of the dollar can come from one-sided increases in interest rates on short-term Government bonds.

BOX SCORE

Voted "Yes" in 45 rollcall votes.
Voted "No" in 39 rollcall votes.
A "No" vote is very often a vote to defeat costly, unworkable legislation.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS (PARTIAL ACTION TAKEN)

1. The House took steps to provide that State laws which parallel Federal laws are concurrently enforcible except where Congress has specifically preempted jurisdiction in a given field. The Senate has not acted on this legislation.

2. The House also passed legislation to permit prosecutions for espionage committed outside the United States and another bill to deny passports to persons whose presence abroad would endanger American security. The Senate is still to act.

If you know of someone who would like a copy of this report, it may be obtained by writing Congressman JOHN E. HENDERSON, House Office Building, Washington 25, D.C. Should you wish additional information on the foregoing legislation, kindly call or write.

Special Milk Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the health of our children is a matter of utmost concern to every Member of Congress and to every parent in the United States.

Providing extra milk to improve the health of our children is a program we can all support.

I want to commend the New Holland Machine Co., New Holland, Pa., for producing a fine color motion picture, "More Milk for Danny." The motion picture, produced with the cooperation of the National Milk Producers Federation, is designed to encourage more schools to participate in the special milk program established in 1954 by Congress, and supported by Congress since that time.

The purpose of the program is to enable children in schools, summer camps, and in child-care centers to obtain more milk by making milk available to children at reduced prices.

Program statistics show that the objectives of the program as stated by Congress are being realized. More schools and child-care institutions are participating in the program each year and more wholesome, nutritious milk is being consumed by children. Over the past 3 years the number of one-half pints of milk consumed under the program increased to more than 2 billion a year.

The fact that the special milk program has made it possible to move this quantity of milk through normal channels of trade at favorable producer prices, as well, adds support to the merits of the program. It benefits our dairy farmers; at the same time it improves the health of our children.

In encouraging greater school and community participation in the special milk program, the motion picture produced by the New Holland Machine Co. greatly furthers the interests of our children's health, our dairy farmers, and of Congress.

The picture, "More Milk for Danny," tells the dramatic story of how milk aids children's health and how parents and school officials can arrange to make it possible for their local schools to take part in the program. The film will be shown in communities coast to coast.

The value of the motion picture in aiding the special milk program has been noted by a number of officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture which is charged with responsibility for administering the program. These following statements reflect a high regard and deep appreciation for the excellence of the film.

By Clarence L. Miller, Assistant Secretary, USDA:

Your movie, "More Milk for Danny," is a generous contribution to the advancement

of the special milk program. We appreciate your making this movie available for public use and hope it will receive wide distribution. It tells a convincing story of community action to localize a national program.

By O. V. Wells, Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service:

This movie is very good. We welcome industry assistance in telling the special milk story. I congratulate the producer of this film for calling attention to the fact that the success and maintenance of the program depend primarily on local interest and support.

By Martin D. Garber, Director, Food Distribution Division, AMS, USDA:

Congratulations on a fine film. "More Milk for Danny" strikes me as much more than an interesting and entertaining documentary—and it surely is that. But it also tells a vital story, about an important Department activity, the special milk program. As audiences view it, and are moved by it, the film will serve to benefit both the children to whom more milk is made available—and the farmers who thus sell more milk. Both are commendable objectives.

By Herbert D. Rorex, Chief, School Lunch Branch, Food Distribution Division, AMS, USDA:

I want to compliment you on the effective way, in "More Milk for Danny," you have explained the Department's special milk program. We're very much pleased with your direct, understandable explanation of how the program works—and the true-to-life portrayal of the program's place in the community.

It is hoped that a widespread viewing of "More Milk for Danny" will stimulate increased consumption of milk by all our people, promoting a healthy America.

Progress Report for America's Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's veterans have become our Nation's leading citizens of today. The patriotic service these Americans rendered to their country as young men in military life is now being translated in civilian life into leadership in government, agriculture, business, labor, and the professions. To my esteemed constituents who are included among our Nation's 23 million veterans, I would, Mr. Speaker, submit a progress report on recent achievements benefiting our deserving ex-servicemen.

The Republican Party has made commendable progress in leading our Nation toward the fulfillment of its obligation to America's veterans. The Republican administration, under the leadership of President Eisenhower, has provided for our veterans improved pensions and dependents' benefits, better medical and hospital care facilities, more realistic educational opportunities, and more adequate business aids.

As a consequence of this farsighted and understanding attitude of the Republican administration toward the veteran we find that for the fiscal year 1960 legislation was passed by the Congress and approved by the Executive providing approximately $5 billion in budgetary expenditures for veterans' services and benefits, including $3.3 billion for compensation in pensions, more than $900 million for hospital and medical care expenses, and approximately $500 million for veteran education and training.

Among other major legislation to be enacted in 1959 was the Veterans Pension Act providing liberalized pension levels which give the greatest recognition to those veterans in the greatest need. This important legislation also improved the equity in compensation paid to veterans' dependents and survivors. To assure a strong national defense the Selective Service Act was also extended during this recently completed first session of the 86th Congress. This legislation will assure that America's youth will be trained and highly skilled in military science in the event that a predator undertakes an attack upon our Nation.

The Congress has passed legislation to strengthen the protection accorded to veterans who become victims of multiple sclerosis and leprosy and has also liberalized the educational and training rights of veterans under the so-called GI bill. Steps also have been taken to assure effective housing programs for veterans. The status of American veterans under the Immigration and Naturalization Act has been improved.

Among other legislative measures that veteran organizations patriotically supported that were enacted during the 1st session of the 86th Congress were statehood for Hawaii, construction of modern naval vessels, protection of the estates of incompetent veterans derived from veterans' benefits, and improved educational opportunities for veterans' children.

The year 1959 has been a year of accomplishment for veterans. To date under the vocational rehabilitation available to disabled veterans we find that approximately 700,000 disabled veterans have been trained to assume a productive self-sustaining position in society. Ten million of our veterans have received education and training under the GI bill. Fifty-five million dollars has been devoted to providing homes for paraplegics, and more than 6 million veterans have received loans for homes, businesses, and agriculture. In 1959 we have found approximately 200,000 veterans a month receiving outpatient care at government medical installations, and 113,000 veterans were receiving hospital care in veterans and related hospitals. Approximately 6½ million American veterans have retained the protection for their survivors accorded by GI insurance. Almost 4 million veterans and dependents are presently receiving compensation and pensions.

Capable and patriotic work has been done by the numerous veterans organizations effectively representing the interests of veterans throughout the Nation. These organizations have worked not only for the benefit of the veteran but they have diligently sought to support the general welfare of all our citizens and to foster a realistic national preparedness program. These veteran organizations are to be commended for their endeavors in behalf of the veteran and for their patriotic interest in a strong America and a dynamic free enterprise economy.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be personally acquainted with many of the veterans who reside in my constituency. I know personally of the deeds of valor they performed in military life, and I am equally aware of the outstanding service they render to country and to their home communities in civilian life.

I have always been determined that our Nation should give proper and appropriate recognition to the veterans in any time of possible need after the battle is won. It is, therefore, with a sense of accomplishment that I can report these recent achievements in behalf of our veterans that have been accomplished under President Eisenhower—a distinguished veteran in his own right. Under his leadership and the leadership of the Republican Party I am sure we can look forward to continuing progress in providing proper benefits for our deserving veterans.

The Fight in 1959 Against Court Curbs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES M. QUIGLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, happily, the attempts to restrict the powers of the Supreme Court made little headway in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. It is not often that a Member of the House gives thanks for the Senate of the United States, but when it comes to court-curbing legislation, I do it from the bottom of my heart.

It was on June 24, 1959, that the House by a rollcall vote of 225 to 192 passed H.R. 3, the perennial proposal of Virginia's arch-conservative, Congressman HOWARD SMITH, which presumes to tell the Supreme Court how to run its business. The Senate, which last year killed the bill by a margin of one vote, failed to move it out of subcommittee this year. And that, let us hope, is where it rests.

The June 24 vote was perhaps the high-water mark of the conservatives in the 1st session of the 86th. In that vote, only one Democratic Congressman north of the Mason-Dixon line—and not all those below it—voted with a solid phalanx of 115 Republicans for a measure that would have denied effectively civil rights within any State that wished to do it.

While in appearance H.R. 3 is one of the simplest bills ever considered by the

Congress, in reality, it is probably the most far-reaching piece of legislation ever to come before the House.

Congressman SMITH's bill concerns itself with what the lawyers call the doctrine of Federal preemption. In a nutshell, this legal doctrine holds that the States may act in certain areas of the law unless the Federal Government by act of Congress has preempted—that is, taken over—in those areas. The doctrine was first conceived by Chief Justice John Marshall as long ago as 1824 when we used it to decide the case of Gibbons against Ogden. Since that date it has been an integral part of the law in this country.

However, Judge SMITH and his followers contend that in recent years the Supreme Court has perverted this doctrine by devising a new and mean twist which they call implied exemption. This is lawyers' language for saying that the Court has implied an intention on the part of Congress to exclude States from areas of the law where Congress never intended this to happen. The supposedly classical example of implied exemption was the case of Pennsylvania against Nelson. In that case Steve Nelson, who was secretary of the Communist Party in Pittsburgh, was convicted under Pennsylvania law for sedition against the United States. The Pennsylvania Supreme Court threw out the conviction on the grounds that Congress, when it passed the Smith Act back in 1939, preempted for the Federal Government the matter of prosecution for sedition against the United States. On appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court agreed that the Pennsylvania Supreme Court had properly interpreted the law.

HOWARD SMITH thinks otherwise. As the author of the 1939 Alien Registration Act, he insists that he never intended to stop Pennsylvania or any other State from prosecuting all they wanted to in this area. He contends further that, since he did not intend it and his act did not say it, he cannot imagine how or why the Court would ever imply it.

The fact of the matter is that back in 1939 when the Smith Act passed, HOWARD SMITH nor any other Member of Congress even gave any thought to—let alone had any fixed intention on—the question of preemption. When the question arose later, the Court came to its conclusion by implication on the basis of the overall purpose and scope of what Congress did. As a matter of fact, this is exactly how Justice Marshall came to his conclusion as to congressional intention back in 1824, and, since Congress almost never spells out its intention on preemption, implication has been the way the Court has almost always had to resolve the question. "That which is clearly implied is of equal force as that which is expressed" was the way Justice Butler stated it back in 1929.

But for the Howard Smiths, what a conservative Butler Court could do is "verboten" to the more liberal Warren Court. H.R. 3 says that unless Congress says specifically that it preempted a field of law the Court may not imply it. And H.R. 3 would apply to every law that Congress ever passed, not just the ones it will pass hereafter.

In the end, unfortunately, the bill passed the House by 33 votes.

In defeat, however, I take consolation from a number of factors. First, I am pleased about the part I was able to play in fighting against this law-wrecking bill. Second, I am proud of the performance of the Democratic membership of the House which voted almost 3 to 2 against the bill as opposed to the Republicans who voted almost 4 to 1 in favor of the legislation. Finally, I feel secure in the knowledge that H.R. 3 and other similar court-restricting bills stand little chance of enactment in the Senate as it is presently constituted.

Centennial Anniversary of Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur in Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include resolutions sponsored by Senator William X. Wall, of Lawrence, Mass.:

Resolutions congratulating the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur of Lawrence upon the celebration of their centennial anniversary of coming to St. Mary's Parish in Lawrence

Whereas on August 20, 1859, at the invitation of the Augustian Fathers of St. Mary's Church in Lawrence, a small group of four sisters from Cincinnati, Ohio, and a superior from Lowell, Mass., came to Lawrence to begin their noble work; and

Whereas, 100 years have passed today since that humble beginning during which by enobling sacrifice, they have made for themselves a most enviable record in the interest of Christian education; and

Whereas the good Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur have played a major part in the growth and development of religion and education in the life of the City of Lawrence; and

Whereas this growth spread from St. Mary's School to St. Laurence's School, St. Rita's School, Holy Rosary School, St. Augustine's School in Lawrence to St. Augustine's School in Andover and St. Monica's School in Methuen; and

Whereas confronted by grave difficulties and unusual privations, the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur in Lawrence persevered and their perseverance was blessed with success; and

Whereas the children to whom the Sisters have so unselfishly ministered have gone forth from their guidance and care into the various spheres of endeavor and have reached the heights of fame and success; and

Whereas it is fitting that homage be paid to the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur of Lawrence for their untiring efforts and sacrifices; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts State Senate hereby extends to the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur of Lawrence, sincere congratulations on the occasion of the completion of 100 years of noble service for the glory of God; and be it further

Resolved, That an engrossed copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith to the Sisters of Notre Dame de Namur of Lawrence by the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Adopted August 20, 1959.

IRVING N. HAYDEN,
Clerk.

Columbus Day: Symbol of American Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 418, which seeks to declare October 12 a legal holiday, I have a deep interest in the celebration of Columbus Day.

Columbus Day is already a legal holiday in many, many States. I look forward to the day, which I fully expect to be soon, when Congress will see fit to follow the lead of these States and appropriately honor the man who braved uncharted seas to discover America.

Particularly in these days of overwhelming challenges, in this space and atomic age, it is appropriate to recall the dauntless faith and courage which brought Columbus across the seas nearly 500 years ago. In facing the challenges of today—of the conquest of space, and of the attainment of peace on earth—we need to draw strength and encouragement from his daring example.

The celebration of Columbus Day has gathered increased momentum in recent years because of the activities of the National Citizenship Committee for Columbus Day. For the past 2 years, I have been happy to serve as national chairman of this committee. It has been an inspiring experience.

The great contribution which the National Citizenship Committee has made is the underlining of Columbus Day as a symbol of inter-American friendship. As a result, more and more people everywhere have become immediately aware that Columbus discovered America—both North and South—and that we are bound together by the bonds of brotherhood to some 20 other American Republics: that we are, in truth, Americans all.

Too many of us still know too little about the people in the other American Republics. It is the goal of Columbus Day celebrations to increase inter-American understanding, and Columbus Day is in fact rapidly becoming the occasion for a reaffirmation of inter-American solidarity and brotherhood.

Moreover, it is rapidly becoming the occasion for joint dedication to the great principle which all Americans have in common.

For all the nations in the Western Hemisphere are bound together, regardless of nationality, race, culture or religious belief, by their belief in freedom of the spirit and freedom of opportunity. These have been the spiritual symbols of America since her discovery, so many years ago, by the great Italian sailor.

These are the spiritual symbols by which America is known in many parts of the world. It is the joint mission of the Americas—North and South—to get these principles across to all other peoples, and thereby prove the value and effectiveness of our Western way of life.

We of the Western Hemisphere have a leadership responsibility that transcends anything man has heretofore faced. We must meet that responsibility with the faith of Columbus to the end that freedom of spirit and freedom of opportunity may one day be the heritage of all mankind.

It is heartening to note that people everywhere have rallied to the call of the National Citizenship Committee to make Columbus Day a day of rededication to inter-American understanding and inter-American ideals. The response has been magnificent. More than ever before, increasing numbers of Senators, Congressmen, Governors, and mayors are making speeches and issuing proclamations encouraging its celebration, and increasing numbers of communities and schools throughout the Nation are learning to appreciate its significance and importance.

This year, more towns and cities than ever before, in both Americas, will set aside October 12 in recognition of our mutual heritage and mutual goals. More and more people are developing an interest in Latin America and a appreciation of American brotherhood. More and more people, through participation in the friendship programs and educational exchanges which the National Citizenship Committee is sponsoring, are learning to understand each other.

The display of enthusiasm must stir us to further activity. I am hopeful that Congress very quickly will join in the mounting enthusiasm and declare October 12 a national holiday—in honor of Christopher Columbus, the historic discovery of America, the principle of inter-American solidarity, and the historic ideals for which America proudly stands.

Resolutions Adopted by Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, recently at St. Louis, Mo., Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America held its 45th annual convention. Numbering over 315,000 American-Jewish women, Hadassah is a nationwide organization composed of 1,288 chapters and groups in 49 States and Puerto Rico. Founded for the purposes of conducting health work in Palestine, now Israel, fostering Jewish ideals in the American Jewish community, and strengthening the principles of democracy, it carries on educational, civic, and youth activities in the United States and maintains and operates a network of medical institutions and educational programs in Israel.

Its members have made a valuable contribution to the strengthening of American spiritual and moral values through their outstanding leadership in numerous communities across the Nation. They are to be commended for their work in advancing the principles of human rights and the dignity of man, and promoting understanding.

In Israel, Hadassah's medical program of curative medicine, teaching, and research includes five hospitals in Jerusalem and one in Beersheba, child guidance and school hygiene and dental service clinics, the maintenance of 36 health welfare stations, and support of a nurses training school, among other things. In addition to these outstanding activities it maintains vocational education schools and centers and participates in a land reclamation program.

These splendid contributions are financed by voluntary efforts and its planning and programing are done through the volunteer work of its officers and members.

At its convention, this fine group of American citizens adopted numerous resolutions in support of U.S. foreign policy and in respect to items of great significance in international relations today. Mr. Speaker, I include these timely and well-considered expressions, which I highly commend, in the Appendix of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

HEALTH FOR PEACE

Whereas the U.S. Senate has unanimously endorsed a resolution designed to advance the status of the health sciences in the United States, the health standards of the American people, and those of other countries and peoples, by cooperative endeavors in health research, research planning, and research training with scientists, research workers, technicians, experts, and teachers of other countries; and to that end help mobilize the health sciences in the United States as a force for peace, progress, and good will among the peoples of the world; and

Whereas this resolution proposes to authorize the Surgeon General to encourage, support, promote, to assist in the training for and planning and conduct of research, investigation, experiments, and studies relating to the causes, diagnosis, and control of disease in foreign countries when necessary and in the United States, and to these ends make financial grants to universities, hospitals, laboratories or other public or private institutions or agencies, or to individuals, in foreign countries or in the United States, to cooperate and assist in the planning and conduct of research, research planning, and research training programs and projects by the World Health Organization and other international organizations.

Hadassah, in convention assembled, urges the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to act favorably on these proposals as represented in Joint Senate Resolution 41.

WORLD REFUGEE YEAR

Whereas the General Assembly of the United States on December 5, 1958, adopted a resolution for a World Refugee Year to begin in June 1959, urging members of the United Nations and its specialized agencies to cooperate in promoting a World Refugee Year as a practical means of securing increased assistance for refugees throughout the world; and

Whereas the United States, consistent with its traditional principles of humanity, sympathy, and interest in the welfare of all peoples of the world, cosponsored and supported the resolution for a World Refugee Year; and

Whereas a White House Conference designated members to constitute a U.S. Committee for Refugees to enlist public support for all possible measures to aid said refugees during the World Refugee Year; and

Whereas the World Refugee Year is an opportunity for America to demonstrate democracy in action and to give new hope for constructive life to more than 15 million homeless refugees; and

Whereas the aims of the World Refugee Year are to focus interest on the refugee problem; to encourage additional financial contributions from governments, voluntary agencies, and the general public for solution of the problem.

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, in its convention assembled, gives its full support to the aims and goals as set forth by the U.S. Committee for the World Refugee Year and urges Congress to pass the necessary legislation to implement said aims and goals.

SUPPORT OF UNITED NATIONS

Whereas Hadassah, a nongovernmental organization of the United Nations, is committed to the principle of enabling the United Nations to become a strong instrument for the removal of the causes of war and the maintenance of world peace; and

Whereas the State Department of the United States has stated that disarmament is the concern of the entire world and that bypassing the United Nations would weaken the authority of that body; and

Whereas there has been newly established a 10-nation Disarmament Commission;

We, Hadassah, in convention assembled do endorse the principle that international negotiations on disarmament be kept within the purview of the United Nations so that the United Nations would assume responsibility for the implementation of any international agreements reached by said Commission.

SUEZ CANAL: AN INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, views the recent decision of the United Arab Republic to refuse passage through the Suez Canal to the ships of any nation carrying cargoes to or from Israel, as compounding its continuous violation of international law, as a betrayal of solemn commitments undertaken by the Government of Egypt, and as an intolerable act of defiance and disregard for the regulations governing a legally ordered international society.

As an organization of 300,000 American citizens, Hadassah respectfully calls the attention of the American people to the address of the President of the United States on the issue of the Suez Canal, on February 20, 1957, the action of the United Nations Security Council on September 1, 1951, and repeated on October 13, 1956, as well as the relevant provisions of the Constantinople Convention.

Convinced that unilateral action by any state in disregard of the principles of international law cannot be countenanced by the community of nations, and that specifically, the principle of free and open transit for the peaceful commerce of all nations is essential to the lawful conduct of international affairs; convinced also that the authority and prestige of the United States as well as the economic development and in-

tegrity of the State of Israel are seriously threatened by this new intransigence on the part of the United Arab Republic. Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, in convention assembled, respectfully urges the U.S. delegation to the United Nations publicly to condemn this new act of piracy on the part of the United Arab Republic in the Suez Canal, and to exert its influence to the end that the United Nations will exercise the full weight of its moral and legal authority to reverse the illegal, dangerous, and defiant attempts of the Government of the United Arab Republic to restrict free passage through the Suez Canal.

ARAB REFUGEES

Whereas, by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations the year June 1959 to June 1960 was designated as World Refugee Year.

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, views with special concern the pitiful plight of the Arab refugees which can be readily solved by a program of resettlement in the countries in which they now live. This view has been overwhelmingly expressed and supported in the United Nations over the past 10 years.

Hadassah expresses the hope that a constructive program will be put into operation so that the Arab refugees may cease to be used as a political pawn by Arab governments and enabled to resume their lives as useful members of society in the lands of their kinsmen.

ARAB DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN CITIZENS

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America, notes that the Arab League Nations, far from desisting in their economic boycott of Israel and their secondary boycott of business firms doing business with Israel, are intensifying their efforts in this direction, and accordingly, reaffirms the position unanimously taken at its 44th annual convention in 1958, namely that, we call once again upon leaders of American business to resist with every legal means at their command the Arab League's introduction of discrimination into American economic practice, and to stand firm against what has been called Arab international blackmail; and

We urge the U.S. Government to resist all efforts made by other governments to introduce discrimination against American citizens on racial or religious grounds, and to refrain from entering into any treaties or executive agreements which sanction these discriminatory practices.

U.S. AID TO ISRAEL

Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America:

Expresses its gratification that the generous assistance consistently granted by the United States to Israel through the mutual security program is being continued for the 1960 fiscal year in the same amount as in 1959, namely, $7.5 million; and

Calls attention once again to the facts that the funds which have been made available to the State of Israel under the mutual security program have helped develop its industry, its agricultural potential, and exploited its natural resources for the benefit of all its citizens, thus demonstrating Israel's will and capacity to use American aid effectively and productively; and

That Israel, a democracy in a strategic and restless area of the world, has demonstrated itself to be a valiant ally of Western interests and objectives.

Labor and Foreign Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has become increasingly obvious that in the onslaught of low-cost imports upon our home market American labor would be one of the most vulnerable among the elements of our economy to the destructive effects of such competition.

There is every evidence that labor in this country is awakening to the threat. A number of unions have in the past combatted low-wage imports by seeking legislation for the greater protection of their jobs and employment opportunities. Some of them have joined hands with both industry and agriculture in recent years toward preservation of the American market against progressive and, in some instances, fatal invasion by goods manufactured abroad at wage rates and under working conditions that are far below those prevailing in this country.

The evidence is mounting that more labor groups are feeling the impact as the tide of imports rises and our exports begin to fall off. They are becoming aware of the defenseless position of labor as contrasted with that of the larger industries, more and more of which are looking overseas for production facilities, with the idea of holding their export markets and in some cases exporting from their foreign factories to this country.

I have been impressed by an advanced text of an address on this subject to be delivered before the Union Label and Service Trades Department of the AFL–CIO by O. R. Strackbein, who is chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, an organization composed of upward of 60 industries, labor organizations, and agricultural associations that have battled to assure a remedy against severe injury from imports whenever it occurs. The occasion was the recent national convention of the AFL–CIO in San Francisco.

It is heartening to observe such cooperation among elements of our economy that in other fields may have a diversity of interests. The address throws light on the position in which the American worker finds himself today as he contemplates the fast-rising flood of imports that laps at the feet of his job. I commend the reading of Mr. Strackbein's remarks to my colleagues:

ADDRESS OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, CHAIRMAN, THE NATIONWIDE COMMITTEE ON IMPORT-EXPORT POLICY, AT ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AFL–CIO UNION LABEL AND SERVICE TRADES DEPARTMENT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

Labor has long had a vital interest in foreign trade, both imports and exports. Its interest is based on the balance of employment resulting from the displacement of jobs by imports, on the one hand, and the addition of jobs by employment in production for export, on the other. It is also concerned over the effect of low-wage import competition on wage levels and wage trends in this country.

Labor, however, has a special concern that sets it apart from some other parts of the economy. It is more vulnerable to the effects of labor-displacing imports than are the larger elements of industry. These have a defense that is not available to labor or, for that matter, to small business and suppliers of materials and parts. The larger companies are able to escape from the domestic scene and to cover themselves by reaching abroad.

During the past two decades labor has generally with notable exceptions approved the lowering of tariffs and trade barriers on the grounds that doing so would lead to trade expansion all around and therefore to increasing employment.

We all know that the United States has lowered its tariffs very drastically through foreign trade agreements. Today our average tariff protection is much lower than it was in 1934 when the tariff cutting program began. It has been reduced approximately 80 percent, part of this decline having been caused by rising prices.

The upshot is that this country has gone a very long way toward freeing our trade. Other countries have also reduced their tariffs; but many of them have substituted other restrictions for the tariff, such as import licenses, exchange controls, barter arrangements and import quotas. These devices are often much more restrictive of trade than tariffs alone. Actually trade barriers throughout the world are not now less restrictive than when we entered the trade agreements system but actually more so—with the exception of ourselves, Canada and perhaps a handful of other countries.

Meantime we have badly exposed ourselves to goods made abroad under low-wage and inferior working conditions. This is something that concerns the union label department.

What I want to talk to you about is just where American labor stands in the world of foreign competition today. I think it finds itself in an almost untenable position. Let me go into a little detail on this point.

There are those who will say immediately that American labor has priced itself out of world markets. Generally there will be the accompanying comment: "Of course there were other contributing factors."

There were indeed; but that is not the point. It is not so much a question of what brought us to our present unhappy competitive position as it is one of asking, What are we going to do about it?

To say that American wages are too high overlooks the obvious fact that foreign wages may be too low. American wages have not priced us out of the home market. They have, on the contrary, provided the purchasing power to absorb the great volume of our industrial output.

Our wages on the other hand, do make for costs that are high in relation to foreign costs in many lines for the simple reason that foreign wages are from less than a tenth to a quarter or a half of ours. Only Canadian wages come within earshot of our own. They are only some 20 or 25 percent below ours.

What could we expect from this kind of a situation?

Time was when the low foreign wages were offset rather effectively by the lower foreign productivity. If our workers received $2 an hour and the foreign workers got only 50 cents, our output per man-hour may have been three or four or five times as high as that of our foreign competitor. The result was that we still came out with lower unit

costs and imports could not hurt us. Of course, there were notable exceptions. Those of our industries that did not enjoy mass production did not have the same higher productivity that was the special advantage of our moving production lines, standardized parts, etc. Our large mass production industries, however, were quite immune to the sting of import competition.

On the contrary, and for the same reason, they were exporters. For that reason they inclined toward freer trade. We need only mention automobiles, steel, electrical appliances and rubber.

In recent times a change has been underway. We are coming more and more to realize that we are living in a changed trade world no less than in a changed and changing scientific and military world.

What are the factors that have produced the changed competitive condition?

We have already noted our drastic tariff reductions of the past 25 years. These would have made us more vulnerable than we had been to low-cost imports without an assist from other factors; but there were others. We have mentioned high wages. It would be better to say high prices and high costs.

How have these come about? They have resulted from conscious policies pursued for some years. We have only to think of price supports for agriculture; minimum-wage laws, social security, the shorter workweek, obligatory collective bargaining, etc. Yet that is not all; nor perhaps more than the half of it. We must not overlook World War II and the resulting high national debt and high taxes. Thereafter came the Korean war, followed by skyrocketing national defense outlays.

Today our annual national budget of nearly $80 billion is three times as high as was our total national debt before 1940. Our interest payment of some $7 billion per year on the national debt alone is higher than was our peacetime total national budget before World War II.

All these costs are added to production costs. The taxes and high Federal outlays do not come free. They have to be paid for. Should we go back to the price level of 1940 we would be sunk under a hopeless burden of debts and taxes. It is bad enough as it is. So it is obvious that wages alone did not create our high prices. They had a great deal of help.

The fact is that we did move, for good or for bad, but as the result of easily distinguishable policies, to a high plateau of prices. The principal trouble today is that other countries have not done for their workers and their farmers what we did in this country.

To be sure, foreign wages have risen; but so have ours, and our upward swing began after the war several years before it got underway in most of the other countries.

The picture, then, shows us economically on a high plateau, surrounded by lower-cost competitive forces on nearly all sides; and our tariff defenses well demolished.

This is not all.

Two really important things that have happened beyond what has already been mentioned have been (1) the introduction of modern machinery and equipment abroad on an unprecedented scale. Since the beginning of the Marshall plan we have shipped abroad over $30 billion worth of machinery. In the past 6 years alone we have shipped $21 billion worth.

The use of this machinery has added greatly to foreign productivity. Even if our prices had stood still the previous competitive situation would have been changed; for introduction of machinery where there was none or a relatively low order of it changed output and costs in a revolutionary way in many a spot.

This would not have had the effect it did if foreign unions were strong and energetic; but in this respect they are far behind our own unions. Foreign producers therefore retain much of their greater productivity resulting from installation of machinery. They can as a result sell at relatively lower prices, as many of our industries have learned in recent years. It has not been unusual to see imports rising from a level of supplying 5 or 10 percent of our home market and going on up the scale to 15 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, and in some cases over 50 percent in a matter of 4 or 5 years. Some of you here today know something about this and it needs no emphasis from me.

(2) The second important change that looms before us is the changing European attitude toward the mass market. On another occasion I have said, "They have seen our system and they have bought it," or words to that effect. The European Common Market is an example. In a few years' time the tariff wall and other trade restrictions (and there are the more important) that have made tight economic compartments out of the European countries, thus greatly limiting the markets for European industries, will be progressively lowered and in time European industry will have a mass market roughly equal to our own. Then there is the free-trade area of the so-called outer seven countries, about which an agreement was reached only a few weeks ago.

Should we oppose these developments?

I think not. There is every reason to believe that they will improve the economy of the countries involved and that is not something that we would wish to oppose. Should we then be indifferent to it?

That does not follow. Not at all. Whereas the European countries may be able to rip down their internal compartments without fear of exposing their industries to a lethal competition they may be able to do so only because there is not so much difference in cost among them as there is between them and us. Moreover, we already have a vast market. They are striving to achieve what we already enjoy. Therefore the medicine that may be good for their malady might be bad for us. A doctor does not prescribe the same medicine for patients that have different diseases.

Now where does this leave us?

Our costs are much higher in some lines of production than those of other countries. Japan is able to run rings around us; and so can some of the European countries in a number of lines. Our watch industry is about gone because of imports. We are now importing more typewriters than we are exporting for the first time. We have for nearly a year now been importing more steel than we export. In the case of automobiles our imports are running 4 to 1 over our exports whereas in the past we were by far the world's foremost automobile exporters. In the case of textiles we have lost leadership in exports to Japan and India; and our imports have been rising sharply. Japan has imposed a quota limitation on her textile exports to us and that fact alone has at least temporarily stopped a panic. Glassware and pottery and fishery products have long been sufferers from imports. Many other items, new ones, are feeling the keen edge of import competition; machine tools, for example, and sewing machines, petroleum, fisheries, bicycles, and many other items.

Yet they say, any of those who are new to the hurt, tariffs are not the answer, and I will quickly agree that in many cases that is true. We need import quotas or a combination of import quotas and a tariff.

As matters stand on the import and the export front American industry will seek to move to automation as quickly as possible to keep costs down; but of course, other countries are on that course too; and we are helping them. Our manufacturers are looking overseas for production facilities and many have set up plants abroad or bought into going concerns or made licensing arrangements under patents for foreign production. The purpose is to supply those markets from within rather than from this country, and also to export from there to third countries rather than from here. In some cases they even ship back to this country. It is estimated that our foreign investments have created 5 million jobs abroad.

This emigration of capital may rescue many of our manufacturers from losses that they would otherwise suffer; but it certainly does not rescue the workers from anything. Rather it confronts them with a shrinkage in jobs. The same with automation that is too rapid. This, too, may help the companies but it will mean fewer jobs. Those thrown out of work will not so easily find other jobs for three reasons: (1) Imports will be removing some jobs; (2) exports will not be expanding, except in subsidized form; and (3) new workers will be coming on the scene at the rate of some 700,000 a year.

Shall we then stand idly by or shall we do something about preserving a reasonable share of our market for our own industries and workers? Shall we recognize the fact that we are facing something we have not faced before and take some holding action with which to buy time? What can we do to bring up wages abroad so as to narrow the wage gap? This will in any case be slow and we must do something in the meantime or instead of bringing up other countries to meet us we will fall in order to meet them.

The union label stands for American standards and to the extent that we purchase union-made goods we can be sure that we are contributing to and not undermining the American standard of living. The very efforts of the union label department is evidence of the prevalent recognition of the destructive effect of competition that comes from beyond the reach of our domestic legislation such as minimum wages, shorter hours, collective bargaining and so on. For such competition we need special devices to assure us that it will not upset and destroy the domestic standards and attainments that in turn have made us competitively so vulnerable.

We must not be deluded into thinking that our competitive discomfiture is a passing nightmare. In the nature of things, considering all the factors on the horizon, it is an ominous confrontation, not a mirage. Our imports have been breaking records successively this year. Our exports are down 20 percent from their heights and even those that we enjoy are heavily subsidized in important segments. Otherwise they would swing into an import balance.

In our total foreign transactions we are running a heavy deficit, amounting to $3.4 billion last year and estimated to exceed over $4 billion this year. Since January 1958 we have lost $3½ billion in gold.

Let no one persuade you that what we face is but a passing case of indigestion. We face a systemic malady; not a mere peptic upset.

There is no good and sound reason why any industry that is in trouble over imports should not have a remedy that will save its job and safeguard the American standard of living.

This was indeed promised by every President since the trade agreements program began. The assurances of the Presidents were echoed by the successive Secretaries of State, Assistant Secretaries, and other Cabinet members. One quotation from Cordell Hull, who as Secretary of State under Franklin Roosevelt, was known as the father of the

trade agreements program, set the pattern. Said Mr. Hull in testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee, March 1934, page 24:

"But our purpose is to make a beginning by picking out one item very carefully here, another commodity over there very carefully, which, as is said, can be made the basis of an interchange in a mutually profitable way, so that instead of anybody being injured, the American people would be helped."

This same theme has run like a refrain throughout the testimony in the succeeding years; but unfortunately the assurances have been forgotten by the executive branch and that is why so many of our industries are in trouble from imports and why their workers face displacement.

To this we must get an answer.

What Can We Do About Juvenile Delinquency?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, of the numerous statistics on crime which have aroused the country, the most heartbreaking are those on youngsters under 18 years. Since 1952 the population group under 18 years of age has increased 22 percent while arrests of persons under 18 years have increased 55 percent. The arrest of juveniles under 18 rose 8.1 percent in 1958 over 1957. Over 12 percent of all the arrests made in the Nation in 1958 were of young people under 18, as contrasted with 4.2 percent in 1948.

Between 1948 and 1957 juvenile-court cases increased 136 percent. Such figures may include some statistical inflation, but all experts agree that the enormous increase in juvenile crime represents a real social trend that society can ignore only at its peril. Murders, assaults, gang warfare, senseless property destruction, often done with little or no motive and no noticeable sense of guilt, form the pattern.

The baffling situation raises a host of questions: Why do they do it? What are the causes? What can be done? How can society both prevent and cure this terrible condition?

In the August 20 issue of the Reporter magazine there appeared an excellent article by Virginia P. Held entitled "What Can We Do About Juvenile Delinquency?" in which the author discussed the ramifications of the problem and the numerous theories and remedial attempts that have been applied to it thus far.

Of particular importance among the complexities of the problem, the author points out, is the seeming absence among most of the delinquents of any sense of values, of any effort to acknowledge and differentiate between right and wrong. There seems to be a tendency to pass the buck on this very serious factor, a tendency which is disturbing to all who ponder over its national implications.

Mr. Speaker, the article from the Reporter is so well done, that I include excerpts from it in the Appendix at the conclusion of my remarks:

THE FORMLESS YEARS: WHAT CAN WE DO ABOUT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY?

(By Virginia P. Held)

There has probably never been a moment in history when adults were not shocked by what they regarded as an unprecedented wave of bad behavior among children and adolescents. But in our time reports of gang warfare in the streets, teenage muggings, and senseless killings have turned shock to cold fear. Juvenile delinquency, particularly in the United States, has come to be considered one of the most urgent social problems of the day, and the epidemic of arrogance and crime seems to be spreading so fast that it obliterates the best efforts society can make to control it—or even to understand it.

There are two major ways of measuring juvenile delinquency statistically. One is to count the number of cases handled by juvenile courts throughout the country; this is done by the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The other is to count the (quite different) number of police arrests of young people; this is done by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

By either measure, juvenile delinquency is increasing. From 1948 through 1957, the latest year for which complete figures are available, juvenile court cases increased 136 percent while the under-17 population increased only 27 percent. According to the FBI statistics, from 1948 through 1957 recorded arrests of persons under 18 multiplied eight times; there were seven times as many arrests for assaults, four times as many for burglaries, and eight times as many for thefts. And in the last 5 years, juvenile arrests for murder and nonaccidental killings have increased more than two and a half times. In 1948, persons under 18 were held responsible for 4.2 percent of all crimes; in 1957 for 12.3 percent.

Of course, statistics can be misleading. Definitions both of who a juvenile is and of what constitutes delinquency vary widely from State to State and even from court to court.

* * * * *

But even after statistical inflation has been discounted, most experts in the field are convinced that the recent simultaneous increases in court cases and police arrests represent a real social trend that society can ignore only at its own peril. Above all, there is no blinking the fact that serious crimes by juveniles, such as burglary and assault, have increased greatly in the past few years.

What a number of people who deal with juvenile delinquents find even more disturbing than the increase in the number and savagery of the offenses is the fact that more and more of the young people who get into trouble seem to act without understandable motive or provocation, and to feel no noticeable guilt for what they have done. Destruction for the sheer joy of destroying erupts in the most surprising places. In prosperous Maplewood, N.J., a gang of boys broke into the junior high school, wrecked classrooms, poured kerosene over library books, and set the school ablaze, causing $300,000 worth of damage. During a 3-month period there were six less costly but similar outbreaks of vandalism in relatively prosperous New York suburbs.

Many juvenile murders are the result of gang warfare, which has become increasingly vicious as it has become more highly organized. (One expert attributes this to the "technological advance" in the weaponry employed by the gangs.) But the number of children and teenagers who senselessly murder close family members is also increasing.

* * * * *

WHY DO THEY DO IT?

* * * * *

In his widely read book "The Shook-up Generation," New York Times correspondent Harrison Salisbury says we have delinquency not because we don't know how to prevent it, "but because we do not have enough interest or energy to do the things we already know will bring an end to delinquency. We do not lack knowledge. We lack the will."

But in the face of so much senseless brutality, it sometimes seems as if we lack both will and knowledge.

A number of earnest attempts have been made to understand and explain what causes juvenile delinquency. Sometimes a particular theory has been hailed by its enthusiasts as the explanation, but while many specific diagnoses have been helpful, the extent and the virulence of the epidemic still seems as baffling as it is frightening.

One recurring idea is that poverty causes delinquency. And yet several studies were made in the 1940's, notably one by Lowell Carr and another by David Bogan, which showed that delinquency rates decrease in periods of widespread unemployment and increase in periods of prosperity.

Another diagnosis blames overcrowding and bad housing. And yet the middle-class suburbs are certainly not without their share of trouble, and there is ample evidence that many a human slum festers behind the smooth exteriors of the new low-cost housing projects, which often breed their own gangs and have above-average delinquency rates.

Still another theory focuses on bad neighborhoods, considered in terms of inhabitants and mores rather than in terms of bricks and mortar. The map of New York's Youth Board Services reveals that the most troubled areas are those with high concentrations of new immigrants and the poor. But even so, there is no getting around the fact that for every slum child who becomes a delinquent a great many do not; the theory does not help to explain the operation of crucial factors within the individual.

Still another theory, whose validity is accepted with varying degrees of emphasis by most experts in the field, puts the blame on broken homes. But an impressive study made by Harvard's Sheldon and Eleanor Glueck makes it clear that the way a child's parents treat him is more important than the way they treat each other.

At present the most popular theory about juvenile delinquency seems to be that it is caused by psychiatric disturbance. * * * The Gluecks, however, found that among the group they studied, feelings of being unwanted and unloved, and tendencies toward insecurity and anxiety were even more prevalent among the nondelinquents than among the delinquents. There is obviously some value in each of the various specific theories that have been advanced to explain what causes juvenile delinquency, but it seems pretty clear that no one of them provides all the answers.

THE GLUECK STUDY

It is generally agreed that the most comprehensive scientific study of the importance that can be ascribed to various social, psychological, and physical factors in the make-up of juvenile delinquents is that which has been provided in recent years by the Gluecks.

* * * * *

The Gluecks found that the tendency toward delinquency appears remarkably early

in a boy's life: 48 percent of the delinquents started to misbehave persistently when they were 7 years old or less, another 39 percent when 8 to 10 years old.

* * * * *

Useful as the Gluecks' prediction table is, of course it does not explain what causes juvenile delinquency. A number of factors, notably the possession of a muscular physique and a high energy output, were found to be important, and in general the studies the Gluecks have completed so far would seem to indicate that juvenile delinquency is not caused by any single factor in and of itself but results from the interaction of various social processes with the biological and psychological makeup of individuals. During the last few years there has been a good deal less emphasis placed on single cure-alls for juvenile delinquency by the private and public agencies that are concerned with the problem. A more modest pluralism has replaced nearly all vestiges of fanaticism for unequivocal theories, and new approaches are constantly being tried in order to make use of a variety of interdependent techniques.

REACHING THE HOPELESS

One such experiment is pavement-pounding social work. The New York City Youth Board found that about one-quarter of the families producing delinquents were producing about three-quarters of them. These families were often the ones given up as hopeless by most social agencies: they were too far gone to ask an agency for assistance and too unreliable to keep appointments with the social workers in the agency's office. The new approach is to go out and find them, persuade them to accept assistance, and try to help the children before they get into trouble. "Reaching" has become the Youth Board's slogan.

* * * * *

Another avenue of attack by the New York City Youth Board is the Street Club project. Some 90 workers take to the streets to find youthful gangs, hang around with them, gain the confidence of their members, arrange truces between gangs, and redirect their energies. They help the boys find jobs, hold dances, and stay out of trouble. In effect, they are trying to bring these youngsters out of the jungle into 20th century society. Or it might be more accurate to call the goal middle-class respectability.

* * * * *

A veneer of middle-class respectability apparently cannot, however, provide immunity against the spreading epidemic of delinquency. Although most of the more obvious elements of social disintegration are not to be observed along the comfortably tree-lined streets of suburbia, juvenile crime is on the increase there too. Figures are harder to get because there is more covering up: when a suburban boy steals a car, his father rushes to the station house, offers to compensate the man from whom his son borrowed the car, and the incident is forgotten. In the city, a Puerto Rican boy caught doing the same thing would be in major trouble.

* * * * *

WHERE THE NEED IS GREATEST

But even if it could be proved that poverty and slum conditions had nothing whatever to do with juvenile delinquency, it is only natural that society's greatest sympathy and concern should be focused on the unfortunate children who have to grow up in the crowded squalor of our big cities. Twenty-seven percent of the people of Manhattan are in rooming houses, often paying a hundred dollars a month for the privilege of living four, five, or six in a single room, with a toilet in the hall that may or may not be in working order. Little children are left to their own devices out on the streets late at night because their parents are sitting on their beds. Older children have nowhere to study and usually no one to commend them if they manage to get good marks. Instead of being under the watchful eye of a minister or teacher or relative, they are transients in decaying neighborhoods where "I didn't see nothin' " is the one cardinal rule and where racial friction frequently breaks out into violence.

* * * * *

One of the most ambitious programs to help city children make the best of their environment has been planned for New York's lower east side. Called mobilization for youth, its purpose is to saturate the district for 6 years with the best that city and private agencies can offer in social work and recreational facilities as well as psychological, psychiatric, and welfare services. The effectiveness of the program will be carefully evaluated and the results should show pretty clearly whether juvenile delinquency can be controlled to any appreciable degree by merely increasing the kinds of services we have tried in the past—or whether they must be supplemented by some radically new approaches to the problem. Although the sponsors are convinced that programs like mobilization for youth can do a great deal of good for a great many children whose needs are desperate, they are realistic about the difficulties they face:

"Statistics indicate that in New York, on a citywide basis, the rate of juvenile delinquency and youthful crime increased in 2 years nearly 30 percent. * * * In the neighborhood of the Lower East Side, the rate of increase was even greater * * * 75 percent. Thus * * * in spite of vigorous, intelligent, well-meaning efforts on the part of a multiplicity of public and voluntary agencies, including the schools, the churches, the social agencies, the police, the courts, the civic organizations, and other groups, as well as the residents themselves, the neighborhood continues to lose ground in its struggle to control the deviant behavior of its children and youth and in its efforts to promote more constructive, socially acceptable patterns of behavior. This critical situation is, of course, not unique to this neighborhood. Rather, it appears to be the common experience."

IT'S NOT MY FAULT

The roots of juvenile delinquency apparently run very deep, and while conceding that society must do all it can to meet desperate needs through such programs as mobilization for youth, a number of thoughtful people who have worked with juvenile delinquents are coming to feel that society might do well to reexamine some of its basic assumptions about preventing delinquency.

One of the most outspoken among those who would like to see a number of changes take place in current thinking about the needs of children is Dr. Melitta Schmideberg, director of the Association for the Psychiatric Treatment of Offenders.

* * * * *

Dr. Schmideberg emphasizes that each society must expect the crimes that are tolerated or sometimes even encouraged by popular attitudes. Punishing the few individuals who have actually committed an offense has far less effect than the way society in general disapproves of and suppresses the very idea of a particular crime.

In the last year for which the figures are available, there were 133 arrests of children under 18 in the United States for murder and nonaccidental killing. Dr. Schmideberg notes that the comparable figures for European countries are a great deal smaller, and in some civilizations homicide committed by children is practically unheard of. Perhaps, she suggests our delinquency rates are increasing because our society simply does not sufficiently abhor and disapprove of the many acts of violence, brutality, theft, and destruction in which its youth indulges.

* * * * *

In sympathizing with the agony of the young offender, Dr. Schmideberg argues, we fail to realize that a growing number experience no agony at all. The attempt to provide humane treatment and psychiatric therapy for delinquents has sometimes had the unfortunate side effect of leading them to take their offenses lightly.

* * * * *

Many of the youngsters Dr. Schmideberg sees have already been to training schools or to jail. "When I ask them why they were sent there, they tell me the judge didn't like them, or their lawyer was no good, or the jury was rigged. Almost never do they say 'I stole,' or 'I shot a man,' as did the English youngsters I worked with; and almost never do they feel any guilt."

Dr. Schmideberg feels that our society has allowed itself to be dominated by its children to a dangerous degree.

* * * * *

Instead of humoring the child who is preoccupied with his own emotions and problems—as most children are—Dr. Schmideberg claims that it is the job of parents, teachers, and psychiatric workers to modify rather than increase the child's self-centeredness. And instead of concentrating almost entirely on changing the factors that may incline a child toward delinquency—poverty, a father who drinks, aggressive impulses, and so on—we should look a bit more at how he can be brought to overcome and control his tendencies to misbehave.

Dr. Schmideberg finds it impossible, with almost all the young offenders she sees, to appeal to any deterrent short of institutionalization. One cannot appeal to the children's religious beliefs—only a small fraction of them have any—or to their conscience or their concern for their families or neighbors. The only thing one can appeal to in the majority of cases is their dislike of being locked up, and even this is not very effective until they have had a taste of it.

* * * * *

LAYING IT ON THE LINE

Another person whose extensive experience with young delinquents has led him to be concerned about present attitudes toward children and adolescents in this country is Judge Peter T. Farrell. A senior and administrative judge of Queens County Court in New York, Judge Farrell handles what are know as "youthful offenders."

* * * * *

He submits that "there has developed in our society the idea that misconduct is always abnormal, and what the law calls crime is to be explained largely in terms of causes beyond the control of the criminal. The philosophy of responsibility has been replaced by the philosophy of excuse. * * * The philosophy of excuse has for a generation, in my opinion, undermined the moral, the legal, and the social responsibilities upon which the stability of our culture must repose. The linking of misbehavior to the maladjustments and to forces beyond the control of the individual offender may frequently be justified but not so often as to warrant a general philosophy of law which has lost sight of the normal standards of individual responsibility and of person freedom. * * * Responsibility should be the universal norm, and excuse the challenged exception."

* * * * *

Eighty-five percent of the boys Judge Farrell puts on probation have no further trouble with the law, a much higher rate of

success than can be claimed by most programs. A program for psychiatric treatment in three cities was considered successful in being able to keep half of its boys from reverting to crime within 2 years.

THE ERA OF GARBLED FREUD

The rising level of youthful misbehavior in our schools is a matter of deep concern to Emil Tron, president of the New York High School Teachers Association. * * * Mr. Tron makes it clear that he doesn't hope for a return of the whipping post. But he feels that there must be a change from the current situation in which schoolchildren feel immune from punishment and teachers helpless to maintain order. He is convinced that the major change must come in the early grades with the very young children, where habits of attention and courtesy should be established.

* * * * *

A wry saying has been making the rounds in public schools recently to the effect that "The teachers are afraid of the principal, the principal is afraid of the supervisor, the supervisor is afraid of the parents and the PTA, and the parents are afraid of their kids. The kids, they ain't afraid of nobody."

The many misinterpretations of child psychology that affect popular attitudes in this country today are a source of deep concern to Dr. Marjorie Rittwagen, the staff psychiatrist for New York City's children's courts who was mentioned earlier. Dr. Rittwagen considers that there are four main causes of delinquency. About the first two—neglectful, disturbed parents and crowded neighborhoods with shifting populations—there is much awareness, though often a sad lack of facilities for treatment. But about the third and fourth major causes—the schools and the frightening absence of any beliefs and values among so many children—there is not even much awareness.

* * * * *

Dr. Rittwagen also observes that in this era of garbled Freud, parents all too often shirk their responsibilities by supposing that little Johnny is just "expressing himself," even when he clobbers his playmate. Or they imagine that since jealousy of his sister led him to hit his friend, his behavior ought to be excused. They let their children run wild and then foist them on the schools.

THE NEXT LESSON

The tendency not to blame children for their misconduct is apparently matched by an equally pervasive tendency among adults to blame somebody else for not instilling in children, before they get in trouble, the sense of values and civilized behavior they desperately need. The producers of TV programs, comics, movies, and newspaper stories which suggest that violence and brutality are acceptable and ordinary say they are only turning out what the public wants. The social workers and psychiatrists proceed on the assumption that it is not their job to meddle with cultural and ethical values—which they assume the child already possesses. The teachers say they are already overburdened trying to teach reading and arithmetic, and it is up to the churches and parents to take care of manners and morals. But the churches' influence, to whatever extent they actually can teach children how to behave, is limited at best: a priest in an average Manhattan neighborhood estimates that less than a quarter of the children there are even remotely touched by religion. And the parents, even if they are not so overwhelmed by their own problems as not to care, are usually hard pressed to know what values they themselves respect. In sum: almost no one seems willing and able to instill, simply and directly, a basic understanding of the difference between right and wrong.

The irony in all this is that children are obviously quick to learn what anyone takes the trouble to teach them. Over and over in talking with people who work with delinquents, I have been told that all children today are extremely conscious of their rights; they know all about them and they assert and insist on them. Our children have learned at least one lesson quite thoroughly: they know all about what society owes them. Apparently a lesson that hasn't been taught, at least so far, is what they owe society.

Education and the World Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHESTER BOWLES

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BOWLES. Mr. Speaker, as millions of American students return to schools, colleges, and universities across the land, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a thoughtful and provocative address on the subject of "Education and the World Community," delivered by the distinguished educator and president of the University of Connecticut, Dr. Albert N. Jorgensen, as his presidential address to the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, here in Washington.

The address follows:

EDUCATION AND THE WORLD COMMUNITY

(Address by Albert N. Jorgensen, president, the University of Connecticut, and president, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities)

One of the prerogatives of the president of this association—in fact, the only prerogative which I have been able to discover—is the privilege, indeed the duty, of delivering the annual president's address.

For the benefit of those who have their guards up, let me say forthwith that I am about to give an upbeat speech.

I have no intention of telling anyone that he is a member of a sick society.

I am not going to develop the theme that the crisis in education strikes at the roots of the free world's capacity to meet the challenge of global communism.

I am not even going to intimidate you by mentioning the name of Mr. Nesmayanov, the Soviet scientific czar, how he runs his office; how much he, his staff, and his teachers get paid; what they count for in the Russian social hierarchy; or how many weekly hours of algebra they prescribe for seventh graders.

Now, I hope you are all as pleased by this partial catalog of what I am not going to say as I am. Not that these things are not important. Perhaps at this particular pass in the political and military affairs of the world, it is necessary for the Department of Defense to be able to lay its hands on an ample supply of, let us say, aeronautical engineers. But I like to think that here, in the bosom of my colleagues and among friends who, like myself, chose a life in education for reasons that have nothing to do with the manufacture of weapons or the competition of nations—I like to think that here we can free a discussion of education from the numbers game we've been playing with the Russians recently.

EDUCATE FOR DIVERSITY

I also like to think that, as modern educators and university graduates, we can address ourselves to the substantial task of fitting human beings for life in a world which has, quite suddenly, crystallized into a single community.

Our task, in short, is to educate for diversity—for living usefully on a planet where people have histories and ideas different from our own.

I want to suggest that that ideal of education which has stirred the hearts of most of us here is just the ideal which is needed for the health of this diversified world community. And I hope to make the further, smaller point that this same ideal of education possesses even a third face; and it is the ideal of a democratic republic like our own United States.

NEW CHALLENGES

If this seems like a lot of talk about government for what purports to be a speech on education, I would like to remind you that this university which we all love and sister institutions in all other States of our Nation implies a special relationship to government—the Government would help with the education of the masses, and the masses would then be better fitted to help with the Government.

But our mutual obligations have not been discharged by complete success. In the next generation the Government of the United States faces a host of brandnew challenges, and, as always, it is up to us to fit ourselves and our students to meet them.

EDUCATION IS A MOOD

Before I can hold up these challenges, I must bow to the academic inevitable and define my terms. Minimally defined, I suppose that for me education is the establishment of a mood, the functioning process by which society seeks to recreate itself, not as it is, but as it desires to be.

EDUCATION-SOCIETY GAP

Usually, the gap between a society's aspirations and its performance is so large that valid doubts arise that education—which, among other things, is the seedbed of aspirations—relates at all to social reality. When the split between education and society progresses far enough, the educated man is declared by a large part of society to be good for nothing. It is said he doesn't know how to do anything; and, insofar as he is tolerated at all, he is taken for a sort of Druid, who has spent years in the forests conning ancient towers and communing with the spirits; a dangerous magician; a man in league with dark powers, prone to unpredictable seizures of nerves. Enough of this image persists that, today, if a Ph. D. wants a part-time job as a gas station attendant he is well advised to keep his academic honors to himself.

FEARS DICTATE VALUES

But sometimes the reality of society is brought into harmony with its needs and its insights, and in these cases education becomes the principal means to protect that harmony from the slings and arrows of an outrageous fortune. Consider the Spartans, a master race, outnumbered by the backward farmers on whose labor they survived. It was a state with a strong boundary psychology; and, like all people behind fences, the Spartans let their fears dictate their values. The highest premiums were put on seamless unity, on absolute loyalty to buddy and city-state, on obedience, courage, and dash in battle—all the normal features of a historical trap, where but a handful of faultlessly disciplined young males stand between empire and extinction.

For a few generations Sparta's educational system brilliantly met the state's peculiar needs, and with such esthetic cleanness of line, that an immortal impression was created in the minds of political theorists and would-be social engineers.

SPARTANS UNARMED

And so the ideal of employing education as the shaper of youth into willing tools for the designs of the rulers of the state has survived in one form or another. But it is only fair to add that time has revealed at least three major flaws in the Spartan system. First, it was not geared for subtle trials of conscience: Outside their own city, Spartan officials were notoriously the most corrupt and easily bribed of all the Greeks. Second, the Spartan system was a rigid system; Spartan power was destroyed by the new tactics of Epaminondas, not tactics of devilish ingenuity, but unconventional enough to confuse and defeat the Spartan array. Third, although the pure simplicity of the Spartan system has been admired, and yearned after, by disciplinarians in state and school for thousands of years, it was not a lovable system. No one, save the Spartans themselves, ever regretted the decision of the Battle of Leuctra. I do not think it unfair to say that these flaws, in one shape or another, have dogged every historical attempt to imitate the Spartan way of life.

If our hypothesis that a nation's educational system is a reflection of a nation's image of itself is correct, we should expect to find that the American educational system reflects in large part the spirit of the basic documents of the American Republic: The Constitution, Declaration of Independence, the writings of the Founding Fathers.

THE SMALL FLAME

The American philosophy—that the personality of the community resides in its individuals, not in a state-idol—did not spring out of the air, but on the contrary can exhibit a history going back to a small flame lit in sixth century Athens. Though the light was dimmed for a thousand years after the fall of Rome, it was rekindled in western Europe at the Renaissance, and finally won its present dominion over a good part of the world as one legacy of the scientific and political revolutions of the 18th century.

THE HUMAN ANIMAL

What the American Founding Fathers gleaned from this tradition was a sophisticated philosophy of the nature of the human animal. This philosophy starts, not with the conspicuous fact that every man is full of conceits, faults, and delusions, but that he is a living collection of natural rights and a prospective harvest of reasonable deeds and indeed virtue which it is the privilege of the teacher to discover and develop. We are always hard put to give this miscellaneous premise a sound name. But the hypothesis inevitably rests on the twin pillars of a central doubt and a central faith.

ULTIMATE DECENCY

The doubt is a doubt of the power of the human soul and mind. No man, and no group of men, we believe, will ever be so good, so wise, so disinterested that we can afford to submit passively to their total judgments, to give blind obedience to their programs, their values, their decisions.

Parallel to this doubt is the central faith; faith in the ultimate decency and potentiality of man. The average man, we say, has strong reasons to want to be happy and to want to be good; and the average man knows that to achieve happiness and goodness he must in some degree exercise his intelligence and control his passions. Therefore, we have no choice but to confide the fortunes of society and the state, and the accumulated treasuries of man's knowledge and experience, to the freeman. Education for freedom thus becomes more than a matter of philosophical preference. It becomes part of the total survival mechanism of a democratic society.

THE TERRIBLE RISKS

What has always struck partisans or quasi-partisans of the perfectly trained man as perilous and intolerable about the democratic ideal are the terrible risks it runs. It is so neat to have a Lycurgus or a Richelieu to write down once for all the basic law of the community, to suppress dissent, to train up each member of the group in the same duties and beliefs his father and grandfather were trained in, to predetermine his exact place within the great mass.

NO GREATER RISK

It is only fair to note that a good many of these risks are real. A democratic educational system does run the same kinds of risk that a democratic political system does—risks are built into both. Indeed, we believe as a matter of doctrine that there is no greater risk than the attempt to eliminate risk. In a minor way we have to run the risk that a well-born sophomore will leave Harvard and spend the next 2 years in a pool hall, or he may persuade his father that he can acquire more know-how on a roulette table in Majorca or Sicily than in the laboratories of Cambridge or New Haven. He might even end up as a member of the beat generation reading his immortal poetry in a night club in San Francisco. Is this education? Well, the boy may turn out to be a minor poet. Or he may turn out to be a public nuisance. Either way, there is no way of taking the gamble out of education.

WE TAKE THE CHANCE

There is another major risk in democratic education. This is the American practice of exposing our students to experience—exposing them, if you will, to thieves, anarchists, Fascists, Communists, suicides, and hypocrites (to characterize only a sample of the world's great poets) as well as exposing them to men like Abraham Lincoln and Albert Schweitzer. We run the risk—often a grave one—of imparting appetites which for one reason or another our citizens should never, or will never, be able to indulge. We are even now producing a crowd whose capacities fall so short of their fancies that a sort of mass schizophrenia infects a whole generation.

THE MALCONTENTS

To the antagonistic observer of the democratic system it sometimes appears that we American educators almost set out deliberately to rear up beat generations, or malcontents, alcoholics, and radicals. Of course, this is nonsense. But what we do have to keep fresh in our minds is that the American Constitution specifically protects the individual's right to be an alcoholic or a radical, if he does not menace the same rights of others, and that so long as these rights are protected there will always be a small number of our youth who openly want to practice them.

THE MODERN SPARTANS

Not for a moment do I recommend complacency over this prospect. These people, many of them, are the failures of our educational system: We should do what we can to ferret out the causes of these failures and, if possible, make repairs. But we should not set as our goal the framing of a system where failure is inconceivable. Infallibility is not among the qualities with which an omnipotent Creator endowed the human race; and those present-day incarnations of Sparta which pride themselves on monolithic victories over the frailties of the human spirit have failed far more profoundly, in their own way, than ever we have.

Today, as always, democratic education is challenged by modern Spartans, and this challenge has taken two forms, nationalism and specialism.

FREEDOM OF ERASMUS

As everyone knows, nationalism began to play the lion's role in Europe around the year 1500. By a freak the generation of Martin Luther and Henry VIII also gave birth to the most articulate and attractive scholar of the order now in its death throes, the famous translator and philosopher, Erasmus of Rotterdam.

Erasmus started out life in the Middle Ages, when a man might criticise the wrongs and abuses that he saw around him—if he cared to look—without being held for a traitor or a heretic. But the comparatively generous Middle Ages passed on before Erasmus did. He lived to see his best friend, Thomas More, killed by that overwhelming specimen of new monarchy, King Henry VIII, for refusing to concede that Henry was Pope of England; and if Erasmus had lived a little longer he would have seen his own works placed on the prohibited list. Erasmus never could understand, never could forgive, the motives of the men who were bringing these changes to pass. He had a very acute sense of what Europe was losing; the giant, loose-hinged community, from Sweden to Italy, from Austria to Ireland, which a man like himself might traverse from end to end and never be more than a few hours away from a familiar college or monastery and a shared faith and tongue.

Erasmus always believed—what I suppose we all believe—that if people only knew more, would occupy themselves more with study and contemplation, then this faction, anger and acid, this greed and hate and bitterness would be swallowed up in the sweet delights of understanding.

It is interesting that most of the humanists of the 16th and 17th centuries detested the germs of nationalism and the germs of science, which came along at the same time. When, in 1550, the humanist movement won a not-too-temporary victory at Oxford, all the mathematical books were thrown out of the college libraries along with the scholastics.

THE SCIENTIST CARRIES US

In our time not only have we learned to trust science, but we lean heavily upon it and—I hope you agree with me—a bit too undiscriminatingly. I am not going to attack science for science is only the given name of the most powerful and profitable intellectual adventures of the past 300 or 400 years. Pontiacs, polymers, and penicillin are the fringe benefits of this adventure. What really counts, however, are the insights into the structure of the universe which Aristotle, for one, would have given his whole crab collection for, along with his metaphysics. But on the way to apotheosis the scientist has tended to become something more, and something less, than a potent philosopher. By concentrating his range of study, by progressively refining the methodology of which he is so proud, the scientist has advanced from philosophy to social revolutions, one after the other—which make those of Caesar and Robespierre, Rousseau, and Marx, look like dumbshows. With each deeper level of specialization he discovers newer, greater powers, and so he is tempted further and further and further. And because of the unprecedented dynamism of his work he has carried a good part of the academic community along with him.

MAN'S DUTY

At this point we educators have the right to intervene. For it is our conviction—and on this ground we shake hands with a mighty host from Socrates and St. Augustine to Erasmus and the Founding Fathers—it is our conviction that a man's duty to life is not exhausted when he has mastered his craft, his business, or his science.

Especially in a republic, a man is a citizen in addition to whatever else he is. Neither indifference nor impatience vetoes that commitment.

THE RUPTURED TIES

Just as nationalism ruptured the bonds which held together men of different regions, so specialization has ruptured the ties which once held together men of different disciplines. The academic community has become like a group of glandular cells scattered through the tissues of a huge body, each secreting its own hormone independently, not realizing that it is the sum of all these hormones, reacting together, which motors the whole. Among other things, it is common to find scholars who have no feeling that it is part of their duty to shepherd their mental offspring. Look for example, what happened during the thirties, when a team of German rocket engineers descended from Herman Oberth placed themselves and their apparatus at the service of a homicidal lunatic. Nor did these men appear to have objected to this exploitation; whether the V2s blasted a practice target in the North Sea wastes or an ancient, lovely town in England was a matter of indifference to them. Now, of course, some of them are working for our own Department of Defense, on the weapons we want. I hope they and we are happier than when they worked for Hitler and Himmler.

IN THE AMERICAN MODE

Meanwhile, there are those who feel that the inroads to science are too important to be harnessed to the cause of human extinction. At least a few of our most prominent scientists refuse to have anything whatever to do with ultimate power used against people. We can understand this position even if we do not agree with it. Another influential party within the scientists exists who remain almost morbidly conscious of the incalculable forces which they are unleashing and of the social responsibility, which they—as the pioneers—must bear. This is a very good attitude, in my opinion, for the scientist is without question the most vigorous of our educated men in his social effects, and it is vital that he conduct himself as an educated man in the American, rather than the Spartan mode.

WHAT DO WE SEE?

At this point I hope that some of the diabolical logic I tried to muster for these remarks is creeping out from between the digressions and cementing them together.

And now the time has come: What is the kind of world community we want, and expect? When we look around us, trying to find a few universals on which to start the long climb toward sanity, trying to forecast the form of a mankind at some measure of peace with itself, what do we see?

DEAR AIR OF FREEDOM

What the world community must be, what we must do our best to help it become, is a place safe for its differences, a place which protects the natural right of the individual to grow and to smell the dear air of freedom if he wants it and deserves it. Most certainly, the world community must not be an arena for world anarchy or lawlessness. It must be made reasonably safe and fit for human life. The unity of the world community must not be based on a dogma, but on a mood, a humanistic mood, a mood of patience, wisdom, tolerance, zest for the progress and triumphs of the human animal; the love of ideas, the love of initiative, and the love of life.

ERASMUS' IDEAL

This call for a return to Erasmus' ideal of fellowship of intelligence is also a call for a return to the ideals of the Founding Fathers of the American Republic, who dreamed of a state where definite limits constrained the degree of commitment to the distinctions of religion, race, and class. No man must kill or even injure a fellow countryman, because he is rich, because he is an atheist or a zealot or because he is alien. It is now the human duty of Americans to embrace as members of their community not just fellow Americans but human beings around the globe.

This enormous expansion of the American ideal will not harm it; it will transfigure it. It is the natural fulfillment for which innumerable great men of the past gave their lives—the natural inflowing, like that of three tributaries to a great river, of three traditions into one which carries on the traffic of the future; the political beliefs and spiritual strength of the Founding Fathers, the ethical presumptions of the humanists, and our own democratic philosophy of education. These streams are not only compatible one with the other, and with the shape of the world to come. They are indissolubly associated.

Our present determination is to build ourselves into a position of scientific and military parity with Russia, and personally I share the conviction that as of this moment this is important. But what will we do when we get there?

No marvels of technology—no great bases carved out of Greenland glaciers, no new models of bombs or tables of organization of the joint chiefs or crewless submarines that automatically fire wingless rockets at unseen targets—none of these things, wonderful as they are, compares with the wise self-command which prevents the same bombs from falling on the tender skin of our own green earth. This, I submit, is the legitimate aim of education in the modern world. These days, it may not always be easy for us to make the big and necessary commitments. For in today's unfamiliar historical terrain, government does not always move straight toward those objectives we've been outlining here; indeed, government sometimes thinks we educators should follow its lead instead of correcting its lead. But our post is not in the rear; that is not where we do the most good; it is our fate to stick our necks way out and keep them out.

THE DIVINE SPARK

It is not our business, I think, to produce happy people or people who believe in big families, or even, in the end, people who believe that the U.S. Constitution is the last word in political theory, or give pat answers to any of life's real problems. It is education's business to shape a decisively influential community of people, around the world, who can and do talk to each other, who have enough sense to see the other fellow's sense, enough knowledge to acknowledge their own ignorance, and who guard the continuity of history and the divine spark in man from the dark legions of chaos.

Education and the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to a crisis that exists in this country. The crisis is in the field of education. I need not dwell on the role of a good, sound educational system in assuring the future of any nation. It is vitally important. History bears out the fact that this importance has long been recognized and taken into acount in the formulation of national policies. Nations that have achieved greatness in the world scene have looked closely to their educational process and have drawn heavily on it to maintain that greatness. This is the lesson of history. We must heed this lesson. So it must be with our Nation.

Yet, as we play our present part on the stage of history, I fear we are not heeding history's lesson. We have reached greatness. What remains, then, is to maintain this hard-earned status. Only since the turn of this century has the United States been reckoned as a great world power. Yet today—a scant half-century later—we are facing a test of not merely whether we can continue to be a great nation but whether we shall continue to exist at all. In the face of this test we are not accepting the friendly, free advice of history—and of commonsense—that it is on the solid education of our young that we shall stand or fall.

Recently those of us who are on the Appropriations Committee had the privilege of hearing testimony on this subject by Adm. Hyman Rickover. Admiral Rickover has devoted a great deal of time to the study of this problem. In his testimony before our committee he gave ample demonstration that he is an extremely well versed and astute observer of the educational systems and trends in the world today.

What Admiral Rickover had to say about our educational system as compared with that of the Soviet Union was both startling and alarming. Most of us have for a long time been inclined to believe without serious question the popular allegation that our schools are the best in the world. It is only natural that we should do this. It is compatible with our national pride to believe it. However, after Admiral Rickover concluded his report it was apparent, at least to me, that the simple truth is that our educational system has room and considerable need for improvement. In this age—the space age—this is a serious thing to have to say. Yet it is true. We must accept this fact and alert ourselves to the danger it holds for the future of our Nation.

Awareness is the first step in the necessary direction. How many of us knew that at the time when Russia was spending over 10 percent of her national income on education, we were spending but 3 percent? I certainly did not. How many in this country were aware that while some 10 million Russians are studying English, a scant several thousand Americans are studying Russian? Admiral Rickover says that in 1957 the Russians had 1,475,000 scientific and professional people—we had 1,330,000. This is about a 10-percent imbalance in favor of the Soviets. But how many of us know about the comparative rates of progress in the field of education? First, the graduate of the Russian secondary school is the educational equivalent of

our student entering junior year of college; second, in education, their rate of progress is increasing at 6 to 7 percent a year; ours at 3 to 4 percent. Consequently we are not only behind in levels of achievement but we are losing ground. We are, in short, being smartly outstripped. This could cost us our very existence.

I could go on at great, great length on this subject. I shall not do so. What I would like to do, by way of concluding, is to leave for due consideration a few pertinent thoughts. In doing this I quote Admiral Rickover:

> We must not permit anyone else to have a higher rate of education than we. It could lead to great national danger. Russia has a standard of living about one-third that of ours. Yet in terms of their national product they devote more than twice what we do to education. So, all factors considered, the support they give to education represents a national effort several times as great as ours.
>
> We ought, first of all, to disabuse ourselves of the quaint notion that we were ahead of all the world in providing public education.
>
> The paradox is that the more educated we are, the better does our system of government function, yet we are not doing all that is possible to become educated. On the other hand, the more educated the Russians are, the more the present regime is internally subjected to criticism, no matter how strong it may become externally; yet the Russians are doing all they can.

I do not say these things as a doom prophet. I say them in the hope that we may alert ourselves as a nation and rise to meet the problem with a solid, constructive front. I say to all my countrymen: "Ponder these things well, America. Ponder them and move forward with dispatch and with the firm resolution and undeniable determination that only a free people united in purpose can achieve."

Our effort to stay on top in education should be concentrated in three major fields.

(a) Give adequate financial support for both school construction and teachers' salaries.

(b) Strive for increased excellence in both science and the humanities. We cannot survive the struggle by abandoning the ideas and principles which have made us great.

(c) Take positive and effective means to support and maintain the private educational system of the country alongside the public system. Private education is essential to progress in providing some measure of competition in teaching excellence and some measure of building cost analysis.

Private education is a natural heritage that gave this country a noble start. Examples such as Yale and Harvard and others bear this out. Private education is a right enjoyed by our citizenry. It should not be a right that can only be exercised at considerable cost and hardship. It is my firm belief that in conjunction with an aid to education bill—we make specific provision to assist the private educational institution in this, her hour of need. She has provided so much with so little.

Report to the People of the Sixth District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, each year I send to the people of Michigan's Sixth District a summary of the major legislative actions taken or not taken during the congressional session.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my report on the 1st session of the 86th Congress, which follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September 1959.

As in a football game, this is now the half-time for the 86th Congress, a breather to review what's happened to date, as well as to look ahead.

The first session has been primarily occupied with labor reform legislation and budget problems. In both, final action was controlled by the outspoken demands of American citizens, evidence of the responsiveness of our Government to the will of its people. For your convenience I have summarized major legislative activity as concisely as possible in this final report.

For the third year, I plan to take my mobile office throughout our district and expect to be in your area. My schedule will be published in your local paper. If you have a problem or would like to discuss legislative matters, I hope you'll drop by. No appointment is necessary and everyone is welcome.

With my best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN.

LABOR REFORM

No single issue created as much controversy and public response as labor reform legislation.

In the closing rush of the 85th Congress last year, a weak reform bill was brought before the House under a parliamentary maneuver permitting no amendments and limiting debate to only 40 minutes. The bill was defeated in the hope that more effective legislation could be enacted by the next Congress.

After months of indecision, Congress was at last prodded into action by the American people. With days for debate—rather than 40 minutes—the House voted 229 to 201 to substitute the Landrum-Griffin bill for the milder version brought to the floor by the Labor Committee. Support grew and by time for final rollcall the bill won approval by the decisive majority of 303 to 125. In one of the longest conferences in legislative history the conferees worked to reconcile the differences between the Senate and House bills. The bill they reported was hammered out in the strong image of the Landrum-Griffin measure. The conference report was accepted by overwhelming votes—in the Senate, 95–2; in the House 352–52—and signed into law September 14.

Its major provisions:

A bill of rights for union members to help them control their own unions and keep racketeers out. This includes secret ballot, periodic elections, right to speak up against policy, inspection of union contracts, financial reports to members, fair disciplinary procedures and court protection of rights.

Requires unions to file detailed reports with the Secretary of Labor on all financial transactions (including loans) and the workings of union constitutions and bylaws.

Requires reports on trusteeships.

Closes the "no man's land" gap between Federal and State jurisdiction by giving States authority over small business labor disputes now rejected by the National Labor Relations Board.

Deals effectively with "hot cargo" agreements.

Closes loopholes on secondary boycotts.

Prohibits "blackmail" type of organizational picketing.

THE 1960 BUDGET

Last January the President submitted a budget calling for expenditures of just over $77 billion, with expected revenues of $77.1 billion—a surplus of $70 million for fiscal 1960.

The intervening conflict over fiscal policy persisted until the daylight hours (6:22 a.m.) of September 15, when Congress adjourned. The President's demand for fiscal integrity repeatedly clashed head-on with the many spending programs advocated by the majority leadership. The deep concern of the American people over Government spending—as expressed by thousands and thousands of letters—strengthened the drive for a balanced budget. The real key to the President's generally acknowledged success, however, was his bold use of his veto power.

Twice he returned housing bills, resulting finally in passage of a third and acceptable measure. His first veto of the public works appropriation bill was upheld by a single vote, but, for the first time, Congress overrode his veto of a second bill which retained the 67 unbudgeted projects to which he objected.

Public sentiment and the imminence of further vetoes combined as an influence for economy. The result was a victory for financial responsibility.

OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATION

Hawaiian statehood: Early action to make Hawaii our 50th State.

Excise taxes: Again extended wartime tax rates on autos, corporations, liquor, and tobacco; scheduled repeal of local telephone tax and 50-percent reduction in passenger travel tax for next July 1. House (but not Senate) passed bill to cut the cabaret tax from 20 percent to 10 percent.

Highway construction: To finance program without drastic curtailment, gas tax was raised 1 cent a gallon until June 1961; for 3 years thereafter one-half of the 10-percent auto excise tax was earmarked for highways.

Draft: Because of continued cold war pressures, the Universal Military Training Act was extended another 4 years, until 1963.

Veterans' pensions: New formula for determining pensions of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities and their widows and children. Substitutes a different and more equitable principle, based upon need; current pensions not adversely affected.

Mutual security: Program of military and economic aid to our allies was continued after the President's requests were reduced by $700 million.

Small business: Increased the revolving fund for loan to small businesses by $75 million.

Housing: After two vetoes, a more limited bill was presented and passed. Among other provisions, this action continued FHA authority to make housing loans.

National debt: Again, the debt ceiling had to be raised * * * to $285 billion permanently, $295 billion temporarily.

Debt financing: To avoid inflationary pressures of short-term financing, the President requested authority to increase interest on savings and long-term bonds. Congress raised rates on savings bonds only.

TVA: The Tennessee Valley Authority was authorized to issue $750 million worth of

bonds for expansion and improvement of its power-producing facilities. Because of subsidy and tax advantage, TVA continues to attract industry to its area.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Despite one of the longest sessions for several years, many important issues remain unresolved. Here are a few:

Wheat surpluses: Another version of higher price supports and controls which led to wheat overproduction was passed, and vetoed. Congress acted neither to override nor to present an alternative bill. The vetoed measure would have increased price supports from 75 to 90 percent of parity and reduced wheat acreage by 25 percent. In his veto message, the President pointed out that from 1954 to 1958 acreage was reduced 25 percent but yield per acre increased 30 percent because the poorest land is retired and better production methods are concentrated on the remainder. In the absence of new and better legislation, the old program—ceiling on long-term Government bonds as effect.

Debt financing: Failed to lift the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds as urged by the President. Request is sure to come again next year.

Civil rights: A rider extending the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, was attached to the mutual security bill, but the real showdown was put off until next year.

Depressed areas: The Senate-passed bill reported by House Committee and awaits action.

Federal aid to education: A House bill was approved by committee but not acted upon.

Tax reform. A study of the Federal income tax structure starts this fall with the possibility that legislation will be presented next year.

Obscene mail: A bill to aid in enforcement of postal laws against this growing threat was passed by the House, no action by Senate.

PUBLIC PROJECTS

Included in the military construction appropriation bill was $551,000 for an Army Reserve Center in Flint. Other progress this year: working plans are being drawn up for the major remodeling and expansion of the Lansing Federal building, new postal facilities have been or will be built in Lansing (East Michigan Avenue branch), Brighton, Swarts Creek, and Webberville.

COMMITTEE WORK

While floor action is often colorful, the real spade work is done by the various committees. Dealing with the vital problems of keeping our Nation militarily strong, my new assignment on the Armed Services Committee has been stimulating and rewarding. Some 50 bills considered by the Committee were passed by the House and either enacted into law or await Senate action when Congress reconvenes. Included among them were the draft extension, authorization for military construction, reserve matters, and many others essential to the giant task of keeping the United States strong enough to deter aggression and to resist it if ever necessary.

To gain background for this complex job, I have inspected many facets of our defense system. Most important was a tour of Western Europe and Berlin during Easter recess at the height of the Berlin crisis. I have cruised underwater aboard the atomic submarine *Skate* (not under the polar cap), flown in our military jets, and also visited our own Michigan bases as my schedule would permit.

Next session, as a member of the special Great White Fleet Subcommittee, I shall study the bold peace plan to use a part of our "mothball" Navy—financed by public subscription—to send help and supplies to needy or disaster-stricken areas of the world.

In addition to Armed Services, I was appointed to the House Administration Committee, which does the housekeeping for the House of Representatives.

SOME RANDOM NOTES

Voting record: During this session I had a voting record of 98 percent. Votes missed were excused because of official business.

Congress itself: With the entry of Alaska and Hawaii into the Union, the 86th Congress has a full House of 437 seats with one vacancy.

The Democrats have a heavy majority:

Senate:	
Democrats	65
Republicans	35
House:	
Democrats	283
Republicans	153

Following the 1960 census there will be a reapportionment. Thirteen States are expected to lose seats and seven, including Michigan, to gain. Population growth will probably give us 2 more seats in the 1962 election, making a total of 20 for Michigan.

Some statistics: A total of 13,837 measures were introduced in the House and Senate, of which 385 were enacted into Public Law. Those not acted upon may be considered next session. To report the debate and proceedings of the session, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, including the Appendix, contained 26,444 pages, some 40 million words.

Visitors: Since January over 600 visitors from home stopped by our Washington office. You're always welcome.

Khrushchev's Brand of Coexistence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Premier Khrushchev constantly uses the word "coexistence." He talks about peaceful coexistence. If I read the history of the last 15 years correctly, the Communist doctrine of coexistence is a one-sided doctrine which permits the Communists to take over eastern European countries, to launch a war in Korea, and to put the screws on in Berlin. This one-sided doctrine of coexistence criticizes the United States for maintaining troops in Berlin, for helping the South Koreans to defend themselves, and for participating in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

One of the most thoughtful statements that has come to my attention recently on the subject of Communist coexistence is a memorandum prepared by Dr. Michael J. Deutch, a distinguished consulting engineer whose office is here in Washington. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum "Observations on the Peaceful Coexistence Offensive," written by Dr. Deutch be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVATIONS ON THE PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE OFFENSIVE

(By Michael J. Deutch)

While stating that peaceful coexistence is inevitable, Khrushchev's article points up a new struggle for which we are ill equipped: Peaceful competition between two worlds in a precarious balance of power.

I

K's coexistence presupposes "an obligation on the part of both sides to desist from violating each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty under any pretext whatsoever, * * * particularly not with the object of altering their system of government."

The Soviets are happy with their Socialist satellite system, and they have inside means of gaining predominance in other people's territories—by subversion (even to the extent of bypassing the local Communist parties) that needs to capitalize only on discontent. In those newly independent states—which are founded on a doubtful economic base—and of uncertain economic progress, there is bound to be growing discontent among the hungry and idle masses. "Peaceful competition does not at all demand abandonment of the ideological conflict," warns Khrushchev, and if he succeeds in inspiring some admiration for the economic development progress in the Soviet orbit, spontaneous revolutions can blossom out freely.

II

"The main thing is to keep to the position of ideological principles without resorting to arms in order to prove that one is right." He obviously intends to keep in a state of constant ideological ferment the unstable fringes of the Western World, until spontaneous ideological combustion throws them into his camp.

On page 5 he says that: "We believe that ultimately that system will be victorious which will offer the nations greater opportunities for improving their material and spiritual life. It is precisely socialism that creates unprecedently great prospects for the inexhaustible creative enthusiasm of the masses, for a genuine flourishing of science and culture, for the realization of man's dream of a happy life, a life without destitute and unemployed people, of a happy childhood, and tranquil old age, of the realization of the most audacious and ambitious human projects, of man's right to create in a truly free manner in the interests of the people."

This is an aspiration that cannot be talked down in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, maybe not even in Latin America. A continuation of our policy to preserve the status quo and advocate "gradual progress through sound capital formation" is bound to leave cracks that the Communists could penetrate. This may also prove for the United States a challenge even more costly than the defense program of the last decade. To the United States, committed to a sound budget and convinced that the fight against communism may bleed us white any return to give-away programs is impossible. The failure of our foreign aid program and the repeated reassurances to public opinion as to our good defense posture makes it very difficult for the administration to sell an aggressive world-wide program to our people.

III

"The new alinement of international forces which has developed since World War II makes a new world war no longer inevitable for the Soviet Union," says Mr. K. Obviously, he counts on the newly independent states of Asia and Africa to be used as a shield for the Soviet Union; he makes clear that he will go to war over any attempt to

roll back communism or liberate his satellites.

While K insists that a choice of systems "will be decided (peacefully) only by the people of each country," he can continue to disrupt the balance, from time to time, by careful exhibition of the progress realized in the Soviet orbit. It is quite certain that the Soviet Union is going to increase its ideological and economic penetration in the "vacuum areas" of the most underdeveloped areas. With a very small expenditure in money and in primitive technology, the Soviets can achieve a spectacular impact on the masses, after the West fails to fulfill their expectations, and the local rulers lose face or prove to be rulers as unbearable as the colonial powers, or become unable to safeguard the independence of these shaky states.

The predicament we are faced with is both economic and technological:

Only a slower rate of economic growth and constant budget reduction at home can achieve the administration's objective of a rollback in the wage and price spiral. On the other hand, only in times of accelerated growth, in a climate of prosperous business and full employment, is there any hope of making the American people accept the sacrifice of a long-term worldwide, dynamic economic offensive. An administration elected on a conservative, status-quo platform cannot preach the people to adopt novel, overexpansionist policies which may result in redistribution of wealth at home.

The technological difficulty we are faced with is that our American investments abroad, our engineering skills, and the scale of our production know-how is geared to the conditions of industrially developed markets, and not always suited to the needs created by the revolution of rising expectations in Asia and Africa. I doubt that Harrison & Abramovitz, or Webb & Knapp, are competent to design, build, and operate a low-cost housing project made of thatched huts. Nor do General Electric or Baldwin-Lima have the know-how to set up small cottage industries in Zamboanga—and do this without overhead, with only minute capital investment, no labor-saving devices—and at the same time train local population in skills that have been taken for granted already among the first settlers in America. In Kaboul or Muscat, kerosene plants of an 1895 Soviet design may be as impressive as huge petroleum refineries of the latest American design. Are we institutionally equipped for this new challenge in no time?

IV

K reveals that it is the successful intelligence and propaganda activities in West Berlin that are really worrying him. He wants a foothold in West Berlin, but is not ready to go to war; we have no concrete program stated as yet.

V

K stresses that the United States should understand the irrevocable fact that the historical processes in the Soviet Union and in Red China are irreversible. That the objectives of Soviet policy have not changed with the death of Stalin is obvious here, even though the timing and tactics may now have changed. The party line now stresses that the cold war has cost both sides up to now $90 billion; that this money is needed for economic progress in the underdeveloped countries, and that this outlay has made him unable to raise the standard of living of his own people, etc. But, the ultimate ideological struggle will continue unabated. There has been no evidence of change in the basic beliefs or the iron will of the Soviet Union or Red China.

VI

K even reveals the price tag on the time concession he offers to the West:

"The policy of peaceful coexistence should receive a firm foundation only with increase of intensive and absolutely unrestricted international trade. All barriers in international trade must be removed."

He needs this time himself, to satisfy at least part of the growing clamor for consumer goods behind the Iron Curtain. His advances in weaponry, the prestige that he is gaining with the parasummit visits, and the prospect of stimulating Russia's and Red China's growth through "free international trade" make him willing to sell—and buy—some time.

Free trade is apt to create problems. The U.S. economy already suffering from overcapacity—is bound to grow slower from now on. There will be more unemployment, more dislocations in some of our old-line industries, and the ECM and Latin American industrialization gather steam. There are but very few raw materials that the Soviet orbit has to offer. On the other hand, the plants and equipment they wish to buy here will serve to accelerate balanced development in the U.S.S.R. and China. In the rest of the free world and particularly in the poorest areas, unrestricted trade with the Red bloc is bound to bring with it serious political jockeying.

VII

As for the social system in some state of southeast Asia or other, that is the domestic affair of the people of each country. This might—with time—be decided in his favor from within each country (not even by visible subversion) if time brings discontent to unstable areas and makes his system look good to the poorest people of the world in a competition for which we are not as yet well equipped, and which may be vital in the areas where the balance of power will be ultimately decided.

Last but not least, Communist propaganda will benefit from Krushchev's visit and his coexistence offensive (1) in the uncommitted areas, and (2) wherever Communists can run openly for office.

Where does this leave us? Are we institutionally equipped to meet this challenge? The answer will be given by the adaptability, the enthusiasm, and the imagination of our technicians.

1. This challenge cannot be met by an economic containment program. This would be too slow and costly. Nor is it feasible to increase across the board our spending for mutual security or foreign aid at a time when the United States is beginning to encounter balance of payments difficulties and some lingering doubts as to the outlook for a stable dollar. Money alone will not supply the answer to the challenge of the future or relieve the pressure of the revolution of rising expectations.

2. There is considerable doubt and confusion here and abroad about foreign assistance. A score of studies of our aid programs, survey committees, and articles (pro and con) underscore the confusion in the public's mind. There is, unfortunately, less and less support among the American people for increased expenditures in foreign aid. Too numerous have been the past mistakes swept under the rug of secrecy. Too great the budgetary confusion. However lavish the public relations shows and the banqueting in favor of international development and increased appropriations, the public will not accept a rehash of pleadings "pro domo suo" as convincing proof that sacrifices are imperative. For instance:

(a) We have never computed how much additional aid would be required to achieve successful economic growth abroad, nor what it will take in terms of manpower resources and technological changes to achieve it.

(b) The present intermingling of military and economic assistance, while it may have been sound budget strategy before an appropriations committee, has created misunderstanding at home and suspicions abroad. The increased confusion between military and economic aid has brought about the paradoxical situation where most Asians now regard U.S. foreign aid as prompted by selfish defense interests, trying to place them on the firing line.

(c) Mutual security must be supplemented openly and explicitly by positive programs for economic and social cohesiveness, not only by support activities.

(d) Widespread concern is voiced over our inability to come forth with any new creative and dramatic programs. The cumbersome machinery by which foreign aid is implemented and executed (the endless coordination and duplication of agencies inhibits the performance) does not lend itself to swift and decisive performance. It is evidence that the composition and administration of our foreign aid program has to be revised.

(e) Basic changes in the administration of our mutual security and foreign aid organization have been recommended by the Draper Committee to correct the inefficiency and the duplication of effort growing out of scattered responsibilities. These very sound recommendations on administrative reorganization will take time to implement. The new agency suggested by the Draper Committee will be only as good as the judgment of the men it can secure. Unfortunately, the task is too pressing to await the reorganization of our Government operations, the coming into being of new lending agencies and further budgetary review. This is clearly no time for complacency. What is required is an attitude of sustained and informed determination to do the job. This cannot be accomplished without a major effort and without cost, although money is not the conditioning difficulty here.

(f) In spite of all its mistakes and disappointments, due to conflicting policies, overstaffing, multiplicity of operating missions and lending agencies, insufficient planning and indecisions, the foreign aid program will be continued for years to come. There are great problems of economic and humanitarian advancement in many countries in the solution of which the United States should take part independently and above the motive of mutual security.

3. The free world must strengthen and re-equip its forces now. Rapidly changing military technology, the increasing loss of popular support for mutual security programs in many parts of the world, combine to make the job extremely difficult. Primary attention should now be focused on Asia and Africa, and the growing problems of nationalism, rapid industrialization and neutralism. To face these problems, we must prove our motives, our moral fiber, our tenacity and capacity of performance, and particularly our boldness. Otherwise, we will not be able to regain the leadership that may already have been lost. We must persuade Asia and Africa that we have a national will to win this peaceful competition. We must also convince their people that when we win the competitive struggle our systems will mean for them not a status quo and dissertations on patience and savings for a better future, but rewards in prosperity and political stability. We cannot continue serving them an academic rehash on balance of payments difficulties and the deficiency of their capital formation. Nor can we give them idle advice and let them struggle and muddle in the implementation of what we have recommended. We have

to show that our technology and our professional men can adapt our way of doing things to the needs and small resources of Africa and Asia. Maybe then we might even win the adherence of the neutral nations to our cause.

4. No aspect of American foreign policy problems presents a deeper challenge than the problem of the underdeveloped areas. Our concern with the economic progress of the underdeveloped countries is in keeping with our own moral traditions and our spiritual faiths. Only by developing the talents and resources of the poorest people in the world can we insure the existence of an international community of peace, progress, and culture, where we would enjoy a free and expanding market for our goods and an outlet for our inventions. The difficulties are great, not only because the technical problems are so complex, but because our approach to the problem is based on the erroneous assumption that our scale of doing things and our engineering and management methods can be easily adapted to these other areas. In reality, concepts, and technology of the past no longer fit the political climate, in which the world-wide clamor for a higher standard of living is voiced. We must adapt our engineering and our construction standards to small-scale, quick turnover small investment, no labor-saved types of manufactures.

Our superior industrial base and production know-how may do the job only if we have a clear sense of direction, ratified by national will and adapted to unfamiliar geography and traditional backgrounds. Some of our allies in the Asian-African arc are not strong at all; nor are they all receptive to help because of their suspicious nationalism.

5. With the complexity of the task, the importance of a highly competent professional force has never been greater. Mutual security and foreign aid outposts are usually staffed with personnel released from other military duties, or from predecessor agencies. Skilled professional men necessary to an effective economic development program abroad are not easily available from present domestic operations. They must have unusual backgrounds and skills-not very common in our organizational elite—not easy to train in a hurry.

(a) We should make more use of the people "out of channels" who have been successful in gaining the respect and confidence of the people of Asia, who have been able to develop a genuine sympathy for these people, who understand foreign lands and foreign cultures and their problems.

(b) Our economic aid would be more efficiently implemented if we have succeeded in persuading the recipient countries to improve their investment climate both for domestic and foreign capital of a private nature. Foreign and private capital should play a major role in the development of Asia and Africa—not only because there is not enough foreign aid available, but because private foreign investment is the best source of financial analysis, engineering planning and efficient managemet, which are the main shortages today. Even where social overhead projects are indispensable, sound management could be entrusted to private capital even if it has to be underwritten by the lending agencies. Aggressive assistance should be given by the U.S. Government to those segments of U.S. investments that can achieve performance abroad.

(c) We cannot stimulate private foreign investment only through tax rebates. We have to stimulate it aggressively, but not before making sure that its brand of know-how and managerial techniques, so essential to the underdeveloped areas, is not going to end in political disaster. Where private investment proves too selfish or inept, it will have to be withdrawn in the end. Where local rable rousers are so rabid as to block economic development rather than accept foreign know-how, we may have to withdraw altogether before being committed in a tragic fiasco.

(d) The splendid work of Foreign Service educational foundations and the Council's seminars for U.S. business executives abroad should be expanded in width and depth.

(e) Solid benefits have resulted from the splendid long-range work of the foundations, which should be expanded.

6. Where our missions cannot voice criticism or where there is too much nationalism and prejudice already for objective aid to balance economical development, it may be that a constructive plan for a specific country might be presented via the U.N., and that constructive criticism from experts sponsored by the U.N. would be more acceptable.

The U.N. remains the greatest symbol of man's hope for peace and the most comprehensive organization working toward it. It has proved its ability to act in a number of situations from Korea to Suez. It is an independent forum for expressing the hopes for humanity and an effective institution for pursuing agreed ends. The United States must, therefore, make an effort together with its allies to develop and implement economic plans which meet the requirements of all partners. We must pool with our allies the technological and managerial skills that are necessary to provide other members of the U.N. with the know-how to meet this challenge.

7. To the maximum degree possible, both the types and the levels of our future economic activity abroad—both Government and private investments—should be adapted to the particular requirements of the recipient countries. We must establish a measure of harmony between the somewhat immature economic development programs of our friends and our own know-how and judgment. We must not proceed on the assumption of our own superiority, nor that our civilization is as good for the people of Asia. In addition to performance along material and scientific lines, we must also make a contribution to intellectual and spiritual leadership.

8. The cost of such a program may be more than we can carry alone. It seems to me that the time has come when some of our European allies should shoulder the financial burden with us and the better endowed countries of this hemisphere. As grants are replaced with self-liquidating loans, and these in turn by a flow of private investments, it may be hoped that clear-cut policies, better organization, and sound engineering judgment will lessen the cost of this vast challenge. There is need of more balance and more efficiency, as well as more capital in these areas.

9. Henry L. Stimson once said that if we can make freedom and prosperity real in the present world, communism is no threat and that in a very large degree the future of our civilization depends on how soon our Nation will fully understand the science and nature of its present machine.

Accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the accomplishments of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of which I am chairman.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am chairman, had a busier year in the 1st session of the 86th Congress than we did in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. There was more legislation referred to us, more reported to you, more bills were passed by the Senate, and more of our bills signed by the President than in the session 2 years ago.

The Senate, through resolutions, instructed us this year to make a thorough study of the world trade situation and of the Nation's transportation system. These studies are underway and will be carried on during the recess of Congress. Interim reports will be ready when the second session convenes next January.

We also recommended, and the Senate approved (S. Res. 136), a major expansion of ocean research. We are lagging behind in this very important field. We need modern ships, laboratories, and more trained oceanographic scientists. Legislation to implement this recommendation has been introduced and there will be extensive hearings next year.

During the congressional session just ended your committee had referred to it a total of 241 bills and resolutions, compared to 199 in the 1st session of the 85th Congress. Of that number we reported to the Senate a total of 71 bills as compared with 54 2 years ago. The Senate passed 66 of these bills as compared with 52 in 1957.

At the end of the session this year 24 Senate bills were pending in House committees as compared to 16 2 years ago, and 13 Senate bills were reported by House committees as compared with 10 in 1957.

A total of 19 Senate bills were passed by the House, the same number as it passed in the 1st session of the 85th Congress.

The President signed 33 of our bills as compared with 30 2 years ago. During the session we acted upon 778 nominations of which 19 were to major posts in the Government while 2 years ago we acted upon 520.

During the year the full committee and our subcommittees held 34 executive meetings as compared with 30 2 years ago. The full committee devoted 49 days to hearings and the subcommittees held hearings on 64 days.

Four hundred and forty-five witnesses appeared before the various hearings.

Number of bills (Senate and House) and resolutions referred to committee	241
Number of bills reported by committee	71
Number of bills passed by Senate	66
Number of Senate bills pending in House committees	24
Number of Senate bills reported by House committees	13
Number of Senate bills passed House	19
Number of conference reports filed in House	4
Number of meetings of conference committees	8
Number of bills signed by President	33
Number of bills vetoed by President	1
Number of routine nominations referred to committee and acted upon	759
Number of major nominations referred to committee and acted upon	19
Number of executive meetings of full committee and subcommittees	34
Number of days of hearings conducted by full committee	49
Number of days of hearings conducted by subcommittees	64

Number of bills, nominations, and miscellaneous legislation on which hearings were held 117
Number of witness appearances before the committee 445

I want to express my deep appreciation for the friendship and hearty cooperation which all members of our committee have given me in expediting the work of the committee and for the long hours they have so willingly devoted to our work. It has been a pleasure to work with each of them and I especially wish to commend the new members who plunged into the stacks of work with the same enthusiasm that has been shown by the oldtimers in our group. I want them to know I deeply appreciate it.

Our committee staff worked long hours, cheerfully and with complete cooperation, and I speak for the full committee when I thank them for it.

Legislative proposals affecting practically every important phase of the Nation's maritime and fishing industry were among the 77 bills acted upon or given initial consideration by our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee. Of these, 35 were reported by your committee and 34 received Senate approval. Twenty-five were sent to the President for signature. One measure was vetoed by the President.

With the shipping industry embarked on a vessel replacement program involving overall expenditures of $3 billion to $4 billion vessel financing was among the more urgent matters considered. Two measures of special significance enacted into law in this field were S. 1434, to authorize Federal ship mortgage insurance for vessels after construction and S. 2148, to permit issuance of public bonds to finance vessels while under construction as well as when actually in service. Both were designed to reduce the interest charges to the companies on their long-term financing. Another bill, S. 1671, to permit a flexible rate of interest instead of the statutory 3½ percent, where construction is financed by the Government, was held for further consideration.

Other spurs to vessel construction enacted were H.R. 6888 (S. 2473) to redefine the term "citizens of the United States" as it appears in the shipping and vessel documentation statutes in order to resolve conflict in interpretation by the Government agencies involved; and S. 2013, to permit additional time for commitment of funds for construction of vessels for the sadly depleted coastwise trades. H.R. 6888 permits a "citizen" corporation to have a minority representation among its managing directors, and makes possible free participation in construction and financing of vessels by certain large corporations formerly unable to participate freely.

The urgent need for increased scientific knowledge and data concerning the Nation's shorelines and offshore waters, in the interest of national security, was recognized by committee introduction and favorable action on two bills, S. 2483 and S. 2482, to provide greater flexibility in the performance of the functions of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The shipping companies using the Panama Canal were aided by enactment of H.R. 4328, which relieves the Panama Canal Company of annual interest payments approximating $250,000 on an emergency fund never used, thus reducing the base amount of the Government's canal investment on which toll payments are based.

Other major matters given consideration by the subcommittee, but held over for further study and action in 1960 were:

Pilotage on the Great Lakes.

Nuclear icebreaker for the Coast Guard, as well as development of nuclear propulsion for commercial vessels.

Amendment of the Merchant Marine Act with regard to foreign holdings of operators receiving or applying for operating differential subsidy.

Licensing of ocean freight forwarders.

Authorizing increased construction subsidies.

Exchange of older vessels for more modern vessels from the reserve fleet.

Status of faculty and staff of the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

The subcommittee also gave thorough attention to the meeting at the State Department in June of foreign government representatives complaining of this Government's maritime policies in aid of shipping. Prior to the meeting, a committee member and staff representative visited England for talks on the matter, and the committee staff participated actively in meetings with State Department people to prepare the U.S. position. It is felt that the meeting with the foreign representatives was helpful toward resolving at least some of the foreign misunderstanding of our shipping policies.

The President vetoed H.R. 8728 (S. 2598). The Federal Boating Act of 1958 set up a numbering system for boats of more than 10 horsepower, with authorization to the States to have their own numbering system—subject to Federal approval for the sake of uniformity. Under the act, such State systems had to be in effect April 1, 1960. Your committee was informed some States could not meet that deadline, so the legislation that was vetoed was introduced and passed. It would have extended the date to April 1, 1961.

This subcommittee, with respect to its jurisdiction over fisheries and wildlife, held hearings in Alaska, Seattle, Wash., and in the District of Columbia. During the recess, additional hearings are scheduled in Alaska, Oregon, and Idaho.

S. 1391, to amend and clarify the Black Bass Act, and S. 1575, to continue research on the effects on wildlife of the use of insecticides, were reported, passed by the Congress and signed by the President.

S. 1262, to inaugurate a research program to increase game and sport fishing in reservoirs and dams; S. 1576, to establish a salt water research laboratory; S. 2053, to authorize the Fish and Wildlife Service to accept a fish hatchery from the State of South Carolina; S. 2578 (H.R. 5421) to provide $5 million per year for 3 years to assist in modernizing our fishing fleet; and S. 2632, to assist Delaware and New Jersey to develop a strain of disease-resistant oysters, were all reported to, and passed by, the Senate.

S. 2086, to establish a National Wildlife Disease Laboratory, was reported to the Senate, but no action was taken before the end of the session.

Our Communications Subcommittee, chaired by Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, held extensive hearings on more than 20 bills and 3 resolutions, involving various phases of the communicaitons industry, ranging from a bill that would permit the merger of international telegraph and marine carriers to expediting and accelerating the development of educational television.

Two of the bills were enacted into law. First, S. 2424, amends the Communications Act so as to exempt from section 315 of the Communications Act, the so-called equal opportunity provision involving legally qualified candidates for public office, bona fide newscasts, news interviews, news documentaries and on-the-spot coverage of news; the second was Senate Joint Resolution 47, that authorized certain communication activities at the IX Plenary Assembly of the International Radio Consultative Committee, held in the United States in April 1959.

S. 1735, to repeal the section of the Communications Act which permits the Comsioners to receive an honorarium for making speeches or writing materials for publication; S. 1736, to eliminate the requirement of an oath or affirmation on certain documents filed with the FCC; S. 1737, to authorize the imposition of fines for certain violations of the rules and regulations of the FCC in the common carrier safety and special service fields; S. 1738, to amend section 5(c) of the Communications Act so as to redefine the duties and functions of the Commission's review staff; S. 1740, to amend section 202(b) of the Communications Act so as to give the FCC legislative authority to regulate charges and services of common carriers for the use of microwave and other point-to-point circuits, along with the use of wires in chain broadcasting or incidental to radio communication of any kind (the FCC's present authority in this respect is now limited to the use of wires under section 202(b)); and S. 1898, to amend section 309(c), the so-called protest provision of the Communications Act, which permits a party to protest a grant that is made without a hearing (the proposed amendment would provide a pregrant hearing procedure in order to eliminate the present hearing procedures that result only after a grant is made without a hearing), were all reported to, and passed by the Senate.

S. 1734 would amend the Communications Act so as to prohibit any person, as well as the staff of the General Counsel, Office of the Chief Engineer, and those who participate in a case of adjudication designated for hearing by the Commission, from directly or indirectly making any presentation respecting such case to the Commission, or any member thereof, any hearing examiner, any assistant to a Commissioner or any member of the review staff, unless all parties to the case were duly notified and given a chance to participate. This bill was reported to the Senate, but remained on the calendar at the end of the session.

Extensive hearings were held by the subcommittee on the community antenna television and booster problem, which resulted in two bills. S. 1886, which was limited to the so-called booster problem, passed the Senate and is now awaiting action in the House. S. 2653, a bill which would place the community antenna television systems under the jurisdiction of the FCC is presently pending on the Senate calendar. These bills are the final result of the hearings held by the committee last session with regard to the problem of bringing television to small communities.

Your committee held hearings on S. 12, cosponsored by Senators MAGNUSON and SCHOEPPEL, which would expedite the utilization of television in our public schools and colleges. This bill was unanimously reported and passed by the Senate early in the session. The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee after holding hearings on the bill voted to conduct a field study during the recess period.

Your committee has received two interim reports from the FCC with regard to its progress in the so-called television allocations problem. We have been following this subject for some time, hoping that the FCC would submit some final recommendations. For one reason or another, such as awaiting the report of the Technical Allocations Study Organization, created by the Commission, and its negotiations with the Military Establishment, final recommendations have not been made. The committee hopes to hold further open hearings on this subject with the purpose of resolving the difficult UHF-VHF allocations as quickly as possible.

Extensive hearings were held on proposed legislation which would permit the merger of international telegraph and marine carriers. Many suggestions for amendments were made during these hearings and a

second committee print has been prepared incorporating some of these suggestions. This print has been submitted to the Government agencies and interested parties for comments. The committee proposes to act on this legislation one way or another as soon after the second session convenes as is possible.

Last year our Aviation Subcommittee headed by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, completely rewrote the laws governing civil aviation. The result was a new, unified Federal Aviation Agency headed by a civilian administrator with complete control over our airspace and air traffic. The act was approved August 23, 1958, with most of its provisions becoming effective 60 days later.

Many amendments to this act were suggested during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, but your committee took the position that a longer look at this new law should be taken before changes were made. We have done just that, and plan hearings and resulting action during the second session.

S. 1, a bill to extend the Federal Airport Act, as passed by the Senate, would have increased the amount of matching funds available to the States for airport construction. The House decreased the amount of authorized funds, and with a deadlocked conference, the old act was merely extended 2 years. Your committee is convinced of the inadequacy of existing law, but is now of the opinion that no real improvement can be made until the next Congress.

S. 1368, a bill to facilitate the financing of new jet and turboprop aircraft was reported, and became law. Under existing law, mortgages on separate propellers could not be registered. Today a modern propeller can cost as much as $25,000. With an estimated expenditure of $4 billion for fleet modernization in the next 3 years, this additional protection for holders of security interests will aid in the financing of the new air fleet. Further, this bill exempted from liability arising out of the operations of aircraft, those persons whose sole interest in the aircraft or its parts was a mortgage or security interest.

Legislation authorizing interstate compacts for the development and operation of airports, use of certified mail by the Federal Aviation Agency, and the transfer of certain historic buildings on the Chantilly Airport site to the Fairfax County Park Authority of Virginia was recommended, and became law. The Congress also enacted legislation to make eligible our two new States, Alaska and Hawaii, to receive allocations from the discretionary fund provided for in the Federal Airport Act.

Various other matters were considered in open committee hearings, and the Subcommittee on Aviation is continuing its careful appraisal of the impact of Military Air Transport Service on our commercial carriers.

During the 85th Congress our Surface Transportation Subcommittee, under the leadership of Senator GEORGE A. SMATHERS, recommended, and the Congress enacted, the first major amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act since 1940 (Transportation Act of 1958). The effectiveness of the new act has been under continued study, with hearings at which representatives of both the carriers and the agencies testified. Hearings were also held on many proposed amendments, the most important of which follow:

BILLS INVOLVING COMMON OWNERSHIP OF VARIOUS FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION

S. 452 would forbid common ownership between various forms of transportation, and would make it unlawful for groups of employees in one segment of the transportation industry to participate with, or support activities of, groups of employees in separate segment of transportation industry to interrupt normal operation of separate segment.

Diametrically opposed to S. 452, as far as common ownership of transportation agencies is concerned, are the following:

S. 1358 would allow ownership of motor carriers under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act by other forms of transportation;

S. 1354 would amend the Federal Aviation Act to remove restrictions against carriers other than air carriers engaging in the business of an air carrier;

S. 1355 would allow ownership of water carriers under part III of the Interstate Commerce Act by other forms of transportation; and

S. 2189 would allow freight forwarders to acquire control of common carriers subject to parts I, II, and III of the Interstate Commerce Act.

BILLS INVOLVING AMENDMENTS OF THE TRAIN DISCONTINUANCE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN SECTION 13a OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

S. 1331, under the present law where States have jurisdiction, trains and ferries operating across State lines may be discontinued by filing a 30-day notice by a railroad, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission orders an investigation, in which case ICC may direct continuance of trains involved for as much as 4 months. After completion of hearing, in which burden of proof is on those wanting trains continued, and upon making necessary findings, the Commission may order the trains continued for a period of up to 1 year. (Trains and ferries operating intrastate are within jurisdiction of the State regulatory body but the railroad may file a petition with the Interstate Commerce Commission if discontinuance is refused by a State body or is not acted upon within 120 days.)

S. 1331 would, on trains or ferries crossing State lines:

1. Require obtaining certificate of public convenience and necessity from either a State body or ICC, thus eliminating jurisdictional "no man's land" caused by giving ICC jurisdiction over passenger trains only where States exercise it.

2. Make hearing mandatory; hearing now discretionary with ICC.

3. Shift burden of proof to carrier; now on those wishing train continued.

4. Give ICC authority to continue train for unlimited time while investigation is conducted, to replace present limit of 4 months.

5. Eliminate 1-year limit on ICC orders of continuance after investigation completed.

6. Allow ICC to impose conditions in connection with discontinuance of service which includes conditions to protect employment of railroad workers whose jobs are adversely affected by discontinuance of trains.

S. 1450, a bill to modify section 13a(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act to require institution of an investigation by ICC of each notice of proposed discontinuance of train or ferry and would eliminate the 4-month limitation on the period the train can be ordered continued while the investigation is being conducted.

BILLS THAT WOULD GIVE THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH COMPENSATION TO BE PAID FOR THE USE OF FREIGHT CARS

S. 1789, S. 1811, and S. 1812. These bills would give the Interstate Commerce Commission additional authority to take into account elements other than the bare costs of ownership of a freight car in establishing per diem rates for freight car use. The purpose is to overcome the decision of *Palmer v. U.S.* (75 F. Supp. 63 (1947)) in which a three judge Federal court held use of word "compensation" in section 1(14)(a) of Interstate Commerce Act precludes the Interstate Commerce Commission from establishing per diem charges in excess of the bare cost of car ownership to owning railroads. Senator SCHOEPPEL held field hearings on this legislation, and S. 1789 was reported favorably by the committee. It is now pending on the Senate Calendar.

BILLS INVOLVING ALASKA TRANSPORTATION

S. 1507, to make Interstate Commerce Act applicable to for hire water carriers operating between ports of Alaska and ports of other States.

S. 2451, to establish a joint board (composed of members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Maritime Board, and Civil Aeronautics Board) and to require mandatory through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and other States.

S. 2452, is the same as S. 2451 except it would make permissive rather than mandatory the filing of through rates and joint rates.

S. 1508, to provide for Interstate Commerce Commission regulation of the Alaska Railroad.

S. 1509, to provide "grandfather" rights for motor carriers and freight forwarders operating within Alaska and between Alaska and other States and for water carriers operating within Alaska. This bill was passed by the Senate and is now pending in the House.

S. 2514, to make the Alaska Railroad a Government corporation.

BILLS INVOLVING TRANSPORTATION SAFETY

S. 1806, to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act, would (1) bring radioactive materials and etiologic agents (live viruses such as polio vaccine) under the act; (2) bring contract and private carriers under the act—make them subject to maximum penalty of $10,000 and 10 years imprisonment rather than the maximum penalty of $500 provided under section 222(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act; (3) tighten up packing requirements for shippers submitting material covered by the act to carriers for transportation; (4) redefine "knowingly" in the act to mean violations by anyone "knowing" that the ICC has outstanding a set of regulations for the transportation of explosives. (The Federal courts have held that "knowingly" at present means "knowingly" violating the Commission's safety regulations.)

S. 1806 was approved by the Senate and is pending in the House.

S. 1964, to amend the Accident Reports Act to require that all injuries on railroads shall be reported; this standard would replace the present ICC standard that a reportable accident is one that causes workers to be absent from their jobs for 72 hours; would require that accidents be reported in all departments of railroads rather than injuries limited to actual operation of the trains as presently required by ICC regulation.

S. 1425, to give the ICC authority over rules and regulations for operation of railroad track motor cars.

In addition, hearings were held on S. 2417, a bill that would repeal the future application of the second proviso of section 206(a)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act that now allows obtaining the right to participate in interstate and foreign commerce by an intrastate carrier upon registration of a State certificate with ICC; present rights of carriers now operating would be protected; but in the future intrastate carriers wishing to participate in interstate and foreign commerce would be required to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity from the ICC.

For some time I have been deeply concerned over our lag in studies of the oceans. Such studies, I believe, are vital to our defense, to the operations of our fisheries, to our commerce and navigation, and to our knowledge of factors affecting our weather and climate. Accordingly, I introduced Sen-

ate Resolution 136, which recommends a major expansion of ocean research and surveys; construction of scientific ships and laboratories to replace old and obsolete existing vessels, and Federal encouragement in the training of oceanographic scientists. This resolution was cosponsored by all members of your committee and by Senator JACKSON, and was adopted without dissent by the Senate on July 15, 1959.

To carry out the recommendations of Senate Resolution 136, on September 11, 1959, I introduced S. 2692, which would establish a comprehensive 10-year program of ocean research and surveys, aid the national defense, and authorize the construction of research and survey ships and facilities. Your committee has held informal hearings, at which five members of the Committee on Oceanography of the National Academy of Sciences—National Resource Council testified. The bill was cosponsored by Senators SCHOEPPEL, BARTLETT, YARBOROUGH, CASE, ENGLE, SCOTT, MCGEE, and BUTLER, all members of the committee, and by Senators HART, SMITH, and CLARK. In addition to the purposes I have mentioned, the bill proposes systematic studies of effects of radioactive materials in marine environments and would authorize appropriations. The appropriations to be authorized by the bill, which is entitled "Marine Sciences and Research Act of 1959," would be in addition to all other appropriations provided for the various departments, agencies, bureaus, and offices engaged in similar or identical functions.

This is very important legislation, and we hope to bring it to the floor during the second session of this Congress.

Your committee held hearings on six bills to amend the Federal Power Act, of which S. 2263 and S. 2264 were reported to and passed by the Senate.

S. 2263 would exempt hydroelectric projects under 2,000 horsepower from certain licensing provisions of the Federal Power Act. The bill actually raises this limitation from 100 horsepower. S. 2264 would prohibit the abandonment or curtailment of interstate electric power sale or transmission without approval of the Federal Power Commission. This bill would bring the Federal Power Act in line with the Natural Gas Act.

Of the other bills, the most important are S. 1762 and S. 2262. This legislation is designed to enable the comprehensive use of an entire river basin to the advantage of all hydroelectric power users and producers. It is claimed that in the Columbia River Basin alone this type of operation would yield over 500,000 kilowatts of additional firm capacity. Senator ENGLE conducted the hearings, and the committee has asked for additional facts and statistics that may require additional hearings.

Senator HARTKE conducted hearings for your committee on S. 1283, a bill to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use. The evidence produced at the hearing was, to say the least, shocking. We were told that yearly deaths from the substances this bill would regulate amount to approximately 5,000 more than all of the so-called dread diseases such as scarlet fever, meningitis, polio, and diphtheria combined.

I have long been interested in this problem, and am happy to report that, as a result of our hearings, industry and government are now in substantial agreement on this legislation. I anticipate the committee will report a clean bill next session.

We also held hearings on S. 1787, a bill to protect the consumer by requiring the labeling of any decorative hardwood product. This bill, with respect to certain hardwood products, is along the lines of the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Fur Products Labeling Act, and the Textile Labeling Act. More work is necessary on this legislation before further action can be taken.

In keeping with its general responsibility for matters pertaining to foreign as well as domestic commerce, your committee initiated a comprehensive study of the foreign trade of the United States. At the close of the session, a staff of specialists had been assembled, and the study was well underway. An interim report is expected to be ready for presentation to the Congress shortly after the opening of the next session.

The aim of the study is to identify and examine the trends and forces affecting our commercial relations with other countries of the world and to evaluate the significance of current changes in terms of the long-range interests of the United States. In its first phase the study will concentrate on U.S. exports with an exploration of the competitive position of U.S. products in world markets. Subsequently, it will turn to the question of imports in relation both to the domestic economy and to the possible expansion of export markets; the effect of common markets and free trade zones of American foreign commerce; the significance of U.S. investment in foreign production; implications of the Sino-Soviet trade expansion program and related questions.

In light of the fact that foreign trade presently accounts for some 8 percent of the gross national product of the United States and that its continued expansion is regarded as essential to the continuing prosperity of our domestic economy, the committee attaches more than ordinary importance to this study. An intensive look at the total picture of changing world trade patterns since the war may reveal opportunities to strengthen the American position without detriment to the position of our world trade partners whose economic welfare in the long run is vital to our own.

The study of transportation authorized by Senate Resolution 29 and expanded by Senate Resolution 151 has been started, and an initial study group has been assembled. It has been recognized for several years that an overall look at transportation in the light of current and projected conditions was imperative. This was again emphasized during the hearings which preceded the Transportation Act of 1958. Transportation—second only to agriculture in the Nation's industry—is too vital to our economy and our defense to permit its ability to serve the Nation to deteriorate.

In its first phase, the study will explore and evaluate what has been done in this field. Information is being accumulated from all available sources including industry and the various Government departments. Subsequently, the study will explore the actual implementation of the national transportation policy vis-a-vis the intent contained therein and the inconsistencies that may exist between the policy and specific examples of legislation and/or regulation.

We must keep before us at all times the thought that each mode of transportation should develop according to its inherent advantages—present or potential. It must be our aim that regulation and Federal aid be administered equitably toward the best good of our entire Nation. We must maintain a flexibility that will facilitate adjustment to the constantly changing economic and technological situation.

Toward these objectives the following study concept was developed. It will be expanded or restricted as the study progresses.

I. Background analysis: The examination of basic considerations in such areas as public interest, social investment, competition, monopoly, and the question of more or less public participation in regulation and aid.

II. Studies in areas and methods of regulation: Regulation by independent commissions, evaluation of administrative policy, possible areas of reduced, extended, or clarified control.

III. Studies in the area of public aid: Public investment and coordination of aid programs.

IV. Studies in equity and transportation policy: Various proposals dealing with allocation and recoupment of costs of public facilities used by commercial interests.

V. Special problems: Examination of specific areas such as rail passenger deficit, commuter and rural service, defense requirements.

Studies are also in process at the Department of Commerce, and they will be examined prior to our proceeding so as to avoid areas of duplication. The Secretary of Commerce has promised complete cooperation.

Your committee anticipates a busy session in 1960.

Statement by Senator Humphrey on S. 950, the So-Called Jukebox Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on S. 950, the so-called jukebox bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I have recently been in receipt of communications from residents of my State expressing their views on S. 950, the so-called jukebox bill, introduced by the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and a group of his colleagues, including myself. Perhaps it may be of assistance to the Members of this body if I comment on the status of this proposed legislation.

Last year, a similar bill, after approval by the appropriate Federal agencies including the Department of State and the Register of Copyrights, was favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The committee report—No. 2414, 85th Congress, 2d session—fully set forth the background of this measure, together with the arguments of both proponents and opponents.

In the past few weeks, under the leadership of the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee [Mr. CELLER], sponsor of a similar measure in the House, meetings have been held between the proponents and opponents of the bill—that is, between representatives of the owners of the musical property and representatives of the jukebox operators and manufacturers. At these meetings, attempts have been made to work out not only the matter of suitable compensation to composers and other copyright owners for the use of their musical property in jukeboxes, but also technical details, including procedures for surveying use of music used in jukeboxes, collecting royalty fees, and the like.

The able chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Copyrights [Mr. O'MAHONEY] recently expressed his hope that in the improved climate now existing, "means may be found whereby the composers who give the Nation its songs may receive the just rewards of their genius and efforts."

I join in the Senator's hopeful outlook, so characteristic of his courage and opti-

mism. The meetings which have been held and which are to continue may soon result in a meeting of minds between the users of music used in jukeboxes and the owners of that music.

The principal legal authorities of the country, as well as the Federal agencies concerned, have made it clear that as a matter of simple justice and equity, the composers are entitled to a reasonable fee for the commercial use of their music in jukeboxes—which for 50 years have been exempt from payment under the antiquated copyright law of 1909. After the careful study made last session by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the hearings held both in the Senate and the House, the question is no longer whether jukeboxes, alone among all commercial users in the Nation, should continue uniquely to benefit from an exemption which in effect accords them a special privilege. Clearly, jukeboxes should be treated exactly like all other commercial users.

The question, as I say, resolves itself not down to "whether," but merely down to "how" and "how much." As I have said, it is my hope that discussions between the interested parties will shortly clarify the matter of rates and procedures. At all events, I firmly believe that the Senate should remove the jukebox exemption, especially as today's large and modern jukebox industry does not seem to me to merit in any way the special privilege accorded it almost accidentally by a law enacted 50 years ago, intended to apply to conditions of that era, and not to electronic mass users of musical property today.

Significant Small-Business Legislation Passed by the 86th Congress, 1st Session

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks by me concerning small-business legislation passed by the 86th Congress, 1st session.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Only a few years ago Mark Twain's well-known comment about the weather was often paraphrased to express the thought that "everyone talks about small business, but no one ever does anything about it."

That observation is now seldom heard because it is no longer in accord with fact. In recent years, the Congress has demonstrated its awareness of the peculiar problems of small business and has acted through noteworthy legislation to assist small firms.

At the conclusion of the 85th Congress, it was my pleasure to insert in the RECORD a summary of laws enacted by that Congress, the primary purpose of which was to help our nationwide community of over 4 million small-business firms remain as competitive factors within our free enterprise system.

The most important enactments of the 85th Congress in behalf of small business, it will be recalled, were passage of the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act, the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and various statutes which, taken together, were calculated to increase the share of small concerns in Government purchases. Had none of these laws been passed, however, the action of the 85th Congress in making the Small Business Administration a permanent agency of the Government would, of itself, have marked a significant milestone in the growing acknowledgment of small business as a vital element of our national economy.

This good work was carried forward during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

For example, the Congress responded with sympathetic understanding and quick action to complaints from many small businessmen that two U.S. Supreme Court decisions handed down in February would increase their liability to multistate taxation of that portion of their business carried on in interstate commerce. What alarmed thousands upon thousands of small businessmen, and especially those who merely send traveling salesmen into neighboring States or who conduct mail order businesses across State lines, was the not-ungrounded apprehension that the 36 States and some 8 cities already taxing interstate commerce would intensify their efforts to collect revenue from out-of-State concerns. Added to this was the fear, subsequently justified, that additional States would be encouraged to tax the income of foreign companies.

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Frankfurter summed up the feelings of the business community when he stated: "It will not, I believe, be gainsaid that there are thousands of relatively small or moderate size corporations doing exclusively interstate business spread over several States. To subject these corporations to a separate income tax in each of these States means that they will have to keep books, make returns, store records, and engage local counsel, all to meet the divers and variegated tax laws of 49 States, with their different times for filing returns, different tax structure, different modes of determining 'net income' and different, often conflicting formulas of apportionment."

Justice Frankfurter went on to say that "this will involve large increases in bookkeeping, accounting, and legal paraphernalia to meet these new demands. The cost of such a farflung scheme for complying with the taxing requirements of the different States may well exceed the burden of the taxes themselves, especially in the case of small companies doing a small volume of business in several States."

On April 8 the Senate Small Business Committee held public hearings on this problem. A second hearing was held on May 1, in Boston. In all, the opinions of more than 80 businessmen, trade association representatives, accountants, and tax experts were received by the committee.

On June 25, 15 members of the committee cosponsored a joint resolution I introduced on June 25 designed to bring about more uniformity in the application of State statutes dealing with the taxation of out-of-State corporations.

In its essential particulars, Senate Joint Resolution 113 was similar to Public Law 86-272, which was approved on September 14, 1959.

Public Law 86-272 limits the power of States to tax certain income derived from interstate commerce by granting tax immunity where the only business activity in a State by an out-of-State company is solicitation of sales. To secure such immunity, the orders resulting from sales solicitation must be sent out of the taxing jurisdiction for approval or rejection and shipment of the goods so ordered must be made from outside of the taxing State. This covers traveling salesmen, who merely solicit orders in interstate commerce, mail-order houses, and also independent contractors such as brokers, who may solicit orders for several out-of-State firms.

By this last provision, when an independent contractor maintains an office within a State, an out-of-State concern selling through that contractor is not subject to an income tax at the point of solicitation.

Title II of Public Law 86-272 also calls for a broad study of taxation of interstate commerce by the Senate Finance Committee and the House Judiciary Committee. The committees will report to Congress with proposals for such additional legislation as may be indicated by July 1, 1962.

The passage of this particular legislation illustrates how sensitive and responsive the Congress has become to the needs of our Nation's small businessmen. It does not, as we know, stand alone as an example of how the 1st session of the 86th Congress demonstrated its alert interest in the problems of small business.

In Public Law 86-376, Congress took steps to make its 1958 small business tax concessions more useful. Section 2 of this act, an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, provides, with specific application to community property States, that in determining the number of shareholders of a small business, a husband and wife owning stock jointly shall be counted as one shareholder. The reason for this amendment was that under the Small Business Tax Adjustment Act of 1958, a corporation with 10 or fewer stockholders may elect to be taxed as a partnership. Formerly, many owners of small firms in community property States were excluded from taking advantage of this option.

Public Law 86-376 also contains an amendment to the Small Business Investment Act which exempts small business investment companies from the personal holding company surtax. This will make it possible for investment companies providing long-term and equity capital for small firms to be formed by family interests and other small groups of investors.

A significant reform of a long time inequity in the field of taxation was another accomplishment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. Under present excise tax laws, independent wholesalers, distributors, and jobbers have been put at a serious financial disadvantage compared with their larger integrated competitors. This has arisen, since many excise tax payments become due when the first sale is made; therefore, independents have become liable for excises when they purchase their supplies from the refiner or manufacturer, while the integrated producer often pays no taxes until he sells his product to the ultimate consumer. Under a provision of Public Law 86-342, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959, jobbers and other independent distributors of gasoline are given the same treatment as refiners and are not liable for taxation on their stocks until sold. This not only frees a large monetary investment previously tied up in taxes, but it also prevents the distributors from being taxed on gasoline spilled or lost through evaporation. In summary, this new law brings a much greater degree of equity between the independent wholesaler and the major oil company which is both his supplier and his competitor. During the coming year, I shall press for legislation bringing this same degree of rationality and fairness to other segments of our economy, such as independent tire dealers, which are also burdened by these Federal excise taxes.

In the antitrust field, headway was made with the passage of a bill I introduced, S. 726, which became Public Law 86-144. This law was designed to end the cumbersome and time-consuming procedures which had been necessary to achieve enforcement of cease-and-desist orders issued by the Federal Trade Commission and other regulatory agencies under section 11 of the Clayton Act. In brief, this law provides that such orders

become effective within 60 days, unless the orders are appealed to the courts.

In addition, amendments to the Small Business Act of 1958 provided authorization for an additional $75 million to the Small Business Administration's lending authority and make it possible for that agency's appropriations to be used, beyond 1960, for management aid programs.

Taken all in all, the session of Congress just ended continued to build upon the groundwork of small business legislation which was laid by the 85th Congress. This is not to say, however, that every needed legislative aim was achieved. Much remains to be done to lessen the impact of taxes on small firms and to sharpen the tools of antitrust enforcement.

I feel confident that the second session of the 86th Congress will address itself with determination to carry forward the good work so well begun.

Appropriate legislative committees and the Small Business Committees of the Senate and House have accomplished substantial preliminary work in the form of hearings and reports on measures calculated to improve the competitive position of small firms. Many such bills have already started on their legislative journey and will carry over into the second session. For that reason, I am hopeful that final congressional action on these bills may be taken early in 1960.

Special Citation to the United States Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the maintenance of highest standards of sanitation is an attainment of greatest importance to the general public, especially to that segment of our people who utilize seagoing transportation. For this reason, I bring to the attention of the Congress the exceptional record of the United States Lines, which has just resulted in the award of a special citation of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This citation has been presented for the third year following inspections showing an earned rating of 95 or better upon official Public Health Service inspections of each of the 58 vessels of this company.

Gen. John M. Franklin is president of United States Lines, and his creditable record of service encompasses notable performance not only in overall direction of this company's operations but also in important assignments accepted at the request of the President and Cabinet officers. He is acknowledged as one of the foremost executives of the maritime industry of the world.

Remarkable is the achievement earning this year's special attainment because it followed the most careful inspections of 166 separate items of sanitary construction and maintenance. Previous citations to this company were awarded in January 1957 and 1958.

The successful operations of United States Lines ships involved cover calls at ports in Europe, the Far East, and Australia, and at all east coast and gulf ports in the United States.

Statue of Liberty Feted at Birthday Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my good friend, Conrad Vuocolo, on the excellent job he is doing in his capacity as director of the tenant relations program of the Jersey City, N.J., Housing Authority, as well as to call attention to a special activity he conducted.

Part of the authority's tenant relations program is to provide summer activities of worthwhile interests for the youngsters housed in the project. These activities are designed to inculcate the principles of American democracy. Accordingly, a trip to the Statue of Liberty was arranged for August 5, 1959, the 75th anniversary of the laying of the pedestal for the statue. The statue was actually completed in Paris on July 4, 1884, and the pedestal was laid here in America on August 5 of that year.

In order to provide an incentive, the authority sponsored a name-the-States-and-their-capitals contest. When the children were being taken to the statue, they insisted on bringing the lady a birthday present and chipped in with their pennies to purchase a 5-carat "diamond" ring at Woolworth's. This emulated contributions of French children 60 years ago who chipped in and helped pay for the statue.

Following is an account of the incident as related in the Jersey Journal of Jersey City, N.J., of August 6. 1959:

MISS LIBERTY NOT FORGOTTEN BY JERSEY CITY KIDS

Ninety-six youngsters from Jersey City's nine housing projects threw a birthday party yesterday for a 75-year-old lady, whose birthday everyone else forgot.

They presented the lady, the Statue of Liberty, with a 5-carat "diamond" ring, paid for with pennies they had contributed.

The diamond was the only thing artificial about the ceremonies conducted at the national monument on Liberty Island.

John Cupo, 9, of 332 Duncan Avenue, presented the ring to Newell H. Foster, superintendent, and Thomas M. Pitkin, supervising park historian.

Cupo represented the 96 children, chosen from the projects' 10,000 kids on a name-the-States-and-their-capitals contest.

Their heads bristling with State capitals, and all dressed in their Sunday best, the children heard Park Superintendent Foster say he was "most elated that the children * * * saw fit to emulate the contributions of French children 80 years ago who chipped in and helped pay for the statue."

Pitkin congratulated Conrad J. Vuocolo, director of tenant relations for the housing agency, and indicated that the Jersey City group was the only group to honor the lady on her 75th birthday.

The Jersey City Housing Authority is to be congratulated on its active sponsorship and participation in the many worthwhile projects for its tenants.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars Endorse the Cold War GI Bill—Comdr. Louis G. Feldmann and All the Members Are Due Congratulations for This Service to Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Veterans of Foreign Wars is the oldest of our great national veterans' organizations. Composed of those who have carried our country's wars to the enemy shores, it is nevertheless gratifying to see that their aims and ideals are not solely to glorify their past heroism, but to work for a better future for all. At their recent 1959 national convention in Los Angeles, the Veterans of Foreign Wars passed a resolution supporting S. 1138, the bill that would allow cold war veterans many of the readjustment benefits received by the veterans of World War II and Korea. The Veterans of Foreign Wars has wisely recognized that the young men presently entering service during our continuation of the compulsory draft laws are in great need of assistance for continuing their education and buying homes upon their return from service. This helping them to help themselves is the wisest and soundest form of veterans' program yet proposed.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars is due congratulations for their recognition and endorsement; it is the type of recognition of the Nation's No. 1 domestic problem—adequate education—that is winning for the Veterans of Foreign Wars an increasing awareness of its great role in building a stronger America. I am proud of my comrades in the Veterans of Foreign Wars; I am proud of my membership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 242

Resolution to support S. 1138, to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who served in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955 and July 1, 1963

Whereas the needs of national defense and of the cold war have required the continued existence of the compulsory military service law; and

Whereas young men and women entering the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, are not under existing law entitled to any readjustment assistance at the end of their tours of military service; and

Whereas the U.S. Senate (86th Cong., 1st sess.) passed the bill S. 1138 to provide a

program of readjustment assistance for persons entering the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, which bill is now pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the bill S. 1138 provides educational assistance, vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with service connected disabilities, and home and farm loan assistance for persons entering the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955; and

Whereas the bill S. 1138 makes appropriate distinctions between wartime service and today's service by providing that (1) more than 180 days must be served on active duty in order to qualify for assistance under the bill, in contrast to the 90-day service period provided in the Korean GI bill; (2) a veteran with a service connected disability of less than 30 percent must clearly show that such disability has caused a "pronounced employment handicap" in order to qualify for vocational rehabilitation training; (3) a loan guarantee fee of one-half of 1 percent of the loan amount will be charged on home and farm loan transactions, and placed in a special fund to cover losses that might arise on loans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 60th National Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That we wholeheartedly endorse and strongly urge the early enactment of S. 1138 by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That our national legislative service be instructed and empowered vigorously to support the bill S. 1138, and to take such action as may be necessary to secure its early passage by the Congress of the United States, and have its provisions made a part of our public laws; and be it further.

Resolved, That our national legislative service be given discretion to oppose the loan feature of the educational program of S. 1138, if after due consideration and staff study it determines that adherence to the principles of Public Law 550 would be in the best interest of veterans and of the Nation.

Report on 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 86th Congress comes to an end, I would like to review, for the benefit of my constituents, some of its accomplishments.

It has been a long and hard-working session. It has been a session which encountered the problems that are bound to arise when a government is divided with one party in control of the executive department and the other party in control of Congress.

But the length and the work and the difficulties are only incidental to the really important fact so far as the American people are concerned. The basic reality is that, though in some instances Congress has not stood sufficiently firm in meeting the Presidential veto or threat of veto of good and needed legislation, particularly in the housing, labor, area redevelopment, and social security fields, nevertheless this has been, in my opinion, a productive session in terms of national needs.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

The most controversial and heated piece of legislation to reach the floor of the House in years was the labor-management reform bill. Pressure was brought to bear upon the whole Congress, and was accentuated through mass media by the President, the Senate Rackets Committee and prolabor and antilabor forces. As a result, Congress was beseiged by carloads of mail and the Capitol was crowded with hundreds of lobbyists and pressure groups. Labor-management reform was supported almost unanimously by Congress, but how to effect remedial legislation that would clear corrupt elements out of unions without imposing punitive measures on all unions caused much heated disputation on the bills.

The Senate passed the Kennedy-Ervin labor-management reform bill on August 25, 1959, by a vote of 90 to 1. When the legislation reached the floor of the House, the committee bill was sidetracked, and the Landrum-Griffin bill was substituted.

I opposed the Landrum-Griffin bill in the House because, in addition to containing some good and needed provisions for ridding labor unions of racketeers and protecting the rank and file workers from abuses, it also contained amendments to the Taft-Hartley law and other provisions, which would clearly injure the legitimate union movement and make it more difficult and almost impossible for the unions to organize in areas where labor was not yet organized. It is my belief that this fact is the reason many of the southern Democrats supported the Landrum-Griffin bill in the belief that with cheap unorganized labor in the South, the chances of inducing industry to move from States like Michigan, in the North, would increase.

I supported the moderate and effective committee bill, which was defeated in the House, but when the House and Senate conferees agreed on a modified version of the House bill, with at least some of the objectionable features removed, together with the rest of my Michigan Democratic colleagues, I voted in favor of the conference report, knowing that this was the last opportunity to get any kind of a labor-management reform bill out of Congress. It is my belief that failure of Congress to carry out this responsibility might well have touched off a wave of anti-labor sentiment that could have set back the cause of unionism.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

The last week of Congress was highlighted by the drive for adjournment. Congress, for the third time this session, passed an omnibus housing bill. The President vetoed the first two, and as we adjourned, has not acted upon the third bill. It is my hope that the President signs this bill or many Federal housing projects, including urban renewal, will be eliminated or drastically curtailed for lack of funds. As Congressman RAINS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, said on the floor of the House, the first housing bill was the best bill; the second was a good one; and the third compromise legislation was a fair one.

It was indeed sad to see neither the first nor the second bill receive the President's signature when they were pared down by congressional leaders in order to fit the needs of the country without overtaxing the economy. Representative government is based on the art of compromise, and I feel Congress performed its obligation by reconciling its original request in this field to gain the approval of the administration. In turn, it is my belief that the President failed to meet the Congress halfway, by failing to approve a fair housing bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We live in an age of pushbutton warfare and we are one of the great powers on earth. Another great power, Soviet Russia, through her leaders, has said on numerous occasions that it has the thermonuclear power to destroy the United States within half a day.

Members of Congress, even before this session, have made every effort to determine whether this Nation is adequately prepared to deter Soviet aggression.

The Gaither report, which was kept secret longer than it should have been, said in part:

> The United States is moving in a frightening course to the status of a second-class power.

The Rockefeller report said:

> Unless present trends are reversed, the world balance of power will shift in favor of the Soviet bloc. If that should happen we are not likely to be given another chance to remedy our failings.

Adm. Hyman G. Rickover stated:

> I think it is almost too late. This is what I worry about. * * * Some of my money for fiscal 1958 which was appropriated by Congress several months ago has not yet been made available to me.

Secretary of Defense McElroy said:

> By 1962 the Russians may lead the United States in guided missiles by as much as 3 to 1.

Gen. Thomas Power, Air Force Strategic Commander, stated:

> I think you are just risking the whole country. That is how important I feel it is. The force which is now programed is not adequate because it is not coming fast enough.

Faced with these grim facts, the Congress approved a measure to create a new National Aeronautics and Space Administration with nearly $500 million to spend; extended the draft to 4 years; extended the Renegotiation Act under which the Government recovers excessive profits on defense contracts, and in general did its best to overcome the administration's avowed intention of lagging behind the Soviet Union in long-range missiles and other thermonuclear instruments of war.

National defense is a continuing struggle between those who would economize to a point of national risk and those who recognize the need for a first-class defense even if it means tightening belts.

In January Members of Congress once more will examine the Nation's defense structure with an eye toward further improvements.

CIVIL WORKS

The President vetoed two civil works appropriation bills, but the Congress overrode his second veto.

Civil works measures long have been termed "pork barrel" by cynics of Government. Actually, civil works provides money for flood control and reclamation projects.

There is nothing "pork barrel" about a flood. More than 1,000 urban communities in the United States have been classified as flood-endangered areas. The flood threat is increasing with the expansion of suburban areas.

During the tragic floods of 1955 damage in the United States was estimated at $1 billion, or approximately the total amount of the civil works measure which was approved over the President's veto.

TAXES

Congress extended for 1 year the Korean war corporation taxes and certain excise taxes. The transportation and local telephone taxes were reduced.

New levies were imposed on life insurance companies which will return the Government another estimated $215 million annually.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

It looked for awhile as if the Federal highway program would be faced with a financial roadblock. As a final resort, Congress increased the Federal gas tax from 3 to 4 cents. This tax becomes effective October 1, 1959, and continues for 21 months.

RAILROAD WORKERS

The Congress approved a measure increasing pension and jobless benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts.

VETERANS

Congress provided $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans. Readjusted non-service-connected disability pensions and provided new pensions for widows.

AGRICULTURE

Congress extended the surplus farm products law. Introduced a Federal food stamp plan for needy families in a few trial areas of the country. I regret that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has indicated that he will not put the plan into effect despite the action of Congress.

POSTAL AND BOND INTEREST RATES

Congress declined to increase postage rates or interest rates on long-term Government bonds but did increase rates on E and H series savings bonds to a maximum interest of 4¼ percent.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

A $63 million matching Federal aid to States was approved this session for airport improvements for the fiscal years of 1960 and 1961.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

In this continuing struggle between the free world and the Communist bloc it is necessary for the United States to bolster the economic and military strength of our Allies.

This Congress established a new Inter-American Development Bank to finance projects in Latin America. Congress also boosted U.S. subscription to the World Bank.

A foreign aid measure was approved which included $2.1 billion in military assistance and another approximately $1 billion in economic assistance.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Congress, at the request of President Eisenhower, raised the legal limit of the national debt to $295 billion. The national debt in 1952, when President Eisenhower assumed office, was $265 billion, or roughly $30 billion less than the present amount.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

A 50th State was born this session of Congress with the admission of Hawaii. The borders of the United States now extend northward to within a few miles of Soviet Siberia and into the strategic Pacific.

These are, I believe, the major accomplishments of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. There were, of course, some fields where Congress should have acted, but did not. I shall attempt to discuss them later.

The National Neurological Research Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Government Operations Subcommittee on Reorganization of International Organizations is conducting an international health study. As chairman of the subcommittee I have been impressed again and again with the need for basic medical research, both in the United States and abroad.

In my conversation with Premier Khrushchev last December my proposal for Soviet-American cooperation on new international medical research efforts struck a responsive chord in the Russian leader.

Basic and coordinated medical research is the key to the prevention and the amelioration of many diseases that plague mankind. What sustained research has done for polio, I believe it can do for other dread diseases.

This point was made in an editorial, "Let's Speed Cancer's Defeat," which appeared in the Life magazine on June 6, 1959. The editorial points out the need for both Government and private investment in medical research, noting that "the administration which last year proposed a $10 million cut on all medical research, this year has proposed another cut in cancer research, to hold it to $75 million."

In this field of nongovernmental research, the Life editorial says:

All medical research is obviously interrelated. * * * Diseases themselves may be interrelated. There is an obvious need for the many voluntary agencies to pool their drives for a single fund for medical research alone, letting other drives, such as the United Funds, provide for patient care, therapy, and rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I applaud Life for this emphasis on basic and coordinated research. In this connection I have learned recently of a new voluntary and nonendowed foundation which embodies this very principle. The National Neurological Research Foundation is devoted entirely to coordinated research on the diseases of the central nervous system—multiple sclerosis, muscular dystrophy, Parkinson's syndrome, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and over 300 other interrelated disorders. Established 3 years ago by Mrs. Rodgers Denckla, the National Neurological Research Foundation stimulates fundamental research by providing 5-year postdoctoral fellowships to selected scientists.

The foundation, with headquarters at 3255 N Street NW., Washington 7, D.C., is operated under the direction of an advisory committee of distinguished medical and lay leaders in the neurological world.

In this vast country of ours we need a variety of fund-raising organizations, but I believe there is great merit in Life's suggestion for correcting the present "bewildering series of drives." Life is also right in focusing attention on the neglected area of basic medical research.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Life editorial referred to above.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Life, June 6, 1959]

LET'S SPEED CANCER'S DEFEAT

The men closest to cancer research have now found enough leads to make them think that wholly new means for cancer cure and prevention are possible. They talk of finding a vaccine which may prevent cancer or a chemical which may cure. Since they have already found a number of such things which work on animals—but not on humans—they are tantalized by their progress.

In view of this one might think that a nation—which proved, with the atomic bomb, that it could solve the supposedly "impossible"—would be stepping up its cancer research on all fronts, especially after the tragic end of John Foster Dulles. Yet the administration, which last year proposed a $10 million cut in all medical research, this year has proposed another cut in cancer research, to hold it to $75 million.

By contrast with this sum, we taxpayers this years are spending $155 million on agricultural research, in effect putting the health of the barnyard ahead of the conquest of cancer. No comparison with the $40 billion going into defense to prevent a nuclear war is justified in logic, but the statistical fact that 40 million Americans now living will have cancer, unless it is conquered, does represent a national disaster comparable to the more sudden devastation of a nuclear war.

Fortunately, the House has already increased the cancer appropriation to $83 million. The Senate committee, which now has the bill, is talking of raising it to $110 million, the minimum which experts regard as indispensable. Here are some of the vital needs:

To improve the procedures and methods of the intensive work now going on in chemotherapy. This has already yielded some 20 compounds which temporarily inhibit various forms of cancer, e.g., the lives of leukemic children can now be prolonged for a year or more.

To increase the study of viruses, which are now a chief suspect in cancer. A single virus has already been found which can cause 26 different types of cancer in animals. Since one virus can cause so many, it raises the hope that a single vaccine could prevent them. A Salk-type vaccine has already been found which makes mice immune to a virus causing leukemia.

To broaden the study of hormones, the internal glandular secretions which control growth, reproduction, digestion, and the functioning of all the organs. Evidence links steroid harmones with the cause and progress of cancer. "Imitation" hormones may be able to block the harmful effects of real hormones.

To increase the supply of trained researchers, clinics, research centers, new medical school facilities. Experience has proved that where Federal matching funds are offered, private funds will quickly flow to fill the gap.

Something besides increased Federal aid also is needed. At present most medical research is dependent on the voluntary agencies which, month after month, stage a bewildering series of drives, now for heart disease, now for cancer, now for polio, now mental health, cerebral palsy, or muscular dystrophy.

There are so many of these drives that the housewives who must do most of the door-to-door fund raising are beginning to revolt and so are the donors themselves. Furthermore, because so much of the funds raised is spent on fund raising (in some cases as much as 25 percent or more), on patient care, and on administration, a relatively small amount actually goes into the medical research which might render all these other expenditures unnecessary. For example, the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, most successful in history, spent most of $500 million on patients, only $34 million on research. Yet the payoff on the latter will soon save the huge former sum.

All medical research is obviously interrelated (Enders' work on growing polio virus in live tissue led to Salk's polio breakthrough; Salk's technique is being used in cancer). Diseases themselves may be interrelated. There is an obvious need for the many voluntary agencies to pool their drives for a single fund for medical research alone, letting other drives, such as the United Funds, provide for patient care, therapy, and rehabilitation. The need is not to stifle the American genius for voluntary organization which De Tocqueville celebrated; the real need is to organize it better. The sooner this is done, and the sooner the full national responsibility for adequate medical research is recognized, the sooner the great breakthroughs may come, in cancer and elsewhere.

One-Hundredth Anniversary of Superior Court of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution sponsored by Senator William X. Wall, of Lawrence, Mass.:

SENATE RESOLUTION 593

Resolutions extending the greetings of the general court upon the 100th anniversary of the Superior Court of Massachusetts

Whereas it is a primary obligation of the Commonwealth to provide tribunals whereby every man shall be afforded a remedy for all wrongs or injuries to his person, property, or good name and an opportunity for a fair and impartial hearing so that he may obtain justice freely and without delay; and

Whereas the general court in 1859 created the superior court more effectively to accomplish these objectives; and

Whereas by increased jurisdiction and power the superior court has become the great trial court of Massachusetts and advancing with the ever-changing conditions of our society which has made substance and not form the basis of our jurisprudence: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts on the occasion of the centennial of the superior court of the Commonwealth extend its sincere greetings and felicitations to the chief justice and the associate justices of the superior court and express the appreciation of the people of Massachusetts for a century of devotion to the best traditions of equal justice under law; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of these resolutions to the honorable the Justices of the Superior Court of Massachusetts.

Interim Report of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, for the 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present the following interim report on the activities of the Committee on Government Operations in the first 9 months of the 86th Congress:

INTERIM REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FOR THE 1ST SESSION, 86TH CONGRESS

Jurisdiction

The jurisdiction and duties of the Committee on Government Operations are set forth in rule XI(8) of the House of Representatives as follows:

All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to * * * (a) budget and accounting measures, other than appropriations, and (b) reorganisations in the executive branch of the Government shall be referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The Committee on Government Operations shall have the duty of (1) receiving and examining reports of the Comptroller General of the United States and of submitting such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of such reports; (2) studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency; (3) evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government; (4) studying intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities and between the United States and international organizations of which the United States is a member.

Organization

In order to perform its functions and to carry out its duties as fully and as effectively as possible, the committee, under the leadership of its chairman, the Honorable WILLIAM L. DAWSON, of Illinois, at the beginning of the 86th Congress, established five regular subcommittees, which among them cover the entire field of executive expenditures. The names and chairmen of these subcommittees are as follows:

Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.

Military Operations Subcommittee, Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.

Government Activities Subcommittee, Hon. JACK BROOKS, chairman.

Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, Hon. L. H. FOUNTAIN, chairman.

Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Hon. PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman.

In addition, two special subcommittees were organized to handle special problems. The first two listed are continuing their studies, and the last completed its work early in the session.

Special Donable Property Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, chairman.

Special Government Information Subcommittee, Hon. JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.

Special Subcommittee on the Reno Interstate Highway, Hon. JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman.

Investigative reports

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress the Committee on Government Operations approved and submitted to the Congress 12 reports of an investigative nature. In addition, one committee print consisting of a staff study was published. At the close of the first session a considerable number of reports and investigations were under preparation. These will be considered by the subcommittees and the full committee early in the second session. A number of hearings have been programed for the recess between sessions.

For convenience, the published reports and the committee prints are listed here with the name of the originating subcommittee. A more detailed discussion of the material will be found below in the breakdown of the committee's activities by subcommittee:

First report (H. Rept. No. 228): "Results From Recommendations Made During 85th Congress in Reports of Committee on Government Operations." (Full committee, Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.) (Minority views.)

Second report (H. Rept. No. 234): "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Air Force Refusal to the General Accounting Office)." (Special Government Information Subcommittee, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.) (Minority views.)

Third report (H. Rept. No. 292): "Reno-Sparks-Verdi Interstate Highway (Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce)." (Special Subcommittee on the Reno Interstate Highway, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman.)

Fourth report (H. Rept. No. 293): "Whether Reservoir Lands Should Be Acquired by Exchange of Timber Lands." (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.)

Fifth report (H. Rept. No. 300): "Civil Defense in Western Europe and the Soviet

Union." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.)

Sixth report (H. Rept. No. 525): "Kings Mills Ordnance Plant (Party Line Fence)." (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, Congressman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, chairman.)

Seventh report (H. Rept. No. 546: "U.S. Aid Operation in Laos." (Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, Congressman PORTER HARDY, JR., chairman.)

Eighth report (H. Rept. No. 674): "Military Supply Management (Single Manager Agencies)." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.)

Ninth report (H. Rept. No. 684): "Disposal Problems of Government-Owned Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba." (Government Activities Subcommittee, Congressman JACK BROOKS, chairman.) (Minority views.)

Tenth report (H. Rept. No. 1112): "Military Air Transportation (Executive Action in Response to Committee Recommendations)." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.)

Eleventh report (H. Rept. No. 1121): "Organization and Management of Missile Programs." (Military Operations Subcommittee, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, chairman.)

Twelfth report (H. Rept. No. 1137): "Availability of Information from Federal Departments and Agencies (Progress of Study, Aug. 1958–July 1959)." (Special Government Information Subcommittee, Congressman JOHN E. MOSS, chairman.) (Minority views.)

Committee print

Notes on the Jurisdiction of the House Committee on Government Operations.

Legislation

The legislative jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations encompasses a wide range of very important governmental operation. It includes all matters relating to budgeting and accounting measures other than appropriations and all matters relating to reorganizations in the executive branch of the Government. In addition, property disposals and matters relating to Federal property and administrative services are referred to the committee. The committe studied a large number of legislative proposals and reported 14 favorably to the House. These are discussed more fully under the subcommittee breakdown below, but those reported are listed here for convenience, with the name of the subcommittee which intially considered them:

H.R. 766, to amend section 5 of the act of July 16, 1914, relating to penalties for the use of Government-owned vehicles for other than official purposes. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.)

H.R. 1321, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (Passed House as S. 144 and was vetoed by the President. House failed to override veto.)

H.R. 2386, to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Mobile, Ala., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land. (Government Activities Subcommittee.)

H.R. 3722, to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit donations of surplus property to volunteer firefighting organizations, and for other purposes. (Special Donable Property Subcommittee.)

H.R. 5140, to further amend the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, so that such act will apply to reorganization plans transmitted to the Congress at any time in conformity with the provisions of the act. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.)

H.R. 5196, to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.)

H.R. 6263, to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to provide for its more effective administration, and to bring to bear an informed public opinion upon price and wage increases which threaten economic stability. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.)

H.R. 6904, to establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. (Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.)

H.R. 7062, to provide for payment of annuities to widows and dependent children of Comptrollers General. (Special Donable Property Subcommittee.) (Public Law 86–87.)

H.R. 7465, for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.)

H.R. 7681, to enact the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 with certain amendments. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.)

House Resolution 295, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959. (Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee.) (Adopted July 7, 1959.)

S. 900, to amend section 204(b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (Public Law 86–215.)

S. 902, to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds, and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes. (Government Activities Subcommittee.) (Public Law 86–31.)

Reorganization plan

Only one reorganization plan was transmitted to the 86th Congress by the President during the 1st session. This, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, was designed to transfer certain functions in connection with forest exchanges and with mineral materials in national forest land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture. The committee held a hearing on the plan and reported favorably a resolution of disapproval (H. Res. 295) which was adopted by the House on July 7, 1959. The basic objection to the plan was that it did not afford adequate protection to the public's interest in the minerals situated on forest lands to be disposed of in the exchanges by the United States. In place of the plan the committee reported favorably H.R. 7681 which will accomplish most of the objectives desired by the President but at the same time preserve the responsibilities of the Secretary of the Interior with respect to minerals in the forest lands. This bill was passed by the House on September 2, 1959, and is now before the Senate.

Committee action on reports of the Comptroller General

Rule XI, clause 8(c)(1) of the rules of the House, imposes the duty upon this committee to receive and examine reports of the Comptroller General referred to it and to make such recommendations to the House as it deems necessary or desirable in connection with the subject matter of the reports.

In discharging this responsibility all reports of the Comptroller General received by the committee are studied and analyzed by the staff and referred to the subcommittee of this committee to which has been assigned general jurisdiction over the subject matter involved.

During the first session a total of 111 reports of the Comptroller General have been received by this committee. After preliminary staff study, these reports were referred to subcommittees of this committee, as follows:

Military Operations Subcommittee	49
Government Activities Subcommittee	28
Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee	15
Inter-Governmental Relations Subcommittee	11
Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee	8

Periodic reports are received from the subcommittees on the action taken with respect to individual reports, and monthly reports are made to the chairman on the status of all reports received. During the session, the subcommittees used the reports to further specific investigations and reviews. In some case, additional information concerning the findings and recommendations of the Comptroller General was requested and received from the administrative agency involved, as well as from the General Accounting Office. In another section of the committee's annual report dealing with the activities of the various subcommittees more specific information on the action taken on these reports is included.

The committee maintains complete files of all the Comptroller General's reports received, and a record is kept showing the subcommittee to which referred, the date of referral and the action taken. All the reports received during the session will be reviewed by the committee in the light of additional information obtained and action taken by the subcommittees and determination will be made whether specific recommendations to the House are necessary or desirable under rule XI.

Subcommittee breakdown

Following is a more detailed description of the committee's activities arranged according to the subcommittees primarily interested in the subject matter involved. At the chairman's request, the subcommittee reports were prepared in accordance with the following outline:

Outline for Annual Subcommittee Reports

I. Investigations:

(a) List investigative reports issued with name of reports, date issued and a summary of each.

(b) List and describe other investigations not resulting in a formal report.

(c) Give money savings or recoveries as a result of any investigations, together with the estimated dollar amount of each.

(d) List and describe any other remedial measures taken and any nonmonetary benefits attained as a result of investigation.

(e) The number of days hearings were held.

II. Legislation:

(a) Total number of measures referred to the subcommittee.

(b) Reports issued with title, date, and summary of each, and description of subsequent legislative action on reported measures.

(c) Number of days of hearings held.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation:

(a) Number of each received.

(b) Wherever action has been taken, name the report acted on, hearings held, if any, describe the action taken, and the resulting monetary and nonmonetary benefits.

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest:

(a) The cumulative money savings or recoveries from such prior activities, naming them.

(b) Other action, executive or otherwise, taken on such prior activities resulting in some affirmative benefit.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON, CHAIRMAN

I. Investigations

(a) Reports issued:

1. "Whether Reservoir Lands Should be Acquired By Exchange Of Timberlands." House Report No. 293. Issued April 23, 1959.

This report stemmed from hearings conducted in the 85th Congress concerning the reservoir land acquisition policies of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Army. One of the questions raised during the hearings concerned efforts of the lumber industry to have Government forest lands conveyed to private companies in exchange for their private forest lands acquired by the Government for reservoir projects. The committee concluded, on the basis of reports from the Departments of the Army, Interior, and Agriculture opposing such exchanges, and on the basis of the committee's own studies, that such exchanges would be contrary to the public interest and overall economy and efficiency, and that the payment of money compensation should continue as the method of acquiring private timber lands for reservoir projects, as is the case in acquisition of other types of land.

It is not feasible to estimate the monetary savings resulting from this report. However, the conclusions of this report will greatly benefit the Nation in protecting the watersheds and the resources of the public lands and national forests against depredation and exploitation of America's timber, minerals, grazing, wildlife, and recreation resources, as well as the sustained yield forest industries that are now dependent upon the Federal forest lands.

2. "Kings Mill Ordnance Plant (Party Line Fence)." House Report No. 525. Issued June 10, 1959.

This report presented the frustrating efforts on the part of a small farmer in Ohio to replace a broken-down woven wire fence between his property and that of the adjoining ordnance plants, and the alleged failure of the Ordnance Department to cooperate by bearing its share of the cost. The Ordnance Department's principal reason for not constructing the fence was that the property was being declared excess and it was no longer responsible for the care and maintenance of the property. Investigation disclosed that the holding agency still retains custody and accountability for excess and surplus real property and is expected to perform the physical care, handling, protection, maintenance and repair, pending transfer to Federal agency or disposal.

The Ordnance Department confirmed the inequity and remedied the situation by erecting its portion of the party fence.

3. "Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report (civilian and military) of the U.S. Government Covering Its Properties Located in Continental United States, in the Territories, and Overseas as of June 30, 1958."

"The Federal Real and Personal Property Inventory Report as of June 30, 1958," was issued in December of 1958 as a committee print. It presented the committee's annual compilation of real and personal assets of the Federal Government.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Importation of foreign excess property: An investigation was begun and hearings were held on the new regulations issued by the Department of Commerce on the importation of foreign excess property. A number of complaints had been received by the subcommittee that small businessmen in the importing field were not being treated fairly. The investigation is continuing and further hearings may be held.

2. Water resources development—Columbia River Basin: Hearings were begun concerning complaints by many organizations in the Pacific Northwest that the report of the Corps of Engineers on the Columbia River Basin disregarded requirements of law to provide plans for comprehensive and coordinated development of the Columbia River Basin. The hearing began on August 13, 1959, and preliminary information was obtained. The hearing was recessed but has not been concluded.

3. Budget and accounting procedures of the Federal Government: The subcommittee is making a continuing investigation and study of the budget and accounting procedures of the Federal Government, including the joint program to improve accounting in the Federal Government.

4. Administrative organization, procedure, and practice: The study of administrative organization, procedure, and practice is continuing with an analysis being made of replies from agencies to the committee's questionnaire.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation. Undetermined.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits. Included in I(a) above.

(e) Days of hearings held. Three days of formal hearings were held during this session.

II. Legislation

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: Eighty-four legislative measures were referred to the subcommittee.

(b) Reports issued:

1. House Report No. 235, H.R. 1321, amending Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1953, March 20, 1959: The report indicated that the bill would restore to the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration the authority to approve or disapprove loans, without the supervision or direction of or any other control by the Secretary of Agriculture; and to reestablish in the REA the functions vested in the agency by the 1936 act. The committee based its approval on the fact that "legislation is now required to attain the nonpolitical independence with which Congress intended the Administrator to act, and to reinstate the powers which Congress intended the Administrator to exercise."

The bill was passed by the House and Senate and vetoed by the President. The veto was sustained.

2. House Report No. 367, H.R. 5140, further amending Reorganization Act of 1949, May 18, 1959: The report indicated that the bill would amend the Reorganization Act of 1949 to extend the authority granted the President to transmit reorganization plans to the Congress for 2 more years. The committee stated that "although very few reorganization plans under the act have been proposed by the President in recent years, the act has, when utilized, proved to be a useful tool in effecting reorganizations in the executive departments and agencies."

The bill was passed by the House, but no action was taken by the Senate.

3. House Report No. 539, H.R. 6263, amending the Employment Act of 1946, June 12, 1959: The report indicated that the bill would amend the Employment Act in two major respects: (a) By declaring it to be the sense of Congress that the President should give due effect to certain provisions of the act which are referred to and in some cases made more precise; and (b) by requiring the President or any agency he designates to hold public hearings on certain price and wage increases, impending or in effect. The committee felt that in carrying out the policies of the Employment Act the President and the Council of Economic Advisers had not been giving sufficient attention to all of its provisions. The committee believed also that the Federal Government should take appropriate steps to discourage price increases which would affect national economic stability. The public hearings proposed would be a practical approach to a serious problem. They would assist in mobilizing public opinion against unjustified price increases and thereby help prevent or reduce them.

The bill was reported to the House and referred to the Committee on Rules. No further action has been taken to date.

4. House Report No. 586, House Resolution 295, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959, June 26, 1959: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 was transmitted by the President to Congress on May 12, 1959. Under the Reorganization Act of 1949, there is no provision whereby Congress can modify the plan except by legislation, and the plan would become automatically effective unless within 60 days either House of Congress disapproved the plan.

The plan would have transferred to the Agriculture Department all the functions of the Secretary of the Interior in making exchanges of public national forest lands for private lands, as well as sales of such lands, and also certain mineral materials in acquired national forest lands. As a result of hearings on the plan, the committee recommended, and the House adopted, House Resolution 295 to disapprove the plan because it failed to provide for the protection and conservation of valuable minerals owned by the United States; because it would create confusion in adjudicating the validity of mining claims on national forest land; because the language of the plan was ambiguous as to what mineral materials would be involved in dispositions from acquired national forest lands; and because it vested unlimited discretion in the Secretary of Agriculture to delegate authority without safeguards concerning public notice and opportunity for public comment as previously required by Congress.

5. House Report No. 633, H.R. 7681, enacting provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 1. of 1959, with certain amendments, July 3, 1959: Since some features of the Reorganization Plan would achieve several useful purposes, the Committee, on July 3, 1959, issued House Report No. 633, recommending adoption of H.R. 7681 which would enact the beneficial features of the plan, together with several amendments designed to safeguard the public interest by insuring that the Secretary of the Interior would continue to exercise functions with respect to minerals on the national forest lands; that the Secretary of Agriculture would not assume the function of determining or adjudicating the validity of mining claims which conflict with forest exchange or sale applications; that the Secretary of Agriculture would not under the Materials Act dispose of minerals subject to the mineral leasing or mining laws; and that would omit the unlimited power of delegation found objectionable in the plan as submitted.

H.R. 7681 passed the House on September 2, 1959, but no action was taken by the Senate.

6. House Report No. 683, H.R. 5196, increasing per diem travel allowances, July 16, 1959: The report pointed out that the bill would amend the Travel Expense Act of 1949 to increase the maximum per diem allowance from the present $12 to $15 per day; increase the mileage rate for motorcycles from 6 to 7 cents per mile and for autos and aircraft from 10 to 12 cents per mile; and provide reimbursement for park-

ing fees. The committee concluded from the evidence before it that there had been a sufficient increase in cost of travel since the act was last amended in 1955 to warrant the higher ceilings proposed.

The bill passed the House but no action was taken in the Senate.

7. House Report No. 889, H.R. 766, penalty for use of Government vehicles, August 12, 1959: The report stated that the bill would modify the existing fixed statutory penalty for the unauthorized use of Government-owned vehicles to give discretion to the heads of departments and agencies in fixing the disciplinary action in any given case. The committee stated: "It is sound administrative practice to handle such cases on their merits and to permit the department head or his representative to give consideration to all such factors as the length and quality of service of the officer or employee involved before fixing the penalty.

The bill was placed on the consent calendar but passed over without prejudice until the next session.

8. House Report No. 940, H.R. 7465, creating a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development, August 18, 1959: The purpose of the legislation is to create a commission to "study and investigate the problems of municipalities and metropolitan expansion, with special reference to the need, in terms of adequate governmental structures, to establish sound revenue policies as related to State and National revenue policies, and to determine the services which such governmental structures should provide. It shall also study existing and developing efforts to cope with municipal and metropolitan problems including Federal policies and programs and any need for improved coordination thereof." The committee was convinced "that the problems of the Nation's cities and metropolitan areas have grown to such magnitude that a temporary Federal Commission to make a comprehensive study and propose solutions is mandatory."

The bill was reported but no action was taken by the House.

(c) Days of hearings: Thirteen days of hearings were held.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation

(a) Number of each received:

Eight reports on audits and reviews made by the General Accounting Office were received by the subcommittee. All these reports were reviewed and analyzed by the staff, and specific actions taken on the findings reported are shown below:

(b) Action taken.

1. Audit of the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Commission: This report was found to contain no findings which require consideration by the Congress, and no further subcommittee action will be taken thereon.

2. Audit of the Federal prison industries: This report was found to contain no findings which require consideration by the Congress, and no further subcommittee action will be taken thereon.

3. Audit of revolving fund operations, Corps of Engineers: The staff ascertained that GAO recommendations calling for agency action have been adopted. While the other recommendations are not such that would require specific committee action, the entire report will be studied further for possible relevancy to other operations of the Corps of Engineers which are under current review by the subcommittee.

4. Audit of Rural Electrification Administration: The findings and disclosures in this report were reviewed in the light of previous work of this committee in the rural electrification area, and in the light of legislation which was then pending. No further action of the committee was considered necessary or desirable in connection with the specific matters reported.

5. Review of management controls of the District of Columbia government: Conferences were held between committee staff and officials of the District of Columbia government to ascertain progress of corrective actions to deficiencies reported by GAO. In most cases the corrective action entails conversion from existing accounting system to a cost or accrual basis, and considerable time will be involved in effecting the change. Status reports have been received and the work appears to be progressing satisfactorily. Staff followup will be undertaken periodically.

6. Short form report on audit of Columbia River power system: This report was reviewed by the staff in relation to similar problems disclosed in the audit report on Central Valley Basin program submitted during the 85th Congress. The Secretary of the Interior was requested to advise on any progress in correcting the deficiencies reported. Conferences were held with GAO officials on the overall progress being made. Information was received that GAO is now conducting a current review of the program, and that report thereon will be submitted soon. Further committee action is deferred pending receipt of the current report.

7. Audit of the Tennessee Valley Authority for fiscal year 1958: The findings and recommendations were reviewed in the light of the provisions of H.R. 3560, and TVA was also requested to comment on GAO findings and to inform the committee of progress being made to resolve difficulties encountered in connection with defective turbogenerators purchased from Westinghouse. The reply has been studied in the light of the report and the new legislation. Staff followup will continue in connection with the reported deficiencies, but further specific action is deferred pending receipt of GAO's report for the current year's operations of TVA.

8. Review of spoil disposal activities, Corps of Engineers (civil functions): The Department of Defense has been requested to comment on the findings of GAO in this report. Further committee action will be held in abeyance pending receipt of reply to the committee request.

IV. Prior activities of the Subcommittee of Current or Continuing Interest

No items.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress

(a) Bills not yet acted upon are being processed for hearings in the second session including major legislation involving amendments to the Government Corporations Control Act; payments in lieu of taxes; budget and accounting procedures; creation of new departments, and others.

(b) The investigation into the importation of foreign excess property is continuing, with the probability that further hearings will be held and new legislation developed.

(c) The study of the Corps of Engineers report on the Columbia River Basin is continuing and preparations are being made for further hearings.

(d) The study of administrative organization, procedure, and practice is continuing and a report is being prepared for approval by the subcommittee.

(e) The compilation of the annual inventory has begun and the report should be issued in December of 1959.

(f) The audit reports referred to the subcommittee are being studied and recommendations for further action are being prepared.

(g) The analysis of Hoover Commission recommendations is being continued for possible recommendations of savings to the departments.

(h) A review of actions taken by the departments on recommendations in current or prior reports will be continued and followed.

MILITARY OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. CHET HOLIFIELD, CHAIRMAN

I. Investigations

(a) Reports issued:

1. "Organization and Management of Missile Programs," 11th report by the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 1121, September 2, 1959 (156 pages).

This report presents for the first time in a public document a comprehensive and systematic account of the major missile programs in the United States. It examines the Department of Defense agencies and organizations for top-level direction of the missile programs, the field agencies and operations of the three military departments in this area, and procurement and management methods.

The report gives particular attention to the background of the Air Force ballistic missile programs and the role of the Ramo-Wooldridge Corp. and Space Technology Laboratories, Inc., as technical managers of these programs for the Air Force.

Other matters considered are missile costs and reliability, air defense problems, military-civilian space relationships, and military service roles and missions.

The subcommittee concludes that the Army and Air Force have no uniquely different role in regard to strategic missiles, and that for efficient and economical weapon development, production and deployment in the future, that the two military services should be merged. The President is asked to direct the appropriate authorities to undertake preparatory studies. In the case of the Ramo-Wooldridge and Space Technology Laboratories enterprises, the report recommends that if the Air Force is to retain a private corporation for technical management functions, the company should be converted into a nonprofit institution.

2. "Military Air Transportation (Executive Action in Response to Committee Recommendations)," 10th report by the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 1112, September 1, 1959 (29 pages).

This is the second report of the Military Operations Subcommittee on military air transportation and related civilian reserve support. It gives an account of recent developments in this field and action taken in response to the committee recommendations contained in the first report (H. Rept. No. 2011, 85th Cong., 2d sess.).

This report points out that during the year since these recommendations were drafted there have been encouraging signs of responsive action in the Department of Defense, the interested civil agencies, and the Congress. Further, the subcommittee's investigations, hearings, and report have had a healthy influence in clearing up many misconceptions about the Military Air Transport Service (MATS) and have helped lay a solid foundation of fact and judgment for a national reappraisal of military-civil roles and relationships in air transportation.

Except for the observations made in the course of this report, the subcommittee presents no new recommendations. It believes that the recommendations made in the first report still are basically valid.

3. "Military Supply Management (Single Manager Agencies)," eighth report by the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 674, July 15, 1959 (49 pages).

The report contains the first systematic account of the single manager program established in 1956 in the Department of Defense and the progress made under the plan, which makes a single agency in one military department responsible for the procurement, inventory management, stock fund maintenance, warehousing, and distribution

functions for all military departments in a given commodity area. The agency is established by the "single manager," who is the Secretary of the military department with the predominant interest in the commodity area.

The report presents recommendations with the objective of deriving the greatest possible savings from the single manager program as it exists and as it can be strengthened. The Department of Defense is asked to explore new ideas along similar lines, or by the addition of new policies, including the use of the General Services Administration in procurement and distribution of common supply items.

4. "Civil Defense in Western Europe and the Soviet Union," fifth report by the Committee on Government Operations, House Report No. 300, April 27, 1959 (109 pages).

This is the fifth civil defense report prepared by the subcommittee in the course of its continuing study and investigation of civil defense matters during the past 4 years. It brings together for the first time in a public document a systematic account of civil defense activities of eight NATO allies (Great Britain, France, Germany, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Italy), two neutrals (Sweden and Switzerland), and the Soviet Union as a great contending power.

The report also discusses the strategic implications of civil defense, including questions of deterrent capabilities, survival after attack, and the considerable effect of the civil defense measures which have been undertaken in the Soviet Union.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Wasteful operation of test aircraft by the Air Force: The staff investigated the use of engine-test YC-121F aircraft, on which tests were completed, for administrative aircraft purposes by the Air Materiel Command, when allegations were made that this use entailed grossly excessive maintenance and operating costs.

The Air Force decided to withdraw these costly aircraft from inventory following the staff inquiry. The estimated money savings are listed in I.c.1. below.

2. Surplus property disposal: The staff has continuously scrutinized military surplus disposal actions, investigating more closely those which indicated dissipation of valuable Government resources. From time to time the field agencies of the General Accounting Office are utilized to assist in checking disposal actions. A report was received from the General Accounting Office on disposal of a large quantity of common supply items at the Naval Supply Center, Oakland, Calif.

3. Military clothing procurement: Following its investigations and reports in this area, the subcommittee staff has received and investigated, from time to time, complaints of irregularities in contract awards. In accord with a recommendation in House Report No. 1168 (85th Cong., 1st sess.), the General Accounting Office was requested to review the operations of the Military Clothing & Textile Supply Agency. This report finally was completed and incorporated into the larger scope of the Military Supply Management investigation (see I(a)3 above).

4. Petroleum storage contract award: The staff investigated the award of a long-term construction and storage contract by the Military Petroleum Supply Agency. The question of the validity and propriety of an award on the basis of a bid for a 20-year period was presented to the Comptroller General, who decided in favor of the successful bidder. The subcommittee reported on this matter in House Report No. 674, "Military Supply Management," and also brought it to the attention of the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, which is responsible for the authorizing legislation for long-term contracts of this kind.

Two Members of Congress who were interested in this matter received oral and written information from the staff.

5. Military-civil programs for airflight safety: The staff has reviewed developments in air traffic control, following the establishment of the new Federal Aviation Agency, with respect to military-civil relationships and cooperation in this area. In view of the complex administrative problems involved and the importance of efficient air traffic management, this inquiry will be continued (see part V below).

6. Air Force procurement in Alaska: The staff investigated several complaints alleging irregularities in contract awards or alleged lack of competition due to sole-source procurement by the Air Force. The Members expressing interest in these matters were duly advised of the results of the investigations.

7. Withdrawal of request for proposal after negotiation with initial low bidder by Ordnance Tank Automotive Command: The staff investigated a complaint alleging irregularities, which wase submitted by a Member of Congress through Chairman DAWSON. The results of the inquiry were transmitted to the Member under dates of March 31 and April 29, 1959.

8. Alleged favoritism and preferential treatment in licensing import of excess military property: The staff investigated allegations concerning the actions of officials in the Office of Foreign Excess Property, Department of Commerce. The complaint was received directly from an unsuccessful applicant for a license to import Army surplus tires bought in Italy and from a Member of the Senate. The office named was the subject of investigation by Chairman DAWSON's subcommittee, as reflected in House Report No. 2601, 85th Congress, 2d session.

The Senator and the complainant were furnished a report of the staff inquiry.

9. Effect of labor difficulties on military procurement of custodial services: The staff investigated complaints received from building maintenance union officials in California about certain military contract awards to companies lacking union organization and allegedly engaging in wage-cutting, which practices led to faulty performance. Military and General Services Administration practices and procedures in relation to custodial services were studied, and note was taken of recent General Services Administration instructions to contracting officers to take into account the influence of labor relations on capability to perform service contracts of this nature. Copies of the report were sent to interested Members of Congress and the complaining parties.

10. Award of contract for Capehart housing: The staff investigated a complaint submitted by a Member, alleging an irregularity in an award for Capehart housing in a certain area to a firm other than the low bidder. The inquiry entailed examination of the structure of bid invitations for Capehart housing. A report of the staff inquiry was submitted to the Member.

11. Alleged lack of competition in fresh milk procurement at certain military installations: Several allegations have been received of an unhealthy condition in procurement practices of this nature. The matter was brought up with the Military Subsistence Supply Agency at the military supply management hearings, which indicated that the responsible officials at higher levels may have insufficient information and control in this area. Further inquiries will be undertaken at selected installations.

12. Employment of retired military officers in defense industry: The staff examined existing statutory provisions relating to this subject and prepared draft legislation proposing one of several alternative approaches to remedial action.

13. Alleged refusal of certain military bases to utilize private contractors for performance of base services: This complaint was investigated, and the staff report on current military policy and practice and planning for future procurement of these services was submitted to the member who first brought the matter to the attention of the subcommittee.

14. Allegation that certain Air Force specifications for liquid penetrant inspection materials are unnecessarily restrictive: Several Members of Congress have expressed an interest in this allegation. The complaint is currently being investigated by the General Accounting Office. The subcommittee staff is following the course of the investigation to determine whether there is any need for further congressional action.

15. Alleged unjustifiable placement of defense contracts with Canadian manufacturers: A report on current practice and policy in this area was submitted to the member who put the matter before the subcommittee.

16. Planned move of a portion of the Navy Purchasing Office from Washington, D.C., to General Stores Supply Office, Philadelphia: The staff investigated complaints received from various manufacturers of hand tools. Several Members of the House and Senate also expressed interest in the matter. The Secretary of Defense was asked to present a justification of this proposed move in terms of economy and efficiency.

17. Problem of effecting settlement between the Navy Department and a small contractor for work previously performed: A report of the full history of the contract and contractor's performance, and a statement as to the Navy's position in the matter were furnished to the member who presented this case to the subcommittee.

18. Alleged bidder collusion on certain hardware bids on military procurement: This complaint is currently under investigation by the staff.

19. Problem of recovery of an overpayment made to a military enlisted man: A verbal report was given to the member who presented the matter to the subcommittee, and a solution was proposed by the staff.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

1. The savings estimated to have resulted from the investigation into the improper use of engine-test aircraft for administrative purposes by the Air Materiel Command (see I(b)1 above) are $610,500 annually.

2. As ascertained in House Report No. 1112, "Military Air Transportation (Executive Action in Response to Committee Recommendations)" (see I(a)2 above), the Air Force has acted to stabilize procurement of commercial airlift services. Prior practice allowed MATS to procure airlift largely on a 30-day "call" basis, with a highly disruptive effect on the industry. The committee proposed that firm contracts be awarded for 12-month periods, and that more carriers be brought under the firm-contract program. As a result of the Air Force action under this recommendation, testimony was that the aggregate of bid prices was $13.6 million less than the original estimate based on experience under the short-term contracts.

In addition, dollar savings which cannot be estimated will result from procedural reduction in bidding, evaluation, negotiation, and award of contracts under the new system.

3. As ascertained in House Report No. 674, "Military Supply Management (Single Manager Agencies)" (see I(a)3 above), the Department of Defense estimated conservatively the following dollar savings resulting from the establishment of the single manager program:

a. Reduction of 600 personnel at an estimated annual payroll reduction of $3 million.

b. Concentration of stocks in fewer storage locations and reduction of 4 million square feet of storage space.

c. Net savings of $2.3 million from consolidation of inspection and test facilities.

d. A one-time saving of $87 million resulting from drawdown of existing stock to fill current needs, reducing procurement by that amount and creating cash in stock funds for use in other areas.

e. Even greater savings resulting from the elimination of duplicating transportation and storage systems, which cannot be estimated, but which are believed to be the greatest benefit of the program.

While the subcommittee does not claim that this year's investigations produced these savings, the report makes clear the role of this subcommittee and predecessor subcommittees in the formulation and establishment of the single-manager concept and program. Some part of these savings may, therefore, be the direct result of the subcommittee's previous efforts, and more important, they tend to illustrate what the subcommittee hopes to achieve by further studies in the supply management field.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

1. "Organization and Management of Missile Programs," House Report No. 1121 (see I(a)1 above).

Although large direct money savings will result from an Army-Air Force merger, as recommended in this report, many nonmonetary benefits also would be realized.

As summarized at page 156 of the subcommittee report:

"With a single military service to develop, build, and deploy ballistic missiles, obvious advantages would seem to accrue:

"The talents and resources of both services can be unified, preserving the best in each system, and eliminating enormous overhead in manpower and facilities.

"Technical capabilities of the Army and the Air Force will be teamed with a diversified missile industry to produce future weapons efficiently at lower cost. The difficult situation confronting the Air Force in respect to Ramo-Wooldridge (STL) will be automatically eliminated.

"The bitter controversy over air defense missions will be ended. Great savings in money will be realized. Service morale and prestige will be heightened. Air defense will get needed emphasis in military planning and budget allocations.

"The military role and interest in space will become clarified. The need for ARPA as intervenor for advanced research in weaponry and space will be eliminated. ARPA functions can be redistributed between NASA and the unified military service, reducing civilian-military competition and duplication in space.

"The interservice conflicts over airlift, tactical support aviation and other matters will be ended, and integrated planning for limited war as well as strategic missions can be effected.

"Problems between the unified military service and the Navy would remain, but these would be of vastly lesser dimension; and ultimately, if weapon logic dictates, a single service in place of three could be organized."

The subcommittee will report future developments at a later date.

2. "Military Air Transportation (Executive Action in Response to Committee Recommendations)," House Report No. 1112 (see I(a)2 above).

The following nonmonetary benefits were achieved in the field of military air transportation:

a. Positive action was taken by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate consistent with subcommittee recommendations. For several years there had been a running controversy between the Appropriations Committees and the Department of Defense about the meaning and effect of language in the appropriation bills regarding the procurement of commercial airlift by MATS. The subcommittee pointed out that the intent of Congress could be more clearly manifested, and fruitless controversy avoided, by earmarking specific dollar amounts in the yearly appropriation bills for MATS commercial augmentation.

This step was taken for the first time in the fiscal year 1959 Defense Appropriations Act, which provided that $80 million of the MATS funds for airlift could be spent only by contracting with commercial air carriers.

In the 1960 Defense Appropriations Act, this sum was increased to $85 million. The designation of specific dollar amounts for MATS' commercial augmentation does not represent an added appropriation to MATS, but an allocation of funds within MATS' budget structure.

b. The subcommittee proposed that if the Department of Defense did not develop an effective program for expanding the use of commercial air services, the Congress should adopt appropriate legislation toward this end. Two types of legislative proposals have been made for increasing the civil airline's share of military airlift. One, sponsored by the Civil Aeronautics Board and introduced as S. 1548, would establish a congressional declaration of policy that civil aircraft facilities be used to the maximum extent, subject to considerations of economy and defense. The other, adopting a statutory formula previously applied to the maritime trade and introduced as H.R. 5265, H.R. 5451, and H.R. 5715, would require at least 50 percent of the Government's air transportation requirements to be performed by commercial air carriers.

c. Following the subcommittee's investigations and hearings in military air transportation, the General Accounting Office decided to institute a long-range audit program of MATS, including a review and evaluation of management and operations under the industrial fund concept recently applied to MATS air transport operations.

d. The subcommittee endorsed a basic reevaluation of civil air policy, to put into better perspective the competing roles of military and civil air carriers and to establish guidelines for long-range policy. The last such study was made in 1954 by the Air Coordinating Committee.

Several studies now are planned or underway in this field:

(1) The President has directed the Secretary of Defense to prepare a study of MATS' peacetime and wartime roles.

(2) Apart from the study mentioned in No. (1) above, the Department of Defense initiated a transportation study to examine the effectiveness of MATS and the other single manager transportation agencies, as part of a broad management survey.

(3) The subcommittee has been advised that the President's Air Coordinating Committee is undertaking to update its 1954 study. This study will be made under the auspices of the Department of Commerce with OCDM lending its full support.

(4) The Federal Aviation Agency is reviewing the 1954 report of the Air Coordinating Committee and considers as one of the new agency's major tasks the giving of serious attention to the establishment of national aviation policy.

e. The subcommittee recommended that MATS modernize its air fleet and concentrate on serving specialized military requirements rather than operating an airline competitive with the civil airlines. The Department of Defense has agreed to stabilize the MATS capability for future operations.

f. The subcommittee made several recommendations directed toward strengthening the Civil Reserve Air Fleet program. As a result, the Department of Defense has directed the Air Force to complete approved programs for purchasing and placement of CRAF spares and equipment at the earliest practicable time and to take positive action on standby contracts with the civil air carriers taking part in the CRAF program. The subcommittee has been advised that the job of moving material to all sites for the 1960 CRAF fleet was expected to be finished this year. In addition, a new draft of the proposed standby contracts was submitted to CRAF carriers, a majority of whom accepted it, and negotiations have been planned with 19 individual carriers. Negotiations have been completed with at least one carrier.

g. As a result of the subcommittee's recommendation that MATS change its contracting methods, MATS contracts for airlift by the commercial carriers are now let on a 12-month basis, resulting in some degree, at least, of stabilization of commercial airlift services rendered to MATS.

3. "Military Supply Management (Single Manager Agencies)," House Report No. 674 (see I(a)3 above).

This report provided the first systematic survey of the single manager concept for military supply management for the Congress and the public. It was learned that there has been considerable opposition and competition in carrying the plan into effect, and various recommendations were made which should put more attention on the failures of certain service elements to support Department of Defense policy and work for the most efficient supply systems possible. It was recommended that the single manager plan be given a further and more emphatic trial and strengthening to attempt to gain all possible economies, and that other management plans and modifications or extensions of the single manager plan also be attempted in order to achieve even greater economies. Moreover, the investigations and hearings that were the basis of this report opened up many new questions and problem areas that will undoubtedly be of value to this and other committees in searching for new means of achieving greater economy and efficiency.

The subcommittee believes that renewed consideration is being given to an increased role for the General Services Administration, which could eliminate some existing duplication, and that other steps that will be explored in supply systems consolidation will contribute to true unification of unprofitably duplicating and competing systems among the military services.

4. "Civil Defense in Western Europe and the Soviet Union," House Report No. 800 (see I(a)4 above).

This report provided the Congress and the American people with the first survey of civil defense measures abroad which affect both U.S. planning and global military strategy. This and the other civil defense reports of the subcommittee have been called basic to the study of civil defense by many of the foremost civil defense planners and national and State consulting and policy groups.

(c) Days of hearings held.

A total of 14 days of public hearings were held by the subcommittee. A breakdown of these hearings, as well as other briefings and executive sessions, is as follows:

1. Organization and management of missile programs: February 4, 5, and 6, March 2, 3, 5, 13, and 20, 1959. In addition, briefings and field investigations and executive sessions amounted to 18 days as follows:

November 29, December 5, 1958; January 8–11 and March 21–28, 1959.

2. Military supply management (single manager agencies): May 25 and 26, 1959; executive sessions and briefings, 1.

3. Military Air Transportation (executive action in response to committee recommendations): May 11, 12, 13, and 14, 1959.

II. Legislation

No legislative measures were referred to the subcommittee during the session under review.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation

(a) Number of each received: 56 reports from the Comptroller General were referred to the subcommittee by Chairman DAWSON.

(b) Action taken:

A report on "Review of Procurement Practices Covering the Award and Administration of Advertised Contracts by the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency" (Executive Committee No. 1023) was submitted by the Comptroller General in response to a recommendation in House Report No. 1168, 85th Congress, 1st session. Matters contained in this report were considered in the subcommittee's hearings on Military Supply Management.

Additionally, the following General Accounting Office reports were examined and analyzed by the staff for possible future investigations:

1. Aeronautical spare parts management:

a. Executive Committee No. 120 of January 7, 1959, a report on procurement of Hi-Value aircraft spare parts at the Sacramento Air Material Area.

b. Executive Committee No. 121 of January 7, 1959, report on a review of selected activities of the aviation segment of the Navy supply system.

c. Executive Committee No. 205, a report on a review of activities of the supply department, Naval Air Station, Alameda, Calif.

d. Executive Committee No. 519 of February 5, 1959, a report on review of the aircraft engine overhaul pipeline in the Department of the Navy.

e. Executive Committee No. 1127 of June 23, 1959, a report on review of Air Force requirements and orders for aeronautical spare parts at San Antonio Air Materiel Area.

f. Executive Committee No. 1139 of June 26, 1959, a report on followup review of aeronautical spare parts at Oklahoma City Air Material Area.

2. Ship parts supply:

a. Executive Committee No. 132 of January 7, 1959, a report on review of selected activities of the Ship Parts Control Center, Mechanicsburg, Pa.

b. Executive Committee No. 622 of February 25, 1959, a report on feasibility of consolidating the Submarine Supply Office with the Ship Parts Control Center.

3. Ship repair:

a. Executive Committee No. 134 of January 7, 1959, a report on review of the settlement of shipbuilders' requests for price increases for damages arising from Government delays in furnishing plans and materials (Bureau of Ships).

b. Executive Committee No. 1081 of June 9, 1959, a report on review of ship overhaul contracting activities by the Industrial Managers (Bureau of Ships).

c. Executive Committee No. 1167 of July 6, 1959, a report on review of supply management and production control activities of selected U.S. naval shipyards (Bureau of Ships).

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest

Due to the nature of the investigations undertaken by this subcommittee, all reports are of continuing interest. As indicated above, prior reports contributed to current hearings and reports, and continuous notice is taken of subjects relating to past reports and investigations.

As mentioned above, the earlier reports of the subcommittee in the civil defense area have continued to be basic texts for everyone interested in the field.

The committee's report on Rocket Launcher Procurement (H. Rept. No. 2660, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) has resulted in many improvements in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation. The subcommittee intends to issue a special report on this matter.

Several earlier reports assisted in laying the foundation for the single manager program in the Department of Defense, described (at I(a)3 above) in the military supply management hearings.

The committee's report on U.S. military aid and supply programs in Western Europe (H. Rept. No. 1371, 85th Cong., 2d sess.) also remains a basic text in this field, and the committee will continue to examine military aid programs that are subject to deficiencies similar to those found in this report.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress

The projected program of the subcommittee will include the following subjects:

1. Organization and management of missile programs—followup investigations and collateral inquiries.

2. Special problems in military procurement and supply management.

3. U.S. military aid programs in South America.

4. Surplus property disposal—examination of management program, including centralized surplus information center and disposal offices, administration of program, and new techniques, including closed-circuit TV auctions.

5. Automatic data processing system planning and management—introduction to the problems which have arisen in the installation and use of ADPS. This program is planned for procurement and services of $350 million for the next fiscal year.

6. Military-civilian relationships in air traffic management.

7. Other investigations which appear worthy of special effort.

GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. JACK BROOKS, CHAIRMAN

I. Investigations

(a) Reports issued:

1. "Disposal problems of Government-owned nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba" (House Rept. No. 684, 86th Cong., 1st sess., July 17, 1959).

Summary: This report is based on public hearings held April 23 and 24, 1958, and subsequent study in connection with operational and disposal problems of the Government's $85 million nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba.

The report emphasizes that ore royalties charged the Government by the Freeport Sulphur Co. for ore utilized at the plant are excessive; details the beneficent role of the Government in Freeport's acquisition of the ore bodies; points out that a grossly misleading comparative cost analysis was supplied by General Services Administration officials to the GSA Administrator in connection with Freeport ores and those owned in the same area by the Bethlehem Steel Co., and presents the facts showing that the Freeport firm ordered a private investigation into the personal life of a high GSA official with whom the firm was attempting to negotiate an estimated $50 million contract in connection with the Government's nickel plant.

Appended to the report is a letter dated March 20, 1959, from the GSA Administrator pointing out that, as a direct result of testimony in the subcommittee hearings, GSA made a downward adjustment in the amount of Freeport-owned ore taken for the Nicaro plant. The Administrator said this resulted in a saving for the first 7 months of the 1958–59 fiscal year of $740,540 and added that the saving to the operation and the Government over the remaining 9 years of the ore contract term will be over $2 million a year if the royalty ore requirements are held to this adjusted level and normal operating conditions ensue.

Attention of the Department of Justice was called to appropriate findings and recommendations in the report, those dealing with the Freeport Sulphur Co.'s private investigation into the GSA official's personal life. The specific recommendations read: "2. That the Department of Justice study the transcript of the subcommittee hearings and pertinent supporting matter to determine whether charges of conspiracy to prevent Ira D. Beynon from discharging his duties as an officer of the United States should be initiated against the Freeport Sulphur Co., and its responsible personnel (18 U.S.C. 372)." The Justice Department, in a letter dated August 27, 1959, said it had studied the transcript of the hearings and "concluded that violations of Federal criminal statutes cannot be developed" and that the file is being closed. The Justice Department failed to contact the subcommittee to secure the pertinent supplementary material cited in the recommendation.

Attention of the Internal Revenue Service was called to the following recommendation:

"3. That the Internal Revenue Service consider the reported admission that the Freeport Sulphur Co. deducted as a 'business expense' the cost of its investigation into the private life of Ira D. Beynon, a U.S. Government official with whom it was doing business, and determine whether this was a legitimate deduction."

The U.S. Treasury Department, in a letter dated September 9, 1959, reported that the matter "will be given careful consideration upon examination of the 1957 return (Freeport's)." Earlier years' returns are now being examined and the agency said that until the 1957 return is examined "and the taxpayer has exhausted his rights of appeal, we are unable to give you the information required."

General Services Administration, in a letter dated September 15, 1959, advised the subcommittee that it is "inviting responsible private interests to submit offers for the purchase of the nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba." The GSA thus is instituting compliance with recommendation No. 7, which reads: "That the Administrator of General Services proceed without undue delay in the efforts to dispose of the nickel plant, but that no offer be accepted which would not assure a reasonable return to the taxpayers."

Additional views were filed.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. The subcommittee's investigation of the Government's $248 million nickel-cobalt contract obligations at Moa Bay, Cuba, and Braithwaite, La., begun during the 85th Congress, resulted in public hearings May 11 and 12, 1959, and subsequent study. Printed transcripts have been distributed and it is anticipated that a report on this investigation, with appropriate findings and recommendations, will be prepared for presentation early in the next session.

A preliminary review of the facts brought out in the hearings and the subcommittee's continuing study indicates that the Government's contract No. DMP 134 with the Freeport Sulphur Co. is one which needlessly exposes the Government to an unnecessary expenditure of some $200 million for nickel and $48 million for cobalt.

Facts introduced in the hearings point out that the Nation's taxpayers apparently

have a quarter-billion dollar obligation for nickel and cobalt they didn't need when the contract was made and don't need now. Authoritative testimony stressed that the so-called nickel shortage, which brought on the expansion of the stockpile goal and this contract, was not a real one. Accurate evidence shows that the Government, itself, both created the shortage and solved it by simply reducing the amount of nickel diverted to the stockpile, bringing supply and demand for nickel into balance soon after the contract with Freeport was signed in March 1957.

Cobalt was not in short supply when the contract was signed, as decisively shown in the hearings, and the market price, soon after the contract took effect, dropped to $1.75 per pound from the $2 per pound contract price—already indicating a loss of nearly $6 million on cobalt purchases alone. Under the contract with Freeport, which calls for the Government to purchase nickel at the highest market price in the past 28 years—74 cents a pound—evidence shows that each 1-cent drop in the price of nickel would mean an inventory loss of $2,700,000 to the American people.

The hearings reviewed in detail the circumstances under which the Government awarded the contract to Freeport, despite recommendation by qualified Government experts that it accept an offer by a Bethlehem Steel Co. subsidiary, which gave the Government access to the same nickel capacity, and greater reserves, but without the obligation to purchase any nickel or cobalt—and to purchase such nickel as it needed at 10 percent under the market price. Bethlehem desired an Import-Export Bank loan at 4½ percent interest to finance its proposed program, while Freeport, with 80 percent accellerated amortization and a guaranteed market with the Government, planned to finance privately. The Office of Defense Mobilization ruled out Government loans as an incentive, thus eliminating the Bethlehem offer.

Among the other points brought out in the hearings was that the Government built and operated a pilot plant at Braithwaite, La., to test and perfect the Freeport nickel extraction process at a cost of nearly $6 million, placing Freeport in a position to develop its ores at Moa Bay, Cuba. The Braithwaite plant then, virtually intact, was sold to Freeport for approximately $214,000. Many other facets of both DMP 134, the nickel-cobalt contract, and DMP 105, under which the Government built and operated the experimental plant in Louisiana, were examined in the hearings and continue under study.

2. The subcommittee, after an investigation by staff members and a study made at subcommittee request by the General Accounting Office, held a public hearing on August 18, 1959, concerning the conversion of dwelling accommodations to office space in the Arlington Towers project (Fourth Arlington Towers Corp., FHA project No. 000-00085).

Apparent violation of Federal Housing Administration regulations by the Fourth Arlington Towers Corp., the insured mortgagor, was the principal subject of the hearing. Printed transcripts of the hearing will be distributed upon receipt from the Public Printer and it is anticipated that a report, with appropriate findings and recommendations, will be prepared for presentation early in the next session.

Testimony by responsible witnesses and facts presented for the record showed that no authority was granted by the authorized agency, FHA, for the conversion to commercial use of 26 residential units involving approximately 20,000 square feet of space located in the Jefferson Building, Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va., and the subsequent leasing of this space by the General Services Administration for use by the Foreign Service Institute of the Department of State. Satisfactory evidence of disposition of the furniture and equipment formerly in the converted dwelling space was not presented when the subcommittee raised the question at the hearing.

Two violations of the Fourth Arlington Towers Corp. charter were shown unmistakably at the hearing:

(a) The conversion to office space was made without the permission of the FHA.

(b) The GSA entered into a 10-year lease of the space when the charter specifically limits the lease period to 3 years.

The hearing also brought out that FHA had taken no action to correct the cited violations until they were called to agency attention by the subcommittee, although it was shown that the agency already possessed knowledge that the conversion was taking place, contrary to regulations. Conflict appeared in testimony between officials of the GSA and FHA as to whether verbal approval had been given to GSA by FHA to proceed with the lease. Written approval was not granted, according to evidence presented at the hearing.

The FHA, in a letter dated August 24, 1959, supplied supplementary information requested by the subcommittee during the hearing. The agency indicated that it will reach a decision in the matter, in the light of the points brought out in the subcommittee hearing, as expeditiously as possible and will keep the subcommittee informed of its progress.

3. The subcommittee pursued the investigation begun in the 85th Congress by the then authorized subcommittee which had called the attention of the Secretary of the Interior to the fact that its regulations in regard to the adult vocational training of Indians was inconsistent with the law as passed by the Congress. As a result of the followup on the initial investigation, the Department of the Interior sponsored legislation to assist the agency in this program. The legislation (S. 1565) passed the Senate and is pending in the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

4. Investigated circumstances connected with GSA invitation to bid NY-DOPA 122 (87,000 square feet for designated center city office and storage space in Philadelphia, Pa.), all bids for same having been rejected by GSA on February 2, 1959. The GSA, at subcommittee request, explained in detail the basis for this action and furnished information concerning the bids received and a copy of the invitation for subcommittee evaluation. GSA received bids on the new invitation July 20, 1959, but award date of the contract has been extended indefinitely, with reported bidder assent, in order to permit completion of a GSA study to determine if presently leased space in Philadelphia can accommodate this need. The matter continues under study by the subcommittee.

5. Having reviewed many proposed sales of surplus property resulting from the Veterans' Administration practice of declaring portions of VA hospital grounds excess, the subcommittee made an overall study of such sales and held conferences with VA officials on the matter. The VA reports it has completed its program of screening its facilities for excess property and does not anticipate further reducing its standards for hospital land areas.

6. Investigated circumstances surrounding leasing of 146,000 square feet in the new Universal Building in Washington, D.C., by GSA for occupancy by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Study indicated the lease was handled according to regulations and that the space leased was most suited to the need and that GSA had secured a 30-cent per square foot reduction from the amount bid. GSA officials pointed out that the successful bidder (Cafritz) is one of the few builders in the area who will complete an office building without requiring that space be leased in advance of completion. The officials pointed out that GSA, in its normal function of meeting space requirements, has to provide space on a fiscal year basis and has no authority to contract for lease space 2 years in advance of completion, which puts the agency in the position of having to take space available when the need arises. GSA officers said when requirements are known sufficiently in advance and an agency is willing to wait, GSA will draw up specifications to meet the agency's particular need and give consideration to new construction.

7. Investigated operation of the GSA's Board of Review, with emphasis on the Board's workload and length of time required to render a decision on cases heard. The problem originally came to subcommittee attention in investigation of the case of a single individual, who did not receive a decision until more than a year after his case was heard by the Board. The subcommittee requested a full report from GSA on the Board's workload and other cases on which decisions were long delayed. The GSA Administrator furnished the subcommittee a detailed report, indicating numerous delayed decisions, and said steps were being taken immediately to remedy the situation by assigning additional personnel to the Board. The matter has continued under subcommittee study, and consideration is being given to preparation of an appropriate report for presentation early in the next session.

8. Investigated contract between the Government and Union Oil Co. and Ohio Oil Co. for oil-gas development in the Knik Arm area of Alaska, determining that the contract qualifies under law for exemption from the Department of the Interior's customary maximum oil-gas lease acreage limitations. No exclusive rights are granted by a development contract and various commitments represent guarantees of the contractor's intent to actually explore and drill on the area covered by the contract. In the course of the investigation, Interior officials said that, in effect, the contractor aids the Government, which now owns about 99 percent of the vast land surface in Alaska, in adding to the still limited information available on the new State's geology.

9. As part of continuing evaluation of air safety procedures and air traffic control under the Federal Aviation Agency, the subcommittee inquired into the agency's investigation of the two Capital Airlines accidents which occurred May 12. Held conferences with FAA investigators and attended CAB hearings in Baltimore, Md., on July 8, 9, and 10. Will evaluate Board's findings upon their release.

10. Investigated contract awards by General Services Administration for leasing of Air Route Traffic Control Centers to be constructed at Hampton, Ga., and Oberlin, Ohio, in connection with protests against the awards made by McCloskey & Co. and J. H. Pomeroy & Co., Inc. The Comptroller General was requested to comment and, after his review of an administrative report by the GSA, he explained in detail why there was no proper basis for action in the matter.

11. Investigated practices of the Civil Service Commission in connection with exceptions made in use of the Federal Register for hearing examiners. Studied opinions submitted at subcommittee request by concerned legal groups and a report submitted by the Commission, and prepared new inquiries with the objective of a possible public hearing on the matter when the investigation is completed.

12. Investigated Housing and Home Finance Agency, particularly the Public Housing Administration and the local authorities with respect to economy and effi-

ciency of operation in the Government interest.

13. Investigated reported employee morale problems in GSA's Transportation and Public Utilities Service and studied details of the proposed personnel changes in the planned reorganization of the service. The reorganization plan is being put into effect, and the matter continues under subcommittee study.

14. Investigated rejection by GSA of bids for approximately 100,000 square feet of space in Detroit, Mich., including clinical space, to be occupied by the Veterans' Administration. Apparent cause for the high bids was the request for clinical space in the same building where other offices were located, GSA officials explained. Clinical space requires special wiring, equipment, plumbing, etc., they pointed out. GSA received permission to readvertise, splitting the clinical space into a separate offering. Bids were opened July 22, 1959, and GSA has not completed its evaluation of them. The subcommittee is continuing its investigation.

15. Investigated organization of the new Office of Saline Water, Department of the Interior, evaluating personnel assignments and plans to carry out provisions of the legislation passed in the 85th Congress.

16. Electrical power deficiencies in St. Thomas, V.I., were brought to subcommittee attention. Subsequent investigation brought assurance from the Department of the Interior that immediate steps were being taken to relieve the power situation on St. Thomas by installation of a new 2,000-kilowatt generator and rebuilt 500-kilowatt emergency generator. The Department said when these facilities are put in use it will not be necessary to operate the older equipment as much as in the past, and service outages should be almost eliminated.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

1. Appended to the subcommittee's report, ninth report of the Committee on Government Operations, titled "Disposal Problems of Government-owned Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba" (H. Rept. No. 684, 86th Cong., 1st sess., July 17, 1959), is a letter dated March 20, 1959, from the Administrator of General Services pointing out that, as a direct result of testimony in the subcommittee hearings, GSA has made a money-saving downward adjustment in the amount of privately owned ore taken for the Nicaro plant. The hearings were part of an extended investigation of the matter.

The GSA Administrator said the result was a saving for the first 7 months of the 1958–59 fiscal year of $740,540 and added that the saving to the operation and the Government over the remaining 9 years of the ore contract will be over $2 million a year if the royalty ore requirements are held to this adjusted level and normal operating conditions ensue.

(NOTE.—Other money savings appear in sec. III and in sec. IV.)

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

1. The subcommittee established conformity of various agencies, including the Department of the Army, in submission of explanatory statements in connection with proposed negotiated sales of surplus property, thus enhancing the efficiency of administration of recently enacted provisions in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

2. Additional personnel were assigned to the GSA Board of Review, as a result of subcommittee study, to lighten the Board's workload and enable it to render decisions in a shorter time than in the recent past.

3. A new generator and a rebuilt generator were to be put into immediate use in St. Thomas, V.I., by the Department of the Interior, following a subcommittee investigation, to eliminate excessive electrical service outages.

4. The Department of the Interior sponsored legislation (S. 1565) to correct inconsistencies in its regulations with regard to the adult vocational training of Indians, following subcommittee investigation.

(e) Days of hearings held:

Three days.

II. Legislation

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee:

During this session of Congress the subcommittee has had a total of 31 measures referred to it for consideration. These measures include 28 House bills and 3 Senate bills.

(b) Reports issued:

Reports of the 86th Congress, 1st session, which accompanied proposed legislation reported from the subcommittee are as follows:

1. Report No. 368, dated June 1, 1959 to accompany S. 900 reported in lieu of H.R. 3152.

Summary: The purpose of the bill was to amend section 204 (b) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to extend the authority of the Administrator of General Services to pay direct expenses in connection with the utilization of excess real property and related personalty, and for other purposes.

S. 900 passed the House with amendments on June 1, 1959, and the Senate agreed to House amendments August 20. Approved September 1, 1959, as Public Law 86–215.

2. Report No. 290, dated April 23, 1959, to accompany H.R. 3153. (S. 902 substituted).

Summary: The purpose of the bill was to provide for the receipt and disbursement of funds, and for continuation of accounts when there is a vacancy in the office of the disbursing officer for the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes.

S. 902 passed the Senate April 10, 1959, and was referred to Government Operations and reported out April 23, as a substitute for H.R. 3153. Passed the House May 18 and became Public Law 86–31 on May 26, 1959.

3. Report No. 890, dated August 12, 1959, to accompany H.R. 2386 (S. 47).

Summary: The purpose of the bill is to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to the city of Mobile, Ala., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain land.

Bill passed the House August 31, 1959 and passed Senate September 9, 1959.

In addition to above, staff study was made of a number of bills, including H.R. 5993, H.R. 6011, and H.R. 6669. These bills all had the same purpose, i.e., to permit certain real property heretofore conveyed to the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College to be used for general educational purposes. It was concluded the wording in H.R. 6669 was preferable, and this bill was passed out by another committee and became law.

Study was made of H.R. 5456, the purpose of which was to provide for the relocation of the National Training School for Boys, and for other purposes. While its purpose was commendable, the bill as drafted cut across jurisdictional lines of three committees, and it was recommended to the Justice Department that they redraft the bill to avoid this conflict. No action was taken in the subcommittee on the original bill and the redraft had not reached it when Congress adjourned.

(c) Days of hearings:

Hearings were held on legislative matters on 5 separate days.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters which are not legislation

(a) Number of each received:

1. The subcommittee has received a total of 68 explanatory statements of proposed negotiated disposals of Government surplus property for consideration during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. The statements are submitted to the committee in accordance with provisions of section 203(e)(6) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and each has been thoroughly reviewed. The original acquisition cost of the property proposed for sale amounted to $34,629,944 and had a current appraised value of $7,087,713, while the proposed disposal price was $6,895,090. Two of the explanatory statements concerned leasing of Government property at a rental of $12,960 for a 1-year period prior to sale.

Fifty-eight explanatory statements pertained to the disposal of real property having an original acquisition cost of $32,685,707. This same real property had a current appraised value of $6,400,381 and the proposed disposal price was $6,240,471.

Eight of the proposed sales were of personal property which had an acquisition cost of $1,944,237, and a current appraised value of $687,332. This property was being sold for $654,619.

2. GAO audit reports, 32.

(b) Action taken:

A. Negotiated sales:

1. In 26 instances of the 68 explanatory statements, more information was felt necessary to evaluate the proposal, and the responsible Government officials accordingly were interviewed. The disposal agency's files also were examined in those cases, and particular attention was given to a study of the appraisal upon which the sales price was based. In five cases it was determined there was sufficient cause to warrant a personal inspection of the property being sold to properly evaluate the material made available to the committee. In those cases an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the negotiation was undertaken which included interviewing of the prospective purchaser and other interested parties, as well as a study of the real estate market in the locale of the subject property. Consultation with local real estate appraisers and review of real estate sales in local land title and abstract companies was necessarily included. These five cases were:

(a) Proposed sale of the former Marine Corps warehouse in Philadelphia, Pa., by the Department of the Navy, to the city of Philadelphia. The building had been appraised at $625,000 in 1957 and at $390,000 in 1958, and was to be sold for $100,000. The property was inspected and Navy and city officials interviewed. The warehouse had been constructed on city-owned land which was leased to the Government. There was no alternative to sell other than to the city, as the 10-year, nonrenewable lease had expired prior to submission of the disposal plan to Congress. The Government's rights were limited to removal and off-site use or demolition and salvage of resultant material which would have been for less than the $100,000 offer from the city. Efforts made by the subcommittee to encourage continued Government use of the warehouse were to no avail, and the city considered its offer of $100,000 the maximum it would pay.

(b) Proposed sale of the Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant, DOD No. 361, located at Nicetown (Philadelphia), Pa., by the Department of the Navy to Midvale-Heppenstall Co., Inc. The facilities, constructed on company-owned land, had an acquisition cost of $10,867,661 in 1941, and were appraised at $443,000. The proposed sale price was $389,500, plus a release of the Government's contract obligation to remove the facilities and restore the premises at Government expense, the cost of which was estimated to be $434,000. After personal inspection of the property and interviews with company officials, the Administrator of GSA was asked to make a technical study of the appraisal and the proposed terms of the sale

and furnish the subcommittee with a report of his findings. The Administrator's report concluded that the findings in the appraisal were considered sound and that "in light of the contractural relationship, it is our view that the offer of Midvale is fair and reasonable and should be accepted." The subcommittee, therefore, advised the Department of the Navy that it would have no further recommendations regarding the proposed sale and they could proceed with disposal plans.

(c) Proposed negotiated sale by GSA of a portion of the Soldiers' Home Reservation in the District of Columbia to the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception for $85,000. The property was inspected and terms of the negotiation and the appraisal upon which the price was based were thoroughly reviewed. It was concluded, that because of the restricted use to which the property could be placed, the sale should be consummated.

(d) Proposed sale by the GSA of a portion of the Camp Adair Military Reservation in Benton County, Oreg., to the Plywood Products Corp. The property to be sold consisted of 123 acres improved with several frame buildings considered to have only salvage value. A recent appraisal listed the value of the improvements at $7,000, and the land at $23,400 for a total value of $30,400. GSA proposed to sell the property for $35,000.

GSA central and regional office files were reviewed and the appraisal thoroughly studied. Local real estate appraisers were consulted, and tenants occupying certain of the buildings were interviewed with respect to their future interest in the property, and conferences were held with the prospective purchaser. It was concluded that the sales price was less than its fair value and would return a greater amount to the Government if exposed for sale through competitive bidding. It was recognized, however, that in the interest of equity and a moral obligation on the Government's behalf, that that portion under lease to the Plywood Products Corp., and on which they have made substantial improvements, should be sold by negotiation. The value of that portion was determined to be $35,000. The remaining portion was believed to have a value of $15,000.

It was, therefore, recommended to the Administrator of GSA that the negotiated sale should not be consummated for less than $50,000, and that if the entire portion of 123 acres should be sold by negotiation, then provision be made for Plywood Products to continue the leases with other tenants on the same terms as presently included in the Government lease. This latter provision is satisfactory to the other tenants. The net savings to the Government in this instance will be $15,000.

(e) The proposed sale of the Naval Supply Depot, Spokane (Velox), Wash., by the GSA to the D–J Co. of Seattle, Wash., for $2,100,000. The personnel of the central and regional offices of GSA were interviewed and a personal inspection made of the property. Information was developed relating to the possibility of a higher offer for the property than the one accepted by GSA. The subcommittee, therefore, recommended to GSA on September 21, 1959, that consummation of the sale to the D–J Co. be rejected and that a new offer be considered which will result in savings of approximately $450,000. The new offer now has been received by the GSA.

B. GAO audit reports:

1. Review of financing and construction of post office and courthouse public building project at Rock Island, Ill., under the lease-purchase program, GSA, June 1958. Upon recommendation of the subcommittee and with the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee, an authorization to use funds from savings on new construction projects was made to enable GSA to pay off the Government's lease-purchase obligation on this project. This action will eliminate the necessity of the payment of interest and real estate taxes, with a resulting saving to the Government of approximately $1,800,000.

2. Audit of Washington National Airport, CAA, Department of Commerce (succeeded by FAA), 1956–58. FAA queried by letter as to corrective action taken. Agency reply shows substantial compliance with GAO recommendations.

3. Audit of abaca fiber program, GSA, 1958. In replying to subcommittee letter, agency states that it is now complying with GAO recommendations.

4. Audit of General Supply Fund, GSA, 1958. Agency has been requested to notify subcommittee of corrective action it is taking in compliance with GAO recommendations.

5. Audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund, GSA, 1958. Agency reply to subcommittee inquiry shows that the corrective action taken is satisfactory.

6. Review of selected activities of the government of the Virgin Islands, 1958. Agency concurs and states that it will comply with GAO recommendations.

7. The following, containing similar findings and recommendations, are under consideration as a group and the Housing and Home Finance Agency has been requested to report corrective action taken in each instance in accordance with GAO recommendations:

(a) Municipal Housing Authority of Buffalo, N.Y., 1959.

(b) Housing Authority of New Orleans, La., 1959.

(c) Housing Authority of Philadelphia, Pa., 1959.

(d) Housing Authority of St. Louis, Mo., 1957.

8. The reports below, are similar in nature, and inquiry has been made concerning the corrective action taken in each case:

(a) Audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, 1957 and 1958. Agency reply shows compliance with GAO recommendations.

(b) Audit of National Capital Housing Authority, 1954–58. No comments have been received thus far from the agency.

(c) Review of Puerto Rico Insuring Office, FHA, 1958. Agency reply is under subcommittee study to determine the need for possible further corrective action by the agency.

(d) Audit of Federal Housing Administration, 1954–57. Corrective legislation recommended in the GAO audit is under study in the Housing Subcommittee, House Banking and Currency Committee.

(e) Audit of Public Housing Administration, 1957. Examining need for legislation recommended by GAO.

(f) Review of Home Mortgage Section, Mortgage Insurance Division, FHA, 1958. Awaiting agency reply to subcommittee query.

(g) Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities in Puerto Rico, HHFA, 1958. Detailed agency reply is under further study.

9. The following reports are under staff study:

(a) Norfolk Redevelopment and Housing Authority, Norfolk, Va., 1959.

(b) Housing Authority of the City and County of San Francisco, Calif., 1959.

(c) Audit of Federal National Mortgage Association, 1958.

(d) Audit of Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, 1957 and 1958.

10. After detailed analysis and review, no action was deemed necessary on the following GAO reports:

(a) Review of loan guarantee program, CAB, 1958.

(b) Audit of Government Printing Office, 1956.

(c) Audit of Federal Housing Administration, 1958.

(d) Audit of Public Housing Administration, 1958.

(e) Housing Authority of Boston, Mass., 1959.

(f) Detroit Housing Commission, Detroit, Mich., 1959.

(g) Louisville Municipal Housing Commission, Louisville, Ky., 1959.

(h) Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, from July 30, 1957, to June 30, 1959.

(i) Audit of Virgin Islands Corporation, 1956.

(j) Audit of Veterans Canteen Service, VA, 1958.

(k) Investigation of alleged procurement procedures, St. Elizabeths Hospital, HEW, 1958. (Referred from the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee.)

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries:

1. The subcommittee's investigation and hearings in 1958, resulting in its report of July 17, 1959, titled "Disposal Problems of Government-Owned Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba" (H. Rept. No. 684, 86th Cong., 1st sess.), have resulted in direct savings in operation of the plant. Based on authoritative figures, a total of approximately $2,500,000 should be saved on ore costs for the nickel plant for the 1958–59 calendar year. The downward adjustment in the amount of privately owned ore taken for the Nicaro plant was made as a direct result of testimony in the subcommittee hearings, resulting in the large savings.

2. The subcommittee, during the 85th Congress, blocked the proposed negotiated sale of the Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard at Newport News, Va., because the price of $3,510,000 appeared grossly out of proportion to the true fair market value of the $20,391,000 facility. GSA, at the subcommittee request, withdrew its delegation of authority to the Secretary of Defense to dispose of the facility and made a new appraisal. The new appraisal has been evaluated by GSA during the 1st session, 86th Congress, and the subcommittee has continued liaison with the agency as negotiations to sell the plant at the new price were initiated. As a result of the subcommittee's insistence on the true fair market value, it is now estimated that the shipyard will be sold for a price at least $2 million more than the one originally proposed, and may exceed that estimation by a considerable amount.

3. The subcommittee initiated study during the 85th Congress of a GAO review of financing and construction of post office and courthouse public building project at Rock Island, Ill., under the lease-purchase program. After study upon recommendation of the subcommittee and with the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee, authorization was made in the 1st session, 86th Congress, for GSA to use funds from savings on new construction projects to pay off the Government's lease-purchase obligation on this project. This action will eliminate the necessity of paying interest and real estate taxes over the canceled period, resulting in a direct saving to the Government of approximately $1,800,000.

4. On August 18, 1958, the subcommittee received an explanatory statement from the GSA proposing to sell a surplus 309-acre portion of the Veterans' Administration Hospital Reservation in St. Cloud, Minn., to the city of St. Cloud for $24,000. The city was to retain a portion of this 209-acre tract for park purposes and turn the balance over to St. Cloud Opportunities, Inc., a quasi-public

organization designed to improve employment opportunities in St. Cloud. This organization was financing the purchase through negotiation and intended to use the property for industrial purposes.

The subcommittee, after a review of the appraisal and contacts with individuals, concluded in a letter to GSA, "Since the city of St. Cloud plans to convey most of the acreage for the purpose of commercial development, it is recommended that its sale be by advertised, competitive bidding rather than by negotiation. It is understood that the portion of the acreage with use restrictions was intended for park and recreational purposes; that portion can still be acquired by the city for 50 percent of its fair market value."

The St. Cloud Opportunities, Inc., was not prohibited from bidding competitively by its charter.

The GSA transferred 27.4 acres of the property to the city for park and recreation purposes for $932.50, which represented 50 percent of its value. The remaining 182.31 acres which under terms of the proposed negotiated sale would have returned $22,135 was disposed of in accordance with the subcommittee's recomendation. On August 27, 1959, the 182.31 acres were offered at public auction and a high bid of $36,463 was received from the St. Cloud Opportunities, Inc., an increase of more than 50 percent and a cash return of more than $13,000 above the terms proposed in the negotiated sale.

(b) Other affirmative benefits:

1. The Veterans' Administration reported the adoption of changes in its burial procedures, recommended by the subcommitee, designed to expedite arrangements for interment in national cemeteries. The changes urged by the subcommitee were adopted and in Circular 10–240, December 17, 1958, the Veterans' Administration set forth the revised agrement reached with the Quartermaster General, which is now in effect. The new procedure is correcting situations, such as the subcommittee pointed out to the VA, in which interment was delayed 5 days over a holiday period because of failure to use commercial telegraph or telephone communications, working a hardship on the family of the deceased.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress

1. Examination of all negotiated sales and leases of Government property referred to the subcommittee.

2. Examine and take necessary action on all GAO reports referred to the subcommittee.

3. Study developments in the operation and proposed disposal of the Government's nickel plant at Nicaro, Cuba. Continue study of production figures and resulting savings. Observe negotiations to sell the plant under the invitation to bid announced September 15, 1959, by the GSA Administrator, and prepare to review final terms.

4. Study transcript of public hearings of May 11 and 12 and supplementary material with the objective of preparing a report to be submitted early in the next session on the nickel-cobalt obligations of the U.S. Government.

5. Study transcript of public hearings of August 18, 1959, and supplementary material with the objective of preparing a report to be submitted early in the next session on the unauthorized conversion of dwelling accommodations to office space in the Arlington Towers project (Fourth Arlington Towers Corp., FHA project No. 000-00085). Maintain liaison with Federal Housing Administration in regard to corrective action to be taken as a result of facts established in the hearing. Distribute printed transcripts of hearing upon receipt from Public Printer.

6. Study developments in connection with the proposed sale of communications facilities at the Newport (R.I.) Naval Base and similar Department of Defense proposals.

7. Study negotiations of the General Services Administration to sell, under a new appraisal price requested by the subcommittee, the $20 million Naval Industrial Reserve Shipyard at Newport News, Va.

8. Take action on inquiries and complaints within jurisdiction which are filed with the subcommittee.

9. Develop study of GAO reports concerning FHA sale of residential housing in Richland, Wash., and Oak Ridge, Tenn.

10. Observe action taken by General Services Administration to utilize the funds from savings on new construction projects, recommended by the subcommitee and authorized with the cooperation of the Appropriations Committee, to pay off the Government's lease-purchase obligation on the post office and courthouse public building project at Rock Island, Ill., in order to save the Government approximately $1,800,000 by eliminating the payment of interest and real estate taxes for the cancelled period.

11. Continue study of activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, particularly the Public Housing Administration and the local authorities, with respect to the economy and efficiency of their operation in the national interest.

12. Further examine steps taken by the General Services Administration to alleviate the heavy workload of its Board of Review, which had caused many decisions to be delayed excessively. Review details with the objective of preparing a report on the matter to be submitted early in the next session.

13. Examine results of study being made by General Services Administration to determine if presently leased space in Philadelphia, Pa., will accommodate the need outlined originally in GSA invitation to bid No. NY–DOPA 122, all bids for the same having been rejected by GSA on February 2, 1959. Award of the contract on a new invitation of July 20, 1959, has been extended by GSA to permit completion of the study. Review details of contract awarded.

14. Develop further material and continue study of report by Civil Service Commission in connection with subcommittee query regarding exceptions made in use of the Federal Register for hearing examiners. Evaluate material developed with the prospect of conducting a public hearing in the matter.

15. Continue study of Federal Aviation Agency problems in connection with air safety procedures and air traffic control. Evaluate CAB findings in connection with two crashes which occurred May 12.

16. Continue study relating to the operation and reorganization plans being put into practice in the GSA's Transportation and Public Utilities Service.

17. Continue examination of proposed lease of office space, including clinical space, for the Veterans' Administration in Detroit, Mich. Evaluate report to be submitted by GSA regional office.

18. Review negotiated sales of surplus property, considered by the subcommittee in recent sessions, which involved sale of "scrambled" facilities or of Government plants built upon property belonging to another party, with a view to preparing a special study of the overall situation and its heavy cost to the taxpayers.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN, CHAIRMAN

I. Investigations

(a) Reports issued: No formal investigative reports were issued during 1959. In a letter sent to the Department of Agriculture on September 12, the subcommittee made a number of informal recommendations concerning policies and procedures of the Department in financing sales of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies. Information disclosed by subcommittee investigations was also called to the attention of appropriate officials of the Departments or agencies concerned in a number of other instances.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

Activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation

The subcommittee's major investigative effort has been devoted to a comprehensive inquiry into activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Particular subjects being examined by the subcommittee include the following:

Resale to U.S. military forces of agricultural commodities sold or subsidized by CCC.

Sales for foreign currency of surplus agricultural commodities sold or subsidized by CCC. Some foreign currency sales have been financed by CCC; others by the International Cooperation Administration. Particular attention is being given to the possibility of cotton sold by CCC being financed for export by CCC on the basis of a higher quality.

Storage of CCC-owned commodities, particularly where such commodities are stored in present or former Government facilities.

Commuter Transportation in Metropolitan Areas, With Particular Reference to the New York-New Jersey Area

The staff made a preliminary study to determine the appropriateness of subcommittee hearings and further investigation of this problem. This study was undertaken because of increasing concern for the ability of existing mass transportation facilities to serve the needs of commuters in our large metropolitan areas and the further deterioration of commuter rail and ferry service, especially in the New York metropolitan area, due to the enactment by the Congress of the Transportation Act of 1958.

Health Research Activities of the National Institutes of Health, U.S. Public Health Service

Considerable staff time has been devoted this year to a study of the economy and efficiency of the numerous extramural health research programs administered by the National Institutes of Health. With larger amounts being appropriated each year by the Congress for an expanded medical research effort to conquer the major killing and disabling diseases. It becomes increasingly important to review the administration of these programs. Attention is being given to the NIH grant and contract arrangements for health research.

Investigation of Conflict of Interests in Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The staff has investigated a possible conflict of interests on the part of an official of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Further information has been requested from the Department to provide a basis for subcommittee action.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

Foreign Currency Transactions

Both the Department of Agriculture and the International Cooperation Administration are studying a number of foreign currency transactions in order to determine whether claims should be filed. The ICA has already filed a claim for approximately $100,000 as a result of one transaction brought to its attention by the subcommittee. The subcommittee is currently studying a number of CCC financed cotton transactions in order to ascertain whether excessive payments have been made and, if so, whether such payments can be recovered.

Resale of CCC Commodities to U.S. Armed Forces

As a result of disclosures at subcommittee hearings, the Army obtained new contracts

for furnishing of recombined milk for troops in Japan, Okinawa, and Guam which are expected to save about a million dollars annually.

Approximately $50,000 was refunded to the Department of Agriculture by a dairy firm which had purchased a substantial quantity of nonfat dry milk from CCC for less than 10 cents per pound and resold it to the U.S. Armed Forces for more than 30 cents per pound.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

The armed services and the Department of Agriculture have taken steps to coordinate their activities with a view to preventing windfall profits through resale to the Armed Forces of agricultural commodities sold or subsidized by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Department of Agriculture and the International Cooperation Administration have taken or are taking certain steps to strengthen their policies and procedures with respect to financing sales of agricultural commodities for foreign currencies.

(e) Days of hearings held: 7 days of investigative hearings were held during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

II. Legislation

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: Four bills were referred to the subcommittee: H.R. 656, H.R. 6904, H.R. 6905, and H.R. 8478.

(b) Reports issued:

Report No. 742, "Establishing an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations," was issued by the committee on July 31, 1959. This report summarizes the purpose and background of the legislation and the testimony presented in hearings to substantiate the need for an advisory commission. It also outlines the committee's concept of the nature of the Commission, the cooperation expected from the States, and the several amendments adopted by the committee.

H.R. 6904 was passed by the House under suspension of the rules on August 17, 1959. The bill passed the Senate, amended, on September 10. The conference report was agreed to by both House and Senate on September 12, and the bill was signed by the President on September 24.

(c) Days of hearings: Four days of hearings were held jointly with the Senate Committee on Government Operations on the identical bills H.R. 6904, H.R. 6905, and S. 2026.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation

Eleven formal reports to the Congress by the General Accounting Office were referred to the subcommittee during the first session of the 86th Congress and have been or are being studied. In addition, the subcommittee has requested and received from the GAO a number of reports made to executive agencies as well as special studies made for the subcommittee and detailed workpapers on which some of the reports to Congress are based. These documents have been or are being studied by the subcommittee.

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries.

Purchase Resale Transactions

As a result of the subcommittee' investigation of cheese and butter purchase-resale transactions, the Government has now recovered more than $2 million, and it appears likely that further recoveries will be made.

Polio Vaccine

The five manufacturers of polio vaccine were indicted for price fixing after a subcommittee investigation. It is expected that trial of these cases will begin on October 13 in Trenton, N.J. The Justice Department is also considering the possibility of civil suits to recover damages for overcharges on Government vaccine purchases.

School Lunch Program

The Justice Department is presently considering income tax cases involving possible civil and criminal liability in connection with transactions related to distribution of surplus commodities to schools and institutions in Illinois.

Transportation of Household Effects

At the subcommittee's request, the Bureau of the Budget conducted a study of transportation of household effects of Government employees. This study indicated a possibility of substantial savings through contracting for movement of household effects on a competitive basis, rather than reimbursing each individual employee at a standard rate. The Budget Bureau is encouraging executive agencies to take advantage of such savings wherever possible.

(b) Other affirmative benefits: No items.

V. Projected program for remainder of the 86th Congress

During the remainder of the 86th Congress, the subcommittee will continue its surveillance of the operations of departments and agencies under its jurisdiction. Particular attention will be given to:

Continuation of the subcommittee's investigation of the Commodity Credit Corporation, including preparation of a comprehensive report setting forth the subcommittee's findings and recommendations.

Continuing and intensifying the subcommittee's examination of the various health research programs being administered by the National Institutes of Health with view to encouraging the maximum possible economy and efficiency in this important field.

Studying operations of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Observing activities of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations with a view to recommending any legislative changes needed to make this body more effective.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND MONETARY AFFAIRS SUBCOMMITTEE, HON. PORTER HARDY, JR., CHAIRMAN

I. Investigations

(a) Reports issued:

1. House Report No. 546, 86th Congress, "U.S. Aid Operations in Laos," issued June 15, 1959.

This report resulted from a comprehensive study of the U.S. aid program in the southeast Asian kingdom of Laos. The purposes of the study were to determine:

a. How and by whom the decision was made as to the number and type of military forces (i.e., "force objectives") the United States would support in Laos;

b. The relationship between the force objectives and the level of aid (i.e., the overall dollar amounts) set for Laos; and

c. Whether the U.S. aid program in Laos was being administered efficiently, economically, and according to law.

The report concluded principally that:

a. In the case of Laos, the determination of force objectives was a political decision made by the Department of State, despite contrary recommendations by the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

b. The high level of economic aid necessary to support such a force had been beyond the capacity of Laos' meager economy to absorb. Inflation and profiteering followed and hampered the objectives of the mutual security program;

c. The administration of the U.S. aid program in Laos was inadequate in effectiveness, scope, and supervision; in fact, in a number of demonstrated instances it was tainted with corruption;

d. ICA and the Department of State have sought to excuse deficiencies and maladministration in the aid program in Laos with the assertion that our aid program, however poorly administered, has saved Laos from going Communist; and

e. On the evidence, a lesser sum of money more efficiently administered would probably have been more effective in achieving economic and political stability in Laos and in increasing its capacity to reject Communist military aggression or political subversion.

The committee recommended, inter alia, that:

a. The Congress should be advised fully as to the extent to which the Department of State participates in determinations (such as those concerning force objectives) which are generally regarded as military in nature;

b. The use of cash grants to provide mutual security assistance should be minimized in favor of aid in kind;

c. Levels of aid should not be set so high that they exceed the absorptive capacity of the local economy.

d. ICA should improve its control mechanisms so that its procedures and standards are complied with, and opportunities for corruption are minimized;

e. State, Defense and ICA should reexamine their roles with respect to Laos in the light of the basic objectives of the mutual security program and the needs of the country; and

f. Congress should amend the Mutual Security Act to improve procedures and control mechanisms in the mutual security program and to provide Congress with better information respecting the determination of individual country levels of aid.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. Federal agencies having international lending functions: The Export-Import Bank, the Development Loan Fund, and the International Cooperation Administration provide loans and loan guarantees for the financing of economic enterprises located in foreign countries. With respect to such functions, each agency has somewhat different purposes, authorities and methods of operation. In addition to these U.S. agencies, there are a number of international agencies having similar financing functions, such as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), the International Finance Corporation, and the recently established Inter-American Development Bank, in which U.S. participation was authorized by the act of August 7, 1959.

As part of a more general study of the U.S. agencies, including their relationships to one another and to the international agencies, the subcommittee has begun preliminary studies of the operations of the Development Loan Fund and the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

a. Development Loan Fund: The subcommittee held a series of hearings to discuss with DLF officials procedures and practices in the conduct of DLF's operations.

The subcommittee staff has undertaken preliminary studies of the operations of the Development Loan Fund, including extensive examination of certain DLF files. In connection with a number of specific issues revealed or confirmed by documents, the staff prepared eight narrative reports for the purpose of briefing the subcommittee members prior to the conduct of hearings on these questions while abroad.

Much time and effort of the subcommittee and its staff were devoted to clearing (in major part successfully) obstacles placed in the path of the subcommittee's access to documents in DFL's official files. These obstacles had been raised both in the name of the executive privilege doctrine currently

being invoked by the executive branch and in the name of the so-called third-agency rule (whereby a document originating with ICA, for example, would be released by DLF only on ICA's specific approval).

b. Export-Import Bank of Washington: The subcommittee held a hearing in the nature of an economic briefing. Officials from the Export-Import Bank and the State Department testified.

The staff made a preliminary study of the operations of the Export-Import Bank, including the matter of the terms of the Bank's sale to outside investors of obligations held in its investment portfolios. In addition, summaries of certain Export-Import Bank loans were prepared for the use of the subcommittee in connection with its current inspection and study trip to Europe and the Near East.

2. Federal Reserve System: The subcommittee held an introductory hearing at which the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, and a number of aids, provided details about the duties and activities of the Board.

The subcommittee conducted preliminary analyses relating to (1) the question of outside audit of operations of the Federal Reserve; and (2) areas of the Board of Governors' operations which might warrant further subcommittee inquiry.

3. Office of Evaluation, International Cooperation Administration. In order to begin a study of ICA's Office of Evaluation, the subcommittee chairman, on February 26, 1959, requested the acting director of ICA to provide full information and documents relating to the activities of the Office of Evaluation. ICA declined to furnish, on the grounds of executive privilege, an important category of documents, namely, copies of all reports, memoranda, and other evaluation documents prepared by the Office of Evaluation.

Moved by this and similarly based frustrations of the subcommittee's work, the chairman successfully sponsored amendments to the Mutual Security Act of 1959 and to the Mutual Security Appropriations Act, 1960, designed to assert the intent and the right of Congress to have full access to information needed for its effective consideration of legislation and appropriations for the mutual security program.

4. St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation: The subcommittee is making some inquiries concerning regulations of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation which bar small pleasure craft from parts of the seaway. Matters discussed in the Corporation's latest response are now under study.

5. U.S. Information Agency: The subcommittee had concluded hearings at the end of the 85th Congress into the operations of the Persian Service of the Voice of America. This inquiry was concerned primarily with allegations relative to the lack of proper and effective monitoring and control of the content of oversea broadcasts. During the current year, officials of USIA have examined into particular, detailed allegations. The results of this inquiry were embodied in a report to the chairman from the Director of USIA, dated July 21, 1959. In the subcommittee's view, several key elements of the allegations were not fully disposed of. Further consultation is planned between the subcommittee and the Agency.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

Manifestly, no accurate quantitative measurement can be made of the dollar savings resulting from improved procedures and performance on the part of ICA which have been stimulated by the subcommittee's investigations. Moreover, in the case of the mutual security program, conservation of funds through more effective planning and more efficient practice ordinarily will mean a saving in the sense of giving more real foreign aid for the funds available.

Because of the magnitude of foreign aid funds and the nature of their use, even small improvements in procedure and practice may result in very large money savings indeed. The minimization of cash grants recommended by the committee, which now appears to be the trend in ICA, could, in Laos alone, mean at least a 10 percent improvement in the effectiveness of U.S. aid funds. On the basis of the level of cash grants in 1957, this would represent more than $3 million worth of aid.

Exposure by the subcommittee investigation in Laos of unlawful or unreported gain on the part of certain persons employed by ICA will probably result in tax recoveries, with penalties, aggregating several thousand dollars.

The Department of State has advised that the U.S. attorney's office now has under review the possibility of prosecuting legal violations by the Universal Construction Co. The U.S. operations mission to Laos has been instructed to file a claim of $4,311.39 as the result of the substandard construction of 14 houses. The general counsel of the International Cooperation Administration is reviewing the legal steps possible to secure additional recoveries.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

1. Legislative measures: As a result of obstacles to the obtaining of essential information encountered by the subcommittee in its investigations of the mutual security program, the subcommittee chairman sponsored several legislative amendments which the 86th Congress enacted as parts of the Mutual Security Act of 1959, and the Mutual Security Appropriations Act, 1960. The action thus taken represents a substantial fulfillment of the ninth recommendation of the committee's Laos report; viz.

"That the Congress give serious consideration to amendments proposed in this year's mutual security bill by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, intended to improve programing procedures and control mechanisms in the mutual security program and to provide the Congress with more detailed and significant information respecting the determination of individual country levels of aid than has heretofore been available."

Subsection 537(f) of the Mutual Security Act was amended to require greater specificity in the request for authorizations and appropriations with respect to (1) how the proposed level of aid for a given country is arrived at; and (2) how a particular level of forces for a given country is determined.

Subsection 533A(d) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959, which deals with the Office of Inspector General and Comptroller (a new office in the Department of State with responsibilities relating to the mutual security program), requires that all documents and other material relating to the activities of that Office shall, on request, be furnished to the GAO and to appropriate committees or subcommittees of Congress.

Subsection 534(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1959 requires that on request of the GAO or appropriate committees and subcommittees of Congress, ICA shall furnish all documents and other material relating to its activities.

Section 108(d) of the Mutual Security Appropriations Act, 1960, provides a conditional limitation on ICA expenditures under the act. The limitation, which will operate against the use of funds for a given country, project, or activity, will become effective whenever 35 days after a written request, ICA has not furnished to the GAO or an appropriate committee or subcommittee of Congress any document or other material relating to ICA administration with respect to a given country, project, or activity. However, the limitation will not operate if, during the 35-day period, there is furnished a certification by the President that he has forbidden the material to be furnished and stating his reasons for doing so.

The need for this limitation on expenditures arose when ICA, acting on policy direction from the President and notwithstanding the enactment of subsections 533A(d) and 534(b) of the Mutual Security Act, persisted in its refusal to the subcommittee of the evaluation documents which the Chairman had requested on February 26, 1959.

2. Other measures: The Department of Justice, the Department of State, and ICA are actively studying factual and legal aspects of the Government's civil and criminal recourse against U.S. citizens who, as the committee's Laos investigation has revealed, appear to have violated Federal law.

(e) Days of hearings held:

1. Laos investigation, 19 days.
2. Development Loan Fund, 3 days.
3. Federal Reserve Board, 1 day.
4. Export-Import Bank of Washington, 1 day.

Total, 24 days.

II. Legislation

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee:

H.R. 8302, 86th Congress, by Congressman PATMAN, to provide for a GAO audit of the Federal Reserve System from 1913 through 1958.

H.R. 6605, 86th Congress, by Congressman HARDY, to amend Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953.

(b) Reports issued: None.

(c) Days of hearings: None. (But, see item (b)2, under part I above.)

III. Reports received such a notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation

(a) Number of each received: The subcommittee has received 15 reports to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States.

(b) Action taken:

1. Audit of St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

2. Audit of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

3. Audit of Export-Import Bank of Washington, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. Being used in connection with curent study.

4. Audit of Federal Home Loan Bank Board, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

5. Audit of Federal home loan banks, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken. Comptroller General's chief recommendation re evasive practice of Federal savings and loan associations which reorganize into State companies is under consideration by legislative committees of Congress.

6. Audit of Custodianship Functions, Office of the Treasurer of the United States, fiscal year 1957.

Report examined and analyzed. Comptroller General stated that Treasury did not agree with GAO on the need for a joint study of U.S. tax and loan accounts in commercial banks.

The subcommittee chairman corresponded and conferred with Treasury officials, and on June 12, the Secretary of the Treasury advised the Comptroller General that a study would be initiated by Treasury in about 90 days. GAO will have a significant part in the study either initially or on review. The Treasury has been asked to keep the subcommittee currently informed.

Collaterally, the subcommittee staff prepared a legislative history study of the provisions of law prohibiting payment of interest on demand deposits in banks which are members of the Federal Reserve.

7. Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance Program for Pakistan, ICA-Department of State, fiscal years 1955–57.

Report examined and analyzed. Being used in connection with current study.

8. Audit of Office of Defense Lending, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

9. Audit of Bureau of Engraving and Printing, Treasury Department, fiscal year 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

10. Audit of Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, December 1958.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

11. Audit of Proposed Economic Assistance Program for China (Taiwan), Korea, and Vietnam for fiscal year 1959.

Report examined and analyzed. Being used in connection with current study.

12. Audit of Bureau of the Mint, Treasury Department, fiscal years 1956–58.

Report now under study.

13. Followup review of Economic and Technical Assistance program for Laos.

Report examined and analyzed. No action taken.

14. Audit of Development Loan Fund, fiscal year 1958.

Report under review in connection with current study.

15. Examination of Economic and Technical Assistance program for India, fiscal years 1955–58.

Report now under study.

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries:

The following paragraph is quoted from this subcommittee's annual report of last year:

"Because of its very nature, the work of the subcommittee has an impact, in varying degrees, on all phases of our foreign aid program. Recommendations for improvement of operations and procedures in ICA/Washington can result in savings in our foreign operations. And exposing slipshod work and wasteful spending in Cambodia will, to the extent corrective measures are taken based on our recommendations, have a chain reaction and inevitably bring about more efficient and economical operations in Pakistan and Vietnam. Although the amount of money saved in this way is undoubtedly large, there is no way it can be estimated with a degree of accuracy sufficient for the purposes of this report. However, firm figures can be arrived at in certain cases which, even without projection, demonstrate that the work of the subcommittee during the past year has resulted in significant money savings and possible money recoveries. It is estimated that these savings and recoveries will amount to at least $1,500,000."

There followed a listing of the specific activities from which it was believed these savings would be developed. Final determination of amounts in each case waits either upon completion of a particular project (and determination of its final total cost) or upon legal action by the Department of Justice or the Internal Revenue Service, not yet accomplished. The estimate of savings remains valid but cannot be further refined at this time.

(b) Other affirmative benefits:

The general nature of this subcommittee's operations is such that it is not always feasible to analyze it in terms of the specific, discrete "activities," each completed at a given point and time. The bulk of the subcommittee's effort is devoted to continuing examination of the foreign-aid program, and it is in this field that major benefits, monetary and otherwise, have resulted. Some of its work, however, such as the effort to obtain for the Congress clear, accurate, and complete information on the program's operation, must, in the nature of our Government, be continuing, even though the objectives will probably never be fully accomplished. It is not always possible to say that a particular remedial action arose from a particular prior activity. In the case of this subcommittee's oversight of the foreign-aid program, remedial action seems to be a continuing step-by-step process. Several of the general lines of improvement are, however, listed here:

1. The clarity, accuracy, completeness, and usefulness of the annual mutual security budget presentation to the Congress have been improved each year for the past several years; in large part, this reflects executive branch reaction to specific recommendations of this subcommittee.

2. This and other committees and subcommittees of Congress have long been plagued with the problem of obtaining adequate information from the executive branch concerning operations conducted with the funds that the Congress appropriates. In the case of the mutual security program, the intent of the Congress to obtain such information, and the power to do so, have both been clarified by the Hardy amendments to this year's mutual security authorization and appropriations acts.

3. The several related reports of this subcommittee on the operations of different facets of the mutual security program provide, taken together, a handy primer to the program, useful to the Congress and the public alike.

4. The continuing scrutiny by the subcommittee of ICA contractual procedures, and operations thereunder, has resulted in a demonstrable improvement in the quality thereof.

5. In the opinion of the Comptroller General, there is evidence that more weight and substance are being given to GAO audits of foreign-aid operations as a result of this subcommittee's followthrough activities on ICA operating deficiencies disclosed by GAO.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress

1. Continuation of a detailed study of certain U.S. lending agencies, including their relationships to one another and to the international lending agencies; these U.S. agencies would include the ICA, the Development Loan Fund, and the Ex-port-Import Bank, as well as the coordinating body, the National Advisory Council on International Monetary Problems.

2. A subsequent inquiry into the acquisition of foreign currencies, especially under Public Law 480, and lending policies and practices in conjunction with such currencies.

3. An inquiry into the effectiveness of ICA's Office of Evaluation and its successor, the Office of the Inspection General and Comptroller (created by the Mutual Security Act of 1959).

4. Continuation of a study of the operations of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON DONABLE PROPERTY, HON. JOHN W. M'CORMACK, CHAIRMAN

I. Investigations

(a) Reports issued: No formal investigative reports.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

The subcommittee has kept in constant contact with the donable surplus property program and the Federal and State agencies responsible for its operation, namely, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; General Services Administration; Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; Department of Defense; and the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. State agency operations visited during the session were Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Minnesota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington. Two State regional meetings were attended and the annual meeting of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property.

As a result of the constant informal investigation of the program and the problems which arose, a number of bottlenecks were eliminated and the program continued to grow as will be indicated by the following table:

Fiscal year	Property allocations		
	Personal	Real	Total
1954	$107,042,941	$10,750,698	$117,793,639
1955	132,174,248	16,088,495	148,262,743
1956	204,497,417	14,375,151	218,872,568
1957	234,862,274	7,303,250	242,165,524
1958	302,458,448	9,478,715	311,937,163
1959	363,329,562	21,179,482	384,509,044

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

The eligible donees received surplus property with acquisition cost of $361 million during the fiscal year 1959 and during the months of July 1959 it amounted to $32,800,593. The use of this property for purposes of education, health, and civil defense, instead of selling it for a few cents on the dollar, indicates a large saving to the taxpayer at a time when our institutions sorely need this help.

In addition, the military agencies now state that they prefer to donate the property rather than employ other disposal methods since time is saved by this method and this means money savings as it costs one-half of 1 percent of the cost value of the property per year to hold it.

II. Legislation

(a) Number of measures referred to the subcommittee: 38 bills were referred to the subcommittee during the session.

(b) Reports issued:

1. Pensions for Comptroller General's dependents (H.R. 7062). This bill was reported from the Government Operations Committee June 12, 1959; Report No. 540. It passed the House June 15, 1959. Reported in the Senate June 18, 1959; Senate Report No. 403 and passed the Senate July 6, 1959 (Public Law 86–87).

2. Surplus property for firefighting organizations. Reported from Government Operations Committee August 12, 1959; Report No. 891, passed the House August 31, 1959. (H.R. 3722 pending in the Senate Government Operations Committee.)

3. Foreign excess property bill (H.R. 8398). Subcommittee reported to full committee but action not completed.

(c) Days of hearings: 2 days of formal hearings.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislative

No reports received.

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries:

The subcommittee report of August 15, 1958, detailed in some length the action taken with respect to the curtailment of cost of telephone services for the SAGE project. As Congressman VINSON stated, "The in-

vestigation of SAGE had reduced the estimate of the telephone services from $240 million per annum to $157 million per annum. This is a saving of $83 million per year or a saving of $830 million over the 10-year period."

It has not been considered necessary to attempt to determine in detail the savings from this continuing project or investigation applicable to the current year. However, on a straight line projection the saving would be $83 million as Congressman VINSON stated on the House floor on April 12, 1956. Further, the cumulative savings for the 4-year period, 1956–59, would be $332 million.

A second prior activity of considerable current interest involves the work of the GSA in appearing before the FCC as a representative of the Government as a user of utility services in order to obtain fair and equitable rates for the SAGE project.

Authority for the GSA stems from section 303, Public Law 968, 84th Congress, 2d session, which was developed by the subcommittee and the House Armed Services Committee following the investigation of SAGE by the subcommittee in 1955. Upon passage of Public Law 968 the subcommittee chairman wrote to the White House asking that steps be taken to implement the law so that GSA would have the resources requisite to appearing before the regulatory agencies concerned. Fifty thousand dollars was made available from the President's emergency fund for the purpose and GSA intervened in hearings before the FCC. Later it became necessary on several occasions to assist GSA in obtaining additional funds to continue the work.

The GSA work has been highly successful. As stated in the July 1959 report of the subcommittee:

"The Civil Service Commission recently considered savings claimed by GSA personnel who petitioned the FCC for lower rates for the Federal Government as a user of utility services.

"After investigation, the Civil Service Commission awarded $10,000 to the personnel involved in handling this matter before the FCC on the basis that $15,385,000 would be saved annually by the Government over a contemplated 10-year period.

"It was estimated that a 15 percent saving on rates applied to SAGE alone or $10 million annually and for civilian agencies other than SAGE $4,600,000 reduction on telephone total of $14,600,000 reduction on telephone rates.

"In addition, a reduction of 18.9 percent was effected in Western Union rates for certain services or $785,000 per year. The total annual savings for all classes is estimated at $15,385,000."

A third prior activity of great potential is the so-called McCormack amendment to the Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1958. The purpose of the amendment was covered in detail in last year's report. The amendment reads:

"Whenever the Secretary of Defense determines it will be advantageous to the Government in terms of effectiveness, economy, or efficiency, he shall provide for the carrying out of any supply or service activity common to more than one military department by a single agency or such other organizational entities as he deems appropriate. For the purposes of this paragraph, any supply or service activity common to more than one military department shall not be considered a 'major combatant function' within the meaning of paragraph (1) hereof."

The potential importance of this amendment caused a number of Senators and Representatives to write to the Secretary of Defense requesting information as to what actions had been taken or were contemplated with respect to its implementation. Attached hereto is a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (S. & L.) responsive to the inquiries.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress

The subcommittee has pending 29 bills to expand the donable program to various groups. The administration opposes the expansion of the program but at the same time has not adequately staffed and organized the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to enable it to screen and allocate all existing surplus property which is useful and needed for the purposes of education, health, and civil defense agencies which are now eligible donees. As a result, much useful and needed surplus property is not being taken but is sold for a few cents on the dollar of acquisition cost.

The subcommittee plans hearings on pending bills and hopes to develop information as to total availability of surplus property and executive agency plans to further improve the existing program.

The Department of Defense has announced that it has $26.7 billion of surpluses marked for disposal and it is expected that the annual rate of disposal will be near $10 billion for several years. The Congress through the current Department of Defense Appropriation Act, Public Law 86–166, section 611, has permitted the Department of Defense to use all receipts from sales in order to accelerate the disposal program. This means a speedup in the disposal program and the eligible donees for surplus property must be geared to a higher speed than heretofore or more good property will be sold.

It is evident that the donable program will continue at a high rate for some time to come and also that more and more bills will be introduced to make surplus property available for meritorious purposes so long as the defense program continues at such a high level and State, county, municipal, and other activities are deprived of much-needed funds.

As stated above, in July the donable program amounted to over $32 million and it is expected that the volume for the current year will exceed last year's total of $361 million by a considerable amount. It seems that the program for the remainder of the 86th Congress will be more active than ever.

"[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1959]

"Schools Buy U.S. Surplus Equipment for Classes as Little as Cent a Pound

"(By Jean White)

"For as little as a cent a pound, schools and colleges carted off $280 million worth of Government surplus property last fiscal year, Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, announced yesterday.

"District public schools took advantage of the bargain bulk rates to buy two 10-ton truckloads of surplus material at $100 a load. In the loads, science teachers have found items like permanent magnets and oscilloscopes worth $60 each on the regular market, Keith Johnson, supervising science director in the public schools, said.

"Most of the surplus equipment, he added, is stripped down for parts for demonstrations and student projects. The mixed assortments include items like tubes, condensers, resistors, transformers, vacuum pumps, meters, and motors.

"The district has been dealing with the area warehouse at Blue Plains for surplus equipment.

"Yesterday at a press conference, Flemming described a supermarket operation now set up at military installations at Oakland, Calif., and Norfolk, Va. Science teachers can shop in person, pick out the equipment they want, pay a cent or two handling charge, and take the equipment away with them that day on a cash-and-carry basis.

"At Norfolk so far, Flemming said, nearly half a million dollars worth of property has been distributed to 55 schools for industrial arts, physics, engineering, science, and technical courses.

"Surplus property is now one of the biggest single sources of Federal aid to education, he added, and is also allocated for health and civil defense uses. Last year the District got $1,348,981 in movable surplus items."

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT INFORMATION, HON. JOHN E. MOSS, CHAIRMAN

1. Investigations

(a) Reports issued:

1. "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Air Force Refusal to the General Accounting Office)," second report by the Committee on Government Operations; House Report No. 234, March 19, 1959.

This report resulted from the subcommittee's hearing with the Comptroller General, the Secretary of the Air Force, and other witnesses on November 12 and 13, 1958, relative to the refusal of the Air Force to make available to the Comptroller General a report entitled "Survey of Management of the Ballistic Missile Program." This hearing was held at the specific direction of Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON. The report stated that the Secretary of Defense had issued a directive granting the Secretaries of the services authority to refuse information to the Comptroller General. The report concluded that the DOD directive was issued without statutory authority, and that it modified and contravened the Budget and Accounting Acts of 1921 and 1950. The report also concluded that the sole basis on which the Secretary of the Air Force refused access to the information in question was a claim of executive privilege, based upon the Attorney General's memorandum attached to the May 17, 1954, letter from the President to the Secretary of Defense.

2. "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies (Progress of Study, August 1958–July 1959)," 12th report by the Committee on Government Operations; House Report No. 1137, September 3, 1959.

This report covered general investigative work of the Special Subcommittee on Government Information. It presented details on 35 specific cases or general areas of restrictions on information from the Federal departments and agencies. It also detailed the refusal, by a subordinate official of the Navy Department, of an unclassified study of the Naval Gun Factory requested by a member of the House Armed Services Committee. The Naval Gun Factory case was the subject of hearings by the Special Subcommittee on Government Information on April 20 and 23, 1959, and the refusal was again based on a claim of executive privilege. The report concludes that, notwithstanding a specific directive by the Secretary of Defense, an Assistant Secretary of the Navy took it upon himself to refuse the information to a Member of Congress on the basis that he was "the alter ego" of the Secretary of the Navy.

The report also covers the followup action by the subcommittee on the effect of Public Law 85–619, the amendment to the "housekeeping" statute (5 U.S.C. 22), which was enacted by the 85th Congress. Other matters documented in the report include:

a. The Defense Department shrouded the Atlas-Score talking satellite project in deep secrecy and, when the event was publicized, created the false impression that the satellite was more than twice as big as the largest comparable Russian satellite.

b. The Defense Department repeatedly used the claim of military security to refuse information about the use of monkeys in

scientific research, then lifted the restrictions to publicize successful research efforts.

c. The Defense Department refused to release pictures of the outside of the Titan missile even though the outside configuration had been declassified and the missile stood in full public view, but pictures were released of the President viewing the completed missile just before the November 1958 elections.

d. The Defense Department reorganized information activities to give the Department's public relations office greater control over the release of information by the military experts.

e. Executive agencies used the excuse of security censorship to delete nonsecurity information from congressional testimony.

f. The Federal Aviation Agency refused to make public reports on malfunctions of new-type altimeters installed in commercial jet airplanes after restricting use of the altimeters, claiming the public might misinterpret the facts.

g. The Federal Power Commission refused to make public a Commission staff report on a proposed power exchange contract, claiming the staff would not comment freely on controversial matters if the information were available to the public.

h. The Labor Department claimed Federal-State cooperation would be weakened by public access to Bureau of Employment Security analyses of administration of State unemployment insurance laws.

i. The Bureau of Prisons denied public access to studies of conditions in local jails for fear of controversy, claiming an executive privilege for the restriction.

j. The Housing and Home Finance Agency refused to make public audit reports of local housing authorities financed with Federal funds, claiming employees would not comment freely if the information were made public and asserting an executive privilege to restrict the reports.

k. The Civil Service Commission claimed an executive privilege to hide the result of an investigation of irregularities in a Virginia rural mail carrier examination.

l. The White House refused a congressional request for information on Operations Coordinating Board guidelines directing Defense Department information policies, claiming an executive privilege to withhold the information.

m. The Housing and Home Finance Agency claimed an executive privilege to refuse information on an investigation of the Los Angeles City Housing Authority to the California State Legislature, the attorney general of California, and to the Congress.

n. The General Accounting Office reported the citation of "executive privilege" for numerous refusals by executive agencies to make available information which the agencies are required by law to provide the GAO.

o. The Civil Service Commission reversed its earlier policy of making public the names of retiring Federal employees, contending that the information should be restricted because there was no law authorizing the release even though no law prohibited it.

p. The Electronic Production Resources Agency in the Defense Department reversed the policy of making available to the public nonsecurity statistics after the Department of Commerce protested release of the information.

q. The Department of Justice continued restrictions on access to information about Federal prisoners.

(b) Investigations not resulting in a formal report:

1. The following investigations by the Special Subcommittee on Government Information have not yet resulted in formal reports:

a. Hearings were held on April 20, 21, and 23, 1959, with representatives of the General Accounting Office and the Department of the Navy on the Navy's refusal to make available to the GAO a copy of a report on procurement activities of the Military Sea Transportation Service.

b. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration reversed its decision to withhold the names of firms which had submitted bids on the space capsule project, but the subcommittee's investigation is continuing into charges that details of the negotiated bids are not made available to Congress.

c. The subcommittee, after investigating the availability of the records of public courts-martial, is drafting statutory language to correct the restriction.

d. The proposed discontinuance of an annual report by the Interior Department on investment and expenditures of the Colorado River Dam fund was investigated and proposed amendatory language has been submitted to the Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee which is considering the legislation in question, S. 899.

e. The subcommittee asked the Post Office Department to justify restrictions on photographs of postal employees in the process of screening objectionable material sent through the mail.

f. Following a subcommittee investigation of restrictions on photographers and newspapermen seeking information about the St. Lawrence Seaway, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation made arrangements to improve access for photographs and news coverage.

g. The subcommittee, at the request of a Member of Congress, investigated the availability of a Federal Aviation Agency medical file concerning a disqualified pilot.

h. An investigation of the refusal of the Department of State to furnish a Member of Congress blank visa forms revealed that the visa forms are serially numbered and controlled, but arrangements were made to make sample forms available to any Member of Congress.

i. The availability of information about Mercury Astronauts has been discussed with officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration who agreed that no public information will be withheld under an exclusive contract for the Astronauts' personal stories.

j. The Department of State, following a subcommittee investigation, made available a copy of a letter the Department sent to the New York Commission Against Discrimination.

k. The subcommittee is investigating the Defense Department's ban of a proposed book by Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command.

l. At the request of a Member of Congress the subcommittee studied the legal aspects of a Defense Department prohibition against dissemination of a report on water contamination.

m. A Pennsylvania contractor was permitted to talk to a Navy technical expert to whom he had been denied access after the subcommittee looked into the matter at the request of a Member of Congress.

n. A Department of Defense agency, following a subcommittee inquiry, took steps to remove restrictions on British technical documents which already had been declassified by the British Government.

o. The subcommittee is continuing an investigation of restrictions on statistics of sales at Army and Air Force post exchanges.

2. The subcommittee provided assistance in obtaining information from Federal executive departments and agencies to the following Members of Congress: FRANK M. COFFIN, EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, DANIEL J. FLOOD, HARLAN HAGEN, BURR P. HARRISON, BYRON L. JOHNSON, RICHARD E. LANEFORD, MORGAN MOULDER, GEORGE MCGOVERN, DON MAGNUSON, CHARLES O. PORTER, GEORGE M. RHODES, PAUL G. ROGERS, JAMES ROOSEVELT, J. T. RUTHERFORD, JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, Senators FRANK CHURCH, STUART SYMINGTON and WILLIAM PROXMIRE.

3. The subcommittee also provided assistance to numerous historians, scientists, researchers and students of government by providing material on Federal freedom of information problems and suggesting sources for additional detailed material.

4. Subcommittee Chairman Moss and Majority Member FASCELL led discussions of specific freedom of information problems at meetings of a number of major organizations.

(c) Monetary savings or recoveries as a result of investigation:

Actual money savings from improvement in the information practices and policies of the Federal Government often are impossible to estimate. A free flow of information in a democratic system, however, results in a responsible—and thus efficient—government.

(d) Other remedial measures taken and nonmonetary benefits:

Improvements in information practices of the executive branch range from the assignment to the President, himself, of the responsibility for refusing information to Congress about the foreign aid program to the removal of restrictions on Bureau of Public Roads statistics about the Nation's highway needs. Following are some of the benefits:

1. At the direction of Chairman WILLIAM L. DAWSON, the subcommittee assisted Congressman PORTER HARDY, Jr., of Virginia, Chairman of the Foreign Operations and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee, in drafting amendments to the Mutual Security Act of 1959 and the Mutual Security Appropriations Act of 1960. The purpose of the Hardy amendments was to curtail the use of executive privilege as a claim of authority to deny information to the General Accounting Office and committees of Congress, and the ultimate effect of the amendments as finally adopted will be to require the President, himself, to justify any refusals of information.

2. The Budget Bureau clarified restrictions on testimony by Defense Department witnesses before congressional appropriations committees, after contending that military experts are not completely free to express personal views at variance with budget requests.

3. The Comptroller of the Currency initially refused to make public the blank forms filled out by persons applying for national bank charters, contending that only legitimate requests for the blank forms should be honored, but later made the blank forms available when asked to cite statutory authority for the refusal.

4. The Federal Aviation Agency made available a previously restricted engineering report on the materials to be used in paving the new Washington International Airport.

5. The Agriculture Department clarified regulations which had been misused to restrict public access to crop allotment records, particularly in California.

6. The Interior Department made available previously restricted information on leases of public lands and took steps to revise information practices in Bureau of Land Management offices.

7. The Navy provided reports of tests of an arctic cargo sled to the designer of the sled who had been trying to get the information for 10 years.

8. The Army disclosed information on medical payments after a private citizen had tried for 8 years to obtain the information.

9. The Bureau of Public Roads removed restrictions on the availability of nationwide highway statistics, making the information available to local government officials who needed it for tax-planning purposes.

(e) Days of hearings held:

Three days hearings with 13 witnesses were held so far by the Special Government Information Subcommittee during 1959.

II. Legislation

No legislative measures were referred to the subcommittee.

III. Reports received such as notice of negotiated sales, General Accounting Office audit reports, and similar matters considered which are not legislation

No such reports were referred to the subcommittee.

IV. Prior activities of the subcommittee of current or continuing interest

(a) Cumulative money savings or recoveries:

1. Estimated savings of approximately $400,000 a year result from Defense Department adoption of recommendations that unnecessary restrictions be removed from "historical" military documents. Following subcommittee hearings and recommendations adopted by the House Government Operations Committee, the Defense Department in September 1958 issued a directive declassifying nearly all Defense Department documents originated before January 1946. The immediate saving in storage costs alone is estimated at $400,000 each year, based upon the volume of stored documents which no longer require the expensive protection given to highly classified material. Additional savings in shipping costs are realized each year.

2. Annual savings of more than $100,000 continue to accrue from the abolition of the Office of Strategic Information in the Department of Commerce—an agency for which appropriations were deleted following subcommittee hearings and full committee recommendations.

(b) Other affirmative benefits:

The Treasury Department adopted regulations providing for public access to applications for tax exemptions filed by nonprofit organizations. The regulations were based upon a law passed during the 85th Congress, following subcommittee hearings and full committee recommendations on the tax exemption information question.

V. Projected program for the remainder of the 86th Congress

1. The subcommittee will complete work on a report, to be filed in the 2d session of the 86th Congress, covering a cooperative research project with the Library of Congress into all laws authorizing Federal restrictions on information.

2. The subcommittee is working with the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on possible legislation as a result of the investigation of the Federal Aviation Agency concerning the availability of reports on malfunctions in aircraft.

3. Possible legislative solutions to the abuses of executive privilege are being developed. Possible legislation includes appropriation limitations to prevent excessive use of executive privilege, and legislative action to permit a court test of the executive privilege claim.

4. A report on the Navy's restrictions on a report of the Military Sea Transportation Service's procurement practices will be completed.

5. Current investigative work which will be continued includes:

a. Improvements in the Department of Defense declassification policies.

b. Defense Department restrictions on nonmilitary information about missile and satellite programs.

c. Department of Commerce involvement in restrictions on statistics about post exchange sales.

d. The legal status of Government employees who contract to sell "personal" information which is valuable only through virtue of their Government employment.

e. The Defense Department policy restricting bylined articles or book by military leaders.

f. Air Force restrictions on information about contracts.

g. Availability of statistical export information from the Bureau of Customs.

h. Possible amendments to the public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act.

i. Department of Agriculture restrictions on information about cattle grazing permits.

j. Department of Agriculture restrictions on information setting the policy for storage of surplus farm products.

k. Restrictions on historical documents filed in the National Archives.

l. Preparations for censorship in the event of a national emergency.

m. Depense Department policy banning the publication of books, magazine articles, etc., by military policy experts.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON RENO HIGHWAYS, HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK, CHAIRMAN

This subcommittee was created for the purpose of investigating and reporting on complaints received by the committee concerning the interstate highway being built through Reno, Nev. The subcommittee held 3 days of hearings in Reno and thereafter submitted a report entitled, "Reno-Sparks-Verdi Interstate Highway (Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce)" which was approved by the full committee and issued on April 23, 1959, as the third report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. No. 292, 86th Cong., 1st sess.)

The report contained four conclusions and recommendations as follows:

A. The record does not support charges that Federal participation in financing the construction of a downtown interstate highway through Reno would be a wasteful expenditure of Federal moneys.

B. Although there was technical compliance by State officials with Federal statutory requirements on public hearings, the Reno controversy stems from the inadequacy of communication from the State on justification for the proposed route to local officials and citizens and indicates the need to amend directives of the Bureau of Public Roads affecting public hearings.

C. Guidelines with respect to consideration of economic effects of route location should be contained in Bureau of Public Roads directive.

D. The investigative function of the Bureau of Public Roads must be strengthened.

Jews in the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me concerning an article in the New Leader.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate and to the American public a remarkable journalistic effort. I refer to a special report prepared by the editors of the New Leader on "Jews in the Soviet Union," which appeared on September 14, 1959.

The New Leader is a distinguished and highly respected periodical dealing with international and domestic issues. In this special issue devoted to the important subject of the Jewish minority in the Soviet Union it has rendered a valuable service to the American people and to the cause of freedom everywhere. The editors believe that this study, which took an entire year to complete, is valuable primarily because it consists almost entirely of documents from Soviet and non-Soviet Communist sources. They point out that this is the first time these documents from various parts of the world have been brought together and printed systematically within one coherent historical and political framework.

I commend this exceptionally fine job of political reporting to all persons interested in Soviet affairs and in the rights of minorities throughout the world.

A Report to the Citizens of the 13th Congressional District of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, following is my end of session report to my constituents whom I have had the privilege and pleasure of serving in this session of Congress:

A REPORT TO THE CITIZENS OF THE 13TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—THE CHALLENGE IN GOVERNMENT

Nearly a year has passed since the voters of New Jersey's 13th Congressional District elected me to the U.S. House of Representatives to serve in the 86th Congress. While the press has been most generous and most fair in reporting for you the positions I have taken on the various issues before this Congress and the general activities of my office, I feel it is appropriate to file with you an end-of-session report on the year's work. I have listed in these pages a summary of my actions on the major issues before the Congress, and other activities in which I have engaged on behalf of the people I am privileged to represent.

In this column I would like to discuss briefly some of the many problems of Government and especially what, in my mind, is a fundamental issue we are facing in Government today.

With the exception of periods when the country was actually at war, no Congress has been faced with problems of such magnitude and complexity as those which confront the 86th. We have before us matters which range from the orbits of outer space to the corridors of the United Nations. Some of these may seem, at times, to be beyond solution, and, indeed, it requires great courage to face up to the challenge of our times.

We have been witness in the past 10 years to a tremendous increase in the population of our own country, and of the whole world. We have marveled at the unbelievable advancements in science. We have followed, not without some trepidation, the coming of age of world communism and the emergence of the Soviet Union as a giant among nations. In the East we have watched China, with its massive population, awaken like a restless dragon.

Suddenly, in the last year of the decade, the full impact of this great population

growth, the advancements in military science and the shifting of power in world politics has come to bear with world-shaking consequence on modern civilization.

Generally, the many problems with which the Congress struggles fall into two categories, domestic problems which most intimately and immediately affect our own citizens and those of greater scope which affect not only our own people, but people the world over.

We are, of course, most conscious of those problems that have come about mainly as the result of our own rapidly increasing population. There continues to be a demand for adequate housing for the growing young families that are the real strength of our Nation and a pressing need for aid to education, not only to the extent of providing sufficient classroom space and a decent standard of pay for the teachers into whose hands we entrust the intellectual and character development of our children, but for the advanced study of young men and women upon whom will depend the future well-being and development of our country.

All of this adds up to a tremendous challenge not alone to the Congress, but to the people of America.

There has been throughout this legislative year, as you know, marked differences of opinion between the heavily Democratic Congress and the Republican administration. As I have studied the positions established and the actions taken on the various major legislative matters, it became quite clear to me that the really fundamental issue is whether the Federal Government will face up to the challenge of this dynamic age by meeting the demands of a growing Nation and its rapidly expanding population, to include such things as a strong defense force, full educational opportunities, adequate housing, care of the aged and mentally ill, public transportation, adequate sanitary systems and water supply; or whether it will compromise this challenge through unrealistic and ultraconservative fiscal policies.

I am as conscious as any citizen of the dangers of inflation, and I have strongly opposed reckless spending projects in Government. But the threat of inflation must not be used by the advocates of the tight dollar to thwart the progress of this country and to deny any of our citizens a decent standard of living and equal opportunities in every field.

The record of service in my first year in the Congress, as you will see in reading this report, favors generally those programs that attempt to provide the needs of a growing Nation. I am convinced that if America is to remain strong and free it must meet realistically the challenge of this period in our history. In this I feel that I reflect generally the feelings of the citizens of the 13th district.

CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
Member of Congress, 13th District, New Jersey.

THE STRENGTH OF OUR ALLIANCE

We are living in an age in which the United States is filling the role of leader of the free nations. The security of any one of them is dependent on the strength of the alliance.

Our day-to-day dealings with the governments of these free nations and with the governments of the Communist nations constitute a major activity of our Government. A great deal of time in the Congress is devoted to a continuing study of this particular function of Government.

Every Member of Congress is assigned to one or more committees, and a good deal of time is spent in committee work. I am assigned to the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Subcommittee of Foreign Economic Policy and Europe. It is a rare privilege for a new member to receive such an important assignment and I am grateful to the House leadership for the confidence they have shown in me.

MISSION TO BERLIN

As a member of the committee, I was afforded an opportunity to observe closely political activity in the European nations and relationships that exist between these nations. The committee had before it as witnesses not only ranking members of our State and Defense Departments but prominent leaders of European countries.

Work on the Foreign Affairs Committee led to my selection to head a special study mission to Berlin during the crises in that German city last spring. Following our return a good deal of time was devoted to writing the Berlin Report, a document which served as a guide for the Foreign Affairs Committee in its deliberation on the Berlin matter.

A recommendation which I made in the report calling for the United States to serve notice that it was prepared to fire the first shot or drop the first bomb, if there should be conclusive evidence that an enemy was preparing to wage war on this country, brought outraged Communists to their feet to denounce me. These denounciations were printed in Pravda and in the Communist newspapers of Red China.

FOREIGN AID

Many weeks of the committee's time were devoted to hearings on the mutual security and foreign aid bills. The last public act of the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles was his appearance before our committee. I had occasion to note at the time that it was evident that he was in intense pain, unafraid of death and drew the strength to testify in this important hearing from his keen sense of duty.

There is no denying that some abuses exist in the foreign aid program, but there is overwhelming evidence that this program is vital and effective in our efforts to stem the spread of communism throughout the world. Not only did I vote for the foreign aid bill, but I was assigned to assist in assuring its passage when it came to the floor for a vote.

KHRUSHCHEV VISIT

I can report that among the members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee there was concern over the President's invitation to the Soviet Premier, Mr. Khrushchev, to visit the United States. My particular concern was for the tremendous propaganda effect of such a visit in nations throughout the world, particularly in the captive nations. While I had serious reservations about the visit, I pointed out at the time that the ultimate responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs rests with the President and once he had made his decision it was our duty to support him, regardless of our personal feelings.

COMMON MARKET STUDY

Following adjournment of the first session, I was selected to be a member of a special study mission which is going to Europe to observe the operation of the European Common Market and the development of integration programs in Western Europe. As an adjunct to the mission, I was assigned to make a study of economic development in Poland and trade relations between that country and the Soviet Union. This aspect of the work will require my visiting Moscow and Warsaw where I will confer with economic advisers of the U.S. Embassies and other trade officials.

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION

There is obvious need for improvement in our unemployment compensation laws. The present law, passed some years ago, is wholly inadequate to meet the problems of the large number of unemployed throughout the country, particularly in labor distressed areas. Hudson County, which is included in the Newark labor market area, is considered, by virtue of continued unemployment of 6 percent of its total labor force, to be a distressed labor area.

I cosponsored in the House a bill which was similar to one introduced in the Senate by Senator KENNEDY of Massachusetts. My bill, H.R. 3563, was designed, among other things, to do the following:

Establish benefits equal to not less than 50 percent of weekly wages, but not more than two-thirds of the average weekly wage in the State.

Establish a uniform payment period of 39 weeks. (It is now 26 weeks).

Passage of this bill would bring an end to the patchwork approach to the serious problems of the existing program which pays too little in benefits for too short a period of time.

Early in the session the Congress voted a temporary extension of authority to pay unemployment benefits for a period of 39 weeks. The extension is to October 31, 1959. Although I voted for this, I protested at the time that this was merely an expedient and not the real solution to the unemployment compensation program.

The Congress failed to enact legislation, such as Senator KENNEDY and I proposed, however this legislation should be given a top priority in the next session.

In my efforts to get action on this legislation during the session, I appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and urged that an effective bill be brought to the floor.

CAVEN POINT

The economy of our area suffered as the result of the decision by the Department of the Army to abandon overseas shipping through its terminal at Caven Point. I devoted a great deal of time in an effort to force a reversal of this decision, carrying my protest as high as the Secretary of Defense, for, in my opinion, the abandonment of its splendid facilities at Caven Point not only was harmful to local economy and added to the problems of our already economically distressed area, but it was a ridiculous move that in no way benefited national economy. The Army may one day regret that it gave up a major deep water channel, direct highway access, ocean terminal. From a standpoint of military preparedness it was certainly an ill-considered move. It has never been explained to my satisfaction why the Army permitted the spending of more than $2 million in public funds to build new facilities at Caven Point which were abandoned without ever being used. Already these brand-new structures are showing signs of the rapid deterioration that hits deserted buildings.

I consider the abandonnment of the Caven Point facilities to be the most wasteful and thoughtless decision by a Government agency that I encountered in my first year in Washington.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The final act of the Congress was to pass a foreign aid bill to which was attached a rider providing for extension of the life of the Civil Rights Commission.

It is most regrettable that the Congress, its efforts in this important field blocked by a strong group of southern legislators, failed to vote a comprehensive civil rights program.

It was impossible to force a bill out of either the Senate or the House Judiciary Committees, the Chairmanship of both being held by members from Southern States.

There is agreement between Democratic and Republican leaders that a comprehensive civil rights bill will be an early order of business in the second session, and it is hoped that some action will take place no later than next February.

When it appeared that the will of the southerners would prevail in the civil rights

matter, I wrote the President urging that he make a nationwide television appeal for public demand for civil rights action, similar to his appeal for a labor reform bill. I felt that the civil rights matter was of equal importance.

In the House many Members signed a discharge petition seeking to force floor action on a civil rights bill despite the failure of the committee to report on a bill. I was one of the signers of the petition. It failed to gain sufficient signatures in the closing days of the session.

A bill aimed at restricting action of the U.S. Supreme Court in civil rights matters was introduced in the House and passed despite strong protests of many Members. I took a determined position against passage of the bill (H.R. 3) and urged its defeat in a speech on the floor of the House. The bill failed to come up for a vote in the Senate.

HOUSING PROGRAM

Probably no matter before the 86th Congress in its 1st session was given as much attention as public housing. The great majority of the Members, both Democratic and Republican, of both the Senate and House favored continuing a sound and constructive public housing program.

The Congress passed three separate housing bills. Two of these were vetoed by the President who favored a drastically reduced housing program. Following the first veto, the Congress passed a second housing bill which was a compromise, an effort to meet the President halfway. The second bill, while it reduced, authorized Federal funding, still retained authority that would have permitted continuing the program at an adequate level.

The third housing bill, while it contained authorization for construction of 37,000 units of low cost housing for families displaced as the result of slum clearance projects, a $50 million authorization for loans for housing for elderly persons, and funds for urban renewal, was only a bit higher than the cost of the administration bill. The final bill provided for an expenditure of about $1 billion over a 2-year period.

I favored a more liberal housing bill than that which was finally passed and was particularly distressed when President Eisenhower vetoed the second housing bill.

Early in the session I introduced a bill calling for a lowering of limits from 65 to 62 years as the age at which individuals might apply for public housing under the elderly persons provisions. I took this action because a large percentage of persons at age 62 are incapacitated or able to work only part time and are frequently forced to live on reduced incomes.

WAR ON INFLATION

My mail is heavy with letters from constituents who are concerned with the continuing threat of inflation. I share this concern and I am conscious that big government spending is a contributing factor. However, some of the economic practices of business are likewise contributing factors. Inflation will be effectively blocked only through cooperation of government, business and the consumer public. While I advocate wise and prudent spending by our government agencies, as I said in another column of this report, ultraconservative fiscal policies and too tight a pinch on dollars can block the full development of the country's resources, slow down our scientific and engineering programs, compromise our national defense and deny our citizens many of the government services to which they are entitled. A proper balance in economy with sensible restraint on government spending would check inflation if business and the consumer public does its part.

The staggering amount of interest which the Federal Government is required to pay on borrowed money is a matter of increasing concern. This is a matter of serious concern and I am certain that the Congress next year will undertake a study of this problem.

IS CONGRESS THE BIG SPENDER?

The public likes to pin the big spending tag on Congress. This is a year when we would do well to follow Al Smith's advice and take a look at the record in this regard.

A. The President's budget for fiscal year 1960 called for $74 billion.

B. The Congress appropriated $72,977,598,352, cutting the President's budget requests by about $1.8 billion.

The Congress trimmed the President's budget requests for the operation of nearly every Federal agency except the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It increased that budget by $25 million, principally for medical research.

Congress cut the President's request for supplemental appropriations by $376 million.

It also cut backdoor spending, which was approved by the President, by several hundred million dollars.

LABOR BILL

One of the most bitter fights during the 1st session of the 86th Congress was over a so-called labor reform bill. Senator KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, had introduced legislation in the Senate which attempted to correct some of the abuses in some labor unions. There were some members of the Congress and the administration who felt that a stronger and more drastic bill was needed than that proposed by Senator KENNEDY and considered favorably by the House Labor Committee, with certain amendments. The result was the Landrum-Griffin bill which was passed by the House. I favored the bill supported by the House Labor Committee and voted against the Landrum-Griffin bill because I felt that in attempting to stamp out abuses which are known to exist in a few labor unions, it restricted legitimate union activities and may prove to be harmful to the honest and upright unions. A Senate and House conference committee, headed by Senator KENNEDY, brought forth a compromise bill which finally was passed by both Houses by large majorities. I voted for the bill as approved by the conference committee.

NONRESIDENT TAX

For many years residents of New Jersey working in New York have been required to pay a tax on income derived from their New York employment. This is not so in the case of New York residents employed in New Jersey. It is grossly unfair to our New Jersey residents and I am deeply concerned for the several thousand citizens of the 13th Congressional District who commute to work in New York and are forced to pay New York State income tax. Early in the session, I was cosponsor of H.R. 4198, a bill that would permit compacts between States to grant uniform tax treatment to nonresident workers. The bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee. During the committee hearings on this bill I appeared as a witness and urged favorable action by the committee. The legislation never reached the House floor for consideration. However, Governor Rockefeller, of New York, has assured me that he will continue to give attention to this problem and there is every indication that the unfair burden imposed by New York State will be eased. I am hopeful that this will be so in the near future.

MEADOWLAND DEVELOPMENT

Important to the economy of Hudson County is the eventual development of its vast meadowlands. Studies are being made by a number of communities and the State of New Jersey who have banned together in a joint effort. During the first session I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and urged that Federal funds be made available in order that the Army engineers might undertake preliminary studies for eventual development of the meadowlands.

GASOLINE TAX

Although I had reservations about increasing Federal taxes on gasoline, I voted in favor of a bill authorizing the increase after having been assured that this was the only means of continuing the Federal highway construction program. Cancellation or postponement of highway construction in New Jersey would not only be harmful to local economy and mean the loss of work by many highway employees, but would delay completion of very badly needed additional expansion of our road nets.

CAN WE BE OF SERVICE?

Very early in my first year in Congress, I learned the importance of maintaining a close relationship with the citizens whom I represent. The interest of the citizens of our district in their Government is evidenced by the large volume of mail which is received in my office in Washington, and by the great many residents of the district who visit in my congressional office in Bayonne.

This interest of citizens in their Government has proven to be of great assistance to me. For I benefit by the views expressed and my actions are guided by the interest of my constituents. I gained a great deal of personal satisfaction in being of assistance to residents of the district whom I have been able to help.

Besides my congressional office at 783 Broadway where I hold office hours each Friday evening starting at 7 p.m., and where my resident secretary, Joseph Topoleski, may be contacted, I also maintain a congressional office in the Main Post Office Building at Warren and Montgomery Streets in Jersey City where my resident secretary for Jersey City, Donald Monahan, and my congressional aid, Mrs. Marcella West, may be contacted.

World Affairs Study Guide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement concerning the 1959–60 World Affairs Study Guide prepared by the Minneapolis Star.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I have just received a copy of the 1959–60 World Affairs Study Guide, prepared by the Minneapolis Star. This guide was edited by Mr. William C. Rogers, Director, Minnesota World Affairs Center, and Mr. Herm Sittard, educational reporter of the Minneapolis Star.

The World Affairs Study Guide is an excellent job in every respect and I commend it to communities throughout the United States. Let me indicate the four main subdivisions of the Guide:

I. Our role in world affairs.

II. Our European and Latin American allies.

III. The Communist world flexes its muscles.

IV. The uncommitted world.

There are a total of 26 different topics, each of which is introduced by basic book-

lets, usually paperback, which are available for serious adult educational purposes. Any American who would follow through this study guide reading a substantial portion of the basic booklets recommended would become very well informed on the contemporary problems of international politics as well as the issues of U.S. foreign policy.

I am deeply impressed by the fairness which characterizes this guide, as well as by its readability and attractiveness for the intelligent reader. I earnestly hope that many local communities will follow the good example set by Minneapolis. This World Affairs Study Guide merits the attention of national organizations seriously concerned with education in the field of foreign affairs.

I congratulate Mr. Rogers and Mr. Sittard, as well as their associates, who went beyond the line of duty in preparing this excellent educational material.

State Department Dining Room Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year when the State Department appropriation was before the House, inadequate explanation was given of the item covering the state dining room in the new State Department Building, and considerable misunderstanding arose. It seems appropriate to clarify the matter before the 1st session of this 86th Congress adjourns.

It has been growing increasingly clear that the lack of a state dining facility large enough to handle the formal functions involved in receiving heads of foreign governments and other prominent officials has become a vital need of government. With the ever growing number of official visitors, it becomes increasingly important to maintain ample facilities for their reception. The new state dining room, which is designed to seat a maximum of 126 people, will be the only Government-owned facility outside the White House adequate for handling formal state functions.

In the recent supplemental appropriations bill for 1960, funds were provided to complete the extension and remodeling of the State Department Building, including $263,000 for furnishing the entire eighth floor. Developed in what would have otherwise been unused roof space the area includes the state dining room, covering 5,455 square feet; a reception room where guests may be received, measuring 1,870 square feet; and a drawing room where guests may gather before and after dinner, covering 2,325 square feet. The remainder of the floor, 7,925 square feet, takes advantage of the less expensive construction cost to locate the normal dining facilities for secretarial rank personnel.

Comprising some 17,575 square feet, this entire area is to be decorated and furnished for $263,000, in accordance with the $15 per square foot standard established by the General Services Administration.

It is planned that the part of the floor where important foreign guests will be officially entertained should be fully representative of the American people and their historical, cultural, and industrial progress. Therefore, decorations and furnishing as planned will be early American, while exclusively American woods, marble, woven fabrics, and reproductions of early furniture styles will be used.

As a member of the State Department Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I would like to compliment the Department on the development of these much-needed facilities. Certainly their availability will make it easier for our Government to return appropriately the hospitality extended to American officials visiting foreign countries.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 135, p. 1942).

Appendix

Report of the Majority Leader on the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when this session of the 86th Congress convened on January 7, the United States and its allies had just rejected Soviet Premier Khrushchev's threat against Berlin as a "public repudiation of solemn engagements"—and the U.S.S.R. had launched its first moon rocket.

Today, as we move toward adjournment, the visit of Mr. Khrushchev to this country conicides with new Communist aggressions against small nations of the Far East, and indeed, even against India.

Thus our going forth, as with our coming in, is is the shadow of historic events.

It is against this background of a momentous era, fraught with the fate of mankind's future and extending beyond this world to the outermost realms of space, that the ultimate record of the 86th Congress must be written.

This has been an active and arduous session, and at this point I want to congratulate the membership of the House of Representatives for a task well done. Members on both sides of the aisle are to be commended for their industry and their devotion to duty, requiring many long hours of work in committee, and frequent protracted sessions on the floor.

As majority leader of a Democratic Congress—the third successively elected by the people during two terms of a Republican President—I may say frankly there were occasions and issues on which the administration could have been more amenable and cooperate with and to the constructive aims of the majority party in the Congress.

Our differences, however, did not extend in any great degreee to the broad front of international relations which, after all, under the Constitution, are within the foreign policy jurisdiction of the President. For example, President Eisenhower invited Mr. Khrushchev to our country. He assumed this responsibility under powers possessed by the President under the Constitution.

I do not know how far in advance other Democratic leaders were informed, but my first information was 15 minutes before the President's press conference, at which the invitation was announced. There was, so far as I have been able to find out, no bipartisan efforts made to ascertain whether or not this invitation should be extended.

After the invitation was extended, Democratic leaders and Members showed their bipartisan understanding—after the fact—by making no public criticism, and showing a restraint of a statesmanlike nature.

This raises an interesting hypothetical question. "Would Republicans have evidenced the same restraint if a Democratic President had issued the invitation?"

It will be interesting and watched closely, and from the angle, if analyzed correctly, to observe during the months ahead, "the law of natural and probable consequences" operating as a result of the visit of Mr. Khrushchev.

In this field, as in national defense, the 86th Congress has written a record of full support of America's leadership of the free world in the struggle against totalitarian forces seeking world domination by godless communism.

As a matter of fact, the great majority of the Democratic majority of the Democratic Members stand for firmer foreign policy, and stronger national defense than does the President, and a substantial percentage of his party.

In other words, the Democratic Party supports the President, plus.

If, for example, the Democratic Party had its way—our Army and Marine Corps would be stronger and larger, as well, as with our Navy and Air Force, modernized.

In 1958, Congress appropriated funds to maintain an Army at a strength of 900,000 officers and enlisted men, and the U.S. Marine Corps at 200,000 but the President ordered a "freeze" on the extra money appropriated for these purposes, and proceeded with reducing our Army below 900,000 and our Marine Corps below 200,000.

Congress can appropriate but cannot force or compel the President to spend.

This year, instead of appropriating enough money for a 900,000 Army, because the President, as he did last year, would freeze and not spend the money to keep our Army at the above strength, the Democratic-controlled Congress appropriated over $400 million toward modernizing our Army—furnishing it with up-to-date instruments of warfare. This is only the first step, as a large percentage of our military equipment and weapons are still of the World War II kind.

Let us hope the President will not freeze this extra money to be used for such an important purpose.

In the field of international affairs, America's policies and programs in this struggle for freedom have evolved over more than a decade of the postwar since President Harry S. Truman first took his courageous stand in saving Greece from Red action, turned aside Communist infiltration of France and Italy, and thwarted threats against Iran and Turkey. The Marshall plan, the Atlantic Pact, and the programs of economic assistance and military aid not only revived and rehabilitated once wartorn and stricken Western Europe, but also helped restore their prosperity so that today they are contributing an increasing share of their own resources to defense of all the Western allies.

For our own part this year the Congress, in the authorization act for the mutual security program, provided that hereafter military aid will become a part of the national defense budget. The emphasis in economic assistance is shifting from outright grants to repayable loans.

Also, the stream of aid is being directed more and more toward the Far East, the Middle East, and Africa, in recognition of the need of new and free countries swept into being on the tide of revolutionary aspirations. We must help them gain the economic strength to fight disease, poverty, and illiteracy which are the breeding grounds of communism, and to take their rightful place in the democratic world.

To this end mutual security appropriation bill provides for $3.2 billion plus for the fiscal year of 1960, with increased appropriations for the Development and Loan Fund for the present fiscal year, and a larger amount for fiscal year 1961. The appropriation bill also provides for military assistance for defense support, for technical cooperation, for special assistance, and also for the President's contingency fund. There is a backlog of several billions of dollars. This program is vitally important in the defense of the free world, and in the national interest of our country.

There are some persons in our country who honestly oppose this program. An examination of what would result in their views were carried out is the best evidence of the weakness of their position. Such persons honestly believe in what is called the fortress America concept. With no mutual security program, this would be the probable ultimate result. Fortunately, this concept is rejected by the great majority of Americans of all political groupings. It would result in America being alone in the world.

However, the administration should administer this program so that the maximum results are obtained for the American taxpayer, and for the countries and their people's benefiting, that the end result sought, of containing and rolling back international communism, is substantially contributed to by this great program.

In view of the recommendation of the President's own Draper Committee that this whole program for survival be

established on a long-range basis, there are many who find it regrettable that the President saw fit to scuttle a congressional plan for 5-year financing of the Development Loan Fund directly through the Treasury instead of on an annual appropriation basis.

By applying the political shibboleth of back-door financing to the proposal, President Eisenhower personally lent encouragement to opponents to make serious inroads upon the entire mutual security program—and then attempt to put the blame on Congress. Yet the President has employed this method of financing on frequent occasions when it suited his purpose.

The Congress authorized increased U.S. subscription to the World Bank whose financial and technical resources used primarily in development of electric power, transportation, communications, agriculture, forestry, and industrial expansion of underdeveloped countries. Likewise our quota of support for the International Monetary Fund was increased, as have the quotas of other nations, to aid it in facilitating the expansion of foreign trade, eliminating exchange barriers, and stabilizing currencies.

To help strengthen the economy of our good neighbors to the south, the Congress provided for establishment of and participation in the Inter-American Development Bank. This legislation fills a need long felt by the Latin American Republics for an institution to meet its particular problems of expansion and growth by development of its resources.

The new bank will have a capital of $1 billion, with an investment of $450 million by the United States, and $550 million by 20 Latin American Republics to supply credit, technical and organizational assistance in the development of specific projects.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill renewing for 3 years the President's authority to implement the terms of the International Wheat Agreement, which the Senate ratified along with the International Sugar Agreement.

One of the great reserve assets the free world has is the 100 million and more persons in Communist-dominated countries who despise Communists and their Kremlin dictators, and who are hoping and praying for an early deliverance from the yoke of communism. In their prayers and hopes they look to America for leadership.

In the last Congress the House and Senate passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, which electrified those people and caused pain and consternation among Soviet leaders, particularly Mr. Khrushchev.

This resolution at this time in the world's history was an outstanding achievement of the recent session.

Under no conditions should any agreement be made with the Soviet Union by the President, or representatives of our country, that will result in selling the people of these countries, so to speak, down the river.

Such action will be a violation of our country's solemn promise. It would not be in the national interest of our country. In the passage of this resolution, the Congress recognized these facts. Any such agreement would be contrary to the intent and the will of Congress.

In the world of today and tomorrow, the State Department must think soundly and function efficiently and effectively. The Congress has given it the means to do so, and if further legislation is necessary, will quickly pass the same.

In this respect a bill passed in the recent session to strengthen and improve the organization of the State Department is important.

In the field of national defense a major achievement of this Congress was the enactment of a Defense Department appropriation, if administered effectively, that reasonably assures the United States of Armed Forces of such great strength and so well equipped as to give pause to the possible intentions of any would-be aggressor.

The Democratic Members, in the main, felt that world conditions called for greater national defense, and would have strongly supported the President if he had requested additional funds, as well as additional taxes for national defense. It is the feeling of the great majority of Democratic Members—and in fairness, there are Republican Members—who feel that in the present world emergency, that if we are to err, it is better to err on the side of strength than on the side of weakness. However, the Congress, as hereinbefore stated in several important aspects, strengthened the overall defenses of our country. As I have said, it is hoped the President will not use his freezing policy of last year. If anyone thinks the Kremlin has changed its intent of world domination on existing evidence, they are living in a dream world.

It is natural, even in the world of today, to hope for the best, if accompanied by the logical thought of preparing for the worst.

This appropriation bill improves overall the defensive and the attack capabilities of each branch of our services—a result attained, I may say, Mr. Speaker, only after many months of controversy in which the Congress resolved differences between the Executive and his own Chiefs of Staff by exercise of its constitutional powers and responsibility.

Staying within the figure requested by the President, yet refusing to sacrifice national security on the altar of false economy, the House and the Senate enacted a measure which in several important respects revised the administration's program.

The budget request for the Department of Defense, not including military construction was $39,248,200,000. The final version of the bill provided $39,228,239,000, or $19,961,000 less than the budget request.

In approving the Defense Appropriation Act, 1960, the committee and the Congress took several major steps making significant changes in the defense program of the Nation. Reductions in the dollar estimates were made where they could be made safely, and a number of substantial increases in certain programs were directed.

As already mentioned, substantial amounts were provided to modernize the equipment of our Army. Four hundred and seventy-five million dollars was made available for this purpose, above the budget estimate, including $100 million in directed reprograming from previously available funds. This increase also provides $137 million for accelerating development of the Nike-Zeus, the only missile we have for defense against ICBM's.

Provision was made to assure survival of a larger part of our retaliatory bomber force, in case of surprise attack, by giving the President discretionary authority in the use of funds to order the immediate imposition of an airborne alert. Such an alert would put a number of our Strategic Air Command bombers in the air 24 hours a day every day, where they would be safe from surprise attack, should the tensions of the world at any particular time require it.

Substantial sums were saved, both in this fiscal year and over future years, by compelling the administration, through action on the appropriation requests, to conduct a thorough review of the entire concept of defense against air attack. As a result of that restudy, the amount to be applied over a period of about 12 years to defense against enemy aircraft will be reduced to a figure substantially below the $49 billion that had been estimated as the total accumulative cost by 1963.

For a strong defense against any future attack, the Congress readopted the time-tested formula of a good offense being the best defense, and provided funds for accelerating the Atlas and Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missiles. For fiscal year 1960, $172 million has been added above the budget to these programs by the Congress. In addition, provision was made giving the Secretary of Defense authority to transfer up to $150 million more for acceleration of such missile programs from lower priority items should such action seem advisable at a later date.

In another area, the Congress paid heed to the statement of Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, who said:

> We need to improve our capability to combat submarines. Since World War II, the submarine has progressed faster than the antisubmarine warfare capability to combat it.

Faced with the imminent threat of nuclear-powered missile launching submarines in the Soviet fleet, the Congress provided funds in the amount of $137 million above the budget for antisubmarine warfare, including an atomic antisubmarine submarine.

As was the case last year, the Congress has again provided funds for maintaining the Marine Corps, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve at 200,000, 400,000, and 300,000, respectively, which strengths represent increases of 25,000, 40,000, and 30,000 above the budget estimates.

In summary, congressional action on defense appropriations for fiscal year 1960 results in a good law, provides greater military strengths in several key

areas than had been budgeted for, does not weaken essential defenses in any area, and all within a figure of $20 million below the budgeted total of $39,248,200,000.

Internal administration conflicts and uncertainty over missile priorities, interservice rivalries, and alleged influence efforts by competing manufacturers, brought action by this Congress for a closer check by the Armed Forces committees on procurement and construction programs.

Amendments written into the Military Construction Authorization Act provide for a modification of the continental air defense plan involving Bomarc and Nike missile sites pending a review of the program by the Secretary of Defense to be submitted to Congress no later than September 15 of this year.

In addition, the broad authority now given the Executive in procurement of aircraft missiles for naval vessels has been restricted to require specific authorization acts by the Congress before appropriations are made.

In other defense actions, the Congress enacted measures authorizing:

Extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

A $110 million construction program of modern naval vessels for 1960.

Funds for the Atomic Energy Commission construction projects for 1960 including those for peaceful uses of the atom.

Reorganization of the Bureaus of Aeronautics and Ordnance in the Department of the Navy into a new Bureau of Naval Weapons to meet the streamlined needs of a modern Navy.

Involuntary retirement of Regular officers of the various branches of the armed services to facilitate promotions and strengthen control over the quality of personnel.

Reserve Officers Career Incentive Act.

Military Construction Act for fiscal year 1960.

Readjustment pay for warrant officers.

Various inquiries and investigations to improve and strengthen the Defense Department, such as (a) adequacy of transportation for mobilization, (b) utilization of military manpower, (c) influence and favoritism in obtaining contracts, (d) acquisition of Wherry housing.

Extension of the Renegotiation Act for 3 years to aid in recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts, and launching of an intensive study of the whole range of procurement and renegotiation policies.

For peaceful purposes and results, nearly a half billion dollars has been appropriated for research and satellite launching activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. This agency was established by law as a result of close and understanding bipartisan action. It is intended and hoped that those administering this agency will give leadership in this very important field that will bring great benefits to our country and to mankind.

In the field of internal security, to protect the Nation from conspiratorial subversion by Communist agents, the House of Representatives has passed and sent to the Senate, bills to—

Amend the Criminal Code to permit prosecutions for espionage directed at, but committed outside, the United States.

Clarify the term "organize" as used in the Smith Act to apply to continuing Communist activities.

Expedite procedures for review and execution of deportation orders against undesirable aliens who now misuse the law as an instrument of delay.

Broaden provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

Give authority to the Secretary of State to deny passports to persons furthering the international Communist cause or whose presence abroad would endanger our security.

Make final orders of the Subversive Activities Board against Communist organizations applicable to their successor groups.

An act creating a single, separate, statutory form of judicial review of administrative orders for the deportation and exclusion of aliens from the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a new chapter in U.S. history was written in the 86th Congress with the granting of admission of Hawaii to the Union as the 50th State. This new star in our flag symbolizes the spirit of true democracy. For Hawaii is peopled by many races and creeds, loyal Americans, who have demonstrated that in diversity there can be unity and that all can live together in peace and harmony.

This example is further attested by the composition of its first delegation in Congress which includes Americans of Japanese and Chinese descent as a native of the United States.

As Hawaii follows Alaska into the Union, we hail this bright new jewel in Liberty's crown.

Various laws affecting natural resources, transportation, and other areas of Government interest has been enacted to fully integrate the new States into the Federal system.

The House has voted to extend the authority of the President, under the Reorganization Act of 1949, to propose plans to Congress for changes in the structure or functions of Government departments or agencies.

Establishment of a permanent Advisory Committee to Intergovernmental Relations has been enacted into law. Such an agency, it is felt, can be of great assistance in the solution of mutual problems growing out of conflicting and overlapping functions.

By amending the Communications Act to exempt news-type programs from the equal time requirement for political candidates on radio and television, the Congress has clarified somewhat a situation that threatened to confuse the public and impose burdens on the networks.

In the field of national economy, during the past session a controversial labor reform bill was enacted into law.

There was no marked differences of opinion on the protection of trust funds, of eliminating racketeering actions, and of protecting the election rights of union members. The three bills considered in the House of Representatives adequately covered these reforms. Labor practically unanimously favored such provisions.

It was in connection with certain provisions of the substitute bill adopted in the House that there was sharp division, with close to one-half of the membership of the House feeling that certain provisions of the substitute bill invaded and impaired the legitimate field of union activities.

The result of the House and Senate conferees, who worked hard and long, and without regard to still existing differences of opinions, worked constructively, was a recognition that some provisions of the substitute bill went too far in this respect, and the conferees recommended relief that both bodies accepted.

Time will tell if there are still provisions in the bill enacted into law that invade and impair legitimate union activities. If so, no one would want such provisions to remain as a part of our law.

It is wrong under the guise of reform to invade or impair the legitimate field of business, industry, or finance.

It is equally wrong in the case of labor.

If the operation of the law just enacted discloses that some of its provisions invade or impair the legitimate field of union activities, the Congress can and should quickly repeal such provisions.

The blanket indictment of all of labor and all labor leaders by some persons and groups is not only unjustified, but inconsistent with the truth. Leaders in the ranks of labor, like those in business, industry, and finance are at least 98 percent honorable and trustworthy.

It is wrong to indict 100 percent of any group of Americans for the wrongdoing of 1 or 2 percent.

Furthermore, in the recent visit of Mr. Khrushchev to our country, the leaders of labor conveyed to the recent visitor, in a firm and definite manner, their love of America, and what our country stands for. There was no subservience on the part of such Americans—leaders of labor.

Mr. Khrushchev left our shores with the definite impression that labor in America stands for "a Government of law, and not of men," and that American labor, organized and unorganized, is vigorously opposed to international communism and its objectives and purposes.

In the field of fiscal affairs the last session made a marked contribution, reducing by well over $1.5 billion the budget estimates submitted by the President to the Congress. In the last 5 years of Democratic control, the Congress has reduced President Eisenhower's budget estimates by over $12 billion. On the question of spenders the record shows the President recommended the spending, during the past 5 years, of $12 billion more than authorized by the Congress.

Upon the recommendation of President Eisenhower, extended to July 1, 1960, the 52 percent corporate rate tax, and the existing schedule of certain excise taxes.

Reduced from 10 to 5 the present tax on transportation of persons, and re-

pealed tax on local telephone calls, effective June 30, 1960.

Despite the Republican promise in 1952 and in 1956 to reduce the national debt, it has sharply increased during the present administration.

President Eisenhower recommended another increase in the recent session.

Recognizing the necessity, the Congress responded and raised the national debt limit by $2 billion to $285 billion, and a further temporary $10 billion increase to $295 billion to June 30, 1960.

The President recommended that the ceiling of 4½ percent on long-term Government bonds be lifted, and also on E and H savings bonds.

The Congress passed a bill relating to E and H savings bonds, increasing the ceiling to 4¼ percent. The necessary orders have been issued to increase the interest on these bonds to 3¾ percent. This will (a) benefit millions of present holders of these bonds, (b) prompt them to hold them, rather than cash them in, (c) increase future purchase of these bonds.

The other request, relating to the lifting of the 4¼-percent ceiling on long-term bonds was not granted, in whole or in part, during the past session.

The responsibility for the present situation of high interest and tight money rests upon the shoulders of the Republican administration and the Federal Reserve System. These policies have already increased in less than 7 years the interest paid yearly on our national debt by close to $4 billions. In addition, private borrowers, and of State, city, and county governments, are paying several billions of dollars more now each year in interest than they did in 1952.

Only a few years back the Treasury Department could have made long-term refinancing at less than 3 percent, but instead of following this sound policy, the administration resorted to short-term borrowings of 5 years or less.

As a result of the administration's failures in abdicating its proper responsibilities to the Federal Reserve System, the country is faced with even higher interest rates.

It is also to be noted that no long-term bonds become due until well in 1960.

The Congress, in the interest of our people, used good judgment in not acting on this recommendation until next year. We will then have an opportunity to evaluate the situation better.

To make the record clear and correct, I call attention to an understanding arrived at between the Secretary of the Treasury and the Ways and Means Committee—a majority of whom were in agreement—to lift the ceiling on long-term bonds, and including a sense of Congress provision, in substance, calling upon the Federal Reserve System to cooperate in keeping interest rates from rising too high and too sharply.

This was a reasonable request in the best interest of our people.

The agreement was no sooner made public than it received the open opposition of the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, and a few days later, the opposition of President Eisenhower.

These facts clearly show that the responsibility does not rest on the shoulders of the Congress.

If the situation next year, due to policies the Democrats have had no control over, calls for legislation increasing or lifting the ceiling on long-term bonds, it is hoped the President and the Administration will show a more understanding and cooperative spirit.

At the request of the President, for the fifth time in 5 years, the Congress has passed legislation raising the limit of the national debt, either on a temporary or a statutory basis.

In 1953, the year President Eisenhower assumed office, the national debt was $258.5 billion. Today, having risen more than $31 billion since that time, it stands at the highest peacetime figure in history—$289.7 billion, and this, despite the Republican promise in 1952 to reduce the national debt.

The legislation enacted by this 1st session of the 86th Congress lifts the statutory limit by $2 billion to $285, and provides for a temporary $10 billion increase to $295 until the end of the current fiscal year, June 30, 1960.

There is some substance to the administration claims that rising defense costs and flexibility of management of the debt require this action. Still it comes with ill grace from an administration which has achieved this sad record after close to 7 years in office to label the Democrats as "spenders" and to pose as the only true apostles of economy and guardians of the dollar value.

The 52-percent corporate income tax rate and the existing schedule of excise rates on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles, parts and accessories were extended to July 1 of next year, but the transportation tax for persons was reduced by half—from 10 to 5 percent—and the tax on local telephone calls repealed, both effective in the next fiscal year.

To meet the rising costs of the interstate highway program, President Eisenhower recommended an increase—temporary—of 1½ cents in the Federal tax on gasoline and diesel fuels. The Congress enacted a temporary 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the present 3 cents a gallon Federal tax in gasoline and diesel fuels with a saving to those affected of one-half cent per gallon. The increase, effective October 1 for a period of 21 months, will make possible a continuance of Federal allotments to the States on a sound basis, and prevent any interruption of the construction of schedules of the States where contract commitments had already been made.

In addition to the revenue from the gas tax boost, the act provides for a future transfer to the highway trust fund of portions of the automobile and parts excise taxes for a limited period.

This is a matter of great importance to our country, and to business and employment. This is one of the outstanding accomplishments of the past session.

For the first time in 10 years the rates of income tax on the earnings of life insurance companies was established on a permanent basis. This problem, the more complex by reason of the varying types of companies, corporate and mutual, was solved with fairness to the companies, to the policyholders and to the stockholders, and with a substantial increase in revenue to the Government. This is a difficult and delicate task well done.

The increasing growth in air traffic and inception of the jet age spurred a continuance of the Federal Airport Act. The Congress extended its provisions to June 30, 1961, and authorized $126 million in grants to the States on a 50–50 matching basis, with funds for terminal facilities limited to essential items.

The Democratic-controlled Congress recognized that larger appropriations should be made in this important field. However, we were faced with a Presidential veto. While we authorized more effective operation of this program during the next 2 years that the President recommended, in the interest of as much advancement as possible, we passed a bill that might not meet a veto. This is what happened. With a divided Government, rather than no legislation in this field being enacted into law, the Democratic Party took the constructive course of making as much progress as possible.

The lending authority of the Small Business Administration was increased by $75 million until next fiscal year. Mounting demands upon its business loan program required this step and have justified congressional recognition of its necessity and value to this segment of our economy.

The efforts of small business to compete against their larger competitors have suffered because of gaps in the law making it difficult for the Federal Trade Commission to enforce the provisions of the Robinson-Patman amendment to the Clayton Act. Before this Congress acted, a company could grant illegal price discriminations three times before effective penalties could be applied. This Congress has amended the law so as to provide that the cease and desist orders issued by the Commission enjoining discriminatory prices become enforcibe within 60 days.

Of importance is a bill that will assist the small business wholesalers of gasoline. Previously gasoline jobbers were required to pay the excise tax when they received the gasoline from the refiner. There was a measure of unfairness in this situation because there was considerable gallonage lost by the wholesalers due to evaporation, shrinkage, and other similar losses. The bill that has passed the Congress permits these wholesalers to pay the tax on the quantities of gasoline sold and thereby remedies the situation prevailing previously wherein these wholesalers were paying an excise tax on gasoline that had been lost due to shrinkage and evaporation.

Other actions were taken during the past session of advantage to small business in being able to more successfully complete with big business, which is

highly favored by the present Republican administration.

The Democratic Party has shown by its actions that it is the real friend of small and independent businesses.

Amendments to the Clayton Antitrust Act enacted by this Congress will strengthen the hand of the Federal Trade Commission in protection of consumers' interests. This legislation by reducing redtape, will expedite procedures for the enforcement of cease-and-desist orders by the Commission against firms engaging in misleading advertising and deceptive sales methods.

The laws governing national banks have been revised to expand both their lending and borrowing powers and by clarification and elimination of ambiguities.

Lowering of the reserve requirements of member banks of the Federal Reserve is authorized, and holding company control of savings and loan associations is limited in other measures approved in this field.

One of the recommendations of President Eisenhower was to increase postal rates, particularly first-class mail, from 4 to 5 cents. It was only last year that postal rates were increased, the first-class mail—the only paying and profit-making part of our postal rates—was increased from 3 cents to 4 cents.

The Democratic Party takes the position a further increase in first-class mail is unjustified, placing an unnecessary and unfair burden upon the vast users of this mail—furthermore, postal rates were only increased last year.

The Democratic Party finds it difficult to understand why the President recommended this increase.

The President in a recent statement criticized the Congress for not increasing the postal rates. This is an indication on his part that the Republican Party will make this a political issue.

If so, the Democratic Party accepts the issue, with the Republican Party standing for an increase of 25 percent in first-class mail, following a 33⅓-percent increase only last year, and the Democratic Party at this time and for the forseeable future, is opposed to the increase from 4 to 5 cents recommended by President Eisenhower.

This Congress has met its obligation to men who served their country in time of war by enactment of a law revising pensions for veterans with non-service-connected disabilities, and for widows and dependent survivors.

The scale of payments is readjusted to eliminate present inequities under which some veterans are receiving pensions who should not, while others are denied benefits who should receive same.

Under the new act, it is estimated 65 to 70 percent of the 805,000 veterans and 450,000 widows now on the rolls will receive increased pensions. None presently on the rolls will be removed.

At the same time, this legislation equalizes the status of World War II and Korean war widows with those of World War I. Beginning next July, they will be eligible for benefits regardless of whether their husbands' disabilities were service connected or not.

The Congress has bolstered the program for direct housing loans to veterans by enacting an increase of $100 million in authorization of this Veterans' Administration fund.

The program is especially designed to assist veterans living in smaller communities and rural areas to whom private types of financing is not available, as it is to those in metropolitan areas. The new authorization, together with funds to become available in 1960 under existing law, should go far toward reducing the waiting list of more than 40,000 veterans seeking direct housing loans.

The Congress has added additional legislation as follows:

An act to permit payments of benefits to veterans who were inducted as aliens—largely during World War I—and who were subsequently discharged without application or solicitation on their part.

An act providing for veterans of the Korean conflict, receiving education or training under the Korean GI bill, a change from the pursuit of one program to the pursuit of another will not be considered a change of program if the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second. As an example, where a veteran may have declared his educational objective to be the attainment of a master's degree and he later decided that he wishes to attain a doctor's degree, this change of objective would not be considered a change of program.

An act that makes applicable to a competent veteran who disappears the provisions of existing law which provide that where an incompetent veteran who is receiving compensation for service-connected disability disappears, the Veterans' Administration may pay his wife, children, and parents the compensation otherwise payable to such veteran, amounts payable to each not to exceed the amount payable if the veteran had died from a service-connected disability; also

An act that increases the presumptive period for service connected for the disease of multiple sclerosis from the present 2-year period to 3 years; also

An act that provides that Hansen's disease—leprosy—developing to a degree of 10 percent within 3 years from the date of a veteran's separation from the service shall be considered to be service connected; also

An act that includes as a child for purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration—except those relating to insurance and the disposition of personal property of a decedent left upon the premises of a VA facility—one who was a member of the veteran's household at the time of his death, and who was adopted by the veteran's spouse within 2 years after the death, unless at the time of the veteran's death the child was receiving regular contributions toward his support from some individual other than the veteran or his spouse, or from any public or private welfare organization furnishing services or assistance to children.

Also passed by the House are these other bills to—

Provide incentives for Reserve officers to continue on duty beyond their obligated service period through increase of readjustment pay;

Amend the Reserve Officer Personnel Act to equalize promotion opportunity in various branches of the armed services;

Extend the period during which families of veterans have preference for admission to public housing projects;

Provide $100 a month pensions for holders of Congressional Medals of Honor.

The program, popularly known as Public Law 480, for disposal of surplus farm commodities, was strengthened and again extended—this time for 2 years.

Under this Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, sales, barter for strategic materials for our defense stockpiles, and donations of millions of tons of the Commodity Credit Corporation's vast stores of surplus are either sold in private transactions, provided for the peoples of other countries in exchange for foreign currencies, or put to humanitarian use for relief of suffering and want in famine, flood, and other emergencies abroad.

An amendment in this year's bill permits the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a food stamp plan for distribution—from groceries up to $250 million worth of food—to certified needy families in this country. This plan, which is not mandatory, would be put into effect experimentally in trial areas and would terminate for study and final decision January 31, 1962. This plan was opposed by Secretary Benson; why, it is hard to understand. Secretary Benson should carry out the intent of Congress.

The language of the new act places increased emphasis upon the efforts to develop further means for expansion of the foreign markets for American agricultural products. To this purpose, at least 5 percent of the foreign currency counterpart funds are to be devoted. It also authorizes long-term loans by the United States to finance sales of surplus to other nations for dollars.

Amendments were added adjusting the limitation on soil conservation rental payments and the marketing quota for 1960 extra long staple cotton.

However laudable this important measure, it will not solve the problem of surpluses.

Every effort by this Congress to tackle the basic issues of falling farm income and overproduction have been rebuffed by the Eisenhower administration. He stands by the Benson theory of lower prices as the means of cutting production and reducing surpluses.

In the meantime, while the cost of the things the farmer buys has been rising, he is getting less and less for his own products. Farm income has been dropping. In the last 4 years, net income of farms has averaged only $11.9 billion as compared to $15.3 billion in 1952.

And farm population—which was 24.2 million persons living on 5.4 million farms in 1952—was down to 20.8 million on 4.7 million farms in 1958.

An increase of over $4 million was provided over the budget to strengthen the research and control work of the Department, much of which results from the in-

creasing threats of insect pests and diseases to the crops of our country.

The budget estimates for the soil conservation program were increased by $7 million over the 1960 budget request to provide technicians to assure adequate assistance to the 2,861 districts expected to be in existence by June 30, 1960, and to meet the needs in watershed and flood prevention work.

Restored was the full $250 million for the agricultural conservation program for 1960, for which the budget proposed a reduction of $100 million. This is the fourth time since 1953 that a substantial cut of this nature has been proposed by the budget.

For the school-lunch program for fiscal year 1960, there was provided an appropriation of $100 million plus a transfer of $43,657,248 from section 32 funds for food purchases. This total of $143,657,248 is compared with $135 million provided for fiscal year 1959 and a budget estimate of $100 million for 1960.

There have been provided sufficient funds for the lending programs of the Rural Electrification Administration and the Farmers Home Administration to assure farmers sufficient credit to meet the difficult economic problems facing them. The budget request for REA appeared to be adequate. A total of $33 million had to be added to the budget request for the Farmers Home Administration to accomplish this.

In early January, the administration through Secretary Benson, promised to submit to the Congress in time to be considered, a broad legislative program.

Despite efforts to have Secretary Benson submit his program with accompanying legislation, he failed to do so before Congress adjourned.

The vetoes of the wheat bill and the tobacco bill were not only unnecessary, but unjustified.

Congress did everything possible to harmonize its views with those of the administration, but the administration did not cooperate as evidenced by the Presidential vetoes of the wheat and tobacco bills. As a result of the vetoes by the President, important segments of our farming community continue to suffer.

It is evident that the great accumulation of wheat surpluses is a No. 1 farm problem. The administration made no recommendations on this or any other agricultural product.

The Congress acted. It passed a good bill reducing the wheat acreage in 1960 by 25 percent below 1959. This would have brought wheat plantings down to 41 million acres and would have reduced production substantially. This would have been less than half the 84 million acres our farmers seeded to wheat 10 years ago. This legislation represented a willingness of our farmers to assume great sacrifices to bring down the wheat surplus.

The President vetoed this bill.

He did so because it included price supports, but overlooked the fact that such price supports were necessary to pervent great hardships to wheat farmers while they were reducing their crops so drastically.

The tobacco bill, also vetoed by the President, was a good bill, the effect of which was to prevent increases in the support prices of tobacco, so that our tobacco might continue to compete pricewise in the world markets.

All interests in tobacco, producer and industry, supported this legislation.

The vetoes of these two bills, undoubtedly upon the recommendations of Secretary Benson, are contrary to the best interests of these important segments of American agriculture, and of our national economy.

The plight of the dairy farmers, also our chicken farmers, particularly in egg and butter products, is another striking illustration of the lack of leadership of the administration. When the administration acted, and then only when public opinion demanded action, it was too late and too litttle.

Other agricultural bills were enacted by the Congress which permit extension of the crop insurance program into additional counties; authorizes leasing of cotton acreage allotments during crop years 1959 through 1961; provides for sale of feed for livestock in emergency areas; authorizes refinancing of loans on family-size farms under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

The House Committee on Agriculture sent 118 bills that had been introduced to Secretary Benson for a report of the Department's position thereon. This is the procedure all committees follow with reference to departments and agencies that bills filed relate to.

Of the 118 bills sent to Secretary Benson to determine his position on them, he approved only 8 of them, and most of them were of a minor nature. He disapproved proposed changes, or did not report at all, with respect to all the others. Secretary Benson opposed all legislation providing fundamental improvements in the operation of farm laws to increase the income of farm families.

For example, Secretary Benson opposed legislation to balance the price supports of small grains to their feed value relationship with corn.

He opposed an additional authorization of $3 million for the special school milk program.

He opposed legislation based on a report of a commission to increase research in industrial uses of products of our farms.

He opposed the food stamp plan—food for the needy.

With the price disaster earlier this year in the poultry industry, Secretary Benson opposed legislation relating to the situation, and to long-range problems of this industry.

His efforts to change policy of REA contrary to existing law and to the intent of Congress, are well known to interested farmers and their organizations.

The failure to meet the crisis in the farmer price for hogs is another striking illustration of the administration's disregard for the farmer. Last July prices for hogs dropped to the lowest level in 15 years. The committee reported a bill, which is opposed by Secretary Benson and the administration.

I could mention a number of other bills that were blindly opposed by Secretary Benson and the administration.

At present writing, Secretary Benson is visiting countries abroad, both inside the Iron Curtain and outside. With the failure of his leadership to the farmers of America, it is difficult to see how he can give good advice to the farmers of other countries.

After two vetoes by the President, the Congress passed and sent to the President for his signature a housing bill substantially the same as two he previously vetoed during this session, and one he also rejected in 1958. The President signed the third bill. This is due to the firmness of Democratic leadership.

This is a bill designed to meet the needs of an expanding population, the problems created by migration to the suburbs, the necessity for restoration of slum areas, and large-scale redevelopment of our urban centers. The measure passed by overwhelming vote.

Increases by $8 billion the authority of the FHA to insure construction loans;

Provides $650 million for loans and grants to communities for urban renewal, with $350 million becoming immediately available and the balance July 1, 1960;

Makes available funds for loans to provide residential housing for elderly families, as well as for financing construction of nursing homes for the aged;

Authorizes the construction of 37,000 additional public housing units;

Reduces downpayments on new homes constructions with FHA insured loans.

Provides $300 million to help finance construction of college dormitories.

While the bill passed by Congress does not carry out the feelings of the great majority of the Democratic Members, the bill represents progress in the best interests of our people. The Democratic Party did not take the position of "all or nothing." Giving practical consideration to a divided government, and having in mind the theory of the best progress possible, the Democratic majority acted constructively, and in the highest traditions of statesmanship.

In addition, the Congress in separate legislation, renewed the voluntary home mortgage credit program which is a help to home buyers in smaller communities in finding financing not normally available to those outside of large cities.

Everyone recognizes the importance of medical research and the part the Federal Government can play in this important field.

The Congress made a large increase in this field over the President's budget estimate. The increased appropriation was nearly $106 million. For example, it is estimated that 16 million of our people suffer in some degree from mental disorders; almost as many are partially or totally disabled by diseases of the heart and the circulatory system, including cerebral vascular diseases. There are 11 million of our people suffering from arthritis and rheumatic diseases, and cancer afflicts 700,000 and annually takes in death 250,000 persons.

Certainly, finding the answers to these and other diseases means more to our people and to humanity than it would ever be possible to measure in dollars and cents.

Wonderful progress has been made in past years in the field of medical science. For example, 1 cancer patient out of 3 can now be saved, as compared to 1 out of 4 as recently as 1938; approximately 80 percent of all persons with epilepsy are capable of regular, productive employment. The major cause of blindness among infants has been practically eliminated. With new drugs and methods of treatment, it is possible to prevent crippling in 70 percent of patients suffering from rheumatic disease, as well as marked advances in other diseases, and conditions of human suffering.

And in this progress, appropriations made by the Congress have played a most important part.

In addition, the Hill-Burton hospital construction program—a matching grant program—was increased from the budget estimate of $101,200,000 to $186 million. This program meets the enthusiastic support of our people.

The construction of health research facilities—on a matching basis—authorizes an appropriation of $30 million each year. This act was passed in 1956. The President, for fiscal year 1960, recommended $20 million. The Congress appropriated the full amount—$130 million.

The pollution of our streams has become a national disgrace. The existing law authorizes an annual appropriation on a matching basis of $50 million annually. For fiscal year 1960, the President recommended $20 million. The Congress considered this amount to be inadequate, increasing it to $50 million for this fiscal year—1960.

These are outstanding achievements on the part of Congress, of inestimable value to our people.

In the health field, substantial increases in appropriations were made for medical research by the National Institutes of Health and other institutions, and extended for 5 years programs for training of public health personnel.

In providing for the continuance of the air pollution control program, the Congress authorizes funds to continue research projects and technical assistance for local health authorities.

The special school milk program which has benefited millions of children throughout the land was given an increased limitation for expenditures to $85 million for 1960 and to $90 million for 1961.

Legislation was enacted to give various States additional time to bring nonprofessional employees of school districts under the Social Security Act.

We have provided increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts. This is a measure of major importance to the several hundred thousands of railroad employees and their families.

Of major importance to Federal employees and their families, which was under consideration for several years and supported by all organizations of Federal employees, is the bill establishing a Government-wide Federal employees health benefit program. This bill is one of the significant acts of this session.

A bill of great importance to our people is one that provided for strengthening the authority of the Post Office Department in curbing the use of mails for the distribution of obscene and fraudulent matter. This bill, which passed the House, when enacted into law, will improve the procedures and criteria for the prevention of obscene material going through the mail.

The House also passed a bill establishing a licensing and control system over the manufacture of narcotic drugs in pursuance of international agreements with other nations to cut down their illicit trade.

Also passed by the House is a bill allowing tax deductions for professional self-employed who set aside income for voluntary plan. This is meritorious legislation and should be enacted into law next year.

By margins in excess of the two-thirds majority necessary, both the House and the Senate overrode the President's veto of a second public works appropriation bill.

The measure provides $1.3 billion for flood control, waterpower, river and harbor improvement, and anti-beach-erosion projects throughout the country.

President Eisenhower's veto message of the original disclosed two things:

First, that he was misinformed as to the status of many of the projects which he classified as "new starts." Actually, they had not only been authorized and budgeted but construction was already underway on some of them.

Second, that he showed a lack of sympathy and understanding with the fundamental policy of conservation of our natural resources. He took the short-sighted position of viewing only the dollars spent on such projects, rather than that they are an investment which returns manifold dividends to our country, as well as protection to our people.

This appropriation bill will bring benefits to millions of persons in various parts of the country. The President took an adamant position of all or nothing on his recommended projects. The Congress included projects of long standing and of great merit. The appropriations provide for an orderly development of our natural resources and represents an investment in America which will bring back manifold returns. Every project has been considered by Congress and authorized by law. The people of the areas of the country who will benefit from this bill are indebted to the Democratic Members of the Congress for the final action.

The Democratic Party is proud of its part in the passage of this bill.

The important problem of public works projects on our rivers and harbors, in the improvement of navigation, and of flood control, was recognized by the passage of an authorization bill, that will permit appropriations in excess of $600 million in the years ahead. Such legislation, and later appropriations, are an investment in America.

One of the greatest examples of Federal public works projects, the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the first time was put on a self-financing basis by the Congress. The new law gives TVA authority to issue up to $750 million in revenue bonds to finance additional facilities. It was due to Democratic insistence that this bill became law.

The problem of pollution of our streams, with its consequent dangers to health and water supplies, was effectively met by the House with passage of a bill increasing from $50 million to $80 million a year the sum which may be appropriated.

These funds are to be used as grants to local governments to help pay the cost of construction of sewage-treatment works.

The Federal allocations represent 30 percent of the cost of the projects as against 70 percent provided by the community.

During the closing days of the session, the Senate passed a bill providing for further increases. The differences between the two branches will be adjusted next year.

In the field of reclamation and development of the Nation's water resources, and in the field of flood protection, bills of import to various parts of our country were passed, and some others were reported out of committee for action next year.

Also, in the field of public lands, many bills were enacted into law.

In the field of Indian affairs, a number of bills of import to our Indian tribes were enacted into law.

The interstate compact for conservation of oil and gas, which was established by oil-producing States with the consent of Congress, was authorized to be extended for another 4 years by legislation enacted into public law.

In the field of immigration and naturalization, important legislation was passed of a progressive and humane nature; among which was a bill enabling the reuniting here of many thousands of families of law-abiding aliens now permanently residenced in the United States. This bill is a decided step in the right direction which many interested persons and groups hope will be followed by future legislation extending its humane benefits.

A measure of great import to the several States relates to State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. The Congress had to act quickly on this matter during the recent session. While the bill is a step in the right direction, the passage of this bill is not intended to be a final or comprehensive solution of all the problems of State taxation of income derived from interstate commerce. A study by appropriate committees will be carried on to determine what further legislation, if any, is required.

The extension of the Civil Rights Commission should and will be followed in the next session by the passage of legislation that will extend existing law in the protection of the constitutional rights of all persons.

In the next session, legislation increasing the minimum wage, and extending

coverage under this law will be acted upon.

Much has been written about the vetoes of President Eisenhower, and that only 1 out of 146 vetoes has been overridden by the Congress. The fact is that most vetoes are on minor bills, and no Congress undertakes to override such a veto.

It must be borne in mind that overriding a veto requires a two-thirds vote of those present and voting thereon. This vote is difficult to obtain, even on legislation—suspension of the rules—requiring such a vote where there is strong opposition. The record shows that where an attempt was made to override a veto, and it failed, that the overwhelming majority of the Democratic numbers followed their leadership. Where a majority vote was required to pass a bill, a clear majority was obtained.

It is significant to note that on the three widely publicized vetoes that the President finally accepted practically the same housing bill as he vetoed on two occasions; that the Congress overrode the second veto of the public works appropriation bill, which is practically the same bill that the President vetoed, and the Rural Electrification Administration bill failed in the House by only four votes in obtaining the necessary two-thirds vote.

An unfortunate pocket veto of the President is the bill establishing for a limited period of time a Research Commission for the Coal Industry.

There is no segment of American industry more adversely affected economically than the coal industry, with resultant widespread unemployment.

Through this Commission that the bill established might have been discovered new uses of coal, bringing new life to the industry, and hope of future employment to the unemployed coalworkers and their families. This measure was not only sound, but humane.

To say the least, it is most unfortunate that the President pocket-vetoed this bill which would cost so little, but could bring so much good.

There is no person in the entire country who more enjoys the confidence and respect of the people of the country—North, East, South, and West—than does Speaker SAM RAYBURN. Everyone knows that, while he is a strong Democrat, above all he is a dedicated American.

With his 47 consecutive years of service in the Congress, Speaker RAYBURN'S long experience enables him as a top expert in appraising a Congress or one of its sessions.

At the end of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, Speaker RAYBURN said:

> I have never known a group of men and women assembled in this Chamber who I thought were more dedicated to the job they were trying to do here than the Members of the 86th Congress.
>
> We have done, in my opinion, a tremendous and outstanding job.

While the record of the 86th Congress remains to be completed at the termination of its 2d session, the Speaker's appraisal of the past session—the 1st session of the 86th Congress—is correct, and, I might add, in spite of the difficulties raised by Presidential vetoes.

In a government of party division between the executive and the legislative, it is imperative that political policy should not hamper either in their respective duties. This Congress has striven to meet the President more than halfway. We have leaned over backwards showing a willingness to compromise to obtain agreement on legislation necessary to the welfare of the country. We did not sacrifice principle in doing so, but, on the other hand, neither did we take an all-or-nothing attitude.

It is sincerely to be hoped that with our return for the second session in January, the President will be of like spirit.

Pornography: The New Black Plague

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Pornography: The New Black Plague," from the National Parent-Teacher, the PTA magazine, September 1959 issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORNOGRAPHY: THE NEW BLACK PLAGUE

Are you one of the growing number of parents who have felt the shock of seeing among their child's possessions some of the filth that is being sent to young people through the mails? Even if you aren't, you can imagine the horror and heartache that such a discovery has brought to other parents. Mailed pornography knows no boundaries. It infiltrates every part of the country, reaching children and youth on farms and in cities, in suburbs and slums, in stern homes and trustingly permissive ones. No child is safe from this most ruthless of all rackets—the distribution of pornography by mail.

The material comes in a plain envelope, bearing your child's name. The pictures inside defy description. They are not just nudes. They picture the naked bodies of men and women, often boys and girls, singly and together, in every imaginable position of lewdness, intimacy, and perversion. Some of them masquerade as "art photographs." Others are portraits to be hung in a youth's room as a reminder of "how joyous life can be if one is modern." Some are enclosed in small, attractive gift cases that a boy can give to his girl or boastfully display to his friends. Other pictures are on the backs of playing cards—samples of complete decks that the recipient is urged to order and resell to his friends, card by card, at a commission that sounds fabulous to a youngster.

Where does the torrent of smut come from? How does it get mailed to your home? Who is responsible?

The child who receives the degrading stuff may be innocent of wrongdoing. As a young art student, he may have answered a magazine advertisement for art materials. Or he may have sent a dime or a quarter for a train or a model airplane offered at a bargain as a come-on. Such innocent actions can put his name on a "sucker list" for commercialized smut.

Or he may have done nothing at all to bring on the deluge. His name may have been taken from a high school yearbook, the membership list of a youth club, or a newspaper story about school activities. The Post Office Department estimates that between 700,000 and a million children will receive unsolicited obscene and pornographic materials through the mails this year. No one can be certain that his child will not be a victim of the mail traffickers in smut and slime.

How does an obscene picture affect a child or youth who sees it? Children are by nature curious, daring, breathlessly eager for new sensations. Yet on some guileless minds such a picture may barely register. On others the imprint may quickly blur and dissolve. But on mind after mind the impression is likely to be powerful and lasting. The U.S. Senate Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency believes pornography may be most damaging to the child who has had little or no sex education.

Pictures of obscenity and perversion may excite children, giving them a feeling of being grown up. Or they may make all intimacy seem foul and disgusting. Testifying before the subcommittee, Dr. Benjamin Karpman, chief psychotherapist at St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D.C., said, "You can take perfectly healthy boys or girls and by exposing them to abnormalities you can virtually crystallize their habits for the rest of their lives."

Arthur E. Summerfield, U.S. Postmaster General, charges the purveyors of pornography with contributing to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency. "Sex criminals and sex murderers," he says, "almost always have a long record of addiction to pornographic and sadistic material." We had better heed the implications of this statement; children who have never been exposed to such material may become the victims of sex criminals who have been exposed to it. It is to the interest of all parents, therefore, that not only their own children but all children be protected from this immoral sewage.

We cannot risk delay. The indecent traffic is growing heavier every day. Mail-order pornography is big business. Every year the "large, defiant barons of obscenity," as Mr. Summerfield calls them, sell some $700 million worth of filth. Complaints about this depraved merchandising flood the Post Office Department at the rate of at least 50,000 annually. They come from clergymen, high school principals, college presidents, newspaper editors, PTA members, and other alarmed citizens.

Why doesn't the Post Office Department do something about the wholesale promotion and distribution of filth through the mails? Over the years the Department has diligently tried to keep the mails clear of indecent matter. But it has met powerful opposition from the people who stand to profit by the corruption of children. Occasionally resistance has come from others—from people dedicated to freedom of the press. Confusing liberty with license, these people unwittingly assist the purveyors of pornography.

Last year the Post Office Department conducted 4,000 investigations of obscene mailings and caused the arrest of 293 persons—an increase of 45 percent over the figure for the previous year and the highest number on record. Nevertheless, as the figures indicate, the quantity of filth in the mails is increasing every day. This is partly because the smut sellers, knowing that tremendous profits can be realized from a small investment, are willing to risk a small fine or a light prison sentence. It is partly because certain courts, notably those in Los Angeles and New York, where most of the mail-order business in pornography originates, have been extremely cautious in their decisions on obscenity. Their liberal rulings have

established virtual sanctuaries in which dealers in obscenity operate with impunity.

In 1958, as a result of persistent urging by the Post Office Department, an important forward step was taken: The obscenity statute was amended. Previously distributors of pornography could be prosecuted only in the district in which the obscene material was mailed. The amended law makes it possible to prosecute the merchants of filth at intermediate offices and at the point of delivery, where the actual damage is done. And it authorizes fines up to $10,000 for second offenders and imprisonment for 10 years. We now have a powerful means of stamping out a vile racket.

But success depends on the cooperation of a concerned citizenry, the people into whose homes the obscene materials are sent. Parents can do more than anyone else to help apprehend the mailers of filth. The Post Office Department, therefore, urges all parents to take two simple steps:

Save all materials received, including the envelopes and enclosures.

Report the matter immediately to the Postmaster General or to the local postmaster and turn the materials over to him.

In appealing to the Nation to defeat commercialized pornography, it was natural that the Post Office Department should ask the help the national congress. At the annual convention last May a message was presented by W. D. Brewer, regional director of the Denver region of the U.S. Post Office Department. Mr. Brewer read a telegram from Deputy Postmaster General Edson O. Sessions addressed to the delegates. "Postmaster General Summerfield," he told them, "is waging an all-out effort at all levels, but most importantly he needs the help of parents and educators if the campaign to erase smut and filth is to be effective. In a recent report to Congress the Postmaster General said, 'It is clear there must be a greater, expanded awareness of the seriousness and the demoralizing results of the wholesale distribution of filth to the children of this country. * * * It is my opinion that the greatest single need today is widespread and concerted public support of this program.'"

The national congress was already acutely aware of the problem. For several months its action committee on comics, motion pictures, radio, and television, headed by J. C. Moffitt, second vice president, had been studying the problem of pornography and its impact upon American children and youth. When the message from the Post Office Department was delivered, the action committee was ready with its recommendations.

The committee urged that State congresses, councils, and local units form action committees and invite all other interested groups to cooperate in the analysis and solution of the problem. Councils and local units were urged to cooperate with distributors of publications and with law-enforcement agents to end the distribution of obscene materials. The committee recommended that each State congress, with professional legal assistance, compile a summary and interpretation of its State laws on obscenity and distribute copies to all PTA's in the State. Through national congress publications the action committee itself proposes to disseminate similar information on Federal laws for the assistance of State and local organizations.

Unanimously the convention approved the recommendations of the action committee and voted to support the Postmaster General's plan for combating the distribution of pornographic materials.

But now a word of clarification: At this moment the national congress is concentrating its forces on just one problem, the most urgent and alarming of all—the filth that crowds home mailboxes and reaches children. The congress has not set out to clean up newsstands, greatly as some may stand in need of a powerful scrub brush and a strong detergent. It is not girding itself to attack the magazines that exploit curiosity about sex and cater to prurient taste. However grave these menaces may be, they are not so immediately urgent as mail pornography.

Nor is the congress unaware of the fact that some adults buy obscene material and bring it home, where it falls into the hands of children. We deplore this. It should be as unthinkable for any parent to bring such poison into his home as it would be to bring heroin or marihuana. But the problem is one of adult enlightenment and thus of adult education.

Still less is the national congress setting itself up as a censor of literature and art or as an agent for the restriction of freedom of expression. We realize that there are differences of taste and judgment about literature and art. But in the matter of mail-order obscenity there are no differences of opinion. The thousands of urgent protests to the Post Office Department prove beyond doubt that most Americans have no difficulty distinguishing between filth and art. No one could look at the slimy stuff that is going through the mails, literally by the ton, and have the slightest doubt that it is filth.

The national congress agrees with the Post Office Department that simple nudity, scanty clothing, or revealing garments, though we may disapprove of them, do not constitute obscenity. But lewd poses, shameless exhibitionism, erotic posturing, and portrayals of unnatural sex behavior are unquestionably obscene. By no stretch of the imagination could any person, any mentally healthy person, deny that these things are pornographic and perverted.

The National Parent-Teacher calls the attention of its readers to the urgency of this problem and to the action that is being taken by the national congress. From time to time the magazine will bring you progress reports from the congress action committee. It will also bring you the views and counsel of psychiatrists, sociologists, law enforcement officers, and other experts.

What can you do right now? Carry out the Postmaster General's instructions and take to your postmaster any indecent material that comes into your home through the mails. Urge your PTA to establish and support a local action committee.

The barons of obscenity exploit the innocence of children for profit. They grow rich by robbing youth of its happiness and its physical and mental health. If we parents, teachers, and other concerned citizens back up the Post Office Department, if we insist on vigorous prosecutions and maximum penalties for the guilty, we can defeat the vicious purveyors of pornography. The job will take perseverance, impatience, and pluck. The stakes are high: Either we wipe out this new black plague or the pernicious infection will spread throughout our society.

Accomplishments of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs During 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, at this midpoint in the 86th Congress I would like to present a brief report on the accomplishments of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during this first session. It has been a great honor and experience to have assumed the chairmanship of this committee, and, before making my report, I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to all members of the committee and to the committee staff for their cooperation and assistance and for their conscientious, diligent attention to the committee's work and activities. Only through such cooperation and diligence were the achievements of the committee during this first session made possible.

I especially want to recognize the leadership of the subcommittee chairmen—Hon. LEO W. O'BRIEN, chairman of the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs; Hon. WALTER ROGERS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation; Hon. GRACIE PFOST, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Lands; Hon. JAMES A. HALEY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs; and Hon. ADAM C. POWELL, chairman of the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining.

I want also to express my sincere appreciation to Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR, ranking minority Member, for the fine cooperation he has given me. I am particularly pleased, too, with the work of the committee's professional and clerical staff, the members of which have set a high standard of performance in committee activities and service to committee members.

STATISTICAL ASPECTS

In this report, I will comment first on the statistical aspects of the committee's work and then on the legislative activity of the committee. Of course, the bare statistics with respect to the committee's workload and performance do not tell the whole story of the committee's accomplishments, but they do help to show in convenient form the quantity of work that was assigned to the committee, the immense amount of time the committee and its members spent on these matters, and the results to date.

First, a bit of history to give us some perspective. The number of bills and resolutions referred to the committee during the first session was greater than ever, and the number of bills that become law was larger than it has been during any first session since the 81st Congress. I present herewith a little table showing the number of bills referred to the committee, the number reported by it, the number which passed the House, and the number which became law during the 1st sessions of the 82d, 83d, 84th, 85th, and 86th Congresses:

	Referred	Reported	Passed House	Enacted
82d	368	83	67	29
83d	421	105	94	58
84th	486	103	97	68
85th	572	79	78	55
86th	641	87	84	71

It will be noted that two other first sessions produced more reports and more bills which passed the House, but none produced as many bills that passed both Houses and were signed by the President.

I want, in this connection, to note that this result reflects the excellent cooperation and understanding that we have had with our counterpart committee in the other body.

Next, and in more detail, the figures for the session that has just ended. During the 141 legislative days of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs convened a total of 158 separate meetings, made up of 121 subcommittee meetings and 37 full committee meetings. Of the 641 bills and resolutions referred to the committee, 381 have been disposed of during this first session and 260 are still pending in the committee. A total of 87 bills or resolutions were approved by the committee and reported to the House, of which 71 passed the House and Senate and were enacted, 1 concurrent resolution was approved by both bodies, 2 bills passed the House and Senate and were vetoed, 10 passed the House and are pending in the Senate, and 3 are awaiting House floor action. Twenty-six of the bills that were enacted carried Senate numbers; 45 carried House numbers.

With respect to subcommittee responsibilities, 13 of the 87 bills and resolutions which received committee approval came from the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, 6 from the Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs, 30 from the Subcommittee on Public Lands, 27 from the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and 8 from the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining. Three were handled by the full committee. Of the 260 bills pending before the committee at the end of this first session, 24 were Senate-passed bills.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

The jurisdiction of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee covers a wide range. The committee is responsible for legislation relating generally to Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Antarctica, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, and the insular possessions of the United States. In the field of irrigation and reclamation, the committee's principal responsibility is for legislation relating to existing and potential multiple-purpose irrigation and reclamation projects, including policies and procedure applicable to such projects. Its responsibilities include legislation involving the public lands generally, forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain, and military parks, battlefields and national cemeteries. It has responsibility for legislation involving the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes, including their care, education, and management, the allotment of Indian lands, and claims paid out of Indian funds. In the field of mines and mining, the committee's responsibilities include legislation involving mining interests generally, the mineral resources of the public lands, and the mineral land laws.

TERRITORIAL AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The most important measure to come out of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee during this session was the bill providing for the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. This action alone would mark the session as a productive one for the committee and the Congress. In view of the many years and many sessions of Congress devoted to this matter, it is very gratifying that Hawaii's admission as our 50th State followed so closely the admission of Alaska as the 49th.

One other measure involving our new States deserves specific mention. This is the Alaska Omnibus Act which made many changes in Federal laws—changes that became necessary and desirable upon Alaska's admission into the Union. Most of these changes are designed to put Alaska under the same general laws, rules, and policies as are applicable to all other States. Other provisions of the bill will also make the transition from territorial status to statehood easier and smoother than it would otherwise be.

Several other bills, of a minor nature, relating to Alaska, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands and Guam were reported by the committee, passed by the House, and enacted during this session.

There are several pieces of legislation presently before the committee which have broad implications for the future of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. In order that the committee may have adequate background for the consideration of this legislation the services of a special consultant were obtained to make a firsthand, on-the-spot study of the progress Puerto Rico has achieved since enactment of the Commonwealth Act of 1952. An excellent report has been prepared which will be of great value to the committee in its planned comprehensive hearings in Puerto Rico this fall.

IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

In the field of reclamation and the development of the Nation's water resources, the most important committee action was the approval of H.R. 7155, to authorize the San Luis unit of the Central Valley project, California, and to open the way for a joint Federal-State development in the San Luis area. Favorable action on this urgently needed project, which will involve a Federal cost of about $290 million, concludes several years' work and study on the part of the committee. This bill was not acted on by the House during the first session.

Three reclamation project authorizing bills which passed the House are H.R. 968, to authorize the Bully Creek extension of the Vale reclamation project in Oregon—$3.3 million development; S. 994, to authorize the Spokane Valley project in Washington and Idaho—$5.1 million development; and H.R. 4279, to authorize the La Feria rehabilitation project in Texas—$6 million development. All three of these bills also passed the Senate and were enacted.

The long-standing problem as to whether the Federal Government or the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would construct the power facilities of the Trinity River project in California was settled once and for all by turning down the so-called partnership proposal. This action was the key to the inclusion of funds in the public works appropriation bill for initiating Federal construction of the powerplants. Further delay in providing these funds would have meant large revenue losses to the Federal Government.

PUBLIC LANDS

The committee reported more bills in the field of public lands, national parks, and so forth, than in any other field. It approved bills establishing four national park units—the Minute Man National Historical Park in Massachusetts, H.R. 5892; the Arkansas Post National Memorial, H.R. 6108; Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park in Missouri, H.R. 725; and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Maryland, H.R. 2331. H.R. 5892 was enacted, H.R. 6108 is pending in the Senate, and H.R. 725 and H.R. 2331 are pending in the House.

A great deal of time was spent considering the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park bills that were referred to the committee. The problems that were particularly troublesome involve potential conflicts in use of the land and water resources of the Potomac basin. The committee resolved the matter by providing that park lands would be available upon Federal statutory authorization for future necessary nonpark uses such as municipal water supply and thereby cleared the way for enactment of this important legislation.

The committee also approved H.R. 5412, which increases the acreage which may be patented to States and local governments under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act of 1926. Among other things, this bill provides that up to 6,400 acres may be conveyed in any one year to any State for not more than three recreational sites. For the years 1960, 1961, and 1962, these figures are doubled. S. 1436, in which the language of H.R. 5412 was substituted, was enacted.

Other measures approved by the committee and passed by the House in this field include several for revising the boundaries of existing national parks and monuments, a few relating to national shrines and monuments, several relating to land exchanges, and one extending the leasing provisions of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to certain lands in Oregon which have heretofore been excluded from its operation.

INDIAN AFFAIRS

Many Indian bills were approved by the committee and passed the House. All are important to the Indian tribes they relate to or affect. Three are important enough to mention here. One is H.R. 8587, which provides for the equalization of allotments on the Agua Caliente Reservation in California. The problem of finding an effective way of securing a reasonable degree of equalization among those to whom full allotments have not already been made, without parceling out certain lands which the band wants to retain in tribal ownership, has been troublesome for a long time. It is a real accomplishment to have this problem satisfactorily resolved.

The second is H.R. 6128 which provides for division of the tribal assets of the Catawba Indian Tribe of South Carolina among its enrolled members. This bill provides for the closing of the mem-

bership roll and for terminating Federal services to the Catawba Indians.

The third bill, H.R. 2722, provides for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, a matter which has been pending since 1906. The bill provides for the establishment of a corporation or a foundation which will handle the sale of certain lands, distribution of per capita funds, and the management of mineral interests.

MINES AND MINING

In the field of mines and mining, the committee approved several important measures. One was the coal research and development bill which had as its objective encouraging and stimulating the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development. It would have created a Coal Research and Development Commission as an independent agency to administer this research and development program. Unfortunately, the bill was pocket-vetoed by the President, although it had passed both Houses by very substantial majorities.

Another is House Concurrent Resolution 177, declaring that it is in the national interest to maintain a sound and stable domestic mining and mineral industry without critical dependence on foreign sources. It calls for reviews of existing agency programs with a view toward using them more effectively to increase production and employment in the critically depressed mining and mineral industries of the country. The resolution points out that further delays in recovery would cause irreparable damage to mining and mineral properties, waste of human and natural resources and loss of productive capacity, and would have a depressing effect upon the national economy and threaten national security.

The hearings on the resolution made clear the precarious state of important segments of our domestic mining and mineral industries. Among the causes of the current condition are the administration of Government purchases, contracts, loans, grants, technical assistance, and barter—all or many of which have directly or indirectly caused abnormal stimulation of foreign development.

During the consideration of the resolution, there was discussion of the extent to which Government might reasonably go in assisting in the increased production and employment in the mining industry. The resolution establishes as a present goal more effective use by the executive agencies of their existing authorizations to protect the critically depressed domestic industries and to provide increased production and employment. None of the requested reviews or studies would be aimed at increasing production or employment beyond a prudent economic limit with due consideration to the public interest.

The committee also approved, and the Congress passed, H.R. 6939 which increases the acreage in Alaska which may be held under coal lease by any one person or firm from 2,560 acres to 10,240 acres or, in some circumstances, to 15,360 acres. This puts Alaska on the same basis as other States.

One other bill deserves mention. The committee approved S. 2181, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act. This bill provides a means whereby bona fide and innocent purchasers of oil and gas leasehold interests in public lands can be dismissed from contests brought by the Department of the Interior for alleged violations by prior leaseholders of acreage limitations. S. 2181 was enacted.

FIELD HEARINGS DURING ADJOURNMENT

In my opinion, proper performance by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of its mission requires its members to be familiar with the people and places under its jurisdiction and the local situations that give rise to legislative matters referred to it. It is for this reason that I favor on-the-ground hearings and inspections and have authorized several trips this fall for a number of special subcommittees.

In connection with territorial and insular affairs, I have authorized a visit to the Pacific to include Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific and comprehensive hearings in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I have authorized a special irrigation subcommittee to inspect potential and existing reclamation projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin and in California. I have also authorized a special public lands subcommittee to hold hearings in Oregon and California on national park and public land matters.

Recruitment of Agricultural Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent statement on the proposed regulations of the Department of Labor pertaining to the recruitment of agricultural workers, prepared by Mr. Norman O. Nilsen, Commissioner of Labor of the State of Oregon, which was presented in his behalf by the Honorable EDITH GREEN, U.S. Representative, Third Congressional District, State of Oregon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF NORMAN O. NILSEN, COMMISSIONER OF LABOR, STATE OF OREGON, PRESENTED BY HON. EDITH GREEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, STATE OF OREGON, PUBLIC HEARING CALLED BY SECRETARY OF LABOR, JAMES P. MITCHELL, SEPTEMBER 10 AND 11, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C., PERTAINING TO AMENDMENTS TO INTERSTATE RECRUITMENT OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS AND PLACEMENT POLICY

Before discussing whether conditions warrant the proposed regulations, it is well to remember that the agricultural industry has literally no investment in the public employment services of the various States. The farm placement activities of these services are financed exclusively by industries covered by unemployment compensation acts. Since agriculture is not covered, it makes no dollar contribution. The activities of the services do not receive money from general taxation and therefore do not make even an indirect contribution.

I am not objecting to this system, necessarily, but I do believe that it becomes more imperative that the farm placement activities use care and diligence to prevent the undermining of agricultural labor conditions. In the nature of things, if the agricultural industry were supplyng any of the funds which support farm placement activities a case might be advanced for allegiance to the immediate or special interests of the agricultural employers. At least, they would earn a large voice in how their contributions were spent. Under the circumstances, however, we are all on an equal footing in making recommendations as to the activities of the farm placement servce, regardless of whether or not we are connected with the agricultural industry.

Patently, under these circumstances, there can be no excuse for any activity which fails to accord minimum standards of fair job placement, housing and wages of workers supplied interstate through the farm placement activities of the public employment services of this country.

The major justification for the proposed regulations, however, are the conditions suffered by many of this country's migratory farm workers—conditions which Government should not countenance at all, let alone conduct itself in such a way as might encourage such conditions. There is incontrovertible evidence of the existence of these conditions but they should be reviewed briefly at this time.

We in Oregon have made an exceptionally close study of their existence and can cite them, chapter and verse. However, every State in which any study has been made has found conditions similar, or worse, to those found in the State of Oregon. A number of State agencies, at the request of a State legislative interim study committee, conducted the extensive survey in 1958 which led to the accumulation of a mountain of information on conditions in Oregon. The bureau of labor interviewed over 1,200 migrants in a scientific sampling of this State's sizable migrant population. In doing so, staff members of my department worked long hours, 7 days a week, during many weeks—they lived with the migrants, worked in the fields with them and sought them out wherever they were—in the camps, in the fields, even in the railroad jungles and the taverns if that was where they were. Other agencies took assignments related to their jurisdiction.

In Oregon the public employment service is not under the bureau of labor. This separate department, therefore, had a different assignment from ours. The State employment service interviewed over 4,000 growers with respect to their problems and their viewpoint. The welfare department talked to all of the migrant applicants for aid during a 2-month period throughout the State. The board of health interviewed 2,000 migrants relative to their health and checked the sanitation of a large number of camps and fields. The industrial accident commission checked over 500 trucks and buses for safety.

The following comments relate in very brief form the findings of these agencies pertinent to the three major areas treated by the regulations proposed by the Secretary of Labor at this hearing:

HOUSING—TITLE 20, CHAPTER V, SECTION 602.9 (D)

The Oregon State Board of Health reported that over one-quarter of all migrant housing facilities in their survey sample were in a condition, or of a type, which were so unsatisfactory as to be menaces to the public health of the State of Oregon. The board of health, moreover, showed that many, many more than one-quarter of the facilities were unsatisfactory in one respect or another, conditions which also would be considered as unhealthful.

The Bureau of Labor found in one county, for example, 14 percent of the migrant population had no shelter other than bedding rolls, tarp and stick arrangements, or personal automobiles. This 14 percent included many family groups, and the total migrant population at the time in this county exceeded 3,000. This same county housed nearly one-quarter of their migrant population in tents, some of which were large platform tents, but many of which were ordinary camping equipment.

The Bureau of Labor found throughout the State that a one-room cabin was the typical situation for a family, or for three or four single migrants. Of those family heads and singles in buildings of one kind or another in our survey sample, 75 percent were in one-room cabins; 65 percent of the families were in one-room cabins. We found these families, approximately 650 rooms, or an average of 4.7 people per room.

We took no average measurement information on the size of the cabins, but anyone familiar with migrant housing knows that the cabins are extremely small. In this one room the parents eat and sleep, feed and bed their children, entertain their friends, store their belongings, and breed and bear more children.

Although the Oregon Board of Health survey, even more than the Bureau of Labor survey, contains conclusive information, the Oregon State Employment Service survey adds insight into the economic context upon which we must focus some attention.

One thousand and seventeen farm operators with migrant housing answered an employment service question which showed that only 15.5 percent of their family units, and 14.6 percent of their barrack units, have been constructed since 1952. There is considerable doubt that the percentage is as high with respect to the proportion of workers accommodated. The only figure available on proportion of workers accommodated was on the barrack type. Of the barrack units built since 1952 (14.6 percent of the total barracks), only 6.3 percent of the total worker capacity was accommodated. (Tables XVII and XVIII, 1958 Farm Operator Survey, Oregon State Employment Service.)

These statistics are dramatized by the most frequent estimate of these farm operators that the life expectancy of their migrant housing was between 10 and 14 years (table XX). With 85 percent of the present housing units already over 7 years old, it is obvious that new construction was not keeping pace with the need.

Furthermore, of the 4,273 farm operators reporting (1,017 of whom had some housing), only 53 were planning any expansion (table XXI).

Since this is the housing situation, it would appear unjustifiable for a Federal agency to sanction importation of workers into a State without some prior investigation of the adequacy of the housing. If such a substantial proportion of the housing is of a quality below decent standards, it is more than likely that a substantial proportion of the imported workers would be inadequately housed.

Many of the growers in Oregon have housing of which they can be proud, and of which the State can be proud. Most Oregon farmers have accommodations which would meet any standards likely to be set. It is, however, the minority of the growers about whom we must concern ourselves, and it is that unfortunately sizable minority who should not receive the benefit of farm placement service activity until some improvement is shown in their housing.

PREVAILING WAGES—TITLE 20, CHAPTER V, SECTION 602.9 (C)

In our survey of the migrant in Oregon in the early part of the 1958 season, the Bureau of Labor found the average weekly earnings of the male migrant to be $32.36 per week. This figure was corroborated by the Oregon State Employment Service study of payroll and man-day figures supplied by the growers themselves. The grower figures reflected average pay per man-day as being $5.37 in the year 1957 for all seasonal farm workers. The low level of earnings of the individual cannot be ignored, even though the earnings of a total family, often cited, might reasonably support them if they were able to earn consistently. In our survey we found the average family earnings to be $80.36 during the season.

The regulations of the Secretary of Labor take on particular importance for the State of Oregon if we are to maintain the standards we now have, inadequate as they are. Farm earnings in Oregon are among the best in the country. In view of the extremely low level of actual earnings, however, we certainly should not permit Government funds to be used in such a way as might undermine wage standards already lower than necessary to maintain a minimum decent standard of living.

AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL WORKERS—TITLE 20, CHAPTER V, SECTION 602.9 (A) AND (B)

The problem of assuring local workers of employment opportunities before clearing an order for out-of-State workers requires consideration of several basic problems and concepts. The most prominent basic concept involves the theoretical benefit to the workers of improved wages and conditions in their local area as a shortage of workers improves their competitive situation. The automatic brake on any runaway effect of such a local shortage is normally that as wages and conditions improve, outside labor is attracted to that area.

These homely statements apply more to industry than to agriculture, however, because heretofore some agricultural industry recruiting practices have prevented agricultural wages and conditions from keeping pace even relatively, with industry. The agricultural industry has demanded that Government supply more workers to meet labor shortages, instead of improving wages and conditions to attract more workers.

While I am not desirous of hurting the agricultural industry, nor of shutting off services to the industry, nor of promoting sudden changes in the patterns of which I complain, I am certainly in accord with allowing basic economic forces to help the situation. Supplying outside labor when not absolutely essential to prevent grievous loss to the agricultural industry acts as a restraint on basic economic forces to the detriment of the wages and conditions.

By being overanxious to supply foreign labor to the Nation's large farms, we have allowed a vampire bat to feast at the expense or our migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The net result in the Western States is that we have two tidal waves of workers flooding over the areas. The Mexican nationals have been moved into the Southwestern States and then into California in such numbers that local farmworkers have not been in much demand, and in such numbers that it could not help but have a deleterious effect on wages and conditions which would have improved more under normal economic circumstances. As the foreign tidal wave grew, the domestic labor which normally lived in those areas or normally served those areas was forced to run to the North in search of a better competitive situation. As these domestic migrants moved North more and more pressures were placed on the competitive situation of local farm labor in Oregon and other States deleterious effect of this second tidal wave of displaced domestic workers has further worked to limit improvement in farmwork conditions.

This statement does not propose to turn back the clock. The Nation must work itself out of this situation carefully, responsibly, and gradually in order not to do an injustice to either our workers or economy. Nonetheless, the Secretary of Labor must be supported in the promulgation of such regulations as are here proposed which will act to curb unnecessary recruiting of outside labor.

Even while avoiding irreparable harm to the agricultural industry, there must still be sufficient pressure maintained on the industry to cause it to more energetically seek answers to the problems of its employees. In any event, Government funds should not be spent in such a manner as to relieve the industry of the responsibility and the need for seeking such answers.

CONCLUSION

To all thinking persons of good conscience, it must be apparent that there is an illness in American economic and social life resulting from the conditions under which our migrant farmworkers live and work. The agricultural industry, perhaps through no fault of its own, has not been able to solve even the uppermost of these problems. Since migrants, either individually or collectively, are not in a position to defend their own interests, and since we cannot realistically expect the industry to make any more substantial progress than it has in the past, it is incumbent upon Government to provide the necessary minimum protections for these citizens and fellow human beings in our country.

The case is so strong for the regulations as proposed by the Secretary of Labor that it is clear that they do not go far enough. How can anyone argue for the expenditure of public funds to bring workers to an employer who is not able, or will not, provide a minimum standard of decency, either through sufficient wages to maintain such a standard or through a combination of wages and housing facilities which would assure such a standard? There can be no reason why the various State employment services, supported as they are by the Federal dollar, should be permitted to dispatch to any farm employer, any labor, interstate or intrastate, if the housing of that employer does not meet minimum standards of sanitation, or if the working conditions and wages provided by that farmer undercut the general level in the area.

Actually, the proposed regulations will not make a substantial contribution to the progress of the domestic migrant worker, but they are important in any event. Substantial progress remains to be made and should be made through legislative and community approaches to the problem, preferably supported or even led by the agricultural industry. At the administrative level, however, certainly these regulations as proposed are the very least that we in this country should expect of a public official with the power and responsibility conferred by statute upon the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

This is all the more true because the standards under the proposed regulations will remain in most States fixed at a level considerably below the level guaranteed by contract to the foreign nationals we import to the competitive disadvantage of our own workers.

It has been a privilege for my testimony urging adoption of the regulations to be entered in the record at this most im-

portant hearing by the Honorable EDITH GREEN of the Third Congressional District in Oregon. I trust that the results of this hearing will be a further indication that we are belatedly recognizing our responsibility as a Nation to provide minimum levels of protection for our farmworker fellow citizens.

Is Tight Money the Only Way To Fight Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress might well be called an educational session in the area of economic policy—educational for the Members of Congress, for the American people, and perhaps even for the members of the executive branch.

There has been much serious thought and serious discussion devoted this year by many Members of the House and Senate to our economic problems and our economic future.

Unfortunately, most of our serious discussions of economics have been overshadowed by repeated political charges against the majority party of budget busting, heavy spending, and fiscal irresponsibility—charges which cannot be substantiated because they are not true, and charges which, whatever their imagined political value, have contributed nothing but confusion to honest efforts to solve the real economic problems our Nation faces.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the American people have not been fooled and will not be fooled by such political shouting, which is intended to divert attention from serious discussion of our real economic problems—how to maintain a strong and growing America, with maximum employment and sustained economic growth, without inflation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the political crying towels will be thrown away after this session, and that in the second session of the 86th Congress we will come to grips with reality, forget the slogans, and get down to the serious business—on both sides of the aisle—of developing sound economic policies which strengthen instead of weaken the United States.

In this connection, I submit for the RECORD the following article which I have just prepared for Commonweal magazine:

IS TIGHT MONEY THE ONLY WAY TO FIGHT INFLATION?

(By HENRY S. REUSS)

A few days short of adjournment, the Democratic Congress handed the Republican administration one of its few defeats of the 1959 session. By a nearly party line vote, the House rejected, 256 to 133 the administration request for removal of the 4¼ percent interest ceiling on U.S. bonds, a ceiling which has been in effect since 1918.

The vote was based mainly on instincts. The Republicans' instincts were with tight money and Andrew Mellon; the Democrats' instincts were with adequate money and Andrew Jackson. The larger question behind the controversy over the 4¼ percent interest ceiling—the question of how best to fight inflation—has not been explored, either by the administration or by Congress.

During the debate, Democrats pointed out that refusal to lift the 4¼ percent ceiling would entail no disastrous consequences for Treasury financing. No Treasury obligations of more than 5-year maturity come due until November 15, 1960. Refunding—the issuing of new securities to replace those that come due before then—can proceed without reference to any interest ceiling. By November 15, 1960, Democrats hope that interest rates will be lower and that the Treasury will be able to sell obligations for less than 4¼ percent.

Meanwhile, why permit the Treasury to saddle generations of future taxpayers with issues of 30-year U.S. bonds at 5 or 6 percent interest? For the next year, refunding operations can just as well be handled by issuing securities of 5 years or less, followed by their refunding at lower rates.

WHY PAY MORE LONGER?

In short, Democrats argue that if the taxpayers are to pay more than 4¼ percent on Government borrowings, it is better to pay it on shorter term obligations than to be stuck with high interest payments for 10, 20, 30, or 40 years.

The dust has partly settled on the interest ceiling issue for the moment. But the question remains: Is the administration's method of fighting inflation—tight money and high interest rates—the way to do it?

High interest rates have been brought about in several ways. On numerous occasions the Treasury has put a higher interest coupon on a new issue than the market required. Then, too, the Federal Reserve has repeatedly raised rediscount rates—the rate which Federal Reserve banks charge member banks for loans it makes to them. Most important of all, the increase in the money supply from 1954 to 1958 was held down to 6.6 percent, compared with a 21.6 percent increase in gross national product during this same period.

Sometimes the administration tries to escape responsibility for high interest rates, asserting that these rates are simply the result of "supply and demand" for money. But this argument overlooks the fact that the administration controls the supply of money through its power to create bank reserves, and controls a good part of the demand for money through the borrowing and credit activities of the Government.

FISCAL POLICY IS BETTER

Critics of administration economic policy argue that a one-track-tight-money policy is far inferior to fiscal policy—the expenditure and taxing policy of the Government—as a means of fighting demand inflation. A tight-money policy, say these critics, retards economic growth, and it fails to make contact at all with some of the most disturbing actual price rises, where the trouble is not primarily excessive demand but interference on the supply side.

Let us look at the first proposition: that a policy of extreme monetary tightness is undesirable, and that better anti-inflationary results, with less damage to the overall economy, can be obtained by a policy of fiscal tightness.

Monetary restraints operate by raising interest rates. By making it more expensive to borrow, this discourages activities which are most easily discouraged by high interest rates. In the main, these are activities, both private and public, which require long-term capital.

On the private side, this takes in the whole housing and construction industry. In 1952, a $10,000 FHA mortgage at 4 percent interest could be paid off over 25 years at a total cost of $15,840 (of which interest was $5,840). In 1959, the same mortgage, now at 5¼ percent, would cost $18,000 to pay off (of which interest is $8,000). The extra $2,160 would have bought another bedroom and bath.

Capital expenditures in new plant and equipment—particularly by small businesses—are likewise sensitive to high interest rates, and are likely to be curtailed.

HALTS LOCAL PROGRAM

On the public side, State and local public works program—vitally needed schools, highways, hospitals—are stretched out, or cut out, because of higher interest rates.

The dangerous effects of all this, on employment, on growth, on meeting national needs, are obvious.

But one may ask, Doesn't tight money restrain consumer spending as well as capital spending? All the evidence is that high interest rates restrain consumer spending only in a marginal way. Today's interest rates are the highest in a generation. Yet consumer spending is at an alltime record high. If interest rates go up, downpayments are reduced, the period of installments strung out from here to eternity, and few installment purchasers ever know the difference.

Nor do consumers tend to increase their savings substantially when interest rates rise. Today, for example, the overall percentage of consumer savings has not expanded despite record-breaking interest rates.

INVESTMENT, GROWTH SUFFER

The administration's obsession with monetary restraints, therefore, fights inflation at the expense of investment and national growth.

During 1947–52, with a policy of adequate money, but fiscal tightness, resulting in a budget surplus of $12.4 billion, our growth was at the healthy rate of 4½ percent a year. During 1953–58, a period of tight money, but loose fiscal policies, resulting in a deficit of $8.5 billion, our growth rate declined to around 2 percent a year. (Compare this with the 5- to 6-percent growth rate achieved during the same period in Western Europe and the 8 to 10 percent achieved in the Soviet Union.)

Besides slowing our rate of growth, the administration's combination of tight money and loose fiscal policies has reduced the management of the national debt to a shambles. Higher and higher interest rates have meant lower and lower market prices for outstanding U.S. securities. This is the largest single factor causing the present crisis in managing our $290 billion national debt.

If price stability, economic growth, and a well-managed national debt are primary objectives of national policy (as they should be), then there is a strong case for abandoning the administration's tight money, fiscal laxity policy and substituting a policy of fiscal tightness and adequate money. A look at next year's budget can give us the outline of such a changed policy.

BUDGET CAN SHOW SURPLUS

If the present recovery continues, there is no reason why the budget to be submitted in January of 1960 cannot adequately provide for the Nation's needs and still show a surplus of $2 to $3 billion. If fat and waste are trimmed from the budget, particularly in the defense and farm programs, expenditures need not run substantially above the present year's $77 billion level. If the temptation is resisted to support a vote-catching election year tax reduction, present prospects are for a surplus of several billions.

The surplus could and should be increased—perhaps to $5 billion—by plugging some of the large loopholes in our tax structure: the oil depletion allowance, failure to

report dividend and interest payments, and excessive entertainment deductions, for example.

A substantial Federal surplus would in itself go far to bring an end to the present tight-money, high-interest, growth-discouraging position. The surplus could be used to retire some of the national debt. Banks and other lenders could use the funds thus obtained to make needed loans both to the private sector of the economy and to State and local governments. With credit more available, interest rates would go down. Growth would be spurred, and the national debt made more manageable.

UPGRADING FISCAL POLICY

Happily, there are signs that forces in both the administration and Congress are beginning to see the advisability of downgrading monetary policy and upgrading fiscal policy as a method of combating demand inflation.

Henry Wallick, just appointed to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, had this to say at the Twenty-ninth Alumni Conference of the School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, on May 9, 1959: "The combination of fiscal-monetary policy that I envisage here is one of the surplus in the budget—you might call it a 'firm' budget policy—and, with a budget surplus, a relatively more relaxed monetary policy. This combination would favor growth because it means more saving and lower interest rates."

And Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, of Arkansas, the extremely hard-headed chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee, has scheduled a series of hearings between now and January for a thoroughgoing overhaul of tax loopholes.

But even if the emphasis shifts from monetary to fiscal policy as a means of fighting inflation, attention must still be given to those areas of price rises which seem to occur because of what happens on the side of supply, rather than because of excess demand.

LOOK AT ADMINISTERED PRICES

The administration has virtually closed its eyes to administered prices as an inflationary factor. Yet it is clear that the largest part of our cost-of-living increase in recent years is a direct result of the practice of key industries, such as steel, autos and petroleum, to raise prices whether justified or not—a practice which can be foisted on the public because such industries are dominated by a few companies and a few men, and everybody goes along for the ride to higher profits.

There must be vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws to halt interlocking collusion against the public interest by administered pricing.

In addition, it is high time that the Government began to perform its duty as the public's fact-finder and educator in cases where industrywide price increases, and related wage increases, may tend to be inflationary. There is need, I think, for legislation, such as that proposed by Senator JOSEPH CLARK of Pennsylvania and myself, establishing Government machinery to give the people the facts on profits, wages, prices and productivity in controversies of vital national concern, such as the current steel strike. A truly informed public opinion can have a moderating effect at the bargaining table.

Food prices to the consumer likewise continue to rise, despite drastic reductions in the family farmgr's income. And at the same time the Department of Agriculture budget goes up and up, while millions of farm folks leave the land.

FARM PROGRAMS GONE SOUR

Obviously, our farm programs have gone sour. Nearly everyone agrees that the piecemeal approach to the farm problem must be replaced with a total overhaul of agricultural legislation, and for months Congress has awaited Secretary Benson's new farm "package." But it has not come, and vetoes have met the admittedly piecemeal efforts of Congress to lessen the problem.

Perhaps the Brannan plan is a term in disrepute. But having seen the agriculture experts and the farm organizations and farmers themselves unable to come up with a solution, I am willing to try almost anything different from what we have now. For why shouldn't food prices reflect what is happening in our farm economy, so that the consumer benefits from lower prices? And why shouldn't the family farmer who follows sound agricultural and conservation practices get direct help if he needs it? It could hardly cost more than the existing mess.

The cost of hospital and medical care is another area of major concern. Short supply, as well as increased demand, makes health care a fast climbing item of family expense, and our expanding, longer living population only adds to the problem. Increased research activity, which the Government has helped to spur and which we clearly need, may add to the shortage of practicing physicians. Moreover, present population growth (3 million a year) surpasses current projections of the rate of increase in medical school enrollment or in number of physicians. And shortages already exist in many specialized areas of medicine, not to mention nursing and related health-care occupations.

To keep the cost of health care from skyrocketing further, we need more doctors, more nurses, more hospital facilities, more training facilities, more nursing homes, and more research. And initially, we need more planning and coordination of private and public effort to attack the needs.

SLOGANS DON'T SOLVE PROBLEM

If, therefore, we are going to face our economic future at all, we must face it honestly, head on, and in its many aspects. Coupled slogans can, of course, fool the public (as well as the slogan writers), but they seldom serve the public interest. It is hardly the answer to shout repeatedly, as the administration does, that it is against inflation and against spending. I know no one in Congress (and few outside it) who is for inflation, Democrat or Republican.

Of course there's room to argue how much to spend on what—and the public should know that the issue between Democrats and Republicans is not one of spending or not spending, but whether what we spend is meeting the priorities of our national needs and whether the taxpayer is getting his money's worth.

On the one hand, the President's defense, agriculture, or foreign aid budgets are not sacred cows, automatically beyond criticism. Nor, on the other hand, are such congressionally approved programs as urban renewal, housing, water pollution control, hospital construction, and medical research to be considered beyond the needs or capabilities of the United States just because the Budget Bureau doesn't like them.

LET'S OPEN BOTH EYES

The economy of the United States must be strong if we are to meet the worldwide challenge of international communism and still take care of our pressing domestic needs. This means sustained economic growth, maximum employment, and price stability. The present administration's policies have fallen short on all counts, and the heart of the problem is in the administration's one-eyed view of inflation as the only evil, and of tight money as the only answer.

If we can only open the other eye, and get some depth perception, we will find there is more than one road leading away from inflation and toward growth and stability.

Arctic Study Lags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Anchorage Times of August 31, 1959, entitled "Arctic Study Lags."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCTIC STUDY LAGS

Alaskans can serve the Nation by launching an all-out effort to win better understanding of the importance and significance of the Arctic Health Research Center in Anchorage.

The program conducted by scientists under this Federal agency is of more than ordinary importance. Its purpose is to find solutions to the problems that make strategic and economic operations difficult in the cold weather areas of the far north.

National leaders at Washington have failed to understand this. They have been niggardly in allocating funds to support and expand the program. Congress, too, has shown misunderstanding and misconception of the program by deleting from appropriation bills some of the funds that have been requested.

It behooves all Alaskans, through their political and civic organizations, to sponsor an educational program that will lead to decisions in Washington that are in accord with the national interests.

During recent years the research programs have been shrinking instead of expanding. Work has had to be curtailed on studies of the factors that make man and animals adaptable to cold weather.

Facilities have been closed down, instead of expanded, in connection with efforts to discover efficient methods for the disposal of human wastes in permafrost areas.

The Nation is not carrying forward as it should scientific investigations into the diseases related to unhealthy environments such as diarrhea and dysenteries.

Even the methods for operating septic tanks in mid-latitudes of Alaska, from Anchorage northward, need improvement. More efficient operating procedures can be found only by study.

These are some of the fields of study in which the Arctic Health Research Center operates. It is one of the few Federal agencies concerned with Arctic investigations and should be a major operation instead of a small one.

Russia is far ahead of the United States in Arctic research. The Soviets have developed grains that grow in the Arctic. They are operating farflung outposts on the polar icecap that outnumber the U.S. activities in that field. They have built large cities in the far north while in Alaska the United States is still trying to make the first beginnings.

The study of problems pertaining to man's adaptability to cold, the building of adequate sanitation facilities and the elimination of diseases, is a basic need for the northward movement of civilization that marks this era.

Discoveries made by the scientists could have strategic value in that the movements and operations of men and weapons might be more efficient, more dependable and less costly. Long-range benefits would be additional dividends in enabling man to bring

to human use many of the resources in areas now considered almost uninhabitable.

The importance of Arctic research should be made known by the State chamber of commerce. It would be appropriate as a special project of the Anchorage chamber. Civic groups would find informational addresses by participants in the research program of great interest.

This subject is too important to leave to the whims and fancies of national leaders who are distant and often uninformed on the problems of the northern areas.

Record of Committee on Public Works in the 86th Congress, 1st Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following summary of public works legislation reported by the Committee on Public Works during the 1st session of the 86th Congress:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Committee on Public Works had 430 bills referred to it during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. These dealt with such subjects as navigation improvements, flood control, water pollution, beach erosion, highways, bridges, public buildings, land conveyances, and water supplies.

The committee acted upon 100 river and harbor, flood control, and watershed resolutions proposed by individual Members of Congress, which require only committee action. The civil works resolutions authorized review survey studies by the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, that will ultimately result in project reports submitted to Congress if the projects are found feasible and are approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, the Chief of Engineers, and the Secretary of the Army. The watershed resolutions were acted upon pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act—Public Law 566, 83d Congress, as amended by Public Law 1018, 84th Congress—which requires watershed projects having more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity to be approved by the Committee on Public Works.

The committee studied and gave particular attention to the needs of every section of the country in reporting the omnibus river and harbor and flood control bill of 1959, believing that continuing conservation and control of the Nation's water resources is necessary and desirable. The committee found it necessary, too, to enact emergency legislation to continue the interstate program on a reasonably uniform schedule, to prevent the economic disadvantages which would result from drastic fluctuations in the level of the program.

The formal opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway on June 26, 1959, marked the beginning of the last phase of one of the most tremendous projects ever to affect the economy of the United States and the Midwest in particular. In order to utilize the seaway to its full capacity, other concomitant projects are necessary. One is the deepening of the connecting channels in the Great Lakes to depths commensurate with the seaway. The other is the deepening of the major harbors to accommodate the shipping which will be able to use the seaway and the connecting channels. Deepening of the connecting channels has been authorized. Deepening of several of the major harbors on the Great Lakes is authorized in projects included in the 1959 Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act.

For many years there has been need for a law to provide continuing and permanent authority for carrying out a program for the repair, remodeling, improving and construction of public buildings in communities throughout the Nation at the least possible cost. A patchwork of laws going back to 1870 and regulations drawn under emergency conditions of depressions and wars hindered the orderly planning and construction of public buildings. The Public Buildings Act of 1959, which originated in the Committee on Public Works, abolished many obsolete laws and will provide a much-needed basis for the planning and construction of public buildings in the future.

The committee again held extensive hearings on legislation to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to finance needed additions to its power system by the issuance of revenue bonds. The House and Senate approved the legislation and it became a public law on August 6, 1959.

One of the most important measures acted upon by the committee in this session was the bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the authorization of funds for construction of sewage-treatment plants. The bill passed the House and Senate and is awaiting conference action.

Following action on the 1959 Highway Act, a special subcommittee on the Federal-aid highway program was appointed to study policies, procedures, and practices involved in the administration of the road program. The investigation was deemed necessary and desirable in the light of numerous serious complaints about the program from many sources during committee hearings and floor debate on the bill providing an additional increase in the Federal gasoline tax. The initial phase of the subcommittee's activity will be devoted primarily to intensive investigative work by the staff. Public hearings will follow, possibly early in the next session.

I have had splendid cooperation and invaluable aid from all committee members. I am grateful to Representatives GEORGE H. FALLON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, JOHN A. BLATNIK, ROBERT E. JONES, and FRANK E. SMITH, who served so ably as subcommittee chairmen. The committee is fortunate in having an efficient, hard-working staff of experienced persons, and I commend them for innumerable tasks well done.

Following is a summary of the bills and resolutions acted upon by the committee in the first session:

Bills and resolutions enacted into law

Public Law No.	Bill No.	Date approved	Title
41	H.R. 2228	June 11, 1959	Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, additional land in exchange for dredging privileges.
35	H.R. 4695	May 29, 1959	Amend title 23 of the United States Code—Highways, to increase period in which construction shall commence on rights-of-way.
[1] 137	H.R. 3460	Aug. 5, 1959	Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, amend re sale of revenue bonds.
203	H.R. 2193	Aug. 25, 1959	Designating Coyote Valley Reservoir in California as Lake Mendocino.
109	H.R. 904	July 17, 1959	Renaming New Richmond locks and dam, Ohio, as the Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam.
193	H.R. 2101	Aug. 25, 1959	Designating Petaluma Creek, Calif., as Petaluma River.
77	H.R. 5515	July 6, 1959	Big Sandy River, Ky.-W. Va., increase authorization relating to dam No. 3.
189	H.R. 109	Aug. 25, 1959	Designating dam and reservoir on Pound River, Va., as the John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir.
98	S. 42	July 17, 1959	Storage space in Table Rock Reservoir, Mo., for water supply for a fish hatchery.
249	H.R. 7645	Sept. 9, 1959	Public Buildings Act of 1959.
191	H.R. 1074	Aug. 25, 1959	Repealing act of Aug. 9, 1939, creating Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission.
190	H.R. 802	....do....	Validating and confirming a contract between the United States and the town of Bridgeport, Wash.
82	S. 692	July 13, 1959	Authorizing sale of certain lands at Table Rock Dam and Reservoir project, Missouri, to State of Missouri.
228	S. 300	Sept. 8, 1959	Amending the act establishing a study commission on certain river basins in the State of Texas.
264	S. 2291	Sept. 14, 1959	Plaque in honor of Hon. Sam D. McReynolds on site of Chickamauga Dam.
328	H.R. 7125	Sept. 21, 1959	President Adams Parkway, study of feasibility.
307	H.R. 616	....do....	Designating dam across Lampasas River, Tex., as Stillhouse Hollow Dam.
334	H.R. 8035	....do....	Designating Dyberry Dam and Reservoir, Lackawaxen River Basin, Pa., as the Gen. Edgar Jadwin Dam and Reservoir.
342	H.R. 8678	....do....	Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959.
297	S. 2230	....do....	National Cultural Center Act, amend re disposition of donated funds.
347	S. 1473	Sept. 22, 1959	Sale of certain land to First Baptist Church of Plymouth, Mass.
348	S. 2302	....do....	Conveyance of land at John Day lock and dam to city of Arlington, Oreg.
248	H.R. 968 (S. 902)	Sept. 9, 1959	Improvement of channel to Port Mansfield, Tex. (S. 902 included in H.R. 968 by Senate amendment.)

[1] Amended by Public Law 86-157 (S. 2471) to delete certain language from sec. 15d(a)

Bills passed by the House and pending in Senate committee

Bill No.	Passed House	Title
H.R. 1	Mar. 13, 1959	Lake Michigan, diversion of water into Illinois Waterway.
H.R. 7634	July 16, 1959	River and harbor and flood control omnibus bill, 1959.
H.R. 7808	July 8, 1959	Designating new lock on St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock.
H.R. 8171	Sept. 9, 1959	Rail transit crossing across Bay of San Francisco.
H.R. 5738	....do.....	Public wharf in Waukegan Harbor, Ill., Waukegan Port District.
H.R. 5349	Sept. 14, 1959	Conveyance of certain real property to Orange County, Calif.

Bills reported by the committee and pending on House Calendar

Bill No.	Reported from committee	Title
H.R. 8347	Sept. 5, 1959	National wildlife refuge at Jackson lock and dam, Alabama.

Bills approved by House and Senate and awaiting conference action

Bill No.	Passed House	Title
H.R. 3610	June 9, 1959	Federal Water Pollution Act, amendment to sec. 6 re sewage treatment plant construction grants.

Bills approved by Senate and referred to committee

Bill No.	Passed Senate	Title
S. 219	Apr. 29, 1959	Government Printing Office annex building.
S. 601	....do.....	Authorizing construction of Bardwell Reservoir, Tex. (included in H.R. 7634).
S. 846	May 20, 1959	Designating Cannelton lock and dam, Indiana, Ohio River, as the George Ewing lock and dam.
S. 1632	....do.....	Authorizing modification of existing navigation project for Kahului Harbor, island of Maui, Hawaii (included in H.R. 7634).
S. 2440	Aug. 19, 1959	Designating Green Peter Dam and Reservoir, Middle Santiam River, Oreg., as the Douglas McKay Dam and Reservoir.
S.J. Res. 115	....do.....	Pan American Health Organization headquarters site.

There follows herewith a digest of the important legislation of national interest and effect handled by the committee:

DIGEST OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1959 (PUBLIC LAW 86-342)

Title I of the new law does the following:

(a) Amends section 108(b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956, as amended, by decreasing the authorization for fiscal year 1961 by $500 million, from $2,500 million to $2,000 million.

(b) Amends section 8 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1958, as amended, by approving the 1956 estimate of cost of completing the Interstate System as the basis for apportioning funds to the States for the fiscal year 1962. This estimate had previously been approved for the 1960 and 1961 fiscal years.

(c) Authorizes an additional $2 million to be appropriated for parkways for the 1960 fiscal year.

(d) Directs the Secretary of Commerce to make a study of the need for extension of the Interstate System in Alaska and Hawaii, and report to the Congress by January 14, 1960, with recommendations as to the approximate routes and mileage thereof.

(e) Amends the Federal standards for State regulation of billboards along the Interstate System to exempt from the standards "those segments of the Interstate System which traverse commercial or industrial zones within the presently existing boundaries of incorporated municipalities wherein the use of real property adjacent to the Interstate System is subject to municipal regulation or control, or which traverse other areas where the land use, as of the date of approval of this act, is clearly established by State law as industrial or commercial."

(f) Provides for the use of emergency relief funds for the repair or reconstruction of forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads whether or not such highways, roads, or trails are on any Federal-aid highway system, with the Federal share of 100 percent payable on account of such work performed with emergency funds on such roads on the public domain.

(g) Increases the authorization for bridges over Federal dams from $10 to $13 million.

Title II provides additional financing for the highway trust fund for the period from October 1, 1959, to July 1, 1964. The Federal tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels is increased by 1 cent a gallon. The increase is effective for 21 months, from October 1, 1959, to July 1, 1961. Five percent of the 10 percent excise tax on automobiles and 5 percent of the 8 percent tax on automotive parts and accessories are earmarked to be allocated to the highway trust fund from July 1, 1961, to July 1, 1964. Several other miscellaneous provisions are included in this title which was handled by the Committee on Ways and Means in the House and the Committee on Finance in the Senate.

The bill became a law with the signature of the President on September 21, 1959.

DIGEST OF TVA SELF-FINANCING (PUBLIC LAW 86-137)

For several years the Tennessee Valley Authority warned that it faced a power shortage. The TVA not only provides power to a burgeoning economy in formerly depressed areas in seven States, but its operations contribute greatly to public health and provide recreation on more than 10,000 miles of manmade lakes behind its dams.

To meet power demands, this legislation was enacted granting the TVA authority to sell up to $750 million worth of revenue bonds to finance expansion of its facilities. Passage of the bill and Presidential approval on August 6, 1959, removes the threat of a power shortage in the important TVA region and will permit these areas to continue sound economic growth.

DIGEST OF THE PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT OF 1959 (PUBLIC LAW 86-249)

This law provides the basic statute which vests in the Administrator of General Services authority and responsibility for acquiring, constructing, altering, repairing, remodeling, improving or extending public buildings and acquiring the necessary sites or additions to sites in connection therewith.

It authorizes a program of public building construction by direct appropriation, which, in the estimation of the committee, will facilitate the construction, at the least possible cost, of public buildings in communities throughout the Nation where an urgent need has been apparent for some years.

Projects initiated under this program must be submitted to the Committees on Public Works of the Senate and House, respectively, for approval, except in the case of alterations costing less than $200,000 and new construction costing less than $100,000.

The bill won bipartisan support, passed House and Senate without controversy, and received presidential approval on September 9, 1959.

DIGEST OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AMENDMENT (H.R. 3610)

The purpose of this bill is to further stimulate construction of needed mu-

nicipal waste-treatment facilities to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into the waters of the Nation.

The bill amends section 6 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 466e) dealing with grants for treatment-plant construction by authorizing—

(a) Grants for projects in the amount of 30 percent of the estimated reasonable cost thereof or $500,000, whichever is the smaller, with the provision that no grant of more than $250,000 shall be approved for a project in any State until all previously filed applications from that State and political subdivisions thereof for grants not exceeding $250,000 have first been approved.

(b) Municipalities to join together to build joint treatment facilities with the amount of grant allocable to each community as if it were a separate project.

(c) Reallocation of grant funds from States not using funds because of lack of projects to States having projects approved for which grants have not been made because of lack of funds.

(d) One hundred million dollars to be appropriated for purposes of construction grants for any fiscal year.

(e) An aggregate of $1 billion to be appropriated for such purposes.

The Senate amended the bill in several respects. One major amendment would reduce the amount authorized to be appropriated for construction grants to $80 million in any fiscal year and to $800 million for the 10-year period which the bill would cover.

The bill is awaiting conference action to reconcile differences between the House and Senate versions.

DIGEST OF RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL OMNIBUS BILL (H. R. 7634)

This is an authorization bill containing a number of navigation, beach erosion, and flood control projects. Title I would authorize 36 navigation projects and 2 beach erosion projects (shore protection). Title I would authorize 10 flood control projects and increase the monetary authorization for six river basins.

No legislation enacted by the Congress is subjected to more study, evaluation, and closer scrutiny than measures authorizing civil works improvements. This bill is no exception. All of the projects in it have been certified as economically sound, promising a greater ratio of benefit than cost.

Included in the bill are a number of authorizations for surveys of similar problems in other localities to be carried out by the Corps of Engineers.

Improvement of waterways has been an important factor in the development and economic growth of the Nation. Piers, wharves, elevators, warehouses, and trackage, developed by local interests as a result of these improvements, help to add to this growth. Civic and local interests must often contribute to the cost of flood control remedial work and harbor and channel improvements with cash, rights-of-way and spoil areas for dredged material.

The bill was approved in the House on July 16, 1959, and is pending in the Senate.

A Modified Statute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, during the session I had the privilege, along with several other Senators, of cosponsoring a bill introduced by our colleague, Senator KEATING, to abolish mandatory capital punishment in the District of Columbia. Under the provisions of the bill it would be discretionary with a jury in murder cases to recommend either the death penalty or life imprisonment. Under the present District of Columbia law, death is the automatic penalty in all first-degree murder cases without regard to the facts and circumstances in a particular case. Such rigid justice is self-defeating, and I am hopeful that in the next session of Congress we will enact this much needed improvement in the present law.

Favorable editorial comments have appeared with regard to this bill in the Jacksonville Journal and the WTOP television and radio editorial. I believe these comments will be of interest to many Members interested in this problem, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jacksonville Journal, June 12, 1959]

A MODIFIED STATUTE

Arguments as to the value and justification of capital punishment still go on. There are few remaining champions of mandatory capital punishment, however.

Most reasonable men of good will have concluded that the automatic death penalty for certain crimes, with neither judge nor jury permitted any discretion in the matter, cannot be justified.

Outward evidence of this feeling lies in the fact that mandatory capital punishment has been abolished in every State. This makes all the more disturbing the fact that such a law is still on the books in the District of Columbia. Anyone who is convicted of first degree murder in the Nation's Capital automatically faces the death penalty.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, has introduced a measure to correct this deplorable situation. In introducing it, he declared that "it is high time that the District of Columbia code was attuned to the practice in the rest of the country."

He is quite right. There seems little valid reason for delay in passage of this legislation modifying a barbaric statute.

[Editorial Broadcast on July 7, 1959, Over WTOP Television and WTOP Radio]

This is the WTOP editorial for tonight.

One of the measures that shouldn't be lost in the legislative shuffle during the closing weeks of Congress is Senator KEATING's bill to abolish mandatory executions for first-degree murder in the District of Columbia.

The present law—passed in 1901—requires that all persons convicted of first-degree murder shall automatically be put to death. The practical effect of this statute is to hinder rather than help process of justice, because juries frequently refuse to return a first-degree conviction, knowing that execution is mandatory, or because the appellate court finds some way to reduce the sentence.

U.S. Attorney Oliver Gasch recently reported to the District judicial conference that since 1953 only 1 of the 104 persons indicted for first-degree murder in the District has been executed. The conference itself voted by an overwhelming majority that mandatory executions should be done away with.

WTOP not only supports the Keating bill but suggests that the whole question of capital punishment should be reviewed. There is a very serious doubt indeed that capital punishment is a deterrent to crime. If it is not, then it is difficult to find moral justification for executions, unless it is the philosophy of an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. It may well be significant that nine States, including Alaska and Hawaii, have abolished executions.

Perhaps the District should adopt a moratorium on capital punishment, maybe for 5 years, to see what would happen to the murder rate. But at the very minimum, the Keating bill should be passed.

That's tonight's WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of America's Farm Workers Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt a letter asking that I join her, Dr. Frank P. Graham, and Mr. A. Philip Randolph in sponsoring the 25th anniversary celebration of one of America's most historic movements for social justice.

I immediately accepted Mrs. Roosevelt's invitation, as for many years I have been very close to this outstanding labor organization which is known as the National Agricultural Workers Union AFL–CIO.

I have since learned that a number of my colleagues in the House are also among the 100 or more equally well known Americans who are also serving on a committee of sponsors for this affair. There are several distinguished Members of the other House and many of the top officials of the larger unions who are also listed, along with religious leaders and other citizens' groups which are interested in the welfare of that segment of our affluent society which has almost been forgotten. They are the men, women, and children who follow the crops with the sun, helping produce the food and clothing we all use.

I have also learned that the quarter of a century struggle by this group of Americans in the lowest economic bracket is to be celebrated on October 17 and 18, in the city of Memphis, Tenn.

This movement had its origin in Arkansas. In the summer of 1934, 18 sharecroppers—11 white and 7 Negro—met in an abandoned schoolhouse on a cotton plantation to form what was first known as the Southern Tenant Farmers Union. Like most organizations of American workers, this movement grew out of the needs of the people it represents. For a quarter of a century it has kept before the public the plight of those who work on the land.

If it had not been for this organization of American farmworkers, few of us would have known about the problems of this depressed element in our country. We are indebted to its inspired leadership and its devoted members for much of our knowledge of what is wrong down on the farm.

I personally participated in one of this organization's major struggles. One of these was an effort to organize and secure recognition on one of the largest corporation farms in California back in 1947. I saw that effort to organize the 12,000-acre Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. ranch defeated by a combination of gunfire, injunctions, and strikebreakers. A strike meeting was fired upon by unknown assassins, and the leader of the strike, Jim Price, was injured for life. An injunction under the newly enacted Taft-Hartley Act prohibited other unions from cooperating, and finally the employer succeeded in breaking the strike by bringing in illegal aliens from Mexico to work his huge holdings. I saw the union make a comeback 2 years later and secure recognition when it led a spontaneous movement of farmworkers resisting a wage cut in the cottonfields of California's rich San Joaquin Valley. Later I saw the union swamped by illegal aliens, or wetbacks from Mexico, in the Imperial Valley down on the border. When I came to Congress I was among those who fought to enact a measure to penalize employers of wetback labor. Although we lost that battle here in Congress, the administration was forced to begin enforcing our immigration laws and the influx of illegal aliens from Mexico, which amounted to over 1 million men in 1953, was brought to an end. Now, nearly half a million legally contracted workers from Mexico are entering the United States each year to work on our larger farms. California imports 100,000 Mexican nationals each year, over one-fifth of the total. For the past 7 years the union has persisted in my native State, as well as elsewhere. Its members were often blacklisted and could not get a job. Its officers and organizers went without a salary, and seldom had the money to buy gasoline to travel in a jalopy along with their members in search of work.

Only this year the executive council of the AFL–CIO approved a broad program to seek to improve the wages, working and living conditions of the Nation's farmworkers. An assessment was levied on the 13½ million members making up the AFL–CIO, and a part of this money has been allocated to build the National Agricultural Workers Union. President George Meany selected the director for the first major effort ever made by organized labor as a whole to unionize workers on the larger farms. An AFL–CIO Agricultural Workers Organizing Committee has been formed and central headquarters opened in Stockton, Calif. A staff of organizers, mostly farmworkers, are now employed by AFL–CIO in the field. While little or no attention has been paid to this development outside California, our local newspapers have carried many feature articles and stories about the AFL–CIO reaching down to help that last man without a strong and effective union.

Ever alert to the major developments likely to affect the big business interests of this country, the Wall Street Journal on August 21 carried a front-page story which I include at this point:

BIG CALIFORNIA FARMS GET UNWELCOME CROP: AFL–CIO ORGANIZERS—MEMBERSHIP GOAL IS 150,000; BIG RANCHERS CONCERNED, STUDY COUNTERMEASURES

(By Jonathan Spivak)

MODESTO, CALIF.—"They should take those guys and run them out of town," growls an angry peach rancher, referring to two union organizers who talk earnestly with harvest hands in front of a State employment agency here.

"Since the AFL–CIO came in here we have hopes and we've got financial aid," declares 54-year-old Charles Walker, an organizer who was recruited by the union right out of the fields.

These opposing viewpoints reflect the battlelines that are forming in California's lush Central Valley around organized labor's newest and most ambitious attempt to unionize agricultural workers.

"They've got a lot of money behind this effort, and if the farmers don't get together to stop them they will succeed," comments Harley Steward, a local rancher.

EARLIER EFFORTS HAVE FAILED

Attempts to organize farm workers are not new, of course. Their traditionally low pay has made them the repeated targets of organizing drives by various unions, including the Teamsters and the United Packinghouse Workers of America. Little has come of these efforts, largely because of the migratory habits of many farmworkers, observers believe.

However, the AFL–CIO, with an eye on the highly mechanized farms in California, recently formed an Agricultural Workers' Organizing Committee with the goal of enrolling 150,000 of the State's farmworkers. Operating out of an abandoned labor hall in Stockton, the AWOC has a full-time paid staff of a dozen, including nine organizers. It has opened branch offices in two other California cities.

Although the number of AWOC organizers is small, it contrasts sharply with previous AFL–CIO policy, which generally was to ignore the task of organizing farm labor. This effort "is for real," a union spokesman declares. And farmers in this area, while stubbornly maintaining that labor organizing will get nowhere if they present a united front, concede they are concerned.

FARMERS ARE OPPOSED

"Our farmers have fully made up their minds they do not want to have to deal with industrial-type unions. I think many of them would let their crops rot on the ground rather than be pressured into recognizing such a union," says John Zuckerman, a director of the San Joaquin Production Association, which has 2,200 farmer members.

The statewide California Farm Bureau Federation, based in Berkeley, is asking its local units to form special committees to keep a close watch on the labor situations in their areas.

"We are encouraging our county leaders to do all they can to remedy a deficiency in farm-labor housing or wages, if any exists," says Louis Rozzoni, president of the federation. Such efforts, of course, would be aimed at lessening any desire of farmworkers to join a union.

The AWOC's activities in California are being financed by part of the proceeds from a cent-a-month levy imposed by the AFL–CIO on all its members for a 6-month period to support organizing drives. A former organizer in the auto industry, Norman Smith, is director of the AWOC.

CONFIDENT OF SUCCESS

Mr. Smith is confident of success, despite past failures. "There are 2 million to 2.5 million farmworkers in the country," he notes. "This could be the largest union in organized labor."

For the last month, the AWOC has been soliciting members for an existing but nearly dormant AFL–CIO union known as the National Agricultural Workers Union. Prior to the current organizing drive, this union was totally inactive in California, according to Mr. Smith. In July, he estimates that 500 workers were enrolled—and he predicts another 1,500 will be signed up this month.

A basic dispute between the union and the ranch owners concerns the adequacy of the wages farmers pay. In the current harvest of California's $22 million peach crop, farmers are offering 15 cents for picking a 40-pound box. They contend an average worker can fill 100 boxes in 7 or 8 hours and earn at least $15 a day. The AWOC counters that at best a fast picker can handle 80 boxes in 10 hours and earn only $12 a day.

Mr. Speaker, it is within the context of these developments that the 25th anniversary celebration of the founding of the National Agricultural Workers Union is being held.

Much of the new activity will no doubt be in my State for some time. However, eventually the organized labor movement of this country will extend its organizing program among farmworkers in the East, the North, and to the South.

One of the slogans of this union is "To the Disinherited Belongs the Future." We who have joined in sponsoring the 25th anniversary of the struggles of this union are hopeful that at last the Nation's farmworker is about to come into his own.

Open House at Prison Chapel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP A. HART

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following story about the new All Faiths Chapel at the State Prison of Southern Michigan. This chapel is located with-

in the confines of the largest walled-prison in the world, located on the fringe of Jackson, Mich., 60 miles east of Detroit. As one privileged to participate in the dedication of this chapel I can testify to its beauty and great value.

The story of this new chapel has attracted great interest among correction officials, as well as the general public, and I feel it merits widespread attention.

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPEN HOUSE AT PRISON CHAPEL

The public had an opportunity to view the State Prison of Southern Michigan's new All Faiths Chapel at an open house Tuesday, June 30, 1959. The prison is located just north of Jackson near Highway 12.

The new $150,000 chapel is modern in design and contains three distinct chapels for the three major religious groups. It was designed by the J. & G. Daverman Co., a Grand Rapids architectural and engineering firm, and it was dedicated in a special Christmas ceremony last December.

The State Prison of Southern Michigan is the largest walled prison in the world and was in 1952 the scene of one of the most violent riots in penal history. Many of the inmates volunteered their services in the construction of the new building which has been constructed in the center of the 54-acre walled yard.

According to Gus Harrison, State corrections director, "more than $11,500 was received in donations toward furnishing the chapel. The inmates themselves contributed nearly $2,000 in a cell-by-cell fund raising campaign."

"This is the first chapel building to be constructed at any of the State's penal institutions and is an integral part of the ambitious and constructive rehabilitation program being cultivated by the Michigan Department of Corrections," Harrison said.

Requests for a chapel facility that would lend itself to an atmosphere of worship and meditation have been of long standing. Several years ago inmates requested permission to erect their own chapel with the stone salvaged from a torn down wall.

The Record on Housing and Urban Renewal—Some Progress in the First Session, More Must Come

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, despite the opposition of the administration, the first session of the 86th Congress did make some progress in the important field of housing and urban renewal. Much more, however, remains to be done in the next session.

Despite two vetoes, a housing bill providing for continuation of minimum programs in urban renewal and housing was enacted.

The bill, as finally passed, will provide funds to keep present housing programs going, at least until next year. The FHA program, so necessary to the private home-building industry, was continued, and 37,000 additional units of public housing were authorized.

The successful voluntary home mortgage credit program was extended to help provide FHA and GI financing in rural communities. Home improvement loans under FHA to enable home owners to continue improving properties were extended. Amendments were added to older laws which should stimulate farm housing research and production of more rental and cooperative housing.

In one most encouraging forward-looking step the bill recognized the particularly pressing housing needs of elderly citizens by authorizing $50 million to be used as loans on liberal terms to private nonprofit groups, such as labor unions and charities, to build housing for the elderly.

The bill encourages FHA loans for the construction of nursing homes, which are desperately needed.

In another advance, the bill recognizes social and economic patterns of our times by an avoidance-of-foreclosure provision designed to prevent citizens from losing their homes because of sudden, communitywide unemployment or other economic factors over which the homeowner has no control.

Much more, however, remains to be done.

The $350 million in slum clearance grants which the bill makes available immediately, and the $300 million to be made available next year, will hardly be enough to cover the projects already approved and others for which applications are pending, let alone the many new urban renewal plans which realistic leaders in cities throughout the country are now drawing up in the interest of continued orderly growth. More public housing will be needed, if only to provide for persons displaced by urban renewal, highway, and other programs.

Long-term, low-interest Government loans to help our colleges expand facilities were deleted from this year's bill because of the President's vetoes. Such loans should be provided next year, either in the new housing bill or in other legislation.

Beyond this, we must face the stark fact that, by 1975, we will have to draw upon our combined private and public resources to build better housing for 22½ million families occupying substandard dwellings.

Fortunately, there is every likelihood of a new housing bill at the next session.

The additional $8 billion overall new authority granted by the present bill to the FHA to enable it to continue insuring loans under its various programs will be used up some time in 1960.

The vexing problem of how to assure an adequate supply of mortgage credit to the homebuilding industry remains unsolved. In periods such as the present when the administration is applying a tight money noose to our economy, the housing industry inevitably becomes the No. 1 victim.

We must somehow find an answer to this "feast or famine" problem if we are to sustain a productive and ever-expanding homebuilding industry. This industry is absolutely vital, not only in meeting the growing needs of our people, but also in maintaining the basic health of our overall economy.

A partial answer may lie in the encouragement of the central mortgage bank type of facility which was proposed by the homebuilders.

The use of mortgage pools managed by commercial banks and sold to pension funds and similar organizations may be the means of tapping the potential reservoir of mortgage credit. Partly because of administration problems, these funds have shied away from mortgage investments, but mortgage pools, administered by commercial banks, and possibly with a Government guarantee, might be attractive investments for these funds into which vast amounts of capital are now flowing.

Lack of basic research has created a problem which has defied housing experts for decades. That is the question of how to produce housing at lower costs so that prices of new housing can be brought more into line with the income of the average American family.

Homebuilding corporations are too small to carry on their own research programs. It seems to me that the solution to this basic problem is an expanded program of housing research. Yet, sadly, Government-aided housing programs do not include a research program. Despite the vast stake which all of us have in meeting this great challenge in the housing field, we are presently failing to provide the research tools which will help to find the answers. By a broad and effective Government-assisted research program we may be able to find ways of making housing production more efficient and lowering the costs of home construction and home ownership.

Against heavy opposition, Congress has maintained housing programs for at least another year. For this the Nation can be thankful, but more, much more, remains to be done.

Primitive Area in South End of Wallowa County, Oreg.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received a communication from the Wallowa County Pomona Grange, No. 22, of Joseph, Oreg., advising me that it adopted a resolution opposing any building of roads or facilities within the primitive area in the south portion of Wallowa County.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this resolution be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY WALLOWA COUNTY POMONA GRANGE, No. 22, AUGUST 1959

Whereas the primitive area in the south end of Wallowa County is one of the few such areas remaining in the Western States; and

Whereas the Forest Service is now surveying and contemplates further surveying and location of roads into this primitive area, which if carried out and used by the public will destroy this area as a resource: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Pomona Grange go on record as opposed to any building of roads or other facilities within this primitive area.

The Need for Closer Relations Between Korea and Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of a free and independent Korea has long enjoyed the sympathy and support of the American people. Our sympathy and support for this cause is anchored in our historic belief that all nations and people are, by right, entitled to the blessings of self-government.

We attested to our belief following World War II when we supported the demands of the Korean people for national self-determination. Dr. Syngman Rhee, the leader of this cause, had spent many years in the United States before World War II, where he espoused the aspirations of his people for national independence. It was only natural that he should return to his native land following the war and there to lead the way in the rebirth of his nation. Dr. Rhee was elected as the first President of the Republic of Korea, in free and unfettered elections, a fitting reward for his life time of service and sacrifice for the cause of Korean liberty and independence. One of the many unfortunate consequences of allowing the Russian Communists to assume the false character of allies of the free world alliance, was the division of Korea into two zones of military occupation. The so-called 38° parallel line was agreed to at Yalta, during the time of this strange alliance with the Russian Communists. Thus, today, we find a divided Korea. One-half is free and self-governing. The other half is under the ruthless, inhuman tyranny of Russian proconsuls whose only loyalty is to Moscow and its goal of world conquest.

Our support for the cause of Korean freedom and independence was again demonstrated in 1950. Then the Russians provoked a war of aggression in Korea, supported by the Red Chinese army. An effort was made to drive the United States out of Asia and to put all of Korea under the inhuman control of Moscow. President Harry S. Truman met this wave of tyranny with swift and direct action. The United Nations, as a consequence, organized its first joint command in support of freedom and against an unprovoked war of Communist aggression.

We Americans will never forget the sacrifices our young men and women made on the battlefields of Korea. Nor will we forget the valor of the Koreans as they fought for the survival of freedom's cause in northeast Asia. Our memory is fresh to the valor and sacrifice of those who came from many countries of the free world to defend freedom's cause.

Had Korea fallen, Japan, the next country on the list of the Communist aggressors, would have been subjected to the tyrant's whip. In this respect the people of Japan owe a just debt of gratitude to the people of Korea and to all the countries who stood with the Koreans in their fight against Communist aggression.

The United Nations properly branded the North Korean puppets and the Red Chinese as criminal aggressors for starting the war in Korea. The resolution of the U.N. still stands on the books. So long as it does, no civilized nation will have any relation with the illegal Russian-puppet regime in North Korea. Nor will Red China be admitted to the United Nations. Any dealings with the puppet regime in North Korea discredits the U.N. and will, if persisted in, eventually destroy the U.N. by discrediting it as an organ working toward peace and justice in the world. The same goes for the case of Red China.

A growing number of Americans are showing concern over the worsening of relations between the Republic of Korea and Japan. This concern results from the realization that misunderstandings between Korea and Japan weaken the fabric of the free-world community. In particular, it weakens the position of freedom's cause in northeast Asia. That is why I have concerned myself with the question of Korean nationals now living in Japan and the problems this has created for both Korea and Japan in the postwar era.

At present there are some 600,000 Koreans living in Japan. These unfortunate people want nothing more than the opportunity to live in peace, in a climate where they are accepted and where they can work out their destiny as free men. At present they are destitute. Lacking acceptance, and uncertain of what the future holds, they are desperate. This situation cries out for remedy, for a solution based upon human justice.

The Governments of Korea and Japan have not been able to reach a settlement of this problem. While these two free Governments remain in disagreement as to a solution of the problem, the Communists are busy exploiting the disagreement to their own advantage.

On the one hand the Government of Korea charges Japan of secret dealings with the puppet regime of Communist occupied North Korea and efforts at the forced deportation of these 600,000 Koreans into the hands of the Communist regime in North Korea.

On the other hand Japan is rightfully concerned with the Communist penetration of the Korean community living in Japan and, in particular, with the threat this poses to their internal security.

Several years ago, during a visit to Japan to study the administration of the Refugee Relief Act, I became acquainted first hand with this problem. I was convinced that Communist agents were making a concerted drive to manipulate this problem as a wedge between the Koreans and the Japanese. As usual, the Communists were trying to win the allegiance of people by playing upon their miserable plight and lack of hope for the future. It was clear to me then that the Communists were playing a game calculated to make both Japan and Korea the losers.

Now the outlines of the Communist plan are out in the open.

They relish seeing the Japanese accused of engaging in acts of forced deportations because they know this will alienate the many friends Japan has won in the postwar era. They enjoy anything which casts the Japanese nation in the role of oppressor, as cold to human values and human rights.

The Communists enjoy equally anything which will keep open the wounds Korea feels from that era of the past which Japan has denounced. Moreover, the Communists seek to pour salt into these reopened wounds so as to distract the Korean nation from its role as defender of a critical flank of the free world.

Thus the Communists are using the sad plight of some 600,000 Koreans to accomplish these two objectives.

It is not my purpose to pass judgment upon the merits or demerits of the case as seen by Japan or Korea. My singular purpose is to warn of the dangers involved in allowing this problem to worsen and reach a climax out of which no one but the common enemy—the Communists—can benefit. Normally, this is a problem which should be resolved through negotiations between the Governments of Korea and Japan. Such efforts made to date have failed to produce a remedy. The matter is now being handled on what might appear to be a nongovernmental basis, that is, between the Red Cross Society of Japan and the so-called Red Cross Society of Communist-occupied North Korea. The legitimate government of the Republic of Korea is being ignored.

The Japanese Government cannot expect the American people to close their eyes to the obvious. It is clear that the Japanese Red Cross can not act in this case without the approval and assistance of the Japanese Government. This is a reality of life and we Americans are realists. We are also aware that any so-called Red Cross Society in North Korea is nothing but a facade—a cheap and shoddy cover for the puppet regime installed there by the Russian Communists. The ling of negotiation between the Government of Japan and the illegal regime in North Korea is painfully obvious.

I point up these facts not to be critical in a negative sense, but to emphasize the need for a remedy to this problem, based upon direct negotiations on a

governmental level, in a spirit of justice and amity. It appears further efforts at bilateral settlement between Japan and Korea will not produce the desired results.

The Republic of Korea is anxious to have these Korean nationals repatriated to free Korea. The people concerned, that is, the overwhelming majority, want to return to free Korea. However, there remains open the question of maintaining the personal and property rights of these people during the repatriation. There is also involved the question of a free choice, that is, the voluntary movement of these people as against measures of duress.

Accordingly, I propose that the good offices of a third nation, a free nation, be accepted by the Governments of Korea and Japan. This is clearly a problem of free Asia and should, therefore, be settled by free Asians. The people of free Asia have come a very long way along the road to democratic self-government during the past decade. We Americans rejoice in this accomplishment and look forward to an unprecedented era of prosperity and progress for the people of free Asia. We believe free Asia has the leadership to resolve problems which may arise between the nations of that vast area.

Specifically, I propose that the Governments of Korea and Japan invite the Government of the Philippines to exercise its good offices in finding a remedy for the 600,000 Koreans now in Japan.

I am confident the Government of the Philippines would act in the name of all humanity and would find a solution which would bring justice to the 600,000 people directly concerned and at the same time heal the old wounds which the meddling Communists have opened on the body politic of both Japan and Korea.

Here, I believe, is an opportunity for both Japan and Korea to remove any doubts which may exist as to their good faith in resolving a problem which has earned both the interest and concern of large numbers of people throughout the world. Here, too, is an opportunity for Japan and Korea to strengthen the cause of human freedom by starting down the road together toward a long era of friendly relations and mutual assistance.

More Civil Defense Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, may I have unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and very shocking news item published in the Cleveland Press.

Civil defense, as presently operated, has caused a waste of nearly $1 billion of taxpayers' money. Here is another example of $195,000 which may be added to the huge waste of this boondoggling, outmoded, futile agency. Defense of our citizens is a part of the defense of the United States against enemy attack, and, of course, the Armed Forces of this Nation should be placed in charge as they would be immediately when a state of emergency exists. Let us not wait until the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces should be compelled to proclaim martial law. We should refuse to make further appropriations for civil defense. We should follow the example of the Commonwealth of Canada and of other allies where the Army or Home Guard is conducting civil defense.

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATE-BUILT AIRSTRIP LACKS ONLY PLANES
(By Robert Burdock)

ATHENS, OHIO.—Ohio University has a new, gleaming, 3,200-foot concrete airstrip built with State money.

But the university doesn't own any airplanes.

The $195,000 airstrip was supposed to handle civil defense air traffic when the university was named last year as the emergency seat of Ohio State government.

But Athens is no longer the official emergency civil defense capital. There now is no specific site.

What's more, until a reporter told him, Thane M. Durey, deputy director of Ohio civil defense, submitted he didn't even know about the new emergency field.

Originally it had been proposed to build the concrete runway with civil defense and other Federal funds. But the State stepped in when these plans fell through.

"It was a special grant by then Gov. C. William O'Neill and the State board of control," said Ohio University Business Manager L. P. Lausche (no relation to the Senator). The grant came during the closing days of the O'Neill administration.

Tribute to Hon. Isidore Dollinger

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BUCKLEY. Mr. Speaker, ISIDORE DOLLINGER is the regular democratic candidate for the office of district attorney of Bronx County and I am certain that he will be elected to that high office this November. This means that he will be leaving Congress and will not be with us in January.

I know that he will be greatly missed in Washington. He is highly spoken of by all who know him; he has made many friends here during the 11 years he has served in the Congress. He is an able legislator, a person of great integrity, a fine gentleman in the truest sense of the word. I know that he will be an outstanding district attorney because of his experience in the law, his capabilities, his conscientious adherence to duty. I knew ISIDORE long before he came to Congress and have found him to be a loyal and true friend; I value our association.

The Bronx will always owe Mr. DOLLINGER a debt of gratitude for the fine work he did in Congress. He has now been drafted for another position of great responsibilities and service to the people. This reflects the confidence we place in him, as well as our faith in his ability. ISIDORE DOLLINGER leaves Congress with our best wishes for his continued success and our kindest regards.

Progress in Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include a letter to the editor by Gen. Hugh B. Hester—retired—that appeared in the June 10, 1959, edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal. I believe that it will be of interest to the Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROGRESS IN DIPLOMACY

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON's speech before the Academy of Political Science, April 13, marks the first time in more than 10 years that a top official of this Government has dared suggest that the Soviet Union might conceivably be quite honest in placing a different interpretation upon an agreement from that of ours. This represents real progress. Instead of accusing the Soviet leaders of willfully violating their alleged agreement for the unification of Germany through free elections (an allegation repeatedly denied by Soviet officials and questioned by many of our ablest students of international relations), the Vice President stated: "But while the agreement seemed clear, as events subsequently developed, Mr. Khrushchev's understanding of its meaning was ostensibly different from ours." And he went on to state "the crucial question remained, How was the agreement to be effective when the parties disagreed as to what it meant? This is typical of a problem that can arise whenever any agreement is entered into between nations."

More than 2 years of experience in negotiating with representatives of the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France in Berlin, Germany, 1945–47, convinces this writer that two essential ingredients at least must always be present in any successful negotiation among great powers, mutually of benefits, and a meeting of minds in a common understanding of the terms of agreement.

The adoption of the Vice President's proposal that a clause in all international agreements permits recourse to a world court or tribunal in cases of different interpretations, would greatly reduce disagreements and tensions later. A further provision for any party, suffering substantial disadvantage or loss of mutuality of benefits through a change in circumstances over which it had no control, to appeal to an international court of equity for redress would further reduce tensions by providing for peaceful settlement of disputes. John Foster Dulles made such a proposal in his book "Peace and War," prior to World War II.

Gen. HUGH B. HESTER (retired).

PHILADELPHIA, *June 10, 1959.*

Report on the Progress of the 86th Congress, 1st Session, to the People of the 32d Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of this 86th Congress, of which I have had the honor and privilege to be a Member from the great 32d District of New York State, draws to a close, I would like to review briefly for the people of my district some of the highlights of these exciting 8½ months—what we have accomplished as well as what remains to be done, for the Nation as well as for our own district.

REPRESENTING MY DISTRICT

May I say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that when I campaigned for Congress last fall I promised the people of my district that if they sent me to Washington I would be sure to speak up loudly and strongly for the interests of our district, and I would work and fight as hard as I knew how to meet the special needs of our area. I assured the people that the Members of Congress would certainly come to know of our district, and would be made well aware of the kind of legislation required to meet our problems.

This, Mr. Speaker, as you know, I have sincerely tried to do, and I hope I may have succeeded in some measure in carrying out these objectives.

REPORTS TO THE PEOPLE

I also promised to keep my people posted on what was going on here in Washington, what I was trying to do as their Congressman, what were the big issues pending before us, how I had voted on these issues, and the reasons why. This, too, Mr. Speaker, I have sincerely tried to do—with weekly newsletters to my constituents, monthly television reports, and periodic press and radio releases. My people may not all approve 100 percent of every vote I have cast, but at least they know how I voted and they knows the reasons why.

This final report to them is being made in this same spirit, as an accounting to which they are rightfully entitled of the stewardship I have tried to render for them as their personal representative in the seat of our National Government in Washington.

THE SESSION IN BRIEF

This has been a long session of Congress, one of the longest in recent history, and in many respects it has been a difficult session, too. And yet I believe that nearly all of us will agree it has also been a worthwhile and productive session. Together we have hammered out a sizable program of constructive, responsible, and effective legislation of which the people of the country and our individual districts can well be proud. We have not, of course, done all of the things that some of us would have liked to see done. But the record we have made has been, in my judgment, Mr. Speaker, a sound, middle-of-the-road record on which we may confidently expect that the 2d session of the 86th Congress will continue to build when it convenes next January. In spite of party differences, the Members of this Congress have worked to achieve a harmony of view with the President of the United States so that together we could write the best legislation possible. Very wisely, in my judgment, we have avoided the strong temptation to play politics, and merely draw the lines of political difference more sharply in preparation for coming campaigns instead of actually passing laws for the benefit of our people.

As a freshman Member of this body I am also proud that the RECORD will show that on the issues presented to us here I have consistently refused to vote on any purely partisan basis, but have tried to cast my vote in the interests of all of the people of my district as their representative, irrespective of party affiliation.

JOBS AND UNEMPLOYMENT

During the months that this first session has been in progress there has been one overriding and essential issue in the minds of all of the people in our district and that has been the issue of jobs and unemployment. Members will recall that I have repeatedly taken the floor of this House to point out the serious economic conditions confronting upstate New York, and to impress upon them the need for appropriate legislative action to meet the steady loss of jobs from certain areas of our country at the very same time that other areas have been reporting unprecedented prosperity.

To my deep regret we did not succeed, in spite of all of the efforts of our bipartisan steering group, in passing through this House the so-called distressed areas bill, adopted earlier by the Senate. This bill would have made funds available immediately to help communities help themselves attract new industries to take up the slack of unemployment and vanished jobs. I confidently expect, however, that this legislation will stand high on the agenda of priority items when the second session convenes in January, and I for one intend to devote my full efforts toward seeing some such legislation enacted into law. Eliminating needless pockets of chronic unemployment such as exist today in Amsterdam, Gloversville, Johnstown, and Schenectady—and to some extent also in Oneonta—is certainly the most pressing single piece of unfinished business before the 86th Congress.

In fact when we convene again I hope we will pass not only the distressed areas bill, of which I am a cosponsor, but also legislation similar to a bill which I have introduced to provide tax relief—through faster tax writeoffs—for industries which will locate or expand their facilities in areas already suffering from unemployment. Legislation of this type is needed to halt the movement of industry away from established industrial States like New York, and will also, I believe, go far toward preventing the growing concentration of defense production in the far western section of our country while New York State, which still pays 20 percent of all Federal taxes, is receiving less than half the amount of defense contracts going to a State like California.

SCOTIA NAVY DEPOT

Even though we need to meet this problem of unemployment on a broad national basis, I am happy to be able to report that we have made some small progress in arresting the decline in jobs in our district and in turning the employment curve back up again. Last fall, before I took office, the Navy announced the closing of the supply depot at Scotia, with an attendant loss of 675 jobs in our area, plus the countless skills and productive know-how built up by these loyal employees over many years. Although the Navy indicated that some of its activities would still be carried on at Scotia after December 31 by the General Services Administration, this was still a heavy blow to our hard-hit area. I have appealed repeatedly to the Navy during the last year, and I have enlisted the full support of our two U.S. Senators in these efforts. But the Navy has refused to alter its plans in any way and, until recently, had been most vague about employment details after January 1, 1960. In the meantime loyal workers were being gradually thrown off their jobs.

I am happy to report, however, that within the past few days Navy Secretary Franke has given me the first official assurance that at least 90 persons presently employed at Scotia will be retained after December 31 to work with GSA. He has also agreed to my request that these persons be selected in advance by the Navy rather than being discharged now and then rehired later on. I hesitate, of course, to hope too much for the future, but I do believe that experience will prove that the proper and most effective conduct of our defense program requires the continued and even fuller utilization of existing facilities and skills at Scotia. In the meantime I have been assured by the Civil Service Commission that they expect to place almost every employee who is let go at Scotia in some other job, either Government or private, and I have tried to be helpful myself in making these changes possible for individual employees.

TURBINES AND TVA

One of the major factors contributing to heavy unemployment in my district has been the sharp decline in turbine manufacturing at the great General Electric works in Schenectady. Part of this decline has resulted from a sudden shift in policy on the part of some of our Government agencies, notably TVA, in favor of purchasing foreign-built turbines rather than those built in America. I have frequently taken this floor, Mr. Speaker, as Members will recall, to protest this disastrous and shortsighted policy on the part of our Government. I am proud that as a result of my efforts along these lines the RECORD shows that before the TVA self-financing bill was adopted this year the TVA Board made a definite commitment to Congress that the Buy-American Act would continue to apply to the $750 million of

additional funds being made available under the legislation. Shortly thereafter Schenectady General Electric was awarded a contract by TVA for production of the largest steam turbine ever built, a 600,000-kilowatt machine. This contract will be of great benefit to our area, though I do wish the lag in time between the contract award and the moment when men are actually put to work was not so long.

Our continued battle against foreign turbine purchases on the part of the Government has also helped, by the way, to channel several other substantial awards to Schenectady GE, including a contract for four huge turbine-generators for the Army Engineers Barkley Dam project in Kentucky. The Army's original award to GE had been protested by one of GE's foreign competitors. But I took exception to this most unusual interruption of normal Army contract procedures, and the Comptroller General ended by authorizing the contract, plus the many jobs it will entail, to Schenectady GE as the Army had originally planned.

GLOVES, CARPETS, AND FOREIGN IMPORTS

The inroads of foreign competition into the turbine manufacturing field are compartively new. But the heavy impact of low-cost, low-wage competition is an old, old story for the glove industry in Fulton County and the carpet industry in Amsterdam. Both industries are in need of immediate relief in terms of higher tariffs or lower import quotas, and I have introduced and fought hard for legislation to help them both. Some measure of the seriousness of the problem which both industries face from foreign imports is shown by the recent announcement that the only two really "chronic" areas of unemployment in all of New York State are Amsterdam and Johnstown-Gloversville, both in my district.

Within recent weeks the leather glove industry has instituted a so-called escape clause action with the U.S. Tariff Commission in Washington. I have joined in support of this action, and expect to testify in behalf of the glove industry during the hearing. Similar action has been taken by the knit glove industry with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, designed to get relief on the basis of the importance of the glove industry to our whole defense mobilization base. After all, you cannot fight with cold hands. I am also supporting this action in the strongest possible way.

Yet more is needed than even favorable decisions in both of these cases. Under present law, for example, even a successful recommendation by the Tariff Commission in favor of the glove industry could be overruled or vetoed by the President for "international" reasons. In fact over the past few years most such recommendations to help hard-hit industries have been vetoed in this way. Decisions to protect local industry must therefore be given greater legislative weight, and I have introduced a bill to prevent any indiscriminate overriding or vetoing of such tariff relief decisions. Besides that, if we are really to be safe, a more favorable tariff on foreign gloves and a sharply reduced quota of imports must be written into the basic trade law itself. I have introduced legislation to fix this import quota at 50 percent of domestic production, which seems to me a fair and reasonable figure.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that those of us who are fighting for legislation to protect local jobs against throatcutting, unfair, low-wage competition from abroad are fighting a hard, uphill battle. But I am confident that our ranks are growing. Our bipartisan group in this House has grown considerably in size during this session, and many influential organizations, including leading national labor unions who originally were opposed to tariff restrictions, have now rallied to our side. The battle is still far from won, but I sincerely believe that our cause is prospering and that victory is in sight.

Legislation of the same kind is needed to protect our local carpet industry. In the meantime I have had occasion to speak out, as Members will recall, against some recent efforts being made to eliminate rugs and carpets from offices in the new Senate Office Building. While this exchange may have had its lighter aspects, the move to replace carpets with other types of floor covering could well jeopardize hundreds of jobs in Amsterdam and other carpet centers in America and it was therefore something that should not have gone unchallenged.

BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL COOPERATION

To me, Mr. Speaker, one of the most encouraging developments of this 1st session of the 86th Congress has been the new spirit of harmony and cooperation between all 43 members of the New York State congressional delegation, regardless of party affiliation. For the first time in many a year, so I am told, Democrats and Republicans got together and pledged our joint efforts to work for increased jobs and industry for our own State. Certainly the need to keep business in New York State and to attract new businesses is something that transcends narrow party lines. If New York suffers we all suffer together. I am glad to have had a small part in stimulating this bipartisan cooperation, and I want to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for the job which they have done in heading up our delegation's bipartisan steering committee. It is time that we in New York pulled together to see that our State gets its fair share of defense contracts, for example, and to see that the interests of an established and progressive industrial State like New York, where men and women work under advanced and civilized conditions and at fair and reasonable wages, are not impaired or jeopardized by unfair legislation or shortsighted actions my executive departments.

KEEPING AMERICA STRONG AGAINST AGGRESSION

I know the people in my district were as pleased as I was at the recognition afforded to our 32d District when I was fortunate enough, as a freshman Member of the House, to be assigned to the powerful Armed Services Committee. We in our district have a direct and personal interest in keeping America strong against any threat of Communist aggression, and in having our armed services efficiently operated and ready for any emergency.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this committee it has been a high privilege to serve under our outstanding and deeply beloved chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], one of the really great Members of this House and the one man who unquestionably knows more than any other living American about the defense of our Nation. I was honored to be selected to represent him this past year on the Board of Visitors at West Point. I was likewise honored to be among those selected by him last March to visit our furthermost outpost of freedom, West Berlin, during the Berlin crisis, so as to report to the other members of our committee as to the condition of our defenses there. And I have been happy to have been selected to serve on the special subcommittee investigating the misuse of personnel in our armed services, under the distinguished chairmanship of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], and alongside the able gentleman from Connecticut, Colonel KOWALSKI, who has waged such a relentless fight against all waste of military manpower.

I believe the record will show, Mr. Speaker, that one of the great achievements of this Congress has been what we have done in the field of national defense. We have appropriated, for example, some $400 million in additional funds to modernize our Army. We have provided funds for a new modern Navy carrier. We have continued the sound program of constructing more of those atomic submarines, pioneered by Vice Admiral Rickover, and developed with the efforts of so many of the great General Electric Co. scientists at the Knolls Atomic Power Laboratory in my own district.

Working together without any touch of narrow partisanship, members of our committee have called attention to the need to stand firmly behind the President in Berlin. As a result of the outspoken comments of some of us with regard to the recent aggression in Laos, our Government has also taken, as it must take, a firmer line there too. Surely we cannot accept at face value the protestations of Premier Khrushchev or other Communist leaders about wanting peace or disarmament while "brush fire" aggressions, nibbling at the fringes of the free world, are allowed to continue unabated in faraway places. We must not be lulled, by any exchange of visits, into letting down our guard or abandoning our defenses without first receiving some ironclad assurances of international inspection and control.

In this past session, Mr. Speaker, I have found myself branded as a warmonger by the Communist propaganda radio for voicing sentiments such as these on the floor of the the House. But I am proud of that attack and I shall of course continue to speak out without fear or hesitation in exercising my responsibility as a Member of Congress and a member of its Committee on Armed Services.

NO DEFENSE CONTRACTS FOR GE?

Knowing the defense needs of our country, Mr. Speaker, I was especially proud, as a freshman member, to have led the fight on the floor of this House some months ago against legislation which would have banned all defense contracts to any company, including the General Electric Co. and ALCO Products in my own district, which had any retired admiral or general on its payroll. Had this hastily conceived legislation actually been approved, New York and my own district would have suffered a heavy blow against our industrial production. Fortunately we defeated the amendment by a single vote, and the subsequent investigation—conducted by the Hébert investigating subcommittee—into the charges which inspired this amendment has not substantiated any of the original assertions about improper influence on the part of our retired officers.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

Let me touch briefly on some of the other highlights of this session too. We have adopted, for example, a bill to eliminate racketeering from labor-management relations. As I have already reported elsewhere in greater detail, I opposed the original Landrum-Griffin bill because I felt that in dealing with racketeering excesses it infringed unfairly and unnecessarily on the legitimate rights of decent, law-abiding unions, and might even jeopardize the industrial position of established States like New York by speeding up shifts of industry to the South. I did support the move to send this bill to conference, however, rather than pigeonholing it, because I believed that many of these bad features could be eliminated by the conference committee. That in fact is just what happened. The bill which finally emerged, and which I supported, even though it has some imperfections which ought to be corrected in the light of the bill's operating experience, is substantially the same kind of fair, middle-of-the-road legislation originally reported out of our House committee.

OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This session of the 86th Congress also took a forward legislative step when it increased the appropriation for medical research by some quarter of a billion dollars, which means that we can now speed up the search for a cure to such diseases as cancer. I am especially pleased that this expanded medical research appropriation included an item of $50,000 which was inserted at my request to authorize a nationwide study into the effects of naturally radioactive rocks on unborn babies, a study to be based on earlier research carried out in New York by our State Health Department in areas of the Adirondacks and in Otsego County with such startling results.

We passed a bill providing much-needed increases in railroad retirement pensions.

We approved admission of Hawaii as the 50th State in our Union and in so doing welcomed to Washington a bipartisan delegation of Congressmen from the Aloha State who are themselves evidence that one more barrier has fallen in our continuing fight against prejudice and bigotry in America.

We adopted an improved and expanded program of veterans' pensions, although the special needs of many of our World War I veterans have still failed, in my judgment, to get proper recognition.

We approved higher interest rates on Government savings bonds, which means that men and women who invest their funds in the future of America will no longer be penalized for their patriotism.

We extended the good work of the Civil Rights Commission for another 2 years.

We passed a reasonable housing program.

We continued the Federal highway program, even though Congress unfortunately refused to provide proper reimbursement for States like New York which have already accomplished so much at their own expense without Federal help. Without such reimbursement, incidentally, it will be much more difficult to get Federal assistance for needed road improvement projects in Hamilton County and elsewhere. Incidentally I voted against the 1-cent boost in the gas tax that was tied onto this program because I believed it was unnecessary and improper.

We authorized a new food-stamp plan to make more of our huge food surpluses, which we are already sending abroad in great quantities, available also to needy people within our own country.

We put a much-needed and long-overdue limit of $35,000 on farm subsidy payments, which should now help to get our farm program geared back toward the small family farmer instead of toward the huge factory-type of farm.

ECONOMY AND INFLATION

I am pleased that this Congress has chosen to live within the Federal budget and not risk further inflation by incurring budget deficits. That decision was the direct result not only of the spirited campaign waged by President Eisenhower, but also of all the letters, telegrams, and phone calls which came from our constituents. I am happy to have had a small part in helping to nail down this important policy decision because I voted against earlier bills which called for excessive spending over and above the budget figures. Later these programs were scaled down to more moderate figures and I was glad to support the programs in that new form. Official figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD now show that Congress has not only ended the session by staying within the President's budget figure but has even reduced the total by some $1.8 billion. This is one more dramatic proof that it does pay to write your Congressman.

Even the public works appropriation bill, the annual water development and flood control measure, was passed at a figure under the President's budget, in spite of much apparent confusion on this point. Congress may have disagreed with the President as to which flood control projects were most urgently needed, but there was no real disagreement that these costs too must be kept within overall budget allocations.

KEARNEY PHILIPPINE AWARD BILL

Naturally I am proud that the final record of this Congress includes one bill, H.R. 5477, which I introduced and fought for until it became law. It is a bill which authorizes my predecessor, former Congressman Bernard W. Kearney, who represented this district with great ability for 16 years until his retirement last year, to accept a medal conferred upon him some time ago by the Philippine Government in appreciation of his many services to Philippine veterans. In spite of some difficulties in getting the bill approved in the Senate, I am happy that with the support of Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, and Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, both former colleagues of "Pat" Kearney in this House, we did get the bill passed and signed into law. This Kearney bill not merely a fitting tribute to a great legislator, and, incidentally, a real thrill for a new Congressman, but it has also served to teach me something about how bills are really enacted into law—a lesson, I hope, that will be helpful in the upcoming second session.

FARM LEGISLATION

While the record of this session of Congress has been a successful one, much of course remains to be done. Besides the urgent need for legislation to deal with the critical problem of unemployment, to which I have already referred, there is, for example, the pressing need for a revamped and more satisfactory farm program. Congress has failed thus far to face up to the challenge of drafting such a program. In voting as I did against such separate agricultural bills as the wheat and cotton legislation offered in this session, I tried to demonstrate my conviction that we cannot continue indefinitely just to increase farm subsidies and then pile up greater and greater surpluses to be stored at the taxpayers' expense. We need a fresh approach to the needs of the farmer, to lift from his back some of the weight of unnecessary government interference, and to give him a fairer opportunity on his own merits to make a more ample living and keep his farm income ahead of his costs of production. In placing a top limit on farm subsidy payments this session of Congress made at least one step in what I regard is the right direction. But we need to move much further ahead next year to assure that any farm program is geared strictly to the family farmer.

MILK CONSUMPTION

Much of the difficulty that confronts the Nation's dairy farmers comes from our continuing failure to promote a really adequate level of fluid milk consumption across the Nation. Here is one area where Government can properly be helpful to the farmer without interfering with the operation of his own busi-

ness. As a Member of Congress I have been greatly concerned with the need to stimulate the consumption of milk, and as a Member of the House Armed Services Committee I have suggested a number of proposals for greater utilization of milk by our armed services and for civil defense stockpile purposes. This is one line of approach that offers real possibilities for expansion and I plan to pursue it even more vigorously in the months ahead.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Unfortunately no action was taken in the House this session on a bill which I joined in sponsoring to establish a Youth Conservation Corps to provide useful outdoor jobs in conservation and reforestation work in such counties as Hamilton, Fulton, and Otsego for young men who have not yet located a position in industry. The bill did pass the Senate, however, and, considering the renewed attention that has been focused on this kind of useful outdoor activity in the light of increased juvenile crime, I am very hopeful our bill will receive an early hearing next session and be speedily adopted into law in line with the recommendation of many civic groups.

NO BIG DAMS FOR OTSEGO COUNTY

My experience during the past year in Washington, I am happy to report, has convinced me that the pressure for construction of any big flood control dams in Otsego County has disappeared. The fact that the 1960 public works appropriation bill contained funds for flood control operations in the Binghamton area is clear evidence, I believe, that the Army Engineers have now abandoned any serious attempt to carry out the alternative program of big upstream dams, including those in Otsego County, originally authorized in 1936. In fact, as a practical matter, I have discovered that hundreds of authorizations for similar flood control projects all over the country have been adopted over the years on which no further action has ever been taken. Apparently it is only when the Army seeks the funds to carry out such authorized projects that the matter really becomes serious. I have learned that no effort whatsoever has been made to obtain any funds for these Otsego County dams, which would indicate that the Army has changed its mind. Still as long as the legal authorization remains on the books there is a kind of technical sword of Damocles hanging over the heads of the people of Otsego County, and so I have introduced legislation to rescind that original 1936 action, and shall continue to fight for the adoption of my bill, to relieve once and for all the minds of the people I have the honor to represent of the fear that their farms and homes might some day be taken from them.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE RAILROADS

The steady decline in railroad passenger operations has become a serious national problem directly affecting our own district. From many angles, including national defense, we simply cannot permit the railroads to wither away, nor can we allow regular passenger operations to be abandoned. One step in helping the railroads is a sensible program of tax relief. With that in mind I have introduced legislation to provide such relief through faster tax writeoffs for railroad equipment and rolling stock. My bill received a highly favorable report last month from the Interstate Commerce Commission, and in view of this favorable report I am hopeful the legislation can be scheduled for hearing and action early in the second session.

COLLEGE SUMMER INTERN PROGRAM

One of the major problems in a democracy is training young men and women in the workings and techniques of free, representative government. Unless our younger people not only understand how government works but also become enthusiastic enough to seek government service themselves we cannot expect to have a healthy and workable democracy.

With this in mind I made my Washington office available this past summer to three young college students who joined our office staff temporarily as summer interns. These young men proved of tremendous value in helping to carry out the many tasks that any congressional office is called upon to perform. One came from Union College in Schenectady, one from State University Teachers College at Oneonta, and one from Harvard. Two of the three were selected by their own colleges and were supported in Washington by special educational grants. I am most enthusiastic about the merits of this program, and the young people who took part in it likewise seemed to enjoy the opportunity to watch the operation of Congress at close hand. I look forward to repeating this arrangement for two or three other students next summer.

ADJOURNMENT SCHEDULE

Let me just conclude by saying that being the Congressman from the 32d District of New York has been the most exciting and thrilling experience I have ever had. Never have I had a more challenging or more stimulating job, and I am deeply grateful to all the people of my district for the opportunity they have given me to serve them in the U.S. House of Representatives. I look forward eagerly to the opportunity to return home and to see and talk with them again. It is my intention to hold open-air office hours in each community throughout my district over the next few weeks so as to be easily available to anyone who may want to take up some kind of problem with his Congressman. The schedule of these visits will be locally announced and I hope everyone will feel free to drop in on me. In these months while Congress is in adjournment I hope to be able to speak with hundreds of my constituents about what I have tried to accomplish in the session and, what is even more important, to learn from them their thoughts, views, criticisms, and suggestions as to the kind of additional legislation which will best meet their needs and interests in the year ahead.

During this period my local office will be open as usual at 505 State Street, Schenectady, telephone Franklin 4-4000, and my staff or I will be available there at all times to render any service we possibly can.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity, too, to extend to you, to my colleagues in this body, and to all the people of the 32d District of New York, my sincere thanks and appreciation for the magnificent support, assistance, and understanding that have been rendered to me during the past 8½ months I have served here. I am more proud today than ever before to be a Member of Congress. And I sincerely hope that with the help and advice which I will seek from my constituents as I meet with them personally during the adjournment period I can come back down here next January prepared to try to do an even better job toward promoting the health, prosperity, and welfare of the people of the 32d District of New York State and of all free Americans.

Safety on the Kitchen Shelf

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDNA OAKES SIMPSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article entitled "Safety on the Kitchen Shelf" from the spring 1959 issue of Corn, a publication of the Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc.:

SAFETY ON THE KITCHEN SHELF

(The corn-refining industry, having a century-old history of identification with the food industry, and mutual interests with other food manufacturers and their products, offers this discussion as a contribution to a better public understanding of food additives.)

The Food Additives Amendment of 1958, Public Law 85-929, was signed by President Eisenhower last September and became effective as of March 5, 1959. It is regarded by the Food and Drug Administration not only as a comprehensive insurance policy for the public health but as a positive impetus to the advance of food technology. The new law can meet both of these desirable ends and thus become that legislative rarity—a law that satisfies everyone—only if wisely administered by the Government and strictly observed by industry.

The old law, enacted in 1938, regarded chemicals for foods as falling into one of two classifications—"poisonous" and "nonpoisonous." The former group, with certain notable exceptions, was ruled out of foods. Exceptions were substances required in production or unavoidable in good manufacturing practice, and even these were disqualified unless a tolerance for their use had been established.

Under the old law there was no fixed responsibility to prove an additive safe. It was the job of the Food and Drug Administration to prove an additive harmful, if such were the case. The new law takes the burden of proof from FDA. The food manufacturer or chemical manufacturer must now prove that his additive is safe in the amount of its intended inclusion in a food.

Adequate proof of safety will require pharmacological and toxicological testing of substances, on the basis of commonly accepted testing procedures. Testing of certain substances may require large numbers of animals to be on test diets for 2 years or more. Such proof of safety can be expensive. The cost of a full-dress toxicological investigation for a new and unknown substance is estimated at around $75,000.

Should the substance for test even be suspected as carcinogenic, testing periods may be as long as 7 years.

Once the food manufacturer's additive tests are completed, the Food and Drug Administration will approve, or decide otherwise. If the available toxicological data point to the necessity of restricting the substance to specific uses and/or amounts, such restrictions will be applied.

If not approved, the additive will be rejected for use. In the latter event, the food manufacturer has a right to a public hearing on the proposed additive and the further right of appeal in court.

In effect, the new law recognizes and corrects the former unrealistic distinction between "harmful" and "safe" additives. It affirms a truth enunciated in the 18th century by a famous alchemist and physician, Paracelsus: "All things are poison and nothing is innocuous. It is only the dosage by which a thing is not poison."

The dosage, indeed, is the very essence of the new law. The difference between safety and danger depends not on the chemical, per se, but on the amount of the chemical. It is at last officially recognized that many chemicals, though harmful in large doses, offer positive improvement to foods—in taste, color, keeping quality and other factors—and should therefore be included in foods if the inclusion is held within strict limits which are proved to be harmless.

Human metabolism decrees whether a substance is harmful or not. Is the substance absorbed, stored, broken down by enzymatic action, chemically changed, or excreted? Since humans react differently from animals, and since the differences are not clearly understood, it is assumed for the assurance of safety that humans are 10 times more sensitive than animals and that 1 human may be 10 times more sensitive than another. You have here a 100-to-1 ratio in the animal human safety equation. This means, in effect, that if 1 gram of an additive in 100 pounds of food is safe for an animal, one-hundredth of a gram may be deemed safe for any human. The 100-to-1 ratio is not inexorably fixed, however. It may be tightened even further, or loosened, depending on the case at hand. An additive that adversely affected bone development in rats would not be permitted in milk at any level. Another additive which, in heavy doses, merely discolored rats' livers, might be permitted in sauces or condiments in greater quantity than the 100-to-1 ratio implies.

Regulation applies not only to intentional additives—substances added directly to foods—but to incidental additives. The latter includes any substance likely to enter food as a result of use in food processing. The law applies to food-packaging materials, irradiating processes, and residue from animal feeds which may carry over into meat, milk, and eggs. It specifically prohibits the use of an additive in any amount if tests show that the substance produces cancer in humans or animals when fed or otherwise appropriately tested.

The Food and Drug Administration has published a list of 188 additives and about 180 flavorings and seasoning agents which it proposes to declare safe but on which final decision has not yet been made. Additives which lack official sanction, and which have been in use prior to January 1, 1958, must have approval within 18 months from the date of passage of the bill, or their use in foods must be discontinued.

Since the cost of testing a single new additive may run from $10,000 to $75,000, it is plain that the Government's new insurance policy for the public health carries a substantial premium, to be paid by industry. John A. Osmundsen, writing recently in the New York Times, estimates that industry will spend "about $20 million in the next 5 years just to clear doubts about some of the additives already in use."

Though the public has been largely unaware of it, the food industry has long been paying, through research and plant improvement, substantial premiums on public health insurance. The great majority of manufacturers who compose this industry have been testing additives for years, satisfying themselves that the additives are safe before including them in foods. Such concern has been based, of course, on a decent and normal regard for the public health. It has been based, too, on the simple economic fact that it is good business to make and sell a product that is wholesome.

Industry's practice of pretesting additives was recently cited by Dr. Arnold J. Lehman, one of the top food and drug officials. He pointed out that although the old law did not require industry to pretest proposed additives, industry had been doing just that for the last 12 years or more. "The responsible members of industry * * * have been testing their additives and discussing their data with us for as long as I've been here," Dr. Lehman said.

What the new law should accomplish, besides public health insurance, is public awareness that its health is being insured—by Government and industry alike.

WHAT ARE ADDITIVES AND WHY NEEDED?

To the food technologist, whether in Government or industry, "additive" is a familiar word. Among laymen, however, the word is not clearly and widely understood. Until recently, no dictionary acknowledged it as a noun. "Trace ingredient" is not a good synonym, for some additives are used in quantities which are far more than traces. An additive is of course an ingredient, but in FDA's meaning of the term it is the kind of ingredient that is proscribed from food unless it qualifies under the procedures enforced by the new law.

Additives and ingredients can be many things, and are added to foods for many reasons—to preserve, to color or flavor, to neutralize certain effects, to stabilize certain ingredients, to emulsify others, or simply to enhance the nutritive quality of a food. Because many of them have long chemical names they may arouse needless apprehension in the lay consumer mind.

Among the 360-odd additives, flavorings and seasonings which FDA proposes to declare safe, many have long chemical names. Probably several hundred others will be declared safe after the evidence from tests is in. A few, deemed safe in the past but later proved to have harmful effects over long periods of use, have been discontinued in food manufacture.

Perhaps the best known and least feared of all chemical additives is that eminently safe deadly poison—salt. It is eminently safe because its intake is strictly limited by taste. It is a deadly poison only in Paracelsus' sense: that all things are poison if taken in excess. In the same sense, water could be called a deadly poison too. Used judiciously, salt delights your taste buds and benefits your digestion. It is in every household, not only because of its fine flavoring effect but because it has a familiar and time-honored name. At the table you could say "pass the sodium chloride" if you wished, and while you'd be perfectly correct you might scare the children or your completely nonchemical dinner guests.

Baking soda has a familiar name, too, and its presence in foods alarms no consumer. Even its chemical name, sodium bicarbonate, is fairly well known and hardly likely to cause goose pimples to arise on the skins of housewives or domestics. One kind of baking powder, which is sodium bicarbonate plus cream of tartar plus corn starch, is in the same comfortable category.

If space permitted, this article could cite scores of useful additives (and many of them have long chemical names) employed today by the baking, soft drink, brewing, dairy products, confectionery, meat packing, and other industries.

The history of adding substances to food is almost as old as the history of food itself. Probably it began when man first learned to preserve meat by salting it. But mostly he ate his food when and where it was produced. The time and space intervals between production and consumption were brief; hence, distribution was but a slight factor in the overall food supply. Diets were lacking in variety, little was known about nutrition, dietary deficiencies and the illnesses resulting therefrom were rife, and life expectancy was short.

A hundred or so years ago the so-called industrial revolution began. The years that followed, and particularly the last two decades, saw first a gradual, then an explosive acceleration of all the factors that have brought chemical additives by the hundreds into foods. Population increased rapidly; people moved to all quarters of the Nation, and distribution had to keep pace. Large areas became urbanized; as the tempo of life quickened more foods were prepared in factories and fewer in homes. Nutritionists unlocked the mysteries of proteins, carbohydrates, fats, and vitamins, and the application of their findings was a tremendous stride forward in balanced and healthful diets. Foods quick frozen in subzero vaults entered the picture, and presently were reaching kitchens, still ice hard, 2,000 miles from the point of origin. The packaging industry contributed a major share to the preservation and distribution of foods and the convenience of their use.

In this gustatory paradise, chemical additives found a place and a need.

CHEMICALS AND FOODS

If the average consumer clearly understood the word "chemical," he could live more comfortably with its application to foods and be less subject to the apprehension which the word inspires. The chemist knows the meaning of the word better than anyone; hence, the chemist is not afraid of it. To the chemist, foods themselves—with or without additives—are but combinations of chemicals. He thinks of food as a compound of proteins, fats, carhohydrates, minerals, cellulose, vitamins, and water, all of which are chemicals.

The trouble with the word "chemical," in the majority of lay minds, is that somehow it is associated with toxic or with poison. This semantic hookup is unfortunate. Some chemicals such as water, the proteins, fats, and carbohydrates, can be consumed in considerable quantities to the great benefit of mankind; indeed their lack in considerable quantities means malnutrition, starvation, and even death.

The Food Protection Committee of the National Research Council has gone on record as follows: "There need be no hazard in the use of chemical additives provided scientific research programs are carried out prior to use. The fact that a chemical is toxic does not mean, per se, that its proper use as an additive will entail a hazard."

Distinguishing between a hazard and toxicity, FPC continues: "Toxicity is the capacity of a substance to produce injury; hazard is the probability that injury will

result from the use of the substance in the quantity and in the manner proposed. A chemical additive should not be used in a food (either in production or in processing) until its safety for a given food use has been established beyond a reasonable doubt, as judged by competent experts."

Precisely that factor of safety, "as judged by competent experts," is the assurance given the public by the new law. Industry will do its own testing, but the final review, and approval or disapproval, rest with the competent experts of the Food and Drug Administration.

THE CRITICS AND ALARMISTS

No responsible scientist, whether employed by Government, industry, or independent research, would contend that absolute safety in foods can ever be achieved. One of the major problems today lies in the area of a great unknown—the longtime effect of some chemicals used in foods. Testing over a period of years will be needed; meanwhile the suspicion of deleterious effects over long periods is enough to keep an additive out of foods.

On the other hand, the responsible scientists, cognizant of the facts of regulation and the efforts of industry to comply with the spirit and letter of the law, will agree that additives are essential to foods, as foods are made and distributed today, and that the minimal hazard they impose is far outweighed by the good they do.

Since everyone must eat, the safety of food is everyone's vital concern. Few public issues have generated more controversy and attracted more critics. The anti-additive voices have ranged from the tempered criticism of thoughtful men to the shrill screaming of quacks, faddists and professional frightmongers. All of them are heard, and most of them must be reckoned with.

A writer who charges government and industry with negligence in food regulation, and warns the public of imminent calamity resulting therefrom, may find a wide audience. Often the pages of popular magazines are open to him, no matter how poorly buttressed by facts his text may be. But the scientist usually defends his cause in one of the professional journals with a small fraction of the audience available to the quack.

WHAT REMAINS

While food regulation probably never will achieve perfection, the provisions of the new law should assure the public that the utmost is being done to enforce safety. Confidence has been voiced by the men who are charged with administering the law, and by others whose integrity and concern for the public welfare are their only guide.

The dietary health of the Nation is probably better than at any time in history. FDA attributes the wholesomeness of foods largely to careful testing programs of the food and chemical industries for many years, and to the continuous exchange of information between industry and Government regarding new additives.

The Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., awake to the responsibilities of its industry, has organized a food additives committee.

The food protection committee's liaison panel, composed of representatives from industry, consulting groups, trade associations, and foundations (of which Corn Industries Research Foundation, Inc., is one), Government agencies, and scientific and technical societies, is charged with exchange of information on problems before the committee.

Industry has no wish to be the sacred cow on the food landscape, above reproach and immune to criticism. But despite the charges sometimes leveled against it, industry can be credited with most of the constructive work in behalf of safe and better foods—the toil and study and the expenditure of fortunes in research. For these efforts it is high time that the food and chemical industries be accorded the recognition that is their due. The millions they have spent in the testing of additives is only part of the story. Additional millions have been spent in obtaining the cleanest raw materials, and on machinery to clean these materials still further once they arrive at plants. The improvement of plant equipment—closed-up processes to prevent airborne contamination—and the institution of better plant-sanitation methods have cost millions more. Painstaking sampling and analyzing of products in process are costly, but they are routine practices in all modern food plants. Sanitary packaging and sanitary conditions of bulk shipments are also part of industry's total contribution to safe and wholesome foods.

It is easy for critics to alarm consumers with undocumented allusions to the perils in foods. But what remains, despite all the prophets of poison, is an incredibly wide choice of good foods, available to consumers everywhere, and constituting collectively the best tasting, most varied and most wholesome diet ever enjoyed by any people.

What remains, after all the viewers with alarm have taken their cracks at industry, is a sharp decline in dietary diseases and a heartening increase in life expectancy, chiefly in past two decades—the very period that has seen an explosive increase in food additives.

What remains, despite the ills the human flesh is heir to, is a generally higher level of the national health than ever in history. It is exemplified in the everyday evidence of the well-being of your family and of ours, and of the family next door, multiplied 50 million times across the country.

People in America are eating well and feeling well.

Kentucky Admits First Negro Woman To Practice Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, under the authority previously granted, I request that the following article from the September 15 edition of the Louisville Courier-Journal, concerning Miss Alberta O. Jones, the first Negro woman admitted to practice law in the Commonwealth of Kentucky, be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN PASSES LAW TEST—FIRST NEGRO IN KENTUCKY

(By Marion Porter)

Notified yesterday she had passed her bar examinations, Kentucky's first Negro woman lawyer already is working on her first case.

Miss Alberta O. Jones is one of 64 men and women who successfully passed the July 1–3 examinations.

Though she intends to specialize in tax law, Miss Jones gladly accepted a divorce case which has been hanging fire 4 years.

FOUR YEARS AGO I PROMISED, IF—

"This girl I know asked me 4 years ago—when she separated from her husband—to handle her divorce," Miss Jones explained. "I promised I would if I made the grade.

"I've seen her in church during the past month and, being uneasy about the outcome of the examinations, I told her, 'You'd better get yourself another lawyer.' She said she'd wait."

Daughter of Mrs. Sadie Jones, 3237 Virginia, Alberta is a graduate of Central High School and the University of Louisville where she majored in accounting.

She took 1 year of law at the University of Louisville and transferred to Howard University, Washington, D.C. She was fourth honor graduate in the university's law school last June.

Miss Jones had a scholarship to Howard. Before entering the university she worked 2 years as accountant for an insurance firm here to earn money for living expenses. At Howard she was on the staff of the Howard Law Journal and was a student counselor.

VOLUNTEERED TO DRAFT LEGISLATION

She was one of the seniors who volunteered to help draft legislation. She explained that often Congressmen would submit the main points of a bill to law students to have it drafted in proper form.

"None of 'my' bills have passed yet, but I'm watching for them," she said.

Studying law in Washington had a special fillip, Miss Jones recalled. Instead of being something very interesting bound between the covers of a book, law came alive.

"Everybody was talking about proposed and old laws—you had to read the newspapers to keep up," Miss Jones said.

The cheerful, outgoing young woman has had offers from several legal firms. She would like to work for a Government agency for a time, then enter private practice.

After her graduation she had several interviews in Washington. Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER invited her to use his office to study for the bar examinations.

"It was kind of him, but there was so much going on I didn't study a lot," she said.

"I WOULD ALWAYS SAY, 'NOT YET' "

Describing her mental anguish waiting for the results of the examinations, Miss Jones said it didn't help any when, in making public speeches, she was introduced as a lawyer.

"I would always have to say, 'Not yet.' "

She often is called on to speak before civic groups and churches, including Phillips Memorial Church where she formerly was Sunday school superintendent.

When she showed up for the exams she went into a tizzy after Vincent Goodlett, secretary of the State Board of Bar examiners, told her that as far as he knew she was the only Negro woman ever to take the State bar examinations—and that she would be Kentucky's first Negro woman attorney if she passed.

"I was completely demoralized at first," Miss Jones said. "If I had known how much was depending on me I would have studied harder—and I would have worn something different."

Picturesque Religious Pageant Marks Golden Jubilee of Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius at Danville, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following feature story written by Mr. John C. Sciranka, editor, of Passaic, N.J., on the occasion of the Golden Jubilee of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius of Danville, Pa., which was observed on September 7, 1959:

PICTURESQUE RELIGIOUS PAGEANT MARKS GOLDEN JUBILEE OF SISTERS OF SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS, DANVILLE, PA.

(By John C. Sciranka)

The golden jubilee of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius on Labor Day, September 7, was a picturesque pageant which attracted over 6,000 people to the Sacred Heart Villa, Danville, Pa., their Motherhouse, which also is the home of their Slovak Girls Academy. Four bishops, 150 priests, and over 400 nuns took part in this historical ceremony.

Most Rev. George L. Leech, D.D., bishop of Harrisburg, Pa., pontificated in the morning and preached the sermon. He also imparted the Papal Blessing from Pope John XXIII. Rt. Rev. Msgr. Michael Polcha, Swoyerville, Pa., preached in Slovak.

After dinner a procession was led by 200 students, 400 sisters, 150 priests, four bishops and several thousand people to the convent cemetery. During the procession the traditional SS. Cyril and Methodius hymn was sung. Here at the grave of Father Matthew Jankola, founder of the order and the late mothers and sisters of the order, Bishop Leech recited prayers. Rev. Michael Lacko, S.J., professor at the Collegio Pontifico Russicum in Rome, preached in Slovak.

At 4 o'clock in the afternoon, Bishob Grutka pontificated in the old Slavonic known as the Glagolitza. It was the first time that the Roman-Slavonic Mass was celebrated by special permission of the Vatican in the Western Hemisphere. Bishop Grutka also preached in Slovak. The students of the academy sang responses and sacred hymns in old Slavonic.

At the conclusion of the religious services, Monsignor Polcha read messages from Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, Gov. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, Gov. Robert B. Meyner of New Jersey, Congressman Daniel J. Flood of Wilkes-Barre, James P. Mitchell, U.S. Secretary of Labor and John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America.

The Voice of America sent three representatives from Washington, D.C., to record the program to be beamed to Slovakia.

Joseph G. Pruša, supreme secretary of the Slovak Catholic Sokol, had a special interview with Mr. Lajda and Mr. Lisy, of the Voice of America, in which he reported the activities of the Slovak Catholic Sokol youth.

Other Sokol officials present at the golden jubilee were Father Louis P. Hohos, supreme chaplain; Paul C. Paliat, supreme president; Miss Mary M. Ruyak, supreme vice president; John A. Kanuck, chairman of the board of auditors; Miss Mary Sterbinsky, Mrs. Helen Ellis, John J. Bartos, Miss Helen Filip, who has two sisters as nuns in Danville, and many Sokol members; John D. Check's daughter, of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., is also a nun in Danville. All American Slovak organizations were represented.

Now let's review the story of the Sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius with Sisters M. Alice, SS. M., who writes that the story of the growth of America is, in part, the story of the birth and growth of the Congregation of the Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius. The history of the community is not bound up with the adventures of the Spanish gold seekers, or the missions of California, or the War for Independence, but with a period that has its own unique importance in the development of our country—the last decades of the 19th century when many of the peoples of Europe braved the Atlantic to escape poverty and oppression.

With this great tide of immigrants a young Slovak seminarian, Matthew Jankola, came to America in 1894. After completing his studies for the priesthood at St. Bonaventure's, Allegheny, N.Y., he was ordained, January 10, 1895, as a priest for the diocese of Scranton, Pa.

Here he found a rich field for apostolic work among the Slovak people who, poor in material possessions but rich in faith, were struggling with an unknown language in a foreign land. To preserve "the pearl of great price," the faith, among their people was the aim of Father Jankola and other priests who had come from Slovakia.

FOUNDS NEW ORDER

As he cared for his own parish in Pittston, Pa., and organized five other parishes where the people could hear the word of God in a language they understood, Father Jankola began to realize the need for parish schools if the faith was to be strengthened among the young. After having applied unsuccessfully in America and in Slovakia for religious teachers, he decided on what seemed a bold and daring plan—the foundation of an American community of Sisters to teach in the Slovak parish schools.

On July 29, 1903, he called a meeting of the Slovak priests of the diocese, discussed his plan with them, established with their cooperation the St. Anthony's treasury to finance the future community, and urged them to encourage vocations among the girls of their parishes.

After he had given the first vocation sermon in his own church, a young girl, Mary Mihalik, presented herself to him as his first candidate. Miss Mihalik and two other applicants were sent to the Czech Benedictine Sisters in Chicago to receive their high school education and later to be trained in the religious life.

But their good intentions were not sufficient to carry the young girls, away from the family circle for the first time in their short lives, through an acute attack of loneliness. While the next two girls who had applied were waiting for the train which would take them to join the first candidates in Chicago, Father Jankola sent a message that they should not go because the other girls had asked to come home. This was the first of the disappointments and frustrations that would water the little seed, hidden and dying in the dark earth, that it might produce rich and precious fruits 50 years later.

When the girls returned, Father Jankola asked several other communities nearer home to train them, but none of the Sisters was able to assist him.

ABOUT TO QUIT

Just as he was about to give up the whole plan, one of his colleagues, Father Pavco, suggested that Father Jankola seek the help of the Superior General of the Sisters, Servants of the Immaculate Heart of Many, of Scranton. "I have heard that her name is Mother Mary Cyril; our common patron might help here; let us try, in the name of God."

Father Jankola found Mother Cyril to be a woman of universal charity, motherly prudence, and great magnanimity of soul, who was to be his greatest support in this difficult undertaking. She accepted the girls, not however, as postulants, but as aspirants, on November 26, 1903, at Mount Saint Marys' Scranton.

After 3 years of study, three of the girls became postulants, January 6, 1906. The decision as to whether the girls should be received into the community of the Immaculate Heart Sisters or be the nucleus of a new community had not as yet been made. Mother Cyril favored the latter plan to which Bishop Michael Hoban at last consented.

Therefore, on July 26, 1906, the "three Marys," Mary Mihalik, Mary Bartek, and Mary Pauly were clothed in a new habit designed by the Immaculate Heart Sisters, and were named in honor of the Holy Family, Sister Mary, Sister Joseph, and Sister Emmanuel. The community was to be known as the Sisters of Saints Cyril and Methodius as Father Jankola wished to honor the patrons of the Slovak people.

IMMEDIATE DEMAND

Immediately four requests for teachers for that school year were received: "We have only three Slovak Sisters. How can we send them to four parishes?" Father Jankola asked.

During the next 2 years, and indeed until the community was able to stand on its own, Mother Cyril provided the novices with the same spiritual and educational advantages that she offered to her own novices.

On September 8, 1908, the Sisters opened their first school in Sacred Heart parish, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Already there had been a second reception in 1909, and yet approbation from Rome was not forthcoming. At last the strain of anxious waiting was replaced by joy when Bishop Hoban returned from Rome that August with Pope Pius X's approval of the new community. On September 11, 1909, the three novices made their profession in Mount St. Mary's chapel and a new community was born.

The Sisters remained under the superiorship of the Immaculate Heart Sisters until Mother Mary Mihalik was elected first superior general in 1915. Just as the Sisters seemed to be facing a promising future, they found themselves in the darkness again. Mother Mary died April 30, 1916, and Father Jankola followed her May 5, 1916.

Moreover, the problem of finding a motherhouse confronted the bereaved Sisters. This was temporarily solved by the lease of a large building at Middletown, Pa., from the First Catholic Slovak Union of America. Finally, with the advice and assistance of Bishop Philip R. McDevitt, of Harrisburg, and other priests of the vicinity, the Sisters purchased an estate at Danville, Pa. They took over in 1919, changing "Castle Grove" to Sacret Heart Villa.

RAPID GROWTH

Here in 1922 they opened Slovak Girl's Academy which has recently been renamed St. Cyril Academy. Both the community and the school grew so rapidly that ground was broken for a new building in 1929. From then on the records show a sure and steady progress.

Today, the congregation, numbering 389 members is in charge of 36 schools in 3 archdioceses and 9 dioceses. Founded to meet the urgent needs of the growing church in America, the Sisters have extended their activities as far as their capacities permit, inspired always by their motto "Thy Kingdom Come." Their primary work is teaching in parish schools, principally in the East, although they have established schools in Charleston, S.C., Chicago, Ill., and several other midwestern cities. Besides conducting an orphanage and two homes for the aged, one at Middletown, Pa., and one at Highland Park, Ill.; the Sisters also engage in cooking, nursing, sewing, and gardening.

Historically, the congregation of the Sisters of Sts. Cyril and Methodius can be traced back 50 years to a priest of zeal and determination, an Immaculate Heart Sister of prudence and charity, and three teenage girls of eager generosity. But the spirit of the Sisters and of their founder has its wellspring in the courage and perseverance of two brother apostles, Cyril and Methodius, who sacrificed wealth and position to bring the faith to the Slavic people 1,100 years ago. Yet, following the example of their holy patrons, the Sisters are not limited in their apostolic ambitions by place or nationality, but measure their mission by the charity of their Divine Model who prayed "that all may be one."

Interpretation of Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, section 8(e) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization and an employer to enter into any agreement whereby the employer ceases or refrains or agrees to cease or refrain from doing business with any other person. The act makes such agreements void. The section provides, however, that the prohibition against such agreements does not apply to the construction industry relating to work to be done at the construction site. My attention has been called to a statement in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator MCNAMARA on September 14—page A8141—to the effect that, in his opinion, the prohibition on hot cargo agreements was not intended to prohibit a fabrication-type clause where the work of fabrication could be done or performed at the jobsite. This view of Senator MCNAMARA does not coincide with mine. In my opinion it is contrary to the clear and literal meaning of the act and would, if accepted, open up a Pandora's box of evils in the construction industry which Congress meant to eliminate, not only in the Reporting Act but in the Taft-Hartley Act as well.

The Senate bill merely outlawed hot cargo agreements with common carriers. The House amendment interdicted agreements not to do business with another entered into by any employer. At the time of the consideration of this amendment there had been some discussion of a proposal to permit unions to picket a construction site if they had disputes with any contractor on the job. It was partly in this frame of reference that the proviso to section 8(e) was written which provides—

> That nothing in this subsection (e) shall apply to an agreement between a labor organization and an employer in the construction industry relating to the contracting or subcontracting of work to be done at the site of construction.

As in the common-situs picketing problem, it was the location of the work that we had in mind and, as a reasonable compromise, we provided that the agreement must relate to work actually done at the site. Work done or products manufactured, processed, fabricated, and so forth by another employer away from the construction site could not be subject to a hot cargo agreement. It was not intended to restrict an employer's freedom to do business or purchase from any other person and to decide in what form the product or materials shall arrive on the job. Furthermore, to interpret the proviso to cover any work or product which could be done at the site would permit restrictions on the installation of many other products besides prefabricated pipe which arrive on the job in prefabricated form. This certainly was not in my mind.

The conference report supports my view. It states, at page 39, that the proviso in question relates only and exclusively to the contracting or subcontracting of work to be done at the site of construction and that it does not exempt from section 8(e) agreements relating to supplies or other products or materials shipped to the site of construction. The legislative history in the Senate is also in accord with my view. On September 3, 1959, Senator KENNEDY, in reporting the conference agreement to the Senate, said at page 16415 of the RECORD:

> It should be particularly noted that the proviso relates only to the "contracting or subcontracting of work to be done at the site of the construction." The proviso does not cover boycotts of goods manufactured in an industrial plant for installation at the jobsite, or suppliers who do not work at the jobsite.

Senator MORSE also said, on the same day at page 16399 of the RECORD, in referring to the hot cargo amendment:

> First. It would prevent a union from protecting the bargaining unit it represents by obtaining an agreement not to subcontract work normally performed by employees in the unit.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare printed a section by section analysis of the act, published September 10, 1959, and stated with respect to the section in question that the prohibition against hot cargo agreements does not apply to the construction industry relating to work to be done at the construction site.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that an employer, even in the construction industry, retains the freedom to choose how the products or materials he utilizes shall arrive on the job—prefabricated or not—and that such freedom cannot be restricted by agreements with labor organizations.

Mutual Security Appropriation Conference Report

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE MEADER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the conference report on the Mutual Security Appropriation bill because I protest the conferees' compromose on the Hardy amendment.

Through the years I have supported the mutual security program and adequate appropriations to carry out its necessary and appropriate functions. But I think the conferees should not have yielded to executive pressures with respect to the phraseology contained in the Hardy amendment, which would have assured effective enforcement of the right of the Congress to complete and accurate information about the expenditure of foreign aid funds.

I believe the bill should have been sent back to conference with instructions to stand fast in upholding the basic prerogatives and necessary factfinding powers of the Congress, as provided in the Hardy amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important to point out exactly what we have done and what we have not done in our final action on the Hardy amendment:

First, the Hardy amendment, even in its tattered and decimated form does establish the principle that the Congress may employ the power of the purse to compel personnel in the executive branch of the Government to honor requests for information by the Congress, its committees, and the General Accounting Office through imposing limitations on the use of appropriated funds.

Second, the watered down phraseology accepted by the conferees is not a recognition by the Congress of the alleged doctrine of executive privilege but rather it indicates only that the Congress, in its wisdom, has refrained from exercising its full power to obtain information from the executive branch of the Government.

Although I am sympathetic with the conferees who were subjected to great pressure, I disagree with what appears to be their retreat in this important area of effective scrutiny by congressional committees of expenditures in the executive branch of Government. Therefore, I was compelled to vote against the conference report.

However, let me hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that I fully appreciate that we have established in law a foundation upon which to build in the future an effective means of obtaining facts with respect to the public business within the possession of executive agencies, without which the Congress cannot intelligently and wisely discharge its policymaking responsibilities.

Mutual Security Appropriation Conference Report

SPEECH

OF

HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan has expressed very clearly many of my own misgivings about the changes to which the conferees have agreed in the language of my amendment. I am disappointed that there has been some yielding in phraseology and for that reason, I too felt that the conference report should be defeated and the original House language should be insisted upon. In voting against the conference report, I want to make it clear that I am not opposing the mutual security appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I would like especially to commend the gentleman from Michigan for the effective work which he has done on this subject. He has made a study of it, and he has been extremely helpful to me. In fact, we have joined our efforts to preserve the rights of the Congress in securing the information which is needed in order that we may carry out our constitutional responsibilities.

Notwithstanding my disappointment in the action of the conferees, there is gratification in the fact that the Congress has clearly asserted its power to enforce its legislative and investigative prerogatives through employing its constitutional power of the purse.

Radio Broadcasts of Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the GTA daily radio roundups of September 9 and 10, 1959, prepared by the public relations staff of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, St. Paul, Minn.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 1959

The kind of gobbledygook that is being fed to the public in some newspapers and magazines is enough to make the most hard-hearted confidence man cry "Uncle." There's just enough truth in what is being said and printed to give the falsehoods and omissions of fact—a ring of veracity.

It is pointless to argue whether this is being done deliberately or through ignorance. What's important is that farmers are being given a black eye in a deliberate attempt to shift the blame for farm troubles to somewhere other than where it really belongs.

Now, what's this gobbledygook that we talk about? Let's look at an example. It's from the Christian Science Monitor, a newspaper of excellent repute and one well-known to many readers. In talking about President Eisenhower's veto last June of the wheat bill that would have cut both production and costs the Monitor says: "In his (the President's) view, overproduction in wheat or any other price-supported crop will not be cut back until the incentive for overproduction is removed. That is until price supports are dropped to a normal market equivalent."

Now, that's gobbledygook. High-sounding but gobbledygook nonetheless. What's the normal market equivalent that wheat prices should be dropped to? Do you know? Does anyone know? The biggest wheat farmer in the country says it costs him up to $1.50 a bushel to raise wheat. The price support next year is $1.77, national average, and much lower in the big Wheat Belt. Can you live on two-bits a bushel?

So no one knows what the normal market equivalent might be. It's just words. Gobbledygook. Many farmers are convinced that the real aim of the administration is to eliminate price supports entirely or drop them so low that it would cost the farmer more to raise and sell wheat than he could get for it. And sure enough, that would bust the surplus and the farmers, too.

Let's look at another statement, again from the Christian Science Monitor. We quote: "Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson has often warned that unless steps are taken to bring the farm program into line with realities it may collapse of its own weight."

But here again—what are "realities?" Do you know? Maybe 50-cent corn or $6 hogs would be "realities" for Benson. Who knows? It's a word with no basis in fact—but in the reader's mind it arouses fears—and stirs prejudices against farmers and farm programs.

Strictly a reality, however, is Secretary Benson's huge 4 billion bushel plus corn crop this year. That's hardly designed to cure overproduction. Yet the Secretary deliberately encouraged farmers to grow it—with his rigged referendum to do away with controls—at the same time offering a price support with no strings attached. Many people in high positions of responsibility are tired of gobbledegook. The very least that farmers and the public are entitled to, they are saying, is factual information, a clearcut Federal farm policy, and a sincere administration to protect the interests of both farmers and consumers.

So beware of gobbledegook. It's nice to hear and nice to read sometimes, but look between the lines for the real meaning. And remember, you can't go wrong when you do business with your own business—GTA the co-op way.

GTA DAILY RADIO ROUNDUP, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER, 10, 1959

The hog market at Minneapolis continues to hover around $13 or $14. That's for 100 pounds of pork on the hoof, alive and kicking. Now just to refresh your memories, that much pork, just one short year ago, was worth between $21 and $22. You can do your reckoning with a stub of a pencil on a scrap of wrapping paper like so many of us do, or with a fancy calculating machine like a big-time statistician but either way you come up with a difference of about $8 a 100 pounds. That's how much less farmers get for 100 pounds of pork that has cost them just as much—or more—to raise. Percentagewise, it's a price cut of about 40 percent in 1 year.

That's hard on farmers. The old excuse that farm prices just naturally act that way is worth about as much as a foam rubber check.

But hogs are just a symbol of the basic weakness in the whole farm pricing system. Except for those few crops that still are favored with a Federal price support farm products are sold at auction. It's a buyer's market. Costs of production, return on investment, payment for labor and management on the farm don't seem to enter into the picture at all the way they do in the price-fixing mechanisms used by all other American businesses.

You've all heard or read the considered opinions of so-called market experts who say: "Well, there's just too many hogs right now. Farmers overproduced. They've got to expect cheap hogs until the market is flushed out."

But compare that to the situation in the auto market. The business magazines tell us that there are almost 1 million surplus 1959 models sitting around with 1960 models already rolling off the production lines. Certainly around the cities there are dozens of vacant lots filled hub to hub with unsold 1959's. But can you buy them for 60 cents on the dollar? No, sir. You can't. The price tag is right there in the window. So much for the factory, so much for the dealer, so much for transportation, heater, turn lights, radio, and so forth. You might wrangle a small discount out of the dealer, but that's the best you can do.

Farmers might like to price their products that way, too, but it is physically impossible with more than 4 million producers scattered all over the Nation. So they long ago appealed to Washington for Federal help in stabilizing farm markets. They got that help, beginning about a quarter of a century ago, but in return they had to agree to accept at least limited control over production, which they did. In recent years help has been very limited and parceled out only with great reluctance. There's a dragging of feet now in top U.S. Department of Agriculture offices over action to bolster hog prices. Washington sources say USDA might step in and buy some pork products from processors if prices skid to $12. But critics say that wouldn't be much help, because so little trickles back through the marketing channels to farmers.

Most farm-State Congressmen look with more favor on a plan that would pay a premium for lightweight hogs. For the same amount of money the premium plan would do twice as much good at the farm level, they say. The Secretary of Agriculture already has the authority to put this premium plan into operation. But has he the will to do so? The answer to that question could mean millions of dollars more or less to farmers who raise hogs.

Tom Burke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the Appendix to the RECORD a brief statement about Tom Burke, who so many of us knew and respected.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOM BURKE

All of us who knew and worked with Tom Burke loved him for his sincerity, and we were deeply moved by his death on September 12, 1959.

In 1935, he was a skilled workman in a Toledo factory who joined with and led other workers to form a unit of the United Automobile Workers Union. Although he subsequently attained high political office, he never lost his interest in his fellow workers. He was elected to the Toledo City Council and then to the 81st Congress where he served with ability and devotion to his ideals. He brought to the House Labor Committee firsthand knowledge of the struggle of American workmen to build democratic unions. This personal experience in the labor movement and deep concern for improvement of the American education system, coupled with his natural candor and judgment, made his advice extremely useful to the Congress.

In recent years, as legislative representative of the CIO and of his own United Auto Workers Union, Tom continued to fight for social legislation and to defend with great

dignity the rights and institutions of American working men and women.

Tom Burke had a distinguished career of public service. I know we are all richer for having known Tom and the country is better because of him.

Addresses by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monddy, September 14, 1959

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my extension of remarks, I included a powerful, appropriate, and timely address by His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman, Archbishop of New York, on September 13, 1959, in the auditorium of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn. There is no person in the world who knows and understands the evil minds of the Kremlin and of Communists than does Cardinal Spellman. Each year, Cardinal Spellman travels, at great sacrifice, to far corners of the world, wherever Americans in our Armed Forces are serving, to bring to them spiritual inspiration and guidance, and his ringing message of Americanism, without regard to race, color, or creed.

His address, and the other one included in my remarks, that His Eminence made at the dedication of the chapel at the U.S. Military Academy, West Point, N.Y., should be widely read.

Cardinal Spellman speaks the thoughts of all Americans without regard to race, color, or creed. He pointedly warns of the duplicity and hypocrisy of atheistic communism.

How true, when His Eminence said in his U.S. Coast Guard Academy address:

The Founding Fathers of our great country were religious God-fearing men and their faith in God and man gave birth to our country and to our traditions. Our Nation began with sacrifices of religious men, and it grew strong in the blessings of our faith merited from God. If we depart from our religious beliefs, if we cast aside the moral principles which are the pillars of our national strength, then we are definitely and rapidly moving along the road to personal and national destruction. The faith of our fathers is stronger by far than any weapon of the enemy.

Cardinal Spellman's two addresses follow:

I am grateful for the opportunity and privilege of offering mass this morning in your beautiful memorial chapel dedicated to our heroic men of the U.S. Coast Guard who, in war and in peace, gave their lives for their country. My message to you this morning may be summarized in your own direst slogan of your philosophy of service: "You have to go out, but you don't have to come back." In these significant, straight speaking words is expressed a concept of duty and sacrifice which has inspired your glorious contributions to our beloved America since the days of Alexander Hamilton.

The Coast Guard is one of the oldest organizations under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, and your achievements become more notable as the years press on. There is no need for me to speak to you of your noble traditions of service, your heroic dead, the important part you played in the major campaigns of recent wars, your constant and continuing sacrifices for the safety of our country. Whenever I pass along the shores of Long Island I think of a starless night a generation ago when a young man of the U.S. Coast Guard confronted enemies of our country landing on a lonely beach. With the pounding surf and seagulls as his only witnesses, 82c, John Cornelius Cullen met the invaders as they tumbled from a rubber boat, bringing with them powerful explosives and detailed plans to wreck our military and industrial potential.

We have come a long way since that night. Times have changed, the scene of battle has shifted, new and more fearsome weapons have been forged in the fires of hate and greed. Saboteurs now arrive on our shores in jet airliners rather than in rubber boats. They meet, not a lone member of the Coast Guard who immediately grasped the situation, knew what to do about it, and did it—rather today some saboteurs are greeted with honors and civic receptions although their briefcases may bulge with propaganda more lethal than explosives. And while their purpose is still sabotage, their targets now are the mind and the conscience of America.

"You have to go out * * *" but no longer do you launch your ships on the beautiful ocean of God's creation; instead you must push along the uncharted and murky channels of native and imported propaganda. And the oceans of printer's ink are more dangerous to our national safety than ever were the perils of the salty seas. In this great, outstanding institution you have learned the normalcies and the vagaries of nature spread across the face of the ocean. But that is not enough. You must also learn the perversions and deceits of the human mind expressed in the lies and distortions of Communist propaganda, vicious and fearsome and which can become fatal unless you recognize it for what it is, even though the text may not be written on a Kremlin letterhead. You must discover it, you must contradict and counteract it wherever you find it. And to do this often requires skill and courage equal to the heroism demanded in facing blazing fire of enemy guns or enduring the fierce strength of raging hurricanes. The men who go down to the sea in ships have a special brand of bravery which has ever been the envy of the landlocked, and America prays today that you may have courage in abundance to bring her safely through the soul-searing storms of these fateful times.

"You have to go out, but you don't have to come back." These ancient words have rung in the minds and hearts of the men of the Coast Guard for many generations. They must have a deep and penetrating meaning to you, as in your turn you go out to meet the challenge of a war against insidious Communistic foes in a divided and confused America. For our national conscience has been sabotaged, and the bugle call to action sounds an uncertain note. We know not which way to turn to meet the enemy. But the war is very real. The stakes are high, and unless you are alert and courageous you may well never come back. And 50 million Americans may perish with you.

I do not give you my opinion. I present a fact which no amount of wishful thinking or loose talking can alter—the grim reality that communism is the most immediate and dangerous threat to America and her free way of life. Where lies proof of this? Attend to the sad litany of 22 once free, now captive countries—among them heroic Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and Hungary; North Korea, North Vietnam, East Germany, Tibet, Czechoslovakia—and so across the map of the world communism infiltrates and dominates, until at last Russia and America are face to face.

Modern history is filled with the wreckage of nations whose leaders thought they could temporize with Communist promises and guarantees and still maintain their liberties. Today, they are the victims of the most monstrous tyranny known to man. They accepted Communists within their free governments; they gave them the protection of their laws; they believed them when they professed that they had no desire to overthrow the countries' legitimate authorities and subjugate their peoples. The faith and good will of these once free nations toward Communists were rewarded with base treachery. And now freedom is but a memory, made more bitter by the knowledge that they themselves played key parts in its loss.

We must remember that history is the only record from which men can profit. By the record of the recent past—which is spread across the face of the earth for all to read—communism condemns itself, for there it tells its own sordid tales of hopes blighted, promises broken, pledges violated, and 900 million peoples enslaved. What has been written is written, and all the waters of the earth's seas cannot wash it away. If we familiarize ourselves with that record we shall take a giant step toward safeguarding our dearly bought liberties, for it is better to be warned by memory than to be betrayed by hope.

Communism is not an idea, it is not an ideal. It is a way of life, a way of life totally opposed to the heritage of freedom which we have received from our fathers. A way of life opposed to every idea, to every ideal we hold sacred and for which millions of our brothers have shed their blood. Misinformed peoples, deceived by the variety of blueprints of peace offered by the Communists, have listened to the silken words of propaganda and have rushed madly to their doom.

What is the Communist blueprint of conquest proposed for America? One of its main objectives is to destroy our belief in the fundamentals of religion and morality. We need but to look about us to see how far we ourselves have departed from the religious practices and the moral code of our fathers. For more than two generations the practice of religion has grown steadily weaker in our Nation's life. We are now reaping the harvest sown over the past decades. A dreadful harvest it is—terrible and terrifying crimes committed by juvenile delinquents; a breakdown of morality in public life so that we now must have a code of ethics for public officials to remind them of what they should have learned earlier in life; the sale of tons of obscene literature to the young, a multimillion-dollar industry; and a daily menu of film and television depravities. Nor is it necessary to fish for further examples from out the dregs of our modern living.

Immorality is not communism, revolt from God is not communism but immorality and irreligion are the best climate for the growth of communism and when we drive God and His law from our lives we have struck a blow for the enemy.

The Founding Fathers of our great country were religious, God-fearing men and their faith in God and man gave birth to our country and to our traditions. Our Nation began with the sacrifices of religious men, and it grew strong in the blessings our faith merited from God. If we depart from our religious beliefs, if we cast aside the moral principles which are the pillars of our national strength, then we are definitely and rapidly moving along the road to personal and national destruction. The faith of our fathers is stronger by far than any weapon of the enemy. The teachings of our faith are more appealing to the hearts of men than the deceits of propaganda. By the ex-

ample of our own lives, believing in the fatherhood of God and living the brotherhood of man, we can save our own immortal souls and influence and help others to save their souls. This is America's way of life. We are in possession of divine truth itself. What the Communist promises with a sneer to those whom he would destroy, we already have in our religious heritage and tradition. Our precious heritage of our faith and our patriotism have been fortified by the sacrifices of our forefathers. Shall we squander it, and in the squandering destroy ourselves?

Cadets of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy you have the training, you have the tradition, you have the rough-hewn philosophy of sacrifice which will assure you victory for yourselves and your country. In this crucial hour we Americans must have the strength and the courage to maintain the noble vision which has been given to us in the faith of our fathers, and we must pray that we shall not be false to its lights and inspirations.

One of America's proudest utterances proclaims the glorious fact that we are "a nation under God." The quality of faith which inspired those sublime and meaningful words must be recaptured if we are to insure our own salvation and the survival of our free and wondrous land; for, in the last analysis it will be the faith of America which shall determine the fate of America—either the faith of the Communists or the faith of our fathers.

As earlier we shared our prayers, I now would like to share with you some thoughts on what we have done here this morning. The dedication of a building to the glory of God is an act of supreme importance. The intense, far-reaching spiritual effects of our actions are expressed by the church in these words, "This is truly an awesome place." Truly we stand in awe of what we have done—the fruit of the heart and the hands of man will be forever the dwelling place of the living God. This chapel is the gate of Heaven, and the court of God. The Lord shall remain here with you; may you always stay close to Him.

In a wider sense the entire Hudson Valley is for me an awesome place, rich in the beauties of nature, dwelling place of duty, stern daughter of the voice of God. To visit the valley of the Hudson is to make a pilgrimage to the shrine of duty consecrated by the sacrifices of religious and military martyrs. In this valley America grew strong, in these highlands of the Hudson was she shielded from those Herod-like tyrants who would slay an infant nation.

It is the good fortune of our country that you are privileged to spend your years of formation in this sanctuary dedicated to honor, duty and service of country. At the head of the valley you may see the raw courage of Nicholas Herkimer at Oriskany and the brilliance of Benedict Arnold at Saratoga, while to the south you may ponder the unwavering leadership of Anthony Wayne at Stony Point. These great victories secured for our new nation the Hudson Valley correctly described as the key to a continent.

We have come a long way since those days—Morgan's forced march from Philadelphia to Saratoga could now be made in less than an hour, and Mad Anthony would be able to demolish the fortifications of Stony Point without leaving the sunshine of Florida. We have come a long way also in another direction. We have entered a new era which has been recently described as the "age of the shrug." You are young men and in this new age you may well discover the answer to the questions asked by Patrick Henry: "Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs, and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot?" Pray God that while there is yet time America may realize that you cannot shrug off the yoke of the conqueror be it forged in steel or in the base metal of propaganda.

So far have we traveled along the wrong road that I feel it our duty as Americans to contrast the vice of Benedict Arnold and the virtue of Anthony Wayne, to speak of the strength and the weakness which have been witnessed by the sheer cliffs of West Point and the brooding rocks of Stony Point.

If General Washington were asked in the summer of 1777 to name his outstanding officers he would certainly have placed Benedict Arnold very near the top of the list. And the conduct of Arnold at Saratoga would have justified his choice. Is there not the legend that even in the white heat of rage at Arnold's base treachery it was said that the leg of the traitor mangled at Saratoga would be buried with full military honors while the rest of him would be hanged?

Saratoga, considered one of the decisive battles of world history, was the climax of Arnold's career. A brilliant soldier, an acknowledged master of military science, Benedict Arnold is remembered chiefly for his treason. What happened to him—was it a desire for luxurious living, wounded pride, religious bigotry? Historians may argue and biographers may choose but this much is certain—he gazed too long on the face of the enemy. He found it comely. He saw there an escape from the harsh realities of life. We too have gazed too long on the face of the enemy, and many of our fellow Americans see there a solution and an escape from fearsome reality. Too many of us have gazed on the face of the enemy until they see there not the countless crushed bodies of freedom fighters of the world but only the seductive smile of the sinister master of Moscow. They have gazed on the face of the enemy too long and now they are deaf to all save the husky voice of the sorcerer, as glibly he speaks of peaceful coexistence, competition in consumer goods.

Benedict Arnold placed his personal problems and his religious bigotry above duty to his country until finally he slipped down the dark waters of the Hudson to the sloop *Vulture* eventually to die in the slums of London. If Americans continue to place a high standard of living above duty to country then we too shall be picked up by today's vulture and carried to suffering and death as have brave but unthinking men before us.

In what seems to be long years ago I stood on these plains of West Point and upon the vigil of the Second World War spoke of the "Road to Victory." Today I must speak of the "Road to War"—a war of the spirit, a war of ideas and ideals.

The impregnable face of Stony Point is a constant reminder that unwavering leadership, complete devotion to duty, rigorous personal discipline can topple any obstacle in the path of America. Within sight of these gray walls Anthony Wayne proved that the human spirit is supreme to any and all material obstacles. There is no need to labor this point with you, cadets of the U.S. Military Academy. You have but to consider the monuments on every side to read again the list of valiant men who were here formed and grounded in the essentials of duty and leadership. To protect our beloved country they marched from here through the length and breadth of the world.

Our enemies have learned to their sorrow that physical power and brute strength are but weak weapons when used to attack the spirit of America. Mighty bastions of oppression around the world have toppled beneath our blows as did Stony Point fall to Anthony Wayne. And for the same reasons—complete devotion to duty, unwavering leadership, rigorous personal discipline.

The enemies of liberty have learned their lesson well, and, for the moment at least, they hesitate to attack us with military power. Rather have they moved the attack to another level. They have unleashed the full force of bestial fury against the moral and religious fiber of America. Duty, leadership, discipline shall once again, under God, bring us victory despite the narcotic of consumer competition, and peaceful coexistence so skillfully administered that we do not realize that liaison with the assassin can end only in the death of the victim.

The grim fact of today's world is this: America is under spiritual siege and her defenses are crumbling. Your warfare is not yet against flesh and blood because the destruction of our spiritual heritage is not yet complete. The rugged uncompromising morality of our fathers has yielded to the simple question, "What's in it for me?" Is this not the same question Benedict Arnold asked himself when he first considered his acts of treason? And is not his answer echoed in the hearts and actions of many Americans today? Is it too much to say that the swelling tide of loose living and personal immorality is also a form of treason? Although it is a treason of pleasure and selfishness committed by foolish and thoughtless men, still it weakens our national fiber and draws us closer to destruction. The treason of Arnold was a deliberate, malicious act calculated to destroy his country. But we will be just as dead, and our country will suffer, be our betrayal stupid or contrived.

The litany of our national transgressions of the moral law is a sordid tale—betrayal of the common good for personal gain, destruction of the home for personal pleasure, dishonesty in public office for personal profit and so on down the miserable categories of depravity. Slowly but surely the individual and his pleasures are becoming the norm of morality and the object of every judgment.

Can a nation be stronger than the sum total of her citizens? If there be no discipline in our personal lives how can we expect to find sacrifice in our national life? To be profligate in our personal lives is truly treason because it aids the enemy to execute his blueprint for Communist domination. The flame of religious fervor which burned so brightly in the days of our fathers has sunk so low that we see no wrong in attempting to join forces with men who burn churches, destroy temples, and murder those who bless the name of God. We are now reaping the bitter harvest of generations of religious apathy and indifference. Because we have abandoned God we have no firm foundation for moral judgment. Is it an exaggeration to say that this is giving aid and comfort to the enemy? The sad course of modern history shows quite clearly that it is a Communist tactic to crush religion and destroy morality. Sometimes it is done by force of arms, sometimes by the sheer weight of words. In either case the result is the same, with liberty lost and the nation destroyed. Study the case of any Soviet-enslaved nation and there you will find Communist propaganda first appealing to the selfish desires of the weak, and later Communists tanks crushing them in the streets of their own cities before they could taste the fruits of their sins.

The same general plan of conquest is in motion in our own land today and so successfully has it been carried out that many Americans are beginning to feel that rather than endanger our standard of living we should take another look at the possibility of cooperating with the enemy. Wise men

learn from history, but, in spite of the abundant evidence of the desire of Russia to engulf the world, in spite of the fact the Russia under communism has reached our own shores in her march to world power, we Americans have failed to learn our lesson from those once free now captive nations who have made the same mistake before us.

It is vital to the safety of America that you cadets of West Point realize that your contribution to our national welfare is not limited to the field of battle. You must be convinced that you are engaged in a war of ideals. Share this conviction with others. Help to restore to our national life those precious concepts of duty, leadership, and sacrifice for the glory of America. When you leave this citadel of duty and honor take with you your conviction that the code is bigger than any one man or personal friendship. And I pray that your devotion to the principles of justice and truth be always as deep rooted and real as it is today; for then will your sacrifices for goodness and truth be rewarded by the strength and security of your beloved country in this world, and your own salvation with God.

Radio Program Entitled "Today in Congress"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, throughout this 1st session of the 86th Congress we who are privileged to serve in this body have had a unique service rendered us and I feel some recognition should be given it. I refer to Joseph McCaffrey's nightly radio program, "Today in Congress," in which Mr. McCaffrey summarized the day's developments here on Capitol Hill and informed us of the program scheduled for the following day.

What made this program unique is the fact that it is the only one of its kind on the air, a sort of Congressional Record of the Air, devoted exclusively to the workings of Congress and all the other interesting events which take place here on the Hill.

Mr. McCaffrey has spent 12 years covering Capitol Hill and knows intimately the workings of Congress. From his experience and his knowledge of the Hill, Mr. McCaffrey is able to capture and compress into his program lively and interesting comprehensive reports of the day's doings.

"Today in Congress" is sponsored each session by the Independent Airlines Association as part of its public service activities.

I know that I do not speak first for those of us immediately concerned, but for those who work in and around the Capitol, and those in other Federal departments whose jobs require them to keep an ear turned to congressional happenings; when I say that this program has been most helpful and that we are indebted to the Independent Airlines Association for making it possible.

The Airlines and Logistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JARMAN
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial which appeared in the New York Times entitled "The Airlines and Logistics."

During this session of Congress, the question of the Military Air Transport Service and its increasing competition with the civilian air carriers has received much attention and has often been a subject for discussion in both Houses. In keeping with my feeling, and that of many of my colleagues, that MATS should be kept out of the airline business and restricted to military functions, I wish to call attention to this editorial.

The editorial follows:

THE AIRLINES AND LOGISTICS

The country has two merchant marine fleets—the ships of the sea and the great carriers of the air. In both of these fields of commercial transport it is generally felt that pressure must be maintained on Government, to prevent the encroachment of federally operated transport systems on the domain of private endeavor.

Both also feel that military establishments could and should do more to channel military cargoes and passengers to private carriers. And, indeed, the Armed Forces are, on both counts, good customers of the air and sea fleets. They recognize, as military authorities have repeatedly made clear, that ships are priceless auxiliaries of the Navy in time of emergency and that private air fleets are an essential part of the military overseas logistic pipeline.

Congress sought, in the session that just ended, to bolster private air enterprise by forcing a reorientation of the Military Air Transport Service nearer to its basic defense mandate: readiness for swift airlift of military personnel and equipment overseas in the event of emergency. In Congress, in the Defense Department and elsewhere in the administration (everywhere, in fact, except in the Air Force itself) there was general agrement that MATS should turn over much of its routine worldwide airline operations to private lines and concentrate on its job. Yet, strangely, this was not accomplished.

The airlift arm has become the world's largest airline. Last year it carried 62 percent of all transatlantic cargo. The regular U.S. carriers handled 17 percent. MATS carries 25 percent of all transatlantic passengers. It has more than 400 aircraft and some 480 stewardesses.

Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY of Oklahoma, who led the fighth to aid the airlines, warned that in 1960 more than 90 percent of the military passenger traffic scheduled by MATS will move on routes where scheduled airlines operate. He and others in the campaign asked two questions: Can MATS be a commercial-type airline and still be ready for emergency? Can military authorities expect commercial lines to stand ready with adequate emergency fleets if Federal competition continues to stifle private enterprise?

The answer to both questions appears clearly to be "No." A redirection of the big airline's activities is an administrative matter, not legislative: It is a move that is long overdue.

Tragedies at Railroad Crossings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, recently there were two great tragedies at railroad crossings, one at Mount Lake Park, Md., where seven children were killed and numerous children were injured, some of the critically, when a school bus was struck by a train at an unprotected grade crossing, and one at Waseca, Minn., where a mother and six children were killed when their automobile was struck by a train at another unprotected grade crossing.

Mr. President, at one time there were warning gates and guards at grade crossings but they have been gradually disappearing from the scene resulting in tragedies such as the above. I introduced a bill that would require all of the railroad companies of the United States to erect warning gates and post a guard at all grade crossings adjacent to the schools. By doing so, I think that we will avert tragedies such as the two great tragedies which happened so close together in the sister State of Maryland which borders us and the sister State of Minnesota which borders my State of North Dakota.

Mr. President, there appeared an article in the Washington, D.C., Star entitled "School Buses Ply 27 Rail Crossings," which gives a rundown on the places where public school buses daily transport children over 27 railroad crossings in the suburban areas of Maryland and Virginia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point since it has a bearing on the bill I introduced.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCHOOL BUSES PLY 27 RAIL CROSSINGS—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SUBURBAN AREAS TAKE STRICT SAFETY PRECAUTIONS

Public school buses daily transport children over 27 railroad crossings in the suburban areas of Maryland and Virginia, a survey shows.

Although most of the crossings are on seldom used spur lines, school transportation officials in each of the jurisdictions surrounding the District said yesterday strict precautions are observed to insure that buses cross the tracks safely.

The survey was prompted by a school bus-train accident in Oakland, Md., on September 10 which killed seven children.

Last Wednesday a grand jury investigating the accident recommended that trains decrease their speed during school hours, especially at crossings; flashing red lights to be installed on top of all school buses, and that school bus drivers be given periodic surprise checks.

School officials in Fairfax County, Va., and Prince Georges County, Md., reported each area has 10 railroad crossings used by school buses.

Montgomery County, Md., has four; Arlington County, Va., two, and the city of Alexandria, Va., one.

PRINCE GEORGES

Prince Georges County has about 200 school buses which carry more than 26,000 students daily. Between 1,000 and 2,000 are carried over 10 railroad crossings.

If possible, buses are routed around railroad crossings even if the route is lengthened by an extra mile or so, according to John Heim, director of school transportation.

"If we avoided all crossings we'd add 4 or 5 hours to some runs and we don't have enough buses to do that," he said.

In Ardmore, bus drivers are told never to take a load across the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks at Ardwick Road. However, they can use the crossing if the vehicle carries no children.

When loaded, the bus uses the Wickfield road bridge about 2 miles away. This bus serves the Landover Hills Elementary School.

Buses use the Pennsylvania Railroad crossing at Springfield-Hill Meade Road in Bowie, and a Seabrook crossing while serving Bowie Elementary, Glenridge Junior High, and Bladensburg Senior High. Both crossings have a watchman, Mr. Heim said.

WATCHMAN ON DUTY

A watchman also is stationed at the Pennsylvania crossing at Glenn Dale Road, which is crossed by buses serving Lincoln Elementary, Glenridge Junior High, Bladensburg Senior High, and Fairmont Heights Junior-Senior High.

The Baltimore & Ohio Railroad crossing at Calvert Road in College Park is guarded by a flashing-light signal and is used by buses serving College Park Elementary.

Other B. & O. crossings are used at Riverdale Road by buses serving Northwestern High School, and at Bladensburg Road by buses going to Bladensburg Senior High and schools for handicapped children at Calvert Homes and Mount Rainier. The two crossings have gates and flashing-light signals.

The Pope's Creek spurline of the Pennsylvania Railroad crosses four roads used by school buses servicing the southern part of the county. These unguarded crossings are at Mitchellville, Central Avenue, Upper Marlboro, and another road farther south.

Buses using one or more of these four crossings carry children attending Mullikin, Tall Oaks, Brandywine, Orme, Holly Grove, and the Marlboro Elementary Schools, in addition to Gwynn Park Junior High and Douglass and Frederick Sasscer Junior-Senior Highs.

FAIRFAX COUNTY

In Fairfax County, 29 county school buses cross 10 railway tracks twice daily.

William H. Ebhardt, supervisor of school transportation, said bus drivers cross tracks only when necessary.

Buses, he said, are timed for the number of seconds it takes them to cross the railroad tracks. The average bus takes about 6 seconds to cross a double line of tracks, he said.

Mr. Ebhardt outlined this safety procedure:

Each bus stops at the grade crossing so the driver can look both ways along the track. The youngster that serves as safety patrolman, gets out and crosses the tracks, looking both ways.

The patrolman then waves the driver across. Before starting up, the driver again looks both ways and then crosses in low gear, not changing gears until he is across.

Mr. Ebhardt said two school employees are on the road at all times checking for safety violations by bus drivers.

County police and Southern Railway inspectors also check on the drivers, he added.

Seven school buses cross over three Southern Railway grade crossings twice a day in Fairfax. Two of the crossings are at Burke and one at Clifton.

There are seven grade crossings on the single track Old Dominion line, which is used infrequently, Mr. Ebhardt said. The crossings and the number of buses using them are: Vienna, five; Dunn Loring Road, two; Cadar Lane Road, three; Shreve Road, four; Route seven in Falls Church, one; Herndon, six; and Hunter Mill Road, one.

All buses make the crossings twice daily.

MONTGOMERY

In Montgomery County, a decision to reroute school buses from two main line grade crossings was made several weeks ago by the school board's transportation director, Richard M. Ream.

Mr. Ream said the two crossings "always worried me."

They were at Halpine and Randolph roads, the only locations where school buses crossed main railroad lines in the county. Baltimore & Ohio railroad crossings in the upper county—at Gaithersburg, Boyds, and Dickerson—are made through underpasses.

At four spots in the county, school buses cross seldom-used spur lines where trains pass at a slow pace after a brakeman halts automobile traffic.

The spur line crossings are on River Road, Dorset Avenue, Jones Mill Road, and Connecticut Avenue.

ARLINGTON

Both school officials and railroad spokesmen agree that railroad crossings in Arlington County do not present a problem.

A school official said school buses travel over two grade crossings, but that all of these involve freight lines over which slow-moving and infrequent trains pass.

A Washington & Old Dominion Railroad spokesman said the railroad maintains about 11 miles of single-track right-of-way in the county. The rail line connects Alexandria with the railroad terminus in Purcellville, Loudoun County.

A spur line, or switchback, branches away from the main line and connects with Rosslyn. In addition, the Pennsylvania Railroad has a short spur line which crosses the 14th Street Bridge to the Pentagon. The spur continues a short distance to Rosslyn.

ALEXANDRIA

The only grade crossing used by school buses in Alexandria is where a sidetrack crosses Washington Street at Wilkes Street.

Assistant Superintendent Raymond F. Sanger said three buses cross that track each schoolday. He added that a school guard always is on duty near that location and signals to the buses if a train is approaching. He noted, however, that the track is used only a few times a week and that trains always travel at low speed.

Mr. Sanger said one bus crosses the track daily en route to Lyles Crouch Elementary School. Two buses cross on their way to the Robert E. Lee Elementary School.

Perversion Portrayed in Mail to Kids

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. AVERY. The following is an article by Bill Colvin, editor of the Manhattan (Kans.) Mercury newspaper which, in my opinion, merits the close attention of all Members of Congress. It is a very excellent article on a subject which is everybody's business. The article follows:

PERVERSION PORTRAYED IN MAIL TO KIDS
(By Bill Colvin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Much of what is written below will be found offensive by many readers. It is shocking. But it was not written as a shock-treatment gimmick to get you to read. The article is the result of an experience in Washington that we believe should be conveyed as clearly and candidly as possible to every parent in every community. If some good is accomplished, we will run the risk of offending.)

WASHINGTON.—How would you like to have your teenage son or daughter take a "correspondence course" in sexual perversion?

I realize this is a shocking and revolting statement. But unless sufficient numbers of parents are shocked and revolted—mainly through the family newspapers of the country, such as the Mercury, where ordinarily such subjects are taboo—the chances get better every day that teenagers in Manhattan are going to be tempted to be enrollees in the "courses" I have mentioned.

Like me, you probably have scoffed at, or at least minimized, the seriousness of the obscene mail problem. But I have changed my mind after seeing a display of this filth, pornography, and perversion that has been taken from the U.S. mails. It is kept under lock and key in a room across the hall from the office of Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield in Washington.

The display in itself was enough to cause the concern I hope to pass along to you. My concern was heightened by the conviction with which the Postmaster General is attacking this problem, for it was Summerfield who personally escorted me into this actual "chamber of horrors."

Have I been too strong in my opening statement of this story? I honestly don't think so after the nauseating experience of seeing what the Nation's filth mongers—to use a charitable description—are mailing to increasing numbers of our youths.

It may surprise you to know this is a half-billion-dollar-a-year enterprise.

It is so lucrative—and becoming more and more so—that there is strong suspicion on the part of responsible authorities, including Postmaster General Summerfield and FBI Chief J. Edgar Hoover, that the field is being eyed seriously by the organized underworld. The Post Office Department is certain that the racketeers already have made a start in it in certain cities—along with their dope, prostitution, and other dirty money schemes.

At the outset let me make it abundantly clear that what we are concerned with is not censorship. This is clearly objectionable and immoral, obscene material going through the mails into fertile fields—children's hands, eyes, and minds. (Unfortunately, the censorship case of "Lady Chatterley's Lover" has arisen in the midst of the obscene mail campaign and has confused the real issue somewhat.)

This is not art, although there are some borderline materials that have been declared art by the courts. The bulk of this junk is not art by any stretch of the imagination.

The so-called art studies or art poses mailings, whether they are actually art or not by interpretation or legal ruling, are not the chief worry causers to the Post Office Department. Postmaster General Summerfield stresses, however that these works of art are the teasers or the starters. In a less serious way perhaps, they can be likened to eventual addiction to dope after being introduced to marihuana. As such they too have become targets of the Department and some local groups.

Gradually youngsters all over the Nation have become somewhat calloused to the art poses. What once was a thrill to kids a generation ago is now old stuff, thanks to a

multitude of magazines on practically every newsstand that leave little or nothing to the imagination. But they still serve to tease—and, better yet, they provide the mailing lists for the plainly obscene and the perverted poses and writings.

And over the course of the years the filthmongers' techniques have improved. Only a few of the photographs are of dilapidated old hags. Relatively young women who might pass for coeds model for these perverted photos that defy description in most oral conversation, let alone writing.

"A young girl or boy with no sex education gets ahold of a set of these," Summerfield says. "He or she sees a normal appearing, attractive person photographed in an unnatural act. Not knowing what is normal the natural inclination is for them to accept this as the normal way to have relations. A potential pervert has been created."

(Summerfield, in an aside, calls attention to the attractive girl who has posed for a series of these acts of perversion. She is a schoolteacher, the postoffice inspectors have found out, in a small southern town. She handsomely adds to her substandard pay as a teacher by making periodic weekend trips to New York to pose for these photographs.)

No, this is not the stuff you and I sneaked into our rooms or gawked at in the alley behind the high school when we were kids. This is mainline material kids are being tempted with—through the mails—by a vastly better organized bunch of filth mongers than they were 20 or 25 years ago.

Quite aside from the warped sexual morals this trash breeds it has been found there is a traceable and direct relationship between the volume of this mail to the juvenile crime rate.

The Federal authorities are convinced that youngsters agitated by the photographs, literature, gimmicks, and movies set forth on a sex sashay—many times with what are mild intentions in their own minds. Thwarted and frustrated when they meet resistance, their aroused and distorted minds flare to violence. The result: the sex maimings and sex murders that are becoming more frequent headline pieces in the papers. The germ was planted in all probability, by a mailed piece of obscenity.

Keep in mind I am not talking about the "arty" kind of stuff but about indescribable photos, drawings and even moving pictures, mainly featuring perversion and unnatural acts.

Many men readers have been to stags where those movies have been shown. But I will challenge any normal man—even as calloused as newsmen frequently get to be—to view two films I saw in the postoffice exhibit and not be shocked beyond any previous experience. These two particular films, by the way, had been sent through the mails. They were being sold by a 16-year-old boy in Texas.

Remember, however, that the first approach, the inroads, the conditioning, was made by the so-called art studies and the girly magazines anyone can buy on almost any newsstand.

Where does this obscene material come from? The Postmaster General's investigators have established New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles as the chief points of origination. But they are mailed everywhere and no home is off-limits to these filth peddlers. They employ first-class mail because that class is not subject to postal inspection. What's more the obscene material market has become so profitable they can afford the first-class rates.

Thousands and thousands of copies can be made from one photographic negative at a fraction of a cent each. Reading material is easily and cheaply reproduced by modern methods. The movies are generally foreign imports. They too are mass copied. Perversion is the keynote here too.

There is even evidence that enterprising youngsters themselves find the filth market profitable. In one particularly nauseating display of drawings depicting unnatural acts there was a group of copies drawn by an artistically inclined teenager. He was cutting out the middleman by doing his own art work and offering them for sale.

I admit that my previous conclusion about Postmaster General Summerfield's attitude was that maybe he just hadn't been exposed to the facts of life or that he is overemphasizing the problem. My conclusion is now that I hadn't been exposed enough myself to the facts of this situation.

In the first place the Postmaster General is bound by Federal statute to ban from the mails any obscene material. This stuff that is going to teenagers by the ton—17 mail bags full picked up in just one haul in New York—is clearly and undeniably obscene. Thus Summerfield is only doing what he is directed to do. But better than that he is reacting in a way that more Americans should: He is righteously indignant and properly so.

Clearly Summerfield intends doing something about the situation that deserves stronger language than "disturbing."

Rightly, we believe, after this first-hand experience, the Postmaster General feels one of the starting places is the newsstands where the "marihuana" material is easily purchased by youngsters.

The second avenue of action is for parents of youngsters receiving obscene mail to take it to their local postmasters. They in turn will turn it over to the inspection department of the Post Office Department for possible prosecution.

Thanks largely to Summerfield the Federal law has now been changed permitting prosecution at the point of receipt. Formerly the offenders could only be tried at the point of mailing. Obviously it would be difficult to take witnesses from Kansas to New York or Los Angeles and as long as the law stayed that way convictions were few and far between. Recently, however, the first conviction was rendered under the new law. Two culprits were prosecuted in Idaho and given 10-year sentences.

Mailing lists? They are easy to come by. Purveyors of perversion frequently buy school yearbooks as their source. Teaser ads—"send just 19 cents for a water gun"—furnish a wealth of names for these folk.

I want to stress once again that I am not easily shocked. I don't think the Postmaster General is either. He appears to me to be a man who has been around the block, as they say. But I can easily understand now what he is talking about when he rises up against obscene mail. I think he has tackled something that is inherently more dangerous to the national welfare than the objects of a good many other crusades that seem more justifiable to the public.

WHAT TO DO? TWO ACTIONS LOCALLY

A two-pronged attack is the approach recommended by Postmaster General Summerfield for combating the inroads of obscene mail and literature.

Success is almost entirely dependent on action from the local level.

One is for parents to take objectionable material that comes to their house in the mail to the local postmaster. He, in turn, will forward it to the Inspector General's office in Washington for possible prosecution. It is necessary to get conviction after conviction to halt the volume of this material that is going through the mail.

The second is to rid local newsstands of objectionable material. Here moral and economic pressure is the key weapon.

Since the courts generally hold in favor of these magazines—the teasers for the more obscene material through the mail—the Post Office Department is powerless to ban most of it from the mails. But local pressures are and can be effective. Organizations like the parent-teacher associations, ministerial alliances, patriotic organizations such as the American Legion, and women's groups all can have important, dynamic, and telling parts in this off-the-newsstand phase that is a major blow against obscenity in the mails. It boils down to refusing to trade with stores with this filth on their newsstands.

Indianapolis, Ind., for example, has been signally effective. In a campaign spearheaded by the Governor of that State several of the above-named organizations went to work assisted by local authorities. They were also aided statewide by the magazine distributors association. The publishers and distributors of the "clean" magazines are finding the economic inroads of the "art" publications are serious. So they have helped.

Today in Indianapolis and several other Indiana cities it is virtually impossible to buy 72 of the worst offender magazines. And among these are some pretty popular and well-known publications that have strayed too far over the borders of decency and morality.

It would be interesting to see what could be accomplished in Kansas and its communities. This State has not been the target of obscene literature that more populated ones have been up to now. But unless action is forthcoming it seems inevitable that the same sickening experience of others awaits us.

As Postmaster General Summerfield summarizes:

Don't be mistaken. This is not censorship. It is not "book burning." Not just a bogeyman scare dreamed up by some do-gooders. This is stomping out an evil that can touch everyone's home.

The Hellenic University of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, recently a group of prominent Americans of Greek extraction led by Judge John C. Pappas, Ambassador Thomas A. Pappas, Mr. Spyros P. Skouras, and others inaugurated plans for the Hellenic University of America, a nonsectarian institution for the enrollment of all students regardless of faith, nationality, race, or creed. History has recorded ancient Greece's many contributions to civilization and they are too many to restate here. However, it is most significant that Americans of the Greek heritage will give to America an educational institution at a time when colleges and universities are full to the brim and prospects of future enrollment for many of our youth in this country will become more and more difficult because of the overcrowded conditions in our Nation's colleges.

To assure the success of the Hellenic University, His Eminence, Archbishop Iakovos, primate of the Greek Orthodox

Church in the Americas, is the honorary chairman of the project and the full support of the many Orthodox Churches' clergy and laymen leaders will be given to the project. I am also informed that the leaders of the many Greek-American organizations, such as, George Loucas of AHEPA, Phillip Williams of GAPA, Demetrios Tsintolas of Pan-Arcadians, Speros Boudoures of GOYA, Andrew Fasseas of Pan-Lacohians, Charles Kotsilibas Davis of Pan-Eleians, and the leaders of Philoptohos, Epirotians, Pan-Rhodians, Macedonians, Pan-Messinians, Levcadians, Fanarion, Cretans, Pan-Cypriots, Naxios, Voice of Greek Orthodoxy, and Daughters of Penelope have expressed their approval and desire to aid such a worthy National Institution for education of the youth.

To best illustrate the great need for such a college of learning and the great effort needed to fulfill this dream for a Hellenic University, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of these remarks an address by Judge John C. Pappas at the Supreme Convention of AHEPA in Los Angeles in excerpt form, a letter to Judge Pappas from P. Tsoumpris, supreme counselor of GAPA and past supreme president of Pan-Arcadians, an editorial from the Boston Traveler, and an article by Richard Jacobson in the Boston Traveler.

Mr. President, I wish the sponsors of the Hellenic University great success because it will bring to our Nation another university at a time when there is the great need. The success of this program will require the best efforts of all, and I am sure that the foundations and those who are in a position to do so will lend a helping hand to the Americans of Greek descent who will make a noble contribution to America in the form of the Hellenic University.

There being no objection, the address, letter, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am speaking, of course, of the eventual establishment of the Hellenic University of America—using the existing facilities of the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox Theological School in Brookline, Mass., as the nucleus.

The provocative plan for the eventual establishment of our own university has been approved by the board of trustees of our theological school, and I am delighted to tell you that work started some time ago on the very first of the new buildings at the seminary, and that I am hopeful by the time I return to Boston the new building will be completed. Thus, the actual physical work on our own Hellenic-sponsored university has begun, and step No. 1 practically completed.

The board of trustees of our seminary has also unanimously voted to accept the creation of the charitable vehicle through which funds will be accepted for the eventual establishment of our university.

The charitable corporation through which the archdiocese will accept funds will be known as the Friends of the Proposed Hellenic University of America.

Without going into details let me read to you the corporate purposes and powers from the bylaws:

"To foster the charitable, educational, and eleemosynary purposes of the Greek archdiocese of North and South America, and more particularly for the purposes of expanding the physical facilities and educational program of the theological school of the archdiocese in Brookline, Mass., enlarging the religious instruction program of the said archdiocese, providing for the eventual establishment of a nonsectarian university with the theological school as a nucleus in said Brookline, Mass., to be known as the Hellenic University of America, provide financial aid to the patriarchate, and for such other educational and religious objectives as the said archdiocese may determine."

Thus, step No. 2—the medium through which we can accept funds—has been accomplished by the board.

Step No. 3—the acquisition of more real property contiguous with our present property—has also been accomplished. I am delighted to tell you that the theological school has just purchased 25 acres of land adjoining its property, thus providing the land requirements for the eventual establishment of our university. You will be happy to know that the theological school now owns approximately 60 acres of desirable land which is more than sufficient space for the university we envision.

With the unanimous aproval and finalization of these three steps—the adoption of the plan to establish the Hellenic University of America, the approval of the establishment of the Friends of the Proposed Hellenic University of America, as a means of raising funds, the acquiring of more real property—the board of trustees has been alert, astute, and farsighted. They should be commended for their wisdom.

The concept of the eventual establishment of the Hellenic University of America is a provocative plan, and goes hand in hand with the ascending dignity of our people in this country.

His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos and America's leading Greek-American industrialist, Spyros Skouras, are cochairmen of the fund-raising activities for the proposed university.

I need not tell you how fortunate the Greek community in America is to have two such distinguished men of vision and endless energy to provide us with their leadership.

* * * * *

But, only last month in New York at a meeting with his Eminence and with Greek-American lay leaders, Mr. Skouras had this to say relative to the university:

"There is still a considerable number of us who emigrated here. But the Greek immigrant is no more. We have now the American of Greek extraction. He is an integral part of the American community. He is now a citizen of substance and moral stature. Up to now, he has been consolidating his position, contributing to American life as a whole by his industry, by his eagerness to work and to learn, by his example as a law-abiding citizen, by serving his adopted country faithfully in peace and war.

"But now he wants to give more—he is in a position to give more. And he looks around. He wants to be identified with America, to leave a lasting monument to this great country of ours, to give something of greater, more lasting value.

"One of the great needs of America today is schools. With our rapidly expanding population, this is of paramount importance.

"Everywhere the cry is for more and more schools. Young people have difficulty in entering college. There are not enough to fill the demand. Other minorities have contributed toward that need. So will the American of Greek extraction.

"Let us give America another great institution of learning, equal to our existing great and world famous universities. A university where any American of any ethnic background will be proud to send his sons, a university toward the establishment of which any American will be willing to contribute.

"Such a university then will be the contribution of the American of Greek extraction to American life and culture. And such a university must have also a school of theological studies. This will fill the need for the higher, more rounded preparation of any theological student, but especially those of the Greek Orthodox faith."

If a man of Mr. Skouras' stature can find the time to analyze the situation as just described, surely we lesser lights can find the time to dedicate ourselves to this concept of a university sponsored by Greek-Americans.

Although I spoke about the Greek spirit, the university itself will be nonsectarian; and to its halls of learning will be welcomed boys of all faiths.

As Mr. Skouras indicated, the Greek community in America will be rendering a great service to its adopted land by providing a much needed institution of higher learning.

According to all available statistics, the need for additional reputable colleges is fast becoming critical. Five years from now the need will be acute. All colleges with good standards are crowded, and admission to colleges of high standing is extremely difficult.

The establishment of a Greek-sponsored university in New England seems to me to be particularly appropriate because it was to New England shores that first came those seeking freedom, and it was in New England that the first colleges were established.

I have talked with many persons associated with colleges and universities and they are thrilled with the decision of the seminary board to establish our university. They think it is a wonderful idea.

When His Eminence Archbishop Iakovos came to Boston last spring to break ground for the first of our university buildings, we together visited His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, popular Roman Catholic archbishop of Boston. Cardinal Cushing was delighted to learn of our decision and said it was about time we did sponsor our own university. He said he would personally endorse it and would make a financial contribution toward its success as soon as the drive is commenced.

[From the Boston Traveler, Sept. 2, 1959]

ATHENS IN AMERICA

For a long time Boston has taken pride in the artistic and intellectual assets that have made it known as the Athens of America.

And now there's reason for more satisfaction, as that description takes on the shape of literal truth in plans for establishing the Nation's first Hellenic University in Jamaica Plain.

The $100 million nonsectarian college, already under construction by the Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary, will add substantially to Boston's standing as a cultural and educational center.

It comes at a fortunate time—in the midst of America's pressing need for more colleges to accommodate a fast-growing student population.

And in emphasizing the Greek heritage, as it will, it will underscore the origins of democracy, to the benefit of all of us.

As important as anything else, the new university will serve as a focus for the fine relationships that exist throughout the Greek community in America.

[From the Boston Traveler, Aug. 31, 1959]

ONE HUNDRED MILLION DOLLAR UNIVERSITY PLANNED BY GREEK GROUP

(By Richard Jacobson)

The Greek Orthodox Theological Seminary has bought the adjacent 25-acre former Bacon estate in Jamaica Plain and will build on it America's first Hellenic University.

The seminary, which now occupies a 35-acre site in Brookline and Jamaica Plain will be the nucleus of the proposed $100 million educational institution.

The university will be nonsectarian and dedicated to inspire and continue the heritage of Greek culture in America.

Although its support will come from Hellenes throughout the United States, Judge John C. Pappas, a moving force behind the development, emphasized that this "will be an educational institution which every American should and will support."

The Bacon estate was purchased at auction in 1941 by the late Vincenzo Barletta, of Roslindale, a contractor. The latter's widow sold the million-foot estate, located off Jamaica Pond, to Judge Pappas, acting for the seminary.

The purchase price was not disclosed, but it was believed to be $200,000.

Judge Pappas said the Greek community in America felt that now was the time to establish a university—a time when higher education of the American youth was so vitally needed.

SAYS GREEK CULTURE HAS MADE UNITED STATES STRONG

"Greek culture has contributed so much in the past to make America strong" he said, "that the Greek community felt this heritage should be encouraged and continued in full bloom in America and with American vigor.

"Hellenes are aware that only in education can we stop the advance of communism and dictatorship in the world. The future of Greek heritage lies in the inspiration we can give to our American youth and to those generations yet unborn.

"Only a university we can call our own—yet which will also belong to all Americans—can nurture that inspiration.

"This university—the first Hellenic University of America—will be our endowment in culture."

WILL SET UP CHAPTERS THROUGHOUT UNITED STATES

Pappas said chapters to support the proposed university would be established throughout the United States as foster alumni groups.

"Spyros Skouras, of New York and California, prominent business industrialist, will lead the campaign for the $100 million," Pappas said.

The first $250,000 building of the university is under construction and will be dedicated shortly.

It lies alongside the seminary, which is the Holy Cross Theological School.

The first structure will contain a library, classrooms, and a gymnasium.

The cost was underwritten by Judge Pappas, his brother, former U.S. Ambassador Thomas A. Pappas, Angelos Cotsidas, and Theodore Tonna, all of New England.

Pappas said Massachusetts was chosen as the site for the university because of the presence here of other great religious and educational institutions, such as Boston College, Tufts, Boston University, and Harvard.

He also cited, as an example of what an ethnic group could do, the amazing growth of Brandeis University under the auspices of the Jewish people.

"I am a member of the board of trustees of Brandeis," he said, "I have seen this educational institution rise in 10 years into one of America's mightiest schools of higher learning for all Americans."

DEAR JUDGE PAPPAS: • • • the Greek Orthodox in this country extend their deepest thanks for the initiative that you have taken in espousing the project of a Hellenic University. This is a tremendous undertaking and one that will capture the spirit and the imagination of the American people of Greek descent, as well as philathropists and educators throughout the country.

• • • First, without a doubt the most tremendous effort ever performed by the Greek people in this country in fund raising was the Greek War Relief Drive, which brought together on the national level, on the regional level, on the State level, and at the city level representatives of our many divergent groups; namely, businessmen, church leaders, and representatives of the two great national organizations, AHEPA and the Greek-American Progressive Association (GAPA), and the numerous large Topica Someta such as the Pan-Arcadian Federation, and the officers of the various churches and groups within a church community. There was hardly a group that was not represented on the Greek War Relief Committee. They did such a tremendous job in raising millions of dollars to send to Greece.

Since you and your brother Tom and Spyros Skouras, among others, are the motivating forces behind this Hellenic University, and since all of you have been for so many years leaders in the Greek War Relief movement and are so well aquainted with the people in the regional, State, and local levels, I do believe that you should call upon these people again to aid you in your nationwide campaign to raise the $100 million that will be necessary to complete this magnificent project. It will require the intensified efforts of all groups to reach the million and a half Greek-Americans in this country.

Secondly, as president of the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America, several years ago I wrote the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation after reading of their numerous bequests to colleges and asked them if their foundation could not also grant a sizable sum to the theological seminary in Boston for its expansion program. Bishop Athenagoras also wrote similar letters. Effort should be made by your committee to contact such foundations who do make substantial contributions for such a purpose.

Thirdly, there must be an intensified public information and education program in bringing vividly to our people the great need and significance of a Hellenic University. This can best be done through the Greek-American newspapers, who have thus far done a magnificent job in editorials and articles; through our Greek-American radio and television programs that are doing so much for the Greek-American community; through the Greek Orthodox Churches throughout the country by announcements from the pulpit by our reverend fathers and through the various church organization meetings; and through discussions in our national organizations, AHEPA and GAPA and Topica Someta and other Greek-American service and civic groups. This method of informing and educating Greek-Americans in the United States of the need of a Hellenic University can be conducted at very little cost and the benefits will be tremendous. You have already received the blessing of the AHEPA family with its pledge of $250,000. I know that both GAPA and the Pan-Arcadian Federation in previous conventions have endorsed the project of a Hellenic or Greek Orthodox University and you can expect their full support.

Address by Hon. William Hamilton, Postmaster General of Canada

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable William Hamilton, Postmaster General for Canada, at the 42d Annual Convention of the Direct Mail Advertising Association in Montreal, Quebec.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a particular pleasure for me, on behalf of the Government and the people of Canada, to welcome your great convention to this country. Some of you will be visiting us for the first time, but I suspect that many—and perhaps the majority—are here on return visits, for between no countries in the world is there such an ebb and flow of people as between Canada and the United States.

As a result, we understand each other rather well and, because we are good neighbors and good friends, we are able to engage in a certain amount of frank talk and discussion of a sort which is not considered polite among more casual acquaintances. There has been a good deal of this in recent years and, while I think it has all been to the good, not all of it has been clearly understood and some false impressions have been created among some people. The most unfortunate of these is that some sort of animosity exists between our two nations in the economic sphere. This is completely false.

It is not to be expected that Canada and the United States will constantly be in agreement on all important matters. In almost everything save geographical limits and natural resources, our country is but a fraction of the United States—in population, in industrial might, and in most other ways the massiveness of our good neighbor to the south is incomparably beyond that of Canada. It has been history's experience that when such a situation exists the smaller national unit falls often under the domination of the larger and in many cases loses its identity completely. This we Canadians are determined will not happen to us, and in that determination we have the complete support of the United States.

However, it is only natural that in many cases specific problems will arise where the interests of our two countries will not coincide and where Canadian interests must be protected by us. Whether it be the development of Canada's natural resources, the growth of our industrial potential, the furtherance of our cultural activities, or anything else, when we in Canada follow a certain course of action our actions are dictated by the positive values of Canada's interests and not by negative feelings of animosity toward anyone and most particularly those who are our friends and with whom we have such a tremendous amount in common.

The friendship of Canada and the United States and our unity of purpose is based on a common tradition, a respect for the rights of man and an unswerving dedication to freedom. We share the basic belief that only under free institutions, with government the servant and not the master, can the individual secure his life, his liberty and the pursuit of happiness. We are both determined to frame and follow policies which safeguard the lives and homes of our people, their peace of mind, their material well being, and above all other things, their ideals.

Members of your association from all over the United States and Canada are met here in common interest and as representatives of a field of activity in which national boundaries are of no concern. Your creations flow without let or hindrance from one nation into another and far beyond the borders of our continent and, in so doing, are a powerful and vital force in our economy and, even more important, a fundamental factor in the successful operation of our whole system of free enterprise.

I know something of the great accomplishments of the Direct Mail Advertising Association itself and of the powerful media which it represents and I congratulate you on your achievements. You are welcome here in Canada, and having some firsthand knowledge of both the members of your local committee and the efforts to which they have gone to make your convention a success, I feel sure your are going to have one of the most successful meetings of your history.

While I know that my previous association with two of Canada's principal sales and advertising organizations lends particular point to my being here with you today, it is a fact that any Postmaster General of Canada, irrespective of his other interests, would feel honored to be asked to your meeting and would feel that he comes to you as a friend of your industry and that that friendship is reciprocated by you.

For it is a cardinal principle of the postal service of Canada that we are a service organization for all Canadians and that our effectiveness depends on the existence of a friendly spirit of cooperation between those who use our services and ourselves. To achieve this, my department must as much as humanly possible adjust itself to our patron's requirements, tailor our operations to their wishes and conduct ourselves in a way which is pleasing and helpful to them. The very motto of our service is a constant reminder of that fact for it is "Servire Populo—To Serve the People" and it is that end which we have ever before us.

As in every business operation—and ours is a business operation—there are limitations to what can be done and these are set primarily by the financial resources available to us. Generally we attempt to operate on a break-even basis by which our postal revenues approximately equal our postal expenditures. We have not done badly in this respect—in the last 2 years we have had revenues of $177,500,000 and a net deficit of $400,000 and in the second revenues of $183,400,000 and a net deficit of $173,000. My good friend, Arthur Summerfield, Postmaster General of the United States, whose last annual report showed a deficit of $890 million tells me that our record in this respect in Canada is not a bad one.

Keeping postal revenues and postal expenditures approximately in balance does not mean by any means that postal service must remain static. While a growth in mail volume brings both increased revenues and increased expenditures, revenues normally increase more rapidly than expenditures and it is our policy to take advantage of this fact and use a portion of the net increase to improve and expand our service to the public and another portion to improve the working conditions of our staffs in various ways.

For example, over the past 2 years we have introduced changes in our policy covering letter carrier delivery which has allowed us to extend house to house deliveries to many new suburban areas which would previously not have been eligible for usch service. We have changed our regulations regarding rural mail services so that these might be extended to thousands of areas and persons previously not so served. We have improved our special delivery services, we have made substantial investments in stamp vending machines, commenced the sale of prepackaged stamps and made many other improvements of direct benefit to our patrons and thus to you as direct mail advertisers.

As far as our staffs are concerned, we have done much to lessen the drudgery of manual labor by the installation of mechanical aids such as conveyors, electric tractors, push-button sortation, and automatic chutes. We have done a lot of experimenting with electronic sorting and have recently let a contract to Canadair for a pilot installation of a complete electromechanical mail-sorting system. As evidence of our determination in this field, we have set up a new Engineering and Development Branch within our organization which will concentrate on developing new methods and new equipment for mail handling.

A steady liberalization of the regulations governing our employees is going on. Our whole Civil Service Act is under revision. It is to be modernized and alined with the newer ideas and practices of industry. Leave credits have been extended and their granting simplified; overtime regulations have been eased and rates adjusted to the greater satisfaction of the employees; terminal leave grants and bonuses are now far more attractive. Encouragement is given to employees' organizations such as recreation associations, credit unions, and sports groups, and the post office has frequently gone on record as being in favor of employee organizations and their functions in improving the working conditions of postal employees.

I place special emphasis in our employee relations, and travel tens of thousands of miles each year to inspect our operations and talk to all ranks of our workers, because I know that in the final analysis the quality of our service is determined by the quality of our staff and the way they do their job. We have 50,000 people in our service, we operate 12,000 post offices, and we handle over 10 million pieces of mail each day, and I am determined to carry our policy of service to the public and cooperation with such people as yourselves to every member of our service, to every part of our country, and to make it genuinely effective. In this I have the support of postal officials at all levels and of our staff and employee associations.

While we all feel that Canada's postal service today is the equal of any in the world, we shall never cease in our efforts to make it even more satisfactory.

Our concept of service to the public, however, extends far beyond improvements in mail services and working conditions. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the functions assigned to our public relations division.

In my opinion the title "Public Relations Divisions" is not the most appropriate one because it brings to mind a rather restrictive field of press releases, advertising and publicity and those other functions which normally fall under public relations work. Admittedly, these are a part of the work of this division but they represent only a portion of its activities for our staff in this field is largely engaged in activities which most business corportations would class under the heading of customer relations and client service.

I want to emphasize this point because I believe our work in this field is different and probably more emphasized than with other postal administrations. In most countries postal problems of the mailer, when they arise, are dealt with by the local postmaster or any members of his staff who happens to be available. These men are busy people, primarily concerned with the movement of the mail and no matter how much they may wish to cooperate they must deal first with the immediate problems of the day in their own operations. I suspect, too, they sometimes have a tendency to subsordinate the interests of the post office patron to the demands of effective postal administration.

In our Canadian postal service we have 22 public relations officers in 17 major centers across Canada where there is a sufficient volume of postal business to merit their work. These men cover not only that immediate point but the surrounding territory as well. Just last week, for example, when I was travelling between Halifax and Moncton I met one of our public relations officer in an area served by a tiny post office with only three employees. It was some 50 miles from his home base in Halifax. One patron using this office was a substantial mailer and our representative was there to help him with his particular problems in order that he might make better use of our services.

These men have a host of functions, all devoted to helping the public. And, because the direct mail industry accounts for such a large volume of our business each year, our public relations officers have a special interest in advising and assisting direct mail advertisers.

In this respect, our men are ready—and indeed anxious—to offer their services at a very early stage in the planning of a direct mail campaign. We have found through experience that we can often save an advertiser a great deal of time, money, and peace of mind if we are brought into a job in the planning stage.

Advertising agencies, of course, all have wonderful creative people full of smart, crisp merchandising ideas. But sometimes, in their eagerness to put out something that is different or punchy, they have a tendency to ignore the mechanics of transmission. Very often we will have agency people come to us with a new direct mail piece that rates tops in selling appeal. It is new, different, smart. The only trouble is, they have left no place in the design where postage can be prepaid, or where an adequate address can be imprinted. Often there's no possible space for the letter carrier to mark a change of address or a reason for nondelivery.

And sometimes it is a size or a shape that will, we know from sad experience, cause nothing but headaches for advertiser and post office alike.

Lately there has been for example, a rash of jumbo-size advertisements and cards. Now these look fine when they come in to us all neatly bundled and packaged. But by the time they've come down to the final sortation, it's a different story. Bundled with other, smaller pieces, they are bound to be string cut, bent and bruised. We can't help it, no matter how careful we may be.

And then, too, there's the problem of letter slots. In Canada, most letter slots are somewhat less than 4¾ inches wide. If a direct mail piece has to be folded to go in the slot, it is never the same again. It gets crushed. The art is spoiled, the presentation lost, the impact destroyed.

Against this sort of thing, our public relations officers stand ready to protect the direct mail advertiser. We don't expect you to know all the intricacies of the postal service, any more than you expect our men to be fully conversant with all the aspects of the advertising business. But we would like to have you call us in—the earlier the better—to our mutual advantage. Our public relations officer is an expert in mail handling. He will steer you around the pitfalls that may beset your mail from the time it comes off the press until it is delivered to the householder. He will see that your service company—or your service department—is supplied with up-to-date zone breakdowns and the other information they must have to handle your materials economically.

And, finally, if you do run into trouble, our public relations officer is there as a trouble-shooter to help pick up the pieces. This is a necessary part of his work—but one that can be, with your cooperation, a less time-consuming one.

No more typical example exists of these men and their devotion to their work than one postal employee of whom we are very proud and who is well known to you—Victor Perry, our senior public relations officer in Toronto, who is one of your six honorary lifetime members. Vic typifies that friendly association between the Post Office Department of Canada and our patrons, and the fact that you have honored him as you have done demonstrates far more than any words of mine the fact that this system of ours really works and really benefits postal users.

I am enthusiastic about my association with the post office, and proud of the part my department plays in your business, because I believe in the value of all kinds of advertising and feel direct mail is one great media of advertising with very special qualifications and advantages which merit its use. All media have fields in which they are preeminent but, to my mind, direct mail leads in two respects which are vital to successful advertising—personal approach and selectivity.

Not all of your output is personalized but that which is, short of the individual salesman's call, comes closest of all advertising to the personal contact. The individually addressed envelope and, even better, the individually personalized enclosure singles out the prospect as one individual human being and gets home to that individual as nothing else can. This costs money but it brings results.

Again, in the field of selectivity direct mail offers particular advantages. A campaign can be restricted geographically down to such fine divisions as one postal walk for a householder mailing; it can be directed to specific income groups, to particular professions, to language and national groups, and to just about any group that the list houses have thought of—and they have a brilliant imagination.

At the outset of my remarks I referred to the friendship which exists between Canada and the United States. I have emphasized during my speech the desire of Canada's postal service to cooperate with you and serve you. I know that the very purpose of your association and this great convention is that you may better work together and benefit one from another.

In the spirit of all these ideals, and in furtherance of our common purpose nationally, postally, and professionally, let me close by quoting to you the words of a simple Canadian spoken more than 50 years ago at the Canadian Club in Boston. You will find in them the expression of that purpose which motivates us both as citizens of two great nations and as practitioners of an activity fundamental to our way of life:

"We're the common heirs of British traditions and the common repository of the splendid achievements of the race, and whatever the flag that flies over our heads, or whatever the formal government to which we subscribe, we are common workers for the social betterment and the moral progress of mankind.

"Is there any reason why we should not neighbor * * * in the blessing of an enduring peace * * * for the high and magnificent ends of a common civilization?

"We desire only that sympathy shall beget sympathy, that confidence shall inspire confidence, and that through the changes and shocks of time we shall stand together. * * * The American people sowed this half of the continent with graves rather than have their flag dishonored or their country dismembered. We are of the same brood, as proud of our free institutions and as jealous for the independence and integrity of our young commonwealth. So let us go on together in peace and in neighborly intercourse and in hearty cooperation."

Mrs. Lydia Cady Langer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain articles, editorials, and resolutions concerning the death of Mrs. Langer.

There being no objection, the articles, editorials, and resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Steuben News, August-September 1959]

SENATOR LANGER'S WIFE PASSED AWAY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Mrs. Lydia Cady Langer, wife of Senator WILLIAM LANGER, of North Dakota, died after a long sickness. Born into a New York family of social distinction, she had been his untiring helpmate in his long and occasionally stormy career. She was known in the Capital as a gracious hostess, and the citizens of North Dakota held her in high esteem.

In addition to the Senator, the following children survive: Mrs. Emma Bulkley Schaeffer, Mrs. Lydia Cady Irwin, Mrs. Mary Erskine Gokey, and Mrs. Cornelia Langer Noland. In North Dakota, the Langers made their home in Bismarck and Wheatland.

The Steuben Society of America, which has had close ties with the Senator since he campaigned for Robert La Follette in 1924, sent him a message of condolence.

SENATORS EXPRESS SORROW AT DEATH

WASHINGTON.—The death of Mrs. William Langer, wife of the Republican Senator from North Dakota, was announced to the Senate Tuesday by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader.

DIRKSEN described Mrs. Langer as a "kindly, gracious lady."

Senator MILTON YOUNG, Republican, of North Dakota, said he regarded Mrs. Langer as one of the most outstanding and wonderful women he had ever known.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, Senate Democratic leader, also said he was deeply distressed by Mrs. Langer's death. At least 10 other Senators extended sympathy to LANGER.

Representative DON SHORT, Republican, of North Dakota, expressed his grief Tuesday.

"Mrs. Short and I were extremely grieved to learn of the passing of Mrs. William Langer," SHORT said in the message from Washington.

"No one was more highly admired and respected by North Dakotans and by all with whom she came in contact here in Washington. North Dakota has lost a fine lady who fought a valiant battle these past several months against an incurable disease.

"Our sympathy goes out to the Senator and his family."

[From the Minot Daily News, Aug. 5, 1959]

WE ADMIRED HER

In North Dakota, the State of her adoption, Mrs. William Langer will be remembered as a gracious woman who pretty well personified the ideas North Dakotans have of those qualities of loyalty and courage which a wife and mother should possess.

We think we speak just about unanimously for the State when we pay Lydia Langer such a personal tribute, and express our sincere sympathy to the Senator and all members of the Langer and Cady families in their bereavement.

The people of North Dakota have known their senior Senator and his career well enough to guess that despite the fact he has been a devoted husband and father, he probably hasn't been the easiest man in the world to keep a home for. The times in which he rose to political strength were turbulent to say the least, and the home he and Mrs. Langer kept at Bismarck while he was Governor was a place to which just about any appellant for the Governor's intervention could gain access, day or night.

Though she ran for Governor herself once, at a time when the Nonpartisan League-controlled Republican machinery needed a candidate to uphold the Langer name in politics, Mrs. Langer was really a modest woman who personally preferred to be a wife rather than a candidate. In the main she kept out of the political limelight. Yet she was, in Bismarck and afterward in Washington, a mainstay of Mr. LANGER. Her loyalty throughout her husband's controversial career made people respect her, and doubtless it was a symbol which made some of his political success possible.

The story of the West is replete with cases of eastern girls who married western men and left environments of refinement and comfort to adapt themselves successfully to new country. Lydia Langer made that adjustment, and the regard North Dakotans had for her is perhaps the best proof of her success. She was a memorable example of the popular western story.

Those messages many North Dakotans have been accustomed to receive from the Langers about Christmas time, signed "Lydia and Bill," were always gracious, and somehow they seemed personal. It may well have been Lydia's touch that made them so. Those messages will be missed. To her bereaved husband, all of us can say, "BILL, we admired Lydia."

[From Bulletin No. 28, Government Employes' Council AFL–CIO, Aug. 6, 1959]

WASHINGTON ACTIVITIES

Mrs. William Langer: We join with Senator and Mrs. Langer's legion of friends in expressing our sympathy to Senator WILLIAM LANGER, his daughters, and all members of their family, in the passing of Mrs. Langer. Thousands of postal and Federal employees will remember Mrs. Langer who attended many national, State, and local conventions along with our great friend and supporter, the Honorable WILLIAM (BILL) LANGER, who has faithfully served for 20 years on the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Mrs. Langer's untimely death was brought about by cancer. Mr. and Mrs. Langer were married for 41 years and worked closely together on all legislation. Services will be conducted from the Augustana Lutheran Church, 16th, New Hampshire Avenue, and V Streets NW., at 1 p.m. Friday, August 7.

CITY OF FARGO, N. DAK.,
August 5, 1959.

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
U.S. Senator and Family,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The city of Fargo is deeply grieved at the passing of your beloved wife and our constant and good friend.

As an expression of our deepest heartfelt sympathy, I am enclosing a certified copy of a resolution which I offered to the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo last evening, as a lasting tribute of our respect and affection for your beloved wife and the mother of your children. The people of Fargo, as well as all the people who knew Mrs. Langer, will forever honor and hold sacred her memory. She was indeed a good friend.

In closing, I sincerely hope that you will take good care of yourself, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor.

RESOLUTION

President Lashkowitz offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

"Be it resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, that—

"Whereas Mrs. William Langer, the beloved wife of our esteemed senior U.S. Senator, the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, has just passed on to her eternal rest; and

"Whereas Mrs. William Langer, as the first lady of North Dakota, and as the helpmate of our distinguished senior Senator, has

come to be known and loved by all the people of our city as a dear friend, whose place will forever be enshrined in our memory; and

"Whereas the city of Fargo deeply mourns the passing on of its beloved friend and good neighbor; and

"Whereas Mrs. William Langer achieved eminence not only as the helpmate and inspiration of North Dakota's greatest Governor, but also has been recognized as an outstanding example of American womanhood who took a vital interest and played a prominent role in local, State, and National affairs and made a lasting contribution to the advancement and development of her adopted State, and merited the affection and respect of the people of our city and State; and

"Whereas Mrs. William Langer has been an example of courage and inspiration to all: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, That it does hereby extend its condolences and deepest heartfelt sympathy on behalf of the citizens of the city of Fargo to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, our distinguished senior Senator, and the bereaved family of Mrs. William Langer; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the permanent minutes of the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo, and that copies be forwarded to the Honorable WILLIAM LANGER, U.S. Senator from North Dakota, and to the bereaved family of Mrs. William Langer, and also to the congressional delegation from North Dakota, with the request that this resolution be read from the floor of the Senate and the U.S. House of Representatives and made a part of the proceedings thereof."

Second by McCannel. On the vote being taken on the question of the adoption of the resolution, Commissioners Hagen, Lewis, Markey, McCannel, and Lashkowitz all voted "aye."

No commissioner being absent and none voting "nay," the president declared the resolution to have been duly passed and adopted.

HERSCHEL LASHKOWITZ,
Mayor.

STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA,
County of Cass, ss:

I, William G. Johnson, do hereby certify that I am the duly appointed, qualified, and acting city auditor of the city of Fargo, N. Dak.; and

That the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Fargo at the regular meeting of the board held on Tuesday, August 4, 1959; and

That such resolution is now a part of the permanent records of the city of Fargo, N. Dak., as such records are filed in the office of the city auditor.

WM. G. JOHNSON,
City Auditor of the City of Fargo, Fargo, N. Dak.

An Invitation to Eastern Oklahoma, Recreational Heartland of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED EDMONDSON
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, September 11, 1959

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the Congress and every American to the significant fact that the State of Oklahoma, and especially eastern Oklahoma, is rapidly becoming the recreational heartland of America.

One of the most amazing developments in recent years is the phenomenal and almost unbelievable growth of Oklahoma in the field of outdoor recreation. For John Q. Public we are fast becoming the Vacation Mecca of the United States.

Few people realize that we have two lakes in Oklahoma whose annual visitor attendance greatly exceeds the combined annual visitor attendance of both Yellowstone National Park and the Grand Canyon—and an even smaller lake with more annual visitor attendance than the Washington Monument and Yosemite National Park combined. These facts are hard to believe about a State only recently known as a "Prairie State."

The present and future role of the State of Oklahoma in outdoor recreation—a new growth industry developing in this country in tremendous proportions and possessing almost unlimited potential—is so promising that it ultimately can transform the State and could well hold the key to providing us with the most amazing economic development in our spectacular State history.

The great boom in outdoor recreation in Oklahoma is keyed to the tremendous development of water resources in our State, which already has more than a quarter of a million acres of surface water impounded in our lakes, to which will be added more than 140,000 surface acres when 5 reservoirs now under construction by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are completed. Still more thousands will be added when other authorized projects are finished.

Oklahoma early realized the great potential in the field of outdoor recreation, and especially water recreation. Its development of State parks and its investment of more than $7 million in five fine resort lodges on Oklahoma lakes, which provide luxury surroundings at moderate prices and which rival the best that are being built with Federal funds under the Mission 66 program, have been unique. In particular, its development of the fabulous Lake Texoma lodge, and of the equally beautiful Western Hills lodge on Fort Gibson Reservoir, has drawn visitors and conventions from all over the country.

Maj. Gen. E. C. Itschner, chief of Army engineers, speaking at Western Hills Lodge about 3 years ago, said that Oklahoma "among all of the State has taken the No. 1 spot in developing reservoirs for recreational use".

Earlier the same year, a corps official of the Tulsa district office, in commending the "foresight and initiative of the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board in realizing the recreational opportunities" on corps reservoirs, said Oklahoma had "given the greatest impetus to the development and use of these lakes far beyond any other agency or private development."

It will come as a major surprise to many people that attendance at State parks in Oklahoma in 1958 was in excess of 8 million, and that Oklahoma ranked eighth nationally among all the States reporting attendance at State parks during 1958 to the National Park Service.

It will come as another surprise to many people that between 1950 and 1958, attendance at Oklahoma State parks increased by a startling 217 percent, as compared to an increase nationally of 108 percent.

It will come as a further surprise to many people that attendance at State parks in Oklahoma in 1958 was considerably greater than it was at State parks in such noted vacation States as Colorado, Florida, Minnesota, Maryland, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Wisconsin.

With these statistics in mind, it is no wonder that the present Governor of Oklahoma recently said that recreation in the Oklahoma lakes area presents opportunities that stand out "like a beacon light of hope" for the future of our State.

Mr. Speaker, what are the ingredients which have brought about this situation in a State which is the fifth youngest in the Union? What accounts for this fantastic growth in recreational visits?

One of the key ingredients is the fact that Oklahoma City early recognized the great potential in water recreation present on its great and growing chains of lakes, and based the fabulous development of its park systems, its lodges, and its resorts primarily to take advantage of this opportunity. In cooperation with other men of vision from the Army Corps of Engineers office in Tulsa, and with other experts in the field, the State of Oklahoma became the true pioneer in the development of a park system based upon the future growth in this new water recreation industry.

As a result, you have in Oklahoma some of the best planned recreation plants on earth. They are in operation 24 hours a day, 12 months a year. More people, more frequently, and over a longer period of the year and during more days of each week, and during more hours of each day, visit lakes and State parks in Oklahoma than at almost any similar area on earth.

As one corps official in Washington said, the type of reservoirs we have in Oklahoma and the Southwest represent a virtual revolution in recreational habits. They serve a much greater proportion of the public, regardless of income, than almost any other kind of outdoor recreation. With the climate of the Southwest, these resorts are open throughout the year, and are in operation day and night—with their lodges, their cottages, their night-fishing docks, and their many other low-cost facilities.

Blessed not only with a climate which permits outdoor recreation throughout the year but also with countless streams and wooded hills and rolling plains, possessed of varied and beautiful natural resources, abounding with scenic spots of infinite beauty and history sites of great interest, Oklahoma is also geographically located to serve all the people of the United States.

Situated right in the middle of the most rapidly growing market areas of

the United States, with 42 million people now within a 500-mile radius of the center of Oklahoma, and realizing that the present rate of population growth in the United States could bring a national population of approximately 260 million people in 1980 and 350 million in the year 2000, Oklahoma is already in a position to capitalize on its pioneering work in the field of outdoor and water recreation.

Still another factor in the development of outdoor recreation is the national trend in the field of recreation and the tremendous growth in public use of recreational facilities throughout the country. It is on this growth trend that Oklahoma has capitalized, and it is most revealing to examine some of the amazing statistics in this field.

Recently I asked the Library of Congress to prepare for me a report on "The Growth of Recreation in the United States"; and this fine report, prepared by Erin W. Nisbet of the Legislative Reference Service, was completed only on September 4. It is probably the most up-to-date report of its kind in existence at the present time.

The Library of Congress report comments upon the astonishing rate of growth on the basis of attendance figures in the recreational use of public lands and State parks. It says in part:

In contrast to a 15.5-percent increase in population from 1950 to 1958, attendance figures show a 492-percent increase at Corps of Engineers water resources projects, a 76-percent increase at all National Park Service areas except the National Capital Park System, a 108-percent increase at all State parks, a 150-percent increase at national forest areas, and an estimated 195-percent increase in attendance at Bureau of Reclamation projects.

I might point out that corps projects located primarily in Oklahoma have, for the past several years, accounted for about 20 percent of national attendance at all corps projects, which in 1958 totaled almost 95 million visitors.

The Library of Congress report continues:

The actual use of the public recreation facilities has far exceeded the planning estimates made over 10 years ago. It is obvious that there will continue to be a growing need for more of such facilities in the future on both public and private lands. In the last 8 years, attendance has been growing at an average annual rate of 7 percent in the National Park System, 11 percent at the national forests, 12 percent at the wildlife refuges, 10 percent at TVA reservoirs, 13 percent at Bureau of Reclamation projects, 22 percent at Corps of Engineers reservoirs, and 9 percent at the State parks.

Mr. Speaker, as a further example of the tremendous public use for recreational purposes of public parks and Federal recreation areas, let me quote the figures on estimated attendance in 1958 in the major categories of facilities of this type in the United States. Attendance at corps projects was 94,793,000; at National Forest lands it was 68,450,000; at all National Park Service areas not including National Capital Park System it was 58,677,000; at State parks it was 237,328,853; at TVA lakes it was 36,600,408; and at wildlife refuges it was 9,114,000.

These figures are astounding because the totals far exceed the population of the United States, which of course is largely accounted for by the fact that many people make repeat visits, and also visit more than one such area each year. But nonetheless, it points up that the entire field of outdoor recreation, with pressing needs for additional facilities which are clearly evident, is sorely in need of increased national attention, especially by the Congress.

The field of outdoor recreation, of which water recreation is a major part, is a tremendous new growth industry. The Library of Congress report indicates that a recent article on the industries related to outdoor recreational activity estimated that business income in this field amounted to $32 billion in 1958.

Mr. Speaker, if we accept that estimate, which could be very conservative, it still would be big business in every sense of the term. Compare that $32 billion estimate with statistics for other fields as estimated by official governmental agencies. The current earnings of all member banks of the Federal Reserve System in 1958 amounted to $7.1 billion. Revenue from ultimate customers of the electric light and power industry amounted to $9.7 billion in 1958. The value added by the manufacture of the primary metal industries—iron, steel, and the nonferrous metals including copper, tin, lead, zinc, and aluminum—was $13.1 billion in 1957. The value added by the manufacture of all chemicals and chemical products was $12.1 billion in 1957. The value of all mineral production in the United States in 1957 was $18.1 billion, and is expected to fall slightly below that figure for 1958.

It is that terrific $32 billion outdoor recreation industry which Oklahoma, and especially eastern Oklahoma, will increasingly share in the future.

For example, in the Second Congressional District of Oklahoma, which I represent, there are three Corps of Engineer projects located completely within the district. They are Fort Gibson Reservoir, which in 1958 had a total visitor attendance of 4,177,800; Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir, which in 1958 had a visitor attendance of 2,297,700; and the smaller Hulah Reservoir, which last year had a visitor attendance of 578,100.

I am certain it will startle a large percentage of the American public to realize that in 1958, attendance at Tenkiller Reservoir exceeded the combined total attendance for the same year at the Washington Monument and the Yosemite National Park; and that attendance at Fort Gibson Reservoir exceeded the combined total attendance at both Yellowstone National Park and the Grand Canyon. Truly these are striking figures, and point up the great future to Oklahoma, and specifically to eastern Oklahoma, that lies ahead of us in the field of outdoor recreation.

Already existing in the Second Congressional District are other additional lakes. One of them, the very highly developed recreational area of Grand Lake, has a surface area of 46,500 acres. Another, much smaller but providing magnificent recreation, is Greenleaf Lake with its fine State park of 1,475 acres built around a jewel of a lake containing 920 acres of surface water.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that Lake Texoma, which Oklahoma shares with Texas, has broken all visitor attendance records at corps reservoirs throughout the Nation during 6 of the past 7 years, and in 1957 had more than 8 million visitor attendance. This Texoma Lake, created by the impoundment of water by Denison Dam during 1942, is noted throughout the world for the fantastic attendance records it has set—and a most significant thing is that in 1946, estimated annual attendance for 1956 was set at 600,000, whereas in that year it actually reached the astounding total of 7,471,600 visitor days—more than 12 times the estimate of 10 years earlier.

As astonishing as is the record of Texoma, corps reservoirs within the Second District of Oklahoma have set some records of their own. In 1950 the corps started keeping attendance records at Lake Hulah, Tenkiller Lake and Fort Gibson Lake although all of them were still under construction and impoundment of water did not begin until March 1951, in the case of Hulah, and late in 1952 in the case of Tenkiller and Fort Gibson.

Attendance figures at Hulah in 1950 were 26,000, 45,000 at Tenkiller, and 195,000 at Fort Gibson. Attendance figures for 1958, which already have been given, would indicate that attendance records have grown since 1950 by the startling figures of 2,120 percent in the case of Hulah, 2,043 percent in the case of Fort Gibson, and 5,007 percent in the case of Tenkiller. Percentage increase at Texoma since 1950 has been 74 percent, while percentage increase at Texoma since 1945—which was after impoundment but earliest attendance records which I have seen—has been approximately 2,745 percent. It should be borne in mind that Texoma has been established not only much longer than any of these other three lakes, but that also it is more than twice as large in water surface area and considerably larger in shoreline area than all the other three lakes combined.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the corps is planning for a total of 12 million visitors at Texoma within the next few years, and similar great growths are expected at Fort Gibson, Tenkiller, and Hulah Lakes.

In the light of these statistics, it came as no surprise to me to learn that the corps has extremely high expectations for attendance at Oologah, Eufaula, and Keystone Reservoirs when they are completed within the next few years. Oologah will lie within the second district, Keystone just to the west and Eufaula will be shared with the third district of Oklahoma.

It is my understanding that the corps expect, within 5 years after impoundment, 1 million visitor attendance at Oologah, and a whopping 10 million visitor attendance each at Eufaula and at Keystone Reservoirs.

If you are a fisherman, consider these interesting reports from Oklahoma lakes: In 1958 the fishing catch at Fort

Gibson was 2,140,000 pounds; at Tenkiller it was 930,000 pounds. At relatively tiny Lake Hulah the 1957 fishing catch was 75,000 pounds. Experts predict that fishing at the new lakes now under construction will be outstanding. Think what this means to Oklahoma, and especially to the second district, in terms of new businesses created by these lakes—such as fishing docks, boating docks, cottages and motels, grocery and supply stores, oil and gasoline stations, and many other related businesses. All go with boating, fishing, swimming, exploring, sightseeing, water skiing, hunting, and other overall vacation activities associated with water recreation.

As a single index, watercraft on peak days jumped from 50 to 950 at Fort Gibson between 1952 and 1958. At Tenkiller, it jumped from 16 in 1952 to 650 in 1958; and at Hulah, it jumped from 10 in 1951 to 250 in 1958.

A corps estimate of the value of recreational activity at the three largest corps projects in Oklahoma in 1957 was set at $66.5 million, of which $60 million was assigned to the much older and long-developed Lake Texoma. However, 1957 recreational business at the recently completed Fort Gibson and Tenkiller Reservoirs was estimated to total at lease $6.5 million, and it has been increasing by leaps and bounds since that time.

The Grand Lake recreational investment had a $31 million price tag placed on it by an official of the Grand Lake Association this year. He also estimated that the number of out-of-state visitors there had increased from 62 to 68 percent.

These figures are striking examples of the pulling power of these lakes and water recreation facilities to people from other States and from very considerable distance. It is my understanding that a Corps study of visitor attendance a couple of years ago at Fort Gibson and Tenkiller indicated that approximately 50 percent of the cars bore out-of-State licenses. Chamber of commerce officials in the Fort Gibson Reservoir area say that cars from virtually every State in the Union have been seen at lake access points, and are being seen in increasing numbers each year.

Mr. Speaker, with eye-opening facts like these before me, I speak with pride and great anticipation for the future of Oklahoma, and particularly of eastern Oklahoma, which will have a tremendous and growing share of our national outdoor recreation business and development. The future is unlimited. The foresight of the State of Oklahoma in preparing for this fabulous revolution in the recreational habits of our American people is hitting pay dirt, and we are prepared to ride with this great tide of the future and to capitalize on the magnificent potentialities which lie before us.

We can also glory in the fact that we will have both a happier and a healthier America as our people move outdoors for recreation, in increasing numbers each year.

General Itschner this year predicted that the Arkansas River basin, which is now being developed for navigation, has the resources to produce an unprecedented explosion of economic growth. He said he "could conceive of few areas of America which have a brighter future." In earlier speeches he has predicted our region would prosper, as has the Ohio Valley, with the industrial development which would come to pass with the completion of the navigation project.

Mr. Speaker, I share fully with General Itschner his faith in the economic boom and the tremendous industrial growth which lie ahead for our region. With river navigation, an abundance of coal and other fuels, and abundant water supply, we are blessed with all the things which we need for great industrial growth.

But, I would point out that the recreational benefits alone which are coming with the development of these great water projects are providing and will increasingly provide an economic growth which will transform the State. Furthermore, I believe that outdoor recreation is as nearly a depression-proof industry as can be found anywhere, and this is demonstrated by cold facts and figures.

Oklahoma is richly blessed with its present and planned facilities for outdoor and water recreation. We have much to offer all America. We invite each and every American to come to our lakes, to visit our historic spots, to see our cowboys who have attained national fame at rodeos, and to thrill as you see the priceless heritage and tremendous contributions our outstanding American Indian tribes have added to our culture and our civilization.

We promise you an Oklahoma welcome you will never forget—a welcome from the Recreational Heartland of America.

Fact Sheet on Puerto Ricans in the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at the recent New York City hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, several witnesses presented conflicting views on the relationship of that city's growing Puerto Rican population to juvenile crime. The record of the hearing was kept open so that the committee might receive a statement from Mr. Joseph Monsuerrat, director of the New York office of the Migration Division, Department of Labor, Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Attached to the statement filed by Mr. Monsuerrat was a document entitled "Fact Sheet on Puerto Ricans in the United States." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because it should receive the widest possible circulation. While it is quite brief, it provides an excellent background for some of the sensational headlines that have appeared recently implying that our problems will be solved if we simply discourage migration. It records the constructive contribution being made by persons of Puerto Rican birth or descent in New York City and elsewhere. Certainly, we in Michigan look upon our growing Puerto Rican population with the knowledge that the typical American community has been strengthened by the diversity of its population. The quest of each new group for improvement in their living standards, their levels of education, and their sense of achievement and recognition in the community has brought new vitality to our way of life with each new group.

In my view Mr. Monsuerrat and the migration service of the Puerto Rican Labor Department are to be commended for the skill and dedication which they bring to the difficult problems of family adjustment in situations of economic dislocation such as we are now facing.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET ON PUERTO RICANS IN THE UNITED STATES

1. WHY DO PUERTO RICANS COME TO THE UNITED STATES?

About 40,000 Puerto Ricans migrate to the United States each year for the same major reason that 40,000,000 immigrants came to our shores in the past and that 5,000,000 mainland Americans migrate from one State to another each year: Better job opportunities in the new area.

The size and destination of the Puerto Rican migration depend on employment opportunities in the United States. When the country is in periods of prosperity, the demand for workers increases and migration also increases. During recessions, migration drops. During depressions, there has been a net migration back to Puerto Rico. The following figures show how the recession affected migration from Puerto Rico during 1957 and 1958:

	Total to the United States	To New York City
1956	52,315	34,000
1957	37,704	22,600
1958	27,728	17,000

The proportion of the newcomers settling in New York City, the world's largest labor market, has declined steadily as relatively more job opportunities have opened up in other areas. In 1947, 95 percent of the newcomers from Puerto Rico were settling in New York. By 1957 and 1958, this figure had dropped to about 60 percent.

2. HOW MANY PUERTO RICANS ARE THERE IN THE UNITED STATES?

Population estimates for December 31, 1958, showed 849,000 Puerto Ricans in the continental United States as a whole. Of these, 608,000 had been born in Puerto Rico, and 241,000 had been born here of Puerto Rican parentage. In New York City, there were 654,000 persons of Puerto Rican birth and parentage, of whom 463,000 had been born on the island and 191,000 on the mainland. Puerto Ricans have been living in every State since 1930.

3. WHO ARE THE PUERTO RICAN NEWCOMERS?

Studies of the Puerto Ricans show that, like all groups of voluntary migrants, they include a larger proportion of more skilled

and better educated persons than would be found in a perfect cross section of the island's labor force. Over 90 percent of the adult migrants are literate, as compared with 87 percent of the population of Puerto Rico. Five percent of the migrants in 1958 had completed at least 4 years of college, including 3 percent who had completed one or more years of graduate study. Most of the migrants have worked in manufacturing and service industries; only a minority have an agricultural background. In 1958, 43 percent of the newcomers knew English at the time they migrated. The 1950 U.S. census showed that 92 percent of the Puerto Rican-born persons living in the United States were white, as compared with 80 percent of the population of Puerto Rico; studies indicate that fewer dark-skinned persons migrate because of an awareness of discrimination and segregation patterns on the mainland.

Misimpressions of newcomers are often based on the ones who tend to be conspicuous in their new environment—those who do not speak English well or are distinguishable by their general appearance or dress. The thousands of Puerto Ricans already well-adjusted to life in the United States are inconspicuous and therefore are frequently not even recognized as Puerto Ricans.

4. WHAT KINDS OF JOBS ARE PUERTO RICANS FILLING ON THE MAINLAND?

In New York and other cities, Puerto Ricans are filling labor shortages in practically every type of industry. The New York garment trades are highly dependent on their more than 45,000 Puerto Rican workers ("If it hadn't been for the Spanish [influx] the industry would have left New York"—head of Local 142, ILGWU). The city's $460 million hotel business and a wide range of related commercial services similarly depend on their workers from Puerto Rico ("The Waldorf-Astoria could not run without its 450 Puerto Rican workers"—personnel director, Waldorf-Astoria).

Puerto Rican workers are also found in restaurants, laundries, drycleaning establishments, hospitals, and throughout the city's manufacturing industries—office equipment, electrical and electronic products, plastics, optical goods, toys, and others. There are more than 4,000 Puerto Rican owners of grocery stores, barbershops, drugstores, and other businesses; several thousand civil service employees, including postal workers, teachers, and police; and physicians, dentists, and lawyers.

Outside New York City, principal jobs include foundry work, leather tanning, shoe manufacture, and electronics in Chicago and Milwaukee; steel in Bethlehem, Pa., and Lorain and Youngstown, Ohio; automobiles in Detroit; men's clothing in Rochester; radio and television manufacture in northern New Jersey.

5. HOW MANY PUERTO RICANS ARE ON WELFARE?

As with other groups, the number of Puerto Ricans receiving public assistance varies with economic conditions, going down in good times and rising during recessions. Data from the New York City Department of Welfare show that between 85 and 95 percent of New York's Puerto Ricans have always been completely self-supporting. During the recession preceding the Korean war, the proportion receiving welfare benefits rose to a high of about 14 percent of the city's Puerto Rican population; during the recent recession, data for April 1957 showed 11 percent receiving welfare; during periods of prosperity, the percentage has been reported at 5 and 6 percent. Approximately half of the Puerto Rican home-relief cases arise because the wage earner, although fully employed, is not paid enough to provide minimum support for his family.

With respect to nonresident relief (persons who have been in the State less than 1 year), studies conducted by the New York State Department of Social Welfare showed that in 1957 total nonresident welfare cases constituted only 1.6 percent of all welfare recipients in the State and that Puerto Ricans accounted for a minority (38 percent) of the nonresident recipients. The majority (54 percent) were from other States and a small number (8 percent) from foreign countries.

It is also significant, as reported by the State welfare department, that between the first half of 1957 and the first half of 1958, when the recession was becoming more severe, resident welfare rolls in New York City increased 11 percent while nonresident rolls decreased by 7 percent. This is another indication that the migration of all groups to new areas declines when fewer jobs are available.

A further study of nonresident relief recipients by the city welfare department showed that Puerto Ricans are the last group to obtain relief. The New York Times reported on June 2, 1957, "A welfare department study on new arrivals who have got relief indicates that the Puerto Ricans involved had been here 5.9 months—longer than both the 5.3 months for Negroes and 4.8 months for other persons." Thus, neither the Puerto Ricans nor the Negro newcomers are the first to obtain relief.

6. HOW HIGH ARE PUERTO RICAN CRIME RATES?

Available figures confirm Time magazine's statement of June 23, 1958: "In New York City some Puerto Ricans have managed to gain for the rest an out-size reputation as gang fighters, "West Side Story" style; actually, Puerto Ricans form 8 percent of the population, and their share of the crime rate is only slightly more than 8 percent."

Accurate overall data on juvenile crime are scant, but a study of two Manhattan school districts showed a lower delinquency rate for the Puerto Rican children than for the non-Puerto Ricans. "The Puerto Rican children were offenders at the rate of 12 per 1,000; the non-Puerto Rican children at the rate of 14 per 1,000." (The Puerto Rican Study: 1953–57 (New York City Board of Education, 1958; p. 120).) The study concluded that "Like other children Puerto Rican children tend to become about as good or about as bad as the children or youth with whom they associate."

From other cities come reports such as the following: "The incidence of crime among the Puerto Ricans has been very low. Almost all run-ins with the law have resulted from lack of understanding about motor vehicle laws." (Trentonian (Trenton, N.J.), Oct. 14, 1957.) "There is no evidence that the Puerto Rican in Reading today is a problem. He is not living on relief, not drawing unemployment checks, not arrested in higher percentage than whites or Negroes." (Reading (Pa.) Record, Oct. 11, 1957.) Nassau and Suffolk police have had virtually no problem with new Puerto Rican residents because the newcomers have integrated themselves into their communities and have been given the opportunity of slumless living." (Newsday, (Garden City, Long Island, N.Y.), Sept. 3, 1959.)

Record Progress in Flood Control for Central Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago Hurricane Diane hit the Northeast with a devastating blow, leaving behind a trail of ruin, destruction, and death. It was on August 19, 1955, that Diane dumped some 19 inches of rain on central Massachusetts and caused one of the worst flood disasters in the history of our area.

In central Massachusetts, which makes up most of the Third Congressional District, seven persons died and an estimated $110 million in property damage was caused.

Today, just 4 short years after this great disaster, we in central Massachusetts are beginning to see the results of a $40 million flood prevention program which got under way almost simultaneously with the rehabilitation program set up immediately after the floods. In these 4 years, there have been inaugurated in New England more flood control projects than in all the previous years of Federal flood work in our section.

When the Congress met in January of 1956, the Massachusetts Congressional Delegation Committee on Flood Control and Rehabilitation recommended eight new construction starts to speed flood control in Massachusetts: Barre Falls, Buffumville, East Brimfield, Hodges Village, Worcester Diversion, West Hill, Westville, and Littleville.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report to the House today that the efforts of the Massachusetts delegation in Congress have been 100 percent successful in getting these vital and necessary projects completed or on the way to completion. In fact, by 1960, those Massachusetts areas hit by the 1955 floods should be afforded a high degree of protection against future floods.

Four of these projects have been completed or are in the final stages of construction: Barre Falls, Buffumville, Hodges Village and Worcester Diversion. East Brimfield will be completed with funds voted by Congress this year. Westville construction will be initiated with funds voted by Congress this year over the President's veto. West Hill construction will be substantially advanced with the $975,000 made available by Congress this year, and finally, the advance planning of Littleville will get underway with the $98,000 authorized by Congress in this year's appropriation bill.

This is a remarkable record of achievement, Mr. Speaker, in such a short span of time but, in final analysis the success of this flood program is due to the urgent and extensive work of many officials and agencies, local, State and Federal, and many individuals who joined to speed the vital and necessary work ahead. Our deep appreciation and gratitude to the House Committee on Appropriations must be reiterated again and again because these good colleagues not only completely evaluated our desperate plight, but moved speedily with a fine spirit of sympathetic understanding and effective support and cooperation to extend Massachusetts and New England the relief and protection from floods for which we had such urgent need.

It is most unfortunate, in my opinion, that such rancor and misunderstanding have been raised as a result of the events

surrounding the public works bill this year.

For 2 years in a row, the President directed that there be no new construction starts. This all-embracing order took in all projects. As a result, our Committee on Appropriations last year, and this year tempered this sweeping rule by providing funds for urgent projects. The committee showed great wisdom and courage in voting these funds because there is no question that a blanket presidential policy of this kind would be bound to work hardship. No better illustrations than West Hill and Westville have demonstrated the need for relaxation of this arbitrary order.

These projects are required as a direct result of the 1955 floods. Had they been instituted after the 1938 floods, Westville and West Hill could have saved in 1955 many lives and millions of dollars in damage. Why, then, include them in a blanket ban on new construction? Not only was the President's directive and subsequent votes of the two public works bills this year most disappointing, but these actions have been entirely incomprehensible. I am at a complete loss to understand such an inflexible policy.

Westville, for example, is a project which has been penalized twice by the very fact that construction funds were deferred until such time as its companion East Brimfield project was in the advanced stages. Congress acquiesced in 1956, at a time when funds were being sped for New England flood control, in an engineering judgment that Westville could be built for less if East Brimfield were built first. Subsequently, the President denied funds for Westville last year and again this year, because it was new construction, thus canceling out a sound engineering judgment prompted largely by motives of economy.

I believe that the Appropriations Committee has shown great foresight and a true apprehension of the real meaning of economy by voting necessary funds for Westville and West Hill. Already deferral of these projects has resulted in heavier costs and expenditures. Further delay would make a bad situation worse and I commend and thank the committee and the Congress for advancing these projects now in the interest of human life and property.

What makes the public works situation all the more incomprehensible, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the foreign aid bill requested by the President this year contains money for new starts—new starts which are denied in our own country—on water development projects and many other large public works scattered all over the world totaling $320 million—all extracted from the pockets of American taxpayers.

This amount of $320 million represents just a little less than the money required for all of New England's flood needs for generations to come. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the present estimated cost of all of the 60 authorized flood control projects for New England, including those which have been completed, those under construction, and those not yet started, is estimated at only $330 million. This is just $10 million more than provided this year for new construction in foreign lands at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Again, to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, how modest our Federal requests are, this $330 million is less than the cost of one single large project in the West, for instance, the John Day Dam and Reservoir on the Columbia River in Oregon and Washington.

True, New England in past years has been passed by for flood control funds largely because of its own indifference, but now that the need is urgent and recognized by our people, let us not gamble with future losses of life and property by budgetary restrictions on such projects as Westville and West Hill and other worthy projects.

This year has seen truly remarkable progress toward the achievement of a flood-control program for New England and particularly for the Central Massachusetts area.

In June a flood-control compact was signed at Hartford, Conn., between Massachusetts and Connecticut to facilitate Federal construction of the four major dams in the Thames Basin: Buffumville, Hodges Village, East Brimfield, and Westville. In addition, the compact, resulting from legislation I was pleased to cosponsor in the 85th Congress, has provision for reimbursement to Massachusetts by Connecticut for 40 percent of the tax losses suffered by landtakings for these dams and reservoirs in the Commonwealth. A six-man commission, of which my good and able friend, Mr. Samuel Sheard, of Sturbridge, is chairman, will assess the tax losses as they affect the individual communities. I am much indebted to Mr. Sheard for the valuable aid rendered by him and his group.

On October 17, Woonsocket in the Blackstone Basin will dedicate the newest link in New England's flood prevention program when the South Main Street dam in the center of the city is formally completed. Some $5 million has been channeled into the project by the Federal Government to build the dam and bridge and deepen, widen, and straighten the Blackstone Channel from the Uxbridge-Rhode Island line.

On October 3, ground is being broken for the Hopkinton dam and reservoir in New Hampshire which may ultimately become one of the largest Federal flood projects east of the Mississippi. The estimated cost is $30 million of which $5,429,000 is provided this year. This project is vitally important to the Merrimack Basin. It will save life and property in the future.

This summer marked the groundbreaking for West Hill in the Blackstone basin, the first major flood control project in Blackstone Valley proper. This is a $2,400,000 dam and reservoir project, for which Congress has previously voted $498,000 and for which $975,000 is being made available this year. The Army engineers have estimated West Hill would have prevented $12,215,000 in damages had it been in operation during the 1955 floods.

Congress has been keenly aware of the Blackstone Valley flood problem for some time past and has demonstrated time and time again its deep concern by taking concrete and effective steps to help. Just 15 years ago this past May, Congress voted $43,000 to begin the planning of West Hill. In 1956, the House took the unprecedented action of voting $100,000 to speed the West Hill planning despite the lack of needed State concurrence, a vital requirement before Federal funds can be made available.

This action was all the more welcome because the engineers had previously indicated their workload was such after the 1955 floods that they would have great difficulty in utilizing these funds in view of the planning workload for other New England projects. Luckily, the engineers' misgivings proved to be groundless and the West Hill planning went ahead instead of being delayed another year.

Again, last year, and as I have stated, Congress reiterated its approval of the West Hill project by making available construction funds despite the budgetary freeze on new construction starts. This congressional action made possible the earmarking of $975,000 this year for West Hill construction, thus gaining more valuable time.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, this has been a good year for New England flood control. Initial approval has been given by the Congress for the authorization of West Thompson Dam and Reservoir on the Quinebaug near Putnam, Conn. This would be the fifth in a series of dams to provide flood protection for communities along the French and Quinebaug Rivers in Massachusetts and Connecticut in the Thames Basin.

The five projects when completed—three are in varying stages of completion with Buffumville in operation, Hodges Village for all practical purposes completed, and East Brimfield nearing completion—these projects should provide the Thames Basin with the most effective protection of any similar basin in the United States, according to the Army Engineers.

This basin, one of five major watersheds in New England, is the one which has seen more than $62 million in damages in the past 20 years.

Completion of the $2,900,000 Buffumville Dam provided a vital protection from the often rampaging waters of the Little River above Webster. Army Engineers estimate that the Buffumville Reservoir has a storage capacity of 12,700 acre-feet, equivalent to 4.2 billion gallons at spillway crest elevation. At full capacity in time of floods, the reservoir will extend about 1.7 miles upstream on the Little River itself and about 1.9 miles upstream on the southerly branch of Little River. A permanent pool of 200 acres is being maintained and a recreational area with free use of all facilities has been developed by the engineers this past summer.

Finishing touches to the $5,300,000 Hodges Village Dam and Reservoir, companion project to Buffumville, are now being made. Operation tests on the sluice gates and a general cleanup of the area will complete the work.

Whenever flooding occurs, the waters of the French River will be controlled

behind the 55-foot dam and dikes for about 3 miles.

The East Brimfield Dam and Reservoir, another Thames Basin project, is designed to provide major reductions in flood damages at Southbridge. It is a $7,400,000 project which will occupy a 2,270-acre basin in Sturbridge, Brimfield, and Holland.

A permanent pool, suitable for recreational activities, will be located immediately above the dam. Storage of water in the lower areas of the reservoir will occur rather frequently, but complete filling of the reservoir will not occur except during major floods.

Some 2,840 acres of land, including about 225 dwellings, are required for East Brimfield. This requirement—and other Federal landtaking for flood control in our area—has meant great sacrifices on the part of the people and the communities involved, as often as not not even indirect beneficiaries of flood control, and it certainly is a tribute to these good people that they have been willing to sacrifice needed land, some of it improved, for the greater benefit of those communities below who have suffered from previous floods.

It is understandable that there should be reluctance to leave these homes, some of which have been in the family for generations, and every effort is being made by the Army engineers to ease this trying period of transition.

Additional progress was made this year, Mr. Speaker, with the completion of the Ware local protection project. This was one of the first projects authorized by the Bush-McCormack Act, speeding small flood control projects up to $400,000 in Federal cost without specific congressional authorization. In July of this year, rains totaling 3.21 inches fell on Ware, raising the level of the Ware River to an unusually high level for the summer months.

Despite the heavy July rainfall, there was no serious flooding. The Barre Falls Dam closed its flood gates and waters were impounded, thus alleviating the heavy flow of water downstream on the Ware River. According to Ware Water Department Superintendent James W. Reilly, the local protection project at Ware helped to prevent flooding, largely as the result of dredging made possible by the Bush-McCormack Act.

Some considerable concern was felt at Ware about the final cost of the Ware local protection project since the Federal Government could only allot $400,000 for the needed work.

It now appears that Ware will be billed only about $2,500 for this work, recent estimates of the final cost having been set at $402,500. Original estimates of Ware's share were set as high as $20,000.

There remains work to be done, Mr. Speaker, because there is a continuing need for solutions to the water disposal problems of all parts of our great Nation. Changing land uses have brought new flood prevention requirements, but the continued cooperation of the State and Federal Governments is bringing about concrete remedies to many troublesome areas.

In the Blackstone Basin, surveys are continuing under the $95,000 voted by Congress in varying amounts since the 1955 floods. This amount includes $20,000 voted this year to continue the study of the Blackstone Valley's flood problems.

Thus far, similar studies in the Chicopee Basin carried out by the Army Engineers with funds for the Northeast flood survey have shown the need for local protective work at Three Rivers above Palmer, local protection at West Warren on the Quabaug and local protection on Conant Brook at Monson, the latter involving a dam and reservoir. Further definite engineer recommendations are awaited by the Congress for legislative action.

In addition, flood protection projects are contemplated under the watershed protection program of the U.S. Department of Agriculture through the SUASCO project on the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers in the Merrimack Basin and Upper Quabaug project in the Chicopee Basin.

In addition, the Army Engineers are giving special attention to the Merrimack Basin under the Northeast flood study, with particular attention to the Nashua River in the Fitchburg-Leominster area. This summer the Engineers initiated a special study of the Merrimack Basin and consideration is being given to all possible reservoirs which might increase the degree of protection provided by the existing channel improvement project on the Nashua in Fitchburg.

As it can be seen, Mr. Speaker, the central Massachusetts are is moving forward in harnessing the floodwaters which have spread so much destruction in the past. The advancement and progress of our flood control program to date make that much easier the no less vital tasks which lie ahead.

And so again, Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my esteemed colleagues, all our people and myself, I express heartfelt thanks to all those in and out of this great Congress who so effectively helped us in our hour of desperate need and in safeguarding the future flood protection of our district, State, and area.

Commissioner Hesburgh on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, in all the publicity attendant upon the release of the Civil Rights Commission's report, too little attention has been paid to one of the most remarkable statements on this fundamental matter which I have ever seen.

I refer to the statement of his individual views filed by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C. S. C., a member of the Commission. Those who are familiar with the career and accomplishments of Father Hesburgh, as president of the University of Notre Dame and in many other positions of heavy public and private responsibility, would be led to expect a statement of high quality.

Their expectations, Mr. Speaker, would be completely fulfilled. As a masterful summary of the philosophical and practical considerations underlying the Commission's report on civil rights, and as a testament to a person's deepest convictions about the rights and dignity accruing to every human being, this statement deserves the widest possible attention. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT BY COMMISSIONER THEODORE M. HESBURGH

I should like to explain my personal position on the basic issues of this report and especially on those recommendations which were not unanimous. May I say at once how deeply I respect the persons, the convictions, and the judgments of all my distinguished fellow Commissioners, and may I frankly disavow for myself any personal claim to ultimate wisdom in these difficult questions of prudential judgment. One can only, in good conscience, do his honest best.

In appraising admittedly thorny situations in the various areas of civil rights examined by the Commission, one must be guided by his own general philosophical and theological convictions. I believe that civil rights were not created, but only recognized and formulated, by our Federal and State Constitutions and charters. Civil rights are important corollaries of the great proposition, at the heart of western civilization, that every human person is a res sacra, a sacred reality, and as such is entitled to the opportunity of fulfilling those great human potentials with which God has endowed every man. Without this spiritual and moral concept of the nature and destiny of man, our political philosophy is meaningless, bankrupt, and defenseless in the face of the opposite philosophy of man that stalks the world today.

I begin then with the proposition so well enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, that all men are indeed created equal. Equality, however, is not the same as egalitarianism, for all men are not created with equal intelligence, equal ambition, equal talent. But all men are entitled to an equal opportunity to exercise and develop whatever intelligence, ambition, and talent they possess. Ultimately, the full flowering of the democratic process depends upon the full development of all the various human talents existing in the Nation.

As I read American history, the unfolding story of our Nation centers about the often agonizing attempt to achieve the fullness of human dignity through the ever-widening application of that equal opportunity which has best characterized America in the family of nations. Deep and often dark emotions have been aroused by the discussion of integration and segregation, but anyone who really understands the majesty of the American dream cannot fail to see in our history that equality of opportunity for all men has been our most valid response to the inherent and God-given dignity of every human person.

I firmly believe that if all Americans are given the equal opportunity to be educated to the full extent of their human talents, equal opportunity to work to the fullness of their potential contribution to our society, equal opportunity at least to live in decent housing and in wholesome neighborhoods consonant with their basic human dignity,

and, moreover, equal access to housing and neighborhoods as befits their means and social development, and, finally, equal opportunity to participate in the body politic through the free and universal exercise of the franchise, then the problem of civil rights for all Americans will eventually solve itself, to the end that America, and the human dignity of all Americans, will be the richer for this solution.

The growth of equal opportunity on this fourfold front of voting, education, work, and housing is the full and unavoidable price of completely eliminating second class citizenship across the face of America. The civil rights problem differs, of course, from place to place, but it would be difficult, if not impossible, to find any section of America where all of these equal opportunities flourish in their fullness. And there are localities in America today where not one of these four opportunities exists for nonwhite Americans.

Several myths impede a reasonable approach to a solution. Perhaps the most basic is the myth of white superiority: that any white man is simply by reason of his being white, superior to any nonwhite man. Apart from the philosophical, theological, and scientific absurdity of this myth, it is best disproved in practice. Deprive any white man, however talented and ambitious, of the equal opportunity to become educated; to work as befits his education, ambition, and talent; to live in a decent house and neighborhood; deprive him of the opportunity of participating in the political process; continue this total deprivation for his children and his children's children, and then see how superior he, his children, and his grandchildren are. On the other hand, open up such equal opportunities to nonwhites and their children, and see how many of them will begin to excel. This is not a distant speculation. It is already happening here and abroad.

A lesser corollary of this myth of white superiority is to say that the nonwhites are not ready for equal opportunity. Yet, if nonwhites are to be eternally denied the opportunity, they will never be ready, and the problem becomes eternally insoluble. There must be a beginning to every solution.

No full-fledged solution is possible unless the fourfold equal opportunity mentioned above is considered to be indivisible. If the nonwhite American is granted one equal opportunity, say, education, and then denied the choice of a job and a house commensurate with his education and achievement, the inner core of his motivation for self-improvement is destroyed. If he achieves education, professional status, and the vote—three equal opportunities possible in some sections of America—and still is constrained from living where his heart desires and his means and achievement permit, then the stigma of second-class citizenship is still visited upon him and his family. I see no answer to this total problem unless human judgments and evaluations be made by reason of the quality, not the pigmentation, of the human person.

No one is so naive as to imagine the complete and overnight realization of equal opportunity on this fourfold front for all Americans. But, on the other hand, no one who really believes in full-fledged citizenship for all Americans should delude himself today regarding the true personal price involved in achieving it. The price will be nothing short of heroism in certain areas. Because of the deep emotional overtones of this problem, and its existence in every phase of American life, no American can escape taking a stand on civil rights. No American can really disengage himself from this problem. Each of us must choose to deepen the anguish of the problem, by silence and passivity, if nothing more, or must take a forthright stand on principles that give some hope of eventual solution.

There have been and will be reasonable differences of opinion regarding the nature and timing of practical solutions. But prudence, patience, good will, honesty, and compassion must be among the ingredients of all hopeful solutions. I pray that our differences of opinion may not divide us; that the basic principles of human dignity may be asserted by all; and that respect for the sacred reality of every human person may be central to all solutions.

Now for the specifics. The Commission's voting recommendation No. 5, for the Presidential appointment of temporary Federal registrars in cases of voting discrimination, is an attempt to assure qualified voters of equal opportunity to vote in the next Federal election, an opportunity now denied many. I have gone beyond this, together with Chairman Hannah and Commissioner Johnson, to propose an amendment to the Constitution that as a long-range solution would clearly and simply, assure all Americans the equal opportunity of free and universal suffrage in all elections. The American dream would thus at last become a political reality, and America could then validly proclaim to all the world that we have full faith in the democratic process, without equivocation, chicanery, or subterfuge. To me, this is the final answer to the problems we have studied in the field of voting.

In education, again I have associated myself with Chairman Hannah and Commissioner Johnson in calling for consistency in the three powers of the Federal Government. The judiciary has outlawed compulsory segregation, and yet legislative programs and executive agencies continue to grant millions to institutions of higher learning which in practice disregard the supreme law of the land. Solutions are admittedly more difficult and complicated in the area of elementary and secondary education. But higher education is a mature and sophisticated domain, the birthplace of our future leaders, the alma mater that is ready, I believe, as the Armed Forces were, to grant immediate full opportunity to all Americans who qualify to enter this domain. I favor equal opportunity to obtain Federal educational subsidies that strengthen all our institutions of higher education in this country, both public and private. But the reception of these public funds should be conditioned by the equal opportunity of all the public to enjoy the educational benefits they provide, insofar as any American is qualified educationally, not racially, to enjoy them. Any other arrangement allows the various branches of Government to work at cross-purposes, and places an undue burden on the judiciary alone. Moreover, I am personally convinced that the intelligent and mature leaders of higher education, administrations and faculties alike, are ready for this forthright admission of equal opportunity in this most sensitive segment of our Nation—our colleges and universities, both public and private.

Finally, in the field of housing, perhaps the most difficult of all areas, I have associated myself with Commissioner Johnson in several conclusions beyond those unanimously adopted by the Commission. Again, the use of public money for the benefit of all, equal oportunity, is the cardinal principle. How to do this practically, in a world of admitted prejudice, is the nub of the problem. It does not appear revolutionary to insist that, when the most needy members of our society—those with the presently poorest housing and the lowest income—are displaced by federally assisted slum clearance, urban redevelopment, or new highway programs, they be given opportunity to find decent, safe, and sanitary housing elsewhere, within their means, and not be dumped into already overcrowded racial ghettos. It does not seem inconsistent with the testimony we have heard to suggest that local and State laws might lead the way in those communities that pride themselves on equal opportunity. However, it would seem inconsistent with equal opportunity if Federal funds are used in a discriminatory manner, either to confine nowhite Americans to a certain area of the city, generally less desirable, or to circumscribe Federal assistance in new private housing almost entirely at the whim of builders for white Americans. Also, it seems unfair that federally assisted hospitals and airports have different facilities for different classes of American citizens.

While Federal laws and policies may and should illuminate the ideal of equal civil rights for all Americans, it is fairly obvious, from the varying and nationwide dimensions of the problem, that only State and local leadership, wise and courageous, patient, compassionate, and understanding, will eventually bring the ideal to greater reality throughout our Nation. It is in this sense that legislation alone will not solve the problem, and that ultimate solutions must come, as the President has said, from individual minds and hearts. But law, defining the goals and standards of the community, is itself one of the great changers of minds and hearts. In this democracy, law points the way toward ultimate freedom and justice for all Americans, everywhere in our land. Equality under the law has long been a cherished American ideal. May it ever become, more and more, a proud American reality.

Report to the 11th Congressional District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR A. KNOX
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include the following report to my constituents, the people of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan:

YOUR WASHINGTON OFFICE REPORT

(By VICTOR A. KNOX, Member of Congress)

NATIONAL DEFENSE AND INTERNAL SECURITY

History teaches us that the way to preserve the peace of the world is to have a strong defense, and for our national defense program Congress has appropriated over $39 billion for fiscal year 1960. Advancements in the field of space exploration and rocketry is deemed essential if we are to remain a preeminent power; for such space purposes $485 million was appropriated.

The Air Force Air Guard at Alpena County Airport will receive $105,000 for operational facilities. Kincheloe Air Force Base at Kinross, Mich. will receive $1,006,000 for troop housing, training, maintenance, and supply facilities.

GOVERNMENT AND REORGANIZATION

The 86th Congress provided five rows of six and four rows of five stars in Old Glory with the addition of Hawaii as the 50th State.

AGRICULTURE

I regret to report that this session of the Congress failed to enact any constructure legislation for the farmer. President Eisenhower vetoed a grossly inequitable wheat bill and no leadership effort has been made to bring this up for recensideration or to act on an omnibus farm bill. Many abuses exist in our farm program which should be

corrected, and I fervently hope this will be accomplished in the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

NATURAL RESOURCES

Of great importance to the people of Michigan was legislation that would have granted diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Chicago drainage canal. This legislation, which I have always opposed, passed the House; however, on September 2, after many days of debate, the Senate referred the bill to the Foreign Relations Committee for further study.

Contained in the public works appropriation bill that had been vetoed twice by the President, but finally approved on September 10, are funds for the following projects: Construction at the Grand Marais Harbor, $292,500; planning for the Hammond Bay Harbor, $19,500; improvements to the South Canal of the St. Mary's River, $2,479,425; and $357,825 for planning the new Poe lock. I believe you would be interested in knowing that from July 1, 1952 to June 30, 1959 some $38,283,000 has been spent in the 11th Congressional District for civil works projects, not including funds that are needed for normal operations and maintenance of existing projects.

HEALTH AND WELFARE

Effective July 1, 1959, those eligible for benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act received a 10 percent increase.

Effective July 1, 1960, the pensions received by the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their dependents will be increased. Under the provisions of this law the widows and orphans of the veterans will be eligible for pensions on the same basis as those dependents of World War I. This law will provide a 10 percent increase or more for 854,406 individuals who are now on the pension rolls, and provide benefits for an additional 72,039 cases that are not now eligible. I believe it is interesting to note that this year the total number of pension cases is expected to reach about 1,331,824 and by 1970 it is expected to be 2 million. The dollar cost of all pensions paid so far for all wars and conflicts in which the United States has engaged totaled $20,293,751,000 on June 30, 1959.

The Congress provided $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans raising the interest rate ceiling from 4¾ percent to 5½ percent, so as to assure availability of funds.

The special school milk program for 1959 was increased by $3 million, and the authorization for this program for 1960 will be $85 million and $90 million for 1961.

After two Presidential vetoes acceptable housing legislation was finally enacted. This provides for the spending of some $1 billion; earmarking $650 million for urban renewal loans; $179 million for public housing; and $250 million for loans for college housing.

NATIONAL ECONOMY

After considerable difficulty in reaching agreement on providing funds to finance the Federal aid highway program, Congress enacted legislation that provides a 1 cent a gallon increase in the Federal motor fuels taxes effective October 1, 1959 to July 1, 1691. With this motor fuels revenue and 5 percentage points of the existing manufacturer's excise tax on passenger cars and 5 percentage points on the existing excise tax on automobile parts and accessories beginning July 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1964, funds should be available to maintain this program on schedule.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress made history in adopting labor reform legislation. I do not believe we can claim that this action was either a personal victory for the President nor for the Republicans and the conservative Democrats who supported the provisons of the Landrum-Griffin bill. It was instead a victory for the working people of our country and the pubilc. The enactment of such legislation was an example of the people asserting their rights when sufficiently aroused. The powerful and well-financed labor bosses could not defeat the demand of the people that legislation be passed which would drive racketeering and corruption from the ranks of organized labor, and that the rights of the individual union members be protected. The new law does these things—it contains a bill of rights with enforcement provisions; then it adds protection to the public as well through the curbing of secondary boycotts, organization and recognition picketing, and in settling the no man's land between State and Federal jurisdictions.

ADDITIONAL BENEFITS RECEIVED IN THE DISTRICT

In 1959 new post offices were dedicated at Mackinaw City, Mackinac Island, and Ellsworth. New facilities will also be provided in McMillan and Newberry. An extensive repair program is in progress at Menominee.

The sewage treatment plant at Escanaba received $58,200 of Federal funds; the sewer pumping station and sewage treatment plant at Sault Ste. Marie received $250,000; the Presque Isle Electric Co-op received a loan of $50,000 and the Cloverland Co-op received $2,650,000; Cheboygan received a loan in the amount of $620,000 for 40 low rent family dwellings.

The Office of Civil Defense and Mobilization has approved Gaylord as the location and placement of Civil Defense Emergency Hospital. The equipment that will be furnished by the Federal Government consists of a complete hospital unit of 200 beds and includes everything from bandages and X-ray machines to equipment for 3 operating rooms.

From September 28 to October 15 I will make a tour of the 16 counties in the 11th Congressional District. It is my hope that my travels through the district will give me opportunity to greet you personally and obtain the benefit of your views on important national issues as well as to be of service to you with respect to any problems you may have involving Federal affairs.

Because of my position as a ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means I have been designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to be one of two House Members attending the meeting of the contracting parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to be held in Tokyo, Japan, beginning October 26; therefore, it will be necessary that I return to Washington after the district tour in order to leave on this important assignment. During the meetings in Japan I will study steps that may be taken by our Government and business community to protect the jobs of our citizens against unfair import competition as well as to expand our export markets.

From November 18 to December 16 the Committee on Ways and Means will be holding panel discussions on the various provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, and I will have to be in Washington for these sessions. My Washington office will be open during the adjournment period of the Congress to handle all matters pertaining to the 11th District.

The thousands of letters that I have received during this session from the district were most welcome. It is good to have the views of the people back home, either for or against a legislative proposal, or on any other problems in which you are interested.

Columbus Day, a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Members of the House, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman PETER W. RODINO, JR., has introduced H.R. 418 which seeks to declare October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday.

I want to congratulate Congressman RODINO for the great ability, zeal, and enthusiasm with which he has pursued the laudable objective of making Columbus Day a national holiday. His efforts are an appropriate accompaniment to his valuable, effective work in many important fields with which the Congress is concerned. Congressman RODINO's service in the Congress has reflected great ability, dedication, and unswerving purpose in serving his district and the Nation.

The designation of Columbus Day as a national holiday has already been too long delayed. I hope that the Congress at an early date will give suitable attention to Congressman RODINO's bill, H.R. 418, and effect its enactment.

At this time I will not elaborate on the many reasons which suggest the propriety of favorable action on this measure. Christopher Columbus was one of the great men of history, an intrepid explorer who, with extreme courage faced untold dangers to discover a great new continent and establish the first settlements here which have led to the fabulous, historic developments of the Americas, and particularly of our own great, beautiful Nation.

Many States, including my own State of Massachusetts, have recognized Columbus Day and there is every reason why the Nation should give fitting recognition to the memory and heroic exploits of a great son of Italy whose achievements made possible the establishment of the greatest government of all times and many other governments and nations of the Western Hemisphere which share with us the common legacy of democracy, freedom, and justice.

Americans of Italian blood and descent, who have made such great contributions to America, and all true lovers of liberty, are interested in H.R. 418 and I hope that it will be passed without further delay, and am proud to pledge myself to that most appropriate objective.

Government Financing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from time to time I have asked the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a careful evaluation of estimates, appropriations, new obligation authority, and new obligation authority outside of the appropriation process—commonly referred to as "backdoor" financing.

In addition I have requested complete data on all other measures which might affect the 1960 budget and also future

years. I am therefore submitting, and ask unanimous consent, for inclusion in the RECORD on the next to the back page of the RECORD certain tables relating to these matters. This I believe will bring this entire physical matter up to date.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Adjustment to appropriation bills*

	President's budget estimates	Final amount approved	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates		President's budget estimates	Final amount approved	Increase or decrease compared to President's budget estimates
Total, all bills (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Sept. 15, 1959)	$74,859,006,445	$72,977,598,352	−$1,881,410,093	Decreases, etc.—Continued			
Decreases which are actually postponements to another year or reductions which must be restored for uncontrollable items:				Liquidation of contract authority, prior-year deficiencies, etc			$48,300,000
Development Loan Fund, 1961 requirements			500,000,000	Reductions in uncontrollable items: Veterans' compensation, pensions, etc			20,962,500
Defense production expansion—restoration of capital			179,285,072	Actual decrease			1,032,862,521
Commodity Credit Corporation—restoration of capital			100,000,000				

TABLE II.—*New obligational authority provided outside the appropriation process (so-called back-door financing)*

Bill No.	Title	President's request	Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease made by the Congress	Bill No.	Title	President's request	Amount agreed to by conferees	Increase or decrease made by the Congress
H.R. 4452 S. 1094	Bretton Woods Agreement Act	$4,550,000,000	$4,550,000,000		H.R. 3460	Tennessee Valley Authority	$750,000,000	$750,000,000	
S. 2654	Housing Act of 1959, 1959-61	800,000,000	925,000,000	+$125,000,000		Total, 1959-61	6,220,000,000	6,451,000,000	$+231,000,000
S. 1 H.R. 1011	Aid to Airports, 1960-61	120,000,000	126,000,000	+6,000,000					
H.R. 2256	Veterans Housing Loan Act		100,000,000	+100,000,000					

TABLE III.—*Other measures affecting the budget in 1960 and future years*

A. AUTHORIZATION IN APPROPRIATION ACTS

Bill No.	Title	President's requests	Amount agreed to by conferees	Increases or decreases made by the Congress	Remarks
H.R. 7349	Commerce appropriation bill—increase in merchant marine subsidized voyages.		$1,300,000,000	+$1,300,000,000	For a 20-year period.
H.R. 7175	Agriculture appropriation bill:				
	Agricultural conservation program	$100,000,000	250,000,000	+150,000,000	Authorization for 1960 crop year, requiring appropriations in fiscal year 1961.
	Farmers Home Administration—loan authorization.	388,000,000	421,000,000	+33,000,000	
H.R. 7509	Public works appropriation bill—public works starts		751,000,000	+751,000,000	Cost to complete after 1960.
H.R. 5676	District of Columbia appropriation bill—loan authorization.	35,400,000	34,300,000	−1,100,000	

B. SUBSTANTIVE LEGISLATION

H.R. 7060	Veterans pension bill		$9,300,000,000	+$9,300,000,000	Estimated costs for 40-year period over existing law. Administration bill (H.R. 6432) proposed savings below existing law of $47,862,000,000 over the 40-year period.
S. 2654	Housing Act of 1959:				
	Public housing—annual contributions		719,000,000	+719,000,000	For a 40-year period.
	All other authorizations for appropriations	$10,000,000	75,000,000	+65,000,000	
S. 1289	Extension of special program		11,000,000	+11,000,000	For a 2-year period.
S. 2162	Federal employees health benefits	80,000,000	110,000,000	+30,000,000	1st year costs.

C. FAILURE TO ENACT PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS

Postal rates	−$350,000,000		+$350,000,000	Proposed increased in postal rates.
Aviation fuel tax and user charges	−140,000,000		+140,000,000	Proposed increase in receipts for full year.
Tax adjustments	−50,000,000		+50,000,000	Do.
Total (net)	73,400,000	$12,971,300,000	[1]12,897,900,000	

[1] The food stamp program (H.R. 8609), which is nonmandatory, would add $220,000,000 to this total for a 2-year period (1960-62). The total excludes pending legislation passed by one or both Houses now awaiting further congressional action. In future fiscal years these bills would cost several billion dollars beyond the President's requests. They include peacetime ex-servicemen's readjustment benefits (S. 1138), youth conservation corps (S. 812), international medica research (S.J. Res. 41), grants to States for educational television (S. 12), area redevelopment (S. 722), and water pollution (H.R. 3610).

Food Stamp Plan Makes Sense Both From Economic and Humanitarian Standpoints

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most monumental problems facing this country today is the almost inconceivable amount of surplus foods stored by the Federal Government as a byproduct of our overall farm program.

We are indeed in a dilemma. Our legislative program, combined with an extremely efficient agricultural economy, has produced the most bountiful crop in the history of mankind. The basic economic law of supply and demand dictates the unwisdom of dumping our surplus on the world market because of the resulting chaotic effect on the economies of the Nation and the world. On the other hand, we have millions of undernourished Americans to whom survival itself is most precarious. Is it not ironic that so many are starving in the midst of plenty?

In my opinion, Congress has provided the tools which, while not solving the problem in its entirety, will certainly be a forward and constructive step toward providing food for the needy at home. I refer to the recently enacted food stamp plan. If the President would follow the intent of Congress and place this plan into effect, the now idle surpluses would be reduced and many of the unfortunate citizens would be given the means to supplement their meager diets.

Beyond question, a healthy America is essential to a strong America. In this connection, I appealed to the President to use the tools given him by this Congress and put into effect pilot food stamp projects in distressed areas of our country.

My letter in this regard follows:

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

Please accept my humble apology for burdening you with additional problems, especially when you are already overburdened with the details of the Khrushchev visit and talks in the interest of all mankind.

But, the daily problems of existence of many unfortunate constituents of mine weigh heavily upon me, also. In the Biddeford-Sanford area of the First Congressional District of Maine there has been for several continuing years, because of economic depression, a condition of surplus and distressed labor which persists even in these times of relative job security in other parts of our country.

Consequently, those of us who represent this district, and that, of course, includes yourself through yours, the highest office of the land, have the direct responsibility to protect the individual welfare of these good citizens who, through no fault of their own, need the support of their fellow Americans in order that they and their families may have something more than a mere existence. They, too, are a part of this great Nation. They have contributed to its growth and they have made it possible over the years, through their conscientious work, for many of the financially secure to achieve the material security which they are now enjoying. But, Mr. President, hundreds and thousands of these most respectable constituents of yours and mine are existing on standards of living far below the levels necessary for self-respect and dignity. Of these facts you must be aware, even though your hours are filled to overflowing with the details of the responsibilities of American and world leadership which bear down so heavily upon your shoulders.

Despite these burdens, none of us in national office today can shrink especially because of ideological reasons from the responsibility of meeting the minimum needs, to say the least, of individual citizens and family groups who need help. Adequate food supplies, with some consideration, at least, for a decently balanced diet, seem to me to be a "must" in our consideration for these good, but needy, people of our own country.

To meet this minimum need the Congress has enacted a permissive food stamp program and, as you know, the language of the bill declared it to be the intent and purpose of the Congress that such a "food-for-the-needy distribution plan with an annual limitation of $250 million should be initiated at your discretion which, in my opinion, should be made applicable in several experimental localities where chronic unemployment has caused these conditions of poverty and undernourishment to develop and persist.

It is with regret that I have noted newspaper comment attributed to you to the effect that you do not intend to honor this intent of Congress. The reasons stated are to the effect that the Federal Government is already contributing to a disproportionate degree to the subsistence needs of these needy people, as well as that the stamp plan would only replace existing food distribution programs by Federal agencies. Of course, you have never stood in one of these food lines and observed the inadequacies and the indecencies of the present distribution plan under the current surplus commodities distribution program. I wonder if you know that butter was recently discontinued by Secretary Benson although the only remaining fat in this unbalanced food distribution program. Cheese was formerly included, and gave these worthy Americans some variety from the drab items to which they are now doomed by your Secretary of Agriculture, who refuses to use funds under section 32 of Customs receipts, where he has broad authority, if he was only ideologically minded to use them.

When you say, Mr. President, that a disproportionate load would be borne by the Federal Government if these very meager provisions of the food stamp plan were implemented, I wonder if you are mindful of the general welfare clause of our Constitution, which obligates us to treat all Americans with the dignity and justice to which they are entitled.

You have never hesitated to urge upon us the need to shoulder far-reaching obligations for the undernourished and the underprivileged of all the foreign areas of the world. I realize that you are a deeply religious and Christian man. I know that Secretary Benson is the same. But, I respectfully submit that neither you nor Mr. Benson are practicing what you preach. If we are our brother's keeper, and I believe that we are, then surely, we should never hesitate to see to it that our brother gets some small part of the fat that this great and wealthy Nation has and will continue to accumulate. It occurs to me that the Secretary may be touring Soviet Russia and other foreign areas looking for needy brothers to "keep," while consciously overlooking the undernourished of America.

In closing, may I respectfully remind you that Ambasasdor Lodge, during the past few days, brought Premier Khrushchev up to date on the type of capitalism which we enjoy, and, in correcting the Premier, our able Ambassador told him that we practice humanitarian principles toward all our people, stressing our social-welfare laws. Your expressed intention to bypass the intent of Congress and deny to our people the humanitarian justice implicit in the food stamp plan certainly is not in keeping with the words of Mr. Lodge.

I urge you, Mr. President, to apply the provisions of this stamp plan, and to name the Biddeford-Sanford area of Maine as a pilot area for this program. My worthy, but needy, people are looking to you for this Christian consideration.

Most respectfully yours,

JAMES C. OLIVER,
Member of Congress.

Summary of the Record and Accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means During the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the usual custom of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and also in specific response to the request of our distinguished majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, to committee chairmen, I am pleased to take this means and opportunity to summarize the record and accomplishments of the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

At the outset, I would like to commend the members of the Committee on Ways and Means for their hard work, their devotion of long hours and days and weeks to our committee activity, and to the manner in which they have diligently carried out their responsibilities as legislators and as members of the committee. My colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means have served ably and conscientiously, and during the course of this session of the 86th Congress they have initiated and acted upon legislation which is meritorious and which is greatly in the public interest.

During the session of the 86th Congress which has just drawn to a close, the committee has acted upon legislation touching practically every field of its broad jurisdiction. As will be recalled, the Committee on Ways and Means has the primary responsibility for considering legislation relating to Federal revenue, our Federal social-security laws and programs, our customs and tariff laws and programs including reciprocal trade agreements, measures relating to the management of the public debt and deposit of public moneys generally, renegotiation, legislation to control the trafficking in narcotics and narcotic drugs, and certain other miscellaneous categories of legislation which are minor

but nonetheless important areas of activity. It is unnecessary to emphasize that the consideration of legislation touching upon any of these fields calls for the highest degree of responsibility, because these areas of legislative activity have an immediate effect upon the lives of all of our citizens and the economy of our Nation.

The legislation which has been favorably acted upon is sound, responsible, and beneficial to the American people. Of course, as is the usual case, there were some measures reported on which there was not unanimous agreement, just as there were some bills reported which I voted against. However, that is the way our committee system works. Customarily, due to the complexities of the legislative measures which come before the Committee on Ways and Means, it is necessary for the committee to devote a considerable amount of time to an intensive exploration of the issues involved and an evaluation of the ramifications which any given proposal may have upon the economy of the Nation prior to taking action. It should be borne in mind, therefore, that the 1st session of the 86th Congress has also been a period of establishing the necessary detailed groundwork in preparation for further activity which will transpire during the second session of this Congress.

Before reviewing in detail the legislation which was favorably reported by the committee during this first session at this point I will present statistics on the committee activity which may be of interest.

From early January of this year until the adjournment of the first session, the full Committee on Ways and Means met in executive session 91 times, covering approximately 75 days, many of which days consisted of both morning and afternoon sessions. In addition, the committee met 40 days in the conduct of public hearings on subjects falling within its jurisdiction. The hearings of the full committee are contained in some 10 volumes covering 5,200 pages of testimony. During the course of these public hearings approximately 450 witnesses personally appeared before the committee to present testimony. In addition, the hearings contain statements and expressions of views of hundreds of additional individuals and organizations on the subjects under consideration.

There follows a complete table which shows all the subjects upon which public hearings were conducted by the committee, along with the number of witnesses who actually appeared personally before the committee and the number of days devoted to each such hearing:

TABLE 1.—*Public hearings, Committee on Ways and Means, 1st sess., 86th Cong.*

	Dates held	Number of—	
		Days	Witnesses
Advisory group recommendations on chs. C, J, and K of the Internal Revenue Code	Feb 24, 25, 26, 27, Mar. 2, 3, and 4, 1959	7	41
Mineral treatment processes for percentage depletion purposes	Mar. 5, 6, 9, 10, and 11, 1959	5	46
Unemployment compensation	Apr. 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16, 1959	8	95
Extension of the Renegotiation Act	Apr. 27, 28, and 29, 1959	3	19
Public debt and interest rate ceiling on bonds	June 10, 11, and 12, 1959	3	16
Foreign Investment Incentive Act (H.R. 5)	July 7, 8, and 9, 1959	3	52
Children's estate tax deduction (H.R. 7924)	July 10, 1959	1	8
Hospital, nursing home, and surgical benefits for beneficiaries (H.R. 4700)	July 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17, 1959	5	91
Taxation of exchanges and distributions pursuant to antitrust decrees (H.R. 8126, 8231)	July 20 and 21, 1959	2	12
Highway trust fund and Federal-aid highway financing program	July 22, 23, and 24, 1959	3	70
Total		40	450

There were referred to the Committee on Ways and Means during the session just concluded a total of 1,606 public bills and resolutions which constitutes approximately 20 percent of all the public bills and resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives during this period. The committee favorably reported to the House of Representatives a total of 56 bills, of which 51 have passed the House of Representatives, 25 have passed the Senate, and 25 have been enacted into public law. These reported measures, as has been pointed out earlier, cover all areas of the committee's jurisdiction. There follow tables which show the foregoing in more detail, including a breakdown of the measures both referred to the committee and reported by the committee:

TABLE 2.—*Legislation referred to Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Cong., 1st sess.*

	Total number of tax bills	Total number of tariff bills	Total number of miscellaneous bills	Total number of social security bills	Total
House bills	943	189	55	385	1,572
House joint resolutions	3	2	1	1	7
House concurrent resolutions	1	0	21	0	22
House resolutions	1	1	2	0	4
Senate bills	0	0	1	0	1
Total	948	192	80	386	1,606

TABLE 3.—*Statistics on status of bills reported by Committee on Ways and Means, 86th Congress, 1st sess.*

	Social security	Tariff	Tax	Miscellaneous	Total
Bills reported to House	4	16	32	4	56
Bills passed House	4	14	28	5	51
Bills reported to Senate	2	9	10	4	25
Bills passed Senate	2	9	10	4	25
Bills enacted into law	2	9	10	4	25

ESTABLISHMENT OF SUBCOMMITTEES

The Committee on Ways and Means, under the Rules of the House of Representatives, is charged with maintaining continuous watchfulness over the administration of the laws within the jurisdiction of the committee by the administrative agencies concerned. In order to more effectively carry out its responsibilities in this regard the committee in the early part of this first session established three subcommittees as follows: Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws; Subcommittee on the Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy; and Subcommittee on Administration of the Social Security Laws. These subcommittees were authorized and directed to maintain watchfulness over the administration of the existing laws within their respective jurisdictions and to take such actions as were appropriate in the premises to advise the full committee with regard thereto. During the latter part of the session just concluded the committee also specifically charged its Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws to make certain studies with respect to the administration of the laws relating to the Federal highway trust fund.

Due to the heavy schedule of the full committee, the subcommittees generally deferred their hearing activities until after adjournment, at which time it is anticipated that each area involved will receive careful and intensive consideration.

The membership of each of the subcommittees is as follows:

Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws: Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman; Hon THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Democrat, of Illinois; Hon. EUGENE J. KEOGH, Democrat, of New York; Hon. FRANK IKARD, Democrat, of Texas; Hon. RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Republican, of Pennsylvania; Hon. NOAH M. MASON, Republican, of Illinois; Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Republican, of Tennessee.

Subcommittee on the Administration of Foreign Trade Laws and Policy: Hon. HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, chairman; Hon. CECIL R. KING, Democrat, of California; Hon. FRANK M. KARSTEN, Democrat, of Missouri; Hon. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, Democrat of Michigan; Hon. JAMES B. FRAZIER, Jr.,

Democrat, of Tennessee; Hon. JOHN W. BYRNES, Republican, of Wisconsin; Hon. VICTOR A. KNOX, Republican, of Michigan; Hon. JAMES B. UTT, Republican, of California; Hon. BRUCE ALGER, Republican, of Texas.

Subcommittee on Administration of the Social Security Laws: Hon. BURR P. HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, chairman; Hon. A. S. HERLONG, JR., Democrat, of Florida; Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR., Democrat, of Pennsylvania; Hon. JOHN C. WATTS, Democrat, of Kentucky; Hon. LEE METCALF, Democrat, of Montana; Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri; Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, Republican, of Ohio; Hon. ALBERT H. BOSCH, Republican, of New York.

PREPARATION FOR PANEL DISCUSSIONS ON TAX REFORM

The committee completed plans for the initial stages of consideration of the practical possibilities for constructive reform of our Federal income tax system. Beginning on November 16, 1959, a series of panel discussions will be conducted at which time the committee will receive the views and opinions of acknowledged experts in all of the major areas of income taxation covered by the Internal Revenue Code. Prior to the conduct of these actual panel discussions there will be published a volume of papers which will have been prepared by the experts who are expected to take part in the November panel discussions. This volume of papers will be made available to Members of Congress and the interested public at an early date. It is anticipated also that a record will be made during the panel discussions which will run for approximately 5 weeks and that this record will likewise be published and made available to all who are interested.

LEGISLATION TO STRENGTHEN AND AID SMALL BUSINESS

Before proceeding to a discussion of the major legislation reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, it is worthwhile to briefly mention at this point several measures which received favorable consideration by the committee which in the aggregate will result in material assistance to our small business enterprises throughout the Nation. As may be recalled, the committee has properly been concerned for the past several years with the continued maintenance of effective opportunities for the Nation's small business activities. During this session of the Congress, the committee took favorable action on a series of measures which will strengthen and assist many small business endeavors. Without undertaking to enumerate them in any order of relative importance, the following measures are worthy of mention: The committee took action to provide that, for purposes of the provisions relating to the payment of the excise tax on gasoline, wholesale distributors of gasoline are to be treated as producers. Under this legislation, a hardship previously existing with regard to the payment of the excise tax by independent distributors and jobbers will be effectively removed. Second, the committee favorably reported and there has been enacted into law a measure to remove a hardship with regard to the taxation of so-called dealer reserves. This legislation, which is summarized at a later point, should be of material benefit in assisting not only dealers in automobiles, but also dealers in other forms of personal and real property. For the most part, these are all small business enterprises. Third, the committee acted to amend the laws relative to the tax treatment of expenditures made to determine the presence, location, quantity, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral—except oil and gas. Prior law provided for a maximum deduction which might be taken for any one year of $100,000, but for no more than 4 years. The legislation approved by the committee would remove the 4-year limitation while maintaining an overall litmit of $400,000. This legislation would, therefore, assist the small enterprises engaged in this form of activity. Still another provision of law which was agreed to by the committee, in the form of acceptance of Senate amendments to another House bill, was a change in the statute relating to the election of certain small business corporations as to their taxable status. Specifically, this provision removed a hardship which had developed under prior law in determining the number of shareholders of a small business corporation where a husband and wife owned stock jointly or as community property. Additionally, the law was clarified with regard to the definition of a small business corporation. Finally, these amendments also included a provision to exempt small-business investment companies from the personal holding company tax, a measure which was requested by the Small Business Administration.

The foregoing is not intended to be a complete or exhaustive discussion of all of the measures which the committee favorably acted upon which will benefit small business, but merely to list a few examples of such measures as indicative of the committee's solicitous regard for the importance of maintaining and strengthening small-business enterprises in our great Nation.

BRIEF OVERALL SUMMARY OF MAJOR BILLS REPORTED

The following measures might well be classed in the category of major legislation favorably reported by the committee during the 1st session of the 86th Congress: the Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959; the Public Debt Act of 1959; the financing provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959; a bill permitting the issuance under specified circumstances of series E and H U.S. savings bonds at interest rates above the existing maximum, et cetera; a bill making technical changes in certain excise tax laws; the extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951; the Tax Rate Extension Act of 1959; the Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act of 1959; and the Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1959. A brief summary of each of these measures follows:

H.R. 4245, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law No. 86-69, signed June 25, 1959:

The Life Insurance Company Tax Act of 1959 provided the most comprehensive revision of the taxation of life insurance companies since 1921. In 1921, life insurance companies were taxed only on a portion of their investment income. The portion taxable broadly represented the amount of investment income over and above the company's requirements for adding interest to life insurance reserves. This excess portion has in the past been computed on the basis of formulas derived from the aggregate industry experience. Since 1921, the life insurance companies paid no tax on their so-called underwriting income, that is, the excess of their premium income over their expenses and their provisions for death benefits and additions to reserves.

The new life insurance company tax law makes two fundamental changes. The law provides that the tax will be based only in part on the company's investment income, and in part on the company's underwriting income. In computing the taxable portion of the investment income, the law avoids the use of industrywide formulas and provides a method whereby each company's investment income tax liability is based upon its own investment experience.

To explain the new law more specifically, the investment income tax is contained in the so-called phase 1 tax. For purposes of this tax, the company first determines its net investment income, that is, the total of interest, dividends, and the like, minus investment expenses. From this, it is permitted a reserve interest deduction computed by multiplying its adjusted reserves by its earnings rate. The earnings rate is the lower of its current earnings rate or the average of its earnings rate over the previous 5 years. The adjusted reserves are the book reserves adjusted to eliminate the effect of the company's arbitarary reserve interest assumption.

The so-called phase 2 of the tax is based upon the company's actual net gain from operations which is, generally speaking, its total income. This total income figure is derived from the company's own books with certain adjustments. If the total income exceeds the phase 1 tax base, the company must add to its taxable income from phase 1 one-half the difference. If the total income is less than the phase 1 tax base, the company may substract the difference, after limiting its deduction for policyholder dividends to a maximum of $250,000.

To comment on the second alternative first, it should be pointed out that the new law for the first time since 1921 provides that the life-insurance company's tax may go down when the company's actual operations show losses. It has been a feature of the investment income tax approach that many new and small life-insurance companies have had to pay substantial taxes on their investment income in years when their own books showed an aggregate loss. For this reason, the new tax law will be of great benefit to many new and small life-insurance companies.

In the case of life-insurance companies whose aggregate income is in excess of the tax case from phase 1, it was explained that they will be taxable currently on only one-half of this difference. The other half will, so to speak, be available as a reserve to meet future contingencies and will be added to the tax base at any time that it is actually paid out to shareholders.

The bill also contains a number of provisions dealing with special situations that might arise in the life-insurance industry.

H. R. 7749, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86-74, signed June 30, 1959:

This bill, which became law without amendment, provided for an increase in the permanent debt ceiling of $2 billion, to $285 billion, and for an additional temporary in-

crease of $10 billion for 1 year, making the debt ceiling $295 billion to June 30, 1960.

The administration had requested that the permanent ceiling be raised to $288 billion, with an additional temporary increase for fiscal year 1960 of $7 billion. The committee, however, did not consider it necessary or advisable to raise the permanent ceiling to the full extent requested by the administration, and in subsequent testimony the Secretary of the Treasury indicated to the Senate Finance Committee that the provisions of the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means were workable in terms of Treasury requirements, and acceptable to the administration.

Title II of H.R. 8678; Public Law 86-342, signed September 21, 1959:

One quite significant and important action of the Committee on Ways and Means was the development of title II of H.R. 8678, which provided financing provisions to secure additional revenue for the Federal-aid highway program, which is financed through the highway trust fund. While the bill H.R. 8678 was formally reported by the Committee on Public Works, title II thereof was developed and drafted by the Committee on Ways and Means in accordance with a prior agreement which had been worked out by the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Public Works. Likewise, the material contained in title II of the House report which accompanied the bill was developed and drafted by the Committee on Ways and Means.

It was drawn to the attention of the committee during the course of the first session that an immediate problem with regard to financing the Federal-aid highway program was in evidence in that without legislation providing further funds for the program, it was estimated that there would be a deficit in the highway trust fund by the end of fiscal year 1960 of some $490 million, and at the end of the fiscal year 1961, an accumulated deficit of $980 million would be in prospect even if no further apportionments were made.

Legislation, therefore, was urgently necessary to provide additional financing for the highway trust fund to meet this immediate problem.

Title II of H.R. 8678, therefore, contained a solution for the financing problems and enabled the continuance of the Federal-aid highway program at a level commensurate with the completion of the program and the needs of the economy. Specifically, title II of H.R. 8678 provided for the imposition of an additional 1-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline, diesel fuel, and special motor fuels, for the 21-month period beginning October 1, 1959, and ending June 30, 1961, and allocation to the highway trust fund of 5 percentage points of the manufacturers' excise tax on passenger cars, etc., and of 5 percentage points of the tax on auto parts and accessories for the 3-year period beginning July 1, 1961, and ending June 30, 1964. The additional revenue provided by title II, combined with the existing revenues of the trust fund, should make possible apportionments for the interstate system of $1.8 billion for the fiscal year 1961 and $2 billion for the fiscal year 1962, in addition to the $2.5 billion of apportionments which had already been made for the fiscal year 1960. These apportionments can be made without suspension of the limitation on the trust fund, which is the so-called Byrd amendment.

These provisions should assure that there will be no deficit in the highway trust fund for 1961 or in any subsequent year through the fiscal year 1964.

H.R. 9035, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86-346, signed September 22, 1959:

Another major bill in the field of general fiscal and debt management legislation which was favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means was H.R. 9035 (which has become Public Law 86-346, approved September 22, 1959).

This bill made a number of changes in the laws relating to savings bond interest rates and other aspects of debt management:

First, it permits the maximum interest rate (or investment yield) limitation of 3.26 percent on series E and H savings bonds to be exceeded where there is a finding by the President that the national interest so requires. The bill also authorizes increasing the interest rates on outstanding series E and H savings bonds. In this case, also, the existing maximum limitation of 3.26 percent on these bonds may be exceeded, but only in the case of a finding by the President that the national interest so requires. A Senate amendment to this section of the bill, which was accepted by the House, added a proviso that in no event may the interest rate or the investment yield on these bonds exceed 4¼ percent per annum.

Second, the bill adds a new section to the Internal Revenue Code providing for nonrecognition of gain or loss on the exchange of U.S. obligations when so provided by regulations. This is intended to aid the Government in its attempts to achieve a better balance in the debt structure by facilitating the refinancing of outstanding securities in advance of their final maturities.

Third, the bill authorizes the issuance of obligations of the United States to Government trust funds at the issue price, whether or not at par. Under existing law in the case of certain trust funds, these obligations may be issued to the funds only at par.

Fourth, the bill makes it clear that both the principal and interest on U.S. obligations are exempt from all State taxes except nondiscriminatory franchise, etc., taxes.

Fifth, the bill relieves from liability to the U.S. Government agents who erroneously paid U.S. bonds if they did not receive written notice from the United States within 10 years from the date of the erroneous payment.

This legislation is quite important to the millions of American citizens who purchase and hold series E and H savings bonds, since it will permit an increase in the interest rate payable to these individuals on this important type of savings, if the President finds that the national interest will thereby be served. The legislation will further encourage investment in these bonds by our individual citizens and will permit them to continue to participate in this vitally important savings program. It will assist the Treasury in the management of the public debt.

H.R. 8725, by Mr. HARRISON; Public Law 86-344; signed September 21, 1959:

In 1958 the Congress passed the Excise Tax Technical Changes Act of 1958, which constituted a comprehensive revision of the technical and administrative provisions of the Federal excise taxes. In a technical revision of this magnitude, almost of necessity there are changes made which after experience in actual operations will require further modifications. The purpose of H.R. 8725, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to effect six such modifications which experience under the 1958 act has shown to be required. These technical changes amend the provisions relating to the retailers' excise tax on jewelry, the exemptions from excise taxes for nonprofit educational organizations, the club dues tax, the tax on communications as it relates to common carriers and communication companies, the basis of the documentary stamp tax in the case of transfers of stock rights or warrants, and the occupational tax applicable to so-called claw, crane, or digger machines in certain cases.

This legislation, which was favored by the Treasury Department, became law in the form reported by the committee.

H.R. 7086, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86-69; signed July 13, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for an extension of renegotiation authority for 4 years to June 30, 1963. Certain other amendments were contained in the bill which the committee was of the opinion would be of benefit to industry as well as contributing to the administration of the act. These related to the factors to be considered in determining excessive profits, the provision for carry forward of losses on renegotiable business, the statements required to be furnished by the Renegotiation Board, proceedings before the Tax Court in renegotiation cases, and review of Tax Court decisions in such cases.

The Senate amended the House bill substantially, and it was sent to conference. Under the conference agreement, which was accepted by both bodies, a 3-year extension of renegotiation authority was provided, to June 30, 1962. In addition, a 5-year carryforward to fiscal years ending after December 31, 1958, of renegotiation losses was provided, in the cases of losses arising in fiscal years ending on or after December 31, 1956. An increase in the compensation of the General Counsel of the Renegotiation Board was provided, to $19,000 per annum. Further, certain studies of procurement policies and practices, the Renegotiation Act, and the policies and practices of the Renegotiation Board were directed to be made. The overall report developed from these studies is to be made not later than March 31, 1961.

H.R. 7523, by Mr. Mills; Public Law 86-75, signed June 30, 1959.

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as the bill passed the House, it would have provided a 1-year extension, to July 1, 1960, of the existing corporate normal tax rate and of certain excise tax rates (the so-called Korean increases, including the increased rates on distilled spirits, beer, wine, cigarettes, passenger automobiles, and automobile parts and accessories). The legislation was designed to implement the request of the administration that these rates be continued for another year.

The Senate, while approving the provisions of the House bill, added several amendments. These included the repeal, as of July 1, 1960, of the excise taxes on communication services, the repeal of the tax on transportation of persons, the repeal of the 4 percent credit against tax presently provided for dividend income, and other amendments relating to the Federal share in certain public assistance programs under the social security law.

Under the conference agreement, and as the bill became law, the bill in addition to providing a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax rate and the excise tax rates referred to above, provides that the tax on transportation of persons will be reduced to 5 percent as of July 1, 1960, and that the tax on general (local) telephone service be repealed as of July 1, 1960.

H.R. 10, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House March 16, 1959.

This bill would permit self-employed individuals to take a current tax deduction for limited amounts of investment in certain types of retirement annuity, or a specific type of retirement trust. The investment, plus accumulated earnings, would be treated as ordinary income when taken down.

The House suspended the rules and passed this bill, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, on March 16, 1959, and at adjournment it was pending before the Senate Committee on Finance.

H.R. 529, by Mr. KARSTEN; passed House September 9, 1959:

This bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, is designed

to give full effect to treaty obligations of the United States to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the manufacture of narcotic drugs and to require that such manufacture be restricted to persons and premises that have been licensed for the purpose. It is also designed to amend the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to bring the regulation of exports in conformity with current treaty obligations, and to permit the importation and exportation of certain narcotic drugs for scientific research purposes. It establishes a comprehensive system of licensing and control over the manufacture, distribution, and use of both natural and synthetic narcotic drugs.

The committee received favorable reports on this legislation from the Departments of State and the Treasury, and it has the approval of the pharmaceutical industry. The committee is of the opinion that enactment of this legislation will be of assistance to the agencies charged with administering our narcotic control laws and treaties, and will be beneficial to the citizens of our Nation.

In addition to the major bills discussed above, there were a number of less comprehensive but nonetheless important bills reported by the Committee on Ways and Means during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, which are summarized below, grouped as to the subject with which each deals—that is, taxes, social security, customs and tariff, and so forth.

TAX LEGISLATION (OTHER THAN EXCISES)

H.R. 47, by Mr. BOGGS; Public Law 86-376, signed September 28, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that, with respect to the $600 dependency exemption for income tax purposes, a child placed with the taxpayer by an authorized placement agency for legal adoption by him shall be treated in the same manner as a natural born child and a legally adopted child, if the child is a member of the individual's household.

The Senate, in addition to approving the provision of the House bill, added two basic amendments, both relating to the tax treatment of small business. The first, making changes in the statute relating to the election of certain small business corporations as to their taxable status (1) amends section 1371 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that in determining the number of shareholders of a small business corporation, a husband and wife owning stock jointly or as community property shall be counted as only one shareholder; (2) amends section 1374 of the code to make clear that a deceased shareholder will not be denied his pro rata share of a small business corporation's net operating loss; and (3) strikes out paragraph (8) of section 1504(b) (relating to the definition of "includible corporation") of the code, thereby clarifying the definition of a small business corporation. The Senate Finance Committee report indicates that this paragraph of the code actually operates to have an effect just the reverse of its original intent, which was to prevent an electing small business corporation from having an 80-percent-owned subsidiary.

The second Senate amendment amended section 542(c) of the code to exempt small business investment companies from the personal holding company tax. This amendment had been requested by the Small Business Administration in an executive communication which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The House agreed to the Senate amendments to this legislation.

H.R. 135, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House August 25, 1959:

This bill, which passed the House unanimously as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, excludes from U.S. tax the portion of amounts paid to nonresident alien individuals by the United States as civil service anuuities and other retirement benefits for services performed abroad as employees of the United States. Under present law, nonresident aliens working for an American Embassy or other Government agency abroad are not subject to U.S. tax on salaries paid by the United States; similarly, amounts set aside by the Government for the future retirement of nonresident aliens working abroad are free of tax. However, to the extent such annuities represent earnings on the amounts set aside by the Government, such payments are taxable. The committee was advised by the Department of State that nonresident alien employees consider their pensions to be deferred compensation, and that since their earned income is tax free, they expect their pensions also to be tax free. The committee was further informed that the imposition of this tax has caused severe hardships and has engendered resentment against the United States, and that this tax treatment has been objected to by many foreign governments, some of which have repeatedly protested its imposition. This legislation, as amended by the committee, was also favored by the Treasury Department.

H.R. 137, by Mr. KEOGH; Public Law 86-175, signed August 21, 1959:

This bill prevents a pyramiding of Federal estate taxes where foreign death taxes are imposed on charitable bequests. This is accomplished by allowing a deduction for estate tax purposes for foreign death taxes (as provided under present law for State death taxes) imposed (and paid) on charitable bequests if (1) the property on which the tax is imposed is situated in the foreign country and included in the gross estate of a citizen or resident of the United States, and (2) if the decrease in tax resulting from the deduction is to go to charities (or the entire Federal estate tax is to be equitably apportioned among all of the transferees of the estate). Where this deduction is allowed, no credit against the estate tax is to be available for the foreign taxes which are deducted.

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as the bill passed the House, this provision would have been effective with respect to the estates of decedents dying after the date of enactment of the bill. The Senate, however, amended the bill to provide an effective date of July 1, 1955 (that is, to apply to the estates of decedents dying on or after that date).

The Senate amendment was accepted by the House.

H.R.1219, by Mr. BENTLEY; Public Law 86-141, signed August 7, 1959:

This bill adds a provision to the 1954 code relating to persons who have been mentally incompetent for a period beginning at least 3 months prior to December 31, 1947, and who remain so until the date of their death. The bill provides that any powers such persons have at the date of their death to change beneficiaries of a trust they created (of the type referred to in section 1000(e) of the 1939 code) are not to result in such property being included in their gross estate for estate tax purposes. This provision is the same as a 1939 code provision (sec. 811(d)(4)) which was applicable with respect to decedents dying after December 31, 1947, and on or before August 16, 1954.

The provision added to the 1954 code by this bill is to apply with respect to estates of decedents dying after August 16, 1954. Thus, as a result of this bill, and previous actions, the exception for mentally incompetent will apply to all years from 1947 forward, so long as the decedent involved is mentally incompetent from October 1, 1947, to the date of his death.

The bill, which became law without amendment, contains a provision that no interest is to be allowed or paid on any overpayment resulting from its enactment with respect to payments made before the date of enactment.

H.R. 2578, by Mr. YATES; passed House August 18, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides that the marital deduction is to be available for estate tax purposes with respect to allowances or awards which, pursuant to local law, are paid within 15 months from the date of a decedent's death to the decedent's surviving spouse for her support during the period the decedent's estate is being settled. This is accomplished by specifically providing that these allowances or awards are property passing from the decedent to a person, and not terminable interests for which no marital deduction is available. Under present law, questions arise as to the circumstances under which the marital deduction is available with respect to an award or allowance made pursuant to local law for support of a decedent's surviving spouse during the period of the settlement of the decedent's estate; these questions for the most part have been resolved by reference to the governing local law as interpreted by the local courts, with the result that the allowance of the marital deduction for these awards has varied from State to State. Uncertainty also exists as to whether any estate tax deduction is available for these allowances. This bill would assure that the extent to which the marital deduction is allowed with respect to these awards or allowances is the same in all States, and will not turn on technical questions of local law.

This legislation passed the House under unanimous consent and at adjournment was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 2906, by Mr. MCCORMACK; Public Law 86-280; signed September 16, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided that the period of limitations for filing a claim for credit or refund for an overpayment of taxes, to the extent attributable to a creation of or an increase in a net operating loss carryback resulting from the elimination of excessive profits by renegotiation, is not to expire before September 1, 1959, or the end of 1 year after the month in which the agreement or order for the elimination of the excessive profits becomes final, whichever is later. The bill amends both the 1939 and 1954 codes, and applies to all 1954 code years and, with respect to the 1939 code, to claims for taxable years ending after December 31, 1952. While the special period provided under the law where net operating loss carrybacks are involved generally provided adequate time for the filing of a claim for credit or refund, the committee's attention was called to a type of case where this was not true and where the taxpayer may not be in a position to know that he is eligible for a credit or refund before the expiration of the period of limitations. This placed the Government in the position in such cases of taking money away from a taxpayer, on one hand, and yet on the other hand denying him the opportunity to obtain a credit or refund where this decreases his tax liability. This legislation was intended to rectify this situation.

The Senate approved the provision of the House bill, and added an amendment directing the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate to allow credit or refund to Dexter Phillips and Jeannette H. Phillips of an income tax overpayment for the calendar year 1951, to the extent such overpayment was attributable to the erroneous inclusion in their gross income for such year of the amount received by Dexter Phillips in final distribution of his grandfather's estate. The Senate report (S. Rept. 663) states that "the

circumstances of this case * * * indicate that a timely claim for refund was made, and that this claim was erroneously rejected by the examining officer and his superior. In view of these circumstances, your committee is of the opinion that relief should be given in this case for the particular taxpayers who, following the conclusions of the Government's representatives concerned, did not further prosecute their claim within the period of limitations."

After conference agreement to the Senate-passed bill, the bill became law in that form.

H.R. 3151, by Mr. CURTIS (Missouri); failed of House passage under suspension of the rules September 1, 1959:

This bill would amend the provisions of present law permitting the Federal Government upon request to enter into an agreement to withhold State or territorial tax from compensation paid Federal employees who are employed in the State or territory so as to also provide for withholding of city taxes by the Federal Government, with respect to its employees who are employed in a city with such a tax, if the city has a population of 75,000 or more. The committee was of the opinion that the same reasons which prompted enactment of the law permitting withholding of State tax from the compensation of Federal employees also required the withholding of city income taxes from such employees, i.e., the fact that cities also have cooperated with the Federal Government with respect to fiscal matters generally and do withhold Federal income taxes from compensation paid their employees.

The restrictions of existing law applicable to State withholding taxes, designed to limit the administrative burdens of the withholding by the Federal Government and to prevent hardship and discrimination in the case of the Federal employees involved, would also apply to the city withholding taxes, under the bill.

The Treasury Department indicated its approval of this legislation, which failed to pass the House under suspension of the rules by a narrow margin, and at adjournment was pending on the Union Calendar.

H.R. 4251, by Mr. BAKER; passed House September 9, 1959:

Under present law, a deduction for income tax purposes may be taken for exploration expenditures made to determine the presence, location, quantity, or quality of any deposit of ore or other mineral. (This is not available in the case of oil and gas wells.) The maximum deduction which may be taken for any year is $100,000, for no more than 4 years (whether or not consecutive) with respect to all property held by the taxpayer. The purpose of H.R. 4251, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to remove the 4-year limitation of present law, and substitute an overall limitation of $400,000; the maximum limitation of $100,000 in any one year would be retained.

The committee was advised that the provision of present law has tended to discriminate against the small producers, in that a large producer may obtain the full benefit of these deductions by claiming $100,000 in each of 4 years, but a small producer whose annual exploration expenditures are not as high as $100,000 will have the deductions available to him reduced below $400,000 because of the 4-year limitation. Under the bill, a taxpayer would still not be able to claim exploration expenditure deductions with respect to any year in excess of $100,000, but if his expenditures on a yearly basis are less than $100,000, he will be able to claim such deductions over more than a 4-year period so long as the total deductions claimed are not in excess of $400,000.

The bill was pending in the Senate Committee on Finance at the time of adjournment.

H.R. 5547, by Mr. MILLS; passed House September 9, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to possessions of the United States.

First, the bill provides that income tax liability incurred to the Virgin Islands may be reduced by grants, subsidies, or similar payments in the case of corporations, and in general only if in past 3 years they have derived 80 percent of their income from sources within the Virgin Islands and 50 percent from the active conduct of a trade or business. Where such conditions are met the income tax liability of the corporations may be reduced only with respect to their income from sources without the United States. In the case of individuals, the bill provides that tax liability may be reduced only in the case of citizens of the United States (whether or not also citizens of the Virgin Islands) only if they are bona fide residents of the Virgin Islands for the entire year. Where these conditions are met the tax liability of the individuals may be reduced only with respect to income from sources within the Virgin Islands. These amendments are to apply to tax liability for taxable years beginning on or after January 1, 1959.

Second, the bill provides that the estate and gift taxes are to apply to those who are U.S. citizens only by reason of citizenship in the U.S. possession and who are residents of a U.S. possession at the time they die or make a gift in the same manner as in the case of those who are "nonresidents not citizens of the United States." In general this means that they are to be subject to estate or gift tax only with respect to property situated in the United States (but not in the case of property situated in the possessions or elsewhere). The estate and gift tax amendments are to apply to estates of decedents dying after, or gifts made after, the date of enactment of this bill.

The bill had the support of the Treasury Department, and passed the House under unanimous consent.

H.R. 6155, by Mr. BETTS, passed the House August 25, 1959:

As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, and as it passed the House, the purpose of this bill is to move forward from September 1, 1951, to September 1, 1957, the date before which certain mutual deposit guarantee funds must be organized in order to qualify for income tax exemption. The other requirements for the exemption, which are left unchanged by this bill, provide that the organizations must be mutual, nonprofit organizations without capital stock and operated to provide reserves and insurance for building and loan associations, cooperative banks, or mutual savings banks.

Three of the four presently existing mutual deposit guarantee funds were organized before September 1, 1951, and therefore presently qualify for exemption. A fourth such organization organized after that date but before September 1, 1957, will qualify for exemption under this bill. These organizations perform essentially the same type of services as the FDIC and FSLIC, Federal corporations which are exempt from income taxation.

H.R. 6482, by Mr. UTT, passed House September 9, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill amends the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the unemployment tax. At present a corporation, which within the first 20 weeks of the year is merged or consolidated in a second corporation, is not treated as an "employer" for purposes of the Federal unemployment tax but generally is so considered for most State unemployment compensation taxes. As a result, the first corporation usually must pay the State tax in such cases, and then the second corporation must pay the full Federal tax but cannot obtain the credit usually available for the State tax paid by the first. This faulty operation of the credit for State taxes is overcome in the bill by permitting the same credit to the second corporation in such cases for the State taxes paid by the first as if this first corporation had been the "employer."

The House passed this bill under unanimous consent and at adjournment it was pending before the Senate Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6777, by Mr. O'BRIEN, of Illinois; passed House August 25, 1959:

This bill relates to restricted stock options where the spread between the option price is from 85 to 95 percent of the price of the stock on the date the option was granted. In these cases, in general, the spread between the option price and the price of the stock at the time the option was granted is treated as ordinary income at the time of the sale of the stock or at the time of the employee's death.

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides that if the stock passes to the surviving spouse, the taxation of the ordinary income element is deferred until the spouse sells the stok or dies, etc. The stock must actually go to the spouse, however, by bequest or inheritance (it can also pass to the spouse by surviving in the case of joint ownership) within 15 months of the employee's death, or if not in this interval the Treasury must be given notice within that time that it may go to the spouse and then inform the Treasury of the subsequent disposition of the stock. The amendment would be effective for employees dying in 1959 and later years.

H.R. 6779, by Mr. SIMPSON; passed House August 25, 1959:

Under present law, the unlimited charitable contribution deduction in general is available where in the last 10 years the charitable contributions and income taxes paid by an individual equal 90 percent of his taxable income (with certain modifications) in each of 8 years. The purpose of H.R. 6779, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend this provision of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the 90-percent test will be considered as satisfied for each of any two consecutive years where it is met on the basis of the average of contributions, taxes, and income in the 2-year period. The bill provides, however, that the charitable contributions and taxes in each of these 2 years must represent at least 75 percent of the income of that year.

The amendment would be effective for the calendar year 1957 and subsequent years, but no refunds or credits are to be paid as a result of this change for any year prior to the calendar year 1959.

H.R. 7588, by Mr. KEOGH; passed House August 18, 1959:

As reported to and passed by the House, this bill would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that personal holding company income is not to include income from copyright royalties. The bill specifies certain conditions to preclude the abuse of this amendment.

The personal holding company tax was developed to prevent the establishment of a corporation to be used as a corporate pocketbook in handling investment income. It has been brought to the committee's attention that existing law does in fact characterize as a personal holding company an organization that is actually an operating company. It was not intended that such an organization be included within the definition of a personal holding company, and this legislation would clarify existing law in that respect.

H.R. 7947, by Mr. IKARD; passed House September 9, 1959:

Under present law, financial institutions selling mortgage paper to the Federal Na-

tional Mortgage Association must subscribe to stock of the Association in an amount equal to 2 percent of the mortgages sold. This stock, however, has been selling on the market at substantially less than the issuance price. The purpose of H.R. 7947 is to provide that where FNMA stock is purchased under these conditions, any excess of the issuance price over the fair market value on the date of issuance is to be treated as an ordinary and necessary business expense in the year of purchase rather than as a part of the cost of acquiring the stock. This treatment is to be available for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1958, and the committee stated in its report on the legislation that it intends no inferences to be drawn as to the tax treatment accorded FNMA stock before the enactment of this provision.

The bill passed the House, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, under unanimous consent.

H.R. 8126, by Mr. SIMPSON; reported to House September 2, 1959:

As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill adds two new sections to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the income tax treatment of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws. The committee was of the opinion that this legislation carries out the policies already established by Congress with respect to the income tax treatment of other situations in which a taxpayer is compelled to divest himself of property as a result of Government action. In such situations it has been considered inappropriate to impose a tax where there is an involuntary realization of gain. The provisions of the bill do not result in exemption from tax, but rather a postponement, where distributions of stock or dispositions of property are made as a result of orders enforcing the antitrust laws.

H.R. 8229, by Mr. KNOX; passed House September 9, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides a new exempt category for income tax purposes in the case of trusts providing for the payment of supplemental unemployment-compensation benefits. These may be the only benefit payments made by the trusts, or may be payments made together with subordinate sick or accident benefits (but not retirement or death benefits). This exempt category differs from the category, already under existing law, under which some of these trusts obtain exemption, in that the new provision does not require the subtrusts to obtain at least 85 percent of their income from employers or employees (and not from investment income). The so-called nondiscriminatory provisions of present law applying to qualified pension, profit sharing, and stock-bonus plans are in general made applicable to the trusts qualifying under the new exemption category. In addition, the prohibited transaction and unrelated business income provisions of present law are made applicable to the new exemption category.

H.R. 9004, by Mr. IKARD; passed House September 9, 1959:

This legislation pertains to the timing of reporting for tax purposes with respect to dealer reserves and provides transitional rules to bring the reporting of dealer reserve income into conformity with proper accounting methods. As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, two alternative methods are provided for payment of tax due on such income not previously reported. First, it provides that such amounts can be treated as required changes in methods of accounting. In general this means that the reserves built up prior to 1954 need not be reported for tax purposes, and that only the excess of the current balance over the 1954 balance in the reserve is to be reported. A second alternative provided permits the computation of the deficiencies (or overassessments) which would arise if the income had been reported in the proper years, and then the sum of these amounts (plus interest up to the time of selecting this alternative) may be paid in 10 annual installments, generally beginning in 1961.

The committee agrees that dealer reserve income should be reported on a proper accrual accounting basis; however, it is believed that a hardship would be created by requiring all dealers to make the transition to this method of reporting this income in 1 year, following recent Supreme Court decisions in this matter, especially in view of the numerous circuit court decisions going to the contrary of these Supreme Court decisions, which many dealers have previously been following.

This legislation passed the House under unanimous consent, and at adjournment was pending before the Senate Committee on Finance.

S. 2282, by Senator SALTONSTALL and Senator KENNEDY; Public Law 86-371, signed September 23, 1959:

The purpose of this legislation was to provide that no department or agency of the United States shall accept compensation from any State or Territory for withholding State or Territorial income taxes. Enactment of this bill had become necessary because of a newly enacted State law providing for compensation to employers who withhold State taxes from their employees, and in the absence of legislation to the contrary, there was doubt as to the power of the executive departments or their officers to decline to accept compensation due to the United States. There are compelling reasons against the wisdom of such acceptance. After consideration, the Committee on Ways and Means agreed to the Senate amendment, and so indicated on the floor of the House, without filing a committee report, whereupon the bill was passed and sent directly to the President.

EXCISE TAX LEGISLATION

H.R. 147, by Mr. KEOGH; Public Law 86-37, signed May 29, 1959:

This bill, which was enacted into law without amendment, suspended through June 30, 1960, the 3-cents-per-pound tax imposed on the first domestic processing of palm oil, palm-kernel oil and fatty acids or salts derived therefrom. This action was taken in order to place these oils on a competitive parity with coconut and babassu oils, which are used for the same general purposes. The tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil was suspended to June 30, 1960, by the provisions of a Senate amendment to H.R. 2842 of the 85th Congress, which the House accepted and which became part of Public Law 85-235; no processing tax is imposed on babassu oil. The resulting situation, therefore, placed palm and palm-kernel oils at a competitive disadvantage, and this legislation was designed to restore the competitive balance.

H.R. 2164, by Mr. FORAND; passed House September 1, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means to the House, this bill would reduce from 20 to 10 percent the tax imposed with respect to roof gardens, cabarets, and similar establishments. The committee stated in its report on the bill (H. Rept. 817) that this action was taken for two principal reasons: First, the present 20-percent rate is discriminatory in that the rates of almost all other ad valorem excise taxes do not exceed 10 percent; and second, it is believed that the present high rate of this tax has been a substantial deterrent to the employment of musicians and other entertainers. The House suspended the rules and passed the bill.

H.R. 4586, by Mr. FORAND; passed House August 18, 1959:

The purpose of this bill, which was reported to the House without amendment by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to exempt aromatic cachous from the excise tax on toilet preparations. The Committee was of the opinion that aromatic cachous (which are aromatic pellets, such as Sen Sen, which are chewed for the purpose of sweetening the breath) should not be subject to tax as toilet preparations since they are more nearly like mouthwashes and candied mints than like the externally applied toilet preparations which comprise the other articles subject to that tax; moreover, the tax on aromatic cachous places them at a competitive disadvantage with nontaxed articles purchased for similar use; and further, they are usually sold in shops which do not handle other articles subject to the toilet preparations tax, thus discouraging the proprietors from handling them because of the burdensome requirement of collecting and remitting negligible amounts of tax.

The Treasury Department submitted a favorable report on this legislation, which passed the House under unanimous consent and at adjournment was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 4857, by Mr. HAGEN; Public Law 86-319, signed August 21, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill amended two of the exemptions from the admissions tax to provide that in determining whether an athletic game is played between students from elementary or secondary schools, or colleges, where the proceeds inure to a hospital for crippled children, or an exempt organization operated exclusively for the benefit of retarded children, the term "student" is to include anyone who was a student at the school or college within the 8 months immediately before the athletic game. This makes the exemption available for all-star and other similar benefit games even though the game is played shortly after the end of the school or college year. The bill was favored by the Treasury Department, and became public law in the form reported by the committee.

H.R. 5751, by Mr. MACHROWICZ; reported to House August 18, 1959 (see H.R. 8678, title II):

As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would have provided that, for purposes of the provisions relating to payment of the excise tax on gasoline, wholesale distributors of gasoline are to be treated as "producers," when they are registered and bonded for this tax. The gasoline tax is payable by the producer or importer at the time he makes his sale; thus, in the case of the integrated company, no tax is collected until after sale to the service station or ultimate consumer. The tax on sales made to independent wholesalers, however, has heretofore been collected at the time of that sale, which the committee believed has resulted in discrimination against independent gasoline wholesale distributors.

This legislation was reported to the House unanimously by the committee; however, the provisions of this amendment were also incorporated in title II of H.R. 8678 (the financing provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1959), and became public law as a part of that bill (Public Law 86-342).

H.R. 6132, by Mr. MILLS; passed House September 9, 1959:

This bill, which was reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House unanimously, without amendment, amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the rate of tax on the issuance of shares or certificates of stock by regulated investment companies.

Under present law the documentary stamp tax on original issues of stock is levied at the rate of 10 cents per $100 of actual value. The documentary stamp tax on stock transfers, on the other hand, is levied at the rate of 4 cents per $100 of actual value.

Regulated investment companies which operate as open-end mutual investment companies, however, do not usually provide for the trading of their securities. Instead they issue new securities to those desiring to buy their stock, and redeem the stock of those desiring to sell. As a result they pay a 10-cents-per-$100 issuance tax on transactions which to others would result in a transfer tax of 4 cents per $100 of actual value.

The bill provides that the issuance tax in the case of qualifying regulated investment companies is to be imposed at the rate of 4 cents per $100 of actual value, rather than the 10-cent rate otherwise applicable.

H.R. 6785, by Mr. FRAZIER; passed House September 9, 1959:

The purpose of this bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend section 4071 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide a tax of 1 cent a pound in the case of the sale of laminated tires not of the type used on highway vehicles if the tires consist wholly of scrap rubber from used tire casings and have an internal metal fastening agent. This is in lieu of the 5-cents-a-pound tax which otherwise would apply. Such tires are used for off-highway purposes, primarily on lifts, cranes, payloaders, weed cutters, and similar types of industrial and farm equipment. The committee was advised that there are relatively few known manufacturers of laminated tires, and it is believed that any revenue loss from enactment of this legislation will be negligible.

H.R. 8318, by Mr. KEOGH; reported to House September 8, 1959:

At the present time bicycle tires are subject to the 5-cents-a-pound manufacturers' tax on tires, and bicycle inner tubes are subject to the 9-cents-a-pound manufacturers' tax on inner tubes. This is true both of tires and tubes manufactured in the United States and those imported. These excise taxes do not apply, however, to tires and tubes already mounted on bicycles when the latter are imported into the United States.

The purpose of this bill, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax on tires and tubes, bicycle tires and tubes sold for use, or used, in the manufacture of new bicycles. The taxes would continue to apply to tires and tubes sold, or used, as replacements.

SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

H.R. 213, by Mr. PATMAN; Public Law 86-284, signed September 16, 1959:

As this bill was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, it amended section 218 of the Social Security Act to provide an additional period of time within which certain State agreements may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees. This provision, under which nine States (including Hawaii) can provide OASI and disability insurance coverage for certain nonprofessional school district employees without a referendum and as a group separate from the professional employees who are in positions under the same retirement system, had expired on July 1, 1957, and the committee was advised that at least some of the named States had not secured the desired coverage before its expiration. In order to accommodate the States whose legislatures meet only in odd-numbered years, the committee-amended bill reinstates this provision to January 1, 1962.

In addition to approving the provisions of the House bill, the Senate added several amendments. These amendments extend to the States of California, Kansas, North Dakota, and Vermont the application of the present provision of the social security law which permits specified States to extend old-age, survivors and disability insurance coverage to policemen and firemen covered by a State or local retirement system. A provision was also adopted which has the effect of validating certain social security contributions which had erroneously been made by certain municipal employees in Oklahoma.

In conference, the House agreed to the Senate amendments.

H.R. 3472, by Mr. FORAND; passed House March 23, 1959:

This bill provides that in determining the eligibility of Federal civilian employees for unemployment compensation, their accrued annual leave shall be treated in accordance with State laws. Under present law, no compensation may be paid to a Federal employee during a period subsequent to separation from Federal service when he is being paid for accrued annual leave. The committee was of the opinion that there is no inconsistency in the payment of both unemployment compensation and a sum for accrued annual leave to the same person for the same period of time, as the concept of insurance, unemployment, and maintenance of purchasing power (with which unemployment compensation is concerned) are not involved with respect to the matter of annual leave. The bill would place the Federal civilian worker in the position of being treated in exactly the same manner as workers in private industry who receive similar annual leave payments upon separation, by making the award of unemployment compensation depend upon the provisions of the appropriate State law. The committee approved a technical amendment to the bill to insure that no change would result in the rules for determining "Federal service" and "Federal wages" for purposes of the exservicemen's unemployment compensation program, which became law last year (Public Law 85-848), and the bill passed the House without further amendment. This legislation is presently pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 5640, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86-7, signed March 31, 1959:

The purpose of this bill, which was reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means and passed the House without amendment, was to extend from April 1, 1959, to July 1, 1959, the time during which unemployed persons who had established a claim to temporary unemployment compensation under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958 before April 1, 1959, might receive such payments. The legislation was designed to provide a gradual closing out of the program rather than a sudden discontinuance. The unexpended balance of the appropriation which had been made at the time the 1958 program was enacted was more than sufficient to take care of the additional payments and costs which the Department of Labor estimated were involved in this legislation.

The Senate amended the bill to some extent, and under the conference report which was agreed to by the House and Senate, the bill became law as passed by the House, with an amendment which had been suggested to the Senate Finance Committee by the Department of Labor which was designed to assure that individuals who had exhausted their regular benefits prior to April 1, 1959, but whose regular report days, under procedures followed by their State agencies, would be after April 1, 1959, would not be precluded from receiving the benefits of this act (in all cases such claims must have been filed before April 7, 1959).

H.R. 5920, by Mr. BOSCH; passed House September 9, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would amend title II of the Social Security Act to change the rule for crediting quarters of coverage on the basis of maximum creditable wages paid in years before 1951 to conform to the rule applied in the case of maximum creditable earnings in years after 1950. Under present law an individual who receives the maximum creditable wages for OASI coverage is given credit for four quarters of coverage, regardless of when in the year the wages were earned; however, with respect to wages earned in a calendar year before 1951, an individual earning the maximum creditable amount is deemed to have a quarter of coverage in each quarter following his first quarter of coverage of such year.

The committee was advised that this discrimination has precluded some individuals from qualifying for OASI coverage, and this legislation would correct this situation.

CUSTOMS AND TARIFF LEGISLATION

H.R. 1217, by Mr. BENTLEY; reported to House August 3, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provides for a 2-year suspension of import duties on amorphous graphite or plumbago (crude or refined) which is valued at $50 per ton or less. The United States is dependent on imports for nearly all its requirements of natural amorphous graphite, which is a mineral with a wide variety of uses. Favorable reports were received on the bill as introduced (which provided for transfer to the free list, irrespective of value) from the Departments of Commerce, Treasury, State, Defense, Labor, and Interior, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission. No action had been taken on this legislation in the House prior to adjournment of the first session.

H.R. 2411, by Mr. MAGNUSON; Public Law 86-262, signed September 1, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill provided for the addition to the free list of tourist literature issued by certain groups, relating chiefly to places or travel facilities outside the United States, the purpose and effect of the legislation being to simplify the traiff treatment of tourist literature and to extend the present duty-free treatment to a broader class of such literature. Safeguarding provisions against abuse are provided for by law. The bill passed the House without amendment.

The Senate, in addition to approving the provisions of the House bill, amended the bill to include the provisions of two other bills which the Committee on Ways and Means reported individually, and both of which passed the House—H.R. 4576 (providing for a 2-year suspension of duty on the importation of book bindings or covers imported by certain institutions) and H.R. 6249 (liberalizing the tariff laws for works of art and other exhibition material). A further Senate Finance Committee amendment relating to the importation of wood moldings, was deleted on the Senate floor. The amendments of the Senate were accepted by the House.

H.R. 2886, by Mr. KEOGH; Public Law 86-235, signed August 8, 1959:

Enactment of this legislation suspended for 3 years the import duties on certain classifications of spun silk yarn provided for in paragraph 1202 of title I of the Tariff Act of 1930. Spun silk yarns of the fineness provided for in this bill are not produced domestically in any quantity. Imported yarns, which are usually finer in size than those of domestic manufacture, are used for various decorative purposes and in the production of certain types of silk broadcloth and other fabrics. The committee was advised that suspension of the duties on the raw materials for such silk fabrics would improve the competitive position of the domestic silk-

weaving industry and would tend to increase the domestic production of silk cloth. Favorable reports on the legislation were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, as well as an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The bill became law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3681, by Mr. OSTERTAG; Public Law 86–34, signed May 29, 1959:

This legislation provided for the duty-free entry of certain chapel bells imported for the use of the Abelard Reynolds School No. 42 in Rochester, N.Y. The committee was advised that these bells are not manufactured in the United States, would be used for the musical training and appreciation of students at the school, and would remain the property of the school. The bill became law without amendment.

H.R. 4385, by Mr. MACHROWICZ; passed House August 18, 1959:

As reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, the purpose of this bill is (1) to add iconostases to the list of articles for which free entry is presently provided in paragraph 1774 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (providing for the free entry of certain articles for religious purposes); (2) to provide for the free entry of adjuncts and appurtenances of the named articles whether to be physically joined thereto or not; and (3) to extend the application of paragraph 1774 to cemeteries, schools, hospitals, orphanages, and similar nonprofit activities staffed and controlled by corporations and associations organized and operated for religious purposes.

The committee was advised by the interested Government Departments that enactment of this bill would assist in solving certain difficult interpretative questions which have arisen under the present provisions of paragraph 1774. Favorable reports on the bill were received from the Departments of State, Labor, and Commerce, and informative reports from the Department of the Treasury and the U.S. Tariff Commision. The House passed the bill under unanimous consent and at adjournment it was pending in the Senate Finance Committee.

H.R. 4576, by Mr. COHELAN; passed House August 18, 1959 (see H.R. 2411):

This bill, as it was reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for a 2-year suspension of the import duties on book bindings or covers imported by certain institutions. The suspension of duty on book bindings or covers provided by Public Law 83–694 and Public Law 84–723 expired on August 31, 1958, and since that time these items have been subject to duty. The committee was advised by the U.S. Tariff Commission that it was not aware of any complaints against imports under the previous temporary duty exemption, and favorable reports on the bill were received from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce.

This bill passed the House under unanimous consent on August 18, 1959; the Senate Finance Committee, however, adopted the provisions of H.R. 4576 as an amendment to H.R. 2411, and the 2-year suspension of duty on book bindings or covers became law as a part of that bill (Public Law 86–262).

H.R. 5054, by Mr. HEALONG; reported to House August 31, 1959:

As reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill would amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide that imported articles whose container must be marked with the name of the country of origin, shall whenever repackaged, have all succeeding containers so marked, whether repackaged by the importer, jobber, distributor, dealer, retailer, or other person. Failure to mark will make the goods subject to seizure and forfeiture under the customs laws. The Committee on Ways and Means amended the bill to limit the importer's liability under its provision so as to apply only until the article in question passes out of his custody and control, and unless and until subsequently repackaged by or for his account.

H.R. 5508, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86–14, signed April 22, 1959:

This bill, which became law without amendment, provided permanent legislation permitting the free entry under bond of imported articles for exhibition or use at fairs designated by the Secretary of Commerce. The bill follows the basic provisions of the numerous trade fair laws which have been enacted for individual fairs in the past, and eliminates the necessity for the enactment of separate laws in behalf of individual fairs and the repeated issuance of regulations, as in the past. The committee was advised that enactment of this legislation, which was recommended by the interested executive departments, would facilitate cultural and commercial interchanges between the United States other countries.

H.R. 5887, by Mr. KEITH; passed the House September 9, 1959:

The purpose of this bill, as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, by placing ground, powdered, or granulated seaweeds on the free list. The seaweed involved is used primarily by domestic processors who produce an end product in the form of a powdered extractive used in foods and other products as jelling, thickening, etc., agents. The committee receives favorable reports on this legislation from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, and an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

H.R. 6054, by Mr. KARTH; Public Law 86–115, signed July 28, 1959:

This bill, which became law in the form in which it was reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for a 1-year continuation, to June 30, 1960, of the suspension of duties on imports of metal scrap. Favorable departmental reports were received on this legislation and the committee received no information indicating any opposion to its enactment.

H.R. 6249, by Mr. METCALF; passed House August 25, 1959 (see H.R. 2411):

As amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, this bill was designed to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, so as to liberalize the definition of "works of art" which may be imported duty-free to include modern art forms and to ease restrictions on the importation of articles of educational or artistic value when they are meant for exhibition and not for sale. The legislation was worked out in cooperation with the Treasury Department to modernize the antiquated provisions of law which tended to sharply reduce the number of abstracts, collages, lithographs, and primitive carvings imported for the enjoyment of the general public. This bill passed the House unanimously on August 25, 1959; the Senate Finance Committee, however, adopted the provisions of H.R. 6249 as an amendment to H.R. 2411, and this legislation became law as a part of that bill (Public Law 86–262).

H.R. 6368, by Mr. HEALONG; Public Law 86–325, signed September 21, 1959:

The purpose of this legislation, which became law without amendment, was to transfer from the dutiable to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 pumice stone imported to be used in the manufacture of concrete masonry products, such as building blocks, bricks, tiles, and similar forms. The Committee on Ways and Means was advised that enactment of this legislation would benefit the makers of building blocks and other masonry products, and that there were no facts to indicate it would have an adverse effect on any U.S. industry. Favorable reports were received on the bill from the Departments of State, Treasury, and Commerce, as well as informative reports from the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Tariff Commission.

H.R. 6579, by Mr. KEOGH; Public Law 86–288, signed September 16, 1959:

This legislation, which was enacted into law in the form reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, provided for the temporary free importation (to the close of September 28, 1960) of extracts, decoctions, and preparations of hemlock suitable for use for tanning, regardless of their chief use. Favorable reports were received on the bill from the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, and Labor, and an informative report from the U.S. Tariff Commission.

H.R. 7456, by Mr. BALDWIN; passed House August 18, 1959:

The purpose of this bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means, is to extent for 3 years (until the close of March 31, 1963) the existing suspension of import duties imposed on casein under paragraph 19 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. The committee was advised by the executive departments that they are unaware of any unfavorable developments resulting from the free importation of casein, and favorable reports were received on this legislation from the Departments of Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce, as well as informative reports from the Department of the Treasury and the U.S. Tariff Commission.

H.R. 7567, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86–99, signed July 17, 1959:

This legislation, which was introduced in behalf of the administration at the request of the Department of Defense, extends for 2 years, to July 1, 1961, the privilege of free importation of gifts from members of the Armed Forces of the United States on duty abroad. This privilege has been provided continuously since 1942, and is limited to shipments of bona fide gifts not exceeding $50 in value.

The Department of Defense in urging the enactment of this legislation expressed the opinion that a very definite morale factor is embodied in this legislation. It is extremely important to a serviceman on tour of duty overseas that he be able to send small gifts and souvenirs from the region in which he is serving to his family and friends in this country. If such articles were made subject to duty, the administrative problems involved in sending gifts home would serve to discourage this practice.

Adequate safeguarding provisions exist in the act and through appropriate administrative regulations. The bill became law without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS

Although the following bills amend the Internal Revenue Code, they are not properly classifiable as tax legislation.

H.R. 4029, by Mr. KING of California; passed House August 18, 1959.

This legislation, which passed the House under unanimous consent, amends the sections of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which were developed from the National Firearms Act. The primary purpose of that act was to facilitate the control of weapon utilization by gangster and other underworld characters. The purpose of the bill is to eliminate the interference of this police regulation of these weapons with sport and recreational utilization without jeopardising the deterrence to improper and unlawful uses. The legislation, the provisions of which were worked out in conferences with representatives of the Internal Revenue Service and law enforcement agencies, would be of benefit to gun collectors, rifle associations, and persons having an avocation involving firearms, without interfering with the effective administration of the National Firearms Act taxes. As a result of the conferences on

this legislation, a number of features have been incorporated in the bill which are designed to aid in enforcement and simplify the administration of these provisions.

H.R. 8685, by Mr. MILLS; Public Law 86-368, signed September 22, 1959.

The purpose of this bill, which became law as amended by the Committee on Ways and Means, was to provide that the Assistant General Counsel for the Treasury Department who is to be the Chief Counsel for the Internal Revenue Service is to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The office of Assistant General Counsel serving as Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service, which the new office replaces, was filled by an appointee of the Secretary of the Treasury. The basic compensation rate of the new officer will be $19,000.

Enactment of this legislation was favored by the Treasury Department.

Your Community in World Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, around the world, the United States, and other nations, are trying to find new, more effective ways to promote international understanding and better relations among countries.

Over the years, countries have made such attempts—on a more limited scale—to carry on interchanges of people, ideas, technical know-how, and otherwise improve relationships with other nations.

Now, however, we live in a shrunken world. The miracles of science and technology—through man's ingenuity—have greatly diminished oceans, mountains, and distances as natural barriers between nations.

Now, once-far-distant countries are over-the-fence, next door neighbors. Modern communication has provided instantaneous contacts between people. Jet travel has greatly reduced the time it take to travel between places—once far apart on the earth. Rocket-powered missiles with warheaded nuclear bombs could—if triggered for war—create such devastation and destruction as the world has never known, almost in a matter of minutes—anywhere on the globe.

In view of these changed conditions, it is particularly important that a stepped-up effort be made to establish a climate more favorable to peace.

Even though science and technology have largely eliminated the natural barriers to physical interchange, however, there still remain obstacles to improving relations among nations. These include: a wide variety of languages; different histories; conflicting economic interests; differing political, ideological, religious, and other philosophies—all of these sometimes become obstacles to better relationships.

However, I am confident that these are not insurmountable.

Nevertheless, the obstacles—in whatever form they exist—cannot be overcome by a do-nothing attitude.

Rather, it will require a sincere, concerted, active effort, both by governments, by people, by organizations, associations, leagues, and other groups—to win the peace—to create the climate for better relationships among different peoples.

At this time, I would like to pay tribute to a splendid, voluntary program, designed to promote much-needed municipal understanding and relationships with communities of other countries.

Through this effort, more than 100 U.S. cities and towns are now participating in a new form of international relations. The program is serving a most constructive purpose.

Recently, the Municipality, published by the League of Wisconsin Municipalities, contained an informative article on this commendable endeavor to promote good will through municipal affiliations with other communities elsewhere in the world.

Illustrative of the kind of constructive action needed in this field, I request unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR COMMUNITY IN WORLD AFFAIRS—AMERICAN MUNICIPALITIES FORM AFFILIATIONS WITH TOWNS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

(By Alan Beals, director, town affiliations, American Municipal Association)

More than 100 U.S. cities and towns are now participating in a new form of international relations at the grass roots level. Called a town affiliation, sister city or twinning, it means broadening the contacts of community organizations, groups and individuals with counterparts overseas to carry out programs of friendship. Cities formally affiliate with overseas cities to achieve this objective.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, in commenting recently on the types of programs undertaken by cities now affiliated, stated, "Congratulations for this great job of international goodwill." Senator CLAIR ENGLE, of California, called the affiliation of American communities the most dynamic development in the field of U.S. foreign relations since World War II.

The President of the United States called a group of leading American citizens to a special White House Conference in 1956 to discuss ways and means for building new roads to international understanding. The aim was to build a people-to-people program of communication between Americans and the citizens of other lands. One objective was to encourage American cities to affiliate with cities overseas. Though the idea is relatively new to America, there are hundreds of affiliations among European cities.

INITIAL CONTACTS

The first contacts between affiliated cities are usually made at the municipal level. The mayor serves as honorary chairman of the affiliation. The next contacts are made between organizations that have counterparts; such as educational, cultural, technical, business, professional, social, civic, service, religious, labor, youth, and hobby groups. From these municipal and organizational contacts, the third level is on a person-to-person basis. When the affiliation between cities is properly organized and established, continuing contacts result on all three levels.

Most American communities form a committee to carry out the program. Members of the committee are generally leaders of organizations which represent a cross-section of the community. The committee is responsible for locating an appropriate sister city.

Selection of a foreign city is based, where feasible, on mutual interest. Some affiliated cities are similar in size and economic characteristics; others are not. The American Municipal Association is available to help in locating an overseas community for affiliation. When the overseas community agrees to join hands, formal resolutions are passed by the respective city councils and ceremonies are usually held in both communities.

Following the formal affiliation, contacts and projects are begun with the sister city. The only limitation on the types and numbers of projects in the imagination of the community. Some towns plan only two or three projects a year, while others, because of their greater resources, undertake more extensive programs. No one organization can be expected to execute a successful town affiliation by itself. The work should be divided among the largest number of people and organizations.

FINANCING

A budget is needed of course. It can be small or large and is generally raised outside of city government funds by the affiliation committee. Communities have used different ways for raising funds to finance a major activity of this type. In Montclair, N.J., an annual ball is held, and all the proceeds are used for the affiliation program with Graz, Austria. In San Jose, Calif., civic and service organizations pay annual membership dues to support the program with Okayama, Japan. Many projects are supported by services of business, cultural and civic groups. Hotels have offered free lodging to overseas visitors, auto dealers have supplied transportation, and manufacturers have lent their private aircraft and pilots.

Many projects can be carried out with little or no cost. Examples are exchanges of school artcraft, exchanges of photographic exhibits, pen pals, tape pals (exchange of tape recordings), exchanges of magazines and technical literature, and contacts between ham radio operators in each community. Civic, service and social clubs establish contacts with counterpart groups in the sister city. If such groups do not exist in the affiliated city, it may be possible to assist citizens overseas to establish such groups.

ASSISTANCE AVAILABLE

The American Municipal Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington 6, D.C., is available to help local communities to establish town affiliations. AMA will provide any city or town with information on speakers who may be able to address a communitywide meeting considering affiliation and with assistance in locating and selecting a city overseas. The AMA brochure, "Your Community in World Affairs," outlines the steps that most American communities have used to initiate affiliation. It is available on request. All communities, large and small, can start a town affiliation with a city overseas. Some fascinating city in another part of the world wants to be friends.

Facts and Fictions of U.S. Capitalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEM MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a provocative essay on U.S. capitalism

was published in the Reporter magazine this month. The author, Mr. David T. Bazelon, is a corporation lawyer, of New York City.

Mr. Bazelon observes that we, as a Nation, suffer from "an astonishing amount of downright mythical thinking" about property and economic organization. He asks who actually enjoys effective ownership of the great business corporations that are the heart of our private property system.

He suggests that—

The issue is, first, to recognize the existence of this crucial economic power now held by corporate and other managers, and then to request them to justify it to us. Power must be legitimated, otherwise any talk of law itself, much less democratic citizenship, becomes absurdly irrelevant.

* * * We are free to engage in politics—and indeed we were as a Nation created free in order to do so. But to pick up our birthright requires at least a significant number of us to indicate with reasonable frankness and accuracy what the basic national power is, where it is, and who the stewards of it are.

I commend this commentary particularly to some of those whose lobbies were so busy recently pushing certain portions of title VII of the Landrum-Griffin bill under the banners of union democracy and labor reform. I respectfully suggest that these gentlemen—who are among those now pointing and chortling the loudest—pause a moment and look in a mirror. They should be seeing themselves, too.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Bazelon's essay in the Appendix of the RECORD:

FACTS AND FICTIONS OF U.S. CAPITALISM

(By David T. Bazelon)

We seem, as a nation, to be committed equally to increasing production and deceiving ourselves about our productive system. The realities of the American economy are massive and dominant in our way of life; and they are extraordinarily dynamic and original in their evolving nature. But the rhetoric we employ to describe this core activity of ours is overwhelmingly obscurantist: reality and image are hardly within hailing distance. To put it simply, we suffer from an astonishing amount of downright mythical thinking about money and property and basic economic organization. While we all know that America manufactures as much as all the rest of the world, the words, images, and ideological structures we use to represent to ourselves what we are and what we do tend to be a quarter, a half, or even a full century old. Old, irrelevant, and misleading.

This stricture applies to liberals and socialists as well as to NAM publicists and their businessmen backers. Indeed, to be fair, one should credit many of the centrally placed executives and managers with a distinctly superior though unshared comprehension of our economic system. As for the rest of us, we seem to have been too busy enjoying its beneficence to have bothered to examine its realities. It is about time we began.

The falsification of economic reality, buttressed by the laziness (or something) of the educated, is becoming a highly organized, even essential instrument of policy—and that is always dangerous, politically, morally, and intellectually. To obscure, as a matter of policy, the existence and nature of the dominant power in a society is to undermine the basic creative sources of social life. This falsification presents America in the classic image of free enterprise and private-property capitalism; its consequence is to conceal the incontestable fact that we are dominated by great faceless corporations "owned" by no one and run by self-designated "managers."

There is a great deal of talk on Madison Avenue these days about the corporate image, which means giving a humanized face to these impersonal structures. And the New York Stock Exchange publicists are pushing hard the idea of a people's capitalism, which has as much to do with capitalism proper as people's democracy has to do with democracy proper. The purpose of these maneuvers is to plug some of the more gaping holes in the traditional web of justifications which, before the New Deal, was deemed sufficient in itself.

What is being simultaneously justified and obscured is the revolutionary emergence of a new American property system—and the fact that the men in control of it, the managers, occupy unexampled positions of power and privilege which are not based on entrepreneurial accumulation or private ownership, to which they were elected only by their peers, and for which they have been answerable only to history.

The managers of corporate industrial wealth and the big-money funds—along with their expert advisers—are the ones who are creating the new system; they run it, and they also best understand it. They know everything worth knowing in a practical way about money, property, and basic economic organization—because that's what they manage. They milk the pre-tax dollar and thread their way through Government regulation on behalf of all sizable funds or forms of wealth. They are personally intimate with the intricacies of the fragmentation of property ownership and the alienation of capital because their very existence derives from those crucial changes in our property system.

What are some of the things the managers know that the rest have not gotten around to learning? We had better—because of their elaborate nature—avoid the subjects of the tax-torn dollar and other Government regulation. But we might take a straight look at property as such. And here the invitation to understanding reads: Nothing is very private in a mass society, including property.

Advanced or even adequate thinking about property by the people who manage it requires what might be called a nonpossessory or nonowning frame of mind. As any good manager knows, ownership is irrelevant—the main thing is control. And frequently control is created or ensured by means of giving up ownership or by having certain others own the property. Management control of big corporations, for instance, is based on a dispersal of stock ownership among as large a public as possible: A.T. & T. has 1,600,000 stockholders, no one of whom owns more than one-thirtieth of one percent. The Ford family retained control over Henry Ford's creation only by giving its stock in the company to a foundation; if it had held on to ownership, it would have lost control. Sears, Roebuck is controlled by company stock held in the company's pension trust: here the management consolidated its position by "giving away" huge sums of money. Managers manage, they don't own.

WHOSE HOUSE IS IT?

In a modern law school, some of the best all-around fun is had in arriving at a definition of property. The faculty considers it a first essential for the development of legal technique to tease the apprentice lawyers out of their ordinary received notions.

First off, the basic image of property—land and things—is pooh-poohed; then the search for a definition is carried through contract rights, choses in action (unrealized rights, including claims in court), and other intangibles. The class then thinks it has the answer: property is rights—called property rights or, in the short form, property. This is the point at which the modern professor enjoys himself most, and to confound the class completely he pulls out a case in which a property right is recognized and enforced by a court for the first time—a good one is the early radio broadcasting case in which a court first held that the right to broadcast a description of a baseball game "belonged" to the baseball club, could be disposed of by it, and could not be pirated by a party lacking contractual privilege from the "owner." Then the coup de grace: Did the court enforce the club owner's right because it was a property right, or was it a property right because the court enforced it? A smile settles on the professor's face, and the pot of gold is indicated: property is a right of use or disposition which will be enforced by a court. On that day we are men; and the legal elite is then prepared to go out, tautology in hand, and grow rich defending and creating such rights.

But a whisper of doubt remains as older tautologies assert themselves: land is land, to own is to own, and all property, like land, is supposed to be owned. Yes, but less frequently nowadays by any one person. Take land, for example: the bank holds a first mortgage on the suburban home, the contractor has a material man's lien, various governmental authorities hold tax liens, the niece of the guy who sold it to you is suing you because her uncle didn't have the right to convey it, and you hocked your equity in order to post bond for your brother-in-law. Who owns the house? Why everybody who has an enforceable right to its use or disposition; and all the possible rights in and to the home, the whole bundle, add up to the ownership of it. In our crowded, mobile society there has occurred a very extensive fragmentation of property ownership.

Some things are too big to own. If the suburban home is too much for me, and a car is too much for an industrial worker, then General Motors is too much for a Du Pont, and Standard Oil of New Jersey is too much for a Rockefeller. The use of the word "ownership" in referring to an agglomeration of industrial capacity like General Motors is, to put it kindly, overripe. And the simple designation of our system as one based on private property is not merely overripe, it is a calculated deceit. The managers know that the ownership of General Motors is irrelevant, but their spokesmen spend millions attempting to convince us that General Motors—and all publicly held American corporations—are owned by, you guessed it, the people-public. When they say "owned," they mean for us to feel the word in the utterly primitive sense. As Keith Funston of the New York Stock Exchange remarked to a group of advertising men, this "is a very humanizing bit of news."

One can face the question "Who owns General Motors?" if one will face the answer—"Nobody." But that is inconceivable, you say. Our training in property thinking (or lack of it) induces a certain horror in contemplating anything so big and so valuable walking around unowned. We abhor the vacuum of nonownership. But how could GM be owned? The total assets of this corporation amount to nearly $7 billion and the market value of its common stock is in excess of $13 billion. There are more than 750,000 stockholders. A control block of stock, usually put at between 20 and 51 percent, affords a means of translating ownership into control; but this is a feature of the aggregate, not of individual shares, and the courts so recognise it. When Du Pont disposes of the major part of its holdings in the company, there will not be anything like a control block in the GM situation.

THE MITE OF OWNERSHIP

The notion that GM (or any one of the great majority of our public corporations) is "owned" proceeds from the time-honored

assumption that to own stock is to own the corporation. If we examine this old-fashioned "self-evident" truth empirically, we note that what the public stockholder actually has is three double-edged rights: (1) he can sell his stock at a profit or at a loss; (2) he can receive or fail to receive a variable dividend; and (3) he can vote "Yes" or "No" on certain issues affecting control of the corporation and the disposition of its properties. The first two items indicate that he owns a negotiable instrument of a certain character—consisting of an "iffy" return on capital and a lottery ticket on market appreciation. Let us look more closely at the third item, the only one of the three that even looks like ownership of the corporation itself. What does the stockholder's vote mean? To skip over several stages of a dull argument, it means that the voter can effect changes of control over "his" property, the corporation, or it means approximately nothing. Can he do this? The answer is "No," not unless an ambitious, well-heeled syndicate mounts a compaign to do so, and thus gives him the opportunity to support them. This does not happen at all often.

A mite of ownership, indeed. Especially when one considers that the essential difference between the incumbent and contending control groups is apt to be that the one has been at that particular trough for a period of time and the other has not. Moreover, in the absence of blatant mismanagement or special business reverses, it is next to impossible to unseat an in-group that is on the alert and well advised by experts. Unlike a campaign for political office, the "ins" have at their disposal not only the corporate patronage but also the corporate treasury; and the voting apathy of the citizen is a form of frenzied activity compared to that of the lottery-ticket holder. As a recent writer so felicitously put it, "The modern proxy contest is at best a device for tempering autocracy by invasion." Following the New York Central and Montgomery Ward fights, in theory the SEC put the final kibosh on the matter by promulgating proxy-fight regulations which ensure that only nice people fighting a good clean fight may now do battle in the arena of what is charmingly called "corporate democracy."

The fundamental meaning of private property is private control over the property one owns, and all the stockholder owns is a share of stock. The corporation is not private property—only the share of stock is.

Twenty-seven years after the publication of A. A. Berle and Gardiner C. Means' "The Modern Corporation and Private Property," the crucial lessons of that landmark work have not been generally assimilated even among the educated. The processes therein described have in the meantime undergone an extensive development. These were adumbrated by Mr. Berle in a brilliant little essay written for the Fund for the Republic a couple of years ago, in which he states flatly that the American corporate system now represents "the highest concentration of economic power in recorded history." The ever-present factual ground of his thinking, which simply cannot be repeated often enough, is that 150 corporations hold away over 50 percent of American manufacturing, based on asset values. On the same basis, "about two-thirds of the economically productive assets of the United States, excluding agriculture, are owned by a group of not more than 500 corporations."

The liberal view since the progressive era has been that big corporations mean big capitalists. The point that has to be gotten into the liberal skull is that the manager is not a capitalist at all: he is a new fish.

The day of classic capitalism based on private property is gone. This is not a matter of ideology; it is a simple question of observable fact.

PIECES OF PAPER

In comprehending the demise of the private-property system, it may be helpful to think of property as being of two kinds—"thing-property" and "rights-property." The former would be the plants, machines, railroads, buildings, etc., most of which are organized in great corporate units. The latter would be pieces of paper, like stock certificates and bonds, representing certain direct entitlements relating to such property. Now we have to complicate the picture a little by indicating a third, hybrid form of property—liquid capital organized in huge blocks, mediating between corporate thing-property and personal rights-property. An example would be the $13 billion or so in mutual funds (growing at the rate of $100 million a month). The point here is that a mutual funds would be capable of exercising ownership control over thing-property, but no one could exercise ownership control over a big mutual fund. The same would hold true of many banks, insurance companies, and pension trusts.

Now, as a consequence of the dispersion decreed by the estate and income tax laws, and the raw fact that corporations and big-money funds get bigger and bigger, there is observable an increasing fragmentation of rights-property and an increasing concentration and accumulation of thing-property (and hybrid-property). Rights-property remains private, but it is just paper—somewhat like money, except that it earns and changes in value. Most thing-property is not private, because it is not owned by private persons and, as we shall see, it does not exist, in the last analysis, for private purposes.

It is beyond the scope of this essay to indicate the concentration of rights-property, but a few facts may help to suggest the truth of the situation. The stock exchange propagandists tell us, and we should believe them, that there are more than 10 million American stockholders. They tell us nothing, however, about the concentration of holdings. Now besides the fact that everybody knows that Nelson Rockefeller owns more stock than most gas-station attendants, we do have some 1957 Federal Reserve Board figures to help us out. At that time, the Board reported that there were 56.1 million spending units in the United States, and that 11 percent of these owned some publicly held stock. Only 3 percent, however, held investments valued at more than $10,000, and no more than 8 percent of the units had an annual income of $10,000 or more. Which bears out what everyone knows anyway, that the distribution of the ownership of income paper is something like the distribution of income itself, only more so; and there is almost none of this paper at and below the median level of income (except insurance, life-and-death savings, etc.), where the imperatives of consumption are absolute.

THE EXPENSE-ACCOUNT BARONS

The psychology (if not the fact) of private-property ownership goes very deep; as Mr. Berle has suggested, we are "the most violently private-property-minded country in the world." There was a profound truth in Jefferson's image of a democracy as a society of small property holders—even if in our day it is so impractical as to be tragic. If a man plants himself firmly upon the rock of his property ownership, he has an independence, and a sense of secure equality with other individuals similarly situated, which indeed does make him, as Jefferson believed, the truly anointed member of a democratic community. Now on what rock does the highly paid corporate executive stand, with his expense account, his stock options, his pension plan, deferred compensation, and death benefits? He stands on the rock of his acceptability to his board of directors and other superiors in a bureaucratic hierarchy. No rock at all; so he buries himself in work, in the immediate presence of power and priveleged consumption.

We should not confuse standard of living with accumulation. The thirty thousand corporate executives earning $60,000 or more a year (as reported by Fortune a few years ago), and indeed all the managers, have excellent and even magnificent standards of living. Mr. J. A. Livingston, a perceptive financial writer for the Philadelphia Bulletin, thinks that the "tax-sheltered managerial elite" is "an overprivileged class in a democratic society." But they are workers and spenders, not accumulators. They don't build family financial empires any longer—the estate and income tax laws, and the corporate bureaucratic organization of wealth, have seen to that. Somebody could doubtless still build a temporary empire by merchandising a frozen daiquiri that can be drunk under water. But such events no longer characterize the system.

Free enterprise, motored by that hallowed value, individual initiative, and based on private property for real, has become a minority sector of the economy; still noisy, exhilarating, and important, but no longer the big show. Also, it is quite significant that two of the more substantial success stories of recent times—Reynolds Metals and Kaiser Aluminum—each involves government beneficence as well as individual initiative.

Perhaps this point that the important managers are mostly not important accumulators can best be made by recalling what the old days were like—before the Pecora investigation and New Deal securities legislation, for instance. Describing the business system in the heyday of American capitalist accumulation, in "The Theory of Business Enterprise," Thorstein Veblen devotes several choice pages to the "accumulation of wealth" by corporate executives. His point was that the corporation men made their fortunes by trading in the stock of the corporations they managed. To this end, their purpose was served by a "discrepancy . . . between the actual and the putative earning-capacity of the corporation's capital." So the directorate gave out "partial information, as well as misinformation" to create such discrepancies. If this was not sufficient, some actual mismanagement could be indulged, if desired, to depress the stock. In those days—what the liberal muckrakers called the "robber baron" period—great fortunes could be and were accumulated.

And today? Apart from taxes, Section 16(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 imposes an absolute liability in favor of the corporation with respect to any insider's short-swing profits in such transactions (which are a matter of public record). Where statutes are not sufficient, the revolution in the corporate common law effected by the brilliant practitioners of minority-stockholder litigation insures that the managers remain housebroken, as they have been for some decades. This does not imply that insider information is not valuable today; one should not underemphasize the extent to which the corporate world has learned to live with restricting legislation and litigation; but the fact remains that control of a corporation is not the paved highway to an accumulation of great wealth which it once was. Now it is, by and large, just a very good job, in terms of both power and material welfare. But the power is based on position, not ownership; and the material advantages are standard-of-living advantages—nothing really important in the way of accumulation. (Not more than enough to support one wife and a lazy son or two after one's death.)

OWN YOUR OWN JOB

Top corporate executives, and other important managers, typically have choice

long-term employment contracts as well as many lucrative fringe benefits. The contracts and benefits afford them substantial security, but they do not amount to owning the job—any more than union seniority and grievance procedures mean the assembly-line worker owns his job. We would like to possess these important things because, in a way, everything depends on them. Some of us want and need the security that a sense of ownership gives so much that we kid ourselves into the belief that we do indeed own what we need to own. For example, a woman who needs to feel that she possesses her husband will literally think and feel a property right in him. This happens to be a property right that, to a considerable degree, the courts will recognize. But they have not come around to accepting much of the ownership quality in our job tenure.

It will come, however, because insofar as we move away from private property and are bureaucratized, we become defined as a society of jobholders—all of us, from the quarter-million-a-year executive to the subsistence laborer. In a certain fundamental sense, both are proletarians: an increasingly comfortable proletarianization is America's gift to the modern world.

The issue is: We can belong to the job as proletarians, or the job can belong to us as individuals. (I don't think Sweden is going to give us a middleway on this issue.) As jobs come more and more to be owned by the jobholder, there will develop an increasingly elaborate structure of rights and duties with regard to jobs as property: a system of law will develop, just as happened in the epoch of bourgeois property after the transcendence of feudal forms. I think this is a more likely outcome than that the human race should manage to dispense with the sense of ownership and property entirely—dispense, that is, with identity in depth between self and thing.

Meanwhile, union members are as much concerned with seniority rights as with wage demands, the secretary home-furnishes her office niche, and the medium-level white-collar worker measures the size and newness of "his" desk against all comers. (Note that many advertisements for new typewriters, postage-meter machines, etc., are directed to the officeworker rather than to the boss.) And also meanwhile, what the junior and senior managers "have"is simply their qualifications to be managers. "Qualification" takes in a great deal—in some corporations it includes the character and social standing of one's wife. It is this compulsion to qualify that has created W. H. Whyte's "organization man" and David Riesman's "other directed" group man. It is obvious that their dominance as social types is tied to the decline of private property.

THE HUNGRY GIANTS

What are the aims of the big corporations that dominate our national life? They are bureaucracies, so they have, at least in the first instance, the purposes of any bureaucratic structure: (1) to maintain itself, (2) to grow bigger, and (3) incidentally to accomplish the function that justifies its existence. The profit motive of corporations—their basic vestigial connection with capitalism proper—subserves all three of these bureaucratic purposes, but especially the second. Corporations are, after all, mainly a means of accumulating and maintaining wealth in an organized form: they are the only remaining legal form of a perpetuity, apart from the sovereign state itself. But there is no perpetuity in the ownership or the control of corporations.

The difference between an economic organization like General Motors or A.T. & T. and a $10 million or even $50 million corporation is not the simple additive one of size. At some point a change in quantity becomes a change in quality, and a new property form is created. Moreover, a smaller corporation may drag along or fail, and only a limited number of people are hurt; but the giants cannot be allowed to fail, and indeed they cannot be allowed for long to function at much below their optimum capacity. National production and the fate of a people would be decisively affected.

Little corporations get bigger—by accumulation, by merger, and simply because we have an expanding economy. At a certain point they transcend their original nature and then two crucial economic events occur simultaneously: There has been a new addition of X million dollars to the sphere of quasi-public or unprivate property and a subtraction of the same amount from the private-property, free-enterprise sector. Note these facts: Between 1949 and 1954, the number of mergers tripled. In recent years, two-thirds of all mergers have been of small companies into larger ones with assets of over $10 million. In this sense, as well as more obvious ones, the quasi-public giants are destroying free enterprise and private property. The tax law, as well as many other economic factors, has contributed to the formation of mergers. The tax-free reorganization sections of the tax code, which allow for the nonrecognition of gain or loss in certain major corporate transactions including mergers, provides positive encouragement to the growth of bigness.

Also, bigness is bigger than any balance sheet will reveal—since many smaller companies are organized in constellations around the giants. There are undoubtedly a number of auto-parts manufacturers and other suppliers that might just as well constitute themselves as divisions of General Motors, for all the make-believe independence their freedom entails. (Some giants have purposefully organized their industries in this way as a defense against the antitrust laws, as well as a means of keeping the unions in line.)

The problem of bigness has been with us since the building of the railroads a century ago, and of course it was a great political issue in the trust-busting era around the turn of the century. From that day till this, the liberal view has been to prevent or disperse the concentration of economic power, rather than to accept it and control it. This has been the impulse behind a considerable amount of fundamental legislation—the Sherman and Clayton Acts, the Robinson-Patman Act, resale price maintenance, the setting up of the Federal Trade Commission, etc. Whatever else may be said of this great effort to preserve capitalism in its classic image, it must at least be pointed out that it has failed. It may have slowed down or in some cases deflected the basic trend, and it certainly made a lot of lawyers rich; but after 50 years of this sort of thing our economy is more than ever dominated by big corporations. If the program is justified as a form of public subsidy to free enterprise in the form of small business, similar to our approach to the farmers, then it is perhaps acceptable. But as a comprehensive program or theory, it is mostly irrelevant to U.S. society.

This liberal attitude is based as solidly on the atavistic myths—of free enterprise and private property—as any NAM speech is. Each group is working a different side of a street that runs through a ghost town.

Marx and Veblen among others were quite right after all in one fundamental insight; industrialism was found eventually to burst out of the straitjacket of early capitalist forms of property—if not into socialism, then into Americanism. An industrial system, as distinct from an ideology or way of doing business, has a dynamic of its own, which is just simply to be itself, to produce efficiently. As long as a society can afford not to produce—is able to deny the industrial dynamic—it can join any property system and any economic ideology it may whimsically desire with the actual system of industry. But when production becomes imperative, any form of property and any ideological element may be required to give way. Give way in fact, of course, not necessarily in name. Which accounts for many of the misnamed facts in our industrial picture.

THE END OF CAPITALISM

The end of capitalism in America as a recognizable entity results from three major historical events—the great depression, the Second World War, and this endless cold war involving continuous competition in production with the Soviet Union. Many good Democrats feel that the New Deal saved capitalism, but that is putting things wrong end up: corporate concentration saved (and imperceptibly transcended) capitalism, while the New Deal merely saved the corporations, by making it possible for them to produce again. That remains one of the primary functions of our Federal Government—to keep saving the corporations. It is unnecessary to refer in detail to the numerous means the Government has used to bolster purchasing power, or to help organize corporations among themselves. To indicate the scope of the latter, Mr. Berle asserts that "roughly two-thirds of American industry and much of American finance is controlled by a formal or informal Federal industrial plan."

Not only do corporations regulate themselves through Government agencies and similar devices, but it is a fact—to be obscured only by conventional thinking—that the very existence of an A.T. & T. or a GM or an RCA is in itself a form of economic planning on a national industrial scale: True, such planning has no broad or socially debated purpose, and is subject to no exterior responsibility other than the brute verdict of events—but still it is that rationalized economic planning so dear to the hearts of older socialists. (It seems an amusing irony that the creepiest part of creeping socialism should be its daily augmentation by the corporate managers.)

So, among other things, the imperatives of production result in an accelerated corporate rationalization of the economy. Let us state these imperatives seriatim, so as to recognize their overwhelming force:

Thou shalt not allow another great depression.

Thou shalt produce fully and efficiently.

Thou shalt compete globally with the Soviet Union—a competition whose key terms are not merely tons of steel and numbers of automobiles but the purposeful organization of production and the rate of industrial growth.

Finally, thou shalt raise and spread the American standard of living.

Almost everything unique about our system results from the action of these imperatives. Since they cannot be expected to diminish, it is fair to assume that we will continue to change in the direction already marked out. We may all see the day again (as with the NRA) when the president of, say, General Motors insists on more socialist control over industry. After all, what's good for the country may also be good for General Motors—at least for the people of General Motors, if not for the thing itself.

So that's our unnamed property system, still woodenly or deceitfully miscalled private. But is all this a word game? No. The issue is, first, to recognize the existence of this crucial power now held by corporate and other managers, and then to request them to justify it to us. Power must be legitimated, otherwise any talk of law itself, much less democratic citizenship, becomes absurdly irrelevant. There are two somewhat contradictory legitimations of corporate power current today, one obscurely explicit

and the other largely implied: (1) it doesn't exist, and (2) it works.

The claim that it doesn't exist derives entirely from the word "private": corporations are private property, and thus are assimilated to an older system of justifications. This view leads one to the truly remarkable proposition that the personality of a young executive (and that of his fiance) is not private, but the multibillion-dollar telephone system is.

The legitimation of corporate power because it "works" amounts to what is probably the lowest level of ideology yet reached by man in his brief but painful rise from the prelingual slime. To coin a lawyer-like phrase, it is unanswerable, contemptible, and irrelevant—and is to be understood as meaning nothing more than "You got yours, Jack." As long as Jack accepts the statement, it is indeed unanswerable—and we are well on our way to accepting unlegitimated power at the very center of our civilization. The worst effect of the lack of legitimation is, as C. Wright Mills screamingly asserts, that ideology and then ideas and finally mind itself become irrelevant to national life. And this is profoundly frightening.

The subject of politics is power. Probably the main reason there is no longer anything recognizably like significant political activity in the United States is that those who would engage in it have failed or refused to confront the facts of national power. They don't or won't see where it is. Let us hope that this situation is transitory, that like the genteel poor we were temporarily embarrassed by insufficient ideological funds.

The most deeply disturbing aspect of our situation is that nobody is holding a gun to our head: We are free to engage in politics—and indeed we were as a Nation created free in order to do so. But to pick up our birthright requires at least a significant number of us to indicate with reasonable frankness and accuracy what the basic national power is, where it is, and who the stewards of it are. If the subject of politics is power, the means is ideological discussion, argument, and conflict. Now in this grand activity many things and many qualities are useful, but one is absolutely indispensable—namely, vital ideology itself. And that's our problem: Our ideologies have become so irrelevant to the facts of life that it is all the ordinary citizen can do to stay awake while the great debate about our fathers' world goes on.

The Increase of Pornography: A Cause for Immediate Concern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most obnoxious practices of our age has greatly expanded its operations in recent years. I refer to the practice of sending obscene literature through the mails.

As a result of my membership on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I have been indoctrinated to a full realization of the operations and ramifications of these purveyors of filth. This practice is a real and immediate threat to our Nation because it strikes primarily at the younger people whose minds are in the formative stage. Of course, the effects are not equal on all of our younger people. Some, because of their character, beliefs, and ideals, perfunctorily dismiss material of this nature and no appreciable harm is done. But police records indicate pornography leaves its impact on a growing number of cases every near. Law officials all over the country report that in recent years many crimes of violence have ben triggered by this pernicious material, and the rate is increasing rapidly.

In my mind, this problem, because of its pernicious effect on the impressionable minds of our youngsters and the resulting decay of the moral fiber of this Nation, is one of the most pressing facing us as a Nation today.

It is encouraging to note that community leaders are joining the efforts of postal officials and law enforcement agencies in their effort to stamp out this illicit trade. The religious leaders of all faiths, long the protectors of the spiritual welfare of our Nation, have declared all-out war against the smut merchants. Their patriotism and courage are to be commended.

Rabbi Samuel Zaitchik, of Lynn, Mass., a dedicated fighter against pornography, in a recent radio address carried the fight against the purveyors of filth into many homes in the New England area. In my opinion, Rabbi Zaitchik's remarks should be read by every man, woman, and child in America. In this connection, I am pleased to insert the message of Rabbi Zaitchik:

Dear friends, tonight I should like to speak to you about words—words spoken, words written, words read. For the past 20 years there has been a great deal of scientific investigation into words—their symbolic meaning, as means of communication, the relationship between words and prejudice, words and behavior, words and morality. There are many branches to this science of semantics—but it is generally agreed that in addition to the influences of heredity, environment, cultural background and economic status—our personalities, our political and social outlooks, our mental health, are greatly affected by our patterns of language, by the words that we speak, that we hear, that we read. In short, it has been demonstrated that it is not always the word that follows the thought, that expresses the thought; quite often it is the opposite—the thought follows the word, the word itself creates the point of view. It is not always that our speech reflects our behavior; quite often it is our behavior that reflects the words that we use. Many studies have been made of bigoted people, and it has often been found that the bigot began not with hatred but with words, with use of labels that he had to justify with hatred. A child repeats a bigoted phrase, repeats the phrase without actually feeling any emotion, hardly knowing its meaning—repeats it enough times until he must believe the words he has uttered. We are, in short, often enslaved by the tyranny of words.

But my subject tonight is not prejudice. My subject tonight is words—words as pornography, words as obscenity. I am not speaking of honest treatment of psychosexual behavior, in fiction, in scholarly scientific studies, in poetry, in drama. These works must be judged according to their artistic value, the integrity of their purpose, and the taste of the individual reader or viewer. I am speaking of words written by people who have either degenerated to the level of their words, or to whom the dollar remains green and delightful even after immersion in mud and slime—words written and peddled by rogues and degenerates and words read by our children, our teenagers, and adults.

Of children and high-schoolers, there is little I need say. We have all heard of tragedies, of broken lives, of distorted personalities resulting from communication between the purveyors of smut and our youth. Everywhere, on street corners, outside our schools, or hiding behind abominable desks or more abominable advertisements, we find these men who begin their day with worship of the impure soul, who laugh at purity of mind and body, whose misbegotten dollars are engraved "Pay to the Order of Twisted Minds."

Of the harmful and often calamitous effects on our children we all agree. But there is sometimes heard a vague justification in respect to adult readers, something hinting at the salutary effect of an occasional aphrodisiac. One might first point out the danger, always present, of such material falling into the hands of curious youngsters, and the resultant confusion, loss of respect, distortion of values. But more important is the danger of our becoming slaves to the tyranny of these words that we read. We may insist again and again that what we read and what we view do not touch our personal lives, our standards of morality—but the truth is that too often if we read enough filth, view enough filth, some of it will rub off on us. When perversity and adultery and indescribable abominations are repeated and repeated and repeated—we begin to think of these things as common, as almost acceptable by the broadminded modernist, as normal biological urges, as sins that cannot be too serious because so many commit them. The ringing God-given "Thou shalt not commit adultery" too often becomes "Thou shalt—because thy body must." We have seen such results only too often in our newspapers.

It may be said that this danger, too, is relatively unimportant, that those few who are so affected by pornographic material would probably have fallen under any circumstances. This may be true—but we must never become too proud to say "There, but for the grace of God, go I."

But there is a third danger, and this is one that cannot be minimized by any decent, thinking individual—and that is this: that the avalanche of pornography and smut while it may not succeed in burying us as individuals, is weakening the foundation of our society. And it is an avalanche become powerful because it has become part of the greater and more destructive avalanche of our present-day psychology of fun. We have become, so many of us, fun-worshipers. In theater, in club, in popular novels, in private get-togethers, we are swept up by this phychology of fun. Not of joy in life, but of fun in life. Not the joy of happy people meeting in warm fellowship, but the fun of wild parties. Not the joy of achievement, but the fun of luxury-spending. Not the joy of quiet contentment, but the fun of sensual comforts. Not the joy of happy, compatible marriage, but the fun of sexual excitement made convenient by marriage. Not the joy of love, but the fun of lust. The pornography, the obscenity, the amorality, and immorality in word, in film, in picture, is perhaps in the final analysis a result of the psychology of fun. For such a psychology tends to go lower and lower seeking satisfaction, relief, seeking an ultimate in the depths. And it can never find it because the answer to life, the meaning of life, the joy of life, the purpose of life, is to be found not in the depths, but in the heights of spirit. We are too many of us slaves to the word "fun." And too many of us have tightened our chains by our reading and viewing of material that belongs in the at-

mosphere of fun. Let us do what we can to force ourselves from the bondage. Words can enslave and words can free. Let us bankrupt the smut peddlers and rogues by rejecting their output. Let us demand beauty, honesty, integrity, and purity in our various media of communications and we will have them. Let us teach our children the delight of the purity of word, the sanctity of the word. Speak purely, read purely, and you will think with purity. Speak with dignity, and your thinking will be dignified. Speak the language of the joy of life, of purpose in life, of achievement in life, and your children will find joy and purpose and achievement. Then we will not fear the smut-peddlers and the rogues. Our children will have been innoculated against their virus. "And these words which I have commanded thee this day shall be upon thine heart. And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children." The pure word, the honest word, the word dignifies life, not degrades it. The rabbis say that one of the reasons the temple was destroyed was that the word had lost its sanctity. Our civilization, our democracy is too in peril. It is time that we join to meet this peril.

Gold and the Dollar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, as a member of the Finance and Joint Economic Committees, I have been following developments affecting our gold and monetary reserves with considerable interest.

Last March I had the privilege of addressing the Amen Corner, a distinguished group of Pittsburgh business and professional men, with reference to some of these problems. At that time, I said:

American citizens are not permitted to convert paper dollars into gold; however, foreigners have this opportunity. In recent years we have been providing them with dollar resources to enable them to draw on our gold balances. Unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments our economy is headed for serious trouble.

In 1948 U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.6 billion. At the end of last year they stood at $20.6 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in 1958 alone totaled $2.3 billion. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of unsound economic policies, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves.

One of our country's most eminent economists, Dr. Roy L. Reierson, vice president and chief economist of the Bankers Trust Co., of New York, after an extended visit to Western Europe, has recently related his views on gold and the dollar.

In his statement he forcefully reaffirms my own conviction that one of the first tasks which will face the 2d session of the 86th Congress is to deal with the problem of removing the interest rate ceiling on Treasury bond issues. I found Dr. Reierson's address of such great interest that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD AND THE DOLLAR

(Address by Dr. Roy L. Reierson, vice president and chief economist, Bankers Trust Co.)

The outlook for the gold price and the situation of the U.S. dollar, two closely related topics, have been under recurrent discussion abroad for a decade and more. In the first few years after World War II, the discussion centered on the huge concentration of gold in the United States and the dollar shortage in the rest of the world. Lately, with gold holdings beginning to be more evenly distributed, emphasis has been on a possible inadequacy of the U.S. gold reserve, the weakness of the dollar, and the prospect for a change in the dollar price of gold.

Questions of this kind evoke keener and much more persistent interest in foreign financial centers than in the United States. However, this should not be surprising; developments concerning a key international currency such as the dollar naturally attract worldwide attention, the more so as foreign central banks and others are large holders of dollar balances. In the European financial markets, any story on gold and the dollar is followed avidly, and this is particularly the case in London, reflecting the presence there of an international market in gold, the interest of the bullion dealers in this topic, the importance of South Africa and the sterling area as a gold producer, and the large number of gold mining stocks traded on the London Exchange. Statements by U.S. Government officials or by Members of Congress that in any way seem to have a bearing on the outlook for the gold price are widely publicized, and the press usually plays up prominently the somber forecasts of a dollar devaluation that occasionally emanate from certain commentators or self-styled experts in the United States.

FOREIGN FEARS

Concern over the dollar apparently reached a peak in the spring of 1958, when the business recession in the United States, the prospect of a huge Federal deficit, and a large outflow of gold all led to a rash of questioning and uncertainty. Many people then contended that the United States might find it necessary to devalue the dollar as a result. Later, as the American business recovery began to take hold, gold losses declined and these expectations gradually diminished. At present, few informed observers hold any change in the relationship of the dollar to gold to be imminent, and even those who are convinced that the United States will raise the gold price within the next 3 to 5 years appear to be in the minority.

This, however, does not mean that foreign observers have relaxed their scrutiny of economic, financial, and political developments in the United States. On the contrary, while confidence in the dollar has been partly restored, financial observers abroad are nonetheless keeping a close and careful watch over the American scene, and are still uneary over some of the trends in this country. Of particular concern is the course of prices and the developments that seem to be keeping inflationary pressures alive. A year ago, there was apprehension over the inflationary implications of the budget deficit then shaping up; later, uneasiness centered on the large spending programs before Congress. The administration's success in forestalling a spending spree was undoubtedly a factor in allaying foreign fears for the dollar in the recent past.

However, many Europeans now are again disturbed, this time because of the unwillingness of congressional leadership to remove the interest rate ceiling on Treasury bond issues, since it forces the Treasury to rely on short-term financing, with all the inflationary implications of such a practice, and because it implies a preference for chronic easy credit and low interest rates. In Western Europe, the financially erudite are aware from personal observation how the practice of pegging interest rates at artificially low levels contributes to inflationary trends and to pressure on the balance of payments; they are convinced that the adoption of such practices by the United States would have similar consequences over here.

Financial circles abroad are concerned with the inflation problem in this country primarily, of course, because of the effects on the U.S. balance of international payments. There is talk that American industry runs the risk of pricing itself out of the world market, the more so as industrial commodity prices as well as living costs failed to ease in the 1957–58 recession and have again been advancing for some time. Simultaneously, imports have soared while exports have declined. Thus, it is considered likely that the balance of payments position of the United States may continue adverse for some time to come and that this will continue to drain the U.S. gold stock.

DEVALUATION PROSPECTS: FOR AND AGAINST

This unfavorable outlook for the balance of payments seems to be the mainstay of the case made by those who believe the United States will eventually find it necessary to raise the gold price above its present $35 an ounce—that is to say, devalue the dollar. The competitive position of American industry in foreign markets will probably continue to worsen, it is said, as rising capital investment and expanding markets in other countries lead to further increases in productivity abroad. In addition, there is the need for continuing large Government programs of foreign grants and credits and the prospect of increasing foreign investment by U.S. business corporations and financial agencies. Thus, it is said, pressure on the balance of payments must be expected to persist over the long term.

At some point, it is argued, the United States will become concerned over the persistent loss of gold; the gold outflow will feed on itself, and the authorities will have to impose an embargo on gold, which in effect would lead to a sharp rise in the gold price at home and abroad. The risk of such a course of events will become particularly acute, it is held, when the American economy experiences another and perhaps more drastic recession, since this is likely to create a favorable climate for currency devaluation as a means for stimulating recovery.

A more substantial body of opinion, however, stresses that U.S. Government officials of both political parties are firmly on record as opposing a change in the gold price, and that the United States cannot, in the foreseeable future, be pressed into a position where it must devalue against its will. Despite a gold outflow of almost $3 billion in the past 1½ years and the recent payment of a gold subscription of $344 million to the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. gold reserve is still huge, comprising close to one-

half of the monetary gold stocks of the free world, and the United States is thus in position to withstand a gold outflow of $1 to $2 billion a year for some time to come. In addition, the gold reserve coverage of Federal Reserve deposit and note liabilities, currently at about 40 percent, still exceeds the statutory requirement of 25 percent by a sizable margin; moreover, in the event of sustained pressure, the statutory requirement could well be lowered without unsettling the financial system. Finally, in the event of emergency, there is a further bulwark in the resources of the international financial institutions, including especially the International Monetary Fund.

PROBLEM OF THE GOLD PRICE

In any event, few Europeans would expect the United States to be able to devalue the dollar unilaterally as a means of bringing the domestic price level in line with world markets. It is generally agreed that other exporting countries would not stand idly by. Rather, the more prevalent belief is that inflationary tendencies and an increasingly troublesome balance of payments problem would make the United States amenable to an increase in the price of gold in which other leading countries would join. In effect, this would be a currency devaluation on an international or practically worldwide scale, leaving the exchange relationships between the dollar and other key currencies substantially unaltered.

The contention that the gold price should be raised in the United States and elsewhere is one of long standing in certain financial circles abroad, particularly in areas with a large gold output. As such, it has cropped up repeatedly since the end of World War II, and has been advanced on various occasions long before the start of the current gold outflow from the United States in early 1958. A major argument propounded in favor of a higher gold price is that world liquidity is being squeezed by the failure of the monetary gold stock to expand in line with higher output, and that the monetary value of gold hence needs to be raised in order to meet the increased requirements for gold reserves on the part of a growing world economy. Also, the cost of mining gold has advanced considerably so that a higher price is needed if gold production is to be maintained and encouraged.

Here, too, however, this line of thinking is by no means universally accepted. An important, thoughtful, and very considerable body of opinion points out that the decline in the U.S. gold stock represents no more than a correction of the former "maldistribution" of gold, and that even today the amount of gold held by the United States is probably disproportionately large compared to the volume of trade and investment activity around the world. More importantly, it is emphasized that a general increase in the gold price would create a serious inflationary potential on an international scale. The problem troubling most industrialized countries in the postwar era has been not a shortage but a surfeit of liquidity, which has contributed to the worldwide uptrend in the price level over the years; only fairly recently have a good many countries been able, through credit policies and other means, to come to grips with this problem. A higher valuation of gold reserves would create, for the treasuries of the various countries, a "profit" which, as a practical matter, it would be difficult to sterilize.

Rather, the prospects would be for such a paper profit to be expended for various purposes, with consequent inflationary effects; also, under conditions of generally active business, an international devaluation of currencies could not fail to lead to higher prices in world commodity markets. The international financial organizations, it is pointed out, provide ways and means to economize on the international use of gold without releasing such an inflationary potential. Finally, a rise in the gold price in the United States and other countries important in world trade would provide a windfall enhancement to the international purchasing power of the Soviet gold output and the Soviet gold stock, which is of unknown size but is believed to be fairly substantial.

On balance, the opponents of a general increase in the gold price seem to have the better of the argument, certainly there are more adherents to this school of thought, which appears to include most financial experts in Western Europe. However, it cannot be denied that the sponsors of a higher gold price internationally count among their number not only some vocal advocates but also some very keen and acute observers.

A REALISTIC APPRAISAL

Against this background of conflicting views and forecasts, it is essential to retain perspective and seek a balanced realistic appraisal of the current standing of the U.S. dollar. To some extent the indubitable decline in the singular esteem in which the dollar was held abroad until a few years ago reflects the material economic improvement of Western Europe, which has strengthened the position of the various currencies involved; this development has been an aim of our foreign economic policy since the end of World War II and is to the benefit of the entire world economy. In addition, of course, the U.S. balance of payments has taken an unfavorable turn which raises some important questions regarding the conduct of our economic affairs. Nevertheless, and without belittling these problems, fears of an imminent dollar crisis appear without substantial foundation.

There is little evidence of any widespread loss of confidence in the dollar. Even in 1958, when American gold losses for a time were running at an exceptionally rapid rate, foreign holdings of short-term dollar assets increased by over $1 billion. So far in 1959, despite a further, albeit slower, gold outflow, another $1 billion and more has been added to these assets, which now aggregate some $16 billion. Both the size of these holdings and their rising trend suggest no real apprehension abroad that a change in the American gold price is at hand.

Several astute Europeans have observed that perhaps the greatest risk in the current situation is a loss of confidence in the dollar on the part of Americans themselves, accompanied by a large-scale movement out of the dollar into foreign currencies or securities, or into gold. So far, however, there is no sign that any such movement has developed or is in the offing. To be sure, it is a matter of common knowledge that American interest in foreign equities has increased considerably in recent years, but the motivating forces seem to be not distrust of the dollar but rather a desire to share in the attractive growth prospects of the European economies and the feeling that more attractive investment values are available in Europe than in the high-priced American market. From time to time, major financial centers abroad receive inquiries from U.S. sources concerning the acquisition of gold, but such inquiries appear to be sporadic and are not followed by action to any significant extent. Thus, there are no indications abroad of any important flight from the dollar.

Nor is the U.S. dollar the only major currency exposed to monetary pressures and an inflationary trend. In some quarters, there is anxiety concerning the future of sterling in the event of a Labor victory in the forthcoming election; despite the stated decision of Labor to defend sterling, the budgetary and other economic policies expected of a Labor government appear to raise doubts about the outlook for sterling over the long term. Caution is apparent also in the appraisal of the French franc; the fiscal and inflationary history of France has been so disappointing for so long a time that more than the past few months of successful reform will be required to reestablish solid international confidence in the country's currency. Political uncertainties also cast a shadow over various other currencies in Western Europe.

While these considerations may help retain perspective, it would be a disservice to deny that the record of the United States in recent years has not been as favorable as those of some major foreign countries. Most European countries have made striking progress toward monetary stability and have moved successfully toward convertibility. Here at home, on the other hand, we have made far too little progress toward containing inflationary tendencies. As of today, to speak of a dollar problem would be exaggerated and extreme, but unless we face up to our situation in the same earnest fashion as our friends abroad, we shall be incurring the risk of sliding into more serious difficulties as time moves on.

RECOGNIZING THE CONSEQUENCES

In summarizing these trends, it seems fair to conclude that the U.S. dollar remains the leading currency of the free world, and there is no visible prospect so far of the dollar being superseded by any other currency. However, instead of being the dominant free currency unit, the dollar is now one among several key currencies in the international economy. Moreover, whereas in the early postwar era economic weakness abroad made the dollar appear strong regardless of the policies we followed at home, U.S. economic policy today must be based on the assumption that the major countries of Western Europe will continue to proceed along the path that has proved so successful in restoring the health of their currencies in recent years.

Today, for the first time in decades, the United States is beginning to feel the discipline of an adverse balance of international payments. For many years, the effects of the outflow of funds as a result of large Governments grants, loans, and expenditures abroad, together with a sustained movement of American dollars into foreign investment, were cushioned by, among others, a large export surplus. Now, however, the export surplus has dwindled, and American industry faces increasing competition from foreign producers, equipped with modern plants and enjoying substantial advantages in labor costs. Moreover, the factors at work suggest that the balance of payments may continue unfavorable for an extended period, with consequent further pressure on our gold reserve.

Assuredly, our gold reserves are still tremendous, and further losses need not be a matter of serious concern, either to foreign creditors or to Americans, provided we follow sensible policies here at home and adopt appropriate action which will redress our balance of payments situation. At the same time, as bankers to the free world, we cannot ignore the point of view of our political and economic partners, and the holders of dollar assets. They have a large stake—economic and political as well as financial—in the soundness of the dollar. Prudence and commonsense dictate that they continue to observe closely current developments in the United States and express themselves freely on matters that arouse their concern.

The actions required to sustain confidence in the U.S. dollar are so well known that no extended discussion is necessary. In essence, the task is to keep stable the purchasing power of our currency. This means a fiscal policy which will achieve substantial budget surpluses in periods of active business to offset the large budget deficits that inevitably appear during economic declines. It means abstaining from the temptation toward an easy money bias, with the inevitable stimulus toward inflationary credit expansion. Equally important is that

Treasury debt management be so conducted as to avoid the inflationary increase in liquidity resulting from a progressive shortening and monetization of the debt, which is the exact opposite of the policies now imposed on the Treasury in consequence of the refusal of Congress to raise the interest rate ceiling on new bond issues. Last, but certainly not least among these major essentials, are wage practices designed to restrain perpetual increases in production costs, and pricing policies that will enable passing on to consumers part of the benefits of rising producivity in the form of lower prices. In this fashion, we shall not only be fortifying our prospects for sustained economic expansion at home, but shall also be enhancing our competitive ability in world markets.

In our international economic policies, too, we shall need to take cognizance of the changed situation regarding our balance of payments. To some extent, our exports are still curtailed by trade restrictions, including the remaining special barriers against shipments from the dollar area. With the improvement of Western European exchange reserves, such restrictions can no longer be justified, and we should certainly press vigorously for their removal.

At the same time, we shall have to be on guard against the pressures already building up to erect greater trade barriers here at home. In view of the rising tide of imports, it is not surprising that many American companies are urging greater protection from foreign competition, and some of the labor unions are also demonstrating a greater inclination toward protectionism. However, if we in the United States try to cope with foreign competition by quotas, higher tariffs, informal arrangements, and other restrictive practices, we shall not only be raising the cost of goods to the consumer but shall be encouraging a renewed trend toward trade restraints on a worldwide scale; on balance, this will do us considerably more harm than good.

Finally, it is essential that we reappraise our policies of Government loans and grants for foreign countries. In the light of our current balance of payments, ambitious plans for increased foreign aid are unrealistic; likewise, the time has come to reexamine our governmental policies with respect to encouraging private investment abroad. Increased investments add to the strain on the balance of payments at the time the tranafers are being made; moreover, if the investment consists of establishing productive facilities abroad, it poses the prospect of further inroads being made upon our already meager export surplus once these facilities come into production.

Unfortunately, there are few signs as yet that we are giving these problems the attention they deserve. Having enjoyed a comfortable foreign trade position for a great many years, it is perhaps understandable that we are reluctant to adapt ourselves to a less favorable environment. The discipline of the balance of payments may have to become much more stringent before we agree to accept the implications of the current state of affairs in the world economy.

The Challenge of Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. OLIVER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the sale of pornography in the United States has become a half billion dollar annual business; a frightening business which threatens the very moral fiber of our society.

Apathy is our greatest enemy. Too often we Americans tend to ignore the sordid, hoping that with time the situation will correct itself. Once the American people are aroused, they have a reputation for tackling and completing even the most difficult tasks. But the basic problem is convincing the public that a threat actually does exist.

We must open our eyes to the existence of this problem. But even more, we must resolve to extinguish the insidious danger it presents to our society, particularly to our youth. If we are honest with ourselves, we must admit that many Americans are either openly or inadvertently contributing to the continuance of this dangerous cancer. Simply by our toleration of this smut, we unwittingly aid its growth. We cannot afford to be bystanders, but must join in the crusade to eradicate this offensive material.

The Reverend James H. Burns, director of the department of pastoral services and social relations of the Massachusetts Council of Churches, effectively pictured the complacency of the American people with regard to this vital issue in a recent radio address. By including his remarks in the RECORD, I hope in some small way to help jar our country into launching an effective program to eliminate this filth from our mails and our newsstands.

Reverend Burns' remarks follow:

This I know: Pursuit of material things, indulgence in filthy things, and hatefulness cause us to lose goodness and holiness from our lives.

In the Gospel according to Dr. Luke, in the second chapter the last 11 verses, he tells the wonderful story about Jesus, Joseph and Mary visiting the temple in Jerusalem during the Feast of the Passover. He tells us they were accustomed to going to the temple each year. This is evidence Mary was a very pious person because women were not required to attend the feast. Children were not required—only when a boy became 13 years of age was he expected to attend the religious feasts.

Many children in Sunday school have worried about part of this story. Because the boy, Jesus, 12 years of age was left behind in a big city. His mother and father (Joseph and Mary) went away and left him it seems and children have worried about this. Actually, the family, the friends and neighbors of Joseph and Mary from Nazareth stayed perhaps 2 days of the feast and started home as was their custom. Many people stayed through only the first 2 days of the feast. Today when we have a celebration of an anniversary there is always a high point such as the anniversary banquet. Although, the celebration may last a week or more, now as then, some come only for the most important event and others leave immediately after that high point in the celebration. As they started out of Jerusalem—most certainly Jesus was along—but before they even got out the north gate of the city he decided to stay the rest of the week. How many boys 14, 15, 16 years of age are quite certain they can look out for themselves? Joseph and Mary discovered he wasn't along only at the end of the day because they traveled in a great company, talking, laughing, making deals, doing business, visiting friends, taking a nap, having a picnic while all parents took care of all the children. It was only at the end of the day when there was a counting of noses that Joseph and Mary discovered Jesus was not there. They had somehow lost him. They immediately checked among their relatives and friends. He wasn't there. It was nighttime so nothing could be done until the next day. Then they retraced their steps the way they had come. They went to the places where they had stopped. They went to the houses of neighbors and friends along the way, and asked, "Have you seen Jesus—have you seen Jesus?" and they didn't find him. They returned to Jerusalem and that was the end of the second day. The next morning they went to the temple, to the church, and they said, "Have you seen Jesus—is Jesus here?" and he was there. He was among the doctors and the teachers. He was listening to them and asking them questions and they were amazed at his understanding and his answers.

Children sometimes ask questions, but they don't want answers. They ask a hundred questions and wait for no answers. At other times children ask penetrating questions. They ask them in such a way the adult answers with more wisdom and more information and more knowledge than he knew he had. Some teachers have this wonderful skill. Instead of asking questions which show up how stupid we are, they ask questions which bring out of the student information and knowledge he was unaware he had learned.

Jesus was asking these questions and as we ask our friends, our relatives, our acquaintances, and other people if they have seen Jesus, we need to ask questions in this very same way.

They were a little surprised and even a little annoyed to find Him in the temple and He said: "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" This is to say: "Wouldn't you know I would be in the church?" They didn't understand what He was saying, but He grew in wisdom and in stature and in favor with God and man.

How like Joseph and Mary most of us are. We go along life's way. We are with our friends doing many of the same things they are doing. Our friends and relatives and we are busy with life's business. It is only at a time when our family is together, suddenly we realize goodness and beauty and holiness are gone. They have gone from our family. Something has been lost. We don't know when we lost it—even as Joseph and Mary didn't know when they lost Jesus. We have lost Jesus from our lives when goodness, beauty, and holiness have departed. We should do as Joseph and Mary. We should search for Him among our teachers, our friends, our relatives, our neighbors. And even as they said, "Have you seen Jesus?" we need to ask our relatives and friends, "How do you have, how do you find, how do you hold in your lives goodness and beauty and holiness?" All too often they won't be able to tell us. We need then to do as Joseph and Mary, retrace our steps along life's pathway, the way we have come, and see if we can find where we lost Him. Along the way we will say: "Where did we lose Jesus? Have you seen Him?" We will hunt for His goodness and beauty and holiness. We may not find Him along that path. Finally, we will go back to the church. We will find Him there. Not that every person in the church is good or beautiful or holy in his behavior, but God in Christ Jesus, His spirit is in the church. We will be, most of us, so much like Joseph and Mary we, too, will be surprised when we find Him. We looked for Him in the church and we will be surprised to find Him there. Also, we will be a little annoyed we found Him there. His spirit will say to us: "But wouldn't you know you would find me in the church." We won't fully understand, but as we attend his spirit we, too, will grow in wisdom, stature, and in favor with God and man.

But the question comes early: "Just how do we lose Jesus with His goodness, and beauty, and holiness from our lives?" There are three major categories:

First, through our anxieties. The sociologists and psychologists tell us this is the age of anxiety. More people of all ages, of all nations, of all walks of life are more anxious in this generation than any time in the history of the word. We became so burdened with anxiety, we are overwhelmed with what someone has called, C.D.T.'s—not D.T.'s. We are all familiar with the condition an alcoholic may attain called delirium tremens. C.D.T.'s are something else.

We can be overwhelmed with the cares, the difficulties and the troubles of everyday life, of every hour of it. Jesus told of the widow who lost a coin and searched for it. He told a story about the lost sheep and the shepherd leaving the 99 to search for the 1 sheep. He told a story of the lost son and his being found (the Prodigal Son). Actually, our C.D.T.'s, our anxieties so overwhelm us we get busy searching for the coin—the money whether it is lost or not. We just don't happen to have it. We are so busy searching for it we forget to hunt for the lost sheep. C.D.T.'s overwhelm us and we lose Jesus from our lives.

Next, there is guilt. All of us feel guilty. We feel guilty because of the things we do which we ought not to have done and because of things we should have done which we have left undone. But, also, we feel guilty because of things which go on in our society over which we seem to have little personal control. In the program heard an hour ago the description of "Pornography, the Business of Evil," the very fact that such a business in such dimensions can exist in our country, in our State and in our cities constitutes a burden of guilt for all of us. We know in our hearts, if we all did our part such a filthy business would be stopped instantly. We know full well this business is doing untold harm to the lives of both young people and adults. Since we have not driven this filthy business—out of business—we all feel partly responsible; that is, a little guilty. Some of us actually, personally make use of the evil materials supplied by the smut merchants. In our hearts, we know we have sinned and in us somewhere are feelings of guilt. The more we allow indulgence in filthy things or indulge in filthy things ourselves, the more certain we are to lose goodness, beauty, and holiness from our lives. Through sin and guilt we lose Jesus. We may have lost Him without knowing it. Forgiveness found through repentance and restoration is the one certain way to find Jesus again.

Next, there is hatefulness. Sometimes nice people are hateful. We all know that we have hateful thoughts about ourselves and about other people. It was Tallulah Bankhead, the famous actress, who was quoted as saying from time to time: "I never wear a shoulder strap bag." She would go on with the conversation until someone would be unable to contain himself and say: "Well, now, why don't you wear a shoulder strap bag?" She would archly say: "Oh, it would interfere with the chip on my shoulder."

We need to examine ourselves and see whether we are growing wings on our shoulders or perhaps, without our knowing it, we have grown chips on our shoulders and we have lost Jesus. Without our knowing it goodness and beauty and holiness have gone from our lives.

Because of our anxieties and because of our guilts and because of our hatefulness, we can lose Jesus from our lives. If we lose Him, let us then do as Joseph and Mary; examine to see how serious the loss is and then search for Him among our friends, our relatives, our neighbors. If we can't find His spirit there, then we retrace our lives, study our lives, see what has happened. At what point did we lose Him? Where did we get involved in some evil, dirty thing in which we knew we should not be involved? Where have we let ourselves be unnecessarily anxious and concerned about material things? Where have we let ourselves be hateful when there was no need to be hateful?

If we cannot find Him along the path as we retrace our way, then let us go back to the church and we will find Him there. In spite of our surprise He will be there waiting for us. This I know, pursuit of material things, indugence in filthy deeds, and hatefulness can make us lose goodness, and holiness from our lives. But if we find Him we, as He, can grow in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man.

Report by Congressman William H. Avery to the 1st Congressional District of Kansas on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, following my usual custom, I am submitting a report to the 1st Congressional District on the 1st session of the 86th Congress. In a report of this nature it is only possible to present the accomplishments of the session and workload of the office in brief outline form.

This was the longest session of the House of Representatives since 1789 except 1940 and the war years, including the first session on Labor Day in 17 years. More than 25,000 pages were used in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to cover business transacted. Almost 14,000 bills and measures were introduced.

Regarding my congressional and committee activity, the following is a brief statistical summary:

One hundred percent voting attendance record.

Answered 88 of 89 quorum calls for 98.8 percent record.

Attended 75 sessions of Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for a 99 percent record.

Five hundred and thirty-seven bills referred to and/or considered by Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Attended all meetings of the Small Business Committee.

One huhdred percent attendance as Private Calendar Committee ranking minority member.

Introduced amendment to limit Commodity Credit loans to any one farmer to $50,000. Avery proposal adopted on floor of the House by a rollcall vote.

Studied 250 private bills as member of Private Calendar Committee.

One of two Congressmen selected to appear on special panel at National Watershed Congress.

Held over 100 conferences with officials in Government agencies on cases for constituents.

To give you some idea of our office operation, for the period of January 4 to October 1, 1959:

Received 6,960 first-class letters from district for an average of 30 per working day.

In total received and answered 17,800 pieces of mail.

Mailed out 40,220 pieces of mail, of which 23,950 was first-class mail.

Processed cases with VA for veterans from every county in district.

Handled over 600 matters dealing with Agriculture Department.

Five hundred and forty-five individuals visited the office in Washington.

Received 100 newspapers per week from district, 15 per week from elsewhere.

Assisted in many types of cases for constituents, such as, immigration, Coast Guard, patents and trademarks, small business, civil service, Bureau of Employees Compensation, passports, and problems of servicemen.

One of the most significant activities of your office in Washington was the inaugural of the "Week in Washington" special nonpartisan educational project for college juniors to see government firsthand. The following schools participated: Kansas University, Kansas State University, Washburn University, St. Benedict's College, and Mt. St. Scholastica College.

The schools select the students with only two requirements—they must be residents of Kansas and in the top half of their class. The schools are instructed the political background of the applicants is not to be considered in the selection.

Upon notification of the student selected, a work project is assigned by this office. The project is an actual job which is for the work routine of the office and in the public interest. The job requires several hours each day for a period of no less than 1 month. For example, one of the projects was a public opinion poll and research survey on Federal issues. In consideration for this work the student is retained on the payroll for a sum not to exceed $150. The money received is applied by the student to his travel expenses. The student is responsible for all expenses.

While in Washington the students visit Congress, committee hearings, both national committees, and historic sites. Appointments were arranged with members of both political parties—each student prepared three questions and asked each person these questions. In general, it is our desire to have the students attempt to obtain as concise a picture as possible of Government and politics at the national level.

To date four students have participated in the project. There are only four other such programs in existence on Capitol Hill.

The following is a brief summary of the appropriations and Federal activity for our district:

Flood control projects, $21,137,025.

Military construction, $2,584,000.

Repair and construction of Federal buildings, $881,700.

Equipment improvements and repairs to post office facilities, $574,447.

Turning to the topic of legislative activity during this session, I am submitting for your information and interest a listing of my vote on major legislative actions before the House. An attempt has been made to make the listing as complete as possible. In the event you should desire additional information regarding any particular vote or legislation, I will be most happy to attempt to furnish such. The listing includes voice votes as well as recorded votes.

First. Introduced and urged passage of amendment to limit commodity credit loans to $50,000. Avery proposal adopted by rollcall vote. During debate in the House your Congressman stated it was never the intention of Congress to subsidize corporation farms. Yet without some limitation the Agriculture Secretary is powerless to refuse to grant support loans to any producer who planted within his acreage allotment. Under this practice some loans have exceeded $1 million.

Second. Voted for the Landrum-Griffin labor-management reform bill, is now public law. This is one of the highlights of the session. Senator McCLELLAN's investigations of racketeering and corrupt practices in certain labor unions had clearly shown the need for some kind of strong corrective legislation to protect the rights of individual workers.

Third. Supported resolution opposing seating of Communist Chinese regime in the United Nations, resolution passed by House.

Fourth. Supported continuing the Federal highway programs by means of a 1-cent-a-gallon gasoline tax increase to avoid deficit spending, became public law. Under the Interstate Highway System there are 803 miles authorized in Kansas, with some $20 million allocated for Kansas. To fail to extend the program on a sound fiscal basis could have resulted in economic detriment to our State.

Fifth. Voted for bill to promote increased research for finding new industrial uses for farm products, passed House, pending in Senate. Your Congressman testified before Agriculture Committee in support of this measure stating:

Agriculture must speed up its research efforts in developing more uses for farm commodities. The bill would not create any new so-called Government agency. It calls for the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the land-grant colleges. Such an approach would permit the facilities at Kansas State to be used.

Sixth. Voted against a greatly expanded Federal aid to airports program on basis of fiscal responsibility. Program was extended at present rate.

Seventh. Voted for veterans' pension plan, enacted as public law.

Eighth. Supported the President's veto of two public works appropriation bills objectionable because of the inclusion of unbudgeted projects costing more than $800 million. The second veto was overridden.

Ninth. Voted for bill to deny passports to persons furthering international communism and whose presence

Tenth. Voted against increasing appropriations by $500 million above administration request for Federal water pollution control, passed House, pending in Senate.

Eleventh. Voted for extension of Public Law 480 to enable us to exchange our agricultural surplus for foreign currencies and make food available to hungry people at home and abroad, is now public law.

Twelfth. Supported the President's request to raise interest rates on Government savings bonds. Also supported his request for authority to raise interest rate on long-term Government bonds. Congress refused to vote the latter request, increase of interest rates on savings bonds now public law.

Thirteenth. Voted to extend the law permitting adoption of eligible foreign orphans, enacted as public law.

Fourteenth. Voted to exempt bona fide news programs from law requiring radio and TV stations to give equal time to all political candidates, is now public law. Presented testimony in support of bill.

Fifteenth. Supported President's veto of bill to give Administrator of REA authority to approve or disapprove loans without concurrence of Secretary of Agriculture, veto sustained.

Sixteenth. Voted for health benefits program for Federal employees, is now public law.

Seventeenth. Supported extension of corporate liquor, cigarette, and automobile excise tax rates, is now public law.

Eighteenth. Voted to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years, passed Congress, is now public law.

Nineteenth. Supported the President's request for funds for the mutual security program, or foreign aid, is now public law.

Twentieth. Voted for the third housing bill satisfactory to the President after voting against two previous vetoed measures loaded with excessive spending programs, third bill enacted as public law.

Twenty-first. Voted for statehood for Hawaii, is now public law.

Twenty-second. Supported legislation to strengthen authority of Post Office Department to curb use of mails for distribution of obscene or fraudulent matter, passed, House, pending in Senate.

Twenty-third. Voted for extension of law granting assistance to schools in areas affected by Federal activities, enacted as public law.

Twenty-fourth. Supported increase in benefits under Railroad Retirement Act, is now public law.

Twenty-fifth. Supported added authority to Small Business Administration to make loans, is now public law.

Twenty-sixth. Supported bill to extend Bankhead-Jones Act authorizing refinancing of loans on family-size farms, enacted as public law.

During the recess, I will be in the district. While your office in Washington will be open to take care of your inquir-
abroad would endanger American security, is now public law.
ies, we will also have an office in the Hotel Jayhawk in Topeka. I will attempt to be there in person as much as possible. However, I intend to travel extensively throughout the district and as a result will not be in the office at all times. I feel it is important to travel extensively in every county in the district to see as many people as possible, to renew acquaintances, and to discuss problems. My schedule now calls for about a speech a day in every county until mid-December.

Please contact me at any time if you feel "Your Office in Washington" can be of assistance. Also, I would enjoy hearing from you at any time regarding legislative matters which are of interest to you. Your views and comments are important. Knowing what you think will better enable me to represent you effectively in Congress.

The Voting Record of Senators

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday, September 14, 1959, there appeared on the front page of the New York Times an article by John D. Morris, implemented by a number of tables recording the votes of Members of the Senate.

This article provoked considerable discussion on the floor of the Senate and a number of mistakes were set forth with reference to how Members actually voted on certain matters and how they were recorded according to the article on page C–24 of the New York Times issue.

I am sure that not only the New York Times but its very excellent staff regrets these errors and is anxious that they be corrected. Accordingly they have been corrected in the New York Times, and I ask unanimous consent that this corrected article be made a part of my remarks for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE VOTING RECORD OF SENATORS

Following is a table listing the detailed record of the 12 most significant votes in the Senate in the 1st session of the 86th Congress just ended. This tabulation corrects a partly erroneous table that appeared in the New York Times on Monday. All Senators are recorded:

Symbols: PF—Paired for; PA—Paired against; Blank indicates not recorded

[Members may pair with others, usually absent, to cancel each other out and not affect the result. See below for explanation of numbered issues]

Senator, party, and State	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
AIKEN (Republican, Vermont)	Yea	Yea		Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay.
ALLOTT (Republican, Colorado)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
ANDERSON (Democrat, New Mexico)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	PA	Nay	PA	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
BARTLETT (Democrat, Alaska)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
BEALL (Republican, Maryland)	Yea		Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay.
BENNETT (Republican, Utah)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay		Nay	Nay	Nay.
BIBLE (Democrat, Nevada)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	PF	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
BRIDGES (Republican, New Hampshire)		Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea		Nay	Nay	Nay	PA.
BUSH (Republican, Connecticut)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	PA	Nay	Nay	Nay.
BUTLER (Republican, Maryland)	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
BYRD (Democrat, Virginia)	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea		Yea	PA	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
BYRD (Democrat, West Virginia)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
CANNON (Democrat, Nevada)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
CAPEHART (Republican, Indiana)	Nay	PA	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea.
CARLSON (Republican, Kansas)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay.
CARROLL (Democrat, Colorado)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
CASE (Republican, New Jersey)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay.
CASE (Republican, South Dakota)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	PA	
CHAVEZ (Democrat, New Mexico)	Nay		Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	PA	Yea	Yea	Yea.
CHURCH (Democrat, Idaho)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	PF	PF.
CLARK (Democrat, Pennsylvania)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
COOPER (Republican, Kentucky)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea		Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea.
COTTON (Republican, New Hampshire)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
CURTIS (Republican, Nebraska)	Nay	Nay		Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
DIRKSEN (Republican, Illinois)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	PA	Nay	Nay.
DODD (Democrat, Connecticut)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
DOUGLAS (Democrat, Illinois)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	PA	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
DWORSHAK (Republican, Idaho)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
EASTLAND (Democrat, Mississippi)	Nay		Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
ELLENDER (Democrat, Louisiana)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
ENGLE (Democrat, California)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
ERVIN (Democrat, North Carolina)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
FONG (Republican, Hawaii)[1]											Nay	Yea.
FREAR (Democrat, Delaware)	Nay		Yea	Nay			Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
FULBRIGHT (Democrat, Arkansas)	Nay	Yea	Nay	PA	Yea	Yea			Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
GOLDWATER (Republican, Arizona)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea		Nay	Nay	PA	Nay.
GORE (Democrat, Tennessee)	Nay	Yea		Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea			Yea	Yea	Yea.
GREEN (Democrat, Rhode Island)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea		Yea	Nay	Yea	PF	Yea	Yea	Yea.
GRUENING (Democrat, Alaska)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
HART (Democrat, Michigan)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
HARTKE (Democrat, Indiana)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	PF.
HAYDEN (Democrat, Arizona)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
HENNINGS (Democrat, Missouri)	Yea	Yea		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea		Yea	PF	Yea.
HICKENLOOPER (Republican, Iowa)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay		Nay	Nay	Yea.
HILL (Democrat, Alabama)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay		Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
HOLLAND (Democrat, Florida)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
HRUSKA (Republican, Nebraska)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota)	Yea	PF		Yea		Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
JACKSON (Democrat, Washington)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
JAVITS (Republican, New York)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay.
JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
JOHNSTON (Democrat, South Carolina)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
JORDAN (Democrat, North Carolina)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
KEATING (Republican, New York)	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
KEFAUVER (Democrat, Tennessee)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
KENNEDY (Democrat, Massachusetts)	Yea		Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	PF	Yea	Yea	PF	Yea.
KERR (Democrat, Oklahoma)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
KUCHEL (Republican, California)	Yea		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
LANGER (Republican, North Dakota)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	PF	Yea	Yea.
LAUCHE (Democrat, Ohio)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
LONG (Democrat, Hawaii) [1]											Yea	Yea.
LONG (Democrat, Louisiana)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MAGNUSON (Democrat, Washington)	Yea	Yea	Yea	PF	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MANSFIELD (Democrat, Montana)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	PA	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MARTIN (Republican, Iowa)	Nay	Nay		Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
MCCARTHY (Democrat, Minnesota)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MCCLELLAN (Democrat, Arkansas)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea		Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
MCGEE (Democrat, Wyoming)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MCNAMARA (Democrat, Michigan)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MONRONEY (Democrat, Oklahoma)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MORSE (Democrat, Oregon)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MORTON (Republican, Kentucky)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
MOSS (Democrat, Utah)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MUNDT (Republican, South Dakota)	PA	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MURRAY (Democrat, Montana)	Nay		Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	PF	Yea	Yea	Yea.
MUSKIE (Democrat, Maine)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay		Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
NEUBERGER (Democrat, Oregon)	PF	PF	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming)	Nay			Yea	Nay	PF	Nay	PF		PF	PF	
PASTORE (Democrat, Rhode Island)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
PROUTY (Republican, Vermont)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay.
PROXMIRE (Democrat, Wisconsin)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
RANDOLPH (Democrat, West Virginia)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay		Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
ROBERTSON (Democrat, Virginia)	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	PF	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea.
RUSSELL (Democrat, Georgia)	Nay	Yea	Nay		Yea	Yea	Yea		Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
SALTONSTALL (Republican, Massachusetts)	Nay	PA	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
SCHOEPPEL (Republican, Kansas)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
SCOTT (Republican, Pennsylvania)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
SMATHERS (Democrat, Florida)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea.
SMITH (Republican, Maine)	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
SPARKMAN (Democrat, Alabama)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
STENNIS (Democrat, Mississippi)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
SYMINGTON (Democrat, Missouri)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
TALMADGE (Democrat, Georgia)	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
THURMOND (Democrat, South Carolina)	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
WILEY (Republican, Wisconsin)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
WILLIAMS (Democrat, New Jersey)	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
WILLIAMS (Republican, Delaware)	Nay		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay	Nay.
YARBOROUGH (Democrat, Texas)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.
YOUNG (Republican, North Dakota)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	PF	Yea	Nay	Nay	Nay	Yea.
YOUNG (Democrat, Ohio)	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea	Yea.

See footnotes on following page.

[1] Sworn in Aug. 24, 1959.

1. Senate rules. Jan. 12, 1959. Douglas (Democrat, Illinois) amendment to enable a majority of the Senate membership (50 Senators) to limit debate 15 days after 16 Senators file a closure motion. Rejected: Yea, 28; nay, 67. Democrats: Yea, 20; nay, 43. Republicans: Yea, 8; nay, 24.

2. Airport construction. Feb. 6, 1959. Passage of 1st Senate bill. Passed: Yea, 63; nay, 22. Democrats: Yea, 51; nay, 5. Republicans: Yea, 12; nay, 17.

3. Hawaii statehood. Mar. 11, 1959. Passage of bill. Passed: Yea, 76; nay, 15. Democrats: Yea, 46; nay, 14. Republicans: Yea, 30; nay, 1.

4. Depressed areas. Mar. 23, 1959. Passage of bill. Passed: Yea, 49; nay, 46. Democrats: Yea, 45; nay, 16. Republicans: Yea, 4; nay, 30.

5. Labor reform. Apr. 22, 1959. McClellan (Democrat, Arkansas) amendment to add to the bill a new section providing a bill of rights with criminal penalties to protect union members against unfair actions by their unions. Agreed to: Yea, 47; nay, 46. Democrats: Yea, 15; nay, 44. Republicans: Yea, 32; nay, 2.

6. Rural Electrification Administration. Apr. 28, 1959. Johnson (Democrat, Texas) motion to pass the bill over the President's veto (⅔ vote required). Passed: Yea, 64; nay, 29. Democrats: Yea, 58; nay, 1. Republicans: Yea, 6; nay, 28.

7. Nomination of Lewis L. Strauss. June 19, 1959. Rejected: Yea, 46; nay, 49. Democrats: Yea, 15; nay, 47. Republicans: Yea, 31; nay, 2.

8. Wheat. June 22, 1959. Johnson (Democrat, Texas) motion to accept the House version. Agreed to: Yea, 44; nay, 40. Democrats: Yea, 41; nay, 12. Republicans: Yea, 3; nay, 28.

9. Foreign aid authorization. July 1, 1959. Aiken (Republican, Vermont) motion on a parliamentary point of order that would have allowed the Development Loan Fund to be financed by Treasury borrowing rather than annual appropriations. Rejected: Yea, 42; nay, 48. Democrats: Yea, 35; nay, 24. Republicans: Yea, 7; nay, 24.

10. Housing. Aug. 12, 1959. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (⅔ majority required). Failed to pass: Yea, 55; nay, 40. Democrats: Yea, 53; nay, 10. Republicans: Yea, 2; nay, 30.

11. Housing (2d bill). Sept. 4, 1959. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (⅔ majority required). Failed to pass: Yea, 58; nay, 36. Democrats: Yea, 52; nay, 9. Republicans: Yea, 6; nay, 27.

12. Public works appropriation. Sept. 10, 1959. Passage of the bill over the President's veto (⅔ majority required). Passed: Yea, 72; nay, 23. Democrats: Yea, 60; nay, 2. Republicans: Yea, 12; nay, 21.

Accomplishments for Alaska in the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERNEST GRUENING

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I have prepared on the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As the 1st session of the 86th Congress comes to an end, I would like to review, for the benefit of my constituents, some of its accomplishments.

This has been an historic session. It has been a long session and, despite disappointments resulting mainly from the use of the Presidential veto to cancel out programs which were for the public good, on the whole a productive session of great accomplishment.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress holds for Alaskans a very special interest, for it is the first session in history in which my fellow citizens in the 49th State have had voting representation in the Congress. It is the first session in which Alaska has had representation in the Senate.

Alaska became a State on January 3, 1959. The session of Congress which began 4 days later, and which is now ending, has fulfilled substantially Alaskans' hopes for the achievement which could be realized under statehood.

We have not reached every goal we set ourselves. We have not solved in 8½ months all of Alaska's problems which could be solved by legislation; but the experience of Alaska in this first session of Congress after statehood has been a happy one. The accomplishments have been so numerous and so substantial that even those of us who have worked most closely with the Alaska legislation which has been considered in this Congress are suprised when we look over the list.

The report which I am about to make is a personal one. It will be my review of what has occurred in this 1st session of the 86th Congress which I feel will be of interest to Alaskans. But I want to emphasize that the results which have been achieved have not been gained by the efforts of any one man. They are instead the achievements of a hard working, a dedicated, and—most important of all—a united delegation.

Alaskans have been fortunate, Mr. President, in this first Congress in which they have had voting representation, in that the two Senators and the Representative elected to come to Washington are men who are politically, personally, and temperamentally in a position to work together. There is nothing so effective as a united team, and Alaska has had one. I have never seen men work more devotedly and more intelligently than have my colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Alaska, BOB BARTLETT, and our State's Member in the other body, RALPH RIVERS, in laboring in this session of Congress for laws which would be good for their fellow Alaskans.

I would like to pay tribute too to the leadership of the Senate for its broad and sympathetic understanding of the many needs of a new State. Both the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and I have had daily testimony to the desire of the majority leader, of the assistant majority leader, of the chairmen of the committees, and others to see that Alaska gets off to a good start as a State.

The combination of a united team from Alaska, working with leadership of the same party, has proved to be unbeatable.

Alaska had many problems when its citizens started down the statehood path at the opening of this session of Congress. It has not so many now. Here is the story of what has been achieved.

ALASKA OMNIBUS ACT

This legislation, which has become Public Law 86–70, is of major importance to Alaska. It was enacted for the purpose of insuring effective transition of Alaska from a Territory to a State. Its provisions include:

1. Transitional grants of Federal funds to the State, authorized to be appropriated over the next 5 years in a total amount of $28,500,000. An appropriation of $10,500,000, representing the transitional grant authorized for the 1960 fiscal year was included in the Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1960 (Public Law 86–213);

2. Provisions for transfers of Federal functions and property no longer needed for those functions to the State government;

3. Amendment of numerous Federal grant-in-aid statutes to authorize Alaska participation as a State, on an equal basis with the other States;

4. Amendment of many other acts to conform with Alaska's status as a State.

Two of this act's provisions which are of special interest to Alaskans have to do with transfer to the State of the Federal airports at Anchorage and Fairbanks (with means provided for extension of their runways to accommodate jet aircraft) and inclusion of Alaska in the major programs of the Federal Aid Highway Act on a basis of full equality starting July 1, 1960. It is also provided in the Alaska Omnibus Act that the State will take over administration of fish and wildlife resources January 1, 1960.

ALASKA OIL AND GAS LEASE ACREAGE INCREASE

The Congress passed H.R. 6940, a bill which, had it not been vetoed by the President, would have increased permissible acreage holdings of oil and gas land from the present limitation of 300,000 acres under option and lease to a total of 600,000 acres for each individual owner. I was a cosponsor of a Senate bill with identical provisions.

The action of the President in vetoing this bill undoubtedly gives to the Alaska delegation in Congress the distinction of having introduced legislation which failed of final enactment due to the most shocking and completely unjustified veto of all the many vetoes ever exercised by the administration. Except as a political gesture, there is no explanation for the action of the President, nor of the Interior Department, in recommending the veto. Means will be sought to achieve the goals of H.R. 6940 in the second session.

ALASKA COAL LEASE ACREAGE LIMITATION INCREASE

The Alaska delegation introduced, and obtained passage of H.R. 6939, which will give Alaska equality with the other States with respect to limitations on acreage which may be held under lease by individuals on public lands containing coal deposits. The law (Public Law 86–252) will now permit lessees in Alaska, as in other States, to hold a total acreage of 10,240 acres, with the possibility of obtaining, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, an additional 5,120 acres. The law represents an increase of a possible 12,800 acres which may be held by individual coal operators over the previous total allowed of 2,560 acres. The prior legislation, which was unduly discriminatory to Alaskan lessees, was repealed by this law. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of this constructive change.

ALASKA OIL AND GAS LAND SELECTION EXTENSION

This important law (Public Law 86–173), of which I was a cosponsor, amends the Alaska Statehood Act to allow the State an additional 5 years within which it may select, as part of the entitlement of approximately 103 million acres under statehood, Federal land which has been placed under oil and gas leases. Under provisions of the Statehood Act, the State was limited in its selection of leased lands to those lands which were under lease at the time of enactment of that act.

FEDERAL AIRPORT ASSISTANCE

The importance to Alaska of air transportation and the fact that airport needs will not be met adequately by legislation enacted early in this session extending provisions of the Federal Airport Aid Act for an additional 2 years was recognized by the Congress by the enactment of Public Law 86–295, which authorizes the Federal Aviation Administrator to allocate discretionary funds to Alaska and Hawaii for the improvement of airports.

Under the present law, as extended by Public Law 86–72, 25 percent of funds authorized are placed in a discretionary fund which the administrator may allocate to the participating States on the basis of priorities of need for special assistance for particular projects. Alaska and Hawaii were not authorized to participate in allocations of the discretionary fund under the general airport aid legislation. This law, which I cosponsored, will permit discretionary allocations to them.

I should mention that I consider the action which the Congress has taken in this

matter to be but a first step toward full equality for Alaska, which by every right should participate in airport aid programs to the same extent as the older States.

FORTY-NINE STAR FLAG

Public Law 86-18, enacted from a bill of which I was a cosponsor, authorized the Architect of the Capitol to present to the State of Alaska the official flag with 49 stars first flown over the west front of the Capitol on the Fourth of July, 1959. The flag will be duly presented to the Alaska congressional delegation by the Architect of the Capitol for transfer to Governor Egan.

RECLAMATION INVESTIGATIONS

I cosponsored also S. 1514, which passed the Senate, which would remove an existing limitation of $250,000 on the amount of money which may be spent annually by the Bureau of Reclamation in making investigations of water resource development projects, including hydroelectric projects, in the State of Alaska. Action in the House of Representatives is hoped for in the 2d session of the 86th Congress next year.

WATER RESOURCES STUDY COMMISSION

Another bill which has passed the Senate would authorize establishment of a special study commission to investigate and report on land and water resources of the State of Alaska. The Commission would be composed of 14 members, appointed by the President, and would be required to report its findings within 7 years after appointment. I am a cosponsor of S. 2628, so providing. We hope for action on it in the House next year.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR HIGHWAYS

This important legislation (Public Law 86-342) provides for increases in excise taxes earmarked for the highway trust fund which finances construction of Federal aid highways and the Interstate Highway System. Included in provisions of the law is a section which authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to study the need for extending the Interstate Highway System to include mileage in Alaska and Hawaii. Under existing legislation, neither of the new States obtains Federal assistance for construction of roads under the interstate highway program.

The highway finance law also provides for use of emergency relief funds for repair or reconstruction of forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads, whether or not they are part of a Federal aid highway system.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK DIRECTORS

S. 2517, which passed the Senate, provides for election of two additional directors of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board district which includes Alaska and Hawaii. By increasing the number of district directors from 11 to 13, the two new States can be represented on the Board, without reduction in membership of older States.

ALASKA MAIL SERVICE

S. 1849, which I introduced for myself and Senator BARTLETT, would improve mail service for the Aleutian Islands by providing that mail boats serving the area would be required to be based in Alaska, and would not allow them to make stops at other than Alaska ports. This restriction on the mail boat run for the Aleutians would insure provision of more efficient service for the localities served by the powerboat operator to whom contracts for mail service are granted by the Post Office Department. The bill passed the Senate August 3.

WATER CARRIER REGULATION

S. 1507, which was introduced by the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee by request, would provide for regulation, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of water carriers operating within the State of Alaska and coastal water carriers operating between Alaska and other United States ports. No action was taken on it in this session.

ALASKA RAILROAD REGULATION

S. 1508, which provides for regulation of the Alaska Railroad by the Interstate Commerce Commission, was reported with amendments by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and no further action has been taken on it.

INCORPORATION OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

S. 2514 would repeal existing legislation governing operation of the Alaska Railroad, and would provide for a new form of management. Under provisions of the bill the Alaska Railroad would function as a government corporation. No action has yet been taken on this bill, of which I am a cosponsor.

GRANDFATHER RIGHTS

The Senate has passed S. 1509, which authorizes certain "grandfather rights" for motor and inland water air carriers in Alaska which come under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission as of the time of passage of the Statehood Act. Action is awaited on this bill in the House.

ALASKA RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

The Congress passed, and the President signed into law, Public Law 86-178, which will extend the life of the Alaska Rail and Highway Commission. The law was changed to provide that at least one member of the Commission must be a resident of Alaska. The Commission is required to make a final report by June 1, 1961, on the cost of constructing rail and highway facilities along routes determined most feasible and beneficial by the Commission. An appropriation for the Commission of $200,000 was included in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act for 1959 (Public Law 86-30).

TRANSPORTATION VIA CANADIAN VESSELS

Public Law 86-126 reenacts previous legislation authorizing for another year the transportation of passengers and cargo by Canadian vessels to ports in southeastern Alaska.

OTHER TRANSPORTATION MEASURES

S. 2451 would require common carriers serving Alaska to establish through routes and joint rates. No action was taken on it. Similarly, no action was taken on S. 2452, which would permit—as contrasted to require—common carriers serving Alaska to establish through routes and joint rates.

APPROPRIATIONS

The gains which we were able to make in this session of Congress in obtaining appropriations needed to carry forward Federal development projects in Alaska can best be understood, I think, by reference to a brief table which I have prepared:

Appropriations requested for Federal Government programs of importance to Alaska

	Requested		Appropriated	
Public works (H.R. 7509; vetoed; not overridden)	By the administration: Nothing for any item.			
(See Budget presentation to Senate Appropriations Committee for additional requests for which no appropriation approved.)	By the Alaska delegation in Congress:			
	Rampart Canyon (investigation)	$100,000	Rampart Canyon (examination and survey)	$50,000
	Dillingham Harbor	406,000	Dillingham Harbor	406,000
	Naknek River	21,000	Naknek River [1]	21,000
	Seldovia Harbor	816,000	Seldovia Harbor [1] (channel work)	245,000
Public works (H.R. 9105; veto overridden, Public Law 86-234).			Same as appropriated in H.R. 7509, each item reduced by 2½ percent	
Supplemental, 1960 (H.R. 7978; Public Law 86-213)	Arctic Health Research Center	226,500	Senate appropriation (omitted in conference)	100,000
	Fire presuppression program, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior	250,000	Fire presuppression program, Bureau of Land Management, Department of Interior	250,000
	Arctic Health Research Center	226,500	Arctic Health Research Center	
Departments of Labor; and Health, Education, and Welfare (H.R. 6769, Public Law 86-158).	Water pollution control program	45,000,000	Water pollution control program	45,000,000
	Bureau of Labor Statistics (for Consumer Price Index studies in Alaska)	175,000	Bureau of Labor Statistics (for Consumer Price Index studies in Alaska)	100,000

[1] Eligible for selection under a lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

This summary of action on appropriation measures does not include appropriations for Federal programs in Alaska which are contained in other appropriation measures, but for which the Alaska delegation made no special request. Such appropriations for programs in Alaska are contained in the Appropriation Act for the Department of Interior, for the Department of Defense, and in the military construction appropriations bill, as well as in the appropriations for all other Federal departments and agencies performing work of the Government in Alaska.

GRADE A FRESH MILK

In addition to this salutary congressional action on requests for appropriations needed for Alaska, Senator BARTLETT and I were successful in obtaining action in the Senate which has resulted in the issuance of a directive by the Secretary of Defense requiring the purchase of fresh grade A milk from Alaskan dairymen for consumption by military personnel stationed in our State. In testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee, we brought attention to the fact that in Alaska servicemen were being served reconstituted grade C milk despite the local availability of fresh grade A milk. The report of the Senate committee included a statement directing the Department of Defense to serve fresh, grade A milk to servicemen stationed in all the States, including Alaska, unless an undue disparity should exist between local prices for fresh milk as compared with other milk products. This directive of the committee was strengthened by a colloquy on the floor of the Senate at the time that body acted on the appropriation measure. Senator CHAVEZ, chairman of the Department of Defense Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, emphasized

that the committee "feels that, even if it costs a little more money, the soldier * * * should be given grade A milk. We did not want any grade B, C, or D milk given to the personnel if it were possible to get grade A milk."

The various measures which I have described up to this point consist for the most part of bills which have gone all the way, or a substantial way, through the legislative mill. In addition, there are a number of bills which I introduced, either for myself or as a cosponsor, which are still awaiting action in Senate committees in the 2d session of the 86th Congress, which will convene next January.

HOMESTEADERS

One of the most important of these, in my estimation, is S. 1670, my bill to enable homesteaders on the Kenai Peninsula and elsewhere in Alaska to obtain oil and gas rights as well as surface rights to lands they have homesteaded. These homesteaders have in effect been deprived of mineral rights which otherwise would have been theirs by the happenstance that oil was discovered on the Kenai Peninsula in July of 1957, bringing into play a statute which reserves oil and gas rights on homesteads to the Federal Government. The homesteaders who would be given relief by the terms of my bill are those who already have valid existing rights at the time of the oil discovery. I regret to report that S. 1670 has been opposed by the Secretary of the Interior, despite what many interpreted as a pledge by him to seek remedial legislation. My bill, still in committee, will have hearings on the Kenai Peninsula in Alaska this fall.

ALASKA HIGHWAY PAVING

Among bills which I have sponsored in the field of transportation, one would authorize negotiations with Canada looking toward paving of the Alaska highway at joint expense. This bill, S. 1125, was introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon, Senator NEUBERGER, whose interest in Alaska has been deep and abiding.

FERRIES, APPROACH ROADS

S. 2661 would amend existing Federal highway aid legislation to provide for Federal assistance in the construction of approach roads to public or privately owned ferries in Alaska (as well as any other States having a similar need). There are sections of my State—southeastern Alaska primarily—where the ruggedness of the terrain is such that highways cannot be built, or cannot be built except at excessive cost. The ferries which in that circumstance provide the only feasible way for automobiles to be moved are deserving of Federal assistance, I contend, to the same extent as are roadways. The ferries in such locations are in essence "floating highways" connecting links of standard roadway.

CONSTRUCTION SUBSIDIES FOR FERRIES

Another related measure, S. 1956, would authorize the Federal Government to pay construction subsidies for vessels used as ferries on a proposed ferry transportation network in southeastern Alaska.

EXEMPTION FROM INSPECTION

S. 2669 would exempt from Coast Guard inspection certain small vessels essential for water transportation in southeastern Alaska. These vessels, serving the population along the protected coast, now enjoy such exemption, but the authority for it will expire next March unless S. 2669 is enacted.

GOLD

My bill, S. 590, provides for free marketing of gold and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay $70 per fine ounce for all gold mined domestically and tendered to the Treasury. This would double the existing price of $35 an ounce and would stimulate the gold mining industry in the mining States.

TIN

Similarly, S. 1957 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make incentive payments to producers of tin.

DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC LAND

S. 1411 would amend an act of August 1, 1956, to provide for the disposal of public lands within highway, telephone, and pipeline withdrawals in Alaska by clarifying the words "restored lands" as used in the act, as including certain lands at Big Delta and Tok Junction.

WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LAND

S. 2587 would extend to all public land withdrawals proposals of the Federal Government the provision of law now applicable to land withdrawals for defense purposes which would require a specific act of Congress for the withdrawal of lands in areas in excess of 5,000 acres for use for any Federal purpose.

SALMON

S. 502 would prohibit the importation of salmon taken on the high seas by nationals of any country that permits fishing for salmon by gill nets in areas inhabited by large quantities of immature North American salmon.

COST OF LIVING ALLOWANCES

S. 176 would authorize payment of cost of living allowances for employees of the Federal Government assigned to Alaska in amounts exceeding the present limit of 25 percent of the basic rate of compensation. My objective is that the allowance paid should reflect the actual added cost of living and not be arbitrarily limited.

LEAVE BENEFITS

S. 973 would permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to accumulate a maximum of 45 days annual leave rather than the 30 days now permitted. This would reestablish the leave privileges in effect prior to the achievement of statehood.

VETERANS

S. 2201 would provide for reestablishment of authorization available to the Veterans' Administration prior to the achievement of statehood under which the Veterans' Administrator could arrange for hospitalization of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities by contracting with private hospitals in Alaska.

TRANSFER OF SURPLUS PROPERTY

In my capacity as chairman of the Donable Property Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations, I am especially interested in studying the effects of existing surplus property legislation on the State of Alaska. In order to meet apparent needs of the State, I have introduced S. 2442, a reenactment of legislation previously in effect, under which the Federal Government was authorized to transfer surplus property to Alaska, without reference to other restrictions of present law which limit such transfers (as donations) to activities organized for purposes of education, public health, and civil defense.

During the adjournment period the Donable Property Subcommittee, under my direction, will make a special study of the disposition of surplus property in Alaska with a view to obtaining early and favorable action on this bill at the next session of Congress.

EXPORT RAIL RATES

S. 1673 would authorize the General Services Administration to appeal decisions of regulatory bodies in the Federal courts. The purpose of the bill is to allow GSA, without reference to the Department of Justice, to appeal adverse decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission which are considered to be adverse to the interests of Alaska. Such a decision was rendered in a case in which export rates were sought from the transcontinental railroads on shipments destined for Alaska. Low export rates such as are denied Alaska shippers are enjoyed on rail movements of cargo destined ultimately for foreign and Hawaii destinations. The provisions of S. 1673 would also extend to other types of regulatory action affecting the GSA.

JUDICIARY

S. 2705 would provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for Alaska, the one judge specified by the Statehood Act being deemed inadequate to handle Federal cases in that extensive jurisdiction.

Many bills of interest to Alaskans, either because the citizens of my State would like to see them enacted, or fear they will be, have been introduced by other Senators. I would like to discuss a few of these briefly.

ARCTIC WILDLIFE RANGE

One bill which was introduced at this session of Congress was opposed by me when it was the subject of a hearing before the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This bill, S. 1899, would establish an Arctic Wildlife Range in Alaska. It would, if enacted, result in the withdrawal of some 9 million acres from northeastern Alaska to be used as a wildlife refuge. There has been no action on this bill.

AIR TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

S. 2042, which Senator MONRONEY introduced, and which was reported by the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, would authorize the Postmaster General to negotiate contracts with air carriers for the transportation of mail of classes other than air mail. This would greatly improve mail service to Alaska from the other States.

ALASKA COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

In the House of Representatives, a bill has been introduced to authorize the Secretary of Defense to dispose of the Alaska Communications System by negotiation. No action has been taken on H.R. 4879.

BRANDED GOODS

The Alaska delegation has gone to considerable lengths to persuade the Secretary of Defense that procurement officers of the Department in Alaska should procure branded goods from Alaska suppliers. The problem was solved by a combination of the effect of passage of the Statehood Act and the passage of the Defense Department Appropriation Act for 1960. The latter carries a provision which has been regularly included in it for many years which prohibits payment of transportation costs of items to be sold at commissaries in the United States. Alaska was not, formerly, considered to be a part of the United States; hence the prohibition did not apply. With this act now signed by the President, Alaska suppliers will be in the same position as those in other States. Under prior authorizations the Defense Department bought branded goods in other States and paid the cost of transportation to Alaska, thus undercutting Alaska merchants.

MAJOR LEGISLATION

Mr. President, my presentation to this point has concerned itself with actions taken by this Congress on bills of particular and specific interest to Alaskans. As citizens of the Nation, Alaskans also participate in the benefits of all general legislation for the people of the United States. In some respects the Congress was frustrated in this session in its attempts to legislate for the people of the United States and to meet the needs of this growing Nation. The frustration came from the use of the veto by the Executive. Vetoes struck down, and set at naught, many pieces of badly needed legislation.

The remedy, in a democracy, lies at the polls. After 1960, with a President from the Democratic Party occupying the White House, we can resume that progress on housing, airport construction, public power,

navigation improvement and developmental programs generally which has been the hallmark of Democratic administrations.

Some progress, despite to "no new starts" philosophy and practice by the Republican administration, was made through major legislation enacted at this session.

HOUSING

After two attempts at passage of housing legislation which met with Presidential vetoes, the Congress finally passed a third housing bill which extends and amends basic housing legislation and meets immediate needs of the housing program.

Of particular interest to Alaska is an amendment to section 214 of the National Housing Act, which authorizes the FHA to insure mortgages on housing in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii in amounts up to 50 percent higher than is authorized elsewhere. The 1959 amendment will allow the administration to apply the 50 percent additional allowance to mortgages insured in maximum amounts as determined under other provisions of the National Housing Act which permit upward adjustments of insurable mortgage amounts required in high-cost areas.

Another of the many amendments enacted by the new law is section 413 which will authorize the use of 20 percent of capital grants for urban renewal to be applied to the redevelopment of nonresidential areas for nonresidential purposes where local public agencies determine that such redevelopment is necessary for the proper development of the community.

I was a cosponsor of the first housing bill introduced at this session of Congress, which contained far more liberal measures with respect to Federal assistance to States for housing programs than the bill which has now become law as Public Law 86–372.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Hawaii was admitted as the 50th State under provisions of Public Law 86–3. I am proud to have been a cosponsor of this legislation which has brought full membership in the family of States to the last organized territory of the United States.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM

Congress acted to safeguard the rights of union members and the public against unfair and unethical practices of labor unions and management. Public Law 86–257 has yet to prove its efficacy and fairness in practice.

AIRPORT CONSTRUCTION

The program under which the States receive Federal assistance for construction and improvement of airports was extended for an additional 2 years. Alaska continues to receive funds allocated on the same basis, with the same matching requirements, as applied to her as a territory. Alaska's share for the 1960 and 1961 fiscal years will be $1,350,000 from the funds to be allocated under the regular matching programs, in addition to such other funds as may be made available to Alaska from the discretionary fund in which the State will share under terms of the special bill enacted upon introduction by the Alaska Senators.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

The GI Assistance Act of 1959 (S. 1138), of which I was a cosponsor, would extend the GI bill of rights for Federal assistance for education, vocational rehabilitation, and for house and farm loans to post-Korean war veterans. This bill passed the Senate July 21. It awaits House action.

A new veterans' pension bill which makes numerous changes in pension rates for veterans and dependents of veterans with nonservice-connected disabilities was enacted as Public Law 86–211.

YOUTH CONSERVATION

S. 812 would establish a Youth Conservation Corps to provide an opportunity for healthful training and employment for young men in connection with carrying out planned conservation programs. This bill, of which I am a cosponsor, passed the Senate August 13.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT

Another bill of which I am a cosponsor, S. 722, would provide Federal assistance for areas of the United States in which there is a substantial amount of unemployment. It passed the Senate March 23.

HEALTH INSURANCE

Public Law 86–382 provides for a federally administered program of health insurance for Federal Government employees. The law authorizes payroll deductions and an equal contribution by the Federal Government to the cost of approved health insurance programs. I am proud to be a cosponsor of related legislation, which has not yet passed, to extend the same health insurance benefits to retired Government employees. That bill is S. 2575.

MUTUAL SECURITY

An extension, with amendments, of basic mutual security legislation was enacted in the form of Public Law 86–148, carrying with it an authorization for funds for assistance to other countries.

As you know, I led an attempt to amend the legislation to require the International Cooperation Administration, which administers the program, to submit firm budgets for expenditures of funds it requests from Congress. The Gruening amendment to the authorization legislation was not adopted. However, I am gratified that the mutual security appropriation law, enacted in the closing hours of the session, contains a provision similar to the one I earlier recommended. Under the amendment, the ICA will be required to report to the Congress any deviations from justification data submitted by the agency to obtain appropriations from Congress.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS ACT

This legislation (Public Law 86–249) provides authorization for construction of Federal public buildings by the General Services Administration. It is expected, under procedures established by this law, that it will be possible for the Government to construct Federal buildings authorized by previous legislation (but for which funds were never provided) at Anchorage, Juneau, and Seward in Alaska.

FLUORSPAR INDUSTRY

Senate Resolution 162, of which I was a cosponsor, requires the Tariff Commission to make a special study of the effects of fluorspar imports on the domestic fluorspar industry with a view toward determining whether import restrictions should be applied in the interests of protection of the domestic industry. Fluorspar is one of Alaska's mineral resources.

LEAD AND ZINC INDUSTRY

Senate Resolution 163, which I also cosponsored, requires the Tariff Commission to make a study of the effects of lead and zinc imports on the domestic industry, with a view to determining whether import restrictions should be applied for its protection.

INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

Public Law 86–121, co-sponsored by me, authorizes the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service to construct sanitation facilities for Indian homes, communities and lands. It applies to Alaska villages.

OTHER ENACTMENTS

The first session also enacted a crash program to attack cancer, heart disease and other killing and crippling diseases. It extended the Civil Rights Commission, liberalized railroad retirement and passed comprehensive legislation to attack the problem of water pollution.

This Congress cut more than $1,850 million from President Eisenhower's appropriation requests, effectively refuting by action the accusation so often made that it consisted mainly of irresponsible spenders. Congress not only took the President at his word in his repeated calls for fiscal integrity and the balanced budget; it went him one better and spent considerably less than he had requested. To the credit of the Congress, let it be recorded also that the sums voted for public works, internal development and the strengthening of our national economy were above his requests. The economies were taken elsewhere.

THE SECOND HALF

The 86th Congress finds itself at what in a football game would be called half time. Ahead of us in the second session, when more touchdowns will be made, I am confident that, with the same attention to business and devotion to the interests of all the people, we can in 1960 write another proud chapter in American history.

The Democratic Web of Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, President Eisenhower recently defined inflation as being—"when you take a market basket full of money to the grocery store and bring back your pocketbook filled with groceries."

The distinguished Democratic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee [Mr. CANNON] had this to say about the impact of the Democratic-controlled 86th Congress on inflation:

We cannot escape the responsibility for the situation as we find it today. Congress spent the money and increased the national debt and brought on the inflation. The responsibility is right here on this floor. We cannot offer an alibi. We cannot pass the buck. * * * Congress did it and let no one try to make the people back home believe any different. * * * this Congress has doubled the cost of breakfast, doubled the cost of school clothing. * * * Congress has increased the cost of living, of every family in the district of every Member of this House.

Bear in mind the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee was talking about a Congress in which the Democratic Party has a majority of 283 to 153 in the House and a majority of 65 to 35 in the Senate—a margin in each House of almost 2 Democrats for every 1 Republican.

Regrettably these remarks are applicable not only to the 86th Congress. Mr. CANNON's remarks are equally applicable to previous Democratic-controlled Congresses such as the 85th and 84th Congresses, the 82d and 81st Congresses, the Democratic-controlled Congresses from the 79th through the 73d Congress.

In the last 27 years the Democratic Party has had control of the Congress in 23 years and has approved deficit spending budgets or deficiency appropriations resulting in deficits in 20 of those years. The average annual deficit in those 20 years of Democratic deficits was $13.5 billion.

Fiscal year 1951 was the only year in the last 27 years in which a budgetary surplus occurred while the Congress and the Executive were under the exclusive control of the Democratic Party. We will all recall that this unusual Democratic surplus happened under revenue circumstances of the highest individual, corporate, and excess profits tax rates in our Nation's history and while our defense spending for the Korean war was mired in bureaucratic indecision after 5 years of Truman neglect of our Nation's military preparedness.

The other 2 fiscal years, 1956 and 1957, in which budgetary surpluses occurred while a Democratic-controlled Congress was in power, can in almost exclusive measure be attributed to the diligent endeavors of the Eisenhower administration to place our Federal Government on a pay-as-you-go basis. It should also be remembered that these surpluses were realized after economic growth had been stimulated by a $7.5 billion tax reduction program accomplished by the Republican administration and the Republican 83d Congress when a budget surplus was at hand.

Since the last Republican Congress in 1953–54, we have had 5 years of Democratic legislative control. The record documents the inescapable conclusion that without the Republican administration and the Republican minority in Congress to serve as a bulwark for the protection of our Nation's fiscal and monetary integrity, the American people would today be caught in a web of disastrous inflation spun by the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party has used its control of the Congress in the past 5 years to try to return this Nation to the discredited spending practices of the voter-repudiated Democratic fair deal. The Democratic Party in seeking to undermine the budget-balancing endeavors of the Republican administration has kept our Nation from making the progress we otherwise would have made in bringing order to our Nation's fiscal and monetary affairs.

Since the advent of the Eisenhower administration in January 1953 certain political demagogues have consistently carped at the administration's fiscal and monetary policy. In essence they have claimed that on the fiscal side we have spent too little and on the monetary side we have inflated not enough. Either these advocates of spend more and pay later are dissatisfied that our tax rates are too low or that our $290 billion public debt should be higher; this conclusion is evident from their relentless clamor for more spending, more Federal bureaucracy with less States' rights, and more erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar.

Criticism by the irresponsible demagogues with respect to the Eisenhower administration's endeavors to protect the purchasing power of the citizen's dollar is not seriously heeded by most thinking people. Unfortunately in recent weeks responsible House Members in positions of Democratic leadership have begun to parrot the left wing line of budget buffoonery. Our Nation's economic strength demands that inflation and its causes be effectively dealt with by all thoughtful citizens regardless of party. It is only in this way that we can curb inflation, foster meaningful economic growth for our Nation, and preserve the vitality of our free-enterprise system.

Mr. Speaker, in the remainder of my remarks I would like to restate briefly the recent criticism of the administration's monetary and fiscal policies, examine into the validity of that criticism, review the fiscal accomplishments of the Eisenhower administration, and then examine inflation's causes and its impact upon our economy.

In essence, the criticism is that the monetary policies of the administration are inconsistent with its fiscal policies in that so-called tight money thwarts economic growth and that when inflationary deficit financing is added, the combination results in rising prices without achieving full employment. The charge is also made that the administration is responsible for deficit financing and loose fiscal policy. Now that we have stated the charge, let us examine the facts. Let us see what political party is responsible for loose fiscal policy—high taxes, deficit spending, and mounting debt.

For convenient reference I will at this point in my remarks include as table 1 a summary of budget totals and public debt for the period 1933–59:

TABLE 1.—*Budget totals and public debt 1933–59*

[In millions of dollars]

Fiscal year	Budget receipts	Budget expenditures	Surplus (+) or deficit (−)	Public debt at end of year
1933	2,021	4,623	−2,602	22,539
1934	3,064	6,694	−3,630	27,053
1935	3,730	6,521	−2,791	28,701
1936	4,069	8,493	−4,425	33,779
1937	4,979	7,756	−2,777	36,425
1938	5,615	6,792	−1,177	37,165
1939	4,996	8,858	−3,862	40,440
1940	5,144	9,062	−3,918	42,968
1941	7,103	13,262	−6,159	48,961
1942	12,555	34,046	−21,490	72,422
1943	21,987	79,407	−57,420	136,696
1944	43,635	95,059	−51,423	201,003
1945	44,478	98,416	−53,941	235,682
1946	39,771	60,448	−20,676	269,422
1947	39,786	39,032	+754	268,286
1948	41,498	33,069	+8,419	252,292
1949	37,696	39,507	−1,811	252,770
1950	36,495	39,617	−3,122	257,357
1951	47,508	44,058	+3,510	255,222
1952	61,391	65,408	−4,017	259,105
1953	64,825	74,274	−9,449	266,071
1954	64,655	67,772	−3,117	271,260
1955	60,390	64,570	−4,180	274,374
1956	66,165	65,540	+1,626	272,753
1957	71,029	69,433	+1,596	270,537
1958	69,117	71,936	−2,819	276,242
1959	68,158	80,699	−12,541	706,841

NOTE.—The change in the public debt from year to year is not necessarily the same as the budget surplus or deficit. It reflects also changes in the Treasury's cash balances, the effect of certain trust fund transactions, and direct borrowing from the public by certain Government enterprises.

In evaluating the data in table 1, it should be remembered that the House was under control of the Democratic Party in the 72d Congress and that actions of the Democratic 73d Congress acted to increase the deficit in fiscal year 1933. Similarly the Democratic 81st Congress by action on Truman requested deficiency appropriations was responsible for the final deficit figure of $1.8 billion in 1949. On the other hand, the Republican Party and the Republican 80th Congress deserve major credit for the economies instituted that led to the budgetary surplus of $754 million in fiscal year 1947.

Turning now to the taxing side of the budget ledger, we find that since the advent of the personal income tax in 1913—approximately 47 years ago—the Democratic Party has controlled the Congress for 31 years and the Republican Party for 16 years. In the 31 years of Democratic control our Nation had 20 major Democratic tax increases. The Republican Party, on the other hand, in its 16 years of stewardship as the majority party in Congress has enacted nine major Republican income tax decreases.

The most noteworthy of these Republican tax decreases occurred during the Republican 80th Congress, when an annual tax saving of $5 billion was given to the American people, and during the Republican 83d Congress, when an annual tax reduction of $7.5 billion occurred. Without these Republican tax reductions made possible by Republican economy, the Democratic imposed tax burdens on our Nation's economy by now might well have snuffed out of existence our free enterprise system and brought on Government regimentation of our economic life.

Democratic tax policy has traditionally been dedicated to broadening the tax base and increasing the tax rates so that under the Democratic Party we have reached the point of taxation according to inability to pay.

Turning now to the expenditure side of the budget ledger, we find that a succession of record high Democratic tax increases was inadequate to finance even greater Democratic spending so that in the period of the New and Fair Deals the public debt was increased by approximately $250 billion. With respect to spending, the Democratic Party's record has been characterized by promises of frugality and performances of profligacy.

In connection with this review of the Democratic Party's record of fiscal extravagance it is interesting to note that the distinguished majority leader of the House when he was a member of the House Committee on Ways and Means joined in signing supplemental views in the committee report accompanying the revenue bill of 1932 to the House, in which he said:

> From this brief statement [with reference to the fiscal position of the Federal Government] it is unmistakably evident that we cannot afford to have an unbalanced budget for 3 consecutive years, and that the committee is warranted in its position that the best interests of the country require that the budget for 1933 be balanced.

I sincerely regret that the gentleman's party did not give more heed to this perceptive observation by their very able and patriotic colleague. After he

made that comment, Democratic majorities in the Congress proceeded in 13 successive years to approve budgetary deficits which were brought to a halt only in 1947 when a Republican Congress was in power. It should be noted that the largest budgetary surplus in the history of our Nation was realized during the Republican 80th Congress in 1948 in the amount of $8.4 billion. Budget expenditures which were reduced in the Republican 80th Congress began a Democratic rise in the 81st Congress which was not reversed until the Republican Party returned to control of the Congress in 1953.

Examining further the record of more recent history we find the following with respect to budget expenditures: In the last Truman budget year the Democratic Congress approved expenditures of $74.3 billion. Fiscal years 1954 and 1955 were Eisenhower budget years in which the President had a Republican Congress to work with and we find a record of declining expenditures in each of those years in the amount of $67.8 billion and $64.6 billion, respectively. With the advent of Democratic control of Congress in calendar year 1955, the Republican trend of declining Federal expenditures was reversed and budget expenditures again began to rise so that for the years indicated expenditures were: fiscal year 1956, $66.5 billion; fiscal year 1957, $69.4 billion; fiscal year 1958, $71.9 billion; and fiscal year 1959, $80.7 billion.

A portent of future spending levels is found in the pattern of new obligational authorizations enacted in preceding years. New obligational authority is an authorization enacted by the Congress prescribing obligations to be incurred by Federal agencies for the payment of money. As these advance spending authorization levels rise and also become current, they exert virtually unmanageable upward pressures on expenditure levels. As our review of the expenditure record has revealed that the Democratic Party is the party of the spenders, so does a review of the new obligational authority record reveal that the Democratic Party is hopelessly committed to rising spending in future years. There follows a summary of new obligational authority voted by the Congress for the period 1952 through 1959:

Fiscal year:	*Amount (billions)*
1952	$91.4
1953	80.3
1954	62.8
1955	57.1
1956	63.2
1957	70.2
1958	76.3
1959	81.4

It is to be noted that the decline in future spending authorizations began in 1953 when the Republican administration and the Republican Congress took office in January 1953 and began to restore order out of the fiscal chaos left by the Truman-Democratic Party. Fiscal year 1955 was the last budget prepared by the Republican Congress and the new obligational authority began to rise in 1956 under a Democratic Congress.

The rising levels of budget expenditures and new obligational authorizations under a Democratic-controlled Congress are directly attributable to the politically motivated conviction of the Democratic Party that the Federal Government can spend the taxpayer's dollar for governmental schemes better than the taxpayer can spend his money to provide for his family's living and educational needs. This fact can be documented by observing that in the 84th Congress the Democrats provided for nearly 200 new or increased spending programs largely imposing Federal-aid on the States. The 85th Congress and the 1st session of the 86th Congress have produced similar records of usurpation of authority by the Federal Government to the detriment of the functioning of our State and local governments and the pocketbooks and liberties of our citizens.

A further demonstration of the extravagaint spending proclivities of the Democratic Party is found in a review of some of the reckless spending bills introduced in the House and Senate by Democratic Members of the Congress in the 1st session of the 86th Congress. Only a partial list of 22 such bills introduced in the House has an estimated 5-year price tag of $152.3 billion. It should be remembered that these "antitaxpayer" proposals are in addition to the regular spending levels that would be required by the so-called typical budget. This raises the somewhat rhetorical question, "In the light of this record how can it be sincerely contended that it is the administration that is responsible for the loose fiscal policies extant today in our Federal affairs?"

The Democratic majority in the 86th Congress did not merely content itself with introducing spending bills. That Democratic majority worked desperately to bust the budget for 1960 and make more difficult budget balances in future years. Table 2 shows the expenditures that were avoided because of Presidential vetoes, bills defeated, and bills on which action was delayed.

Table 2

[In millions]

	Ultimate additional authorized net spending[1]	Expenditure effect on 1960 budget
BILLS DEFEATED		
S. 722, area redevelopment (1960-63)	$337	$10
S. 12, grants to States for educational TV	50	5
S.J. Res. 41, international medical research	50	10
S. 812, Youth Conservation Corps	375	25
S. 1138, peacetime ex-serviceman's readjustment benefits (1960-73)	3,500	10
PENDING IN CONFERENCE		
H.R. 3610, water pollution grants (based on Senate action) (10 years)	300	30
Total	4,612	90
BILLS VETOED BY PRESIDENT		
Housing programs in excess of those finally enacted	531	
Total	5,143	110

[1] Passage of these bills would have added $110 million to 1960 expenditures and considerably more in the next few fiscal years. This would have produced a deficit of $15 million for 1960 rather than the $95 million surplus.

Unfortunately the Democratic budget-busters did succeed in adding additional expenditures to the budget proposals of the President for fiscal year 1960. The budget message for fiscal year 1960 submitted to the Congress in January 1959 called for an expenditure level of $77 billion; it is now estimated fiscal year 1960 expenditures will total $78.9 billion. Table 3 presents a summary analysis of the net fiscal impact of legislative action on the budget in the 1st session of the 86th Congress:

Table 3

The net fiscal impact of all congressional actions in the first session of this Congress upon the President's budget recommendations submitted for fiscal year 1960 is as follows:

1. Net expenditures [1] for fiscal year 1960 were increased by $597 million.
2. Net expenditures over a period of future years after fiscal year 1960 were increased an additional $11.5 billion.
3. Pending legislation passed by one or both Houses of Congress and now awaiting further congressional action in January would cost in future fiscal years an additional several billion dollars beyond the President's requests.[2]

SUMMARY

[In millions]

	Expenditure effect in 1960	Expenditure effect over period of years
A. Actual congressional reductions in President's requests	−$81	−$1,033
B. Increases through "back door financing"	+110	+231
C. Other increases:		
1. In appropriation acts	+25	+2,233
2. In new substantive legislation	+45	+10,125
3. Nonapproval of revenue proposals	+498	+540
Total effect of all congressional actions on President's budget	+597	[3] +12,096
Deduct 1960 expenditure effect		597
Increase after 1960		11,499

[1] Spending required by congressional action over President's requests, plus revenues requested by President but not granted.

[2] These bills include the following: Peacetime ex-servicemen's readjustment benefits (S. 1138), Youth Conservation Corps (S. 812), international medical research (S.J. Res. 41), grants to States for educational television (S. 12), area redevelopment (S. 722), and water pollution (H.R. 3610).

[3] Of this amount $258 million is in loans repayable over a period of years.

Thus, it is apparent that the Democratic budget-busters not only adversely affected the 1960 budget but they have made balanced budgets more difficult of attainment for years to come by enacting Government programs that America's taxpayers cannot afford.

To demonstrate the implications of the spending actions of the Democratic-controlled Congresses under the Eisenhower administration, it can be pointed out that if the spending levels in the period 1956–60 had been held to the 1955 budget level approved by the last Republican Congress, the citizens of our Nation would have saved $44.4 billion for an average of almost $9 billion per year.

Mr. Speaker, despite unthinking contentions to the contrary, in evaluating responsibility for fiscal policy, it must be remembered that no expenditure can be made by the executive branch of the Government without such expenditure first having been authorized by the Congress. Such an authorization may take the form of an appropriation, either current or permanent, or an authority to spend from debt receipts. Therefore,

it is clearly a basic truth under our form of government that the amount of expenditure in any year is determined by the action of the Congress. It is also clear that if we have spent too much or been "fiscally loose," it is the Congress that must accept the responsibility for the fact and the consequence. It serves no useful purpose to attempt to shift the blame to where it does not belong.

The Democratic Party must assume sole responsibility for 93.4 percent of our national debt. In 1953 the debt stood at $266 billion. Under the present administration, hamstrung in its endeavors to foster fiscal responsibility by three Democratic Congresses, the debt has risen approximately $19 billion. On June 30, 1933, the debt was $22.5 billion, which was $1.5 billion less than the $24 billion debt left by the Woodrow Wilson Democratic administration. Therefore, the Democratic administrations of Wilson, Roosevelt, and Truman are responsible for the entire national debt incurred prior to 1953. That Democratic total is $266 billion, or 94.3 percent of the total public indebtedness. The Democratic Party must also assume a pro rata share of the responsibility for the cost of maintaining that debt. Democratic responsibility for the debt arises from that party's undeviating commitment to deficit financing and governmental spending in excess of an expenditure level that can be sustained by our national resources.

Mr. Speaker, this review of the fiscal facts of our Nation clearly shows that it is the Democratic Party that has led our Nation down the path of fiscal folly of extravagant spending, mounting indebtedness, and inflation-eroded dollars. From these facts it is inescapably clear that the Democratic Party in a search for an inflation scapegoat should have ended its hunt at its own front door.

Mr. Speaker, thus far I have reviewed the record of our two great political parties in providing fiscal leadership. The record has proved that the Republican Party when in control of Congress has slashed spending and given meaningful tax reduction to the American people within the framework of a balanced budget that provided a surplus to be used for urgent debt reduction. On the other hand that same record has proved the Democratic Party to be the party of rising taxes, rising spending, and rising public debt. We have also determined that the record of loose fiscal policy that has prevailed during most of the last 27 years must be attributed to the actions of the Democratic majority in the Congress because of its predominant control over the Federal Government's taxing and spending.

Mr. Speaker, I will now turn to a refutation of the charge that the Eisenhower administration's fiscal and monetary policies have not been conducive to economic growth. In reviewing the accomplishments of the Eisenhower Republican administration since January 1953, it might be well for us to review briefly the fiscal position of the United States at the time the Eisenhower administration took office and see what the Republican Party has done to establish order out of Democratic fiscal chaos.

The following is a brief recitation of the fiscal problems irresponsibly left by the previous Democratic administration when the Republican Party came to power in January of 1953:

First. The Federal debt equaled 89 percent of our annual national income. Because of the stringent fiscal policies of the Republican administration and the prosperity that our Nation has experienced under that administration, the national debt today equals 79 percent of the Nation's annual national income.

Second. The Democratic Party had approved budget deficits of almost $10 billion in each of the fiscal years 1953 and 1954. By instituting Republican frugality the Democratic-proposed deficit for 1954 was reduced by more than $6 billion. In addition to these Democratic planned deficits, the outgoing Democratic administration had also left $80 billion in unpaid obligations that had to be met by the Republican administration.

Third. The Democratic caused spiral of inflation had reduced the purchasing power of the dollar from 100 cents in 1939 to 77 cents in 1945, and that purchasing power declined to 52 cents by 1952.

Straightening out the Truman-Democratic messes of war in Korea, budget deficits, and runaway inflation were the most urgent matters for correction by the Republican administration and the Republican Congress in 1953. In dealing with these problems, the Republican Party did not overlook the need to foster economic growth.

America's progress under the leadership of the Republican Party has been the greatest in the history of the world. Contrasting economic events of the past 6 years with comparable data for the Truman era we find the following astounding accomplishments:

First. Employment and family income: In 1959 the average number of gainfully employed stood at 65.3 million persons compared to 61 million in 1952. Average annual family income after taxes which was $4,570 in 1952 increased 24 percent to an average level of $5,675 by 1958. The average family purchased 12.5 percent more in goods and services in real terms in 1958 than in 1952. In the same period farm income per worker increased 13.1 percent.

Second. Housing: From January 1953 through August 1959 6.7 million American families moved into new nonfarm homes; nearly 32 million families now own their own homes or nearly 22 percent more than in 1952.

Third. Cost of living: The success of the Eisenhower administration in curbing the Truman-Democratic runaway inflation has brought stability to the cost of living and because public confidence has been restored in our Government's determination to safeguard the purchasing power of the dollar, an incentive to more saving has resulted. The average annual increase in the cost of living for the 6 year period 1953–58 was 1.4 percent contrasted with an average annual increase of 5.8 percent during the 8 years of the Truman administration. The average per capita savings has increased 12 percent over what it was in 1952.

Fourth. Capital investment: Business capital expenditures for new plant and equipment averaged $21 billion a year during the 8 years of the Democratic administration and $35 billion during the 6 years of the present Republican administration. These capital outlays increased 24.6 percent in 1958 over 1952.

Fifth. Small business: A record total of 4.6 million business firms was reached in the second quarter of 1959. New business incorporations showed a remarkable growth in 1958 and 1959. The administration has effectively worked to abolish Federal enterprises competing with private business.

Sixth. Fiscal data: Federal taxes in terms of net budget receipts from all sources amounted to 22.2 percent of national income in 1952, as compared with 18.8 percent in 1958. Budget expenditures in fiscal year 1959 were 17.4 percent of gross national product, as compared with 19.3 percent in fiscal year 1952. The average relationship of budget expenditures to gross national product during the 8 calendar years of the last Democratic administration was 19.6 percent compared with a relationship of 17.3 percent during the 6 calendar years of the Eisenhower administration. The public debt per capita was $1,688 in December 1952 as compared with $1,612 in December 1958.

A comparison of allocation of interest payments on the public debt by groups of recipients is set forth in table 4:

TABLE 4.—*Estimated distribution of the interest on the public debt, calendar years 1946, 1952, and 1958*

[In billions of dollars]

	1946	1952	1958
Individuals:			
Savings bonds	$0.8	$1.5	$1.4
Other Federal securities	.5	.3	.4
Total	1.3	1.8	1.8
Commercial banks	1.4	1.3	1.6
Mutual savings banks	.3	.2	.2
Insurance companies	.6	.4	.3
Nonfinancial corporations	.2	.4	.5
State and local governments	.2	.2	.4
Miscellaneous investors	.2	.2	.4
Federal Reserve banks	.1	.4	.7
Government investment accounts	.7	1.2	1.5
Total interest expenditures	5.0	6.1	7.4
Addenda: Percent interest expenditure of national income	2.8	2.1	2.0

Mr. Speaker, this brief recitation of a few of the highlights of the economic accomplishments under the Republican Party clearly demonstrates public confidence in the policies and public approval of the principles for which the Republican Party stands. These attainments are conclusive proof of the wisdom and foresight of Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, Democratic deficit spending and the inflation it creates are the gravest threat to the vitality of our free enterprise system. There can be no peaceful coexistence between inflation and economic opportunity.

Inflation is the most dangerous domestic economic problem confronting our Nation in our endeavors to keep fully defended against international commu-

nism. Inflation occurs when the total volume of money expenditures increases more rapidly than the supply of goods and services bought and sold. Man's resistance to the limitation of his environment create the subjective basis for inflationary pressures. Rising prices are merely the symptom and not the cause of inflation. While I do not profess great learning in the science of economics, an empirical examination of present-day circumstances clearly points the finger of blame for inflation on the spending proclivities of government. For example, in the period from 1948—our low point achieved under the Republican 80th Congress—to 1957, Government purchases of goods and services rose more than 200 percent, while private expenditures rose 71 percent.

The increase in Government spending was partly the result of rising prices, but even after making adjustment for this factor, real Government purchases rose by more than 100 percent. This Government spending has caused the governments on the Federal, State, and local levels to take in government revenues one-third of the net national income which suggests that we are well on the road to socializing the income of the people.

It is the inescapable conclusion that what policy the Government takes with respect to spending, taxing, and debt management will be a major factor in determining an inflationary or deflationary course of events. Therefore, one of the first lines of defense against inflation is to control the spending activities of the Congress—to discipline ourselves so as to avoid promises that cannot be kept and to abstain from overloading the economy. It is the Congress that must face up to the uncomfortable political decisions that are demanded by the stern facts of life.

Inflation has no constructive relationship to economic progress. Inflation is not a cause of national growth. Inflation perpetuates and aggravates the hardship and disaster that accompany the cycle of boom and bust. As Mr. Raymond Moley has recently described it, as quoted from page 52 of House Report No. 1148, 86th Congress:

> Inflation is the prescription for bureaucratic tyranny * * * thwarts the individual's means of self-help and personal security by withering his savings and the value of his income * * * transforms the normal transactions of business into speculative gambles, especially for small business * * * spawns demagogs to make the processes of politics and Government a compound of false promises, deceptions, hidden taxes, and worthless benefits * * * rots the fabric of constitutional government. * * * The Nation's credit is the final, ultimate sacrifice. This means economic disaster * * * eagerly awaited by communism.

It is by the restraint of inflation and by the creation of an economic environment providing an incentive to save that we pay the minimum price for economic progress. As the late Prof. Sumner Slichter wrote in the Harvard Business Review for September-October 1957:

> The greatest danger confronting the economy today is that political pressure will force the abandonment of credit restraint. The result would be an acceleration of price increases.

Mr. Speaker, the high level of Government spending approved and virtually forced by the Congress is the strongest evil nurturing inflation today. High levels of Government spending even with a balanced budget during a period of strong business activity are inflationary because a large part of such expenditures go for purposes that neither make more goods or services available nor add to productive capacity. Steps the Congress might take to return to individual control any significant portion of the funds now used by the Federal Government would be steps in the right direction. Failing this, the combined pressures of taxation and personal debt upon disposable income will create irresistible demands for inflation and will reduce to a trickle savings, the lifeblood of productivity. While the easy availability of money for spending is not a sufficient cause of inflation, it is a necessary condition. Stabilization of our Nation's cost of living must be a primary aim of Federal economic policy.

Mr. Speaker, we have demonstrated that spending approved by the Democratic Party during the periods of their control of the Congress and of the administration have created the principal cause of inflation in the United States. The active money supply has been expanded from $36 billion at the end of 1939 to $138 billion at the end of 1958—an increase of 283 percent. We have noted that in the 13 years of a Democratic administration in the period 1939–58 the purchasing power of the dollar dropped 48 cents. The average drop in the value of the dollar during the 8 Truman Democratic years was more than 3 cents per year.

Table 5 sets forth the wholesale price index for the period 1932–58 to demonstrate the impact of inflation on the price level.

TABLE 5.—*Wholesale price index, 1932–58, all commodities*

(1947–49—100)

Year:	Average
1932	42.1
1933	42.8
1934	48.7
1935	52.0
1936	52.5
1937	56.1
1938	51.1
1939	50.1
1940	51.1
1941	56.8
1942	64.2
1943	67.0
1944	67.6
1945	68.8
1946	78.7
1947	96.4
1948	104.4
1949	99.2
1950	103.1
1951	114.8
1952	111.6
1953	110.1
1954	110.3
1955	110.7
1956	114.3
1957	117.6
1958	119.2

An analysis of the wholesale price index by the administration during which price level increases occurred is set forth in table 6:

TABLE 6.—*Wholesale price index*

(1947–49—100)

1932	42.1
1944	67.6
Rise under Roosevelt	[1] 25.5
1944	67.6
1952	111.6
Rise under Truman	[2] 44.0
1952	111.6
June 1959	119.5
Rise under Eisenhower	[3] 7.9

[1] 60.6 percent gain over 13 years.
[2] 65.1 percent gain over 8 years.
[3] 7.1 percent over 7 years, counting 1959.

It will be noted that of the increase of 77.4 points, 25.5 points occurred during the Roosevelt administration, 44 points occurred during the Truman administration, and 7.9 points occurred during the Eisenhower administration. It may be concluded from these tables that the Republican Party has not totally succeeded in stopping inflation, but the inflation would be considerably worse if the Democratic Party were returned to control of both the Executive and the Congress. It is also to be noted that during the period from 1953 through 1955 when we had the beneficial effect of the Republican Party in control of both the Executive and the Congress, we had a sustained period of stability in the price level.

Despite the relentless efforts of the Democratic Party to build an "expending economy" instead of an expanding economy, the Republican administration has succeeded in pursuing fiscal policies that have lent forces of stability to the price levels to mitigate at least in part the deficit fiscal policies approved by the Democratic controlled Congresses.

Rising interest rates just like rising prices are symptoms of inflation. There can be no question that the Democratic created budgetary deficits have put upward pressures on price levels and interest rates.

The record peacetime deficit of $12.5 billion voted by the Congress for fiscal year 1959 has regenerated the fires of inflation as well as raised the level of the public indebtedness to a new record high. In approving this unprecedented peacetime budget the Democratic Party claimed it was overcoming a recessionary trend in our economy, but it is significant to note that the upturn in the economy occurred in April 1958—long before any of these spending programs took effect. But even if such spending had been necessary for fiscal year 1959, a point that I do not concede, the argument of a recession cure cannot be used with respect to the spending level in the 1960 budget. And yet the Democratic Party in the Congress continued its spending ways. As was pointed out earlier in my remarks, the Congress increased net expenditures in 1960 by almost $600 million over the 1960 budget and added $11.5 billion more spending for the years after fiscal 1960.

The Democratic Party has pursued this reckless use of the appropriation process in an effort to curry voter favor. By substituting dollar politics for party principle the Democratic Party seeks to gain the favor of the American people even though it is at the expense of the stability of our monetary structure. As my distinguished committee chairman and colleague [Mr. MILLS] recently said with respect to the difficulty of controlling appropriations in the face of increasing spending authorizations:

It is certainly true * * * that you cannot make authorizations for programs that will cost so much money and then expect through the process of appropriations to materially reduce those authorizations.

The President of the United States in stressing the need for a balanced budget said:

By avoiding a deficit, it will help prevent further increases in the cost of living and the unfair tax that inflation imposes on personal savings and incomes.

In the first session of the 86th Congress the Democratic Party voted to increase authorizations and to increase spending not only in fiscal year 1960 but in future years as well. I would also point out to my Democratic colleagues that you cannot consistently vote to override Presidential vetoes of profligate spending bills and then turn around and criticize the administration for loose fiscal policies.

An example of confused Democratic fiscal and monetary inconsistency arose in the first session of the 86th Congress during the consideration of the President's request for legislation to facilitate economical and efficient public debt management. In regard to this legislation the Democrat Majority in the Congress refused to approve the President's request which was universally supported by informed economists and fiscal authors as being in the interest of sound debt management. The result of this Democratic refusal to act is inevitably going to be the creation of further inflationary pressures to the detriment of citizens living on fixed incomes, wage earners, farmers, consumers, small business—indeed, every segment of our American economy.

In an effort to shift the blame for this irresponsible Democratic failure to act, Democratic spokesmen have endeavored to blame the administration for rising interest costs. One of the arguments they advanced is that interest rates in the immediate post World War II period did not advance appreciably. They present tables demonstrating this fact. They omit from their argument the fact that during much of this time the Federal Reserve was pegging the price of Government bonds with disastrous inflationary consequences. They omit from their tables precipitous decline in the purchasing power of the dollar in the period from 1946 through 1952, and also a listing of average annual yields on municipal bonds for a similar period. In table 7 I provide that data for the period 1946–58:

TABLE 7.—*Average annual purchasing power of the dollar,[1] 1946–58, with 1946 as 100*

	Cents
1946	100.0
1947	87.3
1948	81.1
1949	81.9
1950	81.1
1951	75.1
1952	73.5
1953	72.9
1954	72.6
1955	72.8
1956	71.8
1957	69.4

[1] Based on the Consumer Price Index as compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

AVERAGE ANNUAL YIELDS OF MOODY'S AAA MUNICIPAL BONDS, 1946–58

	Percent
1946	1.10
1947	1.45
1948	1.87
1949	1.65
1950	1.56
1951	1.61
1952	1.80
1953	2.31
1954	2.04
1955	2.18
1956	2.51
1957	3.10
1958	2.92

Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, September 25, 1959, Debt Analysis Staff.

Source: Moody's Municipal and Government Manual.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that the Congress could, for a time, artificially keep the interest rates payable on the public debt at a prescribed level by requiring the Federal Reserve to support Government bond prices, but fortunately for the economic survival of our Nation, the Congress has not seen fit to enact legislation requiring the Federal Reserve to take such a disastrous inflationary course.

President Eisenhower cited the failure of the Congress to enact legislation that he had requested dealing with the public debt as being the "foremost disappointment" in the legislative record of this past session of Congress. He went on to say:

This refusal, by forcing the Treasury to rely exclusively on inflationary short-term borrowing, may reduce the contribution to price stability that a balanced budget helps to provide and could make most difficult the maintenance of confidence both at home and abroad in our determination to manage our fiscal affairs soundly.

The Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth had this to say with respect to the actions by recent Congresses on budgetary authorizations and spending:

The committee has noted an alarming tendency in the Congress to work toward only an illusory balance in the budget, by substituting for current appropriation commitments for later years which will make it exceedingly difficult to avoid future deficits.

Thus, we have the Democratic controlled Congress acting in opposition to debt reduction, committing our Nation to continued levels of high spending, and refusing to give authority to the Executive to engage in proper debt management practices.

Mr. Speaker, tax reduction, expenditure reduction, and debt reduction are things which we have discussed a great deal and done very little about. The only positive actions that have been accomplished in the direction of these meritorious objectives in recent decades have been taken when we have had a Republican majority in the Congress of the United States.

In the conduct of our Nation's fiscal and monetary affairs as in other things, the past is prolog. The American people if they want more inflation, more taxes, and more public debt should support the Democratic Party. If on the other hand the American people believe in pay-as-you-go government, in a sound dollar, and in less onerous tax burdens, the Republican Party must be restored to majority control of the Congress of the United States.

My statements today have not been political arguments but are instead a recitation of fiscal facts. In the contest between free enterprise and communism, the economic strength of our Nation is as essential as our military strength. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the means to both economic and military strength lies in placing our Nation's future in the hands of the Republican Party. The Democratic web of inflation must be broken so that national growth can flourish under the Republican Party free of inflation's lure.

Princeton and Westminster, Mass., Celebrate Their 200th Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, October of this year marks the 200th anniversary of the incorporation of two outstanding communities in my district: the towns of Princeton and Westminster, Mass., with histories that actually go farther back in time than the 200 years of progress which were celebrated this summer with impressive exercises.

Both Princeton and Westminster are located in an area of Massachusetts which was settled by pioneer colonists in the very earliest days of American history. Courageous bands of early settlers, many descendants of which still reside there, carved out of the wilderness a civilization, a tradition, a way of life, and a history which live to this day in the heritage which is so fortunately ours.

The early settlers of Princeton and Westminster helped to establish for all America the basic institutions of democratic government and helped to forge a record of magnificent achievement that lives to this day. It is fitting, Mr. Speak-

er, that we of the present should make note of the struggles and bitter sacrifices of this pioneer people so that we and our posterity may benefit from the remarkable legacy of accomplishment they have left us.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the anniversary celebrations of Princeton and Westminster, I introduced House Resolution 395 on September 12, the full text of which follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 395

Whereas the year 1959 marks the two hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the towns of Princeton and Westminster, Massachusetts; and

Whereas from the time of settlement the people of Princeton and Westminster have figured conspicuously in the founding and growth of this Nation; and

Whereas the observances of the bicentennial anniversaries of Princeton and Westminster were celebrated with impressive community ceremonies which attracted many visitors this summer to central Massachusetts; and

Whereas the anniversary celebration in Princeton will come to an end with the town bicentennial address and community dinner on October 20, 1959: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Princeton and Westminster, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the two hundredth anniversary of these communities and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Princeton and Westminster during the past two hundred years.

This resolution pays humble, but profoundly felt tribute to the communities of Princeton and Westminster on their 200th anniversaries and I know that my colleagues in the House join me in extending congratulations and best wishes to the people of Princeton and Westminster on this great event, so fittingly observed by both towns in separate summer-long celebrations which come to an end in October.

It is not possible for me to recite in this brief address the histories of Princeton and Westminster, but I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the House some of the highlights and accomplishments of these two progressive communities which are part of the Third Congressional District, which I have the great honor to represent in the Congress.

The founding of Westminster was one of the indirect results of King Philip's War of 1675. Veterans of this war in 1685 petitioned the General Court of Massachusetts for a grant of land which had been promised them. The petition was approved and a tract 8 miles square in the Nipmug country was granted the petitioners. Unfortunately, the tract was not located nor surveyed and the land lay dormant until June 1727, when the descendents of the Narragansett soldiers petitioned anew for land. The grant was approved and in 1728 there was reported to the General Court "a plan of a town to the contents of 5 miles square exclusive of the ponds near Rutland and Lunenburg." This tract became the town of Westminster.

Actual settlement of Westminster did not begin until 1737 when Fairbanks Moor of Lancaster erected a frame home for his wife and family of five children. He was joined in the same year by Joseph Holden and his family of Watertown and before winter came both families were settled in their new homes.

Westminster grew slowly because the times were troubled. War between France and England brought the threat of Indian warfare from the powerful tribes which joined the French. The threats of war, actual fighting and only few ominous periods of peace did little to encourage the growth of frontier settlements. Despite these hazards, Westminster saw its population increase from about 130 in 1750 to 350 in 1760. This comparatively rapid growth for a frontier town resulted in independent corporate existence for Westminster in 1759. John Holden and 31 other residents petitioned the general court and on October 20 of that year the district of Westminster come into being. In 1770, Westminster obtained full town powers from the general court.

The early history of Princeton is similar to that of Westminster. Originally a part of Rutland, the town was made a district by the general court in 1759, to which the name of Prince Town was given. The first settler in that area of Rutland which was to become later Princeton was Joshua Wilder who built there in 1734.

Benjamin Houghton and others petitioned the general court on June 8, 1758, to form a new district, but this petition was denied. The following year another petition was presented and, finally, on October 12, 1759, the House passed an act incorporating the area "into a separate district by the name of Prince Town."

Like Westminster, the early settlers of Princeton fought in the French and Indian War. In the Revolutionary War, the Princeton company of minutemen marched toward Lexington and Concord on April 19, 1775, and the town continued to furnish men, arms and money until victory was won. A direct descendant of Jonas Beaman, one of these minutemen, is the general chairman of Princeton's bicentennial celebration. He is P. Alden Beaman, to whom great credit is due for the sucess of the Princeton observance. Another outstanding leader descended from this illustrious family, is John Beaman, a friend and contemporary of mine at Harvard.

In early stagecoach days, Princeton gained fame as a summer resort. Catering to the summer visitor became one of the important activities of the town. Oddly enough, the advent of the automobile which brought famed summer resorts closer to the people began to see the decline of Princeton's many attractive hotels and summer boardinghouses.

John Greenleaf Whittier, on a visit to Princeton's famed Mount Wachusett in the 1860s, was inspired by the peace and beauty of this rural setting to pen these words:

So twilight deepened 'round us. Still and black
The great woods climbed the mountain at our back;
And on their skirts, where yet the lingering day
On the shorn greenness of the clearing lay,
The brown old farmhouse like a bird's nest hung.

The quiet charm of Mount Wachusett, which so impressed Whittier in its pastoral setting, still lives with us today, Mr. Speaker, so much so that my friend, O. J. Whittemore, Jr., of Boylston Avenue, Princeton, was prompted to write me earlier this year, requesting the issuance of a special commemorative stamp, depicting Mount Wachusett, in honor of Princeton's 200th anniversary.

This proposal received my wholehearted support, and on February 18 of this year I introduced H.R. 4734, calling for the issuance of such a stamp. In addition, I sought the help of the Postmaster General in the authorization of the stamp. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the text of H.R. 4734 and the reply I received from the Post Office Department on the Princeton stamp:

H.R. 4734

A bill to provide for the issuance for a special postage stamp to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Princeton, Massachusetts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp to commemorate the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of Princeton, Massachusetts. Such special postage stamp shall have as design a view of famed Mount Wachusett, a central Massachusetts landmark, and shall be issued in such denomination and for such period beginning October 20, 1959, as the Postmaster General may determine, and shall be placed on sale in Princeton, Massachusetts, one day before it is made available to the public elsewhere.

FEBRUARY 24, 1959.

Hon. PHILIP J. PHILBIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: The Postmaster General has asked me to thank you for your letter of February 9 and the enclosed one from Mr. O. J. Whittemore, Jr., Princeton, Mass., requesting that a special stamp be issued this year to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the founding of Princeton, Mass.

The importance of this anniversary to the residents of Princeton is readily appreciated but it is now too late to consider a commemorative stamp for this event. As you will note from the enclosed booklet, requests for commemorative stamps should be submitted preferably 18 months in advance of the proposed date of issuance. Too, the members of the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee feel that celebrations honoring anniversaries of cities and towns do not have widespread national appeal and significance and, therefore, do not meet the established criteria for commemorative issues.

We do, however, appreciate your interest in our philatelic program and regret that our reply cannot be more favorable.

With kindest personal regards.

Cordially yours,

L. ROHE WALTER,
Special Assistant to the Postmaster General.

Mr. Speaker, Mount Wachusett may again become the famed resort area of not too long ago. At present, there is considerable enthusiasm to make of this area a ski resort with lifts, trails, and open slopes.

A major ski development on Mount Wachusett would attract thousands of ski enthusiasts to the central Massachu-

setts area. From its summit, 2,006 feet above sea level, the north slope of Mount Wachusett has a vertical drop of nearly 800 feet, in contrast to the vertical drop of about 600 feet at famed Hogback in Vermont. The Mount Wachusett drop could provide fine ski trails, ranging from a half mile to a mile and a half.

On weekends, the Hogback ski area attracts anywhere from 2,000 to 3,000 ski enthusiasts. If the facilities at Hogback can be matched, and perhaps made better, at Mount Wachusett, this famed natural asset of central Massachusetts may enter an entirely new era of recreational activity, thus attracting many new visitors to the area.

First time visitors to Princeton were many this past summer as a result of the community's bicentennial observance. The program of events began last May with an Old Folks Concert sponsored by the Adult and Senior Youth Choir of the Princeton Congregational Church under the direction of Mrs. Robert Erickson. Other bicentennial activities included the following:

June 7, a rope pull between the bearded men of Princeton and the bearded men of Westminster. The growing of beards by men in both towns began early this year so that by the time summer came there was a distinct frontier atmosphere to many of the bicentennial events.

July 3, food sale sponsored by the Princeton Historical Society on the village green with Mrs. Norman M. Howe as chairman.

July 9, Ye Old Prince Town Fair, sponsored by the Friendship Club, in the vestry of the First Congregational Christian Church with Mrs. H. Chester Morse as chairman.

July 18, 200th anniversary grand parade, Firemen's Muster and Field Day with Paul S. Lantz and H. Merritt Woodward as cochairmen.

August 6, visitation to old homes sponsored by the Princeton Historical Society and the Garden Club with Miss Marjorie Inman as chairman.

August 16, Mountain Holiday Fair sponsored by the Prince of Peace Mission with Joseph O'Connor and Allen C. Ikalainen as cochairmen.

September 5, bicentennial dance with Everett P. Webster as chairman.

The bicentennial observance will come to a close on October 20 with an anniversary address and dinner. P. Alden Beaman is the chairman for this final event of the Princeton celebration.

The July 18 event attracted an estimated 10,000 visitors to Princeton. Highlights included the morning parade, soap box derby, firemen's muster and the beard judging contest. Willie H. Mason of Worcester Road was winner of the beard competition from a field of about 40 members of the Hirsute Hillbillies Society of Princeton. Runners up were Erwin R. Speckman, of Brooks Station Road and Clarence J. Cusson, of Main Street.

The grand parade in the morning was led by Paul Lantz, general chairman of the day's program, accompanied by Cub Scout Jeffrey Kemp, 10, son of Mr. and Mrs. Richard S. Kemp, of Worcester Road, and Brownie Marcia Wambach, 8, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde Wambach, of Esty Road.

Among the bands in the line of march were the 590th Air Force Band, the Royalaires from the Greendale American Legion Post, of Worcester, the Italian-American Drum and Bugle Corps, of Worcester, the Leicester Drum and Bugle Corps, and the Grafton Community Band.

Many outstanding community floats appeared in the parade. The winners of prizes were:

East Princeton Village Improvement Society with a re-creation of the Redemption Rock scene of early Princeton history, showing Mary Rowlandson being redeemed from her Indian captors, which event has become a classic of colonial literature; Princeton Boy Scout Troop 1 with a camp scene; Wiggins and Wolcott, local builders, with a log cabin scene.

The Princeton PTA won a special honorable mention with its float bearing Miss Roslyn Mason, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Rockwood P. Mason of Mountain Road, the Princeton Bicentennial Queen, and her court. The court comprised the Misses Fae Niemi, Susan Woodward, Barbara Stein and Diane Robertson.

In the firemen's muster sponsored by the Wachusett District Firemen's Muster Association, Sterling retained its title by tieing its own record of 46 seconds in the "bed race" and setting a new record of 16.6 seconds in the pump run.

The day's program ended with a community bean supper and square dance on the common.

Highlight of the Westminster anniversary celebration was a huge parade on August 8 with 100 marching units. About 20,000 visitors helped to make this day one of the best ever in the history of the town.

The bicentennial parade was reported to be one of the largest parades ever conducted in the area. The day's events ended with a huge display of fireworks in the evening. Earlier in the evening a band concert was given by the 8th Air Force band from Westover Air Force Base.

The Gardner State Hospital with its float, "The Battle Against Mental Illness," won first honors in the morning parade. Other prizewinners were the bearded "Hillbillies of Princeton" with their float depicting a log cabin; St. Edward the Confessor Church with a float depicting a family in church with the inscription, "The family that prays together stays together." Honor awards were also made to the Westminster PTA for its float depicting an old fashioned schoolhouse, and the Baptist Church with a float built around the cross.

Awards to business organizations went to the following:

Old Mill, first prize; C. L. Smith, boxmaker, second prize, and Grahn, the florist, third prize. Johnson & Sons poultry farm received an honorable mention.

First prize in the single entry division was awarded to Charles L. Smith, 82, owner of the C. L. Smith box factory, who entered two horse-drawn shays, both featured in the 1909 parade when Westminster celebrated its 150th anniversary.

Heading the parade of more than 100 floats, marching units and single entries was a division of mounted State police. Wesley Battles was the grand marshal, Byron Smith, Federal flag bearer, and Mrs. Janet Battles Terrett, State flag bearer. Color guards were Bud Smith and Andrew Michaud, followed by the Westminster band and the official cars.

In the first car, an antique Rolls Royce driven by its owner, Leo Moulter, the passengers were George Dawley, Fred Chalmers, and Stanley Whitney, distinguished elder citizens of the town, and Preston Baker, chairman of the board of selectmen. The second car, a 1959 Rolls Royce driven by Lionel Trinque, had Mrs. Naomi Carpenter and Selectmen Lennard Salo and Daniel O'Hearn as passengers.

Among the bands were the famous Shriners Oriental Band of Boston, the Simplex Band of Gardner, St. Joseph Cadets of Fitchburg, and the Shirley Drum Corps.

Chairman of the Westminster bicentennial observance, which comes to an end in October, is Frank Onischuk.

Mr. Speaker, Princeton and Westminster can be proud indeed of their anniversary observances which were conducted with simplicity and dignity. Their programs provided entertainment for thousands of visitors while giving to the townspeople the opportunity to relive some of the great events of years gone by. Truly, these programs were impressive and interesting and the community leaders deserve the warm thanks of all for a difficult job exceptionally well done.

God willing, may Princeton and Westminster continue to grow and develop their peerless American heritage in helping to build a greater, stronger, more prosperous, happy and peaceful Nation. And may the noble example of the noble sons and daughters of these historic Massachusetts towns long continue to inspire the American people and preserve our blessed heritage.

Salute to Dr. Adenauer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Nikita Khrushchev arrives in the United States on September 15, on the day leaders of the free world will be congratulating Dr. Konrad Adenauer on his 10th anniversary as chancellor of free Germany. For many Americans, this coincidence will revive memories of the decade that began with the Berlin airlift and brought the free world

to the Berlin ultimatum earlier in the year. It will also focus American attention on the sharply divergent postwar roads traveled by the former partners in the Molotov-Ribbentrop pact.

Many memories of evil doings by both the Soviets until Stalin and by the Nazis under Hitler come to mind, but in this 20th century atomic era, we must face forward to ways of peace and understanding and not look backward upon the horrors of misunderstanding and war.

In Germany, an indomitable old man who survived the Hitler terror to reach an age that richly entitled him to honorable retirement instead took up the heavy burdens of government leadership and led his people in one of history's remarkable episodes of moral, political, and economic regeneration.

In his 10 years at the helm of free Germany, Konrad Adenauer opened a new chapter in European history by promulgating the doctrine that Franco-German amity and cooperation were indispensable cornerstones in developing a structure of European unity and security. His refusal to yield before the most menacing threats of the Soviets when he cast his nation's lot with NATO, his steadfast friendship and collaboration with the late John Foster Dulles, and his insistence on free elections as the only honorable formula for a just all-German solution made him the No. 1 target of Kremlin invective and propaganda that sought to depict him as bent on revenge for Germany's defeat in World War II.

The contrasting postwar histories of communism under Stalin and Khrushchev and the Federal Republic of Germany under Konrad Adenauer were vividly recalled to millions of Americans when the coincidence of Dr. Adenauer's 10th anniversary and Khrushchev's arrival in the United States was singled out for comment by leading Members of Congress, some of whom made no secret of their distaste for the Khrushchev visit.

Still fresh in American recollection as the Khrushchev arrival draws near is the observation of Konrad Adenauer in a letter of August 30, responding to another of the ballistic missives Khrushchev regularly hurls at the German Chancellor. Wrote Dr. Adenauer:

> The truly decisive question, which will determine the whole future of all of us, is that of all-out armament with conventional and nuclear weapons. It is devouring immeasurable sums, which would otherwise benefit the social and cultural advancement of mankind. Moreover, it is creating an atmosphere of tension such as precedes the outbreak of a devastating storm in nature.

It was against the background of this invitation to Khrushchev to accompany his professions of peaceful intentions with observable deeds, an invitation that had been repeatedly extended through the years by Dr. Adenauer, the late John Foster Dulles, and the leadership of the entire free world, that the United States took time out from its preparations for the reception of Nikita Khrushchev to pay tribute to the gallant old man of Bonn.

From President Eisenhower came a tribute to Dr. Adenauer for helping his country rise "out of the chaos of war to a position of influence and responsibility." The full text of the President's message read:

> His Excellency Dr. KONRAD ADENAUER,
> *Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, Bonn:*
>
> On the 10th anniversary of the assumption of your duties as Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, I send most cordial personal greetings. On behalf of the American people I congratulate you for your historic contribution not only to the affairs of your own country but to those of the European community as a whole. Through your dedication and inspiring leadership, the Federal Republic has risen out of the chaos of war to a position of influence and responsibility in the community of free nations. Moreover, there has been developed in Germany a government guided by the principles of democracy and motivated by a sincere desire to play a positive role in the great movement toward European cooperation and integration. Your effective work in developing understanding between our two peoples has also been a contribution of major significance. It was a most valued and enjoyable opportunity to confer with you in Bonn recently, and I wish you many more productive years in the interests of your own country and those of the free world.
>
> With assurances of my continued esteem and friendship.
>
> DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Vice President NIXON hailed "this dedicated statesman and leader who has had such a vital part in guiding the physical and spiritual reconstruction of Germany and in restoring her to a position of honor in the community of nations."

Tributes to Dr. Adenauer were sounded by the leaders of both parties of both Houses of Congress, in some cases with pointed references to the Khrushchev tour of the United States. Senator STYLES BRIDGES, Republican, New Hampshire, took the floor of the Senate on September 11 to call attention to the coincidence of Chancellor Adenauer's anniversary and Khrushchev's arrival date in the United States. Senator BRIDGES placed special emphasis on "the great courage and wisdom of Chancellor Adenauer in his fight against what initially appeared to be the overwhelming odds in favor of communism in Germany." He told the Senate that Dr. Adenauer's achievement was all the more praiseworthy "because his government was born out of a nation that had lived for years under the totalitarian philosophy of Hitler and today it stands as one of the foremost nations living under the free principles of democracy."

On September 11, in the House of Representatives, I, who had ever been a relentless foe of the old Nazi regime in Germany, rose to hail the achievements of Chancellor Adenauer, Foreign Minister Brentano, Economics Minister Erhard, and their colleagues "in reestablishing West Germany as a liberal nation in the liberal world, dedicated to the principles of individual freedom and democracy."

I called for U.S. insistence that "East and West Germany be made one Germany." I reaffirmed the determination of the American people "to assure the world that we will never let Berlin down; that Berlin, now an island in a Communist sea, must be integrated into a unified Germany."

Secretary Herter has praised the German Chancellor for "a decade of fruitful endeavor for Germany and the free world." He added:

> In the face of great odds you have guided the material and spiritual restoration of your nation on the path to peace and freedom.

In a concluding sentence, Secretary Herter declared:

> I shall continue to rely on your close and friendly cooperation as we seek to realize our common objectives.

Typical of the American press reactions to the Adenauer anniversary has been editorial comment such as that contained in the Chicago Daily News. Noting that September 15 marks Dr. Adenauer's 10th year as Chancellor of the German Federal Republic, the Daily News said:

> At 83, he is among the world's great statesmen, and the flourishing condition of his country is a tribute to the quality of his leadership. The Chancellor's devotion to freedom cost him dearly in the days of the Hitler dictatorship, which he spent in hiding when not in jail. In the world of today it is heartening to find this dedication to liberty triumphant in the end.

Credit for one of "the great achievements of this decade" was given to Dr. Adenauer by Representative BOYLE, Democratic, of Illinois, in an address to the House of Representatives on September 13. The Illinois Congressman took note of "the miracle of German economic recovery." But he saw even more significance in "the acceptance and development of political as well as economic freedom." He voiced particular praise of Dr. Adenauer and his colleagues for the Government support given to the establishment of good intergroup relations in the Federal Republic. He observed:

> Churches are flourishing in Western Germany. They have been particularly active in promoting German-Jewish relations to atone for the horrible crimes of the Hitler regime.
>
> The Government—
>
> He said—
>
> has led the way in exemplary execution of the restitution and indemnification payments to victims of Nazi barbarism, and most German parties have supported the laws calling for the payment of large sums to the State of Israel.

Finally, Congressman BOYLE pointed out:

> This year again German Brotherhood Week was under the patronage of President Heuss.

Congressman BOYLE's comments were warmly seconded by Representative REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin, who asserted:

> Thanks to the leadership of men like Adenauer and Heuss, and the responsible stature of the other party leaders, the Federal Republic is firmly a partner of the Western alliance. The chances of the continued growth of democracy in Germany are the

best they have ever been in that country's history.

These and similar statements in the Congress proved to be the preface to an outpouring of tributes to Dr. Adenauer that came from the most notable civic, political, and religious leaders of the United States.

The Archbishop of New York, Cardinal Spellman, has marked Dr. Adenauer's anniversary with a message hailing the German Chancellor for "the preservation of peace in his country and throughout the world."

Gen. Lucius Clay and Gen. John J. McCloy, each of whom represented the United States in the crucial German aftermath of World War II, and hence have had a close look at the achievements of Adenauer's leadership in Germany, were among the first to mark the Chancellors' 10th anniversary.

General Clay declared:

Chancellor Adenauer's leadership in the rebuilding of democracy in West Germany, in bringing West Germany into the free world, and in trying to create a new French-German relationship based on understanding and trust have contributed much to the growing strength of the free world and to his stature as a statesman.

General McCloy asserted that Dr. Adenauer "has emerged as one of the world's leading statesmen in a particularly trying period filled with domestic and international problems of the greatest magnitude." He praised the Chancellor's "warm spirit of Western European unity based upon a new and broad understanding with France." His contributions to his own country and the free world, General McCloy said, "mark him as an international figure as well as the leader of his country."

Adlai E. Stevenson saw in Dr. Adenauer a man who will "leave a lasting impression on this generation." He praised the German Chancellor for the peaceful, prosperous, free, and friendly Germany he has helped create.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, one of Nikita Khrushchev's more recent debating adversaries, praised Dr. Adenauer for a caliber of leadership under which "German democracy and freedom have flourished." Senator HUMPHREY went on to say pointedly:

Chancellor Adenauer's unyielding opposition to Soviet pressure and Soviet threats deserve to have the gratitude of the free world.

The roster of distinguished Americans who came forth voicing recognition of Chancellor Adenauer's achievements in this decade of office included:

Senator WILEY, Republican, Wisconsin, who praised the German leader's outstanding service.

Representative CHARLES HALLECK, Republican, Indiana, minority leader, House of Representatives, who paid his respects to Dr. Adenauer for a decade of distinguished leadership.

Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, who saw in Dr. Adenauer "a leading spokesman against Soviet aggression and a courageous advocate of democracy."

Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, Democrat, Pennsylvania, chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, praised Dr. Adenauer "as one of the great and outstanding statesmen of our time."

Governor Stratton, of Illinois, took note of "the reconstruction, progress, and production of Germany under the leadership of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer" and said this was a "dramatic demonstration of the ability of a free people, working under a free government, to improve their standards." He added that Chancellor Adenauer's leadership was "an inspiration to freedom-loving people throughout the world."

Senator THOMAS J. DODD, Democrat, Connecticut, one of the major figures in the postwar trials at Nuremberg declared that under Chancellor Adenauer's direction "democracy has been firmly reestablished in Germany." He added that Dr. Adenauer personally "has been a bastion of strength in the West by his unwavering steadfastness, courage, and dedication to the cause of freedom, during the difficult times of the past decade."

Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Democrat, Illinois, asserted that Chancellor Adenauer's service took in "an outstanding contribution not only to his own country but also the essential unity and cooperation of the free nations."

Finally, Dr. Adenauer has found great favor with our American people, who all wish him good health and happiness. And I would like to quote an expression: "While the candle still burns I can do some mending."

Dr. Adenauer's candle of life still burns and he can still do much good work, not only for Germany, but for the peace of the world.

An Address to the Polish Army Veterans Association of North America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an address which I was privileged to deliver on September 6, 1959, in South Bend, Ind., to the Polish Army Veterans Association of North America.

The address follows:

I am honored indeed to have been invited to address the delegates attending the 29th annual convention of the First District of the Polish Army Veterans Association of North America.

The citizens of South Bend, Ind., are proud that we are able to act as hosts to members of your great organization from eight States—Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Minnesota, and California.

It is particularly appropriate that we should be meeting in the month of September 1959, because it was just 20 years ago that the brave people of Poland suffered the cruel invasion of Hitler's armies. The invasion marked the beginning of the most terrible war that mankind has ever known, a war in which over 6 million Poles sacrificed their lives.

Only a few days ago, speaking from the Chamber of the Parliament of Poland in Warsaw, my good friend and distinguished colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable THADDEUS MACHROWICZ, spoke of the terrible days of September 1939. Congressman MACHROWICZ, who was born in Poland and was an officer in the Polish Army during World War I, addressed the opening session of the Interparliamentary Union meeting in Warsaw. He spoke in Polish with great feeling and emotion about the bravery and sacrifices of Poles in World War II. His speech was received, according to those who heard him, with a tremendous ovation.

The same spirit of dedication to country and love of human freedom which motivated Congressman MACHROWICZ caused some 20,000 Americans during World War I to organize an army at Niagara-on-the-Falls, Ontario, Canada, to join the army of Polish Gen. Jozef Haller in France and to fight on the Allied side with great courage and sacrifice.

Most of you are veterans of that remarkable experience, and some of you are Americans of Polish extraction who fought in World War II.

As we think about that first bond forged between the nations of Poland and the United States in World War I, we must recall how the Polish people, tragically divided among the sovereignties of Prussia, Russia, and Austria-Hungary, were forced to fight brother against brother.

The triumphant campaigns of General Haller's army, however, helped to shape into reality the free and united Poland envisioned by President Woodrow Wilson in the 13th of his famous 14 points.

As President Wilson's Secretary of War, Newton D. Baker, said, "The American contingent of the Polish Army is made up of men moved by the inspiration of the principles involved on the Allied side of the conflict, and their presence on the Western Front represents their adherence to America as the country of their adoption and to Poland, free and self-governing, as the country of their extraction."

It was a cause of inspiration to those who loved freedom throughout the world when, in March of 1920, the Polish Army, one-fourth of its men having recently crossed the Atlantic from America, closed its campaigns at Putsk on the Baltic by reclaiming the sea from which Poland had been cut off for over 200 years.

Poland stood united and free.

Poland had shown that, although impoverished and weak, she was ready to fight to achieve her political independence.

There are, indeed, few nations of the world who feel such a fervent love of country as the Poles. Only a Polish poet would describe his land, as did the great Adam Mickiewicz, as "the Christ among nations."

This deep patriotism, born in part of a profound religious feeling, is a spirit with which we are familiar in the United States. Ever since the days of Pulaski and Kosciusko, the contributions of persons of Polish origin have been felt in every area of American life. We see these contributions in the sciences, the arts, and in the work of many of my distinguished colleagues in Congress of Polish descent, men such as Senator MUSKIE, of Maine; Congressmen MACHROWICZ, LESINSKI, and DINGELL, of Michigan; KLUCZYNSKI, PUCINSKI, and DERWINSKI, of Illinois; ZABLOCKI and O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, and DULSKI, of New York.

Right here in South Bend, Ind., we are familiar with the fine work of Americans of Polish origin. At the turn of the century, one-fifth of the population of our city was Polish-American, and today many of the outstanding leaders in our community are of Polish background.

The peoples of the United States and of Poland have therefore many links that bind

our destinies together. Both our peoples love freedom. Both love peace. It was General Haller himself who once said, "I have never known a fighting man in all of Poland who was not at heart a man of peace."

We do not know now what will be the future for Poland. We hope that the future will bring both freedom and peace. What we do know is that the deep religious faith of the Polish people and their burning love of country will not die.

I can think of no better way to conclude my remarks to you who are members of the Polish Army Veterans Association of North America than to read to you some moving lines written this month by a great American newspaper man, Ralph McGill.

Mr. McGill's essay is entitled "The Cardinal's Sermon."

He writes:

"A news story sets you to thinking.

"It is from a town in Poland.

"It is Czestachowa. It is an old city on the Warta River. It is on a rail junction. It is a busy town, manufacturing textiles, paper, steel, leather.

"Here is a capsule history. In 1655 the Swedes attacked in an invasion of Poland and Russia. This time a group of Pauline Fathers held out in a monastery. They delayed things long enough for the main Polish Army to seize the invaders. In 1705 the Swedes tried again. And failed. The Russians succeeded in 1772. The Prussians took it in 1793. In 1914 the Germans captured it. They did it again in 1939.

"It is a city which has known centuries of misery, suffering, cruelties, disappointments, grief and not much joy.

"The other day it was in the news. Some 100,000 Poles came there to celebrate the anniversary of that victory over the Swedes. It was, as it had to be, a patriotic and religious ceremony. After all, it was a monastery that withstood the seige. Cardinal Wyszinski was there. Thin and pale, he preached a sermon and assisted in a Mass. The hymn and the chants mingled with the industrial sound of the nearby steel plants.

"Now, you must understand Poland is Communist. Mr. Gomulka, a tough, dedicated Communist, is head of it. But he is a Pole. So is the cardinal. Poland is communistic, but it is not Russian. So, the cardinal said in his sermon: 'Governments come and go, but the families and the church remain.'

"No believer," writes McGill, "be he Jew, Roman Catholic, Protestant, or Moslem, can fail to be thrilled by the pale, thin cardinal standing there in Poland proclaiming his faith and that of his people."

Long after governments have passed which deny the dignity and freedom of man, the faith of Cardinal Wyszinski, the faith of the people of Poland, will endure.

Russell Bryant, Editor, Italy News Herald, Italy, Tex., Writes of Soviet Achievement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial written by my good friend, Mr. Russell Bryant, editor and publisher of the Italy News Herald, Italy, Tex.

I have always enjoyed reading Mr. Bryant's editorials, as it has always been obvious that he has given serious and profound thought to his subject before placing it in print.

The following editorial concerns the reported Soviet rocket hitting the moon and contains some level-headed thinking on the part of Mr. Bryant. I wish to commend it to the Members of this body. The editorial follows:

SO THEY HIT THE MOON

Apparently timed to make an impact on thinking in the United States and the world as their Premier began his tour of this country, the Russians fired a rocket that hit the moon during the weekend.

The night the rocket was on its way to the moon we were on a moonlight boat trip on Lake Austin. There was no perceptible sign of worry on the face of the man in the moon. Since the report of the successful landing of 800 pounds of earthly contrivance on the moon we have looked at it each night and can see no change in its appearance.

Rather than be impressed by the accomplishment, it appears to us that the negative result is more noteworthy. Rather than being impressed by the might of Russia, as exemplified in this moon shot, we are reminded of how puny they are in the universal scheme of things. After years of research, trial and effort, and expenditure of inestimable rubles they hit the moon—and the result had less effect then a common housefly settling on the bald pate of Mr. Khrushchev or any of the rest of us devoid of cranial vegetation.

If Mr. Khrushchev wants to really impress the world then why does he not try to do something with his own vast wilderness rather than reach into outer space? Russia is far larger, far older, and far richer in natural resources than the United States, yet on more than one occasion we have had to help them overcome famine, and during World War II only contributions from our hastily devised arsenal enabled them to throw off the crushing weight of Hitler's powerful invading forces.

Even this meager invasion of the moon that gives the Russians such a feeling of accomplishment cannot really be acknowledged as a Russian achievement. The basic knowledge for their rocket development came from German scientists captured by the Russians after our troops were held up in their march across Germany to permit the Russians some semblance of participation in the capitulation of Germany.

Since the end of World War II our noses here in the United States have been kept pretty well to the grindstone as we have had to pay taxes to keep a ready Military Establishment for ourselves and our allies because of Russia's belligerent attitude. Heretofore we have stripped our forces and equipment to only a token force between conflicts. Despite this heavy burden, we have continued to make almost unlimited advancement in domestic fields of necessity and luxury, and few there are of us who have known want except as a result of our own indolence.

If Mr. Khrushchev really wants to make an impression on the United States and the world—if he really wants his trip to this country to be of advantage to his people—he can do it very easily by forgetting his shot to the moon and minutely observe how a free people go about their business; by noticing that our greatest individual concern is the betterment of ourselves, rather than being a slave of the state; how the humanitarianism in us leads us to share with the less fortunate, at home and abroad; how the least to the greatest of us have no demand on other peoples of the earth than that we live and let live as each desires.

If he will observe these things and return to his own country determined to explore and develop his own frontiers, rather than those in space; if he will free his own people and their neighboring countries now held in subjugation by Russia, and allow them their right to select their own form of government and their leaders; if he will make available to the Russian people the right to claim the fruits of their labors; if he will spend the money now going into armaments on tools, implements, food, houses, and clothing—thus permitting us to do more of the same—then, if he will do all these things, he will have done more to relieve those world tensions he worries about than any one other thing. The peace he so loudly longs for will be a reality and he will be looked upon by all people, everywhere, as one of the world's greatest leaders of all times.

We will concede, Mr. Khrushchev, that you hit the moon, but we insist that you can make a much more lasting and more beneficial impact on the greatest planet of all—the earth—if you will but concentrate your thought and endeavor to making it a more pleasant, profitable, and peaceful place for all of us to live.

That, Mr. Khrushchev, is a moon worth shooting at.

Investment in Man: An Economist's View

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Prof. Theodore W. Shultz, writing in the Social Service Review of June 1959, has set forth a most provocative and stimulating article on the "Investment in Man: An Economist's View." I ask unanimous consent that selected excerpts from his article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD setting forth the economic wealth which we as a Nation have in the trained and skilled manpower of our people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVESTMENT IN MAN: AN ECONOMIST'S VIEW[1]

(By Theodore W. Schultz)

My plan is first to comment on the state of our knowledge about investments that people make in themselves and, then, to consider briefly the reluctance that we have in thinking about human wealth, and to give reasons why modern economists have shied away from it. I plan, then, to show how wholly new and important questions can be examined, once we acknowledge the role of human wealth, and how a number of big puzzles in our economic data may be solved. I venture to suggest a human wealth hypothesis and to note that estimates from two recent studies are consistent with it.

It is a simple truth that people invest in themselves. They do it as individuals and as families and through their national and local communities. In making these invest-

[1] Delivered as the fourth Sidney A. and Julia Teller lecture, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, February 19, 1959.

ments, there are many different combinations of family and community arrangements. Our knowledge, however, of the comparative advantages of having either the family, or the community, or combinations of the two, make these investments is very limited. Much of the income that is used in making these investments in ourselves is classified as consumption. Much of the human effort that enters is thought of as leisure, although education, which is one of these investments, is mainly hard work, as any student will say. No doubt most education rates high in serving both consumption and production. This should give it a special priority. But we go on counting expenditures for education as if they were only consumption. Then, by some strange twist, when we look at the vast expenditures that the U.S.S.R. has been pouring into education, we fail to see that many millions of families of that country have valued them highly as consumption and may well have looked upon their level of living as having risen accordingly.

THE NEGLECT OF THE STUDY OF HUMAN WEALTH

People are, also, an important part of the wealth of nations. Moreover, as people invest in themselves they can augment the amount of human wealth; in many countries this form of wealth, measured by what it renders to production, is now vastly larger than all other forms taken together. But our knowledge about national wealth is almost wholly restricted to the nonhuman components, that is, to reproducible physical capital and land. The study of human wealth is everywhere neglected, notwithstanding its importance and notwithstanding the fact that people all about us are investing in themselves.

NEW ECONOMIC HORIZONS

Once we are of a mind that it is meaningful to examine the role that investments in man perform in an economy, a wholly new set of questions becomes relevant and important. Underdeveloped countries everywhere want to accelerate their economic growth. Most of them are strongly committed to programs of constructing new dams and power facilities, roads and harbors, factories, and, above all, steel mills. Meanwhile, in many of these countries, few additional resources are being made available for training and education. The relevant and important question is clearly indicated: Are these countries making an optimum allocation of the resources at their command? To arrive at a valid answer we must use a concept of capital that includes both human and nonhuman wealth. To consider only the latter, as is almost everywhere the case, can give only misleading results. No wonder, therefore, that poor countries are in general being badly misled. There can be little doubt that they are presently allocating their resources in ways that are far from what would be required to achieve an optimum rate of growth. Harberger's study, concentrating on Chile, strongly supports this view, for he finds that technical advances are the key factor in achieving rapid development and that additional expenditures to improve the quality of the (technically trained) labor force are of primary importance in attaining this end.[3]

To consider a somewhat narrower question: Has India in recent years spent too much on irrigation and all too little on training her cultivators on how best to use the additional water? From reports that I get, this has been happening. The error appears to be a very costly one. In Iraq, where the Government has been obtaining huge amounts of revenue from oil, the Development Board, according to Yudelman,[5] will have spent close to $1,400 million by 1960—virtually all on flood control, irrigation, drainage, and other physical structures and only a pittance on training and education to prepare farmers and others in the use of these new facilities. Yudelman concludes that this one-sided allocation represents a most serious error in the efforts of Iraq to achieve agricultural development.

But these are the mistakes of poor countries, especially those in which there are massive governmental programs. Although we may be giving some of these countries bad economic advice, presumably this does not impair our economy. We are always ready to take comfort in our long gradual development, in the open and decentralized character of our economy, and in our large and impressive investments in what I am calling human wealth. There is, however, no room for complacency. We, too, are constantly confronted by the same allocative problem, that is, how much or how little to invest in nonhuman wealth relative to what we put into ourselves. How well or how badly we are doing on this score is subject to debate. But what is not debatable is the fact that there is little or no economic analysis to draw upon because these aspects of this problem have been almost wholly neglected.

In terms of both consumption and economic growth, I have little doubt that in recent years we have been allocating altogether too many of our resources to automobiles and roads compared to what we have allocated to education. But this is an opinion; let me consider situations in which there is some evidence. Negroes on the average earn only a fraction as much as do white workers. May not much and even most of this vast discrepancy in earnings be a direct consequence of the lower productivity of Negroes arising from the deplorably bad education that they have been obtaining? Morton Zeman's study of "White and Non-White Income Differentials in the United States"[6] strongly supports an affirmative answer. The very low earnings of many of the migrant farmworkers may also rest primarily on this factor.

To take still another of the serious income inequalities marked against our national record, namely, the chronic poverty of so many of the rural areas in and about the Appalachian country consisting largely of whites: Is this poverty, also, rooted mainly in the relatively small investments that people in these areas have seen fit and have been able to make in themselves? Tang,[8] in a recent study of two groups of counties in the southern Piedmont region, has found that whereas they started from an equal income position at about the turn of the century, farm people in his developed counties have gained importantly in farm income per worker relative to those in his underdeveloped counties. This divergency in farm income per farmworker has become increasingly larger over time. Even the prosperous and full employment conditions that prevailed between 1940 and 1950 did not change this trend toward increasing income disparity.[9] Tang's findings are not inconsistent with the industrialization hypothesis that he sought to test. A preliminary examination of his data would seem to indicate that they are also consistent with another hypothesis, namely, one based on education and related investments in people as the principal explanatory variable.

The central puzzle is in our economic growth as it is revealed in the many estimates that indicate a large and increasing divergency between the rise in income and in the resources that we use to produce the additional income. Our income has been going up much the faster of the two. For example, between 1889 and 1919 the rate of increase of labor and tangible capital combined was only 67 percent as large as that of income (both are for the private sector of the domestic economy).[7] Even so, between 1919 and 1957 the rate of increase of man-hours worked and of tangible capital, taken together, was down to a mere 32 percent of the rate at which our income rose. It is hard to believe, but wonderful if true, and if true, why? That is the puzzle.

A HUMAN WEALTH HYPOTHESIS

What is it that we have been doing that has given us a rate of economic growth that is three times as large as the rate of increase of labor and capital? My hypothesis is that the explanation is to be found in the large and rapid accumulation of human wealth that is being excluded from our conventional measures of "man-hours worked" and of tangible capital.

The preliminary results from two studies lend support to this hypothesis. The first of these is based on a study that I have made of the formation of human capital, represented by education beyond the eighth grade. This form of capital not only has become very large but has been increasing much more rapidly than has the formation of conventional nonhuman capital.[9] In estimating the gross capital formation entailed in a high school education, I found that in current prices it cost the U.S. economy $127 per student in 1900, and $1,493 in 1956. My estimates for college and university education are $385 for 1900 and $3,580 for 1956; most of these costs are of the nature of opportunity costs because they consist of earnings that students have foregone while they were in school studying. The national totals for all public and private schools must suffice for now; they show that only $180 million of this capital (gross) was formed in 1900, whereas in 1956 it had become no less than $22,700 million. To compare this increase with that of nonhuman capital, I need burden you with only the percentage that one was of the other in each of the two years: In 1900, the formation of this kind of capital, i.e., represented by high school, college, and university education, was only 4 percent of that of all physical capital; by 1956 it had risen to 28 percent of that of physical capital. This dramatic rise in the relative position of this one form of human capital, as I have measured it, nevertheless, substantially underestimates the real relative increase because I am here relying on gross capital formation figures and it is the net figures that count. There are many indications that the net figures have gone up even more because, whereas the useful life of physical capital has been declining, that of human capital has been increasing.

The other study tells us something about the rates of return on this form of human capital. Here I draw on some of the esti-

---

[3] Arnold C. Harberger, "Using the Resources at Hand More Effectively," to appear in the Proceedings of the American Economic Association (1959).

[5] Montague Yudelman, "Some Issues in Agricultural Development in Iraq," Journal of Farm Economics, vol. XL (February 1958).

[6] Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.

[8] Anthony M. Tang, "Economic Development of the Southern Piedmont", 1860–1950 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958).

[9] Ibid., p. 220.

[7] See Fabricant, op. cit.

[9] My paper carries the title, "Gross Capital Formation Represented by High School, College, and University Education in the United States, 1900 to 1956" (AER Paper No. 5807, Department of Economics, University of Chicago, April 29, 1958).

mates that Becker* reported in a recent lecture. He has found that, as of 1950, males were earning a 14.8 percent return on what they had privately invested in acquiring their high school, college, and university education, measured by their opportunity costs (earnings foregone while in school) and their direct costs (tuitions, books, etc.). When the other costs, those not borne by students or their families directly, are added to these private costs, this rate of return was still no less than 11 percent. How does this compare with the rate of return that owners of property were obtaining? Compared to that of corporations before taxes, it is probably not very different. What about the rate of return on all nonhuman wealth, namely, on the approximately $1,000 billion of national wealth, as estimated by Goldsmith? This figure includes all land (agricultural, forestry, and urban), producer and consumer durables, apartment buildings and private residences, government structures, inventories, livestock, monetary metals, and net foreign assets. It is hard to believe that the 11 percent return on this human capital did not exceed by a wide margin the rate of return that was being realized on this huge stock of nonhuman wealth.

It should be pointed out that in both Becker's and my study none of the private or public costs of this education was charged to consumption or to other important goals. This means that we have overestimated the relevant costs of this kind of capital formation because a very substantial part is incurred for these other purposes and it should be attributed to them.

It should be evident that this has been a very preliminary treatment of the investments that we are making in ourselves. Education beyond the eighth grade is only one of the forms that this kind of capital formation takes, albeit a large and increasing form. Elementary education, which we take for granted, may rate even higher in what it renders to an economy. How else, for example, can one explain the early remarkable achievements in agriculture in Japan? Many poor countries are neglecting their elementary education relative to what they are spending on physical plants and equipment; moreover, the cost of this form of education is relatively low because of the low opportunity costs of taking students at that age away from other useful work.

On-the-job training is another way of accumulating some of this human capital. Still another goes back to measures that increase the strength and energy of a people and improve their health and vitality. New, useful knowledge is undoubtedly of strategic importance both in changing the nature of the useful skills that are of most value and in altering and improving the quality of the physical plant and equipment that we employ. I have not touched on the very important question of how we perpetuate this human capital in the home and through institutions other than through organized education.

I have tried to show that the state of our knowledge of investment in man is very meager. Our values and beliefs have hindered us greatly in thinking clearly about it. Economists too have missed seeing the important role that the increasing stock of human capital has come to play in the economy. A concept of capital restricted to tangible property will not do. A much more comprehensive concept of capital is required—one that will include human capital. Once we take this more comprehensive view, the central puzzle in our estimates of economic growth looks solvable; the human wealth hypothesis appears to gain support from studies now under way and it may go a long way in explaining the kind of economic growth that we have been achieving and that poor countries everywhere would like to understand with a view of using this experience to improve their economic lot. Finally, even though this approach to the investment in man were to put us on the right track, much hard thinking and research remain to be done.

*Gary S. Becker, professor at Columbia University, in a lecture given before the Economic Development Workshop at the University of Chicago, Feb. 5, 1959. In this lecture he drew on a major study that he has been making of the economics of education for the National Bureau of Economics Research.

Canada Progresses While the United States Marks Time in Oceanographic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, in the cold war struggle with Russia, it should be remembered that the race for scientific supremacy is composed of many phases. A glance at recent newspapers might lead the casual observer to draw the erroneous conclusion that the entire scientific battle is being waged in outer space. However, many scientific experts feel that the Nation which first unlocks the secrets of the ocean depths holds the key to future survival.

In oceanographic research, our country is lagging far behind the U.S.S.R. The National Academy of Sciences Committee on Oceanography has recommended a $651 million, 10-year program, designed to enable the United States to catch and surpass the Soviet Union in this vital field by 1970. It is imperative that action be taken to implement this program immediately. Our country cannot afford the luxury of further delay.

I am pleased to note that the Canadian Government has embarked upon an intensive program of oceanographic development, one which we would do well to emulate. Construction of a new oceanographic institute and the initiation of a multimillion dollar ship-construction program are encouraging developments. There has always been effective coordination between Canadian and American oceanographers. I am sure that this cooperation will continue in the future, but unless our Government provides adequate funds to finance modernization of our oceanographic fleet and research facilities the United States will not be able to keep pace with future technological developments.

I feel confident, however, that in 1960 Congress will formulate a comprehensive program for oceanographic development. If we wish to compete successfully with Soviet oceanographers, we can afford to do nothing less.

I would like to insert in the RECORD a statement made by Edmund Morris, Canadian Member of Parliament, concerning recent Canadian oceanographic developments:

Canada, which possesses the longest coastline of any country in the world, is taking steps to expand oceanography in the department of mines and technical surveys to fill the gaping need for oceanographic data on its coastal waters for defense and research assessment purposes.

It is setting up on the east coast, in Bedford Basin near Halifax, a $3 million oceanographic institute, which will have the facilities to allow studies in any phase of the science. The new institute will take 5 years to complete and, when in operation, will have a staff of some 300 oceanographers, hydrographers, submarine geologists, and other scientific personnel, plus supporting staff, and an operating fleet of 10 oceanographic vessels.

A multimillion-dollar shipbuilding program has already been set underway to provide the fleet of oceanographic vessels. The first of these vessels, the $7 million C.G.S. *Hudson*, is expected to be commissioned in 1961.

The establishment of the institute, which is to be known as the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, is announced today, on the eve of Dartmouth Natal Day.

Specifically, the new institute will turn an oceanographic spotlight on Canada's Atlantic and subarctic coasts to study the physical characteristics of the waters and underlying seabed. The resultant data is needed for antisubmarine defense to ascertain the resources potential of the country's continental shelf in these regions and to assist navigation.

It will also permit the overdue expansion of the Atlantic and subarctic sections of the Canadian Hydrographic Service. These sections will be moved from Ottawa to Bedford Basin, which will greatly facilitate hydrographic operations in eastern and northern areas. In addition, it will house the regional office of the Geological Survey of Canada.

The whole project will mean the building up, near Dartmouth, of a strong center of marine science. It includes liaison with the Fisheries Research Board, the Atlantic Oceanographic Group, which will be housed in the new Institute, and with Dalhousie University which is setting up—with the help of a National Research Council grant—an Institute of Oceanography for the training of scientists, many of whom will be employed by the new Federal Institute. It will also be the headquarters of the polar group of oceanographers, hydrographers, geologists, and other scientists, working in the icebound sections of the far Arctic. They will carry out a broad program of oceanographic research on the rim of the Arctic Basin.

Canada possesses little knowledge of the oceans which surround it. Except for a specialized program in oceanography by the Fisheries Research Board over the years, oceanography in Canada has been a neglected science, mainly because of the size of the job to be done and the great expense entailed in doing it.

Today, however, the knowledge derived from oceanographic research is vitally needed by government and industry for purposes of defense, commerce, and science. In the face of the growing danger of ballistic-missile-carrying submarines, a detailed knowledge of the characteristics of the water and of the seabed is necessary for the development and operation of adequate instruments of detection.

Knowledge gained from oceanography is required, too, to ascertain the resource potential of the country's continental shelves. This is especially important today because

of the conclusions arrived at by the Geneva Convention of 1958 that the resources of the continental shelves belong to the adjacent nation. On the east coast, Canada's continental shelf extends 100 to 200 miles out into the Atlantic Ocean.

An extensive program of work is envisaged in the new project. Oceanographers and hydrographers will study and map the topography of the ocean floor and measure the movements, temperature, density and chemical properties of the water at various depths.

They will study the separate and distinct layers of water of which the oceans are comprised, and each of which has its own characteristics. Modern methods of submarine detection depend on the transmission of sound in water, which requires a detailed knowledge of these characteristics.

Geologists will study bottom sediments and cores taken from the ocean floor. Such studies will yield valuable data on the life of the earth's crust, changes in climate, vegetation, volcanic activity, etc., enable geologists to recreate the history of mountainous formations on land because, in the depths of the ocean, the temperature remains practically unchanged, there is no erosion and little movement of water; and reveal possible mineral resource wealth on the shelf.

Geophysicists will use magnetometers, gravimeters, and seismic equipment to diagnose the structures underlying the floor.

The new institute will be a combined laboratory and office building, with separate depots, shops, and storage facilities. The scientific personnel will carry out investigations and research in modernly equipped laboratories. It will provide all needed store facilities for its fleet in the way of docking and berthing facilities, and routine repair and maintenance services. The institute is so planned, moreover, to permit the expansion of these facilities, if needed, to meet the requirements of a growing fleet.

The heart of the new project will lie of course in its fleet of oceanographic and hydrographic ships. The ship-building program will add additional ships until the requirements are met for new ships and for the replacement of old and chartered ones now in use by the Canadian Hydrographic Service. The new C.G.S. *Hudson* and all new vessels will be combined oceanographic and and hydrographic ships, equipped with laboratory and other facilities for survey and research work. They will be capable of working in any season of the year, while the larger ships, like the *Hudson*, could work anywhere in the world. All vessels will be strengthened for work in the Arctic.

The expansion in the charting activities of the department's Canadian Hydrographic Service is long overdue. Many factors, including defense needs, the entry of Newfoundland into confederation, and resource development and exploratory and other activity in the Arctic, have greatly increased demand for charts and information on the coastline and waters involved.

Since its establishment in 1883, the service has been operating on a scale far out of proportion to the size of the task to be done. Canada possesses some 120,000 miles of coastline. The greater part of this coastline, much of which is extremely complex and shoal studded, has not yet been charted. The uncharted areas include almost all of the Arctic Archipelago, the northern mainland coast, Hudson Bay, and the Labrador coast.

As a start on the expansion of its hydrographic activities, the department has added the chartered ship M.V. *Theta* to its fleet. It is carrying out tidal current, and oceanographic surveys in Cabot and Hudson Straits. Included in the fleet are the C.G.S. *Baffin*, which is charting in Hudson Strait; the C.G.S. *Kapuskasing*, which is sounding off the east coast of Newfoundland; the C.G.S. *Cartier*, engaged in charting work in the region of Cape Bald and Chaleur Bay in New Brunswick; and the C.G.S. *Acadia*, which is doing similar work on the northeast coast of Prince Edward Island. By 1960 the service hopes to add * * * two additional ships for oceanographic work, and by 1962 the first ship under the new program, C.G.S. *Hudson*, will be added to the fleet.

In setting up the Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Canada is taking cognisance of the importance of the fast-growing science of oceanography and of the value of the contribution it can make in the unraveling of the scientific mysteries of the country's last frontiers—its coastal waves.

Antarctic Map Brought Up to Date

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor there appeared an article by Albert E. Norman, with relation to Antarctica.

In the years ahead, the Great White Continent may well be of increasing importance for strategical, scientific, and other purposes.

Today, far too little is known of Antarctica. Each bit of additional knowledge is, therefore, extremely important.

Believing that this fine article, entitled "Antarctic Map Brought Up to Date," warrants the attention of my colleagues, I request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANTARCTIC MAP BROUGHT UP TO DATE

(By Albert E. Norman)

Australia has moved fast to beat the Soviet Union in producing an up-to-date map of Australian Antarctic territory. The Soviet Government never has recognized the Australian or any other claim to national sovereignty in Antarctica. While the Australian Government said it would be pleased to extend permission for Soviet bases to be located in Australian Antarctic territory for scientific purposes, Moscow did not recognize this invitation and simply moved in its ships and men.

Once they were snugly dug in at their Mirny base, Soviet explorers began air mapping the entire 3,650 coast of Australia's 2,500,000-square mile Antarctic claim, using radio-controlled aircraft.

It was then that the Australian Government realized that the Kremlin intended to publish a map of Soviet Antarctica, without too much regard to the long history of Australian exploration in the region, extending back almost 50 years.

A Soviet map of this large section of the Antarctic, dotted with Soviet place names, very probably would have been extremely useful if produced at the forthcoming 12-nation international conference, sponsored by the United States to decide the future of all Antarctica.

Since the United States did not recognize any claims to national sovereignty in the Antarctic, it would have been difficult for Australia, in face of a well developed Soviet map, to show that this document represented territory claimed by Australia.

One of the recognized tests of sovereignty claims under international law was evidence of effective occupation and administration. This evidence could be further supported when backed by extensive exploration documented with detailed maps.

For the past few years, Australia has maintained permanent bases at Mawson and Davis in Australian Antarctic territory, thus reinforcing its claims to occupation and administration. At the same time, it has made extensive exploration and conducted scientific and weather research programs, quite apart from its efforts under the recent International Geophysical Year program.

In the past 3 years, Australian aircraft have flown 151,500 miles in the Antarctic and have taken 21,000 photographs which included a photographic coverage of about three-quarters of the 3,650-mile coast line of Australian Antarctic territory. These operations have been confined to the brief summer seasons when the weather was suitable.

Numerous overland expeditions have been made by Australian teams, sometimes of no more than four men, traveling light and supported by aircraft. In this way, fairly deep penetrations of the hinterland have been made, bringing to light new mountain ranges and other features. One such discovery was a system towering 12,000 feet, named Mount Menzies for Australia's Prime Minister, Robert G. Menzies.

One of the most interesting Australian expeditions this year succeeded in landing on the uncharted coast of Oates Land, at the eastern end of Australian Antarctic territory. This was the first recorded landing on this heavily icepacked coast which had defied all previous attempts. But Soviet explorers since have claimed the "first ever" landing in this part of the Australian territory.

Piloted by Squadron Leader Douglas Leckie of the Australian Air Force, in a floatplane from the ship, Philip Law, leader of the expedition, made several wide sweeps of the coast before the expedition landed. Later he reported: "I can say that no important rock features now remain undiscovered on the Oates Land coast or on any part of the coast of Australian Antarctic territory."

Soviet scientists have announced that they planned to use specially equipped turboprop aircraft, flying at 50,000 feet, in mapping the Antarctic. The United States has a mapping project in the wind which would call for complete mapping of the huge polar continent in 6 years.

Meanwhile, Antarctic exploration continues. That means more and more new information keeps coming into the mapmakers' hands in Australia. Not content with getting out the latest map that so surprised Moscow, Australian official mapmakers have another scheduled for publication next year. Their operative motto seemed to me: "The only thing better than an up-to-date map of the Antarctic was a more up-to-date one."

Gen. Jack Person: A Credit to his Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, in the area I represent, the Fourth Congressional District of Oregon, there are presently 15 active authorized public works projects under the supervision of the Civil Works Division of the Army Corps

of Engineers. There are also seven navigation studies and five flood control studies authorized in the district at the present time. A number of proposed projects will undoubtedly be authorized after the Congress has had time to study in detail the recently completed Engineer revision of the so-called 308 Report. In addition, there are 12 completed navigation and flood control projects in my district, all of them requiring various degrees of annual maintenance.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, to emphasize the importance to me and my constituents of the Corps of Engineers. The Corps, in its function of carrying out the congressionally authorized program to harness the vast natural water resources of the Nation, has become an important economic factor in southwestern Oregon. In fact, the Corps has become so important to the area I represent in Congress that I consider one of my most critical jobs in Washington is to act as liaison between my constituents and the Corps.

For that reason, I have felt particularly fortunate over the past 3 years that the man who has headed the civil works functions for the Corps of Engineers has been a man not only of great technical ability but a man of such pleasant personality that my relations with him have been among the best I have experienced since coming to the national capital.

The man of whom I speak is Brig. Gen. John L. Person, known as Jack Person to his friends. After almost 3 years as Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works, General Person retired from the Army on June 30 of this year, completing 30 years of capable service to his country. What the Army has lost, the city of Louisville, Ky., has gained. General Person now holds the position of executive consultant to the Metropolitan Sewer District at Louisville. So he has not retired from the engineering profession, just from the Engineers.

General Person is a product of the U.S. Military Academy and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and he has had a distinguished career with the Corps of Engineers, serving in a great variety of important positions in various parts of the country and overseas. On the day of his retirement General Person was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal by the President of the United States, certainly the least his country could do in appreciation for a career of service which reflected the greatest possible credit on the Army and, in particular, on the Corps of Engineers.

The medal was awarded "for exceptionally meritorious service in a duty of great responsibility" to quote from the citation which accompanied it. The citation went on to say that—

Brigadier General Person distinguished himself by eminently meritorious service to the Government in a succession of key positions of great responsibility during the period June 1946 to June 1959.

The citation correctly termed him "an officer of rare and exceptional ability," and it concluded with these well-deserved words of praise:

His outstanding service in all of his assignments constitutes a major contribution to the national welfare, to the development of the natural resources of the United States and to the strengthening of the national defense. General Person's long and distinguished career represents significant achievement in the most cherished traditions of the U.S. Army, and reflects the utmost credit upon himself and the military service.

I could not agree more. Jack Person has had a full life so far—and he is not yet 53 years old. I wish him the best of luck in the future and I am sure he has many years of fine service ahead of him in his new position. But I know he is sorely missed by his many friends in Washington, D.C.

On September 1 General Person was succeeded in office as Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works by Brig. Gen. William F. Cassidy, who came to the post from a tour of duty as senior logistics adviser to the army of the Republic of Korea. I am looking forward to meeting General Cassidy, and I am sure I can expect the meeting to be the beginning of another pleasant relationship with a top career officer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

Classroom and Teacher Shortages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a new school year opened to the same tune of classroom shortages and teacher shortages, which impair the education of at least one out of every four schoolchildren.

This continuing crisis facing the American public school system inspired a series of meetings of representatives of a broad range of national organizations who realize that the time has come to do something about our current school situation.

The meetings were attended by representatives of many of the organizations listed below:

American Association of University Professors.
American Association of University Women.
American Home Economics Association.
American Library Association.
American Parents Committee.
American Veterans Committee.
Americans for Democratic Action.
Associations for Childhood Education International.
General Federation of Womens Clubs.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Education Association.
National Farmers Union.
Textile Workers Union of America.
United Church Women.

The other listed organizations have asked that they also be associated with the following summary, which I would call a primer outlining the needs of elementary and secondary education:

EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND OUR CHILDREN'S FUTURE

The educators of America have made a magnificent contribution to the growth of this Nation.

Between 1870 and 1955, while our population was increasing four times, our public school attendance increased 80 times. From 1900 to 1955 the population of America nearly doubled, but the number of college graduates multiplied 11 times and the number of doctoral degrees 22 times. We have twice as many teachers as we had in 1910 but require 10 times as many college teachers as we did 50 years ago.

Today almost 47 million Americans are attending school—almost 1 out of every 4 people in this country—and 2 million Americans are teaching them in more than 150,000 institutions.

The number of boys and girls attending elementary and secondary schools grew from less than 17 million in 1900 to some 43 million today. College enrollments in the same period rose 15 fold, from 238,000 to almost 4 million.

While we have been increasing the quantity of education we have also been increasing the quality. More than anything else our American educational system is carrying out the American dream of equality of opportunity.

Some of the interest in education and especially in higher education is due to our recent years of prosperity, some to the GI bill which permitted thousands of ex-service men and women, who otherwise would have been unable to go to college, to complete their education.

But there is a more fundamental reason for this growth. College attendance grew even during the depression of the thirties. The chief characteristic of a complex modern society is the insatiable demand for educated people. It is not just technologists and scientists that we need, we need more and more gifted teachers, professional men and scholars.

Despite the heroic efforts our people are making, our educational crisis continues.

THE BUILT-IN CRISIS

On January 28 of this year the U.S. Office of Education announced that this Nation needed an additional 140,500 classrooms to adequately house the boys and girls of America attending the public schools. This is in spite of almost record construction in the 1957–58 school year, when 71,600 classrooms were built. From the fall of 1957 until the end of January 1959, the classroom shortage had been reduced only 1,800.

In August 1959 Secretary Arthur S. Flemming, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, told a news conference that the present shortage was 140,000 classrooms, a reduction of 500 in 7 months.

The reduction in the 2 years prior to his press conference, then, was 2,300, or less than 1,200 a year. At that rate it would be almost 117 years before we have an educational plant adequate to house our schoolchildren. And it is unlikely that the States and local communities will be able even to maintain the pace of 71,000 classrooms a year.

Even if they could, we would still fall behind the phenomenal increase in the number of new schoolchildren each year. According to the Office of Education, America's primary and secondary school enrollment has reached an alltime high for the 15th consecutive year. The increase this year was 1,750,000. If you divide this figure by 27½, the present national average of pupils per classroom, this increase alone would require nearly 64,000 new classrooms. If you add to this 64,000 the 22,000 classrooms needed each year to replace those which are—or should be—abandoned, you have a total of 86,000 classrooms—including libraries, adequately staffed and stocked—needed this year to house the increase and replace facilities which are outmoded, unsafe, or both.

NATION SHORT 195,000 TEACHERS

At the same time, U.S. Commissioner of Education Lawrence G. Derthick announced that a total of 1,563,000 teachers will be needed in both public and nonpublic schools in the coming year, whereas the number presently qualified is 1,368,000. This is a deficit of 195,000 teachers.

The continued shortage of qualified teachers tells the story of the Nation's failure to give members of this profession financial and community standing sufficient to attract them into the field and to keep them in it.

The shortage of teachers is even worse than figures indicate, because teaching in our schools today are at least 92,337 persons with substandard certificates to teach.

A RHETORICAL QUESTION AND ANSWER

At the recent news conference, Secretary Flemming asked reporters rhetorically: "What does this continuing neglect by the Federal Government of this classroom shortage mean in terms of the actual loss of educational opportunity?"

He answered his own question this way: "When there aren't enough classrooms there are generally more pupils per teacher. Educational facilities are crowded. Half-day and split sessions are imposed. There are fewer hours for children in school. Parents, teachers, children are subjected to constant frustration. A crowded classroom robs every child in that room—not just those who make up the statistical enrollment for the school."

According to Secretary Flemming, the education of 10 million American youngsters is being impaired in varying degrees by the classroom shortage.

He said recent reports on public-school enrollment show there were 1,843,000 pupils in excess of normal school capacity last year. These excess students were added to an estimated 6 million in crowded urban elementary schools alone and another 2 million or so in obsolete or inadequate buildings to arrive at the total of 10 million.

These figures are extremely conservative—because they do not include either urban high schools or rural schools.

Thirty pupils make up the desirable maximum class size. If a class has 40 or 50 pupils, then the education of every child is being impaired—not just that of the additional 10 or 20 pupils. And even though the class size may be within the desirable limits, the youngsters are being short-changed if their teacher is substandard.

SOCIETY ALSO IS ROBBED

Not only the child but all of society is robbed by inadequate school facilities and a shortage of qualified teachers. The products of our schools are responsible for this country's livelihood through the maximum development of all the Nation's human resources, an adequate long-range defenes plan based on fuller development and use of top brain power, and greater economic growth which can come through well-educated producers and consumers.

Our national defense, on which we spend more than one-half of every tax dollar, is handicapped by substandard education. Some States have done, continue to do, an outstanding job on classroom construction and recruiting and retaining qualified teachers. What is their interest in schools in other States One of the statistical tables, part of the hearing record of the House Education Committee, provides part of the answer—and illustrates that the classroom shortage is a national problem, and that quality teaching is more important than guided missiles or jet planes. It is the percentage of selective service registrants disqualified because of mental tests in the various States. Such disqualification ranges from 3.5 percent in Montana to almost 50 percent in Mississippi. This means that the States, in which the educational system is more nearly adequate, must make up the draft deficit for those States where the educational plants have run down.

NO. 1 PROBLEM

Securing a major increase in financial support is today's No. 1 school problem. The broadly representative White House Conference on Education estimated in 1955 that between 25 and 30-billion dollars would have to be spent on school construction alone in the next 10 years to bring our school plants up to standard. That Conference also concluded that "the people of the United States must make a greater effort through their local, State, and Federal Governments to improve the education of our youth."

Since that time, State and local governments have made a greater effort while the contribution of the Federal Government, the largest tax collector, has remained at a constant average of 4 percent. Even this 4 percent is distributed inequitably among the States, and goes not for general aid to education but for specialized programs such as construction, operation and maintenance of schools in federally impacted areas, Indian and vocational education.

In recent years, local and State debt has been increasing faster than the Federal debt. Since 1945, the Federal debt has risen less than 10 percent, while the total debt of the States has gone up 500 percent, and the local debt has risen 300 percent.

Across the Nation, school district after school district is reaching the point of exhaustion, exhaustion of debt capacity, exhaustion of ability of local taxpayers to bear the heavy tax burden on local property that good schools and teachers necessitate. The decline of a net gain of 1,800 classrooms in 1958 to a net gain of 500 in 1959 is the first sign of the growing inability to continue to build schools at a rate of more than 71,000 classrooms per year.

OLDER THAN THE CONSTITUTION

Federal assistance to education is not new. It is older than our Federal Constitution. Under the Articles of Confederation, 3 years before our Federal Constitution was ratified, the old Northwest Ordinance of 1785 was enacted. The ordinance specified that in the new lands of our Nation "there shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools within said township." This Federal law was responsible for the establishment of public schools in many States and for many years provided a major portion of their financial support. It is important to note that the establishment of this Federal grant did not interfere with the discretionary right of the individual States to use the money derived therefrom as the State determined it should best be used. Federal aid, without Federal control is thus one of the oldest traditions of public education.

Succeeding public laws for vocational education, federally affected areas, and national defense education are among those currently providing Federal help in special areas. No responsible official has ever charged that there has been Federal control of education in any of these programs.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in Congress are willing to cooperate in any plan to meet the crisis in our classrooms. I appreciate the letters I have received from those who are really interested in solving our most important domestic problem. So do my colleagues in the House.

Petition Concerning Alcoholic Beverages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following petition, together with the names of those who signed it, be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Members of the U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We, the undersigned citizens of Lexington, Ky., hereby petition each of you to support

the Lane bill, H.R. 169, and the Williams bill, H.R. 1075, the purpose of which is to prohibit serving of alcoholic beverages on airplanes while in flight, also the Siler bill, H.R. 2221, to prohibit transportation in interstate commerce of alcoholic beverage advertising and its broadcasting over the air.

Mrs. John A. Guilfeil, Lexington, Ky.; Mr. Bobby Halsey, Mrs. Audrey Martin, Richmond, Ky.; Mrs. Richard G. Chrisman, Mrs. O. W. James, Lexington, Ky.; Mrs. J. A. Brown, Richmond, Ky.; Osborne James, Mrs. Mitchell Coffey, Mrs. D. R. Donovan, Mrs. L. E. Gooch, Mrs. Orville T. Reynolds, Mrs. Wiedon Welsh, Mrs. C. G. Welsh, Mrs. W. R. Flynn, Mrs. Warren Marshall, Mrs. James Dalton, James Yonts, Mrs. Stanley Couchman, Margaret Tucker, B. L. Murphy, Mrs. B. L. Murphy, Besse B. Barker, Ethel Vance, Mrs. Herbert Ashcraft, Mrs. Charles Corroll, Joe R. Baker, Lexington, Ky.

Mrs. Al Smitha, Grace Gentry Lamb, Miss Sue Barker, Mrs. Lee Hazelwood, Mrs. Frank Creger, Herbert Ashcraft, Royce Robey, John Littral, Mrs. Chas. Baesler, Jr., Chas. Baesler, Jr., S. B. Kelley, R. T. Martin, Alice Corbins, Mrs. J. M. Kemper, Mrs. J. L. Busby, Mr. Hubert Ashley, Mrs. Hubert Ashley, Lloyd Mahanes, Mrs. F. S. Eldridge, Mrs. Henry Birch, Mrs. W. R. Denny, Mrs. E. L. Dodson, Mrs. H. A. Raech, Mrs. E. D. Hinkle, Mrs. J. L. Williams, Laura Music, Mrs. S. H. Hart, Sam Hart, Mrs. J. D. Shields, Mrs. R. B. Gibbs, Mrs. Frank Stone, Jr., Mrs. T. Foley, Mrs. Robert Agee, Mrs. Forest Whittaker, Mrs. Betty Lambert, Mrs. L. Hardy, Mrs. J. H. Hanks, Mrs. Cliff Arnall, Mrs. R. C. Carr, Mrs. Goadlett, Mrs. W. H. Sturgill, Mrs. W. Ethington, Mrs. Grace Tate, Mrs. Darnell Moore, Mrs. Norman Sipe, Mrs. R. C. Mitchell, Mrs. F. A. Stephens, Mrs. L. L. Dunn, Mrs. George Taylor, Lexington, Ky.

Resolution of National Tire Dealers' and Retreaders' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the National Tire Dealers' and Retreaders' Association, at its annual conference in Washington, D.C., on September 14, 1959, adopted a resolution which called on the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to establish a national standard for chemical and physical properties of tires offered by the major American rubber manufacturers. I am taking this occasion to call this resolution to the attention of the Congress:

RESOLUTION AT THE ANNUAL CONFERENCE SEPTEMBER 14, 1959, WASHINGTON, D.C., NATIONAL TIRE DEALERS' AND RETREADERS' ASSOCIATION

Whereas there exists no accepted national standard applying to the chemical and physical properties of tires offered by the major American rubber manufacturers; and

Whereas, in lieu of such a standard, the rubber manufacturers have designated their products by names providing no basis for public identification as to relative quality; and

Whereas such meaningless designations cause harm to the public by leading many to purchase products inferior in quality to that required for specific safety and economy of vehicular operation, and to the tire dealers by depriving them of a standard for the honest promotion of premium and first line grade tires which cannot now equitably compete against the misleading claims advanced on behalf of low-priced items: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the National Tire Dealers' and Retreaders' Association, in annual conference assembled this 14th day of September 1959, hereby petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a uniform national code for the alphabetical classification of tires according to their chemical content, rubber content, tensile strength of cord, shock break point of carcass, tread compound and abrasive wear, and such other properties as are known to bear upon their durability and operating strength under specified conditions of use, and requiring all manufacturers to mold the appropriate classification letters into the walls of the tires they produce; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to all tire trade publications, together with an appropriate appeal for their assistance in securing the speedy introduction and enactment of the legislation herein proposed.

The Catholic Register

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, October 14 is an important milestone in the life of an important publication. It marks the completion of a quarter-century of service to the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese by the Catholic Register.

The Catholic Register was initiated under the late Bishop John J. McCort, second ordinary of the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese. It serves 152,918 Catholics in these eight counties of central Pennsylvania: Blair, Cambrai, Centre, Clinton, Huntington, Bedford, Somerset, and Fulton.

The Right Reverend Monsignor Thomas E. Madden, chancellor of the Altoona-Johnstown Diocese, was named first editor and continued in that position until January 1, 1943, at which time the Reverend Vincent A. Luther—now principal of Altoona Catholic High School—was appointed editor. He served in this capacity until Rev. Francis Reed Hoy was appointed editor by the late Bishop Richard T. Guilfoyle on September 24, 1943. Father Hoy remained as editor until his death on February 9, 1959.

The Most Reverend Howard J. Carroll, D.D., present ordinary of the Altoona-Johnstown See, appointed the Reverend Edward W. O'Malley, then assistant editor, to succeed Father Hoy. Under his direction the Catholic Register observes its 25th anniversary, and to him, fellow members of the staff, and clergymen and lay leaders throughout the diocese go the best wishes of friends of all faiths for continued growth in an era when religion faces one of its greatest tests in world history.

In May 1957 His Holiness Pope Pius XII included these observations in a message to the Catholic Press Association of the United States:

In these days and in a country where freedom of the press is established by law, it should not be necessary to insist on the importance of a Catholic press. The power of the written word is being challenged today by other modern arts of communication; yet none will deny the heavy pressure still exercised by the press on molding habits of thought, that would first weaken, then subvert the principles of Christian belief and correct moral conduct.

The very freedom possessed, as you know full well, increases the danger, which only an enlightened and courageous public opinion can avert or lessen. Your associated newspapers, magazines and reviews, both weekly and quarterly, as well as the increasing number of books authored by Catholics, have the noble and truly patriotic task and ambition to help that public opinion to find and hold to the path of truth and justice and, let us say it simply and honestly, holy living. If you succeed in this, you will have made a momentous contribution to the peace, prosperity, and power for good of your beloved country.

The Catholic Register is a beacon along the path of trust, justice, and holy living. To parishioners in its circulation area it fills a vital religious need. To the communities it provides a powerful moral force. To all of us it supplies a wholesome view and attitude which cannot help but contribute generously to the betterment of our society.

Automobile Excise Tax: Temporary or Permanent?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the history of the automobile excise tax in this country is not a very long one. However, its future may very well become a long one indeed. For this tax, which was originally conceived as a temporary measure to bolster the national coffers during the depression, has been continually extended and extended. It has, in fact, been extended so many times that the use of the word "temporary" has begun to seem facetious.

The grounds on which the yearly or biyearly proponents of futher extension base their arguments is that the revenue realized from the excise tax is essential to the national economy and cannot be done without. The amount involved is something approximating $2 billion. Certainly this is a large sum of money. But if, in fact, this amount is not done without some year soon, we should at least stop fooling the people and ourselves that this tax is a temporary thing soon to be eliminated. We should at least be honest and admit that the tax base of the Nation does now and

will continue ever to include this excise as an integral part. To contribute to the dubious aura of temporariness this tax has been changed several times. It has been raised. It has been lowered. Always these changes have been accompanied with claims that the whole thing is temporary so a temporary change matters but little.

The latest move in this little game is the provision in the new highway bill which has the effect of making any reduction in the excise tax impossible until after 1965. This is but the most recent step further along the road to permanency for this "temporary" tax. Where is this trend going to stop? If it does not stop shortly, Mr. Webster's definitions of the words "temporary" and "permanent" will also have to be changed.

The Nation Owes More Than Some Realize to Mr. Dulles' Firmness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post of June 27, 1959, entitled "The Nation Owes More Than Some Realize to Mr. Dulles' Firmness."

I do this at the request of Mr. Robert L. Porter, of Atlanta, Ga., a friend and admirer of former Secretary of State John Foster Dulles.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION OWES MORE THAN SOME REALIZE TO MR. DULLES' FIRMNESS

The tributes to John Foster Dulles make it hard to believe that it is only a couple of years since the late Secretary of State was under heavy attack. Senator WAYNE MORSE declared that Mr. Dulles' "usefulness in his position has long since passed." A year before that Adlai Stevenson urged President Eisenhower to "fire Dulles," whom Adlai accused of "saber-rattling, threats of atomic war, and disregard of our allies." Liberal columnists regularly took off after Dulles, charging him with inflexibility, war-mongering, and other diplomatic errors.

Nevertheless, until cancer tragically intervened, Mr. Dulles steadily survived the calumnies of his critics. He survived, in our opinion, not because Mr. Eisenhower liked him and depended on his advice, but because most of the time Dulles was right. Politically and semantically his "brink-of-war" remark looked like the end. But, despite the yells of protest which greeted that unfortunate phrase, the fact is that any American policy short of surrender to the Reds may fairly be said to take us to the "brink of war." As the late Secretary said on a later occasion, "We have to go on living on the edge of an awful abyss from which we could so readily be rescued if only the Soviet Union did not insist upon retaining for itself the possibility of massive surprise attack."

The same sensitive souls who pretended to believe that Dulles created a "brink of war" when he had realistically recognized that there was one were equally disturbed by his description of Goa, which is on the edge of India, but belongs to Portugal, as a "Portuguese province." How tactless to make such a remark when Nehru was claiming Goa for India. At a press conference Mr. Dulles was asked if the United States regarded Goa as a Portuguese province. His answer was, "As far as I know, all the world regards it as a Portuguese province. It has been Portuguese, I think, for about 400 years." That was the right answer.

Mr. Dulles weathered these storms and a more serious hurricane during the Red Chinese bombardment of Quemoy and Matsu. Many people thought our support of the Chinese Nationalists was another trip to the brink of war. Dire consequences were predicted. Mr. Dulles took the sensible view that, while nobody would advocate going to war for Matsu, the question was, How do you prevent a retreat at the initial point of a thrust from gathering a momentum which will go on from there? Had the advocates of bold and imaginative retreat from these threatened areas had their way, the country might have learned the answer to that question the hard way.

There have been times during the last 10 years when this country could plausibly have moved back from the firing line, made some sort of phony deal with the Communists to secure them in their ill-gotten gains and, by doing so, made Soviet world conquest a present reality. That this hasn't happened is due in no small degree to the character and analytical skill of John Foster Dulles. As one of his colleagues in the State Department put it, "Foster's critics want him to find some way for this country to give the Communists what they want, and because he won't do it they call him 'inflexible.'" Since Mr. Dulles' death, even his critics express admiration for his steadfastness, persisted in after lesser men, similarly afflicted would have quit the field.

In at least one respect the late Secretary of State was more imaginative than his detractors. He was capable of imagining a relaxation of the Communist threat. "There is nothing 'inevitable' about communism," he said in a speech last year, "except that it, too, is bound to change." He foresaw a day when the Communist leaders would see the futility of threats in international dealings, "would be more concerned with the welfare of their own people and less concerned with exploiting other people for expansionist purposes."

To some that prophecy may suggest a departure from Mr. Dulles' characteristic realism. However, a man who could so rightly discern the dangers to our survival and summon the will and courage to deal with them cannot be ignored when he envisions a promise of brighter days ahead.

Of few men can it be more truly said that he gave his life for his country.

Summer Commencement Address of Dr. Harold C. Case, President of Boston University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University, delivered the commencement address at the university's annual summer commencement exercises on August 22, 1959.

In extension of my remarks I include his thought-provoking address, entitled "The Real Cost of Freedom," as follows:

In the middle of the night recently, a brooding silence was over the New Hampshire countryside—crickets chirped, winds sighed in the trees, and every night sound was part of the symphony of nature, emphasizing quietness and promoting sleep.

Suddenly a shattering boom, followed by a series of staccato blasts, precipitated all sleepers into half-dazed waking. The houses shook, windows rattled, and disturbed listeners lay awake and wondered about the cause. Next morning the never-sleeping newspapers reported that these were sonic booms caused by jet planes breaking the sound barrier. They explained that any inconvenience or discomfort experienced by civilians was a small price to pay for national protection.

I am not an expert in military affairs; therefore, I do not know whether or not a lead in speed will guarantee or even help to underwrite the future of freedom. But this much I do know—no increase in miles-per-hour, from Mach I to Mach II, or even IV, will make us better people, more deserving of freedom, or more ready to sacrifice for it.

I recall my first transcontinental flight. It was in a DC-3 plane. The scheduled flying time from New York to Los Angeles was 21 hours. That was two decades ago. A few weeks ago I flew the same route by jet plane in 4 hours, 24 minutes. I walked into the baggage-receiving area in the Los Angeles airport, and while waiting for luggage, I listened to the conversation around me. I discovered that people arrive, after flying 600 miles per hour, with the same problems and thoughts and fears and loves and hates they had at 175 miles per hour. Breaking the sound barrier has nothing to do with making better people, or creating human beings who are more worthy of their heritage and more capable of perpetuating it.

If we could break the thought barrier, we might hope for a better outcome.

Let us make no mistake about it. There is a great struggle going on in American education today, and its outcome may determine the future of American democracy.

It has to do with the question of the use of our enormous resources for the benefit of the individual in this Nation, and throughout the world, or for the creation of a mass society in which the person is primarily a resource for the state, and the mass is the goal, instead of the individual.

This is the issue of quantity versus quality.

The unifying element in our diversity is quality. Today, no person, institution, agency, profession, enterprise, or organization can afford to countenance shoddiness in its philosophy, its goals, its programs, or its persons. The artisan and the artist alike must be nurtured in the same tradition of high quality.

In a university this means carefully formulated objectives, very high standards, gifted students and inspiring teachers meeting each other in an atmosphere in which the mind's adventure is respected.

The desire to know, apparent in every normal child, is often stifled in the higher reaches of education. We need to recreate in students the winsome wonder of learning and knowing, and the sheer delight in stern self-discipline, instead of an unprincipled struggle for grades and for professorial approval. Instilling the powerful desire to learn is basic to all of the future of great

scholarship, and to the preservation of freedom.

Our age demands the habit of looking steadily into the future in terms of new problems emerging, and new knowledge needed to meet and solve them. Education then will use the past as a means for peering ahead, distilling history into eternal verities, providing meaning and magnanimity for progress.

Students must find release for their minds from conventional ways of achieving results, so that they can take a fresh approach to their problems. In the creative approach to an engineering course at M.I.T., students were confronted with a length of galvanized pipe fastened to the floor. In the bottom was a ping-pong ball. On a table were pliers, wrenches, string, a length of rope, a bottle of glue, and a rusty bucket full of muddy water. These students were asked to remove the ping-pong ball from the pipe without lifting the pipe from the floor. After study of the problem, each student, working alone, solved the problem by pouring the muddy water into the pipe and floating the ball to the top.

Another section of the class faced the identical problem, except that the rusty bucket of muddy water was replaced by a cut glass pitcher of ice water. Not a single student solved the problem. None could think of crystal pitchers as pouring spouts, nor of ice water as a float for a ping-pong ball.

Detachment—for originality—is essential, if we are not to drift into a society of mimics.

Consider also that freedom depends on the ability to make much out of little. Some people believe that greatness consists in possessing things—but richness of human living depends on the opposite. In spite of our electronic civilization, our myriad inventions, and our fascinating luxuries, the elemental issues of life are relatively simple.

Food, air to breathe, books, family, dependable friends, meaningful conversation, self-respecting work, knowledge of being useful to one's fellows—these are the rootage. The equipment is lush over growth, and it is neither satisfying nor strength giving.

When you look death in the face, or behold your first-born child, or gaze upon the wonder of a wise senior citizen, you feel ashamed for the artificiality of your environment, and long for reality.

Moreover, in the exercise of our capacity to care intensely and consistently for something or someone beyond ourselves, we discover who we are.

If youth, or the aged, continue to care more about themselves than others, design their lives for comfort, not for efficiency; for getting, not giving; if they grow soft from much pampering, and learn in order to get a job, not in order to know; then no speeding planes nor any soaring satellites, nor any other ingenious device to protect our borders from attack can save us, for we shall have deteriorated within.

Freedom will cost us the price of humility, of dedication, of hard work, of uncomplaining discipline, for the moral value of education lies in this discovery of a world which lies beyond the material, social, and political power by which the world is run, and which can give guidance to the forces at work.

Reduce man to a creature of environment, projected from the accident of birth by impersonal forces to the fatality of death, by jealous chance, and he is quite ready to surrender freedom, rights, and stature. He is already a slave at heart, and no tyrant matters much to him.

Faith is not a matter of convenience. It is a test of survival. Faith will not be restored in a dynamic sense in the West because people find it to be expedient, but only if they find it to be true.

If one believes that the fullness, the plenitude of the good, the true, and the beautiful are in God, he can manage any experience in life. Here is the fundamental root of Western freedom, the metaphysical sense of the infinite value of each person before God, and the infinite respect each man owes to his neighbor, in promoting his well-being and fulfillment.

The restoration of mutual love must precede both health of society and enrichment of individual life.

We stand now staring into outer space with mingled feelings of hope and apprehension. A remote universe has become intimate. The millions of miles which gave us a feeling of security have become items in astronomers' calculations. We know that our world will never again have its old, narrow dimensions. But every advance toward interplanetary communication calls for greatness, here.

I ask of you continuing intellectual adventure, unadorned integrity, a depth of conviction, and a quality of self-discipline beyond the average of the conventional, for in these costly, but rewarding, enterprises you can find the qualities necessary for recreating a democratic, humane society for making freedom permanent. This worth whatever it costs.

The Rural Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the rural development program to improve opportunities and incomes in depressed rural areas throughout the Nation received signal recognition recently when a delegation of top-level Canadian agriculture officials started a two-week tour of program areas in four States.

Thirty States are now going forward with this important program. Leaders in rural communities and trading centers participating report a host of agricultural, industrial, and educational activities which are raising incomes and helping families on small farms help themselves.

In particular, I wish to call attention to the fact that Dr. J. F. Booth, Director of Economics Division, Canada Department of Agriculture, who heads the Canadian group, and his three colleagues visiting U.S. Rural Development areas are here at the behest of the Special Senate Committee on Land Use of the Canadian Parliament. This is proof that the rural development program has gained the attention and interest of many people beyond the U.S. areas which are pioneering this work.

I ask unanimous consent that the following press releases on the Canadians' visit be included in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the press releases were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENIOR CANADIAN AGRICULTURE OFFICIALS TOUR U.S. RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM AREAS

The following is the text of a press release issued today by the Canada Department of Agriculture:

"A group of senior officials of the Canada Department of Agriculture have begun a 2-week tour of sections of the United States to examine and report on U.S. rural development programs.

"The tour stems from a recommendation in July of the Special Senate Committee on Land Use, which was concerned with problems of the low-income farmer in Canada.

"The group is headed by Dr. J. F. Booth, Director of Economics Division, Canada Department of Agriculture. He is accompanied by R. A. Stutt, specialist in land economics, who has been Technical Consultant to the Senate committee; A. E. Barrett, Assistant to the Director General Research; and S. F. Shields, Regional Director, Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration, Swift Current, Saskatchewan, who is in charge of resettlement work for that organization.

"The Canadian experts will fly from Washington, D.C., to Kentucky Wednesday, and then on to Wisconsin at the end of the week. They plan to be in Minnesota on September 23 and in Michigan on the 26th, returning to Ottawa, September 29.

"The group will view demonstration projects in these States, the basic aim of which is to help raise the income levels of operators of small farms. Officials of the United States Department of Agriculture are acting as guides to the Canadians and have cooperated fully in the development of the program. State college officials are arranging for transportation for the Canadian delegation to rural development projects."

The following 30 States are participating in the U.S. rural development program: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Puerto Rico is also participating.

CANADIAN OFFICIALS COMPLETE WASHINGTON PHASE OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT TOUR

A group of senior officials of the Canada Department of Agriculture left Washington today for a 2-week tour of U.S. rural development program areas, after conferences with Federal agency representatives working on the program.

The tour stems from a recommendation in July of a Special Senate Committee on Land Use of the Canadian Parliament, which was studying problems of low income farmers in Canada.

Dr. J. F. Booth, director of economics division, Canada Department of Agriculture, heads the group. He is accompanied by R. A. Stutt, specialist in land economics, who has been technical consultant to the Senate committee; A. E. Barrett, assistant to the director general research; and S. F. Shields, regional director, Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration, Swift Current, Saskatchewan, who is in charge of resettlement work for that organization.

In orientation meetings September 15 and 16 members of the Canadian delegation discussed with Federal officials the planning and operation of U.S. rural development programs and similar efforts to broaden opportunities in disadvantaged farming areas. Representatives of five Federal departments and the Small Business Administration were present at the meetings, of which Paul V. Kepner, deputy administrator, Federal Extension Service, was chairman.

Commenting on the tour of rural development areas, which begins today, Dr. Booth said that the group hopes to become acquainted with State and local officials working in the program, and to view techniques and methods being used to promote economic development in these areas.

"We in Canada want to benefit by your experience in the United States," he said, "and to draw on this experience in order to improve our own efforts in low income farm-

ing communities. We are very much impressed with scope and variety of services being provided through U.S. agencies."

Following is an itinerary of the delegation's visit: September 16 leave Washington, arrive in Lexington, Ky.; September 20 leave Lexington, arrive Madison, Wis.; September 23, leave Eau Claire, Wis., arrive St. Paul, Minn.; September 26, leave Duluth, Minn., arrive Marquette, Mich.; September 29, leave Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., for Ottawa.

The following 30 States and Puerto Rico are participating in the U.S. rural development program: Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

DAV Services in Georgia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRIS FAIRCLOTH BLITCH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of gratitude that I present an exceptional record of vital rehabilitation services freely extended to thousands of Georgia citizens. Those who have benefited directly or indirectly from these splendid humanitarian services, owe much to the source which made it possible.

DAV SETUP

Among the several congressionally chartered veteran organizations, which have State departments and local chapters in Georgia, is the Disabled American Veterans. The DAV is the only such organization composed exclusively of those Americans who have either been wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by reason of active service in the Armed Forces of the United States, or of some country allied with it, during time of war. Formed in 1920, under the leadership of Judge Robert S. Marx, DAV legislative activities have benefited every compensated disabled veteran very substantially. Its immediate past national commander is another judge, Judge David B. Williams, of Concord, Mass. Its present national commander is Bill H. Fribley, of Crestline, Kans., a member of the Kansas Legislature. Its national adjutant is John E. Feighner, of Cincinnati, Ohio. Its national legislative director is Elmer N. Freudenberger, its national director of claims, Cicero F. Hogan, and its national director of employment relations, John W. Burris—all located at its national service headquarters at 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Inasmuch as less than 10 percent of our country's war veterans are receiving monthly disability compensation payments for service-connected disabilities—some 2 million—the DAV can never aspire to become the largest of the several veteran organizations. Nevertheless, since shortly after its formation in 1920, the DAV national headquarters, located in Cincinnati, Ohio, has maintained the largest staff of any veteran organization of full-time trained national service officers, 138 of them, who are located in the 63 regional and 3 district offices of the U.S. Veterans' Administration, and in its central office in Washington, D.C. They have ready access to the official claim records of those claimants who have given them their powers of attorney. All of them being war-handicapped veterans themselves, these service officers are sympathetic and alert as to the problems of other less, well-informed claimants.

DAV SETUP IN GEORGIA

In Georgia the DAV maintains an office located in the VA regional office, 441-449 West Peachtree Street NE., Atlanta 8, Ga. The DAV staffs this office with two national service officers and two clerks. Mr. Roy E. Bevel is the national service officer in charge.

Each of the DAV chapters in Georgia has a service officer who volunteers his energy and time in making initial contacts with veterans or members of their families, assisting them in completing routine and initial steps for claims and forwarding same on to the national service officer in Atlanta for processing and followthrough.

The department commander is Mr. W. L. Jackson, Post Office Box 3047, Macon, Ga., and the department adjutant is Mr. Ralph E. White, 1310 Lakeview Drive, Macon, Ga. The immediate past department commander is Mr. Bill Todd, 121 Central Avenue SW., Atlanta 3, Ga., serving for 3 consecutive years.

In Georgia the VA maintains three hospitals and one domiciliary; one 300-bed general-medical hospital at Atlanta; one 1,329-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Augusta; one 421-bed general medical and tuberculosis hospital at Augusta; one 500-bed general medical at Dublin, and one 640-bed domiciliary at Thomasville, Ga. All of these beds are not filled by Georgia residents; many of them are veterans from almost every State in the Union who go or are sent to the Southeast because of climate conditions.

During the last fiscal year, the VA paid out $110,822,574 for its veterans program in Georgia, including $28,478,464 disability compensation to its 35,890 service-disabled veterans. These Federal expenditures in Georgia furnish substantial purchasing powers in all communities. Only about 8½ percent—3,033—are members of the 45 DAV chapters in Georgia.

SERVICES EXTENDED

This 8½ percent is strange, in view of the very outstanding record of personalized service activities and accomplishments of the DAV national service officers in behalf of Georgia veterans and dependents during the last 10 fiscal years, as revealed by the following statistics:

Claimants contacted (estimated)	73,943
Claims folders reviewed	61,619
Appearances before rating boards	32,149
Compensation increases obtained	2,303
Service connections obtained	586
Nonservice pensions	824
Death benefits obtained	133
Total monetary benefits obtained	$1,713,911.20

These above figures do not include the accomplishments of other national service officers on duty in the central office of the Veterans' Administration, handling appeals and reviews, or in its three district offices, handling death and insurance cases. Over the last 10 years they reported 83,611 claims handled in such district offices, including monetary benefits of $20,850,335.32, and in the central office, they handle 58,282 reviews and appeals, resulting in monetary benefits of $5,337,389.05. Proportionate additional benefits were thereby obtained for Georgia veterans, their dependents, and their survivors.

These figures fail properly to paint the picture of the extent and value of the individualized service and advice, consideration, counsel, and assistance extended to all of the claimants who have contacted DAV service officers in person, by telephone, and by letter.

Pertinent advice was furnished to all disabled veterans—only about 10 percent of whom were DAV members—their dependents, and others, in response to their varied claims for service connection, disability compensation, medical treatment, hospitalization, prosthetic appliances, vocational training, insurance, death compensation or pension, VA guaranty loans for homes, farms, and businesses, and so forth. Helpful advice was also given as to counseling and placement into suitable useful employment—to utilize their remaining abilities—civil service examinations, appointments, retentions, retirement benefits, and multifarious other problems.

PROSECUTION OF CLAIMS

Every claim presents different problems. Too few Americans fully realize that governmental benefits are not automatically awarded to disabled veterans—not given on a silver platter. Frequently, because of lack of official records, death, or disappearance of former buddies and associates, lapse of memory with the passage of time, lack of information and experience, proof of the legal service connection of a disability becomes extremely difficult—too many times impossible. A claims and rating board can obviously not grant favorable action merely based on the opinions, impressions, or conclusions of persons who submit notarized affidavits. Specific, detailed pertinent facts are essential.

The VA, which acts as judge and jury, cannot properly prosecute claims against itself. As the defendant, in effect, the U.S. Veterans' Administration must award the benefits provided under the

laws administered by it only under certain conditions.

A DAV national service officer can and does advise a claimant precisely why his claim may previously have been denied and then specifies what action for additional evidence is essential. The claimant must necessarily bear the burden of obtaining such fact-giving affidavit evidence. The experienced national service officer will, of course, advise him as to its possible improvement, before presenting same to the adjudication agency, in the light of all of the circumstances and facts, and of the pertinent laws, precedents, regulations and schedule of disability ratings. No DAV national service officer, I feel certain, ever uses his skills, except in behalf of worthy claimants, with justifiable claims.

The VA has denied more claims than it has allowed—because most claims are not properly prepared. It is very significant, as pointed out by the DAV acting national director of claims, Chester A. Cash, that a much higher percentage of those claims, which have been prepared and presented with the aid of a DAV national service officer, are eventually favorably acted upon, than is the case of those claimants who have not given their powers of attorney to any such special advocant.

Another fact not generally known is that under the overall review of claims inaugurated by the VA some 4 years ago, the disability compensation payments of about 37,200 veterans have been discontinued and reduced as to about 27,300 others at an aggregate loss to them of more than $28 million per year. About 1.7 percent of such discontinuances and reductions have probably occurred as to disabled veterans in Georgia, with a consequent loss of about $476,000 per year.

Most of these unfortunate claimants were not represented by the DAV or by any other veteran organization. Judging by the past, such unfavorable adjudications will occur as to an additional equal number or more during the next 3 years, before such review is completed. I urge every disabled veteran in Georgia to give his power of attorney to the national service officer of the DAV, or of some other veteran organization, or of the American Red Cross, just as a protective measure.

The average claimant who receives helpful advice probably does not realize the background of training and experience of a competent expert national service officer.

COST OF DAV SERVICE

Measured by the DAV's overall costs of about $12,197,600 during a 10-year period, one would find that it has expended about $3.50 for each claim folder reviewed, or about $8.80 for each rating board appearance, or again, about $22.70 for each favorable award obtained, or about $123 for each service connection obtained, or about $54 for each compensation increase obtained, and has obtained about $14.10 of direct monetary benefits for claimants for each dollar expended by the DAV for its national service officer setup. Moreover, such benefits will generally continue for many years.

Evidently, most claimants are not aware of the fact that the DAV receives no Government subsidy whatsoever. The DAV is enabled to maintain its nationwide staff of expert national service officers primarily because of income from membership dues collected by its local chapters and from the net income of its idento-tag—miniature automobile license tags—project, owned by the DAV and operated by its employees, most of whom are disabled veterans, their wives, or their widows, or other handicapped Americans—a rehabilitation project in thus furnishing them with useful employment. Incidentally, without checking as to whether they have previously sent in a donation, more than 1,400,000 owners of sets of lost keys have received them back from the DAV's idento-tag department, 4,756 of whom, during the last 8 years, were Georgia residents.

FINANCING DAV SERVICES

Every eligible veteran, by becoming a DAV member, and by explaining these factors to fellow citizens, can help the DAV to procure such much-needed public support as well as will enable it to maintain its invaluable nationwide service setup on a more adequate basis. So much more could be accomplished for distressed disabled veterans if the DAV could be enabled, financially, to maintain an expert service officer in every one of the 173 VA hospitals.

During the last 10 years the DAV has also relied on appropriations from its separately incorporated trustees, the DAV Service Foundation, aggregating $3,300,000, exclusively for salaries to its national service officers. Its reserves having been thus nearly exhausted, the DAV Service Foundation is therefore very much in need of the generous support of all service claimants—DAV members and other social-minded Americans—by direct donations, by designations in insurance policies, by benefits in wills, by assignments of stocks and bonds, and by establishing special types of trust funds.

DAV MEMEORIAL HONOR ROLL

A special type of memorial trust fund orignated about 3 years ago with concerned disabled veteran members of the DAV chapter in Butte, Mont., which established the first perpetual rehabilitation fund of $1,000 with the DAV Service Foundation. Recently it added another $100 thereto. Since then, every DAV unit in that State has established such a special memorial trust fund, ranging from $100 to $1,100, equivalent to about $5 per DAV member.

Each claimant who has received any such rehabilitation service can help to make it possible for the DAV to continue such excellent rehabilitation service in Georgia by sending in donations to the DAV Service Foundation, 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington 4, D.C. Every such serviced claimant who is eligible can and should also become a DAV member, preferably a life member, for which the total fee is $100 if born after January 1, 1922; $75 for those born between January 1, 1902 and 1922; and $50 for those born before January 1, 1902, or World War I veterans, payable in installments within 2 full fiscal year periods.

Every American can help to make our Government more representative by being a supporting member of at least one organization which reflects his interests and viewpoints—labor unions, trade associations, and various religious, fraternal, or civic associations. All of America's veterans ought to be members of one or more of the patriotic, service-giving veteran organizations—United Spanish War Veterans, the VFW, the American Legion, the AMVETS, and the DAV. All of America's disabled defenders who are receiving disability compensation have greatly benefited by their own official voice—the DAV.

United States Spends $7 Million on Guard Buildings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the January 28, 1959, issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal, indicating that armories and other National Guard buildings and installations constructed in the Commonwealth of Kentucky during the past 3 years totals over $7 million.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SPENDS $7 MILLION ON GUARD BUILDINGS

FRANKFORT, KY., January 27.—Kentucky has benefited from $7,185,287 in Federal funds for new armories and other National Guard buildings and installations in the past 3 years.

This was reported to Governor Chandler Tuesday by Maj. Gen. J. J. B. Williams, State adjutant general.

Williams told a cabinet meeting the amount was 25 times more than the State had received previously in a similar period.

WORTH $40 MILLION

The new buildings house much of the approximately $40 million worth of equipment which the Federal Government has turned over to the Kentucky National Guard. The equipment includes airplanes, tanks, cannon, jeeps, and firearms.

The $7,185,287, representing funds either received by or allocated to the State, finance major projects such as:

1. The Kentucky Air National Guard headquarters at Standiford Field, Louisville, a $5 million investment. It includes a hangar, base supply warehouse, vehicle-repair shop, crash- and fire-truck station, rocket-storage building, jet-fuel underground storage and dispensing system, and operations-and-training building. All have been completed except the operations-and-training building, which is under construction.

2. The Frankfort military center, a $1 million project. It includes an armory, centralized field maintenance shop, maintenance shop for artillery, airplanes, and helicopters; an office for the U.S. property officer for Kentucky, and a property warehouse.

The Federal Government only recently approved the spending of $270,000 for the warehouse.

INCLUDES BUECHEL

3. New armories at Livermore, Buechel, Frankfort, Olive Hill, Jackson, Carrollton, and Tompkinsville. All have been built or are under construction except at Tompkinsville. Construction of the Tompkinsville armory will begin as soon as weather permits.

All the building at Standiford Field was financed 100 percent by Federal funds. The Federal Government contributes 75 percent of the money for armories, the State 25 percent.

Williams said the Federal Government is providing Kentucky with 15 B–57 two-engine jet airplanes for tactical reconnaissance. Ten planes have already been received. The State still has a few F–86 Sabre jets, which will be placed in storage in another State.

Proposal of a Control Measure on Poisons and Pesticides

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great need in America to protect the various species of our wildlife, the National Trappers Association of America is to be commended on its very timely proposal of a control measure on poisons and pesticides. The text of this proposed legislation follows:

NATIONAL TRAPPERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

We of the National Trappers Association of America propose that—

"Be it enacted by the Congress of the United States of America, That it shall be unlawful for any person or persons to knowingly and willfully, place or cause to be placed, any poison, explosive, or chemical in such a manner as to be fatal or injurious to any bird, fish, or mammal within the boundaries of the United States of America except as hereinafter provided.

"EXCEPTIONS AND PROVISIONS MADE

"1. This act shall not prohibit killing of animals for humane reasons by gun or gas chamber.

"2. This act shall not prohibit use of firearms commonly fired from hand or shoulder.

"3. This act shall not prohibit use of chemicals that are proven to be selective for purposes of conservation by State Conservation agencies or agencies under jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Interior.

"4. This act shall permit use of pesticides only after a safe level of application has been established by authorized research.

"5. This act shall provide that pesticide containers be labeled by the manufacturer with recommendations for safe levels of application as effects all vertbrate animals as may be determined by research and including residual dangers.

"6. This act shall prohibit the sale or use of any chemical or poison known to be a progressive killer. For purposes of this act 'Progressive Killer' shall mean any substance which causes it's victim to be poison to any other bird, fish or mammal by internal consumption, contact or by breathing of fumes.

"7. This act shall provide that research shall be done by Federal and State conservation agencies and persons deemed qualified by such agencies. Cost of research shall be provided for by a tax on pesticides in amount deemed advisable by Congress. Payments made for research work shall not exceed those for similar services.

"8. False reports by any person engaged in such research shall be deemed a violation of this act.

"9. Any violation of this act shall be punishable by a fine of not to exceed $500 or 30 days in jail or both and not less than $25 for a first offense and an additional penalty of $25 for each subsequent conviction.

ALFRED L. COOK,
Chairman, Conservation Committee.
URBANA, IOWA.

Integrity in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, early in the 1st session of the 86th Congress I introduced a bill to protect integrity in governmental processes. Senator NEUBERGER, of Oregon, joined with me in sponsoring the measure.

The major purposes of the bill are four: First, to require all top officials in the legislative as well as the executive branch to make an annual report of their income, including gifts of substantial value; second, to require a detailed report of travel expenditures by congressional committees, including those incurred by staff, as well as by the members themselves, of a committee; third, to provide that any communication, oral or written, concerning a particular case made by a Member of Congress to an administrative agency be made part of the public record of that case; and, fourth, to establish a commission on legislative standards to study and make recommendations concerning the problems of legislative-executive relations in such matters as the proper representation of constituent interest and the prevention of improper influence.

I do not contend the bill is perfect, but it does represent, I believe, a constructive approach to certain problems which deeply involve the public interest. It is my hope, therefore, that next year the Rules Committee, to which the bill was referred, will hold hearings early in the session and that the Congress will take affirmative action in this area. In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to insert in the RECORD a sampling of comments on the bill I have received from political scientists and others actively concerned with the field of government.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PETER'S COLLEGE,
Jersey City, N.J., September 12, 1959.
Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I have received the copy of your bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch which you sent me, and thank you for your kindness. I fully agree with you that the requirement of publicity is the best way to deal with the problem of private pressure on public men, distasteful though it undoubtedly is in many ways. I also like your provision for a Commission on Legislative Standards. In general, I think that laws on this subject should confine their specific and rigid requirements to those points about which there can be little dispute. Further refinements are best left to a commission which can work out norms more precisely as it accumulates experience.

Sincerely yours,
FRANCIS P. CANAVAN, S.J.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION AND SOCIAL SERVICE,
New York, N.Y., September 24, 1959.
Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of the bill you are proposing for the promotion of confidence in the legislative and executive branches of Government. I find it especially significant because it attempts to strike at the roots of unjust, arbitrary government—graft and corruption. I am sure that opponents of the bill will argue that its enactment would make public service less desirable. Let me assure you that the vast majority of present employees and of prospective employees will readily accept the basic principles of the bill—the disclosures of gifts and fees—in the hope that it will eliminate the favored position of those few careerists who utilize their employment as means of gouging the public or enriching themselves at the expense of the public.

You have undertaken a most worthwhile endeavor and I wish you every success.

Sincerely,
MARTIN B. DWORKIS,
Professor of Public Administration.

PRINCETON, N.J., *September 16, 1959.*
Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senator from New Jersey,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I read with great interest the material you sent me recently pertaining to the promotion of public confidence in integrity of Congress and executive branch. I am sure you are to be congratulated upon the vital purpose and the skillful drafting of this bill which ought to receive the support of every good citizen.

In a rather perfunctory reading of this bill 4223 I noted, however, a few may be minor points which might possibly warrant consideration.

Article 1 of the bill refers to the listing of gifts received by an official or by him and his spouse jointly. * * * Would it not be advisable to insert a clause to the effect that a gift * * * given to the wife of an official on the strength of a social connection derived from the official position of her husband would come under the provisions of the bill? This might help to plug a hole of some possible significance.

Paragraph (e) contains an excellent provision concerning the recording of oral and written communications. This covers a wide ground and one certainly most difficult to supervise and to enforce. Here the following point comes to my mind. The bill refers to communications made to the agency or to an officer thereof but perhaps it does not make it quite clear enough that such communications may be made to the official in question not necessarily within the agency but outside of it, within the setting of social intercourse. I realize that the kind of communication made, for instance, at social gatherings is much harder to pin

down, but it should be made absolutely clear that it may be no less incorrect than telephone calls which reach an official at his desk. Though I admit that this kind of contact may be covered by the present version of the bill, a little specification on this point may do no harm.

Thank you for having given me the opportunity to see this fine piece of legislative work.

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. KANN.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 12, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I greatly appreciate receiving a copy of a bill introduced by you to "promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch."

I can think of no more important area in which you could concern yourself. As a former professor of political science, I was continually amazed and alarmed at the readiness with which young people who came into my classes expressed the attitude that politicians were either corrupt or corruptible. The saying most often expressed to me was, "If he isn't rotten when he goes in, he will be when he comes out." No one need tell you how devastating this attitude is in many respects.

The reestablishment of respect for persons in public office is consequently a matter of prime importance. It will take more than legislation, of which you are aware. Your bill, in my judgment sound in all respects, would certainly be most helpful.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN ANTHONY BROWN,
Assistant to the President for Development.

WOODROW WILSON SCHOOL OF
PUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS,
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY,
Princeton, N.J., September 13, 1958.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I have read with great interest and appreciation your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch." As the first, I believe, to recommend this approach to the problem (see my testimony before the Buchanan Committee on Lobbying in 1950), I naturally support the intent of your legislation.

But I am convinced that the greatest area of need is not in the disclosure of outside sources of income. The great need is for the public absorbtion of the fundamental costs of running our two political parties. If the heavy costs of campaigning could be reduced for the parties and for individual candidates, much of the pressure for special favors could be effectively countered. It is possible that the American Heritage Foundation campaign will answer some of the problems. My guess is that ultimately the Congress will have to appropriate sufficient money to sustain the basic operating expenses of our two national committees, and a fixed schedule of political TV; and will have to give the franking privilege for say two or three mailings a campaign to all legitimate candidates for national office. I wish that you and Senator CLARK could join in sponsoring bipartisan legislation to move ahead in this vital area of reform.

In the meantime, I am happy that you are planning to press for S. 4223 in the next session of Congress.

Very sincerely yours,

STEPHEN K. BAILEY,
Professor of Public Affairs.

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Charlottesville, September 19, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: It is with a great deal of pleasure that I answer your letter of September 15 with reference to your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch."

It is becoming increasingly difficult of late to attempt to inculcate in students the respect for their national officials that I deem most necessary if our Nation is to survive in this period of conflict between two divergent ideologies. The sources of this difficulty are numerous and diverse. There can be no question but that the combination of wars—hot and cold—that have faced our youngsters since their birth has had a deleterious effect on them. Boys and girls entering college today have never known a period when they could assess such ideas as the brotherhood of man, or the community of world interests. Yet this, I believe, is not the only, nor even the most significant, cause for the lack of citizen respect for our national officials. Our students today are shocked as more and more incidents of indiscretion are disclosed. The indiscretions fall with equal weight on the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government and are not limited to one or the other of the two major parties. For generations now, citizens have come to expect State governments and State officials to be slightly less than honorable. They wonder, for example, why a man will spend thousands of dollars to secure election to an office that pays a mere pittance in salary. The distressing thing is that now students have transferred this feeling to our National Government. We can hardly decry the lack of moral standards among our children when all about them they see their elders accepting what must be termed graft regardless of how we try to sweeten the word.

In conclusion, Senator, you have my fullest support for your bill. * * * I would hope, further, that your bill would be labeled "a bill to cause a rebirth in public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch." The confidence once was there; it is not there today.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK K. GIBSON,
Assistant Professor.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,
New York, N.Y., September 26, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you for sending me a copy of your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch," together with your remarks in its behalf. The bill, it seems to me, is directed at one of the genuine yet delicate problems of government in a democracy.

It seems to me of the greatest importance that every effort be made to dispel the corrosive and inaccurate public attitude toward politicians. The passage of a bill such as yours may well serve to contribute to this desirable objective. The whole Nation indubitably has a serious stake in such an improvement of the climate of opinion.

My personal feeling is that disclosure of information acts as a much more efficient deterrent to abuses than prohibition of certain activities with criminal penalties. We can rely here on the evidence of the operation of the Florida law on campaign contributions and expenditures. My correspondents in that State tell me that the requirements to publish full information is having a salutary effect upon the tone of politics there in a way seldom seen in other States where absolute limits on amounts of money which may be contributed or expended, and often totally unrealistic limits, are set by law.

Please let me know at any time if there is any way in which I can be of service to you.

With all good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

RHOTEN A. SMITH,
Professor of Politics.

SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY,
MAXWELL GRADUATE SCHOOL OF
CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Syracuse, N.Y., September 16, 1958.

DEAR MR. CASE: I have studied with great interest the text of your bill and the introductory statement. I have connected your initiative with Senator FULBRIGHT'S article that appeared in New York Times magazine on September 14, because both in a sense are related to the problem of fundamental values in our democratic society.

I fully support your initiative for I realize that there is an urgent need to strengthen the trust of the American people in their political leader. I see two main reasons for such measures as the one you propose. Firstly, we face a long-term emergency brought about by a triple revolution: the technological, the awakening of the underdeveloped countries, and the Communist. The United States is surrounded by a quickly changing world; thus we are bound to live in an era of permanent crisis. Secondly, a democracy can successfully survive the oft-repeated shock of crises only if its people rally round their leaders and trust them. The lesson of the French Fourth Republic should not escape our attention. Your measure will help in dissociating the word "politician" from its frequent use as an epithet, because it provides the citizen with the means of checking on the morality of his representatives to whom he has entrusted political power. It has a wider educational meaning because it promotes the ideal of public service and opposes it by implication to the image of a "smart" man.

I hope that the Congress will son pass your bill.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

W. W. KULSKI.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
Hamilton, N.Y., September 30, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I am grateful to you for sending me a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing your statement and the text of the bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch. It is as you say, of utmost importance that we do everything possible to insure that the public has the highest degree of confidence in its legislative and executive officials. This confidence, unfortunately, has been shaken at numerous times in the past. After each of these incidents it has taken a long period to restore full public confidence in our officials.

It seems to me that the bill which you have introduced although it may not prevent all incidents in the future, will go far to restoring public confidence and I hope it may be enacted. I also hope that it will not be weakened by any crippling amendments. It seems to me that each of the provisions that you have included, is important and unless all are enacted there will be serious holes

through which difficulties in the future may arise.

Very sincerely yours,

RODNEY L. MOTT.

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO,
Boulder, Colo., September 16, 1958.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you for your letter of September 10 in which you enclosed the statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD concerning your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch." I wish to congratulate you concerning the introduction of this bill and I sincerely hope that, at the next session of Congress, you and your colleagues will be able to get this or a very similar bill passed into law. You are of course, completely correct in assuming that such a law should be passed both for the purpose of helping to maintain public confidence in our Government and to help public officials maintain the most careful relations with private persons and groups. You may be assured that you have my heartiest support in this project, and I believe that almost all political scientists and other persons knowledgeable about and interested in Government will applaud and support your efforts. If I can be of any direct assistance to you in this matter, please call on me.

Sincerely yours,

CURTIS W. MARTIN,
Chairman,
Department of Political Science.

VASSAR COLLEGE,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Poughkeepsie, N.Y., November 19, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator From New Jersey,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: It was with great interest that I read your proposed bill designed to improve the public service. You are to be commended for trying to solve the difficult problem of maintaining a high ethical level among administrators and legislators.

The bill, as you point out, does cover a great deal of territory. I share your reluctance at the prospect of an invasion of privacy through the public disclosure of income and of dealings in securities, commodities, and real property. There is already considerable reluctance on the part of high calibre people to become involved in public service because of the risks of having their actions misinterpreted on their motives impugned. On balance, however, the public interest demands that the action of public officials be above suspicion, and publicity is probably the best way of assuring probity. Also, as you point out, legislators and administrators will find it easier to reject gifts if there is a policy of making such gifts a matter of public record.

The second aim of your bill—to make all communications to regulatory agencies a part of the public record of cases before them—is laudatory, but I wonder whether the aim can be achieved in this manner. Might not the effect of this provision be that persons who already have informal access to members or staffs of regulatory agencies may obtain even more of an advantage because they hardly need to communicate in any formal sense while less favored persons will be held strictly to the letter of the law requiring public disclosure of communications? In order to try to avoid this sort of thing, would you consider the inclusion of stiff penalties in the Administrative Procedure Act for violation of the communications provision?

As to your final point, I think that the establishment of a Commission on Legislative Standards is a fine idea.

Very sincerely yours,

LLOYD D. MUSOLF,
Associate Professor of Political Science.

ADEL, IOWA, *September 17, 1958.*

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you for the text of your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch" and your introductory statement.

I certainly have no suggestions for modification of the bill or of your plan to press for early consideration when Congress reconvenes.

My general reaction is favorable to the point of enthusiasm. My comments (which you invite) will therefore require restraint lest they become windy and tedious.

I think your proposal is execellent, and that the reasons you state are the right ones.

You say there are probably loopholes in your bill. Experience of course suggests that in new legislative approaches these do prove to exist. But what I've marveled at as I've read your bill is its thoroughness. This I applaud, and for the reason that you briefly but adequately state.

I agree with you that action is necessary, and think you are entirely right in holding that "it would be far more effective to turn the spotlight of publicity on all gifts and favors than to attempt to draw a line between those which are proper and improper."

Behind it all, of course, is the objective—the very important objective of dispelling "the cynical view of politics and public service." This prevalent cynical view I have long deplored. It may be less general, or at least less deep, than it used to be. But it still is prevalent and its effects are mischievous, could be dangerous.

A career in politics ought to be considered one of the highest—indeed probably the highest. For the task of the politician in our kind of society is to make the institutions of freedom work. Our greatest values are involved. Ethical standards in which the people have confidence are obviously vital.

And I conclude about where I started—with expression of the conviction that you are entirely right in relying on openness, upon public disclosure, as the most practical way of reducing public distrust and suspicion.

I should not want to predict early passage of your bill as it is. The scope is large, as you say. I consider that a great merit. It is an important service to look at the need as a whole and to face all the realities in considering therapeutic action.

Sincerely,

W. W. WAYMACK.

PACE COLLEGE,
New York, N.Y., September 16, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of September 10, inclosing information on your bill to promote public confidence in the Congress and the executive branch. I should like to take advantage of your invitation to comment on it and will do so in my capacity as associate professor of social sciences at Pace, where I give courses in government, public administration, economics, and international relations.

A reexamination of the conflict of interest principle and the substitution of a code of conduct for the guidance of public employees were two of the conclusions reached at a seminar conducted by a fellow political scientist, Stephen K. Bailey, at Princeton in 1956. It seems to me that your bill embodies these thoughts and fulfills a need in this area, particularly as regards the Congress. The executive branch, by order of the President, seems to have set up rules which help to solve the conflict of interest problem. Your bill providing for public disclosure would go a long way toward giving information upon which an informed electorate can render its decision.

So much for a general statement. To turn to the specific provisions of the bill, I am puzzled as to why January 1960, was selected as the termination date of your proposed Commission on Legislative Standards. Would the short period of time until that date, assuming the Commission is established in early 1959, be adequate enough to set it up, to study the conflict of interest problem, to hold meetings and to go over the mass of documents it would need? If the solution to the problem requires much time perhaps a permanent commission should be established, otherwise it may not accomplish its objectives.

Several other questions suggest themselves about the Commission on Legislative Standards. Could it subpena a Senator or or Member of the House with his personal records? The proposed bill says that it is to get any information it wants from any agency. Suppose that a security problem was involved and the agency refused information to the Commission on that ground, who would decide?

In my opinion your bill will go a long way toward upholding the principle of public disclosure as an aid to good government and it will abate the conflict of interest dilemma. I intend to follow the progress of S. 4223 and hope that it becomes enacted into law.

Sincerely,

JOHN C. SHERRY, Ph.D.,
Associate Professor, Social Sciences.
WALDWICK, N.J.

AMARILLO COLLEGE,
Amarillo, Tex., September 23, 1955.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you very much for your letter of September 10 covering to me the reprint of your comments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the "Promotion of Public Confidence in the Integrity of Congress and the Executive Branch."

I share with you the conviction that something along this line is greatly needed. Many a devoted public servant has been smeared by the altogether too prevalent assumption that all people who work for the Government of the United States are crooks. To be sure, an occasional public figure proves faithless, but in my considered judgment the integrity of Members of the Congress and administrators in the executive branch of the Government is on the average much higher than is that of people in most other walks of life.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. RAY,
President.

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *October 1, 1958.*

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I thank you for your letter of September 10, 1958, and the inclusion of a copy of your bill S. 4223. I gave the included document a close reading and concur in the opinion that it deserves the highest degree of public support, and that it should be reintroduced during the coming session of Congress.

I can see that the existence of such a law would make the occurrence of the unfortunate Adams-Goldfine incident impossible, or if that is too strong a statement, it would at least place the principals in an unequivocal position as to where they stand in regard to the law.

It could also have a salutary effect on the independent regulatory commissions. I have had the recent opportunity to be in close touch with experts in the field of mass communications research, and I can assure you, Senator CASE, that their attitude toward the

work of the Federal Communications Commission is a highly cynical one. The same attitude is duplicated within areas of the radio-television industry where executives express wishes for greater regularity in the proceedings of the FCC. The present situation renders the decisions of the FCC highly unpredictable.

I note with satisfaction that the provisions of your bill would cover legislators as well as other government officials and thus end the charges of a double standard in regards to legislators.

The establishment of a Commission of Legislative Standards for the purpose of supervision of such a law is again essential to render the proposed legislation effective.

The one criticism that I have to offer concerns the setting of an arbitrary $12,500 salary minimum to be covered by the provisions of such a law. While I do appreciate the importance of clear wording, I feel that $12,500 is a much too high minimum. In certain sensitive areas even secretaries can be very influential in securing access to highly placed officials in strategic moments. Mr. Goldfine certainly proved that he was highly aware of that fact. On the other hand, officials who receive remuneration above the minimum mentioned may be far removed from the places which affect the great issues of public policy. In view of this, the Commission on Legislative Standards could, perhaps, devise a list which would include or exclude officials along functional lines. I realize that the proposed Commission already has the authority to propose supplementary legislation, but the inclusion of the above idea in the original draft might improve the law from the point of view of administrative workability.

Sincerely,

GEORGE KLEIN,
Instructor,
Western Michigan University.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY,
Philadelphia, Pa., September 29, 1958.

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator From New Jersey, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Your proposed bill on the promotion of public confidence in integrity of Congress and the executive branch has been read carefully by me.

I approve this bill as a necessary step to safeguard the executive and legislative branch of our Government against itself—against the great pressures that have been asserted against them by all types of interest groups. This bill is a natural outgrowth of the regulation of lobbying and corrupt practices in election campaigns. It will go far to end the evil which big Government has brought with it. It will go far to restore confidence in our legislators and in governmental officials. It will protect these legislators and officials against their false friends. It will permit a greater concentration on progress aimed at the benefit of all segments of our Nation—rather than special groups.

It is a forward step.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. MCKENNA,
Assistant Professor of Economics.

CRARYVILLE, N.Y., *October 14, 1958.*

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Many thanks for honoring me with your letter of September 12 and for the copy of the bill (S. 4223) you have introduced together with your clearly worded explanatory remarks. A great many American citizens, I am certain, have wondered for some time why such safeguards for the public interest have not been enacted into law, and I am confident that if the voters, adequately informed, were given the opportunity to express their opinions in a referendum they would vote overwhelmingly their approval of your bill. Perhaps under the spur of what has transpired since Congress adjourned there will be a greater appreciation of what the spotlight of publicity can accomplish and you may succeed in getting your bill through the next session of Congress. That will be quite an accomplishment.

As I read the definiteness of section 2, "shall be made a part of the public record," and in section 3, "shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," I am wondering if in section 1(e) with the wording "under such reasonable regulations as he shall prescribe" there might be opened an opportunity for some Comptroller General to prescribe such regulations as to defeat the purpose of the entire section. Could the words quoted above be omitted to make the provision for public inspection as definite as provided in sections 2 and 3? In regard to section 4, of course, it would be impossible to foresee all the "problems of conflicts of interest" the study will reveal but I imagine you must be certain that one of them will be as you state so clearly "the difficult determination of the line between adequate representation of constituent interest and attempted influence."

As a resident of New Jersey at the time of your election to the Senate I took pride in supporting you and I have never regretted it. Many of my friends join me in admiring your intellectual honesty, courage, and thoughtful leadership.

With appreciation and best wishes.

Sincerely,

E. SCHUYLER PALMER.

WESTMINSTER COLLEGE,
New Wilmington, Pa.,
September 27, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: * * *. I was delighted to receive your note of September 12 and also the enclosure of your remarks explaining your bill designed to promote public confidence in integrity of Congress and the executive branch.

As you suggest, it is an extremely vexed and difficult question, certain aspects of which have operated as a kind of twilight zone free from all public scrutiny. I hope that idea can be reintroduced into the forthcoming session of the new Congress.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES P. EDWARDS,
Associate Professor of Political Science.

GLEN ROCK, N.J., *September 20, 1958.*

Senator CLIFFORD CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thanks for your letter of 10 September. I appreciate your sending me a copy of your remarks and proposed bill (S. 4223).

My first reaction would be to concentrate on the establishment of the Commission. Such a commission shall concentrate on study aspects as indicated in the proposed bill. Accordingly, I would recommend leaving details noted at the outset to developments and outcomes of studies pursued and conclusions reached by the Commission after 3 to 5 years of pure study and hearings.

In a word at this stage of the matter I would not advise concentrating on data requirements from Members of Congress. I am not saying that this should not be done but rather it should await a bit of Commission history.

Keep up the good work. I admire your many stands on principles rather than pure party.

Cordially,

EUGENE T. FERRARO, Ph. D.

NEW HAVEN, CONN.,
November 3, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I found your bill, "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch," enclosed in your letter of September 10, 1958, very interesting indeed. I share the goals of such proposals as yours, and in general, I admire the principles which have shaped the provisions of the bill. I agree in particular that public disclosure of gifts and income received by public officials will act as a brake on attempts to influence officials with money and goods. It also does much more credit to the honesty and public spirit of almost all Members of Congress and the executive branch than would an attempt to set specific bounds of propriety.

It would be unfortunate if the requirement of disclosure tended to limit legitimate informal contacts between the regulated and the officials and legislators who do the regulating. For instance, while the public interest should be the basis of decisions for Members and officials of the Federal Communications Commission, it is also important that they maintain close and friendly relations with the communications industries and especially with key figures in it. This is important both for the technical and business education of public officials and for the public education of businessmen. Increased understanding and knowledge of the real problems on both sides of the fence can have only beneficial results.

Thus, while fixing the monetary limits of propriety is undesirable, it is also undesirable to leave the effect of the provision so uncertain that officials might restrict useful informal contacts for fear of censure. This pitfall could be avoided by making it clear in the bill that the intent of the disclosure requirement is not to discourage the informal contacts necessary to the American legislative and administrative process, and that such contacts should be positively encouraged in many cases.

As for section 2, the principle of publicity for all communications regarding cases pending before Government agencies is an excellent one, with great deterrent potential. In theory, I suppose the principle could be extended to matters before Congress—but this seems both impractical and unlikely. The total effect of this provision is quite uncertain, although I am sure that it will force everyone involved at least to justify attempts to influence in terms of the public interest. What effect will it have on the patterns of action and influence of Members of Congress or of the President's staff in their informal relations with, for instance, regulatory commissions? Offhand, it seems likely that section 2 would strengthen the hand of agencies dealing wth attempts by presidential assistants or by Members of Congress to influence them. I hope section 2 will eliminate only those influences from Congress or the Office of the President which are clearly not in the public interest.

The establishment of a Commission on Legislative Standards is a good idea. Although I doubt that it is wise or practical in the long run to specify restrictive procedures in these matters, I am sure that it is useful to focus the attention of Congress and the public on the ramifications of this very ticklish problem.

Sincerely,

RUFUS P. BROWNING.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., September 15, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you for inviting me to comment on S. 4223. I wish

I could do so in some more substantive way than to simply add my hope that you are successful in the undertaking. That legislation of this type is needed, there can be no doubt. Of even greater importance, I am sure that you join me in condemning the circumstances that make it necessary.

I question just how realistic this action really is, but certainly the concerted effort which you mention and of which this is a part cannot help but have a salutary effect. Once a start is made the gaps which you mention may yield to pressure and close themselves.

I heartily commend your efforts and as heartily regret my own unhelpfulness. If it is convenient I would like to be kept informed of your progress.

Sincerely,

DONALD E. MCCLINTOCK,
Assistant Director, the Center for Programs in the Mass Media.

CENTRAL YMCA,
Harrisburg, Pa., September 15, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you for your letter of September 12 and the reprint of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I should like to give more detailed consideration to S. 4223, but at present I am unable to do so.

You may be assured that I do approve of the bill as you explained it while introducing it. Politicians have for some time in this country been held in rather low esteem, yet it would seem to me that after the clergy they should be held in the highest esteem. The enactment of your measure would go a long way toward restoring respect for those in the public service and respect for government in general.

Did not Senator NEUBERGER join you in sponsoring this measure?

I am afraid that there is little hope for passage of the bill, but I wish you all success.

Sincerely yours,

GIBSON GRAY.

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY,
Pasadena, Calif., September 23, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator from New Jersey,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: Thank you for sending your proposal to promote public confidence in high Government officials. I share your fears for invasion of privacy in the lives of Government officials, but nonetheless feel your bill would help meet the persistent and too often justified suspicion citizens have of their elected and appointed rulers.

I hope your bill has good sailing, but am most pessimistic about it, because it will surely be opposed by the very legislators and administrators who might get unfavorable publicity in consequence. Nevertheless, something of the sort must eventually be enacted—I hope at the same time the salaries of officials are raised to a level appropriate to the unparalleled responsibilities they bear.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. DAVIES,
Associate Professor of Political Science.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CASE: Thank you for the copy of your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch."

I have only one question. Does not the application of the provisions to persons compensated in excess of $12,500 per annum exclude the senior clerks of the major committees whose salaries are, according to my recollection, about $8,000 or $10,000? I would suggest that such sensitive personnel in the Congress be included under the provisions of the bill.

Sincerely,

ALFRED JUNZ,
Lecturer in Political Science, Hunter College, New York, N.Y.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS,
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Detroit, Mich., October 21, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD CASE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: It was most thoughtful of you to send to me the text of your bill S. 4223 and the supporting statement which you submitted with it.

It seems to me that the basic problem which is present here cannot only be described as a continuing one in American political life, but has been accentuated, even aggravated by at least three major developments of the past half century. Of course these in turn had their roots in internal developments within our society.

These seem to me to be (1) the changing character of the pattern of ownership—i.e., from direct personal or real property predominantly, to the phase of large stockholding with managerial control in turn to stock holding in some instances with much less or even scant direct control in the corporate directional sense. Patently this renders less clear the scope of impact of the traditional conflict of interest statute, (2) the great transformation of the public desire for service from their legislator from an occasional instance to the point where for some members this is their preferred sphere of activity. This trend as you are certainly aware has hit the area administration and the administrative official and possibly is a necessary development, designed to keep in adaptation a type of governmental operation, (3) the population increase and the complexities of modern life in themselves have deepened this sense of necessary reliance upon what Government may do at many levels. Lastly it is to be noted that as long as there are people looking for favors, there will be some who will succumb to bribery and will become manipulators, whatever their positions in life.

Your proposed solutions are worthy of deep consideration although I cannot presently say that they are necessarily better than others which may be advanced. It is my suggestion that you might well also for the more grievous aspects involving members of the Chambers of Congress and their personal involvers revert to the early use of the contempt process. Your attention is to be directed to the Randall-Whitney situation of 1795, and the Anderson-Williams (I believe it is Williams) situation of 1818, and the extensive debates thereon within the annals of Congress. This is familiar to me as a phase of a protracted study of congressional contempt now awaiting hoped for publication. Should I be able to clarify any of these points or to help you in any way in this matter be assured of my interest and willingness.

Most sincerely,

CHARLES W. SCHULL,
Professor.

NEW YORK, N.Y., *September 12, 1958.*

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: I greatly appreciate the tearsheet from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which provides the substance of your proposed bill to promote public confidence in the integrity of Members of Congress and of the Executive.

Like you, I am loath to violate the privacy of individuals, and that certainly includes Members of Congress. But recent events have made it quite clear that it is of considerable importance to establish criteria which will assist the public official in determining the proper boundary line between doing his duty to a constituent on the one hand and becoming so indebted to an individual that he becomes that individual's lobbyist in the Government. I think this is the objective to be sought in the proposed legislation; the objective is not to reveal dishonesty or misconduct. The run of public officials are certainly as honest as the rest of the community and probably more so.

On the whole, I think that your proposed bill will achieve that purpose although I am inclined to think that, in the first section, you are demanding more detail than is necessary—so much, in fact, that it may prove to become a rather serious reporting burden for the individual Congressman. I certainly wish you well in your efforts to secure some effective legislation of this type.

Yours very sincerely,

ARNOLD J. ZURCHER.

STETSON UNIVERSITY,
De Land, Fla., September 22, 1958.

Hon. CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I appreciate your letter of September 10. I am heartily in favor of your bill "to promote public confidence in the integrity of Congress and the executive branch." I can see no reason why the persons to whom this would apply should not file such statements. If such declarations had been made in the past, I feel sure it would have avoided considerable embarrassment and some bad mistakes.

At the same time, I have long felt it unfortunate that Members of Congress do not—according to what I hear—receive large enough salaries to enable them to live at the level that seems to be demanded without encountering some financial difficulties. Perhaps the point has been exaggerated, but I wonder if it is true that a number of good men refuse to run for the Senate or House of Representatives because of the inadequacy of the salary.

Respectfully yours,

GILBERT L. LYCAN.

Congressman Curtis' Remarks on Action on President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE CANNON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, much of the data included in the tabulations inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 10—pages 17475–6—and in the RECORD of September 11—pages 17622–3—by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is misleading, inaccurate, and carries connotations and inferences not borne out by the facts.

In the RECORD of the 10th, page 17475, he included what he termed "three sets of corrections for table I on appropria-

tions, a revised table II which compares like periods of time in the President's request with corresponding actions of the Congress, and lastly, a table III which includes $1,683,900,000 in spending increases not requested by the President and blithely skipped over by the other two tables."

"CORRECTION A IN TABLE I AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1959"

Its implications are grossly misleading. Table I on the back of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 8, to which he refers, is clearly labeled as covering the appropriation bills for the 1st session of the 86th Congress. The body of that table clearly segregates the 1959 fiscal supplemental bill from the 1960 supplemental and regular bills. In no wise does it purport to deal solely with fiscal 1960; it is a session table, not a fiscal year table. Yet, Mr. CURTIS, in his "correction A," directly infers otherwise because he gives to "correction A" the title "Amounts for other than the fiscal year 1960 included in table I." Congress operates on a session basis and entertains any and all budget requests from the President regardless of the fiscal year to which they pertain. Format of table is no different in substance from previous years.

But, more importantly, Mr. CURTIS uses erroneous figures in his "correction A." He shows the President's budget estimate for the Development Loan Fund under mutual security as $500 million and the amount agreed to by conferees as $590 million, with the result that Congress is shown to have increased the President's budget request by $90 million. This is so far from the truth as to be ridiculous. The President's budget estimate was $700 million for fiscal year 1960 and an additional $500 million for 1961. Congress refused to appropriate any of the $500 million for 1961—yet Mr. CURTIS says $590 million was appropriated. Furthermore, table I to which Mr. CURTIS refers could not have shown, and did not show, any amount having been agreed to by the conferees for the very simple reason that the bill had not even reached the conferees. In fact, it had not even passed the Senate on the date to which he refers. But he, nevertheless, lists $590 million as having been agreed to. The fact is, Congress finally appropriated $550 million against the President's total request of $1,200 million, of which he proposed $700 million for fiscal 1960.

"CORRECTION B IN TABLE I AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1959"

"Correction B" is entitled "Authorizations to expend from public debt receipts in appropriation bills that are not included in table I." Table I is an appropriations table and is so labeled and under the rulings of the House these authorizations to expend from debt receipts have been held not to be an appropriation and, therefore, traditionally have not been included in "appropriation" totals. But, if Mr. CURTIS insists on amending table I to include these—and I did the same thing in my extension of remarks of September 15, page A8236—then he ought to list all such items. But he did not. He failed to include the similar public debt authorization items carried in the District of Columbia appropriation bill. So his "correction B," like "correction A," also needs to be corrected.

"CORRECTION C IN TABLE I AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 1959"

This one he labels "Reported reductions in 1960 annual appropriation acts which will probably have to be restored in future sessions." This is a favorite charge of the opposition. Note use of the word "probably." The President said a similar thing in September 1957 right after Congress had cut his fiscal 1958 budget by approximately $5.7 billion. He indicated that much of the cut was phony and would have to be restored in deficiency bills in the next session. The truth is, as we conclusively documented on the floor when the first deficiency bill of the next session was brought in—February 25, 1958, page 2765, permanent RECORD—that less than 5 percent of the $5.7 billion cut had to be restored the next session and most of that was on mandatory items such as public assistance grants and veterans pension items not subject to precise determination in advance.

Mr. CURTIS now indulges in the same sort of thing. He has not the slightest idea whether any of those amounts which he lists in "correction C" will have to be restored and neither does anyone else. In any event, they are only nominal in amount.

"CORRECTED TABLE II" (NEW OBLIGATIONAL AUTHORITY PROVIDED OUTSIDE THE APPROPRIATION PROCESS)

In this table he seeks to "correct" table II appearing on the back page of the RECORD. But all he has done is to so confuse the situation by the use of inaccurate data that this "corrected table II" probably needs more extensive correction than any other. This "corrected table II" shows that the Congress increased the President's requests on "backdoor" bills by $606 million. That is so far from the truth as to be absolutely absurd.

The first thing he does is to show a $500 million increase by the Congress over the President's request in S. 57, the Housing Act of 1959. Then, he lists S. 2539, the second Housing Act of 1959, but he does not add the figures to arrive at the $606 million alleged increase. And he should not have added the figures on S. 57 in the totals, because the table in the RECORD which he seeks to correct clearly shows that both S. 57 and S. 2539 had been vetoed.

The third-try housing bill, S. 2654, carried no such increases as Mr. CURTIS lists in his table. In my remarks of September 15, page A8237, the correct situation is shown in the last entry on the "backdoor" table.

Incidentally, his most severe castigation was reserved for table II on the back of the RECORD. It is the fact that as of the date the table to which he addresses himself was prepared, for the bills shown it was literally correct in its comparisons of what the Congress had enacted as against what the President had requested. And it showed a reduction, as of that date, of $799 million. What it did not show, and evidently this is the one thing Mr. CURTIS really objected to although his remarks leave the impression the entire table was inaccurate, is that on the airport and housing bills the table did not compare the President's request and amounts made available for similar time periods. But, nevertheless, the table as presented was literally correct. It was not final for the session because the session was not then concluded.

"TABLE III" INSERTED BY MR. CURTIS (P. 17476, RECORD OF SEPTEMBER 10)

Mr. CURTIS identifies this table as one which "includes $1,683,900,000 in spending increases not requested by the President and blithely skipped over by the other two tables." In the first place, neither of the two tables in question, by their headings or otherwise, purported to represent the complete record of what had happened or what was happening to all of the President's budget proposals. Neither of those two tables purported in any way, shape, or form, to deal with budgetary revenue proposals, for example, and of course neither of them in any wise purported to deal with authorizations for appropriations which may or may not later materialize into actual requests. Congress frequently authorizes programs but does not supply the appropriation to carry them out.

For example, Mr. CURTIS lists one item, "All other authorizations for appropriations," showing an increase of $65,400,000 by Congress over the President's requests. He says this will "affect spending in 1960 and future years." How does he know? How does anyone know? Maybe the President will never ask for the money and even if he does, the Congress may well deny it.

Another item in this table is not accurate, or at least it is out of date. He lists an item from S. 57, the Housing Act of 1959, although as of the date of his remarks both that bill and the second housing bill had been vetoed and were in the process of being replaced, by a third housing bill containing lower amounts.

A third item on this table shows an increase of $36 million over the President's request relating to forest and public land highways. This is a duplicate entry because the action taken is already accounted for in table I on appropriations under the Commerce Department appropriation bill.

The insertion of this type of table is informative and useful to the Members and to the country, but not unless it is correct. This one is not correct in at least these three particulars.

REMARKS IN RECORD OF SEPTEMBER 11 (PP. 17622–17623)

In these remarks, Mr. CURTIS drags a number of red herrings across the scene. He confuses and confounds and makes mountains out of molehills.

For example, in the middle column, page 17622, he seems to impart some sinister motive to changes made in the headings of certain columns of the appropriation table appearing on the back of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He tries

to make a big point of the fact that columns formerly headed, for example, "Budget estimates" were changed to read "President's budget estimates." These changes were clarifying and to make a point of them is childish indeed. It can be taken as indicative of the shallowness of most of his arguments.

Furthermore, in these same remarks, in the right hand column of page 17622, he indicates that table II—the back door table—on the back of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was, subsequent to July 6, prepared by an employee of the House Space and Astronautics Committee whereas previously it had been prepared by others. The chairman of that House committee has since stated on the floor that the table was not being prepared by anyone employed by the House Space Committee. More inaccuracy, and indicative of the trivia used to discredit and confuse.

"ALL AGREE IKE'S BUDGET WAS CUT"

This is the heading of a Scripps-Howard news story appearing in the Washington Daily News of Thursday, September 17, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

They all agree, Republicans and Democrats of both House and Senate, that the 1st session of the 86th Congress cut the President's budget by $1,881,410,093.

This news story later refers to some controversy as to precisely how much was provided by the Congress outside the appropriations process—through "back door" bills. I undertook to show the true facts on new authority to obligate the Government provided in back door appropriation bills by inserting a table on page A8237, RECORD of September 15. So far as can be authoritatively determined, it is accurate and furthermore it is fair and honest in its comparisons with the President's requests. I am certain its authenticity can not be successfully challenged. It shows that, on a comparable basis, Congress in these back door bills did exceed the President's requests by some $231 million identified.

Mr. CURTIS—and he ought to enlist the aid of other colleagues of the House—would be performing a distinct public service if he would indulge less in obfuscation and devote his time to calling attention to the evils of back door spending which impairs effective congressional control of the purse strings. The left hand ought to know what the right hand is doing when it comes to handling the public funds. Mr. CURTIS could render valuable assistance in trying to stop this practice. But, all he has done here is to further confuse by disseminating inaccurate and misleading data.

MISLEADING BUDGETS

Incidentally, if Mr. CURTIS wants a lesson in obfuscation and budgetary legerdemain, or wants to complain about it, he should turn to the President's budget for fiscal 1956, submitted in January 1955. That was one of the most extraordinary documents ever submitted to the Congress. In black and white, it said that the Defense Department was going to cut its own budget by $1¾ billion. They did not specify where they were going to cut, but they said they were going to cut. It was only entered as a one-line item, "Unallocated reduction," which was to be allocated as the year proceeded. The truth is that they not only never did allocate it but they spent the $1¾ billion and $41 million besides. If there ever was a case of positive intent to mislead the people, there it was in the budget the President sent down to Congress in January 1955.

Another historic example: On the day the President submitted the fiscal 1958 budget in January 1957, the President's own Cabinet rebelled against it and demanded that Congress cut it. The Secretary of the Treasury himself came out and said it should be cut, hoped it would be cut, and he urged the Congress to cut it. Later in the session, the President sent a secret letter to every department and in substance told them that, regardless of what the budget said or regardless of what the Congress had provided, they were to cut their budgets back to the previous year's level as a minimum. At the same time, the departments were still defending the higher budget then pending before the Congress and every penny requested when many of them knew they were going to have to cut their appropriations once they were granted.

Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me concerning the activities of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As Chairman of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission, which was established in 1957 by Public Law 85–262, I recently distributed to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives a packet of materials and memorandums reporting, in brief survey, the activities of the Commission to date in connection with the commemoration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States.

The members of the Commission have approached the observance with a basic premise in mind—that there should be participation in the observance by all the people of our country, from all walks of life, of all ages, and that the observance should extend beyond our shores to the peoples of the world. Our effort was based upon the assumption that the people needed only to be reminded of the observance, and that they would undertake participation through their own initiative. We have followed this approach in all aspects of the undertaking—in cooperation with State sesquicentennial commissions, educational institutions, churches, the press, broadcasting media, the motion pictures, unions, and numerous clubs, societies, and associations.

At the outset, the staff of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission prepared a basic publication, a handbook, which spelled out in broad terms the objectives intended by the Congress, which offered a brief chronology of the life of Mr. Lincoln, reprinted some of the more famous quotations from his public statements and private communications, and presented specific suggestions for the participation of individuals and organizations throughout the Nation.

I am glad to say that there has been a groundswell of enthusiasm for the observance of Lincoln's birth. Newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations, churches, schools, union organizations, industries, and others have turned their attention to Mr. Lincoln and his life with such spontaneity and enthusiasm that one working closely with the Commission soon had the feeling that Abraham Lincoln walked again in this land.

The Commission itself, of course, has undertaken many specific programs. The Commission published a booklet, entitled "The Lincoln Ideals," and asked newspapers and broadcasters to offer this booklet without cost to readers, listeners, and viewers of Lincoln programs who would write to: Lincoln, Box 1959, Washington, D.C. Letters have come from every State in the Union, including the new States of Alaska and Hawaii, and whether by a wandering broadcast signal or by word of mouth the news reached people in many foreign lands, for the Commission has received requests in at least 30 different languages for "The Lincoln Ideals." Filling these orders alone has been a large task, and I am told that the Commission has printed and distributed over 150,000 of these booklets.

The Commission published also a smaller pamphlet under the title of "Abraham Lincoln Said." The press run on this piece has now reached 250,000. Over 100,000 have been given to visitors at the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, and 35,000 have been distributed on sightseeing buses here and elsewhere. Fourteen airlines, both domestic and overseas, are supplying this booklet to their passengers. Many State fairs cooperated also, exhibiting special Lincoln material and distributing the "Abraham Lincoln Said" pamphlet.

The Commission has distributed to newspapers throughout the Nation condensed quotations from Mr. Lincoln, under the title of "Lincoln Line-A-Days." These have been widely used, in some cases with line drawings illustrating the daily quotation.

The Commission has so far published four issues of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Intelligencer. The first issue was four pages, the second contained six, and the last two have required eight pages to report sesquicentennial activities even in brief fashion. The Intelligencer is mailed to news media, associations, schools, union and industrial organizations, scholars, collectors and people in Government.

One of the most gratifying developments has been the enthusiasm with which State commission and State historical societies have devoted themselves to the sesquicentennial observance. These State commissions are active in 25 States throughout the Nation, and all of them have reported to the national Commission their activities and the response of the people of their States—which has been reported in the Intelligencer.

The Commission has initiated a special school campaign in cooperation with the National Education Association, and the results of this program have been most gratifying.

I am sure that Members of Congress will never forget the joint session of Congress held last February 12, when Mr. Carl Sandburg, one of the Commission's honorary members, and Mr. Fredric March spoke in an historic and moving ceremony.

The U.S. Information Agency has been working on Lincoln Year projects since January, and has sent a great volume of material throughout the world—for the name of Lincoln is known, and held in respect, in every country in the world.

There are many indications of the interest in this commemorative program, and I shall mention a very simple one. As nearly everyone has noticed, a new Lincoln penny was minted this year. The Director of the Mint, Mr. William Brett, told me that by some presently unpredictable date in 1960, more of these coins will have been minted than any other coin in the history of the Nation.

It has not been a surprise to learn that the name "Lincoln" is still magic in our land, and that the principles and ideals for which he stood hold the interest of the people of the world.

Mr. Lincoln had many qualities which can well be recalled in these days. He believed in frugality. On February 21, 1856, Mr. Lincoln wrote to a Mr. George P. Floyd of Quincy, Ill., as follows:

"DEAR SIR: I have just received yours of the 16th, with check on Flagg and Savage for $25. You must think I am a high-priced man. You are too liberal with your money.

"Fifteen dollars is enough for the job. I send you a receipt for $15 and return to you a $10 bill.

"Yours truly,

"A. LINCOLN."

The Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, while understanding the value of the work of the Commission, have very properly limited appropriations for its work to the minimum they believed appropriate. I am glad to say that the Commission has respected the desire of the Congress that it be economical in its expenditures. The Commission returned to the Federal Treasury $3,735.87 of the 1958 appropriation of $37,500, and $32,520.73 of its 1959 appropriation of $350,000. I can assure the Senate that some additional amounts of the 1959 appropriation will be returned following certain fiscal adjustments in the Commission's program. The Commission's appropriation for 1960 was reduced to $145,000; it will exercise the same care in the expenditure of these funds, and will endeavor to return a part of this appropriation to the Treasury.

I would like to express my personal appreciation for the work of my colleagues on the Commission, those appointed by the President of the United States, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and by the President of the Senate, and for the excellent support given us by the 77 honorary members of the Commission. I insert at this point the names of all those who are serving now, and who have served as members of the Commission.

The Commission has extensive plans for additional projects in the concluding months of Lincoln Year. A full report of these and the preceding events in the observance will be contained in the Commission's final report to the Congress.

PRESENT MEMBERS OF THE LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The President of the United States, ex officio.
The President of the Senate, ex officio.
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, ex officio.
Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, U.S. Senate, Chairman.
Miss Bertha S. Adkins, Vice Chairman.
Hon. LEO E. ALLEN, Member of Congress.
Mr. Victor M. Birley.
Dr. Ralph J. Bunche.
Hon. FRANK CHELF, Member of Congress.
Hon. FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senate.
Hon. WINFIELD K. DENTON, Member of Congress.
Dr. John S. Dickey.
Hon. WILLIAM G. BRAY, Member of Congress.
Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, U.S. Senate.
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, U.S. Senate.
Mr. John B. Fisher.
Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr., Member of Congress.
Dr. R. Gerald McMurtry.
Dr. L. Quincy Mumford.
Hon. HOMER CAPEHART, U.S. Senate.
Rev. Paul C. Reinert.
Mr. Walter N. Rothschild.
Hon. William G. Stratton.
Dr. William T. Townsend.
Mr. Conrad L. Wirth.
Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senate.
Hon. EUGENE SILER, Member of Congress.
Hon. Sinclair Weeks.

FORMER MEMBERS OF THE LINCOLN SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

Hon. F. Jay Nimtz.
Hon. William E. Jenner.
Hon. John M. Robsion, Jr.
Mr. Jouett Ross Todd.

Congress Adjourns, Congressmen Migrate Homeward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, last month the Wall Street Journal carried an article by its able Washington correspondent, Mr. Paul Duke, entitled "Congress Off and Running—for Re-election, Business Meetings, Vacations, and Home."

I should like to introduce into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excerpt from this article.

The excerpt follows:

Representative JOHN BRADEMAS, one of 63 first-term Democrats who either ousted Republican incumbents or defeated GOP candidates in 1958, will scramble back to Indiana's Third District to begin a 3-month speaking schedule.

He is already scheduled to address a teachers' convention; school classes; a League of Women Voters meeting; an Odd Fellows convention; a YWCA conference; Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant groups; chambers of commerce, several Democratic rallies and dinners; and a group of Army enlistees doing missile work at South Bend.

In addition, the 32-year-old, one-time Rhodes scholar—a political science professor before going to Congress—plans to shake as many hands as possible at courthouse and street meetings with constituents.

Mr. BRADEMAS is thinking of setting up a mobile office in a Studebaker station wagon (Studebakers are made in South Bend, his hometown) for his tours across the four-county farm and factory district. And he is considering calling on his older political friends, Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; and KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; to join him in a television film conversation for showing at rallies.

A "liberal" Democrat, Mr. BRADEMAS hopes to smooth over relations with organized labor, which wholeheartily supported his election last fall but which differed with his stand on labor reform.

The Teamsters Union singled him out for criticism because he supported legislation stronger than labor leaders wanted, though not as strong as the bill that eventually passed.

"I don't think I've been hurt badly," declares Mr. BRADEMAS. "I made it clear from the outset I was for labor reform and made no bones about it. Anyway, I doubt that it'll be any issue in 1960."

Statement by Senator Wiley on His Activities During the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a review of highlights, including my own activities, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR WILEY'S RECORD IN THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

Upon adjournment of the Congress—as senior Senator of Wisconsin—I am taking this opportunity to review the highlights of legislative action during the session.

The résumé will include (1) measures which I sponsored, cosponsored, or supported; and (2) it will include efforts to oppose legislation which I felt against the best interests of Wisconsin and the Nation.

A brief review cannot, of course, touch upon all the issues raised in this session of Congress.

This effort, however, is to hit the high spots and provide a general idea of my overall record.

STRENGTHENING OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Nationally, the maintenance of a strong defense is still a real challenge before the American people.

The worldwide Communist conspiracy—pursuing its goals of world domination, and controlling about a billion people and vast volumes of natural and strategic resources—continues to be a real threat to our security. Consequently, it is vital that we support a strong U.S. defense—and strengthen efforts to create an ever-stronger free-world alliance—to act as a deterrent to aggression by the Communists.

During the session, I supported, for the most part, the administration's recommendations for expansion of our Army, Navy, and Air Force; procurement of modern aircraft, warships, missiles, and submarines; carrying forward our space exploration programs—with its significance, not only for scientific and military purposes, but also for progress in such fields as weather forecasting and control, communications, transportation, and other activities; extension of the draft; expanding our scientific research and development program; and other measures to provide us with protection in our battle for survival with the Communist world.

MAINTAINING A STRONG ECONOMY

Strengthening our economy, too, is a major challenge. Unless we remain strong and healthy economically, we will not be able to support the needed defenses, nor to meet

the competition by the Communists, in the economic, ideological, scientific, and other fields. Economic progress is needed, too, to further improve the standards of living for our people.

To promote economic activity, measures were enacted to improve and expand our airport construction program; expand the housing program; establish a Commission on Unemployment Problems, to deal with the various aspects of unemployment, which adversely affect the economy; clarify the conditions under which States can tax firms dealing with interstate commerce; and other measures.

During the session, also, a strong constructive effort was made to balance the Federal budget—so as not to increase the burden on the American taxpayer, as well as to keep inflationary pressures at a minimum.

CURBING ABUSES IN THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT FIELD

During its brief lifetime, the Select Committee on Improper Activities in the Labor or Management Field, probing into the field of labor and management, revealed strong evidence of abuses in the labor-management field.

The 86th Congress—courageously and constructively, I believe—enacted legislation designed to curb such abuses.

We recognize, of course, that new laws are only as effective as their enforcement. The task now is to put the new statute, Public Law 86-257, into effect as effectively and quickly as possible.

The purpose of the law is not to unnecessarily hamstring either the unions or management. Rather, the aim is to protect the rights of the workers, preserve the legitimate interests of both union and management, as well as to protect the interests of the public.

VETERANS LEGISLATION

Over the years, the Nation has designed a program of veterans benefits to meet the needs of patriots who have served in our country's armed forces.

In view of the sacrifices of our veterans, it is particularly important, I strongly feel, to maintain a fair system of benefits.

During the session of Congress, a wide variety of proposals were made for further modifying and/or improving such benefits.

However, the major piece of legislation enacted was: Public Law 86-211 to (a) increase non-service-connected pensions to veterans; (b) establish payments on a revised scale, perhaps on need; and (c) equalize pensions of World War II and the Korean war widows, with those of World War I.

The pending legislation relating to pensions, housing, medical care, and other veteran interests will be subject to further consideration next session.

PROTECTION OF CIVIL RIGHTS

As ranking Republican of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I am naturally deeply interested in assuring the protection of the constitutional rights of all our citizens—regardless of race, creed, or national origin. Having cosponsored legislation passed during the 85th Congress—the first major civil rights legislation enacted in 80 years—I again supported such efforts during this Congress. The best that could be obtained was the extension of the Civil Rights Commission, which is carrying on studies and investigations in this field. The purpose is ultimately to strengthen our laws so as to assure preservation of the precious privileges and rights of all our citizens under the Constitution.

COMPLETION OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

In 1954, the enactment of the Wiley-Dondero law authorized the United States to participate in deepening and modernizing the St. Lawrence Seaway. In June 1959 we witnessed the completion of that project. The seaway is now a reality.

During the 50-year effort to get legislative approval of the seaway, strong opposition was voiced by the Atlantic coast ports, the eastern railroads and about 200 other organizations. With the seaway completed, we who supported the project felt that the fight was finished.

Unfortunately, this now appears not to be true. During the 86th Congress, for example, the fight was renewed. How? During the enactment of a law to extend the Public Law 480 program for shipment of surplus farm commodities overseas, an effort was made to tack on an amendment which would have virtually killed off substantial proportion of such traffic through the seaway. The purpose of the amendment was to require that shipment of surplus farm commodities from the Midwest—for example, through Milwaukee, Green Bay, or other lake ports—would, instead, be required to come through gulf or Atlantic coast ports.

Fortunately, we were successful in defeating this ill-advised effort.

Despite this victory, however, the attack should serve to warn us that, in all likelihood, there will be successive efforts in the years ahead to cripple the seaway.

IMPROVING THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

The early completion of work to deepen and improve the Great Lakes connecting channels, too, is of high priority. As yet, these channels between the lakes west of Lake Erie will not handle deep draft vessels. According to schedule, the earliest date at which this work can be completed is 1962.

During this past session, as in previous sessions, it has required a fight to get approval of sufficient funds for deepening and improving these channels. Fortunately, we succeeded in getting approval of about $26.9 million for the fiscal year 1960. The job now is to get adequate funds in years ahead to enable the Corps of Engineers to finish the deepening and improving work by the target date of 1962.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

With the completion of the Seaway, a next major step is the further deepening and improving of our ports and harbors. During this session, it was possible to get approval of additional money for Federal participation in providing for expansion of our port facilities for handling increased volumes of traffic. The harbor projects include Bad River, Bayfield Harbor, Eau Galle River, Saxon Harbor, Two Rivers Harbor.

OPPOSING WATER STEAL BILL

During the past session of Congress, a new effort was made to enact legislation to authorize diversion of dangerously large volumes of water from Lake Michigan.

Although such action has been defeated—either by opposition in Congress or by the President's veto—in previous years, the proponents continue to attempt to push such ill-advised legislation through Congress.

Although the bill again passed the House of Representatives, it was possible—after a long and arduous debate in the Senate—to have the bill recommitted to the Foreign Relations Committee. The purpose of this move is to assure consideration of the international problems created by such legislation, since the diversion bill proposes to take water from the Great Lakes which serve as the common boundary between the United States and Canada.

We can expect that the supporters of this bill will be pushing it again in the next session of Congress.

GREAT LAKES BASIN COMPACT

As the Great Lakes States attempt to further develop their resources, it has been felt that the establishment of a Great Lakes Basin compact would help to speed the development and utilization of the industrial, commercial, cultural, residential and other resources of the area.

Fortunately, it was again possible to get the bill, S. 548, passed by the Senate. As last year, however, it was regrettably bottled up in the House of Representatives.

ICE AGE NATIONAL PARK FOR WISCONSIN

During this session, too, I introduced legislation to establish an ice age national park in Wisconsin. The purpose of this was to preserve the beauty of the unique topographical features of the 500-mile-long moraine area. The moraines include formations of rock, gravel, sand, hills, and valleys—sculptured by glacial action—and are of tremendous geological, scientific, biological and scenic significance. These moraines are unsurpassed anywhere in the United States. A study is being made upon the feasibility of establishing such a park by the Department of the Interior. Unfortunately, this has delayed action on the legislation for a considerable length of time. However, I shall again be urging that the Congress take action for the establishment of a moraine national park in Wisconsin during the next session.

OTHER LEGISLATION SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED BY SENATOR WILEY

Senate Resolution 19 would establish a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the U.S. Senate.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 7 extends best wishes of Congress to the American Dental Association. (Passed on February 9, 1959.)

Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 favors congressional recognition of the National Railroad Museum to be located at Green Bay, Wis.

Senate Joint Resolution 66 provides for the centennial celebration of the establishment of the land grant colleges and State universities and the establishment of the Department of Agriculture.

S. 11, to strengthen the Robinson-Patman Act provisions relating to the burden of rebutting prima facie cases of unlawful price discriminations.

S. 50, to provide for Hawaiian statehood; signed into law on March 18, 1959, and now Public Law 86-3.

S. 265, to establish a Commission on Country Life. The purpose of this bill would be to design long-range programs for brightening the outlook in agriculture.

S. 730 would establish a U.S. Foreign Service Academy to "sharpen up" our Foreign Service program.

S. 764, to establish a Richard E. Byrd Antarctic Commission to better protect U.S. rights in Antarctica.

S. 895, to provide a public defender for indegent defendants in U.S. courts.

S. 910, to authorize payments in lieu of taxes to local governments for Federal nontax-paying property.

S. 988, to establish uniform milk sanitation standards to protect the public health.

S. 1003, to compel production of documentary material in antitrust cases. A bill with similar objectives, S. 716, passed the Senate on July 29, 1959.

S. 1019 extends to Farmers Home Administration operating loan program to bona fide fur farmers.

S. 1123, to establish a National Wilderness Preservation System.

S. 1021, to provide for a fairer apportionment of funds to aid the States in wildlife restoration under the Pittman-Robertson Act.

S. 1289, to increase and extend special milk program for children; enacted as Public Law 86-163.

S. 1315, to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers. Passed Senate April 29, 1959. Referred to the House District of Columbia Committee.

S. 1365, for better disposal to certain welfare agencies of surplus property.

S. 1380, to establish the Patent Office as an independent agency.

S. 1383, to require competitive bidding on Armed Forces contracts.

S. 1395, to provide for an adequate supply of turkeys to consumers, to maintain an orderly marketing condition and to promote the consumption of turkeys.

S. 1459, to establish a Dairy Research Laboratory at Madison, Wis.—in the heart of dairyland.

S. 1885, to establish a Hoover-type commission on Federal taxation for a top-to-bottom overhaul of the system.

S. 2004, to eliminate termination date for non-quota immigrant visas for certain alien orphans.

S. 2080, to establish a National Economic Council for Security and Progress, which would plan and coordinate programs to meet the Communist challeng in the economic sphere.

S. 2123, to provide mandatory sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material.

S. 2188, to establish a Citizens Council for the Advocacy of Freedom, to counter the Communist's ideological offensive on a world-wide basis.

S. 2168. I strongly opposed this bill, aimed at substituting oleomargerine or margerine for butter in the rations of the U.S. Navy.

S. 2242, to make a study for feasible means of deicing the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway for the ultimate purpose of opening this great tradeway to year-around navigation.

S. 2315, to deny passports to supporters of the International Communist movement.

The More Things Seem To Change in the Cold War, the More They Remain the Same

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered to the national strategy seminar, National War College, July 22, 1959:

THE BASIC THEMES

(By Hon. WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota)

General Armstrong, gentlemen, Dr. Kramer's kind remarks recall the years I worked in China as a doctor. In 1930, when I spent 8 months in an area under the Chinese Communists, they were then a little band of supposedly domestic revolutionaries, so-called agrarian reformers, controlling only two mountainous counties. From that time to this I have been a salesman for one idea: that Communists act like Communists. Unfortunately, I have been an unsuccessful salesman, as has almost everybody else who has tried to sell this idea. People insist on believing that they will act like nationalists, that Communist governments operate in terms of national interests. Therefore, if we offer a Communist government in Moscow something that would satisfy the legitimate interests of the Russian people, as Russians, we hope the Communist government there will be influenced or attracted thereby. Or the same in China. It is not so.

A very important official in Washington once said to me that he wasn't too concerned about Red China because he was sure that the interests the Chinese Communists have as Chinese would lead them into conflict with the Soviet Union. I had to say, rather unwisely, I suppose, "This proves, sir, only that you don't know anything about communism." He didn't like it.

The Chinese Communists do not act like Chinese. They were borne Chinese; they speak Chinese; they look like Chinese; but they are not Chinese. They have rejected every value and principle of Chinese culture and thought.

Chinese Communists act like Communists. They are not Chinese patriots; they are part of a world revolution.

We also imagine that Communists act like capitalists. If we will offer them some trade and some profits then they will think in terms of what we consider to be their legitimate interests, their material profits, and we can do business with them. But they don't operate in terms of profits. They are not capitalists.

And they are not Democrats. They are not interested in the well-being and the wishes of the people in the sense that democratically minded people are.

And they are not Christians. We always appeal to them on the basis of Christian, humanitarian motivations. But they are not Christians; they are not humanitarians. This is not to say they are bad people; they are Communists. They are good people, according to Communist standards.

We insist on projecting our values into the minds of people who reject and denounce those values, people who say the values are bad, even when men live up to them: and then we are upset when they don't live by our values. Why do we expect it?

All this is an unintended prelude to what I want to talk about this morning. People say, what a changing world ours is almost from moment to moment. I heard the 8 o'clock news on my car radio this morning. There was speculation about what Mr. Khrushchev had said yesterday. Didn't this hint a basic change in Soviet policy? Always we talk about changes that supposedly are taking place.

Of course, there are great changes in weapons; there are changes in machines; there are changes in means of communication, transportation, gadgets. But have there been many changes in human beings? What is done with the new gadgets is determined by what human beings think and feel, what is in their minds; their vanities, their ambitions, their urges, their follies, their foibles. These remain pretty much the same. In the end it is the human heart, the human being, that is our big problem. Not the machine, but the men who control it.

Looking at our world situation today, sometimes I think that the more things seem to have changed, the more they remain the same.

I

The first thing that remains the same, I have already mentioned: There still is in the world a Communist conspiracy, operated, directed from the Kremlin in Moscow with substations here and there. It has not changed.

Its objective remains the same—world conquest.

It is also still true that we are its main target. Why? Because we are all that stands between it and world conquest. When they are apparently aiming at Quemoy, or at Lebanon, or at something like West Berlin, we are the real target.

When a football player grabs the ball and starts to run, it is a touchdown that he is after on every play. If he can't get a touchdown, at least he hopes he can get a first down, or a few yards. If, at Geneva, they can't get the world by tricking us, maybe they can get a first down by disintegrating the West; or at least they may be able to get West Berlin. And if they can't get that, maybe they can get three or four yards—a thinning out of our forces in West Berlin—an acceptance of East Germany. If not that, at least they can hold the ground they have. They know they can hold that because we have told them in advance that we are not going to try to take anything away from them.

We are like a team that would stand on its 40-yard line and say to the opposing team, "Now, if you try to go through us, we will hold. We will fight back to stop you. But don't worry, we want to have good relations with you; if one of your fellows should drop the ball, we assure you that we will not grab it and run to your goal line. We are just holding on our 40-yard line."

Nobody ever yet won a football game that way. We can't win this kind of a world contest by just being on the defensive. No wonder they want to have conferences. They can't lose. And they can win.

But why we should want to go, I don't know; because we can't win; we aren't trying to win. And we can lose.

If you let me take the offensive and try here, try there, without any fear of defeat or even of reprisal, because you have assured me ahead of time that you are never going to try to score on me, then on one of my probings sooner or later I will break through and win.

Our maximum is just to maintain the status quo. Please, Mr. Khrushchev, be nice enough to give some more assurances like the ones you made before, which you didn't keep. I don't know what will give greater value to a new promise than the old one had. But we almost plaintively plead with them to give us another settlement, to let us hold just what we got at the last settlement.

The status quo is our maximum; it is their minimum. They can't lose; we can't win.

Their objective remains the same. No one can show the slightest evidence of any change in it.

Furthermore, the objective must remain the same. It can't change. They can no more have communism without this fixed, unchanging objective of world conquest than you could have Judaism without the Ten Commandments, or Christianity without the Sermon on the Mount. This objective is the heart of communism as the Ten Commandments are the heart of Judaism. We want communism without communism.

Why must it remain the same? The Communists will explain that to you over and over again, as they did to me in south China 29 years ago when I had some of them as my patients; and again in 1937 and 1938 in north China, when I had another batch of them as patients, including Lin Piao, later the commander of the Fourth Field Army which killed a lot of our boys in Korea. They spent endless hours explaining this. They don't apologize about communism. They boast of it. This is what they believe. They think we are stupid not to see that it is bound to win.

This objective of world domination must remain the same because their great goal is peace, defined in their terms. In order to get peace, they have got to abolish private property, and the capitalistic system which is based on private property. They believe that as long as anyone has captialism, there will always be wars, because capitalism, based on the belief that individuals have a right to hold property as their own, develops selfishness in man, develops aggrandizing, acquisitive tendencies in man. Men try to get what doesn't belong to them. Then, of course, there are wars.

So they have to abolish the capitalistic system if there is to be peace. But they can't abolish the capitalistic system unless

first they conquer the world. That is why the objective of world conquest cannot change. And since we are all that stands between them and world conquest, we are the main target. If we can be confused or lulled into slumber, or divided or separated from our allies; if they can weaken us, they soon will have the rest of the world. Then they can destroy the capitalistic system and the institution of private property. Then they can take children away from their parents so that the parents won't have the opportunity to teach them that they have rights of their own—just because they are human beings.

Then they can brainwash the youth, as they call it; bring them up just as Pavlov brought up dogs, really. He demonstrated that by strict control of the environment of young dogs, he could condition them to make automatic, predictable, unvarying responses. The dogs didn't decide Yes or No according to their own individual wills. They always gave the same answer to the same stimulus.

You and I believe that man has the capacity to make moral judgments. He has a free will. He can say "Yes" or "No," according to what we call his conscience. Communists say we believe these things only because we have been taught them by our parents or our teachers or our religious leaders, by our Declaration of Independence, and so on. But it isn't really so; we would not imagine we have the capacity to make individual decisions as men if we had not been taught that. And if we are not taught a belief in private property as a right, then we won't have an acquisitive urge to get it.

Human beings trained and conditioned by them, without the crazy notion of individual rights that we have been taught, will be cooperative and will think in terms of the masses. Nobody will want anything for himself. And then, of course, policemen won't be needed. And a government will not be needed. And the state will wither away, and men will have the perfect society with peace.

We object that they can't go against human nature. They say they aren't trying to go against human nature; that there isn't any such thing as human nature. Human nature is what you make it. We make it acquisitive and selfish. They are going to make it selfless.

So it is to get peace, and no government at all, that they must first have an all-powerful government—in the Kremlin. It must be all-powerful now in order to conquer the world and get rid of capitalism and these false ideas from the past—and then abolish itself.

It all sounds so convincing. You sit and listen to them in their enthusiasm and sometimes you wonder whether after all we are right, or they.

Of course, this line appeals to the youth in all countries because it promises quick and final answers. Young people everywhere are idealistic, they care about poverty, disease, squalor. They want to improve conditions. They care about the needs of men. Communism offers such attractive solutions.

So, naturally, their first target ideologically in any country is the mind of youth. By the time they get around to uprisings of soldiers, laborers, or peasants, they already have it in the bag. They have already enlisted the youth and trained them long and hard in the Communist faith and methods, as you are, I hope, being trained here, but in a different philosophy.

We say there is a North Star in the world. You don't have to chart your course by it if you don't want to; but there is a North Star. They say that there isn't any North Star. There are no such things as right and wrong, good and evil.

We say you can go with the grain in the wood, or you can go against the grain. But it is better to find the natural grain and go with it. They say there isn't any natural grain; they can make man and the world what they want them to be.

Look around you, gentlemen. Superficially examined, you can find an awful lot in the world that appears to be on their side.

So the Communist objective remains the same. It has to remain the same.

Their strategy also remains the same. It too is fixed. It is permanent revolution.

They are at war, first of all, with their own people. There would be a better chance of our getting along with them, making real peace with them, if they would first make peace with their own people, both in Russia and in China. But permanent revolution is an inherent part of communism. It is a way of life.

The tactics also remain the same—complete fluidity. Everything depends on the situation. One approach to the rich, another to the poor. One to the majority, another to the minority. One to the white, another to the black or to some other race. One to the nativeborn, one to the immigrant. One to the rural fellow, one to the city dweller. This is not just duplicity, this is smart tactics.

When they are winning, they are hard, tough, relentless. At Dien Bien Phu, the French asked for a truce for 24 hours to evacuate the wounded. The Communists, of course, wouldn't give them a truce. Not because they are cruel, but because their objective is victory. They are not humanitarians.

When they are losing, they are soft smiling, seductive. When they were losing in Korea, they said, "Let's have a truce." truce is the military equivalent of the politisue tactically.

In the Chinese Communist catechism, which the youth are taught, there is a very illuminating sentence by Chou En-lai: "A truce is the military equivalent of the opliticaI tactic of coalition."

In politics, if you have enough votes to win, you don't ask for a coalition, you hold an election. But if you don't have enough votes you don't have an election as the way to get to power, you call for a coalition. For example, in Germany today, because they couldn't win an election, they urge a coalition of East and West Germany.

In politics, a coalition. In war, a truce. Not as a means of getting peace but as a means of getting victory. To them a truce is not a peace move; it is a military tactic.

If they haven't enough military strength to win, don't fight. Get around the table and maybe you can, by stalling, pretended negotiation, etc., get there what they couldn't win on the battlefield. When they couldn't win on the battlefield in Korea, they proposed a truce—not to end the struggle, which was our naive notion, but to win the struggle. End the fighting in Korea, where they couldn't win, to shift to Vietnam, where they could win. They really won in both places that way.

At the end of the war in China when Chiang Kai-shek had the upper hand, had the Communists surrounded in the Northwest, for the first time was in a position to defeat them, they said, "We want a truce; we want a truce." We listened to them and forced the Generalissimo into a cease-fire. Four times in one year, 1946, we induced him to order a cease-fire. We put an embargo on 30-caliber ammunition for the 30-caliber rifles we had supplied to his best troops. The morale of Chiang's armed forces and of the Chinese people was destroyed. You can't build any military force or a football team up to a morale peak ready for battle four times in one year, call the game off, and then be able to get the morale up again.

Soldiers and people both said, "Is communism an enemy or isn't it? If it is an enemy, let's fight it. If our leaders are going to have tea with them, then it must not be an enemy. Why die? Let's make terms."

Our American Ambassador to China was ostentatiously sent up to Yenan and hobnobbed with the Communists, putting both the enemy, and the Government of China, our ally, on an equal basis. Chiang Kai-shek was finished, of course, with his own people. They knew he could not make it if we were not really going to help him win. If we had treated the English, French, Italians, or Greeks after the war, the way we treated the Chinese, not one of them could have made it either.

We didn't give the Chinese proper aid to try to help them win. We tried to force them into a coalition with the Reds—because we didn't understand communism.

In Greece, the policy we followed was right. Mr. Truman deserves great credit for it. In 1947, he said, "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." Absolutely right.

We didn't go into Greece and say, "Listen, you ought to arrange a coalition with the Communists. You mustn't have a civil war. You mustn't have bloodshed. You must have a truce." Instead, we said, "We will help you only if you resist a coalition with the Communists and fight them instead." And we helped them build up their forces for that purpose.

Even so, we didn't make much headway until, 6 months later, we sent over General Van Fleet and authorized him to "advise and train at all levels." I fought, bled, and lost in efforts to get those same six words into the directive of our military mission in China in 1947. It never was done. On the contrary, our military mission in China was forbidden by us to advise and train the troops. They couldn't go within 50 miles of the battle lines. They couldn't go out with the forces in the field. They had to sit in Nanking and work out a logistic system on paper.

In Europe, we said, "We will help you only if you keep the Communists out of your government." In China, we said, "We will help you only if you take the Communists into your government."

In Europe, we said, "You must oppose the Communists." In China, we said, "You must appease the Communists."

In Europe, we said, "You must win the civil war." In China we said, "You must not win the civil war; you must have a coalition."

Our policy in Europe was right. It succeeded. Our policy in China was wrong. It failed, of course.

Why did we follow opposite policies on the opposite sides of the globe? Partly because somebody didn't discover that the planet no longer has four separate strategic areas; the Western Hemisphere, North Atlantic, Mediterranean, the Far East. The planet now is one strategic area. A major breakthrough in any one of the four will have disastrous repercussions on the others.

The first T, then, is truce, in any area where they are in trouble, in order to shift to some other area where they may be stronger.

The second T tactic is talk.

People say you never lose anything by talking. You don't? It was during 2 years of talk at Panmunjom that they got the H-bomb. It was during 2 years of talk on disarmament, our hopes lifted one day and dashed the next, all shadow boxing, that they got sputnik. Then they said, no more talks on disarmaments. The talks had served

their purpose. There have not been any serious talks since.

Trade is another. Lenin said, "You can always count on the cupidity of the capitalists." So whenever they get in a jam they offer some trade.

This is an old one. You remember that in 1933 the Communist regime in Russia was at almost its lowest ebb. They were in great trouble at home. Litvinov came here and said, "You have a depression. There is mass unemployment in the United States. Don't you want to put your people back to work? Why don't you recognize the Soviet Union, and have a vast expansion of trade?"

So we recognized them, for that and other reasons. Did our trade go up? No; it went down. We have never had as much trade with the Soviet Union a single year since 1933, when we recognized it, as we had had each of the 5 years before we recognized it. We had much better economic relations with them before we had official relations with them.

Because Communists are not capitalists. They don't trade for commercial reasons, to satisfy the needs of people, to improve their lot, to build better relations, to make a living in the process, and in the end to develop peace. Trade is a weapon for conquest, just like a bomb.

Mr. Mikoyan came over here in January. He obviously had a maximum objective. He hoped he could get some $2 billion worth of credit from the United States, so that they could use our money to buy our goods and machines, and then we would kid ourselves that we had sold them something.

I don't know whether he really thought he could get that. Probably not. But it couldn't do any harm to try. And if he didn't make any headway on that, at least he could make some headway at confusing us and softening us up.

To try to accomplish that, he used the next T—trust. He said, "Why don't you trust us? Why are you so suspicious?"

Most Americans are decent; they were caught in their consciences. They thought, "Well, it is kind of mean of us. Maybe we should trust them more."

Why didn't we insist that they first give us just one good reason to trust them?

I have a friend who was a great football player at Minnesota in the years when we had great football teams there. Three years ago this fall he said to me—this was when the Communists were in one of their periods of turning on the charm and the talk and the soft, smiling, seductive tactics, "Now they are allowing some Americans to come into Russia, they are raising the Iron Curtain. WALTER, you are just playing the same old tune I have heard you play for 20 years. Why don't you change the tune? We ought to give them the benefit of the doubt, believe the best of them, have faith in them, trust them."

I said to him, "How much is two times two?"

He said, "Four."

I said, "Why don't you change that answer? It is the same old tune you have been playing for 20 years. I am getting tired of that tune. Why don't we make it two times two is five, for a while?"

There are some things in arithmetic you can't argue about. And there are some things in communism you can't argue about.

I said to him, "Let's go out to the football game." The first game was coming up the succeeding Saturday—"I don't know much about football. You explain it to me. I think I can hear you say, 'Now, WALTER, keep your eye on the quarterback. He is the key man. Watch how skillfully he fakes a hand-off to the right—to confuse or mislead the other team, and then he will run or pass or something else to the left.'

"When you tell me that, I am going to say, 'How dirty can you be, imputing all those evil motives to that nice, clean-looking young Minnesota quarterback? You ought to believe the best of that boy. You ought to trust him. You ought to give him the benefit of the doubt. You are suggesting that he would trick that other team, that he would mislead them, deceive them. You ought to have faith in him."

I said, "You will say to me, 'WALTER, haven't you ever read the football manual? Don't you know that football is based on two things: power and deception? If you have enough power, you go through. If you don't have enough power, you use tricks. And that boy is the quarterback only because he is the very best man on the team at deceiving the other side.'

"When you make that speech to me, I will say to you, 'Haven't you ever read the Communist textbooks? Don't you know that communism is based on two things: power and deception?' " No, we haven't read. That is the trouble. We don't read. He thinks I ought to read the football manual, but he won't read the Communist manual. Just as a lot of people wouldn't read Hitler's manual. He wrote it all out—Mein Kampf—so everybody would be sure to know, but we wouldn't pay attention to his rule book; we insisted we could do business with him—on our terms.

Likewise, we insist that Communists are going to play by our rule book. No; they are going to play by their rule book; and their rules are power and deception.

Mikoyan is not their number two man because he is good at telling the truth. It is because he is good at deceiving the opponent. He is a smart quarterback, that is all.

If they haven't enough power to go through Turkey, they shoot a forward pass over Turkey to Nasser or Iraq. If they can't drive through Western Europe where we are standing firm, they try an end run across North Africa from Suez through Algeria to Morocco. If they can't get through Vietnam just now, they shoot a forward pass over Vietnam to Sukarno in Indonesia. He isn't sure he is the eligible receiver as yet, but the Commie pass is there for him to gather in if at any moment his confidence in us is shaken.

I hope you will forgive me for being so elementary. I work in a place now where I have to be elementary.

The only thing important in all this is that two times two is still four. We will never get anywhere with all the complicated speculation of commentators about supposed changes in Communist plans and purposes. All the little shades of offers and counteroffers at Berlin or Geneva or elsewhere don't make sense until we know by heart the rules by which the enemy plays.

This is not to condemn; this is just to recognize facts.

Mr. Mikoyan asked, "Why are you so negative? Why don't you take a more positive attitude?"

Some here said, "Well, he may be right; perhaps we shouldn't be so negative."

Why didn't we come back and say, "Who is it that is negative?" How many times have they used the veto at the United Nations? Eighty-seven times. How many times have we used it? Zero.

Then he said, "Well, what is the difference between our troops going into Budapest and your troops going into Lebanon?"

A lot of our people thought, "Well, he probably has got something there." No, he didn't have a thing there.

Why were our troops in Lebanon? Because nine countries within one 24-hour period said we had to come within 48 hours, and they included Greece, Turkey, Iran, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Tunisia, and Morocco—or the Middle East from Morocco to Pakistan would be gone.

We went into Lebanon at their request. Did anybody request the Russian Communists to come into Budapest?

Second, what happened while we were there? Not a Lebanese lost his life. Twenty-seven thousand Hungarians were killed by the Reds in Budapest in a week.

Third, are we still in Lebanon? No, we got out just as soon as our mission was accomplished. Have they gotten out of Budapest? No, indeed. Every Hungarian would give almost anything except his honor to get them out.

Yet this man had the gall—not the gall but the skill in deception—to get up and say with a straight face, "What is the difference between Lebanon and Hungary?" And some Americans were stricken in their consciences.

Then he said, "How would you feel"—and you hear this repeated again and again by American clergymen, professors, statesmen, Congressmen, etc.—"How would you feel if we Russians had bases in Canada and Mexico, the way you have bases all around us, encircling the Soviet bloc?"

We tend to say, "Well, by George, that is right. You can't really blame them for being scared."

But there isn't a shred of validity to that argument if you take a good look at it. Why do we have bases around them? Because the threatened countries asked us to build them. When did we build the bases? After the end of World War II, we had come home and scrapped all our oversea bases, scrapped everything, until the Reds started their moves in Greece and Turkey and started the Berlin blockade and took over Czechoslovakia. It was then that we had to rebuild bases at the request of those people, in order to defend them and us against Soviet expansionism. Our bases are the consequence, not the cause of Soviet actions.

Have you known any Mexicans or Canadians asking Russians to come over and build bases in Canada and Mexico to defend them against the United States? If we were imposing our will upon Canada and Mexico the way the Communists are upon Czechoslovakia, and now in Tibet, or wherever it may be, the Reds ought to be building bases in Mexico and Canada to defend those peoples against the United States. But we are not threatening or forcing our will on our neighbors.

And yet these same old Communist themes, hammered out over and over again, continue to chip away the resolve of the American people and their confidence in their own cause.

We are prisoners of our decencies. We are victims, if I may put it that way, of our codes of sportsmanship. If a man on our football team clips, even though the penalty makes us lose the game, we don't yell; he violated the rules. But Communists don't have our rules. It is not dirty on their part when they deceive; it is just madness on our own part when we refuse to recognize that Communists act like Communists.

Fire doesn't freeze like ice; fire burns like fire. Ice doesn't burn like fire; ice freezes like ice.

Communism doesn't act like nationalism, capitalism, democracy, Christianity, humanitarianism. It acts like communism.

Truce, talk, trade, trust—all in order to get time. Time—for them to work and to get us to relax.

We have always given them the time. Whenever and wherever we had them over a barrel and they asked for time, we gave it to them.

Change the game from football to boxing. About the eighth round you see one of the contenders suddenly get very affectionate

with his opponent. He just embraces him so lovingly.

Now, you don't have difficulty understanding a clinch. You know it doesn't mean that he has given up his desire to win the boxing match. You know that he is in trouble and his clinch is an effort to hang on, to get time until his head can clear, so that he can win, not so that he can lose.

Every time the Communists get into a little difficulty, they clinch. And we say, "Now they are changing; they have decided to give up communism and they are going to be democrats and we can do business with them."

But the more things seem to change, the more they remain the same.

II

What else besides the Communist conspiracy remains the same? The cold war; we have to resist the conspiracy.

Some people act as if the cold war is something that Mr. Acheson first or Mr. Dulles later thought up as a good policy for us to follow. I can assure you there isn't anybody in our country, or at least in the Congress, who likes the cold war. It is not a policy of choice; it is a policy of necessity.

What are the alternatives? One is surrender; do you want that? The other alternative is hot war. Do you want that? With those as the only alternatives, we have no choice except the cold war.

III

But we can't continue the cold war indefinitely. For one reason, it costs too much.

This noon at 12 o'clock we are going to vote—I hope we will adopt it—on the conference report on the mutual security bill. My committee has been working on that bill for more than 4 months, every day. There is almost $3.6 billion in it. Who wants to appropriate that for allies plus $40 billion for our own Armed Forces? No one. Yet if we don't spend more and more for our own defenses and those of other free countries, we invite insecurity—and disaster. But if we do spend more and more for arms and aid, and our currency continues to go down in value, we invite inflation—and disaster.

Either way, disaster. How would you vote?

This is why Mr. Khrushchev has said, "We will bury you." He thinks they are already far enough along so that possibility is in sight. I don't know. But I know there comes a point in a disease beyond which a patient can't be pulled back. Yet as a doctor I don't quit. I have seen many patients that looked hopeless, but we kept on working. Every once in a while a miracle can take place and we save them in spite of the odds. Sometimes the other side too makes mistakes that can save us.

Looked at superficially, they seem to have the edge today, with us in a box. We can't continue the cold war indefinitely. It costs too much and besides, we haven't enough patience; we get frustrated; we want quick answers. Some day we are likely to say "Yes" here or there, in order to get apparent relief from the tensions, and fall into their trap. We cannot escape the cold war.

IV

Another fact that remains unchanged is that we can't call the cold war off except on their terms; and their terms are surrender.

Mr. Roosevelt tried to call it off. He went to Teheran and made agreements; he went to Yalta and made agreements. Out of them came the division of Poland, and the division of Korea, giving the Communists North Korea and Manchuria. Many of our problems in the East and West today came out of those two conferences. We were trying to call the struggle off by giving them what would satisfy their national interests. But Communists don't operate in terms of national interests; they operate in terms of an international conspiracy.

Mr. Truman tried to call the cold war off. He went to Potsdam and there agreed to divide Germany and give them East Germany, in order to reassure them that they wouldn't have anything to fear on their west. The result is what we are wrestling with at Geneva now.

Mr. Eisenhower tried to call it off. He went to Geneva and tried his best to get a settlement. He succeeded in certain things.

No. 1: At that conference we didn't give away anything that did not belong to us; and that was a precedent.

No. 2: A lot of people in Europe thought that we were about to drop atomic bombs, that we were itching to start an atomic war. They had been fed that line. He convinced them that it was not so. People relaxed inside, our Allies and friends.

No. 3: The Communists didn't succeed in splitting the West, as they had hoped they might be able to do.

No. 4: He hit upon that inspired proposal of aerial inspections. "You come and take a look at us; we will give you our table of organization and let you see our armaments and fortifications if you will let us see yours."

I say this was inspired first because it was right and second, because it was smart. Whatever they answered, we were bound to win. If they said, "Yes," then we could inspect and photograph their installations, and learn a lot that we don't know. They would inspect and photograph ours and not learn anything that they don't know already.

If they said, "No," then it would be clear that they were the ones blocking peace, not we.

All these were gains. What was the loss? The big loss that outweighed the gains?

Mr. Eisenhower, in his eagerness to end the cold war convinced them (I think most of our own people demanded that he try to convince them) that they didn't need to be afraid of us—as if their aggressiveness and truculence are based on fear of us, rather than on Communist objectives. He assured them that they had nothing to fear from us; that we would never fight unless we were attacked. That is all they wanted to know.

Mr. Khrushchev went back from Geneva, called all his boys together and had one sentence for them: "We have nothing to fear from Eisenhower." Two weeks later he started operations in the Middle East, the armament of Egypt, and so on.

The mess in the Middle East came right out of Geneva. We went there to try to end the struggle; they went there to try to win the struggle to see how soft we were and where to make the next move with least danger to themselves. Yet some are today passionately urging further similar conferences with them.

We have lost every conference at the summit since the first one in 1918–19 when Woodrow Wilson tried it. Don't misunderstand me. A conference at the summit to finalize, to sign and seal, and to dramatize agreements already worked out can have great value. The conference at San Francisco in 1951, the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty, was such. But if it is a conference to negotiate in public, it is fantastic to put faith in such a procedure with such an adversary.

"Open covenants, openly arrived at," Mr. Wilson said. This was the big mistake that jeopardised the rest of his magnificent career.

Open covenants, yes. Once they are arrived at, they have to be submitted openly to legislatures and to world public opinion, for rejection or acceptance. But they can't be openly arrived at.

I will bet that when you were negotiating with a certain lady to try to persuade her to throw in her lot with you for life, it was not in public.

As soon as she agreed, you rushed back to the fraternity and shouted "Boy, she said yes." Open covenants, yes; but not openly arrived at.

Nothing really important is negotiated in public. The steelworkers today are not negotiating in public. Neither side could make a concession in public because its own people would tear it to pieces. But if they do the negotiating in private, each can make concessions. When they announce the agreement, there is a protest, but the quid pro quos are visible and it is accepted.

We go to the summit to try to get a bona fide settlement. They go there to try to appeal to our people over the heads of our governments, to divide and weaken our leaders by appealing to the hearts and desires of the people, their hopes and fears. There is no change in the fact that the Communists terms are surrender.

Of course, they don't demand surrender all at once. They are willing to to take it island by island, city by city, ally by ally, position by position, and principle by principle.

And they don't demand surrender under the name surrender. They know that would be too difficult. They are perfectly willing to take it under some other name. For example, disengagement is one of the popular names for surrender.

We disengaged ourselves in Korea, you remember. It would be too difficult to hold on to the tip of that peninsula. Avoid trouble; disengage, we were told. So we withdrew our forces and thereby invited the Communists to come in—as they did.

Then we woke up to the fact it wasn't just the tip of Korea that was at stake; it was Japan, the confidence of the people of Asia in us, and the confidence of the people of the world in the United Nations collective security system. We had to go back in, not to save that tip of Korea, but to save our position in the Pacific and the world.

The Communists were angry at our reversal. I don't blame them. We had pulled out and given them a green light to come in. Naturally it did not occur to them that we would give up something we were interested in keeping. Then after we had invited them in, we turned around and drove them out—which was the first time we had ever double crossed the Kremlin.

Another name for surrender—Mr. Lippmann uses this one almost every week—is a realistic readjustment. We aren't doing too well on the 40-yard line, so we should realistically readjust on our 30-yard line. Well, we may have to do it, but let's not kid ourselves that it is an advance. It is a retreat.

Another term is a new approach. This is an intriguing one. We must have a new approach. We must be more flexible. Just why do we need a new approach if we are right?

There are five things I have told my 3 daughters all the years. One is that the first word for a girl is "no." Whatever the proposal, "no." You can change it later from "no" to "yes" and no harm is done. But if you have first said "yes" sometimes you can't change it back to "no." So the first word is "no."

The Communists know that. They have won victory after victory with one word: "Nyet." But we seem to have lost that word. Almost we pursue them, urging them to be nice enough to let us make another concession.

We make a new approach. They say, "no." So we make another new approach. They say, "no." We make another concession, and say, "This is our last offer." They say, "no." Then after a few days or weeks, we will make still another offer. No wonder they are confident that by being adamant,

we will eventually whittle away our whole position—which equals surrender.

Why can't we also say "no," no matter how many times, until there is a real concession by them?

They say, "It is an abnormal situation to have your troops in Berlin." Why don't we reply, "Not as abnormal as for you to have your troops in Budapest."

They say, "We want Berlin to be a free city." Why not reply, "Gladly, when you agree to all Germany's being a free country."

They will also be glad to take our surrender under the name "peaceful coexistence." Peaceful coexistence is another fake move by their quarterback to give the impression that the world revolution has been called off. But note that they don't call it peace. They call it peaceful coexistence. That is smart. Peace means a settlement. Peaceful coexistence means: "Please, won't you be nice enough to let us Communists coexist peacefully as long as you are stronger, until we can become stronger?"

Then it will mean peaceful submission by us.

The Chinese have a saying that the only way you can get unity with a tiger is inside the tiger.

Fortunately, there are two other ways you can get peaceful coexistence with a tiger. One is to have him in a cage—containment. The other is to be strong enough to compel peaceful coexistence; which means you have got to have a chair to hold him off, and a whip to divert his attention, and a gun to shoot if necessary.

We can have peaceful coexistence with communism, if we are strong enough to compel peaceful coexistence—until it is weakened from within by its own inhumanities.

But the term "peaceful coexistence" to them doesn't mean coexistence by a genuine settlement. It means coexistence by our peaceful submission—achieved by them by the threat of force, if possible; or by the use of force, if necessary whenever they can become strong enough or we weak enough so that they think they can win.

Here is a book, "The Black Book on Red China," by Edward Hunter, the man who first organized our information about brainwashing in China. Hunter has a chapter on the "Code Language." A word means one think to us but another thing to them. They can make a foreign language, in effect, out of our words: people, masses, peace, aggression, liberal, reliable. You ought to get the book and go down through the list of terms.

Lenin is reported to have said that the first steps in preparing a people for takeover are to debase its vocabulary and to debauch its currency. These are the two means by which people communicate with each other: words and money. If you destroy the integrity, the honesty of both, there is no way people can communicate. How can you negotiate when they don't mean by good English words the same things we mean by those words? The Communist pros know what we mean by our words; we don't know what they mean. We are helpless, like a ship without a rudder.

Another example is the phrase, "relax tensions." They say we must relax tensions—meaning give up our opposition to their further expansion. No; we must never relax tensions, until the causes of the tensions are removed. We must maintain tensions against whatever oppresses human beings and is aimed at destruction of ourselves. The problem is how to maintain tensions against tyrants without burning up from tension within.

I was trained in medicine in the period when we didn't know much about typhoid fever except that the patient had a very high fever. It seemed a good idea to bring the fever down—relax the tension. A standard treatment, when the temperature got above a certain level, was to put the patients in ice cold water. It frequently killed the patient, but it brought the fever down.

Relaxing tensions is a code word for peaceful surrender.

Well, if the conspiracy remains the same; and the conflict remains the same; and we cannot continue the conflict—the cold war—indefinitely; and it still is true that we cannot call it off except on their terms, and their terms are surrender; what else remains the same?

V

It is still true that we have to win this struggle. And win the cold war is what we have never really tried to do.

Why haven't we tried to win the cold war? For two main reasons, I think. First, the fear that if we were to win the cold war, it might precipitate the hot war. If we push them back into a corner, they may cut loose with their bombs.

Now, that is a genuine hazard. But look at the alternative.

I wish more people in politics and newspaper writers and so on, had to study surgery. Surgeons have to make that kind of dangerous decision every day. A lady comes in with a malignant tumor in her breast. We tell the husband we shall have to remove the breast. He protests. "Doctor, it may take her life; it is mutilating. It is cruel, bloody. It is too dangerous."

We say, "The alternative is to do nothing, and that is more dangerous. She may die if we operate, she is certain to die if we don't operate."

Therefore, we follow the course which may lead, it is true, to a somewhat earlier death; but it more probably may prevent her death. To do nothing has greater risk, and no hope. To operate has less risk and some hope.

So, although it means taking the patient's life in our hands, we do not hesitate to choose the course of less risk and greater hope.

There is an inescapable risk in living on the same planet with this kind of a conspiracy, gentlemen. You can't drive your car back downtown through the traffic without risk. You can sit at home and perhaps live a little longer, but what kind of a life?

There is risk of hot war if we try to win the cold war, but there is also hope, both of freedom and of peace. And no other course gives hope.

A second reason why we haven't really tried to win is this: We have had a feeling that if we can just avoid a shooting war, we Americans will, of course, always win any other kind of war. This is not something we have thought out; it just flows from our typical American self-assurance.

We, of course, will always win any economic struggle. We haven't argued that, We just sort of know it in our bones. Are we so sure now?

We, of course, will win any educational struggle. Are we so sure? Last year in a big high school in my city of Minneapolis, there were 400 graduates and the top 5 honor students all came to this country from DP camps since the war. Are they smarter than our youngsters? No; they work harder; they appreciate their opportunity. We can win the educational struggle, if we work harder. But it isn't automatic.

We have taken for granted that we, of course, will always win any scientific struggle. Sputnik punctured that conceit.

If you are from out of town, you may not have heard the story that went around Washington after our Atlas satellite went up last Christmas with the President's voice coming back. The story was that as sputnik and our Atlas moved in their orbits, they ran across each other and Atlas said in English, "Good morning," and sputnik said in Russian, "Good morning."

They went around a few more days and they came across each other again. Atlas said in English, "How are you?" and Sputnik answered in Russian, "How are you?"

They went around a few more days before they came close again. This time Atlas said, "Now, nobody is listening any longer, let's both be natural and talk German."

There is no certainty that we will win, unless we work harder than they do. It isn't enough to outsit the Commies; we have to outwit them.

Another of these comforting assumptions is that we will, of course, win in any exchange of persons program. If we can just avoid a shooting war and have enough people go back and forth, editors, professors, businessmen, farmers, youth, Congressmen, the Russians and we will get to know and understand each other better. Our system is better and will rub off on them. Theirs is bad and won't rub off on us.

This is an attractive idea; but it isn't necessarily so. I am all for exchange of persons—if we understand it is a tough contest and are willing to make the effort necessary to win. We won't win automatically.

The first reason is because there cannot be a real exchange. Who goes over from our side? Anybody who wants to go. He may be the most ignorant and naive person in our country, may never have read any of their rule books, may be totally unequipped to deal with them. But he can go if he wants to. He is like a brave soldier going into battle—with no training.

Who comes over from their side? Any Russian who wants to? No; only those who are reliable, which means so thoroughly indoctrinated and tested that their bosses are sure they can trust them. And, further, they are skilled in presenting Communist ideas, trained in the dialectic—that is, agents.

Who goes over from our side? Farmers. Whom do they send over? Agents.

Who goes over from our side? Journalists—to get information. Who is sent from their side? Agents—to sell their ideas.

Who goes over from our side? Professors. Who comes over from their side? Agents.

From our side, Congressmen and Senators. Their side, agents.

From our side, clergymen. Their side, agents.

From our side, students. Their side, agents.

From our side, businessmen. From their side, agents.

Why are they now opening a chink in the Iron Curtain? The reasons are easy to see, I think. First, they don't need the curtain so much now. In the beginning, they didn't want to us to see how weak they were, because they assumed that if we saw how weak they were, we would move in on them, as they would move in on us if they saw we were weak. But now they don't need to keep things so concealed, because they are not weak; they are strong. They are glad to have us see that.

Besides, they may have waked up to the fact that the Iron Curtain was probably a historical mistake in the beginning. They don't need to have an Iron Curtain in order to maintain a dictatorship.

Hitler didn't have an Iron Curtain. Who were his best salesmen around the world? Goering? Goebbels? Not many believed them. His best advertisers were American tourists—especially those who boasted that they were hard-headed, practical business people. They didn't need to bother with ideas, or words. They could tell by what they saw.

What did they see? Streets clean, trains on time, no unemployment, no beggars, maternity benefits for the women, summer vacations at public expense, highest standards of living in Europe. What was wrong with that? A system with such fine results must be all

right. Don't look in the gas chambers over there. "We can do business with Hitler."

Who believes Khrushchev? Not very many. Some believed Mikoyan. Not so many believed Kozlov. But if our own Americans come back from Moscow and say, "We found the people of the Soviet Union very friendly and earnestly desiring peace," doesn't that prove we can get along with the Soviet Union? No. It merely proves that the people of the Soviet Union are very friendly and earnestly desire peace. It doesn't prove anything at all about the Soviet Government.

The people in every country are friendly. The people in every country want peace. But the people don't have anything to do with their government in a Communist state. That is the point.

We want to make it easy. If the Russian people are friendly, we conclude that, therefore, we can trust the Soviet Government. Or if the Soviet Government is evil and aggressive and we must resist it, then we seem to think we have to hate the Russian people, for some immature and nonvalid reason.

We will lose, not win, in this exchange of persons if the Americans who go over and see that the ordinary Russian people are friendly conclude that therefore we can relax and trust the Communist rulers.

We aren't so foolish in other walks of life. We don't say, "Put the rotten apples in with the good ones. There are only two rotten ones in the whole barrel. The good apples will prevail over the rotten apples."

We don't say, "It is too cruel to isolate and quarantine that TB case or that smallpox case. How can the patient get better if he isn't allowed to associate with healthy people? Put the diseased with the healthy. The healthy will prevail over the diseased."

No; it is the other way around. If you want to live, you had better keep persons with a vicious, contagious disease quarantined until cured or the disease has run its course.

In economics, we don't say, "Don't worry about that unsound currency; don't worry about the bad Communist economic system. Ours is sounder and it will prevail." It will? Almost the first and most elementary law of economics is that bad currency drives out good.

What goes on that these simple themes that they play over and over again still have such plausibility and appeal? Why do we still insist on believing what we want to believe; or that our honest words mean to them what they mean to us? We just won't do our homework.

VI

There is another fact I want to mention which still remains the same. It is still true that meeting them with firmness and strength, what I call the four P's—power in support of principles, pledges, and peoples—prevents aggression.

Six times in the years after the war they probed us, tested us; and we stood firm. The first three probes were in Azerbaijan, in Greece and Turkey, and the Berlin blockade. We and others stood firm, defied them—and worked hard. The Kremlin blustered—but backed off. No war.

The fourth was the NATO proposal. The Kremlin threatened that it represented Western war-mongering and would lead to war. We all went ahead and formed the alliance anyway in order to build greater strength and unity. The Soviets haven't moved a foot against any NATO country.

The fifth test came over the proposal to give Germany her independence, allow her to rearm, and bring her into Western European union. The Soviets screamed that this was a reconstruction of Hitlerism. (They are playing that record again now.) They warned that this would surely lead to war. To underline their threat, they unilaterally abrogated their treaties of nonaggression and friendship with England and France. Some people panicked, but the West kept its nerve.

You know, when they get tough, we generally do pretty well. It is when they smile that we get confused.

We all went ahead to give Germany her independence. She threw in her lot with the West, began to rearm. Did it lead to war? No. A few weeks later the Kremlin said, Let's sit down and have a nice, chummy conference about Austria.

We got the only diplomatic victory in Europe in all these years—the first time they have withdrawn troops—right after we had sttood firm when they were threatening war.

The next was in the Formosa Straits in 1954–55. We had been backing up in Asia for a decade, except for 1 year in Korea. The Chinese Reds shouted that nothing could prevent their taking Formosa. Finally, the President said one day in a press conference: "If they take Formosa, they will first have to run over the Seventh Fleet." Apparently they went out and took a look at the Seventh Fleet—and decided not to take Formosa. Instead, they went down almost immediately to the Bandoeng Conference and said, "We don't like bloodshed; we are men of peace. Let's all sign agreements based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence."

Confronted with strength on their west, no war; "Let's negotiate."

Strength at last on their east, no war; "Let's negotiate."

Why? They wanted to go south for the moment, where there wasn't any strength. They could come back to the east and west later—whenever we relaxed.

Here was the Middle East—a strategic prize second only to Western Europe. The bridge to Africa; the Suez Canal; oil. Besides, it was boiling with conflicts. England, Greece and Turkey quarreling over Cyprus; North Africa against France; and the Israel-Arab dispute. Where was there ever better fishing?

Logically, the first of the three probes they have made in the last year was in the Middle East. Some asked, "Why are our troops going to Lebanon? Why are you Congressmen always so interested in greasy oil for Wall Street millionaires?"

Now, we weren't interested in greasy oil for millionaires anywhere. We were interested in the fate of the United States, Europe, and the whole free world.

The fate of Europe was directly involved in the Middle East. And we are vitally interested in Europe's survival. We have put quite a bit of effort and money into it—two wars plus the Marshall plan.

In Western Europe is the largest body of highly skilled manpower in the world—275 million people as against our 175 million. Just as capable, and, all the countries together constituting the world's second best workshop. But they don't have adequate fuel. They don't have enough coal; and atomic energy is not yet economically or technically feasible. So, most of their fuel is oil.

Europe gets its oil from three main sources: The Middle East, Venezuela, and the United States. The largest amount comes from the Middle East which has two-thirds to three-fourths of the world's known reserves of oil. The Soviet Union doesn't need the oil, but if it can shut it off from the West—if it can break the pipelines or disrupt the oil fields of the Middle East, then Europe is dependent upon the other two sources.

What is the second largest? Venezuela. Is there any mystery about the preoccupation of world communism with Venezuela?

If they can knock that supply out also, then Europe will be dependent upon the third source, the United States. Again, we are the target. Bleed the United States—bleed her oil, bleed her money.

If these things should happen and Europe become dependent on us, and we don't furnish the oil, then Europe's wheels will grind to a halt; Europe's people won't have work to do; soon they won't have food to eat; there will be unrest and revolution. And the Soviet Union can get Europe—through Iraq and the Middle East. This is part of why we had to go into Lebanon. The Soviets threatened atomic missiles. We all stood firm and acted resolutely. No war.

Their second test in the last year was at Quemoy. People asked, "Are we going to go to war over Quemoy?" No. There never was a chance of that. The President made that assurance repeatedly. But the issue never was Quemoy.

We got into a war a hundred years ago, a terrible war, following the bombardment of an island that lies off the coast of South Carolina just about the same distance as Quemoy lies off the coast of China. But you wouldn't contend that we got into the Civil War over Fort Sumter. We got into the Civil War and fought 4 years over what kind of a country this was to be; or whether it was to be one country—an issue with which we had been struggling for almost a hundred years.

Fort Sumter was an incident, an occasion. It was not the cause. The same with Quemoy. The issue was not Quemoy, a pile of rocks. The issue was conquest by the use of force. Are disputes to be settled by lawless violence and aggression, or by civilized means?

The stake was not Quemoy; the stake was the whole Far East. The Communists were not trying to get just that island. We were not trying to save just that island. They were after—and they said it openly many times—Quemoy, Matsu, Formosa, and "expulsion of the United States from the Western Pacific." Our position in the Pacific was the real target.

If they could show the people of Korea, Japan, Taiwan, Philippines, Vietnam, Indonesia, India, Burma that the United States is what Mao has called it, a paper tiger, that it is an undependable ally, one that puts its tail between its legs and runs when threatened, then the Reds would soon have the Far East. That is what they were after. The stake was Asia, and our own security in the Pacific.

And the problem never was Quemoy. The problem was, and is, Red China. People ask, "What are we going to do about Quemoy?" Well, is that island hurting anybody? We'd better keep our eye on the ball and ask instead, "What are we going to do about Red China?" That is a problem, believe me. I hope we aren't going to do anything that will make it stronger, and a still bigger problem.

Some people suggest that maybe we can solve the problem by helping the Chinese Communists win. That was Mr. Atcheson's theory for a time—that the way to make the Communists fail was to help them win. So we should work for a coalition in China, recognize them, trade with them, etc.

Other people say, "Well, they are there; realism demands that we recognize them." Now we are fully aware that they are there; but that does not mean we should recognize them officially and thereby make them stronger. It isn't because we are hiding our heads in the sand or trying to deny their existence, as some charge, that we refuse to give them official recognition. Rather, it is because we are acutely aware of their existence—and we don't want to make them any stronger.

We have negotiated with them officially 87 times in the last 5 years—at Geneva and Warsaw—trying to get them to let out our prisoners of war, as they promised to do, and to agree to refrain from the use of force in the Formosan Straits. They have demanded every time "withdrawal of the United States from the Western Pacific." That is the price.

Give up Asia—which would mean the demoralization and disintegration of the free world.

There are gangsters in Chicago, but we don't say that therefore we ought to bring the gangsters into the FBI, because how can the FBI plan its campaigns against the gangsters if it doesn't have the gangsters in the FBI to help it plan its campaign against the gangsters?

That is supposed to be realism. Of all courses, the most unrealistic is to build up one's enemies.

Then there is the universality argument. Some say, "Bring them into the United Nations, because all existing governments should be in it." Again, they won't read. The United Nations was never intended to be a universal organization. The language of the charter is plain and clear.

At San Francisco, the founders of the United Nations debated and rejected the concept of making it a universal organization. It is supposed to be an organization of peace-loving nations against gangsters, not a league with the gangsters. The charter says, "membership shall be open to other peace-loving nations which will accept the obligations of the charter." What is the first of the obligations? "To refrain from the use or threat of force in international disputes." Read it.

If you want to change the United Nations and make it a league with the gangsters, then amend the charter. But don't nullify it and make a mockery of it and its principles and commitments. Millions of people want the United Nations to be an instrument for freedom, and justice, and peace in the world. Don't drag it down to the level of the lawless; bring them in only if they are willing to come up to its level.

People said Mr. Dulles was just stubborn, capricious, arbitrary in keeping the Chinese Communists out. No, the United States is not keeping them out. They are keeping themselves out. They refuse to qualify. All they have to do to get in is to meet the entrance requirements by renouncing in a dependable way the use or threat of force against their neighbors.

A youth comes to a university and says, "I want in."

The registrar says, "What are your qualifications?"

"I went through the eighth grade."

"Sorry, you can't get in unless you have a high school diploma."

"I can't? It says 'university.' That means universal. That means everybody is entitled to be in. Besides, I have a gun. You let me in or I will shoot."

If the Chinese Reds want in, just let them qualify by giving up their aggressive expansionism. They will be admitted at the next session which begins in 6 weeks. But, of course, they can't give up conquest by the use or threat of force until they give up communism.

It is easy to see why the Communists want in. It will give them prestige, influence, power. That is why all Communists everywhere work day in and day out for Red China's admission. They know that would give them the ball game. We ought to know it too. If the strong accept them, can the weak continue to resist them? The Communists know, and so do the other peoples of the Far East, that once Red China is admitted, it won't have to fight for the rest of Asia.

Someone always objects, "But Russia is in the U.N. What's the difference?" The difference is that Russia got in at the beginning while pretending to be peace-loving and democratic and willing to fulfill international obligations. Red China does not even pretend.

It is bad enough to have made such a mistake when most people didn't know. What excuse is there for making it again when everyone does know?

The question is asked, "Well, if we are not going to admit Red China, why not kick out the Soviet Union?" It is a good question, but a useless one. It is not possible to kick out the Soviet Union. Under the Charter it can veto its own expulsion.

Someone will say, "But how can we influence the Chinese Communists if we don't have them in the United Nations?"

Well, how can we influence them if we do have them in? We have had the Soviet Union in from the beginning. Can you show me one instance where we have had success in changing its policies?

This is the argument of the lady who thinks that the way to reform a brute is to marry him. It never works, but some are always trying it. Why doesn't it work? Because once she has married him she has lost her bargaining power. Why in the world should he reform after he's already got her?

Likewise, Red China wants in without changing her ways so that she can have all the advantages of being in, plus all the advantages of being out. In both places she will be working against it. Here again, we didn't see what Communists were really after.

President Roosevelt had what he called the grand design. It was described in articles in the Saturday Evening Post or Colliers, written by Forest Davis and Ernest Lindley, in 1943 and 1944, OK'd by Mr. Roosevelt personally. The grand design was to make concessions here and there as necessary to get the Soviet Union to join in forming a world organization for peace.

In the last speech he ever made, he said that he didn't like the concessions he had made at Yalta regarding Poland, but he thought they were necessary and justified if we got the Soviet Union to come along—the assumption being that if they came in, the rotten apples would be cured by association with the good apples. I don't say this in criticism of him. We were all part of that same pattern of thought—or all who hadn't learned about Communists the hard way. We hadn't learned their basic themes.

We were too naive to realize, too decent even to suspect, that if they came into the United Nations, it would be for exactly opposite reasons from the reasons that motivated us.

We thought that everybody that joined would come in, of course, in order to use the organization as a means of resolving disputes. The Communists joined in order to be in a position to make sure that the organization did not succeed in resolving disputes.

Why? The answer is simple. They have a world organization of their own—the Communist Party. It has organized, efficient, disciplined units in every country of the world. They intend to win for their world organization. What could be more advantageous than to have a seat in the rival world organization—the United Nations—where, perfectly legally under the Charter, they can keep it crippled, emasculated, ineffective—while their world organization goes to town? They joined the United Nations to make sure it doesn't work. Naturally they have vetoed every key decision that was in the direction of real peace. It is all plain to anyone who will look.

The third probe this year was at Berlin—still going on. Remember that cool firmness and strength have not yet led to war. Weakness, softness, indecision, vacillation, have led to war four times this century. The way to prevent aggression should be clear to all.

VII

Another fact that unfortunately remains unchanged is that we have developed no adequate defense against this enemy. Why? Because we haven't yet quite accepted the fact that this is a different kind of enemy from any we have faced previously.

We have West Point to train men for land warfare. We have Annapolis to train men for naval warfare. We have added Colorado Springs to train men for air warfare. But now we have an enemy who doesn't limit himself to these ways of fighting—he wages total warfare. For that we have no academy—except, perhaps, this Seminar. No academy working to understand and systematize our knowledge of, and to train men and populations to fight total warfare—military, economic, political, educational, cultural, social, propaganda, deception, subversion—and a dozen more. We have no organization, no agency that is concentrating on just this—specializing in it.

There are recognized rules for traditional warfare. But this is a different kind of warfare—with quite different rules. We haven't learned them; in fact, haven't formulated them, as Clausewitz and others formulated the rules of traditional warfare.

We are like Braddock and his Red Coats when they came over to this country to fight the Indians. He insisted on fighting Indians according to the rules of warfare in Europe that had come down from the Knights of the Round Table. Opposing armies wore different colored uniforms so each would know which were the proper targets to shoot at. They lined up in proper order according to the codes of chivalry. Braddock insisted on fighting the American Indians according to European positional warfare—the only kind he knew. You know what happened to him. He lost.

Fortunately, he had along with him a man named George Washington, who knew something about the Indians. His scouts didn't hesitate to be so mean and unorthodox as to get down behind the bushes and fight Indian warfare. They saved the day.

We haven't any organized unit responsible for doing on a comprehensive scale or official basis, the work that is necessary to develop a science for fighting this different kind of warfare. And we don't have a body of disciplined men, either governmental or civilian, trained in total warfare as the Communists' cadres have been trained for years in how to create riots, how to organize subversion, how to break down communications, how to paralyze the will and the industry and the government of other nations.

Our Foreign Service is magnificent for the old kind of diplomacy, trained to observe, to analyze, to report, to interpret and to transmit. But now our Ambassadors are called upon to manage in some countries a $200 million foreign aid business every year. How many executives does our whole country have that are qualified to conduct such complicated operations? How many such executives are in our Foreign Service? Who is being trained to carry on the kind of total war we are in the midst of now?

VIII

We not only have no adequate defense; we have developed no adequate offense. We have not thought out and systematized the science of taking the initiative for our total cause. Not just with our arms, but with our ideas, the values and the virtues of our system which have given dignity to human beings and better living standards than any other ever has. How many can sell that system with contagious enthusiasm, or even explain it?

We haven't let loose in our world the dynamic forces of freedom in our day, as our

forefathers did in theirs causing peoples everywhere to look toward the "American dream" with stars in their eyes.

In short, we haven't got a strategy for victory. We have only a strategy for holding what we have. Can we hope to win just by holding? No, we must have a strategy of victory.

You remember what our national anthem says? "Blest with victory and peace."

The first condition is victory. It has been demonstrated again and again that it is possible to get victory and still not get peace.

But is is not possible to get a peace that will last without victory. We haven't developed a strategy of victory for this kind of war. We haven't mobilized and released in the world the truly revolutionary forces of freedom.

Well, what are we to do? First, wake up. The Communist target is not just land. The target is man—the mind of man, the whole of man.

Second, we have to study our enemy far more thoroughly. It is so elementary to say that we must know our enemy that, again, I apologize. But it is the big essential.

Some of us have introduced a bill to set up a Freedom Commission to study this whole matter—as the Atomic Energy Commission concentrates on atomic energy and the Space Committee on astronautics. It would have authority also to set up a Freedom Academy so that, somewhere in our Government, there would be an organized group of people working day and night like men in a monastery, to master this new warfare.

Third, we must know ourselves; beef up our weak spots, and concentrate on our strengths. It is by development of our own strong points that we can win victory.

It is the same old fundamentals: Know our enemy; and know ourselves.

The Commission would develop the science of total warfare, it would arrange to train specialists in it, both governmental personnel and selected civilians—journalists, professors, scientists, executives, Reserve officers just like yourselves. It would train them to be professionals in these basic Communist themes, so that our people can't be fooled.

Fourth, we must not let the Communists win any more victories. They are in trouble today—in Berlin, in the Soviet Union itself, in Red China. Keep them in trouble.

Naturally, they want to liquidate West Berlin—for at least three big reasons. One, it stands there as a showcase of freedom. Who will believe their propaganda for communism when in West Berlin people are living so well, and across the street in Communist Berlin are living in misery?

Two, West Berlin is an escape hatch from slavery to freedom. Three million people since the war have come through that escape hatch—from East to West. Two thousand every week. Two to five hundred a day—right now. Naturally, the Reds would like to close that. Especially would they like to have us help them close the door and turn the key in the lock of the jail which is Eastern Europe.

Three, they are afraid of East Germany. They are not so afraid of attack by West Germany; they know it cannot start a war. But they have 22 divisions tied up in East Germany just to hold down the East Germans.

Doubtless they would like to move into Iran—there is good fishing in the Middle East right now, and their radio attacks the Government of Iran every day. But they hesitate to start too big operations in Iran, or anywhere else, just now because East Germany and the satellites might blow up.

And yet we seem to be trying to liquidate the West Berlin situation. I don't know why. They are in far greater trouble there than we are. Let's keep them in trouble, unless and until they are willing to make real and solid concessions.

They are in trouble in Russia, especially among the youth. They wouldn't be reorganizing the educational system that has brought them world leadership in science if they did not have some real difficulties there. Universities that produce scientists—men who ask questions—produce also revolutionaries. But I haven't time to discuss that here.

They are in trouble in China. You hear people say, "Look at the power of the Chinese Communists. They can put 600 million people into communes. Now, they do have a powerful police state, but such a use of their power is not a sign of strength; it is evidence of terrible weakness. Do you know any country where the people enthusiastically support their government and the government has to lock them up every night? And doesn't dare let them to out to work in the fields by day except under armed guards like convicts on a road gang? This is a sign of incredible weakness; it reveals the mass opposition of the people.

The Communists are in trouble at home. Stand firm against any steps or concessions or deals that will help them out of their trouble.

IX

There is still one more fact that remains unchanged—the most encouraging. The urge of man to be free has not been crushed or washed out. It is stirring mightily once more in the world. Not so much among those of us who are still free, but among those who have been deprived of their liberty. And the Communists are afraid, most of all, of that yearning of man for freedom.

At the United Nations where I served as one of our delegates 2 years ago and dealt with the Communists daily, I became convinced:

1. That they are not afraid of attack by us. They know we won't start a war; and despite their threats, they are not going to start one—yet.

2. They are afraid of the people behind the Iron Curtain. Hungary really shook them. I think they believe that they have got to win the whole world, including the United States, within the next few years; or the forces of freedom at work within their own countries and the satellites will weaken them so that they will lose the whole world, including the Soviet Union, within the next few years. Therefore, they are men in a hurry.

3. Before they dare start action against the outside world, they must first break the will-to-resist at home. The people they are afraid of are the 900 millions behind the Curtain, among whom the urge to be free and to live in dignity is moving mightily again.

4. How can they break the will-to-resist behind the Iron Curtain? There is only one way: to confuse and beguile and soften us up; and get us to abandon those millions to their fate.

Their efforts are designed to break the will-to-resist of the captives by trying to weaken our will. If they can get us, under the slogan of relaxing tensions, to accept what Khrushchev calls "the historic changes"; that is, to accept the enslavement of the peoples of Eastern Europe—then that may bring the beginning of the end of the opposition of those peoples.

How long can the people there resist the tyrants if the West accepts those tyrants and appears willing to abandon their victims?

Gentlemen, the strongest weapon we have is not our atomic bomb. And our best ally is not England or any other country; it is 900 million human beings behind the Iron Curtain. They are the most dependable ally, the most strategically located, the one the Communists know they cannot fool, the one the Communists are concerned about most of all.

The test to which you and I ought to subject any proposal made by anybody is just this: If we were to follow the proposed course, would it strengthen the oppressors? Or the oppressed?

Would it give the dictators more influence, power, prestige, respectability, acceptance? Or would it weaken them?

Conversely, if we were to follow the proposed course, would it strengthen or weaken the will-to-resist of the people, their hopes, their morale, their determination to hang on and to bleed the despots by millions of pinpricks, until they can be weakened and pulled down from within?

Does America stand with the oppressors? Or with the oppressed?

Do we believe we can get lasting peace by deals with tyrants at the expense of their victims? Or do we stand with peoples against tyrants?

All this means: Do we believe in ourselves? Do we have as much faith in our faith as they have in theirs?

Steadfast firmness and strength in support of the right, of freedom, and of our own historic principles is not a sterile policy. It is an extraordinarily productive policy. Don't abandon it, especially right now when it is getting results.

The key is power. But not just power.

It is power in support of principles.

It is power in support of pledges, honorable commitments—so that freemen everywhere will know that we won't let them down, we will not break our word.

And it is power in support of peoples, as against tyrants.

It is time for freedom to be on the march. Toynbee has said, "When the frontier between two civilizations stands still, time operates on the barbarians' side." Why? Because they have the will to win. They are tough. They are willing to work.

Too many of us are saying to Khrushchev, "Please let the frontier stand still. It's too bad what you have done to those whom you have already beaten down; but if you will just let us alone, let us enjoy our comforts, what you did to them will be all right with us." This is the way of suicide.

But if, instead, our people will take the trouble to study the Communists and study ourselves and really work at our faith the way they work at theirs, I haven't the slightest doubt as to the outcome.

A Permanent Fair for the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks, the following study prepared by Vladimir N. Pregelj, Economics Division, Library of Congress, on the contribution a permanent fair in the Nation's Capital would make to our foreign policy:

A PERMANENT FAIR FOR WASHINGTON

The importance of a fair as a means of communication between peoples, their cultures and achievements has become more recognized in distinction from that of a fair as a mere place for the exhibition and international exchange of goods. Showing what we are has taken precedence over showing what we can sell, and the favorable consequences of this change have already

begun to be noticed. Even trade fairs, designed primarily to foster international commerce, have become ties of better understanding among the nations.

In the wake of the success registered by the recent great international fairs and exhibitions in Brussels, Moscow, and New York, and the positive impact they had upon the rapprochement among the nations of the world, the United States is again bidding for the privilege of playing host to the most important of international exhibitions—the World's Fair.

But a world's fair is an event which despite its global scope, is not of a permanent nature or even regular recurrence. It is a unique demonstration of human achievements and solidarity; it is here today and gone tomorrow. Surely, the need for better understanding and closer ties between the peoples of the globe is less ephemeral than the opportunities afforded the satisfaction of this need by world fairs. Today, more than ever, cooperative efforts, feeble as they may be, of the nations of the world, especially the free world, need to be of a more enduring nature. International neighborliness has been kindled by the recent exhibitions. In order to keep the fire burning and to further mutual understanding among nations through better knowledge of each other, institutions with a certain degree of permanency ought to be established to provide a suitable forum for international cultural and commercial intercourse.

Washington, the Capital of the United States, is preparing to play host to the next world's fair in 1964. What would be more logical and natural than to use the world's fair as the anchoring post for a continuous chain of international and national expositions and cultural events, to continue its spirit by establishing a tradition in international communication, and thus provide further use for the facilities which it will develop? But even without the stimulus of a world's fair, Washington is the logical site to start a new tradition in international understanding.

Washington is the Capital of a nation born to freedom and human dignity. Its streets and parks are replete with monuments to these priceless values; its official buildings are shrines of democracy in action. In its great halls laws are made by the people and for the people and justice ruled by law is dispensed. Washington is the symbol of human dignity. What better city would be found to be the home of a new tradition whose common denominator is humanity and its progress?

Washington is the embodiment of the United States, its history, its present, its hopes for the future. To many a foreigner Washington is the United States. Its cosmopolitanism, its clean-cut face, its striving—the hallmarks of the American people—are all crystallized in Washington, the All-American city.

Washington is also the focal point of the free world, its unofficial capital upon which are the eyes of the entire world. It is the node to which lead all the roads of the free world and it is the best point of contact and rapprochement between the two parts of the divided world.

Washington as a symbol is, then, the logical site for a permanent international fair. Washington is also a natural choice from a practical viewpoint. It is easily accessible by all means of transportation—public and private; it is conveniently located for foreign visitors who would also want to see other great cities in the East. Within its own limits or in its immediate vicinity it can offer suitable grounds for the construction of permanent fair facilities. It is also fully capable of providing needed facilities for the millions of visitors who would attend it. On the latter point, Washington has the advantage of being able to secure cooperation of neighboring Baltimore and other nearby cities. There is no doubt that the Capital can handle a permanent fair.

In this effort, it can be decisively supported by appropriate legislation. The International Cultural Exchange and Trade Participation Act of 1956 has with great foresight and initiative empowered the President to provide for the participation of the United States in international events of cultural and commercial nature held abroad. The success of the President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations in making the American way of life and the American achievement in all fields of human endeavor better known to the rest of the world and thereby helping dispel misconceptions about this country and build international understanding and good will, hardly needs further elaboration. Yet the act appears to be deficient insofar as it envisages the President's cultural and commercial program only as a one-way street and limits it to fostering U.S. participation abroad to the exclusion of foreign participation at similar events in the United States. To eliminate this shortcoming and tailor the pertinent legislation to the exigencies of a truly international cultural intercourse, H.R. 7533 introduced by Mr. McDOWELL, of Delaware, calls for an amendment of the 1956 act and provides for presidential authority to provide for participation of foreign governments and nationals in cultural events held in the United States. Another bill, H.R. 7534, also introduced by Mr. McDOWELL, focuses more attention on the matter of international cultural exchange relations by providing for an assistant to the Secretary of State for the coordination of international educational and cultural relations.

Aided by such a modified organizational machinery and direct and active participation of the Federal Government in international cultural activities, the establishment of a permanent or regularly periodic fair in Washington is eminently feasible.

The fair may take a variety of forms. It may be a Pan American exhibition placing the emphasis on the United States in relations with its southern neighbors. It may be based on the scope and framework of NATO or of any other international alliance of which the United States is a member. It may, again, specialize in some specific phase of international cooperation. Ways and methods are countless.

By holding exhibitions of this type in Washington, a twofold purpose will be achieved. On the one hand, the visitors from the faraway lands will be able to observe America at work and play not in the form of a dead exhibit, but alive. It will afford them the opportunity to become exposed to the genuineness and spontaneity of the American people; it will make them see at close quarters that democracy works, and how it works. It will give them a chance of feeling that imponderable characteristic, which so often cannot be expressed in graphs, photographs, or even movies, that makes America great.

It will, on the other hand be an excellent meeting ground where the millions of Americans who already visit Washington every year prompted by their patriotic feelings, can become aware of the characteristics, achievements, problems, differences and aspirations of other peoples theretofore entirely unknown, misunderstood or misrepresented. It will help dispel in the minds of the American public many a faulty or hazy notion which still persists about our nearby and faraway neighbors and which at times, for lack of clarity, leads to grave mistakes in our relations with other nations. It will, moreover, afford the leaders and high officials of our Nation, who are often acquainted with the outside world only through written reports, a more vivid and plastic view of the problems they have to deal with in the course of their official duties in regard to other nations.

The positive and constructive result of such an exchange of ideas and information cannot be but assuring. Whatever the immediate scope of such a fair it will always add a stone to the edifice of international understanding and cooperation and thereby greatly aid the establishment of more cordial, realistic, and firm international relations.

A permanent fair in Washington will also be of great benefit to the host city. It will be an added attraction for the visitors from near and far who will realize that Washington has become for them an experience in American life and in world orientation. While it may not be possible to predict the influx of visitors into the city, there is no doubt that a permanent fair will be a definite asset which will continually enhance commerce and culture, stimulate the growth and redevelopment of the city, foster the interest in the Nation's Capital, and help it achieve the stature that is due the Capital of the United States.

The international situation calls for rapprochement and better mutual understanding. Washington is the logical choice to be one of the leading means of implementing this policy through permanently established international exhibitions. Let it assume this role, for it is willing and able to bring it to fruition.

Legislative Report, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. MOELLER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, this report is prepared so that the people of my district and others interested will have a ready source of information as to the activities of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. It is also intended to supply my constituents with a record of the activities of their Congressman during his first term as their representative in the Congress of the United States.

The accomplishments of the 1959 session of Congress were, on the whole, substantial and constitute a record of which we in the Congress are justly proud. We enacted legislation to meet the demands of progress in the broad areas of national defense and security, the national economy, international affairs, our natural resources, and the organization of our Government, as well as in the special fields of social security, health and welfare, veterans' affairs, and others, including some attention to the problems of agriculture. I will devote some time to each of these major fields of legislation. In addition, I will discuss at some length one of the most pressing of all the problems which face us today and that is the Federal budget; Government spending; and the difficulties the Congress surmounted in its appropriations measures in trying to keep spend-

ing at an absolute minimum consistent with the requirements of our national security and the demand that this Nation keep pace with the need for continued progress in providing for the welfare of our people, planning for prosperity in the future, and increasing the pace of our scientific achievements for the good of humanity and for our protection against the competitive menace of the Communist conspiracy under the merciless drive of Nikita Khrushchev. This in itself was no small accomplishment in the face of the administration's demands upon Congress for unprecedented amounts of the taxpayers' money.

With respect to the accomplishments of this session of Congress I want to point out that the laws finally enacted are not the only measure of what the Congress has done. Much of our work during this session will produce its results during the 1960 session and even in later Congresses. I refer to the labors of the various committees of the Congress, which held thousands of meetings, heard testimony on issues covering the whole range of problems in which the Federal Government is concerned, and prepared reports recommending action on these issues or will make such reports next year.

Using the procedures in the House as an example, there were a total of 10,676 bills introduced by its Members. Committee reports were issued on 1,090 of these bills. However, only 187 public bills of the House and 79 private bills were enacted into law. Adding to this the number of Senate-originated bills which became law we have a total of 289 public bills and 185 private bills. Thus, although many of the reported measures will probably never receive final approval of the Congress, we prepared the way during this session for future action on a great many matters of vital import to the people of the United States. The true effectiveness of this 1st session of the 86th Congress, then, will not become apparent until the end of next year's session at the earliest, and the fruits of our labors will continue to be harvested by the succeeding Congresses as they act on the basis of the work of our committees during this past year.

With this in mind let me turn now to the legislation which was enacted in the major areas I have mentioned. In the field of national defense and security the most important work of the Congress, as is the case in almost every year, was that involved in authorizing and appropriating money for the operations of the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending in June 1960. The administration requested $39¼ billion for this purpose. Congress appropriated almost exactly the amount asked, although in doing so we directed that certain changes be made in the uses to which the money was to be put, particularly emphasizing the need to speed up our missile programs; to resolve the conflicting views of the Air Force and the Army on our vital air defense with respect to the use of the Air Force Bomarc and Army Nike-Hercules defense missiles, and a speedup in the development of the Nike-Zeus, the only missile designed to cope with attacking ICBM missiles; and to improve the United States capabilities for waging limited warfare by increasing the size of our marine forces and modernizing Army equipment as well as giving the Navy the materiel it needs to support our ground forces. These steps were taken because of increasing indications that so-called brush fire wars will continue to be a major tool of Russia and its satellites in spreading their empire, testimony from the chiefs of the armed services indicating that the administration had ignored their views on this vital strategic issue, and continuing signs that the administration itself, although headed by a military leader, is unable to cope with the urgent need for positive coordination among the three services in the defense of the Nation. I hope and believe that during the next session the Congress will take further and more positive steps to reorganize the operations of the Department of Defense if the administration itself continues its failure to recognize the present weakness in this area.

The work of my own committee, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, was of great importance particularly in the face of Soviet accomplishments in this field. In addition to authorizing over $500 million of the use of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the operation and development of space rockets and satellites and for a concentrated effort to permit the United States to keep pace with and eventually to surpass the Soviet in space exploration and research, we devoted great effort to attempts to overcome the handicap we face as a result of the administration's failure to develop a comprehensive long-range civilian-military space program, and inadequate coordination of NASA's work and that of the Defense Department's Research Projects Agency. As a new committee, functioning for the first time this year, we have educated ourselves greatly in this complicated field. We are now prepared to take the steps we feel will be needed in the years ahead to see to it that the United States does not fall behind in opening up for the benefit of mankind the vast possibilities inherent in the mysteries of outer space.

The Congress also extended the draft laws until 1963, a step I reluctantly supported; authorized needed construction to modernize our military installations and to implement the air defense plan, and adopted numerous measures to strengthen the organization of the Department of Defense. In addition, the House has passed certain measures dealing with subversion, passport controls, and the like in an effort to strengthen our internal defenses against the Communist movement. The Senate has yet to act on these measures.

The continued strain on our national economy as a result of inflationary pressures required the Congress to take numerous unpleasant actions. These actions, all taken at the request of the President, included an increase in the permanent debt limit to $285 billion and a temporary increase to $295 billion until June 30, 1960, which I voted against; an extension of the present corporate and excise tax rates, with certain modifications, for another year; and an increase in the Federal gasoline tax of 1 cent per gallon to permit the Federal interstate highway construction program to continue.

The Congress, after considerable disagreement with the administration, including vetoes by the President of the first bills passed in each field, took action to extend the Federal Airport Act for 2 years, with expenditures at about the present rates, and to continue the Federal housing programs. I voted against both of these pieces of legislation the first time they were before the House as I considered that they called for far too great an expenditure of tax money at a time when the Federal Government is under a severe economic strain. However, after the programs were trimmed down to what I believed to be a reasonable size, I supported the measures which were finally enacted.

Perhaps the most important measure affecting the national economy upon which the Congress took action was the labor reform bill. This measure, the result of disclosures by the McClellan committee showing that dishonest and corrupt elements had seized control of certain unions, was the cause of the bitterest controversy in Congress in many years. There were those who fought against any but the weakest legislation; there were those who sought to use the committee disclosures as an excuse to enact a law which would deprive organized labor of many of its legitimate rights and weaken the whole labor movement because of the sins of a few; and there was a third group, of which I was a part, which worked for the passage of a law which would deal effectively with crime, corruption, and undemocratic procedures in labor unions without punishing the vast majority of honest unions and union leaders. The bill which finally emerged and was signed by the President, although I feel that it was too severe in some respects, will if properly administered provide at least a part of the answer to the problem of corruption in unions. The other and major part must be played by the honest efforts of leaders in both unions and management, and most particularly by the people of this country in their demands that present laws against criminal actions of this type are honestly enforced by local law-enforcement agencies.

In international affairs the extension of the mutual security program was probably the most important issue with which the Congress was faced. Without going into detail I will point out that the President requested $4,436 million for this purpose. The final amount approved by Congress was $3,626 million. Actually, between his first request and final action the President had added an additional $400 million to his demands so that the end result was that the Congress cut the administration's estimates by $1,200 million. I supported these cuts and also supported the action of Congress in writing into the bill provisions which call for a clear distinction between military and economic foreign aid, direct the President to submit a detailed

plan for progressive reduction of all bilateral grant assistance, and establish in the State Department an Office of the Inspector General and Controller to audit and to oversee the spending of all foreign aid funds. I am sincerely hopeful that these latter actions will enable us to bring the present excessive spending in the field of foreign aid down to a more reasonable amount within the next few years. I shall watch closely the operations of the new Inspector General and Controller in the expectation that needless waste in these programs, such as that disclosed in Laos and other southeast Asia areas, will be eliminated.

It should be pointed out that under our Constitution the House has little voice in the direct conduct of our foreign affairs, and the Senate in most matters can act only in an advisory capacity to the President. Thus, the Congress has little to say about the day to day operations of our State Department in its contacts with foreign governments and must leave the establishment of policy to the President and his advisers. For this reason, the Congress took no official action in such matters as the Khrushchev visit, the Berlin crisis, the Communist crushing of Tibet and the invasion of Laos, other than the voicing of the opinions of individual Members. I personally opposed the Khrushchev visit as an affront to our allies and to the oppressed people of the nations under the heel of Communist dictatorship.

One matter involving international affairs in which the Congress can act is in the field of foreign trade. While no significant legislation in this area was enacted this year a number of studies were undertaken. Probably of most importance was the initiation of legislation looking to the encouragement of the investment of private American capital in certain foreign countries as a possible means of providing them with American dollars through this means. A successful program of this kind might make possible the reduction of direct foreign aid loans and grants at the expense of the American taxpayer. I hope that during the next session in 1960 more positive action on such legislation will be taken.

Of greatest importance in matters involving Government organization was the admission of Hawaii to statehood, thus adding the 50th star to the American flag. I supported this measure wholeheartedly. Other than certain minor legislation, there was only one additional law enacted in this area. This involved the creation of an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to study and to make recommendations with a view to better coordination of the activities of the Federal, State, and local governments, and to reducing the present overlapping responsibilities in many of the activities in which our governmental bodies engage. Such overlaps create confusion in a wide range of Government programs, from our tax systems; our social programs; construction such as highways, airports, and so forth; and other major programs, down to the most minute matters in which the Government is concerned. The new Commission is composed of Members of the House and Senate, representatives of the executive branch of the Federal Government, State Governors, State legislators, mayors, and representatives of county governments.

The continuing growth of Government activities makes this issue of growing concern to all of us. It is my hope that through the committee and action by the Congress we can straighten out some of these problems, particularly with a view to returning to the States some of the responsibilities which they should rightfully bear and which have caused the Federal budget to grow so fast in the past few decades.

In the field of natural resources the Congress took action to remove from the Federal Treasury the necessity of providing funds for future Tennessee Valley Authority construction, while at the same time writing into law a provision which prevents TVA from expanding its activities beyond what is roughly its present territory, thus assuring that it will not enter into competition with existing power companies in the surrounding area. The Congress also provided $1,185 million for continuing the present program of planning and construction of public works projects along our rivers and in our harbors. This appropriation was finally enacted after the President had vetoed two similar measures. The important issue between the Congress and the President was the administration's insistence that no new construction be authorized, even though little immediate expenditure of funds is required. It seems to me that following such a policy hampers an orderly development of our water resources programs, which are of particular importance in the Ohio River Valley. The measure which finally passed into law contains funds for continuing this orderly development, while keeping the total expenditures for the next fiscal year at an amount which is actually $100,000 less than the President himself requested.

The Congress also passed legislation to expand our water pollution control program, also of vital importance to our area; and approved various other measures, including a resolution urging executive studies to assure a continuing sound mining industry, and a Senate committee to study the development and coordination of national water resources policy. I am sorry to report that the President vetoed a bill which would have established a Coal Research and Development Commission to develop programs for maintaining our coal mining industry in the face of competition from other power and heat sources.

In the area of social legislation, no action was taken in the field of civil rights other than to extend the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. Assurances were given, however, that civil rights legislation will be taken up in the Senate early in the next session. Since a Senate filibuster is the major roadblock to effective action on civil rights, I am hopeful that this early consideration will permit final action by the Congress during 1960 on legislation to extend equality to all elements in our population regardless of color or creed.

A number of House-passed measures in this field are awaiting Senate action next year, including bills to permit the self-employed to set aside a portion of their incomes, tax free, for retirement purposes to give them some of the advantages of those under social security; a bill to strengthen the authority of the Post Office Department in curbing distribution of obscene literature; and a bill extending controls over the manufacture of narcotics.

Programs providing health insurance for Federal employees, improving the school milk program, and extending the Federal air pollution control in cooperation with local health authorities were also enacted.

The Senate has passed another measure in which I am interested. This calls for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps in an effort to help curb juvenile delinquency while promoting at the same time the conservation of our natural resources in national forests and parks. I shall follow House action on this bill next year with great attention.

Major veterans legislation enacted was the bill to increase benefits for the dependents of veterans on a revised scale based upon need, and equalizing pensions of World War II and Korean war widows with those of World War I. Direct housing loans to veterans were also authorized, and in addition a number of relatively minor bills relating to medical care, housing, and so forth, were enacted.

The problem of agriculture and our farm programs in general were not squarely met either by the administration or the Congress this year. The administration failed to submit a comprehensive plan for badly needed revision of the programs and, as a result, congressional action was confined to piece meal legislation. I opposed most of those measures on the ground that they only served to contribute more confusion to an already confused situation. One measure which I supported was the extension of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act for another 2 years, broading the authority for disposition of our farm surpluses through this means. This measure also includes a provision for the distribution of surplus products to the needy at home through a trial food stamp plan. I hope that the President will see fit to proceed with this trial program so that we may find out through actual experience whether the controversial plan will actually serve the dual purpose of reducing our surpluses while at the same time contributing to the welfare of those in need of public assistance.

In these and other fields much was done and much remains to be done. It will be my purpose during the 2d session of the 86th Congress to work for the enactment of such further legislation as is needed to round out these programs as much as is possible within the limits of our national economic resources and a sound budgetary policy.

This brings me to the problem of appropriations for Federal expenditures. You will hear much debate during the next few months as to whether this is a spend happy Congress and whether the President or the Congress is responsible for such savings as were made or for excessive spending where it may have occurred. As for actual appropriations for fiscal 1960 the facts are clear. The President requested a total of $74,859,008,445 to be spent in fiscal 1960. The Congress appropriated a total of $72,997,598,352—a net reduction of $1,881,410,093.

For future years spending, the President requested authority for $6,400 million of such funds. The Congress approved $5,701 million—a net reduction of $699 million. The total reduction by the Congress in next year's spending and in authorization for future years was $2,580,410,093.

The controversy will rage as to whether some of the cuts by Congress are actually only postponements until next year or until a supplemental appropriation is required for fiscal 1960, and as to whether in the future year authorizations, the so-called back door spending, the programs approved by the Congress will actually call for more or less spending than the President and his budget experts calculate. There is undoubtedly truth on both sides of these arguments to some extent.

However, we must remember that this argument rages each year. The administration viewpoint conveniently ignores that it is the traditional and, indeed, the only practical method for the Congress to authorize the expenditure of more funds than it is anticipated will be needed. This is to provide for contingencies in any program if for nothing else. It is also to permit an expanded operation in any area if an urgent need should arise. The proof of the pudding is in the eating—and in this case the eating occurs when the Congress actually appropriates the money in each fiscal year and the administration actually spends it. Thus, in the last analysis, it is each year's appropriation bills that actually count.

The Congress this year, as it has in every previous year of this administration, appropriated less money than the President asked for. This year the cut amounted to $1,880 million. The Congress will not vote additional funds for this fiscal year in the next session unless the President asks for them. It is up to the administration, therefore, to determine whether this reduction sticks or not by using the money it has as economically as it can.

As to back door spending the administration actually asked for more than the Congress provided, although the period of years over which this money is to be spent varies. Here again we find that these funds cannot be spent in future years unless some future President puts it into his budget. Some of the programs, once started, must be finished it is true, just as when we build a house or buy a car we must keep up the payments. A great part of each year's appropriations are made up of what was last year's back door spending. For those who try to make the Congress out as a Congress of "spenders" it is manifestly unfair to count this spending twice in one year in an effort to make it appear that the Congress is not economy minded. I am confident that when next years' actual appropriations are made we will again reduce the actual spending below what the President and his advisers ask, and that is the true test.

This is not to say that I do not believe that the Federal Government is not spending more than it should. But when we consider that the administration has 2½ million or more employees under its direct control to manage our affairs, and there are 437 Members of the House and 100 Senators to attempt to oversee what the administration proposes and disposes, it is self-evident that the major responsibility for economy lies with the executive branch. I have voted for many cuts in our spending wherever I had the opportunity. I shall continue this course and I shall continue to look for every opportunity I can find that will encourage the Federal Government to reduce unnecessary programs and to economize to the utmost.

With respect to my personal activities I shall be brief. The House was in session for a total of 141 days during the first session of the 86th Congress, and I attended most of those sessions even when no important legislation was to be considered. My Committee on Science and Astronautics met a total of 146 times, including subcommittee hearings; heard 447 witnesses and listened to several million words of testimony; conducted 30 separate investigations; and issued 21 reports. I took an active part in this committee work, attending practically every meeting of the full committee and of my Subcommittee on Research and Development. In addition, I represented the committee on inspections and investigations at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.; the Huntstone Arsenal in Alabama and at Cape Canaveral, Fla.; and at Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas. These investigations were conducted in the main on weekends and at such times as they would not interfere with the business of the House.

I was given the further honor of representing the House of Representatives at the Atlantic Congress held in London in June to consider the work of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization during its first 10 years, and to make recommendations as to its course during the next 10 years. I was a member of the Spiritual and Cultural Committee at the Atlantic Congress.

In addition to this legislative work my staff and I answered thousands of pieces of mail from the people of the 10th District, involving questions on legislation, personal problems, business problems, and the like. I met with every constituent who visited my office as far as possible; conferred with legislators, Government agency representatives, and so forth, on innumerable occasions; and familiarized myself with the operations of the executive as well as the legislative branch of our Government.

It is my feeling that no Congressman can properly perform his duties unless he keeps in close direct touch with the people of his district. In fulfillment of this obligation I used every weekend on which my presence in Washington was not required to return to the 10th District, usually traveling by auto but also using planes and on one occasion the train. On these weekends I attended every public function to which I was invited and also kept appointments with as many individuals as I could to discuss their personal problems, and with State and local officials on the problems of our area. I estimate that I made at least 15 such trips, involving a round trip mileage of over 800 miles each time, and while in the district traveled thousands of additional miles by auto in making contacts with my constituents.

The above recapitulates only the highlights of the activities of the Representative of the 10th Ohio District during the 1st session of the 86th Congress. I trust that at the end of the second session of this Congress an equally impressive report can be made.

Valuable Insights Into What's Going on Behind the Iron Curtain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of my constituents, Prof. Arthur J. May, recently concluded a trip to Europe which included extensive travels behind the Iron Curtain. Dr. May is a professor of history at the University of Rochester and a distinguished author whose volume, "The Hapsburg Monarchy, 1867–1914," was selected for the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize by the American Historical Association in 1952.

Drawing on his broad background of travel, observation, and study of Europe and European history, Dr. May penned a series of interesting articles for the Gannett Newspapers this summer. They contain learned, well-written, and keen insights into what is going on behind the Iron Curtain and therefore deserve a particularly wide readership at this stage in world affairs. I ask unanimous consent to have a number of Dr. May's valuable articles printed at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[July 16, 1959]

REDS HOLD DR. MAY AND THEN APOLOGIZE

A Rochester history professor and his wife were picked up and held briefly by Red secret police for photographing the mausoleum of a Communist hero in Sofia, Bulgaria.

Dr. Arthur J. May, University of Rochester professor of history, traveling with Mrs. May through Balkan countries beyond the Iron Curtain, reported the incident today. He is writing articles for the Gannett newspapers.

Describing the Bulgarian capital, Sofia, Dr. May wrote:

The holy of holies in Sofia for devout Bulgarian Communists is a chaste, white marble mausoleum containing the embalmed body of Georgi Dimitrov, famed international Communist and leader of the movement that carried Bulgaria into the Soviet camp. When major national celebrations are staged, the roof serves as a reviewing stand for Communist worthies. Festive wreaths and bunches of flowers, some of them well past their prime, decorate the front of the tomb.

At the entryway, two guardsmen, bayonets at the ready, stand immobile. On the hour, a squad of soldiers goosesteps to the door and fresh guards take their stahd. The overall pattern duplicates the mausoleum on the Red Square of Moscow in which Lenin and Stalin line in state.

Soon after the writer and his wife had taken photographs of the Dimitrov memorial, he felt a tap on his shoulder. A pair of men, one sharp-faced and slender, the other fleshy and ruddy in complexion, mumbled something which I interpreted to mean that they wished to exchange local currency for American money, an old Bulgarian custom.

That hypothesis was dead wrong. "Sharpie" repeated "Passport, passport" several times and I answer that the document was at the hotel. After a conference, the secret police, for that is what they actually were, mentioned to us to follow them. It dawned upon us that we were in the toils of the law—or something like that—and that we might be in for a rough experience.

Protesting innocence of any wrongdoing, we marched along to a spot across from police headquarters—as was later learned. While "Sharpie" fixed his gimlet eyes on us, his colleague went into the building. After a short stay he came back with a husky, German-speaking maiden, all smiles, who sweetly said that a "terrible, mistake had been made." Her apologies were profuse nearly to the point of our embarrassment.

Pictures might be taken anywhere, she explained gaily in response to my question. Handshaking, broad smiles on all faces, hearty good-bys in several languages and the episode was over.

But the affair was a less than necessary reminder that Bulgaria like other Communist countries is a police state. Beyond any doubt, however, the rigors of control and repression have been relaxed in the last 4 years.

As for the ordinary citizens of Sofia, they are as friendly and as helpful to visitors as their counterparts in the Soviet Union.

[July 16, 1959]

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER PROFESSOR, ON COLLECTIVE FARM IN BULGARIA, IS TOLD THAT "REDS LEARN MOST FROM CAPITALIST UNITED STATES"

(By Arthur J. May)

PLOVDIV, BULGARIA.—After a tour of this country, Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union called Bulgaria "a garden land." The term certainly applies to the rich, productive agricultural plains in the vicinity of Plovdiv.

Roman conquerors, Slav invaders, the rulers of the Byzantine Empire, the Ottoman Turks, and now a Communist dispensation have been the lot of Bulgaria across the centuries, but mother earth keeps yielding her bounty regardless of the political systems.

Weather conditions have not been favorable for crops this season. That fact, however, is hidden from the foreigner as he observes vast acreages of ripened wheat, corn, tomatoes, strawberries, alfalfa, sugar beets and vineyards. Canning factories have popped up in the midst of fields, and mounds used in pagan religious ceremonies before the coming of Christianity are spotted about. The famous rose-growing valley from which attar of roses is obtained lies several miles to the north.

At noon droves of peasants take shelter from the boiling sun beside haystacks or under trees. A hoof and mouth disease has severely damaged livestock. Vehicles are stopped by inspectors to ascertain whether they are hauling anything likely to spread the disease.

Fields are large because collective farms—or cooperatives as Bulgarians prefer to call them—have taken the place of pre-Communist peasant proprietorships. Collectivization, however harsh it may have been for the individual landowner, makes for greater efficiency in production, the use of labor-saving machinery and specialization in farm tasks.

Approximately 95 percent of the arable soil of Bulgaria is now in collective holdings. The elimination of the private farmstead has raced ahead. Private enterprise farming is confined to rough areas where big machinery cannot be used.

September collective, which we inspected, is described as a good cooperative, though not the best. It represents the pooling of the resources of five villages. Our hosts included Ivan Klessourski, elderly mayor of this community of 16,000, and Atanas Tabacov, president of the collective.

As we walked through fields of crops and orchards the managers explained the organization and functioning of the collective. September covers 12,500 acres, a third in vineyards. Tobacco, rice with water for irrigation sluiced in from the murky Maritza River, fruit and vegetables, wheat and sugar beets in a descending order of importance are the principal productions.

Tools and farm animals belong to the collective in common and the heavy work of plowing and threshing is performed by a machine tractor station.

Tabacov said at first many peasant farmers strongly resisted the pooling of land and livestock, but opposition disappeared as the economic advantages came to be appreciated. He denied that physical coercion had been applied.

Workers are assigned to jobs in keeping with their capacities, I was told, and compensation is related to the kind of work done and the number of days worked. Profits are split up annually in keeping with the workday units that each member of a collective has accumulated.

The net result is a higher annual income per household than was the case under individual production.

Much interest was shown in American methods of farming, though no one from "September" has been sent to America to study techniques. From Iowa, a Bulgarian delegation recently brought home seeds for hybrid corn and other crops, insecticides, and machinery.

"Bulgarian agricultural specialists who have gone to America," Tabacov commented, "have given us reports on what they found, and I have read extensively on the subject. We know of the high productivity in the United States in spite of capitalism, and we want to find out more, especially about raising livestock.

"We can learn more from the United States, than from anywhere else."

[July 27, 1959]

BULGARIA CONFIDENT IN THE RED REGIME

(By Prof. Arthur J. May)

SOFIA, BULGARIA.—Communist Bulgaria rolls out the red carpet for foreign guests with a little extra touch of hospitality for men and women coming from that strange, distant, and little understood colossus across the Atlantic.

Enticing exchange rates on money are held out to tourists and customs examination and other formalities at the frontier have been pared to the bone. As yet, arrangements for dealing with individual travelers are below par, for, as in factories and on farms, the Bulgarian authorities prefer mass production—tourist parties of 30 or more.

The warm welcome extended to visitors from free countries—who are likely to come in a critical frame of mind—testifies to the confidence of the Communists in their regime. It means likewise that living standards have attained a level not likely to provoke violently unsympathetic comment. "Tell your American friends just what you have seen," is an oft-repeated request.

Motorists find driving tame whether in city or countryside—few passenger cars, more buses and trucks. Coming in Bulgaria by train, the motor vehicles noted in hours could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

"Hooting Admitted During the Day" reads the English version of Sofia traffic regulations. Drivers respond to that invitation by blowing their horns whenever overtaking anything. Main thoroughfares are solidly constructed of asphalt or of stones.

On the other hand, roadways are narrow and signs giving directions for going from one town to another are inadequately provided. As a boon to motorists at night, the trees planted along the highways mile after mile are whitewashed for 6 feet from the ground.

"Stop and go" lights in the cities show the conventional colors of the West. Police officers, male and female alike, in trim uniforms regulate the flow of traffic with a white baton which possesses the quality of a magician's wand.

As in Soviet Russia, an official government agency, Balkan-Tourist, has custody of the visitors from foreign parts. Under its auspices, hotels are operated in cities, at seaside and mountain resorts, and through Balkan-Tourist trips into the countryside may be arranged. A profuse abundance of travel literature has been prepared in half a dozen languages.

And for the American traveler in Europe who yearns to get off the beaten track, to obtain first-hand impressions of a carbon copy of Soviet Russia, Bulgaria is just the place. It boasts, too, a surprising array of vacation spots along the Black Sea—the Riviera of this part of the world—for leisurely loafing. One can get by using the English language alone.

Typical of the new Bulgarian hotels are the Balkan in Sofia, and the Tremontioum (Three Mountains) of Plovdiv, excellently appointed, equipped with modern conveniences, and comfortable. The Plovdiv establishment encircles a large open-air restaurant with orchestra and facilities for several hundred patrons. The room assigned to us in Sofia measured 20 feet by 30 feet—far larger than an ordinary native dwelling—not counting an entry hall, and a generous-sized bathroom (in which the water sometimes ran hot).

Meal service is unmistakably on the slow side; if tips were allowed, more speed might be generated. National food specialties as well as standard international fare come in well-cooked and ample proportions. Ordering a meal offers somewhat of a challenge, for the menu is typed on four loose sheets in as many languages, with stated prices for each item, and the total bill must not exceed the figure stated on your coupon. At Plovdiv, the waiter placed an "American" flag on our table—only 16 stars on it, but a gesture of good will.

A Florida-type building frenzy has taken place in the vicinity of Vaina in recent years. From nothing but sand dunes, a resort called "Golden Sands" has come into being with a score of modern hotels, wonderful beaches with sand like fine sugar, and facilities to make holidays diverting. Hundreds of small villas dot the landscape.

In spite of all the energies lately invested in the economic growth of Bulgaria, cul-

tural enrichment has by no means been neglected. Four major universities with a supporting set of professional and technological institutions are filled with students whose tuition and living are supplied free by the government. Seven opera houses in a land of 8 million is not bad at all.

"La Boheme" was well presented in the new Sofia Opera House with K. Popova, a native star as an excellent Mimi, and an impassioned, efficient conductor from France, George Sebastian. Some of the boxes cling rather precariously to the walls, only slightly below the ceiling.

The Bulgarian Communist leadership and doubtless a large proportion of the rank and file feel confident that they are going places, as the saying runs. Greeting the traveler at the frontier are two chaste signs in French: "The doctrines of Marx and Lenin stimulate creative thought in everyone and aspirations for the good life," and, "When peace prevails, a Socialist economy thrives best and grows most rapidly."

[July 29, 1959]

A ROCHESTERIAN TRAVELING BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN FINDS BUSY BULGARIA COMPLETELY SOVIET ORIENTED

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

SOFIA, BULGARIA.—Since the establishment of the authoritarian Communist regime in 1948, industrial expansion has been the dominant accent in Bulgarian economic life.

Whereas previously the economy had been overwhelmingly agrarian, today 40 percent of the employed population are at work in factories, transportation, mines, and trade, and year after year this proportion continues to rise.

Private enterprise has been reduced to zero. As in the Soviet Union itself, Bulgaria proceeds on a definite, though somewhat flexible, blueprint of economic advance, blocked out in 5-year periods. After a decade of more or less successful planning, the country this year is being launched on a "revolutionary leap in national development," as the Communist chiefs call it.

If plans are actually fulfilled, by 1962 industrial output will surpass the production of 1958 by better than 200 percent and for the following 3 years the goal is 300 to 400 percent of present levels. Not content with what is being achieved, Todor Zhikov, First Secretary of the Communist Party—"the Bulgarian Khrushchev"—recently ordered a speedup, so as to fulfill the current plan in 3 years or 4 at the outside.

The Communist leadership aspires to make Bulgaria more nearly like the Soviet Union than any of the other satellites. To meet demands for labor, women and youths in their late teens have been drawn into factories and shops. Nurseries and communal kitchens are taking over chores formerly handled by housewives.

At every turn the economy of Bulgaria is tightly laced in with the other Iron Curtain states, Soviet Russia first and last. From the Soviet Union have come—and more is on the way—loans an easy terms, machinery and plant equipment of various kinds, and technical experts. On their side, Bulgarians have gone to Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Eastern Germany to learn scientific know-how. The bulk of Bulgarian exports, said to be the best quality goods, are siphoned off to Russia.

To get a firsthand look at the tempo of factory production, I spent most of an afternoon at the Low Current Works in Sofia, which turns out radio and telephone materials, electrical measuring instruments and will produce television sets as soon as the telecasting station, now in the building, becomes available.

When I suggested the similarity in manufacturing between this plant and the Stromberg-Carlson Co. of Rochester, N.Y., the managing director nodded, indicating familiarity with the name.

On the welcoming committee at the closely guarded factory entrance was Theodor Shiarpschev, 43 years in America, who returned to his homeland a few years back, perhaps in the spirit of missionary zeal. As his principal assignment he translates articles in American and English technical journals into Bulgarian.

Proudly he displayed a newspaper photograph of his granddaughter in America who had recently been crowned Miss Oakland—or something like that.

We were ushered into the spacious office of the managing director, Dimtri Yonev, who greeted us cordially. About 45 years old, he appeared to be unusually keen and answered almost all of the questions put to him without equivocation. Study, hard work, and ability, he explained, had carried him to the top post in the plant. Wine, cigarettes, and candy were set before us to give the interview a fireside flavor.

In all some 4,000 workers are employed, more women than men and none under 18. Small shops once did inefficiently the jobs carried on here by up-to-date factory methods. The working week runs to 46 hours, unless a job is hazardous in which case 33 hours is the normal stint.

For the most part, wages are paid on the piecework principle and managers are rewarded with bonuses if norms of production are exceeded.

Housing is the responsibility of the municipal authorities, not of factory management. Congestion is acute, but many blocks of apartments have recently been built and others are under construction. The size of living quarters depends upon the size of a family. My request to see the inside of a worker's apartment was vetoed.

Technical schools provide training for 2 to 4 years before youths are equipped for factory employment. Some 300 employees attend free evening schools to enlarge their technical knowledge, and others go off to Russian, Czech, or East German plants with the same purpose in mind.

On walls of workrooms are signs urging the employees to emulate the "speedking workers" of the Soviet Union and to reach the targets of the 5-year plan in 3 years and 10 months.

On parting, Shiarpschev explained Bulgarian ties with Russia this way: "We and the Russians are brothers. They freed us from the Turks in 1877 and from the Fascists and the Nazis in 1944–45. Otherwise, our country would still be under the heel of Hitler."

And he concluded, "Bulgarians want to live in peace. The cold war hurts everyone—military preparations make living harder for all of us." Flower beds graced the factory yard, but permission to take a photograph was denied.

[Aug. 1, 1959]

WOULD HAVE STARVED—YUGOSLAVS GRATEFUL FOR FOOD FROM UNITED STATES

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—Due to curious quirks of nature, crops in Yugoslavia recently have suffered from drought in even-numbered years and been bountiful in alternate years. "Without food from America, we would have starved," a grateful Yugoslav said to me. If assistance from the free world had not been forthcoming, President Tito might have been forced back into the Soviet straitjacket in order to obtain necessary foodstuffs.

Economic aid has been reinforced by military supplies and advisers for purposes of national defense. Thinking in terms of calculated risk, whatever strengthens Tito in his resistance to the Soviet Union renders the safety of ourselves and of other free nations more secure.

Since the end of the war in 1945, the United States has supplied economic aid to Yugoslavia far above a billion dollars. Britain, France and other NATO countries have likewise contributed. Help has come in the form of raw materials for manufacturing and, more importantly, of food—huge quantities of wheat, for instance, from the surpluses accumulated in American grain elevators.

Until this year, the United States also cooperated in the building up of Yugoslav defense forces. When the American military mission came to an end, Maj. Gen. Mercer C. Walter, who was in charge, expressed gratification that American experience had helped "a valiant people to reinforce their will for their own independence." Teams from the American Army, Navy, and Air Force all took part in the program.

Our military technicians assisted in training Yugoslav troops and gave instruction in the use and maintenance of weapons of war supplied by America. Yugoslav officers and men were sent to American military centers to find out about our equipment and methods.

In keeping with Communist doctrine, the Government owns all productive facilities in manufacturing, transportation, banking, and the like. Almost the only private enterprises lingering on in cities and towns are small retail stores and shops of craftsmen.

A distinctive feature of the Yugoslav economic mechanism is workers councils of management in trading concerns and industrial plants. These bodies make decisions on prices, wages, working conditions, and related matters. In practice, the top manager is picked by local units of government, subject to approval by the elected workers council. The rest of the managerial personnel is chosen directly by the workers councils themselves.

Two out of every three Yugoslavs depend upon the land for their livelihood. Traditionally, the small independent farm has prevailed, yielding only enough to maintain the family working it. After experimenting with collective farming, Tito's regime in 1953 allowed peasants to withdraw from collectives if they wished and most did so posthaste. Only around 10 percent of the cultivated soil now is in cooperatives, but they supply a high proportion of the food consumed by urban dwellers.

People on city streets are better dressed than the Russians I observed in 1955. Shop windows display a wide variety of attractive goods, seemingly at pretty stiff prices. About half the take-home of a city family goes into food, though rent consumes under 10 percent.

In areas beyond the central sections of cities, homes with tiny garden plots are seen, but most urbanites live in apartments. And housing congestion is acute because jobs in industry exert a magnetic influence upon surplus workers in the countryside. Some 40,000 stream into Belgrade alone every year.

The Communist regime prides itself on the new civic center in downtown Belgrade—buildings for government offices, headquarters of the Communist Party, stores, and model apartment.

But the showpiece is the glistening Metropole Hotel, the finest in the land. In fact for sheer elegance and luxury it will bear comparison with the grandiose hotel just beyond Disneyland in the environs of Los Angeles.

Food is excellent, the service impeccable, the orchestra good.

Patronage during our visit consisted of members of the diplomatic corps and Yugoslav political personalities and businessmen, usually accompanied by glamorous wives with snappy hair-does and stylish gowns—no stockings, to be sure. A minority of the men

appeared without ties and with shirts open at the neck—once upon a time the trademark of the authentic Communist.

[August 8, 1959]

BEAUTIFUL, COMMUNIST-RIDDEN LAND IN THE MOUNTAINS—RUMANIANS FRIENDLY TO AMERICANS, FEARFUL OF REDS

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

CLUJ, RUMANIA.—It is not as hard for a Westerner to get into Communist Rumania as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle though there are similarities.

First of all special permission must be procured from the State Department, and once that hurdle is surmounted, the tough work really begins.

Travel in a private car is virtually ruled out because of the stickiness of the Rumanian authorities in issuing a visa, the impossibility of getting advance information on road conditions or of arranging hotel reservations. The alternative is to apply for admission with a party and if you are lucky, in you go.

Preliminaries include presentation of a sheaf of photographs and documents setting out no little personal information on yourself and your parents. Then you wait 4 weeks for a visa to be granted, and it arrives just before the scheduled time for the departure of your party.

That's not quite all. Customs inspection at the Rumanian frontier station consumes 4 dreary hours. Not much time is wasted on the luggage of Americans, but the belongings of German-speaking travelers who were born in Rumania and who are on the way to visit relatives are given the most meticulous examination I have ever witnessed anywhere. The point is that many of these Germans are bringing along dutiable goods for friends in need and high charges are exacted on new articles.

When the inspection of the bags of certain travelers is finished you are reminded of the spectacle at the counter of a shop where lingerie is being sold at bargain prices. With patience and not a little good humor, goods are stowed away again. An official guide from the Carpathian Travel Bureau joins your party and serves as escort, general manager, and fountain of information until you return to the frontier. Rigorous rules require that you eat meals with the party and sleep in prescribed hotels. Other than that, you are allowed considerable latitude of movement in a city. Upon leaving Rumania inspection once more is searching, yet less thorough than upon entry.

Ordinary Rumanians are as friendly as they are inquisitive. They go out of their way to help you in getting about and normally glum faces light up when they learn that you are from America. It's a bit disconcerting to have a man kiss your hand as a mark of affection and good will.

Across the centuries fear and suspicion have printed an indelible mark upon the mentality of this folk—fear of the longtime Turkish conquerors and rulers, fear of the unenlightened aristocratic and wealthy master class, and, today, widespread distrust of and resentment against the governing Communist oligarchy.

Herds of cattle, goats, squadrons of geese and ducks wandering along the principal Rumanian highways offer a vastly greater challenge to a chauffeur than competing motor traffic. Scarcity of private cars may be set down as an earmark of a Communist-operated country.

Main roadways themselves are generally good, suitable for a 30- to 35-mile-an-hour pace. Many a passing peasant cart has a rounded cover of patched-up canvas or of crudely made wickerwork, porous when rain falls. Instead of conventional billboards proclaiming the virtues of this commercial product or that, signs along the Rumanian highways summon workers to step up production on farm or in factory or preach in crisp phrases a tenet of the Communist creed.

Occasionally one sees a Red Cross poster, inviting help in first aid or nursing care. In varied languages, too, there are pleas for international peace and friendship, or for investment in state savings banks, vivified by pictures, easy to comprehend.

On Sunday, peasant women and men appear in their picturesque folk costumes, which vary in color and design from one district to another in Rumania and even in keeping with the preferred language of the wearer. Folk dancing festivals are a rich national tradition, which the present regime encourages, and they are done very well indeed. Music may be furnished by a small orchestra or by violins and rectangular or round wooden flutes, sometimes two-piped.

The performance may include a sort of musical play with choral speaking, extolling the virtues of the collective farm. Several folk-dance ensembles have won warm applause in foreign countries. Beyond any doubt they would attract appreciative audiences in America.

An outstanding showpiece of this city is the botanical garden under direction of Prof. George Soffa, a scientist of front rank, and enthusiastic about the treasures in his charge. Some 10,000 specimens brought from all over the globe, but especially from the Balkan peninsula, are laid out with care and intelligence in a 75-acre tract. Particularly prized are the Japanese garden containing an oriental residence and bridge and a Roman area with stone objects from antiquity. Pointing to trees and plants originating in North America—pines, white birch, and poison ivy, Soffa expressed a wish that he could obtain more specimens from the new world.

As in other Communist countries, the tourist business in Rumania is handled by a State agency—Carpathian Tourist. It arranges for accommodation in hotels which are comfortable and clean, for meals, and trips to spots of interest. It is something of a surprise to find goat cheese and ham on your breakfast plate, with tea, cocoa, or coffee covered by a thick layer of whipped cream, as the beverage. Natives favor a small dosage of ardent spirits a half hour before breakfast, to set muscles and brain in active operation early in the day.

For variety and beauty of scenery Rumania has much to commend it. Fat agricultural lands and lush grazing districts are more than matched by lofty ranges of the Carpathian Mountains. Not much has been done to acquaint western nimrods with the big-game possibilities—deer, bear, and wild hogs—which abound in the mountain regions and fill out many a native larder.

In tourism, as in so many other ways, the Communist countries of Eastern Europe take in each other's washing. In other words, while East Germans, Russians, Bulgarians, and so forth, seek out Rumania for their vacations, Rumanians in turn go off to their countries on holiday. Travel is invariably in groups which descend upon hotels and restaurants in scores of even hundreds at a time, each party shepherded by official Carpathian Tourist guides. These personal associations knit tighter the bonds of the international Communist society.

[Aug. 11, 1959]

LAND OF MAGYARS, GYPSIES, GERMANS—SHIFTING RED POLICY HURTS RUMANIAN JEWS WHO WANT TO LEAVE

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

SIBIU, RUMANIA.—"Mammy, mammy, mammy," shrieked a middle-aged woman as the tourist bus pulled away from a Rumanian city. It was the agonized lament of a daughter who had not seen her mother for nearly a full generation and might never see her again.

As for the mother, her wrinkled weather-beaten face sweetness itself, she hastily wiped a tear away, gazed at the departing bus impasively. Doubtless her stoical calm is rooted in a deep religious faith.

The mother in question, while German in speech, is Rumanian in citizenship. Before the Second World War well in excess of a million Germans dwelt in this land of diversified peoples and religious creeds. Their ancestors, handicraftsmen and farmers, migrated into the region as much as 700 years ago and their descendants preserved their German speech, habits, folkways and modes of living.

Responding to the siren call of Hitler, nearly all the German-speaking young men, some 160,000 of them—fought in the Nazi armies or served in other capacities. Those who survived the war have not been permitted to return to their Rumanian homeland and have taken up residence in Germany. Their wives and children remain here and only recently has the Rumanian Government permitted visits.

Ravages of war, deportations to the Soviet Union, and emigration have cut down the German element to approximately one-third of its prewar size.

"Rumania is just like America," a charming lady, who knows her own country infinitely better than she knows ours, said to me. "We have many national and cultural groupings and so have you." What she was unaware of was that nothing comparable to the process of Americanization has taken place in Rumania. Whether the international article in the Communist platform will resolve old-age national antagonisms and fueds here, only the future can tell.

In dealing with the question of Jewish emigration to Israel, the Government of Rumania has oscillated uncertainly between freedom to depart and ironclad prohibition. In the early postwar period a considerable movement to Israel took place, but from 1951 to mid-1958 no lawful emigration was authorized. In June of 1958, 100 were allowed to move away and then in July the barrier was raised anew.

Reversing its policy once more, between September 1958 and March of 1959 about 29,000 passports permitting men and women of the Jewish tradition to leave Rumania were granted, though not all have in fact been used. It appears that not more than 14,000 started westward, proceeding by way of Hungary, Vienna, and Naples, thence by ship to Israel.

Emigrants have been severely restricted on what and how much they may take with them. Once the Iron Curtain is left behind the wanderers are taken care of and transported to Israel by representatives of the American United Jewish Appeal.

Possibly 200,000 Rumanian Jews desire to go to Israel where many already have relatives. Many of them are physicians, engineers and teachers—professions into which local Jews have traditionally entered.

When the door of emigration slammed shut in March of this year, thousands of holders of passports were left in dire straits. In preparation for departure they had plunked down the substantial sums necessary to renounce Rumanian citizenship and to meet other state requirements. Having sold their household possessions for these purposes and to cover the cost of transportation to the West, many Jews have been and yet are dependent on charity for their daily bread.

Outside of top government circles next to nothing is known about the reasoning behind shifting policies.

Prior to the First World War, large sections of Rumania belonged to Hungary and in them lived belts of Hungarian or Magyar-

speaking people. An interesting adventure in handling the ever-delicate problem of nationality rights and interests has been the creation of a Magyar Autonomous Region in the central part of the country, most of whose inhabitants speak a Magyar dialect.

Public leadership in the region is wholly Communist and the degree of home rule permitted is by no means broad. Official transactions are carried on in both the Magyar and Rumanian languages and Magyar is used in press, theater, and schools, though sharp bickering on this last point has occurred.

Now and then along Rumanian highways the traveler notices small encampments of gypsies or sees them in cities.

In all, as many as half a million gypsies may live in Rumania, and little or no intermarriage takes place with other segments of the population. Marriage arrangements in the gypsy communities are financial transactions, the price of a bride depending upon her beauty. A father with several handsome daughters does very well for himself.

[August 13, 1959]

A ROCHESTER PROFESSOR RIDES A ROCK-AND-ROLL BALKAN TRAIN AND FINDS YUGOSLAVS LOVE NEVER-NEVER LAND OF U.S.A.

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

NISH, YUGOSLAVIA.—If you want to get acquainted with ordinary citizens in a Communist country, travel second class by rail.

The third-class category, incidentally, that existed before the Second World War, has been abandoned, many of the cars with hard wooden seats having been upgraded to second class. If you have a phrase-book of the Yugoslav language or a brightly colored map of the country, some American pictures or trinkets, you can attract a curious audience of passengers any hour of the day or night.

Yugoslav trains are always crowded, not only the compartments into which cars are divided, but also the corridors, and it is a fearsome battle to get through to a dining car if one happens to be attached. Strings of 20 cars to a train are not uncommon. When a stop is made, one mob tumbles out and another swarms in pellmell with utter disregard of other travelers.

Under social security regulations, every insured Yugoslav citizen is entitled to one long rail trip a year. That's one reason why so many are on the move. Or maybe they are soldiers on furlough or gangs of 50 to 100 teenagers going off to a roadbuilding or a farmwork project.

Lustily these young people sing doleful folk music or more spirited patriotic and Communist anthems on railroad platforms or from the coach or freight cars in which they travel, each group with a huge flag.

Boys and girls, men and women on the trains, all alike seize the opportunity to parade their knowledge of English, German, or French before you. Although Russian is the second language taught in Yugoslav schools, a west European language is required, too. Speaking knowledge runs the gamut from a few painfully mumbled phrases to tolerable familiarity.

Eyes pop with wonderment and pleasure, even affection, when the Yugoslavs learn you are an American. For many, America is a never-never land of their most fantastic dreams. Some tell you that they have relatives or acquaintances over across. Gaily-colored shirts worn by many boys are stamped with replicas of the State of Texas or even of the Statue of Liberty.

Give them a cancelled postage stamp bearing the likeness of Washington or Lincoln as a souvenir and the Yugoslav fellow travelers tuck them away in their purses along with other prized possessions. Quite likely they will insist on handing you a gift—a pencil, a cigarette, a thimbleful of slivovitz, which tastes like liquid fire, or maybe a bunch of flowers or a treasured trinket.

Teenagers can reel off a longish number of Hollywood stars and rock-and-roll celebrities without batting an eye, and even sing snatches of American song hits although unable to speak English at all. Frequently you are considerably puzzled by their pronunciation of Marilyn Monroe, Elvis Presley, Marlon Brando, or Doris Day, the top favorites, it appears. "Cowboy" sounds the same from Yugoslav lips as from any other. A Texas broncobuster decorated the cover of a book of songs we were shown, some of them in phonetic English.

A young soldier struggled to pronounce the names of Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. Smarter youngsters recalled a pleasing list of famous personalities in American history, but most of those with whom I talked professed complete ignorance of the subject. From his pocket the soldier pulled out a notebook with a calendar in it. He had crossed out with a pencil each day of service and rejoiced over the prospect of being in civilian clothes in another 2 months. Dislike of the routines of conscription is not peculiar to any country.

"I muss learn English better," a tall handsome student of 21 commented. "I studee heem in school and now by myself." Elvis "Praislee" he referred to laughingly as the king of rock-and-roll. "I like that and shaxx best. I want to go to America. I have a friend in Chukawgo, beeg—" and his gesture indicated broad-shouldered.

At one point, when our compartment mates left the train, we snapped a photograph of them waving back at us. Quicker than you could say Jackie Robinson, a gaunt, tough-looking militia man, revolver in his holster, and a long, ugly night-club at his side, stormed up, sputtering a torrent of Yugoslav words. Other passengers attempted to give him a bill of clean health on us, but he kept jabbering on, pointing at our cameras. The American passport however, which he examined carefully, quieted him down and he soon slumped away.

[August 15, 1959]

ONCE "PARIS OF EAST," BUCHAREST TODAY IS "MOSCOW OF SOUTH"

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

BUCHAREST, RUMANIA.—Boasting a population of a million and a quarter, this capital city of the Rumanian republic celebrates this year the 500th anniversary of its foundation.

Construction on the grand scale is planned to commemorate this historic event—hospitals and schools, theaters and a circus, and thousands of dwellings to reduce the frightful housing congestion.

Side streets, frequently only winding narrow lanes, are to be broadened to take care of an anticipated increase in motor traffic. Work on these projects requiring no particular skill is being done by volunteers and groups of youngsters. If targets are reached, the plans will be translated into realities by 1965.

Bucharest prides itself on being the Paris of the East, or used to. Nowadays the Moscow of the south might be more appropriate. Broad, straight boulevards, usually flanked by horsechestnut and lime trees are distinctive features. Along them run streetcars which deserve a blue ribbon as the noisiest in the world. Coupled with blazing summer heat, the racket makes Bucharest uncomfortable for the foreigner, at least.

A wide variety of architectural styles distinguish public buildings, all the way from fairly simple Renaissance structures to the monumental massiveness once popular in the Soviet Union. The State Printing Works is housed in a smaller edition of the new Moscow University and the Dynamo Stadium for sports events is almost an exact replica of one in the Russian capital.

Parks with gay flowerbeds or pleasant lakes are numerous. Close by an immense statue of Stalin is the Stalin Park of Rest and Culture, patterned on Russian models, and lying on both sides of a picturesque lake. Busts of Rumanian authors, musicians, and other artists suggest a gallery in the open air. And in an outdoor theater, exhibitions of folk dancing and concerts are staged.

What used to be the royal palace has been transformed into an art gallery with paintings and sculpture by Rumanian and western masters and a sizable oriental collection. Villas of the dispossessed aristocratic and wealthy classes in unique Rumanian architectural style have been made over into apartments or are used by fragments of the huge state bureaucracy. It is probably no accident that the Soviet Ambassador occupies one of the very largest mansions.

Outside of the sophisticated central area and the old residential districts, extensive areas swarm with humble cottages of the peasant type. Communist orators and press keep saying that these sections, in which most Bucharesters live, will be replaced before long by up-to-date apartment blocks.

Bucharest is a city of churches, mostly small, and sometimes obscured by apartments and other tall buildings. It would be possible, you are told, to visit a different church every day of the year, and Communists tell you that the churches illustrate the philosophical outlook of the outmoded and discarded capitalistic scheme of things.

Suggestive of the traditional linkage between state and church in Rumania, the former Parliament House stands alongside of the Orthodox Cathedral, with a longish plaza of flowerbeds leading to it.

The interior of the cathedral is surprisingly cramped and across the front runs a beautifully decorated ikonostasis or picture stand.

A heavily bearded clergyman reads from a lectern, a 13-year-old girl kneels before an altar, bending her head nearly to the floor, and then kisses several objects on the ikonostasis. Her elderly grandmother follows along afterward.

A short set of stairs leads to a casket holding the embalmed body of a saint, though only the withered hands are exposed. Religious emblems lie upon the coffin. Closely another clergyman watched, with seeming indifference, the movements of tourist parties.

[August 19, 1959]

THEY THINK WE WESTERNERS ARE DYING OF UNDERNOURISHMENT—RED PRESS GIVES RUMANIANS FALSE PICTURE OF WORLD

(By Dr. Arthur J. May)

BUCHAREST, RUMANIA.—At a street corner, a Rumanian fired questions at me in rapid order: "You are an American? How much did your trip cost? How big is New York? Is London larger? Is Shanghai the biggest city in the world? How tall is the highest building in New York?"

When I proposed that the Empire State Building was ten times higher than the stately Hotel Ambassador across from where we were standing, an expression of total incredulity came over his face.

"Ten times bigger than that one? How much did it cost? Are you of German descent? Are you a Jew? How many passengers can your bus carry? How much did you say your trip cost?" (Worked out in relation to the purchasing power of Rumanian money, the cost must have appeared scarcely less fantastic than the Empire State Building.)

It seemed proper for me to put a few questions. "Is living getting better in Ru-

mania?" "For some, yes; for most, no; not enough money," said he.

"Do many have cars like that one?" and I pointed to a small blue job at the curb. "Very, very few," he replied, and then glancing furtively about, he ambled down the street. Exchanges of essentially the same sort were repeated many times over in the course of the Rumanian journey.

According to informed sources, widespread discontent prevails because of police surveillance, pressure upon workers to raise productivity, the housing nightmare, and costs of living.

When a pair of good shoes devours a month's wages, the popular mood can readily be understood. For half-hours on end, I observed pedestrians on main boulevards. Shoes worn by men were generally of stout quality, women's much more flimsy, as would normally be true elsewhere in summer. Necklaces were rarities, earrings commoner, and lipstick still more so.

Clothing is better than I saw in Moscow in 1955. When I made this point to a resident foreigner, he countered, "Come back in January and you'll see them in patched and ragged clothes. Only big shots in the Communist Party and the bureaucracy have anything like a decent wardrobe."

The Communist authorities have genuinely tried to grapple with the wretched congestion in housing, but diversion of funds and labor to industrial purposes has frustrated many a fine program. Of late, the making of consumer goods and of housing materials has been stepped up substantially.

Popular aversion to things as they are, sullen defiance, expresses itself in several ways such as the slowness with which pedestrians get out of the way of an oncoming car at crossings. It is assumed that every car must be carrying someone in authority.

Communists will tell you that Rumania has a free press, but in reality they have only the foggiest notion as to what the term means. Almost all the legally printed matter of the country pours out from Scinteia House, a palatial structure closely resembling the central unit of the new University of Moscow and designed by the same architect.

It is claimed that this printing works is the largest in Europe and can run off 720,000 newspapers in an hour. Eighty percent of the machinery, not all of it up-to-date, has come over from Russia and the rest from Germany. In addition to papers, books, of all kinds, among them those studied in schools, magazines, and picture postcards are printed under this roof. About a third of the output is shipped abroad, chiefly to the Soviet Union.

Newspapers are published in the various languages spoken in Rumania, but contents and format are virtually the same for all. For German readers there is Neuer Weg (the New Way; that is, the Communist way). It has 4 pages several inches larger than an American paper with seven columns to the pages and it not too badly printed.

On the masthead is a standard Communist emblem and the battlecry of Karl Marx, "Proletarians of the World, Unite." A lengthy editorial and the leading news article on page one present a thoroughly Communist-slanted treatment of the diplomatic deliberations going on at Geneva.

"The Soviet proposals offer a genuine foundation for (international) understanding," proclaims the banner headline. For the rest, the front page is given over to reports on visits of delegations from Korea, Greece, and India, stories of two factories which are turning out more goods and at the same time cutting down on coal consumption, and on the percentages of crops already harvested.

On the inside, reports relate how one province has improved farm productivity while in another trasportation is costing too much, and in a third housing projects are being badly done, but a fourth has surpassed the goal for producing building materials.

Elsewhere are an interview with the Foreign Minister, Avram Banaciu, on proposals for a zone in Southeastern Europe from which atomic weapons would be excluded, and what looks like a lopsided summary of a debate in a Canadian Parliament in world affairs. The last page carries a letters-to-the-editor section, instructions on how to use a camera, a discussion on the age of the earth, and little essays on practical subjects.

No stories on crime appear, sports are dismissed in less than a column, radio programs are tucked away in one corner, and there is no advertising whatsoever. Eight rather muddy pictures, varying as to size, illustrate such things as the progress in construction of the gigantic Lenin hydroelectric project, a Greek national hero undergoing punishment for pacifism, and striking workers in Britain who have clashed with police.

Except for Communist sheets, no foreign newspapers are admitted to the country. Inescapably Rumanians have wholly false notions of what is happening in the rest of the world.

They suppose, for example, that droves of people in the Western World drop dead every day because of undernourishment. My request for a chat with Rumanian newspapermen promised for a time to be successful, but in the end I was informed that it could not be arranged because too many writers were away on vacation. The explanation was unconvincing.

Along with press and radio, schools constitute a powerful instrument of Communist indoctrination. In Rumania, as in other Iron Curtain lands, mass education stands high on the lost of national objectives. It is said that more than a fifth of the population, chiefly in the countryside, could neither read nor write when the Communists seized power.

Today, it is asserted that literacy is universal, that all the 16,000 Rumanian villages have schools, and that the period of compulsory attendance has been greatly extended. Foreign observers think these claims are justified, on the whole. As byproducts of more schooling, standards of personal hygiene and community sanitation have been raised among the peasant millions.

On the higher educational plane, attendance has virtually doubled at the four universities of Rumania in the Communist era, not counting students enrolled in evening classes or correspondence courses. Three out of four university learners receive government grants to cover expenses. Advanced, specialized schools in engineering and science, in music and in painting have also been established.

[September 1, 1959]

A TOURING UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER PROFESSOR VISITS A POLICE STATE AND FINDS "PASSIVE RESIGNATION" DESCRIBES ATTITUDE OF HUNGARIANS

(By Arthur J. May)

VIENNA, AUSTRIA.—The ways of the Hungarian police state are too mysterious for the normal mind to fathom.

The authorities allowed me to travel from one end of the republic to the other. They allowed me to stay in Budapest long enough to eat two meals, to have a look around, and to take pictures, and they allowed me to have snacks in two other widely separated cities, but they would not permit me to stay in the country overnight.

No reasons for this irrational behavior were forthcoming.

Or again, at the frontier, a regulation just ordained requires an exit document at the price of 45 Hungarian forints, a trifle more than $2. Austrian schillings, German marks, French francs, American dollars, all were proffered to satisfy the charge, but the border officials would not so much as touch any of this filthy, capitalist money.

Forints they must have and nothing but forints. Since it was Saturday, the bank where foreign currency may lawfully be exchanged was closed and would not reopen until Monday.

To straighten out matters, better than an hour was consumed in making 8 or 10 telephone calls to functionaries higher on the bureaucratic ladder with the net result that payment of the 45 forints could be postponed until the return to the same frontier station.

Much knowledge about Hungary is available in Vienna, best of all watchtowers for the Soviet satellites in southeastern Europe.

Factual information comes from such sources as business and professional men who go into the country and from the steady trickle of refugees who contrive to get out in spite of high, barbed-wire fences and plowed fields stretching all along the Austrian frontier, masses of guards, carrying tommy-guns and binoculars, observation towers with powerful lights, and savage police dogs.

After the revolution of 1956 at least 180,000 people fled from Hungary. A lovely Budapest official escort ("call me Isabella") hastened to tell me that what happened 3 years ago was not a rebellion at all. It was in fact a counter revolution against the People's Republic, organized by a handful of conspirators, egged on by agents of the West.

That theory stands as the official interpretation of 1956, and it was useless to try to convince the dear lady that in reality the uprising had a spontaneous character rising out of active discontent among writers, students, and industrial wage-workers. On the streets of Hungary's cities, the figment of a worker's paradise exploded. Reverberations will echo for generations to come.

Most of the revolutionary refugees found temporary asylum in Austria. From here the great majority has been dispersed all over the globe.

United Nations help and assistance from the Rockefeller Foundation and other American charities have enabled the refugees lingering in Austria to get back on their feet.

I talked with members of the Philharmonica Hungarica, among others. About 50 of them escaped with their families, more or less intact, and are living comfortably in a colony on the edge of Vienna. Almost all of the musicians are young men, the conductor, Zoltan Rozsnyai, being only 33.

In the autumn this distinguished company of artists will tour the United States and present concerts in 45 cities.

Surprisingly enough, families in this colony may communicate by telephone with relatives in Hungary. Moreover, censors appear to have stopped opening and reading letters and they permit foreign books, though not newspapers and magazines, to pass through the mails.

Buildings in Budapest and in other cities which I observed, pockmarked with the fire of machinegun and cannon, bear silent witness to the heoric revolution of 1956 against the monstrous rule by the Communist lackeys of Moscow. At present the Russian garrison is around 70,000, a quarter of them in and around Budapest. In several Hungarian villages I spotted Soviet military officers and men, and I saw a truckload of young Russian soldiers being hauled to their posts.

Faces on the streets of Hungary appear to reflect the presence of the Soviet forces and memories of the savage ferocity with which murderous Russian tanks and guns crushed the 1956 insurrection. Glum and dispirited

are the words that most accurately describe the Hungarians that I saw—passive resignation to a fate that somehow must be endured.

So long as the Communist regime of Hungary is upheld by tens of thousands of Soviet bayonets no new outbreaks of serious dimensions may be expected. Besides, a fresh set of anti-Russian leaders will need to mature. For, in addition to the men and women who fled abroad, about 75,000 insurgents were deported to the Soviet Union and only 1 in 6 of them is known to have been released from vile concentration camps. Conservative estimates place political prisoners in the jails of Hungary at 100,000.

For some free spirits, the Soviet Union offers one consolation. A current Hungarian witticism asks "Why do we love Russia?" And the answer: "Because Russia serves as a buffer state between Hungary and China." Half a century or so hence this bit of humor may be converted into sober reality.

In the last half year, some of the post-revolutionary rigors have been notably relaxed. Scientific and artistic workers are given no little latitude in the exercise of their talents. And the Communist campaign against religion has softened sufficiently to enable the faithful to worship without molestation and for instruction to be given to children.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, on the other hand, 70-year-old prelate of Hungary, still thinks it wise never to leave the safety afforded him by residence in the American Legation in Budapest.

It is permissible for privately operated shops to carry on business, provided employees do not exceed 10. The drive to force the peasantry to pool their land and livestock in collective farms has temporarily abated, so that at the moment around half of the cultivable soil is worked by individual households.

But only collectives get any new agricultural implements and only their members receive social security benefits, free medical care, old age pensions and so forth.

Water is drawn from community pumps or lifted out of the earth by means of long poles. Where brooks exist, maidens industriously scrub away on the family washing. Moldering, unkempt graveyards are full of wreaths long since faded and dried to a crisp. Single horse wagons, slow-footed oxen, or duble-duty cows draw their loads along in the steaming harvest sun. Women, clad in heavy clothing, toil on the wheatlands alongside their menfolk. Bikinis would seem to be more seasonable.

The broad, almost treeless plains running eastward from Budapest, and known as the pusta, belong among the richest granaries of Europe. Pancake flat, they remind the American of sections of our Middle West. Corn and wheat, onions, sugar beets, and sunflowers for oil promise bumper crops this year.

Curiously, potatoes, the poor man's best friend, are not extensively raised.

A Special Report on the 1st Session of the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, following the adjournment of the 1st session of the 86th Congress I prepared a special report on this productive session for distribution to the residents of Indiana's Third District which I have the honor to represent.

My special report follows:

A SPECIAL REPORT ON THE 1ST SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

The 1st session of the 86th Congress was the longest since 1951 and one of the most controversial. Congress produced a great deal of constructive legislation and completed hearings on other important bills with final action awaiting the second session next year. At a time when our country is confronted with a host of pressing problems at home and the challenge of Soviet communism abroad, there is plenty of work left to do.

Here is a report from your Representative in Congress on the first session:

LABOR REFORM BILL PASSED

Hottest legislative battle of the year came on proposals to curb racketeering and insure democracy in certain labor unions.

On September 4 I was among those Members of Congress who voted for the Labor-Management Reform Act of 1959, which is now law.

As a member of the House Education and Labor Committee, I took part in the work of many weeks to produce a fair and effective bill to rid the American labor movement of crooks and racketeers. Because of my stand, I was publicly attacked by Jimmy Hoffa's top labor lawyer.

In the 1958 campaign I promised that I would support reform legislation. I called attention to the fact that my Republican opponent, at that time the Congressman, had in 1958 voted against the Kennedy-Ives labor reform bill. He voted against this bill in spite of the fact that the U.S. Senate had already passed it by an overwhelming vote of 88 to 1.

When I said in the campaign I believed a labor reform law was necessary, I meant exactly what I said.

The final bill passed by Congress was the product of a House-Senate conference committee and represents a vast improvement over the Landrum-Griffin bill originally approved by the House. The Landrum bill imposed such harsh restrictions on decent labor unions that, as Senator JOHN KENNEDY said, it would have brought "the union movement in the South to a dead, screeching halt."

The Landrum bill was opposed by 97 percent of the Democrats in the North (including every Democratic and one Republican Congressman from Indiana) because it so obviously was an attempt to give the relatively nonunionized South a legislative license to steal industry from Indiana and other Northern States which pay union wages. I want industry to stay in Indiana.

Overwhelming Republican support for the Landrum bill was the result of one of the famous "deals" between the GOP and the Dixiecrats in Congress. The Halleck leadership in effect promised to drag Republican feet on civil rights legislation if the South would "go along" on the labor bill.

Major provisions of the new reform law include: A bill of rights for union members, financial and other reporting requirements for both unions and employers, guarantees of fair union elections and honest trusteeship procedures, safeguards of union funds, and prohibitions against convicted felons serving in union office. The bill also contains amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act which tighten up the ban on secondary boycotts, prohibit hot cargo agreements, restrict organizational picketing, and close the "no man's land" gap in National Labor Relations Board cases.

Much of the anticorruption language in the law originated in the bill which I supported in the Education and Labor Committee.

The new law is not perfect and I am still concerned that certain of its provisions will handicap the legitimate activities of the American trade union movement. But I am also convinced that the act will go a long way toward curbing the abuses uncovered by the Senate Rackets Committee which so shocked the American people.

Although honest citizens may differ over the specific provisions of this and other reform bills considered this session, I believe that the Labor-Management Reform Act will be one of the major accomplishments of the 86th Congress.

A SUMMARY OF OTHER MAJOR ACTIONS OF CONGRESS

Congress this year took the historic step of approving statehood for Hawaii. It provided a 2-year, $63-million annual program of Federal aid for airport construction; continued the draft for 4 more years; extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years; and established a health insurance program for Federal employees.

The lion's share of the Federal budget in the cold war age goes to defense. Congress voted $39.2 billion for defense funds for fiscal 1960.

The landing of a Soviet missile on the moon in September gave added significance to the vote of $485 million to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for work on space programs; $229 million was appropriated for Atomic Energy Commission construction projects.

Congress increased benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act, raised the interest rate on E and H savings bonds, and voted to add $200 million a year to the tax bill of the life insurance industry.

The public works bill Congress passed over President Eisenhower's veto contained funds to save human lives and property in Indiana by providing for much-needed flood control projects in the Wabash Valley.

Every Hoosier Representative, Democrat and Republican alike, except CHARLES HALLECK, voted against the 1-cent increase in the Federal gas tax Congress reluctantly accepted. I strongly favor building highways but I want to see more evidence than the Craig and Handley administrations have given that Indiana taxpayers are getting some good highways for their gas tax money.

The major veterans organizations supported a revision of the veterans pension program. The present system of flat monthly payments to all eligible persons was replaced by a sliding-scale of benefits related to other income, with the provision that no one now receiving benefits would be forced to take a cut. About 70 percent of the 1,250,000 veterans, widows and orphans eligible for payments will begin to receive larger benefits next year.

This Congress has been a budget-conscious Congress despite the Republican administration's charge that Democrats are "wild spenders." Congress cut over $1.8 billion from Eisenhower's budget requests for fiscal 1960.

Of the 17 appropriations bills passed, Congress increased only one over the President's request. We voted more money than he wanted for health and medical research. I was proud to support more funds to fight such killers and cripplers as heart disease and cancer.

The President's partisan attacks on Democrats as "spenders" were as unwise in winning support for his foreign aid program in Congress as they were unfair to the Senators and Congressmen on whom he most had to rely for passing it, the Democrats. Although I supported the mutual security program because I believe it essential in fighting communism and encouraging democracy abroad, many Democrats resented the President's curious logic that you were a "spender" if

you voted Federal funds for flood control and housing in America but you were not if you voted for similar programs in other countries in a foreign aid bill.

Congress voted $3.2 billion for the mutual security program, a slash of $1.2 billion under the President's final request. Democrat RAY MADDEN of Gary, Republican Leader HALLECK, and I were the only Indiana Congressmen who voted for the bill.

HOUSING BILL PASSES WITH BRADEMAS AMENDMENT

Every American family seeking to buy a home and nearly every community in the Third District—South Bend, Mishawaka, Michigan City, La Porte, Kingsford Heights, Goshen, Plymouth, Nappanee, Lakeville, and North Liberty—has a stake in the housing bill passed by Congress. After vetoing two excellent bills, President Eisenhower finally approved the third one.

All three included my amendment to permit some 350 South Bend families to keep their homes by authorizing the Federal Housing Administrator to modify the terms of a contract by the Southmore Mutual Housing Corp. to buy a Federal housing project. Homeowners had been threatened with foreclosure for falling behind in mortgage payments.

My amendment will allow the Southmore residents both to keep their homes and to pay their debt on a realistic basis, thus saving the taxpayers money by making costly foreclosure unnecessary.

Major provisions of the Housing Act of 1959 are as follows:

1. Authorized urban renewal grants of $650 million over a 2-year period.
2. Increased by $8 billion the total amount of mortgages FHA can insure.
3. Increased the maximum FHA mortgage from $20,000 to $22,500 and cut downpayment required on homes valued at $13,500 to $18,000 to 10 percent.
4. Authorized $50 million in direct loans for housing for the elderly.
5. Authorized 37,000 units of low-rent public housing, vital for taking care of slum dwellers displaced by urban renewal.
6. Increased the college housing loan fund by $250 million.

MICHIGAN CITY GETS $7,800 FOR HARBOR SURVEY

Passage of the public works appropriations bill over the President's veto means that Michigan City will receive $7,800 in Federal funds for a study survey by the Army Corps of Engineers of the city's proposed harbor improvement project.

I am delighted that this first big step has been taken to better the harbor facilities at Michigan City. The improvements can mean a significant increase in commerce to the benefit of the entire northern Indiana area.

The money will be used to determine if there is economic justification for deepening the harbor and for extending the head of navigation.

HARTKE-BRADEMAS BILL HELPS LA PORTE COUNTY SCHOOL

In the fall of 1958 fire destroyed the grade school in Union Township, La Porte County, near the Kingsbury Ordnance Plant. Senator VANCE HARTKE and I were able, in the closing hours of the last day of this session, to get both the Senate and House to pass a bill which in effect gives the township rent-free classroom space at the vacant Kingsbury plant.

The Army Department, now in charge of the empty plant, had at first billed Union Township $2,325 for temporary classroom space there but later demanded the township pay an additional $2,500 for installation of a new boiler and heating system.

Because the plant was idle and the township was already burdened with the construction of a new school, both Senator HARTKE and I felt the Army demands were excessive and unfair.

By authorizing the Army to credit the cost of installing the boiler and heating system against the rental, our bill in effect cancels the rental and saves the township $2,325 for its new school.

BRADEMAS URGES TAX CUT FOR MUSIC STUDENTS

The study of music has today become a normal part of the school curriculum of American boys and girls. We should do all we can to encourage young people who have the talent to play musical instruments.

In June I introduced a bill to remove the 10 percent Federal excise tax on musical instruments costing $150 or less. This bill, awaiting action next year, is aimed at encouraging the purchase of low-cost musical instruments by students for use in elementary, high school and college music courses.

At present instruments purchased by schools are exempt from this tax. Students who purchase their own instruments, however, must pay the 10-percent tax.

BRADEMAS PROPOSES "GREAT WHITE FLEET"

Last July I joined other Members of Congress in proposing the creation of a Great White Fleet to carry surplus foods and technical and medical aid to disaster and distress areas throughout the world.

Navy hospital ships, transports, and an aircraft carrier would be removed from mothballs and outfitted at relatively small expense to carry help to the world's sick and hungry.

Unarmed and painted white, this fleet would present to the peoples of the world the true image of America as a Nation dedicated to peace, friendship, and the relief of human suffering.

This bold and imaginative proposal makes a great deal more sense to me than many more expensive parts of our foreign aid program.

UNEMPLOYMENT STILL SERIOUS PROBLEM IN UNITED STATES

At a time when Soviet Premier Khrushchev threatens to bury the capitalist system by outproducing us, we must take effective action against chronic unemployment. The Nation cannot afford the lost production and loss of tax revenues caused when millions of persons are without work for long months.

The September statement of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell that unemployment continues to be a significant problem in some parts of the country dramatizes the importance of area redevelopment legislation now pending in Congress.

The Labor Department listed 70 major industrial areas, 17 of them for the first time, as centers of chronic labor surplus because of their heavy unemployment in good times as well as bad.

The area redevelopment bill, the first bill I introduced in Congress, is designed to bring in new industry and create new job opportunities in such chronically distressed communities. The bill, already passed by the Senate, would enable private industry to work jointly with local and Federal governments to encourage industrial growth in distressed areas.

I hope the House will have an opportunity to vote on the area redevelopment bill next year.

Two other proposals Congress will work on in 1960 are bills (1) to set better minimum standards for unemployment insurance benefits, and (2) to improve the minimum wage law by raising the figure from the present $1 an hour and extending coverage to more workers.

BRADEMAS OFFERS RIGHT-TO-VOTE AMENDMENT

In many States, especially in the South, Negro citizens are denied the right to vote through literacy tests, poll taxes, and other devices.

Because I believe such practices are in direct conflict with the American principles of democracy and freedom, in September I introduced a constitutional amendment to guarantee all Americans the right to vote in Federal elections.

This universal suffrage amendment was urged by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, in the recently released report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights of which he is a member.

My amendment, which might better be called the Hesburgh amendment, would insure the right to vote in Federal elections to every citizen who meets his State's age and residence requirements and who is not legally confined at the time of registration or election.

I will work hard for action on this proposal next year. Only those who deny the Hebrew-Christian tradition of respect for the dignity of the individual human being as a child of God can deny to an American citizen the right to vote.

STOP MOVE TO HURT GREAT LAKES SHIPPING

In late August the House voted to extend for 1 year the Public Law 480 program to dispose of Government-owned surplus food stocks to friendly foreign nations.

I voted against an amendment to this bill which would in effect have prevented shipment of surpluses abroad from Great Lakes ports. A coalition of midwest Democrats and Republicans joined to defeat the amendment by a vote of 142 to 134. It was an "anti-St. Lawrence Seaway" proposal that would have favored seaboard and Gulf coast ports.

The extended program authorizes the Government to sell up to $1.5 billion worth of surpluses from our bulging warehouses to foreign countries for foreign currencies and to donate an additional $300 million worth to nations suffering from famine or other disasters.

INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION PAYS DIVIDENDS

America's schools opened this fall with a shortage of 195,000 teachers and 130,000 classrooms.

Indiana, according to State School Superintendent William E. Wilson, is about 3,000 classrooms short and faces "a critical shortage of teachers."

The facts are plain. Many of our Nation's schoolchildren, including many young Hoosiers, are being cheated of a good education because of overcrowded classrooms and a lack of trained teachers.

Every year 2 million more children join the national school population. It has become clear that local and State governments cannot fiscally or physically meet the obvious requirement of more investment in classrooms and teachers. We cannot get much more blood out of the property tax turnip.

These are some of the reasons that, as a member of the General Education Subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee, I was pleased to help write a modified school-support bill under which Federal funds will be provided—$1.1 billion a year for 4 years—to the States to support them in building new schools and improving teachers' salaries.

As a former teacher, I am opposed strongly to Federal control and therefore glad to say the bill contains a provision expressly prohibiting Federal intervention.

A full Education Committee favorably reported the bill but a Republican-Dixiecrat coalition on the Rules Committee has prevented the House from having a chance to vote on the measure. I shall continue to work hard for passage of this bill. A nation that refuses to invest adequately in its

most important natural resource, educated young men and women, will not be able to meet the stern demands of the 20th century. And we are not now investing enough.

BRIDGING THE "LANGUAGE GAP"

More than 3 million Americans are stationed overseas today, yet comparatively few speak a foreign language fluently, and less than 15 percent of our public high school students now study a modern foreign language. The Soviet Union, by way of contrast, has made intensive efforts to encourage such proficiency.

There is no question that the vital interests of the United States abroad have suffered seriously because of our failures in the field of foreign-language training. Last April I analyzed this "language gap" in a speech at Valparaiso University before members of the Indiana Foreign Language Teachers Association.

I proposed the creation of a national language foundation similar to the National Science Foundation to stimulate foreign language study and also suggested granting income tax deductions to language teachers who travel abroad to improve their knowledge of the languages they teach.

BRADEMAS REPRESENTS U.S. CONGRESS IN PERU

In May, legislators from throughout the Western Hemisphere met in Lima, Peru, at the first Inter-American Parliamentary Conference. I was honored to be chosen as one of three to represent the U.S. Congress.

Congressmen POAGE, of Texas, MONTOYA, of New Mexico, and I flew to Lima for the week-long conference and joined in the unanimous adoption of a resolution to encourage the economic integration of South and Central America.

The recent crises in Cuba, Venezuela, and Argentina are dramatic symbols of why we must give greater attention to our relations with Latin American nations. As a delegate to this conference, my own conclusion is that our discussions were of real help in improving these relations.

CARL SANDBURG, ROBERT FROST, DEBBIE QUINN, SAM RAYBURN

Among the personal highlights of my first year in Congress were listening to the white-haired American historian, Carl Sandburg, hold a joint session of Congress hushed and enthralled with his moving address on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. Spending an evening with Robert Frost, four times a Pulitzer prize winner and one of the most distinguished poets America has produced. A warm and kindly, but plain talking, man of granitelike features, Robert Forst believes deeply that we shouldn't make life too easy for people. "If I had one gift to give to man," he told me, "it would be character." Welcoming little Debbie Quinn to Washington. Debbie, 6, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Quinn, of LaPorte. Completely recovered from a serious heart operation, she was formally crowned as America's Valentine Girl of 1959 by Mrs. Eisenhower at the White House. Chatting for an hour in the office of Speaker SAM RAYBURN as he welcomed Mayor Edward F. Voorde, of South Bend, and his 18-year-old daughter, Frances Mary, to Washington.

FILMS AVAILABLE ON FREE LOAN

By writing me at my home office, Federal Building, South Bend 24, Ind., or phoning (South Bend, Central 5-5616), church, school and civil groups can obtain on free loan any of several 16 mm. sound films of interest to Third District citizens.

For example, you can borrow a 10-minute film entitled "Mr. Brademas Goes to Washington," showing the first few weeks in the life of a freshman Congressman. The film, shown to school children throughout the Nation, depicts scenes from our own district as well as shots of President Eisenhower, House Speaker Sam Rayburn and former President Harry Truman.

Other films, all 16 mm., available on free loan through my office, are listed:

"The Challenge of Civil Rights," a 15-minute discussion of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, Congressman Shester Bowles of Connecticut and Congressman Brademas.

"The Ugly American and Our Foreign Aid Program," a 15-minute discussion by Eugene Burdick, co-author of the best-selling novel, U.S. Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota and Congressman Brademas.

"Man on the Hill," a 15-minute color film produced by the U.S. Government describing the job of a Congressman.

"The Role of Religion in the Armed Services," an 11-minute filmed interview in which three uniformed chaplains, Jewish, Protestant, and Roman Catholic—Army, Air Force, and Navy—explain to Congressman BRADEMAS how the Armed Forces provide for the religious needs of servicemen.

HOME OFFICE OPEN DURING ADJOURNMENT

During October, November, and December I can be reached at my home office: Federal Building, South Bend 24, Ind. The telephone number is CEntral 4-5616.

I also plan to tour the four counties of the district from time to time in order that anyone who wishes to take up a problem with me can do so.

My first year of service as your Representative in Congress has been an exciting and satisfying experience. I am honored by the trust you have placed in me, and I welcome your writing to me with your views on important issues and your requests for assistance on matters where I can be helpful. I am here to serve you. Please don't hesitate to call on me.

Your friend,

JOHN BRADEMAS,
Member of Congress.

The Fight in 1959 for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, early last month, school bells rang out across the Nation and, for the 15th consecutive year, a new record number of boys and girls answered. At least one out of every four of them is now being educationally short changed because of the continuing shortage of classrooms and qualified teachers.

Today there are some 43 million boys and girls attending elementary and secondary schools, an increase of 1,750,000 over last year. By the most conservative estimates, the education of 10 million of them is being impaired by the classroom shortage.

Recent reports on public school enrollment show 1,843,000 pupils in excess of normal school capacity. These excess students were added to an estimated 6 million in crowded urban elementary schools and more than another 2 million in obsolete or inadequate buildings. The 10 million figure is extremely conservative—because it does not include either urban high schools or rural schools.

The desirable maximum class size is 30 pupils. If a class has 40 or 50 pupils, the education of every child is being impaired—not just that of the additional 10 or 20 pupils. Even though the class size may be within the desirable limit, the youngsters are being short changed if their teacher is substandard. At the start of this year we were short 195,000 qualified teachers.

Less than 2 months ago, Secretary Flemming of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare told a press conference this Nation is short 140,000 classrooms, or 2,300 better off than we were 2 years ago. If we close this classroom gap at the rate of 1,200 a year, it will be 117 years—the year 2076 before we have an educational plant adequate to house our schoolchildren.

And the States and local districts—reaching the point of exhaustion, exhaustion of debt capacity, exhaustion of ability of local taxpayers to bear the heavy tax burden on local property that good schools and teachers now require—cannot even maintain, much less increase as they must, their phenomenal efforts to catch up to the pupil increase.

President Eisenhower has been all over the lot on the question of whether the Federal Government shall face up to its responsibility in this crisis in our classrooms. I traced his wavering course, from study, through action to inaction and back to study, on page A1565 of the February 26 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since that time, the Administration has sent up its ineffectual answer to the classroom shortage.

It would authorize $300 million a year for 5 years to underwrite school bonds in States guaranteeing a "reasonable tax effort"—undefined—and matching the Federal contribution dollar for dollar with State funds.

This proposal would do nothing for districts which already have reached or neared statutory or constitutional debt ceilings. It would do nothing for States which meet their educational obligation other than by helping build schools. And even should the States be willing to comply with this maximum Federal control—and be willing to rewrite their constitutions and laws—they would still be at the mercy of a band of bureaucrats who would determine what is a "reasonble tax effort" for the citizens of a State to make.

While pushing this program, the administration has served notice that the President would veto my H.R. 22, the School Support Act of 1959, principally sponsored in the other body by the senior Senator from Montana, Senator MURRAY.

As reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, H.R. 22 would authorize allocation of $1.1 billion a year for each of 4 years among the States on a basis of $25 for each school age child. The allotment becomes State money and is to be expended for either construction or teachers' salaries or both as each State wishes.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has reported S. 8, a 2-year $1.1 billion program for classroom construction only.

Both proposals are opposed by the administration, which is so serious about our schools, which President Eisenhower once called "strong points in our national defense," that it even proposes to reduce existing Federal aid programs for construction, operation, and maintenance.

This Federal aid, under Public Laws 815 and 874, goes direct to the local districts for construction, operation, and maintenance—including textbooks and teachers' salaries—in areas of Federal impact.

In the 8 years that these laws have been on the books, the Federal Government has spent more than $901 million on 4,506 projects to build classrooms to house more than 1.3 million children. More than 768 million Federal dollars have been appropriated for operation and maintenance of schools in 3,546 districts with a total enrollment of 8.6 million children.

Schoolchildren, their parents, and future generations will thank this Congress for rejecting Eisenhower recommendations that we cut back these Federal aid programs. A vast majority of the schoolchildren and their parents, from whom I have heard, hope that during the next Congress the Federal Government will shoulder its share of the heavy responsibility for the schooling of the youth of our Nation.

Exported Education Is an Explosive Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP A. HART
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Dr. Benjamin Fine has written three outstanding articles for the North American Newspaper Alliance on one of the United States most significant and growing exports, education. The total impact of this export of talent and skill is quite immeasurable, and I do not believe that Dr. Fine has overestimated the importance of this combined public and private activity when he says that this is America's E-bomb and has a greater potential for improving man's welfare than atomic energy.

In approaching the legislative program of the Federal Government in the next session, I would hope that these articles will provide a starting point by which we, in the Congress, can evaluate the truly basic importance of this great resource.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD these three articles which appeared in the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORTED EDUCATION IS AN EXPLOSIVE FORCE

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK.—The first great need of millions of people in Latin America, Africa and Asia is to learn to read and write. In certain rural areas of Latin America and the Middle East fewer than 10 percent of the people are literate. Literacy is as low as 3 percent in some parts of Iran. Only 20 percent of the people in Libya can read and write. The percentage is 42 in Peru and as high as 50 in Thailand.

To help life these countries from this medieval backwardness, the United States has launched an E-bomb. The E is for education, and it has proved to be one of the most explosive forces known to man.

Every year the Federal Government spends from $30 million to $50 million to help raise the educational standards of underprivileged countries. An arrangement has been made with leading U.S. colleges and universities to sponsor educational projects abroad. Major coordinating agency for all this is the International Cooperation Agency.

ENORMOUS PROBLEMS MET

The problems are enormous. Eighty-five percent of the elementary teachers in Liberia have less than a ninth-grade education. Villagers in Cambodia have built hundreds of schools—but teachers will not be available until the teacher-training program now being developed with U.S. assistance is able to meet the need.

"Such things as organized courses of study, education for living and vocational training are unknown to the great majority of teachers in the less developed countries," ICA officials report. "Learning is by rote, unrelated to community life. It pays little attention to the needs of the schoolchild and his future as a productive citizen."

Here is where the American colleges and universities enter the picture. As part of the Mutual Security Act, the U.S. Government has encouraged American colleges to enter into agreements with foreign universities through which our schools aid in strengthening technical education and other services. The results have been excellent.

TEACHERS TRAINED IN UNITED STATES

Most of the help is technical, not financial. Thousands of teachers have been trained by U.S. educators. In some instances the teachers are brought to this country; in others, American experts go abroad to supervise the training.

The entire faculties of leading normal schools in Bolivia, Paraguay, and Peru have been brought to the United States. Guatemala sent 100 elementary, secondary, and vocational education teachers to the United States for 10 weeks to study and observe education in this country.

Under American tutelage, elementary teaching requirements in Lebanon have been raised from 2 years of training to 3 for a teaching certificate. In Peru, teachers now are required to have 4 years' training, instead of 3, to get the highest degree. In Iran no teacher can teach without at least 1 year of professional training.

TEACHER TRAINING BEGUN

With the help of U.S. educators, Nepal has developed its first teacher training program and established the first teachers college in its history.

American specialists have helped develop several hundred textbooks, used by a million children. Financial support from this country has helped equip more than 500 libraries. Aid from the United States has added equipment to hundreds of science laboratories, shops home economics departments, and other school programs.

Increases in the numbers of students attending school are taking place in almost every one of the 60 countries which are participating in the joint educational programs.

HOW IT GETS STARTED

How does a joint program begin?

According to the two chief architects of the program—Richard B. Farnsworth, deputy chief of the ICA's Office of Educational Services, and Ralph W. Ruffner, director of the ICA's educational services—the initial move must come from the foreign country itself. The United States does not attempt to cram any new ideas or any educational developments down the throat of the foreign people.

This is the way a typical program gets started:

The Minister of Education, or some important official of, let us say India, seeks help for the educational programs in that country. The minister may seek out the U.S. Ambassador, and suggest the help needed. A mission is then set up in India, consisting of ICA representatives.

Through this mission, details are worked out between Indian and American universities. An institution in India may want help in improving its engineering program. It can ask help from Purdue University, or from some other institution here. If the U.S. university agrees to accept the assignment, a contract is drawn up between the U.S. institution and the university in India.

IT WORKS TWO WAYS

"At no time," Dr. Farnsworth explained, "do the American universities force themselves upon the foreign colleges. This is a cooperative project, mutually arrived at, and worked out harmoniously."

Also, it is a two-way street. American educators get as much as they receive. They have left their ivory tower, and will never be the same again. College professors who never left their campuses are now sowing academic seeds all the way from Afghanistan to Vietnam. They leave on missions of from 3 months to 3 years. It is good for the professor, his college, and education generally.

Frequently, it has been found, a college professor who goes abroad for 2 years finds that the accumulated rust of his campus life quickly flakes away. He comes back a more exciting and challenging teacher.

TYPICAL PROGRAMS CITED

A striking illustration of how the program operates to improve educational standards can be seen in Formosa, where Purdue University is helping to improve the engineering school.

Purdue is developing educational facilities for engineering training at Chen Kung University. New laboratory equipment to replace wornout equipment and to meet the increases in enrollment has been furnished by the United States.

The Purdue engineers found that in Formosa engineering was taught by textbooks only. The Chinese students did not have any laboratory experience, or any practical work.

FORMOSA SENDS STUDENTS

Purdue has brought five Formosan students to its campus, where they will get the modern techniques of engineering.

What will happen after the Purdue mission ends? It is the hope of American officials that the techniques learned in the United States will become permanent features of education in Formosa.

The expenditures are relatively small. Our foreign aid bill runs into something like $4 billion a year. Only about $50 million of this goes to the educational program. Some educators believe this is not enough. We get more than our money's worth in good will.

U.S. COLLEGES RAISE WORLD STANDARDS

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK.—American colleges and universities are leaving indelible imprints on

the cultural standards of large numbers of underdeveloped countries.

At the same time, there is some grumbling by American educators. They object to the redtape and occasional unsympathetic attitude found in Washington.

Some of the errors are excusable. They are based on inexperience rather than deliberate interference on the part of State Department officials. The U.S. Government and foreign governments, or American universities and foreign universities, do not always see eye to eye on the objectives of the interuniversity programs. This has resulted in problems and frustrations.

Sharp criticism comes from Prof. Norman D. Palmer, chairman of the international relations program of the University of Pennsylvania and coordinator of the Pennsylvania-University of Karachi project.

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING

"In my judgment," Professor Palmer told this writer, "the International Cooperation Administration has failed miserably to give the interuniversity programs the proper support. The failure has been lack of understanding and of undue restrictions rather than of tangible support in a specific way. Several congressional reports have criticized ICA for its failures in this connection."

A similar complaint comes from the Cornell University controller, A. H. Petersen, who is also the campus coordinator of Cornell's project with the University of the Philippines.

Mr. Petersen says that "while the program is successful from an educational view, the frustrations of doing work under an ICA contract are such that no Administrator would be anxious to repeat the experience. In general, the ICA attitude is not sympathetic to these programs, and the administration is made exceedingly difficult."

MANY APPROVE PROGRAM

Balanced against these criticisms is the approval by many college and university officials. In the main, the program is approved, although many minor irritations crop up. Officials of the American Council on Education, reporting on a study made in 1957, point out that there are no generally accepted standards of procedures for selection of individuals who participate in the program.

Some colleges complain that Government programs involving private institutions are not planned or operated so as to take into account the policies, programs, or problems of the institutions. A clearinghouse between the American universities and the Federal Government was suggested by a number of institutions.

PRACTICES CRITICIZED

Basically, the criticism is leveled against some of the State Department administrative practices, not against the project itself. A NANA survey of 30 typical universities shows unanimous approval of the effectiveness of the program. Much has been done by American educators to help foreign countries expand their own technical, scientific and cultural facilities.

Here are some typical programs, which tend to show the nature of the relationship between the American and foreign university:

Wayne State University has developed an educational program for Thailand. Annual in-service training programs have been conducted for 150 teachers. With no text or reference books in the Thai language, and with no laboratory equipment, Thai instructors must rely heavily upon the lecture method.

Help has been given to the Thailand technical institutes. New teaching methods have been introduced. Says Prof. Gerald Baysinger, university coordinator for foreign visitors:

"As a result of my experience in Thailand, I am convinced that money is well spent in helping educational programs in other countries. Such help is of lasting values to democracy."

PROJECT AIDS INDONESIA

The University of Kentucky is cooperating with the technical and science faculty of the University of Indonesia. Kentucky is promoting development of education in the field of engineering and science, assisting in development of library and laboratory facilities and working toward the training of more Indonesian science professors.

The University of Wyoming is engaged in a program of advice and technical assistance to the Royal Afghan Ministry of Education and the Royal Afghan Ministry of Agriculture. This includes the reorganization and development of the Afghan Institute of Technology and the reorganization of a vocational agriculture school. Afghan students came to the University of Wyoming to get firsthand experience in engineering and agriculture.

Stanford University, in cooperation with the Philippine Department of Education, is engaged in a program to improve the Philippine system of vocational teacher education. The university is helping revise the curriculum in vocational education, to establish shops and libraries and aid in faculty improvement.

Many other projects, all designed to help improve educational levels abroad are now in progress:

New York University has started a program to develop education and professional programs in business administration, industrial management, and executive management training in Israel.

The University of Michigan is engaged in a program to bring industry-sponsored research to Waseda University, Tokyo. Michigan State University has cooperative programs in Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Okinawa, Pakistan, and Vietnam.

RUTGERS IN AFRICA

Rutgers University recently completed an ICA project with the Royal Technical College of East Africa in Nairobi, Kenya, involving aid in designing and equipping an engineering laboratory building. The ICA provided funds for the building and equipment.

These are but samples of the hundreds of programs carried on in every part of the world by American colleges and universities.

They are engaged in a tremendous adventure in international cooperation. To a large extent, the future of civilization and of the world depends more upon what the E-bomb does—E for education—than what tanks and guns may accomplish.

Education is a common bond. The free world needs a higher level of education. It is good to know that much is already being done by American universities to raise the technical, cultural, and scientific standards of the world.

AMERICA EXPORTING EDUCATION OVERSEAS

(By Dr. Benjamin Fine)

NEW YORK.—America is placing its most potent weapon—the E-bomb—in the hands of dozens of countries around the globe, many of them just emerging from the mule cart era.

The "E" is for education, and it has a greater potential for improving man's welfare than atomic energy. In a sense, it is the only kind of bomb which can penetrate the defenses of the Iron Curtain.

Millions of dollars are spent by the U.S. Government, through various agencies and private foundations, to raise the educational levels in many parts of the world. Particular emphasis is placed on the new countries which have sprung up since World War II.

GUNS ARE NOT ENOUGH

Basically, the program is designed to strengthen the free countries and to keep them out of the Communist orbit. Although the United States provides many of these countries with military aid, some responsible quarters believe that guns, bombs and tanks are not enough. Democracy can only be sold if the people understand the concepts of freedom and recognize the responsibilities of free government.

What the educators are doing abroad is in direct contrast to the implications made in "The Ugly American." More than 800 American professors representing every field of learning, are on loan to the governments of 32 countries of the world this year. And the number is growing steadily.

They come from every type of institution—from Harvard and Columbia, Michigan State University and Stanford, Tuskegee Institute, and the University of Chicago.

They have one major objective: To give the countries they visit the benefit of their skills, their know-how, and their achievements.

FORTY-ONE COUNTRIES AIDED

Various agencies take part in this far-reaching program. The largest is the International Cooperation Administration, a unit within the Department of State. More than 300 universities, colleges and technical schools in 41 countries are being aided in their development through the ICA.

Nearly 60 American colleges and universities, in all parts of the country, have contracts with the foreign institutions. More than $30 million a year is spent on these cooperative programs.

The assistance has been both cultural and economic. For example, Wayne State University in Detroit has cooperated with the Bangkok Technical Institute. Today the institute, which did not exist 7 years ago, has 4,600 students.

TEACHERS TRAINED

This international adventure in learning has helped train hundreds of thousands of elementary school teachers. In some instances 80 percent of all teachers have been trained through ICA-sponsored projects. In Nepal, for example, 407 new schools have been opened and training given to 2,300 teachers. School attendance has increased from 15,000 to 85,000.

But there are other important international educational programs, sponsored by private or public funds. Among the most significant are these:

1. Exchange-of-persons activities financed in whole or in part by the Department of State. Examples are the Fulbright program and the Smith-Mundt program.

2. Exchange-of-persons activities financed in whole or in part by the United Nations or its specialized agencies.

3. Exchange-of-persons activities financed in whole or in part by private individuals, organizations, and institutions.

4. Affiliation with foreign educational institutions exclusive of the university contract program of the ICA.

GAINS MADE ABROAD

A survey of the international education program, made by the North American Newspaper Alliance, indicates that vast strides have been made in the last 5 years to improve living and educational standards abroad. Information was received from leading ICA officials and from 30 of the colleges and universities which have contracts with foreign governments or universities abroad.

Despite the roadblocks that sometimes exist—mostly in the form of governmental redtape—the overall program can be judged a complete success. Enough illustrations exist to show that American educators who have gone to foreign lands have helped improve the living standards of the people.

More than 6,000 skilled American technicians today are working overseas spreading technical knowledge in 58 countries. They have trained 3 million people who are now giving that training to others.

According to ICA officials, the areas of training include agriculture, national resources development, industry, mining, labor relations, health, sanitation, education, public administration, housing, public safety, banking, and community development.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

A study made by the Institute of Research on Overseas Programs of Michigan State University shows that 184 American universities have 382 international programs at present. Nearly every type of university in every area of the country is represented. An estimated 7,000 persons participate in the overseas aspects of the international programs of American universities.

Why have the projects been established? Why do American universities and their leading professors go abroad, sometimes as much as 3 years at a time?

UNITED STATES-SOVIET COMPETITION

The NANA survey indicates that the two major objectives are (1) the general advancement of knowledge in underdeveloped foreign countries, and (2) aiding the U.S. foreign policy.

The U.S. program is in direct competition with those sponsored by the Soviet Union in many parts of the world. In India, for example, the Russians have sent teams of technical advisers and educational experts. They have done so in the Middle East and have begun to infiltrate on a cultural level in the Far East.

"The Soviet Union has a strong educational program in India," said Ralph W. Ruffner, director of educational services for the ICA. Mr. Ruffner has just returned from India, where for the last 3 years he was in charge of the American educational program.

"However, we are ahead thus far," he added. "The work done by U.S. universities has helped raise culture and economic standards in many parts of India."

RURAL YOUNG PEOPLE TRAINED

At present, American projects in India are sponsored by the Universities of Illinois, Wisconsin, Tennessee, Ohio State, Kansas State, Missouri, and Columbia University's Teachers College. They are concentrating on agriculture, engineering, and education.

The state of Uttar Pradesh in north India is now setting up a state university patterned after the American land-grant institutions. It will provide training largely for rural young people.

The Indian Institute of Technology is rapidly developing, under American auspices, as the leading engineering university in that part of the world.

America's influence throughout the world is well established on the military and political fronts. Now the United States is emerging as a major force in helping to shape the educational and culture patterns of many lands.

Our democracy will be strengthened as free peoples everywhere raise their educational and economic sights.

Address by Hon. Robert W. Kastenmeier, of Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to place in the RECORD an address by my good friend and colleague from across the Mississippi River, Mr. KASTENMEIER, of Wisconsin. I have read the address with great respect, since it deals incisively with one of the major problems of our government and society.

In a Constitution Day address, Mr. KASTENMEIER was examining a major challenge to our heritage of constitutional government. As he pointed out, in the areas of individual legal rights, rights to economic security, and civil rights we are moving ahead to fulfill the Constitution. But as to the basic aim of the Constitution, the establishment of accountability of the Government to the governed, we are falling behind rather than gaining. Under the pressures of modern hot and cold war, we have allowed certain agencies that make the ultimate decisions to operate without being accountable to the people. Insofar as this is happening, we are losing democratic controls over Government. And, as we might expect, the result is apathy among our people. Like my colleague, I regard this trend as terribly dangerous. I believe his analysis of the situation and of its remedy deserve to be carefully studied by this House and by the people of the Nation:

I am very happy and honored to be here today to speak to you about our Constitution and our attempts to fulfill the meaning of this great document. Constitution Day presents us with the opportunity to reexamine that document, now almost two centuries old, whose interpretations and purpose are still as much the center of dispute now as when it was first presented to the various State conventions for ratification. In this, of course, rests its vitality, excitement, and validity. Thus, to me, the Constitution is not only a framework upon which to operate a government and rule a society, but also, in certain ways, it enumerates goals and aspirations which we as a Nation should achieve.

This is especially true in the area of individual personal rights. The courts, and to a lesser degree Congress, are pursuing a course in which greater rights are guaranteed to the individual.

For example, the whole problem of right to counsel is constantly under review. Because of our dual form of government, it has been generally accepted that the right to counsel as guaranteed under the sixth amendment is only applicable to a Federal court, except in capital cases and in cases where substantive due process is denied to the defendant in the State court. There is now a general feeling among many members of the Judiciary Committee of the Congress, the committee of which I am a member, that the best way to give the sixth amendment meaning as it applies to the Federal court system is actually to guarantee and place at the disposal of indigent defendants a public defender who will have the same status and stature as the local United States attorney. In this way we might go about fulfilling the Constitution as it applies to the individual defendant.

There are other areas, of course, where the problem exists of fulfilling our Constitution and our general conception of equalitarian democracy. As a result of the 1930's a series of economic rights or opportunities, not specifically provided for in the Constitution, are now considered to be almost as important as certain political rights. The protection of such economic rights means that a balance between economic groups must be maintained, since protection for one group sometimes is at the partial expense of another. Where the balance should be held is, therefore, an ethical question that depends in each case on the judgment and spirit of the citizenry.

In another area of individual liberty, the ethics are clear, and they do not in the least pit one group against another. In the area of civil rights, many now argue that the Federal Government must affirmatively guarantee certain rights if they are to be in any sense meaningful. They argue that it is not enough to guarantee on paper the right to vote, or the right to attend schools without regard to race, or the right, if you will, of first-class citizenship. For the most part the ideals of this argument are accepted in our Nation. Although the fight is hard, the pressures great, the traditions of various parts of the Nation strong, I believe that in the not too distant future this kind of equality of opportunity will be guaranteed to our citizens through the positive or affirmative use of Federal law and Federal power.

In another time, perhaps a more socially conscious age, the concept of ordered liberty will embrace rights which are not now articulated. It is this potentiality to expand as man expands which is the genius of our Constitution.

Despite this potentiality, there is a basic area involving our Constitution about which I am deeply disturbed. It does not concern the question of individual liberty or economic opportunities or civil rights, but rather concerns the entire notion of constitutional government. In order to give perspective to this problem, I wish to go over certain basic notions of the framework of freedom granted through the Constitution and the philosophy of government outlined in the Constitution. I hope that this recapitulation of basic axioms upon which our Government is based will not be an empty exercise, but will rather give us insight to a new set of problems peculiar to the authoritarian-oriented 20th century. These latter problems, for which as yet we have found neither answers nor ways to apply our constitutional directives, could erode our free society and the ideals of constitutional government.

Basic to our constitutional form of government is the belief that the ultimate power of government must of necessity reside in the people. James Madison, the philosopher of the Constitution, told the delegates at the constitutional convention: "It seems indispensable that the mass of citizens should not be without a voice in making the laws which they are to obey, and in choosing the magistrates who are to administer them."

To have adopted any other conception would have utterly abandoned the founders' enmity to the worst elements of British rule. For their rebellion against that rule had been aimed directly at the concentration of power and control outside the hands of the people.

Yet this view was not the complete picture. Certainly there were members of the Constitutional Convention who feared control by the people without any system of checks and balances over the choices of the people. The fear was suggested by the classical Greek social experience and Greek philosophy. It was believed that democratic controls quickly ended in control by the tyrant or the demagog. As John Adams once said, "Democracy never lasts long. It soon wastes, exhausts, and murders itself. There never was a democracy yet that did not commit suicide."

The problem of the founders was how to avoid unrestrained power in the hands of either small groups or the people as a whole which could lead to a form of tyranny.

What the Founding Fathers wanted and what they expressed in our Constitution was the concept of balanced government, an idea at least as old as Aristotle. Madison stated

that our Government must be so constructed "that its several constituent parts may, by their mutual relations, be the means of keeping each other in their proper places."

Thus a properly designed state was one in which interest would check interest, class would check class, faction would check faction, and one branch of government would limit the power of the other branch of government, in what one student of that period has called a harmonious system of mutual frustration.

Practically speaking the quest of the Founding Fathers may be reduced to the concept of accountability, which forces various interests to check and control one another, with ultimate power lying in the hands of the people.

Our Nation has used tihs philosophy as a basis for governing since our first days. We have believed in a system of checks and balances; of interest balancing interest and faction balancing faction so that the control of our Nation would not rest with the unchecked few, or a tyranous majority. Some philsophers of American history have suggested that our Founding Fathers' theory of man was not a sanguine one, and hence they conceived of their task in the public realm as balancing vice against vice, or interest against interest. That is how our Government operated through the 1930's.

Since that time—I would say since about 1940, with American involvement in the Second World War—the system of checks and balances, of vice balancing vice, and of accountability, has suffered rapid erosion. Unfortunately, there has arisen the notion of nonaccountability, either to the people or their elected representatives on the part of various defense and other policymaking groups in this country. Under present world conditions, these groups literally have the power of life and death over all of humanity. Such groups have been able to evolve by cloaking their activities under the phrase "national security."

The meaning of this phrase as it is now applied could never have been guessed by the most farsighted of our Founding Fathers. For example, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and other units organized specifically for the purpose of protecting democratic government are, in the name of national security, removed from the normal controls of democratic government. Congress has no control over, and indeed, does not even know, how these groups spend appropriations given to them. Decisionmaking processes and factual decisions are never disclosed until after the fact. It disturbs me to state that there are now organizations within Government, created by Government, which have no obligation to report to the Congress and the electorate which they represent. While it can be argued from a legislative point of view that these groups are responsible only to the Executive, it should be noted that until the Second World War the activities and actions of our various agencies and departments were public knowledge, open to criticism, investigation, and comment by the public and the Congress.

It has been wisely and justly said of our Constitution that it both affirms and denies the principle of affording responsibility to the electorate. Responsibility in this context means no more than that those who govern are accountable to the governed. This accountability means only that the governed have the power both to approve and to dismiss constitutionally those whom they have chosen to govern.

The burning crisis in the life of the American Constitution is that those who are constitutionally accountable are not those who govern. For example, questions as to the nuclear capacity of our Nation and of other countries of the world are questions which involve, in the words of the President, "humanity itself." And yet, paradoxically, this is an area which does not admit the electorate, but only those possessing special technical competence, to make final judgments. And we are told that even if the public did have the special competence required to make final judgments in the use of nuclear weapons, the publicity attending such a debate must necessarily be abandoned in the interests of national security. The public is told it must instruct its elected representatives to willingly foreclose whole areas from public debate or questioning because of the ignorance of the public and the necessity of maintaining the national security. These factors are said to carry such great force as to free many groups of these experts from any duty to account to the legislature. Thus it is that the very area which affects our Nation with the greatest directness is precisely the area where our electorate and its representatives are not going to be permitted to make any decisions at all.

The revolutionary implications of these developments for our constitution are tremendous in scope. We have power delegated by the legislature to experts who are responsive neither to the executive, the judiciary, nor to the legislature itself from which they derive their legal authority. The Roman lawyers had as a maxim in their law the proposition that once delegated, authority cannot be further delegated. Can the legislature, should the legislature delegate to agencies, nominally in the executive but due to the complexity and urgency of their work actually independent, powers which under the constitution are expressly granted to the legislature or the Chief Executive? These are problems with which the exposition of the constitutional law must now grapple.

It is an unhappy situation, whatever the sound reasons which necessitate it, when the feeling spreads among the voters in a democracy that though their vote may perhaps influence agricultural policy, it will not influence the decision as to what amount of strontium will be allowed in the atmosphere; whether American soldiers will be shipped to fight in police actions; whether atomic weapons will be used in wartime. The negative emotional and cultural consequences, the feeling of helplessness engendered is very dangerous in a democracy such as ours. The Constitution presupposes at all times a responsible citizenry. In some instances it provides that the will of the citizenry be responsive to the judgments of the judiciary as to whether or not they have exceeded the bounds to which the Constitution confines them. Now a whole field of problems has been removed from the governed and those who under the Constitution are given the duty of governing.

From such a cultural and political situation a feeling of alienation from government occurs among the electorate. A citizen may well feel himself lost to affect decisions; he feels himself a pawn in the hands of others. In the views of some, this makes for the beginning of a garrison state in which our citizenry may grow passive, indifferent, and atomized.

As I suggested, these problems are recent in origin and were born quite apart from the normal evolution of constitutional processes. Instead they owe their origin to an international power struggle where a society's interest in survival constantly has to be weighed alongside its determination to preserve constitutional government.

But, whatever the origin of our problem, be it a result of general history or the nature of authoritarian ideologies in the 20th century, if we believe in freedom, we must do all in our power to make the concept of government outlined in the Constitution apply to today's life. Given the present size of government and the rise of groups which are to a great extent unaccountable to the people, the task is not an easy one.

I do not believe that the task of restoring accountability and meaning to the democratic process is beyond our strength. A simple beginning might be made by returning to the basic proposition that the people must judge. And this requires only a reaffirming of our belief in ourselves. By our actions in denying information to the electorate are we not actually denying our belief in democracy? Whatever the risk—are we not surrendering that which we most wish to defend?

Accepting or reaccepting the belief that the people must judge, we must provide information so that through their representatives they may again take part in the decisionmaking process. This means that we must completely reevaluate the pernicious and insidious doctrine of secrecy, and reformulate the notion of classified information. We must completely review certain of our approaches to national security. We must know what such amorphous policymaking bodies as the CIA, the AEC, and the Defense Department are doing. We must be willing to undertake large-scale educational programs for our citizens so that when information is made available to them, they will be able to make reasonable choices.

The creativity of the American people cannot be applied to solution of the great economic, social, and technical problems of our time unless they are given the facts. I believe the American poeple have the courage to be free. Let the people and their elected representatives, the Congress, judge more fully those problems which mean life or death to our civilization. Let us return to our Constitution the idea of accountability so basic to the thought of our Founding Fathers. I firmly believe that the people can return to their rightful place as governors rather than the governed.

Finally I believe that we can again continue as a free democratic people despite the authoritarian mood which is that of the 20th century.

In the drama of government in which states are the players, the garrison state waits for its chance in the wings of the stage. It is incumbent upon us to stop it from occupying that stage, from destroying the state of freedom which our Founding Fathers so carefully won for us.

Changing the Perjury Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, several months ago I introduced a bill, S. 1516, which would add a new section to the present perjury law to cover all cases of false swearing. The main purpose of the proposed legislation is to permit punishment in a lesser degree of perjury which does not satisfy the technical requirements of materiality under the present law. The bill is modeled after a statute which has been in effect in my own State of New York for more than 20 years, and I believe its enactment would greatly improve the present state of the law on this subject.

Shortly after this legislation was introduced, an editorial appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune praising its purpose. I believe this editorial will be of interest to many Members, and I ask unanimous consent to insert it at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From the New Orleans Times-Picayune, Apr. 22, 1959]

TURNABOUT PERJURY

Senator KEATING has introduced a long-needed Federal bill to cope with contradictions in sworn testimony such as were dramatized by the Harvey Matusow case. It would remove the necessity (pointed up especially as ridiculous by that case) of Government proof that one of two such contradictory statements was false; that is, of proving which one was or is false.

The fields in which willful contradictions as to material matters would lead to perjury prosecutions are hearings of committees of Congress; grand jury sessions, and court trials. The endorsement of the American Bar Association that has been given the measure, according to Senator KEATING, applies especially to its coverage of congressional hearings. A 5-year limitation is stipulated for the punishable period of turnabout perjury.

Another area of contradictions which committees used frequently to encounter concerns the fifth amendment. It grew fairly common for witnesses to say on oath they would be incriminated by answering certain questions; and on other occasions or in other proceedings, to say or swear that they could have answered the questions in the negative, meaning that the plea of possible self-incrimination was itself a sworn falsehood. There is nothing in the statutes to deal with this misuse of the amendment; and nothing much in court decisions so far to indicate concern for its misuse in any connection.

The Fight in 1959 for Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, conservationists scored at least one major victory over the administration during the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

In the continuing fight for clean water, they again rejected President Eisenhower's proposal to sharply reduce, then end, the Federal grant program which has stimulated the cleanup of 19,000 miles of streams and many more miles of lake and ocean shorelines. They also overrode administration objections and voted to increase the grant authorization from the present $50 million a year.

Ill advisedly, the President again was part of a drive—spearheaded by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the National Association of Manufacturers, and trade associations representing certain polluting industries—to end this program.

In his budget message, as he had last year, President Eisenhower proposed to cut the grant program deeply, to $20 million this year from $45 million. Congress voted $45 million.

Despite administration opposition, the House voted to double the authorization, the Senate voted to raise it to $80 million. In the face of the threat of a pocket veto, the conference was held over until next year.

Last year, the Bureau of the Budget opposed requesting any Federal money for grants to help build State-approved municipal sewage treatment plants. This opposition continues as work goes ahead on the budget President Eisenhower will submit to Congress early next year.

Here is a brief summary of other bills of interest to conservationists:

Enacted were bills to increase the authorization for the continuing research program into the effects of pesticides on fish and wildlife; authorize Federal research on migratory marine game fishes; permit interstate shipment of black bass fish and eggs for breeding and stocking purposes; extend indefinitely the Interior Secretary's authority to use surplus grain to prevent waterfowl depredation; prohibit use of motor vehicles or aircraft or poisoning waterholes in hunting wild horses and burros.

Passed by one body and awaiting action in the other were bills to authorize fisheries research aimed at continuous good fishing in reservoirs behind Federal dams; establish a Youth Conservation Corps to combat juvenile delinquency while benefiting natural resources; for the first time acquire land for fish and wildlife purposes as part of a Federal water resource development project.

Committees in at least one body reported bills which would establish a national wildlife disease research laboratory; authorize fish and game programs and special hunting and fishing permits on military reservations; create a 9-million-acre Arctic wildlife range; establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park; settle the dispute over the Des Plaines public hunting and refuge area in Illinois.

Committees heard measures giving the protection of law to areas now being administered as wilderness areas in national parks, game ranges, migratory waterfowl refuges, primitive, wilderness, and wild areas; adding State wildlife departments to the public agencies eligible to receive donable Federal surplus property; establishing, in varying degrees, the supremacy of State water laws on Federal lands and over Federal programs.

Pending are bills to save our shorelines, purchase and develop 10 principal seashore and Great Lakes coastal areas; amend the Federal Power Act to provide protection and consideration of fish and wildlife resources in the Columbia River Basin, eliminate Federal subsidies for draining wildlife-producing wetlands; make fish and wildlife and recreational values an integral part of the planning of Federal reservoir projects; extend and enlarge the conservation reserve; establish a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers to the President and a Joint Committee on Resources and Conservation; give formal sanction to the long-existing program for the training of graduate students in wildlife sciences under the cooperative program of the Fish and Wildlife Service, land-grant colleges, State fish and game departments, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

During the recess, the new Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, studying the Nation's present and future water needs, will hold 19 public field hearings in all parts of the country. The committee is to make recommendations to the Senate by January 31, 1961. And I hope that long before that date we also have received from the Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service comprehensive long-range programs for the development and management of the public lands and resources in their custody. The Forest Service already has submitted its program.

First Session Wind-Up Report From Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to report to my constituents, the people of Ramsey County, the Fourth Congressional District of Minnesota.

Many have been the descriptions of achievements of the 1st session of the 86th Congress. These rank from "finest" to that of "abysmal failure." As usual, somewhere between the truth lies.

Many people long tired of the vacuum of leadership in our Government out of plain frustration did a lot of wishful thinking that an 86th Congress with a whole new platoon of freshmen Democrats elected in a popular reaction against the 1958 recession could somehow work miracles.

It was unrealistic to think the group of Democratic freshmen without influential committee positions could overcome, with veteran liberal Democrats, a "spoiler" coalition of Republicans and high seniority conservative Democrats who wield effectively, through their one-third votes of the House, an effective veto backstop. In addition, there is the massive opposition of the Federal bureaucracy. As economic recovery took hold, the public pressure for new recovery programs vanished. The administration and the Republican Party capitalized on this shifting sentiment—or the lack of public pressure—by tagging the "spender" label on a Congress that had not even gotten down to serious legislative work.

The strategy, if it was meant to chop the budget, was overwhelmingly successful because the conservative congressional leadership of both parties vied with each other to be fiscally responsible

and to pin the "spender" tag on their opponents. As a result, badly needed programs requiring some investment in order to resume national social and economic progress were stopped dead. Area redevelopment, aid to education, the Youth Conservation Corps, health insurance for the elderly as part of the social security program, and an adequate farm program are very much the unfinished business for our Nation during the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The result of the budget mayhem was that Congress finally appropriated or obligated some $78,678,600,000, or $2,580,410,000 less than the President requested. I am sure the Republican congressional leadership is secretly gloating at having maneuvered the Democrats into using the meat ax on the budget and killing off necessary new programs for our national growth and development.

There is tremendous opportunity for eliminating wasteful expenditures in the budget, particularly in defense spending. I was shocked at the unbelievable performance of the Pentagon in almost literally throwing away millions of dollars on projects of dubious value. About one-fourth of a billion dollars was thrown away in the boron, so called exotic fuel program when two plants were completed and never operated because the Navy and the Air Force junked the whole idea before the machinery could start up. To me the criminal part of this is that money continued to be poured into the project although the upper echelon in the Department of Defense had already abandoned the program.

The same story could be repeated for the jet seaplane program. The Seamaster was abandoned with a loss of $400 million to the taxpayers. Many millions more have been squandered through loose practices in defense contract awards and supervision. The General Accounting Office has forced General Motors, Boeing, Douglas, North American and other defense contractors to return millions of dollars in Government overpayments.

To my mind it is in the area of defense expenditures—for which this Congress has approved over $39.2 billion—that I believe Congress can most profitably achieve the greatest economies.

LABOR LAW

There is no doubt that in the public mind the Griffin-Landrum law is the most important piece of legislation the 86th Congress has thus far passed. This law is the bitter fruit of 2½ years of antilabor propaganda fostered by the McClellan committee hearings.

The Griffin-Landrum bill is a blow at decent unionism which will now be harassed by yards of bureaucrat red tape—already $2 million has been appropriated to hire at least 200 new Government workers and to establish offices so that the anticipated mountain of reports can be processed. A more serious blow to legitimate unionsm lies in the new roadblocks to organizing new plants, especially in the South.

I have contended all along that northern Congressmen who voted for the bill in order to punish Hoffa and other malefactors have unwittingly done their constituencies a grave disservice by giving industry and business in the unorganized South an unfair competitive advantage.

The South is already undercutting decent northern employers with its right-to-work laws, with no unemployment compensation, with little or no workmen's compensation, unfair labor standards, lack of factory health and safety standards, and antiorganizing laws.

Small businessmen who look to the Griffin-Landrum law for solution of their labor relations problems may soon find their hopes illusory, especially in States with no substantial body of labor relations law.

The Griffin-Landrum legislation, in my opinion, is bad law which will require years of expensive court action before we can find out what judges think the language of the bill means. It will prove to be a full employment act for lawyers.

I introduced the labor bill, H.R. 8540, which while it would penalize the crooks and racketeers who prey on the labor movement, would protect the interest of union members and the legitimate activities of labor unions. A similar bill sponsored by Representative SHELLEY was offered as a substitute to the original committee bill but was defeated by a vote of 132–245. Subsequently the move to substitute the Griffin-Landrum bill was passed by a vote of 229–201. I, of course, voted against the Griffin-Landrum substitute and voted against final passage in the House on August 14 when it was adopted by a vote of 303–125.

After a historic series of conference committee meetings during which some of the most vindictive aspects of Griffin-Landrum were modified, the bill was reported out and then passed by the Senate on September 3 by a vote of 95 to 2. The next day, September 4, the House adopted the bill 352 to 52 and sent it to the White House where it was signed into law.

OTHER HIGHLIGHTS OF THE SESSION

DEFENSE

Although the Government is led by the outstanding American military figure of our time, it is becoming apparent that the country's expectations heightened by the promise in the Madison Avenue advertising agency's slogan "more bang for a buck" is doomed to disappointment. The sorry record of wasted millions of dollars, of silly and expensive interservice rivalry, as confusion and the working at cross purposes especially in the missile program could well prove tragic for our country.

The Gaither Report which was kept secret longer than it should have been said in part:

The United States is moving in a frightening course to the status of a second class power.

The Rockefeller report said:

Unless present trends are reversed, the world balance of power will shift in favor of the Soviet bloc. If that should happen, we are not likely to be given another chance to remedy our failings.

Adm. Hyman G. Rickover stated:

I think it is almost too late. This is what I worry about. Some of my money for fiscal 1958 which was appropriated by Congress several months ago has not yet been made available to me.

Secretary of Defense McElroy said:

By 1962 the Russians may lead the United States in guided missiles by as much as 3 to 1.

These are grim facts. The Congress has showed itself willing to appropriate over $39.2 billion for the Defense Department and to give NASA nearly a half billion dollars to spend to facilitate our space program. The Congress extended the draft to 4 years, extended the Renegotiation Act to allow the Government to recapture excess profits on defense contracts and, in general, did its best to overcome the administration's avowed intention of lagging behind the Soviet Union in long-range missiles and thermonuclear instruments of war.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The cold war can continue for generations, experts say. If this is so, it will be necessary for the United States to bolster the economic and military strength of our allies for that period.

The mutual security measure which passed in the closing days of this session appropriated $2.1 billion in military assistance and another approximate $1 billion in economic assistance.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

The whole Federal highway program was practically faced with financial disaster until the Congress most reluctantly passed a 1-cent increase in the Federal gas tax and made other changes in allocation of excise taxes to insure the financial soundness of the program. The tax, effective from October 1, continues for 21 months.

RAILWAY WORKERS

Congress approved a bill increasing pensions and jobless benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts. This law, which I supported, is of extreme importance to the many thousands of families in our district which depend on railroads for their livelihood.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A long overdue improvement in work benefits for Federal employees—the underwriting by the Government of up to 50 percent of the cost of their health benefit plans—was provided by the 86th Congress. This plan is to go into effect next July 1.

Employees hereafter will also be given a day off on Fridays preceding those national holidays which fall on Saturday.

VETERANS

Congress provided $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans. Congress passed a readjustment non-service-connected disability pension law and also provided new pensions for some widows.

AGRICULTURE

Congress has not yet come forth with an adequate program to preserve the family farm, backbone of the greatest agricultural system in the world. During the last session there was passed the surplus farm products law and the Fed-

eral food stamp plan for needy families in a few trial areas in the country. A ceiling of $50,000 was placed on price support payments to single recipients in order to halt the outrageous raid on the Federal Treasury by the corporate farms.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

Sixty-three million dollars a year in matching Federal aid to States was approved for airport improvements for the fiscal years 1960 and 1961. This was far from adequate to complete necessary work, for example, on the airports serving St. Paul and Minneapolis.

CIVIL RIGHTS

The long sought for amendment to the civil rights law was bottled up in the House Rules Committee by hostile southerners and northern Republicans. Only minor progress made in the name of civil rights was the extension of the Civil Rights Commission for an additional 2 years.

NATIONAL DEBT

Congress again, at the request of the President, raised the debt limit to $295 billion. When President Eisenhower took office in 1952 the debt was $265 billion, or approximately $25 billion less than at the present time.

BOND RATE INTEREST

One of the greatest behind the scenes struggles to take place during this session was over the administrations determination to increase the interest giveaway to bankers who already are enjoying the greatest profits in history. The Ways and Means Committee blocked an interest rate increase on the long-term debt but granted a hike on E and H savings bond income.

The interest rate increase fight is a basic economic struggle between the industry-banker-oriented administration and a substantial people-oriented group in Congress. Higher Federal bond interest rates are a cruel indirect tax on all people who pay income taxes and an increased cost of living to anyone who buys anything or even pays a utility bill.

HOUSING

One of the major points of contention between President Eisenhower and the Congress was housing. Three bills were actually passed and two were vetoed. The bill in its final form provides an extension of authority for the FHA to continue the guarantee of funds for home construction.

Maximum interest on rental housing and management type mortages insured by FHA would be raised from 4½ percent to 5¼ percent with the interest ceiling on sales type cooperatives raised from 5 percent to 5¾ percent. The maximum insurable mortgage would be raised from $20,000 to $22,500 for one family units.

The bill also contained authorization for 37,000 new units for low rental public housing to be built as stop gap step toward helping cities rehabilitate blighted areas.

Unfortunately the provision authorizing direct loans to colleges for classroom construction and equipment was a casualty of the President's disapproval.

CIVIL WORKS

The President vetoed two public works bills complaining of the inclusion of 67 projects which the Bureau of the Budget did not include in its 1960 Budget. Congress upset the cherished Eisenhower tradition of "no overridden vetoes" on the second bill by mustering better than two-thirds vote against the President.

The bill means that $159,000 will be spent for the planning of a flood control project in St. Paul and South St. Paul, where damage of approximately $7½ million was suffered in 1951 and 1952. Estimated final cost of this project will be $6.8 million.

HAWAII

Our 50th State was admitted to the Union this session.

CONCLUSION

I believe those who have hastened to disparge this Congress for not having assumed our Nation's leadership in this first session will have reason to be more charitable at the end of the 86th Congress.

Much of the first session's confusion and turmoil engendered by the 1957–58 recession and the windup of the McClellan committee antilabor hysteria will have disappeared and the long overdue task of promoting the general welfare of our country will be earnestly attended to by Congress which is anxious to get down to the task of building.

Some of the urgent legislative issues which I believe will be considered and upon which I am confident action will be taken are:

First. Legislation to relieve chronically depressed areas.

Second. Strengthening the civil rights law.

Third. Providing for aid to education.

Fourth. Plugging tax loopholes, including amendments on (a) 27½ percent depletion allowances, (b) 4 percent dividend credit, (c) tax withholding at source on interest and dividend income, (d) examination of capital gains, (e) examination of nonlegitimate business expense deductions, (f) investigation of undesirable effects of new depreciation provisions.

Fifth. More realistic minimum wage and broadened coverage.

Sixth. Adequate unemployment compensation legislation.

Seventh. Adequate farm legislation.

Eighth. Implementation of laws to promote the growth of small businesses.

Ninth. Health insurance for the elderly as part of the social security program.

Tenth. Post-Korean GI benefit bill.

Eleventh. Measures to promote the economic development of backward foreign areas and to provide immediately urgently needed medical assistance and food to the poor and starving people of these lands.

Twelfth. A water pollution law to save our water resources.

There are other important issues, but I think these must have urgent priority in the consideration of Congress in the next session.

During the recess I will make every endeavor to see and talk with as many of you as is humanly possible. My meetings with you always prove to be stimulating and valuable.

Report on 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, as the 1st session of the 86th Congress comes to an end, I would like to review, for the benefit of my constituents, friends, and neighbors, some of its record.

It has been a long and hardworking session. It has been a session which encountered the problems that are bound to arise when a government is divided with one party in control of the executive department and the other party in control of Congress.

But the length and the work and the difficulties are only incidental to what actually resulted. Though in some instances Congress has not stood sufficiently firm in meeting the Presidential veto or for good and needed legislation, nevertheless this has been, in my opinion, a fairly productive session in terms of national needs. In some respects, this Congress has also refused to pass some legislation which would have been detrimental to the national interest. While it takes a two-thirds majority to pass legislation over a veto, a simple majority can refuse to pass bad legislation.

Congress was faced with the problem of meeting the Soviet menace, of placating the administration in its request for the highest budget in peacetime, of grappling with an $8 billion interest on the national debt, of increasing the limit on the national debt, and of passing a Mutual Security Act. Domestic issues became secondary and/or dependent upon the cost of meeting the Soviet menace, balancing the budget and controlling inflation.

The entire policy of the Eisenhower administration was in a state of fluctuation. A cooperative state of mind and action on the part of Congress was tried to the point of frustration. President Eisenhower requested legislation and then vetoed bills because they were too much or too little or not in exactly the wording he as a matter of hindsight said he would have preferred.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM LEGISLATION

The most controversial and heated piece of legislation to reach the floor of the House was the labor-management reform bill. Pressure was brought to bear upon the whole Congress, and was accentuated through mass media by the President, the Senate Rackets Committee, and prolabor and antilabor forces. On both sides, misinformation was the

order of the day. As a result, Congress was besieged by carloads of mail and the Capitol was crowded with hundreds of lobbyists and pressure groups. Labor-management reform was supported almost unanimously by Congress, but how to effect remedial legislation that would clear corrupt elements out of unions without imposing punitive measures on clean unions and impairing the collective bargaining process, caused much heated disputation on the bills.

The Senate passed the Kennedy-Ervin labor-management reform bill on August 25, 1959, by a vote of 90 to 1. When the legislation reached the floor of the House, the committee bill was sidetracked, and the Landrum-Griffin bill was substituted.

The bill that was finally agreed upon by the House and the Senate and which became law was 95 percent like the sidetracked House bill known as the Elliott bill. It provides for a secret ballot in union elections, financial reports to union members, and some restrictions on organizing activities. It also adopted the Landrum bill provision which denies the protection and services of the National Labor Relations Board to employees and employers of businesses which purchase less than $500,000 from outside the State. Most Iowa businesses are in this category. I vigorously opposed this section of the bill because I don't believe small businesses and employees of small businesses should be discriminated against.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

The last week of Congress was highlighted by the drive for adjournment. Congress, for the third time this session, passed an omnibus housing bill. The President vetoed the first two. After the Congress refused to be a rubber stamp, a third bill was requested which was almost the same as the first two, and many Federal housing projects, including the Des Moines urban renewal would have been eliminated or drastically curtailed for lack of funds had the President not finally agreed to accept such a bill.

Representative government is based on the art of compromise, and I feel Congress performed its obligation by reconciling its original request to some extent in this field to gain the approval of the administration. In turn, it is my belief that the President failed to meet the Congress halfway, by objecting to the program for housing for the elderly, urban renewal, and loans for college dormitories until a third bill was passed by the Congress. This needlessly absorbed much time of Congress that was needed to work on other bills.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

We live in an age of pushbutton warfare, and we are one of the great powers on earth. Another big power, Soviet Russia, through her leaders, has said on numerous occasions that it has the thermonuclear power to destroy the United States within half a day.

Members of Congress, even before this session, have made every effort to determine whether this Nation is adequately prepared to deter Soviet aggression.

The Gaither report, which was kept secret longer than it should have been, said in part:

The United States is moving in a frightening course to the status of a second-class power.

The Rockefeller report said:

Unless present trends are reversed, the world balance of power will shift in favor of the Soviet bloc. If that should happen we are not likely to be given another chance to remedy our failings.

Adm. Hyman G. Rickover stated:

I think it is almost too late. This is what I worry about. Some of my money for fiscal 1958 which was appropriated by Congress several months ago has not yet been made available to me.

Secretary of Defense McElroy said:

By 1962 the Russians may lead the United States in guided missiles by as much as 3 to 1.

Gen. Thomas Power, Air Force Strategic Commander, said:

I think you are just risking the whole country. That is how important I feel it is. The force which is now programed is not adequate because it is not coming fast enough.

Faced with these grim facts, the Congress approved a measure to create a new National Aeronautics and Space Administration with nearly $500 million to spend; extended the draft authorization by 4 years; extended the Renegotiation Act under which the Government recovers excessive profits on defense contracts, and in general did its best to overcome the administration's avowed intention of lagging behind the Soviet Union in long-range missiles and other thermonuclear instruments of war.

CIVIL WORKS

The President vetoed the two bills that contained the Red Rock and Saylorville Dam projects. I worked hard to get these projects and found that they could be sold to Congress on their merits. While we paid for dams and public works for other areas year after year, central Iowa has never before received $1 for construction of a flood control, recreation area, valley development project. With the large-scale movement of population to central Iowa, we need more water in dry weather and less in time of floods and, also, more recreation areas. The Red Rock Dam bill will bring $71 million into this area by the time of completion, and the Army Engineers estimate it will return more than $1.50 of benefits for each $1 of cash cost over and above the value for recreational purposes. These measures have been termed "pork barrel," but there is nothing "pork barrel" about a flood. There have been years when the flood damage totaled in 1 year more than the cost of the flood-control projects in the bill that was passed over the President's veto.

I realize some people do not agree with me and do not approve of these dams on the Des Moines River. It is often said that an elected representative should avoid controversy. That may be good politics, but I think we have better Government when the Congressman takes a stand for or against. I aggressively supported and promoted the Red Rock bill and will accept the blame by those who oppose it.

TAXES

Congress extended for 1 year the Korean war corporation taxes and certain excise taxes. The transportation and local telephone taxes were reduced.

New levies were imposed on life insurance companies which will return the Government another estimated $215 million annually.

HIGHWAY PROGRAM

It looked for a while as if the Federal highway program would be faced with a financial roadblock. As a final resort, Congress yielded to part of the demand of the President and increased the Federal gas tax from 3 to 4 cents. This tax becomes effective October 1, 1959, and continues for 21 months.

This bill did not provide the full amount of money needed by States to continue their program and also absorbed more of their traditional source of revenue, the gasoline tax. Highway users are now paying $1.6 billion more than is used for roads. I believe this bill is due for some revision and improvement in the next session.

RAILROAD WORKERS

The Congress approved a measure increasing pension and jobless benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Acts. The Government does not pay these benefits.

VETERANS

Congress provided $100 million for direct housing loans to veterans. Readjusted non-service-connected disability pensions and provided new pensions for widows.

AGRICULTURE

Congress extended the surplus farm products law. Introduced a Federal food stamp plan for needy families in a few trial areas of the country. I regret that Secretary of Agriculture Benson has indicated that he will not put the plan into effect despite the action of Congress.

The wheat bill, designed to reduce production and cost to the Government without reducing farm income, was vetoed. A tobacco bill was also vetoed. In spite of the fact that the Benson corn law put into effect this year is proving very costly to both the taxpayers and farmers, Benson said he would recommend a veto for any corn bill that reduced production without reducing prices and so there is now a sort of stalemate with Congress refusing to further lower prices and increase production and Government costs.

I think this is a very serious problem and I introduced a bill, H.R. 7710, which I believe would help considerably. I testified for this bill and am going to continue to do all I can to help solve this problem.

POSTAL AND BOND INTEREST RATES

The 1st session of the 86th Congress refused to increase postage rates and interest rates on the long-term Government bonds held by the big banks. The administration wants to increase the maximum interest on these bonds above 4¼ percent. Authority was given to increase the interest rates on the E and H

series savings bonds that are held by individuals.

AIRPORT PROGRAM

A $63 million matching Federal aid to States was approved this session for airport improvements for the fiscal years of 1960 and 1961. The Des Moines Airport is being improved under this program.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

The President requested an extension of the economic and military assistance programs to other countries. I believe in supporting the President on international affairs unless I am fully convinced the national interest demands a contrary action. In the field of foreign policy, we must depend greatly upon any President and without regard to politics because he is the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces and has access to all of the secret information necessary to make decisions. I consider these matters completely above party politics.

THE NATIONAL DEBT

Congress, at the request of President Eisenhower, raised the legal limit of the national debt to $295 billion. The national debt in 1952, when President Eisenhower assumed office, was $265 billion, or roughly $30 billion less than the present amount.

With increases in interest rates, this is becoming a serious matter. Congress reduced the President's spending requests by a net of $1.9 billion. The two sessions of the 85th Congress had reduced his spending requests by $5 billion. Congress spent a lot of time finding ways to cut the spending requests without sacrificing programs necessary to the strengthening of our economy. $259 million was added to the budget for cancer research and health programs, but other nonessential spending requests were reduced enough so that the net reduction was $1.8 billion. Some would have us believe that such a reduction would stop inflation, but I notice the cost of living has continued to rise. The fact is that some basic industries, like steel, are able to set inflationary prices which increase their profits by 600 percent in 1 year and these inflationary pressures more than offset the savings made by Congress.

A joint committee of Congress is now working on an economic study which I hope will help point the way to some needed legislation.

NEAL SMITH RESOLUTION ON NATIONAL FORESTS AND MINERALS

One reorganization plan by the administration would have permitted the sale and transfer of Government minerals in forest lands without notice to the public or approval by the Secretary of the Interior. An employee of the Agriculture Department would have been authorized to make such transfers. Under the law, such administrative plans go into effect unless Congress acts within 60 days. I introduced House Resolution 295 to stop this authority and protect us against what I considered an invitation to another Teapot Dome scandal. My resolution passed July 7 by more than a two-thirds vote. It seems to me that we must protect our Government property and evidently the overwhelming majority in Congress agree.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

A 50th State was born this session of Congress with the admission of Hawaii. The borders of the United States now extend northward to within a few miles of Soviet Siberia and into the strategic Pacific.

There was other legislation passed which was very important to those affected but space will not permit discussing each of the 385 bills which became public law. There are also some laws upon which I believe the Congress should enact but did not, and this means that there is a great deal of work to be done next year.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress came to an end at 6:21 a.m. Tuesday, September 15, after working all through the night giving final approval to the mutual security bill and extending the life of the Civil Rights Commission for 2 years. A broad civil rights bill was blocked by a coalition but is scheduled for early action in the second session. The 1st session of the 86th Congress was in continuous session longer than any other session of Congress since 1951.

I appreciate the opportunity to represent the 5th District of Iowa at the 1st session of the 86th Congress and hope the next session will enact more legislation that is good for our area.

Reins of Riches Match Means of Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article published in the Washington Post on August 16, 1959, over the byline of Gerard Piel, publisher of the Scientific American. The article is condensed from a speech which Mr. Piel made at St. Johns College in Annapolis last April.

The article is a very significant one, I believe, in the light of the recent proposals which have as their objective the reduction of armaments. Not only do I feel strongly that we should use the power of the atom for peaceful purposes, but I also believe that we should realize that a nuclear war might well end civilization on this globe.

Mr. Piel is a magna cum laude graduate of Harvard, a former editor of Life magazine, and presently is the publisher of the Scientific American.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REINS OF RICHES MATCH MEANS OF DESTRUCTION

(By Gerard Piel)

In the darkest hours of human despair, life could never have seemed so transient as it appears to the present generation. Man has survived the cruel trials of natural selection only to face at last the direst of all threats to his existence: himself.

In an arms race that consumes the treasure and genius of civilization, one side—the one we tremble to call our own—has accumulated sufficient destructive capacity to annihilate the other 25 times over. And that other side, by this time, has equipped itself with 10 times the power to destroy us.

Between us, we are in a position to exterminate the entire species seven times over. Neurosis, senility, stupidity, accident—any of these at any moment may push the button on Apocalypse.

WONDER AND IRONY

While time permits, we may stand in wonder at what man has wrought. He has taken in his mortal hands the source of energy that lights the universe through all eternity—or at least for 10 billion years past and 50 billion years to come, in the finite terms in which we measure infinity today. He can ignite stars on earth hotter than any that shine in the firmament.

In the dread rehearsal of our last hour, more than 300 such stars have already winked their blinding light under the roof of our increasingly polluted atmosphere.

It is ironic, though it is inevitable, that the threat now laid to human existence should be leveled by those same nations in which human life has for the first time experienced abundance.

HOW ELSE DECIDE?

Why is it that the most fortunate people on earth should be on the verge of treason to the entire human race?

There are unquestionably many reasons, to be traced at last to the forgotten bloody age, before the beginning of history, when Homo sapiens exterminated the less gifted species of the human genus. The habits learned then still take over on occasion in the behavior of individual men.

In the behavior of States the resort to force and violence is sanctioned by all but one or two churches and by the most eminent moral philosophers. How else could States decide which is to have enough when there is not enough to go around?

But in the very age in which we live there has come an essential change in the condition of human existence. The revolution in man's labor that has come with the present amplification of our capacity for mass murder makes it possible for all men at last to enter into the human estate.

But this declaration does not come escorted by a thunderclap. Its truth is not widely credited. The possibilities of human fulfillment to which it points are not generally comprehended even by those citizens and statesmen whose own style of existence furnishes the most compelling evidence in its support. The revolutionists try to forget the revolution.

We embrace the good fortune that is ours and claim it as our birthright. In fear, we suppress the memory of the recent past and, in a world of increasing impermanence, persuade ourselves that our estate is perpetual.

THE LAST 15 SECONDS

To such a state of mind it may be salutary to recall that the entire biography of man is but a recent event in the history of the earth. We surmise that our genus originated in a recognizable approximation of its modern form not more than 1 million years ago. In the 5 billion years that the earth has

revolved around the sun, those million years are the last 15 seconds of a day.

The first evidence of our species is dated on the order of 100,000 years ago, within the last 2 seconds of the earth's first day. In the flaked stone and sharpened bone we see that evolution has already assumed a new dimension.

The history of civilization, of the settled urban community, goes back no more than 10,000 years, less than two tenths of a second ago. By that time the food-gatherers had brought all of the food crops and all of the domestic animals we know today under cultivation and husbandry. They had learned also another use for fire.

By confining it in a furnace they could raise the temperature from the 400 or 500 degrees of the open campfire to 1,000 degrees. Such temperature drives out the water of crystallization in pottery and bricks and made it possible to store the harvests and build cities.

INVENTION OF SLAVERY

Now, at last, want and the daily struggle for enough food to survive were lifted for a few members of the species. The new technology of agriculture required the labor of only four families on the soil to produce enough food to support themselves and one more family.

The allocation of this surplus was secured by a social invention: the institution of slavery. In the ruins of the earliest cities we see the image of societies that built them: At first temples, later palaces, surrounded by fortifications and the hovels of the slaves.

Since it was now possible for the labor of four families to support a fifth in occupations other than agriculture, the range of technology broadened. The furnaces became hot enough to smelt copper and iron. The wheel and the sail appeared. The pulley and the level, the pump and the bellows and other mechanical contrivances came into use. The way was opened to high civilization and the beginning of recorded history.

In the record we discover three major centers: The Mediterranean, India, and China. Later, in apparent independence of these, came the high civilizations of the Western Hemisphere. But everywhere within the marches of civilization the ratio of four families out of five enslaved to the soil prevailed. And the first urban masses freed for other crafts and functions were enslaved in other ways.

POPULATIONS GREW

Civilization, however, was a success. The human population expanded. Where it had taken 10 square miles of wilderness to support a single human being in the primitive economy of food gathering, now a few acres of agricultural land sufficed to sustain each human life. But the population of the agrarian civilizations pressed everywhere, at all times, on the margin of subsistence.

As the land under cultivation expanded, so did the population; when harvests failed—or when the land failed under unwise exploitation—the population shrank. The fortunes of the most ancient states waxed and waned with the harvests and with outbreaks of epidemic disease.

From the outside, they were threatened by those called barbarians, peoples still in transition from the Stone Age to neolithic culture. But as the slow trial-and-error advance of technology furnished weapons and more secure means of communication, and the rulers learned to manage ever larger social organizations, states blossomed into empires, and history moved into the modern era.

In one form or another, the institution of slavery persisted in almost every center of civilization on into the history of our own Republic.

If we wonder what life was like for ordinary people in those high and far-off times, we need not dig into archeology or scratch for illumination in the history books that have so largely ignored them.

We can see their technological contemporaries struggling for the same sort of life in the world today. They constitute, in fact, nearly two-thirds of the human race. Principally in the Southern Hemisphere, they are the peoples of what we have come to call the underdeveloped regions of the world.

There, four out of five families are still bound to scratching their subsistence from the earth. Their life expectancy, until very recently, was between 30 and 40 years. Their nutrition ranges from 1,300 to 2,000 calories per day, at least 500 calories below the minimum required to sustain the vigor of life.

Contrast their condition with that of the inhabitants of Western civilization. In our own country, the labor of one family in six on the farm yields a harvest equivalent to an average of more than 10,000 calories per capita for the entire population.

From this cornucopia we consume an average of a little more than 3,000 calories each. Life expectancy is moving from 60 to 70 years. Famine and pestilence are echoes of Sunday School Bible lessons. The primary source of energy is the combustion of fuel.

So far as our citizens are concerned and for the overwhelming proportion of Europeans west of the Urals, material want has been effectively abolished. From 150 million in 1770, the white population has increased sixfold to nearly 900 million.

In the same period the colored people of the world have only doubled their numbers, the largest increase coming in the last 50 years.

Beginning in the 18th century, science gained in ascendance as a major enterprise of our civilization. Newton's physics was extended to every branch of inquiry into nature and everywhere extirpated the fallacies, myths, and nonsense that had been cherished from earlier years.

During the past century, the movement has gathered constantly increasing acceleration. It was a century and a half, for example, from the discovery of the force of gravity to the discovery of electromagnetic forces; less than a century thereafter, to the discovery of the force that binds the atomic nucleus, and now less than a generation to the measurement of the weak forces that attend the mysterious decay of the ultimate particles of matter.

Most recently, the search for unity in nature has uncovered the subterranean, looking-glass world of antimatter. Nature apparently guarantees that there shall be no end of our inquiry. Each successful generalization uncovers new gaps in our experience and asks new questions.

Now invention has entered a new phase. It exploits understanding already established, it responds not merely to necessity but to opportunity presented by new knowledge. So long as the enterprise of science is nurtured by society, technology will move forward with it.

Does our appetite for metals at last exhaust the abundant ore beds of the world? According to Harrison Brown and his associates at the California Institute of Technology, we may turn to the granite of the continental masses and extract not only the full spectrum of mineral wealth but the fissionable elements that will provide the energy to power this "Age of Granite."

Or we may turn to the oceans, with their limitless supply of hydrogen for energy, plus all of the minerals leached out of the continental rock by the rains and rivers.

Do we require food? According to studies by the Food and Agriculture Organization, we can, with sufficient investment, expand the world's arable land seven times.

The outcome of the revolution in man's labor thus brings the elimination of want within the reach not only of the living generation of men, but of all the generations we can foresee.

Those latter-day Malthusians who panic at the world's immediate prospective population growth may leave it to later generations to decide how numerous they want to be. Want is no longer a challenge to technology, but to economics and politics. It is a social problem.

Not the least of the social problems posed by technology is the question: How can human dignity and freedom be maintained in a world organized to sustain the logistics of abundance? The management of the high technology of the future might find it in its power and convenience to tamper with the genetic constitution of the species or with the psychological process of individual human minds.

But such questions beset us already in a society that is willing to contemplate suicide and listens every noontime to the wail of sirens. Is this the only face that we can turn to the world's dispossessed, to the 1,500 million beyond the pale of Western civilization?

They have heard the news of the revolution in man's labor. They are impressed by the example of our own Nation, more than that of any other. Thanks principally to death control, they are living longer and feeling well enough to do something about their plight.

The political turmoil of the no longer colonial peoples provides the principal dynamics of this era of international political conflict. It is the power vacuum created by the breakdown of the old order in those regions that sucks the two great power systems to the edge of catastrophe.

In an acutely tender way, the wishes of these aroused people should be on our conscience. They are still extracting the irreplaceable resources of their lands to feed our voracious appetite for raw materials.

We cannot stop at the churlish counsel that the colonials should reduce their numbers. Their population is rising because the modicum of sanitation introduced to protect the white colonials in their midst has reduced their rate of mortality as well.

Their numbers are increasing, according to United Nations studies, at a rate that exceeds 1 percent per year. Since the end of the second world war, their material condition has been in corresponding decline; their calorie intake has actually fallen.

To offset the claim of population growth and reverse the decline in their condition, they must increase their production at a rate greater than their population growth. The larger the differential, the faster will their lot improve. Such an objective is not only technologically but politically and economically feasible.

Our own industrial growth has averaged 5 percent over long periods; it has even reached 8 percent under intense pressure. The growth of our agricultural output has correspondingly proceeded at the rate of 2 percent in normal times.

The success of both kinds of political and social management is proving increasingly attractive to the emergent economies of India, southeast Asia, Indonesia, South America and Africa. In their eyes, it is the results that count.

The task of industrialization involves some simple equations from classical economics. It is well known that the creation of capital requires savings. Savings means that the satisfaction of current want must be set aside to provide for future satisfactions. But when there is not enough to meet current wants to begin with—which is the case in a Malthusian economic system—someone must starve to provide capital. Compulsion is usually necessary to persuade people to starve.

In the present mood of the colonial peoples, however, they are ready to starve if it will do any good. And there are plenty of indigenous leaders ready to furnish the compulsion.

If we had conviction in our political and economic institutions and traditions—and a better understanding of their place in history—we would not willingly see these peoples submit themselves to compulsion. Out of the surplus capacity that troubles our market place we could meet a substantial portion of their need for capital equipment. Thanks to the labors of the international civil service of the United Nations and its accessory technical organizations, we have a pretty good idea of what it would cost.

Something on the order of $500 billion over the next 50 years would secure an average per annum gain of 2 percent in industrial production and a corresponding increase in agricultural output in the areas concerned. This global figure comes out of reasonably detailed local studies; many of the projects are ready for preliminary cost accounting.

Not all of the $500 billion would have to be supplied from outside. At about the halfway point, the new industrial centers would begin to generate some additional capacity of their own.

The bed rock investments, however, are not particularly attractive to the world's capital market. These involve such elementary public utilities as communications systems, including highways as well as railroads, and dams for flood control and irrigation. Investment in such projects would call for the kind of funds we now write off on armaments.

On the whole, we would have to take a long-range view in looking for return on our investment. It would come eventually, however as these economies cross the first hump toward the solution of their food problem.

But the demand for huge volumes of energy, heavy equipment, and big investment would not come at the outset. First there comes lead time for planning, and then engineering. Many of the early gains in these areas would be achieved, anyway, with very little expenditure on capital goods. The first requirement is for brains and knowledge.

Somewhere in our material and intellectual resources we can cetrainly find the capacity to make a beginning. We would soon have additional wealth and brains available for the task as a result of the attenuation of the arms race on which our prosperity now rests so heavily and insecurely.

Whether our present distribution of values permits us to think we can afford action on these lines or not, political and economic necessity will soon supply crude compulsion.

As the principal revolutionists in the revolution of man's labor, our people more than any other have created the conditions that now confront mankind with the choice between extinction and the achievement of its yearning to fulfill its humanity. Surely it will not exceed our capacity for social invention to assume the role that ought to be ours in the making of that choice.

Eric Sevareid: The Great Art of Leadership Is a Necessity for the Ideal Candidate in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some excerpts from an article in a recent issue of Esquire magazine in which Mr. Eric Sevareid, the brilliant and dedicated news analyst, describes in moving words the importance of Presidential leadership to the future of our country.

The excerpt follows:

EXCERPTS FROM "THE IDEAL CANDIDATE FOR 1960," BY MR. ERIC SEVAREID

Woodrow Wilson once said that the purpose of liberal education is to enable one to know a good man when he sees him. Universal free education has worked well enough so that Americans never elect or even nominate a truly bad man. In spite of the adulation of many, Senator McCarthy would never have come within miles of a presidential nomination. But whether we are educated enough to know the better man is a different question. Choices can be very hard to make.

The only rule of thumb I have been able to come to for myself is the "rule of the men and the boys." My observation about politics in many countries is that its practitioners fall into these two groups. The boys in politics are those individuals who want position in order to be something; the men are those who want position in order to do something.

And it is my own personal conviction that the United States has now arrived at a point in the world story when it is utterly imperative that we elect one of the men. I believe this so deeply that I would now much rather take the risk of choosing a man who often acts wrongly than a boy who will not act at all. Most mistaken actions can be corrected; for action begets counteraction and, in any case, the people can only "know what they want" when alternatives are not only presented to them but tried. We do not need a presiding officer; we do terribly need a constitutional leader. Our worst danger at this stage is not that of making mistakes, it is of continuing a political state of blandness, continuing to dull the sharp edges of issues, not by the practical compromise which must often happen, but by compromise as an article of faith. Leadership does not consist of endlessly trying to conciliate "the other fellow," of feeling all possible pulses before making the first timid steps in any direction. Only by boldly taking the steps and accepting the consequences are effective policy or the people's deepest desires discovered.

History will not wait for us; it threatens to bypass us even now. It is rushing on. We are caught in the tides not only of a scientific revolution but of political and social revolutions which we ourselves, not the Communists, inspired in this world generations ago. Even semiprimitive societies in darkest Africa have caught the tides, are taking us at our word—not our present words, uttered hour by dreary hour over the Voice of America, but our old words, the words of Jefferson and Thomas Paine. Millions of people are seeing visions, the same visions we saw so long ago that now we seem to regard them as nightmares.

William Faulkner asks, "What happened to the American dream?" He answers, in part, "We dozed, and it abandoned us. And in that vacuum now there sound no longer the strong loud voices not merely unafraid but not even aware that fear existed, speaking in mutual unification of one mutual hope and will. Because now what we hear is a cacophony of terror and conciliation and compromise babbling only the mouth-sounds, the loud and empty words which we have emasculated of all meaning whatever— freedom, democracy, patriotism—with which, awakened at last, we try in desperation to hide from ourselves that loss."

Truly there is a quiet desperation among those Americans sensitively aware of what is happening in the world today and of what is not happening in America. A great nation cannot stand still; it either moves forward or it moves backward. It is my belief that we are losing touch with the world, indeed with ourselves. Not only do we not know what we want any more; we do not know what we are. Like old women touching their beads, we endlessly count and recount our "blessings" in the form of our "gross national product," our "per capita income," and our production units, whether babies or block-long automobiles; and we call to the gods of "economy," "prudence," and "the middle way," trying to believe that this shall save us, knowing in our hearts that it will not.

We have no national gods in America. Even the one we name on our coins was not there until it was stamped on by an Episcopalian Secretary of the Treasury during the Civil War. We have never had a Fuehrer and want none; we have no king, no Delphic oracle, no Platonic academy of the all-wise. We have only the President of the United States. We cannot be led by our political institutions, admirably organized as they are. Government, as Wilson wrote 4 years before his election, "is not a machine but a living thing. It falls, not under the [Newtonian] theory of the universe, but under the theory of organic life. It is accountable to Darwin, not to Newton."

The Presidency is the only truly national office we have. And, as Wilson said, if the President "rightly interpret the national thought and boldly insist upon it, he is irresistible; and the country never feels the zest of action so much as when its President is of such insight and caliber. Its instinct is for unified action, and it craves a single leader. It is for this reason that it will often prefer to choose a man rather than a party. A President whom it trusts cannot only lead it, but form it to his own views."

This is what the American people now deeply want, and need—to be formed to the views, the faith, the working vision of a great man, who is great because he understands the present and anticipates the future, because he is one with the people, yet above them, because he has the capacity to call up their best instincts, not merely to comfort their expediencies, and because he can stand to the world in their image and as the living symbol of the America they once knew in their schoolbooks and felt in their hearts and have not yet entirely abandoned.

This must come back to us, this leadership, or the marvelous story of the American spirit in the world may soon unwind to a tattered and meaningless end. It is impossible for me to understand how anyone saturated in the history of this land cannot feel this need. And it is strange but true that human nature never changes: we have acted as if opinion polls and committees and the mechanics of organization could find the way for us, and yet, again and again, we are thrown back to the simple, ancient truth that only a man—one man—can lead us.

Leadership of a great and vigorous people is not a process of calculation or organization. Government is not a business. The true function of the Chief Executive has little to do with administration. If these things were not so we would elect businessmen as Presidents and we have never done that. On the level of the presidency there is no such thing as political science. Leadership is an art, not a science or a business, and what our people need and instinctively want is an artist. They have need, now, of a very great artist; for the immense canvas of our national life, our mirror to ourselves and our world, is frayed and obscured with a thousand tiny cracks. The American portrait is growing dim, and only the boldest strokes from the boldest hand will restore the original in its strong and vivid colors.

Report on Major Legislation, 1st Session, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, as this 1st session of the 86th Congress ends, the appraisals of our work over the past 9½ months are coming from every side.

We have heard praise; we have heard criticism. Both have been tempered to a great extent by the political affiliation of the person making the statements, or by the action taken—or not taken—on a particular piece of legislation or program.

Objectively, we can say that this has been a long and hardworking session. We have encountered problems that are peculiar to government when the executive branch is controlled by one party and the legislative branch by another. Of course, not everything has been done. In our growing and complex society, in the maze of governmental organization and actions, new problems and proposals are constantly pressing upon the Congress even before the old ones are dealt with in the lengthy legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to review some of the major achievements of the session.

DIVIDED GOVERNMENT

For the fifth straight year, the Congress has been Democratic-controlled while the administration has been Republican. This has created difficulties in reaching agreement on much legislation. However, again this year, as in the 84th and 85th Congresses, the Congress has made a sustained effort to do more than its share in making this divided Government function efficiently.

We have endeavored to cooperate with the administration; we have sought to pass legislation rather than create issues; and we have devoted months of work to controversial bills in the effort to meet the national needs.

Unfortunately, in many instances, the administration has refused to give its half of the cooperation needed to produce the desired results. The President's veto has nullified congressional work, and the threat of a veto has prevented action on other pending bills.

BUDGET APPROPRIATIONS

Again in this session, as in the previous four sessions of Congress, a reduction has been effected in the record-breaking budget proposals of the administration. Despite misleading statements to the contrary, Congress has been constantly concerned with the need for economy in Government. The facts clearly illustrate that substantial savings were made on various appropriation bills.

In approving 17 regular and supplementary appropriation bills, $1,881,410,093 was cut from the budget estimates submitted by the administration. Actually appropriated was a total of $72,077,598,352; the bulk of this is for fiscal year 1960 but a nominal amount was included for the old fiscal year, 1959. Certain permanent appropriations that become available automatically under previous law, such as the interest payments on the public debt, are not included in this total. Also, new obligational authority for Government spending outside the appropriations process has not been included. These, of course, will have considerable effect on total Government spending for fiscal year 1960.

The appropriation bill for the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare and Labor, was the only one of the 17 bills increased over budget requests. Much of this increase will be utilized in the vital research programs of the National Institutes of Health, which seek to find the causes and cures of crippling and killing diseases.

The largest of the appropriation bills was again that of the Department of Defense. Adequate funds were provided for the activities of the Army, Navy, and Air Force—over $39.2 billion. Congress cut almost $20 million from the budget request for the Department of Defense.

OTHER FISCAL LEGISLATION

The administration again presented a twofold request for an increase in the public debt limit, which was approved. The statutory limit was raised from $283 billion to $285 billion, and a temporary increase of $10 billion was granted to provide "elbowroom" in meanaging the Nation's debt. This means that the debt limit will be $295 billion until June 30, 1960, when it will drop to $285 billion.

In the general field of taxation, legislation has been passed to extend for 1 year the present corporate tax rate and certain excise taxes. Provisions were written into this measure to reduce the transportation tax on persons from 10 to 5 percent and to repeal the tax on local telephone, both changes to become effective on July 1, 1960. In another tax bill, an equitable formula to tax the income of life insurance companies was approved to replace existing temporary tax rates.

Agreement was also reached late in the session on a bill to provide additional revenues for the highway trust fund from which Federal shares of highway construction costs are allocated to the States. Of immediate concern was the continuation of the interstate highway construction, but other Federal aid to primary and secondary highways would have been curtailed without this legislation. As passed, the bill authorizes a 1-cent-per-gallon increase in the Federal gasoline tax; the increase would be in effect for 21 months. It also provides that a portion of certain automobile excise taxes will be transferred to the highway trust fund to keep the construction program—interstate, primary, and secondary—moving along on schedule and on a pay-as-you-go basis.

The House Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over tax legislation, will conduct a general revenue revision study during the adjournment period. This study will be the basis for any tax legislation reported from this committee in the second session.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REFORM

One of the landmarks of this session was the passage of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosures Act of 1959, which resulted directly from the lengthy McClellan committee investigation of abuses and racketeering in the labor-management field. As it became law, the legislation contains portions of three bills brought before the Congress and represents the best that could be achieved to correct the exposures of the McClellan committee while protecting the legitimate interests of both labor and management.

I voted for passage of this legislation.

VETOES KILL FARM BILLS

Mr. Speaker, the prime example of how effectively the veto and the threat of a veto stymied needed legislation this session was in the field of agriculture. As in the past two Congresses, we have found our efforts to write and approve reasonable farm legislation met by an unsympathetic and uncompromising attitude on the part of the administration, especially the Secretary of Agriculture.

The House Agriculture Committee, on which I have again had the privilege of serving in this Congress, held many long and thorough hearings on the several hundred bills referred to it. The record on farm legislation would be much better had we received cooperation from the administration in working out modified approaches to the problems brought before the committee.

The two bills that were passed by Congress to meet the pressing and specific needs of two important commodities—wheat and tobacco—were vetoed.

The wheat proposal would have cut wheat acreage and reduced the wheat surplus. It would have reduced the cost of the program, but it was vetoed. Why? Because it included price support provisions to prevent great hardships on the farmer while wheat acreage was being drastically reduced.

The tobacco legislation, which was of great concern to the tobacco producing areas of Virginia and the Ninth District, had the objective of stabilizing the level of price supports so that American-produced tobacco would be more competitive in the world market. This bill would have aided materially in the retention and expansion of our export market. It was vetoed, although it had the combined and united support of tobacco-grower organizations, farm organizations, and the many other people directly concerned with the tobacco program. The consequences of this veto will be unfavorable to the tobacco farmer and the tobacco industry in general.

Last year we made an extensive study of the tobacco export situation. As a member of that study group and as the sponsor of the House bill to stabilize tobacco price supports—the vetoed bill—I certainly feel that a grave mistake was made by the President in following the Secretary of Agriculture's advice to veto this legislation.

One of the major agricultural bills passed was that extending the Agricul-

tural Trade Development and Assistance Act for 2 years and strengthening its provisions. This bill includes permissive authority to establish a domestic food stamp plan for distribution of additional surplus commodities to needy people here at home, and it also specifies that insofar as practicable the Secretary of Agriculture shall make surplus commodities available for distribution to the Nation's needy before selling them overseas.

Among other agricultural bills given final approval were those to provide additional funds for the school milk program in fiscal year 1959, to authorize $81 million for the program in fiscal year 1960 and $85 million in fiscal year 1961. Awaiting final approval—different versions have been approved in the House and Senate—is a proposal to create an Agricultural Research and Development Commission, to establish more effective research programs to expand markets for agricultural and forestry products, and to reduce farm surpluses. I sponsored a bill similar to that reported from the House Agricultufe Committee.

Renewed efforts will be forthcoming in the next session to pass reasonable and adequate agriculture legislation. The key to the success of these efforts will be the attitude of the administration and the Secretary of Agriculture.

MAJOR MISCELLANEOUS

Also approved in this session were: Statehood for Hawaii; a self-financing program for the Tennessee Valley Authority's future construction of power-producing facilities within its present service area; an extension of the draft until July 1, 1963; a health insurance program for Federal employees under which the Government will share the costs on a 50–50 basis; a 3-year continuation of the Renegotiation Act to provide for recovery of excessive profits on defense contracts; exemption of news-type radio and TV programs from the equal-time requirement of the Federal Communications Act for political candidates; an increase to 4¼ percent in permissible interest payments on savings bonds; additional lending authority—from $500 million to $575 million—for the Small Business Administration; authority for the Federal Reserve Board to lower the reserve requirements for member banks; improved benefits under the Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Compensation Acts.

The omnibus housing bill, which was approved three times before the final version was signed by the President, gives the Federal Housing Administration authority to insure up to $8 billion in new home loans and reduces downpayments on such insured housing. This measure also contains provisions on urban renewal, a loan program for housing for the elderly, and public housing. Airport developments throughout the Nation, including four now under construction or planned in the Ninth District of Virginia, will be able to proceed because of the congressional approval of a 2-year Federal-aid-to-airports program. The military construction bills in this session included authorization and appropriations for additional work at the Abingdon Army Reserve Armory.

VETERANS' PROGRAMS

In addition to several minor changes in the laws governing the various veterans' programs, two bills were approved in this session of general interest to veterans and their families.

The first of these became Public Law 86–211, which modifies and liberalizes the non-service-connected pension program for veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict, their widows and children. This new law provides a sliding scale of pensions based on income and dependency status of the recipient; places World War II and Korean conflict widows and children on the same basis as the widows and children of World War I for purposes of pension eligibility; and makes several other changes and improvements in the existing program. This new law goes into effect on July 1, 1960.

The second major veterans' bill was aimed at improving the opportunities for veterans to secure home loans. This measure authorized $100 million in direct home loan funds, which will enable the backlog of direct home loan applications to be reduced to a great extent. This type of loan is primarily for veterans in rural areas where conventional home financing is not easily available. Authority was provided in this bill, also, for an increase in the maximum interest rate on GI home loans. The rate was increased from the previous 4¾ to 5¼ percent with the hope that additional mortgage funds would become available for veterans desiring to utilize the guarantee home loan program.

VETO HITS NINTH

Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of several bills in this session hit sharply and frequently at the Ninth District of Virginia. The short and long range economic effects of these vetoes can be severe to large segments of my district.

The veto of the tobacco price support stabilization bill, which I have mentioned, will further weaken the position of American-produced tobacco in the world export market. Several thousand farm families in my district depend on burley tobacco as their primary cash crop.

It will be my intention during the adjournment period of Congress to talk with all segments of the tobacco industry—from growers to exporters—and to develop new legislative proposals for the next session. It is my hope that the Tobacco Subcommittee, on which I serve, can again hold hearings next year on the general subject of tobacco legislation and perhaps report a bill to the full House Agriculture Committee.

Although twice vetoed, the public works appropriations bill was finally approved—the first time Congress has overridden a veto of the incumbent President. Additional funds will thus be provided for a flood protection project in my district. The Flannagan Dam and Reservoir located on Pound River in Dickenson will be allocated approximately $2,438,000 to complete planning in the last half of 1959 and to initiate construction early in 1960.

The Corps of Engineers, which recommended this project for construction as one of the flood protection dams on the Big Sandy River tributaries in Virginia, is currently working on preconstruction planning under appropriations granted by Congress in the last 2 years.

The budget for fiscal year 1960 requested only enough funds to complete planning. Approving just this request would have delayed the project another year and only resulted in further increases in costs. I appeared before the Public Works Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee and asked that funds be provided in the bill to begin construction in fiscal year 1960. Following this hearing, and testimony from the Corps of Engineers it had the capability to efficiently and economically utilize additional funds, a total of $2.5 million was put in the bill for the Flannagan Dam and Reservoir. This bill, after it had been passed by the House and Senate, was vetoed. The President objected to the inclusion of several new starts on construction in this fiscal year.

Following the veto, a second public works appropriation bill was reported and a reduction of 2½ percent was made in all projects and programs, bringing the funds for the Flannagan project down to approximately $2,438,000 and reducing the overall total funds below the fiscal year 1960 budget request. This second bill was also vetoed because of the new starts insisted upon by Congress as the continuation of a reasonable and orderly program of flood control and water resource development. This second veto was overridden.

The House approved an omnibus rivers and harbors authorization bill—projects must be authorized before funds can be appropriated for planning and construction—but it will not be passed by the Senate before adjournment. Incorporated into this omnibus bill are provisions of my bill to authorize construction of a flood control reservoir on the North Fork of Pound River above the town of Pound, Wise County. It is hoped that final passage of this bill can come next year.

It has been rumored that a veto message will be forthcoming on a third bill of great interest to the Ninth District—the bill to establish an independent coal research and development commission to coordinate and expand research into new uses and new markets for coal. This proposed research program is of vital concern to the coal industry and the communities dependent on coal production as the basic element in their local economy.

I sponsored a similar bill in both the last and in this session of Congress. Final action was not taken on a coal research bill last year, but we have succeeded in passing a bill this year to carry out the recommendations of the subcommittee for an independent commission to guide the way to new opportunities for coal.

It should be pointed out that recommendations of the subcommittee were almost unanimously those of the coal industry and those leaders in related industries concerned with the future of coal. As in the case of tobacco, the President will be ignoring these united

recommendations if a veto is announced for the coal research bill.

BILLS SPONSORED

In addition to the four bills already mentioned in this summary—coal and agricultural research, tobacco price support stabilization, and authorization of the North Fork of Pound Reservoir—I have sponsored several bills on other subjects.

My bill to designate the Pound River Dam and Reservoir in Dickenson County as the "John W. Flannagan Dam and Reservoir" was passed and became Public Law 86-189. This gives an appropriate name to this flood control project and eliminates the confusion existing between it and the other dam proposed for the North Fork of Pound River in Wise County.

The House approved a bill to make volunteer fire departments eligible to receive donable surplus property from the Government. One of my bills had this objective, but would have also made rescue and first aid squads eligible to receive such property. The Senate has not acted on the House bill as yet. I am considering the introduction of a new bill pertaining to rescue and first aid squads, and hope that further attention will be given to this subject next year.

Two of my social security bills are pending in the House Ways and Means Committee. These would eliminate the requirement that an individual be 50 years of age before receiving disability benefits and provide full benefits to both men and women at age 62. A special study of the disability provisions of the social security program is to be carried out later this year by a subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee. This study is aimed at determining whether the disability program is being administered in an efficient and fair manner and in accordance with the intent of Congress. The term "disability" will be scrutinized and the subcommittee will study allegations made that disability determinations have been slow and that appeals have been unduly delayed. This is definitely a needed study.

Undue criticism has been made of the Nation's farmers because of the cost of the programs conducted by the Department of Agriculture. In reality, much of the Department's work is for the benefit of the general public or serves a dual role of aiding the national welfare and of also benefiting the farmer. There are many examples of these programs too numerous to include in this brief statement. I have introduced a bill to provide that the costs of the surplus food programs, the national school lunch program, surplus foods distribution, and the national school lunch and school milk programs shall be attributed to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare instead of the Department of Agriculture. This bill is pending in the House Government Operations Committee.

A resolution was passed by both Houses calling upon the President to have reviews made of existing programs in the executive branch of the Government with the purpose of utilizing them more fully, to increase employment in the domestic and mining industries, to advise Congress of the actions taken or proposed, and to submit any recommendations for legislation. The coal research bill, which may be vetoed, tied in directly with this resolution. A third proposal, which I have joined in sponsoring, would establish a joint congressional committee to make a full investigation and study of the available fuel reserves, and to formulate proposals for a national fuels policy. This resolution is currently pending in the House Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this report on legislation is brief; it does not attempt to convey my position on every subject discussed; nor does it present arguments for or against bills in each instance. The purpose is to simply review the major subjects and those of particular interest to my district. Inquiries on the contents will be welcome and will be answered fully.

With Careful Administration of Government Expenditures Both Tax Relief and Debt Reduction Can Become a Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the administration has been engaging itself in a series of discussions on financial matters to which Members of Congress should give very serious consideration between now and the opening of the second session in January.

The Budget Director recently stated that U.S. citizens could be given a tax cut without any reduction in military spending if proper measures of economy were effected in other areas. I would certainly not disagree with this theory; on the contrary I am confident that highly important budgetary gains can be accomplished if the executive department will only try to follow the very fiscal policies that it has echoed from time to time. Rather than challenge such appeals for a sensible spending program, I shall assume that the White House and its various departments and agencies are sincere in their expressed concern about the cost of Government and particularly the size of the national debt.

I have always been eager to support any realistic measures—regardless of their political heredity—that are designed to save public funds without interfering with necessary Government services or threatening the general welfare. The executive department must also adhere to these principles if the Nation is to remain economically sound.

Recently a statement was issued in the name of the President. Some of the more offensive political implications need to be corrected, if only for the sake of harmony in setting up the budget for the next fiscal year.

The President said that his biggest disappointment in the record of this Congress was its failure to remove the interest ceiling on long-term Government bonds. Then he said that he deplored the action of Congress in slashing foreign aid. I submit that confidence in Government bonds can best be restored by checking inflation and reducing the national debt. I remind you that by next June 30 the national debt will have risen to $284.7 billion, a gain of more than $18 billion since 1953 when the administration first stepped in with the assurance that the debt would be reduced.

Under the circumstances it is difficult to understand the attacks on Congress for cutting mutual security appropriations. With the flow of gold away from this country and imports gaining as exports drop, the $3¼ billion made available for foreign aid would seem to be ample. Congress has been shown so many instances of poor judgment and waste on the part of administration officials handling the overseas program that the White House should set out to clean up the program as a primary responsibility, and to cooperate in reducing its cost wherever and whenever possible.

To check inflation requires a concerted effort on the part of Congress and the White House. In the recent statement the President patronizingly observed that our farmers are entitled to legislation that will allow them to plan for a secure future. Of course the farmer wants to plan for a secure future. So does the railroader, the factory worker, the coal miner, the truckdriver, the schoolteacher, and the housewife. The man who puts his money in the bank or in insurance certainly cannot feel very secure unless he has some indication that the inflationary spiral is going to level off. What about the pensioner whose income is barely enough to get by on at the present time? How can he feel confident about the future if groceries, fuel, clothing, and other necessities continue to cost more and more?

Regardless of how much talk we hear about wage increases contributing to inflation, you and I know full well that inflation gets its thrust in Washington. Our first target has been to be trimming of Government expenditures, with the savings to be applied to tax reduction and/or debt reduction. Interest on the national debt has now reached the frightful figure of $9 billion per year. Thus the interest alone is now equal to the total cost of more than 3½ million automobiles valued at $2,500 each. It is enough to buy 600,000 homes priced at $15,000 each. Or look at it this way: to pay the annual interest on the national debt requires the Internal Revenue to take $500 from each of 18 million taxpayers.

Yes, the consequences of an enormous national debt are obvious enough. America is going to have to pitch in and start paying off this deficit, and I agree with the Director of the Budget that our objective can be attained if we make the cuts in the proper places. I suggest only

that our own people be given the benefit of any questions involving funds for domestic versus foreign uses.

Mr. Speaker, on March 12, 1959, I introduced H.R. 5634, a bill to establish a program of economic relief for distressed areas through a system of loans and grants-in-aid. This program would have cost a very small percentage of the amount of money that the President wants to send overseas. While a very large part of the funds that are sent abroad are used to purchase foreign materials and equipment that compete with the products of American labor, the revolving funds called for in my bill would have been the means of stimulating the economy of surplus labor areas. My bill was intended to make it possible for West Virginians and other citizens idle through no fault of their own to get back to work. Once returned to a payroll, they would begin buying the things they need so desperately—including clothing, household goods, automobiles, and electrical equipment. This increased buying power would have a very beneficial reaction throughout the producing centers of our land. It would also result in increased tax revenues—local, State, and Federal.

Let me emphasize that I am pleased to hear the administration denounce inflation and appeal for reduced Government spending. To realize this objective during the second session of Congress will require only the proper determination of where cuts are to be made, and it is my hope that the White House will, at that time, show as much concern for the surplus labor areas of this country as has been voiced in behalf of a bigger and more expensive foreign-aid program. When our people have the opportunity to get back to work, the consequent economic stimulation will be felt throughout the country. And, with careful administration of Government expenditures, there is reason to believe that both tax relief and debt reduction can at long last become a reality.

Another Honor for the Padre of the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure that I call the attention of the Members of Congress to another award given the Wisconsin-born priest, Father Joseph F. Thorning. This latest award is the Military Order of Christ, with the rank of commander, bestowed upon Father Thorning by the Government of Portugal for his achievements in the promotion of friendship between Portugal and Brazil, and for his contributions to the knowledge of the culture of these two countries in the United States. I want to join with his many other friends in congratulating Father Thorning—better known as the Padre of the Americas—and hope he may continue his outstanding mission of working for an effective Latin American good neighbor policy for many, many years to come.

To give Members of Congress and the public a better picture of Father Thorning's background and his many accomplishments, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story from the May 14, 1959, issue of the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal. I know that, after reading this story, Father Thorning's background and accomplishments will be greatly appreciated by all people interested in maintaining and improving good relations between the United States and the Latin American countries:

PRIEST CITED BY PORTUGAL—GIVEN DECORATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A Milwaukee-born priest, Father Joseph F. Thorning, 63, has been invested with the insignia of Portugal's highest national decoration, the Military Order of Christ, with the rank of commander.

The presentation was made at the Portuguese Embassy by Ambassador Luis Esteves Fernandes. He praised Father Thornton for "splendid achievements in the promotion of friendship between Portugal and Brazil and for his contributions to the knowledge of the culture of those two countries in the United States."

HAS OTHER DECORATIONS

Father Thorning, who was graduated from Marquette Academy in 1914, has specialized in inter-American relations as an educator, author, and lecturer. He also has been decorated by Brazil, Venezuela, Haiti, Cuba, Colombia, and Spain. He is now associate editor of World Affairs here and pastor of historic Saint Joseph's Church at Carrollton Manor, Md.

In recognition of his unceasing work in behalf of the good neighbor policy, Father Thorning has been asked to deliver the opening prayer in the House of Representatives on Pan American Day for the last 15 years.

On these occasions, Senators and Representatives have praised him as "a great American and a man of God." Senator MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, called him the padre of the Americas, a title that has stuck with him.

PRAYERS FOR LEADERS

In his prayer this year the priest asked divine help for Western Hemisphere leaders in their efforts "to maintain the peace and to win victories against the international masters of deceit, who continue to foment hatred and destruction."

Father Thorning's Viking father, C. M. Thorning, who worked as a shipbuilder on the shores of Lake Michigan, died 2 years ago at the age of 94. Two of the priest's sisters are Mrs. M. Paul Reilly, 2200 Stratford Court, Shorewood, and Mrs. C. R. Reilly, 1908 North 73d Street, Milwaukee.

The Challenge of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, on July 24, before the National Strategy Seminar conducted at the National War College, Washington, D.C., on "The Challenge of the Future."

The address follows:

During the past 10 days, you have been engaged in an examination of the world conflict which Russian communism has created; the nature of this conflict, the tactics and techniques employed by the Communist forces, the strengths and vulnerabilities of both the free world and the Communist forces, and the courses of action which are open to us—both as a nation and as acknowledged leaders of the free world. The formal curriculum for this seminar gives encouraging evidence of a political realism which I hope will be contagious, particularly in those circles which are responsible for the forming and carrying out of our foreign policy. The commandant and faculty of the National War College are to be congratulated for acting as hosts to this timely Reserve Officers Seminar on national strategy, and the Institute of American Strategy, and the Reserve Officers Association which have prepared the voluminous documentation are deserving of all praise. I take special pride in the fact that the idea and the main drive for this seminar came from the Midwest and, indeed, from my own city of Chicago, the home of the Institute.

I fear, however, that you are more or less exhausted by this strenuous program of lectures and study and that my comments, prepared during the spare moments of a somewhat crowded life, may be the crowning indignity of all. For I well know the saying that the mind cannot absorb more than the posterior can endure.

I

Political realism dictates that we accept the fact that we are in a form of war with the forces of world communism. This is not a war of our making or choosing but one which has been forced upon us. It is vital that we recognize the full meaning of this fact, understand the nature of this conflict, and then engage the enemy to the fullest of our capabilities. Otherwise, we shall perish as a free society. The forces of communism leave us no other alternative.

It is the unorthodox nature of the war in which we are engaged that makes it difficult for some to recognize the harshness and the cold reality of our present situation. The nature of the conflict is political, or more accurately stated, geopolitical. By long-standing dogma, unmistakable public declarations, and a documented record of actions over the past 40 years, the Communists leave no room for doubt that the ultimate object of their political warfare is world domination. They are determined, by any and all means, to impose their system upon all nations and people of the world. The tactics they employ to this end are diversified, deceptive, and well organized. Individual liberty as we know it, representative and self-government as we practice it, have no place in the kind of world planned by the elite class—the new aristocracy—spawned by these past 40 years of Communist experience in Soviet Russia. The same type of absolute dictatorial control which they now force upon the people of their captive empire is the dismal and reactionary way of life which they plan for all the people of the world.

THE NATURE OF THE THREAT WE FACE

To understand fully the source and nature of present-day Communist power requires a realistic view of the historic origins of its theory and practice.

Communism as a theory was developed in a setting of great empires and amidst conditions of grave injustices in the then ex-

isting social order. The world of Marx and Engels was controlled by a few great powers, most of which were ruled by hereditary aristocracies. Class distinctions were hard and fixed. The destiny of the individual in terms of his personal dignity and possibilities in life were regulated largely by the accident of birth. Wars were waged for the extension and preservation of empires. These were the conditions against which the Communist manifesto of 1848 was issued.

It should also be recognized that the industrial revolution which brought such a great increase in productivity and which strengthened the middle class and political democracy also brought with it terrible abuses. The spectacle of little children working 12 to 14 hours a day in the textile mills and being whipped by brutal owners for sleeping at their posts properly excites horror and indignation. So does the practice of making women drag coal cars underground, crawling on all fours like animals. And in our own country, the men and women of my generation can remember the horrors of child labor in the sweatshops, as breakerboys, and in the textile mills. Nor can the starvation wages paid to women in stores and factories be ignored nor the 12-hour day which prevailed in steel until the 1920's.

When all this was combined with the waste and luxuries of the rich, as evidenced on Fifth Avenue and in Newport on this continent and in Mayfair in London and their lesser counterparts all over the Western World, is it any wonder that sensitive people were moved to outrage and sought to improve matters? And when these noble souls such as Florence Kelley and Jane Addams were then denounced for their efforts as unpatriotic by many of those who profited from these abuses, is it any wonder that the fires of radicalism were fed and that communism was able to make converts by posing as the champion of the disinherited? But communism in practice has also been a cruel exploiter of the people and has raised a new set of masters over those who do the back-breaking work of the world.

In 1850, self-government was a relatively new political phenomenon, struggling toward stability and permanency. The United State of America, as the repository of this great hope for the future of the world, was still the frequent target of imperial intrigues. But the powerful human appeal of this new way of life was undeniable. By the turn of this century, it had caught the attention and support of the common man in the Western Hemisphere and throughout the European Continent. With the coming of World War I, this spirit—this striving for a better way of life, both political and economic—was reflected in the birth of the national independence movement which shook and finally shattered three of the European empires. I refer to the Czarist Russian, the Austro-Hungarian, and the German Empires. Along with them, the Ottoman Empire also passed into history.

A new world order was taking shape. The fallen empires were replaced by a large number of independent nations. Self-determination was the popular demand by nations long submerged by imperialism. Nationalism emerged as a worldwide political force.

It was in these circumstances that the Communist theoreticians—led by Lenin—seized power in Petrograd, the historic seat of the broken Russian Empire. It was at this point in history (1917–18) that the political war in which we are now engaged began.

The first phase of this war witnessed the conflict between theoretical communism and the national independence movements. No less than 12 independent national states had emerged from the yoke of Russian imperialism. Among these were Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, North Caucasus, Azerbaijan, Turkestan, Cossacia, and Idel-Ural. The leaders and people of these newly independent nations rejected communism as a way of life. In their declarations of independence and constitutions, most of them made it clear that they would settle for nothing less than the modern forms of democracy with representative governments and individual liberty. With Russia as a base of operations, the bolsheviks—as the Communists were then known—launched a campaign of terror, infiltration, and armed aggression against these newly independent nations. In the absence of any effective support from the democracies of the West, all but Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania were occupied and put under Communist military control by 1922.

The flame of nationalism, however, continued to burn brightly in these once-independent nations. By 1925, the internal pressures of this spirit forced the Communist leaders to create a political safety valve. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was manufactured, along with a high-sounding but meaningless constitution, in an effort to placate the independence-minded people of the non-Russian nations and, at the same time, to conceal the colonial and imperialistic nature of the new regime in control of the partially reconstructed Russian Empire.

In the 10-year period which followed, Stalin made an all-out effort to apply the economic and social theories of Marx, Engles, and Lenin. These efforts were met with failures after failure. Nevertheless, Stalin pressed forward with his experiments, extracting a frightful price in human suffering and life.

The determined resistance of the masses of the people forced the Communist theorists to develop the technique of conflict management. They recognized their system was not capable of winning the voluntary acceptance and support of the masses. They also accepted the fact that a constant state of war would exist between their regime and the people, extending over many decades. The immediate task at hand was to establish the organizational mechanisms to manage the conflict so as to keep the masses of people under control.

Gradually, the Communists reverted to the methods of old-fashioned Russian despotism as the system of internal control. The secret police became all-powerful. A network of slave labor camps expanded to unbelievable proportions. Terror tactics and mass purges spread fear everywhere—even among the Communist Party members. Monopolistic state capitalism emerged as the new economic system with slave labor as a calculated, basic element of this system. The Commissariat of Foreign Affairs was charged with developing a worldwide system of espionage and indigenous Communist action elements.

By 1939, the merger of Russian imperialism and theoretical communism was completed. The emotional appeal of theoretical communism gave the Russians an external weapon their imperial system lacked during the long reign of the Tsars. Just as the slogan of "liberty, equality, and fraternity" had enabled the French Revolution to expand beyond the borders of France, so the promises of a classless society, of a fellowship of workers and the abolition of race prejudice, enabled communism to broaden its appeal and to seduce large numbers of well-meaning persons.

One of the great tragedies of modern times is the way in which so many originally decent people have gradually become corrupted by the immoral tactics of the Communist elite and have changed into malevolent beings. And a companion tragedy is the waste of precious energies which men, women, and nations have suffered in worshipping false gods. For the Communists have installed not a new day, but a new and more terrible night.

The despotic system of internal control developed by the czars over the centuries was perfected as the tool of conflict management. With the coming of World War II, the Russians were well prepared with the global plan of conquest tailored to any opportunity which might present itself for extending their Empire.

The nations bordering on the Soviet Union were singled out as the first targets. Their geographical location made them susceptible to a combined forces attack, including military, diplomatic, propaganda and heavy agent infiltration. The military were assigned the primary task with the diplomatic, propaganda and agent cadres playing a supporting role.

A long-range plan was worked out for those nations beyond the immediate reach of the Red army. It was no less complete and, in some respects, it was more elaborate than the short-range plans. Involved was the development of indigenous cadres of skeleton governments, infiltration of existing governments by skilled agents, local Communist Parties, fronts, action groups, covert agent networks, and propaganda operatives. No strata of existing society in the free world was overlooked in the development of these plans.

THE NEW EURASIAN EMPIRE

By 1950, imperial communism was in control of a huge land mass extending from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean. Over 800 million people and some 20-odd nations were forcibly incorporated into this empire. In every case, without exception, military power was the primary instrument of conquest. Diplomacy by ultimatum, intrigue, indigenous Communist Parties, manufactured governments in exile, Russian-style elections, the united front tactics, and a massive global propaganda program were in a carefully coordinated support role. The short-range political objectives of imperial communism had been completed. The new Eurasian empire had a geographical contiguity which offered unique opportunities for geopolitical warfare.

THE RESPONSE OF THE FREE WORLD

Alarm over the growing evidence of Communist aggressive intentions toward the world produced the Truman doctrine of 1947. This saved Greece and Turkey. Continuing Communist aggressions produced the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in 1949. These were purely defensive measures expressing the collective will of freemen to resist aggression. By them, we have unquestionably saved Western Europe and have helped, at least partially, to offset Communist gains in Asia and the Middle East.

But the reaction of imperial communism to these defensive measures was the war of aggression which they launched in Korea in 1950. By this military campaign, in an exposed and then vulnerable area, the forces of imperial communism sought to destroy NATO and to break the will of freemen to resist. Here they made a serious miscalculation. This challenge and the resolve with which it was met, under the leadership of President Truman, provided the spirit and determination needed to build a global defense system against further Communist aggression. The Communist efforts to manipulate the national independence revolution in Indochina, the Communist-provoked crisis in the Quemoy-Matsu strait, and the crisis in the Middle East served to stiffen and strengthen the growing alliances of free nations.

COMMUNIST TOTAL POLITICAL WARFARE

Political warfare is now the primary instrument employed by the forces of world communism. This warfare is supported by an elaborate system of military, diplomatic, economic, psychological, subversive and propaganda support programs. Each of

these support programs are manned by trained action elements prepared to play a well-defined role in the master plan. The master plan, including its time phasing, is directed by the Communist central authority in Moscow. No nation, no organization, no group is immune from its efforts of penetration and manipulation. Thus, this political warfare is total in character.

THE BERLIN CRISIS

Communist diplomacy by ultimatum is an essential part of this political warfare. The thinly disguised threat of Communist nuclear war has been directed at the nations of the NATO community since November 1957. At that time, the Russians delivered diplomatic notes to our European allies expressing this threat. The sputnik success of October 1957 was quickly translated into the image of precise intermediate and intercontinental ballistic missiles by Communist propaganda. Every European nation has been subjected to the relentless pounding of this imagery ever since. Meanwhile, Khrushchev was clamoring for another summit conference without making the purpose of his demands clear. However, Khrushchev was also calling for a status quo, that is, recognition by the free West that the political status of Central and Eastern Europe was frozen. Then came the ultimatum on Berlin. Khrushchev demanded that the United States, Great Britain, and France surrender their legal rights to be in Berlin and thereby desert the free people of West Berlin. He set a due date for our retreat from responsibility. When President Eisenhower made it clear that we would not be intimidated, and that we would hold the Russians responsible for whatever resulted from the ultimatum, Khrushchev then backed off. He then claimed that the due date applied only to the holding of our agreement to hold another summit conference.

It was then that the first serious break in the solidarity of the free nations occurred. The British leaders expressed support for another summit conference. We were finally dragged into a foreign ministers conference, under terms largely controlled by the Communists, to take up a limited agenda tailored to Communist needs. The months of propaganda buildup for this conference caused the people of the world on both sides of the Iron Curtain to turn their eyes and ears toward Geneva. The results of the first round of this conference produced a serious net loss to the free world.

Before the conference got underway, we largely surrendered our position of nonrecognition of the East German Communist regime. By agreeing to their admission as advisers to the conference, we virtually extended de facto recognition to them. The admission of the Federal Republic of Germany to the conference did not raise this question for the Russians, since they had long before extended de jure recognition to it. We have been party to opening the door to legitimizing the communist regime in East Germany. The political pressures on us to complete this defeat will be tremendous in the months immediately ahead.

During the exchange of views which followed, we have more or less agreed to neutralize Radio Rias in West Berlin—the most powerful voice of freedom for the East Germans and very large numbers of people in captive Central Europe. In exchange, the Communists agreed to be less violent in the use of anti-Western propaganda beamed to free Germany and Western Europe. Here we traded a potent weapon for peace for a highly dubious promise.

It was to offset this serious defection on the part of our policy makers that some weeks ago I introduced a resolution making this third week of July "Captive Nations Week" so that we could let the people behind the Iron Curtain know that some of us, at least, did not intend to desert them. I am happy to report that this resolution passed Congress 2 weeks ago and that efforts are being made to carry the message behind the Iron Curtain. This has evidently struck home since Mr. Khrushchev complained about it on Tuesday in Poland. But I see no reason why we should tie our hands propaganda-wise while the Russians are so active beyond their borders.

During the entire course of the first round of discussions in Geneva, we failed to raise the question of the future status of the Communist-occupied nations of central and eastern Europe. By this failure, we made ourselves a tacit party to the acceptance of a status quo in that area. Time and time again, Khrushchev has called for such recognition, particularly through his public offers of pacts of nonaggression and peaceful coexistence with the free West. In the central arena of political warfare, acts of omission are as important as acts of commission. Communist propaganda has made this abundantly clear since the summit conference of 1955.

This estimate is not offered as criticism of the Eisenhower administration or Secretary Herter. The nature of the war in which we are now engaged allows no room for partisan feelings or negative criticism. It is offered as current evidence of Communist political strategy, the tactics they employ to attract world attention to their actions and the reactions of free nations, and the manner in which the central arena of political warfare thus created is used to further their objective.

The meeting of the foreign ministers in Geneva stands as an excellent example of high-level Communist tactics in political warfare. The outmoded forms of passive negotiation which have characterized our efforts at the summits can lead nowhere but to peaceful submission to Communist long-range strategy. While we remain bogged down with useless forms, the Russians move steadily forward to win the battle of substantive political objectives.

THE NEW ISOLATIONISM

The United States, as acknowledged leader of the free world, has been preoccupied with building the military shield required to deter Communist aggression in all parts of the world. The major support effort for this shield has been our economic assistance programs on a global basis. Our international information program has been treated as a questionable experiment, more or less as the fifth wheel on a wagon. We have grown accustomed to reacting to Communist actions. In the process, we have developed an unrealistic dependence on the United Nations for tasks it is either unprepared or unwilling to perform. National attitudes are being fostered which nourish a trend toward a new isolationism, that is, political isolationism. Such descriptive language as "strategic withdrawal," "peaceful competition," and "political evolution" are symptomatic of this trend.

THE REVOLUTIONARY ERA

In our preoccupation with the threat of armed Communist aggression, we have been seemingly asleep to the worldwide revolutionary era in which we are living. The revolutionary era to which I refer is reflected in the acute political awakening of old civilizations long in a dormant stage, the awakening of less advanced civilizations now moving toward modern forms of statehood, and the politically restless spirit which permeates life within the many nations submerged by imperial communism. The motivating force of this revolutionary era is the strong desire of large numbers of people for self-government and their corresponding demands to be free masters of their destinies. They also want to improve their economic position as rapidly as possible. In south and southeast Asia, the old empires have fallen. They have been replaced by self-governing and independent nations. In the Near and Middle East, the former protectorate system has given way to another group of independent nations. In Africa, still more nations have emerged from colonial status and the dual slogans of "Dawn" and "Liberty" which are shouted in every language and dialect of the continent herald the gathering storm of the national independence movement on the march. Within the Communist empire, the political uprising in East Germany, the freedom riots in Poland, the freedom revolution in Hungary, the revolt in Tibet, together with the growing evidence of political unrest in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union and on the China mainland, portend a great political upheaval which could well dwarf the revolution against the empires of the 1917–18 era.

In the Western Hemisphere, this spirit is in evidence as the popular demand for more representative and constitutional forms of democracy and for land reform increases to the south of our borders.

This is the kind of world in which we free Americans live. This is the kind of realistic world view which reflects the hopes and strivings of the common man the world over for peace, for justice, and for a way of life which befits his dignity as man.

There are those who, liking the old order, dislike these modern movements and wish to oppose them with all the power they possess. It is, of course, the free right and privilege of these men so to think and act. I merely wish to suggest that this is a sure way of enabling the Communists to take over the popular movements of these countries and by picturing the United States as the supporter of the present economic and political rulers, to be able to identify us as defenders of reaction. In this way, the new nationalistic and social movements would be turned against us. Now, I happen to be one who does not want this to happen and I therefore wish to utter a solemn warning that, from the standpoint of our national interest, this would be a great mistake. But based upon a long experience in domestic politics, I have some doubt as to how effective any such warning is likely to be upon those who exercise power.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

A declaration of intentions alone will not suffice to bring us into a position becoming to our beliefs and free political institutions in this revolutionary era. We must demonstrate by a program of action that we believe the future belongs to the many, that representative self-government offers the best hopes for the fulfillment of mankind's yearning for a better life and that a just and lasting peace can be won despite the communist threat of nuclear warfare.

But we must act now before the divisions which have developed in our European alliance deepen still further and threaten the stability of our military shield against communist aggression.

May I raise the following very simple questions which may point to some answers?

1. If we permit our defense of West Berlin to be weakened or to be abandoned by one face-saving device or another, how much reliance will the West Germans or other members of the NATO alliance put in our pledges to defend them against attack? Will there not be an inevitable and rapid disintegration of NATO and a scramble by various countries to make terms with Communist Russia?

2. Is it wise to accept the present domination of the captive nations by Russia? Without encouraging any premature revolts, would it not be well to keep the fires of independent and democratic nationalism burning

and to hold out hopes for their ultimate redemption when in God's good time the Russian Communist empire begins to break up? Therefore, should not the Voice of America and Radio Free Europe be encouraged to keep on with their work instead of being dampened down as so many influential persons are quietly advocating?

3. Would not the non-Communist countries of Asia be much less inclined to resist communism by the admission of Red China to the United Nations and by our granting diplomatic recognition to it?

4. Did American encouragement of Batista, Trujillo, and the dictators of Venezuela and Colombia improve our standing with the great masses of Latin America?

5. Will the new loans of $375 million to Franco, plus a probable $130 million more, make it easier to win over the Spanish people to our side? And should we not think about the effect of such a policy upon non-Communist countries?

6. Can we afford anti-British, anti-French or anti-German talk and feelings?

7. Can Italy and Greece be disregarded, and could a modest change in our immigration policy improve relations with those countries?

8. Is it safe to cripple our capacity for limited war by approving the cuts which this administration has made in the Army and Marine Corps?

9. Are we making an adequate effort in the field of missiles?

10. Are there not wastes in our defense establishment which could and should be eliminated or reduced so that the funds thus released could be used to improve our combat efficiency?

11. In view of the fact that the uncommitted peoples of the earth—nearly a billion in number—are almost entirely members of the brown, yellow, and black races, can we help to win their support by displays of race prejudice? Has the spectacle of Little Rock and all that that implies strengthened us in the struggle with communism? Have we properly emphasized the improvements which have been made?

12. Does the existence of the slums of our cities and the conditions under which millions of our children are being brought up present such an attractive picture of life here that other peoples will spontaneously rush to imitate these features? Can we also emphasize such constructive steps as we have taken in these fields?

13. Do the working, living and traveling conditions of migratory workers who harvest many of our crops help us to win the allegiance of the farm laborers of the world?

These are just a few of the questions which I think we should ask ourselves as we enter upon this long struggle with communism.

Some people may resent my raising many of these questions and feel that it is somehow unpatriotic for me to touch upon them. I will merely reply that Communist propaganda is raising them every minute of the day in all parts of the world. The best answer we can make is to deal constructively with them.

It is my conviction also that, since the struggle is a total one, the old distinction between domestic and foreign policy no longer holds good. Our answer must be integral.

I furthermore wish to suggest that there is but one way for us to go, namely, forward into the future in an effort to make good the implicit promise of America, which is a better and a freer life for all the children of man.

Ours is, fortunately, an open society where—despite all our faults—we have the power to correct them. We can do so if we have the will.

And there is one final moral question which we need to answer both individually and collectively and that is:

What is the worst fate which could befall our Nation and the world?

Different people may have different answers, but I have a very simple one—tyranny or slavery.

This is true today as it was in the era of flintlock muskets. Once we agree upon this and also the need for helpful compassion in the world, I believe our duty becomes clearer and the tactics which we should adopt are more evident.

Finally, may I propose that we take the lead by calling a true summit conference of the free nations of the world, both of those who are committed to our side and of those who are uncommitted. Such a conference, under our leadership, might be able to work out a charter and a program for future progress which would bind together the free world.

It could reduce the danger of Communist subversion by setting up a positive and constructive program for improving the economic, social, and political life of mankind. But, if we convene such a summit conference, we should be in earnest and be resolved to back up our words with deeds. Talk is not enough.

In this seminar, you have seen that the struggle is for survival; that it is complicated and that it will be protracted.

You have learned that, while each of us may have our individual viewpoints and criticisms, dedicated men of ability and good will are working tirelessly in the State and Defense Departments, and in the Congress on both sides of the aisle.

You now know—if you did not know before—that there are no magic or simple or easy answers. Acheson, Dulles, and Herter, to name only a few, all fought to the limit of their abilities. Our private and our military people know their grave responsibility.

But this you must recognize; that the President, the executive branch and the Congress require in our free society the support of an intelligent citizenry with a firm national will. This type of seminar, in my opinion, is one of the best means of carrying the message to the people. Nonpartisan studies of our problems, understanding the grave threat which confronts us, reexamining and articulating what free America stands for, and forging our national determination is your job.

I congratulate all those in the Defense Department and the other executive departments who have made this seminar possible. I again congratulate the civilian sponsors, the Institute for American Strategy and the Reserve Officers Association.

I hope that you participants, when you leave here as private citizens, will continue to support the Institute and similar organizations in the continuing and eternal struggle to preserve our hard-won freedoms and human dignity.

National strategy, liberty, and morality is still everyone's responsibility.

The Fight in 1959 for Federal Employee Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. FOLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, with the conclusion of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, it should be noted that considerable progress has been made on legislation affecting Federal employees. It is pertinent, however, to keep in mind the necessity for continually reviewing these programs with an eye to improving working conditions for career employees so as to maintain the high morale conducive to providing an efficient civil service. As the country's largest single employer, the Government of the United States provides a working model for better employer-employee relations in private enterprise.

In the field of fringe benefits, the Government has lagged behind private industry. With passage of S. 2162, the Federal Health Insurance Act, we have taken a long step toward narrowing the gap in a crucially important area. By establishing a contributory health insurance program for Federal employees and their families, the Congress affirmatively has made Federal employment more attractive to young people concerned with their families and futures. Under the provisions of the law, Federal employees may secure protection against many types of ailments. Employees will not only be able to obtain more hospitalization but twice as many benefits as well for each dollar invested, since the Government will be making a matching contribution. Moreover, should the individual Government employee increase his premium, he will be eligible for a higher level of benefits.

Despite opposition from the executive branch to present consideration of proposed legislation for the extension of similar coverage to retired civil service employees, the House will have an opportunity during the next session to consider the Senate bill providing health insurance coverage for these deserving people.

Final hearings were completed on H.R. 5178, which would establish a badly needed medical and health program for oversea employees so that they may avail themselves of appropriate health services and facilities on a uniform basis. In addition, the House passed two other bills relating to overseas employees: S. 96 increased compensation for oversea teachers and other school employees thereby improving overseas school activities while reducing personnel turnover and recruitment problems to a minimum; H.R. 7758, which establishes a uniform system of compensating U.S. citizens for hardships and inconveniences incidental to their overseas assignment. These three bills were concrete actions taken upon recommendations of the 84th Congress to strengthen and improve civilian personnel administration in the oversea activities of our Government.

Other legislation enacted by the House provided for the following:

First. For employees over 65, liberalized Government employment life insurance values so that those remaining in service and paying premiums do not suffer a loss in value.

Second. Increased from $400 to $750 the amount of unsecured loans that the Federal Credit Union may lend to members. Increased the payment period from 3 to 5 years.

Third. Gave Federal employees the preceding Friday off whenever a legal holiday falls on Saturday.

Fourth. Over 400 Public Law 313 and supergrade jobs in defense as well as nondefense agencies.

Additional legislation passed by the House dealt with annuities, residence requirements of postal workers, and increased travel allowances. Also, the Federal Government is authorized by H.R. 7577 to defend employees involved in suits as a result of operating motor vehicle on official business.

While the accomplishments of the House during this session on behalf of the Government employee have been substantial, an increasing number of Federal employee questions will become evident in the second session of this Congress. Among these will be matters relating to the whole spectrum of problems raised in the daily relations between the civil servant and his employer, the Government of the United States—pay raises, leave and travel allowances, promotion policy, retirement, the Hatch Act, automation, union recognition, and other related matters. Many of these are similar to the most vexing problems facing labor and management in the field of private enterprise. Actions taken on behalf of this great group of loyal, and efficient employees who have had their competency tested by competition and their loyalty by investigation, will be reflected not only in the quality of service performed for all the people by its Government, but also in the type of judgment, skill, and good will prevailing in employer-employee relations throughout the community. The Federal employee is deserving our continuing interest.

A Proposal for Tax Equity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, on June 11, 1959, my able and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] and I joined in sponsoring legislation to tax all fire and casualty insurance companies alike—on the same basis and at the same rate as corporations in other industries. These bills, H.R. 7671, Mr. Boggs, and H.R. 7672, Mr. Baker, will eliminate the discrimination which presently exists in the taxation of stock companies as compared with the taxation of mutual and reciprocal fire and casualty insurance companies. The proposal covers all insurance companies other than life companies. It is expected to result in approximately $25 to $30 million additional revenue to the Treasury for a normal year. Under these bills small companies will receive special treatment comparable to that in existing law. It is not our purpose to subject to tax those small mutual and reciprocal companies now exempt.

The Congress recently passed a bill relating to the taxation of the income of life insurance companies. It was the purpose of that legislation to provide increased revenue to the Treasury from the life insurance companies based on both their underwriting and investment income. In framing the life insurance bill, both the Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committee repeatedly emphasized the importance of not discriminating in tax treatment between stock and mutual life insurance companies. It is equally important not to discriminate in the taxation of the different types of fire and casualty insurance companies. Our bills will place all fire and casualty companies on an equal tax basis so that equal incomes will bear equal tax liabilities.

There are three types of fire and casualty insurance companies: stock companies, mutual companies, and reciprocal insurers. The existing Federal tax law discriminates against stock companies in favor of mutual companies and reciprocal companies. Simple equity requires that all be taxed on the same basis and at the same rates.

Our recent hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means have disclosed that all insurance companies have two types of income: First, underwriting income; and, second, investment income. Both types of income should be taxed. No basis exists for excluding either type of income from a fair tax. Under existing law, stock fire and casualty companies are taxed at the full corporate rate of 52 percent on both underwriting and investment income. Since the inception of the Federal income tax, stock companies have paid the regular corporate rates paid by other business corporations. However, mutual companies are taxed on an entirely different basis. Under existing law, mutual companies pay the higher of (a) 1 percent of their premium income plus 1 percent of their gross investment income, or (b) 52 percent on their net investment income only. Reciprocals have never paid any tax whatsoever on their substantial underwriting income, but are taxed on their investment income only. These different methods of taxation are highly preferential in favor of the mutual and reciprocal companies and give them an unwarranted competitive advantage. Federal taxes of all stock companies for the 15 years ended with 1957 amounted to 2 percent of their net premiums written. Federal taxes of all the mutuals and reciprocals for this same period were only 1 percent of their premiums.

The mutuals and reciprocals have earned and retained substantial profits from underwriting and investments. Such retained profits during the 15 years ended with 1957 amounted to $920 million. This increase in surplus was accumulated on a tax-favored basis. The mutuals and reciprocals, by reason of their lesser tax burden, were able to retain much more of their net income than they otherwise could have. They also retained more than twice as much, proportionally, as their stock company competitors.

Under existing law, a large number of small mutual companies are either exempt from tax entirely or receive special tax consideration. The bills we have introduced do not disturb this. Of the 2,500 mutual companies in the United States, approximately 1,750 are tax exempt and their exemption would be continued under these bills. In addition, some 150 mutual companies are partially tax exempt under existing law and our proposal would not increase their tax burden. It would impose no hardship upon small farm and local mutual insurance companies.

The remaining 600 large mutual companies would be taxed at regular corporate rates. These large mutual companies write the same lines of insurance as stock companies in the several States. They use the agency or brokerage system as well as the direct writing system, just as the stock companies do. All are subject to the same State regulation as stock companies. There are no basic methods found in one type that are not found in the others. There is no reason for a disparity in tax treatment.

These 600 large mutuals write 98 percent of the volume of all mutual fire and casualty insurance companies. Under our bills these companies will pay substantially more tax than they have previously paid. For example, the five largest mutuals and the three largest reciprocal companies have for the 16 years ended with 1958 paid total Federal income taxes of $96 million. If they had paid taxes on the corporate basis as proposed in this bill, these eight companies would have paid $182 million, an increase of $86 million, or 90 percent. Of course, equality of taxation between these companies could be achieved by reducing the stock companies' tax basis to the level of the mutual companies. However, this would result in a great loss of revenue to the Treasury. I believe that the most equitable basis of tax for insurance companies is the basis provided for stock companies and companies in industry generally, that is, regular corporate rates. This would bring the taxes of mutual and reciprocal companies in line with the taxes of their competitors.

There is no reason to continue the existing discrimination between fire and casualty companies in the Federal tax laws. Our proposal would eliminate the present competitive impact of the different methods and formulas now applied to these companies. It involves few of the complexities found in our consideration of a permanent bill for the taxation of life insurance companies. On the contrary, it is simple. In summary, this bill would eliminate the existing inequities in the taxation of the various types of fire and casualty companies and would increase the revenue to the Treasury by a substantial amount.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that favorable legislative action can be taken by

the Congress on this meritorious proposal in the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

A Proposal To Encourage Young People To Buy Musical Instruments by Removing the Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the 1st session of the 86th Congress, on June 15, I introduced in the House of Representatives a bill, H.R. 7725, to remove the 10 percent excise tax on all musical instruments costing $150 or less.

The purpose of my proposal is to encourage students in elementary, high school, and college music courses to purchase low-cost musical instruments.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the study of music has become a normal part of the education of American boys and girls, and I believe that we should do whatever we can to encourage young people who are musically talented to play musical instruments.

Let me make very clear that, although music instruction in some form is required in most elementary schools and is an elective course in most high schools, students who buy their instruments are under present law required to pay the 10-percent excise tax.

Musical instruments purchased by schools, however, are exempt from this tax.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to point out that 93 percent of the sales of band and orchestra instruments in the United States are made to parents, students, private teachers, schools, and religious and character-building organizations. More than two-thirds of these sales are made by or for students.

Indeed, over 80 percent of all musical instruments manufactured are purchased for educational purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I think the case for removing the excise tax on musical instruments to help the many young people who study music in our country is best summed up in the following excellent editorial published in the Elkhart (Ind.) Truth and entitled "Lift Instrument Tax, Help Kids."

The editorial follows:

LIFT INSTRUMENT TAX, HELP KIDS

A bill to remove the 10 percent manufacturer's excise tax on musical instruments costing $150 or less has been introduced in Congress by Representative JOHN BRADEMAS of our own Third District.

It is a good bill and should be passed.

As the band instrument capital of the world, Elkhart obviously has a community interest in this matter.

But our support of the bill is not based simply on the Elkhart interest, but rather upon our belief that this would serve the welfare of the entire Nation—and in particular, the Nation's children who buy the lower priced instruments.

The excise tax on musical instruments was placed some two decades ago at a time when materials for such instruments were scarce. That is no longer true.

Like many other excise taxes, this tax continued—no doubt—because of the Federal Government's revenue needs during World War II and succeeding crises.

But relief from excise taxes has been granted in the case of certain products and services outside the music field.

And in fact the 10 percent tax is waived when schools and churches buy musical instuments.

This is judged to be in the public interest. But it seems to us that the public interest also would be served by giving a break to school kids who buy their own instruments.

Since instruments selling for $150 or less are generally of the beginner type, the $150 exemption idea would thus largely benefit students rather than professional users.

An industry source tells us that 93 percent of instrument sales are now made to parents, students, private teachers, schools, religious and character-building organizations.

This is a much higher percentage than in years past, and certainly the further encouragement of such use is a matter of public concern.

From the educational and character-building standpoint, the expansion of school bands and orchestras has been one of the finest developments of recent years.

Relief from the tax on the lower priced instruments would permit either a lower retail price or would forestall a price increase which inflation would otherwise require.

One way or another, we may be very sure that the consumer pays excise taxes—even those levied directly on the manufacturer—and thus stands to benefit when such taxes are lifted.

The proposed exemption on low-priced instruments would itself remove an estimated $3.5 to $4 million of tax revenue.

But if more youngsters buy, they become potential customers later for higher priced instruments which still bear the tax, and thus much of the revenue may be recouped.

Mr. Speaker, I hope very much that Congress will adopt my proposal.

The Fight in 1959 for Fair Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it has been over 20 years since the dark depression days when Franklin D. Roosevelt looked around him and saw "one-third of a nation ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed." Since then as a nation we have come to enjoy unparalleled prosperity.

It would be pleasant to think that the poorest among us have shared equally in that prosperity. It would be even more pleasant to think that the poor are a rapidly diminishing group that will entirely disappear as our technology improves and as our productivity increases.

Poverty is not, however, a condition that is disappearing. Studies by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Commerce Department, the Federal Reserve Board and others make it increasingly evident that tens of millions of our people have not shared in our growing national prosperity, nor can they reasonably expect to do so unless Congress does something about it.

Tens of millions of our people are still ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed. In large part their plight is caused by the payment of wages that are too low to cover the bare necessities of life. No matter how hard they work nor how long they labor, they cannot hope to have the basic minimum standard of food, shelter, clothing and medical care that they have a right to expect.

When the Fair Labor Standards Act was enacted, the 75th Congress pledged "to correct and as rapidly as possible to eliminate conditions detrimental to the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers." Not only has that pledge never been redeemed, but, relative to their fellows, the poorest paid of our workers are worse off than they were in 1938. They have come to form a class increasingly isolated from their fellow workers, a class disorganized, without influence, without voice, without power. They are the forgotten workers of our affluent society.

Liberal amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act can do much to relieve this tragic and indefensible situation. Democratic Members of both Houses of Congress have introduced a number of bills designed to remove the inadequacies of this law, by raising the minimum wage itself and by extending the protection it affords to millions not presently covered.

In keeping with the Republican tradition of despair and accepting the premise that a little misery is inevitable, the administration has opposed these changes, both as to an extension of coverage and as to the increase in the minimum wage.

Typical of the fine measures introduced is the Kennedy-Morse-Roosevelt bill—S. 1046 and H.R. 4488—which would raise the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour and extend the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act to about 7¾ million not presently covered. While no action was taken on this measure in the House, the Labor Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held extensive hearings, and on July 10, favorably reported S. 1046 with amendments. As sent to the full committee, the bill would raise the minimum wage to $1.25 and bring 10 million additional employees under the protection of the act. For the 25 million wage earners now covered by the act, the minimum wage would be raised to $1.15 per hour the first year and $1.25 the second. Newly added groups would receive $1 the first year, the minimum gradually being raised to $1.25 over a 4-year period for most of them. Those not receiving the four-stage raise to $1.25, numbering 2.7 million, are mostly in retail and service trades doing a business of less than $750,000.

This very modest measure was immediately attacked by the President and his Secretary of Labor as, among other things, "inflationary." This was to be

expected, of course. The administration's obsession with inflation is not new. Lacking the energy to act or the intelligence to know what to do on any given issue, inflation is invariably seized upon as a permanent and universal alibi for inactivity. A perfect excuse for a do-nothing government.

As a matter of fact, no significant price effect need be expected from the passage of this legislation. The best estimates place the increase in wages that would result at about $2.5 billion—less than one-half of 1 percent of our gross national product and less than 1 percent of the total compensation paid in wages and salaries for the Nation. This increase will take place gradually over a 4-year period and would mainly affect industries characterized by substantial price competition. Not only would the total impact be slight and slow in coming, but it is unlikely that the entire increase in wage costs would ever be reflected in consumer prices. This reasoning is supported, of course, by studies of the economic effects of the original act and subsequent raises in the minimum wage, with which Mr. Mitchell, at least, should be familiar.

This increase in purchasing power would have beneficial rather than harmful effects on the demand side of the economic picture. Studies of low-income consumer expenditures show that over half of this increase would be spent for food and clothing. Very little of it would be spent on items for which there is a limited supply. This increase in purchasing power would, in fact, give a boost to those very sectors of the economy most in need of a stimulant. It would contribute, in a small way perhaps, to a reduction in our farm surplus. Incidentally, some $100 million would be drained off in excise, income, and social security taxes.

The administration's objections to this type of legislation are not, of course, limited to the inflation issue. I see no reason at this time, however, for a rehash of the tired old alibies that reactionaries have consistently relied upon to excuse inaction in this field.

The fact is that failure to extend coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act and failure to raise the minimum wage would be indefensible—morally, socially, politically, and economically indefensible.

Failure to act will encourage the continuing growth of a depressed class numbering millions, whose members cannot realistically hope to share in our prosperity, nor to share in what we think of as the American way of life. For those whose earnings are presently geared to the Federal minimum wage and for a substantial portion of the 20 million who are without wage-hour protection, there is no hope unless Congress acts. They are for the most part unorganized, immobile, and ignorant of alternative employments.

The gap between what they suffer along with and what the average American worker earns continues to broaden each year. Nor is their plight tragic merely in a relative sense. The fact is, a dollar an hour is simply not enough to get along with. Yet millions of workers are expected to raise a family on that or less. Humanitarian considerations aside, Ricardo's "iron law" of wages would dictate better treatment of the wage earner.

As a nation we can ill afford the costs of such cheap labor. Poverty below the subsistence level quickly translates itself into slums, crime, delinquency and disease for which ultimately we must pay the price. A generation of tens of millions of physically weak and ignorant children constitutes economic waste as real as any of which we might conceive.

I, too, am critical of the measures thus far proposed. I am critical of the fact that they do not accomplish enough. Coverage should be given all the unprotected millions who need it. The constitutional limitations of our power and feasibility of administration are the only justifiable limitations on our action in this regard.

I am particularly concerned that coverage should be extended to the factories of the field, to the farm laborers, to that group which is always left out when leglislation is written, whose rights are consistently bargained away and eliminated from social legislation as the price of getting something else in. I speak of all farm laborers, of course, but particularly the migrants. The exploitation of these people has for much too long imposed a heavy burden on our conscience as a people.

It is imperative also that more effective procedures for the enforcement of FLSA should be provided. The inability of the Labor Department to enforce the act lends encouragement to the unscrupulous employer whose failure to comply is cheating workers of over $350 million a year.

Finally, I urge support for H.R. 8297, a bill which I introduced making the child-labor provisions of FLSA applicable to agricultural employment. It will give to the child working on a "factory" farm the same protection provided years ago to children in other employments. The exploitation of children in this area is a vestige of an older and crueler era which long ago should have been removed.

Amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act along the lines I have suggested should be the first order of business for the second session of the 86th Congress. The needs of millions of our people should be sufficient to stimulate action on our part, but remember, too, that the eyes of the world are upon us. While our standard of living may be impressive, our belief in human dignity is tested by the way in which we treat those at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Hon. Isidore Dollinger

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding Members of this Congress and an able and hardworking member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee will not be with us when we return for the 2d session of the 86th Congress. Our esteemed colleague, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, is resigning after this session of Congress so that he can serve the people of New York as the district attorney of Bronx County.

ISIDORE was elected to Congress in 1948, the same year I was first elected to serve in this great legislative body. I have had an opportunity to observe his work during this entire period and he served with honor and dignity. He is a man of principle who as a dedicated public servant served the interests of his constituents.

During the past two years I have had the pleasure of having ISIDORE DOLLINGER serve on my Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance. He was one of the most outstanding members of that subcommittee and I relied heavily on his advice and counsel in the conduct of our committee business. I am very sorry that ISIDORE DOLLINGER is retiring from Congress but I certainly wish him well because I know that he will appreciate this opportunity to serve his friends in New York as their district attorney.

Figures—of Principal and of Interest—of Speech and of Principle—and of Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the dropping of your gavel coincident with your pronouncement that this 1st session of the 86th Congress has ended, will surely come in a matter of moments. I therefore ask your indulgence, while I recount briefly our congressional activities.

We have done much in which we can take pride as Americans and as Democrats. The thing we prevented, even though important to our American way of life as well as to the world at large, will soon be forgotten.

There is still much to be done. Most of that we will do in the second session of this Congress, which will start on January 6, 1960. But in a never-ending fast-moving world, new problems will always beset us. Instead of delving into the future, a most uncertain task at best, I will dwell on the immediate past.

We have enacted into law some 400 laws of general national and international interest. Of that number, about 100 can be labeled of major importance. Merely to list all of these would take much more time than is now available. I, therefore, will refer only to the most important.

SPENDING

We appropriated more than $39 billion for national security and defense; that is almost 60 percent of the total sum appropriated for the fiscal year for all purposes. This is $20 million less than the President asked for.

The total sum appropriated for all purposes, including what Republicans invidiously refer to as back-door financing, was $75,051,880,215, almost $2 billion less than the President requested.

It can never be sufficiently emphasized that the Congress can merely authorize expenditures and appropriate the money therefor. Only the President and his appointees, under his direction and control, can spend the money. Surely we, the Congress, can refuse to authorize or appropriate. But even after we do both only the Executive—the President—can spend. Under our form of government there is but one spender—the President. Repeatedly, the incumbent now in the White House, has ignored congressional intent and directive. He has refused to spend money as directed, spent it contrary to congressional directives and even spread out and cancelled out contracts authorized and let.

Let us never forget that when our Republican friends and campaigners start calling names, the only spender, reckless or otherwise, in our National Government, is the titular head of the Republican Party, President Eisenhower. By doubling the cost of operation of his own office, he has set the spendthrift example which all his appointees seek to imitate.

While on the subject of spending, let me remind you that a major part of the cost of Government is the interest we pay on U.S. obligations. This administration without the help of Congress and over our vigorous protests has run up that cost from 1953 to date by more than 100 percent. Starting with short-term interest rates of under 2 percent and long-term rates of not more than 2½ percent, President Eisenhower has approved our paying 4¾ percent and assents to the threat of his Secretary of the Treasury that we may yet pay 6 percent. The President and his big-moneyed friends are demanding that the Congress eliminate the limit on the interest rate on long-term bonds so that he can and I quote the President, "demonstrate responsibility in the management of our Federal debt."

Responsibility, indeed. He may have forgotten but we cannot forget that this is the same fiscal genius who in two political campaigns—1952 and 1956—promised to reduce the national debt. Three times since his first promise, at his request we increased the debt limit. This year by $2 billion to $285 billion permanently and to $295 billion temporarily until 1960.

I am proud that this Congress increased the interest rate payable on savings bonds and refused to increase it on long-term bonds. I have been introducing a bill to accomplish that in each of the last four Congresses. The administration has at long last seen the light and gone along with me.

Note the difference between savings bonds, the E- and H-bonds, and other Government securities. The savings bonds are anti-inflationary because they tend to immobilize savings. Other securities produce money that flows into the money stream to pay bills for construction, experimentation, material, services and the like.

Savings bonds traditionally, until 1953, paid an interest rate higher than savings and thrift accounts. Our people are not so stupid as to keep their savings in bonds at minimum rates, when they can keep them in institutions paying maximum rates, all guaranteed by U.S. Government agencies.

I suppose it is human nature to take care of ones friends. So let us not be too hard on Ike and his big business, big-moneyed friends, who say let the devil take care of the masses, the wage-earners and little businessmen and his E and H savings bonds. Be sure these big business operators in Government will take care of their friends with more and more profits and higher and higher interest rates. They will continue to complain about being in the 90-percent tax bracket, to try to make us forget that the little fellows pay 90 percent of the gross tax collection.

Before I leave the fiscal affairs of our Nation I wish to comment on the scare campaign the Republicans are engaging in about inflation.

The one thing they learned from President Roosevelt was "there is nothing to fear except fear itself." The difference is that he tried to teach us to be unafraid. They are using that concept in reverse, to scare us into ignoring the facts of life.

If they can cry inflation loud enough and long enough, we may look away from administered prices that ignore the law of supply and demand. We may not learn that the worst kind of inflation comes from administered prices coupled with unconscionable interest rates. The very people who are demanding that we cut Government expenses are the same ones who are pushing prices up, demanding higher interest rates and tax cuts allowances and exemptions and all to balance the budget.

In 1958, the banks and moneylenders of the country had their best year in our history, in gross receipts, and in net profits—both before and after taxes. Nineteen hundred and fifty-nine will be even better.

The same is true of corporation profits. Eight hundred and eight leading corporations showed a 56-percent increase in profits this year over the same period for 1958—$6,915,729,000, as against $4,438,065,000, or $2,477,644,000 more net profits after taxes. More than half of these did better than that average. Four hundred and twenty-eight of these corporations improved their corporate profits by more than 75 percent in the second quarter of 1959 as against the same quarter in 1958.

These 808 companies are the very ones paying for full page ads to frighten us out of our skins because of inflation they created and as a result of which they made these profits.

BANKING LAWS

In the financial field, we also enacted bills that increased our subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank—to set up a new Inter-American Bank for Central and South America similar to the World Bank, some modernization of the National Banking and Federal Reserve Acts, restrictions on holding companies in the savings and loan association field and the first complete revision in 25 years of the Federal Credit Union Act. I was most pleased that the credit union bill was enacted in almost the exact form in which I had introduced it.

FOREIGN AID

The mutual security authorization and appropriation bills were a fine example of the operation of our Government in true bipartisan spirit, with both parties in Congress and the President moving forward in the best interests of our country and of world peace.

What irked me however, was that in his messages to us asking for legislation in the international field the President indicated we had enough money for loans and grants abroad, for housing abroad, for highways abroad, for reclamation and community facility projects abroad, for schools and education and health programs abroad, in short for almost everything anyone could ask for abroad. But the domestic scene was different. From his veto messages it became apparent, he thought we did not have enough money for any of these things needed so badly at home; not even enough for loans to our cities and States.

My position on these matters was and is quite simple—I am for all of these things for foreign friends. I have always voted for them. But I have and always will vote for them for our people at home as long as we need them.

If the time is here or ever comes that we do not have enough for both, we must first take care of our own and use the surplus, if any, to take care of those abroad.

This is not a matter of charity begins at home. This is fiscal responsibility as to taxpayers' money. I can apportion my personal funds, charitywise as I please. I have no right to do so with taxpayers' funds.

RULE BY VETO

Incidentally, it is well to note, that although we overrode a Presidential veto only once, each of the other votes by which we failed to override, demonstrated that the overwhelming majority of the people and their representatives were against the President. The Constitution requires a two-thirds vote to make a bill law against a Presidential veto. In neither House does the Democratic Party control a two-thirds vote. In the Senate there are 35 Republicans and 65 Democrats. In the House there are 153 Republicans, 283 Democrats, and 1 vacancy. We failed to override vetoes by from one to six votes on important measures, thus permitting one-third of either House plus one to six votes to thwart the will of a vast majority of the people's representatives.

VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Veterans' affairs were given considerable attention. We extended their direct loan program, although in my opin-

ion not sufficiently nor in the right direction. Among other things we should not have increased their interest rates. At the urging of this administration, these rates have now been pushed up by 32 percent since 1953. We wrote a new Veterans' Pension Act and extended veterans' preferences and entitlements. Still pending is much needed legislation for a civilian pardons board to review sentences imposed upon members of the armed services.

MISCELLANEOUS

Business has been helped by amendments to the antitrust laws, the Small Business Administration Act and the Small Business Investment Company Act. Much more needs to be done in these fields.

Increased benefits to retired employees, extended temporary unemployment compensation, changes in our immigration laws, the extension of the Draft Act, establishment of a National Space Agency, aid to Federal airports and a TVA self financing act are among our creditable accomplishments.

HOUSING

Two vetos of the housing bills were further demonstration of smoke screens blown up to camouflage real issues. The third housing bill, which the President approved is just as inflationary as the two he vetoed. The only real difference in substance is that the final approved version omits $50 million in loans for college classrooms. The President admits we need the classrooms but contends that in the $8 billion housing loan guaranty program, which he approved, a $50 million loan program is inflationary. He had his way—a Phillipic victory, if ever there was one. No one will ever be able to assess the loss to the Nation and the world if only one potential genius is denied a college education because these loans are postponed to an election year.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Hawaii became a State, thus establishing another beacon light along the path of true democracy and affirming the divinely inspired sentiments of our Founding Fathers that "all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" and that "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the governed."

Our citizens in the District of Columbia have not fared as well. Five times in the last 10 years, the Senate has passed a bill granting home rule to the District. Not once during that time has the House District Committee reported a bill. Not once in that period, until I filed a discharge petition, to bring a home rule bill before the House, did the House District Committee even conduct any hearings. Congressional courtesy dictates that I do not characterize those hearings. Suffice it to say, that if some members of that committee and of the Rules Committee have their way, no bill will reach the floor in this Congress.

A home rule bill will be acted upon by this Congress only if 219 Members sign my discharge petition. Up to this time 104 Democrats and 16 Republicans or a total of 120 Members have signed it.

Home rule for the District of Columbia is pledged by both party platforms. The public is fast learning that we are getting a lot of double talk from our Republican friends. No one expects southern Republicans or southern Democrats to support home rule for the Nation's Capital. That eliminates about 112 Members, 103 Democrats, and 9 Republicans. Four hundred and thirty-six less 112 leaves 324. One hundred and fifty-three Republicans less 9 southern Republicans leaves a net balance of 144. Two hundred eighty-three Democrats less 103 southern Democrats leaves a net balance of 180. One hundred four of the 180 Democrats have already signed the discharge petition. Only 16 of the 144 Republicans have signed it. That is a terrible indictment of the Republican Party. I am certain that if the Republicans will sign that petition in the same ratio as the Democrats have, in the first 2 weeks of January 1960, enough additional Democrats will sign the petition to bring the bill to the floor.

THE LABOR BILL

One other important piece of legislation that was enacted has been hailed as the labor reform bill. Time will prove, in my opinion, that this was the worst piece of anti-industrial-city and anti-labor bill ever enacted by any Congress.

I impugn no Member's motives, good faith or integrity. I trust that those who voted for that bill will credit as much to me and the 200 colleagues whom I joined in voting against that bill. It ill behooves any citizen, capitalist, union leader, businessman or wage-earner to pretend to be so omniscient as to have the right to accuse anyone on either side of a vote of 229 to 201 of having voted except in accordance with what his conscience dictated was best for our country. If as few as 13 Members voted the other way, the bill would have been defeated by a tie vote of 215 to 215, with the Speaker casting the deciding negative vote. If the four absentees had been present and voted nay—since they were not paired, I do not say they would have so voted—it would have required only a switch of 11 votes to defeat the bill.

No one will dare say that there is any Member of this House, regardless of how he or she voted on this bill, who would not vote to eliminate racketeering and crime not merely from union activities but from every sphere of activity on the American and even on the world scene.

The same must be said about legislation that would make unions more responsible and more responsive to the needs and desires of their members. Again that must also be said of legislation that would protect business as well as the public against illegal or improper activities of unions.

This bill was represented as accomplishing those ends. I will concede, for the sake of argument only, that that was the purpose of the bill.

I am convinced, however, it does not and will not accomplish those ends. To the extent that it tends to, I am afraid it does so by means that the courts will condemn. There are now more than enough laws on our statute books to arrest, indict, and convict every criminal, in and out of unions, whether the crime is perjury, embezzlement, forgery, fraud, bribery, theft, assault, murder, or conspiracy to commit any of these crimes or merely the attempt to do so. On that score, we do not need more laws but better enforcement of those we do have.

To the extent that this bill may make criminal, that which heretofore was legal, though perhaps immoral, under our Constitution, the law must be prospective and not retroactive in its effect.

It follows, therefore, that it will oust from unions, on account of past conduct, no one, no matter how bad and no matter what his name.

Despite all of the foregoing, I could have brought myself to vote for the bill if it had not been for its other many bad features. I believe they far outweighed all the good sought to be accomplished.

In voting on all bills I try to keep in mind our fundamental law, the Constitution, and particularly that portion of it known the world over as the Bill of Rights. I will never vote for any piece of legislation, no matter how well intentioned, which does not square with it. If it violates the Bill of Rights, I cannot support it. That Bill of Rights must forever remain inviolate. If we chip away even the slightest part thereof we begin to destroy it.

This bill, in my opinion, oversteps the bounds of propriety; it makes second-class citizens of unionists and of workingmen who might desire to join unions; it denies them rights guaranteed to them by our Constitution.

Furthermore, this bill can be used to entice business out of our industrial centers and into labor surplus parts of the country. It is not sectionalism that prompts me to take this position. It is part of the free enterprise competitive system, for business to move to the place where it can operate most profitably.

However, the best interests of our country, of the whole country, demand that no part of the country be permitted to entice businessmen to come there because of the promise or intimation that by moving there they will have cheap labor, sweatshop conditions, or nonunion shops. This misnamed labor reform bill practically guarantees to every unionized business firm that it can freely move to nonunion States and be forever free from unionization. To me that means destroying unions and enslaving the working men and women of our country. I am all for raising the standards of our citizens to the highest prevailing. I am opposed to lowering those standards to the lowest prevailing.

A PERSONAL NOTE

Permit me at this time to inject a rather personal note. During this session, I was incapacitated by illness, from which, thank God, I have recovered. For a long time I was out of Washington and for an even longer period prevented from giving full time to my congressional duties. But everything in this world has its compensating balances. My misfortune brought me the good that comes from learning how much our colleagues are genuinely concerned about each

other. They extended to me a spirit of fellowship and camaraderie close to kinship. It crossed district and State lines as well as party lines and religious and color lines. The assistance and offers of aid to me and more particularly to my staff, were immeasurable. I am forever in their debt. I am, indeed, grateful. Some say, only in America can it happen. I say only in America it does happen.

If the Soviet Union Can Afford Scientific Progress and Education Why Can't President Eisenhower—President Eisenhower Should Keep a Scorecard on His Sure-Fire No. 1 Issue for Winning in 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, it would be well, I think, if the President kept a scorecard on his economy record for there is a growing belief that his performance is not quite up to his promises.

You will recall that he recently described economy as the most important single issue for winning the election in 1960 to a $100-a-plate Republican political rally in Washington, D.C., so his performance has to be judged in this context too. The President told the rally that—

It is the Republican Party that fights for responsible, sensible fiscal policy.

The Democratic Party is so deeply interested in genuine economy that Democrats in the Congress have cut the President's budget requests by $10 billion in the past 5 years.

In 1952 the Republicans promised to bring the best business brains to Washington. A few of them are still here, but most of them are gone. If these businessmen had run their own companies the way they have run the Government their companies would be facing bankruptcy. Billions of dollars of tax money are being wasted because of poor management.

If the Soviet Union can afford scientific progress and education why cannot President Eisenhower? This is a good question and gets to the heart of our problem. A balanced budget looks good, but you cannot win wars with one and in this cold war period we may well find that if it means an inadequate education, and a lack of missile progress it may be too expensive to afford.

We cannot afford scientific progress and education in part because our economy has failed to expand and grow as it should have during the past 7 years. It is not keeping up with the growth of the economy of the U.S.S.R.

During these years private investment opportunity has been down about $40 billion, and the unnecessary idleness of plant and manpower has caused us to lose about $150 billion in national output. Net farm income has been $31 billion less than it should have been and wage and salary income almost $100 billion less. Labor Secretary Mitchell and Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Flemming have been doing some fancy talking about hiring the older workers, but we are losing some of our best brains and skills by an unrealistic Federal hiring policy which makes it practically impossible for a man of 45 or older to get a job in the Federal Government. No other nation can afford this kind of waste, and we cannot either.

In his 1952 campaign President Eisenhower promised to tidy up the national debt. Now we know what he had in mind. On June 30, 1959, the fiscal year ended with the largest Federal budget deficit in our history—$12 billion. During the time the President has been in office the public debt has increased from $267 billion to $285 billion. The cost of interest on the public debt has risen from $5.8 billion to $8 billion.

Let us all take note of the fact that the total Federal budget in 1939 for all purposes was only $7.9 billion during the height of the New Deal era under President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

One of the leading spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration, Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE of New Jersey, recently called for a reform of the fantastic farm program. According to the New York Times he asked:

How much longer will the American people tolerate a net expenditure of $4,500 million a year for an unfair and self-defeating farm program which constitutes a major obstacle to a balanced budget?

And, he added—

Only a quarter of American farmers benefit from this program. The average American family is beginning to realize, too, that it is hurt as a consumer of foodstuffs by our high price-support program.

FEDERAL SPENDING FACTS COMPILED BY COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from Bulletin No. 173, Federal Spending Facts, issued in September 1959 by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce which gives the box score on appropriations for 1960:

THE BOX SCORE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1960

On the last page of this analysis is a table [not printed in the RECORD] which shows the results of actions on all appropriations bills for the 1960 fiscal year. Exclusive of the permanent appropriations (mainly interest on the public debt) on which congressional action is not required, the total 1960 appropriations requests considered by Congress was $71,458 million.

The House approved $68,663 million, or $2,795 million less than the total requested. The latter figure, however, does not represent the actual reductions made by the House because the requested total includes $717 million of requests which were submitted to Congress after the House had acted on the bills involved and it includes $28 million of Senate funds not considered by the House. Thus, the net reduction effected by the House in requests that it considered is $2,795 million less $745 million, or $2,050 million. The Senate approved more than the House in every bill but two and effected a net reduction from the total requests in the amount of $419 million.

After differences in House and Senate actions had been resolved by conference committees on the various bills, the final total voted by Congress was $70,213 million, or $1,245 million less than the total requests. Some reduction in dollar amount was made in every bill except one, but many of the reductions were hardly more than token cuts. The one increase was in the bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and was in the amount of $260 million over the request.

Harley O. Staggers Reports on the 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the 1st session of the 86th Congress was a hardworking body of men and women, determined to fight for its goals and undaunted when faced with Presidential vetoes. We are armed with the knowledge there is another session coming up in January 1960, and with it will be renewed action to pick up the unfinished business of the first session and stand ready to shoulder the new challenges of America's needs and world problems.

So many were the issues studied, passed on, or awaiting further action at the next session that it would be impossible to mention all of them here and treat each with proper coverage.

Therefore, I shall refer only to those principal issues which, I believe, to be of the most importance and interest to West Virginia, and particularly to the Second District, which includes the eastern panhandle counties of Jefferson, Berkeley, Morgan, Hampshire, Mineral, Hardy, Grant, Pendleton, and Tucker. Toward the south extending the slice down the Virginia border is Pocahontas County, and lying well within the State are Webster, Randolph, and Barbour Counties. Toward the north on the Maryland and Pennsylvania borders are Preston and Monongalia Counties.

It is my great privilege to serve the people of the Second District as their Representative in Congress and it is my desire to present informally the following:

RAILROAD

Whatever affects the railroad worker affects a very large segment of the people of the Second District of West Virginia. Having once been a railroader, I have a pretty good insight into the problems and hopes of the man at the throttle, the one who carried a braking stick or oil can, or uses the brawn of his muscles to keep the cars rolling and the track in shape. I know full well that these men have hopes and ambitions and plans for a good life and comfortable retirement for themselves and their dependents.

In 1958 Congress passed a 7-percent social security increase which did not apply to railroad employees, who have their own railroad retirement system.

However, on April 29, 1959, an opportunity beckoned to me to strike a blow for the railroad worker. With the combined efforts of my colleagues, we brought forth legislation that promotes the welfare of this group of workers, who, as many do not know, cannot look to social security for assistance, and who must look to Congress for specific legislation.

The passage of H.R. 8610, which became Public Law 86-28 is a milestone in human relations, exemplifying the brotherhood of man, providing for the widows, orphans and aged as well as assisting those who are thrown out of work through no fault of their own. It took a long time to bring about these amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, but the long hours, loss of rest, pleadings and tempers totaled little compared to the great good that has resulted. This improved legislation corrects many inequities in the old act and provides long overdue benefits for railroad workers.

COAL RESEARCH

Knowing how important a successful outcome would be to the State of West Virginia, I worked eagerly and diligently for legislation that would establish a Coal Research and Development Commission. House and Senate Members gave their support, knowing coal and its potentialities mean a great deal to the industrial development of this country and to our national defense.

The coal research bill went through Congress with excellent support only to die at the hands of a Presidential veto. Notwithstanding this defeat, renewed effort will create new legislation on this subject when the 2d session of the 86th Congress comes to bat. A Coal Research and Development Commission would put new hopes and new life into the crippled coal industry so well-known by the operators and workers in West Virginia coalfields.

LABOR

Labor legislation was one of the controversial subjects of this past session of Congress and perhaps received more interest than any other issue. The Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 became a law September 14, 1959.

I felt the committee measure which was approved by the Labor and Education Committee after 3 months' hard work by those experts on labor matters would have effectively stamped out racketeering and wrongdoing in labor unions and would have been more equitable to both industry and labor.

We cannot judge labor leaders by the few who have taken advantage of the trust placed in them by the members of their organizations. We do not judge all the Disciples by Judas who betrayed Christ. Labor, which in my opinion, includes the factory workers, the builders, teachers, farmers, the homemakers, all city, county, State, and Federal employees, and workers in every field of endeavor which has made this a great and mighty Nation—and it is as essential as brains and capital to our way of life.

History has proven that when we chip away at the liberties of any one group we slowly chip away at the liberty and freedom of all.

VETERANS

Many veterans will be pleased to know that legislation was enacted that makes $100 million available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon his request, for immediate use in the direct-loan program for the purpose of reducing existing waiting lists.

Public Law 86-211 modifies the pension programs for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and for their widows and children. It provides a sliding scale of pension based on the income and dependency status of the recipient. No person on the pension rolls on the day before the effective date shall have his pension reduced or shall be removed from the pension rolls because of the enactment. All persons on the pension rolls on the day before the effective date will be permitted election to the higher rates if they qualify under the new program.

Of the several new laws pertaining to veterans, these two, I believe, will be of most interest to the majority of veterans wishing to secure loans or receive a pension.

PUBLIC WORKS

Just about everybody benefits by and enjoys the net results of the public works program. It took an overriding vote of the President's veto to get the public works bill through. "Pork barrel" spending and inflationary recklessness were accusations unfairly thrown at Congress, yet Congress stood firm and voted its convictions.

Many of our national leaders think it is all right to send millions abroad for foreign aid—both economical and military—yet they hold up their hands in horror when a proposal for public works is mentioned for the homefront.

West Virginia came in for close to 70 projects, including a fair number for the Second District: Hildebrand lock and dam on the Monongahela River near Morgantown, $1,246,050; dam 8 on Monongahela River below Morgantown in Pennsylvania, $706,875; flood control project on the Potomac River near the Keyser area has been approved by the Army Engineers; and an engineering investigation toward flood control program on Decker's Creek, $14,625.

HOUSING

Housing legislation had a rough and rocky journey. To combat inflation was the reason the President was said to have had for vetoing the two housing bills that went to his desk. Failing to muster sufficient votes to override the veto, the third—a watered-down and insufficient housing bill—went to the White House where it met a better fate.

There is much clamor about the cost of housing for the low-income groups, yet few of us stop to consider the terrific cost of crime and punishment, of disease and poverty, of ignorance. While not implying that better housing would obliterate these foes of mankind, I believe that it would, at least help to check their upward climb. Environment does not necessarily make a saint or a sinner, but it most certainly plays a great part in determining sound moral, physical, and educational habits.

EDUCATION

For many years the question of Federal aid to education has been discussed by Members of Congress, by educators, and by interested lay citizens. Little or nothing had been done. Then suddenly Russia's sputnik aroused this Nation to its shortcomings in the field of education. Some legislation was passed, and some plans and programs are being studied and talked about, but there still remains the great need for more classrooms, more teachers, more opportunities for higher education for students who can qualify for advanced and specialized training.

I would recommend an all-out crash program to inform and alert every community, every county, and every State to the second-class status of the great majority of our teachers and schools. Bombard the people with the unvarnished truth in understandable terms. As an eye opener: During the year 1956 this Nation spent for liquors over $9 billion; for tobacco almost $8 billion; and for cosmetics, beauty, and barber shops, close to $4 billion which makes a sum of almost $21 billion.

Now, compare $21 billion with $11 billion spent for education. Half again more for liquor, tobacco, and beauty than for education of our youth. It just does not make sense.

I urge all elected officials from the county level up to the President of the United States recognize our situation and prove to the mothers and fathers their trust is well placed.

AGRICULTURE

One job the 86th Congress and the administration must do is to help alleviate the distress in the agricultural situation. As I have said many times in the past, agriculture is the greatest industry in the Nation, and I sincerely feel this problem should be given our first consideration.

Attention must be given to the plight of the small farmers in West Virginia and the Nation. Action must be taken to help the desperate circumstances of this worthy group which has been struggling to earn a livelihood for themselves and try to keep filled the breadbasket of the Nation.

The small farmer is the fundamental strength of the United States. History has shown that when small farmers get into trouble, sooner or later the remainder of the economy is in trouble—and today the small farmers are at the danger point.

I know the farming problem is desperate as I live on a farm in Mineral County myself and I know firsthand some of the difficulties being encountered.

Although the national income has increased 100 percent during the past dozen years, according to Government statistics, figures reflect that the agricultural income for the same period has declined 20 percent. This is further worsened by the fact that the purchasing power of the dollar has been reduced 33 percent. In terms of dollar purchasing power, agriculture is receiving only about half of the amount received 12 years ago. And bringing this down to the farmer, it is even worse because, considering the decline in the purchasing power of the dollar, the farmer is receiving only a net income of about one-third of the amount he received during the previous period. We must agree that this is an intolerable situation which—unless checked—can only lead to further confusion and, eventually, chaos.

SOCIAL SECURITY

This year I introduced legislation to lower the age limit for receiving benefits from social security, in the case of a man to age 60, and in the case of a woman to age 55.

Personally, I do not advocate the compulsory retirement at these ages, but I do feel that those men and women who have worked hard and have reached the ages of 55 and 60, and do want to retire, should have that privilege with full social security benefits.

Statistics of the National Institutes of Health show that some human beings age before others, and some people do not have the life expectancy of 65. Lowering the age limit will give many the opportunity of enjoying their retirement years while they are still physically able to do so.

DEFENSE

A mixture of the 1958 recession with its lower revenues and the spiraling cost of public borrowing, high cost of national security, and the inflationary headaches that face both Government and individual buying have forced the national debt to an alltime high.

Congress endeavored to trim here and there, study item by item, and was able to cut the President's budget by $1.5 billion. The big expenditures still remain for national defense, foreign aid, and capital for World Bank.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII

Now, West Virginia may not have been as interested in Hawaii's becoming our 50th State as some other actions of Congress, but I am sure most of us hope at some time in our lives to visit this beautiful and romantic land.

Last January 3 Alaska became officially the 49th State, and caused the flagmakers to lose some sleep; and then Hawaii donned her official statehood bonnet on August 21, and the flagmakers went into an extended period of insomnia.

To these two new States, we, as the hospitable Americans we are, extend a warm welcome to our family, now numbering 50. To those men and women who worked long years, suffered many disappointments, but never gave up the struggle in building their stairways to statehood, I am sure the majority of our great Nation say "a job well done."

Great dangers beset civilization today from every side—the atom bomb, guided missiles, and diseases of all kinds—but the greatest danger of all is communism. It is more deadly to the human body and soul than poisonous gas or the bite of the cobra.

The greatest struggle today is for the control of the people's minds. A new doctrine is being spread in America and the world that for the sake of peace we can coexist with the antireligious evil called communism; that evil which denies the existence of God and the dignity and eternal life of the human soul.

The communistic propagandists are already at work saying Communists are not so bad, that they want peace, too, and we can coexist with them.

In Biblical days, Job was tempted, as was Jesus, to compromise with evil. To save their lives they were offered worldly pleasures and power, but both resisted these temptations.

Imre Nagy, Premier of the anti-Communist uprising in Hungary, yielded to temptation and agreed to compromise with communism. He lost his life. His last words were, "I want the world to know that there can be no compromise."

Jesus said, "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

This, I believe, is the key to man's eternal future: Faith in himself and faith in Almighty God as the compassionate ruler of destiny.

A Report to the People of the 7th Congressional District of Maryland on the 1st Session of the 86th Congress by Representative Samuel N. Friedel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to give the voters of the 7th Congressional District of Maryland a brief review of the accomplishments of the 1st session of the 86th Congress, together with a summary of my votes on major bills as well as my activities on their behalf.

The 1st session of the 86th Congress has been a constructive and productive one. Much has been accomplished in the public interest, notwithstanding the difficulties encountered by a politically divided Government. Historically, such a division inevitably brings with it conflicts in basic philosophies on vital issues. As always, the Democratic Party has put the welfare of our country above partisanship considerations and has endeavored to achieve amity with the executive branch of Government whenever possible.

As an American citizen, and a representative of the people, I have always advocated an adequate national defense. That is why I voted for ample funds for our Armed Forces as well as for space research. The only way to insure peace and continuance of our way of life is to be fully prepared against any eventuality.

In the field of international affairs, the Congress took cognizance of the enormous and growing Communist potential to launch a full-scale nuclear war. To stem the rising tide of the Red menace, I supported mutual security legislation, thereby assisting the free world in our fight for freedom.

As an ardent advocate of economy and efficiency in Government, I point with pride to the fact that the Democratic-controlled Congress appropriated $1.9 billion less than the President requested.

For many years I have advocated some relief in the amount of Federal income taxes that persons have to pay. Accordingly, I have introduced measures to increase the personal tax exemption of a taxpayer, including the exemption for a spouse and dependents and the additional exemption for old age and blindness, from $600 to $800. This will be of greatest assistance to those persons of small income.

My deep interest for the welfare of labor and my profound concern for the aged of our country are well known. We are all aware of the continuous rise in the cost of living. This is a particularly acute problem of the aged of our Nation, as well as for those who receive support under our survivor programs. To assist in the solution of the problem, I introduced a bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted without deductions from benefits under the act. I also introduced two different bills to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act so as to provide increases in benefits and also to increase the amount of outside income which a survivor annuitant may earn without deduction from his or her annuity.

Because of my interest in the veterans, those valiant defenders of our great Nation that we all love, I am happy to report that the Congress increased pensions to veterans disabled by illness, even though not directly connected with their military service. Widows and orphans of such disabled American veterans are to receive increases, too. In addition, the veterans of the Korean war were given more leeway in the use of educational benefits.

Realizing the great importance of the small-business segment of our economy, the Congress enacted a variety of new laws to assist the small businessman. The Small Business Administration was granted additional authority to make loans. A bill amending the Clayton Antitrust Act to expedite procedures for

enforcement of cease and desist orders of the Federal Trade Commission was enacted. Another measure to help small business was the passage of a statute which provides that no State shall tax the income of any firm whose sole interstate commerce activity within the State is the solicitation of orders by salesmen or by mail, and when orders resulting from such solicitation are approved and filled outside of the taxing State.

As a result of congressional action, a new star will be added to our country's flag. Hawaii was brought into the Union as the 50th State, thus giving due notice to the world that our national frontier is further extended into the Pacific and thereby giving full recognition and citizenship to all Americans of whatever creed or former foreign origin. This will go a long way toward creating a stronger protection of democracy in a most vital part of the world.

This session of the Congress will be remembered for the enactment of a labor reform bill to curb racketeering and corruption that has been brought to light by a Senate committee during public hearings. The individual workingman must be protected against dishonesty and abuse by corrupt union officials. I shall watch how this new law works and see in what manner amendments to it may be indicated or be necessary, as I believe in fairness and equity to labor and management alike.

Believing as I do that every American, of whatever color or creed, is equally entitled to all civil rights, I was pleased that the Congress extended the life of the Civil Rights Commission. Needless to say, such measure had my affirmative vote. The privilege of expression of our political preferences through the franchise should not be restricted or impeded in any manner whatsoever. The right to vote is the cornerstone upon which our democracy is built.

The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect the fact that I have at all times been the spokesman for Maryland's and Baltimore's interests. When the occasion demanded affirmative action, I never hesitated. My many activities on behalf of Friendship International Airport and on behalf of the port of Baltimore are well known. In fact, the Baltimore Chamber of Commerce recently complimented me for my efforts to prevent the exportation of American grain through Canadian ports. I have time and again, strongly protested to the Executive against the removal of various Federal installations and facilities from our city or State. In the interest of industrial peace, I have contacted the President of the United States urging him to take active measures to end the current steel strike. The Bethlehem Steel Co. was urged, in a speech I delivered on the floor of Congress, to sit down with the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers to agree upon a contract. On every occasion when Baltimore's favorable freight differential was attacked by northern interests, I immediately did my best to demonstrate that Baltimore was equitably entitled to retain such differentials becauses of its natural advantages of location.

In summarizing, I include the following brief summary of my voting record on the major issues enacted during the 1st session of the 86th Congress:

Hawaii statehood: Yes.
Foreign bonds: Yes.
TVA bonds: Yes.
Amendment of labor bill: No.
Passage of labor bill: Yes.
Public works: Yes.
Housing bill: Yes.
Federal Aid Highway Act, increase gas tax: Yes.
Interest rise on savings bonds: No.
Mutual security appropriations: Yes.
Extending Civil Rights Commission: Yes.

The door of my office has always been open to everyone, and I am always available when needed by my constituents. I subscribe to the principle that a Congressman's job is to serve the people and be a vital link between them and the Federal Government.

Respect for Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, adult and juvenile delinquency is an evergrowing problem of such importance that all the resources of the Nation must be mobilized to combat it.

There are many agencies in the field which are engaged in a perennial battle against this expanding evil. Present efforts obviously are not enough. We must mobilize our resources to a much greater extent.

Hearings which have been held in various portions of the country by a special Senate committee disclose the need for laws to control the sale of firearms and other weapons; illicit narcotics traffic; transportation of obscene literature and photographs; and for other Federal, State, and local controls.

Rehabilitation programs like the Pennsylvania forestry camps for delinquent boys should be supported. The bill for a Youth Conservation Corps, which has already been passed by the U.S. Senate, would help those who have not become delinquents. Studies which can be undertaken by the National Conference on Children and Youth will also contribute to the solutions which are needed.

It is time to concentrate more firmly on solutions to the problem, and programs should be initiated which would tend to reduce the incidence of delinquency and to create more respect for law.

The Federal Bar Association, Philadelphia chapter, has initiated a program to mobilize the resources of the community to promote respect for law and legal processes. The program is designed to educate adults and juveniles alike in the importance of the role of law in a civilized society and to build a healthy attitude toward the law and legal processes. Through the use of communications media—speakers, educators, the clergy, and community groups—the need, function, and operation of existing laws as well as the importance of adherence to these laws in everyday life will be explained and publicized.

All bar associations, civic organizations, newspapers, radio and television and similar groups throughout the country should mobilize their resources and join in a nationwide crusade—on a never-ending day-to-day basis—to promote respect for the law and adherence to its concepts.

Protests Rise as Imports Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the impact of unreasonable foreign competition has created distress in a growing number of American industries. More and more domestic producers are seeing their markets invaded, and the jobs of more and more American workers are jeopardized.

Documentation for this spreading economic malady can be found on page after page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the official and historic journal of the Congress. Numerous Members of the 86th Congress, in both Houses, have called attention repeatedly to the plight of domestic industries.

To provide my colleagues with authoritative evidence of the alarming dimensions of this national problem, I have compiled a compendium of material from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD bearing on foreign trade. While covering only a few months, this digest will serve as a ready reference to the scope of market losses and job displacement already suffered by domestic industry and workers.

Governmental policies are making Americans dependent upon foreign factories for some goods which this Nation once produced in greater quantity than all other countries combined. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] declared, certain public officials have misinterpreted public opinion. The real public opinion, he said, is that of the displaced American worker, his family, his creditors, and, soon, his local merchants who will have shelves full of—

foreign goods and streets full of unemployed Americans (June 4, 1959).[1]

Real economy may be served better by buying domestic materials at a higher price than by procuring strategic materials from foreign sources. For this reason, among others, a sound national minerals policy is needed in this country. (Senator MURRAY, of Montana, June 9, 1959.)

The jobs of 1,919,200 textile workers are threatened by U.S. trade policies regarding the subsidized exportation of raw cotton and the indiscriminate importation of finished textiles. Congress should act against this grave threat to the American textile industry. (Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, June 9, 1959.)

The State of Massachusetts faces serious unemployment problems, largely because of the plight of the import-distressed textile industry. Many areas are rapidly becoming distressed because the contraction of this industry is accelerating. (Representative LANE, of Massachusetts, June 12, 1959.)

Has the United States kept Japan out of the Communist trading sphere by sacrificing our domestic textile industry? The fact that Japan has recently contracted to buy 6,000 bales of raw cotton from the U.S.S.R. would indicate that this is not the case. The Lancaster (S.C.) News, in an editorial, points out that it is not inconceivable that products woven from Soviet cotton will find their way into Japanese exports to the United States. (Representative HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, June 12, 1959.)

Leading business firms in the United States are purchasing Soviet-produced materials although these materials are readily available here from domestic sources—often in overabundance. This is only one indication that U.S. foreign trade policy is an area which has too long been neglected. (Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, June 15, 1959.)

Representative BAILEY, of West Virginia, proposed that the Buy American Act be amended to give it real effectiveness. An alarming trend is underway to buy from foreign manufacturers more and more items essential to national security (June 15, 1959).

In denying the request of American manufacturers of heavy electrical equipment for reasonable controls on imports, OCDM has struck a blow against national security and threatened the jobs of American workers. (Representative STRATTON, of New York, June 16, 1959.)

Must the United States helplessly watch the extinction of a great natural resource? It is important to the U.S. economy to safeguard the North American salmon. Present Japanese commercial fishing methods may destroy the commercial value of the red salmon runs. (Senator BARTLETT, of Alaska, July 1, 1959.)

Contrary to the fears of many, mandatory controls on imports of crude oil have not increased the price of crude oil in this country. The price has, in fact, declined. It would appear that fears of excessively high petroleum prices as a result of the mandatory import control program are completely groundless. (Senator CARLSON, of Kansas, July 6, 1959.)

"Is our textile industry expendable?" This is the question asked by Donald Comer, chairman of the executive committee of Avondale Mills, in a letter addressed to Assistant Secretary of Commerce Henry Kearns. Mr. Comer points out the great need for relief from many adverse conditions threatening the American cotton industry today. (Representative HUDDLESTON, of Alabama, July 6, 1959.)

Migration of American capital abroad carries with it the transfer of job opportunities from these shores to countries abroad. In addition, goods made abroad by American capital are being shipped back to the United States to compete with domestic industry. Congress should know much more about the implications of this movement of capital, both in the short run and in the long run. (Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, July 8, 1959.)

The U.S. Pacific tuna fleet is being put out of business by mounting tuna imports from Japan. This serious situation is discussed in detail by Ronald J. Ostrow in the Wall Street Journal, July 7, 1959. (Senator ENGLE, of California, July 8, 1959.)

The rising tide of imports hurts not only domestic industry but also the dealer who sells, and the consumer who buys, foreign-made items. By destroying domestic producers, we are undermining the American economy and will foreign manufacturers. (Representative eventually find ourselves at the mercy of BAILEY, of West Virginia, July 13, 1959.)

The domestic shrimp industry will find itself in bankruptcy unless help is provided soon. Shrimp imports are uncontrolled at present and a quota system or reasonable tariff is a dire necessity. (Representative PRESTON, of Georgia, July 13, 1959.)

All of the fleets fishing for tuna out of San Diego and San Pedro have been hit by the vast amount of Japanese tuna being imported into this country. Only responsible safeguards can help the domestic tuna fleets during this critical period. Representative UTT, of California, July 13, 1959.)

The present international competitive situation is dramatically illustrated in a letter from the Japanese Brass Mill to the American Brass Co. The Japanese manufacturer solicited business in this country on grounds that he can purchase rough copper and brass in the United States, fabricate it in Japan, mark it with the name of the American company, and ship it back to the United States for sale with the guarantee that the finished product can still be sold here for less than U.S.-fabricated articles. (Representative MONAGAN, of Connecticut, July 14, 1959.)

It is unfair to American rye growers to import large quantities of rye while U.S. surpluses keep mounting. The Tariff Commission should consider this problem, bearing in mind the effect of rye imports on the producer, the taxpayer, and the national economy. (Representative LANGEN, of Minnesota, July 14, 1959.)

Total world cotton production has increased 9.4 million bales since 1954, while U.S. production has declined 3 million bales. While this country is making a desperate fight to preserve the domestic cotton acreage, imports of cotton textiles continue to rise, from an equivalent of 87,060 bales in 1950 to an estimated equivalent of 286,630 bales in 1958. This not only displaces American textile sales but represents an estimated 500,000 acres that would otherwise have been cultivated by American farmers. (Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, July 15, 1959.)

It is imperative that American farmers and textile workers be given the safeguards which they have a right to expect from their Government. Unfair competition, both in the price of cotton and in the form of cheap imported textiles from Hong Kong and Japan, is throwing cottongrowers off their farms and putting textile employees out of work. (Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, July 16, 1959.)

Liquidation of at least 2 million spindles and the jobs connected with this manufacturing capacity can be prevented by the passage of S. 314, a bill to assist the U.S. cotton textile industry to regain its equitable share of the world market. (Senator SMITH, of Maine, July 16, 1959.)

Private investment abroad raises serious problems which Congress has a duty to consider. There is a vast difference between the jobs made available in this country by American exports and the jobs not made available in this country but provided abroad by U.S. foreign investment. (Senator PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin, July 17, 1959.)

The security of workers' jobs should begin at home, say Patrick E. Gorman and Thomas J. Lloyd in their article about rising meat imports, "Ghost Plants in Packing Towns." While the United States does not begrudge foreign workers their new-found prosperity, it must be remembered that, "we have a right to live too." (Representative SILER, of Kentucky, July 17, 1959.)

Imported textiles are having a dangerous impact on the American economy, and the situation is bound to worsen unless steps are taken to safeguard domestic industry and workers, stated Leon Lowenstein, a leader in the U.S. textile industry. (Representative HUDDLESTON, of Alabama, July 20, 1959.)

"Chicago, once the heart of the giant meat industry, is now but a shadow of its former self," warn Patrick E. Gorman and Thomas J. Lloyd in their article, "Ghost Plants in Packing

[1] Dates in parentheses refer to publication dates in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Towns." Beef from Australia, dumped on the open market cheaper per pound than the American packer can produce it, creates unsound competitive conditions. (Representative PRICE, of Illinois, July 21, 1959.)

The domestic textile industry must be strengthened before the rest of the world become dependent upon the American market. J. Craig Smith, president of Avondale Mills, contends that great ill will could result if the United States encourages other countries to build an industry on the expectation of supplying a market which they will eventually lose. (Representative ROBERTS, of Alabama, July 22, 1959.)

National security is aided by a robust domestic economy, which might not remain so healthy if imports of manufactured products continue to increase. H.R. 8345 would require the Government to award bids on contracts for public works to the lowest domestic bidder if such a bidder had a net income of less than $1 million in the preceding year. (Representative BETTS, of Ohio, July 23, 1959.)

On June 29, the National Cotton Council petitioned the Secretary of Agriculture to act under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. This section contains provisions for relief from imports if it is found that foreign products are disrupting the agriculture program of the Government. Compelling reason for this action are abundant. (Senator THURMOND, of South Carolina, July 24, 1959.)

A thorough investigation of the cotton import problem can lead only to recommendations for a quota schedule on foreign cotton textiles. This would be a realistic answer to the severe problem besetting the domestic cotton textile industry. (Representative OLIVER, of Maine, July 28, 1959.)

The domestic textile market has declined steadily since the United States launched its postwar program to revitalize the economies of other free nations. Present U.S. policies toward cotton textile imports deny this country the rewards it is offering to others. (Senator JORDAN, of North Carolina, July 29, 1959.)

The first meeting of the Textile Industry Advisory Council pointed up many of the basic problems created for the industry by cheap foreign imports, many manufactured of American cotton sold overseas at 25 percent less than the domestic price. (Senator PASTORE, of Rhode Island, Aug. 3, 1959.)

"By allowing Hong Kong's cotton goods to flood the United States we are, in effect, trading with Red China," said J. Craig Smith, president of the Avondale Mills, as quoted in an editorial in the Sylacauga (Ala.) Advance. In 1958, Hong Kong bought 114 million yards of cotton fabric from Red China. During 1959, if the present rate continues, 114 million yards will be shipped from Hong Kong to the United States. The State Department, however, seems unwilling to safeguard the domestic textile industry, even from a hostile power, Red China. (Representative ROBERTS, of Alabama, Aug. 3, 1959.)

Importation of shrimp are steadily increasing to the great detriment of the domestic shrimp industry. Imports totaled 85 million pounds in 1958, and are even higher for the first 5 months of 1959 than for the corresponding period a year ago. (Representative SIKES, of Florida, Aug. 6, 1959.)

Since World War II, over 1 million U.S. jobs have been "exported" and over $27 billion in U.S. capital have been invested in factories, mines, oil wells, and other enterprises abroad. H.R. 5, calculated to induce still more American companies to invest abroad, is a suicidal bill which would sap the foundation of the American economy. (Representative BAILEY, of West Virginia, Aug. 10, 1959.)

American cotton sold abroad for 8 cents less per pound than it can be purchased by domestic mills creates a severe problem for the entire textile industry and related trades, stated Donald Comer, leading American textile manufacturer. American-grown cotton is used to manufacture the very imports which threaten the domestic industry. (Representative HUDDLESTON, of Alabama, Aug. 13, 1959.)

Vanishing American markets pose a real threat to the Nation, according to Mill and Factory magazine. Action must be taken to offset U.S. disadvantages in world trade. (Representative HENDERSON, of Ohio, Aug. 13, 1959.)

Progressive demolition of U.S. tariffs under the trade agreements program instituted in 1934 is a major cause of the exportation of American industry abroad, according to E. F. Tompkins in the New York Journal-American. Some of the largest U.S. industries can no longer compete effectively in the world market. (Representative KNOX, of Michigan, Aug. 14, 1959.)

A recent survey conducted by the magazine Mill and Factory shows that 75 percent of 150 American industrial companies polled expect to lose a greater share of the domestic market to foreign products. Furthermore, nearly two-thirds of these companies anticipate rising unemployment as a direct result of this market invasion. (Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Aug. 14, 1959.)

The U.S. steel industry provides a most dramatic instance of market penetration by imports. This country now buys more steel abroad than it sells, and the industry's production would be far below capacity even without a steel strike this year. (Representative BETTS, of Ohio, Aug. 14, 1959.)

H.R. 5 would injure the Nation by exporting still more American jobs and capital. Domestic industry is already threatened by foreign competition to a dangerous degree. Encouraging American industries to move abroad is not the solution. (Representative BRAY, of Indiana, Aug. 17, 1959.)

Three hundred textile mills have been closed and 345,000 millworkers displaced by the U.S. trade agreements program, warned Representative W. J. BRYAN DORN, of South Carolina, over the Manion Forum radio network on August 9, 1959. Mr. DORN stated that unfair imports are severely damaging the U.S. economy. (Representative LANE, of Massachusetts, Aug. 20, 1959.)

Textile imports must be controlled unless this Nation is willing to write off the domestic textile industry as expendable, according to an editorial in the Lancaster (S.C.) News of August 13, 1959. The United States has already lost foreign markets, but this will be a relatively minor blow should the domestic market be exposed to further invasion of textiles from low-wage countries. (Representative HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, Aug. 20, 1959.)

The rapid rise in imported stainless steel flatware from Japan has caused serious injury to the domestic industry. In a letter to President Eisenhower, the U.S. Stainless Steel Flatware Manufacturers Association asked for relief in the form of a global quota of 4 million dozen annually on all imports of stainless steel flatware having a foreign value up to and including $3.50 per dozen. (Representative DENT, of Pennsylvania, Aug. 20, 1959.)

Tax concessions for American industry abroad are unfair to every American taxpayer. H.R. 5 would, in fact, offer bounties to American industries which do business in foreign countries. (Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, August 25, 1959.)

Steel imports in the first 6 months of 1959 seem sure to have exceeded the 1.7 million tons imported in all of 1958. Ray Vicker and Jeffery Pemberton, in the Wall Street Journal of July 29, 1959, point out that as imports rise, exports are falling steadily. (Senator GOLDWATER, of Arizona, Aug. 25, 1959.)

A large segment of the U.S. labor movement insists on a modernized trade policy geared to meet the current import crisis. Labor will welcome the cooperation and support of farsighted industry groups such as the Trade Relations Council in their campaign to prevent the wholesale destruction of American jobs. (Representative BAILEY, of West Virginia, Aug. 27, 1959.)

Labor and management have joined to discuss the threat of imported textiles to the garment industry. The jobs of 400,000 American workers and the billion-dollar investment of American management are now in jeopardy. (Senator KEATING, of New York, Aug. 27, 1959.)

Huge importations of lamb from Australia and New Zealand must be controlled or the American sheep industry will be led to economic slaughter. (Senator MCGEE, of Wyoming, Aug. 28, 1959.)

The United States must be extremely wary in trade talks with Khrushchev. Before entering into trade agreements with Communist countries, this Nation

must be very sure that American security will not be threatened. (Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, Aug. 31, 1959.)

The flood of foreign imports and the decline of U.S. exports create a truly alarming situation that may well be disastrous for many great American industries. Foreign made sewing machines, watches, typewriters, automobiles, textiles, and other manufactures are bringing unemployment to vast areas of this country. Congress must act soon to prevent the Nation's economic collapse. (Representative PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, Sept. 1, 1959.)

The United States must take a firm stand now against international cartels and monopolies. Restrictive business practices abroad are undermining American economic development. (Representative WOLF, of Iowa, Sept. 2, 1959.)

The American workingman is suffering the disastrous effects of foreign trade policies injurious to the American economy. Imported textiles, wire, automobiles, and countless other manufactures have cost thousands of American jobs. (Representative DENT, of Pennsylvania, Sept. 4, 1959.)

"Exports of U.S. goods are declining while imports from abroad are rising," Leslie Gould observed in his article, "Our Trade Gap Dwindles—Why It May Soon Be Unfavorable." Loss of American technical advantage, restoration of foreign industry, and the passing of the sellers' market can be blamed for this critical problem. (Representative DORN, of South Carolina, Sept. 4, 1959.)

The United States must insist on reciprocal treatment for every tariff concession it grants at the GATT meeting in 1961. Only a reversal of the State Department's past policy of tariff giveaways can preserve the American economy. (Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Sept. 4, 1959.)

Imported crabmeat and canned oysters from Japan threaten prosperity and employment in the Pacific Coast shellfish industry. (Representative MACK of Washington, Sept. 4, 1959.)

For America's coal miners and workers, TVA seems to mean "Take Vittles Away." The United Mine Workers Journal of September 1, 1959, reports that the Tennessee Valley Authority spent $17,900,000 on foreign-made manufactured goods for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959. (Representative SILER, of Kentucky, Sept. 7, 1959.)

The Treasury Department is failing to safeguard American industry from foreign producers who dump their products in the U.S. market. (Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Sept. 8, 1959.)

Japan seems about to destroy completely the U.S. clothing industry. U.S. producers cannot compete with foreign wages, but we can safeguard our right to earn a living. (Representative BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, Sept. 9, 1959.)

Congress, responsible to all U.S. citizens, will be guilty of a grave dereliction of duty if it permits unnecessary deterioration of any domestic industry. (Representative SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, Sept. 10, 1959.)

Cheap men's wear from the Far East threatens the U.S. market and distresses the domestic industry, Laurence G. O'Donnell reported in the Wall Street Journal. (Representative HEMPHILL, of South Carolina, Sept. 11, 1959.)

Agricultural imports from Australia and New Zealand pose a serious threat to U.S. farmers. (Representative KNOX, of Michigan, Sept. 11, 1959.)

Will the introduction of smaller American-made cars restore U.S. export markets lost in recent years? This will be a true test of reciprocity. (Representative KNOX, of Michigan, Sept. 11, 1959.)

A quota and tariff are essential to safeguard the domestic sulfur industry from the disastrous effects of imports from nations where substandard wages and preferential shipping rates prevail. (Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Sept. 11, 1959.)

Prompt action must be taken to assist the crippled domestic mining industry. Imports are working untold hardships on mineworkers and mineowners alike. (Representative PFOST, of Idaho, Sept 12, 1959.)

Before the next GATT negotations in 1961, the American people must be alerted to the dangers inherent in the Government's policy of tariff handouts. There is still time to prevent economic catastrophe. (Representative KNOX, of Michigan, Sept. 12, 1959.)

U.S. typewriter exports sag badly while imports rise, according to a research report by the Business and Defense Services Administration. The United States dominated the world typewriter market before World War II, supplying one-half to two-thirds of world demand. In 1958, less than 10 percent of the world market was supplied by U.S. producers. (Representative BETTS, of Ohio, Sept. 12, 1959.)

U.S. farm imports exceed farm exports despite overwhelming farm surpluses (Representative DORN of South Carolina, Sept. 12, 1959.)

An editorial in Tradeways, the publication of the Trade Relations Council of the United States, points out that further offers to cut our already decimated traiffs cannot hold back the trend toward large trade blocs abroad. The only certainty would be to expose American industries to the increasingly injurious effects of imports from low-wage countries. (Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Sept. 12, 1959.)

The United States cannot compete with low-priced foreign imports, and it is time for the Government to stop assisting American industries that move abroad. (Representative GROSS, of Iowa, Sept. 14, 1959.)

The U.S. textile industry is in serious difficulty, largely because of irresponsible trade policies. At long last, American labor has raised its voice in protest. (Representative SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, Sept. 14, 1959.)

Low-wage, low-taxed, low-priced, subsidized goods entering the United States to compete with high-wage, high-taxed, high-priced domestic products threaten 10 to 15 million American jobs, George E. Sokolsky noted in his syndicated column of September 12, 1959. (Representative BECKER, of New York, Sept. 15, 1959.)

A partial listing of ships and cargoes entering U.S. ports on September 9, 1959, points out the tremendous variety and volume of goods being imported from abroad to compete with American products. (Representative DENT, of Pennsylvania, Sept. 15, 1959.)

Since June 1 of this year alone, between 40 and 50 of our colleagues in the House and Senate have proposed legislation designed to correct some of the injurious effects of the current trade policies of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for this Nation to insist that other nations discontinue their trade discriminations against our exports; it is also time that realistic legislative action be taken to end those trade policies that permit imports to saturate our domestic markets, destroy our jobs, and weaken our defense potential. Our American way of life must be preserved and strengthened by a new trade policy that is in the national interest and that contributes to the welfare of every American.

The Milk Price Crisis in Southeastern Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 14, 1959

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, early this spring, a number of Wisconsin Congressmen spoke on the floor of this House, pointing out the urgency of the situation existing in Wisconsin insofar as the milk market was concerned—and with particular reference to the prices Wisconsin farmers received for grade A milk.

It was a pleasure to participate in this discussion, which took place at the time the Maryland-Virginia Milk Producers Cooperative was engaged in fighting uniform standards for the interstate shipment of fluid milk. In this discussion, we Wisconsin Members, pointed out that for some unknown reason, grade A milk being produced under the highest sanitary standards existing anywhere in the Nation, was being produced in Wisconsin and being sold on the Chicago milk market—or Chicago milkshed as it is commonly known—for $2 less per hundredweight than milk sold on the eastern and southern markets. I inserted in the RECORD on March 9, 1959, page 3238, a letter from the Pure Milk Association, Chicago, Ill., to the effect that the PMA could deliver grade A Wisconsin milk, meeting these highest standards, to the District of Columbia area for $1.02 less per hundredweight than the Washington dairies were paying for milk from the Maryland-Virginia

Milk Producers Co-op. This price, on Wisconsin milk, was after the cost of shipping—about $1 per hundredweight—had been paid.

We, from Wisconsin, could see no reason then and see no reason now why we should sell milk in the Chicago milk market for $2 less than what the same milk would bring in the eastern and southern markets. Wisconsin does not want to engage in tactics which would cause the prices in the eastern and southern markets to come down to the Chicago level when the economic facts are that the Chicago market prices to the farmers should be higher. The discrepancy in prices comes from the fact that the Department of Agriculture, in issuing its marketing orders, uses one formula for basing the price in the East and South and another formula for basing the price in the Chicago and other Midwest markets.

In order to correct this situation, we asked the Department of Agriculture to hold hearings in Chicago so the Pure Milk Association, the Pure Milk Products Cooperative and all other interested organizations and individuals could appear and offer testimony to establish the need for a higher price in the Chicago area and for the use of a different pricing formula. I was only too glad to join in this request with the other Wisconsin Congressmen.

However, the Department of Agriculture refused to hold any hearings and insisted that the Chicago milk price formula continue to be applied. I have been in constant touch with the Pure Milk Association of which a constituent of mine, Arnie Agnew of Milton, Wis., is vice president, and with other associations, and there has been no improvement whatever in the Chicago milk price situation and no constructive action has been taken by the Department of Agriculture.

As a result, while as announced this week by Mr. Benson, the net farm income of all farmers in the Nation has dropped 12 percent in 1959 from a comparable period in 1958, the income of the dairy farmer has dropped even more than 12 percent. With the dairy farmer caught in the price squeeze—costs going up and income going down—these dairymen are unable to meet their bills with their monthly milk checks. They are operating at a loss and the situation in my district in southeastern Wisconsin has become so acute that the sound, conservative, hardworking, old-established dairymen, farmers who are not given to threats or violence, have recently met at Evansville, Wis., to discuss their mutual problem. The result of this meeting is that these same farmers have been giving serious consideration to starting a milk strike. This will be a strike that is justified in every economic respect. It will be a strike that the most fairminded and reasonable person will admit is long overdue. If this strike occurs, as it now appears likely, I predict it will spread from the First Congressional District of Wisconsin to milk-producing areas in Illinois, Minnesota, Ohio, and Michigan. We must remember that the last price increase which dairy farmers received under the milk marketing order administered by Mr. Benson, did not come until the Michigan dairy farmers went on strike and tied up the Detroit milk supply.

I have been interested in an editorial on this subject published by the Janesville Gazette of Janesville, Wis. This paper, which has historically and uniformly supported the Republican Party and its policies, has come out on the side of the dairy farmer, even though the Secretary of Agriculture is a Republican, because the Gazette knows the merits of the case presented by the dairy farmers and knows their financial distress in the area.

A milk strike seems a high price to pay to secure a fair return to keep pace with our present economy. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all Members of this House, that Secretary Benson not only continues to follow unsound policies with his farm program with its astronomical costs and fantastic surpluses, but he has also, in spite of economic charges, refused to schedule hearings on the Chicago milk prices and prefers to ignore the plight of the Wisconsin dairy farmer rather than listen to testimony relative to the merits of these farmers' complaints. Why should our farmers be forced to strike in order to gain recognition of their need for a price increase? Why should Secretary Benson refuse to hold the requested hearings on milk prices?

I take the time to bring this deplorable situation to the attention of the Members of Congress, in the hope of showing why it is necessary for the Wisconsin dairy farmers, in the Chicago milk market, to take the extreme step of giving serious consideration to a milk strike in order to secure for themselves fair treatment and a decent income. I sincerely hope that in this crisis we can operate under the rules of law and reason and not under the rule of economic pressure which would prevail in the event of a milk strike. I call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to act on the dairy farmers' request for hearings on the Chicago milk prices and the pricing formula. I call upon him to act and not to let the situation get out of hand by arbitrarily refusing to act even though duty and responsibility dictate that he should act.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Resolution 198, 86th Congress, 1st session, on September 30, 1959, the Vice President approved the appointment of the following Senators to represent the Senate as a special committee at the ceremonies to be held in Honolulu, Hawaii, on November 26, 1959, to commemorate the first official observance of the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a State: Mr. MANSFIELD, chairman, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. FONG, ex officio, and Mr. LONG of Hawaii, ex officio.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer, plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U. S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*.....6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....3840 Lorcom Lane, Arlington, Va.
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Fong, Hiram L, *Hawaii*.....
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*.....University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*.....
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*.....5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*.....
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Langer, William, *N. Dak*.....2101 Conn. Ave.
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*.....The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*.....
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
Neuberger, Richard L., *Oreg.*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*.....Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*.....
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*.....
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*.....
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Williams of Delaware, and Schoeppel.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Cotton, and Curtis.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Langer, Aiken, Capehart, and Carlson.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Capehart.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Neuberger, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Langer, Dirksen, Hruska, and Keating.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Cooper, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Neuberger, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Carlson, Langer, and Morton.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Neuberger, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Morton, and Keating.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS
JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.
First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.
Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.
Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.
Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.
Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.
Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.
Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.
Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.
Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.
Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Committee on Agriculture

Messrs. Cooley (chairman), Poage, Grant, Gathings, McMillan, Abernethy, Albert, Abbitt, Thompson of Texas, Jones of Missouri, Hagen, Johnson of Wisconsin, Bass of Tennessee, Jennings, Matthews, McGovern, Coad, Breeding, Stubblefield, McSween, Hogan, Levering, Hoeven, Dague, Belcher, McIntire, Dixon, Smith of Kansas, Teague of California, Quie, Short, Mrs. May, Messrs. Pirnie, Latta, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Cannon (chairman), Mahon, Sheppard, Thomas, Kirwan, Norrell, Whitten, Andrews, Rooney, Gary, Fogarty, Sikes, Preston, Passman, Rabaut, Yates, Marshall, Riley, Evins, Shelley, Boland, Magnuson, Natcher, Flood, Denton, Steed, Alexander, Boyle, Santangelo, Montoya, Taber, Jensen, Andersen of Minnesota, Horan, Canfield, Fenton, Ford, Ostertag, Bow, Jonas, Laird, Cederberg, Lipscomb, Rhodes, Pillion, Weaver, Minshall, Thomson of Wyoming, Michel, and Conte.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Vinson (chairman), Kilday, Durham, Rivers of South Carolina, Philbin, Hébert, Winstead, Price, Fisher, Hardy, Doyle, Bennett, Lankford, Huddleston, Byrne of Pennsylvania, Morris of Oklahoma, Kitchin, Anderson of Montana, Brewster, Kowalski, Wampler, Stratton, Cohelan, Arends, Gavin, Norblad, Van Zandt, Bates, Hess, O'Konski, Bray, Wilson, Osmers, Mrs. St. George, Messrs. Gubser, Becker, Chamberlain, and Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Spence (chairman), Brown of Georgia, Patman, Rains, Multer, Addonizio, Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Ashley, Vanik, Rutherford, Barr, Burke of Massachusetts, Moorhead, Clem Miller, Johnson of Colorado, Inouye, Kilburn, McDonough, Widnall, Hiestand, Bass of New Hampshire, Siler, Fino, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Derwinski, Halpern, and Milliken.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. McMillan (chairman), Abernethy, Smith of Virginia, Davis of Georgia, Morrison, Dawson, Williams, Wier, Multer, Dowdy, Matthews, Loser, Harmon, Foley, Irwin, Morris of New Mexico, Auchincloss, Kearns, Broyhill, Springer, Nelsen, O'Konski, Smith of Kansas, Derounian, and Mrs. Weis.

Committee on Education and Labor

Messrs. Barden (chairman), Powell, Bailey, Perkins, Wier, Elliott, Landrum, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Roosevelt, Zelenko, Thompson of New Jersey, Udall, Holland, Teller, Dent, Pucinski, Daniels, Brademas, Gialmo, O'Hara of Michigan, Kearns, Hoffman, Holt, Wainwright, Frelinghuysen, Ayres, Griffin, Lafore, Hiestand, and Quie.

Committee on Foreign Affairs

Messrs. Morgan (chairman), Carnahan, Zablocki, Burleson, Mrs. Kelly, Messrs. Hays, Selden, Pilcher, O'Hara of Illinois, Fountain, Fascell, Coffin, Farbstein, Saund, Diggs, Beckworth, McDowell, Murphy, Meyer, Gallagher, Bowles, Chiperfield, Mrs. Bolton, Messrs. Merrow, Judd, Fulton, Jackson, Mrs. Church, Messrs. Adair, Bentley, Curtis of Massachusetts, and Wainwright.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. Dawson (chairman), Holifield, McCormack, Brooks of Texas, Fountain, Hardy, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Garmatz, Moss, Kilgore, Fascell, Mrs. Griffiths, Messrs. Reuss, Brooks of Louisiana, Mrs. Kee, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Monagan, Smith of Iowa, Hoffman, Riehlman, Meader, Brown of Ohio, Mrs. Dwyer, Messrs. Holt, Griffin, Wallhauser, Mrs. Weis, Messrs. Langen, and Barry.

Committee on House Administration

Messrs. Burleson (chairman), Friedel, Ashmore, Hays of Ohio, Jones of Missouri, Rhodes, Lesinski, Smith of Mississippi, Thompson of New Jersey, Abbitt, Elliott, Mrs. Green of Oregon, Messrs. Everett, Slack, Casey, Carter, Schenck, Corbett, Bennett of Michigan, Lipscomb, Mailliard, Curtin, Mrs. Simpson of Illinois, Messrs. Chamberlain, and Goodell.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Aspinall (chairman), O'Brien of New York, Rogers of Texas, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Haley, Powell, Edmondson, Sisk, Udall, Rutherford, Baring, Ullman, Anderson of Montana, Saund, McGinley, Morris of New Mexico, Rivers of Alaska, Burdick, Randall, Saylor, Wharton, Berry, Westland, Hosmer, Chenoweth, Collier, Withrow, Wilson, Cunningham, Langen, Mrs. Simpson of Illinois, and Mr. Fernós-Isern.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Harris (chairman), Williams, Mack of Illinois, Roberts, Moulder, Staggers, Rogers of Texas, Friedel, Flynt, Macdonald, Rhodes of Pennsylvania, Jarman, O'Brien of New York, Moss, Dingell, Kilgore, Rogers of Florida, Hemphill, Rostenkowski, Brock, Healey, Bennett of Michigan, Springer, Bush, Schenck, Derounian, Younger, Avery, Collier, Glenn, Devine, Nelson, and Keith.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Celler (chairman), Walter, Lane, Feighan, Chelf, Willis, Rodino, Forrester, Rogers of Colorado, Donohue, Brooks of Texas, Tuck, Ashmore, Dowdy, Holtzman, Whitener, Libonati, Loser, Toll, Kastenmeier, Kasem, McCulloch, Miller of New York, Poff, Cramer, Moore, Smith of California, Meader, Henderson, Lindsay, Cahill, and Ray.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries

Messrs. Bonner (chairman), Boykin, Garmatz, Mrs. Sullivan, Messrs. Thompson of Louisiana, George P. Miller, Zelenko, Clark, Ashley, Dingell, Rivers of South Carolina, Macdonald, Lennon, Nix, Anfuso, Oliver, Downing, Flynn, Casey, Johnson of Maryland, Tollefson, Van Pelt, Ray, Mailliard, Dorn of New York, Pelly, Baumhart, Gross, Curtin, Glenn, and Hoffman of Illinois.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Morrison, Davis of Georgia, Lesinski, Holifield, Mrs. Granahan, Messrs. Porter, Scott, Shipley, Dulski, Prokop, Foley, Irwin, Harmon, Alford, Oliver, Rees of Kansas, Corbett, Gross, Broyhill, Johansen, Cunningham, Wallhauser, Barry, and Mrs. St. George.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Buckley (chairman), Fallon, Davis of Tennessee, Blatnik, Jones of Alabama, Smith of Mississippi, Kluczynski, Thompson of Louisiana, Mrs. Blitch, Messrs. Wright, Hull, Gray, Clark, Edmondson, McFall, Brown of Missouri, Mrs. Pfost, Messrs. Young, Hargis, Burke of Kentucky, Johnson of California, Cook, Auchincloss, Mack of Washington, Scherer, Withrow, Cramer, Baldwin, Schwengel, Dooley, Broomfield, Robison, Taylor, and Mumma.

Committee on Rules

Messrs. Smith of Virginia (chairman), Colmer, Madden, Delaney, Trimble, Thornberry, Bolling, O'Neill, Allen, Brown of Ohio, Reece of Tennessee, and Budge.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

Messrs. Brooks (chairman), McCormack, George P. Miller, Teague of Texas, Anfuso, Sisk, Mitchell, Quigley, Hall, Wolf, Karth, Hechler, Daddario, Moeller, King, Roush, Martin, Fulton, McDonough, Chenoweth, Osmers, Van Pelt, Baumhart, Bass of New Hampshire, and Riehlman.

Committee on Un-American Activities

Messrs. Walter (chairman), Moulder, Doyle, Willis, Tuck, Jackson, Scherer, Miller of New York, and Johansen.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs

Messrs. Teague of Texas (chairman), Dorn of South Carolina, Mrs. Kee, Messrs. Boykin, Haley, Baring, Mitchell, Everett, Nix, Quigley, Slack, Flynn, Dulski, Carter, George, Randall, Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts, Messrs. Ayres, Adair, Fino, Saylor, Smith of California, Teague of California, Halpern, ———.

Committee on Ways and Means

Messrs. Mills (chairman), Forand, King, O'Brien, Boggs, Keogh, Harrison, Karsten, Herlong, Ikard, Machrowicz, Frazier, Green of Pennsylvania, Watts, Metcalf, Simpson of Pennsylvania, Mason, Byrnes of Wisconsin, Baker, Curtis of Missouri, Knox, Utt, Betts, Alger, and Bosch.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

(United States Court House, 3d and Constitution Ave.)

Office telephone	*Chief Judge*	*Residence telephone*
	E. Barrett Prettyman, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Oliver 2-3263
	Circuit Judges	
	Henry White Edgerton, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6017
	Wilbur K. Miller, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		North 7-8109
	David L. Bazelon, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-5047
	Charles Fahy, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-6267
	George T. Washington, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-8653
	John A. Danaher, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 3-8315
	Walter M. Bastian, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Emerson 2-4343
	Warren E. Burger, Washington 1, D. C.	
Sterling 3-5700		Jefferson 3-1347

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

(Internal Revenue Building. Phone, National 8-4696)

Chief Judge—Eugene Worley, of Texas, 4745 32d St., North, Arlington, Va.
Judge—Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, Hunting Towers, Alexandria, Va.
Judge—Giles S. Rich, of New York, 4949 Linnean Ave.
Judge—I. Jack Martin, of Ohio, 9614 Hillridge Dr., Rock Creek Hills, Kensington, Md.
Judge—Arthur M. Smith, of Michigan.

THE UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS

(Pennsylvania Ave. and 17th St. Phone, District 7-0642)

Chief Judge—Marvin Jones, of Texas, University Club.
Judge—Samuel E. Whitaker, of Tennessee, 4921 Quebec St.
Judge—J. Warren Madden, of Pennsylvania, 300 East Broad St., Falls Church, Va.
Judge—Don N. Laramore, of Indiana, 5017 Scarsdale Rd., Sumner, Md.
(Vacancy)

EMERGENCY COURT OF APPEALS

Washington 1, D. C.

Chief Judge—Albert B. Maris, Philadelphia 7, Pa. (United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.)
Judge—Calvert Magruder, Boston 9, Mass. (Chief Judge, United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.)
Judge—Thomas F. McAllister, Grand Rapids, Mich. (United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.)
(Vacancy)
(Vacancy)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

District of Columbia

(Washington 1, D. C.)

Chief Judge David A. Pine

Judges

F. Dickinson Letts	Charles F. McLaughlin
James W. Morris	Burnita S. Matthews
Matthew F. McGuire	Luther W. Youngdahl
Alexander Holtzoff	Joseph C. McGarraghy
Richmond B. Keech	John J. Sirica
Edward M. Curran	George L. Hart
Edward A. Tamm	Leonard P. Walsh

UNITED STATES COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

(United States Court of Military Appeals Building, 5th and E Sts. NW.)

Phone, Liberty 5-6700

Chief Judge	Robert E. Quinn
Judge	George W. Latimer
Judge	Homer Ferguson
Commissioner	Richard L. Tedrow
Clerk	Alfred C. Proulx

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Boyle, Charles A., *Ill.*
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Bush, Alvin R., *Pa.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Carter, Steven V., *Iowa*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 2400 Tilden St.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio*
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2480 16th St.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Dollinger, Isidore, *N. Y.*
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.*
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, S[illegible]el N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.* 6377 31st Pl.
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.*
George, Newell A., *Kans.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.*
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, David M., *N. C.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* The Coronet
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*

Lane, Thomas J., *Mass.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Lankford, Richard E., *Md.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Lennon, Alton, *N. C.*
Lesinski, John, *Mich.*
Levering, Robert W., *Ohio.*
Libonati, Roland V., *Ill.*
Lindsay, John V., *N. Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*
Loser, J. Carlton, *Tenn.*—The Congressional
McCormack, John W., *Mass.*—The Washington
McCulloch, William M., *Ohio*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McDonough, Gordon L., *Calif.*
McDowell, Harris B., Jr., *Del.*
McFall, John J., *Calif.*—507 Robinson Ct., Alexandria, Va.
McGinley, Donald F., *Nebr.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
McGovern, George S., *S. Dak.*
McIntire, Clifford G., *Maine*—220 2d St. SE.
McMillan, John L., *S. C.*
McSween, Harold B., *La.*
Macdonald, Torbert H., *Mass.*
Machrowicz, Thaddeus M., *Mich.*—115 Dale Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Mack, Peter F., Jr., *Ill.*
Mack, Russell V., *Wash.*
Madden, Ray J., *Ind.*
Magnuson, Don, *Wash.*
Mahon, George H., *Tex.*—Alban Towers
Mailliard, William S., *Calif.*
Marshall, Fred, *Minn.*
Martin, Joseph W., Jr., *Mass.*—The Hay-Adams
Mason, Noah M., *Ill.*—The Baronet
Matthews, D. R. (Billy), *Fla.*
May, Catherine, *Wash.*
Meader, George, *Mich.*—3360 Tennyson St.
Merrow, Chester E., *N. H.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.*
Meyer, William H., *Vt.*
Michel, Robert H., *Ill.*
Miller, Clem, *Calif.*
Miller, George P., *Calif.*
Miller, William E., *N. Y.*—6605 Radnor Rd., Bethesda, Md.
Milliken, William H., Jr., *Pa.*
Mills, Wilbur D., *Ark.*—2701 Conn. Ave.
Minshall, William E., *Ohio.*—8120 Kerry Lane, Chevy Chase, Md.
Mitchell, Erwin, *Ga.*
Moeller, Walter H., *Ohio.*
Monagan, John S., *Conn.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Moore, Arch A., Jr., *W. Va.*
Moorhead, William S., *Pa.*
Morgan, Thomas E., *Pa.*
Morris, Thomas G., *N. Mex.*
Morris, Toby, *Okla.*—220 2d St. SE.
Morrison, James H., *La.*—4301 Mass. Ave.
Moss, John E., *Calif.*—204 Jefferson St., Alexandria, Va.
Moulder, Morgan M., *Mo.*
Multer, Abraham J., *N. Y.*
Mumma, Walter M., *Pa.*—The Coronet
Murphy, William T., *Ill.*
Murray, Tom, *Tenn.*
Natcher, William H., *Ky.*
Nelsen, Ancher, *Minn.*
Nix, Robert N. C., *Pa.*
Norblad, Walter, *Oreg.*
Norrell, W. F., *Ark.*—2301 Conn. Ave.
O'Brien, Leo W., *N. Y.*
O'Brien, Thomas J., *Ill.*—The Hamilton
O'Hara, Barratt, *Ill.*—The Congressional
O'Hara, James G., *Mich.*
O'Konski, Alvin E., *Wis.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
O'Neill, Thos. P., Jr., *Mass.*
Oliver, James C., *Maine.*
Osmers, Frank C., Jr., *N. J.*
Ostertag, Harold C., *N. Y.*—2480 16th St.
Passman, Otto E., *La.*
Patman, Wright, *Tex.*—117 Carroll St. SE.
Pelly, Thomas M., *Wash.*
Perkins, Carl D., *Ky.*
Pfost, Gracie (Mrs.), *Idaho.*
Philbin, Philip J., *Mass.*
Pilcher, J. L., *Ga.*
Pillion, John R., *N. Y.*
Pirnie, Alexander, *N. Y.*
Poage, W. R., *Tex.*—228 2d St. SE.
Poff, Richard H., *Va.*
Porter, Charles O., *Oreg.*—6338 32d St.
Powell, Adam C., *N. Y.*
Preston, Prince H., *Ga.*
Price, Melvin, *Ill.*
Prokop, Stanley A., *Pa.*
Pucinski, Roman C., *Ill.*
Quie, Albert H., *Minn.*—The Coronet Apt., 200 C St. SE.
Quigley, James M., *Pa.*
Rabaut, Louis C., *Mich.*
Rains, Albert, *Ala.*
Randall, Wm. J., *Mo.*
Ray, John H., *N. Y.*
Rayburn, Sam, *Tex.*
Reece, B. Carroll, *Tenn.*
Rees, Edward H., *Kans.*—1801 16th St.
Reuss, Henry S., *Wis.*—6448 Brooks Lane
Rhodes, George M., *Pa.*—5603 24th Ave. SE., Hillcrest Hgts., Wash. 21, D. C.
Rhodes, John J., *Ariz.*
Riehlman, R. Walter, *N. Y.*—3210 Wis. Ave.
Riley, John J., *S. C.*
Rivers, L. Mendel, *S. C.*
Rivers, Ralph J., *Alaska.*
Roberts, Kenneth A., *Ala.*—6102 Cromwell Dr.
Robison, Howard W., *N. Y.*
Rodino, Peter W., Jr., *N. J.*
Rogers, Byron G., *Colo.*
Rogers, Edith Nourse (Mrs.), *Mass.*—The Shoreham
Rogers, Paul G., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Rogers, Walter, *Tex.*
Rooney, John J., *N. Y.*
Roosevelt, James, *Calif.*
Rostenkowski, Dan, *Ill.*
Roush, J. Edward, *Ind.*
Rutherford, J. T., *Tex.*
Santangelo, Alfred E., *N. Y.*
St. George, Katharine (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Saund, D. S. (Judge), *Calif.*
Saylor, John P., *Pa.*
Schenck, Paul F., *Ohio.*—2601 Woodley Pl.
Scherer, Gordon H., *Ohio.*
Schwengel, Fred, *Iowa.*
Scott, Ralph J., *N. C.*
Selden, Armistead I., Jr., *Ala.*—433 Valley Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Shelley, John F., *Calif.*
Sheppard, Harry R., *Calif.*
Shipley, George E., *Ill.*
Short, Don L., *N. Dak.*
Sikes, Robert L. F., *Fla.*
Siler, Eugene, *Ky.*
Simpson, Edna Oakes, *Ill.*
Simpson, Richard M., *Pa.*—5205 Lawn Way, Chevy Chase, Md.
Sisk, B. F., *Calif.*—129 6th St. NE.
Slack, John M., Jr., *W. Va.*
Smith, Frank E., *Miss.*
Smith, H. Allen, *Calif.*
Smith, Howard W., *Va.*—204 W. Walnut St., Alexandria, Va.
Smith, Neal, *Iowa.*
Smith, Wint, *Kans.*
Spence, Brent, *Ky.*—Sheraton-Park
Springer, William L., *Ill.*
Staggers, Harley O., *W. Va.*
Steed, Tom, *Okla.*
Stratton, Samuel S., *N. Y.*
Stubblefield, Frank A., *Ky.*
Sullivan, Leonor K. (Mrs. John B.), *Mo.*
Taber, John, *N. Y.*
Taylor, Dean P., *N. Y.*
Teague, Charles M., *Calif.*
Teague, Olin E., *Tex.*—6015 Mass. Avé.
Teller, Ludwig, *N. Y.*—Mayflower Hotel
Thomas, Albert, *Tex.*—2901 34th St.
Thompson, Clark W., *Tex.*—3301 Mass. Ave.
Thompson, Frank, Jr., *N. J.*
Thompson, T. A., *La.*—1600 Kenwood Av., Alexandria, Va.
Thomson, Keith, *Wyo.*
Thornberry, Homer, *Tex.*
Toll, Herman, *Pa.*
Tollefson, Thor C., *Wash.*
Trimble, James W., *Ark.*
Tuck, William M., *Va.*
Udall, Stewart L., *Ariz.*
Ullman, Al, *Oreg.*
Utt, James B., *Calif.*
Vanik, Charles A., *Ohio.*
Van Pelt, William K., *Wis.*
Van Zandt, James E., *Pa.*—Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Vinson, Carl, *Ga.*—4 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Wainwright, Stuyvesant, *N. Y.*
Wallhauser, George M., *N. J.*
Walter, Francis E., *Pa.*
Wampler, Fred, *Ind.*
Watts, John C., *Ky.*
Weaver, Phil, *Nebr.*—9408 Crosby Rd., Silver Spring, Md.
Weis, Jessica McC., *N. Y.*
Westland, Jack, *Wash.*
Wharton, J. Ernest, *N. Y.*
Whitener, Basil L., *N. C.*
Whitten, Jamie L., *Miss.*—5804 Nebraska Ave.
Widnall, William B., *N. J.*
Wier, Roy W., *Minn.*
Williams, John Bell, *Miss.*—1001 26th Rd. S., Arlington, Va.
Willis, Edwin E., *La.*
Wilson, Robert C. (Bob), *Calif.*
Winstead, Arthur, *Miss.*
Withrow, Gardner R., *Wis.*
Wolf, Leonard G., *Iowa.*
Wright, Jim, *Tex.*
Yates, Sidney R., *Ill.*
Young, John, *Tex.*
Younger, J. Arthur, *Calif.*—4545 Conn. Ave.
Zablocki, Clement J., *Wis.*
Zelenko, Herbert, *N. Y.*

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER

Fernós-Isern, A., *P. R.*—2210 R St.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Clerk—Ralph R. Roberts.
Sergeant at Arms—Zeake W. Johnson, Jr.
Doorkeeper—William M. Miller, 3119 N. Harrison St., Arlington 7, Va.
Chaplain—Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., 1421 Montague St.
Postmaster—H. H. Morris.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

SENATE

James W. Murphy, 7 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.
John D. Rhodes, 3535 Williamsburg Lane.
Gregor Macpherson, 3111 44th St.
Herbert N. Budlong, Kurtz Rd., McLean, Va.
Charles J. Drescher, 3738 North 4th St., Arlington, Va.
Francis J. Attig, 3919 Livingston St.
Nicholas J. Cinciotta, 216 Normandy Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Julian R. Series, Jr., 4225 North 31st St., Arlington, Va.
Elmer L. Koons (assistant), 826 Aspen St.
Willard W. Pruett (clerk), 701 North Harrison St., Arlington, Va.
Placidino Zagami (clerk), 5805 10th Place, Chillum, Md.

HOUSE

W. L. Fenstermacher, 2929 Connecticut Ave.
Roy L. Whitman, 6101 16th St. NW.
F. S. Milberg, 3 Pooks Hill Road, Bethesda, Md.
E. B. Clark, 604 Bennington Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Frank E. Battaglia, 957 East-West Highway.
Claude S. Scheckel, 6 East Blackthorne St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Albert Schneider, 5420 Connecticut Ave.
Sidney W. Williston (clerk), 1890 Longford Drive, Hyattsville, Md.
Bjarne J. Sigurdsen (assistant clerk), 1021 U Place SE.
James W. Lea (assistant clerk), 5055 Dixon St., Oxon Run Hills, Md.